NOTES BRÈVES

24) Damascus, Hatarikka and Simirra in Tiglath-pileser III’s Summary Inscriptions - In his edition of Tiglath-pileser III’s inscriptions, H. Tadmor (The Inscriptions of Tiglath-pileser III King of Assyria, Jerusalem 1994, pp. 136-139) published his reconstruction of Summary Inscription 4 together with George Smith’s original rough copies and the draft of his reconstructed text (Plates XLIX-LI). The inscription is partly broken and Tadmor restored it on the basis of the king’s other inscriptions. He divided the beginning of the text (lines 1-8) into two parts; The annexation of northern and central Syria in 738 (lines 1-5) and the annexation of Damascus in 733-732 (lines 5-8). Recently, G. Galil (“New Look at the Inscriptions of Tiglath-pileser III”, Biblica 81 [2000], pp. 511-514) suggested to separate lines 5-6 from lines 7-8. He arbitrarily adds a verb (abîl or akṣud) at the end of line 6 (although Smith’s draft clearly indicates that there is no room for a verb at the end of the line) and suggests that the former passage “includes territories of more than one kingdom”. In his opinion, lines 7-8 alone refer to the annexation of Damascus.

It seems to me that Tadmor’s division of lines 1-8 is correct: lines 1-5 outline Tiglath-pileser’s annexations in central Syria in 738 and lines 5-8 outline his annexations in southern Syria (i.e., Damascus) in 732. Moreover, the two passages are built in the same pattern. They both open with the preposition ʾissu (“from”) and a toponym whose location is marked by a relative sentence that opens by ša, to be followed by an adî (“as far as”) and a (long or short) list of toponyms that define the annexed territory. A formula of annexation and the number of governors established in the new provinces follow the topographical description.

Lines 1-5: I ruled [from Mount Yaraqu?] which is [xxxxx(x) of] the city of Hatarikka as far as [all of] Mount Saue (ŠUR Sa-ú-[e a-na gi-mir-ti-šú]), [the cities of] Gub[la, Ellishu?, Ši]mirra, Arqa, Zimar[xx, GN], Usnu, [Siannu, Ma’]ar[a]ba, Ri’sišu[ri], [GN2, together with (a-di)] cities (and) [empor]iums which are [on the shore] of the Upper [Sea] (šá [a-šš tam-tim] e-li-te). I placed four (text six) eunuchs [of mine over] them [as governors].

Lines 5-8: I annexed to Assyria [from Kashpuna which is on the shore of the Lower Sea [as far as the cities of Qa/Min]nite, Gil[ead, and] Abel-shi††i, which is on the border of Bit-Humi[a], the ent[ire land of] Bit-Haza’i]. I placed [x eunuch]s of mine [over them] as governors.

Notes:

Line 1: Mount Yaraqu is mentioned in Ann. 19* :8 as a district of the Kingdom of Hamath, and is located on the northern border of the province of Hatarikka. This is indicated by the description of Shalmaneser III’s eleven’s campaign, which relates that he passed along the foot of Mount Amanus, “crossed over the mountain of Yaraqu and descended against the towns of Hamath”. For the possible location of Yaraqu, see S. Yarnada, The Construction of the Assyrian Empire. A Historical Study of the Inscriptions of Shalmaneser III (859-824 BC) Relating to His Campaigns to the West, Leiden 2000, pp. 173-174, with earlier literature. Mount Saue may be identified with Jebel Ansariyeh, located north of Mount Lebanon (Ami. 19*:5-6; see Tadmor, ibid., p. 60). Summ. 4 defines the borders of the province of Hatarikka by northern (Mount Yaraqu) and southern (Mount Saue) topographical points, which are followed by a list of coastal towns.

Line 2: The full name of the city at the end of the line (Zi-mar-xx) is unknown. The restoration Zimar[ra] was probably made on the basis of the similarity to the city name Šimirra.
Line 4: A similar description appears in Ann. 13*:5, where the long list of coastal towns (lines 4-5) is closes with the words "which are on [the shore] of the sea, together with (other) towns [and] emporiums (a-di URU\textsuperscript{1MS} [E ka-ri])."

Line 6: Tadmor restored it [a-di lîb-bi URU\textsuperscript{1}Qa]-ni-te, i.e., biblical Kenath (Num 32:42; 1 Chr 2:23), modern Qanawat in the Hauran. I restored it [a-di\textsuperscript{1} URU\textsuperscript{1}Mi-in]-ni-te, i.e., biblical Mintith (Jud 11:33), on the western border of the Kingdom of Ammon (N. Na’aman, “Rezin of Damascus and the Land of Gilead," ZDPV 111 (1995), pp. 105-106). Abel-shittiq is biblical Abel-shittim (Num 33:49; abbreviated as Shittim in Num 25:1; Josh 2:1; 3:1), in southwestern Gilead, east of the city of Jericho. It is clear that the Assyrians considered the land of Gilead as part of the annexed Damascene territory. It seems to me that the Gilead was included in the province of Qarnini, which is why a province named Gilead is not included in the lists of Assyrian provinces.

Episodes describing the conquest or surrender of several Palestinian kingdoms and nomadic groups, including the Kingdom of Israel (lines 15-19), follow the Damascus episode. It supports Tadmor’s suggestion that lines 5-8 of Summ. 4 refer to the annexation of Damascus alone. Galil’s suggestion that the passage refers to other kingdoms is evidently wrong.

As noted by Tadmor, lines 1-8 of Summ. 4 are closely related to Summ. 9. A text resembling the outer passage must have covered a slab that has lost and of which Summ 4 forms the second part (see Tadmor, ibid., p. 137 and Summ. 14). The reverse of Summ. 9 opens with the provinces of central Syria and the coast (lines 1-2) and continues with Damascus (lines 3-4). The first passage may be restored as follows:

I annexed to Assyria [the city of Hata]rikka, as far as Mount Sa[u]ne, the city of Kashpuna on the shore of the Lower Sea [as far as Mount Ammanana]. [I placed over them] my two eunuchs as governors.

A third text that describes the central Syrian provinces appears in Summ. 6:22-24. Following is a suggested restoration of the text:

22. [\textit{[URU]}Ha-ta-rik-ka a-di\textsuperscript{KUR}Sa-u-e\textsuperscript{URU}\textit{ş}i-mir-t[a \textsuperscript{KUR}Ar-qa-a
23. [\textit{GN\textsuperscript{URU}}Ku-aš-pu-na ša a-ḫi tam-tim e-lī-tī] a-di\textsuperscript{KUR}Am-ma-na-na
24. [a-na mi-šir māt Aš-sur đū-ṭir-ra 2 \textsuperscript{LUG}su-ut-rēši-ia \textsuperscript{LUG}bēl]-piḫāti eli-šū-nu aš-ku-un

Notes:

Although the text is badly broken, it may safely be restored on the basis of Summ. 9. The two passages appear after passage(s) that relate(s) the conquest of Bit Agusi and Unqi. They first describe the scope of the province of Hatarikka and then define the scope of the province of Šimirra. Finally they mention the appointment of governors in the two provinces.

In sum, the similarity in structure and words of Summ 4 and 9 fully corroborates Tadmor’s identification of the Damascus episodes in the two inscriptions.

Nadav Na’aman (20-02-01)
Dept of Jewish History, Tel Aviv University
Ramat Aviv 69978 (Israel)

25) More Iranian Names in Late Babylonian Sources – The following names are all Old Iranian and are attested in Late Babylonian sources from the Achaemenid period. In this article some new reconstructions or translations are being proposed.

1) Ar-ba-\textsuperscript{i}-\textsuperscript{d}im-ri (FuB 14 17 no.7:3, perhaps U.E.)
This name has been explained as *Arba-mi\textsuperscript{thra}-, ‘the young friend’ or *Arva-mi\textsuperscript{thra}-, ‘brave through Mithra.’\textsuperscript{1} An alternative translation of *Arba-mi\textsuperscript{thra}- could be ‘young through Mithra.’

2) Pa-at-ni-e-šā (TCL 13 186:17)
Zadok concluded that the Iranian name behind this Babylonian writing begins with *Pati-\textsuperscript{2}. It might, however, be better to divide this name in *Pa\textsuperscript{th}ni-, ‘woman, wife,’ and -aišt-. ‘looking for.’ For *Pa\textsuperscript{th}ni-, see Old Indian pātī (SED 582) and Av. *pa\textsuperscript{th}ni- in dāmanā,pa\textsuperscript{th}ni-., nmānā,pa\textsuperscript{th}ni-, ‘lady of the house’ (AIW 1093), ha-pa\textsuperscript{th}ni-, ‘concubine’ (AIW 1765). As for -aišt-, we refer to Av. ašt-, ‘to look for’ (AIW 28:31). Accordingly the Iranian name is *Pa\textsuperscript{th}ni-ašt-, ‘looking for a wife.’

3) Pe-e-mar-di-ı (Dar. 427:20)
This is Iranian *Pa\textsuperscript{th}vāri-ı, ‘protecting the happiness.’ \textsuperscript{3}Pāyā- is a present stem from Av. pā-, ‘to protect’ (AIW 885-886) while *vrd- means ‘happiness,’ cf. Av. vṛvṛdi- (AIW 720).

4) Ra-za-am-ār-ma (Camb. 384:2) and Ra-za-am-ū-mar-ga\textsuperscript{4} (Camb. 384:3)
These names have often been thought to contain the element *razma-, ‘battle’ (cf. Av. rasman-, AIW 1513-1514).\textsuperscript{5} Two authors do not agree with this: Hinz believes that the first component of these names is *razam (acc.sg.), ‘vine,’ while Schmitt rejects the fact that -za-am-V would represent Ir. *razma-.\textsuperscript{6} The problem with Hinz’s conclusion is that his research does not result in meaningful names (see below). Schmitt does not give an alternative reconstruction.
Yet there is no problem in assuming a lecture *razma- for these two names. The vocal (V) that Schmitt uses in his argument to deny this reconstruction is of no importance since the rendering of Iranian vocals in Babylonian is not always very accurate. The question that should be asked is whether Bab. C/VC: (za-am) can represent Ir. C:C (_,tm/) or not, and it can. This is shown, for example, by the names *Rauxšna-dātā- and *Rauxšna-pāṭā-, both of whom’s first component is normally written Ra-šu-ān. This means that Bab. šu-un-renders Ir. /š-k₃-/ and thus that Bab. -za-am- can render /zm-. Consequently, the first component of the two names here under discussion is *razma-. An additional argument is that both names appear in one and the same text, so the writing ra-za-am- for frazmā- might merely be a graphic variant, connected with the particular scribe of Camb. 384.

Let us turn now to the second component of each name. First Ra-za-am-ār-ma will be discussed. Hinz reconstructs *Razgmarvar-, ‘cherishing vines’ for this name, but that is impossible, since -ār-ma- does not represent /barva-/. Several other possibilities have been given, but the most likely one is *Razmarva- ‘brave in battle’ (Av. aurva-, ‘brave,’ AiW 200). As for Ra-za-am-ū-mar-ga-, it can be easily stated that this name is problematic. The second part is written in the same way as the Babylonian versions of OP hauma-varga-, whose second component is not yet clearly analyzed. Yet, in combination with razma-, ‘battle,’ it is better to reconstruct the prefix hu-, ‘good, well,’ instead of the word hauma-. The proposal by Gershevitch to read *Razma-hu-arga- would leave the -m- in Ra-za-am-ū-mar-ga- unexplained. As for now the precise meaning of Ra-za-am-ū-mar-ga- remains unknown.

Dandamayev argues that both names belong to the same person whose Iranian name was *Raudāta-, a derivation from the root raod- ‘to grow’ (AiW 1492-1493), while Zadok derives Ū-ru-ud-da-at from *Ahurādāta-, ‘created by Ahura.’ Zadok is correct. Firstly, the spelling Ū-ru-ud-da-at does not support an Iranian name starting with an /š/. Secondly, the persons bearing this name cannot be the same, since they have different patronymics. Ruddatu is the son of a certain Ú-mar-[..], while Uruddat is the son of Ú-he-e-bar-ra-.
6) Šā-tat-na- (IMT 44:2)
This name is rendering Old Iranian *Šātātāna-. Its first component is without doubt Ir. šāata-, ‘prosperous,’ which is then followed by two suffixes: the hypocoristic suffix -ata- and the patronymic suffix -āna-.
7) Tu-ū-tu (PT 85: obv.3)
According to Dandamayev the etymology of this name is not known. Bab. Tu-ū-tu could, however, be a representation of an Iranian name *Tavātā-, a hypocoristic of *Tav-, ‘to be strong,’ see Av. and OP tav-(AiW 638-639).
8) Ū-pār-at-ta (Dar. 458:13)
Most likely we are dealing here with the Babylonian version of Iranian *hu-frata-, ‘good and fine.’ That a sign with the value /par/ (e.g. -par-, -pár-) can render Iranian /fr/ is shown by the names *Rauxšna-dåta- and *Rauxšna-dåta-. This name has been explained as Iranian *Våråna-, an -åna-patronymicon of Av. våra-, ‘will’ (AiW 1523). A better reconstruction might be *Hu-råna-, ‘he who is a good fighter’ to Av. ſåra-, ‘fighter’ (AiW 1523). According to Zadok, the spelling U-la-na-¥ (PBS 2/1 128:16) represents the same name with an /l/ interchange.
9) Ū-ra-a-nu- (TuM 2/3 189:19:U.E.)
This name has been explained as Iranian *Våråna-, an -åna-patronymicon of Av. våra-, ‘will’ (AiW 1411) or as Iranian *Hu-råna-, ‘having beautiful thighs,’ Av. ſåra- (AiW 1523). A further argument is that *Hu-råna- would leave the -m- in Ra-za-am-ū-mar-ga- unexplained.
10) Ū-šu-ta-pa-nu (IMT 53:7)
The Iranian name behind the Babylonian spelling is *Uštapāna-, analyzed by Donbaz and Stolper as composed of *Ušta- and *pāna-. The second part of this name is clearly to be connected with *pā- ‘to protect.’ The first part is considered by Donbaz and Stolper as being the passive perfect participle of the verb vas-, ‘to wish, to desire’ (AiW 1381-1382). In their view the name has to be interpreted as ‘protecting what is desired.’ Yet, if one connects the first part of this name with the Av. substantive ušta-, ‘happiness, well-being’ (AiW 417-418), the result would be the more appropriate name ‘protecting happiness.’

Notes
26) An Iranian Ghost-name: *Ωuθika-, ‘beetle’ — One of the many Iranian names, only known by their attestations in the so-called Nebenüberlieferung, is *Ωuθika-, a name first analyzed by Gershevitch and connected by him to New Persian süs, ‘beetle’. It is the intention here to prove that the name *Ωuθika-, that has no Middle or New Iranian attestations, is a ghost-name, i.e. a name that never existed and that therefore should be removed from the list of Iranian names.

In order to do this, one has first to assemble all possible spellings that have been connected with this name. There are five such spellings, all Elamite: Du-si-ka₄, Du-tuk-ka₄, Du-ut-tuk-ka₄, Šu-si-ka₄, and Tu-tuk-ka₄. The next step is to find an alternative solution for each of these five writings, which are without any doubt rendering Iranian names. For the occurrences of each spelling we refer to W. Hinz- H. Koch, Elamisches Wörterbuch, AMI Ergänzungsband 17 (Berlin, 1987) (= EW).

1) Du-si-ka₄ (EW 377)

This spelling was connected with *Ωuθika- by Gershevitch and this connection was accepted by Hinz. However, Mayrhofer has suggested a new explanation: *Ταυθικά-, the female equivalent of *Ταυθίκα-, an -ika-hypocorist of *Ταυ-, Skt. toadvisor, ‘granting abundantly’.²

2) Du-tuk-ka₄ (EW 379) and Du-ut-tuk-ka₄ (EW 388)

Both these writings were assigned to *Ωuθika- by Hinz, but Mayrhofer has shown that the Iranian name behind these Elamite spellings is actually *Dǔta-ka-, a -ka-hypocoristic of *Dǔta-, ‘messenger’ (Av. dûta-).³

3) Tu-tuk-ka₄ (EW 379)

Gershevitch argues that Elamite Tu-tuk-ka₄ is a rendering of *Dǔta-vahu-ka-, but this was rejected by Hinz, who proposed to read *Ωuθika-.⁴ This is based on the fact that the Elamite sign -tu- normally renders Iranian /d/. There is, however, (at least) one exception to this rule: in PF 1647:6-7 the month name *Drnabáziß is written tu-ur-na-bá-zí-iß, which proves that -tu-, albeit rarely, can render the Ir. consonant /d/. Accordingly, this name can be a representation of the same name as Du-(ut)-tuk-ka₄ and thus can be read *Dǔta-ka-, as Mayrhofer already has shown.⁵ An even better solution is to reconstruct a name *Ταυθικά- (no. 1). This reconstruction can be perfectly rendered by the spelling Tu-tuk-ka₄.

4) Šu-si-ka₄ (EW 1183)

There is complete concordance among the scholars on the analysis of this name:⁶ it is a clear representation of the Iranian name *Ωuθika-. The only dissident opinion comes from Delaunay,⁷ who considers this spelling as a rendering of the Kassite name Šuziga.⁸ His proposal, however, is not accepted by the El.Wb. 1183, that again stresses the fact that Šu-si-ka₄ is certainly Iranian, in particular that it is the Elamite version of *Ωuθika-.

While it is agreed that we must be looking for an Iranian name, it is not clear that this name is *Ωuθika-. A more plausible name behind this spelling could be *Çau-ka-, an -ka-hypocoristic of *Çau-ca-, which itself is a-ca-derivation of a short name, originating from a compound with *Çau-, ‘capable of,’ the Old Persian equivalent of Av. srao-.

As all the spellings that were connected with *Ωuθika- have been ‘disconnected’ from that name, there is no more reason to believe that such a name really existed and that it had a place in the collection of Iranian names.

Notes

1. I. Gershevitch, “Iranian Nouns and Names in Elamite Garb,” Transactions of the Philological Society 1969, p. 197. This analysis has been accepted subsequently by Hinz and Mayrhofer, see W. Hinz, Neue Wege im Altpersischen, Göttinger Orientforschungen. 3. Reihe: Iranica 1 (Wiesbaden, 1973), p. 89 and M. Mayrhofer, Onomastica Persepolitana: das altiranische


27) On the Beginning of the Ebla Royal Rituals (ARET XI) – The long Ebla royal rituals published in 1993 by P. Fronzaroli as ARET XI may be divided in six main parts (see Bonechi, forthcoming). The first part is rather short, and it may be summarized as follows:

[A1] The main subject: the entrance of the new queen of Ebla into the House of the King’s Father

[A2] Gift by the groom to the bride at the time of her sacrifices to the Sun-Goddess and for the deceased former king of Ebla

[A3] The bride leaves her house and enters the groom’s house (House of His Father)

[A4] Marriage: the king anoints the queen’s head with oil

I suggest in ARET XI 1 obv. 1:13 we may read [a]∅-[∅]-[∅] (ARET XI, p. 3: [∅]-[∅]-[∅]-[∅]-[∅]-[∅]). This new reading implies that, just before her entrance into His Father’s House (i.e. the house of the father of the new king, that is the apartments of the previous king of Ebla within the Palace G), the bride offers one sheep to the Sun-Goddess and one sheep for the previous king (and not for an ancient royal ancestor as Yibbi-li-im, whose mention here would rather surprising; he will be remembered later, during the rituals at Binaš). I think that it also means that the previous kings of Ebla died immediately before the day of the weddings referred to at the very beginning of ARET XI 1 and 2.

Therefore the first part of these rituals may run as follows:

(A 1) XI 1 obv. 1:1-6 // XI 2 obv. 1:1-6

1 wa-ma-sa a-a-du-ga-si [ma]-lik-[tum mi-in (or: si-in)] ē a-bi-š

And (in the following way the king) indeed takes her, the queen, to His Father’s House:

2 [wa-ma-sa x-x] ma-lik-tum mi-in (or: si-in) ē a-mu-š

[And (in the following way the king) indeed takes her, to His Father’s House]:

(A 2) XI 1 obv. 1:7-14 // XI 2 obv. 1:7-[15]

1 gu-λu{3}ām [kū-si-g]₂ nī-gū-[u]₁ udu ̲̲ udu dingir [a]-bū-[i]-sū-[mu-ta]-kā₁

One golden bracelet [is delivered (by the groom to the bride)] at the time of her offering of one sheep to the Sun-Goddess (and) of one sheep for his deceased father (i.e. Yigriš-Halabi).

2 [gu-λu{3}ām [kū-si-g]₂] šu-[mu]-ta]-kā₁ udu ̲̲ udu [nīdba₁] [u] udu dingir ...-iš nīdba₁

[One golden bracelet], delivered (by the groom to the bride when) one sheep to the Sun-Goddess is sacrificed (by her) [(and when) one sheep for the deceased former king (i.e. Yirkaš-damu) is sacrificed (by her)].

(A 3) XI 1 obv. 1:15-19 // XI 2 obv. 1:16-20

1 [wa-ma-sa] u-[il] ma-lik-tum ē a-bi-š

[And (the king) indeed brings] the queen to His Father’s House.

2 [wa-ma-sa u-il ma-lik-tum ē a-mu]-[iš]

[And (the king) indeed brings] the queen to His Father’s House.

(A 4) XI 1 obv. 1:20-II:7 // XI 2 obv. 1:21-II:6

1 wa-ma-sa i-giš al₃-sa sa ma-lik-tum gar mi-in [ud nū[mu]:sā ([∅]-bur-₁)] [m]a-[lik]-tum₁

And, on the [day of the] queen’s [wedding (of the kind bur-₁)], (the king) indeed put olive oil on the queen’s head.

2 [in ud nū[mu]:sā [∅]-bur-₁ [wa-ma-sa i-giš al₃-sa sa ma-lik-tum gar]]

On the day of the queen’s wedding of the kind bur-₁ [the king indeed put olive oil on the queen’s head].

Marco BONECHI (27-03-01)
Via Caduti sul Lavoro, 8
52100 AREZZO (Italie)
On the location of NA Parsua – Parsua (kur Par/Pár-su-a, uru Pár-su-a, kur Pa-ar-su-aš) was on the way from Laruete (in Allah/pria) to Missi according to the itinerary of Sargon II’s eighth campaign (TCL 3, 37ff.). Tiglath-Pileser III annexed the two provinces of Parsua and Bºt-Hamban to Assyria in 744 BC (see H. Tadmor, The inscriptions of Tiglath-Pileser III King of Assyria, Jerusalem 1994 [henceforth Tadmor 1994], 166 ad Summ. 7, 37 and 98: St. I B, 9’f.). Qal’eh Paswê not far from Solduz may be a survival of the name Parsua according to V. Minorsky, BSOAS 19 (1957), 78f. (cf. A.H. Sayce, JRAS 1882, 389; J.V. Kinnier Wilson, Iraq 24, 1969, 111f.). Qal’eh Paswê is far enough from the southern shore of Lake Urmiya. This location is still compatible with the conclusion of L. D. Levine (Iran 12, 1974, 112) that Parsua was raided, but not conquered by Urartu. His localization of Parsua northwest of the Mahidaßt, including the northern end of the Mahidaßt itself (near Ravansar, Levine, Iran 12, 106ff.; idem in T.C. Young and L. D. Levine, eds., Mountains and lowlands: Essays in archaeology of greater Mesopotamia, Malibu 1977, 138f.; followed by G.W. Vera Chamaza, AMI 27, 1994, 97ff.), does not necessarily rule out its extension to the north, as far as Qal’eh Paswê. Levine does not define the eastern border of Parsua, but states that Mannea lay to the north. This statement can be relativized seeing that there are hardly any fixed points of delimitation of Mannea in the west-southwest (at least before Ashurbanipal’s time). Qal’eh Paswê is on Hubußkian territory as implied by J.E. Reade (Iran 16, 1978, 140, fig. 2) and M. Liebig (ZA 81, 1991, 33f.). Levine (in J. Deshayes, ed., Le plateau iranien et l’Asie centrale des origines à la conquête islamique. Colloques internationaux de C.N.R.S. 567, Paris 1977 [henceforth: Levine 1977], 181) is of the opinion that the Mahidaßt was the critical area in the competition between Assyria and Urartu on the hegemony in Media and points out (Levine, Iran 12, 110f.) that Parsua is recorded together with Niqqu and Tugliaß (= Tupliaß) in Tiglath-pileser III (Tadmor 1994, cf. presently). However, this does not bear on its location and does not support a southerly extension of Parsua (see ad Parsuaß below). In fact, in these summary inscriptions Parsua precedes Bit-Kapsi (Tadmor 1994, 124; Summ. 1, 18 ; 132 : Summ. 3, 6’) and Bit-Zatti, Bit-Abdadani, Bit-Kapsi (Tadmor 1994, 164f.: Summ. 7, 29, 35). All these regions are to be sought north of the Great Khorasan Road. The general geographical order of these summary inscriptions is discussed by A.R. George (BiOr 53, 1996, 369, n. 14). The following table presents the sections where the Iranian regions are listed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>number</th>
<th>name</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Namri</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Bit-Sangibuti</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Bit-Hamban</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Suhurzu</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Bit-Barrua</td>
<td>+ (Barrúa)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Bit-Zualzaš</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Bit-Matti</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>((Bit))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Niqqu</td>
<td>+ (of 9)</td>
<td>+ (Niqqu of)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Tupliäš</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Bit-Taramäyu</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Parsua</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Bit-Zatti</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Bit-Abbadani</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Bit-Kapsi</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+ ([up to 18])</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Bit-Sangi</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Bit-Urzakki</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Bit-Ištar</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+ ([Ištar])</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Zaqrüti</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+ (before 17)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Gizinkissi</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+ (after 20)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Niššä</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Šibur</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Uremzan</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+ (-nz-)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Ra’usan</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Upariya</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>B/Pustus</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Ariami</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Mät-Talugallë</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+ (Mät)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Saksukni</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Araquttu</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Kär-Zibra</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Gukinanna</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table: Iranian Regions in Tiglat-Pileser III’s Summary Inscriptions
Regarding geographical arrangement, there are at least three groups of regions, namely a southern (Nos. 1-9, 32-35), northern (Nos. 12-17, 19-21) and an eastern one (Nos. 18, 24-26, 36-41). Most of the remaining regions are mentioned only once. The longest list (A) seems to form an almost full circle, namely from the southwest (notably Namri, Tupilå and Bit-Barrå) to the north (notably Bit-Abdadani, Bit-Kapsi and Sibur), then to the southeast (Uparya and B/Pustus) and southwest (Til-Aššu). In this case 36-41, which are to be sought further east, form an appendix. It is clear therefore that Parsua is associated with the northern group, i.e. the regions which are generally situated north of the Great Khorasan Road. This is in agreement with E. Forrer (Die Provinzeinteilung des assyrischen Reiches, Leipzig 1921, 90), who locates Parsua more to the north, roughly east of Sanandaj. He is followed by Reade (Iran 16, 139) and P. Zimansky (JNES 49, 1990, 14).

The latter criticizes Levine’s southern location of Parsua and points out that it was an extensive territory. The inscriptions of Shalmaneser III (basically describing the campaign of 843 or 842 BC) contain a constant geographical sequence from north to south, viz. kur/Mu-un-na, kur/Al/lab/p-ri-a, kur/arn-pár-su-a, uru/Ab-da-da-a-ni/kur/Ab-da-da-a-nu, uru/kur/Ha-ban, kur/ZALAG/kur/Na-mu-mur and kur/Tug*-li-ia-ā(#). (A.K. Grayson, Assyrian rulers of the early first millennium B.C. II (858-745 B.C.), Toronto 1996 [henceforth: Grayson 1996], 40ff. : A.0.102.6, iii, 61ff.; A.0.102.10, iii, 34ff.; cf. A.0.102.13, 2’ff.). The sequence kur/Mu-un-na, uru/pá/-su-a, kur/Al-la-ab/p-ri-a, kur/Ab-da-da-ni, kur/ZALAG, kur/Na-mu-mur and kur/Tug*-li-ia-ā(#) (Grayson 1996, 60: A.0.102.12, 19’f.) is secondary (a shorter version is contained in the fragment Grayson 1996, 114f.: A.0.102.37, 10’f.). 27 kings of kur/Pár-su-a delivered tribute in 835 BC after Shalmaneser III had completed his campaign against Namri (Grayson 1996, 68: A.0.102.14, 120, see Levine 1977, 178; M. Salvini in H. Hirsch and H. Hunger, eds., AfO Bezhi. 19, Vienna 1982, 391; Vera Chamaza, AMI 27, 99; no specific kingdoms and rulers are recorded). This is not a stereotypic ("typological") number and hence credible. In 829 BC Shalmaneser III received tribute from an unspecified number of Parsuan kings, but he had to conquer the cities of other rulers of Parsua who did not submit to him (Grayson 1996, 68: A.0.102.14, 172ff.; in the following year he had to repeat his activities). It is evident that Parsua was not a consolidated political unit, but rather a cover name for many small entities governed by city rulers, whose foreign policy was not necessarily coordinated. A detailed list of "all the kings of Nairi", who delivered tribute as a result of the third campaign (end of the 820s or beginning of the 810s, presumably sometime between 821 and 819 BC), is preserved in Grayson 1996, 186: fiamߺ-Adad V, A.0.103.1, ii, 16ff.). Nairi in this campaign, in the course of which he defeated S/fiAR-Ω of Zamua, the Sumbeans, Manneans, Parsuans and Taurleans, and he marched against Missi, Gizilb/punda and the Medes (Grayson 1996, 184ff.: A.0.103.1, ii, 16ff.), Nairi in Adad-narå’s III’s time is just a geographical term (see Salvini, Nairi e Urti/atri. Contributo alla storia della formazione del regno di Urtatu, Rome 1967, 23). This applies to Samsi-Adad V’s time as well.

It should be remembered that kur/Par-su-a, which is juxtaposed with Anšan in the account of Sennacherib’s eighth campaign (691 BC), is the earliest mention of Persis (see Diakonoff 1985, 88) and has nothing to do with Parsua in the Zagros. The restoration [...] Par-sa-sa (from P. to Bit-B/Pun), which is suggested by G. Frame apud Grayson 1996, 193: Samsi-Adad V, A.0.103.4, 32’ (cf. 25’; presumably 812 BC), is geographically and historically implausible. The existence of a southern Parsua as early as the beginning of
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29) *Notes on the Names and Professions List* – Line 1: It is now known thanks to the Ebla manuscript (ARCHI 1981; ARCHI 1984:171). I.read:

| IAS 74     | [lugal-men] nun |
| MEE 3 43+  | lugal-men nun  |

As for the PN lugal-men see POMONIO 1987:159. According to my interpretation, here nun means “prince”. Akk. *rubûm*, later attested as title of the OBab rulers of Éunnunna (CHARPIN 1985). Therefore, also this line, as the following ones of the NPL, may have the regular structure of the list, i.e. PN + name of profession. As for the sign lugal, note that according to Biggs’s copy only the right part of L is visible, while, according to Archi’s copy in RA 78, lugal is written ME-LU and not GAL-LU (but a PN *ME-lu-men or a similar name with a different order of reading is unknown to me). Lugal-men, however, is not among the known kings of Pre-Sargonic Kiš (EDZARD 1980:608ff.).

Line 2: As for the PN AKA-utu (énsi) see POMONIO 1987:25.

Line 133: After the copy, the reading A-MIR of the term after the PN lugal-dumu-zi in the Ebla manuscript is certain (read a-nimgir in Archi 1981:188; such an entry is lacking in PSD A/1). As for this difficult term see PSD A/1, p. 115, s.v. a-MIR. As for the two Abu Salabikh sources, as far as I can judge by the photography and the copy of IAS 61 and IAS 69, both have just DIM and not a-dim (cf. p. 69; an entry a-dim is lacking in PSD A/1).

End of the composition: Even if the Abu Salabikh manuscript IAS 61 is unfortunately badly broken, my suggestions, based on the Ebla manuscripts, are the following ones:

The last case of the fourth column of the reverse of the Ebla source (line 143 of the synopsis; read Kiš-sig na-x in Archi 1981:189, and kiš-x₁-na-du in PETTINATO 1981:128), if read na-se₁₁ lú-men” (= Kiš Ki’ NA SIG’), could mark the end of the list. In such a case, all the previous persons mentioned in the 142 entries are from Kiš (at Ebla the Akkadogram na-se₁₁, “people” is common); cf. the end of the List of Geographical Names: mu₃-na₃ uru₃-kī₃.

In any case, the fifth column of the Ebla manuscripts includes:

(a) a short hymn to Zababa, king of Kiš (ll. 144-146; note that in this text the lugal of Kiš is the god Zababa, while according to my interpretation – cf. l. 1 above – the nun of Kiš is a man, Lugal-men);

(b) the colophon with the names of the scribes.

Rev. V:1 of the Ebla manuscript is therefore part of a hymn: ṣur-sag-an-da gu₂-l₃-l₃ (the text in this case is not to be interpreted as PN + NP, ṣur-sag-an-da gu₂-l₃-l₃ in Archi 1981:189), on the ground of passages such as lines 13-15 of the Keš Temple Hymn (GRAGG 1969:167), or XXI:16 in Gudea’s Cylinder A (EDZARD 1996:82):

13 é-mùš-kalam-ma gud₃-hùš-aratta
14 é-kêš₃-mùš-kalam-ma gud₃-hùš-aratta
15 ṣur-sag-da₃-m₃-a an-da gù₃-l₃-a
XXI:16 ṣur-sag-an-da gù₃-l₃-a

If so, however, the grammatical subject of ṣur-sag-an-da gù₃-l₃-l₃ in the end of the NPL would be missing. Therefore, it may be that the subject is in the last case of the fourth column on the reverse of the Ebla manuscript. This subject may be either a temple or a city. The Sumerian Temple Hymn to Zababa of Kiš (n. 35 in SJÖBERG - BERGMANN 1969:43) makes reference to the temple é-dub, but it has a different wording. In GEORGE 1993 the temples in Kiš related with Zababa are:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>é-abzu₃-k₃-ga</td>
<td>n. 37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>é-du₃-k₃-ga</td>
<td>n. 186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>é-dub-ba</td>
<td>n. 200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with its cella é-me-te-ur-sag</td>
<td>n. 785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>é-inim₃-k₃-ga</td>
<td>n. 533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>é-kï₃[(...)</td>
<td>n. 656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>é₃-ul₃(IGL.NIR)-an-na</td>
<td>n. 1075</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Also note the beginning (lines 1-3) of the collection of za-me-hymns from Abu Salabikh in BIGGS 1974:46:

uru an-da mú    City, which has grown high,
an-da gú-lá    embracing the sky,
dEN.LI LUSI²  Nippur!

Moreover, in the same collection there is a short hymn to Zababa (lines 70-71, BIGGS 1974:48):

kiš gud-du    Kiš, perfect ox,
dZA-BA₄ BA₄ zà-me to Zababa, praise!

Unfortunately, even if irrelevant, none of these references clarifies the reading of the last case of the fourth column on the reverse of the Ebla manuscript of the NPL (to be collated). I am not convinced of a correction such as, for instance, kiškiš(NA) guddu'(SIG), but what follows the sign KIŠ must be a qualification of that same city.

In any case, it seems to me that the list of PNs and names of professions of the NPL ends with the line 142 of the synopsis (rev. IV:10: <dkiš-ur-sag KIŠ-sag ká-ká>). Therefore, the short za-me-hymn at the end of the Ebla source of the NPL for the moment may be read as follows:

rev. IV:11      kiš SIG NA/XI Kiš, ...
rev. V:1        ḫur-sag an-da gú-lá-lá mountain embracing the sky!
rev. V:2        dza-ba₄-ba₄ lugal kiški Zababa (is) king of Kiš!
rev. V:2        dza-ba₄-ba₄ zà-me To Zababa, praise!

The reasons of the presence of a hymn at the end of the NPL remain to be clarified.
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30) On the geography, toponymy and anthroponymy of Media – 1. Anthroponymy and toponymy from Šušārā: The onomasticon from OB Šušārā (cf. the index of Eidem 1992) has almost no parallels in the long lists of prisoners of war, who are thought to have originated in Šaššu (the forerunner of Šušārā) in the Ur III period, about a quarter of a millennium earlier (from Umma, collected by Struve 1952, 14ff. : TCL 5, 6039 and 18ff. : Nikol’skiy 329 ; 2042 BC). The reason may be not only the chronological gap, but also the fact that all the names in the lists from Šaššu refer to females, whereas almost all the anthroponyms from Šušārā refer to males (cf. Zadok 1993, 235). The anthroponym Še-pu-ul-lu (Eidem 1992, 46, 1) is probably the same as Ur III Še-pu-la. The latter is recorded at Umma, the same place where the female prisoners are mentioned in the same generation (2028 BC, Zadok 1993, 235 : 3.2.2, 27). Ka-ak-me is recorded as an anthroponym at OB Šušārā (Eidem 1992, 118, 5). Ka-ma-zi from there is perhaps a late form of the toponym Hamazi (presumably with k- for earlier h- like NA Kumurdu for Humurti, cf. below, 2). Ka-ma-zi is classified as an anthroponym by Eidem (1992, 94a ad 124, 10), but it can be interpreted as a toponym in view of the structure of the list ("one Kamazi-garment" like other garments, which are defined by a geographical name, i.e. their place of origin, in line 8f.)¹ and the fact that the only clear anthroponym according to the context (line 6) is preceded by a Personenkeil. In the same manner, Ku-la-ri[-um]] (Eidem 1992, 111, 11 : LUMES ša ¬) is a toponym rather than an anthroponym (as listed by Eidem 1992, 95a) in view of NA Kuš/Kšu-la-ar (Röllig 1980-83), referring to a pass not far from Šušārā. The same may apply to Ku-mu-ur-a-ar-[e] (listed as an anthroponym by Eidem 1992, 95a, s.v. Kumur-asse, but cf. Ziegler 1997, 791) if it refers to Kumurdu (see below, 2). Both are written without a Personenkeil. Most of the names preceded by LUMES in the same document are toponyms. The toponym Tu-ul₄t₄-ša-ašš-ešiš/ašš (Eidem 1992, 90a with refs.) may be compared with the anthroponym Tu-du-mi-im of Tukunani
(Salvini 1996, v, 56). Likewise, the anthroponym Ul-lu-ba from OB Tall Lélân (Hurr. according to Ismail 1991, 121f. ad 109, 5) is homonymous with NA įkur Ul-lu-ba (once Ul-li-ba, Parpola 1970, 366f.), which refers to a region north of Assyria proper (see Postgate 1973, 57f.) not far from the important Hurrian city of Kumme. Toponyms which are homonymous with anthroponyms are not rare in Hurrian (cf. Fincke 1993, pass. and Zadok 1992, 2, 5).

2. Užhari: The two campaigns of Tiglash-piles III to the Zagros (744 and 737 BC) and their long-term effect are discussed by Levine (1977b, 180ff.): basically the Great Khorsaran Road and around it, with the regions lying on the road itself turned into Assyrian provinces and the other entities subjected to Assyria as vassals. If ūrúHa-ar-ta is identical with Mt. Ha-ar-si (cf. Edzard 1957–1971), which is described as situated at the “head” (SAG) of the Kumurdean district, then the way from the western Zagros to Bût-Abbadani was partly controlled by Mannea in Ashurbanipal’s time. ūrúHa-ar-si was situated between ūrúKu-shí-ša-na-di and ūrúŠa-na-di-ti-ku (Tadmor 1994, 46: Ann. 11,1f.). Harši is related to Urart. Wi-a-ar-si-ta according to Diakonoff and Kashkai (1979, 98; -tā is an Urartian suffix). The latter is very probably the same place as Wa-ar-siki (Wa-ar-šeši) from OB Šušārārā (Eidem 1992, 90a with refs.). Troops from PA-ar-siši are listed with troops from other places including Ku-mu-ur-ar- (-tē), which is perhaps identical with Kurmūru (cf. above, 1). PA-ar-sši is a variant of Warš, kupu-ur-ur-a-tā (gentilic) of Mannea (Borger 1996, 34: B iii, 60 = C iv, 72) was equated with Ur III Humurtu by Diakonoff 1956, 282 with n. 3; 1958, 73. Levine (1974, 115) is not aware of Diakonoff’s identification, which may eventually facilitate the localization of Kurmūru, perhaps near the southern section of Mannea. ūrúŠa-na-di-ti-ku is followed by ūrúKiš-ki-ta-ra, ūrúHa-ar-si-Ā+A (originally a gentilic of Ha-ar-šu) and ūrúA+u-ā-ba-ak. From (provided the lacuna does not include more places) Tiglash-piles III proceeded to kuHa-li-ha-adāt-ri (see Streck 1900, 369f.) and ūrúUz-ha-ri (cf. just below). The latter belonged to Bit-Zatti (744 BC, Tadmor 1994, 46: Ann. 11, 1-3), which was on the way to the more easterly Bût-Abbadani. Užhari is perhaps a late form of Sargonic Zahara presumably northwest of Elam (see Edzard, Farber and Sollberger 1977, 193 with previous lit.). Zahara is probably identical with A-Za-ha-ar, a region of Simāški in the Ur III period (see Zadok 1991, 229). Vallat (1993, 305, s.v. Zahara) is of the opinion that Zahara “doit être localisé en Balutchistan iranien ou dans les environs immédiats”. However, Vallat (1993, cxxivf.) does not rule out an alternative localization in western Iran. Potts (1998, 103) hesitatingly suggests to identify Zahara with Azara, presumably in eastern Khuzistan, which is mentioned in the Parthian period, but the forms are different. The fact that Šar-kali-šāri mentions a victorious battle against Elam and Zahara in the neighbourhood of Aššāk and Sakali seems to strengthen the case for a localization of Zahara in western Iran, provided the observation of Hallo (1957–71, 709) that Sakali is a veiled allusion to Qutium is correct. It should be remembered that several regions of northwest Iran, e.g. Harši and Hu’urti, are mentioned in Sargonic and Ur III sources; Žapšali was dependent on Sargonic Zahara presumably northwest of Elam (see Edzard, Farber and Sollberger 1977, 193 with previous lit.). Zahara is probably identical with A-Za-ha-ar, a region of Simāški in the Ur III period (see Zadok 1991, 229). Vallat (1993, 305, s.v. Zahara) is of the opinion that Zahara “doit être localisé en Balutchistan iranien ou dans les environs immédiats”. However, Vallat (1993, cxxivf.) does not rule out an alternative localization in western Iran. Potts (1998, 103) hesitatingly suggests to identify Zahara with Azara, presumably in eastern Khuzistan, which is mentioned in the Parthian period, but the forms are different. The fact that Šar-kali-šāri mentions a victorious battle against Elam and Zahara in the neighbourhood of Aššāk and Sakali seems to strengthen the case for a localization of Zahara in western Iran, provided the observation of Hallo (1957–71, 709) that Sakali is a veiled allusion to Qutium is correct. It should be remembered that several regions of northwest Iran, e.g. Harši and Hu’urti, are mentioned in Sargonic and Ur III sources; Žapšali was dependent on Sargonic Simāški. The same applies to Šig(i)riš and possibly Šiṣtūrmt. Vallat (1993, 305) suggests a general localization for Žapšali on the Iranian Plateau, somewhere between the region of Isfahan and the Caspian sea (cf. Steinkeller 1990; Vallat 1991, 12; Zadok 1991, 227f.). Azahar and Šiṣṭūrmt were dependencies of Simāški (cf. Zadok 1991, 227; Potts 1998, 136f.) on the northern extension of Simāški (Potts 1998, 141f.). There are several cases of toponymic continuity in northwest Iran (e.g., Harši, Harhar,3 Kumūru, Nispi, Sigris, and Šiṣṭūrmt). The river A-rat-ta-a was on the way from Sumi to Surīkaš, a Mannean district bordering on Karalla and Allāhpri in 714 BC (Thureau-Dangin 1912, 31; see Levine 1977a, 137; for Karalla cf. Frame 1999, 48ff.). A-rat-ta-a is at best a homonym of the much earlier legendary land of Aratta (see the comment of Vallat 1993, 18 on Gordon 1960, 132 with n. 63 and Yusifov 1984, 187).

3. *Wilu*: The NA gentilic kūrŪ-lu-ši-Ā (end of the 820s or beginning of the 810s, presumably some-time between 821 and 819 BC, Grayson 1996, 186: Šamsi-Adad V, A.0.103.1, iii, 53; cf. Diakonoff 1991, 15) refers to one of the small polities of Parsua or near it (in northwestern Media). *Wilu* may be homonymous - if not identical - with Ur III Pi-ilši (Sigrist 1984, 4, 10; cf. Zadok 1993, 226: 26.24 PL with the reading wi is very common before the middle of the second millennium BC). This toponym resembles the anthroponyms Ū-e-li, Ū-i-li (Sarg.), Ū-e-li (Ur III, Zadok 1994, 34b, 39b, 40b, 41b). *Wilu* resembles the Ur III toponym Ū-lumši (Edzard and Farber 1974, 204), but the latter is mentioned without any geographical context. *Wil(u)* may be quasi-homonymous with kūrŪ-lu-la near Eribi and Kumuh east of the Zagros (Tadmor 1994, 184: Summ. 9, 21), a basically Hurrian-speaking region.

4. Names of districts in western Iran beginning with Bit: The 22 districts, whose names begin with Bit-, are located in five regions of Media and the piedmont of the Zagros.

(a) Southwestern Media: (1) Bit-Hamban (e.g. kūrÉ-ha-am-buš/DUMU ḫa-an-baš, Parpola 1970, 147, see Levine 1973, 22f.; Herzfeld 1968, 23f.; Reade 1978, 137f.); (2) Bit-Barrūa (kūrÉ-rušši-ūšši, É-Bar-ru-a-šši) in Ellipi (Luckenbill 1924, 28, ii, 25 and 59, 31 resp.) is very probably a dynastic name, presumably named after the Elipanian ruler Ba-ru-a-šši (843 BC, cf. E. Frahm and R. Schmidt in Radner, Parpola and Whiting 1998-99, 273b). It was annexed to the province of Harhar by Sennacherib (see Levine 1974, 117). Bit-Barrūa rather than Bit-Bāri resembles Urart. kūrBa-ru-a-šši (i.e. Ba-ru-a-šši; -tā being an Urart. suffix, cf. above, 2) from the time of Argišti I, i.e. the early eighth century BC. If the Urartian toponym refers to Bit-Barrūa (cf. Diakonoff and
Kashkai 1979, 18f., who does not preclude an identification with Bit-Bäri), then kuṭBa-ra-a-ta would be the earliest attestation of this district, about half a century after the eponymous dynast is mentioned. The earliest Assyrian occurrences of this district are from Tigmalth-Pilesre III’s time: kuṭBa-ar-ra-a and kuṭparuÉ, Bar/Ba-ar-ra-a (Tadmor 1994, 295, index, s.v.).


(b) The upper Diyala basin: (6) Bit-Sangibuti (kuṭÉ-Sa-an-gi-bu-te), kuṭ-Probi, gentilic kuṭSingi-bu-ta(1+A+A), Tadmor 1994, 98 ad Sl. 1, B, 15*: cf. 296, index, s.v. Bit-S.; kuṭSun-gi-bu-tu, Harper 1892-1914, 174, 11. Bilherbeck (1898, 80f.) erroneously identified this district (not the Urartian homonymous one) with Bit-Sangi. He is followed by Levine (1977a, 142f.) and Diakonoff (1991, 16 with n. 11; cf. Vera Chamaza 1994, 105f.). Both districts must be differentiated, seeing that they are listed together in one and the same summary inscription: Tadmor 1994, 164f.: 29f., 34f. has Bit-Sangibuti and Bit-Sangi. Medieval Singjb, which may be normalized as Sangabad/Sanjabid, refers to a village and district (Sanjabadrīd, now Sanjabad, Razmārō 1950, 4, 27b) west of Ḥaltāl, 10 km. northeast of Kiwī (Gronke 1993, 330f., n. 96; Krawulski 1978, map 3 has Sanjbod on ʿĀb-e-Sanjāb south of Ardibil and east of Šangolābād, c. 37° 60- 48° 40). The name of this place may originate from an homonym of Sangibuti, as its location precludes a geographical identification with any of the two NA districts named so.

(c) Near the Great Khorasan Road: Both (7) Bit-Uargi (kuṭÉ-Ū-ar/-ma/-gi) and (8) Bit-Hirmāmi (kuṭÉ-Hir-ir-ma-mi) were situated near Kišēsim whereas (9) Bit-Bagāya (urraÉ, Ba-ga-iA+A+A, Ġā-ba-ia) and (10) Bit-Ramatau (EÉ, Ma-ta-ta-a) belonged to the province of Harhar (see Fuchs 1994, 426f.). (11) Bit-Bäri (kuṭÉ-Ba-a-ri) is juxtaposed with (12) Bit-Barbāri (kuṭÉ-Bar-ba-ri, Fuchs 1998a, 41, vi.b, 21f.). The latter may be merely homonymous with Middle Elamite (ME) kuṭBa-it-ba-ar-ba-ri (Valatt 1993, 44). (13) Bit-Sagbat (kuṭÉ-Sa-ag-bat/ba-at, Tadmor 1994, 164-Summ. 7, 31; Fuchs 1994, 428f.) was situated near Kišēsim (see Fuchs 1994, 428f.). kuṭÉ-Sa/-ga-ri was in Dan-ni-ti ša DUMU KI.A.DINGIR.RA₅ ([][]), i.e. “the fortress of the Babylonian(s)” (= kuṭŚi-il/-ha-zi), according to Fuchs 1994, 428f. (ad Levine 1972, 38, ii, 40), who suggests (following Grantovskiy 1970, 114, cf. Diakonoff and Kashkai 1979, 17f.) that Dannatu ša mār-Bābīl is the same as Urart. BuBuli. There is no absolute certainty that Bit-Sa-ša-ki is the same place as kuṭÉ-Sa-ag-bat/ba-at, Pace Levine (1972, 32; 1974, 110 with n. 73), the latter is presumably not the same place as urraÉSa-ag-bat, which is mentioned together with Elm (see Fuchs 1994, 428, cf. Zadok 1985, 49).

(d) In the section of “Inner” Media which is not too far from the Great Khorasan Road: (14) Bit-Abbadani is written urraÉAb-da-da-a-ni (Grayson 1996, 40; Shalm. III A.010.26, iv. 4f.), early NB Ab-da-da-na (c. 1000-950 BC, Diakonoff 1978). The earliest occurrence of the compound form kuṭBit(EÉ)-Ab-da-da-ni is from 744 BC (Tadmor 1994, 46: Ann. 11, 4, see Herzfeld 1938, 163); (15) Bit-Zatti (kuṭÉ-Za-ti, Tadmor 1994,46: Ann. 11, 3); (16) Bit-Kapsi (kuṭÉ-kap-si/DUMU₅ Kap-si, Tadmor 1994,48: Ann. 11, 6, 10; see Vera Chamaza 1994, 107). Regarding (17) Bit-Urzakki (kuṭÉ-Ur-zak-ki, Tadmor 1994, 296 with refs.), Warzāqān (originally ending in -akāne), a village 10 km. north of Turkūmān, northwest of Mīyāna in the modern district (Dihistān) of Barvānān (Gronke 1993, 311, 331f., 337f., 340), may be based on a form which might have originally been homonymous, but not geographically identical. (18) Bit-Sangi (kuṭÉ-Sa-an-gi, Tadmor 1994, 296, s.v.) is neither the same as Bit-S/Sēk-ki (pace Diakonoff 1956, 160, n. 4) nor is it identical with Bit-Sangibuti (see above, 6). (19) Bit-Itar/Issar (kuṭÉ-/gÉ,xV/INNIN, Tadmor 1994, 296, s.v.; Thureau-Dangin 1912, 46, see Vera Chamaza 1994, 108) is not mentioned in ME “together with Bit-Tazzaki” (pace Diakonoff 1978, 64, who followed König 1965, 129, n. 9). ME has kuṭÉ-it-ta-sak/ēš-EŠšANA (Valatt 1993, 49, s.v. Bit-Tasak-šarri), which has nothing to do with Bit-Tazak-ki; the latter can be read Bit-Ur-zak-ki (17 above). Bit-Itar/Issar was hardly renamed by the Assyrians as assumed by Bilherbeck (1898, 84 with n. 3), since we happen to know that Median places, which were renamed by the Assyrians, generally begin with kār (+ divine or royal name, e.g. Kišēla > Kār-Nabāh, Bit-Asyagī > Kār-Itar or Kār-Addad, and Harhar > Kār-Sarru-kēn, Fuchs 1994, 422, 426, 443). (20) Bit-Tatt[i(…) (EÉ-ma-ar-ta(i-i-x)] is mentioned together with the Salt Desert and Andarpatianu in a damaged text from Esarhaddon’s reign (Starr 1990, 64, 8; no clear geographical context; Bit-tūṭti, being a generic term, is not discussed here).

(e) In the central Zagros and its piedmont: (21) Bit-Kilamzah (urraÉ, Mi-lam-za-ah, Luckenbill 1924, 26, i, 72); (22) Bit-Kubatti (urraÉ, Ku-ba-tu, Luckenbill 1924, 73; annexed to the province of Arrapha). Levine (1973, 313f.) is of the opinion, that unlike Bit-Kilamzah, Bit-Kubatti might have been situated more to the west. Such toponyms are not encountered in Mannea and its environs (the northern homonymous district of 6 above is generally written just Sangibuti) or in Elam. Most of these districts are located in a basically Kassite territory, and the element Bit- may continue the Middle Babylonian practice of naming districts after Kassite and other tribes, notably Bit-Hamban. This practice was later applied also to the territories of the ever-expanding Iranian tribes (out of the 22 toponyms at least eight are Old Iranian [6, 7, 9-11, 15, 17, 18], three Kassite [1, 13, 21], one Iranian or Elamite [2], one Akkadian [19] and one atypical [12]; the linguistic affiliation of the remaining eight is uncertain). It seems that Bit- was added to these toponyms only by Akkadian scribes if to rely on its absence in the very few Urartian renderings of the same toponyms. It is
noteworthy that the earliest Assyrian occurrences of 2 above are written both with Bit- (6x) and without it (1x), but the possibility that the only spelling without Bit- is due to a scribal omission cannot be excluded.

References:
Diakonoff (D'yakonov), I.M. 1956. Istoriya Mädi ot drevneïjsj vremen do konca IV veka do n.e. Moscow-Leningrad.
Struve, V.V. 1952. Lager’ voenomploynyy xençin v Sumere konca tyszacletiya do n.e. VDI 1952/3, 12-25.
31) The city of Anaharath in an Amarna Letter -

Biblical Anaharath was a town in the inheritance of Issachar (Josh 19:19). It is mentioned in Thutmose III’s topographical list (No. 52) and in Amenophis II’s royal inscriptions. Amenophis relates that he plundered Anaharath, and lists the booty he carried away from the place (E. Edel, “Die Stelen Amenophis’ II. aus Karnak und Memphis mit dem Bericht über die asiatischen Feldzüge des Königs” ZDPV 69 [1953], pp. 123 lines 112-115, 134-135, 157). Mentioned in the booty list are six sons of rulers (wrv), 17 maryannu, seven horses and seven chariots. It is unlikely that princes, a military elite and chariots would have been captured in a secondary town. Anaharath must have been a north Palestinian city-state. It is identified at Tel Rekhesh (Tell el-Mukharkhash), in Na‘al Tavor, dominating the basalt plateaus of the eastern Lower Galilee (Y. Aharoni, “Anaharath”, JNES 26 [1967], pp. 212-215).

Until now Anaharath was missing from the list of Canaanite city-states mentioned in the Amarna letters. However, I believe that the city and its ruler are mentioned in letter EA 272. The letter opens thus (lines 1-4): “[T]o the king,[ my lord, my Sun: Message] of Sun-[..., the ruler of] /\[Na\]-\[rat-ar-su, your servant, the dir\]t a[t your feet]”. Knudtzon rendered the city name [Na]-x-\[xa\]-x]. I collated the text (BM 29863) many years ago and, according to my draft copy, the signs na, aḥ and ḫa, although incomplete, are quite certain.

The identity of Naḥḥa[rat-rutu] and biblical Anaharath is self-evident, the omission of the initial vowel has many parallels in Palestinian and ancient Near Eastern onomasticism (for references, see R. Zadok, “West Semitic Toponyms in Assyrian and Babylonian Sources”, in Y. Avishur and J. Blau (eds.), Studies in Bible and Ancient Near East Presented to Samuel E. Loewenstamm, Jerusalem 1978, pp.164-165; idem, “Remarks on the Inscription of Ḥdyš[y] from Tell Fakhrariya”, Tel Aviv 9 (1982), p. 124; N. Na’aman, “Rubatu/Aruboth”, UF 32 [2000], forthcoming). The transcription as given in EA 272: 3 does not support the suggestion of W.F. Albright and T.O. Lambdin (“New Material for the Egyptian Syllabic Orthography”, JJS 2 [1957], p. 115 n. 4), to reconstruct a Canaanite original pronunciation *Anāḫarta, later *Anāḥeret, which was Aramitzized to Anāḥarat. Either Anaharath or Anaharta must have been the original pronunciation of the city name.

Letter EA 272 was written at Gezer as suggested by J.A. Knudtzon (Die El-Amarna-Tafeln II, Leipzig 1915, p. 1329 n. 1) and recently re-checked and re-affirmed by J.-P. Vita (“Das Gezer-Corpus von El-Amama: Umfang und Schreiber”, ZA 90 [2000], pp. 70-71). How should we explain the writing of a letter of Anaharath’s ruler, a city located in Lower Galilee, by the scribe of Gezer? The key to the correct interpretation lies in the wide range of political and military operations that Milki, ruler of Gezer, conducted in north and south Canaan. In the north he interfered in the affairs of Ba‘lu-UR.SAG (EA 249) and helped Tagu, his close ally, to
conquer Rubutu (EA 289: 11-13; 290: 5-11, 25-28) (for a possible location of the city in the plain of Dothan, see Na’aman, *ibid.*). A messenger of Milkišu stayed in the court of Shechem (250: 32-34) (N. Na’aman, “Milkišu’s Messenger and the Sons of Lab’ayu”. *N.A.B.U.* 1999/2, No. 27), and the two partners conspired to set one of Lab’ayu’s son on the throne of Piñīlu (EA 250: 35-39), a plan that they were able to accomplish (EA 255). The close cooperation of Gezer and Shechem in their operations in northern Palestine is amply attested in the Amama letters. Letter EA 272 of Šum-[ ... ] of Anaharath, which was written and sent from Gezer, is another indication of Milkišu’s wide-ranging contacts in northern Palestine. Anaharath was a small city-state located in a peripheral area and possibly had no scribe of its own. Its ruler must have come to Gezer either on his way to Gaza, or to negotiate with Milkišu, and on that occasion asked the local scribe to write a letter to the Pharaoh on his behalf. Nadav Na’aman (24-03-2001)

32) When did Mesopotamia “Lose” Full Moon? – As is well known, lunar phenomena were always devoted a very special interest in Mesopotamia. Starting from the Old-Babylonian period and over a whole millennium, Mesopotamian astronomers collected a wealth of data on the main lunar manifestations, especially eclipses, which eventually developed into a proper lunar theory; this can be found in the late written production in its fully established form (for a classification of Mesopotamian astronomical texts see Sachs 1948), but also in earlier texts like e.g. Babylonian astronomical diaries.

The outburst of scientific astronomy in Mesopotamia can be certainly dated at the 5th century B.C., but this can only be inferred from the manifest differences between earlier and later textual production, due to the lack of written evidence from the period in question (see Britton 1993).

Among other phenomena, lunar syzygies (first and last visibility of the lunar crescent i.e. new Moon, and full Moon) were considered important since the days when they were observed could affect the calendrical setting.

In astronomical diaries, lunar syzygies are entered as six time intervals defined “Lunar Six” by A. Sachs (1948, 273 and 281). These intervals refer to the difference between the crossings of the horizon of Moon and Sun expressed in time degrees (UŠ, corresponding to 4 minutes). As a rule, these were observed, but could also be predicted by means of calculation. They are called na, alleged shortcut for nammurta, “visibility” (see Sachs-Hunger 1988, 21), at the beginning of the month (“night of N, sunset to moonset: nn°”), and KUR, shortcut for ana niph šamaš, “until sunrise” (see *ibid.*) at the end of the month (“night of N, moonrise to sunrise: nn°”) for new Moon; ŠU, “to set” (“night of N, moonset to sunrise: nn°”), and ME, “daylight” said of the remaining part of afternoon (“night of N, moonrise to sunset: nn°”) before opposition; again NA (“night of N, sunrise to moonset: nn°”), and GEₙ₇, “night” said of the first half of the night (“night of N, sunset to moonrise: nn°”) after opposition for full Moon, respectively. Therefore, concerning full Moon two different variables were considered: (1) when and (2) how long the Moon could be seen with the Sun for the first or last time in the morning (ŠU and NA) and in the evening (ME and GEₙ₇).

For an exhaustive explanation of the meaning and development of the Lunar Six see Brack-Bernsen (1993, 353-5).

However, the use of the Lunar Six only characterizes texts produced in recent times, namely after the Persian conquest. This is especially true if full Moon is considered. In fact, in the two oldest datable extant diaries (BM 32312 = *Diaries* No. -651 and VAT 4956 = *Diaries* No. -567, dated 652 and 568 B.C. respectively), the Lunar Six are not yet present. Here, two remarkable characteristics are exhibited.

The first consists of full Moon being referred to in the unsophisticated way that features contemporaneous Neo-Assyrian textual evidence regarding celestial divination, namely astrological reports and letters where the relevant omen from *enüna anu enilili (úma N Šin u Šamaš itti aḫaš innamirû)* is quoted. This corresponds to a telling description of the co-presence of the two celestial bodies exclusively in the evening when the observation was performed.

The *Diaries* Ns. -651 and -567 were written in the years 16 of Šamaššumukin and 37 of Nebuchadnezar II, at Babylon. In these exemplars, the day of full Moon is entered as:

N ilu itti ili innamir, “(on the) Nth day” one god (i.e. Šin) was seen with another god (i.e. Šamaš”).

This refers to the phenomenon of the simultaneous presence of the two celestial bodies in the evening when opposition is visible, that is when the lunar and the solar discs can be observed above the eastern and the western horizon respectively, and they equal each other (see the omens: *Šin u Šamaš štīqilû*, “the Moon and the Sun are in balance”; *Šin u Šamaš šultû“, the Moon and the Sun are in opposition, lit.: face each other”).

The second feature is that unlike Neo-Assyrian reports, where the days of full Moon were seemingly steadily monitored, in the *Diaries* Ns. -651 and -567 that, when complete, stretched over the twelve months, this datum is entered occasionally. In fact, only months: Nisannu, day 14 (*Diaries* No -651 : 16); day 15 of an unknown month (*ibid.*, iv 13); Nisannu, day 14 (*Diaries* No -567 : 4); Šimānu, day 15 (*ibid.*, 17); and Addaru, day 12 (*ibid.*, rev. 16) are attested.
The immediately following datable diary was written in 464 B.C.: here, no mention of full Moon seems to be extant. It is not entirely clear whether this means that Babylonian astronomers had meanwhile “lost” their interest in the phenomenon, possibly because if expressed in the old-fashioned way, it was not useful for computation. The absence of further coeval attestations of such intermediate stage of Babylonian astronomy results in a disappointing vacuum of almost two centuries between the latest evidence of use of the archaic ilu itti ili innamirũ-expression and the “reform” represented by the Lunar Six. Nevertheless, ultimately Diaries Ns. -651 and -567 bridge the gap between qualitative and quantitative astronomy: backwards, with respect to the Neo-Assyrian divination and forwards, with respect to the Seleucid mathematical astronomical texts.

The use of different expressions referring to full Moon in the Babylonian diaries witnesses that somewhere during the 5th century the astronomical lexicon was deprived of its “religious” connotation. The shift from the evocative and eventually wishful simultaneous presence of the two great gods to a dry list of figures further testifies a major change in Babylonian scientific thought.

Notes
1. This note is an issue of the research program “Politics and Participation in Civic Systems of Ancient Empires” directed by Prof. C. Zaccagnini at the I.U.O. (Naples), under the coordination of Prof. A. Schiavone (Florence), with the financial support of the Italian Ministry of Universities (M.U.R.S.T.).
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Dpt di Studi Asiatici - I.U.O. Napoli
Piazza S. Domenico Maggiore, 12
80134 NAPOLI (Italie)
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33) Cuneiform for beginners - The tablet published here has two parts:
A) line 1 in the obverse and line 1 in the reverse.
B) the rest of the tablet.

In part A there are only isolated wedges. On the contrary, in part B there are groups of wedges. Unlike part A, part B was written, erased and rewritten more than once. The beginning of line 2 in the obverse and the reverse (part B) contain groups of wedges of the same type as the isolated wedges in line 1 (part A), receptively.

It is speculated here that this tablet is an exercise in the first stage of the study of cuneiform - the wedges themselves, and that part A, was written by an instructor and part B, by a student.

Notes
1. I am indebted to W.W. Hallo, curator of the Yale Babylonian Collection for his permission to publish this text.
34) Zum sumerischen Verbalpräfix ba- Es dürfte Einigkeit darüber bestehen, dass im Sumerischen die Aufmerksamkeit des Hörers (oder Lesers) bei einer mit ba- oder bi- (as, noch be- oder bi-) beginnenden Verbalform auf eine Sache im Lokativ bzw. Lokativ-Terminativ (auch Direktiv genannt) gelenkt wird. Weiterhin erwog schon A. Falkenstein, z.B. in Das Sumerische 1959, S. 46, die Präfixe ba-da-, ba-ta- und ba-si- als Schreibungen für *ba-da-, *ba-ta- und *ba-si- anzusehen und entsprechend als Aufnahme eines sächlichen Sattels im Komitat, Ablativ oder Terminativ zu erklären.

Verfolgt man diesen Gedanken zu Ende, so stellt sich die Frage, wie der Sprecher (oder Schreiber) den Blick auf eine Sache im Akkusativ lenkte. Man kann die noch fehlende Form in der 3. Ps. Sg. persönlich als *ba-si-Basis rekonstruieren. Da eine solche Form für den Sumerer weder sprech- noch schreibbar war, und der häufigste Hilfsvokal (die Fachtermini wären epithektischer Vokal, Sprossvokal, Svarabbah- ti-Vokal oder Gleitlaut) das a ist, kann die Form nur *ba-si-Basis oder in ns. Schreibung ba-Basis lauten. Sie fällt damit ausserlich mit der Lokativaufnahme zusammen.

Diese Funktion der Akkusativaufnahme scheint mir das ba-z.B. in den bekannten ns. Jahresformeln des Typs mu ON bahu zu haben; denn, da die mit einer Person verbundene Aussage mu PN/GN lugal-e ON mu-hul lautet, wird man das bascherlich auf den (virtuellen) Lokativ mu … (-a) beziehen können.

Bei der Annahme dieser Herkunft des ba- wäre, ausser eine Lücke im Paradigma zu füllen, zweiterlei gewonnen: Mühe lose erklärte sich die Transitivierung von ba-Formen intransitiver Verben und zweitens verlören die gelegentlichen Verwechslungen von ba- und mu- (oder umgekehrt) in den ns. Datenformeln oder in den Varianten litterarischer Texte der altbabylonischen Zeit als Fehler an Gewicht, da beide Aussageweisen nahe beieinanderlagen.

Ist entsprechend gelegentlich auch na-an- auf *n-n- zurückzuführen?

J. B. AUER (25.04.2001)
Uniter Box 18
OT Lindelbach
97236 RANDERSACKER (Allemagne)

35) AB-tum = èß-tum/iltu – The commodity AB-tum - without any doubt to be read èß-tum - is attested only a handful of times, all the occurrences coming from Ur III sources. The examples known to me are as follows:

(a) 100.0.0 in-bul₃-bul₅ 50.0.0 èß-tum gur (Gomi and Sato, SNAT 536 iii 7-8);
(b) 60.0.0 in-bul₃-bul₅ gur 40.0.0 èß-tum gur (YOS 4 298 : 33-34);
(c) 540.0.0 in-bul₃-bul₅ gur 83.0.0 èß-tum gur (ITT 5 6905 : 5'-6');
(d) šu-nig 908.0.0 in-bul₃-bul₅ gur 680.0.0 là 1.0.0 èß-tum gur (Reinsner, TUT 121 vi 9-10);
(e) 120.0.0 in-nu èß-tum Ga-èß il-tu (Yildiz and Lafont, TCT 2 3254 : 1-2);
(f) 2 má 20.0.0 gur … dug-sila èß-tum in-bul₃-bul₅ ú peš šiš-gišimmār gi šiš-ma-nu má bala-šè ak (M. Hussey, Bulletin of the Buffalo Society of Natural Sciences 11/II (1915) no. 8:1-10);
(g) má èß-tum (MVN 8 250 : 7);
(h) 5 ši-ši-hal èß-tum-ma-ta (Sigrist, SAT 1 862 : 1-2).

That AB-tum is to be read èß-tum is shown conclusively by the variant spelling iß-tum, which occurs numerous times, all the occurrences coming from Ur III sources. That èß-tum is to be read èß-tum is shown conclusively by the variant spelling iß-tum, which occurs numerous times, all the occurrences coming from Ur III sources. But is it possible to establish which is which?

However, the exact sense of èß-tum is complicated by the fact that there exists another Sumerian term for “chaff.” That term is in-bul₃-bul₅ (Akk. Pâ’u, pâ’), which is a paradigmatic root, is named together with èß-tum in examples (a), (b), (c), (d), and (f). Characteristically, in these examples the volumes of in-bul₃-bul₅ invariably exceed those of èß-tum.

These facts force one to assume that èß-tum and in-bul₃-bul₅ describe two different, though clearly related, items. One of them must be “chaff” sensu stricto (i.e., separated grain-husks), while the other very likely is processed (probably chopped) straw (German Häcksel). But is it possible to establish which is which? Of some help in this matter is the lexical and bilingual evidence bearing on èß-tum, where this word is consistently equated with the Sumerian in(-nu)-RI:

èß(1)(KU) in-nu-RI = il-tu, in-nu-RI = MIN (Hh. XXIV 229-230 = MSL 11, 85); im in-nu-RI = MIN (= ti-id) il-ti (Hh. X 485 = MSL 7, 104); èß in-nu-RI = il-tu (Practical Vocabulary Assur 34); in-nu-RI im dal-a-gim kib-èß na-an-gi₄-gi₄ = ki-ma il-ti šà šà-a-ra ub-la-iši ana aš-ri-šà a-a i-tur, “like … that has been carried away by the wind may it not return to its place” (CT 17 20:49-50). Cf. also in-nu-RI im dal-la/a-gim, “like … flying in the wind” (“Lamentation over Sumer and Ur” 258); in-nu-RI, in-nu-[RI]-RI (MSL 11, 134 xi 10-11).

Although in(-nu)-RI does not appear in Ur III documents, one finds in them a term in-nu/da, which too denotes “chaff” or some related product. Assuming that in(-nu)-RI is to be read in(-nu)-de₃, this term could be explained as a variant spelling of in-nu/da, both terms deriving from a hypothetical verbal root [de].
Possibly, but by no means necessarily, that hypothetical root is dé, which appears in the technical expression in-ō dé. This operation involved the cleaning or sifting (lit. “pouring”) of straw to remove the remaining grains. See 226.0.0 še gur lugal 5.4.0 gur in-dé-a (MVN 7 108:1-2); 24.1.5 še gur lugal in-dé-a (MVN 12 87:1); še giš è-a in-na in-bi nu-dé (MVN 9 10 3-4); grain in-bi i-dé ... grain in-bi nu-dé (MVN 9 145:1-13); še dé, ḫé dé, in [dé] (TMH a.f. 1/2 171:14-16). Cf. Civil, Farmer’s Instructions, 96.

But, even if one assumes that in-nu-RI is etymologically *in’u-dé-a, “sifted straw,” this still does not explain how in(-nu)-deš = èß-tum differed from in-bulš-bulš, “winnowed / blown out straw.” Of greater help in this connection appears to be the fact that, as noted earlier, in-bulš-bulš was available in considerably greater quantities than èß-tum, which favors the conclusion that in-bulš-bulš, as more common and apparently heavier, is “chopped straw,” whereas èß-tum, together with its apparent equivalent in-nu-uda, is “chaff.” Here it may be significant that, as shown by CT 17 20:49-50 and “Lamentation over Sumer and Ur” 258 (see above), in(-nu)-RIl = īlu was considered a symbol of lightness.

Tentatively, the results of this investigation may be summarized as follows:

1) in-nu/u [in’u]: “straw” (Akk. titnu);
2) èß-tum: “chaff” (Akk. īlu);
3) in(-nu)-deš(RI): “chaff” (Akk. īlu);
4) in-nu/u-da: probably the same as in(-nu)-deš, “chaff”;
5) in-bulš-bulš: “chopped straw” (Akk. pā’u, ṭū).

Notes
1. See AHw., 874; Steinkeller, RA 73 (1979) 91. For the occurrences of in-bulš-bulš, see Steinkeller, op. cit., 91; M. Civil, The Farmer’s Instructions, AuOrSupl. 4, 96; Gomi and Sato, SAT 302 iv 8; Yıldız and Gomi, Istanbul 3 1802:3; Yıldız and Gomi, Istanbul 4 2330:3, 2685:2; Yıldız and Ozaki, Istanbul 5 3274 rev. 1; Sigrist SAT 2-3 992:3; etc. Etymologically, in-bulš-bulš is to be analyzed as *in-straw + bulš-bulš “to blow (away)” (= napāsû; PSD B, 171), “to remove” (nussû; see bu-ur LAGAB∫ÈŠ = nu-as-nu-a! ū ši (ŠE) in Ea 116).
2. See, e.g., MVN 14 391:2; MVN 15 390 xxii 70, xiii 5, 10, 16; MVN 16 1036:1, 4; Yıldız and Gomi, Istanbul 3 1608:1; Yıldız and Gomi, Istanbul 4 2496:1; Sigrist, SAT 1 370:3; Sigrist SAT 2-3 969:1 (spelled in-nu-u-da), 1421:3, 2136:2; Gomi and Sato, SAT 316:1, 536 iii 3). Since there survive mentions of boats loaded with in-nu-u-da (see, e.g., 4 má 60.0.0 gur in-nu-u-da in Sigrist, SAT 1 370:3, the in-nu-u-da, like in-bulš-bulš and èß-tum, must have been available in large quantities.
3. Accordingly, in-nu-u-da would have to be explained as [in’u-de-a]. That in-nu-u-da cannot be analyzed as a hypothetical *inud, “straw,” followed by a genitival suffix -a(k), is shown by the examples in which in-nu/u-da certainly does not stand in genitive, as in Sigrist, SAT 2-3 969, 1421, and 2136.

4. If in-nu-u-da is the same as in(-nu)-deš, we would have to assume, accordingly, that it is also identical with èß-tum. This conclusion finds support in the great rarity of èß-tum, as well as in the fact that in-nu-u-da and èß-tum do not occur together (the only exception here is Gomi and Sato SNAT 536: however, since this text appears to be a composite record, digested from several individual tablets, the use of variant terminology in it would not be surprising).

P. STEINKELLER (29-05-01)
Harvard University - Dept. of Near Eastern Studies
6 Divinity Avenue
CAMBRIDGE, Massachusetts 02138 (USA)

36) Rittu B – In ZA 90 (2000) 295, in his review of CAD volume R, D.O. Edzard objected to my proposal in JCS 19 (1974) 85 that two Akkadian words rittu exist: rittu A “hand,” and rittu B “suitability,” the latter from the root rdw “be suitable.” The objection was purely formal: from the root rdw (“rdv” is presumably a misprint) a form *rittu - rittu is inconceivable, as much as a form *bintu - *bittu from bny or *muatu - *muttu from mnu.

The question of meaning is ignored, but that is also relevant, and the meanings given to the single lemma rittu oppon in AHw., referred to with approval, show the problem: “A. Hand. B. (übertragen) Handgriff ... Machbarkeit, Möglichkeit.” The meaning “handle” from “hand” is easy to understand, but there is no obvious association of “hand” with practicality and possibility. It seems to be stretching the meaning. A survey simply of the passages in CAD under redā B and rittu B shows that they are used with the same meaning. Note in particular that they are often both negated, and that in the contexts there appears to be no difference between al ireddu/ireddā and ul rittum. The ancient Mari scribes certainly saw this rittum as cognate with the verb rdw. Of course, one could dismiss this as folk etymology, so back to form.

First, it is wrong to assume that as root letters y and w behave in identical fashion. Roots with first radical w lose this w completely in the L1 imperative šib (parallelised in Biblical Hebrew), which is not even paralleled in ikis from nks. Also over the centuries the verbs with third radical w tend to pass over into the class with third radical y, but not the opposite (except in late texts and late copies where all endings can be chaotic): OB īdu is often later īdī, but OB ibnī does not evolve into ībnu. Also a middle root letter w disappeared sooner than a middle y. OB forms like iriyab occur, but not ītuwar, except as archaisms. Thus comparison of rdw and bny is not decisive.
The question then is whether the noun from a root with a third radical \( w \) can lose this \( w \) before a fem., -t-. In masculine nouns all third weak letters (as known from Semitics) can disappear: \( \text{pānu} \) from \( p\text{w}w, \text{kīlu} \) from \( kl' \), \( \text{šēlu} \) from \( sl' \), etc. The feminine nouns from \( h\text{dw} \) and \( m\text{nuw} \) appear as \( \text{hīdātu} \) and \( \text{mīnīţū} \) in \( \text{AHw} \), but as \( \text{hīdātu} \) and \( \text{mīnīţū} \) in \( \text{CAD. AHw} \) took both as having the abstract ending -\( ātu \). \( \text{CAD} \) took only the latter in this way, \( \text{hīdātu} \) was judged to have the simple feminine -t only. In view of this disagreement and the lack of certainty, these examples cannot be used. The present writer has hot found any certain case of a root with final \( w \) forming a feminine noun with loss of the \( w \) and the simple feminine -t, but there are not so many roots of this kind. Those with third \( y \) are more common. And from \( \text{banū} \) (\( bny \)) a feminine noun exists: \( \text{kāntūm} \) “mother” with complete loss of the \( y \) and the simple feminine -t. The examples are probably all not older than Middle Babylonian, but that is no argument that Old Babylonian examples with roots with final \( w \) could not exist, as we have already demonstrated. Thus since there is no formal objection to taking \( rittu \) \( B \) from \( rd\text{w} \), and since meaning strongly connects the two, as the ancients attest also, the separation of \( rittu \) \( A \) and \( rittu \) \( B \) is sure.

W.G. LAMBERT  (18-04-01)
Dept of Ancient History and Archaeology – Univ. of Birmingham
BIRMINGHAM B15 2TT (Grande-Bretagne)

37) Eine Perle mit Inschrift des Königs Kurigalzu – Die Perle⁴ weist eine Durchbohrung⁵ auf und hat einen Durchmesser von 17,5 mm und eine Dicke von 6 mm. Sie besteht aus weiß-braun gebändertem Sard-Ontyx⁶. Sie ist gut erhalten, nur an den Kanten des Loches sind kleine Stücke des Steins abgesplittert. Die Perle trägt die folgende dreizeilige Inschrift:

1. \( a-na \) (\( En-\text{llí} \) \( \text{be\text{-}lí\text{-}šu} \) Dem Enil, seinem Herrn,
2. Ku-ri-gal-zu lugal-šár TUR hat Kurigalzu, der ... König der Gesamtheit
3. \( i-qí-šš \) geschenkt“

Für die Zeilen 1 und 3 kommen in Kurigalzu-Inschriften vergleichbare Formulierungen vor⁴. Auch der Königstitel lugal-šár (\( Z. \) 2) ist bei ihm bezeugt⁵. Schwierigkeiten bereitet jedoch am Ende von Z. 2 das sehr klar geschriebene Zeichen TUR. Es gibt dafür wenigstens zwei Erklärungsmöglichkeiten: Entweder wollte der Steinschneider ursprünglich nach dem Epitheton die Filiation des Königs (\( \text{dumu \text{ Bu\text{-}na\text{-}bu\text{-}ri\text{-}ja\text{-}a\text{-}š} \) anbringen und bemerkte erst nach der Fertigstellung des TUR, daß er dafür auf der kleinen Perle keinen Platz hatte. Oder es liegt ein bisher für Kurigalzu noch nicht bezeugtes (und auch sonst nur seltenes) Königseptetheton vor: BANDA³/BAN_NA_DA = \( ek\text{du} \) “wild, ungestüm”⁶. Assyrische Könige ab der Zeit Adad-nirari I benutzten es gelegentlich (Kurigalzu II, um den es sich in der oben publizierten Inschrift handeln dürfte, trat seine Regierung etwa 35 Jahre vor Adad-nirari I an). Gegen eine Deutung als \( ek\text{du} \) spricht jedoch die Schreibung des TUR nach šár. Man würde es direkt nach lugal erwarten. Folglich bleibt nur, darin einen Fehler des Schreibers zu sehen.

1. Dem Eigentümer der Perle, Herrn Dr. E. Homsey, danke ich ganz herzlich für die Publikationserlaubnis.

1. Dem Eigentümer der Perle, Herrn Dr. E. Homsey, danke ich ganz herzlich für die Publikationserlaubnis.
5. AHw 121.12 (an Adad); W.G. Lambert, RA 63, 1969, 66f. (an Ninil, Ninurta, Enil und Adad); E. Sollberger, Genava (NS) 2, 238 Fig. 150 (an Enil).
6. BIB 2, 15.2; L. Delaporte, Musée du Louvre II p. 179 A 819 :2 ; J.A. Brinkman, MSKH 1, 225 Nr. 77 ; mehrfach auch Ku-ri-gal-zu lugal-šar ekdu z.B. H. Limet. Les légendes des sceaux cassites 2.16; 6.20.
7. AHw 193; CAD E 63 ekdu b; M.J. Seux, Epithètes Royales S. 80, 231 (\( qar\text{-}ra\text{-}du \text{ek?\text{-}du?} \), 297 (\( šarru ekdu \).

Hartmut WAETZOLDT  (21-06-2001)
Seminar für Sprachen und Kulturen des Vorderen Orients – Assyriologie
Hauptstr. 126, 69117 HEIDELBERG (Allemagne)

38) Corrigenda to NABU 2001/10 (A Late-Babylonian Mathematical Text) – [Corrections marked in bold]
P. 11 : transliteration l. 11, please read : 48 ıgi-50-<gľal-hi> 1,12(sic) 1,12
P. 12: please read: For the phraseology of the text, see mi GAM mi lu DU-ma lu (x) "what should I multiply by what so that (the result would be x)" in Neugebauer and Sachs, MCT Text Y obv. 5.9 [MCT : 141-45] and AO 6484 problems #14-#17 (= rev. 12, 16, 21, 25) in MCT I: 96-107.

Karen R. NEMET-NEJAT  (31-05-2001)

Dans une série de lettres adressées par le roi Ammi-šaduqa à des responsables de Sippar-Yahurrum, des consignes sont données pour la garde de la ville. Voici ces passages en parallèle tels qu’ils ont été transcrits, traduits et commentés :

– AbB 12 : 17 lú x ḫa NIM i-na bā dā la ú-ur-ra-ad « Der … darf nicht von der Stadtmauer herabsteigen! »
– CTMMA I 69 : 9 LÚ ma-a-nim i-na BĀD la ú-ur-ra-ad « No … shall descend from the wall. » (Il s’agit ici d’une citation par Marduk-muṣallim de la lettre qu’il a reçue du roi.


L’expression LÚ ma-ha-num désigne sûrement un singulier collectif, comme Kraus l’avait pressenti dans sa note d’AbB VII. Il faut traduire : « Les gardes doivent être renforcées. Que pas un homme (originaire) de Mahanum ne descende du mur! »

Or J.-M. Durand, dans sa communication lors de la dernière Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale (Paris, juillet 2000), a indiqué que la ville de Mahanum, siège d’un sanctuaire voué au dieu Addu, se trouvait au sud du Djebel Sindjar ; on sait que le Numhâ était situé dans cette région.

Il apparaît donc que le groupe des Numhéens chargés de monter la garde de Sippar-Yahurrum sous le règne d’Ammi-šaduqa provenait de la ville de Mahanum. Il ne me semble pas possible de préciser à quel moment ils quittèrent leur région d’origine pour aller à Sippar, mais ils forment à n’en pas douter un groupe supplémentaire de personnes d’origine étrangère présentes sur le territoire babylonien à la fin de la première dynastie.

1. Les références à Mahanum, en dehors du nom de l’année ZL 9*, restent peu nombreuses dans les textes publiés ou cités à ce jour :

Il n’y a pas de référence à Mahanum dans ARM II 7 : 19 ; voir LAPO 17, p. 40 n 465 n. B. Noter que J.-M. Durand est revenu sur son hypothèse que Mahanum ne soit pas une localité, mais le terme désignant un « campement » (LAPO 17, p. 417), comme le montrent ses indications dans LAPO 18, p. 130 à propos du dieu Addu, qu’il faut simplement corriger sur un point : « avec un sanctuaire majeur comme celui de Mahanum, il était certainement la grande divinité des Bédouins Bensim’alites. Zimrî-Lîm lui consacra d’ailleurs un trône, ce qui donna son nom à l’année ZL 8* [lire 9*] ». Il est vraisemblable qu’il le lui aporta lui-même, puisqu’à la fin de ZL 8* nous voyons le roi de Mari, sur sa route pour rejoindre son beau-père Yarîm-Lîm, passer par Mahanum (cf. P. V., UF 18). Il est essentiel d’un point de vue pour éliminer la ville de Mahanum de cette campagne en renfort du Yamhad fin ZL 8* ; sa route remontait le Habur jusqu’à Zîlḥân et Qirdahat avant d’oblier vers l’ouest.

Dominique CHARPIN (08-05-2001)
32 bis, avenue Kennedy
92160 ANTONY (France)


Es gibt eine kleine Reliefstele aus Assur, die einen barhäuptigen, auf einem niedrigen Sockel stehenden Mann vor einer kriegerischen Gottheit (Ninurta?) zeigt, deren Füße unmittelbar auf der Standlinie aufstehen (W. Andrae, Das wiedererstandene Assur (1938) Taf. 21 c: Gipssteinplatte; 35 x 30 cm; Ass. 8262 = Brit. Mus. WA 115694). Üblich ist die umgekehrte Verteilung: die Gottheit steht auf einem Sockel und der Betender zu ebener Erde. In beiden Fällen wird aber vermieden, daß Gott und Mensch unmittelbar auf demselben Grund stehen.


Das Bild des “Beters” auf einer Art Plinthe ist auch in Iran bekannt (P. Calmeyer, AMI NF 6, 1973, 147 - 149).

42) našUGU.ÂŠ.GL₁,GL₄ = agusigu – Ein Schultext, der jüngst von P.D. Gesche publiziert wurde, enthält eine bisher nicht belegte Passage aus ur-ša = hubullu XVI.¹ Aus der Zeile BM 37932 Vs. 5′: [našaugs]-âš-gl₁-gîa = a-gu-sî-gu, ergibt sich erstmalig die korrekte akkadische Lesung für den Stein, der am häufigsten in den Schreibungen našUGU.ÂŠ.GL₁,GL₄ und našUGU.ÂŠ.GLGL belegt ist.

Bestätigt wird diese Lesung in einem Text, der für den Träger eines Siegels je nach verwendeter

Ursula SEIDL (31-01-2001)
Nadistr. 129
D-80809 MÜNCHEN (Allemagne)
Steinart Voraussagen trifft. Den Anfang des Textes gibt BAM 194 VIII’ 9’-14’ wieder. Die Parallelen K. 4212 und Rm 320 mit seiner Fortsetzung sind unpubliziert.2

Die Liste beginnt mit der Formulierung na^KIŠIB na^X GAR “Wenn (einer) ein Siegel aus X-Stein trägt” und gibt für zwanzig Steine die entsprechenden “Apodosen”. Die Steinliste wird dann in einem zweiten Abschnitt wiedergegeben, beschreibt aber nun na^KIŠIB GABA-tā na^X

“Wenn das Siegel (auf) seiner Brust (ans) X-Stein ist”. Die relevante Passage lautet:

K. 4212Vs. 2’ na^KIŠIB GUG GAR x  ]
Rm 320 I.S. 10’ na^KIŠIB GABA-tā na^X-
K. 4212Vs. 3’ na^KIŠIB a-ba-ä-mi GAR x [ 1
Rm 320 I.S. 11’ na^KIŠIB GABA-tā ab-ä-i<-mi“[
K. 4212 Vs. 4’ na^KIŠIB a-gu-si-gu GAR
Rm 320 I.S. 12’ na^KIŠIB GABA-tā,GU.AŚ.GI4/4.GI4
K. 4212Vs. 5’ na^KIŠIB AŚ.GI4/4.GI4
Rm 320 I.S. 13’ na^KIŠIB GABA-tā AŚ-GI4


Notes
3. In AHw 360b nur einige der in CAD aufgeführten Belege unter busigu, k/gusºgu.

Añais SCHUSTER (20-05-2001)
Institut für Altorientalische Philologie und Vorderasiatische Altertumskunde
Rosenstraße 9 D - 48143 MÜNSTER (Allemagne)

43) “Queen” in Middle Assyrian – It is generally accepted that the Neo-Assyrian vernacular for “the queen” is written MUNUS.É.GAL, and must be the origin of the Hebrew and Aramaic words seqal etc. This was understood as ša ékalli by Landsberger, but a better equivalence to MUNUS.É.GAL is given by reading issi ékalli “palace woman” (see Parpola, SAAB 2 (1988) 73-6). In that article he refers to the writing MUNUS.É.GAL-li found on a curious late Middle Assyrian clay foot published by S. Franke & G. Wilhelm (Jahrbuch des Museums für Kunst und Gewerbe Hamburg 4 (1985) p. 21; probably reign of Tiglath-Pileser I). The fact that this phrase meaning “queen” is thus already attested in the 2nd millennium suggests a reinterpretation of a difficult letter from Dur-šarrum (Sheikh Hamad). This is the letter to Aššur-iddin, the governor, from one of his staff, published and edited by E.C. Cancik-Kirschbaum, Die mittelassyrischen Briefe aus Tall Šēṭ Hammād, pp. 147-153. His correspondent is reporting to Aššur-iddin about the composition of the royal cavalcade which is about to descend on him. It is a motley collection, including the Kassite king and queen, but it is the first group of visitors which interests us here. The crucial lines are given by the editor as:

8 É.GAL-LIM GAL-tu nāqi Qašt-i-ma-tu
9 à NIN.MEŠ ša 13 MUNUS.MEŠ
10 lu-ā DUMU.MUNUS.MEŠ SIG3 ni-a-tu
11 KIMIN lu-ā kaš-ši-a-tu
12 2 MUNUS.MEŠ a-lāh-hi-na-a-tu
13 KIMIN 1 MUNUS ša-tal-su-tu
14 ŠU.NIN.GIN 6 GIŠ.ut-na-na-a-tu

The editor’s translation of H. 8-9 reads: “(Es wird) ein großer Hofstaat (sein): (nämlich) Qašt-i-mătu und zwei Anführinnen von dreizehn Damen … ” This is undeniably awkward, and I suggest a better solution would be “The Chief Queen Qašt-i-mătu, and her sisters. 13 women, either our own or Kassite high-born ladies …” It certainly seems preferable to take NIN as “sister”, avoiding the awkwardness of understanding what “mistresses of 13 women” would be. Cancik-Kirschbaum is uncertain about Qašt-i-mătu, as she says “Gerne wüßte man mehr über die Dame Qašt-imătu, die an so prominenter Stelle und als einzige namentlich genannt wird. Es ist unwahrscheinlich, dag es sich um die assyrische Königin handelt, bei dieser würde man doch einen Titel erwarten.” (p. 151). Just so. If the words É.GAL-LIM GAL-tu in fact refer to the Queen, the problem is resolved: she is the Queen, and her title is indeed given. (Obiter, in l. 13, given that we are in a harem
environment it is hard to resist the conclusion that the scribe intended 1 MUNUS ša re-šu-tu; but this is not the occasion to pursue the implications of this!"

If É.GAL-lim here refers to the Queen, then it probably also does in ll. 5, 17, 20 and 23. Of course one might say that in all these cases it does as usual just mean “palace”, but there are some reasons to doubt this. I concede that it might mean that, but as the editor has seen, to judge from her translations “Hofstaat” (1. 8), or “Angehörigen des Hofes” (l. 23), it is a little unexpected to find the palace mentioned when it is apparent that the court is on the move, in fact about to spend the night at Apku. Moreover, after enumerating a group of three “allocations” (piqittu) to “the palace”, the author goes on to list an allocation to the king himself (aššum piqitte ša LUGAL), which indicates that the immediate entourage of the king was separate from “the palace”. There could be various explanations of this, but an elegant one is that “the palace” refers to the queen: thus the “allocation for the personnel (ER‡N.MEfi) of the Palace” (11. 17, 20) is to be divided three ways into “1 allocation to the Palace (i.e. the Queen and her household), 1 allocation for the daughters of the king, 1 allocation for the personnel” (the editor reads ma-a-du-te “many” which seems a curiously vague concept in this context; could it perhaps be ma-su¹-ár¹-te or ma-su-šar-te “guard-personnel”?)

The question remains how we should reconstruct the Akkadian terra lying behind the logogram. Is it as in Neo-Assyrian issitu ekall(m)? This would provide one explanation of the apparent genitive -lim (though as Cancik-Kirschbaum suggests (p. 151) it could just be an “erstarre, syntaktisch funktionslose Schreibkonvention for alle Kasus”), but it does not explain the absence of an expected MUNUS, both in line 8 and elsewhere. Perhaps it is more likely that at that stage the usage was just -ßu-lim (though
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Il faut alors peut-être opérer un rapprochement avec une lettre attestant la proclamation de la fin du deuil auquel Íßme-Dagan fait allusion dans IV 61 (= 29-15-570 et MA 3 et probabl. 7 [comm. p. 173]).

Il remarque qu’un des témoins scelle avec un sceau qui le décrit comme « serviteur de Sabium l’objet et non le sujet du verbe dans une formule de nom d’année me paraît contraire à l’esprit du système. Il faut alors peut-être opérer un rapprochement avec une lettre attestant la proclamation de la fin du deuil...
deuil que le pays respectait depuis la mort de Samsu-iluna, au moment même où Abî-eßuh proclamait la *miṣarum* : 

\[ AbB 12 172 : (8') \text{ki-ma be-li i-du-ú mi-šar ma-tim (9')} \text{šar-rum ši-ku-un di-pa-ar kù-gi (10')} \text{a-na [m]a-tim ši-ši à ma-li ma-tim im-si « Comme mon seigneur le sait, le roi a promulgué la "restauration" (miṣarum) du pays : il a levé la torche d'or pour le pays et a lavé les cheveux sales du pays » (voir mon étude sur « Les prêteurs et le palais : les édits de miṣarum des rois de Babylone et leurs traces dans les archives privées », dans A.C.V.M. Bongenaar dans *Interdependency of Institutions and Private Entrepreneurs (MOS Studies 2)*, *PIHANS* 87, Leiden, 2000, p. 185 n. 1). On pourrait alors comprendre que les deux noms d’années d’Apil-Sîn comportent *mâtam* comme objet sous-entendu de urammiku / ugallibu : « année où Apil-Sîn a lavé/rasé (le pays) », c’est-à-dire mis fin au deuil imposé au pays depuis la mort de Sabium.

Dominique CHARPIN (20-05-2001)

**VIE DE L’ASSYRIOLOGIE**


47) **Thèse** : Le samedi 1 juin 2001, Melle Adelina MILLET-ALBA a soutenu à l’EPHE sa thèse de Doctorat sur « La population du royaume de Mari à l’époque du roi Zimri-Lîm d’après les archives du palais de Mari » devant un jury composé de Mme Nele Ziegler (CNRS) et de MM. D. Charpin (Université de Paris I et EPHE), G. Del Olmo Lete (Université de Barcelone) et J.-M. Durand (Collège de France et EPHE, directeur de la thèse) ; M. J. San Martin, qui devait participer au jury, a été empêché *in extremis* suite à des problèmes de transport. Elle a obtenu la mention Très Honorable avec les félicitations du jury unanime.


49) **Nomination** - Benjamin R. Foster has been appointed curator to the Yale Babylonian Collection as successor to William W. Hallo.
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