

N.A.B.U.

Nouvelles Assyriologiques Brèves et Utilitaires 2020

N° 1 (mars)

NOTES BRÈVES

1) Ur-Luma entwendet Kanalwasser — PSD A I 7f. verzeichnet unter a A 2.3.1 einen Ausdruck a bu/bù/bu_x(PI) „to drain water“.¹⁾ Manchmal wird nur das Wasser genannt, häufiger aber steht vor dem Verbum a e, was PSD als „water from the ditch“ interpretiert. Doch e(-g) „Bewässerungskanal“ steht nie in einem dimensional Kasus. In Frage kämen der Lokativ oder der Ablativ. Außerdem würden wir eher den Absolutiv direkt vor dem Verbum erwarten. Also ist a-e „Kanalwasser“ gemeint. Zu dieser Deutung von a-e kommt bereits Krebernik²⁾ aufgrund von SF 54 viii 1-3: a-sùr / sùr e-sì-gen₇ / a-e <e> e-sì-gen₇ „wie Wassergraben-Wasser den Wassergraben füllt, wie Kanalwasser den Kanal füllt“. Cf. *mê šūri, mê ḫarri* MSL 13, 85 (Proto-Kagal). Zu ergänzen wäre noch a-e lá „Kanalwasser blockieren“ oder „... verringern“. LSU 196 (parallel zu a-e bu) und LSU 318.

In ED IIIb Lagaš ist a-e bu nicht sicher belegt aber a-e è und das in einem Kontext, in dem es um die Ableitung von Wasser im großen Stil gehen könnte: ur-lum-ma énsi umma^{ki}-ke₄ e-ki-sur-ra ^dnin-ḡir-su-ka e-ki-sur-ra ^dnanše a-e ì-mi-è „Ur-Luma, der Stadtfürst von Umma hat den Grenzgraben des Ninḡirsu, den Grenzgraben der Nanše, hat das Kanalwasser zu sich (Ventiv) herausgeleitet“.³⁾ Die Übersetzung von Zólyomi, NABU 2019/2: „Ur-Luma, ruler of Umma let water wash away/destroy the boundary levee“ ist grammatisch möglich. Doch Zólyomi muss eine Bedeutungsentwicklung „to leave > to make leave > to remove > to obliterate“ annehmen. Es gibt aber keine Belege die zeigen, dass diese Entwicklung tatsächlich stattgefunden hat.

Anmerkungen

1. Die Schreibung bu_x stützt sich nur auf LSU 144 F, gegen bu in LSU 196 B, EE. Wahrscheinlich ist PI ein auf dem Rand verschriebenes bu. In VS 14, 100 (= AWL 1) iii 2 verbessert PSD in bù[!]. Die Lesung gu₇ ist aber ebenfalls möglich.

2. Manfred Krebernik, Die Beschwörungen aus Fara und Ebla, TSO 2, Hildesheim 1984, 47.

3. Ent. 28 ii 28-35/29 iii 12-19; cf. Ent. 28 iv 10/29 iv 38.

Jan KEETMAN, <jkeet@aol.com>

2) On the alleged inscribed bricks of Naram-Suen from Susa — In 1995 Florence Malbran-Labat edited two fragmentary bricks (IRS 1, Br. 1-2) from Susa –currently housed at the Musée du Louvre, Département des Antiquités Orientales– bearing an inscription of Naram-Suen (MALBRAN-LABAT 1995: 21; see also recently MALBRAN-LABAT 2018: 467). According to the French scholar, the text of the inscription is arranged in seven lines¹⁾ and reads as follows:

[...] [n]a-ra-am^dsuen(EN.ZU)/ šar-ru-um/ dan-num₂/ šar UR₅^{ki}/ u₃ šar ki-ib-ra-tim/ [a]r-ba-im [...]
 [...] Naram-Suen, mighty king, king of Ur, king of the four quarters [...]

For the sake of comparison, F. Malbran-Labat mentioned in her bibliography another inscribed brick published by Vincent Scheil in 1900 (MDP 2: 56, pl. 13: 1)²⁾. The text is arranged in five lines³⁾ and only a part of it is preserved:

[...]/ na-ra-a[m] E[N] [...] šar-ru-[um] [...] dan-n[um₂]/ š[ar] [...]

V. Scheil assigned the inscription to Naram-Suen and his attribution was then followed by F. Malbran-Labat in 1995 (MALBRAN-LABAT 1995: 21). But already SCHEIL 1902: 8, publishing a new brick inscription of Šu-Suen (MDP 4: 8), rightly corrected his previous attribution: “[...] la brique attribuée à Narâm-Sin (*ibid.*, p. 56, pl. 13, n° 1), est en réalité de celles qui nous occupent ici. *Narâm Sin* y est à lire *narâm Bêl* et la première ligne du texte contenant soit Gimil Sin ou un autre nom royal, manque”.

With regards to the bricks Sb 14724 and Sb 14725 (IRS 1, Br. 1-2), they show the same features, i.e. “l’inscription est gravée verticalement sur la tranche de la brique” and “dans le deux cas, le texte conservé est quasiment identique” (MALBRAN-LABAT 1995: 21). As a matter of fact, both inscriptions exhibit some anomalies if compared to other brick inscriptions of Naram-Suen:

- **Typology.** All the bricks of Naram-Suen bear a stamped inscription: see e.g. RIME 2.1.4.14 (FAOS 7 Narāmsîn B3), 2.1.4.15 (FAOS 7 Narāmsîn 17), 2.1.4.16 (FAOS 7 Narāmsîn 19), 2.1.4.17 (FAOS 7 Narāmsîn 18), 2.1.4.22 (FAOS 7 Narāmsîn 19). On the contrary, the two bricks from Susa are handwritten and exhibit some signs partly crossing the line framing, giving rise to a cluttered pattern. It is worth noting that similar features are attested on the bricks from Susa starting from the Ur III period onwards.

- **Position of the inscription.** Naram-Suen’s inscriptions are usually displayed on the beds of the bricks, see for example the bricks published on CDLI as P216564-P216570, P216572, P461454 (all from Nippur) and P216622 (from Tell Brak). The inscriptions of the two bricks from Susa are displayed on the stretcher faces like later inscriptions as, e.g., in Šu-Suen bricks (IRS 3).

- **Titulary.** It shows two peculiarities so far never attested elsewhere in Naram-Suen’s royal inscriptions: a) the syllabic rendering (*šar-ru-um*) for the word “king” rather than the use of the logogram LUGAL⁴⁾ and b) the title “king of Ur”. As early as 1995, Malbran-Labat stressed that the “qualification de ‘roi d’Ur’ est rare” for Naram-Suen (MALBRAN-LABAT 1995: 21). As against, these two features are quite common in all the bricks from Susa that bear a seven line inscription of Šu-Suen: ^dšu-^dsuen(EN.ZU)/ na-ra-am^den-lil₂/ šar-ru-um/ dan-num₂/ šar UR₅^{ki}/ u₃ šar ki-ib-ra-tim/ ar-ba-im (IRS 3; see also RIME 3/2.1.4.10 = FAOS 7, Ur 7). The title of Šu-Suen is identical to the one attested in IRS 1. Moreover, since on the two bricks there is a lacuna before the alleged name of Naram-Suen, it is likely that the inscription did not begin with the name of the Akkadian king (see MALBRAN-LABAT 1995: 21: “l’inscription étant mutilée au début et à la fin, on ne sait pas si elle débutait effectivement par le nom propre ou si une dédicace le précédait et si, à la fin, elle comportait un verbe.”).

- **Dimensions of the bricks.** Sb 14724 measures [18] × 12 × 9 cm, while Sb 14725 measures [19.5] × [18] × 9 cm⁵⁾ (MALBRAN-LABAT 1995: 238). For the sake of comparison, it is worth noting that the bricks with a stamped inscription of Naram-Suen from Nippur and Tell Brak have an average thickness between 7 and 8 cm (see FRAYNE 1993: 119, 126), unlike the bricks in the Louvre which are 9 cm thick. The only 3rd millennium bricks from Susa that have a thickness of 9 cm are those ones of Šu-Suen (IRS 3: 8, 10, 11, 13, 14, 20, 22, 23; see MALBRAN-LABAT 1995: 238).

- **Clay features.** Sb 14724 and Sb 14725 are characterized by “[...] argile ocre-rouge, extrêmement dure et lourde [...]” (MALBRAN-LABAT 1995: 21). Similar features can be found in Šu-Suen’s bricks (see MALBRAN-LABAT 1995: 23 “L’argile est ocre-rouge, lourde et dure, assez comparable à celle utilisée sous Naram-Sin”).

- **Paleography.** The *ductus* of the inscription does not seem to support a Sargonic dating but rather a slightly later one, probably Ur III. More precisely, the signs do not reflect the proper shape and the typical arrangement of the Old Akkadian period (see for example the signs RU, ŠAR, etc.).

The aforementioned anomalies lead to the conclusion that the two alleged bricks of Naram-Suen from Susa should instead be ascribed to Šu-Suen, whose name was written at the beginning of the

inscription, now completely lost. Recently, Michael Roaf has suggested that the Naram-Suen's bricks from Susa "do not belong to the fourth ruler of Akkad" (SALLABERGER – SCHRAKAMP 2015: 123 n. 429). The photograph of Sb 14724 published in MALBRAN-LABAT 1995: 21 shows indeed that the sign ZU is in fact LIL₂, so that the text should be emended as [^dš_u-^dsuen₂]/ [n]a-ra-am ^den-lil₂. This interpretation is corroborated by a similar brick (BK 1) housed in the National Museum of Iran and recently published by MATSUSHIMA 2018: 27. Also in BK 1, the sign LIL₂ was previously read as ZU and thus the brick was labelled with the name of Naram-Suen. As rightly pointed out by Matsushima, the brick should be attributed instead to Šu-Suen.

The current lack of inscribed bricks of Naram-Suen from Susa makes the statement that Naram-Suen was the only Akkadian king whose own inscriptions attest his activity as royal builder in the east (e.g. POTTS 2016: 97) basically unproven. Moreover, it does not support the assumption that those bricks "[...] may relate to his construction there of a temple [...]" (POTTS 2016: 97; see also MALBRAN-LABAT 1995: 21: "Le texte n'indique pas à quel temple appartenait cette brique" and SCHEIL 1900: 56: "Certainement, il construisit à Suse soit des temples, soit des palais. Ce fragment de brique qui a été trouvé à Suse, et qui porte son nom, en fait foi").

Anyway, if not as a builder, the activity of the Akkadian king in Susa is surely attested by the so-called "Treaty of Naram-Suen" found in Susa and dealing with his alliance with a king of Awan whose name is lost (HINZ 1967). As far as archaeology is concerned, STEVE – GASCHÉ 1971: 81 suggested that the structures of the second level ("Agadé ancien") in Susa can be dated to the reigns of Naram-Suen and Maništušū. Moreover, there are reasons to believe that several Old Akkadian cuneiform tablets mainly published in LEGRAIN 1913: 62-131 (see also BASELLO – GIOVINAZZO 2018: 484-485) should be dated to Naram-Suen's reign (SURDI forthcoming).

Notes

1. MALBRAN-LABAT 1995: 21: "[...] le texte conservé [...] compte sept lignes distribuées en registres". MALBRAN-LABAT 1995: 238 mentions seven lines preserved for the inscription on Sb 14724 (IRS 1, Br. 1) and six lines preserved for the inscription on Sb 14725 (IRS 1, Br. 2). As for Sb 14724, neither the photo nor the copy show a dividing stroke between lines 4 and 5, thus they have to be counted as a single line. Moreover, there is no trace of an additional line after the last inscribed one so it cannot be taken into account. Thus, a total of five lines can be counted for Sb 14724. As for the lines of Sb 14725 (IRS 1, Br. 2), nothing can be said since the photo of the inscription has not been published yet.

2. According to F. Malbran-Labat, the brick published by Scheil in MDP 2: 56 is similar to Sb 14724 and Sb 14725 but "il semble s'agir d'une autre brique plus mutilée que celles que nous avons répertoriées" (MALBRAN-LABAT 1995: 21).

3. The photo published in MDP 2, pl. 13: 1 shows five lines, the last of which is occupied by a partially readable sign ŠAR. Nevertheless, in MDP 2: 56 Scheil did not report the line at the beginning of the inscription (where no signs are preserved) but noted two breaks after the sign ŠAR, so that a total of six lines can be counted.

4. Scheil was the first to point out the unexpected use of the syllabic rendering *šar-ru-um* –instead of the logogram LUGAL– in the inscription published in MDP 2: 56: "L'emploi de *šar-ru*, phonétiquement écrit au lieu de l'idéogramme usuel LUGAL, pour nouveau qu'il soit dans ces sortes de formules, ne peut point nous étonner".

5. Square brackets indicate incomplete measures because the bricks are broken.

Bibliography

- BASELLO, G. P. – GIOVINAZZO, G., 2018. "Elamite Administration" in J. Álvarez-Mon, G.P. Basello and Y. Wicks (eds.), *The Elamite World*, London-New York: 481-504.
- FRAYNE, D. R., 1993. *Sargonic and Gutian periods (2334-2113 BC)*, Toronto (= RIME 2).
- , 1997. *Ur III period (2112-2004 BC)*, Toronto (= RIME 3/2).
- GELB, I. J. – KIENAST, B., 1990. *Die altakkadischen Königsinschriften des dritten Jahrtausends v.Chr.*, Stuttgart (= FAOS 7).
- HINZ, W., 1967. "Elams Vertrag mit Narâm-Sîn von Akkade" in ZA 24: 66-96.
- LEGRAIN, L., 1913. "Tablettes de Comptabilité, etc. de l'Époque de la Dynastie d'Agadê" in V. Scheil (ed.), *Mémoires de la Mission archéologique de Susiane XIV. Textes élamites-sémitiques, cinquième série*, Paris: 62-131.
- MALBRAN-LABAT, F., 1995. *Les inscriptions royales de Suse: Briques de l'époque paléo-élamite à l'Empire néo-élamite*, Paris (= IRS).
- , 2018. "Elamite royal inscriptions" in J. Álvarez-Mon, G.P. Basello and Y. Wicks (eds.), *The Elamite World*, London-New York: 464-480.

- MATSUSHIMA, E., 2018. “Bricks” in K. Maekawa (ed.), *Ancient Text Sources in the National Museum of Iran, vol. 1: Brick Inscriptions in the National Museum of Iran: a catalogue*, Kyoto: 2-289.
- POTTS, D.T., 2016². *The Archaeology of Elam. Formation and Transformation of an Ancient Iranian State*, New York.
- SALLABERGER, W. – SCHRACKAMP, I., 2015. “The Gutean Period: A Problem of 3rd Millennium Chronology” in W. Sallaberge and I. Schrackamp (eds.) *Associated Regional Chronologies for the Ancient Near East and the Eastern Mediterranean (ARCANE) 3. History & Philology*, Turnhout: 113-130.
- SCHEIL, V., 1900. *Mémoires de la Mission archéologique de Susiane II. Textes élamites-sémitiques, première série*, Paris (= MDP 2).
- , 1902. *Mémoires de la Mission archéologique de Susiane IV. Textes élamites-sémitiques, deuxième série*, Paris (= MDP 4).
- STEVE, M.-J. – GASCHE, H., 1971. *L'acropole de Suse. Nouvelles fouilles (rapport préliminaire)*, Paris.

Mirko SURDI <mirko.surdi@unive.it> <surdimirko@gmail.com>
Università Ca' Foscari Venezia (ITALY)

3) How to transliterate Sumerian? — A new system for the transliteration of Sumerian was introduced by Pascal Attinger in recent years.¹⁾ He never published a report with full evidence, analysis of the texts he prioritised and detailed justification of the method. His notes in Catherine Mittermayers aBZL are helpful but short. This can be justified by the character of the book. But more justification is still necessary.

Attinger formulates some important goals of his reform like clarifying etymologies, clarifying the direction of the adoption of loanwords, clarifying grammar and so on. His system must be evaluated according to these goals. To give an example, we can't derive PI-dam from ba, if we have not the reading be₆ in our arsenal. The example PI-dam is from Ur III and aBZL is a sign list for Old Babylonian Sumerian. But this limitation of aBZL is rarely noticed and even a system for OB texts, should be created with the earlier texts in mind.

Attingers system is a very important improvement. Every discussion should start with it. But it should be open to discussion. This is difficult without more justification. The list below is meant as a starting point for a more general discussion.

alam/alan: *ALAM-ma/me is never attested in PSD. But as observed by Jagersma (Grammar 216) some words show unexplained preferences like enim-ma-né but dam-a-né. ALAM-na-né is rare as well and in most cases it can be attributed to ALAM-na “stone-statue”. Only Šusin Hist. Inscr. A vi 29 and in Rīmūš C 9, 12 (OB copy) mention ALAM-na-né with another material. We may even think of mistakes because of common ALAM-na “stone-statue” or Akk. *lānu*. In Ur-Namma A 51 the text from Susa changes a-la-na into alam-a-né but this may be a last resort when confronted with a rare expression. Proto-Ea has a-la-âg and a-la-am. All other lexical texts, syllabic writings and glosses show a-la-am/-lam, never *a-la-an. Proto-Ea had the highest priority for Attinger but alam is excluded. Of course alan can be discussed, but in other cases the priority of Proto-Ea and a variety of other Middle Old Babylonian Nippur texts, mostly written by beginners is taken for granted.

^aarim_x(NE.RU): There are two words with the same writing and similar meanings érim and ne-ru. In Ebla enim NE.RU is glossed as en-na-ma en-ru₁₂(EN), VE 197. In some texts with Ur III background a variant A.NE.RU is used.²⁾ It is followed by /m/ and that's why this A.NE.RU belongs to érim while Ebla VE 197 has more similarities with ne-ru. The best solution seems ^aarim_x, from which érim can be derived by vowel harmony. Of course we may try ^eérim, but e₄ as phonetic indicator is problematic.

The sign A is part of about 40 combinations, sometimes because of the meaning “water” or “liquid”. In some cases it is not clear at all why A is added as in A.KAL illu, AxḪA zàḫ, A.ḪA.TAR.DU girim. In some cases it may be a phonetic indicator for /e/: A.ÉSIR = ^eésir, A.TIR = ^eša/eše₄, A.AM = ^eeldig. The meaning of the first is “bitumen” which is more or less fluid. Another explanation could be that the indicator wasn't changed after *aser > /eser/. eša is *sasqû* a quality of flour, from which sometimes with water or another liquid a drink called *mê sasqû* was made (CAD S 193f.). This is only known from Akkadian texts, but that doesn't mean that it was not known in Sumer. It would be surprising, if a phonetic indicator e₄(A) would be used to deny AM the reading am. A writing el-di-ig is found in Tell Haddad, ZA 83, 177, 7. But ildág (A.AM) in Sumerian and *ildakku* in Akkadian are well attested.

The reading e_4 belongs to the word for “water”. But in Sumerian and Akkadian texts as well as in the glosses of Proto-Ea the opposition $a : e$ is used. As phonetic indicator for $/e/$ A would not only be against its normal use as phonogram, it would be as well an indicator for $/e/$ and $/a/$, since it is likely as phonetic indicator in $asil_4$ (EZENxA), aag_4 (A.KA), aaddir (A.PA.BI.ĜEŠ.PAD.DIR), $aktum$ (A.SU), $kadr_4^a$ (NÍĜ.ŠĀ.A) and perhaps in ab_x (ABxA), where it hints on the reading ab against $èš$. May be there is a phonetic reason behind the difference in the use of A as phonogram and as phonetic indicator. But for the time being it seems better avoiding interpretations with e_4 as phonetic indicator.

bára or $para_{10}$? The reading $para_{10}$ may be a reflex of the loan *parakkum*. Compare OB and later bansur (*paššūrum*), but Sjöberg Mondgott 89: 17; 20: $pa-an-su-úr$, Šulpae A 51 var. $en-pà-an-su-ra$. It could be a problem of the quality of some OB texts and not an unexplained development $p > b$ in the younger tradition.

be₆ (PI): Ur III be_6 -dam for $*ba-e$ -dam, ED IIIb/Sargonic Nippur $-be_6$ for $-bé$ (OSP 2, 125, 12 maškim-PI etc.). For $-bé$ compare the opposition $bí : bé$ in the Old Sumerian prefix-harmony, Sargonic Akkadian and $na-bé-a$ “what he is telling”, $ba-gub-bé-en$ Innana B 19 etc.³⁾

The reading pe (not pi) appears first in Sumerian texts with (š) $PE-el(-lá)$ in the city laments. A ED IIIb loan from Akkadian is not $pi-lu_5-da$ but be_6-lu_5-da ($< bēlutum$). This came back into Akkadian as *belludū* not $*pilludū$ as in the dictionaries. The dictionaries show no writing with pi of this word in Akkadian texts. I don’t know any occasion where a reading pi is used in Sumerian and even the OB examples for pe may be be_6 . The $pi-li-pi-li$ is perhaps a *bēlī-bēlī* “My Lord! My Lord!”. This may be true or not, but using a reading $pi-li-pi-li$ to justify pi in Sumerian texts would be a circular argument.

***biz, bez** (BI): In OBO 160/1, 80 Englund argues that the reading $/bi/$ for the sign KAŠ “should represent some object or actions related to the production of beer” and that this reading is most probably derived from the language of the archaic texts. The reading bi is in most cases a wrong convention, since there is a clear opposition $bé$ (BI) : $bí$ (NE) in Sumerian and in Sargonic Akkadian. The reading $bí$ is probably shortened from $bíl$ “to burn” and $bé$ from the verb *bez* “to drop” (PSD B 161f. s. v. *biz*) which may also denote the sound made by the bubbles of beer. At least *bez* should be noted.

bu₁₁(Ú) in the name $^4ba-bu_{11}$ and in a few other divine and personal names. See RA 112, 15-22; NABU 2019/4; NABU 2019/41. aBZL has neither bu_{11} nor $*ba_6$.

***⁷e₅**(NIN) the existence of the reading e_5 is doubtful. NIN^c may be $ereš^c$ (cf. Litke, TBC 3, 68 to II 21) or *nin* with deictic element. Lugalbanda II 294: nin_9 $nin-ĝu_{10}$ “my sister and ruler” or “my royal sister” (not $nin_9-e_5-ĝu_{10}$). In Enki and the world order 403; 406; 412 when Innana is pointing on her so called “sisters” one by one, a deictic element is possible.

ge₇/*gi₇: for ge_7 see MesZL p. 207. Why gi_7 ?

***ia₁₋₄**: there is no reason for a diphthong and a glide should be written j as in AHw/CAD or y . In Presargonic (including Ebla) and Sargonic Semitic the syllable $/ji/$ is written with I (5xAŠ), while $/ja/$ is written with A or NI. Ea II 251 (MSL 14, 258) has: $i+a$ 5xDIŠ = *hanšat* “5”. Normally $i+a$ is interpreted as ja , but in this time Akkadian had no other sign for $/ji/$. It is very probable that the early Semitic writing for $/ji/$ comes from the Sumerian word for “5”. That’s why the reading $iá$ or $já$ for 5xDIŠ should be changed into $jí$.

imi: for IM = *šāru* “Wind” we find the glosses *im*, *i-me*, *i-mi* and in commentaries *tu* (CAD Š II 133; cf. s. v. *īdu*), from which *im* and tu_{15} are as well attested in Proto-Ea. The reading tu_{15} is confirmed by other sources, but is probably shortened from tum_6 (Landsberger MSL 9, 119-21, *tumu* is Emesal). But IM “wind” is ending with a vowel since an expected $-e$ is not written: $ninta á diri-ke_4$ ^{im}*mer-e* *hur-saĝ ki-sikil-ta* IM *si ma-ra-ab-sá-e* „I shall guide towards you the man with extraordinary power, the north-wind, from the mountains, the pure place, the wind” Gudea Cyl. A xi 22f. Of course the case is somehow complex, we may rethink $tu_{15}/tum_6/tumu$, but a simple solution would be *imi* or ime_x . That Proto-Ea has only *im* is no surprise since this reading is very common. But *imi* is hardly only a graphic representation of $/im/$: F. ex. DT 40 (CT 11, 29-32) has ^{i-mi}IM but ^{ab}*ab* and ^{uš}*uš*.

kuĝ_x(PA) perhaps better than kum_x . From Proto-Ea onwards PA has the reading *ku-un* = *kún* translated as *nabātu*, *namāru*. But $ku-ûĝ$ is possible as well. The reading kum_x comes from Ur-Namma C 9: PA-PA-MU. Perhaps we should read $kuĝ_x-kuĝ_x-ĝu_{10}$. There is no other way for writing the vowel

harmony after /...uĝ/ with CV. As far as the author knows, such a writing is not attested after ħuĝ. But this may be not because ĝu₁₀ was not allowed in this position but because ħuĝ didn't trigger this sort of vowel harmony. There are other exceptions from this vowel harmony like ħúl, while for example gul often shows this vowel harmony.

*mí, against aBZL p. 204 sign 450, MUNUS-a for me-a speaks for a reading me_x not *mí. The example shows how some never challenged traditions still form transliterations (in Attingers system far less than before). For the lyre ZÀ.MUNUS (*sammû*) there is twice the gloss za-me-in (MSL 6, 121, CAD S 118b). For the praise zà-MUNUS the ED-writing is zà-ME. The reading mim for MUNUS in Proto-Ea 423 is far from clear. MSL 14, 48 writes it: 'me⁷im. /em/ has no special sign and a reading 'me⁷em has no problem. In some way *mí may have triggered the choice for mín/mim against men_x/mem_x.

še_x (SIG₇): cf. ga-SIG₇-a "Dickmilch" otherwise written ga-še-a (Stol, RIA 8, 193). This is as well the reading of SIG₇ as plural for ti(-l) "to live"; "to dwell": lugal-sa₆-ga an-da-še "they dwell with PN" OSP 1, 26 Rs. i' 3'f. It is one of a view bases without a clear preference for e- and ì- in ED IIIb Lagaš (Poebel, AS 2, 39 add e-SIG₇ in AWAS 24 + 86 iii 10; viii 4; CUSAS 26, 171 v 4). The prefix e- is very rare in front of verbs containing /i/ (Keetman, JCS 57 with n. 16; exception til "to end", BuB 7, 149). The singular base ti(-l) has only ì-ti, showing a different vowel (Poebel, AS 2, 43). If še_x seems to be too radical, at least se₁₂ should be available not only si₁₂. Proto-Ea 413f. has se₁₂, sa₇ not si₁₂. It may be influenced by sig₇. This would be the wrong direction. Since the only way to distinguish /se/ from /si/ is SI-e, but for unknown reasons a pattern *CV-V-VC is normally avoided and therefor SI.IG can be interpreted in both ways as /sig/ or /seg/.

šér (BU): The reading is attested as šér = šarūru "radiance", "brilliance" (CAD A II 140b), which is normally expressed with še-er, še-er-zi. The writing šér instead of še-er is clearly not just a variant like mal for ma-al, but links BU to the meaning. In Old Babylonian Sumerian še-er(-zi) is well attested and that's why we should assume šér as well in Old Babylonian times. I don't see where it is used, but some divine names are formed with BU, which may stand for the notion "brilliant". A confirmation of the old origin of šér comes from ED IIIa: OIP 99 iii 12 šér-dab, but še-er-tab-ba in younger texts (Instr. of Šuruppak 186). Cf. Anu ša amēli 10: BU : AN : [ša] nu-ri and ^dBU-nir (Sîn) in An Anu III 5 after ^dgeš-nu₁₁-gal (alabaster). Cf. Anu ša amēli 33: [^dBU]-^dnir¹ : (Sîn) : šá ni-ip-ĥi. The sign NIR has the reading šer₇ and it is possible that the name of the God was ^dšér⁷, ^dšer⁷ or ^dšér-šer₇.

šilig is cancelled in aBZL. But in the sign IGI = ši seems to be a phonetic indicator. It has also the reading asar/asal used in ^dasal-lú-ĥi. But this word of unknown meaning may be connected with the meaning of šilig. Proto-Ea has silig, both variants could be retained.

ze₅ (ÁB.ŠÀ.GE): attested in ED II Ur and ED IIIb Lagaš.⁴⁾

Discussing the reading of Sumerian is like opening the box of Pandora and her "box" was a pithos! But it is necessary for reasons already mentioned by Attinger.

Notes

1. aBZL; ZA 88 (1988) 165. NABU 2007/37; NABU 2008/72 n. 9, Tableau grammatical sumérien 36-39 unter <<http://www.arch.unibe.ch.attinger>>; NABU 2011/58 n. 1, response to Michalowski MC 15, 242f.
2. Utu-ĥeġal 4; 7; Ur-Namma A 52 D (Ur III); TMH 6, 11 iii 1, iv 1; 14, 7, 15, 16.
3. PSD B 3a; in-be₆-e-éš (Ur III), an-be₆ (Sarg.) PSD B 5b; cf. ka-zu nam-bé-e ID 133, 138, 143, 153, 163 text x. For bé : bí- see Kramer AS 8 already compared by Jagersma, Grammar 214; for Akkadian Sommerfeld IMGULA 3/1, 18; WZKM 102, 218; Hasselbach, Sargonic Akkadian (Wiesbaden 2005) 32; 41-44; be₆ is often used for writing bēlīr "my lord" in ED Akkadian names: Steinkeller NABU 2004/13; Sommerfeld BuB 6, 132 (pi conventional).
4. Krecher ASJ 9 (1987) 85 n. 4; Jagersma apud Selz FAOS 15, 2 (1993) 533f. Meyer-Laurin WO 41 (2011) 50-52; author NABU 2012/58; NABU 2013/20; BiOr 71, 459; NABU 2016/55 n. 1.

Jan KEETMAN <jkeet@aol.com>

4) Innana et Ebiĥ 19 — Dans NABU 2019/89, J. Keetman a remis en question la traduction de saġ gur₄-gur₄ par "faire rouler les têtes"¹⁾ et proposé "die Köpfe verbeulen" (Keetman 2019). Ce sens serait dérivé de "dick machen" (> "Beulen machen" > "verbeulen"). Quoiqu'il ne l'écrive pas explicitement, il semble nier l'existence d'un verbe gur₄ "(faire) rouler". Curieusement, il ne mentionne pas dans sa note un passage

important (discuté dans mon commentaire; v. Attinger 1998:183), à savoir *Uru ammailabi* XXI 74 (cf. Volk 1989:200): saĝ-du ^{ĝes}ella₂ [g]ur/^lkur₄¹-ra-am₃ mi-ni-ib₂-gur₄-gur₄-re-e-en = *qaq-qa-da-a-ti ki-ma/GIM pu-uk-ki ku-ub/kub-bu-ti uš-ta-naq-ra-ar* "Köpfe, die (wie) schwere (Holz-)Kugeln sind, lasse ich [Innana] rollen" (ainsi Volk 1989:205; commentaire pp. 243 sq.).

Il faut distinguer en fait kur₄ "être/devenir/rendre épais" (et sens dérivés) de gur₄², correspondant à l'akkadien *qarāru* et signifiant "se tordre, se tortiller" et "(faire) rouler³". On le rencontre, dans des passages souvent difficile, soit seul ("se tordre": Išme-Dagan AB 82; "se tortiller" Descente d'Innana 229 et 256), soit dans les expressions **a gur** "rouler (larmes)"⁴) (Cavigneaux, ASJ 9, 65:2⁵), CT 58, 20 ii 15), ^{ĝes}naĝa₃ **gur**₄-**gur**₄, litt. "faire tourner (les pilons) sur/dans (bi₂-) les mortiers", d'où "moudre dans des mortiers" (Alster 1997:320, UET 6, 335 et SP 3.39)⁶), **saĝ(-du) gur**₄ "faire rouler les têtes" (Innana et Ebiḥ 20 et *Uru ammailabi* XXI 74) et **šu gur**₄ "se tordre les mains" (Descente d'Innana 389a(?)), "se tordre" (Skly. 56 iii 45 et passages parallèles⁷), CT 17, 19:17).

Dans ces conditions, il me semble inutile de postuler pour Innana et Ebiḥ 19 une acception de kur₄ par ailleurs non attestée.

Notes

1. Ainsi Attinger 1998:169. Contrairement à ce que suppose Keetman, cette traduction n'est pas usuelle ("wie normalerweise übersetzt wird").
2. Je lis, non sans hésitation, kur₄ si GUR₄ signifie "(être/rendre) épais" (et sens dérivés), gur₄ seulement s'il signifie "se tordre, rouler". PrEa 27 a kur. Dans Ea I 23-25, B a kur pour *kabru* et *rabû*, mais gur pour KA.KA.SI.GA. C distingue en revanche gu-ur = *kabru*, qu-ur = KA.KA.SIG.GA et ku-ur = *rabû*; avant tout l'opposition entre gu-ur = *kabru* et ku-ur = *rabû* est suspecte. Emar VI/4, 21:452' a ku.ur [GUR₄...]. Diri Nippur 66-69 enfin a (pour GUR₄.GUR₄) gu-ur-gu-ur aussi bien pour "(être) épais" que pour "se tordre"; v. aussi CAD K 22 s.v. *kabru*. En ce qui concerne les graphies non-standard de kur₄ "(être/rendre) épais", etc., on a gi₇-r dans Ezinam-brebi 168 IIIu (Ur), ku-r dans Innana C 1 C (Nippur) et kur₆ dans Ninisina D 7 B (Ur). Pour gur₄ "se tordre", les textes lexicaux plaident dans leur majorité pour /gur/; noter aussi gu-r dans Cavigneaux, ASJ 9, 65:2.
3. Sur gur₄ "se tordre", etc., cf. CAD G 47 sq. s.v. *garāru* A, Krecher 1966:173 sq., Attinger 1998:183, George 2002:143, Johnson/Geller 2015:212 et Ludwig/Metcalf 2017:18 ad 82.
4. Sur a gur, v. George 2002:143.
5. /gur/ écrit gu-r.
6. Sur les problèmes soulevés par ces deux passages, v. Attinger 2019, note à propos de ^{ĝes}naĝa₃.
7. V. Krecher 1966:173 sq.

Bibliographie

- ALSTER, B. 1997: *Proverbs of Ancient Sumer*.
 ATTINGER, P., 1998: Inana et Ebiḥ, ZA 88, 164-195.
 — 2019: *Lexique sumérien-français* [...]. <http://www.iaw.unibe.ch/attinger> > Dokumente.
 GEORGE, A.R. 2002: How Women Weep? Reflections on a Passage of Bilgames and the Bull of Heaven, dans: S. Parpola and R.M. Whiting (ed.), *Sex and Gender in the Ancient Near East: Proceedings of the 47th Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale*. Helsinki, July 2-6, 2001. Part I, 141-150.
 KRECHER, J. 1966: *Sumerische Kultlyrik*.
 JOHNSON, J. Cale and GELLER, M.J. 2015: *The Class Reunion— An Annotated Translation and Commentary on the Sumerian Dialogue Two Scibes*. CM 47.
 KEETMAN, J., 2019: Innana macht dicke Köpfe, NABU 2019/89.
 LUDWIG, M.-C. and METCALF, C. 2017: The Song of Innana and Išme-Dagan: An Edition of BM 23820+23831, ZA 107, 1-21.
 VOLK, K. 1989: *Die Balaĝ-Komposition Ūru àm-ma-ir-ra-bi. Rekonstruktion und Bearbeitung der Tafeln 18 (19ff.), 19, 20 und 21 der späten, kanonischen Version*. FAOS 18.

Pascal ATTINGER <pascal.attinger@iaw.unibe.ch>
 Neuchâtel (SUISSE)

5) *Ninĝišzida* and *Ninazimua*, Nippur version I. 104 (= Ur version I. 40¹) — The Sumerian narrative *Ninĝišzida* and *Ninazimua*², still presents numerous problems of interpretation, mainly due to the fragmented state of the sources and of the frequent exchanges of unattributable direct speech.³ This note will discuss a detail that has so far escaped attention: the metaphorical expression in the Nippur version line

104 (ms. A⁴), iv 10a-10b) = Ur version 40 (ms. B⁵), rev. 19) of this composition can partly be reconstructed and understood, using parallels in related compositions. The line in question reads as follows:⁶

A	iv 10a	šu-si sa ₇ -sa ₇ -ga
	iv 10 b	bulug ⁷) [ḡis ⁸ taškarin-n]a-gen ₇ KA HAR-ra bi ₂ -bad
B	rev. 19	ḡis ⁸ taškarin-gen ₇ šu- ⁹ si ¹ sa ₆ ¹ ga ¹ x ⁸) ¹ x ¹ [...]

For this line, the following translations were given (either for each version independently, or for a combination of both):

- Die grünen Finger haben wie Buchsbaum-Pflöcke Atemlöcher⁷ geöffnet! (Wilcke 1988 apud Black 2004)
- The green fingers, like boxwood stakes, have opened up... ...! (Black 2004: 225; Nippur version)
- The green fingers... ...like boxwood... ... (Black 2004: 226, Ur version)
- Like a boxwood tree, like one with ‘good hands’ (?)... (J. Peterson CDLI P346112; Ur version)

Due to the fragmented state of l. 40 of the Ur version, the following discussion mainly concerns l. 104 of the Nippur version; the former is, however, important for the reconstruction of the line in question. There exists a neat parallel to l. 104 of the Nippur version in a very similar context:

Dumuzid's Dream, l. 69:

šu-si-ḡu₁₀ ḡis⁸bulug taškarin te ma-ra-ab-hur-hur-re⁹)

‘My fingers, boxwood *needles*,¹⁰) will scratch (my) cheeks because of you.’

It appears that l. 104 of the Nippur version of *Ninḡišzida* and *Ninazimua* likewise describes the lamenting woman, having scratched (hur-ra) herself with her fingers (šu-si) as with *needles* of boxwood¹¹) (bulug ḡis⁸taškarin-na-gen₇).¹² 13)

Similar descriptions of mourning women scratching their faces (and other parts of their body) in grief suggest that the sign KA describes the body part that is injured by the mourning woman, and that it should be read kiri₃ ‘nose’ (or, possibly, ka.g ‘mouth’) here; cf. for instance, *Dumuzid's Dream*, l. 242;¹⁴) *Dumuzid* and *Ĝeštinana*, l. 39;¹⁵) *Inana's Descent to the Netherworld*, l. 37-38¹⁶).

There remains the translation of bi₂-bad. Black's translation for bi₂-bad appears appropriate, assuming that Ninazimua opens her fingers (which had before been tensed, while she was scratching her nose/mouth with them as with needles of boxwood?). One may speculate whether the opening of her fingers possibly implies a ‘happy ending’ of the narrative, i.e. Ninḡišzida returning.¹⁷)

To sum up, the following translation is suggested for l. 104 of the Nippur version of *Ninḡišzida* and *Ninazimua*:

‘She opened the (= her) beautiful fingers, which had scratched the (= her) nose like needles [of boxwood].’

Notes

1. This discussion was written within the project ‘Bestiarium Mesopotamicum: animal omens in Ancient Mesopotamia’. The author cordially thanks Anna Pintér for commenting on an earlier version of this note and James Watson for correcting her English.

2. Translation: Black 2004. In this article, this composition received the ETCSL number 1.7.2. It was, however, not included to the latest online version of ETCSL. (last access: 12.12.2019).

3. See Black 2004, especially 217-219.

4. HS 1520 (TMH NF 4 4 Nippur; collations and partial copy by Wilcke 1976: 44-45).

5. U. 16893 (UET 6/1 27 Ur; collations by Ludwig 2009: 43-44.9). The line in question was collated from the CDLI photo (P346112).

6. The manuscript sigla are those of Black 2004: 219-220. This line is not contained in Black's manuscript C (UM 29-13-180), suggested by him to belong to a possible further version from Nippur.

7. The copy of TMH NF 4 4 shows MU; but see Wilcke 1976: 45 (collation to IV 10b, 1).

8. This sign was given as GEN₇ on CDLI (P346112, last access: 13.12.2019), which might be correct: ḡis⁸taškarin-gen₇ šu sa₆-ga-gen₇ x x [...].

9. Transliteration following Alster 1972: 60 (loc. cit. 61: 69 for variations); Alster 2006: 13, 25; Attinger 2006; Attinger 2015; Tinney 2018. Note the additional lines in the fragments published by Peterson 2011: 49-58.

10. Some manuscripts add -gen₇ (Alster 1972: 60-61; Attinger 2015: 5, fn. 59). On the interpretation of bulug ḡis⁸taškarin, see Alster 1982: 4; PSD B, bulug A.; Steinkeller 2011: 27 (commentary to i 14).

11. On boxwood, see Heimpel 2011: 133; Pfitzner forthcoming, chapter 2.3.1.

12. Although, admittedly, neither of the two manuscripts has bulug ḡis⁸taškarin-na as a whole phrase.

13. Whether there exists a connection of the line in question and of l. 69 of Dumuzid's Dream to Nanna-Su'en's Journey to Nippur, l. 204a (and parallels: l. 215a, 226a, 327a, 248a; these lines are extant only in manuscript DD = JRL E 1; Ferrara 1973), is unclear: šu-si-ne₂ ^{giš}bulug ^{giš}taškarin mu-na-bur₁₂-bur₁₂-re. The similarity is noteworthy.
14. Alster 1972: 80.
15. Sladek 1974: 228; 188 (discussion of igi... hur and kiri₃... hur).
16. Sladek 1974: 188; Attinger 2019: 13, 82 and fn. 275.
17. A happy ending of this composition, telling of Ningišzida's return in the fresh green vegetation after the dry season, was proposed by Wilcke 1988: 246-248.

Bibliography

- ALSTER, B. 1972: *Dumuzi's Dream. Aspects of Oral Poetry in a Sumerian Myth. Mesopotamia* 1. Copenhagen.
- ALSTER, B. 1975: 'A New Source for "Dumuzi's Dream"', in: RA 69: 97-108.
- ALSTER, B. 1982: 'The Mythology of Mourning', in: ASJ 4: 1-16.
- ALSTER, B. 2006: 'New Sources for Dumuzi's Dream', in: ZA 96: 1-30.
- ATTINGER, P. 2006: 'Le rêve de Dumuzi', in: NABU 2006/69: 69-71.
- ATTINGER, P. 2015: *Le rêve de Dumuzi (1.4.3)*.
http://www.iaw.unibe.ch/unibe/portal/fak_historisch/dga/iaw/content/e39448/e99428/e122665/e122821/pane122850/e122903/1_4_3.pdf (letzter Abruf: 15.12.2018).
- ATTINGER, P. 2019: La descente d'Innana dans le monde infernal (1.4.1),
<https://zenodo.org/record/2599619#.XfDVZ3dFyIs> (last access: 13.12.2019).
- BLACK, J. 2004: 'Ningišzida and Ninazimua', in: *Orientalia* NS 73: 215-227.
- HEIMPEL, W. 2011: 'Twenty-Eight Trees Growing in Sumer', in: OWEN, D.I. (ed.): *Garšana Studies*, CUSAS 6 (Bethesda, Maryland: CDL Press): 75-152.
- LUDWIG, M.C. 2009: *Literarische Texte aus Ur. Kollationen und Kommentare zu UET 6/1-2*. UAVA 9. Berlin – Boston.
- PETERSON, J. 2011: *Sumerian Literary Fragments in the University Museum, Philadelphia*. BPOA 9. Madrid.
- PFITZNER, J. forthcoming: 'The Use of *ellum*, *ebbum*, and *namrum* in the sign list Diri', to be published in KASKAL 16.
- SLADEK, W. 1974: *Inanna's Descent to the Netherworld. Dissertation*. The Johns Hopkins University.
- STEINKELLER, P. 2011: 'Third-Millennium Royal and Votive Inscriptions', in: GEORGE, A. (ed.), *Cuneiform Royal Inscriptions and Related Texts in the Schøyen Collection*, CUSAS 17: 1-28.
- TINNEY, St. 2018: "'Dumuzi's Dream" Revisited', in: JNES 77: 85-89.
- WILCKE, C. 1976: *Kollationen zu den sumerischen literarischen Texten aus Nippur in der Hilprecht-Sammlung Jena. Abhandlungen der Sächsischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig, Philologisch-historische Klasse, Band 65, Heft 4*. Berlin.
- WILCKE, C. 1988: 'König Šulgis Himmelfahrt', in: MULLER, C. (ed.), *Münchener Beiträge zur Völkerkunde, Festschrift Laszlo Vajda* (München): 245-255.

Judith PFITZNER <judith.pfitzner@univie.ac.at>
 University of Vienna (AUSTRIA)

6) En marge d'EcritUr, 8 : l'incantation de Ningirim U.30503 — Dans une étude parue en 1999, I. Finkel a publié sous la rubrique « Text 12: U. 30501 » une incantation en akkadien très mutilée, qui s'achève par l'indication : « cette incantation n'est pas la mienne, c'est l'incantation de Ningirim »¹⁾. La description ne précise pas qu'il s'agit d'un fragment issu des fouilles de Woolley à Ur, ce que le numéro de chantier en « U. » indique cependant de manière implicite : il n'y a donc pas de raison de mettre un point d'interrogation comme c'est le cas dans SEAL no. 7195 (« Provenance : Ur (mod. Tell el-Muqayyar) ? »). On sait que les numéros en U. supérieurs à 30000 ont été donnés *a posteriori* à des tablettes et fragments qui ont perdu leur numéro de chantier originel²⁾. Dans le cas présent, le problème est que la description du fragment par I. Finkel indique U. 30503, alors que le numéro dans le titre de la section est U. 30501 : l'une des deux indications est manifestement une erreur typographique³⁾. Le bon numéro (U. 30503) a déjà été indiqué comme tel dans le catalogue de UET 6/3, p. 26b. Grâce au site Ur Online, on peut avoir accès à la photo de U. 30503 du British Museum (<http://www.ur-online.org/subject/52760/>), ce qui n'est pas le cas dans SEAL no. 7195, qui offre en revanche une translittération du peu qui subsiste de cette tablette. Ur Online

donne également la référence au numéro P468486 du CDLI, dont la fiche donne la même photo du BM à une résolution inférieure⁴⁾ ; l'indication « unpublished unassigned ? » doit y être corrigée.

Il est bien sûr regrettable que la provenance précise de cette tablette fragmentaire ne puisse toujours pas être connue. Il est probable qu'elle a fait partie des tablettes non numérotées de la IX^e campagne (1930-31) : l'épigraphiste de cette saison, Ch. Winckworth, fut dépassé par l'abondance des trouvailles épigraphiques dans le quartier AH⁵⁾. On pense immédiatement à la pseudo-école du n° 1 Broad Street comme lieu possible de découverte. De fait, une autre incantation (en akkadien) a été trouvée dans ce bâtiment (UET 6/2 399 [U.16892d], cf. SEAL no. 7046 [bibliographie, copie, photos, édition] et <http://www.ur-online.org/subject/17807/>). Or dans l'inventaire établi par Winckworth des tablettes du n° 1 Broad Street, il est fait mention de « 3 incantation texts »⁶⁾. La deuxième pourrait être UET 6/2 193 (bilingue), qui a perdu son numéro de chantier (cf. SEAL no. 7203 ; photo supplémentaire sur <http://www.ur-online.org/subject/55595/>). Et la troisième serait U. 30503.

On ne doit cependant pas oublier UET 5 85, une incantation (en akkadien) contre la jaunisse, qui a le numéro de chantier U.17204c (SEAL no. 7128) et qui provient du quartier AH, n° 4 Store Street (cf. UE 7, p. 248b). Or parmi les trois tablettes U.17204, celle qui porte le numéro U.17204b n'est pas identifiée : ce pourrait être U.30503, mais il ne s'agit que d'une possibilité. La question reste donc ouverte.

Notes

1. I. L. FINKEL, « On Some Dog, Snake, and Scorpion Incantations », dans T. ABUSCH & K. VAN DER TOORN (éd.), *Mesopotamian Magic. Textual, Historical, and Interpretative Perspectives*, AMD 1, Groningue, 1999, p. 211-252 (p. 235-236). Une grande confusion règne sur la façon de citer les numéros de chantier des objets provenant des fouilles de Woolley à Ur : on trouve tantôt U 30503 (espace après U), tantôt U.30503 (point après U), tantôt enfin U. 30503 (point et espace après U). La norme retenue par le projet ÉcritUr est U.30503 (en conformité avec celle suivie par l'éditeur de UE 7, ainsi que plus récemment par M.-C. LUDWIG et C. WALKER dans UET 6/3) ; je respecte ici le choix de l'éditeur de la tablette.

2. Une liste des numéros en U. saison par saison a été donnée par T. C. MITCHELL dans UE 7, p. 214. Voir également les indications de G. SPADA, *Testi economici da Ur di periodo paleo-babilonese*, Nisaba 12, Messine, 2007, p. 16.

3. La copie se trouve p. 247, mais l'indication qu'on attendrait (« Fig. 12 U. 30501 [ou U. 305003] ») y manque ; elle se trouve cependant sous la forme U. 30503 dans la liste des figures p. 242.

4. 961 Ko, contre 2,4 Mo pour la photo d'Ur Online. L'accès par la fonction Full Search du CDLI s'obtient grâce à Provenience / Excavation Number / U 30503.

5. D. CHARPIN, « Epigraphy of Ur: Past, Present and Future », dans G. FRAME, J. JEFFERS & H. PITTMAN (éd.), *Ur in the Twenty-First Century CE, 62nd Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale, University of Pennsylvania, July 11-15 2016*, Winona Lake, sous presse.

6. L. WOOLLEY, Rapport daté de « March I. 1931, p. 4 § II.a (http://www.ur-online.org/media_item/193954/).

N.B. Les sites sur la Toile ici donnés en référence (Ur Online [<http://www.ur-online.org/>], CDLI [<https://cdli.ucla.edu/>] et SEAL <https://seal.huji.ac.il/>) ont été consultés pour la dernière fois le 21/03/2020.

Dominique CHARPIN <dominique.charpin@college-de-france.fr>
Collège de France-PSL (FRANCE)

7) Ilum-išar et Zimrî-Lîm au Musée du Louvre : trois briques inscrites de Mari¹⁾ — Le département des Antiquités orientales du Musée du Louvre conserve dans ses collections trois briques inscrites provenant du palais de Mari : AO 18924, SH080122+SH080123 et SH111538. Elles appartiennent à deux ensembles : les briques gravées de Ilum-išar pour les deux premières, dont l'une est inédite, et les briques estampillées de Zimrî-Lîm pour la troisième, également inédite. Les textes connus depuis 1936 ont été republiés dans *RIME* sous les numéros E3/2.4.3.1 (Ilum-išar)²⁾ et E4/6.12.1.2 (Zimrî-Lîm)³⁾.

Le rapport préliminaire de la deuxième campagne de fouilles à Mari publié par A. Parrot en 1936 mentionne plusieurs briques inscrites au nom de Ilum-išar trouvées à proximité de la grande salle 65 pendant cette campagne ainsi que quelques autres durant la campagne suivante⁴⁾. En parallèle, F. Thureau-Dangin a publié leur transcription et traduction avec trois photographies⁵⁾. Son cliché n°1 représente AO 18924 qui se trouve dans les collections du Louvre. Les carnets de photographies prises pendant les fouilles permettent de préciser que le cliché 1718 qui représente la brique AO 18924 a été pris le 11 janvier 1936.

La fiche de fouille M. 984, datée du 4 mars 1936, indique qu'elle a été découverte dans le passage entre la salle 60 et la cour 70. Les deux autres photographies publiées par F. Thureau-Dangin montrent une brique, fendue verticalement, qui pourrait correspondre à M. 953 (fiche de fouille MAM datée de mars 1935), et une seconde très fragmentaire dont le rapprochement avec les carnets de fouille n'a pas été concluant.

La brique AO 18924 est fragmentaire⁶⁾ mais son inscription est très bien conservée. Le bord sur la droite, malgré la cassure, semble correspondre à la largeur initiale de la brique. Au revers est gravé le « jeu de 20 cases »⁷⁾. Habituellement, le plateau de ce jeu est composé de deux parties - un bloc principal de trois rangées de quatre cases dont la rangée centrale est prolongée par une allée de huit cases (de façon que le bloc principal et sa prolongation totalisent douze cases). Sur le célèbre plateau de jeu d'Ur, cinq cases sont repérées par une marque : trois dans le bloc principal et deux autres dans l'allée complémentaire⁸⁾. Dans sa version connue à Mari, seulement trois cases sont cochées au lieu de cinq⁹⁾. Le plateau de jeu dessiné sur la brique AO 18924 ne conserve entièrement que le bloc principal de 12 cases et seulement 3 cases subsistent de l'allée complémentaire. Le tout est exécuté très négligemment, et on peut supposer que les cinq cases manquantes dépassaient la largeur de la brique.




AO 18924 (face)

© Musée du Louvre/Dépt. Ant. Orientales/S. Cluzan



(verso)



(verso)

© J. Maniaczyk



SH080122+SH080123 © Musée du Louvre/
Dépt. Ant. Orientales/S. Cluzan

Une autre brique d'Illum-išar est conservée dans les collections du Louvre (SH080122+SH080123). Cassée horizontalement, elle est composée de deux fragments jointifs¹⁰⁾. Le numéro de fouille est illisible mais devrait correspondre à M. 954 (fiche de fouille MAM). L'inscription est bien préservée sauf la quatrième ligne abîmée par la cassure¹¹⁾.

A. Parrot mentionne 10 briques inscrites au nom de Zimrî-Lîm dans l'enceinte du palais, dans les espaces situés autour de la cour 131¹²⁾. Six parmi elles sont décrites comme incurvées. A ce nombre il faut ajouter une brique trouvée dans la « Maison des tablettes » et publiée par J.-C. Margueron¹³⁾. À ce jour, trois photographies ont été publiées pour ce type de briques. La première a illustré les articles de F. Thureau-Dangin en 1936 et de G. Dossin en 1938¹⁴⁾. Les deux autres clichés correspondent à l'objet mentionné par J.-C. Margueron dans sa publication.



SH111538 © Musée du Louvre/
Dépt. Ant. Orientales/S. Cluzan

Une brique, SH111538¹⁵⁾, de type incurvé et estampée au nom de Zimrî-Lîm a été retrouvée dans les collections du Musée du Louvre. Elle ne correspond à aucune des briques déjà publiées. Il n'est pas possible d'établir où elle a été prélevée. L'escalier d'accès au « Bâtiment aux Peintures » (salle 132), la plus remarquable structure circulaire dans le palais de Mari, pourrait constituer une hypothèse. Néanmoins la description qu'en donne A. Parrot mentionne des briques sensiblement plus grandes¹⁶⁾ et ne signale pas de briques inscrites. L'essai de reconstitution basé sur la brique du Louvre forme un cercle de 20 briques et de 2,7 m de diamètre.



SH111538 (inscription) © Musée du Louvre/
Dépt. Ant. Orientales/S. Cluzan

L'inscription imprimée sur toutes les briques est identique. Elle représente toujours le même défaut - le coin à gauche en haut est en saillie et un trait irrégulier marque le texte du début de la troisième ligne jusqu'au signe IM de la première ligne. La matrice à estampe a dû être cassée ou fissurée à cet endroit. Il semble probable que cette marque a disqualifié une partie des briques lesquelles, finalement, ont été utilisées dans le cadre de travaux d'aménagement dans les diverses salles du Palais.

Notes


1. Je tiens à remercier les personnes qui ont rendu cette étude possible : Sophie Cluzan et Jean-Claude Margueron.
2. Frayne D., *RIME* 3/2, p. 443.
3. Frayne D., *RIME* 4, p. 624.
4. Parrot A., *Les Fouilles de Mari. Deuxième campagne (hiver 1934-35)*, Syria 17 (1936), p. 24.
5. Thureau-Dangin F., *Textes de Mari*, RA 33 (1936), pp. 177-179.
6. 0,31 m x 0,245 m x 0,065-0,072 m ; 7,28 kg.
7. Dunn-Vaturi A.-E., notice 14 dans : *Art du jeu, jeu dans l'art de Babylone à l'Occident médiéval*. RMN, Paris 2012, p. 56.
8. Finkel I.L., *On the Rules for the Royal Game of Ur* dans : *Ancient Board Games in Perspective: Papers from the 1990 British Museum Colloquium, with Additional Contributions*, British Museum Press, London 2007, pp. 22-38.
9. Les plateaux de jeu mentionnés dans Parrot A., MAM II.1 pp. 12-13, 47, 182, 247 et 275.
10. L'ensemble mesure 0,31 m x 0,31 m x 0,065 m et pèse 10,1 kg (le rapprochement de deux morceaux a été fait récemment).
11. S. Cluzan remarque la présence d'un signe tracé à gauche de l'inscription au niveau de la troisième ligne du texte. Il a été gravé en même temps que la totalité de l'inscription avec un calame. Elle note qu'il pourrait s'agir d'une occurrence d'un phénomène déjà rencontré sur des objets datés de la fin de Ville II de Mari : « *Des marques sur les statues mésopotamiennes. Changement de statut et histoire : le cas de la fin de la ville II de Mari.* » dans : Geyer B., Matoian V. (éd.), *De l'île d'Aphrodite au Paradis perdu, itinéraire d'un gentilhomme lyonnais. En hommage à Yves Calvet*, RSO XXII, 2015, p. 319-329.
12. Parrot A., MAM II.1 pp. 18 (3 ex.), 47 (1), 52 (1), 67-68 (1), 81 (1), 247 (2 fragments), 282 (1).

13. Margueron J.-C., *Mari. Métropole de l'Euphrate au III^e et au début du II^e millénaire av. J.-C.*, Picard/ERC, Paris 2004, p. 440-441, fig. 417 (sol dallé avec au centre la brique estampée) et 418 (gros plan sur l'inscription estampée de la brique).

14. Thureau-Dangin F. (op.cit. p.170) a publié l'image détournée se limitant à l'inscription. Dossin G. dans « *Les archives épistolaires du palais de Mari* », *Syria* 19 (1938), a communiqué le cliché entier (pl. XVI n° 2) qui correspond au numéro AP203_1719 des carnets de photographies d'A. Parrot.

15. Largeur maximale entre les deux angles supérieurs : 0,395 m ; minimale entre les deux angles inférieurs : 0,335 m. Longueur 0,33 m, épaisseur 0,055 m, poids 11,24 kg.

16. La description d'A. Parrot est sommaire et ses figures sont contradictoires : Parrot A., MAM II.1, p. 62-63, fig. 62-63 (l.max. 0,41 m, l.min. 0,36 m, long. 0,43 m et long. base 0,415, sommet 0,34, haut 0,41, épaisseur 0,065).



Jeux gravés sur briques dans l'avant-cour 154 d'après A. Parrot, MAM II.1 p. 13 fig. 7.

Jaroslav MANIACZYK <jaroslav.maniaczyk@louvre.fr>

Musée du Louvre – Département des Antiquités orientales, Paris (FRANCE)

8) Cooking Up a Storm: The True Story of Yale's Culinary Texts — In a November 2019 interview with National Public Radio's Scott Simon, Gojko Barjamovic discussed his recent cooking endeavors using the culinary texts in the Yale Babylonian Collection (YBC) (<https://www.npr.org/sections/thesalt/2019/11/16>).

As Barjamovic tells it, the tablets were long thought to be medical texts. In the 1940s, he says, Mary Hussey, “a scholar from Connecticut,” suggested they were recipes, but “people really didn't believe her.” In the 1980s, Jean Bottéro “heard about this rumor that they might be recipes, so he went to Yale and found out that they were.”

Here, take a large pinch of smelling salts! The need for them is particularly baffling, given that Barjamovic himself had written more factually on “The Yale Recipes: Acquisition and Discovery” in *Mesopotamia Speaks: Highlights of the Yale Babylonian Collection*, pp. 117-19, published just a few months previously. Still, some key ingredients are missing. When added to the mix, drawn from both the

Yale University and YBC archives, these provide a better understanding of the history of the scholarship on these remarkable documents. In addition, the full story furnishes a fine illustration of how progress in Assyriology is achieved by decades of collaborative work.

In 1943, Mary Hussey, a native of Ohio and Professor Emerita of Religion and Biblical Literature at Mount Holyoke College in South Hadley, Massachusetts, turned her attention to a group of incantations and rituals in the YBC, a project reflecting her career-long interest in Mesopotamian religion. The task of publishing them was entrusted to her by YBC Curator Ferris Stephens, who gave her a preliminary list of tablets to include. She intended to work on them in her spare time, especially over the summer. But since she was not eager to leave her cool, spacious house in rural South Hadley for hot, humid, noisy New Haven, Stephens offered to transfer the tablets to the Mount Holyoke library. He sent them up in batches, by auto and by Railway Express, then the standard way to ship packages, using a coordinated train and delivery truck service.

Hussey and Stephens agreed that the culinary tablets should be part of her publication, slated to be volume 12 in the *Yale Oriental Series (YOS)*. She understood quite clearly that the texts were recipes, but viewed them as “pharmaceutical.” In fact, Stephens had long previously catalogued the culinary tablet YBC 4644 as a “medical text.”

Hussey’s preliminary translations confirm that she grasped their essence, if not their purpose. In the introduction she wrote for her volume and in private communication with friends and colleagues, she was perplexed as to why, when the dishes were ready, they were not rushed off to the patient but set out for some unspecified reason.

As YBC Curator, Stephens’s publication philosophy was that text volumes should contain only tablet copies and indices, as primary source material in its purest, most enduring form. Hussey therefore planned that her translations should appear in a separate study of texts concerned with diagnoses, therapies, the “pharmaceutical” recipes, and exorcisms. She agreed with Stephens that “the editor seems to me to owe something to whoever uses these texts, but little should go into the volume that is not of permanent value.”

As Hussey finished her copies, she sent the tablets back to New Haven, where Stephens painstakingly collated them, sign by sign, using a microscope. Then he returned them to her, so she could check and correct her copies. Stephens also wrote her detailed guidelines about making up the plates for the volume. After years of work, Hussey finally had a manuscript ready for consideration, which she entitled “Akkadian Religious Texts.”

In November of 1951, Hussey mailed it to Albrecht Goetze, Professor of Assyriology at Yale since 1934, following his dismissal from his German university post for political reasons. She had become friends with him, initially because she had been working on a study of the Akkadian words for parts of the liver, stomach, and areas around the kidney of a sacrificial lamb (published in *JCS* 2 [1948]: 25-34), a special interest of his in connection with his work at the time on the YBC’s Old Babylonian extispicy tablets (*YOS* 10 [1947]). Goetze and his wife had even spent a week at her house at South Hadley, enjoying the quiet countryside.

Although Goetze expressed himself impatient with the pace of Stephens’s collations, he himself put off reading her manuscript. Among other reasons, he felt that the projected volume of *YOS* 11 by Samuel Feigin, submitted decades previously, should be published ahead of her volume 12. From his correspondence with her, it is evident that he too thought that the culinary texts were medical in nature, but suggested that Hussey call YBC 8958 a “ritual” in preference to her proposed terms “pharmacopoeia” or “list of drugs.” After all, he went on say, “medicine in Babylonia was a ritual matter.”

In early 1952, he sent back her manuscript with numerous comments, but it got lost in the mail and there was a further delay until another copy reached her. On June 16, 1952, she wrote him about the progress of her book. Just four days later, she died unexpectedly, while attending a conference.

Thanks to Hussey’s friend Helen Griffiths, we know something of her delight when Goetze’s annotations arrived. Griffiths was with her as she opened the packet, and recollected “her great happiness” at that moment, “her great respect and admiration” for his scholarship, and “her sense of privilege” at working with him. Griffiths reported that Hussey had certain reservations, though, about Goetze’s proposals. She objected to his use of the term “incantation.” As Griffiths wrote to Goetze, “She would not

have that, that what was under consideration were *exorcisms* not *incantations*, an *exorcism* being a *drawing out* and an *incantation* a *putting in*. Of course they are often used interchangeably but in a work of scholarship, she felt, the use should be exact. She also questioned your use of the word *charm*... The work was at the center of her life. I know that she felt strongly about having both photographs and drawings of each tablet. She told me that though it was not the custom she felt it to be the only scholarly way..."

One notes with some regret that what proved to be her dying wishes about her project were never carried out. To his credit, Stephens did have the photographs made, but the Yale photographer took so long and was so difficult to work with that they were not ready at the time of her death, and evidently Goetze and Stephens decided not to include them.

Another friend of Hussey's, Norma Kjöllner, wrote to Goetze in November 1953, saying, "She and I had some wonderful chats in the evening by her fireside when often she consulted my opinion as to why these ancient peoples prepared birds and animals as it was written down. It was fun!" Clearly Hussey was fascinated by these recipe texts, but, in the culinary (think New England boiled dinner) and Assyriological context of her place and era, she could scarcely have imagined that they might be reflections of Mesopotamian *haute cuisine*!

After Hussey died, her manuscript languished. In *JCS* 9 (1955): 116, Goetze wrote in vague terms that her volume would appear in "the near future." In 1956, Franz Köcher inquired about it in connection with his plan to compile new editions of the Mesopotamian medical corpus. Goetze responded that he hoped it would be ready by the end of 1956, adding that he knew of no medical texts in the Yale Babylonian Collection. While he may have been thinking of material of the canonical type published by Campbell Thompson from Nineveh, it seems apparent that Goetze had, at some point in the interim, realized the true nature of the culinary tablets.

Goetze wrote several versions of a new introduction to the Hussey volume. The last treated selected passages in the culinary texts in transliteration and translation. Possibly at a professional meeting in Europe, Goetze informally mentioned the culinary texts to interested colleagues or to Köcher himself, who wrote again in 1957, now saying that he wanted to include Yale's Old Babylonian incantations in his study. Goetze refused to send him any of Hussey's copies in advance of publication. Köcher tried again in 1960 and 1961, to no avail. In 1961-62, Goetze was still working on the manuscript, but he always had numerous projects going at once and he was never able to bring the volume to completion.

When William W. Hallo became YBC Curator in 1963, he inherited a pile of unfinished manuscripts, Hussey's among them, which he resolved to publish at last. To this end, he invited Jan van Dijk to ready what was now known as the Hussey/Goetze manuscript for publication (Stephens's important contribution to the volume was overlooked). With additional copies of his own and an entirely new introduction, it finally appeared in 1985 as *Early Mesopotamian Incantations and Rituals* (YOS 11). In it, the culinary texts are labeled simply "Akkadian recipes." We may note in passing that the original volume 11 finally appeared as YOS 12, *Legal and Administrative Texts of the Reign of Samsu-iluna*, after a lapse of five decades.

In 1978, Hallo sent Hussey's copies of the culinary tablets to Bottéro, who was preparing a major study of Mesopotamian cooking for the *Reallexikon der Assyriologie*. Hallo gave his and van Dijk's permission for him to publish an edition of them. Bottéro never actually went to Yale, using instead excellent new photographs, Hussey's careful copies (as collated minutely by Stephens), Goetze's notes, van Dijk's work, and additional collations by Walter Farber. His magisterial publication appeared in 1995 as *Textes culinaires mésopotamiens/Mesopotamian Culinary Texts*. In his introduction, he thanks Köcher for having alerted him to the Yale tablets.

According to Barjamovic, his latest in a long line of events making "Mesopotamian" food based on these texts represents a great improvement over Bottéro for two reasons. First, "we quite simply understand many of the words better than he did." Since Barjamovic has not published the requisite philological apparatus to support such a statement, it is difficult to evaluate his contention.

"Secondly, and more importantly, we're working together as a team and he worked alone." As is evident from the introduction to his book, Bottéro regarded his publication as the result of a collaborative effort by many colleagues, departed and living, including a culinary expert. But the image of Bottéro toiling by himself reminds me of President Kennedy's remark when he hosted Nobel prize winners at a White

House dinner: “This is the most extraordinary collection of talent, of human knowledge, that has ever been gathered together at the White House, with the possible exception of when Thomas Jefferson dined alone.”

Sources

The Hussey-Goetze correspondence is in the Yale Manuscripts and Archives, Albrecht Goetze Papers, MS 648, Box 9 folders 229-30; the correspondence with Köcher is Box 11 folder 280. The Stephens-Hussey correspondence and portions of Hussey’s original manuscript are to be found in the Yale Babylonian Collection Curatorial Archives. I thank Benjamin R. Foster for this information and for examining the correspondence on my behalf. In *Mesopotamia Speaks*, Barjamovic notes (without documentation) that recent studies carried out on the clay indicate that the culinary texts might have come from Larsa, presumably referring to the work of William Charamut, a Yale graduate student, using PXRF, a method pioneered by Etsuo Uchida and colleagues (*Archaeological Discovery* 2015/3: 179-207). The Larsa provenance was long since assumed by others on epigraphic and other grounds, so one awaits definitive publication of the analytical method and results.

Alice SLOTSKY <aliceslotsky@aya.yale.edu>

Visiting Associate Professor (retired), Brown University, Providence, RI (USA)

9) Supplement: New Light on the Yale Culinary Tablets — The records of the Yale Treasurer’s Office, normally unappetizing fare, may add additional information to Alice Slotsky’s account of the modern history of the Yale culinary tablets. From the early financial records of the Yale Babylonian Collection contained therein, we learn that in 1913 the dealer Messayeh sold Albert T. Clay “three medicinal texts” from Ur. In a summary memo to the Yale treasurer two years later, June 29, 1915, in which he proudly listed some of his more spectacular acquisitions, Clay gives more information: “Mugheir Lot (i.e. Ur of the Chaldees) \$225 1) Two large medical texts of the time of Abraham, the earliest known 2) A large Sumerian hymn, same period 3) A collection of 138 tablets belonging to the administrative activities of the temple of Ur. They are most important as they contain a number of dates referring to historical events of the Larsa-Ur dynasty”. It would have been easy for him to have forgotten in the interim that he had actually bought three “medicinal tablets” two years previous. In those days, he was offered as many as 6000 tablets in a single lot (in that case from Drehem) and sometimes sold as many as 2000 at a time to pay for the items he wanted to retain. Thus staggering numbers of tablets passed through his hands in short order.

The “medical texts” clearly caught his experienced eye because of their unusual content. It is no great leap of faith to suggest that these “large medical texts” refer to the Yale culinary tablets, which may thereby be attributed to Ur, rather than Larsa, fully in accord with Bottéro’s comments on their “southern” orthography, *Textes culinaires*, 131. Although “temple document” was then a common term for what would now be called “administrative text,” the fact that Yale acquired in the same purchase temple records properly speaking, mostly for the management of livestock, from Old Babylonian Ur raises the possibility that the culinary texts were in fact found somewhere in the temple complex, rather than in a private house.

It would follow that the recipes were intended for the gods, as discussed by Bottéro in RLA 6: 295-7, and, with reference to the Yale texts specifically, in an interview published in *Le Figaro Magazine*, May 7, 1989, p. 44: “Ceux qui me les ont communiquées pouvaient penser qu’il s’agissait de pharmacopée. En les lisant de près, j’ai vu que c’était bel et bien des plats, surtout de viande bouillie... Il s’agit de haute cuisine, d’une cuisine précieuse par le goût, la complication, la richesse: elle était faite pour le roi ou pour les dieux, qui étaient traités comme les rois. Il fallait donc leur offrir des repas, dont nous avons quelquefois le menu...” One may therefore suggest that it was Clay who laid the first foundation stone for Bottéro’s brilliant study by recognizing the exceptional nature of these tablets, amidst the thousands submitted for his consideration. All students of Mesopotamian cuisine should be grateful that he decided to buy and keep them.

Reference

Yale Manuscripts and Archives, Office of the Treasurer, Record Unit 151, YRG 5-A, Series III, Box 348, folder 2383.

Benjamin R. FOSTER <benjamin.foster@yale.edu>

Yale University, New Haven (USA)

10) Noms d'années de rois du Malgium sur quelques étiquettes — Parmi les documents inédits catalogués dans CDLI et pour lesquels des photographies sont disponibles, trois étiquettes (P3931351, P393145 et P390463) présentent les mêmes caractéristiques formelles et textuelles que celles publiées par R. H. Mayr (2012). Au niveau de la tranche droite, la forme l'étiquette est légèrement arrondie, et du côté de la tranche gauche, on observe deux orifices (pour une cordelette). En plus d'une structure semblable du texte (face : type d'animal / BA.UŠ₂ / KI NP ; revers : ITI NM / MU...), les anthroponymes et les noms d'années trouvent des parallèles parmi les neuf étiquettes publiées par R. H. Mayr (noms d'années revues par R. de Boer 2013). Les impressions des cartouches de sceaux-cylindres situées sur les différentes surfaces des étiquettes sont également analogues. Par commodité, nous suivrons la dénomination de A à K des empreintes que R. H. Mayr a adoptée (Mayr 2012, 412-416). Les cartouches des sceaux A, B, C et D mentionnent le nom du propriétaire suivi le plus souvent par sa fonction de scribe (les sceaux B et D indiquent également une filiation). Les cartouches des sceaux E à K mentionnent que les propriétaires étaient au service d'un souverain, soit Nabi-Enlil (sceaux G et J) ou Šū-Amurru (sceaux F, H, I et K).

Le nombre d'étiquettes présentant ainsi les mêmes caractéristiques formelles et rédactionnelles s'élève à 12 pièces : 9 publiées par R. H. Mayr et conservées à la Cornell University (désigné ici de la façon suivante 1, 2, etc.) et trois provenant d'une collection privée (nommées ici 10', 11', 12'). À ces 12 pièces, il est possible d'adjoindre, sur la base de la translittération (notamment des noms d'années et des anthroponymes), au moins 8 nouvelles étiquettes récemment éditées par M. Sigrist et T. Ozaki dans le volume CUSAS 40 (textes n^{os} 1627, 1628, 1643, 1945, 1950, 1952, 1954 et 2008). L'absence dans CUSAS 40 de photographies et de copies, et le fait que les empreintes sur ces étiquettes soient qualifiées le plus souvent d'illisible ne permettent pas des rapprochements stricts du point de vue formel et rédactionnel.

Etant issues de fouilles clandestines, il est très vraisemblable que d'autres pièces viendront augmenter cette archive. La provenance exacte de ces étiquettes demeure inconnue. Selon R. de Boer (2013), ces étiquettes proviendraient du royaume tigréen du Malgium et dateraient du début de l'époque paléo-babylonienne (20^e siècle av. J.-C.). Cette proposition se base sur deux relectures à corrélérer :

1. La mention de ^dDAM.KI.NA, divinité principale du Malgium, dans le nom d'année des étiquettes 7 et 9 ;
2. Selon le cartouche du sceau J, le roi Nabi-Enlil est le fils de Šū-Kakka qui doit être rapproché d'un souverain tigréen Šū-Kakka connu par la documentation « Early Old Babylonian » d'Ešnunna.

Édition des étiquettes 10', 11' et 12'

Les photographies sur CDLI ne permettent pas une lecture assurée de tous les textes et cartouches imprimés. Par ailleurs, seuls sont disponibles les faces et revers, il manque les tranches qui pourraient porter des empreintes de sceaux-cylindres comme sur les étiquettes (1 à 9) publiées par R. H. Mayr (2012).

Étiquette 10' (47 × 40 mm ; CDLI P393135)

- | | |
|---|---|
| f. 1. [1] SILA ₄ ŠU DU ₃ A.LUM ¹ | r. 4. 'ITI A ₂ ¹ .KI.TI |
| 2. BA.UŠ ₂ | 5. [MU ¹ <i>du-nu-um</i> ^{ki} |
| 3. KI šu- ^d DUMU.ZI | 'ŠA ₃ ¹ GU ₂ ^{id2} IDIGNA |
| | BA.ḪUL |

Une corrélation est semble-t-il possible entre le nom d'année présent sur l'étiquette et les empreintes des cartouches des sceaux-cylindres. L'étiquette 10' présente un nom d'année (MU *du-nu-um*^{ki} ŠA₃ GU₂ ^{id2}IDIGNA BA.ḪUL) semblable à celui des étiquettes 2 et 3 (pour les variantes orthographiques voir tableau ci-dessous). Le nom d'année sur l'étiquette 4 (MU *du-nu-um* BA.ḪUL) est une version abrégée de celui des étiquettes 2, 3 et 10'. Des empreintes sont discernables sur la face et le revers de l'étiquette 10' : plusieurs empreintes du sceau F sur la face et du sceau J sur le revers. Les empreintes des sceaux F et J se trouvent sur les étiquettes 2, 3 et 4 dont le nom d'année commémore le même événement. L'étiquette 5 qui porte aussi les empreintes des sceaux F et J est datée de l'année suivante (MU US₂.SA *du-un-nu-um*^{ki} BA.ḪUL).

Cartouche sceau-cylindre J

- | | |
|--|-----------------------------|
| i ^d na-bi ₂ / | ii [. . .] |
| ^d EN.LIL ₂ | SA ₁₃ .DUB.BA |
| NITA ₂ KALA.GA | ARAD ₂ .DA.NI.IR |
| DUMU ^d šu-kak-ka ₃ | IN.NA.BA |

Cartouche sceau-cylindre F

- i₃-li₂-ra-bi*
DUB.SAR
DUMU *na-ap-li-is*
ARAD₂ *šu-^dMAR.TU*

Parmi les textes publiés dans CUSAS 40, le texte 1952, portant le scellement du sceau A (*Ar-wu-um*, DUB.SAR, DUMU...) et le nom d'année MU *du-nu-um*^{ki} ŠA₃ [GU₂ ^{id}₂ IDIGNA] BA.ĤUL, peut être rapproché des étiquettes 2 à 5 et de ce fait de l'étiquette 10' (voir tableau ci-dessous). En raison des parallèles ici rassemblés, dans CUSAS 40 1952, l'anthroponyme suivant le signe KI doit être *gi-m[il]*-^dAdad comme sur les étiquettes 1, 9 et 12' au lieu de *š_i2-l[a]*¹²-^dAdad. L'individu nommé *š_u*-^dDUMU.ZI dans l'étiquette 10' trouve un parallèle dans CUSAS 40 1945 également daté du mois A₂.KI.TI et présentant un nom d'année similaire à l'étiquette 1. Outre la mention de *š_u*-^dDUMU.ZI, M. Sigrist et T. Ozaki, CUSAS 40 1945, citent après ce dernier la mention EGIR ZU₂.SI.KA « après la *tonte* » que l'on retrouve aussi sur l'étiquette 4 datée du mois EZEN-^dSUL.GE.

Étiquette 11' (44 × 39 mm ; CDLI P393145)

- | | | | |
|----|--|----|--|
| f. | 1. '3 ⁷¹ SILA ₄ 'GUB ¹ ou 'NIM ⁷¹
2. BA.UŠ ₂
3. KI <i>i-pi₂</i> - ⁷¹ <i>iq</i> ⁷¹ -[...] | r. | 4. 'TI x x ¹ [(...)]
5. MU BAD ₃ GIBIL
<i>du-nu-um</i> ^{ki}
MU.DU ₃ |
|----|--|----|--|

Cette étiquette présente des similitudes avec l'étiquette 6 : – l'anthroponyme *i-pi₂*-⁷¹*iq*⁷¹-[...] à la ligne 3, et un même nom d'année. Le nom d'année présent sur l'étiquette 11' (MU BAD₃ GIBIL *du-nu-um*^{ki} MU.DU₃) est assez clair même si le signe GIBIL est légèrement effacé. L'étiquette 11' permet ainsi de proposer une nouvelle lecture du nom d'année inscrit sur l'étiquette 6. Au lieu de MU GAN₂-NE [?] / *du-nu-um* / MU.[ĤU]L², il faut probablement lire MU⁷¹BAD₃¹ GIBIL *du-un-nu-um* MU.DU₃ : le signe GIBIL est ici bien visible, et la fin du ĤUL doit être le signe DU₃. La photographie sur CDLI ne permet pas d'identifier les empreintes laissées par les sceaux-cylindres. Les quelques traces visibles sur la face pourraient être celles du sceau K. Selon la copie de l'étiquette 6, l'anthroponyme suivant le signe KI pourrait être *i-pi₂*-*iq-eš₄*-[tar].

Étiquette 12' (42 × 37 mm ; CDLI P390463)

- | | | | |
|----|---|----|---|
| f. | 1. '1 ¹ MAŠ ₂ .[GA]L
2. 'BA ¹ .UŠ ₂
3. NIG ₂ <i>gi-mil</i> - ^d IM | r. | 4. ITI MAŠ.DA ₃ .GU ₇
5. MU US ₂ .SA BAD ₃
^d DAM.KI.NA ¹
[x ¹ -KI ² -x x |
|----|---|----|---|

En raison de la mention de ^dDAM.KI.NA dans le nom d'année, l'étiquette 12' peut-être rapprochée des étiquettes 7 et 9. À la ligne 3, l'étiquette 12' cite NIG₂ *gi-mil*-^dIM. L'emploi de NIG₂ à cette place du formulaire est unique parmi les étiquettes analogues (voir tableau ci-dessous). Le nom propre est par ailleurs déjà connu dans les étiquettes 1 et 9 publiées par R. H. Mayr et par M. Sigrist et T. Ozaki dans CUSAS 40 1952: sur l'étiquette 1 à la ligne 3, une lecture *gi-mil*-^dIM au lieu de *ki₂-ri₂*-^dIM peut-être proposée, et sur l'étiquette 9, fin de la face, les traces des signes concordent avec la lecture [...g]*i-mil*-^dIM. La qualité de la photographie disponible sur CDLI ne permet pas de lire l'ensemble des cartouches des sceaux-cylindres imprimés. Les traces des empreintes peuvent néanmoins correspondre aux cartouches des sceaux I et K présents sur les étiquettes 7 et 9.

Cartouche du sceau-cylindre I	Cartouche du sceau-cylindre K	ii ARAD ₂ - ^d EN. /LIL ₂ .LA ₂
^d š _u - ^d MAR.TU	i ^d š _u - ^d MAR./ TU	ŠA ₁₃ .DUB.BA
LUGAL KALA.GA	LUGAL KALA.GA	ARAD ₂ .DA.NI.IR
^d EN.ZU- <i>ba-ni</i>	DUMU ^d <i>na-bi</i> ₂ -/ ^d EN.LIL ₂	IN.NA.BA
DUB.SAR		
[DUMU...] ?		
[ARAD ₂ .ZU] ?		

L'étiquette 12' cite MU US₂.SA BAD₃ / ^dDAM.KI.NA / [x¹ KI² x x « Année suivante (l'année) : la *place forte* de Damkina... ». La fin du nom d'année est difficile à lire sur la photographie. De plus, la photographie de la tranche étant indisponible sur CDLI, il n'est pas exclu que le nom d'année s'achève sur la tranche comme sur l'étiquette 7.

À la lumière du nom d'année sur l'étiquette 12', le signe après US₂.SA, sur les étiquettes 7 et 9, doit être BAD₃ au lieu de URU. Il est alors possible d'affirmer que les noms d'années présents sur les étiquettes

7, 9 et 12' font référence à un même événement à savoir la construction d'une place forte pour Damkina, bien qu'aucun verbe exprimant l'idée de « construire » (DIM₂ ou DU₃) ne soit présent.

Un des indices permettant de relier les rois Šū-Kakka, Nabi-Enlil et Šū-Amurru au Malgium est ici renforcé puisque ce nom d'année commémore l'édification d'un dais/trône pour la déesse Damkina et fait écho à un nom d'année du règne de Šū-Kakka MU ^dšū-kak-ka₃ LUGAL.E URU ZA.GIN₃ KU₃.GI ^dDAM.GAL.NUN.NA.RA MU.NA.DIM₂ (ce nom d'année cité par R. de Boer 2013, 21 est publié depuis peu : voir CUSAS 40, textes 1991,1992 et 1993).

Noms d'années et empreintes des sceaux-cylindres

Parmi les sceaux-cylindres documentés par ces étiquettes (notamment celles publiées ici et par R. H. Mayr), les sceaux J et K, de type IN.NA.BA (sceaux offerts par le roi) permettent de proposer trois générations de rois du Malgium puisque les cartouches de ces deux sceaux indiquent la filiation de deux rois : Šū-Kakka, Nabi-Enlil (fils du précédent) et Šū-Amurru (fils du précédent). Hormis les empreintes de ces deux sceaux, d'autres empreintes de sceaux de serviteurs au service de Nabi-Enlil ou de Šū-Amurru se trouvent sur ces étiquettes.

Comme cela a été exposé dans les commentaires d'édition des étiquettes 10', 11' et 12', une corrélation peut être établie entre le nom d'année datant une étiquette et les empreintes sur cette dernière (observation déjà relevée pour les étiquettes 1 à 9 par R. H. Mayr, 2012, 410-411). Plusieurs groupes selon les noms d'années et les empreintes ont été établis (voir tableau ci-dessous) auxquels ont été adjointes les étiquettes éditées dans CUSAS 40 même si les empreintes sur ces dernières sont en partie illisibles.

Il est vraisemblable que l'étiquette présentant seulement des empreintes de sceaux de serviteurs de Nabi-Enlil soit plus ancienne que celle scellée par des sceaux de serviteurs de Šū-Amurru. Seul le nom d'année inscrit sur l'étiquette 1 car exclusivement scellée par des sceaux de serviteurs de Nabi-Enlil pourrait être un nom d'année du temps de Nabi-Enlil. Les autres étiquettes sont scellées par au moins un des serviteurs de Šū-Amurru.

En combinant les noms d'années et empreintes de sceaux des serviteurs royaux, un classement relatif des noms d'années sur ces étiquettes peut être proposé.

Sceaux G et J (serviteurs de Nabi-Enlil, absence de sceaux de serviteurs de Šū-Amurru) + nom d'année relatif au creusement d'un canal

- MU ID₂ e-deš₃-tum / MU.BA.AL (étiquette 1) + (CUSAS 40, textes n°s 1627, 1945, 1950, 1954)

Après avoir collationné sur photographie l'étiquette 1, le nom du canal est bien ID₂ e-deš₃(UR)-tum « nouveau canal » au lieu de ID₂ su-x-tum (Mayr 2012, 410 et 417) comme proposé par R. de Boer (2013, 21) et par M. Sigrist et T. Ozaki CUSAS 40 (2019, 325). Un canal portant le même nom et orthographié de façon analogue est cité à deux reprises dans un passage très fragmentaire du cadastre d'Ur-Nammu (RIME 3/2.1.1.21, ex. 28). Le nom de ce canal peut être rapproché d'un nom de canal présent dans les listes proto-UR₅-RA=*hubullu* et UR₅-RA=*hubullu*. Le cylindre scolaire paléo-babylonien A 7895 cite dans la section consacrée aux cours d'eau ID₂ i-di-iš-tum (col. ix, 7 ; MSL XI, p. 147, Forerunner 12). Une autre liste d'époque paléo-babylonienne mentionne ID₂ e-di-iš¹-tum (OECT 4 162, col. ii, 15 ; MSL XI, p. 145, Forerunner 10). Dans la liste UR₅-RA=*hubullu* du premier millénaire, ID₂ e-di-iš-tum = ŠU se trouve parmi les noms de cours d'eau (UR₅-RA=*hubullu* XXII, section 7, col. iii l. 6 ; MSL XI). Enfin, ID₂ e-di-eš-tum est présent dans une liste de noms de cours d'eau issue d'un commentaire de UR₅-RA=*hubullu* (« Recension B, Tablet IV », MSL XI, p. 39). Les commentaires de UR₅-RA=*hubullu* se construisent sur trois colonnes dont la troisième contient un terme destiné à préciser l'équivalent proposé dans la deuxième colonne. Selon le passage de ce commentaire le terme *i₃-dig-lat* « Tigre » serait le terme précisant ID₂ e-di-eš-tum. Cette équivalence montre que le nom d'année inscrit sur l'étiquette 1 commémore le creusement ou l'entretien d'un canal dans la région du Tigre.

MSL XI, p. 39 : commentaires de UR₅-RA = *hubullu*, « Recension B, Tablet IV »

1. id ₂ sal.l[a]	[ŠU]	<i>i₃-dig-lat</i>
2. id ₂ e.di.eš.tum	ŠU	[MIN]
3. id ₂ ḫal.ḫal	ŠU	[MIN]
4. id ₂ ku ₆	ID ₂ nu-nu	[...]

Sceaux J (serviteur de Nābi-Enlil) et sceau F (serviteur de Šū-Amurru) + nom d'année relatif à la destruction de Dunnum
 Dans ce groupe, deux noms d'années font référence à la destruction de Dunnum située au bord du Tigre. L'année « a » documentée par quatre étiquettes présente des variantes (présence ou absence du terme BAD₃, du déterminatif ^{ki}, ou encore une version abrégée pour l'étiquette 4).

L'évènement de la destruction de Dunnum a également été pris pour désigner l'année suivante. Seule l'étiquette 5 cite l'année « a+1 »

Šū-Amurru « a »

- MU BAD₃ *du-un nu-um* / ŠA₃ GU₂ ^{id}2IDIGNA / BA.ĤUL (étiquette 3)
- MU BAD₃ *du-nu-um* / ŠA₃ GU₂ ^{id}2IDIGNA / BA.ĤUL (étiquette 2)
- MU *du-un-nu-um* / ŠA₃ [GU₂ ^{id}2IDIGNA] BA.ĤUL (CUSAS 40 1952)
- MU *du-nu-um*^{ki} / ŠA₃¹ GU₂ ^{id}2IDIGNA / BA.ĤUL (étiquette 10') + (CUSAS 2057-14, texte pour lequel seul le nom d'année est disponible).
- MU *du-nu-um* / BA.ĤUL (étiquette 4)

Šū-Amurru « a+1 »

- MU US₂.SA / *du-un-nu-um*^{ki} / BA.ĤUL (étiquette 5)

Sceaux I et K (serviteurs de Šū-Amurru) + nom d'année relatif à la construction de la « nouvelle Dunnum »

Ce groupe se compose des étiquettes 6 et 11' qui sont datées par le nom d'année commémorant la construction de la nouvelle muraille de Dunnum. L'évènement relaté dans les noms d'année « a » et « a+1 » inscrits sur des étiquettes scellées par des sceaux de serviteurs des rois Nābi-Enlil et Šū-Amurru doit être plus ancien que la construction de la nouvelle muraille de Dunnum. En effet, seules les empreintes de sceaux de serviteurs de Šū-Amurru sont présentes sur les étiquettes 6 et 11'. Dans ce cas nous aurions ainsi une année commémorant la destruction voire la prise Dunnum sur le Tigre (année « a » et « a+1 »), suivie de peu d'une nouvelle construction des remparts (année « b »). Le nombre d'années entre ces deux évènements demeure inconnu.

Šū-Amurru « b »

- MU BAD₃ GIBIL / *du-un-nu-um* / MU.DU₃ (étiquette 6)
- MU ŠAD₃¹ GIBIL / *du-nu-um*^{ki} / MU.DU₃ (étiquette 11')
- Une autre mention de ce nom d'année est documentée par le texte CUSAS 40 2057-11 dont le contenu n'est pas disponible : MU BAD₃ GIBIL *du-un-nu-um* MU.DU₃?

Sceaux H, I et K (serviteurs de Šū-Amurru) + nom d'année relatif au dais de Damkina

Sur les étiquettes 7, 9 et 12', le nom d'année fait référence à l'édification d'une *place forte* (BAD₃) pour la déesse Damkina. Sur ces trois étiquettes, le nom d'année débute par MU US₂.SA « année suivant (l'année) ». Sur l'étiquette 9, la mention MU US₂.SA.BI en fin du nom d'année montre que l'établissement du dais/trône de Damkina fut utilisé pour nommer trois années consécutives. Grâce aux clichés que nous avons reçus par R. H. Mayr, ces noms d'années mentionnent les termes KU₃.BABBAR « argent » et KU.SIG₁₇.(GA) « or », métaux précieux ayant participé à l'édification du dais de Damkina. Puis, il est possible que sur les étiquettes 9 et 12' la séquence X KI⁷ suivant directement ^dDAM.KI.NA soit un qualificatif pour cette dernière (voire un toponyme) car cette séquence est absente sur l'étiquette 7.

Les empreintes des sceaux sur ces étiquettes suggèrent des noms d'années durant le règne de Šū-Amurru postérieurs à « a » et « a+1 ».

Šū-Amurru « c-1 »

La mention « année suivante » (MU US₂.SA) permet de restituer l'année précédente.

- MU BAD₃ ^dDAM.KI.NA...

L'étiquette CUSAS 40 1628, appartenant à la même série que celles publiées par Mayr et dans cette note, mentionne selon l'édition le nom d'année suivant : MU URU^{ki} ^dNANNA GAR.RA MU.DU₃ (pour l'ensemble du contenu voir le tableau ci-dessous). Ne disposant ni de copie, ni de photographie, il est difficile de collationner ce texte. Une hypothèse de lecture peut être avancée sur la base de la translittération proposée à savoir : MU URU^{ki} ^dDAM.KI.NA.RA MU.DU₃ : le signe identifié par NANNA(SES.KI) et GAR pourrait être respectivement DAM.KI et NA. Dans ce cas, MU URU^{ki} ^dDAM.KI.NA.RA MU.DU₃ serait le nom d'année Šū-Amurru « c-1 ». L'alternance URU^{ki} avec BAD₃ dans les noms d'années suivants (MU US₂.SA) n'est pas en

contradiction avec cette proposition.

Šū-Amurru « c »

- [MU] US₂.SA BAD₃¹ / ^dDAM.KI.NA¹ x KI² / ^rKU₃.BABBAR KU₃.SIG₁₇. GA¹ (étiquette 9)
- MU US₂.SA BAD₃ / ^dDAM.KI.NA¹ / [x¹ ^rKI² x x [(...)] (étiquette 12')

Šū-Amurru « c+1 »

- MU US₂.SA BAD₃ / ^dDAM.KI.NA / ^rKU₃.BABBAR KU₃¹ [...] / [MU] US₂.SA. ^rBI¹ (étiquette 7)

Sceaux H, I et K (serviteurs de Šū-Amurru) + nom d'année relatif au creusement d'un canal

L'étiquette 8 cite le nom d'année relatif au creusement d'un canal nommé ID₂ GAL.E₃.A (lecture proposée dans la fiche Archibab T15839 au lieu de ID₂-GAL-BABBAR ~ GUB-A). En raison des empreintes des sceaux H, I et K, ce nom d'année doit être attribué à Šū-Amurru, vraisemblablement postérieur aux noms d'années « a » et « a+1 ».

Šū-Amurru « d »

- MU ID₂ GAL.E₃.A / MU.BA.AL (étiquette 8) + (CUSAS 40 2008)

Conclusion

Présenter une chronologie relative des événements demeure une tâche délicate puisque rien ne permet d'organiser de façon certaine les noms d'années « b », « c », et « d » de Šū-Amurru. L'empreinte du sceau B (sceau d'Ilī-kibrī, scribe) sur les étiquettes 1 (règne de Nābi-Enlil) et 6 (année « b » de Šū-Amurru) pourrait suggérer une proximité temporelle entre ces deux étiquettes. Dans ce cas, l'année « b » de Šū-Amurru commémorant la construction de la « Dunnum nouvelle » serait antérieure aux années « c » et « d ». De nouvelles données permettront de confirmer ou d'infirmer cette proposition.

Enfin, dans le volume CUSAS 40, se trouvent d'autres textes ou étiquettes datés par des noms d'années de rois du Malgium dont ceux relatifs à Šū-Kakka, père de Nābi-Enlil et grand-père de Šū-Amurru (voir l'index des noms d'années dans CUSAS 40, 117-121 ; et voir particulièrement les documents enregistrant des sorties de bétail depuis le service de Bēli-ilī et scellés par Māt-ilī).

Étiquette 10'

(47 × 40 mm ; CDLI P393135)



Source photographique : CDLI

Étiquette 11'

(44 × 39 mm ; CDLI P393145)



Source photographique : CDLI

Étiquette 12'

(42 × 37 mm ; CDLI P390463)



Source photographique : CDLI

Notes

1. Ces trois étiquettes dont les photographies sont disponibles sur le site CDLI n'appartiennent pas à une collection publique. Ces trois pièces initialement proposées à la vente sur <http://www.ancientresource.com/lots/mesopotamian.html> sont désormais dispersées dans des collections privées (je remercie Robert Englund pour m'avoir communiqué ces informations).

2. Je remercie vivement R. H. Mayr pour m'avoir transmis de nombreuses photographies sans lesquelles certaines lectures n'auraient pas été possibles.

Tableau : étiquettes classées selon les noms d'années

n°	nbr	type d'animal	abrégé et/ou autres informations	KI+NP (+et/ou autres informations)	nom de mois	nom d'année	empreintes de sceaux-cylindres									
							A	B	C	D	E	F	SA	NE	SA	SA
CUSAS 40 1945	1	U ₈	BAUŠ ₂	KI šu- ⁶ DU MU ZI TA EER ZI ₂ SI KA	ITI A ₂ KI IT	MUD ₂ e-deš-tum/ MUBA.AL										
CUSAS 40 1950	2	U ₈	BAUŠ ₂	KI a-bi-ia	ITIZEN-SIL.GE	MUD ₂ e-deš-tum/ MUBA.AL										
CUSAS 40 1954	2	U ₈	BAUŠ ₂	KI nu-ma-a-a	ITIMIN-EŠ ₃	MUD ₂ e-deš-tum/ MUBA.AL										
	1	KIR ₁ UR ₄														
	1	UZ ₃	BAUŠ ₂	KI gi-mil- ⁴ IM	ITIZEM-MAH ₁	MUD ₂ e-deš-tum/ MUBA.AL		X	X						X	
CUSAS 40 1627	[...]	UDU	BAUŠ ₂	KIM- ² DU MU ZI [...]	ITIZEMMEKI.GA ₂	MUD ₂ e-deš-tum/ MUBA.AL										
2	5	U ₈	BAUŠ ₂	KI a-bi-ia	ITTI ₃ B ₁₂ KU ₂	MUBAD ₂ du-nu-um SA ₃ GU ₂ ⁴ DU GNA/BAHUL	X		X			X				X
3	1	UDU	i-hu- ⁴ EN ZI ₁ i ₂ DA B ₃	KIDUMU u-bar-um	ITTI ₃ B ₁₂ KU ₂	MU du-in-nu-um SA ₃ GU ₂ ⁴ DU GNA/BAHUL	X		X			X				X
CUSAS 40 1952	5	UZ ₃	BAUŠ ₂	KI gi-mil- ⁴ IM	ITIKISIK ₂ - ⁴ NIN.AZU	MU du-in-nu-um SA ₃ GU ₂ ⁴ DU GNA/BAHUL	X									
10 ¹	[I]	SIL A ₄ ŠUDU ₃ A ₁ UDU ¹	BAUŠ ₂	KI šu- ⁶ DU MU ZI	ITTI A ₂ KU IT	MU du-in-nu-um ⁴⁰ SA ₃ GU ₂ ⁴ DU GNA/BAHUL						X				X
4	1	GURK.AL X	BAUŠ ₂	KI NE UD ¹ -ba-d EER ZI ₂ SI KA	ITIZEN-SIL.GE ¹	MU du-in-nu-um/BAHUL	X		X			X				X?
5	1	UZ ₃	UR.MAH.E ¹ NGAZ «qu'un bon a été»	KI i-hu- ⁴ EN ZI	ITIKISIK ₂ - ⁴ NIN.AZU	MUS.SA/du-in-nu-um ⁴⁰ BAHUL	X		X			X				X
6	1	UDU ¹	BAUŠ ₂	KI i-pi- ⁴ EN ZI	ITTI SES.DAGU ⁷	MU BAD ₃ GIBU/du-in-nu-um MUDU ₃		X							X	X
11 ¹	2 ou 3	SIL A ₄ GUB ¹ (ou SIL A ₄ /NDU ¹)	BAUŠ ₂	KI i-pi- ⁴ EN ZI	ITTI X X X [...]	MUBAD ₂ GIBU/du-in-nu-um ⁴⁰ MUDU ₃										
12 ¹	1	MAŠ ₂ GAL	BAUŠ ₂	NIG ₂ gi-mil- ⁴ IM	ITIMAS ¹ DA A ₄ d ¹ 7	MUS.SA RADU/DAM ¹ KINA ¹ [X] ¹ K ¹ X X							X			X
9	n	X.GIB	BAUŠ ₂ [...]	KI gi-mil- ⁴ IM	ITIZEN'-X-X-X	[MU] ¹ US.SA BAD ₃ "DAM KINA' X KI" [K] ₃ BABBAR KU ₃ SGU ₂ GA ¹					X		X		X	X
7	1	U ₈	BAUŠ ₂	KI nu-ma-a	ITIDRI ME KI(GA ₂) ²	MUS.SA BAD ₃ /DAM KINA [K] ₃ BABBAR KU ₃ [...]...] [MU] ¹ US.SA BI ¹					X		X		X	X
CUSAS 40 1628	61	SIL A ₄ UR ₄	BAUŠ ₂	KI nu-ma-a-a	ITISEKIN KU ₃	MUR ⁴⁰ NANNA GARRAMU/ DU ₃ autre préposition envisageable ; MUR ⁴⁰ DAM KINARA MUDU ₃										
8	2	SIL A ₄ GA	BAUŠ ₂	KI EN ZI nu-wi-ir	ITISEKIN KU ₃	MUD ₂ GALE ₃ A/ MUBA.AL					X			X		X
CUSAS 40 2008	17 17 17	U ₈ UDU SIL A ₄	—	KI i-dm- ⁴ ŠAR A ₂	ITIMAS ¹ [DA ₃ GU ₃]	MUD ₂ GALE ₃ A/ MUBA.AL								X?		X?
CUSAS 40 1643	2	U ₈ UDUNTA ₂	BAUŠ ₂	KIDUMU u-bar-um	ITIZEN-SIL.GE	MUD ₂ [...]/MUBA.AL										

Abbréviations : NP : nom propre ; NE : empreinte d'un serviteur du roi Nabi-Enlil ; SA : empreinte d'un serviteur du roi Šu-Amurru.

Bibliographie

- Archibab www.archibab.fr
 CUSAS 40 SIGRIST M. & OZAKI T., 2019, *Tablets from the Irisağrig Archive*, CUSAS 40, University Park, Pennsylvania.
 MSL XI REINER E., 1974, *The Serie HAR-ra = ĩubullu. Tablets XX-XXIV*, MSL XI, Roma.
 DE BOER R., 2013, « An Early Old Babylonian Archive from the Kingdom of Malgium », *JA* 301.1, p. 19-25.
 MAYR R. H., 2012, « Seal Impressions on Administrative Tags from the Reign of Šu-Amurru », in Boiy, T., Bretschneider, J., Goddeeris, A., Hameeuw, H., Jans, G., and Tavemier, J. (eds) *The Ancient Near East. A Life ! Festschrift Karel Van Lerberghe*, OLA 220, Leuven, p. 409-423.

Laurent COLONNA D'ISTRIA <colonnadistria@uliege.be>
 Université de Liège (BELGIQUE)

11) New etiquettes from Lagaba concerning beer and by-products, and the placement of the year MU GIBIL — A recent article by L. R. Siddall, W. Horowitz et P. Zilberg (2018, henceforth 'the authors') brought 14 new etiquettes (*bullae*), originally from Lagaba, to our attention, presented in a table and accompanied by partial photographs. Twelve of these etiquettes, which W. J. Beasley, founder of the Australian Institute of Archaeology, acquired from the Baghdad-based antiquities dealer E. Jawahery in August 1935, are nowadays held at the Australian Institute of Archaeology at Macleod, in the suburbs of Melbourne (IA7.877 to IA7.887), and at the Nicholson Museum of the University of Sydney (NM44.20); two others were discovered in the collection of the Otago Museum in Dunedin, New Zealand (E47.285 and E47.540). As already noted by the authors, two further etiquettes previously published by O. Tammuz (1994) should be added to this group, which originally come from the Ternbach collection and are held at the Israel Museum of Jerusalem (IMJ 87.160.0652 and IMJ 87.160.0653). The list can be augmented by another etiquette, probably also from the Ternbach collection, and nowadays preserved in the Michail collection in Milan, which was published by G. Pettinato (1997: 191, no. 107). Here follows the text, with corrections of the *editio princeps* by reconsidering the available photo (corrections indicated by *):

	0,0.4* DUH* DURU ₅ *	40 SILA ₃ of moist draff
2	ŠU.TLA <i>be-el-šu-nu</i> KI ĩ*-lĩ*-ũ*-dUTU	received by Belšunu from Ili-u-Šamaš.
4	ITI DU ₆ .KÛ U ₄ 2.KAM MU ^{gi8} TUKUL ŠU.NIR*	(Date:) 2/vii/Si 7.

There are thus (up to date) 17 etiquettes that form a coherent dossier covering a limited amount of time: each records the receipt of a certain type of good delivered by Ili-u-Šamaš. Thirteen of them are dated between the months v and x of Samsu-iluna 7 (henceforth Si 7; date formula MU ^{gi8}TUKUL ŠU.NIR KÛ.GI), and the other four date to the month iii of a year whose name is not directly specified (MU GIBIL "new year"). The available editions and photographs do not always allow to decipher the name of the recipient: when the name is readable, it is Belšunu for the texts dating to Si 7 while Sin-abušu is recipient in those dated by the formula MU GIBIL. As already remarked by the authors, these etiquettes have two distinct forms depending on their date. The texts dating to Si 7 have three roughly oval and curved surfaces ("cornish pasty shape"), while those dated to MU GIBIL have a "three-sided pyramid shape".

Some photographs show that the etiquettes had string holes. The authors follow the idea that the etiquettes were attached to the good they recorded by means of a string (Siddall, Horowitz and Zilberg 2018: 11). However, it is now known that these concise administrative texts could have been strung together on a cord to preserve their chronological order to facilitate the production of a recapitulative account if necessary (see Charpin 2008 and most recently Charpin in press). That explains why these texts are found in one archive and not scattered across the archives of the recipients (as would be the case if they were attached to the delivered good).

The authors assume further, following O. Tammuz (1994), that the object that is received is designated by the logogram ŠIM, to be read *riqqum* (cf. CAD R, p. 368 sq.), and that we are dealing with receipts of an aromatic substance. Upon re-examination of the available photographs, a reading as DUH DURU₅ = *tuhhū raṭbātum* 'moist draff' seems preferable (cf. CAD T, p. 453b-454a). This by-product of

beer production is commonly used as animal fodder (see Röllig 1970 and the review by Stol 1971, specifically on this subject). This is supported by the fact that these etiquettes are related to a dossier of beer receipts associated with the same Ili-u-Šamaš, certainly a brewer, but which were written on tablets sealed by the recipient. Eleven of those beer receipts are held at the Yale Babylonian Collection. O. Tammuz edited them in his unpublished PhD thesis (1993) and they will soon be published by A. Jacquet in BIN 11 (nos. 155-165). The oldest one, NBC 8819, dating to 12/viii/Si 6, is apparently a receipt of barley (scribal error by writing ŠE instead of KAŠ?); the recipient is Šamaš-muballit, son of Abum-waqar (according to his seal). The other ten, all receipts of beer, are dated between the months vi and xi of Si 7; they are thus contemporaneous with the etiquettes discussed here; the recipients are either Belšunu, son of Imgur-Edimanna, or his brother Marduk-našir (according to their seals), both well-known individuals from the Lagaba archives (Frankena 1973). Furthermore, there are three receipts held in the De Liagre Böhl Collection at Leiden that belong to the same dossier. They were published by W. F. Leemans in TLB 1 (copy) and SLB 1/3 (edition) as numbers 107-109. SLB 1/3 107 is a receipt of beer by Belšunu from Ili-u-Šamaš dated to 7/xii/Si 19, so twelve years after the first group; numbers 108 and 109 are dated to the days 13 and 19/ix/Si 19 respectively (or perhaps Si 21, the use of the abbreviated year name MU GU.ZA BĀR IN.DĪM allows for both); the recipients are Pirhum-lizziz, Zababa-našir (son of Šu-Amurru and nephew of Belšunu and Marduk-našir) and Sin-išmeanni.

D. Charpin commented on that dossier of beer receipts in his article tracing the impact of royal edicts in Old Babylonian archives (Charpin 2000: 193-194), proposing that these texts styled as receipts were in fact debt notes that were never reimbursed due to the pronouncement of the *mīšarum* edict by Samsu-iluna in month iii of his 8th regnal year. Given the dates of the texts, this idea is certainly tempting, but the forthcoming study of the Lagaba texts by A. Jacquet permits to regard the entirety of these texts as simple administrative receipts which would have been discarded, perhaps coinciding with the *mīšarum*, when the brewer Ili-u-Šamaš revisited his archives to sort out cancelled debts. The draft receipts apparently suffered the same fate.

The currently available documentation does not seem to allow to determine the reasons for using one medium rather than the other (etiquette vs. tablet). Both carry the same amount of text (usually five lines) and are mostly sealed. There are, however, two differences. First, writing medium varies according to the product documented: the beer receipts (dealing with something liquid) were written on tablets while the draft receipts (dealing with something solid) were written on etiquettes. Second, the beer tablets are sealed by the recipient (Belšunu or Marduk-muballit) while the draft receipts are sealed with the seal of a man whose entire name is not yet known to us, [...] Ištaran, son of Abum-[wa]qar, servant of Ninsinanna (reading A. Jacquet) who is not the explicit recipient of the product as indicated in the text. Only a full edition of these documents might allow a better understanding of the use of these different supports.

The four etiquettes dated to the year MU GIBIL are problematic. It is generally considered that the texts dated with this date formula are, within the reign of Samsu-iluna, texts from his 29th regnal year (thus an abbreviated form of MU GIBIL EGIR MU *sa-am-su-i-lu-na* LUGAL.E Á.ÁG.GÁ 4EN.LÍL.LÁ; see for example TMH 10 185). At Lagaba, this is certainly the case in SLB 1/3 150 (20/iii/MU GIBIL = Si 29), an account of barley expenditures from the service of Bašti-il-aba. Afterwards this same Bašti-il-aba can be found again renting a field in SLB 1/3 142, a contract dated to 30/vi/Si 30 (MU GIBIL 2.KAM.MA). This perhaps also applies to SLB 1/3 92 (recapitulative account of barley expenditures for the month GU₄.SI.SÁ [ii]; 1/iii/MU GIBIL = Si 29?) and SLB 1/3 166 (barley[?] ration list; 10/i/MU GIBIL = Si 29?). However, four unedited documents from the Yale Babylonian Collection seem to indicate the proximity of year called MU GIBIL to the years Si 6 and Si 8: NBC 8534 (-/i/MU GIBIL; to be published as BIN 11 22) is part of a series of 16 barley and silver loans which were granted by Marduk-muballit between xi/Si 5 and vii/Si 8, and were cancelled by the *mīšarum* in Si 8 (Charpin 2000: 194 sq.; Jacquet 2013: 78 sq.). NBC 8543 (1/i/MU GIBIL; BIN 11 114), NBC 8578 (2/i/MU GIBIL; BIN 11 115), and NBC 8872 (2+x/i/MU GIBIL; BIN 11 116) are part of a series of 85 barley expenditures sealed by Sagil-mansum and dated between vi/Si 6 and xi/Si 7. According to O. Tammuz (1993: 63) “they were written either in Samsuiluna year 6, or more probably in Samsuiluna year 7”. These tablets are dated to the very first days of the year which led O. Tammuz (1993: 64) to suggest that “it is plausible that Sagil-mansum (the sender) was not yet informed of

the name of the new year when he sent the tablets” (see also O. Tammuz 1993: 171, with the same argument). Within this series hitherto known texts dated with the year formula MU GIBIL could be placed either at the very beginning of Si 6, or at the very beginning of Si 7, or even at the very beginning of Si 8, an option not considered by O. Tammuz.

What to think of the four new etiquettes dated to the month iii/MU GIBIL? Positioning them at the beginning of Si 6 seems very unlikely because the following text in the series of moist draff receipts (IA7.879) is dated to the 16/v/Si 7 and there would thus be a gap of more than a year in the sequence. Positioning them at the beginning of Si 7 is possible within the sequence of receipts, but is at odds with the sequence of barley expenditures sealed by Sagil-mansum, which shows that the official year name of Si 7 is used from the 16/i (NBC 8871 = BIN 11 54) as well as during the month ii (NBC 8910 = BIN 11 55 and NBC 8732 = BIN 11 56). The last option is to position the four texts at the beginning of Si 8, which seems permissible by each of the three series. The most likely positioning of those texts dated with the formula MU GIBIL is thus Si 8, neatly following the texts of Si 7 and just preceding the proclamation of the *mīšarum*. It is still unclear why, in these dossiers, the year name MU GIBIL had been carried through into iii/Si 8 even though the official year name has already been known at Lagaba, according other local archives, since the beginning of the year (see NBC 8563 = BIN 11 178 [14/i/Si 8] and NBC 6749 = BIN 11 188 [1/iii/Si 8]). This argument would also apply to a placement at the beginning of Si 7. If our hypothesis is correct, the dossier of beer and moist draff receipts belonging to Ili-u-Šamaš can thus be reconstructed as follows (subject to a full edition of the texts in Australia and New Zealand collections; the asterisks* signal corrections made, especially considering the reading of the months names, based on the available photographs):

Type	Reference	Date	Content
tablet	NBC 8819 [BIN 11 155]	12/viii/Si 6	Receipt of 124 SILA ₃ of barley by Šamaš-muballit from Ili-u-Šamaš Sealing: Šamaš-muballit, son of Abum-waqar, servant of Ninsianna
etiquette	IA7.879	16/v/Si 7	Receipt of 40 SILA ₃ of moist draff by Belšunu from Ili-u-Šamaš Sealing: no information
tablet	NBC 8798 [BIN 11 156]	1/vi/Si 7	Receipt of 56 SILA ₃ of beer by Belšunu from Ili-u-Šamaš Sealing: Belšunu, son of Imgur-Edimanna, servant of Nabium
etiquette	IMJ 87.160.0653 ¹⁾ [Tammuz 1994]	13/vi/Si 7	Receipt of 40 SILA ₃ of moist draff by Belšunu from Ili-u-Šamaš Sealing: [...] Išaran, son of Abum-waqar, servant of Ninsianna
etiquette	IMJ 87.160.0652 ²⁾ [Tammuz 1994]	14/vi/Si 7	Receipt of 40 SILA ₃ of moist draff by Belšunu from Ili-u-Šamaš Sealing: [...] Išaran, son of Abum-waqar, servant of Ninsianna
tablet	NBC 8554 [BIN 11 157]	15/vi/Si 7	Receipt of 256 SILA ₃ of beer by Belšunu from Ili-u-Šamaš Sealing: Belšunu, son of Imgur-Edimanna, servant of Nabium
etiquette	IA7.886	26/vi/Si 7	Receipt of 40 SILA ₃ of moist draff by (?) from Ili-u-Šamaš Sealing: no information
etiquette	IA7.878	1/vii*/Si 7	Receipt of 40 SILA ₃ of moist draff by (?) from Ili-u-Šamaš Sealing: no information
etiquette	Michail 107	2/vii/Si 7	Receipt of 40 SILA ₃ of moist draff by Belšunu from Ili-u-Šamaš Sealing: not visible on available photos
tablet	NBC 8779 [BIN 11 158]	9/vii/Si 7	Receipt of 53 SILA ₃ of beer by Marduk-našir from Ili-u-Šamaš Sealing: Marduk-našir, son of Imgur-Edimanna, servant of Nabium
etiquette	IA7.884	16?/vii*/Si 7	Receipt of 40 SILA ₃ of moist draff by (?) from Ili-u-Šamaš Sealing: no information
tablet	NBC 8786 [BIN 11 159]	8/viii/Si 7	Receipt of 20 SILA ₃ of beer by Belšunu from Ili-u-Šamaš Sealing: Belšunu, son of Imgur-Edimanna, servant of Nabium
etiquette	IA7.887	10/viii*/Si 7	Receipt of 40 SILA ₃ of moist draff by (?) from Ili-u-Šamaš Sealed but the sealing is not readable on the available photo
etiquette	IA7.885	11*/viii*/Si 7	Receipt of 40 SILA ₃ of moist draff by (?) from Ili-u-Šamaš Sealing: no information
etiquette	IA7.881	20/viii/Si 7	Receipt of 40 SILA ₃ of moist draff by Belšunu from Ili-u-Šamaš Sealing: no information
tablet	NBC 8750 [BIN 11 160]	22/viii/Si 7	Receipt of 16 SILA ₃ of beer by Marduk-našir from Ili-u-Šamaš Sealing: Marduk-našir, son of Imgur-Edimanna, servant of Nabium
etiquette	IA7.877	1/ix*/Si 7	Receipt of 40 SILA ₃ of moist draff by (?) from Ili-u-Šamaš Sealing: no information

etiquette	E47.285	4/ix*/Si 7	Receipt of 40 SILA ₃ of moist draff by (?) from Ili-u-Šamaš Sealing: no information
etiquette	NM44.20³⁾	16/ix*/Si 7	Receipt of 40 SILA ₃ of moist draff by Belšunu from Ili-u-Šamaš Sealing: [...] Ištar, son of Abum-waqar, servant of Ninsianna
tablet	NBC 8785 [BIN 11 161]	6/x/Si 7	Receipt of 20 SILA ₃ of beer by Marduk-našir from Ili-u-Šamaš Sealing: Marduk-našir, son of Imgur-Edimanna, servant of Nabium
tablet	NBC 8588 [BIN 11 162]	7/x/Si 7	Receipt of 22 SILA ₃ of beer by Marduk-našir from Ili-u-Šamaš Sealing: Marduk-našir, son of Imgur-Edimanna, servant of Nabium
tablet	NBC 8795 [BIN 11 163]	17/x/Si 7	Receipt of 20 SILA ₃ of beer by Marduk-našir from Ili-u-Šamaš Sealing: Marduk-našir, son of Imgur-Edimanna, servant of Nabium
tablet	NBC 8796 [BIN 11 164]	19/x/Si 7	Receipt of 73 SILA ₃ of beer by Belšunu from Ili-u-Šamaš Sealing: Belšunu, son of Imgur-Edimanna, servant of Nabium
tablet	NBC 8775 [BIN 11 165]	30/xi/Si 7	Receipt of 71 SILA ₃ of beer by Belšunu from Ili-u-Šamaš Sealing: Belšunu, son of Imgur-Edimanna, servant of Nabium
etiquette	E47.540	6/iii/MU GIBIL = Si 8	Receipt of 20 SILA ₃ of moist draff by (?) from Ili-u-Šamaš Sealing: no information
etiquette	IA7.883	16/iii*/MU GIBIL = Si 8	Receipt of [...] SILA ₃ of moist draff by (?) from Ili-u-Šamaš Sealing: no information
etiquette	IA7.880	20/iii/MU GIBIL = Si 8	Receipt of 30 SILA ₃ of moist draff by Sin-abušu from Ili-u-Šamaš Sealing: no information
etiquette	IA7.882	20/iii/MU GIBIL = Si 8	Receipt of 20 SILA ₃ of moist draff by Sin-abušu from Ili-u-Šamaš Sealing: no information
tablet	SLB 1/3 108	13/ix/Si 19 (or 21?)	Receipt of 70 SILA ₃ of beer by Pirhum-lizziz, Zababa-našir, and Sin-išmeanni from Ili-u-Šamaš Sealing: Zababa-našir, son of Šu-Amurum, servant of Nabium
tablet	SLB 1/3 109	19/ix/Si 19 (or 21?)	Receipt of 66 SILA ₃ of beer by Pirhum-lizziz, Zababa-našir, and Sin-išmeanni from Ili-u-Šamaš Sealing: Zababa-našir, son of Šu-Amurum, servant of Nabium
tablet	SLB 1/3 107	7/xii/Si 19	Receipt of 90 SILA ₃ of beer by Belšunu from Ili-u-Šamaš Sealing: Belšunu, son of Imgur-Edimanna, servant of Nabium

Table 1. Accounts of the brewer Ili-u-Šamaš from Lagaba during the reign of Samsu-iluna in chronological order.

Notes

1. See the CDLI photo: P430059.
2. See the CDLI photo: P430057.
3. A high quality photograph is available on the museum website of the University of Sydney: https://sydney.edu.au/museums/collections_search/?record=ecatalogue.40255; see also CDLI: P418022.

References

- CHARPIN, D. 2000. Les prêteurs et le palais : les édits de *mīšarum* des rois de Babylone et leurs traces dans les archives privées, in: A. C. V. M. Bongenaar (éd.), *Interdependency of Institutions and Private Entrepreneurs. Proceedings of the Second MOS Symposium (Leiden 1998)*, PIHANS 87, Leiden, p. 185-211.
- CHARPIN, D. 2008. Histoire de la Mésopotamie. I. Les archives d'Alammush-nasir, *Annuaire de l'École pratique des hautes études (EPHE), Section des sciences historiques et philologiques* 139 (2006-2007), p. 17-19 (<https://journals.openedition.org/ashp/147>; last consulted on February 27th, 2020).
- CHARPIN, D. sous presse. Une technique méconnue d'archivage chronologique des tablettes comptables, in: I. Arkhipov, G. Chambon et N. Ziegler (éds.), *L'administration économique du palais au Proche-Orient à l'âge du Bronze : Actes des colloques franco-russes, 2014-2016*, PIPOAC 4, Leuven/Paris/Walpole.
- FRANKENA, R. 1973. Einige Bemerkungen zu den Hauptpersonen der Lagaba-Tafel, in: M. A. Beek, A. A. Kampman, C. Nijland & J. Ryckmans (éds.), *Symbolae biblicae et mesopotamicae Francisco Mario Theodoro De Liagre Böhl dedicatae*, Leiden, p. 149-160.
- JACQUET, A. 2013. Family Archives in Mesopotamia during the Old Babylonian Period, in: M. Faraguna (éd.), *Legal Documents in Ancient Societies IV. Archives and Archival Documents in Ancient Societies. Trieste 30 September-1 October 2011*, Graeca Tergestina. Storia e Civiltà 1, Trieste, p. 63-85.
- PETTINATO, G. 1997. *L'uomo cominciò a scrivere. Iscrizioni cuneiformi della collezione Michail*, Milan.
- RÖLLIG, W. 1970. *Das Bier im alten Mesopotamien*, Berlin.

- SIDDALL, L. R., W. HOROWITZ et P. ZILBERG, 2018. Old Babylonian clay bullae from Lagaba in the Australian Institute of Archaeology and other collections, *Buried History. The Journal of the Australian Institute of Archaeology*, Volume 54, p. 11-14.
- STOL, M. 1971. Zur altnesopotamischen Bierbereitung, *BiOr* 28/3-4, p. 167-171.
- TAMMUZ, O. 1993. *Archives from Lagaba* (2 volumes), PhD dissertation, Yale University (U.M.I. No. 9426208).
- TAMMUZ, O. 1994. Old Babylonian Bullae in the Israel Museum, *NABU* 1994/52 (fascicle no. 3, p. 46-47).


Acknowledgments

We would like to warmly thank C. Schmidhuber for the English translation of this note.

Antoine JACQUET <antoine.jacquet@college-de-france.fr>
Collège de France, PROCLAC UMR 7192, Paris

Denis LACAMBRE <denis.lacambre@univ-lille.fr>
Univ. Lille, HALMA UMR 8164 (FRANCE)

12) MAH 16526 - *Bīt asīrī* flour receipt —



Obverse

- | | |
|--|-------------------------|
| 1 [...]-zíd-ús | ...lower-quality flour |
| 2 [(...)] a-na si-lá | To be delivered |
| 3 'lú' kíĝ.gi ₄ .a | To the messenger, |
| 4 lú 'KÁ.DIĜIR.RA ^{ki} | the man of Babylon, |
| 5 lú kíĝ-gi ₄ -a 'UD.UNUG.KI' | the messenger of Larsa, |

Lower edge

- | | |
|-----------------------|---------------------|
| 1 lú su-tu-um | the Sutean |
| 2 ù a-hi-a-tim | and other expenses. |
| 3 u ₄ ?... | ... |

Reverse

- | | |
|--|-------------------------------|
| 1 zi -ga | expenditure |
| 2 ša é a-si-rum | in the House of the Prisoners |
| 3 nì-šu ^d EN.ZU-še-mi | responsibility of Sin-šemi |
| 4 [empty line below horizontal ruling] | |
| 5 iti zíz-a u ₄ 13-kam | Month 11 day 13 |

Upper edge

- | | |
|--|---------------|
| 1 mu ri-'im ¹ . ^d a-nu-... | Year Rim-Anum |
| 2 'lugal ¹ -e | the king |
| 3 [illegible] | |

Table 1: MAH 16526

The dispersion of ancient cuneiform archives through commercial channels is the cause – it is a topos but reflects a sad reality – of much damage to historical studies. Like shrapnel, their dispersion has left splinters in many expected and unexpected places in the world. The archive of the *bīt-asīrī* in ancient Uruk, 120 years after its discovery, now well identified, has been reconstructed and thoroughly studied (most prominently Rositani 2003; Seri 2013; Charpin 2014). One more splinter – MAH 16526 (CDLI *sub* P424120) – still reposes in the Musée d'Art et d'Histoire, as yet unrecognized because it was heavily defaced. The tablet was given to the MAH in 1938 by Alfred Boissier, along with a large part of his collection; its provenance is unknown.

It bears no traces of a seal, but it is very worn. It is dated to the accession year (year 0) of Rīm-Anum (we follow the reconstruction of Charpin 2014, 129 : Rīm-Anum 0 = Samsu-iluna 8).

Our text belongs to series I of Rositani (2003, p. 10) and fills a gap in the reconstruction of the daily expenses of the *b.a.* over a short span of time. Like all members of the series, it is marked by almost military uniformity and a laconic style. It has not only the same configuration as Seri 1 (18.X) and 2 (dated 14.XI), but in this case even the same protagonists.

Sîn-šēmi (^dEN.ZU-še-mi), the ‘préposé aux prisonniers’ *wakil* (*šāpir*²) *asīrī*, is present in almost all the *bīt asīrī* texts.

The flour was to be delivered to the messenger (messengers³) of² the man of Babylon, the messenger (messengers³) of Larsa, the Sutean(s) and for other expenses. Unfortunately l. 3 of the lower edge, which may have given a precious indication on the circumstances, remained illegible to us.

Developing on Seri’s tables (Seri 2013, p. 83 ff. and 347 ff.), one obtains the following overview of the flour issued by the *bīt asīrī* (series I as defined by Rositani 2003) around the day our tablet was written:

Publication	Beneficiaries	Date	Quantity (in liters)
RSO 82, 2	restored: [lú.k.g.a] larsa ^{ki} / lú.k.[g.a] ṛéš ^l -nun ^{ki} */ ù aḫiātīm	RimA 0/XI/9	?
UF 10, 13	šudē lú.k.g.a ša Rīm-Sîn	RimA 0/XI/12	120
MAH 16526	ana p. lú.k.g.a / lú k.d.r ^{ki} / lú.k.g.a larsa ^{ki} / lú.su-tu-um / ù aḫiātīm	RimA 0/XI/13	?
UF 10, 21	ana tākulti lú.k.g.a.meš larsa ^{ki} / lú k.d.r ^{ki} ù aḫiātīm	RimA 0/XI/14	120
Ros. I 10	ana p. lú.k.g.a.meš larsa ^{ki} / lú k.d.r ^{ki} / lú.su-tu-um / ù aḫiātīm	RimA 0/XI/15	100
Seri 2	ana p. lú.k.g.a.meš larsa ^{ki} / lú k.d.r ^{ki} / lú.su-tu-um / ù aḫiātīm	RimA 0/XI/16?	150?
Ros. I 13	ana tākulti / lú.k.g.a.meš / lú ì-si-in ^{ki}	RimA 0/XI/23	90

Table 2: Sequence of *bīt asīrī* documents

Note: ad RSO 82, 2 : ṛéš^l-nun^{ki} does not seem plausible : either éš^l-nun-<na>^{ki} or perhaps UD^l.NUN^{ki} (Adab) ? But Adab has not appeared yet in the *bīt asīrī* texts, whereas Ešnuna is frequently attested. Some prisoners from that city were brought to the *bīt asīrī* around the same days (Seri 2013, p. 114 s. v. Ešnuna). Could messengers have negotiated to redeem them?

Ros. = Rositani 2003 ; Seri = Seri 2013 ; k.d.r = Babil ; k.g.a = kiḡ-gi₄-a ; p. = piqittu (SI.LÁ).

Do we have to attribute any significance to the difference between *piqittu* (SI.LÁ) and *šudū* ? Hardly. Only *tākultu* should correspond to a more solemn event, perhaps a banquet in presence of the king.

The messengers of neighboring Larsa remained hosted several days in the autumn of Si 8 in Uruk, meeting Babylonian and Sutean envoys. The envoys from Isin followed soon after.

We might add that even for such a modest archive, work remains to be done. For example, with the technology that enables recognition of faces and fingerprints, it should be possible to study the archive from formal and material points of view (format of tablets related to content, scribal characteristics etc.)

Bibliography

- A. ROSITANI 2003, *Rīm-Anum texts in the British Museum*, Nisaba 4.
- A. SERI 2013, *The house of prisoners. Slavery and state in Uruk during the revolt against Samsu-iluna*, SANER 2.
- D. CHARPIN 2014, “Chroniques bibliographiques 15. Le royaume d’Uruk et le pays d’Apum, deux voisins de Babylone vaincus par Samsu-iluna”, RA 108, pp. 121–160.

Antoine CAVIGNEAUX <antoinecavigneaux@gmail.com>

Emmert CLEVENSTINE <emmert.clevenstine@orange.fr>

13) Middle Assyrian Hazaziri = Old Babylonian Hazazar and Hittite Hašašar? — In MARV III 19 two separate incidents involving Assyrian merchants having their goods forcibly taken from them are reported. These incidents occurred at Imar and Hazaziri a place that has so far not been located see Yamada, 2011 p. 200 and last referenced in MTT 1/2 2017 p. 63. The text is dated to a limu from the time of

Shalmaneser 1 (Yamada, 2011 p. 200 note 4 with references to date and previous literature.) The first place in this text is the well known I/Emar (Meskene Qadime) on the Euphrates. I would like to tentatively propose that the other place, written URU *Ḫa-za-ʿzi-ri* in MARV III 19, 6, is Old Babylonian Hazazar (*Ḫa-za-za-ar^{ki}*) RGTC 3, 1980 p. 96 and Hittite Hašašar (URU *Ḫa-ša-a-šar*) in RGTC 6, 1978 p. 94 most recently discussed by Villard 1986 and Klengel, Lipiński FS 1995 p. 130 to be sought quite generally in the province of Idlib, Syria. Another reference to Ḫašašaru (URU *Ḫa-ša-ša-ri*) can be found at Ugarit for which see RGTC 12/2 2001 p. 119.¹⁾

In the Old Babylonian itinerary of Zimri Lim to Ugarit, Hazazar, is about two days journey from Muzunnum, which is in turn one day away from Aleppo.²⁾

The Old Babylonian Evidence is well presented by Villard 1986 p. 398:

“D'autre part M.C. Astour a montré [80] que les villes de Muzunnum et Hazazar apparaissent par ailleurs dans des textes hittites, la première se retrouvant également dans les textes d'Alalah [81], et la seconde dans ceux d'Ugarit, ce qui l'a amené à proposer pour Muzunnum une localisation "sur l'ancienne route de Qinnasrîn à Hama" tandis que Hazazar serait quelque part entre Tunip et Alalah. On notera aussi que Hazazar est située, d'après ARMT XXV, 134, texte rédigé au début du retour de Zimri-Lim, à deux journées de marche au plus de Muzunnum. Layašum se trouvant entre ces deux villes, nous aurions depuis Alep la séquence Muzunnum, Layašum, et Hazazar, chacune située à une étape de la suivante. Hazazar, quant à elle, pourrait se trouver sur l'Oronte, point de départ naturel d'une route caravanière se dirigeant vers le Sud. De là, l'expédition emprunta sans doute un chemin parallèle à la route actuelle d'Alep à Lattaquié, par Jisr eš Šughûr et la vallée du Kabîr.”

The Hittite reference to Mušunipa (URU *mu-šu-un-ni-ba*) RGTC 6 p. 276, comes from a list of north Syrian places in KBo 8:38 and is sometimes identified with the Muzunnum of the Mari texts (Astour 1973 p. 73-75), and located some 30km southwest of Aleppo. It is explicitly placed one day's journey southwest of Aleppo in an OB itinerary (Villard 1986; Lipiński 2000 p. 297-298). Astour's tentative location for Mušuniba at Tell Maraq (Astour 1973 p. 55 n 47 appears too far south of the area suggested by the above mentioned OB itinerary. (RGTC 12/2 p. 202 “scheint zu entfernt von Alalakh”). Unfortunately his proposal for Muzunnum/Mušuniba also locates a number of other places mentioned in KBo 8: 38 too far south namely: Aḫaša and Turpanta although he does indicate their tentative placement on his maps (Astour 1977, 1995) with a question mark. Frayne proposed Miznaz, about 20 miles (30 KM) southwest of Aleppo, as the location of Muzunnum (Frayne 2006 p. 38-40 table, text and map). This agrees with what is anticipated based on the OB itinerary and even somewhat recalls the name Muzunnum although the resemblance might still be considered accidental (Miller 2016 p. 111 n. 25; Villard 1986 p. 397-399 and map).³⁾ The equation of Muzunnum and Mušuniba seems possible but they could still be separate toponyms (Lipiński, 2006 p. 258ff seems to separate Mušuniba and Muzunnum and Miller 2016 p. 111 n. 25 also suggests caution with this identification). Nonetheless, the location of Muzunnum a day's journey southwest of Aleppo indicates that the Northern Syrian province of Idlib is the most likely region to look for the other toponyms.

Some uncertainty continues to exist with the identifications and locations of Muzunnum / Mušuniba. However, the identification of Middle Assyrian toponym Hazazar with the already recognized Old Babylonian Hazazar, Hittite Hašašar and Ugarit Ḫašašaru seems to fit the North Syrian context of MARV III 19. Finally, based mostly on the Old Babylonian text, Hazazar is to be placed approximately two days further west of Aleppo toward the Orontes and somewhere near the Jisr es Sughûr although we cannot be any more exact at this time.

Notes

1. The earliest references to Ḫašašar can be found at Ebla see RGTC 12/1 1993 p. 177. On the z/š writings see: Marco Bonechi, “Aleppo in Età Archaica A proposito di un'opera recente”, SEL 7, 1990 p. 18-19 n. 6 and Alfonso Archi, Haššum/ Hassuwan and Uršum/Uršaum, in *Muhibbe Daria Armağani* ed. Taner Tarhan, Aksel Tibet and Erkan Konyar 2008 p. 92 n. 2.

2. This proposal was posted on an online Forum, first posted April 2013, that is no longer available. I also suggested it in passing in a letter to Dr Freydank in March 2013 and received a positive reply on April 2, 2013. However, as this suggestion is no longer discoverable with a simple Google search I have decided to make it easier to find and so that it might eventually be considered for updates to the Middle Assyrian toponym series MTT I /2. 2017 p. 63.

3. I would suggest that if we can closely confine a proposed toponym to a relatively small area then comparison with modern place names might be provisionally considered.

Bibliography

- ASTOUR 1973 = M. C. ASTOUR, "Note toponymique à la tablette A.1270 de Mari," *RA* 67 (1973) p. 73-75.
 ASTOUR 1977 = M. C. ASTOUR, "Tunip-Hamath and its Region," *Or* 46 (1977) p. 51-64.
 ASTOUR 1995 = M. C. ASTOUR, "La topographie du royaume d'Ougarit," *RSO* 11 (1995) p. 55-71.
 FAIST 2001 = B. I. FAIST, *Der Fernhandel des assyrischen Reiches zwischen dem 14. und 11. Jh. v. Chr.*, AOAT 265, 2001 Münster.
 FRAYNE 2006 = D. FRAYNE, "Tell 'Acharneh and the Orontes Valley: Early Textual Sources," p. 25-42 in *Tell 'Acharneh 1998-2004 : rapports préliminaires sur les campagnes de fouilles et saison d'études* (Michel Fortin, éditeur) Brepols, 2006.
 KLENGEL, 1995 = H. KLENGEL, "Tunip und andere Probleme der historischen Geographie Mittelsyriens," *Immigration and Emigration within the Ancient Near East Festschrift E. Lipiński*, (eds. K. van Lerberghe and A. Schoors) OLA 65, 1995 p. 125-134.
 LAFONT 2016 = B. LAFONT, "Que nous apprennent les textes de Mari sur l'Oronte?" *Syria Supplément IV* 2016 p. 89-96.
 LIPÍŃSKI 2000 = E. LIPÍŃSKI, *The Arameans: Their Ancient History, Culture Religion*, OLA Peeters 2000.
 LIPÍŃSKI 2006 = E. LIPÍŃSKI, *On the Skirts of Canaan in the Iron Age Historical and Topographical Researches*, OLA 153, 2006.
 MILLER 2016 = J. L. MILLER, "The Contribution of the Hittite Documentation to the Historical Geography of the Middle Orontes Region," *Syria Supplément IV* 2016 p. 107-118.
 MARV III = H. FREYDANK, *Mittelassyrische Rechtsurkunden und Verwaltungstexte* WVDOG 92, 1994.
 FREYDANK 2013 = personal communication dated April 2 of that year.
 MTT I/2 2017 = E. CANKI-KIRSCHBAUM and C. HESS, *Toponyme der mittelassyrischen Texte: Der Westen des mittelassyrischen Reiches* Materialien zu Toponymie und Topographie I Obermesopotamien im 2. Jt. v.Chr. MTT I/2, SEPOA, Paris 2017.
 RGTC 3 = *Die Orts- und Gewässernamen der altbabylonischen Zeit*, by B. GRONEBERG. TAVO B 7/6 Ludwig Reichert Verlag, Wiesbaden 1980.
 RGTC 6 = *Die Orts- und Gewässernamen der Hethitischen Texte*, by G. F. DEL MONTE and J. TISCHLER. TAVO B 7/6 Ludwig Reichert Verlag, Wiesbaden 1978.
 RGTC 12/1 = M. BONECHI, *I nomi geografici dei testi di Ebla* / TAVO B 12/1 Dr Ludwig Reichert Verlag, Wiesbaden, Germany 1993.
 RGTC 12/2 = J. A. BELMONTE MARÍN, *Die Orts- und Gewässernamen der Texte aus Syrien im 2. Jt. V. Chr.* / TAVO B 12/2 Dr Ludwig Reichert Verlag, Wiesbaden 2001.
 VILLARD 1986 = P. VILLARD, "Un Roi de Mari à Ugarit," *UF* 18 (1986) p. 387-412.
 YAMADA 2011 = M. YAMADA, "The Second Military Conflict Between 'Assyria' and 'Hatti' in the Reign of Tukulti Ninurta I," *RA* 105 (2011) p. 199-220.

Herbert STORCK <hastorck@gmail.com>
 Toronto, Ontario (CANADA)

14) Teḫip-tilla Family Documents Among Recently Published "Harvard" Nuzi Texts — The archives of the family of Teḫip-tilla son of Puḫi-šenni were discovered during the initial season of excavations at Nuzi, 1925-26, and ended up at the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago. They were overwhelmingly published in the series, *JEN* (= *Joint Expedition with the Iraq Museum at Nuzi*). A few of these "Chicago" tablets were published elsewhere (e.g., Lacheman 1935). Still other Teḫip-tilla tablets, not identified as being from the 1925-1926 season, ended up in other museum and private collections (see, e.g., Lacheman 1967; and Maidman 1997; see further, Maidman 1976: 594-595). The largest number belonging to this last type was housed ultimately at the Harvard Semitic Museum. A few were published in the series, *HSS* (= *Harvard Semitic Series*) and have been known for many years (the last volume of *HSS* Nuzi texts was published in 1962¹⁾) and elsewhere.²⁾ About eight others have been published in the recent series *EN* (= *Excavations at Nuzi*),³⁾ embedded within the volumes of *SCCNH* (= *Studies on the Civilization and Culture of Nuzi and the Hurrians*). These latter texts from the Teḫip-tilla family archive are, of course, less well known. Three of these tablets have been edited or otherwise treated in the literature:

EN 10/1, 25 (SMN 1584) + *JEN* 13. Treated in Maidman 1987a.

EN 10/2, 110 (SMN 1721). Treated in Maidman 1987b.

EN 11/2, 74 (SMN 2972) (+ *JEN* 384. Treated in Maidman, forthcoming.

Incidentally, the first and third items prove that these joined “Harvard” texts are strays from the “Chicago” collection and must have originated in rooms 15 or 16 of the Tehip-tilla family quarters in the Nuzi suburbs.

The other texts that I have identified are: *EN* 10/1, 12; *EN* 10/2, 162; *EN* 11/2, 107. These all involve Tehip-tilla himself. *EN* 11/2, 103 may well belong to this group as well. *EN* 9/1, 314 is a text of Tehip-tilla’s daughter-in-law, Uzna wife of Enna-mati. The text derives from room T19, near the main Tehip-tilla family archive.⁴⁾

(Other *EN* 9 and 11 texts also mention members of the Tehip-tilla family but almost certainly are not part of the same archive. *EN* 9/1, 192, 199, and 251 all pertain to antichretic loan transactions of Puḫi-šenni son of Zike, a great-grandson of Tehip-tilla by his second son. *EN* 11/1, 58 identifies Zike’s brother, Tarmi-tilla son of Šurki-tilla as, probably, a principal party in the text. These documents derive from a different archive.⁵⁾ *EN* 9/3, 78 names Umpiya son of Ḫaiš-tešup as a witness (ll. 27, 36). He is a nephew of Tehip-tilla, but the text is certainly not part of the family archive.)

EN 9/2, 110; and *EN* 10/2, 121 may pertain to Tehip-tilla as well, or, in the case of *EN* 9/2, 110, to his son, Šurki-tilla.⁶⁾

By far, the most complete of these recent “Harvard” strays dealing with Tehip-tilla himself, is *EN* 11/2, 107. It is sufficiently preserved so as to merit a discrete edition. It follows here.

EN 11/2, 107⁷⁾

Transliteration

Obverse

- 1 [tup-pí ma-ru-ti ša^m] Eḫ-li-pa-pu
- 2 [DUMU PN ù ša] Ḫa-ni-ku-uz-zi
- 3 [DUMU PN] 2 ŠEŠ.MEŠ an-nu-ti
- 4 [Ḫe-ḫi-ip-til-la DUMU P] u-ḫi-še-en-ni
- 5 [a-na ma-ru-ti i-te-e] p-šu
- 6 [n ANŠE?] ḪA.ŠA i-na il-ta-an
- 7 [] ù i-na šu-ta-an
- 8 [] -li-ya-WA
- 9 [] .M]EŠ Eḫ-li-pa-pu
- 10 [ù Ḫa-ni-ku-(uz-zi) ki-i-ma ḪA.LA-šu
- 11 [a-na Ḫe-ḫi-ip-til-la i] d-di-nu
- 12 [ù Ḫe-ḫi-ip-til-la n A]NŠE ŠE.MEŠ ki-i-ma
- 13 [NÍG.BA-šu-nu a-na Ḫe-ḫi-ip-til-la
- 14 [ù a-na Ḫa-ni-ku-(uz-zi) i-di-na-aš-šu-nu
- 15 [il-ka_{1/4} ša A.ŠA Eḫ-li-pa-pu ù Ḫa-ni-ku-zi
na-šu-ú]
- 16 [šum-ma A.ŠA š] a-a-šu pa-qi-ra-na [TUK^{š1}]
- 17 [Ḫe-ḫi-ip-til-la] u ù Ḫa-ni-ku-zi
- 18 [ú-za-ak-ku-ú ù a-na Ḫe-ḫi-ip-til-la SUM-nu
- 19 [šum-ma Ḫe-ḫi-ip-til-la] ḪA-ni-ku-zi
- 20 [KI.BAL n MA.NA KÙ.BABBAR (ù)
n M]A.NA KÙ.SIG₁₇ [ú-ma-al-lu-ú]
- 21 [] ḪA-ni-ku-zi [(?)]

(Broken)

Reverse

(Broken)

- 22 [NA₄]-ḫa?

Translation

[Tablet of adoption of] Eḫlip-apu [son of PN and of Ḫanikuzzi [son of PN?/PN₂?]. These two brothers adopt[ed] [Tehip-tilla son of] Puḫi-šenni.

Eḫlip-apu [and] Ḫanikuzzi gave [to Tehip-tilla] as his inheritance share... [homers?] of land to the north of... and to the south of... -liya... (a substantive)-s.

And Tehip-tilla gave to Eḫlip-apu and Ḫanikuzzi... homers of barley as [their gift].

Eḫlip-apu and Ḫanikuzzi [shall bear the ilku of the land].

Should that land [have] claimants, Eḫlip-apu and Ḫanikuzzi [shall clear (the land) and give (it) [to] Tehip-tilla.

[Should Eḫlip-apu] and Ḫanikuzzi [abrogate (this contract), they shall pay n minas of silver (and) n] minas of gold.

[Seal impression of]... -ḫa(?).

Comments and notes to the lines

This transaction and the parties involved are not known to me from any other Tehip-tilla family text or from any other Nuzi text at all.

1. 1: [Ḫe-ḫi-ip-til-la] This PN is nowhere else attested with the PN at line 2.

1. 2: Ḫa-ni-ku-uz-zi. This PN is nowhere else attested with the PN at line 1.

1. 3: These are not necessarily literally brothers. Therefore, the patronymic at line 3 is not necessarily the patronymic at line 2.

1. 4: [Ḫe-ḫi-ip-til-la]. Proved by line 18. For this reason, this text is assigned to the archive of Tehip-tilla son of Puḫi-šenni.

1. 8: [...-]i-ya-WA. There are not enough data to further locate this land. The *dimtu* of Ulūliya (in the town of Unap-še) is one possibility.
 1. 16: [TUK^{-š}]. Or the like.
 1. 20: [KI.BAL]. Or the like.

Notes

1. HSS XIX.
2. P-S.
3. “EN” is used here as an independent siglum, as opposed to EN 1-8 (= HSS V, IX- X, XIII-XVI, XIX). EN continues the publication of Nuzi tablets initiated in HSS.
4. See Lacheman 1958: vi.
5. For this archival context, see J. Justel in a forthcoming study of the home, status, and archives of Zike son of Šurki-tilla.
6. If the latter be the case, then it would also belong to the group of texts of Puḫi-šenni son of Zike and of Tarmi-tilla son of Šurki-tilla identified above.
7. The catalogue number of this item is unclear. Spering 2009: 683b has ERL 96, while p. 720 has ERL 90 (ERL = Ernest René Lacheman). “ERL” is one of the sigla identifying “Harvard” tablets not assigned “SMN” numbers. In fact, the concordance at Spering 2009: 683 disagrees with Spering 2009: 718-723 regarding the catalogue numbers of EN 11/2, 105-110. EN 11/2, 111 is not represented in the catalogue at all.

Abbreviations

- EN, 9/1 Tablet published in LACHEMAN†, E.R., D.I. OWEN, and M.A. MORRISON, 1987, Part III: Texts in the Harvard Semitic Museum; Excavations at Nuzi 9/1. Pp. 355-702 in *General Studies and Excavations at Nuzi 9/1*, ed. D.I. Owen and M. Morrison. SCCNH 2. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns.
- EN, 9/2 Tablet published in LACHEMAN†, E.R., M.A. MORRISON, and D.I. OWEN, 1993, Part 2: Texts in the Harvard Semitic Museum; Excavations at Nuzi 9/2. Pp. 131-398 in *The Eastern Archives of Nuzi... and Excavations at Nuzi 9/2...* SCCNH 4. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns.
- EN, 9/3 Tablet published in LACHEMAN†, E.R., and D.I. OWEN, 1995, Part 2: Texts in the Harvard Semitic Museum; Excavations at Nuzi 9/3. Pp. 85-357 in *General Studies... and Excavations at Nuzi 9/3...*, ed. D.I. Owen. SCCNH 5. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns.
- EN, 10/1 Tablet published in FINCKE, J., 1996, Excavations at Nuzi 10/1, 1-65. Pp. 379-468 in *Richard F.S. Starr Memorial Volume*, ed. D.I. Owen and G. Wilhelm. SCCNH 8. Bethesda, MD.: CDL Press.
- EN, 10/2 Tablet published in FINCKE, J., 1998, Excavations at Nuzi 10/2, 66-174. Pp. 219-373 in *General Studies and Excavations at Nuzi 10/2*, ed. D.I. Owen and M. Morrison. SCCNH 9. Bethesda Md., CDL Press.
- EN, 11/2 Tablet published in SPERING, B., 2009, Part III: Excavations at Nuzi 11/2, 61-111. Pp. 681-723 in *General Studies and Excavations at Nuzi 11/2: Studies... Owen...*, ed. D.I. Owen and G. Wilhelm. SCCNH 18. Bethesda, Md.: CDL Press.
- P-S Tablet published in PFEIFFER, R.H., and E.A. SPEISER, 1935-36, *One Hundred New Selected Nuzi Texts*. AASOR 16. New Haven: American Schools of Oriental Research.
- SMN Semitic Museum (Harvard), unpublished Nuzi tablet

Bibliography

- LACHEMAN, E.R., 1935, New Nuzi Texts and a New Method of Copying Cuneiform Tablets. *JAOS* 55: 429-431 + 6 plates.
- , 1958, *Excavations at Nuzi... vol. 7: Economic and Social Documents*. Harvard Semitic Series 16. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- , 1967, Les Tablettes de Kerkouk au Musée d'Art et d'Histoire de Genève. *Genava* 15: 5-23.
- MAIDMAN, M.P., 1976, *A Socio-economic Analysis of a Nuzi Family Archive*. Ph.D. diss., Pennsylvania. Ann Arbor, Mich.: University Microfilms.
- , 1987a 2. A Tale of Two Cities. Pp. 345-349 in *General Studies and Excavations at Nuzi 9/1*, ed. D.I. Owen and M. Morrison. SCCNH 2. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns.
- , 1987b 3. A Second Tehip-tilla Fragment at Harvard. P. 349 in *General Studies and Excavations at Nuzi 9/1*, ed. D.I. Owen and M. Morrison. SCCNH 2. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns.
- , 1997 A New Tehip-tilla Text Fragment. Pp. 335-338 in *Crossing Boundaries...: Studies in Honor of Michael C. Astour...*, ed. G. D. Young, M. W. Chavalas, and R. E. Averbeck. Bethesda, Md.: CDL Press.
- , forthcoming, The Peculiar Dossier of Šukr-apu son of Eteya. *Orientalia*.

Maynard P. MAIDMAN <mmaidman@yorku.ca>
 York University, emeritus (CANADA)

15) The terrace of Aššur-uballiṭ in RIMA 2 A.0.100.5 — In one of his inscriptions, Tukulti-Ninurta II mentions a former renovation of the terrace of his palace at Aššur by a king called ^maš-š[ur-bēl-k]a-la (RIMA 2 A.0.100.5, l. 137; SCHRAMM 1970: 154, rev. 55) or ^{md}[aš-šur-bēl-k]a-la (WEIDNER 1930-1931: 78). The earliest edition of the inscription reconstructs the royal name as ^{md}aš-š[ur-uba]lliṭ (SCHEIL 1909: 26, rev. 55; cf. LUCKENBILL 1926: 1:133, no. 417: 'Assur-uballit'). Both the readings Aššur-bēl-kala and Aššur-uballiṭ are possible: the last sign of the name, -la (LABAT 1976: 59, no. 55; see the facsimiles for A.0.100.5 in SCHEIL 1909: pl. vi, rev. 55; SCHRAMM 1970: pl. vi, rev. 55), is attested for the last part of Aššur-uballiṭ's name (e.g. in KING 1904: 169, no. 4 l. 7: ^{md}aš-šur-TI-LA; KAH 2 27 ll. 1 and 13: ^{md}aš-šur-TI-LA).

The option for either reading seems to be linked to a passage in the *Broken Obelisk*, which mentions work on the terrace of the New Palace at Aššur (RIMA 2 A.0.89.7, v 20-31).¹⁾ The obelisk was at first ascribed (partly) to Tiglath-pileser I but later (entirely) to Aššur-bēl-kala.²⁾ It was exactly at the moment that the *Broken Obelisk* (and hence the work on the terrace) was no longer ascribed to Tiglath-pileser I but to Aššur-bēl-kala that the reading ^{md}aš-šur-bēl-ka-la was proposed for the first time for A.0.100.5 (WEIDNER 1930-1931: 78, 92-94).

Recently, the *Broken Obelisk* has been reascribed to Tiglath-pileser I (MAHIEU 2018: 78-86). As a consequence, the reading ^{md}aš-šur-uballiṭ should be reappraised for A.0.100.5. Aššur-uballiṭ did work on the terrace of the New Palace at Aššur (RIMA 1 A.0.73.2; cf. A.0.73.1002), which speaks in favour of the reconstruction of his name. In contrast, for Aššur-bēl-kala – apart from the doubtful attribution of the passage in the *Broken Obelisk* – there is no such evidence.

Notes

1. Cf. GRAYSON 1991: 170: "The building section (lines 136–41 [in RIMA 2 A.0.100.5] and cf. A.0.100.1) concerns the reconstruction of the wall of the large palace terrace which had previously been built by Aššur-bēl-kala. This is presumably the same as 'the large terrace of New Palace', the restoration of which is described in the Broken Obelisk (A.0.89.7 v 20–31)."

2. For a survey of the attributions proposed for the *Broken Obelisk*, see BÖRKER-KLÄHN 1982: 178 (no. 131).

Bibliography

- BÖRKER-KLÄHN, J., 1982: *Alt Vorderasiatische Bildstelen und vergleichbare Felsreliefs*, vol. 1: *Text*, with a contribution by A. SHUNNAR-MISERA (BaF 4), Mainz am Rhein.
- GRAYSON, A. K., 1991: *Assyrian Rulers of the Early First Millennium BC: I (1114-859 BC)* (RIMA 2), Toronto.
- KING, L. W., 1904: *Records of the Reign of Tukulti-Ninib I, King of Assyria, about B.C. 1275* (Studies in Eastern History 1), London.
- LABAT, R., 1976: *Manuel d'épigraphie akkadienne (signes, syllabaire, idéogrammes)*, 5th ed., new, revised, and corrected ed. by F. MALBRAN-LABAT, Paris.
- LUCKENBILL, D. D., 1926: *Ancient Records of Assyria and Babylonia*, vol. 1, Chicago.
- MAHIEU, B., 2018: "The Old and Middle Assyrian Calendars, and the Adoption of the Babylonian Calendar by Tiglath-pileser I (Attested in the *Doppeldatierungen* and in the Broken Obelisk)," *SAAB* 24, 63-95.
- SCHEIL, J.-V., 1909: *Annales de Tukulti Ninip II, roi d'Assyrie 889-884*, with the collaboration of J.-É. GAUTIER (BEHE.H 178), Paris.
- SCHRAMM, W., 1970: "Die Annalen des assyrischen Königs Tukulti-Ninurta II. (890-884 v. Chr.)," *BO* 27, 147-160.
- WEIDNER, E. F., 1930-1931: "Die Annalen des Königs Aššurbêl-kala von Assyrien," *AfO* 6, 75-94.

Bieke MAHIEU <assistant.au.projet.b.e.s.t@gmail.com>
École biblique et archéologique française de Jérusalem (ISRAEL)

16) The Divine Determinative And The Names Of Assyrian Rulers — The divine determinative¹⁾ in the writing of royal names in Mesopotamian cuneiform has long been a part of the debate on the issue of royal deification in ancient Mesopotamia.²⁾ This brief article discusses the presence (and absence) of the divine determinative in the writing of the names of Assyrian rulers and thus contributes to the debate on royal deification in ancient Assyria.³⁾

After having conducted searches in the online databases RIAo (Royal Inscriptions of Assyria online) and RINAPo (Royal Inscriptions of the Neo-Assyrian Period online),⁴⁾ complemented by some manual book and article surveys,⁵⁾ the following attestations of the writing of the names of Assyrian rulers with the divine determinative were found⁶⁾:

Old Assyrian Period:

^d LUGAL-GIN	Sargon I	RIMA 1, A.0.35.1: 1
^d LUGAL-GIN	Sargon I	RIMA 1, A.0.35.2001: 2
^d na-ra-am- ^d ZUEN	Naram-Sin	SAAB 12/1: 1: i 1

Middle Assyrian Period:

^d GIŠ.tukul-ti- ^d nin-urta	Tukulti-Ninurta I	RIMA 1, A.0.78.19: 1
[^d]rGISKIM ¹ -MAŠ	Tukulti-Ninurta I	RIMA 1, A.0.78.28: o 1
^d GISKIM-MAŠ	Tukulti-Ninurta I	RIMA 1, A.0.78.28: r 9
^d r ¹ tukul ¹ -ti- ^d nin-u[rta]	Tukulti-Ninurta I	RIMA 1, A.0.78.37: 3

Neo-Assyrian Period:

[^{md} tukul-ti- ^d MAŠ]	Tukulti-Ninurta II	RIMA 3, A.0.102.5: i 1
[^{md} tukul-ti- ^d MAŠ]	Tukulti-Ninurta II	RIMA 3, A.0.102.11: o 12'
^d LUGAL-ú-kin	Sargon II	RIMB 2, B.6.22.4: i 1
^d LUGAL-GI.NA	Sargon II	RIMB 2, B.6.22.5: 6
^d LUGAL-ú-kin	Sargon II	RIMB 2, B.6.22.6: 4

Before commenting on the attestations listed above, it should be remarked that these are strikingly few, considering the enormity of the Assyrian (especially Neo-Assyrian) text corpus.⁷⁾ Anyway, there are no attestations from Assur-based rulers of the third millennium BCE, but there are indeed some attestations from the Old Assyrian period, i.e. from the reigns of Sargon I and Naram-Sin. From the Middle Assyrian period, there are attestations from the reign of Tukulti-Ninurta I, and from the Neo-Assyrian period, there are attestations in the texts of Shalmaneser III regarding Tukulti-Ninurta II.

Beginning with the attestations from the Old Assyrian period, the name of Sargon I (c. 1900 BCE) is written with the divine determinative in several impressions on clay tablets and envelopes from the Assyrian trade colony karum Kanesh in Anatolia. The text presents Sargon I as, “Sargon (^dLUGAL-GIN), vice-regent of the god Ashur, son of Ikunum, vice-regent of the god Ashur” (RIMA 1, A.0.35.1). The same writing is found in a dedicatory text (from a woman named Haditum) which tells of the dedication of a bronze plate to the old Ishtar temple at Assur when Sargon I was ruler (RIMA 1, A.0.35.2001). These are the only known “royal inscriptions” attributed to Sargon I. The form ^dLUGAL-GIN can be transcribed into Akkadian as *šarrum-kīn*, meaning “the king is legitimate (as ruler)”. The word “king” (*šarrum*) naturally refers to Sargon I and the worldly sphere.

Naram-Sin (c. 1850 BCE), another Assyrian ruler of the Old Assyrian period, also has seal impressions on documentary evidence from the Assyrian trade colony karum Kanesh in Anatolia which contain his personal name written with the divine determinative. The text in question here presents Naram-Sin as, “Naram-Sin (^dna-ra-am-^dZUEN), vice-regent of the god Ashur, son of Puzur-Ashur, vice-regent of the god Ashur” (SAAB 12/1: 1). There is no other known royal inscription of this ruler. The form ^dna-ra-am-^dZUEN can be transcribed into Akkadian as *Narām-Šīn*, meaning “beloved of Sin”. The verbal adjective (giving passive meaning) form of the verb *rāmu*, “to love”, is obviously not a divine element, in contrast to the moon-god Sin whose name is written next.

Continuing with attestations from the Middle Assyrian period, the name of Tukulti-Ninurta I (1244-1208 BCE) is written with the divine determinative before a “worldly” word in several texts. A text on clay cones from Assur concerning this ruler’s work on the wall and moat of that city presents the king as ^dGIŠ.tukul-ti-^dnin-urta in starting the section of royal titles (RIMA 1, A.0.78.19: 1). The writing ^dGISKIM-MAŠ can be found (twice, starting sections of royal titles) on a clay tablet from Nineveh which has a copy of an inscription from a royal seal of lapis lazuli, originally belonging to a Babylonian king (RIMA 1, A.0.78.28: o 1, r 9). Finally, the writing (*kar*-)^dr¹tukul¹-ti-^dnin-u[rta] appears on bricks from Assur and Kar-Tukulti-Ninurta (RIMA 1, A.0.78.37: 3). While the royal name that the text begins with lacks a divine

determinative (l. 1), the writing of the mentioned toponym contains one (l. 3). The form ^dGISKIM-MAŠ (with variations) can be transcribed into Akkadian as *Tukulti-Ninurta*, meaning “my support (is) Ninurta”. The word for “support” (*tukultu*) can naturally not be seen as a divine element, in contrast to the god Ninurta whose name concludes the royal name.

Concluding with attestations from the Neo-Assyrian period, the name of Tukulti-Ninurta II (890-884 BCE) can be written with the divine determinative in the royal inscriptions of Shalmaneser III (858-824 BCE). In a summary inscription on a bronze gate at Imgur-Enlil (Balawat), Ashurnasirpal II (the reigning king’s father) is presented as the son of [^{md}*tukul-ti*-^dMAŠ] in the first line of the text (RIMA 3, A.0.102.5: i 1). The same (reconstructed)⁸ writing can be found in a fragmentary annalistic inscription on a stone slab fragment from Assur which e.g. speaks of Ashurnasirpal II as the offspring of Tukulti-Ninurta II in the section of royal titles and epithets (RIMA 3, A.0.102.11: o 12’). It should be noted here that the word *tukultu* is preceded by both personal and divine determinatives. Finally, the name of Sargon II (721-705 BCE) is written with the divine determinative in three royal inscriptions from Uruk regarding work on Eanna (RIMB 2, B.6.22.4: i 1; B.6.22.5: 6; B.6.22.6: 4).

How should these attestations be understood? To begin with, the overwhelming absence of divine determinatives in front of “worldly” word elements that form part of Assyrian royal names must be stressed. That said, the above-discussed attestations are not self-evidently expressing royal deification either. The names Sargon and Naram-Sin obviously allude to the famous Old Akkadian/Sargonic kings with the same names. These kings seem to have reached a semi-divine status in the Old Assyrian period, much like Gilgamesh, the legendary and partly divine ruler of Uruk, was seen as more than a mere mortal.⁹ In other words, the deification in the names of Sargon I and Naram-Sin of Assyria primarily tells of the statuses (in terms of mortal/divine) of these Sargonic kings. Anyway, it might have been the perceived heroic qualities of the Sargonic kings that the said Old Assyrian rulers sought to associate themselves with.¹⁰ As for the supposed deification of Tukulti-Ninurta I, it is true that there are reforms in the royal ideology of that king’s time, related to the elevation of the king.¹¹ Still, the number of times where the name is written *without* the divine determinative greatly outnumbers the ones including it.¹² The great majority of the former writing makes it reasonable to claim that scribal errors or an alternative scribal convention were at play in the latter writing.¹³ The writing of Tukulti-Ninurta II’s name in Shalmaneser III’s royal inscriptions is harder to grasp. The number of times where the former’s name is written *without* the divine determinative dominates,¹⁴ and Tukulti-Ninurta II himself did not write his name with the divine determinative in front of *tukultu*.¹⁵

All in all, in the debate on royal deification in ancient Assyria, the factor of divine determinatives consistently speaks in favour of the idea that Assyrian rulers did *not* claim divine status in their royal inscriptions. Rather, they presented themselves as mortals who were supported from “above” in the execution of their divine office, the vice-regentship or kingship of the god Ashur.¹⁶

Notes

1. Conveyed through the ‘dingir’-sign (sign no. 10 in MZL (pp. 248-250)) in its classificatory function.
2. See e.g. the classical works by R. Labat (1939) and H. Frankfort (1948).
3. See e.g. the works by J.E. Reade (rejecting deification) (1998) and S. Parpola (identifying deification) (1999).
4. <http://oracc.museum.upenn.edu/riao/pager> (2020-01-07), <http://oracc.museum.upenn.edu/rinap/corpus/> (2020-01-07). Based on the books RIMA 1-3 and RINAP 1, 3-5. The search-element was ‘d’ (standing for the divine determinative sign). It is only natural to focus on royal inscriptions, considering the inherently ideological and programmatic character of this genre.
5. RINAP 2 (the texts of Sargon II) is unpublished. ISKh, SAAS 8, Iraq 37, OrNS 68, and MDOG 115 were then surveyed.
6. Divine determinatives that directly precede divine names in the names of Assyrian kings are ignored in this article. Both personal names of reigning kings (living rulers) and royal predecessors (deceased rulers) are included in the discussion.
7. There is a possibility that royal deification may be “hidden” behind the divine determinatives preceding divine names (see e.g. the royal names Shalmaneser and Sennacherib where the divine elements come first). However, an added personal determinative regularly and supposedly distinguishes the mortal ruler from the divinity, as in ^{md}EN.ZU-ŠEŠ-MEŠ-*eri-ba* (Sennacherib). When the divine name concludes the royal name, the divine determinative is normally postponed accordingly, as in *pu-zu-ur*-^da-šūr (Puzur-Ashur III) and ^{me}-*ri-ba*-^dIŠKUR (Eriba-Adad I). Royal names without divine

names in them lack divine determinatives, as in *i-ri-šu-um* (Erishum I) and ^mGIŠ.tukul-ti-IBILA-é-šár-ra (Tiglath-pileser I). The name Shamshi-Adad (I-V) should be considered as containing *two* divine names, as implied in the occasional writing ^dUTU-ši-^dISKUR. The name of the ancestor king Bel-bani (^{m(d)}EN-ba-ni) most likely has a divine name as first element.

8. Following the transliterations at <http://oracc.org/riao/Q004610/> and <http://oracc.org/riao/Q004616/> (2020-01-10).

9. For the repute and deification of Sargonic rulers, see e.g. Liverani 1993: 41-67 (as for Assyria) and Kuhrt 1997: 44-55 (generally). For the partly divine (“2/3 a god”) Gilgamesh (^dGIŠ.GÍN.MAŠ), see the Gilgamesh epic (SAACT 1, I 45-46).

10. For the importance of royal heroism in Assyrian state ideology, see e.g. Liverani 1993: 41-67 and Gaspa 2007.

11. The ideology of Tukulti-Ninurta I is innovative in the sense that the king is now imagined as divinely created, as endowed with royal radiance (*melammu*), and as a representation (*šalmu*) of the deities (Machinist 2011: 409-413).

12. Proceeding from RIMA 1 (pp. 231-299), the name is written 34 (full reconstructions not counted) times *without* a divine determinative directly preceding *tukultu*. The proportion counted in percent is then as high as 91,9 %. Furthermore, the proportion in question increases with an “exemplar”-based way of counting, in its giving 145 times and 94,2 %.

13. Admittedly, though, one should be careful in suggesting scribal errors simply because things do not fit in. Nevertheless, the great minority of the writing with the divine determinative arguably makes it legitimate to at least suggest the possibility.

14. A mention of the reigning king’s closest predecessors is a standard feature of early Neo-Assyrian royal inscriptions (Karlsson 2016: 215-216). Consequently, the number of attestations without the divine determinative should be significant.

15. For Tukulti-Ninurta II (whose name is often written ^mGISKIM-^dMAŠ) and his texts, see RIMA 2 (pp. 164-188).

16. For such a conclusion (based on additional evidence and early Neo-Assyrian sources), see Karlsson 2016: 75-93.

References

- FRANKFORT, H. (1948), *Kingship and the Gods: A Study of Ancient Near Eastern Religion as the Integration of Society and Nature*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- GASPA, S. (2007), ‘Qarrādūtū: il motivo dell’eroismo del re assiro nella titolatura regia sargonide tra rievocazioni letterarie, concezioni religiose ed aspirazioni’, in A. Coppola ed., *Eroi, eroismi, eroizzazioni*. Padua: Sargon srl, 233-268.
- IRAQ 37 = H.W.F. SAGGS, ‘Historical Texts and Fragments of Sargon II of Assyria. 1. The ‘Aššur Charter’’, *Iraq* 37 (1975), 11-20.
- ISKH = A. FUCHS, *Die Inschriften Sargons II. aus Khorsabad*. Göttingen: Cuvillier, 1994.
- KARLSSON, M. (2016), *Relations of Power in Early Neo-Assyrian State Ideology* (SANER 10). Boston and Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- KUHRT, A. (1997), *The Ancient Near East c. 3000-330 BC*. London and New York: Routledge.
- LABAT, R. (1939), *Le caractère religieux de la royauté assyro-babylonienne*. Paris: Librairie d’Amérique et d’Orient.
- LIVERANI, M. (1993), *Akkad, the First World Empire: Structure, Ideology, Traditions*. Padua: Sargon srl.
- MACHINIST, P. (2011), ‘Kingship and Divinity in Imperial Assyria’, in J. Renger ed., *Assur - Gott, Stadt und Land* (CDOG 5). Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 405-430.
- MDOG 115 = W.R. MAYER, ‘Sargons Feldzug gegen Urartu – 714 v. Chr.: Text und Übersetzung’, *MDOG* 115 (1983), 65-132.
- MZL = R. BORGER, *Mesopotamisches Zeichenlexikon* (AOAT 305). Münster: Ugarit, 2003.
- OrNS 68 = G. FRAME, ‘The Inscription of Sargon II at Tang-i Var’, *OrNS* 68 (1999), 31-57.
- PARPOLA, S. (1999), ‘Sons of God: The Ideology of Assyrian Kingship’, *Archaeology Odyssey* 2/5, 16-27.
- READE, J.E. (1998), *Assyrian Sculpture*. London: British Museum Press.
- RIMA 1-3 = A.K. GRAYSON, *Royal Inscriptions of Mesopotamia, Assyrian Periods 1-3*. Toronto, Buffalo, and London: University of Toronto Press, 1987-1996.
- RIMB 2 = G. FRAME, *Rulers of Babylon: From the Second Dynasty of Isin to the End of Assyrian Domination (1157-612 BC)*. Toronto, Buffalo, and London: University of Toronto Press, 1995.
- RINAP 1, 3-5 = E. LEICHTY et al., *The Royal Inscriptions of the Neo-Assyrian Period 1, 3-5*. Philadelphia: Eisenbrauns and University of Pennsylvania Press, 2011-.
- SAAB 12/1 = H.D. GALTER, ‘Textanalyse assyrischer Königsinschriften: Die Puzur-Aššur Dynastie’, *SAAB* XII/1 (1998), 1-38.
- SAACT 1 = S. PARPOLA, *The Standard Babylonian Epic of Gilgamesh*. Helsinki: The Neo-Assyrian Text Corpus Project, 1997.
- SAAS 8 = A. FUCHS, *Die Annalen des Jahres 711 v. Chr.* Helsinki: The Neo-Assyrian Text Corpus Project, 1998.

Mattias KARLSSON <mattias.karlsson@lingfil.uu.se>
Uppsala University (SWEDEN)

17) Dūr-Katlimmu, an Alleged Neo-Assyrian Library Text, Ḫana, and the Early History of Dura-Europos

— In 2002, Karen Radner published most of the Neo-Assyrian texts from Tall Šēḫ Ḫamad (ancient Dūr-Katlimmu), a major contribution to our knowledge of this city, its history and economy, and the history of the Neo-Assyrian empire. All the texts edited in Radner's volume originated from the lower town, with one exception: the small fragment DeZ 13218/18 (Radner 2002: 25–26, 268, no. 1), an isolated find, was discovered on the tell of the site, embedded in one of the bricks that comprised the upper layer of the wall of a tower. As Radner realized, this fragment was different from the other tablets published by her, all of them Neo-Assyrian archival documents. Radner classified it as a literary text, comparable in its appearance to Neo-Assyrian library texts from Nineveh and Ashur, and argued that its existence suggested the possibility that one day additional Neo-Assyrian library texts might be found on the tell.

This would be an exciting prospect, but it seems to me that the fragment is actually not literary in character, but rather legal – although due to the small size of the piece absolute certainty remains elusive.¹⁾ Here is an updated edition of the text, based on Radner's copy and the (unfortunately very small) photo on p. 268. Readings differing from Radner's are marked with asterisks.

1' [n] 'IKU*? A*? ŠĀ*? A*?ḡ.G[ĀR*?...]	[n] <i>ikû of land in the district [of...]</i>
2' [ÚS*.S]A*.DU AN.TA 'x' [...]	the upper long side (borders on)... [...]
3' [ÚS*.S]A*.DU KI.TA 'x' [...]	the lower long side (borders on)... [...]
4' [...] <i>pu-zu-ri</i> 'x' [...]	[...] (of) Puzzuru... [...]
5' [SAG*.KI*] AN.TA 'x' [...]	the upper [short side] (borders on)... [...]
6' [SAG*.KI* K]I*.TA 'x' [...]	the lower [short side] (borders on)... [...]
7' [...] 'x' [...]	[...]... [...]

The text seems to document a transaction concerning a field, with the borders indicated by phrases that include the terms ÚS.SA.DU/SAG.KI AN.TA/KI.TA. Radner copied and transliterated the sign interpreted by me as SA as É, but this makes little sense, and based on the photo, reading SA, while not intuitive, does seem epigraphically possible (see below note 3). It may well be, moreover, that the first preserved sign in line 1' includes two small vertical wedges not shown in the hand copy.²⁾

The use of ÚS.SA.DU/SAG.KI AN.TA/KI.TA does not help much with the dating of the fragment –Akkadian real estate records with these expressions are known from the Old Babylonian period onwards up to and including Late Babylonian times. But a few additional features exhibited by the fragment allow us to establish a more precise date. A first clue is provided by the forms of the signs TA and ZU. Both are evidently not Neo-Assyrian, and while the ZU could be both Middle Assyrian and Babylonian, the TA has clearly the characteristic Babylonian sign form.³⁾ This may at first glance come as a surprise, but one that can be overcome when considering a second clue the fragment provides: the sign sequence *pu-zu-ri*, found in line 4'. Even though interpretations of *pu-zu-ri* as a verbal adjective or infinitive of *pazāru* D or a genitive of the noun *puz(u)ru* cannot be entirely excluded, it seems more likely that the signs actually represent a personal name: Puzzuru.⁴⁾ As far as I can determine, this name is not attested in the Middle Assyrian onomasticon as it is known from texts from Dūr-Katlimmu and elsewhere. It is, however, well documented in texts from the Middle Euphrates region written in a Babylonian-inspired script that date to the period of the so-called kings of Ḫana, who ruled this area from the eighteenth to the fourteenth or early thirteenth century BCE, sometimes as vassals of more powerful rulers and sometimes independently.⁵⁾

This provides us with a more restricted time frame for our fragment, one that can be narrowed down even further. It is unlikely that the fragment dates to the early Ḫana period, which followed the reign of Hammurapi of Babylon (even though an archive of a certain Puzzurum dating to this period was uncovered at Terqa⁶⁾), or to the subsequent era of Mittani dominion. While Tall Šēḫ Ḫamad was apparently home to some settlement during these phases, Charpin and Ziegler have pointed out (2003: 35) that it was most likely only during the following period that it became a more important city. The king to whom Dūr-Katlimmu owed the original form of its name, Dūr-Iggid-Lim, was probably not Yaggid-Lim of Mari, an Old Babylonian ruler, but rather Iggid-Lim of Ḫana, who held his office during the period when Ḫana was largely free from foreign interference, possibly in the early or mid-fourteenth century (Podany 2014: 55). It is therefore tempting to date the fragment to the fourteenth century, prior to the period of Assyrian

dominion in the thirteenth century,⁷⁾ which would make it the earliest text discovered so far at Tall Šēḫ Ḥamad.

Such a dating is also suggested by another Ḥana text: the adoption and inheritance contract RBC 779 (Podany et al. 1991–1993; Podany 2002: 126–29, LH 11; Charpin 2002: 77–78, 82–84). This text, written during the reign of Iggid-Lim and sealed with a seal of this king, mentions in lines 19'–24', among the items to be inherited by a woman named Adda-nahda, land in the district of Saggaratum, located some 30 km south of Dūr-Katlimmu, as well as “the house of UR.ŠUM.GAL, bordering on (the property of) the sons of Puzzuru” (É UR.ŠUM.GAL ÚS.SA.DU DUMU.MES *pu-zu-ri*). As we have seen, the personal name Puzzuru is found written in exactly the same way (in the genitive and without mimation), and with very similar sign forms, in line 4' of the fragment from Tall Šēḫ Ḥamad, and it seems possible that both texts reference the very same individual.⁸⁾ If this – admittedly uncertain – assumption is correct, the fragment would date to the reign of Iggid-Lim as well, or to the period shortly thereafter. It might have belonged to a royal grant, like several other Ḥana texts, or another contract. Its now lost left portion may once have displayed a royal seal impression. It is unclear where RBC 779 was found. Charpin (2002: 63, n. 11) tentatively suggested that the tablet might come from Terqa, but it could also originate from some site on the Khabur, including Tall Šēḫ Ḥamad. Between 1750 and 1300 BCE, substantial portions of the Khabur area seem to have been controlled, at least intermittently, by the Ḥana kings.⁹⁾

As mentioned in the previous section, the Tall Šēḫ Ḥamad fragment discussed here was found embedded in a brick. It shares this feature with another fragmentary document from the Ḥana period, YBC 6518, a contract, or perhaps rather a royal grant, from the reign of the late Ḥana king Hammurapi concerning several fields in the districts of the city of Damara and a place called Baramati (editions: Stephens 1937 and Podany 2002: 139–43, LH 14; corrections and notes: Charpin 2002: 84, 92). The (unbaked) brick with this tablet was found in 1936/1937 within the wall of a first century AD temple in Dura-Europos, the famous garrison city on the Middle Euphrates primarily known for its Roman period houses and sanctuaries devoted to various deities and religions. Stephens argued that the toponym Damara, which seems to be mentioned twice in the text,¹⁰⁾ is most likely an early form of Dura(-Europos) (*Damara* = **Daw(a)ra* > *Dūra*), a suggestion accepted by Durand (1990: 114–15, 120) and Charpin (2002: 92).¹¹⁾

In view of the considerable distance between Dura-Europos and Tall Šēḫ Ḥamad, some 100 km as the crow flies, it seems unlikely that the brick containing the fragment discussed here was produced in the area of Dura-Europos as well and only later brought to Tall Šēḫ Ḥamad. Nonetheless, I would like to conclude this note with a short – and admittedly speculative – discussion of a possible connection between these two sites. The thirteenth century Middle Assyrian archival texts from Tall Šēḫ Ḥamad published by Rölliġ 2008a and Salah 2014¹²⁾ mention some three dozen times a city or town called Duara, usually written ^{ur}*du-a-ra*, but occasionally also ^{ur}*du-ra*, ^{ur}*du-PI(wa?)*, ^{ur}*du-ú-a-ra*, and ^{ur}*a-du-ra*.¹³⁾ According to the texts – mostly harvest reports and personnel lists, bureaucrats who supervised agricultural activities in the area of Dūr-Katlimmu were also in some way involved in the administration of cultivated fields (never more than 100 *ikū* [= 36 ha] in size) in or near Duara.¹⁴⁾

The location of this place has so far remained uncertain. Pfälzner (1993: 96) proposed that Duara be identified with Tall Umm °Aqrēbe in the area of the Wādī °Aġġ, 46 km east of Tall Šēḫ Ḥamad, a suggestion based on the Middle Assyrian ceramics found at Tall Umm °Aqrēbe and the argument that the seed and yield rates the Dūr-Katlimmu texts provide for Duara seem so low that the town could not be located near a river. Rölliġ (2008b), calling Duara a “satellite city” of Dūr-Katlimmu, expressed some doubt about Pfälzner’s reasoning but refrained from identifying it with any other site. Reculeau (2011: 194–98) pointed out that the seed and yield rates recorded for Duara in the Tall Šēḫ Ḥamad texts are actually not lower than those recorded for Dūr-Katlimmu, which means that the town might well have been located on a river rather than in the steppe, most likely, in Reculeau’s opinion, on the banks of the Lower Khabur, “if not directly in the vicinity of Dūr-Katlimmu” (p. 197). But Reculeau also noted that there are problems with this proposal, among them the fact that according to one of the Tall Šēḫ Ḥamad texts (Rölliġ 2008a, no. 79), sowing was possible in and around Dūr-Katlimmu while Duara was still in the hands of some unnamed enemy.¹⁵⁾ A related text (Rölliġ 2008a, no. 80) indicates that Duara(?)¹⁶⁾ was a walled town, and additional

evidence shows that the city was home to various granaries and a “palace” (*ekallu*),¹⁷⁾ and that during the eponymate of Urad-ilāne (Tukultī-Ninurta I year 8?), the powerful Aššur-iddin – who shortly thereafter became Assyria’s “Grand Vizier” (*sukallu rabīu*) – served as Duara’s “provincial governor” (*bēl pāḫete ša Duara*).¹⁸⁾ All this suggests that Duara cannot have been just a small hamlet.

Until now, the search for Duara has proved futile. Based on the similarities of the names, I would like to propose here, however tentatively, to identify Duara with the town of Damara (= *Daw(a)ra), mentioned in the Ḫana period contract YBC 6518, and with the later city of Dura(-Europos).¹⁹⁾ The site of Dura-Europos has so far not produced any archaeological remains dating before the Seleucid period, but such remains might be hidden under the later layers, and Durand (1990: 114–15, 120) has pointed to the possibility that a settlement “au pied de l’actuelle falaise de Doura-Europos” was at some point washed away by the Euphrates.



Figure 1. *uru^uda-ma-ra^{ki}* in YBC 6518 (photos: Klaus Wagensohnner).

The reason why administrators in Dūr-Katlimmu would have dealt with the cultivation of fields in an area some 100 km away cannot be found in the agricultural geography of the region – it must have been political. As pointed out above, the political portfolio of Aššur-iddin, who resided for an extended period of time in Dūr-Katlimmu and served first as a “vizier” and then, during the second decade of Tukultī-Ninurta I’s reign, as Assyria’s “Grand Vizier” (Cancik-Kirschbaum 1994: 19–32; Bloch 2010: 8, 15; Salah 2014: 45–46), also included the governorship of Duara. Aššur-iddin, who hailed from the Assyrian royal family, was the main addressee of the letters found in the archive in “Building P,” the same archive that produced the administrative texts mentioning Duara. In view of the considerable power held by him, Duara could well have been located in some distance from Dūr-Katlimmu and yet have been administered from there on his behalf (and perhaps earlier on behalf of his father and predecessor Qibi-Aššur).²⁰⁾ That the Assyrian state of the second half of the thirteenth century might have controlled over many years a strategically important town on the right bank of the Middle Euphrates is somewhat unexpected (see Luciani 1999–2001, M. Yamada 2011), but it should be noted that a letter written to Aššur-iddin, probably in Tukultī-Ninurta’s eighteenth year, by his subordinate Sîn-mudammeq (Cancik-Kirschbaum 1996, no. 2) talks about the sender organizing the harvest in Terqa, quite possibly the well-known site of Tall ʿAššara on the same river bank, located no more than 30 km upstream from Dura-Europos.²¹⁾

It goes without saying that the scenario outlined here remains hypothetical. The identification of Duara with Damara and Dura-Europos should not be unquestioningly accepted without further corroboration.

Notes

1. As recognized by Radner (2010: 178–80, Text 4), another fragmentary Neo-Assyrian tablet from Tall Šeḫ Hamad, excavated in the lower town, is indeed a literary text. SH 08/6153/619+620, the lower part of a tablet inscribed with an apparently unparalleled Sumero-Akkadian bilingual royal(?) hymn, was found in the fill of a canal and can be dated, based on the archaeological context, to the first half of the eighth century BCE.
2. I owe the decipherment of line 1’ to Daisuke Shibata, who kindly read a first draft of this note and provided helpful feedback – but is of course not responsible for the opinions expressed here.
3. I expect the SA to have a Babylonian form as well, but on the photo the exact outline of the sign is difficult to discern. The upper horizontal wedge may be positioned lower than in most other instances, yet only collation will be able to clarify the matter.
4. The reading Puzzuru, rather than Puzuru, follows Charpin 2002: 64, n. 17.

5. Among the many relevant publications that have appeared on the land of Ḫana since the early 2000s, see especially Podany 2002, Charpin 2002, S. Yamada 2011, Podany 2014, Rouault 2017, and Kühne 2018.

6. See Rouault 1984.

7. Two later texts formulated in the “Ḫana style,” from the reigns of Tukultī-Ninurta I and Aššur-rēša-iši, respectively, are written in Middle Assyrian script (Podany 2002: 151–53, LH 17; Tsukimoto 2011).

8. A possible restoration for the line is hence: [DUMU.MEŠ] *pu-zu-ri* ¹x¹ [...]. In line 1’ of our fragment, one could perhaps follow RBC 779, line 19’ (5 IKU A.ŠÀ A.GÀR ^{uru}sag-ga-ra-ti^{ki} i-na mu-ša-ri) and restore: [n] ^{IKU}*? A*? .ŠÀ*? A*? ¹.G[ÀR*? ^{uru}sag-ga-ra-ti^{ki} (...)]. One difference between the two texts is that the Tall Šēḫ Ḫamad fragment, if correctly restored here, uses both ŪS.SA.DU and SAG.KI, whereas in RBC 779 only ŪS.SA.DU is found. For a diachronic overview of attestations of these and related terms in the Ḫana documents, see Podany 2002: 159–60, 224–26.

9. A few years ago, S. Yamada (2011) published another adoption contract from the period of the Ḫana kings, found at Tell Ṭābān further north on the Khabur. It is dated to the reign of Aḫuni, who was king after Iggid-Lim’s son and successor Iših-Dagan, and bears some striking similarities with RBC 779.

10. Obv. 1: ^{uru}da-¹ma¹-ra^{ki} and 11: [^{uru}da-m]a-ra^{ki}. Even though the name is damaged in both lines and written over the edge onto the reverse (see Figure 1), the reading (collated) seems sound.

11. “Dura-Europos” is a hybrid toponym created by modern scholars. It combines the two names of the city, the age-old “Dura” and the name given to it by the Macedonian colonists, “Europos” (see Kaizer 2015: 99–101). Leriche and Coqueugniot (2011: 38, reference courtesy Blair Fowlkes-Childs) have argued that it would be “more appropriate to use the name Europos-Dura to cover the five and half centuries of its existence,” but considering that “Dura” was the original name of the city and was never fully replaced, this seems unwarranted.

12. An additional group of Middle Assyrian texts from Tall Šēḫ Ḫamad is scheduled to be published by E. Cancik-Kirschbaum. They may shed further light on the issues addressed here. For a list of attestations of “Duara,” see Cancik-Kirschbaum and Hess 2017: 39–40.

13. The only reference to Duara outside the Dūr-Katlimmu texts is found in a document from Ashur, MARV 1, no. 7: 6–10, which records a delivery of different kinds of bread from Duara (1 *me* 20 NINDA.MEŠ *ar-ru-ku-tu* / 12 NINDA.MEŠ *ḫu-ru-ḫu-ru* / 20 NINDA MEŠ *ša pi-i ka-sa-a-te* / 7 NINDA.MEŠ *GAL-tu ša is-ḫi* / *ša* ^{uru}du-a-ra). According to Bloch 2010, the text dates to Tukultī-Ninurta I’s seventh year.

14. In most tablets, a longer section on Dūr-Katlimmu is followed by a shorter one on Duara.

15. This enemy activity, possibly related to the Ḫanaeans (Kühne 2018: 144) or to nomadic raiders (Jakob 2017: 126), affected Duara between years 14(?) and 16(?) of Tukultī-Ninurta I’s reign.

16. The reading is not entirely certain; the text, which also includes other idiosyncratic writings, actually has ^{uru}a-ra-a.

17. For the textual evidence see Röllig 2008b: 192.

18. See Salah 2014: 45–46, 78, note on line 17, and 248, note on line 60. Röllig (2008b: 193) argued that this evidence “begründet sicher nicht eine Verwaltungseinheit mit dem Namen D[uara],” which seems, however, questionable.

19. The Middle Assyrian name “Duara” can perhaps be explained in light of Middle Assyrian infinitive forms for *verba mediae ū* such as *duāku* (Babylonian: *dāku*). [After I completed this note, C. Hess sent me his forthcoming article “Etymologisches zu Mittellassyrisch Duara,” to be published in BATSH 12, in which he thoroughly explores possible etymologies of the toponym, but without suggesting a specific location for it.]

20. Traffic between the two sites may have been facilitated by canals that linked the regions of the Middle Euphrates and the Lower (and Upper) Khabur. The exact profile and history of this canal system remains, however, difficult to establish (see Reculeau 2010: 204–07; Kühne 2018). As indicated by the personnel lists from Tall Šēḫ Ḫamad, the use of unfree *šiluḫlu*-laborers working in Duara but answering to administrators in Dūr-Katlimmu seems to have ceased after the eponymate of Abattu (Tukultī-Ninurta I, year 10?), even though independent farmers active in Duara are still mentioned in texts from the end of Tukultī-Ninurta’s reign (Salah 2014: 35). Most of the *šiluḫlus* and other individuals from Duara (including widows and *ḫarimtu*-“prostitutes”) have good Akkadian names.

21. Luciani 1999–2001: 94–101, 107 claimed that this Terqa should rather be located on the Balikh River, but at least one of her arguments, that the name of the city on the Middle Euphrates had changed to Sirqa by the thirteenth century, has been invalidated by Charpin 2002: 92.

References

- BLOCH, Y. 2010: “The Order of Eponyms in the Reign of Tukultī-Ninurta I,” *OrNS* 79, 1–35.
 CANKIK-KIRSCHBAUM, E. 1996: *Die mittellassyrischen Briefe aus Tall Šēḫ Ḫamad*, BATSH 4/1, Berlin.
 CANKIK-KIRSCHBAUM, E. and HESS, C. 2017: *Toponyme der mittellassyrischen Texte: Der Westen des mittellassyrischen Reiches*, MTT I/2, Paris.
 CHARPIN, D. 2002: “Chroniques du Moyen-Euphrate, 1. Le ‘royaume de Hana’: textes et histoire,” *RA* 96, 61–92.
 CHARPIN, D., and ZIEGLER, N. 2003: *Mari et le Proche-Orient à l’époque amorrite. Essai d’histoire politique*, FM 5, Paris.

- DURAND, J. M. 1990: “Problèmes d’eau et d’irrigation dans la région de Mari,” in: B. Geyer (ed.), *Techniques et pratiques hydro-agricoles traditionnelles en domaine irrigué*, BAH 136/1, Paris, 101–42.
- JAKOB, S. 2017: “The Middle Assyrian Period (14th to 11th Century BCE),” in: E. Frahm (ed.), *A Companion to Assyria*, Hoboken, 117–42.
- KAIZER, T. 2015: “Dura-Europos under Roman Rule,” in: J. M. Cortés Copete et al. (ed.), *Ruling the Greek World: Approaches to the Roman Empire in the East*, Stuttgart, 91–101.
- KÜHNE, H. 2018: “Politics and Water Management at the Lower Ḫabūr (Syria) in the Middle Assyrian Period and beyond – a New Appraisal,” in: H. Kühne (ed.), *Water for Assyria*, StCh 7, Wiesbaden, 137–94.
- KÜHNE, H. (ed.) 2010: *Dūr-Katlimmu 2008 and Beyond*, StCh 1, Wiesbaden.
- LERICHE, P., and COQUEUGNIOT, G. 2011: “New Research by the French-Syrian Archaeological Expedition to Europos-Dura and New Data on Polytheistic Sanctuaries in Europos-Dura,” in: J. Y. Chi and S. Heath (ed.), *Edge of Empires: Pagans, Jews, and Christians at Roman Dura-Europos*, New York, 14–38.
- LUCIANI, M. 1999–2001: “On Assyrian Frontiers and the Middle Euphrates,” *SAAB* 13, 87–114.
- PFÄLZNER, P. 1993: “Die Späte Bronzezeit: Tall Umm 'Aqrebe,” in: R. Bernbeck (ed.), *Steppe als Kulturlandschaft. Das Aḡiḡgebiet vom Neolithikum bis in islamische Zeit*, Berlin, 70–96.
- PODANY, A. 2002: *The Land of Hana. Kings, Chronology, and Scribal Tradition*, Bethesda, MD.
- 2014: “Hana and the Low Chronology,” *JNES* 73, 51–73.
- PODANY, A. et al. 1991–1993: “An Adoption and Inheritance Contract from the Reign of Iggid-Lim of Ḫana,” *JCS* 43–45, 39–51.
- RADNER, K. 2002: *Die neuassyrischen Texte aus Tall Šēḫ Hamad*, BATSH 6/2, Berlin.
- 2010: “Neue neuassyrische Texte aus Dūr-Katlimmu,” in: Kühne (ed.) 2010: 175–86.
- RECULEAU, H. 2010: “The Lower Ḫabūr before the Assyrians,” in: Kühne (ed.) 2010: 187–215.
- 2011: *Climate, Environment and Agriculture in Assyria in the 2nd Half of the 2nd Millennium BCE*, StCh 2, Wiesbaden.
- RÖLLIG, W. 2008a: *Land- und Viehwirtschaft am Unteren Ḫabūr in mittelassyrischer Zeit*, BATSH 9, Wiesbaden.
- 2008b: “Duara. Die Satellitenstadt zu Dūr-Katlimmu,” in: D. Bonatz et al. (ed.), *Fundstellen. Gesammelte Schriften zur Archäologie und Geschichte Alt Vorderasiens ad honorem Hartmut Kühne*, Wiesbaden, 189–96.
- ROUAULT, O. 1984: *Terqa Final Reports 1: L’archive de Puzurum*, BiMes 16, Malibu.
- 2017: “Zimri-Lim von Terqa,” *RIA* 15, 299–300.
- SALAH, S. 2014: *Die mittelassyrischen Personen- und Rationenlisten aus Tall Šēḫ Hamad/Dūr-Katlimmu*, BATSH 9, Wiesbaden.
- STEPHENS, F. J. 1937: “A Cuneiform Tablet from Dura-Europas,” *RA* 34, 184–90.
- TSUKIMOTO, A. 2011: “Ein neuester Text im Ḫana-Stil in mittelassyrischer Schrift,” *RA* 105, 85–93.
- YAMADA, M. 2011: “The Second Military Conflict between ‘Assyria’ and ‘Ḫatti’ in the Reign of Tukulti-Ninurta I,” *RA* 105, 199–220.
- YAMADA, S. 2011: “An Adoption Contract from Tell Taban, the Kings of the Land of Hana, and the Hana-style Scribal Tradition,” *RA* 105, 61–84.

Eckart FRAHM <eckart.frahm@yale.edu>
Yale University, New Haven (USA)

18) A stamped brick with the inscription of Šagarakti-Šuriaš from Nippur¹⁾ — The early Nippur expeditions of the University of Pennsylvania (1889-1900) produced a vast amount of bricks with inscriptions, among others, of several Kassite kings.²⁾ A so far mostly overlooked example exists with a brick stamped on the edge, from the reign of Šagarakti-Šuriaš.³⁾ Although plenty of votive objects with the inscription of this king have been excavated at Nippur, including the “Kassite hoard”,⁴⁾ to my knowledge this seems to be, so far, the only preserved example of a brick with inscription of Šagarakti-Šuriaš and it comes from a primary archaeological context.⁵⁾ According to Hilprecht in his disputed publication of 1903⁶⁾ it was found *in situ* within the walls of the “House of Bel”, i. e. within the fabric of the supporting wall of burnt bricks of the “Enlil Temple” (EN) which was later excavated by the “Joint Expedition” of Chicago and Philadelphia from 1948 until 1950.⁷⁾

Here can be published, for the first time, a transliteration together with a paper squeeze (Fig. 1), one of a set of such squeezes preserved in the archive of the University of Pennsylvania Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology, prepared by Hilprecht himself at Nippur.⁸⁾

The Sumerian possession inscription of Šagarakti-Šuriaš duplicates the content of the inscription on the brick stamps of Kudur-Enlil, which were found in a big number in the environs of the “Enlil Temple”.⁹⁾ The consistency within the content of the inscriptions could be seen as indicator for a continuation of construction work at the “Enlil Temple” by the successor of Kudur-Enlil.¹⁰⁾

Transliteration (based on Hilprecht) and translation:

- | | |
|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| 1. Ša-ga-rak-ti Šu-ri-ia-aš | Šagarakti-Šuriaš |
| 2. lugal KÁ-DINGIR-RA ^{ki} | king of Babylon |
| 3. SAG-UŠ É ^d EN-LÍL | benefactor of the temple of Enlil |




Fig. 1. Paper squeeze (designated as “F”) of the stamp inscription of Šagarakti-Šuriaš made by Hilprecht at Nippur on 15 May 1900 (“Šagarakti-Šuriaš 15/V 1900”). Photographed by B. Schneider in 2008 (above: original, below: horizontally mirrored back side). Courtesy of the Archive of the University of Pennsylvania Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology, Philadelphia, PA.

Notes

1. Funded within the Post-DocTrack Program of the OeAW. The author wants to thank Alex Pezzati (Senior Archivist, University of Pennsylvania Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology, Philadelphia, PA) for his assistance and permission to publish the rubbing of this inscription here. Additionally, the cooperation with Aage Westenholz and Inger Jentoft (“Nippur Digitized”) always leads to valuable discussions. The generous sharing of data within this cooperation has to be pointed out here as a driving force for my own studies.
2. BEHRENS 1985.
3. It was also not included in the catalogue of BRINKMAN 1976.
4. CLAYDEN 2011: 1-56; BRINKMAN 1976: 287-289 (V.2.1-2.9). Additional votive objects from the Kassite period were found within the large mud bricks of “Parthian Phase II/III”.
5. SCHNEIDER 2018, 236; 578; 587; 627; 690-691; 923-924 (Appendix).

6. HILPRECHT 1903, 472. This is confirmed by the entry of 8 May 1900 in his unpublished diary from the “Schriftliche Nachlass” (HSN) of the Hilprecht-Collection, Jena. A transcription of this Journal was provided to me by Manfred Krebernik (Kustos) at an early stage of my Nippur research in 2006/07. For the entry see SCHNEIDER 2020 (Appendix).

7. McCOWN AND HAINES 1967, 1-33. See now also SCHNEIDER 2016; SCHNEIDER 2018; SCHNEIDER 2020.

8. A try to localize this brick in Philadelphia and Jena was so far unsuccessful. Therefore it is whether nowadays stored in the Istanbul Museum or it could have found its way into the antiquities market.

9. See BRINKMAN 1976, 190-191 (P.2.1). Although, the layout of the stamp inscription differs, as the examples of Kudur-Enlil comprise one column of three lines, instead of the two columns each with three lines of Šagarakti-Šuriaš. For the archaeological context of the Kudur-Enlil bricks see also McCOWN AND HAINES 1967, 1; 14; 16-17; 27.

10. For a summary of the construction history see SCHNEIDER 2016; SCHNEIDER 2020.

Bibliography

BEHRENS, H. 1985, Die Backsteine mit Keilinschriften im University Museum, *JCS* 37/2, 229-248.

BRINKMAN, J. A. 1976, *Materials and Studies for Kassite History Vol. I – A catalogue of cuneiform sources pertaining to specific monarchs of the Kassite dynasty*, Chicago.

CLAYDEN, T. 2011, “The Nippur ‘hoard’”, *Al-Rāfidān. Journal of Western Asiatic Studies* Vol. XXXII, Tokyo, 1-56.

HILPRECHT, H. V. 1903, *Explorations in Bible Lands during the 19th Century*, Philadelphia.

McCOWN, D. E. & HAINES, R. C. 1967, *Nippur I – Temple of Enlil, Scribal Quarter, and Soundings: Excavations of the Joint Expedition to Nippur of the University Museum of Philadelphia and the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago*, OIP 78, Chicago.

SCHNEIDER, B. 2016, “Remarks on the Archaeology of the Kassite Ekur of Nippur, including some Lapis-lazuli findings in context”, in *Proceedings of the workshop: Cultural & Material Contacts in the Ancient Near East - Movements of People, Objects and Ideas* (Torino, December 1-2, 2014).

SCHNEIDER, B. 2018, *Baugeschichtliche Untersuchungen am Ekur in Nippur: Aufarbeitung der Altgrabungen von 1889-1900 – Stratigraphie und Fundbearbeitung* (unpublished PhD dissertation at the University of Innsbruck).

SCHNEIDER, B. 2020, “Studies concerning the Kassite Period Ekur of Nippur Construction History and Findings”, in Paulus, S. & Clayden, T., *Babylonia under the Sealand and Kassite Dynasties*. Studies in Ancient Near Eastern Records (SANER) 24.

Bernhard SCHNEIDER <mcb170@gmail.com>

19) The eponym Enlil-nadin-apli and the capture of Kaštiliaš IV — A precise synchronism between Middle Babylonian and Middle Assyrian chronology depends on the placement of the Assyrian eponym Enlil-nadin-apli. Year 7 of Kashtiliash IV started in the eponymate of Enlil-nadin-apli, as implied by texts from Tell Imlihiye and Assur. When combined with statements in the Tukulti-Ninurta epic, the synchronism indicates a start of the Middle Assyrian year around summer solstice.

Before the publication of BATSH 18 by Saqer Salah the sequence of the first 16 eponyms of the reign of Tukulti-Ninurta I (TN I) appeared to be firmly established, from the ruler himself to Aššur-zera-iddina. Now we know that Enlil-nadin-apli must be included,¹⁾ but on first sight he does not fit in. He hardly can belong to the first decade, since there was not much change in the families of the Elamite archers in Harbe between the years of Enlil-nadin-apli and Ber-išmanni (about year 22 of TN I).²⁾ The sequence from Aššur-da”an to Abattu son of Adad-šumu-lešir (years 9-11 of TN I) is certain due to DeZ 3830, DeZ 3827 etc. Indeed, DeZ 3830 lists the five years from Urad-ilani to Aššur-da”an (years 8-12 of TN I) in sequence, and one would need strong reasons to insert another eponym in between. Saqer Salah inserted Enlil-nadin-apli between Ušur-namkur-šarri and Aššur-bel-ilani, but he admitted that the sequence Etel-pi-Aššur → Ušur-namkur-šarri → Aššur-bel-ilani is explicitly referred to as a 3-year sequence in DeZ 3395. A placement of Enlil-nadin-apli after Aššur-bel-ilani contradicts the observations of Saqer Salah, anyhow the sequence Aššur-bel-ilani → Aššur-zera-iddina is firm by DeZ 3365.

This leaves the direct succession Aššur-da”an → Etel-pi-Aššur as the weakest link. It is only supported by DeZ 3395. This text is dated to Etel-pi-Aššur and refers to the most recent count of donkeys in the year of Aššur-da”an. If such counts were performed annually the text would indeed imply a direct sequence, but a detailed study of the inventory texts from Dur-Katlimmu yields a somewhat different

picture. For reasons of space, the arguments have to be presented elsewhere. It turns out that there were annual inventories in the early years of both Salmanassar I and TN I and for the six years of an epizootic plague in the later years of Salmanassar I, but less rigid accounting at other times. Thus the most likely sequence for the eponyms of the years 12-17 of TN I is

Aššur-da'an → Enlil-nadin-apli → Etel-pi-Aššur → Ušur-namkur-šarri → Aššur-bel-ilani → Aššur-zera-iddina.

This has immediate consequences for the history of the conflict between Assyria and Babylonia under TN I. Since the struggle over the East Tigris region along the border lay at the core of the conflict,³⁾ a first attack in this area would be expected. Indeed the excavations at Tell Imlihiye⁴⁾ and Tell Zubeidi⁵⁾ in the Hamrin region recovered a destruction level separating the reigns of Šagarakti-šuriaš (Tell Zubeidi nr. 717) and Enlil-nadin-šumi (Tell Zubeidi nr. 719) and an archive showing stable conditions until year 6 of Kaštiliaš IV at nearby Tell Imlihiye. The big landowner at Tell Zubeidi was called Kilamdu and the lender of grain at Tell Imlihiye of this name must have been the same man. The texts of the Tell Imlihiye archive seem to have been selected from a bigger archive for safe storage, but unfortunately they were not found under archaeological control. Nevertheless the excavators were confident to use the texts and the complete destruction of the Tell Zubeidi settlement by fire as evidence for an attack by TN I close to the end of the reign of Kaštiliaš IV. At the time no explicit texts reporting this attack against the Diyala/Hamrin region were known, however.

Meanwhile, two such texts have been published by Donbaz in KAM 11.⁶⁾ Indeed, texts Nr. 24 and 35 state that TN I went to the land of Halman in the eponym year of Enlil-nadin-apli.⁷⁾ The texts from Tell Imlihiye include annual documentation of normal life including the early part of year 6 of Kaštiliaš IV. Thus the campaign of TN I must have overlapped with year 6 and/or year 7 of the Babylonian king. To be more precise one must consider the Babylonian and Assyrian months. After long discussions, it turned out that a lunisolar year with intercalations existed both in the Old Assyrian⁸⁾ and the Middle Assyrian period⁹⁾. It appears that tablets written in the Middle Assyrian intercalation months had the same date formula as those for the preceding 12th month (Hibur), but were distinguished by being stored together with the tablets dated by the subsequent eponym, as seen in archive M6. The strongest argument for lunisolar nature of the Middle Assyrian year is the consistent reporting of harvests and herds at the end of the year. In the late years of Salmanassar I and during the reign of TN I the reports were written in Hibur, for earlier years of Salmanassar I reports in the 11th month Abu-šarrani are typical.

Long-distance warfare was seasonal, too, since it was intended to feed the own troupes and to starve the enemy. When a bridgehead in enemy territory existed, it could be supplied with grain to allow warfare out of season, but for initial attacks the early harvest time was favoured.¹⁰⁾ Since Babylonian harvests happened a bit earlier than Assyrian ones, an Assyrian attack in the 10th month Muhur-ilani made sense, in agreement with the dates of KAM 11, 24 and 35. I had assumed that these texts refer to the start of the campaign, but S. Jakob pointed out to me that KAM 11 35 with date 21 Muhur-ilani refers to the return of TN I from Halman, so that the similar but somewhat damaged text KAM 11 24 from 14 Muhur-ilani must refer to a victory banquet. Captives from this war are documented in the 9th month of the subsequent Assyrian year with eponym Etel-pi-Aššur (MARV I 1 and MARV IV 40). Somewhat later in that year, again in the war season there was another campaign against Babylonia, since MARV VIII 51 from 28 Muhur-ilani refers to donkeys who had transported weapons and MARV I 1 from the 11th month mentions hungry troupes who had returned from Babylonia.

The Tukulti-Ninurta epic about the war against Kaštiliaš IV is very specific about the time of the year, close to the end of the wet season:

"Surely now you have courage, for the month of the spring flood, the water will be your ally, and you have pitched your camp in remote places, trusting in G[irra]. But in the dry season, when the peak flood ends, and the god... with fire, in what remote place will you trust to save your people?" (A IV 21'-24').¹¹⁾

Perhaps the epic conflates the two campaigns, but this does not matter, since the season was the same. Thus all data indicate a war in Babylonian months I/II, corresponding to the 10th Assyrian month. This must be compared to the texts from Tell Imlihiye. They belonged to the family of the poor farmer Apil-Nergal. He borrowed grain with the obligation to return it at harvest time, but had to borrow again

year after year.¹²⁾ When he selected texts for safekeeping, he kept all such contracts that were dated in the reign of Kaštiliaš IV, from his accession year to year 6 (BaM 13 nrs. 27-29, 31, 33, 34, 35), including the two loans from Kilamdu. From the reign of Šagarakti-šuriaš he only kept the loan contracts from years 4² and 5 (nrs. 24, 30), perhaps the years when the chain of loans had started. In year 5 of Šagarakti-šuriaš Apil-Nergal had taken a loan shortly before sowing time, but for the later loans he had switched to the time just after the harvest, where the loans must have been cheaper. Since the loan of year 6 of Kaštiliaš IV proceeded as usual, the attack of TN I must have happened at early harvest time in year 7. This means that the eponymate of Enlil-nadin-apli covered the end of year 6 and most of year 7 of Kaštiliaš IV.

Kaštiliaš IV himself continued to rule after this first encounter, since he could start his year 8 in Babylon. Again this agrees with the Tukulti-Ninurta epic. Most probably he was captured early in his year 8, in the eponymy of Etel-pi-Aššur. The text IM 50036 from the 5th month of this year need not imply that he still was free, since Enlil-nadin-šumi may have acceded later. In any case the late part of his year 8 overlapped with the eponymy of Ušur-namkur-sarri, in which no Assyrian war is documented. A capture in the eponymy of Etel-pi-Assur was first argued for by Jakob¹³⁾ and is now strongly supported. For the subsequent years compare Liebig's analysis.¹⁴⁾ The Assyrian attack had weakened the Babylonian defences east of the Tigris, so Elam could invade. Enlil-nadin-šumi, successor of Kaštiliaš IV was dethroned by the Elamites in the eponymate of Ušur-namkur-šarri, when Assyria was not in a position to intervene. The next Babylonian ruler, Kadašman-Harbe II may have been installed with Elamite support. In the Hamrin, the Elamites did less damage than TN I, since Kilamdu's settlement at Tell Zubeidi was rebuilt under Enlil-nadin-šumi and survived the troubled times. Tell Imlihiye remained devastated. Apil-Nergal could not recover his archive, perhaps he was dead or enslaved.

Notes

1. S. SALAH, *Die mittellassyrischen Personen- und Rationenlisten aus Tall Šēḫ Ḥamad/Dūr-Katlimmu*, BATSH 18 (2014) 59, n. 462.
2. S. JAKOB, *Die mittellassyrischen Texte aus Tell Chuera in Nordost-Syrien*, Wiesbaden 2009.
3. S. JAKOB, *Das Osttigrisgebiet im strategischen Konzept mittellassyrischer Könige zwischen 1350 und 1056 v. Chr.*, HSAO 14 (2011) 191.
4. K. KESSLER, *Kassitische Tontafeln vom Tell Imlihiye*, BaM 13 (1982) 51-116.
5. R. M. BOEHMER et al., *Tell Imlihiye, Tell Zubeidi, Tell Abbas*, Mainz 1985.
6. V. DONBAZ, *Middle Assyrian Texts from Assur at the Eski Sark Müzesi in Istanbul*, WVDOG 146, KAM 11, Wiesbaden 2016.
7. H. FREYDANK, *Anmerkungen zu mittellassyrischen Texten. 11. Transliterationen zu V. Donbaz, KAM 11*, Zeitschrift für Altorientalische und Biblische Rechtsgeschichte 23 (2017) 21-89. For the location of Halman see C. Glatz et al., *Babylonian Encounters in the Upper Diyala River Valley*, AJA 123 (2019) 439-471.
8. E. P. STRATFORD, *Successor Eponyms, Debt Notes, Intercalation, and the Old Assyrian Calendar during Kültepe Level II: A Critical Reappraisal*, JNES 74 (2015) 301-324.
9. E. CANKI-KIRSCHBAUM and J. C. JOHNSON, *Middle Assyrian Calendrics*, SAAB 19 (2011).
10. M. STOL, *Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft in altbabylonischer Zeit*, OBO 160/4 (2004) 829f.
11. B. R. FOSTER, *Before the Muses: An Anthology of Akkadian Literature*, Potomac 1996.
12. KESSLER, op. cit., p. 53.
13. S. JAKOB, *Sag mir quando, sag mir wann*, 56th RAI (2013) 509-523.
14. M. LIEBIG, NABU 2011/19.

Werner NAHM <wnahm@stp.dias.ie>

Dublin Institute for advanced studies (IRELAND)

20) A family of cognates for “granary” — Akk. *qarītu(m)*, *qirīti*, “grain-store” (CDA, 285b), “Kornboden, Speicher” (AHw, 903-904), “storeroom, granary” (CAD Q, 132-133), also occurs as Akk. *bīt qarīti*, “storehouse” (CAD Q, 133; cf. CDA, 285b). The cognates previously mentioned (in AHw, 903b) are Heb. *qōrā*, “beam”; Aram. *qārīt*, “beam” (DPJA, 504b) and somewhat remotely, Arab. *qarīja*, “yard of a ship, a squared piece of wood upon the head of the mast of a ship” (AEL, 2988) or simply “yard” (DMWA, 761a). Conversely, under Heb. *qōrā*, “beam” (HALOT, 1091), there is a reference to Akk. *qarītu(m)*, and these same cognates are listed, with the addition of Syr. *qārīta*, “beam” (SL, 1411a)¹⁾. The implication seems to be that granaries were built exclusively with beams of wood (cf. HALOT, 1138b),

although of course they could be made of brick or stone, plaster or even clay, as shown by Harari *rīq*, “granary of clay” (EDH, 135a).

However, a much closer cognate is Arab. *maqarr*, “storage place” (DMWA, 752b; cf. BK, 701), from the verb *qarra*, “to settle down, rest, remain etc.”; IV “to safeguard (something) etc.” (cf. AEL, 2499). Also relevant are: Mehri *mākārēt*, “store or hiding-place for stolen goods”; *mākrawt*, “hiding-place” (ML, 237); Harsūsi *mākerāwt*, “hiding place (for s.t.)” (HL, 78) – all derived from MSA *krw/y* as in Harsūsi *krw/y*, “to hide” (HL, 77-78); Jibbāli *kry*, “to hide; to be hidden” (JL, 150) and Mehri *kry*, “to hide” (ML, 237). Other cognates that can be mentioned are Soqotri *qāre*, “cacher” and its derivative *šiqre*, “cachette” (LSoq, 386), Aram. *qry*, “to place” (DSA II, 802) and Ug. *qry*, “to place, to hide”. For the semantic shift cf. Aram. *byt gnzyn*, “treasure house” (DJPA, 93a), from *gnz*, “to hide” (DJPA, 133b) and Aram. *ṭmn*, “to conceal, hide; to cache s.t. in an insulated environment to keep it hot or cold” (DJBA, 507a).

Also significant, possibly, are Arab. *qarār*, “a resting-place” (AEL, 2501; cf. Hava, 597a and DMWA, 752b) or “séjour fixe” (BK, 700), as used in Qur’ān 27, 61; 77, 17 etc., and Minaean *qrqr*, “(hypostyle) hall” or “cella”, used in an inscription from a temple, which may connote the sense of limited access or of being hidden. As AGOSTINI²⁾ comments: “the main architectonic component of the entire sacral structure is clearly identified by the [Minaean] term *qrqr*, which is the main roofed building, probably forbidden to a large section of the population”.

Ultimately, Arab. *maqarr*, “storage place”, and its MSA equivalents (see above) seem to be the closest cognates for Akk. *qarītu*, “granary”.

Notes

1. It would seem, instead, that a possible cognate for Heb. *qōrā*, “beam” is Akk. *qurū*, “(a length of wood)” (CDA, 292a); for others see KAHAL, 499b.

2. A. AGOSTINI, “Two new inscriptions from the recently excavated temple of ‘Athtar dhū-Qabḏ in Barāqish (Ancient Minaean Yathill). In memoriam Alessandro de Maigret”, *Arabian Archaeology and Epigraphy* 22 (2011) 48-58 (51b).

Abbreviations

AEL	E.W. LANE, <i>An Arabic-English Lexicon</i> , vols 1-8 (London 1863-1893).
BK	A. DE BIBERSTEIN-KAZIMIRSKI, <i>Dictionnaire arabe-français</i> , vols. 1-2 (Paris 1860).
DJBA	M. SOKOLOFF, <i>A Dictionary of Jewish Babylonian Aramaic</i> (Ramat Gan/Baltimore 2002).
DJPA	M. SOKOLOFF, <i>Dictionary of the Jewish Palestinian Aramaic of the Byzantine Period</i> . (Ramat Gan 1990).
DMWA	H. WEHR – A. COWAN, <i>A Dictionary of Modern Written Arabic</i> (Wiesbaden 1971).
DSA	A. TAL, <i>A Dictionary of Samaritan Aramaic</i> , vols I–II (HdO I/50; Leiden 2000).
EDH	W. LESLAU, <i>Etymological Dictionary of Harari</i> (Los Angeles 1963).
Hava	J. G. HAVA, <i>Al-faraid Arabic-English Dictionary for the use of students</i> (Beirut 1964).
HL	T.M. JOHNSTONE, <i>Harsūsi Lexicon and English-Harsūsi Word-list</i> (London/New York/Toronto 1977).
JL	T.M. JOHNSTONE, <i>Jibbāli Lexicon</i> (Oxford 1981).
KAHAL	W. DIETRICH – S. ARNET (eds), <i>Konkise und aktualisierte Ausgabe des Hebräischen und Aramäischen Lexikons zum Alten Testament</i> (Leiden/Boston 2013).
LSoq	W. LESLAU, <i>Lexique Soqotri (Subarabique moderne)</i> (Paris 1938).
ML	T. M. JOHNSTONE, <i>Mehri Lexicon and English-Mehri Word-list</i> (London 1987).
SL	M. SOKOLOFF, <i>A Syriac Lexicon. A Translation from the Latin, Correction, Expansion and Update of C. Brockelmann's Lexicon Syriacum</i> (Winona Lake/Piscataway 2009).

Wilfred G. E. WATSON <wge.watson@gmail.com>

21) Ištar die Sture oder Ištar die Furchteinflößende? — Das hethitische Verb *puntariyela-* ist in zwei Texten belegt: Einerseits in einem Ritual (CTH 788), in dem seine Bedeutung wegen des fragmentarischen Kontexts völlig unklar ist (KBo 19.145 iii 12’, Haas – Wegner 1988/I: 212-213; sowohl sie als auch Haas – Thiel 1978: 301 lassen es ohne Übersetzung¹⁾). Andererseits in einer lexikalischen Liste und zwar im folgenden Paragraphen (Erim-ḫuš Boğ. C, KUB 3.99 ii 11’-15’, Umschrift und Übersetzung nach Scheucher 2012: 650-651):

orthographisch Sumerisch	Akkadisch	Hethitisch	
gú-[x]-[x] ¹ -a	[...] KU	<i>pu-un-tar-ya-u-wa-ar</i>	‚stubbornness‘
gú-e-la-a-e	[x] ¹ -[x-(x)] šá ANŠE	ANŠE-aš <i>pu-un-ta-ri-ya-[u-wa-ar]</i>	‚stubbornness of the donkey‘
gú-šu-e-[x]	[x.x.x] ¹	<i>gal-gal-ni-ya-u-wa-ar</i>	‚to clash, clang‘ ⁽²⁾
gú-šu-e-[x-x]	[x.KI.x] ¹ TA ni	ši-i-ša-aš KIMIN	‚ditto of the stag‘ ⁽³⁾
gú-ki-[x x]	[x] ¹ -ŠA-DU-u	^{UZU} GABA-it <i>hu-it-ti-[ya-u-wa-ar]</i>	‚to draw by the breast‘

Scheuchers Übersetzung des aus diesem Verb gebildeten Verbalsubstantivs als ‚stubbornness‘ entspricht der *communis opinio* der Forschung,⁽⁴⁾ die auf zwei Beobachtungen beruht: erstens, dass es sich hier um eine Eigenschaft des Esels handelt (Zeile 12‘) und zweitens, dass die einzig bekannte Ableitung aus diesem Verb, das Adjektiv *puntariyalali-*, als Beschreibung von Ištar im Vergleich mit einem Esel dient (KUB 24.7 ii 18, dazu ausführlich unten) und dementsprechend als ‚störrisch, eigensinnig‘ übersetzt wird.⁽⁵⁾

Aus semantischer Sicht ist diese Deutung zweifellos möglich. Dennoch lohnt es sich auf noch eine weitere Möglichkeit aufmerksam zu machen, vor allem, weil sie semantisch noch besser passt. Das Problem besteht nämlich darin, dass sich die traditionelle Deutung mit der lexikalischen Liste nur bedingt vereinbaren lässt. Einerseits führt diese Deutung dazu, dass dieser Paragraph aus Einträgen besteht, die offensichtlich semantisch nichts miteinander zu tun haben (‚stubbornness‘ vs. ‚to clang‘ vs. ‚to draw by the breast‘). Man kann zwar argumentieren, dass ein semantischer Zusammenhang bekanntlich nicht unbedingt notwendig ist, bzw. dass ein formaler Zusammenhang (hier mit gú anlautende Wörter) ausreicht. Dennoch könnte ein zumindest teilweise nachvollziehbarer semantischer Zusammenhang der Einträge die Logik der Gruppierung besser erklären, insbesondere weil die vorangehenden bzw. nachfolgenden Paragraphen dem semantischen Prinzip und nicht dem formalen Prinzip folgen (z.B. Z. 8‘-10‘: ‚laughing‘, ‚game, dance‘, ‚to rejoice‘; Z. 14‘-15‘: ‚field, territory‘; ‚boundary of field and ground‘; vgl. Scheucher 2012: 650-651). In diesem Sinne behauptete auch Scheucher 2012: 651, dass „the semantic field indicated by the Hittite translations correspond quite well with Sum. gú „neck““. Ob diese Entsprechung semantisch tatsächlich so passend ist, muss dahingestellt bleiben. Es ist z.B. unklar, wie man im Falle von gú-šu-e(-) die Bedeutung ‚to clash, clang‘ aus dem Wort ‚Hals‘ bekommt. Wie Scheucher feststellt, sind die Wörter in der sumerischen Kolumne hapax legomena, weshalb die Deutung mit gú ‚Hals‘ nicht bewiesen werden kann. Daher muss man darauf aufmerksam machen, dass das sumerische Wort gù ‚Stimme, Schrei, Schall‘ (Attinger 1993: 530-531 mit Lit., vgl. auch Attinger online s.v.; ePSD2 2.0 s.v.) eine noch passendere Lösung für den Aufbau und die Bedeutungsangaben dieses Paragraphen bietet (für die gut belegten unorthographischen und derivativen Schreibungen in den lexikalischen Listen aus Hattuša s. den Überblick in Scheucher 2012: 50-51, 216-218). Eine Herleitung von ‚to clash, clang‘ aus ‚Stimme, Schrei, Schall‘ ist absolut einwandfrei. In der nächsten Zeile handelt es sich dann um die Stimme oder den Schrei des šīša-. Interessanterweise gehen diesen beiden Einträgen zwei parallel aufgebaute Einträge voran: Es handelt sich dabei um ein Abstraktum gefolgt von demselben Abstraktum als Besitz oder Eigenschaft des Esels. Da die sumerischen Wörter wieder auf <gú> aufgebaut sind, ist es logisch anzunehmen, dass es sich um die Stimme des Esels, d.h. den bekannten Eselsschrei handelt.⁽⁶⁾ Dies würde bedeuten, dass *puntariyawar* ‚Schrei‘ und *puntariyela-* ‚schreien‘ bedeuten.⁽⁷⁾ Aber passt diese Deutung zum Derivat *puntariyalali-*?

Dieses Adjektiv ist in einem fragmentarisch überlieferten Paragraphen des hurro-hethitischen Hymnus zu Ištar belegt, in dem, wie schon erwähnt, Ištar mit einem Esel verglichen wird (KUB 24.7 ii 18-19). Der vorgeschlagenen Deutung zufolge wäre *puntariyalali-* ein Nomen agentis aus dem Verb ‚schreien‘, d.h. ‚die Schreiende‘: „Du bist schreiend wie ein Esel, Königin Ištar!“. Der Schrei des Esels ist bekanntlich furchterregend: eine durchaus passende Beschreibung einer Kriegsgöttin wie Ištar. Gegenüber der traditionellen Deutung ‚stur‘ passt die Bedeutung ‚schreien‘ besser auch zu den nachfolgenden Zeilen, in denen Ištar mit einem Löwen verglichen wird, gefolgt von einem Hinweis auf eine „schreckliche“ Wolke (KUB 24.7 ii 21-22).

Zusammenfassend kann man feststellen, dass die Möglichkeit, dass *puntariyela-* ‚schreien‘ und *puntariyalali-* ‚schreiend‘ bedeuten, die bekannten Textstellen semantisch einleuchtender erklärt, als die traditionelle Interpretation ‚stur (sein)‘.

Anmerkungen

1. Allerdings geben Haas – Wegner 1988/II: 159 ohne Begründung eine Bedeutung ‚unberechenbar sein‘ an und zudem ohne die *communis opinio* (vgl. unten) widerlegt zu haben.
2. Güterbock in MSL XVII: 121 ließ dieses Wort ohne Übersetzung (ihm folgt HW² K: 33, das Scheuchers Vorschlag nicht erwähnt; Tischler 2008, 2016 nimmt dieses Wort nicht auf) und Scheucher begründete seine Bedeutungsangabe nicht. Das Verb *galgalniye/a-* kann allerdings kaum vom Verb *galgalināi-* ‚to clash, clang‘ (zur Bedeutung s. HED K: 25 *contra* HW² K: 33 [„(weh)klagen(?)“]) getrennt werden, auch wenn der Zusammenhang zwischen beiden Wörtern unklar bleibt: *galgalniye/a-* kann sowohl eine sekundäre Form von *galgalināi-* als auch ein aus dem gleichen Substantiv gebildetes Verb sein. Aber in beiden Fällen bleibt der Schwund des *i* in **galgalin°* unerklärt. Wurde das Zeichen <i> in *galgalniyawar* einfach durch Schreiberfehler ausgelassen? (Ünal 2007: 307 = 2016: 250 betrachtet *galgalniyawar* als Verbalsubstantiv von *galgalināi-* [obwohl dies unregelmäßig wäre], allerdings bucht er das Wort fehlerhaft als †*galgaliniyawar*).
3. Ein Wort *ššā-* wurde nicht in die gängigen hethitischen Wörterbücher (Friedrich 1952-1966; CHD Š; Tischler 2008, 2016; Ünal 2007, 2016) aufgenommen. Güterbock in MSL XVII: 121 ließ dieses Wort ohne Übersetzung und Scheucher begründete seine Bedeutungsangabe nicht. Somit bleibt die Bedeutung von *ššā-* vorerst unbekannt.
4. Güterbock in MSL XVII: 121; CHD P: 377 (obwohl nur als „very uncertain“); Ünal 2007: 552, 2016: 422; Tischler 2008: 150, 2016: 284, HEG L-S: 649; Kloekhorst 2008: 681 (mit Fragezeichen); HED Pe-Pu: 119; Schürr 2019: 563.
5. Archi 1977: 309; Oettinger 1979: 352 (mit Fragezeichen); Güterbock 1983: 163; Starke 1990: 378; Melchert 1993: 179; Haas 1994: 351, 2006: 201; Collins 2002: 242; Ünal 2007: 552, 2016: 422; Kloekhorst 2008: 681 (mit Fragezeichen); Tischler 2008: 150, 2016: 284, HEG L-S: 649; CHD P: 377; HED Pe-Pu: 119; Schürr 2019: 563.
6. Dem ePSD 2.0 zufolge bedeutet *gū mur* ‚Eselsschrei‘ (s.v.). Diese Deutung erscheint allerdings nur in Black 2003: 47 (ohne Begründung), sonst wird es anhand der Beleglage nur mit ‚schreien‘ übersetzt (Civil 1984: 294-295 mit Diskussion und Beleglage, ihm schließt sich auch Attinger 1993: 180; vgl. auch Attinger online s.v. *mur*: ‚crier, gronder‘).
7. Die letzte Zeile des Paragraphen bleibt auch mit dieser Deutung rätselhaft, was vor allem daran liegt, dass der Sinn des Ausdrucks ‚mit der Brust ziehen‘ völlig unklar ist (vgl. die Bemerkung ‚Brustanschirung‘ mit Fragezeichen in HW² H: 672). Enrique Jiménez wies mich freundlicherweise darauf hin, dass der unmittelbar vorangehende Paragraph des hier besprochenen Paragraphen des Boğ. C in Erim-ḫuš Tafel II (Z. 202-204) durch einen Paragraphen mit Wörtern aus *gū-dé* ‚ausrufen‘ fortgesetzt wird (Z. 205-207). Ob man dies als unterstützendes Argument beibringen kann, muss offen bleiben: die parallelen Stellen des nächsten Paragraphen des Boğ. C (Z. 16‘-17‘) erscheinen in Tafel II erst viel später (Z. 264-265).

Danksagung

Diese Notiz ist im Rahmen des durch die DFG finanzierten Forschungsprojekts „*Digitales philologisch-etymologisches Wörterbuch der altanatolischen Kleinkorpussprachen*“ entstanden.

Literatur

- CHD = GÜTERBOCK, H. G. et al. (Hg.) (1980ff): *The Hittite Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago*. Chicago.
- HED = PUHVEL, J. (1984ff): *Hittite Etymological Dictionary*. Berlin – New York.
- HEG = TISCHLER, J. (1977-2016): *Hethitisches etymologisches Glossar I-IV*. IBS 20. Innsbruck.
- HW² = FRIEDRICH, J. et al. (1975-): *Hethitisches Wörterbuch*. Zweite, völlig neubearbeitete Auflage auf der Grundlage der edierten hethitischen Texte. Heidelberg.
- ePSD 2.0 = TINNEY, S. – JONES, P. – VELDHIJS, N. (eds.): *Electronic Pennsylvania Sumerian Dictionary 2.0 (built 2020-01-29)*. <http://oracc.museum.upenn.edu/epsd2/index.html>.
- MSL XVII = CAVIGNEAUX, A. – GÜTERBOCK, H. G. – ROTH, M. T. (1985): *Materials for the Sumerian Lexicon XVII. The Series Erim-ḫuš = anantu and An-ta-gál = šaqû*. Roma.
- ARCHI, A. (1977): I poteri della dea Ištar ḫurrita-ittita. *Oriens Antiquus* 16: 297-311.
- ATTINGER, P. (1993): Eléments de linguistique sumérienne. La construction de *du₁₁/e/di* «dire». OBO Sonderband. Fribourg – Göttingen.
- ATTINGER, P. (online): *Lexique sumérien-français*. Stand: 1. Februar 2019. Zenodo. <http://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.2585683>.
- BLACK, J. (2003): Sumerian Noises. Ideophones in Context. In: W. SALLABERGER – K. VOLK – A. ZGOLL (Hg.): *Literatur, Politik und Recht in Mesopotamien. Festschrift für Claus Wilcke*. Orientalia Biblica et Christiana 14. Wiesbaden, 35-52.
- CIVIL, M. (1984): Notes on the “Instructions of Šuruppak”. *JNES* 43: 281-298.
- COLLINS, B. J. (2002): Animals in Hittite Literature. In: id. (Hg.): *A History of the Animal World in the Ancient Near East*. HdO 64. Leiden – Boston – Köln, 237-250.
- FRIEDRICH, J. (1952-1966): *Kurzgefaßtes hethitisches Wörterbuch. Kurzgefasste Sammlung der Deutungen hethitischer Wörter*. Heidelberg.

- GÜTERBOCK, H. G. (1983): A Hurro-Hittite Hymn to Ishtar. *JAOS* 103: 155-164.
- HAAS, V. (1994): *Geschichte der hethitischen Religion*. HdO 15. Leiden – New York – Köln.
- HAAS, V. (2006): *Die hethitische Literatur. Texte, Stilistik, Motive*. Berlin – New York.
- HAAS, V. – THIEL, H. J. (1978): *Die Beschwörungsrituale der Allaiturah(h)i und verwandte Texte*. Hurritologische Studien II. AOAT 31. Kevelaer – Neukirchen.
- HAAS, V. – WEGNER, I. (1988): *Die Rituale der Beschwörerinnen* ^{SALŠU.GI I-II}. ChS I/5. Roma.
- KLOEKHORST, A. (2008): *Etymological Dictionary of the Hittite Inherited Lexicon*. Leiden Indo-European Etymological Dictionary Series 5. Leiden – Boston.
- MELCHERT, H. C. (1993): *Cuneiform Luvian Lexicon*. Chapel Hill.
- OETTINGER, N. (1979): *Die Stammbildung des hethitischen Verbuns*. Erlanger Beiträge zur Sprach- und Kulturwissenschaft 64. Nürnberg.
- SCHEUCHER, T. S. (2012): *The Transmissional and Functional Context of the Lexical Lists from Hattuša and from the Contemporaneous Traditions in Late-Bronze-Age Syria*. Doktorarbeit. Universiteit Leiden.
- SCHÜRR, D. (2019): Von Bock und Roß und vielleicht Kalb im Lykischen. In: N. B. Guzzo – P. Taracha (Hg.): „And I Knew Twelve Languages“. *A Tribute to Massimo Poetto on the Occasion of His 70th Birthday*. Warsaw, 560-572.
- STARKE, F. (1990): *Untersuchung zur Stammbildung des keilschrift-luwischen Nomens*. StBoT 31. Wiesbaden.
- TISCHLER, J. (2008²): *Hethitisches Handwörterbuch. Mit dem Wortschatz der Nachbarsprachen*. IBS 102. Innsbruck.
- TISCHLER, J. (2016): *Vocabulaire hittite y compris louvite, palaïte, akkadien et sumérien*. Lettres orientales et classiques 20. Leuven – Paris – Bristol.
- ÜNAL, A. (2007): *Multilinguales Handwörterbuch des Hethitischen. A Concise Multilingual Hittite Dictionary. Hititçe Çok Dilli El Sözlüğü*. Hamburg.
- ÜNAL, A. (2016): *Hititçe-Türkçe Türkçe-Hititçe Büyük Sözlük. Hattice, Hurrice, Hiyeroglif Luwicesi, Çivi Yazısı Luwicesi ve Palaca Sözcük Listeleriyle Birlikte*. Ankara.

Zsolt SIMON <zsltsimon@gmail.com>

Inst. für Assyriologie und Hethitologie, Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München (DEUTSCHLAND)

22) Wie war die *walwaya*-Quelle? — Das Wort *wa-al-wa-ya-an-za* ist ein Hapax im folgenden Abschnitt eines hethitischen topographischen Textes: SI 'DÀRA'.MAŠ *ar-ma-ta-al-li-ya-an-za wa-al-wa-ya-an-za PÚ-ru* ‚Hirschhorn: eine krankheitbringende, w. Quelle‘ (KBo 62.5, 6-7; Lorenz – Rieken 2007: 467-468). Aus morphologischer Sicht gibt es zwei Möglichkeiten: entweder ein Nom. Sg. c. eines *-nt*-Stammes *walwayant-* oder ein luwischer Nom.-Akk. Sg. n. eines Adjektivs *walwayali-* (d.h. ein luwisches Fremdwort im hethitischen Text). Lorenz – Rieken 2007: 473 mit Anm. 14 argumentierten zu Recht für die zweite Lösung, weil diese Interpretation *walwayali-* mit dem nachfolgenden Wort *PÚ-ru / wattaru-* (n.) ‚Quelle‘ als kongruierender Ausdruck verbinden lässt und dadurch „eine sinnvollere Deutung“ erlaubt (der Vollständigkeit zuliebe soll erwähnt werden, dass das „Ergativsuffix“ nicht in Frage kommen kann, weil ein dafür notwendiges transitives Verb fehlt und das kongruierende Wort ‚Quelle‘, ebenfalls ein Neutrum, kein Ergativsuffix aufweist).

Die Bedeutung des Adjektivs ist allerdings unklar. Ünal 2007:784, 2016:581 übersetzte es vorsichtig als ‚a topographic feature‘, dagegen plädierten Lorenz – Rieken 2007: 473-476 für eine Bedeutung ‚trügerisch‘, der sich seitdem weitere Forscher ohne Bedenken angeschlossen haben (Tischler 2014: 130 [allerdings nicht aufgenommen in Tischler 2008, 2016a, und 2016]; Gerçek 2017: 51; Alparslan – Doğan-Alparslan 2018: 236).

Lorenz – Rieken 2007: 473-476 machten auf das Glossenkeilwort *walwayalla/i-* aufmerksam, das eine reguläre Ableitung von *walwaya-* darstellt. Obwohl die genaue Bedeutung dieses nur in einem Gerichtsprotokoll belegten Glossenkeilworts noch unklar ist, kann aufgrund des Kontexts von einer ungefähren Bedeutung ‚Betrug, Verleumdung‘ ausgegangen werden. Daher schlugen Lorenz und Rieken eine Bedeutung ‚trügerisch, verleumderisch‘ für *walwaya-* vor: die „trügerische“ Quelle, deren Wasser „ungesunde oder sogar giftige Substanzen enthält“.

Wie sie allerdings selbst feststellen, ist *walwaya-* ein Zugehörigkeitsadjektiv zum luwischen Substantiv **walwa-* ‚Löwe‘ (Lorenz – Rieken 2007: 473-474, 476 Anm. 25). Dies führt zu einem

semantischen Problem, weil der Bedeutungswandel ‚löwenähnlich, zum Löwen gehörig‘ > ‚trügerisch‘ alles andere als einleuchtend ist. Die von den beiden Autoren dazu genannte Analogie, das Bedeutungsspektrum von dt. *wölfisch*, ist nur teilweise hilfreich, da *wölfisch* nichts vergleichbares bedeutet. Nach dem Grimmschen Wörterbuch wird *wölfisch* metaphorisch in den Bedeutungen „wolfähnlich, wild, gierig, gefräßig wie ein wolf, schädlich“ verwendet (<http://dwb.uni-trier.de/de/s.v.>). Daher kann *walwaya/i-* bestenfalls ‚schädlich‘ bedeuten (was übrigens in diesem Kontext ebenfalls passen würde), wenn man (anders als im vorliegenden Aufsatz) dem Bedeutungswandel ‚löwisch‘ > ‚schädlich‘ Glauben schenken möchte.

Eine solche metaphorische Interpretation ist jedoch gar nicht unbedingt notwendig. Die Grundbedeutung ‚löwenähnlich, zum Löwen gehörig‘ kann nämlich einfach als die Beschreibung der Quelle verstanden werden: diese könnte sich auf eine um die Quelle gebaute Struktur in Form eines Löwen beziehen. Quellen mit tiergestaltigem Überbau sind im hethiterzeitlichen Anatolien tatsächlich gut belegt, man denke an die beiden Stierreliefs aus Derbent und Bişek/Arifegazi mit einem Bohrloch in der Schnauze zum Ableiten des Quellwassers (für eine ausführliche Beschreibung s. Neve 1988, bes. 264; das sog. *Löwenbecken* in Hattuša war kein Wasserbecken sondern ein Statuensockel, s. die Diskussion in Schachner 2018: 39). Wie die Berggötter mit Bohrlöchern in ihrem Körper des Quellheiligtums von Eflatun Pınar zeigen (vgl. Bachmann – Özenir 2004: 95-96), können die Gestalten auch andere Wesen verkörpern. Daher kann der Text einfach auf eine „löwengestaltige Quelle“, d.h. ein mit der Quelle verbundenes Löwenrelief bzw. Quellbecken mit Löwenrelief (mit Bohrloch für das Wasser) hinweisen (Löwen wurden schon in der großreichszeitlichen Skulptur oft dargestellt, für ein Überblick s. Summers – Özen 2012: 509-513, 515-517). Man könnte einwenden, dass eine im vorliegenden Text als „krankheitsbringende“ (sollte diese Bedeutungsangabe zutreffend sein) bezeichnete Quelle gar nicht zu einem Brunnen ausgebaut worden wäre, doch dieser Zustand könnte auch erst danach eingetreten sein.

Danksagung

Diese Notiz ist im Rahmen des durch die DFG finanzierten Forschungsprojekts „*Digitales philologisch-etymologisches Wörterbuch der altanatolischen Kleinkorpussprachen*“ entstanden. Ich bedanke mich bei Diether Schürr für den Hinweis auf das Grimmsche Wörterbuch.

Literatur (außer die in der vorigen Notiz zitierten Titel)

- ALPARSLAN, M. – DOĞAN-ALPARSLAN, M. (2018): Handelsrouten und militärische Straßen im hethitischen Anatolien unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der Geographie Anatoliens. In: Ü. Yalçın (Hg.): *Anatolian Metal VIII. Eliten – Handwerk – Prestigegüter*. Der Anschnitt Beiheft 39. Bochum, 233-240.
- BACHMANN, M. – ÖZENIR, S. (2004): Das Quellheiligtum Eflatun Pınar. *Archäologischer Anzeiger* 2004: 85-122.
- GERÇEK, N. İ. (2017): Hittite Geographers: Geographical Perceptions and Practices in Hittite Anatolia. *Journal of Ancient Near Eastern History* 4: 39-60.
- LORENZ, J. – RIEKEN, E. (2007): „Auf dem Weg der Stadt Šaššuna...“. In: D. GRODDEK – M. ZORMAN (Hg.): *Tabularia Hethaeorum. Hethitologische Beiträge Silvin Koşak zum 65. Geburtstag*. DBH 25. Wiesbaden, 467-486.
- NEVE, P. (1988): Ein hethitisches Stierbecken aus Derbent bei Boğazköy. In: E. NEU – C. RÜSTEL (Hg.): *Documentum Asiae Minoris Antiquae. Festschrift für Heinrich Otten zum 75. Geburtstag*. Wiesbaden, 263-272.
- SCHACHNER, A. (2018): Die Ausgrabungen in Boğazköy-Hattuša. *Archäologischer Anzeiger* 2018: 1-72.
- SUMMERS, G. D. – ÖZEN, E. (2012): The Hittite Stone and Sculpture Quarry at Karakız Kasabası and Hapis Boğazi in the District of Sorgun, Yozgat, Central Anatolia. *AJA* 116: 507-519.
- TISCHLER, J. (2008²): *Hethitisches Handwörterbuch. Mit dem Wortschatz der Nachbarsprachen*. IBS 102. Innsbruck.
- TISCHLER, J. (2014): Rezension zu CHD Š/3. ZA 104: 229-231.
- TISCHLER, J. (2016a): *Hethitisches etymologisches Glossar IV. Lieferung 16*. W-Z. IBS 20. Innsbruck.

Zsolt SIMON <zsoltsimon@gmail.com>

23) Nouveaux fragments de cunéiforme louvite II — Dans cette note utilitaire, six nouveaux fragments de cunéiforme louvite sont présentés, édités et brièvement commentés. Le premier fragment est KBo 47.290. Lors de sa publication en autographie, il a été placé dans la catégorie CTH 832 (*Hethitische Fragmente verschiedenen Inhaltes*) et une première translittération a ensuite été offerte par Groddek (2011: 224f.). Les lignes 3'–5' appartiennent cependant à la langue louvite. Le passage doit être comparé à celui de KUB 35.24 ro. 5'–7', donc à une tablette du grand rituel louvite de Kuwattalla et Šilalluḫi (CTH 761). Considérant la largeur des lignes de KBo 47.290, on peut affirmer qu'il s'agit d'une tablette à colonne unique et donc d'une appartenant à la première rédaction du grand rituel performé par Kuwattalla uniquement.

1' []x 'ap¹-pí-iš-k[e-ez²-zi²]
 2' [] []

 3' [na-a-ú-wa-ti-ia-ta ḫar-ma-ḫa-a-ti mu-u-wa-i na-a-ú-w]a¹-ti-ia-ta¹ a¹-a-la-l[a-at-ta-ti mu-u-wa-i]
 4' [na-a-ú-wa-ti-ia-ta ma-an-na-ḫu-un-na-ti mu-u-wa-i] na¹-a¹-ú-wa-ti¹ia-ta¹ [da-a-u-wa-aš-ša-an-za-ti]
 5' [ti-ti-ta-a-ti mu-u-wa-i ^{UZU}ŠÀ-ti ^{UZU}NÍG.GIG-ti] 12¹-ta-a¹-ti 'ḫa-ap¹-[pí-ša-ti mu-u-wa-i]

Le fragment suivant est KBo 49.243, publié en autographie par Torri (2006) et attribué à CTH 831 (*Fragments in unbekannter oder undeterminierter Sprache*). Pour les raisons mentionnées ci-dessous, cette pièce devrait être déplacée vers CTH 770 (*Luwische Ritualfragmente*).

1']x-x-x[
 2' -]x-ta du-d[u²-
 3']x a-pa-a-aš-pa-wa [
 4']x-[w]a² za-a d[u-
 5']x-du x[
 6']x[

La particule enclitique =pa à la troisième ligne n'est pas connue en hittite, mais plutôt en langue louvite ou palaïte, ce qui exclut le hittite. De plus, la séquence de particules -pa-wa est bien connue en louvite, voir KBo 29.34+, 10', 18', KUB 35.91, 6' et KUB 35.97 6'. Ensuite, le prénom démonstratif a-pa-a-aš en palaïte est normalement enclitique tandis qu'en louvite il est tonique, ce qui rendrait une attribution au palaïte moins certaine. Finalement, on y reconnaît le pronom démonstratif louvite za-a au nominatif et à l'accusatif, singulier et pluriel, du genre neutre, ce qui nous assure que ce fragment contient un passage en langue louvite.

Le fragment KBo 58.233 publié en autographie par Miller (2008) s'est retrouvé dans la catégorie des fragments en langue hourrite (CTH 791). Cependant, pour des raisons mentionnées ci-dessous, ce fragment devrait être assigné plutôt à la langue louvite (CTH 770), ce qui nous amène à une meilleure lecture de celui-ci. Une première translittération est offerte par Groddek (2012: 159).

1']^rd-an-ta-li-aš¹ [
 2' -w]a² *še*-i-ḫu-wa-i-i[n(-)
 3']x pa-a-ku-wa an-z[a^d-za-
 4' (-)t]a-a-ri-ip-i-ḫ[i
 5']pa-a-ku-wa-an a[n^d-
 6']x ši-an-ni-i[n(-)
 7']x-la pa-š[i-
 8']x[

 9']x[

Tout d'abord, le mot pa-a-ku-wa(-an), qui apparaît aux lignes 3' et 5', peut être analysé comme pā=kuwa (ou pā=ku=wa) et pā=kuwa=an (ou pā=ku=wa=an), c'est-à-dire comme une chaîne de particules bien connue en louvite. Ensuite, le terme šēḫuwaī[n(-), qui signifie 'sure, amer' en louvite (voir ši-e-ḫu-wa-en-zi (KBo 13.260 iii 11')), est un autre indice important pour son attribution à une langue autre que le hourrite. Cependant le mot (-)t]a-a-ri-ip-i-ḫ[i, à la ligne 4', pourrait être identifié comme un mot hourrite en contexte louvite. Pour cela, il suffit de comparer le mot pī-i-ša-i-ša-a[p¹-ḫi (KBo 39.179, 2'), attesté également en contexte louvite et signifiant en hourrite 'celui de la montagne Pišaiša'; voir Wegner (2000: 50). Dans ce cas, il serait possible de reconnaître le même suffixe -pheli- dans le mot (-)t]a-a-ri-ip-i-ḫ[i, quoique la voyelle -i- insérée entre les signes -ip- et -ḫi- fasse difficulté (courtoisie de S. Görke). En conséquence, l'identification de ce mot doit rester hypothétique. En résumé, ce fragment contient un passage en langue louvite employant possiblement un terme hourrite.

Le prochain fragment discuté ici est KBo 60.32, publié en autographie par Miller (2009) et placé dans la catégorie CTH 470 (*Ritualfragmente*). Cependant celui-ci contient de multiples passages en langue louvite. En collaboration avec A. Mouton et I. Yakubovich (travaillant sur le projet *Luwili*), nous sommes parvenus à identifier le contenu comme appartenant au rituel de Purianni (CTH 758). De plus, en comparant les mains d'écriture, nous avons pu attribuer ce fragment à la même tablette que celle de KBo 53.228. Donc, une première translittération du fragment KBo 60.32 est offerte ici.

1' [...	DINGIR ^M] ^{ES} -an-za [
2' [...	]x-a-ri-x[-]x[
3' [...	(-)d]u ² -u-ra-a -i[
4' [...	Š]A EN SÍSKUR [
5' [...	na-aš-t]a an-da
6' [ki-iš-ša-an me-ma-i]	
7' [...	GIŠ ^{gu}]l-lu-uš-ta-n[i
8' [...	]a ¹ -ad-du-wa-al[
9' [...	im-ma-ra-aš-š]a ^d U-aš-ša-an-[za
10' [...	pá]r-ra-an ni-i[š]
11' [...	]EN SÍSKUR-ša-[an ša-ra-a]
12' [pa-ap-pár-aš-zi nu ki-iš-ša-an me-m]a-i	
13' [wa-a-ar-ša-at-ta ÍD-ti na-na-am-ma-a]n ² MUN-pa a-a-l[a-ti u-wa-ni-ia-ti]	
14' [ú-pa-am-ma-an wa-a-ar-ša-at-t]a zi-la Í[D-i an-da]	
15' [na-a-wa i-ti MUN-pa-at-ta z]i-i-la	
16' [a-a-li-i u-wa-ni-ia na-a-wa]i ¹ -ti	
17' [...	]x[...]

Pour l'invocation de l'eau et du sel (13'-16'), voir les versions parallèles du rituel telles que KUB 35.54 iii 15-21 et KUB 35.47.

Le fragment KBo 60.305, qui a été publié en autographie par Jared Miller et placé dans la catégorie CTH 832 (*Hethitische Fragmente verschiedenen Inhaltes*), appartient plutôt à CTH 768 (*Luwische mythologische Fragmente*). Le contenu ainsi que la main d'écriture nous permettent de joindre ce fragment à la même tablette que KBo 29.41.

col. de gauche		col. de droite	
1' [...	]x	1' [...	x[
2' [...	]x	2' [...	hal-w[a-
3' [...	]x-ta	3' [...	^{URU} ha-[
4' [...	-n]u ² -wa-at-ta	4' [...	^{URU} ha-tin-[zu-wa
5' [...	]a ¹ -ta-ši ¹	5' [...	hu-da-r[a ² -
6' [...	]x	6' [...	pu-ri-i[n ² (-)
7' [...	]x	7' [...	za-ra-a[t-
8' [...	]x	8' [...	x[

Même si les mots sur le fragment sont tous incomplets, il est possible de l'attribuer à la langue louvite. Premièrement, on y trouve dans la colonne de gauche, à la ligne 4', une forme verbale louvite à la 3^e personne de singulier prétérite d'une formation causative en *-nuwa-*. Deuxièmement, on peut identifier dans la colonne de droite, à la ligne 2', le mot *halwa-* se retrouvant dans plusieurs dérivatifs louvites (voir Melchert 1993: 49f.). Par la suite, la restauration offerte du toponyme ^{URU}ha-tin-[zu-wa...], une ville se trouvant à la proximité de Nerik (del Monte & Tischler 1978: 102), est attirante, mais doit être considérée incertaine. Finalement, ce type de division des paragraphes rappelle les fragments de mythologie louvite (CTH 768), auxquels KBo 60.305 peut être attribué.

Le dernier fragment présenté ici est DBH 46/2.33. Il a été publié par Akdoğan (2016: 19f.) et placé sous CTH 470 (*Ritualfragmente*). Le passage préservé ici se termine par une incantation louvite KUB 9.6 + KUB 35.39 Rs. 25' f., connue dans le rituel du *dupaduparša* (CTH 759) et donc permettant de restaurer certaines paroles du nouveau fragment. Donc, DBH 46/2.33 est attribué ici à CTH 759.

1'	[...]	] ku[-...]
2'	[...]	^{UZ}]U wa-al-l[a-
3'	[...]	]x-an-ta x-x[
4'	[...]	] 1 NINDA.GUR ₄ .RA ŠAL-MU da-a-i [...]
5'	[...]	]x da-a-i še-er-ma-aš-ša-an GEŠTI[N
6'	[...]	]nam-ma-az ^{MUNUS} ŠU.GI EGIR-an-da[
7'	[...]	]nu-uz-zi te-pu da-a-i an-da-ma-a[n
8'	[...]	SÍ]G SA ₅ iš-ḫi-ia-a-an [(-x)]
9'	[...]	A-NA B]E-EL-TI SÍSKUR pa-ra-a e-ep[-zi
10'	[...]	BE-E]L-TI SÍSKUR QA-TAM pa-ra-a [
11'	[...]	a]n-da ki-iš-ša-an me-e-ma-[i]
12'	[ku-iš-tar ma-al-ḫa-aš-š]	a-aš-ša-an-za-an E[N]-ḫa ¹ a-a[d-du-wa-la]
13'	[a-a-an-ni-ti...	wa ²]-a-aš-ša-ra-a ku-w[a-
14'	[...]	]a ² -aš ḫi ¹ -x-x[
15'	[...]	] ḫi ¹ -[

Il est important de noter que le fragment contient une version du rituel performée pour une femme (*BELTI SÍSKUR*), tandis que d'autres versions précisent plutôt le caractère masculin du seigneur du rituel (*^LBEL SÍSKUR*); voir KUB 35.15 ii 6', 8' et 11' et KUB 32.14+ iii 15' (courtoisie de I. Yakubovich). La restauration du signe *wa* dans *wa²]-a-aš-ša-ra-a* ne peut pas être considérée comme étant assurée, mais semble probable, si l'on considère le mot louvite *waššar-* 'faveur'.

Bibliographie

- AKDOĞAN, R. (2016). Hethitische Texte Bo 4658-Bo 5000. Teil 1: Transkriptionen. Dresdner Beiträge zur Hethitologie 46. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- GRODDEK, D. (2011). Hethitische Texte in Transkription KBo 47. Dresdner Beiträge zur Hethitologie 33. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- GRODDEK, D. (2012). Hethitische Texte in Transkription KBo 58. Dresdner Beiträge zur Hethitologie 39. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- MELCHERT, C. (1993). Cuneiform Luwian Lexicon. Lexica Anatolica 2. Chapel Hill: self-published.
- MILLER, J. (2008). Keilschrifttexte aus Boghazköi 58. Texte aus dem Bezirk des großen Tempels IX. Berlin: Akademie.
- MILLER, J. (2009). Keilschrifttexte aus Boghazköi 60. Texte aus dem Bezirk des großen Tempels XI. Berlin: Akademie.
- DEL MONTE, Giuseppe F. & Tischler, Johann (1978). Die Orts- und Gewässernamen der hethitischen Texte. Répertoire géographique des textes cunéiformes 6/1. Wiesbaden: Reichert.
- TORRI, J. (2006). Keilschrifttexte aus Boghazköi 49. Texte aus Stadtplanquadrat L/18 IV. Teil. Berlin: Akademie.
- WEGNER, I. (2000). Hurritisch. Eine Einführung. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

David SASSEVILLE <dvdssasseville@web.de>

Institut für Vergleichende Sprachwissenschaft, Philipps-Universität Marburg (ALLEMAGNE)

24) Assyrian camels and Luwian officials —

(1) **Luwian Camels.** In a 2016 paper on some specific verbal forms of Luwian, I. Yakubovich (2016) cursorily suggests that the twice attested Luwian sequence *ka-mara/i^{+ralli}-* may represent the word for "camel", resulting from a borrowing from Semitic. The word occurs in the ASSUR Letter F+G at lines §28 and §31, a letter sent by an Iron Age Luwian merchant named Taksalas, in a context that suggests that 4 *k.*'s were bought back (but for a different interpretation of the verb *isa-*, cf. Sasseville 2018, 161f., quoted

in eDiAnA, s.v. *ka-mara/i-*), and therefore any available *k.*'s were to be dispatched to the sender of the message (Hawkins 2000, 537; Giusfredi 2010, 226-230).

That camels and dromedaries were known to the Luwian peoples of the Iron Age Syro-Anatolian interface is certain: a Karkemish “camel-rider” relief was exposed already by Hogarth (1914, plate B 9b; 1952 plate B 16b), and the Tell Halaf reliefs of the palace of King Kapara also contain at least an example, now at the Walters Art Museum (which is here reproduced in Fig. 1).

Exactly how frequent the presence of the animal was in the Syro-Anatolian area is unclear. Given the modest number of representations, it is possible that camels and dromedaries were somewhat exotic and infrequent (nor would they represent the sole example of unusual animals at the courts of local rulers), and certainly they did not originate from the area. In general, camels and dromedaries were certainly diffused in Egypt already during the Middle and Late Bronze age, and they became more frequent in the Ancient



Near East with the intensive interactions with the Arab peoples during the 1st millennium BCE (cf. Aubaile 2012).

In order to try and evaluate the likelihood of camels being mentioned among the commodities quoted in the ASSUR Letters, however, we would need to ascertain the original provenance of the archive, which, to date, is not possible, as they were retrieved in a much later archaeological context (Giusfredi 2010, 208). A central Anatolian origin of the documents seems possible, based on the similarity with the KULULU LEAD STRIPS (cf. Giusfredi 2010, 208f., where, however, I presented this possibility as almost certain, a statement that is probably too optimistic). Still, the texts are not generous in terms of recognizable toponyms, with the few exceptions including a possible reference to Karkemish (*ka+ra/i-mi-sà*, with an omitted KA sign, in Letter A, §6; Hawkins 2000, 534, Giusfredi 2010, 211), which would make the presence of camels far more likely.

Fig. 1. the dromedary rider relief from the Kapara palace in Tell Halaf, 10th-9th century BCE, Walters Art Museum, Creative Commons license.

As for the formal analysis, the Assyrian form is *gammalu* (or *gammālu*), attested from Neo-Assyrian onwards, and considered to be a loanword from a West Semitic language, possibly Aramaic (where the attestations are generally later, but the title “camel-rider” may occur already in the first Sefire Treaty (KAI 222, face B line 36). A Proto-Semitic etymology would send it back to **gml*, which regularly yields the Aramaic forms and the Standard Arabic ones (while the forms in the other and later languages would probably result from a rather complex net of lexical borrowings).

Yakubovich proposes the comparison basing on the well-known alternation of /l/- and /r/-signs in the graphemics of the Late Hieroglyphic Luwian texts. A writing *ka-mara^{+ra/i-}* could conceal a reading /kamala/; furthermore, Yakubovich suggests that the presence of a /k/ instead of a voiced /g/ would make Luwian a possible intermediate language of diffusion for the Semitic **gamal*-words to eventually become the Greek κάμηλος. This final consideration is not very cogent, as the devoicing of an initial stop can easily happen in contexts of adaptation and requires no formal explanation in terms of sound change (which is expected to be regular and predictable only when it occurs over time within a single language). Furthermore, the path of diffusion of the words for “camel” in Semitic is not entirely clear: as already stated, they seem to be West Semitic loans into Late Akkadian, but the reconstruction of the triconsonantal stem **gml* is no help when one tries to identify the direction of the borrowings. Therefore, the details of the circulation of

this Wanderwort are probably best left untouched, as the “camel”-words may be themselves loans in most of the languages involved, and there is no way to establish which Semitic language acted as a medium for its circulation in the central and western areas of the Mediterranean world. Notwithstanding these methodological observations, though, the general idea that the Luwian *k*.’s quoted in the ASSUR Letters were in fact camels is a very solid one.

Of course, one may argue that other explanations may exist, but after a survey of similar segments in the languages of the area, they all appear to be less convincing. The Luwian lexicon offers no solid *comparandum* (the Hittite word *kammara*-, “fog”, seems semantically unfit, as also observed in eDiAna, s.v.). As for other Akkadian candidate model words, a Late Babylonian designation for “net”, *kaṁāru*, is attested (Von Soden, AHw. s.v.), which would theoretically represent an alternative possibility. Still, “hunting nets” seem to be way too common an item to occur in the context of requests for commodities to be sent via traveling agents. Therefore, the “camel” hypothesis still seems preferable to me, especially in light of the onomastic evidence I will present in the next paragraph.

(2) “Mr. Camel rider”. There is a further point that requires explanation and that was left untouched by Yakubovich. The Karkemish inscription on the CEKKE stela is a contract written under the supervision of DOMINUS-tiwaras, a high official, discussing the purchase of a town by king Kamanis; the town - or village - is purchased in exchange for mules and silver, and since the text is written after the transaction was completed, the toponym employed is Kamana, evidently a new designation derived from the personal name of the aforementioned ruler. The text mentions a number of people (listed as a seires of couple, each composed by a father and a son) who were probably officials from neighboring centres that had been summoned, very possibly having the function of witnesses. One of them (§17e; Hawkins 2000, 146) is named Kamari- (*ka-mara^{rali}-sa*), which is exactly the same word as *k*., used here as a personal name. The official comes from a town that was perhaps called Ladapa or Ludapa (*la/iu-tà^l-pa-*) and has a son who bears a theophoric compound Luwian name Kwanza-Iarris (REL-*za-ia+rali-sa*). Since the fact that a son bears a Luwian name does not imply that the name of the father had to be also Luwian, and given the apparent perfect match with the name of the Luwian “camel”, it is necessary to evaluate whether a derivation of the personal name from the name of the animal is formally and semantically acceptable.

The first issue one encounters is semantic. If the name Kamaris of CEKKE is in fact connected to *ka-mari*- “camel”, it is unlikely that we are dealing with a primitive name (“Mr. Camel”). More likely, the name may feature the typical contraction of the *-iya*- derivational morpheme producing genitival adjectives into a (probably long) /i/: the name would then be Kamari(ya)-, “of the camel(s)” > “camel rider”. A personal name deriving from a title or an occupation is typologically more acceptable than a name coinciding with the designation of an animal. Still, if we are in fact dealing with a contracted genitival adjective and with a professional designation becoming a personal name, then it is necessary to stress that the second occurrence of the *k*. in the ASSUR Letter F+G §31, the one in which the dispatchment of *k*.’s is requested, could also indicate camel-riders instead of camels, as traveling agents are certainly involved in the trading procedures described in the ASSUR Letters.

(3) *187(-)ka-pa+rali- Before the recognition of the value /mara/i/, the sign *462 was tentatively transcribed as a sign for /pa/ (PÁ³). This would imply the necessity to discuss, here, the possibility of comparing the name of a commodity quoted in the KIRŞEHİR Letter §20 (Giusfredi 2010, 237-238) as *187(-)ka-pa+rali-. If this were to be identified with our putative camel-words, the analysis would become problematic (I thank Ilya Yakubovich, *personal communication*, for making me aware of this issue). However, nothing indicates that the forms are related: the hypothesis of a value /pa/ for §462 is no longer founded, and the logogram/determinative *187 never appears with the *ka-mara/i*-words. The form in the KIRŞEHİR Letter, a common gender noun inflected in the accusative, is probably to be read *kappari*-, and may be compared, instead, with other forms, as for instance the name of the Hittite fine garment ^{TUG}*kappari*- (on which cf. HED K, s.v., and which in Giusfredi 2010, 230, I indicated as a *comparandum* also for the *ka-mara/i*-words, a statement that I now wish to retract).

(4) Conclusion. While some details of the analysis I presented can only remain speculative, Yakubovich’s proposal to connect the *k*.-word(s) of Luwian with Assyrian “camels” appears very convincing, and no serious objections can be raised either from a historical or from a philological point of

view. As the documents that contain the word are probably to be connected with the area of Karkemish and with the Syro-Anatolian interface regions, the presence of camels during the Iron Age is unsurprising and testified also by iconographic materials.

Of the two occurrences in the ASSUR Letters, the first one refers to “camels” being bought, while the second one requires some of them to be sent. As the personal name Kamari- in the CEKKE stela is best analysed as Kamari(ya)-, a hypostasized gentival adjective meaning “camel-rider”, there is a chance that also the second occurrence in the letters may have represented riders rather than animals (which constitutes an undecidable but marginal point).

Caution should, on the other hand, be exerted as regards the hypothesis that Luwian would have acted as the medium of diffusion of the Semitic word for “camel” to Greece and to the Greek language. Not only there is no need to invoke the Luwian devoicing of the initial velar stop to explain the adaptation κάμηλος of Greek: geography would definitely pose problems, because, to the best of our knowledge, the only areas in which the presence of the word emerges with certainty is the Syro-Anatolian interface, while no occurrence comes from the central and peninsular portions of the Luwian speaking regions.

Note

This note is a result of the project PALaC, that has received funding from the European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union’s Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme (grant agreement n° 757299).

References

- Aubaile 2012 = AUBAILE, F., 2012. “Pathways of diffusion of some plants and animals between Asia and the Mediterranean region”. *Revue d’ethnoécologie* [en ligne] 1.
 eDiAna = Digital Philological-Etymological Dictionary of the Minor Ancient Anatolian Corpus Language, available at <https://www.ediana.gwi.uni-muenchen.de/news.php> (visited on February, 14, 2020).
 HED K = PUHVEL, J., 1991, *Hittite Etymological Dictionary, Words beginning with K*, Berlin/New York.
 Giusfredi 2010 = GIUSFREDI, F., 2010. *Sources for a socio-economic history of the Neo-Hittite states*, Texte der Hethiter 28, Heidelberg.
 Hawkins 2000 = HAWKINS, J. D., 2000. *Corpus of Hieroglyphic Luwian Inscriptions. Volume 1. Inscriptions of the Iron Age*. Berlin/New York.
 KAI = DONNER, H. and RÖLLIG, W., 1995. *Kanaanäische und Aramäische Inschriften*. Wiesbaden.
 Hogarth 1914 = HOGARTH, D. G., 1914. *Carchemish I: Introductory*, London.
 Sasseville 2018 = SASSEVILLE, D., 2018. *The Pre-History of the Verbal System Formation of the Luwian Languages*. PhD Thesis, Philipps-Universität Marburg.
 Yakubovich 2016 = YAKUBOVICH, I., 2016. “Some transitive motion verbs and related lexemes in Late Luwian”. *Indogermanische Forschungen* 121/1, 69-92.

Federico GIUSFREDI <federico.giusfredi@univr.it>
 Dipartimento Culture e Civiltà, Università di Verona (ITALY)

25) Ashurnasirpal I’s Supposed Brick Inscription — Hidden away in a publication that is not widely available, Olaf Pedersén has indicated that the attribution of a stamped brick inscription to Ashurnasirpal I is “falsch” (1997, p. 201, Ass 19515a). In fact, Ashurnasirpal I does not have any contemporary inscriptions that are securely attributable to him, a fact that deserves wider appreciation, and which has implications for the authorship of the White Obelisk. This note will suggest an explanation of how two bricks with a stamped inscription of Ashurnasirpal II (883-859 BC), son of Tukulti-Ninurta II, came to be wrongly attributed to Ashurnasirpal I (1049-1031), son of Shamshi-Adad IV.

In RIMA 2, Grayson (1991, pp. 122-3) begins Ashurnasirpal I’s reign with the comment, “Confusion is the key word for this reign since it is not clear which Ashurnasirpal this is.” Aside from a possible clay cone (A.0.92.1001), Grayson gives him only two bricks with a three line stamped inscription from Assur (A.0.92.1) which he translates as:

“(Property of) the palace of Ashurnasirpal, king of the universe, king of Assyria, son of Šamšī-Adad (IV) (who was) also king of Assyria”.

There is indeed confusion over this inscription and it seems that it was actually Ashurnasirpal II’s despite the reading that the Ashurnasirpal concerned was a son of Shamshi-Adad IV. Grayson’s

bibliography for this inscription includes “1922 Schroeder, KAH 2 no. 80 (copy)”. He also notes that he was unable to locate any brick which carried the text. He wrote:

“Schroeder (KAH 2 no. 80) said there were two exs. and gave them the Ass numbers 19515a and b (see his note on p. 107). But Ass 19515a (VA Ass 3255) and 19515b are exs. of a text of Asn. II (A.0.101.129) and the details about provenance and dimensions given by Schroeder match the bricks of Asn. II.”

Schroeder gave a copy of the cuneiform of his no. 80 (p. 47) which is presented as a clear text but, as Grayson noted, it has the same excavation number (Ass 19515a) as one for Ashurnasirpal II (Schroeder’s no. 93, p. 63) and the texts have the same three line layout with the same text except for the names of the fathers. See also Schroeder pp. 107-8 where nos. 80 and 93 have the same dimensions (48.5 x 48.5 x 6.5 cm) and come from the same excavation square (fE5II, a location in the Old Palace). It should be noted that in Schroeder’s time the Ashurnasirpals were numbered one higher than in modern notation, so that Ashurnasirpal I was numbered II, and II was numbered III.

In RIMA 2, under Ashurnasirpal II’s text A.0.101.129, a total of 15 bricks are listed (p. 378). The two with the same excavation numbers as for Ashurnasirpal I (Ass. 19515a and b) are exemplars 2 and 15 respectively (19515b is given as unlocated). Three of the exemplars have photographs in the Assur Fotoarchiv:

- 1) Photo 5833 of ex. 11 only shows a half brick but part of the name of the father, Tukulti-Ninurta, is clear.
- 2) Photo 2748 is of ex. 1, Ass 11652. Tukulti-Ninurta is faint but appears correct. This brick is illustrated in Andrae 1913, Taf. 91.
- 3) Photo 6065 is of ex. 2, Ass. 19515a, which Schroeder attributed to both Ashurnasirpals. Tukulti-Ninurta is not clear. See fig. 1.

Was Schroeder working from Photo 6065 or the brick itself or a similarly poor original? Could he have misread Ashurnasirpal II’s father as Shamshi-Adad? It is not normally possible to confuse the two names, but there are slight similarities in the cuneiform of Shamshi-Adad and Tukulti-Ninurta which on a worn or inadequately impressed brick might lead to confusion. The transliterations given in RIMA 2 for the fathers’ names are as follows (pp. 123 & 379):

Shamshi-Adad: UTU-ši-^d10

Tukulti-Ninurta: GISKIM-MAŠ

And the sign sequences given by Schroeder appear to be:

Shamshi-Adad: 381, 449, 13, 411

Tukulti-Ninurta: 452, 74

Comparing the signs, the initial wedges of 452 are partly similar to 381, and 74 is partly similar to 13. Bearing in mind the poor impression on the brick, could Schroeder have initially read a possible Shamshi-Adad and noted it down, and subsequently read other bricks as Tukulti-Ninurta without realising his initial mistake? Speculating further, perhaps due to confused paperwork Schroeder later came to publish and thought that he had two different texts.

Pedde & Lundström’s 2008 publication of the Old Palace in Assur provides much detail on Square fE5II where the inscribed bricks were found. For Ashurnasirpal I they note that the two bricks Ass 19515a-b are of Ashurnasirpal II and that it is therefore unclear what text KAH II 80 was inscribed on (p. 177). Also, on the accompanying CD they follow Pedersén in calling the attribution to Ashurnasirpal I “falsch” (go to Funddatenbank, Grabungsraster, click on Square fE5II and scroll down to Nr. 19515a). For Ashurnasirpal II (pp. 179-181) they list numerous bricks of various sizes with the Ashurnasirpal II stamp from rooms which are in Square fE5II (Rooms 1-4, 9; see Taf. 8). Ass 19515a-b came from Room 3 (p. 46; Taf. 30, abb. 71 shows Ashurnasirpal II stamped bricks *in situ* in the flooring). Lundström was uncertain as to whether or not Ashurnasirpal had built the Neo-Assyrian palace or merely completed the interior (pp. 180-1 & n. 263).

In view of the identical size and layout of the bricks, the similarity of the texts, their similar locations in Assur, the great number of Ashurnasirpal II bricks in the same location and the identical excavation numbers, it seems certain that some mistake has occurred, as Grayson strongly hinted, now confirmed by Pedersén and followed by Pedde & Lundström. The lack of any contemporary texts clearly attributable to

Ashurnasirpal I must have implications for the authorship of the White Obelisk despite the difficulties in linking it to Ashurnasirpal II. It is still attributed to Ashurnasirpal I on its label in the British Museum.




Fig. 1. The inscribed part of brick Ass 19515a (part of Assur Photo 6065). The father's name is the right hand half of the middle line. © Vorderasiatisches Museum – SMB, Sammlung DOG, photo: 6065 taken by Conrad Preusser in 1912.

References

- ANDRAE, W., 1913, *Die Festungswerke von Assur* (plates volume; ignore the Etana plates in their online version which gives the photos from the text volume!).
- GRAYSON, A., 1991, *Assyrian Rulers of the Early First Millennium BC (1114-859 BC)*, RIMA 2.
- PEDDE, F. & LUNDSTRÖM, S., 2008, *Der Alte Palast in Assur*, WVD OG 120.
- PEDERSÉN, O., 1997, *Katalog der beschrifteten Objekte aus Assur*, ADOG 23.
- SCHROEDER, O., 1922, *Keilschrifttexte aus Assur, Historischen Inhalts* 2, KAH 2. (<http://etana.org/sites/default/files/coretexts/14874.pdf>).

Robert M. PORTER <rporter@talktalk.net>
Croydon (UK)

26) Ninurta *bēl nignakki* no more¹⁾ — In a recent contribution on the goddess Kusu, I assessed the evidence for the epithet *bēl nignakki* ‘Lord of the Censer’, said to be used of Ninurta in *Šurpu* III.²⁾ While concluding that the epithet is probably attributable to a misreading of traces, a problem remained in that it was listed by Tallqvist in his 1938 work *Akkadische Götterepitheta* without a reference,³⁾ apparently predating the first suggestion of the reading in *Šurpu*.

In fact, I overlooked the fact that the true originator of the suggested reading was not Köcher,⁴⁾ but Zimmern⁵⁾ in a 1915-16 review of the first few issues of Ebeling’s KAR. Zimmern supported his reading with reference to BBR 27 (K. 4245) which has since been re-edited by Livingstone as one of the duplicates to CBS 6060.⁶⁾ In my article, I offered the occurrence of the epithet in Tallqvist as a very tentative support to the equation of Uraš with the censer in CBS 6060. As it turns out, this resulted in a century of circular argumentation, and as the relevant line in *Šurpu* is not to be read *bēl nignakki* ‘Lord of the censer’, but rather *bēl kakki* ‘Lord of the weapon’, the most likely source of Tallqvist’s epithet is no longer valid. While it is still possible that Tallqvist knew of another attestation, there is no evidence of it, and until some is forthcoming the epithet should be forgotten.

This does not materially affect the conclusions reached in my article, as CBS 6060 still gives Uraš as an equation for the censer.

Notes

1. This note results from research conducted under the auspices of the project REPAC “Repetition, Parallelism and Creativity: an Inquiry into the Construction of Meaning in Ancient Mesopotamian Literature and Erudition” (2019-2024, University of Vienna) that has received funding from the European Research Council (ERC) under Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme (Grant agreement no. 803060).
2. Simons (RA) 2018: 144-145.
3. Tallqvist (*Götterepitheta*) 1938: 426.
4. Köcher (MIO) 1954: 228.
5. Zimmern (ZA) 1915-1916: 191, n. 1.
6. Livingstone (MMEW) 1986: 178-179.

Bibliography

- KÖCHER, F. (1954): Zur zweiten und dritten Tafel der Beschwörungsserie *Šurpu*. In: MIO 2, 218-244.

- LIVINGSTONE, A. (1986): *Mystical and Mythological Explanatory Works of Assyrian and Babylonian Scholars*, Oxford.
- SIMONS, F. (2018): The Goddess Kusu. In *RA* 112, 123-148.
- TALLQVIST, K. (1938) *Akkadische Götterepitheta*, Helsinki.
- ZIMMERN, H. (1915-1916): Zu den «Keilschrifttexten aus Assur Religiösen Inhalts». In: *ZA* 30, 184-229.

Frank SIMONS <fjms708@gmail.com>

27) Arameo-Akkadica¹ — The words discussed below are either Akkadian borrowings in Aramaic (1-3) or LB renderings of Aramaic words (4). In addition, some Akkadian names in Aramaic transcription are dealt with (5).

1. 'klwšy (pl.) occurs in the phrase 'klwšy dMh̄wz' d'y l' 'bdy hlšy "the ' of Mehoza, who, if they do not work, feel faint" (Babylonian Talmud, Bābā M'ešā 77a, 16). The textual variants of this *hapax legomenon* are thoroughly discussed by Friedman (1993:412 and *passim*). The reconstructed sg. *'klwš' is rendered as "a workman whose job requires physical strength" by Friedman (1993:421-430). He is followed by Sokoloff (2002:131b, s.v.). *'klwš' cannot be etymologized as Aramaic and does not look Semitic at all. The explanations of several early commentators (from the late Geonic and early post-Geonic period) deserve to be mentioned: Rabbi Hananel (son of Hushiel, Qayrawan, 965-1055 CE) has "these 'klwšy who carry a jug on a pole" (*hny ' d'ny hbyr' bmwt*),²) Rashi (Solomon son of Isaac, 1040-1105 CE) states "they are always used to carry loads" (*rgylm lš't mš'wt tmyd*) and Baruch (son of Samuel) the Sephardic (*hSprdy*, 2nd half of the 12th century CE) equates them (following Rabbi Hananel) with "the porters" (*hktpym*). As I gather from the very detailed and cautious discussion of Friedman (1993:428-429 with nn. 115, 118 and *passim*), these early commentators were part of an unceasing stream of tradition which continues Geonic learning (JBA was still the vernacular in Babylonia albeit on the verge of demise due to the spread of Arabic); the more so since – as will be shown presently from an entirely different angle – their explanations fall not far off the mark. In view of the context, it can be argued that 'klwš' has the same denotation as NB/LB *atkalušu* "porter" (for this Akkadian occupational term see Jursa and Wesseli 1996). The difference between the original Akkadian form and its proposed JBA survival is minimal, and it is explicable in phonological terms. The *-t-* of the Akkadian source was assimilated to the following *k* in the Aramaic continuant. It may be surmised that the initial syllable (*at-*) of the original form was unstressed, whereas the final syllable was long. This is indicated both by the geminated *š* in NB/LB (final written vowels like *-u* in this case were not pronounced in NB/LB) and by the Aram. <w>. The stress was very probably on the last syllable and this might have motivated the assimilation of the *-t-*.

2. spr mt', which is compared with 'nqwlmwš < οἰκονόμος in the Babylonian Talmud, Bābā Batrā 68b, 8 (Palestinian Talmud 'yqwmns < 'yqwnwmws, cf. Levy 1924, 1:70a, 115a, s.v. '(w)nqlmwš), originates from Akkad. *šāpir māti* "governor" according to Sokoloff (2002:828b, s.v.), who renders it as "town official". In this case, in view of the initial sibilant, it is an Assyrian form. However, the Akkadian title is recorded only in OB and was in use only in Babylonia and Mari, not in Assyria (cf. CAD Š/1:456-457a, s.v. *šāpiru*, 2a; NB has only the hapax *šāpir ša GN*). Therefore, it seems more likely that *spr mt'*, who in context is described as an official acquainted with all the town's accounts, refers to the town scribe. Scribes functioned also as accountants, and thus they covered also the range of activities of the οἰκονόμος.

3. sygny. *sa-ga-ni-iā* "my officials, superiors" is recorded in a NB letter, which is datable to the 1st half of the 6th century BCE on prosopographical grounds (cf. Levavi 2018:397 *ad* YOS 3, 142, 26; CAD S:21b). It is the Neo-Assyrian vernacular form of Akkad. *šaknu* with intervocalic /k/ > /g/ (see Fales 1980:264). The /k/ became intervocalic due to anaptyxis (*qatl* > *qatal*, possibly motivated by a sonans /n/) in NA. NB *sa-ga-ni-iā* is the unambiguous evidence for this shift apart from the Aramaic transcriptions (*sgn*) as the NA non-logographic spellings of this title look traditional (mostly *šak-nV*, cf. CAD Š/1:186-187, where only the *status constructus* – in the minority of cases – is spelled *šak-an-*, assimilated *šā-ka-*).³) The term referring to royal officials was borrowed in NB and lives on in JBA *sygny* "prefects, governors" (paired with *šlyy* "rulers", cf. Sokoloff 2002:799b, where the Mandaic equivalent is compared, and Müller-Kessler 2011:242 *ad* 799b). The use of the NA form (borrowed via Aramaic in view of the *qatal*-formation,

cf. von Soden 1977:193, i.e. only ultimately a dialect borrowing) instead of *šaknu* which is the standard and very common form in NB with a long and continuous tradition of usage, becomes understandable in view of the fact that several NB terms for royal officials (e.g. *mašennu*, see Jursa 2010:80-81) are originally Assyrian, and struck roots in Babylonia during the hundred years of Assyrian rule.⁴⁾ This seems more likely than the cautious suggestion of Abraham and Sokoloff (2011:48b:199), namely that it “may be attributed to the scribe’s spoken Assyrian dialect”, the more so since the NA dialect did not significantly influenced the NB one (cf. Beaulieu 2013:366). This belongs to the phenomenon of degradation of terms of the series *šaknu* = (*bēl*) *pīhati* = *ahšadrapānu* (see Stolper 1985:58), all referring both to governors of provinces and to less specific and minor royal officials. As far as *šaknu* is concerned, it referred both to provincial governors and to lower officials as early as the NA period (see Postgate 1980). Hence *šaknu* is a special case within this trio (the distribution of the other two terms is more limited in time and space). For obvious political reasons, this lesser title refers to local potentates and vassals instead of “king”. This is the case of the rulers of MB Amurru and Ugarit (Fales 1984:164-165). In the same manner, NA GAR.KUR = *šaknu* refers to the ruler of Gozan, whose title in the Aramaic parallel text is *mlk* “king” (see Greenfield and Shaffer 1983:110; Fales 1983:249; cf. CAD Š/1:183a, s.v. *šaknu* 1, 5’).

4. Two Aramaic occupational terms in LB

1’. ^{lu}*gi-ra-A+A* renders JBA *gyr’h* “arrow maker” (to *gyr’* “arrow”). Iddin-Nabû son of (A) ^{lu}*gi-ra-A+A* is recorded in Borsippa, archive of Rē’i-alpē, 11.II.14 Dar. I = 508 BCE (BM 26547, 8). His property and that of Nabû-lū-ṭābu son of *Ba-al-la-šū⁵⁾* bordered on Rēmūt-Nabû’s pledged arable land stretching over two sectors of the irrigated area of Iddin-Amurru (see Zadok 2006:411:18 and cf. Waerzeggers 2010:649). This professional term ends with *-āyu* like NB/LB < Aram. *šaqqāyu* “sack maker”, which is spelled ^{lu}*šá-aq-qa-A+A* (Camb. 197, 3), ^{lu}*šá-qa-A+A* (CT 57, 237, i, 2), ^{lu}*šá-qa-A+[A]* (CT 56, 399, 7-8) and ^{lu}*šaq-qa-A+A* (CAD S:168b, cf. Bongenaar, NB *Ehabbar*:554a). Therefore, there is good reason for thinking that also the word for “sack” begins with */š/*, the more so since all its spellings start with SAG (= *šaq*) in NB/LB (CAD S:168-169). On the other hand, genuine Akkad. (OA, OB) *saqu* refers to a cloth. “Sack” in OB (onwards) is *udû* (made of wool) and *bašāmu* in MB (Alalah). Compare perhaps Jewish Palestinian Aramaic *sqyy* (Sokoloff 1990:387b), whose meaning is not quite certain, and Middle Heb. *sq’y* “sack maker” (Bar-Asher 2015:1018-1019, 1030, 1040-1041, there is no need to assume here a derivation from a secondary root Š-Q-Y). More such terms are e.g., JBA *dyqwl’h* “basket maker/seller” to *dyqwl’* “a type of basket”, *hql’h* “field worker” (to *hql’* “field”), *sd’h* “maker of stocks” to *sd’* “stock”. (Sokoloff 2002:282-283, 334-335, 480a, 788a). NB *eš-da-A+A* is based on *ēšidu* “harvester”. Here the gentilic suffix is attached to a base which is in itself a professional term. It is analogous to JBA *sqwl’h* “polisher” and *š(’)qwl’h* “porter” (their bases have Old Syriac equivalents, viz. *s/šqwl’*, see Sokoloff 2002:829a, 1173a).⁶⁾ Cf. 2’ below.

2’. ^{lu}*ma-gal-la-a* “parchment maker” (not in CAD) presumably goes back to *magall-āy*. This purely Aramaic term from Seleucid Uruk is the equivalent of the hybrid (Arameo-Iranian) *magallatu-karānu* (pl., sg. **magallatu-kara-*) from the Achaemenid period according to Corò 2018:39. The gentilic suffix *-āy* is attached to the base (the word itself ends with fem. *-t*), like *gyn’h* (Mand. *gyn’y’*) “vegetable gardener” (to *gynt’* “vegetable garden”) and *hnww’h* “tavern keeper” (to *hnwt’*, Sokoloff 2002:281-282, 473a), cf. 1’ above. It can be surmised that after the fall of the Achaemenid empire the (partially) Iranian term was not in use.

5. Akkadian names on dockets (etc.) compared with such names in purely Aramaic texts. The transcriptions of Akkadian names on Aramaic dockets are thoroughly analyzed by Streck 2017. This note is basically complementary and offers more comparanda. *’dnbw* does not render *Iddina-Nabû* (pace Zadok 2003a:564:108), but rather *Iddin-Nabû* in view of ([i]d¹-din-^d+AG (son of Nabû-šuma-ušur descendant of ¹⁹Šarrah, scribe, Babylon, Bēliya archive, 8.V.8 Dar. I = 514 BCE, BM 96266, 18f.)). The sequence < *nn* > reflects a pausa between the two name elements *Iddin* and *Nabû* (see Streck 2017:188). An analogous case is Aram. *Šnn’d* = NA *Sîn-na’id* from Assur (cf. Kaufman 1974:103-104, n. 364). In general, Akkadian (Babylonian) anthroponyms in Official Aramaic texts (from Babylonia and Egypt) match the spellings of the Aramaic epigraphs. Here is a selection:

Šwš'blt (< Šamaš-uballit); 'rdknn (Ardi-Kinūni, cf. CAD K:395b, s.v. kinūnu, 2d, all the examples are pre-1st millennium BCE, but the Aramaic transcription proves that this anthroponym was still current in the middle of the 1st millennium BCE); Lbšnsk° (Lā-abāši-Nuska); Šwš'htn (< Šamaš-aha-ittannu) son of Šmšy (Šamšāyu); 'tyblm°r° (Itti-Bēl-limmir, written plene in view of -y-); and 'lbl (Ilu-Bēl, Dupont-Sommer 1945-46 with interpretation of the whole list from Larsa).

'nwštbls'qb (< Ninūrta-balāssu-iqbī); 'nwštly (< Ninūrta-ilīya or < Ninūrta-lē'i); Lbš (Lā-abāši); Blty (Bal(ā)ṭiya); Ndn'nwšt (< Nādin-Ninūrta); 'nwštwšr (Ninūrta-ušur, plene in view of -wšr-; the same component is generally spelled -'šr, cf. Mrdkšr'sr, Nrglšr'sr below); 'll'tn (Illil-ittannu). Šw'dn (< Šuma-iddina) is with VmV > VwV, but Blšmdn (Bēl-šuma-iddina) in the same ostrakon retains intervocalic m (see Montgomery 1908:206-207, where all the other names of this list from Nippur are explained). For Ninūrta > NA (I)nūrta and N/LB Inūšta see S. Parpola, PNA 1:xxv.- 'ndblt (on a docket from the Murašû archive, Achaemenid Nippur) renders the well-attested anthroponym Andi (< Amti)-Bēlti "Bēltu's maid"; differently Streck 2017:190 ad 145: Andu (< Antu)-bēlet (Antu is hitherto not attested in names from this archive). The following examples are from Achaemenid Egypt (Porten [Pearce and Zadok] 2016:8-11):

Blbn renders Bēl-bani; less likely Bēl-ibni in view of the retention of -' in Šrnda'h (Šarru-nādin-ahī), Mrdkšr'sr (Marduk-šarra-ušur) and Nbwzr'dn (Nabû-zēra-iddina, also OT like Nrglšr'sr = Nergal-šarra-ušur). Šbwdaq (Porten [Pearce and Zadok] 2016:3, 9-10); -w- is a plene spelling like in 'nwštwšr above) renders Šābu-damqu, which is recorded only in NA (K. Akerman, PNA 3:1162-1163 "the troops are fine", or rather "the troops are expert, skillful", cf. CAD D:71a, s.v. damqu, 4 ad OIP 2, 70, 31). Nbwdaq "Nabû is good" (Porten [Pearce and Zadok] 2016:4, 9) ends with the same component. For mq > nq, which is more common in NA than in NB/LB see von Soden, GAG³:40:31f, and cf. CAD D:69-70, 73b, s.v. damqu, 1, a, b (already OB), 8; 180-181, s.v. dumqu (already in MB Alalakh du-un-qī-iš, cf. CAD D:180a). Bntsr(l) (Bānttu-Issār-ālī) and Šndn (< Šin-iddina, Porten [Pearce and Zadok] 2016:5, 11) are typically Assyrian.

Notes

1. Abbreviations of as in CAD unless otherwise indicated. CPA = Christian Palestinian Aramaic; JBA = Jewish Babylonian Aramaic; OSyr. = Old Syriac; Sam. = Samaritan.
2. He is quoted by Rabbi Nathan son of Jechiel of Rome (1035-1103 CE) in his *Aruch completum sive lexicon vocabula et res, quae in libris Targumicis, Talmudicis et Midraschicis continentur* (ed. A. Kohut, Vienna 1878, reprinted New York 1955):236b with n. 9.
3. ADD 88, rev. 1 (see Postgate 1980:67 and cf. CAD Š/1:184b).
4. Aram. sgn is also recorded at Persepolis (cf. Kaufman 1974:97-98), where the Aramaic scribes originated from Babylonia in view of their designation there.
5. Apparently a qattāl-formation of B-L-Š "to search, inquire" in OSyr., Sam. Aram., CPA, i.e. "searcher, seeker", cf. Sam. Aram. blwš, JBA blwš "searcher, seeker" (Tal 2000:101-102); MHeb. hblšyn "the searching ones" (Levy 1924, 1:237b ad Mishna Kelim 15, 4, not listed in Bar-Asher 2015:1015-1060).
6. With dropping of short unstressed -i-. A variant of the gentilic suffix (with ā > ō) is -wy- which is extant in 'mrwy "wool dealer" (to 'mr "wool"), mbrwy "ferryboat operator" (to mbr < m'br "ferry"), npwy "dealer in npī", and qšwy "archer" (Sokoloff 2002:639-640, 760b, 871a, 1051b).

Bibliography

- ABRAHAM, K. and SOKOLOFF, M. 2011. Aramaic Loanwords in Akkadian – A Reassessment of the Proposals. AfO 51: 22-76.
- BAR-ASHER, M. 2015. *A Morphology of Mishnaic Hebrew: Introductions and Noun Morphology*, 1/2. Jerusalem (in Hebrew).
- BEAULIEU, P.-A. 2013. Aspects of Aramaic and Babylonian Linguistic Interaction in First Millennium BC Iraq. *Journal of Language Contact* 6: 358-378.
- CORÒ, P. 2018. *Seleucid Tablets from Uruk in the British Museum. Text Editions and Commentary*. Antichistica 16. Studi orientali 6. Venice.
- DUPONT-SOMMER, A. 1945-46. Un ostrakon araméen inédit de Larsa. RA 40: 143-147.
- FALES, F.M. 1980. Accadico e aramaico: livelli dell'interferenza linguistica. VO 3: 243-267.
1983. Le double bilinguisme de la statue de Tell Fekherye. Syria 60: 233-250.
1984. An Akkadian Letter from Ugarit between Šaknus. OrAnt. 23: 163-166.
- FRIEDMAN, Sh. Y. 1993. Tyqwny 'rkym lmylwn htlmwdy (g) - 'wklws' - 'wklwz' - 'blrw' - blwz' - 'klwšy' - blwšy, in Bar-Asher, M. and Rosenthal, D. (eds.), *Mehqerei Talmud: Talmudic Studies Dedicated to*

- the Memory of Professor Eliezer Shimshon Rosenthal*, 2. Jerusalem: 411-430.
- GREENFIELD, J.C. and SHAFFER, A. 1983. Notes on the Akkadian-Aramaic Bilingual Statue from Tell Fekherye. *Iraq* 45: 109-116.
- JURSA, M. 2010. Der neubabylonische Hof, in Jacobs, B. and Rollinger, R. (eds.), *Der Achämenidenhof/The Achaemenid Court. Akten des 2. Internationalen Kolloquiums zum Thema "Vorderasien im Spannungsfeld klassischer und altorientalischer Überlieferungen. Landgut Castelen bei Basel, 23.-25. Mai 2007*. Classica et Orientalia, 2. Wiesbaden: 67-106.
- JURSA, M. and WESZEL, M. 1996. *Atkalluššu, der "Träger". *NABU* 1996/26.
- KAUFMAN, S.A. 1974. *The Akkadian Influences on Aramaic*. AS 19. Chicago.
- LEVAVI, Y. 2018. *Administrative Epistolography in the Formative Phase of the Neo-Babylonian Empire*. Spätbabylonische Briefe 2. Dubsar 3. Münster.
- LEVY, J. 1924. *Wörterbuch über die Talmudim und Midraschim* 1-4. Berlin and Vienna.
- MONTGOMERY, J.A. 1908. An Aramaic Ostrakon from Nippur and the Greek Obolos. *JAOS* 29: 204-209.
- MÜLLER-KESSLER, Ch. 2011. Beiträge zum Babylonisch-Talmudisch-Aramäischen Wörterbuch. *OrNS* 80: 214-251.
- PNA 1 = RADNER, K. 1998-1999. *The Prosopography of the Neo-Assyrian Empire* 1. Helsinki.
- PNA 3 = BAKER, H.D. 2002-2011. *The Prosopography of the Neo-Assyrian Empire* 3. Helsinki.
- PORTEN, B., PEARCE, L. and ZADOK, R. 2016. Akkadian Names in Aramaic Documents from Ancient Egypt. *BASOR* 375: 1-12.
- POSTGATE, J.N. 1980. The Place of the Šaknu in Assyrian Government. *AnSt* 30: 67-76.
- VON SODEN, W. 1977. Aramäische Wörter in neuassyrischen und neu- und spätbabylonischen Texte. Ein Vorbericht III. *OrNS* 46: 183-197.
- SOKOLOFF, M. 1990. *A Dictionary of Jewish Palestinian Aramaic of the Byzantine Period*. Dictionaries of Talmud, Targum and Midrash 2. Ramat-Gan.
2002. *A Dictionary of Jewish Babylonian Aramaic of the Talmudic and Geonic Period*. Dictionaries of Talmud, Targum and Midrash 3. Ramat-Gan.
- STOLPER, M.W. 1985. *Entrepreneurs and Empire: The Murašû Archive, the Murašû Firm, and Persian Rule in Babylonia*. PIHANS 54. Leiden.
- STRECK, M.P. 2017. Late Babylonian in Aramaic Epigraphs on Cuneiform Tablets, in Berlejung, A., Maeir, A.M. and Schüle, A. (eds.), *Wandering Arameans: Arameans outside Syria. Textual and Archaeological Perspectives*. LAOS 5. Wiesbaden: 169-194.
- TAL, A. 2000. *A Dictionary of Samaritan Aramaic* 1-2. Handbook of Oriental Studies 1/50. Leiden, Boston and Köln.
- WAERZEGGERS, C. 2010. *The Ezida Temple of Borsippa: Priesthood, Cult, Archives*. Achaemenid History 15. Leiden.
- ZADOK, R. 2006. The Geography of the Borsippa Region, in Amit, Y. et al. (eds.), *Essays on Ancient Israel in Its Near Eastern Context: A Tribute to Nadav Na'aman*. Winona Lake: 389-453.

Ran ZADOK <zadokr@tauex.tau.ac.il>

Tel Aviv University, Institute of Archaeology (ISRAEL)

28) Bethel – an originally North Syrian deity¹⁾ — The god Bethel (*Ba-A+A-ti-DINGIR^{meš}*)²⁾ is first encountered in Esarhaddon's treaty with Baal king of Tyre, which is datable to 676 BCE or shortly later (see Parpola and Watanabe 1988:xxix). [Aššūr, Mullissu], Ištar Arbail, Gula and Sebeti (the Pleiades), who are followed by *dBa-A+A-ti-DINGIR^{meš}* and *dA-na-ti-ba-ṛAṽ[A-ti-DINGI]R^{meš}*, are all subsumed as the deities of Assyria, Babylonia (Akkad) and Transeuphratene (*Eber-nāri*). In fact, the deities of Transeuphratene are represented here only by the pair *dBa-A+A-ti-DINGIR^{meš}* (male) and *dA-na-ti-ba-ṛAṽ[A-ti-DINGI]R^{meš}* (female). The spelling of the initial component renders a diphthong, viz. *Bayt-, which is the Aramaic rather than the Phoenician form.³⁾ The section of the curses has (Parpola and Watanabe 1988:27, iv, 6'-9') "May *Ba-A+A-ti-DINGIR^{meš}* and *dA-na-ti-ba-ṛAṽ[A-ti-DINGI]R^{meš}* deliver you to the paws of a man-eating lion". These seven deities (a symbolic-typological number as usual in such lists) belong to the Assyrian party, whereas the six preserved deities of the Tyrian party are listed last. They consist of the associative triad *Ba-al-sa-me-me*, *Ba-al-ma-la-ge-e*, and *Ba-al-Ša-pu-nu* (grouped together due to their common initial component),⁴⁾ the pair *Mi-il-qar-tu* and *Ia-su-mu-nu* (the tutelary gods of Tyre and Sidon respectively),⁵⁾ as well as the only goddess *As-tar-tú* (Parpola and Watanabe 1988:27, iv, 10-18). In case of a Tyrian violation of the treaty, the curse inflicted by the triad, who were basically storm deities,

is raising an evil wind and a strong wave against Tyrian ships with disastrous results on the navigation, the main branch of the Tyrian economy. The curse by As-tar-tú is due to her role as a warrior goddess.⁶⁾ Mi-il-qar-tu and Ia-su-mu-nu as city gods would cause loss of independence resulting in famine and deportation of the Tyrian people.

^dBa-A+A-ti (text: BAL)-DINGIR and <^{dd}¹Ba-A+A-ti-DINGIR recur in a list of deities of Esarhaddon's Succession Treaty from Tall Ta'yīnāt (ancient Kullaniya, the capital of Patin/Unqi in northwestern Syria). This treaty is datable to 672 BCE (see Lauinger 2012:87). The curse inflicted by this pair is similar to that of the treaty with Tyre. The list of 12 Mesopotamian deities in the Succession Treaty from Kullaniya is longer than that of the treaty with Tyre, but is equally of a symbolic-typological number (ten gods and two goddesses, see the Excursus below).

Syrian deities are listed after the Mesopotamian ones (Lauinger 2012:102, vi, 44-51). They amount to six (Adad & Šala of Kurbail in line 45 are intrusive as they are an Assyrian divine pair):

^dA-ra-miš, lord of two locales (EN URU KUR SI⁷⁾ EN URU KUR 'a-za-i?'), the latter is perhaps Rasm et-tanjara according to Athanasiou 1977:327, n. 7); the Queen of Ekron (*šar-rat A-am-qár-'ru-u-na'*, Lauinger 2012:47, see 119 *ad loc.*); and the pair ^dBa-A+A-ti (text: BAL)-DINGIR <^{dd}¹Ba-A+A-ti-DINGIR; as well as Kubaba and Karhuha of Carchemish. ^dA-ra-miš, [^dBa-A+A-ti-DINGIR] and [^dA-na-ti]-Ba-A+A-ti-DINGIR are also listed in Calah (Watanabe 1987:116:54-55, cf. Lauinger 2012:119 *ad vi*, 48).

The cult of Bethel persisted in Antiochene and adjacent regions as late as the Roman period (see below). Philo of Byblos has βαίτυλος which has become a common noun in Greek. It is based on a form where the diphthong is preserved and is "offenbar aus einer nicht-phönizischen Tradition".⁸⁾ The form originated perhaps in the north-Syrian coast where Ionians came into contact with Arameans as early as the NA period. The Biblical deity 'l Byt'l is mentioned in Jacob's 2nd visit to the town of Bethel (Genesis 35, 7). The passage belongs to the early Pentateuchal source E, which preserves material about the relationship of Jacob and his clan with the early Arameans. The god Byt'l was indeed worshipped by the Arameans in the 1st millennium BCE and as late as the Roman period. It was described by Jacob as an angel/messenger, who rescued him (cf. Genesis 48, 16⁹⁾). Other verses are less explicit.¹⁰⁾ A tradition, which has been incorporated in the Deuteronomistic History (Judges 1, 23-26) has it that the original name of the town of Bethel was Lwz, and that an individual from there migrated to the "Land of the Hittites" (i.e. northern Syria and southeastern Anatolia) and founded there a homonymous town.¹¹⁾ Is it an allusion to the Bethel cult in northern Syria?

The absence of Byt'l from the relatively long list of deities in the treaty of Sfire and that of Aššūr-nērārī V may be due to the fact that this list is very damaged. Evidence for the existence of the divine triad (father, mother and son) Byt'l, 'ntbyt'l (apparently Bethel's spouse) and 'šmbyt'l, i.e. "Bethel's offspring", is found in Aramaic documents from Achaemenid Elephantine in Upper Egypt. These deities are thoroughly discussed by Porten (1969:118-119, cf. Baudissin 1929:191, 197), who refers to the Greek inscriptions from Kafr-Nabu on Jabal Sam'ān in Antiochene from 224 CE, where Σμβετυλος, i.e. 'šmbyt'l (followed by Λέων "lion") is invoked.¹²⁾ The occurrence of the deity "Zeus Betylos of the dwellers along the Orontes" in Dura-Europos in the same century is further evidence for the worship of Bethel in northern Syria.

Porten (2014) presents a nearly comprehensive list of anthroponyms with the theophorous element Bethel. The earliest dated ones are from 571/0 BCE (perhaps from Sfire)¹³⁾ and the latest dated one is from 400 BCE (Porten 2014:225:1-4 and 230:45 respectively). Noteworthy are the filiation Byt'lzbd son of 'šmrm and Byt'lntn father of Hrmmtn (Porten 2014:230:49; 232:62), which reveal that Bethel was revered together with Eshem and Herem in the same family. The following complementary material is within the same geographical and chronological range:¹⁴⁾

^dBa-'ti-li-ki-nu "Bethel is righteous", Babylon, 16.VI.2 Camb. = 528 BCE (Zadok 2003a:520:A/3.1.1.1.1.3);

Bit(^dÉ)-il-šur? "Bethel is (my) wall", found at Nippur, 13.IX.3 Camb. = 527 BCE (Zadok 2003a:525:A/3.1.3.4);

Ba-ti-il-la-ma-' "Bethel has accompanied" and ^dBa-'-it-il(DINGIR^{meš})-ga-da "Bethel is (my) good luck", archive of the Ebabbar temple of Sippar, datable to the long 6th century BCE (Zadok 2003b:264*

1.3.10 and 266* 1.3.14, 11). The commonest anthroponym with Akkadian predicative elements is *Bīt-il-šarra-ušur* (É-DINGIR-LUGAL-ÛRU), i.e. “Bethel protect, keep safe the king!”. It is borne by several individuals (Porten 2014:226-229:11, 14, 19, 21-23, 30, 33, 36, add B. father of [B]u?-la-’, Babylon, 5.-.13 Dar. I = 509/8 BCE, Zadok 2018:266:3, 14’) and is indicative of their link to the palatial sector. The same applies to *Šamaš-šarra-ušur* son of *Bit(É)-il-ba-ha-tu₄* (Porten 2014:226:18). The predicative element of *É-DINGIR^{mes}* (<...>?, archive of the Ebabbar temple of Sippar, time of Nabonidus, Spar and Jursa 2014, 67, 1) is lost.

The vast geographical diffusion of the Bethel anthroponyms is due to the massive Assyrian and targeted Babylonian deportations from northern Syria to Babylonia. People were deported by Nebuchadnezzar II to Babylonia following his campaigns in northern and central Syria. The Bethel anthroponyms from Achaemenid Egypt refer to descendants of people who were brought from northern Syria during the short Egyptian rule there at the end of the 7th century BCE, although later waves of migrations cannot be ruled out. Generally, there is very little NB/LB material from northern Syria. NB/LB has *Bīt(É)-il-ha-na-nu*, 1, 7; *Bīt(É)-il-[...]*, 2 and *Bīt(É)-il-a-di-ir¹* from ^{umu}Am-mat, possibly Hamath (found at Nērab in northern Syria, dated to 10.II.13 Nbn. = 543 BCE). More revealing is a deed from Sippar, 4.I.7 Cyr. = 532 BCE (Wunsch, *Urkunden*, 48). Both parties are Aramean (‘Ha-mat-ia-a-’ vs Zab-di-ia). They were linked to the Ebabbar temple there, seeing that the litigation about a house was brought before the chief administrator (*šangû*) of Ebabbar of Sippar (also the *simmāgir* royal official Nabû-šarra-ušur was involved).¹⁵⁾ *Ha-mat-ia-a-’* (23) *Ha-ma-tu₄-ia-a-’* (16), whose name is a shortened form of the feminine gentilic of Hamath, was the mother of *Bīt(É)-il-ha-na-nu*, who was dead by then. She took care of his junior son (her grandson) *Bīt(É)-il-ia-a-hi-ru*.¹⁶⁾ It can be argued that the family, whose three members bore Aramaic names, was of Hamathean extraction and worshipped Bethel.

Finally, it must be stressed that no exclusive Hebrew-Canaanite predicative elements are contained in the numerous anthroponyms with the theophorous element *Byt’l*. All the anthroponyms in question are explicable in Aramaic terms, except for one which has an Arabian predicative element.¹⁷⁾

Excursus: the Mesopotamian deities (with a comparison to several pertinent lists)

I. Kullaniya = Tall Ta’yīnāt (Lauinger 2012:92, i, 22-26, see 114) - subsumed as the deities of Assyria and Babylonia (Sumer & Akkad). It is partially restored from I’. Calah (Watanabe 1987:58:§2 [= Parpola and Watanabe 1988:29, lines 16-20], see 178 *ad loc.*). The Calah list is expanded and has 17 deities: 12 male and 5 female, a typological number consisting of 10 + 7 and subsumed as deities of Assyria and Babylonia (Sumer & Akkad). The list recurs in Watanabe 1987: 59-60:§3 [= Parpola and Watanabe 1988:30, lines 25-30], where the deities are described as of Assur, Nineveh, Calah, Arbail, Kalzi and Harran, as well as of Babylon, Borsippa and Nippur (6+3).

II. follows I and fully duplicates I’. It is unfortunately damaged (Lauinger 2012:93, i, 29-45’) and is subsumed as deities of Assyrian cities.

III. Lauinger 2012:99-102:v, 78-vi, 41; altogether 14 [7x2] deities) || III’. Watanabe 1987:111-116: §§37-53 (= Parpola and Watanabe 1988:45-48, lines 414-463) has 17 deities (9 male and 8 female; 10+7). [Šamaš] is to be restored in the lacuna between v, 90 and vi, 1, but probably not Inūrta, being the main deity of Calah and Dilbat (elsewhere listed together with stars), the more so since Uraš, the tutelary god of the city of Dilbat, is listed in I = II. Therefore Dilbat appears only in III, apparently replacing Uraš. Likewise, Ištar of Nineveh (I = II) is replaced by Mullissu of Nineveh in III. Sebettu (III’) is omitted in III (see Lauinger 2012:119 *ad vi*, 44).

Table 1: The lists

No.	I	I’	II	III	III’
1	Aššūr	Aššūr	Aššūr	Aššūr	Aššūr
2	Anu	Anu	Anu	Mullissu	Mullissu
3	Enlil	Enlil	Enlil	Anu	Anu
4	[Ea]	Ea	Ea	Šin	Šin
5	Šin	Šin	Šin	[Šamaš]	Šamaš
6	Šamaš	Šamaš	[Šamaš]	Marduk	Inūrta
7	Adad	Adad	[Adad]	Šarpānitu (Zarbānitu)	Dilbat
8	Marduk	Marduk	[Marduk]	Belet-ilī	Marduk
9	Nabû	Nabû	[Nabû]	Adad	Šarpānitu (Zarbānitu)
10	[Nuska]	Nuska	[Nuska]	Ištar	Belet-ilī

11	Šerûa	Uraš	Uraš	Nergal	Adad
12	Bēlet-ilī	Nergal	Nergal	Mullissu of Nineveh	Ištar
13		Mullissu	Mullissu	Ištar Arbail	Nergal
14		Šerûa	Šerûa	Gula	Mullissu of Nineveh
15		Bēlet-ilī	Bēlet-ilī		Ištar Arbail
16		Ištar of Nineveh	Ištar of Nineveh		Gula
17		Ištar Arbail	Ištar Arbail		Sebetti

Comment

I, 2-4 form an early (Sumerian) triad. Regarding the pair of the astral deities Sîn and Šamaš, this is the traditional order, as the Moongod was initially more popular than the Sungod. The inverted order in Assurbanipal's treaty with the Babylonians (VI below) is exceptional.

Pairs of deities (a god and his female spouse) are a minority here: Aššūr and Mullissu as well as Marduk and Šarpānītu (both in III). Inūrta and his spouse Gula appear in the same list but are not juxtaposed (they are paired together in IV where pairing is the norm). Aššūr and Mullissu are not paired in I = II, where Aššūr's spouses Mullissu and Šerûa are listed together. On the other hand, the majority of the Mesopotamian deities in Matī'il's treaties (IV and V below) are arranged in no less than 15 pairs in IV (2-31, generally a god and his female spouse). V has at least six preserved pairs. Nabû immediately follows Marduk (= Bēl), who is considered his father according to the Babylonian theology current in that period. IV, 32-34 and presumably 36, who are Assyrian deities, are exceptionally listed individually. IV, 39-40 (Phoenician) are exceptionally a pair of male gods. The deities of Carchemish (IV, 41-42) are also paired, but this is the only case where the female spouse precedes the god. The last preserved section of IV seems to list deities of Inner Syria (like V), but is very damaged.

Table 2: Alphabetic arrangement and preliminary classification

No.	DN (alphabetic)	I	II	III	male	female	Assyrian/Babylonian (Bab. unmarked)
1	Adad	+	+	+	+		
2	Anu	+	+	+	+		
3	Aššūr	+	+	+	+		Assyrian
4	Bēlet-ilī	+	+	+		+	
5	Dilbat			+		+	
6	Ea	+	+		+		
7	Enlil	+	+		+		
8	Gula			+		+	
9	Inūrta			+	+		
10	Ištar Arbail	+	+	+		+	Assyrian
11	Ištar of Nineveh	+	+			+	Assyrian
12	Marduk	+	+	+	+		
13	Mullissu	+	+	+		+	Assyrian
14	Mullissu of Nineveh			+		+	Assyrian
15	Nabû	+	+		+		
16	Nergal	+	+	+	+		
17	Nuska	+	+		+		
18	Sebetti			+	+		
19	Sîn	+	+	+	+		
20	Šarpānītu			+		+	
21	Šamaš	+	+	+	+		
22	Šerûa	+	+			+	Assyrian
23	Uraš	+	+		+		

Substantial comparative lists are contained in the treaties of Matī'il of Arpad with IV. Aššūr-nērārī V and with V. Brg'yh of Ktk (found in Sfire, Donner and Röllig 2002, 222A, 7-13) as well as in VI, the treaty of Assurbanipal with the Babylonians. The treaty of Matī'il with Aššūr-nērārī V has at least 46 deities (Parpola and Watanabe 1988:13(2), vi, 6-26, see xxvii-xxviii):

Table 3: IV compared with V

No.	IV	V
1	Aššūr	

2-3	Anu and Antu	
4-5	Enlil and Mullissu	5 = A. 2. Miš
6-7	Ea and Damkina	
8-9	Sîn and Nikkal	13. S[n and 14. Nkl]
10-11	Šamaš and Nūr	11. Šmš and 12. Nr
12-13	Adad and Šala	
14-15	Marduk and Zarbānītu	3. Mrdk and 4. Zrpnt
16-17	Nabû and Tašmētu	5. Nb' and 6. T[šmt]
18-19	Ninūrta and Gula	
20-21	Uraš and Ninegal	
22-23	Zababa and Ba'u	
24-25	Nergal and Laš	9. Nrgl and 10. Lš
26-27	Madānu and Ningirsu	
28-29	Humhummu and Išum	
30-31	Girra and Nuska	7. ['r() and 8. Nš]k
32	Ištar of Nineveh	
33	Ištar Arbail	
34	Adad of Kurbail	
35	Adad of Aleppo	B. 1. [Hdd H]lb
36	Pālil	
37-38	Dagan and ^d [M]u?-sur-u-na	
39-40	^d M[i-il-qar-tu] and ^d Ia-s[u-mu-na]	
41-42	^d Kū-b[a-ba] and ^d Kar]-hu-ha	
43	Adad	
44	^d [x] x	
45	^d Ra-ma-nu of [Damascus]	
46	^d Zir-[...]	

V. Sfire

A.1. ['sr] and 2. Miš

3. Mrdk and 4. Zrpnt

5. Nb' and 6. T[šmt]

7. ['r() and 8. Nš]k

9. Nrgl and 10. Lš

11. Šmš and 12. Nr

13. S[n and 14. Nkl]

[...]

15. Nkr and 16. Kd'h (apparently Mesopotamian, cf. Zadok 1984:530);

Subsumed as *kl 'lhy rḥbh w'dm[h]* (cf. Zadok 1984:530-531).

B. 1. [Hdd H]lb

2. Sbt

3. 'l

4. 'lyn

5. Šmy[n and 6. 'rq]

7. Š(w)]lh and 8. M'ynn

9. Ywm and 10. Lylh

Subsumed as *[kl 'lhy 'rpd?]* "all the gods of Arpad"? (see Donner and Röllig 1968:243-244 with lit.).

Table 4: Alphabetic arrangement of IV and V

No.	DN	No.	No.	DN	No.
1	'l	V, B3	31	^d [M]u?-sur-u-na	IV.38
2	'lyn	V, B4	32	Nabû	IV.16
3-3a	Adad	IV 12, 43	32a	Nb'	V, A.5
4	Adad of Aleppo	IV.35	33	Nergal	IV.24
5	Adad of Kurbail	IV.34	34	Nikkal	IV.9
6	Antu	IV.3	35	Ninegal	IV.21
7	Anu	IV.2	36	Ningirsu	IV.27
8	Aššūr	IV.2	37	Ninūrta	IV.18
9	Ba'u	IV 23	38	Nkr	V, A.15

10	Dagan	IV.37	39	Nr	V, A.12
11	Damkina	IV.7	33a	Nrgl	V, A.9
12	Ea	IV.6	40	[Nš]k	V, A.8
13	Enlil	IV.4	39a	Nūr	IV.11
14	Girra	IV.30	40a	Nuska	IV.31
15	Gula	IV.19	41	Pālil	IV.36
4a	[Hdd H]lb	V, B.1	42	^d Ra-ma-nu of [Damascus]	IV.45
16	Humhummu	IV.28	43	Sbt	V, B.2
17	^d Ia-s[u-mu-na]	IV.40	44	Sîn	IV.8
18	Ištar Arbail	IV.33	44a	S[n]	V, A.13
19	Ištar of Nineveh	IV.32	45	[S(w)]lh	V, B.7
20	Išum	IV.29	46	Šala	IV.13
21	[^d Kar]-hu-ha	IV.42	47	Šamaš	IV.10
22	Kd'h	V, A.16	47a	Šmš	V, A.11
23	^d Kū-b[a-ba]	IV.41	48	Šmy[n]	V, B.5
24	Laš	IV.25	49	Tašmētu	IV.17
24a	Lš	V, A.10	49a	T[šmt]	V, A.6
25	Lylh	V, B.10	50	Uraš	IV.20
26	M'ynn	V, B.8	51	Ywm	V, B.9
27	Mačānu	IV.26	52	Zababa	IV.22
28	Marduk	IV.14	53	Zarbānītu	IV.15
29	^d M[i-il-qar-tu]	IV.39	54	^d Zir[...]	IV.46
30	Miš	V, A.2	53a	Zrpnt	V, A.4
28a	Mrdk	V, A.3	55	^d [x]x	IV.44
30a	Mullissu	IV.5			

VI. Assurbanipal's treaty with the Babylonians

Aššūr Marduk Nabû Šamaš Sîn Ea Adad Ninūrta Nergal Zababa Pālil Zarbānītu Nanâ Ištar Arbail	The list (if it is complete) has 14 deities, i.e. a multiplicative of the symbolic number seven. All the deities are common Mesopotamian, apart from Aššūr and Ištar Arbail, who are typically Assyrian and are listed first and last respectively. Several deities were tutelary gods of both Assyrian and Babylonian cities, viz. (N)inūrta (of Calah and Nippur), Sîn (of Harran and Ur), Nergal (of Cutha and Tarbišu). Pālil is Nergal's equivalent (of Udannu, but also popular in Assyria). Zababa was the tutelary god of Kish, but was worshipped also in Assyria, while Adad (tutelary god of Kurbail) was worshipped in Babylonia as well (without the local specification). Nanâ was the main goddess of Uruk. She was also associated with Nabû in Borsippa. Here she follows Zarbānītu/Šarpānītu, Marduk's spouse, like Nabû who follows Marduk in this list. Nabû and Šamaš were the main gods of Borsippa and Sippar respectively, but very popular in Assyria as well. Marduk, the head of the Babylonian pantheon, immediately follows Aššūr. On the whole, the attribution of the deities to cultic centres here is implicit, but it can be compared with I above, where the deities are explicitly associated with Assyrian and Babylonian temple cities. This list has a short but representative coverage, and is not devoid of sophistication.
--	--

Notes

1. Abbreviations as in CAD unless otherwise indicated. Rulers' names: Camb. = Cambyses; Cyr. = Cyrus; Dar. = Darius; Nbn. = Nabonidus.
2. The evidence for the cult of this deity is summarized by Röllig 1995 and Niehr 2014:153.
3. The diphthong /ay/ was preserved in the NA toponyms *Ba-na-A+A-bar-qa*, which refers to a place in Palestine, located in a region which belonged to the periphery of Philistia, very close to the Israelite border (cf. Zadok 1978:60). It was under Phoenician (Sidonian) control much later (in the Achaemenid period).

4. See Lipiński 1995:79-90, 243-251.
5. See Lipiński 1995:226-243 and 154-168 respectively.
6. On this aspect cf. Lipiński 1995:131-132.
7. See Zadok 2018:262, with n. 944. EN ...SI < b'l qrm is analogous to the much later Latin gentilic *Balcaranensis* which is based on Pun. *B'l qrm (cf. Friedrich *et al.* 1999:148:226).
8. Friedrich *et al.* 1999:169:241 (see Zuntz 1946).
9. See Rofé 1979:236f.
10. Notably rw'h 'bn Ysr'l ("the shepherd of the rock of Israel") in Genesis 49, 24 (Pentateuchal source J). It possibly alludes to the stele erected by Jacob in Bethel (see Luther 1901:70-72; Danell 1946:39 and the commentaries). 'bn Ysr'l is synonymous with šwr Ysr'l. For the suggestion that Byt 'wn < Byt 'bn "the place, precinct of the sacred stone, stele" was the name of the Bethel temple see Na'aman 1987.
11. Mazar (1981:146) suggested to identify the new foundation Lwz (MT Lûz) with *Lawazantiya* of Kizzuwatna (Cilicia), but the forms are far from identical and lûz "almond" (a common West Semitic lexeme) is productive in Syro-Palestinian toponymy.
12. See Jalabert and Mouterde 1939:216-217 ad 376. The original diphthong is monophthongized (-βετ-) in this occurrence from late antiquity. For association of Syrian betyl with a lion (in Baalbek and Emesene which borders on Antiochene and the Hamath region) see Seyrig 1929:236-237 and Ronzevalle 1937-38:56-57, 125.
13. NA Bēt-ilāyū (É-DINGIR-A+[A]) from Assur (undated, but definitely pre-612 BCE) does not necessarily belong here, but may be a gentilic (see N. Alhadeff, PNA 1:342a). **Ba-'ti-še-zib* does not belong here. The emendation by Porten (2014:226:13) is unjustified as its theophorous element is *Bayt* "temple" (cf. Zadok 1978:59), like that of OT *Btw'l* (cf. Meyer 1906:240; defective for *Bytw'l) "*Bayt* is god"; for the type DN ending in the nominative suffix -w + 'l see Zadok 1988:46:1141.
14. **Ba-'it-il-da-la-a₄*, Bīt(É)-il-[da]-la-a₄ can be read -da-la-a-an in view of Aram. *Byl'ldny* (Porten 2014:225:8 compared with 3-5).
15. See Wunsch, *Urkunden*:177. A later *simmagir* official, named Nargiya, is recorded in Babylon on 21.V.25 Dar. I = 497 BCE ([Jursa,] Paszkowiak [and Waerzeggers] 2003-04:255-259, 6, 7). He had his own judge named Ga-ar-ga-a, who bore a non-Babylonian name like many judges after Darius I's reform.
16. 18, 24, 25; **É-il-ia-hi-ru* (11); [...-i]a-hi-ru (7); [...]-ru (3), [...-r]u (16) "Bethel will rouse, awake, stir up to activity".
17. Bīt(É)-il-ba-ha-tu₄ (Porten 2014:226:18, see Zadok 1978:61, 227, 234). Bīt(É)-il-a-di-ir' ends with an anaptyctic form of Aram. *'adr* (<*'adr*) "support" rather than with Phoen. *'dr* "mighty" which is a *qattil*-formation (cf. Friedrich *et al.* 1999:136:199).

Bibliography

- ATHANASIOU, H. 1977. *Rasm et-Tanjara: A Recently Discovered Syrian Tell in the Ghab. 1: Inventory of the Chance Finds*. Ph. D. dissertation, University of Missouri. Columbia.
- BAUDISSIN, W.W. 1929. *Kyrios als Gottesname im Judentum und seine Stelle in der Religionsgeschichte, 4: Nachträge und Register*. Giessen.
- DANELL, G.A. 1946. *Studies in the Name Israel in the Old Testament*. Uppsala.
- DDD = van der Toorn, K. *et al.* (eds.), *Dictionary of Deities and Demons in the Bible*. Leiden, New York and Köln.
- DONNER, H. and RÖLLIG, W. 1968. *Kanaanäische und aramäische Inschriften, 2: Kommentar*. Wiesbaden.
2002. *Kanaanäische und aramäische Inschriften, 1: Texte*. 5th ed. Wiesbaden.
- FRIEDRICH, J., RÖLLIG, W., AMADASI GUZZO, M.G. and MAYER, W. 1999. *Phönizisch-Punische Grammatik*. AnOr 55. 3rd ed. Rome.
- JALABERT, L. and MOUTERDE, R. 1939. *Inscriptions grecques et latines de la Syrie. 2: Chalcidique et Antiochène*. BAH 32. Paris.
- JURSA, M., PASZKOWIAK, J. and WAERZEGGERS, C. 2003-04. Three Court Records. AfO 50:255-268.
- LAUINGER, J. 2012. Esarhaddon's succession Treaty at Tell Tayinat: Text and Commentary. JCS 64:87-123.
- LIPINSKI, E. 1995. *Dieux et déesses de l'univers phénicien et punique*. OLA 64. Leuven.
- LUTHER, B. 1901. Die israelitischen Stämme. ZAW 21:1-76.
- MAZAR, B. 1981. The Process of Israelite Settlement in the Hill Country. *ErIs* 15:145-150 (in Heb.).
- MEYER, E. 1906. *Die Israeliten und ihre Nachbarstämme; alttestamentliche Untersuchungen*. Halle.
- NA'AMAN, N. 1987. Beth-aven, Bethel and Early Israelite Sanctuaries. ZDPV 103:13-21.
- NIEHR, H. 2014. *The Aramaeans in Ancient Syria*. Handbook of Oriental Studies 1/106. Leiden, Boston and Köln.
- PARPOLA, S. and WATANABE, K. 1988. *Neo-Assyrian Treaties and Loyalty Oaths*. SAA 2. Helsinki.
- PORTEN, B. 1969. The Religion of the Jews of Elephantine in Light of the Hermopolis Papyri. JNES 28:116-121.
2014. A Comprehensive Table of Bethel Names in Ancient Inscriptions. *Maarav* 21:223-234.

- RÖLLIG, W. 1995. Bethel. DDD:331-333.
 ROFÉ, A. 1979. *The Belief in Angels in the Bible and in Early Israel*. Jerusalem (in Hebrew).
 RONZEVALLÉ, P.S. 1937-1938. Notes et études d'archéologie orientale (troisième série, 2). MUSJ 21:1-181.
 SEYRIG, H. 1929. La triade héliopolitaine et les temples de Baalbek. *Syria* 10:314-356.
 SPAR, I. and JURSA, M. 2014. *The Ebabbar Temple Archive and Other Texts from the Fourth to the First Millennium B.C.* CTMMA 4. Winona Lake.
 WATANABE, K. 1987. *Die adê-Vereidigung anlässlich der Thronfolgeregelung Asarhaddons*. BaM Beiheft 3. Berlin.
 ZADOK, R. 1978. *On West Semites in Babylonia during the Chaldean and Achaemenian Periods: An Onomastic Study*. Jerusalem.
 1984. On the Historical Background of the Sefire Treaty. *Annali dell'Istituto Orientale di Napoli* 44:529-538.
 1988. *The Pre-Hellenistic Israelite Anthroponymy and Prosopography*. OLA 28. Leuven.
 2003a. The Representation of Foreigners in Neo- and Late-Babylonian Legal Documents (Eighth through Second Centuries B.C.E.), in Lipschits, O. and Blenkinsopp, J. (eds.), *Judah and the Judeans in the Neo-Babylonian Period*. Winona Lake: 471-589.
 2003b. West Semites in Administrative and Epistolary Documents from Northern and Central Babylonia, in Deutsch, R. (ed.), *Shlomo; Studies in Epigraphy, Iconography, History and Archaeology in Honor of Shlomo Mousaieff*. Tel Aviv:255-271.
 2018. Some Unpublished Neo- and Late-Babylonian Documents, in Koliński, R. et al. (eds.), *Awilum ša lā maše - Man who Cannot Be Forgotten: Studies in Honor of Prof. Stefan Zawadzki Presented on the Occasion of His 70th Birthday*. AOAT 463. Münster:259-286.
 ZUNTZ, G. 1946. Baitylos and Bethel. *Classica et Mediaevalia* 8:169-219.

Ran ZADOK <zadokr@tauex.tau.ac.il>

29) Another Sequence of “If a Star Changes into...” (K 6448 + 8459) — The sequence of omens having the structure DIŠ MUL *ana...* GUR “If a star changes into...”, where a star can transform into a wide variety of objects (animals, metals, stones, etc.) has been studied by J.C. Fincke in “If a Star Changes into Ashes...” A Sequence of Unusual Celestial Omens”, *Iraq* 75 (2013) 171–196. She presented several manuscripts displaying this sequence to which we can now add K 6448 + 8459 (CDLI no. P396541).¹⁾ This fragment supplies a new variety to the already curious mix of, for example, tutelary deities *šedu* (20'), *lamassatu* (21'), an insect *mūnu* “caterpillar” (36'), a body part *aḫu* “arm” (42'), the metals *parzillu* “iron” (16'), *annaku* “tin” (17'), *abāru* “lead” (18') and other inanimate objects, such as *unqu* “ring” (l. 19'), *abni*^{sic} *īni* “eye-stone” (23'), *aban suluppi* “date-stone” (24'), *ḥašabtu* “sherd” (26'), *šinnu* “tooth” (28'), *tibnu* “straw” (35'), *sahlû* “cress” (37') and *kakkussu* “k-plant” (39').

It should be noted that [DIŠ MUL] is generally omitted in K 6448 + 8459, which may cause one to believe that this fragment contains dream omens.²⁾ It becomes clear, from the section on agricultural products (ll. 30'–34'), that we have here another omen sequence of the type DIŠ MUL *ana...* GUR. This section corresponds directly with the omens 75*–79* presented by Fincke (2013: 191).³⁾

As for the metal section, the sequence of [*kaspu*] “silver” (13'), *ḥurāṣu* “gold” (14') and *erû* “copper” (15') correspond with omens 38–40 (Fincke 2013: 188). However, it appears that “gold” has a deviating apodosis in the present manuscript; the apodoses for “silver” and “copper” are, unfortunately, not preserved in K 6448 + 8459.

Alternative apodoses are also displayed for the transformation of objects including *uqniātu* “blue wool” (22') ~ omen 7, *abnu* “stone” (25') ~ omen 12, *ḥuṣābu* “twig” (27') ~ omen 14 and *ṯidu* “clay” (38') ~ omen 73*.

K 6448 + 8459

1'	[DIŠ MUL <i>ana</i>	]	'GUR'	[	]
2'	[DIŠ MUL <i>ana</i>	] 'x'	GUR	[	]
3'	[DIŠ MUL <i>ana</i>	] 't'	GUR	[	]
4'	[DIŠ MUL <i>ana</i>	] 'x'	GUR	[	]
5'	[DIŠ MUL <i>ana</i>	]	GUR	[	]
6'	[DIŠ MUL <i>ana</i>	]	GUR	[	]
7'	[DIŠ MUL <i>ana</i>	]	GUR	[	]
8'	[DIŠ MUL <i>ana</i>	] -i	GUR	<i>ina</i> [	]

9'	[DIŠ MUL <i>ana</i>] 'x ga n ¹	GUR	d[u ²	]
10'	[DIŠ MUL <i>ana</i>] 'x ir/sa ¹	GUR	NA [BI	]
11'	[DIŠ MUL <i>ana</i>] ši	GUR	[	]
12'	[DIŠ MUL <i>ana</i>] na	GUR	NU[MUN ²	]
13'	[DIŠ MUL <i>ana</i> KÙ.BABBAR]	GUR	[	]
14'	[DIŠ MUL <i>ana</i> 'KÙ SIG ₁₇	GUR	ŠE.G[A	]
15'	[DIŠ MUL <i>ana</i> URUDU	'GUR ¹	[	]
16'	[DIŠ MUL <i>ana</i> A]N.BAR	GUR	LÚ BIDUMU 'x ¹ [	]
17'	[DIŠ MUL <i>ana</i> A]N.NA	GUR	'x ¹ -re-e [	]
18'	[DIŠ MUL <i>ana</i> A.GAR ₅	GUR	LÚ MUNUS[	]
19'	[DIŠ MUL <i>ana</i> un-qi	GUR	[	]
20'	[DIŠ MUL] 'ana ¹ še-e-di	GUR	[	]
21'	[DIŠ MUL] 'ana ¹ dLAMMA-ti	GUR	LÚ [	]
22'	[DIŠ MUL <i>ana</i> SÍG.ZA.GÍN	GUR	'a ¹ [	]
23'	[DIŠ MUL <i>ana</i> ab-ni i-ni	GUR	[	]
24'	[DIŠ MUL <i>ana</i> NA ₄ ZÚ LUM	'GUR ¹	NIN 'É ²¹ [	]
25'	[DIŠ MUL <i>ana</i> NA ₄	'GUR ¹	DU[MU	]
26'	[DIŠ MUL <i>ana</i> ha-ša-ab-'ti ¹	GUR	'zi x ¹ [	]
27'	[DIŠ MUL <i>ana</i> hu-ša-a-'bi ¹	GUR	É B[I	]
28'	[DIŠ MUL <i>ana</i> ši-in-'ni ¹	GUR	[	]
29'	[DIŠ MUL] 'ana ¹ ud-'de ¹ -e	GUR	ŠÀ.BI [	]
30'	[DIŠ MUL] 'ana ¹ ha ¹ -li ¹ -ri	GUR	ŠÀ.BI [	]
31'	[DIŠ MUL] 'ana ¹ GÚ. TUR	GUR	ŠÀ. HÚ[L.LA]	]
32'	[DIŠ MUL] 'ana sa ¹ -al-ti	GUR	TIL U[D-mi]	]
33'	[DIŠ MUL] 'ana še ¹ -gu-ú-šu ¹ (RU)	GUR	Ì.DUB ^{meš} [SA] ₅ ^{meš} 'SÙ ¹ [^{meš}]	]
34'	[DIŠ MUL <i>ana</i> a]r-su-up-pi	GUR	Ì ¹ MAŠ.EN ¹ .GAG NÍG.TUK // BURU ₁₄ DÙ[-uš]	]
35'	[DIŠ MUL <i>ana</i> IN.NU	GUR	Ì.DUB LÚ 'x ¹ [	]
36'	[DIŠ MUL] 'ana mu ¹ -nim	GUR	NIN É it-ta-[	]
37'	[DIŠ MUL] 'ana ¹ ZÀ.'HÍ.LI	GUR	NIN 'É ¹ [	]
38'	[DIŠ MUL] 'ana ¹ IM	GUR	É BI la šu [	]
39'	[DIŠ MUL] 'ana ¹ kak-ku-si	GUR	ana É BI la šu [	]
40'	[DIŠ MUL] 'ana ¹ be-pí TUR	GUR	NU DÙ.GA U[ZU	]
41'	[DIŠ MUL] 'ana ¹ be-pí ši	GUR	ina ŠÀ.BINU D[ÙG.GA	]
42'	[DIŠ MUL <i>ana</i> 'Á ¹	GUR	NINDA mat-qá [ikkal]	]
43'	[DIŠ MUL <i>ana</i> x] 'x ¹ na	GUR	NINDA mat-qá [ikkal]	]
44'	[DIŠ MUL <i>ana</i> x x] 'mi ¹	GUR	ŠUB-tim [	]
45'	[DIŠ MUL <i>ana</i> x x (x)] 'x x ¹	GUR	nim 'x ¹ [	]

(breaks)

Notes

1. Collated by the present author in February 2020.

2. Metamorphosis omens are also known from the corpus of dream omens from the Second Millennium, i.e., (OB Sippar) BM 96951: iv 17'-21' with the following transformational objects: (head of) a god, lion, donkey, goat or stone; (MB Susa) MDP 14, 49-59 (AS 9930): i 2'-11' with the following transformational objects: wild animal, lion, dog, donkey or ox. With regard to the dream omen series, Zaqīqu - from the First Millennium - a section with the keyword *itār* (GUR) is therefore expected, but is - as yet - undiscovered. A new edition of all Mesopotamian dream omens is scheduled by the present author.

3. Note for l. 32' that we find the lexical variant *saltu* instead of ZÍZ.AN.NA /ZÍZ.A.AN (*kunāšu*) ~ omen 77*. Compared with the other manuscripts, l. 34' contains an additional apodosis.

Elyze ZOMER <elyze.zomer@staff.uni-marburg.de>
Philipps-Universität Marburg (GERMANY)

30) The Neo-Assyrian Representation of a Royal Family on a Cylinder Seal — In my article on the visibility of Neo-Assyrian women¹⁾ I have discussed nearly all known representations of the Neo-Assyrian queens. Initially the image on a seal below was not referred to since my primary interest was monumental depictions visible to the public. Three years after the submission of the aforementioned article, I was willing

to add to it the reference to the image in question because of its importance for the discussion of a tasselled ribbon as a royalty-related headgear and of the religious role of the royal triad of the king, the queen and the crown prince.²⁾ But the proof-reading process of Eisenbrauns—Penn State University Press did not allow me to do this. I am glad to use the facilities of *NABU* for a full-scale discussion of this unique representation of a Neo-Assyrian royal family.



Representation of a Royal Family on the Cylinder Seal from the Queens' Tombs. Nimrud. Tomb III.
Modern Seal Impression ND 1989.332.

The carnelian cylinder seal with the golden cups found in the queen's tombs in Kalḫu (above; Nimrud; Tomb III) was discussed by Julian Reade in his article on the Assyrian royal headgear.³⁾ Reade had immediately identified in the beardless image flanking the stylized tree together with the king as a queen because of her mural crown.⁴⁾ Reade, however, failed to recognize a crown prince in the figure behind the king, despite the fact that it was Reade himself who in his pioneering article⁵⁾ demonstrated that "the diadem with two bands pending behind" is the signifier of the NA crown prince and is "identical to the diadem worn by the king."⁶⁾ Later I have proved that tasselled headband is a signifier of belonging to immediate royal family⁷⁾ and, besides the king and the crown prince, it was worn by queens and some of the kings' brothers—Sīn-aḫu-ušur and Šamaš-šumu-ukīn, as a crown prince of Babylon.⁸⁾ Besides the royal triad, tassels hanging from crowns down the back are a typical accessory of gods and genii present on their multiple monumental and miniature representations. The tasselled headband is attached also to the headdress of the queen on the discussed seal.

The image behind the king upon the seal from Tomb III is a representation of a youthful beardless crown prince and not of a eunuch.⁹⁾ This is confirmed not only by the fact that he, as well as the king and the queen on this seal,¹⁰⁾ is wearing tasselled headband, but also by the identical dresses worn by this beardless figure and the king. Assyrian artists were very capable of demarcating age in representations, even the miniature ones, as prove the golden stamp seal of Queen Ḥamâ and the golden pendant of unknown queen from Tomb III.¹¹⁾ The beardless male image on the seal in question certainly represents a young person.

Thus, this seal bears a so far unique representation of an Assyrian royal family performing a religious ritual—the king, the crown prince, and the queen are adoring the stylized tree. The style of the tree, definitely a pomegranate, is similar to those of nos. 152 and 247 in the Catalogue of the Western Asiatic Seals in the British Museum V. Dominique Collon dated the first one to the ninth century BCE and the second to the late ninth-eight century.¹²⁾ The seal under discussion was found in the tomb of Mullissu-mukannišat-Nīnua,¹³⁾ the queen of Assurnasirpal II and subsequently of his son, Shalmaneser III. It is tempting to suggest that the scene on this seal depicts them, especially in the light of the fact that adoration of the stylized tree is the main motif of monumental representations of both these kings. But the tomb was robbed and the objects found in it range in time from Shalmaneser III to Sargon II. Thus, any identification of royal triad on this seal remains a suggestion.

I have already discussed the triad of the Assyrian king, queen and crown prince as earthly representatives of divine family and referred to their administrative and religious roles as a triad.¹⁴⁾ The parallelism between the family of Aššur and the royal family, was first noticed by Simo Parpola.¹⁵⁾

The administrative role of the king, the queen and the crown prince and the appearance of the bureau seals of each of them on the same bullae was discussed by Karen Radner.¹⁶⁾ Thus, there is no need to return to these matters in details on a short note. But it should be stressed again that the king and the queen, together or apart, are represented adoring gods. Queens alone or with the king appear worshiping Mullissu on their signet-ring seals.¹⁷⁾ To the best of my knowledge there are no representations, which can be unequivocally interpreted as the crown prince worshipping the gods, although D. Collon suggested that seal no. 163 in her catalogue of the NA and NB seals at the BM could represent the king and the crown prince.¹⁸⁾ This seal is also cut in the linear style as is the seal under discussion. She further supported her suggestion by the parallel published by Anton Moortgat.¹⁹⁾ In both cases headgears are, however, missing which makes the identification unsure. Beardless worshiper without a headband but with tassels hanging down the back and clad in luxurious dress of a facture identical with that of the goddess is shown in front of Ištar of Arbela on the NA chalcedony seal of an exquisite quality.²⁰⁾ The images of the crown princes Assurbanipal and Šamaš-šumu-ukīn accompanying Esarhaddon on the steles of Sam'al and Til Barsip²¹⁾ might be interpreted as representing them indirectly participating in the adoration of the gods by their father. Thus, the seal discussed here is a unique representation of the entire royal triad performing together a religious ritual—the adoration of the stylized tree. The composition displays a clear hierarchy: the king is the superior—he stands next to the tree and has a “retinue;” the queen is the second in importance—she is also shown in the immediate proximity to the tree, but appears alone. The crown prince is definitely the minor in the triad—he follows the king, and without his dress and his headgear, could be and was mistaken for an attendant. This hierarchy within the royal triad is well known to us from the distribution lists SAA 1 34: 8–17 and rev 2'–11' and SAA 7 155: 1–3, where the queen appears after the king and before the crown prince. Her allotment in the distribution is larger than that of the later but smaller than that of the former. These texts derive from times of Sargon II.²²⁾ The carving on the carnelian cylinder from Tomb III proves that the hierarchy within the royal family was the same—the king, the queen, and only then the crown prince—also before Sargon's reign.²³⁾

Notes

1. MAY 2018, especially 259–263.
2. MAY 2018: 268, 271–272.
3. READE 2009: 254–263.
4. L. AL-GAILANI WERR (2008: 161 with fig. 19-w) considered it to be an image of a goddess.
5. READE 1972: 193.
6. IBID.
7. MAY 2012: 203–204 with figs. 8.12–8.18 and MAY 2018: 2018: 261–262 with figs. 4–5, and p. 272 with n. 143.
8. For the diadems of Sīn-aḥu-uṣur and Šamaš-šumu-ukīn, see figs. 8.12 and 8.14 (Sam'al stele of Esarhaddon) respectively in MAY 2012 with the related discussion.
9. Šamši-ilu, as suggested by READE (2009: 253–254).
10. And elsewhere. See MAY 2018: 268, 271–272.
11. See discussion in MAY 2018: 266.
12. COLLON 2001: 88–89 and 131–132.
13. DAMERJI 2008: 82.
14. MAY 2018: 268, 271–272; see also MAY 2012: 198–199.
15. PARPOLA 2012: 619–620.
16. RADNER 2008, especially 504–506 with figs. 23–30.
17. Images of the king in adoration gesture are ubiquitous on the steles, rock reliefs and palatial imagery of Assurbanipal II and Shalmaneser III; for the queens, see MAY 2018: figs. 4–5 and the discussion on pp. 270–271—the chalcedony stamp seal BM 2002-05-15, 1 of Sennacherib's queen and the signet ring of Queen Hamā.
18. COLLON 2001: 94.
19. MOORTGAT 1940 no. 675.
20. COLLON 2001: no. 240.
21. BÖRKER-KLÄHN 1982: nos. 217–219. The princes appear with folded hand; only the king performs *appa labānu* towards divine symbols.
22. Correct for SAA 1 34, the date of SAA 1 155 is not unequivocally clear.
23. Sennacherib was a mature man when Sargon seized the throne (Frahm 2005: 47). When depicted as the crown prince on Dūr-Šarrukīn reliefs, he is always shown with the beard. Thus, it is hardly possible that the present seal depicts Sargon, his queen and Sennacherib.

Bibliography

- AL-GAILANI WERR L. 2008 “Nimrud Seals,” in J. E. Curtis, H. McCall, D. Collon, and L. al-Gailani Werr (eds.) *New light on Nimrud: Proceedings of the Nimrud Conference 11th-13th March 2002*, London, pp. 155–162.
- BÖRKER-KLAHN J. 1982 *Alt Vorderasiatische Bildstelen und vergleichbare Felsreliefs*, BaF 4, Mainz am Rhein.
- COLLON D. 2001 *Catalogue of the Western Asiatic Seals in the British Museum. Cylinder seals V: Neo-Assyrian and Neo-Babylonian Periods*. London.
- DAMERJI M. S. 2008 “An Introduction to the Nimrud Tombs,” J. E. Curtis, H. McCall, D. Collon, and L. al-Gailani Werr (eds.) *New light on Nimrud: Proceedings of the Nimrud Conference 11th-13th March 2002*, London, pp. 81–82.
- FRAHM E. 2005 “Observations on the Name and Age of Sargon II and on Some Patterns of Assyrian Onomastics,” *NABU* 2005/44, 46–50.
- MAY N. N. 2012 “^mAli-talīmu, or What Can Be Learned from the Destruction of Figurative Complexes?” in N. N. May (ed.) *Iconoclasm and Text Destruction in the Ancient Near East and Beyond*. OIS 8. Chicago, pp. 183–230.
- MAY N. N. 2018 “Neo-Assyrian Women, their Visibility and Representation in Written and Pictorial Sources”. In A. Garcia-Ventura/S. Svärd (eds.), *Gender, Methodology and the Ancient Near East*. University Park, pp. 249–288.
- MOORTGAT A. 1940 *Vorderasiatische Rollsiegel: ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Steinschneidekunst*. Berlin.
- PARPOLA S. 2012 “The Neo-Assyrian Royal Harem,” in G. Lanfranchi, D. Bonacossi, C. Pappi, and S. Ponchia (eds.) *Leggo! Studies Presented to Frederick Mario Fales on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday*, LAOS 2. Wiesbaden, pp. 613–626.
- RADNER K. 2008 “The Delegation of Power: Neo-Assyrian Bureau Seals,” in P. Briant, W. Henkelman, and M. Stolper (eds.) *L'Archive des Fortifications de Persépolis: État des questions et perspectives de recherches*, Persika 12. Paris, pp. 481–515.
- READE J. E. 2009 “Faz, Diadem, Turban, Chaplet: Power-Dressing at the Assyrian Court,” in M. Luukko, S. Svärd, and R. Mattila (eds.) *Of God(s), Trees, Kings, and Scholars: Neo-Assyrian and Related Studies in Honour of Simo Parpola*, StOr 106. Helsinki, pp. 239–64.

Natalie Naomi MAY <n.may@hum.leidenuniv.nl>
Leiden (THE NETHERLANDS)

31) The Royal Assyrian Rosette — Studies on the ancient Near Eastern ornamental rosette motif have been made. The present communication expands on these studies by highlighting a selection of the Assyrian rosette as image and its context. The rosette is assumed to derive from a floral plant, a ‘daisy-like’ flower of the Asteraceae family. An Assyrian rendering of a similar flower is among the flora in the garden scene depicted on a wall relief from Room E of the North Palace of Ashurbanipal at Nineveh (Barnett 1976: pl. 15). Furthermore, daisies do occur among the fragmentary ‘painted’ bricks discovered at Khorsabad (Albenda 1986: pls. 150-151), dated to the reign of Sargon II. These examples show the petals of white and yellow flowers surrounding a central disc in yellow and white, respectively. Among the rosettes represented on Assyrian artifacts, one version close to an actual daisy is the large cluster of petaled flowers that adorns the gold crown discovered in the coffin of an 8th century BCE Assyrian queen at Nimrud (Oates 2001: 86, pl. 4a; Gansell 2016: 58, fig. 8).

Early on, ancient Near Eastern and Egyptian rosettes showed four, six, or eight petals (corolla) surrounding a central disc. Further versions of the rosette with twelve or more petals occurred during the Middle Assyrian and Neo-Assyrian periods. At times the rosette is found in artworks and objects that in some way relate to the religious or royal sphere. In these instances, depending upon its application in the visual and plastic arts and its mention in the ancient texts, the rosette has been interpreted as a symbol of the goddess Ishtar, or as an emblem of Assyrian kingship or Assyrian royalty. Turning to the Middle Assyrian period, a rosette composed of thirteen short petals with rounded end surrounding a ring-and-dot center decorates the upper corners of one side of a carved stone pedestal belonging to the Assyrian king, Tukulti-Ninurta I (Andrae 1977: fig. 136). On the same surface is the double image of the king as worshiper before a symbol set upon on a pedestal. Here one may consider the notion of a linkage between the cultic scene and rosette, although the latter does serve as a decorative space filler.

Mention may be made of two small fragmentary baked plaques with relief decoration that were found at Diqdiqqeh, an unstratified site a short distance from Ur (Woolley 1965: 92-93, pl. 31, nos. 24-25). They are attributed to the late second millennium Kassite period. Each plaque shows the frontal view of a draped female wearing a tall battlemented headdress and holding a vessel in each hand. Large eight-petaled rosettes fill the space behind one female standing in a rectangular niche, and similar rosettes rest on the chest and shoulders of the other female. Both females are identified as representing the same goddess. Although the plaques are crudely worked, the repetitive rosettes on these objects may reference a fabric pattern. An example is the pattern of rosettes that decorates the upper garment of the healing goddess Gula (Ornan 2004: 18, fig.12) who is represented on a Kassite *kudurru* found at Sippar and presently housed in the British Museum (BM 90858).

A much later version of a goddess-with-rosette occurs on a bas-relief of the Assyrian king, Tiglath-Pileser III, on which is shown the deporting of four statues of deities by Assyrian soldiers (Barnett and Falkner 1962: 29-30, pls. 42-43). Of the three goddesses represented, two are seated on a high back chair, one in profile and holding a large ring in each hand, and the other with frontal face and holding a ring and a plant (?). The large rosette on top of their respective horned headdress seem to indicate their identities; however, as they were taken from a foreign territory, Barnett suggests Media rather than Babylonia as the place of origin for the seizing of the statues. The subject of a female with a hand-held ring is illustrated among wall reliefs from the Northwest Palace of Ashurnasirpal II at Nimrud. Three extant depictions of female genii with two or four wings hold a large beaded ring in their lowered left hand (Albenda 1996: figs. 1-4). Rosette discs are among the decorated pendants of their respective necklaces. On other wall reliefs of the same king are represented refined renderings of the traditional rosette that decorate bracelets and headbands worn by various human figures (Barnett and Lorenzini 1975: pls. 1, 9, 11, 12) (Fig. 1). A similar rosette appears on the tasseled side-ornament of the visible Assyrian king's chariot horse, depicted on an extant relief presently housed in the British Museum (BM 124534).



Fig. 1. Detail: British Museum 124567 © The Trustees of the British Museum



Fig. 2. Detail: Musée du Louvre AO 19917 © Musée du Louvre



Fig. 3. Detail: British Museum 124867 © The Trustees of the British Museum

Another version of the rosette was utilized by two Assyrian kings, Tiglath-Pileser III and Sargon II. The motif may be described as a double or layered rosette; that is, the addition of small florets surrounding the disc in the center of the flower. This rosette seems to have been favored by Sargon II, especially for wristband decoration. The same rosette motif also occurs on the headbands worn by wingless male genii depicted on the reliefs of both kings (Barnett and Falkner 1962: 33, pl. 54; Albenda 1986: 164, fig. 21) (Fig. 2). Similar rosettes also decorate horse cheek straps (Barnett and Lorenzini 1975: pl. 61). Comparable to the relief versions are the small clay bracteates shaped as double rosettes that were discovered in a burial at Ashur (Haller 1954: 110, pl. 23a). These rosettes were probably intended for clothing attachment, since such purposes are described in the texts (Oppenheim 1949: 173-174) and exemplified by the rosettes carved in relief on the dress of the fragmentary stone sculpture of a goddess from Carchemish (Woolley and Barnett

1952: 240, pl. B.64a-c). It may be noted that modern day daisies of the layered variety are grown, and one may surmise that a related flower-type was likewise cultivated in the Assyrian royal garden.

On the lion-hunt bas-reliefs in Room C of the North Palace at Nineveh, the image of king Ashurbanipal is displayed several times standing in his chariot and wearing a lavishly patterned costume (Barnett 1976: pls. 8, 10-11, 12). In addition, exceptional rosette discs decorate his tall headdress (Fig. 3). These rosettes disclose the attention that was given to details of a living flower of the Asteraceae family. For example, there is the subtle curved outline of the individual petals, and within each is the line of a ligule. Furthermore, included in the central disc is a ring of dots that likely represent disc flowers (anther tubes). Of interest, the Room C rosette does not seem to recur elsewhere among the contemporary palace reliefs, suggesting that this rosette was designed solely for Ashurbanipal.

As evidenced by the visual arts, the assumption accepted here is that the standard rosette motif in Assyria originated from a natural flower. In brief, the rosette as symbol was associated with a goddess; however, in the Neo-Assyrian period the rosette as image of a daisy variety was a royal choice.

References

- ALBENDA, P. 1986. *The Palace of Sargon, King of Assyria*. Paris.
 — 1996. “The Beardless Winged Genies from the Northwest Palace at Nimrud”, *SAAB* 10: 67-78.
 ANDRAE, W. 1977. *Das wiedererstandene Assur*. (rev. ed.). Munich.
 BARNETT, R. D. 1976. *Sculptures from the North Palace of Ashurbanipal at Nineveh (668-627 B.C.)*. London.
 BARNETT and FALKNER, M. 1962. *The Sculptures of Assur-nasir-apli II (883-859 B.C.), Tiglath-Pileser III (745-727 B.C.), Esarhaddon (681-669 B.C.), from the Central and South-West Palaces at Nimrud*. London.
 BARNETT, R. D. and LORENZINI, A. 1975. *Assyrian Sculpture in the British Museum*. Toronto.
 GANSELL, A. R. 2016. “Imperial Fashion Networks: Royal Assyrian, Pan-Near Eastern, Intercultural and Composite Style Adornment from the Neo-Assyrian Women’s Tombs at Nimrud”. Pp. 54-64 in ed., J. Aruz et al, *Assyria to Iberia. Art and Culture in the Iron Age*. New York.
 HALLER, A. 1954. *Die Gräber und Gräfte von Assur*. Berlin.
 OATES, J. and D. 2001. *Nimrud. An Assyrian City Revealed*. London.
 OPPENHEIM A. L. 1949. “The Golden Garments of the Gods”, *JNES* 8: 172-193.
 ORNAN, T. 2004. “The Goddess Gula and Her Dog”, *Israel Museum of Archaeology* 1: 13-30.
 WOOLLEY, L. 1965. *The Kassite Period and the Kings of Assyria*. London.
 WOOLLEY, L. and BARNETT, R. D. 1952. *Carchemish. Report on the Excavations at Jerablus on Behalf of the British Museum, Part III*. London.

Pauline ALBENDA <palbenda@msn.com>

32) New Data on the Neo-Babylonian Ḫarrān-Kiš and the collation of BE 8, 113* — Eleven texts mentioning Ḫarrān-Kiš were listed by Zadok in RGTC 8 (1985: 153). It is now possible, however, to add four new tablets and correct two of the previously known records. Among the latter is BE 8, 113 for which collation is presented later in the text.

The updated list of the Neo-Babylonian legal documents mentioning Ḫarrān-Kiš consists of 16 tablets. Nine texts were written in Ḫarrān-Kiš: BE 8, 113; *Camb.* 55;¹⁾ *Dar.* 38; *Dar.* 226; *Dar.* 304; *Dar.* 377; *Dar.* 419; *Nbn.* 916; VS 5, 33. Additionally, seven texts mention this settlement in various contexts: Abraham 2004, No. 73; BaAr 4, 7; BE 8, 105; *Nbn.* 1098;²⁾ Wunsch 2000, No. 34; Wunsch 2000, No. 39; Wunsch 2000, No. 233. The earliest reference to Ḫarrān-Kiš is 13-XIIb-3 Nbn (Wunsch 2000, No. 34) and the latest is 25-VI-19 DarI (BE 8, 113). New or corrected attestations are as follows:

- kaskal.2-kiš.ki: BaAr 4, 7: 8; BE 8, 113: r.5’ (uru.kiš.ki in Zadok 1985: 201); *Nbn.* 1098: 3 (kaskal-kiš.ki in Zadok 1985: 153);²⁾ VS 5, 33: 19; Wunsch 2000, No. 233: 2
- [kaskal.2]-kiš.ki: Abraham 2004, No. 73: 9

Archival attributions of tablets mentioning Ḫarrān-Kiš are listed below.

- the (Ea-)ēpeš-ilī A archive from Babylon: BE 8, 113; *Camb.* 55; *Dar.* 38; *Dar.* 226; *Dar.* 304; *Dar.* 377; *Dar.* 419; *Nbn.* 1098
- the Ebabbar archive from Sippar: BaAr 4, 7

- the Egibi archive from Babylon: Abraham 2004, No. 73; *Nbn.* 916; Wunsch 2000, No. 34; Wunsch 2000, No. 39; Wunsch 2000, No. 233
- the Gaḥal archive from Babylon: BE 8, 105
- the Sîn-ilī archive from Babylon: VS 5, 33

Edition and collation of BE 8, 113³⁾

- obv. 1. 15 gur zú.lum.ma zag.lu buru₁₄ a.šà 2-^rta¹ ká.meš
 2. šá^{md}en-tin-ⁱt dumu šá^{md}amar.utu-mu-dù dumu^{md}dù-eš-dingir
 3. u^{md}amar.utu-pap dumu šá^{md}ag-mu-mu dumu^{md}dù-eš-dingir ina muḫ-^{hi}
 4. ^{md}30-dù dumu šá^{md}ba-di-il dumu^{md}si-^{tu}-^rkan¹
 5. ina iti.apin zú.lum.ma-a₄ 15¹ (tablet: 14) ^rgur^{*1} [gam-ru-tu]
 6. [ina ḫa]-^rša^{*-ri}*¹ ina ma-ši-^{ḫu} šá 1 pi ^rina¹ [muḫ-^{hi}]
 7. [1-et rit-ti] ^ri-nam-din¹
 (remainder of obv. lost)
 (beginning of rev. lost)
- rev. 1'. [...] ^rx x x x¹ [...]
 2'. ^rta-at¹-tan-nu dumu šá^{md}id-di-[ia]
 3'. ^m (remainder of the line blank)
 4'. ^mre-mut-^rag¹ lú.umbisag dumu šá^{md}ag-sur
 5'. dumu^mzálag-dingir-^{šú} ^rkaskal^{*1.2}-kiš.ki iti.kin
 6'. ud.25.kam mu.19.kam
 7'. ^mda-a-ri-^{iá}-mu-uš lugal e.ki
 u.e. 8'. lugal kur.kur

Translation

1-7 15 *kurru* of dates, impost on the harvest, two items, are owed by Sîn-ibni, son of ^mBa-di-il, descendant of ^mSi-tu-kan, to Bēl-uballit, son of Marduk-šumu-ibni, descendant of Epeš-ilī, and Marduk-nāšir, son of Nabû-šumu-iddin, descendant of Epeš-ilī. He will deliver 15 *kurru* of dates, [the entire amount], in the month of *araḫsammu*, [in the sto]rehouse, in the *mašīḫu*-measure of 1 *pānu*, a[ll at once]. [...]

[Witnesses:...]]

r.1' [...]... [...]

r.2' Tattannu, son of Iddia;

r.3' (blank line with a single male name determinative at the beginning)

r.4'-5a' Rēmūt-Nabû, the scribe, son of Nabû-ēṭir, descendant of Nūr-ilīšu.

r.5b'-8' Ḫarrān-Kiš, the month of *ulūlu*, 25th day, 19th year of Darius, king of Babylon, king of the lands.

Notes

4: for the reading of the names ^mBa-di-il and ^mSi-tu-kan see Zadok 2003: 485, cf. also Mādu-ilī and ^mx-tu-^rURU²⁾ respectively in the Prosobab⁴⁾

5: 15 *kurru* is the expected amount but the tablet clearly has 14

r.3': single male name determinative was written at the beginning of the line but the scribe left rest of it unscribed; it seems that he simply hurried up with the determinative while composing the witness list and in fact did not intend to put there another name

r.5': for the reading of the family name Nūr-ilīšu see Wunsch 2014: 307 n. 59; for the localisation of Ḫarrān-Kiš on the Nār-Bānītu—canal flowing near Babylon towards Kiš—see Zadok 1985: 153; for the attestations of Nār-Bānītu see Zadok 1985: 366–367 and Ermidoro 2016: 150–151; note that already Langdon (1924: 21) remarked that this document was written in Ḫarrān-Kiš


Collation of BE 8, 113 (CBS 535)



Line 5: ina iti.apin zú.lum.ma-a₄
 15¹ (tablet: 14) ^rgur^{*1} [gam-ru-tu]



Line 6: [ina ḫa]-^rša^{*-ri}*¹ ina ma-ši-^{ḫu}
 šá 1 pi ^rina¹ [1-et rit-ti]



Line r.5': dumu ^mzálag-dingir-^{šú}
^rkaskal^{*1.2}-kiš.ki iti.kin

Notes

* I would like to thank Michael Jursa and Witold Tyborowski for reading and improving the draft of this note. Needless to say, any mistakes remaining are my own responsibility.

1. Its place of issue is “^{id}-^ddù-tu₄ šá kaskal(-)kiš.ki.” Here it is not certain whether “Nār-Bānītu on the road to Kiš” or “Nār-Bānītu of Ḫarrān-Kiš” was meant. Zadok 1985: 153 chose the latter. Note also text *Camb.* 56 from the

same archive which was written on the very same day as *Camb.* 55 and shares the same man obliged to pay *imittu* and the first two witnesses. Its place of issue is given simply as “Nār-Bānītu.” Additionally, we can mention BaAr 4, 7 where *imittu* is to be paid “*ina kaskal.2-kiš.ki ina muḫ-ḫi id.*” Was this unnamed canal also the Nār-Bānītu? Finally, the “road to Kiš”—not to be confused with the settlement of Ḫarrān-Kiš—is mentioned explicitly in SAA 18, 67 (=CT 54, 324): “*kaskal.2 a-na kiš.[ki]*,” but sadly in a broken context.

2. The copy of *Nbn.* 1098 does not contain the endings of lines 2–4 which are present in the transcription of this text in Kohler and Peiser 1891: 14 (84-2-11, 69= BM 77335). Line 3 ends with “*kaskal.2-kiš¹.[ki]*”—a reading proved by collation of the tablet in May 2019. Strassmaier’s copy lacks this fragment because these endings are all inscribed on a single flake which was glued to the tablet after he finished his copy. Note, however, that it is not considered to be a join.

3. Collation based on the photo available in the CDLI: <https://cdli.ucla.edu/P257985>. [Accessed 10.02.2020].

4. <https://prosobab.leidenuniv.nl/attestation/36700>. [Accessed: 10.02.2020].

Bibliography

Abbreviations follow the CDLI Abbreviations for Assyriology

http://cdli.ox.ac.uk/wiki/abbreviations_for_assyriology [Accessed: 10.02.2020].

ABRAHAM, K. 2004: *Business and Politics under the Persian Empire: The Financial Dealings of Marduk-nāsir-apli of the House of Egibi (521–487 B.C.E.)*, Bethesda.

ERMIDORO, S. 2016: “New Data on the Babylonian Hydraulic Landscape: An Update to the *Répertoire Géographique des Textes Cunéiformes* Vol. 8,” *Kaskal* 13, 135–174.

KOHLER J. and F. E. PEISER 1891: *Aus dem Babylonischen Rechtsleben* 2, Leipzig.

LANGDON, S. 1924: *Excavations at Kish I*, Paris.

WUNSCH, C. 2000: *Das Egibi-Archiv I. Die Felder und Gärten* (CM 20), Groningen.

WUNSCH, C. 2014: “Babylonische Familiennamen,” in: M. Krebernik and H. Neumann (eds.), *Babylonien und seine Nachbarn. Wissenschaftliches Kolloquium aus Anlass des 75. Geburtstages von Joachim Oelsner, Jena, 2. und 3. März 2007* (AOAT 369), Münster, 289–314.

ZADOK, R. 1985: *Geographical Names According to New- and Late-Babylonian Texts* (RGTC 8), Wiesbaden.

ZADOK, R. 2003: “The Representation of Foreigners in Neo- and Late-Babylonian Legal Documents (Eighth through Second Centuries B.C.E.),” in: O. Lipschits and J. Blenkinsopp (eds.), *Judah and the Judeans in the Neo-Babylonian Period*, Winona Lake, 471–589.

Internet resources

CDLI (Cuneiform Digital Library Initiative): <https://cdli.ucla.edu> [Accessed: 10.02.2020].

PROSOBAB: C. Waerzeggers, M. Groß, et al., *Prosobab: Prosopography of Babylonia (c. 620-330 BCE)* (Leiden University, 2019), available at <https://prosobab.leidenuniv.nl>. [Accessed: 10.02.2020].

Stanisław CHMIEŁOWSKI <stanislaw.chmielowski@amu.edu.pl>

Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznań (POLAND)

33) A New Attestation of Baga-pānu, the assumed governor of Babylonia — BM 38453 published here deserves attention because it is an addition to the texts that mention Baga-pānu, although this time indirectly, as it concerns the activity of certain Bēl-silim, a person dependent on Baga-pānu, presumably his official. Baga-pānu is mentioned in a few texts,¹⁾ while in two he holds the title of governor of Babylon.²⁾ Most recently BM 47423 was published by M. Sandowicz,³⁾ and although Baga-pānu is not named governor, this supports his high position as it shows him as person higher in status than the governor of Dilbat and the local authorities of the Eimbianu temple of Uraš. The local body of *mār banê* working under the supervision of Mušēzib-Marduk, the šangû of the Eimbianu temple in Dilbat made the decision to release Bēl-iddin from the custody in the city in accordance with the desire of Baga-pānu delivered to them by Ubār, father of Bēl-iddin, acting as the messenger of Baga-pānu. BM 47423 shows clearly that Baga-pānu’s authority extended beyond Babylon.

BM 38453 concerns the hire of a boat by Bēl-silim, official of Baga-pānu, from Iddin-Amurru beginning from 10th day of Šabaṭu of an unknown year. The parties agreed that Bēl-silim will pay the rent and give back the boat to Iddin-Amurru in the capital city. This is important because it suggests that Bēl-silim, a person from entourage of Baga-pānu, lived in the capital like his master. Presumably the text was written in Babylon in the time of Darius I, although it did not resolve the question of Baga-pānu’s position in the administrative structure of Persian empire. From both the new documents BM 47423 and BM 38453

two conclusions seem certain, i.e. that Baga-pānu exercised his power from Babylon, and that he extended it outside the district of Babylon, at least over north and central Babylonia, at least in the period between 503/2 and 494/3 BC (see note 2), although nothing speaks for his position of governor of large satrap of Babylon and Across-the-river (Ēbir-nāri) for already in 502 BC this position was held by Tattannu; i.e. Baga-pānu must have held an inferior position.⁴⁾

BM 38453 (80-11-12, 336)⁵⁾

5.5 x 3.7 cm

Obv. 1'. [...] 'x¹ [...]

2'. [x x-n]a^{lú}r^{x1} [...] giš.má šá]

3'. [m]mu-^dkur.gal a-n[a x iti.meš a-na x ma-na]

4'. ½ gín kù.babbar a-na^{md}en-si-lim l^ú [...]

5'. ^mba-ga-pa-nu id-din ul-tu u₄.10.ka[m]

6'. šá iti.zíz giš.má ina igi-šú giš.má u i-di

7'. ina e^{ki} i-nam-din 2 gín kù.babbar ina i-di

8'. giš.má-šú^mmu-^dkur.gal ina šu_{ii}

9'. ^{md}en-si-lim ma-^{hi}ir 1^{en} u₄-mu

Edge 10'. ^mmu-^dkur.gal ana mu^h-^{hi}

11'. ^{md}en-si-lim ul i-man-nu

Rev. 12'. ^{lú}mu-kin-nu^mni-din-tu₄

13'. a-šú šá^{md}amar-utu-ri-man-ni

14'. ^mid-di-ia a-šú šá^mdù-ia

One blank line

15'. 'x x x x¹ [...]

Rest lost

[...the boat, which] Iddin-Amurru rented to Bēl-silim, [the ...] of Baga-pānu f[or x month(s) for x mina](s) (and) half shekels of silver.



From 10th day of Šabaṭu, the boat is in his (Bēl-silim)'s disposal. He (Bēl-silim) will give the boat and a wage (for the boat) in the city of Babylon. 2 shekels of silver as wage for his boat Iddin-Amurru has received from Bēl-silim. One/First day Iddin-Amurru will not count to Bēl-silim.

Witnesses:

Nidintu, son of Marduk-rēmanni

Iddiya, son of Bāniya

...



Notes

Ll. 9-11'. The expression 1^{en} u₄-mu PN1 ana mu^h-^{hi}/PN2 ul i-man-nu has no parallel in texts known to me; the translation is literal, and its sense not fully certain.

L. 14. For the spelling ^mdù-ia as Bāniya, see Thissen 2014, 150f.

Notes

1. Tavernier 2007, 137 and Zadok 2009, 135, 138, see also MacGinnis 2008, 87-94.

2. Stigers 1976, no. 22 dated to 19th year of Darius I (503/2 BC) and Zadok 2002, 585-86 (BM 85223: 30; date broken, but years 27th and 28th (of Darius I, i.e. 495/4 and 494/3) are mentioned (l. 16).

3. Sandowicz 2019, no. 45.

4. See the list of Governor of Babylon and Across-the River, "Governor of Babylon" and "(district governor)", in Stolper 1989, 290.

5. The tablet is published with the kind permission of the Trustees of the British Museum.

Bibliography

- MACGINNIS, J., A Judgement of Darius the King, JCS 60, 2008, 87-99.
 SANDOWICZ, M., Neo-Babylonian Dispute Documents in the British Museum, Münster 2019.
 STIGERS, H.G., Neo- and Late-Babylonian Business Documents from the John Frederick Lewis Collection, JCS 28, 1976, 3-59.
 STOLPER, M. W., The Governor of Babylon and Across-the-River, JNES 48, 1989, 283-305.
 TAVERNIER, J., *Iranica in the Achaemenid Period (ca. 550-330 B.C.)*, Leuven-Paris-Dudley, MA 2007.
 THISSEN, C., Studies in Neo-Babylonian Onomastics: the Use of the Sign DÜ, Akkadica 135, 2004, 145-171.
 ZADOK, R., Contributions to Babylonian Geography, Prosopography and Documentation, in: O. Loretz, K. A. Metzler and H. Schaudig, *Ex Mesopotamia et Syria Lux, Festschrift für Manfred Dietrich*, AOAT 281, Münster 2002, 871-897.
 ZADOK, R., *Iranisches Personennamenbuch*, Bd. VII *Iranische Namen in Semitischen Nebenüberlieferungen*, Faszikel B: Iranische Personennamen in der Neu- und Spätbabylonischen Nebenüberlieferung, Wien 2009.

Stefan ZAWADZKI (Poznań) <stefanzawadzki@wp.pl>
 ul. Szeherezady 21 60-195 Poznań (POLAND)

34) Erratum to S. Zawadzki, *The Rental of Houses in the Neo-Babylonian Period* — Due to various causes, some errors have appeared in this book. I would like to list them below.

- p. 76, note 247, delete the first sentence.
 p. 78, n. 255, delete “Sūqaya” at the very end of the note.
 p. 92, no 317, instead 3 ½ should be ½ *ma-na*.
 p. 127, Innin-mukîn-apli (two times), change to Innin-ālik-pāni.
 p. 155, l. 12' should be *i]-di é* (é without cursive).
 p. 165, note to l. 10, should be “The níg looks like pad.”
 p. 184, ll. 16-18: 2 gín, 2 gín 1 gín belong to the second column (presented properly in translation).
 p. 188, copy of rev. 2'. The sign *mi* in *mi-šil* is miscopied.
 p. 194, third line from the top, should be: “2 shekels the house of Iqīša, son of Bēl-kēšir, the carpenter”.
 p. 208, l. 1 of transliteration: instead of ^{lú}erín.meš šá é.meš *ina šá ina* 'x' should be ^{lú}erín.meš šá *ina é.meš šá ina* 'x'.
 p. 210, l. 7 should be 1 ½ gín (not 2 ½ gín). Change also in translation on p. 211 to 31 ½.
 p. 220, in translation, the dividing line should be after l. 2.
 p. 226, l. 1, should be 1 gu₄ and in translation “1 bull, two-year old.”
 p. 256, translation of ll. 20-23: instead of “total 2 kur.ra-garments... and 3 jerkins.” should be “total 2 kur.ra-garments and 2 jerkins”.
 p. 269. Copy is correct. Change in translation:
 l. 13, instead of ^mna-ba-a-na-a should be ^mba-na-a-a.
 l. 17, in ^mna-ba-a-na, delete na, and change in translation instead “Dabibi” should be “Nabaya.”
 p. 280, l. 5, change 1/3 *ma-na* to ½ *ma-na*.
 p. 295, delete last *ú**.
 p. 310, 7.1. Index of Texts. Delete in the explanation note “fat number means that the copy is published.”
 p. 320 (under Iddinaya/Erība-Marduk//Šangû-Nabû) BM 77626: 3 change to Iddinaya/Erība-E[a]//Āšipu-Nabû BM 77625+, no. 120: 3.
 p. 329 (under Kidin-Sîn) instead of “S 5, 67:4” should be VS 5, 67 no. 119: 14.
 p. 330 (under Šangû-Nabû) change to Āšipu-Nabû and BM 77626: 3 to 77625+, no. 120: 3. For interpretation of Dar 275, see the next note.

Stefan ZAWADZKI <stefanzawadzki@wp.pl>

35) The date of death of Itti-Marduk-balātu of the Egibi family* — The large number of documents in the archive of the Egibi family may lead to the conclusion that at least the basic data about the head of each generation (especially concerning the beginning and end of their activity, i.e. their death), are already well known. Therefore, I was greatly surprised when I noted that the death date for Itti-Marduk-balaātu, head of the third generation, is uncertain and that one document has been omitted in the discussion.

Let me present a few opinions on this subject:

“Itti-Marduk-balātu [IMB] führte die Geschäfte in den dritten Generation bis **zum Ende von Cambyses’** (529-522) Regierung, ihm folgte Marduk-nāšir-apli [MNA] zur Zeit Darius (521-486)” (Wunsch 1999, 349).

“Als IMB relative früh und wohl recht unerwartet im **Jahr 8 Cam starb**, trat sein älterer Sohn Marduk-nāšir-apli als Oberhaupt der vierten Generation sein Nachfolge an” (Wunsch 2000, 15).

“When his [MNA] father [i.e. IMB] suddenly died in 522/521 (= 8 Camb) (...) MNA assumed control over family business” (Abraham 2004, 14; evidently influenced by Wunsch 2000).

The next opinion is less precise, but shifts the death of IMB by at least ten months:¹⁾

“He [IMB] seems to have died suddenly **at the beginning of Darius reign...**” (Wunsch 2007, 233).

As we see the opinion of Cornelia Wunsch is that IMB died in the eight year of Cambyses (522 BC) and that family business was taken over by MNA at the beginning of Darius’ reign. The beginning of Darius’ reign may be understood either as his Accession Year (522/21 BC) or his first year (521/20 BC). However, as the last document mentioning Cambyses is Cam 409, dated to the 23rd day of Nisannu, and IMB is mentioned in a few documents of Nebuchadnezzar III from Babylon,²⁾ it is certain that IMB lived a few months longer than Cambyses, at least till the month Tašrītu 552/1 BC (Nbk 10). The basis for prolonging the life of IMB “to the beginning of Darius reign” is not explained by Wunsch.

In this context the document Dar 275, dated to the 18th day of the **tenth year** of Darius, needs to be mentioned and discussed.³⁾ According to it in that year IMB, son of Nabû-aḥḫē-iddin, acting by his proxy, Šamaš-iddin, his slave, rented his house (located in *mūtaq ša-Nergal-ša-ḫadē* in Kašir, the district of Babylon, and near other houses of IMB) to Ša-Bēl-bani, slave of Nidintu, son of Iddiya, for 2 qū of bread daily. No typical obligations are mentioned, but it is said that the tenant *maššartu ša sūti inaššar*, i.e. that the tenant will take care of the *sūtu*. I do not know any other text in which the term *sūtu* is used instead of *idu* in any house rental text, and the sense of this obligation is therefore unclear.

The tenth year of Darius date for this transaction is evidently wrong, as there is no doubt that IMB had already been dead for about ten years. For this reason in my *Rental of Houses*, p. 36, I suggested dating the text to the first year of Darius, but, while writing chapter 2.2.10 a few months later, I dated it –following Strassmaier’s copy– to the tenth year (pp. 76, 85). Then, during my short stay in the British Museum in November 2019, I collated the tablet to resolve my doubts. To my surprise Strassmaier’s copy of the year number is accurate and it is beyond doubt that the tablet is dated to the tenth year. Since –as is remarked above– there is no doubt that IMB had been dead from about ten years, the question is raised how to explain the dating in Dar 275. At least two different possibilities have to be taken into account:

1. The scribe who wrote the document mistakenly dated it to tenth year while it was written in fact in the first year. Although such a possibility cannot be excluded, the second alternative seems more probable to me, that
2. Dar 275 is not an original document, but a later copy, written in or after the tenth year and the copyist misread one vertical wedge as a Winkelhaken *u* (10) given that the vertical wedge (*diš*) is sometimes slanting.⁴⁾
3. I took also into account the third possibility that the slaves were still named according to the dead owner until the division of inheritance between IMB’s sons in the fourteenth year of Darius (Dar 379). This explanation, however, is not acceptable as can be demonstrated by the case of Madānu-bēl-ušur.⁵⁾ He was first slave of Iddin-Marduk, son of Iqīša, descendant of Nūr-Sin, i.e. father-in-law of IMB. In the fourth year of Cambyses he is described as slave of IMB, i.e. Iddin-Marduk had sold Madānu-bēl-ušur to IMB after the twenty-fourth day of Šabaṭu, third year when he is still slave of Iddin-Marduk (Cam 218) and before the tenth day of Tebētu, fourth year of Cambyses, by which time he is already slave of IMB (Cam 257). Madānu-bēl-ušur occurs as slave of IMB until the eighth year of Cambyses (Cam 409), but in Dar 177 (written in the fifth year of Darius), although he is not named slave of MNA, he is active under his supervision. Also later, although Madānu-bēl-ušur fulfilled the orders of MNA, he is not called slave.⁶⁾ This speaks against the idea that document in question was written in the tenth year of Darius.

It seems to me that the best explanation is that Dar 275 is really a later copy by an apprentice scribe who made a number of errors:

L. 1. The first sign in the name of NAI, father of IMB, was written badly as ^{md}en, but next the scribe added two short horizontal wedges such as are typical for the sign *ag* (the wedges are perfectly copied by Strassmaier). The reading *ag* is certain because at the beginning of the second line we must read [a ^{me}-gi-b]i since the partly preserved sign is not 30

(as suggested by Strassmaier's copy and accepted by Joannès in <http://www.achemenet.com/en/item/?textual-sources/texts-by-regions/babylonia/babylon/1658177-regions/>), but rather [b]i (one *u* sign and below only part of one slanting line (rest of the second *u*)).

2. The second part of line 5 and whole of line 6 were intentionally erased although they are still visible, and were copied perfectly by Strassmaier, who, however, did not count line 6 in his numbering of lines. This is the right decision as the erased lines repeat what was written above and are unnecessary.

3. In line 11 there is *é ina igi-šú-nu* but there is only one tenant involved, i.e. it should be *é ina igi-šú*; cf. *id-din* at the end of line 9.

4. The scribe made error(s) in the name in line 18 and it is not clear what he wanted to write. Joannès in his transliteration in www.achemenet.com suggests reading ^mmu-*lib*¹²-šī (*ina igi šā*), but he is right that the second sign is hardly *lib* (it looks like *lu*) and there are three unnecessary characters.

5. In the last line the scribe repeated *lugal tin.tir^{ki} lugal tin.tir^{ki}* instead of writing either *lugal tin.tir^{ki} lugal kur.kur* or *lugal kur.kur.meš*.

The errors, some very simple, make it very probable that the tablet is a copy by a young scribe, who copied *dīš* (1) as *u* (10). Given that neither Šamaš-iddin,⁷ slave of IMB acting as his proxy, nor the tenant Bēl-bāni, slave of Iddiya, Iddin-Nabû, the scribe, son of Arad-Bēl of the Marduku family occurs – according to the best of my knowledge – in any other document, the argument presented above is the only plausible way of dating the tablet. If this interpretation is acceptable it leads to the conclusion that IMB was still alive on eighteenth day of Ulûlu, the first year of Darius.

There is however, another, earlier document Dar 15 (BM 41447), dated to an unknown day of month Simānu, first year of Darius. According to lines 1-6 MNA borrowed 5 minas of silver from a certain Nabû-mukin-zēri (father's and family names broken off) promising to give back silver in month Aiaru, obviously next year. Important are, however, lines 7-10, suggesting that the debt of IMB is now paid (or to be paid) by MNA:

⁷*ri-il-tu₄ ú-il-ti šā 10⁷ [ma²-na² kù.babbar]* ⁸*x x x x¹ šā^{md}ag-d[u-numun]*

⁹*šā ina muḫ-ḫi^{mk}i^damar.utu-[tin]* ¹⁰*ina šuⁱⁱamar.utu-na-šir-[ibila...]*

“The remaining debt of 10⁷ [minas? of silver] ⁸*x x x x¹* belonging to Nabû-mu[kin-zēri], owed by IMB, [will be/was received?] from MNA.”⁸

The quoted fragment suggests that IMB was already dead and that his son MNA promised to regulate the debt. It might have been concluded that at that time, i.e. Simānu (III) first year of Darius, IMB was already dead, which contradicts the proposed date of his death in Ulûlu (VI) this year. However, there are serious doubt on the reading of the month and the year in this tablet as, according to collation by Jürgen Lorenz,⁹ is “das von Strassmaier kopierte Zeichen SIG₄ bei der Schreibung des Monatsnamens möglich. Allerdings ist davon heute kaum mehr als ein Winkelhaken erhalten. Obwohl 1 die wahrscheinliche Lesung für die Jahreszahl ist, konnte sie auch höher gewesen sein.”¹⁰ In light of Jürgen Lorenz' observation it is more probable that Dar 15 was written later, probably in the second year of Darius.¹¹

The first text which might be interpreted as written after the death of IMB is Dar 26 = CM 20B, no. 177 dated to the eighth day of Addaru, first year of Darius. It concerns the purchase of a palm garden outside the city wall and an unbuilt place (*kišubbû*) in Litamu, in the province of Babylon, by MNA from Kalbā, son of Šillā of the Nabaya family for the large sum of 8 ½ minas of silver. In lines 30-31 the following remark occurs:

mimma ina kaspi rašātu ša IMB abi ša MNA ina šīmi eqli šuāti ul manā,

“None of the silver owed to IMB, the father of MNA, is counted in the price of that field.”¹²

It follows from this statement that MNA paid for the purchased plot(s) using his own silver, despite the fact that Kalbā owed some sum to IMB. It seems to me that the declaration was added on request of MNA, who wished to avoid any suspicion about his brothers (or maybe also his uncle, Nergal-ētir, as IMB managed his share also till the death) that he bought the plot(s) using the sum owed by Kalbā to IMB, which belonged to the inheritance to be divided between the successors (this time MNA and his brothers and maybe, their uncle).¹³

The idea that IMB died in the first year of Darius is supported by the documents from the second year of Darius when MNA concluded transactions together with his brothers (Dar 35 = CM 20B, no. 103, rental of a field dated to the 28th day of Du'ūzu and Dar 45, loan of silver dated to the 17th day of Tašrītu); in the third year his share (*zittu*) and shares of his brothers (Dar 79 = CM 20B, no. 100, receipt for dates) are mentioned;¹⁴⁾ in Dar 80 = CM 20B, no. 12A (cf. the sketch of this document, CM 20B, no. 11) the share of Nergal-ētir, brother of IMB, is separated from the share of MNA and his brothers. In the following years MNA acted many times also in the name of his brothers as they used the fields, fruit garden and palm groves undivided.¹⁵⁾ Note, however, that MNA more often concluded transactions regarding only his own fields or garden or, as in CM 20B, no. 239 (dated to the 14th year) and Dar 426 = CM 20B, no. 162 (dated to the 16th year of Darius) regarding only his share in the palm garden belonging to him and his brothers,¹⁶⁾ loaned or borrowed silver, purchased fields, palm garden and houses and loaned them, etc. It should be stressed that the subjects of inheritance division made in the 14th year of Darius (Dar 379) were slaves and houses only. But already before the death of IMB not only MNA, but also his younger brothers had assets making them possible to conclude transactions independently from their father (see Cam 341, sixth year of Cambyses, transaction of MNA with his brothers). It seems probable that the division of silver (presumably a very large amount) left by their late father was divided quite early. This is suggested by the fact that only in Dar 45, dated to the 17th day of Tašrītu, second year of Darius, MNA loaned 1 mina 50 shekels of silver in his own and his brothers' names. Almost all later contracts for the loan of silver are concluded only in the name of MNA, and only extremely seldom with one of his brothers (Abraham 2004, no. 73), in which we have to recognize voluntary agreement between them. However, already according to Dar 70, dated to the second day of Abu, third year of Darius, MNA regulated the debt of his father, suggesting that the division of silver left by IMB had taken place prior to this date, but all sums due from their late father diminished the silver to be divided, and regulation of these debts was on MNA.

In light of the above discussion the following conclusions are offered:

1. IMB died after the 18th day of Ulūlu but before the eighth day of Addaru, first year of Darius.
2. If we accept that the original version of Dar 275 was written in first year of Darius, it means that the document was drafted when the capital city recognized Nebuchadnezzar IV (Araḥa, son of Ḫaldita) as king of Babylon.¹⁷⁾ By such dating of his text IMB declared himself as follower of Persian against "native" (in fact also "fremd" because of his Urartian origin) ruler, supported by part at least of the Babylonian elite. The sudden death of IMB might reflect a punishment imposed by Nebuchadnezzar IV and/or his followers. Certainly IMB, who had very good relations with earlier Persian kings (Cyrus and Cambyses),¹⁸⁾ can have had no interest to enter into conflict with the future Persian king, whoever that would be. The sudden death of IMB had no negative influence on activity of the Egibi family at the time of MNA, who had very good relations without any disturbances with the Persian administration in Babylonia, also at the beginning of Darius' rule.¹⁹⁾

If the original tablet from which Dar 275 was copied should be dated to the first year of Darius, it must be excluded from my discussion of rental of houses in the tenth year of Darius and it would be the first document from the first year of Darius, where, in the turmoil in Babylonia between Nebuchadnezzar IV and Darius, IMB decided to conclude the contract obliging his tenant to pay rent not in silver neither in two instalments yearly, nor monthly, but in the form of daily payment in bread. This would be another case of the direct influence of a political situation on house rent contracts discussed in my book.

Notes

*I wish to thank Irving L. Finkel for kind collation of Dar 15, improvement of my English and additional invaluable suggestions. Thanks are addressed also to M. Sandowicz and R. Tarasewicz, who kindly read the text and made valuable suggestions.

1. The last surely dated document of Cambyses is Cam 409 dated to the end of the first month (Nisannu), 8th year of Cambyses, while the earliest document of Darius, dated to the beginning of the tenth month (Ṭebētu), his Accession Year (WVDOG 4, Taf.15, 3: 1-2), i.e. both within the same 522/1 BC.

2. The earliest is Nbk 3 (dated to the 17th day of Tašrītu; the last is Nbk 10 dated to the 21st day of the month Kislimu).

3. The date has not been questioned by scholars, see Dandamayev 1984, 342; Joannès, www.achemenet.com/en/item/?textual-sources/texts-by-regions/babylonia/babylon/1658177.

4. See Zawadzki 1990, where I presented arguments for the idea that, contrary to the copy of the Babylonian Chronicle BM 25127, Nebuchadnezzar ascended to the throne on the tenth day (sign *u*) of Ulūlu, while the copyist understood it to have taken place on the first day of this month and thus drew one vertical wedge (*diš*) denoting numeral 1. In Dar 275 the situation is opposite, i.e. that scribe wrote wedge *u* (10 as numeral) while in the original tablet was *diš* sign for numeral 1. That such mistakes are possible is unambiguously demonstrated in the case of BM 56353 where Stevenson 1902, no. 31 copied the year as 10 (*u*), while in fact it is year 1 (*diš*; courtesy of M. Sandowicz).

5. See the detailed description in Dandamayev 1984, 345-364.

6. The first document in which Madānu-bēl-ušur is named as slave of MNA is Dar 308, dated to the 26th day of Tašritu, 11th year of Darius, i.e. about three years before the division of inheritance between MNA and his brothers. Only after the division of inheritance is Madānu-bēl-ušur regularly named as slave of MNA.

7. Out of this name only tiny parts of *mu* and the following *lú* (one wedge from each character) are preserved but the reading is certain. The space between *m[u]* and *l[u]* is so small, that any additional sign is excluded. It seems to me that the condition of the tablet, especially the inside part, still looks as it did when Strassmaier made his copy.

8. It seems that line 11 opens a list of witnesses. (suggestion approved by Irving L. Finkel).

9. In my article Zawadzki 1994 all data are based on cuneiform copies accessible at that time, or on the data from catalogues published by Leichty 1986, Leichty and Grayson 1987 and Leichty, Finkelstein and Walker 1988; in the case of unpublished tablets, as before I have had no possibility to read or collate.

10. Lorenz 2008, 22, note 9. The tablet was kindly collated again by Irving L. Finkel, who is “inclined to read year 1 from the size of the vertical and the spacing”. However, as sometimes the vertical wedges are written tightly I prefer to date the tablet to the second year as only with this date we avoid the contradiction between this tablet and suggested date of Dar 275.

11. If such an interpretation of Dar 15 is acceptable, it should be deleted from the table in Bloch 2015, 12.

12. Cf. CAD R 214 and Wunsch, CM 20B, no. 177.

13. See C. Wunsch, CM 20B, p. 212, a commentary to line 30.

14. Note that such a formula is far from clear. It might be understood either as proof that the given plot was undivided, although MNA recognized the right of his brothers to their share in the inheritance from his father, or quite the opposite, that the plot was already divided, but they decided to manage it together. Only in such a document as CM 20B, no. 239 (14th year of Darius), Dar 426 = CM 20B, no. 162 (16th year of Darius) which concerns only the share of IMB in palm garden rented to other persons, or Dar 488 = CM 20B, no. 216 (19th year of Darius) in which Nabû-aḥḫē-bullit, brother of MNA sold his share, is it certain that a given plot was divided and each brother disposed of it alone and could – as in the last case – sell it.

15. For detailed discussion of these texts, see Wunsch in CM 20A.

16. The latest text showing that the inherited fields were undivided or managed undivided is Dar 503 = CM 20B, no. 214 dated to the 20th year of Darius.

17. Bloch 2015, 13.

18. Concerning his relation with Persia, see Tolini 2011, 193-230 with earlier literature.

19. A comprehensive and excellent analysis of these relations is given by Abraham 2004, 17-142 with summary, 134-42 and 178-183.

Bibliography

- ABRAHAM, K. (2008), *Business and Politics under the Persian Empire. The Financial Dealings of Marduk-nāṣir-apli of the House of Egibi (521-487 BCE)*, Bethesda.
- BLOCH, Y. (2015), The Contribution of Babylonian Tablets in the Collection of David Sofer to the Chronology of the Revolts against Darius I, Aof 42, 1-14.
- DANDAMAEV, M. A. (1984), *Slavery in Babylonia from Nabopolassar to Alexander the Great (626-331 B C)*, DeKalb.
- CAM = STRASSMAIER J. N., *Inschriften von Cambyzes, König von Babylon (529-521 v. Chr.)*, Leipzig 1990.
- DAR = STRASSMAIER J. N., *Inschriften von Darius, König von Babylon (521-485 v. Chr.)*, Leipzig 1892.
- LEICHTY, E. (1986), *Catalogue of the Babylonian Tablets in the British Museum*, vol. VI: *Tablets from Sippar 1*, London.
- LEICHTY E. and GRAYSON, A. K. (1987), *Catalogue of the Babylonian Tablets in the British Museum*, vol. VII: *Tablets from Sippar 2*, London.
- LEICHTY, E., FINKELSTEIN A. and WALKER, C. B. F. (1988), *Catalogue of the Babylonian Tablets in the British Museum*, vol. VIII: *Tablets from Sippar 3*, London.
- LORENZ, J. (2008), *Nebukadnezar III/IV. Die politische Wirren nach dem Tod des Kambyzes im Spiegel der Keilschrifttexte*, Dresden.
- SANDOWICZ, M. (forthcoming), *Companions of Nabonidus*.

- TOLINI G. (Ph.D 2011), *La Babylonie et L'Iran. Les Relations d'une province avec le coeur de l'empire achéménide (539-331 avant notre ère)*.
- STEVENSON, J. H. (1902): *Assyrian and Babylonian Contracts with Aramaic Reference Notes*. New York/Cincinnati/Chicago.
- WEISSBACH, F. H. (1903), *Babylonische Miscellen*, WVDOG 4, Leipzig.
- WUNSCH C. (1999), Neubabylonische Urkunden: Die Geschäftsurkunden der Familie Egibi, in: J. Renger, (ed.), *Babylon, Focus mesopotamischer Geschichte, Wiege früherer Gelehrsamkeit, Mythos in der Moderne*, Berlin.
- WUNSCH C. (2000), *Die Felder und Gärten I-II*, CM 20 A and B, Groningen.
- WUNSCH C. (2007), The Egibi Family, in: G. Leick (ed), *The Babylonian World*, New York and London.
- ZAWADZKI, S. (1990), Ein wichtiger Fehler in der Neubabylonischen Chronik BM 21946 und seine Folgen: das Krönungsdatum Nebuchadnezzar II, *AoF* 17, 100-106.
- ZAWADZKI, S. 2018, *The Rental of Houses in the Neo-Babylonian Period (VI-V Centuries BC)*, Warszawa.

Stefan ZAWADZKI <stefanzawadzki@wp.pl>

36) Akkete polis — La science assyriologique moderne a consacré beaucoup d'efforts à la localisation d'Akkade ; une mise au point extensive, époque par époque, a été donnée récemment par plusieurs spécialistes dans Ziegler/Cancik-Kirschbaum (2014), p. 145–228. En général, avec quelques exceptions, on tend aujourd'hui à situer Akkade sur le Tigre ou très près du Tigre (peut-être à l'embouchure de l'Adhaim/Radan), en tout cas entre Baghdad et Samarra (voir le résumé de N. Ziegler, *op. cit.* p. 148). Un indice important a été oublié dans l'argumentation, il nous a été transmis par Zosime, dans son *Histoire nouvelle*, livre III 28 (éd. Paschoud, p. 48). Zosime, ce « torrent bourbeux qui charrie des paillettes d'or » (Paschoud, introduction, p. xiii), raconte qu'en 363 de notre ère, l'armée de Julien, abandonnant Ctésiphon et faisant retraite vers le nord, traverse la Diyala et finit par rejoindre le Tigre et par le longer. Au cours de cette remontée, elle atteint la localité d'Akkete (Ακκήτη πόλις, peut-être même avec l'harmonie vocalique assyrienne), qu'on peut situer à peu près à mi-chemin entre la ville moderne de Baghdad et Samarra (voir l'interprétation de la route et les localisations que propose Paschoud, carte 3). Dans son étude sur l'empire romain, l'historien italien S. Mazzarino (1962², p. 469 et 471), cité par Paschoud, n. 80, p. 197, voulait y voir l'ancienne Akkade. Mazzarino était conscient de l'audace de son hypothèse (« La mia proposta, di identificare Akketes polis con Akkad a oriente del Tigri, maravigliera molti. »), mais, à la lumière de nos nouvelles connaissances, elle paraît inspirée. Akkade était sur la rive gauche (est) du fleuve ancien, mais, compte tenu du déplacement du cours du Tigre à cette latitude (Adams 1965, p. 66 ; Wilkinson 1990), il faut sans doute aujourd'hui chercher le site à une certaine distance de la rive droite (ouest) moderne, sur l'ancien cours. Si Hucumbra, le nom d'une étape antérieure (chez Ammien Marcellin XXV 1, 4), correspond à celui de la ville islamique de 'ukbarā, comme le supposa d'abord M. Streck (RE s.v. Hucumbra), il faut chercher Akkade en amont de cette ville, qui est localisée (33°45'N ; 44°20'E selon Streck). Cependant Paschoud (n. 78, p. 195 sq.), estimant la longueur des marches journalières, met en doute cette identification. R. Zadok (NABU 2000/3) évoque la possibilité d'une mention textuelle au XIII^e siècle (l'évêque de Ctésiphon y aurait célébré un baptême). C'est encore possible, mais, si Akkade subsistait encore au XIII^e siècle, elle vivait ses derniers jours, car c'est le siècle de la migration fluviale, puis de l'invasion mongole. Quant au tell sargonique, s'il en reste quelque chose, il a dû grandement souffrir des habitats ultérieurs et des mouvements du fleuve.

Bibliographie

- R. MCC. ADAMS, *Land behind Baghdad*. Chicago 1965.
- S. MAZZARINO, *Trattato di storia romana II ; l'impero romano*². Roma 1962.
- T. J. WILKINSON, « The canals of the Qādisiyya area and the changing course of the Tigris ». *Iraq* 52 (1990), p. 121–129.
- N. ZIEGLER/E. CANKIK-KIRSCHBAUM (éd.), *Entre les fleuves II. D'Aššur à Mari et au-delà*. BBVO 24. PeWe Verlag, Gladbeck 2014.
- ZOSIME, *Histoire nouvelle*, tome II, 1^{re} partie (livre III), éd. F. Paschoud, Les Belles Lettres, Paris 1979.

Antoine CAVIGNEAUX,
Université de Genève (SUISSE)

37) Korrigenda zu Manuel Ceccarelli, Die *adab*-Komposition *Išme-Dagan B*, WZKM 109 (2019) 137–170 — Während der redaktionellen Arbeit an meinem Aufsatz sind einige Änderungen übersehen worden. Die Redaktion von WZKM hat die entsprechenden Korrigenda online zur Verfügung gestellt.

Ich hatte bereits angefangen diese Note für NABU zu verfassen, als mir Prof. Pascal Attinger seine Anmerkungen schickte. Hier habe ich nun die ursprünglichen Korrigenda und Attingers wichtigste Anmerkungen zusammengestellt.¹⁾

1.2. Überlieferungsgeschichte und Sitz im Leben von Išme-Dagan B

S. 141 Anm. 18

Zum Zyklus um Išme-Dagan s. auch G. Zólyomi, „Hymns to Ninisina and Nergal on the Tablets Ash 1911.235 and Ni 9672.“ In: *Your Praise is Sweet. A Memorial Volume for Jeremy Black from Students, Colleagues and Friends*, hrsg. v. H. D. Baker, E. Robson und G. Zólyomi. London: 2010: 420–428.

S. 141 Anm. 21

Von Išme-Dagan T sind zwei Manuskripte erhalten, s. G. Zólyomi, a.a.O., 413, 421. Von Išme-Dagan M sind zwei Manuskripte mit unterschiedlichen Fassungen erhalten, s. G. Zólyomi, „Another Recension of Išme-Dagan O: BM 114862 (CT 58 25).“ In: *Iraq* 63 (2001) 139–147, besonders S. 144–147.²⁾

2.2. Partitur

- Z. 45 B** ⁱ⁷buranuna-^re¹ (Hinweis P. Attinger)
Z. 59 im-ma-da-an-ku₄-k[u₄(-x)] (Hinweis P. Attinger)
Z. 62 am Schluss: [ħul₂-bi]
Z. 63 ħul₂-bi

2.3. Übersetzung

Z. 7. Ersetze mit:

7. Die mit den kühlenden Händen, die Beschwörungspriesterin der zahlreichen Leute [...]

Z. 47. Ersetze mit:

47. In ihren Obstgärten möge dir der Boden (an die Datteln und die Weintrauben angrenzen =) mit Datteln und Weintrauben überladen sein.

Z. 62-63 Ersetze mit:

62. Rechte Frau, Tochter Ans, Enlil [hat dir] in d[ies]er Angelegenheit beigestanden. [Freue dich über[?] sein[?]] reines, [mit] Lapis[lazuli] (geschmücktes) Postament...

63. Junge Frau Babu, Enlil hat dir [in dieser Angelegenheit beigestanden.] Freue dich über[?] [sein[?]] reines, [mit Lapislazuli (geschmücktes) Postament...]

3. Kommentar

S. 152. Füge folgenden Kommentar zu Z. 7 hinzu:

7. Ich verstehe **šu-ħal-bi** als *bahuvrihi*-Kompositum. Zum Epitheton **ama šu-ħal-bi** s. zuletzt George (2016: 106) „mother with cooling hands“; **ħal-bi** = **ħalba/i** (A.MUŠ₃.DI) akk. *ħalpû* „Frost“, *takšātu* „Kälte“, *šupšuħu* „beruhigen, lindern“.

S. 155 zu 20

P. Attinger hat mich auf folgende Belege für **mu** = **mu₄** hingewiesen: CT 44, 13:6(?); *Utu-Beschwörung* 231 C; Cohen, *Eršemma* 99 Nr. 171:94 (**mu-r**); *Išbi-Erra E* 78 B (**mu-mu**).

S. 162 zu Z. 62–63

ħul₂-bi lässt sich als Imperativ+{bi} deuten (Hinweis P. Attinger);³⁾ Der Direktiv {bi} könnte hier eine obligatorische Ergänzung ausdrücken („sich über etw. freuen“) und sich auf das Postament beziehen. Die Schwierigkeit liegt jedoch darin, dass **ħul₂** meistens mit dem Komitativ oder mit dem Terminativ konstruiert wird.⁴⁾ *Ezinam und Mutterschaf* 108 scheint als Beleg auszuschneiden, denn dort kann {bi} das zweite Agens einer kausativen Konstruktion ausdrücken:⁵⁾ (*Ezinam und Mutterschaf* 107–108): **zulumħi tu₉ siki babbar₂-ra-ġu₁₀/lugal para₁₀-ga-ni im-mi-in-ħul₂-le** (1 x: **-le-en**). C. Mittermayer übersetzt die Stelle mit: „Durch mein langes Fell, das Gewand aus weißer Wolle, / lasse ich den König sich an seinem Thron erfreuen“; sie verweist aber gleichzeitig auf die wörtliche Übersetzung: „Ich lasse mein Vlies (...) den König an seinem Thron erfreuen“.⁶⁾ Man merke jedoch, dass die Verbalform weder Komitativ noch Terminativ enthält.

Bibliografie

S. 164. Nach: „Brisch, N.M., 2007...“ füge „Ceccarelli, M.“ hinzu.

S. 166. Füge folgenden Titel hinzu:

GEORGE, A.R., 2016: *Mesopotamian Incantations and Related Texts in the Schøyen Collection*. CUSAS 32. Bethesda, MA: CDL-Press.

Anmerkungen

1. An dieser Stelle möchte ich mich bei Prof. P. Attinger für seine Anmerkungen herzlich bedanken.
2. An dieser Stelle möchte ich mich bei Prof. G. Zólyomi für diese bibliographischen Hinweise herzlich bedanken.
3. Vgl. P. Attinger NABU 2004/75.
4. Vgl. M. Jaques, *Le vocabulaire des sentiments dans les textes sumériens* (AOAT 332). Münster: Ugarit-Verlag 2006, 33–35.
5. So auch C. Mittermayer (Email vom 24.02.2020).
6. C. Mittermayer, *Was sprach der eine zum anderen? Argumentationsformen in den sumerischen Rangstreitgesprächen* (UAVA 15). Berlin: De Gruyter 2019, 43 mit Anm. 217.

Manuel CECCARELLI <manuelcecca@yahoo.it>
Waldheimstr. 22 3012 Bern (SCHWEIZ)

N.A.B.U.

- Abonnement pour un an/*Subscription for one year*:
- | | |
|-----------------------------|---------|
| EUROPE/EUROPA | 30,00 € |
| AUTRES PAYS/OTHER COUNTRIES | 40,00 € |
- Par carte de crédit (et Paypal) sur la boutique en ligne de la SEPOA
By credit card (and Paypal) through our online store
http://sepoa.fr/?product_cat=revue-nabu
- Par virement postal à l'ordre de/*To Giro Account: Société pour l'Étude du Proche-Orient Ancien*,
39, avenue d'Alembert, 92160 ANTONY. IBAN: FR 23 2004 1000 0114 69184V02 032 BIC: PSSTFRPPPAR
- Par chèque postal ou bancaire en **Euros COMPENSABLE EN FRANCE** à l'ordre de/*By Bank check in Euros PAYABLE IN FRANCE and made out to: Société pour l'Étude du Proche-Orient Ancien*.

Les manuscrits (WORD & PDF) pour publication sont à envoyer à l'adresse suivante :
Manuscripts (WORD & PDF) to be published should be sent to the following address:
nabu@sepoa.fr

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

Directeur honoraire : Jean-Marie DURAND

Rédactrice en chef : Nele ZIEGLER - Secrétaire d'édition : J.-M. ROYNARD

N.A.B.U. est publié par la Société pour l'Étude du Proche-Orient Ancien, Association (Loi de 1901) sans but lucratif

ISSN n° 0989-5671. Dépôt légal : Paris, 04-2020. Reproduction par photocopie

Directeur de la publication : D. Charpin