

Reallexikon der Assyriologie und Vorderasiatischen Archäologie

Begründet von
E. Ebeling und B. Meissner

fortgeführt von
E. Weidner, W. von Soden und D. O. Edzard

herausgegeben von M. P. Streck

unter Mitwirkung von
G. Frantz-Szabó · M. Krebernik · D. Morandi Bonacossi
J. N. Postgate · U. Seidl · M. Stol · G. Wilhelm

Redaktion
T. Blaschke · S. Ecklin · J. Fechner · S. Pfaffinger

Band 13 · 5./6. Lieferung

Susa. B – Telipinu. B

2012

Sonderdruck

De Gruyter

hung wurden neben Keramik vor allem sehr fein gearbeitete Steingefäße, Flint- und Obsidian*-Klingen gefunden. Da das Material aus dem oberen Hangbereich des Hügels erodiert war, könnte die Belegung des Platzes bis in das akeram. Neolithikum zurückreichen. Die Parallelen der groben, häckselgemagerten Ware weisen in den zentralen Zagros: Scherben der „Standard-Painted Ware“, teilweise im charakteristischen „tadpole“-Muster, besitzen Parallelen in Qal’at* Garmō und Tepe Gurān O-H (RIA 3 Nachträge S. 722) (ca. 6500–6000); eine rotpolierte Ware mit Entsprechungen in Tepe Sarāb* und Gurān H-D datiert dagegen in den darauffolgenden Zeithorizont (ca. 6000–5600). Die Abschlagsindustrie von T. wird dem jüngeren Abschnitt der „Mlefatian industry“ zugerechnet (nach Kozłowski 1999), ebenfalls mit Vergleichen im Zagros und in Obermesopotamien. Von 168 gesammelten Obsidian-Fragmenten scheinen 77 % aus Kappadokien und 23 % aus der Van-Region zu stammen (Mortensen 2002; nach Wright 1969 tritt dagegen einzig Obsidian aus Bingöl und Nemrut Dağı in T. auf). Die Bearbeitung von Obsidian-Klingen in T. selbst ist sehr wahrscheinlich. Zwischen T. und Çogā Mamī wurde eine namenlose Fundstelle mit ‘Ubaid 2–4-Keramik entdeckt (Oates 1968, 10).

Kozłowski S. 1999: The eastern wing of the Fertile Crescent (= BAR IntSer. 760). – Mortensen P. 2002: A note on the chipped stone industry of Tamerkhan, IrAnt. 37, 219–226. – Oates J. 1968: Prehistoric investigations near Mandali, Iraq, Iraq 30, 1–30; ead. 1969: Choga Mami, 1967–1968: a preliminary report, Iraq 31, 115–152; ead. 1973: The background and development of early farming communities in Mesopotamia and the Zagros, Proceedings of the Prehistoric Society 39, 147–181. – Wright G. A. 1969: Obsidian analysis and prehistoric Near Eastern trade: 7500–3500 B.C.

K. B. Kaniuth

Tamariske (tamarisk).

§ 1. Modern flora. – § 2. Ancient terminology. – § 3. Wood. – § 4. Galls and bark. – § 5. Salt exudate. – § 6. Shade and windbreak. – § 7. Rituals and holy tamarisks. – § 8. In literature.

§ 1. Modern flora. “*Tamarix* is one of the most characteristic genera in the Mid-

dle East” (Zohary 1973, 385; see also Gamble 1922, 47; Willcox 1992, 2; Streck 2004, 254). Townsend/Guest 1980, 160–169 (see also Baum 1978) list eleven species of t. in modern Iraq. *Tamarix aphylla* (= *T. articulata*), a sometimes cultivated tree, attains heights of more than 10 m. Also common are *T. arceuthoides*, a “shrubby tree”, *T. ramosissima*, a “shrub or shrubby tree”, *T. brachystachys*, a “low tree or shrub”, and *T. aucherana*, a “tall or bushy shrub” (Townsend/Guest 1980, 162, 164, 167f.). *Tamarix* species grow almost everywhere in Iraq, esp. in steppes, deserts, wadis, river banks, dikes, on river islands, and in gardens (Garten*). They are drought resistant and salt-tolerant and they yield no fruit. For drawings and photos of t. see Streck 2004, 275, 280f. and the lit. ibid. 252 n. 13.

§ 2. Ancient terminology. Akk. *bīnu* (OAkk., OB and SB, rarely Ass.) was identified as t. by comparison with Jewish-Aramaic and Syriac *bīnā* (Streck 2004, 251f.). Another word in Akk. is *ṭarpa’u* (MB, SB, NA), related to Arabic *ṭarfā’* (ibid. 253f.). *bīnu* corresponds to Sum. *šinig* (MSL 5, 98: 67; Powell 1992, 106f.; Heimpel 2011, 127). The hapax legomena *kupu’ālu* and *tumānu*, equated in Malku II 137 with *bīnu*, are unclear (Hruša 2010, 217 and 343). The Hitt. word for t. is ^{gis}*pain(n)i-lpaeni-*, probably a loan from Akk. via Hurr., see CHD P 55f.

bīnu and *ṭarpa’u* denote t. species which yield timber, *šinig* is cultivated (see § 3) and *šinig/bīnu* is high enough to provide shade (see § 6). All these facts point to an identification with treelike species, probably chiefly *Tamarix aphylla*, apparently already present in ancient Mesopotamia (Streck 2004, 253).

§ 3. Wood. T. wood is “moderately hard” (Gamble 1922, 47) and “quite useful” in a region “where timber is scarce” (Townsend/Guest 1980, 166); for further botanical and ethnographic lit. see Streck 2004, 276. Roof beams made of t. were excavated in Larsa and Tall Abū Ṣalābīḥ (Moorey/Postgate 1992, 198). For identifi-

cations of t. wood from Tell ed-Dēr and ‘Uwēli see Moorey 1994, 360. In Garšana t. roof beams are “always mentioned after Euphrates poplar, which indicates that they were rated less valuable as building timber” (Heimpel 2011, 127). The trees are qualified in Ur III texts as gal “large”, murub₄ “medium”, gīd “long” (Heimpel 2011, 84), tur(-tur) “small” (ibid. 92, 96), ê-da, lit. “side of the house” and dim “post” (both unclear, ibid. 91), and ḤAR, perhaps “transplant” (ibid. 142f.). Ur III texts mention t. timbers from 6 to 12 cubits (ca. 6.50 m) length (Streck 2004, 252; Heimpel 2011, 92). Monocultures of t. trees managed by a lú ḡišsinig “t. person” are attested in the ED and the Ur III period indicating “the centrality of the tamarisk in tree culture” (Heimpel 2011, 79, see also ibid. 78 and 145f.). They were planted in large numbers in gardens, associated with date palms or pines (ibid. 79, 83f., 92, 127, 146f.), on dikes (ibid. 92f.) and river banks (ibid. 77f.), and, together with willows (Weide*) and reed (Schilf*), in the *nagab-tum* “reed pasture” (ibid. 80). T. wood is worked by the *naggāru* “carpenter”. Parts of the tree used include *utlu* “trunk” (Streck 2004, 277); pa-ku₅ “cut-branches” one cubit long (Heimpel 2011, 142); *papallu* “twigs” (Streck 2004, 277); saḡ-ku₅ “cut-tops” (Heimpel 2011, 121). T. wood was used for:

a) ḡiš-ūr “roof beams” (Heimpel 2011, 78, 83, 141; see also wood remains in excavations, above); ig “door” MSL 6, 44: 12. See also Moorey/Postgate 1992, 185 and 189f., Moorey 1994, 359 and Streck 2004, 253 for *tarpa’u* mentioned in connection with palace-suits.

b) Implements of different kinds, generally designated as *unūt šipri* (Streck 2004, 277), or specifically mentioned: eme apin “plow shares” (Heimpel 2011, 78, 83, 141, explicitly mentioned also by Gamble 1922, 47); zú ḡiš gán ūr-ra “tines of harrow beams” (Heimpel 2011, 78, 83, 141); al “hoe”, *marru* “spade”, and the loom (Streck 2004, 276); *pilaqqu* “spindle whorl” CAD B 242 *bīnu* A d2’; *ḥaššinnu* “ax”, *patru* “dagger” CAD B 242 *bīnu* A

d4’ “in magic use”. For “weapons” in Hitt. see CHD P 55f.

c) Furnishings, generally designated as *muttalliku* (Streck 2004, 276), or specifically mentioned: banšur/*paššūru* “table”, ḡiš-gu-za “chair”, ḡiri-gub “footstool” (Streck l.c.).

d) Containers: *mallatu* “plate”, *buniḡ/buginnu* “trough”, *kappu* “bowl”, *itqūru* “spoon” (Streck 2004, 276; CAD B 242 *bīnu* A d3’; T 62 *tarpa’u*).

e) A *makurru*-boat “in magic use” CAD B 242 *bīnu* A d4’; Wiggermann 1992, 90.

f) Divine statues (Streck 2004, 277f.) and “figurines in magic use” (CAD B 242 *bīnu* A d5’). See “the bone of divinity, the consecrated tamarisk (*bīnu*), the holy wood for the image of the statues” Wiggermann 1992, 9: 81f.

g) For t. perhaps used as firewood see Moorey 1994, 348; Streck 2004, 278.

§ 4. Galls and bark. “The bark and the galls ... are employed for tanning and their medicinal usage is traditional, dating back in our territory at least to Babylonian and Sumerian times” (Townsend/Guest 1980, 161; for further botanical lit. see Streck 2004, 285). *kamūn bīni* “t. galls” (ibid. 285f.) and *qulēpti bīni* are used as ingredients in medical receipts (CAD B 241 *bīnu* A c5’ and 9’). The equation of *kamūn bīni*, lit. “fungus of the t.”, with *gabū* “alum”, a known tanning agent and corrosive, indicates that the galls were used for tanning also in Mesopotamia (Streck 2004, 286).

Hardly correct J. Kinnier Wilson, JMC 6 (2005) 9: *kamūn bīni* = *Cynomorium*, a fungus on the roots of desert shrubs, and *zēr bīni*, lit. “seeds of the t.” = t. gall because the fungus is not a tanning agent and a word for the ubiquitous t. seeds would be missing.

§ 5. Salt exudate. “The twigs are often hoary with a saline efflorescence” (Gamble 1922, 47; for further botanical lit. and a photo see Streck 2004, 281). In the debate between *Date Palm and Tamarisk* (see § 8) ll. 45’f., the t. boasts of being full of *šumbabû/šubbabû*. Whereas Wilcke 1989, 181 and 189 understood this as a reference to

the “manna” of *T. mannifera* – in fact the excretions of insects puncturing the twigs of t. – Streck 2004, 279–282 argues for an identification with the common salt exudate of all t. species, because *T. mannifera* is not found in Iraq and the description of *bīnu* in the debate points more to a tree than a shrub. Another word for this salt exudate is probably *ḫil bīni* in BAM 1, 1 i 39.

§ 6. Shade and windbreak. T. “provide shade and pleasant green screens in gardens” (Townsend/Guest 1980, 161; for further botanical lit. see Streck 2004, 276). According to the debate between *Date Palm and Tamarisk* (see § 8) ll. 9f., the king plants a t. (*bīnu*) in his palace in whose shade he feasts (Streck 2004, 274). Cf. *Nin-ḡišzida’s Journey* (ZA 93, 76) ll. 33–35: “I am like a t. (*šinig*) that no one irrigated with early waters, so no one can sit in its shade”, an image of a t. that does not accomplish its normal task. In the Ur III tablet PDT 918 from Drehem t. are planted in three strips. The distance between the trees – between 0.63 m and 3.23 m – is given in the text, an indication that the presumably watered and shaded ground between the trees was used. Additionally, the strips of trees probably also provided a windbreak (Heimpel 2011, 78).

§ 7. Rituals and holy tamarisks. In the debate between *Date Palm and Tamarisk* (see § 8), the latter refers to itself in l. 36’ as a *mašmaššu* “exorcist” who purifies and renews the temple. The magic use of t., esp. in purifying rites, is often mentioned in cuneiform texts: see CAD B 240f.; Gudea Cyl. B iv 10f.: “when they purified the E-ninnu with t. (*šinig*)”. For the use of t. in Hitt. purification rituals see CHD P 55f. Often *mê bīni* “t. water”, i. e. holy water mixed with (crushed) t. twigs, is used (Streck 2004, 284f.: not “t. sap”!). The magical and purifying power of t. is most probably related to the typically deep roots of t. that connect the tree with the *apsû*, the source of the holy water (Krebernik 1984, 226f.; Streck 2004, 282–284, also discussing other opinions).

Sometimes t. of gods are mentioned (M. Stol, Fs. W. H. Ph. Römer 423, e. g.: t. of Enlil TCL 1, 145: 6; of Šamaš VS 18, 24: 4; of Ningišzida OECT 15, 18 r. 24). Also the “lone t.” might be a holy tree (if not simply referring to the habitat in the steppe), e. g. *Lugalbanda* (C. Wilcke, Das Lugalbandaeos [1969]; ETCSL 1.8.2.2) 399f.; AMT 90, 1 r. iii 8; BAM 3, 244: 58 (*ēda*); STT 2, 254: 29 (*aḫû*).

§ 8. In literature. The debate poem between *Date Palm and Tamarisk* is known in Sumerian (Cavigneaux 2003, 53–57; ETCSL 5.3.7) and Akkadian (Wilcke 1989; Streck 2004). Both trees belong to the most important exponents of Mesopot. flora. Whereas the date-palm (Palme*) is the fruit-tree par-excellence the t. is typically fruitless. However, both trees also show common features, such as providing shade and being used in rituals (Streck 2004, 254f.).

The t. occurs in comparisons and metaphors. The frequent comparison “Like an uprooted t. (*šinig/bīnu*) it (the evil) must not come back” (CAD B 240 *bīnu* A 22’; Maul 1994, 65; GAAL 2, 70: 39; 68: 20) probably refers to the deep roots of the tree (Streck 2004, 284). The metaphor “My lord/Enlil, your face is a t. (*bīnu*)” Atr. I 93f., 95f. and the comparison “Her face became green-yellow like a t. (*bīnu*) twig” *Ištar’s Descent* (SAACT 6, 10) l. 29 are images for turning pale (Streck 1999, 71 and 98). In *Inana and Dumuzi Y* (ETCSL 4.8.25) l. 37a “shaggy-necked one” is compared with a t. (*ḡiššinig*).

Baum B. R. 1978: The genus tamarix. – Cavigneaux A. 2003: Fragments littéraires susiens, Fs. C. Wilcke 53–62. – Gamble J. S. 1922: A manual of Indian timbers: an account of the growth, distribution, and uses of the trees and shrubs of India and Ceylon with descriptions of their wood-structure. – Heimpel W. 2011: Twenty-eight trees growing in Sumer, in: D. I. Owen (ed.), *Garšana studies* (= CUSAS 6), 75–152. – Hrůša I. 2010: Die akkadische Synonymenliste *malku* = *šarru* (= AOAT 50). – Krebernik M. 1984: Die Beschwörungen aus Fara und Ebla (= TSO 2). – Maul S. M. 1994: Namburbi. – Moorey P. R. S. 1994: Ancient Mesopotamian materials and industries: the archaeological evidence. – Moorey P. R. S./Postgate J. N. 1992: Some wood identifications from Meso-

potamian sites, BSA 6, 197–200. – Powell M. A. 1992: Timber production in presargonic Lagaš, BSA 6, 99–122. – Streck M. P. 1999: Die Bildersprache der akkadischen Epik (= AOAT 264); id. 2004: Dattelpalme und Tamariske in Mesopotamien nach dem akkadischen Streitgespräch, ZA 94, 250–290. – Townsend C. C./Guest E. 1980: Cornaceae to Rubiaceae (= Flora of Iraq 4/1). – Wiggermann F. A. M. 1992: Mesopotamian protective spirits: the ritual texts (= CumMon. 1). – Wilcke C. 1989: Die Emar-Version von “Dattelpalme und Tamariske”: ein Rekonstruktionsversuch, ZA 79, 161–190. – Willcox G. H. 1992: Timber and trees: ancient exploitation in the Middle East: evidence from plant remains, BSA 6, 1–31. – Zohary M. 1973: Geobotanical foundations of the Middle East 1–2 (= Geobotanica Selecta 3).

M. P. Streck

Tamarmara s. Šulinkatte.

Tamas(s)os s. Tamesu/i.

Tambaja, Tabbaja. Im neuass. Staatskult verehrte Gottheit, mehrmals zusammen mit Šamša/ija* genannt. T. besaß Kultbilder im Assur-Tempel, wo sie zum Kreis der Mullissu (Ninlil*) zählte (STT 88 i 46, s. R. Frankena, BiOr. 18 [1961] 199: ^dTam-ba-ia // ABL 1413: 6': ^dTab-b[a-a-a]; GAB 20), und im Sin-Samaš-Tempel (III R 66 ii 30: ^dTam-ba-a-a // STT 88 ii 55: ^dTab-ba-ia). Auf letzteren bezieht sich wohl der fragmentarische Brief SAA 13, 47, welcher von Statuen der Gottheiten Nikkal (Ningal*), ^dTam-ba-a-a (Rs. 5, 7) und Šamaš handelt.

M. Krebernik

Tamesu/i (KUR^{uru}Ta-me-su, ^{uru}Ta-me-si, cf. NAT 344; RGTC 7/1, 247f.). Town on Cyprus (Zypern*) mentioned in several NA inscriptions. In his annals for 673, Esarhaddon gives a list of kings and their cities/countries, ten of which are said to be located on Cyprus, “the land of Jadnāna in the middle of the sea” (Borger, Ash. 60 § 27 v 68, 71f.). Together with kings from the Levant they provide wood and stone for Esarhaddon’s palace in Nineveh. The king of T. is called ^mGÍR-me-(e-)su, pos-

sibly to be read Admesu* (cf. Ionic Ἰαδμητος and Doric Ἰαδμητος, see Lipiński 1991, 61; id. 2004, 62, 71; Mayer 1996, 478f.; PNA 1, 54). Esarhaddon’s list is reproduced almost verbatim in Assurbanipal’s annals, where the same kings are reported to assist the Ass. king during his first Egypt. campaign in 667 (VAB 7, 140: 42 = BIWA 19 and 212). T. is probably identical with Homeric Τεμέση (Odyssey I: 184, see Lipiński 2004, 71) and with later Tamassos (Ταμασσός, Τάμασος; for Phoen. *tmš*, see P. Filigheddu, UF 38 [2006] 219), modern name Politiko. The town was built during the 8th cent. and lay close to a copper mine in the center of the island (Parpola/Porter 2001, maps 7 and 20).

Baurain C./Destrooper-Georgiades A. 1995: Chypre, in: V. Krings (ed.), La civilisation phénicienne et punique (= HdOr. 1/20), 597–631, esp. 618f. – Buchholz H.-G./Untiedt K. 1996: Tamassos: ein antikes Königreich auf Zypern. – Lipiński E. 1991: The Cypriote vassals of Esarhaddon, Fs. H. Tadmor 58–64; id. 2004: Itineraria Phoenicia (= Studia Phoenicia 18). – Mayer Wa. 1996: Zypern und Ägäis aus der Sicht der Staaten Vorderasiens in der 1. Hälfte des 1. Jahrtausends, UF 28, 463–484. – Onasch H.-U. 1994: Die assyrischen Eroberungen Ägyptens (= AAT 27). – Parpola S./Porter M. 2001: The Helsinki atlas of the Near East in the Neo-Assyrian period. – Senff R. 2002: Tamassos, Der Neue Pauly 12, 2.

W. H. van Soldt

Tamininga. T. (*Ta-mel-mi-ni-in-gal-qa*, *Ta-pi-ni-qa*) ist eine heth. Stadt unbekannter Lage, die nur als Herkunftsort einer Ištar-Gestalt des anatol.-hurr. Šauška*-Typs (mit Zofen Ninatta und Kulitta*) seit mittelheth. Zeit bezeugt ist. Ihre Erwähnungen im Zusammenhang mit Šamuḫa* (KUB 12, 5 i 1; iv 17'–21' [CTH 713], mittelheth. mit jung-heth. Duplikaten bzw. Parallelen, s. Wegner 1995, 83–96) und später auch mit der dortigen Šauška (KUB 27, 1 ii 48 [CTH 712], s. Wegner 1995, 31 Z. 4, und 40 Z. 48; hurr. Adjektiv *ta-me-ni-ga-ḫe*) sowie mit Karahna (KUB 25, 32+ i 17' [CTH 681], s. McMahon 1991, 60 Z. 37) bieten allerdings keinen sicheren Hinweis auf die Lage der Stadt; s. Miller 2004, 384 n. 600; vgl. Danmanville 1962, 56f.