

Territorium bezeichnet, soweit man sieht, allgemein akzeptiert. Doch gerade die Verwendung des Begriffes in den Texten aus Nuzi hat seit jeher Anlass zu unterschiedlichen Interpretationen gegeben: Welche territorialen, verwaltungstechnischen, sozialen und soziologischen Konnotationen verbinden sich mit einem *dimtu*?

In der hier vorgestellten Monographie wird der Versuch unternommen durch Verknüpfung archäologischer Befunde und schriftlicher Überlieferung dieses komplexe Bedeutungsgefüge nach Möglichkeit deutlicher zu charakterisieren. Dieser methodische Ansatz wird in der Gliederung des Materials kenntlich: Der erste Abschnitt („*Dimātu in written sources*“, Part I S. 3-36) umfasst eine diachronische Untersuchung des Lexems *dimtu* und der verschiedenen schriftlichen Quellen. Die Überlieferung für Arraphe (I. *Definition of dimtu in the kingdom of Arraphe*) und die übrige keilschriftliche Überlieferung (II. *Territorial and temporal distribution of dimtu outside the kingdom of Arraphe*) werden getrennt behandelt. In einem zweiten Abschnitt („*Dimātu in archaeological research*“, Part II, S. 39-88) beschreibt Vf. verschiedene archäologische Befunde, für die eine Deutung als *dimtu* erwogen wurde (III. *The archaeology of dimtu settlements*). Ausführlich werden die Möglichkeiten erörtert, anhand von quantitativer Klassifizierung von Siedlungen im Rahmen archäologischer Oberflächen-Untersuchungen Siedlungen vom Typus *dimtu* zu identifizieren (IV. *The survey method as means of discovering dimtu settlements*). Im dritten Abschnitt (*Studies on dimatu problem*, Part III, S. 91-122) geht es um *dimtu* als spezifische sozioökonomische Struktur des Staates von Arraphe. Eine knappe Zusammenfassung der Ergebnisse aus den Abschnitten I. — III. findet sich in Abschnitt IV (Part IV, S.125-127), gefolgt von bibliographischen Angaben in Abschnitt V (Part V, S. 131-147) und umfangreichen Appendices, die das Werk unter verschiedenen Gesichtspunkten erschließen (Part VI, S. 151-228).

Während die Gliederung die Vorgehensweise des Autors gut veranschaulicht, macht sie zugleich auch die Schwierigkeiten des Unterfangens deutlich. Gerade die ungleiche Verteilung des Materials und die teilweise divergierenden Befunde der verschiedenen Quellen und Quellentypen stehen einer konsequenten Verknüpfung archäologischer und philologischer Befunde entgegen. Diese Probleme werden insbesondere im zweiten Teil des Buches deutlich. So findet die terminologische Auseinandersetzung mit den semantisch offenbar teilweise parallel gebrauchten Begriffen *dimtu* und *dunnu* keinen Eingang in die weiteren Überlegungen. Als Beispiel sei hier die Diskussion um die in Tell Rijim ergrabenen Strukturen herangezogen. Implizit scheint der Autor hier doch einen strukturellen und auch im archäologischen Befund sichtbaren Unterschied zwischen *dimtu* und *dunnu* anzunehmen, wenn er schreibt: „(...) it seems to me that the architectural plan of the Tell Rijim is much closer to this *dunnu* [gemeint ist Sabi Abyad, E.C.-K.] than to the *dimtu* identified at Tell Fahar.“ (S.63: n.b. in Ermangelung aussagekräftiger Schriftquellen für das assyrische Kerngebiet im 16. Jh. sollte einem fehlenden Textbefund nicht zuviel Gewicht beigemessen werden.)

Zu den ungelösten Problemen, die der Autor mehrfach aufgreift, zählt die sehr grundsätzliche Frage, ob und inwieweit die Verbindung von Toponymen (im weitesten Sinne) und Eigennamen tatsächlich Rückschlüsse auf ein bestehendes oder ursprüngliches Eigentumsverhältnisse zulässt (z.B. S. 27f. für die aB, S. 30 für die mA Zeit). Von besonderem

ASSYRIOLOGIE

KOLIŃSKI, Rafał — Mesopotamian *dimātu* of the Second Millennium BC. BAR International Series 1004. Archaeopress, Oxford, 2001. (30 cm, X, 228). ISBN 1-84171-283-3. £ 37.00

Die im folgenden vorgestellte Arbeit ist der sozioökonomischen Institution *dimtu* im zweiten vorchristlichen Jahrtausends im Alten Orient gewidmet. Der Begriff *dimtu* ist in den verschiedenen Epochen der altorientalischen Geschichte in unterschiedlicher Dichte belegt. Der forschungsgeschichtliche Rückblick macht deutlich, dass bereits hinsichtlich der Bedeutung des Begriffes und der durch ihn bezeichneten gesellschaftlichen Realität keine Einigkeit besteht. Zwar ist die Annahme, dass *dimtu* sich im Grundsatz auf ein bestimmtes

Interesse dürften die Überlegungen zu den Veränderungen der Siedlungsmuster im nördlichen Mesopotamien sein. Danach stehen einem großen Anteil von Siedlungen unter 1 Hektar Größe im früheren 2. Jt. eine überwiegende Zahl an Siedlungen in der Größenordnung von 1-2 Hektar zum Ende des 2. Jt. gegenüber (S.64-76). Die Gültigkeit dieses Befundes wird freilich, wie der Autor selbst anmerkt, eingeschränkt durch die ungleiche Verteilung der Daten.

An einigen Stellen stolpert man im Text über kleine Inkonssequenzen. Gewöhnungsbedürftig ist u.a. die Tatsache, dass sowohl die Hauptabschnitte (Part I-VI) als auch die ihnen untergeordneten Kapitel dieselbe Nummerierung mit römischen Ziffern aufweisen. Auch die Gründe für die territoriale Zuordnung der mittellassyrischen Zeit unter "Southern Mesopotamia" bzw. der neuassyrischen Zeit unter „Elam“ bleiben unklar, u.a.m. Eine ganze Reihe von Punkten bedürften einer intensiveren Auseinandersetzung, z.B. inwieweit der Befund aus Tell Billa zuverlässige Schlussfolgerungen über die Häufigkeit von *dunnu* in den mittellassyrischen Provinzen zulässt (S. 31-32), bleibt zumindest fraglich; anderes bliebe zu diskutieren. Dessen ungeachtet ist hervorzuheben, dass der Band Philologen und Archäologen willkommen sein wird: als Materialsammlung, als kritische Auseinandersetzung mit schwierigen Befunden und — *last but not least* — als wichtiger Beitrag auf dem Weg zu einer Wirtschafts- und Sozialgeschichte des Vorderen Orients, die sämtliche verfügbaren Quellen, archäologische wie epigraphische, gleichermaßen berücksichtigt.

Berlin, im März 2004

Eva CANCIK-KIRSCHBAUM

* *
*

FUCHS, A., S. PARPOLA — The Correspondence of Sargon II, Part III: Letters from Babylonia and the Eastern Provinces. (State Archives of Assyria Vol. XV). Helsinki University Press, Helsinki, 2001. (25 cm, LVIII, 280, III pls.). ISBN 951-570-001-9; ISBN 951-570-496-0.

Letters from Babylonia and the Eastern Provinces completes the edition of the Assyrian language correspondence of Sargon II; the other parts of the corpus are to be found in SAA 1 (S. Parpola, *The Correspondence of Sargon II, Part I: Letters from Assyria and the West*) and SAA 5 (G.B. Lanfranchi and S. Parpola, *The Correspondence of Sargon II, Part II: Letters from the Northern and Northeastern Provinces*). A. Fuchs wrote the introduction and S. Parpola prepared the text editions. The former also made many useful comments on the preliminary proofs of the editions and the arrangement of the letters owes much to him.

SAA 15 consists of an introduction, transliterations and translations of the texts, a glossary, indices, collations (of 95 letters), and photographs (of no. 129 only). The introduction comprises discussions of the war against Merodach-baladan (pp. XIII–XXIII), the Neo-Assyrian Zagros and Western Iran (pp. XXIV–XXXI), and Dēr and the Elamite frontier (pp. XXXII–XXXV); an attempt to provide a chronological framework (pp. XXXVI–XLVII); and notes on the text editions (XLVIII–L). The 391 texts edited in the volume are divided into three main sections (Letters from the Eastern Provinces and Media, Letters from Babylonia, and Miscellaneous Letters), which are grouped further into nine chapters:

1. Letters from Arrapha (nos. 1–23); 2. Letters from Lubda and the Hamrin Area (nos. 24–52); 3. Letters from Parsua, Bit-Hamban and Šingibutu (nos. 53–82); 4. Letters from Kar-Šarrukin (nos. 83–110); 5. Letters from Dēr and Yadburu (nos. 111–154); 6. Letters from Northern Babylonia (nos. 155–216); 7. Letters from Central and Southern Babylonia (nos. 217–273); 8. Additions to SAA 1 and SAA 5 (nos. 274–287); and 9. Varia and Unassigned (nos. 288–391). In addition to all identifiable Assyrian letters sent to Sargon from Babylonia and the southeastern provinces, the volume contains 14 fragments which should have been included in SAA 1 or SAA 5, but which were overlooked at the time, as well as 94 fragments of unknown authorship and provenance; the editors (p. XLVIII) stress that not all of these letters belong to the Sargon correspondence. Furthermore, nine fragmentary letters (nos. 137, 178, 343, 360, and 387–391) are published here for the first time.

Very few of the texts edited are complete; the majority are fragmentary. Despite this, Parpola has made a tremendous effort in presenting up-to-date and reliable editions, as well as gathering the texts into fairly coherent groups. The editions benefit greatly from Parpola's many years of experience with Neo-Assyrian royal correspondence and his unrestricted access to the SAA database.¹⁾ The accuracy of the transliterations was ensured by repeated collation of the texts. Such time consuming work deserves our appreciation. Over all, the translations raise little doubt although there is some inconsistency in the translation of individual words and there are several passages where the translation could be better; for example, Parpola translates "[NN]" for ^maš-[šur-EN-PAB] in no. 62:2 and "[following the king], my lo[rd]'s instructions" for ^{ki-i ša} LUGAL ^{be}-lī ^{iš-pur-an-ni} in no. 280 r.5.

With regard to the texts included in the volume, there is at least one instance where the text genre of the fragment is uncertain: no. 309 could be part of an administrative document or part of a letter (compare no. 181:8–23). There is also one case where the letter does not appear to be royal correspondence; no. 371 is a personal letter from [^mx]-^lx-ia?¹ to Bel-abu-ušur.

Fuchs' introduction is a critical appraisal of numerous reports sent from no less than thirty officials reporting on the war with Merodach-baladan (Marduk-aplu-iddina II), events in the Zagros and Western Iran, and Dēr and the Elamite Frontier. He also attempts to establish an eight-phased chronological framework for the period from 710 to the beginning of 706: (1) 710a, (2) 710b, (3) 710c–709a, (4) 709b, (5) 708a, (6) 708b–707a, (7) 707b, and (8) 707c–706a. Of the 391 letters edited in the volume, 186 texts are assigned dates. Of these, 55 of the dates as regarded as tentative and another 51 are cited as "the given year and afterwards until the end of Sargon's reign." The dates of the texts provided in the proposed chronology (pp. XL–XLI) correspond with only a few minor discrepancies to those provided in Table VI (pp. XLII–XLVII):²⁾

¹⁾ The database was probably used a great deal in restoring partially preserved names. One example is ^mah-^{he}-[šá-a-a] in no. 358:11. Although this name is the most common personal name beginning with Ahhē- in Neo-Assyrian texts and the only occurrence of an Ahhē-name in the volume, it is not the only possibility: Ahhē'a, Ahhē-ballit, Ahhē-damqū, Ahhē-iddina, Ahhē-iqbi, Ahhē-riša, Ahhē-šāia, Ahhē-šallim, and Ahhē-šu (PNA 1/1 pp. 60–62). The name should probably be read as Ahhē-[...].

²⁾ This does include texts whose date is cited as firm in one place and tentative(?) in another. These are: nos. 31, 68, 88, 100, 174, 191–192, 195–196, 201, 216, and 227.

Text no.	Date in Proposed Chronology	Date in Table VI
4	710b	710b+ ³⁾
138	709b	709b+
140	709b	710b+?
141	709b?	710b+?
187	710a	no date given
188	710a?	no date given
221	707b	710b+
238	710b	710b+
267	709b	709b+
286	708a	no date given

Fuchs makes a valiant attempt in his appraisal of the material, despite nearly all of the letters being heavily damaged or broken, the language of the texts being highly idiomatic and not always comprehensible, the historical context of the reports being unclear, and none of the tablets being dated. The chronological vagueness of the letters permits many possible interpretations of the Sargon correspondence, one of which is presented in the introduction. Of course, further analysis of the material by other specialists will doubtlessly yield alternate interpretations and chronological arrangements of the corpus, or part thereof. Regardless of whether scholars agree or disagree with the appraisal and proposed chronological framework, Fuchs' introduction will serve as a solid foundation for future studies on the war with Merodach-baladan II, events in the Zagros and Western Iran, and Dēr and the Elamite Frontier.

The reviewer has no major problems with Fuchs' analysis of the letters and chronological framework. However, I have three short remarks about the war of succession in Ellipi (pp. XXIX–XXXI and XLI).

1. Fuchs (p. XXIX) divides the succession into three stages: a) the demise of Daltâ, b) the short reign of Nibê, and c) the Assyrian campaign to install Ašpa-bara. Later on in the discussion (p. XXXI and XLI), he describes a fourth event, Ašpa-bara's civil war with Lutû, a son of the recently deceased Ellipean king.⁴⁾ Therefore, the war of succession should be divided into four phases and should be considered over in 706 once Lutû and his supporters had been subdued, not in 707 when Ašpa-bara was installed on the throne by Sargon's magnates.

2. Fuchs (pp. XXX, XLI, and XLIII) regards no. 84, a letter ascribed to Nabû-belû-ka'in when he was governor of Kar-Šarrukin, as being written closest to the time of Daltâ's death in 708 (shortly before [x]1st of Kislev) since the sender reports: "Concerning news of Daltâ: he does not leave the house and no one enters into his presence" (lines 3–4). He dates the letter to 708a and suggests that the Ellipean king may have been ill or had just died and his death was being kept secret in order to prepare for the succession. Fuchs, however, does not mention the possibility that the letter may have been sent to Sargon in 713, when Ellipi revolted against Daltâ; during this time, the Ellipean king may have been confined to his royal residence.⁵⁾ Therefore, no. 84 should be assigned a less precise date, ca. 713–708a.

³⁾ The siglum + after the date indicates "the given year and afterwards until the end of Sargon's reign." Therefore, Fuchs regards 710b+ as 710b–705, not as 710b.

⁴⁾ The fighting between these two Ellipean cousins is not referred to in the PNA entries for Ašpa-bara (PNA 1/1 p. 143) and Lutû (PNA 2/2 p. 673). The pertinent information in no. 101:10–15 is overlooked in both cases.

⁵⁾ Fuchs refers to this possibility in PNA 1/2 p. 373 sub. Daltâ §c. For references to Daltâ and the Ellipean rebellion, see PNA 1/2 p. 373.

3. Fuchs does not include no. 34 ("A Bodyguard Sends the Magnates Off") in his study of the war of succession (pp. XXIX–XXXI) or in the proposed chronology for 708a–706a (p. XLI); the text is not assigned a date in Table VI (p. XLIII). The letter, which is attributed to Nabû-belû-ka'in by Parpola, states that the bodyguard Sîn-kenu-ušur came to an unspecified location and told the magnates to "set out and go" (*na-mi-šá li-kal-ka*), and reports that they have departed (lines 3'–8'). The text may have been composed in 707b, shortly after the Assyrian "magnates" departed the area around the cities of Urammu and Sumurzu (in the province of Namri) to aid Ašpa-bara.⁶⁾ If this proves true, then no. 34 was written shortly before nos. 35 and 95 since both letters report that "the magnates... have entered the land of Ellipi"; the text's placement in the volume suggests that it was written prior to no. 35. It is unclear why Fuchs did not refer to this letter in his study. With regard to the attribution of the letter, it is not explained in the critical apparatus why the text is assigned to Nabû-belû-ka'in.⁷⁾ Parpola makes no reference to the scribal hand, such as "hand of Nabû-belû-ka'in," "tentatively assigned to Nabû-belû-ka'in," or "assignation to Nabû-belû-ka'in" in ascertained by orthographic details." The attribution to this official is less certain when it is pointed out that the opening address does not match any of the known letters of this individual, specifically *a-dan-niš 'lu! DI!-mu!* in line 2'. Therefore, it is likely that no. 34 was written by an official other than Nabû-belû-ka'in, perhaps the provincial governor of Namri, the governor of Urammu, or the governor of Sumurzu; this assumes the association of the letter with the campaign to Ellipi in 707. Until the scribal hand can be confirmed, the authorship of the text should be regarded as uncertain.

The only major complaint that the reviewer has with the volume is that the proposed dates of the letters do not appear in the critical apparatus at the bottom of each page, as they do in SAA 8 (H. Hunger, *Astrological Reports to Assyrian Kings*) and SAA 10 (S. Parpola, *Letters from Assyrian and Babylonian Scholars*). This is a major inconvenience for the reader, principally since he or she must either write the dates in the appropriate places or constantly consult the introduction each and every time he or she wishes to know the approximate date of composition of a letter. Either way, the reader is inconvenienced since time is wasted flipping back and forth between pages.

In sum, SAA 15 is a professional treatment of the correspondence of Sargon II, specifically the letters from Babylonia and the eastern provinces. Fuchs deserves our gratitude for his efforts in providing a well-thought out and coherent background with a chronological framework of the texts, and for attempting to date many of the letters in the corpus. Parpola deserves our appreciation for all of his years of hard work on the editions. *The Correspondence of Sargon II, Part III*, like the other volumes in the SAA series, is an important contribution to the field of Neo-Assyrian studies. Although much work can still be done on this text corpus, Fuchs' and Parpola's volume lays a solid foundation for future studies and text editions.

Toronto, April 2004

Jamie R. NOVOTNY

⁶⁾ The rallying-point for the magnates is referred to in no. 76 and in SAA 1 no. 13.

⁷⁾ For the career of this official, see most recently PNA 2/2 p. 815–817 no. 1.