

Zeitschrift für Assyriologie und Vorderasiatische Archäologie

Herausgegeben von
Walther Sallaberger
in Verbindung mit
A. Cavigneaux · Th. van den Hout

Band 99 · 2009

7458



Walter de Gruyter · Berlin · New York

CHRISTIANSEN, BIRGIT: Die Ritualtradition der Ambazzi: Eine philologische Bearbeitung und entstehungsgeschichtliche Analyse der Ritualltexte CTH 391, CTH 429 und CTH 463. (Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten 48). Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2006. xix, 449 S. 16,5 × 24 cm. ISBN 978-3-447-05333-4. Preis: € 98,00.

This volume constitutes a revised version of Christiansen's (henceforth Ch.) *Magisterarbeit* submitted to the Freie Universität Berlin, 2003, supervised by Prof. Dr. V. Haas. Anyone who reads Ch. and is also familiar with my work on the Kizzuwatnean rituals (StBoT 46) will hardly be surprised that this review of Ch.'s work is marked by broad agreement and approbation. Indeed, one might go so far as to say that the two could be read as complementary volumes.

As intimated in the title, the redactional history (Entstehungsgeschichte) of the texts is a primary object of the study, and from the opening lines it is clear that Ch. is also much concerned with the terminology and methodology underlying her work, a conscientiousness and deliberateness which can be regarded as exemplary in a field that all too often ignores (or assumes) such issues. The distinctions, e.g., between ritual and ritual text, 'author' and 'actor' are fruitfully emphasized. Very welcome is her brief sketch of varied and often opposing statements in the secondary literature on issues of relevance to the redactional history of such texts and their *Sitz im Leben* in light of the fact that little research specifically devoted to these questions exists.

The thorough textual presentation of the three text groups includes transliteration, with variants indicated in footnotes, and translation of the main text copies, followed by transliterations of the duplicate fragments, dating of the texts by palaeographical and orthographical criteria and copious philological commentary. For CTH 391 a very useful interlinear synopsis of the parallel passages is added.¹

Transliterations² and translations are highly reliable, the philological commentary very thorough and judicious.³ The only significant improvement I can offer is the join of 391.2.B (KUB 57.122) and 391.3 (IBoT 2.122), whereby the first paragraph can be restored after 391.2 iii 4–11 (KBo 13.109), resulting in the following (cf. pp. 156, 158, 168):


KUB 57.122+IBoT 2.122 r. Kol.

— — — — —
 0' [dZa-ar-ni-za-aš dTar-pa-ad-da-aš-ši-iš]
 1' dA-la-u-wa-i-mi-iš dMa-a[m-ma-a-i-mi-iš]
 2' DINGIR^{MES} LU^{MES} GIŠ^S ha-at-tal-wa-za [GIM-an]
 3' GIŠ^SSAG.KUL EGIR-pa na-an-ı-na-a-ı[i]

¹ Of the previously unpublished texts from Ch.'s corpus (p. xix), 1563/v has now been published as KBo 53.21, 1343/v as KBo 48.103, 572/t as KBo 48.13, and 225/v as KBo 54.17.

² In 391.1 iii 15 I would restore 3 rather than 1 and accept the incongruence, otherwise rife in this text. Between 391.1.A iv 2' and 3' a paragraph divider should be inserted.

³ The occasional minor misstep hardly detracts: on p. 53, n. 228 read 'Akk.'; on p. 84 read 'Anstelle des als Dativ fungierenden Akkusativs (Akk. des Bezugs) dTarpattassan ist ein Vokativ zu erwarten,' p. 85: 'An folgenden Stellen ist der als Dat. fungierende Akk. (Akk. des Bezugs) korrekt gebraucht;' cf. in the index, p. 409, the listing of Tarpattassan as gen. instead of acc.

- 4' ^{GI}IG-ia EGIR-pa h́e-e[š-ke-ez-zí]
 5' LUGAL-i-ia HUL-u-wa-aš [UN^{MEŠ}]
 6' AN-ZE-EL-LU hur-ke-el [pa-ap-ra-tar]
 7'  mu-u-la-tar QA-TAM-MA a[r-ḥa a-ra-id-du]
-
- 8' EGIR-ŠŪ-kán MUNUSŠU.GI NA[GGA te-piú]
 9' ^{SIG}iš-tág-ga-i an-da h[ú-u-la-li-i-e-ez-zí]
 10' na-at LUGAL ZAG-ni ŠU-[ŠU GİR-ŠU]
 11' an-da ḥa-ma-an-zi na[m-ma-at-ší-kán]
 12' ar-ḥa da-a-i na-at-kán [A-NA PÉŠ.TUR]
 13' ^rda¹-a-i nu te-ez-zí [

It would also seem quite likely that CTH 391.4 (KBo 43.35) can be joined to the top of rev. iv of CTH 391.1.A (KUB 27.67+KUB 9.25), but unfortunately the former is housed in the museum in Ankara, the latter in Istanbul, disallowing any attempt at confirmation on the originals. In any case they show the same hand and almost certainly were written by the same scribe. In the resulting l. 11']x^Jna¹-i^dTa[r²- can be read.

In 391.1 i 10, ii 11, iii 16 Ch. translates 'Pfeile' for G^Iḫ^{i,a}, and though GI does in fact occasionally represent 'arrow' (e.g. KBo 6.34+ ii 51; kindly pointed out to me by B. Christiansen), one might nevertheless want to avoid obscuring the fact that no more than 'reed' is actually written, which could perhaps indicate that only models were envisioned for the ritual rather than actual arrows, for which one would expect ^{GI/GI}GAG.(ú.)TAG.(GA). This possibility should be considered in the light of Ch.'s interpretation of *ezza-* (pp. 92 ff.) in this context as 'reed', in which case the bow would be made of reed as well, but which would seem to render the locution G^Iḫ^{i,a} *ezzas* (e.g. ii 11) redundant unless one in fact translates GI as 'arrow'.

391.1 i 26, ii 27, iii 31; 391.2 ii 7' should be translated 'Wie die Wäscher/Walker dieses bearbeiten (*anniya-*) und von ihm die Fusseln (somit) entfernen ...'; that is to say, 'säubern' is a too liberal translation of *anniya-* and indeed obscures the grammatical construction. Cf. Ch.'s correct translation of the parallel structured locution in 391.2 iii 6-8, 'Wie der Querbalkenriegel den Sicherungsriegel zurücklenkt und die Tür (somit) öffnet ...'

In 429.1 i 39'-42' (pp. 186 f.) one should presumably translate, '[(Und)] wie *asara-astaggassa-* (und?/des?) *ḥanzana-* von [...] abgeschnitten [(ist und)] man das Tuch wegnimmt, [so] soll von [dir] die böse Zung[e (a)bge]schnitten sein, [und] sie soll von [dir *eb/en*] [so] weggenommen sein,' whereby the entire paragraph constitutes a continuation of the recitation begun in §6. Ch.'s considerations (p. 260) on the lack of a verb would thus be superfluous. Further, though Ch. parses *astagga=ssan* < *astaggan=san*, translating '[(sein/ihr)]' (pp. 186 f., 236), this would appear to be unlikely, and there seems to be no reason why a stem *astaggassa-* would be less likely, and indeed Ch. herself appears to have considered the option, as reflected in her Glossar (p. 339). The other possibility, and perhaps the more likely one, would be to see *-asta* and *-san* as a further example of two local particles in the same clause, in which case it would resemble that in KBo 21.33+ iv 20'f., for which, see E. Neu, Fs. Čop 1993, 138 f.

One should also translate 'Huf' or 'Bein' in §§23 and 47 rather than 'Pfote', as a goat naturally has no paws. At the end of §24 one should probably translate 'und sie/er opfert' (cf. §§41, 47), as nowhere in the text are any liquids or libation vessels at issue (except in §46, where however, blood is the liquid, and it is sprinkled). I wonder if one should not in

§27 translate rather, '[We]nn auch vor <den Göttern> ein anderer Böses [sprich]t, weil du mächtig bist, sprich Gutes [für mich vor] allen Göttern!' On p. 40, n. 179, read 'Anm. 347'.

Ch., based first and foremost on the switches between 1st and 3rd sg. in the narrative passages and the recurrent confusion in the number of ritual patrons, writes that (p. 122), 'es sich um eine Kompilation handelt, die aus verschiedenen Textfassungen zusammengesetzt wurde,' and I can only agree.⁴ I think, however, that one might form a more specific, though still very tentative, hypothesis about the nature of the compositions from which these texts were compiled. First, it seems not unlikely that a version or versions would have existed for a single ritual patron, another (or others) for more than one.⁵ In fact, 391.2 is a version for a single patron, i.e. the king, though it is difficult to determine whether it is to be placed before or after 391.1 in the genealogical tree of the various redactional stages.⁶ Second, the composition seems to reflect three texts with three different purposes: one or more composed with the intent of treating or satisfying the deities (§§1, 21–25, 40–42); one aimed at treating the ritual patron or patrons (§§2–20, 30–39);⁷ and one intended to be performed by the ritual patron for his/her own benefit (§§26–27, 43–52).

Ch. herself (p. 116; cf. also 119) considers who might be speaking in this latter substratum (§§26–27, 43–52; 391.1 ii 63–64), concluding that the context suggests that the 'Ritualherr gemeint ist,' i.e. the ritual patron(s) treated in the text up to this point (s. also p. 131). It must be noted, though, that the ritual patron/s does/do not appear at all after §42, so that one suspects that the rest of the text has been exapted from such a 'do-it-yourself' ritual composition.⁸ The person speaking, then, would not be the ritual patron of the foregoing passages, but the person carrying out the ritual for his/her own benefit.⁹

Also the distribution of the deities is of interest in this context:¹⁰ Only Tarpatassa and Zarniza are mentioned in §§1–10; only Alauwaima in §§12–26 (along with Mamma in

⁴ Her further suggestion, however, that (p. 122) 'die Unebenheiten belassen (wurden), vermutlich um gerade kenntlich zu machen, daß es sich um einen gewachsenen Text handelt,' I do not find likely.

⁵ Similarly with the Mastigga rituals; see Miller, StBoT 46, 232–238.

⁶ Ch. (p. 167) places 391.2 later than 391.1 due essentially to the palaeographical and orthographical characteristics, while she notes (p. 159) that some older sign forms in 391.2 may indicate an older Vorlage. I suspect, in fact, that 391.1 is likely to have been compiled on the basis of (a Vorlage for) 391.2 or similar texts, as 391.2 does not show the *Kohärenzstörungen* so conspicuous in 391.1. Thus 391.2 may well be a late copy of a very early *Textexemplar* in the redactional history of the group.

⁷ This does not disregard, of course, the fact that the aim of treating the deities is the benefit of the ritual patrons.

⁸ Such are known, of course, e.g. Zarpiya's ritual, which is to be carried out by the 'master of the house' (B.J. Collins, CoS 1 [2003] 161–162), and KUB 17.28 ii 33–iii 17, treated recently by G. Torri, JANER 4 (2004) 129–141.

⁹ For two other ritual texts that appear to have been sliced together from existing compositions, cf. the Old Hittite Ritual for the Weathergod (G. Wilhelm, StudMed 9 [1995] 381–388) and the Ritual for the Purification of a House through Conjurament of the Netherworld Deities (Miller, TUAT NF 4, 206–217, esp. ns. 75 and 155).

¹⁰ Along with the fact that Alauwaima, although not even mentioned in the incipit, receives by far the more desirable offering, a goat, as compared to a miserable mouse for the others.

§§21 and 23); only Tarpatassa in §§28–51 (with Mamma in §§40–47). Of note is the fact that the passages with Tarpatassa and those with Alauwaima are mutually exclusive, as are those with Zarniza vs. those with Mamma, perhaps suggesting that §§1–11 derive from one composition, §§12–27 from a second, §§28–42 from a third,¹¹ which happens to correspond to the three parallel sections from §§1–42. If so, we can postulate that 4 texts served as material for this composition, the first three parallel sections, originally three separate versions for distinct deities, then the fourth, a do-it-yourself ritual.¹²

Ch. also devotes considerable thought to the *Sitz im Leben* of the texts, granting that one cannot exclude the possibility that the texts functioned as instruction manuals, but concluding (p. 126): ‘Vielmehr weist der Befund darauf hin, daß die hethitischen Schreiber den Text in erster Linie als gelehrte Überlieferung betrachteten, die es für nachfolgende Generationen zu tradieren galt.’¹³ Of special interest in this context is the composition treated last in Ch.’s work, CTH 463 (pp. 285ff.). Although likewise attributed to a female ritualist (perhaps Amb]azzi), its incipit consists of a compilation of Mesopotamian omens as possible reasons for enacting the ritual, omens that are otherwise known from Hattusa exclusively from scholarly translations. Ch. therefore concludes (p. 304) that it is unlikely that a female Hittite ritualist such as Amb]azzi in fact composed such a text or enacted or dictated such a ritual: ‘Der “Sitz im Leben” des Textes liegt also wohl nicht in der rituellen Praxis des hethitischen Hofes, sondern in der schreiberlichen Gelehrsamkeit.’

Ch. (p. 244–247) also attempts to establish what sections of the ritual are erzählende Rede and which are Rezitationen, and her discussion represents a significant advance upon Haroutunian’s (Fs. Hoffner [2003] 149–168) treatment in this respect.¹⁴

With regard to the important question of the relationship between the texts and the ritualists to whom the compositions are ascribed,¹⁵ Ch. writes (p. 316), ‘Für die These, daß es sich bei den uns vorliegenden Ritualtexten um Diktate der im Incipit und Kolophon genannten Personen handelt, gibt es ... ebenfalls keine stichhaltigen Argumente. ... Dies schließt aber natürlich nicht die Möglichkeit aus, daß die Erstverschriftlichung aufgrund eines Diktates dieser Personen erfolgte. Aber auch andere Arten des Verhältnisses zwischen ritualkundiger Person und Text sind denkbar: So könnte ein Schreiber das Ri-

¹¹ Also in §§43–52 appear Tarpatassa and Alauwaima.

¹² It should be noted, however, that the seemingly random occurrences of the sg. vs. pl. ritual patrons (pp. 117ff.) do not overlap with these sections in a way that would suggest that one or more of the sections was originally for a sg. patron, one or more for pl. patrons. The relationship would have been more complex.

¹³ Only rarely is Ch.’s usage perhaps somewhat misleading (p. 125): ‘Der Text hat sicherlich seinen primären “Sitz im Leben” in der hethitischen Ritualistik, d.h. in der Art und Weise, in der bestimmte Personen innerhalb der hethitischen Gesellschaft Störungen wie Krankheit, Unfruchtbarkeit etc. für gewöhnlich zu beheben versuchten.’ It seems to me that this describes not the *Sitz im Leben* of the texts at hand, but the *Sitz im Leben* of the rituals reflected in them. The *Sitz im Leben* of the rituals would presumably have been different than that of the texts. It is also not clear to me where she envisions that 391.1 specifically was compiled. On p. 167 she writes, concerning 391.2, ‘Die charakteristischen Abweichungen von CTH 391.1 und das zentralanatolische Kolorit sprechen für eine Kompilation am Hof in Hattusa.’ Does this imply that 391.1 was compiled elsewhere? If so, where? In Arzawa itself?

¹⁴ See already, similarly, my comments in my review of Fs. Hoffner in JAOS 125 (2005) 287.

¹⁵ See similarly Miller, StBoT 46, 469–532.

tual auch aufgrund einer mündlichen, mehr oder weniger präzisen Tradition, die in ihrem Kern auf den jeweiligen Ritualexperthen zurückgeht, erstmals verschriftlicht haben. Schließlich ist jedoch auch in Betracht zu ziehen, daß die Texte lediglich diesen rituellkundigen Personen zugeschrieben wurden.⁷

Ch. is certainly to be congratulated for providing the research community not only with current, high-quality editions of three groups of ritual texts, but also with well considered observations and insights into the processes by which those texts may have emerged.

JARED L. MILLER – Mainz/München

MOUTON, ALICE: *Rêves hittites. Contribution à une histoire et une anthropologie du rêve en Anatolie ancienne.* (Culture and History of the Ancient Near East 28). Leiden/Boston: Brill 2007. xxx, 346 S. 16,8 × 24,7 cm. ISBN 978-90-04-16024-8. Preis: € 84,00.

Over the last fifty years the dream in the ancient Near East has enjoyed considerable scholarly interest.¹ But whereas numerous studies on ancient Mesopotamian, Egyptian and Israelite dreams have seen the light of day, until recently only a few smaller articles had been published on Hittite oneirology and oneiromancy.² Now a much required systematic study of Hittite dreams has finally appeared. Mouton analyses Hittite dream-terminology and the contexts of the sources (Ch. I), Hittite dream-conceptions (Ch. II), and the role the dream played in Hittite daily life (Ch. III). The greater part of this work, however, consists of an impressive corpus of 133 (fragments of) Hittite dream-texts (Ch. IV). Transcriptions and translations of more than forty of these texts are presented here for the first time, which adds greatly to the value of the book. Among these texts are (fragments of) historical texts, rituals, royal dream-reports, and a large number of divinatory texts. Through the publication of this collection of dream-texts and the discussion of these texts an important contribution has been made to the study of Hittite and ancient Near Eastern oneirology and oneiromancy. This being said, I will now concentrate on a number of issues from the introductory chapters.

First, there is the issue surrounding the use of the word ‘anthropology’. When it is given such a central position as in a title (“... une anthropologie du rêve ...”), one expects the investigation to be somehow connected to the concepts, methods, and theoretical frameworks used by anthropologists today. But such a connection is not established in this work. Here ‘anthropology’ is defined “dans son acception la plus large” as “l’étude de l’homme et de son comportement” (xxiii, n. 14). Although there is nothing wrong with this definition, one may wonder whether a simple ‘inquiry into the dream’, or anything of the like, would not have been less ambiguous. Perhaps the term ‘anthropological’ was thought to suit the central questions addressed in this investigation, namely those related to Hittite notions concerning the origin of dreams, and to the value of dreams in the lives

¹ The first general study of ancient Near Eastern oneirology and oneiromancy is considered to be A.L. Oppenheim’s *The Interpretation of Dreams in the Ancient Near East with a Translation of an Assyrian Dream-Book*. Transactions of the American Philosophical Society NS 46/3 (Philadelphia 1956).

² These are briefly discussed by Mouton on pages xxi–xxiii of the introduction.