JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN ORIENTAL SOCIETY

Volume 125

PUBLISHED BY THE AMERICAN ORIENTAL SOCIETY
Harlan Hatcher Graduate Library
University of Michigan
Ann Arbor, Michigan, U.S.A. 48109-1205
2005—ISSN 0003-0279

The interpretation of the Third Intermediate Period is especially difficult, as Redford points out, for there is a curious divergence between the Nubian archaeology and the occasional monument, such as the Kadimalo/Karimala inscription. See Morkot, *Black Pharaohs*, pp. 151–53, with recent considerations from R. Caminos, and Tormod Eide, Tomas Hägg, Richard Pierce, and László Török, *Fontes Historiae Nubiorum* I (Bergen, 1994), 35–41.

Redford's account of the Twenty-fifth Dynasty mixes history with the results of his own archaeological research in Thebes. The historical account is straightforward enough, although he uses a chronology that makes Shabako the victor of Eltekah (pp. 90–92), while others have had Shebitku as the ruler with Taharqo present as an officer, or only as a later gloss (Morkot, *Black Pharaohs*, pp. 210–11, citing Kitchen). Redford also draws a fairly sharp distinction between the Kushites' treatment of the Delta, which was left under local dynasts, and their rule in the Nile Valley, where they concentrated their power and their building program. It was, in Redford's view, the last hurrah for the cult of Amun as the national god of Egypt, and he deals with it not just from the point of view of the religious construction and restorations but from that of the reviving life of Thebes as his excavations uncovered it.

In the main chapters of this book, Redford is completely at home. The discussions drill down to original sources, although he might have referred the reader more often to texts in the *Fontes*. Some problems appear in the introductory and epilogue chapters. For example, in dealing with the Neolithic, Redford accepts that early Nubia was stimulated by ceramic styles from the north (p. 3), while the direction of ceramic influence, despite Egyptian imports, was largely the reverse. This continues with an underestimation of the A-Group based on observations that are now obsolete. This would not be much of a difficulty, except that it reflects the traditional Egypt-centered assumption that Nubia furnished only raw material and, occasionally, manpower. That the relationship was more balanced is indicated, for example, by the Old Kingdom execration texts, and by the fact that Nubians penetrated Egypt at all levels after the Old Kingdom. The concept of boundary was just that, a concept. In actuality, foreigners entered Egypt and Egyptians departed their country in some numbers. Some cultural influence was bound to follow, but this was well enough naturalized by the Egyptians to go unnoticed by most Egyptologists. In the epilogue Redford refers to the Kushite use of Egyptian culture as increasingly bastardized and degenerate. Although reams of scholarship to the contrary invite citation, a simple glance at the temple reliefs of Musawwarat and Naga is enough to repel the notion.

The traditional view of the Nubian intervention of the Twenty-fifth Dynasty is that it was an anomaly, and this is what comes through in the present volume. However, Redford has himself mentioned earlier Nubian rulers, dynasties, and interventions in Egypt, so it was far from anomalous. Moreover, when the Twenty-fifth Dynasty arrived on the scene, Kush clearly outclassed any power in Egypt and had to be dislodged by the greatest military power of the day, and then only after repeated attempts. Kush was forestalled thereafter only with the help of foreign troops, thus only by adding extra weight to the balance.

If this review has stressed differences of approach and opinion, I now stress that this is an interesting, well-written, informative, and challenging book, and it is well worth reading.

Bruce Williams
Chicago

Hittite Studies in Honor of Harry A. Hoffner Jr. on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday. Edited by Gary Beckman, Richard Beal, and Gregory McMahon. Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns, 2003. Pp. xxiv + 406, illus. $59.50.

This volume is a collection of studies from thirty-four leading Hittitologists, primarily in English, but also in German, French, and Italian, dedicated to Harry A. Hoffner, Jr., himself a prominent Hittitologist, longtime professor at the University of Chicago, and for many years editor, along with

H. G. Güterbock, of the *Chicago Hittite Dictionary*. It includes a full bibliography of Harry Hoffner's publications, as well as comprehensive indices. The volume appeared some four years after the articles were submitted (see, e.g., p. 348). Only selected articles will be commented upon here.

A. Archi brings out the importance of not confusing the Old, Middle, and Neo-Hittite linguistic and paleographic scheme with the historical situation, which does not lend itself to the term Middle Kingdom. He would rather designate the period from Ḫattusili I through the predecessors of Tudḫaliya I (I/II) as the Old Kingdom, and the period from Tudḫaliya I to Suppiluliuma I as the Early Empire period. He emphasizes Tudḫaliya's military successes, which laid the groundwork for the Empire period, as well as the massive influx of Hurrian cultural elements at around the same time.

R. Beal presents a thorough discussion of the complex issue of the predecessors of Ḫattusili I, mercifully providing genealogical charts for what he considers the two most likely alternative reconstructions.[1] Among other points that should find acceptance are Beal's rejection of the claim that Ḫattusili I's self-legitimation through the Tawananna in the incipit of his Annals indicates a remnant of matriarchy, his rejection of the suggestion that this titulary is a late Empire insertion; his acceptance that the oft-debated section of the list of offerings to deceased royalty in which Ḫuzziya, Kantuzzili, PU-Šarruma, Tudḫaliya, Papaḫdilmaḫ, and Labarna (= Ḫattusili I) appear indeed refers to the beginnings of the Old Kingdom, despite the occurrence of a Hurrian name; perhaps also his dating of the Zalpa legend to the time of Ḫattusili I, and his alternative identifications of the king, the grandfather of the king, the "old king," and the "father of the old king," all Hittite rulers; and that there is no compelling reason to assume that Labarna (II) changed his name to Ḫattusili (I) upon re-establishing the city of Ḫattusa.

Central to Beal's paradigm is his suggestion concerning how Ḫattusili could have been a son of Papaḫdilmaḫ, who would have lost his struggle with Labarna (I) for the throne: "Perhaps after a bloody civil war both sides were tired of fighting and reached a compromise by which Papaḫdilmaḫ and his followers agreed to recognize Labarna in return for the succession passing to Papaḫdilmaḫ's son upon Labarna's death, by-passing any children of Labarna and Tawananna" (pp. 25–26). This suggestion, of course, is purely speculative, and finds no explicit support in the textual evidence, forcing Beal to refer to a similar deal made between England's Matilda and Stephen.

G. Beckman[2] seeks to address primarily the question of "When during the second half of the second millennium B.C.E. was something approximating the standard, or 'canonical,' form of the [Gilgamesh] narrative achieved?" (p. 41), a question for which the Boğazköy material has special relevance, being practically the only Kassite-period source. He points out a number of interesting variants found only in the Boğazköy texts, such as the fact that Gilgamesh was created "by committee" rather than born to King Lugalbanda and the goddess Ninsun (p. 43), and discusses elements lacking in the Boğazköy tablets as compared to the Mesopotamian and vice-versa. He then compares the orthography of the various personal names found in the Mesopotamian and Boğazköy texts, finding that "the Hittite version seldom employs the onomastic renderings found in the edition of Sîn-leqe-unninnī." The structural comparison and the onomastic evidence leads Beckman to suggest that the twelve-tablet canonical version had not yet been compiled by the thirteenth century, and that the Boğazköy material was based on precanonical texts. One might have expected some discussion of the fact that the Hittite texts seem to be at least in part reliant on the Hurrian material (p. 51), even though the Akkadian was also available to the scribes at Ḫattusa.[3]

T. R. Bryce first takes issue with E. Cline's assumption, presented in *Sailing the Wine-Dark Sea*, that one should expect that the Aḫḫiyawans, i.e., the Myceneans, and the Hittites of central Anatolia should have had an active trade, given their attested political contacts. The lack of textual and archaeological

1. Depending on whether one interpolates "and" or "the" concerning the syntactic relationship between Papaḫdilmaḫ and La[barna] in the offering list of divine kings; see pp. 15f.

2. Beckman announces with this article a forthcoming edition of the Boğazköy Gilgamesh fragments (p. 38 n. 13).

3. On this question, cf. J. Klinger, in *Motivation und Mechanismen des Kulturkontaktes in der späten Bronzezeit*, Eothen 13 (2005), 103–27.

evidence for such is explained by Cline by proposing a Hittite trade embargo. Bryce reasonably counters that such a proposal is unnecessary, as there is no compelling reason to expect extensive trade contacts, since efficient and cost-effective trade routes and mutual supply and demand would have been lacking.

He then switches gears, seeking to explain the background of the situation and especially the somewhat surprising fact that the author of the so-called Tawagalawa Letter (*CTH* 181) clearly addresses the king of Aḫḫiyawa as a Great King. Bryce, of course, is not the first[4] to consider whether this mode of address in the letter "may well have been no more than a piece of unprecedented, ad hoc diplomacy" (p. 67), and he suggests that it should not be taken to indicate that the Aḫḫiyawan king was generally included in the ancient Near Eastern "club" of great kings. Rather, it should be related to Ḫattusili III's insecurity as a usurper and his search for support among great kings and vassals (pp. 67ff.).[5]

However, Bryce's interpretation of the Tawagalawa letter as a piece of conciliatory diplomacy intended to gain the support of the king of Aḫḫiyawa ignores the often satirical, even sarcastic, tone of the letter,[6] that the letter deals entirely with the fact that the Aḫḫiyawan king was supporting a great thorn in the Hittite flesh, Piyamaradu, and, perhaps more importantly, the fact that the letter itself was written from Millawanda, an Aḫḫiyawan outpost which Ḫattusili had recently occupied, a fact unlikely to have greatly pleased the king of Aḫḫiyawa. Bryce's claim that the so-called Milawata Letter "almost certainly indicates that Millawanda had once more reverted to Hittite overlordship" (p. 71) has also been questioned.[7]

B. J. Collins proposes that the Hittite word *kūrala-* refers to the male red deer (*Cervus elaphus*) and should mean "horned one." In so doing, she first provides a brief summary of the iconographic evidence, in which she highlights the difficulty of matching the representations with species, of which the red, roe, and fallow deer are native to Anatolia. She then suggests that DÀRA.MAŠ/*AYALU* was most likely used to signify the most common of the species, the red deer, and posits that Hittite *aliya-*, from PIE **el*, may be its equivalent. Her identification of the hapax *kūrala-* as the male of the red deer stems from the context of the Maşat letter in which it occurs, as well as her suggested link with **ker*, which has been suggested to have been the PIE term for the male red deer. Support to the hypothesis is seen in the name of the god of the stag, Runta, and his royal namesake, Kurunta. Convenient tables of IE names for several deer species are also provided.

F. Pecchioli Daddi addresses the place and function of the dignitaries designated $^{\text{LÚ}}$KUŠ$_7$.GUŠKIN, the "squire of gold," and LÚ $^{\text{GIŠ}}$ŠUKUR.GUŠKIN, the "man of the lance of gold." She concludes that the LÚ $^{\text{GIŠ}}$ŠUKUR.GUŠKIN is always found in connection with, indeed belongs to a specific contingent of, the $^{\text{LÚ.MEŠ}}$*MEŠEDI*, the personal bodyguard of the king. The "lance of gold" is not simply a weapon borne by this group, but is a symbol of the presence of the king. Significantly, the designation LÚ $^{\text{GIŠ}}$ŠUKUR.GUŠKIN is found only in texts of the Old and Middle Hittite periods. The $^{\text{LÚ}}$KUŠ$_7$.GUŠKIN, on the other hand, is found from the time of Telipinu up until the end of the empire. It designates provincial officials removed from the Hittite capital and responsible for the administration and governance of the provinces.

A. M. and B. Dinçol discuss two bullae stamped with the same seal, which they read L 130–134 (AVIS) and L. 103 (CERVUS$_2$) + L 383 (SPINA), a personal name that they interpret as Arrunti. This person's titles are read as INFANS + L 300 = NEPOS, MAGNUS.REX, L 300, MAGNUS, and L 254. They then offer the translation "Arrunti, Enkel des Großkönigs, (aus der königlichen) Sippe, Vorrangiger." In Arrunti they see the Hurrian son of a Hittite princess married to a Syrian vassal or an official in a southeastern land who wished to emphasize his connection to the Hittite royal family, despite not being a Hittite prince. In an addendum, however, the authors refer to the publication of further seals from Ḫattusa and Kaman Kalehöyük which would place their readings and interpretations in doubt.

4. E.g., H. G. Güterbock, AJA 87 (1983): 135–36.

5. It should be noted that Bryce's statement (p. 65), according to which no texts from an Aḫḫiyawan king to the Hittite ruler have been identified is no longer current, as KUB 26.91 is now understood to be just such a text; see, e.g., O. R. Gurney, *Fs. Popko* (2002), 135 and n. 13, where it is shown that A. Kammenhuber correctly identified the sender as early as 1981; cf. P. Taracha, *Fs. Haas* (2001), 419 and n. 9.

6. Noted, e.g., by V. Parker, *OrNS* 68 (1999): 70 and n. 25.

7. E.g., I. Singer, *AnSt* 33 (1983): 215; J. D. Hawkins, *AnSt* 48 (1998): 19 and nn. 89, 92.

J. Freu is concerned primarily with countering the thesis presented by J. C. de Moor that the Hittite empire was overthrown by a coalition of Sea Peoples, Egypt, and Assyria, and in this he surely succeeds. He also argues against the conception, as championed above all by M. Astour, of a state of nearly constant warfare between Ḫatti and Assyria from the time of the ascendancy of the Assyrian state until the fall of the Hittite Empire. He points instead to numerous traces of diplomatic contacts.

O. R. Gurney, after a brief survey of the uses of the terms "Upper" and "Lower" Land in Mesopotamia, rejects E. Forrer's proposal that the Hittites would have borrowed the terms from the Old Assyrian colonists, since they used the term "Lower Land" in reference to Mesopotamia from their Anatolian perspective. He then presents a general discussion of the extent and borders of the Upper Land through much of Hittite history, suggesting that the term was fluid and that it essentially indicated the "highlands."[8] He then returns to the question of the location of Samuḫa, discussing the pros and cons of the suggested locations on the Murad Su and the Kızılırmak, concluding that the matter must remain open for the time being.

H. G. Güterbock briefly discusses the acrobat scenes on the orthostats at Alaca and the bull-jumping scenes from Anatolia and Syria, before turning to KUB 25.37++ iii 1, which he suggests can be interpreted as a reference to bull-jumping.[9]

V. Haas discusses the evolution and transmission of Hittite ritual practice, focusing on the scapegoat motif, which he suggests may have originated in northwestern Syria (p. 137).[10] He suggests the transmission of ritual elements from certain Eblaitic rituals to the Hittite ritual of Asḫella, despite the *ca.* thousand-year gap between the sources with no intervening attestations. He bases his far-reaching suggestion on an alleged detail of correspondence between the two, stating that the rings attached to goats in both are of iron.[11] In fact, however, the ring in the Eblaitic ritual is of silver (p. 135), that in Asḫella's ritual of iron and lead (p. 138).[12] He then puts forth the more plausible suggestion of interpreting the pairing of the Hittite king with a substitute woman, again in Asḫella's ritual, against the background of typologically similar Mesopotamian rituals in which the patient is married to the substitute—be it a woman or a piglet—beforehand. Finally, he suggests seeing in the Hebrew term *azazel* the roots *ēz*, "Ziege," and *ʿzl*, "weggehen," and compares this to the Hittite "ritual of the goat."

R. Haase seeks to establish the jurisdiction of the king in the law system, as gleaned from those Hittite Laws which are said to be a "decision of the king" (§§44b, 49, 102, 111, 173, 187, 189, 196, 198, 199). After briefly discussing each paragraph, he tries to determine what the laws have in common, concluding that crimes against the king or his palace and matters of sexual taboo are cases for the king. However, he must define the former so broadly that witchcraft fits into the rubric, which is certainly a stretch, and as Haase himself states, his scheme fails to explain why stealing a certain amount of wood from the pond (§102) is a case for the king. And surely the matter of a Luwian/Arzawan abducting a Hittite subject and taking him out of the country (§§19–22) or that of stealing items from the palace gate itself (§126/23) would be a matter that affects the king or his palace. Further, the cases in §164–65/149–50 and 170/55 are also cases of sorcery like those in §§44b and 111, but they are not cases for the king. Thus, one might doubt this attempt at (rather modern) rationalization and perhaps look to the chaotic nature of tradition and precedent for an "explanation." More palatable is his suggestion that §§126, 166, 170.2 present cases in which the offender is caught *in flagranti* and killed on the spot by those who catch him, which would explain why no reference to a law case or the king's court is found or to be expected.

8. For a further recent discussion of the location of Samuḫa and the Upper Land, see G. Wilhelm, *Mem. Imparati* (2002), 885–90; also to be mentioned is the suggestion by A. Müller-Karpe, *MDOG* 132 (2000): 355–65, that Samuḫa be identified with Kayalıpınar.

9. The question of bull-jumpers in Hittite texts has since been taken up by P. Taracha in *Archeologia* 53 (2002): 7–20, and *NABU* 2004/2 (pro), and O. Soysal in *NABU* 2003/4, 2003/95, 2004/1, 2004/64 (contra).

10. For an alternative view, see J. L. Miller, *StBoT* 46 (2004), 464–68. One should not discount the possibility that such rites arose independently in various regions and time periods; see 458ff.

11. "Daß sich älteste Ritualtraditionen in der hethitischen Überlieferung erhalten haben, zeigt das Detail des Eisenringes, mit welchem in den Ritualen aus Ebla die Substituts-Ziege versehen wird" (p. 138).

12. For further discussion of attempts to distinguish transmitted from merely typological similarity, see J. L. Miller, *StBoT* 46 (2004), 458–61.

H. S. Haroutunian presents a first, welcome edition of *CTH* 429, a ritual to treat a person defiled by speaking evil before the gods. A few brief notes are in order. The quoted incantation of §6 likely continues to the end of l. 38′, despite the lack of *-wa*(*r*)- in l. 37′. Lines 39′–40′ would thus be part of the prescriptions rather than the incantation. The quoted incantation presumably picks up again in l. 41′ (despite the lack of introductory *memai* or *tezzi*), continuing to the end of §7, while the expected *-wa*(*r*)- should perhaps be restored at the beginning of ll. 41′ and 42′. Similarly, the quoted incantation of §12 presumably begins already in §11, as is clear from the 1 pl. pret. form in ii 6′. Finally, Haroutunian translates *kāsa* as "Look (here)!" or "Behold!" though, as Hoffner has shown,[13] *kāsa* belongs to the category of verbal aspect, bringing the event or thought into the immediate proximity of the speech moment.

J. D. Hawkins proposes a new reading for the epigraph of the Storm-god on Urḫi-Teššub's (Mursili III's) seal from Nişantepe, which he suggests is the same as that on the Imamkulu relief: DEUS.TONITRUS.GENUFLECTERE.*MI*. The first three signs he interprets as a logogram for the Storm-god of Aleppo, the MI-sign functioning as a pseudo-phonetic complement *-ma* (MI being chosen over MA due to graphic considerations), the string representing the ethnicon Ḫalpuma, "the Ḫalabean," referring of course to the Storm-god in the eagle chariot depicted on the seal and the relief. He then briefly compares these scenes and inscriptions with those from the newly uncovered orthostats at Aleppo and discusses the "theological promiscuity" of Urḫi-Teššub, who is depicted elsewhere in the embrace of the god Šarruma and is called the "beloved of the Storm-god and the Sun-goddess of Arinna."

T. van den Hout, in the first instalment of a promised series, presents the most thorough discussion to date of the syntactic and semantic characteristics of the so-called Hittite phraseological construction. Perhaps the most significant of the many cogent points in the article is his suggestion that the construction indicates not only temporal consecutiveness, as Disterhaft has proposed, but also a causal and/or logical consecutiveness, which he suggests can be translated by "thereupon," "daraufhin." Also very useful is a table presenting the verbs which appear with phraseological *uwa-* vs. those which appear with *pai-*.

P. H. J. Houwink ten Cate compares the outline tablets of the AN.TAḪ.ŠUM festival, showing the outlier position of Dupl. F, VS(NF) 12.1, as compared to Dupls. A–E.[14]

G. McMahon, in a highly theoretical article, discusses the relevance for the Hittite context of R. Girard's primitive, unanimous act of generative violence as the genesis of all sacrifice and ritual. McMahon's general conclusion that Girard's theory would be useful as an explanation of Hittite cult offerings (p. 279), as well as such statements as "Certainly the Hattian / early Hittite conjunction of myth and ritual bears out Girard's theory of the origin of all myth in initial spontaneous group sacrifice" (p. 270) will presumably not find favor with all readers.

J. Klinger, who has suggested that the paleographic criteria developed for dating the Hittite-language texts are relevant also for the Akkadian texts and that no "chancellery ductus" existed, examines the treaties in Akkadian found at Boğazköy. He concludes that those which show a non-Boğazköy ductus were indeed inscribed elsewhere, and that these reflect various scribal schools.[15]

S. Košak presents a new edition of the "Tale of the Merchant" (*CTH* 822), including joins with KBo 24.34 and KBo 41.128, showing that the tale is actually embedded within a ritual composition.

S. de Martino and F. Imparati suggest that the "Puḫanu Chronicle" can be interpreted as dealing with Ḫattusili I's failed efforts to conquer Aleppo and consequent attempts to regain the favor of the Hittite gods and the Storm-god of Aleppo.[16]

M. Popko attempts to establish the locations within the topography of Ḫattusa of a number of textually attested temples, especially on the Büyükkale, but the effort cannot be considered a success. First, he follows the outdated conclusion that the Upper City, and its many temples, was an expansion

13. H. A. Hoffner, *JAOS* 88 (1968): 532; see also Hoffner and H. C. Melchert, *Mem. Imparati* (2002), 386–88.

14. Cf. now D. Schwemer, *AOAT* 318 (2004), 395–412.

15. Cf. now the similar conclusions in D. Schwemer, *ZA* 94 (2004): 75–79.

16. Cf. what would seem to be a very enlightening study of the Puḫanu-Chronicle by A. Gilan, *AoF* 31 (2004): 263–96.

under Tudḫaliya IV and thus excludes them from consideration. Second, he repeatedly takes statements such as "the king leaves temple X and goes to temple Y" as indicating close proximity, though the reader of course has no idea if the walk would have taken 20 minutes or 15 seconds. Similarly, he generally understands phrases with *sara* or *katta* as indicating either going up to Büyükkale or coming down from it, completely ignoring the fact that the entire topography of Ḫattusa is rather varied, and hence, that one could easily "go up/down" while remaining on the Büyükkale or within the "Lower" City.

J. Sasson, in the only contribution devoted wholly to Mesopotamian sources, discusses BM 13192, in which Šat-Marduk and Aḫuni swear before king Samšu-iluna to avoid sexual relations. Sasson suggests seeing the document not in the light of the law codes, as has often been done, but as a hearing initiated by Šat-Marduk, an independent woman, in an attempt to stop Aḫuni's sexual harassment of her.

I. Singer convincingly argues that the Taki-Šarruma found in a Middle Assyrian letter from Tell Šēḫ Ḥamad as "governor of the land," in the Ugaritic documentation as "chief scribe" and at Ḫattusa as "chief scribe" and "chief scribe 'on wood' " should be identified as the same individual, datable to the reign of Suppiluliuma II, for whom he seems to have been a particularly important official in Syrian affairs. (For Benti-Šarruma rather than Taki-Šarruma as the author of RS 94.2523, cf. now Malbran-Labat and Lackenbacher, *NABU* 2005/10; Lackenbacher and Malbran-Labat, *NABU* 2005/90.)

JARED MILLER
AKADEMIE DER WISSENSCHAFTEN UND DER LITERATUR, MAINZ

Drehem Administrative Documents from the Reign of Amar-Suena. Cuneiform Texts from the Ur III Period in the Oriental Institute, vol. 2. By MARKUS HILGERT, with a contribution by Clemens D. Reichel. Oriental Institute Publications, vol. 121. Chicago: THE ORIENTAL INSTITUTE, 2003. Pp. xxxviii + 649, plates. $140. [Distributed by The David Brown Book Company, Oakville, Conn.]

Dr. Markus Hilgert has published a superb volume of 506 tablets housed in the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago. These tablets, found at the site of Drehem, are all dated to the reign of the third king of the Third Dynasty of Ur, Amar-Sin. The book has no fewer than 649 pages and seventy-nine plates, divided into thirty-four sections. The author offers a marvelous treatment of this group of tablets by presenting all possible information to be gained from them. Numerous charts and tables facilitate access to all of this data. The book is a mine of information for various difficult readings in the texts, and also for understanding the Drehem archive. The following remarks are not meant to diminish the value of this *editio princeps* of these tablets.

Given the size of the volume needed to present the five hundred tablets, it would have been interesting to add a little more about the interpretation of the administrative system during Amar-Sin's reign. It seems to me that the reign of Amar-Sin achieved its most accomplished state in its administration of Drehem, even without the routine use of seals as in Girsu or Umma. Such a practice would become usual once more only with the reign of Šu-Sin.

The central office (p. 54), headed by Abbašaga, recorded all deliveries brought to Drehem, recognizable by the fact that all the tablets are labeled m u - t u m_2 "delivery." Such tablets without the name of Abbašaga were receipts given to the person who made the deliveries. In most cases one finds m u - t u m_2 Abbašaga i_3 - d a b_5, "Abbašaga took into account." Once the delivery had been recorded by the Drehem central administration, in most cases Abbašaga transferred the cattle to other officials or fatteners, according to the needs of the palace or temples and the type of animals received. These transfers are made to a number of bureaus, as demonstrated here. These transactions can be recognized as k i Abbašaga-t a PN i_3 - d a b_5.

In some instances, Abbašaga directly dispensed the animals under his control: these tablets employ the formula k i Abbašaga-t a b a - z i. Naša, mentioned at the beginning of the list (p. 53), is a holdover