

WAAL, W. J. I. — Hittite Diplomatics. Studies in Ancient Document Format and Record Management (Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten, 57). Verlag Otto Harrassowitz, Wiesbaden, 2015. (24,5 cm, XXI, 620). ISBN 978-3-447-10482-1. ISSN 0585-5853. € 98,-.

For the first century after the “decipherment” of the Hittite language in the early twentieth century, studies of the tablets recovered from the Hittite capital, Boğazköy/Ḫattuša, while numerous, were constrained by the necessarily slow pace of publication of the 30,000 or so intact tablets (few) and fragments (many) and by the lack of adequate lexical tools. Now that the bulk of the textual material has been made available and almost the entire vocabulary treated by one or another of several dictionary projects, it has become possible to conduct more global studies of the archives as a whole and of the scribes who composed and inscribed them. Accordingly, in 2015 S. Gordin presented a study of the organization of two scribal schools active at Ḫattuša in *Hittite Scribal Circles. Scholarly Tradition and Writing Habits*,¹⁾ while the volume under review, revised from a 2010 Leiden doctoral thesis and also appearing in 2015, applies the rigorous methodology of diplomatics to the entire corpus of Hittite cuneiform documents, including those written in foreign tongues.

Following an introduction to the practice of diplomatics and an overview of the archaeological contexts of the findspots of the Hittite material (chapter 1),²⁾ Willemijn Waal examines the production³⁾ and physical features of the tablets (chapter 2), the details of their inscription with cuneiform writing (chapter 3), and the placement of text on their surface (chapters 4–6). She establishes typologies of practice for each of these areas, in the process demonstrating that the very existence of such standards implies some type of unified scribal training for the Hittite bureaucracy (p. 123, cf. p. 176). The short chapter 6 summarizes the previous discussions and sets Hittite usage within the context of textual production in the wider ancient Near East. Particularly welcome are the numerous clear photographs that the author includes throughout this section of the book to illustrate her presentation.

Chapter 7 covers the Hittite-language vocabulary for writing materials—types of tablets, including wooden documents, and styli—while chapter 8 distills a typology for the colophons that are found occasionally in older texts but that come into much wider use in the fourteenth and thirteenth centuries (p. 160). The final chapter 9 considers what the contents of the tablets themselves, their colophons, and archaeology allow us to say about “record management” among the Hittites. It must be remarked that, despite its inclusion in the sub-title of this work, Waal has little to add on this latter topic to what has been written in recent years by Th. van den Hout.⁴⁾

¹⁾ StBoT 59, Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz. See my review in *OLZ*, forthcoming.

²⁾ Including the provincial Anatolian sites of Maşat Höyük, Kuşaklı, and Ortaköy, where smaller archives have been found in recent years.

³⁾ On p. 59 n. 178 the author reports on a modest experiment performed with the assistance of preparators at Chicago’s Oriental Institute that demonstrated that an air-dried modern clay tablet could still be inscribed some 24 hours after its shaping, but that after 30 hours this became ever more difficult.

⁴⁾ See “Reflections on the Origins and Development of the Hittite Tablet Collections in Ḫattuša and Their Consequences for the Rise of Hittite Literacy,” in *Central-North Anatolia in the Hittite Period*, ed. F. P. Daddi,

To this reviewer it appears that no rigorous system was in place in Hatti for storage and retrieval of tablets. Although certain sub-groups of texts, such as the KILAM festival (CTH 627, nos. II.22.96ff. here) and the (*h*)*i*šuwa ceremonies (CTH 628, nos. II.22.121ff.), employ a more-or-less standardized colophon *within their category*, entire other genres (e.g., oracle reports) basically eschew these scribal notes.⁵⁾ In any event, the placement of colophons at the end of the final column of text on the reverse—or even at the conclusion of the penultimate column in the rare cases when the final column was uninscribed—would have made it difficult for Hittite archivists to identify them on the shelves in their repositories.

Ancillary tools included in the volume are lists of tablets displaying various layout features (appendix I), a roster of scribes appearing in colophons (appendix III), and a bibliography and index. But the heart of this book, comprising nearly half of its pages, is definitely the complete corpus⁶⁾ of nearly 1000 colophons transliterated and translated in appendix II, organized according to entries in E. Laroche's *Catalogue des textes hittites* and constantly updated in the *Konkordanz* of the Hethitologie-Portal Mainz (<http://www.hethport.uni-wuerzburg.de/HPM/index.html>).

In its extensive coverage and high standard of philological analysis, this work will be indispensable for anyone pursuing in-depth study of the Hittite textual record. Willemijn Waal is to be congratulated on the fruits of her many years of labor on this significant project.⁷⁾

Particular Comments

Pp. 56f.: Add to the corpus of pierced tablets E. Rieken, “Kp 14/03—eine SMS aus der Hethiterzeit?” in *Beiträge zur Kenntnis und Deutung altorientalischer Archivalien. Festschrift für Helmut Freydank zum 80. Geburtstag*, ed. D. Prechel and H. Neumann (Münster: Zaphon, 2019): 265–73.

P. 93 n. 293: Read KBo 29.26 (not .65).

P. 99: The identification here of the use of a left vertical marginal line in the layout of a tablet as an idiosyncrasy of the scribe Talmi-Teššub argues in favor of maintaining this reading of the broken scribal name in the colophon of KBo 35.260+, which displays this same feature. See Gordin, *StBoT* 59, 153 n. 628.

P. 149: Although the early royal land grants do not feature colophons, all do name their scribes at the conclusion of their witness lists, thus fulfilling one of the functions of the colophon.

P. 170: Translate VSNF 12.58 + KUB 46.39 rev. 8': “If a person takes for himself the enemy's house and the gods of the enemy ...”

Additions and Corrections to Corpus of Colophons⁸⁾

CTH 3 (p. 221)—To be added here is KBo 3.38 rev. 32: *QA-TI*, which is written on the same line as the final words of the text. For this, cf. the similar placement of the Akkadogram in KUB 6.45 iv 61.

CTH 393 (p. 304)—VBoT 24 iv 36–37: Translate “When they send <<for>> the god ...”

CTH 397 (p. 306)—Read KUB 24.15 iv 2': ^{MUNUS}Š[U?]. GI.

CTH 408 (p. 314)—Translate KUB 7.2 iv 4'–5': “If the gods were subjected to witchcraft in regard to a person ...”

CTH 413 (p. 317)—Restore KBo 4.1 rev. 31: [(1) I]M. GÍD.DA after KUB 2.2 ii 36.

CTH 427 (p. 321)—Read KBo 6.34 iv 18: ... *le-en-ki-ya* ^{erasure}.

CTH 433 (p. 323)—Read KBo 20.107 iv 21': ... *hu-u-ma-da-a-az*.

CTH 472 (p. 345)—The colophon of KBo 23.1 rev. 38ff. has been restored from the similar lines in ii 17–21, but this has not been indicated by brackets.

CTH 476 (p. 348)—^{GÍŠ}GAG in KBo 5.1 iv 39' should be rendered as usual as ‘peg’, not ‘leg’. For the construction of a birth-stool, see my remarks in *StBoT* 29, 102.

CTH 495 (p. 359)—Render VSNF 12.58 + KUB 46.39 rev. 3': “1 (rite): If a god wants a town from a person.”

CTH 533 (p. 382)—Read KUB 29.11 + KBo 36.48 iv/iii 4': ŠU.NÍGIN 59 ŠID[.BI(.IM)]; cf. Hoffner, *GsSachs*, 173.

CTH 537 (p. 383)—Add KBo 36.51++ (G. Wilhelm, *StBoT* 36, 25) rev. 18': *Ú-UL QA-TI*.

CTH 637 (p. 457)—KUB 51.1 is now joined to KBo 54.125 and the colophon iv 8'–9' reads: DUB[.N].KAM *QA-TI m[a-a-an ...] / ^{URU}Ka-a-aš-ḫa A-NA [...]*.

CTH 659 (p. 652)—Add the colophon to unpublished Bo 6868, transliterated by H. Otten, *JCS* 4 (1950): 134.

CTH 713 (p. 502)—Add KUB 45.32 iv 4'–9', I. Wegner, *ChS* I/3–1, 91 (no. 13).

CTH 741 (p. 515)—In KBo 23.103 iv 14, “pile” is a poor translation of *ukturi*; rather ‘ghat’, if indeed the word is not an adjective modifying the following *EZEN-ni*.

CTH 825 (p. 538)—Translate *EZEN*₄ *AYARI*, KBo 47.139 rev. 1': “Festival of the Stag.”

Ann Arbor,
June 2019

Gary BECKMAN

G. Torri, and C. Corti (Rome: Herder, 2009), 71–96, as well as his several more recent contributions to the question.

⁵⁾ See p. 147, Table 8.1a for the distribution of colophons among types of text. Waal stresses the provisional nature of this listing (p. 149), given the uncertainty when dealing with a corpus as generally fragmentary as that from Boğazköy, of determining that a text did *not* have a colophon.

⁶⁾ See a couple of additions in Additions and Corrections below.

⁷⁾ Earlier reviews of this book include those of E. Devecchi, *ZA* 107 (2017): 307–11, and of A. Mouton, *Syria* 94 (2017): 397–99.

⁸⁾ See already the list of Devecchi, 309–10.