

ON THE IDENTIFICATION OF OLD ASSYRIAN SEALS

KLAAS R. VEENHOF

For Önhan Tunca, septagenario

1. Introduction¹

Old Assyrian (OA) seals are a subject where the interests of Önhan Tunca and the present writer met. We both wrote on the seal impressions on the bullae discovered at Acemhöyük² and I offered him some help when he was preparing his manuscript on the inscriptions of the cylinder seal impressions and bullae found at Kültepe/Kanesh, published in Tunca 2001. I therefore present to him (and others) observations on the problem of identifying seals, their owners and users, in the light of new publications, in particular in the rich volume Özgüç 2006 and in AKT 6 and 8, which contain many photos of sealed envelopes. In what follows I focus on the impressions of the cylinder seals.

The study of seals is a challenge when few original seals are available and one has to work from ancient impressions, as is the case for *kārum* Kanesh, which yielded thousands of sealed tablet envelopes and bullae, but few original cylinder seals. The inhabitants of the *kārum* apparently had the opportunity to leave before the destructions that brought it to an end, taking along their most valuable belongings, among which no doubt their seals. How many of the OA seals acquired by various collectors and museums originate from Kültepe, having been found and sold by local diggers, is impossible to say. There is perhaps only one impression on an envelope from Kültepe made by such a seal.³ The seals in these collections have no inscriptions that allow the identification of their owners as OA traders. The cylinder seals found at Kültepe (far less numerous than the Anatolian stamp seals) were discovered in the

¹ The original manuscript of this article was completed in the spring of 2011 for a Festschrift to be offered to Önhan Tunca on the occasion of his 65th birthday. The regrettable, repeated delays made me decide, more than seven years later, to publish it elsewhere. There has been steady progress in Old Assyrian studies since I wrote it, but I have kept additions to a minimum. We now have hundreds of new seal impressions, published together with the texts to which they belong, in M. T. Larsen's volumes of AKT 6 and in my own AKT 8 (2017). In the latter the seal impressions are presented with their CS numbers (CS 1135-1260), thanks to the help of Dr. M. Omura, and their owners have been identified as far as possible. These data are condensed in a list of seals and sealers (Ch. XXIV of AKT 8), that presents all CS numbers with their identified owners and all persons who have sealed records. It should help those editing and studying new archives to discover identical seals and sealers. The many seals of the AKT 6 archive served as the basis of the important dissertation by Agnete Wisti Lassen, defended in Copenhagen in 2012, *Glyptic Encounters. A Stylistic and Prosopographical Study of Seals in the Old Assyrian Period – Chronology, Ownership and Identity* (2 vols, 565 p.). Its publication is unfortunately delayed and I have not used its data and conclusions.

² See Tunca 1989 and 1993, and Veenhof 1993.

³ Seal no. 347 in the Pierpont Morgan Library at New York, with the inscription ^dUTU / ^dA-a, is almost identical to impression A on ICK 1, 27a, drawn by Mrs. Matoušová, as pointed out in N. Özgüç 1986, p. 50.

ruins of the houses, in graves or were stray finds⁴ and thus far not one of them matches an impression on an envelope of a tablet.

The seals on such envelopes in general are carefully impressed and many envelopes were accidentally fired when the houses where they were kept burned down. But seal impressions can also be damaged by conflagration and destruction, be partly covered or obliterated by the text written on the envelope, or be truncated due to the limited room or the peculiar shape of a bulla. Reconstructions are frequently possible, because many important traders have impressed their seals on a number of envelopes and bullae. The problems of working from ancient impressions, however, are compensated by the fact that they acquaint us with seals *in situ*, that is on the envelopes of inscribed documents that are part of archives, which usually shed light on the question who owned and used them. This helps us to narrow down their dates and occasionally reveals something of the history of a seal, such as the transfer of ownership, a change of the inscription or an adaptation of the iconographic scene.

Nevertheless, identification often still presents problems, especially when the name of the sealer's father is not mentioned, compounded by the fact that several OA personal names were very popular, so that we encounter many namesakes. In such cases identification is risky, as I showed recently (Veenhof 2017, 247-249) when discussing OA seal impressions on bullae excavated at Acemhöyük, where most of the above-mentioned control mechanisms are lacking.

The sheer number of cylinder seal impressions found at Kültepe in combination with the popularity of particular designs and scenes can make it difficult to discover identical or to distinguish very similar seals, especially when (as is true for most of them) they are not provided with an inscription. To help their identification a new numbering system was introduced in Özgüç and Tunca 2001, where the stamp seals (St) and cylinder seals (CS) were identified by consecutive numbers, starting with the earliest bullae of 1948 (Kt a/20 = CS 1, Kt a/56 = St 1, both purchased at Kültepe in 1948). The new system thus far counts more than 130 different stamp seals and 1084 cylinder seals. It is very useful for identification and pointing out duplicates or comparable seals, because it saves us the trouble of referring to excavation numbers of tablets (with added capitals for different impressions on the same envelope or bulla) and to the numerous text and seal publications.⁵ The numbering started with the impressions on bullae from the years 1948-1997 (CS 1-254), was continued in Özgüç 2006, with the seals on the Kt d/k and Kt n/k envelopes (CS 256-850), and will proceed with seals from Kt e/k – i/k (CS 851-1090), followed by those from archives excavated in 1991 and 1992 (CS 1091-1260), to be published by Dr. M. Omura.⁶ Starting the numbering with seals on bullae from many different archives, excavated during fifty years, was not a very happy idea and makes finding out whether a seal impression on a new text is already known

⁴ Özkan 2010, 148, mentions a number of nearly 300 seals, most of which are stamp seals. See for some cylinder seals N. Özgüç 1968, Pl. XXIX, 2-4; T. Özgüç 2003, 282ff.; Özkan 2010. The latter mentions that thus far the impressions of ca. 2000 different seals have been identified.

⁵ See for a bibliography on seals, Michel 2003, 188-194; Michel 2005/2006, 448; Michel 2011b, 436; Michel 2015, 557.

⁶ See Dr. M. Omura's note 1 on AKT 5, p. 211, accompanying the publication of the five seals from the archive of Kuliya, numbered CS 1081-1084. That of the five different impressions in this little archive only one was known before indicates that the number of different cylinder seals will keep growing. Her new volume will include the seal impressions (CS 1085-1260) on envelopes from the archive of Elamma, which in the meantime have been published in AKT 8 (2017).

and numbered not easy. It would also have been very useful to add to the simple CS-numbers sigla or abbreviations to identify type, format and a few other essential data⁷ for classification and easy identification, in combination with a presentation of all data in a way comparable to the “Tables with essential data from text envelopes” in Teissier 1994, 103-203. That remains a challenge for the future, now that always more seals are being published.

Since the publication of Özgüç 2006, with more than 700 seal impressions,⁸ is by far the biggest and most important addition to the corpus, I pay special attention to it. It publishes the impressions on texts excavated in 1951 (Kt d/k) and 1962 (Kt n/k), and these two archives were probably preferred because they contain a large number of well-preserved, sealed envelopes. Many of the d/k texts have now been published in AKT 10, but it remains a serious disadvantage that the other texts are largely unpublished, unlike e.g. envelopes from the Kt a/k and 90/k archives, which would have allowed a combined study of texts and seals.⁹ The volume describes and classifies the impressions and shows them in photos and in drawings by Dr. Özkan (Kt d/k and Kt n/k) and Dr. M. Omura (Kt d/k), while the preface mentions that the latter “prepared a comparative list of the drawings and completed missing ones”. Moreover, the help of the epigraphist Dr. A. Karaduman (earlier name Uzunalımoğlu) was enlisted, who deciphered the seal inscriptions and identified many owners/users on the basis of the texts written on the envelopes; her findings are mentioned in the description of every single seal impression. The volume thus provides us with an enormous amount of classified new data, important both for the seal specialist and the philologist, and I have profited from it in various ways. But as a student of the Kültepe texts, who wants to know who are the owners and users of the seals and to understand their role in the transactions recorded, I miss information on the text types (debt-note, quittance, letter, verdict, deposition, sale contract, etc.), the date of the text (if available), and the number and names of those who have sealed the envelope. They are always listed on the envelopes with the words KIŠIB A DUMU B, “seal of A son of B”, which I call a KIŠIB notation in what follows.¹⁰ Most such data must have been available, because the epigraphist studied the texts written on the envelopes and it is a pity they are not mentioned. Seals are not only miniature works of art,¹¹ produced in a particular style and with a particular technique¹² from a few preferred kinds of

⁷ Identifying e.g. CS 431 as: “CS 431, OA, wo, 1.8, in”, meaning: “Old Assyrian style, worship scene, 1.8 cm high, inscription”. This would make identification of similar and comparable seals much easier.

⁸ Not all of them are new, as references to impressions published in Özgüç and Tunca 2001 and other occurrences elsewhere (listed in Teissier 1994, together with those published later in CTMMA 1) show. Impressions that thus far are unclear or only partially preserved are not numbered pending more complete occurrences and final identification.

⁹ Debt-notes from Kt a/k are published in AKT 1, all contracts from Kt 90/k in TPAK 1.

¹⁰ Although it is true, as I have shown in Veenhof 1987, 352-354, that the sequence of these KIŠIB notations is by no means always identical to the sequence of the actual seal impressions. In debt-notes the relative position of the seal of the debtor and the witnesses varies.

¹¹ E. K. Rasmussen’s recent book *The Cylinder Seal as objet d’art* (Copenhagen 2010), as its subtitle, *Near Eastern Masterpieces in Private Collections* shows, deals with seals devoid of any archival or textual context.

¹² I will not comment on the technique, but call attention to the occurrence of seals with a metal cap. One gold-capped lapis lazuli seal (in Anatolian style) was discovered in *kārum* Kanesh (Kt f/k 278; see Özkan 2010, 150, fig. 6). More such capped seals may have been in use and could have caused the linear, horizontal depression, seemingly between two lines, that borders the scene in some impressions, e.g. in the royal seals of Erišum I and Narām-Suen (Özkan 2010, 149, fig. 1) and possibly in CS 106, 301, 376, 448, and 526. But the double line in the drawings may also render a single line or groove incised in the seal itself, which runs parallel to the “line” that is the natural demarcation of an impression caused by the edge of the seal as it was rolled over the clay. The descriptions in Özgüç 2006 anyhow do not mention the use of capped seals. The clearly incised line or groove at the top of a seal

stone,¹³ they are also important pieces of personal property, as is demonstrated by the fact that testaments may stipulate who will inherit them. Whether its owner or somebody else used it and how a user, different from the person whose name was inscribed on it, may have acquired it, are important questions that can only be answered by studying impressions and texts together. It may help to better understand the use and fate of seals, to narrow down the date of their use, and even to shed light on possible preferences of particular owners (perhaps due to their ethnicity, family traditions, status or profession) for seals in a particular style.

Fortunately, Dr. Karaduman has identified some fifty users/owners of seals on the basis of the KIŠIB notations, primarily those of the addresses of letters, which are easily identifiable because only their writer sealed them, but occasionally also impressions on debt-notes and other records. It is clear that, once the texts themselves are published, many more identifications will be possible, especially by comparison and elimination when searching for common sealers on different envelopes. This is made easier because this volume mentions for each individual seal where additional impressions are found, many of which are on other envelopes of the same archive.¹⁴ And the number of additional impressions keeps growing, as I also know from the study of complete, mostly unopened envelopes from the house excavated in 1986, entrusted to me for publication by Tahsin Özgüç.

2. Remarks on the seals of the Kt d/k archive¹⁵

The d/k archive is that of the Anatolian Peruwa, son of Šuppipra, an important businessman, whose title was “head of the herdsmen” (*rabi rē’i*). His seal was **CS 259**,¹⁶ but impressions are rare, because he usually appears as a creditor, who does not seal debt-notes. His large house and the texts found there are described in Özgüç 2006, XVIII and 22f. The archive comprises 46 intact (including 16 unopened) and broken envelopes (with their tablets) and 4 envelope fragments; no bullae were found. They bear in all impressions of 29 stamp seals (only the owner of St 85, the common sealer of d/k 9 (AKT 10, 21) and d/k 10 (AKT 10, 60), could be identified as Kikaršan) and 102 cylinder seals, only two of which were identified: **CS 50** (also on the bulla Kt f/k 95) belongs to Peruwa, son of Nakiahšan, and **CS 292** (= d/k 22D and 34A), in Old Syrian style, re-cut and re-used, to Šar(a)bunuwa, son of Da[.....].

(cf. T. Özgüç 2003, 297, fig. 348; see for the impressions of the seal of king Sargon on Kt c/k 1389, Özgüç 2006, Pl. 156), visible in the impression made of a cylinder seal found during the excavations (shown in *Anatolia’s Prologue*, 353f. no. 472) may well have been made for fixing the rim of a (now lost) metal cap. See for a lapis lazuli seal with a golden cap, *ibidem* no. 470.

¹³ Usually from hematite and lapis lazuli, see the references in Larsen 1977, 93f., with note 14, and Teissier 1994, 51f. (it is now certain that *husārum* means lapis lazuli in OA, see Michel 2001).

¹⁴ This happens in the description of its first occurrence. I noted some omissions in the references to additional occurrences in the Kt n/k archive itself: 1739A: +1941D, 1747D: + 1883C, 1752C: + 1839B and 1918A, 1766: + 2042A, 1769C: + 1873C, 1793A: + 1830E, 1814B: + 1962A, 1814D: + 1994B, 1830D: + 1939C, 1841D: + 1876C and 1945, 1848C: + 1929F, 1851: + 1856, 1870B: + 1899B.

¹⁵ In what follows the numbers of the seals discussed are printed bold, the capitals after the d/k numbers refer to the seal impressions on the envelopes, as designated in Özgüç 2006.

¹⁶ Peruwa was a common name and several men bearing it occur in this archive, among them Nakiahšan, the owner of CS 50 (see below). The archive owner, Peruwa, son of Šuppipra, figures with his seal as first witness on AKT 10, 41 (d/k 29), a marriage contract, on c/k 1637:1 (the division of an inheritance), and on AKT 8, 187 (91/k 394 seal A), as witness to a settlement between an Anatolian and some Assyrians. He features as buyer of a field in AKT 10, 64 (d/k 52), which bears the impressions of four seals including his (see Özgüç 2006 and below). See on his house and archive also Michel 2011a, 99-103.

Identification was possible since they occur as “common sealers” on various envelopes. It does not surprise that only very few cylinder seals impressed on these records, ca. 60 of which are in Anatolian style,¹⁷ bear an inscription, for of the ca. 200 persons mentioned as sealers in the KIŠIB notations less than 20 bear an Assyrian name.¹⁸ Of the inscribed seals **CS 294** is unreadable and **CS 258** still shows KIŠIB *Šu-pu*-[...], which can be restored as Šupunuman or Šupunahšu, since both feature as witness and sealer in d/k 8. The damaged inscription **CS 268** = d/k 14D and Ashm. 1933.1049E¹⁹ might perhaps be read *En-n[a]-(x)-/um² / DUMU Šu-A²-[x]*, but no person of that name figures in the KIŠIB notations of these three contracts.²⁰ D/k 12 (AKT 10, 24) and Ashm. 1933.1049 share a witness, Šu-Bēlum (alongside Anatolian witnesses and parties), but if it is his seal, we have to explain his absence among the sealers on d/k 14 (AKT 10, 26).

Comparable problems are met when comparing the sealers listed in the KIŠIB notations of envelopes of the d/k archive with the seals actually impressed and identified by CS numbers. Several times the number of sealers does not correspond to the number of impressions or the presence of impressions of an identical seal is not matched by the presence (as witness or debtor) of the same person as “common sealer”, as the following examples show.

D/k 52 (AKT 10, 64), in which Peruwa buys a field, bears the impressions of four seals including his, **CS 259** (see Özgüç 2006, 92). But if Peruwa sealed the contract as buyer, as proof of his satisfaction, we need five seals, also those of the four witnesses mentioned at the end of the tablet. Moreover, the KIŠIB notation on the envelope lists eight sealers, four witnesses and four sellers (omitting one of them, for the contract mentions five!). It is very likely that the five sellers were relatives (sons of one dead father?), who together were bound by one single seal impression.²¹ If so, two impressions remain for the four witnesses who must have shared seals, perhaps as relatives, and this could explain why **CS 292**, identified as the seal of Šarabunuwa, is absent.

D/k 14C (AKT 10, 26B) and d/k 16C (AKT 10, 28B) both are impressions of **CS 275**, but there is no common sealer; Peruwa as creditor would not have sealed and his name does not figure in the KIŠIB notation. Similarly, **CS 255** appears on d/k 6A (AKT 10, 59B), 11A (AKT 10, 55B) and 40A (AKT 10, 62B), but no sealer is common to all three and only Šezur occurs twice, in d/k 6A:3 and 40A:7. D/k 17 (AKT 10, 29B), a debt-note for 3 1/2 minas of silver, owed to Peruwa by an Assyrian with his Anatolian wife and son, mentions six sealers and bears four different seal impressions: **CS 50** = d/k 22A, the seal of Peruwa, son of Nakhiašan (witness and first sealer), and **CS 275** = d/k 14C, **CS 284** = d/k 35C, and **CS 285** = d/k 18C, 19B. Of the five other sealers the last three are the debtor

¹⁷ In addition, 22 are said to be in OA, 5 in Old Babylonian, and 7 in Old Syrian style.

¹⁸ Most of the ca. 20 Assyrians (probably including some men with Assyrian names, born from mixed marriages, such as Ennam-Aššur and his brother Šezur, sons of Hapa and Šakriašwe, in AKT 10, 62) appear as witnesses. In three cases – AKT 10, 20, 27 and 48 – Assyrians figure as debtors and in AKT 10, 41 an Assyrian marries an Anatolian girl and in these records we find most Assyrian witnesses.

¹⁹ See Kennedy and Garelli 1960, 17f. no. 12, where it is the fifth(!) seal, on the left edge, shown as fig. 4.

²⁰ Transcriptions of unpublished Kt d/k texts were known to me from transcriptions made by Cécile Michel, but they have now been published in AKT 10 (2016), where the seal impressions published in 2006 unfortunately are ignored. See for remarks on some envelopes and seals of this group, Hecker 2008, 101, note 2.

²¹ The field is bought (lines 6-10) “from A., Š. [ú² H.,] I. ú K. a-HI-šú”, where the last word can be taken as plural, *ahhēšú*, “his brothers. The double *u* (preserved on the tablet) may indicate that there were two groups of men. Another problem is that the first seller, Ata, is not mentioned in the KIŠIB notation. Was he absent (or perhaps dead), so that he could not seal and/or were the four others perhaps his brothers or sons acting in his name?

Alāhum, with his wife and son, all three bound by the seal of the *pater familias*, which must be CS 284, since this seal and Alāhum as sealer occur together also on d/k 35 (AKT 10, 47B). The three records with impressions of CS 285, d/k 17-19, have no common sealer, but Hašui, [son of Šup]pipra, appears in two of them, d/k 17 and 19.

The envelope d/k 18 (AKT 10, 30B) mentions five sealers, but only bears three impressions, St 36, CS 285 and CS 286. CS 286 = KKS 31D (seal 96) most probably belongs to Apizia(h)šu, witness in both contracts. This seal also occurs on the damaged envelope d/k 47 (AKT 10, 18B) as seal A (together with CS 277, the seal of Dalaš, see below), but on the tablet (AKT 10, 18A) Apiziahšu is not mentioned. He must have been mentioned as witness among the sealers on the damaged envelope, where only the KIŠIB notations of the debtor and his family are preserved. Note also that KKS 31b does not mention Apiziahšu, while he features as sealer on the envelope that also bears an impression of his seal. This shows that damage and scribal features (mistakes) must also be taken into account when there are discrepancies between the number of sealers and seal impressions.

The identification of CS 256 = d/k 7C (AKT 10, 54B) on the basis of its occurrence (as only seal, five times impressed) on n/k 2088, as the seal of *tamkārūm* is questionable. The term most probably identifies the seal as that of the sender of a letter, since we have at least fifteen letters whose writer, for whatever reason, avoids his name and figures as *tamkārūm*, perhaps meaning “trader, boss of a firm”, cf. TC 3, 43; VS 26, 74; POAT 40, etc. But its appearance on d/k 7 is puzzling, since this is a deed of sale of a slave between Anatolians, with impressions of three stamp seals and CS 256. The latter might have belonged to the Assyrian witness to the transaction, Ennam-Aššur, and it would be important to see whether this fits the text of n/k 2088 and why his name is not mentioned. There are a few occurrences of *tamkārūm* meaning “Assyrian trader”, alongside *nuā’um*, “native Anatolian”, e.g. in the deed of divorce n/k 1414:7ff., which states the divorced wife now “can go where she wishes, either to *nuā’um* or to a *tamkārūm*”, but this meaning seems impossible here.

Such observations – which could be easily multiplied and which have been made before²² – reveal the problems we encounter with the sealing practices of Anatolians. An investigation on a much broader basis is needed to discover what are customary rules and what individual solutions. The examples given anyhow show that two debtors could be represented by only one seal, in particular if they were relatives, such as two brothers (as is also the case in KKS 6, mentioned in footnote 45, below) or a married couple. If Anatolian families were debtors, the seal of the *pater familias* was sufficient to bind all his dependent family members as co-debtors, subject to the rules of joint-liability. The latter could also (and more often) be expressed by stating that the debt “was bound” on (*rakis ina šēr*) their persons,²³ but in the cases discussed it was established by including them in the KIŠIB notation on the envelope, although they had not actually sealed it. The mention of the presence of their seal refers to the seal impression of the *pater familias*, which was essential and considered sufficient proof of (the acceptance of) their liability (cf. already Larsen 1977, 99). In addition to the example of Alāhum’s family in d/k 17, mentioned above, there is the case of d/k 20 (AKT 10, 32B), which has four seal impressions and in which Alpuar, his wife, two sons and daughter

²² Cf. the introduction to KKS, 19-21; and Teissier 1994, Ch. 6, on seal ownership.

²³ See my observations on joint-liability in Veenhof 2001, 148-152, where I called this the *rakis*-formula, which implied that such family members could be seized by the creditor and taken as pledge.

acknowledge a silver debt owed to Peruwa. It states that their seal was on the envelope, although they had not actually sealed it.

Contracts with an Anatolian debtor in which his wife is co-debtor or at least jointly liable can state that the wife has sealed the envelope, although it carries only his seal impression. A different redaction is attested in d/k 15 (AKT 10, 27B), which bears six seal impressions and also mentions six sealers, four witnesses and two Assyrian debtors. Here the debt-clause includes the debtors' anonymous wives (*iššēr u aššātišunu ...išu*) and the KIŠIB notation similarly writes "the seal of P., the seal of Š., and of their wives", stating that their seal was on the envelope, although they had not actually sealed it. This happened in the same way in AKT 1, 57, with the anonymous wife of Kikarša.

In other cases where the number of impressed seals is less than that of the sealers mentioned, we do not know what the relation was between the persons represented by seal impressions only. KKS 8b, a debt-note for a large amount of grain owed by the Anatolian Utkariya to an Assyrian, has five seal impressions and mentions five sealers, three witnesses, the debtor and only the first of the two guarantors, mentioned in the body of the contract. The seal of the latter must have bound his colleague too, but we do not know how they were related. The grain loan d/k 19A (AKT 10, 31B) lists five sealers, but bears only three different seal impressions, a ring (1.2/1.0 cm) and CS 272 and 285. Of these CS 272 belongs to Atali, son of Hanariri, the second witness (common sealer of d/k 13, 19, 23 and 41), while CS 285 (see above) may have belonged to Hašui, [son of Šup]pipra. If so, there remains only the impression of a ring for the third witness, Hištahšu, and two debtors, Kalua and Tahaya. The fact that the same ring was impressed six times may be meaningful and it may have served to bind the two debtors, who had different fathers but somehow cooperated, and perhaps the third witness, Hištahšu. However, a man of that name, son of Šimnušan, occurs as sealer and witness in the archive, in d/k 9A:4 (AKT 10, 21B) and 41A:1 (AKT 10, 57B), and he must be the owner of CS 261, their only common seal. The absence of this seal on d/k 19 is a problem, but this envelope anyhow bears too few seals for all parties and witnesses. Hištahšu (without filiation) is also one of the five persons that according to the KIŠIB notation sealed the slave sale Kt d/k 49 (AKT 10, 58B), where he figures as witness. On its damaged envelope only CS 334 and a ring (1.3/0.8 cm) seem to be preserved, so that CS 261, if he was the same man, could be missing by damage. But it could be a different Hištahšu, for several men of that name are attested in our texts.²⁴

These observations show that determining the owner of a seal may be difficult, even when we know the text, and it raises questions about who is sealing in Anatolian contracts and why. Nevertheless, knowledge of who sealed the envelope (as witness or party) in many cases allows the identification of the seal owner. D/k 19, 28 and 48 were published in Balkan 1974 and 1979, and it is regrettable that their data were not used in Özgüç 2006. Kt c/k 1634, 1635, 1637, 1639 and 1641, also found in Peruwa's house and whose seals are included in Özgüç 2006, were published in Albayrak 2006. But both authors apparently were unaware of the fact that they worked on the same texts, so that information on the seals and the texts was not combined. Using such publications, more identifications are possible and some conclusions

²⁴ Son of Mata or Kuta, TC 3, 328:21; son of a woman named Talhama, ICK 1, 19:9ff.; witness, TC 3, 254a:3; the name, with its female counterpart Hištahšušar, is not rare.

can be reached about who is sealing. Without going into detail, I list the following, including some of the cases mentioned above (I omit Kt in the sigla of the tablets):

CS 258 = d/k 12A (AKT 10, 24B), 14D (AKT 10, 26B): seal of *Šuppu[numan]* or *Šuppu[nahšu]*;

CS 259 = c/k 1637B, d/k 29A (AKT 10, 41B), 52A (AKT 10, 64B), 91/k 394A (AKT 8, 187): seal of *Peruwa*, son of *Šuppipra*;

CS 261 = d/k 9A (AKT 10, 21B), 41A (AKT 10, 57B): seal of *Hištahšu*, son of *Šimnušan*;

CS 268 = d/k 12A (AKT 10, 24B), 14D (AKT 10, 26B): seal of *En-n[a-x]/-um?*
DUMU *Šu-A?* -[x-(x)];

CS 272 = d/k 13C (AKT 10, 25B), 23A (AKT 10, 35B), 41B (AKT 10, 57B): seal of *Atali*, son of *Hanariri* (41a:3), witness;

CS 277 = d/k 15B (AKT 10, 27B), 47A (AKT 10, 18B), and KTS 46b (*EL* no. 107B) seal a = ICK 2, Pl. CXXXVIII, Ka 83A: seal of *Dalaš*, son of *Hamara*;

CS 279 = d/k 15D (AKT 10, 27B), d/k 30D (descriptions differ; AKT 10, 42B): seal of *Ilī-ašranni*, witness;

CS 281 = d/k 15F (AKT 10, 27B) = TC 3 no. 42 (on TC 3, 224; same seal on TC 2, 70A) = Teissier no. 82: seal of *Aššur-mālik*, son of *Ahu-waqar*, but no *Aššur-mālik* figures in d/k 15;

CS 284 = d/k 17A (AKT 10, 29B), 35C (AKT 10, 47B): seal of *Alāhum*, debtor sealing also for his wife and son *Ennum-Ištar*;

CS 285 = d/k 17C (AKT 10, 29B), 18C (AKT 10, 30B), 19B (AKT 10, 31B): perhaps the seal of *Hašui*, son of [Šup]pipra, but he does not feature in d/k 18;²⁵

CS 286 = d/k 18B (AKT 10, 30B), 47B (AKT 10, 18B), KKS 31D: seal of *Apizia(h)-šū*;

CS 300 = d/k 27D (AKT 10, 61B) = CCT 6 seal 52 (from CCT 1, 10b-11a = *EL* no. 15): owner/user of seal unknown, no “common sealer”;

CS 308 = c/k 1634A, 1635A, and d/k 31A (AKT 10, 43B): seal of *Alili*, son of *Ali*, witness.

3. Remarks on the seals of the Kt n/k archive

The large archive Kt n/k (in what follows I only use the numbers, omitting Kt n/k), discovered in 1962, comes from a house in square C-D/11-12, shown in Özgüç 2006, 10-11, and described in T. Özgüç 1986, 6 (English part). The archive from *kārum* Kanesh level II begins with Kt n/k 80 and comprises ca. 2000 different texts, ca. 1600 tablets and 400 envelopes; all were found in a single room (no. 6) “in the collapsed burnt debris of the upper floor”, because “at the time of the conflagration they fell from an upper archive room on the ground floor”. The high numbers (between 1700 and 2100) assigned to the dozen bullae (nos. 1703-1712, 1717-1718) and the sealed envelopes, most probably do not reflect their original disposition, which was anyhow disturbed by the collapse of the upper floor. The numbers apparently were given after the tablets had been retrieved from the ruins and their grouping and numbering

²⁵ For this name and its bearers, see Balkan 1976, 41 on 2B:1.

seem to have been made on the basis of typology. After the bullae, with the lowest numbers (n/k 1703-1718), the 209 unopened plus some opened and fragmentary envelopes have numbers ranging from 1716 to 1962, while the numbers of the bulk of the 22 opened and 131 fragmentary envelopes have numbers ranging from 1971 until 2125. Together these envelopes contain an enormous number of seal impressions, most of which are also new.²⁶

The seals are on envelopes that belong to a great variety of records, but which categories they represent is not mentioned.²⁷ The introduction to the Ušur-ša-Ištar archive (p. 33) mentions that Mrs. Karaduman “prepared a list of 62 letters” and some addressees are mentioned, but unfortunately not the names of the writers of the letters, which are vital for a study of the seals, because their seals are always impressed on the letter envelope and thus can be easily identified. Envelopes with only one (at times repeated) seal impression most probably are those of letters and therefore the description gives the names of the sealers “according to the inscription on the envelope”. But not all of them are writers of letters, for there also exist depositions (1810, 1818) and rare debt-notes (1805) with the seal of only one witness, and with two seals both options are available. It would have been important and easy to mention whether the envelope belonged to a letter, debt-note, quittance, deposition, verdict, etc.

Most seal impressions on debt-notes are those of witnesses and debtors (with an occasional seal of a guarantor), depositions bear the impressions of those who rendered testimony or supplied written depositions (occasionally also of those who were present when the witnesses testified under oath and “heard their utterance”).²⁸ Records of solutions reached by arbiters and verdicts of judges contain the impressions by these persons, just like persons who declare that they have been paid or promise not to vindicate. It is difficult to find out which of the three or four impressions on the envelope of a debt-note belongs to the debtor, since there is no fixed order (although the debtor is frequently listed last in the KIŠIB notation, cf. AKT 6 nos. 17, 21, 24, 28, 32, 35, etc.) and only a minority of the seals bears an inscription. It would have been important to mention the names of the debtor to allow future identification of his seal from occurrences on other envelopes. This lack is only partially repaired in Karaduman 2008, which lists on p. 102ff. the debtors and creditors of 31 debt-notes, but there were many more in this archive as I know from the transliterations of the envelopes of a few dozen debt notes (including six *be’ulātu*-loans), ranging from n/k 1788 until 1843, made available to me long ago by V. Donbaz. The names of the sealers listed in the KIŠIB notations

²⁶ Several seals on n/k envelopes were first published and drawn in Özgüç and Tunca 2001 and it does not surprise that impressions on n/k envelopes in several cases allowed better and more complete drawings than those on the small bullae. Compare the drawings in both volumes of CS 20, 49, 73 – both drawings in Özgüç 2006, Pls. 20 and 21! – 106, and 170. I note also a few curious differences. Özgüç 2006, Pl. 63 omits the inscription of CS 105, scribbled between the figures, shown and readable (*En-um-A-šur* / DUMU *I-dí-A-šur*) in Özgüç and Tunca 2001, Pl. 17 (cf. the description of 1862C). The inscription on CS 230, as drawn in Özgüç and Tunca 2001, Pl. 37, and to be read *I-tur₄-DINGIR* / [DUM]U *A-mur¹-Iš[ta_r]*, contrary to what is usual has the filiation (DUMU ...) in the left vertical line, which was corrected in the drawing in Özgüç 2006, Pl. 65. But wrongly so, as the photos of A. 852 (=AO 7297; see Teissier 1994, no. 312) and N. Özgüç 1965, Pl. XV no. 44, show.

²⁷ For a classification and categorization of sealed records, see Teissier 1994, part I, Ch. 4.

²⁸ *Pāšunu išme*, see the observations in Veenhof 1991, 457f. and VS 26, 110A = EL no. 243B, “N., son of P., (and) I., son of K., grasped the dagger of Aššur and A., son of M., (and) Z., son of L., heard their statement”, where the two seal impressions on the envelope are those of the last two persons. In Kt 86/k 171 the three men who “heard their statement” have sealed the envelope. The text on the bulla Kt n/k 1708 (Özgüç and Tunca 2001, 326) explicitly identifies the seal impressions as those of the two men “who heard their statement”.

of Kt n/k 1722 and 1737 are in fact mentioned in a publication of N. Özgüç herself²⁹ and it surprises that she does not refer to them or use them. Debt-notes are important because they are usually dated and reveal during which years certain seals were used.

Kt n/k is the archive of Uşur-ša-Ištar, son of Aššur-imittī, whose inscribed seal is **CS 79** (see Özgüç and Tunca 2001, Pl. 13, n/k 1718). Many texts from it have been studied³⁰ and ca. 110 were published in various places, 60 (n/k 551-610, of which ca. 40 are letters) as AKT 2 and 50 others in a variety of articles,³¹ but no catalogue or general overview of this very important archive is available. This of course made it very difficult for those studying the seal impressions to use the textual data for identifications and it is unfortunate that the knowledge of the archive available in Ankara University was not tapped and that publications of texts from this archive were not used or referred to.³² The archive contained many letters written by persons whose seals were identified on envelopes, such as Ah-šalim (**CS 822**), Hunniya (**CS 73**), Ikūn-pīya (**CS 718**), Kurara (**CS 447**), Mannum-kī-Aššur (**CS 371**), Šū-Bēlum (**CS 655**), Usānum (**CS 357**), and Uzubiškum (**CS 444**), but the seals of two women, Akatiya, the sister of Uşur-ša-Ištar, and Šīmat-Suen, the wife of Mannum-kī-Aššur, who wrote a series of letters (including n/k 1336, by the two of them together), have not yet been identified.³³ A number of opened or fragmentary envelopes must have belonged to tablets containing these letters and in some cases the names of the writer(s) on the envelope and the negative imprint of the letter on its inside could have helped to identify the tablets to which they belonged.

Dr. Karaduman, an experienced tablet reader, provided the text of the inscriptions on more than one hundred cylinder seals³⁴ and in addition established for another 50 seals, on the basis of the texts written on the envelopes, who used or owned them. Reading seal inscriptions from impressions (often in negative) can be difficult, because not all inscriptions were professionally made. Seal cutters apparently were no scribes, which could result in odd sign forms,³⁵

²⁹ N. Özgüç 1996, 204.

³⁰ Three Assyriologists of Ankara University, Sabahattin Bayram, Salih Çeçen and Cahit Günbattı, studied parts of the archive, especially letters. Together with Bayram and Günbattı I read hundreds of letters (mainly between Kt n/k 80 and 540), when they worked as research fellows at Leiden University. Çeçen, who was a research fellow in Münster, worked mainly on higher numbers, between 1000 and 1700. These efforts thus far have not led to a systematic publication of the correspondence and their knowledge of the texts was not used in the publication of the seal impressions.

³¹ See the references in Michel 2003, 82ff. (with the supplements Michel 2005-2006, 2011b, 2015), and the recent edition in Karaduman 2008.

³² 1716 (with five seal impressions) was published by S. Bayram (*Türk Tarih Kongresi* 10, Ankara 1990, 461) and 1772, with the seal of Bugānum (**CS 462**), by S. Bayram and S. Çeçen, *Belleten* 60 (1996), 615 and 633. Several debt-notes without envelopes were published in Uzunaliçoğlu 1993. Among the 60 n/k texts published in AKT 2 (1995) there are a few witnessed records and about 40 letters, in which several of the persons that figure as sealers on envelopes occur.

³³ See for some remarks on these ladies, Günbattı 1992, 232f.

³⁴ Ten inscribed seals were identified in Özgüç and Tunca 2001: CS 20, 49, 69, 72, 77, 79, 87, 105, 170, 230.

³⁵ Several signs (such as the rather square DUMU) exhibit more archaic or lapidary forms, common for engraving in stone, others are more cursive and reflect the shapes of signs written in clay. In OA texts the name of the god Aššur is rarely written with the divine determinative and is spelled both *A-šur* and *A-šūr*, but in seal inscriptions the divine determinative occurs more often and they always write *A-šūr*. Similarly, the name element Puzur is always written *Puzur*₄, never, as happens frequently on clay, *Puzur*₂. *La* is usually written with LA₁ (e.g. in *La-qé-pu-um*), only rarely with LÁ (e.g. in 711, for lack of room, perhaps due to writing between the figures of the scene). These features resemble the “conservative spelling” that I noted for the oldest part of the Kültepe Eponym List (Veenhof 2003, 12). On the other hand, /di/ is regularly written with the sign DÍ (especially in *I-dí-DN*) and rarely with TI = di (e.g. in **CS 644** and in *Ku-bi-TI* in **CS 542**). Curious are the writing of DUMU at the end of line 2 in **CS 494** and the division of the sign LI over two lines in **CS 700** (DUMU GE₆-*li-Ištar* = Šilli-Ištar). In **CS 311** the sign

and the writing is at times rather shallow, as if it was scratched and not properly engraved in the stone. This could result in faint impressions in the clay, while the limited room available or damage regularly also made part of an inscription – often the beginning and the end of the usually two lines of script – difficult to read or missing. Names not written in a framed cartouche, but scribbled between the figures of the scene may also present problems.³⁶ Reading such inscriptions requires a trained eye and several times Dr. Karaduman's readings make sense of what in the drawing of the seal looks difficult or meaningless. It is not clear to me to what extent those who drew the seals cooperated with her, because several of her readings did not result in improved drawings of the inscription.³⁷

I add remarks on the reading and identification of some seals.

CS 170 = 2091 = 91/k 114A: allow to complete the drawing in Özgüç and Tunca 2001, Pl. 87: read *Na-bi-d*EN.ZU and not *Na-bi-d*EN.LÍL;

CS 222 = 1842B, etc.: occurrence on the envelope of the letter AKT 6b, 390 shows it to be the seal of Ennam-Aššur, son of Šallim-Aššur;

CS 225 = 94/k 1059 (in Özgüç and Tunca 2001, Pl. 36): seal of Zukua, son of Aššur-idī; drawing to be completed after the photo of AKT 6c, 602 and see for lines 3-4 of the text on the bulla AKT 6c, 591;

CS 355 = 1698C, 2073 and 2075 = TC 3 no. 3 = Teissier no. 114: seal of Šu-Bēlum, son of A-zu-a, common sealer;

CS 443 = 1752C, 1782A, 1793A, 1830A, 1839B, 1918A: seal of DINGIR-na-da, son of Ba-zi-a, common sealer;³⁸

CS 497 = 1785B, 1793B, 1839B(sic): seal of A-zu, son of DINGIR-na-da;³⁹

CS 512 = 1789D, and 1790C: seal of *Ili-iddinaššu* (witness, debtor), common sealer;

ŠÜR (from *A-šūr*) is written between the two lines. Another feature to be noted is that a number of seal inscriptions start with KIŠIB, while most begin with the name itself. A comprehensive study of the seal inscriptions remains a challenge.

³⁶ Such inscriptions, usually in a more cursive script, presumably were added secondarily to existing seals, either when they were bought from a seal cutter or after they had been acquired. Seals with an inscription written within the iconographic scene, often between the figures and in two separate lines, in are in Özgüç and Tunca 2001: CS 105, 145, 199; in Özgüç 2006: CS 374, 455 (only the second line, the filiation), 460, 520 (under the throne of the deity), 551 (three small lines underneath the 'bull altar'); see also CCT 6 no. 84; CTMMA 1 no. 57; ICK 1, 22a,A, 27a,A, 41a,C; KKS 9 and 41; TC 3, 45, 46; VS 26, 23; Dalley, Edinburgh, no. 7A seal 2, etc.

³⁷ Note in particular CS 359, 383, 412, 432, 456, 461 (the drawing shows no inscription!) and 646 (the drawing only shows part of DUMU). The name of a sealer suggested by the text on an envelope of course does not simply allow restoring the drawing of a partial or damaged impression.

³⁸ 1830B and 1939A are said to be CS 442, but actually are CS 443 (see the next footnote and the cross reference to 1782A); CS 442 only figures as 1752A (the remarks in Veenhof 2009, 184 reflect the embarrassment before discovering this confusion). A problem is still created by 1801, a deposition with only one seal, CS 534, according to the text that of DINGIR-nādā, son of Baziya, who is the user of CS 443. Was this a namesake or did he have a second seal?

³⁹ CS 496 and 497 = 1785A and B are also confused, for if 1793B is CS 497, then 1830B should be CS 496. CS 443 + 497 + 518 appear on 1793 and also, together with three other seals, as 1830 A, B (which hence cannot be CS 496), and E. These two contracts have three sealers in common, the witnesses DINGIR-nādā, son of Baziya = CS 443 (see above), Ennam-Aššur, son of Aššur-šamši, and Azu, son of DINGIR-nādā, debtor in both. The occurrence of CS 518 as 92/k 165D and the mention "KIŠIB E., son of A." in its line 3, prove that this was his seal, so that CS 497 must be that of Azu. Note that all seal(er)s of n/k 1939 also appear on 1793 and 1830: CS 443(!), 518, 588, and 589; if their texts were known, more identifications would be possible.

- CS 518 = 1793A, 1830E, 1939B, 92/k 165D (AKT 8, 231 with Pl. 47: seal of *Ennam-Aššur*, son of *Aššur-šamšī* (common sealer);
- CS 533 = 1899C = 91/k 477B (AKT 8, 64, Pl. 14) = 91/k 488A (AKT 8, 99, Pls. 19-20): inscription *Ga-zu-um*, seal of *Amur-šamaš*, son of *Miša/ur-rabi*;
- CS 542 = 1809 B, 1881B, 1916A, 1948C = Kt 86/k 162A: seal of *Ša-lim-A-šūr / DUMU Ku-bi-di*(TI) (misread *Šu-Bēlim* in 1881B and 1948C). The seal was used (after being inherited?) by his son *Aššur-bāni*. This had already happened during eponymy year REL 62 (the date of Kt 86/k 162), which makes it, as acquired by its first owner, a very old seal.
- CS 552 = 1815A: the name of the father is *Šu-mi-a-bi-a*;
- CS 554 = 1816A: seal of *Šu-Ištar* son of *Uku*;
- CS 601 = 1835B, 1896: the name *Šu-^dIštar* is misread *Idi-Aššur* in 1896B;
- CS 626 = 1844C = Teissier no. 329 = CTMMA 1 no. 32: seal of *Ilabrat-bāni*, son of *Aššur-mālik*;
- CS 627 = 1844D = Kt g/k 410 = Kt 91/k 392B (AKT 8, 15, Pl. 3): seal of *Ennam-Aššur*, son of *Ušariya*, witness;
- CS 640 = 1850C = Kt 92/k 172B (AKT 8, 290, Pl. 58): seal of *Ennāniya*, son of *Izzizam-ilī*;
- CS 682 = 1871B: read probably *En-nam-^dA-šūr / DUMU A-ta-na-[ah-DINGIR[?]]*;
- CS 700 = 1885A: the name of Naniya's father is *GE₆-li-Ištar = (Šilli-Ištar* (see above, note 33);
- CS 727 = 1898B: read *DUMU I-dī-A-šūr* instead of *Itab-Aššur*;
- CS 739 = 1906A = 91/k 403A (AKT 8, 312, Pl. 63) = 92/k 160 (AKT 8, 25; envelope of a letter): used by *Aššur-mūtappil*;
- CS 759 = 1921B: read probably [KIŠIB] *I-dī-[x x] / DUMU Šu-li-a*;
- CS 839 = 2063: same seal on AKT 6c, 673a, seal of *Puzur-Anna*.

It is no wonder that some badly written or damaged names on the seals could not be deciphered and that some tentative readings, especially if they yield strange or uncommon names do not convince. Those on **CS 359, 467, 536, 540, 551, 572, 619, 629,**⁴⁰ **771, 776** (the drawing shows no DUMU before the putative ĪR), **785**, and **789** (the drawing shows four lines of script, the description mentions only three) remain unclear and without study of the originals (impressions and texts on the envelopes) alternative readings are risky. The reading of the name **CS 359** = 1716A as “1) *Aššur-il ītaba* 2) *Šu-a-num's son*” yields an unacceptable name that can also not be linked with one of the sealers of the contract, which was published by Bayram.⁴¹ The inscription on **CS 619**, also attested as CCT 6 no. 41, seems to read *Puzur₄- x [x/] / DUMU I-ka-x [(x)]*.

⁴⁰ The reading of **CS 629** as n/k 1845B differs from the one as 1981A and both are difficult to match with the drawing; a reading *Itti-Sin* is impossible (*itti* should be *išti* in OA) and the inscription may have started with *i-TI = i-dī = iddin*, “he gave”, as is the case in **CS 644**, where we must read *Iddin-Ištar*.

⁴¹ See above note 32. The description of Kt n/k 1716 mentions the presence of five different seals (ignored by Bayram), probably four belonging to the five witnesses (the third is the wife of the second and did not have a seal of her own) and the fifth of the debtor, *Bulina*, whose wife and co-debtor *Walawala* probably did not have a seal of her own and was bound by his seal.

There are also some errors in the writing of Assyrian names, inconsistencies in the spelling, typographical errors, presumably also because the data provided by the epigraphist were at times misread, misunderstood or not corrected in the proofs. This great volume would have deserved a better final editorial check. I would also have preferred a less simplified rendering of the names, to bring out specific spelling features, such as mentioned above in note 35, which can be important for dating the seals.⁴² A special section, where all seal inscriptions and data on owners/users (with their roles as witness, debtor, writer of a letter, etc.) are presented in a systematic way (by CS number, text number and by their names in alphabetical order), with transcriptions of their names according to the philological tradition, as was done in Tunca 2001, 311-317, would have been most welcome.

4. *Owners and users; on the borrowing and transfer of seals*

In Özgüç 2006 and various other studies a distinction is made between the owners and users of a seal, but these terms are confusing, because the norm is that the person who impresses a seal on an envelope and thus “uses” it, was its owner. Borrowing one’s seal to somebody else to use it is very unlikely, even in the community of traveling traders, for impressing a seal on an envelope made its owner – whether he was identified by the inscription on or the iconography of the seal – liable for the obligation recorded (paying a debt, witnessing a contract, etc.). Most prominent traders had their representatives (*ša kīma jāti*, “the one who replaces me”; traders in Kanesh had them in Assur), who could be authorised to carry out commercial transactions for them, such as paying or collecting debts, transferring goods or tablets, selling or buying. Traders could also appoint a person called a “stand-in”, *šazzuztum*, who would “answer for them” in particular legal situations (in particular to provide security). But such people used their own seals and I know of no evidence that the person they represented borrowed them his seal. A different feature is that in specific situations somebody could be authorised to seal for, in the name of somebody who was absent, e.g. “in representation of” a woman, who was not present at a legal action in which she was a party, but was bound by the seal impression of somebody else. This was the case in TC 1, 79 = *EL* no. 11, where in the KIŠIB notation also “the seal of Ahaha, daughter of Pūšu-kēn” is mentioned, although she was not present and her seal was not impressed, but the last line states that “Iddin-abum, son of Aššur-mālik, represented Ahaha” (*kīma A. izziz*), which implies that she was bound by the seal impression of her representative.⁴³

Teissier 1994, 46, assumes that borrowing is obvious “when, for example, the seal of a party in a contract is used by a sealer who is associated with him”, but the three examples she adduces all concern Anatolians and are not convincing. Her first example, e.g., is the seal of Šadahšu, identified with TC 3 no. 76 = seal B on TC 3, 253a, where he figures as witness, and

⁴² There are also some mistakes, e.g.; CS 727, presumably DUMU *I-dī-A-šūr*; CS 629, the reading of inscription on n/k 1845B differs from that on n/k 1981 and the copy agrees with neither of them; CS 682, read *En-nam-^dA-šūr / DUMU A-ta-na-lah*.

⁴³ See Veenhof 2008, 110. The same happened in CCT 5, 16a, where Abāya marries Adad-šamšī, which is sealed by the groom and three men, but the KIŠIB notation does not mention the seal of Adad-šamšī. In the contract she promises to pay a fine if she divorces her husband and lines 17f. state: “Kukusānum, son of Akūtum, represented her” (*kīma šīātī izziz*). The text on the tablet accordingly mentions the presence of his seal, but does not list him among the witnesses.

it is identical to seal B on TC 3, 218, where Šadahšu is creditor. Since creditors do not seal debt-notes, somebody else, presumably a witness acting in the interest of the creditor, perhaps a business associate, must have used his seal. While this reasoning is sound, the first step, identifying TC 3 no. 76 with Šadahšu's seal, is not beyond doubt (as she admits by adding a question mark in her catalogue under no. 6). For TC 3, 253 is a deed of sale of a slave that mentions five sealers (among them the well-known Wašhupa, "head of the market", and the seller, Nakile'ed), but shows only three different impressions, TC 3 nos. 76, 94, and 95. This means that two of these impressions must have bound more than one person, which makes it difficult to say whose seal it was. Moreover, impressing a seal that would also bind somebody else, perhaps a relative or business associate of the seal's owner, is different from borrowing it, in the sense of authorizing somebody else to use it for and in the absence of its owner. Teissier's two other examples raise similar problems.

A special feature is the use of a man's seal by his brother. It is also attested for seals published in Özgüç 2006, e.g. for **CS 373** (= n/k 1725B and 1803C), inscribed with the name of Puzur-Ištar, son of Amur-ilī, but used by Aššur-re'ī, son of Amur-ilī. Teissier (1994, 46 with note 39) assumes that brothers may have borrowed each other's seal, but this is also hard to prove and considering the fact (shown by Larsen 2007) that brothers, after the death of their fathers, operated as independent traders (although this does not rule out forms of cooperation) does not make this very likely. The first example adduced by Teissier is Dadaya, son of Aššur-imitī, who used the seal of his brother Ili-šadu'e (see the data in Teissier 1994, 118, under no. 98). But I note that whereas Dadaya is well attested, also as user of his brother's seal, his brother who as its first owner had his name inscribed on it, is absent in the sources,⁴⁴ which suggests that Dadaya had inherited or taken over the seal of his dead brother. I therefore agree with Larsen (1977, 99 with note 60) that such seals were inherited from brother to brother. This conclusion is supported by the history of the seal of Puzur-Ištar, son of Šu-Anum, discussed below, and Sturm 1999, 726, mentions another example of such a transfer of a seal between brothers.⁴⁵ A clear link between the transfer of a seal and the death of its owner is found in the testimony, recorded in CCT 5, 9b:26-30, where Puzur-Ištar describes how his brother, when he was about to die (*ina bāb muātišu*, l. 16), "himself loosened his seal from his belt and gave it to me" in the presence of two witnesses.⁴⁶

But not all cases where someone uses a seal inscribed with the name of his brother can be explained in this way. An example is the use of the seal KKS no. 16 (= **CS 60**, on the bulla Kt j/k 619, see Özgüç and Tunca 2001, 311 and Pl. 11), inscribed with the name ^dA-šur-GAL / DUMU *La-qé-ep*. It is impressed on KKS 6, whose KIŠIB notation indeed mentions this man as sealer, but in the contract Aššur-rabi plays no role, while one of the witnesses is Wardum, known (e.g. in TPAK 1, 156b:4) as a son of Lā-qēp. Matouš 1974, who analysed the case, speaks of a "gemeinsames Siegel", but in KKS 83, note 3, modifies this slightly by speaking of "gemeinsame Benutzung". While the argument Matouš adduces on KKS p. 31

⁴⁴ Dadaya, son of Aššur-imitī, priest of Suen, is attested several times between eponymy year 94 (Kt 89/k 325:29) and 112 (TC 3, 213:3,5). The only occurrence of an Ili-šadu'e, perhaps the same man, but without filiation, is as addressee of a letter sent to him in Assur by Buzāzu. This leaves the possibility open that Ili-šadu'e, who lived in Assur, had died early and left his seal to his brother.

⁴⁵ Ili-ālum, son of Aššur-idī, using the seal of his brother Ṭāb-šilli-Aššur.

⁴⁶ *Kunukkūšu H.-ma / ina qá-«qá»-áb-li-šu / ipturma iddinam.*

is not valid,⁴⁷ common use (for borrowing) by both brothers is still very likely because, different from the cases mentioned before. Aššur-rabi to all appearances was still alive when his brother used his seal on KKS 6, during eponymy year REL 101. He figures in *EL* 79, during year REL 97, in BIN 6, 244:19 (as witness) during year REL 100, and in POAT 4:43 (as debtor) during year REL 107. That the situation is different is also indicated by the fact that in all other cases where a person uses a seal inscribed with a different name (of his brother, father or somebody else), the KIŠIB notation always identifies it as the seal of the user, because he was (known to be) its new owner. But in KKS 6 it is designated not as Wardum's seal, but in line with its inscription, as that of his brother. The scribe who made this record apparently knew that it was indeed the seal of his brother and designated it as such. And it could anyhow easily be connected with his brother, the witness, if the latter would have to be summoned to testify.⁴⁸ Other cases where two relatives shared a seal or used it jointly are unknown to me. That in this case, after the death of their father, one brother would have proposed the other to use his seal jointly, suggested by Hecker 2004, 292, is not convincing.⁴⁹

While for the transfer of a seal from brother to brother the verb “to inherit” is not appropriate, this is different with its transfer from a father to his son, which is mentioned in a few texts. It was inherited by a son on the basis of his father's last will, as mentioned already by M. T. Larsen (1977, 98), in ICK 1, 12b:33-34, where the father stipulated: “My seal Iaya will take”. The unique testament of the widow Ištar-lamassī (Kt 91/k 453 = AKT 8, 170:11f.) states that the executioners after her death “shall send the seal to my daughter, the *ugbaltu*-priestess”.⁵⁰ Something similar is mentioned in the record of a legal fight between the sons of the dead Puzur-ilī, analysed in Hecker 2004, where one son asserts (text B: 32-37), “Our father, when he was still alive, gave me the lapis lazuli seal in the presence of you, PN₁ and PN₂, with the words: The seal is for your sister, go to the City and give it to her”.⁵¹

That this actually happened is confirmed by envelopes where a man is listed as sealer, while the inscription on the seal impressed identifies his father as its original owner. An example is provided by the damaged CS 77 = n/k 1717B, drawn on Özgüç and Tunca 2001, Pl. 13, whose inscription is restored as *A-šūr-ta-[ak-lá-ku]* / DUMU *Puzu[r₄-Sú-in]* in Özgüç and Tunca 2001, 312. A new occurrence as seal A on Kt 91/k 516a (AKT 8, 201, with Pl. 39), where the name of the father is also only partially preserved), dated to eponymy year REL 108, shows

⁴⁷ That the KIŠIB notation mentions five sealers, while the envelope has only four different impressions “würde dafür sprechen, dass die beiden Brüder Aššur-rabi und Wardum ... ein gemeinsames Siegel benutzt haben”. This is not true, for only Wardum, recorded as witness, sealed. The lack of one seal impression is due to the fact that the two Anatolian debtors, Ha/ulupa and A/Imuwašu, mentioned in the KIŠIB notation, where they are identified as brothers, are bound by one seal impression only, presumably seal 19 (three times a circular stamp seal).

⁴⁸ See for La-qēp and his sons also J. Lewy, *HUCA* 27 (1956), 8 notes 15-17, p. 10 note 44, and p. 76 note 325. Note that both Aššur-rabi and his brother Wardum named their sons after their grandfather, see CCT 5, 9b:30 and ICK 2, 76:5', and also *EL* 144:19 and TC 3, 269:2ff. (mentions the death of Wardum). The occurrence of a Wardum, son of Lā-qēp in *EL* 94:22 (sic), during eponymy year 119, might refer to Wardum's grandson.

⁴⁹ He finds this proposal in the words *kunukkam lu niknuk* (text B: 19-21, 40, 54, see notes 41-44), which he translates as “lass uns das Siegel (gemeinsam) benutzen”. I believe they mean “let us put the seal under seal”, in order to ship it safely to Assur, as also the ensuing verdict of the *kārum* states (l. 51) “Both of you together (*kil-lallākunu*) will seal the seal and entrust it to an affiliated trader who is traveling to the City”. The risk of its unauthorized use required putting a seal under seal until its eventual owner was known. Seals were also put under seal when they were entrusted for safekeeping to somebody else and CTMMA 84:50-54 list two seals that had been put in a man's strong-room in this way.

⁵⁰ *Kunukkam ana* DUMU.MÍ-[tí-a] / *gubabtim ú-šé-b[u-lu]*, the last verb because the girl lived in Assur.

⁵¹ See the analysis in Hecker 2004, 292f.

that we have to restore the inscription as DUMU *Puzur₄-Ištar*, for Puzur-Ištar, son of Aššur-taklāku, is one of the three witnesses who sealed this quittance.⁵² Other such cases where a son uses his father's seal are CS 392 = n/k 1733C and 1787A, inscribed with the name of *A-šūr-DÙG / DUMU MAR.TU-ba-ni*, but used, as stated by Mrs. Karaduman, by Iddin-Adad, son of Aššur-ṭāb; and CS 542 = n/k 1809B, with the inscription *Ša-lim-A-šūr / DUMU Ku-bi-di*, while one of the only two sealers is Aššur-bāni, son of Šallim-Aššur, who also uses his father's seal on Kt 86/k 162, seal A (see above in the list of § 3). Larsen (1977, 98) also found a case where the use of a seal by both a father and his son is attested. The seal inscribed with the name of Aššur-rē'ī, son of Puzur-Ištar, was used by Aššur-rē'ī himself, as witness, in TC 3, 247 (= TC 3 seal 45) and in FT 2a (seal A),⁵³ and by his son Pilah-Ištar in BIN 4, 211 = *EL* no. 163. The son used it in eponymy year REL 107 (or perhaps 115), and TC 3, 245 and FT 2, although undated, are probably ca. thirty years older, since, as pointed out by Larsen, they are related to CCT 1, 5a = *EL* no. 73, dated to eponymy year REL 76. This makes it likely that Pilah-Ištar (who is attested in texts ranging from eponymy year REL 96 to 107; in year REL 106 he served as week eponym, cf. TPAK 1, 169:5'-7') inherited his father's seal. If we knew more texts written on the sealed envelopes we could identify more cases where a son uses his father's seal – also cases where the seal is not inscribed, but the mention of the sealers reveals what is at stake – and perhaps even a few dated ones to prove that the seal was indeed inherited from the father.

In the testament ICK 1, 12 the eldest son is assigned his father's seal and CS 77 was inherited by the son who was named after his grandfather (which meant that his name was actually on the seal), who may have been the eldest son. But we do not know whether this was the rule, for the sons who inherited their father's seals CS 392 and 542 were not named after their grandfathers. This neither implies nor excludes that they were younger sons, because the system of papponomy was by no means a general rule in Old Assyrian society.

The “owner” as distinguished from a “user” of a seal normally is the previous owner, who had ordered or bought the seal and who in some cases also had his name inscribed on it. The “user” is the new owner, a man with a different name, who according to the KIŠIB notation had impressed it on an envelope, but had failed to erase or replace the original inscription. There are many examples of this feature on the texts of the d/k and n/k archives and it must have been more common, but we can usually only establish it when inscribed seals are used. How persons different from and, as far as we can trace, no relatives of the original owners, acquired such seals is unknown. They may have bought them, for we know from KTS 33b: 5-16, that seals were sold: “You wrote me several times, saying: Šu-Bēlum's lapis lazuli seal is with me; give Šu-Bēlum his seal. If you have sold it, give him the price of his seal in silver and satisfy Šu-Bēlum so that he does not claim his seal”.⁵⁴ It was apparently possible to sell

⁵² The new, better preserved impression shows the horns of the second bull-man.

⁵³ See M. T. Larsen and E. Møller in Fs. P. Garelli, 229f., with a drawing of the seal on p. 248. A complication is that CS 145 on bulla Kt 88/k 447 (Tunca 2001, 334) is a seal inscribed with the name of *A-šūr-SIP[A] / DUMU Puzur₄-Ištar*. Since a namesake with the same father is unlikely, we could assume that Pilah-Ištar, presumably before he inherited his father's seal (the bulla mentions that the packet it sealed was addressed to Pilah-Ištar's wife) also had a seal of his own. There are now many more data on these persons, thanks to the publication of the archive of Aššur-rē'ī and his son in AKT 7A, where fig. 5 shows the father's seal = CS 145.

⁵⁴ (5) *šinēšu u šalāšēšu/ tašpuram / umma attāma kunukkuḡum / ša Šu-Bēlim ša husārim / ištia ibašši kunukkušu diššum* (10) *šumma ana šimim taddiššu / kaspam šim kunukkišu / diššum Šu-Bēlam ṭa'ibma* (15) *ana kunukkišu / lā iturram*.

the seal of a man still alive and around and there is no mention of the concern about the possible use by the buyer of this seal.

5. *Re-cutting and changing seals and their inscriptions*

Seal specialists observe that quite a number of seals in due time were re-cut or adapted and the descriptions in Özgüç and Tunca 2001 and Özgüç 2006 mention this for more than fifty seals. It is probable, though difficult to prove, that this happened at the request of a new owner, who in some cases might also have changed the inscription. The inscribed seal in OA style of Puzur-Ištar, son of the *laputtā'um* Šu-Anum (CS 545), at some time was acquired and used by his brother Bušiya (who impressed it as witness on CTMMA 1, 92a, drawn as seal 53) and Özgüç and Tunca 2001, 139 with note 3, are inclined to credit him for re-cutting and adding some elements. Since we have no envelope with an impression of the original seal, we do not know when this change occurred, but apparently rather soon, for Bušiya already uses this seal in eponymy year REL 76 (Kt n/k 1811B).⁵⁵ Since Puzur-Ištar himself never occurs as an acting person we may assume, as in the case of the seal of Ilī-šadu'e (discussed above), that he had died young and that his seal was taken over by his brother. The latter did not consider it necessary to change its inscription, perhaps because the mention of the name of their father was sufficient to identify him as the brother of the first owner.

A change is attested for CS 606 (n/k 1836C = Teissier 1994, no. 582a), where the difficult inscription looks like *I-ku²-u-m[u-x]* / DUMU *I-ra-am²-da-ad²* (cf. *EL* I, p. 213, seal c).⁵⁶ This seal was used as seal C on TC 1, 64 (= *EL* 221), an unopened envelope recording a promise not to raise claims, sealed by three persons, one a party to the agreement and two witnesses, one of them Iddin-abum. He has apparently impressed CS 606, for he figures later as its owner and user also on ICK 1, 36a (seal B). By that time the original inscription had been replaced by *I-dí-a-bu-um* / DUMU *I-sú-rik*(SUD_X), the name of one of the main figures of the Šallim-Aššur archive, edited by M. T. Larsen in AKT 6. An impression of his adapted seal (A) on text 24 is shown there on p. 461 and it also occurs on the envelopes AKT 6a, nos. 17, 21, 28 and 32. When the change of the inscription took place is not clear, because TC 1, 64 is not dated and we can only establish that the inscription was changed before eponymy year REL 99, because ICK 1, 36 and AKT 6, 21 are dated by a double week-eponym (without mention of a eponymy year), which disappear after that year.⁵⁷ Iddin-abum, whose career seems to have begun around eponymy year REL 76 (see AKT 6a, p. 15), apparently had acquired an old, inscribed seal and in due time replaced the inscription by his own name.

An in many ways interesting example is CS 819 (= n/k 1963E and several other occurrences), inscribed with the words KIŠIB *Eb-da-/m[u]* / *me-ki-im Eb-la-[im]*", a seal originally belonging to a man (an official?) from Ebla, acquired and used by Aššur-nādā. In due time he replaced the original inscription by his own name, *A-šūr-na-d[a]* / DUMU *A-šūr-i-[dí]*, attested in the adapted version known as CCT 6 no. 26, unfortunately on an isolated and

⁵⁵ CTMMA 1, 92 is undated; the other texts with the seal, listed in Özgüç 2006, 176, under B, are unpublished.

⁵⁶ The drawing does not support the reading by Dr. Karaduman in Özgüç 2006, 199, "LUGAL-kin son Ramadad", because at least DUMU *I-* as the beginning of the second line is very clear.

⁵⁷ The debt-note of Iddin-abum AKT 6, 23, is dated to the early double week-eponym of year REL 77, but its envelope is not preserved, so we do not know which seal was used.

undated envelope. But this must have happened fairly late, since the use of the unchanged seal is still attested between eponymy years REL 76 and 91.⁵⁸

Another interesting case are the two versions of CS 444, the seal of Uzi/ubiškum, son of the *laputtā'um* Šu-Anum, CS 444a = n/k 1769A and 1873C, and CS 444b = Kt a/k 424, n/k 1754-62, 1764, 1841B (sic!), 1938B, and CTMMA 1, no. 41. Özgüç and Tunca 2001, 139, call the latter, provided with various additions, the “preferred altered form of his seal”, but the reason for these changes is not clear. The change must have been made after eponymy year REL 86, when CS 444a = ICK 2, Pl. CVI, Ka 446B appears on the envelope of ICK 1, 99, and before year REL 97 when CS 444b appears on Kt a/k 424a (courtesy J. G. Dercksen).⁵⁹ The use of obviously old seals, e.g. with inscriptions from the time of the Ur III empire (CS 421, of the scribe Ur-nigingar; CS 520, of a servant of king Ibbi-Suen; CTMMA 1, no. 54, of the scribe Ur-Lugalbanda) will not have been confusing and their antiquity and “status” may have had a certain appeal. This could explain why the new owner of CS 520, Amurru-bāni, did not erase the original inscription, but added his own name in very small signs underneath the throne of the seated deity.

A special case could be the use of the seal of one’s father or predecessor in an official function soon after his death, when the successor had not yet acquired a seal of his own. Krysztal 2004 argues that the letter POAT 18, addressed to Pūšu-kēn and whose envelope bears the impression of the seal of king Šarrum-kēn, for chronological reasons (letters are not dated) must have been written by his son and successor Puzur-Aššur II. The latter would have used his father’s seal during the very beginning of his reign, for he must have written this letter, about collecting silver still owed to his father, pretty soon after the latter’s death. A somewhat comparable case is that of CS 358, impressed on the letter n/k 1702 and described in Özgüç 2006, 106. It bears the inscription *Šu-A-nu-um* NU.BÀNDA / DUMU *A-mur-DINGIR*,⁶⁰ but is identified on the envelope (shown and described in Özgüç and Tunca 2001, 137f. and Pl. D, 1) as KIŠIB *Hu-bi-tim* NU.BÀNDA. Hubitum⁶¹ occupied the same, high office of *laputtā'um* as the man whose seal he apparently had acquired or taken over, presumably because he succeeded him in his office by an appointment we would expect the City Assembly of Assur to make. In Özgüç and Tunca 2001, 138, it is argued that the original seal of Šu-Anum in the Isin-Larsa style, was changed for Hubitum: “Hubitum’s seal-cutter erased the seated deity, in its place he carved the bull with the cone and three figures below, elixir-vase, vase, small worshipper and reclining animal in Old Assyrian style”. No impression of Šu-Anum’s original seal has thus far turned up and it would be interesting if dated occurrences of impressions of both seals could indicate when, after the death of Šu-Anum, the change of office and the adaptation of the seal had taken place. The new *laputtā'um* may not have considered it necessary to replace his predecessor’s name by his own, because the

⁵⁸ See Teissier 1994, nos. 529a=b and 529c, and M. V. Tonietti, *MARI* 8 (1997), 224-230. The original seal occurs on TC 3, 247, undated, but related to and presumably only slightly later than *EL* 73, from year REL 76, and its use in year REL 91 is on Kt c/k 650B (courtesy J. G. Dercksen).

⁵⁹ Uzubiškum is relatively well attested, first during eponymy year REL 85 (AKT 2, 6:49). He was involved in the wool trade (AKT 6, 90:3, cf. 100:9, where he witnesses the receipt of a payment for wool by his brother). Prag I 501:18, mentioning a letter written “when U. was alive” (*ina buluṭ* U.), refers to his death and in AKT 5, 49:6’, during eponymy year REL 129, we meet a son of him as witness.

⁶⁰ Šu-Anum, *laputtā'um*, is known as such also from the seals of three of his children, Amur-ilī (named after his grandfather), Puzur-Ištar (CS 545), and Uzubiškum (CS 444a/b), both discussed above.

⁶¹ See for him Dercksen 2004, 67f.

mention of his prestigious office – the only one to be recorded on OA seals – was deemed sufficient. A different decision was taken by the owner of **CS 49**, which, according to its inscription originally belonged to Assur’s ruler Šilulu, son of Dakiki, and was subsequently acquired and used by the trader Šilulu, son of Uku.⁶² It can hardly be a coincidence that both owners had the same name, but we know nothing about their (genealogical or professional) relationship and in this case the prestigious title and seal of the older namesake may have been the reason for not changing the inscription.

Many new owners did not consider it necessary to change the inscription and only laborious prosopographical research may turn up genealogical evidence to explain some cases and to show whether there is a chronological link with the death of the original owner. The possibility of buying seals (mentioned above) implies that the old and new owner may not have had any relationship and in most cases we simply do not know how and why the new owner acquired the seal. An example is Usānum, son of Amur-Aššur, a regular correspondent of Ušur-ša-Ištar, who used **CS 357**, inscribed with the name of Rubātum, daughter of Amur-ilī (perhaps a sister of the just-mentioned *laputtā’um* of that name).⁶³ Another is **CS 431** (= n/k 1747F), a seal inscribed with the name of Puzur-Aššur, son of Iddin-Aššur, regularly used by a certain Kula, since in various contracts on which this seal is impressed alongside others, he is the only “common sealer”.⁶⁴ They belong to a list of persons designated as “users” in Uzunalımoğlu 1993, 58, where she presents 16 cases in the n/k archive, a number that will certainly increase when more texts on the envelopes become known.⁶⁵

Seals whose original inscription was completely erased by a new owner are of course very hard to trace. Erasing an inscription may not have been rare, since Özgüç 2006 mentions for no less than 40 seals from the n/k archive that they were re-cut, frequently by being provided with “later additions”. Even more difficult is it to trace un-inscribed seals used subsequently by two owners.

6. Conclusions

The volumes Özgüç and Tunca 2001 and Özgüç 2006 have provided us with a wealth of new material and have contributed to identifying the owners of the seals, both previous ones and later ones, by their descriptions and by registering names inscribed on the seals and pointing out who used them according to the text written on the envelopes where they are impressed. Identifying the owners still poses many problems, because most seals do not bear a name and registering their use on envelopes confronts us with a variety of problems, when the inscription does not match the name of the sealer mentioned, when the texts, especially those in

⁶² See for this seal Balkan 1955, 54f., and for the question when the original Šilulu might have ruled Assur, Veenhof 2008, 31f.

⁶³ A check in Özgüç 2006 (under Kt n/k 1700) reveals that **CS 357**, with one exception (Kt n/k 1763, which is unopened), always appears on opened and fragmented envelopes (listed in the description of Kt n/k 1700). They must have belonged to the almost 20 tablets with letters of Usānum, mostly addressed to Ušur-ša-Ištar. It seems likely that the broken envelopes were kept together with the tablets to which they belonged, which would confirm the suggestion that the high numbers of the envelopes do not reflect their original disposition.

⁶⁴ Two contracts where he seals, n/k 1747 and 1812, were published by Karaduman 2008, as nos. 3 and 4, but since in both the same debtor and witnesses occur with seals without inscriptions, they offer no clue; it is provided by the other occurrences of **CS 431**.

⁶⁵ **CS 441** does not belong in this list, because its “owner”, king Ikūnum, is identical to its “user”, the *waklum*.

which Anatolians figure, mention more (frequently) or less (only occasionally) sealers than the number of different impressions, and when we do not understand why particular persons have sealed or failed to seal an envelope. The only way of solving part of these puzzles is by collecting more occurrences and in particular by studying seal impressions in combination with the text written on the envelope and, when available, the tablet inside, and by undertaking prosopographical research to find out who is who. This may shed light on the role and the genealogical or business relations of the sealers, and helps to show during which periods particular seals (in their original or their adapted form) were used. And this may provide clues for understanding when and perhaps why a seal changed hands or was adapted. In addition, it may give us some insight into the reasons why particular people (possibly due to their ethnic origin or social status) preferred particular types of seals and why inscriptions on particular seals were or were not changed. Many of these issues relating to the use of seals have been raised in the past, in particular by Larsen 1977 and Teissier 1994, but answers proved difficult and will only be possible on the basis of a meticulous collection and interpretation of the data, for which the cooperation between the seal specialist and the epigraphist is essential. This happened in the edition of the bullae in Özgüç and Tunca 2001,⁶⁶ and while the contributions of Dr. Karaduman to Özgüç 2006 are valuable, too many textual data apparently could not or were not taken into account. Thereby the number of possible identifications of seal owners remained restricted, while also questions about ownership, transfer and use were not asked or could not yet be answered. The separate publication of seal impressions and texts for the time being may probably be inevitable, considering the quantity of the material, the diverging specializations, and the difference in pace, but a further integration of data and cooperation⁶⁷ is very desirable, so that both can use each other's data and the epigraphist can present the seals (also) in his text edition.⁶⁸

This does not mean that we will find answers to all questions. This is not surprising, because the ancient Assyrians took the possession, transfer and use of seals for granted and only rarely saw reasons to write about it. But it may give us some consolation that the Assyrians themselves at times were also not certain about the identification of a seal impression and the ownership of a seal, as shown by a dozen texts that raise the issue of “identifying a seal” (*kunukkam waddu'um*).⁶⁹ This issue needs a special investigation, but the following quotation

⁶⁶ It is a great pity that the bullae, as their excavations numbers show, were often separated from the stacks of tablets or containers to which they were originally attached and on which they were found, as described in T. Özgüç 1994, 369.

⁶⁷ Texts and seals were published together in ICK 1 and 2 and KKS, and in CTMMA 1. My own experiences in this matter are positive, due to the cooperation with Dr. E. Klengel-Brandt in the edition of texts and seals on the Kültepe tablets in Berlin (VS 26, 1992), and with Dr. M. Omura, who studied and drew the seal impressions on the envelopes in the archive of Kuliya, published in AKT 5 and those in the archive of Elamma, published in AKT 8. The seal impressions of AKT 8 will be published separately by Dr. M. Omura, but we exchanged data and information on their inscriptions and occurrences on other texts. My text edition mentions the seal impressions by their new CS numbers, tries to identify their owners and includes information on their occurrence on other texts, kindly supplied by Dr. M. Omura. Together we managed to identify quite a number of seal owners, summarized in AKT 8, Ch. XXIV “Seals and Sealers”.

⁶⁸ Most volumes that edit texts excavated at Kültepe since 1948 (AKT 1-4, 6, 8 and TPAK) unfortunately, for various reasons did not, could not or were not allowed to include drawings of the seals. See for some remarks on the seals in AKT 4 the observations in Veenhof 2009, 182-184.

⁶⁹ We find it also in a number of new records recently published in AKT 7A, where a son and heir finds debt-notes in his father's archive and asks his debtor's sons to identify their father's seal and to find out whether the debt has been paid or not. See my remarks on this feature in *NABU* 2015/11.

from a testimony about an encounter between Adad-šulūli (A.) and Sukkallum (S.) shows what is at stake (Kt a/k 264:5-23): “A. said to S.: ‘You owe 3½ minas of refined copper to my harnesser I.; I have a valid record of yours to that effect in my possession. Lila, son of D. and Š., son of I., ‘lie on your tablet’. If Lila identifies his seals on your valid record and says: ‘They are my seals’, you shall pay me the copper and the interest on it as mentioned in this tablet and you shall not protest’. S. answered him: ‘Then I will pay you’.”⁷⁰

It is interesting to note that the presence of an impression, even when the accompanying text must have stated that Lila’s seal was impressed on the envelope (unfortunately the envelope in question, AKT 1, 43, is damaged and the KIŠIB notations are missing), apparently was not sufficient to press a claim and that the witness who had sealed the envelope (in OA *na’al*, “lies on it”) himself had to identify it, perhaps because it was an anepigraphic seal of a rather common type, which the ancients as well as modern scholars had difficulty in identifying. Perhaps even because the unauthorised use of seals that had changed hands was not a purely theoretical risk.

I end with a serious desideratum. Now that all unopened envelopes have been thoroughly studied, their seals photographed, drawn and described, they should be opened, as was done regularly during the first years of the excavation, also with some texts from the d/k archive, studied by Balkan. This is particularly important for letters and judicial records, whose envelopes only contain an address or a very short summary, while the whole text on the tablets inside no doubt will make a valuable addition to our knowledge of this archive, of OA trade in general and of the use and ownership of the many seals. It would also honour the efforts of the excavators, who spent much time and care on retrieving and salvaging these records and cannot be happy to see them in a way buried again, unread, in the vaults of the museum in Ankara.

Abbreviations

AKT = (Ankara) Kültepe Tabletleri/Ankaraner Kültepe Texte:

1. E. Bilgiç, H. Sever, C. Günbattı, and S. Bayram. TTKY VI-33, Ankara 1990.
2. E. Bilgiç and S. Bayram. TTKY VI-33^a, Ankara 1995.
3. E. Bilgiç and C. Günbattı, *Ankaraner Kültepe-Texte 3. Texte der Grabungskampagne 1970*. FAOS Beiheft 3, Stuttgart 1995.
4. I. Albayrak, *Kt. o/k*. TTKY VI-33^b, Ankara 2006.
5. K. R. Veenhof, *The Archive of Kuliya, son of Ali-abum (Kt. 92/k 188- 263)*. TTKY VI-33^c, Ankara 2010.
6. M. T. Larsen, *The Archive of the Šalim-Aššur Family*, vols. 1-3. TTKY VI-33^{d, a-c}, Ankara 2010-2014.
7. S. Bayram and R. Kuzuoğlu, *Aššur-rē’i Ailesinin Arşivi*, I. TTKY VI-33^{e, a}, Ankara 2015.
8. K. R. Veenhof, *The Archive of Elamma, son of Iddin-Suen and his Family (Kt 01/k 295-568 and Kt 92/k 94-187)*. TTKY VI-33^f, Ankara 2017.
10. C. Günbattı, *Anadolulu Tüccarlar Šarabunuwa ve Peruwa’nin Arşivleri*. TTKY VI-33^h, Ankara 2016.

AMMY = *Anadolu Medeniyetleri Müzesi Yıllığı*, Ankara.

⁷⁰ Lines 12-19, *ina ṭuppika / L. mer’a D. / u Š. mer’a I. (15) na-lu ina ṭuppi<ka> / harmim šumma / L. kunuk-kīšu / ūtaddi umma kunukkū’a ...*; see for *niālum*, “to lie”, used of a witness who has sealed an envelope, the comments on AKT 5, 38:4.

- Anatolia's Prologue* = F. Kulakoğlu and S. Kangal (eds.), *Anatolia's Prologue. Kültepe Kanesh Karum. Catalogue of the Exposition in Istanbul 2010* (Kayseri Metropolitan Municipality Publication No. 78), Kayseri 2010.
- Fs. Larsen = J. G. Dercksen (ed.), *Assyria and Beyond. Studies Presented to Mogens Trolle Larsen* (PIHANS 100), Leiden 2004.
- Fs. N. Özgüç = M. J. Mellink, E. Porada, and T. Özgüç (eds.), *Aspects of Art and Iconography: Anatolia and its Neighbors. Studies in Honor of Nimet Özgüç*, Ankara 1993.
- Fs. Veenhof = W. H. van Soldt (ed.), *Veenhof Anniversary Volume*, Leiden 2001.
- KKS = L. Matouš and M. Matoušová-Rajmová, *Kappadokische Keilschrifttafeln mit Siegeln aus den Sammlungen der Karlsuniversität in Prag*, Prag 1984.
- OAB = Old Assyrian Bibliography, see Michel 2003, 2005-2006, 2011b, 2015.
- POAT = C. Gwaltney, *The Pennsylvania Old Assyrian Texts* (HUCA Suppl. 3), Cincinnati 1983.
- TPAK 1 = C. Michel and P. Garelli, *Tablettes paléo-assyriennes de Kültepe*, t. 1 (Kt 90/k), Paris 1997.

Bibliography

- Albayrak, I. 2006. Fünf Urkunden aus dem Archiv von Peruwa, Sohn von Šuppibra. *JEOL* 39, 95-105.
- Balkan, K. 1955. *Observations on the Chronological Problems of Kārūm Kanīš*. TTKY VII/28. Ankara.
- . 1974. Cancellation of Debts in Cappadocian Tablets from Kültepe. In: K. Bittel *et al.* (eds.), *Anatolian Studies Presented to Hans Gustav Güterbock*, 29-41. PIHANS 35. Istanbul.
- . 1979. *Makriš* and *Ašiš*, Component-parts of Wagons and Ploughs Respectively, in a Cappadocian Tablet from Kültepe. In: *Florilegium Anatolicum. Mélanges offerts à Emmanuel Laroche*, 49-58. Paris.
- Dercksen, J. G. 2004: *Old Assyrian Institutions*. MOS Studies 4. Leiden.
- Günbatti, C. 1992. Some Observations about the Commercial Activities of Women in the Light of the Kültepe Tablets. In: H. Otten *et al.* (eds.), *Hittite and Other Anatolian and Near Eastern Studies in Honour of Sedat S. Alp*, 249-254. Ankara.
- Hecker, K. 2004. Beim Tode unseres Vaters ... Der leidige Streit ums Erbe. In: Fs. M. T. Larsen, 281-297.
- . 2008. Wer war Tarâm-Mari? In: C. Michel (ed.), *Old Assyrian Studies in Memory of Paul Garelli*, 101-108. OAAS 4. Leiden.
- Karaduman, A. 2008. Three Kültepe Texts Regarding the Payment of a Debt in Installments. *JNES* 67, 81-106.
- Kennedy, D. and P. Garelli. 1960. Seize tablettes cappadociennes de l'Ashmolean Museum d'Oxford. *JCS* 14, 1-22.
- Kryszat, G. 2004. Wer schrieb die *waklum*-Briefe? In: Fs. M. T. Larsen, 353-358.
- Larsen, M. T. 1977. Seal Use in the Old Assyrian Period. In: M. Gibson and R. D. Biggs (eds.), *Seals and Sealing in the Ancient Near East*, 89-105. Bibl.Mes. 6. Malibu.
- . 2007. Individual and Family in Old Assyrian Society. *JCS* 59, 93-106.
- Matouš, L. 1974. Zur Benutzung des gemeinsamen Siegels im "Kappadokischen" Verpflichtungsscheine I 453. *BagM* 7, 119-123.
- Michel, C. 2001. Le lapis lazuli des Assyriens au début du IIe millénaire av. J.-C. In: Fs. Veenhof, 341-359.
- . 2003. *Old Assyrian Bibliography*. OAAS 1. Leiden.
- . 2005-2006. Old Assyrian Bibliography 1. *AfO* 51, 436-449.
- . 2011a. The Private Archives from Kaniš Belonging to Anatolians. *AoF* 38, 94-115.
- . 2011b. Old Assyrian Bibliography 2. *AfO* 52, 416-437.
- . 2015. Old Assyrian Bibliography 3. *AfO* 53, 525-559.
- Özgüç, N. 1965. *The Anatolian Group of Cylinder Seal Impressions from Kültepe*. TTKY V/22. Ankara.
- . 1968. *Seals and Seal Impressions of Level Ib from Kārūm Kanīš*. TTKY V/25. Ankara.

- . 1986. Seals of the Old Assyrian Colony Period and Some Observations on the Seal Impressions. In: J. V. Canby *et al.* (eds.), *Ancient Anatolia. Essays in Honor of M. J. Mellink*, 22-34. Madison.
- . 1996. Remarks on the Impressions of ^dIM.KAS.KUR – ^dAdad-ellat's Seal. In: U. Magen and M. Rashad (eds.), *Vom Halys zum Euphrat. Thomas Beran zum Ehren*, 203-212. Archäologische Studien zur Kultur und Geschichte des Alten Orients, Bd. 7. Münster.
- . 2006. *Kültepe-Kaniš/Neša. Seal Impressions on the Clay Envelopes from the Archives of the Native Peruwa and Assyrian Trader Ušur-ša-Ištar son of Aššur-imitti*. TTKY V/50. Ankara.
- Özgüç, N. and Ö. Tunca. 2001. *Kültepe-Kaniš. Sealed and Inscribed Clay Bullae*. TTKY V/48. Ankara.
- Özgüç, T. 1994. A Boat-Shaped Cult-Vessel from the *kārum* Kanish. In: H. Gasche *et al.* (eds.), *Cinquante-deux réflexions sur le Proche-Orient Ancien offertes en hommage à Léon De Meyer*, 369-377. Leuven.
- . 2003. *Kültepe, Kaniš / Neša. The Earliest International Trade Center and the Oldest Capital City of the Hittites*. The Middle Eastern Culture Center in Japan. Tokyo.
- Özkan, S. 2010. The Glyptic Art at Kanesh. In: *Anatolia's Prologue*, 148-153, 353-355, nos. 469-479.
- Sturm, Th. 1999. Das Siegel des Ili-bāni, eines Cousins des altassyrischen Kaufmanns Imdī-ilum. *Ugarit-Forschungen* 31, 725-731.
- Teissier, B. 1994. *Sealing and Seals on Texts from Kültepe Kārum Level 2*. PIHANS 70. Istanbul.
- Tunca, Ö. 1989. Cylinder Seal Inscriptions of Šamši-Adad and his Officials from Acemhöyük. In: K. Emre *et al.* (eds.), *Anatolia and the Ancient Near East. Studies in Honor of Tahsin Özgüç*, 481-484. Ankara.
- . 1993. Des inscriptions de sceaux-cylindres diverses provenant d'Acemhöyük. In: Fs. N. Özgüç, 629-633.
- . 2001. Silindir Mühür Baskıları ve Kil Bullalarda Yazıtlar/Inscriptions on the Cylinder Seal Impressions and on the Bullae. In: N. Özgüç and Ö. Tunca 2001, XXV-LII, 255-358, Pls. 141-162.
- Uzunalımoğlu, A. 1993. Karumu'un II. Tabakasından Bir Grup Borç Mukavelesi. *AMMY* 1992, 51-70.
- Veenhof, K. R. 1987. Review of KKS. *OLZ* 82, 350-356.
- . 1991. Private Summons and Arbitration among the Old Assyrian Traders. *Bulletin of the Middle Eastern Culture Center in Japan* V (= *Fs T. Mikasa*), 437-459.
- . 1993. On the Identification and Implications of Some Bullae from Acemhöyük and Kültepe. In: Fs. N. Özgüç, 645-657.
- . 2001. The Old Assyrian Period. In: R. Westbrook and R. Jasnow (eds.), *Security for Debt in Ancient Near Eastern Law*, 93-159. CHANE 9. Leiden.
- . 2003. *The Old Assyrian List of Year Eponyms from Karum Kanish and its Chronological Implications*. TTKY VI/64. Ankara.
- . 2008. The Old Assyrian Period. In: M. Wäffler (ed.), *Mesopotamia. The Old Assyrian Period. Annäherungen* 5, Part I, 13-263. OBO 160/5. Fribourg/Göttingen.
- . 2009. A New Volume of Old Assyrian Texts from *kārum* Kanesh (Review of AKT 4). *JEOL* 41, 179-202.
- . 2017. Acemhöyük: Seals, Chronology and History. In: *Proceedings of the Second Kültepe International Meeting 2015*. Subartu 39, 243-257.

