

These insights by Milstein are especially consistent with the “empirical evidence” or “hard evidence” found in Mesopotamian literature, in Qumran literature, and in the text-critical comparison of the MT, LXX, SP, and other “versions” of the Hebrew Bible (for example, see the essays in Person and Rezetko 2016, including one by Milstein on the Gilgamesh Epic). These insights need to be taken far more seriously especially by biblical scholars, because as Milstein notes there is a tension between Assyriologists and biblical scholars: “In response to these and other factors, Assyriologists focus considerably less on questions of textual development” (p. 13). “The enormous amount of evidence that is available makes Assyriologists acutely aware not only of what they have but also of what they are missing” (p. 13).

Nevertheless, Milstein’s analysis of the biblical texts in chapters 5–6 proceeds in a manner consistent with how biblical scholars have practiced source and redaction criticism for the past 150 years or more—that is, putting a tremendous emphasis on what the modern scholars consider to be “inconsistencies”—despite the fact that there are biblical texts for which “hard evidence” is available for revision through introduction, as Milstein herself noted (pp. 58–61). But she clearly wanted to demonstrate how her study of revision through introduction with “hard evidence” in Mesopotamian texts may serve as some type of control on source and redactional arguments of biblical texts for which there is no “hard evidence” (pp. 28, 38). However, in order to do just that, she had to resort to playing very close attention to “inconsistencies.”

In her analysis of the Gilgamesh Epic based on textual variation, Milstein includes an entire section on “Competing Sets of Logic in the Old Babylonian Epic” (pp. 115–22). With the “hard evidence” we have for the epic, we are on a sounder footing to talk about “inconsistencies” here, but Milstein’s conclusion concerning “that pesky word” (p. 208; quoted above) nevertheless still applies to some degree. That is, these “inconsistencies” nevertheless continued within the stream of tradition. However, the use of “that pesky word” is much more problematic in her discussion of the biblical texts for which there is no “hard evidence” in her sections “The Independent Logic of Judges 9:26–54” (pp. 153–60), “The Independent Logic of Judges 8:4–21” (pp. 161–64), and “Competing Sets of Logic in Judges 19–21” (pp. 175–85). As she notes, “the two Hebrew cases . . . rely primarily on inconsistencies in the final forms of the texts” (p. 41). In my opinion, her argument for revision through introduction would have been much stronger if she had discussed those biblical texts for which “hard evidence” exists rather than relying on the problematic criterion of “inconsistencies” alone for her analysis of the biblical texts.

Therefore, Milstein reaches some important insights that all scholars of ancient literature need to take far more seriously when they analyze ancient texts. Unfortunately, in my opinion, this sometime includes Milstein herself as she analyzes the biblical texts in chapters 5–6. Nevertheless, Milstein’s discussion of revision through introduction is an important addition to recent discussions of the literary history of ancient texts, especially since it is the first monograph devoted to revision through introduction, a scribal technique that obviously was used widely through the ancient Near Eastern and Mediterranean world.

RAYMOND PERSON  
OHIO NORTHERN UNIVERSITY

#### REFERENCE

Person, Raymond F., Jr., and Robert Rezetko, eds. 2016. *Empirical Models Challenging Biblical Criticism*. Atlanta: SBL Press.

---

*Hittite Diplomatics: Studies in Ancient Document Format and Record Management*. By WILLEMIJN J. I. WAAL. Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten, vol. 57. Wiesbaden: HARRASSOWITZ VERLAG, 2015. Pp. xxi + 620, illus. €98.

Recent studies have shifted the focus of Hittitologists from the subject matter of a text to its creation and the organizational *apparatus* underlying it: archives, scribes, and scribal culture (Gordin 2015, van

den Hout 2016). What has been missing until now was an analysis of documents as such, and this is the field of diplomatics: “Diplomatics is the study of the *Wesen* and *Werden* of documentation, the analysis of genesis, inner constitution and transmission of documents, and of their relationship with the facts represented in them and with their creators” (Cencetti 1985: 285, translation: Duranti 1989: 7). Waal’s book fills this gap. It is a revision of her 2010 Faculty of Arts at Leiden University dissertation. The aims of the book are very ambitious for a single work: “an overview of the most important intrinsic and extrinsic metadata” of Hittite tablets (p. 16), the reconstruction of the stages of the editorial development of documents up until standardization in the late thirteenth century BC, and record management and archival organization (pp. 3, 189).

The book is divided into three main sections: the introduction (chapter 1); the analysis of the physical extrinsic features of tablets, their layout, and the terminology for writing documents (chapters 2–7), along with appendix I (pp. 191–210); the study of colophons and of record management (chapters 8–9), with appendices II and III (pp. 364–509; 553–62), i.e., the text corpus of Hittite colophons, and the scribes’ names attested in them.

The second and the third parts are unbalanced: the description of extrinsic features and matters related to them occupies six of seven chapters and without decisive results, with the exception of a few examples (pp. 23ff.). Chapter 8 deals with the description of intrinsic characteristics and is limited to colophons, but lacks detailed explanation (pp. 139–72). Other intrinsic characteristics of documents, such as “the parts determining the tenor of the whole” (Duranti 1991: 11), are completely ignored. Hittite texts are generally introduced by *incipits* with the “title” and often also with other relevant information not always quoted in colophons (Gordin 2015: 39ff.) and they vary according to text genre. The lesser degree of standardization of *incipits* compared to that of colophons is related to their function: they refer to the composition itself, and not to storage and retrieval. Waal only mentions the *incipits* in ritual texts (pp. 293f.), and does not discuss the structures of different kinds of texts, fundamental in diplomatics (Duranti 1991: 6ff.).

Waal claims, in agreement with current opinion, that the function of colophons was for storage and retrieval, much like catalog cards, and adds that their occurrence is more related to *disposal* than to genre: only permanent records, i.e., those intended to be filed in the collections, “virtually always have a colophon” (pp. 155ff.). She also states: “overall, the OS colophons give the same information as later colophons” (p. 159), but this is only true for storage and retrieval needs. The oldest colophons date back to the sixteenth-fifteenth century (pp. 157ff.; van den Hout 2009: 80f.; Gordin 2015: 39) and contain only information useful for archival purposes. The scribes’ names are found from around the fifteenth century, with the first genealogy appearing in the middle of the fifteenth century. However, the colophons from the late thirteenth century are full of information, both on the text itself and sometimes on the scribe too: subscriptions or scribal signatures, mostly in festival and ritual texts (Gordin 2015: 105ff.).

Subscriptions are an anomaly from the perspective of diplomatics and archival organization; what was their purpose? They must be considered in relation to the distinction between “scrivener” (simple clerks) and “writers” (*literati*), the educated officials, the élite, those involved with high-level cultural work and educated within scribal circles to carry out this task (van den Hout 2016). The texts with subscriptions may be the final exams of young “writers.”

The colophons that mention a witnessing authority favor this hypothesis: they are tests submitted to a supervisor’s judgment; those without them could be tests *in itinere*. These tablets are not part of the official collections; they are outside of the administration’s needs. They were found in these same buildings because these were multifunctional offices: bureaus, archives, scribal libraries (Gordin 2015: 11). Some ritual and festival texts, either single- or double-columned, do not have colophons (pp. 302; 398f.), but end with a blank space, which is sometimes separated from the previous text by a single or double paragraph line.

Waal, however, does not mention this. For example, ritual texts: in two columns and with double paragraph lines: IBoT 3.148; in a single column and with one paragraph line: KUB 7.13; in two columns without a paragraph line: KUB 39.57; festival texts: in two columns and with double paragraph lines: KBo 2.4; in two(?) columns and with single paragraph lines: KUB 27.13; in two columns without a paragraph line: KUB 30.32, VSN 12.31, KUB 9.2; in a single column and with one paragraph line:

KBo 20.33. What was the function of this blank space? Would the scribes write the colophon in at a later time?

There is yet another question: Were the tablets without a colophon and with a final blank space considered part of the collections or not, even though they were found there? The organization of the archives and the chancery presented by colophons is that of the end of the empire, that is, from the reign of Tudḫaliya IV onwards; little is known of the previous phases. Van den Hout (2009: 84) has shown 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,” and this picture remains unchanged.

Unfortunately, these considerations do not emerge clearly from Waal’s book, since there is no final summary chapter. The highlights of the evolution of the chancery and record management identified by the author are fragmented in margins of the paragraphs or chapters.

To conclude, I would like to reflect on the expression ANA GIŠ.ḪUR *ḫandan*, translated by Waal as “matched with a wooden tablet” (pp. 165ff.; 401ff.). Marazzi (1994: 145ff.) proposed to read it “piano’ [. . .] ‘modello’, ‘regola’”: “<questa tavoletta è> ordinata/preparata conformemente al (giusto/originario?) piano/programma [. . .].” Gordin (2015: 209ff.), starting from this interpretation, translates GIŠ.ḪUR as “ordinance” or “list.” I propose to return to Marazzi’s suggestion and translate the Sumero-gram as “model, regulation.” This meaning appears from its first known occurrence in the “Ammuna Chronicle” KUB 36.98, Rs. 10 *ē]ppun GIŠ.ḪUR-mitt-a uḫḫun* “I took and I looked at my regulation” (van den Hout 2009: 86; de Martino and Imparati 1999: 73ff.): the king consults the *regulation*, leaving to others the state administration.

GIŠ.ḪUR is to be related to DUB.SAR.GIŠ “secretary,” literally “scribe on wood” (van den Hout 2010; Gordin 2015: 140ff.), a category of scribe entrusted with the elaboration of *regulations*. The expression ANA GIŠ.ḪUR *ḫandan* is often associated with *ištarniyaš EGIR-an tarnummaš* (p. 168), which I propose to translate “as released by the center” (free-standing genitive: “of what is of the leaving out of the center”), namely, from the central office. The expression *ištarniyaš EGIR-an tarnummaš ANA GIŠ.ḪUR ḫandan* is therefore to be understood as “elaborated according to the regulation issued by the center,” confirming that the directives from the center had not been modified. Finally, I would like to emphasize the correspondence between *parkui tuppi* “final, corrected draft,” literally “pure tablet” (p. 125), and the medieval *redactio in mundum*, the final and definitive draft (Pratesi 1982: 57).

Waal’s study is pioneering in Hittitology and therefore deserving of the utmost attention. It has shown that diplomatics can be fruitfully applied to Hittite texts and can provide relevant information for the reconstruction of the chancery and record management in Ḫattuša.

RITA FRANCIA  
“LA SAPIENZA,” ROME

#### REFERENCES

- Cencetti, G. 1985. La Preparazione dell’Archivista. In *Antologia di Scritti Archivistici*. Pp. 281–313. Rome: Romualdo Giuffrida.
- de Martino, S., and F. Imparati. 1999. La cosiddetta “cronaca di Ammuna.” In *Eothen 10*, ed. S. de Martino and F. Imparati. Pp. 69–82. Florence: LoGisma.
- Duranti, L. 1989. Diplomatics: New Uses of an Old Science. *Archivaria* 28: 7–27.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1991. Diplomatics: New Uses of an Old Science (Part V). *Archivaria* 32: 6–224.
- Gordin, S. 2015. *Hittite Scribal Circles: Scholarly Tradition and Writing Habits*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Marazzi, M. 1994. Ma gli hittiti scrivevano veramente su “legno”? In *Miscellanea di studi linguistici in onore di W. Belardi*, ed. P. Cipriano, P. Di Giovine, and M. Mancini. Pp. 131–60. Rome: Il Calamo.
- Pratesi, A. 1982. *Genesis e forme del documento medievale*. Rome: Juvence.
- van den Hout, Th. 2009. Reflections on the Origins and Development of the Hittite Tablet Collections in Hattusa and Their Consequences for the Rise of Hittite Literacy. In *Studia Asiana 5*, ed. F. Pecchioli-Daddi, G. Torri, and C. Corti. Pp. 131–60. Roma: Herder.

\_\_\_\_\_. 2010. <sup>LU</sup>DUB.SAR.GIŠ = “Clerk”? *Or* 79: 255–67.

\_\_\_\_\_. 2016. In *Royal Circles: The Nature of Hittite Scholarship*. *JANEH* 2: 203–7.

---

*The Nabataean Temple at Khirbet et-Tannur: Volume 1—Architecture and Religion. Final Report on Nelson Glueck's 1937 Excavation.* By JUDITH S. MCKENZIE et al. *Annual of the American Schools of Oriental Research*, vol. 67. Boston: AMERICAN SCHOOLS OF ORIENTAL RESEARCH, 2013. Pp. xxvii + 340, illus. \$89.95. [Distributed by ISD, Bristol, Conn.]

*The Nabataean Temple at Khirbet et-Tannur: Volume 2—Cultic Offerings, Vessels, and Other Specialist Reports. Final Report on Nelson Glueck's 1937 Excavation.* By JUDITH S. MCKENZIE et al. *Annual of the American Schools of Oriental Research*, vol. 68. Boston: AMERICAN SCHOOLS OF ORIENTAL RESEARCH, 2013. Pp. xx + 329, illus. \$89.95. [Distributed by ISD, Bristol, Conn.]

After a long hiatus, the publication of Nelson Glueck's excavation of the temple complex at Khirbet et-Tannur in 1937 is now a reality. Glueck never achieved a final publication of the excavations due to the interruption of WWII and his tenure as president of the Cincinnati Hebrew Union College after 1947. What was known about the excavation was from a series of preliminary reports he published, and from a popular account he produced in *Deities and Dolphins: The Story of the Nabataeans* in 1965 (hereafter *DD*), aided by his loyal assistant Eleanor K. Vogel. The inspiration for publishing a final report was the preparation for the Petra exhibit at the American Museum of Natural History in New York in 2003. The exhibit marked the uniting of the sculpture from the Cincinnati Art Museum with that from the Semitic Museum of Harvard University. Judith McKenzie's study of the assemblage exposed her to the complete archive of Glueck's excavation, which she recognized needed publication.

Some of the stimulus also was Jean Starcky's perceptive and exacting critique of Glueck's popular account in *DD*, which raised concerns about the chronological phases of Glueck's analysis (1968: 212–25). Faced with the complex archive and artifacts, McKenzie astutely assembled an array of specialists to examine the remains. McKenzie provides the more general treatment of the architecture and art, but is also prominently involved in the Specialist Reports. The result is an impressive two volumes, lavishly illustrated, which are destined to be the guiding work on Khirbet et-Tannur in the future.

*Volume 1: Architecture and Religion* is primarily the contribution of Judith McKenzie. In the introduction (chapter 1) the background of the Tannur excavations is rehearsed, from the initial exploration of the site in 1936, the seven weeks of excavation in the spring and fall of 1937, and the shipping of some of the artifacts and remains to Harvard's Semitic Museum and Cincinnati's Art Museum in 1939. As Director of the American Schools of Oriental Research from 1936 to 1940, Glueck's methodology was influenced by Sir Flinders Petrie for stratigraphy and Clarence Fisher for pottery, both residents of the school in Jerusalem at the time.

The heart of the volume is chapter 2, “Architecture and Phases.” In it, McKenzie provides a systematic re-examination of Glueck's stratigraphical chronology of the site.

The earliest is *Period 1*, dating to the late second and first centuries BC. The architecture for this period is a rubble platform beneath the Temple Enclosure with three rooms in the north. The early altar filled with charred remains has several blocks with Nabataean diagonal dressing (*DD* 90). The dating to the first century AD is reinforced by four Nabataean Aramaic texts and some *Dekorphase* I Nabataean fine ware pottery from the sanctuary area dating to the same period. An incense altar and stele were dedicated to the Edomite god Qōs. During the first century AD, an enclosure wall was added around the altar. There are three times as many sherds of the last quarter of the first century AD as of the first three quarters of that century combined.

After an earthquake destroyed the entire temple complex in AD 111/112, the sanctuary was rebuilt and refashioned in the first half of the second century AD, ostensibly by the same architects and sculptors who built the nearby temple at Khirbet edh-Dharih. The main construction was executed in *Period 2*, when an Inner Temenos Wall was added with Altar 2, which had niches in the Altar platform for the cult statues, and where busts of other deities (Helios, Kronos) were displayed, including the vegetation