SAA XI consists of an introduction, transliterations and
translations of the texts, a glossary, indices, corrigenda to SAA
VII (Imperial Administrative Records, Part I: Palace and Tem-
ple Administration [Helsinki, 1992]), collations, and copies.
The 233 texts edited in the volume are divided into two main
sections (1. provincial administration and taxation, and 2. mil-
itary administration and population management), which are
classified further into ten thematic groups: 1. geographical lists
(nos. 1-14); 2. building texts (nos. 15-22); 3. miscellaneous
commodities (nos. 23-48); 4. sealings (nos. 49-75); 5. domes-
tic animals (nos. 76-105); 6. horses (nos. 106-121); 7. military
personnel (nos. 122-143); 8. deportees and displaced persons
(nos. 144-200); 9. Harran census (nos. 201-220); and 10.
schedules of land and people (nos. 221-233). The majority of
the material was first published by C.H.M. Johns in Assyrian
Deeds and Documents (ADD; Cambridge, 1898-1923) and in
An Assyrian Doomday Book or liber censuum of the District
around Harrân; in the Seventh Century B.C. (ADB; Leipzig,
1901). An additional 53 texts have been added to this corpus:
47 hitherto unpublished tablets or their fragments (copies on
pp. 201-211) and 6 texts from the 1954 excavations at Nebi

Very few texts edited in the volume are complete; the major-
ity are fragmentary and are often composed of several
small fragments. Of all Neo-Assyrian documents, adminis-
trative records are probably the most difficult for Assyriolo-
gists to analyze; this is in part due to their poor state of
preservation. Despite this, Fales and Postgate have made a
tremendous effort in presenting up-to-date and reliable edi-
tions, as well as gathering the texts into fairly coherent
groups. The editions themselves are a great improvement
over those published by Johns. The accuracy of the transli-
terations was ensured by repeated collation of the texts. Such
time consuming work deserves our appreciation. Over all, the
translations raise little doubt, given the stereotypical nature
of the texts and the number of difficult technical terms; from
time to time there is inconsistency in the translation of indi-
vidual words, but this is a minor complaint.

The republication of the so-called “Harran Census” (nos.
201-220) makes these texts available to a new generation of
scholars and their students; this is particularly important
given the number of studies on Harran which have been
announced recently (K. Åkerman, The City of Harrân in the
Neo-Assyrian Period; and S.W. Holloway, “Materials for the
Study of Harrân: Bronze Age to the Fall of Assyria: Part 1:
Texts”). 1) The tablets and fragments are arranged into three
groups: tablets and fragments bearing “scribe A”-type char-
acteristics (nos. 201-212), those written in a “scribe B”-type
manner (nos. 213-218), and “two unusual texts” (nos. 219-
220). For details on the specific orthographic habits of scribes
A and B, see S. Parpola, ZA 64 (1975) pp. 98-110. Of the
texts assigned to the series, no. 219 is perhaps the most
usual since it mentions property belonging to the chief cup-
bearer (GAL KAŠ.LUL), the palace herald (600 KUR), the
sartinnus (sar-tin), the governor of Nineveh (NAM NINA.Î),
the treasurer of the crown prince (IGLDUB A MAN), the
treasurer of the Aššur temple (IGLDUB E aš-šur), and the
Ištar temple at Hušûrûnu (115 URU ḫu).

1) The reviewer’s dissertation (Shultul, Ezipar, Emelamana, and Shî’s
Akkû House: A Study of Assyrian Building Activities at Harrân [Toronto,
2003]) is not included since its central theme is on Assyrian building
activities, particularly during the reign of Assurbanipal (668-631).
Despite the exact purpose or administrative occasion of the series being unspecified in the texts themselves, Fales — working upon Parpola’s proposed date of the texts (ZA 64 [1975] p. 108) and Postgate’s suggestion of the purpose of the series (JESHO 17 [1974] p. 229) — argues convincingly that “The compilation of the ‘Harran Census’ could be referred — at least as a working hypothesis — to the vast operation of tax-exemption undertaken by Sargon upon his ascent to the throne, by which the kidimmātu that the cities of Assur and Harran had enjoyed of old, and that had lapsed, was ‘restored.’” The “Harran Census” is probably a register of the landed properties in the area around the newly exempted city. We currently have no information on how Sargon II implemented the kidimmātu of Harran, apart from what he claims in his inscriptions. Furthermore, it would be interesting to know which official was responsible for carrying out the vast operation. Since Nabû-pāšir (PNA 2/II [Helsinki, 2001] pp. 858-859 no. 1) appears to have been the governor of Harran during the reign of Sargon, it is possible that he was involved in some manner in the preparation of the register of landed properties which were to be exempted from īlku- and tupškku-duities. Although the administrative records dealing with construction at Dūr-Sarrukin (nos. 15-22) are fragmentarily preserved, it should be noted that Harran, or Assur for that matter, does not appear in those texts, perhaps a further testament to its newly established kidinnu-status.

The only major discrepancy that the reviewer has with Fales’ translation of the “Harran Census” texts is with ḫipā-a-ni (or Ḫq-pa-a-ni) being regarded as a toponym (Fales, RSO 45 [1970] pp. 21-28). We regard it as a nominal form (possibly derived from an Aramaic word meaning “rocky area” [p. XXXII]); Johns (ADB p. 78 sub. Ḫqpānu) and V.A. Jakobson (AOAT 267 [Münster, 1999] pp. 241-243) interpret Ḫq-pa-a-ni as “(land) being under the control of the king’s official (qēpu).” Our reasoning is that the word occurs 14 times in the texts, but only once with a determinative (KUR Ḫq-an in no. 213 rev. ii 20). All of the other toponyms appearing in the series are preceded without exception by URU or URU.SE (rarely by KUR). In addition, passages such as 10 LIM GIS til-lit Ḫn 1 Ḫq-pa-a-ni 1 Ē 1 ad-ru, “10,000 vine stalks in the Ḫqānū; 1 house; (and) 1 threshing-floor” (p. 128 no. 203 iv 6-7), provide supporting evidence against the term in question being regarded as a geographical name; for Ḫqānū in similar contexts, see also p. 124 no. 201 iii 37 and p. 129 no. 203 rev. iii 10. Therefore, ṭi-na Ḫqānū in passages similar to PAP URU.SE LUGAL / qa-ni URU dim-me-ti / ṭi-na Ḫq-pa-a-ni (p. 122 no. 201 i 38-40) should probably be understood as “in the Ḫqānū (rocky area?)”, rather than “in the district of Ḫqānū.” However, KUR Ḫq-an in no. 213 rev. ii 20, should be regarded as a toponym.

In sum, SAA XI is a professional treatment of imperial administrative records dealing specifically with provincial and military administration. Fales and Postgate deserve our gratitude and appreciation for their contribution to the field of Neo-Assyrian studies.
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