

BC. It seems inevitable however to check the original tablets once again before the final editing state to avoid misinterpretation in many cases.

Stefan Jakob
University of Heidelberg

HELMUT FREYDANK:

Assyrische Jahresbeamte des 12. Jh. v. Chr.: Eponymen von Tukultī-Ninurta I bis Tukultī-apil-ešarra I.

(Alter Orient und Altes Testament 429.) xiv, 251 pp. Münster: Ugarit Verlag, 2016. ISBN 978 3 86835 179 8.

doi:10.1017/S0041977X17000039

This book is a welcome update to its author's earlier work on the Assyrian yearly eponyms of the late second millennium BCE (H. Freydank, *Beiträge zur mittelassyrischen Chronologie und Geschichte* [SGKAO 21], Berlin, 1991; hereafter *BMCG*). The present book is concerned with the eponyms of the period from Tukultī-Ninurta I to Tiglath-pileser I. Those eponyms are discussed mostly on the basis of administrative tablets from the Aššur temple archive (archive M4 in O. Pedersén, *Archives and Libraries in the City of Assur I*, Uppsala, 1985, pp. 43–53).

The book comprises an introduction, seven chapters of discussion, alphabetical lists of eponym names with citations of cuneiform tablets mentioning them, a table presenting the absolute chronology of the Assyrian kings, concordances listing the tablets discussed in the book and indexes.

Freydank (p. 4) declines to adopt a definite position on whether the Assyrian calendar in the thirteenth–twelfth centuries BCE was purely lunar (without intercalation) or luni-solar. Listing the eponyms of the reign of Tukultī-Ninurta I, Freydank specifies (pp. 8–10) his regnal years as 1233–1196 BCE, which means that he considers the average length of the Assyrian calendar year as equal to that of the Julian year (365.25 days). Also, the dating of the beginning of the reign of Tukultī-Ninurta I to 1233 BCE is based on the low chronology of the Middle Assyrian period, assuming only 36 years of reign for Aššur-dān I – a number which is actually not mentioned in any manuscript of the Assyrian King List (AKL), and whose restoration in the Nassouhi manuscript is problematic. In his discussion of the problem (p. 1), Freydank leaves open the possibility that Aššur-dān I reigned for 46 years.

The sequence of the first sixteen eponyms in the reign of Tukultī-Ninurta I is commonly agreed. Freydank's discussion centres on the eponyms of the subsequent period. Most of the discussion is dedicated to Llop's proposal (*Time and History in the Ancient Near East* [CRRAI 56], Winona Lake, IN, 2013, pp. 549–59) to place the eponyms Bēr-nādin-apli and Ninu'āyu before Abī-ilī son of Katiri, hence in the late second decade of Tukultī-Ninurta's reign. Freydank is sceptical of Llop's proposal, observing that only the eponym Bēr-nādin-apli, but not Ninu'āyu, is attested in the archive from Tell Šēḫ Ḥamad. This objection would be valid if one could assume that the chronological coverage of the archive from Tell Šēḫ Ḥamad is complete. Yet it is possible that tablets belonging to some eponym years are simply missing from the archive.

More importantly, the recent publication of ration lists from Tell Šēḫ Ḥamad by Salah has demonstrated that several girls born no later than the eponym year of Abattu son of Adad-šamšī (the tenth regnal year of Tukultī-Ninurta I) were still considered to belong to the age-category *tārītu* – the penultimate pre-adult age-category, before *talmitu* “apprentice” – in the eponym year of Salmānu-šuma-ušur, which

Salah places 12 years later (S. Salah, *BATSH* 18, pp. 53–4). This time span is too large. Some of the eponyms placed by Salah between Abattu son of Adad-šamši and Salmānu-šuma-ušur should be omitted from the sequence. Moreover, since the eponym Abī-ilī immediately preceded Salmānu-šuma-ušur, it is difficult to place either Ninu'āyu or Bēr-nādin-apli before Abī-ilī. These considerations are not mentioned by Freydanck.

Freydanck's discussion of the eponyms of the reigns of the descendants of Tukultī-Ninurta I before Ninurta-apil-Ekur (pp. 15–28) is based, to a large extent, on the presentation of the chronology of the archive from Tell Šābī Abyaḍ, given by Frans Wiggermann at the 60th RAI (Warsaw, July 2014). This is important, as the archive from Tell Šābī Abyaḍ unfortunately remains unpublished. Another source of eponyms for this period is the Aššur temple archive M4 – more precisely, the tablets dating to the period of activity of Aba-lā-īde as the administrator of regular offerings during the reigns of Aššur-nērārī III and Ellil-kudurrī-ušur.

In this regard it should be noted that Freydanck (p. 17, n. 40) reads the name of the eponym dating the tablet *MARV* III 28, from the period of the activity of Aba-lā-īde, as Ibašši-ilī (^mI.GÁL-DINGIR). In the published hand-copy of the tablet, the eponym name (in the last line on the upper edge) is shown as badly damaged, but the final sign is drawn as Ú rather than DINGIR. However, the photograph of the tablet now available on the CDLI website (<http://cdli.ucla.edu/dl/photo/P281972.jpg>) allows the reading DINGIR for the final sign. In total, 16 eponyms are attested for the reigns of the descendants of Tukultī-Ninurta I, which indicates that his son Aššur-nādin-apli must have reigned for four years rather than three (pp. 16, 22–3).

With regard to the reign of Ninurta-apil-Ekur (pp. 29–32), the eponyms belonging to this period are attested in the archive M4, in the periods of the activity of Sīn-uballit and Sīn-nādin-apli as the administrators of regular offerings. Freydanck reverses his earlier reconstruction in *BMCG* (pp. 69–70), and now places Sīn-nādin-apli before Sīn-uballit.

Most of the discussion in the book (pp. 33–101) is dedicated to the period of the reigns of Aššur-dān I, his two sons (Ninurta-tukilti-Aššur and Mutakkil-Nusku), and his grandson Aššur-rēša-iši I. It is still impossible to reconstruct any extensive sequence of eponyms in this period, but Freydanck has managed to assemble a large number of individual eponyms, covering the majority of the reign of Aššur-dān I even if he reigned for 46 years (Freydanck, pp. 50–51, lists the eponyms assuming a 36-year reign).

The AKL mentions the term *tuppišu* as the duration of the reigns of Ninurta-tukilti-Aššur and Mutakkil-Nusku. This term has been recently interpreted by H.D. Baker (*RA* 104, 2010, pp. 131–62) as meaning “one year”, based mostly on Neo-Babylonian house rental documents. Freydanck (pp. 33, 38–42) does not accept this interpretation, arguing instead for a long regency period of Ninurta-tukilti-Aššur (at least), subsumed under the nominal reign of his father Aššur-dān I. It is true that Ninurta-tukilti-Aššur is attested in a prominent position during several eponym years, but this does not rule out the possibility that he spent most of his career as a prince in the service of his royal father, and formally reigned for one year only.

The final chapter of the discussion (pp. 102–29) deals with the eponyms of the reign of Tiglath-pileser I (1114–1076 BCE). The eponyms of the final eleven years of his reign are attested in the eponym list *KAV* 21–4 (see pp. 124–9). For the preceding three decades, individual eponyms are known, and their distance from the eponym year of the king himself – his first regnal year – can be estimated based on the shifts of the Assyrian calendar months with regard to the months of the Babylonian calendar (*BMCG*, pp. 82–7). Interestingly, for one of those eponyms – Taklāk-ana-Aššur, in the early third decade of the reign of Tiglath-pileser I – a name-sake should now be postulated around the beginning of that king's reign (pp. 74–8).

Freydank has offered his readers a meticulous study, whether or not one agrees with all of his conclusions. It will be indispensable for further research on Middle Assyrian chronology.

Yigal Bloch
University of Haifa

ILAN PELED:

Masculinities and Third Gender. The Origins and Nature of an Institutionalized Gender Otherness in the Ancient Near East.

(Alter Orient und Altes Testament 435.) 333 pp. Münster: Ugarit-Verlag, 2016. €109. ISBN 978 3 86835 195 8.

doi:10.1017/S0041977X17000040

Interest in gender studies has undergone a notable expansion in recent decades, and the arena of ancient Near Eastern studies is no exception to this general rule. Nevertheless, the vast majority of the research in this field has focused on women; it has equated women with gender, rather than acknowledging that women's studies are just one branch among other possible developments in gender studies. A monograph whose title announces that "masculinities", "third gender" and "gender otherness" are the subjects it will examine is, without doubt, a welcome contribution to gender studies in general and to ancient Near Eastern studies in particular. The author, Ilan Peled, who has published a revised version of his PhD dissertation, is to be congratulated for his courageous choice of research topic and for his thorough treatment of both the primary sources and the secondary literature.

The volume comprises five chapters preceded by an introduction and followed by a summary and conclusions section. The first chapter presents a selection of texts. Chapters 2–5 are devoted to the analysis of mainly Sumerian and Akkadian terms identified and labelled by Peled as "third gender figures", i.e. *gala/kalû*, *kulu'u*, *assimmu*, *kurgarrû*, *lû-sag/ša rēši*, *girseqû*, *tiru/tîru*, SAG-UR-SAG, *pi-li-pi-li/pilpilû*, *sinnišānu*, *nāš pilaqqi* and *parû*. In his analysis of each term Peled offers a state-of-the-art of the research together with a selection of texts, in transliteration and in English translation. In doing so – that is, by confronting primary sources with hypotheses proposed in the secondary literature, rather than privileging the purely philological debate – the author aims to assess the plausibility of certain arguments, giving at the same time his own interpretations and tentative translations in order to provide a clearer explanation of how gender is constructed and shaped through these figures. As a result, this monograph offers a useful selection of primary sources presented in an accessible way to both Assyriologists and to non-specialists interested in the field (p. 25). The work is a welcome contribution and is likely to facilitate a fruitful (and very necessary) multidisciplinary debate. The author states that he "saw no point in reinventing the philological wheel" (p. 15). In other words, care in the treatment of primary sources does not necessarily mean offering completely new translations; all too often, an overemphasis on philological aspects can detract from the analysis and interpretation, but this is certainly not a criticism that can be levelled at Peled's book.

Indeed, in the introduction the author declares that his aim is "to present a lexical study with a limited degree of interpretation" (p. 18). However, I would say that it is impossible to limit the degree of interpretation, especially in a research topic like this one, where fundamental choices such as the use of the label "third gender" and the selection of the above-mentioned terms as subjects for inquiry already involve a