

Kitap Eleştirileri / Recensiones

Veenhof, K.R. – E. Klengel-Brandt, *Altassyrische Tontafeln aus Kültepe: Texte und Siegelabrollungen (Vorderasiatische Schriftdenkmäler der Staatlichen Museen zu Berlin, N.F., Heft 10 (Heft 26))*, Gebr. Mann Verlag, Berlin, 1992 (60 pp., 51 plates of mixed format), ISBN 3 7861 1668 7.

(Veysel Donbaz)

Despite the fact that the volume has appeared long ago (1992), my collations of some texts could be done only in the year 2000 during my visit to Berlin (the Assur Project's meeting) where I could collate only some of the texts hoping to return to the remaining ones in the following years. But, I could not realize my aim for some good reasons, therefore I decided to publish my first impressions now.

I would like to congratulate both of the authors open heartedly for their achievement of bringing out a volume like this. Still my comments will cover mainly the text edition part and not the seal impressions studied by Evelyn Klengel-Brandt.

In early 1977, I was at the Vorderasiatisches Museum of Berlin to collate some Middle Assyrian administrative texts published by Ebeling and Meissner. During my stay, I kindly asked to study and publish the Old Assyrian texts from the director Dr. Liane Jakob-Rost and assistant director Evelyn Klengel-Brandt. I was not given a positive answer since the texts had already been assigned to Klaas Veenhof. The volume under review is the fruit of the cooperation of Veenhof and Klengel-Brandt. Many years later, Evelyn Klengel-Brandt showed interest to the Middle Assyrian seals in Istanbul; it is a pity that her will could not be fulfilled due to administrative reasons. Reviews of VS 26 by the scholars have already found their way in a number of publications (see OAAS 1, p. 30 including hers in *Bibliotheca Orientalis* LII No 5/6, September-November 1995, pp. 722-727). Knowing that it is a belated review, I will mention a few remarks in the following.

Professor Veenhof has recently contributed many useful articles and books (the last of which is OBO 160/5, Teil 1 on Old Assyrian in general and he is keen in his views. As a leading specialist on the Old Assyrian, he was

undoubtedly expected to have brought up a broader study concerning these *ca.* 200 Cappadocian tablets, instead of presenting them in hand copies with a very brief information in the catalogue (pp.17-31). It is also very regrettable not to see any photographs apart from those (mainly fragments) which belong to the category of the seal impressions (Katalog Nos. 1-49) that Dr. Evelyn Klengel-Brandt studied. When one looks at the copies, most of them seem to have been finished in haste and one-handedly as if all of them were written by a single scribe. They look good but the way that Professor Veenhof presents them made the autographies small and illegible on the edges and especially on the left edges where normally the text comes to an end. We may also put the blame on the originals as well as on the scribes who were short of space and time to finish the texts and therefore wrote these special parts with smaller and insignificant signs. This tendency is very dominant in the copies. In them, one can observe that no serious distinction is made between the syllables *ku* and *ma* (Nos. 3, 2; 7, 3 are some examples to check). The copies are drawn in such a way that in a single short text one can find two or three different forms of an individual sign; or three signs are made exactly the same way as seen below. No. 141, 1 ff: i-nu-mì 50 TÚG 4) 2 TÚG šu-ri-en₆ 9) ŠU NIGIN 9 TÚG šu-ri-tum (the underlined signs are all alike). The other allusions are as follows:

- 1 lines 22.24-25: The DINGIR determinatives of the PN ^dIM lacks one diagonal, and the IM sign is not complete in line 24 and looks like *dí*.
- 2 2: Read Ir(?)*-ma-A-šur*. It is read Ir(im)-Aššur in page 37, but on the other hand see other attestations with the theophoric elements like -Ištar, -Aššur, and -Adad (TPAK 206, 11; 207,3; 213, 5; ATHE 47B, 1; A, 1). With regards to form, this it can be read as Šál(?)*-ma-A-šur* (see No.148, [25]) and No.3,5 cannot simply be *-ir* (one sees one separation sign after *-ir*). 6: One vertical wedge (word divider) is missing in between the two words.
- 3 5: Here the PN cannot simply be Ir(?)*-ma-Ašur* which we alluded to above. However see an explicit *-ir* sign in the photograph catalogue (Kat.No. 33, 1) which has at least 5 verticals crossing over the two diagonals.
6: Read Šu₁-ma-li-[ib]-bi-i-lí. 19: Read Šu₁-ma-li-bi₄-i-lí-[a] the traces of an *a* can be seen on the edge. 24: a-na.....-tim li²-il₅-qé ; 25:.....[lu]-bi₄-il₅-ma.
- 7 5: PN *ú-ub-lu*: the sign *ú* is all right, the tablet has a clear *ú* sign. 6: Try KÜ.B ša Pu[zur₄-]. 8: In the copy of TÚG sign before the break the last vertical is missing which is complete on the original.

- 000 22: While reading the name LUGAL-^dIM the author prefers a phonetic value as Šarrum-^dAdad, which, I believe, has to be read as Šarr(a)-Adad on the basis of the examples presented below: *Prague* I 558,4 it is written phonetically as Ša-ru-um-^dAdad and LUGAL-ke-en₆ / LUGAL-GI[?].NA are read so Šarrum-Adad and Šarrum-kēn in I 677,21; I 662,4 respectively. But LUGAL-Sú-en₆ (I 442,26.44; I 507,20; kt n/k 87,31; 97,11) are preferably read Šarra-Su'en against the reading Šarrum-kēn and Šarrum-Adad. See also some phonetically written spelling of the logogram LUGAL: Ša-ru-^dIM (*TC* III 78, 24); Ša-ra-at-Ištar (*BIN* IV 88, 2); Ša-ra-bu-nu-wa (*KKS* 31A, 18; B.5; I 657,7); Ša-ri-i-lí (kt n/k 98.3.5.16; and *vice versa* DINGIR-LUGAL=Illum/Ili-šar (Kt n/k 1925 mentioned by Veenhof, *OALE*, 44) and Nu-bar-LUGAL (kt c/k 440,40) is written as Nu-bar-ša-ri in the same text (kt c/k 440,20) and Šar-ra-ma-te-en₆ (*VS* 26, 43, rev.7') which is read as Šarra-mat by the author himself (page 41) simply prove that the name should be read as Šarr(a)-Adad (see also Albayrak, *KT* IV No.34, 3.5). 25: Add a -ta in between ku- and -nu / ku-ta-nu. 27: Add one vertical to the sign -ta in the word *kutānu*. 15 and 39 and 29,3: Read Ili-ālum (see also Donbaz, *NABU* 1991/9).
- 15B 11: The first sign is not properly drawn. 12: The proposed reading Aj-amši-ilī for A-a-am-šī-il₅ is not very attractive. Aya-amšil would have been appropriate see PN Amšil (*CCT* IV 18b, 19). Otherwise the names ending with -il₅ we should have read so (e.g. Ēnu-gāmil (I 770,7); Aššur-muttabbil (No.7, [1] Iš-me-li-il₅ (Albayrak, *KT* IV who reads it Išme-<En>-lil. The name Enlil is always written logographically ^dEN.LÍL); DINGIR^{lim}-ga-mì-il₅ (*KT* IV, 23, 910). It can be argued in the names Ha-at-tù-šī-il₅ (*OIP* 27, 14, 4.9; Ha-za-mì-il₅ (*FAOS* I 34,2,8); Dan-na-i-il₅ (*BIN* IV 19, 37).
- 33 4: [ù] a-bu-ki[?] The last sign is problematic. 8: Following the erased -mur, there is a word divider not to be circulated as unnecessary. 10': The iš- sign is not clearly visible, the copy is partly shaded.
- 0A 1:The *i* sign is partly visible.The third sign -be is also clearly seen on the original.
- 46 2: qí[?]-bi-ma: The first sign is written over erasure. As it stands it looks like an explicit qá-. Copy shows no sign of erasure dotting.
- 56 2: Restore Sú-e-<a>-ma -a was skipped out. 39: The last sign of té-er-ta-[kà] is not there. 41: The last two signs do not exist, they should be deleted.

- 65 5: Restore 1 ma-na [n GÍN] KÛ.GI. The erased part has enough space for a fraction of weight in shekels. Lines 12 and 24: i-da-na-kum[?] and aš-pu-ra-kum[?]. In neither of these the sign *-kum* is proper. In the first one it fails two verticals and added two more fish-tails to the middle part and the latter finishes with four fish-tails as it does with the first one instead of two each. This is due to the fact that the scribe somehow got mixed up since there is a proper *-kum* sign in the expression lá ih-ta-lá-qum (l.14).
- 68 14: If we are looking for a PN try Ú(?) -šur-<ša>-Ištar (No.77,5). Note that the left edge is inscribed unusually against the traditional way.
- 69 21: Add an *-a* to the PN I-na-<a> (see *Innāya* 169, 21 it is complete). Besides, there are a few differences between the copy and the transliteration of Cécil Michel e.g. 34: A half preserved *-[m]a*, and *-ší* (35) are missing in the copy, and in line 40 following [x x]-áb-ší-šu (perhaps *litabšišu*) three signs do not correspond to each other's readings and the left edge is very illegible though it is better preserved in Michel's transliteration.
- 72 1: The first sign of the name is not clear from the copy but the second name is A-mur-Ištar-ma. The *-šu* sign at the end should be deleted.
5: The tablet shows Šu(?)^[d] Na-war. The second sign cannot be seen.
7: The *-mu* sign in ni-ig-mu(?) -ur is drawn like ŠEŠ in spite of it is being an explicit *-mu* as seen on the tablet.
- 73 12: [IG]I is not fully seen, only the horizontal exists.
- 74 5: The circled sign is the overrunning from the 4th line and perhaps is a *-[šu]*. 41: The first two signs are not seen on the original, so this should be corrected as [lu r]a-qá-tim.
- 81 4: The traces of the first sign is not *-da*, but rather *-[nim/num]*.
- 88 1: Remaining of *[-n]a* is partially seen and confirms the copy. 3: read [KIŠ]IB delete [ú] (see photo Kat.No.5).
- 91A 1: Add *-na* to the PN E-dí-<na>-a . 3: Read [Šu-L]á-ba-an DUMU Dan-í-li and delete Elāli this PN does not occur in this text. The first sign is a definitive *dan* and the following one is *ì-* is clear also from the photo (see Kat. No.8, 9) and author's copy (see also *CCT* V, 24b, 11; *Kayseri* 22,13; *Innāya*, 202 and 186).

- 95A 9: Delete *-ir*, correct *-ni* in *i-ša-qú-lu-ni*?. 11: *i-lá-ak-š[um]* against the tablet (95B,16 *i-lá-ak-tum*!).
- 96B 3: The *be-* signs are a problem in the name Šalim-Bēli (lines 3 and 11) the second sign of the PN is a compound writing neither *-lim* nor *-be*.
- 100 21.22.23: It seems that the scribe of this text was an apprentice, for he uses unusual terminology: *ba-al* / *be-al* instead of *be-el* which is imperative in *bēl hubullišu* “his creditor” and *bēl tusinnim* “a governmental body” who are on his side together with his brother.
- 101 3: *a-šu-mi* the sign certainly was not meant for the logogram É, but it should be accepted for É, but it looks as though it has been specially broadened to make it look like É[?]. 6’: Read 1 *ma-na* 16 GÍN delete 15. 7’: Read *Ha-šu-i* (CCT VI 34a, rev.5’; Kt 87/k 266,1 GÚDA “priest”) add it to the index. 13’: Read IGI [Ší]-li-[a] (BIN IV 146, 3; I 544, 3).
- 103 rev.5’: Read IGI [Šu]-nu-nu DUB.SAR and add the name to the index.
- 109 1.4.10: Read Šarnikan all through instead of Šarnigat and Šarniga (KKS 534, 1, [17]; Kt 87/k 285,7.8.17.19;253,6. 8 ;312, 2. 16 (Hecker, *ArAn* 3, (1997) 168. 170. 171).
- 110B Add lines 19-21 to the tablet which were left out in the copy. (19) *Ha-hu-um i-dí-ni-a-tí-ma* (20) IGI *pá-at-ri-im* (21) *ša A-šur ší-bu-tí-ni*.
- 111 4’: Read *lu-qú-tam-šu-nu* and delete Šu-Nu-[nu] (see No.103,5 above).
- 115 9: ^dEN.LÍL-*ba-ni*. Delete the word divider between DINGIR and EN signs (see line 14)
- 125 8’: Complete the PN as *Wa-al-[hi-iš-na]*(Kt n/k 2100, 2.5); 10’: Read *Ha-a[l-ki₅-a-šu]* (Kt y/t 4,3 both of the references can be seen in *CIRRAI* 34, 416-417) and delete 124,10’; 14’: read *mì-iš-lim* G[IG ...] (see 122,2.4); 18’: complete *Iš-[me-lim]* father of Aššur-nādā, add the occurrence to the index.
- 149 13: Try É *I-šar[?]-Sú-en₆*

154 3: Although this line is erased, the remains of the sign reveal [25] GÚ 50 ma-na. 13: Add *-ma* to <ma>-na. This text can be compared to CCT VI 34a which is a list of the people receiving copper, among whom an anonymous *rubātum* and *rubā'um* are mentioned to have received copper (3.5 ; rev. 3'.4'. 7: Read 34 ½ ma-na delete 35).

157 The text, though very fragmentary, offers other precious items to be mentioned than TÚG *kabdān* (6') . . .]ša NA₄.ZA.GÌN(3'); 1 ma-na AN.NA ([4'].-7'); *kutānum* (4'.6') ; 2 ANŠE (7') ; 9 TÚG šu-ru-[tum] (see No.141, 9). Line numbering begins from (l.e. 1).

196 The text can be improved further, which records some bundles of straw due to individuals.

- Obv. 1) 4[?] GÚ hu-tum
 2) 70 ku-lu-pí-ni[m]
 3) ša tí-ib-nim
 4) ša Ku-zi-zi
 5) DUMU Hu-ma-da-[šu]
 6) ha-bu-lam
 7-9) are illegible
 10) 30[?] Zu-šál- x
 11) ša tí-ib-nim
 12) ša Lu-x x x
 13) ú Ša-da-num
 14) DUMU Ša-ru-zi-ma
 15) 7[?]..... Ha-nu
 16) DUMU..... -za-zu
 17) IGI Šu-Ištar
 l.e. 18) DUMU A-hu-qa[r]

This transliteration can be improved too, but, nevertheless it points out to the necessity that some of the PNs should be added to the index: Humada[šu] father of Kuzizi (196,4-5; partially seen in No.33,3 and frequently attested from 1-b texts (Kt 87/k 253,6 etc.); Hanu(15), and Ahu-(w)aqar(18) attested many times here (see the indeks p.33). Delete the PNs Tí-ba/ma-da and Ahunum from the index.

Notwithstanding these remarks, we have to thank to Professor Veenhof for his extraordinary efforts for bringing out a nice volume at this format and size, from which we have greatly benefited. I personally believe that our suggestions and minor corrections will add positively to its value.

Asurolog Veysel Donbaz (Emekli Müze Uzmanı)
Ferit Selimpaşa Caddesi
Güzide Hanım Sk. 7/12
Bahçelievler, İstanbul / Türkiye

Bibliography and Abbreviations

- BIN IV Clay, A.T., *Letters and Transactions from Cappadocia, Babylonian Inscriptions in the Collection of J.B.Nies* Part 4, New Havens, 1927.
- CCT IV Smith, S., *Cuneiform Texts from Cappadocian Tablets in the British Museum* Part 4, London, 1927.
- CCT V Smith, S. – D. J.Wiseman, *Cuneiform Texts from Cappadocian Tablets In the British Museum*, Part 5, London, 1956.
- CCT VI Garelli, P. – D. Collon, *Cuneiform Texts from Cappadocian Tablets in the British Museum*, Part 6, London, 1975.
- CIRRAI 34 Erkanal, H. – V. Donbaz – A. Uğuroğlu (eds.), *XXXIV Uluslararası Assirioloji Kongresi*, (İstanbul 1987), TTKY XXVI/3, Ankara, 1998.
- FAOS 1 Kienast, B., *Das altassyrische Kaufvertragsrecht, Freiburger altorientalische Studien Beihefte Bd 1*, K. Hecker – B. Kienast (eds.), Wiesbaden /Stuttgart, 1984.
- Innāya Michel, C., *Innāya dans les tablettes paléo-assyriennes I-II*, Paris, 1991.
- KT IV Albayrak, İ., *Kültepe Tabletleri IV*, TTKY VI. Dizi Sayı 33^b, Ankara, 2006.
- KKS Matouš, L. – M. Matoušavá-Rajmová, *Kappodokische Keilschrifttafeln mit Siegeln aus der Sammlung der Karlsuniversität in Prag*, Prag, 1984.
- NABU *Nouvelles assyriologiques brèves et utilitaires*, Société pour l'étude du Proche-Orient Ancien, Paris, 1991.
- OAAS 1 Michel, C., *Old Assyrian Bibliography of Cuneiform Texts, Bullae, Seals and the Results of the Excavations at Aššur, Kültepe/Kaniš, Acemhöyük, Alişar and Boğazköy*, OASS 1, Leiden, 2003.
- OALE Veenhof, K.R., *The Old Assyrian List of Year Eponyms from Karum Kanish and its Chronological Implications*, TTKY VI/64, Ankara, 2002.
- OBO Veenhof, K.R., Teil 1, *Mesopotamia, The Old Assyrian Period* (pp.1-264, Teil 2, Jesper Eidem, *Apum: A Kingdom on the Old Assyrian Route* (pp.265-382), Academic Press Fribourg, 2008.
- OIP 27 Gelb, I.J., *Inscriptions from Alişar and Vicinity*, Chicago, 1935.
- TC III Lewy, J., *Tablettes cappadociennes du Louvre*, Paris, 1935-1937.
- TPAK 1 Michel, C. – P. Garelli, *Tablettes paléo-assyriennes de Kültepe*, Vol. 1, Paris, 1997.