

## ASSYRIOLOGIE

BORGER, R. — Mesopotamisches Zeichenlexikon. Zweite, revidierte und aktualisierte Auflage. (Alter Orient und Altes Testament, Band 305 (2. Auflage)). Ugarit Verlag, Münster, 2010. (24,5 cm, XII, 736). ISBN 978-3-86835-043-2. € 80,-; \$ 115,-.

Rykle Borger hat beträchtliche Arbeit auf zwei Werke verwendet, die anderen Assyriologen das Leben leichter machen: sein *Handbuch der Keilschriftliteratur* und sein *Mesopotamisches Zeichenlexikon* (MesZL). Einen Satz des Inhaltes: „Erstellt mit Hilfe von Rykle Borger“ könnte man unter fast jede Arbeit in diesem Fach schreiben.

MesZL ist teilweise an die Stelle des *Manuel d'épigraphie akkadienne* von Labat getreten. Ein großer Vorzug des Manuel bleibt jedoch seine Übersichtlichkeit. Während die Informationen zu einem Zeichen bei Borger über mindestens drei Kapitel verstreut sind, findet man im Manuel alles auf einen Blick. Bei der älteren Paläographie und den Gleichungen sumerischer Wörter findet man bei Labat auch noch immer mehr als bei Borger. Allerdings weiß man bei Labat in der Regel nicht, woher er sein Wissen hat. So lässt sich bei Borger erstmals nachverfolgen, wo Lesungen in den lexikalischen Listen zu finden sind. Allerdings notiert Borger nur die Lesungen, nicht die akkadischen Gleichungen. Im Vorwort verweist Borger darauf, dass sich mit Hilfe der Angaben in Kapitel II und der Wörterbücher ein „erheblicher Anteil des sumerischen Wortschatzes eruieren“ ließe. Man nehme also ein sumerisches Wortzeichen, schaue bei MesZL nach, wo es in MSL vorkommt, finde die Gleichungen und sehe in den Wörterbüchern die Bedeutung nach. Das ist nicht nur sehr umständlich, es führt auch vielfach nicht zum Erfolg, weil Borger auf Listen, die nur akkadische Übersetzungen aber keine Lautwerte enthalten, nicht verweist. Die Gleichungen sind nicht nur für das Sumerische wichtig. Sie gehörten zum Bildungsgut der Schreiber und wurden immer wieder für gelehrte Erklärungen oder auch mal für eine verblüffende Schreibung herangezogen. Der Vorteil von Borgers Zurückhaltung ist, dass der Benutzer nicht unbesehen aufgrund einer Gleichung ein sonst nicht belegtes Logogramm benutzen wird. Andererseits hilft MesZL nicht bei der Entdeckung seltener logographischer Schreibungen.

Z. B. findet man in Kapitel III zu PÄ *tamû* „schwören“ und *zakāru* „nennen“. Der Gebrauch von PÄ zur Schreibung von *zakāru* ist aber marginal. Für das Sumerische wäre es ebenso wichtig gewesen auch die Gleichungen *watû* „finden“, *nabû* „nennen; berufen“ zu notieren. Das wäre nicht nur eine Hilfe für die Sumerologie. Zweisprachige Texte und sogar einsprachige Passagen in Sumerisch finden sich bis fast ans Ende der keilschriftlichen Überlieferung. Für schwierige, insbesondere beschädigte Textstellen sind die Gleichungen eine große Hilfe. Dabei hätte ein bloßer Verweis auf die akkadischen Wörter gereicht, da sich die Belege leicht in CAD finden lassen.

Dagegen wäre die Zusammenstellung der grammatischen Elemente des Sumerischen (Kapitel VI) entbehrlich gewesen und ebenso die Zusammenstellung der Emesalwörter (hierfür Schretter, *Emesal Studien*). Da es mittlerweile zwei akkadische Wörterbücher gibt, hätte man auch auf das Glossar (Kapitel VI) verzichten können. Unklar ist dem Rezensenten auch warum Lautwerte mit „überhängendem Vokal“ wie *lugala*, *nuna* etc. in der Liste der Lautwerte (Kapitel IV)

zitiert werden. Falkenstein hat diese Lesungen nach Bedarf kreiert, weil er sich ein Schriftsystem, in dem nicht alles was gesprochen wird auch geschrieben wird, nicht vorgestellt hat. Doch wenn man die älteren Texte insgesamt betrachtet, dann ist offensichtlich, dass es defektive Schreibungen gab und es gibt keinen Grund, dieses System auszugleichen, indem man etwa aus LUGAL-né, weil das Suffix /-ane/ lautet (häufig als /-ani/ interpretiert) eine nicht belegte Wortform „lugala“ zu erschließen.

Der Unterschied zur 1. Auflage von 2003 ist nur gering (Hinweise im Vorwort ix). Offenbar war es ein besonderes Anliegen des Autors, die Seitenzahlen einzuhalten, was ihm über 700 Seiten gelungen ist. Dabei hat sich Borger wie sein Lehrer von Soden als Meister der Informationsverdichtung erwiesen. Die Sorge, ja die Seiten einzuhalten, mag aber auch einer der Gründe gewesen sein, warum aBZL (C. Mittermayer, *Altbabylonische Zeichenliste der sumerisch-literarischen Texte*, OBO Sonderband, Fribourg/Göttingen 2006) nicht eingearbeitet wurde. Wahrscheinlich scheute Borger auch die Auseinandersetzung mit Attingers Umschriftsystem. Z. B. schreibt Attinger ge-guna<sub>4</sub><sup>na</sup> statt ge-gun<sub>4</sub>-na. Ein Lautwert gun<sub>4</sub> ist nicht belegt und die Schreibung GE.GUNU<sub>4</sub>. NA zeigt, dass der zweite Teil der Fügung /guna/ ist (cf. altsum. ge-gù-na Behrens FAOS 6, 414). Hieraus lässt sich weder ein Silben- noch ein Wortzeichen gun<sub>4</sub> ableiten.

Borger hatte die Möglichkeit, sich entweder Attinger anzuschließen, die Fälle einzeln zu diskutieren oder wie getan, alles beim Alten zu belassen, wofür sich pragmatische Gründe anführen lassen. Im Vorwort hätte diese Entscheidung allerdings erwähnt werden sollen.

Außerdem enthält aBZL sehr viele Informationen, die nicht nur mit einer anderen Auffassung der Umschrift zu tun haben. Z. B. werden zu isimu<sub>4</sub> (PAB.SIG<sub>7</sub>.NUN) die Varianten PAB.SIG<sub>7</sub>.NUN.EZEN/BAD = isimu<sub>x</sub> angegeben. Das hätte eigentlich aufgenommen werden müssen. Es ist durchaus von Vorteil, wenn man etwa Rosengartens Liste der Zeichen der präargonischen Wirtschaftstexte aus Lagaš bei jedem Zeichen in Kapitel II zitiert findet. Aber warum muss man für aBZL in eine Konkordanz schauen? Nicht eingearbeitet wurden Verweise auf C. Mittermayer, *Die Entwicklung der Tierkopfzeichen*, AOAT 316, Münster 2005.

Leider erschien die neue Auflage gleichzeitig mit Miguel Civils, *The Lexical Texts in the Schøyen Collection* (CUSAS 12, Bethesda 2010, hier Civil). Ich nehme die Gelegenheit wahr, dieses Material einzuarbeiten und mache einige weitere Ergänzungen. Die Hinweise beziehen sich weitgehend auf Kapitel II, das vor allem die graphische Trennung und die Lesung der Zeichen zum Inhalt hat und das Kernstück von MesZL ist. Geordnet sind die Einträge nach der Nummerierung von Borger. Neue Lautwerte, die sich aus CUSAS 12 ergeben habe ich mit einem Stern (\*) am Ende gekennzeichnet und gegebenenfalls mit zusätzlichen Indizes versehen. In einigen Fällen lese ich anders als in CUSAS 12. Lesungen, die sich weder in MesZL noch in CUSAS 12 finden, sind mit zwei Sternen (\*\*\*) gekennzeichnet.

47 KAxBALAG gu<sub>17</sub>\* (*rigmu*) Civil 24, 8.

49 KAxŠU atab\* Civil 24, 17 + K(ommentar).

61 EME.SAL.MEŠ = *lišānātu*? Frahm, *Commentaries* 329, Anm. 1575.

87 KU<sub>4</sub> namšeše\* (= ŠABRA) Civil 12, 206.

**113** BAD, BE: Schreibung von /ba<sup>c</sup>/ später /be/, cf. ji → i, Keetman JCS 60, 109f.

**115** ŠIR, ŠIR.UD = bu<sub>19</sub>\* Civil 20, 23'. ŠIR.BUR = numma\*\* in n.<sup>mušen</sup> = zību „Geier“, Veldhuis CM 22, 276f, dort auch zur Lesung buru<sub>4</sub> in b.<sup>mušen</sup> = āribu „Krähe“ zu unterscheiden von uga<sup>mušen</sup> = āribu „Rabe“ (sic). Dass für Geier und Krähe im Sumerischen zwar verschiedene Worte, aber die gleiche Graphik verwendet wird, mag damit zusammenhängen, dass Krähen wie der in Mesopotamien nachgewiesene Corvus corone capellanus (Iraq 71, 104) häufig Aas fressen (entgegen Veldhuis CM 22, 226 schließen sich auch „crow“ und „bird of prey“ nicht aus, womit die Annahme, ŠIR.BUR stünde erst ab Ur III auch für Krähe, hinfällig ist). Zu vergleichen ist die semantische Vermengung von Geier und Schakal (CAD Z 106b).

**117** NUMUN, Archi Eblaitica 1, 98: Zeichenname nu-gū-LUM → nuġun\* (aBZL 26). Civil

20, 27': niġ-gu-úNUMUN → Nebenform niġgu\*.

**124** IDIGNA/DALLA, aB ist dalla = MAŠ+IDIGNA (aBZL 30 und 87). Diese Unterscheidung findet sich bereits bei Gudea und in Lagaš ED IIIb. Ein sarg. Beleg aus Ur (UET 2 Pl. 47, 19 iii 4) schreibt dalla entsprechend. Im Norden und Ebla beginnt das Zeichen für beide Lesungen zunächst mit AŠ (in Fāra kann ich nur idigna sicher nachweisen), das in ED IIIb wie bei HÉ aufgegeben wird. Ältester Beleg ohne AŠ ist dalla ELTS 14 i 4 (ED IIIa/b, Isin?). Sargonisch bleiben die Zeichen im Norden ununterscheidbar.

**135** BURU<sub>5</sub> Entwicklung: Veldhuis CM 22, 230.

**150** HÚBxUD (HÚBxMIN) tahtu\* (*kamāru*) Civil 9, 53.

**153** MÜŠ min<sub>9</sub>\* Civil 19, 17, erschlossenes suġ<sub>10</sub> ebd. 20 belegt.

**165** ENxKÁR akar\* Civil 21, 8', cf. enkar u. an-kár, en-kár Gudea Zyl. A vi 21, B vii 13.

**184** <sup>za-ra-ab</sup>SAGxSAL = *nissatu*, sonst SAG.PA.LAGAB; Verwechslung?

**253** I (i), **260** IA (I+A): Vor Ur III steht I für /ji/ GAG<sup>3</sup> § 22b\*, c\*. Eventuell gibt es Ausnahmen, die den späteren Zustand schon lange vorwegnehmen. Dafür spricht bereits IAS 74, 139: i-bí-la und dass statt U = /ju/ in einigen Texten ú bzw. ù geschrieben wird, Keetman JCS 60, 108. Für I als /ji/ einen besonderen Index einzusetzen ist überflüssig, da ji (IA) erst später gebraucht wird. Borgers Umschriften als „ii“, „ia“ etc. geben Anlass für Verwirrung: Es liegt kein anderer Laut vor als in arab. *jaqtulu*, hebr. *jiktōb* und schon gar nicht handelt es sich um zwei Vokale. Umschrift also ji (oder yi) und nicht „ii“ etc. **253**, **216** (TAB.TAB.AŠ = ja<sub>7</sub>), **861** (5xDIŠ = já) sind graphische Varianten und daher ist für I, zumindest wenn das Zeichen für die Zahl 5 steht, im Sumerischen ja<sub>x</sub> oder ähnlich (beachte, dass es keine andere Glosse etwa für /ji/ gibt) anzusetzen. Die Lesung ji könnte daher im Sumerischen durchaus ursprünglich sein, cf. Keetman NABU 2009, 65.

**261** <sup>ni-in</sup>IN = šū Civil 12, 234. Oder -n- in „i-in-Verb“?

**266** LUGAL lillia\* (in ŠE LUGAL) Civil 10, 99.

**297** AZ, Lesung aza im Sumerischen, Attinger NABU 2006, 37.

**298** GABA, <sup>a-lam-ga</sup>GABAxGABA = *mušēzibu* und weiteres Cavigneaux, *Fs. Attinger* 76.

**312** GIBIL; NExPAB, NEšeššig, ergänze NExKASKAL.

Civil 9, 41-44(!):

gi	NE.KASKAL	e-de-šum	
gi-il	NE.MIN	eš-šum	
gi-bi	NE	2	
gi-bi-il	NE	3	(cf. MSL 14, 449 u. Civil 14 K)

Neue Lesungen: gil<sub>4</sub>\*, gibi\* und ġigi\* (Civil 13, PAS 28, 21').

**316**, **317**, **318**, **334**, **335** Der neue Text zu Ea VII 22-25 (Civil 4, 4-7) ist wohl so zu

rekonstruieren:

šu-rum NINDÁ.<AŠ>? ma-la-x-[x] (eventuell auch *mal-amala*)

šu-šu-rum NINDÁ.[AŠ].AŠ ši-in-nu-ú

udu-gaba NINDÁ.[U] ma-la-ma-l[a]

2 udu-gaba NINDÁ.[U].U ši-in-nu-ú cf. MSL 14, 459, Civil mit K. anders.

**321** NINDÁxBÁN gurmi\* (*sūtu*) Civil 8, 13.

**328** NINDÁxŠID? (MesZL), NINDÁxKID CAD N I 206f. Dazu nun Civil 8, 10f.:

<sup>gur-me-dub</sup>NINDÁxŠID = *šermu* (ŠID deutlich anders als DUB)

<sup>ba-rí-ga</sup>NINDÁxDUB = *paršiktu* cf. CAD S 420a

e-me-du-ub<sup>GÁ</sup>xDUB = *sūtu*

e-me-du-ub<sup>GÁ</sup>xŠID = *sūtu*, *širmu*

Es sind also NINDÁxŠID (gurmedub\*) und NINDÁxDUB (bariga\*) zu trennen.

**334** <sup>gur-ba-ru</sup>NINDÁxU = āš-mu akkadisch mir unklar, Lautwert gurbaru\* neu, cf. **316** etc.

**339** GUM nuġa\* = *esittu* „Mörser“ (sonst naġa<sub>4</sub>) Civil 8, 12.

**340** GAZ kazba\* = kaš-bu-um Civil 8, 27; kaz\*\* Frahm, *Commentaries* 241.

**373** ŠIMxGAR babiru\* Civil 4, 10'. Nach Sallaberger, *Fs. Attinger* 308-10 babir\*\* „Sauerteig“, Varianten bābir\*\* (ŠIM), bābir\*\* (KAŠxGAR).

**380** NI, 4 NI in Kreuzform, Cavigneaux, *Fs. Attinger* 76.

**485** ŠID zadra\* Civil 10, 139.

**490** Ú, für ba<sub>6</sub>, bu<sub>11</sub> Rubio JCS 62, 35ff. In ED PN vermutlich pu<sub>11</sub>. Cf. Pù-i-lum, Pù-Ma-ma, Ú-il, Ú-Ma-ma, Ú.KA-il, Pù-pù, Ú-Ú (Belege Sommerfeld BuB 4/1, 132/135, Luzag 1 i 9). Für ba<sub>6</sub> spricht nur der Wechsel <sup>d</sup>ba-Ú/ba, <sup>d</sup>ab-Ú/ba und Gudea Statue B vi 5: ba<sub>6</sub>-sal-la, wo aber auch ein Fehler für ba aufgrund von häufigem ú-sal-la vorliegen könnte. Eine lautliche Variante erscheint sinnvoller als eine graphische. Also <sup>d</sup>ba-bu<sub>11</sub> vereinfacht, vor allem in PN zu ba-ba. Damit ist die Graphik erklärt und es entfällt der ungewöhnliche a/u-Wechsel bei einem Silbenzeichen.

**543** GÀR, gàra in dam-gàra (Gilgameš und Huwawa B 48, aBZL 209). Cf. **598**.

**561** DA, DAxDA Cavigneaux, Fs. Attinger 76; 78.

**570** LUL zulun\* *lezû* Civil 13, 246 + K! Ebd. 253 <sup>na-gàr</sup> LUL(NAR) = na-âg-rum.

**579** ŠE ninga\* *marû* Civil 12, 199.

**587** TIR si<sub>25</sub>\*, še<sub>30</sub>\* Civil 12, 218 + K.

**598** PI: die auf Borger zurückgehende Standartumschrift des Zeichens als pi in prä-akkad. und sarg. Texten verunklart das Schriftsystem. Im Sumerischen ist wohl be<sub>6</sub> zu lesen (Wechsel mit bé) und diese Lesung ist vor Ur III auch im Akkadischen normal (was pe nicht ausschließt). Akkadisch kommt die Lesung wa erst ED IIIb in Mari auf (Sommerfeld BuB 4/1, 132; in Ebla: wa, wi, wu, Krebernik ZA 72, 199). Vorher ließ sich /wa/ offenbar nicht schreiben. Daher steht gâr in Personennamen für /waqar/ oder /waqara/.

**672** ÁB, ergänze ÁB.ŠÀ.GE = ze<sub>x</sub> in ED Lagaš. Zuletzt Meyer-Laurin WdO 41; Keetman NABU 2012, 58; NABU 2013, 20. Lesung: ze<sub>5</sub>\*\*.

**681** MI ġizza\* (*ša* GIŠ.MI, *šillu*) Civil 11, 185-186.

**685** PAN bana\*, PAN.GAM bandur\*, zúgud\* Civil 20, 17'-19'.

**729** SIG<sub>5</sub> zag<sub>4</sub>\* *damqu* Civil 21, 38'.

**730** IGI.GAR/ERÍM (KURUM<sub>7</sub>) sikku\* Civil 21, 40' K.

**812** UDU, Lesung udu (Ur III Nebenform /uda/ oder /ada/) Keetman NABU 2012, 25.

**851** ZA zur erschlossenen Lesung ze<sub>4</sub>\*\* in ZA-e „du“ (aB durchgehend oder teilweise) Attinger ZA 101, 173-90, Keetman NABU 2012, 9.

**883** SAL, zum Lautwert mí, me<sub>x</sub>: Verweis auf [a-]me É.[SAL] Diri V 288 ist irrelevant, da nicht auf die Aussprache der Komponenten eines zusammengesetzten Zeichens geschlossen werden kann. Siehe jedoch MÍ-a für me-a, Sjöberg *Mondgott* 13, woraus sich me<sub>x</sub> ergibt, mí nicht belegt.

Ebenso wie andere Zeichenlisten betrachtet MesZL die sumerischen Lautwerte durch eine akkadische Brille. In den meisten Fällen kann im Akkadischen ab Ur III ein Lautwert, der e enthält auch mit i gelesen werden und umgekehrt. Im Sumerischen gibt es auch Zeichen deren Lesung zwischen e und i wechselt, z. B. ni/né. Doch das ist die Ausnahme. Dass im Reichsakkadischen wie in der südaltsumerischen Präfixharmonie separate Zeichenreihen Ke/Ki verwendet werden, sollte zu denken geben. Die aus dem Sumerischen (z. B. Vokalharmonie, Schreibung von Suffixen) ableitbaren Unterscheidungen zwischen /e/ und /i/ stimmen nicht immer mit dem Befund der Listen überein. Der Grund ist vermutlich, dass die sumerischen Vokale von den akkadischen abwichen (Bestand an Vokalen, Artikulation) und dass man sich in der Keilschrift mit dem Vorhandenen behalf und keine phonologisch eindeutigen Schreibungen entwickelte (cf. mu/ġu<sub>10</sub>, ġá/ġe<sub>26</sub>). Das ist aber noch kein Grund, Lesungen mit /i/ mechanisch hinzuzuerfinden oder gar zur normalen Referenz zu machen, wo im Sumerischen nur Lesungen mit /e/ belegt sind. Z. B. postuliert MesZL wie andere

Zeichenlisten einen Lautwert gi<sub>7</sub>, obwohl nur ge<sub>7</sub>(ŠÈ) belegt ist. Eine Durchsicht von Proto-Ea zeigt deutlich, dass der Wechsel zwischen /e/ und /i/ in den Glossen ziemlich selten ist und meist nur ein Text abweicht, obwohl Proto-Ea weitgehend von Anfängern aufgeschrieben wurde.

Borger hat ein Handbuch für das Akkadische vorwiegend der nachaltbabylonischen Zeit geschrieben und dies mit seinem enormen Überblick über die Literatur in sehr nützlicher Weise ergänzt. Trotzdem wäre die Zusammenarbeit mit einem Assyriologen, der seinen Forschungsschwerpunkt mehr in den älteren Epochen hat, sinnvoll gewesen.

Kritik an der Anlage des Buches wurde oben ebenfalls geäußert. Alles in allem hat Borger der Assyriologie ein phantastisches Hilfsmittel geschenkt, das eine Fülle von Informationen zusammenfasst und in Borgers unpräntentioser Art viele Verbesserungen beisteuert.

Rykle Borger ist wenige Monate nachdem er die Arbeit an der Neuauflage abgeschlossen hatte verstorben. Wir werden diesen emsigen Arbeiter an der Verbesserung unseres Faches vermissen.

Staufen (Freiburg), 3. 3. 2014

Jan KEETMAN

\*  
\* \*

ANDERSSON, J. — Kingship in the Early Mesopotamian Onomasticon 2800-2200 BCE. (Studia Semitica Upsalensis, 28). Uppsala Universitet, Uppsala, 2012. (24 cm, XXXIX, 440). ISBN 978-91-554-8270-1. ISSN 0585-5535.

#### Summary of the contents

J. Andersson's book first aims to pinpoint beliefs and ideas essential for the conception of human and divine lordship in ancient Mesopotamia concerning religious, socio-economical and political matters, as far as these can be demonstrated in the onomasticon from 2800 until 2200. The author concentrates on names containing the lexemes (Sum.) "lugal" and (Akk.) "šarrum", both commonly translated with "king" in the human, and "lord" in the divine sphere. From the methodological point of view, J. Andersson takes it for granted that the choice of a name for children was not only an expression of sentiments, such as wishes for good luck and prosperity, but furthermore an indication of the influence of common cultural and religious rules exerted on the population (the main discussion pp. 2ff.).

After an overview of the principles one can recognize in name-giving, of previous research, method, sources and scopes (pp. 10-22), J. Andersson gives a brief survey of the historical and ideological development of Sumer and Akkad from Uruk IV until Ur III, including the archaeological sites which yielded the texts and sealings. According to the aim of his work, the author focuses on dominant social groups and kingship (pp. 25-45).

In dwelling on the details of name-giving, J. Andersson conveys first a general overview of the timing for naming a child or adolescent, the persons doing this, and reasons for changing an extant name (pp. 46-53).

The next item is a more detailed investigation of Sumerian and Akkadian name-giving, stressing formal criteria and abbreviations, personal relations to the named human being,



or the lack of them and — as the main issue — the meanings of “lugal” and “*šarrum*”. Concerning “lugal”: “king”, “divinity”, “owner”, or the address (-gu<sub>10</sub>) “milord” (the last being rather difficult to identify); concerning “*šarrum*”: “king”, “divinity” or “baby” (the last when taking in consideration “*še(a)rrum* cf. p. 77 note 392, probably a play of words) (pp. 46-77).

In the semantic analysis (pp. 78-215) J. Andersson distributes the names over nine categories for the Sumerian and Akkadian material respectively, showing at the very beginning of each chapter the cities of their bearers and the frequency of appearance in the sub-periods from ED I until Classical Sargonic.

In 1-6 the divisions applied by D.O. Edzard and A. Westenholz (cf. essentially p. 15) are combined:

1. Dominion, 2. Wisdom and awareness, 3. Protection, 4. Care and attentiveness, 5. Creation, fertility and prosperity, 6. Cult or gods, 7. Qualitative-descriptive.

Categories 8-9 are added by J. Andersson: 8. Unattributable and unintelligible, 9. Non-existent names and misreadings (concerning Akkadian: non-existent *šarrum*-names and misreadings).

Except category 2, Wisdom and awareness, these categories are subdivided in respect of the proximity between the lugal or *šarrum* and the subject(s) the name is dealing with. E.g., in 3.1.3 Protection (cf. p. 107): 1. p. of the individual (the relationship between the name-bearer and the king), 2. p. of the city (city and king) 3. p. of the country (country and king). The author states that the attribution of names to one or another category can be questionable.

The lexemes used in the names treated above are listed in tables (pp. 216-227), organized according to the categories Divinities, Localities, Nouns, adjectives and verbs, Sumerian verbal prefixes, Akkadian finite verb al forms (pp. 216-227) in the left column; the names containing the lexemes in the right one.

How the names under discussion attest to the development of kingship from ED I until Classical Sargonic, J. Andersson demonstrates from a synchronic and a diachronic approach showing the presence or absence of the (sub)categories used in the semantic analysis.

From the synchronic point of view (pp. 228-231), in ED I-II (no *šarrum*-names are mentioned) names concerning 1. Dominion are most prominent, less 5. Creation and fertility; 6. Cult or gods only in general formulations. Andersson states that more than 50% of the names found in ED I-II do not occur in later periods.

In ED IIIa (from this time on, *šarrum*-names consist — with some exceptions in ED IIIb — of *šarrum*+PN), the frequency of categories is this: the prevalence of 1. Dominion continues, names are mentioning now insignia of kingship, wisdom of the ruler in exercising power, the land of Sumer (kalam) and foreign countries (kur) as well as their inhabitants. 2. Wisdom and awareness, attributed to the king personally, not yet as a gift of deities like in the royal inscriptions from ED IIIb on. 5. Fertility and Prosperity as far as the cities and their territories are concerned. 6. The gods — Enlil, Dumuzi, and presumably already An and Utu being of great importance — are now interacting with the king. More than 50% of the names found in ED IIIa do not occur in periods later than ED IIIb.

In ED IIIb, the category 1. Dominion is absolutely predominant in all respects compared to the other ones. The king now frequently is celebrated as the man holding sway

over the country (kalam) and the people. 3. Protection increases remarkably in importance, not only in human-related lugal-, but also in *šarrum*-names. J. Andersson stresses that approximately 75% of all names originating from ED IIIb are concerned with the above mentioned categories. ED IIIb was the first time that 40% of all names occurred in category 6., Cult or gods.

In ES (=Early Sargonic) until LS, the variety of items referred to in category 1. Dominion grows, mainly as far as clothing and insignia are concerned. 3 Protection becomes still more important than in former periods; 4. Care and attentiveness toward the individual is now well represented. 6. Cult or gods — except efforts in favour of precisely named holy places, gods or ceremonies — and 7. Qualitative-descriptive — in respect of his ability as warrior — underwent a significant loss of popularity for creating names, both categories having been widespread until ES.

On the other hand, many more names than ever before can now be found connecting the king with divine light and brilliance or originating from natural phenomena (another aspect of category 7.).

From the diachronic point of view (pp. 231-242), J. Andersson first conveys an impression of the uncertainty one must take into account when trying to gain an overview of the demographic situation in the sites where his material comes from, so that the ratio between Sumerian and Akkadian speaking population and the influence that might have been exercised on each other in regard of name-giving remains unclear.

In what follows the author shows the growing prevalence of the lexemes lugal and *šarrum* in comparison with (Sum.) en and nin and (Akk.) *ba'lum* respectively, also frequently used in name-giving, and belonging to — approximately — the identical semantic field. In the formulation of names lugal supplants with highest frequency the lexemes e<sub>2</sub> and nin at the same position.

lugal (var: nu-gal<sub>2</sub>)-names in the territories north of Sumer (examples from Ebla, Mari and the territories north of Kiš) are construed in accordance with the principles followed in Sumer and do not represent an autochthonous tradition.

At the end of the chapter J. Andersson summarizes differences and similarities in name-giving, stressing that in Sumerian lugal-names the institution of kingship as an abstract entity, its visible attributes and their key-role for providing prosperity prevail, while Akkadian *šarrum*-names are commonly related to the official. The *šarrum* figures mainly as protector of his subjects, less as benefactor or the person who runs cultic or religious affairs. In both languages qualities like justice, righteousness, wisdom and personal ability are ascribed to the king.

In what way the onomasticon treated in his work corresponds with the political and cultural development from ED I until CS, J. Andersson investigates pp. 243-259.

As far as the 3<sup>rd</sup> millennium is concerned, the author dwells on Th. Jacobsen's thesis on the origin of kingship in the Sumerian city-state: from an occasional need for a military leader, elected by his fellow-citizens, who had to be a young, tough, independent, noble and a well-to-do member of the community. Stressing the apparent and well known lack of sources for this idea apart from literary texts, J. Andersson supposes that the name *Iphur-Kiš* (enemy of Naramsu'en during the “Great Revolt”) may be a hint that in times of old the lugal was actually elected by an assembly.

The main novelty in ED I-II was the appearance of *lugal* as a title of either officials involved in administration and management or owners of properties and heads of families. Being officials, they would have been appointed according to their ability to run affairs. Being chiefs of related groups of people, *nam-lugal* would be passed on within the family.

Since *pa<sub>3</sub>*, “chosen”, occurs in a name of this time (*lugal-pa<sub>3</sub>*), J. Andersson presumes that on the one hand political or economical leaders might have been appointed by divinities, on the other the divinities as owners of temples and their estates themselves could be named “*lugal*”.

Concerning the *lugal* as a human being, one cannot as yet find striking symbols of dominant power ascribed to him in this period, but names characterizing the subject as a young animal show the *lugal* in the role of the (good) shepherd, *sipa*, that was to become so important in the second half of the 3<sup>rd</sup> millennium.

In ED IIIa, inscriptions of rulers, officials or private persons appear for the first time, showing the *lugal* as builder of sanctuaries, performing religious ceremonies, and for that reason being entitled to dispose of the resources of the land. Some cities are confederated in associations of political importance. In literary works the ruler cooperates with heroes and gods, mainly in Kiš, Aratta, Uruk and Kiengi. Attributes of kingship like scepters or headdresses are mentioned, illustrating the prominent position of the *lugal*, now being appointed by deities. All those novelties are reflected in contemporary name-giving. An increasing number of *lugal*-names may refer to the leading divinities in the lists of deities composed in Šuruppak and Abu Salabih.

In ED IIIb, city federations, having attained great importance during ED IIIa, are replaced by alliances between rulers. This increasing role of the *lugal* in this type of interstate relationship corresponds with the growing popularity of *lugal*-names, stressing not only the election but also the origin from the gods, and the proximity between the *lugal* and the deities.

At the very end of this period *Lugalzagesi* of Uruk unites the southern plain, founding what one can call a genuine state. *Lugalzagesi* presents himself as an officer of the main gods in the same way as a bureaucrat of a city-state would have defined his position toward the head of his state. The *lugal*-names reflect the benefits people are convinced to receive from the *lugal*, featured now as the *sipa* of the country and its inhabitants. Because the cities, honoring their superior gods as main supporters of *Lugalzagesi*'s rule, in his great inscription of Nippur, appear already in the lists of cities first composed in Uruk III, it becomes clear that *Lugalzagesi*'s political thinking is rooted in the ancient past of Mesopotamia.

On ES and MS J. Andersson points out that any statement on the political development of this period must take into account the lack of sources on matters of fundamental importance. Sargon of Akkad on the one hand perpetuates ideological principles created in ED Sumer, but on the other he and his successors were faced with large-scale revolts in former independent city-states in the south. So the Akkadian king manages cultic affairs and temple-building programs in Sumer — e.g. Nippur —, while claiming to have appointed citizens of Akkad as governors of Sumerian sites and tearing down the city-walls.

Nevertheless, the variety of novel requirements of the system of Akkadian rule results in an extended perception of cultic and political matters: In *šarrum*-names along the

dominant deities Il and Ištar some other — like Su'en — appear; in royal epitheta the great gods of Sumer, e.g. An, Enlil and Utu, feature as protective divinities. Names showing the living ruler as deified occur already now (*sar-ru-i<sub>3</sub>-li<sub>2</sub>*), some decades before Naramsu'en's deification.

While in MS until CS the most remarkable feature has been the deification of Naramsu'en as (one of the) protective deity(ies) of Akkad by the wish of the inhabitants of this city, no names originating from this period show a peculiar impact of this event (but cf. above, on names in ES and MS). But the importance of a personal relationship between king and official can be easily proved by names like *ibni-šarrum* and *šarriš-takal*. In Akkadian name-giving Ea, Šamaš, Adad and Nergal were added to the group Il, Ištar and Su'en already having been popular since times of old.

The referents of *lugal* and *šarrum*-names J. Andersson identifies — as he explicitly states with a high degree of probability — in accordance with these criteria:

In *lugal*-names the human ruler is meant by names including terms signifying power, giving orders and judgments, appointment by the gods and the circumstances of living in the country. A deity is meant by names including *iti* (month), so *lugal-iti-da* (the *lugal* (= Nanna/Su'en) (is reborn) each month, cf. p. 343-346), most frequently used from ED IIIb until CS; *apin* (plough) like *lugal<sup>gis</sup>apin-du<sub>10</sub>* (the *lugal* (= Ningirsu and Ninurta) is one who makes the plow good, cf. p. 310f.), *Ezem* (festival) had to be listed here, since the author ascribes the —*ezem*- names to divine referents too (cf. p. 131f.).

In *šarrum*-names the king is meant in connection with terms signifying his personal ability of all kinds, frequently in juxtaposition with divinities symbolizing these qualities (cf. the abovementioned deities in Akkadian name-giving of MS until CS), and in names calling the *šarrum* “my god” (or similar).

In his concluding discussion J. Andersson presumes that from ED IIIa on *lugal* changes into a comprehensive term, referring to human and divine domination, without respect of the current holders of political power. So the *lugal* may be either the ruler of a state or a deity of local authority or one of the “great gods” of the land, which leads the author to conclude that “*lugal*-names are likely to have referred to deities more often, or at least as often as they could have had a human referent” (p. 263).

#### General comments

J. Andersson's work offers an excellent philological analysis of name-giving, while affording reference material from all kinds of sources.

A point for criticism concerning Sumerian names including the term *me*, being fundamental for the understanding of Sumerian kingship, could be the translation limited to the meanings “rites” and “ordinances”, without considering “divine entities of culture”. E.g. *lugal-me-gal-gal* “the *lugal* (performs) the great rites (?)” (cf. p. 362) should rather be translated „the king (his *me* are) paramount“. Cf. G. Farber-Flügge, *Der Mythos “Inanna und Enki” unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der Liste der me*. St.Pohl 10, Rom 1973, p. 154f., s.v. *gal*. Note *me nam-nun-na* already in Abu Salabih: B. Alster, *The Instructions of Suruppak, A Sumerian Proverb Collection*, Mesopotamia 2, Copenhagen 1974, 46 l. 209.

Less convincing seems to be the integration of the names into the historical background. Taking into account the extremely limited number of names originating from ED I-II, any such attempt must be of little relevance.

Generally speaking, J. Andersson considers the first occurrence of any kind of source as evidence of the first occurrence of the phenomena illustrated by it, without taking into consideration that only the kind of source could be novel. E.g., one can hardly imagine that Mesalim lugal Kiš or Urnaše of Lagaš mentioning the construction of sanctuaries in the oldest more comprehensive inscriptions of ED IIIa had been the first rulers able to perform such projects.

In judging political mainstreams it seems to be inappropriate to employ modern ideas: When J. Andersson stresses the predominance of personal relationships between city-rulers in ED IIIb in opposite to confederations of states in ED IIIa, he presupposes a difference between the state as a legal entity and its ruler being able to interact with other heads of states on a separate level.

Sumerian name-giving in the time of Akkadian rule in Sumer rises the question what kind of lugal people imagined when formulating lugal-names for children or adults. Bearing in mind the hostility testified by the revolts against Rimuš and Naramsu'en, only reminiscences of the traditional nam-lugal can be imagined. The complexity of this topic shows Rimuš, calling Kaku, leader of insurgent Ur, "lugal of Ur" (I.J. Gelb-B. Kienast, *Die altakkadischen Königsinschriften des dritten Jahrtausends v. Chr.*, FAOS 7, Stuttgart 1990, p. 191, Rimuš C1, ll. 17ff.).

Karl-Franzens-Universität, Graz P. PANITSCHKEK  
Institut für Alte Geschichte und Altertumskunde  
Februar, 2014

\*  
\* \*

VON DASSOW, E. — *State and Society in the Late Bronze Age. Alalah under the Mittani Empire. (Studies on the Civilization and Culture of Nuzi and the Hurrians, 17).* CDL Press, Bethesda, 2008. (26 cm, XX, 593). ISBN 978-1-934309-14-8. \$ 60.00.

Cet ouvrage est consacré à la société d'Alalah telle qu'elle apparaît dans les tablettes du niveau IV, soit la période où ce royaume est intégré à l'empire du Mittani. Son titre, *State and Society*, s'explique par le fait que les documents issus de ce niveau, trouvés pour la plupart dans des bâtiments institutionnels (palais et forteresse), sont produits par l'administration du royaume: la vision qu'ils donnent de la société, et quasiment la seule à laquelle l'historien ait accès, correspond donc à celle du pouvoir.

Le premier chapitre présente une longue et solide introduction à l'histoire d'Alalah au Bronze Récent. Il récapitule ce qui peut être reconstitué de l'histoire événementielle et tente de préciser la chronologie, essentiellement à partir de l'inscription d'Idrimi, des tablettes du niveau IV et des synchronismes possibles avec les rois du Mittani et du Hatti. Le niveau IV est à situer, approximativement, entre la construction du palais sous Idrimi, dans le deuxième quart du XV<sup>e</sup> s. (l'accession au trône d'Idrimi se plaçant vers 1475), et la destruction du palais, vers 1400. Cela fait de la documentation d'Alalah le corpus le plus abondant — et quasiment le

seul — pour le milieu du XV<sup>e</sup> s., époque de l'apogée du Mittani. La plupart des tablettes examinées dans l'ouvrage datent de Niqmepa, le successeur d'Idrimi, soit du troisième quart du XV<sup>e</sup> s. Les tablettes de Nuzi, à l'autre extrémité de l'empire, sont plus importantes en nombre, mais légèrement postérieures: elles couvrent la fin du XV<sup>e</sup> s. et le début du XIV<sup>e</sup>. Une mise au point sur la population et les langues clôt le chapitre, en soulignant avec prudence que l'épigraphiste a affaire à des données linguistiques plutôt qu'ethniques, la langue écrite dans les tablettes d'Alalah étant, comme à Nuzi, un akkadien «hourritisé». L'auteur fournit également une mise au point utile sur la question indo-aryenne: si le terme *maryanni*, attesté dans les tablettes d'Alalah IV pour désigner un groupe social, a bien une étymologie indo-aryenne, les autres éléments indo-aryens sont surtout présents dans quelques rares noms propres (qui ne sont d'ailleurs pas systématiquement ceux de membres de ce groupe) et rien ne laisse supposer qu'il y ait eu une composante ethnique indo-aryenne dans la population d'Alalah.

Le deuxième chapitre fait l'inventaire de la terminologie utilisée dans les listes de personnes trouvées à Alalah niveau IV, en limitant l'enquête aux gens libres. Selon les types de listes, des terminologies diverses sont employées. Le groupe de tablettes le plus cohérent et le mieux préservé est formé de listes de recensement (groupe A). La population est répartie en quatre catégories: *maryanni*, *ehelle*, *haniahhe* et *hupše*; les *habiru* (personnes déplacées) forment une catégorie particulière. À l'issue d'une discussion historiographique et méthodologique sur la terminologie moderne, E. von Dassow choisit de désigner comme «classes» ces différentes catégories, car les individus y sont rattachés en fonction de critères extrinsèques de nature socio-économique, et non en fonction de la naissance ou de l'appartenance ethnique, ni de leur relation à un patron (ou pas uniquement); le passage d'une classe à une autre est possible. Ces classes se caractérisent par la possession (ou non) de certains biens, l'exercice de certains métiers ou fonctions, l'accomplissement d'un service de nature militaire ou civile.

Les différents types de listes, qui forment le corpus de base de l'étude, sont ensuite présentés en détail au chapitre 3, en renvoyant aux importants travaux antérieurs de M. Dietrich et O. Loretz. Ces groupes de tablettes semblent former les restes de dossiers dont seule une partie nous est parvenue. Ainsi les 33 listes relevant du «groupe A» témoignent peut-être d'un recensement général du royaume, les autres tablettes ayant disparu. Elles livrent plus de 700 noms propres d'hommes de différentes villes, répartis dans les 4 classes énumérées ci-dessus. D'après ce qui est conservé, les *hupše* représentent 65% des personnes enregistrées, les trois autres classes représentant chacune 11 à 13% de la population. La prosopographie permet de dater ce groupe de la fin du règne de Niqmepa.

Un autre ensemble de 33 tablettes concerne des *bītū*, «maisonnées» ou «familles», classées selon une dizaine de catégories, dont certaines sont identiques à celles du groupe A. À côté de tablettes qui concernent les maisonnées de plusieurs villes, 7 ou 8 autres, définies comme «groupe B», enregistrent apparemment toutes les maisonnées d'une seule ville. L'auteur tente de trouver des équivalences entre les différentes catégories et d'expliquer la terminologie. Ainsi aux *hupše* du groupe A correspondraient, dans le groupe B, les *unušuhuli*, astreints à un service (*unušše*) et les *purre*, qui en seraient au contraire exemptés, selon une étymologie qui fait venir ce terme de la racine sémitique *brr*. Les *ša*



*narkabti* du groupe B correspondraient à la classe *maryanni* du groupe A; les *naggāru*, charpentiers (B), seraient une sous-catégorie des *ehelle* (A et B) et les *muškēnu* (B) seraient équivalents aux *haniahhe* (A et B). Les listes du groupe B seraient plus anciennes d'une génération que celles du groupe A et dateraient du début du règne de Niqmepa; elles recenseraient les maisonnées sur lesquelles pèse un service, civil ou militaire.

D'autres tablettes enregistrent les terres d'une ville ainsi que les tenanciers. Il ne s'agit apparemment pas de l'ensemble des terres de la localité, puisque parfois seuls les vignobles sont mentionnés. On ignore si ce sont des terres de fonction attribuées par le palais contre un service ou des propriétés familiales, mais l'existence même des listes prouve que le palais s'y intéresse. Dans certaines tablettes, qui forment un «groupe C», les personnes détenant ces terres sont aussi connues par les listes du groupe A. Les groupes A et C sont donc contemporains et une enquête sur ces tenanciers montre qu'ils appartiennent aux 4 classes du groupe A.

Des listes de troupes, contemporaines du groupe B d'après la prosopographie, comptabilisent des archers («groupe DB»). Un «groupe D», lui aussi contemporain de B, enregistre surtout des *habiru*. Deux tablettes comptent des archers et des *habiru*, des chars étant associés à chacun de ces deux groupes; il s'agit peut-être de la levée d'une armée en une occasion précise du règne de Niqmepa.

Enfin des listes de petit bétail (brebis et bœufs, chèvres et bœufs) sont associées à des noms de localités, sans que l'on puisse savoir si les gens de ces localités fournissent ou au contraire reçoivent les animaux («groupe E»). Elles sont également contemporaines du groupe B.

Ce travail minutieux de classement typologique inclut en outre l'étude précise d'un certain nombre de tablettes, qui ne rentrent pas toujours exactement dans les types définis. Il aboutit à une mise en ordre chronologique de ces listes et à l'étude des relations qu'elles entretiennent les unes avec les autres. Le groupe B, le plus ancien, semble correspondre au recensement de la population en fonction de ses devoirs envers l'Etat, sur la base des maisonnées. Les groupes DB et D, à la phase suivante du processus, enregistrent l'enrôlement effectif. Les listes E d'animaux sont contemporaines de ce premier groupe. Plus tardives sont les listes du groupe A, qui ne s'intéressent plus aux maisonnées mais seulement aux hommes adultes, et qui offrent un système différent de recensement de la population, réduit à 4 classes. Le groupe C, avec ses cadastres, est contemporain de A.

Le chapitre 4 analyse la répartition de la société en 4 classes telle qu'elle apparaît dans les listes du groupe A, les plus récentes. Au sommet, la classe *maryanni*, qui n'apparaît qu'à partir de la fin du règne de Niqmepa, correspond à une élite aristocratique, participant à la vie de la cour et à l'administration. Le roi peut faire accéder un individu à cette classe. Les indices concernant la situation économique de ses membres, tirés de quelques enquêtes prosopographiques, les montrent employeurs plutôt qu'employés, propriétaires de terres plutôt que producteurs, titulaires d'une fonction plutôt que d'un métier. Leur lien avec les chars est soigneusement examiné: ils semblent être les seuls à détenir des chars, qui leur sont fournis, comme les chevaux, par l'administration; ils ne les conduisent pas, mais y tiennent la fonction la plus prestigieuse, celle de l'archer. Cependant ce critère ne définit pas l'appartenance à la classe *maryanni*, puisque certains d'entre eux, dans les listes du groupe A, apparaissent comme

«n'ayant pas de char». Les *maryannina* ne seraient donc pas dès l'origine des combattants en char ayant formé une classe supérieure; il faudrait plutôt envisager une évolution dans l'autre sens, les *maryannina* constituant une élite sociale qui, du fait de son statut, aurait logiquement obtenu de servir dans l'arme la plus prestigieuse au Bronze Récent, les chars.

Les trois autres classes sont moins bien documentées. La classe *ehelle* (correspondant à l'akkadien *šūzubu*) n'est attestée comme telle que dans les listes du niveau IV d'Alalakh. Elle est composée de personnes exerçant un métier ou employées par l'administration royale ou par les membres de la noblesse; de ce fait, elles sont exemptées du service *unušše*, car elles sont plus utiles à l'État dans le cadre de leur profession; elles peuvent néanmoins faire un service militaire comme archers. Les métiers attestés sont, entre autres, tailleur de pierre, graveur de sceaux, travailleur du cuir, métallurgiste, charpentier fabricant de meubles ou de chars; s'y ajoutent les soins aux animaux, notamment aux chevaux. La proportion des *ehellena* dans la population augmente au cours du règne de Niqmepa.

La classe *haniahhe*, attestée elle aussi uniquement à Alalakh IV, a pour équivalent akkadien *ekû* ou *muškēnu* et désigne les «pauvres». Certains de ses membres sont artisans, mais ils ne sont jamais connus comme employeurs ni comme exerçant des fonctions officielles. Ils font un service militaire.

Enfin la classe *hupše*, de loin la plus nombreuse, serait constituée de paysans, comme l'indiquent à la fois l'un de ses équivalents akkadiens, «gens (ou troupes) du *namû*», et le fait que ses occupations concernent surtout l'agriculture et l'élevage. Elle forme l'essentiel de l'armée, de la force de travail et de la population soumise aux taxes. Du fait même qu'elle représente la majorité de la population, donc la norme, elle apparaît très peu en dehors des listes et on ne possède sur elle qu'assez peu d'informations.

À ces 4 classes s'ajoutent les *habiru*, qui apparaissent dans les listes comme un groupe particulier, enregistré à part, mais qui peut faire partie des autres classes ou catégories: il existe ainsi des *habiru* qui sont aussi *bēl narkabti*, *ehelle* ou *muškēnu*. Puisqu'il s'agit de gens ayant migré, nombre d'entre eux viennent d'autres villes du royaume ou de pays étrangers, comme Amurru, Canaan, le Hatti, etc. Mentionnés sur l'inscription de la statue d'Idrimi, certains ont pu arriver à Alalakh avec lui. D'après les listes de type D, ils effectuent un service militaire.

Le cinquième et dernier chapitre élargit la réflexion, pour replacer dans le contexte historique plus large de l'empire mittanien la documentation d'Alalakh IV, en la comparant notamment à celle du royaume d'Arraphe. L'auteur renvoie sur ce point à l'ouvrage de G. Dosch, *Zur Struktur der Gesellschaft des Königreichs Arraphe*, Heidelberg, 1993, qui distingue également quatre classes (*Gesellschaftsklassen*). Elles portent des noms différents de celles attestées à Alalakh mais semblent leur correspondre, puisque l'on retrouve au sommet de la société les *rākib narkabti*, noblesse qui combat en char et qui, comme les *maryannina*, est bien mieux documentée que les autres classes. Celles-ci se composent des artisans (*nakušše*), des paysans qui doivent le service royal (*ālik ilki*) et des *aššābu*, qui cultivent les terres qui ne leur appartiennent pas et forment la catégorie la plus pauvre. E. von Dassow en conclut que ces classifications, sous des appellations diverses, répondent néanmoins probablement aux besoins du Mittani et reflètent une conception et une

organisation similaires de la société. Elle tente aussi de replacer ces listes dans l'histoire d'Alalakh: la première phase de recensement (listes B) et d'enrôlement (DB, B) ainsi que les listes E de bétail, peut-être réquisitionné, correspondraient à la préparation de la guerre contre Tunip, Etat voisin d'Alalakh au sud, passé sous contrôle égyptien. Après la victoire d'Alalakh et la conclusion d'un traité avec Tunip, l'administration aurait procédé à un nouveau recensement de la population, désormais organisée en 4 classes (listes A), en notant les informations importantes dans le cas d'une éventuelle mobilisation.

Plusieurs annexes très consistantes complètent l'ouvrage. Une liste des 299 tablettes issues du niveau IV et de 23 autres de provenance incertaine, mais qui se rattachent probablement au même niveau, est donnée; pour chaque tablette est indiquée la référence aux publications antérieures, le numéro de fouille, le lieu de découverte (un plan est joint à cette annexe), le type de document, le sujet et, le cas échéant, le nom de la personne impliquée, la présence de scellements et le nom du roi. Une liste des noms de personnes recense 132 femmes et 3350 hommes attestés dans les tablettes du niveau IV (avec, lorsque cela est possible, de nombreuses indications complémentaires: patronyme, lieu d'origine, classe sociale, métier...). L'index géographique, accompagné d'une carte, est plus sommaire, puisque J. Belmonte Marín a inclus les toponymes d'Alalakh dans son ouvrage *Die Orts- und Gewässernamen der Texte aus Syrien im 2. Jt. v. Chr.*, RGTC 12/2, Wiesbaden, 2001. La bibliographie est suivie par l'index des sources antiques, d'Alalakh et d'autres sites, celui du vocabulaire (akkadien, ouest-sémitique, hourrite) et des logogrammes, des noms de personnes, de divinités et de lieux ainsi que des sujets étudiés dans l'ouvrage.

Les pages qui précèdent ont tenté de résumer le plus simplement possible cet ouvrage extrêmement dense. Le matériel analysé par l'auteur, aride et ingrat à première vue, s'avère riche d'enseignements lorsqu'il est, comme ici, traité de façon très systématique, rigoureuse et détaillée: établissement d'une typologie des listes, mise en relation de celles qui mentionnent les mêmes villes, les mêmes groupes de personnes, les mêmes noms propres, pour aboutir à une définition et une description des classes qui composent la société, du moins du point de vue de l'administration, et à une mise en ordre chronologique de l'ensemble qui permet de suivre les évolutions. En plusieurs endroits de son travail, E. von Dassow aide le lecteur en récapitulant les résultats auxquels elle est arrivée, ou en dressant des tableaux qui viennent schématiser et synthétiser les données. La méthodologie est toujours soigneusement présentée et discutée. Une grande prudence est observée, pour interroger les «évidences» qui risquent d'être des idées reçues si elles ne sont pas démontrées, pour définir précisément les termes employés, ou pour justifier l'utilisation de données nécessairement incomplètes. Les discussions antérieures sont utilement rappelées, avec des bilans historiographiques sur des points particuliers qui ont déjà fait l'objet d'études et de discussions abondantes, comme la classe *maryanni*.

L'auteur a depuis poursuivi ses travaux sur le Bronze Récent et en particulier sur deux Etats soumis au Mittani, les mieux documentés, Alalakh et Arraphe. On peut citer, parmi ses articles, «Field Troop Rosters from the City of Arraphe», dans G. Wilhelm (éd.), *General Studies and Excavations at Nuzi* 11/2, SCCNH 18, Bethesda, 2009, p. 605-636; «What Did Archives Mean in Mittani? The Case of 15th-century

BCE Alalah», *Journal of the Canadian Society for Mesopotamian Studies* 5, 2010, p. 37-53; «Levantine Politics under Mittanian Hegemony», dans E. Cancik-Kirschbaum, N. Brisch et J. Eidem (éd.), *Constituent, Confederate, and Conquered Space. The Emergence of the Mittani State*, Topoi. Berlin Studies of the Ancient World 17, Berlin, 2014, p. 11-32. En outre, en même temps que l'ouvrage sous recension, est paru le livre de C. Niedorf, *Die mittelbabylonischen Rechtsurkunden aus Alalah (Schicht IV)*, AOAT 352, Münster, 2008, qui étudie une cinquantaine de procès, testaments et contrats d'Alalakh. Les études sur les tablettes trouvées à Tell Atchana, et plus généralement sur le début du Bronze Récent, se portent donc bien et éclairent de mieux en mieux une période pendant longtemps considérée comme obscure.

Université de Lille 3 (France)  
18/04/2014

Brigitte LION

\*  
\* \*

RUTZ, M. — Bodies of Knowledge in Ancient Mesopotamia. The Diviners of Late Bronze Age Emar and their Tablet Collection. (Ancient Magic and Divination, 9). Brill Academic Publishers, Leiden-Boston, 2013. (24 cm, XXI, 682). ISBN 978-90-04-24567-9. ISSN 1566-7952. € 168,00.

Cet imposant volume est une version ajournée d'une thèse de doctorat *Scholars, Texts and Contexts: An archaeological and Textual Study of the Diviner's Archive from Late Bronze Age Emar, Syria* réalisée sous la direction de Barry Eichler. Organisé en deux parties distinctes, l'ouvrage, qui se veut un outil de travail pour les futures études sur le corpus des textes du bâtiment M1 d'Emar, est organisé comme suit: la première partie (pp. 1-328) est composée de 5 chapitres, tandis que la seconde (pp. 329-572) est un catalogue raisonné des tablettes retrouvées à Emar, subdivisé en 4 appendices (A-D). L'ouvrage comporte enfin une importante bibliographie et divers index.

L'auteur a voulu mettre en pratique une méthode pour l'étude de la divination en tant qu'élément culturel en étudiant, de manière pluridisciplinaire, tant les sources épigraphiques qu'archéologiques. Il s'agit d'une approche descriptive et interprétative sur les devins d'Emar et leurs activités dans le contexte plus large de la divination dans la culture cunéiforme, sans toutefois inclure les textes inédits en langue hourrite, ni les textes issus du marché de l'art dont l'origine exacte ne peut être assurée.

L'introduction du volume pose les bases méthodologiques de l'étude et définit le terme «devin» dans les recherches actuelles, en posant justement la question de la validité et de l'adéquation des traductions habituellement admises pour les logogrammes comme HAL. La compréhension de ce dernier est particulièrement importante pour saisir la personnalité des devins d'Emar (voir ci-dessous).

Cette approche holistique prend en considération la combinaison des informations archéologiques à disposition sur le contexte des tablettes, et l'auteur a raison de souligner qu'Emar est un cas idoine pour une telle approche. Le but de l'ouvrage est de restituer l'articulation entre les textes et leur lieu de découverte dans l'archive. Rutz, comme PEDERSÉN (1998), considère ainsi le corpus du bâtiment M1 comme un



tout cohérent. Au final cette étude devait permettre de répondre à la question de l'identité des scribes et des devins d'Emar, mais aussi à celle de la formation de l'archive, de son classement et de son utilisation. L'auteur propose ainsi d'analyser l'emplacement des divers textes dans l'archive. L'analyse des titres de fonctions présents dans les colophons devrait permettre de comprendre l'organisation interne de l'archive M1, mais aussi, parfois, les motivations à l'origine de la rédaction des textes en question.

Dans le premier chapitre, Rutz montre comment archéologie et épigraphie sont complémentaires et représentent des axes d'informations interdépendants dans l'étude des sociétés antiques.

Le chapitre 2 reprend l'historique des fouilles d'Emar et replace la ville dans un contexte historique plus large. L'auteur se positionne aussi clairement en faveur de l'interprétation offerte par les fouilles allemandes de l'université de Tübingen, à l'encontre de l'hypothèse de J.-C. Margueron que la ville d'Emar est une ville neuve fondée au Bronze Récent.

Le chapitre 3 s'intéresse spécifiquement au bâtiment M1, à son organisation et à la reconstitution de l'archive. L'auteur reprend l'ensemble des rapports de fouilles disponibles pour en présenter une synthèse. Il spécifie également la nature du matériel archéologique découvert en précisant systématiquement quel matériel a été publié et lequel doit encore l'être. Il insiste également sur la nécessité de la publication finale des fouilles françaises.

Une fois un relevé des fouilles restitué (fig. 9, p. 112), l'auteur décrit secteur par secteur chaque unité de fouille afin de localiser tablettes et fragments le plus précisément possible. Des tableaux récapitulatifs (table 1-8) décomptent le nombre total de textes par genres et le pourcentage qu'ils représentent dans chaque unité.

Le chapitre 4 dresse l'inventaire des genres littéraires et des dossiers dans l'archive et les titres attestés dans les colophons ainsi que les noms personnels. Il s'agit du chapitre central de l'ouvrage, qui met en lumière la démarche et la finalité de la recherche dont le double but est affiché (p. 127):

- a) un descriptif total de l'ensemble du matériel épigraphique de M1;
- b) la possibilité de calculer un nombre minimum de tablettes individuelles pour chaque genre de texte. On différencie ainsi plus clairement les fragments des tablettes.

Le chapitre 5 reprend en conclusion la discussion sur la nature du bâtiment M1 citant les diverses études précédentes (ARNAUD, DURAND, MARGUERON, SEMINARA, COHEN, MORI), à la lumière des éléments introduits dans les chapitres 3 et 4 sur la nature des textes et leur classement. L'auteur conclut que le bâtiment est une structure domestique et rejette l'identification de M1 avec un temple. Cette interprétation avait déjà été proposée par MORI (2003), contrairement à ce qui était communément admis à la suite des travaux de MARGUERON (1973). FLEMING (2000) avait de son côté déjà longuement traité de cette problématique, concluant que le bâtiment était un temple. L'auteur donne aussi dans ce chapitre ses conclusions sur la formation, la taille, la composition et l'organisation de l'archive. Si certaines proportions ont pu être établies, la distribution des textes et l'organisation matérielle de l'archive restent difficiles à établir.

L'ensemble des appendices fournit toutes les informations disponibles sur les tablettes (numéro d'inventaire, localisation de la découverte, type de textes, nom du scribe), tandis que les index listent la totalité des textes publiés et des objets inscrits, publiés ou non. Le premier index est ordonné suivant les numéros de fouille (numéro d'inventaire); de là le lecteur peut utiliser les index successifs classés respectivement par lieu de découverte et par genre littéraire. L'appendice A fonctionne avec les chapitres 2 et 3; les appendices B et C fonctionnent avec le chapitre 4.

Quelques remarques m'ont été inspirées par la lecture.

– L'épineuse question de la chronologie des textes dans l'archive ne fait pas l'objet d'un commentaire précis (p. 88-90), même si Rutz semble refuser, contrairement à PRUZSINSZKY (2003) l'idée que certains scribes rédigeaient des documents tant dans le style «syrien» que dans le style «syro-hittite» (p. 42), il reconnaît l'existence de duplicats dans les deux styles (p. 325). Cependant SKAIST (1988) puis COHEN et d'ALFONSO (2008) ont montré comment, pendant une trentaine d'années, les deux traditions sribales ont coexisté. Peut-être aurait-il été intéressant de mentionner la figure de Kidin-Gula, personnage au nom kassite connu dans les colophons de l'archive M1, qui, malgré son origine babylonienne, enseignait au sein de l'école M1. Comment Kidin-Gula pouvait-il enseigner un système si différent de celui qu'il pratiquait?

– Les influences de la domination hittite sont sous-estimées (pp. 90-92). Force est de constater cependant que les devins d'Emar acquièrent leur puissance à l'époque de la domination hittite. La présence de lettres hittites (Msk 731097 et 74734) dans l'archives M1 prouve les liens étroits que ce clan cultivait avec le pouvoir hittite à Karkémis mais aussi dans la capitale hittite. La lettre akkadienne Emar 271 montre d'ailleurs clairement comment les habitants de d'Emar rendaient un culte aux divinités hittites. Dans cette perspective, il serait intéressant de considérer les devins du clan de Zū-Ba'la comme des fonctionnaires avec des responsabilités et des prérogatives comparables à celles des *Bel Madgalti* de l'administration hittite, dans le contexte de la réorganisation de cultes voulue par Tudḫaliya IV, voir à ce sujet MICHEL, P. M., 2014.

– Sur la compréhension du logogramme ḪAL. Le titre de devin s'écrit <sup>LU</sup>MÁŠ.ŠU.GÍD.GÍD, graphie syrienne que l'on retrouve précisément dans les documents de type syrien, comme Emar 158:12 ou Emar 446. À Emar, les devins du clan de Zū-Ba'la se nomment <sup>LU</sup>ḪAL, alors que la désignation <sup>LU</sup>AZU n'apparaît que dans les textes en langue hittite (Msk. 73.1097). On sait cependant qu'en dehors du cercle de Zū-Ba'la il y avait d'autres <sup>LU</sup>ḪAL, mais personne, en dehors de ce clan, ne portait la mention «ša DINGIRMEŠ ša <sup>URU</sup>E-mar». Notons encore que personne, à part Šaggar-abu et Ba'al-malik, ne portait simultanément le titre de scribe et de devin. La désignation du devin à Emar change avec l'arrivée des Hittites et on retrouve <sup>LU</sup>ḪAL dans tous les documents syro-hittites. Dans le contexte particulier d'Emar ḪAL devait désigner une fonction différente de celle du devin. Le rôle de cette famille à Emar est avant tout d'administrer les cultes. Voir BIGA, M. G., 2006, «Operatori culturali a Ebla», in Rocchi, M., Xella, P., & Zamora J. Á. (éds.), *Gli operatori culturali (SEL 23)*, Verona, p. 17 et WEEDEN, M., 2011, *Hittite Logograms and Hittite Scholarship*, (StBoT 54), Wiesbaden,

Harrassowitz, p. 251. Peut-être faut-il lire <sup>LÚ</sup>HAL *ša pirišti* «celui qui est dans le secret»? Des rituels hittites d'évocation pour Ištar de Ninive (CTH 716.1 et CTH 716.4) qui mentionnent le <sup>LÚ</sup>HAL comme acteur principal tendraient à le prouver. Le rôle du <sup>LÚ</sup>HAL dans ces rituels n'a pas de rapport avec la divination. La dénomination <sup>LÚ</sup>HAL est peut-être un emprunt hittite à Emar où le terme désignerait un administrateur cultuel. Il est intéressant de remarquer entre autre que, dans Msk. 73.1097, le scribe a utilisé le sumérogramme <sup>LÚ</sup>AZU pour indiquer la «profession» de Zū-Ba'la, alors que dans d'autres documents émarjotes on trouve alternativement <sup>LÚ</sup>HAL ou <sup>LÚ</sup>MÁŠ.ŠU.GÍD.GÍD, (YAMADA, M., 1998, p. 325, note 7). Chez les Hittites, le <sup>LÚ</sup>AZU est le prêtre qui officie dans de nombreux rituels hurro-hittites même là où il n'y a pas opérations mantiques.

– L'auteur mentionne rapidement les problématiques liées aux étymologies des noms de prêtresses syriennes attestées à Emar (pp. 145-146): *entul/ittu/ettu* et *maš'artu*. Pour cette dernière, il a été proposé de rattacher le terme à l'hébreu *š'r* «rester/subsister». La racine *š'r* est manquante en akkadien, mais on la retrouve à Ugarit (KTU 1.18, IV, 15; 4.290,3 par exemple) signifiant «rester» au sens de «übrig bleiben» qu'on peut rendre par «subsister». La racine est aussi attestée en hébreu, en nabatéen (*š'rjt*), en palmyrénien (*š'r*), en judéo-araméen et en syriaque (*š'jārā*) et dans beaucoup d'autres langues ouest-sémitiques, au sens de «reste». Elle rend au mieux compte de l'hapax paléo-assyrien *maš'ertu* dans un document paléo-assyrien (CTMMA 1 78a+b, LAPO 19, p. 496, N°380, l. 31), voir MICHEL, P. M., 2014, p. 123-124.

– L'interprétation du nom Adda est aussi problématique. Rutz mentionne p. 288, note 270 une suggestion de DURAND (1990, p. 76-77) d'identifier Adda avec Ba'al-qarrād. Cette identification est ensuite considérée comme acquise p. 295. Mais la question reste posée de savoir s'il s'agit d'un nom propre (hittite?) ou non. On citera à ce sujet, plus récemment, COHEN, Y., 2009, p. 162, note 46, qui propose qu'Adda ne soit pas un prénom mais une désignation (hittite?) remplaçant l'habituel *abī* «mon père» qui introduit une lettre envoyée à un supérieur. Dans Emar 260, l. 2, la femme d'Adda est nommée Ammi, peut-être au sens de «mère».

– Les introductions thématiques proposées au début des diverses rubriques du chapitre 4 sur les genres de textes représentent une synthèse agréable à lire mais allongent le texte sans fournir d'éléments nouveaux.

– p. 297 l'auteur discute la traduction akkadienne de BĀRA dans la tablette du Vocabulaire S<sup>a</sup> (Emar 537: 755). À cette discussion peut-être pourrions nous ajouter que, suivant CIVIL<sup>1)</sup>, BĀRA serait emprunté par le sumérien au sémitique *parak*. La racine *fłprq* signifiant «séparer», ferait du *pirikku* (attesté dans divers textes de Mari et dans Emar 446: 48-50) un «rideau, tissu de séparation», cf. hébr. *parōket*, «rideau de séparation dans le temple». *prk* serait un mot sémitique emprunté par le sumérien sous la forme BĀRA et ré-emprunté ensuite sous la forme *parakku* et dont *pirikku* serait une attestation plus ancienne conservée dans les dialectes de l'akkadien du Nord (Assur dans BIN 6, 97: 20-22).

En conclusion, l'avantage d'un tel ouvrage réside assurément dans son aspect exhaustif. Quiconque voudra travailler sur des textes de l'archive du devin d'Emar devra le consulter pour compléter et corriger parfois les identifications proposées par Arnaud. Les «joins» proposés ne sont pas très nombreux, mais constituent cependant une avancée dans l'étude de ce corpus. Il est regrettable qu'au final il n'ait pas été possible d'obtenir des résultats plus précis pour localiser les genres de textes dans l'organisation interne du bâtiment. L'auteur conclut lui-même en écrivant p. 316: «Unfortunately no correlation of find-spot and content is perceptible for the dossiers of the various diviners or the isolated dossiers found in the collection». On ne parvient pas, au final, à discerner de division claire dans l'organisation interne de l'archive entre les genres de textes: religieux, littéraires, lexicaux, administratifs ni d'ailleurs de séparation interne entre les textes en akkadien et ceux en hittite ou en hurrite, pas plus qu'entre documents publics et archives privées.

Finalement, je note quelques négligences dans l'orthographe française, notamment p. 260 couleur (pour couleure), syllabiare (pour syllabaire), p. 268 héros (pour héroes) et p. 274 par (pour pas).

#### Bibliographie

- ARNAUD, D., 1980, «La bibliothèque d'un devin Syrien à Meskéné-Emar (Syrie)», *CRAIBL* 1980, p. 375-387.
- CIVIL, M., 2007, «Early Semitic Loanwords in Sumerian», *Fs. D. Biggs*, p. 11-33.
- COHEN, Y., 2009, *The Scribes and Scholars of the City of Emar in the Late Bronze Age*, Winona Lake, Eisenbrauns. (HSS 59)
- COHEN, Y. et d'ALFONSO, L., 2008, «The Duration of the Emar Archives and the Relative and Absolute Chronology of the City», in *The City of Emar among the Late Bronze Age Empires: History, Landscape and Society*, AOAT 349, Münster, Ugarit-Verlag, p. 3-25.
- DURAND, J.-M., 1990, Review of Arnaud, Emar VI 1-3, *RA* 84, p. 49-85.???
- FLEMING, D. E., 1992, *The Installation of Baal's Priestess at Emar: A Window on Ancient Syrian Religion*, Atlanta. (HSS 42)
- , 2000, *Time at Emar: The Cultic Calendar and the Rituals from the Diviner's Archive*, Winona Lake, Eisenbrauns.
- MARGUERON, J.-C., 1975a, «Les fouilles françaises de Meskéné-Emar (Syrie)», *CRAIBL*, p. 201-211.
- , 1975b, «Quatre campagnes de fouilles à Emar (1972-1974): un bilan provisoire», *Syria* 52, p. 53-85.
- MICHEL, P. M., 2014, *Le culte des pierres à Emar à l'époque hittite*, Fribourg Academic Press, Göttingen. (OBO 266).
- MORI, L., 2003, *Reconstructing the Emar Landscape*, Università di Roma La Sapienza, Roma. (Quaderni di Geografia Storica 6).
- PEDERSÉN, O., 1998, *Archives and Libraries in the Ancient Near East 1500-300 B. C.*, Bethesda.
- PRUZSINSZKY, R., 2003, *Die Personennamen der Texte aus Emar*, Bethesda. (SCCNH 13)
- SEMINARA, S., 1998, *L'accadico di Emar*, Università di Roma La Sapienza, Roma. (MVS 6)
- SKAIST, A., 1988, «The Chronology of the Legal Texts from Emar», *ZA* 88, p. 45-71.

Université de Genève,  
1<sup>er</sup> juin 2014

Patrick Maxime MICHEL

\*  
\* \*

<sup>1)</sup> CIVIL, M., 2007, spécialement p. 21.

BAGG, A.M. — Die Assyrer und das Westland: Studien zur historischen Geographie und Herrschaftspraxis in der Levante im 1. Jt. v. Z.. (Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta, 216). Editions Peeters, Leuven, 2012. (25 cm, XXX, 502, karten). ISBN 978-90-429-2569-4. € 85,-.

This book informs its readers abundantly about the way the Neo-Assyrians perceived the area that is named Levant from a Western perspective. In order to achieve his goal, Bagg lists and discusses all toponyms related to the ‘West’ as mentioned in Neo-Assyrian non-literary texts.

After an introduction, he observes in chapter 2 that the area between the Taurus Mountains and ‘the brook of Egypt’ is named by the Assyrians in three different ways: Hattu, Amurru, and Eber-nāri. These indications cannot be connected to specific areas in the West. He then mentions and maps the various states in the area, the majority of which later became a vassal-state and in many cases an Assyrian province. By way of a side-step, he offers an excursus on the location of the enigmatic country *KTK* which is referred to in the Aramaic treaty of Mati’el of Arpad with Barga’yah of *KTK*. After presenting and discussing 17 different views on the location and or identification, he arrives at the conclusions the location of *KTK* remains an unsolved problem. The only thing that can be said with some certainty is that the area must have been on Northern Syria (pp. 41-52).

Chapter 3 is dedicated to a presentation of all Neo-Assyrian toponyms related to the ‘West’. Bagg classifies them in various groups. The first group deals with Physical Geography. Here he observes that the two great seas — the Mediterranean and the Persian Gulf — were construed by the Assyrians as two opposite ends of the ‘world’. They had no concept of what was ‘beyond’. Next Bagg discusses the names for rivers and mountains and tries to identify them. The maps at the end of his book visualise his attempts and are of great help. The next group is labelled as Human Geography. This section displays the toponyms for entities that came into being as a result of human actions: countries, cities, villages, hamlets etc. The majority of these toponyms can now be connected with present locations as is made visible by his maps. Bagg correctly observes that the Assyrians did not have the habit of renaming localities with Assyrian or Assyrianized names. In the section on Economic Geography the commodities are listed that were indigenous to the various areas, (vassal-)states, and provinces in the West. This survey is of great importance in view of the fact that the Assyrians were in need of all sorts of goods that were not available in their homeland. The Political Geography of the next section deals with the Assyrian politics of campaign, submission, and annexation. The final section deals with the astonishing fact that the Assyrians did not develop a system of roads. Neither did they construct bridges which is remarkable in view of the many rivers that were crossed.

Chapter four outlines the way the Assyrians came to the west. The available evidence indicates that no such thing as a grand master plan to conquer the west existed. The Assyrian expansion was triggered by all sorts of unforeseen conflicts in the border areas. It was only in the age of Tiglath-Pileser III that a more systematic approach towards the bordering states and provinces was developed. These insights, however, are not new, they were already developed by Donner and Liverani.

The fifth chapter is the most interesting one. Applying the typology of empires as developed by H. Münkler, *Die Imperien: Die Logik der Weltherrschaft von alten Rom bis zu den Vereinigten Staaten*, Berlin: Rohwolt, 2005, the character of the Assyrian empire is established. According to Bagg, the Assyrian empire was “weder eine organisierte Räuberbande noch ein Weltreich mit zivilisatorischem Anspruch” (p. 305). This implies that the Assyrians cannot be compared to the Mongols under Djengis Khan. Their empire faded away with the death of its founding figure. On the other hand, the Assyrians can also not be compared to the Romans or the British who both created long lasting empires and tried to impose their way of life on all corners of the empire. The Assyrians formed an empire without a mission. Their aim was not the Assyrianization of the world. Their main thrive was to secure the stream of commodities to the Assyrian heartland. An interesting entity is the so-called Augustan threshold. This concept is named after the Roman emperor who correctly saw that the period of expansion of the Roman Empire needed to be followed by an age of consolidation mainly by administrative measures. According to Münkler, empires that are unable to cross this threshold will not survive in the long run. Bagg argues, correctly, that the shift in politics in the reign of Tiglath-Pileser III were part of the process of crossing the threshold.

The book is concluded with a series of detailed indexes and a set of about 50 maps that correspond to the various sections in the discussion. The maps are very helpful in visualizing the argument. The indexes offer an easy way to the detailed discussions throughout the book.

Utrecht University  
June 2014

Bob BECKING

\*  
\* \*

LUUKKO, M. (ed.) — The Correspondence of Tiglath-Pileser III and Sargon II from Calah/Nimrud. The Neo-Assyrian Text Corpus Project. Publications of the Foundation for Finnish Assyriological Research. (State Archives of Assyria, 19; PPFAR, 6). Eisenbrauns, Winona Lake, 2012 (24 cm, LXXIV, 287, 3 PLS.) ISBN 978-952-10-1338-6. ISSN 1798-7431. \$ 89.50.

To the best of my knowledge SAA 19 is the only case in Assyriology when the third edition of the same text corpus is published within fifty-five years.<sup>1)</sup> The Helsinki Neo-Assyrian Text Corpus Project elevated the publications of the Neo-Assyrian documents to the highest standard and the book under review is the evidence of it. This last volume of the State Archives of Assyria series presents the publication of the so-called “Nimrud Letters” collated and re-edited by Mikko Luukko in accordance with the modern-days requirements. However, the appearance of the present edition only ten years after the publication of the Nimrud Letters by Henry Saggs became necessary not only because of the need

<sup>1)</sup> Previously 105 of the Nimrud Letters” were published by Saggs in *Iraq* in 1955-1974. The entire corpus was published by him in 2001 (Henry W.F. Saggs (2001), *The Nimrud Letters, 1952*, Cuneiform Texts from Nimrud V. British School of Archaeology in Iraq).



to upgrade the transliteration, but due to a number of reasons very well grounded by Luukko himself (LIV-LIX). Of prime importance was the possibility to make collations, since the tablets have been cleaned by conservators, and the occurrence of the new joins.

The corpus includes altogether 229 letters. Of them 151 are ascribed by Luukko to the reign of Tiglath-pileser III,<sup>2)</sup> and the rest to the time of Sargon II.<sup>3)</sup> However, many of the letters tentatively assigned to the period of Tiglath-pileser III may well be written during the reign of Sargon II, as will be shown below. As Luukko himself points out, dating of the NA letters is “frustrating” (XX-XXI, XLII, LXVII), and it must be always remembered by the researchers to come that the suggested dates are by no means an *ultima veritas*. Naturally, Luukko refers also to the question of the attribution of some of the Nimrud Letters to the short reign of Shalmaneser V, but due to the reasons outlined by him in the Introduction, no unequivocal solution can be suggested so far (XX-XXI and LI-LII).<sup>4)</sup>

In accordance to the standard of the State Archives of Assyria series, SAA 19 is provided with the Introduction,<sup>5)</sup> which is one of the longest among the SAA volumes’ introductions. It supplies the information which makes the understanding of this letters corpus easier, especially for the reader who is not specialising in the matters discussed by Luukko. The Introduction includes the historical framework for the second half of the eighth century (XXVIII-XXXVI), which in fact mostly concerns the reign of Tiglath-pileser III: the list of governors appointed by this king, the chronology of the Mukīn-zēri’s uprising, “some influential figures in the Nimrud Letters” (XL-LIV) and so forth. Especially valuable is the comparative analysis of the annals and correspondence of Tiglath-pileser III in conjunction with his provincial governors (XVI-XVIII). The stress on the reign of Tiglath-pileser III is totally justified since the matters of the reign of Sargon II were already referred to in SAA 1, 5, 15 and 17, and since Luukko suggests that most of the corpus published in SAA 19 belongs to Tiglath-pileser III (XX-XXV). But unfortunately, SAA 1, 5, 15, and 17 do no juxtaposing of the information about Sargon’s governors in the letters and in the royal inscriptions as does SAA 19 for Tiglath-pileser III. Neither Tiglath-pileser, nor Sargon even bother to mention the names of the governors of the newly annexed provinces. Their royal inscriptions only state the appointment of a royal eunuch as a governor. An attempt to identify these eunuchs by name through Sargon II’s correspondence, similar to that undertaken by Luukko in SAA 19 certainly would be very helpful.

Because the corpus was already previously published, many of its subjects-matters had been already investigated by

various scholars.<sup>6)</sup> However, in his Introduction Luukko undertakes some further research into the information provided by the Nimrud Letters. He refers to the issues compulsory from the point of the SAA series format, such as the statistics concerning the correspondents (XV-XVI) and the reasoning for dating the letters (XX-XXV). Very interesting are author’s insights into the types of the introductory formulae (XIX-XX), and his extremely important analyses of the information on deportations and treaties provided by this corpus of letters (XXXVI-XXXIX and XXXIX-XL respectively). The study of the introductory formulae allowed Luukko to establish with the outmost precision, which of the crown prince correspondence belongs to Ulūlāiu (=Shalmaneser V) and which to Sennacherib (XX, L-LI, 10-13, nos. 8-11 and 160, no. 158).<sup>7)</sup> Exploration on individuals most prominent in the Nimrud Letters is a valuable contribution to the NA prosopography, especially in the light of the fact that this corpus material often is not included in the printed version of the PNA, and so far also not in its online updates. Some of these prominent individuals, like Ašīpā and Qurdi-Aššūr-lāmur, had already received an extensive treatment.<sup>8)</sup> Among those discussed in the Introduction very thought-provoking are activities of the governors of Kār-Shalmaneser/Til-Barsip, Inūrta-bēlu-ušur and Inūrta-ilā’ī (XLV-XLII). The Nimrud Letters shed a new light on the early career of Babylonia’s Chaldean chieftain Merodach-baladan (XLII-XLIII), later famous for his struggle with Sargon II and Sennacherib.

Letter 76 possibly contains an earliest Neo-Assyrian example of the diviner’s advice to the king and is explored with the help of the topical parallels from the other Neo-Assyrian letters (XXXIV-XXXV). This letter is probably not only the earliest evidence of divination in the NA correspondence, but it also refers to the augur (*dāgil iššūri*, r. 15), the kind of diviner of all of Mesopotamia attested in Assyria

<sup>2)</sup> The publishers omitted the name of Sargon II on the spine of the book cover. I am grateful to Cornelia Wunsch who drew my attention to this fact.

<sup>3)</sup> Of the Sargon II’s letters, nos. 152, 153, 159, 170, 171, 189, 190, 191 in SAA 19 have been already published in SAA 1, 5, and 15 and are referred to, but not re-edited in the reviewed editions.

<sup>4)</sup> See also Karen Radner (2004), “Salmanassar V. in den Nimrud Letters,” *Archiv für Orientforschung* 50:95-104.

<sup>5)</sup> As well as with Glossary and Indices, the hand copies of collations together with some hand copies of the entire tablets by Saggs and photographs of some of the tablets. The letters are arranged in the usual for SAA way starting with letters of the king and the crown prince, and then clustered according to the geographical provenance.

<sup>6)</sup> E.g. Bradley J. Parker (2009), “Asipa Again: A Microhistory of an Assyrian Provincial Administrator,” in *Of God(s), Trees, Kings, and Scholars: Neo-Assyrian and Related Studies in Honour of Simo Parpola*, edited by M. Luukko, S. Svård, R. Mattila. *Studia Orientalia* 106, Helsinki: The Finnish Oriental Society, 179-192; Shigeo Yamada (2008), “Qurdi-Assur-lamur: His Letters and Career,” in *Treasures on Camels’ Humps: Historical and Literary Studies from the Ancient Near East Presented to Israel Eph’al*, edited by M. Cogan and D. Kahn. Jerusalem: Hebrew University Magnes Press, 296-311; Peter Dubovský (2006), *Hezekiah and the Assyrian Spies: Reconstruction of the Neo-Assyrian Intelligence Services and its Significance for 2 Kings 18-19* *Biblica et Orientalia* 49. Rome: Pontificio Istituto Biblico / Biblical Institute Press and (2012), “King’s Direct Control: Neo-Assyrian *Qēpu* Officials,” in *Organization, Representation, and Symbols of Power in the Ancient Near East: Proceedings of the 54th Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale at Würzburg 20-25 July 2008*, edited by G. Wilhelm. Winona Lake IN, Eisenbrauns: 449-460; Natalie N. May (2012a), “*Ali-talimu*, or What Can Be Learned from the Destruction of Figurative Complexes?” in *Iconoclasm and Text Destruction in the Ancient Near East and Beyond*, edited by N. N. May, Oriental Institute Seminars 8. Chicago: the University of Chicago: 183-230, (2012b), “Royal Triumph as an Aspect of the Neo-Assyrian Decorative Program,” in *Organization, Representation, and Symbols of Power in the Ancient Near East: Proceedings of the 54th Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale at Würzburg 20-25 July 2008*, edited by G. Wilhelm. Winona Lake IN, Eisenbrauns: 461-488, and (2010), “The *Qersu* in Neo-Assyrian Cultic Setting. Its Origin, Depiction and Evolution,” in *Language in the Ancient Near East. Proceedings of 53rd Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale, International Congress of Assyriology and Ancient Near Eastern Archaeology, Moscow/StPetersburg, July 23-28, 2007*, edited by L. Kogan et al. *Babel und Bibel* 4/1: 441-489.

<sup>7)</sup> Compare Radner 2004: 101

<sup>8)</sup> Parker 2009 and Yamada 2008 respectively.

only.<sup>9)</sup> Moreover, the augur in question is quite a celebrity — his name is known both to the king and to the sender of the letter. He is also not a local specialist, but is to be loaned from the king of Šubria.

Some of the themes related to in the Introduction were treated by the author in response to previous research,<sup>10)</sup> for instance the question of transporting ice and snow in the letters of Ulūlāiu, and the meaning of the word *ku(p)pū* in these letters.

However, as is the purpose of the SAA series, the Introduction as well as the commentaries only touch up many important topics and leave their detailed elaboration to other scholars.<sup>11)</sup> Despite that the Nimrud Letters were already treated prior to their present SAA 19 edition there are still many aspects, which deserve and need further research. The most interesting perspectives seem to be the enquiry into the matters of the barley supplies and distribution,<sup>12)</sup> and the exploration of the evidence for the existence of the mercenaries in the Neo-Assyrian period, both as entire ethnic groups (no. 44 r. 2-10 and below) and on a personal level (no. 160: 7).<sup>13)</sup> The Aramean tribe of Itu'eans (*Itu'u*) is mentioned in multiple letters (nos. 6, 22, 25, 39, 70, 77, 100, 120, 154, 176, 177, 184). The distribution of the letters, which refer to Itu'eans, encompasses the west, the north and the south (Babylonia) of the Empire, both in the reign of Tiglath-pileser III and Sargon II. The tribe seems to serve a punitive squad (no. 22, 19-20), probably on a mercenary basis (no. 17, 6-7), not unlike the Arab tribes used as frontier guard under Esarhaddon and Assurbanipal.<sup>14)</sup>

<sup>9)</sup> Probably Hittite influence back in the Middle Assyrian period. On bird divination see Nicla de Zorzi (2009), "Bird Divination in Mesopotamia. New Evidence from BM 108874," *Kaskal* 6: 85-135.

<sup>10)</sup> Radner 2004: 101-102.

<sup>11)</sup> Naturally, in the light of the collations provided by the edition under review some previous research might be reconsidered (e.g. Dubovský 2006: 46-48).

<sup>12)</sup> Nos. 3, 19, 27, 36, 45, 47, 60, 80, 81, 83, 108, 109, 110, 120, 122, 128, 147, 167, 172, 196, 200, 211, 225, 227.

<sup>13)</sup> I cannot agree with the translation of *riksu* as "recruit," suggested for this letter by SAA 19, since it makes no sense in this letter context. Much more plausible is that a high qualified mercenary, a specialist in horses, is involved here. Compare CAD R 139b-140). In CTN III no. 121:6-7 *raksūte* is mentioned in conjunction with Samaritans, probably charioteers at Sargon II's service. The context is, however, unclear. See F. Mario Fales (2013), "On רכש ר, *rakkasu*, and *raksu*," in the Shadow of Bezalel. Aramaic, Biblical, and Ancient Near Eastern Studies in Honor of Bezalel Porten, edited by A. Botta, *Culture and History of the Ancient Near East*. Leiden: Brill, 2013, 82, 86 and Tamás Dezső (2012), *The Assyrian army. I, The Structure of the Neo-Assyrian Army as Reconstructed from the Assyrian Palace Reliefs and Cuneiform Sources 2. Cavalry and Chariotry*: 117 on *raksu/riksu*.

<sup>14)</sup> F. Mario Fales (2002), "Central Syria in the Letters to Sargon II," in *Kein Land für sich allein: Studien zum Kulturkontakte in Kanaan, Israel/Palästina und Ebirnāri für Manfred Weippert zum 65. Geburtstag*, *Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis* 67, edited by U. Hübner and E. A. Knauf: 140 defines the function of Itu'eans as "military police." Dezső describes them as a border guard and police force (2006), "The Reconstruction of the Neo-Assyrian Army as Depicted on the Assyrian Palace Reliefs, 745—612 BC", *Acta Archaeologica Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 57: 91-94, 97, 110, 123 and *idem*, (2006), "A Reconstruction of the Army of Sargon II (721-705 BC) Based on the Nimrud Horse Lists," *State Archives of Assyria Bulletin* 15: 92-93. On Itu'eans see most detailed *idem*, (2012), *The Assyrian army...I. Infantry*. Budapest: Eötvös University Press: 33-38. Luukko mentions that Suhean and Aramean deportees could also constitute ethnic based force of mercenaries (XXXVIII-XXXIX, nos. 17, 18, 175). Those could, however, be the cases of a *corvée* or an enforced conscription, like it seems to be in the case of Israelite charioteers in the army of Sargon II (Stephanie Dalley (1985), "Foreign Chariotry and Cavalry in the Armies of Tiglath-Pileser III and Sargon II," *Iraq* 47: 31-48; Jr. K. Lawson Younger (1998), "The Deportations of the Israelites," *Journal of Biblical*

It is highly interesting that the correspondence of both Tiglath-pileser III and Sargon II often relates to various fortification works and to the supply of horses, mules and chariots. But Sargon II's correspondence in the Nimrud Letters corpus often deals with the royal express service (nos. 161[=SAA 5, no. 74], 162, 193, 194) and mentions road stations (*bēt mardīti*), mule or horse teams (*urū*; also 160, 175, 208<sup>15)</sup>). My first impression is that this is another evidence of Sargon II's innovations introduced into governing of the empire, which Tiglath-pileser III had created. Reinforcement of the communication system seems to be important aspect of Sargon's organisational novelties.<sup>16)</sup>

Luukko elaborates on differences in the policies of Tiglath-pileser III and Sargon II towards Babylonia (XXXI-XXXIII). In Tiglath-pileser's times the magnates and other royal officials certainly had much more autonomy in waging military campaigns. Sargon diminished the might of the magnates and consolidated the royal power<sup>17)</sup> also in the military sphere. Unlike Sargon, who was personally present in the region and took part in the struggle with Merodach-Baladan, Tiglath-pileser III delegated his officials to suppress the Mukīn-zēri's rebellion. They dealt with the uprising totally on their own, reporting their actions to the king and expecting him to arrive for the triumphal entrance to Babylon in order to celebrate the anticipated victory (no. 98 r.7).<sup>18)</sup> The main difference between the two kings in ruling Babylonia was Sargon II putting his brother and vizier (*sukkallu*) Sīn-aḫū-uṣur to administer Babylonia in his absence (May 2012a: 195-207 and May, forthcoming).<sup>19)</sup>

The Nimrud Letters constitute the earliest source on the education and functions of the Assyrian crown princes. Despite that these topics already deserved intensive treatment, especially in concern of the education of Assurbanipal and the other members of Esarhaddon's family,<sup>20)</sup> the short,

*Literature* 117: 201-227) and Judeans as the body guards of Sennacherib (Richard D. Barnett [1958], "The Siege of Lachish," *Israel Exploration Journal* 8/3: 164; Richard D. Barnett, Erika Bleibtreu, and Geoffrey Turner (1998), *Sculptures from the Southwest Palace of Sennacherib at Nineveh*. London: British Museum Press: 135. Compare also SAA 1 nos. 155 and 223. Further on tribal or ethnic based Assyrian army units see Dezső (2006), "The Reconstruction of the Neo-Assyrian Army...": 91-94, 97, 110, 123; *idem* (2006), "A Reconstruction of the Army of Sargon II...": 95-96, 99-102, 105 and (2012) *The Assyrian army...I. Infantry*: 33-51.

<sup>15)</sup> It is not clear whether those teams are related to the "post" service or not.

<sup>16)</sup> See Natalie N. May (forthcoming), "Administrative Reforms of Sargon II and Tiglath-pileser III". See also Simo Parpola in SAA 1 XII-XIV and Karlheinz Kessler (1997) "'Royal Roads' and other Questions of the Neo-Assyrian Communication System," in *Assyria 1995: Proceedings of the 10th Anniversary Symposium of the Neo-Assyrian Text Corpus Project, Helsinki, September 7-11, 1995*, edited by S. Parpola and R.M. Whiting. Helsinki: Neo-Assyrian Text Corpus Project: 129-136 on Assyrian royal roads.

<sup>17)</sup> May 2012a: 195-207, and May, forthcoming.

<sup>18)</sup> A brief mention of the white donkey for the king (no. 98 r. 7) in conjunction with the news of Babylonians can only relate to the preparation of his triumphal entrance to the city riding this donkey. Compare ARM VI no. 76: 19-25 and May, 2012b.

<sup>19)</sup> May 2012a was published few months after SAA 19. This is probably the reason why Luukko is still unaware of the identity of Sargon's *sukkallu* (XXXII).

<sup>20)</sup> See e.g. Alasdair Livingstone (2007), "Ashurbanipal: Literate or Not? ZA 96: 98-118; Silvie Zamazalová, (2011), "The Education of Neo-Assyrian Princes," in *The Oxford Handbook of Cuneiform Culture*, edited by K. Radner and E. Robson. Oxford: Oxford University Press: 313-330; Natalie N. May (2013), "'I read the inscriptions from before the flood ...' Neo-Sumerian influences in Ashurbanipal's royal self-image," in *Time and*

but very illuminating discussion by Luukko (L-LI), is so far the only treatment of the earlier Assyrian evidence. The crown prince duties and authority were to some extent discussed by Karen Radner (2004). It seems that the crown prince's authority was beyond that of any of the magnates, and that he was responsible for governing of palace matters, especially those related to the distribution of the goods and the protection of the queen. He was also in charge of collection of tribute and supervised the duties of the magnates, such as supplying horses (SAA 1 33-34; see also SAA 19, LI). The role of the crown prince in the Assyrian intelligence service is well known.<sup>21</sup> However, the diachronic analysis comparing the functions of Ulūlāiu and Sennacherib seems to be necessary, as probably is the investigation based on the entire corpus of evidence, and not on the letters of these two crown princes only.

The Nimrud Letters contain valuable information on Assyrian functionaries such as *rab kāri* (no. 38) or *rab maddatti* (91),<sup>22</sup> major-domos (*rab bēti*) of various officials (nos. 62, 74, 210) whose activities were important enough to be reported to the king, the *mušarkisu* connected to the recruitment (nos. 91, 166, 188).<sup>23</sup> They also mention *daiālu* (nos. 61, 67, 183), scouts or inspectors (CAD D 27a-28b). *Šaniu* of at least two kinds are often related.<sup>24</sup> Each of these kinds of officials deserves a detailed study such as that of Peter Dubovský's research on the *qēpu*.<sup>25</sup>

Luukko (XXXVI) refers to the Moab's plea for help against Qedarite attacks in no. 29 as an example of the Assyria's growing prestige. Interestingly, the closest parallel to this case is provided by the non-Assyrian source originating from the same region (II Kgs 16:7-8). This Biblical passage describes the embassy and the gifts sent to Tiglath-pileser III by Ahaz in order to acquire Assyrian help against the attacks of Rezin of Damascus and Pekah of Israel.<sup>26</sup>

There is a number of the astonishing facts conveyed by the Nimrud Letters. No. 71 reports of the defeat of the Assyrian army by the Urartians and the death of the chief cup-bearer in the battle (XLI). To the best of my knowledge it is the only case when an Assyrian source describes openly an event of this kind. Another unique feature is the date which occurs on the royal letter: the 24th of Adar (no. 7 r.7 — the last line). Some of the MA letters are dated either by the

month, day and a *limmu*-year or just by the day.<sup>27</sup> So far this is the only NA letter with the date marked on it. The reason is not quite clear. Most plausible is that since the king demanded an urgent response (r. 6) the date of the letter itself was important. Rather interesting is the information on Ionians (*Iauna*, nos. 25-26), which was comprehensively treated by Giovanni Lanfranchi involving the other available sources.<sup>28</sup> Letter 22 describes Assyrian tight control over the Phoenician trade of the Lebanese cedar. SAA 19 corpus provides also further information on tributes and taxes, such as *kaiamāniū* (no. 91), *iškāru* (nos. 6, 10, 12, 16, 35, 52, 154, 168, 184) and so forth.

As was already mentioned, Luukko himself stresses the difficulty in dating many letters of the corpus. The dating, for instance, depends strongly on the question of the possible continuity of the tenure of some officials, for instance Ašipā<sup>29</sup> or Šil-Bēl,<sup>30</sup> from the reign of Tiglath-pileser III into the reign of Sargon II, or on the details of the both kings' activities towards Urartu. However, the reviewer can with certainty attribute no. 142 to the time of Sargon II and not of Tiglath-pileser III on the grounds that it is addressed to *sukkallu*, that is Šin-aḫu-ušur, Sargon II's brother, who was in charge of Babylonia.<sup>31</sup> The fact that the letter refers to the Babylonian affairs and is written in NB ductus confirms such dating since it is typical of many letters addressed to Šin-aḫu-ušur. I suggest to read lines 5-6 of this letter as LÚ.A-KIN šá LUGAL mu-šá-pi-šá 'dul-lu' šá KASKAL, as does Saggs,<sup>32</sup> but to translate it: "royal messenger, performing the duty of the road," since neither the SAA 19 reading, nor Saggs translation make any sense.

Translations suggested in SAA 19 are not always optimal or exact, and the commentary does not always propose variations. For instance, *qersu* in no. 17 r. 10 and in 207: 7 does not mean "cart," but rather a portable sanctuary,<sup>33</sup> especially since the Nimrud Letters corpus contain the term for "cart" *tallaku/tallaktu* (nos. 155, 156) with the detailed description of its use.<sup>34</sup> Another example is *māhiru*, which suits no. 19:7 in its basic meaning "market price" better than the suggested "exchange rate."<sup>35</sup> Interpreting *ēqu* as a "sacred tree" in no. 23:8 is rather bold.

It remained an enigma to me why Nabû-nammir is suggested to be a vizier (XVI, XXI, XXIV, 258). The reason might be his activities in Babylonia, but the *sukkallu* active in Babylonia was Sargon's brother Šin-aḫu-ušur,<sup>36</sup> and not Tiglath-pileser III's official. In fact there is hardly any evidence of the *sukkallu* in the reign of the latter (no. 89:17).

It is the pleasure of the reviewer to congratulate Mikko Luukko with his important accomplishment, which makes

*History in the Ancient Near East. Proceedings of the 56th Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale, International Congress of Assyriology and Ancient Near Eastern Archaeology at Barcelona, July 26–30, 2010*, edited by L. Feliu, J. Llop, A. Millet Albà, and J. Sanmartín. Winona Lake IN, Eisenbrauns: 195–206.

<sup>21</sup> Dubovský 2006:266, SAA I nos. 29 and 32.

<sup>22</sup> However, Luukko notes that this profession is a *hapax*.

<sup>23</sup> See Dezső (2006), "The Reconstruction of the Neo-Assyrian Army...: 123, (2006) "A Reconstruction of the Army of Sargon II...: 95-96, 106-108 and (2012), *The Assyrian army...2. Cavalry and Chariotry*: 43-44.

<sup>24</sup> See SAA 19: 249 (index) for the references.

<sup>25</sup> Dubovský 2012. *Rab bēti* was to some extent explored by Dezső (2006), "A Reconstruction of the Army of Sargon II 15: 121 and (2012), *The Assyrian army...1. Infantry*: 187-189.

<sup>26</sup> "So Ahaz sent messengers to Tiglath-pileser king of Assyria, saying: 'I am your servant and your son; come up, and save me out of the hand of the king of Aram, and out of the hand of the king of Israel, who rise up against me.' And Ahaz took the silver and gold that was found in the house of the YHWH and in the treasures of the king's house, and sent it for a present to the king of Assyria."

<sup>27</sup> Jaume Llop (2012), "Middle Assyrian Letters: A New Survey," *Aula Orientalis* 30/2: 296.

<sup>28</sup> Lanfranchi, Giovanni B (2000), "The Ideological and Political Impact of the Assyrian Imperial Expansion on the Greek World in the 8th and 7th Centuries," in *The Heirs of Assyria: Proceedings of the Opening Symposium of the Assyrian and Babylonian Intellectual Heritage Project Held in Tvarminne, Finland, October 8-11, 1998*, Melammu Symposia 1 edited by S. Aro and R. M. Whiting. Helsinki: Neo-Assyrian Text Corpus Project: 7-34.

<sup>29</sup> Parker 2008:185.

<sup>30</sup> Raija Mattila (2002), "Šil-Bēl" in *PNA* 3/1 1171a-1172b.

<sup>31</sup> May 2012a: 195-207.

<sup>32</sup> CTN V:79.

<sup>33</sup> See May 2010.

<sup>34</sup> See also CAD T 99.

<sup>35</sup> It is also translated as "market price" in the index (240).

<sup>36</sup> May 2012:195-207 and forthcoming.



the most modern and precise edition of the Nimrud Letters available for the study by the scholarly community. Obviously the range of information and themes for research exceeds far beyond those outlined in this review.

Berlin, March 13, 2014

Natalie N. MAY

\*  
\* \*

FAIST, B. — Alltagstexte aus neuassyrischen Archiven und Bibliotheken der Stadt Assur. (Studien zu den Assur-Texten, 3). Verlag Otto Harrassowitz, Wiesbaden, 2007. (30 cm, XX, 250). ISBN 978-3-447-05647-2. ISSN 1438-3187, € 54,-.

FAIST, B. — Neuassyrische Rechtsurkunden IV. Mit einem Beitrag von Evelyn Klengel-Brandt. (Wissenschaftliche Veröffentlichungen der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft, 132). Verlag Otto Harrassowitz, Wiesbaden, 2010. (35 cm, VII, 66, 6 Taf.). ISBN 978-3-447-06458-3. ISSN 0342-4464, € 52,-.

“Alltagstexte” in the title of the first book announced here are private legal texts, administrative texts of an organisation, and letters (p. 1a). Some were found in private archives, others in libraries — following a distinction made by O. Pedersén (p. 2a). Here 112 such texts are published (only one letter) (p. 3-4). The author published them in copy in her earlier book, *Keilschrifttexte aus neuassyrischer Zeit 3* (= KAN 3) (2005). Which is now followed by her next edition of texts, KAN 4, the second book announced here. These KAN books, presenting the copies, are followed by other books with transliterations and translations with introductions, discussions and indexes, appearing in the series *StAT*, here volume 3. Since a long time most of the texts in *StAT 3* were in Berlin and in the past several scholars commented on them; particularly K. Deller and K. Radner. Most important, at an earlier stage O. Pedersén had summarized every text and assigned to it its place within an “archive”. His classifications are followed here. The author of this book was the first to copy them all and to study them in depth and within their archival contexts. She consulted the excavation records and the Assur photos which enabled here to discover lacunas in the now available material. She arranged the texts according to archive. Each archive begins with a survey of the other texts belonging to it, published here and elsewhere — or not accessible or lost (p. 10a). One document had been copied before, no. 45 = KAJ 196. Most texts date to 648-610 BC.

Many persons were not incorporated in the *Prosopography of the Neo-Assyrian Empire* (PNA) and this is noted every time (p. 10b, p. 235a). More than once the book disagrees with PNA in giving other readings (a list on p. 233-235). Eponyms not mentioned by A.R. Millard are listed on p. 235b. Assyrian orthography is notoriously irregular and the author can explain many deviations with help of the study by M.P. Streck, “Keilschrift und Alphabet”, in D. Borchers a.o., *Hieroglyphen, Alphabete ...* (2001) 77-79 (p. 74b, 84b, 94b, 131, 142a, 166 f., etc.). Earlier readings of seal impressions in R.M. Whiting, *Assyria* (1995) 140, are corrected (p. 41a, 50a).

Many of the texts give the verdict after a litigation (*dēnu, sartu*), in their terse style. In several texts women are surety

for debts or guarantor (nos. 64, 65 [with comment], 67, 84, 107, etc.).

Some exceptional groups of texts: (1) The large “archive of the Egyptians” (N 31, p. 125-149); a full edition by H.-U. Onasch is in preparation. (2) The archive found in a jar (N 29, p. 123). When the manuscript was completed, the author found another piece, published at the end, no. 115 (p. 172 f.). (3) Archive N 27 contained three Aramaic dockets, published long ago; they can now be studied in their context (p. 72 ff.).

Exceptional details: (1) An interesting list with garments found in the Assur temple, already seen by earlier scholars, with the garment *nixsu* (no. 1:10, 13), not in *CAD*. (2) A temple loan, with a discussion of *rēšātu* (plur. of *rēštu*) (no. 109, p. 162-4). (3) A corn loan docket, no. 48. (4) Disc. of geographical names: Till-Lini, near Harran (p. 91a), Dūr-Sîn-ahhē-eriba (p. 101b).

Additional remarks: (1) Add to the bibliography on *pirru* (p. 120b) J.N. Postgate in Ph. Abrahami, L. Battini, *Les armées du Proche-Orient ancien* (2008) 84 ff. (MA). (2) In no. 7:3 perhaps *mašrat naq-la-pat* “worn, peeled” (verb *qalāpu*). (3) 2 QA DU KUR Izalli (no.8:8): possibly West-Semitic *kad* “amphora”, for the famous wine from Izallu, mentioned in Ezekiel 27:19: *dannē jajin me-Ūzzāl*, A.R. Millard, *JSS 7* (1962) 201-3. (4) In the indexes *DĪ = diqaru* in no. 8:1, 4 is missing.

We are grateful for this solid text edition.

Leiden, March 2014

Marten STOL

\*  
\* \*

GASPA, S. — Alimenti e pratici alimentari in Assiria: Le materie alimentari nel culto ufficiale dell’Assiria del primo millennio A.C. (History of the Ancient Near East, Monographs, 13). Sargon, Editrice e Libreria, Padova, 2012. (29 cm, XI, 325). ISBN 978-88-9567229-8. € 70,-.

Die hier zu besprechende Monographie basiert auf der in Verbindung mit dem Projekt *Lessico dell'alimentazione nel Vicino Oriente Antico* (Koordinator L. Milano) verfassten und im Jahre 2011 an der Universität Neapel L’Orientale abgeschlossenen Doktorarbeit des Autors. Mit dieser Arbeit liegt nun erstmals eine umfassende Studie zu den in neuassyrischer Zeit verwendeten Opfermaterialien und deren Verarbeitung vor. S. Gaspa bietet damit nicht nur eine detaillierte Abhandlung über die verfügbaren Nahrungsmittel im Allgemeinen, sondern setzt sich akribisch mit dem Speiseplan der assyrischen Elite und der Götter auseinander. Um ein möglichst breites Spektrum an Informationen zu liefern, gibt der Autor auch großzügigen Einblick in die mittelassyrische Evidenz und bezieht zudem einschlägige Hinweise aus dem Textmaterial anderer Perioden des Alten Orients mit ein. Neben den schriftlichen Quellen wird auch die Ikonographie (vor allem jene der Orthostatenreliefs) berücksichtigt.

Das Buch gliedert sich in drei Teile. Im einleitenden Teil bespricht Gaspa kurz die Quellenlage und bietet einen Überblick über die Termini für Trank- und Speiseopfer sowie der Schüttopfer (einschließlich Belegen). Zudem diskutiert der

Autor hier die Bedeutung der Göttermahlzeit und die Rolle des Königs als Ernährer der Götter in Mesopotamien. Dabei kommt er vor allem auch auf den Umstand zu sprechen, dass das Göttermahl in seiner Zusammensetzung den Ernährungsgewohnheiten der irdenen Gesellschaft bzw. deren Elite entspricht sowie deren Lebensgrundlagen und kulturellen Errungenschaften (Ackerbau, Viehzucht, Handel, ...) widerspiegelt. Gaspa geht hierbei auch näher auf das im Wechselspiel zwischen Götterwelt und Menschenwelt grundlegende Prinzip der Reziprozität zur Aufrechterhaltung der kosmischen Ordnung ein. Zum einen ernähren die Menschen (repräsentiert durch den König) die Götter, zum anderen lassen Letztere wiederum die Menschen (Tempelpersonal, König und dessen Hofstaat) durch die Opferreste (bzw. ihre Essenreste) an ihrer Mahlzeit teilhaben, deren Verzehr dann auch im Rahmen von festlichen Banketten am königlichen Hof stattfindet. Wenn Gaspa (S. 39) das fundamentale Interesse des assyrischen Staates an der Aufrechterhaltung der Opferwirtschaft und deren Bedeutung in der staatlichen Verwaltung betont, kann dem nur zugestimmt werden.

Das Kernstück der Arbeit bildet eine detaillierte Abhandlung zu den Nahrungsmitteln in neuassyrischer Zeit, thematisch aufgegliedert in die Sektionen Getreide, Fleisch (Nutz- und Wildtiere), Fisch, Milch- und Milchprodukte, Gemüse und Obst, Fette (pflanzlicher und tierischer Art), Gewürze und Süßstoffe sowie Getränke. Jedes dieser Unterkapitel ist nach demselben Schema aufgebaut. Nach einer allgemeinen Besprechung der Evidenz und der Terminologie, beschreibt der Autor die Verarbeitungstechniken und die Endprodukte und geht auf die allgemeine Bedeutung der jeweiligen Nahrungsmittel in der damaligen Ernährung ein. In Verbindung mit der Verarbeitung der Lebensmittel informiert Gaspa kurz auch über die zuständigen Berufe und Ämter und führt durchwegs eine Fülle von Belegstellen an (eine vollständige Sammlung der Belegstellen sowie die Besprechung von Ämtern und Berufen wie Koch finden sich in der noch unveröffentlichten Dissertation über den königlichen Haushalt in neuassyrischer Zeit der Rezensentin). Unter anderem sind hier Gaspa's aufschlussreiche Ausführungen zum ambivalenten Terminus *dišpu*, der sowohl einen Fruchtsirup (aus Datteln, Feigen...) als auch Bienenhonig bezeichnet (S. 216-218), und die Entwicklung des Weinanbaus in Assyrien des 1. Jahrtausends (S. 234-236) zu nennen. Die Sektionen enden stets mit einer Besprechung über die Rolle der jeweiligen Nahrungsmittel in der Opferverwaltung und im Kultbetrieb, anhand von Verwaltungstexten (insbesondere SAA 7 158-181 und 182-219) und anderen Texten (Ritualtexte, königliche Dekrete, ...), die Informationen zu Kultritualen liefern.

Der dritte und letzte Teil der Arbeit beschäftigt sich mit der Verwaltung der Nahrungsmittel für den Kult in Assur anhand des Dekrets SAA 12 69 (zusammen mit dem dazugehörigen Fragment SAA 12 70) über die Palastausgaben für den Kultbetrieb des Aššur-Tempels. Die für die neuassyrische Zeit einmalige Dokumentation über die Art und Menge der Naturalausgaben und das für dessen Verarbeitung zuständige Personal ist sicherlich ein probates Mittel um ein besseres Verständnis für die damit einhergehende Administration zu entwickeln, wenngleich sie doch nur ein Schlaglicht auf ein höchst komplexes System wirft und Gaspa hiermit nur begrenzt eine Synthese zur Kultopferverwaltung gelingt. Es sei hier noch auf die Besprechung dieses Textes durch selbigen Autor im Artikel *Organizing the Festive Cycles at the*

*Aššur Temple: Royal Dispositions for the Provision and Processing of Foodstuffs in First Millennium BC Assyria* (in *State Archives of Assyria Bulletin* 18) hingewiesen.

Rezensentin möchte vor allem noch auf eine Beobachtung näher eingehen. Die Gruppe der Verwaltungstexte SAA 7 182-219, die eine wesentliche Quelle für Gaspa's Studien darstellt, wurde nicht vollständig korrekt interpretiert. Die Gruppe, die zuletzt von S. Parpola (2004) besprochen wurde, dokumentiert das Opfermaterial bzw. dessen zum feierlichen Verzehr gedachten Reste (*rēḫāti*) rund um die Kulthandlungen im Aššur-Tempel anlässlich der Frühjahrsfeierlichkeiten in Assur. Bei der Aufschlüsselung der involvierten Opferarten nennt Gaspa (S. 5-6), neben Opfern im Dagan-Heiligtum, den „neuen regulären Opfern“ (*ginû eššu*) und den Opfern zur Hochzeitsnacht (*quršû*) der Mullissu, auch die Opfer der „ersten Früchte“ (*rēšāti*). Mit Ausnahme der Letzteren, die laut Autor mit einem Gutteil der gelisteten Opfermaterie in Zusammenhang stehen (S. 5, Fn. 44), sind die Zuweisungen völlig einsichtig, da die angeführten Sektionen unmissverständliche Unterschriften aufweisen.<sup>1)</sup> Die *rēšāti* werden allerdings tatsächlich nur einmal in Verbindung mit Opfertätigkeiten im Land Akkad genannt (SAA 7 212 r. 12-13) und es besteht kein Anlass hier an anderer Stelle diese Art von Opfergaben zu vermuten. Die laut Autor als mit *rēšāti*-Opfern zusammenhängenden Textpartien müssen in anderer Weise gedeutet werden. Bisherige Besprechungen dieser Textgruppe fassten sie als Abschnitte über die Opferreste (*rēḫāti*) auf, die hier gewissermaßen als eigene Opfergattung präsentiert werden (Van Driel 1969: 209-211, gefolgt von Fales und Postgate 1992: XXXV und auch Parpola 2004: 289). Dies rührt vor allem daher, dass die besagten Abschnitte in der Mehrheit der Fälle mit der Bemerkung „(Reste) von vor dem Gott Aššur (*ša pān Aššur*)“ abschließen (SAA 7 190 r. 5-6; 191 r. 8'; 192 r. 9; 199 r. 7'; 201 r. 4; 202 r. 6; 207:17; 209:18; 210 r. 1; 211 r. 11; 215:8'; 216:19). Dieselbe Phrase findet sich stattdessen teilweise auch als Unterschrift von unmittelbar darauffolgenden Abschnitten über die *ginû eššu* Opfer (SAA 7 189 r. 12; 196 r. 11; 200 r. 4 und 206 r. 4), wodurch (wie schon von Van Driel 1969: 210 bemerkt) ersichtlich wird, dass es sich in beiden Abschnitten um die Reste von Opfern für Aššur handelt (vielleicht am deutlichsten ist dies in der Liste SAA 7 189, die hier zusätzlich ein Summenzeichen anführt). Da die Kategorie „Opferreste“ somit auch auf — hinsichtlich ihrer kultischen Verwendung — schon bestimmten Opfermaterialien angewendet wird, liegt der Schluss nahe, dass dies auch auf die hier zur Diskussion stehenden Passagen zutrifft. In Anbetracht der in den meisten Fällen darauffolgenden Abschnitte über die *ginû eššu* (teilweise sind stattdessen anschließend die *quršû*-Opfermaterialien gelistet, SAA 7 208, 215 und 216, die ihrerseits gelegentlich den Abschnitten über die *ginû eššu* vorangehen, SAA 7 209 und 210), sind hier womöglich Materialien der gewöhnlichen *ginû*-Opfer dokumentiert, die in diesen Listen andernfalls keine Berücksichtigung finden. Eine weiteres Indiz dafür ist auch das in den entsprechenden Abschnitten gelistete *ginû*-Brot (*aklu ginû*, in SAA 7 192:12; 196:5';

<sup>1)</sup> Die Sektionen sind visuell nicht sichtbar gemacht, aber inhaltlich zu erkennen durch die Unterschriften und durch die konstante Reihung der Nahrungsmittel (im Wesentlichen: Fleisch, Getreide- und Getreideprodukte, Hülsenfrüchte, Gemüse und Obst) innerhalb eines Abschnitts.

201:10; 207:8; 209:10; 210:11; 211:16; 212:13; 214:6'; 216:8), das ferner (wenn auch wesentlich seltener) unter der als *ginû eššu* deklarierten Opfermaterie aufscheint (SAA 7 196 r. 8). Die Deutung der *rēšāti* als eigene Kategorie neben Opfergattungen wie *quršū* ist nach Meinung der Rezensentin nicht zufriedenstellend, da es sich hierbei nicht um eine bestimmte Art von Opfer handelt, sondern um die Reste von durchgeführten Opfern unterschiedlichster Art. In jedem Fall sind die besagten Abschnitte nicht, wie bei Gaspa, in Verbindung mit *rēšāti*-Opfern zu sehen und der Leser sei darauf aufmerksam gemacht, dass vor allem im Hauptteil der Monographie laufend fälschlicherweise von den *rēšāti*-Sektionen in den Verwaltungstexten SAA 7 182-219 die Rede ist.

Ungeachtet dieses Irrtums bietet Gaspa mit seiner minutiös ausgearbeiteten Quellenstudie ein ungemein arbeitserleichterndes und aufschlussreiches Handbuch (auch durch ein, wenngleich auf bestimmte Textgattungen eingeschränktes, Glossar im Anhang) zu den in neuassyrischer Zeit (im profanen und kulturellen Bereich) verwendeten Nahrungsmitteln.

Institut für Orientalistik, Universität Wien Melanie GROSS  
März 2014

FALES, F.M. und Postgate, J.N. (1992) *Imperial Administrative Records, Part I: Palace and Temple Administration* (SAA 7) Helsinki.

PARPOLA, S. (2004) The Leftovers of God and King: on the Distribution of Meat at the Assyrian and Achaemenid Imperial Courts, in C. Grottanelli und L. Milano (Hrsg.), *Food and Identity in the Ancient World* (History of the Ancient Near East, Studies 9) Padua: 281-312.

VAN DRIEL, G. (1969) *The Cult of Aššur*. Assen.

\*  
\* \*

DALLEY S. — The Mystery of the Hanging Garden of Babylon. An elusive world wonder traced. Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2013. (22 cm, XVIII, 279). ISBN 978-0-19-966226-5. £ 25.00.

In Antiquity, the Hanging Garden of Babylon (Philo, Diodorus and Strabo used the singular) was considered one of the seven World Wonders. The fact that no archaeological remains of such a garden, described in different ways in the Classical sources, were found *in situ*, explains the variety of reconstructions and locations (within the city) proposed by different scholars. Furthermore, as Nebuchadnezzar, according to the Classical texts the builder of the Hanging Garden, does not mention any spectacular garden in his inscriptions, even the real existence of this World Wonder was put in question. This book intends to unravel the “mystery” by transplanting the garden from Babylon to Nineveh and attributing it to Sennacherib, the alleged inventor of the Archimedean screw, by means of which the Hanging Garden was watered, so say the Classical sources.

The book begins with an Introduction (pp. 1–11) in which the author presents first herself and then a general overview of the World Wonders. In Chapter 1 (Drawing a Blank in Babylon, pp. 13–27) Dalley briefly describes the archaeological situation in Babylon and lists some of the proposed locations for the Hanging Garden. Nebuchadnezzar is indeed

named as its builder, but only by Josephus (quoting from Berossus). Dalley stresses the negative evidence, namely that the other Classical authors do not mention the builder by name, that the Hanging Garden is not attested in indigenous Babylonian sources, and that Herodotus did not mention this World Wonder when speaking about Babylon.

Chapter 2 (Classical Writers and their Testimony, pp. 29–41) is an overview of the main Greek and Latin sources, which are quoted in translation, following the respective editions. Diodorus Siculus (1<sup>st</sup> cent. BC), who quotes Ctesias (5<sup>th</sup> cent. BC), and Strabo (1<sup>st</sup> cent. BC/1<sup>st</sup> cent. AD) are two of the earliest authors to deal with the Hanging Garden. Dalley points out that, according to Diodorus, the water-raising mechanism was not visible and that Strabo explicitly mentions watering by means of Archimedean screws. Quoting Berossus, a priest of Marduk who lived in Babylon in the 3<sup>rd</sup> cent. BC, Josephus (1<sup>st</sup> cent. AD) attributed the Hanging Garden to Nebuchadnezzar. According to Dalley “Berossus himself may not have mentioned Nebuchadnezzar in connection with the garden, but rather that passage was probably added to his original text by one of the authors who quoted from him in the two centuries that separate Berossus from Josephus” (p. 35). Further Classical authors are Quintus Curtius Rufus (late 1<sup>st</sup> cent. AD) and Philo of Byzantium, who, according to Dalley, was not the Greek engineer of the 3<sup>rd</sup> cent. BC but a much later homonymous writer called the Paradoxographer (4<sup>th</sup>–5<sup>th</sup> cent. AD, p. 39). Dalley concludes that the Classical texts give a useful description of the Hanging Garden, which was located beside the king’s palace in a citadel, shaped as a Greek theatre, watered by screws, and inspired by a homesick queen.

In Chapter 3 (Three Pictures, and Archimedes, pp. 45–59) Dalley presents on the one hand three — well-known — Assyrian wall reliefs from the palaces of Sargon in Dūr-Šarrukēn (fig. 11), and of Sennacherib (fig. 13) and Ashurbanipal (fig. 14) in Nineveh depicting gardens. On the other hand, she gives an overview of the sources which attribute the invention of the screw to Archimedes and questions the reliability of those sources. Dalley sees Sennacherib as the inventor of the Archimedean screw, a subject dealt with in Chapter 4 (Sennacherib’s Great Invention, pp. 61–82). She interprets two terms in a passage of Sennacherib’s inscriptions describing a new water-lifting device, *gišmahḫu* (tree-trunks used as columns or beams) and *alamittu* (palm-tree), as the hollow cylinder and the helical surface of an Archimedean screw, respectively. The same components are mentioned in a previous passage of the same inscription among those objects which were made of bronze by means of an innovative casting method using clay moulds. She mentions also that replications of Sennacherib’s bronze screws were cast for the television programme *Secrets of the Ancients*.

Chapter 5 (Engineering for Water Management, pp. 83–105) offers a description of Sennacherib’s hydraulic projects for the water-supply of Nineveh, the old city that was enlarged and converted into the new Assyrian capital. In Chapter 6 (Confusion of Names, pp. 107–126) Dalley tries to explain the confusion between Nineveh and Babylon in some Classical sources on the background of the cuneiform sources, alleging for instance that, in reshaping Nineveh, Sennacherib imitated Babylon (p. 111). She finds further evidence in the “Toledo tables” of the medieval astronomer Azarqiel (around 1070 AD), who gives geographical coordinates for different Babylons, one of them located in Assyria.



The construction of Sennacherib's Southwest Palace in Nineveh, the so-called "Palace Without Rival", which is described in detail in several royal inscriptions and which has partially been excavated, is the main subject of Chapter 7 (The Unrivalled Palace, the Queen and the Garden, pp. 127–151). Dalley sees Tašmētu-šarrat, Sennacherib's first wife, as the "Syrian Queen" of Diodorus' account ("Median Queen" in Josephus), for whom the Hanging Garden was built, when the king dedicated a section of his palace to her. At the end of the chapter two reconstruction drawings of Sennacherib's palace garden in Nineveh are shown and commented. Chapter 8 (Symbolism and Imitators, pp. 153–178) considers the Assyrian tradition of royal gardens with exotic flora initiated by Tiglath-Pileser I. According to Dalley, the "World Wonder created by Sennacherib" was imitated by famous kings like Hezekiah (8<sup>th</sup> cent. BC) and Herod the Great (1<sup>st</sup> cent. BC) and may have inspired the description of the garden of Alcinous in the *Odyssey*.

Chapter 9 (Defeat and Revival, pp. 179–202) deals with Nineveh's survival as a city after the conquest in 612 BC. The city was not completely destroyed and, although it suffered a severe decline, was still partially populated in Hellenistic and later times. Even if "the Hanging Garden itself was not necessarily still visible and visited", the palaces and some of the wall plates depicting gardens "could still be visited at least in part" (p. 202). All the arguments of Dalley's thesis are once more presented in the Conclusions (pp. 203–208) beginning with the following asseveration: "This book has shown that the Hanging Garden was built at Nineveh, not Babylon, by Sennacherib, not Nebuchadnezzar or Sennacherib" (p. 203). Furthermore, "the correct decipherment of a 7<sup>th</sup>-century BC Assyrian inscription gives a match with the crucial elements in descriptions of later Greek authors" (loc. cit.). The pertinent passages of the Assyrian inscription are presented in an Appendix (pp. 209–213). Notes to the chapters (pp. 215–244), a Bibliography (p. 245–268), and an Index (pp. 269–279) complete the book.

S. Dalley presented the thesis of the Hanging Garden of Nineveh already at the 39<sup>th</sup> *Rencontre Assyriologique* held at Heidelberg (Germany) in July 1992, and since then she has written many articles related to this subject: "Nineveh, Babylon and the Hanging Gardens: Cuneiform and Classical Sources Reconciled", *Iraq* 56, 1994, 45–58, "The Hanging Gardens of Babylon at Nineveh", *HSAO* 6, 1997, 19–24, "Waterworks in the time of Hezekiah and Judaeen princesses in Assyria", *Bulletin of the Anglo-Israel Archaeological Society* 18, 2000, 119–121, "Water management in Assyria from the ninth to the seventh centuries BC", *ARAM* 13/14, 2001–2002, 443–460, "More about the Hanging Gardens", in: Al-Gailani et al. (ed.), *Of Pots and Plans, Papers on the Archaeology and History of Mesopotamia and Syria presented to David Oates in Honour of his 75<sup>th</sup> Birthday*, London, 2002, 67–73, "Sennacherib, Archimedes, and the Water Screw. The Context of Invention in the Ancient World", in: *Technology and Culture* 44, 2003, 1–26 (together with J. P. Oleson), and "Water supply for cities in the late eighth and seventh centuries BC: Assyria and Urartu 2", in: A. Çilingiroğlu/G. Darbyshire (ed.), *Anatolian Iron Ages 5*, Ankara, 2005, 39–43.

The book is largely based on these articles. Furthermore, the description of Sennacherib's hydraulic projects (Chap. 5) has profited a lot from the works of D. Oates (*Studies in the Ancient History of Northern Iraq*, London, 1968), J. E. Reade

("Studies in Assyrian geography, Part I: Sennacherib and the waters of Nineveh", *RA* 72, 1978, 47–72 and 157–175), A. M. Bagg (*Assyrische Wasserbauten*, Mainz, 2000), and J. Ur ("Sennacherib's northern Assyrian canals: new insights from satellite imagery and aerial photography", *Iraq* 67/1, 2005, 317–345). The account of Sennacherib's palace (Chap. 7), also a well-studied subject, bases mainly on the works of J. M. Russell (*Sennacherib's Palace Without Rival at Nineveh*, Chicago, 1991) and J. E. Reade ("Nineveh", in: *RIA* 9, 388–433).

Dalley's thesis — and consequently the content of her book — is not only already known but has also been contested. The principal pillar of her thesis, namely that Sennacherib invented the Archimedean screw was challenged by A. M. Bagg (*op. cit.*, 198–204). Dalley tried to refute his counter-arguments, but without substantial evidence (*AfO* 48/49, 2001/2002, 212–216) and ignored the criticism in her publications after 2000. Furthermore, the whole thesis was completely demolished by R. Bichler and R. Rollinger in their article "Die Hängenden Gärten zu Ninive — Die Lösung eines Rätsels?" (in: R. Rollinger [ed.], *Von Sumer bis Homer, Festschrift für Manfred Schretten zur 60. Geburtstag am 25. Februar 2004*, Münster, 2005, 153–218), where they present and extensively discuss the Classical sources and refute every one of Dalley's arguments convincingly. Bichler's and Rollinger's criticism was altogether ignored by Dalley. It is not my aim to repeat what has already been written in the above-mentioned critical publications, but some comments seem necessary, and I will concentrate on the principal aspects of Dalley's thesis.

First of all there is a severe methodological problem. Dalley's argumentation rests on a selective and biased use of the available sources. She takes from the Classical sources whatever fits her thesis, disqualifying or leaving aside contrary information. She presents her thesis as a solid building of irrefutable arguments, that are in fact nothing but a chain of speculations without a single concrete proof. How can such a castle in the air be presented as a coherent argumentation? The answer is simple: The assumed thesis determines the use and interpretation of the sources as well as the outcome. In his review of Dalley's book *The Legacy of Mesopotamia* (Oxford, 1998), M. Stol already noticed "the most speculative ideas", regarded some alleged links as "very thin, if not non-existent", and considered that "some lessons in method" were necessary (*BiOr* 55, 1998, 805).

Dalley's chain of thought can be summarized as follows: 1) the Classical sources mention a Hanging Garden in Babylon, which was watered by screws and built by Nebuchadnezzar; 2) such a World Wonder has neither been found in Babylon nor is it mentioned in Nebuchadnezzar's inscriptions; 3) Sennacherib built a royal park in Nineveh watered by screws which he had invented; 4) the Classical sources confuse Babylon with Nineveh. *Ergo*: The Hanging Garden was Sennacherib's palace garden in Nineveh. To assume the reliability of the Classical sources notwithstanding their (strongly differing!) descriptions of the Hanging Garden, and furthermore to consider the remaining information as corrupted, is a highly questionable method. The accounts of the Classical authors span a period between 400/500 and 600/700 years (according to Dalley between 600/700 and 1100/1200, as she identifies Philo with the so-called Paradoxographer) after the time of Nebuchadnezzar/Sennacherib, and they quote secondary or tertiary sources. Therefore, to discern

between real data, corrupted information and fantasy is a difficult task demanding a stringent methodology and much caution.

A central point in Dalley's thesis is her belief that the Hanging Garden was watered by means of Archimedean screws, as this is the only link to Sennacherib. Strabo and Philo, two men who lived between 600 and — according to Dalley — 1100 years after Sennacherib, do mention screws (Greek *kochlias*), but most probably because this was a usual water-lifting device at their time. Furthermore, nothing in Sennacherib's description of a new device for drawing water points to an Archimedean screw (CT 26, vii, 45–49 and further texts, A. M. Bagg, *op. cit.*, 203 with note 315 and text No 38 on pp. 339f.) or to the new method of casting (CT 26, vi, 89 — vii, 19 and further texts, A. M. Bagg, *op. cit.*, text No 41, pp. 342–344). The terms *gišmaḥḥu* and *alamittu* refer to the main parts or structure of the device, probably its pillars and crossbeam(s); the interpretation as the hollow cylinder and the helical part of a screw is mere speculation without any philological or technical basis, but it is necessary for the whole thesis. Dalley leaves aside that the inscription mentions chains and ropes that may allude to a kind of chain of buckets but are incompatible with a screw. Also, the device stood over wells, and it is not possible to draw water from a well with a screw (nor from a cistern, as Dalley translates *būru*). With the help of the reconstructed screws Dalley aims to prove that it was possible to build them in the 7<sup>th</sup> century BC. But, leaving aside that there is no evidence for screws in the cuneiform sources and that, at least up to Roman times, screws were made of wood, it is indeed possible to construct many objects using ancient techniques and the materials then available, but the objects did not necessarily exist in Antiquity. As Sennacherib did not invent the Archimedean screw, there is no link to the Hanging Garden, and Dalley's theory collapses (“All the arguments to be found in this book stem from the better understanding of an original Assyrian text”, p. 204).

Assyrian wall reliefs depicting gardens, especially the plate from Ashurbanipal's palace (BM 124939, fig. 14 on p. 52), have, in Dalley's view, many matches with the Classical accounts about the Hanging Garden (p. 54). The plate matches with the description of an Assyrian royal park (*kirimaḥḥu*) that we know from the written sources, but nothing points to a shape like a Greek theatre. The reconstruction drawings on pp. 148f. are conditioned by the assumed thesis and are not supported by the iconographic, written or archaeological evidence. Furthermore it is probable but not certain that the depicted garden was Sennacherib's palace garden in Nineveh. Still more hazardous is Dalley's proposal that the reliefs were accessible centuries after 612 BC. That Nineveh was not completely destroyed but survived as a minor settlement up to the Parthian period, is generally accepted. That centuries after an important destruction, Sennacherib's and Ashurbanipal's palaces and their reliefs were still accessible, in particular the room with the plate showing the irrigated garden in a good state of preservation, is improbable. Furthermore, if visitors in Antiquity saw the wall relief in Nineveh and identified the depicted garden with a garden no longer existing there, why would any of the Classical sources mention a Hanging Garden in Nineveh?

According to Dalley, no Hanging Garden was found in Babylon because this World Wonder never existed there. She does not consider that, like in the case of Babylon, no Hanging Garden has ever been found in Nineveh, and without the

written and iconographic evidence we would never have known about a royal garden in that city. The problem remains that Nebuchadnezzar's inscriptions do not mention any Hanging Garden, but the garden may not have been especially impressive or only a part of another structure mentioned in the texts or it may even have been built later in the Persian period (R. Bichler/R. Rollinger, *op. cit.*, 202–206). These are not definite but at least alternative explanations.

Another great problem of Dalley's thesis is the fact that all Classical sources locate the Hanging Garden in Babylon. If, as she postulates, reliable cuneiform sources as well as scholars who could read them, were still available when the Classical accounts were written, how is it possible that all sources without exception mention Babylon instead of Nineveh? Among all Classical accounts about the Hanging Garden Josephus is the least unreliable, as he quotes from Berossus, a priest of Marduk who lived in Babylon. He, too, locates the Hanging Garden in Babylon and attributes it to Nebuchadnezzar. This is a real crux for Dalley's argumentation, and she eliminates it by means of an ingenious magic trick: Berossus' reliability is not to be doubted, but Josephus used a corrupted version containing later additions. Furthermore, most of the Classical accounts refer to the Hanging Garden after having mentioned Babylon's city wall. Is it a mere coincidence that two World Wonders are mentioned side by side and in relation with the same city? If the location of the Hanging Garden in Babylon is wrong, why is the location of the city wall reliable? The construction of a monumental double city wall by Nebuchadnezzar is attested in his inscriptions. But also Sennacherib built a colossal city wall, which is attested in written and in archaeological sources... For a detailed refutation of Dalley's argumentation concerning the Classical sources, see R. Bichler/R. Rollinger, *op. cit.*

About the Assyrian palace gardens we are well informed from cuneiform and iconographic sources. If a garden did exist in Babylon as is mentioned in much later Classical sources, we do not know where it was located and what it looked like. In science there are no mysteries, but only yet unsolved problems, because the sources are few, difficult to interpret, fragmentary, contradictory, or of questionable reliability. New, even provocative ideas may open new ways and are always welcome, if they are compatible with the available data. The removal of the Hanging Garden from Babylon to Nineveh may appear as an ingenious solution, but it implies to contradict all available sources (R. Bichler/R. Rollinger, *op. cit.*, 206). The Hanging Garden of Babylon remains an unsolved problem, but only one among many, and certainly not the most relevant one.

Heidelberg, January 2014

Ariel M. BAGG

\*  
\* \*

JACOBS, B., und R. ROLLINGER (eds.) — Der Achämenidenhof / The Achaemenid Court. (Classica et Orientalia, Band 2). Verlag Otto Harrassowitz, Wiesbaden, 2010. (24,5 cm, XI, 941). ISBN 978-3-447-06159-9. ISSN 2190-3638. € 118,-.

The book under review is the result of an international colloquium held in Basel, May 2007, belonging to a series of colloquia on the topic “Vorderasien im Spannungsfeld

klassischer und altorientalischer Überlieferungen". Fortunately, the interaction between the studies of the ancient Near East and the classical world is gaining ground and the editors, Bruno Jacobs and Robert Rollinger, have done their part in promoting this work. The topic of this conference is the Achaemenid court, hence a topic concerning the Persian empire, a topic that only can be dealt with in cooperation of scholars from various fields and in this respect the editors are following the approach of the lifework of Heleen Sancisi-Weerdenburg, the *Achaemenid History Series*.

The volume is multi-disciplinary in many ways. There is attention for the topic of court culture in general, from Antiquity to the modern era (discussed by Jan Hirschbiegel: 'Hof. Zur Überzeitlichkeit eines zeitgebundenes Phänomens' (pp. 13-37) and 'Achämeniden und Burgunder. Bemerkungen am Rande' (pp. 913-924). Secondly the book contains contributions by scholars of many disciplines, such as Assyriology, classics, archaeology, Iranology and Old Testament studies. Not all contributions are interdisciplinary; the book contains many, though valuable, articles on specific topics and details. It has become a massive book (ix + 941 pp). There are articles on courts in antiquity (section I: Babylonia – M. Jursa; Assyria – G.B. Lanfranchi; Elam – D.T. Potts; Alexander's court — Alessandra Coppola. Three articles describe the court as seen from the outside world (section II: Herodotus – R. Bichler; Xenophon – C. Tuplin; the Old Testament – H.-P. Mathys). There is only one article on archaeology (section III: the Apadana – D. Huff). Six articles are devoted to the court life and court ceremonial (section IV: B. Jacobs, E. Kistler, Maria Brosius, C. Binder, A. Keaveney, J. Wiesehöfer). Four articles are written from the perspective of religion (A. de Jong), law (R. Rollinger on torture and bodily punishments, collecting an impressive amount of evidence from all kinds of sources) and taxation (W. Henkelman and C. Waerzeggers — see below; section V). Three articles concern the Achaemenid court as centre of power, especially related to the western regions (section VI. M. Waters on Samos, D. Kaplan on Daskyleion and Margaret C. Miller on gift exchange in the western satrapies). Section VII consists of two articles containing overall reflections on the topic. Amélie Kuhrt presents her 'concluding remarks' and Hirschbiegel reviews the volume with an eye on parallels and even reception of Persian models, as transmitted by classical sources, in the Burgundian court.

I do not intend to review the book in much detail, discussing every article, as this is not useful four years after the publication of the volume, and it has been done by David Engels in the easily accessible *Bryn Mawr Classical Review* 2011.03.39 (<http://bmcr.brynmawr.edu/2011/2011-03-39.html>). I shall discuss some topics on which I hope that I can contribute some thoughts and evidence.

The most massive article of the book is written by Wouter Henkelman, "Consumed before the King." The table of Darius, that of Irdabama and Irtašuna, and that of his satrap, Karkiš' (pp. 667-775). It is an extensive study on the taxation policy of the Persian kings, which entailed presents for the king and other high functionaries. The article presents a huge amount of evidence from the Persepolis Fortification tablets, not only from the published ones, but also from the c. 3000 unpublished tablets Henkelman is about to publish. The article presents a welcome expansion of the evidence that was available in Briant & Herrenschildt 1986, with contributions on the 'table of the King' by Briant and Sancisi-

Weerdenburg. Again, it is impossible for me to discuss all this evidence. I may refer only to a few conclusions which have relevance for the situation in the Seleucid empire.

In the first place the article presents evidence against the assumption that all land and resources were considered as royal (p. 700). The royal domain (*ulhi*) was a separate economic entity, yet closely related and overlapping with the Persepolis economy (p. 731; 733). The idea that all land in the East belonged to the king derives from the Marxian concept of the Asiatic Mode of Production, a model that still permeates modern textbooks on the ancient Near East, including the Seleucid empire; but for the Seleucid empire this concept is not valid as I have tried to argue on earlier occasions (Van der Spek 1986, 1993).

A second interesting observation concerns the position of the satrap. The word is usually taken to mean 'governor of a province, a satrapy'. That is correct in a sense but the meaning of the word is "guardian of the kingdom" and that allowed the satrap to wield executive power in the name of the King of Kings even beyond his province (p. 712, quoting earlier defenders of the idea, such as Briant, Stolper and Dandamaev (note 170)). The same may be true for the Seleucid empire where we see satraps and *stratēgoi* operating outside their assigned territory. The prime example is of course Antigonos, satrap of Phrygia (but who could also rely on his position as *stratēgos* of Asia), Patrokles, *stratēgos* of Babylonia, and the unnamed satrap of Babylonia in the time of Antiochus I, who before 274 was in Sardes (AD I -273B r34'). We have unfortunately no good evidence of the powers of these functionaries outside their territories, but the Persian example may improve our understanding of the position of the Hellenistic satraps (cf. Capdetrey 2007: 283-300). It reminds us also of the Roman concept of *provincia*, from which the English word 'province' is derived. The original meaning of the word, however, is the sphere of authority held by a magistrate. This could be the government of a province, but it might as well be another task, as for instance the task given to Pompey to combat the pirates in the 60s BC.

The third common phenomenon is the itinerant court (p. 713). Achaemenid residences Ecbatana, Persepolis, Susa and Babylon continued to host the Seleucid royal court on occasion (except probably Persepolis), to which the new cities, such as Seleucia on the Tigris, Seleucia on the Sea, Antioch on the Orontes, and a few older cities such as Sardes and Ephesus were added.

One of the most intriguing articles I find the one by Caroline Waerzeggers, 'Babylonians in Susa. The Travels of Babylonian Businessmen to Susa reconsidered' (pp. 777-813). In this article she first of all solved the wretched question whether the city of Susa, mentioned in many Babylonian cuneiform documents, refers to the capital of Elam and the Persian empire or to some community in Babylon, or alternatively to one of these dependent of the context. In my view she convincingly argues that all references refer to Susa, the capital in Elam. A very helpful and convenient conclusion indeed. It is to be noted that in the view of the western world at least (i.e. the Greek world and the world of the Hebrew Bible) Susa was *the* capital of the Persian empire. Persepolis is not mentioned at all before Alexander the Great. For the Hebrews and the Greeks the Persian court was at Susa.

Waerzeggers refers to two astronomical diaries from the Achaemenid period that mention Susa in an unequivocal way. AD I no. -366 A II 8 reports that in June 367 BC some-



one was appointed satrap [of Babylonia?] in Susa, apparently the Achaemenid capital. In AD I no. -346 r14 we read that in February 346 BC some prince entered Babylon and later left Babylon for Susa, again certainly the Achaemenid capital. The diaries from the Hellenistic and Parthian periods often mention Susa, and in all cases it certainly is Susa in Elam: AD -328, r27 (November 329, when Alexander the Great was in Bactria): the astronomer hears that some military commander (<sup>lú</sup>GAL *ki-sir*) goes from Susa (<sup>uru</sup>*Šu-šá-an*) to the land of ‘Ha[-ni?’ (= Macedonia?); AD -183A, r12: <sup>lú</sup>GAL ÉRIN<sup>mes</sup> *šá uruŠu-šá-an lúe-[lam]-mu-ú lúKÚR*, ‘the commander of Susa, the Elamite, the enemy’; AD -143A, 18 (2x), 19: <sup>uru</sup>MUŠ.ŠĒŠ<sup>ki</sup> (in connection with Elam); AD III no. -137A r7’ (Parthian period): [... *su]-ún<sup>2</sup>-qa<sup>2</sup> u SU.KÚ ina MUŠ.ŠĒŠ<sup>ki</sup> u URU<sup>mes</sup> šá KUR NIM.MA GAR-an*, ‘[... fa]mine and hunger occurred in Susa and the cities of Elam’ (August 138 BC); AD III -132D<sub>2</sub>: 9’: Elam and Susa mentioned together; AD III no. -124 B 19’: <sup>uru</sup>*Šu-šá-an ana li-mit NIM.MA<sup>ki</sup>*; AD III no. -90 r1-2: mentioning a general who departed from (*ina*) the other side of the Tigris (Ctesiphon?) to the surroundings of Susa (<sup>uru</sup>*Šu-šá-an*); high prices in Susa are noted, certainly all this relating to Susa in Elam.

In the second part of her article she discusses the phenomenon that from the reign of Darius I onwards members of the elite of various Babylonian cities visited Susa on a regular basis. These trips were part and parcel of Darius’ taxation policy. They had to present gifts to the king and one of the obligations was to provide food provision to the Elamite court, which, as I may add, may well have contributed to the souring prices of grain and other goods in the reign of Darius I (cf. Jursa *et al.* 2010: 443ff). The price rates were higher in Susa than in Babylonia (p. 798), and this should have triggered trade of Babylonian barley and other foodstuffs to Susa, but unfortunately there is no evidence for this (p. 807; see also Van der Spek, Van Leeuwen and Van Zanden 2014, esp. the contribution by M. Jursa). It is assumed that commercial trade of grain within Babylonia was profitable, but outside Babylonia difficult due to transport costs.

Another point of interest are the travel routes (p. 804). Waerzeggers provides evidence that the Nār-Kabari (Biblical Kebar) is part of the road to Susa. The passage she quotes from an astronomical diary from the early Parthian period (AD III no. -140C obv. 38) suggests that the Kebar canal came close to Seleucia on the Tigris. The passage concerns a military action against an Elamite attack in December 141 BC by a certain Antiochus, the chief general, who was appointed by the Parthian king Mithradates I after he had conquered Babylon a few months before. The passage runs as follows:

37. [<sup>U</sup><sub>4</sub><sup>2</sup> <sup>X</sup><sub>2</sub>] <sup>1</sup>An <sup>lú</sup>GAL.ÉRIN<sup>mes</sup> *šá ana muh-hi 4 lúGAL.ÉRIN<sup>mes</sup>-ú-tú šá ana ku-um <sup>1</sup>Ar-šá-ka-a LUGAL TA <sup>uru</sup>Se-l[u-ke-’a-a šá ana muh-hi]*

38. [<sup>id</sup>]IDIGNA *a-na IGI šá lúNIM.MA<sup>ki</sup> ana LÚ.NE È ina <sup>id</sup>Ka-ba-ri DUH u <sup>lú</sup>ÉRIN<sup>mes</sup> MEŠ-tú <sup>’x</sup>[, . . . . .]*

39. [*ana L*]Ú.NE È-ú <sup>lú</sup>UN<sup>mes</sup> *šá ina <sup>uru</sup>Se-lu-ke-’a-a u <sup>lú</sup>UN<sup>mes</sup> šá ina E<sup>ki</sup> TUŠ-u’ ú-nu-tú <sup>’x</sup>[, . . . . .]*

40. [*ina*] IGI *na-šú<sup>2</sup>-mu-ú šá lúNIM.MA<sup>ki</sup> i-na-ša-ru-ú*

37. [The X<sup>th</sup> day,?] Antiochus, the *stratēgos* who is in charge of four *stratēgoi*, who was representing king Arsakes (=Mithradates I), went out from Sel[eu]cia which is on the]

38. Tigris against the Elamite (= Kamnaskires I or II) for fighting;

from the river Kebar he departed and numerous troops [... ..]

39. [(for) fight]ing went<sup>pl</sup> out. The people who are in Seleucia and the people who dwell in

Babylon, safeguarded<sup>40</sup> the[ir] belongings [*and* . . . . .]

40. against<sup>2</sup> carrying them away<sup>2</sup> by the Elamite.

Waerzeggers interprets (quite logically actually) that the general “left Seleucia-on-the-Tigris for the river Nār-Kabari in order to fight an Elamite enemy”, but *ina* <sup>id</sup>*Ka-ba-ri* DUH rather means “from (*ina*) the river Kebar”, just as in line 35 of the same tablet the astronomer heard that the king and his troops departed from (*ina*) Hyrcania (*ina* <sup>uru</sup>*Ar-qa-ni-’a-a* DUH-*ár*). So it looks as if the Elamites came close to Seleucia via the Kebar and Antiochus advanced against them and that the Kebar had an extension north of Babylon. The Jews living on the borders of the Kebar (Ezekiel 1:1) may well have lived close to Babylon or even north of it.

These are only a few notes that gave me further thought. This book of nearly 1000 pages will give thoughts and information to many readers. It is thus recommended not only for its insights, but also for the presentation of new evidence.

VU University Amsterdam,  
May 2014

R.J. VAN DER SPEK

### Bibliography

- AD = SACHS, A. and HUNGER, H., *Astronomical Diaries and Related Texts from Babylonia*. 3 Volumes: I: 652-262 BC, Vienna 1988; II: 261-165 BC, Vienna 1989; III 164-61 BC, Vienna 1996.
- BRIANT, P. & HERRENSCHMIDT, Cl. eds. 1986, *Le tribut dans l’empire perse*. Paris.
- CAPDETREY, L. 2007, *Le pouvoir séleucide. Territoire, administration, finances d’un royaume hellénistique (312-129 av. J.-C.)*. Rennes.
- JURSA, M. *et al.* 2010, *Aspects of the economic history of Babylonia in the first millennium BC*. AOAT 377. Münster.
- VAN DER SPEK, R.J. 1986, *Grondbezit in het Seleucidische rijk*. Amsterdam.
- VAN DER SPEK, R.J. 1993, ‘New evidence on Seleucid Land Policy’, in: H. Sancisi-Weerdenburg *et al.* eds., *De Agricultura. In memoriam Pieter Willem de Neeve*. Amsterdam.
- VAN DER SPEK, R.J. Van Leeuwen, B. and Van Zanden, J.L. eds. 2014, *A History of Market Performance from Ancient Babylonia to the Modern World*. London.

### KORTE AANKONDIGINGEN

MAYER, W. — Assyrien und Urartu I. Der Achte Feldzug Sargons II. im Jahr 714 v. Chr. (Alter Orient und Altes Testament, 395/1). Ugarit Verlag, Münster, 2013. (25 cm, XV, 189). ISBN 978-3-86835-078-4. € 64,-.

MAYER, W. — Assyrien und Urartu II. Die assyrisch-urartäischen Bilinguen. (Alter Orient und Altes Testament, 395/2). Ugarit Verlag, Münster, 2013. (24,5 cm, XV, 156). ISBN 978-3-86835-091-3. € 58,-.

These two volumes give an edition of the famous “Eighth Campaign” of Sargon II of Assyria, against Urartu (714 B.C.), and of bilingual Urartean inscriptions.

Volume I first studies the text as a letter to the gods of Assyria; such letters may have been the basis of royal annals,

composed later (p. 6-9). In introductory chapters background information is given: the peoples in the region, the history of Urartu and its expansion before 720 B.C.; Sargon and his strategies against Urartu; the campaign itself (with an excursus on the extensive booty list). The second part is the edition of the text of 430 lines, with a German translation. Indexes of names and words (declined and conjugated forms) conclude the book.

The second volume edits the bilingual stelae found in the country of Muşaşir (Ardine; now Muğēsir) published over the years: the Kalleh-Šīn stela of king Išpuine, son of Sardure I (p. 11-47); those of king Rusā (Ursā), found in Topzawa, Movana and Mergeh Karvan (p. 49-108), with historical introductions and comments, mainly linguistic. Chapter 4 offers new observations on the grammar of the Neo-Assyrian used here and Urartean (p. 7 f., 109-119); an analytic glossary of the bilinguals follows. In five Appendixes short inscriptions in Neo-Assyrian and some royal decisions (in Urartean) are discussed.

\*  
\* \*

MacGINNIS, J., with copies of the cuneiform texts by C. WUNSCH — The Arrows of the Sun. Armed Forces in Sippar in the First Millennium B.C. (Babylonische Archive, Band 4). ISLET-Verlag, Dresden, 2012. (24,5 cm, VIII, 135). ISBN 978-3-9808466-5-3. € 40,-.

This first half of this book offers a full investigation of the organisation of the Neo-Babylonian army at Sippar; all references are given in extensive footnotes. Chapter II describes the contingents: infantry, i.e., the archers (mainly dependents, *širku*), the “bow fief”, their tasks (p. 3-11); the cavalry, the grooms (*šušānu*) and their “horse fief” (p. 12-15); the chariot crews, consisting of the *mār damqa*, *mukil appāti*, and *tašlišu*, the “chariot fief” (p. 15-19). The free citizens and the fiefs again (including the *bīt ritti*), the *ilku* and the (*m*)*urāšu* bowmen (p. 23-2). Chapters IV and V: the military officers and their hierarchy (31-37) (the *qīpu* is the overall commander of the forces in Sippar, p. 49). Chapter VII on mobilisation, campaigns, booty, prisoners from Egypt and other countries (p. 39-47).

The second half of the book offers full editions of 54 new texts from the British Museum and full indexes and the bibliography. — This book was reviewed by R. Pirngruber, OLZ 108 (2013) 92 f.