

Zitierhinweis

Liu, Changyu: review of: Tohru Ozaki / Marcel Sigrist, Tablets in Jerusalem. Sainte-Anne and Sainte-Étienne, Changchun: Inst. for the History of Ancient Civilizations, 2010, in: Journal of Ancient Civilizations, 28 (2013), p. 136-139, DOI: 10.21245/rec.ant.2038342633



copyright

Dieser Beitrag kann vom Nutzer zu eigenen nicht-kommerziellen Zwecken heruntergeladen und/oder ausgedruckt werden. Darüber hinausgehende Nutzungen sind ohne weitere Genehmigung der Rechteinhaber nur im Rahmen der gesetzlichen Schrankenbestimmungen (§§ 44a-63a UrhG) zulässig.

BOOK REVIEWS

Review article: OZAKI Tohru and SIGRIST Marcel. 2010. *Tablets in Jerusalem: Sainte-Anne and Saint-Étienne. (Periodic Publications on Ancient Civilizations, No. 4).* Changchun: IHAC. ISSI 1004-9371, CN 22-1213/K, Pp. 164+70 plates, \$50 (hardcover).

Reviewed by Changyu Liu, Seminar für Sprachen und Kulturen des Vorderen Orients – Assyriologie, Ruprecht-Karls-Universität Heidelberg (assyrialiu@yahoo.com).

The volume under review, written by Tohru Ozaki (formerly Gomi) and Marcel Sigrist, contains 298 texts, almost all of which originate from three main provenances of the Ur III Dynasty: Lagaš, Umma and Puzriš-Dagan. In general, the tablets provide lists of livestock and goods being disbursed, transferred and accepted in and out of re-distribution centers. Among them, 245 texts were received by Pères Blancs de Sainte-Anne in Jerusalem from Iraq at the beginning of the last century, 19 of which were later bought by the Musée biblique of Louvain; and 53 texts were acquired by the Ecole Biblique et Archéologique Française under Saint-Étienne.

The texts of Sainte-Anne were published by Edouard Dhorme in *RA* 9, 39–63 (1912), and the texts of Saint-Étienne were catalogued by Alan R. Millard in the *Revue Biblique* 92, 570–576 (1985).

According to my own private correspondence with T. Ozaki in 2010, M. Sigrist produced the beautiful hand-copies of these tablets over a number of years, while Ozaki read them, adding short comments and providing the indices.

The book consists of twelve segments: 1) a “Preface”, in which the authors illustrate the history of the cuneiform tablets stored at both Sainte-Anne and Saint-Étienne; 2) a “Table of Contents”; 3) a “Catalogue of Texts”; 4) a “Classification of Texts According to their Provenance”; 5) “Month Names and Year Formulae”; 6) a “Chronological List”; 7) a “Catalogue of Seal Inscriptions”; 8) a “Concordance of Museum Numbers”; 9) a “List of Texts Already Published”, which lists 41 formerly published texts; 10) the “Texts Nos. 1–298” which contains the primary content of this volume including transliterations for each text, provision of sources previously published, and similar content (including some references, interpretations and even deductions for questionable or rarely-used proper names); 11) the “Indices” which contain the Names of Deities and Deified Kings, Personal Names, Geographical Names, and Selected Words and Phrases; 12) the “Copies of the Texts Nos. 1–298” which provides copies of

almost every cuneiform tablet included in this volume.

Before it was published, I had the opportunity to check the manuscript for minor spelling errors and the super/subscripts of several Sumerian words. Much indebted to the photographs provided by *CDLI*, I have been able to reread the copies and transliterations in this volume and find a number of small possible inaccuracies or ambiguities. The following are comments and suggested alternative readings to the volume:

8:3 would be better written as ^{munus}aš₂-gar₃ gub, rather than ^{munus}ašgar ġin. For the term gub, see Steinkeller, *BSA* 8 p.54-55.

10:1 the sign is u₈ not udu.

20:1-4 the ending signs of each line: ZA, BI, MAŠ, MAŠ, appeared incomprehensibly and without any other parallels. There may be three possible explanations for these anomalies: 1) the tablet is fake; 2) these four signs have specific meanings, which are currently unknown; 3) the scribe made errors in the writing, and the probable suggested alternative readings are ud₅ maš₂ nu-a instead of ud₅ maš₂ ZA, ^{munus}aš₂-gar₃ ga instead of ^{munus}ašgar BI, maš₂ a dara₄ {MAŠ} and ^{munus}ašgar a dara₄ {MAŠ}.

21:8 probably read dara₄ nita₂ not udu nita₂.

33:2 not u₄ 16-[k]am, but u₄ 15-k[am].

36:1 not read amar alim munus ga, but amar eme₆ ga.

37:1 not read alim, but lulim.

40:3 the sign is not ke₄, but e.

40 missed the left edge: 5 udu.

47:1-3 not read si₄-a, but gun₃-a, see Steinkeller, *BSA* 8 p.55.

53:1 not read kir₁₁ gi, but kir₁₁ sig₁₇. sig₁₇ means “yellow”, see Steinkeller, *BSA* 8 p.56.

57:7 probably read u₈, not udu.

59 the date is certain in AS 4, not AS 9. For the discussion for AS 4, see Wu, *CDLN* 2010:001.

62:5 not ša₃ Tum-ma-al, but ša₃ Tum-ma-al^{ki}.

69:3 the unknown signs: NI.AN.BAR.AR, are probably read I₃-lal₃-lum.

74:3 not read ša₃ mu-DU-ta, but ša₃ mu-DU-ra-ta. For this discussion, see Hilgert, *OIP* 121 p.20-21.

75:3 not u₄ 3-kam, but u₄ 6-kam.

91 the edge should be 3.46, not 3.56.

93:4 for this PN: Na-me-ir-ilum, not referring to the popular PN: Na-wi-ir-ilum, I guess that the scribe possibly made mistakes and carelessly wrote the sign ME instead of WI. Another instance of Na-me-ir-ilum, see *Mes* 12 95 E.

95:6 not dara₄-a, but there are three possibilities, a:dara₄, gun₃-a, and su₄. It is

unclear if the last sign is “a” or not.

103:3 the first number is not 2 (ud₅), but 4 (ud₅).

103:7' the number is probably not 1, but 2.

106:1 the number is not 1.32;0.0, but 2.32;0.0.

106:3 the PN is not Lugal-amar-ku₃, as the final sign is surely zu; the middle sign seems to be amar. As there is no available parallel for PN Lugal-amar-zu, I propose the PN may be Lugal-ku₃!-zu (AMAR).

111:8 the second number is not 3 (maš₂), but 5 (maš₂).

112:4 the sign za is clear.

112:20 the first number is not 5 (gu₂), but 9 (gu₂). Also note that it is not the form 10-la₂-1.

113:1 not read udu u₂, but udu, without the sign u₂.

114:1 not read udu u₂, but udu.

115:I 5 not read udu niga, but udu u₂.

115:II 16 not read maš₂, but maš₂-[gal u₂], by recounting the types of animals.

115:IV 10 following this line, one line is missing: 4 udu, which is a sum.

116:6 not read u₈ u₂, but u₈ niga. Following this, the line 12 should be [šu-niĝin₂ 2]+1 udu maš₂ niga hi-a, not [šu-niĝin₂ 1]+1 udu maš₂ niga hi-a; similarly the line 13 should be [šu-niĝin₂ 3]+1 udu u₂, not [šu-niĝin₂ 4]+1 udu u₂.

119:10 the sign DIĜIR is clear.

120:8 the sign is not min, but min₃.

121 the first part has been destroyed, but according to the paralleled texts *PPAC* 4 122 and 287, the recovery is probably [38 udu maš₂ hi-a] / [2 maš-da₃].

121:1' according to the paralleled texts *PPAC* 4 122 and 287, and weighing the space of the destroyed signs, the recovery is ki [U₂-ta₂-mi-šar-r]a-am-ta, rather than ki [Tu-r]a-am-ta.

122:7 according to the paralleled texts *PPAC* 4 121 and 287, the recovery is not [u₄ -kam] but [kišib Ba-ba-ti].

146:4 not read šu ba-ti, but šu ba-an-ti.

159:23 the year name is not mu En-mah-gal-an-na / en An-na ba-huĝ, but mu En-mah-gal-an-na / en^dNanna ba-huĝ.

187:13 lacking the sign u₄, this is not niĝ₂-ba nu₂-a-k[a-ni], but niĝ₂-ba u₄ nu₂-a-k[a-ni].

187:16 lacking ba-zi in the end.

188:3 this line is not ki^dEn-lil₂-la₂-/ta, but ki Ab-ba-sa₆-ga-/ta.

188:4 this line is not Ab-ba-sa₆-ga / i₃-dab₅, but En-lil₂-la₂ / i₃-dab₅. Line 3 and line 4 are reversals.

197:5 not read gu₄ a am ĝiš, but gu₄ a am ĝiš-du₃.

- 205:1 following 2.48 udu niga, the transliteration missed 1 sila₃-/ta.
 205:3 following 2.57 udu niga, the transliteration missed 1 sila₃-/ta.
 208 the edge: 5 udu is clear.
 211:4 the number is not 27, but 28.
 240:12 the number is not 1 (sila₄), but 2 (sila₄).
 243 following the first line: 1 udu 4 maš₂ [], lacked a line: Ku₃-^dNanna.
 266:II 6 the number is not 4, but 5.
 267:IV' 1 it is not Gu₂-ab-ba-gu-la, but Gu₂-ab-ba-ki-gu-la, lacking a sign ki.
 267:IV' 3 it is not Gu₂-ab-ba-gu-la, but Gu₂-ab-ba-ki-gu-la.
 273:26' it is not maš₂-nu-a, but maš₂-nu₂-a.
 283:10 it should be 4 sila₃ Ur-^dNin-pirig, not A-bu-ni.
 283:11 it should be 4 sila₃ A-bu-ni, not 4 sila₃ Ur-^dNin-pirig.
 298:II 1 not read maš₂-gal niga sig₅ us₂, but maš₂-gal niga 4-kam us₂.
 298:II 5 the number is not 61, but 1.
 298:III 1 it is not Du₆-ku₂, but du₆-ku₃.
 298:III 19 not read gu₄ niga, but gu₄ u₂.

In addition, there are alternative understandings for three signs appearing in this volume: Eš₄ of Eš₄-tar₂, gukkan and ad₂ of ^dNanše-ad₂-ĝal₂ – Eš₁₈, gukkal, and ul₄, respectively, following Hilgert, *OIP* 121.

By and large, this volume is excellent and forms an extraordinarily significant contribution to the study of the administrative and economic activities of the Ur III Dynasty. For instance, it added to the existing corpus of primary materials used for the study of the administrative records issued by Šulgi-iriĝu, who dealt exclusively with dead animals, and by Aba-saga and Intaea the principle officials of the “central bureau” of the Puzriš-Dagan organization, and so forth, which allows us to better understand the internal structure and the administrative activities of the Puzriš-Dagan organization.

I must once more take the opportunity to commend both authors, Tohru Ozaki and Marcel Sigris, whose untiring efforts in making cuneiform texts available for study have transformed scholarship on the Ur III period. Amazingly, in only a few decades, they have provided nearly one half of all our sources for Ur III history through their indefatigable work in copying and transliterating cuneiform tablets in museums or libraries. Their ongoing dedication remains an inspiration to us all.