1) Some considerations on the geographical lists from the Uruk III period

This note is a compilation of observations made from a comparison of the Proto-Euphratic (PE) list “Cities” (ATU 3) with the geographical lists “Geography” published in ATU 3 (henceforth GL, numbers 1–8 and X) and the only other known GL, namely MS 3173 (= GL 9). In the first instance only the list “Cities” itself (because of the well-known place names) and GL 8 (URU in the colophon) can without doubt be seen as GLs. The list “Cities” makes it clear that there was originally no determinative for GNs: Determinatives are added to (almost) all the entries in a list. AB und É could be termed as “2nd order determinatives” as they are part of several GNs but are not used throughout (see NABU 2013/55, note 13).

GL 8, a “non-canonical” GL, shows that a determinative for GNs (especially not KI) was never introduced in the PE writing system (KI occurs in GL 8 at the beginning and at the end of toponyms, so it is a sign like any other). In the other GLs only the GNs GI UNUG, ILDUM, NÍ, NUN A and UB, which are known from Cities and GL 8, can with certainty be found. To ASAR und NUN (?) the determinative KI is added. Each of the lists contains only a few of these GNs; the lists are linked to each other by further entries.

The appearance of a GN in a list does not necessarily mean that it is a GN list: Compare UNUG in Cities and in Lú A; the GN ŠENNUR (GL 1, 2, 3, 9) is also listed in “Tribute” and is probably not a GN there. In GL 1 and 9 (and possibly also in GL X) entries without KI are followed by ones with KI. GL 3, 4, 5 and 7 have no KI section, but do contain KI entries; there are no KI entries in GL 6). GL 2, col. ii is, as far as it is preserved, a duplicate of GL 9, iii 7–11 (i.e. a “canonical” list?). After the city GI UNUG, which is known from Cities, the KI section begins in both lists with ŠÁM KI, followed by a MAR section in GL 9 (the GL 2 part is missing). It is not a foregone conclusion that GNs are listed in the KI section (possibly also in the MAR section); it could be an arrangement according to signs or to concepts which are still unknown to us (GL 9 sections: …-Ø [= ?], …-KI, …-MAR, …-Ø; compare ATU 3, Unid. 44 […] or Unid. 50 [EN-…]). However, this would mean that KI had different meanings in the Uruk III period texts and in Sumerian: In the ED I-II texts from Ur KI would emerge as a GN determinative “out of nothing”. If one assumes, on the other hand, that the “GLs” are indeed GLs, which is not only suggested by entries such as GAL SIMUG KI in GL 4 (see, in contrast, GAL TÜR in GL 8!), KI definitely fulfills the function of a determinative in the GLs 1, (3) and 9; as a consequence, EN ZATU647+BA in GL 4 must be equated with EN ZATU647+BA KI in GL 1. The town ASAR (Cities 49) appears in GL 9 as ASAR KI (col. vii 5”). The same argument could be made for NUN/NUN KI (see note 5).

Since in PE no evidence for a GN determinative KI can be provided (see above), it makes sense to assume it is a Sumerian innovation. Is it conceivable that lists such as GL 1 were written by a Sumerian scribe who left the “well-known” (PE) GNs unchanged, but appended at the end of the list Sumerian or
little-known PE GNs, which do not appear in Cities and well-established PE GLs, by adding the Sumerian determinative KI to mark them as place names. A similar assumption has been made by Burrows for the archaic texts from Ur (UET 2, p. 22).

A PE scribe would presumably not have come up with the idea of “suddenly” writing some of the well-known GNs (especially ASAR, Cities 49) by adding KI; if KI had been a PE innovation, it would probably have been attached to all GNs (see note 2). Mixed lists such as GL 4 (KI and non-KI entries are mixed up) are unorthodox from a PE perspective, and even more so are those such as GL 1. In GL 6, KI in the colophon could correspond to URU in GL 8.

KI should have primarily meant “field” (MSVO 1, 1: KI A and BU KI; OBO 160/1, 204–213). From this, KI = place could have developed via “field + settlement” = “hamlet” (only in Sumerian?); other explanations (phonetic consonance of PE KI and Sumerian KI = place and the like) are conceivable. One cannot argue that in GL 9 a GN list is followed by a list of fields since KI is not a determinative for fields in PE (see, e.g., MSVO 1, nos. 1–12).

Notes

* Abbreviations as in NABU 2018/93. – ED: Early Dynastic; GL: Geographical list; GN: Geographical name (means place name in this note); PE: Proto-Euphratic.
1. Reference should be made to the remarks in ATU 3 and OBO 160/1, 90–94. The composite transcription of GL X (ATU 3, 150f.) contains entries from GL 3 and GL 4, but not the GNs from W 20266, 148, ~149 and ~174. (This fragment is classified as GL X [ATU 3, p. 162] or as “Unidentified” [ATU 3, catalogue and CDLI]). Somewhat inconsistently, only the three latter fragments are referred to as “GL X” in this note.
2. Simplifying, one could say that there are lists in which (with very few exceptions) only one determinative is used throughout (Birds [MUŠEN], Fish [KU₃], Swine [ŠUBUR], Wood [GIŠ]), lists without determinatives (Tribute, Lú A, Officials, Cities, Geography, Grain) and lists in which the entries are arranged in subject groups (Vessels, Metal, Animals, Plant).
3. Reference needs to be made to ÙRI AB = URU (Cities 1), ÙRI É (Cities 27) and ÙRI KI (GL 9, iii 14’). The “2nd order determinatives” are a fixed part of the GN, they cannot be omitted (ad EN NUN for EN É/KID see OBO 160/1, 94). The variant É NINLIL of NINLIL in Cities 38 can hardly be considered a counterexample. MÛŠ (GL 3) and MUŠ AB (= ZABALAM, GL X [in Cities (no. 6) not preserved, but compare SF 23, i 6]) should therefore be different towns. See also [Ø?] É KI (GL 3, iv 11).
4. KI in BAPPIR (Cities 56) is presumably not a determinative. KI in AK SI KI instead of SI AK (Cities 57) is probably due to inattention on the part of the scribe (repetition of the sign KI from the previous line). KI in BU [Ø?] KI (Cities 52) instead of BU ŠÁ (Cities 52) could be a scribal error. Still the ED III copy SF 23 of Cities shows that KI was originally not a determinative for place names. KI, KI? NUN, Cities 15’; NUN does not occur by itself in Cities); GL 2: GI UNUG, GL 3: NÍ, GL 4: ILDUM, NÍ; GL 5: –; GL 6: –; GL 7: NUN A (only in GL 8, not in Cities); GL 8: NÍ, NUN A (not in Cities), UB, UNUG; GL 9: ASAR (appears as ASAR KI), GI UNUG, UB.
5. Destroyed place names remain disregarded. GL 1: NUN (which appears as NUN KI; GL 8: [Ø?] NUN or [I] NUN, Cities 15’; NUN does not occur by itself in Cities); GL 2: GI UNUG; GL 3: NÍ; GL 4: ILDUM, NÍ; GL 5: –; GL 6: –; GL 7: NUN A (only in GL 8, not in Cities); GL 8: NÍ, NUN A (not in Cities), UB, UNUG; GL 9: ASAR (appears as ASAR KI), GI UNUG, UB.
6. An MUš KI: GL 3, 9; EN ZATU647+BA KI: GL 1, 4 (without KI); EZEN+SU: GL 1, 2, 9; EZINU: GL 3, 9; KA ZAG/MEŠc: GL 1, 9; ŚÁM KI: GL 2, 9; ŠENNUR: GL 1, 2, 3, 9; TUM: GL 3, 9; UB KA ZAG/MEŠc: GL 1, 2, 9 (none of the entries are completely preserved); isolated: GL 5–7, X (possibly [ANŠE] X = [Ø?] [KI] from GL 1, iv 1 and [ANŠE] from GL 6, ii 3 belong together).
7. Aside from GL 1, iii 3, 4, 6 and GL 9, iii 13’.
8. GL 9, iii 6’–9’ (possibly even 3’–9’ appear in the same sequence in GL 1, ii 5–8 (2–8). See OIP 99, 39 plus duplicates: Also here, a KI section follows after GI UNUG in col. vii (but KI is at the beginning of the entries); compare KI NÁM DI (viii 12’) and DI NÁM KI (GL 4, iii 3).
10. The determinative KI with ASAR, EN ZATU647+BA and NUN (?) should then be due to inattentiveness.

Erlend GEHLKEN (27–03–2019)
Universität Frankfurt/Main (Allemagne)

2) On the meaning of a-e i₃-mi-e₃ in En-menetana 17) — The expression a-e i₃-mi-e₃ is used twice to describe the hostile action of an Umma ruler in En-menetana 1 (RIME 1.9.5.1) (CDLI Q001103). These passages are preserved in two of the published manuscripts: the Louvre cone (AO 3004 = CDLI P222532) and the Yale jar (NBC 2501 = CDLI P222533).

First time the actor is Ur-Luma. The description of this episode is the same in both manuscripts:
(1) AO 3004 2:28–35 = NBC 2501 3:12–19
ur-lum-ma, ensi₂, umma₃-ke₃, eg₂ ki-sur-ra, õnin-njir₂-su-ka, eg₂ ki-sur-ra, ῾nanše, a-e i₃-mi-e₃

Second time the action was carried out by Il. The description of this episode is different in the two manuscripts. The Louvre version specifies the location of Ninjirsu’s boundary (im-dub-ba) in 4:6–7; while the Yale version names two additional deities in 3:35–36.

(2) AO 3004 3:38–4:10
e₂ ki-sur-ra, õnin-njir₂-su-ka, eg₂ ki-sur-ra, ῾nanše, im-dub-ba, õnin-njir₂-su-ka, gu₂ (idigna-še₃ nal₂-la, gu₂-gu₂ njir₂-su₃-ka, nam-nun-da-ki-ṣar-ra, õnin-šur-ṣa₃n-ka, a-e i₃-mi-e₃

The construction used is the same in both episodes. The verbal form is transitive, its subject (= A[gent]) is a human actor, the word a “water” is case-marked with a case-marker =/e/.² the object (= P[atient]) of the verbal form is the boundary levees, which are in the absolutive. So, the verbal form has three participants: an Agent, a Patient, and a participant case-marked with =/e/.

This pattern is characteristic of causative verbal forms with a non-human causee, derived from an underlying transitive construction.³ The form of the finite verb confirms this assumption, as it may be analysed as im-m-b-i-n-e-o (FIN-VEN-3.SG.NN-4.3.SG.H.I-A-leave-3.SG.P).³ The structure of the verbal prefix-chain indicates that the =/e/ case-marker is not the ergative but the locative³, the case used to denote the causee in causative forms of transitive verbs.

Below is a selection of translations of ex. (1), demonstrating that the grammar of this passage is routinely negected.⁵

“(Ur-luma, ruler of Umma, diverted water into the boundary-channel of Ningirsu and the boundary channel of NaNše.” (Cooper 1986: 55)

“(Ur-Luma) diverted water from the boundary dike of the god Ningirsu and the boundary dike of the goddess NaNše.” (Frayne 2007: 196)

“(Ur-Luma) had the water go out of Ningirsu’s canal and NaNše’ border canal.” (Jagersma 2010: 432)

In both Cooper’s and Frayne’s translation the word a “water” is assumed to be in the absolutive, and the boundary levee in an adverbial case. Jagersma’s translation correctly reflects the causative construction but disregards the absolutive case of the boundary levees.⁶

If these passages contain a causative construction as assumed and demonstrated above, then the underlying transitive construction must be one in which the word a “water” functions as the Agent, the levees as the Patient, and the verb e₂ has a transitive meaning.⁷

The Akkadian equivalent of the verb e₂ “to leave, go out”, (w)ṣ₃₄u₃ is used regularly in transitive constructions in Š-stem; and the causative form šu₃₄u₃ “make/let go out” is attested to mean in certain contexts “to carry off, to remove”, cf. CAD A/II, ṣu₃₄u₃ 6j. A similar semantic development may also be imagined in Sumerian: “to leave” > “to make something leave” > “to remove” > “to obliterate”.

In Sumerian texts from the 3rd millennium we have numerous attestations of expressions in which a “water” functions as the agent of a destructive action. In these expressions water may “carry off/wash away” fields (a-e de₇a) or “consume/destroy” levees (a-e gu₇a), see Wilcke 1999a: 303–320 and 1999b.

I therefore suggest that the causative verbal form a-e i₃-mi-e₃ in En-metena 1 is based on an idiom a-e — e₃ used as a literary synonym of the idioms a-e — de₇ and a-e — gu₇, its meaning is “to wash away, to destroy”.

Ex. (1) may thus be translated as

“Ur-Luma, ruler of Umma, let water wash away/destroy the boundary levee of Ninjirsu, the boundary levee of NaNše.”

In causative constructions in which the causee is non-human inanimate, the causee may be interpreted as the instrument with which the verbal action is carried out. Consequently, a less literal translation of ex. (1) may be:
Ur-Luma, ruler of Umma, washed away/destroyed the boundary levee of Ninjursu, the boundary levee of Nanše with water.”

This translation not only adheres to the grammar of the Sumerian construction but also explains the sense of En-metena’s action in a later part of the text:

(4) AO 3004 5:12–12 = NBC 2501 5:36–37
nam-nun-da-ki-par-ra, ur₃-be₂ na₃-a mu-na-ni-du₃
“(En-metena) built the substructure of the Namnunda-kiñana of stone for him.”

On the basis of the passage in exx. (2) and (3), Namnunda-kiñana was the name of a segment of the levees or it may refer to the boundary levees as a whole. En-metena strengthens its substructure so that no future ruler of Umma may destroy it so easily as apparently Ur-Luma and Il did, when its base was not made of stone.

The passage of exx. (2) and (3) is followed by the clause of ex. (5) below:

(5) AO 3004 4:11–12 = NBC 2501 4:39
še lagas₃₄ 3600 guru₇-ama₃ i₃-su

Here the verb su is usually understood as “to replace, repay”, Akkadian riₐbu, cf., e.g., Cooper’s (1986: 55) translation: “He repaid (only) 3600 guru (18,662,400 hl.) of Lagash’s barley”. After the hostile action described in the passage of exx. (2) and (3), however, it is unlikely that Il would have been willing to fulfil any repayment. It seems more logical to understand the verb su here as “to submerge”, Akkadian ūbbû, cf. already Sjöberg 1967: 277.11 If Il destroyed the boundary levees with the help of water as was assumed above, the water must have also affected the neighbouring fields with their barley. A translation of ex. (5) as “He (= Il) set under water 3600 guru of the barley of Lagas” would therefore fit better into the context.8)

Notes
1. I thank Ingo Schrakamp for his comments on a draft of this note.
4. The abbreviations in the gloss are: FIN = finite marker; VEN = ventive; SG = singular; NH = non-human; L₃ = locative₃; H = human; A = agent, subject of a transitive verb; P = patient, object of a transitive verb. See Zólyomi 2017, and especially pp. 77–87 for the description of the verbal form used in this note. For the case labelled as locative₃, see Zólyomi 2017: 215–221.
5. Steible and Behrens are uncertain about the meaning of this passage: “Die genaue Bedeutung von a-e – ê bleibt unklar und wird hier versuchsweise angegeben mit ‘(einen Kanal) des Wassers berauben(?)’ …” (1982, II: 117). The translation in PSD A/I: 9 “(at) the boundary ditch of Ninjursu and the boundary ditch of Nanše he diverted the water of ditch(?)” was elegantly dismissed by P. Attinger in his review of the volume: “à distinguer de a ê est l’obscur a-e ūbbû” (ZA 85: 130). See Steiner 1986: 276 for a much larger selection of translations, including Steiner’s.
6. Jagersma’s translation is in contradiction with his analysis and glossing of ex. (1), which show that he also considers the levees to be the object of the verb; so Ceccarelli’s (1995 n3) criticism against his translation (“it must be noted that the causative construction of an intransitive verb corresponds to a monotransitive construction and one would expect a₃halative + e”) is not pertinent.
7. In the expression a e₃-a “water that left, breach”, the verb e₃ is intransitive “to leave” and the word a “water” is understood as its intransitive subject, cf. Civil 1994: 134 and R. de Maaijer and B. Jagersma’s review of PSD A/I in AO 34–35: 280.
8. Bauer (1998: 473) paraphrases this passage as “Er entzog einem so großen Gebiet das Wasser, daß 3’6000 Haufen … Getreide vernichtet wurden”. It is unclear which meaning Bauer assigns to the verb su.
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3) Éblaïte *munabbi’tum* = akkadien d’Émar *munus.me* *munabbi’ātu* — À Ébla on trouve la graphie *mu-na-bi-tum* dans le cadre des lamentations funèbres exécutées lors des obsèques d’importants personnages de la cour. Les passages concernés jusqu’à présent connus sont les suivants :

   1) *ARET* XX 25 f. IV:17–V:13: 1 túg-NI.NI / 2 kin sīki / 1 dam / *mu-na-bi-tum* / 12 kin sīki / 6 dam / eme-bal-SU / 1 túg-NI.NI 3 na₄ sīki / 1 dam / *mu-na-bi-tum* / 15 na₄ sīki / 5 dam / eme-bal-SU / ēr (funéra li es de la princesse *Dar-ib-da-mu*);

   2) *TM* 75.G.2276 r. I:3–11: 1 túg-NI.NI 3 na₄ sīki 1 dam *mu-na-bi-tum* 12 na₄ sīki 6 dam eme-bal-SU (funéra li es de la princesse *Ti-īsh-te-da-mu*);


Or, si dans les textes mésopotamiens on ne connaît que la forme masculine *munabbā*, attestée seulement dans les listes lexicales en tant qu’équivalent de mots sumériens signifiant « lamentateur »³, jusqu’à présent il n’avait pas été remarqué que le parallèle le plus étroit avec le mot éblaïte *mu-na-bi-tum* on le retrouve dans les textes d’Émar du milieu du deuxième millénaire av. J.-C., où le terme au génitif *munus.me* *mu*-bi-a-ti (var. *munus.me* *mu*-bi-ia-ti), indiquant une typologie d’opératrices cultuelles liées à la déesse *Ishara*⁵, peut être interprété comme /munabbi’āti/, participe féminin pluriel de la forme D de *nb*. La graphie avec la voyelle non contractée et présentant le signe *mu*(A) à la place de *mu* semble indiquer qu’il s’agit d’un terme local de tradition sémitique occidentale⁶. Même si les passages attestant ce terme gardent une certaine opacité, la signification que le verbe *nabā* (à la forme G ainsi qu’à la forme D) présente ailleurs dans les textes d’Émar en rapport avec le culte des ancêtres et des dieux familiaux, a amené les savants à voir dans ces opératrices cultuelles des lamentatrices⁷. La comparaison que l’on vient de proposer avec les attestations éblaïtes confirme maintenant cette hypothèse.

Ces professionnelles, qui accomplissaient leur tâche pendant les cérémonies en l’honneur des défunts et des ancêtres divinisés, étaient bien enracinées dans la tradition religieuse de la Syrie ancienne, si
elles sont citées encore dans la Bible, où en effet on connaît en Ézéchiel 13:17 le terme mitnabbe'ōt, voire un participe féminin pluriel hitpael de *nb, correspondant aux formes que nous avons trouvées à Ébla et Émar83. Ces femmes sont accusées de sorcellerie et a priori méprisées comme c’est toujours le cas dans la Bible pour les nécromans et en général pour tous les opérateurs cultuels liés au culte des défunts. On a raison de supposer, en revanche, qu’il s’agissait de professionnelles très respectées qui garantissaient la continuité du rapport entre la communauté et ses ancêtres99.
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und ur-ab-bu um dieselbe Person handelt, ist aufgrund des kišeš-Vermerks in Rs. 1 unzweifelhaft (siehe dazu SALLABERGER 1999, 228-231).


Tatsächlich lassen sich jedoch zwei Fälle orthografischer Varianten in Personennamen anführen, die sich zweifelsfrei auf denselben Namensträger beziehen und den Ansatz der Lautwerte bu₁₁, pu₁₁ und die Lesungen ³⁴ba-bu₁₁, ³⁴ab-bu₁₁ unterstützen.
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5) A crying calf in HAV 5, 5 — CBS 12590 = HAV 5 is a small but nice fragment and the only known peace of a cultic song in favour of the God Lulal. An excellent edition together with a study of Lulal was just published by Anna Glenn and Jeremiah Peterson in AoF 45 (2018) 168-81. But the phrasing in line 5 seems still obscure:

amār āb kû-ga ī gārā KAxLI.KAxLI amašt-a gû peš-3a1

We expect the calf suckling milk from the cow so that its neck (gû) can grow (peš). The normal phrasing would be ga gû as it is used in line 6 and 7.

A possible reading of KAxLI is mu₇ roughly “to cry”. This verb can be used in connection with cattle (already mentioned by Glenn and Peterson). It can have the meaning to cry something in the difficult context Ean. 1 ix 6f.: igi-ba bī-mu₇ mu₇; lû-lîl₇-e (following line is missing) “in their frontline he was crying: ‘this good-for-nothing…”’

Infinite verbal forms are difficult. They can be interpreted as active or passive participles or infinitives (author NABU 2013/20) and they are lacking the prefixes which are sometimes important for the meaning of the verb. In the so called mes-an-né-pâ-da construction the ergative is marked. But often the infinite verb and its objects are used as an apposition for a word. This word is not a part of the infinite construction and that’s why it can’t take a mark which belongs to the infinite construction. We have to guess if the infinite verb is used transitive or not.

The poor calf may cry something to the “pure cow”. But āb kû-ga is non-person class and in this case we expect the locative-terminative instead of the dative, rarely written after a vowel. Now we will hear the calf crying:

“A calf, crying to the pure cow: ‘Butter! Cream!’ - whose neck grows thick in the fold”.

Jan KEETMAN <jkeet@aol.com>


Es gibt keinen Text, der die sumerische Aussprache zur Gleichung KIŠ.ARAD = šakkanakkum angibt.20 In Ur III-Texten finden sich Schreibungen wie ša-GA-na-kum.21 Doch anstatt hier ein akkadisiertes Sumerisch anzunehmen, ist es einfacher und mit der Ur III-Orthographie völlig in Übereinstimmung, gleich akkadisch zu lesen: ša-kā-na-kum.

Es gibt eine Reihe sumerischer Lehnworte im Akkadischen, die ebenfalls auf –akkum enden wie iššiakkum „Stadtfürst“, abarrakkum „Verwalter“. Außerdem reiht sich der Bedeutungsbereich von KIŠ.ARAD, šakkanakkum hoher militärischer Befehlshaber, in etwa „General“, „Gouverneur“, Herrscherstitel, gut in die Reihe dieser Lehnworte ein und es gibt ein ähnliches akkadisches Wort šaknu(m)
„Gouverneur“. Also vermutete Hallo die Rückentlehnung von šaknum aus dem Sumerischen. Status constructus šakin, selten šakan, woraus sich über einen Prädikativ *šakina ein Lehnwort *šagina, bzw. *šagana ableiten ließe. Doch šaknum ist erst altbabylonisch belegt und hat als Logogramm GAR.DU. Ein Lehnwort *šagina sollte im Sumerischen vokalisch auslauten. Also lässt sich keine Rückentlehnung šakkanakkum damit begründen.

Eine andere Theorie, die als Vermutung auch Eingang in CAD gefunden hat, ist ein freier Genitiv von einem Wort /šakan/ für Esel. Schrakamp vergleicht „Marschall“ von mittelhochdeutsch marschale „Pferdeknecht“.


„Gouverneur“.
Anmerkungen
4. CAD S 1 175b; Schrakamp 2010, 200f. mit weiterer Lit. in Anm. 1302.
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Nicht jeder hat dieser speziellen Messer und so ist CA 205f. nur von Messern die Rede: ki-sikil-bē siki sab nu-gā-ša šuruš-bē ǧiri saq11 na-gā-ša „ihre jungen Frauen hören nicht auf, die Haare abzutrennen, die jungen Männer hören nicht auf, (sich) mit dem Messer zu malträtieren“.1)

Das Verbum ḥur hat wohl die Grundbedeutung „ritzen“, „Linien ziehen“ (eṣēru), kann aber auch eine Verletzung mit einer Spindel, also wohl durch einen Stich beschreiben.2) In Innanas Gang zur Unterwelt 37f. bedeutet ḫur ziemlich sicher „kratzen“. Da es sich dabei um einen Ausdruck der Trauer an/auf (Verabf-) Hügel handelt, liegt auch beim Gebrauch von Messern „ritzen“ näher als „stechen“.


Daneben hat aber PSD B für ba-da-ra noch die Übersetzung: „rod“ (pushed through the seal for rolling“). Der einzige Beleg sind die Geschenke Ur-Nammas für Ninigšzida, Ur-Nammas Tod 120: nakšēb za-gin ba-da-ra 1-lā-ā. Flückiger-Hawker 1999, 122 (cf. 175): „A lapis lazuli seal which is hanging from a


Wahrscheinlich handelt es sich um ein Lehnhwort von patrum oder patarrum. patrum ist ein Schwert bzw. großes Messer. patarrum ist aus dem Zusammenhang von ʾīṣtar Louvre und Erra-Epos und der wahrscheinlich nicht zufälligen Ähnlichkeit mit patrum am ehesten als ein spezielles Messer zu deuten. Nimmt man die Hinweise auf eine Axt mehr ernst als die Beziehung zu den Messern in ʾīṣtar Louvre, so könnte man an eine Sichelaxt denken, was gut dazu passt, dass der einzige Beleg außerhalb von kultischen Handlungen auf Maništāšu datiert (zur Sichelaxt Schrakamp 2010). Nichts deutet auf einen Stab.

Bei lá im Sinne von herunterhängen würde man eine Konstruktion mit dem Ablativ erwarten. Siehe Innanas Gang zur Unterwelt 172; Dumuzis Traum 33; 56. Es könnte auch bedeuten, dass es ein ba-da-ra zum umbinden war.

Vielleicht bekam Ningēšzida ein Siegel weil er einmal die Funktion des Schreibers in der Unterwelt innehatte, oder wenigstens siegelte. Altbabylonische Texte weisen diese Rolle Ningēštinana und Ninazimu zu. Letztere ist die Gemahlin des Ningēšzida und erstere wird als Ǧēštinana ebenfalls zur Gemahlin des Ningēšzida, während Ningēšzida aB in die Rolle des Sesselträgers der Unterwelt schlüpft (Katz 2003, 174; 391-95).


Anmerkungen

1. zu ʾgīri saga₁₁ (bzw. saga₁₁, sig₄₈) vgl. ʾgīri saga₁₁ „zertreten“ SP 3.8, šu saga₁₁ „die Augen reiben“ Dumuzis Traum 18, Lugalbanda I 362. Anders Attinger 2007/2017 mit Verweis auf eine späte Bilingue: „ses yeux humains ne cessent d’aiguiser (leurs) poignards (pour se lacerer)“.  
3. Z. B. „KIŠIB-šā lu alāṭ „(und) hast du auch sein Siegel (um)hängen“ BWL 102, 82; weitere Belege CAD K 447b1f. 544b.  
4. Siehe CAD s. v. ʾıḥzā b, kšub₃, mandtu 2b, pingu b(?), sānu₃.
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8) Iškur and the Four Heroes — CBS 15142 (CDLI P269698) is the bottom left corner fragment of an 

*ingida* preserving portions of both sides of the tablet, written in a familiar OB Nippur script. The preserved 

content includes the exertion of the storm god’s powers in conjunction with a group of what seems to be four 

heroes, assuming that the ur-sag gal-gal-la of obverse 3’, whose qualities are subsequently described in 

obverse 4’-6’, pertains to the ensuing description of four entities on the reverse. The juxtaposition of their 

numbered totality (limmu₄-meš) with the “seven storms” (u₄ imin) that are attributed to Iškur elsewhere¹) may 

summarize the ensuing section where the heroes are individually mentioned. Depending on the connotation 

of the dative²) in conjunction with the first three of the heroes, who are introduced by an ordinal genitival 

copulative phrase modified by the deictic suffix -bi (#.ak.am.bi), either Iškur is using his powers as a storm 

god on the heroes’ behalf or he is transferring this power directly to them. Thus, the dative reflects either an 

ethical dative or marks the indirect object of a verb such as šum; “to give,” which may have occurred in lines 

r1-3 or possibly, in introduction, o8’. A similar convention of ordinal introduction is famously observed with 

the seven heroes appointed by Utu to escort Gilgamesh, Enkidu, and the Urukean to and through the seven 

mountain ranges in Gilgamesh and Huwawa A 37f. and Gilgamesh and Huwawa B 38f. An ordinal sequence 

is also used to introduce seven names of Inana in the *balag* compositions *uruamirabi* tablet 21 lines 80-86 


A strikingly similar but not identical passage to CBS 15142 occurs within the section preceding the 

*sāgaru* rubric of the Iškur adab composition Ur-Ninurta F (VAT 8212, VS 17 40) rev. 1f.’ (van Dijk 1965: 

11 n. 11, Schwemer 2001: 181, ETCSL 2.5.6.6). It is unclear if CBS 15142 is a variant version of the same 

text, but given the considerable amount of lexemic variation between the two, it seems most likely that they 

were separate texts. In Ur-Ninurta F, this stimulation of the growth of abundant grain is for the immediate 

benefit of king Ur-Ninurta of Iššin as the provider of his people,³) while in the current context, no mention of 

a king is preserved, unless the bal of CBS 15142 reverse 7 refers to the reign of a mortal king⁴).

I do not currently know of an unequivocal reflex of these four ur-sag from elsewhere, although the statement of Ezina/Anān after asserting her ability to withstand Iškur’s winds in Sheep and Grain 140 ³Anān-

ta-šu-ur-sa-ša ra-šu-ša ta-da Ša₂₂-la nu-mu-un-ta-dag-ge-en “I am Anān, born for (a fight with?) the hero—I will not 

relent!” may reference these entities. The description of the entities in service of Suen, Ninlil and Iškur, 

frequently understood to be nocturnal demons, in the difficult conclusion of Lugalbanda Hurrim, lines 401-

405 (see Alster 2005: 63, Konstantinopoulos 2015: 87-88) is reminiscent of the four heroes’ role, albeit 

without eliciting the positive effect of a bountiful harvest. In the Lugalbanda Hurrim passage, they are 

described without explicit numeric designation, as Iškur’s “helpers” who make flax and barley tremble and 

massacre the livestock. If there is a direct connection, the latter context could hint at a lack of formal 

attachment to the circle of any one deity. A direct reflex of these four heroes is not immediately evident within 

Iškur’s divine circle, perhaps due to the fact that they were not fully divine. The number four is somewhat 

novel and may somehow reflect the four winds or possibly a team of four animals, although the application 

of the lexeme ur-sa-ša to an animal would be rather unusual.⁵) If a team of animals was referenced here, it may 

evoke the An : Anum tradition⁶) (An : Anum 3 253-256), where Iškur/Adad is attributed with four bovines, 

including two calves, Amar-Suena and ⁴PA+U₂₃-ab-ba, and two bulls, Šeriš and Magiru. The two bulls 

probably reflect the storm god’s chariot team on analogy with the Hittite god Teššub, with the anomalous god 

Magiru perhaps somehow a corruption or re-interpretation of Ḫurri (see the discussion of Schwemer 2001: 

69-70, 481-482).
Several subordinate deities could also be involved with Iškur’s storms in an analogous manner to the contexts under consideration. The deities Haniš and Šullat, who were associated with Iškur/Adad as well as with Utu/Samaš as the vanguards of destruction (see George 2003: 884 and Schwemer 2001: 413f.), Iškur is also attributed with six Šu-gud10 functionaries (Anu: Anum 3 257-262, for these deities, see also Gabbay 2014: 105), with all but the first bearing names that could evidence a connection to the storm or abundance arising from its precipitation (4Ur₄-sur-ra, 4Pirig₃-gu₁-dug₃-ga, 4Mur-šu₄-ni-ta, 4Šeg₆-mu-un-gi₄-gi₄ and 4Giri₁₇-zal-kalam-ma). The reading as well as the precise meaning of the designation GUD.BALAG, to be read gud-balag or perhaps šu-gud₁₀, is obscure and debated, but, as Michalowski has recently suggested (Michalowski 2010: 222 n. 47), it may in some instances reflect the rarely attested and variously rendered /gud/ = qarrada(m) and thus could possibly be understood as a rare synonym of ur-saḡ.

As Schwemer notes (2008: 130, 134), the climatic conditions of the Mesopotamian alluvial plain and the resulting reliance on irrigation rather than rain for agriculture tend to make the depiction of the destructive forces of the storm god Iškur/Adad more prominent than his role in the abundance and fertility of the land. Such a conception of precipitation may be reflected by the fact that Iškur is sometimes mentioned in conjunction with the flourishing of crops without eschewing his seemingly incompatible primary role as a destructive storm. This is apparent in CBS 15142 and Ur-Ninurta F, where a description of the violent storm, even including a description of destroying the field in CBS 15142 r3, and the yielding of an abundant crop are immediately juxtaposed with each other. Another context where the stark contrast between the violent storm and the role of Iškur in furnishing abundance to the land is immediately reconciled to each other is found at the beginning of the text “Sin-iddinam and Iškur” (Michalowski 1988: 268, Wagensonner 2011: 19), where a description of Iškur’s powers as storm god culminates in the simple enclitic sentence za-pa-aḫ₂-bi he₂-ĝal₂-an₃ “the scream of the storm wind is abundance.” A symbiotic relationship between Iškur and the grain goddesses is alluded to in numerous other contexts such as Isbi-Erra E (Nisaba hymn) 83-84, where Iškur is said to grow barley on Nisaba’s behalf with wind and rain as her helper (a₂-dah), Ininnšaĝura 99-102, as well as their respective roles in various curses found in royal inscriptions. In contrast, in contexts such as Sheep and Grain 134-140 and Ninmešara 10 (via simile), an antagonistic relationship is implied between Iškur and the grain goddesses.

CBS 15142

1) eg₂-pa₅-re x […]
   The dike and ditch…

2) gana₃-zid-de₃ še x […]
   The fertile field… grain…

3) ur-saḡ gal-gal-[l]a…
   The great heroes…

4) e₄-ne-ne-ne […]
   They…

5) šaĝ₄-ta kalag-ga […]
   From the womb (i.e., since birth) strong…

6) sul a₂-pa₁-du-[a] […]
   The youth having discovered his strength…

7) “Iškur-re an nīg₂-[da]-ga-la?…
   Iškur…[broad?] heaven

8) limmu₄(4xDIš₃)-me-eš₂ u₂-imin […]
   They were four, the seven storms…

9) di₃-ra u₂ Šeg₁₂-gi₄-gi₄-da x […]
   For(to the first), a storm that is to scream…

10) min-kam-bi-ir u₂ du₄-du₇-du₇-da x […]
    For(to the second), a storm that is to thrash…

VS 17 40

min-[kam]-ma₃ tum₄-u₃₂-[u]₃₂₃ mir-ra-da m[u-]...
    (For(to?) the second, the southern and northern winds (?) that are to rage(?)

r3) eš₃-kam-bi-ir gana₂-nīg₂-[hu]-lu₂-gal₂ […]
   For the third the field… with(?) malevolence

VS 17 40
eš₃-kam-ma-ra tum₄ hu₂-an-na-[ke₃] gaba gi₄-bi n[u?-tuƙu?]…
   For(to the third), a destructive wind of the sky, unopposed(?)
The A sign was written over another sign, perhaps a ŠAG₄ sign as a corrected error of anticipation for the next line. For the orthography of the third person plural independent pronoun with initial e₄, see Attinger 1993: 171. The triplicated form ié-ne-ne, possibly carrying an additional connotation of totality or emphasis, is only occasionally attested in the Old Babylonian period (see, for example, Lugabbanda Hurrim 490; Hundosag Hymn 74), with the Akkadian explanations ša-ru and ka-ru-ša-ru-ša in grammatical texts (OBGT I 380, XVI 5, see MSL 4 5 0, 126). For discussion, see Attinger and Krebernik 2004: 65.

Compare the numerical specification with the enclitic copula of the seven heroes in Gilgameš and Huwawa A 36, as well as the seven brothers of Lugabbanda in Lugabbanda Hurrim 59. Note that the dative is also omitted for fourth entity in Ur-Ninurta F, perhaps suggesting that the fourth hero is the primary agent of this action in contrast to his counterparts. The restoration of the verb, which šeḫ anak is the likely semantic object of as marked by the locative terminative, is somewhat uncertain. It seems most likely that a compound verb with the nominal component g揭示r₁ “foot” occurs here. In later tradition g揭示r occurs with the verb ra(h) “to strike” to elicit the Akkadian translation rešlu(m), “to trample, devastate,” etc., a verb which only describes devastation at the hands of the storm god (see George 1991: 157, Schwemer 2001: 63 n. 364. The current context may therefore more fully express the corresponding Sumerian expression g揭示₁… ra(h), with the action of striking or trampling of the feet represented by the pelting of rain drops or hail.

The interpretation of the corresponding line in Ur-Ninurta F is somewhat ambiguous. As copied by van Dijk, the combination IM MIR MIR-RA-DA is present, leaving the interpretation between tammim mir-mir-ра-da “northern wind that is to rage” or tum₄ mir-mir-ra-da “wind that is to rage.” If the former was intended, note the northern and southern winds may also act together in conjunction with Iškur’s storm in Šulgi A 60, although the great majority of sources give mir-mir-ra (var. -re,-e) without the wind determinative rather than tammim mir-ra, which only occurs in one source (see Delnero 2006: 1893, Vacin 2011: 438).

For the occurrence of reduplicated di₄ in an analogous agricultural context, compare Enki and the World Order 311, for which see the remarks of Schwemer 2001: 177 n. 1243. This line contains a rarely attested syllabic spelling of/absin “furrow”: compare, for example, the syllabic sandhī writing ab-si₂-na-nam (for ab-si₂-na-na-nam) attested at Kiš (OECT 5, 4 (PSK 451), rev. iii 8’: see Bowen 2017: 143)

For u₄ he₂-gal₂ “day of abundance,” compare/contrast the u₄ di₄-ga “propitious day” of Ur-Ninurta F (VS 17 40 8’). The BAL sign, perhaps referring to the mortal king’s reign, is unequivocal in CBS 15142 against the partially paleographically similar NUMUN of VS 17 40, making the direct compatibility of these lines unlikely.

Notes
1. See, for example, Lugabbanda and Anzu 172 (where it serves as a simile for great speed) and the Iškur èrêma gu₁₄ mah pa e₂-a 18 (Cohen 1981: 52, Schwemer 2001: 184, 188), and note also Iškur’s use of seven winds (tum₄ imin of Šulgi A 61 and the […] tammim mir “seven southern and northern winds?”) mentioned in the hymn to Iškur’s temple at Karkar (Temple Hymns 339).

2. Without recourse to the contents of CBS 15142, Schwemer 2001: 182 n. 1267 assumed the dative was an error for the terminative -še in VS 17 40 and assumed a instance-based temporal connotation.

3. Note that for VS 17 40 r₇’ g(ar) “meadow” is not present. Instead, the compound gu₂…gur is a very likely restoration: read Ur-“Nin-urta gur-di₄ gur-ša-ma-a gu₂ mu-na-[n-gur 0/…]

4. If CBS 15142 was a wholly separate text, it is possible that it belongs to the Iškur adab am ud-da u₄-a lugal “[Iškur?…], known only from the fragment CBS 7055 (STVC 57, see Schwemer 2001: 175, 190-191, Metcalf 2015: 230) or what is most likely a tigi or adab of Iškur mentioning Išme-Dagan, 3N-T 901, 32 (+) 3N-T 906, 224 (catalogued by Schwemer 2001: 175 n. 1236).

5. Note that in the Iškur èrêma gu₁₄ mah pa e₂-a 18, Iškur seems to control the reins of the seven storms (if a reading IB₂xE₃ = zib₂, “(equine) bridle”) applies: for the rare attestations of this word, see Attinger 1998: 186, and note in comparison that the “animals of Utu/Samaš’s chariot team seem to have almost always been horses: see the detailed
examination of Bonechi and Alaura 2012. Perhaps some kind of numerical adaptation is involved in o8’, as a team of four would have been more manageable than a team of seven.

6. For the Iškur/Adad circle of An: Anum 3 see Schwemer 2001: 16f.

7. For the most recent iteration of the predominant interpretation of GUD-BALAG as a musical instrument, see Gabbay 2014: 103-114, who understands it to originally refer to the bull-headed sound box of a lyre.

8. A gentler description of Iškur’s role in aiding the crop is articulated in a kakanišara composition of Iškur to be published by Geller and Schwemer (I am grateful to Professor Schwemer for sharing a preliminary version of the text with me).

9. In Ur-Ninurta B 9-10 and Išme-Dagan Db 25-27 a very similar role is attributed to Enki (delegated by An in the former context), which is further evocative of the delegation of these powers by Enki to Iškur in Enki and the World Order 308-316.
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9) Nouveau fragment de Gilgamesh et Ḫuwa A. — Ni 9780 (ISET 1 p.180) n’a pas encore à ma connaissance été remarqué, même dans le travail colossal de Delnero 2006. Ce fragment contient le bas de la face et le début du revers d’une tablette, une Teiltafel, contenant un extrait de l’œuvre. Il faut intervertir oy (en fait le revers) et ay (en fait la face). Le progrès pour la reconstitution est minime et le fragment n’a pas pu être joint aux témoins publiés.

1’ (=55) […] ‘a₂₃ nam-‘ur₃-[sa₂₃-…]
2’ (=55) […]-ni-im-de₂₃-de₂₃
3’ (=56) […]-ed₁nin-na gir₁₂-ni bi₂₃-in-gub

rev.
1 (=57) […] haš₃[ur] ṭe₂š₃taškarin-na-ka
2 (=57) […]-ni-sag₃-sag₃₂₃-ge
3 (=58) […]-d’e₃₂₃-rey₃₂₃-eš₃₂₃am₃
4 (=58) […]-bi₂₃₃-[n²₂₃-‘gar²]}
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10) Bilgameš, Enkidu et le monde infernal 147-164 — Dans un article récent (2018), P. Steinkeller a remis en question l’interprétation usuelle de GiEN 147-164, à savoir que Bilgameš contraindrait les jeunes gens d’Uruk à jouer avec lui à un jeu, quelle que soit la nature exacte de ce jeu
de. Il écrit à la p. 159 :
« But this is a completely preposterous idea. What kind of a team ball-game is this, one that continues day after day, from sunrise till sunset, and that involves many players but only one stick?! The text makes it clear that the handling of the puku₃ et mekkû was done exclusively by Gilgameš, with the suffering of the young men of Uruk being merely a result of those actions. »

Et un peu plus loin (pp. 160 sq.):
« There cannot be any doubt, I believe, that the pukku et mekkû formed some kind of a percussion instrument or noise maker, which Gilgameš used to mobilize the men of Uruk for corvée work, and probably also to keep them working. […] Therefore, one can be quite confident that puckku was either a type of drum or some sort of an idophone, with the mekkû constituting the accompanying drumstick or beater. » Lui-même propose de traduire les ll. 151-164 de la manière suivante (p. 172) : « (With) the ‘drum’ he makes a request, he brings out the ‘drum’ into the broad street. He sounds the ‘noise-maker’, he brings out the ‘noise-maker’ into the broad street. The young men of his city whom the ‘drum’ requested, the free citizens—(even) the sons of widows—he puts loads (of building materials) on their backs. ‘Oh my neck, oh my back!’ they are lamenting. The ones who had mothers, (their mothers) brought food for them. The ones who had sisters, (their sisters) poured drink for them. After the dusk fell down, at the spot where he had laid down the ‘drum’, he drew a mark. He lifted his ‘drum’ before him and carried it to his house. At dawn, as he was again putting loads on their backs at the spot where he had drawn a mark, because of the oppression of widows, because of the outcry of young widows, his ‘drum’ and his ‘drumstick’ fell down to the bottom of the Netherworld. »

Indépendamment du fait que je ne vois pas sur quoi repose l’affirmation qu’il y aurait seulement « one stick » et que « the handling of the puckku and mekkû was done exclusively by Gilgameš » (cursives de l’auteur)²⁵, la traduction de Steinkeller, aussi séduisante soit-elle contextuellement, soulève de nombreuses difficultés philologiques. Je me contente de mentionner les principales d’entre elles :
— que ella₂₃ puckku désignent un instrument de musique (Steinkeller pp. 161-163 et 171 n. 52) est rendu assez peu probable par Volk 1998 : 200, l. 74 (commentaire pp. 243 sq.), où Innana dit faire rouler les têtes comme de lourds ella₂₃/pukkt.
— du₁₁₃-du₁₁₃₂₃ (ll. 151 sq.) ne peut pas être une forme verbale conjuguée imperfective (Steinkeller p. 172: “he makes”[151], “[he] sounds”[152]).
— Aux ll. 151 sq., les deux textes de Nippur (N1 et N24) ont na-mu-un-e. Si e était une graphie non-standard de e₃ (Steinkeller p. 171, n. 53), on attendrait alors na-mu-un-e-de₂₃ (comp. na-mu-un-e₃₂₃-de₂₃ dans Ur₃).
— Une lecture bun₃ de IM n’est sinon pas attestée à l’ép. paléobab. Ici, N1 et N9 auraient bun₃ pour bun₂ à la l. 152 (Steinkeller p. 171, n. 52).
— Il est difficilement crédible que *ib₂₂-ba u₃-a (ll. 154 et 161) remonte à *ib₂₂-bi-a i₃-u₅-a (Steinkeller p. 171, n. 54), entre autres raisons parce que N1 à *ib₂₂-ba u₃-a à l. 154 et ib₂₂-ba u₃-a à l. 161. Je ne connais par ailleurs aucune forme verbale du type i₃-u₅(….) à Ur III ou à l’ép. paléobab., et l’on aurait de toute façon attendu une forme transitive.

— ū du₄-du₅ pour ū du₃-du₄ (Steinkeller pp. 171 sq., n. 55) serait attesté dans les sept duplicats (quatre de Nippur et trois d’Ur). Dans les textes littéraires paléobab., ū du₃ n’est sinon pas une graphie alternative de ū du₄.

Dans ces conditions, l’interprétation traditionnelle, aussi obscure soit-elle dans le détail, me semble être clairement préférable.

Notes
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11) Un nouveau duplicat de la Lamentation sur Sumer et Ur — IB 472b, publié récemment par C. Wilcke⁹¹, n’est pas un fragment de lettre littéraire (ainsi Wilcke, op. cit. p. 58, avec hésitation), mais un duplicat de la Lamentation sur Sumer et Ur (ll. 313-318) : (313) […] ir […]²³ / (314) […]⁴ nanna²⁻kam […] / (315) […] gen⁴-gu₁₂-bi₂₁-du₁₁ [… ] / (316) […]⁴ nanna²⁻kam […] / (317) […]⁴ nanna²⁻kam […] / (318) […]⁴ nanna²⁻kam […] / (319) […]⁴ nanna²⁻kam […] / (320) […]⁴ nanna²⁻kam [… ]. Le texte composite du passage est :

313) kir₃ ma₃₃-ba gu₁₂-ak-e³¹ ir mu₃-un-uf₁₂-ur₃-e
314) bur-sa₄(-ta)₂₂-siikit₃ nanna-ka(m) za-pa-a₃₂-bi ba-ra-[g]ul
315) e₂-gud-gen₁₂-gu₁₂-bi₂₁-du₁₁-ma-a-ri si-ga-bi ba₁₂-du₁₁²³
316) mu₃-un-ku₁₂(DU₁₂)₂₂-ga₃-si mu₃-un-za₂₋₃-e gu₃-ran-bi ba₃₂₃-si-ud₁³
317) NAḪAR (geš₃) nanna₃ geš-gana₃ i₃₃-ku₃₃-ku₁₂₂₃-nu₃₃-și-gurum-e
318) kar-za-gin-ya₃-nā₃-nanna-ka₃-a₃-e₂-ba₂-da₂-la₂₃

«Prépare-t-on (encore)⁰⁹ des bœufs et des moutons dans ses immenses fours? Ils ne dégagent plus d’odeurs alléchantes⁰⁹. Dans le bursag⁰⁹, le remue-ménage des brasseurs de Nanna a pris fin. Le temple, qui avait mugi comme un bœuf, est envahi par le silence⁰⁹. Les livraisons sacrées n’arrivent plus régulièrement⁰⁹; après avoir été instaurées, elles ont été supprimées⁰⁹. La meule, le mortier et le pilon gisent (inutilisés), personne ne se penche plus vers eux. Au Quai brillant de Nanna,…¹⁰»

Notes

2. Peut-être ligne en retrait.
4. Ainsi la version de Nippur // « on ne prépare plus » (HH).
5. Envisageable serait aussi « On prépare des bœufs et des moutons dans ses immenses fours, mais ils ne dégagent plus d’odeurs alléchantes. »
6. Ainsi peut-être X (littéralement ablatif à valeur locative); dans GG et HH, on a probabl. un pendens.
8. Littéralement « On ne dirige plus les livraisons sacrées ici » v.s.
10. Pour a-e₁₃ a₂₃, Comp. I. 196, où a-e₁₃ a₂₃ (B) est parallèle à a-e₂₃ BU (x 3). Le sens de l’expression m’échappe, -e faisant problème. Le PSD (A/I 6 s.v. a A 2.1), s’inspirant probabl. d’une suggestion de M. Yoshikawa (Or. 44 [1975] 449 sq.), propose « the water of the canal », mais attendu serait alors a eg₂-ga. M. Jaques (AOAT 332 [2006] 63 n. 135) essaye de tourner la difficulté en traduisant « il (= le bateau) est enlisé dans la vase (?) »; à la l. 196, il n’est toutefois pas question de bateau, et dans notre passage, seulement à la ligne suivante.

Pascal ATTINGER (29-12-2018) <pascal.atinger@iaw.unibe.ch> Rue de Tivoli 10, CH 2000 Neuchâtel

12) The Reading of the Name of an Early Assyrian King — The name of the fourth king in the two exemplars (the Khorsabad King List and the Seventh Day Adventist Seminary King List, both copied in the 8th century B.C.E.) of the Assyrian King List (AKL) is written as “KID-la-(a)-mu” (JNES 13: 211-212). The reading of the first sign “KID” was not certain. It was read “Kītī/a(m)” (JNES 13: 222; KZW: 4) at first. When publishing the tablet of “the Genealogy of the Hammurapi Dynasty (GHD)” (BM 80328), Finkelstein proposed that the name “KID-la-(a)-mu” in the AKL might be identical with the latter part of “Ya-am-qū-uzu-ḫa-lam-ma” in the GHD (obv.3’), where two names were misconstrued by the scribe as one, and read the sign “KID” as “sā/a/īṭ” (JCS 20: 100). Accepting the proposal of Finkelstein, RIA read the name as “Sūḫlāmu” (RIA 6: 102; RIA 13: 262).

However, Charpin and Durand demonstrated that the separation of the name “Ya-am-qū-uzu-ḫa-lam-ma” in the GHD was unnecessary, because it could be transcribed as “Yām-qū-šūm-ḪALAM.MA”, meaning “la ruine s’abatit sur lui” (RA 80: 160). The argument of Charpin and Durand is apparently more reasonable (Abr-N 35: 24). Therefore, the reading of “Sūḫlāmu” based upon the similarities between the two names in the AKL and the GHD remains controversial.

The name “KID-la-(a)-mu” belongs to the seventeen royal names in the beginning part of the AKL, and except the last two of them mentioned by later Assyrian kings in the royal inscriptions (RIMA 1, A.0.77.1: 113’; RINAP 4, No.57: iii 17’), none of those names were attested by textual sources other than the AKL. So, no other source can be drawn to help read this name. Although most of those names seem to be Semitic (JNES 1: 252-253; SAHNI: 22), no general consensus has been reached as to whether or not they were “Akkadian or Akkadianized” (JCS 8: 109-110, n. 106; KZW: 4).

However, since the subscript of the AKL states that “in totality seventeen kings who lived in tents”, it would imply that those kings were most likely nomadic rulers from the late 3rd millennium B.C.E. (ARCANE 3: 31; CAH 1/2: 745), when they had probably not yet settled at Aššur. Those names preserved
in the AKL must have derived from an oral tradition (SAHNI: 22). On the other hand, the similarities between the two groups of names in the AKL and the GHD as observed by Finkelstein are dramatic, but as suggested by Hallo, the specific parallels between the two documents would show that the scribe of the AKL (cherishing the similar purpose as that of the scribe of the GHD) might have intended to “provide the founder of Assur’s independence with a genealogy linking him to the Amorite tribes that swept all over Mesopotamia upon the fall of Ur” (EI 14: 5). Accordingly, it is reasonable to assume that the seventeen names in the AKL might have been the Akkadian phonetic writings of the Amorite names coming down from the ancient times.

I would propose that we read the name “KID-la-(a)-mu” as “Lillāmu”. We know that the sign “KID” can be read “līlī” and the writing of ““[lîl]îl-lā” for “līlī” meaning “demon” (AOAT 305: 340) is well known, too. Two Amorite personal names written in Akkadian are attested in Old Babylonian documents (AS 21: 619, No.4364, No.4366): “li-la-mi-x-x” (YBC 11155 = JCS 14/1: No.82, obv.8’) and “li-li-im” (ARM 13: No.73, 5’). If “li-la-mi” stands for “Lilami” or “Lilamu”, then “Lillāmu” would be the same name. And if the name “li-li-im” stands for “Lilium” or “Lilum”, then “Lillāmu” would be the same name. Similarly, another name “Ḫarḫarū” in the group of the seventeen kings in the beginning part of the AKL was thought by Kraus (KZW: 6–7) to be probably related with “ha-ar-ḫa-ar” in an Old Babylonian tablet (VAT 1433). Furthermore, the personal name “Li(l)imu” is well attested throughout history (MAD 3: 161; PNA 2: 662): it was written as “li-li” in an Old Akkadian legal document (OAI: No.17, obv.4’) and a Sargonic text (MAD 1: No.163, iii 36’), “li-lum” in two Old Akkadian administrative documents (OAI: No.23, obv.1’; RTC, No.91, obv. iii 17’) and an envelope from Puzriš-Dagan of the Ur III period (PDTI: No.517), while “li-il-lum” (the name of a bearded courtier) in a Neo-Assyrian administrative document (SAA 11: No.164, rev.6’).

The meaning of the name “Lillāmu” might be not so clear by itself, but if we connect it with “Li(l)imu”, then the meanings of “līlum” as an Akkadian word might shed some light on this matter (CAD 9: 189–190): besides being used as a personal name, it also means “fool, moron” (“līlum” or “li-il-lum”), or it denotes “a qualification of horses”, or it refers to a demon or a god (“li-il₃-lu-[u][m]” or “li-il₃-lum”).

Some abbreviations

Abr-N = Abn-Nahrain, an Annual Published by the School of Fine Arts, Classical Studies and Archaeology, Eretz-Israel: Archaeological, Historical and Geographical Studies


SAA = State Archives of Assyria


Fei CHEN <chenfei17@pku.edu.cn>
Peking University, No.5 Yiheyuan Road, 100871 Beijing

13) The second Practical Vocabulary from Kültepe — The recent publication of Kt. n/k 1697 by S. Çeçen and H. Erol in Archivium Anatolicum 12/2 (2018) sheds new light on scribal education in the Old Assyrian period. The tablet differs in many respects from the Practical Vocabulary (PVK) published by K. Hecker in Nimet Özgüç AV (Ankara 1993), which is known from two sources: A (Kt. 76+79), a coarsely written and partially preserved tablet, and B (k/ 129*), the lower half of the reverse of a carefully written tablet. PVK consists of six thematic sections: 1. a metrological sequence (weights); 2. metals and metal objects; 3. stones and stone objects; 4. animals; 5. oils and perfumes; 6. logograms for multiplication. Many of the entries (and also a special sign for ‘one-eighth’ in A l 6’) do not occur in standard Old Assyrian documents, a feature PVK has in common with other thematic school texts.
Also K.t. n/k 1697 contains a blend of practical and learned words and logograms. It does not contain a metrological section. Instead, nearly two-thirds of the text consist of calculations of exchange rates of metals and stones. Separated by a blank space follow sections on pottery (dug) and textiles (tūg) and the text ends with hides (kuṣ) of various animals. The calculations followed by various sections remind one of the Ur III period Practical Vocabulary of Susa (V. Scheil, RA 18, 1921, 53), the preserved part of which contains two calculations of gold prices in 1'-3' and 4'-6' and a list of other metals in various quantities.(note 1)

The calculations in K.t. n/k 1697 deserve some comment. As Çeçen and Erol observed, errors in most of these calculations show this text to have served educational purposes. The first three commodities are varieties of gold: ‘choice quality’ (*liqtum*) at 15, usual quality (si-sá) at 3 1/3, and *zikium* gold at 5 ½ shekels (= sh.) of silver per sh. All three are known with the same ratios from round tablets with a single simple mathematical exercise from Assur and Kültepe: ‘choice gold’ in K.t. 84/k 3; usual quality in Ass 13058f (wr. ‘hu-sá’, see below), and *zikium* gold in Assur 13058e and K.t. a/k 178. None of these three designations is attested in standard OA. According to H. Waetzoldt, *hu*-a is the best quality in Ur III. In OA, however, ‘red’ (*sānum*/*hu*-sa) is the best quality in Ur III. In K.t. a/k 1697 the writing with the archaic logogram *ts* instead of *sù* or *su* is further only attested in two Old Babylonian (mid 19th c.) texts from the Sín-kāšīd palace in Uruk (see K. Reiter, *Die Metalle im Alten Orient*, 332); the substance does not appear to occur in any later document. Sugen was more expensive than copper, see also H. Waetzoldt, *OA* 23, 17.

Borax is noted in line 37, where it is valued at 1 mina of copper per 1 2/3 minas and is written with the archaic logogram *s*īg₃ (reading with Çeçen and Erol, who however translate *yīn* ‘wool’), for which see P. Attinger, *ZA* 85, 1995, 136 (*āgar*). Next follow two entries with wool: goat hair (38, siki ud₃₃ at 7 minas of copper per talent and wool (*sīki*-tù or siki gen “ordinary wool”, 40) at 7 2/3 minas. The sole verbal form in the text is *umāṭaṭer* (41) introducing the equivalent in copper. This form does not occur elsewhere but is reminiscent of the use of *maḥātum* Gt in mathematical texts; it may be another denominative form derived from *maḥātum* (see N.J.C. Kouwenberg, *Gemination in the Akkadian Verb*, 180). The subject is 1 sg or the implied word *maḥātum*.

Calculations with tin figure again in (42) at 4 ½ (but first given in copper!), in (45) at 4 ½ in silver of good quality (sis₃), and in (46) at 4 ½ sh. (but first given in copper; line 47: ma-na <<TA>>) of tin per sh. of silver. The ratio between copper and silver is about 1:30 (43) and 1:60 (47). The last calculations concern (bronze) *samrutum* of 12 sh. weight at 29 in copper and then in the copper’s silver value (at 1:40).
The selected goods, quantities, and prices tell us about this text as a didactic tool. It includes the logograms for gold, silver, tin, bronze, and copper, but uses unfamiliar familial qualities of gold and some archaic sign forms as well as a few rare goods, preferably in phantastic quantities unlikely to have reached an OA merchant: 7 minas of elmešum (cf. CAD E 108: ‘no econ. text ever mentions the e-stone’), or 8 minas of iron. The Practical Vocabulary of Susa lists these two items as well, but in realistic quantities, 10 sh. of iron (an) and 1 sh. of elmešum (su₂₃-āg). The quantities seem to be chosen for arithmetical purposes; the number 105 occurs four times and 155 once. Some of the prices are plausible and lapis lazuli at 1 sh. of silver per 2 ½ sh. approaches 2/3 (ICK 2, 274) and the ratio in VS 26, 12:4-6, slightly less than 2 (purchase in Assur). On the other hand, the prices for tin (10, 4 ½ , and 2 ½ sh. per sh. of silver) are too high to refer to prices in 19th c. Assur (ranging from 17-12), but could fit sale prices in Anatolia (ranging from 10-4); 2 ½ is unattested and makes it doubtful whether these tin prices reflect OA practice. The bronze objects are valued per piece and their weight is specified (possibly to confuse the pupil): samrutum of 12 sh. at 29 sh. of copper, samulium-cups of 18 sh. at 45, cups of 18 sh. at 45 and 51, cups of 20 sh. at 60. No evidence exists to compare these data with real prices. Note that the one entry in PVK giving the object’s weight concerns a (bronze) sickle (ni-ga-lúm ki-lá-be 1/3 ma-[l[a], B:3). All these features indicate that this part of the text was meant as an exercise in making calculations and writing (rare) logograms. The text may represent a scribal tradition developed during the late third millennium to which also the vocabulary from Susa belongs.

1. The metal section in the Practical Vocabulary of Susa reads: I (1') […] kù-[gi] (2') […]-tä-[ām] (3') [kù-bi… ma]-na (4') ½ ma-na kù-gi (5') níg? (wr. 2/3)-ki-2-tä-ām (6') kù-bi 1 ma-na (7') 1 ma-na kù-babbar (8') ½ ma-na urudu (9') 5 ma-na an-na (10') [x] ma-na zabar (11') [x] ma-na hé-āg (12') x […] x (13') 15 ma-na urudu-luh-ha (14') 10 ma-na [x] urudu (15') 1/3 ma-na níg-ne-ak (16') 1/3 ma-na níg-ne-[x] (17') 1/3 ma-na urudu-ti-[l[a] (18') 10 gín an (19') 1 gín su₂₃-āg (rest of column lists textiles).

Note that Limet, Le travail du métal, 256 reads line 5’ against the copy as: 2/3 kimin 2-tä-ām “à raison de 2 pour 2/3 du même”, which makes no sense.

Jan Gerrit DERCKSEN <j.g.dercksen@hum.leidenuniv.nl>


P. 12: to the list of the attestations, is now to be added three provisions partially preserved in MS 4287 obv. ii 39–47. This is a large six-column tablet, containing a phrasebook of legal terminology and a doxology to Nisaba and Haya, whose preliminary transliteration and translation (provided anonymously) will appear in GEORGE–SPADA 2019, No. 64.

P. 13, Tab. B – Laws of Lipit-Istar, §34: the injured part is only sa-sal and not sa-sal-ku and the verb is bi₂-in-kud instead of bi₂-in-sil.

P. 15, n. 6: the first provision, which belongs to the Laws of Ur-Namma and not the Laws of Lipit-Istar as erroneously indicated in the article, should be corrected as follows:

tukum-[bi] gud ab₂ ur₂-ra lu₁ [in-ňu-g₂] mu 2-an₃ addi-[r-bi] 8 še gur in-na-a₂-a₂-[e] gud-ab₂ saŋ-
muru₃₃ addi-[bi] 6 še gur in-na-a₂-a₂-[e], “if a man hires an ox for the rear of the team, he will pay 8 gur of barley for two years as its hire; if it is an ox for the front of the team he will pay 6 gur of barley (for two years) as its hire” (LU §B1; CIVIL 2011: 249 and 268).

P. 16, commentary to 5’-10’: based on the new edition of the Laws of Lipit-Istar that appeared in WILCKE 2014, the verbal form used in §34 (g45 in Wilcke’s edition, p. 598) is bi₂-in-kud and not bi₂-in-sil as suggested by ROTH 1980 and 1997.
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15) A new reading to Old Babylonian Etana — According to CAD K, 18 s.v. kabbutum means to “respect an oath.” This expression rests on an attestation in the Old Babylonian Etana Myth (SEAL 1.1.6.2), namely the version from Susa (Sb 9469), line rev. 13’. Editors of the text (Kinnier Wilson 1985 and Haul 2000), however, read this line as follows: a-du-ur-ma ʾiš-ka u₂-ka-ab-bi-it (ādur-ma rēška ukabbit), “I respect and honor your head.” Neither J. V. Kinnier Wilson nor Michael Haul studied the original tablet. Kinnier Wilson based his hand copy on the copy published by Vincent Scheil in RA 24, 106 and notes that the tablet is missing since its first publication (1985: 21, note 34; Haul 2000: 104; ebd. 2004: 238, note 5). A photo of the tablet’s obverse housed at the Louvre appeared in Harper, Aruz, and Talon 1992: 274, no. 192; both sides were published as photograph later on in André-Salvini 2008: 320, no. 282.

![Fig. 1](image1.jpg)

Fig. 1. A fully preserved sign NI in line 12’ of Sb 9469 and the damaged sign in the subsequent line

New photos (thankfully taken by Jaroslaw Maniaczyk from the Louvre) and a second attestation of this expression help to clarify the situation (Fig. 1). YBC 13521 is a small clay prism, which contains a rare example of an Akkadian court procedure that is probably not based on an historical case, but entered written lore (compare CUSAS 10, 17a–c published by George 2009). Line 27 of this text reads: ni-ʾiš-ka u₂-kab-bi-it, “He respected the oath (sworn by) you.” (This text will be published by the author in a forthcoming article.)

![Fig. 2](image2.jpg)

Fig. 2. The damaged sign in line 12’ of Sb 9469

The preceding line in the Old Babylonian version of Etana probably also allows for a new reading. Kinnier Wilson (1985: 110–111) read this line: a-na e-ri-i ʾšu³-ma-ni a-na-ku aš-ru-ul[k], “To the eagle I gave my provisions”; Michael Haul (2000: 110–111) reads: a-na e-ri-i ʾšu³-ma-ni a-na-ku aš-ru-ul[k], “Dem Adler habe ich ʾWohlergehen (?) beschert!” The damaged sign (read im or ʾšu³ in previous editions) could in fact also be ra: ana eri ramani anaku ašruk. If this is correct, then the snake says to the sun god as follows:

Reverse

11’) ʾar³-ka-la-ak-ku-um-ma bētu³ qu₂-ra-(du)
12’) a-na e-ri-i ʾsā³-ma-ni a-na-ku aš-ru-ul[k]
13’) a-du-ur-ma ʾnīš-ka u₂-ka-ab-bi-it

“I trusted in you, o warrior Šamaš,
I presented myself to the eagle,
(because) I was in fear and respected the oath sworn by you.”
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16) Bilingual Šuruppak — The Old Babylonian school lentil YBC 8934 (YPM BC 022993; CDLI no. P309732) was published by Bendt Alster in his *Proverbs of Ancient Sumer* (1997), p. 332 with a hand copy of the obverse on pl. 131. The two lines of Sumerian text repeated by a student on the reverse are, as noted by Alster, parallel to line 99 of the *Instructions of Šuruppak*: *g*ā-*r*ā-āb-*š*um₂-*b*ē₂/*l*ū₂-*r*a *g*a-ni-i-n-u₂, “Let me hold onto the man (who says) this: ‘Let me give it to you!’” (see Alster 2005: 75), analyzed as *g*ā-*r*ā-*b*.*š*um-*b*ē₂/*l*ū₂-*r*a *g*a-ni-i-n-u₂. The instructor’s model text is followed by two lines written into the blank space in a slightly smaller hand. Alster attempted to interpret these two lines as either a date or names. Personal names do occur on occasion as “colophons” on school lentils; see, for instance, the unpublished school lentil YBC 9924 with three personal names starting in the element *n*īn followed by the name Taribātum written in smaller script into the blank space below. The same name appears on the lentil YBC 9907 with entries from Division 3 of *Ura*; an individual named Ilšu-idīšu is attested on YBC 9917, another lentil with Nin-names.

Collation of the tablet YBC 8934, however, shows that these two additional lines contain in fact the Akkadian rendering of the Sumerian and are read as follows (Fig. 1):

\[
[a\text{-wi-la}]\text{m} \; \text{lu-di-ku-um-mi}
\]
\[
\text{lu-ar-x-di-šu}
\]
\[
[aw\text{-ti}\text{-la}]\text{m} \; \text{luddikkum-mi lurdīšu}
\]

“Let me follow the man who says ‘Let me give (it) to you!’”

The particle -mi that is used to flag direct speech (*GAG* § 123c) appears to render the possessive or deictic enclitic -bē₂ in the first Sumerian form. Usually Akkadian -mi is represented by the Sumerian suffix -ēše (written e-še) that is quite common in proverbs, in particular (Thomsen 1987: 279) and compare to *NBGT* I, 461: e-še : *mi-i* K1.TA, “(Sumerian) *ēše/ (is equivalent) to (Akkadian) mi used as enclitic” (see *MSL* 4, 147; read after AO 17602 [CDLI P493409] rev. iv,21). In this line enclitic -bē₂ appears to be deictic referring to the direct speech (*g*ā-*r*a-ā*b*-*š*um₂₂) itself.

Still problematic is the third sign in the second line of the Akkadian translation: It seems unlikely that it is a malformed TA. Possibly the scribe forgot to erase a malformed sign DI before writing it properly.
Although several Akkadian versions of *Instructions of Šuruppak* survive in the textual record and even a translation into Hurrian, this unprovenienced school lentil is the only Sumero-Akkadian manuscript known to date. Compare the list of manuscripts in Alster 2005: 47–53. Alster, however, did not include this lentil into his edition of the *Instructions of Šuruppak*. Unfortunately, none of the Akkadian versions preserve line 99 in order to serve as a point for comparison.

Akkadian renderings of Sumerian text on school lentils or Type IV-tablets are comparatively rare and are usually added as annotations or glosses (see, for instance, the proverbs on the lentil UET 6, 368). Similar examples are the unpublished lentil YBC 9882 with an extract of *Ana ittišu* or CUNES 51-07-109 with a short passage from *Ura* followed by pronunciation and Akkadian equivalent added into the blank space (this tablet will be published by A. Gadotti and A. Kleinerman).
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17) Ein Laḫmu im Raum 132 des „Palais Royal“ zu Mari — Cette petite étude, écrite “sur commande” il y a presque 20 ans n’est jamais parue. Elle est redevenue actuelle dans les détours que j’ai faits pour mes recherches sur les couleurs de la carnation humaine en Mésopotamie. Je remercie Béatrice Muller qui, en acceptant d’écrire un article et en me pourvoyant en photos en couleurs, qui paratront dans la publication finale sur la polychromie des statues mésopotamiennes, a indirectement relancé le sujet.


Abb. 1: Wandmalerei im Raum 132, Register 3-5 mit einer H. von 1,73 m. Parrot 1958, pl. E

Oben bricht das Fragment mit einem gewellten Streifen ab, der symbolisch Wasser wiedergibt. Links vom Wesen befand sich eine weitere Szene, von der außer wenigen qcm Hintergrund nichts erhalten ist. Ihr Grund ist wiederum schwarz, anders als bei dem anschließenden Bild mit hellbraunem Grund. Der Zusammenhang zwischen dem schwarzen Wesen und dem restlichen Register ist unklar.


In Anlehnung an den Laḫmu mit ausgebreiteten Armen gibt es zwei Möglichkeiten, den Unterkörper des Wesens zu rekonstruieren: entweder stand er (Abb. 3a) oder er kniete (Abb. 3b). In der knienden Haltung könnte der Platz zwischen dem knienden Laḫmu und der Registerhöhe mit einer Standfläche ausgefüllt sein.

Abb. 3. Zeichnung von Manfred Lerchl, Institut für Vorderasiatische Archäologie, Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München

Nun hat die farbige Abbildung, die B. Muller dankenswerterweise zur Verfügung gestellt hat, einen Anstoß gegeben, sich noch einmal mit der Deutung dieses Bildes zu beschäftigen.

Abb. 4: Fragment Nr. 62. Westwand im Hof 106. H. 5 cm. Schwarz-weiß, Parrot 1958, 45, Fig. 37. © Mission archéologique de Mari, Foto S. Cluzan

Abb. 5: Fragment Nr. 9. Parrot 1958, 29 Fig. 24. Fundort: Südwand im Hof 106. H. 15 cm

Das leider sehr kleine Fragment Nr. 62 auf Abb. 4 stammt aus dem hoch angebrachten Register der südlichen Wand im Hof 106. Das en face dargestellte Gesicht zeigt, wie im Raum 132, eine breite Nase, dicke Lippen und einen Bart. Schließlich zeigt ein weiteres Fragment, auf Abb. 5 abgebildet, ein ebenfalls en face wiedergegebenes Gesicht, das trotz etwas breiteren Schnurrbarts vergleichbar ist. Wie Fragment Nr. 62, stammt es aus den hohen Registern im Hof 106, diesmal von der Südwand. Eine Einheit ergibt sich ebenfalls im Maß (Abb. 6).


damit verbunden, den religiösen und schutzbedürftigen Aspekt des Königs als Inhalt zu haben. Anders auf der Westwand (Abb. 4), auf der einige Fragmente eine Kriegsszene vermuten lassen, ohne jedoch ein eindeutiges Bild zu ermöglichen.

Abb. 6: Ausschnitt aus Abb. 1, Abb. 4 und 5, im gleichen Maßstab


Jedoch, ob Sternenhimmel, Gebirge oder ein weiteres Element, Wesen wie der Lahmu bändigen oder halten fest Wesen oder Gegenstände. Dieses Bändigen und Festhalten verliehen Lahmu positive Kraft, die im Raum 132, einer Ištar-Kapelle mit der Abbildung des Königs, und auf den politisch-religiösen Wandmalereien im Hof 106 ganz besonders wichtig war.

Anmerkungen

3. Blocher 1992, Nr. 217, 320; Colbow 1996, 44 Nr. 6 (allein); Nunn 1997, Tf. Nr. 1; Otto 2000, Nr. 81, 422.
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On notera d’abord deux nouvelles attestations d’une princesse qui était prétresse du dieu Adad, aux n° 174 : 2 (DUMU.MUNUS LUGAL seulement) et 175 : 2 (NIN.DINGIR 4ISKUR DUMU.MUNUS LUGAL)12. Les textes ne sont pas datés, mais leur rattachement aux archives de ce que A. Goddeeris a appelé « central redistributive household » permet de les situer dans la deuxième moitié du règne de Rim-Sin. Cette prétresse reste jusqu’à présent anonyme.

Le n° 101 nous apprend pour la première fois l’existence d’un fils de Rim-Sin nommé Kalum-Šamaš : deux individus vont trouver Kalum-Šamaš, le fils du roi (l. 2 et 6 : 1ka-lu-um-4UTU DUMU LUGAL), pour se plaindre que Šili-Ninurta fils de Šamaš-gamil s’est emparé de leur servante Ištar-ummi. Le texte date de l’an 57 de Rim-Sin. Il est intéressant de le comparer à VS 18 1, où un certain Nergal-rimi-li, également qualifié de « fils du roi » (l. 54 : 14NÈ.ERI13,GAL-ri-im-i-li DUMU LUGAL), intervient dans une affaire liée à un divorce : ce texte est antérieur de deux ans à TMH 10 101, puisqu’il date de l’an 55 de Rim-Sin. Il est intéressant de voir que les deux fils de Rim-Sin qui nous sont connus portent des noms théophores de Šamaš et de Nergal, ce qui renvoie aux deux villes principales du royaume, Larsa et Maškan-šapir52. On constate par ailleurs qu’à la fin de son règne, le vieux Rim-Sin se fit aider, non seulement par son frère Sin-muballit (qui résidait à Maškan-šapir comme nous l’ont appris ARM 26/2 362 et 385), mais également par ses fils : l’un d’eux intervint à Larsa (VS 18 1), l’autre à Nippur (TMH 10 101). Nous ignorons comment la succession de Rim-Sin avait éventuellement été préparée, mais la question ne se posait finalement pas, en raison de la victoire de Hammu-rabi53.

Notes

1. A. Goddeeris a justement rapproché TMH 10 175 de CBS 7435, où figure « the allocation of 1 bariga of grain to Ishkur-eshar, identified as lú nin-dirig īškur dumu-munus lugal » (J. Robertson, CRAI 35, 1992, p. 184 n. 26). Elle a en revanche eu tort de qualifier TMH 10 175 de « list of miscellaneous barley expantidures », traduisant l. 5 i-di-in par « he has given », alors qu’on a affaire à un mandement (letter-order), comportant avant la date l’impératif « donne ! ».


3. Il me semble difficile de tirer des conclusions du sens des noms de ces deux princes pour tenter de déterminer qui serait l’ainé : Nergal-rim-ili (« Nergal est le taureau sauvage des dieux »), plutôt que Kalum-Šamaš (« Agneau de Šamaš »).


Dominique Charpin


C’est M. Stol qui a reconnu dans la séquence É.MUD.KUR.RA.KE4 une des façons de désigner l’Ekišnugal. Il indiquait : « I do not understand this year name. Probably it says that Rim-Sin II founded (gar) the temple Emudkurruk to/as… (KLEDEN). (…) The year name refers to some activity of the king in Ur or near Ur »). M. Van De Mieroop a compris la séquence LUGAL ŠEŠ.UNU3.MA comme « king of Ur »². Au même moment D. Frayne est allé plus loin, en traduisant : « The year Rim-Sin, king of Ur, laid (the foundations) (ki…gar) of (the temple) E-mud-kur at Edina »³. Il comprenait que Rim-Sin II avait construit un temple du dieu Sin dans la ville d’Edina, connue plus fréquemment sous la forme Udinnim (EZENxSIG3). Le problème est que KLEDIN.ŠE serait une façon très étrange de noter un toponyme. Par ailleurs, M. Van De Mieroop et D. Frayne ont sans doute eu tort de considérer que Rim-Sin II se définissait comme « roi d’Ur »⁴. « Roi d’Ur » devrait être noté avec une marque de génitif suivie d’un ergatif (LUGAL.ŠEŠ.UNU3.MA.KE4). En outre, je ne connais pas d’exemple où le nom d’un souverain serait dans un nom d’année suivie par la mention « roi de » et le nom de sa capitale⁵. Il s’agit donc plutôt d’un locatif : « à Ur ». Si l’on ajoute que cette formulation ne se trouve que sur des textes découverts à Ur, il m’est mieux comprendre avec M. Stol que le nom d’année célèbre une activité de construction de Rim-Sin II dans l’Ekišnugal à Ur. Cependant, aucune inscription commémorative n’a jusqu’à présent été retrouvée sur place, qui permettrait de mieux comprendre de quoi il s’agit.

Notes


— « U.7752 La fiche de chantier indique : “Tablet, large fragment”. Actuellement introuvable au BM » ;

Je suppose que si le fragment U.7752 était introuvable au British Museum lorsque je travaillais à mon livre, c’est sans doute qu’il avait été mis de côté à l’intention d’U. Jeyes, qui préparait alors le sien…

Quoi qu’il en soit, il est fort intéressant de noter que les abriqqum qui demeuraient au no 7 Quiet Street conservaient chez eux également une tablette divinatoire : la copie d’un texte de ce genre faisait manifestement partie de la formation de futurs purificateurs, dans un monde où les spécialisations étaient moins étroites qu’on ne l’a parfois cru. U. Jeyes avait noté : « The Ur tablet, no. 10, displays an orthography which is typical of southern tradition. It is written in the younger cursive, mimation and the initial “w” are preserved and ideographic writings are rare. A dating to Hammurapi or earlier seems likely » (p. 6). La prise en compte du contexte archéologique permet de confirmer cette analyse : il est en effet vraisemblable que la tablette fut écrite pendant le règne de Rim-Sin I, comme vraisemblablement la majorité des textes « littéraires et religieux » découverts au no 7 Quiet Street3.

Notes

* Cette note a été rédigée dans le cadre du projet ANR « EcritUr ».
21) Updating the list of Late OB Babylonian fortresses — By the Late Old Babylonian period (i.e., post-Samsuiluna), the state’s fortresses outnumbered its cities at least seven to one. In 2005, I identified at least 13 fortress communities which were staffed and in active use during the Late OB; by now, we can count at least 28, and perhaps as many as 43.

The 2005 list of 13 fortresses included Kullizu, Bāṣum, “the Tigris fort,” Dūr-Šamaš, two forts named Dūr-Ammittana (one on the Silakkum canal, the other on the Me-Enlil canal), Dūr-Iṣkum-Marduk, Dūr-Ammiṣaduqa, Ḥaradum, Ḥiritum, Dūr-Sumu-la-El, Dūr-Api-Šin, and Dūr-Šin-muballit (see Richardson 2005: 286–87 for discussion). All 13 either bore the name of a fortification (dūrū), or were called bīrītu, dunnītu, or dimūtu by some source – fortified farmsteads, towers, or fortresses of some kind—and for many of them there was corollary evidence for their staffing by soldiers in the Late OB specifically.

We can add to this list another four fortresses from evidence I previously overlooked. The first three are Dūr-Nabium from BE 6/1 83 (Ad 31), and Dūr-Hammurabi and Dūr-Šamaš (probably to be identified with Maškan-šāpir; see CUSAS 29 p. 4) from OLA 21 8 (Ad 7). The fourth is Luḫaya, which was rebuilt or expanded by Abi-eṣṣuḫ and celebrated in his year-name “v.” The place is better known as a royal residence from as early as the reign of Ḥammurabi (Hornsell 1999: 260 n. 92), but it was identified as a fortified town, Dūr-Luḫaya, in a text dated to Samsu-illa’s first year (YOS 12 26:38). The place was occupied at least into the reign of Ammittana (see Pientka 1998: 221).

We can now identify another 11 fortresses under the control of the Babylonian Crown and active in the 17th century BC from newly-published texts in CUSAS 8 and 29: two separate forts named Dūr-Abi-eṣṣuḫ (see esp. CUSAS 29 27), Dūr-Šin-iddinām (CUSAS 8 80), Dūr-ilīlim (CUSAS 8 7, 21, 52), Dūr-Šarrīm (CUSAS 29 67), Bagān(n)a (CUSAS 29 39), Nuƙar (CUSAS 29 40, 71), Dūr-Ḫašš-iddinām (CUSAS 29 35 and 189), Kūr-Nabium (CUSAS 29 2), the “fortress of Nippur” (bīrītu en-liši, CUSAS 29 1), and the “Fortress of the Mount of Eana” (bīrītu du₆₄-ē-an-na, CUSAS 29 18). This brings the confirmed list of fortresses active in the Late OB to at least 28.

Another 15 places might also belong on the list, though it is not possible to prove on present evidence (again see Richardson 2005: 287). Six of these have clear links to military staff or activity, but are not identified anywhere to my knowledge as fortresses: Ṣupur-Šubula, Ṣarrum-laba, Dimat-Šarrīm, Dumneši-iddī, Iškun-Iṣtar (perhaps but not necessarily identical to the toponym Dūr-Iškun-Iṣtar), and Dimat-Enlīlim. Conversely, nine or more places clearly identified as fortresses of the earlier First Dynasty state cannot be identified as occupied or in use during 17th century BC, including Dūr-Samsuiluna, Šīramāḫ, Pada, Lagaba, Ibušum, Gulaba, Uṣi-ana-Erra, and “various fortresses of the land Warûm” (RIME 4 3.7.8:50–51: bād-didli-ma-da GN).

Against these 28 or more fortresses, the Babylonian state comprised only the four cities Babylon, Šippar, Dilbat, and Kiš—a smaller urban component than it had had since the 19th century. Although the staffing and/or settlement of the Babylonian fortresses probably entailed relatively few men, probably not much more than a hundred each at a time, the disparity of numbers only continues to suggest that at least the *modality* of fortress settlement, as way of life and demographic norm, may have affected the political character of the Babylonian state and its kingship in the 17th century BC.
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22) The Kings of Mittani in Light of the New Evidence from Terqa — The archaeological investigation of the Late Bronze Age Middle Euphrates and Lower Habur regions around Terqa has yielded interesting information about the history of the area and of Mesopotamia as a whole (I follow Charpin in avoiding the use of any potentially misleading name for the local kingdom). While the record is incomplete and new findings have been reported usually in no more than summary fashion, enough information has appeared to demonstrate that the region was part of the hegemonic kingdom of Mittani during the 15th century BC, with the names of three Mittanian kings appearing in local documents. More specifically, the name of the local ruler Qīš-Addu is associated with those of Pa-ra-tar-na or Pa-ri-tar-na (TQ 12 T9, T10, T15, and T16), Sa-i-tar-na (TQ 12 T19), and Sa-u-su-da-at-ra (TQ 12 T6 and T12) (ROUAULT 2004: 56-57, updating ROUAULT 1992; CHARPIN 2002: 78 n. 121). It is generally accepted that these names are renditions of the attested Mittanian royal names Parattarna, Šuttarna, and Sauštatar (ROUAULT 2004; de MARTINO 2004: 37; YAMADA 2011: 61; PODANY 2014: 53-54; von DASSOW 2014: 18-19 n. 22).

While the general inference is the contemporaneity of Qīš-Addu with three Mittanian kings, Amanda Podany has been able to infer something more, which allows us to arrive at even more definitive conclusions. Working with the published image of TQ12 T6 (GUALANDI 1998) and the testimony of the original discussion (ROUAULT 1992: 254), she determined that in this specific document Qīš-Addu is termed merely governor (sakkânakkù), under his king (?) and father (?) Sinia; Qīš-Addu’s apparent accession as king, as he is attested in the other documents, would have followed sometime later (PODANY 2014: 63-67). This fact is key, because it anchors Sausadatra (Saušṭatar), also attested in TQ12 T6, as an earlier Mittanian contemporary of Qīš-Addu than Parattarna and Sa’ītarna (Šuttarna?).

Although we cannot yet be certain of the relative order of Parattarna and Sa’ītarna, the fact that Sauštatar preceded them allows us to compare and integrate this information into the known sequence of Mittanian monarchs. At its most basic and least controversial, this runs: Kirta-Šuttarna I—?Parattarna I—?Parsatatar—Šauštatar—?Artatama I—Šuttarna II—Artašumara and Tušratta (MAIDMAN 2017: 19-20). Circumstantial considerations have led some scholars to postulate an additional Parattarna II after Sauštatar (WILHELM 1976; STEIN 1989; FREU 2003: 45) and a Sauštatar I before Parsatatar, to be distinguished from the latter’s son Sauštatar II (FREU 2003: 65-70), although these postulations are not universally accepted as fact (see the sober assessment of MAIDMAN 2017: 22 and 27 n. 23). But the Terqa evidence indicates that Sauštatar was succeeded (in whatever order) by Parattarna and Sa’ītarna, still within the reign of Qīš-Addu (documents TQ12 T12, T9, T10, T15, T16, and T19). This and other considerations imply that they must have reigned between Sauštatar and Artatama I.

One result of this outcome is to confirm the already postulated existence of Parattarna II as a successor of Sauštatar. Hitherto this was based on the more or less contemporary attestations of the death of a king Parattarna and the use of the seal of “Šauštatar son of Parsatatar” (whether by Sauštatar or one of his successors) in documents from Nuzi, which seemed to preclude or problematize the possibility that such a short span of time could have included the death of Parattarna I, the unattested reign of Parsatatar, and the rule of Sauštatar or, even worse, of one of his heirs. As shown by Maidman, that reasoning did not absolutely necessitate the postulation of a Parattarna II. However, the evidence from Terqa does: Parattarna I was a contemporary of Idrimi of Alalaḥ; Sauštatar was a contemporary of Idrimi’s son Niqmepa and of governor, later king, Qīš-Addu; Parattarna II was a later contemporary of king Qīš-Addu. Thus, the Parattarna attested in the Terqa documents cannot be identified with Parattarna I (as suggested by YAMADA 2011: 61; it is also unnecessary to postulate two Sauštatars with FREU 2003 and YAMADA 2011).

Another result of the above conclusion is that a hitherto unknown additional king named Sa’ītarna (either a new name or a rendition of the familiar name Šuttarna) also reigned between Sauštatar and Artatama I. Even if his name were a rendition of Šuttarna (possible but note the caution of de MARTINO 2014: 69 and MAIDMAN 2017: 16), Sa’ītarna cannot be identified with any known king of that name. With Sauštatar clearly attested as a successor of Šuttarna I (whose seal he used on Alalaḥ documents AT 13 and 14; WILHELM 1989: 28) and as the first Mittanian contemporary of Qīš-Addu, Sa’ītarna cannot be identified with Šuttarna I (contra YAMADA 2011: 61). With Šuttarna II being the son of Artatama I and the father of Tušratta, Sa’ītarna cannot be identified with Šuttarna II. Sa’ītarna was therefore a distinct king. Since he
appears in only one Terqa text so far, unless we assume an ephemeral reign, we might tentatively place him near the end of Qīš-Addu’s reign, i.e., as a successor of Parattarna II.

If the name Saʿītarna really is a rendition of Šuttarna, we might obtain a very neat papponymy sequence: Saʿītarna/Šuttarna–?Artatama I–Šuttarna II–?Artatama II–Šuttarna III. However, given the uncertainty in interpreting the name, it seems best to continue using the spelling from the Terqa document (TQ12 T19), rather than prematurely renumbering the later kings named Šuttarna. Whether Saʿītarna or Šuttarna, the name type is generally agreed to be of Indo-European origin, like Artatama (*rūdhāman, “having law as his abode”), Artasušumara (*rútšmūra, “mindful of law”), and Tušratta (tvesaratha, “having a rushing chariot”) (Hess 1993: 38-39, 161-162; Parpola 2015: 88); note also the recent interpretations of Kirta (*kṛta, “famed”), Parsatatar (*prasthātar, “front-standing chariot warrior”), Sauštatar (*savayṣṭhātar, “left-standing chariot warrior”), and Šattiwaza (*sātavāja, “handsome prize/strength”) (Parpola 2015: 88-89). Unfortunately, there is not yet any generally agreed specific etymology for names of the type Parattarna, Šuttarna (Hess 1993: 149-150), and the possibly distinct Saʿītarna. There might be possible connections between these names and Sanskrit elements like para (“excelling”), bhāra (“burden”), su (“good, well”), sāya (“sleeping”), tarpactedar/taurana (“calf, youth”), taraṇa (“helping, carrying, crossing”), but these are simply educated guesses.

It would make sense to review the relative chronology of the resulting sequence of Mittanian monarchs, which is entirely dependent on chronological synchronisms with foreign rulers. The evidence from Terqa has been used somewhat precipitately in discussions on the absolute chronology of the Ancient Near East (e.g., Gualandi 1998; Yamada 2011; Podany 2014). Given the probably incomplete state of the record, the best we can do here is simply check for approximate compatibility with a chronological arrangement that appears to be sensible. While my reconstruction does not depend precisely on any specific chronology, I am currently inclined toward a Lowered Middle Chronology for Mesopotamia (fall of Babylon 1587 BC: de Jong and Foerstmeyer 2010; Manning et al. 2016 and 2017) and a version of the Low Chronology for Egypt (Thutmose III from 1479 BC; Rameses II from 1279 BC: von Beckerath 1997; Krauss 2015). In the listing below the (accession) dates are very approximate and the symbol “~” indicates known synchronisms between monarchs. Cf. de Martino 2004: 40.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Monarch</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1570</td>
<td>Kirta (unclear if he reigned)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1550</td>
<td>Šuttarna I (son?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1520</td>
<td>Parattarna I (son?)<del>Idrimi of Alalah</del>Pilliya of Kizzuwatna~Zidanta II of Ḥatti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1485</td>
<td>Parsatatar (son?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1465</td>
<td>Sauštatar (son?)<del>Sinia, Qīš-Addu at Terqa; Tuδjašiya I of Ḥatti; Niqmėpa of Alalah</del>Sunaššara of Kizzuwatna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1435</td>
<td>Parattarna II (son?)~Qīš-Addu at Terqa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1425</td>
<td>Saʿītarna (brother?)~Qīš-Addu at Terqa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1400</td>
<td>Artatama I (son?)~Thutmose IV of Egypt 1397–1387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1380</td>
<td>Šuttarna II (son)~Amenhotpe III of Egypt in 1378 (Yr 10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1360</td>
<td>Artasušumara (son)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1358</td>
<td>Tušratta (brother)~Amenhotpe III in 1355 (Yr 33), Aḥenaten of Egypt in 1348 (Yr 2); Šuppiluliuma I of Ḥatti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1335</td>
<td>Artatama II (brother?)~Šuppiluliuma I of Ḥatti; Aššur-uballiṯ I of Assyria 1355–1319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1330</td>
<td>Šuttarna III (son)~Šuppiluliuma I of Ḥatti; Aššur-uballiṯ I of Assyria 1355–1319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1330</td>
<td>Šattiwaza (son of Tušratta)~Šuppiluliuma I of Ḥatti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1305</td>
<td>Šattuara I (son?)~Adad-nērāri I of Assyria 1297–1265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1285</td>
<td>Warsašutta (son)~Adad-nērāri I of Assyria 1297–1265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1265</td>
<td>Šattuara II (son?)~Salmānās-āšarēd I of Assyria 1265–1235</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The listing above generally assumes generations of 20–30 years, adjusted to fit any known synchronisms. Parattarna II and Saʿītarna are assumed to have been part of the same generation to fit more easily as contemporaries of Qīš-Addu after Sauštatar. Sauštatar and especially Parattarna I are assumed to have had relatively long reigns (although it is not necessary to infer more than 37 years for Parattarna I based on the Idrimi inscription). All this, excepting the explicit synchronisms (and even there the chronology is debatable) is largely conjecture, and the dates above could easily be shifted by a decade or
more as needed before c. 1400 BC. Equally conjectural are many of the chronological parameters that have been applied to history of Mittani and its dependencies. There appears to have been no Mittani (at least none reaching the Euphrates) when the Hittites marched on Babylon and back, but that does not necessarily affect the date of Kirta (who may have reigned elsewhere or not reigned at all). It is not yet possible to identify the culprit for the expulsion of Idrimi from his home city of Aleppo (Hittites, Mittanians, Egyptians, or internal trouble have all been proposed). Nevertheless, it would be reasonable to conclude that an Ultra-Low Chronology (fall of Babylon 1499 BC) is impossible (cf. MAIDMAN 2017: 25), and a traditional Low Chronology (fall of Babylon 1531 BC) perhaps unlikely.

The correlation of Egyptian aggression in Syria and the fortunes of Mittani is also unclear and cannot settle the chronology. Its high tides were in Year 2 of Thutmose I (c. 1493 BC, if not a decade earlier), Year 33 of Thutmose III (c. 1447 BC), and Year 3 of Amenhotep II (c. 1425 BC). It has been argued that the apparently powerful kings Parattarna I and Sauštatar must be placed so as to avoid these periods of presumed setbacks (FREU 2003: 38 Parattarna I before Thutmose I; 50 Sauštatar “I” before Thutmose III; 63, 65-70). But none of the relevant Egyptian texts name the contemporary Mittanian rulers; while the campaigns likely impacted Mittanian vassals, it remains unclear whether there were direct clashes with Mittani. The application of the term Naḫarina (generally assumed to mean Mittani) to Upper Mesopotamia in these texts has been questioned, and it has been argued that the locations involved were in Israel, Lebanon, and southern Syria (VANDERSLEYEN 1995: 257-261, 294-307, 324-329, although he allows for a reference to Karkamiš—some part of its territory—in a toponym list of Thutmose III). It has also been asserted that even at its height Mittani was so weak that we should not be surprised to find Egyptian incursions into its territory (WARBURTON 2001: 48-70).

Between the absence of evidence and the wide variation in interpretation, it does not seem realistic to insist upon a specific scenario in that early period, before c. 1400 BC. Suffice it to say that a power could assert itself between Zagros and the Mediterranean (Akkad, Assyria) without having to give up one end of its hegemony for another, a great king could have a bad day (Šamši-Adad I, Ḫammu-rāpi), or even lose his kingdom at the height of its power (İbāl-pī-El II, Rîm-Sin, Žimmī-Līm, Croesus). If Egyptian and Hittite interventions in Syria did reach the Euphrates and overran the lands of Mittanian vassals, these were passing and probably fleeting occurrences, not necessitating a simplistic chronological implication to get suspected great kings like Parattarna I and Sauštatar out of harm’s way; but if they do, the chronological arrangement above is certainly general and approximate enough to allow it. Overall, we do not yet know enough about Mittani (or Terqa, or Alalaḫ, or Nuzi) to settle the dilemmas of absolute chronology with precision. But what we do know appears to fit comfortably enough within an acceptable framework, even with the application of new evidence, like the present confirmation of a previously postulated king and the identification of a previously unknown one.
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23) Logographic writings of Hittite šuppiyaḫḫ — In NABU 2018/106, P. Taracha identified the correct reading of ZU-UH-HI³ in KUB 58.5 obv. i 13’ as KU-ah-ğu. While the logographic writing of the verb šuppiyaḫḫ- is rare, it is not unique. KU-ah-ğu also occurs in KUB 28.89 obv. i 11, a fragment of a festival pertaining to the cult of Nerik (see E. ROCHE 1961: 43 and Hethitisches Wörterbuch 467 [3. Ergänzungsheft]). I was able to locate both of these attestations, including KUB 58.5, under KU in the lexical files of the Hethitologie-Archiv in Mainz. A further attestation of logographic šuppiyaḫḫ-, in the 3rd person plural present, might occur in another fragment pertaining to the cult of Nerik (either a festival or a cult inventory text).³ KUB 53.21 rev. 8’ an ne-rik-ka₃ li-la-an ku-wa-pi KU-an-zi “And (in) Nerik, whenever they purify the lila-.” Since lilan (possibly the name of a building or room)⁵ is the accusative direct object, KU-an-zi can best be understood here as factitive šuppiyaḫḫanzi, although this is not entirely certain.⁴ An additional alleged attestation of logographic šuppiyaḫḫ- in a fragment of the hišwa- festival (VS NF 12.23 obv. 2’³) should not be read as KU-ğu, but must instead be emended to KU-še₂⁵.³)

The verbal substantive šuppiyaḫḫuwar is attested once in logographic writing in a cult inventory text, KBo 27.41: 4’ [...] xeš en₂ KU-ah-ğu-[...] . Although this line is quite fragmentary, it can most likely be restored as the name of a festival, since festival names commonly occur in the cult inventories. I thus propose a restoration as en₂ *šuppiyaḫḫuwarwaš “festival of purification”¹⁷ It is possible that the festival name also specified the object that was purified. Compare, for example, KUB 44.21 obv. ii 2–3: ģar<ZAG.GAR.RA> šuppiyaḫḫuwaš en₂ “festival of purification of the altar”.

Three of the aforementioned texts (KUB 28.89+, KUB 53.21 and KBo 27.41) are paleographically dated as Late New Script,⁶ while one text (KUB 58.5+) is a New Script copy of an older tablet (according to P. TARACHA 2018). Not surprisingly, this rare logographic writing of the verb šuppiyaḫḫ- is found precisely in later texts, two of which are cult inventories where one would particularly expect to find more efficient writing conventions.⁹ Significantly, the usual conservative tendency that can be generally observed in copies of older festival texts was not followed by the scribe of KUB 58.5 when he chose the writing KU-ah-ğu instead of syllabic šu-up-pi-ia-ah-ğu.

Notes

1. Thus the reading by D. GRODDEK 2010: 96, where the small capitals of the transliteration indicate uncertainty as to whether the signs should be read logographically or phonetically. Contra M. WITTE 2011: 178, who claimed that ZU UH HI cannot be read as an Akkadogram, this exact string occurs in the e.l₃.₄ḫuš lexical series (KBo 26.20 + KBo 13.1 obv. ii 33’ ) in the Akkadian word ši-ah-ğu ‘laughing’ (cf. CAD $ 235) equivalent to Sumerian zu₃ and
Hittite ḫḫḫšăršanan za (cf. HW² III ḫ/I, 10 and T. Scheucher 2012: 624–25). This reading, however, would not fit the context of KBo 54.134 obv. i 13′.

2. M. Cammarosano 2013: 80–81, 89 claimed this text should be identified as a cult inventory.

3. This could refer to a building; cf. ˡˡˡ-i-la-aš (IBrT 2.23 rev. 3) attested in the fragmentary context of a festival description.

4. The Mainzer file card transliterates the verb as KU-an-ci. If, however, lila- is understood as ‘conciliation, pacification’, referring to a festival (a well-attested festival name in the cult inventory texts as pointed out to me by M. Cammarosano [personal communication]; cf. CHD L–N 57), then this would unlikely be the object of ˢᵗᵘᵖᵖⁱʸᵃḇʰᵃⁿᶻⁱ. Correspondingly, the verb would have to be emended either to (흐)-ia-an-ci “they perform the conciliation (festival)” or possibly to SU-m-anzi “they give/ provide for a conciliation (festival)” (thus the alternative reading on a Mainzer file card for lilan).

5. I would like to thank Robert Marineau (personal communication) for bringing this text to my attention.

6. Thus D. Grodde et al. 2002: 45. This emendation corresponds to other attestations of gold or silver laḫanni- vessels used in libation ceremonies (cf. CHD L–N 6), thus the sentence of VS NF 12.13 obv. 2’ ending with ṣippantī in obv. 3′, can be translated, “[…] with two laḫanni- vessels of gold […] (someone) libates beer-wine.”

7. Cf. SISKUR ṣǔpṗiyaḥباحث in Kp 15/07 lo. e. 2 (M. Cammarosano 2018: 412–13) (pointed out to me by M. Cammarosano, personal communication).

8. KUB 28.89+, KUB 53.21 and KBo 27.41 are dated “šjh.” in S. Košak, hethiber.net/: hetkonk (v. 1.991).

9. On the orthographic peculiarities of cult inventory texts, see E. Rieken & M. Cammarosano forthcoming, who established that—contrary to expectations—cult inventory texts do not always use the most economic orthographic conventions.
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24) Stringing it all together — The various translations of the obscure Ugaritic word rīm (KTU 1.3 [RS 2.014] +3.363 + 3.364) iii 4; KTU 1.7 [RS 5.180 + 5.198]:22; KTU 1.101 [RS 24.245]:17) include “coral(s),” “beloved,” “instrument which accompanies singing”(i) and even “Gegenstand der Liebe (Amulett)”(ii). Instead of any of these, some years ago J. C. Greenfield (apud Pope 1977: 294) had “suggested (orally) that the word might be connected with rim, ‘bull’ or ‘buffalo,’ and compared Mesopotamian harps or lyres in the form of a bull’s head”(ii). Later, Watson (1983: 162) also translated “bull-headed harp” (cf. also Watson 1994: 61) and Wyatt (2002: 76 and n. 36) proposed “bull-shaped instrument”, both similarly referring to the form of the musical instrument, perhaps a harp (لى-کار, “lyre”), as in the famous Sumerian examples from Ur, on which see below(i). Support for this now comes from Akkadian, where ala means “bull of heaven” (CDA, 13b)(iii) but can also mean “(small) lyre, harp.” Kilmmer (1995-1997: 465) had noted that “Some terms, like ala (á-là) and balaggu (balag), seem to represent both stringed instruments and percussion instruments; we have tried to find a way round this confusion by understanding that the sound boxes of a balaggu “harp” or the ala instrument could have been drummable resonators and stringed instruments at the same time, and that eventually their names were associated with
the percussion instruments alone”. Mirelman (2007) has also discussed the wider semantic field of Sumerian á-lá = Akkadian alâ, but that discussion is really complementary to the present enquiry, since it dealt primarily with the use of the term to denote a kind of drum. As noted by Shehata (2017: 74): “der Terminus alâ(m) scheint nicht ausschließlich die große Rahmentrommel bezeichnet zu haben. So lassen Belege aus Emesal-Texten vermuten, dass derselbe Terminus auch ein kleines, von einer Person zu tragendes Instrument meint”. She added: “Ausgehend von seiner Einordnung und Beschreibung [in the lexical lists] muss es sich bei diesem alâ(m) um eine kleine Leier oder Harfe handeln” (ibid., 74). The Ugaritic pair rîm and rîmt suggests an analogous formation as in Akkadian of alâ(m), “lyre” from alâ, “bull”. This leaves us with the following comparative table (Table 1):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mesopotamia</th>
<th>meaning</th>
<th>Ugarit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>alâ</td>
<td>bull</td>
<td>rîm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>alâ(m)</td>
<td>(bull-headed) lyre</td>
<td>rîmt</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1.

If the etymological link indicated here is tenable, we may reasonably ask why such a link should be made. What is significant about the relationship between the bull (originally specifically the aurochs) and the musical instrument? Was it a mere assonantal equivalence, or perhaps something more culturally significant? We shall suggest reasons here why the latter is the more likely answer.

Firstly, the material remains and iconographical references should be noted. Several stringed instruments (classified by various authorities as harps or lyres) were found in the excavations at Ur and other sites (see Table 2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>British Museum</th>
<th>British Museum</th>
<th>Iraq Museum</th>
<th>Penn State Museum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Queen’s Lyre”</td>
<td>“Silver Lyre”</td>
<td>“Golden Lyre”, “Bull’s Lyre”</td>
<td>“Great Lyre”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOOLLEY “harp”</td>
<td>WOOLLEY “lyre”</td>
<td>WOOLLEY “lyre”</td>
<td>WOOLLEY “lyre”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U 10412 (2nd frag in PG/1130)</td>
<td>U 12354</td>
<td>U 12353</td>
<td>U 10556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOOLLEY plates 109-110</td>
<td>WOOLLEY plate 111</td>
<td>WOOLLEY plates 113-115, 117</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tomb of Qn Shub-ad (now read Puabi)</td>
<td>Death pit of Tomb PG/1237</td>
<td>Death pit of Tomb PG/1237</td>
<td>Tomb of King</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM 121198.a</td>
<td>BM 121199</td>
<td>U 12353</td>
<td>BM 17694B/C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Aurochs-Head Instruments from Ur (Woolley 1934)

As Table 2 indicates, there was a remarkable concentration of instruments in the royal necropolis at Ur. Several examples survive of instruments with an elaborate aurochs head attached to the sounding box. The Pennsylvania example also has an inlaid panel below the bull’s head, showing among other things a donkey playing a bull-headed lyre, which is supported by what appears to be a bear. In addition, such instruments are illustrated twice on the Royal Standard from Ur (BM 121201).

Bull-lyres are also illustrated on the Gudea stela, and on a number of cylinder seals from scattered sites (e.g. Rice 1998: 95 fig. 8.3; a man with bull’s head plays an instrument on which the sounding box is an entire aurochs, Susa, ca 2700 [AMIE 1966: 161 fig. 115], 1980, §1765). See also the seal from Failaka Island, Bahrain (Rice 1994: 166, fig. 7.9, Kuwait Nat. Mus. 881 UK). Van Dijk listed a number of further examples: from Fara (Martin 1988 catalogue numbers 529-531, VA 8629, VA 6665, VA 6598 and VA 6639; and AMIE 1980 §1201). From Nippur she noted AMIE 1980, §1704; from Khafaje, AMIE 1980,
§1200; and from Uruk, AMIET 1980, §1198. A seal impression from Ur depicts a harp being played by an equid on a seal impression found at Ur, see ZETTLER – HÔNE (1998: 57). For a general survey see LAWERGEN 1997.

It is surely significant that all the Ur examples noted above come from funerary deposits. An online note on the Great Lyre from the Penn State Museum draws on this fact, observing that “The imagery used in the lyre represent significant parts of Early Mesopotamian funerary rituals. The bearded bull on the front represents the sun god Shamash, depicted in cuneiform texts as the golden bull with lapis lazuli beard. Shamash is the divine judge who shines light on all things. Only Shamash can descend into the underworld and emerge again at sunrise.” And VAN DIJK interpreted the lower lapis lazuli scenes on the Great Lyre as showing a funerary feast. This reinforces the broader argument, as it not only chimes well with the concentration of all the Ur material in a funerary context, but also corresponds to the later well-known function of the Ugaritic goddess Shapsh as psychopomp: she descends into the underworld with the corpse of the deceased Niqmaddu IV in KTU 1.161:18-19, as well as cooperating with Anat in the recovery of Baal’s cadaver from the underworld and his later burial (KTU 1.6 i 14-18). However, we should not conclude that this was the exclusive context, since reference of the seals remains imponderable, and the rīmt instrument mentioned in the Baal Cycle (KTU 1.3 iii 4, cited in 1.7 R 22, and also occurring in 1.101:18) is not linked to a specifically funerary context, unless the pacification rite described, setting concord in the earth etc.10 (KTU 1.1 i-ii [1- to 4]), ii 19-21, 1.3 iii 15-17, 1.3 iv 8-10, 22-25, (27-31)), be taken as broadly modelled on burial rites. But the emphasis on a chthonian dimension echoes the much older evidence of bull-symbolism, which D. LEWIS-WILLIAMS, in his analysis of Upper Palaeolithic religiosity, examined in the context of the imagery of the European parietal art, to be seen as reflecting shamanic practices and beliefs11.

A further possible symbolic dimension to the bull imagery noted here is suggested by the study of Palaeolithic and other early musical instruments. It has been suggested that instruments made from the remains of certain animals could harness the symbolic power of the animal in question, such as a vulture, a mammoth or an aurochs, and enable the instrument-player to identify in some mystical way with the animal and exercise its power12. The same principle explains the widespread use of animal parts as clothing (particularly by cultic personnel such as shamans) for instance leopard, lion or tiger skins, deer antlers, bear claws and so on. The masks worn by Assyrian priests in the cult of the sacred tree (sc. of royal ancestors) are a good ancient Near Eastern example of the symbolic transfer believed to be operative.

Notes
1. WATSON 1996: 78.
3. For descriptions of such lyres see VAN DIJK 2013.
6. Kindly brought to our attention by Nele Ziegler.
7. The feminine form rūm (rīm) denotes a stringed musical instrument, indicated by the parallelism in KTU 1.101:17 to be a knār, “lyre” (noted by WYATT 2019 in press).
8. VAN DIJK 2013: 10-11.
12. S. WYATT 2016, passim (following VIVEIRO DE CASTRO 1998); WYATT – WYATT 2013: 423 n. 31. The practice may even have involved human remains, harnessing ancestral powers: S. WYATT 2009: 15-16.

References
25) Wrapping up Ug. prtl — In a recent contribution to this bulletin (NABU 2018/105) it was proposed that Ug. prtl means “turban” or the like. In response (e-mail 14.03.2019), Professor Manfried Dietrich suggested an etymology for this word, namely Common Semitic *PTL/PTL, “to wrap”, where in all the Semitic languages except for Ugaritic, the /l/ has been de-emphasised as /l/, probably due to the presence of /l/ in Akk. petālu(m), petēlu(m), “drehen,wickeln” (AHw, 847a; cf. CDA, 270a; CAD P, 270-271); Aram. prtl, “to twist” (DSA II, 717a); Harari (af)fiṭāla, “(to) spin” (EDH, 65b); Jibb. fitl, “to roll a wick” (JH, 64), Arab. fatala, “he twisted it” (AEL, 2333) as well as Heb. ptl, “drehen,wickeln”, Heb. pāṭēlī, “verschnürt; Faden” and Heb. pāṭalot, “verdreht,verschroben” (KAHAL, 466b). Cf. also Syr. prtl, “to twist” (DDVS, 26b; SL, 1268) and Mand. pīula, “wreath” (MD, 384b; cf. PTL, ibid. 385a). For PTL to be
the underlying root of Ug. ṭrl, the middle doubled consonant of the root (/ṭ), probably as */ptṭulu/, must have been dissimilated by an /r/. In fact, as an example of this very change, in the section on “Dissimilation von Geminaten” of his Grundriss (p. 245, §90 hh. A.f. ζ.), BROCKELMANN mentioned Neo-Syriac partel, “drehen”, which (apart from the de-emphasis of /ṭ/) corresponds closely to Ug. ṭrl.

Notes

1. Another example is Ug. plṭ, “to be safe”; D: “to save, rescue” (DUL, 662), Heb. plṭ, “to escape”, pi. “to save” (HALOT, 930-931), Old Aram. plṭ, pa. “to deliver, save” (DNWSI, 915), Syr. plṭ, “to escape, flee” ; pa. “to allow to escape” (SL, 1198-1199) but Arab. ḥalata, afalata, “to escape, get away” (AEL, 2435-2436), with non-emphatic /ṭ/; for the /ṭ/ - /ṭ/ interchange (Ug. ṭrl / Aram. brṭl see also Akk. balaṭu, “to live; D: bring back to life, revive etc.” (CDA, 36-37). For the interchange between /ṭ/ and /ṭ/ in Ugaritic personal names cf. TROPPER, 98 §2.134 b. Anm. and ibid., 97 §32.133.

2. As Manfried Dietrich proposed. Dissimilation by means of /r/ in long (geminated) consonants is well-known in Semitic; cf. LIPINSKI 2001, 183 §23.9 and for an example in Ugaritic cf. TROPPER, 151 §33.122.2.
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26) The impression of an inscribed Middle Assyrian cylinder seal on a Late Babylonian cuneiform tablet — The cuneiform tablet TCL 13 182 (AO 6919) is a rental contract in dialogue form, dated 13/IV/2 Darius I = 13 July 520 BCE¹. The tablet measures 10.5 cm wide by 7.0 cm high. It was issued and sealed by Bel-iddina šatam E-ana, son of Šin-erēš, and by two of his deputies, Nergal-Šar-usur qīpu and Barik-‘El ša-rēš šarri, bēl-piqiṭī E-ana. The tablet’s three seal impressions—Bel-iddina’s on the upper edge, the remaining two on the lower, each captioned in cuneiform NA₄KIŠB PN—were first published by DELAPORTE 1923, p. 175; pl. 121, 1a–1b (A. 795). The two impressions on the lower edge were left by contemporary stamp seals (see now, EHRENBERG 1999, nos. 53 and 74) and need detain us no further. Bel-iddina’s impression (Fig. 1), on the other hand, appears to have been produced by an heirloom, a centuries-old cuneiform-inscribed and figured cylinder seal. The seal, some 4.3 cm in circumference (*diam. 1.4 cm), was rolled through one-and-a-half rotations, more or less centered on the inscription. The impression is preserved to perhaps half its original height at 1.6 cm, with neither its upper nor lower edges evident. DELAPORTE (1923, p. 175), who did not remark on the seal’s antiquity, described it simply as depicting “[u]n archer diadémé bande son arc et s’apprête à tirer sur un bouquetin dressé, dont il est séparé par un arbre chargé de fruits”. The cuneiform seal inscription (Fig. 2), consisting of a personal name and patronym inscribed so as to be read in the impression in three horizontal, ever-briefer lines inserted in the space between the backs of the hunter and his prey, does not, however, name its user, Bel-iddina, rather, it reads (following Delaporte, for the moment, in modern notation) ṣu-ŠEŠ-SUM-na ṣel .addProperty(ignored) ṣama-Ša-ha-iddina son of Nabû-lē’ti” (ibid.).

Fig. 1. AUWE 18 no. 217 (author’s composite, 2:1).

Fig. 2. Cuneiform hand copy (E. Ehrenberg).
MATTHEWS 1990, in his computer-aided comprehensive examination of Middle Assyrian seal styles, included a life-size line drawing of this impression (no. 312), identifying it as an example of the “Adad-nirari I style” of the ca. early thirteenth century BCE. He observed that a scene featuring a tree with a twisted trunk (and globular crown) on a hill marked by a scale pattern (here, not preserved) and a kneeling archer aiming at an animal (lower half of neither preserved) on the other side of the tree is one of the most characteristic scenes of this period (ibid., p. 95; cf. nos. 311, 313–14).

EHRENBERG 1999, as part of her study of the seal impressions on E-ana tablets in the Yale Babylonian Collection (AUWE 18), published a more detailed photograph and line-drawing revealing new iconographic details (pl. 28, no. 217). She particularly noted the “superb, highly modeled quality of the seal” (ibid., p. 39), citing by their publication sigla the same three examples for comparanda as had MATTHEWS (1990, p. 102); MOORTGAT 1942, figs. 16 and 17 from Aššur, the latter with the remains of two similar rayed field fillers as seen partially impressed here above the inscription, and fig. 18 (de Clercq no. 311). Not noted by previous commentators is the treatment of the hair held in place by a diadem, which is wider above the forehead, narrower above the ears, and tied in a knot behind the head with the loose ends pointing downward toward the drawn right hand. These features are closely paralleled by the (standing) archer on the cylinder seal BN 367 (= MATTHEWS 1990, no. 308), also in the “Adad-nirari I style”; in both cases the bowstring and arrow-shaft pass impossibly out of sight behind the hunter’s head while the hand drawing the bow is placed to the left of his head and above the right shoulder, conventions regularly seen in comparable contemporary Egyptian New Kingdom representations. Perhaps an idealized image of Adad-nirari I, himself, (r. ca. 1305–ca. 1274 BCE7) was intended to be seen here.

EHRENBERG (1999, p. 39) further observed that at the presumed time of the carving of the original intaglio, Uruk would have been subject to Kassite control, thus it is likely that the seal made its way to Uruk only later. She also suggested (ibid., p. 102) that the present seal inscription was a later addition; nevertheless, the script of the inscription, despite two slightly oddly carved signs (SUM, NA), which may be nothing more than an illiterate seal cutter’s infelicities, is still within the range of Middle Assyrian lapidary sign forms.

Today, in light of the seal impression’s signature motif and style and the currently accepted conventions for normalizing Middle Assyrian personal names, the three signs comprising Šamaš-aḫa-iddina’s patronym, first read Š-PA-DA = Nabû-ššu-iddin, would be accepted as the son of Iba-Ŝu-iddin, grandson of Qābī-Ŝu-iddin, grand-grandson of Ibaššu-illī, and a great-great-grand-son of king Adad-nirari I, is known from several sources dated to the later Middle Assyrian period (WIGGEMANN 2006). In a Neo-Assyrian copy of a Middle Babylonian letter (K. 1109+K. 3045), the contemporary Babylonian king Adad-suma-šu-ur addressed his derisive missive to both the de jure king Aššur-nîrari III (as per his place in the Assyrian King List) and to Ili-ḫaddā, calling them together “kings of Assyria” (ll. 1–2)4. Ili-ḫaddā was in fact sukkalu rabi(u) “grand vizier” and šar Ḥanigalbat “king of Hanigalbat”5, as were his father and grandfather (SZUCHMAN 2007, p. 213); he was also the father of Assyrian king Ninurta-apil-Enur (r. ca. 1191–ca. 1179 BCE), the progenitor of the remainder of the main line of Middle Assyrian kings reigning beginning shortly after Tukulti-Ninurta I’s murder, ca. 1207 BCE6.

Šamaš-aḫa-iddina, should he be accepted as the son of Ili-ḫaddā, son of Aššur-iddin, would be reunited with his other brothers, the king Ninurta-apil-Enur and the limu-official Marduk-taššin Qutmušu7. Further, it would appear that the seal in question, perhaps one of the finest examples of ca. early 13th c. BCE Middle Assyrian cylinder seals depicting a royal hunting scene, somehow came, a century later, into the hands of Šamaš-aḫa-iddina who then had it inscribed for himself. How and when this seal then reached the hands of Bēl-iddina in E-ana in Uruk some six centuries later also remains to be determined8.

Notes
1. For an edition of the text, see MOORE 1935, pp. 186–89, CNB 182; cf. JANOVIC 2013, p. 239 and n. 878.
2. All Middle Assyrian regnal dates cited herein follow BRINKMANN 1977, without prejudice.
3. E.g., ÜNGNAD 1938, p. 448, “kaum Š-PA-DA = Nībī-ššu-iddin”; also note the variant ŠINGIR-I-ḪADU-PA-DA in two exemplars (B, C) of the Assyrian King List (GRAYSON 1980–83, p. 111), suggesting here a case of crasis wherein in

– 42 –
pronunciation and spelling the –t of the preceding pronominal suffix was assimilated to the following i- prefix of the predicate yielding the form ỉlî-haddā, or the like; cf. III R 4 no. 5 ((K. 3045): 5 DINGIR-ha-da a [...] 4. cdl.ucla.edu/P393862; for a modern edition, and lists of previous editions, translations, and discussions, see FRAZER 2015, pp. 208–25. Contrast HARPER 1909, no. 924, where the unmarked restorations of the signs at the ends of ll. 1 (~d[a-a-ni]) and 5 (~[a-ni]) (cf. WATERMAN 1930, p. 142, no. 924) are not supported by earlier copies, e.g., III R 4 no. 5, ROST 1897 245 no. 5 (courtesy Mary FRAZER, personal communication).

5. The impression of Ỉlî-haddā’s cylinder seal on a clay envelope from Tell Sabi Abyad (T93-36) is also known; it depicts, presumably, Ỉlî-haddā himself seated on a horse facing left, half-rearing on its hind legs, in front of a city-gate-like structure to the right (WIGGEMANN 2006).

6. Cf. Eponym List C (KA V 19), l. 6: ʿDINGIR-po-du DUMU SAG […] whose broken patronym is irreconcilable with the patronym (Aššur-iddin) of the grand vizier; UNGNAD (1938, p. 437) stated categorically that most of the names in List C, including the name in question, are not eponyms.

7. ANDRAE 1913, p. 85, no. 129; cf. UNGNAD 1938, p. 438, ll. 129; SZUCHMAN 2007, p. 213, fig. 4.

8. Also note AUWE 18 no. 216, another incompletely rolled, ca. thirteenth century BCE figured Middle Assyrian cylinder seal impression, this one depicting, from the left, a beardless figure, forearms raised as in adornation, and a bearded mountain goat both profile left, their backs to a few leaf-tipped branches of a tree; it is the only seal impression on NCBT 551 rev., an unpublished, undated, Late Babylonian E-ana archive tablet fragment in the Yale Babylonian Collection, listing nine individuals by name and the [quantity] of silver each received (courtesy of Elizabeth E. Payne, personal communication).
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27) Slave Buying His Own Freedom in Assyria — The cuneiform document KMM A 46 nr. A-2716-4 located at the University of Tartu Art Museum was published for the first time in 1989 in the first issue of the Russian scientific journal Vestnik Drevney Istorii (Journal of Ancient History) by N. Jankovskaya (1989, 82–85). This text was also later translated into Estonian and published in 2010 by V. Sazonov and P. Espak in the history journal Tuna (Espak, Sazonov 2010). The photo of the cuneiform tablet was first published in 1982 in the volume Alma Mater Tartuensis (Ilomet, Palamets 1982, 150) and in 2006 in a book dedicated to the 200th anniversary of the University of Tartu Art Museum (Sahk 2006, 32–33). Here,
we present a new transliteration and English translation of this important text, which describes a slave buying his freedom from his owner.

This cuneiform tablet was donated to the University of Tartu Art Museum by the Estonian General Johan Laidoner (1884-1953) who, from October to December 1925, stayed in Mosul as chairman of the committee of the League of Nations resolving border disputes between Iraq and Turkey. During his stay in Iraq, he bought several artefacts of Mesopotamian origin from Mosul’s antiquities market, including the cuneiform tablet presented here. Laidoner mentions these facts in a letter which he sent to his wife Maria on the 5th of November, 1925. When he returned to Estonia in 1926, he donated different Ancient Mesopotamian artefacts acquired from Iraq to the University of Tartu (Erelt 2006).

The tablet was written in the Middle-Assyrian dialect of the Akkadian language and probably originates from the reign of Tiglath-Pileser I (1115-1076) (Jankovskaya 1989, 83). We do not have any information about the place of origin of the tablet. The text does not belong to the Urad-Šerk’a (son of Melisah) archive edited by Postgate (1988), since the patronym of our Urad-Šerp’a is different.

The cuneiform tablet and its envelope are made of unbaked clay. It measures 5.9 x 4.4 x 1.9 cm, and the measurements of the cover are 6.5 x 4.9 x 2.5 cm. The tablet is a typical juridical document from the Middle-Assyrian period. First the participants of the contract are specified, then the nature and value of the transaction. In this text six witnesses are mentioned, which is certainly more than usual. The month and year of the transaction (containing a previously unknown year eponym) are inscribed at the end of the text along with the scribe’s name and seal impressions. The tablet was sealed in a clay envelope on which the nature of the document and its date were written.

This legal document is quite unique because it describes how a slave (Šamaš-taklāku) bought himself out of slavery. Information about such procedures from Ancient Assyria and the entire Ancient Near East is rare and our text offers new unique perspectives in interpreting the nature of slavery in the ancient world. Although the nature and causes of Šamaš-taklāku’s “slavery” is unknown, we can conclude that at least in certain circumstances a slave could own private property and use this property to buy himself out from his lower social position. In that sense the “slavery” of Šamaš-taklāku is possibly comparable to the “financial imprisonment” of today’s bankrupted individuals unable to pay back their debts and therefore obliged to fulfil certain conditions to regain their economic, financial and personal freedom. In that sense the document indicates that ancient “slavery” and “personal liberty” were in practice a much more complex issue than commonly thought.

Transliteration (slashes indicate continuation of the line over right edge to the reverse of the tablet)

Obv. 1. =aUTU-ta-ak-la-ku / IR
2. ša =IR-Sē-ru-a / DUMU DUMU-[^IM]
3. a-na pa-tu-ar ra-/-mi-ni-šu
4. i-na E be-li-šu
5. a-na ra-/-mi-/-ni-šu ú-/-lu-/-li
6. 1 5/6 MA.NA 5 GIN / KU.BABBAR
7. i-di-in-ma ra-ma/-i/-an-šu
8. ip-ši-ur / UD-mi
9. an-ni-e šu-/-u-tu / ú DUMU.MEŠ/-šu ša
10. IR-Sē-ru-[a] DUMU DUMU-[^IM] be-li-šu a-na 4UTU-ta-ak/-la-ku
11. a DUMU.MEŠ-šu la i/-tu-ru/-ma
12. la i-/-ra-/-gu-mu
Edge
13. tu-aro
14. ú da-ba-bu
Rev. 15. la-a-aš-šu
16. IGI Pu-šu-nu DUMU Ta-ri-ba-ši
17. IGI A-bu-ia-e DUMU 4AG-SIG\(_2\)
18. IGI Su-ti-ši DUMU T[^el]-ia-e
19. IGI A-pil-ku-bi DUMU [A-bi]-ri-iš
20. IGI =IR-Sē-ru-a
21. DUMU Zu-zu-a LÜ.SU.I
22. IGI A-da-lāl
U.E. 23. ITU.NIN-É.GAL [li-mu]
24. ₆=BE-LUGAL-DINGIR.MEŠ
L.E. 25. =Pa-ku-a

Text on the envelope
1. DUB i-ip-ti-ri
2. ša ₆=UTU-ta-ak-la-ku
   (cylinder seal impression)
3. ITU.NIN-É.GAL li-mu
4. ₆=BE-LUGAL-DINGIR.MEŠ
   (cylinder seal impression)
   (Espak, Sazonov 2010, 83-88; Jankovskaya 1989, 82-85).

Translation
1 Šamaš-taklāku, ² a slave of Urad-Šērū’a son of Mār-Adad,
2 to release himself (and) free himself from the household of his master ³ has paid 1 5/6 mina and 5 shekels of silver,
4 and has released himself.
5 From this day on he and his sons, ¹⁰ (namely) those of Urad-Šērū’a son of Mār-Adad, his master, ¹¹ shall not revoke
6 or raise a claim against Šamaš-taklāku and his sons.
7 There shall be no revocation and litigation.
8 Before Pāhī’nū son of Taribātu. ¹⁷ Before Abuyā’u son of Nabū-dammīq. ¹⁸ Before Sūṭ’tu son of Tāyā’u. ¹⁹ Before
9 Apil-Kūbi son of Abī-ērīš. ¹⁰ Before Urad-Šērū’a son of Šērū’a, the barber. ²² Before Adallāl.
10 Month of Bēlat-ēkalli, ²⁵ eponymate of Illīl-šarr-ili.
¹¹ This short article was written with the financial support of the grants PUT 500 and PHVKU16926.

We are very thankful to Prof. S. Parpola for help with the transliteration and translation. We are thankful to Prof.
G. J. Selz, Dr. S. Fink, Prof. V. Emelianov and Dr. Jaume Llop-Raduà for critical remarks.
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28) A duck-weight from the reign of Tukulti-Ninurta II (890-884 BC) — This duck-weight in the British Museum, numbered BM 91439 (= 1848-11-04.167), was brought from Layard’s first season of excavations in Assyria (1845-1847), and is registered as coming from Nimrud. No more detailed
provenance seems available. It is made of fine-grained whitish stone, and has the conventional shape of a goose or duck with the head turned to rest on the back. It is 7.1 cm long, 4.1 cm wide, and 4.1 cm high; its mass is c. 178 grams. On the neck there are eight horizontal strokes, with the upper two separate from the lower six, and there are six lines of cuneiform inscription on the left side. Although illustrations of this weight have been published (photographs: Kwasman and Parpola 1991: xxxi, fig. 6b, right; Curtis and Reade 1995, 194 no. 205; drawing with partial copy of cuneiform: Al-Rawi 2008, 130, no. 15-I, reprinted by Peyronnel 2015: 107, no. 37, Fig. 11), much of the text has remained enigmatic. This is because, while the object is virtually complete, the inscribed surface is so scratched and abraded that it is difficult to distinguish many of the signs. The following incomplete transliteration is the result of prolonged and repeated study in different lights.

1. DINGIR-ba-ni NAM ZAG =KU-MAŠ SANGA AŠ 20 ŠÙ 20 KUR AŠ.KI
2. a-šar’ x x x x šá KUR KUR lu-ub-da
3. a-na maḫi x x (x)-a’ ma’ i-su-ra x x
4. u-piš-ma’ (?)
5. 6-su

1. Ilu-bani, border governor of Tukulti-Ninurta, sangû of Assur, king of the universe, king of Assyria,
2. …of the mountain of the land of Lubda
3. for the… did I assuredly
4. make (this)!
5. One sixth

Note

1. Reading NAM ZAG as pḫat pāṭi.

Discussion

Ilu-bani had this weight made out of stone from Lubda, just as c. 808 BC the turtanu Nergal-ilaya had a weight made out of Median stone (George 1979: 134). Lubda lay south-east of Ashur near Babylonian territory (Kessler 1987), and was somehow associated with Suhi, since the governors of Lubda and Suhi jointly presented Ashurnasirpal II with five elephants (Grayson 1991: 291). Suhi was south-west of Ashur on the Euphrates, also near Babylonian territory. A pro-Assyrian governor of Suhi under Tukulti-Ninurta II and Ashurnasirpal II was named in Assyrian royal documents as Ilu-ibni (Brinkman 1968: 183-184; Baker 2000: 528). We take Ilu-bani and Ilu-ibni to be the same person, with Ilu-bani as the preferable form since it is the one given on his own weight.

The term 6-su indicates that this weight is one sixth of a heavy mina of c. 1070g. Reade (2018: 159) has proposed that 1070g was the traditional mass of the mina in northern Assyria (e.g. Nineveh), later standardized as 1010g so that it was exactly double the traditional 505g mina used in southern Assyria (e.g.
The Neo-Assyrian word *muškinnu* — The unusual noun *muškinnu* is attested exclusively in two lexical texts – both found in Nineveh and dating to the Neo-Assyrian period – as *muš-kin[u]-nu* (K 04400+: r i 23') and *muš-tin-nu* (K 08285+: i’ 1’). This word is doubtfully suggested to mean ‘bel[t]’ (see, e.g., AHw. or CDA s.v.; more cautiously CAD ‘part of a ḫindu-bag’) because both lexical texts list clothing, garments, bands, belts, bags, etc. Morphologically, *muškinnu* is a derivative with -inn(um), an affix usually attached to foreign words (see von Soden 1952[1995], 90 § 58 b, with references). Consequently, *muškinnu* may derive from *mušku*. Then, it is difficult not to consider *muškinnu* as derived from the demonym *Mušku*, reused in Neo-Assyrian times for the Phrygians (see Radner 2013; likely also in Hieroglyphic Luwian *Muska-*; KARKAMIŠ A6 §6). If this identification is right, *muškinnu* very likely means ‘fibula’ rather than ‘belt’. Indeed, the Phrygians were the firsts to produce bronze fibulae in Anatolia in the second half of the 8th century BC and it is clear that this Phrygian product spread beyond the Phrygian lands: in the West, “Phrygian fibulae were copied by East Greeks and apparently by Lydians” (Muscarella 1967, 58) and, in the East, Warpalawas, the king of Tabal, is depicted as wearing one of these fibulae in the Ivriz relief (Mellink 1979, 252; see also van Dongen 2014, 702). Note also that another Neo-Assyrian tablet from Nineveh attests *Muški* (scil. Phrygian) products related to clothing in Assyria: 2 TŪG.KLTA-hal-la-pat mu-us-ki1 unfolds ‘2 Muški reinforced lower garments – Abdi-milki, the chief tailor’ (SAA 07 126, 4-5).

**Bibliography**


**I. L. FINKEL,** The British Museum

J. E. READE, University of Copenhagen <juilianreade@gmail.com>

29) The Neo-Assyrian word *muškinnu* — The unusual noun *muškinnu* is attested exclusively in two lexical texts – both found in Nineveh and dating to the Neo-Assyrian period – as *muš-kin[u]-nu* (K 04400+: r i 23') and *muš-tin-nu* (K 08285+: i' 1'). This word is doubtfully suggested to mean ‘belt’ (see, e.g., AHw. or CDA s.v.; more cautiously CAD ‘part of a ḫindu-bag’) because both lexical texts list clothing, garments, bands, belts, bags, etc. Morphologically, *muškinnu* is a derivative with -inn(um), an affix usually attached to foreign words (see von Soden 1952[1995], 90 § 58 b, with references). Consequently, *muškinnu* may derive from *mušku*. Then, it is difficult not to consider *muškinnu* as derived from the demonym *Mušku*, reused in Neo-Assyrian times for the Phrygians (see Radner 2013; likely also in Hieroglyphic Luwian *Muska-*; KARKAMIŠ A6 §6). If this identification is right, *muškinnu* very likely means ‘fibula’ rather than ‘belt’. Indeed, the Phrygians were the firsts to produce bronze fibulae in Anatolia in the second half of the 8th century BC and it is clear that this Phrygian product spread beyond the Phrygian lands: in the West, “Phrygian fibulae were copied by East Greeks and apparently by Lydians” (Muscarella 1967, 58) and, in the East, Warpalawas, the king of Tabal, is depicted as wearing one of these fibulae in the Ivriz relief (Mellink 1979, 252; see also van Dongen 2014, 702). Note also that another Neo-Assyrian tablet from Nineveh attests *Muški* (scil. Phrygian) products related to clothing in Assyria: 2 TŪG.KLTA-hal-la-pat mu-us-ki1 unfolds ‘2 Muški reinforced lower garments – Abdi-milki, the chief tailor’ (SAA 07 126, 4-5).
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30) An Unusual Arc and the Eclipsed Moon with Colour of elmēšu — It is known that an auroral oval extends to mid- to low-latitude areas during large geomagnetic storms such as occurred in September 1859 and November 1882 (Cliver and Dietrich 2013; Hayakawa, Ebihara, Hand, et al. 2018; Love 2018), as shown in Figure 1. The earliest datable auroral records are thought to trace back to Babylonian observations. During the night on the 12th/13th March -566, a Babylonian observer recorded that a “red glow (akakūtu) flared up in the west” in Babylon (Stephenson, Willis, and Hallinan 2004; Hayakawa et al. 2016). The Astronomical Diaries from Babylonia (ADB) record eight additional auroral candidates, four of which are considered likely to be aurora (Hayakawa et al. 2016).

Record #8 of Hayakawa et al. (2016, 4) is the case of a coloured night rainbow, depicted with a relative clause ṣā MŪŠ₃₂₃₂₃₂₃₂₃₂₃₂₃₂₃₂₃₂₃₂₃₃ SUD. This type of coloured night rainbow is consistent with the description of the arc structure of an auroral display, as shown in Figure 1 (e.g. Neumeyer 1864, 242; Capron 1883; see also, Chamberlain 1961, 116-124). Upon this interpretation, Hayakawa et al. (2016, 4) translate the relative clause as “whose (the rainbow’s) shine was red”, following the translation by Sachs and Hunger (1996, 291). However, in this paper, we would like to propose another possible interpretation of this clause. The transcription of record #8 and our new translation are as follows:

ADB -122A ‘Obv.’ 11’
[x x] šā ṣā šin t’IRM AN NA šā žmāšū (MŪŠ₃₂₃₂₃₂₃₂₃₂₃₂₃₂₃₂₃₂₃₃ SUD) TA SI ana Á ULÙ [GIB…]
[…] and (?) setting of the moon, a rainbow whose glows were (like) elmēšu [stretched] from the north to the south side […]

This entry reports an unusual rainbow observed after the setting of the moon during the night of the 28th/29th or 29th/30th April -122 (the normalized lunar ages on these days are 0.210 and 0.244, respectively. See Hayakawa et al. 2016, 4). The single sign SUD is difficult to be transcribed in this context. However, the SUD sign is used to describe a colour of sūmu, or “redness”, of the moon in the eclipses recorded in ADB (-108B ‘Obv.’ 8) and in three observational reports of individual eclipses (Hunger, Sachs, and Steele 2001, No. 20 ‘Obv. 8’, No. 21 Obv. 9, No. 22 Rev. 1-2) (see also Hunger, Sachs, and Steele 2001, 38). This indicates that the SUD sign is used to describe a colour of the part of the moon that entered the Earth’s umbra. This sign, as the complement of sūmu, was translated as “red brown” by Sachs and Hunger (1996, 355), and by Hunger, Sachs, and Steele (2001, 63, 65, 67). The SUD sign in ADB -122A may also be a complement to describe the colour of the “glows” of an unusual rainbow.

This reminds us of the compound Sumerogram SUD.ÁG, which represents the Akkadian word elmēšu or elmēšu, and may mean “amber”. The word elmēšu seems to be the cognate of the Hebrew hašmal, which appears in Ezekiel 1:4, 27; 8:2 and is translated as elektron, or “amber”, in Septuagint (for identification, see Landsberger 1967, 190-198). Although this identification is uncertain, the word certainly refers to “a precious stone of characteristic sparkle and brilliancy” and “a characteristic color” (Oppenheim 1958, 107-108). Such a word is suitable for describing the colour of the “glow” of a rainbow.

The compound Sumerogram SUD.ÁG can be abbreviated as SUD in ADB. The scholars who wrote ADB frequently use such abbreviations. For example, a'TIR AN(NA), or “rainbow”, is abbreviated as TIR at -651 Col. iv 20’; A.AN (= ŠÈG), or “rain”, is abbreviated as AN (ADB -122A ’Obv.’ 10’, 11’; -122B ’Obv.’ 4’; et passim); IM.DIR, or “clouds”, is shortened to DIR (ADB -122A ’Obv.’ 10’, 18’, 20’; et passim); and NIM.GÍR, “lightning”, is abbreviated as GÍR (ADB -124B ’Obv.’ 23’; -120 ’Rev.’ 17’; -119B₁ ’Obv.’ 2’; et passim). TIR represents the Akkadian word marzâti, AN žamnu, DIR erpetu, and GÍR birqua.

If the sign SUD represents SUD.ÁG (elmēšu), and the word means “amber”, observers might have recognized an amber-like orange colour of the unusual rainbow (aurora) of ADB -122A, and the eclipsed moon during the lunar eclipses recorded in ADB -108B and by Hunger, Sachs, and Steele (2001, Nos. 20, 21, and 22). The eclipse of No. 22 was nearly a total one and the special colour of the eclipsed moon could be easily observed in such a case. If the eclipsed moon in these cases was “red brown”, as interpreted in previous studies, such eclipses can be graded as L= 3 on the Danjon Scale (Danjon 1921, 262). However, if the moon was “amber” or orange, they may be graded as L= 4.

The amber-like colour of the unusual rainbow (aurora) of ADB -122A reminds us of a record of an aurora on the 4th February 1872. This aurora was globally visible (Silverman 2008; Hayakawa, Ebihara, Willis, et al. 2018) and was reported even in Alexandria (Earwaker 1872, 323; Donati 1874). T. W. Webb
at Hardwick Vicarage in England (near the border with Wales) also reported “a view of the magnificent aurora” on this occasion. He recognized the aurora when he “found the western horizon glowing with amber light, in which was no trace of the expected ruddiness” of the reflection of a crimson sunset (Webb 1872).

Figure 1. Drawings of auroral arcs: (a) “a beautiful red arc of light” in Melbourne during the great magnetic storm on 1st/2nd September 1859 in Neumeyer (1864, 242) and (b) an “auroral beam” observed by Capron (1883, 243), a spectroscopist at Guildown in England, during the magnetic storm on 17th November 1882. For the latter, Capron used his spectroscope and detected the “principal citron auroral line (W.L. 5569)” in this arc. Note that W.L. indicates “wave length” here.

Acknowledgements
The research for this paper was funded by the Mission Research Projects of RISH and JSPS KAKENHI, Grant nos. JP18K00987, JP18H01254, and JP17J06954.

References
31) **An alternative reading of Lugale’s stone passage** — In the last issue of NABU, M. Ramez published a note on the passage dealing with stones in *Lugale*. The aim of this communication is to review the explanations provided by the author with regard to the number and judgement of stones, and to offer some alternative views. In this respect, the first question that emerges is if the selection of stones was influenced by some kind of numerical logic. The answer given to this question in the said note seems to be positive: the author postulated a literary game, in which 49 stone names are given in advance, and one has to find the 50th that is hidden in the text. The last stone name is either *mazalag* occurring outside of the stone passage, where the fate of the defeated daemon Asag is described (*Lugale* 328), or the form *na₄ugu₄ bur₃da* translated in connection with the ‘plant-stone’ (*me₂₄u*) as “la pierre qui perce la corailine” (*Lugale* 434). The number 50 plays a central role in this reconstruction because of its close connection to the god Ningirsu, whose temple is called *ninal* (‘the house of fifty’). While it is indeed possible that on some level numerical considerations had an impact on *Lugale’s* stone passage, the idea of a literary game, as described in the note under discussion here, is hindered by difficulties. It is important to notice, for instance, that no such game has ever been identified in the corpus of the Sumerian literary texts; and even if other examples were known, there are issues with the interpretation of the Sumerian text, which need to be addressed, because it is mainly due to the incorrect rendering of some Sumerian terms that the total number of stone names occurring in *Lugale* can be put at 50. One such problem concerns the non-existent form *na₄ugu₄ bur₃da*. There is a certain *ugu₄bur₃da* attested in lexical lists, but this form is rather an attributive construction, with the non-finite verb *bur₃da* referring to the drilled state of carnelian. Also, in the case of *Lugale* there is no need to turn the determinative *na₄* into a logogram,
since the context clearly suggests the meaning ‘drilled carnelian’. On the other hand, it should also be noted that strictly speaking not 49, but only 47 names occur in the stone passage. In the list provided by Ramez, the form *₅₃* 会展*um* (no. 27) is also included despite the fact that no manuscript of *Lugale* has this form with the determinative *na₄*. From the missing determinative it clearly follows that not a stone name is meant here. *Lugale* uses the form in its literal sense “at the opening/mouth (of) the leather pouch”, in order to allude to a technological aspect, namely, that recently finished precious stone beads were kept in wet leather bags, until they regained their lustrous appearance. Interestingly, this reference can be found in the introductory unit preceding the description of the actual judgement. A closer look at the stone passage reveals other similar references, one of which introduces the last judgement rendered to the stones *₅₃* 会展 *g a r a n u m and na₄ b a₁*. The form *₅₃* 会展 *b i s i g₇-s i g₇*, which is present in this context, has already been understood by van Dijk as an independent stone name. The idea was adapted later by Ramez, who included *₅₃* 会展 *b i s i g₇-s i g₇* in her list as the 49th name. However, the use of the demonstrative /be/ seems to render this form an umbrella term referring back to the two stones previously listed. The introductory unit can thus be translated as follows: “The hero turns to the *k u r - g a r a n u - u m* -stone. He calls out to the b a₁ -stone. The lord for these yellow/green cosmetics, Ninurta, the son of Enlil, fixes their destinies”.

While discussing the numerical logic behind the stone passage, Ramez also revisited van Dijk’s idea about the canonical number of stones. This idea is based on the Late Babylonian text CT 51 88, which gives the sum total of 30 as the number of blessed stones in *Lugale*. It is hardly possible that such a late text reflects some kind of primeval version of the stone passage, with an initial number of stones that had been expanded by the time the first manuscripts of *Lugale* appeared in the Sumerian literary corpus. Rather than considering the probability of such a theory, it is worth having a closer look at the textual tradition itself, from which it becomes evident that the clear differentiation between blessed and cursed stones is an invention introduced in the bilingual tradition by replacing the verb *na₄* *t a r*, originally of neutral connotation (i.e., ‘to decide the fate’), with a *₃* *s a r* (‘to curse’) whenever a negative judgement is made. As for the stones with a positive fate, the verb *na₄* *t a r* remains in place and thereby acquires the secondary meaning ‘to bless’. That this latter verb has a neutral meaning in the monolingual recension of *Lugale* is clear from its usage in connection with both negative and positive judgements; the other verb, a *₃* *s a r*, is attested only twice in this recension. Turning now back to CT 51 88, this Late Babylonian text seems to be in direct relation with the bilingual textual tradition. It lists only the blessed stones and excludes the ones with a negative fate, which is exactly what is to be expected in the obviously apotropaic context of this text.

On the basis of this demonstration, it seems reasonable to say that the main source of influence for creating *Lugale*’s stone passage was hardly some kind of numerical logic. Even if it played a role in the process, the selection of suitable stones may have had a different dynamic created by the requirements of contemporary scientific thinking. It has already been demonstrated that the main goal of texts dealing with certain aspects of the material world was not to describe in great detail the relevant natural phenomena, but to present the corresponding Sumerian terminology in a narrative framework. The highest form of science was of this nature, manifesting itself, first and foremost, in the knowledge of the Sumerian language and writing, while also conforming to the principle: the more archaic the Sumerian expression, the higher its scientific value. *Lugale* is indeed a multi-layered composition with important symbolical and religious connotations, but in its core the same holds true for the stone passage, where quite archaic and rare stone names are presented most of the time.

Finally, there is the organisation of judgements within the stone passage, which needs to be treated briefly. In this respect, Ramez presented a diagram showing a schematic representation of what she called “le caractère cyclique de cette alternance, révélant un rythme certain dans ce classement particulier des pierres qui était vraisemblablement basé sur une symbolique particulière envisagée par l’auteur”. The idea of the cyclical or rhythmic alternation between negative and positive judgements is hindered by difficulties, such as the question if a clear differentiation was made between blessed and cursed stones in the monolingual recension. As demonstrated above, such a sharp differentiation appears to be an invention in the bilingual textual tradition, where the verb *₃* *s a r* is used consistently whenever a negative
judgement is made. In the case of the monolingual recension this pattern cannot be recognized with certainty. Since the verb nam tar has a neutral meaning here, the alternation is only secondarily present in the text. In other words, one has to look at the actual judgement to find whether the stone under discussion is cursed or blessed. Even if we limit the scope of the investigation to the bilingual text, there are specific patterns to be discerned, which can be explained by the characteristics of each and every stone, rather than by some kind of poetic consideration about an overarching rhythm of alternation between the blessed and cursed types. For instance, the fate of the ‘plant-stone’ is decided first, because it is placed as king above all the other stones at the beginning of Lugale.\(^{18}\) That the precious stones occur right in the middle of the stone passage accords well with their being the most important materials: they stand in the focal point of the text. Another interesting pattern emerges in the case of three consecutive judgements rendered to the stones esi (statue), na (stele) and e - l - e - l (podium\(^{2}\)). On the basis of their function, these stones appear to be discussed in close connection to each other, because they represent different aspects of what one might call large-scale sculpture.\(^ {19}\)

Notes

1. The work on this communication was supported by the “ÚNKP-18-3 New National Excellence Program” of the Ministry of Human Capacities of Hungary. I would like to thank Gabriella Juhász for correcting my English.


4. That such games exist in Ancient Greek literature (RAMEZ, NABU 2018/110, p. 174, n. 14) is of lesser importance. One should rather look for numerical considerations in Sumerian compositions which are similar to the stone passage of Lugale in that their main topic comprises a certain aspect of the natural world, such as birds (Nanse C), fish (Home of the Fish) and, to a lesser extent, plants (Enki and Ninursag 190-219).

5. Ur₃-ra XVI 136 (MSL 10 p. 8). See also the late Old Babylonian forerunner from Sippar l. 62 (MSL 10 p. 52) and the Old Babylonian forerunner from Nippur l. 49 (MSL 10 p. 56).

6. The formulation is as follows: “after the ‘plant-stone’ touches it, it is the drilled carnelian (or: the carnelian is drilled)” \(\text{sa}_u \text{ub}\)-\(\text{ta}\)-\(\text{gu}_3\) \(\text{bu}_\gamma\)-\(\text{da}\).

7. Instead, the forms that occur in the passage listing the precious stones (Lugale 528-533) are z\(\text{i} \text{k}u\text{m}\text{m}\text{u}\text{d}\) and K\(\text{a} \text{k}u\text{m}\text{m}\text{u}\text{d}\). There is a single attestation of the stone name \(\text{mi}_\text{zi}-\text{k}u\text{m}\text{m}\text{u}\text{d}\) in the Old Babylonian forerunner of Ur₃-ra XVI from Nippur l. 170 (MSL 10 p. 60), which might explain the reading postulated by van Dijk first and accepted later on by RAMEZ. Note, however, that \(\text{mi}_\text{zi}-\text{k}u\text{m}\text{m}\text{u}\text{d}\) is not listed among the precious stones in this text.


10. ur-sag \(\text{sa}_u \text{gur}-\text{ga}\)-\(\text{ra}\)-\(\text{nu}\)-\(\text{um}\)-\(\text{e}\) \(\text{ga}\)-\(\text{gub}\) / na\(\text{bal}\)-\(\text{e}\) \(\text{ga}\)-\(\text{gub}\) ba\(\text{de}\)-\(\text{ze}\)-\(\text{e}\) / en\(\text{e}\) \(\text{si}\)-\(\text{mi}\)-\(\text{g}\)-\(\text{e}\) \(\text{ga}\)-\(\text{be}\) / \(\text{mi}\)-\(\text{ib}\)-\(\text{tar}\)-\(\text{re}\) (Lugale 634-637). For similar understandings of the passage, see Jacobsen, Harps that Once…, p. 268 and HEIMPEL/SALGUES, Erzählungen, p. 63.


14. Lugale 524 and 545. In addition, there are two other instances where aš₂ sār occurs as a variant besides nam tar. A manuscript of Lugale 418 from Ur (UET 6/1 4), which has much in common with the bilingual tradition, contains aš₂ sār instead of the better attested nam tar. On the other hand, both verbs are known from one manuscript each in the case of Lugale 481. An Ur manuscript (UET 6/1 5) contains the verb nam tar, while
aš₂sar occurs in another manuscript from Nippur (BE 29/1 6). Note, furthermore, that in the monolingual version the phrase kalam -mā ib₂-ba du₇₄ (“to speak in the land in anger”) might imply the negative outcome of the judgement. 


16. Note, for instance, that a number of stone names is attested only in the Old Babylonian forerunners of Urṣa-ra XVI (e.g., mā-gar, mā-gul-gul and māša-ga-ra). The reason why they have not survived the process of canonisation might lie in the fact that they were too obscure even by the time the Old Babylonian manuscripts of Urṣa-ra were created. Another interesting example is the stone called sū in Akkadian. This stone name occurs first in the Early Dynastic Practical Vocabulary A1 97 where it is equated with the Sumerian phrase ud₇₄ si mum₂ (“stone of the smith”). Some precious stones (māza-gin, māpirig-gun₂, etc.) are also known from this text; see the edition in M. CIVIL: The Early Dynastic Practical Vocabulary A (Archaic HAR₇₄-A). ARE₄ 4. Roma, 2008. 


18. Lugale 34-36. After Asag creates the stone army, the ‘plant-stone’ is named king. For a discussion of this passage with earlier literature, see SIMKÓ, AoF 41, 114-115. 

19. Note that eri and na are also depicted in the inscriptions of Gudea as two separate stones, which complement each other on both material and functional levels.

Krisztián SIMKÓ <krisimko@gmail.com> 

32) BM 45792 (1881-07-06, 209), Maqlû VII 79a–93 and 143–161 — The vast majority of sources for the magical series Maqlû comes from Nineveh, which makes the identification of new sources from Babylonia always a welcome addition. One more fragment from the collection of Babylonian tablets of the British Museum can be added to tablet VII of this series: BM 45792, a middle part fragment with the right edge partly preserved. According to its registration number (1881-07-06, 209) this fragment comes from Babylon itself. Large so-called ‘firing-holes’ can be seen on its reverse. Judging from the curve of both the obverse and the reverse this fragment belongs to a tablet with two columns on each side. Thus parts of columns ii and iii are preserved. Since the standard Nineveh version of Maqlû VII has altogether 178 lines and the text on the reverse of this fragment breaks at l. 161, the scribe must have added some extra text to his tablet, perhaps the beginning of tablet VIII. Sometimes the scribe wrote two lines of the Nineveh edition into the same line, and the text displays mistakes and minor variations. The horizontal lines separating each incantation are hardly visible.

In his critical edition of The Magical Ceremony Maqlû (AMD 10; 2015), Tzvi Abusch presented only two fragments from Sippur and one from Babylon (BM 41198, source ee) next to thirteen sources from Assyria for this tablet (transliteration on pp. 167–191; transcription and translation on pp. 349–360). The source from Babylon, BM 41198 (1881-04-28, 745), is a fragment from the left edge and since the text of both fragments overlaps in one line (l. 161) both come from different tablets. Still, the appearance and the way the scribe distributed the lines of the Nineveh recension on his tablet are similar. I publish BM 45792 by courtesy of the Trustees of the British Museum. Since the variants to the standard Nineveh version are minor, only a transliteration will be presented here, including the corresponding lines numbers in the edition of Abusch added. BM 45792 measures 65° × 60° × 38 mm.

Obverse

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>79a²</td>
<td>i i’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>ii ²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81-82</td>
<td>ii ³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>ii ⁴</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84-85</td>
<td>ii ⁵</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86-87</td>
<td>ii ⁶</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>ii ⁷</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>ii ⁸</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>ii ⁹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91-92</td>
<td>ii ¹₀</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>ii ¹¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Pictorial evidence for columns in Assyrian architecture comes from several illustrations depicted on Neo-Assyrian artifacts. Column bases were excavated at several sites in Assyria proper, which is arranged in chronological sequence of discovery. It is followed by a list of similar style column bases from North Syria, and they are datable to the 19th century; however, except for the stone bases, no column shafts presumably of wood have been recovered. Column bases were excavated at several sites in Assyria. They have convex sides and have been described as 'cushion-shaped'. In some instances, the bases rested on a rectangular stone. As a unit, the two stone works represent early versions of the torus and plinth, respectively. Additionally, column bases showing a similarity to the Assyrian style were discovered in northern Syria, and they are datable to the late 8th or 7th centuries BCE.

The Assyrian and North Syrian column bases that are recorded in the excavation reports oftentimes survive in drawings or photographs, and several are extant. Both the Assyrian and North Syrian groups merit study as artifacts related to the early history of columned architecture in the ancient Near East. This paper gives to that study by providing a list of column bases discovered in Assyria proper, which is arranged in chronological sequence of discovery. It is followed by a list of similar style column bases from North Syria sites. All these finds come from excavation reports dated to the 19th and early 20th centuries.
Assyrian sites

1. Nineveh. In his book published in 1853, Austen Henry Layard describes the finding of four circular pedestals (column bases) to the north of the ruins at the site. He writes that “they appear to form part of a double line of similar objects... and may have supported a wooden column of a covered way.” He provides the following measurements: “distance between the pedestals facing each other was 9 feet 3 inches, the second pair was about 84 feet from the first. Their diameter, 11 ½ inches in the narrowest, and 2 feet 7 inches in the broadest part.” A drawing of one column base accompanied the description (Layard 1853: 589-590).

2. Khorsabad (ancient Dur-Sharrukin). Victor Place expanded the exploration of Khorsabad in 1853. His volume of plates published in 1867 includes precise line drawings of the plan and elevation of a limestone column base identified as a capital (“chapiteau”). The addition in his drawing of part of a shaft extending from the base is likely conjectural. Place states that the stone object was found in Court XVIII of the Dépendances, which he thought served as a stable for horses and equipment (Place 1867: IV, 95, pl. 35). See fig. 1, top right.

3. Nineveh, North Palace. At the ruined entrance to the North Palace, George Smith found two column bases. The pedestals were 14 inches x 10 inches x 3 inches high. The circular work was 8 ½ inches in diameter in a flat circle to receive the column. The total height of the torus was 8 inches. Smith also found a small model in “yellowstone” (limestone) of a winged cow-bull with a human head - a female sphinx. On top of the wings stands the base of the column (Smith 1875: 431; Curtis and Reade 1995: 100 pl. 44). One of Smith’s column bases and the model of the winged sphinx are presently housed in the British Museum; the second column base is in the Istanbul Archaeological Museum (Barnett 1976: 35, pl. I). See fig. 1, middle left and middle right.

4. Assur. A 1909 excavation report by Walter Andrae mentions the discovery of two limestone column bases. They were found in and under the pavement of a Late Assyrian house. One torus rested on a rectangular plinth and was cushion-shaped. The second column base consisted of a large roundel and at the top, in the flat round groove, was the lower section of the stone shaft. Still visible around the shaft and torus were vertical flat stripes. Both finds were photographed (Andrae: 1909: 40-41, pls. 11, 12).

5. Khorsabad. Renewed excavations at the site were undertaken in late 1929 and early 1930s. A wall relief discovered in Room 7 of the palace showed a landscape scene that included a columned portico (fig. 1, top left). In Residence K three basalt column bases were found stacked against the wall of a vestibule. They are of approximately the same size and measure 0.20 cm high x 0.35 cm diameter, with a depression at the top. They were removed to the Oriental Institute of Chicago. Elsewhere at the site, a columned portico was exposed in Palace F. Two huge basalt column bases resting on stone plinths were found still in place. Each torus measured 1.80 m x 2.40 m (Loud 1936: figs. 83, 89; Loud and Altman 1938: 31, pls. 32B, 38, 41B-C). See fig. 1, bottom.

Northern Syrian sites

1. Zincirli (ancient Sam’al). A column base was exposed in situ, in the northwest building of the upper palace at the site. It had a high torus and rested on a rectangular plinth. It was carefully worked in hard stone and its upper flat surface measured 0.71 m in diameter (Koldewey 1898: 93, 142, 199, pl. 22, figs. 47, 48).

2. Carchemish. Two small column bases of white limestone were found in position, in a structure described as a ‘hilani’. They were thought to be of “later date of the Iron Age”. A basalt column base was found in the ‘hilani’ and its lower diameter, 0.95 cm, matched the circular depression on the pavement of the inner entrance to the building. The published photograph of a decorated basalt cushion-shape column base is probably the find from the ‘hilani’. Also illustrated is a decorated column base with a cushion shape from the nearby site of Zamaghara (Woolley 1921: 150-51, fig. 61; Woolley and Barnett 1978: 177-180, pl. 39a).

3. Arslan Tash (ancient Hadatu). In the center of the entranceway of a building, labeled “building with ivories”, was found a basalt column base in situ. It rested on a rectangular basalt plinth. The total
height measured about 43 cm. The upper surface of the column base had a shallow recess. A photograph showing the object was published (Thureau-Dangin 1931: 46, pl. V, no.2).

4. Tell Tayinat (ancient Kunulua). In the course of the 1935-1938 excavations, a limestone column base with curved sides was found on the floor in the courtyard of building 1, west central building complex. It was thought out of context. The base was made up of a rectangular plinth and a decorated torus 68.50 cm in diameter and 32 cm in height. A depression at the top of the base could take a column about 49 cm wide. A photograph showing the findspot and two drawings of the torus were published (Haines 1971: 40-41, pls. 78C, 117B).

**Commentary**

According to the excavated evidence, the Assyrian style of the basalt column bases recovered from the royal residential areas in Khorsabad and Nineveh was fashioned in the mid-8th century and continued in the 7th century. One may surmise that the column bases from the two Assyrian sites were crafted in the royal workshops. The relief decoration on these bases, consisting of two double bands of arches encircling the body, was likewise standardized. Of related interest, the nearly identical decorated motif on the finds from Nineveh show them to be contemporary and datable to the reign of Ashurbanipal (668-627), for whom the North Palace was constructed. On the other hand, the two limestone column bases excavated at Assur were certainly produced outside the Assyrian royal workshops and are perhaps datable to the end of the 7th century. It may be mentioned that the large roundel shape of one column base from Assur can be compared with the individual column bases excavated at the Median site of Tepe Nush-I Jan in modern day Iran and described as a “circular surround” (Stronach and Roaf 1978: 6, pls. III b, c). One may surmise that the introduction of stone for the shaft of the column, as shown on the Assur example, led to the need for a structural modification and eventually a roundel, which generally formed the lower section of columns of later date, replaced the cushion-shape base.
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34) The Complexity of Understanding: from a Neo-Assyrian Cylinder Seal – BM WA 132257 – to Sargon II’s Throne Room, to Bavian Sculpture and to the ‘god at the entrance of his temple’ — The Neo-Assyrian Cylinder Seal WA 132257, today in the British Museum and attributed to the 8th century,1) can perhaps find a precise date. Two elements support this assumption: the inscription of property mentioning Ahu-lamur and the iconography. The name Ahu-lamur is a common one in Neo-Assyrian sources (Radner 1998: 80-82), used so frequently under different kings that alone it can’t help for a better

— 57 —
date. On the other hand, the iconography is quite rare: beside a classical ‘adoration’ scene, showing a worshipper in front of a god, the insertion of the god in a temple and the protection of the temple’s entrance by four non-human figures are quite rare subjects. The gate is protected by two pseudo-Gilgamesh (figures with 6 curls hair symmetrical disposed, identified with Gilgamesh since Bachmann 1927: 14) standing on winged human-headed bulls. The choice of the pseudo-Gilgamesh is strongly significant: since the Akkadian period in the glyptic and then in the terracotta the representation of a god at the entrance of his temple is an important topic to stress his full and strongest power (Battini 2017). The seal WA 132257 innovates in the association of the pseudo-Gilgamesh to the winged bull. A similar association is attested for the first time in the palace of Sargon II (cfr Battini 2014; what Albenda defines ‘Grand Royal Emblem’), so the cylinder could not date before 722 and even later, the construction of the new capital having lasted 17 years. It is worth mentioning that 3 people named Ahu-lamur cited by official texts lived under Sargon: a military official, a dispatch rider and a third man with different charges. Also Sennacherib’s Bavian sculpture employs the association of the pseudo-Gilgamesh with the winged bull. And we know 4 people named Ahu-lamur living under Sennacherib’s reign, one of whom is a priest of Assur.

But the Bavian composition is quite different both from WA 132257 and from the Palace of Sargon II. Here the motif is used for one entrance, as in the seal, and it is not by hazard that it’s the entrance of the throne room. The seal is an explicit allusion to the palace, clearly for the royal court, and it can be dated between 715 and 705 BCE. Its owner can be more likely the military officer who can easier have access to the royal palace.

Through the seal, the significance of Sargon II’s throne room becomes more evident: until now it was clear that the figures of pseudo-Gilgamesh were used for protecting the space in which the king shows himself to his subjects and to associate him with the millenary subject of the master of animals (Albenda 1986: 101-102). Now, considering the long history of the topic of the ‘god at the entrance of his temple’ (Battini 2017), it is possible to understand the sophisticated allusion of Sargon II to his godlike nature even in the architectural and decorative realizations of his palace. That this allusion is made through the recovery of Akkadian topics is not surprising from a king whose name is already an obvious manifesto.

In the light of these considerations, the meaning of the Bavian sculpture seems to be even more enriched with a new nuance: with the association of a pseudo-Gilgamesh and a winged bull Sennacherib makes a direct and clear allusion to his ‘beloved and hated’ father\(^2\) and through this to his own divine nature. But he overcomes Sargon II in making the place that in the classic scheme of the ‘god at the entrance’ would have been that of the god.

Notes

1. Collon 2001: 142-3, no. 277, pl. 23, 40, 43; Watanabe 1993a: 119 and pl. 5 no.7.6; Watanabe 1993b: 306, no. 3.4.4, pl. 117: 13. Chalcedony, h.= 3.04 cm; diam= 1.04 cm.

2. The complex relations between Sennacherib and Sargon (cf. ‘psychohistory’ of E. Frahm 2014) are also explicit in the name of his palace: ‘Palace without Rivals’ (ÉGAL ZAGDINU TUKUA) is another allusion to the ‘Palace without equal’ (ÉGAL GABARINU TUKUA) of Sargon II… The opposition of the two kings is more programmatic than real, and other considerations let more plausibly think that Sennacherib could never forget the impression of the paternal figure.
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35) A Greek substitute šatammu (temple dean) in Babylon in 125 BC — The establishment of a Greek community in Babylon with its own institutions next to the traditional Babylonian government structures. The Greeks were indicated as pulițē or pulițānu, probably representing the Greek word politai, “citizens”, and they were first attested in the Astronomical Diaries under the reign of Antiochus IV (169 BC). Afterwards, more evidence concerning the politai appeared. Tom Boiy (2004: 208) observed that one diary from the time of Antiochus III may mention the politai in a break already in 187 BC. One Babylonian chronicle, BCHP 14, even expressly says that a king Antiochus settled “Greek” pulițānu, in Babylon. Apparently these politai were considered an ethnic group, though it might well be that some of these politai were Hellenized Babylonians, who thus assumed a multiple identity (Van der Spek 2005 and 2009). These citizens had their meetings (assemblies) in the theatre (Van der Spek 2001). In important matters the king communicated with both communities. Letters were sent both to the šatammu and the kiništātu and to the paḥattu (‘governor’, Greek epistatēs) and the politai. However, as was observed by Roberto Sciacchitano (2012), we see that these citizens, headed by a governor, gradually became the main addressees of royal messages at the expense of the traditional Babylonian local authorities. So it seems that gradually the epistatēs and the politai were considered the main authorities in Babylon. The temple was thus robbed of its political function. This idea was further elaborated by Philippe Clancier (2012), who rightly criticized the use of the term “apartheid” by Van der Spek, as Hellenized Babylonians might belong to the group of “citizens”.

Clancier called this community (or the entire city — in this he is not always consistent) polis. This is a term used by classicists to define the Greek independent city-state and as such it is established in the classical discourse. I have always found this confusing as a cursory reading of ancient Greek authors like Herodotus, Xenophon, Aristotle and Polybius shows that they used the word polis indiscriminately for all kinds of city: dependent, independent, Greek, Phoenician, Mesopotamian, with every conceivable constitution. Another objection is that it suggests that the Seleucid administration recognized “city status” of certain cities. This is a Medieval concept, not applicable to the Hellenistic kingdoms. What the kings did in some cases is grant a new politeia, “citizenship; constitution”, with registered citizens, but these constitutions could differ widely and sometimes were hardly Greek, as is exemplified by Jerusalem, where the main authority remained with the high priest and the temple board (gerousia, sanhedrin), and by Babylon where the new citizens might be of Greek descent, but probably also comprised Hellenized Babylonians, where the council had a Macedonian name (peliganes – see BCHP 18B: 3) and where Esagila remained the city’s main sanctuary. The foundation of a new Greek temple is not recorded, neither in excavations, nor in texts, and that is probably not accidental. The temple may indeed have been by both politai and indigenous Babylonians, esp. after 125 BC, when a Greek was appointed substitute šatammu of Esagila (Sachs & Hunger 1996: 270-1, No. -124A rev. 21).

We propose a new edition of the relevant passage in the diary:

-124A  Abu (V) = August 12th – September 10th, 125 BC

r18’ • ...ITU BI ḷÌ[UJ X̄kam (?) ḅì;mâ'-ma'a'-i'r ī-šUŠ [{...}]

r19’ [.........] 1-en x x x x-a-e] ī-ta-a-ra-bi 4โยGAL.ERIN ina ša 4posix GALERIN ina

r20’ [u ī-x̄UŠ M EŠ Ukkin ša ī-SAG.GIL 1-EN UGū x X (UDUNIT) SISKŪR mar]-ru-ū'-nū ana

NIDBA ana tar-ša KA-šAMAR-ra-bi 4GUB-zu-niš-suš ana 4EN-GASAN-ūd DINGIṚ ina GALIN ina

[a-an bul-ti ša LUGAL a a-na bulši šu GAR-an ūa DU-uš (aš-kin-nu)]

r21’ [ITU BI ḷÌ[UJI X̄kam.SAR.MEŠ ša LUGAL ina ī-EGLI.DUHA ša-su-šu ša man-nu-šu ša 1-en

i-a'-man-ma-a-a-a-bi ina ī-SÀ-TAM.MEŠ ī-SAG.GIL ku-um X₃₂[U] [IGI ...]

r22’ […] [ITU BI ḷÌ[UJI X̄kam.SAR.MEŠ ša LUGAL ina aš-aš M[U]-a-ti ša-su-šu ša mu-na-ša ITU BAR ina

25שק ina Am-ri-dāši ū ...[ ...]

r23’ […] [x x ha-an-ti ša INU₃ x x (KA xX₃₂) 4PosY] ū GIGIN ina X₃₂[U ...]

r24’ [ITU BI ḷÌ[UJI X̄kam. ... ... ... ... T]A -uši ša LUI-ke-a-a ša ana muh-hi ša-DIGNA ana URU₃₂ ša

KUR Ma-dá-a-a ša ša [ ...]
Translation

r18’ …… That month, /on the Xth day/ the sātāmum of Babylonia’[…]

r19’ ….. a certain X-aya (or: PN) who represented 4 the general (stratēgos) of Babylonia of the province of 5 the four generals, from Seleucia [which is on the Tigris entered Babylon. The sātāmum of Esagila]

r20’ [and the Babylonians (of) the Assembly of Esagila] provided [1 bull and X] fattened’ [sacrificial sheep] for him opposite the Gate of Lamassu-rabi [and he performed offerings] to Bēl, Bēltia and the great gods, [for the life of the king and for his (own) life (and prostrated himself).]

r21’ [That month, on day X, a parchment message of the king in the theatre⁰⁰] was read about the appointment of a certain Greek to the office of sātāmum of Esagila as substitute of /Bēl-lumur\[the sātāmum…]

r22’ [That month, that day a parchment message of the king] in this place (i.e. the theatre) was read as follows: “In the month Nisannu (I), on the 25th [day] (= May 10), the city Ammarida […]

r23’ […] quickly on […] and sick’ […]

r24’ [In that month, on the Xth day, the sātārump (or general) of Babylonia] from Seleucia which is on the Tigris to the province ⁰⁰ of Media x x [went out…]

At first sight is seems that the sātāmum was replaced by the Greek person, but that is not the case. He took over duties of the sātāmum, while the latter remained in office. We happen to know the name of this sātāmum: Bēl-lumur. He is mentioned as sātāmum in the famous Hyspaosines text (BOR 4, 132: 7, Schoulo 2000: 31-34 [⁰⁰EN,IGI]) dated to 127 BC and in Astronomical Diary concerning 120 BC (ADART No. -119B: 11 [⁰⁰U,IGI]).⁰⁰ Our document is dated in between, so it must concern Bēl-lumur and the traces indeed allow a reading "U,IGI. Substitutes of sātāmum are attested on other occasions as well. Sātāmum Bēl-bullissu was represented at times by his brother Bēl-tabtan-bullīt in the 80s BC.⁰⁰ A well-known example from the time of Antiochus IV (169 BC) is a Babylonian jeweller, who was the substitute of his brother in the office of sātāmum, and was appointed gazzakku by order of the king (cf. n. 4). In our case it is not a brother, but “a Greek”, apparently one of the polittai, probably of Greek descent indeed (why else would the diarist stress this?), possibly one of the Hellenized Babylonians. One might speculate that it was his duty to see to it that polittai could use the temple as their sanctuary. Whether they did offerings “in the Greek fashion” (as is mentioned on occasion in cuneiform sources since Antiochus I ¹⁰⁰) is difficult to say. A similar phenomenon is attested in Greek cities and villages in the Fayyum oasis and other places in Egypt, where Greeks and Egyptians alike worshipped indigenous Egyptian gods (Bowman 1986: 166-90).

Notes

2. In the Roman period it is perhaps the Greek equivalent of the municipium or civitas. The Romans liked juridical distinctions between cities.
3. Suggestion Roberto Scandra, collated viable, as it is confirmed by Caroline Waerzeggers november 2008.
4. Same person mentioned in a diary of a year earlier: ADART -126B r2’ […]x]· ‘-a-a sā u-še-piŠ 4 gal erin [Meš…]. For the construction ša u-še-piš ku-um, ‘who acted as representative/ substitute of’; ADART -141C: 11’, 107C r16'; CT 49, 160: 2; Kesslers 2000: 223, No. 17:4 (read ku-um instead of did-lu in the break); a brother of the sātāmum ša ana ku-um-mi-su ŠA,tam-Ša-tu’iq-[še-piš], ADART -168A r13’.
5. Lit.: ‘the general of Babylonia of the house (Ē, bittu) of the four generals’. For the meaning “area, region, province” see CAD B 292-3, s.v. bittu 5. However, the function occurs more often and in nearly all other cases the function is written: GAL.ERIN²⁰⁰ KUR UR²⁰⁰ ša ina muh-hi 4 GAL.ERIN²⁰⁰, ‘the general of Babylonia who is in charge of the four generals’. The construction with E occurs once more: ADART -229B obv. 9’. Mitsuma (2007) assumes that he was the supervisor of Upper Satrapies. This seems to be contradicted by AD -140A, r8: […]m[t-hi 4 120GAL u-qi-tu ša KUR UR²⁰⁰, in charge of four of the generals of Akkad”. Whatever the case, the expressions are apparently synonymous.
6. For the theatre in Babylon see Van der Spek 2001.
7. For this translation consult Van der Spek 2016.
9. CT 49, 160: 1-2; Kesslers 2000: 223 No. 17: 4; Van der Spek 2000: 440 (cf. n. 4 above). The interpretation of the name, written ⁰⁰EN-tab-tan-TIN-i, is controversial. In van der Spek 2000 I read Bēl-tabtan-uballit, but the better reading is: Bēl-tabtan-bullīt (‘Bēl, keep alive (whom) you have created’ - so an imperative (rather than uballit) for TIN is necessary; cf. CAD B 88, s.v. banā 3a-3’). The reading of Ahw, Bēl-tabtan-u-bullīt (from a supposed taqtānna, derived from patānu, ‘to make strong’; Ahw 1232a), is less convincing. Jursa writes the similar name ⁰⁰BE-tab-tan-TIN-i, as Ea-tabtanā-bullīt (Jursa 2006: 145 (CT 49, 126:2) et passim). Whatever the case: final vowels were not
pronounced anymore in Late Babylonian; the scribes consistently write tab-tan, so to avoid problems I follow the scribes: Bēl-tabtan-bullīt.

10. BCHP 6; other references mentioned in the commentary.
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36) Notes on the Ibn al-Nadîm’s Kitāb al-Fihrist: some Evidence of the Mesopotamian Writing Tradition — Abu’l-Farāj Mohammad bin Abī Ya‘qūb Eshāq al-Warrāq al-Nadīm was the author of Kitāb al-Fihrist, an “index” of the Arabic books available in Baghdad in the 10th century. Known as Ibn al-Nadīm, he probably was born in Baghdad around 932 (320 AH) and died there in 990 (380 AH). His exact origin is not known. However, there has been some debate on his possible Persian origin. The Persian title of his book, i.e., pehrest/fehrest/fehres/fahrāsat is noteworthy in this regard. Ibn al-Nadīm gathered a booklist in Arabic in which covers different writing systems and the works of numerous writers who were known at his time. It is not only a valuable source “for the culture of Medieval Islam and the literary men who represented it, but it also gives valuable information about the heritage of antiquity available to the Muslims at the time” (Sellheim & Zakeri 1999).

Kitāb al-Fihrist has ten discourses (maqalāt), each divided into several sections. A part of its first discourse “on the revealed Scriptures of Muslims, Jews and Christians, with an emphasis on the Koran and Koranic sciences” contains some remarks on the kinds of scripts known to Ibn al-Nadīm (Ibid). In this discourse, he also discussed the shape of the scripts and their origins.

There are two notable items in the first section of the first discourse:
1. Under the “Remarks on Arabic Writing”:

“Ka‘b b. al-Ahbar is not responsible for his statement, that the first to originate the Arabic and Persian scripts and other forms of writing was Adam, for whom be peace. Three hundred years before his death, he wrote on clay which he baked so that it kept safe even when the Flood overflowed the earth. Then each people found its script and wrote with it” (Dodge, 1970, p. 7).

2. Under the “Remarks about Types of Paper”:

“It is said that first of all Adam wrote on clay. Then for a period after that, the people wrote on copper and stone for the sake of durability. This was before the Flood” (Ibid., p. 39).

The following issues in Ibn al-Nadim’s accounts of different types of writings and writing materials would be noteworthy:

1. The source of the first paragraph as he mentioned was Ka‘b al-Ahbar. The same quotation of Ka‘b al-Ahbar could also be observed in Kitab al-Wuzara wal-Kottab (p. 8) about fifty years before the compilation of Kitab al-Fihrist. Kitab al-Wuzara wal-Kottab was written by al-Jaheṣyārī al-Jaḥṣyārī (died 943, Baghdad), one of the secretaries at the court of Abbasids. It is noteworthy that he was also mentioned in Ibn al-Nadim’s work five times (Dodge, 1970, pp. 23, 278, 366, 381, 714). What remains of the book of Al-Jaheṣyārī, begins with the history of scripts and the history of administration in Iran before the Islamic period and continues with the scribes of the early Islamic period and so on (Bahramian, 2012, p. 68). Several attestations of Al-Jaheṣyārī in Kitab al-Fihrist, as well as the similarities in quoting from Ka‘b al-Ahbar, may suggest that Ibn al-Nadim might have used either al-Jaheṣyārī’s work or the same source as that of Kitab al-Wuzara wal-Kottab.

2. Ka‘b al-Ahbar was the famous Jewish scholar at the court of Mu‘awiyyah I, the first Umayyad Caliph (born c. 602, Mecca – died 680, Damascus). There are several hundred critical remarks in early Islamic books attributed to him. “He is considered to have possessed a profound knowledge of the Bible and southern Arabian tradition, as well as personal wisdom. Numerous statements are attributed to him without any argument because he inspired so much confidence” (Schmitz, 1990, pp. 316-317). It is worth investigating whether the source for both Ibn al-Nadim’s and al-Jaheṣyārī’s works was Ka‘b al-Ahbar, since he, as mentioned above, could have been aware of probable Hebrew or Biblical accounts of writing on clay tablets in Mesopotamia. Therefore, it is necessary to consider whether there are such accounts in Hebrew and Biblical sources, something that needs an overall investigation within such sources.

3. The author of Kitab al-Fihrist, under “the Remarks about Types of Paper,” shows at least his awareness of the existence of a writing tradition on clay tablets and other materials. It has been generally accepted that the last types of cuneiform tablets ever found in any archaeological excavations were written in Mesopotamia in the first century AD. There also have been arguments on the survival of cuneiform culture up to the second century and even into the third, when many old traditions were finally extinguished by the religious reforms of the Sasanians, who had put an end to the Parthian rule in Mesopotamia by 224 (George, 2007, pp. 63-64). However, it is notable that at the time of the compilation of Kitab al-Fihrist in the 10th century (about nine centuries after the first cuneiform tablet written in Mesopotamia), the tradition of writing on clay tablets was still known to the author of Kitab al-Wuzara wal-Kottab and also to the author of Kitab al-Fihrist. Ibn al-Nadim’s statement on writing on clay tablets might have come from two different sources, i.e., either from some written sources (as we observed in Kitab al-Wuzara wal-Kottab) or from oral traditions in Mesopotamia. In other words, some people in Mesopotamia in the 10th century might still have had some information about the tradition of writing on clay via oral traditions. Although there is some doubt about his professional occupation and we do not know for certain if he was a bookseller or not, however we can ascertain that his father Abu Ya‘qub al-Warrāq al-Nadim was a bookseller or bookbinder. His interest in gathering information about the books, types of scripts, and so forth, might have been a family tradition derived from his father’s practice of bookbinding and bookselling. A similar condition can be observed in the life of al-Jaheṣyārī. As noted before, he was among the secretaries at the court of the Abbasids, and it is highly probable that he too followed the traditional professional occupation of his family. Therefore, there could be another possibility of the transmission of a long tradition of writing
on clay in Mesopotamia to such secretaries through oral traditions as a hereditary practice of their families and their careers.

Notes

1. Kaʾb al-ʿAbbār, a Yemenite Jew who became a convert to Islam, probably in 638 and is considered the oldest authority on Judaico-Islamic traditions (Schmitz, 1990, p. 316).

2. The author is grateful to Pasha Daneshmand for calling his attention on this part of Ketāb al-Vozārāʾ al-Kotṭāb.

3. Note that in the second text (Under the “Remarks about Types of Paper”) Ibn al-Nadīm narrated his statement with “It is said that…”, This could be an indication that this part of his remarks on different material of writing may come from oral traditions.
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Le bilan de l’année 2018 s’établit à 392 textes nouveaux intégralement publiés : George CUSAS 36 (220), Chambon FM 15 (74), Reculeau FM 16 (57), Fiette Archibab 3 (16), De Graef AOAT 440 (14), Crisostomo RA 112 (8), Durand Ebla and Beyond (1), Durand & Chambon Semitica 60 (1), Földi ANEMS 3 (1). Les textes de Mari représentent (comme souvent) un tiers du total (133/392).


Dominique CHARPIN & Antoine JACQUET


Nele ZIEGLER

39) Réorganisation de la Rédaction de *NABU* — En 1987, c’est à l’initiative de Jean-Marie Durand que *NABU* a pris naissance. Depuis de nombreuses années, c’est sur ses épaules qu’a repose la charge du contact avec les auteurs et de la mise au point de chaque numéro ; une nouvelle formule a désormais été trouvée, qui le décharge de ce lourd fardeau, grâce à la collaboration de Jean-Michel Roynard, IE à l’UMS 2409. Désormais, il faut adresser vos contributions à : nabu@sepoa.fr.

Au nom de toute l’assyriologie, nous souhaitons remercier Jean-Marie Durand pour son engagement sans faille en faveur d’un journal dont l’utilité a été amplement démontrée et dont le succès est largement dû à ses efforts.