



Die Apologie Hattusilis III. Das Bild der Überlieferung

Review Author[s]:
Harry A. Hoffner

Journal of the American Oriental Society, Vol. 105, No. 2. (Apr. - Jun., 1985), pp.
337-339.

Stable URL:

<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0003-0279%28198504%2F06%29105%3A2%3C337%3ADAHIDB%3E2.0.CO%3B2-V>

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.

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.

the nature of current politics in Iran, this is likely to be all that we shall know for some time to come.

ELIZABETH C. STONE

STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK AT STONY BROOK

Die Apologie Hattusilis III. Das Bild der Überlieferung. By HEINRICH OTTEN. Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten. Heft 24. Wiesbaden: OTTO HARRASSOWITZ. 1981. Pp. ix + 127. 7 plates.

The Apology of Hattusili III is one of the most important texts in the Hittite archives, indeed even in the literature of the Ancient Near East. Such a status demands that it be accessible in the clearest and most accurate form to scholars outside of Hittitology.

For its day the edition of this text by Albrecht Goetze (*Hattušiliš: Der Bericht über seine Thronbesteigung nebst den Paralleltexen*. Mitteilungen der Vorderasiatisch-Aegyptischen Gesellschaft 29/3 1924) was a model of careful scholarship. It contained a full transliteration of the text with all known variants listed in footnotes to the transliteration and identified by text sigla and line numbers. Goetze's German translation of the text on the facing pages formed the basis of all subsequent translations and indeed remains the basis of Otten's translation here. The transliteration and translation of the text were followed by a detailed philological and historical commentary keyed to the line count adopted for Goetze's edition. A very full and detailed glossary contained not only all words (including the smallest particles) appearing in the Apology, but those appearing in the closely related texts *KBo* IV 12 (*CTH* 87) and *KBo* VI 29 (*CTH* 85) which Goetze had also edited in this volume. All in all, it was a very helpful organization of the material.

However, even in Goetze's day new fragments of the composition were discovered among the tablets found at Boğazköy. In 1930 Goetze published *Neue Bruchstücke zum grossen Text des Hattušiliš und den Paralleltexen* (*MVAeG* 34/2), which took account of the newly identified pieces and offered revised transliteration and translation of sections of the text. This little book (88 pages) too had commentary and a glossary. Because of the identification of new unpublished fragments of the text over the fifty years since 1930, it is obvious that a new treatment of the enlarged text is desirable. As the epigrapher of the Boğazköy Expedition who has personally made most of the new identifications and knows the contents of the unpublished Hittite fragments better than anyone else, Heinrich Otten is the best qualified person to update Goetze's edition.

The book under review is not a new edition. Otten wisely subtitled the book "Das Bild der Überlieferung," for what has been attempted is a transliteration of copy A with restorations from the other copies and a "Variantenapparat" on pages 66–80 in four parallel columns, each devoted to one of the exemplars of the text.

The parallel column format of Otten's Variantenapparat shows more clearly than the traditional variant apparatus in footnotes the differences in wording of the various manuscripts of the text. Even so, the absence of line numbers in the columns devoted to copies B, C, D, etc. and the separation of this Variantenapparat from the connected transliteration of copy A on pages 4–28 is an inconvenience which ought to have been avoided. The correspondence of the line numbers can be found in the "Konkordanz" on pages 43–53, but why this had to be presented separately from the Variantenapparat remains a mystery. If Otten was seeking a better way to represent the exact wording of each manuscript and the relationships between these, one wonders why he did not use the "Partitur" (or "Score") Method. This method is now being employed by many Assyriologists whose requirements are the same as Hittitologists in this matter.

There is no doubt that this volume will serve its users well. The skill and experience of its author insure that. It is a great advantage to everyone to have the new material made available and integrated into Goetze's earlier edition. The "Einleitung" makes the reader aware of the principal studies since 1930 of Hattusili III and his texts. It also takes account of palaeological criteria for the relative "dating" of copies, a procedure which, although originally applied within Hittitology to gross distinctions (Old Hittite versus New Hittite copies), has been successfully applied also by Otten and his students to the copies made under different New Hittite emperors. This procedure has even been adopted by A. Kammenhuber and her students. Otten takes account (p. 3) of the difference of opinion about the designation of this Hattusili text, and opts for the term "Apologie," following E. H. Sturtevant (defended by H. M. Wolf 1967), against other proposals. The chapter "Das Überlieferungsbild" (pp. 34–42), in which Otten discusses for each paragraph of the text the nature of the text witness and special problems which arise regarding the reconstruction of the original text, is especially welcome. Here Otten's expertise and long experience are especially evident.

The book has many virtues. But we must also register our disappointment with some aspects.

The table of joins (pages 54–56) is redundant with the join sketches (pages 58–65) and the paragraph by paragraph discussion of the reconstruction of the copies (pages 34–42). The join sketches (pages 58–65) should have included the line numbers from the original cuneiform editions. In the join sketch on page 64 *Bo* 10019 (published as part of *KUB*

XIX 64) is misaligned with *KUB* XIX 17 i 28–31. Bo 10019 belongs higher up and farther to the left on the sketch, for it contains the lines F i 30–35, which correspond to A iii 32–37. I have confirmed this from the original in Istanbul. Otten apparently used the alignment suggested in the copy of *KUB* XIX 67 without checking it against the original.

The translation is printed in a connected fashion on pages facing the transliteration, but with only the numbers of the first lines of each paragraph. This makes it very difficult to find the translation of a particular line. Furthermore there is no translation offered for the variants, since these are not noted here but in the Variantenapparat (pages 66–80).

The book contains no separate commentary on the text, only isolated comments in footnotes to the translation. There is not even a consistent means of referring to translations and comments by other scholars in publications since Goetze's. Bibliography is offered in a most abbreviated fashion (page 1 note 3) by referring the reader to E. Laroche, *CTH* (1971), p. 15 and A. Ünal, *THeth* 3 (1974), p. 10f., neither of which attempts a complete bibliographical coverage.

The glossary is not as complete as Goetze's. Goetze, of course, included in his glossary references to occurrences of words in the parallel texts *KBo* IV 12 (*CTH* 87) and *KBo* VI 29 (*CTH* 85). But in addition, Goetze's coverage of the main text was more detailed. He noted in every case whether with a given verb, enclitic particles or preverb/adverbs were present. Otten does this, but inconsistently. For example, under *tarna-* we are not told that *piran katta* occurs, and under *tiya-* we are not told that *šer* occurs. Hatt. IV 74–75 contains a very interesting sentence, which Otten has correctly interpreted and translated: *nu-uš-ma-ša-an* ^dİŠTAR *šar-la-im-mi-in* *ši-pa-an-za-kán-zi* "und sie werden sie für sich (*nu=šmaš=an*) als die erhabene Ištar beopfern." *-šmaš* is the 3rd pl. dat. used reflexively, *-an* (not *-šan*!) is the direct object "her" referring to Ištar. The sequence of *=šmaš=an* is not irregular, but perfectly correct according to the rules I have established in my contribution to the second Güterbock Festschrift (forthcoming). But although Otten's translation here is faultless, he has not registered these important facts in his glossary. Quite properly there is no *-šan* entry there. But under *-an-* on p. 82 the line IV 74 is omitted. More importantly, under *šip(p)ant-* "libieren, opfern" (p. 99), where this line is noted, there is no indication that the verb ever takes as a direct object the recipient of the offering ("beopfern") nor that the pronoun *-šmaš* "für sich" accompanies it.

The translations of lemma entries in the glossary rarely coincide with the German words which Otten uses to translate these words in the text. For example, *ep-* "(er)greifen," but ii 22 "an sich nehmen"; *handai-* "(sich) fügen," but iii 2 *handawen* "wir hielten zusammen"; *harganu-* "zerstören," but ii 19 "zugrunderichten"; *hulliia-* "bekämpfen," but ii 25 "schlagen"; *kaneš-* "anerkennen," but in all finite forms it is

translated "jemandem gewogen sein/halten," and the verbal substantive *kaniššuwār* is translated "Gewogenheit," "Wohll wollen," and "Huld"; *ninink-* "(er)heben," but ii 52 "aufnehmen"; *pehute-* "(hin)führen," but ii 51 (+ *arha*) "abziehen" and iii 17 (+ EGIR-*pa*) "erbringen"; *tapar-* "leiten, verwalten," but i 27 "regieren," i 65, ii 64, 74 "befehligen"; *walḥ-* "schlagen, überfallen," but ii 6, 7, 10, 11 "heimsuchen"; no cross reference is given under *walḥ-* to GUL-*heškir* which in the glossary (p. 108) is rendered "schlagen" but in ii 42 as "losschlagen"; *wete-* "bauen," but ii 49, 53 (var.) "befestigen"; GIDIM "Toter, Totengeist," but ii 1, 52 "die Manen"; ŠU.AN "Siegesdenkmal(?)," but ii 25, 44 "ein Mal"; ^(SAL)ESERTI "Konkubine," but iii 41 "Haremsfrau." One could continue, but the point has been made. Some of these pairs of German words are very close in meaning. But it would have been so much better if the words actually used in the connected translation had been included in the glossary.

The translation of the text in general follows that of Goetze. Where it does not, the author has usually indicated this in a footnote.

What follows are comments on the translation and interpretation.

i 28. The iterative *maniyahḥiškī* is lexical and indicates the translation "verwalten" ("govern"), which is not attested for a finite form of the noniterative *maniyahḥ-*. Cf. *CHD* 3/2 165ff., meaning 5. Otten's attempt to render the iterative with the words "lange Zeit" is therefore unjustified.

i 67–69. This should be translated: "Against whatever enemy land I turned my own eyes, no enemy turned back my eyes to me." The difference between the two clauses is signaled by the presence of *-za* in the first ("turned my own eyes") and its absence in the second ("turned back another's eyes"). Cf. Hoffner, *JAOS* 93 523, 1973. For the idea, being unable to resist the intimidating look, compare: ^d*Kumarbiyaš* IGI.ḪI.A-wa *Ū-UL namma manzazzi* "He can no longer resist Kumarbi's eyes" *KUB* XXXIII 120 i 20–21, cf. *CHD* 3/2 s.v. *mazz-* a 1' b'.

ii 34–35. Instead of ERÍN.MEŠ-*ti=ma=kan kappuwawar Ū-UL ēšta* "For the army (dat.-loc.) there was no counting." Copy C's nom. sg. ERÍN.MEŠ-*az=ma=kan* is a mistake. The usual phrasing is *nu=šan kappuwawar* NU.GÁL *ēšta* (*AM* 56, 76), or *nu=šan irḥas miyanaš* NU.GÁL *ēšta* (*AM* 170), where the *=šan* "on (it/them)" stands in place of the dat.-loc. of the counted object.

iii 7–8. Otten's translation "Und unser Haus(wesen) machte (gute) Fortschritte" is an improvement on earlier translations. Add to his justification in the footnote that *para iyannai-* "to advance" is contrasted with EGIR-*pa tiya-* "to retreat, step back" in *KUB* VIII 53: 18–19 (Gilg.).

iv 21. Otten's translation, which prefers an old Kammenhuber interpretation (1953) to Güterbock's solution in 1957 is

very weak. It is abundantly clear that the speech must commence immediately following the words "appeared in a dream (saying)." Otten's claim that Güterbock's (also Hoffner's in *JNES* 28, 1969, 228) interpretation *innarā=wa-šmaš* "wohl an der Graphik (-u-wa-, Dupl. -a-u-wa-) scheitert" is groundless. Compare *ma-a-u-wa*, *ma-u-wa*, and *ma-a-wa* as writings of **mā=wa* (OH of *mān* "when, if" + *=wa*). Cf. *CHD* 3/2, 144 s.v. *mān*. The writing -u-wa of the quotative particle is quite rare, but just to show that *ma(-a)-u-wa* and *inna-rauwašmaš* are not the only examples let me also call attention to another example in the OH Telepinu Myth (in post-OH copy): [*par*] *tauwa=šet=wa amiyanta a-pa-aš-ša-u-wa (apaš=a=wa) amianza* "Its (the bee's) wings are small, and it is small" *KUB XVII 10 i 38*, cf. ed. Laroche, *Myth.*, p. 32. Apparently where -wa immediately followed the vowel *a* it could be written -u-wa. The *=šmaš*, as I showed in 1969, performs the same functions as *=za* in the nominal sentence with first or second person subject: "On your own you (pl.) are weak, but . . ."

iv 33–35. I have already (*CHD* 3 141a sub *man b 1'*) registered my dissatisfaction with the interpretation of these two clauses as a contrary to fact condition followed by a "would" clause. The *CHD* interprets both clauses as "would" clauses. In view of the immediately preceding and following sentences one needs here some description of Urḫitešub's conduct after he was sent to Nuḫašši which caused Ḫattušili to reconsider the wisdom of this place of internment. Theorizings about what might have happened if he had done such and such a thing were equally possible before the former king was even sent to Syria. The examples listed in *CHD* under *man b' 1'* include many which could just as well belong under *man a 2' b' 2''* (as noted there). In this case the *CHD*'s translation "he would have plotted . . . he would have driven" is merely the equivalent of "he wanted to plot . . . he wanted to drive." This gives us precisely the description of behavior after the transfer to Nuḫašši that he needed in order to understand Ḫattušili's decision to move Urḫitešub elsewhere.

Every book in the two series *StBoT* and *Theth* is a welcome addition to the tools of the Hittitologist. This update of the textual basis of the Apology of Ḫattušili is certainly a useful contribution to the study of this text. Since the time demands upon Otten may have ruled out the possibility of his undertaking unassisted a true edition of this enlarged text, it is a pity that he did not associate with himself some younger scholar who could have performed the other tasks necessary to make a full edition. As it is, he has laid a good foundation, on which someone else will build.

HARRY A. HOFFNER

ORIENTAL INSTITUTE, UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

From the Records of a Priestly Family from Memphis, Vol. I.

By E. A. E. REYMOND. Pp. xvii + 285; 17 plates. Ägyptologische Abhandlungen Band 38.) Wiesbaden: OTTO HARRASSOWITZ. 1981.

In the first volume of *Records* R. edits twenty-two hieroglyphic and/or demotic inscriptions of the Ptolemaic Period. The texts, funerary in nature, document the careers of members of a priestly family which had a hereditary claim to the chief priesthood of Ptah. In addition to transliterations and translations, the book includes essays on the historical significance of the monuments, emphasizing genealogical matters. There are also glossaries of the texts and photographs of most of the edited inscriptions.

While several of the texts have been published before,¹ it is certainly useful to have the documentation gathered together systematically. As a convenient collection of the material, the book will no doubt be much utilized by scholars interested in the native priesthood under the Ptolemies.

It was, I believe, an unfortunate decision to publish the inscriptions without philological commentary. R.'s discussions of individual words and phrases are, presumably, in the volume due to appear "at some future date" (p. 12). As it stands, one is not infrequently at a complete loss to understand why a particular reading has been chosen. Given the abundance of unusual vocabulary in the corpus, especially in the demotic inscriptions, this is no small matter. It would have been far preferable, I suggest, to have published fewer texts with the full commentary.

Although R. has obviously expended much effort in deciphering and interpreting the inscriptions, the usefulness of the volume is seriously undermined by the inadequacy of the text editions. In particular, the presentation of the demotic texts leaves much to be desired, being at best confusing, at worst misleading. R. provides free-hand copies of the demotic inscriptions, but these may depart without comment from what seems clear enough on the photographs. In the transliteration and translation, she often does not indicate damaged or restored words by means of brackets, half-brackets, and question marks. Thus the reader unfamiliar with demotic may easily be misled into assuming that words in fact damaged or restored stand unquestionably in the inscription. Moreover, while one must await the philological commentary before passing final judgement on the translations and readings, numerous renderings are extremely uncertain, and should, at the very least, have been marked as such.

¹ Most notably in H. Brugsch, *Thesaurus Inscriptionum Aegyptiacarum*, volume 5 (Leipzig, 1981).