

A NEW VOLUME OF OLD ASSYRIAN TEXTS FROM KĀRUM KANESH¹

KLAAS R. VEENHOF

The last two volumes of Old Assyrian texts excavated in the commercial quarter (called *kārum*) of the ancient Anatolian city of Kanesh (modern Kültepe), preserved in the Museum of Anatolian Civilizations at Ankara and edited by Turkish scholars there, appeared in 1995: *Ankara Kültepe Tabletleri 2* (Ankara) and *Ankaraner Kültepe-Texte 3* (Wiesbaden).² A fourth volume edited by Irfan Albayrak, entitled *Kültepe Tabletleri IV* appeared in 2006. The editor is docent Assyriology of the University of Ankara and is known from several publications of Old Assyrian records.³ The title is surprising, because its number suggests a continuation of the series started in 1990, while the omission of 'Ankara' yields a new title and I strongly suggest to abbreviate it as *AKT 4*. The new book, in 8vo, makes a handy volume, but uses many small pages (168 and 74 plates) for editing 71 texts. Considering the thousands of texts in Ankara still to be published, the 4to-format of *AKT 1* and *2* is to be preferred, also because it allows printing transliterations and translations in parallel columns, as was done in M. T. Larsen, *The Aššur-nādā Archive* (OAA 1, Leiden 2001), which is helpful to any student of these texts.

¹ Review article of Irfan Albayrak, *Kültepe Tabletleri IV* (Kt. o/k), Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları VI /33b, Ankara 2006; xxii + 168 p., 74 color plates.

Some abbreviations used here:

- ArAn* *Archivum Anatolicum* (Ankara) 1995ff.
Bullae N. Özgüç - Ö. Tunca, *Kültepe-Kaniş. Sealed and Inscribed Clay Bullae* (TTKY V/48), Ankara 2001.
Kaniş II T. Özgüç, *Kültepe- Kaniş II. New Researches at the Trading Center of the Ancient Near East* (TTKY V/41), Ankara 1986.
Kuliya K. R. Veenhof, *The Archive of Kuliya, son of Ali-ahum* (Kt 92/k 188-263), Ankara TTK, in press.
Özgüç 2006 N. Özgüç, *Seal Impressions on the Clay Envelopes from the Archives of the Native Peruwa and Assyrian Trader Ušur-ša-Ištar son of Aššur-imiti* (TTKY V/50), Ankara.
OAA(S) *Old Assyrian Archives (Supplement)*, NINO Leiden, 2001ff.
OACT J. G. Derksen, *The Old Assyrian Copper Trade in Anatolia*, Istanbul 1996.
OBO 160/5,1 K. R. Veenhof, *The Old Assyrian Period*, in: M. Wäfler (ed.), *Mesopotamia. The Old Assyrian Period. Annäherungen 5* (Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis 160/5), Fribourg- Göttingen 2008), part 1.
POAT W. G. Gwaltney, *The Pennsylvania Old Assyrian Texts* (HUCA Supplements 3), Cincinnati 1983.
TPAK 1 C. Michel - P. Garelli, *Tablettes paléo-assyriennes de Kültepe*, 1 (Kt 90/k), Paris 1997.
Veenhof 2003 K. R. Veenhof, *The Old Assyrian List of Year Eponyms from Karum Kanish* TTKY V/64) Ankara (cf. the additions and corrections in *NABU* 2007/49).

² Followed in 1997 by TPAK 1, the edition of 240 texts excavated in 1990.

³ In S. Alp – A. Süel (eds.), *III. Uluslararası Hititoloji Kongresi Bildirileri 1996* (Ankara 1998) 1-14, 'the archive of Madawada' (an Anatolian woman; Kt o/k 39, 40, 44, 46, 64, 81 and 106); in *ArAn* 4 (2000) 17-27, the testament of Agua (Kt o/k 196a+c); in *AMMY* 2000 (2001) 300-311, the sale of fields and an orchard (Kt o/k 52); and in *AMMY* 2003/4 (2005), 269-77 (Kt o/k 60, 74 and 75; 74 = AKT 4, 21). I regret that the editor did not include these scattered Kt o/k texts in AKT 4 and integrate their data in his indexes. Other texts from Kültepe were published by him in *ArAn* 5 (2002) 1-10 (Kt 88/k 71), *ArAn* 6 (2003) 1-9 (Kt 88/k 963, a letter of *kārum* Kanesh), and in *JEOL* 39 (2005) 95-105 (five texts of Peruwa, from the Kt c/k group).

The volume under review edits 71 texts excavated in 1963 in a large house in squares B-D/11-12 of *kārum* Kanesh level II, the lay-out and contents of which were described *Kaniš II*, English part p. 6f., where it figures as the 'sixth building of the second district', with fig. 11 (ground plan) and plates 18-20. It is strange that the editor does not refer to this final publication and only quotes the very short, preliminary information passed on by the excavator via J. N. Postgate's survey in *AnSt* 14 (1964) 21.

After a short introduction (in Turkish and English), the texts are presented in transliteration and Turkish translation, with short philological notes, followed by indices, mainly of names (no lists of year- or week-eponyms, but one of month-names!), and an alphabetically arranged selection of a few dozen interesting or new Assyrian words and expressions. The final part consists of color plates of all tablets and envelopes. They offer a good idea of the variety in handwriting and 'style' of the tablets, which range from a few small ones (60 has only 10 lines of script) to large memorandums, such as 26, measuring no less than 19.3 x 9.1 cm., with 99 lines of script, and from a few somewhat roughly written documents (e.g. 70) to many tablets in a professional hand (e.g. 30 with 15 lines on 5.6 cm.). We welcome this volume and express the hope that it inaugurates, after an interval of ten years, the resumption of the systematic edition of the excavated 'Kultepe texts' by our colleagues in Ankara.

1. Survey of the texts

The collection comprises contracts (mainly debt-notes), a few judicial records, some memorandums and more than forty letters that offer information on the trade, the traders, their family and personnel, which help to complement the picture of Old Assyrian society and trade we have. Most of the *debt-notes* (1-12), with dates ranging between eponymies 77 and 110,⁴ are for relatively small amounts of silver (less than 30 shekels), only two are somewhat bigger (132 shekels in 2 and 129 in 6). The four cases where the creditor figures as anonymous *tamkārum* (7, 10, 11 and 12; in the last contract the debt is said to be the unpaid rest of a capital owed, *šimtum*) concern the smallest amounts, of 4, 11, 14 and 16 shekels of silver, and the '*tamkāru*-formula' probably was chosen to allow the cession or transfer of these small debts.⁵ Texts 1, 2, and 6 do not mention a payment date, but only that from (*ištu*) a particular date on (in 1 and 2 a specific week, in 6 the middle of a month, called *šapattum*) interest is due. This is also the case in 4 and 7, but both add at the end a clause that obliges the debtor to pay 'wherever we/they will meet' (7 adds 'in the City or in the countryside', i.e. in Assur or in Anatolia; see below, § 7 on text 4). Texts 3, 5, 8, 9-12 stipulate payment after a number of weeks (from 3 to 30) or months (2 in 5), followed by a stipulation on default interest (30% per year). The former must be commercial loans, taken out 'against interest', without a fixed due date, most of the latter presumably reflect debts due to credit sale or consignment (in 8

⁴ The numbers given to the eponyms in Veenhof 2003. A reconsideration (in *NABU* 2007/49) of the sources for eponyms 40-41 and new evidence convinced me that we have to add *Šuli, son of Šalmah* as eponym 41, which would raise the numbers assigned to the eponymies by one. To avoid confusion and because not all my colleagues are convinced, I stick here to the 'old' numbers.

⁵ This purpose is explicitly indicated by the formula 'he who holds the tablet is the creditor', used in 26: 11, where the Assyrian term *muka'il tuppim* is a rare variant (also used in Kt 91/k 195: 27f. and TPAK 1, 120a: 6) of the much more common *wābil tuppim*, see my observations in *JESHO* 40 (1997) 351ff. on 'anonymous creditors and bearer cheques' and the comments on *Kuliya* text 37: 17ff.

silver and salt), where the debtor gets some time to earn the silver he has to pay, after which default interest is due. The debt of 9 must be a 'service loan' that the debtor can 'manage' (*be'ālum*) for 30 weeks, also because the amount of ½ mina of silver is typical for such loans, whereby the person contracted receives an interest free working capital (*be'ūlātum*). It is striking that, apart from four debts due to the anonymous 'creditor' (*tamkārum*, texts 7 and 10-12), only two are to the same creditor (Šu-Bēlum, during eponymy years 81 and 82), which raises questions about the archive owner. The debt-notes date from two periods, the older ones ranging between eponymy years 77 and 86, the younger ones between 96 and 111. In addition to the debt-notes there is an interesting partnership contract (14, between three traders and a money-lender; see below § 7) and a somewhat unusual quittance, relating to a debt of Šu-Bēlum (15), both undated.

Five of the six *judicial records* are depositions (16-19 and 57, related to letter 56) by persons who had been 'seized' by parties as witnesses, to be present at a settlement of accounts (17) or a private summons (18-19), while 16 and 57 (whose end is missing) were drawn up in connection with a lawsuit before a court, in 16 the *wabartum* Wašhaniya, in 17 *kārum* Burušhattum. Text 27 is a verdict of *wabartum* Zalpa, which forces parties to negotiate (*atwūm*) in *kārum* Kanesh on the basis of their records and witnesses. At the end it names a *pāšer awitīm*, 'the one who solves a case', here presumably a person delegated to supervise the negotiations and to see to it that a solution is reached.⁶ Texts 20-24 are *memorandums* in the first person about payments, entrusting (*paqādum*) goods for transport (in 24: 10, 'at the entrance of the gate'), and transactions in textiles. Nos. 25-26 are large ones, of 56 and 99 lines respectively, in which traders summarize all(?) their outstanding claims in the form of transcripts or excerpts of the original debt-notes.⁷ The first is a late one (eponymy dates between years 102 and 128) that mentions different creditors, in the second Hunniya is the creditor (see below note 40) and it contains data on eleven different transactions, with dates ranging between eponymy years 98 and 110 (see below, § 5, on the date in line 70).

The letters mention many different addressees, which suggests they are not from the archive of one single trader, as pointed out by the editor in his Introduction. They deal with a variety of subjects that can only be mentioned selectively here. Several concern small transactions and domestic issues and there are no so-called 'caravan documents', as defined in M. T. Larsen, *Old Assyrian Caravan Procedures* (1967), a circumstance which probably reflects the status and specialization of their addressees. The envelope of letter 35 was opened, that of

⁶ *Pāšer awitīm* thus far occurs ten times and qualifies persons designated as such in verdicts of the City Assembly or of a *kārum*, but what they have to do is never explicitly stated. The verb *pašārum*, 'to solve, unravel', is rare in OA (*CAD P* s.v., 239, 4) and outside this expression (and a few occurrences of the D-stem, presumably meaning 'to break one's word, to cancel a promise') it occurs only in the so-called 'Statutes of *kārum* Kanesh' (see M. T. Larsen, *OACC*, 285, text 2), where members of the *kārum* who convene (*ina puhrim*) as a court-of-law can be divided into groups by its secretary 'to solve an issue/case' ([*awatam*] *ipaššurū*). A *pāšer awitīm* may have been delegated by the authorities to do the same in less complicated cases, in order to unburden the tasks of formal courts in Assur and the colonies, and also to see to the implementation of a procedural verdict. The *pāšer awitīm* may have reported back to those who had delegated him, to inform them about the solution reached and perhaps to certify it. Occurrences in published texts are: *EL* 275 (cancellation of a marriage promise), 278 (settlement about transport costs, etc.) - both, like AKT 4, 27, verdicts by colonies in Anatolia, - *EL* 327 (a procedural verdict by the City-Assembly), and AKT 3, 37 (a verdict by the 'Elders'), both in Assur. In Kt n/k 147, mentioned in *CAD P*, the issue is the identification of a dead trader's seal impression by his widow and son.

⁷ See for such texts K. R. Veenhof, *JEOL* 28 (1985) 10-23.

41 not, which is a pity because there are two other letters to what is presumably the same addressee, Āmur-ilī (37 and 38). As indicated by the editor, there are a few small groups with the same addressees, such as 51-56, all addressed by Iddin-Suen to 'my representatives' in conjunction with a few named persons, and 28-32, all written by Išim-Suen to the lady Šīmat-Ištar, alone or together with Ennam-Aššur (once) and her brother Ušur-ša-Aššur (three times).

Grateful to the editor for making this collection of texts available for study, I must also mention some shortcomings, in part the result of poor proof reading and some lack of consistency. There are dozens of cases where in the transliteration the diacritics are missing or wrong (notably in KŪ, GĪN, in the spelling of *š*, *š* and *ṭ*, in the last case apparently also because of problems with the font, so that it occasionally appears as *æ*). The captions to the photos of tablets 18 and 35 are missing, in the photos of nos. 24, 50, 55, 64, and 67 obverse and reverse have been interchanged and this happened also in the edition of 67 on p. 132f. In internal references the Kt o/k numbers should have been replaced by the numbers of the edition, the more so because there is no concordance between them.

The volume contains no cuneiform copies of the tablets, but color photos that offer a realistic picture of the tablets, but create problems because some are too dark or too small to read well and, more seriously, the inscribed edges of the tablets that frequently create problems for the decipherer are never shown. When a proposed reading does not convince or exclamation marks after a sign indicate that a reading deviates from what is on the tablet, there is frequently no possibility to check the original, so that doubts remain. This problem could have been solved if the editor had included a list with cuneiform copies of problematic signs, words or lines to show what is actually on the tablet, even when he himself did not understand it, a method this writer used in his edition of the archive of *Kuliya*.

2. The seal impressions

The seal impressions on a dozen envelopes, available in frequently not very clear photos, receive no attention from the editor, there are no attempts to identify them and the occasional inscriptions on them are not deciphered. This is a pity because seal impressions are an integral part of written documents and some of their owners or users can be identified by their inscriptions, by comparison with published seal impressions,⁸ and by collecting evidence from other texts where the same people (with their patronymics) figure and may have sealed. Identification by comparison gradually becomes more feasible, since much work is now being done on a systematic presentation and analysis of the seal impressions by Professor Nimet Özgüç in cooperation with Mrs Masako Omura, and in *Bullae* a new numbering system for all seals has been introduced — CS + number for cylinder seals, St + number for stamp seals, — which now already covers more than 1300 impressions.⁹ I list here, in alphabetical order, the persons who according to the notation 'seal (KIŠIB) of A son of B' have sealed the envelopes

⁸ For which one may consult B. Teissier, *Sealings and Seals on Texts from Kültepe kārūm level 2* (Istanbul 1994), who presents 677 seal impressions in drawings and contains more than hundred pages with tables listing all essential data known about them (the nature of the texts in which they occur and the names of the people who are involved in them, many of which have indeed sealed them).

⁹ See its application in *Bullae* and in Özgüç 2006, a volume which comprises the seal impressions of the texts numbered Kt d/k and Kt n/k. The five seals in my forthcoming *Kuliya*, drawn by Mrs M. Omura, are numbered CS 826 and 1081-1084 in the new system.

published in AKT 4 as owners or users of a seal, indicating also in which capacity they have done so, to help future identification. The second column (A, B, etc.) refers to the order in which the impressions appear on the envelope in the sequence: obverse, lower edge, reverse, upper edge, left edge, and right edge, according to the information given in the editor's transliterations. However, we cannot simply assign them to those listed as sealers because the order of the impressions is not always identical to that of the 'KIŠIB notations' (which are no real captions added to the impressions),¹⁰ and in some cases the identifications given by the editor (A, etc.) are not convincing (see below, notes a-d). The dates are the eponymy years.

no.	seal	name of sealer	son of	type of text	capacity	date
7	A-D	Adad-bāni	Kanaya	debt-note	witness	98
10	A-C	Āmur-Šamaš	Irišum	debt-note	witness	106
41	A	Ānah-ilī		letter	writer	--
3	A-D	Aššur-[.....] ^{a)}	[.....]	debt-note	?	82
4	A-C	Aššur-mutappil	Šu-Bēlum	debt-note	witness	86
12	A-C	Aššur-mutappil	Puzur-Aššur	debt-note	witness	110
11	A-C	Aššur-ṭāb	Šu-Ištar	debt-note	witness	106 ^{b)}
16	A	Atata	Ennānum	agreement	witness	--
2	A-D	Azu	Puzur-Aššur	debt-note	witness	81
4	A-C	Buzazu	Šu-Suen	debt-note	witness	86
7	A-? ^{c)}	Dadaya	Lalum	debt-note	debtor	98
11	A-C	Damiq-pī-Aššur	Ikuppiya	debt-note	witness	106 ^{b)}
1	A-C	Ennam-Aššur	Aššur-šamšī	debt-note	witness	77
4	A-C	Ennam-Aššur	Šukutum	debt-note	debtor	86
1	A-C	Ennam-ilī	Kuzari	debt-note	witness	77
7	B	Enna(m)-Suen	Abubu	debt-note	witness	98
10	A-C	Erra-šululī	Aššur-idī	debt-note	witness	106
10	A-C	Imlik-ilum	slave of Iddin-Kūbum	debt-note	debtor	--
3	A-D	Kula[?]	[.....]	debt-note	witness	82
35	A	Kusātum		letter	writer	--
1	A-C	Nūr-Ištar	<i>mupazzirum</i>	debt-note	debtor	77
11	A-C	Qatatum	Azuzaya	debt-note	debtor	110
2	A-D	Susaya	Šu-Kubum	debt-note	witness	81
2	A-D	Šu-Bēlum	Aššur-rēṭī	debt-note	debtor	81
2	A-D	Ušur-ša-Aššur	Amriya	debt-note	witness	81
27	A-?	<i>wabartum</i> Zalpa ^{d)}		verdict	<i>wabartum</i>	--
3	A-D	[.....]	Šu[.....]	debt-note	witness(?)	82

a) Albayrak reads *A-šu[r-ṭāb DUMU Aššur-šamšī]* and restores the same name in l. 6, making him the debtor, but this is uncertain; another problem is that he mentions the presence of 4 different seals, while he reads/restores only 3 'KIŠIB notations'.

b) The name of the eponym's father is broken and probably is Šu-[Aššur] = 106, attested in text 10.

c) But only three 'KIŠIB notations'; the photo is too vague for checking.

d) The photo is vague, but it is clear that there are impressions of several different seals; one single seal of (a representative of) a *wabartum* would be abnormal, See K. Hecker, *kunuk kārīm šaḥer rabi*, in *Festschrift B. Kienast*, AOAT 274 (2003) 183-196, esp. 190, B, 'seal of the *wabartum* of Hanaknak', with 5 different seals, and 194, F, 'seal of the *wabartum* of Ulama', with 4 different seal impressions. The mention there (p. 195, under H) of our envelope as having '5 Abrollungen des gleichen Siegels' ('freundliche Mitteilung von Irfan Albayrak') is not correct. On the left side of impression B there seems to be an inscription.

¹⁰ See my observations in *OLZ* 1987, 352f.

Without good photos or drawings it is difficult to identify seal impressions with those already known and published, but occasionally this is possible. The two witnesses who sealed text 7, Adad-bāni, son of Kanaya, and Enna-Suen, son of Abubu, are known from several other texts. The first occurs as witness also in CCT 5, 25c: 17f. (a quittance), ICK 2, 123 rev.: 9', and Kt 91/k 408: 11 (all three undated), and as creditor in Kt a/k 85: 3', but this is not helpful, since of none of these texts the sealed envelope has been preserved. Ennam-Suen, son of Abubu, occurs as witness in CCT 5, 31a: 22f., Kt a/k 605: 26f., and Kt k/k 44: 32 (eponymy year 105; courtesy K. Hecker), and is mentioned in TPAK 1, 196: 5. According to information provided by Mrs Omura his seal, now numbered CS 1046, also occurs on Kt i/k 47B and her drawing reveals that it bears the inscription *En-na-Sú-en / DUMU A-bu-bu*. This inscription can also be detected on seal B of text 7, which should have been mentioned in its edition.

Other identifications are more problematic. Azu, son of Puzur-Aššur, of text 2, occurs as a witness also in VAS 26, 125: 7', CTMMA 1, 84a: 105, and Kt 86/k 223: 12, and as a debtor in Kt 91/k 140: 13 (his house is mentioned in TPAK 1, 210: 4), but apparently no envelopes bearing his seal are known. Ennam-Aššur, son of Aššur-šamšī, of text 1, occurs as a witness also in the related texts Kt n/k 1793: 2f. and Kt n/k 1830: 2 (both record debts to the same creditor, Mannum-kī-Aššur; I owe transcriptions of both to the kindness of V. Donbaz). The seal impressions on these envelopes have been published in N. Özgüç 2006 and according to her the first envelope bears the impressions CS 443, 497 and 518, the second CS 442, 496, 518, 587, 588 and 589. The text on the envelopes show that they have two witnesses in common, alongside Ennam-Aššur also Ilī-nādā, son of Bazia (Bazi<a> in Kt n/k 1793: 1), while in both (in Kt n/k 1830 together with his two brothers) Azu, son of Ilī-nādā, figures as a debtor, whose seal according to the notation 'KIŠIB Azu' is impressed on both debt-notes. But instead of three shared seal impressions they have only CS 518 (1793A, 1830E) in common, an uninscribed seal in two registers, shown in Özgüç pl. 42.¹¹ This seal is ruled out for AKT 4, I, because all four of its seals have one register only. As for the other two seals impressed on Kt n/k 1793, CS 443 is said to occur also as Kt n/k 1752C, 1782A and 1918A (not mentioned in Özgüç pl. 23), and CS 497 also as Kt n/k 1785B.¹² Recently A. Karaduman has mentioned that Kt n/k 1752 is a debt-note for silver, owed by Šu-Bēlum, son of Ikūnum, to Mannu-kī-Aššur (the same creditor as in Kt n/k 1793 and 1830), and that its envelope bears 3 seal impressions, CS 439 (= n/k 1749B), CS 442 (= n/k 1830A and 1939A) and CS 443 (see above), obviously the debtor and two witnesses. This indicates that problems of identification could be solved if seal impressions were published together with the text on which they feature,¹³ and this would also allow to trace and identify such sealers in other archives, since many of them feature in documents from various houses.

3. Archival classification

In his short introduction (p. 12) the editor states that the information provided by the excavator, that the tablets 'were recovered from different archives, some belonging to locals, some

¹¹ Here Kt n/k 1830E is not mentioned, but the seal is said to occur also as Kt n/k 1937B, to which one must add its occurrence as Kt n/k 1939B, see Özgüç p. 278.

¹² Özgüç also mentions its occurrence as Kt n/k 1830B, but this must be a mistake, since Özgüç p. 191 states that this envelope bears an impression of CS 496, a seal that also occurs as Kt 1785A, which must be the source of this mistake.

¹³ For this cooperation between seal specialist and philologist is essential. We are grateful that in Özgüç 2006 Dr. A. Karaduman supplied the reading of the seal inscriptions and in a number of cases also identified the user/owner of a seal from the text written on an envelope. But it is regrettable that the accompanying texts remain unknown and that even information about their nature (debt-note, other contract, deposition, verdict, letter, etc.) and for the numerous sealed debt-notes the number and names of debtors and witnesses are not given.

others to Assyrian merchants', is confirmed by his own 'revision of all tablets in the archive'. This made it impossible to identify the owners of some tablets and to gain more information on the families of the merchants. This conclusion is supported by the texts published in this volume, which makes a proper archival classification difficult. The edition therefore arranges the texts typologically and on the basis of the identity of persons who wrote or received letters 'in order to be able to present relevant tablets together'. This is sensible, but it is of course a disappointment that in the case of tablets found by an official excavation of a building destroyed with its contents *in situ* individual archives or dossiers could not be identified. The various lots must originally have been kept separate or at least have been distinguishable in some way, in the first place for the owner and users of the archival room, who from time to time had to retrieve or read documents, as we know from many letters.

The present volume published only 71 of the texts found in 1963. Adding those edited in four articles published previously by the editor (see note 3), we now know 83 of the texts excavated, to which we can add the 8 inscribed bullae of the Kt o/k group (Kt o/k 64, 196b-1, 196b-2, and 198-204, edited in *Bullae*¹⁴), ignored by the editor. This means that still ca. 115 documents found in 1963 remain unpublished.¹⁵ This makes the volume somewhat comparable to AKT 3, which contains only ca. two-thirds of the texts excavated in 1970, because it does not include the texts in sealed envelopes and a number of texts published separately. It is a great pity that the four volumes of the series AKT published thus far do not contain a single complete archive. I express the hope that the editor will soon publish the remaining texts from 1963, to make a systematic analysis of all tablets (also those in still unopened envelopes) possible. Such an analysis, in combination with data provided by texts from other archives that also feature persons occurring in Kt o/k texts, will yield more insight, even though it does not guarantee that all questions can be answered.

The editor's observations on the texts on p. 12 bear the heading '1963 (o/k) Archive'. It seems to use the term 'archive' in the same way as Professor Tahsin Özgüç regularly did, as a kind of synonym of 'house', e.g. in the title of the English part of his *Kaniš II*, 'Archives and Districts of the *karum* at Kanish'. 'Archive' is probably an abbreviation of 'archive building', a term he uses *ibidem* p. 5, where the 'third building' is described as 'two rooms of a ruined archive building'.¹⁶ He apparently designated a house after what for him was its main feature, the 'archival room', as is clear from *ibidem* p. 3, where the 'fourth building' (with two rooms) is said to be one 'without tablets or archive', apparently meaning without a special archival room. The use of the singular 'archive' suggests that an 'archival building' contained one archive to which all the tablets found there belonged. This is a valid, first approach, since the texts, apart from 'stray tablets' and 'intrusive tablets' (that only ended up there in the course of its destruction or due to later rebuilding in the level Ib period) must have been deliberately deposited there and thus reflect the archival holdings present at the time the room was

¹⁴ See p. 174ff., pl. 65-69, p. 312ff. (14 seal inscriptions on CS 80-89 and 93-96), and p. 327ff. (the texts on the bullae).

¹⁵ And the single tablet found on the tepe, Kt o/k 1 (see *Kaniš II* p. 21, unpublished).

¹⁶ See also his *Kultepe, Kaniš/Neša* (Tokyo 2003) 88, where the caption of fig. 32, which shows the house of Ali-ahum, reads 'Archive of Alahum', and note the title of his article mentioned below in footnote 25. In his contribution to *Cinquante-deux réflexions sur le Proche-Orient offertes en hommage à Léon De Meyer* (MHEO II, Leuven, 1994) 369, when describing the house of Elamma, in grid LVI-LVII/128-129, he writes 'This archive covers an area of 130 m²'.

destroyed. It is extremely unlikely that when the house of a dead trader was sold his archive was left in the room where also the new owner would store his records. We thus far also have no evidence that two independent traders (father and son or two brothers is a different matter) lived in the same house and kept their tablets in the same 'archival room'.¹⁷ Therefore, the presence of 'strange records' must in some way reflect the contacts, the social or legal obligations and transactions of the archive owner, even when (as happens frequently) the text of these 'strange records' does not bear this out.¹⁸ The owner may have allowed somebody else to deposit tablets in his archival room, may have taken care of records of others, or have acquired them in the framework of a legal transaction. Some people did not have a house of their own in the colony and this explains the presence of records belonging to members of the family or personnel of the owner of the house.¹⁹ Texts also report that traders for various reasons, e.g. when they had to leave for a longer period,²⁰ did 'leave behind' tablets with others as 'safe deposit' (*ana nabšēm ezābum*, e.g. in CTMMA 1, 84),²¹ and tablets could also be ceded and handed over as pledges or security. But without written evidence — and CTMMA 1, 84 is exceptional since the information is provided in a deposition, made because the removal of tablets had led to a lawsuit — it is difficult to explain the presence of 'strange records', unless they themselves offer a clue, e.g. by revealing that their owner was a debtor, partner or relative of the archive owner.

The texts excavated in 1990 in the house in squares LVIII-LIX/132-133 and edited in TPAK 1, consist of archival lots of two different traders, Šumi-abiya and Aššur-mutappil. Michel convincingly suggests that the latter (of whom no debt-notes are preserved!) may have deposited his correspondence in the former's archival room when he left, and Šumi-abiya may have added to this lot some letters arriving after Aššur-mutappil had departed, which were never opened.²² CTMMA 1, 84 shows that the owner of an archive knew very well and apparently kept a list of such tablets and the letter quoted in note 20 states that such tablets were 'sealed', i.e. placed in a sealed container, so that they were kept separate and were easily identifiable. This also happened with important single tablets of legal value, which could be sent to somebody and stored in his archive as a sealed packet, provided with a bulla that identified them as 'missive of PN' (*našpa/ertum ša...*).²³ This evokes the picture

¹⁷ See now the valuable observations in M. T. Larsen, 'Individual and Family in Old Assyrian Society', *JCS* 59 (2007) 93-106, esp. p. 103f.

¹⁸ See my remarks in 'Archives of Old Assyrian Traders', in M. Brosius (ed.), *Ancient Archives and Archival Traditions* (Oxford 2003) 78-123, esp. 115ff., 5.2, 'Strange records'.

¹⁹ Tablets belonging to different members of his family were found in the archive of Elamma, excavated in 1991. In the archive of Imdilum a small group of records belonging to Ušur-ša-Aššur was found, a man who, as his service contract shows, was in Imdilum's service as transporter and apparently did not have a house of his own.

²⁰ In Kt d/k 2: 9ff. a trader writes to a woman, 'When I was about to leave on a journey, we entrusted many tablets to B.,... you and I, we brought them into the storeroom (*huršum*) and we sealed them'.

²¹ According to this deposition two boxes of tablets removed from a trader's living quarter are said to contain, in addition to ca. twenty of his own records, also (lines 40f.) 'tablets of others/outside, which they had left in deposit with me' (*ṭuppē ahiūtīm ša ana nabšē(m) ēzibūninni*), and lines 46ff. specify three more records by the words 'PN left them to me' (PN *ēzibam*).

²² See the introduction to TPAK 1, 33f.

²³ Nearly forty of the bullae found in houses of *kārum* Kanesh bear an inscription that uses the term *našpertum* and in addition we have bullae identifying one or a group of tablets (*ṭuppum/ṭuppū ša...*). Others describe the contents of a packet or container as 'duplicates of...' (*mehrum/mehrātum*, Kt c/k 839, Kt m/k 100, Kt 89/k 401), 'memorandums' (*tahsisātum*, Kt 94/k 879, 1664), or even list various types of records stored in one container (Kt 94/k 878, 'my case-enclosed tablets, my duplicates and memorandums', *ṭuppūya harrumūtum mehrūya u tahsisātum*). See Bullae 319-350, 'Inscriptions on the bullae'.

of a trader's archival room with, alongside the bulk of the records that reflect his own business, also some packets, bags or containers with tablets belonging to others, identified and protected by sealed and inscribed bullae.²⁴

Only a time consuming study of such 'strange tablets' within the framework of a reconstruction of the business and family relations of the archive owner may provide clues. But if this is possible such tablets, since their presence was not by accident, in turn may shed light on the business of the archive owner as reconstructed from his own records. To achieve this goal not only the texts, but also the archaeological data on their discovery are important. If 'strange tablets', as seems likely, were somehow kept apart, their exact find spots are important, as are those of the bullae, especially of the numerous ones with string holes that must originally have been attached to packets and containers with such tablets. Unfortunately, such detailed archaeological data usually are missing, since we only learn in which room tablets (without or with envelopes) were found and how they were stored (in boxes, baskets, jars, on shelves, etc.). Information (with photos or drawings) on the exact find spots of numbered tablets or groups of tablets is rarely provided²⁵ and tablet numbers only mention the year of excavation, no grid numbers to reveal their find spots. Recent studies of excavated archives that use archaeological data in combination with numbers and contents of the tablets, show the potential of such an 'archival approach'. An example are the archives found in 1993, studied by Cécile Michel²⁶ with the help of a map of the houses where they were found and data on the location of the three groups of tablets, provided by the director of the excavations, Professor Kulakoğlu. She could establish that 'the first house contains a majority of letters and a strong proportion of envelopes. The first group of tablets discovered in the second house has a lot of loan contracts, while the second group..... has many more of the other contracts. The personal memoranda form the great majority of the tablets numbered between 610 and 650', while a third group of twenty documents comprises mostly fragmentary envelopes. More such detailed data on other archives will allow us to discover certain patterns of classifying and storing tablets in an archival room.

In many cases tablet numbers make long, continuous series, which suggests that they were all found in one and the same house, while study of the texts may reveal that they comprise different archives from different houses, excavated in the same year. I discovered that the tablets excavated in 1991 because of their contents had to be divided into two archives: those with numbers Kt 91/k 103-284 and those numbered Kt 91/k 285ff. The latter group is the

²⁴ See for such inscribed bullae, *Bullae* 272ff., especially Kt c/k 834, c/k 1366, m/k 100, o/k 202, and 94/k 878f., 94/k 1061f., 94/k 1290, 94/k 1664f.

²⁵ It is occasionally offered in an article, such as T. Özgüç, 'Observations on the Architectural Peculiarities of the Archive of an Assyrian Trader of Kārum Kanesh', in: W. H. van Soldt (ed.), *Veenhof Anniversary Volume* (PIHANS 89, Leiden 2001) 367-371, which deals with the house in squares LXV-LXVI/130-131, which (although it is not mentioned there) was excavated in 1994. It describes how the hundreds of tablets and envelopes were found, fallen from shelves, packed in bags, in straw wrappings, sacks and pots; unbaked tablets next to the hearth. But since no tablet numbers are connected with these facilities and containers we cannot say which tablet was found where and to which group it belonged. To be able to do so they should, moreover, be located within a grid system that is finer than the one used, which works with squares of 10 by 10 m.

²⁶ In *AoF* 35 (2008) 53-67. See also her observations on how the letters were preserved and classified in archives in: *La lettre d'archive, Topoi*, Supplement 9 (2008) 117-140, and earlier her 'Quelques réflexions sur les archives récentes de Kültepe', in: *Acts of the IIIrd International Congress of Hittology, Çorum 1966* (Ankara 1998) 419-433.

archive of Elamma, found in the house in square LVI-LVII/128-129 according to information made available by the excavator.²⁷ The former is a completely different group that, as the excavator later told me, was found ca. 30 m north of Elamma's house in square LII-LIII/126-127. The same is true of the tablets found in 1994, the first and second group of which, Kt 94/k 117-230 and Kt 94/k 279-568, are from a house in grid LII/125, while the third and largest group, Kt 94/k 569-1715, is from a large house in grid LIV-LV/130-131.²⁸

4. *The bullae in the archive*

Among the documents excavated in 1963 is also a number of so-called bullae, sealed and frequently also inscribed pieces of clay in specific shapes, used as stoppers of vessels or attached to containers with tablets. Unfortunately, their mainly sequential excavation numbers (Kt o/k 63, o/k 196b, o/k 198-204a)²⁹ obscure their association with particular (lots/containers) of tablets. Even so, seal impressions and inscriptions on bullae may provide useful prosopographic and textual information and it is a pity that the editor of AKT 4 has ignored them. The text on the bulla Kt o/k 199 is a witnessed quittance in the first person, dealing with the payment of a debt of 1½ minas of silver to Ilī-ālum, a man known from other texts of the 'archive'. More important is the bulla Kt o/k 203, inscribed with the words 'tablet(s) with the testament of Agua' (*tup-pu ša šimāt Agua*), which must have been attached (it has a string hole) to a packet or container with (among others?) the large, undated testament Kt o/k 196a/b in its sealed envelope (10.7 x 6.7 x 3.9 cm), which was published separately in Albayrak 2000.³⁰ The editor did not mention or use this bulla there, but states that this Agua (son of Šu-Anum) 'auch ein Archiv in den o/k Texten hat' (p. 21), apparently the archive of his (eldest) son Šu-Bēlum, who figures in the testament as his father's successor and the future owner of the house in Kanesh, presumably the one where these texts were found. As mentioned in § 1 we meet him in texts 2: 7 and 3: 7 as a creditor in debt-notes dated to the eponymy years 81 and 82 and he may have kept text 15, an undated quittance, after he had paid his debt. These dates suggest that his father Agua

²⁷ See for a description of Elamma's house (with ground plan) and the discovery of tablets in rooms 3, 4 and 5, T. Özgüç in: *Studies De Meyer* (see above note 16) 369ff., where however it is not mentioned which groups were found where. Professor Özgüç later told me that the excavation of Elamma's house could only be completed during the next season and that the texts numbered Kt 92/k 94-187 were found 'collapsed on the floor of the south side of the second room' of Elamma's house. The next group of texts found in 1992, Kt 92/k 188-263, again without any interruption of the sequential numbering, constitutes the archive of *Kuliya*, found in a neighboring house (in grid LV-LVI/126-127). Tablets with still higher numbers belong to a large archive (or archives; highest number known to me Kt 92/k 1050) found in again another house excavated in 1992, according to Özgüç –Tunca 2001, 226, in squares LV-LVI/126-127. This is difficult to believe, because this is the square occupied by the house of the just mentioned *Kuliya* that, according to the excavator, was empty apart from his archive.

²⁸ The house was described in the article of T. Özgüç mentioned in note 25. This very large archive is being edited by M. T. Larsen and a first volume of it is now in press. See for the archival aspect now M. T. Larsen, 'Archives and filing systems at Kültepe', in: C. Michel (ed.), *Studies in Memory of Paul Garelli*, Leiden: NINO, 2008, 77-88.

²⁹ See *Bullae*, p. 174ff., pl. 65-69, p. 312-14 (seal inscriptions on CS 80-89 and 93-96), and p. 327ff. (the texts on the bullae); Kt o/k 63 is an isolated stopper of a jug with a stamp seal.

³⁰ See for this text (in which the husband stipulates that his wife/widow 'is father and mother' over the silver she inherits), C. Michel, *RA* 94 (2000) 1-10. Testaments were extremely valuable documents, carefully preserved in archives; note in *POAT* 19: 27ff. an instruction to entrust the last will of Aššur-imittī, which is in Hurama, 'wrapped in reed, carefully (*ina qanu'ē lawwiāma damqiš*) to a reliable trader' who will bring it to Assur.

belonged to an early generation of traders. The testament of Agua must have been preserved in the archival room, in a special packet, because of its importance for documenting Šu-Bēlum's rights and status. But it was a duplicate, since it was in an unopened envelope,³¹ and we know that such documents were officially opened only after the death of the testator, usually in Assur, a moment eagerly awaited by relatives and others, as is clear from the letter AKT 3, 94. Note in this connection that letter 45, written on the occasion of the death of lady Akatia, states that her daughter Lamassatum has was taking steps to open the testament (see below).

The archival situation of the testament of Agua is somewhat mysterious. Case and tablet (Kt o/k 196a and c) figure alongside two bullae numbered Kt o/k 196b1 and 196b2 (*Bullae* 175f., pl. 65-67, seal impressions 264f., inscriptions 327f.) and in addition there is a tablet numbered Kt o/k 196b, studied (but not published) by Albayrak, who states that it has no relation with the testament.³² The separate study and selective edition of tablets and bullae and the lack of any detailed information on the circumstances of their discovery obscure the facts, but since all share the number Kt o/k 196 they most probably were found together (in one container or as a separate lot) and cannot have been completely unrelated. This is confirmed by the fact that the inscriptions on two of the five seals (CS 81 and 83, see *Bullae* pl. 14 and p. 268f.) impressed on Kt o/k 196b1 identify them as belonging to *Puzur*₄-[*Ištar*] / *DUMU A-gu*₅-a, and [Ú]-šú-ur-ša-A-[šūr] / [DUM]U *A-gu*₅-a, two sons of Agua, who occur also in lines 33f. of his testament as heirs. Bulla Kt o/k 196b2 is also sealed by five persons, among whom Šu-Bēlum, without patronymic, but certainly Agua's eldest son, and Aššur-idī, another son of Agua, mentioned in line 26 of the testament.³³ These two physically very similar ('baked, low hemispheroid, string marks on the concave back, three horizontal string holes') bullae, with in all ten seal impressions,³⁴ including those of Agua's four sons, may have been attached to one single packet or container, which — considering its excavation number — might have included also the tablet Kt o/k 196b, mentioned by Albayrak. The mention of the fifth seal impression on Kt o/k 196b2 is followed by the signs *ša š[í x x x]*, which Tunca in *Bullae* 327 convincingly restores as *ša š[imat....]*, 'of the last will of [.....]', referring to the text on the bulla Kt o/k 203 (p. 329; see above), a bulla which may have been attached to the testament Kt o/k 196a,c. This inscription indicates that we may have to do with several different tablets (*tup-pu*) relating to the last will of Agua and perhaps ensuing legal arrangements, kept in one container and protected by two complementary sealed bullae. But questions remain: the two sons of Agua, represented by impressions of their inscribed seals on Kt o/k 196b1, do not figure among the five persons whose seals are mentioned and one wonders who used their seals. It is possible that one of the two men identified as 'son of Puzur-Ištar', Šu-Kūbum or Puzur-Anna, was a grandson of Agua, who used his father's seal, but since the published texts of Kt o/k offer no insight into the family of Agua, these are merely suggestions.

³¹ The archive of Šalim-Aššur, excavated in 1994, contains a letter written by his son in which he asks to have a copy of his father's last will sent from Assur to Kanesh (information by M. T. Larsen).

³² Albayrak 2000, 21, note 7.

³³ The Ušur-ša-Aššur who is stated to have sealed it (line 3) is different from the just mentioned son of Agua, because the inscription on his seal (CS 87) reads: *KIŠIB Amur-Aššur / DUMU Šu-li*.

³⁴ Even a very large bulla could not have accommodated ten seal impressions with ten lines of text.

5. The archaeological data

According to information provided by the excavator³⁵ the Kt o/k texts of 1963 belonged to 'archives of Assyrian and local Anatolian merchants whose names were not hitherto known'. But two other reports, also based on information provided by him, mention 'two Assyrian archives, providing some 200 new tablets' (Mellink) or 'four new archives, consisting of 214 tablets' (Alkim).³⁶ While Alkim's slightly higher number is a minor problem, the different numbers of archives (perhaps based on a first inspection of the tablets by K. Balkan) is puzzling. The more detailed archaeological record, in *Kaniš* II, 6f., is also not clear and perhaps even contradictory, since it first states that 'an archive of nearly 200 tablets and envelopes' was found in room 2, the 'pantry' (see the ground plan fig. 11)³⁷ of the 'sixth building of district 2', which is the house located in squares B-D/11-12. But on the same page we read that in room 4, 'a later annex' added to the west of the house and linked with room 3 by means of door, also '200 tablets, envelopes and small vessels came to light'. Since the descriptions of the contents of both rooms is almost identical and other reports fix the number of tablets found in 1963 at 207, I presume that the information on the contents of room 4 is a mistake. Some tablets might have been found there (perhaps the origin of the information on the discovery of texts of Anatolian merchants, mentioned above?), but we can only guess which. It cannot have been the seven tablets of Madawada (see note 3), though this might explain the figure 214 (= 207 + 7) of Alkim, because the excavation numbers of this small lot range between Kt o/k 39 to 106 and are not consecutive, as would have been the case with a new lot excavated in a different room. To all appearances, Madawada's tablets were also found in room 2.

Since the description of the large house B-D/11-12 gives no further information on the location and disposition of the (groups of) tablets in room 2, we have no archaeological clues for an archival classification. The presence of a few small coherent groups, such as the lot of Madawada or the letters of Iddin-Suen (nos. 51-56, all addressed to 'my representatives' in conjunction with particular persons), are hardly sufficient to speak of different 'archives'; they could be small dossiers or files deposited in room 2 for reasons unknown to us. The excavation numbers of the tablets unfortunately provide no clues, since the group of letters of Iddin-Suen have no sequential numbers, but are Kt o/k 59, 61, 86, 100, 101 (a deposition on a conflict between him and Erbī-Adad), 103, and 111. These numbers may reflect the fact that the retrieval of the compacted tablets from the ruined room was very difficult, as the excavator told me, and that numbers were given later. There may also have been early disturbance, due to the destruction of the *kārum*³⁸ and the later building of the houses level Ib, the foun-

³⁵ Translated into English in *AnSt* 14 [1964] 21.

³⁶ M. Mellink in *AJA* 68 (1964) 151f.; this report also mentions the discovery of 'some lexicographical ones and lists of furniture'. H. Alkim's statement is found in *JEOL* 18 (1964), 250. Her figure (214) is presumably provisional, but cannot be explained by assuming that it included some tablets from level Ib, since no texts from level Ib were found in 1963 (see the list in *Kaniš* II, 19); only one uninscribed bulla, Kt o/k 204a, found on the city-mound, in the 'palace of Warshama', dates to level Ib (see *Bullae* 177f, with pl. 69, St. 26). The date of the single tablet also found there, Kt o/t 1 (*Kaniš* II, 21) is unknown.

³⁷ See for this large, atypical house also T. Özgüç, *Kültepe, Kaniš/Neša* (Tokyo 2003) 99ff., figs. 51, 53 and 58 (where it is designated as 'Archive of level II opening to the street').

³⁸ The description in *Kaniš* II also does not mention (as was indicated in the introduction to TPAK 1) whether the (all?) tablets were found on the floor, or some perhaps among the debris and therefore possibly fallen from a second floor, which cannot be excluded since (p. 6 bottom) 'burnt debris from the upper floor filled the rooms of the ground floor'.

dations of which were dug into the ruins of level II. This is borne out for the Kt o/k group, as observed by the editor on p. 13, by the presence of some documents that must have belonged to the archive of the neighboring house in squares C-D/11-12, belonging to Ušur-ša-Ištar. This clear disturbance implies that other tablets too may have ended up with or near the original contents of room 2 of house B-D/11-12. A possible candidate — but without knowledge of the unpublished records I have to be careful — is the interesting Kt o/k 52, which records the transfer of four fields and an orchard by Kubidahšu to Ašu'ad, with unique stipulations on the joint ownership of the available irrigation water (lines 10f., *mā'ē šiqītum / ša illukūni ša kilallēšunuma*, see Albayrak 2001, cf. note 3), since there are no further occurrences of these persons in the published Kt o/k texts.

6. Dating the texts

The year eponyms figuring in debt-notes and memorandums help us to date the lots and they range, with substantial gaps, from year 77 to 128, with two exceptions. Text 13 is from month II of eponymy year 136, the very year when level of *kārum* came to an end by destruction. As the editor mentions, it is duplicated by ICK 1, 119, but it is unclear how one copy ended up in the house excavated in 1963. The other exception is eponym 69, in 26: 70, but it is very doubtful. The creditor in the texts excerpted in this memorandum is Hunniya,³⁹ and the occurrence of eponymy year 69 would mean that he had been active over a period of 42 years (the first debt-note in line 7f. is dated to eponymy year 110), which is very unlikely, also because the other contracts in which he figures are dated between years 96 and 110. Moreover, the reading of the name is an emendation, because the editor added an exclamation mark after *šū-*, but the very small and dark photo of the tablet does not allow me to come up with a different reading.

We must distinguish between dates occurring in actual debt-notes and those figuring in memoranda that list (excerpts of) many debt-notes, presumably to draw up a list of those still to be paid, some of which may be old. Actual debt-notes in the archive, presumably recording unpaid debts,⁴⁰ are dated to eponymy years 77, 81, 82, 86, 96, 97, 99-101, 106, and 111. Memorandum 25 contains debt claims dating to eponymy years 102, 114, 117 and 128; memorandum 26 debts from years 96, 97, 101, 105 (3x), and 110. With the editor (p. 13) I believe that the latter memorandum probably belongs to the archive Kt n/k of the neighboring house, excavated in 1962 in square C-D/11-12, whose owner was Hunniya's brother Ušur-ša-Ištar (see note 40). The more so since Hunniya does not appear in the other documents published in AKT 4,⁴¹ while he figures prominently in the Kt n/k archive, and also because more texts

³⁹ We must restore his now missing name at the end of l. 24, since he was the son of Aššur-imitī and a brother of Ušur-ša-Aššur; cf. ATHE 24: 40, Kt j/k 201: 8, Kt k/k 44: 24, and VAS 26, 107: 21f. In l. 39 we have to read *Hu'-ni-[a-a]*, and he also is the creditor in l. 49ff., where we have to read, with the photo, *ū Hunniya [a]-na qātē Irma-Aššur* ⁵⁰ *i-dī-nu-ni*.....⁵¹..... *a-šē-[er]*. In the debt-note copied in lines 1-11 the creditor remains anonymous (*tamkārum*), but here Hunniya and his brother must figure as debtors, assuming that before their names in l. 5 *iššēr* has been omitted (by the ancient scribe or the modern editor; the photo is too dark to be sure).

⁴⁰ The rule was that a debt-note was returned to the debtor when he paid; if on that occasion the debt-note was not available the debtor received a quittance, which he could later exchange for the original debt-note.

⁴¹ His occurrence in 21: 20 as the person to whom a shipment of merchandise was entrusted, presumably in Assur, is not relevant here and we do not know who the anonymous speaker/writer ('I entrusted') of this document was.

found in 1963 and bearing kt o/k numbers seem to belong to the archive found in 1962, as the editor of AKT 4 observes on p. 13.⁴² In memorandum 25 we meet several different creditors and this makes it difficult to know who was its writer and why it belonged to the archive. Iddin-Kūbum might offer a clue, because he figures in other texts too, as owner of a slave in 10: 4, as partner in the contract 14: 5, and as recipient of the letter 33. If so, the dates mentioned indicate that he belonged to the later period, but we need more information on him (his patronymic is not mentioned), perhaps hidden in the unpublished tablets of the archive.

In letter 51 we meet a problematic year eponym. It mentions three tablets recording debts of Al-tāb, the second of which (lines 6-9) is due 'since the eponymy of Enna(m)-Suen, son of Kurara'. This eponym also attested in Kt j/k 300: 8f. (during month viii),⁴³ but none of the four eponyms with the name Enna(m)-Suen that figure in the now complete eponym list — a son of Pussānum, year 38; a son of Šu-Aššur, year 108; a son of Šu-Ištar, year 114; a son of Iddin-abum, year 135 — has a father named Kurara. This means that Kurara must be a mistake⁴⁴ and because the first Enna(m)-Suen is too early and the last too late, we may identify him with eponym 107 or 114. The first alternative is attractive, since (as noted in Veenhof 2003, 55, f.) the debtor in Kt j/k 300 has the rare name Kurkuriya, son of Šah(e)r-ilī, who occurs also in KTS 1, 44a (EL no. 62; cf. Dalley, *Edinburgh* no. 9: 31ff.), dated to eponymy year 107.⁴⁵ The mistaken name of his father could have been suggested by the occurrence in several texts of an Enna(m)-Suen, son of Kurara, whom the scribe of our texts may have known well. That this 'mistake' was made in two different texts presents a problem, but it is less serious than the impossibility of inserting an additional year eponym in the list.

Finally, note in text 1: 13 a 'successor eponymy' designated not (as usual) as *ša qātē*, 'who (took over from) the hands of', but by the rare *ša warki*, 'who comes after', not surprising since our text is from year 79 and *ša warki* is restricted to early eponymy years: 67, 74 and 77.⁴⁶

7. New and interesting data in the texts

Old Assyrian is a difficult dialect and the special terminology and subject matter of the commercial texts usually is not very familiar to the average assyriologist or historian, who therefore relies heavily on the translation and accompanying comments in text editions by specialists. It is therefore a pity that it has been decided to present translations of and comments on the texts in this volume again (as was the case in AKT 1 and 2) only in Turkish, so that most readers will be unable to use them. Assyriology is an international discipline and its results, irrespective of where the items studied or published were found, should be presented in a generally understood language, therefore neither in Turkish, nor in Danish, nor in Dutch.

⁴² 'These tablets are the continuation of the 1962 archive uncovered a year earlier', and he mentions as such text 26 and letter 45, addressed to Ušur-ša-Ištar, in which he is informed of the death of his sister Akatiya, apparently in Assur (see for her C. Günbattı, in: *Studies in Honour of Sedat Alp* [Ankara 1992] 232f.).

⁴³ It was mentioned by H. Sever in the *Uluslararası 1. Hititoloji Kongresi Bildirileri* (Çorum 1990) 137, as no. 16, and I have studied the tablet in Ankara in 1987.

⁴⁴ Kryszat in OAAS 2, 113 no. 53, after discussing the problem, followed me in considering a scribal error in the writing the name of the father (Kurara) the most likely solution.

⁴⁵ The first witness in Kt j/k 300 is *Ma-sā-a* son of Aššur-nimrī, also attested in the memorandum 25: 11f. (undated). The second is Aššur-kēna-rām, son of Aššur-bāni, also attested in AKT 3, 93: 9 (transports a tablet), Kt 87/k 41: 19 (acts as arbitrator), and Kt 92/k 471: 1f. (witness, on a bulla), but none of these texts is dated.

⁴⁶ See Veenhof 2003, 29.

It must also be in the interest of a scholar that his publications can be read and used by his colleagues. The use of the Turkish language in AKT 4 has the effect that the transliterations that can be read become more important and I therefore add some comments on them, pointing out first (§ 7) interesting lexical features and other data, and next (§ 8) a number of necessary corrections, mainly several improved readings and interpretations.

In 1: 3, in a context that has nothing to do with transport of merchandise, we find the seal impression of a debtor called 'Nūr-Ištar, the smuggler' (*mupazzirum*). That this designation replaces the normal identification as 'son of PN',⁴⁷ indicates that this was his profession. As such he is comparable to 'Aššur-bāni, the smuggler', mentioned as father of a debtor in TC 1, 81: 17, and to the two smugglers, Zuba and Adad-bāni, mentioned in Kt 94/k 1359: 5ff. (courtesy M. T. Larsen) as transporters of textiles, who have to be paid their wage.

Text 4: 14-17 stipulates payment when creditor and debtor will meet, which uses the first person plural, 'Wherever we meet... he will pay to me' (*alī ninnammuru... išaqqalam*). There are more examples of the use of the first person,⁴⁸ in particular when special security clauses in the interest of the creditor are added to a probably standard formulary. In the case of *amārum*, both the G-stem (with the creditor who spots the debtor as subject) and the N-stem (reciprocal, creditor and debtor 'meet', or passive, the debtor 'is seen') occur and there is also some hesitation between first and third person forms. In TC 3, 219 the tablet has *alī ammurušu kaspī alaqqe*, 'wherever I see him I will collect my silver', while the envelope writes *alīma emmurušu*, 'wherever he sees him'.⁴⁹ The first person occurs also in EL 97: 21, *alī ammurušu*, and in Kt 91/k 489B: 11, *ašar ammurušu*, the third person in TC 3 248: 16, *alī emmuruš*. The N-stem occurs in the singular, with the debtor as subject, in 7: 14f., 'wherever he will be seen (*alī innammuruni*),⁵⁰ either in the City or in Anatolia ('the countryside'), he will pay', which is identical to Kt 92/k 201: 13'f. and Kt 94/k 172: 17f. (courtesy Michel), where the apodosis reads 'the creditor (*tamkārum*) [will collect his silver]'. The rarer reciprocal *nanmurum* is used in 4: 14f., quoted above, and in Kt 87/k 278: 9ff. (courtesy K. Hecker), which demands payment within five months in the City and adds 'if he does not pay, wherever we meet (*ašar ninnammuru*) he will pay 15 shekels of silver'. The added specification 'either in the City or in Anatolia' reveals that the clause has to prevent the debtor's refusal to pay with the argument that debts have to be collected where they were contracted, a rule obtaining in certain situations and stated in POAT 16: 34ff., 'Don't you know the rule (*awātum*) of the City: What is of Anatolia shall be collected only in Anatolia, what is of the City only in

⁴⁷ According to Albayrak, who refers to the unpublished text Kt o/k 131: 13, he may have been the son of Ennamya and (because of his fairly rare name) may occur also in TC 3, 91: 47, which lists a debt owed by Nūr-Ištar, *hurdum* (posthumous child?) of Ennamaya, and in POAT 7: 15f., which mentions a transport by Nūr-Ištar and the same eponymy year as AKT 4, 1.

⁴⁸ See K. R. Veenhof, in: R. Westbrook – R. Jasnow (eds.), *Security for Debt in Ancient Near Eastern Law* (Leiden-Boston 2001) 153 with note 148.

⁴⁹ On the basis of the distinction between the prefix vowels of the first and third person singular, noted in GKT § 89a.

⁵⁰ Also in Prag I 615: 10ff., *ašar innammurun[i]... išaqqal*, and Kt 87/k 262: 16f. (courtesy K. Hecker), with two debtors, *alī innammurūni kaspam išaqqulū*. It occurs with the 'tamkārum clause' in Kt 91/k 203: 15ff., '*alī ina-mu-ru-ú* the bearer of the tablet is the creditor', where notwithstanding the long vowel the verb must in the singular and refer to the debtor, from whom the creditor can claim payment anywhere, if he submits the debt-note. A somewhat comparable clause occurs in EL 35: 18ff., 'wherever he (scil. the creditor) brings him (the debtor) his tablet he will pay' (*alī tuppūšu uballušunni išaqqal*), a verbal description of the situation succinctly and repeatedly rendered by *wābil tuppim šut tamkārum*, 'the bearer of the tablet is the creditor'.

the City?' (*ša eqlim ina eqlimma illaqqe ša ālim ina ālimma illaqqe*). Such a rule makes sense because of the substantial costs of transporting silver from Anatolia to Assur, where, moreover, its exchange value from the point of view of the Assyrians was much higher. On the other hand, in a society of traveling traders, where money must circulate and creditor and/or debtor may not be available and meet at the due date, delayed payment has to be prevented, a. o. by the clause discussed here.⁵¹

Text 6: 9f. offers a new occurrence of the specification of the due date of the interest on a debt, payable 'from month X, when the god has reached the *šapattum*', that is the day of the full moon, half-way the month. It can be added to the list in Veenhof, *JEOL* 34 [1995/6], 16ff., together with Kt 93/k 206: 5f. (courtesy C. Michel) and Kt 94/k 826: 9f. (courtesy M. T. Larsen), in both again *ilum šapattam illikma*. Its mention in debt-notes reflects the wish to fix the date when the debt started (it is frequently followed by 'he received the silver', *kas-pam ilqe*) or when the payment of the capital or the interest became due (in text 6 and Kt 93/k 206) more precisely than somewhere within a month or week (*hamuštum*).

Text 14 is an interesting partnership contract, because the anonymous *tamkārum* of l. 2, to whom the capital belongs, is identical to the first of the three partners, A., since l. 14 states that 'this silver belongs to A.' This form of partnership is best attested in OB partnerships for the exploitation of fields, in which the owner of the field also figures as one of the tenants, which assures him two-thirds of the yield: the rent, usually one-third of the yield, and half of the share of the two tenants, usually two-thirds of the yield.⁵² Since in our case there is no rent and no interest is stipulated, one may assume that the other two partners do the actual trading, while A. receives one-third of the profit, which more or less equals the annual interest of 30% due to a creditor, unless the capital with the odd amount if 3 minas 48 shekels of silver (= 1 mina 16 shekels per partner), already includes a surcharge as a hidden interest.

In 24: 3 we have the first OA occurrence of TÚG NÍG.LÁM = *lamahuššúm*, a garment of fine quality, here part of a lot of 'extra fine textiles', entrusted 'at the entrance of the gate' (presumably in Assur) for transport to Anatolia. The Akkadian name contains the element *huššú*, from HUŠ.A, 'red', and in *ARMT* 21 (1983) 415, J.-M. Durand suggests that the garment attested there as *túg na.ma.huš.a* is a variant spelling of it. This allows the further suggestion that the woolen garment attested a few times and in small numbers in OA texts as *namaššuhum* is the OA equivalent⁵³ of TÚG NÍG.LÁM. As stated in my *AOAT* 167, 12, it was also produced in Assur and an expensive item (mentioned together with Abarnian and Akkadian textiles).

Text 28: 7 has the first occurrence of the nisbe *ekallium* (É.GAL-/li-ú-tim, collated) from *ekallum*, meaning 'fit for the palace, of 'palatial' quality', which suits the description of the textiles in question as being 'of extra fine quality'; it is somewhat comparable to the designation of textiles as *ša šarruttim*, 'of royal quality'.

⁵¹ Cf. also the instruction, in *ATHE* 34: 19ff., by a frustrated creditor: 'Seize him (the debtor) and make him pay the silver. Inform the scribe of the *kārum* if he does not turn up on the market' (*šumma ina mahīrim lā innamar*). This is similar to stipulations in OB commercial loans that demand payment when creditor and debtor meet 'in the/a *kārum*', e.g. in *ARMT* 8, 78: 23ff., 'He will pay to whoever is carrying his bond in the *kārum* where he turns up, on the basis of the text of this tablet' (*ina kārim ša innamaru... itanappal*); see my observations in *JESHO* 40 (1997) 360f.

⁵² See W. Eilers, *Gesellschaftsformen im altbabylonischen Recht* (LRS 65, Leipzig 1931) 42 and 50f.

⁵³ But it occurs since Oakk times and is once attested in OB as *namanšu'um*, see *CAD* N/I, 220.

In 30: 28f. we meet the expression *tiṭtam gamārum*, 'to use up the clay', scil. by producing many clay tablets, which thus far has not been recognized in OA (for an OB example see *ARM* 28, 105: 9-10). Alongside 30: 28f., *tī-ṭam ša ālim ina šutēbulim, ag-da^{sic}-mar*, 'I have used up the clay of the city (of Assur) by constantly sending (letters)', we have in Kt 89/k 232: 9ff. (courtesy Y. Kawasaki), *tiṭtam, ša ālim ina, tišappurim agdamrakkunni* ('by constantly sending'); note that both letters use a verb that refers to the sending of the letters, not to their fabrication. Without specification the expression appears in Kt n/k 161: 37f., *tiṭtam ša Kaneš nigdamrakkum* (courtesy S. Bayram). It reflects the mood of traders who wrote many letters without getting a (or a satisfactory) answer, which is also reflected in a letter formerly in the Kalley Collection (1943/1: 30ff., transliteration by Landsberger), 'Why should we keep hurling big words at each other with a sling over a distance of ten double hours?'⁵⁴, and in *Prag I* 637: 22ff., 'Since I am staying here ten, yea twenty times (*ešrišu u ešrāma*) letters of mine have been going to you concerning your coming here'. But a continuous stream of letters could also irritate their addressee, as in *CCT* 3, 38: 19ff., 'Why have you written me a hundred times (*adi metā*)? You know that I am weak!'

In 33: 21 we must read [*q*]á-at-kā *šabātam ale'e*, 'I can seize your hand', an idiomatic expression for 'I can support you, come to your aid', attested in OA, a.o. in *Prag I* 663: 14f. and Kt 88/k 963: 331f., *ina / mimma ēma qātkunu /šabātam ana ša terrabāninni / kārum ile'e*, 'the *kārum* is able to support you in anything, wherever it may be, so that (?) you may enter (to do business).' It also occurs in Babylonian, see my remarks in *Akkadica* 94/95 (1995) 35f.

In 37: 15 *ú-ma-ar* must be a present tense of the D-stem of *amārum*, 'to inspect, to check'. See for this stem of the verb Th. Sturm, *UF* 27 (1995) 487-503, who adduces many examples of the verbal adjective *ammurum*, used of silver, but could not yet list a fientic form. Our writer says: 'I will check the silver when [I] arrive; let his silver (-*šu* visible on the photo) be ready when I come!'

In 49: 5 we have a rare occurrence of the plural of *šāltum*, 'fight, quarrel', *šālātim ša aštanamme'uni*, 'the quarrels I keep hearing rumors about', also attested in *TPAK* 1, 46: 20, 'you keep writing me reports about your fights' (*ša ša-lá-tí-ku-nu*).

28-30. All three letters were written from Assur (cf. 30: 28) by Išim-Suen to Ušur-ša-Aššur and his sister Šimat-Ištar and they deal for a large part with the same issues, mainly the shipment of small numbers of textiles to Kanesh, where they have to be sold by the addressees (29: 7). The letters must have been sent in fairly rapid succession, presumably in the order in which they are published in *AKT* 4. In 32: 4f., addressed to Enna-Aššur and Šimat-Ištar, the writer indeed states that 'letters of mine are all the time coming to you' (*našperātūya ittanal-lakānikkunūti*). These letters nicely reflect the continuing activity of the family of Išim-Suen in Assur, who keeps sending small numbers of textiles with different transporters (in all nine of them are mentioned), apparently whenever they had them available and transporters could take them along.⁵⁵ Several times it is mentioned that they have been paid their expenses (*gamaršu(nu) šabbū*, e.g. 28: 6.9; 29: 17), probably a proportional share of the total expenses made for the larger shipment to which these few textiles were added. The writer also wishes

⁵⁴ *Mīnam awātīm rabiātīm, ana eqlim 10 bēre ina, wašpim lū nittaddima.*

⁵⁵ They also brought items for Išim-Suen back from Anatolia, silver and sandals (28: 31f.).

to be informed about what happened with all his shipments (*mimma šēbulātiya*) and textiles (29: 23ff.) and asks to be sent a final report (*našpertum zakūtum*). And there is of course the well-known concern about outstanding claims (*bābtum*, 30: 21), silver due by various persons who must have bought the textiles in Kanesh, which the addressees have to collect (*šašqulum*, 28: 18; 29: 20; 32: 8), which may imply summoning them to do so (*šabātum*, 28: 21). The letters also deal with more personal matters, such as a child (*šuhārum*) of Ušur-ša-Aššur (which is said to be well, 29: 26ff. and 30: 25ff.), and in 28: 26f. the writer addresses Šimat-Ištar and reacts to her complaints.

There are many small differences between these letters, some of which reflect developments over time, while others are simply variations in the formulation of and the order in which items are mentioned. While 28: 6.9 and 29: 6.14 state that transporters are on their way (*naš'ū*) with textiles to Kanesh, 30: 4ff. write that 'one has delivered them there' (*ammaḡam ublam*), presumably because they must have arrived in the mean time. The four textiles qualified in the first letters as 'of extremely good quality' (28: 4.7, 29: 4.15), even as 'fit for the palace' (*ekallūm*, 28: 7), later, in 30: 4f., are simply called 'the textiles'. Letter 29: 17 adds a TÚG *qablūm*, shipped by Ennanātum, and 30: 9ff. two other textiles, a *nibrārum* and a cloak (*nahlaptum*), sent with different transporters after letter 28 had been dispatched. All three mention a 'šitrum in Akkadian style', transported by Adad-šululī, son of Aššur-šad-ilī,⁵⁶ but 29: 21f. and 30: 16f. also list a second *šitrum*, shipped by Šu-Kubum (in 30: 18 expressed by *inniš'am*) and according to 29: 22f. sent 'under the seal of your (i.e. Ušur-ša-Aššur's) daughter Bēlatum'. It may have been meant as a gift for Šimat-Ištar, since it is brought to her (*naš'akkim*). The two addressees (whose family relationship remains unclear)⁵⁷ are also addressed separately. Ušur-ša-Aššur is asked to collect silver from debtors of the writer (28: 16ff.) and also 29: 26ff. and 30: 25ff. are directed to him. There is an interesting mix of forms in the second person singular and plural, which indicates the roles of both addressees. In 28: 18 Ušur-ša-Aššur has to make a debtor pay (*šašqil*), while in l. 21 both addressees together have to summon another one (*šabtā*). In 29: 20, notwithstanding the introductory *ahī attā*, 'please, my brother', the request is addressed to both addressees (*šašqilāma šēbilānim*). Note also that while in 28: 15 the 'šitrum in Akkadian style' is said to be brought 'to you' (fem.), that is Šimat-Ištar, while 29: 14 uses the plural suffix (*naš'akkunūti*).

In 71: 5 we meet the expression *ana šēpēya tamtaqut*, 'you threw yourself down at my feet', in order to make a humble request. It is listed in CAD M/I, 242, 2' and Š/II, 298A, 3', as occurring in OB, but no OA occurrences are mentioned, but it is now attested there four times (cf. JAOS 122/4 (2002) 799a, on I 447^{sic}). We find it also in Prag I 467: 22, where we have to read *ana šēp ummi<ā>nīka mu-<qū>-ut-ma*, in Kt n/k 128: 10 (courtesy S. Bayram), *ana šēp tamkārim nimtaqut*, and in Kt 92/176: 21f., *e-ni-na¹-ma ana šēp PN amqut*, 'I begged for mercy and threw myself at the feet of PN'. While the last three references use the construct state of the singular of *šēpum* (as does the OB reference in AbB 11, 15: 6f.), *šē-pè-e-a* in our letter, because of the plene-writing, must be a dual.

⁵⁶ In 29: 14 he is called 'the harnesser (*kaššārum*) of Kuliya'. We know him as such from the archive of Kuliya (see my forthcoming edition, Ch. II.5.a), where however *kaššārum* is not used and the function of his father, *laput-tā'um*, is not mentioned.

⁵⁷ Ušur-ša-Aššur may have been married to Kusātum, a sister of Išim-Suen, cf. 39: 29ff.

Wool plays an important role in a small group of letters (52-56) written by Iddin-Suen, where there is a preference for 'good quality soft wool' (*šaptum naribum damiqum*), which his 'agents' Baba and Irbi-Adad have to buy for him and which is rather cheap, 6 minas (52: 4ff.; 53: 12, cf. 54: 9f.) for 1 shekel of silver. The wool had to be acquired for an Anatolian, who for that purpose had made silver and a (copper or bronze) cauldron (*zirum*) weighing 20 minas (53: 4.14f.; 55: 5f.)⁵⁸ available to Iddin-Suen. The cauldron had to be sold for wool (55: 18ff.) to satisfy him quickly (52: 19) for the debt claim he thus had obtained on Iddin-Suen (54: 25ff.). If not, 'he would drink Iddin-Suen's blood' (*nu'ā'um dāmēya lā išatti*, 53: 23), a nice expression (also current in some modern languages) that means to hate or to put extreme pressure on somebody.⁵⁹

Salt occurs in text 8, one of the few OA texts where it figures. Line 2 mentions the debt of a small quantity of salt, measured in 'qarts' (*qūm*), but in BIN 6, 232: 11 salt is measured in 'jars' (*karputum*). A bag of salt probably also occurs in 64: 16 and 20 (*tā'-āb-tām/tim*, with the photo; TA is different from ŠA in 19f.), alongside grain (*aršātum*). The price of salt is not clear, since TC 3, 109 writes about its sale 'at 1/2 shekel per' (1/2 GÍN.TA), but does not specify the measure used. Kt 92/k 231 (*Kuliya* text 23) mentions the writer's intention to sell 6 1/3 shekels of silver for salt. Large quantities were at times handled, salt for 10 shekels of silver occurs in TTC 7: 2 and OIP 27, 10: 6, and according to Prag 537: 19 no less than 6 donkeys are used to carry (*zabālum*) salt to the land of Elmelme, which is unknown. Small payments for salt probably were made for domestic purposes, 67 1/2 grains of silver in Kt 73/k 12: 10, and 1 shekel of silver in CCT 5, 32b: 5. Some traders apparently had specialized in this product, they were called 'salt dealer' (Kt 86/k 153A: 4, PN *ša tābtim*).

The letters contain some interesting invocations of the gods,⁶⁰ used to convince the addressees that the writer speaks the truth. Letter 42: 23 uses 'my gods and Ištar truly know that...' (*ilūya u Ištar lū ide'ūn[i]*), where the identity of the writer's gods remains unknown, and 50: 22 has the unique combination 'Aššur and Išartum, the god of my father, truly know...' (*A-šūr ú I-šar-tum, il₃ abiya lū ide'ā*), where the identity of the god(dess) Išartum - a real adjective, 'The fair one', or a substantivized noun, 'Righteousness'? — who occurs only here, is puzzling. Gods also appear in 63: 14f., in Šimat-Ištar's promise to pray for her addressee 'before my god, Aššur' (*mahar Aššur, iliya lakrubakkum*; was she an *ugbaltu* priestess in Aššur, like many eldest daughters of traders?), in the title 'priest of Adad' (48: 34f.), and in the remarkable statement in 56: 31ff., 'Anunu is bringing the dagger of Aššur (*patram ša Aššur naši*). Let him give it there, in your presence, to Aššur-bēl-awātum, Anunu's slave'. Was the transfer of this dagger necessary because it had to be used somewhere for swearing an oath? In the difficult and emotional letter 69 we have two references to the gods. In lines 6ff. Lāqēpum warns Šuli, who defiles and despises him (l. 15, *šeṭuttam laqā'um*), 'Do not.... with/from Aššur and my god (*išti, Aššur u iliya, e ta-at-ba-al*).⁶¹ You know neither father nor mother, it was me who raised you!' And somewhat later (l. 20) he wishes that 'my

⁵⁸ See for these vessels, made of copper or bronze, OACT 241, where their weight ranges from 15 to nearly 60 minas.

⁵⁹ Read in 54: 7, *ta-sí-ú-ni*, 'when you invited', and restore in 54: 11f. probably 'from it you [gave me] 10 minas of wool when I left' (*šaptam, [inūmi] a-tal-kā-ni, [ta-dí-n]am*), cf. 53: 11f.

⁶⁰ Data collected here, because gods are not listed in the index.

⁶¹ The photo is not very clear, but I doubt whether there really is a sign between *-al* and *a-*.

god may call you to account!' (*ilī liš'alka*). The verb *tabālum* with the preposition *išti* must denote something negative, like 'to estrange one self from', 'to blame, be angry with', but what exactly it means is not clear to me.

8. Observations on the reading of the texts

Finally I offer a number of more detailed observations on the reading and interpretation of the texts. They include corrections, based on the study of the photos or my understanding of the texts, some were suggested or confirmed by collations carried out by J. G. Dercksen, indicated by '(D)'. I refer the reader also to the many corrections which K. Hecker incorporated in his transcriptions of these texts on the internet site www.hethport.uni-wuerzburg.de, under 'Altassyrische Texte'. While I communicated some of my ideas with him, we worked mainly independently, so that there is a some overlap, but to prevent duplication I mention his corrections only in rare cases by means of (H). I am well aware of the fact that there are always problems in reading, editing and translating these ancient texts, especially letters, some of which are difficult, damaged or (especially letters from and to women) not of standard type, notably those in which writers get emotional and write on personal matters. No edition therefore can be perfect or final. Some readings, however, that create grammatical or semantic problems might have been avoided by a more systematic use and study of the relevant scholarly literature (which, apart from references to the *CAD*, is rarely quoted) and of the vocabulary and phraseology of the ancient Assyrian traders.

3. The restoration in lines 3 and 6 of the name of the debtor as 'Aššur-[īāb, son of Aššur-šamšī]', while only part of the first Aššur is preserved and the name does not occur in the other texts, is doubtful. Read in l. 13, with photo, *a-wa-at kārim* and ignore the comment.

9. The week eponym in l. 15, during month VII of eponymy year 102, probably is Dān-[Aššur], the only eponym whose name begins with Dān-, also attested in Kt 87/k 535: 4', during month III of eponymy year 105.

10. Correct in l. 1 the name of the first witness into Erra-šulūlī (spelled *Īr-ra-AN.DÙL*), a rare name, but cf. AKT 3, 5:12 (*-šu-lu-li*) and 97: 2 (*-AN.DÙL*). The week eponym designated as *muštaqqitum* also occurs in TPAK 1, 116: 6, one month later than in no. 10. In line 13 I feel tempted to emend the curious rate of default interest into '1/3 shekel 15 grains' = 5/12 shekel or ca. 45 % per year, but the lack of a photo of the upper edge makes it impossible to check this. In line 18 the damaged name of the father of the year eponym probably has to be restored as Šu-[Aššur], which makes him the one of year 107, which fits the week eponym of l. 12, Aššur-mālik s. Sukkaliya, also attested (in 25: 29) during year 103; he could be identical to the one nicknamed 'the black one' (*šallāmum*) in Kt 91/k 456: 10, during eponymy year 104.

16. An interesting deposition by a single witness (his fellow witness was absent),⁶² written on an unopened envelope, on a settlement of accounts between A. and H. concerning 'expenses of the death of Itūr-ilī', presumably for the funerary rites and the burial, for which A. had given H. 1 talent of refined copper. The latter equates it with 25 shekels of silver (an

⁶² The envelope accordingly should carry the impressions of only one single seal and the obverse, as far as the unclear photo allows me to see, indeed bears two impressions of one and the same seal (although the editor considers them to be different), that of Atata, son of Ennānum.

exchange rate of 144:1, fairly high for this kind of copper; the restoration at the end of l. 13 is superfluous), which he promises to give. Note in l. 19 the spelling *Wa-āš-hi-ni-a*.

17. Lines 14ff. contain an interesting statement about the price of a textile: 'I smuggled textile is due by Šu-Anum. They will ask Puzur-Aššur how much it is worth ('will fetch', *kīma ubbulu*) and then he will pay as price of this textile as much as Puzur-Aššur says'.

19. Read in l. 5, [*tā*]m-šī-ma *ṭuppī... talput*, 'at your own initiative you wrote my tablet'. It surprises that this summons concerning a small amount of silver is witnessed by two Envoys of the City.

20. The rare word *ma-āš-er¹-tim* (D) in line is also attested in CTMMA 1, 78b: 2, in the supplement of a letter with instructions to a woman: 'Buy a sheep and let there be a *maš'er-tum* available (*libbiši*) for the girl'.

25. This large memorandum is also shown on the dust jacket of *Kaniš II*. Note in l. 11f., as witnesses of a transaction in meteoric iron (*amūtum*), prince Aduda and a man called Išme-Ilil. The scribe mistakenly twice wrote *I-dī-Ku-um* (l. 15, 22) for Iddin-Kubum. The name Kuškānum in 25 is curious, the more so since we know from other texts (e.g. AnOr 6 = *EL* 321: 49) a Pušqānum, father of Dān-Aššur. The mention, in the summary of l. 55f., of '14 encased records of his' is strange, since this memorandum contains the texts of (the envelopes of) only five sealed records. Perhaps (there is no photo of the left edge) the editor took the first small vertical of the sign for '5' as the *Winkelhaken* for '10'.

26. Read in line 5, as often in this formula (see already *AOATT* 58ff.) *KÙ.BABBAR ú-du*, 'the (amount of) silver has been determined/established'. In l. 14 the strange *kā¹-sá-ar* (on the right edge) must be miswritten or misread for *sá-ri-dam*, the word also used in l. 15; the witness in l. 81 must be *I-dī-[^d]Adad DUMU šī-lá-[^dAdad]* (also H).

28. Read in line 24, with the photo, *našpertam ša I*. In lines 26-31 the meaning of the words, quoted as written by the lady Šīmat-Ištar (read l. 27 with the photo *ša ta-āš-pu-ri-ni*) is difficult: 'Why did you write me: '*I-li-a e-bi₄-ib* and I have used up the barley you left behind'. Should I send you (fem.) barley from the City?' Because sending barley from Assur to Anatolia is very strange, I take line 30-31 as an ironic question. The beginning of l. 28 (on the edge and not on the photo) is mysterious, the verb looks like an imperative of the D-stem, 'purify', but said to a woman it should be *ebbibī*, and what is *i-li-a*? Hecker takes it as a personal name, Iliya. Perhaps it could be an expletive ('..... my gods!'), introducing the sad admission that all the grain has been used up.

30. The expression *ēnē PN patā'um*, in l. 24, according to *CAD* P, 351 s.v. *īnu*, means 'to encourage, make happy'. Lines 29ff. state: 'But you, instead of encouraging me, no message of yours has ever come to me!', which means that in my opinion (*pace* H) the *lá* of l. 32 is correct.

34. The writer's accusation, 'in the eye of (read in l. 10, *e-en*) my brothers and servants you have treated me / turned me into ('placed me') for/as..... and you have.....' (*a-na NI-šī-im taštakananni, ta-al-tām-LAM*) is difficult, but reminds me of *ana lā awīlim šakānum*, 'to treat as / turn into a non-gentleman'. Since the collective *nišū*, 'people', does not make sense, one might venture *nēšum*, 'lion', attested in Kt 94/k 845: 15 (courtesy M. T. Larsen)⁶³, but 'to turn into / treat as a lion' is without parallel. The final verb, read *ta-al-tām-nim¹* by the editor, is weird, but must be from *lamānum*, perhaps 'you have proved to be evil to me'. In lines 34f.

⁶³ 'Here, in the gate of the *kārum*, PN blocked (my access) like a lion' (*kīma nēšim parik*).

we have what the Assyrian called a 'binding contract' (*tarkistum*), that is the promise to pay a fine of two or three times (*šušalšum*) the amount involved, if a financial claim submitted during a summons proves to be wrong or is wrongly denied. Therefore one has to read in line 35 *ru-ta-ki-sá-sú* (Dt-stem), 'let him bind himself by contract', cf. CAD R 104, 12.

35. The writer, the woman Kusātum, in complaining of her situation uses several uncommon plene-writings, *a-hi-i* (l. 5), *mu-tí-i* (l. 10), and *iš-té-e*, 'with, from' (l. 13, 16); in l. 30 the verb must be *li-sú-uq-ma*, 'let him select and '(H).

40. Collation by Dercksen shows that line 5 starts with *mī-ma*, which yields: 'You did by no means call for payment in silver for your *pirikannu*-textiles'. In l. 12 we may restore *ahhūya* [*bēlūya*] and the last verbal form (l. 23) is *uš-ta-la-ma-an* (D).

42. This is an interesting, but unfortunately damaged letter by a trader to his *amtu*-wife Niwahšušar, related to 43, difficult to understand when the emotional husband complains about what she is doing. Some readings by the editor are problematic; in l. 11 *sardam* must be 'olive oil', in l. 18 Hecker reads *a-na ālikim*, while *ta-d[a-ga]l-ni* in l. 19 is impossible (the second sign is no DA and the subjunctive cannot end in *-gal-ni*). Perhaps the wife is reproached because, instead of (*kīma*) writing about how she and the children are doing, she speaks (*ta-q[á-be-i²]-ni*) or complains to the traveler(s) about her fate (*ūtahhīram*, 'he has been late in...'). The writer seems to say that her fate is not really that bad, presumably by referring to other women, who 'for a one or even two years are not allowed to (visit) their husbands' (*ana muššīna lā uš-[ta²]-ša-ra*, Št-stem of *wšr?*).

45. As pointed out by the editor (p. 13), this letter, written from Assur, together with the memorandum 26, belongs to the large Kt n/k archive of Ušur-ša-Ištar, excavated in 1962. His sister Akatia⁶⁴ according to lines 2f. of this letter is now dead and her death is also the subject of Kt n/k 204 (courtesy S. Bayram), written by her sister Šīmat-Suen to her two brothers. It also mentions her debt of 1 mina of silver⁶⁵ and the use of bronze (paid to the authorities and deposited as pledge, *šapartum*) and the fact that 1 talent of copper had been spent on her tomb (*ana qubur A. gamer*, l. 27f.). Kt n/k 540 (courtesy C. Günbattu), a letter written by an anonymous *awiltum*, in l. 27f. mentions that 'the bronze that your sister left behind has entered the City-office' (to pay for debts owed to the City). The Lamassatum of l. 20ff. could be Ušur-ša-Aššur's daughter, who has now taken up residence in his house (also according to Kt n/k 204: 39f.), arguing that 'on the basis/by force of (*ina*) a last will each sister will manage her own assets' (*ina šīmātīm ahātum ahāt tabe'el*) and that she therefore she intends to open (her mother's?) last will.⁶⁶

48. In l. 10, Hecker reads *ù-ru-ba-tí-šu*, the use of *ù* rather suggests the reading 'the silver including its interest and its *rub(b)ātum*'. The meaning is unclear, but perhaps it means 'its increase', considering that the verb *rabūm* is used in later Assyrian for 'to accrue', referring to the adding of interest, or a derivative of the root meaning 'four'.

⁶⁴ See for her C. Günbattu in: *Festschrift für Sedat Alp* (Ankara 1992) 232f., and for other members of the family S. Çeçen, *ArAn* 2 (1996) 11-17. The inhabitants of the houses where archives Kt n/k and Kt o/k were found, situated in grids C-D/11-12 and B-D/11-12 respectively, were neighbors and some texts of the large Kt n/k archive due to destruction and disturbance must have ended up in the ruins of the Kt o/k house, as the editor of AKT 4 observed (p. 13).

⁶⁵ Read in l. 4 of our letter probably *té-zi-i[b] ú*, because a dative, '(left) for you', does not fit.

⁶⁶ A dramatic letter written by Lamassatum to Ušur-ša-Ištar and Hunniya, written in the same situation, is Kt n/k 792, parts of which were quoted by S. Çeçen in *ArAn* 2 (1996) 16, note 33.

49. In l. 11, we have to read, with the photo, *tù-ša-ba-ma* < *šutabbāma*, an imperative Dt of *šabā'um*, with metathesis, 'satisfy yourselves'.

50. Note in l. 9 the remarkable verbal form *lik(UR)-ta-na-kā-nam*, 'let him send (the purchases) to me piecemeal, under seal'. Lines 16ff. deal with textiles (in l. 20 also *šú-ba-tí*) of A. and the 'licensed traders' (*mer'ē um-mi¹-a-nim*), given as *tadmiqtum* (l. 19). The verbal form *tám-ta-hi-ir* in l. 19, 'you have accepted', instead of *tamtahar*, is remarkable and might reflect a hesitation between the G-stem and the D-stem (*tumtahhir*, with plural object). The meaning of what looks like a reproach, *qātka ma-ni-a-at* (21f.), is not clear ('your hand/share has now been...'); in l. 23 the photo suggests $\frac{1}{2}$ *ma-na*, as is also required by the addition of line 26, where *ištēnā* (normally, 'each one, one by one') is used for *ištēniš*, 'all together'. Read in l. 30 presumably *e-ru-ma* = *ērumma* < *ērub+ma*, 'enter Kanesh', just like the scribe in l. 7 writes *té-zi-ma* (the letter has one single addressee!) for *tēzib+ma*.

51. The editor makes the interesting suggestion to connect the noun *ta-wi-ni-tám* of l. 21 with the preceding verb, 'you have cheated me (*tū-ni-e-ma*) and keep writing me *ta-wi-ni-tám*'. This might be possible if this is a D-stem verb, **wannu'um*, with a derived *taprist*-form, *tawnūtum*, which would require a reading *ta-aw-ni-tám*.⁶⁷

55. Read in l. 13 (on the photo obverse and reverse have been interchanged) probably [*š*]é-né-en: *ša sí-ni-iš/ša-tim*, 'woman's sandals'.

58. In l. 7ff. the philological puzzle is what 'I sold it (the wool) one third at half' (*šalšum mišla addiššīna*) means, when applied to 300 units (minas) of wool and the yield is 130 minas of copper, after deduction of 10 minas. Read in l. 23 'I gave to your maid' (*ana am¹-tí-kā*).

63. The lady Šīmat-Aššur, who lives all alone in her house (*ina bēt raminiya ušbāku*) in Assur, opens her letter to her brother Adu with a remarkable sentence, probably to be read as a question, 'Do those who become angry with their sisters, stay angry forever?' (*ša išti : ahu-ātišunu, izanni'ū : adi dūrimma : izanniū*). It is a dramatic appeal to him to change his attitude, since after his departure for Anatolia, ten years ago, he has never paid any attention to her / given her any present (l. 9, *šumīma lā tazzakar*), so that she is in serious financial problems. The final words, 'Please my brother, help me with some silver, even one single shekel, then I will pray for you before Aššur!', may indicate that she served as a *ugbaltu*-priestess in Assur.

66. Another dramatic letter by a man who has learned that his father is detained in (jail in) a local Anatolian palace and asks his addressees in that town for information. In l. 9f. we probably have to read: '(If you observe) that my father's release will not take place...' (*ù-šu-ur : a-bi-a, lá [i-ba]-ší*), if we take the editor's *IGI* [x] as a damaged *ù* (D). To thank his addressees for their advice he promises to consider himself in the future (14f. *ana ūmim wa-ar-ki-e-im*, D) their brother. He asks his addressees (l. 19-22): 'Get hold of any word whatsoever that arrives and send it to me' (*awatam, ištēt ša kīma illuku šabtāma šuprānimma*). The continuation (ll. 24-27) is even more dramatic, if we may translate: 'If it indeed comes to pass, I am ready to perish together with my father' (*šumma-ma, illakma : qadē abiyama u anāku lahliqma*), but (since?) to you I am indeed dear/valuable (*damqakkunūti*) I will stay, although(?) I do not believe that my father will come down' (from the palace; *warād abiya lā aqīap*).

⁶⁷ Suggestion of N. J. C. Kouwenberg; cf. also OB *tāwītum* from *wu'um*.

67. In the edition and on the photo obverse and reverse have been exchanged. The address begins with what is numbered as line 15' and the letters probably ends with (l. 10'-14' + 27'f.): 'If he refuses to pay the silver, let your report come to me [with the first opportunity], so that I here can [hire] an attorney [who will make him pay on the basis] of his tablet' (27'f.: *ra-bi-ša'-am lá-[hu-uz-ma [a-ma-lá³] ṭuppišu [lūšašqilšu]*).

68. The variation between contracted and un-contracted plural forms of the adjective in lines 3 and 5, *e-DÛ-ú-tim* // *e-DU-tim*, is remarkable. The meaning of the adjective, which also appears as *waDium*, is not clear (the reason for leaving the nature of the dental undetermined) and I refer the reader to *Kuliya*, the comments on text 57: 4.

69. This emotional letter too causes problems of interpretation, also because the photo is not always clear and no edges (the editor writes two exclamation marks in the first line of the lower edge) are shown. The reading by the editor suggests that the writer claims to have provided the addressee, who was raised by him, with eyes⁶⁸ and (perhaps) to have given him a fine position (*mazzazam damqam...uštazziz+ma*),⁶⁹ to which the latter had reacted by despising his well-doer. This makes him conclude 'I do not mean to you as much as [Ah]-šalim does' (*mala A. lá am-ta-ša-kum*), where he uses the idiom *mala...mašā'um*, also (though not recorded in *CAD M/II s.v.*) attested in OA, e.g. in Kt 91/k 138: 5f., *mala abiya u anāku lā amši*, 'I myself did not match my father', and in LB 1229: 13f., *ša mala mer'iya lā mašū*, 'somebody who does not match my son'. In l. 22 one might read, with the photo *lá tá-ba'-kuni* and *ṭiābum*, 'to be pleasing to', can be construed with both *eli* and *ina šēr*, but the first person suffix *iššēriya* does not fit here. At the end the writer warns that if his addressee does not do what he asks him, 'you are no longer my son!' (*lā mer'ī a-ta'*).

71. Since the lines 11-12 on the lower edge seem to be fairly short, one may restore: 'Within ten days [I will send it to you] either from Kuššara or from Šamuha. If I do not [send it I will pay you the] trip[le]' (*a-na 10 u₄-[me] / ištu Kuššara / ú-ul iš-tù Šamuha / [ušebbal-akkum / šu-ma lá tū-šé-bi-lá-kum / šu-ša-a[l-šu-um ašaqal]*).

⁶⁸ Reading in l. 11f., *a-na-ku' e'-né-en ú-ša-ar-ší-ú-kà*, indeed a bold statement. One would like to know the probability of the readings marked by an exclamation mark and why the verb is in the subjunctive, while the preceding *urabbika* is not.

⁶⁹ The verbal form read in l. 12, in the subjunctive or plural, is impossible after *urabbika* (read perhaps *ušarši ú GA-[] ú mazzazam*, etc.; cf. l. 18, *tartiši ú mala...*); the occurrence of *mazzazum*, 'position' (presumably with the corresponding verb *uštazziz*) is the first in OA.