

## Citation style

Liu, Changyu: Rezension über: 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), S. 136-139, DOI: 10.21245/rec.ant.2038342633



## copyright

This article may be downloaded and/or used within the private copying exemption. Any further use without permission of the rights owner shall be subject to legal licences (§§ 44a-63a UrhG / German Copyright Act).

## 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 <sup>munus</sup>aš<sub>2</sub>-gar<sub>3</sub> gub, rather than <sup>munus</sup>ašgar ġin. For the term gub, see Steinkeller, *BSA* 8 p.54-55.

10:1 the sign is u<sub>8</sub> 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 ud<sub>5</sub> maš<sub>2</sub> nu-a instead of ud<sub>5</sub> maš<sub>2</sub> ZA, <sup>munus</sup>aš<sub>2</sub>-gar<sub>3</sub> ga instead of <sup>munus</sup>ašgar BI, maš<sub>2</sub> a dara<sub>4</sub> {MAŠ} and <sup>munus</sup>ašgar a dara<sub>4</sub> {MAŠ}.

21:8 probably read dara<sub>4</sub> nita<sub>2</sub> not udu nita<sub>2</sub>.

33:2 not u<sub>4</sub> 16-[k]am, but u<sub>4</sub> 15-k[am].

36:1 not read amar alim munus ga, but amar eme<sub>6</sub> ga.

37:1 not read alim, but lulim.

40:3 the sign is not ke<sub>4</sub>, but e.

40 missed the left edge: 5 udu.

47:1-3 not read si<sub>4</sub>-a, but gun<sub>3</sub>-a, see Steinkeller, *BSA* 8 p.55.

53:1 not read kir<sub>11</sub> gi, but kir<sub>11</sub> sig<sub>17</sub>. sig<sub>17</sub> means “yellow”, see Steinkeller, *BSA* 8 p.56.

57:7 probably read u<sub>8</sub>, 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 ša<sub>3</sub> Tum-ma-al, but ša<sub>3</sub> Tum-ma-al<sup>ki</sup>.

69:3 the unknown signs: NI.AN.BAR.AR, are probably read I<sub>3</sub>-lal<sub>3</sub>-lum.

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

75:3 not u<sub>4</sub> 3-kam, but u<sub>4</sub> 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 dara<sub>4</sub>-a, but there are three possibilities, a:dara<sub>4</sub>, gun<sub>3</sub>-a, and su<sub>4</sub>. It is

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

103:3 the first number is not 2 (ud<sub>5</sub>), but 4 (ud<sub>5</sub>).

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-ku<sub>3</sub>, 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-ku<sub>3</sub>!-zu (AMAR).

111:8 the second number is not 3 (maš<sub>2</sub>), but 5 (maš<sub>2</sub>).

112:4 the sign za is clear.

112:20 the first number is not 5 (gu<sub>2</sub>), but 9 (gu<sub>2</sub>). Also note that it is not the form 10-la<sub>2</sub>-1.

113:1 not read udu u<sub>2</sub>, but udu, without the sign u<sub>2</sub>.

114:1 not read udu u<sub>2</sub>, but udu.

115:I 5 not read udu niga, but udu u<sub>2</sub>.

115:II 16 not read maš<sub>2</sub>, but maš<sub>2</sub>-[gal u<sub>2</sub>], 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 u<sub>8</sub> u<sub>2</sub>, but u<sub>8</sub> niga. Following this, the line 12 should be [šu-niĝin<sub>2</sub> 2]+1 udu maš<sub>2</sub> niga hi-a, not [šu-niĝin<sub>2</sub> 1]+1 udu maš<sub>2</sub> niga hi-a; similarly the line 13 should be [šu-niĝin<sub>2</sub> 3]+1 udu u<sub>2</sub>, not [šu-niĝin<sub>2</sub> 4]+1 udu u<sub>2</sub>.

119:10 the sign DIĜIR is clear.

120:8 the sign is not min, but min<sub>3</sub>.

121 the first part has been destroyed, but according to the paralleled texts *PPAC* 4 122 and 287, the recovery is probably [38 udu maš<sub>2</sub> hi-a] / [2 maš-da<sub>3</sub>].

121:1' according to the paralleled texts *PPAC* 4 122 and 287, and weighing the space of the destroyed signs, the recovery is ki [U<sub>2</sub>-ta<sub>2</sub>-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 [u<sub>4</sub> -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<sup>d</sup>Nanna ba-huĝ.

187:13 lacking the sign u<sub>4</sub>, this is not niĝ<sub>2</sub>-ba nu<sub>2</sub>-a-k[a-ni], but niĝ<sub>2</sub>-ba u<sub>4</sub> nu<sub>2</sub>-a-k[a-ni].

187:16 lacking ba-zi in the end.

188:3 this line is not ki<sup>d</sup>En-lil<sub>2</sub>-la<sub>2</sub>-/ta, but ki Ab-ba-sa<sub>6</sub>-ga-/ta.

188:4 this line is not Ab-ba-sa<sub>6</sub>-ga / i<sub>3</sub>-dab<sub>5</sub>, but En-lil<sub>2</sub>-la<sub>2</sub> / i<sub>3</sub>-dab<sub>5</sub>. Line 3 and line 4 are reversals.

197:5 not read gu<sub>4</sub> a am ĝiš, but gu<sub>4</sub> a am ĝiš-du<sub>3</sub>.

- 205:1 following 2.48 udu niga, the transliteration missed 1 sila<sub>3</sub>-/ta.  
 205:3 following 2.57 udu niga, the transliteration missed 1 sila<sub>3</sub>-/ta.  
 208 the edge: 5 udu is clear.  
 211:4 the number is not 27, but 28.  
 240:12 the number is not 1 (sila<sub>4</sub>), but 2 (sila<sub>4</sub>).  
 243 following the first line: 1 udu 4 maš<sub>2</sub> [ ], lacked a line: Ku<sub>3</sub>-<sup>d</sup>Nanna.  
 266:II 6 the number is not 4, but 5.  
 267:IV' 1 it is not Gu<sub>2</sub>-ab-ba-gu-la, but Gu<sub>2</sub>-ab-ba-ki-gu-la, lacking a sign ki.  
 267:IV' 3 it is not Gu<sub>2</sub>-ab-ba-gu-la, but Gu<sub>2</sub>-ab-ba-ki-gu-la.  
 273:26' it is not maš<sub>2</sub>-nu-a, but maš<sub>2</sub>-nu<sub>2</sub>-a.  
 283:10 it should be 4 sila<sub>3</sub> Ur-<sup>d</sup>Nin-pirig, not A-bu-ni.  
 283:11 it should be 4 sila<sub>3</sub> A-bu-ni, not 4 sila<sub>3</sub> Ur-<sup>d</sup>Nin-pirig.  
 298:II 1 not read maš<sub>2</sub>-gal niga sig<sub>5</sub> us<sub>2</sub>, but maš<sub>2</sub>-gal niga 4-kam us<sub>2</sub>.  
 298:II 5 the number is not 61, but 1.  
 298:III 1 it is not Du<sub>6</sub>-ku<sub>2</sub>, but du<sub>6</sub>-ku<sub>3</sub>.  
 298:III 19 not read gu<sub>4</sub> niga, but gu<sub>4</sub> u<sub>2</sub>.

In addition, there are alternative understandings for three signs appearing in this volume: Eš<sub>4</sub> of Eš<sub>4</sub>-tar<sub>2</sub>, gukkan and ad<sub>2</sub> of <sup>d</sup>Nanše-ad<sub>2</sub>-ĝal<sub>2</sub> – Eš<sub>18</sub>, gukkal, and ul<sub>4</sub>, 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.