

This volume contains much that is of value and is a fitting tribute to the eminent jubilarian.

Oriental Institute
The University of Chicago

J. A. BRANKMAN

Semiramis. Entstehung und Nachhall einer orientalischen Sage. By WILHELM EILERS. "Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften Philologisch-historische Klasse, Sitzungsberichte," vol. 274, Abhandlung 2, Vienna: 1971. Pp. 83 + 7 pls. + map. 68 140.

The Near East produced a number of personalities who, for reasons often obscure, caught the imagination of the ancients. In the process, the lives and deeds of these characters were embellished with myth and legend, and then passed on to further generations. The Semiramis story, which is the subject of the short monograph under review, is a good case in point.

Eilers's work is divided into five chapters. He begins by briefly recounting and commenting upon the classical story of Semiramis, as preserved in Book 2 (4-20) of Diodorus Siculus's *The Library of History*. As noted by Eilers, the Semiramis of the Greek sources has been transformed from a historical personality to a heroic paradigm. Chapter two considers the origin of the Semiramis story and its historical realities. The Assyrian queen Samsuramat is examined, and a *sitz im Leben* proposed for the later embellishment of the story. Chapter three traces the post-classical developments of the tale, especially as they are preserved in the medieval Iranian stories of Shirin. In this chapter, great stress is laid on the geographical place names connected with the Shirin epic. The fourth chapter tries to point to Armenia and western Iran as the place where the Semiramis legend was preserved and nurtured. Finally, there is a short set of conclusions, indexes, and plates which include two marvelous, full color miniatures from manuscripts of the Shirin epic.

As can be seen, the range of subject matter covered in the monograph is enormous, and

in a short review we can hardly do justice to Eilers's many hypotheses and arguments. We must therefore confine our remarks to a few selected points. Eilers accepts the equation of Semiramis with Samsuramat, wife of Shamshi-Adad V, mother of Adad-nirari III, and queen regnant during her son's minority. (His understanding of *ina kusi b kam ka ina kusti karrihi rabbi abhuma* as "Als ich im fünften Jahre mich machting [oder hier = gross geworden] auf den königlichen Thron setzte . . ." is highly unlikely.) He then asks the question of her origin. Noting that the arguments based on the etymology of her name are inconclusive, he proposes to see in Samsuramat an Urtarian princess married to an Assyrian king in a diplomatic match. It seems strange that such would have been the case. Assyrian-Urtarian relations reached an all-time low during the latter years of Shamshi-Adad III and the reign of Shamshi-Adad V, and remained so for some time thereafter. This was the period in which Urtaria was expanding at Assyria's expense, and it hardly would have been a propitious moment for a diplomatically arranged marriage. Equally unlikely is the proposed connection between the mountain Sinirris mentioned in Sargon's eighth campaign and the name Semiramis. Indeed, the reasoning behind the entire section linking the "goddess of love" aspect of the Semiramis legend and the various syncretisms with Ishtar of Nineveh seems forced and hard to accept.

Eilers's attempt to link the Semiramis legend with the Shirin epic also bears close scrutiny. That two folk heroines share certain traits is not sufficient to establish a direct link between stories. The Semiramis myth comes from the Mediterranean world, the Shirin legends are Iranian. The link either in eastern Anatolia or in Mesopotamia is missing in the early periods. The historic Semiramis bears virtually no relationship to Semiramis, and even less to Shirin. Until some trace of this link is found, or until quite specific parallels between Semiramis and Shirin can be pointed out, the question of their relationship will remain moot.

The task which Eilers set himself was not a simple one. The relationships between ancient Near Eastern tales and those of the classical and post-classical Near East is well worth exploring. We owe Eilers our gratitude for undertaking this, and hope for more material to remove much of the mystery surrounding this fascinating woman.

Royal Ontario Museum
University of Toronto

LOUIS D. LEVINE

Das Erta-Epos. Keilschriftstud. By LUDWIG CAGNI. "Studia Pohl," vol. 6. Rome: Päpstliches Bibelinstitut, 1970. Pp. xiii + 76. DM 5.30.

Kurz nach dem Erscheinen seiner vorliegenden Edition des Erta-Epos hat L. Cagni auch einen in Keilschrift übertragenen Text des Epos für Unterrichtszwecke veröffentlicht. Dieses Buch wird gewiss dazu beitragen, dass das Erta-Epos zu einem der auch von Studenten oft gelesenen Werke der Keilschriftliteratur wird. Cagni hat den Text in neuassyrischer Schrift wiedergegeben, in der die meisten erhaltenen Exemplare des Erta-Epos geschrieben sind. Für den Unterricht ist es sicher vorteilhaft, innerhalb desselben Textes nur eine Art von Schrift vorzufinden. An den wenigen Stellen, wo wegen des schlechten Erhaltungszustandes die neubabylonischen Zeichenformen des Originals geboten werden mussten, ist jeweils darauf hingewiesen worden. Die Varianten sind (in gut lesbarer Handschrift) vollständig angegeben worden; so steht auch an schwierigen Stellen alle Information zur Verfügung, die wir über den Text haben. Da die Edition Cagni's kurz vorher erschienen war, konnte in der Diskussion von Lösungen auf sie verwiesen werden; überdies hat Cagni die Gelegenheit benützt, eine Anzahl von Berichtigungen zur Edition in einem Anhang zum weitgehendsten Werk zusammenzustellen. M. J. J. teilte mir mit, dass sich ein weiteres, neubabylonisches Fragment mit Anfang und Ende der 4. Tafel in der Sammlung Montefiore (no. 837) befindet.

BOOK REVIEWS

Wir sind Cagni für seine Arbeiten am Erta-Epos sehr zu Dank verpflichtet.

Oriental Institute
The University of Chicago

HERMANN HUNGER

Texte aus Chagar Bazar und Tell Brak. Teil I. By OSWALD LORETT. "Alter Orient und Altes Testament," vol. 3. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Verlag Butzon and Bercker Kevelaer, 1969. Pp. 37 + 40 pls. DM 26.

At a time when new sites in northern Iraq and the neighboring areas of Syria are releasing long-hidden remains and thus yielding new evidence on the history of Upper Mesopotamia in the eighteenth century B.C., the long-known texts from Tell Chagar Bazar—that is, those texts which found their way to the British Museum—have now been published in full. The volume contains 67 texts which can be dated to the time of Samsi-Adad, the contemporary of Zimrilim of Mari and Hammurapi of Babylon. They were already presented in translation in *littin milhurri*, *Festschrift Wolfgang Freiherr von Soden zum 19. VI. 1968 gedemeit* (Alter Orient und Altes Testament, vol. 1, 1969), pp. 200-243. In addition to those texts, Lorett copied 17 additional texts of various content and character which, on the basis of paleographic and direct evidence, can be dated to the Old Akkadian period. This publication supercedes in part the earlier work of C. J. Gadd in *Iraq 4* (1937): 178-85, and *Iraq 7* (1940): 22-61 and pls. 1-5. Gadd copied only a few texts, and described the remainder in the form of indexes of personal names and a glossary containing all occurring words. Both an index of personal and geographical names and a glossary to the Old Babylonian texts are given by Lorett in *littin milhurri*, pp. 244-60, and in revised form in the volume under review. Since so much diligence has been devoted to these, one wonders why there should not have been a

list of the occurring *limu*-names and the month names separate from the general glossary or index of personal names, which would have just filled the empty space on p. 27. More regrettable is the lack of a separate column on pp. 12 ff. providing information on the dates (year, month, day) of the texts, which is the custom followed in publications of this type.

Since the analysis of the texts promised by the author depends on an opportunity for him to copy the texts now in the Museum of Aleppo, meanwhile a few remarks on the character and some of the peculiarities of the texts here published may elucidate their importance. Nevertheless, the reader is still referred to the very useful introduction given by C. J. Gadd in *Iraq* 7 (1940): 22 ff. The texts were written during the eparchy of Adadbanī—also occurring in texts from Alahar: see K. Balkan, *Observations on the Chronological Problems of the Karum Kanis* (1955), p. 101 (hereafter: *Chronology*); from Mari, see *Archives royales de Mari* (hereafter: *ARM*), and *ARM* 7, the latter referring to the volumes containing translations and translations), vol. 8 no. 8:36 ff. where the full date reads *kanis tibitum ina min isiknu limu* (Adadbanī—of Abijaja, Awilija (also in Kültepe Ib, see K. Balkan, *Chronology*, p. 100; in Mari, see *ARM* 7 p. 170), *Asūrnalik* (also in texts from Terqa; see Syria 5 [1924]: 277), Ilrahī, Ikūpi (perhaps identical with Ikūpi in texts from Alahar, for which see K. Balkan, *Chronology*, p. 101; for other occurrences of Ikūpi in Mari see *ARM* 12 14:14, and in Tell er-Rimah see S. Page, *Iraq* 30 [1968]: 95), and Nimer-sin (also in Mari, see *ARM* 7 p. 170; for other references see H. Hirsch, *Untersuchungen zur altassyrischen Religion*, p. 3 n. 15). Of these, 35 texts alone belong to the eparchy of Adadbanī, and of them twelve to the month Mesrišnu. Six texts from Aleppo, A. 936, 941, 942, 946, 952, 965, have to be added to this group. As Gadd pointed out, the archive of Chagar Bazar has to be dated to the period when Šamsiādad was king of Assyria. This is shown by the seal inscription found in text no. 23 (but also in nos. 9, 10,

24, 27, 33, 36, and 38; Māšum, the bearer of the seal, can be identified with the Māšum, frequently mentioned in the correspondence of Jamsiādad; for references see *ARM* 15, p. 152) and by the names of officials which contain the king's name as a theophorous element (Šamsi-Adad-tukult in A. 994 and Šamsi-Adad-III, see below to no. 40:31).

The question of the ancient name of the site has been linked in previous discussions with the content of the tablets themselves, since they partly concern the transactions of a royal household. Nevertheless an identification on this basis alone is not self-evident, because Šamsiādad was a king on the parent, because Šamsiādad was a king on the move (see J. R. Kupper, *The Cambridge Ancient History*, vol. 2, chap. 1, p. 8). Kupper favored an identification with Šubetanil, while later on W. W. Hallo and J. Aro proposed Adakka (references given by Lorentz on p. 27). J. R. Kupper's discussion of the ancient name of Chagar Bazar in *Les nomades en Mésopotamie au temps des rois de Mari* (1957) is also useful because he has given there a general outline of the tablets and their contents (pp. 5 ff., 23 ff.).

The Old Babylonian texts from Chagar Bazar were found together in room 106 of a large building which was excavated only in part (see M. Mallowan, *Iraq* 9 [1947]: 82 f., and pl. 83), so other texts still might be found on the site. All texts are concerned with the distribution of cereals, mostly barley. Though no. 14 listing dead or fugitive persons may conceivably be considered an exception to this, it also has to do with the subject of cereal distribution, since these persons no longer can be recipients of rations. The lists of cattle in nos. 35 and 39 are to be interpreted in the same manner since a reliable account of the animals is necessary in order to distribute fodder for them. None of the texts lists barley received. Members of three different households or economic units were the recipients of barley rations, members of the palace (see for instance nos. 41 and 44), the "house of Šubetanil" (see nos. 40 and 47), and the ergasterion (*maṣrum*). The latter deserves some comment

It is certainly not a prison. It seems to be an institution which housed forced laborers, in Chagar Bazar according to the extant texts, mostly women who were engaged in the manufacture of goods. Ergasteria are likewise mentioned in the texts from Mari. In a number of cases the introduction to a letter addressed to the king reads "Mari, the palace, the temples and the ergasteria are well" (see *ARM* 13 26:5 f., 34:14 f., 53:7). These texts let us understand the ergasterion as one of the basic institutions of the kingdom of Mari. An unusual expenditure was the distribution of rations on the occasion of a *tibitum* to Jamsiādad, Šamsiādad's son, and his men (nos. 4, 9, 10, 11, 20, 23, 24, 25, 27, 33, 36, 54, A. 925, 935; see further 36, 43, 46, and A. 926, which mentions 2760 + x men, for this see C. J. Gadd, *Iraq* 7 [1940]: 48). For the *tibitum* itself, of J. R. Kupper, *Studia Mariana*, pp. 98 ff., and recently J. Sasson, *The Military Establishment in Mari* (Budia Pohl, vol. 3, 1969), pp. 7 ff., and for the *tibitum* references from the texts from Chagar Bazar, see J. R. Kupper, *Les nomades en Mésopotamie au temps des rois de Mari*, pp. 23 ff. The publication of the Chagar Bazar texts does not shed new light on the nature of the *tibitum* itself. It should, however, be noted that the evidence linking this procedure with the distribution or redistribution of fields has not found much attention so far (for refs. see *CAD* E pp. 6 f. s. v. *ebitu* v.). Māšum, whose seal impressions can be found on a part of the *tibitum* texts (see above) is, according to *ARM* 1 60:6 *tupkar Amurrim*. In other letters he appears together with other officials serving as adviser to Jamsiādad. It seems as if he was placed in this position by Šamsiādad to aid the inexperienced, sometimes inefficient or lazy Jamsiādad in all matters concerning the administration of his province. Two letters relate Māšum to the undertaking of a *tibitum*, perhaps the one mentioned in the texts from Chagar Bazar: *ARM* 1 62 reports Jamsiādad's request to send Māšum to Jamsiādag to learn how to undertake a *tibitum*. Šamsi-Adad agreed and later sent Māšum back to

Jamsiādad. *ARM* 4 7 tells that Māšum was sent with full instructions concerning the *tibitum*. A rather marginal episode has been preserved in the latter *ARM* 5 46: 20 ff. Ikūrim, also known from the Chagar Bazar texts as belonging to the ergasterion of Jamsiādad, complains about the release of a slave girl by Māšum.

The month names occurring in the texts from Chagar Bazar deserve some comment. They are, in alphabetical order, Abum, Adad-rum, Ašarum, Kūnūm*, Maritum, Mana, Margānum*, Nabūrum*, Tanjūrum*: the texts in Aleppo provide the names of the remaining months: Tamuz, Tirum, Nigūm. According to S. Page, *Iraq* 30 (1968): 95, the same names occur in the tablets found at Tell er-Rimah. Interestingly enough, they do not match the OA month names (for which see J. Levy, *ArOr.* 11 [1939]: 35 ff.) and those to be found in the economic texts of the Assyrian interregnum in Mari, which are strictly those used during the Zimrilim reign. The month names used in Chagar Bazar correspond to the month names used in the letters of Šamsiādad (see *ARM* 15, p. 164, there marked "A"). Some of the names occur also in texts from the Diyala region (above marked with an asterisk).

The following remarks—not intended to be exhaustive—are aimed at furthering the understanding of particular passages or texts. There are a number of new readings and some discrepancies between the translations in *Idān miḡuri*, pp. 200 ff. and the volume under review which are also listed below. After completion of the draft of this review the present writer was able to collate a number of passages. For permission to make these collations, he wishes to express his appreciation and gratefulness to Drs. R. D. Barnett and E. Sollberger of the Department of Western Asiatic Antiquities in British Museum, London. The collated passages are indicated by an asterisk.

- No. 1:10—read now *an... asit anūm* ulūu*.
No. 2—previously copied by C. J. Gadd, *Iraq* 4 (1937): 184, fig. 1, No. 3:9—read with copy UD. 5. KAM, so also C. J. Gadd, *Iraq* 4 (1937):

