

ON THE NATURE OF THE TABLET COLLECTIONS OF ḪATTUŠA

by THEO VAN DEN HOUT

1. INTRODUCTION

In the memorial volume for Fiorella Imparati I discussed the definition of the word “literature” as applied to Hittite texts. There I tried to define it as much as possible from within, that is, without applying our modern notions about literature. Inevitably, I briefly touched upon the discussion surrounding the characterization of the tablet collections of the Hittite capital Ḫattuša as either archives or libraries. In this paper I want to look more closely into that question.

Over the decades the tablet collections of Ḫattuša - when explicitly discussed - have been characterized mostly as libraries and only rarely as archives¹. Occasionally the terms have been mixed up in a confusing way, starting with Emil Forrer saying: “Sowie die Tafeln uns vorliegen, haben wir es also nicht mit einem Archiv, sondern mit einer Bibliothek zu tun, die ... zugleich als Archiv gedient hat”². Whichever one uses, both terms presuppose an idea of order, of system but confronted with the difficulties of detecting a system, in the archaeological find complex some scholars have refrained from using these terms³ while others out of despair at the seeming state of disorder have denied the existence of “specialized archives”⁴. Starting from the observation that we have so many copies or duplicates, which was already taken by Emil Forrer⁵ as characteristic of a library rather than an archive, and the fact that we hardly have any real “originals” except for a Kizzuwatna treaty, the Bronze tablet and the Landschenkungsurkunden, Heinrich Otten in the late 1950’s suggested that the Hittite state archives had not yet been found⁶. With the ongoing excavations now having covered most of the area of the capital, this seems

¹ See, for instance, for the tablet collections in Ḫattuša as libraries rather than archives F. Milkau/J. Schawe, “Der alte Vorderorient” in F. Milkau, *Handbuch der Bibliothekswissenschaft, Dritter Band, Geschichte der Bibliotheken* (Wiesbaden 1955), 39f., H. Otten, *Das Altertum 1* (1955) 78 (for Bldg. A), J. Papritz, “Archive in Altmesopotamien. Theorie und Tatsachen”, *Archivalische Zeitschrift* 55 (1959) 29, Otten in K.R. Veenhof, 30. CRRAI Leiden 1983 (Leiden/Istanbul 1986), 184f. (with older literature), id. apud S. Košak, *StBoT* 34, 8, as well as Košak, *FsHouwink ten Cate* 177, R. Francia, *Archivi e Cultura* 29 (1996) 127-129, S. Alaura, *StBoT* 45, 25, as opposed to M. Giorgieri, *ZA* 87 (1997) 158 with n. 3 who thinks it was more of an archive. Besides these explicit discussions on how to characterize the tablet collections, they are often in a very general way referred to as archives and less often as libraries, but “archives” in those cases is just an imprecise use of the term.

² *ZDMG* 76/NF 1 (1922) 182.

³ Cf. K. Bittel, *NHF* 120 n. 2.

⁴ So R. Francia, *Archivi e Cultura* 29 (1996) 129, H. Klengel, *MemGüterbock* 102 n. 4.

⁵ See above n. 2.

⁶ Apud J. Papritz, *Archivalische Zeitschrift* 55 (1959) 29 n. 57, and repeated by E. Posner, *Archives in the Ancient World* (Cambridge, MA, 1972) 35.

hardly tenable any longer. But Otten's observation remains very important and is a question we will have to come back to.

Most definitions of the terms "archive" and "library" used in our field or in Ancient Near Eastern studies in general have used contents as at least a partial guide in determining the status of tablet collections as an archive or library. Compare the most recent definitions by Pedersén:

The term 'archive' here, as in some other studies, refers to a collection of texts, each text documenting a message or a statement, for example, letters, legal, economic and administrative documents. In an archive there is usually just one copy of each text, although occasionally a few copies may exist. 'Library', on the other hand, denotes a collection of texts normally with multiple copies for use in different places at different times, and includes, e.g. literary, historical, religious, and scientific texts. In other words, libraries may be said to consist of the texts of tradition. With rather broad definitions of the terms "document" and "literary text," it may be simplest to say that archives are collections of documents and libraries are collections of literary texts⁷.

Pedersén then points out that "Occasionally a few library texts have been found in an archive and a few archive texts in a library". For these cases he proposes the terms "archive with library" and "library with archive"⁸. However, reducing the "archive-library" question to the distinction literary versus non-literary is mainly moving the problem to another equally difficult issue.

In my contribution to the memorial volume for Fiorella Imparati I also wondered whether the terms "archive" and "library" are useful at all in describing the Hittite tablet collections. If contents are any guide, it should not be too difficult to assign most Hittite compositions to an archive or a library according to our modern or to some form of alleged ancient standards. But what would the use of these terms be, if the Hittites did not store archival and library materials separately (if not in separate buildings than at least on different floors, rooms or shelves)⁹? That is a matter which only archaeology can clarify but thus far we have not been very fortunate in that respect. However, there are some good reasons to assume that

⁷ O. Pedersén, *Archives and Libraries in the Ancient Near East 1500-300 B.C.* (Bethesda, MD 1998), 3. For other earlier definitions or discussions of the problem within the field of ancient Near Eastern studies see e.g. A.A. Kampman, *Archieven en Bibliotheken in het Oude Nabije Oosten* (Antwerpen 1942), 3f., G. Goossens, RA 46 (1952) 98-107, F. Milkau/J. Schawe in F. Milkau, *Handbuch der Bibliothekswissenschaft, Dritter Band, Geschichte der Bibliotheken* (Wiesbaden 1955), 3f., M. Weitemeyer, "Archive and Library Technique in Ancient Mesopotamia", *Libri* 6 (1955-1956) 218, J. Papritz, *Archivalische Zeitschrift* 55 (1959) 11-51, E. Posner, *Archives in the Ancient World* (Cambridge, MA, 1972) 4f., K. Veenhof, 30. CRRAI (Leiden 1983) 7, 9, H. Otten, *ibid.* 184-185, J. Black/W. Tait, CANE 4, 2197, 2202, 2206, R. Francia, *Archivi e Cultura* 29 (1996) 119 n. 1 (with lit.), J. du Toit, 43. CRRAI (Prague 1996), 389-395.

⁸ Pedersén, *l.c.*

⁹ For Bldg. A the question of the exact spot, where the tablets were kept (just in room 5 in the basement or upstairs?), seems difficult to answer: cf. K. Bittel (/R. Naumann), *BoHa* I, 54, Otten, *Das Altertum* 1 (1955) 73. The situation in the rooms 10-12 in Temple I is even more complex, compare O. Puchstein, *WDOG* 19, 124-126.

there must have been some kind of organization which we can try to describe in terms of archive versus library.

2. INFORMATION OR RECORD MANAGEMENT IN THE HITTITE EMPIRE

There are many arguments that speak in favor of some system of information or record management in the tablet collections of the Hittite capital. But, more importantly, that there must have been specialized tablet collections, that is, a system which enabled scribes and officials to retrieve information effectively from the tablet rooms, is in my opinion an inescapable premiss of any investigation into this matter: an international power like the Hittite empire cannot have existed without some system of record management. Not only are colophons, shelf lists and labels as well as *Sammel tafeln* traces of such a system, the texts themselves indicate that scribes were able to search the collections and retrieve material they needed. One need only recall the order Šuppiluliuma gave to fetch the Kuruštama treaty tablet when the deal with the Egyptian embassy under Hani was concluded or the search for tablets ordered by Muršili in connection with the Plague Prayers. Also, Hittite historiography could not have been written, new treaties could not have been compiled, new hymns and prayers composed without the help of earlier sources present in the tablet rooms. Finally, the organizational principles visible elsewhere in the Hittite empire, for instance, at Ugarit¹⁰, strongly point to an existing system of some kind. The fact that we find it difficult to detect such a system in Hattuša in all probability says more about us than about the Hittites¹¹.

If, then, we assume a system, it is legitimate to try describe it in terms of “archive” and/or “library.” The relevance of trying to characterize the Hittite tablet collections as such or to detect any system is obvious: the organization of an archive reflects the organization of an administration and the existence and contents of a library can tell us something about the cultural values of a civilization. If we are not able to apply these terms, we will never have an idea of how the Hittite state and its bureaucracy worked. If on the other hand we can detect some system in the management of the corpus of Hittite texts in its entirety, the *Schriftgutverwaltung*, we will gain important information on the workings of the administration which will in turn be beneficial in the study of single texts and the *Sitz im Leben* of groups of texts and individual compositions.

The problems we confront in these matters are manifold. Most of these seem of our own making rather than inherent to the Hittite material, let alone that we should blame the Hittite scribes. Firstly, we keep being reminded about the loss of archaeological exact information of the first approx. 10.000 fragments of the Winckler-Makridi excavations¹². Also, Hittitologists have for very understandable reasons concentrated their efforts on editing individual compositions rather than

¹⁰ On this see W.H. van Soldt, “The Palace Archives at Ugarit” in K.R. Veenhof, 30. CRRAI Leiden 1983 (Leiden/Istanbul 1986), 196-204.

¹¹ For an example of this see below.

¹² See my remarks on this in the GsImparati 857-878.

on looking at text genres or the entire text corpus and its organization as a whole. Thirdly, when addressing this question, insufficient methodology and unfounded suppositions often stood in the way of reaching sound conclusions. More theoretical treatments on the complex question of archives vs. libraries were often ignored. And it was always automatically, it seems, assumed that shelf lists reflected the order of tablets in the building where the shelf lists were found. Finally, the often perplexing problems that arise from the findspots that we do know, contribute to the problem considerably.

Today, one hundred years after the first texts from Ḫattuša were published, it is about time that we look more closely at these questions. In recent years several articles appeared dealing with these and related issues¹³. Extremely important in this matter is, of course, the invaluable work done by Silvin Košak in his *StBoT*-volumes 34, 39, 42 and 43 and his *Konkordanz der hethitischen Texte* on the website *Hethitologie Portal Mainz*¹⁴.

3. ANOTHER APPROACH

I would like to approach the matter from the more theoretical point of view of “modern”, that is, pre-computer age, archival science. I believe archival science can help us in the question of how to describe the tablet collections at Ḫattuša and in solving some of the perplexing questions that confront us.

A general definition of archive or archival collection runs as follows:

An archival collection is the whole of the written documents, (...) officially received or produced by an administrative body or one of its officials, in so far as these documents were intended to remain in the custody of that body or of that official¹⁵.

¹³ See S. Alaura, “Die Identifizierung der im ‘Gebäude E’ von Büyükkale-Boğazköy gefundenen Tontafelfragmente aus der Grabung von 1933”, *AoF* 25 (1988) 193-214. ead., “Archive und Bibliotheken in Ḫattuša”, *StBoT* 45, 12-26, R. Francia, “Archivi e biblioteche nell’Anatolia del II millennio a.C. Archivi e Cultura 29 (1996) 119-138, C. Karasu, “Some Remarks on Archive-Library Systems of Ḫattuša-Boğazköy”, *Archivum Anatolicum* 2 (1996) 39-59, S. Košak, “The Palace Library ‘Building A’ on Büyükkale”, *FsHouwink ten Cate* 173-179, and my article in the *GsImparati*.

¹⁴ <http://www.hethiter.net>

¹⁵ S. Muller/J.A. Feith/R. Fruin, *Manual for the Arrangement and Description of Archives* (New York 1968), 13 (henceforth referred to as Muller et al., *Manual*). This originally Dutch handbook of 1898 (*Handleiding voor het ordenen en beschrijven van archieven*, Groningen) is one of the basic works of archival science and can be found quoted in practically all later manuals of archival science (cf. T.R. Schellenberg, *Modern Archives. Principles and Techniques* (Chicago 1956), 12, henceforth referred to as Schellenberg, *Modern Archives*). It is also mentioned as a highly useful point of departure in some of the older publications on the question of Ancient Near Eastern tablet collections (cf. G. Goossens, *RA* 46 (1952) 98 n. 1, M. Weitemeyer, *Libri* 6 (1955-1956) 235 n. 8, J. Papritz, *Archivalische Zeitschrift* 55 (1959) 16) but later works no longer seem to use it and archival science is largely ignored in general. Pedersén, *Archives and Libraries in the Ancient Near East 1500-300 B.C.* (Bethesda, ML 1998), merely refers to more general works in two footnotes (pp. 2-3 notes 2 and 3).

Applying this definition to the situation of the second millennium Hittite empire, every written document that somehow belongs to the business of its administration is an archival piece. Note that nothing is said about the contents of documents. The business of a particular administrative unit will determine the contents of its archive. Since we know that in the Hittite empire religion was an integral and essential part of the administration, there is no need to be surprised at the overwhelming presence of documents of a religious character in the tablet collections of Ḫattuša or to use that observation in determining the character of the tablet collection. It is also essential to keep in mind that an archive is “an organic whole, a living organism, which grows, takes shape, and undergoes changes in accordance with fixed rules”¹⁶. An archive grows passively: in and of itself it stores all it produces and receives. This is in contrast to a library which actively chooses what material it wishes to collect¹⁷.

Besides this we need to make a distinction between “living” and “historical” archives, to adopt a more international usage of the terms. In spite of the lack of a standard use of the word archive and the fact that languages sometimes use different terms, a basic distinction is made throughout:

	“living archive”	“historical archive”
English	<i>administration/record(s)</i>	<i>archive(s)</i> ¹⁸
German	<i>Kanzlei-/Registrargut</i>	<i>Archiv</i>
French (Italian, Dutch etc.)	<i>archive vivante / administrative</i>	<i>archive historique</i>

A living archive is what any administration of current affairs builds up and needs in order to fulfil its administrative functions. After documents have lost their immediate relevance for the present administration and have become inactive, they will be either discarded or moved elsewhere from the “living” to the “historical” archive. When this is done, is each administration’s or its supervising body’s decision. Often a major political-administrative change will be a reason for discarding documents: a new king, for instance, would do wise to hold on to his predecessor’s dossiers but might decide to use the opportunity to remove those of the latter’s predecessor. A period of 25 years or one generation seems fairly standard¹⁹. Generally, historical archives are considered a relatively modern phenomenon and scholars like G. Goossens²⁰ and Johannes Papritz²¹ described almost all Ancient Near Eastern tablet collections as living archives. Although this seems to be justified in

¹⁶ Muller et al., Manual 19.

¹⁷ For a discussion on the differences between archives and libraries see Schellenberg, *Modern Archives* 20-25.

¹⁸ The term “archive”, mostly pl. “archives” can indicate both the institution as well as the document(s) that institution keeps. This dual meaning is matched by the combination “administration/records” on the “living archive” side.

¹⁹ Muller et al., Manual 44f.

²⁰ G. Goossens, “Introduction à l’archivéconomie de l’Asie antérieure”, *RA* 46 (1952) 100.

²¹ J. Papritz, *Archivalische Zeitschrift* 55 (1959) 18.

the majority of cases, there is one category of texts which comes close to historical archives. The specific findspots of the so-called *Landschenkungsurkunden* in Bldg. D. on Büyükkale, in the north-west area of Temple 1, in the *Westbau* near Nişantepe and in Temple 8 in the Oberstadt as well as the thousands of sealings found in connection with them on the first three locations, point to an awareness on the side of the Hittites that this material was different from all others²². Also, the unique character of the *Landschenkungsurkunden*, i.e., the complete absence of duplicates here, fully conforms to the prerequisite of a historical archive, that there will always be just a single copy²³, the so-called engrossed copy or charter²⁴.

4. THE HITTITE TABLET COLLECTIONS AS ARCHIVES

In the memorial volume for Fiorella Imparati I proposed the following dichotomy in the Hittite textcorpus from Ḫattuša of genres that were regularly copied (Group A) and those that were not (Group B):

A. *Texts with duplicates*

historiography, treaties, edicts (CTH 1-147, 211-216)
 instructions (CTH 251-275)
 laws (CTH 291-292)
 celestial oracle theory (CTH 531-535)

 hymns and prayers (CTH 371-389)
 festivals (CTH 591-721)
 rituals (CTH 390-500)
 mythology, Anatolian (CTH 321-338)

B. *unica*

letters (CTH 151-210)
 title deeds (CTH 221-225)
 hippological texts (CTH 284-287)
 court depositions (CTH 293-297)
 non-celestial oracle theory (CTH 536-560)
 oracle practice (CTH 561-582)
 vows (CTH 583-590)
 administrative texts:
 - palace and temple administration
 (CTH 231-250)

²² On the special position of the *Landschenkungsurkunden* in the corpus of Hittite texts see my remarks in the GsImparati §7.

²³ Muller et al., Manual 35f. Schellenberg, *Modern Archives* 13f., calls it essential for (historical) archives, that they “are kept for the use of others than those that created them”, e.g. for the use of historians who want to study the workings of a past government but not for that government itself. In all likelihood, that was not true for Hittite society, and as a consequence Schellenberg would not approve of the *Landschenkungsurkunden* as possible evidence for a historical archive. However, this condition is not felt as essential by everyone and cannot be found in Muller et al. The *Landschenkungsurkunden* could also be described as retroacta (on that see below §4) but the very specific find situation of these documents seems to set them apart from other compositions for which this term will be used below.

²⁴ On these terms see Muller et al., Manual 204-208. In Hittitology the term “original” is often used for this but also for any pre-existing document that a present tablet was copied from. For the former it would be better to avoid the term “original” and to distinguish between drafts and engrossed copies/charters; for the latter “original” might serve, although a good English equivalent for the German “Vorlage” would be preferable.

and non-Anatolian (CTH 341-369)	- cult inventories (CTH 501-530)
Hattic, Palaic, Luwian, Hurrian texts (CTH 725-791)	- tablet collection shelf lists (CTH 276-282)
lexical lists (CTH 299-309)	- tablet collection labels (CTH 283)
Sumerian and Akkadian compositions (CTH 310-316, 792-819)	

Texts of group B constitute the main part of the daily administration, the living archive, the texts of just a limited time span, that must have been discarded or recycled after probably not more than one or two generations. As a rule these texts date to the last 50 years of the empire. However, according to the above definition and the already mentioned important role of the administration in religious matters most texts of group A can be described as material of living archives as well. These are the compositions, that were regularly copied, and also the ones we often have manuscripts of in Middle (c. 1500-1350 B.C.) and/or Old Script (c. 1650-1500). Given the multiple duplicates that often exist – as opposed to the “unica” of the *Landschenkungsurkunden* and the sealings – these are not documents of a historical archive but part of an administration with no separation of religious and secular matters. But, if so, how do we explain the pre-empire period documents, i.e., those written in Old Script and esp. the more numerous ones in Middle Script, that apparently were not discarded? It is clear that most locations where tablets were kept, housed a considerable number of such older tablets, that must have been kept for many more generations than just one or two²⁵. The shelf lists also explicitly refer to “old” tablets²⁶.

Maintaining the cultic calendar and keeping the festival scenarios up-to-date was as much government business as drafting diplomatic documents like treaties, writing instructions and letters, keeping track of incoming and outgoing goods, etc. The older manuscripts thus were a vital part of the archive necessary in the production of new texts that were in constant demand. Such texts never formed part of a canon in the sense that they were continuously subjected to new redactions. In archival terms they are often called “retroacta”: earlier documents relating to the same matter. Often they have been removed from their original locus in the archive to be added to a current dossier and not put back²⁷. Whether that was the case here as well, is very difficult to say: were these older tablets stored somewhere else and taken down from their shelves when needed? Or were they kept with the more current tablets forming a dossier? However that may have been, their role as *retroacta* is evident²⁸.

²⁵ The exact numbers of OS and MS fragments found at the different findspots can be easily found through S. Košak, Konkordanz der hethitischen Texte (Hethitologie Portal Mainz).

²⁶ Cf. KBo 7.73+KBo 31.4 vi 28”f. *karūliya=ma=ššan ... tuppiya* “on the old tablet” (CTH 276.13+277.2); KUB 30.62+KBo 31.7, 8-9 *TUPPI... LABIRU* “old tablet” (CTH 282.2, ed. E. Laroche, CTH p. 168, cf. H. Güterbock, AfO 38-39 (1991-1992) 134, and S. Košak, FsHouwink ten Cate 175 with n. 14); the Akkadian adj. *MAHRU* found twice in the shelf lists referring to tablets (KUB 30.54 i 14, translit. Laroche, CTH p. 178 without the DUB; KUB 30.62+KBo 31.7, 7) may also refer to older tablets in the sense of “first, original.”

²⁷ Muller et al., Manual 62f.

²⁸ For the possibility of the *Landschenkungsurkunden* as retroacta see above n. 23.

Such an approach is more difficult in the case of historiography like the Deeds of Šuppiliuma or Muršili's own Annals: these were compositions that needed no updating. Yet, they were a necessary source for other works like the historical preambles to treaties. They "serve[d] as aids in the performance of administrative duty"²⁹. For this archivists reckon with the existence of "archive libraries" or "Dienstbibliotheken"³⁰: although this combination may at first sound contradictory, it designates material that an archive needs to do its job. Every archive possesses works that are not part of its *ex officio* collected materials but are necessary to perform its duties. The distinction between *retroacta* and an archive library may at times be blurred or difficult for us to make: copies of older state treaties such as the Treaty between Telipinu and Išputaḫšu of Kizzuwatna mentioned in a shelf list³¹, are as much a historical source which a King might use in writing historiography as well as an essential element in drafting a new treaty³².

Before we turn to genres for which a purpose within the administration seems very far fetched and to the issue of findspots, it is interesting to look for a moment at what Laroche called the "fichier" or what is nowadays mostly referred to as shelf lists³³. Traditionally, it has been assumed - and both terms seem to reflect that - as a stock taking of what was on a shelf in a tablet room at a given moment³⁴. Since in some cases it seems possible to identify compositions mentioned in the lists with tablets found in the same building where the list was found, the shelf lists were used as information on the original whereabouts of tablets³⁵. However, the shelf lists themselves make that assumption questionable. First of all, in at least one instance two duplicates or parallel texts among the shelf lists come from different findspots: KUB 30.51++ (CTH 277.4A) was found in Bldg. C, whereas KBo 16.68++ (CTH 277.4B) originates from Bldg. A. More often, shelf lists and the texts they

²⁹ Muller et al., Manual 153.

³⁰ Muller et al., Manual 152-154, see also Schellenberg, *Modern Archives* 24, and Papritz, *Archivalische Zeitschrift* 55 (1959) 20f. In the same way a library will have its own archive covering the administration of the library.

³¹ KUB 30.42+(KBo 31.8) iv 21-24 (CTH 276.1, ed. Laroche, CTH p. 163f.).

³² In order to determine whether we are dealing with a library or an archive in case of a supposed mixture of library and archive, it is therefore necessary to look at the function of texts in their cultural setting rather than a quantitative issue as advocated by Pedersén, *Archives and Libraries in the Ancient Near East 1500-300 B.C.* (Bethesda, MD 1998), 3 (see his definition quoted above §1). Compare also Papritz, *Archivalische Zeitschrift* 55 (1959) 29, who quotes Milkau and Schawe (see above n. 1) for characterizing the tablet collections at Ḫattuša as a *Staatsbibliothek*, but is having trouble explaining "das aus der Welt der Kanzleien stammende Schriftgut dazwischen.". He then continues: "Es wäre durchaus möglich, daß zwei Schriftgutkörper ineinandergeraten sind, aber fast hat es den Anschein, als seien zum mindesten die Staatsverträge für die Zwecke, die wir mit einer Bibliothek verbinden, abgeschrieben worden."

³³ For the latter term see already M. Weitemeyer, "Archive and Library Technique in Ancient Mesopotamia", *Libri* 6 (1955-1956) 231.

³⁴ I made the same assumption in the GsImparati §10 but as will become clear in the following I am less certain about that now than when I wrote that section.

³⁵ Compare for instance H. Otten, *MDOG* 91 (1958) 75, and 30. *CRRAI* (Leiden 1983), 189, H. Güterbock, *AFO* 38-39 (1991-1992) 132-137, but K. Bittel/(R. Naumann), *BoHa* I, 56, already rightly warns that they should not be taken as "Kataloge im heutigen Sinne."

seem to refer to, are found in different places. However, from a more general archivalistic point of view it holds true, that “Most old inventories (...) were drawn up for some particular purpose, e.g., in connection with the handing over of the collection from one official to another; they were then hastily drawn up and the descriptions, even shorter than usual, do not always give correctly the contents of the documents”³⁶. Moreover, inventorying should not be confused with storing: the order of an inventory does not necessarily match the order on the place where tablets are kept³⁷. Inventories could thus be made for any kind of reasons of which that of a simple catalogue is only one and not the most likely one at that.

5. FINDSPOTS

The biggest hurdle in trying to detect a system in the tablet collections has always been the actual findspot of tablets³⁸. On the one hand there are consistencies which strengthen the assumption of some form of organization³⁹. By way of an example we can point at the corpus of administrative texts as edited by Silvin Košak and Jana Siegelová. As Siegelová points out, the overwhelming majority of those texts stem from Büyükkale with a concentration in the Buildings D and E⁴⁰. The majority of treaties has been found in the store rooms surrounding Temple 1⁴¹ but some fragments come from Bldgs. A, B, D, E and the Haus am Hang as well. Other consistent groups will be mentioned below. According to Elmar Edel⁴² the Egyptian-Hittite correspondence was unearthed in the Buildings A and E on Büyükkale and in the storerooms surrounding Temple 1 in the Lower City, a situation he characterized as “ein mittleres Durcheinander”⁴³. To make matters worse we can look at the treaty of Telipinu with Išputaḫšu (CTH 21) mentioned in the shelf list KUB 30.42+ iv 15'-18' (21'-24') found in Bldg. A. One fragment of the Akkad. version, KUB 31.82, was found on Büyükkale in Bldg. D, two fragments of the Hitt. version KBo 19.36-37 come from the storerooms. The other fragments, KUB 31.81 (Hittite) and KUB 4.76 (Akkadian), have Bo-numbers and might therefore also come from the temple; however, as far as Bü. is concerned, they could stem from Bldg. E only.

³⁶ Muller et al., Manual 61.

³⁷ Muller et al., Manual 156.

³⁸ Whenever findspots of text groups are mentioned below, it should be kept in mind that this always means “findspots of tablets, of which we know where they were found”. As far as the first roughly 10.000 fragments unearthed between 1906 and 1912 are concerned, we only know that they must come from Temple 1, Bldg. E or the Haus am Hang; see Gsİmparati n. 5.

³⁹ It should be kept in mind, that 100% consistency is found practically nowhere: nine out of ten tablets or their fragments can be found in one place but there will always be one stray piece. The reality of a working administration as well as later disturbances of the archaeological record make it unrealistic to expect otherwise.

⁴⁰ See Siegelová, Verw. 6-10.

⁴¹ Cf. Otten, StBoT Bh. 1, 55.

⁴² ÄHK II 19-21.

⁴³ ÄHK II 20.

There are two possible reactions to this. One can either despair and deny the Hittite scribes a basic sense of organization, which as I tried to point out earlier is in my opinion an unlikely assumption. Or one can try to make the best of the information we have. Confronted with the findspot situation of the Egyptian-Hittite correspondence, Edel for instance, blamed a disinterest during the reign of Tuḫaliya IV for a gradual dispersal of the material. This suggestion goes back to his specific ideas of dating the correspondence to a single reign (Ḫattušili III-Puduḫepa) and rests on archivalistically simplistic suppositions.

In trying to make sense of what we have, we need to keep in mind a number of things. First of all, as was stated at the very beginning, an archive is a living organism where documents, dossiers and parts of dossiers circulate among different offices. At the moment, that the life of a living archive is fairly suddenly terminated such as the administration at the end of the Hittite empire, we should not expect a situation where every record has neatly arrived back at its original or final destination. On the contrary, the latest views on the demise of the Hittite capital suggest a serious upheaval of the tablet collections. The most recent and relevant documents seem to have been removed and what was left behind, may have been left in some disarray, not to mention disturbances caused by later occupation of the site⁴⁴. But there is another thing: it is not realistic to expect, for instance, all the Egyptian correspondence to have been kept in a single place. Keeping documents together according to their contents is only one way of organizing them. Instead of interpreting the various findspots as a sign of inability of organizing their own material on the Hittites' side, we would do better to see it as potential information on the "paper trail" of Hittite bureaucracy. If a copy of Telipinu's treaty was kept on Büyükkale, we do not need to wonder why it was found there instead of in the storerooms surrounding Temple 1: working copies could be everywhere where needed in the administration.

This brings us back to Otten's early suggestion that the Hittite "state archives" had not yet been found⁴⁵. With his remarks Otten referred to the sealed copies of state treaties. It is striking indeed that so many "original" documents or engrossed copies have never been found. We know of their existence and according to the texts they were usually deposited in temples⁴⁶. Only a treaty with Eḫeya of Kizzuwatna (CTH 29; KBo 28.108(+)+109+) from the general area of Temple 1 (L/19 in the *Grabungsschutt*) has been found sealed⁴⁷. The other exception is the Bronze Tablet with the treaty of Tuḫaliya with Kuruntiya of Tarḫuntašša, but that was found secondarily buried, obviously not in its original place of deposition and stripped of its seals. But not only treaties were deposited in temples: we know that to be true also for Muršili II's Ten Year Annals (CTH 61.I), his Deeds of Ḫuppiluliuma (CTH 40) and the Šaḫurunuwa-Urkunde (CTH 225)⁴⁸.

⁴⁴ On this see H. Otten, *Damals* 29/2 (1997) 29, J. Seeher, *StBoT* 45, 623-634, esp. 633.

⁴⁵ See above §1. Strictly speaking, the deposition of engrossed copies or charters in a temple or similar institution may not qualify that structure as an archives: on this see the remarks by Papritz, *Archivalische Zeitschrift* 55 (1959) 37f.

⁴⁶ Compare for example the list of the seven copies of the Treaty of Tuḫaliya with Kurunta of Tarḫuntašša iv 44-51 (ed. Otten, *StBoT* Bh. 1, 28f.).

⁴⁷ See Otten, *MDOG* 103 (1971) 66.

⁴⁸ For the Deeds cf. H. Roszkowska-Mutschler, *FsPopko* 296, for CTH 225 see my remarks in *BiOr.* 60 (2003) 176.

Of course, those missing “archives” might theoretically still be found but, as mentioned earlier, with the excavations progressing that chance becomes more remote every campaign. Moreover, since according to the texts the engrossed copies (among them many metal tablets) were deposited in the temple(s), we should be looking for them there. It is often stated, that indeed treaties have been found “in Temple 1”, and we tend to see that as confirmation of what the texts tell us. However, no text has ever been found *in* Temple 1 itself but only in the store rooms surrounding the temple. When the texts say that tablets have been deposited in the temple before the deity, there is no doubt that we have to take this literally. Within the temple building itself, there must have been a designated space where the engrossed copies were deposited. What the relation of the store rooms to the temple exactly was, remains to be determined⁴⁹.

The most likely possibility is, that the engrossed copies were among the materials that the last king and his scribes took with them from the temple(s). The tablets deposited in the temples were in a way the warranties of their political system and esp. their foreign policies. Moving them to their new residence was proof of the intended ongoing existence of a Hittite empire. The originals of one’s important papers proving the legitimacy of certain rights and possessions are the first things that one takes with one when having to move somewhere. A good illustration of the importance of such documents and holding on to them was suggested to me by Harry Hoffner: in the Milawata letter the Hittite king sends his envoy ^{md}LAMMA with the necessary documents to prove the legitimate claim of Walmu on the throne of Wiluša⁵⁰.

6. LIBRARIES IN THE HITTITE TABLET COLLECTIONS?

Not all genres of texts found in the tablet collections in Ḫattuša can be easily described as falling under an administrative heading. To these text groups belong in my opinion the non-Anatolian myths (CTH 341-369), the translated or adapted and non-translated Sumero-Akkadian compositions (CTH 310-316, 792-819), the Hurrian-Hittite Bilingual, the lexical lists (CTH 299-309) and at least part of the omen literature (CTH 531-560). One might also consider the hippological treatises (CTH 284-287) here. Some or all of these seem to have been kept out of some kind of academic interest, either educational, aesthetic or historical⁵¹, but they may have

⁴⁹ One cannot, therefore, conclude from the deposition phrase in the Šahurunuwa-Urkunde rev. 35 (“This tablet shall be deposited before the Stormgod of Ḫatti”) and the fact that the preserved fragments were found or can be traced back to the store rooms surrounding Temple 1, that the latter was regarded as the Stormgod’s temple (so M. Popko, *AoF* 29 [2002] 80). On the relation between Temple 1 and the surrounding storerooms see my contribution to “The Life and Times of Ḫattušili III and Tuḫaliya IV” (ed. Th. van den Hout, Leiden 2006).

⁵⁰ KUB 19.55+KUB 48.90 rev. 38’-39’ (CTH 182, Tuḫaliya IV), ed. H.A. Hoffner, *AfO* Bh. 19 (1982) 131f., for the historical background see T.R. Bryce, *The Kingdom of the Hittites* (Oxford 1988), 340-342, and J.D. Hawkins, *AnSt.* 48 (1998) 19.

⁵¹ Mostly these texts are assigned a role in the training of scribes (cf. recently G. Beckman in D. Kuhn/H. Stahl (edd.), *Die Gegenwart des Altertums. Formen und Funktionen des Altertumsbezugs in den Hochkulturen der Alten Welt* (Heidelberg 2001), 86f.). It should be kept in mind, however, that we

played no role in the administration of the Hittite state: they all represent foreign material that can only have been actively collected. If besides the archival material we are looking for library texts, it may be here. Now, it is striking to see that the findspots of most of these are very consistent. The non-Anatolian myths, the Hurrian-Hittite Bilingual, the translated/adapted Sumerian-Akkadian compositions and the lexical texts, of which we know the findspot, were almost exclusively found in the storerooms surrounding Temple 1 as well as some pieces (including the entire Hurrian-Hittite Bilingual) in Temples 15-16, and the Haus am Hang. The non-translated Sumerian-Akkadian literature on the other hand stems from Büyükkale mostly, predominantly from Bldg. A, only rarely was a piece found in the Lower City. This would seem to find confirmation in the fact that the only purely Akkadian text listed among the *Littérature de traduction* (CTH 310-316) is the sole exception there: KUB 37.36(+) under CTH 312 *Hymne à Ištar* was found in Bldg. A as opposed to the rest of the Hittite material from the storerooms surrounding Temple 1 and the Haus am Hang. All hippological texts were found on Büyükkale, mostly in Bldg. A. The omen texts show the least consistent picture: whereas most seem to come to from Bldg. A, they were also found at other buildings on Büyükkale as well several pieces in the Haus am Hang. Rarely, however, were pieces unearthed in the storerooms surrounding Temple 1.

These small collections in the storerooms thus come closest to what one could call libraries. However, in order to do so safely, we would of course need to know whether they were in some way kept together and/or separate from other material. The question is whether we will ever know this. Given the parallel of the Hurrian-Hittite bilingual that was found within temple buildings (15-16) themselves, one may rightly wonder whether the proximity of Temple 1 plays a role here⁵².

That the hippological treatises and the majority of the non-translated Sumerian-Akkadian materials were not kept in the Lower City, probably has to do with the character of Bldg. A as a record center or depository of less current texts as I have tried to show elsewhere⁵³. How we judge the situation of the omen texts in this context, probably depends on the role these texts played. The celestial omens seem to have had some practical relevance, albeit marginal, witness among other things

do not seem to have much evidence of scribal education in the form of exercise tablets and the like. Also, the fact that the non-translated Sumerian-Akkadian compositions (CTH 792-819) show a very low duplication rate, does not speak in favor of that view. As Beckman, o.c. 85-91, also argues, "antiquarian curiosity" and their use as topoi in the Hittites' own historiography will have played a role as well, one for which we do have evidence (on this see also M. Van De Mierop, *SMEA* 42 (2000) 133-159).

⁵² Archi, CANE 2374a, states that "literary texts, of foreign origin, all come from temple libraries. They were vehicles for religious concepts that the Hittites collected." Strictly taken, only for the Hurrian-Hittite bilingual such an origin can be claimed. Again, it needs to be stressed that the relation between the storerooms surrounding Temple 1 and Temple 1 itself needs to be determined (cf. above §5 with fn. 49) before we can say this. All that in my opinion can be said at this moment, is that especially the storerooms apparently held materials that seem more library-like than archival and that their findspot may indicate that these were of more than just historical interest to the Hittites (otherwise they would probably have been transferred to Bldg. A).

⁵³ See my contribution to "The Life and Times of Ḫattušili III and Tuthaliya IV" (see above fn. 49).

the copies that were made⁵⁴. As such they might have served as part of the *Dienstbibliothek* on the acropolis. The non-celestial omina which seem to have been present as unica only, most probably lacked such a relevance. Were they simply appended to the celestial ones in the *Dienstbibliothek*?

7. CONCLUSIONS

In the preceding paragraphs I have tried to describe the Hittite textcorpus in terms of library and archive using an established definition of the latter in modern archival science. The above definition (§3) of an archive implies that the business of an administration determines the contents of its archives, both living and historical. We know that the administration in the Hittite capital consisted as much of secular as religious affairs and that the two were very much intertwined. This means that there is no reason to reject religious documents as (living) archival material. Also, given the existence of *retroacta* and certain materials as *Dienstbibliotheken*, there is no reason why duplicates could not be included. We can thus describe most of the texts that have come down to us as archival and the rooms and buildings that housed them as archives. What emerges is the picture of a lively administration that must have been spread out over several locations in Ḫattuša. Probably they were offices with different competencies, exchanging documents and dossiers and each performing its share in the paper trail of the empire.

To refine this picture, that is, to define for instance the competencies of specific “offices” and to reconstruct the way individual documents made their way through Hittite bureaucracy, may never be possible. A lot of necessary archaeological information has been lost, disturbances already during the days of the Hittite empire and in the centuries following its demise have done irreparable damage, and we simply cannot expect to be able to fully reconstruct the workings of a civilization that has been “dead” for so long. Yet, different ways of looking at our material, new approaches may add to our knowledge of Hittite administration.

Theo P.J. van den Hout
The Oriental Institute
University of Chicago
1155 E. 58th Street
Chicago, IL 60637 (USA)

⁵⁴ On this relevance see my *Purity of Kingship* 44, 167f., and *RIA* s.v. *Omina*.