Reflections on the Origins and Development of the Hittite Tablet Collections in Ḫattuša and Their Consequences for the Rise of Hittite Literacy·

THEO VAN DEN HOUT
Chicago University, Oriental Institute

1. Introduction

The state in which the Hittite text corpus presents itself to us is that in which it was fairly suddenly and, so it seems, deliberately left behind around 1200 BC by the ruling elite as it gave up the city of Ḫattuša as the residence of the almost 500 year old kingdom and empire. All places of primary storage contain a mix of older and newer records in a single archaeological stratum[1] and in at least one case there is evidence of chronological ordering of records[2] within one location. This does not mean that older strata have not occasionally yielded tablets or fragments but these are the exception, not the rule. The three most important storage places show a meaningful distribution of records between them[3] and, moreover, the corpus itself contains numerous references to a system of record keeping. As stated, this system is in evidence for the late 13th century BC but we need to ask ourselves when and how it evolved and how it started. Hittite kings repeatedly refer to "old tablets"[4] as do occasionally the shelf lists.[5] How old these tablets really were is impossible to say as

---

[1] Thus already H.G. Güterbock, "Hethitische Literatur", in: W. Röllig, *Neues Handbuch der Literaturwissenschaft*, Bd. 1, 216, E. Neu, *Althethitische Ritualtexte in Umschrift*, StBoT 25 (Wiesbaden 1980), xv n. 8.

[2] s. K. Bittel, "Bemerkungen zu dem auf Büyükkale (Boğazköy) entdeckten Siegeldepot", *JKF* 1 (1950-1951), 167f.; for Bldg. D on Büyükkale s. S. Herbordt, *Die Prinzen- und Beamtensiegel der hethitischen Grossreichszeit auf Tonbullen aus dem Nişantepe-Archiv in Hattusa*, BoHa 19 (Mainz am Rhein 2005), 7-23, for the Westbau in the Upper City.

[3] So Th. van den Hout, "Administration in the Reign of Tutæaliya IV and the Later Years of the Hittite Empire", in: Th. van den Hout, *The Life and Times of Ḫattušili III and Tutḫaliya IV. Proceedings of a Symposium Held in Honour of J. de Roos* (Leiden 2006), 77-106.

[4] KUB 12.27 :11, 13 + KUB 43.100 rev. 29, 31 (*annallaz* GIS*LE'U*) w. dupls. KUB 12.31 rev. 19, 21 and KBo 4.2 iv 42-43, 45, ed. A. Götze - H. Pedersen, *Muršilis Sprachlähmung* (København 1934), 10-13, R. Lebrun, "L'aphasie de Mursili II = CTH 486", *Hethitica* 6 (1985), 108, 112.

[5] cf. KUB 30.62:8-9 (ed. P. Dardano, *Die hethitischen Tontafelkataloge aus Ḫattuša (CTH 276-282)*, StBoT 47 [Wiesbaden 2006], 241f.), KBo 7.73+KBo 31.4 vi 28"-29" (ed. Dardano, *StBoT* 47,

long as we do not have the physical tablets that these expressions refer to and even then it is often difficult to be precise. But it does raise the question of when the Hittites began to keep tablets for future reference and when they started something of a system through which they could be retrieved. "From the viewpoint of the historian today, the formation of an archive seems an obvious and essential step, once documents were produced in any quantity. To medieval governments, however, neither the urgency nor the usefulness of archives would have appeared as compelling."[6] This will have been no less true of ancient Near Eastern states: most never reached the level of organization we observe in the late Hittite empire.[7]

One way to see how the Hittite tablet collections originated and developed is to look at the oldest specimens of writing among the records that form the late-13th century collection, see what genres they belong to, but also what references our texts in general contain to tablet use and literacy in the Old Kingdom: in short, we should look at everything that can shed light on early scribal, administrative or archival practices.[8] Now, generally, tablets and fragments are characterized as written in Old, Middle or New Script (OS, MS, NS). With this paleographic dating system we mean that a record was written down in either of the following chronological periods:

Old Script	1650-1500
Middle Script	1500-1350
New Script	1350-1180[9]

In seemingly parallel fashion scholars in the past have divided Hittite history into an Old, Middle and New Kingdom albeit not always with periods equivalent to the ones just mentioned.[10] I fully agree, however, with the strong reservations expressed by others concerning this division: Hittite history can be divided into two periods at best, an Old and

---

108f.). The Akkadian adjective *MAḪRU* "first, old, original" in KUB 30.54 i 14 (cf. Dardano, *StBoT* 47, 119f.: "Erste Taf[el]") and KBo 31.7 + KUB 30.62:7 (cf. Dardano, *StBoT* 47, 241f.: "erste Tafel") are probably to be interpreted as "old" rather than "first" as well.

[6] M.T. Clanchy, *From Memory to Written Record. England 1066-1307* (Malden, MA/Oxford/Victoria 1993[2]), 70.

[7] S. also Clanchy, *Memory to Written Record*, 154: "Making documents for administrative use, keeping them as records and using them again for reference were three distinct stages of development which did not automatically and immediately follow from each other."

[8] I will use the combination Old Kingdom as defined by T.R. Bryce, *The Kingdom of the Hittites* (Oxford 2005[2]), 6, with the rough dates provided in his list of rulers ibid. xv.

[9] Within each ductus subdivisions are distinguished although certainly for the OS period there is no clear idea when one starts replacing the other.

[10] See for an overview A. Archi, "Middle Hittite - 'Middle Kingdom'", in: G. Beckman - R.H. Beal - G. McMahon, *Hittite Studies in Honor of Harry A. Hoffner Jr. on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday* (Winona Lake, IN 2003), 1-4.

a New Kingdom.[11] The latter starts with the reign of Tudḫaliya I at the end of the 15th century or even around 1400 BC, not because a new dynasty takes over but because after a long time of relative weakness Hittite power reasserted itself again on the international stage and would continue to do so until the fall of the empire after 1200 BC.

Another caveat concerning the labels OS, MS and NS is that they do not necessarily say anything about the date of composition: given the frequent practice of copying texts we regularly encounter NS manuscripts of what had originally been an Old Hittite (OH) composition. Sometimes such copies can be very faithful to their original but oftentimes they will contain either deliberate or unconscious modernizations ranging from substantial alterations of their contents to just simple variations in spelling and/or morphology. Of course, transitions between OS, MS and NS have been gradual and a certain overlap of ductus types in transitional periods has to be expected.[12] On the basis of their contents compositions can often be ascribed within each period to a certain king and if the date of composition and the ductus and sign forms of a particular fragment coincide our usage of the term "original" illustrates the possible assumption that the tablet or fragment in question is a contemporary one, that is, written when it was composed. In fact, when in 1952 archaeologists found in Boğazköy the fragment 29/k (later published as KBo 7.14) of the Zukraši-text in an allegedly older layer, philologists dated not only the composition but also the tablet itself to Ḫattušili I or his successor Muršili I at the latest.[13] However, an OS tablet containing a composition dating to the reign of Muršili I from the very beginning of the 16th century could still be a copy made at the very end of that same century according to the paleographic periods given above and still receive the label OS.

Lately this dating system has come under pressure. This is aptly illustrated by the fact that the Zukraši-text KBo 7.14 that generated the entire paleographic dating system of Hittite texts is now dated in Silvin Košak's Konkordanz[14] as "ah.?/mh.?".[15] It has been recognized that the distinction between OS and MS is one of ductus (i.e., general characteristics of a scribal hand like density, slant, beginning of lines very much to the left) rather than individual sign shapes.[16] And sign shapes that were once seen as solid criteria for paleographic distinction now turn out to be less trustworthy.[17] Jared Miller[18] and Maciej

---

[11] See Güterbock, *Neues Handbuch d. Lit.*, Bd. 1:214-216, Bryce, *Kingdom*[2] 5f. (for a king list see ibid. p. xv), Archi, *FsHoffner* 1-12, and id., "Remarks on the Early Empire Documents", *AoF* 32 (2005), 225-229, and Popko, *FsKošak,* 575.

[12] See thus already Neu, *StBoT* 25, xv-xvii, who also acknowledges a possible subjective element in paleographic datings; see also more recently Groddek, *Eine althethitische Tafel des* KI.LAM-*Festes*, IJDL Suppl. 1 (München 2004), 10.

[13] Thus H. Otten, "Die inschriftlichen Funde", *MDOG* 86 (1953) 61-63, see also A. Kammenhuber, *Altkleinasiatische Sprachen*, HbOr (Leiden 1969), 162.

[14] That is, in the *Konkordanz der hethitischen Keilschrifttafeln* by Silvin Košak (http://www.hethport.uni-wuerzburg.de/hetkonk/, Version 1.1).

[15] s. now also Popko, *FsKošak* 578 ("eine frühmittelhethitische Niederschrift"), 579.

[16] s. J. Klinger, "Wer lehrte die Hethitern das Schreiben?", in: S. Alp - A. Süel, *III. Uluslararası Hititoloji Kongresi Bildirileri/ Acts of the IIIrd International Congress of Hittitology*, ICH 3 (Ankara 1998), 372 n. 19; cf. also Popko, *FsKošak* 576.

[17] So, for instance, G. Wilhelm apud J. Seeher, "Die Ausgrabungen in Boğazköy-Ḫattuša 2004", *AA* 2005, 77 n. 18, who has now cast doubt on the validity of the TA sign as a possible dating criterion.

Popko[19] have claimed that the range of OS dating should be expanded. Reviving some dissenting voices from the early 1980's[20] they have made it clear on different grounds that several tablets and fragments that have been characterized as OS are in fact texts from the post-OS period. Miller therefore now suggests a Ductus I from the beginning of the OH period up to c. 1400 BC (i.e., up to Tudḫaliya I), a Ductus II for the very brief period from around 1400 up to 1375/1350 BC (i.e., up to Šuppiluliuma I) with a third type to the end of the Hittite empire around 1200 BC. Popko still accepts the OS label but wants to see it overlap with the MS ductus into the reign of Tudḫaliya I around 1400 BC. This means that strictly taken, while OS (or Miller's Ductus I) may be older, we can no longer be sure: for all we know, OS records could theoretically stem from anywhere between 1650 and 1400 BC. The earlier mentioned ductus does not help us either since its use as a dating criterion is far from proven and is based on a rather subjective idea of scribal development. With the empire period starting around 1400 BC it is important, therefore, that when taking into account the oldest datable records we limit ourselves to those records that can with certainty be dated to the Old Kingdom on other than paleographic grounds.

2. The oldest datable Hittite records

As Miller rightly observes, we can date a tablet or fragment independently from its sign forms and ductus only when we have true originals where we can observe a chronological coincidence of composition and tablet. For the Old Kingdom these are the *Landschenkungsurkunden* or charters[21] and the sealed tablet with the treaty between Eḫeya of Kizzuwatna and the Hittite king Taḫurwaili who was either the first or second successor of Telipinu.[22] Their status as sealed records makes them in diplomatic terms true and legally authentic originals written when they were first issued.[23] According to the latest study by Gernot Wilhelm the oldest among them can be ascribed to Telipinu around 1500

The allegedly OS form with the heads of its two inscribed verticals sticking out above the upper horizontal, can be observed in charters dated to the late-15th century. The later form of TA with the heads hanging from the upper horizontal is attested in a charter to be dated around 1500.

[18] *Studies in the Origins, Development and Interpretation of the Kizzuwatna Rituals* StBoT 46 (Wiesbaden 2004), 463f. n. 773.

[19] "Einige Bemerkungen zum alt- und mittelhethitischen Duktus", *RO* 58 (2005 [2006]), 9-13, *FsKošak* 575-581.

[20] s. Berman, review of Neu, *StBoT* 25, *BiOr*. 38 (1981) 653f.; on the problem of distinguishing within OS see, for instance, more recently also I. Singer, review of H.A. Hoffner, *The Laws of the Hittites* (Leiden 1997), *JNES* 60 (2001), 288.

[21] Thus already Emil Forrer, "Die Inschriften und Sprachen des Ḫatti-Reiches", *ZDMG* 76 (1922), 183.

[22] KBo 28.108 + 109 + KUB 3.13 with the seal Bo 69/200, for which see Otten, "Das Siegel des hethitischen Großkönigs Taḫurwaili", *MDOG* 103 (1971), 59f., 66f., H.M. Kümmel, KBo 28, vii, Herbordt, *BoHa* 19, 28. Of course, one should add the letter of Ḫattušili I to the ruler Tunip-Teššub of Tikunani which being the original document should go straight back to the days of Ḫattušili. However, since it was not found in Ḫattuša it cannot help us here (but see below §6).

[23] S. thus also Klinger, "Das Korpus der Maşat-Briefe und seine Beziehungen zu den Texten aus Ḫattuša", *ZA* 85 (1995), 74.

BC or at best to his immediate predecessors Ḫuzziya or Ammuna in the late-16th century.[24] The most recent one bears the name of Arnuwanda I early in the 14th century. These are also the only cases where we can establish how long they were kept: charters and treaties are typically the kinds of records an administration wants to keep and both were part of late 13th century collections and archaeological context.[25] Most charters have been found in context with clay bullae that included the last known Hittite kings of around 1200 BC which means that the oldest charters were thus kept on file for some 300 years. The sealed treaty of Taḫurwaili was found in the storerooms surrounding Temple 1 in the Lower City and it, too, is likely to have been part of a collection that was maintained until the end of the empire. Later references in the Hittite text corpus and the obvious compilatory character of many treaties also point at the later use and consultation of such records.

3. The OS and MS corpora

Another way to show a growing practice of keeping certain records for future reference, is to look at the corpus of texts in OS and MS. Of course, we have to be careful here. As we saw, the interpretation behind the labels OS and MS is very much in flux now. Keeping in mind that truly historically datable records are only available in the case of the sealed copies of charters and treaties, we can, however, use the corpora as working hypotheses and see if our analysis contributes anything to the present debate.

Counted in separate entries[26] the OS corpus contains just over 200 numbers, whereas the MS corpus has some 1260. If we look at the corpus of texts that are classified as being written in OS we see a very specific pattern. The overwhelming majority (86.5%) of OS tablets and fragments fall in the category of rituals and festivals, including Anatolian myths as an integral part of rituals. None of these, however, can be dated precisely. In theory, they could have been written as late as the end of the 16th century or, with the observations of Miller and Popko in mind, even later. A significant number of them belong to what we traditionally consider the earliest stratum of Hittite religion because of its strong Hattian or Palaic background.

As far as historical narrative in OS is concerned (6.25%), almost all instances reflect either the pre-Ḫattuša era (the Anitta Text CTH 1) or early-Ḫattuša era (the Zalpa Text CTH 3, the "Palace Chronicles" CTH 8-9, the Zukraši Text CTH 15). The composition of the latter is usually ascribed to the reigns of either Ḫattušili I or Muršili I. Apart from unidentifiable fragments, the only other OS manuscript of an historical nature is a fragment from the treaty of Telipinu and Išputaḫšu of Kizzuwatna which should date to around 1500

---

[24] "Zur Datierung der älteren hethitischen Landschenkungsurkunden", *AoF* 32 (2005), 276. As far as I can see it may not be necessary to assume a date of the earliest charters prior to Telipinu. Wilhelm's nos. 1-2 and 4-5 all share the PN Šandamei and can thus not be too far removed in time from each other. Moreover, K.K. Riemschneider's original suggestion ("Die hethitischen Landschenkungsurkunden", *MIO* 6 [1958], 327f.) that Telipinu's name is missing in the *tabarna*-seals because he was the first one to issue them, is a still attractive one.

[25] cf. both Bldg. D on Büyükkale and the Westbau in the Upper City; s. above n. 2.

[26] For the definition of an "entry" s. S. Košak, "The Palace Library 'Building A' on Büyükkale", in: Th. van den Hout - J. de Roos, *Studio historiae ardens. Ancient Near Eastern Studies Presented to Philo H.J. Houwink ten Cate on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday* (Leiden 1995), 174 w. n. 12.

BC, usually taken as the end of the OS period. The OS manuscripts of the Laws should be mentioned here as well. When exactly the earliest redaction was put in writing, remains a matter of some debate. While most scholars favor a date in the reigns of Ḫattušili I and Muršili I, the most recent editor of the collection, Harry Hoffner, attributes it to Telipinu.[27] Again, paleography alone cannot help us decide this matter.[28] All this means that there is a gap in OS attestation from about Muršili I to Telipinu which may be almost as long as a century.

If we look at what we do not have we must keep in mind that any administration regularly disposes of records that are no longer considered relevant and not needed for future reference. This means that records of what we consider a purely administrative nature may have existed but have been discarded and are probably irretrievably lost to us. Other kinds of records, however, are usually kept and it is legitimate that we look for those that from a later 13th century viewpoint we may reasonably expect. Of those ("Group A"[29]) texts we are missing OS instructions(?)[30], celestial omina, hymns(?), prayers, non-Anatolian mythology, hippological treatises, lexical lists, and Sumerian and Akkadian compositions. The absence, on the other hand, of Group B genres like correspondence or any kind of bookkeeping records need not surprise us.

The MS corpus is, again, heavily dominated by festival and ritual scenarios (76%) but the ethnic mix is far more diverse now: besides the almost exclusive Hittite or Hattian character of the OS corpus, we now see extensive Kizzuwatnean, Luwian and especially Hurrian portions as well. The percentage of historical narrative and diplomatic texts is practically identical (6.5%) although treaties are much more numerous now. New in the MS group are instructions (some of which are historically datable to Tudḫaliya I and Arnuwanda I: CTH 251, 252, 257, 258, 259, 261), hippological treatises, non-Anatolian mythological compositions (Gilgameš, Ullikummi and the Kešši saga), and hymns and prayers (two of which are historically datable to the reigns of Tudḫaliya I and Arnuwanda I: CTH 373, 375). These all concern Group A texts but there are also Group B texts. There is a sizable group of letter fragments (some 32 entries[31]), there are some shelf lists and two labels.[32] Although not necessarily expected in a tablet collection that was terminated as late as around 1200 BC, some of these were apparently kept and stored.

---

[27] Hoffner, *LH* 229f.; for the other view s. Singer, *JNES* 60 (2001) 288 w. lit.

[28] s. Singer, *JNES* 60 (2001) 288.

[29] For the dichotomy of Hittite texts along these lines (Groups A and B) s. Th. van den Hout, "Another View of Hittite Literature", in: St. de Martino - F. Pecchioli Daddi, *Anatolia Antica. Studi in memoria di Fiorella Imparati* (Firenze 2002), 864, and id., "On the Nature of the Tablet Collections of Ḫattuša", *SMEA* 47 (2005) 282f.

[30] Although KBo 22.1 is listed in the Konkordanz as having been written in OS ("ah."), the DA and IT signs have the characterictic (early?) MS shape; for a photo s. P. Neve, "Grabungen im Gebiet des großen Tempels (Tempel I) im Jahr 1971", in K. Bittel et al., *Boğazköy V. Funde aus den Grabungen 1970 und 1971* (Berlin 1975), 45.

[31] The MS letters have been collected and discussed by St. de Martino, "Hittite Letters from the Time of Tutḫaliya I/II, Arnuwanda I and Tutḫaliya III", *AoF* 32 (2005) 291-321.

[32] The Konk. lists KUB 57.30 as a possible MS vow fragment (CTH 590?) which would also make it a Group II text. With G. Beckman, "Fragment of a Wisdom Text(?)", in: W.W. Hallo - K.L.

Within Group B records, correspondence is generally the category that can last longest depending on the importance attached to the topics dealt with in the letters. Most of the MS letters were found in what seem to be secondary contexts and cannot therefore be used for our purposes.[33] But there are also some that formed an integral part of the Bldg. A collection.[34] Three of these may go back to the period of Arnuwanda I and Tudḫaliya III.[35] The presence in the late 13th century collection of this correspondence as a selection of the many letters received and of the drafts or copies of those sent, can therefore be taken as a sign of archival activity.[36]

The two MS shelf lists likewise stem from Bldg. A.[37] The relevance of these lists for our purposes is twofold: by themselves they are a clear indication of considerable archival activity and, if we could identify among the ones listed historically datable compositions, they might give us a terminus ad or post quem for the decision to hold on to certain records. In this second respect the material is disappointing, unfortunately. Besides chronologically unspecific festival and ritual scenarios the best preserved of the two lists, KBo 31.1 ++,[38] mentions a number of royal edicts, none of which can be assigned to a known ruler, however. Several compositions match existing fragments in OS but that is not very helpful as we saw since the OS period may have lasted well into the 15th century. The other shelf list KBo 31.11 does not yield any relevant dating information either.[39] So these shelf lists merely corroborate what we had established already, that in the MS as defined above (§1) period there was already clear archival activity.

Younger, *The Context of Scripture. Volume One*, CoS 1 (Leiden/New York/Köln 1997), 215f., however, I prefer to see it as a wisdom literature text.

[33] This may be already a Hittite dump when the find spot report says "unter heth. Lehmfüllung" as in the case of KBo 18.54, found in p-q/10-11(cf. van den Hout, *FsdeRoos* 81f.). This might then be extended to the other letters unearthed in the same area (KBo 18.38, 40, 44, 51, 58, 64, 68, 81, 84, 123, 131, 132). Others cannot be traced to a building like, for instance, KBo 8.18 found in Bkkle. aa/16 or come from a building for which there is no convincing evidence that it was ever a primary place of storage like in the case of KBo 14.49 (Bldg. H), KBo 18.51 (Bldg. C) or KBo 28.51 (Bldg. M). The latter is a fragment of the second letter the widow of the Egyptian Pharaoh sent to Šuppiluliuma I. This is typically the kind of record one would expect an administration to hold on to and perhaps it did. Such stray tablets may have been the result of later, that is, post-Hittite interference.

[34] KBo 28.57, 59, 66, 71 (all Rm. 5), KBo 18. 69 (Rm. 4)

[35] S. de Martino, *AoF* 32 (2005) 296, 317 (on KBo 18.14), 298f. (on KBo 18.66), 299 (on KBo 18.69).

[36] How intensive the exchange of letters in this period could be, is perfectly illustrated by the tablet collection found at Maşat Höyük. In this provincial settlement at some 100 kms from the capital Ḫattuša 98 letters and pieces of letters were found. Although there are differing opinions, I believe the period of time covered by the collection to be two years at the most, more likely just one (s. van den Hout, forthcoming in *ICH* 6). In a conservative estimate we can thus assume an average of 50 letters received in Maşat per year in answer to as many written from there. This is an exchange of about 100 documents annually and double the amount if we assume the period covered by the archive to be a single year. Maşat was just one of many such local centers that depended in their policy making on orders from the central authority. All this presupposes a chancery in the capital or travelling with the king that must have issued hundreds of such missives on an annual basis.

[37] KBo 31.1 and 11.

[38] Ed. Dardano, *StBoT* 47, 190-209.

[39] Ed. Dardano, *StBoT* 47, 260-262.

Of the two MS labels one is dated by its script only and was found in secondary context.[40] Intriguing, however, is the one published as KUB 30.71 and coming from Bldg. A (Rm. 5). It bears the following text:

1. *tuzziaš*
2. *uttar*
3. [m]*Šanta*

"Report of the Army; Šanta" (or: "Army report (of) Šanta")

Šanta or Šanda is best known as the main commander of Ḫattušili I's army in northern Syria, the so-called Uršu text.[41] It contains the account in Akkadian of the not very successful siege of the town of Uršu and the king's frustration at the incompetence of his men. The date of that tablet has been disputed but most scholars date it to the Old Kingdom.[42] Šanda is the most frequently mentioned person in the text[43] as far as it is preserved and he is twice said to have brought a message or report ([m]*Šanda ṭemam ublam* "Šanda brought a message/report"[44]). The text on the label would fit the Uršu text well as a title and although it cannot be proven, it might well have served once in the tablet collections to point its keepers to this composition.

4. References to older tablets in Hittite texts

The probably clearest reference to the existence of an older datable tablet in the later Hittite tablet collections is the following entry in the NS shelf list KUB 30.42+ iv:

15. DUB.1.KAM *išḫiula<š>* [m]*Išpudaḫšuš=za*
16. LUGAL KUR [URU]*Kizzuwatna*
17. [m]*Telipinušš=a* LUGAL KUR *Ḫatti*
18. GIM-*an išḫiūl iēr QATI*

"One treaty tablet: 'When Išpudaḫšu, King of the land of Kizzuwatna, and Telipinu, King of Ḫatti-Land concluded a treaty.' Complete."[45]

---

[40] KBo 47.314 found on Büyükkale p/10 close to Bldg. D.

[41] KBo 1.11 (CTH 7), ed. G. Beckman, "The Siege of Uršu Text (*CTH* 7) and Old Hittite Historiography", *JCS* 47 (1995) 23-34. Note, however, another Šanta in what seems to be a military context in KBo 32.201 left edge 3 (MS; pers. comm. W. Waal).

[42] E. Neu, Glossar zu den althethitischen Ritualtexten (Wiesbaden 1983 = *StBoT* 26), x n. 7, A. Kempinski, *Syrien und Palästina (Kanaan) in der letzten Phase der mittelbronze IIB-Zeit (1650-1570 v.Chr.)*, ÄAT 4 (Wiesbaden 1983), 33, Beckman, *JCS* 47 (1995) 27.

[43] KBo 1.11obv.! 2, 3, 4, 21, rev.! 10.

[44] KBo 1.11 obv.! 2, rev.! 10.

[45] Ed. Dardano, *StBoT* 47, 28f. (with cumulative line count 21-24), with commentary ibid. 37.

Fragments of this treaty (CTH 21), both in Akkadian and Hittite, have been found in the storerooms surrounding Temple 1 and Bldg. D on Büyükkale while others stem from the early excavations by Winckler and Makridi.[46] Another shelf list mentions a Ḫantili in connection with a treaty but it remains unclear whether it is Ḫantili the king and if so, which of the two.[47]

One of the earliest references to retrieving and using older records dates to the year 1324 BC when Šuppiluliuma I (c.1360?-1320) ordered an older treaty (*išḫiulaš ... tuppi*[48]) with Egypt to be read out loud at the festive and solemn occasion of his decision to send a son to become the next Pharaoh of Egypt. The text in question was the Kuruštama-treaty, either from the days of Tuthmosis III (mid- or third quarter of the 15th century) as has been suggested[49] or of Amenophis II (late 15th century) with Singer.[50] If so, this text must have been kept or copied since it was first commissioned in the 15th century and then attests to a decision on the side of the then king and his successors to keep this record on file.[51]

There is also interesting negative evidence for institutional memory: in the Alakšandu Treaty the Hittite king Muwatalli II (c. 1295-1274 BC) explicitly mentions that he knows that his predecessor Labarna conquered Arzawa and Wiluša but that it is unknown to him under which king they again defected since the matter is long past:

3.   *karū=za kuwapi* ᵐ*Labarnas ABI* [(*ABBA=IA*)]
4.   KUR ᵁᴿᵁ*Arzawa* KUR ᵁᴿᵁ*Wilu*[*šša*] *ḫūmand*[*a tarḫta n=at=za*]
5.   ÌR-*aḫta nu apattan* EGIR-*an*[*d*]*a* ⌜KUR⌝ ᵁᴿᵁ*Arzawa*
6.   *kuru*[*r*]*iyaḫta* KUR ᵁᴿᵁ*Wi*[*l*]*ušša=ma*
7.   *ANA* KUR ᵁᴿᵁ*Ḫatti kuedani* LUGAL-*i*
8.   ⌜*a*⌝*uwan arḫa tīyat nu memīyaš kui*[(*t*)]
9.   [(*i*)]*štantanza* ⌜*n=an* UL *šaqqaš*⌝[*ḫi*]

"When in the past Labarna, the father of my fathers, [had defeated and] subjugated all of Arzawa (and) Wilu[šša], Arzawa later on turned hos[t]ile for that reason. Under what king, however, Wi[l]ušša defected from Ḫatti-Land, I do not know because the matter is so long ago."[52]

---

[46] s. Konkordanz for details.

[47] KBo 19.35:1 (NS), ed. Dardano, *StBoT* 47, 86.

[48] KBo 14.12 iv 26, ed. H.G. Güterbock, "The Deeds of Suppiluliuma as Told by His Son, Mursili II", *JCS* 10 (1956) 98.

[49] cf. D. Sürenhagen, *Paritätische Staatsverträge aus hethitischer Sicht* (Pavia 1985 = *StMed* 5), 17-39, Bryce, *Kingdom*² 119, 423 n. 110.

[50] "The Kuruštama Treaty Revisited", in: D. Groddek - S. Rößle, *Šarnikzel. Hethitologische Studien zum Gedenken an Emil Orgetorix Forrer* (Dresden 2004 = GsForrer), 606f., compare now most recently D. Sürenhagen, "Forerunners of the Hattusili-Ramses treaty", *BMSAES* 6 (2006) 65f.

[51] Note that Sürenhagen, *StMed* 5, 25, claims that the reference to the same treaty in the so-called Second Plague Prayer of Muršili II is a direct quote from a colophon or a shelf-list-like record.

[52] KUB 21.2 + KUB 48.95 i 3-9 w. dupl. KUB 21.5 i 2-6, ed. SV 2:50f., tr. G. Beckman, *Hittite Diplomatic Texts*² (Altlanta, GA 1999), 87; s. also F. Starke, "Troia im Kontext des historisch-politischen und sprachlichen Umfeldes Kleinasiens im 2. Jahrtausend", *Studia Troica* 7 (1997) 473f. n. 79, and J. Klinger, "Historiographie als Paradigma. Die Quellen zur hethitischen Geschichte und

The Labarna mentioned can be Ḫattušili I's immediate predecessor or even more likely Ḫattušili himself.[53] His allegedly successful conquest may understandably have been part of Hittite lore and oral tradition but the less glamorous subsequent loss of his achievements was probably all too soon forgotten and no longer retrievable for later generations without written records. The text's sequel makes it clear that the defection at any rate predated Tudḫaliya I of the late 15th century BC.

Another piece of negative evidence concerning archival practices is that of the so-called Sammeltafeln: they can be seen as ancient dossiers compiling more compositions of related contents on one or a series of tablets. They are attested in the form of the Sammeltafeln themselves[54] or indirectly through their being mentioned in the shelf lists.[55] No Sammeltafeln are known that show either OS or MS.

5. Scribes from the pre-Empire period

In general, assuming they played a role in the retrieval of records, colophons can be taken as a sign of archival organization. A few OS fragments contain such a colophon. The following instances are known to me[56]:

KBo 22.2 rev. 16 (CTH 3)
TIL.LA "Finished"[57]

KUB 36.104 rev. 10 (CTH 8)
TIL.LA "Finished"[58]

KUB 28.15 rev. lower edge (pers. comm. W. Waal)
ṬUP-PÍ ⌜2⌝.K[AM ...] "Second tablet"

KBo 17.11 + iv 17 (restored after KBo 17.74 iv 43, CTH 631)
[(ṬUP-PÍ te-et-ḫ)]é-e[(š-na-⌜aš⌝)] "Tablet of Thunder"[59]

---

ihre Deutung", in: G. Wilhelm, *Akten des IV. Internationalen Kongresses für Hethitologie*, StBoT 45 (Wiesbaden 2001), 285 n. 37. For the historical setting s. T.R. Bryce, "History" in H.C. Melchert, *The Luwians* (Leiden/Boston 2003), 46-48.

[53] Arzawa is mentioned in Ḫattušili I's Annals (KBo 10.1 obv. 10 [Akkad.] = KBo 10.2 i 22 [Hitt.]). For a negative assessment of the truth value of Muwatalli II's statement s. Bryce, *History* 47f.

[54] For a list s. L. Mascheroni, "A proposito delle cosidette *Sammeltafeln* etee", in: F. Imparati, *Studi di styoriae di filologia anatolica dedicati a Giovanni Pugliese Carratelli* (Firenze 1988), 133f. s. also Th. van den Hout, forthcoming *RlA* s.v. *Sammeltafel*.

[55] s. Dardano, *StBoT* 47, 24f., 93f., 102f., 132f., 149-151, 176f., 233f.

[56] Cf. Popko, *RO* 58 (2005) 11 n. 6. W. Waal kindly draws my attention to the following colophons in fragments considered as "ah.?" in the Konk.: KBo 17.74+ iv 43, KBo 38.12+ vi? 15-16, KUB 28.18 rev. 16; uncertain is the status of KUB 28.32 rev. (Konk.: "ah.").

[57] ed. H. Otten, *Eine althethitische Erzählung um die Stadt Zalpa*, StBoT 17 (Wiesbaden 1973), 12f.

[58] ed. P. Dardano, *L'aneddoto e il racconto in età antico-hittita: la cosidetta "Cronaca di palazzo"* (Roma 1997), 60f.

KBo 20.13 + l.e. (CTH 631)
[...]x(-)*šamuriya* [60]

KBo 20.10 + KBo 25.59 v 1 (CTH 669)
⌈DUB.2.KAM⌉   *ŠA ḪARUPT*[*I* o]x[o o]x x x   "Second tablet of …"[61]

KUB 28.36 + KBo 25.125 rev.
SÌR-*RU ŠA* [LÚ.MEŠ]NAR GIŠ.[d]INANNA GAL.GAL ⌈*INA*⌉ x[...]
"Song of the singers of the big lyre in …"[62]

KBo 30.32 rev.
[*ḫ*]*a*?*nte*[*zzi tuppi*? ...]   "[F]irs[t tablet (?)]"

KBo 30.37 iv
[... -]x-*iaš* [URU]Nerikki[63]

Unfortunately, they are of little use: dated by ductus alone they are subject again to the limitations we saw earlier and for the last one the Konkordanz wavers between OS and MS. To what extent it is significant that no names of scribes seem to be attested in them remains to be seen: there are similar anonymous colophons also from later periods and given the low number of colophons in OS we should be careful not to attach too much importance to it.

Again, it is the Landschenkungsurkunden that provide us with the earliest datable names of individual scribes:[64]

Aškaliya	İK 174-66
Ḫutarli	Bo 90/729, Bo 90/750, 140/f
Inar	Bo 90/722[65]

---

[59] ed. E. Neu, *Ein althethitisch Gewitterritual*, StBoT 12 (Wiesbaden 1970), 34f., translit. id., *StBoT* 25:69.

[60] translit. Neu, *StBoT* 25:69; possibly GN according to Neu, *StBoT* 26:306.

[61] Translit. Neu, *StBoT* 25:134; on *ḪARUPT*[*I*] see Neu, *StBoT* 26:295 n. 5.

[62] Translit. Neu, *StBoT* 25:210 w. n. 700.

[63] Translit. KBo 30 Inhaltsübersicht iv sub num. 37; *Konkordanz*: "ah.?/mh.?"

[64] All unpublished attestations are taken from Wilhelm, *AoF* 32 (2005) 277f. Intriguing is the mentioning of Pirwa, an otherwise unknown scribe-on-wood (LÚ.DUB.SAR GIŠ), in some fragments of the Disappearing Deity myths: s. H. Otten, *Die Überlieferungen des Telipinu-Mythus* (Leipzig 1942), 63f., F. Pecchioli Daddi - A.M. Polvani, *La mitologia ittita* (Brescia 1990), 92 w. n. 13, and Th. van den Hout, "Pirwa, Perwa", *RlA* 10, 576a. Although the fragments in question are all in NS, the general antiquity of these myths (s. however also Popko, *FsKošak* 580) makes it possible to think of a scribe from the Old Kingdom.

[65] apud M. Marizza, *Dignitari ittiti del tempo di Tuthaliya I/II, Arnuwanda I, Tuthaliya III* (Firenze 2007), 143. Given his title ("scriba su tavolette di legno") he may not have been the scribe who wrote the actual tablet Bo 90/722 but just one of the witnesses. Since Bo 90/722 belongs to the

Išpunnuma	Bo 90/732, Bo 82/162[66]
Zuwa	Bo 91/1791

These names are all attested on charters with so-called anonymous tabarna-seals that with Wilhelm on prosopographical grounds now have to be dated to approximately 1500 BC or slightly earlier.[67] Of these, Išpunnuma also worked under Telipinu's successor Alluwamna. These scribes appear at the end of the list of witnesses with their title DUB.SAR "scribe" and the verb *IŠṬUR* "he wrote."

Other charters give us the following scribes' names of the later 15th century (in chronological order):

Ḫanikuili	Bo 90/728, Bo 90/568 ++, Bo 90/758 (all Ḫantili II, middle(?) of 15th century),[68]
Zuzzu	LSU 2 (= SBo text 2; Ḫuzziya II later 15th century)[69]
Waršiya	KBo 32.185, Antike Welt 1992:61 Abb. 166 (both Muwatalli I, late 15th century), KBo 32.187, LSU 9
Inar	KBo 5.7 (Arnuwanda I, early 14th century)
Šuppiluliuma	KBo 5.7 (Arnuwanda I, early 14th century)

Especially the name of Ḫanikuili is interesting since it is also preserved in two colophons one of which is written in clear MS. Of the two, KBo 31.48, preserves only part of the colophon:

[...]x ᵐ*Ḫanikuili*[...]
[DUB.x.K]AM *ŠA DĪNI*[*M* ...]

"[Hand(?) o]f Ḫanikuili [?], [x]th [tablet(?)] of the lawsuit [...]"[70]

In the other, clearly MS colophon of a prism containing the legend of the Akkadian king Naram-Sin, Ḫanikuili gives an elaborate description of himself as well as the name of his father who was a scribe also:

earliest datable charters (s. Wilhelm, *AoF* 32 (2005) 277 no. 3) this Inar must be another individual than the scribe Inar who was responsible for KBo 5.7 (see below).

[66] In both cases the title DUB.SAR has been restored but the position at the end of the list of witnesses supports their identification as scribes.

[67] *AoF* 32 (2005), 272-279.

[68] S. Wilhelm, *AoF* 32 (2005), 278f. For an edition of Bo 90/758 s. Chr. Rüster, "Eine Urkunde Ḫantilis II.", *IM* 43 (1993), 63-70, who ibid. p. 69 n. 19, suggests that the name of Ḫanikkuili might also be restored in LSU 17.

[69] The LSU siglum refers to K.K. Riemschneider, "Die hethitischen Landschenkungsurkunden", *MIO* 6 (1958), 321-381.

[70] S. Rüster, *IM* 43 (1993), 69f. w. n. 21, who characterizes it as "mittelhethitisch" but the *Konkordanz* may be more realistic giving it as undecided.

ŠU ᵐ*Ḫanikuili* DUB.SAR
DUMU ᵈ*Anu*-LUGAL.DINGIR.MEŠ [D]UB.SAR ᵣBALᵧ[71]

"Hand of Ḫanikuili, scribe, son of Anu-šar-ilāni, scribe, interpreter(?)"

In the subsequent lines he describes himself as the servant of a whole series of Mesopotamian deities and as the "beloved of Ḫebat (and) […]." With Beckman[72] one can trace this family of scribes down to the end of the 13th century ending with his namesake and scribe Ḫanikuili, who wrote one of the best preserved manuscripts of the Hittite laws. Although no definitive proof is available as yet, Beckman is right in suggesting that the older Ḫanikuili mentioned by his 13th century namesake is probably the same as the one who wrote the prism KBo 19.99.[73] There is no reason not to add now the other colophon, KBo 31.48, and the above mentioned charters.[74] The latter make it possible to date these records to the middle of the 15th century.

Finally, we can identify a group of scribes that must have been active in the general period between 1500 and 1350 but who cannot be assigned to a specific king:

AMAR-ti (Ḫubiti?)	KUB 32.19 + iv 49, KBo 22.129a rev. 10[75]
Aškaliya	Bo 2004/1:31[76]
Kukkuwa	KUB 34.45 + KBo 16.63 obv. 11
Muwa(?)	Herbordt, BoHa 19:15, 42 (Abb. 22a = No. 259)[77]
NU.ᴳᴵˢKIRI	KUB 32.19 + iv 50(?)
ŠUKUR-anza	KBo 15.10 iv 3

The composition on the tablet written by ŠUKUR-*anza* dates to the reign of Tudḫaliya I (late 15th century) but at present we are unable to determine whether this is a contemporaneous exemplar or a copy of several decades later.[78]

---

[71] KBo 19.99 Seite b; for the reading BAL (instead of BAL.BI) and its translation "interpreter" s. HZL 4.

[72] *JCS* 35 (1983) 103-106.

[73] *JCS* 35 (1983) 105 n. 45.

[74] Thus suggested by Miller, *StBoT* 46:37f.

[75] S. L. Mascheroni, "Scribi hurriti a Boğazköy: una verifica prosopografica", *SMEA* 24 (1984) 157.

[76] Mentioned by Wilhelm, *AoF* 32 (2005), 274, and *AA* 2005, 77. According to him this would probably be another scribe than the one who wrote İK 174-66 listed above.

[77] S. also ead., "Hittite Glyptic: A Reassessment in the Light of Recent Discoveries", in: D.P. Mielke - U.-D. Schoop - J. Seeher, *Strukturierung und Datierung in der hethitischen Archäologie/Structuring and Dating in Hittite Archaeology*, Byzas 4 (İstanbul 2006), 99f. w. fig. 6. To what extent the Chief Scribe Matu (s. Herbordt, ibid. 105f. w. fig. 13) should be included here remains uncertain. If the several seal impressions carrying the name Matu belonged to one and the same person, it shows how careful we must be in positing stylistic developments and in drawing chronological conclusions from them.

[78] I am leaving out here the small group of scribes that was active around 1375 BC and that we can identify through the texts found at Maşat Höyük; for a list see G. Beckman, "Hittite Provincial

6. Writing practices in the Old Kingdom prior to 1500 BC

The conclusion to be drawn thus far is that there does not seem to be any evidence for archival practices of a more or less professional chancery in Ḫattuša prior to the late 16th century BC, that is, somewhere between Ammuna and Telipinu. There are no records of which we can claim with certainty that they were written earlier nor do we know of any scribes by name that predate these kings. All positive evidence of such practices, that is, the physical existence of "Group I" records, shelf lists and colophons as well as later references to archival practice date to around 1500 BC at the earliest. Yet we know that writing was certainly practiced: a Labarna LUGAL.GAL "Labarna Great King" who is positively to be identified as Ḫattušili I, sent a letter to Tunip-Teššub, king of Tikunani in the upper Euphrates area.[79] In corresponding with the local ruler in the north Syrian area the Hittite king, of course, had no choice but to write in Akkadian. Although the provenance of the letter is unknown, having been sent by Ḫattušili to the Syro-Mesopotamian area, it may be supposed to have been found there.[80]

What about evidence of writing for internal administrative purposes? References to tablets and scribes in Old Hittite compositions are not very frequent.[81] Well known are the words spoken by Ḫattušili I to his grandson Muršili (I) on what may have been his death bed:

56. … *uddār=met=ta peḫḫun nu kī*
57. [*tupp*]*i* ITU-*mi* ITU-*mi peran=tet ḫalzeššandu*
"I have given you my advice and this [tabl]et they shall read before you every month."[82]

The composition is known as Ḫattušili's "political testament" and is preserved in both Akkadian and Hittite but only in a late, that is, 13th century copy. In his likewise bilingual Annals Ḫattušili I lists his *res gestae* and the booty he brought home. Towards the end of the NS manuscript he says:

nu=za kī ALAM=*IA ŠA* KÙ.GI *iyanun*

Administration in Anatolia and Syria: the View from Maşat and Emar", in: O. Carruba - M. Giorgieri - C. Mora, *Atti del II Congresso Internazionale di Hittitologia*, (Pavia 1995), 33, for the dating see van den Hout, *ICH* 6 forthcoming.
[79] Ed. M. Salvini, "Una lettera di Ḫattušili I relativa alla spedizione contro Ḫaḫḫum", *SMEA* 34 (1994) 61-80, see also J. Klinger, *TUAT* Erg. 66f.
[80] Thus Salvini, *SMEA* 34 (1994) 66.
[81] In KBo 7.14 obv. 16 (Konk. "ah.?/mh.?", ed. St. de Martino, *Annali e res gestae antico ittiti* [Pavia 2003 = *StMed*. 12], 112f.), one of the fragments concerning the Syrian campaigns of Ḫattušili I, tablets (*ṬUP-PA-ᵊA-TI*) are mentioned but they were sent by Ḫāluti, a non-Hittite general, to the king of Ḫaššu and thus not relevant to the point discussed here (for the reading Ḫaluti instead of Zaluti see most recently O. Soysal, "Beiträge zur althethitischen Geschichte (III). Kleine Fragmente historischen Inhalts", *ZA* 95 [2005] 143).
[82] KUB 1.16 iii 56-57 (CTH 6, NS), ed. F. Sommer - A. Falkenstein, *Die hethitisch-akkadische Bilingue des Ḫattušili I. (Labarna II.)* (Hildesheim 1974), 14f., tr. Beckman, *CoS* 2, 81.

"and this gold statue of myself I made"[83]

With "this" (*kī*) he implies that the text we are reading was inscribed on or very near a statue of himself.[84]

The NS version of the conquest of Zalpa, usually ascribed to Muršili I[85] mentions in broken context a scribe or scribes:

tupalān kuēl SAG.DU-*i* x[
"on the head of what scribe(s) … ["[86]

A tablet is mentioned in a fragmentary historical text in NS that refers to Ḫattušili I and Muršili I and must have been composed by one of their Old Kingdom successors, possibly Ḫantili I:

19. [*apenišš*]*an=pát tuppi*[*a*(-)
20. [*ud*]*dār*
"in just [that wa]y o[n] a tablet [… these(?) w]ords"[87]

The tablet referred to seems to have been a publicly displayed document just like the one on or near the statue of Ḫattušili I that we just saw.[88]   Neither of the two texts can therefore be taken as real evidence for the scribal administrative or archival activity that we are seeking to identify. Potentially interesting but again, unfortunately, fragmentarily preserved is a passage from an historical composition by Ammuna:

8. [*mān=šan ANA* ᴳᴵˢGU.Z]A *ABI=IA ēšḫaḫati n=apa utni=mit ma*[(*niya*)]*ḫḫaḫḫ*[*ati*]
9. [*ḫ*]*enkun šumeš maniyaḫḫešketten nu ap*[(*iya=pat* M)]U.KAM-*ti*
10. [*ē*]*ppun* GIŠ.ḪUR=*mitt=a ūḫḫun nu=šša*[(*n*)]

[83] KBo 10.2 (CTH 4) iii 21, ed. St. de Martino, *StMed*. 12:68f.; see also V. Haas, *Die hethitische Literatur* (Berlin/New York 2006), 33, 40.

[84] The Akkadian version KBo 10.1 rev. 14 does not have a matching demonstrative (*ù* ALAM *ša* KÙ.GI *i-pu-uš-ma* "and I made a statue of gold"), see ed. E. Devecchi, *Gli annali di Ḫattušili I nella versione accadica* (Pavia 2005 = *StMed*. 16), 54f.

[85] Thus, for instance, H. Otten, *StBoT* 17:62, and J. Klinger, *Untersuchungen zur Rekonstruktion der hattischen Kultschicht*, StBoT 37 (Wiesbaden 1996), 117-123;   s. however differently D. Sürenhagen, "Verwandtschaftsbeziehungen und Erbrecht im althethitischen Königshaus vor Telipinu - ein erneuter Erklärungsversuch", *AoF* 25 (1998), 83 n. 39, and R.H. Beal, "The Predecessors of Ḫattušili I", in: G. Beckman - R.H. Beal - G. McMahon, *Hittite Studies in Honor of Harry A. Hoffner Jr. on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday* (Winona Lake, IN 2003), 21-24.

[86] KBo 3.38 (CTH 3) obv. 25, ed. H. Otten, *StBoT* 17, 8f., with commentary ibid. 41.   Strictly taken it is unclear what scribe (or scribes) is being referred to.   It could be either a scribe of the Hittite king or one from Zalpa.

[87] KBo 3.57 (CTH 11) iii 19-20, ed. St. de Martino, *StMed*. 12, 200f. ;   s. also J. Klinger, "Der Beitrag der Textfunde zur Archäologiegeschichte der hethitischen Haupstadt", in *Byzas* 4, 6f.

[88] s. Ph. Houwink ten Cate, "The History of Warfare According to Hittite Sources: The Annals of Hattusilis I (part II)", *Anatolica* 11 (1984) 64, G. del Monte, *L'annalistica ittita* (Brescia 1993), 9. Note also KBo 3.37 iii 1 the verb *IŠṬUR* "he wrote."

11. [-]*un ANA* ^{GIŠ}GIGIR=*ia*=*kan* ^{GIŠ}GIGIR *mekka*[(*n neḫḫ*)]*un*[89]

"[When] I had sat down [on] my father's [thron]e, I governed my country. [To …]I [g]ave (saying): 'You shall govern […].' It was in that year[90] that I [t]ook/[s]eized and I looked at my tablet and […] I [… -]ed and many a chariot I turned against chariot."

Several scenarios seem possible but in each of them it seems as if the king checks a record before taking action. The same use of writing can be found in a passage in Telipinu's so-called Proclamation. In it he formulates rules for royal succession in an attempt to avoid the bloodshed that so characterized the generations that ruled before him. He calls upon his audience to put an end to the chain of murders that took place in the royal family and then continues as follows:

46. *namma kuiš=a* LUGAL-*uš kišari nu* ŠEŠ-*aš* NIN-*aš idālu šanaḫzi*
47. *šumešš=a pankuš=ši<š> nu=šši karši tetten kī=wa ēšnaš uttar*
48. *tuppiaz au karū=wa ēšḫa*r ^{URU}*Ḫattuši makkešta*
49. *nu=war=at=apa* DINGIR.MEŠ-*iš šallai ḫaššannai dāer*

"Further, whoever becomes king and seeks evil for (his) brother (and) sister, you (shall be) his family council and you must tell him forthright: "Look at this record of bloodshed on the tablet: 'In the past bloodshed had become frequent in Ḫattuša and the gods took revenge on the royal family.'""[91]

Telipinu is clearly referring to an internal document that he supposes to be retrievable in the future. The document in question does not have to predate Telipinu by much. In fact, as in the interpretation just given, he may be referring to his Proclamation itself where he has already twice said the same thing albeit in slightly different wording:

31. *nu šallaš=pat ḫaššannaš ēšḫar pangariyattati*
    (…)
33. *kāša=wa* ^{URU}*Ḫattuši ēšḫar pangariyattati*

"Bloodshed of the royal family has become widespread (… and the Men of the Gods too are saying:) 'Bloodshed has become widespread now in Ḫattuša'"[92]

---

[89] KUB 36.98 (CTH 18) rev. 8-11, w. dupls. KUB 26.71 obv. 21-24 and KBo 3.59:1-3, ed. St. de Martino, "La cosidetta 'Cronaca di Ammuna'", in: St. de Martino - F. Imparati, *Studi e testi* (Firenze 1999 = *Eothen* 10), 73-75.
[90] For the translation of *apiya* MU.KAM-*ti* (instead of *apedani* MU.KAM-*ti*) s. P. Goedegebuure, forthcoming.
[91] KBo 3.1+ (CTH 19) ii 46-49, ed. I. Hoffmann, *Der Erlaß Telipinus* THeth 11 (Heidelberg 1984), 34f. For -*apa* in "rechtlichem Kontext" (here "re-venge") s. E. Rieken, "Die hethitische 'Ortsbezugspartikel' -*apa*", in: Th. Poschenrieder, *Die Indogermanistik und ihre Anrainer* (Innsbruck 2004), 248f.
[92] KBo 3.1+ (CTH 19) ii 31 and 33, ed. I. Hoffmann, *THeth.* 11:30f. For the verbs *makkešš-* and *pangariya-* s. CHD s.vv.

Regardless of what document Telipinu refers to here, his intention to keep a record for posterity is what counts and makes him a ruler with true historical awareness.[93]

The scant references to writing in Old Kingdom compositions thus seem to support the impression already gained that there is no evidence of systematic scribal practices suggestive of a professional chancery until the later 16th century BC at the earliest. This raises the question about the beginnings of writing and the rise of literacy in the early Old Kingdom that I will turn to now.

7. The rise of writing in the Old Hittite Kingdom

It is — mostly silently — assumed that from the moment they adopted the cuneiform script, the Hittites began composing and writing in Hittite and began keeping tablet collections. Modern scholarship has it that it was the Hittite king Ḫattušili I (second half of 17th century) who brought back with him from his campaigns in Syria what became the typical Hittite cuneiform variant.[94] Early in his reign he conquered the city of Alalaḫ, nowadays Tel Atçana very near the modern Turkish-Syrian border. Although not identical,[95] the cuneiform texts from Alalaḫ's Level VII (c. 1750-1650) offer the closest known parallel to the Hittite type. This would provide a fairly exact date for the import of the Hittite cuneiform script somewhere in the second half of the 17th century. This assumption is not unproblematic, however, and even if it is correct, it is not very likely that this led to an immediate outburst of compositions in Hittite.

If it was under Ḫattušili indeed that the cuneiform script was (re-)introduced, this should have been a gradual process.[96] We know that Ḫattušili corresponded in Akkadian with Tunip-Teššub of Tikunani, a local king in the North-Syrian area. For this he is likely to have employed a Syro-Mesopotamian scribe.[97] It may have been such situations that prompted Ḫattušili to consider using the cuneiform script for internal Hittite purposes as well and if so, it is only to be expected that he turned to those same scribes.[98] Parallels suggest that the initial step probably was to have such internal documents composed in the language that came with the script and its scribes, *in casu* Akkadian rather than Hittite. It is a well-known phenomenon that for recording purposes a society that adopts a script from

---

[93] From the reign of Telipinu also stems his treaty with Išputaḫšu (CTH 21) where in one of the fragments with the Hittite version we encounter DUB.BA.MEŠ=*IA* "my tablets" (KBo 19.37:6) in otherwise broken context.

[94] S. Kammenhuber, *HbOr*, 162-165, Rüster/Neu, *HZL*, 15. and most recently, for instance, J.D. Hawkins, "Scripts and Texts" in: H.C. Melchert, *The Luwians* (Leiden/Boston 2003), 129, Devecchi, *StMed*, 16, 24-26. For the view that the OS variant of Hittite cuneiform would be more archaic in some respects than the Old Babylonian cursive s. G. Wilhelm, "Zur Paläographie der in Ägypten geschriebenen Keilschriftbriefen", *SAK* 11 (1984), 649 n. 17 (with corrigenda in id., *Medizinische Omina aus Ḫattuša in akkadischer Sprache*, StBoT 36 [Wiesbaden 1994], 8 n. 31).

[95] See Klinger *ICH* 3, 369-371.

[96] Thus already Klinger, *ICH* 3, 369.

[97] Thus Archi, *FsHoffner*, 8, cf. also Klinger, *ICH* 3, 372. Salvini, *The Ḫabiru Prism of King Tunip-Teššup of Tikunani* (Roma 1996), 9, leaves the question open.

[98] S. Kempinski, *AÄT* 4, 33 n. 21.

another society, initially adopts the language of the former along with the script.[99] Using a new script to write the own vernacular often takes considerable time. Not only do the foreign scribes need time to master a new language and local scribes to learn the writing technique and script but initially writing may also have an aura of learnedness or solemnity that is not always easily given up. More than the time to acquire the necessary language and technical skills, it often is tradition that keeps a vernacular from being written. It took hundreds of years before Italian, French and Spanish started being written instead of the traditional Latin. We don't have to go that far, however: the strong bond between script and language can be observed also in the occasional use of the Old Assyrian cuneiform by local Anatolians[100] or the use of the Assyrian dialect in the earliest Urartean inscriptions from the reign of Sarduri I (c. 840-820 BC).[101] It may, finally, also be reflected in the famous spearhead of Anitta. The Akkadian inscription "Palace of Anitta, Great Prince" sounds more internally administrative than anything else.[102]

In two recent articles Jörg Klinger studied the Akkadian-written tradition in Ḫattuša in some detail and raised several pertinent questions, especially for the early period. Documents like the Uršu-text and the letter to Tunip-Teššub show that Akkadian writing was indeed practiced at the Hittite court in the days of Ḫattušili I but why do we not have any OS copies of the traditional Akkadian canon such as the Legends of Sargon and Naram-Sin or any lexical texts from that period that one would expect if they worked in the chancery at Ḫattuša and are supposed to have trained indigenous scribes?[103] In both genres the earliest identifiable copies show Middle Script (1500-1350 BC).[104] And why do we not have any Akkadian versions of the texts for which we do have OS "originals" in Hittite? Accepting the traditional dating of OS tablets to the period between 1650 and 1500, Klinger can only — and somewhat reluctantly — conclude that two distinct groups of scribes worked at Ḫattuša at the same time: foreign specialists for the Akkadian

---

[99] Cf. F. Coulmas, *Writing Systems. An introduction to their linguistic analysis* (Cambridge 2003), 178f.

[100] S. K.R. Veenhof, "The Old Assyrian Merchants and Their Relations with the Native Population of Anatolia", *BBVO* 1 (1982), 147-160, J.G. Dercksen, "On Anatolian Loanwords in Akkadian Texts from Kültepe", *ZA* 97 (2007) forthcoming; compare also the fragmentary Old Assyrian tablet issued by Anitta found atAlišar published by I.J. Gelb, *Inscriptions from Alishar and Vicinity* (Chicago 1935) text no. 1, pp. 19-21, or the letter addressed to Waršama by Anumḫerwe from Mama in Old Assyrian.

[101] s. G. Wilhelm, "Urartu als Region der Keilschrift-Kultur", in: V. Haas, *Das Reich Urartu. Ein altorientalischer Staat im 1. Jahrtausend v. Chr.* (Konstanz 1986), 99-106, M. Salvini, *Geschichte und Kultur der Urartäer* (Darmstadt 1995), 36.

[102] Seen in this light, it is only to be expected that the text which Anitta posted on or kept near his city gate was written in Old Assyrian as well.

[103] cf. G. Beckman, "Sargon and Naram-Sin in Ḫatti: Reflections of Mesopotamian Antiquity among the Hittites", in: D. Kuhn - H. Stahl, *Die Gegenwart des Altertums. Formen und Funktionen des Altertumsbezugs in den Hochkulturen der Alten Welt* (Heidelberg 2001), 86: "The study of cuneiform, everywhere restricted to a small scribal class, was carried out in Ǣatti as in the south primarily through the rote copying of models, beginning with basic sign lists, proceeding through simple texts, and concluding with the classics of the Mesopotamian 'canon.'"

[104] s. Klinger, *ICH* 3, 369.

compositions and indigenous Hittite scribes, each using a very different ductus. Finally, the combination of the necessary assumption of a learning curve[105] and of the simultaneity of the two scribal groups, forces Klinger to accept that the beginning of the Hittite Schrift- und Schultradition must be earlier than the beginning of the text tradition that we have. Putting those beginnings at around 1650 BC, they are, however, as he correctly observes completely undocumented.[106] Of course, one can assume — and again we mostly seem to do so silently[107] — that the further removed in time, the more will have been lost for ever: absence of evidence is not evidence of absence. There are, however, several observations that plead against this view. The one-sidedness of the OS corpus (§3) along the lines of the traditional paleographic dating system, for instance, seems to rule out such an explanation. If a greater diversity of genres had existed between 1650 and 1500 BC, one might have expected a more even distribution of preserved texts over these genres. Instead, we may take the archaeological record as a fair reflection of the spread of genres and the rise of literacy. Parallels suggest that it is likely to reflect the gradual process in which writing becomes ever more widespread and is increasingly used, a process in which an increasingly complex social and political situation plays an important role.[108] Proliferation of documents is more closely linked to political and administrative systems than to the simple passing of time.[109] A case in point is that of the Old Assyrian *kārum* Kaneš where of the older Level II we have up to 30,000 records as opposed to very few documents that were found in the more recent Level Ib. The period following the collapse of the Hittite empire, usually referred to as the "Dark Age" is another illustration of this principle. Judged by datable compositions, whether in OS or in later copies, it is no coincidence that after the several compositions that tell about and originally stem from the reigns of Ḫattušili I and Muršili I, texts become extremely scarce. After Muršili's murder the kingdom lost its newly acquired role in international politics and became entangled in innerdynastic strife and internecine murders. A turning point, it seems, came with Telipinu who is known for his reforms of royal succession and administration as reflected in his Proclamation and started treaty relations with Kizzuwatna in south-eastern Anatolia. The period following Telipinu up until Tudḫaliya I is attested only through charters and treaties with Kizzuwatna. Although not a rich attestation, these records show at least both internal and external political and thus scribal activity. Only with Tudḫaliya I at the beginning of the empire period do we start having a more regular and diverse record.

---

[105] So Klinger, *ICH* 3, 369.

[106] Klinger, *ICH* 3, 374. One might mention here the recent identification among the Old Assyrian records from Kültepe of some tablets written in a north-Syrian ductus: see K. Hecker, "Zur Herkunft der hethitischen Keilschrift", *SCCNH* 8 (1996), 291-303. This only means, however, that the North-Syrian scribes, not writing in Old Assyrian, assumed (or hoped) that their communication could nevertheless be read by the Anatolian addressees. It does not say (yet) that Anatolians used it.

[107] But not always, see Klinger, *Byzas* 4, 10, and J. Seeher, "Chronology in Ḫattuša: New Approaches to an Old problem", *Byzas* 4, 207.

[108] s., for instance, J. Cooper, "Babylonian beginnings: the origins of the cuneiform writing system in comparative perspective", in: S.D. Houston, *The First Writing. Script Invention as History and Process* (Cambridge 2004), 72-80.

[109] For medieval England compare Clanchy, *Memory to Written Record,* 44-80.

As we saw, more systematic scribal practices are not in evidence, it seems, before c. 1500 BC. If we widen the scope from clay records to writing in general, two other pieces of writing that are also exactly datable need mentioning. The oldest is the inscription on a bronze so-called lugged ax in Akkadian mentioning the Old Hittite king and predecessor of Telipinu, Ammuna of the mid- or later 16th century.[110] Unfortunately, the ax is unprovenanced but for our present purposes that is not absolutely essential. The inscription is the formula that we find with light variations in the seal impressions on the *Landschenkungsurkunden*:

tabarna Ammuna LUGAL.GAL *ša išar* INIM *ušpaḫu* BA.ÚŠ
"Tabarna, Ammuna, Great King: whoever violates (his) just word will die"

The words would not be inappropriate if the ax was used as a symbol of power as is likely to have been the case with the ceremonial ax from Şarkışla.[111] Such use is portrayed on what is usually called the King's Gate in Ḫattuša, where a male figure carries an ax that is very similar to the Şarkışla one. The only difference is that the latter is elaborately sculptured while the Ammuna ax is completely unadorned but for the inscription.

The second piece dates to the very end of the Old Kingdom or even the beginning of the Empire. This is the bronze sword of a Tudḫaliya. It, too, has an inscription in Akkadian with an historical reference that allows us to ascribe it to Tudḫaliya I of the late 15th century:

inūma ^m*Dutḫaliya* LUGAL.GAL KUR ^{URU}*Āššuwa uḫalliq* GÍR.ḪI.A *annūtim ana* ^dIŠKUR *bēlišu ušeli*
"When Tudḫaliya, Great King, had destroyed the land of Aššuwa, he dedicated these swords to the Stormgod, his Lord"[112]

One of the swords was found just outside the walls of Boğazköy and is likely to stem from a temple dedicated to the Stormgod in the city.[113]

---

[110] See M. Salvini, "Un documento del re ittita Ammuna", *SMEA* 32 (1993), 85-89 w. Tav. I.

[111] s. K. Bittel, *Beitrag zur Kenntnis hethitischer Bildkunst* (Heidelberg 1976), 19-27.

[112] s. A. Ertekin - I. Ediz, "The Unique Sword from Boğazköy/Ḫattuša", in: M.J. Mellink et al., *Aspects of Art and Iconography: Anatolia and its Neighbours. Studies in Honour of Nimet Özgüç* (Ankara 1993), 719-725, A. Ünal, *FsNÖzgüç* 727-730, M. Salvini - L. Vagnetti, "Una spada di tipo egeo da Boğazköy", *PP* 49 (1994), 215-236, X. Buchholz, "Eine hethitische Schwertweihung", *JPR* 8 (1994) 20-41, St. de Martino, *L'Anatolia occidentale nel medio regno ittita*, Eothen 5 (Firenze 1996), 24f. Whether the weapon is a piece of booty and thus of an Aegean type or Anatolian, remains a matter of debate: s. P. Taracha, "Is Tutḫaliya's Sword Really Aegean?", in *FsHoffner*, 367-376 w. lit.

[113] Whether the ANKARA bowl (cf. J.D. Hawkins, "A Hieroglyphic Luwian Inscription on a Silver Bowl in the Museum of Anatolian Civilizations, Ankara", *Anadolu Medeniyetleri Müzesi* 1996 [1997], 7-21) is also to be attributed to Tudḫaliya I remains uncertain.

If we now look again at the evidence for the earliest datable writing in the Old Kingdom we see two surprising things:

date	found in Ḫattuša	unprovenanced
middle/later 17th cent.		letter of Ḫattušili to Tunip-Teššub
c. 1550		ax of Ammuna
c. 1520- c. 1375	charters (c. 60)	
c. 1490	treaty of Taḫurwaili	
c. 1450	texts written by Ḫanikuili[114]	
c. 1400	sword of Tudḫaliya I	

All of the above documents are in Akkadian and except for the letter to Tunip-Teššub and the treaty of Taḫurwaili they are all internal records. In the case of the one colophon KBo 31.48 with Ḫanikuili one could, of course, argue that we do not have the composition itself but the Akkadian-phrased indication of the topic ([DUB.x.K]AM *ŠA DĪNI*[*M* ...] "[x-]th [tablet] of the lawsuit"), although certainly not conclusive,[115] at least supports the hypothesis that it was written in Akkadian instead of Hittite.

Although datable only on the basis of its (north-Syrian) ductus one might add to the above list at the same chronological level as Ḫattušili's letter to Tunip-Teššub, the Uršu-text KBo 1.11 containing the account in Akkadian of the siege of Uršu (see already above §3). Found in Ḫattuša, it shows the Akkadian dialect and ductus common to the general Syro-Mesopotamian area of Alalaḫ VII and the letter to Tunip-Teššub. According to most scholars it is therefore old and should be roughly contemporary with Ḫattušili I's reign to which its contents are dated.[116] That it was an import piece is unlikely because it tells of a Hittite king and his commander and, moreover, contains a few Hittite words and phrases. Dating it early, Aharon Kempinski considered it possible that "dies überhaupt der älteste der hethitischen und akkadischen Texte ist, die bis jetzt in Boğazköy gefunden worden sind."[117] While acknowledging the likelihood of Kempinski's paleographic observation and the date of the tablet, Jörg Klinger rightly countered that "dann allerdings die auffallende Differenz des Zeichengebrauchs in den zeitgleichen hethitischsprachigen Texten [unerklärt bleibt]."[118] This objection and the questions asked by Klinger that we saw earlier are understandable from the viewpoint that there was an active chancery producing both Akkadian and Hittite records during the reigns of Ḫattušili I and Muršili I. If, however, the

---

[114] Besides the charters mentioned in §5 these are KBo 19.99 and KBo 31.48.

[115] For *ṬUPPU ŠA* DI.ḪI.A in Hitt. context see KBo 3.3 iv 2, 12 (Murš. II, ed. H. Klengel, "Der Schiedsspruch des Mursili II. hinsichtlich Barga und seine Übereinkunft mit Duppi-Tešup von Amurru", *Or*. 32 (1963) 38f., 44f.).

[116] s. Kempinski, *AÄT* 4, 33, Neu, *StBoT* 25, 26 n. 7, Beckman, *JCS* 47 (1995) 27, and Klinger, *ICH* 3, 370 n. 16, 372, and *FsHoffner* 240 n. 16. The Konkordanz has now changed its characterization from "jh." to "k.A." and rightly notes the resemblance to the cuneiform used in the Tikunani-letter.

[117] *AÄT* 4, 33 n. 20.

[118] *ICH* 3, 370 n. 16 (italics mine).

records in Hittite are no longer necessarily "zeitgleich" since regular writing practices may not have started until the late 16th century, Kempinksi may well have been right. The few Hittite words and phrases in the Uršu-text may then be regarded as early experiments with writing in Hittite and consequently might be the oldest written Hittite words preserved. The Hittite words in the charters would be the next ones that we have. There may have been some further experimenting in the approximately one hundred years that elapsed between Muršili I and Telipinu but given the lack of records and compositions as well as the relative malaise of the Hittite kingdom in those intervening years, writing may have foundered for lack of administrative and political incentive. In this scenario the dearth of written records from the Hittite administration might reflect the little need they felt for a script for internal purposes. Cuneiform writing had been available to the Hittites for some two centuries during the Old Assyrian period and whenever after the collapse of the Assyrian trading network the Hittites ventured eastwards, they must have come into contact with literate societies but they may not have fully embraced it themselves until the reign of Telipinu or slightly earlier.[119]

Only by the time of the earliest charters does the typical Hittite cuneiform seem to become more firmly established. Following Wilhelm these can be dated to the later 16th century, to the reigns of Ammuna and Ḫuzziya at the earliest. To this we may add the Ammuna ax that we already saw: its sign forms do not show any significant deviations from the typical Hittite cuneiform.[120] The latter would thus have gained its final foothold somewhere in the course of the later 16th century. Not coincidentally, the charters are also the first direct expression of administrative activity. Administration and literacy are very much interdependent: the rise of a more complex administration gives rise to the need for written records and the growing existence of written records will stimulate literacy in its turn. With his administrative reforms and renewal of international diplomacy Telipinu is an excellent candidate for a king who may have given the decisive push in getting the cuneiform script definitively established in the Hittite kingdom.[121] Besides the charters his so-called Proclamation describes a nation-wide administrative reform[122] and his also seems to be the first of a series of treaties with Kizzuwatna in south-eastern Anatolia. Again, the fact that the treaty is in Akkadian has everything to do with the text's "international"

---

[119] For Ferdinand Sommer's theory (*Hethiter und Hethitisch* [Stuttgart 1947], 8-10) that the Hittites had already adopted their variant of cuneiform writing before entering Anatolia see Kammenhuber, *HbOr*, 162-165.

[120] For the ŠA sign without inscribed vertical s. *HZL* 158/11. Interesting here is the early sealing of a *tawananna* as published by D. Bawanypeck, "Die hethitischen Königssiegel vom Westbau des Nişantepe in Boğazköy-Ḫattuša", *Byzas* 4, 117f. w. Abb. 2.1, showing variants of the MUNUS and NA signs that are not among the shapes common in the later Hittite cuneiform. The specific NA sign can be found also, for instance, on the Kültepe tablet k/k 4 (cf. Hecker, *SCCNH* 8 [1996], 291-303, Salvini, *SMEA* 34 [1994] 74).

[121] For external relations as an important incentive for literacy cf. Jack Goody, *The logic of writing and the organization of society* (Cambridge 1986), 100-102.

[122] On this reform and its topographical extension s. I. Singer, "The AGRIG in the Hittite Texts", *AnSt.* 34 (1984), 97-127.

character but this does not apply to the charters that are for internal use only. The sudden and relatively short-lived appearance of the charters may also be easier to explain as a phenomenon related to the increased use and establishment of the cuneiform script for internal purposes in Hittite society than if the latter had already been widely in use for 150 years. Land tenure before that must have been provable by memory and/or symbolic means[123] only but once writing had established itself, documentary evidence may have become increasingly common (and required) in the form of the *Landschenkungsurkunden*.

It should also be noted that all manuscripts of the Hittite version of the Telipinu Proclamation date to the 13th century while the ductus of the Akkadian fragments[124] remains a more open question. Klinger, for instance, suggests dating them at least partially as "vor-großreichszeitlich."[125] Although the manuscripts of the Akkadian versions of Ḫattušili I's Annals and his so-called Political Testament date with certainty to the 13th century, their being in Akkadian finds a more ready explanation in the development sketched here. The earliest written versions probably were in Akkadian and possibly in a cuneiform variant that was akin to the one of the Uršu-text and Ḫattušili's letter to Tunip-Teššub but not the one we call Hittite. This does not necessarily mean that they were composed in that language and that an entire audience was kept in the dark, only that they were written down in Akkadian. Michael Clanchy observes for 12th and 13th century England:

A statement made in court in English or French, for example, might be written down in Latin, or conversely a Latin charter might be read out in English or French. Men like Abbot Samson evidently interchanged languages effortlessly, using whichever one was appropriate for the occasion. … A royal message to a sheriff in the thirteenth century might have been spoken by the king in French, written out in Latin, and then read to the recipient in English.[126]

This ability to change languages may have been exactly what men like Ḫanikuili and his father Anu-šar-ilāni prided themselves in when they described themselves as "interpreters."[127] If we may take Anu-šar-ilāni's name as an indication of his Mesopotamian origins, then his son Ḫanikuili may well have grown up in Ḫattuša and may be expected to have been fully bilingual.

8. Conclusions and consequences

General considerations concerning the introduction of writing in a society, the present status of the debate surrounding paleographic dating of Hittite tablets and some

---

[123] cf. the story of the Earl Warenne under Edward I of England after the Norman conquest in Clanchy, *Memory to Written Record*, 35f.; s. also Goody, *The logic of writing and the organization of society*, 159-165.

[124] s. Hoffmann, *THeth*, 11, 1, 58-62.

[125] *FsHoffner,* 240 n. 16. The Akkadian fragments may belong to two different manuscripts (s. Hoffmann in preceding footnote).

[126] Clanchy, *Memory to Written Record,* 206.

[127] S. above §5.

observations concerning the development of the Hittite tablet collections force us to question some long-held views and lead to the following alternative scenario. The rise of writing and literacy in the Old Hittite Kingdom, that is, up until the late 15th century BC, must have been a gradual process dictated by need and availability. Anatolians in the period of the Old Assyrian trading posts would occasionally use the Old Assyrian cuneiform script and language for their own purposes. When Ḫattušili I needed to communicate with Tunip-Teššub in the Syro-Mesopotamian area he secured the services of a foreign scribe while the Uršu-text may be an example of his use of the same cuneiform script and language for internal purposes. If the Uršu-text is old indeed, it may also offer one of the earliest glimpses at attempting to write Hittite. As far as datable records go, however, the typical Hittite variant of cuneiform does not seem to be attested until the late 16th century. It may have been Telipinu who with his renewed international policies towards Kizzuwatna as well as his reforms on various internal levels set in motion a process whereby a gradually increasing and more complex administration could no longer exist without the existence of a more or less permanent "writing office."[128] Initially, Akkadian was still the language of written communication[129] that had come with the script but the shift to writing in Hittite was made in the 15th century. The first stages can be seen in the early *Landschenkungsurkunden* with the occasional Hittite technical term in them but by the time of Arnuwanda I such charters were reduced to a formulaic framework in Akkadian with all the details filled out in Hittite.[130] In the 15th century also our corpus of what we usually call OS and MS would have been written. Judging by the absence of any further Akkadian versions, the shift to using Hittite only for internal purposes seems to have been completed towards the end of the 15th century: with Tudḫaliya I we start having an uninterrupted tradition of compositions in Hittite only while the surprising Akkadian inscription on the sword probably represents the last vestige of what by then must have been seen an old, perhaps even outdated, but venerated tradition worthy of this unique occasion. The beginnings of the archival system that is in evidence for the late 13th century probably do not antedate Tudḫaliya I. What may have been a modest "writing office" until then, perhaps morphed into a real chancery in his reign.[131]

The advantages of this alternative scenario are that it closely follows the available and datable evidence, that it is in line with typological parallels and leaves no gaps in an expected development: the Akkadian compositions and lexical lists that should go with a scribal education are there. It also provides a natural explanation for the use of Akkadian in early Hittite records. Of course, there are some serious consequences also. The traditional distinction between OS and MS may have to be given up and collapsed into one. As already stated, our corpus of non-datable OS and MS religious texts would have to have

---

[128] For the distinction between a writing office and a chancery s. apud Clanchy, *Memory to Written Record,* 56.

[129] Cf. similarly Popko, *FsKošak* 579.

[130] Cf. Archi, *AoF* 32 (2005) 228.

[131] Note the different assessment by Archi, *AoF* 32 (2005) 227, according to whom "at the start of the empire, the archives and libraries were reorganized."

been written down in the 15th and earlier 14th century and our distinctions between the two corpora may have been influenced by subject matter rather than real paleographic differences. For some Old Hittite compositions with historical narrative like the Anitta and Zukraši-texts, the Zalpa-tale, and the Palace Chronicles we may have to assume original Akkadian versions that were later translated into Hittite.[132] There may also have existed a certain oral tradition. The Hittite version of Telipinu's Proclamation shows the characteristics of orality: the sketchy first part with its short sentences is very formulaic[133] until it becomes increasingly detailed from Muršili I's reign onwards. When the much more detailed historical narrative of Muršili's successor Ḫantili starts we are only two generations removed from its author Telipinu, that is, a period that could be covered by institutional and in this case also family memory without recourse to written sources. [134]

Finally, if the beginnings of a more permanent Hittite literacy using the familiar type of Hittite cuneiform do not predate the later 16th century this also has consequences for the adoption of the cuneiform script by the Hittites. Instead of being forced as Klinger rightly saw, to assume a date prior to Ḫattušili I, a development of the original Syrian ductus imported by him as exemplified by the Alalaḫ VII texts into what became the typical Hittite cuneiform in the course of the 16th century seems conceivable. It may have competed at first with the variant known from the Tikunani letter and Uršu text but eventually won out.

As stated above, the scenario presented here is an alternative and it needs to be compared as such with the traditional view and the merits of both should be weighed one against the other. This alternative is by no means new. Already in 1922 Emil Forrer hypothesized precisely in view of the charters "daß damals die Keilschrift nur für die babylonische Sprache gebraucht wurde, und daß ihre Übertragung auf die kanisische Sprache einer späteren Zeit angehört."[135] But his suggestion was never taken up again, it seems. Hard evidence is rarely available in these matters but an open-minded discussion of the several possibilities may bring us closer to a view that seems to be the least controversial and explains more naturally the evidence at hand.

---

[132] cf. Popko, *FsKošak* 579.

[133] Note that Archi, "I modi della memoria" in ***, 26, points at the composition's short sentences and simple syntax in its early part and suggests that such compositions may have been read publicly.

[134] Unless the differences between the narrative historical texts on the one hand and the OS rituals and later (that is, Telipinu) historical corpus as claimed by E. Rieken, "Die Partikeln *-a, -ya, -ma* im Althethitischen und das Akkadogramm *Ū*", in: M. Ofitsch - Chr. Zinko, *125 Jahre Indogermanistik in Graz* (Graz 2000), 11f., are due to genre distinctions (pers. comm. P. Goedegebuure), an oral transmission would be the only way to account for them.

[135] *ZDMG* 76 (1922) 183.