N.A.B.U.

Nouvelles Assyriologiques Brèves et Utilitaires

2015

N°1 (mars)

NOTES BRÈVES

01) Hamburg meets Uruk – a perhaps somewhat daring hypothesis* — "What's the name of the mayor of Wesel?" The echo reflected by a rock face to which one shouts this question is "Esel!", that is "donkey"– a joke which many German children are familiar with. Others, such as the boiler cleaners ("Kesselklopfer"), who in the age of steam navigation brushed down the scale inside the boilers of the steamboats in Hamburg harbour, were not satisfied with such amusing answers. When the workers shouted at one another in the interior of the huge metal boilers there was a similar echo effect. In order to make conversation between them possible they shifted initial consonant clusters to the end of a word and by additionally attaching an "i" they made the pronunciation easier: in this manner "Wesel" becomes "Esel-wi". That was the so-called "Kesselklopfersprache" ("boiler cleaners'" language),[1] which the modern age has swept away.

Is it conceivable that though there was no "boiler cleaners'" language in the archaic city of Uruk a standardised "boiler cleaners'" spelling had become well established, a spelling in which the first part of a lexeme was written at the end?[2]

In the Uruk IV period the canonisation process of the lexical lists is still in progress. Looking at the forerunners of the archaic list "Lú A" (ATU 3, pl. 23) it is striking that the elements NÁM and GAL are still missing in most of the texts (compare GA in W 9656,x). The addition of qualifying elements sets up a form of hierarchy: GA GAL, GA GEŠTU, GA NUN (W 9656,h). NÁM can still stand in any position.

In the Uruk III period the arrangement of the signs in accordance with formal criteria was in all likelihood an intended standard: apart from occasional exceptions (ÚMUN GAL in W 21552 [ATU 3, pl. 10]) and some ambiguous entries (e. g., in the texts W 17942 [pl. 1] or W 20234 [pl. 6]) NÁM and GAL are written in the first position now (list "Lú A"; for NAMEŠDA see note 2). Determinatives appear in the final position (a noticeable exception is GIŠ which can also be written at the beginning or in the middle of an expression [ATU 3, list "Wood"]; the position of the sign AN differs as well [ATU 3, list "Metal"]).[3] It cannot be ascertained whether determinatives (or categorising elements in the broader sense) were in some cases pronounced.[4] It is particularly striking that ÁB, GU₄ and AMAR are always written in the non-Sumerian manner in the final position of the entries in the list "Animals"[5] [ATU 3] (BABBAR ÁB instead of ÁB BABBAR, "white cow"). The syllabic duplicate MEE 3, 62 shows that the entries we are dealing with are "boiler cleaners'" spellings, in other words they have to be read in the

Sumerian standard order of speaking as /ab-babbar/ (etc.), which leads to the conclusion that this convention might have been valid for the other lists as well.

One may wonder why this *abzu*-type orthography, which one would not really expect in carefully elaborated lexical lists, was finally given up (apart from the well-known exceptions [ABZU, LUGAL, UŠUMGAL: LAK, p. 5] and the entries in the copies of the lexical lists[6]). The expresssion GAL UKKIN = KINGAL (*UKKIN GAL?) might be an indication that those spellings were not introduced by the Sumerians (see ATU 3, list "Lú A", 16 [however, UKKIN GAL in one of the above mentioned forerunners (W 9656,h)]; likewise UŠUMGAL, ~ 99). In this case a supposed *abzu* spelling is also unambiguously read against the direction of writing and is pronounced as in Sumerian (element /gal/). Is it conceivable that because of the assumption that lexical entries should be read from right to left as in the case of the list "Animals", this profession was literally (sign-for-sign) translated from another language (PE?), in which "GAL UKKIN" was the normal order of writing and reading, and then incorporated in this "mirror-inverted" form as a foreign word into the Sumerian language (compare later kingal beside GAL.UKKIN as well as the title gal-ukkin-na)? A similar example in English: the Italian *conto corrente* becomes (literally translated) *current* (or *running*) *account* although the verb "to run" has originally nothing in common with an account.

KINGAL and UŠUMGAL were "literally" incorporated into the Sumerian language; other archaic professions that were preserved (GAL NI [*GAL NIM], GAL ŠUBUR, GAL TE) had readings which were independent of the spelling (šandan, úkur, tirum) and therefore cannot be classified as possible *abzu* spellings. Some fossilized "boiler cleaners'" spellings will be found in the PE language, too (see note 2; similarly, until recently one could write either DM 3,45 or 3,45 DM).

Ironically enough, the attestations given in the archaic text corpus (before the Ur archive) do not seem to prove that ABZU itself, from which the *abzu*-type orthography derives its name, was written in the *abzu*-type orthography; it could have been later turned into an *abzu* spelling by the Sumerians, who believed that AB as part of a geographical name should "classically" (PE) be in the final position (ATU 3, list "Cities").

To summarize, then, it would appear that the *abzu*-type orthography does *not* seem to be a Sumerian quirk but rather the PE standard direction of writing and speaking. The Sumerians did however borrow some learned expressions in the reverse order of spelling from the PE lists "Lú A" and "Cities" (ABZU and other toponyms, the pronunciation of which is independent of the spelling); apart from that they copied the archaic lists but used the Sumerian equivalents when writing administrative documents (e. g., áb-babbar against BABBAR ÁB as in the list "Animals").

* Abbreviations as in *NABU* 2013/55; LAK: A. Deimel, *Liste der archaischen Keilschriftzeichen*, WVDOG 40 (1922); MEE 3: G. Pettinato, *Testi lessicali monolingui della biblioteca L. 2769*, Materiali epigrafici di Ebla, 3 (1981); (ED: Early Dynastic; PE: Proto-Euphratic).

1) K. Siewert, *Die Kedelkloppersprook. Geheimsprache aus dem Hamburger Hafen*, Hamburg 2002.

2) So-called *abzu*-type orthography: the writer could have said to himself "LÚ-GAL", GAL being the last mentally articulated entity, which was written down spontaneously and followed by the beginning of the word. Furthermore, there are spellings arranged according to the aesthetic appearance (ligatures EŠDA+NÁM, NI+RU), spellings taking skillful advantage of the available space (see NAMEŠDA in W 17942 [ATU 3, pl. 1]; in this case presumably to be considered as an indication of the correct order of the signs as well), as well as playful or arbitrary spellings (because a sign has a higher information content than a letter the sense of a case inscribed with only a few signs is easy to comprehend).

3) Sometimes inattentiveness might be the reason (left column of the reverse of the list "Swine", ATU 3, pl. 36). Two examples for variants: a) ATU 3, list "Wood", 24: GIŠ GI BU (W 20495), BU GIŠ GI (W 20327,2) [*one* entry in different texts], b) list "Wood", 20 and 21: GIŠ MA and ḪAŠḪUR GIŠ instead of the usual GIŠ ḪAŠḪUR [comparable entries in one and the same text, W 20327,2].

4) Compare bil*berry*, black*berry*, straw*berry*, but: red currant; categorising elements may stand at the beginning or at the end of a word (like GIŠ): Kanarien*vogel*, *Vogel* Strauß; Heiligen*stadt*, *Stadt*olden*dorf* (even two categorising elements). The "determinatives" AB and É were certainly not pronounced (otherwise a corresponding phoneme or syllable should be traceable in the geographical names which contain those signs), they were not even recognised by the Sumerians as such (*NABU* 2013/55, note 13).

5) Latest edition: R. Pientka-Hinz, Bunte Kühe? Zu den frühesten Farbbezeichnungen im Alten Orient, WOO (Wiener Offene Orientalistik) 6 (2011), 325–374.

6) The ED copies (actually adaptations) of the archaic lists include considerable deviations, compare, e. g., GÍR ÁB (ATU 3, list "Metal", 69) and ÁB GÍR (MEE 3, p. 82, 69) ⌈ ⌉

Erlend GEHLKEN
Universität Frankfurt/Main (GERMANY)

02) Éblaïte *ma-ga-za-u$_9$*, « gouge » — À Ébla on connaît la graphie *ma-ga-za-u$_9$* jusqu'à présent grâce à seulement deux passages de textes adminitratifs toujours inédits:

[1] TM.75.G.2359 r. XII:7 - XIII :6:[1] 57 gín DILMUN nagga / šub / *si-in* / 6 ma-na ša-pi 6 gín DILMUN a-gar$_5$-gar$_5$ / kin$_5$-aka / 5 tùn tur tar tar / 5 dub-nagar sal 15 / 5 dub-nagar sal 10 / 5 ***ma-ga-za-u$_9$*** 10 / 5 *ma-za-<ḫa>-ru$_{12}$* tar / [...] / [...] / [...] ⌈x⌉ / 5 nagar-nagar gibil / lú / giš-taškarin / *wa-ba-rú*[*m*] / [šu-]ba$_4$-ti ;

[2] TM.75.G.2462 f. XI:32 - XIII:6:[2] šušana$_x$-7 nagga / š[ub *si-in*] / [2] ma-na ša-pi-3 a-gar$_5$-gar$_5$ / kin$_5$-aka / 2 tùn tur tar / 1 dub-nagar šu-mu-nígin šušana$_x$ / 1 dub-nagar šušana$_x$ sal / 1 ***ma-ga-za-u$_9$*** šušana$_x$ / 1 dub-nagar 15 sal / 2 dub-nagar 10 10 / 1 *ma-za-ḫa-lum* 10 / 1 zú 10 / 1 *ḫa-ra-nu* 5 / 1 dub-nagar tur 4 / 1 UŠ×KÍD 6 / *mi-ga-NI* / lú *in-ma-lik* / šušana$_x$-7 nagga / šub *si-in* / 2 ma-na ša-pi-3 a-gar$_5$-gar$_5$ / kin$_5$-aka / 2 tùn tur tar / 1 dub-nagar šu-mu-nígin šušana$_x$ / 1 dub-nagar šušana$_x$ sal / 1 ***ma-ga-za-u$_9$**** šušana$_x$ / 1 dub-nagar 15 sal / 2 dub-nagar 10 10 / [1 *m*]*a-za-ḫa-lum* 10 / 1 zú 10 / 1 *ḫa-ra-nu* 5 / 1 dub-nagar tur 4 / 1 UŠ×KÍD 6 / *zu-za-um*.

Il s'agit des sorties du métal utilisé pour faire (kin$_5$-aka) des outils destinés dans **[1]** aux charpentiers (nagar-nagar) qui étaient préposés au travail des objets en buis (giš-taškarin)[3] et dans **[2]** à des personnages dont la charge n'est pas indiquée, peut-être des charpentiers eux-aussi,[4] ou bien des médecins, étant donné que ces derniers reçoivent ailleurs presque les mêmes objets,[5] la plupart desquels sont difficiles à identifier. Le graphie *ma-ga-za-u$_9$* indique donc le nom d'un de ces outils et l'on trouve cité aussi sous la forme du duel dans **[3]** TM.75.G.2359 f. X:13:[6] 2 *ma-ga-za-'à*. Il a été proposé que ce mot tire son origine de la racine sémitique **gz'*, « couper »,[7] en tant que substantif avec schéma *ma12a3-*. Même si l'on peut considérer apte au contexte le sens de cette racine, l'hypothèse est de toute façon improbable puisqu'à Ébla les signes *u$_9$* et *'à* ne sont jamais utilisés pour rendre /'/ étymologique.[8] En accord avec les règles du syllabaire éblaïte,[9] il vaut mieux de penser, à mon avis, à une comparaison avec le sém. occ. **ksḫ*, « couper ; emporter », une racine qui est connue successivement en hébreu, en araméen et en arabe.[10] Bien qu'actuellement il demeure sans doute difficile de trouver une traduction précise du terme éblaïte, on peut supposer qu'il s'agisse d'une sorte de gouge,[11] un outil à graver qui sert dans la sculpture sur bois pour le travail grossier ainsi que pour la finition.

[1] Cité par CATAGNOTI sous presse.
[2] Cité par ARCHI 1995: 7. Je remercie le prof. A. Archi qui a eu l'amabilité de collationner le texte.
[3] CATAGNOTI sous presse.
[4] Nous savons qu'il existe à Ébla un *in-ma-lik* nagar d'après *ARET* IV 23 (19), mais il n'est pas du tout certain qu'il s'agisse du même personnage que celui qui est cité dans le passage **[2]**.
[5] Comme ARCHI 1995: 10 l'a bien vu. Il faut remarquer, en outre, qu'une fois dans les textes connus quelques-uns de ces outils sont livrés au ministre *ib-rí-um*, voir *MEE* 7 47 r. XIV:9-21: ša-pi gín DILMUN kù:babbar / šu-bal-aka / 8 gín DILMUN kù-sig$_{17}$ / nu$_{11}$-za 1 *za-ḫa-da* / *ib-rí-um* / 8 gín DILMUN nagga / šub *si-in* / 1 tùn tur 1 dub-⌈nagar⌉ sal / 1 *ma-za-ḫa-rúm* / 1 UŠ×KID / *si-in* / za$_x$ / ⌈*ib-rí*⌉-[*um*].
[6] Cité par ARCHI 1995: 9.
[7] Par ARCHI 1995: 23, qui traduit « rasp ».
[8] CONTI 1990: 16-17.
[9] Pour l'emploi des signes *u$_9$* et *'à* pour rendre /ḫ/ étymologique, CONTI 1990: 16-17.
[10] Pour cette racine, *DRS* 10, 1248-1249; *HAL*, 465.
[11] Même si dans les passages **[1-2]** on ne trouve pas le sumérien šum, « scie », qui est cité dans d'autres listes analogues d'outils où il n'y a pas, en revanche, la graphie sémitique étudiée ici (voir, par example, *MEE* 12 37 r. XII:33 - XIII:13: 4 ma-na 5 gín DILMUN nagga / šub *si-in* / 30 lá-2 ma-na tar-5 gín DILMUN a-gar$_5$-gar$_5$ / 10 tùn tur tar / 20 dub nagar ⌈maḫ⌉ šušana$_x$ / 20 dub-nagar tur 15 / 20 dub-nagar sal 4 / 20 *ma-za-ḫa-lu* 10 / 20 *ḫa-ra-an* 7 / 20 *ḫa-ra-an* 5 / 20 UŠ×KÍD 2 / 10 ma-na a-gar$_5$-gar$_5$ / 20 šum tar / lú gibil / nagar-nagar / *wa-ba-rúm* / šu-ba--ti), nous n'avons aucune preuve pour affirmer que *ma-ga-za-u$_9$* est l'équivalent sémitique de šum. Pour ce dernier mot on verra la liste lexicale éblaïte, *VE* 766 (source D), šum^{urudu} = *sar-sa-rúm*, /šaršārum/, du sém. **w/nśr*, « scier » (CONTI 1990: 188, avec bibliographie).

Bibliographie

ARCHI, A., 1995, « List of Tools », dans M. Dietrich & O. Loretz (éds.), *Vom Alten Orient zum Alten Testament. Festschrift für Wolfram Freiherrn von Soden zum 85. Geburtstag am 19. Juni 1993*, AOAT 240, Neukirchen-Vluyn, 7-10.

CATAGNOTI, A., sous presse, « Il lessico dei vegetali ad Ebla : bosso ».

CONTI, G., 1990, *Il sillabario della quarta fonte della lista lessicale eblaita*, QdS 17, Firenze.

Jacopo PASQUALI, <pasquali.jacopo@tin.it>
Via degli Alfani, 77, 50121 FIRENZE. ITALIE.

03) Un nouvel exemplaire d'une inscription de fondation de Goudéa*)— Dans une collection privée d'Allemagne est préservé un clou de fondation en argile de Goudéa, souverain néo-sumérien, qui fut *Ensi* de la cité-État de Lagaš d'environ 2141 à 2122 avant Jésus-Christ. L'inscription est déjà bien connue par d'autres documents. Par exemple l'exemplaire de Berlin, Vorderasiatisches Museum, Inv.-N°· 3118, conserve cette inscription, comme des centaines d'autres dans des collections différentes. L'inscription est connue sous la désignation STEIBLE 48 et porte le numéro 37 dans l'édition des textes de Dietz Otto EDZARD.[1] Cette inscription apparaît le plus souvent ; elle est suivie pour la fréquence par le texte STEIBLE 51, qui correspond à EDZARD 41 (Gudea E3/1.1.7.41).

Ce clou mesure 13,6 cm de longueur, pour une épaisseur maximale de 6,5 cm. La partie inférieure a une largeur maximale de 1, 3 cm. Au regard de ces proportions, il s'agit d'un objet dans la norme en comparaison d'autres exemplaires. L'inscription, dont sont conservées treize lignes, repose sur une case de 10,5 cm de longueur avec dix cartouches, la case de gauche mesurant 5,6 cm et la case de droite 4,55 cm de large. L'état de conservation est bon, les signes eux-mêmes se détachent nettement sur l'argile. Seul un petit morceau de 1,2 cm dans la partie inférieure est cassé.

Col. I:

1		^{d}nin-ĝír-su
2		ur-saĝ kal(a)-ga
3		^{d}en-líl-lá-ra
4		gù-dé-a
5		PA.TE.SI (=énsi)
6		ŠIR.BUR.LA^{ki}-ke$_4$
7		níĝ-du$_7$-e pa mu-na-è
8		é-ninnu ^{d}IM.MI.MUŠEN-bábbar-ra-ni

Col. 2:

9	𒈬𒈾𒆕	mu-na-dù
10	𒆠𒁉𒈬𒈾𒄄	ki-ˊbiˀ mu-na-gi₄

Transcription analytique:

1 Nin.ĝirsu(==ak)
2 Ur-saĝ kalag-a
3 En.lil=a(k)==ra
4 Gu.de-a
5 ensi
6 Lagaš=(a)k==e
7 niĝ.ul==e mu-n.a-(n)-e-Ø
8 E.ninnu Anzu(=ak) babbar=ani
9 mu-n.a-(n)-du-Ø
10 ki=bi mu-n.a-(n)-gi-Ø

«¹ Pour Ningirsu, ² guerrier fort ³ d'Enlil, ⁴ Goudéa («l'Appelé»), ⁵ *Ensi* ⁶ du Lagaš, ⁷ il fait les choses comme elles apparaissent. ⁹ Il lui construit (et) ¹⁰ lui restaure ⁸ l'*E.ninnu* («Maison des Cinquante») d'Anzu, l'oiseau-tonnerre blanc.»

L'inscription montre clairement que le scribe a tout d'abord compartimenté le clou de fondation en cases diverses. Au bord, à droite, les lignes sont beaucoup plus longues que les cases du texte ne l'auraient exigé.

*) Je remercie le collectionneur pour m'avoir autorisé à publier cet objet et SANDRINE VUILLEIMIER (Heidelberg) pour avoir corrigé mon français. J'exprime mes remerciements à Carsten PEUST (Constance) pour sa police de caractères sumériens: <www.peust.de/publications.html>.

1) D. O. EDZARD, *Gudea and his Dynasty* (RIME 3/1), Toronto 1997, p. 135sq. (Gudea E3/1.1.7.37) et H. STEIBLE, *Die neusumerischen Bau- und Weihinschriften* (Freiburger Altorientalische Studien 9), Stuttgart 1991, nº48.

Christoffer THEIS <Christoffer_Theis@web.de>

04) The fat-tailed sheep (gukkal) in *Enki and Ninhursaŋa* B II 10[*] — Collation of the only source that preserves Enki and Ninhursaŋa line B II 10 (Attinger ZA 74, 12, Steinkeller ZA 72, 248 n. 37), which occurs within a section describing the specific gifts or tribute of various exotic locations given to Dilmun at the behest of Enki, U 7754=UET 6/1, 1 obv. ii 11 from a photo housed in the Babylonian section in Philadelphia suggests that instead of what has been read as two signs, siki SAHAR and the like, it is instead one sign, namely, the GUKKAL sign (by the Old Babylonian Period, a ligature of the UDU and HUL₂ signs). This sign is attested only rarely in Old Babylonian literary texts (Summer and Winter 73, Keš Temple Hymn 66, Nanna's Journey to Nippur 269, and possibly the fragmentary hymnic imgida CBS 13618+CBS 13642+N 7003 rev. 4', as well as in the balaŋ tradition). Thus, the entire line is to be read kur za-lam-ŋar^ki gukkal sag₉-ga [...] hu-mu-ra-ab-[...]: "May the "country of the tent" ...   good quality fat-tailed sheep for you." Assuming that an analogy with real-life tribute and trade configurations conditioned the passage in Enki and Ninhursaŋ and the kur za-lam-ŋar^ki is an oblique reference to the Mardu nomads, this reading better reflects the prevailing evidence of Ur III administrative texts from Puzriš-Dagan, as discussed recently by Sallaberger 2014, 108-110. In these texts, the fat-tailed sheep as a whole animal is an import that is typically associated with the Mardu, who in contrast do not seem to be attested as either producers or suppliers of wool for export.

*) My thanks are due to Pascal Attinger and Walther Sallaberger for their helpful input regarding this communication, the accuracy of which is my responsibility alone.

Bibliography

Sallaberger, W., 2014, The Value of Wool in Early Bronze Age Mesopotamia. On the Control of Sheep and the Handling of Wool in the Presargonic to the Ur III periods (c 2400-2000 BC), in Breniquet, C., and Michel, C., eds., Wool Economy in the Ancient Near East and the Aegean, Oxford Books, 94-114.

Jeremiah PETERSON, <jeremie.peterson@gmail.com>

05) Kress 47: a new manuscript of "The Exaltation of Inana (Inana B)" — Kress 47 is a fragmentary one-column tablet; approx. 5 lines are broken away from its lower part. Its provenance is unknown; it comes from a private German collection. A photo of the tablet is published on CDLI with the catalogue number P342799.

The tablet appears to be a new, type III manuscript of the composition "The exaltation of Inana (Inana B)" (ETCSL 4.07.2). Originally it duplicated ll. 30–55 of the composition; see Delnero 2006: 2044-2058 for a score of these lines. In obv. 6 (= 35) the text writes the word du_6-de_3 phonetically as du_{10}-de_3; the same writing is attested also in mss. Ur_4 and X_1 (sigla are those of Delnero 2006).

What follows is a transliteration of the tablet based on the photo published by CDLI (the restorations follow the composite text of the ETCSL):

Obverse

1. (= 30) [^{d}]⌜iškur⌝-da šeg$_x$(KAxLI)$^?$ mu-da-an-⌜gi$_4$⌝-[gi$_4$-in]
2. (= 31) ⌜im⌝-ḫul-⌜im⌝-ḫul-da im-da-⌜kuš$_2$⌝-[u$_3$-de$_2$-en]
3. (= 32) [ĝiri$_3$]-za ⌜nu-kuš$_2$⌝-[u$_3$] i-im-⌜si⌝
4. (= 33) ⌜balaĝ⌝ a-nir-⌜ra-ta⌝ i-lu im-da-[ab-be$_2$]
5. (= 34) [nin]-ĝu$_{10}$ ^{d}a-nun-na diĝir gal-gal-e-[ne]
6. (= 35) [su]-⌜din⌝^{mušen} dal-la-gin$_7$ du$_{10}$-de$_3$ mu-e-[ši-ib-ra-aš]
7. (= 36) ⌜igi⌝ ḫuš-a-za la-ba-sug$_2$-ge-⌜de$_3$$^?$⌝-[eš]
8. (= 37) ⌜saĝ⌝-ki ḫuš-a-za saĝ ⌜nu-mu⌝-[un-de$_3$-ĝa$_2$-ĝa$_2$]
9. (= 38) ⌜šag$_4$⌝ ib$_2$-ba-za a-ba-a ib$_2$-te-[en-te-en]
10. (= 39) [šag$_4$] ḫul-ĝal$_2$-la-za te-⌜en⌝-[ten-bi maḫ-am$_3$]
11. (= 40) [nin ur$_5$ i$_3$]-sag$_9$ nin šag$_4$ [i$_3$-ḫul$_2$]
12. (= 41) [ib$_2$-ba] ⌜nu⌝-te-⌜en-te-en⌝ [dumu gal ^{d}suen-na]
13. (= 42) [nin kur]-⌜ra⌝ dirig-⌜ga⌝ [a]-⌜ba⌝ [ki-za ba-an-tum$_3$]
14. (= 43) [ḫur-saĝ] ⌜ki⌝-za ba-[e$^?$]-⌜de$_3$$^?$⌝-[gid$_3$-de$_2$-en ^{d}ezina$_2$ niĝ$_2$-gig-bi]
15. (= 44) […] ⌜izi$^?$⌝ […]

rest broken

Reverse

beginning broken

1'. (= 54) ⌜šag$_4$ tur$_3$-bi-ta⌝ [ĝiri$_3$ ḫe$_2$-eb$_2$-ta];-⌜an-ze$_2$⌝-[er]
2'. (= 55) munus-bi dam-a-ni-ta sag$_9$-[ga na-an];-da-⌜ab⌝-[be$_2$]

double ruling

References

DELNERO, Paul (2006), *Variation on Sumerian Literary Compositions. A Case Study Based on the Decade*. PhD diss., Univ. of Pennsylvania.

Gábor ZÓLYOMI, <gzolyomi@gmail.com>
Department of Assyriology and Hebrew Studies, L. Eötvös University, Budapest

06) Corrigenda zu Claus Wilcke, „Gesetze in sumerischer Sprache," — in: N. Koslova, E. Vizirova, G. Zólyomi, Hg., *Studies in Sumerian Language and Literature. Festschrift für Joachim Krecher*. Babel&Bibel 8 = Orientalia et Classica 56 (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns) 2014 (ersch. 2015), S. 455-616 — *Hier wird jeweils die gesamte Zeile zitiert; korrigierte Buchstaben, Wörter oder Satzzeichen sind dabei unterstrichen.*

S. 467, 2.2.4.4, letzte Zeile: ausgefallen, da § e5-6 die Situation von § e4 voraussetzen.

S. 469, 2. Absatz, 3. Zeile von unten: etc. Im CL folgt auf § f39 über den **mu$_{10}$-ús-sá-tur** § f40 über den Ehemann

S. 493, 2. Absatz, 4. Zeile: gekehrten Vorzeichen: der Paragraph würde für Sklavinnen in gleicher

S. 505, 2. Absatz, letzte Zeile: **líl-gim**, $^{(l.Rd. ii) 25}$ **mu [en]/-un[u$_6$-gal** ...]

S. 505, 3. Absatz, Zeile 8 von unten: her", hat er gesagt. Ur-gudena.k hat (den Sklaven) von ihm gekauft;

S. 512, 3. Absatz, 3. Zeile: Nin-KA-gina.k sich im Hause ihres Vaters Lu-Nanna.k dem Ur-

S. 534, 7. Absatz: ‚An (und seit) diesem Tage gilt:'^{124}

S. 544, letzter Absatz, 1. Zeile: **§23'**. ‚Wenn jemand jemandes Auge ausreißt, wird er ½ Pfund Silber

S. 545, Anm. 202, 3. Zeile: Wird nach einer Vielzahl von Peitschenschnüren bei **ùsan** und nur eine<u>m</u> breiten

S. 549, 4. Absatz, 2. Zeile: **du₁₁, gú in-ni-ˊĝar**$^{?}$**ˋ, lú-bi,** $^{v\,1}$ **á-ni íb-ta-e₁₁-dè**

S. 556,1. Absatz. 2. Zeile: **in-na-an-*tuš**$^{?}$ **ˊdam**$^{!?}$**ˋ(ˊ*NIN₉ˋ)**^{256} [**šà-ga-na-ke₄**] / **ḫa-b[a**^{257}**-an-du₁₂-du₁₂**]

S. 556, Anm. 258, letzte Zeile: <u>ein</u> Rückkehrrecht des Ehemannes?

S. 557, 4. Zeile: wenn jeman[des] Ehefrau [*stirbt, ...*]

S. 557, Anm. 264, 4. Zeile: das seiner Ehefrau und ihre<u>n</u> Eltern gemeinsam zustand; denn sonst würde es an

S. 561, Anm. 284, 3. Zeile: qualifiziert (siehe obe<u>n,</u> 2.7.1); n. b., **á u₄** 1(/**buru₁₄-k**) ist in Text X anders als **á**

S. 562, 3. Absatz, 1. und 2. Zeile: **X**$^{viii\,2}$ **šitim-ma** {Ras.} **á ˊiti**^{292}**-1-a-ni** / 0;0.3, **nagar ašgab ad-kíd túg/-du₈, simug ázlag kù-dím bur-gul, á u₄ buru₁₄-ka-ˊne/-neˋ** 0;0.3-**ta,** $^{viii\,5}$ **en-ˊte-**

S. 564, Anm. 312, 5. Zeile: nach dem Binden und <u>A</u>usbreiten der Garben, bezeugt z.B. in TENUS 242 (AS

S. 574, nach Z. 4 (vor „Editionen" etc.) bitte einfügen: T₁ <u>CBS 9556: PBS 15 pl. 17 no. 47,</u> T₂ <u>A 32768: Biggs 1969: 14-15; 40 no. 49.</u>

S. 589, 3. Absatz, 1.-2. Zeile: **§c22 (17)**. ‚Wenn <u>jemand</u> jemandem ohne Handhabe etwas, wovon er nichts weiß, zur Last <u>legt</u> und derjenige (= der Verleumder) ihn nicht

S. 597, 2. Absatz, 1. Zeile: **§f41 (31)** ‚Wenn ein Vater zu Lebzeite<u>n e</u>inem Kind, das ihm gefällt,

S. 600, Zeile i 6: im Ekur sein Haupt erh<u>o</u>ben <u>haben</u>, möge dem strahlenden Antlitz Enlils begegnet sein!

S. 601, Zeilen k4-k5:

k 4 B₃ $^{xx\,5'-6'}$ [^{d}**En-ki** ^{d}**Iškur]** ^{d}**Ašnan** ^{d}**Sumugan-da, en ḫé-ĝál-la-ke₄-ne**

 I$^{Rs.\,7}$ [^{d}**En-ki)** ˊ^{d}**Iškur** ^{d}**Sumugan** ^{d}**Ašnan**ˋ, [....]

k 5 B₃$^{xx\,7'-8'}$ [**ḫé-ĝál an k]i-ˊaˋ aˊ-ba-an-da/-[kar-r]e-eš, [... ḫu-mu-ni-i]n/-[...]-ˊne**ˋ

S. 601, Zeile l 1:

l 1 B₁$^{xx\,1'-3'}$ ˊ^{d}ˋ**Nu[ska sukkal maḫ]** / ˊ^{d}**En**ˋ-**l[íl-lá-ke₄] kadra**$^{!}$ **é-ˊkur**ˋ-

S. 605, 2. Absatz, 2. Zeile: phorischen /-bi/ (in **lú-bi** ‚der<u>jenige</u>, der erwähnte' = ‚dieser') demonstratives

S. 610, s.v. Neumann 2011, 2. Zeile: End of the T<u>h</u>ird Millennium B.C. Culbertson, L. (Hrsg.).

S. 614, s.v. Wilcke 1992, 2.-3. Zeile: Außenseiter und Randgruppen. Beiäge zu einer Sozialge-

S. 615, s.v. Wilcke 2000a, 2. Zeile: Überlegungen zur Literalität im Alten Zweistromland (SBAW <u>2000/6</u>).

<div align="right">Claus WILCKE, <wilcke@rz.uni-leipzig.de></div>

07) A New Text About Nin-abul[1] — CUNES 48-06-383 (84×72×26) is an Old Babylonian bilingual Sumero-Akkadian tablet housed in the Jonathan and Jeannette Rosen Ancient Near Eastern Studies Tablet Collection at Cornell University. This tablet belongs to a large group of Old Babylonian scribal school texts written primarily in Sumerian. While the provenance of this text and the others in this group is unknown, it is clear that they were intended as exercises to teach Babylonian-speaking children how to read and write the Sumerian language.

In particular, CUNES 48-06-383 contains a bilingual exercise already known in unilingual format from Old Babylonian Ur (UET 6/2 289). The latter was published by ALSTER (1997:314-315) in his book on Sumerian proverbs.[2] However, we are hesitant to classify these two texts as such on account of their incipit and their subject matter.

Although the content of the text preserved in both exemplars is the same, it is developed differently. Of course, we cannot establish complete parallelism because a portion of the CUNES text is not preserved. However, what remains shows a direct correlation between the two manuscripts.

It is impossible to establish an *Urtext*. In other words, we cannot argue that either the Ur or the CUNES tablet preserves the original or most grammatically accurate version of the composition. Instead, it is likely that the master exercises, from which the students learned, were slightly different.[3]

In support of this hypothesis, it is important to consider the recensional variation in Old Babylonian exercise texts. N. Veldhuis recently argued that Old Babylonian lexical lists displayed a large degree of flexibility as a result of their status as educational texts. As he states: "Adding or omitting a single entry here or there, or changing their order is of no consequence at all. The lexical texts are not treated as venerable relics - the way third millennium lexical texts were treated - but as a means to a goal." (2014:202). Clearly, this is applicable also to other genres of school texts. Moreover, this further suggests that the teachers of the Old Babylonian schools were still sufficiently familiar with the Sumerian material that they were not afraid of manipulating the curriculum to meet their pedagogical goals.[4] As a result, limited recensional variation is not uncommon.

It is likely, therefore, that this is the explanation for the variation between the Ur and CUNES texts. For example, whereas the teacher of UET 6/2 289 used the sentence preserved in line 5, indicating

Nin-abul's scorn of the lying informer, the teacher of the CUNES tablet did not include it. Similarly, the teacher of the Ur text concluded the exercise with a final warning about the fate of the informer (ll. 8-10), while the teacher of the Cornell text did not.[5]

CUNES 48-06-383

Obv.   1. lú-ka-šu-dug$_4$ lul-la-ra
      2. *a-na mu-na-gi-ir sà-ra-tim*
      3. ^{d}nin-abul-l[a x (x?)] x ĝeštug(PI)-kam
      4. [^{d}*be-e*]*l-ti-ab*[*ul*](KÁ.[GAL])*-la i-*GI
      5. saĝ-ĝá-na /x\-[(x?)]-íl
      6. *re-<es->su ú-ka-/a*\-{2 signs erased}-*ma*
      7. níĝ-sa$_6$-ga-ni hu!-lu igi mu-un-ku-re
      8. *da-am-qà-ti-/šu*\ *a-na le-/em-né*\-*tim*
      ~ *ú-ta-ar*
      9. [x] /SAR zi?\ [n]u-mu-un-D[U]-/x\
      10. [. . .] /x\-*am ú-la* /x\-[*x*]-/x\-*ša*

Rev.   1. [. . .] /x\ mu-DU-DU-
      ~e
      2. [. . .] *ú-ba-na-*
      ~*šum!*
      ~ [*it-*]/*ta*\-*ra-aṣ*
      3. [x x] /nu?-mu-na\<<-e>>-dug$_4$ šu-luh
      ~ ša kag mu-na-gub
      4. *pag-ri ú-la i*-{erasure}-ZU *a-na pi-i*
      ~ *ka-ra-ši i-ka-mi-*
      ~*sú*
      5. ^{d}utu en níĝ-si-sá-e <si> sá-a-e
      6. ^{d}*šamaš be-el ša mi-ša-ra i-ra-mu*
      7. níĝ-NE.RU ib-su-su níĝ-gi-na
      ~ x-úg-ga
      8. *ra-ga-am ú-ṭe-bi-ma ki-ta-am*
      ~ *uṣ-ṣa-/ar*\

Obv.   1. Against the lying informer:
      2. Against the lying informer:
      3. Nin-abul . . .
      4. Belet-abul . . .
      5. she lifts his head (and)
      6. she holds his head and
      7. she changes his good fortune into misfortune.
      8. she changes his good fortune into misfortune.
      9. She does not . . .
      10. She does not . . .

      1. [. . .] . . .
      2. [. . .] she points (her) finger at him
      3. She did not . . . to him, she established for him a cleansing of the mouth.
      4. She does not . . . (his) body, she consigns him to destruction.
      5. Utu, lord who provides justice,
      6. Utu, lord who loves justice,
      7. He submerges evil, . . . truth.
      8. He submerges evil and establishes truth.

1, 2. The equation lú-ka-šu-du = *munaggiru* is attested in OB lexical texts for which see CAD M/II 198.

3, 4. ᵈNin-abul is attested in An=Anum l. 47, as an alternate name for Ama-sagnudi, the wife of Nin-šubur (CAVIGNEAUX & KREBERNIK 1998-2000:325). After the divine name, we expect an epithet describing a facet of Nin-abul's domain or power. To our knowledge, there are no known epithets for Nin-abul, making restoration difficult. Moreover, the Sumerian and Akkadian appear to have different interpretations for this line.

6. Although there is an Old Babylonian expression *rēšam kullu*, "to wait for, to take care of, to be at the disposal of, in readiness for a specific purpose (said of persons, commodities, boats, etc." (CAD K p. 516), the context here seems to be that Nin-abul is directing her attention towards the lying informer in order to dispense justice. As such we chose to translate the line literally.

7. The expression igi kúr is attested in Proto-Izi (MSL 13, 34), and Erimuhuš 2, Seg.2, 11, where it is equated to *mu-tir i-na-a-ti*. It occurs also in SP 22 vii:26 (ALSTER 1997:267).

8. This line is a literal translation of UET 6/2 289 l. 3. For a similar expression see CH xliii 105.

Reverse

2. This line is a close translation of the Sumerian preserved in UET 6/2 289 l. 5. For the expression *ubāna tarāṣu*, "to extend the finger and point (for good or evil purpose) see CAD U p. 6 with examples.

3. The interpretation of this line is complicated by the fact that the beginning is broken. Two actions seem to be described here. The first one, which uses the verb dug$_4$ (given the space perhaps a compound verb), is negative. In the second action it appears that Nin-abul institutes a purification ritual for the mouth of the lying informant. Admittedly, this interpretation has its problems considering that the writer seems to slip back into Akkadian to express the genitival relation between šu-luh and ka. Nevertheless, such meaning fits the context. The concept of purifying the mouth is attested in the Sumerian composition *The Death of Gilgamesh*, Me-Turan version l. 60 where Gilgamesh is described as the one who established the hand and mouth purification rituals (šu-/luh\ ka-/luh\ x (x) /si mu-un-si-sá\-e).

4. Our translation of the second half of this line is based on the assumption that the student confused two slightly different Akkadian expressions. The first one is *ina pî karāši*, for the use of which see CAD P p. 471 and Sjöberg & Bergmann 1969:75 for additional references to *pî karāši*. The second is *ana karāši kamāsu*, "to consign to annihilation" or "to gather for destruction" (Lambert & Millard 1969:96 l. 54, 98 l. 43).

5. níĝ-si-sá is found often in association with Utu in Sumerian literature - see for example Šulgi D l5, Šulgi Q l. 5, Ibbi-Suen C 57, and Išme-Dagan A + V Segment A 90. The restoration of <si> sá is based on context. In this case there is a discrepancy between the Sumerian (l. 5) and the Akkadian (l. 6). It appears that the student was confused about the verbal form, and so, instead of supplying the expected ki-áĝ, made do with a verb influenced by the noun níĝ-si-sá and potentially by the Old Babylonian use of *šutēšuru*, "to provide justice, to see that justice is done" (CAD E p. 361-2). However, J. Peterson (personal communication) suggested an alternative solution to this line: ^{d}utu en níĝ-si-sá-e ki a-e, where a is an atypical *Auslaut* for áĝ.

6. This line is a literal translation of line 6 of UET 6/2 289.

7. The second verbal form in this line is problematic. The first sign could be either lu- or, better, ku-. However, neither solution is satisfactory in the present context.

8. We interpret *ú-ṭe-bi-ma* as a D-stem of *ṭebûm* based on the Sumerian ib-su-su in line 7. For lexical equivalents between *ṭebûm* and su-su see CAD Ṭ p. 67. The expression *raggam tubbû*, however, is to our knowledge unattested. We read *uṣ-ṣa-/ar* as a durative D-stem of *eṣēru*, "to establish," although again it is not used in this context.

UET 6/2 289

Obverse

    1. ka-šu!-dug$_4$-dug$_4$ lú-lul-la-ra
    2. ^{d}nin-abul-la saĝ-a-ni bí-in-gul?
    3. sa$_6$-ga-ni hul-šè ba-da-ĝál
    4. igi-ni téš la-ba-an-tuku
    5. šu-si egir-a-ni mu-un-da-ĝál
    6. ^{d}utu en níĝ-gi-na ki-áĝ
    7. níĝ-NE.RU ba-an-da-bur$_{12}$ níĝ-gi-na gíd-/da\
    8. nam-tag dugud íb-ta-/ab\-[x]
    9. KA x KAL [x]
    10. im-da-šub-bu-/dè\

    1. Against the lying informer:
    2. Nin-abul destroyed his head.
    3. She turned his good (fortune) into bad (fortune).
    4. Her face showed no pride (in him).
    5. She pointed (her) finger at his back.
    6. Utu, lord who loves truth,
    7. tore out evil and, having prolonged truth,
    8. he [. . .] a heavy punishment.
    9. [. . . .]
    10. he falls.

thank also Laura Johnson-Kelly, Rosen Collection Manager, Head Conservator/Photographer, for her photographs of CUNES 48-06-383, and Dr. Jonathan Taylor of the British Museum for providing a photograph of UET 6/2 289.

2) The text has more recently been studied DE CLERCQ 2003:76-77.

3) We do not believe that the variation in the Sumerian is the result of "speculative philology" on the part of the student who composed CUNES 48-06-383. For this sort of scholarship, which provides esoteric or theoretical translations of Akkadian words into Sumerian, see e.g. VELDHUIS 2014:222.

4) VELDHUIS 2011:20. See further VELDHUIS 2014:212: "Nippur teachers had the freedom to experiment, to add an exercise or omit it."

5) Of course, the variation was not necessarily or even likely the result of the teachers who supervised the lessons resulting in CUNES 48-06-383 and UET 6/2 289. Given the current evidence, it is impossible to know when the manuscript tradition diverged, assuming it ever had a common ancestor.

Bibliography

ALSTER, B., 1997, *Proverbs of Ancient Sumer*, Bethesda.

CAVIGNEAUX, A. & M. KREBERNIK, 1998-2000, "Nin-abula." *RLA* 9, 325.

DE CLERCQ, G., 2003, "Die Göttin Ninegal/Bēlet-ekallim nach den altorientalischen Quellen des 3. und 2. Jt. v. Chr.," PhD dissertation, Julius-Maximilians-Universität, Würzburg.

LAMBERT, W.G & A.R. MILLARD, 1966, *Atra-hasīs. The Babylonian Story of the Flood*, Oxford.

SJÖBERG, Å.W. & E. BERGMANN, 1969, *The Collection of Sumerian Temple Hymns*, Locust Valley.

VELDHUIS, N., 2011, "Domesticizing Babylonian Scribal Culture in Assyria: Transformation by Preservation," in W.S. van Egmond and W.H. van Soldt (eds.), *Theory and Practice of Knowledge Transfer. Studies in School Education in the Ancient Near East and Beyond*, Leiden, p. 11-23.

ID., N., 2014, *History of the Cuneiform Lexical Tradition*, Münster.

Alhena GADOTTI, Towson University, & Alexandra KLEINERMAN, Cornell University

08) The government of Assur during the rule of Samsi-Addu — Among the tablets excavated in the karum of Kültepe in 2001, is a diplomatic letter dating to around 1775 BC, which has now been published by Cahit Günbatti in his book *Harsamna Krali Hurmeli'ye Gönderilen Mektup ve Kaniš Krallari/The Letter sent to Hurmeli King of Harsamna and the Kings of Kaniš* (Ankara 2014), 88ff. This letter (Kt 01/k 217) contains the answer by the leaders of Assur to a demand from Hurmeli, king of Harsamna. Hurmeli had put them under pressure to intervene with Samsi-Addu on his behalf. The senders of the letter report how they implored Samsi-Addu (shortly before his death) not to send troops in support of the king of Zalpa, even before the letter from Hurmeli arrived. Their efforts were futile and Samsi-Addu made it clear that he did not want merchants to interfere in the affairs of great kings. What body of local government would be capable of addressing Samsi-Addu like this in order to protect the interests of Assur's merchants? Unfortunately, the name of the sender is partly lost. Günbatti restored (3) ... *um-ma* [*ší-ip-ru*] (4) *ša ālim Aššur ur-d*[*u-kà*] "from [the envoys] of the city Assur, your slaves". This seems unlikely since the senders are in the city of Assur ("here" in line 50), and clearly had a higher status than any envoy could have. Alternative restorations are the Assembly, the Elders or the *nibum*. The city assembly in Assur was called "the city" (*ālum*) when a legal decision taken by it was communicated by the king; the use of *puhrum ša GN as name of the sender of a letter does not seem to occur. The *nibum* was an institution with unclear capacities; it was subordinated to the Elders, as appears from a letter from Level II (TC 1, 1), which it sent to Kanesh. The *nibum* is attested on bullae found at Acemhöyük as the sender of consignments to the Kanesh Colony, and the *nibum* thus continued to play an active role in Assur at the time of Samsi-Addu. We do not know whether they would identify themselves as *nibum ša ālim Aššur*. More importantly, its junior position compared to the Elders within Assur's hierarchy makes it unlikely that the *nibum* would be in contact with foreign kings and appeal to Samsi-Addu.

The best candidate to restore the broken address seems to me to be the Elders because the senders of the letter write "Now, we hereby send to you our two envoys, PN1 and PN2, belonging to the Elders, who are from among us" (58: *ša šé-bu-tim ša ba-ri-ni*; for this use of *ša barini*, cf. AKT 5, 3:19). This clumsy phrasing serves to underline their status. Without excluding the existence of the Assembly at this time, the Elders of Assur seem to have acted as the city's highest body here. I restore the broken part of the address: *umma* [*šé-bu-tum*], *ša ālim Aššur urd*[*ūkāma*] "the Elders of the city of Assur, your servants".

Letters sent by the Elders of a town to a king are known from the Mari archives. A.2417, edited by J.-M. Durand in *RA* 82 (1988) and as LAPO 17 no.607, for example, was sent by "the Elders of Talhayûm, your servants".

J. G. DERCKSEN <j.g.dercksen@hum.leidenuniv.nl>

09) *Nikkassū* - A calculating instrument? — CAD N/II, 229b gives as the forth meaning of *nikkassu* "(an emblem of Šamaš)", which is "large" according to the Old Babylonian texts TCL 10, 4A (*rabûtum*) and TCL 11, 173 (gu.la). K.R. Veenhof (FS Claus Wilcke, 2003), interpreted this as "great abacus". It is unknown how such a device would look like. J. Friberg doubted its very existence because of the many digits needed in complex sexagesimal calculations. Moreover, no such device has been found during excavations and instead specific tablets may have been employed. On the other had, the use of a calculating instrument by Old Assyrian merchants was suggested by Cécile Michel in 'Calculer chez les marchands Assyriens' (CultureMATH (site expert ENS/DESCO) - juin 2006, p.14). In an article in the exhibition catalogue *Anatolia's Prologue* (p.91), she argued that what are commonly understood as game boards (last discussed by K. Spreer, FS Hartmut Kühne, 2008) might in fact have been computing tools.

Kültepe Tabletleri VI-b, 468 (Kt 94/k 670), first discussed by Barjamovic and Larsen in *AoF* 45 (2008), 153, lists cultic equipment that was in an Assyrian's main house in Kanesh. Not all items in this list are necessarily cultic, however. The wax tablet (*ṭuppum ša iskūrim*) may well have belonged to the man's writing gear. The same goes for the *nikkassū*, interpreted by the editor as a "*nikkassu*-emblem (of Šamaš)", but more likely here to be seen in its primary function, as a merchant's calculating instrument.

J. G. DERCKSEN

10) Altassyrisch *išhiulum*: kein Vertrag, sondern ein Gürtel?*) — Das altassyrische Wort *išhiulum* (bisher belegt nur in BIN 6, 145: 9: *iš-hi-ú-li*) wird seit LANDSBERGER (1950: 341 Anm. 67 §5) allgemein als ‚(Lohn)Vertrag' übersetzt, dementsprechend mit heth. *išhiul-* ‚Vertrag' identifiziert und als heth. Fremdwort (ggf. Lehnwort) in dem altassyrischen Text betrachtet.[1] Es gibt jedoch auch Vorbehalte gegenüber diesem Ansatz, die von den genannten Autoren nicht berücksichtigt wurden: Bilgiç 1954: 65-66 äußerte sich als erster skeptisch, indem er darauf aufmerksam machte, dass diese Textstelle bei der Bestimmung der Bedeutung nicht ausreicht. Ähnlich skeptisch sind KRONASSER 1966: 138 („So kommt m.E. die Bedeutung „Lohnvertrag" (…) kaum in Betracht, von Sicherheit ist keine Rede. Bedeutung und Herkunft (…) sind unklar"); PUHVEL 1984: 401 („perhaps"); TISCHLER 1977-1983: 390 („semantisch ganz unklar"), dem zufolge das Wort „wahrscheinlich" eine Ware bedeuten würde (dagegen folgt TISCHLER 1995: 364 der *communis opinio*); und DERCKSEN 2007: 36, der *išhiul* ebenfalls als ‚perhaps a commodity' übersetzt. Der Text lautet wie folgt (Übersetzung nach ULSHÖFER 1995: 191-192, Nr. 201):

„7 ½ Šeqel Silber für Kleinkram, als er nach Luhusaddia ging. 4 ½ Šeqel für Kurāra auf den Namen seines Burschen. 5 Šeqel Silber von früher sind vom Kaufpreis der Sicheln übriggeblieben. 1 ½ Šeqel für den *išhiulum*. (Leerzeile) All das ist bei Huzziš und Duruhnu."

In dieser kurzen Notiz möchte ich zeigen, dass auch die Bedeutung ‚eine Art Ware' zum hethitischen Befund passt: es ist nämlich bekannt, dass das [a] des Altassyrischen in den Kültepe-Texten gelegentlich zu [o] werden kann, und zwar u.a. vor [l], vgl. HECKER 1968: 19 mit Lit.: *ku-lu-ma-am* ‚Lamm' (OIP 27, 18 A: 7.16, B: 4) statt *kalūmum*; *pá-šu-lu-um* ‚eine Goldlegierung, Blassgold' (CCT 5, 41b: 5) statt *pašallum* (wenn keine Vokalharmonie).[2]

Altass. *išhiul-* kann daher nicht nur heth. *išhiul-*, sondern auch heth. **išhial-* widergeben. Ein solches heth. Wort ist in der Tat belegt, und zwar als (TÚG)*išhiyal-* ‚(Kopf)Binde, Band, Gürtel' (vgl. PUHVEL 1984: 400; RIEKEN 1999: 445-446). Diese Bedeutungen passen auch an der genannten Textstelle. Ob die Schreibung hier aber letztlich als *išhiul* oder *išhiyal* zu interpretieren ist, hängt von weiteren Belegstellen ab.

¹⁾ Z. B. FRIEDRICH 1957: 41; CAD s.v.; AHw s.v.; KAMMENHUBER 1972-1975: 385; MACQUEEN 1986: 31; Alp 1997: 42; RIEKEN 1999: 463; WATKINS 2004: 551; STRECK 2005: 71; GOEDEGEBUURE 2008: 172.

²⁾ Diese Erscheinung könnte auch die Vokalschwankung im Fremdwort *ú-lu-ra-nu* / *a-lu-ra-num* (Bedeutung unbekannt, DERCKSEN 2007: 29 mit Lit.) erklären. Allerdings ist hier die ursprüngliche Vokalqualität mangels einer Etymologie nicht bekannt.

Literatur

ALP, Sedat (1997): Die Mehrheit der einheimischen Bevölkerung in der Kārum-Zeit in Kaneš/Neša. *SMEA* 39: 35-48.

BILGIÇ, Emin (1954): *Die einheimischen Appellativa der kappadokischen Texte und ihre Bedeutung für die anatolischen Sprachen*. Ankara

DERCKSEN, Jan Gerrit (2007): On Anatolian Loanwords in Akkadian Texts from Kültepe. *ZA* 97: 26-46.

FRIEDRICH, Johannes (1957): *Hethitisches Wörterbuch. Kurzgefasste kritische Sammlung der Deutungen hethitischer Wörter. 1. Ergänzungsheft*. Heidelberg

GOEDEGEBUURE, Petra M. (2008): Central Anatolian Languages and Language Communities in the Colony Period: A Luwian-Hattian Symbiosis and the Indpendent Hittites. In: Dercksen, Jan Gerrit (Hg.): *Anatolia and the Jazira during the Old Assyrian Period*. OAAS 3. PIHANS 111. Leiden, 137-180.

HECKER, Karl (1968): *Grammatik der Kültepe-Texte*. AnOr 44. Roma

KAMMENHUBER, Annelies (1972-1975): Hethiter, Sprache. *RlA* 4: 384-389.

KRONASSER, Heinz (1966): *Etymologie der hethitischen Sprache 1*. Wiesbaden

LANDSBERGER, Benno (1950-1951): Kommt *Hattum* „Hettiterland" und *Hattī'um* „Hettiter" in den Kültepe-Tafeln vor? *ArOr* 18: 329-350.

MACQUEEN, J. G. (1986): *The Hittites and Their Contemporaries in Asia Minor*. London

PUHVEL, Jaan (1984): *Hittite Etymological Dictionary 1-2. Words beginning with A / E and I*. Berlin – New York

RIEKEN, Elisabeth (1999): *Untersuchungen zur nominalen Stammbildung des Hethitischen*. StBoT 44. Wiesbaden

STRECK, Michael P. (2005): Akkadisch. In: id. (Hg.): *Sprachen des Alten Orients*. Darmstadt, 44-79.

TISCHLER, Johann (1977-1983): *Hethitisches etymologisches Glossar I. A-K*. IBS 20. Innsbruck

TISCHLER, Johann (1995): Die kappadokischen Texte als älteste Quelle indogermanischen Sprachgutes. In: Carruba, Onofrio – Giorgieri, Mauro – Mora, Clelia (Hg.): *Atti del II Congresso internazionale di Hittitologia*. StMed 9. Pavia, 359-368.

ULSHÖFER, Andrea Marie (1995): *Die altassyrischen Privaturkunden*. FAOS Beiheft 4. Stuttgart

WATKINS, Calvert (2004): Hittite. In: Woodard, Roger D. (Hg.): *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of the World's Ancient Languages*. Cambridge, 551-575.

Zsolt SIMON, <zsltsimon@gmail.com>
Institut für Assyriologie und Hethitologie, Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität, München

11) *Ba'ārum,* **"to start a fight", in Old Assyrian —** The simple type of the Old Assyrian cuneiform writing, which a limited number of often polyvalent signs, often causes problems in identifying words. Uncertainty about phonemes can make an etymological approach difficult and this may be compounded by the occurrence of words not or only rarely attested in other dialects of Akkadian, some of which also have specific, at times rather technical meanings. This applies in particular to verbs and I have recently written an article (to appear in *Orientalia*) in which a number of them are analyzed in detail. After its completion I received the new volume Kültepe texts, *Kültepe Tabletleri* VIIa, by S. Bayram and R. Kuzuoğlu (TTKY VI/33-e-a, Ankara 2014), which contains a large part (308 texts) of the archive of Aššur-rē'ī, excavated in 1988. It contains another verb whose spelling and meaning have raised problems and which is variously interpreted as *parā'um*, *barā'um* or *buārum* and even is emended to *pašārum*. This note tries to clarify its meaning to prevent further confusion in forthcoming editions of Kültepe texts.

We have at least six occurrences of the verb, four of them in texts of the new volume, nos. 30, 34, 58 and 59, to which I refer in what follows as **A**, **B**, **C** and **D**. They appear in the fairly stereotyped context of a confrontation between two (groups of) persons, both calling themselves "son of a dead man" (*mēr'a mētim*), that is heirs. The one who takes the initiative has found in his dead father's archive sealed documents recording debts owed by the father of the other party. He wants to make sure whether they indeed record debts of the latter and whether they still have to be or already have been paid, without the

original debt-note having been cancelled or returned. Debts were often paid to partners, agents or representatives of a creditor and payments could be made in various places, circumstances which prevented the debtor getting "his" debt-note back. In such situations the heir of the dead debtor is asked to identify (*waddu'um*) his father's seals on the debt-notes and to provide evidence of payment. This was not always easy and in some cases the heir had to admit that he did not know his father's seal (*kunuk abia ula idē*, C:22-23), because "I am (too) young (*ṣaḫrāku*, in C:22 and D:22, not recognized by the editors). The evidence the son of the debtor is asked to provide[1] can be a quittance (*ṭuppum ša šabā'ē*, B:22-23, C:16-17, and D:20,) or witnesses of the payment (*šībū*, D:21), also designated as *ša pā'ē* (A:15,27), "oral witnesses", who according to this text would prove "that your father satisfied my father with the silver". If evidence is provided "that these tablets (the debt-notes) are invalid" (l. 17, *ša kīma ṭuppū anniūtum akkušūni*; see for this meaning of *akāšum* D, my forthcoming article in *Orientalia*, § 1), they can be cancelled, which is expressed in C:19 by "they can die" (*limūtū*) and in A:20 and B:26 that the heir can "kill" them (*dukā*, not recognized by the editors). In this way the problems can be solved without involving the legal authorities, hence the request in B:26-27, *addīnim la tašapparani*, "do not send me to a lawsuit". This is supported by the last line of this text, *ula rigmātum šībuttum*, "this is not a legal complaint, it is (only) a testimony". But the procedure may require time, for in A:21-22 the heirs of the debtor declare: "We will go and search (the evidence) for you within one year", the reason why this record is dated.

In all four texts quoted the person who takes the initiative, after having observed that both parties are "sons of dead men" (A:13, B:17, C:15, and D:14) says *lá ni*-IB-TA-*ar*. The editors have struggled with this verbal form, which they always emend into *ni-ip-ta-<ša>-ar*, spelling it in B:17 and D:14 with -*ta*-, but in A:13 and C:15 with -*ṭá*-. This last spelling must be a mistake, since their comment on D:14 states that the verb cannot be *paṭārum*, because it has a past tense *ipṭur* (but in the context a past tense is excluded), the reason why they emend the form into a perfect tense of *pašārum*. They were perhaps inspired to do so by K. Hecker *et alii*, *Kappadokische Keilschrifttafeln aus den Sammlungen der Karlsuniversität Prag* (Prag 1998), who does the same in text I 499:4 (**E**), although they do not refer to it. Here, in a confrontation between two men meant to solve the problem of a partially paid debt, the first one starts with *lá ni-ib-ta-ar*. The editors of this text also emended it into *ni-ip-ta-<ša>-ar* and tentatively translated (without comment) "Wir haben (noch) keine *Lösung gefunden*", taking the form as a perfect from *pašārum*. The editors of D refer to CAD P, *pašāru*, meaning 5, "to release from legal obligations, promises" and translate "biz (meseleyi) oluruna bırakmayacağiz". This solution is unacceptable, because we cannot assume that the scribe in all cases made the same mistake. Moreover, the meaning does not fit, because request of the heir is a negative one (and with *pašarum* one would expect a positive one!), sprung from the wish to settle the affair without involving judges or a court. The form is also attested in M.T. Larsen's AKT 6 (*Kültepe Tabletleri* VI-a, TTKY VI/33d-a, Ankara 2010), 229:4 (**F**), in a similar context, also preceded by "we are heirs". Larsen transliterated *la ni-ip-ta-ar* and translated "we have not (finished) checking", taking the form, following a suggestion of Dercksen, as a perfect of the verb *pa'ārum*, "to search for, to inspect", which is assumed to be attested in KTS 1, 1a:24 (*mamman a*-BA-*a-ri-kà* [25] *laššuma jāti tassalḫanni*, "since there is nobody to ....., you have cheated me!"). But the context is unclear and assuming the obscure verb *pa'ārum* is not attractive, while also the use of the perfect tense in all texts quoted is not easy to explain.

Kouwenberg, in the unpubl. ms. of his OA grammar, finds a D-stem of our verb in *la tu-ba-ar-ni-a-tí* in AKT 6, 217: 22 (**G**), in a very similar context. Persons handed over to a guarantor by an opponent because of a debt claim, declare: "[4] We are heirs. We have in our possession (*ka''ulum*) a tablet stating that you three owe silver and that you are jointly liable. [10] If you have either oral witnesses (*ša pā'ē*) against Š. or against our fathers, or have a quittance with the seal of our fathers,[17] or witnesses, bring them to these two men (*ana annēnma ru'āma*), for what can we say, we are heirs; [22] *la tù-ba-ar-ni-a-tí*. Testimony". What in texts A-E applies to both parties in the conflict, "let us not ....", is here asked by one party from the other "do not .... us". Larsen tentatively ("the passage is not clear") translates: "Do not drag us to court!", suggesting a derivation from *bu'ārum*, in the D-stem "to demonstrate, to provide proof". Similar forms occur in two other texts, also in the mouth of a man who states that he is "the son

of a dead man". In Kt 92/k 328:9 (S. Bayram, *Archivum Anatolicum* 4 [1998], 44-45; **H**), such a man reproaches his opponent (creditor) of having taken his slaves as distraint, whereupon both went to the *kārum*, where the victim told his opponent: "I am an heir, do not ... me!" (*lá tù-ba-e-ri = la tuba'ar + ī*). And in AKT 6, 85:11-13 (**I**) the heir states that his opponent did not show him documentary proof of his claim, followed by: "Do not ... me!" (*lá tù-ba-a-ra-ni = tuba''ar + anni*). Larsen translated "You do not provide proof for me", which is problematic, since this requires a dative suffix, while a personal accusative suffix should mean "proof against/about me", which does not fit here. Th. K. Hertel in his *Old Assyrian Legal Practices* (PIHANS 123, Leiden 2013), 344 note 1096, translates text H by "I am an heir, you cannot force me to provide evidence". But this would require a causative Š-stem,[3] which does not exist, and it also does not make sense in this text. These problems make a D-stem of *buārum* very doubtful and it would be impossible if the same verb, as is very likely, in used KTS 1, 1a:24 (quoted above), where the infinitive *a*-BA-*a-ri-kà* excludes *buārum* and suggests *ba'ārum*.

The only suitable candidate, since *ba'ārum*, "to catch" does not fit, is *ba'ārum* (CAD B *bâru* B), meaning "to stir up a fight", in the Gt-stem. It is not only used for "to revolt, to rebel", but also for strife inside a family, between husband and wife and between brothers, in which context also the Gt-stem occurs, *athū ibtarrū*, in YOS 10, 45:55. The OA use of this Gt-stem for strife between business partners fits extremely well: "Let's not fight against each other!" The use of the D-stem, not attested in other periods, is surprising, but could be a factitive, "Do not make me start a fight", hence not only a plea, but also a warning. Moreover, the great contextual similarity of the occurrences of the Gt- and D-stems, pointed out above, demands considering them as deriving from the same verb.

1) For providing evidence the texts uses various verbs: *wabālum*, "to bring" in A:19 (object usually tablets), *radā'um*, (B:24 and D:18, usually with persons as objects, but also with written evidence), and *šēṣu'um*, "to produce" (C:18). Having such evidence is designated by *išum* (witnesses, D:22), *kalā'um* D-stem, "to detain" (A:17), *ka''ulum* (C:17, D:16, "to have in one's possession", tablets; one of the two in B:23, where one must read *tù-kà-/lá   ri-da-ni-ma*).

2) A similar translation is proposed in CAD s.v. *bâru* A, 3a, for CH § 126:9, *bābtašu ...ubāršu*, "his city quarter will have him establish that ...", but it should be translated as "the city quarter shall establish against him", as M. T. Roth does (Eilers/Landsberger: "uberführt seine Behörde ihn"). In OB we have constructions with a single acc., which may refer to what is proved (*halqam ubār*, CH § 23) or to the person against or about whom something is proved/established (CH § 126, quoted above; *kīma mārat awīlim šī ubārši*, AbB 6, 80:5-6). We also have a double accusative (*še'am ... bīršu*, AbB 14, 34:12) and constructions with an personal dative and a personal or impersonal accusative (PN *ubārakkuššu*, CT 6, 34b:15; *ana* PN *bītam ubirrū*, VS 8, 65:10).

3) No D-stem of this verb is attested, apart from the lexical reference in *MSL* 17, 224:133-135, tag = *ba'arum*, ku₆.dab₅.ba = MIN *ša* KU₆, tag.tag = *bu''urum*. The D-stem may be conditioned by the plurality of the object or the nature of the action; N.J.C. Kouwenberg, *Gemination in the Akkadian Verb* (Assen 1997), mentions in Ch. 6 the use of D-stems of transitive verbs conditioned by the plurality of the object, listing i.a. "verbs of seizing and controlling" and "verbs of collecting".

K.R. VEENHOFF < k.r.veenhoff@hetnet.nl >

12) How to get rid of somebody? A note on ARM 14, 78 and Genesis 37 — In my contribution to J.G. Dercksen (ed.), *Anatolia and the Jazira during the Old Assyrian Period* (Leiden 2008) 19ff., I commented on the fact the some OA legal texts and letters that demand that persons should disappear for good, with no possibility of return, prescribe their sale to people from Talhat. I concluded that from the perspective of Kanesh, Talhat, across the Euphrates, presumably somewhere in the area of Viranşehir, was a foreign city. I compared a stipulation in two legal records from OB Ur (UET 5, 97:19-22 and Tell Sifr no. 13:14-18), where adoptive parents may sell their rebellious son "to Elam (only in UET 5, 97), Sutûm or the Yahmuṭu". I should have mentioned also ARM 14, 78, edited with a new translation and comments by J.M. Durand in *LAPO* 18 (Paris 2000) 66f., as no. 929. In this letter one of the ways to prevent two robbed and maltreated traders of Zalmaqum from stirring up unrest by their story is "to sell them to faraway Sutû, to the Yahmamû or the Almutû, or to any place(?) where one does/can not listen (to them; *ašar lā uznim*) and from where they cannot reach their country". I refer to the comments of Durand on the identification of the last two names and to his observation in *LAPO* 17 (1998) 506, that Sutû "sont des gens à qui on vendait, comme aux Barberesques du XVIIᵉ ou XVIIIᵉ siècle européen, des

gens dont on voulait se debarrasser".

It is interesting that in OB texts from Ur and Mari (the letter quotes an advice of the king of that city) the same is mentioned: selling them abroad from where they cannot return and where, moreover, their story will not be listened to, perhaps will not even be understood. Their preferred buyers are nomadic groups, who travel far and apparently also engage in slave trade, at times also in people captured during their razzia's (see for the Sutû, of which the above mentioned Yahammû/Yahmamû and Al(a)mutû apparently were clans, F. Joannès, *MARI* 8 (1997) 411, and M. Anbar, *Les tribus amurrites de Mari* (*OBO* 108, 1991) 88f). This strategy calls to mind the story of Joseph, who is sold by his brothers in Dothan to a passing caravan of Ishmaelites (Gen. 37:25-28), again nomadic traders who travel over considerable distances.

While the OA texts and the letter from Mari are explicit in mentioning why such a sale is preferred, in the story of Joseph it is said to be in order to prevent bloodshed, but obviously also to exclude a possible of return home. While Joseph's brothers prefer selling him into slavery over killing him, in the Mari letter the king apparently prefers it over the possibility, suggested in the earlier letter ARM 14, 77, of locking them up in an ergasterion (which may entail blinding them, see K. van der Toorn, *RA* 79, 1985, 189f. on ARM 14, 78:10'f.). But, as the rev. of ARM 14, 78 shows, somebody vigorously protests against the proposed sale, declaring (reading with Durand): "Their robbers have disappeared. Who would (dare to) sell these men to the Sutû? Am I the one to do so? It is not good to sell these men to the Sutû." The next two lines, starting with *ēzub la Sutî*, are severely damaged and Durand does not translate them, but an interpretation seems possible, for *ezub la* (see my comments in *RA* 76 (1982) 134f.) introduces the *minus* in an argument *a minori ad majus* and is also used in connection with a particular distance or locale, "not just to ..., but all the way to ...". The first verbal form of l. 7' cannot mean "remettre en échange(?)" (as if it were to be derived from *šupêlum*), but is a D-stem of the verb *šapālum*, see CAD Š/I, 426, 4. It tentatively suggests a meaning "to lower a price", which it renders by "they sell them at any price(?)". But I prefer the alternative meaning (introduced as "possibly") "to send downstream", which fits the situation, since the victims are in Saggarātum on the Habur. We might perhaps read: *ezub lā Sutî an*[*a…i-b*]*a-aš-šu-ú* (7') *lišappilūšunūtima ba-b*[*il-šu-nu e iš-ša-a*]*l-ma* (8') *awassu<nu> uṣṣima inanna* [...], "Not just to the Sutû, one must bring them further downstream to where... are, lest the one who delivers them is [interrogated] and their affair be revealed and then...". Therefore, so he concludes, blinding them (*īnēšunu lapātum*) or cutting out their tongues is to be preferred.

1) A slave originating from Talhat (written URU^KI *Ta-al-hu-ú*) is mentioned in TCL 1, 156:2 (Ammi-ditana year 37). F. van Koppen, in: H. Hunger – R. Pruszinszky (eds.), *Mesopotamian Dark Age Revisited* (Wien 2004) 28 no. 21 (following J. Finkelstein, *JNES* 21 [1962] 78 note 22) wants to restore after the place name [*birit nārim*], "(from) Mesopotamia", i.e. from within the great western bend of the Euphrates.

2) He takes *e-èš ki* as a place-name, while I tentatively render it by "to any place where" (connecting it with *ayyiš*).

3) Note *AbB* 12, 56:8ff., where a Babylonian trader, apparently from Sippar (where his letter was found) mentions his purchase in Aššur (l. 28) of a slave from the Suhean Sumu-hammu (who is now staying in Babylon, lines 18f.) "for the Šubareans"(l. 12).

K.R. VEENHOF

13) The answer of the cleaner in "At the Cleaner's" (UET VI/2, 404:27-30) — The recent new edition of the OB dialogue between a cleaner or fuller and his client by N. Wasserman in *Iraq* 75 (2013) 255-277, has considerably improved its understanding thanks to his lexical and comparative analysis of the treatment asked by the client. Due to damage of the tablet and lexical puzzles some problems remain, which I cannot solve, but the reading and interpretation of the answer given by the cleaner in lines 27-30 can be improved. Wasserman reads and translates:

aššum Ea bēl ne-em-qì-im ša uballaṭu[*ni*] [28] *ezib la jāti ša taqabbû um-mé-ni ù mu-ša-*[*di-ni*] [29] *ša kīma kāti libbam iraššûma* [30] *šipram rittāšu ikaššadā ula ibašši*.

"By the name of Ea, the lord of wisdom who keeps me alive! Drop it! Not me! What you are saying – only my creditor and my tax collector have the nerve (to talk) like you! Nobody's hands could manage this work!"

The invocation of Ea is not "by the name of Ea", where "name" is derived from *aššum*, for *aššum* is a preposition used in such invocations, meaning simply "By Ea" (so already Gadd and see my note on this use of *aššum* in *JCS* 30 (1978) 186-8). In that note (p. 187 no. 3) I also read and translated the attribute of Ea as *bēl né-em-sí-im*, "lord of the washtub" (due to a printing error my text has *ší* instead of *sí*), a reading also adopted by CAD N/I s.v. *namsû*, meaning c) and by B.R. Foster in his *Before the Muses* (Bethesda 1993) I, 89. CAD writes *ni-im-sí*(text -GI)-*im*. Reading the third sign as GI and following Gadd's first edition and later Livingstone (in *Festgabe für Karlheinz Deller*, AOAT 220, 1988, 177), Wasserman maintains *nemqum* as a unique by-form of *nēmequm,* but the copy in UET VI/2 (1966) shows a clear ZI. The cleaner thus invokes his patron deity, the god of crafts, and links him with the tool that is essential for him.

According to Wasserman he calls his exacting client *ummēnī u muša*[*ddinī*]*,* "my creditor and my tax collector", following his predecessors, like Livingstone and Foster. This double designation is explained as a reaction to the meagre wage (one *sūtu* of barley!) his client promises him, which is indeed minimal compared by what we know, as Wasserman shows. But the cleaner's use of *ummēnum* is remarkable, since it is not the normal term for the creditor (one would expect *tamkārum* or *bēl hubullim*) and designates the investor, financier, who of course has a claim on his partner or agent, but does not figure as a typical creditor and does not fit here. And while a "tax collector" may have been the prototype of the man who asks more than he is entitled to, its use in our text is also surprising. This suggests to understand *ummēnum* as "master, expert" (which also more often appears in its contracted form, while as "investor" one nearly always meets the uncontracted *ummiānum*). The extremely detailed, technical instructions his client gives him makes the cleaner call him "my master (of crafts)" and this leads to restoring the second designation as *mu-ša-*[*hi-zi*], "my instructor", because his client seems to teach him how to do his job (I suggested both meanings to the CAD, which accepted them in their translation of our text in vol. U/W 113, 8'). Note that these two designations are the subject of line 28, but an address in the vocative: "My master, my instructor!"

Finally, the translation "Drop it! Not me!" (Livingstone: "Disregard it! Not me."; Foster: "Lay off!"), ignores the syntax of the sentence that starts with the composite preposition *ezi/ub la*, which I discussed in *RA* 76 (1982) 134f. The syntax demands a translation "(It's) not just me, there is nobody who can gather the courage[1] and has such manual skills as you to accomplish this task!"

That the cleaner calls his client "my master and my instructor" adds to "the entertaining aspect of the text", advocated by Erica Reiner and B.R. Foster, which Wasserman (p. 258/9), in my opinion downplays too much in favor of its didactic nature. Both may well go together.

1) The translation of *libbam rašûm* is difficult. I know the combination from OAss, where it means "take courage", which is not too different from Wasserman's "has the nerve", or Foster's "has the gall". My translation expresses that the text uses the fientic *iraššû* and not a stative to describe the man's frame of mind.

K.R. VEENHOF

14) Les fouilles de Tell Leilan, précisions — Suite aux craintes que j'ai exprimées récemment dans la *RA* 108, 2014, p. 144, H. Weiss m'a transmis, dans un courriel du 06/02/2015, les informations suivantes : « All of the Lower Town Palace East excavation area was completely back-filled and protected upon termination of our excavation, returned to its farmer-owner, and has been happily under cereal cultivation for the past 25 years—precisely as it had been for the previous 3,700 years. We have back-filled all of our excavations since 1982, when we back-filled the columned temple façade on the Leilan Acropolis in order to preserve it. » H. Weiss m'a signalé par ailleurs que la photo que j'ai publiée dans mon *Hammurabi of Babylon* (I.B. Tauris, 2012, p. 51 fig. 12 comme « A view from the palace of the lower town of Šubat-Enlil (Tell Leilan) » est en fait une vue « of the Tell Leilan Lower Town South excavation area (terminal Akkadian), several years after its last excavation in 1989. The (Eastern) Lower Town Palace, to which the legend refers, was back-filled, and completely covered, immediately after its last excavation in 1989 » (l'erreur était déjà dans l'édition française de 2003, p. 74 fig. 12). Je remercie H. Weiss de ces précisions.

D. CHARPIN <dominique.charpin@college-de-france.fr>

15) En marge d'ARCHIBAB, 20: *kišippu(m)* « sceau » – Le terme *kišippu(m)* n'est enregistré par le CAD s. v. **kišibbu** (*kišīppu*) que dans deux textes SB : l'*Enūma eliš* et le conte du *Pauvre homme de Nippur*. Préparant dans le cadre du projet ARCHIBAB l'édition des textes du Musée des Antiquités de Rouen, je voudrais signaler sur un contrat daté de Abi-ešuh (HG 141), la mention qui accompagne par trois fois des empreintes des sceaux sur la marge de la tablette, sous la forme : *ki-še-eB* NP. On pourrait croire qu'il s'agit d'une graphie phonétique du sumérogramme KIŠIB, mais on peut tout aussi bien considérer qu'il s'agit de la plus ancienne attestation de l'emprunt par l'akkadien du sumérien KIŠIB.

Le signe final (IB) laisse ouverte la possibilité d'une lecture avec B ou P. Je préfère considérer que l'emprunt en akkadien a été fait sous la forme *kišippu(m)* et non *kišibbu(m)*, si l'on admet la règle qui veut qu'à une consonne sonore en sumérien corresponde une sourde en akkadien – nos dictionnaires modernes n'étant pas toujours cohérents sur ce point (É.GAL est lu *ekallum*, mais NAR.GAL devrait être lu *narkallum*, etc.). Comme dans bien des cas, l'akkadien a donc laissé subsister deux mots côte à côte, le sémitique *kunukkum* et l'emprunt au sumérien *kišippum*.

Cette observation pourrait régler le cas de ARM 28 97-bis. J.-R. Kupper avait transcrit : (5) *a-nu-um-ma* 11 SU KÙ.BABBAR *i-na* na₄ *tup-pí* (6) *šu-mi-ia ak-nu-uk-ma* (7) *a-na ṣe-er a-bi-ia* (8) *uš-ta-bi-la-am* « Voilà que j'ai fait porter à mon père 11 sicles d'argent sous un sceau à mon nom » et noté : « On remarquera le sens rare de na₄ *tuppum* "sceau" ». J'avais noté à propos de ce texte : « pour *ṭuppum* = sceau, cf. ARM 8 16 + 84 TL [*MARI* 1, p. 102-103] et ARM 8 34, enveloppe TL » (*RA* 102, p. 164 n. 73) : dans tous les cas, il s'agit d'indication par le scribe à côté d'une empreinte de sceau : *ṭup-pí* NP. Étant donné que la cursive paléo-babylonienne ne distingue plus KIŠIB et DUB, I. Arkhipov a préféré une lecture KIŠIB.BI, qu'il a ainsi légitimée : « Il est plus simple de considérer kišib-bi comme un sumérogramme figé du type ki-lá-bi » (ARM 32, p. 85 n. 267). Cette explication ne me semble guère probable dans le cas d'une lettre comme ARM 28 97-bis. Deux solutions sont envisageables. Les exemples de Mari pourraient être à comprendre comme ⁽ⁿᵃ⁴⁾KIŠIB-*pí*, le signe *-pí* indiquant comme complément phonétique une lecture *kišippi*. Cependant, la tablette HG 141 documente l'état construit attendu *kišip* NP. Faut-il alors comprendre que les scribes « mariotes » ont réinterprété KIŠIB en DUB ?

D. CHARPIN

16) En marge de HIGEOMES 2 : Hazatānum ou Hazakkānum à Chagar Bazar*⁾ ? — Le toponyme sur la tablette *OBTCB* 10 (= BM 131696), ligne 2, a été lu Hazatānum (*ha-za-ta-nim*) dans l'édition de Ph. TALON, *Old Babylonian Texts from Chagar Bazar*, Bruxelles, 1997. Cette lecture a été reprise dans l'ouvrage de M. WÄFLER, *Tall al-Ḥamīdīya* 3, *OBOSA* 21, 2001, p. 90, *sub* Ḫazatanum, avec cette unique référence. Pourtant, on retrouve bien ici le toponyme Hazakkānum comme J. EIDEM l'avait déjà proposé, dans « Some Upper Mesopotamian Toponyms », *NABU* 1996/1, p. 5-6, note 6 et plus récemment M. GUICHARD, dans « Bédouins et sédentaires au pays de l'Ida-Maraṣ », *Semitica* 55, 2013, p. 68, *sub* l. 23'. Ces lectures ont été réalisées à partir de la copie de C.J. GADD (*Iraq* 4, 1937, p. 185, fig. 2 *sub* A.387). Une collation effectuée par moi-même au British Museum (en septembre 2010) montre très clairement un signe KA, bien que l'écriture en soit assez resserrée. Le signe n'est pas un TA, comme le montre une comparaison avec le signe TA de la ligne 6 ; cela avait déjà été noté par F. VAN KOPPEN dans *AfO* 46/47, 1999-2000, p. 341a *sub* 10.

Le problème de la lecture de ce toponyme vient du fait que la fin de la ligne a été écrite largement sur le revers et qu'elle s'intercale au final entre les lignes 7 et 8 du revers. Cela explique aussi sans doute l'absence de déterminatif postposé KI. Le KA lui-même se trouve ainsi en partie sur la tranche de cette petite tablette assez plate, d'où les problèmes de lecture qui ont pu se produire. Il faut donc bien lire *ha-za-ka*-*nim*. Il s'agit de la ville bien connue par les textes de Mari sous les formes Hazakkānum, Hazikkānum ou Hazakkān, que M. GUICHARD a proposé, à titre d'hypothèse, d'identifier avec Tell Qarāṣa au sud de Tell Leilan (cf. *FM* II, 1994, p. 244). Il s'agit du site n° 98 dans D.J.W. MEIJER, *A Survey in Northeastern Syria*, Leyde, 1986. Le toponyme Hazatānum n'est donc pour l'instant pas attesté à Chagar Bazar.

Denis LACAMBRE, < denis.lacambre@univ-lille3.fr >
Univ. Lille 3 - HALMA (UMR 8164), IUF et Mission archéologique de l'Univ. de Liège en Syrie

17) Notes on A.1289⁺ – A.1289⁺ is a letter of Ibal-pi-El II, king of Ešnunna, to Zimri-Lim, king of Mari. Dominique Charpin published it in *Mél. Garelli* (1991, p. 147–159). Jean-Marie Durand collated the text and translated it anew (*LAPO* 16 281). The purpose of our note is to correct a few paleographic and orthographic errors of the available transliteration. These corrections are relevant to the description of differences between various Old Babylonian orthographies, especially between Ešnunna and the kingdoms of Šamši-Adad and Zimri-Lim (see our *What is Old Babylonian Language, or How to Write an Old Babylonian Grammar*, forthcoming).

1) All the "*sú*" in the edition are wrong, the copy and the photo have SU rather than ZU in all cases (ll. ii 6, 10, 11, 14, iii 16, 34, iv 25').

2) In ll. i 7, ii 6 and 14, it is advisable to transliterate *la-wi-a-ku* rather than the edition's "*la-wa-a-ku*," since /ia/ is never contracted to /â/ in the epistolary corpus of Ibal-pi-El II, cf. in the present letter *an-ni-a-tim* (i 24), *ra-bi-am* (iii 29), *pa-ni-a-ti-šu* (iii 37), *tu-ša-ri-a-am* (iii 41), *šu-ri-aš-šu-nu-ti-ma (*iii 50), *su-ti-a-am-ma (*iv 15').

3) In ll. iii ll. 6, 8, 10, and 22, the editor reads the sign sequence UNU.KI and tentatively translates it as "demeure" or "centre du pouvoir." We read the signs in question as AB.KI, which squares better with the copy and the photo, and interpret them as *ìs-qí* for *isqum* 'share (of a patrimony)':

an-ni-ki-a-am aš-šum ìs-qí-ka […], *tu-ur-ri-im ta-a*[*š-ta-n*]*a-ap-pa-ra-am*, *ù* 6 LUGAL.ME[Š *ša i*]*š-tu* U₄-*mi ma-du-tim i-na ìs-qí-šu-nu*, ⌜*is-su*⌝-[*hu a-na*] *a-li-šu-nu tu-ut-ta-na-ar-š*[*u-nu-ti*], [… *h*]*a-ra-da*ᵏⁱ *ìs-qí la-bi-ra-a*[*m*], […]-x-*ra-a*[*n-n*]*i* 'Here you keep writing to me about giving back […] your paternal estate, and you are going to restore to their cities six kings who were uprooted from their patrimonies long ago. […] Harradum, my old patrimony […]' (iii 6–12).

ù pí-qa-at aš-šum ìs-qí la-bi-ra-am, […]-*ú-ma pa-ṭì-ia i-na* [*h*]*a-ra-di-im*ᵏⁱ *ú-ki-in-nu*, […-*š*]*u-nu* 'And perhaps, since […] my old patrimony and set my borders in Harradum […]' (iii 22–24).

Dominique Charpin suggests us two tokens of *isqum* with the same meaning 'royal patrimony' and in similar contexts (*ARM* 28 148: 5 and A.1215 : 27). Both letters were published later than A.1289⁺.

Ilya ARKHIPOV <arkhipoff@mail.ru>
Russian Academy of Sciences, Institute of World History, MOSCOU, RUSSIE
Sergey LOESOV <sergeloesov@gmail.com>
Russian State University for the Humanities, Institute for Or. and Class. Studies, MOSCOU, RUSSIE

18) Dating YBC 2242, the Kadašman-Ḫarbe I stone — This inscription, with its anomalous historical preamble, eclectic literary style, and occasionally esoteric orthography, is a welcome addition to the corpus of published kudurrus (edition by Paulus, AOAT 51, pp. 296-304, pls. 1-7). One may, however, note features which suggest a dating later than the reign of Kadašman-Ḫarbe I himself (c. 1400). Most obvious is the writing of the masculine personal determinative with a horizontal rather than a vertical wedge, which rarely occurs in Babylonian non-scholarly texts dating from the second half of the second millennium. In this text the horizontal determinative is used before the name of the recipient of the grant, ᵐᵈAMAR.UTU-*šam-ši-ì-lí,* in i 17 and again before the ancestral name ᵐLÚ-ᵈDUMU.NUN.NA in i 26 (the name of the father in i 19 has no preceding determinative, and the name of the grandfather in i 22 may also have no determinative, but the passage is damaged); it also occurs before the name of a man associated with a neighboring piece of real estate É ᵐ*ma-a-zi/ṣí* (iii 10) and perhaps in similar context in iii 17. These are the only clearly preserved masculine personal determinatives in the body of the text.

This distinctive horizontal writing of the masculine personal determinative is very rare in Babylonian official and semi-official inscriptions in the second half of the second millennium. But it is attested also on another stone inscription (9 N 99 = IM 71204), a duck weight found at Nippur and dating to the reign of Marduk-šāpik-zēri (1081-1069), the seventh king of the Isin II dynasty. This inscription is written in the name of ᵐ*nap-sa-me-ni* who bears the titles UGULA AZU NU.ÈŠ ᵈ50.LÁ ÌR ᵈAMAR.UTU-*ša-pí-ik*-NUMUN LUGAL KÁ.DINGIR.RA.KI-KE₄, "overseer of the diviners, *nišakku*-official of Enlil,

servant of Marduk-šāpik-zēri, king of Babylon" (latest edition: Frame, RIMB 2 48-49 B.2.7.2001, with references to earlier literature).

In what appears to be a colophon at the end of column iv of YBC 2242 (following a double horizontal ruling after iv 10), there occurs in line 14 the same distinctive horizontal masculine determinative preceding a name which begins ᵐ*nap-sa-*[…] and in lines 2'-3' of an unattached fragment of the same stone (pl. 7, lower right) the name [ᵈAM]AR.UTU-*ša-pí-i*[*k*]/-*ze-ri-im*. This combination of circumstances strongly suggests that YBC 2242 was itself produced in the early eleventh century by or for an official during the reign of Marduk-šāpik-zēri. It is also worth noting that Seidl, commenting on the representation of the king on this stone, finds the closest parallel for the monarch's crown in a relief on a kudurru from the reign of Marduk-nādin-aḫḫē, Marduk-šāpik-zēri's predecessor (cited by Paulus, AOAT 51, p. 296).[1]

I prefer to prescind here from the question of whether this inscription may be based on an original composed in the time of Kadašman-Ḫarbe I or whether it is a later composition. Those interested in the beginning historical phases of the Kassite dynasty are familiar with other purportedly early documents associated with titles to gifts or benefactions for temples or individuals which exist only in later copies (e.g., the Agum-kakrime text, the Kurigalzu I donation) and whose authenticity has often been called into question.[2] This deserves further study.

Napsamenni, the individual with the affinity for distinctive determinatives, is also known from an administrative document drawn up in the reign of Marduk-nādin-aḫḫē, in whose second year (1098) he supervised the transfer of 158 luxury garments from Babylon to Nippur on the occasion of a celebrity wedding. He was already a *nišakku* of Enlil at that time, though as yet but a simple diviner (LÚ.ḪAL), with only a vertical determinative (HS 157 = TuM NF 5 44:105).[3]

1) The colophon is badly damaged and difficult to reconstruct. One might perhaps suggest *ba-a-*[*r*]*i*?(-)⌈*i*⌉ in line 15: either an indication of inspection (*ba-a-*[*r*]*i*?) or—much less likely— the syllabically written title of Napsamenni (*ba-a-*[*r*]*i*?-⌈*i*⌉) in the genitive. The apparent partial horizontal wedge to the left of the top of the vertical in the putative RI as drawn in the cuneiform copy in AOAT 51, pl. 7 does not exist on the stone (photographs of the passage kindly made available by Elizabeth Payne, who also commented on the traces of the sign).

2) Note too the presence of *mārē/mārū ummâni* in YBC 2242 ii 39'-40': DUMU.ME *um-m*[*a-ni*] / *na-ak-lu*[*-ti*/-*tu*] followed by a verb *ú-še-*[…] (perhaps to be restored *ú-še-*[*šib*] ?) and then by references to real property, presumably an object of donation. Compare the DUMU.MEŠ *um-ma-ni* in similar context in the Agum-kakrime inscription (vii 5).

3) I wish to thank Grant Frame and Jonathan Tenney for commenting on an advanced draft of this note.

J. A. BRINKMAN <j-brinkman@uchicago.edu>

19) New reading of the Emirgazi monuments — Among Anatolian hieroglyphs, the sign Laroche 267 "STELE" is used for standing stone monuments. The exact meaning of STELE and its Luwian reading are however unknown[1]. Some interesting stone monuments could help in the identification of these monuments. I will restrict myself here to monuments dating back to Tudhaliya IV, in the late 13th Century BCE.

First are two stone bases originating from the lower city of Ḫattuša and conserved in the Istanbul Museum (inv. N°7775 et 7776 = BOĞAZKÖY 1 & 2[2]).

The first bears an inscription showing a man and the second one, a lady. The inscriptions are read:

Bossert 1952 :516 :	"Diesen Malstein (Mann) Lapramaḫa…te"
	"Diesen Malstein (Frau) xx…te"
Marazzi 1990[3] : tav. X.2 :	"Questa stele il devoto tal de'tali qui di fronte ha posto"
	"Questa stela, io (nome) davanti ho posto"
I would translate :	"This STELE is erected by Sir Tabami, here in front"
	"This STELE is erected by the Lady…(x-L.352 ?), here in front".

Those two bases, hollowed out in their inner centers, contained standing objects, likely stones. If the Luwian reading of STELE is unknown, Hittite texts attest the worship of standing stones under the vocable *ḫuwaši*. When we look at the sign STELE (267 of Laroche), we clearly see that it is a

combination of the signs "LAPIS" et "SCALPRUM", in other words, the sign represents exactly the very object it is written on[4].

The same sign is also attested elsewhere, specially on the so-called Emirgazi "altars". On those so-called "altars", the sign designating them, L. 267, appears on lines 3, 6, 7, 24 et 27. If this sign is the sign for STELE, it should not be considered to represent "altar"[5]. In the cuneiform writing in Hittite texts, "altar" is attested under the logogram ^{GIŠ}ZAG.GAR.RA. A. Ünal has also demonstrated in a study that the Hittites called the altars GIŠ (sic !, even though mostly made of stone!) BANŠUR, and the ones made of wicker-work GIŠ.BANŠUR.AD.KID[6]. BANŠUR is however the logogram used for table, offering table and not clearly for the altar.

Is there a possible confusion between the two objects "stele" and "altar" ? If the sign L.267, attested on the stone bases from the Istanbul Museum, designates the installation with standing stones put inside the bases, we should admit that L.267 could not be used for " altar ", but rather for the "STELE" = standing stone, which is known as Hittite *ḫuwaši*.

Furthermore, we know that the altars I and IV from Emirgazi could be inserted into rectangular bases, also covered with hieroglyphic writing. It seems that the way that the Emirgazi stones were placed in them is similar to the manner in which the stones were inserted into the Istanbul bases[7] and maybe also similar to that of the Karahöyük stele[8].

HAWKINS (2006)[9] noted that

" the EMIRGAZI altars text thus details the setting up of cult object(s) and stelae for the Stag-God and Ala on Mount Sarpa, and a connected ritual for Tudḫaliya himself. In the inscription STELE is written with the usual square block hieroglyph, L.267. The ˈaltarsˈ themselves are stone representations of offering table (log. ZAG.GAR.RA, Hittite *ištanana-*), which are seen in representations of festivals, e.g. on the Inandık vase[10], and are often stated to be made of wicker (AD.KID). Are these the ˈstelaeˈ actually referred to in the text, often qualified as ˈthis steleˈ ? "

The answer to the question would be affirmative, except for the fact that these *stelae* are not altars but rather holy standing stones.

The Emirgazi inscriptions say that nobody is supposed to change the divine patrons of the STELE in question, or damage it (§16). And this goes well together with the line which contains the injunction against altering the text of the inscription. In addition, §25 says that those stones must be made TANA "sanctified". The Luwian term *tana*, as known from the Empire-period Emirgazi inscription, indicates a state that a stele is supposed to be in[11], and is translated by H. C. Melchert as ''sanctified''[12]. The consecration of these stones was performed by Tudḫaliya IV. This interpretation suggests that the Emirgazi stones are a equivalent to what Hittites call *ḫuwaši* rather than altars (*ištanana-*).

On the linguistic level, there is an argument for this identification : a word *hwa-sa-ti-*(sic !) appears beside the STELE sign.

I would propose to read the Emirgazi monument in a different way[13] :

§11 DEUS-ní-zi/a STELE kwi/a-i(a)-sa hwi/a-sa-ti-sa
Whose *ḫuwaši* is the stele for the gods,
§12 i(a)-zi/a-tá-sa wa/i-tá STELE pa-sa-' hwi/a-sa-ti-sa i(a)-zi/a-i(a)-ru.
let the stele to be made become the *ḫuwaši* of that one.

The improvement in the reading consists in placing i(a)-zi/a-tá-sa- on the left periphery of the second clause[14]. Otherwise it would be impossible to explain the absence of the ''initial-a-final'' at the beginning of the second clause. Furthermore, as STELE is a neuter in Luwian, one cannot accept an agreement between stele and kwi/a-(i)a-sa or pa-sa-'.

An alternative would be to consider kwi/a-i(a)-sa as /kwiyas(sa)/ "whose" and pa-sa-a as /abas(sa)/ "of that one" as plain demonstratives modifying *ḫuwaši*. The alternative translation would be :

" Which *ḫuwaši* is the stele for the gods, let the stele to be made become that *ḫuwaši* ".

The latter interpretation would clearly indicate that the demonstrative refers to the stone on which the inscription appears. In the first translation, one could only recognize the equation made between STELE and *ḫuwaši* : the STELE is the *ḫuwaši* of the god.

One could also think that the the Emirgazi monuments are indeed altars, and that the STELE to which the text refers was a standing stone placed in the rectangular base, within the altars. However, the text indicates a plural form which identifies all the standing stone monuments as being STELE (§24 with demonstrative plural *zaya*). All of them have to be made *tana*, and all of them, as being holy, should be protected.

The word was first read HWISTISA by Hawkins, whose vocalisation is difficult to explain. The word *hwasatt(i)-* (sic!), nom. sg. *hwasattis*, can however be explained as the Luwian extended form of Hittite *ḫuwaši-*. The suffix *-att(i)-* is productive in Luwian (cf. *lalatt(i)-* "language" vs. *lala-* "tongue").

The precise reading of the logogram STELE is unknown[15]. STELE seems to be a generic sign for numbers of different standing stones. In several cases, at least under Tudḫaliya IV, it could well refer to the known cultic standing stones worshipped in the rituals.

Regarding the Emirgazi monuments and their inscriptions, we could consider that, in the perspective of the king who is the author, they belong to a specific category of standing stones, which is the Hittite *ḫuwaši* of the gods. *ḫuwaši*s dating back to Tudḫaliya IV are well documented. And the specific word "*ḫuwaši*" is attested elsewhere in apposition to specify the nature of the standing stone. This can be seen in the Maštigga ritual, where *tanid-* is visibly a gloss for Hittite *ḫuwaši*[16].

KUB X 76 l. 5-7 + XII 59 col. III, l. 7-9 (CTH 404 1.II.B) :

kuis=war=at ueteskit ^NA4^*ḫuwaši*^HI.A *ta-a-ni-ta kinuna=war=at=kan kāsa lagāri*

"He who constructed them, the *ḫuwaši*-standing stones (*tanid-*), here they are, they are toppling".

From this, one could postulate that the Emirgazi monuments are part of the sacred standing stones, referred to in Hittite by the word *ḫuwaši*.

1) On the reading of hieroglyphs, Laroche underlined that "Il convient d'insister sur ce principe de déchiffrement, parfois négligé, que la lecture phonétique d'un idéogramme hiéroglyphique n'est pas immédiate. Nous voyons bien que, comme en cunéiforme, le même signe peut recouvrir des synonymes dans des langues diffé-rentes, ou même servir de déterminatif général à des notions apparentées : Yazılıkaya est écrit en hiéroglyphique, pensé en hourrite. Ce principe condamne l'expression « hittite hiéroglyphique » appliquée à une langue, a fortiori à un peuple", Laroche, E., 1952, *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 6, 119, note 38.

2) WINCKLER, H., 1907 : 57sq.

3) MARAZZI, M., 1990.

4) See also BOSSERT, H. Th., 1952: 508.

5) Vs. BOSSERT, H. Th., 1952, 497 : "Wir beschäftigen uns im Folgenden mit einem Worte (ed. : *wanid*), das ich 1932 mit 'Altar', 1951 mit 'Malstein' zu übersetzen versuchte". There is a specific sign for offering table, which is MENSA.

6) ÜNAL, A., 1994: 383–291.

7) MASSON, E., 1979 : 9 and fig. 2.

8) Several examples of hieroglyphic monuments are, in fact, stone bases, see also BOSSERT, H. Th., 1952, 498, 506 : "Man darf jedoch ohne weiteres annehmen, dass alle Stelen mit ihrem untersten Teil in Basen oder in erdboden eingelassen waren (…)."

9) HAWKINS, J. D., 2006 : 49–76.

10) A study will be specifically dedicated to the iconography of standing stones in Hittite art: MICHEL, P. M., 2015, " What does a *ḫuwaši* look like ?" (forthcoming).

11) WEEDEN, M., 2010 : 52, note 86.

12) MELCHERT, C., 1997 : 47–51.

13) Warm thanks to Ilya Yakubovich for his very friendly help and the time he spent with me dealing with this interpretation.

14) Personal communication of Ilya Yakubovich.

15) As a determinative, STELE is attested before two words : *tanid-* and *wanid-*. See : Restan §3 za-pa-wa/i ("STELE")wa/i-ni-za (DEUS)pa-ha-la-ti-ia CRUS-nu-ha-á; Maraš 11 §4 za-a-wa/i-ta ("STELE")wa/i-ni-za REL-sa[... ; Meharde §1 |za-a-wa/i |(STELE)ta-ni?-(2)sà-za |DEUS.REGIO-ni-sa (3) |(MAGNUS.DOMINA)ha-su-sa$_5$+ra/i-sa; or Sheizar §4 |za-pa-wa/i-mu |(STELE)ta-‹ni›-sà |mi-i-zi-´ |INFANS.NEPOS-zi |INFANS.NEPOS-ka-la-zi |(INFANS)NEG$_2$-wa/i-zi ||. Note that in Karkamiš, the sign L. 267 has the phonetic value /wa/ as seen in several inscriptions, such as Karkamiš A18h §1 za-wa/i STELE-ni-zi! VIR-ti-sa (DEUS)SOL-wa/i+ra/i-ma-sa-´ CAPUT-ta-sa.

16) See Yakubovich I., 2009 : note 86. This interpretation was communicated by C. Melchert.

Bibliography

BOSSERT, H. Th., 1952, "Das H-H Wort für 'Malstein'", *Belleten* (Türk Tarih Kurumu) 16, 495–545.

HAWKINS, J. D., 2006, "Tudḫaliya the Hunter", in *The Life and Time of Ḫattušili III and Tudḫaliya IV*, 49–76.

MARAZZI, M., 1990, *Il Geroglifico Anatolico, Problemi di analisi e prospettive di ricerca*, Roma.

MASSON, E., 1979, "Les inscriptions louvites hiéroglyphiques d'Emirgazi", *Journal des Savants*, 3–49.

MELCHERT, C., 1997, "Luvian /tāna-/ 'sanctified, inviolable' ", *Historische Sprachforschung* 110, 47–51.

ÜNAL, A., 1994, "Zur Beschaffenheit des hethitischen Opfertisches aus philologischer und archäologischer Sicht", in P. Calmeyer, K. Hecker, L. Jakob Rost et C. B. F. Walker (eds.), *Beiträge zur Altorientalischen Archäologie und Alterumskunde: Festschrift für B. Hrouda zum 65. Geburstag*, 383–291.

WEEDEN, M., 2010, "Tuwati and Wasusarma : Imitating the behaviour of Assyria", *Iraq* 72, 39–61.

WINCKLER, H., 1907, "Vorläufige Nachrichten über die Ausgrabungen in Boghaz-köi im Sommer 1907", *MDOG* 35, 1–59.

YAKUBOVICH I., 2009, *Sociolinguistics of the Luvian Language* (vol. 1).

Patrick MICHEL <PatrickMaxime.Michel@unige.ch >

20) KUB 37.139: A fragment of an (historical) royal epic from Ḫattuša — This interesting small Akkadian fragment KUB 37.139 (388/b), known only *passim* in AHw and CAD, has never been fully edited or studied. It was found in Büyükkale building A and is written in Hittite ductus. Dating remains difficult since diagnostic signs are not conclusive, but suggest a relatively older date, e.g. LI, Ù, ÚR (old) versus ŠAR (middle/late). In addition, the attestation of the sign ÚR in Bogazköy Akkadian can be added to the list of Durham 1976, 323 n. 425.

Only a short passage where the (unknown) protagonist king is said to address his troops is preserved. *Contra* SASSMANNSHAUSEN 2008, 283 who classified this text as "mythologisch", I would like to suggest that this fragment belongs to an (historical) royal epic, since the addressing of the troops by the protagonist king is a common motif for such epics, e.g. Zimri-lim epic (OB), Gulkišar epic (OB/MB), and the *šar tamḫāri* epic (MB). Unfortunately, there are no indications, such as vanguard god(s) or geographical references, to which king this fragment may apply.

(broken)

1'.	*ša* ⸢x⸣ […]
2'.	*ra-bi-i* ⸢x⸣ ⸢x⸣ […]
3'.	*úr-ra ù mu-u-š[a …]*
4'.	*er-ru pí-i-šu i-pu-u[š ...]*
5'.	*šar šar-ra-ni pí-i-šu* [*īpušamma ...*]
6'.	*a-na qar-ra-a-dì-*[*šu izakkar …*]
7'.	*qar-ra-dì-ia-ma še20-ma* [...]
8'.	*le-e-qa-a a-ma-ti-i*[*a …*]
9'.	ir ma aḫ *a-pé-e-*⸢x⸣ […]
10'.	[…]⸢x⸣ ⸢x⸣ ⸢(x)⸣ ⸢x⸣ ⸢x⸣ ⸢x⸣ […]

(broken)

1'. […]
2'. […] great […]
3'. Day and night […]
4'. The mighty one opened his mouth […]
5'. The king of kings [opened] his mouth […]
6'. and [speaks] to [his] warriors:
7'. "My warriors, listen to (my) […]
8'. Receive [my] words! […]
9'. […]
10'. […]

4'. *erru* is another attestation of *werru* (*erru*) V "starker?" cf. AHw 1495. Interestingly, one of the other few attestations is found in the Old Babylonian (historical) royal epic "Erra and Narām-Sîn" (BM 120003): 37 *wi-ru-um*, cf. LAMBERT 1973, 361 and 363; WESTENHOLZ 1997, 196-197.

5'. Until now the earliest attestation of the epithet *šar šarrāni* "king of kings" dates back to Tukulti-Ninurta I (1243-1207 BCE), cf. WEIDNER 1959, 18 l. 3. Although it could be suggested that this fragment might be related to the well-known Tukulti-Ninurta epic, this can be excluded based on the palaeographic evidence mentioned above, which suggests that KUB 37.139 is of an earlier date.

Bibliography

DURHAM, J.W. 1976: *Studies in Boğazköy Akkadian*, Ph.D. dissertation, Harvard University.

LAMBERT, W.G. 1973: "Studies in Nergal", *BiOr* 30, 355-363.

SASSMANNSHAUSEN, L. 2008: "Babylonische Schriftkultur des 2. Jahrtausends v. Chr. in den Nachbarländern und im östlichen Mittelmeerraum", *AuOr* 26, 263-293.

WEIDNER, E. 1959: *Die Inschriften Tukulti-Ninurtas I. und seiner Nachfolger*, AfO beiheft 12, Graz.

WESTENHOLZ, J.G., 1997: *Legends of the Kings of Akkade*, Mesopotamian Civilizations 7, Winona Lake.

Elyze ZOMER, <elyse.zomer@uni-leipzig.de>
Universität Leipzig, GERMANY

21) ᵐMU.PAP and [m……]-ḫa-a-a*) — The personal name written as "ᵐMU.PAP" appears in KAV 182, iii 12', a fragment of Synchronistic King List[1], and "[ᵐ……]-ḫa-a-a" in KAV 216, iii 21', the main exemplar of that king list:

KAV 182 (Column iii)

... …	
12. ᵐᵈMEZ-za-kir-MU	ᵐMU-PAP-[… …]
… …	

KAV 216 (Column iii)

… ...	… ...	
20. ᵐ[ᵈ]Šùl-ma-nu-MAŠ min	ᵐᵈ[… …	min]
21. [ᵐ… …]-ḫa-a-a um-[… …]		
... …		

It was once suggested by A. K. Grayson (AOAT 1 [1969], 114.) that the two names were identical, referring to the same *ummânu*, the (chief) royal scribe[2] of the Babylonian king, Marduk-zākir-šumi I (ca. 855–819 BC). However, the identification for the two names might remain open to question.

According to Grayson, "[ᵐ……]-ḫa-a-a", which was also restored by him as [ᵐ]MU?-ḫa-a-a (RLA 6 [1980-83], 119, iii, 21'), would be a partly syllabic writing of "ᵐMU.PAP". However, there seems to be no any ground to construct the syllabic connection between "ḫa-a-a" and "PAP". Besides, the heading signs before "ḫa-a-a" in KAV 216, iii 21' were partly damaged, but it is almost certain that here must be an original "LUḪ", since three vertical wedges and a slant wedge (which could be the right part of LUḪ) can be seen and there will be no space left for another sign between the personal name determinative and LUḪ[3]. Most importantly, to be judged by the format of Synchronistic King List (KAV 216), the name of a certain king's *ummânu* will be inscribed directly below the royal name of that king[4]. Accordingly, "[……]-ḫa-a-a" below the name of the Assyrian king Šalmaneser III (859–824 BC) in KAV 216, iii 20'-21' (the left half-lines) must be an Assyrian *ummânu*, but not a Babylonian one.

Actually, "ᵐMU.PAP" in KAV 182, iii 12' must be identical with "ᵐMU-[……]" in KAV 10 (another fragment of Synchronistic King List), ii 10', since in the two fragments, this name appears in the similar position: directly below or after the name of Marduk-zākir-šumi I, as the *ummânu* of this king:

KAV 10 (Column ii)

… …
9. ^{md}MEZ-[…]
10. ^mMU-[…]
… …

Furthermore, Brinkman (JCS 16 [1962], 99, 25.1.3.) suggested that a "MU.ŠEŠ" (or "MU. ÙRU"), the *kalû*-priest of Marduk and scribe appearing in a Babylonian *kudurru* (F. Thureau-Dangin, RA 16 [1919], 126, iv 23'; S. Paulus, AOAT 51 [2014], 669, Rs.IV23) dated to the second year of Marduk-zākir-šumi I was also identical with "MU.PAP" in KAV 182 and KAV 10.

Thus, "^mMU.PAP" and "[^m……]-ḫa-a-a" are two personal names. Besides, the readings of the two names are also noteworthy. If "LUḪ" can be accepted, i.e. the name in KAV 216 is written as "[^mluḫ]-ḫa-a-a", then it might be read as "Luḫḫaja" (or "Laḫḫaja"), which would come from a month-name "*Laḫḫum*", usually written as "*La-aḫ-ḫu-um*", "*La-ḫu-um*", "*La-aḫ-ḫi-im*" or "*La-ḫi-im*" (AHw, 528; CAD 9, 41.) and mainly used in Mari and Susa in Ur III and Old Babylonian Periods [5]. As for "MU.ŠEŠ", another writing form of "MU.PAP", it was once read as "Šum(a)-uṣur" (F. Thureau-Dangin, RA 16 [1919], 126, iv 23'; S. Paulus, AOAT 51 [2014], 669, Rs.IV23). Nevertheless, since "Šum(a)-uṣur" is not popular for personal names, the more appropriate reading may be "Nādin-aḫi"[6].

*) The writer wishes to thank Prof. Sallaberger for his suggestions for this note. The writer is also grateful to the Graduate School of Distant Worlds at Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München, by which the writer was financed to do a visiting post-doctoral study. This note was written at that Graduate School.

1) The Synchronistic King List is a special king list in ancient Mesopotamia, in which the Assyrian kings and the Babylonian kings (perhaps mainly from 18th to 7th Century BC) are recorded together in one list, roughly with contemporary pairs being parallel in right and left sides of each column. One main exemplar (KAV 216; for the full copy, see also E. F. Weidner, AfO 3 [1926], 70-71) and several fragments of this list (KAV 9, 10, 11, 12, 13 and182) have been found. For transliterations of the exemplar and fragments, see Grayson, RLA 6 (1980-83), 116-117.

2) The exact function of listing those *ummânū* immediately after their kings is not clear. For meanings of this post, see CAD 20, 108-115; for more implications, see Parpola, LAS IIA (1971), 6-7.

3) Prof. Sallagerber, who kindly discussed the readings of the two names with the writer, also thought that LUḪ could be determined here.

4) This can be seen from KAV 216, iii 2', 12', 15', 17', 19', where the names of those *ummânū* are inscribed under the names of the Babylonian kings in the right half-lines of that column.

5) W. Hinz identified it as the Elamite month "ITU ^dMAḪ" (August), but E. Reiner excluded it from the Elamite month-names, since it could also be found in Mari. See Hinz, Or 32 (1963), 18; Reiner, AfO 24 (1973), 99, n.20.

6) "Šum(a)-uṣur" is absent from the personal name collections of PNA, while an individual named "Nādin-aḫi" from Assur in the late reign of Assurbanipal can be convinced. See PNA 2, 919.

Fei CHEN <cf001126@126.com>
Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität, Distant Worlds, Schellingstraße 3, 80799 München

22) Die Unterwerfung Ba'alus im Jahre 671 v.Chr. — Zwar stellt Asarhaddon in AsBbE. 7'-8' (Leichty 2011: 135) die Behauptung auf, dass er bei der Eroberung von Tyros sämtliche Städte des Ba'alus geraubt habe, allerdings wird gemeinhin angenommen, dass diese Aussage nicht den historischen Tatsachen entspreche (GRAYSON 1991: 126). Schaut man sich lediglich AsBbE.7'-8' sowie Frt. F. 12'-14' (LEICHTY 2011:87) zur Betrachtung des Beispiels von Tyros an, so bleibt völlig unklar, wie die Folgen dieser Belagerung tatsächlich ausgefallen sind. Beispielsweise kann diesbezüglich folgende Beschreibung von Graysons angeführt werden: „The result of the siege is not recorded, apart from Esarhaddon's grandiose claim that he conquered Tyros and deprived Baal of his all cities and possessions. Tyre probably did not actually fall but the siege may have been continued by an Assyrian contingent, while the bulk of the troops proceeded to Egypt" (GRAYSON 1991: 126). Neben Grayson verweisen viele weitere Forscher bei der Analyse von Tyros ausschließlich auf AsBbE.7'-8' und Frt.F.12'-14', ohne in diesem Zusammenhang auch Frt.A.Rs.1'-11' (LEICHTY 2011: 76) mit in den Blick zu nehmen (KATZENSTEIN 1997²: 279; LIPIŃSKI 1999: 242-243; FUCHS 2008: 94). Ausgehend davon

möchte ich an dieser Stelle auf der Basis von Frt.A.Rs.1'-11' eben diese Belagerung einmal detailliert betrachten. In diesem Kontext muss jedoch akzeptiert werden, dass aufgrund der physischen Beschädigung des Textes nicht immer Sicherheit bezüglich der Lesbarkeit gegeben sein kann. Folgende Stellen werden behandelt:

Zeile 1'-5': Rebellion des Ba'alu und anschließende gehorsame Unterwerfung.

Zeile 6'-7': Entrichtung eines erheblichen Tributs zur Unterwerfung und Übergabe der Töchter inklusive Mitgift seitens des Ba'alu, Unterwerfungszeremonie.

Zeile 8'-10': Annexion der Festlandstädte des Ba'alu ins assyrische Reich.

Aus Frt.A.Rs.1'-11' kann die Situation, die sich nach der Belagerung einstellte, wie folgt rekonstruiert werden: Ba'alu, der König von Tyros, stand auf Seiten von Ägypten, weshalb die Stadt Tyros durch die assyrischen Truppen belagert wurde. Vermutlich hat sich Ba'alu Assyrien im Verlauf dieser Belagerung ergeben, woraufhin ihm der rückständige jährliche Tribut während der Rebellion und die Übergabe seiner Töchter mitsamt Mitgift als Bedingungen der Unterwerfung auferlegt wurden oder er dies aus eigenem Antrieb zur Unterwerfung übersandte.

Ba'alu, dem durch Asarhaddon verziehen und dessen Gebiet schließlich nicht erobert wurde, rebellierte später in der Zeit von Aššurbanipal erneut. In Bezug auf die Zeilen 8'-10' wäre es naheliegend zu vermuten, dass die ins assyrische Reich annektierten Festlandstädte die im Jahre 677/676 v.Chr. durch Asarhaddon dem Ba'alu gegebenen Städte Ma'rubu und Ṣarepta, die an der nördliche Grenze des Landes Tyros liegen, umfassen (LEICHTY 2011: 17 Nin.A iii 15-17).

Bibliographie

FUCHS, A. (2008): Über den Wert von Befestigungsanlagen, ZA 98. 45-99.

GRAYSON, A.K. (1991): Assyria: Sennacherib and Esarhaddon (704-669 B.C.). In: J. Bordmann – I.E.S. Edwards – E. SOLLBERGER – N.G.L. Hammond (Hrsg.), The Cambridge Ancient History, Second Edition, Volume 3, Part 2: The Assyrian and Babylonian Empires and other States of the Near East, from Eight to the Sixth Centuries B.C., Cambridge, 103-141.

LEICHTY, E. (2011): The Royal Inscriptions of Esarhaddon, King of Assyria (680-669 BC) (RINAP 4), Winona Lake.

LIPIŃSKI, M. (1999): Ba'alu. In: K. Radner (Hrsg.): The Prosopography of the Neo-Assyrian empire, 1/2: B-G, Helsinki, 242-243.

Katsuji SANO, <ksassur@hotmail.co.jp>

23) An error in *astrolabe* K 14943+81-7-27, 94 — K 14943+81-7-27, 94 is a circular *astrolabe*, or *three -stars-each*, found in the library of Nineveh and in possession of the British Museum. A copy of the tablet has been published in CT 33. An interesting feature of this tablet is that it contains an error, most likely a scribal error, which I will describe below after giving a brief overview of the genre.

Mesopotamian astronomy divided the skies into three paths, *ḫarrānū*, identified by the deities Enlil, Anu and Ea. Enlil being the northernmost path and Ea being the southernmost. Astrolabes belong to a genre of astronomical texts that list one star for each of these paths per month: a total of thirty-six stars divided into three paths within twelve months. Besides indicating a star, some astrolabes also give a numerical value for each month and each path, most likely related to the length of daylight. The month containing a summer solstice is given the highest value (4;00 for Ea) and the month with the winter solstice the lowest (2;00 for Ea). Months containing an equinox are in between (3;00 for Ea). The months without such astronomical cardinal points progress in a linear cycle throughout the year. The numerical values are halved for the path of Anu and halved again for the path of Enlil. Circular astrolabes place Enlil in the innermost circle and Ea in the outermost circle.

The text under discussion gives an erroneous star within the path of Ea for the month *Ṭebētu*, the tenth month in the calendar. The star mentioned is 'ur.gu.la', a star which all other known astrolabes list within the path of Anu in the month *Simānu*, the third month. The star we expect to find within the path of Ea in the tenth month is the star 'gu.la'. This can be inferred from other astrolabes, such as VAT 9614-C (in: KAV 218).

In BPO 2.2, Reiner identifies 'ur.gu.la' with Leo and 'gu.la' with the Aquarius. At the time, Leo had a declension of -15° and a right ascension of 280°, meaning it was visible in the third month.

Aquarius would be visible in the tenth month. This suggests that the given 'ur.gu.la' for *Ṭebētu* is indeed erroneous.

Another argument, which also ensures that the month is correct, stems from the numerical values in the text. Here the values 2;20 for the path of Ea and 1;10 for the path of Anu are given for *Ṭebētu*, which correspond to the numerical values given in other astrolabes, such as BM 82923 (in MDOG 109). A last argument can be made in that for the path of Anu the star 'al.lul' is given, which we would expect at this place in accordance with other astrolabes.

In the introduction I suggested the error is perhaps due to a scribal error. The reasoning behind this is that 'ur.gu.la' and 'gu.la' are rather close, the difference being the sign UR. A scribe without knowledge of the meaning behind these signs could have easily mistaken one sign from the other.

Twan H.M. PETERS
Leiden University, THE NETHERLANDS

24) Jupiter omens: an Addendum to BPO 4[1] **—** The previously unpublished Neo-Assyrian astrological tablet K 9775[2] contains omens which find parallels in some of the tablets belonging to or associated with the Jupiter Tablets of the astrological series *Enūma Anu Enlil*, i.e., Tablets (63) 64-65 (66). These Tablets of *Enūma Anu Enlil* have been published along with related material by E. Reiner and D. Pingree in *Babylonian Planetary Omens Part 4* (= BPO 4; CM 30), Leiden-Boston 2005, but their state of reconstruction is still very fragmentary: it is not yet possible to establish their correct number within the series and it is generally difficult to distinguish between texts actually belonging to the latter and other texts, such as excerpts.[3] In BPO 4 the surviving material has been organized in 13 thematic groups (A-M): the main topic of the tablets in the Groups A to H is the interaction of Jupiter with planets and constellations. Group I deals with Jupiter, the Sun and the Moon, and light phenomena associated with Jupiter; the luminosity and visibility of Jupiter, its color, as well various light and atmospheric phenomena, are treated in the tablets belonging to J and L. Miscellaneous Jupiter omens are collected in M. While it seems impossible at this point to determine the exact nature of K 9775, on which for the most part only apodoses are preserved, the sequence of the omens can been tentatively restored from parallel texts published in BPO 4. The obverse of K 9775 preserves the remainder of one omen dealing with the relationship between Jupiter and the Scorpion (mulGÍR.TAB; Scorpius), followed by a section regarding Jupiter and the Yoke (mulŠUDUN; Boötes). Parallels are found in Groups A, D and J tablets. The omens on the reverse concern light phenomena associated with Jupiter and duplicate Groups I, J and, to a lesser extent, D tablets. K 9775 originally consisted of four columns, of which only parts of the first, third and fourth columns have survived. The thick tablet fragment measures 7,62 cm in length and 8,89 cm in width and is inscribed on both sides in a rather large Neo-Assyrian script. The two columns on each side of the tablet are separated by a double line, while a third marks the beginning of the omens with the sequence of DIŠ written over it. 'Firing holes' fill the space between the two central lines on the reverse. Horizontal lines intersecting the vertical ones seem to define thematic subdivisions within the text.[4]

Obv?. col. i
1'. [DIŠ mulSAG.ME.GAR mul… *ik-šu-dam-ma* …] ˹*nu*˺-˹*šur*˺-˹*ru*˺-[*u* …] (ruling)
2'. [DIŠ mulSAG.ME.GAR *ana* IGI mulŠUDUN *šá* KUR URIki *is-sà*]-*ḫur* gišTUKUL.MEŠ *ana* KUR [URIki …]
3'. [DIŠ mulSAG.ME.GAR *ana* IGI mulŠUDUN *šá* KUR NIM.MAki *is*]-*sà-ḫur* gišTUKUL.MEŠ *ana* KUR [NIM.MAki …]
4'. [DIŠ mulSAG.ME.GAR … mulŠUDUN *is*-… *ina* KU]R *Gu-ti*ki giš TUKUL.˹MEŠ˺ […]
5'. [DIŠ mulSAG.ME.GAR … mulŠUDUN *is*-… *ina* KU]R MAR.TUki giš TUKUL.MEŠ *ka-a*[*n*?-*sa*?]
6'. [… *ina* MU BI] LUGAL URIki KUR-*ád*
7'. [… *ina* MU BI] LUGAL NIMki KUR-*ád*
8'. [… *ina* MU BI LUGAL S]U.BIR₄ki *u Gu-ti*ki KUR-*ád*
9'. [… *ina* MU BI LUGAL MA]R.TUki KUR-*ád*
10'. […] bi KI.MIN *ina* MU.BI
11'. [DINGIR.ME GU₇.ME KUR *iš-šá-líl-ma ša* SAHAR].ŠUB.BA-*e ina* KUR GÁL.MEŠ
12'. [… UN.ME NÍG].GA-*ši-na ana* KÙ.BABBAR BÚR.MEŠ (ruling)
13'. [… *ina* KUR URUki] dMIN.NA.BI *i-rab-bi-iṣ*
14'. [… *in*]*a* KUR NIM.MAki [dMIN.NA.BI *i-rab-bi-iṣ*]

15'. [… *ina* KUR SU.BIR₄]ᵣki� *u Gu-ti*[ᵏⁱ ᵈMIN.NA.BI *i-rab-bi-iṣ*]

(break)

Commentary:

1': "[If Jupiter reaches …] diminution […]". The proposed reconstruction is based on BM 35122 (BPO 4, 82ff. Group D) obv.ʔ: 17'-18', which is the last omen of a section (ll. 1'-18') concerning the relationship between Jupiter and the Scorpion. A parallel text is K 6457+ (BPO 4, 52 Group A): 1'-13'.

2'-3': "[If Jupiter tu]rns around [in front of the Yoke of the land of Akkad / Elam]: the weapons [of the land of Akkad / Elam …]. The proposed reconstruction is based on BM 35122 obv.ʔ: 19'-20' and K 6457+: 14'. The latter preserves the beginning of the protasis, which after collation can be read as follows: [DIŠ ᵐᵘˡS]AG.ME.GAR *ana* IGI ᵐᵘˡŠUDUN *šá* NI[M.MAᵏⁱ …]; then the tablet breaks off. BM 35122 documents the rest of the protasis and the beginning of the apodosis: 19'.] *šá* KUR URIᵏⁱ *is-sà-ḫur* ᵍⁱˢTUKU[L / 20'. ᵐᵘˡŠUDU]N *šá* KUR NIM.MAᵏⁱ *is-sà-ḫ*[*ur*ʔ. The verb of l. 20' is read *is-sà-n*[*iq* in BPO 4, 82, whereas the original transliteration of A. Sachs, kindly put at my disposal by H. Hunger, has *is-sà-ḫ*[*ur*. If the proposed reconstruction is correct, K 9775 is closer to BM 35122 in that both include the omen dealing with the Yoke of the Land of Akkad which seems to be missing in K 6457+. K 7066+ (BPO 4, 54 Group A): 21'-23' is probably another parallel text.

4'-5': see BM 35122 obv.ʔ: 21'. ᵐ]ᵘˡŠUDUN *i*[*s*- and 23'.] *ana* ᵐᵘˡŠUDUN *is*-[.

4'-15': the sequence of the apodoses is roughly paralleled by K 6098+ (BPO 4, 144ff. Group J) obv.: 1'-12' and K 6876 (BPO 4, 148 Group J) i: 1'-5'. The protases are broken off in both texts. For the apodosis of 5' see K 6098+: 2': ᵍⁱˢTUKUL.MEŠ ᵣ*ka*ᵌ-ᵣ*an*ʔᵌ-*s*[*a*ʔ] (from *kamāsu* "to gather"?).

8': K 6098+: 5' has *ina* MU] BI LUGAL SU.BIR₄ᵏⁱ *u* LUGAL *Gu-ti*ᵏⁱ KUR.MEŠ.

10'-12': these lines seem to contain a single omen; the parallel text K 6098+ has either another omen after this or a longer apodosis (l. 9').

The beginning of the obverse of K 9775 is probably duplicated by another small unpublished Neo-Assyrian fragment, K 14496, which reads: 1'. […] ᵣxᵌ *ina* KUR MAR.TU[ᵏⁱ …] (ruling) / 2'. [… *is-sà*]-*ḫur* ᵍⁱˢTUKUL.ME *ana* […] / 3'. […] ᵣxᵌ (two parallel horizontal wedges) / 4'. [… ᵍⁱˢ]TUKUL.ME *ana* KUR […] 5'. […] ᵣxᵌ […] / 6'. […] ᵣxᵌ […]. A plausible reconstruction of l. 1' is *ina* KUR MAR.TU[ᵏⁱ *nu-šur-ru-u* GÁL …] "[there will be diminution] in Amurru" (see K 8097, BPO 4, 102ff. Group G, i: 8'ff.).

Rev?. col. iii

1'. GAR-*a*[*n* …]

2'. DIŠ KI.MIN […] (ruling)

3'. DIŠ KI.MI[N …]

4'. DIŠ KI.[MIN …] (ruling)

5'. DIŠ K[I.MIN …]

6'. […]

7'. DIŠ […]

(break of 3+ ll.)

8'⁺. […]

9'⁺. DIŠ […] (ruling)

10'⁺. DIŠ […]

(break)

Rev?. col. iv

1'. [⸢x⸣

(ruling)

2'. [DIŠ ᵐᵘˡSAG.ME.GAR *ana* KI *ni-ib-tú* ŠUB : *ana* KI ŠUR NAM.BAD *qú-bu-ri ina* KUR G]ÁL.MEŠ

3'. [DIŠ ᵐᵘˡSAG.ME.GAR *ana* KI *ni-ib-tú um-taš-ši-ra* LUGAL *dan-nu* : LUGAL *na-aš-pa*]n-⸢*ti*⸣ *ina* KUR GÁL-*ši* (ruling)

4'. [DIŠ ᵐᵘˡSAG.ME.GAR *ṣir-ḫa* GAR ŠUB-*ti*]*m* KUR

5'. [DIŠ ᵐᵘˡSAG.ME.GAR *ṣir-ḫa ana* IM.U₁₈.LU GAR KI.LAM] *i-šaq-qú*

6'. [DIŠ ᵐᵘˡSAG.ME.GAR *ṣir-ḫa ana* IM.SI.SÁ GAR LUGAL *e-tel-liš* DU].DU DINGIR.MEŠ *i-rid-du-šu*

7'. [DIŠ ᵐᵘˡSAG.ME.GAR *ṣir-ḫa ana* IM.KUR.RA GAR KUR MUNUS.KÚR : NU *k*]*it-tú i-dab-bu-ub*

8'. [DIŠ ᵐᵘˡSAG.ME.GAR *ṣir-ḫa ana* IM.MAR.TU GAR *ma-mi*]-*tú* ŠUB-*ut* (ruling)

9'. [DIŠ ᵐᵘˡSAG.ME.GAR *ina* EN.NUN AN.ÚSAN *ana* IM.SI.SÁ *ṣir-ḫa* GAR SAG KUR U]RIᵏⁱ *ra-pa-du* DAB-*bat*

10'. [DIŠ ᵐᵘˡSAG.ME.GAR *ina* EN.NUN MURUB₄.BA *ana* IM.SI.SÁ *ṣir-ḫa* GAR MURUB₄ KUR UR]ᵏⁱ *ra-pa-du* DAB-*bat*

11'. [DIŠ ᵐᵘˡSAG.ME.GAR *ina* EN.NUN UD.ZAL.LI *ana* IM.SI.SÁ *ṣir-ḫa* GAR SUḪUŠ KUR URI]ᵏⁱ *ra-pa-du* DAB-*bat*

12'. [DIŠ ᵐᵘˡSAG.ME.GAR *ina* EN.NUN AN.ÚSAN *ana* IM.U₁₈.LU *ṣir-ḫa* GAR SAG KUR NIM].MAᵏⁱ *ra-pa-du* DAB

13'. [DIŠ ^{mul}SAG.ME.GAR *ina* EN.NUN MURUB₄.BA *ana* IM.U₁₈.LU *ṣir-ḫa* GAR MURUB₄ KUR NIM].MA^{ki} *ra-pa-du* ˹DAB˺

14'. [DIŠ ^{mul}SAG.ME.GAR ina EN.NUN UD.ZAL.LI *ana* IM.U₁₈.LU *ṣir-ḫa* GAR SUḪUŠ KUR NIM.M]A^{ki} *ra-pa-*[*du* DA]B

15'. [DIŠ ^{mul}SAG.ME.GAR *ina* EN.NUN AN.ÚSAN *ana* IM.MAR.TU *ṣir-ḫa* GAR SAG KUR MAR.TU^{ki}] *r*[*a-pa-d*]*u* DAB

16'. [DIŠ ^{mul}SAG.ME.GAR *ina* EN.NUN MURUB₄.BA *ana* IM.MAR.TU *ṣir-ḫa* GAR MURUB₄ KUR MAR.TU^{ki} *ra-pa*]-*du* DAB

17'. [DIŠ ^{mul}SAG.ME.GAR *ina* EN.NUN UD.ZAL.LI *ana* IM.MAR.TU *ṣir-ḫa* GAR SUḪUŠ KUR MAR.TU^{ki} *r*]*a-pa-du* DAB

18'. [DIŠ ^{mul}SAG.ME.GAR *ina* EN.NUN AN.ÚSAN *ana* IM.KUR.RA *ṣir-ḫa* GAR SAG KUR SU.BIR₄^k]ⁱ ˹*u*˺ *Gu-*KI.{erasure}MIN

19'. [DIŠ ^{mul}SAG.ME.GAR *ina* EN.NUN MURUB₄.BA *ana* IM.KUR.RA *ṣir-ḫa* GAR MURUB₄ KUR SU.BIR₄^k]ⁱ ˹*u*˺ *Gu-* KI.MIN

20'. [DIŠ ^{mul}SAG.ME.GAR *ina* EN.NUN UD.ZAL.LI *ana* IM.KUR.RA *ṣir-ḫa* GAR SUḪUŠ KUR SU.BIR₄^{ki} *u*] *Gu-*KI.MIN (ruling)

21'. […] *šu*[?]/*ku*[?] BAD.MEŠ

22'. [… KU]R[?]/BI[?] ˹BAD˺.˹MEŠ˺

(break)

Commentary:

2'-20': a parallel sequence of apodoses can be found in K 2076+ (BPO 4, 134ff. Group J): 19'-37'. See also K 12803 (BPO 4, 141 Group J): 2'-7'. The *ṣirḫu*-section appears also in K 2126 (BPO 4, 124ff. Group I) rev.: 1'-11', K 12164+ (BPO 4, 128ff. Group I): 1'-4' and BM 47688 (BPO 4, 74ff Group D): rev. 1-3. The first line of our text is broken: the traces visible at its end, i.e., the lower part of two parallel vertical wedges, could correspond to the sign DAB, see K 2076+: 18' (*ra-pa-du* DAB-*bat*).

5': K 2076+: 22' has KI.LAM *i-šaq-qú u* GÁN.BA LAL-*al*. CAD M/1, 94b translates the apodosis as follows: "business activities will be on the upswing but there will be a scarcity in the amount (of goods) obtainable (for one shekel)".

6': K 2076+: 23' has LUGAL *e-tel-liš* DU.MEŠ : DINGIR.MEŠ UŠ.MEŠ-*šú*.

18'-20': K 2076+: 35'ff. have only SU.BIR₄^{ki}. Another possible reconstruction is GU^{ki} MIN (see BM 36315: 6' in BPO 4, 56).

21'-22': on K 2076+ the *ṣirḫu*-section is followed by a section concerning the scintillating (SUR) of Jupiter and its relationship with various planets and constellations (K 2076+: 38ff.); see also K 2126: 38'ff., K 12164+: 5'ff., BM 47688 rev.: 4ff. The closest parallels for these two apodoses are K 2076+: 40'-41'.

1) This note results from research undertaken within the framework of a M4Human Marie Curie Fellowship funded by the Gerda Henkel Foundation and the European Commission on the topic of "Mesopotamian Lung Omens: The Chapter *Šumma ḫašû* of the Extispicy Series *Bārûtu*". K 9775 and K 14496 are published here by the kind permission of the Trustees of the British Museum.

2) K 9775 is not included in E. Reiner, "Celestial Omen Tablets and Fragments in the British Museum", in S.M. Maul (ed.), *Festschrift für Rykle Borger*…(CM 10), Groningen 1998, 215-302. The description of the tablet provided by Bezold in the third volume of his *Catalogue of the Cuneiform Tablets in the Kouyunjik Collection of the British Museum* is misleading as it refers to "Forecasts concerning MUR and ^{giš}TUKUL, *etc.*".

3) See, in detail, BPO 4, 1-26. See also the review by L. Verderame, "Il pianeta Giove nella tradizione mesopotamica", *Rivista degli Studi Orientali* 83 (2010), 441-450.

4) A photo of the tablet is available online: http://cdli.ucla.edu/P398306. A similar layout is displayed by K 8097 (BPO 4, 102ff. Group G) and Sm 1529 (BPO 4, 194 Group M); the latter possibly belongs to the same tablet as K 9775. See also K 2568+ (BPO 4, 92f. Group E) and K 12578 (BPO 4, 190 Group M).

Nicla DE ZORZI (nicla.de.zorzi@univie.ac.at)

Institut für Orientalistik der Universität Wien, Spitalgasse 2 Hof 4, A-1090 WIEN

N.A.B.U.

Abonnement pour un an / *Subscription for one year*:   EUROPE / *EUROPA*   18 €
                                                  AUTRES PAYS / *OTHER COUNTRIES*   27 €

– Par chèque postal ou bancaire en **Euros COMPENSABLE EN FRANCE** à l'ordre de / *By Bank check in* **Euros**
   PAYABLE IN FRANCE *and made out to*: <u>Société pour l'Étude du Proche-Orient Ancien</u>.
   Pour tout paiement par chèque en Euros compensable à l'étranger, ajouter 11 €
   With checks in Euros payable in other countries, add 11 €.

– Par virement postal à l'ordre de / *To Giro Account:* <u>Société pour l'Étude du Proche-Orient Ancien</u>,
   14, rue des Sources, 92160 Antony. **CCP 14.691 84 V PARIS**

<div align="center">

IBAN: FR 23 2004 1000 0114 69184V02 032
BIC: PSSTFRPPPAR

**Téléchargez tous les numéros de *NABU* depuis 1987 gratuitement,
abonnez-vous à *NABU* ou commandez les volumes des *Mémoires de NABU*
sur http://www.sepoa.fr**

***For subscriptions in USA only*:**
One year = 34 US $. Our financial representative in the USA is Pr. Jack SASSON, 230 Divinity School,
Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tenn. 37240-2701 USA. Make check payable to: «Jack M. Sasson»

</div>

<div align="center">

Les manuscrits pour publication sont à envoyer à l'adresse suivante :
Manuscripts to be published should be sent to the following address:
J.-M. Durand – IPOA, Collège de France, 52 rue du Cardinal Lemoine, 75005 Paris, France.
e-mail: jean-marie.durand@college-de-france.fr

Pour tout ce qui concerne les affaires administratives, les abonnements et les réclamations,
adresser un courrier à la **nouvelle adresse électronique : contact@sepoa.fr**

</div>