

Die hethitischen Tontafelkataloge aus Hattuša (CTH 276-282). By Paola Dardano. Studien zu den Boğazköy-texten, no. 47. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2006. Pp. xviii + 396. EUR 98,00.

The bulk of Hittite cuneiform sources can be fairly described as belonging to state archives kept in locations designated by the royal administration. Most of the tablets found in Hattusa come either from several buildings on Büyükkale, a steep hill occupied by the royal residence, from the largest temple of the capital, or from the “House on the Slope” located between the two. The concentration of written sources in several well-defined spots correlates with their genre peculiarities. In a sharp contrast with the Mesopotamian cuneiform tradition, the Hittite capital has yet to yield private archives, and only a few documents that may reflect the day-to-day activities of private individuals have survived.

The sources represented in the Hittite royal archives can be divided into two groups: the texts of a long-term interest, which were to be maintained in good order for as long as Hattusa remained the Hittite capital, and the texts of a limited time-span, which were probably discarded or recycled after one or two generations. Typical representatives of Group A are laws, treaties, and scripts of rituals and festivals, whereas court depositions, letters, and cult inventories represent paragon examples of Group B. The texts belonging to Group A, but not to Group B, are frequently available in multiple copies, some of which may have been written several centuries before the collapse of the Hittite Empire (see Th. Van den Hout “Another view of Hittite Literature,” in S. de Martino and F. Pecchioli-Daddi, eds., Anatolia Antica. Studi in memoria di Fiorella Imparati [Florence, 2002], pp. 857-78.). There is significant correlation between the tablets related to Group A and those that are itemized in the inventory tablets known as shelf-lists.

The precise purpose of the shelf-lists remains unknown. It is clear, however, that they did not form one large catalog that would allow its users to determine the precise location of each document within the archives. The shelf-lists do not cross-reference each other, nor can one find there any

retrieval code similar to the modern library call numbers. As far as their archeological find spots indicate, they were scattered throughout all the buildings that housed significant tablet collections. The order of entries in each inventory list is largely haphazard, and probably follows the actual order of tablets on a shelf at the moment of its compilation. Additional remarks in the entries may address the lack of individual tablets in a series containing a particular text. On the whole, these features place the shelf-lists among the other types of Hittite inventory texts, such as lists of jewelry or garments deposited in the royal storehouses (Cf. S. Kořak, Hittite Inventory Texts (CTH 241-250), *Texte der Hethiter* 10 [Heidelberg, 1982]).

In spite of the fact that the shelf-lists tell us little about the administration of the Hittite royal archives, they are of great value for evaluating their state of preservation. There is no wonder that Emmanuel Laroche took up the task of comparing individual entries in these documents with the actual tablets found in Boğazköy in an appendix to his pioneering Catalogue des texts Hittites [Paris: Klincksieck, 271]. Among some 200 legible entries available to him, only about thirty could be identified. In the meanwhile, the autographs of Hittite shelf-lists have been published in their entirety, and the need for a new philological treatment of these texts became apparent. The book under review represents an annotated philological edition of all the shelf-list fragments excavated thus far. It can be viewed as a testimony both to the progress of Hittitology and to the limitations of our knowledge: among some 430 reasonably well-preserved shelf list entries, only between eighty and ninety appear to refer to known texts, and some of the identifications are quite tentative.

The above statistics should not be taken in a spirit of disparagement. In fact, the main value of Dardano's book lies precisely in the area of textual identification. The author meticulously studied the suggestions of the previous scholars regarding the previously known entries and made a number of original comparisons involving the recently published shelf-lists. We simply should reconcile ourselves to the idea that the Boğazköy tablets available to us represent only a portion of the original collection. It is not the violent destruction of Hattusa that should be blamed for the loss of the rest of the archives: if anything, it contributed to their preservation, since the tablets were perfectly baked in

the general conflagration. We should rather allow for a possibility that that a Hittite king (perhaps Suppiluliyama II or his immediate successor) had peacefully abandoned the city before it was destroyed and had taken along the most important documents. If this is the case, the philologists can only can only cherish an evil hope that the last abode of the Hittite ruling dynasty was burned as thoroughly as was Hattusa for the benefit of modern scholarship, and wait for its eventual discovery.

Beyond the area of textual identification, the main value of the commentary lies in abundant references to secondary literature. The author does not seem interested in tracing the historical implications of her analysis. Only eight pages in the Introduction (pp. 9-17) can be viewed as describing the overall organization of the Hittite archival practices. Given that the Paola Dardano is a professional linguist, she can hardly be blamed for this decision, but one has to observe that it narrows the potential audience of the book under review.

An example of a textual identification that is not followed to its proper conclusions is Dardano's treatment of a shelf list entry KBo 31.4+ iv 12'-28' (Text II b) referring to the collection of assorted rituals CTH 390 (pp. 112-13). The author compares the discussed passage with the colophon KUB 7.1 + KBo 3.8 iv 5-16 and the etiquette KUB 30.48. The etiquettes are small tablets that were probably placed on a shelf in front of each text and contained its "bibliographic" data. While the suggested identification is no doubt correct, in that all the three descriptions refer to the same text, one can make the next step and claim that the shelf list entry in this case is directly based on the colophon, as opposed to the etiquette. The scribe of the colophon presented the texts in a peculiar order, beginning with the ritual of Šušumaniga he had copied last, and the same order can be observed in the shelf list entry. By contrast, the etiquette shows the same order of rituals as the main text of the tablet. In addition, the scribe of KUB 7.1+, whose native language was apparently not Hittite, used a nonce creation ka-ri-e-ra-a-mi 'he devours', which the scribe of the shelf list "emended" to ka-ri-ra-pí. Both forms are presumably inspired by Hitt. karab- 'to devour', but none of them occurs anywhere else in the Hittite corpus.

The author is quite thorough in her transliteration of clearly preserved passages in the texts under consideration. As a rare lapsus calami, note the false restoration [ma-a-an la-a-la-an a-n]i- in KBo 31.4++ (= Text II.b) i 11' (p. 99), whereas, as noted in her commentary (p. 109), one expects la-a-la-aš in the ritual of Uruwanda based on KBo 11.11 i 1. In KUB 30.55 (= Text II.e) rev.[?] 9', the Akkadogram KA-ŠI-IP is incorrectly given in lower case as ka-ši-ip (p. 156), but correctly analyzed as a derivative of Akkadian kašāpu in her commentary (p. 159). Mistakes such as these are probably inevitable in editorial work and, to the author's credit, they do not form a pattern.

By contrast, the transliteration of broken or incorrectly written signs can be improved in many cases. The following comments are limited to KUB 30.51++ (= Text II.d.A) and its parallel KBo 31.27++ (= Text II.d.B). The traces in KUB 30.51++ i 1' suggest a reading «mu-ga»-a-m[i. In i 8', Dardano gives the end of the line as simply] x x, but the text continues on after the second broken sign, and may be read as] x ^{UR}[^{U?}mu[?]-kiš[?]]. In i 13', the end of the line may be read as ha]r-ra-a-an based on the traces. In ii 13', where Dardano reads «GUL»[(-an)]-«zi», the traces read better as «GUL-ah-zi» despite how the parallel text reads. The author reads in ii 18' da-aš-šu-un[!] when it should be da-aš-šu-uš[!] (text: -un). In KBo 31.27++ i 15', she treats the entire last portion of the line as being restored, while there are actually traces of ha]r[?]-z[i[?]]. In ii 28', she emends the first form but fails to note that the -ša- is actually a -ta- according to the handcopy.

The German translation appears to be of excellent quality to the American and Russian authors of this review, even though small issues in the rendering of KUB 30.51++ are in store. For i 3' the German should read [Der Anrufung] since the mu-ga-a-u-wa-aš is completely restored. In i 4', the feminine personal name marker should come before the bracket (i.e. read: der ^f[... instead of der [^f...]). The commentary for these texts is thorough in certain aspects but surprisingly lacking in others. The author does a good job of bringing in relevant outside material, but sometimes fails to mention items of interest. The following comments will be limited to the first page of her commentary to KUB 30.51++ on page 132. In her discussion of i 6', Dardano does not mention the shelf list KBo 31.1 iii 8 (= Text III.a) where several other deities are mentioned in conjunction with

^fAnnanna. The author does not address the issue in i 7' where we find the atypical situation where a profession (^{LÚ}SANGA) is given without a personal name, which is virtually ubiquitous in such a formula. The use of the verb aniya- in KUB 30.51++ i 9' versus the more specific mugai- in the parallel KBo 31.27++ i 4' also requires comments. It is likely that the first term functions as a hyperonym to the second one in the relevant context.

The general format of the publication is similar to that of other textual editions that appeared in the StBoT series. The reference apparatus includes the glossary and the complete index of the cited Hittite passages. As an innovative feature of the edition, one must mention direct citations from the online Konkordanz der hethitischen Keilschrifttafeln compiled by S. Košak and currently available at www.hethiter.net. The data borrowed from the Konkordanz include the paleographic dating of each shelf-lists, the reference to the relevant joins and the precise location where each of the joined fragments has been found, and the reference to the secondary literature where the discussed shelf-list has been edited or mentioned. Many scholars in the humanities are accustomed to the situation when their printed work is cited in digital publications, sometimes with egregious errors, but few can take pride in the fact that others reproduce their online work in a printed format. It is, however, no secret that the Hittitologists nowadays consult Košak's online Konkordanz more frequently than any single printed monograph. Paola Dardano should be applauded for her decision to faithfully reproduce the relevant parts of this monumental work, and we hope that the same practice will be continued in the future StBoT publications.

Dennis Campbell and Ilya Yakubovich

University of Chicago