

ABOUT A NEW CORPUS OF URARTIAN INSCRIPTIONS

by MIRJO SALVINI

An imposing work¹ in Russian has been published by the Oriental Institute of the Academy of Sciences of the Armenian Republic (*Nacional'naja Akademija Nauk Respubliki Armenii, Institut Vostokovedenija*). It furnishes a summary of the research carried out by the author, Nikolaj Vasilievič Harutjunjan, whose production in the field of Urartology has now continued for almost fifty years. The very size of this volume itself reveals that we are not in the presence only of a compilation of Urartian inscriptions, the transcription and translation of which would not alone demand so much space. The philological aspect of each text is, in fact,

¹ N. V. Arutjunjan, *Korpus urartskich klinoobraznych nadpisej* (KUKN) (Nikolay Harouthiounyan, *Corpus of Urartian Cuneiform Inscriptions*), Izdatel'stvo "GITUTJUN", Erevan 2001, 542 pages, CLXXXIII plates, 1 map at end, A4 format. ISBN 5 – 8080 – 0476 – 4; price \$ 100 (+ \$ 10 postage).

Following rare abbreviations are here employed:

ABZ = R. Borger, *Assyrisch-Babylonische Zeichenliste* (2. Aufl.), (AOAT 33/33A), Neukirchen-Vluyn 1981.

CICH = C. F. Lehmann-Haupt, *Corpus Inscriptionum Chaldicarum*, Berlin-Leipzig, 1928-35.

HchI = F. W. König, *Handbuch der chaldischen Inschriften*, AfO, Beiheft 8, Graz 1955-57.

JKIF = «Jahrbuch für Kleinasiatische Forschung», Heidelberg 1950 ff.

KUKN = N. V. Arutjunjan, *Korpus urartskich klinoobraznych nadpisej*, Erevan 2001.

MÉA = R. Labat, *Manuel d'épigraphie akkadienne* (5^{ème} éd. revue par F. Malbran-Labat), Paris 1976.

NUNKb = N. V. Arutjunjan (Harutjunjan), *Novye Urartskie Nadpisi Karmir-blura*, Erevan 1966.

SCCNH = «Studies on the Civilization of Nuzi and the Hurrians», Winona Lake 1981 ff.

Sg. 8 = F. Thureau-Dangin, *Une relation de la huitième campagne de Sargon* (= TCL 3; additions in ZA 34, 113-122 and AfO 12, 144-148).

UKN = G. A. Melikišvili, *Urartskie klinoobraznye nadpisi*, Moskva 1960.

UKN II = G. A. Melikišvili, *Urartskie klinoobraznye nadpisi II. Otkritija i publikacii 1954-1970 gg.*, VDI 1971/3, 229-255; 4, 267-293.

UPD = I. M. Diakonoff, *Urartskie pis'ma i dokumenty*, Moskva-Leningrad 1963.

VO = «Vicino Oriente», Roma.

presented in great detail as the author deals with epigraphic, paleographic, lexical and grammatical problems which arise in understanding these often still difficult texts. One could, therefore, extract a treaty on Urartian grammar and a comparative study with Hurrian. Moreover, fully 123 pages (p. 407-530) are dedicated to extensive analytical indexes which, in truth, are far more than simple indexes. They are presented as differentiated glossaries, all the attestations referring to the new numeration of the texts in the Corpus: these are subdivided into "Determinatives" (p. 407-411), "Heterograms"² (412-425), "Akkadian Words"³ (426-430), "Lexicon of the Urartian Language" (p. 431-476), "Proper Nouns, of persons and divinities" (p. 477-492) and "Geographical and Ethnic Denominations"⁴ (p. 493-530).

From the range of these indexes it is clear that we have not only an analytical index, but a lexicon and even an Urartian dictionary of 45 pages. Here we may find numerous linguistic comparisons and the requisite bibliographies that enable us to trace back to the first translator of a term and later contributions. In this field, we clearly find the results of decades of philological work and extensive experience in the interpretation of the Urartian texts. The same holds true for the lists of names, with prosopographic indications concerning the dynastic successions and historical discussion of the organisation of the Urartian pantheon. As far as the glossary of geographical and ethnic terms is concerned, this equates to a treatise on the historical geography of the Urartian Kingdom, a field to which Harutjunjan has made important contributions (*Biajnili - Urartu*, Erevan 1970; *Toponimika Urartu*, Erevan 1985). We have here a complete series of "entries" in a kind of historical-geographical encyclopaedia, so that each element could, with little adaptation, have its place in the *Reallexikon der Assyriologie*. The same holds true for the personal names and divine names listed and considered by Harutjunjan.

Thus, these *ukazateli* (indexes) alone constitute an extremely important work of reference which augurs for easy access to Urartian texts and command of the entire lexical and onomastic wealth of this language. Obviously, such an instrument is useful or dependable only insofar as the textual basis from which it derives is certain.

The fundamental part of the work consists, therefore, of the "Inscriptions. Transliterations, translations, commentaries" (p. 7-404) to which is added a "Postscript. New Urartian inscriptions" (p. 531-533). It

² Sumerograms and Akkadograms together.

³ This is the lexicon of the few texts in Assyrian language.

⁴ The ethnic names are those of regions with the masculine personal determinative (ᵐ). This is a mechanical subdivision which does not, however, resolve a difficult problem.

must immediately be said that the reference model of this work, its layout and structure, is clearly that of the previous Urartian corpus in Russian by G. A. Melikišvili, *Urartskie klinoobraznye nadpisi*, Moskva 1960 (= UKN), which was followed eleven years later by *Urartskie klinoobraznye nadpisi II. Otkritija i publikacii 1954-1970 gg.*, VDI 1971/3, 229-255; 4, 267-293⁵.

The texts are presented chronologically as in UKN and HchI and, earlier, in the unfinished CICH. We start with the "Sardursburg" texts of Sarduri I and end with the texts of unknown author. In all, 599 numbers are recorded to which are added the five texts of the "Postscript" (p. 531-533, Nos 1-5). One may at once note that such a system of continuous and progressive numbering – used moreover in all previous works – should communicate immediately the total number of existing Urartian inscriptions, or at least those discovered prior to a given date. This, however, is not the case. We may clearly see that Harutjunjan has been obliged to insert some new texts – or texts of which he learnt at some later date⁶, – during his preparation of the corpus. These are marked by a number followed by a letter (e.g. between 278 and 279 we have text 278a). This same system, however, is also used to indicate duplicates (e.g. 509a-b are two identical texts) and we also encounter contradictions such as 510a-x, indicating an unknown number of duplicates, followed by 510b which is a completely different text. Conversely, extremely short duplicate inscriptions are assigned separate numbers, as in the case of 294-307 which refer to 14 bronze cups carrying the indication that they are the property of Sarduri II⁷. Why not label these 294a-m? Even stranger is the case of 174A and B and 174C. The first two numbers are presented as two parts of a large stele of Argišti I, whilst 174C is the rock inscription of Hanak by the same king. Here the confusion is exasperated by the use of capital letters which, however, have two different meanings.

These examples are sufficient to indicate how this kind of continuous, sequential numbering is intrinsically unsuitable for providing precise information on the quantity or quality of the texts. These faults or defects in the presentation had already been found in the corpus by Melikišvili: we

⁵ This may also be seen from the title and abbreviation: UKN becomes Korpus UKN = KUKN.

⁶ I do not understand why he inserts as No 172b the inscription by Minua from the *susi* temple of Yukarı Anzaf, published by A. and B. Dinçol in Fs. Van Loon, Istanbul 1995, whilst the other texts of Išpuini, Minua, and Argišti II, again from Anzaf (Yukarı and Aşağı), published in the same work, are relegated to the "Posleslovie" (= Afterword, but it is an Appendix), p. 531 ff. He could quite well have inserted them in their place under the respective sovereigns using the system of a number followed by a letter.

⁷ They correspond to UKN 177-190.

only need to consider numbers UKN 173 to 263, which refer to the inscribed bronzes of Sarduri II. There too the duplicates are listed either as 176a-b, or as 177-190. As we have seen, to a system already questionable *per se*, Harutjunjan adds further confusion.

Amongst the texts of an individual sovereign, the means chosen by Harutjunjan of presenting them is not, in my opinion, correlated to any clear criteria. Let us take, for example, the texts of Išpuini: why is No 25, an inscription on the plinth of a column, placed in the middle of a series of inscriptions on bronzes (Nos 21-24, 26-29)? Here the necessary attention to the different typologies of written documents is lacking. We cannot bundle everything together and consider in the same manner great monumental inscriptions and brief texts written on bronzes or clay bullae.

A further incongruity is found in the numbering of the lines in inscriptions which repeat the same text two or more times, as frequently occurs in Urartian. The most striking example is the great inscription in the rock niche of Meher Kapısı (No 38). Harutjunjan divides this into two parts, called Tekst I (lines 1-31) and Tekst II (lines 1-63), with separate numbering of the lines. Likewise, for the inscribed niche of Yeşilalıç (No 36). This is an innovation in respect to UKN which one may accept, as long as it is employed coherently. But in other, analogous cases, the author does not apply the same criteria. So the stele of Karagündüz (No 35), which bears the same text three times, twice on the obverse and once on the reverse, is treated differently. Tekst I (lines 1-30), Tekst II (lines 31-44), and Tekst III (lines 1-38). So, if once cites KUKN 35 Tekst II 32 we have the impression that we are dealing with the 32nd line of the second text (we should, however, also specify that this is on the obverse). Instead, it is line 32 of the obverse of the stele, but only the second line of the second text. The same may be seen with the inscription of Minua, numbers 126, 129-133, all subdivided into Tekst I and II but with continuous numbering of the lines.

What is lacking in Harutjunjan's corpus may be summed up as follows:

- Lists of concordances with the previous corpora, CICH, UKN, HchI, an essential instrument found only in HchI up to 1955. This will continue to be referred to as it also provides concordances with all of the earliest collections of texts.
- A map showing the distribution of the texts, especially those *in situ* (mainly rock inscriptions). This is provided only in König's corpus, HchI.
- A bibliography of textual editions, in place of which the list of abbreviations (p. 538-541) does not fulfil requirements. Today, moreover, we have an excellent general annotated bibliography on Urartu in P. Zimansky's

work, *Ancient Ararat. A Handbook of Urartian Studies*, Caravan Books, Delmar, New York 1998. On this subject, I may warmly recommend that one consults the chapter dedicated to “Language and Writing”, and the headings from 360 to 739.

- A list of the periods of reign of the Urartian sovereigns. Given the chronological order of the texts and the author’s continuous references to history and dynastic succession, this should have been an essential complement to the work.

- A palaeographic list of Urartian signs with their forms both on stone and clay. This is, instead, provided by UKN e IIchI (signs on stone or rock), as well as by UPD (cursive signs, that is to say, on clay tablets and bullae). Here, too, the frequent palaeographic discussions in the philological field would have indicated the usefulness of such a list.

- A grammatical outline, such as that which accompanies Melikišvili’s corpus.

- Original documentation, as in CICH which, with its reproductions of squeezes and original photographs, remains an irreplaceable source. UKN also contained the previously unpublished photographs of squeezes held in the Georgian Museum in Tbilisi. Harutjunjan’s plates are, instead, all reproductions – and poor ones at that – of previously published photographs and autographic copies. Thus they have nothing new to offer us.

Here then follow annotations on the individual texts.

Each inscription has a “heading” indicating its provenance⁸, present whereabouts and relevant bibliography which includes not only the *editio princeps* but all the previous editions and, occasionally and very usefully, other studies on the text. The measurements of the texts are not given, as was frequently the case in earlier editions, with the notable exception of HchI by F. W. König. A somewhat wasteful element is the way in which Melikišvili’s corpus is cited not merely with the abbreviation UKN, but with the author’s name, the quotation from the journal “Vestnik Drevnej Istorii” (= VDI) together with year (1953) and pages, progressive number, UKN and text number and again, when necessary, quotation from supplement in VDI 1971 etc. For example, at No 209 we find: Melikišvili, UKN, s. 452, *Posl.*, No 12; *on že*, VDI, 1971, No 3, s. 245, No 398. It would have sufficed to cite UKN II 398 or even merely UKN 398, given that the reader may refer repeatedly to the list of abbreviations on p. 539.

Nos 4, 5, 6. The three duplicates of the text by Sarduri I, published by

⁸ It is admirable how the author has made every attempt to indicate alternative names, especially the modern name where this has changed, and to provide a detailed topographical description.

E. Bilgiç in TAD 9/1, 1959, 3-6, do not correspond to UKN 319-325, as Melikišvili was already mistaken in the indications he gave (he had repeated this in UKN II 319-325, VDI 1971/3, p. 232-233), believing that these were the stones discovered by the American expedition. In reality, H. Otto, AfO 14, 1941, 94, referred to six of the inscribed stones re-used in the citadel walls, which were rediscovered in 1969, numbering 15 and published in 1973⁹.

No 20a. This is the stele Karahan 8 in A. M. Dinçol's edition, "Anadolu Araştırmaları" 6, 1978, 24-26 (Pl. IX-Xa). This incomplete stele by Işpuini belongs to a series of stelae, which were erected in a "sanctuary of the stelae"¹⁰, which can be reconstructed on the basis of the notable number of stelae by Işpuini and Minua, mainly from the village of Karahan, on the north-easternmost shore of Lake Van. Stelae Karahan 2 and 8 are by Işpuini, and Karahan 1, 5, 7, and UKN II 382¹¹ are by Minua¹². See also below at No 42.

Unfortunately Harutjunjan does not publish the duplicate stele of Karahan 2; this stele too is dedicated to god Ua in the "City of Haldi", and it was published, like the others, by Dinçol-Kavaklı in JKlF Bh 1 p. 55f.

This is the transliteration, which should assume the No 20b in KUKN:

- 1 ʰhal-di-ni-ni uš-ma-ši-ni
- 2 ʰhal-di-e e-ú-ri-[e]
- 3 ʰiš-pu-ú-i-ni-še ʰsar₅-du-ri-[hi-ni-še]
- 4 ʰhal-di-ni-li KÁ ši-di-iš-tú-a-[li]
- 5 ʰhal-di-ni URU ba-du-si-[e]
- 6 i-ni ʰú-a-i tē-ri-bi-šú-z[i]
- 7 ku-gu-ú-ni ʰhal-di-ni U[RU]
- 8 ú-i gi-e-i iš-ti-ni
- 9 ši-da-ú-ri ʰiš-pu-ú-i-ni-š[e]
- 10 ʰsar₅-du-ri-hi-ni-še ši-di-iš-tú-ni
- 11 e-ú-e É.GAL šú-ḫí e-ú-e
- 12 ʰsul-di-e šú-ḫí te-ru-ni
- 13 [b]ur-ga-na-ni ʰsa-ri šú-ḫí te-ru-ni

⁹ M. Salvini, Urartäisches epigraphisches Material aus Van und Umgebung, «Belleten» XXXVII (1973), 279-287.

¹⁰ M. Salvini, Reflections about the Urartian Shrines of the Stelae, *Fs. N. Özgüç*, Ankara 1993, 543-548.

¹¹ Unknown provenance, but probably also from Karahan.

¹² The stelae from Karahan have been published by A. M. Dinçol-E. Kavaklı, Die neuen urartäischen Inschriften aus der Umgebung von Van, JKlF Bh 1, Istanbul 1978, (18 Pl.); iid. Neuere urartäische Inschriften aus dem Dorfe Karahan, «Anadolu Araştırmaları» 6, 1978, 19-32 (10 Pl.).

- 14 𐎶𐎶𐎵-𐎠-𐎢 be-𐎠-𐎢
 15 𐎶𐎶𐎵-𐎠-𐎢 KÁ be-𐎠-𐎢
 16 𐎶𐎵-𐎠-𐎢 be-𐎠-𐎢
 17 [m]a-nu-li-ni ul-gu-ú-še
 18 [m]iš-pu-ú-i-ni-e 𐎠𐎶sar₅-du-ri-ḫi-ni-e
 19 𐎠𐎢ni-nu-ú-a 𐎠iš-pu-ú-i-ni-ḫi-ni-[e]
 20 𐎠e¹-𐎶a NU-ni 𐎶𐎶𐎵-𐎠-[ni]
 21 ar-ni ma-ni-[ni] e-ú-e 𐎶𐎵-[a-ni]

[beginning of the second version]

- 22 [D]𐎶𐎶𐎵-𐎠-𐎢 uš-ma-ši-ni
 23 [D]𐎶𐎶𐎵-𐎠-[e] e-ú-ri-[e]
 24 [m]iš-pu-ú-i-ni-še 𐎠𐎶sar₅-du-ri-ḫi-ni-še]
 25 [𐎶𐎶𐎵-d]i-ni-li KÁ ši-di-i[š-tú-a-li]

No 30. Stele of Kelišin. The information in the “heading” should be integrated with reference to the collations and photographs which I published in 1984¹³.

No 38. Inscription by Išpuini and Minua in the rock niche of Meher Kapısı.

line 14 – The author believes that DINGIR should be considered an ideogram not a determinative, and that what follows is not the name of a divinity but a noun. He therefore transcribes DINGIR ar-ṭu-𐎶a-ra-sa-ú-e and not 𐎶ar-ṭu-𐎶a-ra-sa-ú-e as all the previous editions did. He bases this on the number of animals sacrificed (2 oxen and 34 sheep), which is great even for the “gods of sacrifices” ([DINGIR]^{MES} *aṭqananaue*), but the reasoning here escapes me. See also the lengthy excursus in note 4, p. 303 on the same divine name which occurs in the epigraph of Rusa I from Mahmud Abad, line 4.

line 19 – Harutjunjan reads at the start of this line, in the place of the DINGIR given in the previous editions, the sign AB which he chooses to interpret as the determinative of the Urartian word *ṣuininaue*, with the meaning “sea”. Harutjunjan translates *^{AB}*ṣuininaue* DINGIR “to the god of the seas” but it would be better to analyse and translate this differently: 𐎶ṣui=ni=na=ue DINGIR^{<MES>} “to the god(s) of the (divine) lake”. In fact, given the phenomenon of the “Suffixanreihung” the suffix of the plural –na– followed by the dative –ue, this refers to the nomen rectum expressed by the

¹³ In P. E. Pecorella-M. Salvini, *Tra lo Zagros e l'Urmia. Ricerche storiche ed archeologiche nell'Azerbaigian iraniano* (I.G. LXXVIII), Roma 1984, p. 63f., and Pl. I-II, IV-VII.

ideogram DINGIR, in which, as often occurs, the plural is understood. In note 22 on p. 49 he explains that he bases his translation on a new reading of the photograph of the paper squeezes published in CICH Pl. VII. Thus the Urartian word *šue* should be read as *šve/tsve*, and can be linked to the Armenian *tsov* “sea”. There are two problems, however, with this. In the first place, the sign is not AB, but DINGIR. Secondly, there is no determinative AB of “sea” in either Urartian or Akkadian. See MÉA p. 20 on with the list of determinatives and No 128. The ideogram of “sea” is A.AB.BA. Harutjunjan bases his statements on ABZ No 128, which records an AB = *tâmtu* “Meer”, quoting EAK I 121f. where a rare logogram, AB.MEŠ^{ite}, occurs in a text of Tiglatpileser I. This, however, is far from representing any possible comparison with Urartian epigraphy. Above all else, the other attestations of *šui* make it obligatory to translate the term with “lake” and not “sea”. The Urartians could perhaps have defined Lake Sevan as a “sea”, as the Assyrians called Lake Van and Lake Urmia seas (UKN 266 = KUKN 389, line 5: 4 LUGAL^{MEŠ} *šui=ni=ani aptini*, “4 kings from this part of the lake”; Harutjunjan: “of the sea”), but it is hard to believe that they defined as a sea the artificial lake of Rusa II at the Keşiş Göl (UKN 268, 4: “I gave the name “Rusa=i *šue*”). Yet Harutjunjan here again speaks of an artificial basin which Rusa called “sea of Rusa” (p. 300). It is difficult to explain how Harutjunjan can define as “marine” (*primorskiĭ*) the location of the city of Halpa in Commagene (see the “Annals” of Sarduri, KUKN 241, E 51). This probably is, instead, the lake of Gölbaşı¹⁴, which is found on the highlands of the eastern Taurus. In any case, the reading DINGIR is beyond doubt and I have been able to check this on photographs I have taken of the original.

Line 26 – This line has a lacuna which it is difficult to integrate, even with the help of the corresponding line in the second part of the text, which is a duplicate of the first. Harutjunjan I 26 transcribes 3 GUD 30 UDU *ú-i*–[*e ti-ip-na?*] *la-ku-ni*, integrating with II 52 *ú*–[*i-e ti-ip-na?*] [; CICH 10, 26: *ú-i ti-šu te-ku-ni*; HchI 10, 26: *ú-i ti-šu la-ku-ni*; UKN 27, 26 *ú-i* [...] *šú la-ku-ni*. I fear that it is not possible to base any considerations on the signs conserved in line 83 (according to the traditional numbering of the previous corpora), that is to say] *i e ti ip na* [. In the photographs which I took in August 2001, at the critical point I see the signs *ú* and *i* separated by a space produced by a pre-existing fissure in the rock, followed by traces which could confirm *ti*, but also DINGIR. I cannot distinguish, instead, *šú*, but it may be possible – forming a combination with the clear *la*, to read NIN, therefore ^oNIN. At this point a comparison may be made with Ayanis, *susi* II 2: ^oNIN^{MEŠ}–*ú-e*.

¹⁴ M. Salvini, *Geschichte und Kultur der Urartäer*, Darmstadt 1995, 75.

No 40. Stele of unknown provenance; the text can be integrated with Karahan 1 (KUKN 172a) and Karahan 8 (KUKN 20a).

Obv.

- 1' [mⁱš-pu-ú-i-ni-i]-e[-hⁱi-ni-še]
- 2' [e-³a É.GAL šú-ú]-r^hí¹ e-³a¹ [URU]
- 3' [Gⁱul-di šú-ú-hⁱí] te-ru-[ú-ni]
- 4' [bur]-r^{ga}¹-na-ni [Gⁱza-ri]
- 5' [šú-h^e te-ru-ni]
- 6' rDhal-[d]i-[i-ni] be-[di-i-ni]
- 7' rDhal-di-[n]a-[ni KÁ be-di-ni]
- 8' rDna-a-l[a]-a-[i-ni be-di-ni]
- 9' [ma]-a-nu-l[i NU-ni ul-gu-ú-še]
- 10' mⁱš-pu-ú-[i-ni-i-e]
- 11' m^Dsar₅-d[u-ú-ri-e-hⁱi-ni-e]
- 12' m^mi-nu-a mⁱš-p[u-ú-i-ni-e-hⁱi-ni-e]
- 13' ^re¹-³a NU-ni ^D[hal-di-ni ar-a-ni]
- 14' [m]a-a-nu-li-ni ^re¹-³a ^Dna-la-i-ni]
- 15' ^Dhal-di-[ni-ni uš-ma-ši-ni]
- 16' ^Dhal-d[i-e e-ú-ri-e]
- 17' m^mi-nu-a-še mⁱ[iš-pu-i-ni-hⁱi-ni-še]
- 18' rDhal-d[i]-ni-l[i KÁ ši-di-iš-tú-a-li]
- 19' ^{rURU}ar-šu-ni¹-[ú-i-ni-e]
- 20' [ba-du-si]-r^e ^D[na-la-i-ni-e]
- 21' ^rtè-ri¹-bi šú-[zi ku-gu-ni]
- 22' ^{rURU}ar-šu-i¹-[ni-e ú-i]
- 23' [gi]-r^e-i iš¹-[ti-ni ši-da-ú-ri]
- 24' [m^mi-nu-a-še mⁱš-pu-i-ni-hⁱi-ni-še]
- 25' [ši-di-iš-tú-ni e-³a É.GAL šú-hⁱí]
- 26' [e-³a URU Gⁱul-di-e šú-hⁱí te-ru-ni]
- 27' ^rbur-ga-na-ni¹ [Gⁱza-ri šú-hⁱí te-ru-ni]
- 28' rDhal-d[i-i-ni be-di-i-ni]
- 29' rDhal-di-n[a-ni KÁ be-di-ni]
- 30' rDn[a]-a-l[a-i-ni be-di-ni]
- 31' [m]a-a-nu-l[i NU-ni ul-gu-še]
- 32' mⁱš-pu-ú¹-[i-ni-i-e]
- 33' m^Dsar₅-du-[ú-ri-e-hⁱi-ni-e]
- 34' m^mi-nu-a mⁱš-pu-ú-[i-ni-e-hⁱi-ni-e]
- 35' ^re¹-³a NU-ni ^D[hal-di-ni ar-a-ni]
- 36' [m]a-a-nu-li-ni e-³a ^Dna-la-i-ni]

The first lines can be restituted with KUKN 172a (= Karahan 1), 1-7, lines 19'-28' with KUKN 38a (= Karahan 7), 3-12.

Rev.

- 1 [ᵐmì-nu-ú-a-še ᵐiš-pu-i-ni-ḥi-ni-še a-li]
- 2 [i-ni pu-l]u-si za-du-b[i]
- 3 [ᵐmì-nu-ú-a-še ᵐiš-pu-ú-i]-ni-ḥi-ni-[-še]
- 4 [a]-li ᵐḥal-di-n]i-[e ba-du]-si-e DUB-[te]
- 5 [tc-r]u-[ú]-[bi a-li ᵐᵀᵀar]-ṣu-ni-ú-i-[-ni]
- 6 [DUB-t]e te-[ru-ú-bi a]-li i-na-[a]
- 7 [pu]-lu-si-i-[na-a DUB-t]e te-ru-ú-[-bi]
- 8 [a]-lu-uš-ni tú-[li-e a-lu]-še pi-tú-li-[e]
- 9 [a]-lu-še še-[ir-du-li]-ᵀe¹ a-lu-[-še]
- 10 [ú]-li-e i-n[i-li du-li]-ᵀe¹ ᵐḥal-di-[-še]
- 11 [ᵀ]IM-še ᵀUTU-[-še qi-ú-ra]-a-še DINGIR^{MES}-[-še]
- 12 [tú-r]u-ti-ni-ᵀe¹-[ni m]a-ᵀa¹-ni e-ᵀa¹
- 13 [zi]-li-bi q[i-ú-ra-a-n]i e-di-ni

No 41 from Berkri (today's Muradiye, CICH 29 = UKN 99 = HchI 74) and No 42, from Karahan¹⁵ are two parts of the same stele. See No 42.

No 42. This is the Karahan 5 stele of the *editio princeps* by A. M. Dinçol which I had joined in Fs N. Özgüç, Ankara 1993, 543-548, with UKN 99 (= KUKN 41). The author neither quotes nor uses my join, although he certainly knows of it. The first 17 lines are integrated on the basis of all the parallel texts and the reconstruction of the common text that I used in the above mentioned study. H. makes improper use of pointed brackets < > rather than of square ones []. The former should be used to integrate a sign or part of a text omitted due to scribal error. Here, instead, we are dealing with a lost part of a text, given that the upper section of the stele is broken, and square brackets should have been used.

No 45. Rock inscription of Taštepe: Harutjunjan does not accept my integration or interpretation of line 4: ᵀᵀᵀme-iš-ta-ḥa-li. He insists, instead, on ḥa-ᵀú¹-[-ni], giving no importance at all to the autographic copy. Unfortunately, he also entirely fails to consider the historical-geographical question, for which I must refer the reader to the study of this subject in *Tra lo Zagros e l'Urmia*, quoted above note 13.

With Nos 49-52 and 55 Harutjunjan falls into serious error. He does not

¹⁵ A. M. Dinçol-E. Kavaklı, «Anadolu Araştırmaları» 6, 1978, 19f.

know at all the long temple inscription of Körzüt published by A. M. Dinçol in *IstMitt* 26, 1976, 19-30 and studied again by myself in *SMEA* 22, 1980, 137-167. See also below at No 140.

No 63. Three-line inscription by Minua along the path of the canal. It is not true that this inscription is incomplete. It belongs to a series of epigraphs consisting of only three lines, like Nos 69-72.

No 82. The ancient name of the village from which this stele comes is Gjusak, the modern name, Köşk. I do not know at all that indicated by Harutjunjan, Karatavuk (= Black Chicken) and ask myself which map the author was using.

No 88. On the *susi* temple and its inscriptions, see B. André-Salvini and M. Salvini, *Ricognizioni epigrafiche urartee*, *SMEA* 36, 1995, 125-139 (+ 6 plates.), in particular p. 128-130 and pl. IV, and 137-139.

No 93 must be eliminated, because it is part of No 105.

No 118. The translation of *taramanili*, which is a *plurale tantum*, is not necessarily plural in the sense of "springs" (*istočniki*), but rather "fountain" (*rodnik*). Moreover, in the two inscriptions on the *taramanili* (see also No 158), Minua undoubtedly celebrates the construction of a "fountain", as the sultans celebrated their *çeşme*, around a natural spring. The *plurale tantum* of the Urartian term, which is related to Hurrian *tarmani*, may be explained by the presence of numerous sources.

No 139. This is the rock niche of Minua near the "Sardursburg", which I published in «*Belleten*» 37, 1973, 279f. Harutjunjan places between square brackets the start of all four lines, criticizing my transcription. But the left-hand part of the inscription is not damaged, only covered by a line of shadow, as may clearly be seen in the photograph. I had, moreover, explained that the lighting conditions were unsatisfactory, the inscription in July/August only receiving light at dawn or sunset¹⁶ since the rock is north-facing. Harutjunjan rightly corrects my transcription of the number of *kapi* (measurements for dry goods), adding the number 90 in place of the determinative of the plural MEŠ, which is written in the same way (a vertical wedge followed by three triangular ones).

No 140. Here, the author mechanically places, among the texts of Minua, three of the fragments which I published in «*Belleten*» 37, 1973, 282, those which enable us to integrate the name of Minua through the patronymic Išpuinihi (fragments a, c, g). This was the precise reason which lead me to attribute all the fragmentary inscriptions on stones re-used in the citadel walls of Van Kalesi to this sovereign. Harutjunjan, however, relegates the

¹⁶ I took the photograph shortly after 6 o'clock in the morning, early August 1969.

other stones to the group of texts of unknown author (Nos 466-477), ignoring the fact that these are fragments of a single, large inscription, as I had clearly stressed in my publication. And there is yet more. He ignores my contribution *Un testo celebrativo di Menua*, SMEA 22, 1980, 137-167, in which I reconstructed the existence of six duplicates of the important text by Minua (A-F), identifying in stones *a* and *b* the remains of duplicate F. See Pl. III with photographs and table 2 at the foot of the article with the reconstruction of the text.

No 162. This must be eliminated as it relates to the first, incomplete publication of No 168 (Rock niche of Ezhdaha Bulaqi in Iranian Azerbaijan).

No 172. ^hšur-iš(?)–hi does not exist. This had already been corrected by König, HchI 40B. We should read ú!–ri!–i[š]–hi, leaving aside comparisons which the erroneous reading has provoked in Russian literature on the subject. Here we are dealing with the term *urišhi* “property”, to which is linked ^hurišh^usi “treasure”: see M. Salvini, SMEA 22, 1980, 186 on. In his glossary p. 473, however, Harutjunjan does not quote my interpretation and stands by earlier ones, translating the terms respectively as “object” and “storehouse”. It would, instead, have been opportune to recall that my interpretation was based on the alternation between the logographic writing NÍG(o NÌ).GA, indicating “property, treasure” (ABZ and MÉA 597) and the phonetic form *urišhi*.

No 172a. This was not an unpublished inscription from Van Museum as the author believes. It is the stele Karahan 1, published by A. M. Dinçol–E. Kavaklı, *Die neuen urartäischen Inschriften aus der Umgebung von Van*, JKIF Bh 1, Istanbul 1978, 48 ff. This is a strange oversight, as Harutjunjan knows this publication, having quoted it at Nos 20a, 38a, 42, 43. Even less comprehensible is the fact that he deduces that it is from Karahan on the basis of similarity with the others.

No 172b. This is one of the inscriptions from the *susi* temple of Yukarı Anzaf. Given that the Author accepts that it belongs to No 88, which had the same provenance, I do not understand why he did not put it alongside that inscription. Merely because No 88 was already published long time ago (CICH 63 = HchI 46 = UKN 71) and No 172b only in 1995? Also amongst the texts of the same sovereign it is legitimate to follow a certain order. It saddens me to say that here we are faced with a shuffling of the cards without any clear criteria being applied.

No 172c. Neither is this an unpublished inscription from Van Museum, but Karahan 4, published by Dinçol and Kavaklı at the same time as 172a. A further mistake consists of the Author’s presenting only the first 14 lines, whilst the stele has 21! From line 15 on the second copy of the same text commences.

- 1 𐎶𐎠𐎠𐎠𐎠𐎠𐎠
- 2 uš-ma-a-ši-i-ni
- 3 𐎶𐎠𐎠𐎠𐎠𐎠𐎠
- 4 e-ú-ri-i-e
- 5 𐎠𐎠𐎠𐎠𐎠𐎠𐎠𐎠
- 6 𐎠iš-pu-ú-i-ni-ḫi-ni-še
- 7 i-ni pu-lu-si-e
- 8 ku-ú-gu-ú-ni
- 9 𐎠𐎠𐎠𐎠𐎠𐎠𐎠𐎠
- 10 𐎠iš-pu-ú-i-ni-e-ḫi
- 11 LUGÁL tar-a-i-e
- 12 LUGÁL al-su-i-ni-e
- 13 LUGÁL ^{KUR}bi-i-a-i-na-e
- 14 a-lu-si ^{URU}tu-uš-pa-a URU
- 15 𐎶𐎠𐎠𐎠𐎠𐎠𐎠
- 16 uš-ma-a-ši-i-ni
- 17 𐎶𐎠𐎠𐎠𐎠𐎠𐎠
- 18 e-ú-ri-i-e
- 19 [𐎠𐎠𐎠]𐎠𐎠𐎠𐎠𐎠𐎠
- 20 [𐎠iš-pu]-𐎠ú-i-𐎠𐎠𐎠𐎠𐎠𐎠
- 21 []x x

Coming to the end of the texts of Minua I must also note that Harutjunjan has forgotten the following inscriptions:

– the stele of Karahan 3 (URU = Minuaḫinili), published by Dinçol-Kavakli, JFK Bh 1, Istanbul 1978, 59-60, Pl. VI-IX;

– two duplicate stone inscriptions from Pirabat (Ağrı) concerning the construction of a fortress (É.GAL), N. Başgelen, «Arkeoloji ve Sanat» 28-31 (1985) p. 16, and then Dinçol, «Anadolu Araştırmaları» 11, 1989, 138, fig. 1-3;

– the inscription from the *susi*-Tempel in Anzaf, O. Belli, «Arkeoloji ve Sanat» 54/55, 1992, 13-30;

– an erratic stone from Körzüt, concerning the construction of a generic building (É): N. Başgelen «Arkeoloji ve Sanat» 28-31, 1985, 17 fig. 6.

– a stele dedicated to God Šebitu, of unknown provenance: V. Donbaz-G. Wilhelm, SCCNH 8, 1996, 269-272.

– The inscription on the bronze candelabrum of the Israel Museum, Jerusalem: M. Salvini, Or 60 (1991), 344-346 (Pl. CVII). Thus – concerning the last one – the new term *dašusi* is missing from the glossary, which I translated with “Illuminations” or with German “Leuchter” linking it to the *dašie* (see the Glossary p. 441: “*značenie ne izvestno*” = the meaning is unknown) of 𐎶𐎠𐎠, to whom an animal sacrifice is due in the epigraph of

Meher Kapısı (No 38 I 15, II 26), and which I suggested at the same time translating as “to the Light of Haldi”. A pity, therefore, as we know that in the study of such a little-known civilisation as that of Urartu, even the smallest element may be of importance.

– Moreover there are six more unpublished inscriptions by Minua, which will be soon added to the corpus of Minua.

With No 173 the texts of Argišti I begin. This is the lengthy text of the Annals, to which Harutjunjan dedicated a paper at the start of his research career; see the literature quoted in the “heading”, where no mention is made of the collation which appeared years ago in SMEA: B. André-Salvini – M. Salvini, “Gli Annali di Argišti I. Note e collazioni”, SMEA 30, 1992, 9-23 (Pl. I-IV). This omission is strange since, at p. 175 note 29 of this study, it is quoted as approving a certain transcription. Given the importance of the document and the fact that all editions are substantially based on Schulz’s ancient copy, the results of a collation based on the original should have been taken into due consideration. I shall not go into details here regarding the individual readings, but cannot but mention col. VII, that in the worst state of conservation, which is entirely different in both appearance and content to the reproduction furnished by Harutjunjan, which actually represents a step backwards compared to UKN 127 VII. See p. 22 and Pl. IVa of the article quoted.

No 174A, B. This is the stele of Surb Sahak (UKN 128, HchI 174). In SMEA 36, 1995, 131-133 I wrote something on the relationship between this text and that of the “Horhor Annals” of Argišti I, but Harutjunjan does not take this into consideration, just as he ignores what I wrote on the reconstruction of the text of the Annals in *Geschichte und Kultur der Urartäer*, Darmstadt 1995, 58-62, even though this was of a certain importance in reconstructing the most important text of Urartian epigraphy.

No 194. This text must be eliminated. I believe that I demonstrated in my article “Falso ottocentesco di un’epigrafe urartea”, «Studi epigrafici e lessicali» 2, 1985, 143-146, that we are in fact dealing with a forgery. But Harutjunjan either does not know of the article or chooses to ignore it.

No 202, line 5: Harutjunjan transcribes i-na-ni-i me-na-ni e-di-ni, showing that he does not care what I wrote in SMEA 22, 1980, p. 164. In this way, he renounces understanding and, in effect, does not translate from line 5 onwards. Instead, ina=ni ime=na=ni edini means “because of/on the occasion of this foundation”, given that we have the alternation between the writing URU₄-na-ni and i-me-na-ni. We may now add the temple inscription from Ayanis, II 4 i-na-na-ni ^{tr}URU₄ e-di-ni, which confirms the

correctness of my integration of UKN II 448, 9-10; the two inscriptions are, now, duplicates of each other¹⁷.

No 241. Annals of Sarduri II. In his reconstruction of this important text, Harutjunjan does not take into consideration my study of the monument in *Geschichte und Kultur der Urartäer*, 66 ff. Here, once again, however, the re-composition of the text, which must bear in mind the archaeological situation, the succession of various inscribed surfaces – stelae and rock faces – is an extremely important factor which we cannot take as having been resolved once and for all. It is also essential for a reconstruction of historical events, as I believe I have adequately demonstrated.

No 270 is a text of Rusa II. Melikišvili, UKN 143, attributed it to Argišti I. I do not understand why Harutjunjan inserts this among the texts of Sarduri II. In this he shows that he has not taken even one step forward since his 1966 publication (*Novye Urartskie Nadpisi Karmir-blura*), where he presented UKN 143 as Tekst IV. Then, as today, he rightly noted the textual correspondences with Tekst I which he published (UKN 448 = KUKN 424, of Rusa II) and observed that they integrated each other. He did not, however, draw a very simple, self-evident conclusion from this: that the two texts are duplicates and that, as a result, this also is by Rusa II. What is somewhat singular is the fact that, in the *apparatus criticus*, text 424 (the temple inscription of Rusa II) continues to be quoted without the consequences being noted. He even goes so far as to integrate the name of Sarduri in line 11. All is now clear thanks also to the new text from the *susi* temple of Ayanis. But see below my comments on texts 414-416 and 424-426 of Rusa II.

Nos 273-274. I dedicated an article to the rock inscriptions of Sarduri II at Karataş (northern shore of Lake Van) in *Or* 62, 1993, 71-79 (Pl. I-II), based on my collations *in situ* and on the original copies by Schulz. Harutjunjan knows and quotes this study but, yet again, does not take it into any consideration at all. One example may suffice: No 273 line 5. Instead of the syllabogram *pi* we should read GIŠ, with consequent implications with regard to the interpretation. This is a case which is clearly resolved by Schulz's original copy, which I published on that occasion, and which cannot be ignored.

No 275, line 3: the reading GAR-ú-e instead of the previous šá-ú-e is an interesting suggestion, but the determinative LÚ (^{LÚ}GAR = *šaknu*, "governor") is lacking.

No 278a. On this text see M. Salvini, *I granai delle città urartee*, in «Eothen» 9 (Studi e Testi I), Firenze 1998, 131-149.

¹⁷ A. Çilingiroğlu-M. Salvini (Eds), *Ayanis I. Ten Year's Excavations at Rusaḫinili Eiduru-kai, 1989-1998*, Rome 2001, 253 ff.

No 387. The bilingual Urartian-Assyrian text from Topzawa is, as we know, a fundamental text of the Urartian civilisation, and not only because of the contribution which, like the bilingual text of Kelišin, it has made to our interpretation of the Urartian language. It is, above all, an historical document of the greatest importance which sheds light on the conflict between Assyria and Urartu during the reigns of Sargon and Rusa I. Thanks to a partial duplicate found in the Zagros mountains in 1976 – the stele of Mergeh Karvan –, and to the photographic documentation of Topzawa obtained by George Cameron and Reiner M. Boehmer, I was able to provide a new edition of what I called the “Urartian-Assyrian Bilingual (Text) of Rusa I”¹⁸. Now, Harutjunjan knows this work and cites it at the beginning but clearly opts for the transcription by M. de Tseretheli, RA 45, 1951, p. 3-20, 195-208, here, unfortunately, following in the steps of Melikišvili (UKN 264). In the “heading” Harutjunjan presents the document in a misleading way and is silent on a fundamental point, that is to say, the fact that the upper section of the stele is damaged. He writes: “The inscription is severely damaged. Initially, this was only published in part (Urartian text lines 9-32; Assyrian text, lines 10-29, Lehmann-Haupt etc.). Later, on the basis of a photograph of the squeeze, it was published in its entirety: M. de Tseretheli, RA etc.” Such premises are, alas, mistaken. C. F. Lehmann-Haupt, the discoverer and first editor and, afterwards, F. W. König, HchI 122, did not transcribe the first lines (of the preserved part, not in fact the start of the original text!) for the very good reason that nothing at all can be seen on the stone.

Harutjunjan, however, concludes: “Here below we furnish the Urartian and Assyrian texts substantially as given by M. Tseretheli”. Unfortunately, this is a seriously wrong and entirely unjustifiable choice. The transcription of Tseretheli, which König warned against as early as 1955¹⁹ as I did in my new edition is, sadly, in part pure invention. I cannot, therefore, comprehend why Harutjunjan, having new autographic copies and photographs of the stele of Topzawa at his disposition, as well as the edition of the new stele of Mergeh Karvan, was in no way troubled and slavishly followed this appalling example. The result, I am afraid to say, is absolutely catastrophic.

Here I must make a sad general comment on what at first glance appears to be the most valid, rich and important part of the entire work, the *apparatus criticus*. As we may see, this overabundance of notes is, in part,

¹⁸ In P. E. Pecorella-M. Salvini, *Tra lo Zagros e l'Urmia*, pp. 79-95.

¹⁹ See note 1 on p. 144: “Was M. v. Tseretheli auf den Abklatschen gelesen haben will, ist dort, wo er kontrolliert werden kann, reine Willkür”.

useless or almost so. Harutjunjan often limits himself to recording the variants of readings, without explaining the reasons behind his choices. I cite only line 17 of the Assyrian version: Harutjunjan, like Tseretheli and Melikišvili, transcribes [a-d]i šá-di-e ^[KUR]Aš-šur^{KI} lu-ú a-ta-la-ka translating this as “(I, Rusa,) came as far as the mountains of Assyria”; whilst my edition at line 16’//19’ (respectively, of Topzawa and Mergeh Karvan) requires the reading [ana] ṣá¹-de-e ^{KUR}an-da-ru-tú a-ta-l[a-ak] “(I, Rusa,) went (up) onto Mount Andarutu”. My copy of the stele of Mergeh Karvan, and – if he cannot trust the copy – the published photograph, leave no room for doubt. In this, as in other cases, Harutjunjan demonstrates his lack of trust in documentary evidence (which should, instead, represent the sole basis for the judgement of each and every one of us), or rather not to be interested at all in consulting such evidence and to prefer to base his choices on imagination. This is an extremely serious mistake and undermines the worth of the entire work. However, as far as the bilingual text of Rusa is concerned, Harutjunjan has no luck here either, as a new edition is foreseen thanks to the discovery of a further duplicate on the stele of Movana (a village lying 30km west of Urumiyeh) which will soon be published in SMEA²⁰. This is a stele which has been preserved completely, and which is more than twice the size of the broken stele of Topzawa. The text, although seriously damaged, is consequently also far longer. Suffice it to say that, in the Assyrian version, line 5’ of Topzawa corresponds to line 30’ of Movana and, for the Urartian version, Topzawa 12’ = Movana 60. From this we may deduce that all of the first part of Tseretheli’s transliteration, unwisely taken up by Melikišvili and Harutjunjan, who believe they are reproducing the start of the stele, is to be rejected. Apart from anything else, it would have been enough to compare König’s edition and mine in *Tra lo Zagros e l’Urmia*. I shall limit myself only to giving the example that the line with Andarutu is confirmed completely by Movana – line 44’ [ana (šá)]-de-e ^{KUR}an-da-ru-tú-ú a-t[(a-l)a-ak]. The quotation of mount Andarutu also in the Urartian source represents an important convergence with the chronicle of Sargon’s “Eighth Campaign” (Sg. 8, 424) which mentions a mount Andarutta that the Assyrian king had to pass before re-entering his own country. I have spoken at length on this text as it is an important document and I felt it necessary to point out that an “edition” such as this one – more in this specific case than for other texts – could have extremely damaging consequences for Urartian philology.

No 389, rock inscription of Tsovinar, on the southern shore of Lake

²⁰ The new edition, moreover, was announced in SMEA 39 (1997), 290-292: B. André-Salvini, M. Salvini, “New Urartian Research in Iranian Azerbaijan”.

Sevan. At line 17, Harutjunjan rightly opts for the reading [e]→a É.GAL which was suggested by M. Israeljan in the place of ¹⁰IM-i-ni É.GAL. The former had been supported by Melikišvili, thus giving weight to the erroneous interpretation that it dealt with the “Fortress of the Storm God Teišeba”. I can confirm the new reading following my collation of October 1993. Line 20, however, should not be empty. I could distinguish at least [...] ¹⁰UTU ni ti-ni [...] zi zi [...]. Unfortunately, an Armenian celebratory stele has since been erected which touches the inscribed rock face and prevents us from reading the final section clearly.

No 391. The stele of Keşiş Göl was inserted amongst the text of Rusa I, but Harutjunjan does not exclude the possibility that the author may have been Rusa II.

No 392. This is the incomplete epigraph of Rusa I from Mahmud Abad which I published in AMI 10, 1977, 125-136. At line 4 Harutjunjan's interpretation diverges from my own. In a lengthy excursus at note 4, p. 303, he maintains that DINGIR should be considered as an ideogram and not a determinative and that what follows is not the name of a god, but a noun. He therefore transcribes DINGIR ar-tu→a-ra-sa-ú-e and quotes the inscription of Meher Kapisi (see above at No 38) where we find a list of sacrificial gifts “to the gods of the sacrifices” (DINGIR^{MES} *aṭqananaue*), and “to the god(s) of the divine lake” (¹⁰šuininaue DINGIR<MEŠ>).

With regard to line 9 and note 9, p. 304, it is right to correct with TE the reading LA in my first publication of the Mahmud Abad epigraph. It is, instead, wrong to ignore the fact that, already in the volume *Tra lo Zagros e l'Urmia*, Roma 1984, p. 78 I had corrected this to TE (TEMEN), “foundation”, just as Harutjunjan now proposes. Insofar as the phonetic correspondence of ¹⁰URU₄-nani is concerned, this is not *menani*, but *imenani*, as I have already pointed out in relation to No 202: see SMEA 22, 1980, p. 164. The contexts, moreover, can no longer justify the identification of *susi* with É.BĀRA, as Harutjunjan sustains.

No 393. Harutjunjan has clearly seen that in the publication of the Bastam 1 tablet, at line 1 I omitted to indicate with a colon (:) in transcription the dividing sign between words which consists of two small wedges, one above the other, and which are instead present in my autographic copy. This tablet and the following one (No 394 = Bastam 2 in my edition) have been the object of corrections in reading by Harutjunjan in an article he published in «Drevnij Vostok» 5, 1988, 85-92. He reproduced this in French in «Altorientalische Forschungen» 15, 1988, 119-123. I replied with a contribution in «Vicino Oriente» 8/2 (1992), 77-82, accepting one correction and responding to other proposals of alternative readings. Before going into detail it saddens me to note that Harutjunjan here insists on

repeating his critical observations without ever mentioning my reply of which he is more than aware. At p. 307 note 25, discussing the seal impression (1. ^mRu-[sa-a-i? ^m]pSar₅-du-^{hi} 2. KIŠIB ^{lú}A.NIN-li) common to the two tablets (Bastam 1 and 2), Harutjunjan attributes this to the reign of Rusa I, deducing that here we are dealing with Rusa (I), son of Sarduri (II), when he was *carèvič*, prince heir to the throne. Now, however, as a result of new, clearer seal impressions found on the bullae from Ayanis, we are obliged to abandon the reading ^{lú}A.NIN-li in favour of ^{lú}a-^{šu}-li, name of a function which we cannot yet translate²¹. Consequently there is no longer any reason to attribute the documents to Rusa I, or rather to the period of Sarduri II's reign when his son Rusa was heir to the throne. But Harutjunjan, who relegates such dating to a note, does not appear to grasp the important consequences for any historical reconstruction. There is, above all, one fundamental consideration to be made: until proof to the contrary becomes available, all the documents on clay, tablets and bullae date to the period of Rusa II's reign and provide evidence of his administrative reforms. Thus, even though the reading of the title remained unaltered *^{lú}A.NIN-li, the author should have reflected on the far greater problem of the historical picture.

As I wrote in "Note sulle tavolette di Bastam", VO 8, 1992, 77-82, I fully accept the reading *ši* instead of *ia* in the personal name ^mLu-ub-^{šú}-^{ši}!-ni in Bastam 1 (= KUKN 393), lines 3 and 8, but am, at the same time, astonished that Harutjunjan himself does not recognise the same name in the other tablet, Bastam 2 (= KUKN 394). He reads, instead, [^m ...]-lu(?)^{-šú}-ta-ni-di, without any valid reason. Amongst other things, the personage has, in both texts, the same title, ^{lú}É.GAL. The sign which he reads *ta* is, in fact, *ši* which he accuses me of not have read in Bastam 1. Harutjunjan also insists on his alternative readings without taking into account my palaeographic note in VO 8, 1992. The reading NINDA at lines 6 and 9 is undoubtedly better than mine, NÍG. It is in fact likely that we are dealing here with rations of "breads" and not of "things" in general. At line 7 Harutjunjan reads A tar-a instead of my a-tar-a, a word which I did not know and cannot translate, but his interpretation of A tar-a as "elder son" does not find a comparison in tablet UPD 12 (= KUKN 412) line 2, where Harutjunjan like Diakonoff reads Šá-ga DUMU tar-a "Šaga, elder son". On the basis of the Ayanis texts we must now read a single personal name: Šá-ga-pu_x-tar-a (see *Ayanis I*, p. 262).

At p. 306, note 9 and p. 307 note 26 (still on text No 393), I am afraid that Harutjunjan attributes to me an opinion which I have never expressed,

²¹ *Ayanis I*, 23, 316s.

that ^{GIS}uduwe is the same as ^{GIS}uldi/uduli “vine grapevine”. I instead wrote in *Bastam I* p. 121 that ^{GIS}uduwe is “irgendeine Pflanzung, ein Feld o. ä.”. Page 307, note 25, Harutjunjan defines the ^{MD}Sar₅-du-ḫi of the seal as a mistake for ^{MD}Sar₅-du-ri-ḫi, whereas this is an abbreviation known especially in the Ayanis bullae.

No 411. This is the stele known as coming from Sisian, which was published by Harutjunjan himself in 1982²². It is now presented as the stele of Thanahat, from the name of the Armenian temple of the IV century near the village of Arevis, 17 kms from the centre of Sisian. Some corrections of the reading compared to the first edition are presented. In the transcription, an improper use is made of brackets, more so than in the first edition, and these are generally misleading. It is not at all clear, for example, why in line 1 of the Ro [e¹-[ú-ri]-ṛi-e¹ becomes ṛe-[ú-ri]-[ie, with two square half-brackets above and below. Also, in the Rev., from line 25 to line 34 both square brackets and < > are used contemporaneously. Without referring to previous editions one cannot understand that the text stops at line 27 as the stele is broken in the lower part, or that the remaining lines have been reconstructed by analogy with the stele of Zwartnots, again by Argišti II.

The last three lines should, therefore, be transcribed thus:

- 25 ^{MD}ar-giš-ti-še [a-li-e]
 26 [a-]lu-še ti-ni-ni [tú-li-e]
 27 [ma-s]i t[i-ni te-li-i e-a-i]

as not as presented by Harutjunjan:

- *25 ^{MD}ar-giš-ti-še <a-li-e>
 *26 [a-]lu-še ti-ni-ni <tú-li-e>
 *27 [ma-s]i t<i-ni te-li-i e-a-i>

The others are then placed between < >, which is utterly misleading. These are not signs which the scribe forgot, but reconstructions of parts of the text which should, therefore, be placed between square brackets. This is not merely a formality seeing as, whilst the first edition at note 3, p. 90 informs the reader that the cursing formula has been reconstructed on the basis of the Zwartnots stele, Harutjunjan says nothing of the kind in his corpus. On the contrary, the fact that also a-li-e and tú-li-e at lines 25 and 26 are between < >, whilst for [ma-s]i square brackets are used, only serves to

²² N. V. Harutjunjan, La nouvelle inscription ourartéenne découverte en Arménie Soviétique, in: *Gesellschaft und Kultur im Alten Vorderasien*, Hrg H. Klengel, Berlin 1982, 89-93.

create even greater confusion and to substantially hinder any understanding of what the text actually consists of.

In Ro 11 we read, in the well-wishing formula, [e-ia] ar-[di-i-še] as two distinct words, translated as “a takže vlast”, that is, “and also power”. So e-ia would now be the conjunction. The same sequence is found on another stele by Argišti II (UKN 276 = HchI 124 = KUKN 406, Ro 11), as well as in the temple inscription of Çavuştepe (KUKN 247, 9), and Harutjunjan again makes of these two separate words. This recurs also on the “bilingual” stone of Minua from Kevenli²³: al-su-i-še₂₀ e-ia-ar-di-še₂₀. In effect, e-ia-ar-di-še is a single word, which is found also in the inscription of the *susi* temple of Ayanis (I 7)²⁴. e-ia is not a variant of the conjunction e-³a (read e-³e), e-ú-e (read *ewe*). This was claimed first by I. M. Diakonoff, AMI 22, 1989, 97, who contradicts himself, however, in AMI 24, 1991, 13 isolating the word *ardiše*, which he translates as “decree”.

From the historical-geographical point of view, it is interesting to note that the place name ^{KUR}Šu-lu-qu (Rev. 11) is also found in the Ayanis inscription (VI 11: ^{KUR}Ši-lu-qu-ni-) in the following context: “Rusa, the son of Argišti, says: I brought (deported) men women and cattle from the Lulu countries (= “the enemy, barbarian countries”), (i. e.) from Assur, from Targuni (not identified), from Etiuni (Armenia), from Tablani, from Qainaru, from H̄ate (the Neo-Hittite country, like Malatya), from Muški, from Šiluquni”²⁵. On this point, Harutjunjan’s indications, in the first edition as in this present corpus (p. 327 note 15, and glossary p. 522), are extremely interesting and useful. It would appear that this region came within the borders of Etiuḫi, which recurs at line 2 of the reverse. He deduces that the large region of Etiuni-Etiuḫi stretched from modern-day Sarıkamış to the west as far as the area of Sisian. Secondly, he identifies a survival of the name up to the mediaeval region of Şluq (VII cent. A.D.).

Be that as it may, as regards the list of regions in the Ayanis text from which the deportees come, these are not presented in any logical order. In

²³ First edition: A. M. Dinçol-E. Kavaklı, *Die neuen urartaeischen Inschriften aus der Umgebung von Van*, JKF Bh 1, Istanbul 1978, 67. See also M. Salvini, Una “bilingue” assiro-urartea, *Studia Mediterranea Piero Meriggi dicata*, vol. I, Pavia 1979, 575-593.

²⁴ *Ayanis I*, p. 254 and comment on p. 260.

²⁵ I must correct the translation given by P. Zimansky in: *Great Anatolia and the Indo-Hittite Language Family. Papers Presented at a Colloquium Hosted by the University of Richmond, March 18-19*, Ed. by Robert Drews, «Journal of Indo-European Studies», Monograph Series: Number 38, Washington 2001, p. 21 ff. “Rusa the son Argišti speaks, I conquered the enemy lands: the land of Assur ...” does not correspond to the text which reads “I deported men and women from enemy lands...”.

particular, Šiluquni, although lying in present-day Armenia, is cited far from Etiuḫi/Etiuni, of which it was probably part.

No 412a. Here, as in other cases of finds from regular excavations, it would be good practice to give the inventory number: this is the bulla Ba 78-146, published by myself in *Bastam II*, 134f.

N^{os}. 414, 415, 416, 424, 425, 426, 427. The context and structure of these texts by Rusa II have not been understood by Harutjunjan, who does not recognise the fact that they are duplicates. Unfortunately, although being the esteem editor of the text of Karmir-blur²⁶, he does not know of my contribution on the same text and the *susi* temple²⁷, in which I gave an initial order to those texts and duplicates from Armavir and Adilcevaz. I began from the consideration that the inscriptions of Karmir-blur, published as though distinct from each other, were in fact part of a single large text, as a result of which we had the join UKN II 448+449(+450, that is to say KUKN 424+425(+427. Today, with the discovery of the inscription of the *susi* temple of Ayanis²⁸ and its publication, I believe a definitive place has been established for this material, and I refer clearly to this. B. B. Piotrovskij, in the preface to Harutjunjan's publication (NUNKb), had already provided all the archaeological elements, the measurements of the inscribed blocks and had attempted to reconstruct the position of these texts inside the temple. This is reproduced by the same author, Piotrovskij, in *Karmir-blur. Al'bom*, Leningrad 1970, fig. 19. The photograph, now reproduced in Pl. CLVII of KUKN, shows the inscribed stones placed in two rows, one above the other. There are problems, however, as I noted in AMI 12, where I provide my own reconstruction of the original position of the stones. I must point out that the position of the inscription in the *susi* temple of Ayanis, the only one so far found *in situ*, would appear to support the hypothesis of two overlying rows. Further checks are, however, required on integrations to be made and on the measurements, before we can arrive at any definitive idea. It is clear, though, that this section of Harutjunjan's corpus also is already out of date and therefore cannot be used.

No 414. This inscription from Adilcevaz (UKN 278 = HchI 128), contains an important text, which was studied also by J. Friedrich (ZDMG 105, 1955, 65-70), if for no other reason than that it includes the place name Muški. But this must be linked to further three texts also from Adilcevaz, resulting in the

²⁶ *Novye klinoobraznye nadpisi iz Karmir-blura* (abbr. NUNKb), Jerewan 1966.

²⁷ *Das susi-Heiligtum von Karmir-blur und der urartäische Turmtempel*, AMI 12, 1979, 249-269.

²⁸ *Ayanis I*, 253-270.

following join: UKN II 451(=KUKN 415)(+)UKN II 452(=KUKN 416)+UKN 278(=KUKN 414)(+)UKN 300(=KUKN 489). Harutjunjan pointed out that.

No 415 had a great deal in common with the text of Karmir-blur No 425, without noting the duplicate nature of the texts or the respective joins which unite three inscriptions of Karmir-blur and four of Adilcevaz. Both may now be seen to be duplicates of the new temple text of Ayanis. Karmir-blur corresponds to Ay I 1-IV 7, VIII 1-11, and Adilcevaz is a duplicate of Ay III 11-IV 10, VI 5-VIII 9²⁹. See the transcription below p. X.Y.

The stone inscription published by P. Hulin in AnSt 9, 1959, 193-195, (UKN II 452 = KUKN 416) has a strange shape which indicates that the text to which it belonged was positioned differently at Adilcevaz compared to Ayanis.

No 417a-x. The one line inscription on the carved blocks of Kefkalesi has been published in its entirety by M. Salvini, "The Inscription of the Urartian King Rusa II at Kefkalesi (Adilcevaz)", SMEA 40, 1998, 123-129 (see below No 427a!). Harutjunjan records only the first quarter of this short text, basing himself on the first incomplete publication by the excavators E. Bilgiç and B. Ögün, «Anadolu» 9, 1967, p. 17 and Pl. XXIV. He does not realise that this is the same inscription as 427a.

417a-x should, therefore, be eliminated.

No 418. Also in the inscription of Mazgirt, line 12, Harutjunjan recognises the form a-mi-ni-ni, imperative of *am-* "to burn", which I had first identified on one of the blocks from Kefkalesi³⁰ (KUKN 427a, line 4).

No 420a. This and the following (No 420b) are the same type of cylinder seal of Rusa II, attested too by numerous impressions. The inscription is on two lines. Harutjunjan, according to his source (in the first case Zimansky, in the second Salvini) transcribes and interprets them differently without seeming to be aware of any contradiction. In the first case he takes (line 1) ^mRu-sa-a-i-ni KIŠIB, "Rusean seal", to be an adjective, in line with an old and outdated grammatical interpretation. In the second case he correctly reproduces (line 2) i-ni KIŠIB ^mRu-sa-a<-i> "this is the seal of Rusa". Harutjunjan does not, however, recognise the final -i, although this is clearly visible on some examples such as Ba 75/93³¹. In these two cases, the second line bears the patronymic ^mAr-giš-te-ḫi-ni-i "of the son of Argišti", and I do not see at all how this can be

²⁹ *Ayanis I*, p. 256 Fig. 5.

³⁰ M. Salvini, The Inscription of the Urartian King Rusa II at Kefkalesi (Adilcevaz), SMEA 40, 1998, 123-129.

³¹ *Bastam I*, Taf. 32, 7.

reconciled with his interpretation of line 1 of No 420a. A rectangular stamp seal of Rusa II is attested at Ayanis: ^mRu-sa-a-i ^mAr-giš-te-ḫi-ni-i, and we understand KIŠIB³².

No 427a. Not four lines, but one single line running on the four faces of the square blocks! See above, sub 417a-x, which is to be eliminated. As we are, actually, dealing with at least eight examples, they should theoretically be indicated as 427a-x.

No 442. Here Harutjunjan makes up for a grave omission by the editors of a shield of Rusa III from the excavations carried out by A. Erzen at Toprakkale, the only translation of which was that by E. Bilgiç. Cf. A. Erzen, ArchAnz 1962, Heft 2, p. 406, see UKN II 458a (and UKN II 454, on information from Mellink AJA 66, 1962, 1). He reconstructs the cuneiform text perfectly on the basis of other, analogous texts. We must recall that this is as yet unpublished even though it has been on display in the Ankara Museum for decades.

No 445. Why attribute to some imaginary Rusa IV this seal on a famous bulla of Karmir-blur? Perhaps because of difficulty in reading or interpreting the text. The reading which Harutjunjan gives, who had already made this proposal in «Acta Antiqua Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae» 12, 1974, 423-424, is as follows: (line 1) ^mr[u-s]a-i-ni KIŠIB (r. 2) (r. 2) ^mru-sa-ḫi É.G[AL(?) -ni?] “Rusean seal, from the (?) fortress of the son of Rusa”. The first line can neither be transcribed nor interpreted in such a way. For 25 years now we have known that there is not an adjectival possessive suffix *-ini in Urartian³³. Moreover, the seals of Bastam help us here: i-ni K[İŠIB ^mru]-sa-a-i³⁴, “this (is) the seal of Rusa”. In the case of KUKN 445 we clearly have an abbreviation, as in other examples of the Bastam seal where we read only i-ni KIŠIB ^mru-sa-a³⁵. The second line is more difficult, and I in turn attempt to give an alternative. One may, therefore, read as follows: (line 1) i-ni KIŠIB ^mru-[s]a-<a-i> (line 2) ^mru-sa-ḫi É.ʽBÁRAʽ?? The sanctuary É.BÁRA plays an important role for Rusa II; one need only recall the foundation inscription of Rusai URU.TUR (Bastam) (No 419, line 1), the tablet of Toprakkale, No 424 Obv. 6, the temple inscription of Karmir-blur, No 424, 12,13.

³² Ayanis I, p. 316, Seal Ay-1.

³³ See G. Wilhelm, ZA 66, 1976, 105 ff., M. Salvini, «AIQN. Annali del Seminario di Studi del Mondo Classico Sezione Linguistica», 1, 1979, 98, 113. See also above at No 420a.

³⁴ M. Salvini, in: (W. Kleiss, Ed) *Bastam I*, Berlin 1979, 133; id. *Bastam II*, Berlin 1988, 125; U. Seidl, *ibid.* 146: seal B 3.

³⁵ U. Seidl, *Bastam II*, 147: seal B 4.

Nos 466-477. These small fragments should be attributed to Minua (see above on No 140), and individual numbering is useless.

No 471. Publishing these together with other fragments inserted in the wall of the citadel, in «Belleten» 37, 1973, 284, I drew a comparison with text UKN 28 (= KUKN 44), which enables us to reconstruct two geographical names. We may deduce that the scattered and re-used stones are from a large surface inscribed with the “*res gestae*”, or the “*Annals*” of Minua, and that the Kōrzūt text relates to only one important episode, a hypothesis I put forward in SMEA 22, 1980, 146.

Nº 511a-d. These should be attributed to Rusa II, although it is possible that they are later. In that case, however, one would have to deal with the question of the duration of the city-fortress of Bastam, and confront the theory of St. Kroll. There is an underlying more general problem concerning the introduction of texts on clay, that is to say inscriptions on tablets and bullae. The archaeological and philological documents available to date clearly show that this practice was introduced with the reign of Rusa II, whilst we have absolutely no evidence of any such kinds of documents in preceding periods.

No 2 of the appendix (p. 532), inscription on bronze rings from Yukarı Anzaf. This is a dedication by Išpuini and Minua to the god Țaldi, on the occasion of their conquest over the region of the city of Amuša. Harutjunjan notes that this city “obviously” does not have anything to do with the city of the same name, Amuša, conquered by Arğıšti II, as we learn from the stele of Sisian, published by Harutjunjan himself (No 411). We are, however, here in the presence of important historical information which we may connect with the rock inscription of Odzasar (No 39a), in which Išpuini and Minua show that they have conquered lands to the north of the Araxes, in Nachičevan, coming from the territory of modern-day Iranian Azerbaijan. The position of the stele of Sisian, although of a much later date, by Arğıšti II, demonstrates just how far the Urartian conquerors of the late IX century, Išpuini and his son Minua, pushed.

No 5 of the appendix (p. 533). Harutjunjan only presents the text of Dinçol, in his transcription, and quotes my paper in SMEA 40, 1998, saying that I simply reproduce the text. He does not realise that I had made a join with a slab in the Vorderasiatisches Museum of Berlin, and that the text of Minua differs notably.

Particular comments:

Page 407 on. It is fine to list the determinatives separately, but it seems to me entirely useless to have wasted so much energy gathering all the

quotations of D(INGIR), m, MEŠ, URU etc. The reader could have found these directly in the lists of divinities, personal names, and so on.

P. 413: under BANEŠ, as well as p. 451 under *kapi*, it would have been correct to quote M. Salvini, “Nuove iscrizioni urartee dagli scavi di Arinberd, nell’Armenia Sovietica”, SMEA 9 (1969), 7-24, who was the first to establish the absolute value of this unit for measuring dry goods.

P. 435: *armuzi*, “sem’jā”. See *Ayanis I*, p. 262, due to alternance with NUMUN. See also sub *zil(i)bi* (p. 476).

P. 437: Harutjunjan continues to translate ^(E)*ašihusi* as “house of sacrifices”, following König in this, HchI p. 175, “Trankopfer-Kultraum” oder “Götter-Tempel”; but he brings no new evidence to that which we already had. Thus, I do not know how this is to be translated.

P. 461. ^(E)*susi(e)* “sanctuary”; Harutjunjan still does not have in the glossary the identification with “temple-tower”, whilst at p. 138 note 8 in the commentary of the text of Kevenli (No 141) he considers my comparison of the Urartian *susi* and the Assyrian *is-tu* very probable, with the consequent translation “temple-tower”.

P. 473, *urišhi*, ^(E)*urišhusi*; only the second has the determinative of building, not the first. He reproduces the traditional translation, respectively “object, instrument” and “storehouse”, showing that he is not aware of my translations “property” and “treasure”, in SMEA 22, 1980, 185s.

P. 477. ^DAdaruta is a deified mountain; cf. Andarutta (Sg. 8, 424) and Andarutu (stele of Mergeh Karvan by Rusa I: *Tra lo Zagros e l’Urmia*, p. 84. See my comments above on the Bilingual inscription of Topzawa (No 387).

P. 490: Harutjunjan writes: “^mŠaga – name of the eldest son (DUMU *tara*) of the king of Iški/ugulu”. The name is really ^mšá-ga-pu_x-tar-a, see *Ayanis I*, 262 and 271f.

P. 491: no longer ^mTUR-Tata but ^mpu_x-ta-ta-, see *ibid*.

P. 511. ^{URU}Išala(ni); this is one of the very place names also known from Assyrian sources (^{URU}Izalla: see therefore the important study by K. Kessler, *Untersuchungen zur historischen Topographie Nordmesopotamiens nach keilschriftlichen Quellen des 1. Jahrtausends v. Chr.*, Wiesbaden 1980, p. 25. Cf. also RIA V, 1976-80, 225f. [J. N. Postgate]).

P. 516. ^{KUR}Muškini, the presentation of the historical-geographical data is excellent, re-establishing and delimiting their true meaning, beyond hasty identifications with Phrygia which have, however, been made. It is not correct, however, to say that this place name is mentioned between Ziuquni and Hate (in text No 414). The position of Ziuquni on the northern shore of Lake Van is, moreover, clear also to Harutjunjan himself, see p. 530 s.v. Ziuquni.

P. 517, s.v. ^{KUR}Nuniba(ḥali); these are not seal impressions which we find

on the bullae of Bastam, from which this and other place names derive, but writings on bullae which served as small clay tablets, or dockets. The heading for pl. CLXXIII, 1, correctly defines them as “writings on clay bullae”.

These comments could continue, but this article-review is already too long. In conclusion, I may say that the new Urartian corpus by Harutjunjan, despite its size, does not represent a reliable reference manual for the reasons I have outlined above. This is not to say that, among the numerous philological observations, one cannot find precious information or acceptable proposals.

A scholar interested in Urartian texts, therefore, must also refer to the older corpora, CICH, UKN, UKN II, HchI and UPD, which complement each other and contain all the useful information gathered before 1970. Unfortunately, for later discoveries, new publications of texts, new editions and joins, the situation with regard to KUKN is, in general, as I have described it and one must refer time after time to the original editions.

Mirjo Salvini

Istituto per gli Studi Micenei ed Egeo-Anatolici (CNR)

via Giano della Bella, 18

I – 00162 Roma