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42) NABU aura 35 ans et souhaite faire un bilan sur sa vie — La revue NABU, ou comme on pourrait être tenté de l’écrire “N.A.B.U.”, a été fondée par J.-M. Durand. Un premier fascicule de 12 pages est paru en mars 1987 – et à la fin de cette année, la toute jeune revue comptait 78 pages. NABU a été créé dans le but de diffuser rapidement et régulièrement des informations scientifiques ou touchant la vie assyriologique et elle est depuis cette date restée fidèle à son nom : Nouvelles Assyriologiques Brèves et Utilitaires. Tous les trois mois les lecteurs fidèles découvrent un nouveau fascicule, produit par un formatage simple grâce à Word et reproduit par photocopie n/b dans la même boutique à quelques pas de la Sorbonne et du Collège de France. NABU a grandi, grossi surtout. La revue s’est modernisée aussi ! Désormais librement accessible en ligne, les lecteurs bénéficient des photos couleur d’assez bonne qualité. 35 ans fidèlement au service de l’Assyriologie !

Je souhaite, dans le fascicule NABU 2022 n°4, daté de décembre 2022, publier une Table de matières cumulée des NABU de 1987 à 2022. Nous pensons qu’un tel récapitulatif de 35 années d’existence peut être utile à tout le monde.

Pour cette raison nous n’allons accepter aucune note à partir du 1er septembre 2022. Nous allons recommencer à accueillir des manuscrits en 2023, mais sous de nouvelles modalités que nous devons élaborer pour simplifier la production de ce trimestriel.


Cette situation n’est pas réjouissante et il me semble qu’il est nécessaire – afin d’assurer l’avenir de la revue – d’inventer un nouveau modèle de dépôt de notes qui facilitera le travail des personnes en charge du formatage. Je pense à la mise en place d’un document Word à utiliser par les auteurs (“NABU Home Model”), d’une “style sheet”, et de l’instauration de quelques normes de présentation qui s’imposeront aux auteurs dans l’avenir.

Un bilan, une cure de juvence nécessaire, … rien d’extraordinaire après 35 années de labeur !

Nele ZIEGLER <nziegler@msh-paris.fr>
Institut des Civilisations du Collège de France, UMR 7192, Paris (FRANCE)
43) Fara Notes, 1: Administrative lists identified as dub bar and dub gibil — The assignments of donkeys for ploughing to various individuals represent one of the most prominent text groups from Fara, ancient Šuruppak. After their edition by Pomponio/Visicato (1994, 301–448 = EDATŠ) they have been re-edited by Steibe/Yıldız (2015 = WVDOG 143) including some new texts and collations. These two books carefully note parallel sequences of personal names between various texts of larger and smaller size (Lecompte 2017 added more data). The repetition of names in a similar order is known from various administrative archives over the course of several years. The parallels indicate a historical “reality” behind the sequences that is not connected to the professions as it is the case in lists from other places; thus the parallel sequences may relate to other factors (such as, e.g., the location of the fields or the city-quarters?). The apparent differences between lists (with, at times, more entries in the smaller than in the larger list), however, actually do not support fully the conclusion by Pomponio/Visicato (1994) that the lists cover only one year or a very short period. The lists of men working in agriculture represent the important social group of the “farmers and soldiers” (thus Schrakamp 2014), and therefore a better understanding of the lists of fields, barley and plough animals is essential for an analysis of the society of Šuruppak.

The subscripts identify the estates (of the city-goddess Sud: WVDOG 143, nos. 32, 33, 39; also called dīgīr “deity” no. 44; e₂ g e mᵉ₂ “female servants’ estate”: ibid. nos. 31, 36, 68) or the person responsible for the account (WVDODG 143, nos. 4, 5, 24, 44: saq-an-tuku dub-sar).

Another element is the designation of a list as dub gibil “new tablet” or dub bar(-ra) “additional(?) tablet” in the subscripts. The size of the tablets (large/medium/small) does not reflect the distribution of the terms exactly. In the following list the references with improved readings (compared to the edition of Steibe/Yıldız 2015) are marked by an asterisk (*):

- dub gibil: WVDOG 143, no. 1 (= WF 22 = EDATŠ no. 115; large tablet); no. 27* (medium); no. 66 (small); no. 77 (= WF 21 = EDATŠ no. 157, small); no. 78* (small)
- dub bar: WVDOG 143, no. 58* (medium); no. 61* (= TSŠ 106 = EDATŠ no. 154, small/medium); no. 67* (small); no. 70* (= WF 14 = EDATŠ no. 155; small); no. 71* (small); no. 89* (medium?)
- note the variant form dub bar-ra in other contexts, with goats: WVDOG 143, 156* (= TSŠ 156, small); with barley: WF 87 (= EDATŠ no. 22, medium)
- unclear: WVDOG 143, no. 53 (dub-[bar?]; medium)

On dub gibil: Reading of WVDOG 143, no. 27 v 3 as [dub] gibil with Lecompte (2017, 277). In WVDOG 143, no. 78 iii 1 the edition has “dub (= MES)-gibil”, but the photo shows a clear DUB sign.

On dub bar: The term dub bar(-ra) was not identified by Steibe/Yıldız (2015), but they read mostly dub-“dili” instead, namely in WVDOG 143, no. 58 iv 3; 61 iv 2; 67 iv 3; 70 iv 3. However, the sign BAR often has the appearance of AŠ in Fara texts (Krebernik 1998, 280), and the -ra of the parallels indicates the correct reading. Furthermore, the term was emended incorrectly (as happens so often in Assyriology), reading “mes(=DUB)-bar” WVDOG 143, no. 71 iv 3, and “mes(=DUB)-bar-ra” no. 156: 2. For “mes-bar” in WVDOG 143, no. 89 r.ii’2 the correct interpretation is instead [d]ub bar (the first small vertical, differentiating DUB from MES, is not preserved).

Although it is still unclear how the terms dub gibil “new tablet” or dub bar(-ra) “additional(?) tablet” relate exactly to the management of agricultural labour, these subscripts contribute to a better evaluation of the accounting practices at Šuruppak.
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44) Fara Notes, 2: ǧiři₂ du₃ “to mark out (a field) with a dagger” — TSŠ 881 is a most remarkable Fara text with more than fifty entries listing barley, barley flour, and beer for various recipients, summarized as “barley” given out during a period of one month (ti 1, r.x). The text can thus be described as an early representative of the important group of “bread and beer” texts known so well from many third-millennium archives (see also Fara Note 3). The photograph available for TSŠ 881 on CDLI (P010929_d) shows many details that are not seen on Raymond Jestin’s copy from 1937, and the tablet might have already suffered in the decades after its discovery in 1902. Evidently, Cripps (2013, § 9) could not use the photo, and thus his edition is largely outdated now.

The cereals were not only given to guests at the political centre of the Șuruppaq (see Fara Note 3), but also for festivals: the a₂-ki-ti of the Șe₄-ki-ti temple (o. ii 2–3’), the ab-e₃ festival (r.i 6), an unclear action related to a “large garment” (tu₃ g₉,e₄₃) for a bride (e₂-g₉,u-e₄₃; o. v 6–15), an expenditure for carriers, “when ... (for?)” the context of purchases, such as “buying a well house” (e₂-engur ș₃₉₉₃, o. iii 8’), or “buying a well house for water” (e₂-engur ș₃₉₉₃, o. vi 10–11). The sale documents from the Fara period include long lists of gifts (namely barley and cereal products, fat, soup, and textiles) given to the sellers and persons involved in the transaction (see, e.g. Krecher 1980, 491–493; Gelb et al. 1991; Wilcke 1996). Our document most probably reflects the issuing of a segment of these donations, namely the barley products from the granary–milling house complex of the local palace of Șuruppaq.

Seen in this light, the expenditure for a ritual act called aš₃ ǧiři₂ du₃, literally “to drive in daggers (at) a field”, fits well into a larger context of ritual acts performed at sales. The two relevant passages read as follows (the transliteration of numbers follows Molina 2014, 39–40):

(1) TSŠ 881 r.iv 7–13:

0.20e dabin / 0.20e dabin tur-tur / 1ac kaš sila₃ / aš₃ ǧiři₂ du₃ / l₁u₃ kaš kur-ra / baḥar₃ / maškim

“120 sila of barley flour, 120 sila of ‘small’ (breads made from?) barley flour, 1 sila-vessel of beer: marking out the field by a dagger, at the day of beer of the ... (lit. mountain); Baḥar was the commissary (responsible for the transaction)”

(2) TSŠ 881 r.vii 15–18:

[x] kaš sila₃ / l½c še din sila₃ / aš₃ ǧiři₂ du₃ / nam-maḥ / dub-sar

“[x] sila-vessel of beer, half a sila-vessel of barley beer: marking out the field by a dagger; Nammaḥ was the scribe (responsible for the transaction)”

The parallels and the context prove that ǧiři₂ du₃ cannot be the name of a field. The meaning of the phrase “beer of the mountain (kur)” eludes me; it evidently refers to a drinking party, but I am not aware of any passages which provide information to define kur more precisely.

The act of “driving in” (du₃) a dagger reminds one of the symbolic act of “driving a nail” (g₉,a₃ du₃) into the wall (e₃gar) of a house to mark the property and its sale (see Müller 1979; Malul 1987; id. 1988, 363–76; Gelb et al. 1991, 240–41). However, since this act is performed for fields as well, a simple
distribution of the phrase with a "nail" (gāg) for houses and with a "dagger" (gēri₂) for fields does not seem plausible.

A "dagger" (or "sword", gēri₂) is a highly symbolic weapon, as made clear by an oath sworn in the context of field sales. CT 5, 3 = OIP 104, no. 36 ii 4-11 (Sippur, ED IIIb): NAM.KUD / I,IR / LU₂,NA,ME / i-na-kir / ap-lu / gēri₂ / "lugal, asal, asal (REŠ-65, a) / HI,LU₂, translated by P. Steinke as follows (Gelb et al. 1991, 109): "the oath by oil nobody should change/violate; (if somebody does change it), then the heirs(?) of the sellers with the dagger of Lugal-asal will kill him"; or: "(the preceding persons) have sworn by oil that ...". This oath most probably refers to the symbolic act of anointing often performed by the herald (nīgir) in sales of houses, fields, and persons: a "nail" (gāg) is driven into a wall, and its spot is anointed, as recorded by the formula gāg-be₂ eḡar-ra bi₂-du₃ i₃-be₂ za₂-ge be₂-₃a₅ (Gelb et al. 1991, 240–42; Krecher 1980, 494): "he drove its 'nail' (referring to the contract, i.e. serving as a writing medium for the text) into the wall, he applied the oil (necessary for the proper execution of this act) on it (i.e. the nail)" (i₃ ak "to apply oil" is construed with the directive case).

The act of announcing the sale by driving a nail into the wall, however, was different from "demarcating with a dagger", an act performed in a field. Most probably, the latter act delimited the field to which the new property rights were then transferred. If this reconstruction is correct, the dagger used to mark the field for the new owner could have been a divine weapon upon which an oath was sworn at the completion of the procedure (see above).

Delimiting (sur) a field with a dagger (gēri₂) for measuring it out (gid₂) is also referred to in TSŠ 881 in a different way:

(3) TSŠ 881 o. ix 7-15:

0.0.4c dabin / 0.0.4c dabin /x x x/ u₄ / aša₃ gēri₂ sur / mu-gid₂-da / nam-maḥ / dub-sar / lugal [...] "40 sila of barley flour, 40 sila of 'small' (breads made from?) barley flour, [for PERSON], when he measured the field, delimited with a dagger; Nammaḥ was the scribe (responsible for the transaction); ...".

As scribe, Nammaḥ signs as being responsible for the transaction (2) as well; but this does not prove that (2) and (3) refer to one and the same field transfer, since Nammaḥ is more often listed as the scribe responsible for the expenditures that happened during the month covered by TSŠ 881.

The meaning for the phrase gēri₂ du₃ derived from the Fara document TSŠ 881 explains the final passage in a statute inscription of Enmetena of Lagas. Here Enmetena identifies the fields handed over to Enlil’s newly built sanctuary e₂-ad-da (iii 6); the fields were obviously designated to provide the temple’s income, including a field already selected by his father and predecessor Enanatum (noted, e.g., by Cooper 1986, 63 fn.2).

(4) Ent. 1 (Steible/Behrens 1982/I, 211–214) = RIME 1.9.5.17 (Frayne 2008, 219–222), shoulder inscription, cols. v–vi:

(⁵)(¹) 25,0.0₂šan₄, en-an-na-tum₂ sur naššē e-ta₂-c₁₁
(²) 11,0.₂šan₄, m₁₂,za₂ša₁₂,šē₂₃, aša₃ abba₂ ni₂n₃,-ka₃₄, pa₃ₔ₄₂₅, ku₂₄₂₄, u₂₅-sa₃₅
(⁶) 1.0₀,₀₂ša₃, en-l₁₂, (²) vo₅,₁₂₉ aša₃ gu₂₂, eden-na₉-ka
(²) en-₃e₅,₃, ze₅₁₂-one₂₅, lag₅₂₉₂₅₅, en-l₁₂, (⁶) e₂₂₂₄₂₂₂₂₉₂₀-ka<_₇> gēri₂, e-na-du₅₉

"25 bur (162.5 hectares) of Enanatum, the border of Nansa, was drained (lit. risen [from the water]), 11 bur (71.5 hectares) in the L-field, a field in the marshes of Nīn, bordering on the sacred canal, 60 bur (390 hectares) of Enlil in the Guedena field.

Enmetena, the ruler of Lagas, marked it (i.e., the described area) out with a dagger for Enlil of the Eadda." Steible/Behrens (1982/I, 214) translate: "... hat Enmetena ... dem Enlil ... abgetrennt". In their commentary (Steible/Behrens 1982/I, 110) they write: "Die Verbindung gēr---dū ist, soweit wir sehen, singulär. Die Übersetzung ist aufgrund des Kontextes geraten; E. Sollberger, IRSA 66f. mit Anm. c übersetzt ,a découpé(?)' und M. Lambert, OrNS 44 (1975) 36 Anm. 79 ,fit décârter.'"

Frayne (2008, 220 ad vi 7) has chosen another solution: "In col. vi line 7 the tentative translation 'cleared it (from stubble)?' follows Selz’s 'geredet(?)' (Untersuchungen p. 128 § 8)" (Selz 1995, 128 fn.100)
504 arrives at this translation by comparing the expression ku₆ ɢər₂₂ du₃₂-a in DP 336 ii 3, „nach dem Kontext vielleicht ‘ausgenommene/entschuppte Fische’.“). Cooper (1986, 63: La 5.17) left the phrase untranslated. The comparison with the Fara references from TSŞ 881 hopefully solves this puzzle.

To the best of my knowledge, the phrase ɢər₂₂ du₃₂ “to mark (a field) out with a dagger” survives in the available written documentation only in the name of a field (a-ša₃ ɢər₂₂-du₃₂-a, ITT 3.5268; cf. a-ša₃ ɢər₂₂ NATN 382 r.10).
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45) Fara Notes 3: Mariotes in Šuruppag—The photo for TSŞ 881 on CDLI (P010929_d) allows a better interpretation of this document, and it provides the earliest reference to Mari in an archival text from Babylonia. As noted in Fara Note 2, the photo must have been taken before Jestin’s publication in 1937, and evidently the relevant passage of the tablet is not preserved any more, since Steible (2015) in his very careful study of the geographical names occurring in Fara texts did not mention the reference to “Mari” discussed here, although his article is based on his thorough knowledge of the Fara tablets housed in Istanbul.

TSŞ 881 lists not only expenditures of flour and beer to people, but also repeated charges of barley to feed donkeys (a-nše) of guests. The entries usually follow the pattern n še anše PERSON “n (amount of) barley for the donkeys of PERSON”. Although the same sign (LAK 240/53, Krebernik 1998, 277) is used for both ɢər₂₂ and a-nše, an interpretation of the phrase n še anše PERSON as .viewer PN “via PN”, “expedition of PN”, can be safely excluded: (1) in all instances the document lists še “barley”, and not flour, as in the other instances of expenditures for persons; (2) a-nše is usually written in the same box as še, but neither occurs in a separate box, nor combined with the personal name (še anše thus is graphically organised in the same way as the note that barley was used to buy beer, še ka₇₃ ša₁₀₂); (3) entries with the phrase n še anše PERSON are usually concluded by a person acting as maškim “commissionary” (or as “scribe”, du₃₂-sar), thus another “conveyor” (if it were ɢər₂₂ PN) can be excluded; (4) the long entry o. vii 6–13 lists in hierarchical order first flour for the recipient, then “barley to buy beer” (še ka₇₃ ša₁₀₂) and finally “barley for donkeys” (še anše); (5) the frequent combination n še anše PN na₇₃ can be understood as “n barley for donkeys of PN (who was at the) drinking (party)”; the photo does not permit an interpretation as gu₅₃ “to eat”.

The owners of the donkeys mentioned in TSŞ 881 include an “envoy” (sug₂₂₁, o. v 16), a “son of the king” (dumu lu₃₁[gal]) for one month (o. ii 11′–13′), and even the “king” (lug₃₂₁, r. ii 5) himself. Another royal prince who received flour and beer during his stay was associated with the city of Sippir (o.
vi 11–12), another person came from Kiš (r. iv 15–16), one from Urua (URUŠA o. v 2–3), a shipper and a
fisherman from Elam were there (lu₂ ṣu₃ NIM, r. viii 12–13; šukud₂ NIM, r. iv 2–3), and Dilmun is
mentioned in an unclear context (o. vii 2). These place-names (Sippir, Kiš, Urua, Elam, Dilmun) demarcate
the borders of the geographical scope covered by the texts from Fara (Steible 2015, 160–61). The
expenditures directly reflect the comings and goings of people at the local ruler’s residence at Fara, and
indeed the first entry notes flour and beer for the “big ruler (ensi.g) at a drinking party(?)” (NIÇ₂ PA.TE.SI
gal / našuši o. i 4’–5’). Already the second entry is the one that interests us here:

3.0.0c še I1d₂-ga anše / ma-ri₃₂ / [šu ba]-ti (TSŠ 881 o. i 6'–8’)

“These lika-measures (= 720 sīla) for the donkeys, the one(s) from Mari received it”

The restoration of o. i 8’ is based on parallel entries in the same text, with groups of persons “having
received” (šu ba-ti) flour (“persons punting boats”, lu₂ ma₂-gi₂₂, o. vi 13–14; “three carriers”, i₁₂, r. i
11–12; “persons cutting brushwood(?) from Kiš”, lu₂ u₂₂-ku₂ sīši₃₄, r. iv 15–16; unclear r. vi 7–8).

Donkeys of high-ranking guests were thus fed from the granaries of a city, a practice known from
the ED IIIb archive from Tell Beydar (ancient Nabada; early–mid 24th century BCE), with large
expenditures of barley for the king (EN) of Nagar who regularly came to Nabada to stay there for several
days (Sallaberger 1996, 103–6).

TSŠ 881 offers the first reference to the city of Mari in an administrative document from the Fara
period (ED IIIa, 26th century BCE). Previously, Mari was only known from two entries in scholarly texts
from Tell Abū Şalāṭī: Early Dynastic Practical Vocabulary (EDPV) A line 208 ba₂₁aš ma-ri₂₃ “the Mari
harp” (Abū Şalāṭī source OIP 99, 33 viii 21; edition Civil 2008); OIP 99, 328 v 7 ma-ri₂ in an unclear
literary or lexical context.

The administrative context now attests to Mariotes arriving by donkey at Šuruppak. As is well
known, Šuruppak served in this period as an important centre for the cities of Sumer (ki-en-ge), a region
from Uruk in the south to Kiš in the north and including Lagaš, Umma, Adab and Nippur (Steible 2015,
161 with further literature). The Fāra document TSŠ 881 allows a glimpse of the political centre of
Šuruppak, where travellers from the Gulf (Dilmun), from Elam, or from Mari and the inhabitants of
Babylonia met. The administrative note on fodder for donkeys thus provides a historical anchorage for
close links between Mari and Lower Mesopotamia, as well as the wide-reaching trade connections during
the period of the rise of Mari’s Ville II (Otto 2014), one and a half centuries before the contacts revealed
by the documents from the Royal Palace G at Ebla (second third of the 24th century BCE).
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46) Minima Eblaïtica 26: A Point of history: the Death of King Irkab-damu, and the Synchronism between the Death of two Kings of Mari and two Kings of Kakmium — ARET XV 10 § 70 mentions the gift of a mantel and two silver toggle-pins for the spouse of the minister Arrukum on the occasion of her “purification rite”: 1-giš-sag dam Ar-ru[i]₂-gûm. This rite was celebrated in connection to the death of a relative, in this case certainly the death of Arrukum.

That this was the last monthly document of garments distribution to be attributed to this minister (in month i-si, I/IX) is confirmed by “the news of the defeat”, níg-mul, til, of the city of Ḫazuwan brought by Ebla as a chief of the charioteers, registered in the following section of the same text, ARET XV 10 § 71. Ḫazuwan, must be located either at Tilbešar or Mulum (just north of the present Syrian–Turkish border). ARET XXI 3 § 17 mentions that “a son of the king of Ḫazuwan had to be killed in the city of Garaman”, in ud dumu-nita en Ḫa-zu-wa-an₃₉ ḫi-uš in Ga-ra-ma-an₃₉ (Archi 2021, pp., 199–200). This is the annual document concerning the metal expenditures of the first year of minister Iribium, Arrukum’s successor. The killing of the king of Ḫazuwan’s son has to be connected with the city’s defeat. This city was at this point included in Ebla’s territory, as can be deduced from the fact that in later documents a king of Ḫazuwan is no longer mentioned. ARET XV 10 §§ 74–76 registers a third “death”, uš; that of the king of Kakmium, a city to be placed north of Ebla; ARET XIII 5 § 39, and 10 § 10 mentions the cluster: Kakmium, Ḫazuwan, and Nlar.

King Irkab-damu died several months after Arrukum, and ARET XIV 54 records the gifts for Dusigu (Irkab-damu’s spouse of second rank and mother of Is’ar-damu, the new king) for her 1-giš-sag rite. This document is dated: “(when) Irkab-damu went to his destiny; eleventh <year>”, si-ni uš-sù 10+1. The recently appointed Iribium (grateful for the honour he had received) presented a sumptuous gift: a mantel and two toggle-pins in gold weighing a hefty 1 mina (470 g), (§ 45).

The first annual document concerning the “deliveries”, mu-DU, to the Central Administration, to be ascribed to Iribium, ARET XIV 55, is dated to the “second year (from) the king’s death”, (i.e. of Irkab-damu), (§ 32: 2 mu uš en). This is presumably because Iribium had already been acting as minister already during several months of the previous administrative year, whose incomes were attributed to Arrukum (perhaps in document ARET XIV 52).

The death of Arrukum, together with that of the king of Kakmium, and the death of Irkab-damu must therefore all be placed within a time span of about eight months between two years.

The death of king Enna-Dagan of Mari also fell within this very short period. After having sent his menacing letter (ARET XIII 4), in which he reproached Ebla for having drastically reduced or even altogether stopped paying the tribute imposed by Iblul-il, Enna-Dagan moved with his army. A battle was fought in Eblaite territory, near ‘A-ti-ids(NI)/id₉₅, won by Ebla. This is reported in the monthly documents ARET XV 18 § 21, to be dated to the minister Arrukum): “Buda-malik, (son) of the judge Enna-il, brought the news that Mari was vanquished”, níg-“mul” Ma-r₉₅ til (month ‘a-num-na-at, VIII/IV of the year preceding Arrukum’s death).

MEE 7, 23 (month ga-sum, VII/III), a monthly document of the distribution of garments, dates Irkab-damu’s death no earlier than eleven months after the battle of ‘Atidu. It is reported that the king was “ill”, tu-ra, and the situation was dire: one entry exceptionally applied to five gods: “three minas of gold
Nizi’s death, in the fifth or sixth year of Irkab-damu. It is uncertain if the amount of gold for Hadda, a war god (his yearly gift was a “battle-mace”, ḫa-bīū) was the one already registered in the lenticular tablet ARET VII 115, or if this had been a previous gift. This other text directly connects a magnificent gift in gold with the battle of ‘Atid(u): “one belt with sheath and frog of 1;45 minas of gold, and a pectoral of 1;19 minas of gold (for a total of 3;04 minas, 1.72 kg) (for the purification) by the god Hadda of Irkab-damu. Purification in the year (in which) Mari was vanquished by ‘Atid(u)”, sikil “Á-da Ír-kab-da-mu sikil in mu Ma-ri₅ⁱ àga-’kár’(ŠÉ) àš-ti ‘Á-ti-id₇ⁱ (this battle, and its consequences, has previously been discussed in Archi 2019, pp. 146–150).

Irkab-damu must have died not much later than the date of MEE 7, 23. Enna-Dagan also died in that year, as is deduced from the fact that ARET XXI 3 (the annual document of expenditures of metals from the second half of the first year of minister Ibrium) registers the sending of a plaque of 30 shekels (350 g) to “Iku(n)-išar, king of Mari” through Dutum, a messenger from Mari (§ 48), choosing a modest gift to re-establish diplomatic relations. This was also the first year of king Iš’ar-damu, Irkab-damu’s successor.

It is conceivable that Enna-Dagan also died as a consequence of the ‘Atidu battle.

The chronological sequence of these events could be reconstructed in the following way (second column month sequence according to Archi 2017; third column according to Pettinato 1974/77):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(year Irkab-damu 10 / 11)</th>
<th>month</th>
<th>month</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Battle of ‘Atid(u)</td>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrukum’s death; defeat of Ḫuzuwan</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>IX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(year Irkab-damu 11 / 12)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irkab-damu ill; Enna-Dagan dead</td>
<td>VII</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(year Iš’ar-damu 01)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibrium 01; king Iš’ar-damu 01; killing of the son of the king of Ḫuzuwan; Iku(n)-išar king of Mari</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Another synchronism is given in TM.75.G.1574; the death of a king of Mari and of a king of Kakkium: in DIŠ mu lugal Ma-ri₅ⁱ ù ṣe en [Ka]k-mi-u₅ⁱ [u]š. This document registers the sheep “under the control”, Iš Su, of Du-biš-sum and Dar-mi-a: 65,300 and 18,950 respectively (Archi 1984, pp. 68–69). Darmia was (together with Tir) the most important “lord”, lugal, until the appointment of Arrukum as minister, not later than the sixth year of Irkab-damu’s reign (ARET XIV, pp. VII, 4–5, 15); Dubišum (also an important “lord”) may have remained in office for a very few years.

This datum suggests that the document be dated to the first six years of Irkab-damu’s period. Iblul-il of Mari died approximately in the third year of Irkab-damu, and three years of reign are attributed to Nizi his successor (Archi 2016, pp. 3–6, 10–11). It seems perhaps more probable that TM.75.G.1574 refers to Nizi’s death, in the fifth or sixth year of Irkab-damu.
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Antagal A 157: [gi] sug¹⁰₄š-e = šulpu (gi nach CAD ergänzt) passt nicht, denn sug (LAGABxA) „Sumpf“ ist schwerlich eine alternative Schreibung für sù mit g-Auslaut. CAD übersetzt šulpu mit „1. stalk, 2. area under cultivation, cultivated field, 3. (a flute or other Reed instrument)“. Es ist plausibel anzunehmen, dass sug-še zu 2 gehört und in ₄kù-sù der „heilige Halm“ gemeint ist und einen Auslaut auf d besitzt bzw. phonetisch nicht abschließend geklärtes DR.


USAN hat auch die Lesung sùb in mu₃-sùb „Hirte“ (MSL 14, 491, 82) frühdastischen gut belegt (SF 28 i 7; ii 5; IAS 510 ii 1; DP 31 v 31). Das Zeichen (LAK556; RSP357) ähnelt jüngерem USAN. In FD IIIb Lagaš gibt es nur BUg = RSP336 und es steht für sù mit d oder g im Auslaut. Auch Gudea schreibt durchgehend B.Ug für sù: ZyI. A ii 5; B xxiv 8, Statue E viii 10 etc. Dass ein Wort für „Abend“, „Westen“, „Dämmerung“ bzw. ein Beiname der Innana im Namen der Getreidegöttin ₄kù-SÜ.PA.SIKIL auftaucht, ist unwahrscheinlich. Eher knüpft ḫUSAN.PA.SIKIL an die Himmelsregion an-pa = ēlāt šāmē an. Auch in SF 36 vi 2 (siehe unten) macht es keinen Sinn. ED Lû A 84f. BUg AN.PA.SIKIL enku, (ZAG) / BUg.PA.SIKIL enku, wird in OIP 11, 24 ii* 5’f. als en-kù ū-si₄-na/ en-kù ba-a₄-ti erläutert. Was ein
Sud mit Feldern und Feldpflanzen, insbesondere auch mit dem Halm des Weizens in Verbindung gebracht, ziemlich sicher herauszulesen: Die Verbindung von Sud und Enl
unverständlichen Passagen und mutmaßlich fehlender Verben unsicher bleiben, so sind doch zwei Dinge unverwechselbar: Der Tisch und wird eb
d(dafür) gehört Sud
Sud, die großen …

Entsprechend heißt es im Schlussteil: má
da dab
Fruchtbarkeit

Gleichklang

Weizenhalm und den Tempel, den Ort erster Güte in Ambartur" v 15

Pflanzen: zà
die genannten Vögel?) ein Ort verraten werden: ki zu

Kultorte. SU ist vermutlich ein phonetisches Hilfszeichen.


Mag auch der Versuch, die zugrundeliegende Erzählung in Teilen zu erfassen aufgrund der vielen unverständlichen Passagen und mutmaßlich fehlender Verben unsicher bleiben, so sind doch zwei Dinge ziemlich sicher herauszulesen: Die Verbindung von Sud und Enlil (é-kur iiii 14; é-en-līl(E) vii 12) und dass Sud mit Feldern und Feldpflanzen, insbesondere auch mit dem Halm des Weizens in Verbindung gebracht, bzw. sogar identifiziert wird.

—107—
Ihre Verwandtschaftsverhältnisse weisen Sud klar als eine Getreidegöttin aus. Nach Enlil und Sud war sie die Tochter von Nisaba/Nunbarṣegunu und Ḥaja. Nisabas Name wurde als „Herrin der Getreidezuteilungen“ gedeutet (Selz 1989) und Ḥaja ist wahrscheinlich etymologisch verwandt mit dem akkadischen Wort eḫu-ū „Gerste“. 2 Sud ist zugleich die Mutter der Nisaba, die gleichzeitig mit der Getreidegöttin Ezina gleichgesetzt wird (siehe unten). In Enlil und Sud wird Sud mit Ninlil gleichgesetzt. In Enlil und Ninlil ist Ninlil die Tochter der Nunbarṣegunu „Fürstin, (deren) Leib scheckige Gerste ist“. SF 36 zeigt, dass Sud bereits in FD IIIa als Gemahlin des Enlil angesehen werden konnte. In einem Fluch heißt es, Enlil solle Salz in der Ackerfurche aufsteigen lassen (Ean. 63 iii’ 4–6, RIME1.9.3.3). Das deutet auf eine Beziehung Enlils zum Feldbau, mit dem auch sein Sohn Ninurta zu tun hatte. Der Name seines nördlichen Pendants als oberster Gott Dagan, heißt auf Hebräisch „Getreide“, was die Annahme stützt, dass auch der oberste Gott im an Getreide besonders reichen Sumer wenigstens in die Landwirtschaft eingeherrat hatte.


\[\begin{align*}
\text{lux} & \text{ da-ṣu-ğu₅ mu-un-uₙ-d₅ kūₗ niṣaba-ke₅, } \\
\text{ʿezīna } Ḥa₃ la₄ zi ki-en-ge-ra ḫₑ-em ab-si₃-nₜ ni-siₕ₌₅ ṣa₅₉ ³₂₉₃-₃₉₉₉₉ ṣi₉ pa₉ e₃-ₙₖ₉-
\text{ʿiskur kūₗ-gā u-a₈-zu ḫₑ-em a k₉-ta mi₉-ri-in-d₅ } \\
\text{Meine eingesetzte Gemahlin hat geboren, die Reine, die Nisaba.}
\end{align*}\]

Die Ezina, die wachsende Ezina soll das Leben Sumers sein!

Wenn du dich selbst erscheinen lässt in der Furche wie ein schönes Mädchen, soll ʿiskur, der Wasserregulierer dein Ernährer sein! Wasser gießt er dir unt-

**Anmerkungen**

1 Die andere Form findet sich hingegen auf der wohl wesentlich älteren Figure aus plumes und zwar mit schrägen Strichen, wie sie auch in den archaischen Texten aus Ur vorkommen.
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49) A tablet from Drehem — In January 2022 I was contacted by Douglas Seiler (UC Berkeley, Astronomy Department) with photographs of a Drehem tablet, dated AS 7 V 24. According to this source, the tablet has been in the family of a friend for about a hundred years – which approximately matches the appearance of Drehem tablets on the antiquities market. The images were taken by Douglas Seiler and prepared for publication by John Carnahan. The current owner prefers to remain anonymous.
The text reads:

1 udu a-lum 1 aslum sheep
2 sila₂ 2 lambs
1 kir₁₁ gukkal 1 female fat-tailed lamb
ud 24-kam the 24th day
ki ab-ba-sac-ga-ta from Abbasaga
šu-ma-ma šumama
i₄-dab₅ took.

(blank)

iti ezem .Listen to the (blank) page
mu hu-uh₂-nu-ri(ki) ba-hul Year that Huhnuri was destroyed (AS 7)

left side 4 udu (total) 4 sheep

The text joins dozens of similar texts in which Abbasaga transfers animals to šumama in the years AS 6-8. A chronological listing of 61 such documents, starting AS 6 III 1 and ending AS 8 III 29 is provided by Changyu Liu, Organization, Administrative Practices and Written Documentation in Mesopotamia during the Ur III Period (Münster: Ugarit Verlag 2017) section 2.2.2.1.15 (p.92 with note 504 and summary in table 2.7 on pp.97-98). In the meantime, several additional such texts have appeared, for instance Nisaba 33, 188 (P517368); HSS 68, 174 (P407070); HSS 68, 187 (P407083); HSS 68, 325 (P407254); HSS 68, 360 (P407292); and three texts in the Hermitage Museum, to be published by Natalia Koslova (Erm 07866 = P211680; Erm 07849 = P211664; and Erm 14860 = P212161).

Niek VELDHUIS <veldhuis@berkeley.edu>
UC Berkeley (USA)

50) Polishing some Sumerian Jewels* — In a recent reading of Miguel Civil’s 1987 “Sumerian Riddles: A Corpus,” I came across the fragmentary and cryptic riddle no. 15 (=CBS 9814+9815 rev iii’ 3’–5’). Largely following Bendt Alster’s 1976 edition, Civil rendered:

1-am₃ pu₂ al-b[a-al(?)] ‘One has [dug] (or opened) a well,
2-am₃ igi am₃-bar[re (…)] ‘two look at it.
ki-bur₃-bi gi₃ bir₄ igi-b[a[-(]?)]-ra(?)] Answer: a flaccid penis in view(?).’

The reading “flaccid” from bir₄ stands firm, explained by both Alster and Civil from OB Lu, where it is equated to kalṣum, “shriveled.” ¹ The restoration igi-b[a[-(]?)]-ra(?)], however, seems less likely. The logic of the riddle more probably demands something which makes better sense of the “one”/“two” construction. I therefore propose that we restore a reference to penis/testicles: i.e., that the penis “digs” the “well” while the two testicles “look at it.” Thus, this proposed reconstruction:

1-am₃ pu₂ al-b[a-al(?)] ‘One has [opened up] the well,
2-am₃ igi am₃-bar[re (…)] ‘the (other) two looked on.
ki-bur₃-bi ge₅₂, bir₂₁ u₄₁ [šir (x’)] ²) ‘Answer: a flaccid penis and [testicles].’

My understanding is that the action of the first two lines is set in the past; thus, the flaccidity of the penis has resulted from past action, with coitus having been completed by the time of the climactic punchline.

The reconstruction is supported in five ways. First, it fits the context and logic of the riddle, where if the penis is the “one,” some entity needs to answer as the “two.” Second, the paleography allows us to as easily read u₄₁ as igi+bar₁. Third, the pairing of “penis” and “testicles” is already implied in the corpus of Sumerian proverbs, where both are of course vehicles for various humorous observations. ³) Fourth, there is at least one other bawdy joke in this same corpus of riddles (indeed, from the same tablet): no. 8, where the answer is that “the vagina” is like a “(sweet?) mouth.” ⁴) Fifth, the majority of riddle answers are almost all composed of nouns without verbal constructions; that is, answers are typically nominal simplicia
("a dog," "a school," "a deaf person," etc.). A reconstruction of "penis and testicles" would conceivably better conform to this pattern than "a penis in view," which is a noun with a verbal adjective.

Civil opined that the "chronological and cultural distance" of esoteric riddles and proverbs often made comprehension problematic, a sentiment echoed by all who have worked on the seemingly insurmountable challenges they present. But in this instance we may face nothing more complicated than a four-thousand year old schoolboy "bofa deez" joke.

Notes

1 I extend thanks to Piotr Michalowski, who made suggestions on a previous draft of this note. But I alone am responsible for any errors and all tasteless humor.

2 E.g., MSL XII p. 205 Recension D l. 28, where lu₂₄-geš₂ bir₂-ra = kalšu, listed together with the "lame person" (l. 30, lu₂₄ du₁₀-sa-dar), the "clubfoot" (l. 31, lu₂₄-ma-an-zī-la₂), etc. Note also Gudea StB iv 2, where the geš₂ bir₂ is one of the "persons ritually unclean and unpleasant to look at." Cf. CAD kalšu s.v. "to shrivel," including one use in reference to a penis. Note further Prov.Col 2.117, "The dog licks its shrivelled penis" (ur-gir₂₄ geš₂ bir₂-hi eme šu₄₄-bē₂); and Prov.Col 5.44.6 (lUET 6, 236), "Make the donkey sit like this! Make it lift its shrivelled penis!" (anše-ne₂₃-am₁₃ tuš-ma-ab giš₁₃ pîr₂-hi il₂₃-il₂₃-nil₂₁). My thanks to Michalowski for some of these references.

3 It may further be that šir is followed by an adjective in parallel to giš bir₂: "cramped" (giš₂-giš₂) is a possibility. Akkadian descriptions of testicles as having "stiffness" are more common than other alternatives: see mungu A, e.g., isikšu munga, "stiffness of the testicle," from the root verb mašṭu. Thus, I propose "cramped" (mungu). A reconstruction of sug₂₃ ("drained") is also possible from Akkadian parallels (from Summa izbu as šir₂₃ meš₂₃ régatérêqa [CAD I/J s.v. izku s. 1a-1’]), but contexts seem to indicate understanding missing rather than empty testicles.

4 Note especially the alteration SPC 16.4₄ and 23.7 "A shepherd’s sex appeal is his penis/testicles," as well as SPC 1.159, 2.78 and .117, 4.7, 5.4₄ and 8.6₂₁.

5 Of the twenty riddles treated by Civil (1987) which preserve answers, only five (nos. 7, 17–19, 24) are more than bare nouns. Nos. 7 and 18 are nouns modified by adjectives; nos. 17, 19, and 24 include verbal constructions. The repetition of bar as the verb in the second and third lines seems unlikely.
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51) The porters list, unpublished text from University of Pennsylvania Museum — I have hand-copied this text at my last visit to Penn Museum on my birthday March/29/2022, after the end of AOS meeting in Boston. The museum was very kind to allow me to study and publish the text. The text records assigning four porters, to carry the gypsum to a house, in addition to two other men with unknown positions, probably one of them is the (Ugula: overseer). Then the scribe left a long space after the last personal name, and wrote the name of the city Uri₂.

The tablet (CBS 11008):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Obv.1</th>
<th>Porters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ug₂₃-I₄GA₆</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ur₄-DUNŠUL</td>
<td>Lugal-uš</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ur₄-DUNŠUL</td>
<td>Nig₂₄-sa₁₃ge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ur₂-DUNŠUL</td>
<td>Lugal-gaba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>e₂₃ im-babbar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ur-ad-[x]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lusuen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Space)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Uri₂¹</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Low.ed</th>
<th>Gypsum (to) the house</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lu₄-suen (EN.ZU)</td>
<td>Gypsum (to) the house</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rev.</th>
<th>Ur city</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Uri₂¹</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

–111–
Most of the personal names in the list appears in Nippur assigned as farmers, supervisors and porters. As for Urdun who is strangely mentioned three times in three lines one after another in the text, he appears in Ur III texts receiving amount of silver. (Owen, D. 1982, pl. 159, t. 706), and in seal impressions as (nu-bandas: overseer) son of A-ka-la. (Pohl, A. 1937, 15; Waetzoldt, H. 1976, 318). While lugal-gaba appears in texts from Nippur as (muhaldim lugal: king’s cook) son of ku-li. (Owen, D. 1982, pl. 158, t. 698). There is a lot of mysterious going around this text, according to the personal name that was repeated three times, it might be a school text, the student kept repeating the name to exercise writing. Or it might be an administrative text, and there are three men with same name (Urdun) assigned in this text. After discussing the content of the text with Prof. Walther Sallaberger, he assumed the term “e₂-im-babbar” might be another personal name, the heading (ug₃-il₂: porters) however, made me think “e₂-im-babbar” is a term not a personal name, because the porters were assigned to carry the gypsum to a house. Prof. Sallaberger could add; it is also strange writing the name of the city Ur, using the sign Uri₂, instead of Uri₅. Anyhow, the mysterious about this text, is bringing it closer to define its genre as a school text, according to the repeated name, the Uri₂ sign and the hand typing.
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52) A note on possible initial and final consonantal clusters in Sumerian words*

“SYLLABLE STRUCTURE. Here again we are dependent on Akkadian, because we are only able to reach Sumerian syllabograms through their Akkadian pronunciation. As a Semitic language has no initial consonantal clusters ... or word-final clusters ... we cannot identify Sumerian syllables with a structure differing from Akkadian. Therefore, while we may ask whether Sumerian syllables of the type bra-, pli-, ..., -urps actually existed, there is no way to prove them” (Edzard 2003, 22).

This statement cannot be agreed with unreservedly. Edzard refers ibidem to Postgate, who contradicts Falkenstein’s assumption that ‘ba-ra-’ could be a spelling for intended *b+ra (Postgate 1974, 18 on the considerations of Falkenstein 1949, 190 and ~ 1950, 185)3).

Consonantal clusters of two consonants inside the word at a syllable boundary are common (ašgar, äš-gar)4). Consonantal clusters at the beginning and end of words are not unequivocally proven. Postgate deals with special cases; can it be ascertained, or at least made plausible, that no such consonantal clusters existed? In a mixed word/syllable script such as cuneiform, not all initial and final consonants of a syllable would necessarily have to be written5). Vowels could be written individually, as corresponding words existed (a = water etc.); with the exception of the plosives (b, p; d, t; g, k), all phonemes can be pronounced with the same sustained length as the vowels. The possibility of assigning a cuneiform sign to those phonemes was not realised (this would have been a preliminary stage to an alphabetic script); at least there is no indication of it anywhere6). Presumably there was no reason to do so either. One kept to what – in the opinion of the author (cf. NABU 2013/55) – had been adopted from the Proto-Euphratians, “one sign = one word/one syllable”.

If one assumes on a trial basis that “he wrote” (in-sar) was pronounced *n-sar, the simplest spelling with syllables would be ‘ni-sar’ or ‘in-sar’. The latter is more likely, as it seems to come closer in pronunciation to *n-sar (the vowel “i” is arbitrarily chosen; cf. Turkish İzmir for Smyrna). The “i” in “in-sar” can be understood as a “peg element” (NABU 2021/64). The question is whether that peg element was pronounced or not. If it was pronounced, there were presumably no initial consonantal clusters. If it was not pronounced, but only written, because “n” alone could not be written, there were initial consonantal clusters. An article by Wilcke (~ 1988) proves helpful in making this decision. Although it only deals with Neo-Sumerian verbal forms, this does not detract from its argumentation. The spellings i-ib-, i-im- and i-in- at the beginning of verbal forms examined by Wilcke are not the norm. As an example, ‘i-in-ğal’ is picked out (Wilcke 1988, 24, c2.01). This spelling shows that there were, or at least could be, vowels before *n-ğal:

a) The spelling could indicate that the “i” in “in-ğal” is to be pronounced long – this is an unlikely assumption. A scribe knew whether the vowel was long or short: it could at most be an occasional instance of hypercorrectness (see Edzard 2003, 13, “Vowels”; cf. Falkenstein 1964, 29 ad lá-u-ù).

b) Spellings with “i” at the beginning could indicate that otherwise an *n/b/m-verbal root (in the chosen example: *n-ğal) is to be read. However, this can also be ruled out: the spellings i-ib, i-im, i-im- (Wilcke 1988, I) display “regressive vowel take-up”, which shows that the “simple vowel” is to be spoken before b, n and m. The double spellings a-ab- etc. beginning with “a” and “u” (many examples in Wilcke1988, note 36) are to be evaluated differently, since here the simple vowel must necessarily be pronounced. In the case of “a”, it is the formerly “independent” conjugation prefix “a” (Falkenstein 1964, § 32; Thomsen 1984, §§ 316-321), which is recorded in Edzard 2003, § 12.10 next to “a1” as an allomorph of the morpheme “a(l)” (“prefixed indicator”). For “u”, prospective forms (ü-ü-) and negated forms (nu-ü-ub- etc., in this case with progressive vowel harmony) come into consideration.

One would suppose that the verbal forms with a twice written initial vowel fulfill certain selection criteria (in the example chosen above, ‘i-in-ğal’, “i” could indicate that the “n” is the shortened form of the locative 2 element “ni”: Wilcke 1988, 24 and 37f.; Edzard 2003, 100 bottom). However, this does not seem to be the case, as there are often parallels with only a single written vowel (Wilcke 1988, passim [cf. especially p. 9 top5) as well as notes 80 and 82]). In “n-ul-” (*u-al-) the prospective and the morpheme “a(l)” are linked together (Edzard 2003, § 12.10). Generalised, this means that there were probably no initial consonantal clusters.

For final consonantal clusters, peg elements of the form CV could have been introduced (following the resumption of the last consonant in the spelling of case endings: Ê-an-na *Ê-an-a(k)6). There do not
seem to be any clear indications of this. Also, when adding case endings, final consonantal clusters should become noticeable. If one assumes that AMAR /amār/ (call) was actually to be read as */amāst/ or similar, the genitive should have been written AMAR-ra(k) or syllabically */a-ma-ra(k) (analogously when swapping r and s in the hypothetical pronunciation). Likewise, final consonantal clusters should have been revealed in the adoption of words from Sumerian into Akkadian: If AN = */an/ (heaven, sky) was actually read as */a-nu/ or similar, it should have been adopted into Akkadian in the form */a-lu-nu. Such spellings are not known (to me) for either Sumerian or Akkadian.

The sounds  and ì (=[phoneme “dr”], the only two “genuine” candidates for consonantal clusters, must have been perceived as one phoneme each by the Sumerians (otherwise one would have had consonantal clusters after all; compare ζ, ξ and γ in Greek). The Akkadians could represent  by “ng” (which often becomes n, g or gg; cf. hé-gáäl > hegállu), thus splitting the phoneme (cf. in German fangen [ng = ], but in hyphenation fan-gen); this “ng” is to be separated from “genuine” Sumerian “n-g” (as in engar /en-gar/, cf. German an-genen).) In this context, reference to ” should also be made to the (albeit late) “unorthographic spellings” (brief summary: Thomsen 1984, 284).

Résumé: Postgate’s considerations, which have been slightly expanded in the present contribution, suggest that there were neither initial nor final consonantal clusters in Sumerian words.

Notes

* Abbreviations as in NABU 2019/56; /.../: (approximate) reading of the sign (combination) “...”; >: becomes; C: consonant; V: vowel.

Postgate points out that his findings do not necessarily also have to apply to the periods before or after Gudea. On the page given by Edzard l. c. *b+ta is dealt with, among other things. Postgate deals with this in four points, the last two of which (3 and 4) are decisive: 3) it would be contrary to the nature of an infix (pronominal element [b] + dimensional element [a]) to place it at the beginning of a verbal form; however, Postgate overlooks the fact that the term “infix” was coined by modern grammarians. 4) The form ’ba’ba-ta’è’ (Gudea, Cyl. A ix 26) would seem to prove that ’ba-ta’ is not merely a spelling for *b+ta, since *labta-è could have been written as ’la-ab-ta’è’. This sounds convincing; however, frequently occurring spellings were often retained (think of ŠU.NIG.TUR.LAL-bi = tukumbi; cf. also Edzard 2003, § 12.8.1.20 ad “[e]neši”). It is therefore conceivable that the negation (ia-) must not necessarily have had an influence on the usual spelling ’ba-ta(è)” (cf. on this also G. Zólyomi, Directive infix and oblique object in Sumerian, (...), Or 68 [1999] 215–253, note 20). Just for the sake of completeness, it should be pointed out that, for example, for ‘adbar’ (ad-bar; basalt/basaltic lava) a spelling ’a-da-bar’ is also documented (ePSD). Auxiliary vowels to facilitate pronunciation are found in many languages (cf. for example in Akkadian laburu instead of the expected *labru, urballu” instead of urballu, in German dialectally “jetzert” for “jetzt”).

2 The “Ur III unorthodox spelling nam-bi-ri” for – according to Edzard – assumed (nambi) is evaluated by Edzard as a “secondary phonetic phenomenon” (“b” being a gliding sound, “glide”) [Edzard 2003, 22; NB: here Edzard assesses CV (bi) as C (b)].

3 Compare “Linear B” on Crete: ta-to-mo = στοίχως, pa-te = πατίνω and πίντες (the examples are taken from W. Eckschmitt, Das Gedächtnis der Völker, Berlin 1968).

4 For Akkadian see W. von Soden, Grundriß der akkadischen Grammatik, AnOr 33/47, Rome 1969, § 8e.

5 Wilcke comments on possible differences in meaning between the spellings with single and doubled vowels, for example, at the end of note 31, on page 40 top and on page 46 bottom (here with reference to Yoshikawa, ICS 29, 223ff.). Two different schools of scribes were contemplated by Krecher (cf. on this Wilcke 1988, 6f.).

6 The five (late) spellings “-gni-ra” for “gud (= bull)” (Thomsen 1984, § 23: “gudr”; evidence in the ePSD s.v. gad) may hardly be understood in this sense. Moreover, this is the “phoneme” ì (see below). In this context, reference should also be made to the (albeit late) “unorthographic spellings” (brief summary: Thomsen 1984, 281–284).

7 In theory, all Sumerian and Akkadian texts should have been examined. This, of course, did not happen. Presumably there are further cases that should be assessed as in footnote 2 (or considered as errors). A spoken consonantal cluster could possibly have survived in the word for “date” (fruit) (borrowed into Sumerian?): zù-lum(b) > suluppum (Falkenstein 1964, § 8.a.2; B. Landsberger, Die Anfänge der Zivilisation in Mesopotamien, Ankara Üniversitesi, Dil ve Tarih-Coğrafya Fakültesi Dergisi, 431–437 [1944], 436 [sulumb]).
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53) The diri-compound SIKI.PA.IB in the Old Babylonian period — To this date, the only discussion of the rare diri-compound SIKI.PA.IB is found in Falkenstein’s edition of syllabic Sumerian incantations from Hattuša, published in 1939. He identified the compound’s linguistic form as /hamanzer/, which he linked to ḫanāṣtru “mouse”, and translated it as “Haarknäuel” (a term probably best rendered as “wad of hair” in English). This note offers a re-evaluation of the lexeme.25

1. OB attestations. Most attestations of SIKI.PA.IB date to the Old Babylonian period. It is found in the lexical lists Ugu-nu₁₀ and Diri (both from Nippur), as well as in unprovenanced Diri “Oxford”:

- **OB Diri Nippur Sect. 6 2: [SIKI.PA].IB : mu-ša-[a-ṭum];**
- **OB Ugu-nu₁₀ Nippur (MSL IX 51 S20 = Ist Ni. 4617) rev. i 8’: SIKI.PA.IB-nu₁₀;**
- **OB Ugu-nu₁₀ Nippur (MSL IX 51 S1 = CBS 6559+) rev. i 26: SIKI.PA.-nu₁₀;**
- **OB Diri “Oxford” 421: [SIKI].PA.IB : mu-ša₁-a-tù.**

Outside of the lexical material the lexeme is also found in three mss. of an incantation against witchcraft.26

All three texts are written in standard orthographic Sumerian.

- **ms. A:** JRL 1059 = AoO 24 pl. 2 obv. 3-5 (Wilcke 1973: 10-13)
- **ms. B:** CBS 11933 obv. i 1-4” (Geller 1989)
- **ms. C:** CBS 332 = PBS 1/2 122 obv. 5-9 (Lutz 1919: 56, Falkenstein 1931: 50)

KUB 30 1 is a later recension of the same incantation, probably dating to the Kassite period (Falkenstein 1939: 9). It is written in an unusual syllabic Sumerian, the investigation of which led Falkenstein to conclude that the text was produced by a non-Hittite scribe in Hattuša (o.c. 11).27

- **ms. D:** KUB 30 1 obv. 5-8 (Falkenstein 1939)

The relevant lines describe how a witch creates figurines of her victims:

- **A:** ki-sikil ṣuruš šu-du-a ă-lâ ⸌Tx x ⸌i-ṇen im-[ZU].[AB]
- **B:** [⸌ă-lă-dâ-e-dé][[] x
- **C:** ki-sikil ṣuruš [⸌],[i-ṇen im-ZU.AB
- **D:** ki-si-ku-šuruš šu-da a-la-al-le-[g]eme , i-gi-in im-ma-ab-[zu]

- **A:** ḫabrud-[da SIKI.PA.IB-re [šu im-ma-an-ti]
- **B:** [ḥabrud]-[da SIKI.PA.IB ,][šu im-ma-ab-ti
- **C:** ḫabrud-da SIKI.PA.IB [⸌]
- **D:** ha-ma-an-zé-er šu im-ma-[ ]

“arabu-clay from a hole (and) SIKI.PA.IB she took; she fashioned an effigy (and) wrapped it in SIKI.PA.IB.”

2. Linguistic form. Based on the Kassite text’s ha-ma-an-zé-er (KUB 30 1 7), Falkenstein 1939: 25 proposed the reading ḫamāner for SIKI.PA.IB. This suggestion was strengthened by the use of SIKI.PA.IB-re in JRL 1059 obv. 4f. (see Wilcke 1973: 13). Falkenstein considered the linguistic form ḫamāner as inseparable from Akk. ḫa.naṣ(š)tru “mouse”28 (Falkenstein 1939: 27), noting the use of ū for /ši/ (o.c. 11). This supposed link between the two lexemes led him to speculate that “mouse” might have
been a metaphor for the “Haarknäuel” (o.c. 27). Although the phonological similarity between /hamanzer/ and *hašiṣṭruna is indeed striking, I propose another interpretation of the Sumerian.

The lexieme can be understood as a frozen verbal form *hašma-nZR; the most likely candidate for the verbal base is zē.(r) = zī.(r)7) “to cut, remove”. The verb zī.(r) is typically used to designate the removal of plants, but also of hair (Civit 1994: 70) and animal fleece (Waetzoldt 1972: 12-14). Molina and Such-Gutiérrez (2004: 6f.) have shown that in the context of plant removal the verbal base designates the extralinguistic event of cutting off plants at the lower part of the stem, using a small sharp tool. It is possible that the extralinguistic event of cutting hair and fleece was conceptualised in a similar manner.8)

The modal proclitic {ha} is used to express assertions, wishes, or commands (Jagersma 2010: 561). Together with perfective forms it can express wishes/commands – /hamanzir/ as “may s/he cut for me” or “let him/her cut for me” –, but also “assert strongly a past action or state” (oc. 562) – “s/he truly has cut for me”. In the OB incantation the witch creates a figurine of her victim using clay and hamanzir. It is safe to assume that this was conceptualised as an act of sympathetic magic, in which the victim’s hamanzir had to be collected. This context makes the assertive function of {ha} in the frozen verbal form more likely.9)

The lexieme hamanzir can therefore be added to the list of Sumerian substantivised and lemmatised finite verbal forms (cf. Salz 1993: 43).10)

3. Constituent graphemes. The constituent graphemes of the diri-compound SIK.LAP.AIB also transport meaning on the graphemic level, independently of the linguistic form.

Falkenstein 1939: 27 understood the constituents siki and PA.IB(šab)11) as “plucked wool” (“ausgeraute Wolle”), based on the later equation of šab with Akk. bāgūmu(m) “to pluck” (see AHw I: 104, CAD B: 97ff.).

The Old Babylonian bilingual lists containing a section on PA.IB offer a number of Akkadian verbs associated with Sum. šab, but bāgūmu(m) is not among them:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OB Diri “Oxford”</th>
<th>OB Diri Sippur</th>
<th>OB Diri Nippur</th>
<th>OB Lú Nippur</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1ša-ra-mu</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>ša-ru-um</td>
<td>ša-ru-um</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1qaš-ra-mu</td>
<td>ša-ru-um</td>
<td>ha-ru-šu</td>
<td>ša-ru-um</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1ha-ru-šu</td>
<td>ha-ru-šu</td>
<td>ha-ru-šu</td>
<td>ha-ru-šu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1eše-ru</td>
<td>ha-ru-šu</td>
<td>ha-ru-šu</td>
<td>ha-ru-šu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1ša-ap-pa</td>
<td>ša-ru-um</td>
<td>ša-ru-um</td>
<td>ša-ru-um</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tab. 1: Akkadian verbs associated with Sum. PA.IB(šab) in OB bilingual lists.

Table 1 shows the distribution of these verbs across the respective lists. Note that the OB Lú Nippur ms. MSL XII 29 D contains the same verbs as OB Diri Nippur.

The three Diri recensions agree on Akk. šarāmu(m) “to break off, to cut off” (AHw III: 1184, CAD Š II: 48f.) and esēqum “to incise, to cut in” (AHw I: 249, CAD E: 331f.). Additionally, the Diri recensions “Oxford” and Nippur agree on harāšum “to cut off, to cut in deeply; to make clear” (AHw I: 323f. s.v. 1, CAD H: 92ff. s.v. A); see also the proverb N 3395 obv. 8, in which Sum. šab-šab-e corresponds to Akk. i-ha-ra-[šu] (Alster 1997: 289).

Compare the use of šab in literary compositions: LB I 311f. (ll 323f.): 96i-ni-ri-na-bi 9A.GUG4 gid-da a-ša-ga-kej3, kug 4lugal-banda4 ǰiri-ta ba-ra-an-šab “...Its roots, which are like the tallest rushes in the
meadows, Holy Lugalbanda cut off with a knife” (Vanstiphout 2003: 120f.); *Sīn-iddinam to Utu* 15 (Borger 1991: 34): jurusī2-zi šu-ud-á-ba-gi2 ūn₂ ab₂-gur₁₀ ba₂-an-šab₂-či₂ gurun₂-gibil₂-gi2-im₂-ma₂-an₂-[dub₂-uš] “Your young men were harvested like grain in the right time, they were cut down – like fresh fruit they were made tremble”; *Šulgi* B 339: pirin₂ igt₂ urad₂sukur₂-ra₂ ga₂-ra₇ur₂-gi2 ūn₂-šab₂-e₂ “Lions – the front of the spear cut them down like leeks”; *Uruk Lament* 3.14: sa₂-sa₂-bi urad₂šum₂-me₂ ūn₂-dam₂ ši₂-ri₂-bi₂ hu₂-r₂i₂(ERI₂xMIN₂)-i₂nu₂-[mense₂-na₂]-l₂š₂ “Its muscles shall be saws that slash; its feet shall be eagles’ (talons)” (Green 1984: 270). Particularly noteworthy is *CurAg* 205: ki-sikil₂-bi₂ šab₂-či₂ ūn₂-ša₂-n₂-ša₂-n₂ “Its young women did not restrain from cutting off (their) hair” (trsl. adapted from Cooper 1983: 61).

Bilingual lists and literary compositions suggest that the constituent graphemes siki and šab₂(PA₂.IB₂) of the diri-compound SIKI₂.PA₂.IB can be understood as an etymographic writing for “cut-off hair” (“abgeschneiteten Haar”) rather than “plucked wool”. Note also that the currently available OB material associates SIKI₂.PA₂.IB₂(hamanzir) only with human beings, never with animals.

4. **Semantic structure.** Based on the considerations regarding both the linguistic form /hamanzir/ and the diri-compound SIKI₂.PA₂.IB we can aim to reflect the semantic structure of the lexeme with a translation of “CUT”. This conceptual difference can be understood as an example for translation processes between the two languages that do not involve direct dictionary-type equations of the form “A = B”. A neutral translation like the fortuitous “loose hair” used in Geller 1989: 199 seems appropriate if a translator does not want to reflect the specific semantic structure transported in the Sumerian or the Akkadian lexeme.

It is interesting to note that the Sumerian lexeme differs in this regard from the Akkadian *mušātu(m)* typically associated with it. The Akkadian lexeme was first discussed together with SIKI₂.PA₂.IB in Falkenstein 1939: 27, who convincingly connected it with Akk. *mušṭu(m) “comb”* (AHw II: 687 s.v., CAD M/II: 290f. s.v.). Falkenstein’s translation of *mušātu(m)* as “ausgekämmtes Haar” (taken up in AHw II: 682 s.v.) is based on *mušṭu(m)* and the etymographic understanding of Sumerian SIKI₂.PA₂.IB (Falkenstein l.c.). CAD M/II: 262 s.v. translates “hair comblings”. Here, the extralinguistic referent is conceptualised with the semantic domain ‘COMB’.12

The same extralinguistic referent is conceptualised as part of different semantic domains in Sumerian hamanzir(SIKI₂.PA₂.IB) ‘CUT’ and Akkadian *mušātu(m) ‘COMB’. This conceptual difference can be understood as an example for translation processes between the two languages that do not involve direct dictionary-type equations of the form “A = B”. A neutral translation like the fortuitous “loose hair” used in Geller 1989: 199 seems appropriate if a translator does not want to reflect the specific semantic structure transported in the Sumerian or the Akkadian lexeme.

---

1. Research for this article was funded by a DOC Fellowship of the Austrian Academy of Sciences (2016-2019).
2. Of these, CBS 332 = PBS 1/2 122 (Falkenstein 1939) and JRL 1059 = AFO 24 pl. 2 (Wilcke 1973) are unprovenanced. CBS 11933 (Geller 1989) is from Nippur.
3. For KUB 30 1 see also Viano 2016: 229-233.
4. For the lexeme see AHw I: 355 s.v. *hums₂/stru(m)*, CAD H: 236 s.v. *hu₄ns₂ra₂u₂ra₂*
5. Civil 1966: 123 fn. 14 has listed hamanzer as a word of unknown origin.
7. For the preferred reading zi see Molina – Such-Gutierrez 2004: 4-5.
8. The association between sharp implements (dagger, sword) and the removal of hair in *Eridu Lament* 5.5-6 might suggest this as well: šu₂-min₂-a₂-na₂-šir₂ ba₂-da₂-ra₂ šu₂ bi₂-in₂-da₂₂ ur₂-bi₂ i₂-l₂-gun₂-e₂ , siki₂-n₂ "nūm₂n₂-bur₂-gi₂n₂ i₂-z₂-i₂ l₂-u₂-sig₂ n₂₂₂ “She held dagger and sword in her two hands – they clash together. She cuts off her hair like rushes, uttering a bitter lament” (trsl. adapted from Green 1978: 137).
9. Neo-Assyrian *Diri V* 147 gives the linguistic form hu₂-mu₂-zir₂(MU₂Š) for a cloth TŪG₂.SIKI₂.PA₂.IB₂, with a variant writing hu₂-n₂u₂-un₂₂₂-zir₂ in VAT 10240 (MSL XV 166 C) obv. ii 11’. This *hum₂(n)₂zir₂ can similarly be understood as “hu₂-mu₂(n)₂zir₂ “she truly has cut”.
10. Compare also the lexeme ganzer “netherworld” < *ga₂+n₂zi₂(x)*, cf. Selz 1993: 40 with fn. 84.
the field had to be left fallow every other year (to maintain its productivity), which doubles the payback period of about 7 years (or 7 harvests).

tenant.

Hammu investor purchasing a field could recoup the investment by leasing out the field and collecting rent.

Š number of field sales (A.

Payback period for land is calculated by dividing the initial investment by the sum of the profit from each harvest, where profit = gross income – expenses. The longer the payback period, the less profitable the investment. Let’s establish the parameters for a calculation of the payback period. Sippur had the largest number of field sales (A.ŞÂ) of any site used in my study. Twenty-three field sales from Sippur were dated under Hammu-rabi, the most under any ruler. The mean price for those 23 sales was 6.20 shekels/iku. An investor purchasing a field could recoup the investment by leasing out the field and collecting rent.¹¹ Under Hammu-rabi, a lessor (owner) received rent of about 1 gur barley per iku of field, which typically equaled 1/3d of the crop,²¹ which implies a total yield of 3 gur/iku or 54 gur/bur. Expenses were borne by the tenant.²³ Using 1 shekel silver as the average price of 1 gur of barley under Hammu-rabi, a lessee (tenant) paid 2 shekels silver per iku of field, which equaled 1/3d of the crop,²³ which implies a total yield of 3 gur/iku or 54 gur/bur. Expenses were borne by the tenant.²³

Assuming an investor with surplus capital had decided to purchase land, it is reasonable to assume he based his decision in a large part on the payback period. Sippur had the largest number of field sales (A.ŞÂ) of any site used in my study. Twenty-three field sales from Sippur were dated under Hammu-rabi, the most under any ruler. The mean price for those 23 sales was 6.20 shekels/iku. An investor purchasing a field could recoup the investment by leasing out the field and collecting rent.¹¹ Under Hammu-rabi, a lessor (owner) received rent of about 1 gur barley per iku of field, which typically equaled 1/3d of the crop,²¹ which implies a total yield of 3 gur/iku or 54 gur/bur. Expenses were borne by the tenant.²³ Using 1 shekel silver as the average price of 1 gur of barley under Hammu-rabi results in a payback period of about 7 years (or 7 harvests).²³ But as Marten Stol pointed out,⁵ one must account for the fact that the field had to be left fallow every other year (to maintain its productivity), which doubles the payback period of sharecropping.
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period to 14 years, excluding taxes. 6) Fourteen years is, however, overly optimistic, in that it assumes an “average” harvest each year. That was definitely not the case. 7) This leads to an obvious question. Given a minimum payback period of 14 years, why would anyone buy land? The answer is that the investor did not sell the barley he received, but rather loaned it out. Barley loans were extremely profitable. Van De Mieroop has shown that the standard 33% interest on barley loans was not for one year, but for the term of the loan, which could be as little as one month. 8)

Moreover, when harvests were poor, the tenant almost certainly ended up borrowing barley from the landowner (lessor) to feed his family. It’s no wonder the archives of individuals such as Sin-iddinam, Šumšunu-watar and Šissu-nawrat from Kish show them purchasing land and making loans. 9) In the case of Šumšunu-watar, his archive also includes field leases.

Notes
1) The archive of Šumšunu-watar of Kish shows him purchasing fields and orchards and leasing fields and orchards. In OECT 13, 280, for example, Šumšunu-watar leases out a field of 6? iku and orchard in month 5 of Sumu-abum year 13. In RA 8, 1, dated the same month and year, he purchased a field of 11 ½ iku. See also YOS 14, 109 and 113, where Šumšunu-watar is owed barley for the lease of his field (and orchard in 109). There are eleven sales in the database where Šumšunu-watar purchases fields and/or orchards.

2) See Leemans 1975: 141-142 for a discussion of rental rates. The Code of Hammu-rabi (CH §46 indicates the rental rate could be 1/3 to 1/2 the yield. CH §58 and §255 indicate that 1 bur of field could yield 60 gur of barley, in line with a 1 gur per iku field rental rate (equal to a yield of 54 gur/bur).

3) Stol 2004: 850 and see CAD M p. 204 (mānahtum mg. 2b).

4) Van De Mieroop 1992: 192, using slightly different price and yield parameters (and excluding expenses), calculated that it took three harvests to recover the price of a field, spread out over 6 years to account for leaving the land fallow. He assumed the purchaser did not lease out the field but farmed it himself, which would have shortened the payback period.


6) Instead of payback period, Renger 1987: 59 looked at how much land was needed to support a family. He calculated a family of five (1 adult male and 4 dependents) consumed 7.2 gur barley/year, which required 14 iku of field to produce (assuming half cultivated, half fallow). His calculation was based on a yield of 20 gur/bur (333 sila/iku), which he considered to be the average barley yield during the OB period. Using 20 gur/bur instead of 54 gur/bur to calculate payback period would almost triple the fourteen-year estimate.

7) Even in modern-day America, not unlike their ancient counterparts, farmers are at the mercy of the weather. A longtime friend of mine, who farms 80 acres in central Illinois, stated that “for every good year (harvest), there are 2-3 bad years and 5 okay years.” (Personal communication 7/30/2018.) The primitive farming techniques employed by the Babylonian farmer, the greater susceptibility of their crop to diseases and natural disasters, coupled with perennial warfare undoubtedly skewed that ratio towards the negative. For a study of the variability of rainfall and its effect on yields in the Middle Assyrian kingdom, see Reculeau 2011. This variability of yields (harvests) in Babylonia is reflected in OB barley prices, which fluctuate markedly even within a few years (e.g., TMH 10, 105).
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55) The redaction and interpretation of § 117-118 of the Laws of Hammurabi — According LH § 117, if a man has defaulted and cannot pay his debt he has two options: he can either sell (ana kaspim ittinand) his wife and/or (u) children or (ulu) give them into debt service (ana kiššātim ittinand). § 118, dealing with the handing over of a slave or (ulu) slave-girl ana kiššātim, also has ittinand. The difference in § 117 between itdin and ittinand, which describe similar actions with the defaulting debtor as agents, is a problem. In Ammi-šuđuq’a’s Edict § 20 both options (together with a third one of “giving” himself or family members as pledge, ana mazzāzanım), are governed by one single verbal form, which must be [iddin]. Why is in § 117 ittinand used alongside itdin and what does it mean?

A look at the various translations of LH yields a mixed picture (italics in the translations are mine). M. Roth, LCMA, “If… he sells or gives into debt service”, ignores the difference in § 117, but her translation of § 118, “If he should give… into debt service”, suggests that she took ittinand there as a (future) perfect. Th. Meek, in ANET, translates ittinand by “he has put himself into bondage”, taking it as a reflexive Gt-form, but this interpretation is impossible in § 118, where the slaves are the object of the action. W. Eilers (AO 31, 1932) translates ittinand both in § 117 and § 118 simply by “gingibt”, as if it was it a normal G-stem. The re-edition, supervised by K. Hecker (Codex Hammurabi, Marix Verlag 2009), translates ittinand in § 117 by “gegeben hat”, as a perfect of the G-stem, but writes in § 118 “gegeben werden”, which suggests an N-stem. E. Cohen (following Huehnergard and GAG) takes ittinand in § 118 as perfect of the N-stem, but he ignores § 117. The interpretation as passive might be supported with Ammi-šuđuq’a’s Edict, where after the active itdin of § 20, § 21, which focuses on the fate of the victims, uses passive verbal forms (innadin, ikkašši, inneziš). If LH § 117 and 118 were to exhibit the same distinction ittinand of § 118 might be a N-stem, with the slaves as logical object, although the perfect remains difficult, but a passive is impossible in § 117.

Kraus, in Ein Edikt des Königs Ammi-šuđuq’a von Babylon (Leiden 1958) 178ff., rejects the interpretation of ittinand advocated by Meek and Poebel, and follows von Soden, who identified it as a preterite of the Gtn-stem, a derivation followed by Borger, TUAT I/1 (1982), 56, “jeweils in ein Gewaltverhältnis gibt”. A. Finet (LAPO 6, 1973) translates in § 117 both verbal forms in the same way, “il a dû vendre / livrer”, but notes that he considers the second, ittinand (also in § 118) as a preterite of the Gtn-stem, with distributive meaning, although he maintains that the form could be a perfect of the N-stem, “il a été livré”. Kraus rightly observes that is impossible that § 117 envisages that all family members are sold and suggests that “his wife, his son and his daughter” are objects of a “distributive predicate”, which means “dass die Familienmitglieder einander in der kiššatun abwechselten”, which implies that u here means “or”. This fits § 118, where “slave or (ulu) slave-girl”, both written with logograms, can be taken as objects, but it is strange that in § 117, after simple itdin in the first part of the protasis, the second part with the same objects and subject, would add the notion “abwechselnd/ jeweils”.

That family members were given “abwechselnd” into kiššatun is not very likely and the iterative form here must express that they are alternative victims, from which the pater familias or his creditor could choose. “Alternative” fits the “distributive nuance” of the tn-inf, as pointed out by Kouwenberg (The Akkadian Verb, 416). One finds this use of the Gtn often with the verb apālim, “to meet an obligation” (see CAD A/II, s.v, many examples under 1, b)-f), including the ones quoted below), which has as object various obligations and responsibilities, not because they have to be met repeatedly or sequentially, but are alternatives chosen due to the circumstances. The Gtn then refers to obligations whatever they may turn out to be, e.g. in “he is responsible to the king in each case that may arise” (piḫatam šati šarra rum itanappal, OB), “he will answer the man who vindicates, whatever his claim” (bāṣqirānum itanappal, OB), and “I myself will take care of every obstacle that may hinder me” (ana aṿātim ša iparrikkan anāku utanappal, AbB 14, 88:15-16). The same use of the Gtn occurs with stipulations on a fine or penalty, e.g. in LH § 4, aran d ninim šuṭti ittanassāši, “he will bear the penalty imposed by the verdict in question”, where the Gtn takes into account that the penalty may differ depending the decision of the judges.

According to the standard grammar ittinand is a perfect of the N-stem (see GAG § 33 f, with § 102c, on the preservation of the n, “um Verwechselungen von Formen auszuschließen”). But a perfect is impossible in § 117, since there is no conseccusio temporum; not itdin ma but itdin ulu, followed by an alternative, for which one expects a second verb in the preterite, which makes the interpretation as a past
tense of the Gtn the best solution. This means that ittandin stands for ittaddin, which, if not a mistake, could be an attempt to bring out the underlying m-infix by non-assimilation of the n. One might be tempted to compare CAD N/I s.v. nadānum, p. 43, 1, 3’, which mentions the co-occurrence of the I/2 forms ittandin and ittaddin in OB, but Kouwenberg informs me that the Gt-stem of nadānum does not exist and that such forms are also not quoted in CAD.

The co-occurrence of ittandin and ittaddin has a parallel in Old Assyrian, where the normal distinction between the perfect and the preterit of the N-stem is also the (non-)assimilation of the n. The perfect i-ta-an-di-in (ittandin), “it has been sold” (AKT 6, 411:44; AKT 11, 149:28), versus the preterite i-ta-di-na (ittaddinā), “they were sold” (AKT 1, 46:13). Kouwenberg, GOA 558f., accepted my idea and the last form was a pret. of the Ntn, but admits that it might be a perfect N with assimilation, and this now proves indeed to be the case, since this form is also attested in TC 3, 216A:18, šumma bētū ... i-ta-di-na, “if the houses have been sold”, where a Ntn (ittaddinā) does not fit the context. OA has more cases of assimilated alongside non-assimilated forms of the N-stem. We find them with našši’um: the imperative našši or našši’, the infinitive naššu’um or naššu’um, and the perfect tatašši or tatānši (see Kouwenberg, GOA 558). Also with nadād’um: ana na-an-du-em (GOA 558), alongside URUDU-kā i-ta-an-di (kt 87/k 453:25, courtesy K. Hecker), “your copper has been stored”.

The appearance of ittandin in § 117, even when interpreted as a past tense of the Gtn, remains strange after the preceding īddin, because we would expect the same verbal form to govern both parts of the protasis. A possible explanation is that this reflects editorial activity of those who drafted the laws. In our case there might have been a “Vorlage” for § 117, perhaps a royal edict, which just like Edict As § 20 enumerated the various options regarding the victims and their fates by using only one single verbal form, īddin. The more sophisticated Gtn-stem, “he gave them alternatively” (ittandin), might then have been added by the learned scribe, who also replaced ū by the explicit ulu “or”, both of which he then used also in § 118. One might also argue than an alternative was realistic with the handing over of a person for kūsāti, but that sale was final, without alternative victim. But, of course, this ‘solution’ is hypothetical and the result remains strange in such a carefully formulated text as LH.

Notes
1 I use M. Roth’s translation for kūsāti, without entering the discussion on its meaning.
2 Driver-Miles, The Babylonian Laws, vol. 1, 208: “the debtor escapes from personal liability by voluntarily delivering up some member (singular - K.R.V.) of his family”. They assume that in our paragraphs “the debtor raises money from a merchant by pledging or selling a dependent member of his household with the object of paying an antecedent debt due to another person”. This is doubtful, for it is not clear how a debtor can raise money in this way. I rather follow Koschaker, Babylonisch-assyrisches Bürgschaftrecht, 129f., who assumes that the debtor delivers the dependent to his own creditor (which is what tankārum in § 118 must mean).
3 Not restored by Kraus in his transliteration (there is just enough room for it in the break), but presented his translation. One could compare the stativa ana kāspim nādākū, used in a case of kūsāti, in AbB 8, 100:14.
5 Conditional Structures in Mesopotamian Old Babylonian (Winona Lake 2012) 139, note 22 (reference N.J.C. Kouwenberg).
6 One might argue that the defaulting debtor himself could sell his wife (or hand her over as pledge), but that being subjected to kūsāti is not an action of his, but a high-handed measure of his creditor (Westbrook “a drastic act of self-help”), who seizes his victim (and according to a number of OB school letters puts her in a prison). To describe her fate a passive verbal form, “she was given”, therefore would be appropriate. But in § 117, which deals with the debtor’s “wife, son u daughter”, a plural verbal form then would be required, unless one interprets the conjunction ū as “or”. However, § 118 uses ūlu to indicate alternatives, which fits the singular ittandin there.
7 It is not clear to me where von Soden stated this. In his GAG § 33f, ittandin is still identified as perfect of the N-stem and only later, in AHw 702, as Gtn (under b, “jeweils geben”).
8 Another example could be the ilteqqû in § 5:18’ of the “Edict of Ammi-šaduqa”, referring to the taking of interest on various kinds of debts.
9 Repeated in his Königliche Verfü gungen in altbabylonischer Zeit (Leiden 1984), 267.
10 Unlikely, because it occurs twice. But mistakes occur even in official texts, e.g. in Edict Ammi-šaduqa § 15, IV:40, where im-ma-ak-ku-su should be i-ma-ak-ku-su, with the màkîsûm as subject. Kraus’s proposal (1984, 243) to
maintain it as an example of the reflexive use of the N-stem is not convincing, since the example he adduces (tامکارم ša ul immaggar, “the creditor does not accept (his proposal)”) is syntactically different from § 15 (مکیسم ša bilat eqlim... ¡n(m)mekkias). The mistake is presumably due to the appearance of the passive immakkas in the next lines.

11 Other examples are i-ta-an-ki-ši (VS 26, 20:25) and i-ta-an-di, “it has been deposited” (Kr 87/k 453:25).

12 In Manuscrit Mesopotamica. Festschrift für Johannes Renger (AOAT 267), 602f., “this general sale is reflected in ... i-ta-di-šu = ittaddūtu”; Kouwenberg, loc.cit., explains the in-form from “its composite subject”. Note that šettu as used in TC 3, 216:15 is grammatically a plural, but in OAss. is used for one house (in casu a particular house in Durhumit); “houses” are bēttāmum.

13 One might suppose that the first verbal form in § 117, iiddin, is a later insertion in a ruling with used only ittandin, also in § 118, but it is difficult to see why the writer would have added iiddin.
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56) En marge d’ARCHIBAB, 36 : le prix des briques cuites à l’époque paléo-babylonienne — Dans son très utile ouvrage sur La Brique et sa mise en œuvre en Mésopotamie des origines à l’époque achéménide, M. Sauvage donne p. 84 un tableau du prix des briques à trois époques : la troisième dynastie d’Ur, la période paléo-babylonienne et la période néo-babylonienne. La troisième référence paléo-babylonienne, AO 1651a, portera sur 2 160 briques cuites pour un prix total de 5 sicles d’argent, ce qui donnerait un équivalent de 432 briques cuites pour 1 sicle d’argent.

Le texte AO 1651, copié par Thureau-Dangin dans TCL 1 (1651a = 82 [tablette] et 1651b = 83 [enveloppe]) est rédigé comme un prêt. Sin-šadi-il et ses trois frères, présentés comme débiteurs, s’engagent à livrer à deux femmes, dont une religieuse-nadlium, 3 sar, soit 2160 briques cuites (agurrum). Le texte comporte une échéance (le 8 du mois viii) mais le contrat ne comporte pas l’indication du jour et du mois, seulement le nom de l’année (an 10 de Hammu-rabi). Les lignes qui suivent l’échéance constituent manifestement une amende au cas où la livraison ne serait pas honorée dans le délai prévu :

\[\begin{array}{c}
\text{ITI APIN.DU₉.A U₄ 18.KAM} \\
\text{SIG₃.AL.ÜR.RA} \\
\text{T.} \quad \text{i-na pu-at i-tu-nim} \\
\text{12} \quad \text{i-na-ad-di-Šu} \\
\text{i-ul id-di-nu-m} \\
\text{R.14} \quad \text{10 GIN KÙ.BABBAR ÎLÂ.E.MÉŠ} \\
\end{array}\]

« (9-12) Ils devront livrer les briques cuites le 18 du mois viii avant le four (atûnum). (13-14) S’ils ne (les) ont pas livrées, ils devront verser 10 sicles d’argent. »

L’indication que la livraison doit se faire « avant le four » signifie que les quatre hommes n’ont pas à assurer le transport1. Les 10 sicles ne représentent pas le prix des briques, mais une compensation au cas où la livraison ne serait pas effectuée dans les conditions convenues. Dans des clauses de ce genre, pour que l’amende ait un effet dissuasif, il faut bien entendu qu’elle soit supérieure à la valeur de l’objet à livrer2. Les données de ce contrat ne peuvent donc telles qu’elles alimenter le dossier du prix des briques à l’époque paléo-babylonienne.

Notes

1 Pour un cas où le transport par bateau est explicitement à la charge de celui qui commande des briques cuites, voir la lettre AbB 12 23 (<http://www.archibab.fr/T13741>).
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n’était connu que par un nom d’année de Naram-Sin et par le texte fameux d’une tablette découverte à Ur par L. Woolley. L’article de JNES 79 est consacré à l’édition commentée du fragment IM 221139 et s’achève par une réédité de UET 1 275 (p. 14-20), texte qui est présenté dans l’introduction de l’article en ces termes (p. 2b) : « it is now clear that the tablet in question tells us only part of the story, it being just an excerpt from a longer inscription, presumably copied by an apprentice scribe as an exercise » (les italiques sont de DC). À l’époque paléo-babylonienne, ce genre d’exercice ne comporte pas de colophon indiquant l’identité du copiste. Mais on est désolé de voir que les efforts pour remettre dans leur contexte les découvertes épigraphiques faites à Ur sont ignorés (p. 13 n. 41). En effet, cette tablette, pourvue de la cote U 7756, n’est pas isolée : elle appartient à un groupe d’exercices d’apprentis scribes de différentes natures retrouvé dans la maison n° 7 Quiet Street, que j’ai commenté dans mon livre sur Le Clergé d’Ur2. Il est vrai que D. Frayne dans RIME 2, 1993, p. 132, n’avait pas renvoyé à cet ouvrage dans sa bibliographie ; il ne figure pas non plus dans la bibliographie supplémentaire de JNES 79, p. 14b. Je me permets d’indiquer pour finir que j’ai attiré l’attention plus récemment sur un autre de ces exercices de copie d’inscriptions paléo-akkadiennes découverts au n° 7 Quiet Street, le « disque » d’Enheduanna UET 1 289 (U 7737)3).

Notes


2 D. Charpin, Le Clergé d’Ur au siècle d’Hammurabi (XIXe-XVIIe siècles av. J.-C.), HEO 22, Genèse-Paris, 1986, p. 425-427. On y corrigerait l’attribution des commentaires de UET I à Burrows. Celui-ci était bien l’épigraphe de la 5e campagne (1926-27) lors de laquelle ces tablettes furent découvertes (cf. AJ VII/4, 1927, p. 404), mais ce fut à S. Smith que revint le soin de les publier (cf. la préface de UET I, p. V : « The Supplement containing Nos. 267 to 309, which was added after the results of 1926-7 were available, is mainly the work of the Rev. E. R. Burrows, S.J.; Nos. 274-276 were copied and translated by Mr. Sidney Smith. »).
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58) A Late Old Babylonian list of rations from Dur-Abi-ešu in the Cotsen collection (Los Angeles) — I have identified another text from Dur-Abi-ešu in the Cotsen collection (Cots. Coll. 96222.1) Working on the photographs made available on the CDLI, I have been able to read a substantial part of the text. However, a collation is still necessary. As I won’t be able to travel to Los Angeles in a near future, I am publishing here some preliminary remarks about that text.

Photographs of Cots. Coll. 96222 have been published by M. Wilson, Education in the Earliest Schools: Cuneiform Manuscripts in the Cotsen Collection, Los Angeles, 2008, text n. 37. The latter identified it as a school text and described the tablet in the following way:

“Wrong! This practice administrative list has many careless spelling mistakes, and the teacher has shown his disapproval by emphatically crossing out the entire text.” (p. 27)

“This practice administrative text is a list of men’s names and the amounts they have been paid. The surfaces of both the obverse and the reverse have been deeply scored with an “X” reaching corner to corner, perhaps because the text has so many simple errors. The tablet is dated to year fourteen of king Samsu-ditana, c. 1612.” (p. 135)

Cots. Coll. 96222 enumerates rations (of grain, probably barley) given to fifty-three individuals. It is dated 23(+x)/viii/Samsu-ditana 14:

54 ITI APIN₄₃DU₈₃AU₄ 23(+)KAM
55 MU sa-am-sa-di-ta-na LUGAL₁E
56 dPAP.NU₄AN.KI
Month viii, 23(+x)th day.

Year Samsu-ditana the king (for) Papnunanki (= Year 14).

Although the tablet had, indeed, been crossed out, this was not done because a teacher had been upset or displeased. Rather, this is a well known administrative practice: it means that, when the administration settled the accounts (ina epēš nikkasṭi in Akkadian\(^5\)), the data recorded on the tablet were transferred to the balanced account. This tablet, already dealt with, could therefore be discarded. Another possible explanation comes from the historical background: a famine seems to have occurred in Babylonia in the last months of the year Samsu-ditana 14, probably resulting in a mišarum in Samsu-ditana 15 (D. Charpin, RA 99, 2005, p. 150-151): could it be that this text was cancelled because the distribution itself was cancelled for lack of grain?

Cots. Coll. 96222 is similar to the long lists CUSAS 8 59-62, which “record barley, sesame, and silver to be distributed to the temple’s personnel and deities, and they all date from the year Samsuditana 10,”\(^6\) but it was written four years later. Many of the people mentioned in Cots. Coll. 96222 are attested in CUSAS 8 59-62, as well as in other accounting texts from Dur-Abi-ešuh from the time of Samsu-ditana:

- CUSAS 8 59: list of sesame rations given to about sixty individuals and gods (2/v/Samsu-ditana 10);
- CUSAS 8 60: list of barley rations given to about fifty individuals. The rations are received in the temple of the goddess Mišarum (13/v/Samsu-ditana 10);
- CUSAS 8 61: list of silver and grain rations given to sixteen individuals;
- CUSAS 8 62: list of barley rations given to about fifty individuals and gods; 4/vi/Samsu-ditana 10);
- CUSAS 8 64: receipt of barley for months ii and iii (30/iii/Samsu-ditana 11);
- CUSAS 8 67: small barley account (7/iv/Samsu-ditana 11);
- CUSAS 8 68: small barley account (23/iv/Samsu-ditana 11);
- CUSAS 8 71: small barley account (3/v/Samsu-ditana 11);
- CUSAS 8 75: expenditure of barley (11/v/Samsu-ditana 11).

The barley expenditure in CUSAS 8 87 is not dated, but the tablet mentions the same people as in CUSAS 8 59-62 and Cots. Coll. 96222. This document was therefore written under the reign of King Samsu-ditana. The same applies to the accounting texts CUSAS 8 86, 87, 88, and 89, as well as to CUSAS 29 170 and 171.

Below is an index of the people whom I have identified, with their attestations in texts from Dur-Abi-ešuh from the same period. Most of them are men, but there are a few children (“son of PN”) and at least a woman. When their title is given, these people are nēšakkum-priests, chief accountants (sandabakkum), and intendants (Satammum) — hence temple personnel. The children are probably their sons: Utu-mupada, whose son is mentioned on line 23, is known as the chief accountant of the god Enlil. Those without any title were probably also working in some way for the temples of Dur-Abi-ešuh.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Texts</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A man with the name Ali-talimi is mentioned in a loan of silver dated 25/iv/Samsu-ditana 13. He is a scribe:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Cots. Coll. 96222: 12)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(The title requires a collation, to see clearly the edge.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awiliya</td>
<td>0,2.0 a-wi-il-ia GÁ’ DUB’ BA’</td>
<td>— CUSAS 8 59: 3 (a-wi-il-ia). The same name appears line 54, and refers to someone receiving grain to be given to Inanna (‘INANNA GİR a-wi-il-ia’); probably the same man;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Cots. Coll. 96222: 1)</td>
<td>— CUSAS 8 60: 42 (a-wi-il-ia);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>— CUSAS 8 61: 16 (a-wi-il-ia);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>— CUSAS 8 62: 28 (a-wi-il-ia);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>— CUSAS 8 88: 1 (a-wi-il-ia).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Etelpu(m)</td>
<td>0,3.0 e-tel-pu</td>
<td>Several men with the name Etelpu(m) are attested under Samsu-ditana:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Cots. Coll. 96222: 16)</td>
<td>— CUSAS 8 60: 29 + 34 (e-tel-pu-um);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>— CUSAS 8 62: 6 (e-tel-pu DUMU SANGA) + 22 (e-tel-pu DUMU be-li-ia);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>— CUSAS 8 87: 9 (e-tel-pu-um DUMU be-li-ia);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>— CUSAS 29 171: 5 (e-tel-pu);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ebatum</td>
<td></td>
<td>— CUSAS 29 205: 6' (e-tel-pu; letter written in Ammi-ditana 11).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beliya</td>
<td></td>
<td>— CUSAS 8 60: 5 (gi-mil-lum); — CUSAS 8 62: 37 (gi-mil-lum DUMU (IConfiguration-na-gi-ir).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibnatum</td>
<td>0.2.0 ib-na-tum</td>
<td>(Cots. Coll. 96222: 21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iddatum</td>
<td>0.3.0 id-da-tum</td>
<td>DUMU GİR.NI.Ì.Sàq. — CUSAS 8 59: 7 (id-da-tum DUMU GİR.NI.Ì.Sàq). Maybe also in CUSAS 8 60: 25 (id-da-tum), CUSAS 8 83: 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iluni</td>
<td></td>
<td>(id-da-tum) undated) and 88: 5 (undated). Another Iddatum, son of Enlil-eribam, is attested in CUSAS 8 62: 38.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ili-bani</td>
<td>0.2.0 i-li-ba-ni</td>
<td>(Cots. Coll. 96222: 41)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iluni</td>
<td>0.2.0 i-lu-ni</td>
<td>Several men with the name Iluni are attested under Samsu-ditana: — CUSAS 8 59: 28 (i-lu-ni) and 39 (i-lu-ni ŠÀ.TAM); — CUSAS 8 60: 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(i-lu-ni DUMU hu-za-lum); — CUSAS 8 62: 15 (i-lu-ni DUMU hu-za-lum) and 27 (i-lu-ni DUMU el-le-tum); — CUSAS 8 84: 9 (i-lu-ni ŠÀ.TAM); —</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CUSAS 8 89: 12 (i-lu-ni).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lu-Asalluḫi,</td>
<td>0.3.0</td>
<td>LÚ.&lt;&lt;LÚ”&gt;=&gt;ASALLÚ.HI — CUSAS 8 59: 22 (LÚ.&lt;&lt;ASALLÚ.HI); — CUSAS 8 60: 18 (LÚ.&lt;&lt;ASALLÚ.HI ŠÀ.TAM); — CUSAS 8 61: 20 (LÚ.&lt;&lt;ASALLÚ.HI); —</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>šatammu</td>
<td></td>
<td>CUSAS 8 62: 40 (LÚ.&lt;&lt;ASALLÚ.HI); — CUSAS 8 71: 3 (LÚ.&lt;&lt;ASALLÚ.HI); — CUSAS 8 75: 1 (LÚ.&lt;&lt;ASALLÚ.HI); — CUSAS 8 89: 6 (LÚ.&lt;&lt;ASALLÚ.HI); —</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CUSAS 29 170: 2 (LÚ.&lt;&lt;ASALLÚ.HI).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lugal-šēš,</td>
<td>0.4.0</td>
<td>LUGAL.ŠEŠ — CUSAS 8 59: 9 (LUGAL.ŠEŠ); — CUSAS 8 60: 15 (LUGAL.ŠEŠ) and 44 (DUMU LUGAL.ŠEŠ); — CUSAS 8 62: 31 (LUGAL.ŠEŠ); — CUSAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nēšakkum-priest</td>
<td></td>
<td>8 86: 9 (LUGAL.ŠEŠ); — CUSAS 8 88: 8 (LUGAL.ŠEŠ). The same man is probably mentioned in a silver loan dated 13/iii/Samsu-ditana 11. Here</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>his title and patronym are given: — CUSAS 8 52: 11 (IGI LUGAL.ŠEŠ NU.ŠEŠ DUMU NIN.URTA-ra-im-NUMUN).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mār Beliya</td>
<td>[x] DUMU be-lī-ia-a</td>
<td>(Cots. Coll. 96222: 27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“the son of”</td>
<td></td>
<td>Beliya” — CUSAS 8 59: 13 (DUMU be-lī-ia-a); — CUSAS 8 61: 2 (DUMU be-lī-ia-a); — CUSAS 8 87: 13 (DUMU be-lī-ia-a); —</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CUSAS 8 88: 12 (DUMU be-lī-ia-a). Maybe also in CUSAS 8 83: 4 (DUMU be-lī-ia-a, undated).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mār Ebatum</td>
<td>[x] DUMU e-ba-tum</td>
<td>(Cots. Coll. 96222: 25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“the son of”</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ebatum” — CUSAS 8 59: 13 (DUMU be-lī-ia-a); — CUSAS 8 61: 2 (DUMU be-lī-ia-a); — CUSAS 8 87: 13 (DUMU be-lī-ia-a); —</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CUSAS 8 88: 12 (DUMU be-lī-ia-a). Maybe also in CUSAS 8 83: 4 (DUMU be-lī-ia-a, undated).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Title or Description</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mār Ene</td>
<td>“the son of Ene”</td>
<td>[x] DUMU e-ne-e (Cots. Coll. 96222: 30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>— CUSAS 8 59: 35 (DUMU e-ne-e);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>— CUSAS 8 60: 47 (DUMU e-ne-e);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>— CUSAS 8 62: 8 (DUMU e-ne-e);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>— CUSAS 8 89: 17 (DUMU e-ne-e).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mār Eterum</td>
<td>“the son of Eterum”</td>
<td>0,5.0 DUMU 1 e-te-rum (Cots. Coll. 96222: 19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The father, Eterum, is mentioned in several lists:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>— CUSAS 8 59: 18 (e-te-rum). Line 61, he receives grain to be given to Ninsianna (ŠNIN.SI,AN,NA GĪR e-te-rum);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>— CUSAS 8 60: 33 (e-te-rum);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>— CUSAS 8 87: 14 (e-te-rum);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>— CUSAS 8 89: 2 (e-te-rum).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Taribum) mār</td>
<td>Hulmatum “the son of Hulmatum”</td>
<td>0,4.0 DUMU hu-ul-ma-tum (Cots. Coll. 96222: 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>His name, Taribum, is specified in two lists:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>— CUSAS 8 59: 29 (ta-ri-bu-am DUMU hu-ul-ma-tum; this T. is not the šatammum, cf. CUSAS 8 62: 30 vs. 44);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mār Ibi</td>
<td>“the son of Ibi”</td>
<td>0,4.0 DUMU i-bi-i (Cots. Coll. 96222: 13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>— CUSAS 8 59: 12 (DUMU i-bi-i);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>— CUSAS 8 60: 30 (DUMU i-bi-i);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>— CUSAS 8 61: 22 (DUMU i-bi-i);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>— CUSAS 8 88: 11 (DUMU i-bi-i).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mār Sinatum</td>
<td>“the son of Sinatum”</td>
<td>[x] 1 DUMU3 si-na-tum (Cots. Coll. 96222: 29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>— CUSAS 8 59: 15 (DUMU si-na-tum).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mār Utu-mupada</td>
<td>“the son of Utu-mupada”</td>
<td>0 DUMU ⁴ UTU.MU.PÀ&lt;DA&gt; (Cots. Coll. 96222: 23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>His father, Utu-mupada, was šandabakkum of Enlil. He is mentioned in several texts:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>— CUSAS 8 20: 24 (IGI ⁴ UTU.MU.PÀ.DA GĀ,DUB.BA ⁴ EN.LÍ.LÁ; a loan dated 12/v/Samsu-ditana 2);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>— CUSAS 8 44: 11 (IGI ⁴ UTU.MU.PÀ.DA GĀ,DUB.BA; loan dated […]ii/Samsu-ditana 3);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>— CUSAS 8 59: 4 (⁴ UTU.MU.PÀ.DA);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>— CUSAS 8 60: 3 (⁴ UTU.MU.PÀ.DA);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>— CUSAS 8 62: 1 (⁴ UTU.MU.PÀ.DA GĀ,DUB.BA));</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>— CUSAS 8 88: 2 (⁴ UTU.MU.PÀ.DA)).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nanna-medu</td>
<td></td>
<td>0,3.0 ⁴ ŠEŠ.KL.ME.DU (Cots. Coll. 96222: 8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>— CUSAS 8 59: 19 (⁴ ŠEŠ.KL.ME.DU);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>— CUSAS 8 60: 48 (⁴ ŠEŠ.KL.ME.DU);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>— CUSAS 8 62: 2 (⁴ ŠEŠ.KL.ME.DU);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>— CUSAS 8 75: 3 (⁴ ŠEŠ.KL.ME.DU);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ninnutum</td>
<td></td>
<td>[x] ni-in-nu-tum (Cots. Coll. 96222: 35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>— CUSAS 8 59: 10 (ni-in-nu-tum);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>— CUSAS 8 60: 35 (ni-in-nu-tum);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>— CUSAS 8 62: 5 (ni-in-nu-tum);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>— CUSAS 8 84: 12 (ni-in-nu-tum);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>— CUSAS 8 88: 9 (ni-in-nu-tum).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ninurta-muballit</td>
<td></td>
<td>0,4.0 ⁴ NIN.URTA-mu-ba-li-šit (Cots. Coll. 96222: 22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>At least two men with this name are attested:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>— CUSAS 8 59: 21 (⁴ NIN.URTA-mu-ba-li-šit) and 40 (⁴ NIN.URTA-mu-ba-li-šit). Line 58, one of them receives grain to be given to Pabilsag (⁴ PA,BIL.SAG GĪR ⁴ NIN.URTA-mu-ba-li-šit);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>— CUSAS 8 61: 21 (⁴ NIN.URTA-mu-ba-li-šit);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>— CUSAS 8 89: 5 (⁴ NIN.URTA-mu-ba-li-šit).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rimtum, wife of Atta</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 muunu ri-im-tum (Cots. Coll. 96222: 17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>— CUSAS 8 67: 6-7 (&lt;&lt;&lt;MUNUS&gt;&gt;)&gt; muunu ri-im-tum DAM a-at-a-a);</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Museums and Collections

### Sin-itram

[Cots. Coll. 96222: 34]

- CUSAS 8 71: 5 (MUNUS a-at-ta-a).
- Her husband is attested in several texts:
  - CUSAS 8 59: 41 (a-at-ta-a);
  - CUSAS 8 60: 19 (a-at-ta-a);
  - CUSAS 8 62: 39 (a-at-ta-a);
  - CUSAS 29 171: 9 (la³-at-ta-a).

### Sununu, sandabakkum

[Cots. Coll. 96222: 18]

- CUSAS 8 59: 17 (sî-na-nu);
- CUSAS 8 60: 32 (sî-na-nu GÁ.DUB.BA);
- CUSAS 8 61: 14 (sî-na-nu);
- CUSAS 8 62: 20 (sî-na-nu GÁ.DUB.BA);
- CUSAS 8 89: 1 (sî-na-nu).

### Šumum-libši

[Cots. Coll. 96222: 51]

- A man named Šumum-libši is attested as barber (ŠU.I) in two receipts from the year Samsu-ditana 3 (CUSAS 8 33: 4 and 38: 4).

### Taribum, šatammun

[Cots. Coll. 96222: 6]


### Taribum

[Cots. Coll. 96222: 40]

- There are several men with that name, cf. CUSAS 8 61: 5+6.

### Utu-luti, sandabakkum

[Cots. Coll. 96222: 15]

- CUSAS 8 59: 37 (⁵UTU.L.U.TI GÁ.DUB.BA);
- CUSAS 8 60: 40 (⁵UTU.L.U.TI);
- CUSAS 8 64: 6 (⁵UTU.L.U.TI);
- CUSAS 8 68: 3 (⁵UTU.L.U.TI).

And in two texts written under Ammi-šaduqa:
- CUSAS 8 23: 25 (⁴UTU.L.U.TI GÁ.DUB.BA; Ammi-šaduqa 8; sacrificial sheep receipt);
- CUSAS 8 54: 16 (⁴UTU.L.U.TI GÁ.DUB.BA; Ammi-šaduqa 2; barley receipt).

### Notes

1. Museum number PARS 64. CDLI P273826.

---

59) ‘Open the Granary!’ Ur-Zababa’s Letter to Śilli-Šamaš: The Duplicate from the Cotsen Collection — Andrew George recently published sixty-six Akkadian letters from the Schøyen collection which he identified as school exercises.1 Several unpublished tablets from the Rosen and Cotsen collections are quoted as well, and one of them is edited (Cots. Coll. 40719).

Among the tablets from the Cotsen collection (Los Angeles) mentioned in his book is Cots. Coll. 52150, which he identified as a duplicate of three tablets from the Schøyen collection (MS 2748 = CUSAS 43 5A, MS 3688 = 5B, and MS 3747 = 5C) and two tablets from the Rosen collection (CUNES 48-09-288 and CUNES 48-11-074, unpublished). All six tablets have the same text. A. George gives it the title “‘Open the Granary!’ Ur-Zababa’s Letter to Śilli-Šamaš” in CUSAS 43. Having photographed Cots. Coll. 52150 while working in the Cotsen collection in 2017, I am offering here an edition of this tablet.

Cots. Coll. 52150, now in the Lloyd E. Cotsen Cuneiform Tablets Collection at UCLA, has the museum number SC-III-Ii.2 A photograph and a short description have been published by M. Wilson,

Cots. Coll. 52150, Lloyd E. Cotsen Cuneiform Tablets Collection (Collection 1883). Library Special Collections, Charles E. Young Research Library, UCLA. Photographs by M. Béranger.

Cots. Coll. 52150 is a rectangular single-column tablet. As attested for other school texts, the tablet has been smashed shortly after being written, while the clay was still wet. The cuneiform signs are well formed and regular, and a piece of clay envelope still adheres to the reverse. Thus, this tablet adds to the number of school letters in envelopes. There are only six of them known to me to date.\(^3\) In real-life, envelopes were used to protect the tablet during its transport, and to guarantee the confidentiality and integrity of the message. Once the letter was enclosed, senders wrote the name of the addressee on the...
envelope (ana PN “To so-and-so”) and rolled their seal. As expected for a tablet written at school, no sealing is preserved on the fragment of the envelope attached to Cots. Coll. 52150. Besides, there is more text on the envelope than just the address, and although it is fragmentary, it is clear that the scribe wrote another text. This is consistent with what I have already observed: as opposed to real-life letters, letters from the school context contain additional text on the envelope. Thus, the students were using the clay of the envelope to practice writing.


O.  
2.  
4.  
6.  
8.  
10.  
12.  
14.  
16.  
18.  
R.20  
22.  
24.  
26.  
28.  
30.  
32.  

Envelope:

1’  
2’  
4’  

Notes to the text:

1. Say to Ṣilli-Šamaš: thus (speaks) Ur-Zababa.

3. Say to the shepherd: let it stay at your disposal as provision for the small livestock.

5. Also, Apil-Damu must not stay overnight with you for another day. Send him back to me.

7. Here the work is interrupted. Don’t keep him! (It is) urgent!


(1-3) Say to Ṣilli-Šamaš: thus (speaks) Ur-Zababa.

(4-7) Herewith I’ve sent you Apil-Damu. (It is) urgent! When you see this sealed tablet of mine, you and him open the 180 kor ( = 54000 liters) outer granary and give: (15-19) - 8 kor (2400 liters) as barley ration: the plowman - 18 kor (5400 liters) as barley ration: the 3 ox-drivers - 32 kor (9600 liters) as barley ration: the 4 boatmen - 7 kor (2100 liters) as barley ration: the shepherd - 7 kor as barley ration: the cowherd

(8) It is urgent! (9-10) When you see this sealed tablet of mine, you and him open the 180 kor ( = 54000 liters) outer granary and give: (15-19) - 8 kor (2400 liters) as barley ration: the plowman - 18 kor (5400 liters) as barley ration: the 3 ox-drivers - 32 kor (9600 liters) as barley ration: the 4 boatmen - 7 kor (2100 liters) as barley ration: the shepherd - 7 kor as barley ration: the cowherd

(21) and measure again the reminder and (22-24) let it stay at your disposal as provision for the oxen and fodder for the small livestock. (25-27) Also, Apil-Damu must not stay overnight with you for another day. (28) Send him back to me.

(29) Here the work is interrupted. (30) Don’t keep him! (31) (It is) urgent!
Line 5' the scribe may have repeated line 23. If so, we should read: [₅ ki-is-sā]-ti₃ U₃[UDU.HI.A]. The signs in line 4' do not match those on line 22.

2. Commentary

2.1 Comparison of the manuscripts

The letter on Cots. Coll. 52150 is identical to the three letters published by A. George. There are hardly any variation between the manuscripts:

(a) Layout:
   (i) grouping of two lines on the same line (52150: 29-30 = 5A: 29 = 5B: 28 = 5C: 28-29).

(b) Spelling variants:
   (i) se-rī-ka (5C: 6). Instead of se-rī-ka (52150: 6, 5A: 6, and 5B: 6);
   (ii) pi-te-a-am (5A: 14) vs. pi-te-e₄-ma (5C: 13);
   (iii) ša-pa-e₄-lam (5A: 21). Instead of ša-pe-e₄-lam (52150: 21, 5B: 20, and 5C: 20);
   (iv) ša-an-ni₃-ma (52150: 21 and 5A: 21);
   (v) [k]i-is-sā-di₃-at (5A: 23). Instead of ki-is-sā-di₃-at (52150: 23, 5B: 22, and 5C: 22);
   (vi) a-pi₄-la-ma (5B: 24). Instead of a-pi₄-la-mu (52150: 25, 5A: 25, and 5C: 24);
   (vii) la i-bi-tam (5B: 26). Instead of la i-bi-tam (52150: 27, 5A: 27, and 5C: 26).

(c) Additional line:
   (i) at-ta₂₃ i₃-su₂₃ (52150: 13 and 5A: 13).

(d) Omissions (most of them due to carelessness and appearing on 5B):
   (i) 3 S₄₃.GU₄ (5B: 15). Instead of 3 ERIN S₄₃.GU₄;
   (ii) 4 L₄₃.M₄₃.TUR (5B: 16). Instead of 4 ERIN₂₃ L₄₃.M₄₃.TUR;
   (iii) U₃₄<DU₄.HI₄ (52150: 18);
   (iv) id₃=n₃₃-a₃-a₃ (5B: 19);
   (v) šu₄<nt₄-a₄-ma (5B: 20);
   (vi) S₄₄<GA₄.GU₄₄.HI₄ (52150: 22).

(e) Content variants:
   (i) pi-te-a-ma (52150: 14 and 5B: 13) (imperative plural) vs. pi-te-a-am (5A: 14) and pi-te-e₄-ma (5C: 13) (imperative singular);
   (ii) 7,0,0 GUR (52150: 18 and 5C: 17) vs. 8,0,0 GUR (5A: 18 and 5B: 17);
   (iii) 7,0,0 GUR (52150: 19 and 5C: 18) vs. 7₃₄+6₄ₓ₃₄,1,0 GUR (5A: 19) vs. 8,0,0 GUR (5B: 18).

2.2 Mirroring actual administrative practices?

In the text the plowman and each boatman are to receive 8 gur (2400 liters) of barley ration; the shepherd is to receive 7 gur or 8 gur (2100 or 2400 liters); the cowherd 6₄ˣ₄ gur 1 pi, 7 gur or 8 gur depending on the manuscript (1860+, 2100 or 2400 liters); and each ox-driver shall receive 6 gur (1800 liters). Basic workers received an average of 60 liters of barley per month (720 per year) during the Old Babylonian period: the amounts given here are, thus, tremendous and unrealistic. According to A. George, this could be explained, if the rations were to be given not to individuals but to their households (CUSAS 43, p. 20). This seems atypical to me. Here the numbers were probably not meant to mirror actual practices. Rather, they are here because the students practiced using the capacity measure system.

2.3 Provenance

The four tablets from the Cotsen and Schøyen collections show little variations and were perhaps produced in the same school. In his book, A. George assumes that the tablets in the Schøyen collection come from Larsa or a city under its control, such as Adab (CUSAS 43, p. 47). My work on a few school letters from the Cotsen collection also led me to the conclusion that they were written in southern Mesopotamia (Mél. Charpin, p. 126). It is certain that there are tablets found in Larsa, or its vicinity, in the Los Angeles collection, as several tablets from that collection bear year names of Rim-Sin I or mention this king:

- Cots. Coll. 40720 (Wilson Education 170; CDLI P388373) is not a school letter but a real letter sent by Rim-Sin;
- Cots. Coll. 40834A (Wilson Education 57; P388290) is a personal name list dated Rim-Sin 33 according to Mark Wilson. I cannot verify the date on the CDLI photograph;
- Cots. Coll. 52149 (Wilson Education 73; P388302) is not a school letter but a letter sent by Rim-Sin;
- Cots. Coll. 52154 (Wilson Education 172; P388375) is not a school letter but a letter sent by Rim-Sin;
- Cots. Coll. 52177 (Wilson Education 177; P388377) is a model contract mentioning Rim-Sin in the final oath.
The regnal years of its kings can be split into two exact parallels of 368 ÷ 2 = 184 years each: (Mahieu 2021) comprise

Recently it has been argued that both the late Akkadian period (Mahieu 2019) and the entire Kassite period (Brinkman 1977: 346 n. 5; Gasche BKL.A), before its end 60 minutes ago.

From Larsa, or a place controlled by Larsa. It is not sure that this is a school exercise.

Earliest Schools


2 CDLI P388301 and Archibab T25643. According to the website of the Cotsen collection (http://www.oac.cdlib.org/findaid/ark:/13030/k0t01nf169), the dimensions of the tablet are: 3 5/8" height x 1 15/16" width x 1 1/2" depth.


M. Wilson identified the tablet Cots. Coll. 52187, which has an envelope, as a school letter (Education in the Earliest Schools, Los Angeles, 2008, p. 85 no. 171; P388374). Because only a small portion of the tablet is visible, I am not sure that this is a school exercise.

4 “Since internal evidence suggests that many of the Old Babylonian tablets in the Schøyen Collection stem from Larsa, or a place controlled by Larsa—such as Adab—and date to the era of Rim-Sin I, it may be supposed that the school letters published here belong to the scribal curriculum of the Larsa state at the end of that city’s domination.” (CUSAS 43, p. 47).


Marine BÉRANGER, <marine.beranger@fu-berlin.de>

60) The Sealand I comprising two lines of 184 years each, with the conquest of Babylon 35 years before its end — According to the Babylonian King List A (BM 33332, CT 36 pls. 24-25; henceforth BKL.A), the Sealand I reigned 368 years (i.15), but several data (in particular the synchronisms with Babylon I) imply that the dynasty cannot have lasted that long (Poebel 1947: 120; Jaritz 1958: 189; Brinkman 1977: 346 n. 5; Gasche et al. 1998: 67; van Koppenn 2010: 454; Boivin 2018: 77-78, 241-247). Recently it has been argued that both the late Akkadian period (Mahieu 2019) and the entire Kassite period (Mahieu 2021) comprise two lines of rulers. A similar hypothesis can be made for the Sealand I as well. The regnal years of its kings can be split into two exact parallels of 368 ÷ 2 = 184 years each:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>III-ma-ilu (BKL.A i.4, 60 years)</th>
<th>Subtotal</th>
<th>Itti-ilinib (BKL.A i.5, 55 years)</th>
<th>Subtotal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dam(i)q-ilıšu (BKL.A i.6, 139 years)</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>Iskibal (BKL.A i.7, 115 years)</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peqgaldrameš (BKL.A i.10, 50 years)</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>Šuššu (BKL.A i.8, 24 years)</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ayadaragalama (BKL.A i.11, 28 years)</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>Gulkıšar (BKL.A i.9, 55 years)</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melamkura (BKL.A i.13, 7 years)</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>Akurduana (BKL.A i.12, 26 years)</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes

1 My thanks go to Ceren Mengi and Francesca Nebiolo for the photomontage, and to Lynn-Salammbo Zimmermann for proofreading the English of an earlier draft.


3 CDLI P388301 and Archibab T25643. According to the website of the Cotsen collection (http://www.oac.cdlib.org/findaid/ark:/13030/k0t01nf169), the dimensions of the tablet are: 3 5/8" height x 1 15/16" width x 1 1/2" depth.


M. Wilson identified the tablet Cots. Coll. 52187, which has an envelope, as a school letter (Education in the Earliest Schools, Los Angeles, 2008, p. 85 no. 171; P388374). Because only a small portion of the tablet is visible, I am not sure that this is a school exercise.

4 “Since internal evidence suggests that many of the Old Babylonian tablets in the Schøyen Collection stem from Larsa, or a place controlled by Larsa—such as Adab—and date to the era of Rim-Sin I, it may be supposed that the school letters published here belong to the scribal curriculum of the Larsa state at the end of that city’s domination.” (CUSAS 43, p. 47).

The regnal years presented above are those commonly proposed for the Sealand I, except for Dam(i)q-ililišu, who is given 139 instead of 16, 26, 36, or 46 years. Both the decade and the digit of Dam(i)q-ililišu’s years in BKL.A i.6 are unclear (cf. Brinkman 1993: 7: 10+(+)-67). If one opts for the (generally preferred) decade of 30 and if one adds a row of three wedges to the digit of 6, one obtains 39. This number is probable because it results in a total of 368 years for the sum of the individual reigns, i.e. the number required according to BKL.A i.15. Moreover, if Dam(i)q-ililišu reigns 39 years, he reigns as many years as his two contemporaries, Iškibah and Šušši, together do (15+24 = 39 years).

The proposed parallel shows four pairs of rulers with similar reign lengths:

- Ili-ma-ilu (60 years) // Itti-ili-nibi (55 years)
- Pušgaldarašem (50 years) // Gulkišar (55 years)
- Ayadaragalama (28 years) // Akurdana (26 years)
- Melamkura (7 years) // Ea-gamil (9 years)

To this list should be added Dam(i)q-ililišu (39 years), who parallels two kings: Iškibah (15 years) and Šušši (24 years). In order to indicate that Iškibah (i.7) and Šušši (i.8) belong together, BKL.A calls Šušši a “brother” (šeš = aḫu), the sole kinship for the Sealand I found in BKL.A. Moreover, BKL.A adds two intriguing horizontal wedges (aš) for them: a wedge between Itti-ili-nibi (i.5) and Dam(i)q-ililišu (i.6), and a wedge after Gulkišar (i.9). These two instances are the only cases of such wedges in the (preserved) BKL.A. The wedges have been supposed to represent omitted kings (Landsberger 1954: 69 n. 177; Boivin 2018: 37). They might, however, rather demarcate the exceptional lineage: between i.5 and i.9, three kings occur (Dam(i)q-ililišu, Iškibah, and Šušši, i.6-8), in contradistinction to the pairing of two kings in all other instances of the Sealand I.

Not only are the reign lengths of the contemporary kings similar (60~55, 39=15+24, 50~55, 28~26, and 7~9), there is also a common break: the reigns of Gulkišar and Pušgaldarašem end at the same time, after 149 years (60+39+50 = 149 = 55+15+24+55), with still 35 years following (28+7 = 35 = 26+9). The break plausibly marks the end of the Old Babylonian dynasty. That Babylon I ends 35 years before the Sealand I, is suggested by the era of the resettlement of Babylon (found on tablets from Tell Muhammad: “Year x that Babylon was resettled,” Gasche et al. 1998: 84; cf. van Koppen 2010: 462). This era likely begins at the conquest of Babylon(10) and is attested from year 36 until year 41 (Gasche et al. 1998: 86-87). The first attestation, in year 36, points to a time span of 35 years (from year 1 until year 36), i.e. a period which lasts as long as the 28+7 and 26+9 years of the late Sealand I. If these periods correspond, then the era was applied for the first time at the end of the Sealand I (when the 28+7 = 26+9 years end), and Babylon was conquered 35 years earlier (when the era begins), i.e. at the end of the reigns of Gulkišar and Pušgaldarašem.

Further arguments favour a setting of Babylon’s capture in that context. The Synchronistic King List (A.117 = Ass 14616c, AfO 3: 70-71) adds a king (i.5) named giš-en (Brinkman 1977: 337; Grayson 1980: 117, 120 [note to i.5]) or diš+i-u-en (Brinkman 1993: 7; Dalley 2009: 2; Boivin 2018: 37) between Gulkišar (i.4) and Pušgaldarašem (i.6). In the present analysis, Babylon is captured at the end of the reigns of Gulkišar and Pušgaldarašem. The otherwise unknown person giš-en/diš+i-u-en, who is mentioned between these two kings, might well be a ruler who partook in the capture of Babylon. Similarly, a kudurrū dated to year 4 of Enlil-nadin-apli of Isin II records 696 years for the period lasting from Gulkišar until Nebuchadnezzar I (CBM 13 I 6-8, Paulus 2014: 521). These 696 years are the sum of the 120 years running from Pušgaldarašem until Ea-gamil of the Sealand I (50+28+26+7+9) plus the 576 years of the Kassite government (BKL.A ii.16). The count thus begins between Gulkišar and Pušgaldarašem, i.e. at the position of giš-en/diš+i-u-en, at the conquest of Babylon.

The setting of Babylon’s capture at the end of Gulkišar’s reign is also indicated by BM 120960, a glass recipe written by an administrator of the Marduk temple in Babylon. It is dated to mu uš.Sa ‘gal-lišar lugal.e “year after Gulkišar the king” (l. 43, trans. Gadd & Thompson 1936: 91-92). The use of a year formula mentioning a king of the Sealand I by a Babylonian scribe suggests that one brought the recipe to safety in the South at the time of Babylon’s capture. (2) Though the setting is likely fictitious (Oppenheim 1970: 60-62; Wiggermann 2008: 225, 227 [no. 4]; Boivin 2018: 119), the date formula might still testify
that Babylon was taken at the end of Gulkišar’s reign: the preservation of the recipe was set in the year that followed Gulkišar’s kingship,\(^3\) when people were fleeing from Babylon.

The *Epic of Gulkišar* seems to confirm that setting. Gulkišar is said to have campaigned against Samsuditana (HS 1885+ obv. 7', Zofer 2019: 28, 31), the last king of Babylon I. This campaign might have brought both Gulkišar’s and Samsuditana’s reigns to an end: in the present reconstruction, Babylon I ends at the same time as Gulkišar’s reign.

In addition to this synchronism between Gulkišar and Samsuditana, three more synchronisms exist between the Sealand I and Babylon I:

1. Ili-ma-ulu is contemporary with Samsuiluna and Abi-ešu (*Chronicle of Early Kings* B rev. 6'-10').\(^4\)
2. In his regnal year 37, Ammiditana “destroyed the wall of Udinim which (the people/troops of) Damqi-ilishu had built” (trans. Horsnell 1999: 2:320).
3. Ea-gamil comes after Samsuditana (*Chronicle of Early Kings* B rev. 11'-12').

The chronological relationship between the two dynasties can be reconstructed as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sealand I</th>
<th>Subtotal</th>
<th>Babylon I</th>
<th>Subtotal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ili-ma-ulu</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Samsuiluna (38 year-names; 35 years BKL.B 7)(^5)</td>
<td>38/35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Abi-ešu (28 year-names; 25 years BKL.B 8)</td>
<td>66/60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dam(iq)-ilišu</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>Ammiditana (37 year-names; 25 years BKL.B 9)</td>
<td>103/85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pešgaldaramēš</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>Ammisaduqa (17+x year-names; 21 years BKL.B 10)</td>
<td>120+x/106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>// Gulkišar</td>
<td></td>
<td>Samsuditana (31 year-names;(^6) 31 years BKL.B 11)</td>
<td>151+x/137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ayadaragalama</td>
<td>177</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melamkura</td>
<td>184</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>// Ea-gamil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The reduction of the duration of the Sealand I from 368 to 184 years accords with the synchronisms: Ili-ma-ulu is contemporary with Samsuiluna and Abi-ešu; Dam(iq)-ilišu reigns before year 37 of Ammiditana; Gulkišar’s reign (at the subtotal of 149 years) can have ended at the same time as Samsuditana’s (at the subtotal of 151+x/137 years); and Ea-gamil reigned after Samsuditana. The hypothesis of a double line thus offers a convenient explanation for the available data.

**Notes**

1. The spelling used for the royal names is not the one found in BKL.A but the conventional one (see Boivin 2018: 33-37). Contemporary sources attest 2 year-names for Ili-ma-ulu, year 29 for Pešgaldaramēš, 11 year-names and year 8 for Ayadaragalama, and year 4 for Ea-gamil (ibid. 248-250).
5. Lehmann-Haupt 1898: 17; Gadd 1921: 24; Schmidtké 1952: 78; Grayson 1980: 91; Brinkman 1993: 7: 24\(^1\). The number 27 has been proposed by Pinches 1883-1884: 195; Schrader 1890: 286; Rost 1897: pl. ii; Winckler 1909: 68; Gressmann 1926: 1:332. The reduction of the duration of the Sealand I from 368 to 184 years accords with the two kings are successive.
6. An archive of uncertain provenance contains tablets dated according to the reigns of Pešgaldaramēš and Ayadaragalama (Dalley 2009: 1-3, 10-12). This suggests that the two kings are successive.
7. Gadd 1921: 24; Schmidtké 1952: 78; Oppenheim 1969; Grayson 1980: 91; Brinkman 1993: 7. The number 6 (Pinches 1883-1884: 195; Schrader 1890: 286; Winckler 1909: 68; Gressmann 1926: 1:332) and the number 8 (Knudtzon 1893: 1:pl. 60; Rost 1897: pl. ii; Lehmann-Haupt 1898: 18) had been proposed before.
The three kings preceding Nebuchadnezzar I in Isin II (Marduk-kabit-ahhešu, Itti-Marduk-balatu, and Ninurta-nadin-šumu) are excluded from the 696 years: Brinkman 1968: 83-84; cf. Boivin 2018: 45.


The present analysis sets the relevant year after Gulkšar’s reign, whereas Landsberger (1954: 68 n. 174 (d]) translates as “des Jahres, das auf das Jahr des Regierungsantrittes des Gulkšar folgte”; similarly Oppenheim 1970: 60, 64 (kiv), and Wiggermann 2008: 225: “year (after that in which) Gulkšar (became) king”; cf. Boivin 2018: 119: “apparently very early in Gulkšar’s reign.” However, in addition to its basic meaning of regnal year 1, the expression mu RN lugal.e can also denote any year of a kingship (Charpin 2001: 91 [comment to pp. 43-44]). By extension, mu ušuša RN lugal.e might indicate the year after a kingship.

For a transliteration and translation of the Chronicle of Early Kings, see Grayson 1975: 152-156 (Chronicle 20); Glassner 2004: 268-273 (nos. 39-40). The contemporaneity of Ilia-ma-ilu and Samsuiluna is confirmed by prosopographic evidence: Ubar-Ba’u is mentioned in year 54 of Rim-Sin I of Larsa (SAOC 44 11), and Ubar-Ba’u’s sons appear in year 1 of Ili-ma-ilu (SAOC 44 12; see Boivin 2018: 243). Year 54 of Rim-Sin I parallels year 24 of Hammurabi (Charpin & Ziegler 2003: 262). Given that Ubar-Ba’u belongs to the mid-reign of Hammurabi, Ubar-Ba’u’s sons and Ili-ma-ilu belong to the generation following Hammurabi, i.e. to Samsuiluna’s.

For a transliteration of the Babylonian King List B (BKL.B), see Grayson 1980: 100 (§3.7).
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61) Elamite hutili/hutliš — The Elamite lexeme hutili/hutliš (and not hudli as read by the CAD Ḥ, 223, and Malbran-Labat 2021, 1337) occurs three times in seal inscriptions, dated to the end of the sukkalmah-period (2nd half of the 16th century BCE; Amiet 1972, 240 and 258). Two times it is spelled hu-ut-li, more precisely on two inscriptions belonging to two seal impressions. Both impressions are applied to what Amiet calls “un grand contrat de la fin de l’époque des Sukkalmahhu” (Amiet 1966, 330). Unfortunately, no further information on this text exists.

**MDP 43 2022a**

1) [x]  
2) hu-ut-li  
3) Te-ep-ǐ-į-ų-į  
4) dumu mu-a ū-ǔ Utu  
5) ir x-ǔ Utu

**Comments:**

(3) Te-ep-ǐ-į-ų-į: the restoration by Hinz & Koch (1987, 314) seems not to be contradicted by the photograph of the inscription in MDP 43, Pl. 176. If the proposed restoration is correct, Teptiyu is a hypocoristic in -ṭiyu- of a name with Tepti. Hypocoristic names with this suffix, a cluster of the suffixes -i and -u, are not uncommon in Elamite (Zadok 1983, 114), other examples being A-at-ti-ū (MDP 28 413 rev. 3, from atta- “father”); L-gū (MDP 9 299 rev. 2,8) and I-ki-û-û (MDP 22 161:15, from ikī- “brother”); Ka-ī-ū-[ũ] (MDP 24 334:17); Kur-ri-û-û (MDP 43 1823), Zi-ῦ-û (MDP 28 486:2), Zi-û-û (MDP 22 71:24) and Zi-û-û (MDP 22 73:25; from zīya- “to look”); Zi-ű-û (MDP 24 334:2; from ḫūn[ā]- meaning unknown); according to Zadok 1983, 114). The Elamo-Akkadian equivalent of this name is Bēliyu, spelled Be-î-û (MDP 28 539:1) and Be-î-û (MDP 28 537:1), from belu “lord”, although Zadok prefers a link with El. pīl “to maintain, restore” (cf. also Zadok 1984, 34). In any case, we have here an Elamite name with an Akkadian patronymic.

**MDP 43 2022b**

1) ūTU-GAL  
2) dumu Sī-mu-û-pī  
3) hu-ut-li  
4) Da-a-û ūî Šamaš-rabi, son of Simut-ahpi, hutli of Taya

—135—
Historically seen, both meanings are possible. Many agents in the service of other persons are attested in the Mesopotamian records, e.g. in the Murašu Archive (Stolper 1985, 20-22). Messengers of private individuals are not that frequently attested, but still appear sufficiently enough in the historical sources. Some examples are:

1) The messenger of Nūr-Sīn (Aab 9 227:16-18; Old Babylonian);
2) A messenger of Aya-nārī, who is an official or the king of Ṭab’el (Iraq 17, 131 no. 14:4-5; Neo-Assyrian; cf. Meier 1988, 115);
3) Bēl-udu’a, the messenger of Eṭerī the šatammu (CT 53 68:9-10; Neo-Assyrian);
4) Bêl-ūpāḥḫir, the messenger of Umman-šibir, a high-ranked Elamite official (ABL 792:5-7; Neo-Assyrian; cf. de Vaan 1995, 284-285).

Two remarks remain to be dealt with. Since hutli is clearly a professional indication, one could argue that a final -r- is missing, -r- being the suffix indicating agent nouns in Elamite. Nevertheless, Old Elamite agent nouns could be constructed without this suffix, e.g. puhu-teppi “apprentice scribe”, an Elamite notion attested in the Babylonian administrative texts from Susa (Hinz & Koch 1987, 230-231). Note that hutli too occurs in a Mesopotamian context. In conclusion, Akkadian-speaking scribes did not add the expected suffixes to Elamite lexemes, contrary to Elamite-speaking scribes, for instance in the Narâm-Sîn Treaty.

The second remark concerns the different form hutli and hutliš. The reason for the existence of the two variants is not easy to find. It could be due to a scribal error, in that sense that the scribe of MDP 43 2023 thought that hutli- was a verbal root, that had to be conjugated in the third person singular, hence hutliš. This idea, however, remains hypothetical.

To summarize, it remains difficult to establish the exact meaning of hutli, but one should no too hastily accept a meaning “messenger” (hutli as derived noun from hul la-), as a meaning “agent, attendant” or “manager” cannot be excluded (hutli as compound of hut- and li-). Even when a form hutli is more credible than a form hul la, the available source material is far too flimsy to offer absolute certainty in this discussion.
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62) Middle Hittite Period Tablets: Some Opinions on the KBo 32.114(+)-KBo 32.106 — KBo 32.114 and KBo 32.106 are two texts written in the Middle Hittite ductus, which belong to the Festival of the Goddess Teteḫšapı. As a result of our investigation, it has been determined that these two texts are direct joins. It is seen that there are common aspects of both texts dating, ductus, and findspots. Also, there are the same expressions such as GIR.ZABAR, LI.GIR, DUG.zalha- in the text too.

KBo 32.114(+)-KBo 32.106 (Duplicate Text KBo 64.174) [1)

| obv. | x+1 | [ x] | x+1 | [ (2’) The Sun Goddess’
| 3’ | nu VI GIR.ZABAR | (3’) dagger of six bronze [ |
In the 6. line of this text, 
(4') in the middle of it … [ 
(5') they receive. [When] 
(6') to swallow … [ 
(7') wine supplier [gives] the zalha-
 vessel to the man who swallows the dagger. 
(8') [pours] a glass of wine into it. 
(9') then the six blades of bronze forward which 
sharpness are [ 
(10') pu-ts] it in the wine. 
(11') a jester to him/her in front of [ 
(12') the zalha-
 vessel in front of him … [ 
(13') followed by three zintuhyya[] women [ 
(14') they [strike three pairs of huhupal-
(15') they sing the song all the time … [ 
(16') … [ 

rev.⁷] 
(1') … [ 
(2') … [ 
(3') … six knif[es’] from the zalha-
 vessel [ 
(4') the man who swallowed the dagger [car]ries the (knife). And the man who swallowed the 
dagger puts it up’. 
(5') holds. He [gives’] [it] to the king. 
(6') … keeps the jester. 
(7') … then the pieces of the sword again 
(8') stick into. Then it throat[- 
(9') says. He pu[ts] it. 
(10') he gives to the jester. He gives also three 
knaves the dag[ger-man]. 
(11') the dagger-man takes also] three bronze 
knives. It … [ 
(12') the dag[ger-
 man swallows it again. [ 
(13') they cur]sy. Then … [ 
(14') ] to the jester [ 
(15') … [ 

In the 6. line of this text, pa-a-aš-su-an-z[ passes as -a]š-su-u-wa-an-z[ in the third line of KBo 64.174 
duplicate text], A. Únal completes this line as “pa-a-aš-su-an-z[ [zi-in-na-i]” ²¹, but in the duplicate text, 
this line passes as pa-a-aš-su-an-z[ a-x]. 

The word hu-uh-hu][[ in the rev. ⁷] 8’ line of the text was completed in A. Únal’s same work 
with a question mark as hu-uh-hu[.pa-a]. However, the word GIBhuhupalGIBhuhupawall⁻ does not have a hu-
uh-hu]- conjugation.⁵ When we look at the noun conjugations of the word hu-uh-hu[[-, we see that the 
closest form to this spelling is a[UZU]huHurta-, a[UZU]huHurta, a[UZU]huHurta, huvaHurti, huvaHurti-.
huvaHurti-. The indefinite form of this word hu-
uh-hu-u-r[[- appears in the Tumnaviya ritual without determinative: EME-aš a-pé-el hu-uh-hu-u-r[[- ( 
(KBo 21.6 ay.9’).⁷ It is seen that in the Hittite-Hurrian mythological fragment (KUB 43.36 26’) the word 
takes place as hu-uh-hu[-. On the other way, this word is written as a[UZU]hu-uh-hu-wa[ … ] together with determinative.⁵ 

The Pl.N.A.n. form of hu(h)urtalla, < huvahhuwarta[lla,⁶ meaning “necklace or water pipe”, 
“hu-uh-hu-u-r[la]” also exemplifies this writing, and the inventory fragment text appears in KUB 58.59 I 8 as [ ]
In the light of all this information, the word hu-u-hu-[ in the rev. 7' line of our text can be completed as hu-u-hu-[ur-ti, which means “windpipe, throat, trachea” or as hu-u-hu-[ur-tal-su meaning “necklace, water pipe”].

We can complete the rev. 7’ line of the text according to both KUB 60.56 7’ (LÜ URU Ha[r]-har- na GÍR pa-aš-zü) and the rev. 12’ line of our text as “GÍR pa-aš-zü”. The word “kinuhi-”10, which is used as a part of sword and dagger and is in the rev. 7’ line of our text, appears as a Pl.Nom.c. in this text, which we have only examined, while it is in the Sg.Nom.c. form in other cuneiform texts. Although we do not know the reason why the word kinuhi¬ is used in the Pl.Nom.c. form in this text, the fact that the stick (crossguard/quillon) placed at right angles between the hilt and the barrel has bilateral protrusions to better grasp or swallow the sword may have pointed to the plural form of this word. As a result, it is seen that more written sources are needed to reach a definite conclusion about the word kinuhi¬.

Notes
8 See Groddek 2006: 56.
10 KUB 42.58 obv. 5 1 GÍR kinuhiš KÜ[.BABBAR; KBo 18.178 obv. 5 1 GÍR kinuhiš; KUB 42.11 II 10 I SAG.DU kinuhiš. See Puhvel 1997: (HED/K), 83.
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63) For an explanation of a peculiar Hittite list of body parts* — The Hittite “Incantation of the binding” (SIPAT ḫaminkawaiš), included in the Sammetlafel KUB 7.1 + KBo 3.8 (CTH 390.A, NS) together with four other ritual texts, is composed of two parallel sections: in the first one, a number of natural elements are bound (ḫamenk-) by the “large river” and, after the conjuring (ḫuek-) of the goddess Kamrušpa, they are untied (lā-); in the second one, the body parts of a child are bound, the goddess Ḥannahanna instructs the old woman to conjure them, and they are finally untied. In each of the two sections, all the elements bound, conjured, and untied are listed thrice, so that, in the second section, we
have three mostly-parallel lists of body parts roughly running from head to toe, which I have summarised in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>iii 32-42 (bound)</th>
<th>iii 45-53 (conjured)</th>
<th>iii 54-60 (untied)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>šapptiš tētanuš ‘pure hairs’</td>
<td>šapptiš tētanuš ‘pure hairs’</td>
<td>šapptiš tētanuš ‘pure hairs’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ṣapptiš ‘skull’</td>
<td>ṣapptiš ‘skull’</td>
<td>ṣapptiš ‘skull’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>409.IV.Tf02.A, NS) and KUB 9.34+ (409.II.Tf02.A, NS), each of which includes two mostly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the lists of body parts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>409.IV.Tf02.A, NS) and KUB 9.34+ (409.II.Tf02.A, NS), each of which includes two mostly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the lists of body parts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that are found in two manuscripts of the Ritual of Tunnawiya, KUB 9.4+ (CTH 409.IV.Ti02.A, NS) and KUB 9.34+ (409.II.Ti02.A, NS), each of which includes two mostly-parallel lists, in which the body parts of the patient are arranged together with those of a ram:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen, the three lists are not perfectly parallel to each other: the order of the pure hairs and the skull is inverted in the second and third list, as well as the order of the nose and the ears; the windpipe and the liver are missing in the third list, while the heart only appears in the second one, and the bladder is replaced by the thigh in the third one. The element on which I would like to focus here is consistent in the three lists: the occurrence of ŠUḪḪ.ŠU ‘his hands’ at the very end, after the knees, which is quite unexpected in an enumeration running from head to toe and requires an explanation.

First of all, one should note that the reading ŠUḪḪ.ŠU is not unanimously accepted: since the partial edition by Alp (1957: 42–45) and the complete edition of the text by Kronasser (1961), the sequence is often read as TŬGḪḪ.ŠU ‘his cloths’, 1 although it could seem less pertinent in a list of body parts, while the reading ŠUḪḪ.ŠU, later also taken into account by Kronasser (1962: 112) following a suggestion by Goetze and Meriggi, is found in Larocchi’s (1965: 171-172) edition. 2 Based on the photos available on the Hethitologie Portal Mainz, the sign on the tablet is clearly ŠU in the first two occurrences (the third one is partly broken), and it is correctly read as such in the online edition by Fuscagni (2017). 3

That the occurrence of the hands at the end of the list is unexpected can be shown by comparing it with the lists of body parts found in two manuscripts of the Ritual of Tunnawiya, KUB 9.4+ (CTH 409.IV.Ti02.A, NS) and KUB 9.34+ (409.II.Ti02.A, NS), each of which includes two mostly-parallel lists, in which the body parts of the patient are arranged together with those of a ram: 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KUB 9.4+ i 3-18</th>
<th>KUB 9.34 ii 22-34</th>
<th>KUB 9.4+ i 23-39</th>
<th>KUB 9.34 ii 38-47</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SAG.DU ‘head’</td>
<td>SAG.DU ‘head’</td>
<td>SAG.DU ‘head’</td>
<td>SAG.DU ‘head’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>taršna- ‘throat’</td>
<td>taršna- ‘throat’</td>
<td>taršna- ‘throat’</td>
<td>taršna- ‘throat’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ištana- ‘ear’</td>
<td>UZḪĠ ‘ear’</td>
<td>ḤASISU ‘ear’</td>
<td>UZḪĠ ‘ear’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ŠUḪḪ.ŠU ‘his hands’</td>
<td>ŠUḪḪ.ŠU ‘his hands’</td>
<td>ŠUḪḪ.ŠU ‘his hands’</td>
<td>ŠUḪḪ.ŠU ‘his hands’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KUB 9.4+ i 3-18</th>
<th>KUB 9.34 ii 22-34</th>
<th>KUB 9.4+ i 23-39</th>
<th>KUB 9.34 ii 38-47</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ŠUḪḪ.ŠU ‘his hands’</td>
<td>ŠUḪḪ.ŠU ‘his hands’</td>
<td>ŠUḪḪ.ŠU ‘his hands’</td>
<td>ŠUḪḪ.ŠU ‘his hands’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ŠUḪḪ.ŠU ‘his hands’</td>
<td>ŠUḪḪ.ŠU ‘his hands’</td>
<td>ŠUḪḪ.ŠU ‘his hands’</td>
<td>ŠUḪḪ.ŠU ‘his hands’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As can be seen, although the lists are not perfectly matched with each other, the hands are always included, as expected, among the upper parts of the body and represented by EUSH’kalulupa- ‘finger’ and šankuwaya- ‘nail’ (KUB 9.4+ i 8-9 and KUB 9.34+ ii 40-41); by ŠÜ ‘hand’ and UMBIN ‘nail’ (KUB 9.34 ii 26-27); or just by šankuwaya- ‘nail’ (KUB 9.4+ i 27). Of course, these lists significantly diverge from the ones in CTH 390.A – they share almost nothing – and the texts belong to different traditions; nevertheless, I think that the comparison holds, and the issue of the hands consistently found at the end of the lists in CTH 390.A is worthy of discussion, in search of a possible explanation.5)

The first possibility is that there is nothing to be explained: the text is correct as it is, and the sequence does not need to be strictly ordered from head to toe; it is just a matter of variation. Also note that hands are a peripheral body part, with a wide range of movement outside the vertical axis of the body, which could justify their placement at the margins of a list. Otherwise, one may perhaps think that the scribe made a mistake, forgetting to include the hands in the expected place and adding them at the end of the list. However, the same mistake repeated thrice seems to me to be an unlikely explanation. The possibility of a later addition of something not belonging to the original text also seems to be unlikely for a relevant body part like the hands, and one should note that the duplicate KBo 22.128+ (CTH 390.C, NS) probably had the same text.6)

In my view, it is possible that the text is correct, and I suggest that the explanation for the unexpected collocation of the hands at the end of the list can be that the child for whom the incantation was intended was an infant who still did not walk, but crawled. This solution would both restore the expected head-to-toe sequence and explain why the feet are never mentioned in the three lists: his “feet” – so to say – are the knees and the hands.

However, there is a text that, at a first glance, may seem to provide a counterexample, because it features a list of body parts ending with knees, feet, and hands. The passage runs as follows:7)

**KUB 43.53 i (CTH 412.3.1.B, OH/LNS)**

1+ […] *eras.* […]*eš-ša-r* [da-a-ak-ki] *SA·DU-SÍ*
4’ [da-a-ak-ki] a-i-iš-ta-pa K1AXU-i da-a-ak[ki]
6’ m[i-lj]-aš-ši-iš mi-e-li-aš <da-a-ak-ki> *iš-šiše-ta iš-aš-ši da-a-ak-ki
7’ pal-[a-n]-aš-ša-pa pal-ta-ni da-a-ak-ki GABA-ŠÍ A-NA GABA-ŠÍ da-a-ak-ki
10’ [EUG]LÁG·GÚN·A-ŠÍ A-NA [EUG]LÁG·GÚN·A-ŠÍ da-a-ak-ki
11’ ge-en-[a-š]-ša-te ge-<en>-<u-ša-[a-a]-ki KAR-SÍ-ŠÍ
14’ *m[i]-u-ra-aš-ši-iš mi-u-ra-aš-ša <da-a-ak-ki> gi-nuš-t[a] gi-nu-aš da-[a-a]-[a]-ki

---

5) As can be seen, although the lists are not perfectly matched with each other, the hands are always included, as expected, among the upper parts of the body and represented by EUSH’kalulupa- ‘finger’ and šankuwaya- ‘nail’ (KUB 9.4+ i 8-9 and KUB 9.34+ ii 40-41); by ŠÜ ‘hand’ and UMBIN ‘nail’ (KUB 9.34 ii 26-27); or just by šankuwaya- ‘nail’ (KUB 9.4+ i 27). Of course, these lists significantly diverge from the ones in CTH 390.A – they share almost nothing – and the texts belong to different traditions. Nevertheless, I think that the comparison holds, and the issue of the hands consistently found at the end of the lists in CTH 390.A is worthy of discussion, in search of a possible explanation.

6) The first possibility is that there is nothing to be explained: the text is correct as it is, and the sequence does not need to be strictly ordered from head to toe; it is just a matter of variation. Also note that hands are a peripheral body part, with a wide range of movement outside the vertical axis of the body, which could justify their placement at the margins of a list. Otherwise, one may perhaps think that the scribe made a mistake, forgetting to include the hands in the expected place and adding them at the end of the list. However, the same mistake repeated thrice seems to me to be an unlikely explanation. The possibility of a later addition of something not belonging to the original text also seems to be unlikely for a relevant body part like the hands, and one should note that the duplicate KBo 22.128+ (CTH 390.C, NS) probably had the same text.

7) In my view, it is possible that the text is correct, and I suggest that the explanation for the unexpected collocation of the hands at the end of the list can be that the child for whom the incantation was intended was an infant who still did not walk, but crawled. This solution would both restore the expected head-to-toe sequence and explain why the feet are never mentioned in the three lists: his “feet” – so to say – are the knees and the hands. However, there is a text that, at a first glance, may seem to provide a counterexample, because it features a list of body parts ending with knees, feet, and hands. The passage runs as follows.
Again, the hands unexpectedly close the list, and in this case no child is involved, because the ritual is for Labarna-Hattušili. Haas (1971: 417) translates ŠUḪA as ‘toes’ here, a solution that could also work for the lists in CTH 390.A. However, if the word for ‘finger/toe’, kalulupa-, seems to metonymically represent the hands in some of the manuscripts of the Ritual of Tunnawiya mentioned above (either with or without the nails), the possibility that the Sumerogram for hand could be used to mean the toes is less obvious, so that I would avoid such an explanation and rather literally take ŠUḪA as ‘hands’.

The solution, in my opinion, is actually quite similar to the one suggested for CTH 390.A: in KUB 43.53, the body parts of Labarna are matched with the body parts of an animal, so that the order knees-feet-hands at the end of the list may depend on the quadrupedal gait of the animal. Unlike the lists in CTH 390.A, the feet are also included in KUB 43.53 because both the animal and Labarna actually use them to walk. Of course, such order was possible, but not mandatory, because the lists in the Ritual of Tunnawiya mentioned above also match the body parts of a human with those of an animal, but follow the human order. Therefore, the list in KUB 43.53 is probably not an obstacle to my interpretation of CTH 390.A, but its unusual order may rather find an analogous explanation.

However, two problems exist with my solution. The first one is represented by the short list of body parts included in the Middle-Hittite ritual against Ziplantawiya’s witchcraft:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KBo 15.10+ (CTH 443.1, MS)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i 24 še-er SAG.DU-ŠU ḫar-kān-du ŠÂ-ŠU ge-en-zu-še-et</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i 25 (ke)-še-er-ŠU-ŠU, ḫar-kān-du</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘They (scil. the evil tongues) shall hold her head, they shall hold her heart, her abdomen, her knees, her hands, her feet.’

I see no obvious explanation why the hands could be after the knees in this context. One could say that, in such a short list, included in a text with several inconsistencies and peculiarities (which, in my opinion, may point to a non-definitive text), a switch between knees and hands might not be particularly meaningful, also because it might have been triggered by the common pairing of hands and feet that is found in other texts, an explanation that cannot work for CTH 390.A, in which the feet are lacking. However, I admit that this is not a very strong argument.

The other problem is represented by the presence of the local adverb šer ‘up, above’ in the three passages of CTH 390.A including the hands:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KUB 7.1 + KBo 3.8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>iii 41 … na-ax ŠUḪA-gi-nu-ūš-ši-it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii 42 ḫa-mi-ik-ta-at še-er-ma-aš ŠUḪA-SU ḫa-mi-ik-ta</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘he (scil. the child) is bound with respect to his knees; above, he is bound with respect to his hands.’

| iii 53 na-ax ŠUḪA-ŠU KL MIN še-er-ma-an ŠUḪA-ŠU KL MIN |

‘ditto (scil. she shall conjure) him with respect to the knees; above, ditto him with respect to his hands.’

| iii 60 na-ax ŠUḪA-ŠU la-a-ā-an še-er-ma-an ŠUḪA-ŠU KL MIN |

‘I have untied him with respect to the knee; above, ditto (scil. I have untied) him with respect to his hands.’
A local interpretation of šer seems to be unavoidable here, and it would be consistent with the other local indications found in the three lists. Thus, the consistent presence of šer in the three passages seems to actually point to the hands belonging to the upper part of the body. Although, in my opinion, such an indication does not necessarily imply the standing position of the child, I concede that this could be a potential problem for my interpretation, for which I have no convincing solution.

Notes

8 Abbreviations follow the conventions of the RIA. I would like to thank Paola Cotticelli for her valuable suggestions.


2 [(ŠU]²){²}²ŠU is also given by Otten and Rüster (1977: 58) in the edition of the duplicate KBo 22.128+(CTH 390.C, iii 6). See also HW² H: 120 and CHD Š: 423.

3 Thus also Puértolas Rubio 2020: 142 fn. 42, 143 fn. 43.

4 For an analysis of these lists, see Kloekhorst 2005 (which includes a similar table), with references. In order to make the comparison straightforward, transcriptions have been normalised and do not reflect the higher degree of spelling variation in the original texts. Body parts that are entirely lost due to a break of the tablet have been included between square brackets and marked by a question mark.

5 Cf. also KBo 46.62 ii 5'-14' (CTH 475.Tl02.1, NS), in which offerings are assigned to the body parts of the Storm-god, listed in the following order: shoulder, breast and nipples, upper arms, fists, hands, fingers, buttocks, penis, knees and thighs, feet (see Grodeck 2015: 46).

6 In the first and second list (the third one is only partially preserved), the knees are followed by a last body part: although the tablet is broken and the noun cannot be read, ŠU²ŠU is the most likely restoration.

7 Edited by Giorgieri 1992.

8 There is a PAB-like sign in the intercolumnium next to line 12’, which may be related to the fact that the line is repeated immediately after.

9 Incidentally, this parallel structure could also definitively dismiss the reading TŪG²ŠU in CTH 390.A.

10 Thus also Vanséveren 2020: 154.

11 While GÌR ‘feet’ is generally found for the paws of an animal (e.g. in the descriptions of representations of animals, see CHD P: 233), the ‘hand’ of an animal is occasionally found in ritual texts (see Mouton 2004: 71). Here, the front paws are probably referred to as ‘hands’ because of the parallelism with the human body.

12 An analogous list, in which the body parts of a new-born child are matched with those of a goat can be found in KBo 17.61 (CTH 430.2, MS), but the tablet is partly broken, and the hands are not found in the preserved text. However, knees and feet seem to be the last elements of the list (see the online edition by Fuscagni 2013).


14 See e.g. Christiansen 2007, with references.

15 See e.g. the list in KUB 41.21 i 8’-13’.

16 Cf. iji 32 … na-aš šu-ap-ši-il te-e-ta-nu-šu (33) [ḫa-mi-îk-ta-at ka-ta-an-ma-aš šu-pal-la-aš ša-mi-ik-ta-at, ‘he is [b]ound with respect to the pure hairs; below, he is bound with respect to the skull’ (note that kattan does not occur in the second and third list, in which the skull precedes the pure hairs); iji 37 na-aš UGU²pa-ap-pa-aš-ša-la-aš ša-mi-ik-ta ka-ta-an ma-aš (38) UGU²GABA ša-mi-ik-ta, ‘he is bound with respect to the oesophagus; below, he is bound with respect to the chest’; iji 45 … nu-va-aš-ši-iš-ša-an še-er UGU²šu-pal-la-aš ŠU²ša-mi-ik-du²wa², ‘on top of him, she shall conjure the skull’; iji 54 še-er-an UGU²šu-pal-la-aš la-a-su-un, ‘above, I have untied him with respect to the skull’).

17 See also KBo 6.34+ i 23 … nu-aš ka-ta-an GÌR²ŠU²NU²pa²-ta²(i-li-it)²(24) pa-tal-li-yu-an-du še-er-ra-aš ŠU²MEŠŠU²NU iš-ši-an-du, ‘they shall fetter their feet below with fetters, they shall bind their hands above’ (CTH 427.A, NS). According to Wegner (1981: 112 fn. 4), še-er-ma-aš may favour the reading TŪG²ŠU rather than ŠU²ŠU, “when man cannot apprehend will, daß die Hände über das Knie gebunden werden sollen”.
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A Kurigalzu Brick Inscription — A fragment of a brick with complete inscription preserved on the British market in 2009. It was believed to originate from the Kenneth Rendell Collection (USA). Unfortunately, after these 13 years no further information than those details given here is available today. The fragment’s size is 21.5 x 8.7 cm today.

The complete inscription consists of the following 16 lines of text in Sumerian:

1.  Nina-gal (For the) goddess Ningal
2.   ni-na-ir his lady
3.   Ku-ri-gal-zu Kurigalzu
4.   GIR₂,NITA₂ governor
5.  ₄en-li₂-la₂ of Enlil
6.   lugal-kal-ga (the) mighty king
7.   lugal-an-ab-da₂-limmu₂-ba king of the four regions
8.   e₂-a-ni her temple
9.   u₃-ul-li₂-a-ta (which) from long ago
10.  ba-du₁-a ba-til had been built (and) has come to an end/has finished
11.  mu-un-gibil he has renovated
12.   mu-na-du₃ he built
13.   ki-bi-šé₃ to its place/to its (former) state

Valerio PISANIELLO <valerio.pisaniello@univr.it>
University of Verona (ITALY)
The 16 lines of text dedicate a temple to the goddess “Ningal”. The text starts on the first line by mentioning her name. According to line 3 the construction activities on this Ningal temple were ordered by Kurigalzu. Today two kings with the name Kurigalzu (I. & II.) are known. Clayden made clear that Kurigalzu I. (x-1375 BC) was responsible for one of the most extensive and widespread building construction programs with his structures still evident today in Babylonia\(^2\). In lines 12-16 in the text, Kurigalzu writes that he restored the Ningal temple. According to Clayden, Veldhuis, and Bartelmus\(^3\) the restorations of the Ningal temple at Ur were ordered by Kurigalzu I. in the first half of the 14th century BC. Therefore, it is highly probable that our inscription was ordered by Kurigalzu I., an assumption also made by Bartelmus and Miglus for the brick published by Sollberger\(^4\).

A comparison of our brick inscription (Fig. 1, left) with the drawing of the inscription published by Sollberger as his number 99 (Fig. 1, right\(^5\)) strongly suggests that the two texts are the same. Thus, the brick considered here is likely another specimen of the bricks of a Ningal temple at Ur. Bartelmus notes that the building’s name is not given in the text she quoted\(^6\). Known are two intact bricks and a fragment of a brick\(^7\), all three of them containing the identical 16-line text shown above (Fig. 1, right). Brinkman classified\(^8\) this text as Q.2.36.1-2 and Sollberger was the first to publish a drawing of the inscription\(^9\). The text is several times quoted\(^10\). But it seems that nobody so far transliterated or translated this inscription. Veldhuis considered the Kassite Sumerian peculiarities in orthography – especially prevalent during the period of Kurigalzu I. – to be attempts to archaize text\(^11\). Such orthographic peculiarities are readily found in our present inscription as well, particularly for the cuneiform signs containing higher suffix numbers in the transliteration.

Considering the irregular frame and lines separating one line of text from the next one, it is obvious that the inscription was not impressed with a stamp but written by hand making careless written cuneiform signs possible. In this context it is interesting to have a closer look at line 14. The identification of the first two signs is not straightforward. The first one could most probably be a somewhat altered “bi” or a “KU” sign similar to that found in line 3. The second sign looks rather like a “RE” or a rare form of a “BA”
sign but could just as well be understood as a poorly crafted or intentionally altered “in” sign compared with the “in” sign in line 16. However, taking into account that line 14 of the drawing published by Sollberger (Fig. 1, right) can clearly be transliterated to bi₂-in-gi₂-a and considering the close similarity between the appearance of both entire texts in Fig. 1 overall, it is not a stretch to conclude that the transliteration of the text investigated here is also bi₂-in-gi₂-a. As a whole our text fits well to other inscriptions of Kurigalzu for other buildings suggesting a unique orthographic style for his inscriptions. Especially brick inscriptions by Kurigalzu for the temple e₂-kiš-nu-gal₂ of the god Nanna at Ur are in some lines identical.

Clearly our brick belongs to one of Ningal’s temples (line 1). Her main city of worship was Ur although she was venerated throughout Mesopotamia. Places of worship published in the literature include the known temples of Ningal listed by Zgoll and a shrine with the name “Sacred Bedroom” mentioned by Frayne and Stuckey. Gadd published a text of a partly preserved inscription on a brick of an assumed Ningal temple from Ur built by Kurigalzu which is related to our text. In it the temple’s name is also not given. But that inscription has only nine lines and the name of the deity is not fully present because the artifact is fragmented at the right edge. (In Gadd’s transliteration his line 9 is our line 11.) On his plate 37 the upper and lower frame of the inscription indicates that there were no further lines. Therefore, Gadd’s brick belongs probably to another temple of Ningal than ours.

Because temples had normally a name, this name could be written at line 8 on our brick where the temple is addressed. Due to the rough surface of the brick line 8 is not very clearly readable but it is tempting to search for the temple’s name here. Under great magnification the cuneiform signs e₂-a-ni (= her temple) can be made out in the photo of Fig. 1 (left) in agreement with Sollberger’s drawing (Fig. 1, right) where the temple is also addressed in a general form of “her temple” without a name.

In chapter IV of his volume VIII of Ur Excavations Woolley described the construction activities of Kurigalzu at the GI-PAR-KU complex with the temple of Ningal at Ur. He mentioned that Kurigalzu erected a second temple for Ningal at the opposite side of the Via Sacra, at the SE limits of the Ziggurat platform. Recently Miglus revisited the information of the construction activities of Kurigalzu at Ur. He proposes two possibilities for the second Ningal temple: Either there was a second temple for Ningal in the court of the Ziggurat in earlier time; or Kurigalzu established a new temple that he wanted to be considered as of an old tradition. If the name of the deity in the nine-line inscription Q.2.37 on that fragmentary brick is correctly reconstructed the brick belongs to a Ningal temple at Ur. At least on the picture published by Gadd on the first line DINGIR NIN is to be read. So, two distinctly different types of Ningal temple bricks exist at Ur with inscriptions of different length (16 and 9 lines: Q.2.36 and Q.2.37). In this case it is very well possible that two temples for Ningal existed at Ur in the time of Kurigalzu. As is evident from the brick’s inscription this temple is designated as already very old at the time Kurigalzu restored it although no direct evidence of the existence of an earlier building such as walls, foundations or artifacts thereof survived so far. Taking our text literally such remains are not to be expected as Kurigalzu had renewed the temple down to the foundations.

In conclusion, it is highly probable that the brick discussed here belongs to a second Ningal temple at Ur. The brick discussed here is a new addition to the very short list of bricks from a Ningal temple at Ur that were restored or created by Kurigalzu I. and that survived into our time.

Notes
1 Linguistic proofreading by T. Wytenbach (Santa Barbara, CA), is greatly appreciated.
3 Clayden 1995, 61; Clayden 1996; Veldhuis 2008, 25, 27; Bartelmus 2017, 281, Tab. 11.3.
4 Bartelmus 2017, 295, Tab. 14a; Miglus 2017, 340, Abb. 13.05.
5 Sollberger 1965, 21, Pl. 24, Nr. 99.
6 Bartelmus 2017, 281, Tab. 11.3. One inscription of 16 lines and one of nine lines.
7 The two bricks were found in situ SW of great court, the fragment on the surface of Dub-lal-mah: Sollberger 1965, 21.
8 Brinkman 1976, 218.
12. BM 90733; BM 137496; BM 090715 (CDLI Nr. P428301); Gadd 1928, Nr. 152-163; Walker & Wilcke 1981, 96-98.
13. E.g., CDLI Nr. P428483 (BM 123337); CDLI Nr. P373953 = Gadd 1928, 49, Nr. 162.
17. Gadd 1928, 48, Nr. 156, Pl. 37.
22. Gadd 1928, Nr. 156, Pl. 37.
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65) The Son of King Kurigalzu on a Kassite Prayer Seal — The cylinder seal NCBS 276 belongs to the group of seals known as “Kassite prayer seals,” studied in Limet 1971. A modern impression of the seal and an edition of its inscription were first published in 1934 (von der Osten 1934: #276, pp. 44 and 164, plate xx), and the text was re-edited in Limet’s work (seal #7.7, p. 95). It has since been mentioned in other collections of Kassite material (Jaritz 1958: 247, #144; Brinkman 1976: 230, Q.2.106) and in more recent treatments of Kassite glyptic art (Stiehler-Alegria Delgado 1996: 180, #46).

Beginning with von der Osten 1934, and continuing in the re-edition of the inscription in Limet 1971, the name of the seal’s owner in line 1 has been read as Nār-Enlil, interpreting the signs as “ZALAG-urs–é-en-lil”. Subsequent treatments of this seal and its text have accepted the original reading, although not without hesitation. 5

This reading, however, has three problems: 1) The third sign of the first line is clearly not UR3 (or even UR2). 2) The nominal element nūru is not spelled this way elsewhere in personal names of the Middle Babylonian period; it is typically written ZALAG(-um)–DN3 or nu-urz–DN (Limet 1971: 125, Hölscher
1996: 161-162). 3) The end of the line is broken, and the damaged sign remaining after the divine determinative does not at all look like the ligature of 4EN, which appears clearly on the line beneath it. This indicates that the divine name cannot be Enlil4 (see drawing below).

Inscription on Cylinder Seal NCBS 276 (YPM BC 037173)

2. nu-e\^i-n\^il\_tu]  2. The nu’e\^i-priest of Enlil
4. lugal ki\^i\_tu]  4. King of the Universe
5. ina e\^i-tu-d[\_u]  5. May he frequent the temple!
6. ti-la diri]  6. May (his) life be long!

Text Comments
1) The name of the owner of this seal should be read as Ba’il-Marduk. The first element of the name is spelled "ba-il-\. The third sign is a clear IL sign. As for the sign before it, ZALAG (=UD) and BA can look quite similar in their lapidary forms found on seals. For an example, note the similar shapes of these two signs on the Kassite seal BM 89128, lines 1 and 3 (Limet 1971: 8.6, a photo of a modern impression is found in Collon 1987: #238). But given the horizontal crossing the right side vertical wedge, the sign is better read as BA.

In addition to paleographical considerations, this reading of the first element is a better fit with the onomastics of the Middle Babylonian period. The entry in CAD B: 30 for the noun bā’ilu defines it as “ruler” and states that it occurs only in Middle Babylonian personal names. Several different names of the type Ba’il-DN appear in Kassite Babylonia: ba-il-\^aAMAR.UTU, ba-il-\^aAG, ba-il-\^aNUSKU, ba-il-\^a-te-sub, and ba-il-\^aNIN.UTA (Hölscher 1996: 44, for the last name, see van Soldt 2015: #358, line 20). The reading presented here of the name on the seal NCBS 276 is consistent with the spellings of these other Middle Babylonian names.

The second element of the name, the theophoric element, is more difficult because it is broken. The divine determinative is clearly present, and the next sign is partially preserved, along with a trace of the final sign. This partial sign matches quite well with the shape of the lapidary form of the sign AMAR, and the remaining traces and space in the line match those of an UTU sign. For drawings of similarly shaped AMAR signs on Kassite seals, see seal 1, line 1 in Nougayrol 1966, and line 1 of the seal in Limet and T\_rokay 1969 (Limet 1971: 5.9 and 11.2, respectively). Because of this similarity, the divine name is a good match for a\^iAMAR.UTU.

2) There is a little chipping at the end of this line, but not enough to fit the LA\_2 sign suggested by Limet as a restoration (1971: 95).

5-6) I have rendered the verbs in these lines as volitional forms, despite only the roots being present. This reading is supported on the basis of other Kassite prayer seals (both Akkadian and Sumerian) containing volitional forms. See for example the line ti-la he\^i-yu, which appears in seals 6.5 and 7.20 in Limet 1971.

5) The earlier editions by von der Osten and Limet read this line as nam-ti du-d[\_u]. The first sign in the line cannot be NAM, but there are many parallel examples of the line ina e\^i-ga[l du-du] “May he go about in the palace” (seals 7.13, 7.14, 7.15, 7.18, 7.23, 7.25, 7.26, 7.27 and 7.28 in Limet 1971). The initial ina e2 is a much better paleographic fit for the beginning of the line.
Only the TI sign seems out of place. I think it is most likely read e₂-ti, unusual as that may be, but e₂-ti “house of life” is also possible. “Life” is more commonly written ti-la or nam-ti-la in the Kassite prayer seals, though ti does occasionally occur. Since the more common version of this formula reads e₂-gul “palace” instead of e₂-ti “house, temple”, one might suppose that the difference is due to the fact that the seal’s owner was a member of the royal family who had become a priest: perhaps he no longer required a blessing for the palace, but one instead for his new profession in a temple.

One remaining issue is the question of which of the two Kassite kings named Kurigalzu was the father of Bā’īl-Marduk. Kurigalzu I (son of Kadashman-Ḫarḫu) and Kurigalzu II (son of Burna-Buriash) both reigned about 50 years apart, and are often difficult to distinguish when they appear in royal inscriptions, unless they appear with their patronyms (Brinkman 1976: 205-207, Brinkman 1980-1983: 369, Beaulieu 2018: 137). Previous treatments of the seal NCBS 276 are not in agreement on which Kurigalzu is meant: Stiehler-Alegria Delgado (1996: 180) assigned it to Kurigalzu I, while Jaritz (1958: 247) placed it under Kurigalzu II. Brinkman (1976: 207, 230) placed all materials relating to both kings named Kurigalzu together. One criterion that may prove useful for distinguishing them is the epithet “king of the universe” lugal kiššu (= Akkadian šar kiššatu) given to the Kurigalzu on NCBS 276, line 4. According to Beaulieu (2018: 144), this title first appeared among the Kassite kings in the reign of Kadashman-Enlil I, and became more popular under his successor Burna-buriash II, continuing in common use through the end of the Kassite dynasty. If this assertion is true, it would be significant because Kadashman-Enlil I reigned after Kurigalzu I, but before Kurigalzu II.

This new reading may also add a new piece (albeit a small one) to the puzzle regarding the interactions between Marduk and Enlil in the Kassite period. Syncretism between Marduk and Enlil in the late Kassite period laid the groundwork for the supremacy of Marduk that would eclipse older Mesopotamian religious conceptions in the late second millennium. It may be significant, then, that a priest of Enlil (and one coming from the royal family, no less) had a Marduk name in the late fourteenth century.

Notes

1. I would like to thank Prof. Eckart Frahm, Prof. Benjamin Foster, and Klaus Wagensonner for their advice and feedback on this note.

2. Limet (1971: 95) recognized that the name was possible within Middle Babylonian onomastics, though he doubted the reading of UR₁ for the third sign, suggesting UR₂. Brinkman (1976: 203) read Nār-DN, following the original interpretation of the first element, but noting the damaged divine name.

3. ZALAG = UD, and in Old Babylonian was sometimes not differentiated from ZALAG₂ (= ERIM), which was also used for Akkadian nitrū. See Borger 2004: 379 and 385.

4. Von der Osten did not indicate the breakage in the seal in his edition, nor the fact that his reading of the name was restored. The plate image of the seal rollout indicates that the line was in fact broken at that time, so it is not the case that the damage to the seal occurred after von der Osten examined it.

5. The reading of the second sign as either ZALAG (UD) or BA depends on whether the horizontal stroke on the right side of the sign is interpreted as a horizontal wedge or as the head of the lower vertical wedge. Because most of the vertical wedges on this seal have heads that angle, I interpret this stroke as a horizontal wedge and have drawn it accordingly.

6. See Limet 1971: 134, 138-139. A temple by the name of e₂-ti-la is attested in Borsippa, rebuilt by Nebuchadnezzar II. It cannot be the same temple, however, since it was dedicated to Gula. See George 1993: 150.


8. For a summary of this process and the scholarship on it, see Lambert 2013: 265-271, and for recent contributions to this narrative, see Tenney 2016.
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An Unpublished Urartian Inscription from Aznavurtepe Temple — Aznavurtepe Fortress was built on a natural hill which is 2 kilometers northwest of Patnos District of Ağrı Province. This fortress is in the north of Van Lake, at the heart of the Urartian geography, in a strategically significant place on the expedition route from the capital of the kingdom (Van Fortress-Urartian Tušpa) to the west and northwest. The first archaeological investigation in the fortress was conducted by Burney which was followed by a brief treasure digging that harmed the temple located at the top of the hill, then by excavations in 1961-63 under the direction of Balkan.

Those excavations revealed a temple with square plan in Urartian susi (5 x 5 m) at the top of the citadel and its related spaces, as well as western and southern fortifications. Unfortunately, today, we do not have much information other than given in two articles published by Balkan with limited data and visuals, based on these three excavation seasons realized thanks to big investment. On the façade and inner walls of the susi temple excavated by Balkan were gabro blocks with Urartian cuneiform inscriptions. Although it was the Urartian King Išpuini (830-820 BC) who constructed the first architectural buildings in Aznavurtepe, the inscriptions on the temple walls refer to his son Minua (810-780 BC). The two duplicate cuneiform inscriptions on four blocks of the inner walls of the temple building give an account of Haldinili KÁ constructed by Minua for the city of Aludiri, succession of Minua to the throne of kingdom, and his expeditions to Šatiru, Baštu and Malmali lands in the east, and Alži, Šašnu lands in the west (CTU I. A 5-
During the excavation seasons, Balkan had first revealed the inscribed block on the short wall on the right to the temple building entrance (Fig.1-2). According to his notes, the block with inscriptions was 30 cm. in height and 145 cm. in width. There are six lines of inscriptions in cuneiform, with 3.5 cm of line spacings (Fig.2).

![Image](image_url)

Fig. 2. Balkan 1960, 128/No.3.

1. Dšal-di-i-ni-ni uš-ma-a-ši-i-ni
2. URU-a-[i-š-[é-e]-ri]-i-e inš-pú-ú-i-ni-ḫi-ni-šē
3. E.GAL ši-di-[iš-tú-ni ba-d]šu-si-i-e
4. Dšal-di-i-ni-ni uš-ma-[š]-i-ni mi-nu-a-šē

Translation: (1) Through the protection of the god Ḫaldi, Minua (2-3) son of Išpuini has built perfectly a fortress in the city of Aludiri (4) Through the protection of the god Ḫaldi, Minua (5) (son) of Išpuini has built the Gates of the god Ḫaldi (6) in the city of Aludiri perfectly (CTU I. A 5-37).

In his short report, Balkan refers to the idea that there must have been another inscribed block on the short wall on the left hand side, corresponding to the one on the right (Fig.1). He also states that the treasure hunters who dug the temple before him saw this highly damaged inscribed block. This inscription has been revealed at later stages of the excavations, however its interpretation and publication is not made by Balkan. Having been partially restored during those excavations the Aznavurtepe susi temple has been smashed by treasure hunters from the end of the excavations (1963) to today. During the researches or surveys we made in the fortress twice in 2015 and 2020, we immediately noticed an inscribed one among the irregularly scattered, half-buried blocks of temple walls (Fig.3-4). Very few signs were survived at the beginning of the inscription lines on the gabro block whose surface was mainly broken, which indicated that the inscription consists of six lines. Measured height of the inscribed block is 30 cm, whereas the line spacings are 3 cm. This inscription must be the duplicate of the inscription on the right wall of the temple building not published by Balkan. As a matter of fact, the dimensions of the blocks and the completed inscription text confirm this observation. The only discrepancy is that the inscription should actually consist of eight lines, given the height of the block and the flow of the text. Based on the dimensions of the inscription and the order of existing line beginnings, the newly found duplicate inscription can be completed as follows:

1. Dšal-[di-i-ni-ni uš-ma-a-ši-i-ni]
2. mi-nu-[a-še inš-pú-ú-i-ni-ḫi-ni-šē]
4. URU-[lu-di-ri-e E.GAL ši-di-iš-tú-ni ba-du-si]
5. Dšal-di-i-ni-ni uš-ma-a-ši-i-ni]
6. mi-nu-a-šē inš-pú-ú-i-ni-ḫi-ni-šē
References

5. It was the King Išpuini who constructed the first architectural buildings at the Aznavurtepe Fortress. For inscriptions found here see: (CTU I. A 2-10).
8. “Ḫaldinili KÁ” in Urartian inscriptions, which can be translated as “Gates of God Haldi” was probably an expression designating the susi type temples dedicated to God Haldi. For more details see: B.Genç, 2016, p. 67-76; R. Kuvanç et al., 2022, p. 55-88.

Notes

5. It was the King Išpuini who constructed the first architectural buildings at the Aznavurtepe Fortress. For inscriptions found here see: (CTU I. A 2-10).
8. “Ḫaldinili KÁ” in Urartian inscriptions, which can be translated as “Gates of God Haldi” was probably an expression designating the susi type temples dedicated to God Haldi. For more details see: B.Genç, 2016, p. 67-76; R. Kuvanç et al., 2022, p. 55-88.
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The temple room of Aznavurtepe Fortress is a typical example of the standard Urartian susi type temples. However, there is no mention of susi in the inscriptions found at the fortress. Instead, there is the expression “Ḫaldinili KÁ” in the inscriptions on the temple walls. The temple must have been constructed right after the succession of Minua to the throne of Urartu. On the inner walls of the temple building, there are annals of King Minua’s enthronement and his first military campaigns. Therefore it can be stated that this temple building, in a way, is the first one whose façade is inscribed among the susi type temples identified so far. In fact, duplicated inscriptions of Urartian temples, the latter of which we have introduced here, are perhaps an indication that this tradition began with Minua.
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8. “Ḫaldinili KÁ” in Urartian inscriptions, which can be translated as “Gates of God Haldi” was probably an expression designating the susi type temples dedicated to God Haldi. For more details see: B.Genç, 2016, p. 67-76; R. Kuvanç et al., 2022, p. 55-88.
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Fig. 3-4. Inscription on the left wall of the Aznarpe susi temple (2015)
67) Remarques sur la détermination du nom entre lycien et grec d’Asie Mineure — Melchert (2014 : 69), reprenant une idée exprimée de façon moins contraignante par Rutherford (2002 : 208s.), énumère parmi les évidences de contact linguistique entre le lycien et le grec l’absence de l’article défini dans les inscriptions grecques de Lycie en raison de l’interférence avec le lycien qui est une langue sans article (comme le reste des langues anatoliennes).

Toutefois, l’analyse des formules de filiation dans les inscriptions a montré que l’article défini est bien souvent absent dans cette typologie de texte provenant non seulement de l’Asie Mineure mais de toute la Grèce, excluant ainsi l’hypothèse de contact linguistique avec les langues anatoliennes comme explication primaire. Dans une précédente recherche (Merlin/Pisaniello 2019 : 101ss.), nous avons constaté que l’article défini dans les formules de filiation, qui est omis devant les anthroponymes dans les inscriptions bilingues lycien-grec, est en fait également absent dans les inscriptions monolingues éloignées de la Lycie, mais il est présent lorsqu’il s’agit d’exprimer le nom du père du père, en Lycie et ailleurs, afin de séparer deux génitifs ayant un référent différent, dans la formule ‘x fils de y ARTICLE fils de z’.

Voici deux exemples, entre beaucoup d’autres, attestés à des époques assez anciennes.

IG IX 1.869, VI siècle av. J.-C. (Corcyre)
οτάλα Σεντιάριος τού Μπενίκιος ειμ’ ετ’ τύμβοι.
Je suis la stèle de Xenare, fils de Meixis, sur (sa) tombe.

Didyma 209, VII/VI siècle av. J.-C. (Didymes, Ionie)
oi Ἀναξιμάνδροι παῖδες τοῦ Μανδρομάχοις ἀνέθεκον ἐπὶ τοὺς Σεριστικέρες.
Les fils d’Anaximandros, fils de Mandromachos, dédièrent, à Terpsikéreis.

Ceci était le premier point de révision. Le deuxième point concerne l’expression de la détermination. L’analyse des articles comme marques de détermination doit être élargie à l’ensemble du syntagme nominal et à la possibilité que l’article défini ou un pronom démonstratif, soit par les deux, soit par aucun des deux.

La langue lycienne ne possède pas d’articles, mais elle possède des démonstratifs. Les formules d’ouverture montrent que la grande majorité des syntagmes nominaux déterminés sont formés par démonstratif + nom dans cet ordre : ebēñē xe burā (attesté 60 fois) vs. xurā ebēñē (6) ; ebēñē prinawā (25) vs. prinawā ebēñē (2) ; ebēñē ūttā (3) ; ebēñē tezī (2) ; ebeija erawazija-arawazija (2) vs. arawazija ebeija (1) ; ebeija erublija (1) ; ebeija xruwata (1) ; ebeis tukedris (1) ; ebēñē sttalā (1). Dans environ 90% des occurrences, le modèle est démonstratif + nom contre une dizaine de cas (dont certains contiennent plutôt un adverbe démonstratif) dans lesquels le démonstratif suit le nom. En termes de variation linguistique, il semble sûr de dire que l’ordre démonstratif + nom est la règle, alors que l’inverse est la variation2.

Le grec au contraire, fait notoire, a développé au cours de son histoire un article défini qui vient du démonstratif indo-européen *so, *seh, *tud au moyen d’un processus de grammaticalisation, typologiquement commun dans les langues du monde. Pour cette étude, l’attention a été portée sur les syntagmes grecs contenant des mots liés à la sphère funéraire, en particulier μνήμα, σῆμα (στήμα dans le vocalisme dorique), τύμβος, en comptant les occurrences du nom accompagné d’un démonstratif et/ou de
l’article défini dans les différentes constructions possibles. Les occurrences ont été collectées à partir du corpus informatisé des inscriptions grecques (https://inscriptions.packhum.org/, dernier accès le 30 avril 2022), en considérant aussi les formes fléchies et celles avec apocope de la dernière voyelle, par ex. τὸ μνῆμα ‘ou τύμβος ὁδ.” La recherche a produit les résultats suivants, ordonnés par ordre de fréquence pour chacun des mots choisis : τὸ μνῆμα (244 occurrences) ; τοῦτο τὸ μνῆμα (40) ; μνῆμα τόδε (38) ; τὸ μνῆμα τοῦτο (24) ; τὸ μνήμα (12) ; τοῦτο μνῆμα (5) ; τὸ τὸ μνήμα (5) ; τὸ μνήμα τόδε (2). Puis, τὸ τύμβος (187) ; τύμβος ὁδε (33) ; οὗτος ὁ τύμβος (15) ; ὁδε τύμβος (9) ; ὁ τύμβος οὗτος (7) ; οὗτος τύμβος (2) ; ὁ δε τύμβος (1) ; ὁ τύμβος ὁδε (1). Enfin, τὸ σήμα/σάμα (173) ; τὸ σήμα/σάμα (99) ; σήμα/σάμα τόδε (68) ; τοῦτο τὸ σήμα (10) ; τὸ σήμα τοῦτο (2) ; τὸ τὸ σήμα (2) ; τὸ σήμα τόδε (1) ; τὸ σήμα (1).

Par rapport à ces données quelques remarques peuvent être faites. Tout d’abord et de manière très générale, la langue épigraphique grecque admet une certaine variété d’expressions, mais présente un taux différent de fréquence relative des constructions syntaxiques : certaines sont très courantes, d’autres moins, mais toujours attestées. On observe aussi que le démonstratif ὁδε est plus fréquemment postposé que préposé et que les formes avec démonstratif mais sans article tels que τοῦτο μνῆμα, ainsi que τοῦτον τύμβον et τοῦτο σήμα, sont très rares.

Les occurrences en Asie Mineure ont été séparées du reste des occurrences afin de vérifier les éventuelles tendances aréales dans lesquelles le contact linguistique avec les langues anatoliennes pourrait entrer en jeu. À cet égard le résultat le plus intéressant vient de τοῦτο τὸ μνῆμα, attesté 38 fois au total, dont 33 en Asie Mineure. Comme l’observait Brixhe (2007 : 930) la mise en avant en grec de l’objet (τοῦτο τὸ μνῆμα ‘ce mémorial’ à l’accusatif) crée une correspondance avec la structure Objet–Verbe–Sujet du texte lycien. Nous observons aussi que les formes contenant les autres lexèmes en particulier à l’accusatif, à savoir τύμβον ou σήμα accompagnés de τοῦτον, avec ou sans article, sont peu fréquentes et attestées presque exclusivement en Asie Mineure. En outre, si l’on supprime les mots indiquant la tombe ou le monument, pour ne retenir que la construction démonstratif + article + nom l’on constate que plus de la moitié des inscriptions portant démonstratif + article proviennent d’Asie Mineure (par ex. τοῦτο τό, 404 sur 725)². Malgré le fait qu’une analyse minutieuse de tous les textes serait nécessaire pour une correcte évaluation linguistique et chronologique des inscriptions, les données proposées semblent conduire vers l’hypothèse du contact : la préférence pour la construction démonstratif + article pourrait représenter en effet un trait aréal, c’est-à-dire propre du grec d’Asie Mineure sous l’influence des langues anatoliennes, bien qu’on ne puisse complètement écarter l’hypothèse d’une caractéristique due au type de texte, à savoir les inscriptions funéraires.

En considérant les inscriptions bilinéaires lycien-grec, nous avons affaire à plusieurs stratégies de correspondance textuelle entre les deux langues :

- Absence du syntagme correspondant en grec : TL 23, 25a, 143, 139 ;
- Correspondance avec la mise en avant du démonstratif et l’insertion de l’article défini : TL 6 τοῦτο τὸ μνῆμα qui correspond à ebēnēn ἰτατά ;
- Correspondance avec ὁδε postposé (TL 44a) bien que le texte soit assez complexe, le grec étant une courte épigramme ;
- Correspondance avec article + nom + ὁδε : TL 117.

L’inscription bilinéaire TL 117 mérite quelques remarques supplémentaires. Tout d’abord, la formule article + nom + ὁδε est très inhabituelle, car elle ne se trouve attestée que 4 fois sur l’ensemble des inscriptions grecques.

Pour ce qui concerne l’article défini, il est absent devant νιός mais pas devant γυναικί. Cette incertitude pourrait montrer une difficulté à rendre une langue sans article. Toutefois, si le lycien n’a pas d’article, il a d’autres dispositifs pour marquer la définition. L’un d’entre eux est le démonstratif (1, ebeija eravazija ‘cette construction’), l’autre est le possessif (4, ladi ehbi litt. ‘femme/épouse à lui’). Le possessif est rendu en grec par un simple article défini ayant la fonction, entre autres, de marquer la détermination en termes de possession unique (la femme = sa femme, son épouse). La syntaxe du texte grec apparaît moins « naturelle » car elle sonne comme une traduction mot à mot du lycien. D’un point de vue
sociolinguistique, cela pourrait être un indice du fait que le document a été écrit par un locuteur grec non natif.

En résumé, l’absence de l’article défini dans des positions attendues des syntagmes nominaux grecs ne peut pas simplement être attribuée au contact avec une langue sans article, et ceci pour plusieurs raisons : 1) l’article n’est pas toujours absent, il apparaît dans des formules standardisées mais aussi dans d’autres positions dans lesquelles il est requis (entre deux noms au génitifs se référant à deux personnes différentes) ; 2) la présence d’autres déterminants tels que les démonstratifs et les possessifs doit être prise en compte, car dans les langues sans article ces formes remplissent la fonction de la détermination.

Notes


1. Cette inscription ne montre pas encore la notation postérieure du long /ō/ sous l’ortographe <ου>.

2. Nous ne disposons pas d’inscriptions bilingues montrant l’éventuel correspondant grec de ce dernier type de structure.

3. Par démonstratif je considère ici le démonstratif « fort » représenté par ούτος, τούτον, τοῦτο, et non par les formes de δῆ.
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68) On the unit UŠ = šuššān — The unit known by the logogram UŠ is attested countless times from the third millennium BCE until the end of cuneiform. Three distinct metrological functions of UŠ can be distinguished (Powell 1987, 465–468). Throughout all periods UŠ denotes a unit of length with the equivalences 1 UŠ = 60 nindanu (NINDA) and 1 bēru (DANNA) = 30 UŠ. From the late second millennium onward these are also units of time, such that 1 day (24 h) = 12 bēru = 360 UŠ. After the zodiac was introduced in the fifth century BCE, the UŠ also became a unit of celestial distance along or perpendicular to the ecliptic (the circle at the center of the zodiac), such that 1 zodiacal sign = 30 UŠ and 12 zodiacal signs = 360 UŠ. In this function the UŠ corresponds more or less to the modern degree of arc. In spite of the ubiquity of the UŠ in diverse sources from all periods, its Akkadian reading has remained elusive. No conclusive evidence for a phonetic writing appears to have been pointed out and the relevant sections of the lexical lists which are assumed to contain this information, in particular Ea Tablet VI and Aa Tablets 30–34, are not preserved (MSL 14, 431). However, evidence for the Akkadian reading of UŠ has been hiding in plain sight in W 23281 (SpTU 4 173), a metrological compendium from Achaemenid Uruk (Robson 2007; Friberg and al-Rawi 2016: 87–105; Proust 2019). Its first section (obv. i 1–34 = §1 in Friberg and al-Rawi 2016) contains a list of relations between different length units based on the template “absolute number (a) of smaller unit (b) = larger unit (c)”. The following quotations summarize the evidence for the reading of UŠ:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>obv. i</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>c</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>c</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8)</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>aššālu</td>
<td>šu-uš-ša₂-an</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>cubits</td>
<td>šuššān</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>aššālu</td>
<td>šu-uš-ša₂-an</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100 cubits</td>
<td>šuššān</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>aššālu</td>
<td>šu-uš-ša₂-an</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>300 cubits</td>
<td>šuššān</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>aššālu</td>
<td>šu-uš-ša₂-an</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>200 cubits</td>
<td>šuššān</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>aššālu</td>
<td>šu-uš-ša₂-an</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>150 cubits</td>
<td>šuššān</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>aššālu</td>
<td>šu-uš-ša₂-an</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100 cubits</td>
<td>šuššān</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>aššālu</td>
<td>šu-uš-ša₂-an</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>60 cubits</td>
<td>šuššān</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>aššālu</td>
<td>šu-uš-ša₂-an</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20 cubits</td>
<td>šuššān</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>aššālu</td>
<td>šu-uš-ša₂-an</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>300 cubits</td>
<td>šuššān</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>aššālu</td>
<td>šu-uš-ša₂-an</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>200 cubits</td>
<td>šuššān</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>aššālu</td>
<td>šu-uš-ša₂-an</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>150 cubits</td>
<td>šuššān</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>aššālu</td>
<td>šu-uš-ša₂-an</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100 cubits</td>
<td>šuššān</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The underlying length metrology combines Old Babylonian with Late Babylonian elements (Friberg and al-Rawi 2016, 93–95). An unusual aspect of the list is that most length units are written phonetically and that the unit UŠ is lacking. But the quoted entries mention the previously unknown unit šu-uš-ša₂-an = šuššān in slots where one expects UŠ. This becomes clear if we compare them with equivalences of the UŠ known from other sources (Powell 1987, 460: Table III). For example, line 8 corresponds to the equivalence 720 cubits = 1 UŠ, line 20 to 6 aššālu = 1 UŠ, line 27 to 30 šuššān = 1 bēru, and line 30 to 240 purdu (≈ 240 nikakkum) = 1 UŠ. Further confirmation is offered by BM 33458+33577+33585, an unpublished fragment probably from Seleucid or Parthian Babylon (Ossendrijver, forthcoming) with a partial duplicate of W 23281 §1 in which UŠ replaces šu-uš-ša₂-an in the entries corresponding to lines 8–9:

| side X 15) | 7 6 me 20 | i-na am₄-ma₁-[ti] | 60 | cubits | šuššān |
| side X 16) | 7 6 lim 2 me 1 | i-na am₄-ma₁-[ti] | 10 | 100 cubits | šuššān |

(The tablet includes an extra column for the floating sexagesimal numbers which are assigned to the units, i.e. 1 for 1 UŠ and 10 for 10 UŠ). The evidence proves beyond doubt that šuššān is the Akkadian reading of the unit UŠ – at least for the scribe of W 23281. This conclusion was not drawn by Friberg and al-Rawi (2016), 95, because in dictionaries and lexical texts šuššān is attested only as the Akkadian reading of ŠUSANA = 1/3 (CAD Vol. Ⅲi, 384). The evidence from W 23281 suggests the existence of a homophonous word šuššān(UŠ) which has thus far escaped attention.
It is plausible that this word derives from šuššu (šāšu, šāši) = 60, considering that UŠ is also a common logogram for 60 in all periods of cuneiform. This is now confirmed by a Neo Assyrian star list from Assur (Hätinen and Schaudig, forthcoming) in which the time between successive stellar culminations (ziqpu) is expressed in bēru(DANNA) and šu-ši = šāši instead of the expected UŠ. This indicates that in some regions and periods the Akkadian reading of the unit UŠ is šāši, the word for 60. The origin and meaning of the ending -ān are less clear, but a possible parallel is the Late Babylonian spelling of the length unit ṣuppān (see e.g. W 23281 §1b, c, f in Friberg and al-Rawi 2016, 92). This might suggest that the ending -ān was appended to the word for 60 in the Neo or Late Babylonian period. The reason why the unit UŠ is named after the number 60 could be that it consists of 60 smaller units, i.e. the nindanu(NINDA). The etymology of šuššān(ŠUŠANA) = 1/3 is probably different. According to the AHw (Vol. III šušša) and Kraus (1970), 142 it could be a dualis of šuššu < šuššu = 1/6, resulting in 2/6 = 1/3. On that account each distinct word šuššān derives from a distinct word šuššu, one meaning 60 and one meaning 1/6.

Although the evidence for šuššān presented above concerns UŠ as a unit of length, there is no reason to suppose that it does not carry over to the reading of UŠ as a unit of time and celestial distance in Late Babylonian astral science. This could support a suggestion by Ossendrijver and Winkler (2018), 392–393, that the Demotic word for degree, šwsw, which has no convincing Egyptian or Greek etymology, is a loanword from Akkadian šuššān, and analogously for Syriac ss', attested with the meaning degree in the Syriac Treatise on the cause of lunar eclipses (Villey 2011/2012, 418; examples: 165, 167, 168). However, the precise manner in which šuššān could have become Demotic šwsw and Syriac ss' remains to be established.
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Für das akkadische Material ziehen wir das Streitgespräch „Der Stier und das Pferd“ heran. In der Einleitung wird folgende Beschreibung von den positiven Seiten der Flut gegeben:
Of the Euphratres [………….] abundance.
Its flood [………….] Tigris.[…]
[They removed] the riverside meadows [and flooded] the fields,
[They carried off] the elevations and watered the low-lying land,
[They swept] away (the soil) of the plain into the depressions and [down the slopes,]
[They prevailed] over the low-lying land and watered the ground,
The unworked [land] became a bog.
In reed-bed [and thicket] the plants grew,
The bosom of the baren earth was split,
It made pasture flourish for cattle, and produced luxuriant growth

Die Wohltaten der Flut scheinen einen Schwerpunkt der Zeilen zu bilden. Die besondere Note des Textes besteht daran, dass sich gerade auch das Vieh an deren Gaben erfreut. Die gleiche Vorstellung lässt sich im Ägyptischen belegen.

Der Gedanke spiegelt sich dort in dem Nilhymnus auf oDeM 1675 wider, der zur Nebenüberlieferung gehört und durch noch kunstvollere Naturschilderungen als der berühmteren Haupttyp zu begeistern vermag. Die Datierung kann mit dem Neuen Reich angegeben werden. In jenem Rahmen sind folgende Worte zu finden:

Die Stiere laben sich auch hier am frischen Grün (šꜥr), das dank des genügend hohen Pegelstandes empor gesprossen ist. Im Grunde liegt dabei eine reziproke Situation vor. Der Nil sorgt mit dem Pflanzenwachstum für die Nahrung der Stiere und wird durch deren freudige Reaktion auf dieses alljährlich wiederkehrende Geschenk selbst verherrlicht.


Anmerkungen

2 G. Posener, Catalogue de ostraca hiératiques litteraires de Deir el Médineh, III, DFIFAO 18 (Le Caire, 1951), pl. 84.

Stefan BOJOWALD <stefan.bojowald@t-online.de>
70) Nabû-zuqqu-pēnu and Indication of Place of Writing in Neo-Assyrian Colophons — It would be more appropriate to call this note “the Absence of Indication of Place of Writing in Neo-Assyrian Colophons” since there is only one group of texts in which place of writing is indicated in Assyria. These are tablets from the library of the illustrious Neo-Assyrian scholar, Nabû-zuqqu-pēnu (active 716-684 BCE), which were found at Nineveh. His library was apparently brought to Nineveh by his sons, who both hold highest scholarly positions at the court. One of them, Nabu-zēru-lēṣīr was the ummānu of Esarhaddon, the other — Adad-šumu-usur — the king’s chief exorcist. But all the colophons of Nabû-zuqqu-pēnu, which have dating formulas, include also, if preserved, the place of writing of the tablet. Due to his precision we know that all his tablets were written at Kalḫu and not at Nineveh. All the tablets of Nabû-zuqqu-pēnu, but one, are written in NA script.\textsuperscript{7}

In my recent study of the colophons of Nabû-zuqqu-pēnu, I investigated a significant novelty, which he tried to introduce to the Assyrian milieu. This is the use of the Babylonian dating system by regnal year.\textsuperscript{3} Nabû-zuqqu-pēnu’s double and triple dates differ from those of his colleagues, who followed this fashion. Nabû-zuqqu-pēnu counted the first regnal year in Babylonian style, i.e., the first full year of a king in his office was considered as his first regnal year. Other Assyrian scribes started their counting from the year of the king’s ascension to the throne, even if it happened in the middle of the year.\textsuperscript{11} This Nabû-zuqqu-pēnu’s innovation was rather popular among the top echelons of Assyrian scribes\textsuperscript{5} and in Sargon’s and Sennacherib’s times double\textsuperscript{6} or Babylonian-style dating\textsuperscript{7} was used even in royal grants. Nonetheless, this Nabû-zuqqu-pēnu’s novelty lasted only until the mid-reign of Esarhaddon.\textsuperscript{8} Later this practice was completely abandoned and only the limmu dates appear in Assyrian colophons and documents after 676 BCE.

In my research on Nabû-zuqqu-pēnu I had, however, overlooked the other important innovation of this most learned Assyrian scholar — the indication of place of writing in the colophons that he appended to his tablets. In Babylonia this feature is common in all LB colophons. This habit apparently continued from the earlier periods. Place of writing in Babylonia, as well as in the colophons of Nabû-zuqqu-pēnu, is a part of dating formulas. But Nabû-zuqqu-pēnu had totally failed to plant the indication of such an important and informative aspect as the place of writing into Assyrian soil. In Assyria place of writing is found only in the colophons of Nabû-zuqqu-pēnu.\textsuperscript{9} The place of its writing (Nīna\textsuperscript{6}) is indicated on Sargon’s grant dealing with the lands around the village of Maganuba,\textsuperscript{10} where Dur-Šarrukin, his new capital, was built. But this is apparently the direct influence of Nabû-zuqqu-pēnu, who was deeply involved in the matters concerning the construction Dur-Šarrukin.\textsuperscript{11} “Palace of Assurbanipal,” characteristic for Assurbanipal library colophons, is the “owner” of the tablet and not the place of writing. It is not a part of dating formula and typically none of the Assurbanipal’s library colophons have dating formulas at all.

Besides the tablets of Nabû-zuqqu-pēnu’s collection, place is indicated in the colophons of the extispicy queries and reports. Most of these texts were written in Babylonian ductus. But the majority of these group of extispicy tablets, although written in Babylonian script, have colophons in NA ductus, sometimes in smaller signs.\textsuperscript{12} The locations found in these colophons also are a part of their dating formulas, but they are written at the end of the formula and not at its beginning, while places of writing in Babylonian colophons and in the colophons of Nabû-zuqqu-pēnu appear before the date. Typically, all the dating formulas of the extispicy queries and reports are in accordance with the Assyrian tradition, i.e., the dating is by limmu.\textsuperscript{13} These colophons were most probably inserted by the Assyrian supervisors of teams of Assyrian and Babylonian haruspices that worked for the king at Nineveh, Kalḫu and Arbela. Location is indicated in eight colophons of the extispicy reports and queries in Babylonian script,\textsuperscript{14} and in six in Assyrian script.\textsuperscript{15} But the colophon of SAA 4 324 (651) written in NB script clearly explains what these locations are. It states that extispicy was performed at Arbela (ina limmū dirī nū).\textsuperscript{16} The location in the extispicy queries and reports colophons points to the place of performance of extispicy and not to the place of writing. For this reason, such details as the exact place — a certain palace, not just a city, — often is named. But the incorporation of the location into a date formula, makes it look like as if a place of writing is indicated. It is worth noticing that extispicy reports are much more often dated than astrological reports.\textsuperscript{17} Given that all Assurbanipal’s extispicy reports with the place of performance marked, stem from 652-650 — the time of Šamaš-šumu-ukīn’s revolt, and the two of Esarhaddon’s to 672 — the year of the
death of his queen and of his of succession treaty, it is clear that such details as place of performance and date were indicated only on the most important divinatory documents.

Nabû-zuqup-kênu’s Assyrian colleagues obviously did not accept his Babylonian trend and even his sons and grandsons did not follow the example of their brilliant teacher. Assyrians did not mark place of writing on their scholarly tablets. They apparently knew, in which of their centers of scholarship the tablets were written just due to the name of the scholar. But for modern scholars the absence of a place of writing in NA colophons is regretful and can lead to mistakes in establishing the affiliation of a scribe or owner of tablets that were moved from one place to another. But most plausibly, this innovation of Nabû-zuqup-kênu, did not took a root in Assyria, because it was not in a habit of Assyrians to mark the locations in any kind of documents—neither in scholarly, nor in administrative and legal texts. Thus, the extispicy queries and reports with their place of performance and Nabû-zuqup-kênu’s colophons with the marked place of writing are extremely exceptional. Assyrians stucked to their tradition and did not indicated places of writing in their texts, although some of them followed Nabû-zuqup-kênu and used Babylonian regnal-year dating system.

Notes

1 I have edited all the dated colophons of Nabû-zuqup-kênu in May 2018: 125-134 and 140-151. All the dates in this note are naturally BCE. Abbreviations in this note are in accordance with RIA.

2 The only Babylonian tablet in his collection is K. 75 + K. 237 (see Frazer 2016 and May 2018: 131 for the colophon). It has been suggested that Rm 2,127, written in Babylonian script could also belong to Nabû-zuqup-kênu’s collection (Jiménez 2015).

3 May 2018: 112-116. Nabû-zuqup-kênu actually tried to introduce the double dating—this is the dating by the eponym year and by the year of the king in Assyria. In case of Sargon II, it could be triple dating—also by the year of Sargon, king of Babylon. Some top Assyrian scholars followed his example (ibid.: 134-140) and used double dating, but triple dating was applied only by Nabû-zuqup-kênu.

4 May 2018: 120. For instance, SAA 6 48 is dated to the last (681), 24th year of Sennacherib, which means that the scribe started his count of the regnal years of this king with 705 BCE—the year of death of Sargon, the last regnal year of Sennacherib’s father. This is according to the SAA 6 text editors—I could not find the date on CDLI photograph of the tablet.

5 Ibid.: 134-140.

6 SAA 12 19 (713; May 2018: 12 20, date lost in both eponym and regnal-year formulas.

7 SAA 12 86, year 22 of Sennacherib, apparently 683 BCE.

8 Last double-dated text is SAA 6 212 (676 BCE; May 2018: 140).

9 It is possible that Inûrta-abalissu, Nabû-zuqup-kênu’s relative from Aššur, indicated that his tablet was written there in his colophon with the double date (May 2018: 134), but now this part of his colophon is broken off. Otherwise, the only scholarly tablet with the place of writing in the colophon, which stems from Assyria, is K. 10129 (EAE III; Verderame 2002: 80 text a). Although this tablet was written at Nineveh (NINA4), its scribe Nabû-sâpik-zéri was Babylonian and wrote in Babylonian ductus. H. Hunger (1968) does not discuss places of writing in colophons at all.

10 SAA12 19; see also May 2018: 136.

11 May 2018: 116-120.

12 There are more colophons with the dating formulas on these extispicy texts, which do not contain the location (with the date and ducus of the colophon indicated I could check and indicate the ducus of their colophons only for those of the tablets, whose photographs can be found on CDLI); SAA 4 3, 5, 6 (all have day and month only; NB cols.); SAA 4 331 (year broken; NB col.); SAA 4 212 (year broken; NA col.); SAA 4 272 (657); SAA 4 305 (651; NA col.); SAA 4 329 (651; NA col.); SAA 4 282 (651; NA col.); SAA 4 330 (651; NA col.); SAA 4 286 (651; NA col.); SAA 4 281 (651; NA col.); SAA 4 333 (650; NA col.); SAA 4 341 (year broken; NA col.); SAA 4 304 (year broken; NA col.); SAA 4 332 (year broken; NA col.); SAA 4 323 (652; NA col.); SAA 4 285 (651; NB col.); SAA 4 293 (651; NA col.); SAA 4 316 (652; NA col.); SAA 4 332 (year broken; NA col.); SAA 4 335 (year broken; NB’ col.); SAA 4 336 (year broken; NB col.); SAA 4 341 (most of the colophon broken away); SAA 4 35 (most of the colophon broken away); SAA 4 57 (most of the colophon broken away); SAA 4 65 (year broken; NB col.); SAA 4 228 (date and place broken). Six more extispicy texts colophons written in Assyrian ductus had date formulas: SAA 4 270 (658); SAA 4 212 (date broken); SAA 4 90 (date broken); SAA 4 317 (652); SAA 4 296 (date broken); SAA 4 273 (657); SAA 4 287 (651) and SAA 4 23 (date broken).

13 See discussion in SAA 4 LVI-LII.

14 In seven of them as a part of a dating formula: SAA 4 13 (unknown year; "KAL-ḫa"); 1880-7-19, 72 + 1880-7-19, 76 ("KAL-ḫa; 672); SAA 4 262 Succession Palace (ina e [re-du-ti’]; 668; NB col.); SAA 4 279 (E.GAL.GIBIL;
652) and SAA 4 280 (E.GAL GIBIL; 651); SAA 4 283 (E.U.Š; 651); SAA 4 327 (E.U.Š; 651); SAA 4 340 (place is broken; 652). All these tablets are written in NB dactyl with the colophons in NA script except for SAA 4 262. In SAA 4 122 ~KAl-[ba]~ appears after the names of the reporters, but there is no date formula.

15 Confirmed also by SAA 4 156 and SAA 4 329 (651).

16 SAA 4 183 (ina E.GAL ma-Šar-te ~KAl-ša~; 672); SAA 4 156 (Dú-eš ina E.GAL eš-še-te ina ~NIN.A.KI~; date broken); SAA 4 89 (ina E.U.S.; date broken); SAA 4 300 (~NIN.MI.MU.DINGIR; year broken); SAA 4 319 (~NIN.A.; E.GAL gibil e-top-SAR; 651); SAA 4 296 (~NIN.A.ŠE.E.GAL.GIBIL; year broken).

17 For three Babylonian style dates on astrological reports, see May 2018: 151-152. Only one of them, SAA 8 501, has the day, others only give the year. One—UET 6 413, was written in Babylonia in 657 for Šamaš-šumu-ukin. J. Fincke considers it to be a report (Fincke 2010: 43, n. 49; 46), but F. Rochberg describes this tablet as just EAE excerpt (Rochberg-Halton 1988: 222, 223). Besides these three, there are only two more dated astrological reports, SAA 8 8 and SAA 8 186. Their dates are both in Assyrian style and both by the eponymate of Lābāši, i.e., again 657. SAA 8 186 is unassigned, but SAA 8 8 is written by Issār-šumu-ēreš, the grandson of Nabû-uzuq-šu-kēnu and by that point already the ummānu of Assurbanipal. He dates his report related to terrestrial and not celestial omens, only by year. Anonymous SAA 8 186 has the day too. Place was never indicated in astrological reports. Why the astrological reports were less accurate than that of extispicy in their date formulas remains unclear, as well as why three reports are dated to 657, if indeed the date had any significance and was not accidental. One of the extispicy queries is dated to 657 as well (SAA 4 272). It asks if Assurbanipal should attack Gambulu.

18 See ns. 14, 16. As for the divinatory reports with dates in colophons (ns. 12, 14, 16, 18) in general, while 668 is the first full year of Assurbanipal as a king, the reason of appearance of the date in 658-657 in the reports of Assurbanipal and Šamaš-šumu-ukin is not clear to me.

19 On the other hand, many queries and reports from the same year could be written without date and place indicated. This matter needs a further investigation.

20 The city of origin of the tablet from which the copy was made can be marked in Assyrian colophons as well, e.g., K 4191; KAR 177; 1881-2-4, 306; KAR 150; LKA 145; KAR 376 + 377, and the Khorsabad King List. The latter two state that the tablet is a copy of the originals from Nineveh and Assur respectively. K. 7660, K. 9235, K. 11560 declare that they were excerpted from the originals from Assyria and Babylonia (mār Aššur ā Akkad), without indicating a particular city.

21 Like AO 5372 +, the tablet of Sargon’s Eighth Campaign, whose composer, Nabû-šallimšunu, was affiliated in Kālū, while the tablet was found in Assur in N4 or ND 1120, whose author was Zaia, the hereditary scribe of the city Assur, whose tablet, in turn, was found at Kālū. See May 2016: 742-744, May 2017, and May 2018: 113-114 contra PNA: 1439, s.v. Zāzā 1.

Bibliography


Natalie Naomi May <natalie.may@mail.huji.ac.il>
71) Sennacherib’s choice of circular/elliptical military camps — Why did the Assyrian king Sennacherib choose to give his military camps a uniquely circular/elliptical shape? Documentation on the camps is limited for the Neo-Assyrian period: they are very rarely mentioned in the inscriptions (SAA 1: 13, 14-19; 47, r., 1-16) and sometimes represented on the reliefs of the royal palaces (King 1915, pls. LIII, XIX, LXXII; Barnett 1998, pls. 412, 504; Barnett 1976, pl. LXVIa)¹, with possible captions (Russell 1999, 138)². These are temporary camps of the army on the field built in enemy territory.

If we compare the representations of the camps on the reliefs of Shalmaneser III and those of Sennacherib, we note an important evolution. Of the 20 camps of Shalmaneser identified, 14 have a quadrangular shape, 4 are circular and two appear elliptical (Micale-Nadali 2004, 170). Sennacherib’s camps are all circular or elliptical. The exclusive choice of this form by Sennacherib was probably voluntary because he was a technology-loving king who made all kinds of inventions and innovations (Elayi 2019, 190-202). He understood that circular/elliptical camps had real advantages over quadrangular camps in the contexts where they were built. A strategic advantage has rightly been underlined: the angles of the quadrangular camps are dangerous because the defenders must defend themselves on two fronts; the continuous rounding of the camp makes it possible to eliminate the four weak points of the angles (Micale-Nadali 2004, 164-165).

There is another important advantage of circular/elliptical camps that has not been mentioned. This advantage corresponds to the specific needs of the context where they were built. Sennacherib’s reliefs depict them in mountainous regions, in the usual stylized fashion. In fact, the majority of his campaigns took place in mountainous regions. The question of the area was therefore essential because it was difficult to find a sufficient flat surface to build the camp. It was also necessary to settle the camp near a water point for men and animals, which further reduced the possibilities. The choice of the site was made in advance and with caution as indicated in Sargon II’s texts (SAA 1: 13, 14-19; 47, r., 1-16).

For the same perimeter, a circular camp contains more surface area than a square camp: about 27% more³. For example, for a perimeter of 800 m, the area increases from 400 hectares to 510 hectares. Conversely, for the same area, the circular camp has a smaller perimeter of about 13% compared to a square camp⁴. For example, for an area of 400 hectares, the perimeter is reduced from 800 m to approximately 710 m. These results hold if the camp is quadrangular instead of square, but the increase of area or decrease of perimeter must be calculated for each case. With regard to the elliptical-shaped camps, the gain in area compared to the quadrangular camps cannot be calculated for lack of precise dimensions.

The gain in surface area makes it possible to accommodate more people and equipment. Thus, in a camp of Sennacherib are represented the king in the center, the tents of the soldiers along the wall, two priests performing a ceremony in front of an incense-burner, an altar and a chariot (Micale-Nadali 2004, 163-164). Reducing the perimeter reduces the number of guards needed to protect the camp and therefore increases the proportion of soldiers who can rest during this time. Sennacherib’s choice to favor circular/elliptical camps was therefore fully justified.

Notes

¹ The depiction of camps should not be confused with that of fortified towns.
² Room I, slab 14; Room V, slab 43; Room X, slab 7; Room XXXVI, slab 12.
³ Let us consider a square camp with side a and a circular camp with diameter D, having the same area (a² = πD²/4). The ratio of the perimeters of the square camp and the circular camp is equal to 2√π = 1.13. Therefore the perimeter of the square camp is about 13% larger than that of the circular camp.
⁴ Let us now compare the two square and circular camps having the same perimeter (4a = πD). The ratio between the area of the circular camp and that of the square camp is equal to 4/π, or 1.27. Therefore the area of the circular camp is about 27% larger than that of the square camp.
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62) Not one of us (any more): from Nabû-šēzibanni to Pišamelki — The Egyptian ruler Psammetichus I (664–610 BCE), son of Necho I (672–664 BCE), was a key person with regard to the Assyrian period of Egyptian history. 21 In an inscription of Ashurbanipal (668–631 BCE), Psammetichus I is described as the Assyrian vassal of the delta city Athribis. Later in the same inscription, Psammetichus I is presented as the sole ruler of an independent Egypt. This shift of political status is accompanied by a variation in the name of this Egyptian ruler. He carries an Akkadian name in his position as vassal and an African name in his position as sovereign.

The relevant passages in the inscription of Ashurbanipal are given below.

"Moreover, I [Ashurbanipal] appointed Nabû-šēzibanni, his [Necho I’s] son, in the city Athribis. I performed more kind (and) good deed(s) for him than the father [Esarhaddon] who had engendered me (RINAP 5/1 11 ii 17–19)."

"He [=Gyges] allowed an interruption (in the sending of) his mounted messenger(s), whom he used to constantly send to inquire about my well-being. Because he did not honor the word(s) of (the god) Aššur, the god who created me, he trusted in his own strength and (his) heart became proud. He sent his forces to aid Psammetichus I, the king of Egypt who had cast off the yoke of my lordly majesty, and (then) I myself heard about (this) and made an appeal to (the god) Aššur and the goddess Ištar, saying: ‘Let his corpse be cast down before his enemy and let them carry away his bones.’ Just as I had appealed to (the god) Aššur, it was fulfilled and his corpse was cast down before his enemy and they carried away his bones (RINAP 5/1 11 ii 111–118)."

The first passage states that Psammetichus I (referred to as Nabû-šēzibanni, the Akkadian name) is installed by Ashurbanipal as the vassal in Athribis. The second passage claims that Psammetichus I (referred to as “the king of Egypt” and as Pišamelki, the African name) had received military aid from Gyges of Lydia, an arch-enemy of Assyria, and that Psammetichus I “had cast off the yoke of my [Ashurbanipal’s] lordly majesty” (ša ʾislâ nîr bēlāttīyâ).

How can this name change be understood? I suggest that it can be explained as telling of the subtlety of Assyrian royal inscriptions, according to which changes and variations in this genre need to be taken seriously (1), and as reflecting an ideological shift, according to which Psammetichus I was transferred from an Assyrian to a non-Assyrian ideological sphere (2). Thus, the name change is meaningful and indicative of a change in the Assyrian worldview.

Beginning with the relevancy of changes and variations in Assyrian royal inscriptions, I suggest that the name change is far from random and coincidental, but that it is meaningful and tells of the subtlety of Assyrian royal inscriptions. 22 It would be too much of a coincidence that Ashurbanipal carelessly would have given Psammetichus I two different names in the same inscription and that the latter’s African name only would have happened to describe Psammetichus I when he ruled an Egypt independent from Assyria. Thus, the transference in question puts the spotlight on the circumstance that changes and variations in Assyrian royal inscriptions can not automatically be dismissed as hyperbole or scribal errors, but that these need to be taken seriously, both in the light of historical and ideological developments.

Concluding with the ideological shift, I suggest that Psammetichus I was transferred from an Assyrian to a non-Assyrian ideological sphere, in the sense that he was “honoured” with an Akkadian name when he served as an Assyrian vassal, but that this “honour” was withdrawn from him when he governed Egypt independent from Assyria. Thus, Ashurbanipal seems to say that Psammetichus I was “not one of us” any more. Regarding the nature of this exclusion, it is certainly ideological but surprisingly factual, at least if judging by the standards on how Marduk-apla-iddina II (for example) is slandered in Assyrian royal inscriptions. 23 Moreover, Psammetichus I was the ruler of Egypt when Egyptian forces supported the Neo-Assyrian empire in the latter’s fight for survival decades later. 24 This all points to the finding that Neo-Assyrian imperial ideology centred on political, rather than on ethnical, identity. 25
Notes
1. For the Assyrian conquest of Egypt, see Onasch 1994.
4. For the great significance of variations in Assyrian royal inscriptions, see Liverani 1981.
5. For the representations of this ruler in Assyrian (and Babylonian) sources, see Karlsson 2021.
6. For an overview of Egyptian-Mesopotamian relations around this time, see Spalinger 1977.
7. For this recognition of the political identity as crucial in the Neo-Assyrian empire, meaning that ethnicity was of minor importance in the creation and maintenance of the empire, see Machinist 1993.
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73) Pabaku: A New Egyptian Name in Cuneiform? — The personal name Pabaku appears in a business document (WVDOG 152, V.2., II.1) from the city of Assur and the reign of Ashurbanipal.1) The name in question is not included in the PNA-volumes or in the lists of the PNAo (which provide updates to the PNA-volumes). Question is, how can this evidently new name be classified in an etymological sense?

Before turning to the actual analysis, the document in question needs to be described. The text states that a certain [k x]-mu-[x], son of [N x]-aššAMAR.UTU, has borrowed 4 1/3 shekels of silver from someone whose name has not been preserved, and stipulates when the loan should be paid and that a rate of interest comes into effect if the payment should be delayed. The text concludes by listing three witnesses ([Pabaku-[Pa]-ba-ku 1]Pu-[tu]-bi-ki-šá 1DI-mu-á) and by giving the date (the eponymat of Ša-Nabû-šá).

As indicated by the title of this note, Pabaku may be an Egyptian name. Both contexts and the name itself speak in favour of such an interpretation. Beginning with contexts, the temporal context, that is, the date of the document (658 BCE), is unproblematic, considering the fact that Egypt was conquered by Assyria in 671 BCE. As for the spatial context, the document comes from Assur, long known to have housed a sizeable Egyptian population in the seventh century BCE. The extensive N31-archive is generally referred to as an archive of Egyptians (PEDERSÉN 1986, 125-129; DONBAZ and PARPOLA 2001, xvi; FAIST 2007, 125-129), and so is the nearby archive Assur 52b (to which this document belongs) (RADNER 2016, 121). As for the textual context, although the name of the debtor’s father (ḫ –– Marduk) as well as that of the third witness (Šulmû) seem to be Akkadian, the name of the second witness (Puṭubišša) is clearly Egyptian, containing the Egyptian form pr-di, which means “given by (DN)”.

Turning to the name itself and consulting the reference work on Egyptian names in Mesopotamian cuneiform (Ranke 1910, 47, 60), pa and ku are meaningful with regard to cuneiform and Egyptian words. These syllables can refer to the definitive article p and to a manifestation of the soul in Egyptian thought, the kš. The name of another manifestation of the soul in Egyptian thought, the bš, may be suggested as the second element of Pabaku. This interpretation is not without its problems, though. The meaning of the name “the bš (and) the kš” is obscure, such a name does not appear in the Egyptian onomasticon (Ranke 1935), and the word bš (meaning “soul”) is not attested in cuneiform elsewhere (Ranke 1910).
Still proceeding from the idea that Pabaku points to an Egyptian name, there is another possibility with regard to the meaning of the name Pabaku. The name pi-bi-k, meaning “the servant”, is (by contrast) attested in the Egyptian onomasticon (Ranke 1935, 104:20). Of course, this interpretation rests on the presumptions that an alternative cuneiform form of bi-k (Ranke 1910, 47) is at hand (bak(k)u rather than bukk(k)u). Strengthening the interpretation that Pabaku is a cuneiform version of pi-bi-k, the latter name is masculine and frequent (Ranke 1935, 104:20). In light of the fact that pi-bi-k is a name actually attested in the Egyptian onomasticon, the interpretation (pi-bi-k) of Pabaku as expressing pi-bi-k may be preferable to the former interpretation.

Notes

1. The text is inscribed on both sides of a clay tablet (IM 124740 = Ass.1990-126) that measures 4.1 x 2.6 x 2.0 cm and forms a part of the 15 documents that make up archive Assur 52b.
2. For personal names introduced by pi-di, see PNA 3/i, pp. 1001-1003; Ranke 1910, 48-49; Ranke 1935, 121:17-126:15. Like Pabaku, Putubikiu is not found in any other text.
3. Note, however, the word for “ram”, also giving bi, which appears as bi in cuneiform (Ranke 1910, 46). This indicates that the word for “(bi-)soul” would have appeared the same.
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74) Nabopolassar auditing Eanna’s practice of disbursing barley to prebendary bakers. — YBC 3457 was published a long time ago by Weisberg 1967 (no. 8), but to my knowledge this unique text has never been explained in its entirety, and its wider implications have been overlooked. It regards a royal intervention in Eanna’s measurement practices with respect to the cult: weight and capacity measures are used to establish a standard quantity of barley to be used for producing a given quantity of takkasu offering (bread). The weighing of barley is unusual, the closest parallel is found in Borsippa (Waerzeggers 2010: 64-65, where our text is mentioned in note 334). However, the ‘sacrificial manû’ of Borsippa seems to be different from the normal weight measure, which arguably is used here. I suggest that this text is about calibrating capacity measures against weight measures.

YBC 3457 = YNER 1, 8 (collated)

1 2 gù-bà-nu₄ ana ma-nu-ú ina igi lugal
   ina ₄-kā qa-t₄-nu ki-i iy-ḥi-iṭ
   35 ½ ma-na re-e-sī 1 bān tak-ka-su-ú
   ki-i iš-šū-ú 8 ma-na ḫa-a-tu
5 a-na ṭ₄-mu₄-ne i-qab-bi
   ṭ₄-ma al-la a-ga-a la tu-ban-t₄-na₄-as
L.e.  lib-ḫu-ū šā ṭ₄-en ba-nu
Rev.  7 ½ ma-na še.bar a-tar₂₂-ṭ₄
   ina igi-ni-ku-nu ter-ra-a-ma
10 in-na-a₄-ū ina lib-bi a-ga-a
   lu-ū ú-šu-uz-za-tu-nu

—165—
When 2 wooden šutu measures were weighed against the mina in the king’s presence in the Narrow Gate, (the result was) 35 ½ minas. When (the king) made a check for one šutu of takkasû (bread), 8 minas (of barley) turned out to be the necessary raw material. So (the king) said to the bakers: ‘you should not use more than the information that one of the preparation of the offerings; the preparation is to be made as it is for Bēl (i.e., in Esangila). You have an excess of 7 ½ minas of barley at your disposal (viz., for every šutu of takkasû expected from you). Give it back. You should now keep to this (rule).’ 8.12.19 Nabopolassar, king of Babylon.

1) Reading 2 šutu ban… does not allow explaining how the result of the measurement could be 35.5 minas. Taking DIŠ as ana yields a phrase that expresses well what this text is interested in: capacity measures are converted into weight measures (lit. are being measured (nuḫūtu) “for” (or “against,” ana, “the mina”).

2) The reading bētu qatnu for the first signs is certain.

3) The first temporal clause in this text ends in a nominal sentence, as does the second (lines 3b-4). However, in contrast to the main clause of the second sentence (8 ma.na ḫa-â-ku), I suggest ending the first sentence after the quantity, taking re-e-ši with what follows. Otherwise, one would have to take rešu as something like “capital amount,” as in “35 ½ minas were the …”. This is not normal LB usage for this word. Also, the following sentence would not yield any convincing sense in this reading (neither metrologically nor regarding the literal interpretation of našu “take away”), whereas the phrase reš x našu “to check, examine, investigate x” works well.

4) This sentence could mean: “as it is done for Bēl it is fine,” or “it is (to be) presented as it is done for Bēl.” As the second alternative takes up the specific meaning of bunū in line 6, it is preferable.

5) The phonetic complement refers to the frequent rendering of št/ as [st].

The language in this text is highly technical and terse, and much information is implicit rather than explicit. The interpretation of the difficult first part of the text follows from the second part (l. 6ff.). There, it is clear that the bakers of Eanna have been issued with barley for the preparation of the offerings (bunū in) in excess of expected standards; they are required to give back the excess and are enjoined to keep to the standards forthwith, following the Esangila temple’s best practice. From this, it follows that this quantity of barley is under discussion in the text’s first part. Understanding this part is not straightforward, though.

First, it should be noted that all the quantities referred to explicitly in this text are small and certainly would not merit royal involvement if they were all that is at issue here. The point that is being made is one of principle, of establishing a standard. The actual amounts of grain to be redistributed as a consequence of the royal decision would have been a multiple of what is discussed here, the calculation being based on the standard figures sanctioned by the king. Lines 3-4 say that the king established that one šutu of takkasû bread (6 litres) requires the input of 8 minas (4 kgs) of barley. These lines are the metrological anchor for understanding the text, in that they show that notwithstanding the oddity of weight measures being used for grain, the common mina and the common šutu are used. This is borne out by the following rough calculation: one kilogram of barley or wheat today is said to produce some 0.8 kgs of flour; therefore 8 minas = (4 x 0.8) = 3.2 kgs of flour. These, at 0.6 kg per litre, equal 5.33 litres. Thus, if takkasû bread made of 8 minas = 3.2 kgs of flour gained about 12 percent in volume through baking, we would arrive at the required 6 litres. The text states that this ratio of 8 minas of barley for 6 liters of takkasû is the standard used in Esangila, which also the Eanna’s bakers should follow. According to lines 8-10, the bakers are required to return 7.5 minas of barley as a consequence of that decision, so one can deduce that they were issued with 15.5 minas originally. (As stated above, the text is concerned with standards, so we should understand these quantities as relative, in the sense that the temple had originally issued 15.5 minas of barley for every šutu of takkasû expected from a baker, and subsequently, according to the king’s decision, for each expected šutu of takkasû, 7.5 minas of barley of the original 15.5 minas were to be returned.) Consequently, the first part of the text must contain the information about the excess quantity the bakers were issued with.

I understand lines 1-3 to say that two wooden šutu measures were found to weigh 35.5 minas. This result, combined with the information that one šutu of takkasû requires 8 minas of barley, yields the conclusion that 7.5 minas of barley should be returned. 8+7.5 = 15.5; this number, indicating the net quantity of barley issued to the bakers, is clearly connected with, or rather, contained in, the 35.5 minas. The solution must be to take as written the explicit statement that 2 šutu ban, two šutu measures, and not two šutu (barley), were weighed: two wooden containers are meant, and they were full when they were
weighed. Together these containers would have held 15.5 minas = 12 litres of barley, and consequently each would have had the net weight of 10 minas. Indeed, 7.75 minas of barley, 3.875 kgs, equal (at 1 l = 0.62 kg, Jursa 2010: 4482\textsuperscript{200}) 6.25 \approx 6.1. As for the weight of the containers, this was clearly standardized at 10 minas. We know that they were made out of wood, and, as they were used in the cult and were considered to be calibrated models – as such they were inspected by the king, after all – it is certain they were well-made, massive objects, and quite possibly made out of precious materials. We cannot be sure of their shape and exact make-up, so we will assume, argumenti causa, that they were simple cylinder-shaped containers carved from solid date palm wood that could hold 6 litres exactly. Date palm wood has an average density of 0.46 g/cm\textsuperscript{3} (Elkhal et al. 2022). Hypothesizing for instance a plausible opening of 20 cm diameter and an outer diameter of 27 (wall thickness throughout: 3.5 cms), we get an inner height of 19.1 cm and an outer height of 22.6 cm. The resulting (12940-6000=)6940 cm\textsuperscript{3} of date palm wood would weigh 3.2 kgs. The same container made out of cedar of Lebanon (erennu, 0.58 g/cm\textsuperscript{3}, https://www.engineeringtoolbox.com/wood-density-d_40.html) would weigh 4 kg, if sissoo wood (musukkannu, Dalbergia sissoo, 0.77 g/cm\textsuperscript{3}, https://www.wood-database.com/sissoo) had been used, we would arrive at 5.3 kgs, and of course the wooden container might have had additional (metal?) fittings. It is therefore quite plausible that the empty s\textit{tu}u container weighed 5 kgs, and the full, 8.875 kgs (17.75 minas; x2 = 35.5).

In short then, the king’s inspection found a) that the bakers of Eanna customarily received two s\textit{tu}u of barley for making one s\textit{tu}u of takkas\textit{u} (implicit), b) that these two s\textit{tu}u of barley, weighed together with the standardized wooden s\textit{tu}u measures used in the temple, amounted to 35.5 minas (explicit), the weight of a s\textit{tu}u measure being 10 minas (implicit), c) that therefore the bakers had received 15.5 minas for making one s\textit{tu}u of takkas\textit{u} (implicit), d) that for making one s\textit{tu}u of takkas\textit{u}, only 8 minas of barley were actually necessary, as by the standard followed in Esangila (explicit), and e) that as a consequence, 7.5 minas of barley were to be given back (explicit) for every s\textit{tu}u of takkas\textit{u} for which the bakers had been issued materials (implicit). This royal ruling cannot have been particularly popular among the community of temple bakers in that it amounted to a massive curtailing of their incomes while the share of the gods remained untouched: in essence, the king eliminated a priestly privilege.

The wider implications of this text in the light of other pertinent documents (NBDMich. 52, BM 114552 // BM 114555) will be discussed elsewhere. Regarding metrology and the king’s role as a guarantor for the precision of weights and measures in a cultic context, the calibration of capacity measures against weight measures is particularly striking. As for the historical background, suffice it to state the text belongs into the wider context of the gradual affirmation of royal authority over temple institutions in the first decades of the Neo-Babylonian empire. As in other cases, the standards promoted by the Neo-Babylonian kings for this purpose are those of the Esangila temple (most recently, Jursa and Gordin 2019: 44-50), but this is the first time in which such a reference to Esangila practice can be attributed to Nabopolassar.
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75) Une pique de Scheil contre « certain “terrassier” » — E. Jiménez a récemment attiré l’attention sur les poèmes latins de Scheil\(^1\); il a traduit en anglais certains d’entre eux, offrant des clés permettant d’identifier certaines des personnalités qui s’y trouvent évoquées. Les deux premiers livres des *Epigrammata* furent traduits en vers français par Ph. Jolivald en 1922\(^2\). À l’occasion du centième anniversaire de la parution de ce livre, je souhaiterais élucider une de ces épigrammes.

On trouve en effet dans le Livre I des *Epigrammata* sous le n° XI un poème qui n’est guère amical à l’égard d’un collègue :

**XI**

*A certain fouilleur.*

« Ecbatanis citius venare quod olfacis arvis,  
Plaudemus tibi, dummodò abhinc fugias,  
Sicque latres Kurdis ibi qui caput osque probrosa  
Obliniant : scabiem his tangere non vetitum ! »

La traduction française de Ph. Jolivald, comme toujours très large, donne ceci :

« Cours vite déterrer dans les champs d’Ecbatane  
Ce que ton flair y cherche; et nous t’applaudirons,  
Te sentant loin de nous. Mais ce que nous rirons  
Si, pour te revalor quelque basse chicane,  
Des Kurdes, un beau jour, postés aux environs,  
Viennent te barbouiller la tête et la figure!  
Ils ne craignent pas, eux, de manier l’ordure. »

Comme l’a indiqué E. Jiménez, « Although Scheil’s friends and enemies often appear in his poems, neither of them is explicitly identified ». Quel est donc ce « fouilleur » que Scheil dépêchait manifestement ? Le savoir au loin lui plaisait, et il se réjouissait à l’idée qu’il soit attaqué par des bandits kurdes. Pour les besoins de la versification française, Jolivald s’est beaucoup éloigné du texte latin de Scheil : dans l’original, il ne s’agit pas « de manier l’ordure », mais il est question de « gale » (*scabies*) – Jolivald avait besoin de trouver une rime avec « figure », d’où son « ordure ». Quel est donc ce savant « galeux » ainsi visé par Scheil ? La solution n’est pas très difficile à trouver : il s’agit de Charles Fossey. En effet, celui-ci mena en 1913 une mission archéologique à Hamadan, l’antique Ecbatane, qui ne fut guère fructueuse\(^3\). La raison de l’hostilité de Scheil pourrait paraître évidente : Fossey occupait en effet depuis 1906 la chaire d’assyriologie du Collège de France à laquelle Scheil avait pourtant été élu\(^4\). Je ne pense pas cependant qu’il s’agisse là du seul motif de la hargne dominicain. La question était aussi celle des fouilles françaises en Perse. En 1912, suite à l’éviction de J. de Morgan, le P. Scheil s’était retrouvé co-directeur des fouilles de Suse avec R. de Mecquenem; mais le ministère de l’Instruction Publique souhaitait diversifier les activités archéologiques de la France en Perse et Fossey obtint dans ce cadre une subvention pour sa mission – qui se solda par un échec complet.

La charité du P. Scheil avait manifestement des limites… Mais comme il l’a écrit ailleurs\(^5\):  
« Adieu ! Retiens que ma devise / Tient en deux mots : Vie et franchise ! » Et j’observe que la moquerie de Scheil à l’égard de Fossey s’accentua avec le temps : dans la seconde édition des *Epigrammata*, parue en 1934, le titre du poème devint en effet : « A certain “terrassier” »…\(^6\)
Notes

5. Épigramme LVIII (Trad. Jolivald, op. cit., p. 27).
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76) Zu Joachim Oelsner, Der Kodex Ḥammu-rāpi. Textkritische Ausgabe und Übersetzung, Münster 2022 (dubser 4) — Während der Druckphase des Buches stieß ich bei der Beschäftigung mit Keilschrifttexten anderen Inhalts und anderer Perioden auf die Webseite „Louve site des collections“ (zuletzt aufgerufen 04.05.2022), die bei der Erarbeitung des Buches übersehen und deshalb nicht berücksichtigt worden war. Die dort zu findenden Angaben zu den Steinfragmenten des Kodex Ḥammu-rāpi (= KHJ) und den im Louvre befindlichen Tontafelabschriften erlauben einige Ergänzungen: Fotos sind zu finden zu S. 41-44 A.2.2: Stfr 3 (Sb 14699), Stfr 4 (Sb 14698) Seite A und B, Stfr 7 (Sb 14697) sowie Stfr 8 (Sb 14688), ebenso zu S. 46 aB 1 (AO 10237), S. 48 aB 5 (außerdem Nennung der Fundstelle [= Apadana] und der Museumsummer [= AS 15375 200; letztere auch CDLI sub P370229]; auf dem Foto der Rückseite ist trotz Korrosion zu erkennen, dass diese unbeschrieben ist; das Stück könnte auch sub A.2.3.3 [Sch] eingeordnet werden) und S. 57f. nANin 2 (AO 7757 = 1k. ob. Ecke der Tafel).
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