

folgendes verwiesen sein: 1. é-gal ist auch die Bezeichnung für drei 'Tempel' des Staatsgottes Ningirsu-k, die vermutlich vom Stadtfürsten direkt verwaltet wurden. 2. Es gab ohne Zweifel in kleinerem Umfang auch 'Privateigentum' an Immobilien. 3. Die dazu gehörenden kleineren Individualhaushalte – sie sind sicher mit der Elite des Staates, wie z. B. einem gewissen Me'anesi zu verbinden – gefährden und sprengen tendenziell die „Tempelstaat-Ökonomie“. 4. Aller Wahrscheinlichkeit nach besaß die allgemein unterstellte Trennung von „säkularen“ und „religiösen“ Institutionen in der ausgehenden frühdynastischen Zeit eine weitaus geringere Bedeutung.

Visicato (und Pomponio) ergänzen die in diesem Bande gemachten Beobachtungen, die auf eine große Bedeutung der „Tempelhaushalte“ in Fara hinweisen, durch den Verweis auf ihre früheren Untersuchungen zur Funktion des é-gal, welche sich mit dem „northern centralized type“, d. h. der nördlichen „Palastwirtschaft“, in Übereinstimmung zeigten. Demnach wären in Fara „both northern and southern features“ zu beobachten. Der springende Punkt scheint Rez. allerdings darin zu bestehen, daß sich in Girsu und wohl bereits in Fara der Herrscher mehr und mehr aus seiner Rolle als „Priesterkönig“ bzw. als Verkörperung einer (männlichen) Stadtgottheit löst. Dies geschieht möglicher Weise unter dem Einfluß „nördlicher“ Palast-orientierter Konzepte, hat aber gewiß auch Wurzeln im Management der männlichen Arbeitskräfte für allfällige Gemeinschaftsarbeiten (Bau- und Kanalarbeiten, Krieg) und im Entstehen individuellen wirtschaftlichen Einflusses. Wenn Visicato abschließend, im Anschluß an H. Nissen, auf die wohl unterschätzte Bedeutung kooperativer Strukturen in der ausgehenden frühdynastischen Zeit hinweist, dann stimmt Rez. vollinhaltlich zu. Aber das ist ein anderes Thema.

Den knappen Indizes folgt als Appendix eine Prosopographie der Fara-Kaufverträge (es sind über 100 Verkäufer und 35 Käufer bezeugt!) von G. Visicato. So groß der Nutzen prosopographischer Forschung für die Interpretation des Urkunden-Materials auch ist, so schwierig (und selten) sind entsprechende Arbeiten; vgl. hier aber F. Pomponio, *La prosopografia dei testi Presargonici di Fara, Studi Semitici N. S.* 3, Roma 1987. G. Visicato hat damit für eine besonders wichtige Textgattung im Fara-Material ein nützliches Werkzeug bereit gestellt. Abgeschlossen wird der Band durch hilfreiche, aber nicht besonders gute Photographien der edierten Dokumente.

Bei der Benutzung des Buches hat Rez. gelegentlich bemerkt, daß die Querverweise nicht korrekt sind. Vermutlich ist dies dem Layout-Prozeß des Buches geschuldet, jedoch schmälern solche Details den Gesamteindruck nicht: Bei diesem Werk handelt es sich um eine mustergültige, modernsten Standards genügende Edition eines vor allem wirtschaftsgeschichtlich

besonders wichtigen Teilkorpus. Mit dem fortschreitenden Verständnis der Fara- und Girsu-Urkunden wird es möglich werden, die geläufigen Modelle der frühen wirtschaftsgeschichtlichen Entwicklung entscheidend zu modifizieren.

Wien.

Gebhard J. Selz.

**Tohru Ozaki and Marcel Sigrist**, *Ur III Administrative Tablets from the British Museum 1-2*. 542 + 316 pp. Madrid, Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 2006 (= *Biblioteca del Próximo Oriente Antiquo* 1-2). Bd. 1: \$ 75,-, Bd. 2: \$ 99,-.

Without the prolific production of our two authors Ozaki and Sigrist, the field of Assyriology would be, by my unofficial count, 22,582 sources poorer in its investigation in particular of the social history of the Ur III period. The 2670 British Museum tablets published here for the first time (2687 entries less 17 published previously, and including 16 collated texts that were not numbered in the present publication) thus represent but a fraction of our mounting debt to these two men, though one we very gratefully acknowledge. The authors state in their preface to vol. 1 (p. 9) that “the British Museum probably houses the largest number of cuneiform tablets in the world,” although we would be hard pressed to name a candidate collection that can possibly rival that of the BM. Of the approximately ten million objects in this museum (Jonathan Taylor, “Ashurbanipal’s Library as a Model for Cultural Heritage Management in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century”, <<http://static.cdli.ucla.edu/workshop/papers/taylor.html>>), we may place the minimum number of cuneiform inscriptions at 130,000, thus easily outpacing the other significant collections in Istanbul (impossible to estimate with conviction, but possibly ca. 75,000 tablets and fragments), Yale (ca. 40,000), Philadelphia (29,000) and Baghdad (ca. 20,000). It is possible that the cuneiform collection of the British Museum surpasses in numbers all other collections, public and private, together. It is therefore difficult to overestimate the importance of coming to grips with the breadth and depth of this collection, and of caring for the timely capture, dissemination and annotation of the large numbers of unpublished texts in the BM.

The transliterations in these volumes are to be lauded for their attention to conventions, including a highly standardized treatment of numerical notation. It remains very frustrating for specialists working on some large collection of Ur III texts, however, to become involved with terminology and accounting computations only to run against the wall of transliterations with no visual data. The solution to this

problem, where editors for understandable reasons choose not to dedicate their short lives to the production of hand drawings, is obvious to everyone who has given the matter more than a passing thought. Make the production of digital images of the target group of texts a part of the publication process, and care for public access to these images as either a CD insert in the book cover, or preferably, in an online forum.

Some might object to the decision of the authors and their editor to split the indices of these 2700 texts in the two volumes, thus forcing the reader to consult both volumes separately when he searches for attestations of the proper nouns and selected lexical items that constitute the subject of the indices. But this is not different from the indexing of any other volume of Ur III texts. Two major web projects are working to consolidate all such indices into one address (the Los Angeles/Berlin project CDLI at <<http://cdli.ucla.edu/>> and the Madrid project BDTNS at <<http://bdts.filol.csic.es/>>), and the authors Ozaki and Sigrist are active participants in both of these projects. Once the field is assured that one or both of these projects have established permanent data accessibility for Ur III texts, publications such as BPOA 1-2 will necessarily lose much of their allure, with the exception of the always welcome commentaries to the individual texts. And frankly, in the final analysis these and subsequent volumes will always make a welcome addition to the specialist's weekend reading. How else will we ever confront each text, though a small player in the landscape of Ur III accounting systems, as a witness valuable in and of itself, if not in this form?

#### Notes on individual texts:

- 7 obv. 7': ba-ri<sub>2</sub>-ga-bi appears otherwise only attested in the concrete context of amounts of bitumen destined to caulk such containers (MVN 9, 18, calculating from two to three ban<sub>2</sub> esir<sub>2</sub> E<sub>2</sub>-A per wooden barig container, next to a ceramic pot for wine requiring 2 ban<sub>2</sub> of the same sort of bitumen; SAT 2, 29, is unclear).
- 14 n.: The proposed reading of gukkan instead of gukkal (add to the authors' references TLB 3, 50 rev. 7; UET 3, 1550, rev. 7) must obviously be taken with a grain of salt. The most reliable lexical source, Proto-Ea 255, gives the reading of ku-un-gal-la ([...]un-la), consonant with later lexical glosses and the Akkadian loan *gukkallum*. It is on the other hand the case that no 3<sup>rd</sup> millennium reference known to me confirms an l Auslaut of the word for "fat-tailed sheep," so that it would be wise to use the neutral term GUKKAL(n) until lexical evidence is found that supports a revised reading.
- 17 and *passim*: the reading /gin/ of the sign DU qualifying kaš and other products makes no good phonological sense, assuming the authors are thinking of gi(n), "to be firm, constant," for a term that characterized products of common quality. CDLI's choice of /du/ is an evident reference to German "geläufig" etc.
- 27: The meaning of igi 1(u)-gal<sub>2</sub>-bi 8;0,0 gur, "its tenth is 8 gur," is unclear given the preceding lines, according to the present transliteration containing notations amounting to 120 gur, unless "common beer" was reckoned against barley at a rate of 3 liters of barley per 1 liter of beer.
- 90: The relationship of 1:10 between i<sub>3</sub> nun and zu<sub>2</sub>-lum in this text is unclear to me.
- 230: Note the unusual variant du for du<sub>6</sub> in e<sub>2</sub>-du<sub>6</sub>-la, "estate".
- 370 is one of a number of new examples of accounts that contain entries describing barge transportation and work-days necessary to cover specified distances by boat, successfully exploited by P. Steinkeller, "New Light on the Hydrology and Topography of Southern Mesopotamia in the Third Millennium," ZA 91 (2001) 22-84. See also nos. 427, 514, 621, 628, 729, 957, 1054, 1374, 2173, 2470 and 2677.
- 397 is a quick reference of various accounting debits (la<sub>2</sub>-ia<sub>3</sub>) and surpluses (diri) reckoned against known Umma foremen (for the record, I could find no single instance in which the numbers matched those of known accounts).
- 417 cp. MVN 4, 173 and 176.
- 421 is a reference list of two sets of deficits and surpluses apparently achieved in an account of Umma's chief cattle manager (šuš<sub>3</sub>) Ur-e'e in the year Šu-Suen 2 or 1. Such accounts, particularly when they deal with herd animals and their products, are not uncommon (for instance, see ARRIM 7, 12, UDT 43, ASJ 8, 107 27, *Nik.* 2, 382, etc.). Since it is unlikely that Ur-e'e's son Lu-Haya would have received these amounts (one positive, one negative in bookkeeping terms), we should assume that line rev. 7 (kišib<sub>3</sub> lu<sub>2</sub>-<sup>u</sup>ja-ia<sub>3</sub>) refers to the seal impression of Lu-Haya on this tablet that merely signaled they were correctly transferred from Ur-e'e's account.
- 427: see above to no. 370.
- 450 presumes a brick production rate of three workdays per sar of bricks, or of 20 shekels (1/3 brick-sar) of bricks per day, consonant with the rates recorded in *Fs. Sjöberg* 138 (A 2976) and MVN 8, 244 (the former bricks also recorded as du<sub>8</sub>-a, "baked"). With a sar of 720 bricks, this means a production rate of 240 bricks per man-day. We may note that the account actually records the receipt of 6 gur of barley by an Umma foreman of millers that was evidently designated for the specific purpose of producing bricks for some structure within the milling operation, whereby the number of bricks produced came short of the foreman's grain debit by 63 sila<sub>3</sub>; these 63 sila<sub>3</sub> would then be debited to a subsequent account of this foreman.
- 499: According to *OrSP* 47-49, 239, Ur-ki-ama/dagal (left edge, and see no. 886) was an Umma fisheries foreman in charge of 83 workmen. If this line is a general qualifier of the text, it is hard to clearly relate the given number (14.00) to the entries of fish and silver and to an eventual "guarantee" of the fishermen (šu-du<sub>8</sub>-a šu-ku<sub>6</sub>-e-ne).
- 514: see no. 370.
- 582: At first glance, this text would appear to point to a heretofore poorly attested combination of (female) workers qualified as a<sub>2</sub> 1/2 or 2/3 while at the same time constituting small groups evidently made up of numbers of women assigned to similar work norms (see rev. 2-3 and 5-7). The calculation of the total, however, records the tally of workers as if they were in fact assigned to full production tasks: (12 1/3 [geme<sub>2</sub> a<sub>2</sub> 2/3] + 9 1/2 [geme<sub>2</sub> a<sub>2</sub> 1/2]) × 30 = 655 = 10.55. This irregularity and the unclear administrative notice rev. 8 (mu a<sub>2</sub> 2/3(diš) a<sub>2</sub> 1/2(diš) a<sub>2</sub> silim-ma-aš ugu<sub>2</sub>-a ba-a-ga<sub>2</sub>-ra-še<sub>3</sub>) suggest that this is a student's practice account.
- 621: see no. 370.

- 628: see no. 370.  
 658 obv. 1: certainly not i<sub>3</sub> nun but some sort of freshwater fish.  
 729: see no. 370.  
 882 is an interesting agricultural production norm text with harvest expectations per orchard iku (ca. 3600 m<sup>2</sup>) of listed commodities, including 2 ban<sub>2</sub> of gazi, 1 ban<sub>2</sub> of u<sub>2</sub>-kur, etc., described rev. 2 as “the ‘load’ of one iku of orchard.”  
 886: see no. 499.  
 957: see no. 370.  
 1018 states explicitly that the fisheries “tithes” (za<sub>3</sub>-10) was delivered to the royal household from that of the Umma ensi<sub>2</sub>. The official in charge of levying this tax was Ur-Utu, in two extraordinary royal accounts in the Banca d’Italia collection qualified, as we would expect, as enku<sup>ku</sup> (ZA<sub>3</sub>-KU<sub>6</sub>; F. d’Agostino and F. Pomponio, ZA 95, 176 obv. iv 17’ and 191 obv. i 15’ after reference to silver remittances of the “fisheries tax office,” nam-enku). Cf. BBVO 10, 185 n. 587, and here no. 2412 (obv. 1-4: baskets of smoked fish ... za<sub>3</sub>-bi ib<sub>2</sub>-ta-zi / ku<sub>6</sub> nam-enku / ki ur-<sup>d</sup>utu-ta ...).  
 1041 gives an equivalency rate of 1 gur barley per oxen carcass.  
 1054: see no. 370.  
 1229: Note the close relationship of “feather-silver” with maš<sub>2</sub> a-ša<sub>3</sub>-ga in MVN 21, 344 (rev. 17: nig<sub>2</sub>-ka<sub>9</sub> ak maš<sub>2</sub> a-ša<sub>3</sub>-ga u<sub>3</sub> ku<sub>3</sub> pa mušen-na), and cp. SNAT 518 obv. 1-3, TCL 5, 6045 obv. i 2-4.  
 1374: see no. 370.  
 1877 is an important collection of silver accounts of sanga and šabra in Girsu (1<sup>st</sup> account: obv. i 1 - ii 2, sanga Ningeszida; 2<sup>nd</sup>: ii 3 - iii 4, sanga Šulgi; 3<sup>rd</sup>: iii 5 - v 6, sanga Ningirsu; 4<sup>th</sup>: v 7 - vi 3 (several adjustments in the numerical notations of this sub-account are necessary).  
 1997: Nippur month names list.  
 2173: see no. 370.  
 2334 is an account of relatively large numbers of bricks for a chief gala-official, two leather worker foremen, a fisheries foreman and a cantor. To gaba-ri, “copies,” cp. J. Dahl, CDLB 2003/5.  
 2412: see no. 1018.  
 2445 records an irregular, and irregularly low work norm of ca. 1.43 volume-shekels per workday ((3 1/3 sar × 60 =) 200 gin<sub>2</sub> ÷ (1.10 × 2) = 1.4285...) to dig a ditch; collation required.  
 2470: see no. 370.  
 2543 cp. MVN 3, 329, MVN 11, 209 and TRU 45 with the same cast of characters.  
 2677: see no. 370.

Los Angeles.

R. K. Englund.

**David I. Owen and Rudolf H. Mayr**, *The Garšana Archives*. xii + 492 pp., XXXVII plates. Bethesda (Maryland), CDL Press, 2007 (= *Cornell University Studies in Assyriology and Sumerology* (CUSAS), vol. 3). \$ 125,-. ISBN 978-1934309-025.

Pour ceux qu’intéresse la période dite «d’Ur III», voici un livre important et attendu, après qu’une série

d’articles et de communications en avaient annoncé la parution imminente<sup>1</sup>: il propose l’édition de près de mille cinq cents nouveaux textes cunéiformes, constituant un lot d’archives cohérent et de nature assez nouvelle pour Ur III. Les tablettes qui composent cette collection sont aujourd’hui presque toutes conservées à Cornell University (Ithaca, État de New York).

Dans leurs remerciements (p. vii-x), les auteurs rappellent l’histoire de la collection, primitivement acquise par les époux Rosen (New York City), avant qu’elle ne soit cédée à Cornell University, ainsi que l’histoire de leur projet de publication qui a notamment amené à la création de cette nouvelle série éditoriale intitulée CUSAS (*Cornell University Studies in Assyriology and Sumerology*).

Dès 1997 et le début des recherches entreprises sur cette documentation, R. Mayr a été le premier à reconnaître l’originalité de ce lot d’archives d’Ur III. C’est notamment l’étude des nombreuses empreintes de sceau mentionnant des serviteurs de deux personnages nommés Simat-Ištaran et Šu-Kabta, qui lui a permis de l’identifier. Puis le fait que le toponyme Garšana<sup>ki</sup> soit mentionné dans plus d’un tiers des textes a ensuite amené les auteurs à proposer de considérer cet ensemble comme constituant des «Archives de Garšana».

S’il n’a jamais été question de la présence de tablettes similaires dans aucune collection du monde avant les années 1990, c’est vraisemblablement que les textes dont il est ici question sont issus de nouvelles trouvailles clandestines, résultat des pillages récents dont souffre l’Irak, particulièrement depuis la première Guerre du Golfe. On ne sait donc absolument rien de leur provenance ni de leur contexte archéologique. On notera à ce propos qu’un autre ensemble d’archives, comparable à certains points de vue à celui de Garšana, est en train d’être actuellement reconstitué de la même façon par D. Owen, mais à partir de lots qui, cette fois, sont aujourd’hui beaucoup plus dispersés<sup>2</sup>: il s’agit d’archives qui proviendraient d’Irisagrigrig<sup>3</sup>.

<sup>1</sup>) Voir par exemple les articles de D. Owen dans H. Waetzoldt (ed.), *Festschrift Giovanni Pettinato* (Heidelberg, 2004), ou dans B. Lion et C. Michel (ed.), *De la domestication au tabou. Le cas des suidés au Proche-Orient ancien* (Paris, 2006), ainsi que sa communication (demeurée inédite) à la 47<sup>e</sup> RAI (Helsinki, 2001).

<sup>2</sup>) La présence de nouveaux lots appartenant vraisemblablement à ces archives ont, par exemple, été tout récemment identifiés dans une collection privée au Liban.

<sup>3</sup>) Voir p. 5 et n. 25 ce qu’en dit pour l’heure D. Owen, qui en prépare une étude à paraître dans le volume 15 de la collection italienne *Nisaba*. Bien que le calendrier utilisé dans ces textes soit le même que celui employé par exemple dans les archives de Tûram-ili (et donc différent de celui des archives de Garšana), D. Owen pense (p. 5) qu’un lien existe entre les lots d’archives de Garšana et d’Irisagrigrig.