



Review: [Untitled]

Reviewed Work(s):

Répertoire Géographique des Textes Cunéiformes, Band 6: Die Orts- und Gewässernamen der hethitischen Texte by Giuseppe F. del Monte; Johann Tischler

Harry A. Hoffner, Jr.

Journal of the American Oriental Society, Vol. 100, No. 2. (Apr. - Jun., 1980), pp. 192-194.

Stable URL:

<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0003-0279%28198004%2F06%29100%3A2%3C192%3ARGDTCB%3E2.0.CO%3B2-H>

Journal of the American Oriental Society is currently published by American Oriental Society.

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/aos.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.

The JSTOR Archive is a trusted digital repository providing for long-term preservation and access to leading academic journals and scholarly literature from around the world. The Archive is supported by libraries, scholarly societies, publishers, and foundations. It is an initiative of JSTOR, a not-for-profit organization with a mission to help the scholarly community take advantage of advances in technology. For more information regarding JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

priestly recognition of the role of the prophet in the interpretation of the law (p. 93). The canon, he thus argues, is 'prophetic'—albeit in a transformed sense.

Blenkinsopp goes on to argue that the addition of the prophetic corpus to the Pentateuch reflects further accommodations between priests and prophets. Although prophecy was in eclipse, the canonization of prophecy went hand-in-hand with a growing eschatologization of older oracles (p. 108ff.). This emphasis on future hope led to a new accommodation with the priestly emphasis on law—a resolution evident in the concluding vv. of Malachi 3, which closes the prophetic canon (p. 116). Future hope and emphasis on the law could co-exist. The final index of the relation between law and prophecy is evident in the addition of the Writings: this conglomerate of writings is, argues Blenkinsopp, an attempt to indicate, through a cross-section of texts, how the prophetic dimension could be preserved in new circumstances. Thus, in Prov. 1-9, Wisdom takes over prophetic exhortatory tasks; whereas Chronicles is an attempt to show that history fulfills prophecy, i.e. serves older prophetic functions. (p. 131).

Blenkinsopp has made many bold hypotheses and provided a new framework for evaluating and discerning the process of canonization. But it seems to this reviewer that many of his claims are either supposititious or put too much weight on the available evidence. Thus, there is no reason to see in Deut. a reaction to "free prophecy" rather than an attempt to signify important aspects of prophecy; nor is the notion "free prophecy" clear—for certainly the classical prophets speak on behalf of the covenant and nowhere claim independent authority owing to new revelations. In fact, even where prophets reinterpret older laws, they do so by extending their context or reference, never by subverting the original authority (see my "Torah and Tradition" in *Theology and Tradition*, ed. D. Knight, 275-300). As regards the P literature, Blenkinsopp has admirably traced certain structures, but his view that the narratives of the Flood and Tabernacle are actually allegories of the exile, which level a critique of Marduk's temple in Babylon, is without foundation; moreover, his claim that P (in Joshua) actually refers to the settlement is a bold—though undeveloped—hypothesis, and does not go on to explain why, if P's emphasis of Flood-Tabernacle-Land (in similar terms) allegorizes the exile and return, P closes the Pentateuch at Deut.!

It is also unclear why or how one should agree that P attempted to take over Deut.'s charismatic models (pp. 75, 79, 85)—for parallel traditions of revelation in prophetic (intuitive) and priestly (mantic) circles undoubtedly co-existed. Further, the whole claim that one may infer from the end of Deut. that P was suggesting an accommodation between a fixed Torah and open prophecy, the latter serving as the mediating/interpreting agent, is without clear indication in

the MT; and it is similarly supposititious to argue that the placement of the prophetic corpus after the Torah is a compromise tactic, sanctioning the prophets as commentators of the Torah (p. 116). Blenkinsopp's point regarding the eschatologization of prophecy is, however, well-taken; but one nevertheless wonders whether this point bears more on issues of redaction criticism than those of canon criticism as it has begun to develop. In fact, Blenkinsopp does not deal with canon criticism in relation to the prophetic corpus (cf. Child's recent piece in *Interpretation* 32 (1978), 46-55. Also unnoticed in this regard are those hermeneutical features within the Hebrew Bible reflecting a canonical consciousness of sorts (cf. my article, above, and forthcoming in *JBL*, 1980).

In all these and other matters opinions will differ and Blenkinsopp's book will stimulate discussion. And, if there is no strong evidence for many details argued, the suggestiveness of the over-all framework and argument will no doubt stimulate new attempts at solution. More significantly, Blenkinsopp's work raises the important point that any history of the religion of Israel must take into account the origin and formation of the canon as an historical and theological problem; indeed, the history of this religion must be appreciated in terms of its multiple tensions, and its reworking of old traditions in response to new claims (p. 141). For posing this issue within a suggestive cognitive and historical framework, Blenkinsopp has put us in his debt.

MICHAEL FISHBANE

BRANDEIS UNIVERSITY

Répertoire Géographique des Textes Cunéiformes, Band 6: Die Orts- und Gewässernamen der hethitischen Texte. By GIUSEPPE F. DEL MONTE UND JOHANN TISCHLER. Pp. xvii + 596. [Beihefte zum Tübinger Atlas des Vorderen Orients, Reihe B, No. 7.] Wiesbaden: DR. LUDWIG REICHERT VERLAG. 1978. DM 74.

Only five years after the publication (in 1973) of Hayri Ertem's *Boğazköy metinlerinde geçen coğrafya adları dizini* (List of Geographical Names Occurring in the Boğazköy Texts) a new handbook of geographical names based upon documents of the Hittites (including those composed in Akkadian) has appeared. This 596-page volume, which forms Volume 6 of the *Répertoire Géographique des Textes Cunéiformes* edited by Wolfgang Röllig, has been produced by Giuseppe F. del Monte and Johann Tischler. The bulk of the volume (519 pp.) contains a catalogue of the "Ortsnamen" (city, country, and mountain names) prepared by del Monte. The last 40 pages contains a catalogue of "Gewässernamen" (river and spring names) prepared by Tischler. 36

pages of detailed indices and a foldout map conclude the volume. Although the collaboration of the two scholars was obviously advantageous for the production of a complete coverage, it would have been better if the two men had followed the same methods and utilized the same complete corpus. Del Monte used only published texts inclusive of KUB 44 and KBo 22, even deciding not to use published references to GNs in unpublished texts because only the published copy allows for control on the transliteration and a context for determining location, etc. This shows admirable restraint, even if it denies to the users data available in the scholarly literature which could be used with caution. Tischler, on the other hand, had access to the Marburg files of Professor Heinrich Otten and permission to use materials from unpublished texts found therein.

The methods of the two men also differ, even if only slightly. Del Monte indicates the context of the occurrences through German translations; Tischler transliterates the immediate context without translation. Del Monte makes full, and generally good use of cross referencing; Tischler makes far too little use of it. Even when the same name occurs as a "Gewässernamen" and an "Ortsnamen" (e.g., Harranašša is both a spring, TÚL, and a mountain, HUR.SAG), he makes no cross-reference to del Monte's entry.

It seems to me that two questions need to be answered about this book: (1) How does it compare with the only other similar manual available (Ertem's) in completeness and accuracy of data? and (2) How well does this volume succeed in what it has tried to do?

The del Monte-Tischler book (hereafter: RGTC 6) is three times the size of the Ertem book. Ertem was able to use KBo 1-20, KUB 1-40 and the other smaller series of cuneiform texts. RGTC 6 could use six additional volumes of published texts and (in Tischler's case) also unpublished texts from Marburg. But the increased size of RGTC 6 is due more to a fuller treatment than simply more references. While Ertem gave the names in broad transcription in the lemma and only references and brief bibliography beyond that, RGTC 6 offers a more sensibly alphabetized scheme of lemmata (merging g/k, b/p, etc., and ignoring consonantal doubling as a factor in alphabetization), fully transliterated names, some indication of immediate context (del Monte by translations, Tischler by transliteration), discussion which extends beyond the question of localization to include material culture, economy, pantheon, cult, and bibliography. In accuracy of citations the two books are about equal: neither attains the level of accuracy which one has the right to expect of a reference tool. In both cases users must be advised to check all references against the cuneiform copies.

As to an evaluation of RGTC 6 on its own, I offer the following remarks. To test the volume's accuracy I sampled

sections. In the first 29 pages (through Araphi) I noted the following: ^{URU}A-ia-ak-IZ-az KBo 15.29 iii 12 is listed only under Akkade but with no cross reference under its own spelling, spellings of ^{URU}A.GA.DĒ with Hittite complimentation such as KBo 22.6 iv 27, gentilic ^{URU}A-la-nu-ma-aš "LAMMA KUB 2.1 i 45 (registered in Ertem as separate entry, belongs under Alana), ^{URU}Am-ma-ha-az (abl.) KUB 15.35 + KBo 2.9 i 35, ^{HUR.SAG}A-mar-za-ki-na Merzifon 2 rev. 12 (JRAS 1907, 920) with "dup." pappenna A-am-mar-za-ak-ki-na KUB 40.97 iv3 (misread RGTC 6, 17 as A-ne-me-za-ak cf. Dinçol, JCS 24 30), ^{URU}Am-ga-az (abl.) KUB 15.34 + KBo 2.9 i 33 (= KBo 2.9 i 7), ^{URU}An-ka-ta-ha KBo 2.31 rev! 15 = ^{URU}An-na-ta-ha HT 2 iii 12, ^{URU}An-zu(sic)-uš-na KBo 14.21 i 15 deserves a lemma in [] with cross-reference to Ankušna, correct to ^{URU}A-ap-pa-ia KBo 10.2 i 53 sub Apaja, ^{URU}Ap-pa-ri-[a- KBo 14.79 iii 3, ^{KUR}A-pi-šu-uš-š[KUB 23:22:5', ^{HUR.SAG}Ap?-ri?-ga-ak-x[Merzifon 2 rev. 8 (JRAS 1907, 920; JCS 24 29f.), under Araphi correct to ^{URU}A-ar-ra-ap-hi-ni KBo 21.28 i 5'. Other additions could be made from texts which have been published after RGTC 6 went to press, but they would have no bearing on the accuracy of this book. In addition to omitted names, however, I discovered other inaccuracies in the above-mentioned section. Under Ajala the cross reference should be to Mililija on p. 268, not Hililija for which there exists no entry. Under Ailanuwa the reference should be to KUB 36.67 iii 14, not 15. Under Akkade (which should be Akata according to RGTC 6's lemma procedures) the forms called "Stf." are not intended to be syllabic for the Hittite. They should have been rendered in upper case letters like a logogram ^{URU}A.AG.GA.DĒ, etc. KBo 12.2 obv. 2 ^{URU}A.GA.DĒ-aš, which was available to the authors, should have been included and should have alerted them to the true status of these "Stf." spellings. See now also KBo 22.6 iv 27. KUB 29.4 iii 43 reads ^{URU}A-ag-ga-ta-az, and there should have been a cross-reference lemma [Aijakka] see under Akata. If the duplicate to ^{URU}A-ag-ga-ta-az has URUA-i-ia-aq-qa!-az, how is one to explain the second name? No explanation is offered.

Under Alasija: what is the basis for the strange translation "gajjātu-Droge"? Presumably it is AHw 466 on UM (= PBS) 2/2 107:37, where von Soden's "als Droge" compares with CAD K 1 sub *ka'ātu* "a list of spices". Unfortunately the various occurrences of this word are scattered in the CAD in G and K with the most important evidence yet to come in Q under *qajātu*. Among other things it is now clear from the Yale nigga B which I communicated to Civil for MSL 13 121:246 that *qajātu/gajātu* is a dish prepared by roasting barley and like Akkad. *qalītu* and *lābtu* (AHw)/*laptu* B (CAD) was used to translate Sumerian (še-)ja-a. Without citing the evidence I alluded to this in Alim. Heth. 77. That such a dish could be used to treat the sick does not, of

course, mean that it was a "Droge". Nor does the Hittite occurrence necessarily suggest it was given in the items of tribute to serve as a medicine.

The practice of translating some context for the passages in which the names occur is occasionally helpful. But in other places it is not only unnecessary, it is a waste of space and of the reader's time. For example, the long section KBo 16.68+ iii 2-25 (!), KBo 16.77:8-12, etc. tells us nothing significant about the cult of the city Ališa. Other examples could be adduced. The volume could have been more compact, without impairing its usefulness. In the interest of making the coverage of "Wirtschaft" more complete the authors could have made good use of the discussion in my *Alim. Heth.* about place names occurring in the NINDA names.

Tischler's much smaller part of the volume showed fewer inaccuracies. In my limited sampling I found the following: add ^{TUL}Al?-ni-ia-aš KUB 38.10 iv 20. Under Aranzahi: by Bo 68 I 16' he means KBo 22.6 i 16 (Bo 68/28). This need not be "Stf.", it could be locative following *ANA* and followed by šuppi ^{ID}i. ^{ID}A-ra-an-za-hi-it could be instru-mental rather than "Hurrian"; and it is usually so translated in KUB 33.120 i 32. Add ^{ID}A-ar-ša-an-ti-ia KBo 17.54 i 5? If this is not a proper name "Flowing River", but "at the flowing river", one might expect a-ar-ša-an-ti-ia ^{ID}(n)i. ^{ID} appears to be a determinative, and, if so, then one expects this to be a name. What Tischler lists, following Ünal, as a river name Azzi is to be read ^{ID}az-zi-ia "and from the river" KUB 31.101:33. "101a" is wrong, and "Rs." is not needed, since the line count is continuous on this tablet. And since this would be the only evidence for this river name, it is clear that it rests on a misreading. On Halwanna a cross reference to the mountain-name would have been useful.

This is a useful book to own. The pity is that with only a bit more time and effort it could have been made much more so. A more thorough proofreading could have removed most of the careless errors. And the authors should have added more cross references to facilitate comparisons between similar names. It could have been made more compact by the omission of unnecessary translations of contexts which contribute nothing.

Despite its shortcomings all Hittitologists and students of the ancient Near East welcome this new, fuller coverage of the geographical names from Hittite texts.

HARRY A. HOFFNER, JR.

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

ings of the name with GA and DÊ tend to be transcribed as Sumerograms. Cf. for example F. R. Kraus, *Sumerer und Akkader* (Amsterdam, 1970), 27ff.

Early Old Babylonian Documents. By STEPHEN D. SIMMONS with the collaboration of EDWIN C. KINGSBURY. Pp. x + 103 + CXXIII plates (351 copies of tablets - 158 copies of seals). [Yale Oriental Series. Babylonian Texts, vol. XIV.] New Haven and London: YALE UNIVERSITY PRESS. 1978. \$20.00.

In this book Simmons, in collaboration with E. C. Kingsbury, provides an introduction, a catalogue, indices and autographs to 351 Old Babylonian economic and legal documents together with 158 seal inscriptions from them. The documents belong to the Nies Babylonian Collection, the Yale Babylonian Collection and the Morgan Library Collection, and one tablet to the private collection of the late Dr. Douglas Rugh. Kingsbury has collaborated by assisting in compiling the catalogue and indices, making a "tentative introduction" used by Simmons in preparing the present Introduction, and by collation of the tablets.

The documents date to a period of two centuries from the end of the Third Dynasty of Ur to the rise of Hammurabi. They involve, amongst other topics, loans, real estate transactions, legal affidavits, hire contracts, adoption, surety, distraint, inheritance, commodities for cultic use, *asirum* and rations. A couple of letters are included (#69 and 317).

Simmons began working with a number of the texts included in this volume back in 1956 in connection with his Yale doctoral dissertation which was published as "Early Old Babylonian Tablets from Ḥarmal and Elsewhere" (*JCS* 13 [1959], pp. 71-93, 105-19; *JCS* 14 [1960], pp. 23-32, 49-55, 75-87, 117-25; *JCS* 15 [1961], pp. 49-58, 81-83). The scholarly world can be grateful that we at last have the autographs of the tablets transliterated and translated in that dissertation.

Simmons, who autographed all but #344 (by F. J. Stephens) and some of the seals (by E. C. Kingsbury), has provided first-class autographs, rendered with accuracy and clarity. The line numbering, however, is at times inconsistent. Frequently, scribes, when inscribing a sentence that requires a little more than one line of space, will inscribe one full line and then complete the sentence on a second line towards the right-hand side of the tablet's surface as it faces him, leaving the first part of the line blank. In such situations Simmons has sometimes numbered these two lines as one line and sometimes as two lines without any clear rationale, (e.g., 91:18 [one and a half lines counted as one line]; 92:15 [one and a half lines counted as two lines]). A major example occurs in 106 (case): 15-19. Where Simmons counts five lines

¹ I have opted for the writing as Sumerogram rather than Akkadogram, because in Assyriological literature the spell-