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FOREWORD

Robert D. Biggs joined the staff of the Chicago Assyrian Dictionary (CAD) in 1963 after receiving his Ph.D. from Johns Hopkins University. In June 2004, he celebrated his seventieth birthday and retired from the University of Chicago as Professor of Assyriology in the Oriental Institute and the Department of Near Eastern Languages and Civilizations; his service to the CAD, however, will continue until the final volume appears. To acknowledge and honor his forty-one years of extraordinary service to the CAD as collaborator, Associate Editor, and Editorial Board member, contributions from some of his former and current CAD colleagues are assembled into the volume, *Studies Presented to Robert D. Biggs, June 4, 2004*, From the Workshop of the Chicago Assyrian Dictionary, vol. 2. It is fitting to revive this series, as the first volume, *Studies Presented to A. Leo Oppenheim, June 7, 1964*, From the Workshop of the Chicago Assyrian Dictionary, appeared forty years ago, and Bob’s contribution there was his first published article.

The contributions range over the several areas to which Bob has contributed: Akkadian and Sumerian, texts and archaeology, literature and medicine, philology and lexicography. The common thread throughout this volume is that every contributor has enjoyed the privilege of discussing her or his scholarly work with our esteemed colleague Robert D. Biggs in the fertile field of the Chicago Assyrian Dictionary.

The editors are grateful for the support of Gil Stein, Director of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago. We also wish to acknowledge the invaluable technical and editorial assistance of Linda McLarnan, the Manuscript Editor of the CAD, and of Leslie Schramer and Katie L. Johnson of the Oriental Institute Publications office.

MARThA T. ROTH
Professor of Assyriology
Editor-in-Charge, Chicago Assyrian Dictionary
EDITORIAL NOTE

Whenever possible, texts and monographs cited in the articles in this volume have followed the most recent list of bibliographical abbreviations of the Chicago Assyrian Dictionary (vol. T). All other citations, as well as the punctuation and presentation, have generally followed the editorial style of the Journal of Near Eastern Studies.

For the four contributions in German, it was decided to keep the old spelling and word-division and not to follow the guidelines of the controversial, and still not universally observed, language reform, the Neue Rechtsschreibung. To date (May 2006), the rules for this language reform are still being revised.

PAULA VON BECHTOLSHEIM
Managing Editor, Journal of Near Eastern Studies
MY CAREER IN ASSYRIOLOGY
AND NEAR EASTERN ARCHAEOLOGY*

Robert D. Biggs, The University of Chicago

My father’s grandparents and great-grandparents crossed the vast American plains in wagons drawn by teams of oxen from Arkansas to the Walla Walla area of Washington Territory in 1870 in a typical pattern of western migration in America before the coming of the railroads to the West. My mother’s parents, on the other hand, were immigrants from Denmark in 1901. Like many other immigrant families from Scandinavia, they settled in a farming community peopled mainly by fellow Danes, first in Colorado, and subsequently near St. Andrews in central Washington State.

My interest in languages arose early. My Danish grandmother, who was in her mid-thirties when she came to America, learned to understand English and to speak a heavily accented English, but never learned to write in English. In the days before many farm families had telephones, family members wrote to one another a couple of times a week. My grandmother wrote, of course, in Danish, which was my mother’s first language and which she had learned to read and write in summer Danish schools in her rural community. While still in elementary school, I wanted to learn to read my grandmother’s letters myself. With the help of a small Danish-English dictionary and an elementary grammar that my mother had, I learned Danish vocabulary and Danish grammar well enough to understand her letters. By the time I was in high school, I had developed an interest in family history, so I began to write to my grandmother’s sister and my grandfather’s brother and sisters who had remained in Denmark. At that time, hardly anyone—certainly not of their generation or even the next—in rural Denmark studied English, so I attempted to write to them in Danish. I certainly made many mistakes, but apparently they were able to understand what I wrote, and I could understand their responses.

In 1943 my parents moved from the small town of Hunters (near the Columbia River and across the river from the Colville Indian Reservation) to a 240-acre farm in Spokane County, Washington. We had no electricity or running water (water was pumped from a well by a windmill or by a hand pump). We children attended the local two-room school that was two miles away, but in 1945 our school district was split

* This article appeared in the Journal of Assyrian Academic Studies 19/1 (2005): 5–27. We would like to thank Robert Paulissian, M.D., and the journal’s Editorial Board for granting us permission to republish the article. This version includes a few minor corrections.
and consolidated with two schools in nearby towns. Our new school in Medical Lake was still small—two grades to each room. In high school, I had an opportunity to study Spanish—the only language offered at first. This was a lot of fun. The next year several of us who were interested asked the teacher of Spanish if she would also offer Latin. I did not realize at the time what an added burden that was, but she took it on cheerfully and offered us two years of Latin. In my junior and senior years, the same teacher offered German to a small class of about five of us, with textbooks that used the old German Gothic script.

I knew that I did not want a future life as a farmer. Especially in retrospect, I treasure some of the experiences of farm life, but the drudgery of twice-a-day milking and feeding of cows, the care of other animals, the discomforts of putting up hay in the summertime, the dustiness of planting and tilling and wheat harvesting, building barbed-wire fences, and such did not appeal to me. I definitely wanted something different in my future.

Having a younger brother and three sisters, I realized that there was no question of any family financial support for college, but as valedictorian of my high school graduating class in 1952 at Medical Lake, Eastern Washington College of Education (subsequently Eastern Washington University) in the town of Cheney offered me a scholarship of $100 that paid most of my student fees. At that time, it was possible to get part-time work on campus that paid enough to cover room and board (the pay was 80 cents an hour). One year I worked in the college library, the next year on the grounds crew (raking leaves, chipping ice off sidewalks, digging ditches, etc.), and then did janitorial work in the college elementary school. I also earned extra money by editing and typing the term papers of other students for fifty cents a page.

I was excited by the opportunities to study languages in college. My Spanish was good enough that I could immediately take advanced classes. In my first year, I also began the study of French and Russian. Russian seemed a timely language to study, and, indeed, the leader of the Soviet Union, Joseph Stalin, died in 1953 during the year I studied Russian. Unfortunately the professor of Russian (he was a native of Russia, but taught in the economics department) did not return the following year, so I had to give up on Russian. Hoping to be able to teach Spanish and French at the high-school level, I pursued a degree in education.

Summers in my college years (and part of my graduate school years as well) were spent working in the Green Giant pea cannery in Dayton, Washington, the area where my father’s family had settled in 1870. Most of the men working in the pea harvest were from Mexico (they were called braceros in Spanish), and I got acquainted with several of them. They appreciated having an American who was reasonably fluent in their language and who enjoyed the Mexican music with them on the jukebox in one of the local taverns.

In my first years at Green Giant, I had relatively low-skill jobs such as handling the empty wooden boxes that the peas were hauled to the cannery in. Eventually I had
a much more responsible job — processing the peas in huge retorts with steam. About a
dozens of these retorts were arranged in a circle. A crane lowered three large steel bas-
kets filled with cans of peas into each retort, which was then clamped shut. My job was
to turn on the steam, bring the temperature to a certain degree, and to cook the peas for
a specified length of time. So it was a matter of keeping an eye on six or eight retorts at
a time, both for temperature and timing, all a few minutes apart. Luckily, I never blew
the top off a retort or overcooked a load of peas. To this day, the smell of canned peas
reminds me of my years working for the Jolly Green Giant.

When the pea-canning season was finished, I usually drove a truck in the wheat
harvest for farmers in the area hauling a truck load of threshed wheat to the nearest
grain elevator, about 20 miles away, thus earning money for clothing and books for the
coming college year. Driving a wheat truck is not as easy as it sounds. The threshed
wheat is held in a large hopper on the combine until it is nearly full. A man on the
combine signals the truck driver, who drives so that an augur moves the wheat through
what looks like a huge spout and into the bed of the truck. So as not to lose any time,
the combine does not stop or slow down, so the truck must keep the same speed. The
driver has to be careful to keep the spout over the bed of the truck and also not to drive
into the combine. This gets tricky on the rolling hills of the Dayton area. The combine
has a leveling device that keeps the body of the combine level even on a hillside (and
they do tip over occasionally nevertheless), but it can be a bit scary for a truck driver.
Depending on the distance to the grain elevator and whether there was a line of trucks
waiting to unload, there was often some time to read a bit between runs. Thus I had a
chance to read several French novels, the memoirs of Simone de Beauvoir, and Shake-
speare plays while I waited.

For recreational reading in my college years, I followed up on a youthful interest
in ancient Egypt and its pyramids and mummies. At some point I had read Edward
Chiera’s They Wrote on Clay (Chicago, 1938, reprinted 1957), which was my intro-
duction to the world of Babylonia and Assyria and its mysterious cuneiform script. I
was fascinated by the thought of someone being able to read cuneiform and to read
something that no one had read in thousands of years. It was also then that I first read
W. F. Albright’s From the Stone Age to Christianity (Baltimore, 1940, second edition
1957) and it opened up to me a new window on the ancient Near East. I wondered if I
was foolish to think of trying to study the ancient Near East seriously.

I became active in student government, particularly in my junior and senior years.
In the summer of 1955 I was a delegate to the national meeting of the National Student
Association at the University of Minnesota in Minneapolis. The plenary sessions lasted
late into the evening, with especially heated discussions on foreign policy matters. One
of the hottest topics was whether the China seat on the Security Council of the United
Nations should be the Nationalist government in Taiwan or the People’s Republic of
China. In 1956 I applied to attend a six-week seminar of the organization devoted to
issues of foreign policy as they affected students. I was among those selected to at-
tend the seminar, held at Harvard University. It was only many years later that it was disclosed that these seminars were secretly funded by the United States government through the Central Intelligence Agency.

In my senior year of college, my French teacher encouraged me to apply for a Fulbright Scholarship to study for a year in France. The Dean of Students urged me to apply also for a Danforth Fellowship (funded by the founders of the Ralston-Purina Company in St. Louis). To my great surprise, I was awarded both a Danforth (to pursue a higher degree) and a Fulbright. Since the Fulbright was for only one year, it was agreed that I should take up the Fulbright first. Thus, for the 1956/57 academic year, I was assigned to Toulouse in southwestern France (a city, I confess, I had never heard of before). I crossed the Atlantic from New York City to Le Havre, France, on the 1936 Cunard ocean liner, the original “Queen Mary,” a wonderful Art Deco ship (now docked in Long Beach, California, as a tourist attraction). Once in Toulouse, it was made clear to me that I was not obliged to pursue the course of study originally proposed, so I registered for a course in Greek and Roman art, and then I learned that across town there was the Institut Catholique where one could study Hebrew, Arabic, and even Akkadian! Abbé Maurice Bailliet welcomed me warmly in his courses of Hebrew and Akkadian, and I started Arabic with another faculty member. While I kept up with the other students in the classes, I have to confess that I did not learn a great deal beyond the scripts and rudimentary grammar.

Hebrew and Arabic use alphabetic scripts, so the script is not a real hurdle to learning the languages. Cuneiform is another matter. As the name implies, the script is made up of wedge-shaped marks. In the case of clay, the wedges are made with a reed stylus in the damp clay. In the case of stone, the wedges need to be chiseled into the stone. Cuneiform is a script that has been used to write many different languages, the first of which was Sumerian, the language of ancient Sumer that is unrelated to any other known language. Later, it was adapted, and somewhat modified, to write Akkadian (the term used to include both Babylonian and Assyrian). The script utilizes several hundred signs.

While I was in Toulouse, I had an opportunity to meet with Professor Georges Boyer, an elderly historian of law who was also a scholar of cuneiform. He was then preparing an edition of legal texts discovered by French excavators at the Syrian site of Mari and which appeared in 1958 as *Textes juridiques* in the series Archives Royales de Mari. He was the first professional Assyriologist I ever met.

Being in Europe meant it was possible to make brief visits to other areas of France. I was also able to make two trips to Spain, one to central Spain where there were lots of remnants of the Roman period. In the spring I hitchhiked with a German girl to Barcelona where we were able to get a boat to Palma de Mallorca. In the long Easter recess, I took a train to Denmark to visit my mother’s relatives for the first time.

Even though the Fulbright paid enough for living expenses and a bit of travel, more extensive travel required other strategies. At that time, it was quite common for students to hitchhike (called “auto-stop” in some European languages) throughout
Europe, so I decided I would hitchhike to Greece or as far as I could get, stopping at night in youth hostels or inexpensive hotels. I especially wanted to visit the Roman ruins across southern France (Narbonne, Arles, Nimes, Fréjus, etc.). In Trieste, Italy, I was able to get a visa to travel through Yugoslavia. I had no concept of how little traffic there would be in Yugoslavia—the main north-south highway was cobblestones, and so little traveled that grass grew in the roadway. Yugoslavia was then still only slowly recovering from World War II. I saw many people walking barefoot along the roadway carrying their shoes, obviously to prevent unnecessary wear. Cars were few and far between, and I even had a few rides on donkey carts. Somewhere south of Belgrade, a young Greek man driving a German car stopped for me. I soon realized that he had a double purpose—not only to have someone to talk to for the long trip, but also to have an accomplice in his smuggling operation. He asked me to hide a number of wristwatches and women’s nylon stockings in the bottom of my knapsack to smuggle into Greece. But his main purpose was to smuggle the car into Greece by having documents altered and the serial number filed off at a small town near the border. The customs agent gave up searching my knapsack before he got to the watches and nylons under my loaf of bread. My friend had no problem with the car. We crossed the border into Greece and drove on to Athens where I stayed with his family for several days. He also took me to Mycenae and Epidaurus (famous in the history of Greek medicine). Of course I visited the Parthenon and other famous sites (including the Areopagos where the Apostle Paul had preached) before taking an overnight boat to the island of Crete.

I had had a year of Classical Greek in college, but that was not much help with Modern Greek, though of course I could read the street signs perfectly well.

After a few days in Crete, during which I got to visit the site of Knossos (about 1600 B.C.), home of the legendary King Minos, I was able to go on to the Island of Rhodes for a few days and then to get passage on a tiny fishing boat to the small fishing village of Marmaris on the southwestern Turkish coast. Marmaris is now a tourist center, but it certainly was not at that time. I was able to find a small hotel. The sheets had obviously been slept in before, but there really was not much choice. I asked why the legs of the bed were sitting in cans of water. I was told that the water prevented bedbugs from getting into the bed. Maybe this worked—I did not get any bedbug bites! After a day or so there, I took a bus to Istanbul, where I stayed in an inexpensive hotel while I visited Hagia Sophia, the Blue Mosque, the Topkapi Palace Museum, the covered bazaar, and other major sites in Istanbul. But I wanted to go inland as well, so I took a bus to Ankara, the capital in central Anatolia, which had a fine museum of Hittite culture. I had hoped to visit the ruins of the ancient Hittite capital, Hattusha, but time was running out, so I took a train back to Istanbul and then to Western Europe. But the time in the Moslem areas of Yugoslavia and in Turkey had given me a foretaste of the Middle East.

The Danforth Fellowship paid not only tuition but also a stipend for living expenses and books. I applied to several graduate schools, but I really wanted to go to Johns Hopkins in Baltimore to study with W. F. Albright, whose book *From the Stone*
Age to Christianity had so excited me some years earlier. After a cross-country trip by Greyhound bus from Spokane, Washington, to Baltimore, I showed up at Johns Hopkins. Albright was Chairman of the Oriental Seminary (now called the Department of Near Eastern Studies), so, of course, I had to see him. He was interested that I had just spent a year in France, so he began to speak to me in French. I had read of his great language prowess and of the many languages he could speak, so I was curious to hear how good his spoken French was. It was only a couple of years later that I learned that this conversation was my language exam in French, which I had passed! I did not know in advance that 1957/58 was Albright’s final year and that he was retiring, but I was glad to have had his courses in ancient Near Eastern history and Palestinian archaeology as well as a seminar on the Dead Sea Scrolls. I stayed in touch with him until he died.

In 1957/58, an advanced graduate student, Edward Campbell, taught Akkadian at Johns Hopkins. The next year, as I recall, Thomas Lambdin taught the second-year course. But fortunately for me, the following year, 1959, Johns Hopkins hired a full-time Assyriologist, W. G. Lambert, who, though originally from Birmingham, England, had been teaching in Toronto. His Toronto student, Kirk Grayson, followed him to Baltimore, so there were two of us who were serious about Assyriology.

The Johns Hopkins tradition was the study of a number of languages. Everyone took several years of Biblical Hebrew. Most of us took two or three years of Classical Arabic. I also had a couple of years of Egyptian hieroglyphics, as well as Ugaritic, the language written in an alphabetic cuneiform script in the area of ancient Ugarit on the coast of Syria. The only one of these languages that I have followed up on or that has proved particularly useful is Arabic, though the Classical Arabic we studied is a far cry from the Iraqi Arabic heard on the streets of Baghdad or spoken by our workmen. Nevertheless, I can usually get the gist of a radio news broadcast or a newspaper article in Modern Standard Arabic, which is based on Classical.

I wrote my Ph.D. dissertation under Lambert on Babylonian potency incantations, of which he had identified and copied new fragments, particularly in the British Museum (the dissertation was published in an expanded version in 1967 as ÅÀ.ZI.GA: Ancient Mesopotamian Potency Incantations). Kirk Grayson and I both were awarded our doctorate degrees on the same day in June 1962. While Grayson had been recruited for work on the Assyrian Dictionary in Chicago, Lambert had supported my application to the Baghdad School of the American Schools of Oriental Research for a fellowship to study Sumerian incantations in the Iraq Museum in Baghdad. Dr. Vaughn Crawford of the Metropolitan Museum in New York, who was a member of the Baghdad School Committee, had arranged for me to stay at the British School of Archaeology in Baghdad with whose expedition he had worked several seasons at the old Assyrian capital Nimrud (ancient Kalhu, Calah of the Old Testament). When passing through Chicago that summer, I visited the Oriental Institute and met with Professors Leo Oppenheim and Erica Reiner, but I also met Donald Hansen, who was a member of the Oriental Institute expedition to Nippur. He urged me to pay a visit to Nippur while I was in Iraq.
In late summer 1962 I headed for Iraq, traveling on the Norwegian ship “Staverngerfjord” to Copenhagen, where a cousin met me and traveled with me to Jutland, the peninsula which is the mainland of Denmark, where I was to visit Danish family (I stayed with my grandfather’s youngest brother and his family). While there, I fell ill with hepatitis, conjectured to have been contracted from eating contaminated shellfish in Baltimore. I spent a month in a hospital in Skive, the principal town in that part of Jutland, and then recuperated with cousins before I was strong enough to continue by train to Baghdad, stopping each night to spend the night in a hotel to rest. After a couple of days of rest in Istanbul, I boarded a train bound for Baghdad. On the platform I heard the news that Eleanor Roosevelt, the much-admired widow of President Franklin Roosevelt, had died. The slow train (I think it was an extension of the Simplon Orient Express, though certainly not the luxurious one made famous by Agatha Christie) made frequent stops across Turkey, where passengers could get off and buy provisions or buy from vendors on the platform who crowded near the train windows at every station. Among the passengers in my compartment was an elderly Iraqi couple traveling to Baghdad. They had a small primus that they lit occasionally to brew tea, which they shared with me. The further we traveled, the more the sights and smells became Middle Eastern—the calls of the muezzin, the herds of camels, the sound of spoken Turkish and then Arabic. As the sun rose on the last morning, I caught sight through the train window of the Malwiyah (the spiral minaret in Samarra which I recognized from having seen it on a series of Iraqi postage stamps). After the long dusty overland journey, it was a relief to arrive at the British School where I heard native speakers of English for the first time in a long while. Despite the horrors we associate with Baghdad these days, it seemed then to be a magical moment, the culmination of a long dream.

The British School of Archaeology was then headquartered in an old Ottoman Turkish house on the bank of the Tigris directly across the river from the Zia Hotel (I believe it is called the Tia Hotel in Agatha Christie novels) where archaeologists had traditionally stayed in Baghdad. The house had the typical central courtyard, surrounded by rooms on the ground floor and on the second floor (first floor in British terminology).

Among the young British who were at the School that year was Julian Reade, who has become well known as an authority on Assyrian sculpture and on British excavations in Assyria. He went to the Iraq Museum each morning, so he showed me what bus would drop me right across the street from the Museum and he introduced me to officials and young colleagues there. This was the original Iraq Museum, not its successor on the other side of the Tigris that was looted in the aftermath of the 2003 invasion of Iraq. The old museum was small and there were no special facilities for visiting researchers, but the Director of the Museum, Faraj Basmachi, had a small table set up for me in his office near a window so I had good natural light for reading cuneiform tablets. He facilitated my getting the cuneiform tablets I wanted to study.
The Iraq Department of Antiquities was without doubt one of the most professional of any in the Arab world. When I arrived in Baghdad, the Director General of Antiquities was Taha Baqir, and the Director of Excavations was Fuad Safar (a Christian). Both had graduate degrees from the University of Chicago. Taha Baqir retired from his position and died a number of years ago, but Fuad Safar remained a towering presence and the intellectual center of the Department until his tragic death in 1978 in an automobile wreck when en route to visit a site in an area of salvage excavations.

In November 1962 there was a bit of excitement at the British School when they got word of the impending visit of the British archaeologist Max Mallowan and his wife Agatha Christie. We were all told that we were to address her only as Mrs. Mallowan and that we were not to mention her mystery novels or her plays. As it happened, when they arrived, they had just the night before attended a celebration of the fifteenth year of her play “The Mousetrap” in London, and they were still wearing the clothes they had worn to the celebration the evening before. Due to turbulence en route, a flight attendant (they were called stewardesses then) had spilled a whole tray of Coca-Cola on her but, unfazed, she soaked her skirt in a bathtub and changed. The next day (a Friday) a trip had been planned for Babylon, so I finally got to see fabled Babylon. It was a disappointment to find that the Tower of Babel was now a deep, water-filled hole in the ground and that no one knew for sure where the Hanging Gardens of Babylon had been located. However, there was a wonderful tranquility walking among the groves of date palms along the slowly moving Euphrates. Now, so many years later, the phrase that comes to mind when I think of Babylon is from Psalm 137, “By the waters of Babylon, there we sat down and wept.”

At the School, all residents had breakfast on their own schedule, but lunch and dinner were taken together in the ground-floor dining room. The Brits apparently all learn at school the art of telling amusing stories, and we heard a good many, but I felt somewhat out of my element. One evening at dinner, Mrs. Mallowan good-naturedly called me “Robert-the-Silent,” and it is true that I was rather silent. Following British custom, tea was served every afternoon around 4:30 in the second floor sitting room, usually with small cookies that the Persian cook, Ali, had baked. Mrs. Mallowan was often sitting there reading a murder mystery or knitting.

Tea might be the traditional British black tea or what is called *chai hamuth* (literally “bitter tea”), which is made from dried crushed Basra limes (*numi Basra*). The latter is nearly always sweetened with sugar. Both *chai hamuth* and regular tea are served in Iraqi teahouses in small glasses called *istakhan*. If one does not specify, the tea will be served with several teaspoons of sugar added. I always found it necessary to say “*kullish qalil*, very little.”

Normally at meals (and especially at breakfast), the local Iraqi flat bread (called *khubuz*) was served. The local Iraqi wine (from northern Iraq) was not especially good, and was only rarely served, but one could get Lebanese wine occasionally. Each person could keep a personal bottle of alcohol in the bar in the sitting room for a cocktail
before dinner. The local drink was *araq* (the Iraqi version of Turkish *raki*, Greek *ouzo*, etc.), an anise-flavored alcoholic drink to which water is added. Unique to Iraqi varieties of *araq*, as far as I know, is one called *mastaki* that tastes, to most non-Iraqis, like turpentine.

When I was first in Iraq, the value of the Iraqi dinar was tied to the British pound. In fact, the banking system was really a holdover from earlier British influence in Iraq, even to banks being closed on Boxing Day (the day after Christmas). Across from one of the main banks, the Rafidain, were the small stands of the money changers where most of us changed currency as needed.

One of the pleasures of living in Baghdad was visiting the *suq* (the Arabic word for what is elsewhere called a bazaar). Different areas were specialized in different things. The silver *suq* was dominated by elderly men with long beards (they were predominantly members of a religious group known as Mandaeans, whose religious rites, focused heavily on water, we could often see from the British School on the bank of the Tigris). Here one heard the gentle taps of the smiths’ small mallets on the silver as they made the typical Iraqi *niello* work (napkin rings, cigarette cases, sometimes whole tea sets) decorated with scenes of boats on the Tigris, camels, and mosques. The copper *suq* was a very noisy place, with a great deal of hammering as the coppersmiths made copper pots and pans and other household utensils. There one had to shout to be heard over the din of the hammering. There was also a carpet *suq*. In the cloth *suq* one could choose a fabric, have measurements taken, and come back in a day or so to pick up a *disdasha* (the long dresslike garment traditionally worn by men) or a warm wool *abba* (very welcome for warmth in unheated rooms). This is the old, traditional part of the *suq*, between the Tigris and Rashid Street, one of the main thoroughfares of old Baghdad. On the other side of Rashid Street is the Shorjah, the spice *suq*, the area where one buys tea, coffee, pots and pans, and kitchen wares, but also the area where used Western style clothing was sold (an inexpensive place to buy warm clothing for wearing on archaeological digs). A report I first saw on April 20, 2005, says that the Shorjah has been destroyed by fire. Baghdad, along with Aleppo, had one of the great old *suqs*, largely unmodernized, except for dangling electric light bulbs. I think it is a cultural calamity that any part of it be lost.

It had been arranged that in late December I would go south to Afak to visit the Oriental Institute excavations at Nippur. I took a train to Diwaniyah, where the Nippur driver, Jabbar, was to meet me with the expedition Land Rover. The expedition had rented a house beside the canal and a few feet from the *suq* in Afak (and drove daily to the site, some seven miles away). There I met Donald Hansen again and the Field Director, Carl Haines, as well as Giorgio Buccellati, a student at the University of Chicago who was that season’s epigrapher (responsible for finds of cuneiform texts). I greatly enjoyed visiting the site and participating in the work. I spent Christmas with the Nippur Expedition, but I then returned to Baghdad so Robert McCormick Adams, the new Director of the Oriental Institute, could have what had been my room.
In the early spring of 1963, I took a train north to Mosul so I could visit the British excavations at Nimrud. While I was there, they arranged a Friday outing to visit some of the Christian monasteries in Assyria, including Mar Behnam, one of the best-known monasteries and which is still in active use. A couple of the monks gave us a tour of the monastery. Especially in view of the very early establishment of Christianity in Assyria and its continuity to the present and the continuity of the population, I think there is every likelihood that ancient Assyrians are among the ancestors of modern Assyrians of the area.

In 1981 I was able to visit additional monasteries on a trip to the north arranged by the Directorate General of Antiquities. On this occasion they had arranged for the whole group to have lunch at a monastery. We were served some of the local wine. The extent and importance of Christianity in northern Iraq is probably little recognized in Europe or America. An excellent study (of which I own a set) is J. M. Fiey, *Assyrie chrétienne: Contribution à l’étude de l’histoire et de la géographie ecclésiastiques et monastiques de l’Iraq* [Christian Assyria: Contribution to the study of ecclesiastical and monastic history and geography in northern Iraq], 3 volumes (Beirut, 1965–68). Fiey also wrote a separate volume on Christian Mosul. Unfortunately, I have never had an opportunity for independent travel to Christian towns and villages in Iraq. In Baghdad I knew the Assyrian scholar, Donny George, former Director of the Iraq Museum. Ironically, most Assyrian Christians I know I met in Chicago, beginning with the late Fred Tamimi in the 1970s; subsequently his brother-in-law, Robert Paulissian, M.D.; the Northeastern Illinois University linguist Edward Odisho; Daniel Benjamin; and Norman Solkhah of Chicago, who founded a Mesopotamian museum in Chicago, to name only a few with whom I have had long and most cordial friendships.

In 1962/63 there were relatively few foreigners in Baghdad, and most were in the diplomatic corps, though several were there as commercial representatives (such as an American, who was married to an Italian woman, who was head of the Pan American Airlines office). I was readily integrated into the Anglophone group (which included a Danish couple who lived at Abu Ghraib — at that time, the center for dairy research). One of the frequent activities was a Friday picnic outing to visit various ancient sites reachable from Baghdad. This was a wonderful opportunity to get a feel for the geography and the climate and to see the native wildlife. The picnics usually featured bread and cheese, sometimes canned hams, and one couple regularly brought a thermos of martinis. But there were also frequent dinner parties at the homes of various diplomatic personnel where there was vivacious discussion of current political events, particularly in British homes where the men in the group separated from the women, usually for cigars and brandy after dinner. Later that year, and in subsequent years, many of these people used their Fridays for visits to our excavations, invariably bringing fresh fruits and vegetables that we could not get locally and occasionally an imported Danish ham. When the weather was hot, a cooler of beer such as Pilsner Urquell (or the excellent Iraqi beer, Ferida) was especially welcome.
Circumstances—and probably just plain luck—triggered events that were to lead to extraordinary finds of cuneiform tablets. Oriental Institute Director Robert Adams had decided that at the close of the season at Nippur, the Nippur Land Rover (owned by the Oriental Institute) should be used by the Oriental Institute’s expedition at Choga Mish in Iranian Khuzestan (southwestern Iran), directed by Pinhas Delougaz and Helene Kantor, two of the senior professors of archaeology at the Oriental Institute. Adams asked Donald Hansen to drive it there and agreed to Donald’s request that I accompany him. Due to Iraqi customs regulations, we were not allowed to take the Land Rover out of the country without posting a security deposit (something like $1,500 as I recall), which Adams authorized the Oriental Institute in Chicago to wire to Baghdad (wiring funds was perfectly easy in the banking system then in use). We got our Iranian visas and then drove to Basrah and spent the night, but then there was a heavy rain, so we spent another night hoping the mud that lay between Basrah and the Iranian border would have dried sufficiently. Despite being bogged down in the mud several times, we made it to a sleepy border crossing where we crossed into Iran and made our way to Ahwaz, where we spent the night before going on to Choga Mish. We had been in Iran only a couple of days when we got word that there had been a revolution in Iraq, and the Leader (al-za‘im), Abd al-Karim Qassem, had been killed (February 9, 1963) and the borders of Iraq had been closed. I spent ten days or so participating in the excavations at Choga Mish. I was also able to visit the nearby site of Jundi Shapur, well known as the location of one of the Nestorian (also called the Assyrian Church of the East) schools that had a leading role in preserving (in Syriac) Greek writings on medicine, astronomy, and mathematics. There is a new book by Raymond Le Coz, Les médecins nestoriens au Moyen Âge: Les maîtres des arabes [The Nestorian physicians in the Middle Ages: The teachers of the Arabs] (Paris, 2004). He has an excellent discussion of the medical school at Jundi Shapur on pp. 53–66. I also took advantage of being in Iran to visit Persepolis, Shiraz, Isfahan, and then Tehran, before joining a busload of Shiite pilgrims en route to Baghdad.

When Donald Hansen returned to Iraq, he found that the security deposit could not be refunded and taken out of the country. He then made a bold proposal to Director Adams. There was a site a few miles from Nippur that he had visited several years before where the surface of the tell was littered with pottery of the Early Dynastic period (mid-third millennium B.C.) and earlier, levels that lie many meters below the surface at Nippur. He proposed using that money for a brief sounding at the site of Abu Salabikh. The Department of Antiquities approved the request and loaned us two or three large canvas tents that served as work areas, dining room, and sleeping quarters. I was listed as epigrapher. Vaughn Crawford was to join us later from his season with the British at Nimrud and was to be the photographer. Donald Hansen hired as a cook an elderly man from India who had come to Iraq in the time of World War I. He had cooked for various foreign families in Baghdad and, in spite of our limited facilities, was innovative in serving us good meals with locally available products (in the spring it seemed
to be mostly zucchini squash, tomatoes, and onions, though we could buy eggs and live chickens from local farmers). Iraq had good plants for processing jams made from local fruits—especially figs, though they also made jam from carrots. Dates were always available and very cheap. From the Nippur Expedition we had borrowed cots, mattresses, sheets, pots and pans, and dishes (the English-made set that had been used by the Oriental Institute in its excavations at Megiddo in Palestine in the 1930s). We also borrowed their refrigerator, which operated by burning kerosene. Kerosene lamps provided our lighting. Some of these lamps used mantles (defined by the dictionary as “a lacy hood or sheath of some refractory material that gives light by incandescence when placed over a flame”). Such lamps had to be pumped up constantly to maintain enough pressure to provide a good light. The disadvantage of such light is that it attracts vast numbers of insects, making it a challenge to do much work at night by lamplight.

People who live in cities can have no idea of how much more of the heavens are visible at night when there is no light pollution at all. It is easy to understand that the rise of astronomy should have occurred in such a land.

At the highest point of the mound was an area where heavy burning had turned the soil a reddish color. We decided to start our excavations there. We soon found that mud-brick walls had been so thoroughly baked in a conflagration that they were baked red. In the first few days, two cuneiform tablets were discovered, both baked hard, apparently in the huge fire that consumed the building. They had to be soaked for days in changes of water to dissolve the accretion of salt on their surface. Later, a number of small, unbaked fragments of tablets began to turn up in the debris. Vaughn Crawford took these to Nippur, where he baked them in the Nippur kiln (fueled by diesel). It was soon obvious to me that some of these fragments had lists of geographical names and that others appeared to be literary. One very thick tablet had a colophon on the back (giving the name of the scribe). Amazingly, the names were Semitic, that is, of the same language group as Babylonian and Assyrian, rather than the unrelated Sumerian language expected in the mid-third millennium. Adams, back in Chicago, seemed sufficiently impressed with the finds that he sent some additional funding, so we were able to continue until early June, when it became much too hot for fieldwork in southern Iraq.

We wanted to return to the site, but were not able to arrange it until January 1965. Almost immediately, in the same area, we came upon a huge pile of unbaked cuneiform tablets, obviously thrown into a rubbish pit along with broken pottery, fish bones, and bones of slaughtered animals. Selma al-Radi, the representative of the Iraqi Department of Antiquities, and I spent the next several weeks with the help of one Sherqati workman (Sherqat is the modern village near the ancient site of Assur; men from the village were trained by the Germans excavating Assur early in the twentieth century in the art of excavating mud-brick; their descendants have been the traditional skilled workmen on most archaeological expeditions until comparatively recently) carefully excavating the tablets—several hundreds of fragments, and some very large tablets with hundreds
of lines of writing. It soon became obvious that some of these were truly literary in the sense of belles lettres. Selma has given an account of the adventures—and misadventures—of this season in her article, “Digging with Donald,” in Erica Ehrenberg, ed., Leaving No Stones Unturned: Essays on the Ancient Near East and Egypt in Honor of Donald P. Hansen (Winona Lake, Indiana, 2002), pp. ix–xii.

After the close of the brief season, we transported the tablets to Nippur to the newly constructed expedition house where, for the next couple of months, I labored daily at baking and cleaning the tablets (along with Selma al-Radi). So that I could bake every day, I constructed a second kiln, for after firing, the tablets need to cool in the kiln for a day or so before they are cool enough to handle.

Before turning the tablets over to the Iraq Museum, I made Latex molds of most of them so that they could be cast in plaster of Paris in Chicago for study. Back in Chicago, with access to books, I was able to identify some of the literary texts as the same compositions known from copies from hundreds of years later. I spent several years of evenings and weekends working on my drawings of the inscriptions—a slow and laborious task. This involved several trips to the Iraq Museum to compare my drawings with the originals so I could further revise them. One of these visits was a month in the summer of 1972. Summer temperatures in Baghdad are often in the 120 to 140 degrees Fahrenheit range. The Iraq Museum had its air-conditioning system turned to the maximum, so I was more comfortable wearing a sweater in the museum, but one was hit with a blast of hot air when stepping outside. At the time, only a couple of luxury hotels had air conditioning. Most hotels had only an overhead fan. I decided then not to plan another summer visit to Baghdad.

Thus the site of Abu Salabikh (ancient name still unknown), and its tablets, whose discovery was due to fortuitous circumstances, revealed an important, and unexpected, aspect of mid-third-millennium literature and scholarship and demonstrated that people speaking a Semitic language, rather than being simple herdsmen tending their flocks, were deeply immersed in a center of Sumerian learning. I published these texts in a thick volume in 1974 (Inscriptions from Tell Abū Ṣalābīḥ, Oriental Institute Publications, vol. 99 [Chicago, 1974]). Several compositions were present in a number of fragmentary or somewhat damaged copies, and it was possible for me to reconstruct several compositions in virtually complete form and to present them in transliteration. The conventions for writing Sumerian were substantially different in the mid-third millennium than in the texts from several centuries later that are more familiar to us. While some passages we can translate with reasonable confidence, and can present tentative translations of others, some still defy us, though a great deal of progress has been made (mainly by other scholars) since I first published these texts more than thirty years ago.

Because of my extensive experience with texts of the mid-third millennium B.C., I was in a unique position to appreciate the importance of an extraordinary discovery in the mid-1970s of tablets of similar age by an Italian expedition from the Univer-
sity of Rome at the ancient site of Ebla (modern Tell Mardikh) near Aleppo in Syria. Initial reports, both in the popular press and in scholarly journals, caused great excitement among Bible scholars who were hearing that the names of Abraham, Sodom and Gomorrah, and a wealth of other names familiar from the Old Testament were found in these new tablets. Several of us, including my late colleague Ignace J. Gelb, who were experienced in the peculiarities of third-millennium cuneiform spelling conventions, were skeptical. Gelb’s initial analysis was published as “Thoughts about Ibla: A Preliminary Evaluation, March 1977,” Syro-Mesopotamian Studies 1, pp. 3–30 in 1977. In 1978 I was invited to discuss these finds in a lecture to the Chicago Society of the Archaeological Institute of America. Then I was asked to give my perspective on the topic in an article in Biblical Archaeologist (“The Ebla Tablets: An Interim Perspective,” Biblical Archaeologist 43 [1980]: 76–87), which is an updated and shortened version of my 1978 lecture. About that time, a film was produced for airing on PBS stations. It was called “The Royal Archives of Ebla” and included interviews with both Gelb and me. Such was the frenzy in some biblical circles that a well-known radio evangelist included Ebla on his Holy Land tours! In the end, sober scholarship prevailed and the question of Ebla and the Bible is now a dead issue.

In 1982 I had an opportunity to visit the site of Ebla. I had accompanied two Chicago couples and a couple from Australia on a trip to Yemen and Syria that spring. While the others terminated their visit in Damascus, I wanted to stay on to visit Ebla, since it had been a focus of a lot of my scholarly activity for several years. The Syrian ambassador to Washington (whom I had met when he was in Chicago) had urged me to present myself at the Department of Antiquities. Indeed, I found that because of my publications and lectures concerned with the disputes about the Ebla tablets, my name was well known to the Director General of Antiquities and other officials, and they received me most cordially.

It was easy to get a ticket on a modern bus going to Aleppo. En route we passed through the ancient city of Hama (especially famous for its water wheels) and saw with our own eyes the recent devastation of the city caused by the putting down of a local uprising. In Aleppo I stayed at the Baron Hotel, the same hotel where archaeologists normally stayed in the 1930s (Agatha Christie and her husband Max Mallowan were regular guests during their years in Syria) and which had been little modernized since then. That year Chicago friends and colleagues, Paul Zimansky and his wife Elizabeth Stone were in Aleppo, so we jointly hired a car and driver to take us to Ebla and to some of the Roman and medieval ruins in the area. The Italian team had not yet arrived at Ebla for that season’s work, but we were able to visit the site and get a good idea of the architecture of the third-millennium palace where the tablets had been discovered.

I now backtrack in time and geography to Washington State. As a child and teenager, I attended the only local church, the Evangelical United Brethren (a denomination that subsequently merged with the United Methodist Church). Our exposure to other Christian denominations, even Protestant ones, was limited, and I doubt that many of
us were even acquainted with any Roman Catholics. College was a bit more diverse but not much. It was not until I lived in France that I had regular contact with Roman Catholics. One was a fellow Fulbright Scholar with whom I planned a trip to Italy during the Christmas vacation. He had a cousin who was a priest in Rome and who was able to get us tickets for a “semi-private” audience with Pope Pius XII. The Pope who succeeded Pius XII was John XXIII, whom I came to admire greatly. In June 1963 I was ready to leave Baghdad, so I reserved a seat in a shared taxi to go to Jerusalem. Because of the extreme heat in the daytime, the taxi traveled across the desert at night. Upon arriving in Damascus the next morning, we learned that Pope John had died during the night. After a change of taxis in Damascus, it was on to Jerusalem. At that time, the Old City of Jerusalem was under the control of Jordan and could be reached easily from Damascus. Because I was a Fellow of the American Schools of Oriental Research that year, I was able to stay at their facility in Jerusalem for a modest charge. In Jerusalem it seemed that everyone was talking about the Pope’s death, and church authorities announced that there would be a High Pontifical Mass in the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, which I was able to attend and which I found very moving.

While in Jerusalem, I took a day’s trip to visit Bethlehem. Whether the Church of the Nativity covers the real birthplace of Jesus or not, it is very moving for anyone raised a Christian to visit the site so long associated with his birth.

I made my way from Jerusalem to Beirut and then on to Istanbul where I visited the archaeological museum. This museum has a fabulous collection of Near Eastern antiquities since, when Middle Eastern countries were still part of the Ottoman Empire, the government’s share went to the capital, Istanbul. I met colleagues there, including Muazzez Çiğ, who was in charge of the collection of cuneiform tablets, as well as Veysel Donbaz, who is now the head of the collection. I went on to Berlin to study some of the tablets in their collection from the German excavations at Assur. At that time (and for a number of subsequent visits in the next years) one found a pension or hotel in West Berlin and made the daily crossing of the Berlin Wall at Checkpoint Charlie into East Berlin. Colleagues there (among them Liane Jakob-Rost and Evelyn Klengel-Brandt) were warmly welcoming.

I eventually got to London, where the annual meeting of Assyriologists (Rencontre Assyriologique) was being held. The Rencontre, normally an annual event, was held mostly in Western Europe in the earlier years, but in 1967 it was held in Chicago for the first time in the U.S. In 2004 it was held in South Africa, and the 2005 meeting again was held in Chicago. It is a collegial gathering of scholars of ancient Mesopotamia and nearby lands, whether philologists, archaeologists, or art historians. At the 1963 London Rencontre I was able to meet (or at least see and listen to) some of the leading scholars whose books and articles I had studied. Although I have returned frequently to the British Museum to study cuneiform tablets, for the duration of the conference, the Students’ Room was closed to visitors, so I was not able to study any tablets at that time.
While still in Baghdad, I had received an offer of an appointment as a Research Associate on the *Chicago Assyrian Dictionary*, which I eagerly accepted, as my first employment as an Assyriologist. The annual salary of $5,000 sounded good to someone who had never had a salaried job. I arrived in Chicago in the fall of 1963 to find a small apartment and to take up my appointment at the University of Chicago. I soon found a congenial group of people, mostly either graduate students or Assistant Professors, who were approximately in my age group and who shared an interest in the ancient or modern Middle East or the Mediterranean area in general. Every couple of weeks one of us would host a small party, sometimes enlivened by a young American woman who had learned to play the Turkish *saz* (a stringed instrument) very well and who had a beautiful singing voice. One such gathering turned out not to be a party, but rather a solemn gathering of mourners, the day after the assassination of President John F. Kennedy.

One of the young women in our group worked in the Oriental Institute administrative office. She advised me that, if I expected to get a better salary, I would stand a better chance if I had a job offer from elsewhere. As it happened, my Johns Hopkins classmate Kirk Grayson had been teaching at Temple University in Philadelphia but had been appointed to a position in his native Canada. I applied for his position and received an offer. This resulted, in 1964, in my receiving a modest salary increase but also an appointment as Assistant Professor of Assyriology in the Department of Oriental Languages (as it was then called, for it included Chinese and Japanese) and an appointment as Associate Editor of the *Assyrian Dictionary*.

An administrative peculiarity of the Oriental Institute is that it is a research institution that grants no degrees. Degrees in its subject matters are offered through what is now called the Department of Near Eastern Languages and Civilizations, which is one of the departments in the Humanities Division. So this meant that I was then in a tenure-track position. Several years later, when I received an offer of an appointment at Johns Hopkins, I was promoted to Associate Professor (with tenure).

I enjoyed my work on the *Assyrian Dictionary*, but I was also eager to follow up my own research interests. I often returned to the Oriental Institute in the evenings after supper and usually came in on weekends as well, either to use the vocabulary files of the *Assyrian Dictionary* or to use the library.

It was exciting to be working with some of the top scholars in the field of Assyriology, and they fostered an attitude of expanding one’s scholarly horizons. We young Research Associates were encouraged to sit in on courses, especially the courses in Sumerian, the very ancient non-Semitic language of Mesopotamia. There was also a tradition of weekly reading sessions where we collectively read through newly published volumes of texts that had been published only in drawings of the cuneiform (a practice several of us continue, even in our retirement). It was partly an effort to document new occurrences of words that would be cited in future volumes of the *Assyrian Dictionary* but also, for us young Assyriologists, to develop our skills at reading a variety of genres of texts.
In 1963 the first volume of Franz Köcher’s *Die babylonisch-assyrische Medizin* was published. While it was his intention to follow up the publication of his hand drawings of the cuneiform with transliterations and translations, at his death in 2002 only the six volumes of his drawings had been published. Babylonian medical texts are a special challenge to read, as they include a great many names of plants (mostly unidentified) whose Babylonian names are often hidden behind the Sumerian words that served as sort of an abbreviation. In addition, the texts are filled with technical vocabulary for the procedures of preparation of medications and their administration. But I was determined to learn to read these texts, so I plunged in, reading and rereading as I became more familiar with the genre. Babylonian medical texts have been one of my principal specialties within the vast domain of cuneiform studies. In 2004 I was appointed to the two-member editorial board of the series *Die babylonisch-assyrische Medizin* published by de Gruyter in Berlin.

Another interest I developed was Babylonian divination, that is, the “science” of foretelling events from omens. There are vast collections of such omens of many different kinds. The Babylonians believed that the gods wrote messages on the livers and other organs of sheep that experts could interpret. In the first millennium B.C. astrology became increasingly important, especially for the Assyrian Court. Monstrous births (such as a three-legged chicken or a two-headed lamb) were considered very bad omens that might affect the king. I have made a particular study of the liver omens, which, like medical texts, form a highly technical genre.

Leo Oppenheim and Erica Reiner were very flexible about the months I spent working on the *Assyrian Dictionary*, thus permitting me to serve as epigraphist on the Oriental Institute’s Nippur Expedition in 1964/65, 1976, 1977, 1981, and 1985. Nippur, the ancient religious capital of Sumer, was first excavated by Americans from the University of Pennsylvania in 1888. In 1948 the Oriental Institute, in collaboration with the University of Pennsylvania (and at times other institutions) resumed excavations there. By far the greatest proportion of Sumerian literature known to us has been recovered from the excavations at Nippur, principally those carried out by the University of Pennsylvania at the end of the nineteenth and beginning of the twentieth centuries.

In 1964 en route to Iraq I stopped in Jordan to visit my Johns Hopkins friend and colleague, Ray Cleveland, who was living in Jericho. A friend of his from the Jericho refugee camp joined us on an overnight trip to visit Petra. We got up the next morning to snow, the first the young man had ever seen. Despite rain, we spent an enjoyable day visiting the spectacular site. Back in Jericho we were able to visit the Dead Sea and the area of the caves where the Dead Sea Scrolls had been discovered.

Occasionally when we had visitors at Nippur, we would arrange for camel rides (there were plenty of camels in the area). On one occasion a member of the Oriental Institute Visiting Committee and her daughter were visiting, and a camel ride to the nearby (several miles) site of Drehem was planned. Camels have notoriously bad breath and can be rather contrary, not to mention providing a rather rough ride, and we were all rather sore by the time we got back to the expedition house.
One of the facts of life in southern Iraq is the occurrence of sandstorms, sometimes lasting several days at a time. On the excavation site wearing goggles helped somewhat, but nevertheless, one’s hair and clothing were soon full of fine sand. To minimize the amount that filtered in between gaps between windowpanes in my room at the expedition house, I employed the old technique of wetting newspapers and stuffing every crevice as tightly as possible. While this helped some, fine sand was always ubiquitous on tables, chairs, and in one’s bed.

In addition to my several seasons at Nippur, I was able to join Donald Hansen and Vaughn Crawford as epigraphist and archaeologist on the Metropolitan Museum-New York University, Institute of Fine Arts Expedition to al-Hiba in 1968/69 and 1970/71. Each year a student from the University of Chicago accompanied me, first Elizabeth Carter, now a professor of archaeology at the University of California at Los Angeles, and in the second year Abdullah Masry, who returned to his native Saudi Arabia to a position in the Department of Antiquities.

The site of al-Hiba, first mentioned above, is now known to be ancient Lagash, the capital of one of the Sumerian city-states of the third millennium B.C. It was a low mound that lay on the very edge of one of the great marshes of southern Iraq. The nearest town was Shaṭra, but the site could be reached then only by canal, meaning a couple of hours by a motorized boat. The people in the area lived much as their Sumerian predecessors did thousands of years ago, for ecological conditions had changed little. In excavations, we find baked clay model boats that look just like the ones called tarada that are the means of locomotion in the marshes, propelled by long punting poles.

The only practical building material in the area was reeds from the marshes, so all our structures for sleeping quarters, work areas, dining, etc., were made of reeds by local workmen accustomed to building with reeds. (For illustrations of such reed structures and the process of constructing them, see Ochsenschlager’s book cited below. Such structures very closely resemble depictions on ancient cylinder seals from Mesopotamia.) To our chagrin, we discovered that in their first year of use, reed houses leak when it rains, which it did a lot! The marshes were an area of incredible beauty and tranquility, teeming with waterfowl and fish. Flocks of storks often flew overhead. Occasionally, especially after a heavy rain, we also saw a wild boar. The local economy was largely dependent on reeds and water buffalo. They provided milk, and their dung was collected and mixed with straw for fuel for baking bread. The way of life of these people, before many modern developments reached them, and before Saddam Hussein largely destroyed their way of life by draining the marshes, has recently been documented by Edward Ochsenschlager in his book *Iraq’s Marsh Arabs in the Garden of Eden* (Philadelphia, 2004). A great many of his photographs were taken in the late 1960s and early 1970s.

Although not easily accessible for residents of Baghdad, at Christmas 1968 our Danish friends from Abu Ghraib, Kirsten and Hans “Bielle” Bielefeldt, came to visit with their two children. Although we could not have a traditional Christmas tree, we
fashioned one from a dried shrub and decorated it with small red and white Danish flags and some foliage from the marshes. On Christmas Eve, following Danish customs, we sang and danced out one end and in the other of the reed house that served as our living room and dining room. Such are the memories of Christmas in the marsh area of Iraq, far from the Santas and the commercialism of an American Christmas.

Our workmen were entirely from local villages, and there needed to be a certain delicacy in hiring men from the various sheikhs’ groups. This is a very conservative area, and there was a discreet request, made through the representative of the Iraqi Department of Antiquities, that the female members of our staff cover their lower extremities more carefully (this was the era of the mini-skirt!). Nevertheless, at lunch break, there would often be someone who played a drum and someone else a flute. One small elderly man, obviously something of a “character” among the group, sang and danced with many lewd gestures, much to the merriment of the other workmen.

Our 1970/71 season at al-Hiba ended tragically. While I and a couple of others stayed behind to close up camp, the first boatload of our expedition members and some of the household staff left to return to Baghdad. Another boat speeding on the canal in the opposite direction rammed their boat, and Roberta Lewis was killed instantly.

I decided in 1968 that en route to Iraq, I would visit Afghanistan, a country that held a great fascination for me, especially the small area that used to be known as Kafiristan, “Land of the Heathens,” for the area had never been converted to Islam until forced to convert in the nineteenth century, when it was renamed Nuristan, “Land of Light.” Afghanistan’s national airline had flights to Kabul from Beirut, so I went, staying in an old and somewhat decrepit hotel in Kabul. One of the young managers there spoke quite good English and offered to accompany me if I hired a car and driver to an area in the south where his uncle owned a number of villages. It happened that the uncle was away, but the family welcomed us, and we slept on mats in the small building that served as the compound’s mosque. We spent a couple of days walking to the various villages, always warmly welcomed with tea or fresh watermelon. Here in these villages I could see traditional craftsmen at work making rope, making bullets, and watched a woman weaving on a large flat loom. Returning to Kabul, I hired another car and driver to take me to Bamiyan in the heart of the Hindu Kush Mountains. En route, we passed great numbers of nomads coming down from the mountains for winter, with small children, chickens, and lambs tied to loaded camels. The women in particular were dressed in colorful clothing. At Bamiyan there was a rest house that offered beds and a simple meal for visitors. From there I could look across the valley and see the two giant statues of the Buddha carved into the cliff and which I was able to explore in detail the following day—the same Buddhas that the Taliban destroyed several years ago. Unfortunately, because of political tensions, no foreigners were allowed in Nuristan. However, I was able to purchase in Kabul a Nuristan harp that very closely resembles harps played in Sumer thousands of years ago. After getting an export authorization from the National Museum, I was able to have it sent to me in Chicago, where it still sits, unplayed, in my Chicago home.
One of the pleasant aspects of my years in Baghdad was the possibility of accompanying Iraqi friends for an evening in a casino along the bank of the Tigris. An Iraqi casino is not a gambling establishment, but a sort of outdoor café. These are located along Abu Nuwas Street, named for the Abbasid poet Abu Nuwas (born about A.D. 756) from the time of the Caliph Harun al-Rashid when Baghdad was at the height of its glory. At street level, one can choose a live fish (called mazquf) from several held in a tank of water. The fish will later be roasted over wood. In the meantime, one descends to a lower level where tables are set up fairly far apart in a grassy area. Here one can order araq or beer and typical appetizers such as pistachios, jajik (a yogurt and cucumber dip), or fresh fruits in season (such as plums). Typically songs sung by Umm Kalthum, a famous Egyptian singer who was much loved throughout the Arab world, would be played from tape recordings. Especially in hot weather, this is probably the coolest place in Baghdad and certainly provides a relaxing evening.

In all my years in Iraq, I never felt I was in the slightest danger (except on the two-lane highways where Iraqi drivers take death-defying risks constantly, especially when behind a slow-moving truck). In fact, I used to say that I felt safer on the streets of Baghdad than I did in Chicago. Our expeditions have been in Iraq at various times of international crisis, including the 1967 Middle East war, but we never felt that we were personally at risk.

In 1971, at the death of Keith Seele who had been Editor since 1948, I was appointed to the editorship of the Journal of Near Eastern Studies. William Rainey Harper, who was later to become the first President of the University of Chicago, had founded its predecessor journal, Hebraica, in 1884. The Journal of Near Eastern Studies is one of the principal journals in America devoted to the Near and Middle East, though its coverage is generally prehistory to the end of the Ottoman Empire about 1918. I have served now (2005) as its editor for 34 years, but anticipate being relieved of the responsibility within a year or so. For most of those years I have had the expert help of Paula von Bechtolsheim, who is now Managing Editor. Her background in studying Turkish and other modern Middle Eastern languages has been an invaluable complement to my own studies of the ancient Near East, and her knowledge of German and French has also proved to be important.

My editorial experience has been put to use in several other publications. My friend and colleague McGuire Gibson organized a symposium at the Oriental Institute on seals and sealing practices in the ancient Near East. I did most of the editorial work (and in the days before most of us had computers, it involved a lot of retyping on a manual typewriter and cutting and pasting by hand); it was published as Seals and Sealing in the Ancient Near East in Malibu in 1977 as a volume of the series Bibliotheca Mesopotamica. He also organized another symposium, this one on bureaucracy in the ancient Near East, for which I again did a lot of the editorial work. It was published as The Organization of Power: Aspects of Bureaucracy in the Ancient Near East by the Oriental Institute in 1987 (it went out of print so quickly that a slightly revised version...
was published in 1991). In between these two symposiums, the Chicago Rug Society, of which I was a member, decided to mount an exhibition of Kurdish weavings at the Block Gallery at Northwestern University. I served as Editor for the beautifully illustrated book that accompanied the exhibition and symposium, *Discoveries from Kurdish Looms* (Evanston, 1983). Among the participants and authors was William Eagleton, an American diplomat who had spent considerable time in Iraqi Kurdistan and whom I knew from his posting at the American embassy in Baghdad. I saw him again in Damascus in 1985 where he was then the American ambassador.

In 1974 I was asked by the chief editor of the Time-Life series Great Ages of Man to be their principal consultant for the book *The Birth of Writing*. While the actual writing was done by one of their professional writers, they employ scholars as consultants to advise on factual matters, questions of emphasis, on sources for photographs, and to advise on other areas to explore. This involved a number of visits to their headquarters in New York City and even a trip to upstate New York to consult on the premises of their artist, who was doing the drawings and paintings for their illustrations. Their pay at the time was $100 a day, which earned me a nice supplementary income that year, plus giving me the satisfaction on working on a worthwhile project. Later I was asked to advise them on the second edition of *The Cradle of Civilization* (about ancient Mesopotamia).

While the Oriental Institute was not able to follow up its soundings at Abu Salabikh in 1963 and 1965 with full-scale excavations, the British School of Archaeology, recognizing the site’s great potential to provide information on the third millennium in that part of Iraq, decided to undertake excavations. In 1976 Nicholas Postgate, the Field Director of the expedition, invited me to join the expedition as epigraphist, which I was happy to do. Once again, it was a matter of living in tents, though this time it was the fall of the year, so instead of the weather getting hotter and hotter as in 1963, this time it got colder and colder. Late in the fall, at the time of a fairly long religious holiday, Postgate allowed several of us to take the Land Rover for a trip of a couple of days into Kurdistan, an area that had generally been largely inaccessible to foreigners. So for the first—and only—time I got to visit Kurdish towns and villages whose names were then largely unknown to most people in Europe or America.

In 1981 the Iraqi government invited me (and several other colleagues from Chicago and other American and European universities) to attend the Third International Symposium on Babylon, Assur, and Himrin in Baghdad in November. It was well organized, with copious lunches and dinners. The tours included a two-day trip to northern Iraq, including a stop in Haditha. One of the overnight stays was in large tents. Evening entertainment that day included singing and dancing by Iraqi gypsies (singular Kawli, plural Kawaliyyah) such as we had seen a number of times in southern Iraq. Weather in northern Iraq was getting decidedly cold, so we had a certain amount of discomfort, but the hospitality was warm and generous, typical of the Iraq I knew.
In 1984 the international meeting of Assyriologists was held in Leningrad (whose name was subsequently restored to St. Petersburg). This provided an opportunity for me to visit the Soviet Union for the first time. I went a couple of days early to visit museums (such as the Hermitage) and various other attractions in the city. My Toronto friend and colleague Grant Frame had earlier suggested that we sign up for a two-week guided tour of Soviet Central Asia (this was the only practical way to visit this area at the time). I eagerly jumped at the chance. Following the Rencontre in Leningrad, we spent several days in Moscow, where our tour was leaving from. We had two young women as our tour guides. They were very friendly and congenial on the tour buses, but they were not allowed to sit with us at meals. At each stop, local guides gave detailed talks. Seeing the Islamic monuments in Samarkand and Bukhara was especially interesting. Tbilisi, in Soviet Georgia, was quite different, for here one saw churches rather than mosques. It was interesting to find that one could buy Danish beer more cheaply in Central Asia than in Copenhagen, where I had a day’s layover en route to Chicago.

In the 1985 season at Nippur, few cuneiform tablets were found, and I was not normally needed on the excavation, so I took over the responsibility of driving to Afak to buy the canisters of cooking gas we needed, to do shopping, and to pick up bread. I stood in line at the bakery to buy bread hot from the oven. That year we had not hired a local cook, and Beverly Armstrong, wife of staff member James Armstrong, did most of the cooking. However, I made the rice for both lunch and dinner, preparing it Iraqi style with a golden crust on the bottom. Among our guests that year were James Akins, the American ambassador to Saudi Arabia in the Nixon administration, and his wife Marjorie (Marney) who had been great friends of the Nippur Expedition when they lived in Baghdad in the early 1960s. I drove us one day to visit the nearby site of Isin, which had been excavated by a German expedition. The site has since the invasion of Iraq in 2003 been totally destroyed by looters.

That year my Danish friends from early Baghdad years, the Bielefeldts, were living in Bahrain and they had invited me to visit them at the close of our season. Kirsten had maintained her interest in archaeology, so she drove me to visit various sites. On a Friday the three of us took a picnic lunch and drove to the other end of the island. From Bahrain, I went on to Damascus, where I had been invited to give a series of lectures at Damascus University.

The looting of the Iraq Museum in the immediate aftermath of the invasion of Iraq caused great anger and outrage among members of the archaeological community and, indeed, caused embarrassed consternation in the U.S. State Department. In an effort to take some kind of remedial action, a meeting was called of people from the State Department, the Department of Homeland Security, U.S. customs officers, law enforcement agencies from European countries, representatives of international cultural organizations such as UNESCO, and international police. The meeting was held at INTERPOL headquarters in Lyon, France. To aid these people in recognizing the kinds of antiquities they should be on the lookout for, several scholars were invited to give
illustrated talks. The State Department asked me to make the presentation on cuneiform tablets. I would like to think that our efforts have helped in the recovery of some of the stolen antiquities.

While I would never claim any professional qualifications as an archaeologist, I have greatly enjoyed my many seasons on expeditions in Iraq and my many visits to ancient sites, both in Iraq and in other countries. Because of my interest in archaeology, I joined the Archaeological Institute of America in the 1960s. In 1985 I was elected President of the Chicago Society of the Archaeological Institute and remained president until 1992, so my terms in office included my presiding over the celebrations for the centennial of the Chicago Society in 1989. I remain a member of the Executive Committee.

My years at the University included teaching courses frequently, most often in Babylonian literature, Babylonian divination, Babylonian medicine and other scientific texts, as well as Babylonian religious texts, and, occasionally, a course in Old Akkadian, the Semitic language of Babylonia in the third millennium B.C. But I decided that I would take retirement in June 2004, just short of my 70th birthday—at least retirement from teaching and from committee responsibilities, though I continue (for now) as Editor of the Journal of Near Eastern Studies. I continue my commitment to the Chicago Assyrian Dictionary and will help with verifying the references for the final volume, U/W.

I am truly grateful to the Oriental Institute and to the many friends, colleagues, and students who have made my long tenure here so professionally and personally rewarding. I hope that my contributions to accomplishing the mission of the Oriental Institute and to the field of Assyriology and the study of the ancient Near East in general have justified the confidence shown by my appointment more than forty years ago. As a late colleague said a few days before his death, “It’s been fun!” But I expect my fun to continue for a while. It is my hope that eventually some of my ashes can be scattered at Nippur, reuniting me in a sense with a land I came to love and whose ancient culture has been the focus of my professional life.
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MASCULINE OR FEMININE? THE CASE OF CONFLICTING GENDER DETERMINATIVES FOR MIDDLE BABYLONIAN PERSONAL NAMES*

J. A. Brinkman, The University of Chicago

In Babylonian texts, beginning in the Middle Babylonian period and continuing for centuries thereafter, personal names were regularly prefixed with a gender determinative: /∆/ (the vertical wedge) before male names and /ƒ/ (the SAL or MUNUS sign) before female names. Though personal names in the very earliest Middle Babylonian documents seem to lack such indicators, the prefixing of personal gender determinatives seems to have become the rule by about 1400 B.C. Through the rest of this period, with the exception of royal names, very few personal names were written without one of these prefatory elements.

---


2 Ni. 3199 and D 85, legal texts from the reigns of Kadašman-Ḫarbe I and Kurigalzu I, respectively, use such determinatives. The latter text is published by V. Donbaz in “Two Documents from the Diverse Collections in Istanbul,” SCCNH 2, pp. 72–75.

3 Though the masculine personal determinative is used occasionally before names of kings in Babylonian texts written during their throne tenure in the Kassite period, most such names occur without a personal determinative. The writings are cited in detail in Brinkman MSKH 1 88–319, passim. In the following Post-Kassite period, down to 722 B.C., the names of Babylonian kings are almost never preceded by a masculine personal determinative in Babylonian inscriptions written during their reigns (references in Brinkman PKB, passim), though such determinatives are occasionally added in later copies.

4 For example, [ḫd]NIN.IB-SAG DUMU 𒈗šum-ma-li (Ni. 832:17), 𒄀UD-šá-ZALAG-ir1 DUMU 𒈗LÚ-�AMAR._UTU UM 29-15-681:26. Lack of personal determinatives is at present confined mostly to patronyms and matronyms. A notable exception to this picture is the work roster Ni. 911, a text without preserved date but clearly from the height of the Kassite period in the fourteenth and thirteenth centuries (because of the distinctive text style and personal names), which lists more than thirty names of living persons without preceding personal determinatives. It may also be observed that, when female sex-age classifications are listed before a personal name in a Middle Babylonian labor roster, the feminine personal
A small group of personal names poses an interesting variation within this framework. These names are written with both the masculine and feminine personal determinatives, in that sequence, for example, $\text{Hu-mur-ti}$ (gen.)$^5$ and $\text{In-bu-ša}$. At first glance, one may be inclined to interpret these as scribal errors or to try to read the SAL sign syllabically (for example, as sal, šal, or rak).$^7$ But there are now more than twenty-five known examples of this phenomenon among published and unpublished Middle Babylonian texts, and in many instances it is clear that the name following the two determinatives is complete in itself and thus does not require the SAL sign to be read syllabically. Examples of such complete names are:

1. $\text{Amat-Adad}$: $\text{GÉME-IM}$ (CBS 13253 rev.? 7’)
2. $\text{Hu-mur-tu}$: $\text{Hu-mur-ti}$ (gen.; TuM NF 5 29:34)
3. $\text{Ina-Ekur-rišat}$: $\text{Ina-É.KUR-ri-šat}$ (CBS 3640 rev. ii’ 12’)
4. $\text{Inbúša}$: $\text{In-bu-ša}$ (CBS 3640 ii’ 14’)
5. $\text{Muštašitu}$: $\text{Muš-ta-[i][l]}$ (gen.; CBS 3640 rev. i’ 6’)
6. $\text{Napširi-Bēlu}$: $\text{Nap-ši-ri-NIN}$ (Ni. 1264:8)
7. $\text{Rabāt-Gula}$: $\text{Ra-bat-dgu-la}$ (CBS 3640 rev. ii’ 8’)
8. $\text{Rabātu}$: $\text{Ra-ba-ti}$ (gen.; BE 15 87:4, 175:15)
9. $\text{Simut-abūša}$: $\text{Si-mu-ut-a-bu-ša}$ (BM 82699 iv 7’)
10. $\text{Surānitu}$: $\text{Šu-ra-ni-[i]}$ (gen.; Ni. 836:13’)$^8$

How is one to interpret these double determinatives? It hardly seems necessary to infer that these cases describe persons of biologically ambiguous or indeterminate sex, and the graphic convention $\text{Hu}$ seems unlikely to be argot or an example of scribal determinative before the name is frequently omitted; for example, BE 14 58:6, 7, 12, and passim (in comparable contexts, the masculine personal determinative is not omitted).$^5$ Where textual references to personal name forms ending in an -i are quoted without context in this article and the final vowel in question may result from the fact that the context requires a genitive case, such forms will be marked “gen.,” indicating that the name in this instance may be declined for case. (This does not imply that forms not so designated are not serving a genitive function within a clause but just that the ending of the form in context does not seem to be influenced by declension.)$^5$

$^5$ TuM NF 5 29:34; CBS 3640 ii’ 14’.

$^6$ Where textual references to personal name forms ending in an -i are quoted without context in this article and the final vowel in question may result from the fact that the context requires a genitive case, such forms will be marked “gen.,” indicating that the name in this instance may be declined for case. (This does not imply that forms not so designated are not serving a genitive function within a clause but just that the ending of the form in context does not seem to be influenced by declension.)

$^7$ TuM NF 5 29:34; CBS 3640 ii’ 14’.

$^8$ $\text{Surānitu}$ seems to be the word for “female cat,” hitherto unattested, at least in Middle Babylonian. It occurs also in the name $\text{O DUMU Šu-ra-ni-ši}$ in Ni. 6670:17.
esoterica, as it occurs in a variety of pedestrian text types, including administrative lists and memoranda, letters, and legal documents. Thus far unambiguous occurrences of $\exists$PNs are restricted to two patterns: \( a \) PN DUMU(.$\text{SAL}$) $\exists$PN, and \( b \) $\emptyset$ DUMU $\exists$PN. For example:

1. \( ^{\text{ik-ku-uk-ku}} \text{DUMU} ^{\text{ra-ba-ti}} \) (BE 15 87:3–4)
2. $\emptyset$ DUMU \( ^{\text{ja-lú-ti}} \) (Ni. 6670:11)\(^9\)

There is as yet no unambiguous attestation of $\exists$PN other than in a citation of parentage.\(^10\)

What is the meaning of these occurrences? One hint may be provided by the unpublished text CBS 3640, a roster of servile personnel, which contains an abundance of such names in varying context. Here is one of the better-preserved passages:

Rev. ii'

8' \( \text{GURUš.TUR} \) 9' \( \text{SUD-ù-} \) \( \text{lu-} \) \( \text{lu} \) \( \text{DUMU} \) \( ^{\text{ra-bat-dù}} \) \( \text{gu-la} \)
9' \( \text{pir-su} \) \( ^{\text{mu-} \) \( \text{šab-} \) \( \text{šu-} \) \( \text{à} \) \( \text{DUMU} \) \( \text{KI.MIN} \)
10' \( \text{SAL.TUR} \) \( ^{\text{li-} \) \( \text{ta-} \) \( \text{dù} \) \( \text{gu-la} \) \( \text{DUMU.SAL} \) \( \text{KI.MIN} \)
11' \( \text{DUMU.SAL.GABA} \) \( ^{\text{ta-ri-} \) \( \text{ba-tum} \) \( \text{DUMU.SAL} \) \( \text{KI.MIN} \)
12' \( \text{GURUš.TUR} \) \( ^{\text{ta-} \) \( \text{qi-} \) \( \text{ša-} \) \( \text{dù} \) \( \text{gu-la} \) \( \text{DUMU} \) \( \text{KI.MIN} \)
13' \( \text{pir-su} \) \( ^{\text{BA-} \) \( \text{šá-} \) \( \text{dù} \) \( \text{GUR} \) \( \text{DUMU} \) \( \text{KI.MIN} \)
14' \( \text{pir-su} \) \( ^{\text{iz-} \) \( \text{kur-} \) \( \text{dù} \) \( \text{GUR} \) \( \text{DUMU} \) \( \text{KI.MIN} \)
15' \( \text{SAL.TUR} \) \( ^{\text{ni-} \) \( \text{ip-} \) \( \text{pu-ri-tum} \) \( \text{DUMU.SAL} \) \( \text{KI.MIN} \)
16' \( \text{SAL.T[UR]} \) \( ^{\text{muš-} \) \( \text{ta-i-tum} \) \( \text{DUMU.SAL} \) \( \text{KI.MIN} \)
17' \( \text{[ ]} \) \( ^{\text{fr-} \) \( \text{tar-} \) \( \text{ba-tu-} \) \( \text{šá} \) \( \text{DUMU.SAL} \) \( \text{KI.MIN} \)
18' \( \text{[ ]} \) \( ^{\text{fr-} \) \( \text{ra-bat-DINGIR-sa} \) \( \text{DUMU.SAL} \) \( \text{KI.MIN} \)

Each entry consists of three parts: the sex-age classification of the worker,\(^11\) the name of the worker prefixed with either a masculine or feminine personal determinative, and then the rubric “son/daughter of” followed by the name of the parent. Parents’ names are written out in full the first time each occurs, but for subsequent entries the name is

---

\(^9\) Names of the type $\emptyset$ DUMU(.$\text{SAL}$) PN are discussed in Clay PN, p. 45 (though he broadens the category unduly to include also personal names prefixed with sex-age classifications such as DUMU.SAL.GABA) and in Hölscher Personennamen, p. 7.

\(^10\) For a possible exception, see the excursus on Ḥazi and Ḥagi names below.

\(^11\) This classification section contains three subcolumns, the first listing the sex-age classification, the second noting whether the worker had died, and the third recording whether the worker had fled or escaped. In the passage quoted above, the second and third subcolumns are blank for lines 8’–15’, then destroyed for the last three lines. (Sex-age classifications in these rosters have been discussed in J. A. Brinkman, “Sex, Age, and Physical Condition Designations for Servile Laborers in the Middle Babylonian Period,” Kraus AV, pp. 1–8.)
abbreviated as “the same” (KI.MIN). The full or abbreviated parental name is prefixed by personal gender determinatives: $\text{∆/}$ is used when the descendant is male and only $\text{/}$/ is used when the descendant is female. In every case in this passage the name of the parent is a matronym, but the choice of personal determinative(s) before the matronym varies with the gender of the offspring. Other sections of this roster list male and female laborers with patronyms (usually prefixed with $\text{∆/}$), with matronyms (usually prefixed with either $\text{∆/}$ or $\text{/}$/), or without indication of parentage; and the pattern $\text{∆/PN}$ is restricted to parents of male descendants.\(^{12}\)

Even in its present damaged condition, CBS 3640 preserves twelve examples of $\text{∆/PN}$ that adhere to this paradigm.\(^{13}\) Outside this text there are at least fourteen further examples of $\text{∆/PN}$ parentage (i.e., matronym) linked to male descendants: a) five of the type $\text{PN DUMU ∆/PN}$; b) at least nine of the type $\text{Ø DUMU ∆/PN}$. Thus far I have seen only one example of a female descendant linked with a matronym written with both the masculine and feminine personal determinatives: [...]-x $\text{DUMU.SAL ∆/GÉME-∂IM CBS}$ 13253 rev.? 7'.\(^{14}\)

Matronyms in Middle Babylonian texts are also written in the more customary way, i.e., with the female personal determinative alone. There are multiple cases of matronyms attested in the following patterns:

\[ a) \text{PN DUMU ∆/PN — e.g., ∆/30-na-ap-ši-ra MU.NI [D]UMU ∆/ri-ri-tum (D. 85:1–2, published in Donbaz, SCCNH 2, pp. 72–75);} \]
\[ b) \text{PN DUMU ∆/PN — e.g., ∆/ina-AN.∆₁-nam₁-rat DUMU.SAL ∆/la-ti (CBS 3640 ii’ 18’);} \]
\[ c) \text{Ø DUMU ∆/PN — e.g., Ø DUMU ∆/a-da-ri-ti (Sassmannshausen Beitr., p. 240, no. 43:14);} \]
\[ d) \text{Ø DUMU.SAL ∆/PN — e.g., Ø DUMU.SAL ∆/hi-li₂-da-an-na-ru (Ni. 1151:8’).} \(^{15}\)\]

There are also examples of $\text{PN DUMU.SAL Ø/PN}$, in which the parent is a woman, such as, $\text{PN DUMU.SAL ∆/hu-zu-ti}$ (Ni. 1056 rev. ii 23’)\(^{16}\) and $\text{PN DUMU.SAL ∆/ni-sa-an-ni-ti}$ (UM 29-16-108:4).

\[ 12 \text{ But the patterns $\text{PN DUMU ∆/PN}$/KI.MIN and} \]
\[ 13 \text{I.e., in addition to examples of $\text{KI.MIN}$.
\]
\[ 14 \text{Where clearly preserved, the style of worker entries in this text is generally $\text{PN DUMU.SAL}$ $\text{PN}. \text{The sole exception to this pattern is the line cited here in which the parent’s name is preceded by $\text{Κ Min}$. There seems little question that the broken section at the beginning of this line originally contained a female personal name.}$} \]
\[ 15 \text{Note also the occurrence of $\text{Ø DUMU.SAL} ∆/ir-it-₁₃um₃-ma$ at Dur-Kurigalzu (O. R. Gurney, “Texts from Dur-Kurigalzu,” Iraq 11 [1949]: 145, no. 6:7).} \]
\[ 16 \text{Huzzu’tu (Huzzûtu) or Ḥunzu’tu, “the cripple”; see Hölscher Personennamen, p. 86 s.v. Ḥuzzûtu). The name is written $\text{PN}$ $\text{PN};$
So we are left with the following picture. Current attestations of $\text{PN}$ occur in a variety of text types written by different scribes. These texts, where they contain a regnal year and a royal name, fall across a range of several decades in the thirteenth century (from 1300 till at least 1232, i.e., from Nazi-Maruttaš year 8 till at least the first year of Kaštiliašu IV).\(^{17}\) All occurrences discussed thus far are in texts from Nippur, which has provided the overwhelming majority of documentation currently available for the period. The use of the double determinative seems to reflect scribal choice, since the more common way of expressing gender for matronyms by prefixing simple $\text{f}$ was also in use at Nippur over the same time range. There is no indication that the women with $\text{f}$ determinatives occupied a distinctive social or economic status in the community other than their role as mothers and presumably heads of household (in the absence of citation of a patronym); this is illustrated clearly in the passage from CBS 3640 cited above, where different occurrences of the name of the same woman are sometimes prefixed with $\text{f}$ and sometimes with $\text{f}$.\(^{18}\) And it is worth observing that women do occur as household heads in many instances at Nippur in the Middle Babylonian period, chiefly as the principal of a $\text{qinnu}$ or putative family/clan grouping\(^ {19}\) or as chief representative and primary referent in laborer households where an adult male was lacking.\(^ {20}\) (Under certain circumstances, these two categories may overlap.) Was it felt in some cases by scribes that the prefixing of a masculine personal determinative before a female name marked an elevated status as head of household, a rank customarily reserved for an adult male?

\(^{17}\) TuM NF 5 34:36', Ni. 852:14, Ni. 1154 i 10', and Ni. 11373 i 15': $\text{hu-un-zu-}^{*}\text{-tum}$ in CBS 4909 rev. 7' and Sassmannshausen Beitr., p. 278, no. 96:19 (and partially restored ibid., line 4), $\text{hu-un-zu-}^{*}\text{-ti}$ (gen.) in Ni. 826:4. It corresponds to the masculine $\text{Huzzu'}$ or $\text{Hunzu'}$ (also written $\text{hu-un-zu-hu}$); references to $\text{Hunzu'}$ or $\text{Hunzahu}$ may be found in Hölscher Personenamen, p. 85, to which may be added the genitive $\text{hu-un-zu-i}$ in Ni. 732:22'. The male form $\text{Hunzu'}$ had become an ancestral or family name by the late Middle Babylonian period (see W. G. Lambert, “Ancestors, Authors, and Canonicity,” JCS 11 [1957]: 2–4, 6–7, and passim); this family was to remain prominent until well into the Seleucid period. In Ni. 1056, the text cited here, the personal determinative is also omitted before the name of a male parent: $\text{ša-KA-}^{*}\text{-gu-la DUMU.SAL Šur-}^{*}\text{IM}$ (rev. ii 22').

\(^{18}\) Though it may be observed that many of the female names are drawn from servile laborer rosters or ration lists, indicating a relatively low social status. But in some instances there is insufficient information available to draw conclusions about the status of the women.

\(^{19}\) In which case the $\text{qinnu}$ is named after them (for example, $\text{qin-ni}$ $\text{GAL-}^{*}\text{-iš-}^{*}\text{-ša-ra}$, CT 51 19:5). Many, and perhaps most, $\text{qinnātu}$ attested in Middle Babylonian administrative texts seem to involve persons of servile laborer status.

\(^{20}\) See, for example, Ištär-bēl- Washer and her family (BE 14 58:12–17), Ina-Akkadi-rabāt and her family (UM 29-15-760:6–8'). Such examples are abundant in worker rosters and ration lists.
A prominent female family head is also attested at Middle Babylonian Ur, where her designation as ancestress/parent also led to scribal inconsistency. The name of Dey(y)anyahu, attested as the ancestress of at least seven males, is written sometimes with a masculine, sometimes with a feminine personal determinative, and — on one occasion — perhaps with both determinatives.

This brief survey has called attention to the existence of Middle Babylonian female personal names prefixed with both the masculine and feminine personal determinatives. A possible explanation for the choice of the /I/ expression and for its significance would focus on the enhanced prominence of the designated women as heads of family or household, though we should bear in mind that the present distribution of attestations of /P/PNs solely as matronyms could be due to the accidents of textual survival. Additional data and further research should be able to test the accuracy and relevance of this hypothesis. Even more interesting and fruitful should be a broader study of the roles and influence of women, especially as heads of household, in Middle Babylonian society.

---


22 The name is written ∆da-a-a-na-ti, ƒda-a-a-na-ti, ∆ƒ∑da-a-a-na-ti (once), and ƒdi-ia-na-ti (all gen.) in its fully preserved attestations (references in UET 7, p. 12, supplemented by Gurney MB Texts, p. 197; see also n. 23 below). This is a hypocoristic of an original Dey(y)Ωnat-ina-GN, which became Dey(y)Ωnat + the case ending -u. To judge from the orthography of personal names, the spoken forms for classical day(y)aniu and day(y)antu in the Middle Babylonian period must have been something like dey(y)aniu and dey(y)andu; note the spellings Ø DUMU 1de-e-a-a-ni (gen.) in CBS 10908:6’, 1de-e-a-ani-UNUG.KI in Ni. 1066+1069 rev. ii’ 5’ (cf. SAL di-ia-an-di-i-na-UNUG.KI in BE 15 188 rev. iii’ 8’). Personal names formed with Dayyânat-/Dey(y)ânat- are all borne by women in the Middle Babylonian period. Such names are most commonly written in a form such as Day(y)ant(i)-ina-GN; note the sample of writings for Dayyant(i)-ina-Uruk quoted in Hölscher Personennamen, pp. 58–59 — and comparable writings can be found for the names Day(y)ant(i)-ina-Akkadi (Ni. 6713 i 4’) and Day(y)ant(i)-ina-Lisin, though the latter is written SAL da-a-a-di-i-na-i-si-in in Ni. 6874 rev. i’ 15’. These names, which use a stative form, are to be distinguished from names such as 1Day(y)antï-Bëlet-Nippuri, in which day(y)antï is the noun day(y)antu with the first-person singular genitive pronominal suffix. (For the use of dey(y)aniu and other occupation/profession names as family or ancestral names in the Middle Babylonian period, see my article “The Use of Occupation Names as Patronymic in the Kassite Period: A Forerunner of Neo-Babylonian Ancestral Names?” in A. Guinan et al., eds., If a Man Builds a Joyful House: Essays in Honor of Erle Verdun Leichty [Leiden and Boston, 2006].)

23 With a masculine personal determinative in UET 7 18:2 and rev. 8, 22:5, 30:3, 33:7, 46:13; with a feminine personal determinative in UET 7 12:4’, 21 rev. 11, 25:8. In UET 7 2 rev. 25, to judge from the copy, the scribe seems to have written both determinatives; note also the comment by Gurney MB Texts, p. 28.

24 For the possible occurrence of one such individual in non-matronym status, see the discussion of NBC 7948 in the excursus on Ḥazi and Ḥagi names below.
Postscript

Other examples of masculine and feminine personal determinatives written before Middle Babylonian matronyms have recently come to my attention, and these in part expand the range of the attestations. In texts from Babylon, there are now at least two such instances in the form $\text{IPN DUMU IPN}$; the matronyms in these cases are $\text{I}^i\text{bab-}la-a-a-i-[i]$ (gen.) Bab 34300 rev. 3 (no date preserved) and $\text{I}^i\text{lu-ri-in-di}$ (gen.) VAT 13210:10 (Kudur-Enlil year 6 [1259]). In a tablet offered at a Bonhams auction in May 2003, a legal text dated in the first year of Kadašman-Turgu (1281) recounts the efforts of Ina-piša-imrir to buy a young slave-girl as a bride for her son; Ina-piša-imrir’s name is consistently written with the feminine determinative alone (lines 1, 7, 10, etc.) except in the sole case where it occurs as a matronym for her son, Adadmuššêšir — there her name after the DUMU sign is written with both the masculine and feminine determinatives: $\text{I}^i\text{i+na-KA ša-im-ri-ir}$ (line 4). Finally, in a legal text dated in Šagarakti-Šuriaš year 5 (1241) in the Cornell University cuneiform collection, another Middle Babylonian matronym is attested in the sequence $\text{I}^i\text{qu-Inu1-nu DUMU ñiš-tar-šar-rat}$ (Cornell, no. 5:10–11).

EXCURSUS

Haþi and Haþi Names

There is a small group of personal names that contain the elements haþi and haþi and are also apparently preceded by the determinative cluster $\text{I}^i\text{I}$. But, since the interpretation of these names has yet to be adequately established and a syllabic reading for the SAL sign definitively excluded, I am treating these names here separately.

The most common of these names is written $\text{I}^i\text{ha-zi-dAMAR.UTU}$ (or $\text{SAL-}\text{ha-zi-dAMAR.UTU}$).26 It is attested to date in three texts:

1. $\text{Ø DUMU I}^i\text{ha-zi-dAMAR.UTU}$, listed in an entry in a ration text that records fodder for horses (BE 14 56a:23; dated Nazi-Maruttaš, year 13 [= 1295 B.C.]).27


26 I am here provisionally reading the SAL sign as the feminine personal determinative, without implying that this will be the preferred or finally accepted reading.

27 Clay interpreted this name as $\text{Shal(?)-}ha-zidMarduk$ (BE 14, p. 52) and $\text{Šal-}ha-zi-Marduk$ (Clay *PN*, p. 128). Hölscher *Personennamen*, p. 200, transliterated $\text{mSA\-}liš-zi-dAMAR.UTU$ and suggested a possible emendation to $\text{ŠadžaMarduk}$. 
2. Ø DUMU.SAL ḫa-zi-.Assembly.UTU, mentioned four times in a legal text concerned with real estate described as ḫa PN (Ni. 1585:5, 9, 12, 17; dated Šagarakti-Šuriaš, year 4 [= 1242 B.C.]).

3. ḫa-zi-Assembly.UTU, mentioned in an undated letter from Itti-Marduk-balatu to Esagil-šaduuni dealing with livestock and related matters (NBC 7948:13).

The same or a similar name may occur in the administrative text AO 8136 rev. 15 (Durand Textes babyloniens, pl. 14): ḫa-zi-[x].

There does not seem to be an appropriate ḫaz or ḫazi element known in either Akkadian or Kassite, but there are numerous attestations of a stem ḫaz, or more precisely ḫaṣ (“to hear”) in Hurrian, which also occurs in personal names. Thomas Richter has observed that the Hurrian consonant /ž/ was written in two principal ways in cuneiform script: either with a sign in the “z” sign-series or with a sign in the “š” sign-series. ḫaṣib, a third-person nonergative form of the verb ḫaṣ, is attested in names written in such ways as ḫaṣib-Aranziḫ or ḫaṣib-Tešup. ḫaṣib written with a “zi” sign is attested generally at Mari and in what at one time constituted the core region of the Mittani state between the Euphrates and Tigris. Written with a “ši” sign, it is attested outside this region, both to the west (for example, Alalakh, TigunΩnu) and to the east (Nuzi, Shemshara). The final b of this verb form sometimes assimilates, partially or fully, to a following consonant in such names as ḫaṣik-Kewar, ḫašil-Lumti, ḫašim-Matka, ḫašim-Nati, ḫašim-Nawar, and ḫašin-Nawar; and the resulting doubled consonant

28 The first of these references occurs in the phrase ḫa-šum mi-ši-il-ti ḫa DUMU.SAL ḫa-zi-Assembly.UTU. This seems to be the first attestation of mišitu in Middle Babylonian (the term is otherwise known only in first-millennium texts).

29 Hölscher Personennamen, p. 82, reads ḫa-zi-[x], but all the personal-name entries in this section of the text begin with a damaged masculine personal determinative (lines 2–7, 9–16). A similar damaged name ḫa-zi[ ] may occur in Ni. 6606:8, a tēlītu account dated in year 5 of Kadašman-Enlil II (= 1259 B.C.).


31 Or ḫaẓip.

32 For example, at Chagar Bazar and Rimah. For the situation at Emar, see R. Pruzsinszky, SCCNH 13, pp. 239, 250, and 253. The verb form ḫaṣib is not yet attested in Emar personal names, but may be represented in apparent hypocoristics such as ḫa-zi-ia and ḫa-zi (references cited on p. 374 of the text on the compact disk issued with SCCNH 13).

33 Walter Farber has kindly called my attention to the writing ḫa-šek-en-u in an Old Babylonian PN from Tell ed-Dër (Edzard Tell ed-Dër, no. 61:17).

34 These examples are drawn primarily from the Nuzi corpus, and references for the names may be found in NPN, pp. 56–57 and Cassin Anthroponymie, p. 53, with the exception of ḫašik-Nawar, which is found in the TigunΩnu prism (Salvini, The ḫbiru Prism of King Tunip-Tešup of Tikumani, i 13, ii 15, viii 51). That assimilation does not always take place in such contexts at Nuzi may be seen from such name forms as ḫašik-Kiaš and ḫašib-Ninu (Cassin Anthroponymie, p. 54). The more restricted corpus of names available from Mari, Chagar Bazar, and Tell Rimah does not seem to favor this assimilation, such as ḫaṣib-Nawar (ARM 23 125:5, 160:3), ḫaṣib-Kuzuḫ (AOAT 1 217 no. 40:26), ḫa-zi-ib-mu-[ ] (OBT Tell Rimah 322 v 36).
can be written singly or doubly, for example, ḫa-ši-lu-um-ti vs. ḫa-ši-il-lu-um-ti, ḫa-ši-na-mar vs. ḫa-ši-in-na-ma-ar. 35 Though hybrid Hurrian-Akkadian personal names are relatively rare, 36 there are a few known examples such as Gimil-Tešup and Ḫašib-Bēl(e)ti-ekalī. 37 Ḫazi-Marduk, or perhaps more properly Ḫazi(m)-Marduk (from Ḫažib-Marduk), could theoretically be explained as an example of such a hybrid name.

One drawback to this explanation is that one would have to assume a writing of the Hurrian /ʒ/ with a “zi” sign at Nippur — which would apparently deviate from the geographic pattern of orthographic distribution sketched above. 38 But there is another more serious objection. At Nippur, the /ʒ/ in the name Ḫažib-Tilla is written with a “ṣi” sign: 1ḫa-ṣi-ib-til-la seems to be the local orthography for this name, attested in several texts. 39 The situation is further complicated by the presence of a similar name written 1ḥi-ṣi-ib-til-la or 1ḥi-ṣib-til-la in these and other Nippur texts; 40 the initial element of this name seems otherwise unparalleled in Hurrian, though one may ponder the possibility of a derivation from the Akkadian ḫišbu, “abundance,” which is attested in topographical names and at least once in an Old Babylonian personal name. 41 The orthography of Hurrian names at Middle Babylonian Nippur is as yet imperfectly understood, 42 and further research may yield a more nuanced view of scribal practices.

Another aspect of this name, 1ḫa-Marduk, which is not yet shared with the 1PNs discussed in the main section of this article, is that in one instance it occurs as the name of a living individual, not just as an ancestor.

There is similar uncertainty about the interpretation of a name written 1ḥa-gi or 1SAL-ḫa-gi, which occurs once as the name of a living individual in an account text

35 JEN 516:15, HSS 16 333:11; JEN 250:31, HSS 16 348:14.
36 Mauro Giorgieri, “L’onomastica hurrita,” La parola del passato 55 (2000): 291 under 2.5; see also examples cited ibid., p. 288 under 2.2.1.
37 NPN, pp. 85, 57; Cassin Anthroponymie, pp. 82, 54.
38 Note, however, that Purves in NPN, p. 215 s.v. ḫaz, observed that ḫaš “to hear” was written as ḫaz in personal names in documents drafted by Akkadian scribes at Nuzi. He also suggested that ḫaz might be the Akkadian rendering of Hurrian ḫaš.
39 ḫa-ṣi-ib-til-la in CBS 3480 i 39’, CBS 4914 rev. 12’, and CBS 11143 i 25’; ḫa-ṣi-ib-til-[a], ḫa-ṣi-ib-til-la in PBS 2/2 84:22, 35. The spelling ḫa-ṣi-ib-til-la, cited in Hölscher Personennamen, p. 81, is from the Istanbul tablet D 137, which is from Nuzi or a related area, not Nippur (note also the comment by Sassmannshausen, in his review of Hölscher Personennamen, in BiOr 55 [1998]: 825).
40 ḫi-ṣi-ib-til-la in CBS 3480 i 138’1, 42’; CBS 4914 rev. 111’1, 15’; CBS 11143 i 24’ (a CBS 3480 reference, with a queried -ṣi-, is cited by Clay PN, p. 80); ḫi-ṣib-til-la in Ni. 5860 ii 5’; 8’; and Ni. 6470 ii’ 9’. That ḫišib-Tilla is not simply a variant of Ḫašib-Tilla seems likely from the fact that these names are used to designate different persons in three of the same rosters.
41 As noted in CAD ḫ s.v. ḫišbu A.
42 One may have to reckon with improvised renderings by local scribes of sounds absent from the customary Babylonian phonological inventory or with traditional writings imported by foreign scribes educated elsewhere. Or, in this case, could the similarity of the non-theophoric elements of the two names (ḫišib and ḫašib) have influenced the scribal choice of orthography? It may also be noted that work rosters record the presence of foreign scribes at Nippur in the Middle Babylonian period (for example, scribes from Arrapḫa are mentioned in Ni. 1624 ii’ 8’–9’).
dated in year 3 of Šagarakti-Šuriaš (= 1243 B.C.).

Insofar as I am aware, there does not appear to be an appropriate element ḫag(i) or ḫak(i) in Akkadian, Kassite, or Hurrian; and there seems to be no obvious explanation of this name.

These names are mentioned here as potential further examples of the /ḥif/ personal-name category, but better and less ambiguous evidence is needed to determine with reasonable certainty how they are to be read and interpreted.

---

EARLY SEMITIC LOANWORDS IN SUMERIAN

Miguel Civil, The University of Chicago

The existence of two successive layers of loanwords (hereafter LW) of Semitic origin in Sumerian has been recognized for a very long time. The first and older one has the ending -a, the second the ending -um. A third, and presumably still older, layer of endingless forms, such as silim, has been of course recognized, 1 but the words belonging to it have so far not been systematically collected and analyzed. The present article is a first attempt to examine, at least partially, this lexical subset. Its existence and importance are not surprising, given the close symbiosis of Sumerians and Semites in southern Mesopotamia since the beginning of historical times. I am pleased to offer this article as a modest homage to my friend and colleague Robert D. Biggs, who presented the earliest convincing evidence for the presence of Semites among the Mesopotamian scribes. 2

1 This article is a partial result of an investigation aimed at detecting regularities in the phonological shape of the entries of the Sumerian lexicon 3 and the possible relationship of those shapes with semantic sets as well as with historical factors in the formation of the lexicon. The historical aspect will be limited here to the identification of possible Semitic etymologies. 4 To keep the investigation within reasonable limits,

2 See his pioneering article “Semitic Names in the Fara Period,” JCS 36 (1967): 55–66 and especially his monumental work Inscriptions from Tell Abū Ṣalābīkh, OIP 99 (Chicago, 1974), pp. 34–35. Some of the points discussed in this paper, and related matters, have already been presented by me at the 204th (Madison, Wisconsin, 1994) and 206th (Philadelphia, 1996) Annual Meetings of the American Oriental Society, and at the 48th Rencontre Assyriologique International in Leiden in 2002. I thank my colleagues Gonzalo Rubio and Leonid Kogan for their suggestions and corrections. Of course, all errors are mine. The financial aid of the Institut Català de Recerca i d’Estudis Avançats (Barcelona) is gratefully acknowledged.
3 The term “lexicon” is taken here as the inventory of the lexical (as opposed to grammatical) morphemes of a language, but the label “lexical phonology” is avoided because of its associations with particular linguistic schools.
4 This is not to deny that there cannot be other sources, besides the uncontrollable, unknown languages of the area. Indo-European, for instance, may have provided a certain number of words, such as maḥ “large, great” (competing with gal); cf. Skt. mah-, Gk. μέγας, IE *meǵ(h)-; see also the discussion of dītaraḥ below. To date, published attempts to identify Indo-European words have been rather unfortunate; see G. Rubio, “On the Alleged ‘Pre-Sumerian Substratum’,” JCS 51 (1999): 9–11.
it will be arbitrarily circumscribed to a graphically and phonologically defined lexical subset of words that fulfill the following conditions:

\[ a \) the word must have the form \( C_1 V_1 C_2 V_2 C_3 \);\]
\[ b \) \( V_1 = V_2; \]
\[ c \) \( -V_2 C_3 \) should not be -um, unless it can be proved that this \( m \) is part of the radical; otherwise there are no restrictions in the choice of the consonants (including duplicated consonants and clusters);
\[ d \) the word, as far as it can be ascertained, should not be the result of a reduplication process nor a (homovocalic) compound of two monosyllabic roots.

The provisional exclusion of heterovocalic CVCVC-forms, such as ḥaššur “apple” or ḥazin “ax,” as well as of items of the form VCVC, such as asal “poplar” (Arabic atāl ‘tl, Heb. ešal, Egypt. jzsr.(t) “tamarisk”) or udun “oven” (Akk. alūṭu, Arabic ‘attūn, Ge’eż ‘etōn), whose etymology may involve at times initial Semitic “laryngeals,” is due purely to economy of space. Homovocalic variants of words regularly attested as heterovocalic are also omitted, such as ḥubur, variant of ḥe(n)bur “reed shoot”; ḥulup, variant of ḥalup “a kind of tree”; and so on. A further exclusion eliminates Akkadian words given in some syllabaries in the construct state, such as UR = ka-la-ab in Proto-Ea 648. Condition \( d \) requires (1) that the word not be a transparent compound such as ṣušur “beam” < ṣe/š “piece of wood” + ūr “roof,” with vowel assimilation, or nis(s)ig “vegetable” < niṣ “thing” + sig “green,” or the result of vowel harmony: za-pa-ág “shout” < zi “breath” + pa-ág “to emit(?);” (2) nor should it be an opaque compound (in practice, no confirmation of this fact will be possible in most cases) such as šidim “mason,” conceivably from ši(g)₄ “brickwork” + dūm “to build”; (3) unambiguous reduplicated forms must also be eliminated: babbar “white” < bar + bar, nunus “eggs” < *nus + nus, etc. The rationale behind the choice of CVCVC-forms, besides keeping the length of this article within reasonable limits, is that longer lexical items provide a wider, safer base of comparison and the risk of operating with chance similarities is thus minimized. There are no doubt shorter LWs, but the phonological correspondences will be more solidly established first with the help of the longer ones, so that the results of the study of the \( C_1 V_1 C_2 V_2 C_3 \)-forms, as defined above, will be but a first step toward an examination of the whole lexicon.

2. It is not easy to determine the monosyllabic or polysyllabic nature of a Sumerian word. Apparently monosyllabic entries dominate the Sumerian lexicon. Of the 200 most frequent verbal stems, only about 8 percent are graphically bisyllabic; the rest

\[ ^5 \] C in this paper includes consonantal clusters.
\[ ^6 \] Other processes may be involved, as in ušum “(mythical) snake” < *wušum < bušum (MUŠ

\( = bù-šúm, \) in Ebla; cf. Akk. bašmu, Ugar. ḫn, Arabic baṭan.\)
are monosyllabic. Statistics about nominal stems give similar results: samples from literary texts show 79–82 percent of monosyllabic roots, 10–15 percent of bisyllabic, 7–8 percent of CVCVC-forms. Due to the nature of cuneiform syllabic writing and to various scribal habits, however, the graphic syllabification may not exactly match the phonological one. Syllabic writing cannot directly represent a word-initial or word-final consonantic cluster without the insertion of an epenthetic vowel or the (graphic) elision of one of the consonants, usually the first. At all times, the scribes alternate very frequently, and freely(?), between CVC and CVCV definitions. Thus nî-ir “foot” alternating with nî-ri may in principle represent /niːr/ or /niri/; ka-la-ak “strong” can be /kalk/, /klak/, or /kalak/; and so on. Furthermore, in these cases, as well as in apparently bisyllabic words of the form VCV, such as igi, aga, ugu, etc., the scribe could have used a final vowel to indicate some property of the consonant or of the preceding, not contiguous, vowel, as in the English spellings of the type ate, same, etc. The sonority hierarchy of the syllable makes it quite likely that in a sequence stop + liquid a vowel in between is a merely graphic epenthesis. Furthermore, a CV graphic syllable can correspond in fact to a CVC syllable, due to the scribal conventions that may delete the graphic representation of syllable-final consonants. Thus one has spellings, such as du-si (/tupsik/) “basket for dirt,” written alternatively tu-up-ši-ik (Hh. V–VII 194 Emar) (Akk. tupšikku), with cluster simplification and nonrepresentation of the final consonant. A Sumerian LW in Akkadian, if available, can disambiguate between CVC- and CVCV-forms. In the first case, the LW will end in -CCu, in the second with a long vowel -û.

3. All the preceding considerations suggesting that the writing CVCVC could occasionally represent a phonologically monosyllabic word do not really affect the outcome of the present investigation. The triconsonantic structure remains in all cases

---

7 Note that igi gives the LWs igu and igû in Akkadian, failing to provide an answer. The long form, however, may be due to the fact that sign names tend to end in a long vowel. Cf., on the other hand, the formation of the so-called marâ-forms of the Sumerian verb by the addition of the suffix -e, which may simply signal a change in the stem vowel. Finally, and as a corollary, traditionally accepted CVCV-forms may be in fact CVC: dumu “son” could very well be /dum/. The syllabaries give equal chances to both forms, and the frequent parallelism dam // dum(u) could, perhaps, be an indication that the short form is preferable. Note, however, the Emešal spelling du₂-mu (that could nonetheless be taken as an indication of an Emešal reading */dum/) and the Greek transcription δομο in S. M. Maul, “Neues zu den ‘Graeco-Babylonica,’ ” ZA 81 (1991): 92:7.

8 This phenomenon is not limited to obstruent + liquids. An epenthetic vowel may be present in words of the form C₁iC₂a(C₃), where C₁ is a sibilant and C₂ a stop or a lateral. Examples include šita “mace,” šitan “small ditch,” sila “street,” silà “measure,” sipad “shepherd,” and many others. The hypothesis that phonologically they are /štə/, /slə/, /spə/, etc., is extremely likely. Equally likely is the assumption that the syllabary definitions of the word for “bread” (ni-in-da, in-da, ni-da, i-da, and ì-da) are attempts to represent /nda/ or /nta/. Note that such phenomena do not need to be purely graphic; Spanish cruz “cross,” for instance, gives ruz in Chol Mayan and kurus in Tzotzil Mayan.
intact and can thus always be compared with a presumed Semitic original. Once a credible relationship between a Sumerian word and a Semitic counterpart has been established, the problem of the direction of the borrowing should be tackled. Given the lack of information about the early stages of Akkadian and the uncertainties about archaic Semitic, the whole resting on a background of unknown linguistic entities, clear answers often will be impossible. Even if it can be established that two words are cognates, the direction of a borrowing often cannot be ascertained. The possibilities are many. A word (1) may have entered the Sumerian lexicon from what one could call Proto-Akkadian, in which case the word may or may not have survived into the historical stages of Akkadian, (2) it may have been borrowed from a Semitic language other than Akkadian, or (3) Sumerian and Semitic/Akkadian may both stem from a common, unknown source. In the opposite direction, (4) a Sumerian word may have been borrowed by a Semitic language. For instance, the name of the šutur-garment may be a derivation of the root str “to cover, to hide,” well attested in Semitic but not in Akkadian (except perhaps in Old Assyrian šitru). The words zú-lum and sulupp su “date,” like other terms related to the date palm, both come in all likelihood from an unknown language spoken in the Gulf area, according to botanists the location of the origin of the date palm. The other Semitic languages have a different word for the date: Arabic tamr, tummār, and parallels. Backborrowings are also possible: Arabic bunżur (and vars.) “female sex organ,” a common Semitic term, became b/penzer in Sumerian but seems to have reentered Akkadian as (u)pinzer “cobweb” and bunzirru “hunting blind.” One case where the direction of borrowing is clear is Akk. us/zqûru “crescent moon”: Sumerian shares saḫar (with var. s/sakar) “moon” with Semitic (šaḥr) and adds u₄ to the form u₄-sak/šar. The Akkadian initial u- and the -q- show that the term was borrowed from Semitic through Sumerian.

4. From the examination of the list of CVCVC-words in the Appendix (see below), one can draw the conclusion that a sizable number of them have a Semitic etymology, creating the presumption that the words of unknown origin in the same list may very well be in their majority, if not Semitic, at least foreign. As for more specific details about the form of the LWs from Semitic, as well as about the borrowing process, one can draw here only very provisional conclusions, since the evidence has been restricted, in an arbitrary way, to a particular homovocalic form. Additional evidence, from long, heterovocalic forms, as well as from shorter words, will be required for safer, more general, conclusions. One can, nevertheless, already formulate a few conclusions.

---

9 Cf. also Arabic tamar “fruit” and the name of the date palm: Sum. nimbar, Akk. (giš)-šimmar.
10 It is likely, however, that the number of Semitic LWs is much higher among the CVCVC- and VCVC-words than among shorter ones, due to the high frequency of triconsonantism in Semitic stems.
4.1. Writing and Phonology

It must be remembered that the writing system is markedly underdifferentiating, as
easily seen in (2) below and in the well-known case of stops and sibilants (not exam-
ined here).

(1) Many of the words in the list are always, or at least very frequently, written syl-
labically in texts with standard orthography and in the vocabularies.

(2) [H]-signs, very frequent in the list, correspond to a wide range of Semitic
sounds: 
, ‘, h, ġ. In some cases, however, the Semitic consonant is omitted
altogether.\textsuperscript{11} In any case, the opinion that Akkadian lost these sounds due to
Sumerian influence is in need of revision.

(3) [H] alternates with [R] in Sumerian apparently only in words of Semitic origin
(besides šuḫ/ruš “root,” šuḫ/ruz “to set on fire,” note ḫ/ruš “angry,” Akk. ezzu),
pointing to a fricative uvular pronunciation of the rhotic,\textsuperscript{12} contrasting
with the “flap” pronunciation suggested by the common graphic alternation
<r/d>.

(4) Alternations between [L] and [R] are frequent (including metathesis), as well as
between [N] and [L]; there are also some infrequent alternations between [D]
and [S].

(5) Alternations between /bu/ and /gu/ are shown to be an internal phenomenon of
Sumerian; words with etymological /b/ have variants with /g/.

(6) [S] would correspond exceptionally to /š/ in saḫar and *salam.

(7) The typological issue of the excessive number of u-vowels in Sumerian is
evident in the list (a = 33.8 percent, i = 26.7 percent, but u = 39.4 percent).
It cannot be discussed here other than to say that it can already be detected in
the Ebla Sign List: ū-su-ru₁₂-(um) for e-sīr “sandal” (96), ū-ru₁₂-š(ūm) for
ereš “lady” (30), ū-šu-wu-(um) for anše “donkey” (85), and so on. It may be
due to a variety of reasons ranging from the presence of an undetected (and
undetectable) additional back vowel to a possible use of /u/ as a “neutral”
vowel in citation forms.

\textsuperscript{11} Resulting in a VCVC-word; for instance, a-ga-
am “doorkeeper’s helper”; cf. Arabic ‘a‘gama “to
close the door,” Soqotri *egom “barrer, obstructer”; see W. Leslau, Lexique Soqotri (Sudarabique mo-
derne) avec comparaisons et explications étymo-

\textsuperscript{12} But in what language, Sumerian or Semitic?
Note that in the first example Sum. h/r corre-
sponds to Sem. -r- (šrš); in the second it corre-
sponds to -h- (ḥdq) and in the last to -z- (‘zz).
4.2. Morphology

(1) Verbal roots are mostly conjugated according to the regular rules of Sumerian: they are provided with normal verbal affixes and subject to reduplication.

(2) There are, however, a number of cases that use a periphrastic conjugation with the auxiliaries ak, dug₄/e, or dù.

(3) Plural/totality is at times indicated by reduplication.

(4) The assimilated verbal stems with initial šu- (mostly causative š-forms) are reanalyzed as native compound verbs with šu; the remaining part can then be given the status of independent stem. Note also some nouns with initial /ša/ interpreted as ša-.

4.3. Lexicon

(1) A borrowing process often results in “doublets”; the new, foreign word does not eliminate a semantically close native one that is retained, but whose meaning may be readjusted, taking on a more specialized (or conversely more generic) sense: kaskal and ṣar-ra-an “road, caravan”; ṣír and ba-da-ra “knife, sword”; me and ṣar-za “legal/religious duties” (both Akk. parṣu, Arabic fard); agar and ašag/k “cultivated field”; and so on.

(2) A group of words sharing a concrete phonological pattern may belong to the same semantic field. The best-known example is the pattern C₁aC₂sin, which includes almost exclusively terms related to cereal culture and brewing. The pattern C₁aC₂ur designates trees (ḫašḥur “apple tree,” ḫalup “a type of oak,” etc.) and is, perhaps, of “Caucasic” origin. In the present list one can easily detect the well-known pattern C₁aC₂aC₃ in words common to Semitic designating professions. Conversely, the members of one borrowed semantic field may have no common phonological pattern. The names of equids in Sumerian would seem to be all foreign, but they show no common pattern. No phonological structure, for instance, is common to two borrowed words related to land tenure: temen “reserved plot in a field” (hence “perimeter of a sacred area”) and agar “agricultural field,” presumably related to τέμενος and ὀφρος respectively. The linguistic origin of the semantic fields has a historical and cultural significance. Provisionally, it is worth pointing out the apparent southern origin of the names of some containers and, curiously, of some anatomical terms.

---

14 The close semantic resemblance between the Sumero-Akkadian and the Arabic terms would seem worthy of close study.
5. The time of entry of these LWs into the Sumerian lexicon cannot be determined with any satisfactory degree of accuracy. Nor is there any evidence that they arrived all at once within a limited period of time. The majority are words of extremely low frequency, or even *hapax legomena*, and the kind of texts in which they would be expected are practically nonexistent before the eighteenth century B.C. Note, however, cases such as šu-du₃-ûr, already in Early Dynastic lists. An indication of an early date would be the morphological adaptation, reflected in the normal verbal affixes and reduplication, and the reanalysis of verbs with šu- as compound verbs. Both could take place only, it would seem, at a period when Sumerian was very much a living language. It is possible, however, that at some relatively late time LWs were introduced as a sort of literary fashion. This would apply, for instance, to periphrastic forms with dù (instead of the expected dug₁/e or ak), such as ga-ba-al-dù or sikil-dù-a, typical forms in Old Babylonian Edubba texts.

6. In conclusion, there are a number of Semitic lexical borrowings in Sumerian, many of them apparently coming directly from a language other than Akkadian, even when they also appear in historical Akkadian. Their number is moderate, far from the number of Arabic words in Spanish, or French words in Middle English, and clearly lower than the number of borrowings from Sumerian into Akkadian but, nevertheless, significant and consonant with the coexistence of Sumerian- and Semitic-speaking populations that must have taken place from the dawn of history. Every presumed LW requires a detailed study of its individual history, something for future investigation by others. The purpose of this article is just to establish the existence of this phenomenon, as a starting point for further investigation.

**APPENDIX: CHECKLIST OF CVCVC-WORDS IN SUMERIAN**

This appendix includes most of the homovocalic CVCVC-words of the Sumerian lexicon (a few possibly *lexicalized* reduplications, for example, kinkin or gigir, and some borderline cases have been included). Discussion and nonessential references have been kept to a minimum. To justify in detail a single entry would often require an article-length study. The headword in the individual entries is given in transcription, followed by the essential evidence from the syllabaries and other graphic data and an

---

English gloss. The Akkadian translation and Semitic parallels then follow. If the Akkadian translation is not etymologically compatible with the headword, it is separated by a semicolon. If the Semitic relationship of a word is apparently well established on the basis of a single language, no effort has been made to include all the information about the distribution of this word within the Semitic family (e.g., in Ugar., Aram., etc.). Morphological information (Morph.) about inflected forms, if attested, some literary passages (Lit.), and occasional comments may be added at the end. The entries have been kept as brief as possible; as a rule, information about the sources that can be found easily in the syllabaries and customary dictionaries is not given. The entries are grouped in three sublists, according to their vowel, e and i being grouped together (except in words where they are consistently attested as different, as in geštin “vine, wine”). Personal and geographical names are excluded from the list.

**CaCaC**


002. bandar (syll. ba-dar; ḫA-tenū: ba-an-dar) “dagger” (or the like) Akk. patru. Var. of ba-da-ra, but cf. Akk. patarru (back loan?).

003. baraḫ (syll. ba-ra-āj) “brawl?” PSD B 19b s.v.; possibly a form of the verb ra-āj. Cf. gaba-ra-āj “rebellion.”


005. daban (syll. da-ba-an, da-ban; KU7: da-ba-an) “a leather part of the horse harness”; Akk. šardappu.


009. ganam (LAGAB×GUD+GUD and vars.: ga-nam) “sheep” Arabic ġanam “sheep” (collective); Akk. immertu, laḫru “ewe.”

---

16 Note, however, the widespread opinion that the original Indo-European form was closer to the τορκος of Hesiod (and the τορκες of Hesychius) because of sporadic Greek spellings with initial ζ (ζορζ) and common Celtic *yorck-; see, for example, P. Chantraine, *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque: histoire des mots* (Paris, 1968–80), p. 293.
011. gašam/n (NUN.ME.TAG: ga-šá-am) “artisan, expert”; Akk. mudû “expert” and syn.
012. gašan, Emesal form of din.
014. ḫarran (syll. ḫar-ra-an) “road” Akk. ḫarrânu, Soqotri ʿorim (better ʿorim), Mehri ḥörü “road” are unlikely cognates.
015. kalak (syll. ka-la-ak-k, ka-la-k; KAL: ka-al complement -g-) “strong”; Akk. dannu.
016. kal/nam (syll. ka-na-m-, ka-na-ŋ-, ge-ne-m- Ebla; UN: ka-nam, ka-lam, ka-la-ma; Emesal ka-na-âŋ) “homeland”; Akk. mātu. Despite the traditional transliteration with -l-, the form with -n- is lexically better attested. Perhaps a compound ki + X.
017. kamar (syll. ka-mar, ki-mar Pre-Sar.; NI: ga-mar) “a fish trap” Akk. kamâru A. A compound of ki, in view of the Pre-Sar. var. ki-mar.
018. kankan (KÁ: ka-an-ka-an, a-ga-an, a-ka-an, a-ka, ka-a) “gate”; Akk. bâbu. Perhaps a redupl. of /(a)kan/. The form akan is the better attested against traditional transliteration kâ.
019. kapar (syll. ga-ab-bar, gâb-ra; PA.DAG.KISIM×KAK: [ka]-bar/pár) “a shepherd” Akk. kaparru. The spelling gâb-ra, which looks like an active participle of the type ga-b-R, is based on folk etymology and is not the source of the Akkadian form.
020. kapas (syll. ka-pa-z-) “sea snail” Akk. kapâšu, from kapâšu “to curl”; Sem. qpš in AHw.
021. k/garan (syll. ga-ra-an) “a bunch of fruits” Akk. karânu “grapes”; also inbu. See also girin.
022. karaš A (KI.KAL.IDIM: ka-ra-âš, ga-ra-âš) “army camp” Akk. karašu A. Could be a compound ki + X.
023. karaš B (wr. as in garaš A) “disaster” Akk. karašû, Arabic karraṭa, with chronological and semantic problems.
025. karam (GÁ×UD: ka-ra-am) “ruin” Akk. karmu.
026. katam (syll. ga-dam) “cover” Akk. katammu.
027. laban (EZEN×LA: la-ba-an) “a sheep disease”; Akk. pismu. See also libin and lubun.
028. labar (syll. la-bar Emesal), (1) “servant”; Akk. ardu, (2) “cantor”; Akk. kalû, (3) “minister”; Akk. sukkaḻu. Could be main dialect written NU-bar = la-g-bar. Like libir, labar has a wide range of meanings in need of clarification.
lagab (LAGAB: la-ga-ab) “block”; Akk. upqu and related terms.

lagar A (SAL.ME: la-ga-ar, lu-ku-ur) “a religious/social class of women”; Akk. nadiṭu.


lagar C syn. of labar (3).

laḥan (syll. la-ḥa-da-m- Ebla, la-ḥa-an) “jug” Akk. laḥannu “a type of bottle.” Cf. λεκόνη (AHw.)?

laḥar (syll. na-ḥi-r- Ebla; LAGAB×GUD and vars.: la-ḥar, la-ḥa-rû) “ewe” Akk. laḥru, Sem. rḥl (metathesis).

laḥtan (NUNUZ.ÁB≈LA/SILÀ and vars.: laḥ-ta-an) “a jar for brewing” Akk. laḥtanu. The lex. texts make a careful distinction between laḥan and laḥtan; the relation between the two is unclear.

larāḥ (syll. la-ra-aḥ) “narrowness, distress”; Akk. puṣqu.

madal (BU: ma-da-al, mu-du-ul, ma-ad-la, mu-ud-la, ma-al-la, mu-ul-la) “a pole to carry loads”; Akk. maššû, makkû “a pole.”

makkaš (AŠ, DIŠ: ma-ak-kaš, ma-ka-āš) “scream”; Akk. ikkilu.

malāḥ (syll. má-laḥ) “boatman” Akk. malāḫu. A native compound or popular etymology?

masap (syll. gi.ma-sá-ab) “a type of basket” Akk. masabbu/masappu, Soqotri msefi, Amharic masob [LS 289].


maškan (syll. maš-gān) “place, settlement” Akk. maškanu, Arabic maskan.


naŋaḥ (syll. na-ga-ŋaḥ) “stupid”; Akk. nu ’ū. Cf. perhaps Arabic ḫaḡḡa, Soqotri nohog “jouer, s’amuser.”

nanam (ŠÀ×NE: na-nam, ni-ni-im) “jealousy”; redupl.? Akk. qinū.


---

17 Perhaps derived from a gentilic, compare nu ’ū/nuwâ ’um “Anatolian native” in Old Assyrian texts. Note Soqotri mangainah, manqaynah “fou” (from gnh, derived from n-gnn “être, devenir fou”). The change gnn > gnḡ, however, is specifically Soqotri.

048. palak (syll. ba-la-g-, ma-la-g- Ebla; BAL: ba-la) “spindle” Akk. pilaqqu, Heb. pelek.

049. papaḥ (syll. pa-pa-āḥ) “inner room” Akk. papāhu. Redupl.?

050. papal (syll. pa-pa-al) “shoot, tendril” Akk. papallu. Redupl.?

051. parak n. (BARĀ: ba-ra, pa-ra-ak) (1) “curtain of separation” (around the area reserved to the king and royal family or to a deity in a temple), fig. “royal person, royal abode” Akk. parakku, Sem. ḫprq “to separate,” Akk. parāqu (but cf. also parāku “to put an obstacle on the way”),18 (2) “a package made with sackcloth”; Akk. bašamu, saqqu.

052. parak v. (DAG: ba-ra, ba-ar, pa-ăr, complement -g-) “to spread out (a net, a bedspread, etc.)”; Akk. šuparruru.


054. sabad (GÁ≈SIG‡: sa-bad) “battle” or “middle part?”; 19 Akk. qablu. Var. /sad/ with slightly different signs.


056. saŋjar (syll. sa-gar) in sa-gar — ak “to spin”; Akk. ūmāṭ.


059. saḥ/kar (syll. sa-kar, åá-kar, var. sa-ḥar) (1) in uš-sakar “crescent moon” Akk. usq/kāru, South Arabic and Sem. šahr “moon”; (2) “a vessel” Akk. šaharratu.

060. *salam “statue, figure,” assuming an interpretation sa‡-alam or sa‡alam, Akk. salmu; otherwise bunnannū, etc.

061. samak (URUDA×U, UM/DUB, and vars.; sa-ma-ak, su-mu-uk) “mole, wart”; Akk. šulu, umṣatu.

062. saman (ÉŠ.SUD.NUN.ÉŠ.TU and vars.: sa-ma-an, su-mu-un) “leading rope” Akk. šummanu, Arabic zīmām “rein, halter.”

---


19 Lex. hapax, cannot be decided to which of the two qabilu homonyms it belongs.

20 [SED no. 284] would separate, against AHw. and CAD, sērū “back” from sērū “desert,” the latter belonging originally to the root šyr.

064. šagan (U.GAN: sa-ka-an, sa-ma-an, šá-gan) “a vessel”; Akk. šikkatu A.

065. šațar (KA×GAR: ša-gá-ar; Esmesal ša-mar) “hunger” Soqotri šáqar, šágar, with Kushitic parallels; Akk. bubûtu A and syns.

066. šakal (syll. šá-kal) “a tree” Akk. šakkullu.

067. šamaḫ (syll. šá-maḫ) “large intestine” Akk. šammâḫu, šamaḫḫu (also irru kabru), Ge‘ ez semâḥḥîḥ “spleen” [SED no. 247].

068. šarag (syll. ša-ra-g-, -š-ra-g-; SAR-g-) “to dry up, to shrink”; Akk. ụbbulu, muṯtu. Morph. ba-da-an-ša-ra, mu-(un)-ša-ra-ge, nam-ba-ša-ra-ge-en, nu-ša-ra-ge.

069. šaraḫ (syll. šá-ra-ḫ) (1) “to knead (clay),” (2) “to double a reed plaiting” Arabic sara’a “to braid, plait”; Akk. (1) pasâlu, pisîlu, (2) eşēpu “to twine.”


071. šatam (syll. šá-tam) “a functionary” Akk. šatammu.


074. tamkar (syll. dam-gâr) “merchant” Akk. tamkâru. Cf. Heb. makar, etc.


076. zagar (syll. za-gâr) “tower” Akk. zaqâru “to be high, pointed.” Cf. ziqqurratum, also Akk. dimtu.

077. zaḥhal (syll. za-ḥa-al) “to disappear” Arabic zaḥala “to go away.” In za-ḥa-al—ak; Akk. ḫalâqu “to disappear.”

078. zaḥ胺 (syll. za-ḥa-am, za-ḥa-an) “a mineral”(?); Akk. unknown. Lit. kû-babbar-üz níg-za-ḥa-am(var. -an)-še ḥé-sa₁₀-sa₁₀ Agade 243; the context requires the name of a mineral or metal of a value between that of silver and that of copper. As a verb: za-ḥa-am-ma-mu-dè Inanna-Abzu col. ii 19 (broken context). Cf. perhaps Arabic saḥ/ḥam “black.” One could propose manganese oxide (“kohl”) for the noun and “to make up (the eyes)” for the verb.

21 The translation ša libbi espu, in Hh. VIII 310 (revised) and parallels, shows that it was understood as a compound: ša + ra-ḥā.
079. zaḥan (U.GA: za-ḥa-an) (1) “a cereal concoction” Akk. zaḥānu, also dīktu, (2) “a saucer” (?). Cf. perhaps Arabic, Jibbali ṣaḥn, Soqotri ṣaḥen.

080. zaḥaš (syll. za-ḥa-āš) “leg”; Akk. purīdu “leg,” also puṣqu “narrowness, difficulty.”

081. zalag/k (UD: za-la-ag) “clean, shiny, bright”; Akk. ābbu and syns. Cf. zīlg/k [DRS 733, 742].

082. zalaḫ (syll. za-la-āḫ) “to slip through an opening (said of a draft, a ghost)” Arabic zala’ā “to slide along, to slip”; Akk. zāqu. Morph. mu-un-za-la-āḫ-(ḥe)-e-ne, nam-ba-za-la-ḥe-en.

083. zalam (syll. za-lam) in za-lam-gar “tents.” Cf. perhaps Arabic zlām “members of a clan/tribe”?


085. zaral A (syll. za-ra-āḥ, and KI.SAG.SAL for [2]) (1) “female genitals” (or a disease thereof); cf. perhaps Soqotri zirho “saleté”; Akk. laqlaqqu, (2) “a bird name”; Akk. igirū “heron” (?) and laqlaqqu “stork.”

086. zaral B (SAG.PA.LAGAB: za-ra-āḥ, also LU.KI.KAK, KU.KI.SAG) “grief”; Akk. nissatu. Cf. perhaps Akk. and Arabic āṣṛḥ, if the grief is expressed with sounds.

CiCiC/CeCeC

087. b/penzer (syll. pe-en-ze₂-er, be₂-en-ze₂-er, bi-in-zi-ir) “the female sex organ, or part thereof” Akk. biṣṣūru, Arabic baṣr, bunṣur, with vars. [SED no. 37]; Sum. also “cobweb,” by semantic extension.

088. birig (syll. bi-ri-ig) “to sneer at”; Akk. ganāṣu.

089. dikbir (KI.NE.AN.MÙÅ: di-ik-bi-ir) “?”; Akk. aṣur pindi and vars. Perhaps < *X + kibir, since the Akk. term seems to have something to do with fire or coal.

090. dilim A (di-li-NE Ebla; LIŠ: di-li-im) “shallow dish, bowl, spoon, skull” Akk. tilištu but more frequently itqvuru, itqurtu. It is possible, in view of the distribution of their different forms, and despite their different Akkadian translations, that dilim = itqvuru, silim (KAL) = ḫub/pšašû, and ti-lim-(da) = karpatu, represent one and the same word.22 Cf. also lim₈(BUR) “bowl” Akk. lummu. Var. silim/silim in Dialogue 1:35.

---

22 For the consonantic alternation, cf. d/s/tal = rapāšu.
091. dilim (LAGAB×IM: di-li-im, and vars.) “oven.” Part of a group of vars. of šu-rin “oven” with r > 1 and final -m/n (JCS 25 [1973]: 173); influenced by dilim A?


095. dinik A (syll. di-ni-g-; KI.NE: di-ni-ig) “crucible, brazier”; Akk. kûru B.

096. dinik B (LÚ.(ME).EN, LÚ.LAGAB: di-ni-ig) “important person”; Akk. šapsu.

097. dirîk (syll. di-ri-k-; SI.A: di-ri, complement -g-) “to be more, to surpass”; Akk. (w)atûru.


099. g/kid/tim (syll. gi-dim, ki-ti-im, -ga-[i]-m Ebla) “ghost of a dead person”; Akk. eøemmu. The form with k- is the better attested. The Akkadian word is probably related, but it is not clear how, perhaps kit/dim < ki + idim. For another case of the loss of initial k-, see kešeg.

100. gidim (gé-dím) “an ax” Sem. *gdm, Akk. (Mari) qudûmu; otherwise, Akk. agû, titennu. The relationship with aga/aga = ṣû-du-mu (Emar), ṣû-du-mu-um (Ebla), and cognates (Aram., Tigre, etc.) is not completely clear.

101. g/kid/tim (syll. gi-dim, ki-ti-im, -ga-[i]-m Ebla) “ghost of a dead person”; Akk. etemmu. The form with k- is the better attested. The Akkadian word is probably related, but it is not clear how, perhaps kit/dim < ki + idim. For another case of the loss of initial k-, see kešeg.


103. gili mb (GI≈GI≈: gi-li-im, ki-li-im, gi-ib) “to put crosswise, to obstruct”; Akk. parâku, egêru, etc.

104. ɲilip (KA×LI: gá-li, gi-li, me-li, mi-li, mi-ri, mi-li-b- UET 6 354:3; me-li Hh. XV 31b; gi-ri VAT 9523 i’ 8’; KAXRÚ: mi-li-ib; KAXNIG+SÅ+A: me-li; KAXU: me-li) “melodious voice.” Cf. Akk. ḫalâlu B “to pipe, wheeze,” Ge‘ez ḫеллат, Heb. ḥâlîl “flute”), also Akk. ma’latu, mallatu, nemêlu “throat, or part thereof.” There could be two words, one *ɲjili/ or */ɲill/ root *ɲll, the other /ɲilip/.


106. girin A (gi-ri-in, gi-rin; LAGAB: gi-ri-im, gi-ri-in, gi-ri₄-in) “flower” Akk. girîmmu, girînnu (from Sum.); also illuru, inbu and syn. In Sumerian contexts,
the meaning is “flower” rather than “fruit.” The word belongs to an apparent Ablaut set with gurun “fruit” and garan “a bunch of fruits.”


108. ḫiskim (IGI.DUB: giš-gi-im, giš-ki-im, i-is-ki-im; Emesal mu-uš-ki-im) “sign, signal” Akk. giskimmu; usually ittu A. A compound of ḫiš.

109. ḫibis (syl. ḫi-pi-is; TUR.DIŞ: ḫi-bi-is; AL×UŠ: ḫi-bi-is) (1) “?”; Akk. ruššû A “to act in contempt(?)”; (2) aplu “son,” and cf. ḫibis-kar = mēlu lu “to play.” There are a number of textual problems in the lexical sources, and in the various Akk. translations, concerning this word.

110. ḫilip A (NAGA: ḫi-li-ib, ḫé-li-ib) “to thrive, flourish” Akk. elēpu, Soqotri ʿolif “pousser (feuilles)” [LS 311]; Akk. also šămāḫu “to flourish” and nāḫu “to (be) calm.”

111. ḫilip B (IGI.KUR: ḫi-li-ib) “netherworld.”

112. ḫenzer n. (IGI.DIM: ḫe-en-zèr, ḫe-e[n-]e-ru) “small, infant.”


116. ḫirin C (KU₂: ḫi-ri-in) “waterskin” Akk. ḫirin nu, as a foreign word in Malku; also zim/buḫaru Ea IV 194. The usual Akk. term is nādu.


118. kilib (LAGAB, LAGAB.LAGAB: ki-li-ib, ki-lib, ki-līb) “totality”; Akk. napharu.


120. kirid (KĒŠ: ki-ri-id, ki-ri-is) “pin, needle” Akk. kirissu.


122. kisim B (DAG.KISIM₅×SI: ki-si-im) “sheepfold”; Akk. tarbašu.

123. kisim C (DAG.KISIM₅×U+GĪR: ki-si-im) “an insect”; Akk. šiḫu.


125. kešeg (syl. ke-še-eg; GĪR, Ú.GĪR: ki-ši) “a thorny plant” Akk. ašāgu, Arabic šōk.

126. kešer (syl. ke-še-er; GĪR.BAR) in ke-še-er nu-tuku “to have no limit” Arabic kaṭara “to be too much”; Akk. kišda la išū.
127. kezer (yll. ke-zé-er) in ke-zé-er — ak “to wear a chignon (or the like)”\textsuperscript{24} Akk. kezēru, and cf. kašāru “to tie together, to knot,” Heb. qšr, Aram. qtr, Ge’ez q’waşara.

128. libin (EZEN×LI: li-bi-in) “a disease of ovines”; Akk. irdu. See also laban and lubun.


130. libir; Emesal form of nimjir, sukkal, etc.

131. libiš (ÁB.ŞÀ: li-biš; λεπεσ) “heart, courage”; Akk. libbu. The lex. attestations of this word are very late. Perhaps < libbu + iš.


133. ligim/n (IGI.TUR.TUR: li-gi-in, li-gi-ma) “offspring, offshoot” Akk. ligimû, also ziqpu, niplu, etc. The var. li-gi-ma and the Akk. form suggest a word with final vowel.


136. nigin (U.UD.KID: ni-gi-in) (1) “fetus,” (2) “inner room of a temple”; Akk. (1) kūbu, (2) kummu. There is no evidence for the nature of the middle consonant.

137. ninnin A (LAGAB, LAGAB.LAGAB: ni-mi-en, ni-me-in, ni-ge-en, ni-gi-in, ni-in-ni) “to encircle, to go around”; Akk. lamû, paḫûru, etc. Possibly a redupl. form.


140. piriñ (yll. ba-rí-g- Ebla; PIRIG: pi-ri-ig) “lion” (poetic); Akk. labbu, nēšu.

141. sikil A (yll. -s-ki-il, -å-ki-il; EL: si-ki-il, si-ke-el) “clean, pristine, virgin”; Akk. ellu, etc.

142. sikil B (as above) in sikil-dû-a “(acting) silly, stupid” Akk. saklu “simple person,” Syr. skl “(to be) foolish.” In Akk. lex. only, magru “insulting.”

143. silik A (GIÅGAL≈IGI: si-li-ig, åi-li-ig; si-la-g- Ebla) “stopped, ended”(?); Akk. several translations, mostly unclear.


\textsuperscript{24} One must consider kezēru a sort of dou-
blet of kašāru. For the type of hairdo involved, see J. Börker-Klähn, “Haartrachten,” RLA 4,
146. simik. See samak.
147. šibir (U.EN×GÁN-tenû: si-bi-ir, ši-bir) “crooked staff” Akk. šibirru. The form with initial š- is better attested.
149. šikin (syll. ši-kin; DUG, ŠÍG.LAM: ši-ki-in) “a type of clay pot” Akk. šikinnu.
150. šinik (GAD.NAGA: ši-ni-ig, še-ni-ig) “tamarisk”; Akk. bīnu.
152. tikil (syll. ti-ki-il, -t-ki-il) “to protrude(?)” (said of eyes, stomach); Akk. (lipbu) eḫtu, eedu. Morph. igi-ti-ti-ki-il, å̄-at-ki-il.
153. temen (TE: te-me-en) “perimeter, marked-off area” Akk. temennu, Gk. τέμενος.
154. zibin (DAG.KISIM₄×TAK₄, DAG.KISIM₄×Ý+GÍR: zi-bi-in) “caterpillar”; Akk. nappillu.
155. zeber (syll. giš.gud-zé-bè-er [M. Sigrist, Tablettes du Princeton Theological Seminary (Philadelphia, 1990), no. 248]) “a tool”; if this tool is the same as umbin-gud (despite the inversion of components), zeber could be a reflex of Akk. ụpru “fingernail,” Sem. *ṭmpr [SED no. 285].

CuCuC

156. buluṣ A (PAP.PAP: bu-lu-un, bu-lu-ug) “to grow, to raise (a child)”; Akk. rabû, rubbû.
157. buluṣ B (BALAG: bu-lu-un) (1) “a musical instrument” Akk. balaggu, var. of balaq; (2) “to boast, give oneself importance”; Akk. kubburu.
158. buluḫ (ḪAL: bu-lu-ûḫ) “to vomit”; Akk. arû B “to vomit,” also ašû “?,” ḫāṣu B “to worry.” The latter equation indicates some confusion with puļuḫ “to fear.” Onomatopoeic.
159. burut (U: bu-ru, complemented -d) “hole, to pierce” Arabic farata (C. Brockelmann, Lexicon Syriacum [Edinburgh, 1895], p. 609).
161. dubul B (ŠU.BU: du-bu-ul) “to flourish, to be exuberant”; Akk. elēpu.
164. durun (ŠU.LAGAB: du-ru-un) var. of šu-rin “oven.”
165. guduk (syll. gú-du-g⸺; ḫINKUNME: gu-du, complemented -g) “a religious occupation”; Akk. paššu.


168. g/kurum (syll. gu-ru-um) “pile” Akk. karΩmu “to pile up.”

169. gurunu (GURUN and vars.: gu-ru-un) “fruit.” See garan.

170. gurûš (syll. gurû-ru-ûš; TAG: gu-ru-ûš) “to tear to pieces” Akk. qarâšu, Arabic qaraša. Mostly in gurû-ru-ûš—ûr “to bare the teeth, to bite” (said of wild animals); Akk. gâš “to.” Morph. gurû-ru-ûš—dug,e, gû-gurû-ru-ûš (redupl.).

171. gušur (syll. gu-šu-r-) “to compensate” Akk. kašâru C. Morph. ḫa-mu-na-ab-gušu-re (Ur III).

172. ñuruš (syll. mu-rí-š: Ebla; KAL: gu-ru-uš, mu-ru-uš, gi-ri <x>; cf. ARAD×KUR: ki-ra-âš “(able) man”; Akk. etlu. A compound < *ñir-uš or the like?

173. ñubud (syll. ñu-bu-us; KA.ŠU.GÁL: ñu-bu-ud) “to present oneself to a deity” Sem. ḫâ “to serve” (often with religious overtones), Akk. labΩn appi, šukwu.25


178. ñulum (DAG.KISIM₂×LUM/ḤA: ñu-lum) “fishnet” (?) Akk. unknown.

179. ñumulû (LAGAB×U+A: ñu-mu-ûh) “swamp, flooded land”; Akk. miḥšû. The vars. /umaḥ/, /amaḥ/ are better attested, so that it is probably a compound *a-maḥ.

180. ñutul A (syll. ñu-tu-ul) “to shovel, to pile up” (clay, dirt, malt) Akk. ŋutûlu “piled up clay” and ḫadâlu B(!) “to shovel.”

25 The gloss “ZI.UD” in Erimhuš V 170 (CAD B s.v. balâšu lex. section) has to be read ḫu⁻bû⁻-ud. Akk. balâšu includes two verbs: a) “to present oneself to a deity,” as above, and b) “to look at” (perhaps a by-form of palâšu). How the gloss ñubud could be applied to the discontinuous lexeme KA.ŠU.GÁL is an interesting question.
181. ḫutul B (syll. ḫu-tu-ul) “to flare the nostrils” (said of a horse). Lit.: [an]še-kur-ra kir, ḫu-tu-ul-ḫu-tu-ul-e, i-bī gūn-nu-gūn-nu-e “a horse with flaring nostrils, with sparkling eyes” (CT 15 18:27 f.).

182. ḫutul C (syll. ḫu-tu-ul) “to wrap up, to bandage” Akk. ḫadālu A(!), Arabic ḫatala, Heb. ḥṭl; Akk. also ḫatū ša murṣī “to bandage a wound/a diseased spot.”

183. kurum (PAD: ku-ru-um) “share, portion” Akk. kurummatu.

184. kurun (DIN, DUG, etc.: ku-ru-un, ku-ru-un) “wine” Akk. karΩnu, kurunnu.


187. kušum A (U.PIRIG: ku-šu-um, ku-šu, ki-ši) “to advance creeping, or fearfully(?)” (said of an animal); Akk. šāqu A, nāqu B, lāpu, with unclear mngs.

188. kušum B (BI.LUL: ku-šu-um, ku-zu-um) “to tremble(?)”; Akk. nāqu B, šāqu A. Also syn. of kušum A.

189. kušum C (ZUM: ku-šu-um) “?”; Akk. marru “bitter” (unclear).

190. lubun (EZEN≈LU: lu-bu-un) “a disease of ovines”; Akk. ḫingu. See also laban and libin.


192. lugut B (BAD.UD: lu-gu-ud) “(whitish) suppuration”; Akk. šarku.


196. munus (SAL: mu-nu-us, mu-nu-uš; Emesal nu-nus) “woman, female”; Akk. sinništu.


200. muruš (syll. mu-ru-uš) “buttocks”; Akk. šuḫu, išu. Possibly scribal error for murub?

201. nunḫun (syll. nu-gú-n- Ebla, ni-gi-n-, níg-gi-n-; NUMUN: nu-mu-un) “seed”; Akk. zēru.


203. numun (ZI+ZI.LAGAB and vars.: nu-mu-un; Emesal šu-mu-un) “a type of rush or sedge”; Akk. elpetu, etc.


206. pusuḫ (syll. pu-su-uš) “?” in pu-su-uš—ak Akk. puššušuḫu.

207. putuk (syll. pu-du/tu-uk) “to destroy (the enemy)” Akk. patāqu, Arabic fataqa. In pu-du/tu-uk—ak/za “to destroy, to kill”; Akk. probably ubbatu.27


209. subur B (syll. su-bu-r-; ŠUBUR: su-bur, su-bar, su-bir, šu-bur) “servant” (derived from the gentilic “Subarian”). Form with š- only in the late source Šb.28


211. suḫur n. B (as in A) “carp”; Akk. purādu. Cf. perhaps Arabic šuʿūr “a saltwater fish.”29

212. suḫur n. C (SUḪUR: su-ḫu-ur, etc.) “goadstick”; Akk. mekkû, meḏigītu.

213. suḫur v. (SUḪUR: su-ḫu-ur) (1) “to trim or comb the hair,” (2) “to make smaller” (Akk. šuḫuru), (3) “to goad, to scratch”; Akk. qamamu (1), nukkuru (2), ekēku (3). See z/suḫur [254].

26 Arabic falāha (AHw. 812) does not fit semantically.


28 Letherinus nebulasis according to C. Bailey, A Culture of Desert Survival (New Haven, 2004), p. 79.
214. suḫuš “root.” See suruš.
216. sukuṭ (GALAM: su-ku-ud, šu-ku-ud) “tall, high”; Akk. mēlā “elevation.”
217. s/zulug/k A (syll. su-lu-ug; -s-lu-ug; LUL: zu-lu-ug, za-la-ag) “(to be) brilliant, shiny”; Akk. namāru, namrū. A syn. of zalag/k. Also in su-lu-ug-lā (var. LUL-lā) = nappāhu “metalworker.”
218. suluk B (LUL: su-lu-ug) “a clay pot”; Akk. šakannu.
220. sumuk A (syll. su-mu-ug, zu-mu-ug) (a) “to fear, to terrify,” (b) “to be angry”; Akk. adāru, palāḫu; late mng. “eclipse” (for its psychological effects). Morph. su—mug-mug.
222. sumun A (BAD: su-mu-un, šu-mu-un, su-un, su-gi-in) “old, worn out; old remainder” Akk. sumkinnu, also labīru “ancient.”
223. sumun B (syll. su-me-n- Ebla, su-mu-n-; GUL: su-mu-un, sú-mu-un) “wild cow”; Akk. rimtu.
229. šugur A (syll. šu-gurš) “a basket for fruits” Akk. šug(u)rū (note long final vowel) and var. (Landsberger Date Palm, pp. 37–38).

---

29 The original meaning is “tool, utensil” in general, related to šu-duš, šitaš, etc.; later specialized as “loom,” “yoke,” “tools for a trade,” etc.

233. šukur A (IGI.KAK: šu-ku-ur, šu-gur) “tip (of an arrow, etc.), stake, spear” Akk. šukurru.


235. šuluḫ (syll. šu-luḫ, šu-luḫ) “to dredge (canals), to clean (ritually)” Akk. šuluḫḫu (a religious rite). 30


238. šurum (LAGAB×GUD/GUD+GUD: šu-ru-um, šu-ru-un, šu-ri-im) a) “bedding place for animals,” b) “dung”; Akk. a) rubšu, b) piqqannu and syns.

239. šuruš “root.” See suruš.

240. šusub (syll. šu-su-ub) “to wipe, to polish, to scrape” Akk. esēpu Š, Sem. ʾsp; Akk. also qatāpu “to pick” (pomegranates). Reanalyzed as šu + su-ub, giving su-ub, written also subē, Morph. šu ḥē-eb-su-ub-be, šu u-me-ni-su-ub-su-ub. As a noun: (1) tūgšu-su-ub Akk. šusuppu “wiping rag, towel,” (2) šu-su-ub “scrapings”; Akk. šukkultu.


242. šutbul in šutubul (syll. šu-du-bu-ul, šu-tu-bu-ūr) “to mix ingredients (at least one of them a liquid)” Akk. šutābulu, also marāsu “to stir into a liquid,” še-e-jā-um (mg. uncert.). Morph. šu im-tu-bu-ur (var. mi-ni-). See d/tubul.


244. šutum (GLNA.AB.DU₂/TUM: šu-tu-um) “storehouse” Akk. šutummu.


30 “Hand washing” is a popular etymology, already attested in Ebla (Conti, Il sillabario, p. 172, no. 626); originally the word had nothing to do with hand washing.


249. tukur A (KAXŠE: tu-ku-ur) “to chew”; Akk. kasūsu A.

250. tukur B (LAGAB: tu-kur) “heavy, important”; Akk. kabtu.

251. zub/gud (ḪA-tenû: zu-bu-d-, zu-gu-ud) (1) “a mace”; Akk. patarru (reading of logogram is uncert.), (2) “an animal” Akk. zubuttu. See also bandar.

252. zubur (sign ŠL 364: za-bar, zu-bur) (mng. uncert.) Akk. zabaru.

253. z/suul (syll. zu-ḫu-ul) “?” (said of face, neck, hands) Akk. saḫālu “to pierce” does not fit semantically, unless it has a figurative mng. Lex. igi zu-ḫu-ul = pa-nu ṣa-aḫ-ru-[tum], šu zu-ḫu-ul = qā-tum ṣa-hi-il-[tum]. Lit. [g]ú zu-ḫu-ul-a-ni-ta dû-du-ām; šu-ni ab-zu-ḫu-ul (“a zuul hand cannot write well”).

254. z/suur (syll. zu/šu-ḫu-r-) “?”; see suur v. (2) [213]; (silver) uradaḫu-bu-um zuḫu-re-še (Ur III).

255. zukum (ZI+ZILAGAB: zu-ku-um) “to step on, to trample”; Akk. kabāsu.

256. zulug. See s/zulug/k.

257. zulu mb (syll. zú-lum) “date” Akk. suluppu.

31 No form *tuḥul seems to be attested; despite the discussion in MSL 9 20, all the forms there are clearly Middle Assyrian or Neo-Babylonian GUL-signs.

32 Probably “full” form of g/kur₄.

33 Arabic ḏahala “to be negligent” would fit the construction with šu “hand” but hardly with igi or gú.
PECUS NON OLET?
VISITING THE ROYAL STOCKYARDS OF DREHEM
DURING THE FIRST MONTH OF AMARSU’ENA 2

Gertrud Farber, The University of Chicago

The smells emanating from the royal stockyards at Drehem must have been a familiar, and probably not very pleasant, daily experience for all the officials and personnel working there during the Ur III empire. Fortunately, they are not preserved on the administrative records that have survived into our times. The following article is meant to give a glimpse of the activities there, and I hope that its presentation in a Festchrift for Bob Biggs will not conjure up too much of a real-life atmosphere and will thus not interfere with the erešu tābu of cedar wood and incense more appropriate to a truly Mesopotamian celebration!

ÂS 1310¹ is a balanced ki-bi-gi₄-a account of the first month of Amarsu’ena 2 (AS 2), listing all livestock that was handled by the main administration of the stockyards in Drehem during that time. This text gives us the opportunity to compare a monthly summary with transactions recorded individually on single tablets during that month, thereby enabling us in a few cases to follow the tracks of a single animal from the time it entered the royal administration to its final distribution. By identifying day-by-day transactions with those recorded in the ki-bi-gi₄-a text, we can learn more about the officials handling the transactions, the origin of the animals, and the terminology for the different types of deliveries and expenditures.

Text ÂS 1310 has five sections (A.1–5) dealing with incoming livestock and seventeen sections (B.1–17) for expenditures. For the convenience of the reader, I have included a graphical analysis of the text below.

¹ A four-column tablet of the Staatliche Sammlung Ägyptischer Kunst, München (measurements 11.5 cm × 13.8 cm). My hand-copy was submitted in 2000, together with my article “One Bear for the Ensi, Fifteen Sheep for the Dogs,” for publication in Acta Sumerologica (Japan) 21 (still in press). The copy is repeated here; see pp. 63–64. For the other texts of this small collection, see G. Farber (in collaboration with W. Farber), “Die Keilschrifttafeln der Staatlichen Sammlung Ägyptischer Kunst, München,” ZA 91 (2001): 207–24.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>i</th>
<th>ii</th>
<th>iii</th>
<th>iv</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A: incoming livestock in 5 sections:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i 29–ii 10: A.4:</td>
<td></td>
<td>i 11–19: A.5:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>166 animals</td>
<td>920 animals</td>
<td>(blank)</td>
<td>si-ug-gur,-ur-ri-kam</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>é-du₄-lá</td>
<td>a-ša-ta</td>
<td>ša-bi-ta</td>
<td>si-ga lugal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B: withdrawal of livestock in 17 sections:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv 3–17: B.1:</td>
<td></td>
<td>iv 18–22: B.2:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>773 animals</td>
<td>5 animals</td>
<td>bi-ṣu-[u]-lugal-bi ur-ni₄₄₄-₄₄₄-₄₄₄-₄₄₄-₄₄₄</td>
<td>bi-[u]-lugal-bi ur-ni₄₄₄-₄₄₄-₄₄₄-₄₄₄-₄₄₄</td>
<td>bi-[u]-lugal-bi ur-ni₄₄₄-₄₄₄-₄₄₄-₄₄₄-₄₄₄</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zi-ga lugal</td>
<td>a-bi</td>
<td>ku₄₄₄-bi lugal-ér₄₄₄</td>
<td>a-bi</td>
<td>ku₄₄₄-bi lugal-ér₄₄₄</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ad₄₄₄₄-bi ur-ni₄₄₄-₄₄₄</td>
<td>a-bi</td>
<td>ku₄₄₄-bi lugal-ér₄₄₄</td>
<td>a-bi</td>
<td>ku₄₄₄-bi lugal-ér₄₄₄</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>šu-bi-ta</td>
<td>a-bi</td>
<td>ku₄₄₄-bi lugal-ér₄₄₄</td>
<td>a-bi</td>
<td>ku₄₄₄-bi lugal-ér₄₄₄</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>end of šu-ni₄₄₄</td>
<td>a-bi</td>
<td>ku₄₄₄-bi lugal-ér₄₄₄</td>
<td>a-bi</td>
<td>ku₄₄₄-bi lugal-ér₄₄₄</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>end of deliveries</td>
<td>beginning of kilib-ba</td>
<td>beginning of šu-ni₄₄₄</td>
<td>si-ga lugal</td>
<td>si-ga lugal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i 1–20: A.1:</td>
<td></td>
<td>i 22–24: A.2:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,794 animals</td>
<td>4 animals</td>
<td>277 animals</td>
<td>277 animals</td>
<td>si-ga lugal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mu-DU lugal</td>
<td>[mu-DU d]Šu-[g]i</td>
<td>mu-DU lugal</td>
<td>mu-DU lugal</td>
<td>si-ga lugal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>end of deliveries</td>
<td>beginning of šu-ni₄₄₄</td>
<td>(blank)</td>
<td>si-ga lugal</td>
<td>si-ga lugal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i 25–28: A.3:</td>
<td></td>
<td>i 30–32: B.4:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 animals</td>
<td>30 animals</td>
<td>30 animals</td>
<td>30 animals</td>
<td>si-ga lugal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ki ša]bra-ne-ta</td>
<td>sá-du₄₄₄₄</td>
<td>sá-du₄₄₄₄</td>
<td>sá-du₄₄₄₄</td>
<td>si-ga lugal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>end of kilib-ba</td>
<td>end of kilib-ba</td>
<td>end of kilib-ba</td>
<td>end of kilib-ba</td>
<td>end of kilib-ba</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 1. OUTLINE OF ĀŠ 1310 OVERSE**
### Table 1. Outline of ÅS 1310 Reverse

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>viii</th>
<th>vii</th>
<th>vi</th>
<th>v</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>end of šu-niğin</td>
<td>v 29–vi 3: <strong>B.11:</strong> 515 animals</td>
<td>v 1–5: <strong>B.6:</strong> 14 animals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(blank)</td>
<td>kišib ḫul-gi-a-ḡu₁₀</td>
<td>mu ṣul-gi šu ba-ti</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>beginning of kilib-ba</td>
<td>vi 4–9: <strong>B.12:</strong> 12 animals</td>
<td>v 6–10: <strong>B.7:</strong> 30 animals: ba-ug₄ mu ṣul-gi DINGIR-ba-ni</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vii 1–9: <strong>B.17:</strong> 869 animals</td>
<td>kišib lú-di-gir-ra dumu ṣul-la</td>
<td>šu ba-ti</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(blank)</td>
<td>end of withdrawals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>end of kilib-ba</td>
<td>vi 10–18: <strong>B.13:</strong> 1,051 animals</td>
<td>v 11–13: <strong>B.8:</strong> 1 animal: ba-ūš</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grand total: 3,898 animals</td>
<td>kišib na-lu₂</td>
<td>kišib énsi ū šabra-ne</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(blank)</td>
<td>vi 19–22: <strong>B.14:</strong> 3 animals</td>
<td>v 14–18: <strong>B.9:</strong> 4 animals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>vi 23–27: <strong>B.15:</strong> 55 animals</td>
<td>kišib šu-ir-ra</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>kišib ur-šu-ga-lam-ma</td>
<td>v 19–28: <strong>B.10:</strong> 137 animals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ki-bi-gi₄-a</td>
<td>kišib šu-ga-lam-ma</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ab-ba-sa₃-ga</td>
<td>inim-ḥar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iti maš-dà-gu₂ mu ḫamar- ḫu’en lugal-e ur-bû- lum₁₁ mu-ḥul</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>kišib be-li-A.ZU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I have collected all documents pertaining to the first month of Amarsu’ena 2 that I could find\textsuperscript{2} and have tried to match the animals from the individual documents with those of the monthly record.

TEXTS\textsuperscript{3}

\begin{itemize}
\item \(-/I_a = \text{PDT 2 958} (-/I), \text{mu-DU lugal ab-ba-sa}_6\text{-ga \-}i\text{-dab}_3\)
\item \(-/I_b = \text{AUCT 1 230} (-/I), \text{be-lî-A.ZU \-}i\text{-dab}_3\)
\item \(-/I_c = \text{Or., s.p., 47–49 62} (-/I)\text{ and Genouillac} \text{Trouvaille 31} (-/I), \text{lû-\-di\-gîr-\-ra \-}sâ\-bra \-i\text{-dab}_3\)
\item \(1/I_a = \text{SAT 2 693 (1/I), ki ab-ba-sa}_6\text{-ga-ta ba-zi}\)
\item \(1/I_b = 1/I_b + 2/I + 3/Ia + 4/Ia = \text{SAT 2 723 (1–4/I), ur-\-ni}_6\text{-\-gâr \-}su ba-ti, ki ab-ba-sa}_6\text{-ga-ta ba-zi}\)
\item \(1/I_c = \text{ROM 1 119 (1/I), ki } d\text{-}sul\text{-}gi\text{-a\-a\-\-gû}_2\text{\-ta ur-\-ni}_6\text{-\-gâr \-}su ba-ti}\)
\item \(1/I_d = \text{NBC 10869 (1/I), ki } d\text{-}sul\text{-}gi\text{-a\-a\-\-gû}_2\text{\-ta ba-zi}\)
\item \(2/I = \text{see 1/Ib}\)
\item \(3/Ia = \text{see 1/Ib}\)
\item \(3/Ib = \text{Watson, Birmingham} 7 (3/I), \text{ki } d\text{-}sul\text{-}gi\text{-a\-a\-\-gû}_2\text{\-ta ur-\-ni}_6\text{-\-gâr \-}su ba-ti\)
\item \(4/Ia = \text{see 1/Ib}\)
\item \(4/Ib = \text{Acta Sumerologica (Japan) 9 (1987): 266, no. 70 (4/I), ki ab-ba-sa}_6\text{-ga-ta ba-zi}\)
\item \(4/Ic = \text{Nesbit, Sumerian Records} 13 (4/I), \text{ki } d\text{-}sul\text{-}gi\text{-a\-a\-\-gû}_2\text{\-ta ur-\-ni}_6\text{-\-gâr \-}su ba-ti}\)
\end{itemize}

\textsuperscript{2} I would like to thank W. Sallaberger, M. Molina, and M. Sigrist for their help in locating or checking publications that were not accessible to me. Special thanks go to N. Koslova and U. Kasten for giving me access to unpublished material and to W. W. Hallo for providing me with transliterations of five texts from the Yale Babylonian Collection.

\textsuperscript{3} The sigla used to identify the texts from the first month of Amarsu’ena 2 (I/AS 2) correspond to the dates of the transactions documented in the texts; thus \(1/I_a\) indicates the first (of four, in this case) document dated to day 1, month 1. Abbreviations for text publications not in the CAD are the following:

\begin{itemize}
\item \textit{BAOM} \textit{Bulletin of the Ancient Orient Museum} (Tokyo)
\item \textit{DTBM} J. Politi and L. Verderame, \textit{The Drehem Texts in the British Museum (DTBM)}, NISABA 8 (Messina, 2005)
\item \textit{Nesbit, Sumerian Records} W. M. Nesbit, \textit{Sumerian Records from Drehem} (New York, 1914)
\item \textit{OIP 121} M. Hilgert, \textit{Drehem Administrative Documents from the Reign of Amar-Suena, Cuneiform Texts from the Ur III Period in the Oriental Institute}, vol. 2, OIP 121 (Chicago, 2003)
\item \textit{PDT} 2 F. Yıldız and T. Gomi, \textit{Die Puzriå-Dagan-Texte der Istanbuler archäologischen Museen, Teil II: Nr. 726-1379}, Freiburger altorientalische Studien 16 (Stuttgart, 1988)
\item \textit{SANTAG} 7 O. Tohru, \textit{Keilschrifttexte aus japanischen Sammlungen}, SANTAG 7 (Wiesbaden, 2002)
\item \textit{SAT 2} M. Sigrist, \textit{Texts from the Yale Babylonian Collections, Part 1}, Sumerian Archival Texts 2 (Bethesda, Maryland, 2000)
\item Sigrist, \textit{Rochester M. Sigrist, Documents from Tablet Collections in Rochester, New York} (Bethesda, Maryland, 1991)
\item \textit{TAD} S. Langdon, \textit{Tablets from the Archives of Drehem} (Paris, 1911)
\end{itemize}
PECUS NON OLET? VISITING THE ROYAL STOCKYARDS OF DREHEM

To be published by N. Koslova.

4 To be published by N. Koslova.
In what follows I will discuss the ki-bi-gi₄-a document ÄS 1310 section by section and compare it with all individual transaction documents from I/AS 2.

A. INCOMING LIVESTOCK

A.1. mu-DU lugal

The most important document to be matched with ÄS 1310 is PDT 2 958 (-/Ia), which records all mu-DU lugal deliveries of I/AS 2.⁵ The number of animals is exactly the same as in the section ÄS 1310 A.1, but PDT 2 958 originally contained all information available about the deliveries to the Puzriš-Dagan organization: a more detailed description of the animals, the day they were delivered, and the names of the deliverers.⁶

Unfortunately, only PDT 2 958 cols. i–iii and vi–viii of what seemingly was a four-column tablet are preserved. We thus have detailed information on the delivery of only ca. 600 animals out of a total of 2,794. Surprisingly, the day-dates are only recorded for the first four days or for 45 animals. Since the tablet is complete to the end of col. iii, this could mean that all 565 remaining animals were delivered on the fifth day, which is, however, highly unlikely. I therefore assume that for some reason the recording scribe deemed it important to specify only the first four days of the month, and I have included all the information concerning those four days in table 2.⁷

Col. vi of PDT 2 958 gives us the first summation, a šu-nīgin of 31 different kinds of animals, sorted by species, several criteria of quality, sex, and age. Col. vii contains a second summation, a šu-nīgin of 18 different kinds of animals, this time indicating species, only fattened or unfattened quality, and sex. This is the same arrangement as seen in ÄS 1310 A.1. Finally, col. viii contains the grand total, a kilib-ba of 12 entries, sorted by species and sex only.

With the help of PDT 2 958 vi we can now identify 31, instead of 18, different types of animals in ÄS 1310 A.1.

Comparing A.1 with the deliveries A.2–5, we learn that in our text the following animals are delivered as mu-DU lugal only and do not come from other deliveries:

All fattened (niga) animals,⁸ the anše-ZI.ZI, the dara₄, and the az.


⁶ For the names of the deliverers from PDT 2 958 and other documents from I/AS 2, see the appendix below.

⁷ Information on the other animals and their deliverers is included in the appendix.

⁸ Note, however, that in the ki-bi-gi₄-a documents, PIOL 19 345 (H. Sauren, *Les tablettes cu-néiformes de l’époque d’Ur des collections de la New York Public Library*, Publications de l’Institut orientaliste de Louvain 19 [Louvain-la-Neuve, 1978]) and Hilgert, OIP 121, no. 248, fattened animals are also delivered from ū-du₄-la.
All amar maš-dà recorded on individual delivery documents must also be part of the mu-DU lugal. The three coming from the fields would not be categorized as a delivery.

All animals classified as mu-DU are considered part of the mu-DU lugal and are therefore entered in table 2 below.

Summary

Of the 2,794 animals of the mu-DU lugal, only 234 (or 233) animals can be documented in 24 (or 23) individual transaction documents:

55 gu₄-niga, 71 gu₅, 8 á, 1 šeg₉-bar munus(?), 2 anše-ZI.ZI munus, 45 udu-niga, 2 ud₃-niga, 22 udu, 7 máš, 1 dara₃ nita, 19 maš-dà, 1 az

The texts are: -/Ia, -/Ib, 1/Ia, 4/Ia, 8/Ia, 8/9/14/I, 9/Ia, 10/Ia, 10/Ib, 13/I, 17/Ia, 21/Ia, 21/Ib, 22/Ia, 22/Ib, 22/Ie, 24/Ia, (24/Ib), 25/Ia, 25/28/30/I, 27/Ia, 28/Ia, 29/Ia, 29/Ib.

A.2. [mu-DU d]šul-gi

1 udu no details known
[3] máš no details known

One might expect the expenditures for Šulgi’s throne (B.2) to have been drawn from the deliveries for Šulgi. Those expenditures, however (3 udu-niga from mu-DU lugal, 1 udu, 1 máš), do not match the deliveries.

A.3. [ki ša]bra-ne-ta

For deliveries ki énsi û šabra-e-ne-ta, here šabra-ne only, see Maeda, “Bringing,” pp. 81 ff.

[9 anše]-kúnga níta transferred to dan-dšul-gi (B.6) and fed to the dogs, no individual document preserved
[5 anše]-kúnga munus transferred to dan-dšul-gi (B.6) and fed to the dogs, no individual document preserved

---

9 See W. Sallaberger, Der kultische Kalender der Ur III-Zeit, Untersuchungen zur Assyriologie und vorderasiatischen Archäologie 7/1 and 7/2 (Berlin, 1993), pp. 27 f.
10 There are a total of two šeg₉-bar munus delivered in AS 1310, one as mu-DU lugal, one as é-du₃-ia. The animal transferred to lú-di₃-ri-ta in text 24/Ib (1 šeg₉-bar munus ga) could come from either source.
11 See Sallaberger, Kalender, pp. 28 f.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANIMALS IN AS 1310</th>
<th>DETAILED SPECIES</th>
<th>ANIMALS ATTESTED IN INDIVIDUAL DOCUMENTS</th>
<th>TOTAL OF INDIVIDUALLY ATTESTED ANIMALS</th>
<th>FINAL DISBURSAL OF ANIMALS IN AS 1310 DELIVERED AS mu-DU lugal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>Species</td>
<td>Species</td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>mu-DU (delivered by and processed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147</td>
<td>gu-niga</td>
<td>gu-niga</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>ab-niga</td>
<td>ab-niga</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>gu</td>
<td>gu-gùn-a</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>ab</td>
<td>ab-gùn-a</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 (9/Ia) by qa-al-ma-a-um mar-tu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ab-mu-2 (-gùn-a)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 (9/Ia) by qa-al-ma-a-um mar-tu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ab-amar-ga</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ab</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6 mu-DU lugal (30/Ia = 25/28/30/I)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal Species</td>
<td>Detailed Species</td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>Species</td>
<td>Amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 ṣeg₂-bar munus</td>
<td>1 anše-ZI.ZI nita</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>anše-ZI.ZI munus</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>4 by ir₁₁-₄-gü₁₀ (-/Ia = -/Ia i 5)</td>
<td>3 (-/Ia: (u₃)-1) by ur-ṣugal-bín-da</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>u₄-niga</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1 by ir₁₁-₄-gü₁₀ (-/Ia = -/Ia i 6)</td>
<td>1 by lú-₄-hin[ ] (9/Ia)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>u₇-niga</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>kir₁₁-niga</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 2. mu-DU lugal (A.1) (cont.)**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANIMALS IN ÄS 1310</th>
<th>DETAILED SPECIES PDT 2 958 VI</th>
<th>ANIMALS ATTESTED IN INDIVIDUAL DOCUMENTS</th>
<th>TOTAL OF INDIVIDUALLY ATTESTED ANIMALS</th>
<th>FINAL DSBURSAL OF ANIMALS IN ÄS 1310 DELIVERED AS mu-DU lugal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>Species</td>
<td>Species</td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>mu-DU (delivered by and processed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>udu-niga</td>
<td>monoš-š-gár-niga</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1 (22/lb) by zé-na-na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,442</td>
<td>udu</td>
<td>udu</td>
<td>1,166</td>
<td>1 (22/lb) by šu₂-EN.ZU di-ku₃</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>udu-a-lum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>gukkal</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (-/la: u₂-2) by [...]-ni lú-má ninda dir-ra (?)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>gukkal</td>
<td>giš-dù</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>208</td>
<td>sila₄</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (9/la) by én-si</td>
<td>the same disbursed (17/la)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 (-/la: u₂-1) by á-pi₂-li-a, ur-ni₂-gar, ur-ē-an-n₂, ur₂-lugal-bān-da, lú₂-asar-lú-hi, NE₂.NI, NE₂-a, gi₂-dé-a, za₂-ni₂-a, ur₂-nin₂-a-zu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 (-/la: u₂-2) by ZU₂.TLI₂, ba₂za-₄, šar₂-su₂-un₂-bu₂-ni₂, gi₂-a₂-kam</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 (-/la: u₂-4) by du₁₁-gu₂-zí-da, pi₂-zur₂-e₂₂₃₅-tar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>Species</td>
<td>Species</td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>mu-DU (delivered by and processed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>u₈</td>
<td>u₈-gukkal</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>746</td>
<td>máš</td>
<td>máš-gal</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 (22/lb) by en 4inanna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (22/lb) by nī₈-gu-du</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>ud₃</td>
<td>ud₃</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>dara₈ níta</td>
<td>dara₈ níta</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>maš-dá</td>
<td>amar</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>4 by še₇-kal-la (1/Ia = -/la i 20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>maš-dá</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 by ku-ù and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 (22/lb): 2 by ur₈-tilla₈, sa₈га, 2 dead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (27/Ia) by ur₈-tilla₈, sa₈га</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 2. mu-DU lugal (A.1) (cont.)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>mu-DU (delivered by and processed)</th>
<th>ba-zi (disbursed by ab-ba-sa-igunga)</th>
<th>i-dab, (transferred to)</th>
<th>Subtotal</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>az</td>
<td>amar az</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1 (8/Ib = 8/9/14/I)</td>
<td>the same transferred to šu- eš(e) kîr u-qa-da-šu (8/Ia, 8/Ib), then to lê-qa-nan na šabra qa-nana (B.9) (8/Ib = 8/9/14/I)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 2. mu-DU lugal (A.1.) (cont.)
A.4. é-du₆-la

4 gu₄
2 from nīḡ-gur₁₁ PN (25/Ib = 25/28/30/I), transferred to ₃en-līl-lā a-ša-šē (B.17) (25/28/30/I)

12 áb
8 from nīḡ-gur₁₁ PN (25/Ib and 30/Ia = 25/28/30/I), transferred to ₃en-līl-lā a-ša-šē (B.17) (25/28/30/I)

7 šeg₉-bar nīta
all transferred to lú-diḡir-ra dumu ir₁₁-hūl-la (B.12); no individual documents preserved

1 šeg₉-bar munus
transferred to lú-diḡir-ra dumu ir₁₁-hūl-la (B.12)

1 amar šeg₉-bar munus known from a transferral document (24/Ib); this could also be the šeg₉-bar munus from the mu-DU lugal (A.1)

2 dúsu nīta, 1 dúsu munus transferred (25/Id) to šu-IDIM, the father of šu-ir-ra, who sealed the receipt of these animals (see B.14)

32 udu
no details known

23 u₈
no details known

37 máš
no details known

47 ud₅
no details known

All gu₄ and áb (except those coming from the “fields”) are delivered as mu-DU lugal or é-du₆-la.¹³ Of the 73 gu₄ and 14 áb of CT 32 48 BM 103448 (25/28/30/I), 71 gu₄ and 6 áb were delivered as mu-DU lugal (A.1). The rest are 2 gu₄ and 7 áb nīḡ-gur₁₁ in-na-ti (25/Ib) and 1 áb nīḡ-gur₁₁ mar-tu-ne (30/Ia). Since 8 of 11 cows of the mu-DU lugal could be individually documented, the 8 cows from nīḡ-gur₁₁ must come from other sources, in this case the é-du₆-la, a term closely related to nīḡ-gur₁₁, which is some kind of semiprivate property.¹⁴ The 2 gu₄ from nīḡ-gur₁₁ most probably come from é-du₆-la as well.

---

¹³ Sallaberger states (Kalender, pp. 27 f.) that the term mu-DU lugal combines all mu-DU deliveries, including é-du₆-la and nīḡ-GA entries, which in AS 1310, however, are listed separately.

A.5. a-ša-ta

17 gu₄ number identical with those being disbursed as zi-ga lugal (B.1)
8 gu₄ (-/Ic) transferred as bala ar-ši-ah ēnsi KÁ.DINGIRᵏ¹⁵ to lú-diģir-ra šabra via uš-ģu₁₀, the fattener; disbursed as zi-ga lugal (B.1); this lú-diģir-ra šabra not identical with lú-diģir-ra dumu inim-dišāra (B.10), nor one of the ēnsi ū šabra-ne (B.9) ¹⁶

1 áb no details known
347 udu no details known
12 ṭu₃¹ number identical with those being disbursed as zi-ga lugal (B.1)
356 [máš] ⁴⁵ máš (-/Ic) transferred as bala ar-ši-ah ēnsi KÁ.DINGIRᵏⁱ to lú-diģir-ra šabra via uš-ģu₁₀, the fattener (see gu₄ above and n. 16); disbursed as zi-ga lugal (B.1)
184 [u]ṭu₃ number identical with those being disbursed as zi-ga lugal (B.1)
3 maš-dà no details known

¹⁵ Animals from the bala-fund were transferred by an official of the main administration into the care and responsibility of a representative of a province and eventually disbursed as zi-ga lugal. Assuming that it is not a coincidence that the number of gu₄ from the sections a-ša-ta and zi-ga lugal are identical, these 8 gu₄ were kept in the “fields” before final distribution.
¹⁶ All gu₄ and 11 of the 18 máš that lú-diģir-ra dumu inim-dišāra (B.10) receives from ab-ba-sa₆-ga during this month are attested in individual transferral documents. Therefore these 8 gu₄ and 45 máš must have been transferred to a different lú-diģir-ra functioning as a bala-official. In Jones-Snyder, no. 137 (AS 4), a badly damaged text, a lú-diģir-ra šabra is attested performing a ĝri-function.
B. OUTGOING LIVESTOCK

B.1. zi-ga lugal

All animals appear to have been slaughtered. Their bodies are given (šu ba-ti) to ur-ŠNIŠ-ŠAR (see B.8); their skins go to lugal-ÉREN.

Some documents tell us the purpose of the deliveries or the final destination of the animals. I assume that all animals that were meant for deities, for the kitchen, the é-uz-ga, and the é-kišib-ba were royal expenditures (zi-ga lugal).¹⁷

4 gu₄-niga from mu-DU lugal (A.1)

17 gu₄ number identical with those coming a-ša-ta (A.5)

8 gu₄ (-/Ic) transferred as bala ar-ši-aḫ énṣi KÁ.DINGIRKI to lú-diğer-ra šabra via uš-ŠU₁₀, the fattener. See section A.5 and n. 16 above.

2 udu-niga from mu-DU lugal (A.1)

1 udu₅-niga from mu-DU lugal (A.1)

1 munus-ši-gar-niga (22/Ib) for dēn-līl

242 udu 9 sila₄ for deities: 4 for dənu-ni-tum, 3 for dən-a-na-a (1/Ia); 1 for dətu (22/Ib; see A.1); 1 for dənanna (24/Ia; see A.1)

34 udu for é-muḫaldim: 1 (1/Ia); 3 šu-gíd (1–4/I); 30 šu-gíd (17/Ia)

18 sila₄ for é-muḫaldim: 17 šu-gíd (1–4/I); 1 šu-gíd (4/Ib)

1 sila₄ for é-uz-ga (17/Ia; see A.1)

1 dead sila₄ for é-kišib-ba (23/I)

12 u₈ number identical with those coming a-ša-ta (A.5)

2 šu-gíd for é-muḫaldim (1–4/I)

261 máš 1 for dənanna (22/Ib; see A.1)

50 máš šu-gíd for é-muḫaldim: 1 (1/Ia); 21 (1–4/I); 28 (17/Ia)

45 máš (-/Ic) transferred as bala ar-ši-aḫ énṣi KÁ.DINGIRKI to lú-diğer-ra šabra via uš-ŠU₁₀, the fattener. They probably came a-ša-ta; see section A.5. and n. 16 above.

184 ud₅ number identical with those coming a-ša-ta (A.5)

151 udu for é-muḫaldim: 147 udu šu-gíd, 4 munus, aš-gâr šu-gíd (1–4/I)

1 udu mÄš ná-a (17/Ia; see A.1) for é-uz-gâ

50 maš-dà from mu-DU lugal (A.1); 3 might have come a-šà-ta (A.5)

6 amar maš-dà for deities: 1 for ṃen-lîl, 1 for ṃin-lîl, 2 for ṃanna (1/Ia; see A.1); 2 for ṃanna (4/Ib; see A.1)

11 amar maš-dà for é-uz-gâ: 1 (4/Ib; see A.1); 2 (17/Ia); 2 (22/Ib; see A.1); 5 (24/Ia; see A.1); 1 (27/I; see A.1)

4 amar maš-dà for é-kišib-ba, all dead: 1 (17/Ia); 2 (22/Ib; see A.1); 1 (24/Ia; see A.1)

B.2. giš-gu-za dšul-gi

3 udu-niga from mu-DU lugal (A.1)

1 udu no details known

1 máš no details known

The animals withdrawn for giš-gu-za dšul-gi are not the same as the ones delivered as mu-DU dšul-gi; see A.2 above.

B.3. níñ-ba lugal

9 guš-niga from mu-DU lugal (A.1)

5 udu-niga from mu-DU lugal (A.1)

4 udu-niga and 1 silaš-niga (1/Ia) withdrawn for da-da gala18

161 udu 1 udu from mu-DU lugal (A.1) withdrawn for i-šar-kur-ba-aš rá-gab (22/Ib)

101 máš no details known

1 maš-dà from mu-DU-lugal (A.1) or a-šà-ta (A.5)

B.4. and B.5 sā-du11 dgu-la19 and sā-du11 inim-dnanna

30 udu sā-du11 dgu-la no details known

6 udu sā-du11 inim-dnanna no details known

The same amount, 30 udu for sā-du11 dgu-la and 6 udu for sā-du11 inim-dnanna, is recorded in the ki-bi-gi₄-a document PIOL 19 345 iv 31–v 1 (V/AS 2); also in SAT 2

---

18 For da-da gala, see idem, “Bal-énsi,” p. 135.

19 See Sallaberger, Kalender, p. 29 and no. 122.
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724 ix 35–38; xi 9–12 (expenditures of ab-ba-sa₆-ga in XI/AS 2); and in MVN 11 184, 31, 34 (expenditures of ur-kù-nun-na in III/AS 3). In these texts inim-₅₄nanna is identified as dumu lugal. He is well attested as the son of Amarsu’ena; see D. R. Frayne, Ur III Period (2112–2004 B.C.), RIME 3/2 (Toronto, 1997), p. 268, and Sigrist, Drehem, p. 361, n. 41.²⁰


B.6. mu ur-ra-šè dan-ᵈšul-gi²³ šu ba-ti

9 anše-kúnga níta        ki šabra-ne-ta (A.3), no individual document preserved
5 anše-kúnga munus        ki šabra-ne-ta (A.3), no individual document preserved

It does not seem very likely that the kúnga were raised to be fed to dogs, so perhaps their death was accidental. We also have attestations of dúsu being fed to dogs; see PIOL 19 345 iv 14–19 or Hilgert, OIP 121, nos. 498 and 499. For carcass removal by dogs, see W. Heimpel, “Hund,” RLA 4, p. 495, § 4.2.

B.7. mu ur-ra-šè DINGIR-ba-ni²⁴ šu ba-ti

15 udu        no details known
15 máš        no details known

B.8. kišib ur-ni₉-gar

For ur-ni₉-gar, see Jones-Snyder, p. 223 and figure 4 on p. 224. This section lists only one animal for which ur-ni₉-gar issued a sealed tablet (kišib). All the other animals whose carcasses are given to ur-ni₉-gar and which are withdrawn as zi-ga lugal (see B.1) do not belong in this section.

1 áb (ba-úš) 1 of 7 cows (30/Ia = 25/28/30/I) transferred to ḍᵉⁿ-l₁₁-lₗá (B.17), received as mu-DU lugal (A.1) or from é-du₉-la (A.4)

²⁰  M. Sigrist, Drehem (Bethesda, Maryland, 1992).
²¹ Not from § 45 because the total number of animals is noted on the left edge of the tablet, a practice starting in the fifth month of AS 1; see Hilgert, OIP 121, p. 18.
²³ The recipients (šu ba-ti) of dead animals for dogs normally were herdsmen in charge of the dogs.
²⁴ See B.6. and n. 23 above.
This cow is not recorded in an individual document as dead or as transferred to ur-ni\(_{-}\)-\(\tilde{g}\)ar. If this, however, had been the cow’s fate, the one missing cow in 25/28/30/I could be explained as follows.

In section B.17, 13 \(\tilde{a}\)b are returned to the fields. In the transferral document CT 32 48 BM 103448 (25/28/30/I), however, 14 cows are taken over by d\(\text{en-lil-lÁ}l\)Á, the official who manages cattle in the fields (see B.17). Both documents, ÅS 1310 and BM 103448, were written on or after the 30th of the month. If one of the 7 cows taken over by d\(\text{en-lil-lÁ}l\)Á on the 30th died after the three-day document was written but before the records for the whole month were compiled, that one dead cow could in the meantime have become the responsibility of ur-ni\(_{-}\)-\(\tilde{g}\)ar, who is known for handling carcasses. No text documenting the demise of this one cow is preserved.

**EXCURSUS**

We have only one individual document from I/AS 2 in which ur-ni\(_{-}\)-\(\tilde{g}\)ar “accepts” (\(\tilde{s}\)u ba-ti) animals from the central bureau of ab-ba-sà\(_{-}\)-ga: SAT 2 723 (1–4/I). Both ur-ni\(_{-}\)-\(\tilde{g}\)ar and his successor d\(\text{sul-gi-irî-\(\tilde{g}\)u\(_{10}\) receive dead animals from all units of the livestock-managing administration in Puzri\(\tilde{d}\)âgan and other cities, but the central bureau is very rarely explicitly mentioned.\(^{25}\) This fact, however, does not necessarily mean that he did not handle carcasses coming from the main bureau. References such as ÅS 1310 iv 13 ff. demonstrate that most likely all animals for the zi-ga lugal that had been or were to be slaughtered, for instance, for the kitchen,\(^{26}\) were handled by ur-ni\(_{-}\)-\(\tilde{g}\)ar (\(\tilde{s}\)u ba-ti).

The above-mentioned SAT 2 723 records 194 \(\tilde{s}\)u-gíd-animals destined (as zi-ga lugal; see B.1) for the kitchen.\(^{27}\) This is one of the rare texts that record the “accep-

---

\(^{25}\) See Hilgert, OIP 121, pp. 14 f. Other texts in which ur-ni\(_{-}\)-\(\tilde{g}\)ar receives dead animals from the central bureau are: Or., s.p., 47–49 131 (VII/AS 2); SAT 2 724 ix 32 f. and x 6 f. (IX/AS 2); Hilgert, OIP 121, no. 132 (XI/AS 2) and all its duplicates (see M. Hilgert, “Notes and Observations on Ur III Tablets from the Oriental Institute,” *JCS* 49 [1997]: 46). Compare also a receipt for dead animals in *PDT* 1 585 (XII/AS 1) by \(\text{nu-\(\tilde{u}\)-\(\text{x}\)\(_{8}\)EN.ZU}, who seems better known for dealing with wool and hides; see Hilgert, OIP 121, p. 70.

\(^{26}\) The texts normally do not specify the destination “kitchen” for animals “accepted” by ur-ni\(_{-}\)-\(\tilde{g}\)ar. Some other references in which ur-ni\(_{-}\)-\(\tilde{g}\)ar is mentioned in connection with the kitchen are MVN 15 36 (VIII/S 47), MVN 13 530 (IX/S 47), and Torino I 213 (X/AS 4).

\(^{27}\) \(\tilde{s}\)u-gíd é mu\(\tilde{h}\)aldim-\(\tilde{s}\)é, é p\(\text{u-zur\(_{8}\)i\(_{-}\)-\(\text{I}\)\(_{-}\)-\(\tilde{g}\)u\(_{10}\)da-gà\(_{-}\)-\(\tilde{g}\)an\(_{-}\)ki}-

ta, uri\(_{x}\)ki-\(\tilde{s}\)é, má zi-kum-ma-ke\(_{-}\) ib-DU, ur-ni\(_{-}\)-\(\tilde{g}\)ar \(\tilde{s}\)u ba-ti, ki ab-ba-sà\(_{-}\)-\(g\)a-ta ba-zi.

For má zi-kum-ma, see W. Heimpel, “Towards an Understanding of the Term siKKum,” *RA* 88 (1994): 5–31, especially 24 f. and 29. This seems to be a boat used by the royal messengers for crossing a river. It seems surprising that such a boat would have been used to transport animals that were probably still alive to Ur. So far, no references for zi-kum/gúm are known from Drehem. The only other text recording a ziKKum-boat is *UTI* 3, no. 1678 (F. Yıldız and T. Gomi, *Die Umma-Texte aus den archäologischen Museen zu Istanbul*, Band 3 [Nr. 1601–2300] [Bethesda, Maryland, 1993]), which records mats (kid) má zi-ku-ma-\(\tilde{s}\)é.

The verbal form ib-gub “they were placed (on the boat)” seems to be another example
tance” (šu ba-ti) of dead or to-be-slaughtered animals by ur-ni₅-ğa̱r or his successor as well as the withdrawal (ba-zi or zi-ga) of animals from one of the administration bureaus.²⁸

ur-ni₅-ğa̱r is recorded as handling many more dead animals during I/AS 2. They come from the bureaus of lú-di'gīr-ra dumu inim-dšāra (B.10) and dšul-gi-a-a-ḡu₁₀ (B.11).

From lú-di'gīr-ra dumu inim-dšāra:

17/Ib: 1 ud₅ a-dara₄, 1 māš a-dara₄, 1 sila₄-ga a-udu ḫur-sağ, 1 māš-ga a-dara₄
18/Ib: 1 munus₄-ş-găr, 1 kir₁₁-ga
21/Ic: 2 māš-ga a-dara₄, 1 munus₄-ş-găr-ga a-dara₄, 1 amar maš-dā
27/Ib: 1 amar peš-ga, 1 gukkal-niga sig₅-ūs, 1 u₈-niga sig₅-ūs, 1 u₈, 1 gukkal, 1 munus₄-ş-găr, 2 sila₄-ga, 2 kir₁₁-ga, 2 munus₄-ş-găr-ga

From dšul-gi-a-a-ḡu₁₀:

1/Ic: 3 udu, 3 u₆, 5 sila₄, 1 māš-gal, 3 sila₄-ga, 1 kir₁₁-ga, 2 māš-ga
3/Ib: 1 amar peš-a-am-ga, 2 udu, 3 māš-gal, 6 sila₄, 1 kir₁₁, 1 māš, 2 sila₄-ga, 2 kir₁₁-ga, 2 māš-ga
4/Ic: 1 munus₄-ş-găr babbar, 1 āb, 5 udu, 1 gukkal¹, 1 ud₅, 5 sila₄, 1 kir₁₁, 1 sila₄-ga, 1 kir₁₁-ga
6/I: 1 amar peš-ga gün-a, 2 udu aslum₃(A.LUM)-niga sig₅-ūs, 1 u₈-niga, 1 māš-gal-niga, 2 udu, 2 kir₁₁, 1 māš, 2 kir₁₁-ga, 1 munus₄-ş-găr-ga
7/I: 1 gukkal-niga, 2 udu, 1 u₈, 2 māš-gal, 1 ud₅, 8 sila₄, 3 kir₁₁, 3 māš, 1 kir₁₁-ga, 1 māš-ga
15/I: 1 māš-gal sig₃, 1 māš-ga babbar, 2 udu-niga, 1 gukkal, 1 ud₅, 1 sila₄, 1 kir₁₁-gu-kkal, 1 māš, 1 māš-ga
29/Ic: 1 māš-gal-niga, 1 udu, 1 u₈, 1 sila₄, 1 kir₁₁, 1 sila₄-ga, 1 kir₁₁-ga, 2 māš-ga

²⁸ Other examples for occurrences of šu ba-ti and ba-zi / zi-ga in the same text are MVN 15 36 (VIII/Š 47), MVN 13 530 (IX/Š 47), PDT 1 623 (I/SS 5), all withdrawals by the main withdrawing official, MVN 13 422 (II/ŠS 7, with no name of withdrawing official), MVN 13 830 (III/ŠS 2), and MVN 13 810 (VIII/ŠS 2), both withdrawals of na-lu₅. Similar documents are PDT 1 467 (VIII/Š 47), PDT 1 467 (III/AS 5), and MVN 13 89 (XII/ŠS 8) in which the keepers of the dogs receive dead animals withdrawn by officials of the main bureau.
B.9. kišib énsi ù šabra-ne

2 áb from mu-DU lugal (A.1)
1 áb gùn-a, 1 áb-mu-2 gùn-a delivered by ša-al-ma-nu-um mar-tu (9/Ia); transferred together with the dara₄ and the az to lú-d₄nanna šabra d₄nanna (9/Ib = 8/9/14/I)

1 dara₄ níta from mu-DU lugal (A.1)
1 dara₄ níta transferred together with the 2 áb and the az to lú-d₄nanna šabra d₄nanna (14/I = 8/9/14/I)

1 az from mu-DU lugal (A.1)
1 amar az transferred to šu-eš₄₈-tár u₄-da-tu₃ (8/Ia), then together with the 2 áb and the dara₄ to lú-d₄nanna šabra d₄nanna (8/Ib = 8/9/14/I)

B.10. kišib lú-diği̇r-ra dumu inim₄šára

For lú-diği̇r-ra dumu inim₄šára, see Maeda, “Bringing,” pp. 90 f., and Sigrist, Drehem, pp. 324 f. He shared the responsibility for “normal” animals, such as cows, sheep, and goats, with d₄şul-gi-a-a-ĝûṭ₇₄ (B.11) in the Nagabtum. For lú-diği̇r-ra dumu ir₄₁-ţhul-la, see B.12; for the bala-official lú-diği̇r-ra šabra, see section A.5 (a-şā-ta) and n. 16 above.

33 gu₄-niga from mu-DU lugal (A.1)
33 gu₄-niga: 5 (22/Ia), 28 (25/Ia) transferred to lú-diği̇r-ra
15 gu₄ 2 gu₄-mu-2 (22/Ia) and 13 gu₄ (25/Ia) transferred to lú-diği̇r-ra
7 áb 2 áb and 3 áb-mu-2 (22/Ia) transferred to lú-diği̇r-ra
3 udu-niga from mu-DU lugal (A.1)
3 udu-niga (29/Ib) transferred to lú-diği̇r-ra
38 udu 11 udu, 4 gukkal, 3 sila₄ (22/Ia) transferred to lú-diği̇r-ra
15 u₈ 6 u₈ (22/Ia) transferred to lú-diği̇r-ra
18 máš 7 máš, 4 máš-ga (22/Ia) transferred to lú-diği̇r-ra
8 ud₅ 7 ud₅ (22/Ia) transferred to lú-diği̇r-ra

---

²⁹ For deliveries by énsi and šabra, see A.3.
³⁰ Is this the same lú-d₄nanna šabra as the bala-official? See Maeda, “Bal-ënsi,” p. 148. We also know a lú-d₄nanna šabra delivering sila₄-niga from PDT 2 958 ii 8 (-/Ia) and Hilgert, OIP 121, no. 73 (III/AS 1).
³¹ For the entertainer šu-eš₄₈-tár, see Sigrist, Drehem, pp. 221 and 284. Did he stay with the bear cub when it was handed over to the šabra? For u₄-da-tu₃, see also W. H. Ph. Römer, “Der Spaßmacher im alten Zweistromland,” Persica 7 (1975–78): 43–68, esp. 51.
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lú-diŋir-ra dumu inim-dšára is also known for being in charge of newborn animals for which we have one document during I/AS 2:

4/Id: 1 amar anše-zi.zi-munus-ga, 4 màš a-a-dara₄, 7 munùš-aš-gàr-ga a-dara₄ ùtu-da ša na-gab-tum-ma

It is surprising that he deals with an equid here. Those are normally the responsibility of lú-diŋir-ra dumu iršš-ḫûl-la (B.12), who, however, was not connected with the Nagabtum.

For the transferral of dead animals by lú-diŋir-ra to ur-ni₂-gar, see B.8.

B.11. kišib dšul-gi-a-a-ġu₁₀

For dšul-gi-a-a-ġu₁₀, see Maeda, “Bringing,” pp. 89 f., and Sigrist, Drehem, pp. 332 ff. He was responsible, together with lú-diŋir-ra dumu inim-dšára (B.10), for live-stock in the Nagabtum.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>gu₄-niga</th>
<th>from mu-DU lugal (A.1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5 gu₄-niga (22/Ie) transferred to dšul-gi-a-a-ġu₁₀

1 gu₄-niga (28/Ib) transferred to dšul-gi-a-a-ġu₁₀

14 gu₄ no details known

1 áb no details known

7 udu-niga from mu-DU lugal (A.1)

1 ud₅-I-nig¹ from mu-DU lugal (A.1)

257 udu 8 gukkal (28/Ib) transferred to dšul-gi-a-a-ġu₁₀

11 u₈ 1 U₈,ḪÛL (28/Ib) transferred to dšul-gi-a-a-ġu₁₀

189 màš 4 màš (28/Ib) transferred to dšul-gi-a-a-ġu₁₀

dšul-gi-a-a-ġu₁₀ is also known for being in charge of newborn animals:

| 20/Ia:   | 2 sila₄-ga, 1 kir₁₁-ga, 1 màš-ga, 4 munùš-aš-gàr-ga ùtu-da |
| 22/Id:   | 2 amar gu₄-ga, 5 sila₄-ga, 4 kir₁₁-ga ùtu-da |
| 23/Ib:   | 4 sila₄-ga, 3 kir₁₁-ga, 2 màš-ga, 4 munùš-aš-gàr-ga ùtu-da |
| 25/Ie:   | 3 sila₄-ga, 2 kir₁₁-ga, 2 màš-ga, 1 munùš-aš-gàr-ga ùtu-da |

We also have five disbursal documents (ba-zi) from dšul-gi-a-a-ġu₁₀’s own bureau during I/AS 2:

1/Id: 30 udu-niga sá-du₁₁ a-bi-si-im-ti, nu-ḫi-DINGIR sukkal maškim³²

³² Cf. the exact number of udu-niga being disbursed for Queen Abisimti by the same official one year later: Hilgert, OIP 121, no. 11 (II/AS 3).
16/I: 1 udu-niga, 1 māš-gal-niga for *bu-ša-am* of Simanum, ǧīrī ūu-zi-ri sukkal, īr₁₁₂ūg₁₀ maškim

18/Ia: 2 udu-niga for ME-šul-gi₃₃ dumu-munus lugal, 1 udu-niga, 1 māš-gal-niga for *bu-ša-am* of Simanum, ǧīrī ūu-zi-ri sukkal, īr₁₁₂ūg₁₀ maškim

20/Ib: 2 udu-niga for *bu-ša-am* of Simanum, ǧīrī ūu-zi-ri sukkal, īr₁₁₂ūg₁₀ maškim (KAÅš₄)

30/Ib: 2 udu-niga for *bu-ša-am* of Simanum, ǧīrī ūu-zi-ri sukkal, īr₁₁₂ūg₁₀ maškim

For the transferral of dead animals by šul-gi-a-a-ū to ur-ni₉-ĝar, see B.8.

**B.12. kišib lū-diğir-ra dumu īr₁₁-hûl-la**

For lū-diğir-ra dumu īr₁₁-hûl-la, see Maeda, “Bringing,” p. 90, and Sigrist, *Drehem*, pp. 324 f. He was responsible for equids and “odd” animals such as bears, deer, ibexes, etc. For lū-diğir-ra dumu inim-šāra, see B.10; for lū-diğir-ra šabra, see section A.5 and n. 16 above.

7 šeg₉-bar nīta from é-du₉-la (A.4)

2 šeg₉-bar munus 1 šeg₉-bar munus from mu-DU lugal (A.1), 1 from é-du₉-la (A.4)

1 amar šeg₉-bar munus ga (24/Ib) transferred to lū-diğir-ra

1 anše-ZI.ZI nīta from mu-DU lugal (A.1)

2 anše-ZI.ZI munus from mu-DU lugal (A.1)

2 anše-ZI.ZI munus (21/Ia) transferred to lū-diğir-ra

**B.13. kišib na-lu₅**

Most of the “fattened” (niga) animals from the mu-DU lugal (A.1) were transferred to na-lu₅.

231 udu-niga from mu-DU lugal (A.1, from a total of 255)

27 udu-niga known from transferral documents:

20 udu-niga, 3 sila₄-niga (10/Ia); 2 udu-niga, 1 sila₄-niga (13/I); 1 sila₄-niga (21/Ib)

4 u₈-niga from mu-DU lugal (A.1, from a total of 4)

4 māš-niga from mu-DU lugal (A.1, from a total of 4)

---

₃₃ For ME-šul-gi, one of Šulgi’s daughters, see Sigrist, *Drehem*, p. 363.
3 ud₃-niγa from mu-DU lugal (A.1, from a total of 5)

451 udu

341 udu known from transferral documents:

5 gûkkal, 1 gûkkal-ĝiš-du (11/I); 1 siša₄ (21/Ib); 90 udu (22/Ic);
242 udu (25/Ic); 2 siša₄ (29/Ia)

1 u₈

1 Uₙ₅,²U̇L (11/I) transferred to na-lu₅

357 māš

323 māš known from transferral documents:

1 māš (11/I); 60 māš (22/Ic); 262 māš (25/Ic)

B.14. kišiš šu-ir-ra

For šu-ir-ra, see K. van Lerberghe, “Une tablette de Drehem et le fonctionnaire Šu-Irra,” OLP 10, pp. 109–23; Sigrist, Drehem, p. 284; Hilgert, OIP 121, p. 70; and Maeda, “Bringing,” pp. 85 f. Maeda and Sigrist list him as one of the fatteners (kuš₇) of small livestock, but in a number of texts he seems to be in charge of equids; see Hilgert, OIP 121, nos. 120, 220, 222, 306, 319, 498, 499, 500, 501; PIOL 19 345 v 31; and our text. For his father šu-‘IDIM, see Sigrist, Drehem, p. 331, and van Lerberghe, “Une tablette de Drehem,” pp. 116 f. and 122. At the time Sigrist’s book was published, šu-‘IDIM was known to us only during AS 1 and only in connection with the handling of asses. AS 1310, however, shows him still doing this in I/AS 2, and Hilgert, OIP 121, no. 115 (IX/AS 1) tells us that he worked with small livestock as well.

2 dúsu nīta, 1 dúsu munus from ē-du₆-la (A.4)

all 3 transferred (25/IId) to šu-‘IDIM, the father of šu-ir-ra, who sealed receipt of these animals

B.15. kišiš ur-šu-ga-lam-ma

53 gu₄-niγa from mu-DU lugal (A.1)

3 gu₄-niγa (10/Ib) transferred to ur-šu-ga-lam-ma

1 áb-niγa from mu-DU lugal (A.1)

1 gu₄ no details known

ÅS 1310 and 10/Ib show that ur-šu-ga-lam-ma already worked at the beginning of AS 2, not starting as late as AS 3 as assumed by Sigrist, Drehem, p. 335.

---

Maeda, “Bringing,” pp. 83 f., states that be-li-A.ZU and šu-ir-ra (B.14) received livestock from fields but never from mu-DU lugal. In our text, however, they receive animals both from ē-du₆-la and mu-DU lugal.
B.16. kišib be-lí-A.ZU for šu⁽⁴⁾(BA)-lá-a síla-a sig₇-a

For be-lí-A.ZU, who was in charge of breeding animals, see Maeda, “Bringing,” pp. 83 ff., and Sigrist, Drehem, pp. 116 f. and 320. He would also temporarily take care of animals that had not yet reached their final destination and were held in reserve (síla-a sig₇-a; see Sigrist, Drehem, pp. 112 f.).

13 gu₄-niga from mu-DU lugal (A.1) all of these animals transferred
4 udu-niga from mu-DU lugal (A.1) to be-lí-A.ZU (-/Ib) by ab-ba-sa₆-ga as šu-lá-a
99 udu

B.17. ib-tag₄ a-ša-šé

The official in charge of breeding and managing cattle in the “fields” was den-lîl-lá; see Maeda, “Bringing,” p. 84. We have one text recording the transferral of not-yet-distributed large cattle from ab-ba-sa₆-ga to den-lîl-lá (CT 32 48 BM 103448 = 25/Ib+28/Ia+30/Ia = 25/28/30/I) but no documentation for small livestock. The official taking those animals back to the “fields” would have been ur-kù-nun-na.

73 gu₄ 71 gu₄ (25/28/30/I) from mu-DU lugal (A.1)
2 gu₄ nîģ-gur₁₁ in-na-ti (25/Ib) from é-du₆-la (A.4)
all 73 transferred to den-lîl-lá (25/28/30/I)
13 áb 6 áb (30/Ia) from mu-DU lugal (A.1)
8 áb from é-du₆-la (A.4): 7 nîģ-gur₁₁ in-na-ti (25/Ib), 1 nîģ-gur₁₁ mar-tu-ne (30/Ia)
all 14 transferred to den-lîl-lá (25/28/30/I)

according to ĀS 1310, only 13 of these 14 áb transferred a-ša-šé; 1 áb probably died and was transferred to ur-ni₃-gar (see B.8)

522 udu no details known
17 u₈ no details known
200 máṣ no details known
40 u₉ no details known
4 maṣ-dâ from mu-DU lugal (A.1) or a-ša-ta (A.5)

---

³⁵ See n. 34 above.
### Table 3. Animals Recorded in ÄS 1310 and Animals Known from Individual Transaction Documents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section in ÄS 1310</th>
<th>ÄS 1310 Number of Animals</th>
<th>Number of Animals Recorded in Individual Documents</th>
<th>Number of Individual Documents Preserved and Text Sigla</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.1. mu-DU lugal</td>
<td>2,794</td>
<td>234 (maybe 233)</td>
<td>23 (maybe 24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-/Ia, -/Ib, 1/Ia, 4/Ib, 8/Ia, 8/9/14/I, 9/Ia, 10/Ia, 10/Ib, 13/I, 17/Ia, 21/Ia, 21/Ib, 22/Ia, 22/Ib, 24/Ia, (24/Ib), 25/Ia, 25/28/30/I, 27/Ia, 28/Ia, 29/Ia, 29/Ib</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.2. mu-DU ṝul-gi</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.3. ki šabra-ne-ta</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.4. ě-du-ja</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>13 (maybe 14)</td>
<td>2 (maybe 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(24/Ib), 25/Id, 25/28/30/I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.5. a-sā-ta</td>
<td>920</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-/Ic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.1. zi-ga lugal</td>
<td>773</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-/Ia, 1/Ia, 1-4/I, 4/Ib, 17/Ia, 22/Ia, 23/Ia, 24/Ia, 27/I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.2. ṝi-gu-za ṝul-gi</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.3. nēḫ Ba lugal</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1/Ia, 22/Ib</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.4. sā-du₁₁ ṝi-qa</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.5. sā-du₁₁ Ṯi-nanna</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.6. dan ṝi-ul-gi</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.7. DINGIR-ba-ni</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.8. ur-nil-ḡar</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(—)</td>
<td>(—)(see B.17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.9. énsi ū šabra-ne</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8/Ib, 9/Ia, 8/9/14/I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.10. lū-diḡir-ra dumu inim-⸫a-ra</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22/Ia, 25/Ia, 29/Ib</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.11. ṝul-qi-a-ḫu-ḫu₁₀</td>
<td>515</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>28/Ib</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.12. lū-diḡir-ra dumu ir₁₁-ḥu-l-la</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21/Ia, 24/Ib</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.13. na-šu₃</td>
<td>1,051</td>
<td>692</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10/Ia, 11/Ia, 13/I, 21/Ib, 22/Ic, 25/Ic, 29/Ia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.14. ṝu-ir-ra</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25/Id</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.15. ur-šu-ga-lam-ma</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10/Ib</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.16. be-li-A.ZU</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-/Ib</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.17. a-sā-sē</td>
<td>869</td>
<td>86 (+ 1 dead)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25/28/30/I</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I. DELIVERERS OF ANIMALS IN I/AS 2

a-a-gₜגגₜ₁₀  gu₄-niga, udu-niga, udu  -/IA

a-bu-ni  gu₄-niga, udu-niga, udu, máš  -/IA

a-bu-um dumu lugal  amar maš-dā  24/IA

a-mur-é-a  áb-[…], udu-niga-sig₅, udu-[…], máš, sila₄-[…]  -/IA

á-pi₅-la-núm nu-banda  máš  -/IA

á-pi₅-li-a  sila₄  -/IA

ba-za-X  sila₄?  -/IA

du₂-ú-du  gu₄-niga, udu-niga-sig₅, udu-niga, sila₁₄-[…], udu  -/IA

du₁₁-ga-zì-da  sila₄  -/IA

en d₄inanna (not name but title)  sila₄  17/IA; sila₄, máš  22/IB

en-sa-kù-ge  máš  -/IA

énsi (no place name given)  sila₄  9/IA

gments-a  sila₄  -/IA

gá-a-kam  sila₄  -/IA

ha-ab-ru-še-er  amar maš-dā  -/IA; 4/IB

ḥu-ba-a  gu₄-niga, udu-niga-sig₅, udu-niga, udu, máš, sila₄  -/IA

ḥu-un-ḥa-ab-ur  gu₄-niga, udu, máš  -/IA

in-na-ti (nîg-ɡur₁₁)  gu₄, áb  25/28/30/I

in-ta-è-a  [...]₂X  -/IA

ir₁₁-γlu₁₀  gu₄-niga, udu-niga-sig₅, udu-niga, sila₄-niga, udu, máš  -/IA; udu-niga, sila₄-niga  1/IA

ir₁₁-ra-nu-id  amar maš-dā  24/IA

iš-du-ki-in  gu₄-niga, udu-niga-sig₅, udu, máš, sila₄  -/IA; see also ŠUHUSH-ki-in

KA.X  udu-niga-sig₅  -/IA

ku-ù  amar maš-dā  -/IA; 4/IB; […]  9/IA

lú₃-dasar-lú-ḥi  udu-niga, sila₄  -/IA

lú₃-dnanna  […]  -/IA

lú₃-dnanna šabra  sila₄-niga  -/IA
PECUS NON OLET? VISITING THE ROYAL STOCKYARDS OF DREHEM

lú-₃₄nin-šubur    gu₄-niga, udu-niga-sig₅, udu-niga, sil₄-niga, udu, máš -/Iₐ
lú-₃₄šúra        máš -/Iₐ
lú-₃₄[...]         sil₄-niga  9/Iₐ
lugal-má-gur₈-re   gu₄-niga, udu-niga-sig₅, sil₄-niga, udu -/Iₐ
na-ra-am-i-lí      máš, sil₄ -/Iₐ
NE.NI.NE-a        sil₄ -/Iₐ
nīg-gu-du        máš -/Iₐ
pū-zur₈-eš₁₈-tár    sil₄ -/Iₐ
SUḪUS-ki-in    amar maš-dā 24/Iₐ; see also iš-du-ki-in or šu-ru-uš-ki-in
ṣa-al-ma-nu-um mar-tu    āb-gūn-a, āb-mu-2 9/Iₐ
ṣar-ru-um-ba-ni    sil₄ -/Iₐ; udu-niga-sig₅, udu-niga, udu, máš, SILA₄.  ḤŪL -/Iₐ
šēš-kal-la        amar maš-dā -/Iₐ; 1/Iₐ
šu-₃主观EN.ZU di-kū₅    udu 22/Iₐ
šu-ru-uš-ki-in    gu₄-niga, udu-niga-[,][,], máš, sil₄ -/Iₐ; see also SUḪUS-ki-in
₂šul-gi-na-da     amar maš-dā 24/Iₐ
ur-é-an-na        sil₄ -/Iₐ
ur-₃₋en-līf-lá (dam)    amar maš-dā -/Iₐ
ur-₃₋en-līf-lá     máš -/Iₐ
ur-₃₋lugal-bān-da    sil₄ -/Iₐ
ur-ni₃-ḡar         gu₄-niga, udu-nīg-a, udu, sil₄ -/Iₐ
ur-₃₋nin-a-zu      sil₄ -/Iₐ
ur-₃₋nin-gal    munusāš-gār-niga -/Iₐ
ur-₃₋nin-gublaga    [,] -/Iₐ
ur-tilla₅(AN.GE₂₃,AN) sağa    amar maš-dā 22/Iₐ; 27/Iₐ
za-ni-a        sil₄ -/Iₐ
zabar-dab₅ (not name but title)    gu₄-niga, udu-nīg-a-sig₅, udu-nīg-a, udu, máš, sil₄ -/Iₐ; sil₄ 24/Iₐ
zé-na-na        gu₄-niga, udu, máš -/Iₐ; munusāš-gār-niga 22/Iₐ
ZU.TL.X        sil₄ -/Iₐ
[...]NI lú-má-ninda dir-ra    gukkal? -/Iₐ
II. OTHER PERSONAL NAMES, NOT INCLUDING THE ADMINISTRATION OFFICIALS

a-a-kal-la (maškim) 17/1a; 22/1b
a-bí-st-im-ti 1/1a (gīri); 1/1d
ar-ši-ah énsi KÁ.DINGIRki -/1c
bu/bù-ša-am lù ši-ma-ni-umki 16/I; 18/1a (bù-); 20/1b; 30/1b
da-da gala 1/1a
šu-zi-ri sukkal (gīri) 16/I; 18/1a; 20/1b; 30/1b
i-šar-kur-ba-aš rá-gab 22/1b
i-ti-šu-[lum] (gīri) -/1a
ir₁₁-šu₁₀ (maškim) 1/1a; 16/I; 18/1a; 20/1b; 22/1b; 30/1b
lú-di-gir-ra šabra (1-dab₅) -/1c
lú-d₄-nanna šabra d₄-nanna 8/9/14/I
ME-dšul-gi dumu-munus lugal 18/1a
d₄-nanše-ul₄-gal (maškim) 1/1a; 4/1b; 22/1b; 24/1a
nu-ḫi-DINGIR sukkal (maškim) 1/1d
šu-eš₁₈-tár u₄-da-tuš 8/1a; 8/9/14/I
ur-d₄-ba-ba₅ (maškim) 4/1b; 24/1a; 27/1a
uš-šu₁₀ kurušda (gīri) -/1c
zabar-dab₅ (not name but title; maškim) 1/1a
IMGUR-SÎN UND SEINE BEIDEN SÖHNE:
EINE (NICHT GANZ) NEUE ALTBABYLONISCHE
ERBTEILUNGSURKUNDE AUS UR, GEFUNDEN
WAHRSCHEINLICH IN LARSA

Walter Farber, The University of Chicago

Vor fast 50 Jahren hat W. F. Leemans\(^1\) ein kleines Dossier altbabylonischer Ur-
kunden zusammengestellt, das den Grundbesitz einer Familie zuerst in Ur, später in
Ur und Larsa über drei Generationen hinweg dokumentiert. Er hat dabei überzeugend
argumentiert, daß zumindest der Leittext dieses Dossiers in Ur geschrieben (wenn auch
wohl nicht dort gefunden) wurde.\(^2\) Dieser Text, damals nur erhalten in Form zweier
Fragmente der Tafelhülle einer Erbteilung zwischen Sîn-muballit\(î\) und Enlil-issu, den
Söhnen des Imgur-Sîn, wurde von V. Scheil noch lange vor Beginn der offiziellen
Ausgrabungen in Ur auszugsweise publiziert\(^3\) und von Leemans\(^4\) paraphrasiert. Der
Aufbewahrungsort der Bruchstücke war Leemans unbekannt, eine vollständigere Bear-
beitung damit ausgeschlossen. Ein Datum war auf Scheils Fragmenten ebenfalls nicht
erhalten.

Auch für die chronologisch auf diesen Leittext folgende Urkunde (Vindikation
eines den beiden Brüdern gemeinsam gehörigen Hauses in Ur, datiert Rîm-Sîn 35)\(^5\) ist
mit Leemans sehr wahrscheinlich anzunehmen, daß sie noch in Ur geschrieben wurde.\(^6\)
Die verbleibenden beiden Urkunden des Dossiers, zuerst die Erbteilung zwischen Ilî-
amta\(ḫ\)ar, Ilî-awîlî und Enlil-gâmil, den Söhnen des Sîn-muballit\(î\) (datiert Rîm-Sîn 51)\(^7\),
und danach noch die Vindikation eines Hauses in Ur, das Ilî-amta\(ḫ\)ar von Sîn-muballit
geerbt hatte (Datum aus der unvollständigen Publikation\(^8\) nicht zu ersehen), sind
dagegen wahrscheinlich nach dem Umzug des Sîn-muballit\(î\) nach Larsa zu datieren und

---

1 W. F. Leemans, “The Old-Babylonian Business
Documents from Ur” (Rez.-Artikel zu UET 5),
2 Etwas anders Charpin Archives familiales, S.
60, der weiterhin mit einer aus Raubgrabungen in
Ur stammenden Tafel zu rechnen scheint.
3 V. Scheil, “L’expression NU-HA-SÁ-SÍ”, RA
15 (1918): 80f.
5 V. Scheil, “Le terme put bîtî ullašu en Droit ba-
bylonien”, RA 12 (1915): 115f.
6 Vgl. auch zu diesem Text Charpin Archives fami-
liales, S. 60, und Leemans, “Business
Documents”, S. 119ff.
7 C.-F. Jean, Sumer et Akkad (Paris, 1923), Nr.
CLXXV–CLXXVII:166.
8 V. Scheil, “L’expression Qatam nasâḥu ‘retirer
le main’”, RA 14 (1917): 95f.

Vor Jahren spielte mir nun der Zufall die noch unpublizierte Innentafel zu den von Scheil bekanntgemachten Hüllenfragmenten des Leittextes in die Hände. Der damit rekonstruierbare volle Wortlaut der Erbteilung vermag zwar zu Leemans’ archivisch orientierter Argumentation nichts Wichtiges hinzuzufügen, erweitert aber trotzdem unsere Kenntnis des Zusammenhanges beträchtlich. Möge die Veröffentlichung dieser Tafel in einem Florilegium für Bob Biggs zur Buntheit des Gratulations-Straußes aus dem CAD-Garten beitragen!


---

9 Vgl. dazu auch noch unten Anm. 10.
11 An dieser Stelle sei dem damaligen Direktor des Übersee-Museums, Herrn Dr. H. Ganslmayer, sehr herzlich für die freundliche Genehmigung zur Publikation dieser Urkunde gedankt.
13 Durand Catalogue EPHE, Taf. 68 Nr. 316+317.

Bremen A 13120 (Innentafel) // Durand Catalogue EPHE, Taf. 68 Nr. 316+317 (Hülle)

\textit{Umschrift}

\begin{verbatim}
1  2 sar 10 gín é.dù.a è e.sír dagal.la
2  da è DINGIR-šu-na-ši-ir ù da è.e.sír – –
H\textsuperscript{1-2}  [ -n]a-ši-ir [ ] e.sír na-an-ni
3  1 ìr ðEN.ZU-\textit{ga-mi-el} mu.ni
H\textsuperscript{3}  [ ] ðEN.ZU-\textit{ga-mi-il} mu.ni
4  1 ìr \textit{šum-ma}-DINGIR mu.ni
H\textsuperscript{4}  [ ] \textit{šum-ma}-DINGIR mu.ni
5  1 ìr i-li-ma-a-\textit{hi} mu.ni
H\textsuperscript{5}  [ -l]i-ma-a-\textit{hi} mu.ni
6  2 urudušèrer.šèr 1 urudušèkin.\textit{gис} kiri\textsubscript{6} ki.lá.bi\textsubscript{7} x[x]
H\textsuperscript{6}  [ \textit{šèr} 1 urudušèkin.\textit{gис} kiri\textsubscript{6} – –
7  1 nagad.gis.\textit{esir} ò 1 ð\textit{gис}.\textit{é}.gal\textsuperscript{1}
H\textsuperscript{7}  – – [ ? ]
8  1 ð\textit{gис}.\textit{ká}.bar.ra 1 ð\textit{gис} banšur.zà.gu.la
H\textsuperscript{7-8}  [ ð\textit{j}g.ká.bar.ra [ .l]a
9  1 ð\textit{gис} ná – – 4 ð\textit{gис}.\textit{gu}.\textit{za.sír}.da 1 ð\textit{gис} bugin
H\textsuperscript{8-9}  1 ð\textit{gис} ná 1 ð\textit{gис} bugin [ – –
10 1 ð\textit{gис}.nig.baneš 1 ð\textit{gис} nig.bán \textless \textless x\textless \textless >>
H\textsuperscript{9}  [ ð\textit{gис}.nig.baneš 1 ð\textit{gис} [ ]
11 ḥa.la ð\textit{EN}-mu-ba-li-\textit{it} šèš.gu.la
H\textsuperscript{10}  [ ]-\textit{li-\textit{it} šèš.g[.u ]
12 3 sar è.dù.a \textless\textless 1\textgreater\textgreater da è lr.ð\textit{EN}.ZU lu[\textit{mg}]?
13 ù da è a-\textit{hi-mar-\textit{ši} nagar
\end{verbatim}

\textsuperscript{15} Vgl. dazu bereits Scheil, “L’expression NU-HA-SA-SI”, S. 80; bei Durand sind diese Spuren weder erwähnt noch kopiert.
2 sar ě.šub.ba da <č³> mi-su-ú-um
üt da é a-al-d³UTU?
1 ěr na-ahy-lu-WA-AN mu.ni
1 ěr i-li-TAB.BA-e mu.ni
N4' [ ] i-li-[ ]
1 ěr gi-li-d³UTU mu.ni
N2' (unleserlich)
2 urudú sèr.šeř 1 urudú kin.ğiš kiři₆
N₃' (unleserlich)
1 naga₃,esir,₁.è 1 giš,ġiš,gišimmar
N₄' (unleserlich)
1 giš,banšu r 1 giš,nà 4 giš,gu.za,sír.da
N₅' (unleserlich)
1 giš,bugin 1 giš,níg,baneš 1 giš,níg,bán
N₆' (unleserlich)
½ ma.na 5 gíın kù.babbar ki.ta é e.sír dagal,la
N₇' ½ ma.na 5 gíın kù.babbar [ ]
H₁' [ ]-l]a₇
ха.ле dEN.LÍL-is-su šeš.tu[r]
N₈' (unleserlich)
허]a.ле [ ]
N₉' 
허]a.łe i.ba,[ ]
N₁₀' giš šub.ba i.šub.bu.e.ne
(Η) — — — —
u₄,kúr.še dam.går dEN.ZU-mu-ba-li-š
N₁¹' u₄,kúr.še dam.går dEN.ZU-mu-[ ]
H₃' — — [d]am.går dEN.ZU-mu-ba-li-š
N₁²' dEN.LÍL-is-su nu-ḫa-sa-žé-e-en
N₁³' dEN.LÍL-is-su nu-ḫa-sa-[ ]
H₄' dEN.LÍL-is-su nu-ḫa-sa-žé —
N₁⁴' dam.går dEN.LÍL-is-su
N₁⁵' dam.går dEN.LÍL-is-su
H₅' dam.går dEN.LÍL-is-su
dEN.ZU-mu-ba-li-ît nu-ḫa-sa-zé-e-en

N14°
dEN.ZU-mu-ba-li-ît nu-

H5°–6°
idEN.ZU-mu-ba-li-ît nu-ḫa-sa-zé-e-en

(−) – – –
(N) – – –

H7° u₃,kūr Ṽ,ulu₃ Ṽ,ulu₃,ra

(−) – – –
(N) – – –

H8° [nu].mu.un,gi₄,gi₄,dē

31
mu.lugal.bi in.pād,c.eš

N15°
mu.lugal.[

H9°
[ .lu]gal.bi in.pād –

32
igi  getByIdne dumu ši-ma-a-

(H) – – –

33
idnanna-ma.an,sum dumu ši-su-na-aw-ra-at

H10°
[m]a.an,sum dumu²¹(_HI) ši-su-na-aw-ra-a(r)

34
lip-qū-ša dumu $s[u]^2$-ma-a

35
mi-il-ki-idEN.LīL dumu dEN.ZU-APIN

36
lan-da-ku-ul-lum dumu DU₁₀-šī-li--uri₂

37
é-ga-mi-el dumu PŪ-SA-ir¹-ra

38
idIM-ba-ni dumu WA-Za-a

39
idEN.ZU-ma-gir₁₄(ḤA) d[u]m dEN.ZU-ga-mil

40
e-te-el.<KA>-dEN.ZU dumu da-da-a

41
idIM-ra-bi dumu dEN.ZU-ni-a

42
be-li-i dumu im-gur·dEN.ZU

43
na-bi-i-li-šu dumu dEN.ZU-i-di[n²-na]m?

44
idEN.ZU-re-me-ni dub.sar <<1>>

45
lū.inim.ma.bi.meš

46[i]ti.bára.zag.gar

47
mu.ūs.sa ěd.lagaša zag.a.ab.ba gá.ba.al

Burgul-Siegel (auf Tafel und Hülle)¹⁶: dEN.ZU-mu-ba-li-ît

Übersetzung

1 2 Sar 10 Gin Wohnhaus, Haus (an) der Hauptstraße,
  angrenzend an das Haus des Ilšu-nāṣir und angrenzend an die Straße17,
  1 Sklave namens Šin-gāmil,
  1 Sklave namens Šumma-ilum,
  5 1 Sklave namens Ilīma-aḫī,
  2 Kupfer-Ketten, 1 kupferne Garten-Sichel von x[x] Gewicht18,
  1 Mörser für Trockenasphalt19, 1 Tür für den Empfangsraum,
  1 Tür für das äußere Tor, 1 Opfertisch,
  1 Bett, 4 Trage-Stühle, 1 Trog,20
10 1 3-Ban-Maß, 1 1-Ban-Maß:
  Anteil des Šin-muballit, des ältesten Bruders.
  3 Sar Wohnhaus, angrenzend an das Haus des Brauers21 Warad-Šin
  und angrenzend an das Haus des Tischlers Āḫimaršī,
  2 Sar unbebautes Grundstück angrenzend an <das Haus des> Misūm7
  und angrenzend an das Haus des Al-Šamaš7,
  1 Sklave namens Naḫlu WAN,
  1 Sklave namens Īlī-tappē,
  1 Sklave namens Šilli-Šamaš,
  2 Kupfer-Ketten, 1 kupferne Garten-Sichel,
20 1 Mörser für Trockenasphalt, 1 Palmholz-Tür,
  1 Tisch, 1 Bett, 4 Trage-Stühle,
  1 Trog, 1 3-Ban-Maß, 1 1-Ban-Maß,
  ½ Mine 5 Sekel Silber, Ausgleichszahlung für das Haus (an) der Hauptstraße21:
  Anteil des Enlil-issu, des jüngeren Bruders.

25 Sie haben' die Teilung durchgeführt,
  haben' das Los geworfen.22
  In Zukunft23 wird ein Gläubiger des Šin-muballit
  sich nicht an Enlil-issu halten können,
  ein Gläubiger des Enlil-issu
30 sich nicht an Šin-muballit halten können.
  (Hülle fügt ein:
    In Zukunft wird einer auf den anderen nicht zurückkommen.)
  Das haben sie beim König geschworen.

18 Hülle: “von x[x] Gewicht” ausgelassen.
19 Auf der Hülle erst in Z. 9 genannt.
20 Die Hülle nennt dieselben Gegenstände, aber in anderer Reihenfolge.
21 Hülle: “Ausgleichszahlung …” ausgelassen.
22 Zeile auf der Hülle ausgelassen.
23 Hülle: “In Zukunft” hier ausgelassen (s. jedoch nach Z. 30!).
Vor PN\textsubscript{1-12} (= 12 Zeugen),
(und) Šin-rēmēni, dem Schreiber,
den Zeugen dafür.
Datum (Nisan, Rîm-Šin 10)

Kommentar

Z. 2: Nanni ist als PN in Ur mehrfach belegt (s. UET 5, Index S. 51b). Für Straßenamen des Typs sūq PN oder sūqum ša PN vgl. CAD S s.v. sūqu Bed. 1b-1'. Die Innentafel verzichtet auf eine Benennung der Straße.

Z. 6 und 19: Ein urudu₃er.šēr = šeršerretum ist als Wertgegenstand auch in UET 5 402:1 genannt; die nunmehr zwei Belege aus Ur sind in CAD Š/2 s.v. šeršerratu dem bisher recht spärlichen aB Material hinzuflügen.

urudu₃kin.ģis₃ki₃r₃ kann ich sonst nicht belegen; eine “Garten-Sichel” paßt jedoch gut zu der aus YOS 13 71:3 bekannten “Sichel für das Feld/die Feldarbeit” (urudu₃u.kin ša a.šā, s. CAD N/2 s.v. niggallu Bed. 1a).

Z. 7 (und 20): Für (gi₃)₃naga₃.esir₂.ē = esittum ša kuprim “Mörser für Trocken-Bitumen” vgl. CAD K s.v. kupru Bed. a zu ARM 7 263 iv 6. P. Steinkeller\textsuperscript{24} argumentiert überzeugend für eine Übersetzung “Mörser” (und nicht “Stößel”) für esittum (naga₃) und madakkum (gi₃₃naga₃.zid.gaz).


Z. 8: gi₃₃ig.kā.bar.ra ist nach der Hülle eindeutig so zu lesen. Kalla\textsuperscript{26} nimmt an, daß das gleichfalls in Erbteilungen aus Ur zu findende Lemma gi₃₃ig.ē.bar.ra damit identisch sei, und beide Schreibungen in Ur akkadischem dalat barakkim entsprächen.\textsuperscript{27} In der Tat ist es oft schwierig, die richtige Lesung des mittleren Zeichens zu eruieren, da die Schreiber hier offenbar gelegentlich geradezu “Mischzeichen” zwischen é und kā produziert haben (vgl. z.B. UET 5 100:6, 106:4, 115:2\textsuperscript{28}). Als ein solches ist wohl auch die fast wie e₁ aussehende Uniform auf unserer Tafel (ebenso UET 5 119:6), die Elemente von é mit dem gebrochenen Senkrechten von kā verbindet, zu deuten.

\textsuperscript{24} P. Steinkeller, Sale Documents of the Ur III Period, Freiburger altorientalische Studien 17 (Stuttgart, 1989), S. 36–38.
\textsuperscript{26} Ibid.


Z. 14: mi-su-ú-um ist offenbar über ein radiertes Zeichen, möglicherweise é, geschrieben, was die Deutung als PN in Frage stellt. Die unreflektierte Endung legt trotzdem einen solchen nahe, doch ist mir ein zur Schreibung passender Name nicht geläufig. Oder ist vielleicht trotz der Nominativform an die Bezeichnung einer Straße zu denken und auf die bisher ganz unklare Gleichung sila.tûr = mi-su-u (Izi D ii 13) zu verweisen?


29 M. Van De Mieroop, Crafts in the Early Isin Period, OLA 24 (Leuven, 1987), S. 140, Index.


Z. 38: *Wašà könnte ein Hypokoristikon sein; ich kenne jedoch keine aB Personenamen, die mit *waši- o. ä. beginnen. Stattdessen ist daher vielleicht eher pe-ša-a zu lesen (zu einer möglichen Verwendung von WA = pile in unserem Text vgl. bereits oben zu Z. 16); vgl. damit den PN Pešûm (Stamm, Namengebung\(^40\), S. 267) und vielleicht auch die in Ur belegten Namen pa-(aZ-)za-a und PI-sa-a (UE 5, Index S. 53f.)?


Exkurs: Die Gläubiger-Klausel in Z. 27–30


Wohl wissend, daß ich damit nur ein altbekanntes Problem wieder einmal in Erinnerung rufe, ohne selbst zu einer neuen Lösung zu kommen, seien hier die bisher zehn (wohl alle in Ur geschriebenen) Belege\(^45\) für die Gläubiger-Klausel in Erbteilungsurkunden nochmals in abkürzender Transliteration zusammengestellt:

\(^{40}\) J. J. Stamm, Die akkadische Namengebung, MVAG 44 (Leipzig, 1939).
\(^{42}\) R. Borger, Mesopotamisches Zeichenlexikon, AOAT 305 (Münster, 2003).
\(^{44}\) Kraus, “Neue Rechtsurkunden”, S. 127 f.

\(^{45}\) Ich danke G. Kalla für die Überlassung seiner Zusammenstellung aller altbabylonischen Erbteilungsurkunden, die mir bestätigte, daß ich offenbar keinen einschlägigen Text übersehen hatte. Auch die Diskussionen mit meiner Studentin T. Ponsford, die sich in ihrer Magisterarbeit mit den aB Erbteilungsurkunden aus Ur befaßt hat, jedoch für diese Klausel ebenfalls keine endgültige Erklärung fand, seien hier dankend erwähnt.
a) Jean, *Šumer et Akkad*, Nr. CLXXVIII:165, 7–9 (vgl. Leemans, “Business Documents”, S. 114b; zur wahrscheinlichen Herkunft aus Ur s. Charpin *Archives familiales*, S. 58); schlecht erhalten, wohl Teilung zwischen zwei Brüdern:

dam.gàr PN₁ / [P]N₂ nu.ḫa.ba(abu?) aj.ab.en

b) Jean, *Tell Sifr* 14 13 f. (aus Ur, s. Charpin *Archives familiales*, S. 45 f. und 209, und vgl. Kraus, “Neue Rechtsurkunden”, S. 127; Klausel nur auf der Tafel, Hülle anders); Teilzettel mit Inventar des Erbteils eines Bruders (von zwei?):

dam.gàr šeš šeš.ra / nu.ḫa.sa.ab.zë.en

c) UET 5 109:31–37 (vgl. Leemans, “Business Documents”, S. 114 und Kraus, “Neue Rechtsurkunden”, S. 128); Teilung zwischen drei Brüdern:

\[
\text{u₄,kùr.še} \text{ dam.gàr PN₁ / PN₂ ù PN₃ / nu.ḫa.sa.ab.zë.en / dam.gàr PN₂ / üSic PN₃}
\]

\[
\text{PN₁ / nu.ḫa.sa.ab.zë.en / dam.gàr PN₃ PN₁ / ù PN₂ nu.ḫa.sa.ab.zë.en}
\]

d) UET 5 110:24–26 (vgl. Kraus, “Neue Rechtsurkunden”, S. 128); Teilung zwischen drei Brüdern:

dam.gàr PN₁ / PN₂ ù PN₃ / nu.ḫa.sa.ab.[x]

e) UET 5 119:45–49 (vgl. Kraus, “Neue Rechtsurkunden”, S. 27); Teilung zwischen zwei Brüdern:

dam.gàr PN₁ / PN₂ / nu.ḫa.sa.ab.zë.e[.en?]/ dam.gàr PN₂ / PN₁ nu.ḫa.s[a. ... ]


\[
\text{dam.gàr PN₁ / PN₃ ù PN₂ / nu.ḫa.sa.ab.zë.e[.en?] / dam.gàr PN₃ / PN₁ ù [PN₂?] / nu.ḫa.sa.ab.zë.e[.en?]}
\]

46 Da PN₂ (Z. 35: *Annum-piš-šu* oder AN.Dül-[U.D]AR zu lesen?) nicht wie PN₄ (Z. 64) mit dem Zeichen A beginnt, ist Identität von PN₂ und PN₄ auszuschließen. PN₂ und PN₄ sind möglicherweise abhängige Familienmitglieder (Söhne?) der Haupterben PN₁ und PN₃.

g) TIM 5 15:12–15 (aus Ur, vgl. Kalla, “Nachlaß”, S. 41; bei Charpin *Archives familiales*, S. 56 noch nicht aufgeführt); Teilung zwischen drei Brüdern:

dam.gàr PN₁ / ù PN₂ / PN₃ / nu.ḫa.za.an.zë
h) A 13120: 27–30 // Durand Catalogue EPHE, Taf. 68 Nr. 316+317 rev. 3′–6′ (aus Ur oder zumindest in Ur geschrieben, vgl. Leemans, “Business Documents”, S. 114 und Charpin Archives familiales, S. 60 zu RA 15 80 f.); Teilung zwischen zwei Brüdern:

\[ u₄.kúr. še \text{dam.gār } PN¹ / PN₂ nu.ḥa.sa.zē.e.en / \text{dam.gār } PN₂ / PN₁ nu.ḥa.sa.zē.e.en \]

// \text{dam.gār } PN₁ / PN₂ nu.ḥa.sa.zē / \text{dam.gār } PN₂ PN₁ / nu.ḥa.sa.zē.e.en

i) UET 5 116:17–19 (vgl. Kraus, “Neue Rechtsurkunden”, S. 128); Anerkennung des Erbteils eines Bruders durch den anderen:

\[ \text{dam.gār } PN₁ / PN₂ / nu.un.ne.dib.bé \]

j) UET 5 114:8–11 (vgl. Kraus, “Neue Rechtsurkunden”, S. 128); Teilung zwischen zwei Brüdern:

\[ \text{um.mi.<a> } PN¹ / PN₂ ú-la i-ša-ba-at / \text{um.mi.a } PN₂ / PN₁ ú-la i-ša-ba-at \]


\[ PN₁ / PN₂ / ü PN₃ / e-li PN₄ / mi-ma ü-la i-šu-ú / \]

\[ \text{dam.gār.meš } / PN₁ / PN₄ / ú-la i-ša-ba-at \]

\[ oe.uchicago.edu \]

\[ oe.uchicago.edu \]

---

Sowohl Charpin, als auch CAD T nehmen dabei an, daß trotz des fehlenden ü und der Nicht-Kongruenz zum singularischen Verbum *işabbat* das pluralische Nomen dam. gär.meş hier für PN₂+PN₃ stehen müsse. Im Lichte der oben genannten Belege glaube ich jedoch eher, daß auch hier die Grammatik der starren Klausel nur flüchtig und ungenau dem Sachverhalt angepaßt wurde, und daß entsprechend alle etwaigen Gläubiger von PN₁, PN₂ und PN₃ (daher der Plural des Subjekts dam.gär.meş) in den Verzicht, individuell zu klagen (daher der Singular der Verbalform *işabbat*) einbezogen wurden. Zu vergleichen sind hierbei vor allem die ebenfalls stark abgekürzten Beispiele oben a), d) und g), wo auch nicht alle theoretisch denkbaren Möglichkeiten durchgespielt werden, sowie vielleicht die mit dem Sachverhalt nicht harmonierende Numerus-Konstruktion in Beleg i).

KOPIEN

Abbildung 1. Burgul-Siegel auf Tafel Bremen A 13120

sic!
Abbildung 2. Tafel Bremen A 13120, Vorderseite
A “GALLEON” AT NIPPUR

McGuire Gibson, The University of Chicago

Bob Biggs is famous at Nippur for having found a hoard of Islamic coins in 1963 by stubbing his toe on it. Thus it is appropriate to honor him with a numismatic article.

In 1964/65 Bob was the epigrapher not only for the ninth season of excavations at Nippur, but also for the second season of soundings at Abu Salabikh, which was being conducted for the Oriental Institute by Donald Hansen. The season at Nippur was a long one (November to June), and for me it was even longer, since I had arrived in Baghdad in late September, thinking that the rest of the team would arrive in a couple of weeks. I had already spent several months in Europe and Turkey, taking advantage of a Ryerson Traveling Fellowship to visit museums and see sites. My early arrival in Baghdad meant that I had a wonderful opportunity to get to know the city and the nearby archaeological sites in a way that most new members of field teams never do.

Much of the Nippur season was devoted to the construction of the expedition house, which engaged the time and effort of the director, James Knudstad. From November through late January, while the major construction of the walls and roof was under way, we lived in houses that were usually occupied by the Sherqati excavators or used for storage of the railroad and other equipment. In January, Bob, Donald Hansen, Diane Taylor (another Chicago graduate student), and Selma al-Radi, an Iraqi Antiquities Department representative, came to collect equipment and then go on to begin work at Abu Salabikh.

The archaeological goal of the season at Nippur was to expose as much as possible of the Parthian Fortress that was built around and above the ancient ziggurat complex É-Kur, the shrine of Enlil. The expedition intended to reexcavate the entire Fortress, which had been dug and mapped by the old University of Pennsylvania expedition in the 1890s. Once the Fortress was completely planned, and those plans had been compared to the ones presented by the Pennsylvania Expedition,1 the entire structure was to be demolished in order to examine in a number of seasons the early levels of the ziggurat complex. The importance of É-Kur, as the shrine of the chief god of the pantheon, was thought justification enough to demolish the massive Parthian remains.

1 H. Hilprecht, Explorations in Bible Lands during the 19th Century (Edinburgh, 1907), p. 559.
The first task of the season was the removal of a large dump that the Pennsylvania Expedition had deposited on the south corner of the Parthian Fortress. Even though I was new to excavation in the Near East, it was thought that I could be trusted to direct the seventy workmen who were to remove the dump, which we began to do in November.2

Even with the large workforce and a hand-pushed railroad, it still took more than two months to remove the dump. Consequently, the normal recording procedures were barely in operation during that time, except for the cataloguing, photographing, and drawing of the few objects coming from the dump or found on the surface of the mound. Many of those surface finds were made by Abdullah Sultan, the overseer of the dig house, who had been a fixture on Chicago expeditions since the 1930s. Although probably already seventy years old, Abdullah had remarkable eyesight, and on his occasional solitary afternoon walks over the mounds, he would spot objects that most people would have missed. Many evenings he returned with a handful of corroded, green coins.

In previous seasons, a few coins had been excavated and tripped over, and they had been catalogued, but we had little knowledge of the range of numismatic evidence at Nippur. Coins are a prime source for dating, and the sample from the surface would give some indication of the international connections of the city during the late periods and would furnish a rough date for the last occupation of the site. This season, having the time to do so, I decided to treat the surface coins as a sample collection, and I began to “clean” them using the methods then prescribed by standard field conservation manuals.

Throughout the season, I cleaned and catalogued about two hundred coins, identifying them as best I could, using the limited resources in our small dig library.3 When the actual digging began in February, and I became fully engaged in the cataloguing and photography, I had much less time to spend on coins.

After the Abu Salabikh dig ended its three-week soundings in late January of 1965, Bob returned to Nippur, along with Diane Taylor and Selma al-Radi, who was to replace Tariq al-Janabi as government representative at Nippur. They brought with them the unbaked Early Dynastic tablets, some of unusually large size, which had been found in a stack, many stuck together.4 By this time, the new expedition house had its

---

2 I owe much to Carl Haines, who had been director at Nippur until the previous season. He and Thorkild Jacobsen were with us for the first month of the dig, and the days and evenings were rich in advice, as well as stories, of the early days of Oriental Institute expeditions across the Near East. I owe a great debt of gratitude to Tariq al-Janabi, our Antiquities Department representative for the first two months, and to Khalaf Jasim, the foreman, and the other Sherqatis as well as the local Nippur men from whom I also learned much, including basic Arabic.
3 The coins are to be published by Edward J. Keall in his projected Oriental Institute volume on the Parthian Fortress.
4 The returnees also included Siraj ad-Din, one of the great cooks that expeditions could have in those years. Having arrived with the British Indian Army in 1918, he, like many others, had chosen to stay in Iraq, where they worked for English
roof, windows, and doors, making it habitable although far from finished. We took up residence in its raw mud-brick rooms, using pressure lamps and kerosene lanterns to work by. The bathrooms and toilets were not yet finished, although we had cold running water in parts of the house, so we had the usual reed-mat-walled facilities outside the building. It was not until the next season, 1965/66, that Knudstad returned to finish the house, plastering the interior walls, laying tiles, installing the plumbing fixtures, the electrical systems, and so on. While doing that, he also made a new topographic map of the site. During 1966/67 he returned again to resume work on the Parthian Fortress. After the work was finished, the Directorate General of Antiquities found the ruins so impressive that it was decided that the Fortress had to remain standing as a tourist attraction, so the demolition never took place. The lower levels of the É-Kur complex were to remain unexplored.

Having brought the Abu Salabikh tablets back to Nippur, Bob and Selma began the laborious task of separating, baking, gluing, solidifying, and photographing them as well as making latex molds that we could take back to Chicago in order to make plaster casts. Until March 1965, when the actual digging at Nippur came to an end, I remained an observer of the labor on the tablets whenever I was at the expedition house. The tablets were mainly the task of Bob and Selma, since Diane was also working on the excavation and, at night, still completing the catalogue of other finds from Abu Salabikh. From seven in the morning until nine at night, they bent over the tablets, catching the best light from windows or from pressure lamps. Working through the winter with a kerosene heater on either side of him, bundled in a sweater, Bob would hunch over fragments. But before he could get to that stage, he had to bake the tablets in a specially built kiln, following the design of Delougaz. The baking was a painstaking process that showed the care and precision with which Bob worked. Every two or three days, he prepared another set of fragments, placing them initially in earthenware bowls filled with sand that would protect the tablets from overfiring. Because of the number and size of the Abu Salabikh tablets, however, the bowls soon proved to be unsuited to the task. He had a smith create two large and deep steel containers, without tops, which he could fill with many more and larger fragments, thus speeding up the pace at which the tablets were baked. Until they were baked, the tablets could not be treated, and there were months of painstaking work before all would be processed.

---

officers, officials, and later for embassies and companies. Officially retired by the time we met him, Siraj was a gray-haired, pudgy gentleman with a mild manner and a repertoire of recipes that seemed endless. Rounding out the household was Jabbar Nasr, the driver, a local man from Afak, who was an expert on the desert tracks that linked the two rivers. He drove Bob Adams on most of his surveys in southern Iraq, and he served the Nippur Expedition until the 1980s. He was a mixed blessing, but his resourcefulness made him almost indispensable. He helped Bob Biggs set up and run a small sandblasting device from a spark plug of the Land Rover, allowing a gentle, controlled cleaning of the faces of tablets once they were baked.

5 P. Delougaz, I. Plano-convex Bricks and the Methods of their Employment, II. The Treatment of Clay Tablets in the Field, SAOC 7 (Chicago, 1933).
Bob had made a careful record, using Polaroid photos and drawings, as he excavated the stack of tablets. Now, with each tablet or set of related fragments that he laid in the sand-filled steel containers, he would include a potsherd, into which he had scratched in the tablet’s identifying number. A sherd would survive the firing, and no other material would. After the baking, that sherd would stay with the tablet throughout the cleaning, consolidation, and gluing process and would be discarded only when the tablet had been numbered with India ink. This procedure resulted in his knowing at all times exactly where each fragment had been found. The system, still in use at Nippur and on our other operations not only for tablets but also for ancient seal impressions, avoids the loss of provenience information, which was all too common an occurrence on older digs.

Bob was able to fit two of the steel containers into the upper chamber of the oven. He would then seal the entrance of that chamber with baked bricks and mud mortar, leaving a small space in which to insert a fragment of tempered glass, usually from a broken pressure lamp. This glass “window” was all-important in the process because it would give the signal that the firing had reached 800 degrees centigrade, meaning that after a well-calculated period of additional firing, the heat would approach 1,600 degrees centigrade, the optimum temperature for good tablet baking. The firing chamber, situated below the upper chamber, was equipped with a steel plate onto which crude oil would be dripped in a regulated way through a tube from a barrel on one side of the kiln. Another tube led down from a barrel of water on the other side.

Once the upper chamber was sealed, Bob would turn a spigot, and fuel would drip onto the plate at a very slow rate, a drop at a time. The fuel would be lit, and a tiny amount of water would be allowed to fall in slow drops onto the pan, creating a flashy, sustained, though low, heat. The process started with a very low fire in order to allow the heat to build gradually and penetrate slowly into the tablets, driving out any moisture so that the tablets would not explode. After several hours, the number of drops of oil and water would be increased, following a very strict schedule. Almost immediately upon firing, the glass window in the upper chamber would go black with carbon. At the height of the baking, sometime after dark, the fire would be roaring, and Bob would check the glass window from time to time. Finally, usually at about 9 P.M., the carbon on the inside of the window would burn off, indicating that the required temperature had been reached, ensuring a good baking. Usually he would wait for a half hour or so to make sure that the firing was sufficient; then he would cut off the oil and water, and he and Abdullah Sultan would seal up the firing chamber entry with baked bricks and mud. Overnight and during the following day, the oven would gradually cool. Then the chambers would be opened and the tablet containers removed. Throughout many firings over several months, Bob took notes and made adjustments in the fuel/water ratio, time sequence, and so forth. During seasons in which he could not join us, those notes were still used at Nippur. Of course, we preferred having him with us because he was an ideal team member, never complaining, always patient and cheerful, ready to help with anything, and not afraid of getting dirty in the trenches.
Once the tablets and tablet fragments had been fired, they would be very carefully removed from their beds of sand, joined and cleaned of surface salts, and then glued. After the actual digging was finished in March, I joined Bob and Selma in the cleaning and gluing of tablets and especially in the making of latex molds. By now, it was hot and insects were numerous, so we tried to position ourselves near doorways to catch the light and any breeze as we worked. At night, the pressure lamps gave great light, but they were sources of heat, even in the relative coolness of the evenings.

In between sessions of tablet work, I would check the progress of the coins, which I was still cleaning. From the sample of cleaned coins, we found out that Nippur had issues from as early as the Achaemenid period and as late as the early Abbasid. Some of the oldest coins were very early examples of Athenian owls and a variety of early Greek city issues from Caria, Ionia, and other locations in Anatolia. Also present in the sample of surface finds were Seleucid, Roman, Parthian, Characenie, Byzantine, Sassanian, and early Islamic coins. We had no issues later than shortly after A.D. 800. Coin finds in subsequent seasons confirmed that date as the terminal occupation of the city.

One small coin among my sample defied classification. As it emerged from the outer green corrosion layer and then from below the red layer, it became obvious that the coin was copper or bronze, but it had an unusual design. I could make out Latin letters. At first, I thought the inscription might be on an odd Byzantine issue. But as the design was exposed further, it became clear that the main motif was a European sailing ship such as a galleon, heading away from the viewer, toward the left. On the reverse was a rising sun with stars and a crescent moon.

I stopped the chemical treatment and put the coin in a distilled water bath in a small dish. I had not yet had time to photograph it, but I had made some rough sketches (fig. 1). I also had made some notes: “Bronze, 1.8 cm. Dm, Obv. Sailing ship (European?) with Latin(?) words in upper field. Rev. Rising sun, with rays, under 5 stars and a crescent, Inscription unclear and partial. There is a clear I. I. H.” The edge of the coin

---

6 We left Nippur in June, and the rest of the crew went back to Chicago, leaving me to spend another month in the old Ottoman house that was then the headquarters of the British School of Archaeology in Baghdad. I owe a debt of gratitude to David Oates for allowing me to reside there. Even after the departure of the British, I was allowed to stay and finish the photographing of the tablets, and I went to the Iraq Museum every day and took the shots with a 4” × 5” camera. Back at the British School, in the late afternoon and night, when the temperature had dropped to only about 90 degrees Fahrenheit, I would try to develop the film, but I had no way to control the temperature of the water, given the struggle that refrigerators have in that climate.

7 Bob’s response to the heat was to wear shorts. He suffered a sand-fly bite, which resulted in the development of a Baghdad boil on his thigh. When he arrived back in Chicago, he became a favorite show-and-tell object for the tropical medicine specialists at the University Hospital. Characteristically, he took all this with patience and forbearance.
was broken away in places. The coin was sitting on a table in its dish when we had a visit by a group of diplomats from at least ten of the embassies in Baghdad. After they left, I went to get the coin for photography, and it was not in the dish. I searched the floor, thinking it had been jostled by the crowd of visitors and had fallen. It was never found.

In 1966, I received a fellowship to attend the Summer Seminar at the American Numismatic Society, where I worked on a hoard of Sasanian coins. While there I described the mystery coin to some of the curators and showed my sketches. One of them said it did not appear to be a coin but, rather, a casting-counter (jeton, Rechenpfennig). He advised me to look at the Numismatic Society’s counters, and there I found our “galleon” among the Rechenpfennigs struck in Nuremberg (figs. 2–3).

Casting-counters, or jetons (sometimes called “calculi”), were used in a system of accounting that is similar to the abacus, but they are laid down on lined boards or cloths. They were first given the form of coins in thirteenth-century France, although discs of stone, bone, wood, or horn had been used on lined or grooved boards or printed cloth in Classical antiquity. It is thought that the counting boards and calculi were developed
to deal with “cumbersome Roman numerals.”

But the use of calculi or tokens with a variety of shapes as part of a different kind of accounting system has been projected back to the Uruk period and even earlier times in Mesopotamia. Throughout ancient Mesopotamian history the mathematical system, which was based on sixty, also would have been cumbersome. Counters for mathematics began to go out of use in Europe in the seventeenth century, and the introduction of the decimal system in Revolutionary France seems to have been the final blow. But they continued to be produced as gaming pieces. Even though they were out of fashion for accounting in Europe, they continued in their original use far later in other parts of the world. The longevity of the idea behind the system is shown by the continued use of the abacus in Asia, despite the fact that most or all electronic calculators are now being manufactured there.

The system of counters and counting boards was widely used throughout Medieval and Renaissance Europe, initially being closely connected with royal establishments, and their manufacture was closely controlled. Counters were sold as sets, usually of a hundred. Metals used included gold, silver, and lead, but the most common material was copper and its various alloys. The size and weight of counters could vary widely, since there was not the necessity to maintain a fixed value, as with coins.

Functioning in a similar manner to an abacus, counters would be laid down on or between lines drawn on paper or parchment, or incised into a board or table, each line or space being given a certain numerical value. Addition, subtraction, multiplication, and division could be performed rapidly. The counters had a wide circulation in Europe and the Mediterranean, and through foreign trade spread to many other parts of the world, where they sometimes took on the role of coins, either used fraudulently (gilding copper counters to pass them off as coins) or used as petty change, and, like real coins, transformed into jewelry. Counters were sometimes also used as souvenirs of specific events and thrown out to crowds by kings or officials.

---

12 Barnard, *Casting-Counter*, p. 78.
13 Ibid., pl. 27, 2 and 6 for pierced examples.
A great proportion of counters were struck in Nuremberg, apparently because they were cheaper than other counters, being light in weight.

The old saying “Nuremberg’s hand is in every land,” which dates from the days before the overland trade-route from the East was replaced by the sea-route after the rounding of the Cape at the end of the 15th century, and when Nuremberg was perhaps the most important center of distribution in Europe, is peculiarly applicable to it as a source from which emanated immense numbers of cheap casting-pieces. The Nuremberg jettons, however do not seem to go farther back than about 1500, but their descendants, the spielmarken, or counters for play, outlived the casting-counter and survive to our own times.15

Nuremberg counters tended to become much smaller and lighter in the early nineteenth century, and it was in this time that the Nippur counter was most probably struck.

The Nippur counter was thin and small, measuring only 1.8 cm in diameter. On the obverse was a three-masted sailing ship, facing left and shown in three-quarter view. Around the edge, from the left, was the legend “PLUS UL[TRA].” The reverse had a rising sun with rays upon which were interspersed five stars under a crescent. Around the edge, from the lower left, could be seen a part of an inscription that I can now reconstruct as “RECHENPFENNIG.” The initials I. I. H. indicate that the maker was Johann Iacob Habelt, who died in 1867.16 Counters of this type, with the ship and rising sun, were struck as early as the late eighteenth century by a number of men,17 but the initials indicate that it was produced by Habelt. He and others were still striking counters of this type during the earlier half of the nineteenth century, giving us a rough date for the origin of the Nippur counter.

The appearance of a Nuremberg casting-counter at Nippur raises two questions. How did it get to Nippur and when? As far as I can determine, there was no sizable village near Nippur in the earlier half of the nineteenth century. The city of Nippur had been deserted since shortly after A.D. 800, according to the coin evidence. The entire area around Nippur appears to have been in great decline even before the Mongol invasion of 1258, and we assumed that the land around the site had remained uncultivated from that date until the early twentieth century. But in the late 1980s, a Nippur Expedition member, Margaret Brandt, discovered not more than 200 meters east of the ziggurat a small, crooked canal and a village site, which could be dated by the pottery and coins to the Ilkhanid period (fourteenth–fifteenth centuries A.D.). We had not seen the village before that because a giant dune belt, stretching to the north, east, and southeast, had covered that site and about half of Nippur during most of the period of

15 Ibid., pp. 65–66.
16 Mitchiner, Jetons, no. 2040.
17 See, for example, Gebert, “Die Nürnberger Rechenpfennigschläger,” p. 40: Wolfgang Magnus Anert, who became a master in 1778; Mitchiner, Jetons, nos. 1989–90: Johann Iacob Lauer, retired 1852; no. 2039: Jost Carl Gerner, died 1854; nos. 2050–51, Ludwig Christian Lauer, died 1873; nos. 2175–77: Iohan Christian Reich, who died in 1814, struck similar counters that were significantly different in detail.
modern digging (1948 onward). Only in the 1980s did the belt begin to diminish and retreat from the area. We cannot find evidence of any villages of the Ottoman period in the immediate Nippur vicinity, and visitors in the mid-nineteenth century characterize the area to the north as desert, with areas of dunes, that was used by shepherds for grazing.\(^\text{18}\) The mound of Nippur itself was at the northern edge of the extensive Afak marsh,\(^\text{19}\) the original formation of which we cannot determine. In 1889, when the University of Pennsylvania Expedition arrived to begin its excavations,\(^\text{20}\) the site still was approached by boat, and the village of Afak was little different than it was when Layard saw it. But by 1900, the marsh had dried up because of the breaking of the Hindiya Barrage north of Hilla, depriving the eastern branches of the Euphrates of water.

The marsh, in the mid-nineteenth century, stretched for many kilometers from at least as far west as present-day Dagharah toward the east, where it surrounded Bismaya, or ancient Adab.\(^\text{21}\) It was estimated that the population of the marsh in 1850 was 3,000 families.\(^\text{22}\) Loftus’ description makes it clear that the inhabitants of the marsh were living on the products of the water buffalo and on rice cultivation, but we must assume that, like all marsh-dwellers, they also fished and hunted and sold items made from reeds. Layard gives some detail on the main village in the marsh, Suq al-Afak,\(^\text{23}\) which consisted of reed houses and a small market around one mud-brick structure—the watchtower of the local shaykh. He describes the bazaar as consisting of a few reed buildings with merchants selling a variety of goods, including imported cloth from England, spices, and items from across the Middle East. There were, as well, Christian metalworkers making jewelry. The implication of this description is that even though there were no large towns and almost no masonry buildings in the vicinity, there was commerce in the area of Nippur.

In addition to the marsh-dwellers, there were other inhabitants of the region. Layard, Loftus, and Peters all describe the tent camps of “Arab herders” in the desert to the

\(\text{18}\) From W. K. Loftus, *Travels and Researches in Chaldaea and Susiana* … (London, 1857), and A. H. Layard, *Discoveries in the Ruins of Nineveh and Babylon* … (London, 1853), it is apparent that the great dune belt had already engulfed much of the area, including irrigated fields and villages directly east and southeast of Babylon and Kish and that villages southeast of Hilla were being overwhelmed by dunes at that time. Layard indicates that dunes were also forming in the area of Shomel, which is just north of Dagharah, only 25 kilometers or so northeast of Nippur. The enveloping of the Nippur area took place some time after 1920 and before 1948. There is no evidence of dunes on the site in photographs taken by a University of Chicago group in 1920 (The Oriental Institute Archives), but most of the mounds were covered by 1948, when Chicago began work there.

\(\text{19}\) Loftus, *Travels and Researches in Chaldaea and Susiana*, pp. 101–2.

\(\text{20}\) J. P. Peters, *Nippur, or Explorations and Adventures on the Euphrates: The Narrative of the University of Pennsylvania Expedition to Babylon in the Years 1888–1890* (London, 1897), vol. 1, pp. 229ff.; see also Hilprecht, *Explorations in Bible Lands*.

\(\text{21}\) Loftus, *Travels and Researches in Chaldaea and Susiana*, pp. 90–104.

\(\text{22}\) Ibid., p. 91.

\(\text{23}\) Layard, *Discoveries in the Ruins of Nineveh and Babylon*, pp. 544–55.
We can also assume that the great camel-herding tribes of Arabia had already for centuries been making their yearly visit to the Nippur area, just as they were still doing each spring in the 1970s. Their annual round took them from Arabia through Iraq and into Syria before they turned back south through Jordan. One morning in 1975, we awoke to find the plain around Nippur dotted with hundreds of camels. Bedu tents were pitched next to villages across the plain. On the mound of Nippur itself was the tent of the nomadic shaikh. He had chosen this position for his tent because the tell was owned by the Department of Antiquities and was thus neutral territory for the tribal segments that farmed in the area. There was, therefore, no obligation on the part of the local people to extend continuous hospitality to him and his retinue, which would have been a great burden. Of course, the local shaikhs invited the nomadic leader to their houses, and he reciprocated. For the few days that they remained around Nippur, the nomads traded with the local people and in the town of Afak. Some marriages were arranged, resulting in the introduction of a few more women to the local population. I do not know if it happened on this occasion, but sometimes men and entire nuclear families remained behind, using real or fictive ties of kinship to ease their way into the local society.

The Nippur casting-counter may have arrived on the site any time after its manufacture in the first half of the nineteenth century. Perhaps it came as part of a piece of jewelry, dropped by a woman walking across the mound. Some of the counters in museum collections are pierced for suspension, and the Nippur example also may have been, since there is a bit missing on one edge. But it is equally probable that the counter was still in use as small change in the 1890s, and one of Pennsylvania’s workmen might have lost it.

It is reasonable to assume that a casting-counter would first have been used in Iraq as a mathematical device even after it had gone out of its primary use in Europe. The Near East would have been familiar with such counters. There were merchants of the East India Company in Basra from the seventeenth century onward, as there had been Portuguese and Dutch traders even earlier. But it is likely that if the item came to Iraq as a counter, it was for the use of Turkish and Arab merchants, who probably still used the system in the early nineteenth century. Counters spread with trade, and trade was international and even intercontinental long before the striking of the counter.

At any rate, I like to think that this little bit of copper, dropped by some unknown person on a site in the alluvial desert of southern Iraq, adds a small piece to the picture of international commerce, even if it last saw service as a dangling ornament in a woman’s hair.

24 Ibid., pp. 228 ff.; Loftus, Travels and Researches in Chaldaea and Susiana, pp. 84 ff.; and Peters, Nippur, or Explorations and Adventures on the Euphrates, pp. 288 ff.

25 At Nippur, in a hoard of seventy-eight Islamic coins (M. L. Bates, “A Horde of Dirhams Found at Nippur,” in M. Gibson et al., Excavations at Nippur, Twelfth Season, OIC 23 [Chicago, 1978], pp. 26–38), there were several that had been minted in North Africa, which is just as far from Nippur as Nuremberg is.
LIEBES- UND HUNDEBESCHWÖRUNGEN IM KONTEXT

Brigitte Groneberg, Universität Göttingen

ana bi-ıṣ-ṣu-ri-ka šā tak-la-a-tū kalba(UR-GU₂) ū-šē-reb bāba(KĀ) a-rak-kās

Var: a-na [bi-ıṣ]-ṣu-ri-ki šā tak-la-te kal-bi ū-šē-er-re-eb bāba(KĀ) a-rak-kaš

In deine Vagina, der du vertraust, lasse ich den Hund eintreten, das Tor binde ich zu!

So heißt es am 5.(?) Tag des “Divine Love Lyrics”-Rituals. Wie so oft in diesem Ritual wird nicht ausdrücklich gesagt, wer gemeint ist oder wer die Beschwörung, um die es sich handelt, spricht. Nach einer Beschworungssequenz von 5 Zeilen (Z. 7–11), die jeweils litaneiartig mit biṣṣuru “Vagina” beginnt, verläßt der kurgarru das Stadttor und kauert sich gegenüber von Hursagkalamma hin, um Flehgebete zu sprechen und Seufzergesänge anzustimmen. Deshalb ist es wahrscheinlich, daß dieser Kultdiener der Ištargestalten die biṣṣuru-Beschworungssequenz auf dem Weg “vom Akītu-Haus bis zum Tor des Uraš” (Z. 6) ausführt.

Die Frage muß gestellt werden, welche Wirkung dem Akt des in der Vagina fest eingeschnürten Hunds zugeschrieben wird, und ausgehend vom Gegenstand der Beschwörung, biṣṣuru, wessen Vagina beschworen sein könnte.

---


Man kann ausschließen, daß diese respektlose Beschwörungssequenz eine Gött
heit anreden könnte, selbst wenn es sich um Göttinnen wie Nanäya oder Šarrat-Nippuri
handeln würde, die erotische Aspekte vertreten. Höchst wahrscheinlich ist die Vagina
einer Hündin gemeint, in die das Geschlechtsteil eines Rüden eingebunden wird, wie
aus der Isin-“Liebesbeschwörung” und verwandten Texten hervorgeht:

16  uk-ta-as-sí-i-ka i-na KA-ja ša ša-ra-a-tim
17  i-na ú-ri-ja ša ši-i-na-tim …
20  a i-li-ik na-ak-ra-tum i-na še-ri-i-ka
16  Ich habe Dich gebunden mit meinem Haar-Mund,
17  mit meiner Urin-Scham …
20  die Feindin7 soll nicht zu Dir gehen!

Das evozierte Bild meint unzweifelhaft die Eigenart des Hundes, nach der
Kopulation einige Zeit mit der Hündin verbunden zu bleiben, eine Fähigkeit, die
in beiden Beschworungen, die über tausend Jahre auseinanderliegen, angesprochen
ist. Diesem Akt kann man eine bannende Funktion zusprechen, aber auch eine
erotisierende, Fruchtbarkeit anregende Wirkung, da die Bedeutung eines jeden Symbols
jeweils kontextgebunden und im Einklang mit der Zielrichtung des gesamten Vorgangs
gedeutet werden muß. In den “Divine Love Lyrics” geht aus dem Kontext nicht klar
hervor, ob die Beschworung Zauberei abwenden oder Zauberei bewirken soll. Dennoch
möchte ich eine exorzistische Funktion annehmen, weil die Kultpriester mit Klagen
befaßt sind und auch sonst als positive Helfer bei offiziellen wie privaten Ritualen
auftreten.8 Nur deshalb ist es wahrscheinlich, daß das Symbol “Hund” in diesem Text
Übel abweisend evoziert wird und der Akt für eine negative Kraft verwendet wird, die
eine Gefährdung bannen soll. In der oben zitierten Isin-“Liebesbeschwörung” wird,
anders als in den “Divine Love Lyrics”, die Gefährdung genannt: Es ist die nakratum
“Feindin”. Ein anonymes “Ich” will eine männliche Person mithilfe des Symbols
“Hund” bannen und binden, um sie durch diesen Bann von der “Feindin” fernzuhalten.

Der Symbolwert des Hundes ist komplexer, als oft angenommen wird, denn sein
Ansehen bewegt sich zwischen Extremen: Einerseits ist er das Begleittier der Heilgöttin
Gula und verwandter Gottheiten, andererseits ist er ein schmutziges, verachtetes Tier.

---

5 Der teilweise parallele Textzeugen LKA 92
spricht in dem fortführenden Teil (Z. 18–22), der
auf die bišsuru-Passagen folgt, Ištar als “Mutter
Babylons” an. Im Haupttext Sp. III 7 ff. hält
die Prozession in Z. 5 vor dem Akītu-Haus der
Šarrat-Nippuri.
6 Wilcke, “Liebesbeschwörungen aus Isin”, ZA 75
7 nakratum: gemeint ist eine Feindin, von der aus
dem Kontext der Beschworungen hervorgeht, daß
von ihr Zauberei vermutet wird.
8 B. Groneberg, “Die sumerisch-akkadische
Inanna/Ištar: Hermaphroditos?”, WO 17 (1986):
33–39.

Die negative Seite des Hundes wird in der altbabylonischen Hundebeschwörung VAS 17 8 beschrieben:

3 [sī]-il₂-li du-ri-im mu-uz-za-zu-ú-šu Im Schatten der Mauer ist sein Aufenthaltsplatz,
4 as-ku-pa-tum na-ar-ba-šú-šu die Schwelle ist sein Liegeplatz,
5 i-na pi-i-šu na-ši-i ni-il-šu in seinem Maul trägt er seinen Samen.
6 a-šar iš-šu-ku ma-ra-šu i-zi-ib … Wo er beißt, läßt er sein Kind zurück …

Rd.: KA-inim-ma ur-gi₇, ti-la-kam Es ist eine Beschwörung des lebenden Hundes.11

An diesen Plätzen liegt er, hungert, dürstet und wird schließlich vernichtet, z. B. in der Beschwörung OECT 11 4:

1 ú-ug-gu-ur ši-pi-[i[n] Schnellfüßig,12
2 a-ru-úh la-sà-ma-am schnell rennend,
3 bu-bu-ta-am ma-ad reichlich hungrig,
4 it-ni-[iš] a-ka-la-am geschwächt durch (mangelndes) Essen,
5 i-na as-[k]u-pa-tim ist er ständig auf der Schwelle
6 ir-ta-na-bi-iṣ gelagert.
7 e-ma iš-šu-[k][u m]e-ra-nam i-zi-ib Wo er beißt, hinterläßt er ein Junges!
8 ú-su-úh ša-ar-[k][a]-am Reiße aus den Eiter
9 ša pa-ni-[š][u] [sei]nes Gesichtes
10 ú pu-ul-hi-ta-am und den Schrecken

11 In Anlehnung an van Dijk (VAS 17 10 ad 8) übersetzt Sigrist (“On the Bite of a Dog”, S. 86) ur-gi₇-ti-la-kam mit “for resurrecting a thoroughbred dog”.
11 ša ša-ap-ti-šu seiner Lippen!
12 ka-al-bu-um li-m[u-ur] Der Hund soll ste[rben] (und)
13 [a1-we-lum li-ib-l[u-ur]] der Mensch soll le[ben]!

(4 Zeilen zerstört)

Unterschrift: KA-inim-ma x x x

Von den älteren akkadischen Beschwörungen bis zum Ende der altbabylonischen Zeit sind eine ganze Anzahl gegen Hunde oder Teilspektren des Hundes gerichtet.13 Schon der Blick des schwarzen Hundes gilt als ein bedrohliches Zeichen, wie in einer altassyrischen Beschwörung, die offenbar zum Schutz der Karawanen vor den Gefährdungen in der freien Natur (Steppe) durch den schwarzen Hund verwendet wird14:

da-mu-um da-ma-mu-um Blut, ja Blut(?).
kà-al-bu-um Der schwarze Hund
ša-al-mu-um
i-tí-li-im / ra-bi₃-îš ist auf einem Hügel hingelagert
ú-qá-a illat-tám (und) wartet auf die isolierte
ú-qá-a illat-tám Karawane,
pá-ri-is-tám eø-lam₃ den braven Mann

dam-qám / i-ta-na-áp-[i]-sâ belauern seine Augen!
e-na-šu

Es folgen Ritualanweisungen, die in den Textfluß integriert sind: “14 Töchter Eas”15 werden aufgefordert, ihre Töpfe aus Karneol und anderen kostbaren Steinen mit

---

13 Die Beschwörungen wurden von mir nicht sys-
tematisch gesammelt, s. aber W. Farber, “Zur äl-
teren akkadischen Beschworungsliteratur”, ZA 71 (1981): 57 zu C 31. Folgende Beschworungen evozieren Hunde oder Emanationen des Hundes aus den älteren Epochen (bis zum Ende der alt-
babylonischen Zeit):

Owen, NATN 917 (s. G. Cunningham, “Deliver Me from Evil”: Mesopotamian Incantations 2500–1500 BC, Studia Pohl, Series Maior 17 [Rome, 1997]), S. 97 Text 72 (nach S. 65 die einzige akkadische Beschworung aus der Ur-III-
Zeit; anders CAD K s.v. kalbu Bed. 1c: “OAkk. inc.”).


TIM 9 73 Vs. (s. Farber, “Beschwörungsliteratur”, S. 55: C 18).

Greengus Ischchali No. 302 (s. Farber “Beschwörungsliteratur”, S. 57: C 31).

---


15 Es könnten 2 × 7 Geburtshelfergöttinnen ge-
meint sein. Der Ausgang der Beschworung läßt
ein abgeschlossenes Reinigungsrutual vermuten: ši-i et-lám / [a-n]a iš-ri-kà [t]u-ur: “gehe hinaus,
Mann, zu deinem Ort kehre zurück!”
reinem Wasser zu füllen, jedoch erlaubt der dann zerstörte Text keine weitere funktionale Zuordnung des Rituals.

Die Anwendung der Hundebeschwörungen in den ganz unterschiedlichen Situationen ist ein Hinweis darauf, daß sie sich gegen das Phänomen des schwarzen Hundes an sich richteten und nicht gegen einen spezifischen schwarzen Hund. Der schwarze Hund war bekanntlich mit der Dämonin Lamaštu assoziiert und damit in der Tat ein lebendes Übel, das exorziert werden mußte.

Für eine auch positive Rezeption der Rolle des Hundes spricht seine Zuordnung zur Heilgöttin Gula (und verwandten Gottheiten). Das offizielle Kultsymbol der Göttin Gula, das ḏkalbŭum genannt wird und als giš.tukul = kakkum “Signum” die Göttin vertritt, ist in der altbabylonischen Zeit ein Hund.

Die Hundeart scheint für das Symbol der Gula nicht ausschlaggebend zu sein. Im sogenannten Hundefriedhof auf der Rampe in der Nähe des Heiligtums der Gula in Isin wurde sowohl ein bulliger, mastiffartiger Hund als auch eine halbgroße, zierlichere Rasse gefunden, die auch auf Rollsiegeln abgebildet werden. Es ist daher zu vermuten, daß das Symbol nicht auf eine bestimmte Hunderasse, sondern auf den Begriff “Hund” an sich definiert wird.

Wie schon an anderer Stelle ausgeführt, können Symbole einen oder mehrere Aspekte ihrer Bezugfigur widerspiegeln. In diesem Fall vermute ich, daß das Hundesymbol mit dem Heilaspekt der Heilgöttin Gula (und ihrer Hypostasen bzw. verwandter Heilgöttinnen) zusammenhängt.

---

16 Contra Veenhof, “Against a Black Dog”, S. 431.
19 Ibid., S. 293 f.


---

23 CAD A/2 s.v. Der *asū* war nach CH § 215 an chirurgischen Operationen beteiligt.
Ein weiterer Titel der Göttin ist åim-mu¤/Ωåiptu “Beschwörungspriesterin”.  
Für die Heilgottheiten gehörte beides, Beschwörungen wie konkrete medizinische Versorgung, zweifellos immer zum Heilungsprozess, selbst wenn asû und åäipu eine andere Ausbildung durchlaufen, wie I. Finkel an unterschiedlichen Textgenres belegen will. 
Die Aufgaben der Heilgöttin zeigen, daß zwischen dem praktischen Anrühren und Verabreichen von Salben und Verbänden, den Verrichtungen am Körper des Patienten und dem Beschwören der unheilvollen Kräfte nicht zu trennen ist.
Weihgaben dieser Art sind “Stellvertretergaben”. Mit ihnen soll einerseits die Aufmerksamkeit der Göttin auf den gefährdeten Spender gelenkt und andererseits das Böse gebannt werden. Es liegt nahe anzunehmen, daß die Hunde im “Hundefriedhof” in Isin semantisch in die gleiche Kategorie gehören und wie Stellvertreter-“Figuren” für Menschen, die durch Krankheit befallen oder in Todesnähe geraten sind, behandelt werden – mit allen Konsequenzen für ihre Gesundheit und ihr Leben.


Gegen diesen kranken oder doch zumindest als gefährlich eingestuften Hund richtet sich die Beschwörung AUAM 73 2416:

3 ka-al-bu-um a-wi-lam iš-šu-uk
4 a-nu-um-ma a-na ša-ri-im
5 a-li-ki-im qí-bi-a-ma
6 ni-ši-ik ka-al-bi-im
7 me-ra-né-e a-i-ib-ni
8 šu-ri-ba ka-al-ba-am
9 a-na ši-bi-it-ti-im

Ein Hund biß einen Mann!
Nunmehr sagt zum wehenden Wind:
“Der Biß des Hundes soll nicht junge Hunde erschaffen!”
Steckt den Hund ins Gefängnis!


36 I. Fuhr, ibid., S. 135–46.
37 H. Avalos, Illness and Health Care in the Ancient Near East: The Role of the Temple in Greece, Mesopotamia, and Israel, HSM 54 (Atlanta, 1995), S. 60 f.
Der Hund soll sterben, und

der Mensch soll leben!

In erster Instanz soll der Wind den Fluch hinwegtragen und damit die Katharsis bewirken, in zweiter Instanz ist das Einsperren und sogar der Tod des Hundes nötig, um den Menschen gesunden zu lassen. Damit wird ein Ersatzritual impliziert, nicht aber die Anwendung beschrieben oder angeordnet. Die Frage bleibt stehen, ob die rituelle Sequenz der verbalen Beschwörung ausreichte, das Böse hinwegzutragen, oder ob die Tötung des Hundes so obligatorisch war, daß sie nicht einmal beschrieben wurde.

Eine ähnliche Aussage enthält die Beschwörung LB 2001:\n
\[
\begin{align*}
5 & \textit{i-na šı-in-ni-šu} & \text{in seinen Zähnen} \\
6 & \textit{e-hi-il ni-il-šu} & \text{hängt sein Samen} \\
7 & \textit{a-šar iš-šu-ku} & \text{wo er biß,} \\
8 & \textit{ma-ra-šu} & \text{ließ er seinen Sohn} \\
9 & \textit{i-zi-ib} & \text{zurück!}
\end{align*}
\]


In einigen Beschwörungsritualen kommt dem Hund eine tragende Rolle als Medium bei der Bannung und Vernichtung des Bösen zu. Diese Rituale sind im Umfeld des “Liebeszaubers” einzuordnen und wollen entweder das Einwirken eines unheilvollen Anti-Liebes-Zaubers abwehren oder zur Liebe veranlassen.

“Liebeszauber”-Texte stellte der Jubilar kurz im \textit{Reallexikon der Assyriologie} vor.\(^{44}\) Als deren Ziel gab er an: “to gain the affection of a woman or to gain her acquiescence in lovemaking”\(^{45}\) und trennte sie deshalb von den šà-zi-ga-(Potenz-)Beschwörungen der jüngeren Zeit, die ausschließlich der Erweckung oder Versicherung der männlichen Potenz gewidmet seien.\(^{46}\) Die Zielrichtung der

\(^{42}\) Vgl. schon Sigrist, “On the Bite of a Dog”, S. 85, Anm. 3.
\(^{43}\) Groneberg, “Tiere als Symbole”, S. 303.
\(^{44}\) R. D. Biggs, “Liebeszauber”, \textit{RLA} 7, S. 17 f.
\(^{45}\) Ibid., S. 17, linke Sp., Ende 1. Abschnitt.
\(^{46}\) Idem, Šaziga.
Liebeszaubertexte ist allerdings bei den älteren Beschworungen, die er aus der altakkadischen, altassyrischen und altbabylonischen Zeit anführt, schwierig zu erschließen. Die jüngeren Liebeszaubertexte scheinen Beschworungsrituale zum Erlangen der Zuneigung (?) einer Frau zu sein.49


Diese altbabylonische Liebesbeschwörung ist in vielerlei Hinsicht bemerkenswert. Sie enthält nicht das sonst übliche Musterritual, das als Vorlage für einen Beschworungspriester gelten dürfte, sondern ein ganz konkretes Ritual, das mit namentlich genannten Teilnehmern52 stattgefunden hat und schriftlich fixiert wurde. Unklar bleibt, ob die Verschriftung einer Beschwörung auch sonst häufiger üblich war, um das magische Verfahren noch zu intensivieren, oder ob es sich um einen Ausnahmeakt handelte.
der diesen einen verhandelten Fall besonders wirkungsmächtig absichern wollte. Die Beschwörungstafel mit sehr unterschiedlich titulierten Beschwörungssteilen, die aber dennoch nach meiner Meinung zu einem einzigen Beschwörungsvorgang gehören, wurde anschließend zerbrochen und in einem verschlossenen Topf begraben. Das geschah vermutlich, um die Tafel unschädlich zu machen, damit kein dem magischen Akt widerläufiger Gegenzauber ausgeführt werden konnte.

Diesem Liebeszaubertext ist es zu verdanken, daß bisher nur einzeln tradierte Beschworungselemente im Zusammenhang gesehen werden können.


```
9  e-el-li-a-at ka-al-bi-im šú-mi-im?  em-šú-tim
10  me-hi-iš pa-ni-inš ši-pi-ir tu-ū[r]-ti i-ni-im
11  am-ta-ha-aš mu-úh-ha-ka uš-ta-an-ni ŋe-em-ka
12  šu-uk-nam te-e-em-ka a-na ŋe-em-ja
13  šu-uk-nam mi-li-ik-ka a-na mi-il-ki-ja
14  a-ka-al-la-ka ki-ma 4Šitar ik-lu-ú 4DUMU-ZI
```

Beschworungsteil von der Isin-Beschwörung:

```
9  e-el-li-a-at ka-al-bi-im šú-mi-im?  em-šú-tim
10  me-hi-iš pa-ni-inš ši-pi-ir tu-ū[r]-ti i-ni-im
11  am-ta-ha-aš mu-úh-ha-ka uš-ta-an-ni ŋe-em-ka
12  šu-uk-nam te-e-em-ka a-na ŋe-em-ja
13  šu-uk-nam mi-li-ik-ka a-na mi-il-ki-ja
14  a-ka-al-la-ka ki-ma 4Šitar ik-lu-ú 4DUMU-ZI
```

9 Speichel des Hundes, des Durstes (?), des Hungers!
10 Mit der Niederlage (?), dem Werk des Augenwendens (?)
11 habe ich deinen Schädel geschlagen und deinen Verstand verwirrt!
12 Richte deine Entscheidung nach meiner Entscheidung,
13 Folge meinem Rat!
14 Ich werde dich halten wie Ištar Dumuzi gehalten hat,
15 (wie) Zeraå (die Biergottheit) ihren Trinker gebunden hat!
16 Ich habe Dich gebunden mit meinem Haar-Mund
17 mit meiner Urin-Scham
18 mit meinem Speichel-Mund
19 mit meiner Urin-Scham!
20 die Feindin soll nicht zu Dir gehen!
21 Hingelagert ist der Rüde, gelagert ist der Eber:
22 Du lagere dich (auch) ständig auf meine Oberschenkel!

Die Wirkung dieser Beschwörung ist auf eine männliche Person gerichtet, wie die meisten Teile der Isin-Beschwörung. Angeredet wird wohl ein männliches Substitut, das in der Tiervagina magisch gebannt werden soll. Dadurch steht es in den folgenden Prozeduren (stellvertretend für den zu Beschwörenden) zur Verfügung und dieser ist gleichzeitig gebannt. Es redet die/der Ausführende der Beschwörung in den Zeilen 16–19 für das Medium “Hund”.

Beschwörungen dieser Art sind entweder exorzistisch oder bezwecken eine Attraktion, die Erzwingung der Zuneigung. Sie dienen der Abwendung des Liebeszaubers einer anderen Person oder der Attraktion eines geliebten Menschen. J. A. Scurlock\textsuperscript{56} und J. Cooper\textsuperscript{57} erkannten die enge Beziehung der Hundebeschwörungen zu den Beschwörungen gegen uzzum “rage” und verwiesen beide auf einen dritten Beschwörungstyp, einen sogenannten “Selbstbefruchtungstyp”. Cooper führte aus, daß dieser einen Fluch provoziere und dadurch den eigenen Sprecher – in Abkapselung gegen das äußere Böse – beschützen solle.


\begin{verbatim}
112  u šu³-mu-um i-na-ši pa-la ra-ma-ni-šu
113  u al-pu-um i-na-ši pa-la ra-ma-ni-šu
114  īk[i]-ma na-ru-um īr-hu-ú ki-ib-ri-i-ša
115  [a]-ra-ah-hi ra-ma-ni-ma
116  a-ra-ah-hi pa-ag-ri

112 Aber der Lauch hebt für sich selbst hoch den Stengel!
113 Und das Rind hebt für sich selbst hoch die Stange!
114 Wie der Fluß seine Ufer befruchtete,
115 So werde ich mich selbst befrucken,
116 werde ich meinen Körper befruchen!
\end{verbatim}

Die Beschwörung von uzzum ist in mindestens drei Beschworungssequenzen in den Zeilen 78–84, 85–94, 95–98 belegt.\textsuperscript{58}

\begin{verbatim}
95  uz-zu-um [?] uz-zu-um
96  ki-ma aš-[k]u-[u[p-p]a-[t[i]m lu-ka-bi-is-k[a]
97  ki-ma qá-aq-[qá-ri-im lu-te-et-ti-iq-ka
98  še-hi-it [uz]-zu-um ša dNa-na-a
\end{verbatim}

\textsuperscript{56} Scurlock, “‘Love-hungry’ Entu-Priestess”, S. 109 ff.

\textsuperscript{57} Cooper, “Magic and M(is)use”, S. 47 ff.


Raserei, Raserei!
wie eine Schwelle will ich dich niedertreten,
wie einen Erdboden will ich dich immer wieder überschreiten!
Springe an, Raserei der Nanaya!

Als Unterschrift wird verbucht (vermutlich die Nennung einer *materia magica*):

KA-inim-ma-lag-mun-kam
Beschwörung (mithilfe/des) Salzklumpens.


15  *ki-ma šu-mu-nim*
16  *lu-ne-ê ki-bi-îs-ka*
17  *lu-še-ô i-ša-tam*
18  *ša li-ib-bi-ka*

Ebenso wie das ‘Halteseil’
will ich deinen Schritt verändern,
ich will herausgehen lassen das Feuer,
das, was in deinem Inneren (haust)!60

Nutznießerin der Isin-Beschwörung ist ein anonymes “Ich”. Die Liebesbeschwörung der Zeilen 42–46 richtet sich an eine männliche Person und ist so individuell gestaltet, daß sie im Wortlaut nach meinem Wissen ohne Parallelen ist:

42  *na-ra-mu-um na-ra-mu-um*
43  *ša iš-ku-nu-ka é-a û dEN-LIL*
44  *ki-ma dIštar î-na pa-ra-ak-ki-im wa-aš-ba-at*
45  *ki-ma dNa-na-a i-na šu-tu-mi-im wa-aš-ba-at*
46  *a-la-mi-ka e-nê-e-tum ma-aq-li-a-am e-ra-am-ma*
47  *aš-ša-a-tum mu-te-ši-na i-ze-er-ra*

Oh Geliebter, Geliebter!

Dich, den Ea und Enlil einsetzten, so wie Ištar im Heiligtum wohnt, (und) wie Nanāya im Schatzhaus wohnt, dich werde ich einkreisen! Die ēntum-Priesterinnen lieben Maqlû!

Die Ehefrauen hassen ihre Ehemänner!

Schneide ihre (Sg.) erhabene Nase ab!

Setze ihre (Sg.) Nase unter meinen Fuß!

Wie sich ihre (Sg.) Liebe über mich erhob,

So soll sich meine Liebe über ihre (Sg.) Liebe erheben!

Für den angeredeten “Geliebten” könnte die Person Errabānīi stehen, der in Zeilen 117 und 120 nochmals beschworen wird:

117 up-te-et-ti-ku-um se-bé-et ba-bi-ja ∆ēr-ra-ba-ni …
120 [i³-t]a-ku-ul li-ib-bi-ka šu-ta-ag-ti-a-am i-na še-ri-ja

Ich öffnete dir immer meine sieben Tore, Errabani! …

[Das immer wieder Ver]letztwerden deines Herzens beende in Bezug auf mich!

Trotz der Unklarheiten der dazwischen liegenden Zeilen geht aus dieser Bitte hervor, daß das redende “Ich” sich um Errabānī bemüht: Auch dieses sind Zeilen mit individuellen Redewendungen, die einen konkreten Sachverhalt anzusprechen scheinen.


61 Gemeint ist, daß der Geliebte auch nach Wunsch der Götter im Herzen fest verankert ist.
62 Was mit den “sieben Toren” gemeint ist, wird nicht näher ausgeführt. Zu der Bedeutung von akālum N-Stamm “to hurt” im Passiv, s. CAD A/1 s.v. akālu Bed. 12. Der hier angenom- mene Infinitiv Ntn *itākulum ist allerdings bisher sonst nicht belegt.

... und der Hund?


Es könnte also sehr gut sein, daß lebende Hunde im Kult der Heilgöttin von Isin bei Exorzismen und Ritualen vom Typ Maqlû als endgültige Vernichter von Übel galten, mutiliert wurden und ihr Leben ließen. Der Liebeszauber, der in der Isin-Beschwörung angewendet wird, versucht, das Einwirken der “Feindin” zu beenden, wie die überwiegend paradigmatischen Beschworungsteile (Hundebeschwörung, pitirtum, uzzum-Beschwörung und “Selbstbefruchtungstyp”) deutlich machen. Sie bannen die Zauberin, trennen die Kontrahenten, machen die Übeltäter unfruchtbar und beschwören die Fähigkeit des Beschworenen, seine eigene Potenz erhalten zu können.


67 Diese Deutung scheint mir beim “Selbst-befruchtungstyp” angebracht zu sein, wenn man den Wortlaut wortgetreu deutet. Das impliziert die eigene Absperrung gegenüber den Zaubereien eines Anderen.

70 Scurlock, “‘Love-hungry’ Entu-Priestess”, S. 111f.
Der recht dramatische Brief, den Iddin-Ištar vor Jahrhunderten, ja Jahrtausenden an Aššur-nādad geschrieben hat, ist uns seit Jahrzehnten bekannt.1

In diesem Beitrag möchte ich hauptsächlich über die Verbalform in der Aussage in den Zeilen 14 f. sprechen: (14) Aššur-ma ú i-il₃-kà (15) a-wi-lam i-tī-dī-ma…

Die Fortsetzung dazu, die mit einer Verbalform+ma schließt, sei kurz erwähnt: (16) ú ² KÜ.BABBAR a-qâ-tī-a ma-qī-fît-ma (17) a-dî u₄-mi-im (18) a-nim šu-ta-bu-a-tī.

Dazu die Zeilen 14–18 in der Übersetzung von Larsen: “While Aššur himself and your own god have rejected the man, still silver has fallen into my hands and until this day you have been fully satisfied.”

Vor gut fünfundzwanzig Jahren hat das CAD N/1 s.v. nadû v. Bed. 1c–6’, an BIN 6 39:19: DN u DN₃ iška li-dî-a-ni “may Aššur and your personal god, DN₃, reject me”, und BIN 6 97:22: cf. DN u DN₃ … li-dî-a-ni diese Stelle mit “also” angeschlossen und übersetzt: “Aššur himself and your god have rejected the man.”

Während man in der Übersetzung “may… reject me” nicht genau erkennen kann, wie man li-dî-a-ni analysiert hat, ist bei unserer Stelle klar, daß die deutliche 3. Person Sg. i-tī-dî-ma frei als Plural (genau genommen als Dual, den man aber nicht ausdrücken kann) übersetzt wird; das ist dem Sinn nach richtig, aber warum im Altassyrischen die 3. Sg.?


Man soll sicherlich noch einmal darauf hinweisen, daß auch nach der Verbalform i-tī-dî ein -ma steht und die weiteren Mitteilungen wieder mit der Kopula u angeschlossen werden.


2 Bezeichnet den Worttrenner.

3 Vom Ende der nächsten Zeile.

Wir wollen ferner hier schon bemerken, daß wir in dieser in einer t-Form im Grundstamm formulierten Aussage gewissermaßen einen auf eine andere Person bezogenen Vollzug der vorher zitierten Selbstverfluchtung … \textit{li-di-a-ni} sehen können.

Kurz zu dieser Form: nach dem eben zu \textit{i-tí-di-ma} Gesagten soll man darin vermutlich eine 3. Sg. \textit{+-anni} sehen, nicht etwa einen Dual \textit{+-ni}.

Dafür spricht auch die im \textit{CAD} als letztes altassyrisches Zitat gebrachte ganz eindeutige Stelle Kienast \textit{ATHE} 65:29: “and note \textit{Aššur i-ta-ad-a-ni-ma}”, in der wieder eine klare 3. Sg. vorliegt, die hier auf das einzige Subjekt, Aššur, bezogen ist. Wie haben Schreiber und Leser die vorher zitierten Aussagen verstanden? Sollen wir von dieser Stelle ausgehen und annehmen, daß diese Vorstellung so stark war, daß man das am Ende stehende Verbum auf jeden Fall auf Aššur bezogen – Aššur mit \textit{-ma} betont – und dazu angefügt hat, daß auch “dein Gott” sich dem angeschlossen hat? Oder die Verbform auf das unmittelbar davor stehende ilka beziehen, eine Aussage, durch die das am Satzbeginn stehende \textit{Aššur(-ma)} erklärt wird?


Davor steht im \textit{CAD} nur mehr das mit “cf.” an unsere Stelle CCT 3 16b: 15 angegeschlossene Zitat \textit{JCS} 14 8 No. 4:35: \textit{Aššur u ilka i-ta-ad-a-ni-ma} – ohne Übersetzung, wo man in der Verbform sicherlich ebenso eine 3. Sg. sehen soll: “Aššur und dein Gott hat mich …”, also hier auf den Sprecher bezogen.

Wir sehen, daß in allen diesen sehr ernsten negativen, offensichtlich in der Religion gegründeten Aussagen, genauer, in dem Wirken der Götter in den Bereich des Menschen hinein, Verbformen mit infigiertem \textit{-t-} stehen.

Das \textit{CAD} meint diese und andere solche Formen, wenn es S. 69 rechts im heading heißt: I, I/2, …, während das \textit{AHw.}, S. 705 ff., nur ein G und Gtn … kennt.


Um diese Verbform besser verstehen zu können, habe ich aus der Literatur, die nach \textit{CAD} N erschienen ist, sehr flüchtig – wenn ich auch kürzere Zitate aus unveröffentlichten Kt-Nummern mitrechn – etwas mehr als 6 200 Texte überflogen, vor allem altassyrische und altbabylonische; um diese Perioden geht es auch im wesentlichen in den folgenden Bemerkungen.
Dabei habe ich nicht nur entsprechende Formen von *nadûm* gesucht, sondern auch andere Verben kurz angesehen; weil *t*-Formen bekanntlich auch mit der “Ventivendung” erscheinen, habe ich auch manche Verbalformen mit dieser Endung notiert.6

Vollständigkeit war dabei in keiner Weise beabsichtigt, auch deshalb nicht, weil ich es mir erspart habe, in der National- oder Universitätsbibliothek zu arbeiten, sondern nur die Bücher und Zeitschriften angesehen habe, die ich selbst besitze; ebenso folgte die Auswahl der Verben keinerlei bestimmten Regeln, es wurden aber vorwiegend Formen notiert, die nicht in einer Sequenz Prt. – *t*-Form stehen; aber solche Formen werden sehr wohl besprochen und analysiert.

Ähnlich ging es bei den Verben mit einer “Ventivendung” eher um Formen, die nicht deutlich “her zu (mir)” u. ä. zeigen – um absichtlich hier so vage zu formulieren.

Die Belegsammlung aller dieser Verben kann hier nicht vorgeführt werden, sie wird hoffentlich an anderer Stelle erscheinen; deshalb muß ich auch auf allgemeine Bemerkungen verzichten, ich darf aber auf meine eben in den Anmerkungen genannten Arbeiten verweisen.

Ausgehend von der Form *i-tí-dí-ma* bleiben wir hier also beim Verbum *nadûm*, wobei wir zunächst noch einmal auf das *CAD* zurückblicken, dieses also in gewisser Hinsicht auch als Forschungsobjekt betrachten.

Dort werden I/2-Formen verstreut, in verschiedenen Abschnitten zitiert; uns interessiert neben dem Altassyrischen, das wir in den eben zitierten Formen gefunden haben, und dem Altbabylonischen vor allem auch die jüngere literarische Sprache.

Alle diese Formen sind lang bekannt, aber doch einige Worte wert: Da findet sich ganz nebenbei sogleich im ersten Abschnitt zu *lu ana mê lu ana išâti ŠUB-ú BBSīt. No. 4 iiii 3*, cf. MDP 2 113 iiii 16: “also, wr. *it-ta-di*” MDP 2 pl. 22 v 51 *CAD N/1 s.v. nadâ* v. Bed. 1a–1’) – und das ist es dort. Dann kommen schon literarische Belege aus der jüngeren Literatursprache, STT 38:131 (Poor Man of Nippur, Bed. 1a–1’e’) und Gilgamesch (Bed. 1a–1’d’), in I ii 34 … *iktârîš ittadî …*; Gilg. noch öfters: *it-ta-di qûlîptû XI 289* (Bed. 1c–1’), III iv 21 *indi it-ta-di* … (Bed. 2a–9’), VI 158 *it-ta-di a-ru-ru-ta* (Bed. 6 s.v. *arûru-tû*) oder XI 217. 227 … *it-ta-di* (Bed. 6 s.v. šibu).


---


Man wird zugeben, daß dies eine sehr wichtige Stelle ist – die t-Form am Beginn, Trägerin der wichtigen, dramatischen Mitteilung, von der alles Folgende abhängt.

Anschließend daran vielleicht wieder in der Reihenfolge des CAD selbst:

Dem kurzen Zitat it-ta-di-a-ša-šu OECT 3 41:9 (CAD N/1 s.v. nadû v. Bed. 1c–3’) kann man nicht entnehmen, daß diese Verbalform in einer -ma-Verbindung steht, aber nicht in einer Sequenz Prt.-ma – t-Form.

In der Bearbeitung von Kraus, AbB 4 119:(5)–13:


Man beachte das “(deshalb)” der Übersetzung und wohl auch das zweimalige -a-ša-šu.

Auf ARM 2 10:6 ana GN alākam ta-at-ta-di “you have neglected going to GN” (CAD N/1 s.v. nadû v. Bed. 1c–4’) wird mit “note” hingewiesen.

---

7 Ich zitiere absichtlich meist in dieser Form; darüber mehr in der geplanten oben erwähnten größeren Arbeit.

Das ist so nicht ganz richtig, aber die Stelle ist aus anderen Gründen interessant. Das Verbum steht in einem *šumma*-Satz. Durand nimmt in *Documents de Mari*, Nr. 470, für Zeile 4 einen alten Vorschlag von W. von Soden an\(^9\) und übersetzt überzeugend: “Si après réflexion, en fonction de ma tablette précédente que je t’ai envoyée, tu as abandonné (le projet) d’aller à Heššum ...”.

Das erste Verbum ist sicher richtig ergänzt, wir haben dann zwei *t*-Formen verschiedenen Funktion nebeneinander.

Die Stelle VAS 16 200:9 (*CAD N/1 s.v. *nadû* v. Bed. 2c–1´b´) wird mit gutem Grund ohne Übersetzung nur als “cf. [... ] x *kaspam* it-ta-di-i” zitiert, wobei man den Akkusativ *kaspam* bemerkt.

Die Stelle ist schwierig, weil sie in großteils zerstörtem Zusammenhang steht. In der Bearbeitung von Frankena, AbB 6 200: 8ff.: “... aber das Haus ist ruiniert.\(^10\) Drei … ein Sekel Silber ist soeben herausgeworfen worden.” Man bemerkt “soeben”, auch, daß -i in der Übersetzung ignoriert ist; “herausgeworfen” steht vielleicht für “hinausgeworfen”, was ganz etwas anderes bedeutet; “herausgeworfen” ergibt für mich in diesem Zusammenhang keinen Sinn. Der Brief ist alles andere als lustig: Von “kämpfen um das Haus” ist die Rede, ein “Mann wird vernichtet werden”, Schuldhaft und dergleichen mehr (12 ff.).

Zwei Stellen sollen noch zitiert werden; in der ersten, CT 4 19a:22, kann man aus dem Zitat im *CAD* (*N/1 s.v. *nadû* v. Bed. 2e) wieder nicht erkennen, daß das Verbum nicht isoliert steht, sondern diesmal in einer Prt.-*ma* – *t*-Form-Sequenz. Sie ist aber trotzdem interessant: *eqlam ... u kakkarātim ana mudasī at-ta-di* “I put down the field and the (uncultivated) plots on the list.”

Dazu etwas ausführlicher die Bearbeitung von Frankena, AbB 2 90:10 ff.:

Mein Herr möge den Qišṭi-Nabû befragen (*li-iš-ta-al*). Sein Sinn ist darauf gerichtet, die Felder der *rēdû* zu vernichten. Ich habe den Herrn “Leutevater” unterrichtet. Man hat den Nanna-mansi, den Obmann … zitiert (*is-sū-šu-ma*), und daß er ein ausgewähltes Feld den *rēdû* gegeben hat (*id-di-η [o]*) hat er zugegeben (*a-an-na i-ta-pa-al [o]*) (und) man hat die Tafel der Ausgabe (der Felder)\(^11\) der Verstorbenen mir gebracht (*ub-lu-nim-ma*), und (die Stellen), wo die *rēdû* ein Feld besitzen (*ša-ab-tu*), und die Grundstücke habe ich auf eine Liste eingetragen (*a-na ... at-ta-di*) und die Liste habe ich in ... hineingebracht (*uš-te-rī-ib*) ...

---

\(^9\) “Neue Bände der Archives Royales de Mari,” *Or.*, n.s., 22 (1953): 195: ... *šum-ma [a-aš-ta-al]-ma*.

\(^10\) Mit der Anmerkung, daß in *ḥu-ul-lu-uq* das Zeichen *UG* ganz unsicher sei.

\(^11\) *ṭup-pl tam-li-tim ša mi-tu-t[lim]*. Deutsche Übersetzung schwer verständlich; wird aber hier nicht diskutiert.
Aber die folgende, letzte Stelle paßt wieder sehr gut zu unseren Überlegungen: UCP 9 341 Nr. 16: 9 (CAD N1 s.v. nadā v. Bed. 6 s.v. tuššû) awilum tu-ša-am elija it-ta-di “the man has accused me wrongly”, in Stol, AbB 11, die Nummer 180. Ein kurzer Brief – die Vorderseite nach Resten in Zeile 11 abgebrochen, die Rückseite war nicht beschrieben – der hauptsächlich aus dieser Mitteilung besteht.

Nach Anrede und Segensformel in Zeilen 6ff.: “Concerning the letters (un-ne-du-uk-ki) that you sent to me (ša tu-ša-bi-lam), the man has uttered slander against me. I want to come (lu-ul-li-kam-ma), and that … (remainder lost).”

Der Eindruck, den wir beim Durchgehen der Bearbeitung von nadā im CAD gewonnen haben, hat sich bei der Durchsicht der neueren Literatur, von der ich oben gesprochen habe, durchaus bestätigt. Das war nicht anders zu erwarten, ist aber doch willkommen, als weitere Bestätigung dafür, daß man das CAD sehr wohl als statistisch hinreichende Quelle verwenden kann. Auch soll man dieses Verbum, um darauf nochmals hinzuweisen, zusammen mit allen anderen betrachten, die anderswo besprochen werden sollen: Die Ergebnisse passen gut zusammen.

Kienast ATHE 61: 25 wurde schon von Hecker in Grammatik § 97c zusammen mit den anderen hier besprochenen Stellen genannt und die t-Formen wurden als Perfekt notiert. Es heißt in ATHE 61 nach der Kopie: (23) … i-lá-qé (24) i-na na čč a-na-ku-ma (25) i-na ra-mi-Ini-a₁: a-tí-di (26) um-ma a-na-ku-ma … . Also anákūma … a-tí-dí, und zwar i-na ra-mi-Ini-a₁, und dann die Erklärung umma anákūma …


Es sei bei dieser Gelegenheit aber gestattet, doch kurz auf einige religiöse Aussagen einzugehen, weil wir ja von einem solchen Kontext ausgegangen sind.

In KTS 2 45:28 finden wir eine interessante, sehr logische Variante der liṭṭulā-Formel, nämlich (28) … d4-A-šur ̀u Dingir,ḪI.LA₄-ni (29) li-tù-lu … “Aššur und unsere Götter mögen Zeugen sein (, daß sich niemand auch nur einem S(ekel) von deinem Silber nähert!)”.

Es geht wieder einmal um viel Gold in diesem Brief der Gläubiger (umme ʾânū) an Idī-Ištar, um eine Urkunde des Fürsten, die es schon gibt, und eine andere, die man ausstellen lassen könnte … .

Also “unsere Götter” – die nicht namentlich genannt werden – zusammen mit, nach Aššur genannt, so daß es also völlig unmöglich ist, Aššur in einer Zusammenfassung “unsere Götter” zu subsumieren. Daß in der Verbalform der korrekte Plural steht, sei nur am Rande erwähnt.
Da ist aber der an InnΩja gerichtete Brief von Šumma-libb-Aššur,12 KTS 2 52. Der Brief weist mehrere Fehler auf und ist nicht gut verständlich – das sei sogleich eingangs betont.

Wir geben zuerst die Umschrift und Übersetzung der Zeilen 8b–18 nach KTS 2:

(8) … ma-ti-ma (9) i-na re-ši-kā (10) lá a-zi-iz /ma a-na-ku (11) šu-um-kā i-na (12) lá i-dim a-zA-kā-[ar] (13) <<a-zA-kā-ar>> A-š[ār] ilS-kā (14) ū MAR. TU (15) ilS-kā Kl li it ku-ni (16) e-zi-ib šu-mi-kā lá (17) za-kā-ri-im šu-mi lR₴₄·ₕkā (18) za-kā-ra-am lá a-le-[e]


Cécile Michel hat diesen Text bearbeitet. Ihre Umschrift und Übersetzung folgen hier:14

(8) … ma-ti-ma (9) i-na re-ši-kā (10) lá a-zi-iz /ma a-na-/l₄₅ku (11) šu-um-kā i-na (12) lá i-dim a-zA-kā-[ar] (13) <<a-zA-kā-ar>> A-š[ār] / ilS-kā (14) ū MAR. TU (15) ilS-kā Kl li-id-gu₄ₕlā (16) e-zi-ib šu-mi-kā (17) za-kā-ri-im šu-mi lR₴₄·ₕkā (18) za-kā-ra-am lá a-le-[e]

N’ai-je pas toujours été à ton service, et moi-même prononcerai-je ton nom sans raison? Qu’Aššur, ton dieu, et Amurrum, ton dieu, considèrent, indépendamment de ton nom que (je ne peux) citer, je ne peux pas citer (non plus) le nom de ton serviteur.

In dieser Umschrift, die zweifellos einen Fortschritt bringt, ist ganz wichtig, daß angemerkt wird, welche Zeichen aus einer folgenden Zeile herausgehoben wurden – wir kommen sofort darauf zurück. Es ist aber auch klar, daß das deutliche NI am Ende von Zeile 16, das in der Umschrift in KTS 2 am Ende von Zeile 15 steht, fehlt!


12 Schreibung der Personennamen nach den jeweiligen Autoren.
13 Bezeichnet den Worttrenner.
14 Michel InnΩja, Band 2, S. 93 f., Nr. 65.
15 Bezeichnet den Worttrenner (hier in Z. 10 vor ma!) oder weist darauf hin, daß das oder die folgenden Zeichen am Ende der nächsten Zeile stehen.
Wir haben am Beginn dieser Ausführungen die Übersetzung “... Aššur himself and your own god” zitiert, gewiß zustimmend, weil wir es so erwarten, und eben auf die Formulierung “Aššur und unsere Götter” hingewiesen: Die vorgeschlagene Umschrift und Übersetzung müßte völlig zweifelsfrei sein, wenn man sich ernsthaft damit auseinandersetzen sollte. Das ist sicher nicht der Fall. Aber vielleicht war der Wunsch der Vater des Gedankens.


Für die Fortsetzung halte ich li-id-gu₅/-lā von Michel für beachtenswert, aber statt KI li-id-gu₅/-lā NI so zu lassen, möchte man vielleicht doch in KI die Subjunktion kī sehen und in NI die Subjunktivendung -ni. Ungewöhnlich, aber nicht unmöglich, daß gemeint war: “Aššur und Amurrum, dein Gott, dein Gott – daß sie ‘schauen’ mögen!”

In Matouš Prag möchte ich auf zwei Texte hinweisen, zuerst I 479: 5 ff.: (“Wenn du mein Bruder bist, schicke mir den (Wert) meiner Stoffe, des früheren und von diesem, zusammen!”) (9) ... DINGIRlu-um (10) ṭlu ıḥ-dī-a-♭-nī-ma (11) ıke-na₁-tū-nī “Der Gott soll mich verwerfen, (wenn) es (nicht) wahr ist: (4 Stoffe gab ich dir vor ...)”

Wir kommen auf diesen Text noch zurück, aber vorher kurz zu Matouš Prag I 711. Dort heißt es: (8) ṭ ni-im-ta-lih-ka (9) a-wa-tī-nī a-mī-ša-am (10) ni-na-dī-am “Dann können wir beraten, ob wir unseren Rechtsstreit dorthin verlegen” und (18) lu-ba-tī-gā-ma šī-it-a-al (19) a-wa-tī-nī a-mī-ša-am (20) lu ni-dī-a-am “(Wenn du willst, dann soll Anina dort ...) beenden. Dann berate dich (mit ihm), ob wir unseren Rechtsstreit dorthin verlegen (und dann möge dein Bescheid zu mir kommen ...)”

Und Michel und Garelli Kültepe 1 47,17 f. mit der bekannten Phrase (17) ... A-šūr (18) ṭ d[NIN.SUBUR] lu i-dī-a. Sollen wir demnach doch versuchen, in Matouš Prag I 479: 10 ohne Emendation auszukommen?


Zum Altbabylonischen am Beginn mit sicherem Griff ein sehr schwieriger, interessanter Brief, ARMT 10 60.

Wir begnügen uns hier damit, auf Durand Documents de Mari, Nr. 1091, hinzuweisen, wo auf S. 275 zur Übersetzung “Maintenant, de l’audace!” in der Anm. 14 zu den Zeilen 9–14 die Lesung [la-a i]t-ta-di, ... gegeben wird, womit ARMT 10 60: 8 f. [i-na-a]n-na a-ah-ka, [tå'-a]t'-ta-di verbessert wird.


Gehen wir nochmals zum CAD, Band Ḥ s.v. ḫuptu A Bed. b in Elam.18 Das erste Zitat: “field and garden PN has given as a gift (iddiššin u iqīssi) to PN₂ his wife, he has set it aside as a ḫ.-holding (a-na ḫu-up-ti ittadi [i-ta-di]) (she may give it to an heir)”

MDP 24 378:8.

Noch ein Blick in AbB:

Cagni, AbB 8 100:5–6 erinnert an unseren Ausgangspunkt: (Zu ... sprich: also (sagt) das Mädchen:) “Seit dem Tag, an dem du mich preisgegeben hast und weggegangen bist” (iš-tu ... ša ta-di-a-an-ni-ma, r[a]-al-li-ḳu) (, als Gegenleistung für (geschuldete) 10 Sekel Silber ...).

Doch wenigstens eine Ś-Form: Stol, AbB 11 33:9, in einem Satz, der nach der Anrede und Segensformel beginnt: “I myself have hindered Gimil-Gula, ... , from even approaching the head of the district” ((7) a-na ša-pি-ir ma-tim (8) a-na sa-na-qí-imma (9) a-na-ku uš-ta-ad-di-šu) ... “.

Eine -am-Form in van Soldt, AbB 13 6:27: “We poured five kor of barley into one boat ( ... ni-it-bu-uk-ma), but it (began to) take in water and would have sunk (me-e id-di-a-am-ma ìt-te-bu-ú-ma-an)”.

Ein trauriger Beleg zum Abschluß – der aber auch zum Beginn paßt:

van Soldt, AbB 13 85:21: “They have treated Iluni harshly (a-na ... qá-ta-am ud-da-an-ni-nu) (and) they have put him in fetters (ma-an-da-a it-ta-du-šu). In accordance with his high status let my father negotiate his release ...” – um doch mit einer positiven Wendung zu schließen.

18 Lies in N/1 s.v. nadû v. Bed. 2h ḫuptu A statt C.
Although Bob Biggs is not a Hittitologist, he has contributed significantly to the understanding of Akkadian literary texts, including myths. Since the Illuyanka Myth is one of the most important myths in the Hittite repertoire,¹ and is widely known in translation far beyond the field of Hittitology, it seems appropriate to me to dedicate to him this brief commentary on the myth. In the notations of the lines that follow I have used the sigla of the editions of the text, but I have engaged as many of the various published translations and commentaries as possible.

In the form we have it today the Illuyanka Myth consists of two stories recounted on a single tablet. Each story is followed by a ritual. The main cuneiform text is KBo 3.7 with seven duplicates.² The text has been often translated³ and studied.⁴

---

I. THE DATING OF THE COMPOSITION

Although all extant manuscripts of the Illuyanka text are copies made after the Old Hittite period, the original form of the composition derives from Old Hittite. One can see this from sporadic linguistic archaisms. Pecchioli Daddi and Polvani note the following linguistic archaisms: the enclitic pronoun -e in § 10 B i 12', 13', -apa in anda-ma-pa § 4 A i 13 and am-mu-ug-ga-za-pa § 26 A iii 29, and the use of the allative in gi-im-ra § 13 C i 18. It may be that Stefanini’s mān with final force (§ 1 A i 3), if he is right in his analysis, is also an archaism. To these examples we may also add: Old Hittite ma-a-wa (§ 8 A i 25, § 13 C i 18, 21) for later ma-a-an-wa, kat-ti-ti (§ 8 A i 25) for later -ta katta(n), the writing -z for the reflexive particle in ìÎnarašš=a=ız (§ 9 B i 4), and andan Ê-[(ri)] (§ 13 C i 16) instead of later Ê-ri anda. The Old Hittite nongeminating -a for change of topic (often rendered “but”) is also attested in a-pa-a-ša § 14 C i 23 (beginning apodosis after a mān clause), mān=aš pa-a-i-ta “but when he went” § 24 A iii 13, “Za-li-nu-i-šā in § 29 D iv 6, ku-i-ta § 33 A iv 18, and erroneously for the geminating -a in ša-ku-wa-aš-še<-et>-ta “and his eyes” § 24 A iii 18. Archaic elements having to do with the contents of the stories are amply discussed in LMI, p. 39, n. 4.

It would be interesting to determine if the archaic elements are equally distributed between the narrative and ritual portions of the two accounts. If they are, this would indicate that the rituals as well as the narratives stem from the Old Hittite period. If not, we may be permitted to look to religious-political influences from the thirteenth century on the rituals. As for archaic linguistic elements in the ritual portion of Account 1 (§§ 18–19: A ii 21–30), there is nothing linguistically distinctive of Old Hittite versus

---

5 So, for example, García Trabazo, Textos religiosos hititas, p. 78, and compare the on-line concordance of S. Košak at http://www.orient.uni-wuerzburg.de/hetkonk/hetkonk_abfrage.php. García Trabazo dates them all to the fourteenth century B.C., while Košak dates KBo 12.83 (“F”) to the thirteenth (“sjh.”).


7 LMI, p. 39, n. 3.

later periods. But in the ritual of Account 2 (§§ 27–35) there are a few possible linguistic archaisms: *pa-i-u-wa-ni* § 30 D iv 9 (and *pa-a-i-wa-ni* in A and C) with its Old Hittite/Middle Hittite -wani ending, the older *e-šu-wa-aš-ta* of § 30 D iv 10 (contrasted with its duplicate A iv 7, which modernized as *e-šu-wa-aš-ta-ti*), the construction of middle *eš*—“sit down”—with -šan but no -za, the Old Hittite spelling ša-al-li-iš (A iv 17) versus post-Old Hittite šał-li-iš.

This is scant evidence, but it is enough to suggest an Old Hittite archetype for the ritual in Account 2. On the other hand, New Hittite spellings (which arguably could be due to the scribe rather than the original) abound in the ritual portions. If these New Hittite spellings belong to the original form of the rituals, one could suppose that the old narratives were joined to newly created rituals.

Kellerman mentions several elements of the contents of the two rituals to argue that the second is more recent and more appropriate to the late empire period (Tudhaliya IV) than the first. In the first ritual the name of the god Zaliyanu is written with the mountain determinative, ḪUR.SAG Zali(ya)nu, while in the second it is written with the DINGIR determinative ḪZali(ya)nu. In the second ritual he has both a wife and a concubine and is therefore portrayed as fully anthropomorphic. But is this evidence compelling? If the transfer from mountain to anthropomorphic deity could be conclusively shown to be a widespread and virtually exceptionless trend in Hittite cult, this would be a significant indication of a later date for the second ritual. Kellerman quotes Laroche for the elements of Tudhaliya IV’s religious reforms, which include the replacement of ancient theriomorphic images, stelae, and different objects thought to be divine incarnations by anthropomorphic statues. But a mountain deity is not theriomorphic, and there is no way to show a mountain-god in art other than in the traditional style with human heads but sloping rocky flanks, i.e., half and half.

With respect to the content of the text, one can see its original Old Hittite setting in the following five features, already noted by *LMJ*: (1) the role played by the city of Nerik, which was lost to the Hittites from the late Old Kingdom until the reign of Ḫattušili III, (2) the use of the matrimonial institution of the *LÚ antiyanza*, known to us only in the Old Hittite laws, (3) the fact that the myth furnishes an etiology for the Old Hittite festival of *purulli*, (4) the mention (in the second account) of the *LÚGUDU⁄G* Taḫpurili (see below in § 29), who is mentioned in an Old Hittite Script text, and (5) the names of the deities, all of which belong to the pre-Hittite Hattian sphere.

---

9 Unless one wishes to exaggerate the importance of the mildly temporal use of *mān* in line 22. But since it is likely that in *hi-ni-ik-ta* we have a “dynamic” (i.e., deponent) middle form, present tense (correctly in *LMJ*, p. 52, “avrà distribuito”), there is nothing unusual in New Hittite about a temporal use *mān* with a pres.-future (“whenever”). Its clause establishes a contingency for the action of *pīđāi* in line 24.


II. TRANSMISSION

*LMI*, p. 40, argues against oral transmission from the Old Hittite period to the first written form in New Hittite for the following reasons. (1) The linguistic archaisms in the text are grammatical, not just lexical, and would not have survived oral transmission for centuries in a nonmetrical form. (2) The name of the text’s author, Kella, is only attested in the pre-imperial period. A copy attested in one small fragment appears to show Middle Hittite script. But the vast majority of the extant copies are New Hittite and were probably made during a period of reinterest in the north, such as in Ḫattušili III’s reign, and were copied from Kella’s Old Hittite exemplar, which has never been recovered. But if the extant copies are only one copying away from an Old Hittite archetype, I am surprised at how few archaisms remain. *LMI*’s assessment of the age of the Kella name militates against the view of Kellerman, who assumes that Kella is not the ancient author of the stories, but a New Hittite GUDU₁₂-priest contemporary with the copy, that is, during the reigns of Ḫattušili III and the cult reformer Tudḫaliya IV.

III. INTERPRETATION

*Purulli* was an Old Hittite festival, which continued to be celebrated in the early empire before the revival of contact with Nerik in the north under Ḫattušili III. We know this because in his annals Muršili II wrote: “I celebrated the *purulli* festival, the great festival, for the Storm-god of Ḫatti and the Storm-god of Zippalanda.” Some scholars claim that the *purulli* festival was the Hattic festival of the New Year, although this can only be an inference, since it is never called such in the texts.

While each has a subplot, both stories focus on a conflict between the chief Storm-god of the Hittites, the Storm-god of Heaven, and a huge and powerful reptile, Sum. MUŞ, Hitt. *illuyanka-* or *elliyanka-* . In English translations this reptile is sometimes called a “dragon” (*LMI*, “il drago”). But one should not prejudice the conception of this huge being by a word associated with a particular mythological creature that figures in Western fairy tales.

The word *illuyanka-* , also written *elliyanka-* , is thought by Puhvel to be an “autochthonous term,” that is, non-Indo-European. But in a recent article Katz has proposed

---

12 The name occurs in Old Assyrian Kültepe texts, in the Telepinu Proclamation, and in an Old Hittite land-grant text (according to *LMI*).
15 For example, García Trabazo, *Textos religiosos hititas*, pp. 77–78, 83 with n. 16.
an Indo-European etymology for the word.\footnote{J. T. Katz, “How to Be a Dragon in Indo-European: Hittite illuyankaš and Its Linguistic and Cultural Congeners in Latin, Greek, and Germanic,” in J. Jasanoff, H. C. Melchert, and L. Olivier, eds., \textit{Mír Curad: Studies in Honor of Calvert Watkins}, Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft, Band 92 (Innsbruck, 1998), pp. 317–34.} What is certain is that it is a noun, not a proper name, and should be translated—failing any more specific evidence—with as general a term as possible, “serpent” or “reptile.”

Most interpreters would agree today that there is more to these stories than literature. One can read the Kumarbi Epic without reference to Hittite concepts of ritual and kingship, for whatever theological and ritual concepts are embedded in those stories are most probably Hurrian or Mesopotamian but not necessarily Hittite. This is not the case with Old Hittite myths such as this one and the so-called Telepinu Myth.

Where interpreters are not in agreement is in the details of the interpretation of the symbolism. It is inevitable in literary works employing symbolism that only some details of the story are intended to be understood symbolically. Many elements are merely details essential to the plot of the narrative and to lend verisimilitude. It is difficult for interpreters to know which details are intended to be taken symbolically. Which of the following elements of the first Illuyanka story, for example, should one consider as having a symbolic meaning?

1. The Storm-god and serpent fight, and the Storm-god is defeated.
2. The fight takes place in Kiškilušša.
3. The Storm-god appeals to the other gods for help (§ 4 A I 13).
4. Inara prepares a feast with the emphasis on beverage types.
5. Inara finds Ḫupašiya in Zikkaratta and proposes that he assist her.
6. Ḫupašiya agrees on condition that he may sleep with her, and she concurs.
7. Inara hides Ḫupašiya.
8. Inara ornaments herself and calls the serpent up (ṣarā kallišta) out of his hole/cave.
9. The serpent and his children come up, eat and drink to excess.
10. They are unable to go back down into their hole.
11. Ḫupašiya ties (kalēliet) the serpent up with a cord (or with cords).
12. The Storm-god kills the serpent, and the other gods side with him once again.
14. She installs Ḫupašiya in the house.
15. She warns him against looking out the window at other mortals while she is away.
16. After 20 days of obedience, he looks outside and sees his wife and children.
17. When she returns, he begs to be able to return to his family.
Most interpreters would consider numbers 1, 12, and 13 as theologically and ritual-
ly significant, but the rest of the details are folkloristic and are present only in order to
fill out a plausible story. Yet one wonders if there is a theological or ritual significance
to some of the other details, such as the locus of the original fight in Kiåkiluååa (no. 2),
the choice of Zikkaratta as Ḫupašiya’s hometown (no. 5), and the entire set of events
involving Ḫupašiya, who seems to have been the unsuccessful prototype of the Hittite
king in his relationship to Inara, the daughter of the Storm-god. Certainly the specification
of 20 days as the duration of Inara’s absence from Ḫupašiya (§ 14 C I 23) serves
no obvious part of the narrative plot itself and raises the suspicion that there is some
obscure allusion here to the duration of a festival of Inara celebrated in the open coun-
try (Hittite *gimra*). An official at Tapikka bore the Akkadian name ʾmâr-ešrē, also
written in Sumerian as DUMU.UD.20.KAM “son (born on) the 20th day.” Which 20th
day does this name refer to, if indeed there was not a particular 20th day of a festival
that was particularly auspicious for the birth of children? Admittedly, this Babylonian
personal name already existed in Mesopotamia, and the day referred to was the 20th
day of the month on which a joyful festival was celebrated in honor of the Sun-god
Šamaš.\(^{18}\) But an official in Maṣat-Tapikka would hardly have taken a name referring
to his own date of birth, if that was to refer to a festival for Šamaš that did not exist in
Hatti. Most likely, therefore, the name was reinterpreted in terms of a known Anatolian
festival.

It is widely believed, perhaps correctly, that the conflict between the serpent and
the Storm-god is over the control of the waters, so necessary for agriculture and life.\(^{19}\)
The Storm-god would presumably be lord of the rainfall, while the serpent controlled
the subterranean water sources. By defeating the Storm-god, the serpent thwarts the
rainfall and continues by himself to control the subterranean springs, which he can cut
off at will. But there are unanswered questions regarding the theory that it was only
the Storm-god who controlled the rains. Strange as it seems, where the Illuyanka Myth
itself mentions a divine being who is asked to give rain (§ 19), it is not a storm-god,
but Mt. Zaliyanu, a deified mountain near the city of Nerik. Why is the Storm-god
not asked? Furthermore, the triad of deities who in their priests or emblems remain to
preside over the cult location at Tanipiya, include in the persons of the Mountain-god
Zaliyanu and the goddesses Za(š)ḫapuna and Tazzuwašši (perhaps deified springs\(^{20}\))
precisely these two sources of water. Indeed, Haas claims that both of these god-
desses were “Tochtergöttinnen” and “Quellnymphen.”\(^{21}\) But his further claim that
Tazzuwašši\(^{22}\) has the variant name Tašimi or Tešimi is unsupported by his evidence.\(^{23}\)

---
\(^{18}\) See *CAD* E s.v. *ešrā* usage b-2’ and *ešrāa* for the name ʾmâr-ešrē in Akkadian texts.
\(^{19}\) For example, García Trabazo, *Textos religiosos hititas*, p. 78 (“por el control de las aguas”).
\(^{20}\) As mountain deities are always male in Hit-
tite, so springs are female. And the spring name
\(^{21}\) *GhK*, p. 446.
\(^{22}\) Ibid., p. 446, n. 39.
\(^{23}\) Ibid., pp. 598–99.
All that is known is that Tešimi is the beloved of the Storm-god of Nerik, and in some texts Zaḫaṇpu is also associated with him as a consort. Tazzuwašši, on the other hand, is called the concubine (šašanza) of the Mountain-god Zaliyanu, whose wife (DAM) is Za(s)ḫaṇpu. The picture offered by the two narratives and their two ritual sections is not uniform theologically.

The two accounts exhibit other important differences: (1) The first contains several geographical references that permit localization in the north near Nerik, while the second has no such references and involves only an anonymous “sea,” which could be the Black Sea, the Mediterranean, the Tuz Gölü (Salt Lake), or (according to LMI) it refers simply to the mythical “sea,” the locus of the marine enemies of ancient Near Eastern storm-gods. (2) The serpent of Account 1 lives in a cave or hole in the ground and is terrestrial, while that of Account 2 is marine. The serpentine opponent of the Storm-god in both Illuyanka and the Kumarbi cycle of stories is stereotypical: powerful and gluttonous. LMI maintains that he is also portrayed as stupid. But it can be argued that he is merely outwitted by the more crafty and clever Inara and her father. Certainly the point of the stories is the superior wisdom of the Storm-god. If his opponent were portrayed as a dunce, it would reduce his triumph to mere “child’s play.” In both the Illuyanka and Ḫedammu (CTH, no. 348)24 stories the protagonist, or one of his allies, defeats the serpent by trickery. The trick in the second Illuyanka story is so complex (involving an understanding of the antiyanza marriage customs25) and works only over such a lengthy period of time (during which the child born to the Daughter of a Poor Man grows to adulthood), that one would be hard-pressed to say that the serpent was stupid not to have detected it. Since nothing in the account suggests that the true parentage of the son of the Daughter of a Poor Man was known in advance by the serpent, he could not have suspected the trap. LMI is right in pointing out that we have no clue as to what the serpent thought he would derive from the marriage other than a son-in-law. No dowry (Hittite iwaru) paid by the boy’s mother is mentioned.

---


Both *LMI*, p. 42, and Haas consider the goddess Inara to be the real protagonist of Account 1. She shows similarities to ḫIÅTAR in the Hurrian myths, who in those stories aids her brother, the Storm-god (dU), uses her feminine charms to seduce opponents, and remains faithful to the powerless Storm-god when the other deities have deserted him. But unlike ḫIÅTAR, Inara is also a protectress of kingship. Whether she was the only divine protectress of Hittite kingship depends on whether one considers ḡalmaššuit in the originally Old Hittite ritual for building a new palace (KUB 29.1 and duplicates) to be the embodiment of Hittite kingship. And as *LMI* correctly notes, since we lack the original Old Hittite version and detailed knowledge of Hattic theology, we do not know if Inara’s ḫIÅTAR traits are Old Hittite or added by the New Hittite scribes. Judging from Inara’s role of providing abundant wine, ordinary beer, and waḫḫi beer (§ 5), she may have also been associated with the growth of vines and cereal crops necessary to produce these fermented beverages. The coda to Account 1 (§§ 13–16) suggests that she was a deity of the wild, open spaces (*gimpā-*), where she lived alone, isolated from human life in the cities and villages. In another myth about Inara there is mention of a horn, perhaps a hunting horn, by which cult officials could produce a sound called ḫInaraḫaluga—“the message of Inara.” See *CHD* P s.v. *palwatalla*.

*LMI*, p. 43, offers two reasons why Ḫupašiya was chosen to assist Inara in rescuing the Storm-god: courage (binding the serpent) and initiative (asks to sleep with Inara). It is true that these are only displayed after she has made him the initial offer, but they are intended to reveal innate qualities that he possessed before she selected him.

As for why he was prohibited from looking out the window at fellow mortals, Gaster suggested it was to prevent him from having sex with his wife and thereby weakening himself and transmitting to her some of the special powers now transmitted to him by his sexual union with Inara. Mora prefers to think that it was a matter of preserving Ḫupašiya’s purity, which would be violated by even looking at his wife. Beckman attributes Ḫupašiya’s death to *hybris* in first connecting with a goddess and then renouncing her. Pecchioli Daddi and Polvani (in *LMI*) compare Ḫupašiya’s role with that of the Old Hittite kings in their relationship to the gods and propose that in respect to his sacred royal duties—heroic (i.e., military) and sacral—he failed in the sacral and having become impure was no longer worthy of the preeminence accorded him. The explanation offered by Gaster, Gurney, and Beckman need not have any reference to Hittite kingship. But those of Mora, Pecchioli Daddi, Polvani, and García Trabazo do. Once again, we must decide if even such a prominent part of the story needs to be taken symbolically. If so, we must follow those four scholars. I am inclined to do so. My published remark (cited in *LMI*, p. 43, n. 22) that the mention of the lo-

---

26 García Trabazo, *Textos religiosos hititas*, p. 79, agrees with this conception.


cality (Tarukka) of Inara’s house might have had an etiological motive, to explain a prominent ruin in the area, was predicated on the common view that the house on the rock was destroyed by Inara and sown with cress so as never again to be inhabited. Even if that house was not destroyed, its survival in that area could still have motivated the mention of Tarukka. My remark never intended to deny that the entire episode concerning the house on the rock might have a function other than etiology as well.

The “house” (or temple) built on the rock does indeed—as LMI correctly notes—remind one of the palace of the Labarna, which in a famous Old Hittite liturgical song (KUB 36.110:13–16) is said to be built on a rock, where it endures, in contrast to the house of the traitor (appaliyalla-)

whose house built in the path of the flood is washed away. But, contrary to LMI, p. 43, Inara builds the house “for herself” (§ 13 C I 14 nu=z=(š)an dInaraš É-er wetet “Inara built a house for herself (-za)”—note the reflexive particle -za. The house “for herself” must be a temple, not a palace for Ḥupašiya as king. It is true that Ḥupašiya would also live in this house/temple but as her lover and consort, which symbolically might correspond to her priest.

There seems to be some misunderstanding of the nature of Ḥupašiya’s offence. It is true, as others have pointed out, that he disobeys the goddess. But his action is more than merely becoming impure and unworthy. When he pleads to return to his home (§ 15 C i 27), he is not simply asking for a short leave to enjoy family life and return to Inara. Rather, he is renouncing the special relationship that had been established between the two of them involving the permanent renunciation of his former earthly ties. This has to be taken into consideration before symbolic allusions to Hittite kingship are drawn from the story. We know from the Instructions for Priests that ordinary priests could go home to eat their main meal at dusk and even have sexual intercourse with their wives, but they had to return to the temple in the evening to spend the night there. And before returning to duty they had to bathe and report in the temple that they had slept with a woman. But the purity demands on the king were more stringent and of a different order from those imposed on priests. The king was the “holy priest” above all others. Yet even Hittite kings occasionally became temporarily impure. If there is a symbolic allusion to the duties of kingship here, I would think that

30 Followed by García Trabazo, Textos religiosos hititas, p. 79.
31 Various attempts have been made to interpret the word appaliyalla- (“trapper,” etc.). I myself once suggested that it meant “deceived one, fool.” But since it is in a political aspect that Labarna’s house is contrasted with that of the appaliyalla-, and since in Hittite treaties it is traitors who perform the action appali da- “to betray (the king),” I think it best to translate appaliyalla- as “traitor.”


33 KUB 13.4 ii 75–iii 1. See also iii 15, 68, and 74.
instead of sexual impurity it might lie in putting the interests of his human subjects above those of the gods who have chosen and installed him: a species of “spiritual unfaithfulness” rather than a physical one. There was always the danger that pressure from his subjects would dissuade a king from actions for which divine guidance had been given by oracular means. It is for this reason that in the Political Testament of Ḫattuṣili I\(^\text{34}\) the king instructs his council (pankuš) regarding his successor: “Let not the elders continually speak to him ... Let not the elders of Ḫatti continually speak to you, (my son)” (KUB 1.16 ii 58–60).

It appears that recent interpreters who have expressed themselves on the issue assume that Inara killed Ḫupašiya.\(^\text{35}\) If his sin was hybris, as Beckman proposed,\(^\text{36}\) there is ample reason to expect such a harsh punishment. But we should be clear that nothing in the preserved parts of the relevant lines remotely suggests that he was killed.\(^\text{37}\) LMI even says that Inara destroyed “the house.” And since only one “house” is mentioned in the story, this would mean that she destroyed the temple/house that she had built on the rock. Yet only a few lines later we read that she placed in the hands of the Hittite king “her house and the subterranean waters.” The reader must be expected to understand by “her house” precisely that house in which she had kept Ḫupašiya. The Hittite king was expected to be Ḫupašiya’s successor in this house, even if not in the literal sense of Inara’s consort. It seems more likely to me that Ḫupašiya was rejected as Inara’s consort and sent home, although it is likely that once he was rejected by Inara, the narrator Kella would not bother to dwell upon details of his later life in this text.

If, despite the doubts I have just raised, the missing part of the tablet did tell of the death of Ḫupašiya, since it would have been Inara who killed him as punishment, it is difficult to follow Gaster, Haas, and García Trabazo in seeing his death as symbolizing the death of plant life with the arrival of another winter.\(^\text{38}\) Why would Inara, the daughter of the Storm-god and protectress of kingship, be the appropriate one to put an end to the fertile season, symbolically initiating another cycle of infertility and the renewed

---


\(^{37}\) See the remark in HM\(^1\), p. 38, n. 1.

\(^{38}\) See García Trabazo, Textos religiosos hititas, p. 79 and n. 7.
reign of the serpent? If it turns out that Inara killed Ḫupašiya, I would be more inclined to see this as a punishment for his hybris, as Beckman claimed.

LMI, pp. 47 f., propounds a theory to explain why, although the chief male deity of the two accounts is just called dU or dĬSKŪR, the ritual at the end exalts dZaliyanu (a mountain-god, not a storm-god) as the rain-giver. LMI thinks that the ritual pertains to the situation at the beginning of both myths, when the Storm-god was disabled, and purulli is performed to replace his functionality with Zaliyanu. The account of the Storm-god’s recovery is merely an appendix. This theory is at first glance plausible, but I find it ultimately improbable, since the Storm-god’s recovery is the main point of both stories and is not placed at the end as an appendix. No mention is made of ill effects on the land from his defeat or disablement. Unlike in the so-called Disappearing Deity Myths, the text does not elaborate the natural catastrophes that must have followed from the Storm-god’s disablement. Furthermore, the text says that the occasion for celebrating the purulli festival was Inara’s gift of her house and the subterranean waters to the king (§ 17 A ii 18–19), and this was impossible until after the killing of the serpent and his kin, which also resulted in the gods’ aligning themselves with the Storm-god again. In terms of the narrative, then, purulli could be celebrated only after the Storm-god recovered his old position. Purulli then ensured a fruitful spring and harvest but not by surrogates of the Storm-god.

The existence of the two versions is explained as depending on when (first or second purulli) and where (Nerik, Kaštama, Tanipiya) it was performed in connection with the purulli (LMI, p. 48).

Gonnet proposes the theory that in the second account the son of the Storm-god represents dU URU Nerik, and the serpent represents the Kaškaeans who had overrun Nerik.39 Certainly the epithet “snake” was hurled at enemies, as is clearly seen in the Political Testament of Ḫattušili I: nu annaš=šaš MUŠ[-aš kuit uttar nu apāt daškit] “he always took the word of his mother, (that) snake” (KUB 1.16 ii 10).40 If Gonnet is right in this assumption, it shows that the characteristics associated in Hittite myths with serpents—malevolence and greed and possibly stupidity41—were also attributed by them to the Kaška people. Other examples of such unfavorable epithets used for the Kaška are “swineherds.”42

41 But see my doubts expressed above on the supposed stupidity of the serpent.

Finally, I would agree with LMI, pp. 41–42, that the presence of what appear to be folkloristic motifs in the stories—especially the alleged “stupidity” of the serpent—are not evidence of the naiveté (LMI’s word is “ingenuità”) of these tales. Many of the same motifs can be found not only in the Hittite myths of Hurrian origin (Ḫedammu, Ullikummi), but also in other myths and epics from the ancient Near East, such as the Egyptian tales of Horus and Seth, the Doomed Prince, and the Babylonian Gilgamesh. As LMI correctly notes, since the serpent tales were part of a cult legend, they had to be mere outlines, very schematic, in order to fit within the parameters of the purulli festival.

LINE-BY-LINE COMMENTS (§ NUMBERS FROM BECKMAN’S EDITION)

The Serpent Story: Account 1

§ 1 A i 1 The restoration [ŁÚGUDU⁄¤] depends on A iv 30. In the northern Anatolian cult centers, as depicted in the cult inventories,43 each temple had three major cult officials: a ŁÚGUDU₁₂, a ŁÚSANGA (šANKUNNI-), and an ŁAMA-DINGIR-LIM (i.e., šIHWANZANNI-). The syllabic reading of ŁÚGUDU₁₂ was not tazzeli-, as is still anachronistically maintained by Haas and García Trabazo.44 The correct reading, which we know from phonetic complements was an a-stem, was probably kum-ra-, borrowed from kumru, which was the Old Assyrian reading of ŁÚGUDU₁₂.45

A i 2 Güterbock wished to read: [US]-MA m.Ki-il-l[a SA] dU URI Ne-ri-ik (2) ne-pí-ša-aš di[M-aš DUMU]-aš!? (3) pu-ru-ul-li-ia-aš ut-tar and render: “Thus says Killa: the words of the purulli festival of the Storm-god of Nerik, [the son of] the Storm-god of heaven (are as follows).”46 If this reading were accepted, Killa would not be given here, as he is in the colophon of copy A, the title ŁÚGUDU₁₂.

Otten’s collation of the line yielded different traces,47 which were followed by LMI, namely, ne-pí-ša-aš di[M-h]u-[n]a (i.e., Tarḫuna).

A i 3 Despite a certain similarity of sound, there is no etymological connection between purulli and the word for the lots, pul, cast in the ritual at the end of one of the versions. Rather, purulli is a Hittite word, probably derived from w/pur

44 García Trabazo, Textos religiosos hititas, p. 83 with n. 14.
45 See H. A. Hoffner, Jr., “Hittite Equivalents of Old Assyrian kumrum and epattum,” WZKM 86 (1996): 151–56, where I proposed kumra- as the Hittite reading of ŁÚGUDU₁₂. H. Otten, “Erwägungen zur Kontinuität altanatolischer Kulte,” in Uluslararasi I: Hititoloji Kongresi Bildirileri (19–21 Temmuz 1990) (Çorum, Turkey, 1990), pp. 34–42, had already correctly derived this Hittite kumra- from Old Assyrian krumru(m) but did not suggest that it was the syllabic equivalent of the logogram ŁÚGUDU₁₂. For a brief discussion of Anatolian deities served by kumru-priests in Old Assyrian texts, see Popko, Religions of Asia Minor, pp. 24–25.
“land.” It may have been a spring festival designed to ensure abundant crops in the coming harvests (in LMI “probabilmente in primavera”). The festival was originally performed in Nerik but after the loss of Nerik transferred to Hakmiš and Utruna.

LMI, p. 50, n. 7, and García Trabazo quite correctly exclude Goetze and Kellermann’s reading nu-ma-a-an “no longer,” but neither notes that núman does not even mean “no longer” but “does not want to” (see § 11 B i 14 below).

§ 2 A i 6 Stefanini argues for a “final” force for mân “so that,” comparing Latin ut and Greek ἢς. This suggestion was followed by LMI, p. 50, n. 8 (“[proprio] perché”), and García Trabazo but not by others. No “final” sense of mân was indicated in the CHD article on the word, which appeared a year after Stefanini’s article.

§ 3 A i 10 Contrary to the claim in LMI, p. 50, n. 10, Kiškilušša is not “unattested elsewhere”: it is found as Ga[s]kilušša in KUB 19.33 + 34 i 34 (DŠ frag. 3454), where—as in this myth—it is also associated with URU Tarukka. This fact was noted already by Gonnet and was registered by del Monte. One of the features that distinguishes the first Serpent Story (Account 1) from the second (Account 2) is the presence in the first of toponyms, several of which are known from other texts, and all of which establish the locale of the action in north-central Asia Minor (on this see LMI, p. 41).

---

51 Stefanini, “Alcuni problemi ittiti, lessicali e sintattici,” p. 255.
54 Translated in *CoS* 1, p. 191, rt. col.
55 Gonnet, “Institution d’un culte chez les hittites,” p. 100 with nn. 51 and 54.
§ 4  A i 13  As pointed out in CHD s.v. -mu, an-da-ma-pa is to be analyzed as anda=m(û)=apa; so that Beckman’s translation “Come in!” (in CoS 1) is excluded, and the word “mío” in Pecchioli Daddi and Polvani’s translation “Accorrete (in mio aiuto)” (LMI) and the “mí” in García Trabazo’s “¡Venid a (mí)!” should be removed from inside the parentheses, since the pronoun -mu is actually present in the form -ma-pa from *-mu + -apa.

A i 14  Beckman (CoS 1) includes line 14 in the Storm-god’s quoted invitation, probably because of the paragraph line after it. But that leaves the immediately following sentence in line 15 without an explicit subject. I prefer LMI’s interpretation as a statement. That anda=m(û)=apa tiyatten means to come to someone’s aid or join his side rather than assemble for a party or festival seems clear from the evil invitation to treachery quoted in KUB 21.42 + 26.12+ iii 10 nu=wa=kan eḫu tamedani anda tiyaweni “Come, let’s join someone else’s side”; compare also KUB 26.32+ iii 10–15. Furthermore, Beckman’s interpretation ignores the nu in line 15, which continues the statement of line 14.

§ 5  A i 15–18  mekkı handait and iyāda iet make the same statement: a lot of drink was prepared. Accordingly, Beckman (CoS 1) is right to translate palḫi as plural “vessels” (contra LMI “un vaso di vino, uno di …” and García Trabazo “una marmita de vino, una …”).57 In fact, the form is probably a collective in -i, not a neuter pl. Stefanini seems to think the three beverages are drawn from a single large vessel.58 But that would not fit with the three mentions of palḫi. The beverages marnuwan and wallḫi are varieties of beer.59 The New Hittite Script copy’s i-ia-a-“šu” is explained by the “stepped” form of DA in Old Hittite Script, which makes confusion with SU possible for a New Hittite copyist. For the loss of final r in Hittite, see Neu and Melchert.60 For another (Middle Hittite in New Script) example of iyata tameta, see KBo 12.42:4–5 uwaweni nu=wa iyata tameta / pe harweni. See also Puhvel, HED s.v. iyata(r).

A i 20  I prefer “found” (HM² 12) rather than “encountered” (LMI, CoS 1, García Trabazo) for wemĩ(e)ti, since it seems unlikely that Inara’s meeting with him was by chance: I think she intentionally went in search of a particular man and made her offer to him, just as the bee in the Telepinu Myth searches for and eventually finds the god who will restore fertility and plenty.

57 García Trabazo, Textos religiosos hittitas, p. 87.
59 Correctly García Trabazo, Textos religiosos hittitas, p. 87.
§ 7 A i 21 Instead of a dative-locative form ḫuḫpašiya might be a vocative here: “Thus spoke Inar: ‘O ḫuḫpašiya, I am about to...’.”

A i 23 For the use of ḫarp- (mid.) for divorce (and remarriage?), see Laws § 31 (with -kan) and for livestock wandering from one corral or fold to another in Laws § 66 (without local particle). This double emphasis of separation from association and joining another is particularly appropriate here, where in order to become Inara’s partner, ḫuḫpašiya must first leave his wife and family. Inara needs the assistance of a mortal to accomplish her task, much as there was a necessary collaboration between divine and human participants in the rituals to recover the “Disappearing Deity” in the Old Hittite Telepinu-type myths (cf. Beckman’s observation quoted in LMI, p. 43, n. 22). To his observation may be added that even in the building rituals it is always stressed in the ritual dedicatory prayers that the mortal king who authorized its building was not acting alone as a human but in concert with all the gods: “This temple which we have just built for you, O god—and here he calls by name the deity for whom they were building it—it was not we who built it: all the gods built it.”

§ 8 A i 24–26 ḫuḫpašiya consents on the condition that he be permitted to sleep with the goddess. His motive here is clearly not mere lust, but precisely what is it? Is he expressing a belief (shared also by the narrator of this story) that sexual intercourse with the goddess will confer upon him the necessary courage and skill to succeed in her commission? If the latter is the case, then his precondition both ensures his success in the near future and obligates him in the long run to abandon his family permanently. This is an important question in view of LMI’s theory about the reasons why Inara chose ḫuḫpašiya (LMI, p. 43, top). In Hittite belief, as expressed in the Paškuwatti ritual, sleeping with a goddess in her temple (Lat. incubatio) conferred sexual potency on a previously impotent man.

§ 9 B i 4’–5’ There is a certain (perhaps deliberate) ambiguity in munnΩit “hid”: Inara hid ḫuḫpašiya from his own family (wife and children), and she hid him from the invited serpent. Although the text does not state it explicitly, the Storm-god himself is in hiding until the serpent has been tied up. There is a sexual motive in the words -z unuttat “adorned herself” (line 5’). The serpent is attracted to the feast not just by the lavish food but by the sexual charms of Inara. Compare the actions of ISTAR in the Kumarbi Cycle, where she seeks to disable

---

61 kāša ké kue É.DINGIR-LIM tak ANA DINGIR-LIM wetummen DINGIR-LIM=ya=kan / SUM=SU ḫalzai wedanzi=ya=at kedani nu=war=at UL / anzaš wetummen DINGIR.MES=war=at ḫimanteš weter, KBo 4.1 i 28–30 (CTH, no. 413).

62 Goetze, Kleinasien, p. 148.

or distract the Storm-god’s reptilian foes twice, successfully in Ḥedammu and unsuccessfully in Ullikummi (HM², p. 61 § 36), by displaying her naked charms and singing.

§ 10 B i 9–10 (cf. B i 17–18) Although the serpent’s offspring are not mentioned in B i 17–18, it is clear that they are present at the banquet because it is necessary to kill the entire family to ensure that no other member of the brood can later rise against the Storm-god and regain control of the subterranean waters. Compare Kumarbi’s emasculation of Anu to prevent any descendant from taking revenge (HM², pp. 41–43).

B i 11 LMI, HM², and Beckman (CoS 1) translate DUG palḫan ẖūmandan as “every vessel” and García Trabazo as plural accusative “todas las marmitas.” But Melchert has correctly observed that there is no evidence other than this passage for an a-stem variant of (DUG)palḫi-. He interprets the two-word phrase as the Old Hittite genitive plural in -an: “they drank (some) of all the vessels,” a partitive genitive, which makes better sense.

§ 11 B i 14 nūman can mean either “not want to” or “be unable to.” Contrary to earlier claims, it never means “no longer.” In HM² I rendered this line as “not want to,” while LMI and García Trabazo chose “be unable to” (“non furono … in grado di, “no pueden bajar”). It could be either.

B i 16 The verb kālel(i)ye- is archaic (not noticed in HED K 22): all datable texts or fragments in which it appears have an Old Hittite archetype. It tends to be replaced by other words for “bind, tie” in later Hittite. There is a noun kaliliulli- derived from this verb root in KUB 7.1 + KBo 3.8 ii 40 (Old Hittite in New Hittite Script).

§ 12 B i 17–18 Although the Storm-god needs a mortal’s help to trap and disarm the serpent, the execution must be carried out by the Storm-god himself. For line 18, see LMI, p. 51, n. 14, where the views of Gonnet and LMI are contrasted. The gods fall in behind whichever party wins. Although they were all invited to the EZEN, they waited until after the serpent’s death to take the side of the Storm-god.

64 Edited in Siegelová, Appu-Märchen, pp. 54–55, translated in HM², p. 54.
65 For the importance of these two seduction attempts in determining the sequence of the myths in the Kumarbi Cycle, see HM², p. 42 (introduction).
66 García Trabazo, Textos religiosos hititas, p. 89.
68 As demonstrated in Hoffner, “Hittite mān and nūman,” pp. 38–45.
69 García Trabazo, Textos religiosos hititas, p. 89: “ya no pueden” should have been rendered “(ya) no puedan,” since there is no Hittite term for “(no) longer” in the text.
71 A point recognized also by García Trabazo, Textos religiosos hititas, p. 89, n. 53.
§ 13 C i 14–15 -za-an stands for -z(ə) + -šan. The duplicates equate 4Inaraš here with 4LAMMA-aš. But since the copies are late, how early does this equation go back?72 The “house” on a rock is obviously a temple. On the significance of -za here, see the discussion above.

C i 17 ašaš-/ašeš- “to settle (someone)” implies that she established his permanent residence with her.73 Quite likely Ḥupašiya has been made Inara’s priest not just her lover. And since, if as a special kind of celibate, live-in priest, he sleeps every night in the cella, he thus sleeps with Inara. It is not possible to assume that the Hittite LGUDU was celibate, since the “wife of the G.,” DAM LGUDU₁₂, is mentioned in IBoT 3.1 23, 26, but perhaps an earlier Hattian equivalent was celibate and was conceived as the bedfellow of the goddess. Hittite priests did not sleep in the cella.

C i 17–22 The text suggests that Inara’s house was so close to Ḥupašiya’s home that looking out the window would cause him to see his family. What is the significance of keeping Ḥupašiya from seeing his family? Possibly it is that he has agreed to become a celibate priest and voluntarily cuts himself off from wife and family. In a similar way the “son of the Storm-god” in Account 2 severs his familial ties in order to join the family of the serpent, as an antiyanza.74 Looking through windows, especially temple or cella windows, was potentially dangerous. In one oracle inquiry it was determined that the deity was angry because someone outside the cella had looked through a window and seen the divine statue.75 In this case, however, we have the opposite: a lover-priest of the goddess looking out a temple window and seeing a woman whom he was supposed to have renounced. Temple windows marked the boundary between sacred and profane. For this reason offerings made to holy places in the temple always include the windows.76

§ 14 C i 25 Ḥupašiya’s plea here is to be released from his vows (as a priest?) to Inara.

73 Cf. García Trabazo, Textos religiosos hititas, p. 89, “estableció a Ḥupašiya.”
75 The relevant passage reads: “Because it was determined by oracle that the god’s anger was because of sacrilege (maraštarri-), we questioned the temple servants. (One of them,) Tila, said: ‘People aren’t supposed to look at (the statue of) the Stormgod. Yet a woman looked in through a window’” (D. J. Wiseman, The Alalakh Texts, Occasional Papers of the British Institute of Archaeology in Ankara, no. 2 [London, 1953], p. 454 ii 7–10).
76 See Goetze, Kleinasien, p. 162.
§ 16 A ii 9–12  *LMI* assumes the broken section contains three important events: “la descrizione dell’ira di Inara, la distruzione della casa - sulle cui rovine sembra che il dio della tempesta semini erba - e l’uccisione di Ḫupašiya.” None of these assumed events, however, is supported by the traces that remain. It is true that the mortal who collaborates with the Storm-god in the second account dies at the end. But this is the only reason to assume that Inara kills Ḫupašiya. His disobedience in looking out the window and his plea to return home very likely resulted in his dismissal from Inara’s house (temple) and from the priesthood.

A ii 13  Goetze (*ANET*²) arrived at his translation “sowed cress/weeds over the ruins” by reading [*ZÀ.AÆ.LI*] = Akk. *saḫlû*, Hitt. *zaḫḫeli*. He was followed by *LMI*, p. 51 (“sembra che ... semini erba”) but not by Beckman (edition and *CoS 1*) or by me (*HM*²). The gesture is, of course, perfectly appropriate to condemning a site never to be inhabited again. But the reading of the traces raises objections. In the copy there is insufficient space to restore *ZAG*. Furthermore, in attested examples of *ZÀ.AÆ.LI* in Hittite texts it either has no determinative or it has the posted determinative SAR. It never has the preposed determinative Ú. In addition, a new text from Ortaköy (Or 95/3)⁷⁸ gives the correct “Hittite” reading of *ZÀ.AÆ.LI.(SAR)*, namely, *marašḫanḫaš*. I used quotation marks on “Hittite” because this could be either a real Hittite word or a Hattic loanword. The previously known reading *zaḫḫeli*, if it is not a misreading, appears on its face to be a Sumero-Akkadian loanword into Hittite. With regard to the possibility of reading *ZÀ.AÆ.LI* here in Illuyanka, we learn from the immediately following context that Inara went to Kiškilušša and placed her house/temple and the subterranean waters in the lands of the (Hittite) king (see discussion above). She could hardly do this if she had sown its ruins with cress/weeds.

§ 17 A ii 15–20  Stefanini prefers to translate: “And since (*kuit*) we are (re-)performing the first purulli — (that is) how (*mân*) Inara ... in Kiskilussa set her house and the river of the watery abyss into the hands of the king — the hand of the king [will hold] the house of Inara and the watery abyss.” But one could render this: “And (this is) why (*kuit*) we celebrate the first purulli.” The purulli celebration was motivated by Inara’s gift to the king of the subterranean waters, which she obtained by killing the serpent. This would agree with what *LMI*, p. 41, writes: “Inara affida al re ...; in ricordo di tale avvenimento viene istituita la prima festa del purulli.” And since Inara makes this grant only after the defeat of the serpent, causing the gods to realign with the Storm-god, it

---


⁷⁹ Stefanini, “Alcuni problemi ittiti, lessicali e sintattici,” p. 256.
would be an objection to the later assertion in LMI, p. 48 (“Nel momento di debolezza del dio della tempesta l’ordine di importanza degli dei viene modificato e la festa del purulli viene celebrata proprio per assicurare che il paese di Hatti prosperi anche senza la momentanea protezione della sua divinità principale”). The granting of her house/temple to the Hittite king further shows that the king has inherited what Ḫupašiya had forfeited, namely, the priesthood of Inara and the control of the subterranean water sources.

§ 18

A ii 21  Although ĥU.R.SAG Zali(ya)nu (also written dZali(ya)nu) is worshiped in various festival texts, ironically he does not appear in the Tetešawi festival, the very one Pecchioli Daddi thinks might be purulli.

A ii 22–23  LMI takes ĥeuš as nom. sg., ĥiṅikta as pres. middle(!), and the thought is a pres.-future passive. It renders ĥeuš … ĥiṅikta as “dopo che avrà distribuito la pioggia” “after the rain will have been distributed.” My earlier translation in HM is wrong on this point and should be corrected accordingly.

A ii 24  Although this in itself does not prove Pecchioli Daddi’s theory that the Tetešawi festival is the purulli, it is interesting that the LÚ GIÅGIDRU participates in the Festival of dTetešawi (CTH, no. 738), as (judging from this line) he also does in EZEN₄ purulli, and other festival texts mention the “staffs of Zaliyanu” (GIÅGIDRU.HI.A dZaliyanu, KUB 20.80 iii 17).

The Serpent Story: Account 2

§ 21

D iii 1–5  In the broken context we are not told the circumstances of the original defeat of the Storm-god. But here he is not only defeated. Although, contrary to nature, the injured Storm-god can continue to live even without a heart, he is clearly disabled. What is the significance of the choice of “heart and eyes” among all other body parts (ears, nose, head, brain, etc.) that could be taken from him? There are rituals that refer to parts of the Storm-god’s body. In KUB 17.29 ii 6–19 the violating of a neighbor’s boundary line is said to be tantamount to violating or injuring the Storm-god’s knees, and violating a roadway (which also served as an even more conspicuous boundary) was violating the Storm-god’s chest (UZUGABA). Do the eyes and heart refer to his “intelligence and courage”? Perhaps, but without a commentary like the one just cited from KUB 17.29 we really cannot be certain. In the Late Egyptian story of the Contendings of Horus and Seth, the evil god Seth removes from the sleeping Horus his two eyes and buries them. Later, Hathor, the Mistress of the Southern Sycamore, miraculously restores Horus’s eyes. Here there is much native Egyptian symbolism involving the “Eye of Horus.”

§ 22 A iii 4 LMI has pointed out that a DUMU.MUNUS LÜMAÅ.EN.KAK “daughter of a poor man” appears in a festival text for dTetešhabi (CTH, no. 738: KBo 25.48 iii 6’), which may be another name for dInara. The context mentions a NIN. DINGIR, a LÜ GIS.GIDRU, and DUMU.MEŠ È.GAL. She may also appear without the LÜMAÅ.EN.KAK in another EZEN₄ dTetešhabi fragment in the sequence NIN. DINGIR [DU]MU.MUNUS AMA.DINGIR-LIM=ya (KUB 11.32 + 20.17+ ii 8, 25). In all of these contexts there are many Hattic words and phrases (illuwaya illuwaya, and awazza awazzanga and hakanteš kantišma mayamauma) called out by the participants. Since this DUMU.MUNUS LÜMAÅ.EN.KAK in the Tetešhabi festival always occurs as a kind of priestess, it is possible that she represented a class of girls given to the cult of Tetešhabi by poorer parents who could not afford a dowry to obtain husbands for them. If so, then perhaps in the second version of the Illuyanka Myth the Storm-god actually takes an unmarried temple-girl as his wife. Against this interpretation is the grouping of the DUMU.MUNUS between NIN.DINGIR and AMA.DINGIR-LIM in KUB 11.32 + ii 8, since she is flanked by relatively high-ranking women in the cult, a position not to be expected of a poor girl donated to a temple. Her prominence in the festival suggests an important position. Perhaps she is the priestess who plays the role of the wife of the Storm-god in the Serpent Story as a cult drama.

A iii 10 ff. The É DAM-KA constitutes more than just her father. Note the -šmaš dative forms in 11, 13, 15 and the plural verbs pier in 14, 16. The decision on the nature of the “dowry” to this antiyanza was apparently made by her father and at least one other person, perhaps his wife. Compare Laws §§ 28–28. Of course the marriage customs and laws reflected in the original Serpent Story were not Hittite but Hattian. Nevertheless, in the present Hittite adaptation they probably reflect Hittite family law as well.

A iii 22 LMI, p. 53 does not seem to translate the namma, which I take as “again” (he fought the serpent there before). If the sea is a historical one, LMI prefers the Black Sea to the Mediterranean, since the antiyanza marriage custom reflected in Account 2 is thought to be Hattian and therefore “northern.”

A iii 23 The -ši is anticipatory for the serpent mentioned in line 24. The apparent acc. sg. MUSilluyanka[n] shows that namma cannot mean “again” here but “at last” (HM², p. 13). See the discussion in CHD s.v. namma. Here, too, LMI, p. 53, chose not to render the namma explicitly.

A iii 25 I would personally include among the linguistic archaisms of this text the use of a supinum on a perfective stem: tarḫ(u)wan, instead of imperfective tarḫšškiwan, and the genitive + postposition (illuyankaš katta).

§ 26 A iii 29 First clause: not “seize me” (LMI) but “include me” (HM², p. 13). This is the meaning of -za + apa … anda ep-. For a different view, see E. Rieken, in Die Indogermanistik und ihre Anrainer (Innsbruck, 2004), p. 255.

A iii 30 This clause is asyndetic, indicating that it is essentially describing the action of iii 29 more fully. “Including” the son means having no pity upon him.
A iii 31 The referent in -šu is (perhaps intentionally?) vague: is the young man here styled as the natural son of the Storm-god (LMI, p. 53, “il suo proprio figlio”; GhR, p. 705, “seinen [eigenen] Sohn”) or the legal son (antiyant-) of the serpent? Perhaps the lack of a -za to identify the -šu with the subject of the sentence points to the second alternative: he is now the legal son of the serpent, and it is as such that he is killed (kuenta).

§ 28 D iv 1’–4’ Beckman and LMI agree on the translation. But what does this mean? Notice that the verbs are preterites: the action is not prescriptive but a record of something once done. LMI, pp. 47–48, gives a plausible explanation: with the disablement of the Storm-god at the beginning of the story, it is necessary to find a new deity to provide the water to sustain the land. This means that the Storm-god, who was once the “foremost” god (hantezziyaš) has been made “last” (appezziyaš), and a subordinate deity (appezziyaš), in this case the Mountain-god Zaliyanu, has been elevated or promoted to assume the role of the “foremost” deity (hantezziyaš). The specific method of choosing a subordinate to fill this role as “foremost” is the casting of the lot (§ 31 C iv 13). The reason for the use of the plural hantezziuš and appezziuš is that this is a general statement, one that does not refer specifically to the incident of the replacement of the Storm-god by Zaliyanu but to the reversal of roles in times of emergency.

§ 29 D iv 5’–7’ ogenerated and LMI agree on the translation. Haas renders this sentence: “(Deshalb) ist Zali(ya)nu, nämlich seine Gemahlin Za(š)hapuna, größer als der Wettergott von Nerik.” My translation in HM² should be amended to “Zalinuwa’s wife, Zašhapuna, is greater than the Storm-god of Nerik.” dZalinu(iša), being a mountain-god, is certainly a male, which means dZa(š)hapuna is female.

Exemplar D reads Ltahpurili, while the other manuscripts, A and C, have mTaḥpurili. This Hattic personal name may be built upon a variant spelling of the DN dTaḥ(a)puna. This name was mistakenly read as mTaḥ-pu-tal-li by Laroche.

§ 30 D iv 10 eš- (mid.) with -šan but without -za could be an archaic feature surviving from the original Old Hittite version. And if so, it would be a rare piece of evidence for an Old Hittite origin of the ritual portion of the text. But then again it might just be an affectation, that is, an archaizing feature. paiwani ešuwašta

---

82 GhR, p. 706.
83 Cf. LMI, p. 53, n. 23.
occurs in an Old Hittite Script passage (KUB 31.143 ii 36), which might suggest that D’s kuwapı ešuwašta is closer to the Old Hittite version than A’s kuwapit ešuwaštati.

§ 31  D iv 12  Manuscript D has the post-Old Hittite nonassimilated form ma-a-an-wa, versus A and C with the Old Hittite form ma-a-wa.

D iv 15  Beckman, LMI, and Haas all render ṢA-ŠU as “diorite,” although there is reason to translate it as “basalt.” 85 The precise identification of this stone type in Hittite must for the time being remain open. As for the translation of lines D iv 14–16 and duplicates, see the long note in LMI, p. 54, n. 26. LMI and Polvani 86 understand that the GUDU₁₂-priest who holds Zaliyanu sits on the throne above the spring, while Haas paraphrases (“setzt … (ihn) auf den Dioritstuhl nieder”) in order to make the text say that the GUDU₁₂ seats Zaliyanu on the throne above the spring. 87 The ¹GUDU₁₂’s holding Zaliyanu is probably the same thing as his holding the staff (GİS·GİDRU) of Zaliyanu, mentioned in Bo 3649 iii 4’. 88 The GİS·GİDRU “staff” is a visible symbol of the Mountain-god Zaliyanu. And if this is the case, then it rules out Haas’s idea that the god’s statue is “seated,” since one cannot “seat” (ašeš-) a staff.

§ 32  A iv 14 ff.  A iv 17 preserves an archaic writing of ša-al-li-š, for which D iv 19 has šal-li-iš.

§ 33  The text reads “these three LÚ.MEŠ remain in Tanipiya,” perhaps using the logogram LÚ.MEŠ (literally “men”) to refer to the god Zaliyanu and two goddesses Zašhapuna and Tazzuwašši. Kellerman is wrong when she writes that the expression LÚ.MEŠ (§ 33 A iv 19) is “usually found in cult inventories as designating statues.” 89 The collocation DINGIR·MEŠ LÚ.MEŠ in all Hittite text genres denotes male deities and in the cult inventories ALAM LÚ designates the statue of a male (deity). But LÚ.MEŠ alone does not designate statues of deities, either in the cult inventories or anywhere else in Hittite texts. So unless it refers to three male priests of these three deities, the use of LÚ.MEŠ in § 33 remains an unsolved problem.

---

85 Cf. A. M. Polvani, La terminologia dei minerali nei testi ittiti, Parte prima, Eothen 3 (Florence, 1988), pp. 38–46, and add now CAD §3 161f. s.v. šuš.
87 GhR, p. 706.
88 Haas, KN, p. 80, n. 4.
89 Kellerman, “Towards the Further Interpretation of the purulli-Festival,” p. 36.
HOW TO MAKE THE GODS SPEAK:  
A LATE BABYLONIAN TABLET RELATED TO  
THE MICROZODIAC

Hermann Hunger, Universität Wien

I

The tablet BM 33535 (fig. 1) belongs to a small group of texts based on the so-called microzodiac and was used in connection with medical treatment. In view of Bob Biggs’ long-standing work on medical texts, this little tablet may be of interest to him. He may also be able to solve the problems that I could not.

BM 33535 (= Rm 4, 91)

Obv.

1 MÚL.MAŠ.MAŠ šá MÚL.PA Lagaš(ŠIR.BUR.LA)ki x x [x ?]
2 kiškanû(GIŠ.KÍN) pešû(BABBAR) kiškanû(GIŠ.KÍN) šalmu(MI) kiškanû(GIŠ.KÍN) sâmu(SA₃) Ú.NI[R]?
3 amîlînu(Ú.LÚ-an) engisî(NA₄.EN.GI.SA₆) anzaḫhu(NA₄.AN.NE)
4 šá 2-i eš-pu NA₄ ḫe-e-e²-en-zu // SA.A

5 MÚL.MAŠ.MAŠ šá MÚL.PA ūm(UD) il āli(URU) ma-a-šá dSin Šamaš(dUTU)
6 dU.GUR isinni(EZEN) Ninurta(dMAŠ)

7 DIŠ ina Simâni(ITI.SIG₄) ištu(TA) UD-1-KAM adî(EN) UD-30-KAM
8 amîlu(LÚ) lim-ta-[a]s²-su šaman(ī) šimeššalî(ŠIM.ŠEŠ) lippašî(HE.ŠEŠ)
9 taktîma(TÚG.AN.TA.DUL) lîlabilî(MU₄.MU₄) šêna(KUŠ.E.SÍR) liškun(HE.GAR)
10 akla(NINDA) šá arsuppi(ŠE.ÈSTUB) lîkul(KÚ) KAŠ.ŠE.GA² lišti(NAG)
11 li-pi-ir ina ūrî(ÛR) lînîl(HE.NÁ)
12 AN KUN NU MU₄.MU₄ ilû(DINGIR.MEŠ) mu-ši-ti
13 itti(KI)-šú i-dab-bu-bu

1 I thank the Trustees of the British Museum for granting me permission to publish this tablet.
14 ina mašak(KUŠ) imēri(ANŠE) ina šer ʾān(SA) imēri(ANŠE) ina ūrri(DUR) takilti(SIG. ZA.GIN.NA)
15 tāl-pap ina kišādi(GŪ)-šū tašakkan(GAR)

16 MŪL.MAŠ.MAŠ GIŠ.ḫa-lu-ūb MUŠEN? ab? si? ki?

Rev.
1 MŪL.ALLA šá MŪL.PA Mu-ta-ba[pki]
2 GIŠ.ḫa-lu-ūb šaššūgu(GIŠ.MES.GĀM) U [x]
3 zēr(NUMUN) ʿurtī(ŪR) NA₂.AN.BAR NA₂.URUDU NA₂.mu-ṣa
4 GIŠ? SA.A

5 MŪL.ALLA šá PA īm(UD) il ʿāli(ŪR) Šamaš(DU.TU) dajjān(DI.KUD) māti(KUR)
6 u dŠul-pa-ē-a pīr(BAD) bābī(KĀ)

7 DIŠ ina Du ʾāzi(ITI.ŠU) ʾiṣtu(TA) UD-1-KAM adi(EN) UD-30-KAM
8 amīlu(LŪ) lim-tas-sa šaman(I.GIŠ) sa ba li za ma? li
9 lippašš(HE.ŠEŠ) li-tar-ri-šā šēna(KUŠ.E.SĪR) šeḥerta(TUR.7.RA) liškun(GAR-un)
10 ḫallûra(GŪ.GAL) likul(HE.KŪ) kakkû(GŪ.TUR) likul(HE.KŪ)
11 erša(GIŠ.NĀ) li-is-kùp-ma linīl(HE.NĀ)
12 ištar(D15)-šū ʾittī(KI)-šū idabbub(KA-ub)

13 ina mašak(KUŠ) sisī(ANŠE.KUR.RA) ina šer ʾān(SA) sisī(ANŠE.KUR.RA)
14 ina ūrri(DUR) šipāṭi(SIG) sāmāti(SA₂) tāl-pap ina kišādi(GŪ)-šū tašakkan(GAR-an)

15 MŪL.ALLA MUŠEN qa-qu-ū GIŠ.ḪAŠHUR?

Translation

Obv.
1 (Subsection) Gemini of Sagittarius. Lagaš, ...;
2 white kiškanû-tree, black kiškanû-tree, red kiškanû-tree, ...,
3 amēlānu-plant, engisû-stone, anzahšu-glass
4 which is multiplied by? two, ...-stone. SA.A

5 (Subsection) Gemini of Sagittarius: (feast)day of the city god. The twins7 Sin and Šamaš.
6 Nergal. Feast of Ninurta.
7 In Simanu, from the 1st to the 30th day,
8 let the man wash himself, let him anoint himself with the oil of the šimeššalu-plant,
9 let him be clothed with a blanket, let him put on a sandal,
10 let him eat bread (made) from arsuppu-barley, let him drink beer (made) from arsuppu-barley,
11 let him put on a headdress?, let him sleep on the roof,
12 let him not be clothed …, (and) the gods of the night
13 will talk with him.

14 You wrap (a medication) in a (piece of) hide of a donkey, with a sinew of a donkey, with a thread of red wool,
15 you place (it) on his neck.

16 Gemini: ḫalub-tree, …-bird.

Rev.

1 (Subsection) Cancer of Sagittarius. Mutabal.
2 ḫalub-tree, šaššugu-tree, […]-plant,
3 seed of urtû-plant, iron ore, copper ore, mušu-stone.
4 … SA.A

5 (Subsection) Cancer of Sagittarius: (feast)day of the city god, Šamaš, judge of the land,
6 and Šulpa’ée. Opening of the gate.

7 In month Du’uzu, from the 1st to the 30th day,
8 let the man wash himself, let him anoint himself with oil of …,
9 let him …, let him put on a small’ sandal,
10 let him eat chickpeas, let him eat lentils,
11 let him lie still (on) a bed and sleep,
12 his goddess will talk with him.

13 You wrap (a medication) in a (piece of) hide of a horse, with a sinew of a horse,
14 with a thread of red wool, (and) place (it) on his neck.

15 Cancer: bird qaqqû, apple? tree.
Commentary

Obv.

1 The traces at the end of the line could be taken for GIŠ.KÍN, as in the following line, but there is little space in the break at the end to add a color. The usual sequence of colors is white, black, red, and green; the first three of them follow in line 2, so the missing green would have to be restored at the end of line 1. Since colors are usually enumerated beginning with white, the color green in line 1 would be out of sequence.

4 In view of the number 2-š, I take es₃-p₃ to be from ešēpu “to double.” It should be noted, though, that usually ešēpu is construed with ana; even the reading of the following stone name is unclear to me; the signs SA.A are preceded by a separation sign. Their meaning is obscure. They occur again at the end of the first paragraph of the reverse.

5 f. Cf. Weidner Gestirn-Darstellungen, p. 25 “Gemini” (read probably EZEN ⁴MAŠ there too).

8 There is little space for [a]s, but in view of rev. 8 this is the most likely restoration.

10 ŠE.GA is probably an error for ŠE.EŠTUB, which looks similar; I could not find a suitable reading for KAŠ ŠE.GA.

11 The interpretation of li-pi-ir as a precative of apāru is uncertain because it is not said what the headdress should be.

12 If an emendation of AN KUN to GIŠ.KUN is accepted, one could understand this sentence as rapaštu la ulabbaš “let him leave his loin without clothing.”

16 On the basis of the parallel line at the end of the reverse, I expect the name of a bird here too but cannot read it.

Rev.

9 I could not find a satisfactory explanation for li-tar-ri-šu. Neither (w)arāšu nor erēšu makes much sense.

11 One would expect ina erši.

II

The astrological concept of a microzodiac was first detected in cuneiform material by A. Sachs.² Each sign of the zodiac is subdivided into twelve parts; these parts have the usual names of the zodiacal signs, beginning with the name of the sign that is subdivided. In this way, the first part of the first sign, Aries, is called Aries of Aries, the

second Taurus of Aries, and so on. Since each sign has a length of 30 degrees, each part has a length of $2\frac{1}{2}$ degrees. A celestial body, such as the moon or a planet, can then by its position in the zodiac be associated not just with the main signs, but also with their parts. Thereby the possible astrological associations are multiplied.

Since Sachs’s discovery, more texts that in some way made use of a microzodiac were published, notably by E. Weidner. The following related materials are known to me at present.

From Uruk

[1] VAT 7851 (Weidner *Gestirn-Darstellungen*, pp. 12 ff.)
[2] VAT 7847 + AO 6448 (TCL 6 12; Weidner *Gestirn-Darstellungen*, pp. 15 ff.)

From Babylon

[5] BM 34572 (*LBAT* 1580)
[6] BM 34664 (*LBAT* 1503)
[7] BM 34713 (*LBAT* 1499)
[8] BM 33535 (published here)
[9] BM 35784 (*LBAT* 1578)

There is no common format to these tablets, and not all of them use the microzodiac for the same purpose. Three ([4], [6], [7]) give a scheme for the rising times of sections of the ecliptic and are not immediately concerned with astrology. One ([12]) is not really understood. Of the remaining seven, five were dealt with by Weidner; an additional tablet parallel to them ([10]) is found in the British Museum. I intend to publish this elsewhere.

---

3 Weidner *Gestirn-Darstellungen*.
4 This and the tablets BM 34664 and 34713 below have been dealt with by F. Rochberg in “A Babylonian Rising-Times Scheme in Non-Tabular Astronomical Texts,” in C. Burnett et al., eds., *Studies in the History of the Exact Sciences in Honour of David Pingree* (Leiden and Boston, 2004), pp. 56–94.
5 I intend to publish this elsewhere.
The tablets have been well described by Weidner, and I repeat just what can be said about the microzodiac.

The table for the microzodiac (in nos. [1], [2], and [5], for example) has twelve columns, each of which is labeled with the name of a microsign, as explained above. In the first row of boxes, the following items are listed for each microsign: a place-name (city or temple) and one or two names of trees, plants, and stones. The computations that follow the first row are obscure to me; they are not connected with the signs of the microzodiac. The next row of twelve boxes contains elements of predictions of the kind occurring in the apodoses of omens; they are said to depend on the brightness of the planets. After this there is another row of boxes mentioning cultic events and another one with prescriptions for actions to be taken or avoided, in the style of hemerologies.

III

The present text deals with the two subsections Gemini (MÚL.MAŠ.MAŠ) and Cancer (MÚL.ALLA) of the sign Sagittarius (MÚL.PA), which are the seventh and eighth subsections of this sign according to the description given above. Unfortunately, these subsections are not preserved in the other tablets dealing with microzodiacs so that a comparison is not possible. In general, the text belongs to the field of medical astrology. Obverse and reverse have five paragraphs each that are separated by rulings.

The first paragraph begins with the heading, the microzodiacal sign. Then a place-name and the names of trees, plants, and stones are listed. This is also the case in texts [2], [5], [9], [10], [11], and [12] in the list above; nothing of the preserved parts of these texts is exactly the same as in our text. Such an enumeration of trees, plants, and stones need not in itself have anything to do with medicine. Several similar texts exist, however, that clearly show that medicine is involved. First, some of the so-called Kalendertexte can be mentioned.

---

6 As recognized by von Weiher, the layout of this fragment is parallel to the tablets treated by Weidner Gestirn-Darstellungen. Since the sections labeled “Row B” always have the same text for a given microzodiacal sign (ibid., p. 26), it is possible to identify the signs. The microzodiacal signs on the obverse are Aries, Taurus, and Gemini; on the reverse they are Pisces, Aries, and Taurus. This shows that the signs subdivided here are Cancer and Gemini: if the rows of microzodiacal signs end with Gemini and Taurus, they must have begun with Cancer and Gemini respectively; and the subdivisions always begin with the microzodiacal sign of the same name as the sign subdivided. It follows that obverse and reverse are to be interchanged. The double ruling in the lower part of the obverse makes it likely that the text ended here and was followed by a colophon. This tablet from Uruk therefore was concerned with the same part of the zodiac as LBAT 1580, from Babylon (“Text 3” in Weidner Gestirn-Darstellungen; E. Reiner told me that the fragment BM 78831 joins the right edge). This makes improved readings (if not understanding) of von Weiher’s tablet possible; see the appendix below.

7 This topic was explored by E. Reiner in her Astral Magic in Babylonia (Philadelphia, 1995).

8 For a complete listing, see the article by L. Brack-Bernsen and J. M. Steele, “Babylonian Mathemagics,” in Burnett et al., eds., Studies in the History of the Exact Sciences, pp. 95–125.
Each entry in such a Kalendertext begins with two pairs of integer numbers, which do not concern us here.\(^9\) The names of one or more trees, stones, and plants are listed, as are sometimes also place- or temple-names. Then prescriptions as they are found in hemerologies follow: which ceremonies are to be performed on that day and in which activities it is propitious to engage. Texts [17] and [18], however, assign to each calendar date an ointment the ingredients of which are related to the zodiacal sign in question by an association, either linguistic or just orthographic, based on the name of the sign. Not all of these associations are clear to a modern reader, but it is evident that they are based on the creatures forming the zodiac as it was in use in Hellenistic times.

There are more texts of a similar kind. One was published by I. L. Finkel;\(^{10}\) I quote his description: “Twelve sections, one for each month of the year, prescribe in turn two or three of the following elements: a certain stone in an oil to apply to part of the body; a certain plant to be drunk in a certain liquid; and a certain colour wool to be tied on as an amulet at a certain body part.” In this text it is clear how the stone, plant, and wool are to be used, but it is not stated for which purpose the treatment is intended. This example, too, makes it likely that those of the texts mentioned above that just enumerate stones, plants, and trees also imply their use in medications.

The second paragraph of our text is exactly the same as that found in Weidner’s Gestirn-Darstellungen listing cultic events and called by him “Row B.”\(^{11}\)

The third paragraph gives instructions about what a man should eat, drink, put on, etc., and where he should sleep so that the “gods of the night” (or, on the reverse, “his goddess”) will talk to him. This paragraph (like the corresponding one on the reverse) is similar to the last part of the Kalendertexte listed above as [13] and [14].\(^{12}\) Unfortunately, they are fragmentary and seem not to have the same purpose as our text.\(^{13}\)

---

\(^9\) Their mathematical structure has been explained by Brack-Bernsen and Steele (ibid., pp. 105–15).


\(^{11}\) Weidner Gestirn-Darstellungen, p. 24.

\(^{12}\) Read the beginning of rev. 17 of the first text in Weidner’s book: DiŠ ina 1 ..., and the beginning of rev. 9 of the second: [DiŠ] ina 91 ..., where the numbers 1 and 9 represent the months Nisannu and Kislimu.

\(^{13}\) In [13], the result of the procedure is: bēl nukurtišu ana KI GAR [...].
The important point is that the instructions of this paragraph prepare for a dream incubation: the gods of the night, or the personal goddess, are to speak to the one who is sleeping. Such incubation has been assumed with good reason for Mari, Assyria, Babylonia, and other regions of the Near East, but specific procedures have so far been rare in cuneiform sources. Most examples adduced for incubation are uncertain. Some rites attested in texts of the first millennium B.C. that are to be performed in order that one may receive a “decision” (EŠ.BAR) while sleeping could be seen as concerning incubation. They include, for example, the cleaning of the place of offerings and reciting incantations to the Big Dipper. The procedures in our text are quite different: they consist of preparations applied to the person who wishes to have the gods speak.

In the fourth paragraph, some ingredients are to be wrapped in animal hide, tied together with wool, and put on a person’s neck. Whether this person is the same as the one in the preceding lines cannot be said. The procedure seems, rather, to be therapeutic. I can see no connection between the animal whose hide was used (donkey, horse) and the zodiac.

The fifth paragraph is just one line long. The name of the microzodiacal sign is repeated, and the name of a tree and a bird appear. Nothing is said about their meaning in this context.

The purpose of this text is unclear to me. It draws together material that is attested elsewhere, and it presupposes the invention of the microzodiac. It also seems to be only a small part of a larger ensemble; considering that two microzodiacal signs make up only 5 degrees of the zodiac, one could assume the existence of seventy-one more tablets of this type. I tend to doubt this, however; there is much diversity in tablets dealing with medical astrology. Rarely do two tablets have exactly the same layout and contents. Rather, selections from previously existing material mixed with new ideas are arranged according to the interests or needs of the authors of new texts.

---

14 J.-M. Durand, ARMT 26/1, p. 461.
17 Ibid., pp. 355 ff.
# APPENDIX

**von Weiher Uruk 167**

### Obv.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A x+1</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 30 8 18 U.MEŠ x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(Aquarius)</th>
<th>(Pisces)</th>
<th>(Aries)</th>
<th>(Taurus)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>u₄-um il URU x¹²</td>
<td>u₄-um il URU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B 1</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[u₄-um diš-tar]</td>
<td>u₄-um BAD KĀ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[bêlet] KUR.KUR u</td>
<td>EN GAL-u dAMAR.UD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>dAMAR.UD LUGAL</td>
<td>u UR.SAG dNin-urta</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Rev.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A x+1</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 URU.MEŠ¹ an-nu-ti</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| x+2 | MUL].ALLA¹ KI¹ ISKIM¹ KUR.SU.BIR₄ KI EŠ.BAR-šu-nu M[E-a GAR] |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(Aries)</th>
<th>(Taurus)</th>
<th>(Gemini)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>u₄-um il URU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>u₄-um il URU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>UR.SAG GAL-u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>u UR.SAG dNin-urta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>u dU.GUR EZEN² dMAŠ?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notes

18 The parallels in rev. B 3 and in text [2] (TCL 6 12 x 8’, see Weidner Gestirn-Darstellungen, p. 25) have UR.SAG.

19 The parallel in text [2] (TCL 6 12 xi 8’) has ma-a-šû.
Figure 1a. BM 33535, Obverse
Figure 1b. BM 33535, Reverse
ZUM IMPERATIV DES SEMITISCHEN

Burkhart Kienast, Universität Freiburg i. Br.

1.1. Der Imperativ wird in allen semitischen Sprachen einheitlich gebildet und scheint von daher keine Probleme zu bieten. Doch bei näherem Hinsehen zeigt sich, daß eine Reihe von Fragen einer Beantwortung harren. Bevor wir uns dem eigentlichen Thema zuwenden, scheint es aber geboten, die Entwicklung der semitischen Tempora aus unserer Sicht kurz darzustellen. Vgl. im einzelnen die entsprechenden Kapitel in B. Kienast, HSSp.¹


1.3. Demnach haben die beiden Präfixkonjugationen des Altsemitischen neben unterschiedlichen indikativischen Gebrauchsweisen beide auch jussivische Funktion (vgl. HSSp § 227). Eine deutliche Abgrenzung der Modi erfolgt nur ungenügend und besonders im Gebrauch unterschiedlicher Negationen bei Verneinung. Vgl. die babylonischen Beispiele:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tempus</th>
<th>Beispiel</th>
<th>Bedeutung</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Präteritum</td>
<td>iddin</td>
<td>“er hat gegeben”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prekativ</td>
<td>liddin</td>
<td>“er möge geben”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vetitiv</td>
<td>aj iddin</td>
<td>“er soll nicht geben”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Präsens</td>
<td>ul inaddin</td>
<td>“er wird nicht geben”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prohibitiv</td>
<td>là inaddin</td>
<td>“er soll nicht geben”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.4. Im Frühjungsemitischen steht die Kurzform *jaqtul > jʿeqt el (Prohibitiv jeqtel) zwar noch neben dem alten Präsens *jaqattal > jʿeqatt el, aber beide Formen sind nun modal differenziert: jʿeqatt el wird nur noch indikativisch verwendet, die jussivischen Funktionen beider Präfixkonjugationen sind in jʿeqtel konzentriert, dessen präteritaler Gebrauch ganz auf das neue Perfekt qatala verlagert worden ist (vgl. HSSp § 228.)

1.5. Im Spätjungsemitischen gehört der Jussiv jaqtul (Prohibitiv lā jaqtul) in das Modalsystem des Imperfektes jaqtulu, das in Opposition zum Perfekt qatala steht.


2.2. Allen semitischen Sprachen gemeinsam ist auch ein besonderes Phänomen: Der Imperativ lässt sich grundsätzlich nicht mit einer Negation verbinden; negierte Befehle müssen daher auf andere Weise dargestellt werden: Im Akkadischen stehen dafür der Prohibitiv (lā+Präsens) und der Vetitiv (ajjē+Präteritum) zur Verfügung, in allen anderen semitischen Sprachen nur der Prohibitiv, der hier durch lā oder ʿal mit dem Jussiv gebildet wird. Vgl. die folgenden Beispiele:

**a) Akkadisch** (von Soden GAG § 84a [Imperativ], § 84h–i [Prohibitiv und Vetitiv]):

positiver Befehl: kaspam ana PN idin “gib das Silber dem PN”

negiert Prohibitiv: kaspam ana PN lā tanaddin “du sollst das Silber nicht dem PN geben” = “gib das Silber nicht dem PN”

negiert Vetitiv: kaspam ana PN ē taddin “du sollst das Silber nicht dem PN geben” = “gib das Silber nicht dem PN”
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b) Gēz (Dillmann, *EG* § 190 [Imperativ], § 197a [Prohibitiv]):

- positiver Befehl: *qtetl nafs* "töte ihn"
- negiert Prohibitiv: *ī tqtetl nafs* "du sollst ihn nicht töten" = "töte ihn nicht"

c) Ugaritisch (Verreet, *Modi Ugaritici* § 10 [Imperativ], § 9.5 [Prohibitiv]):

- positiver Befehl: *bhtm l bn = *bahātī-ma lū bini “baue doch Häuser“ (V 120)
- negiert Prohibitiv: *l tbn = *’al tabkī-nī “du sollst mich nicht beweinen“ = “beweine mich nicht” (V 117)

d) Arabisch (Wright und de Goeje, *GAL*, Bd. 1 § 98 [Imperativ], Band 2 § 17b [Imperativ] und § 30 [Prohibitiv]):

- positiver Befehl: *’uktub “schreib“
- negiert Prohibitiv: *lā taḥzān ’inna-llāha ma’-nā “du sollst nicht traurig sein, denn Gott ist mit uns“ = “sei nicht traurig, denn Gott ist mit uns”


3.2. Im Altsemitischen liegen die Dinge komplizierter, weil hier dem positiven Imperativ negiert zwei Modi, der Prohibitiv und der Vetitiv, gegenüberstehen und eine klare Abgrenzung der beiden Modi in den Grammatiken bisher nicht zu finden war. Vgl.: “Die Form des entschiedenen Verbots ist der Prohibitiv” (von Soden *GAG* § 81h) und “Der Vetitiv bezeichnet einen negativen Wunsch oft sehr dringender Art, der Höher- und Gleichgestellten gegenüber geäußert wird, aber wohl kein formales Verbot” (von Soden *GAG* § 81i). Es mag immerhin von Interesse sein, daß der Vetitiv im ersten Jahrtausend nur noch in literarischen Texten vorkommt, sonst aber vom Prohibitiv abgelöst wird.

---

3.3. Eine deutliche Abgrenzung der beiden Modi ist aber sehr wohl möglich und fügt sich, wenigstens primär, in das allgemeine Spektrum der Tempora Präsens und Präteritum ohne Schwierigkeiten ein (vgl. HSSp § 254):

a) Der Prohibitiv ist entsprechend der Verbindung der Negation mit dem Präsens imperfektiv; vgl. etwa:

Altakkadisch: adī ēnēja lā tāmuru akalam šikaram lā tala ’’amu “(du seist beschworen:) Bevor du meine Augen (= mich) nicht gesehen hast, sollst du weder Speis’ noch Trank zu dir nehmen."

Altbabylonisch: kaspm an an PN lā tanaddin “du sollst das Silber nicht dem PN geben” = “gib das Silber nicht dem PN.” Hier liegt ein Verbot vor, dem PN das Silber jetzt oder später auszuhändigen.

b) Der Vetitiv aber besteht aus der Verbindung der Negation mit dem Präteritum und muß daher, zumindest von Hause aus, perfektiver Natur sein. Dafür gibt es auch eindeutige Beispiele:

Eine altakkadische Fluchformel besagt: aplam a ulid šumam a īrši “einen Erben soll er nicht zeugen, einen Namen(sträger) nicht bekommen.” Das Zitat ist nicht ganz genau übersetzt, denn es ist ja nicht nur gemeint, daß der Übeltäter hinfort keine Nachkommen mehr zeugen soll – dafür müßte der Prohibitiv stehen –, sondern vor allem auch, daß seine in der Vergangenheit bereits gezeugten Erben ausgelöscht werden sollen, als hätten sie nie existiert. Wir müssen also korrekt übersetzen: “Einen Erben soll er nicht gezeugt, einen Namen(sträger) nicht bekommen haben.”


c) In den vorstehenden Beispielen bezieht sich die Verbotsform aber nur formal ausschließlich auf die Vergangenheit, sachlich ist natürlich auch die Zukunft mit eingeschlossen. Und es bedarf nur einer geringfügigen Aspektverschiebung, um den Vetitiv inhaltlich dem Prohibitiv anzunähern: Vgl. etwa Altassyrisch: assurri mamman ē taqip-ī ma ina warkītim libbaka ē imraš “irgendetjemandem sollst du nicht vertrauen, (damit) später dein Herz sich nicht betrübe.”

Dieser Prozeß der funktionalen Annäherung des Vetitivs an den Prohibitiv hat letztlich zu seiner völligen Verdrängung geführt. Und man darf die Vermutung äußern, daß die Entwicklungen beim Imperativ wenigstens indirekt diesen Prozeß beeinflußt haben.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Präsen</th>
<th>Präteritum</th>
<th>Imperativ</th>
<th>Partizip</th>
<th>Verbaladjektiv</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>iparras</td>
<td>(*parrVs)</td>
<td></td>
<td>parrVs/sum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>uparras</td>
<td>uparris</td>
<td>muparris</td>
<td>parrusum/parrusum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Š</td>
<td>ušapas</td>
<td>ušapris</td>
<td>šupris/šapris</td>
<td>šuprusum/šaprusum</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Damit wurde es notwendig, die Funktionen des alten, imperfektiven Imperativs des G-Stammes auf den perfektiven Imperativ zu übertragen, was dann auch auf die Entwicklung beim Vetitiv Wirkungen gezeigt haben mag. So heißt es in der Briefeintrachtungsf ormel: *ana PN qibi-ma “Zu PN sprich”, was keineswegs perfektiv verstanden werden kann.


4.3. Wie wir gesehen haben, ist der Vetitiv noch gelegentlich in seiner primären perfekten Funktion zu belegen, aber er hat sich in vielen Fällen dem Prohibitiv angenähert und ist schließlich von diesem verdrängt worden. In ähnlicher Weise ist die Negierung

4.4. Die hier angesprochenen Fragen sind, soweit mir bekannt, bisher weder in der Altorientalistik noch in der Semitistik sonst behandelt worden, und es scheint, daß erst die historische Betrachtung unsere Untersuchungen ermöglicht hat. In jedem Fall sind weitere, einsprachliche Detailuntersuchungen zum Gebrauch der Modi wünschenswert, um unsere Vorstellungen einer Überprüfung zu unterziehen.

5.1. Auch andere Sprachen mit einem imperfektiven und einem perfektiven Imperativ können nur die imperfektive Form negieren, während die perfektive Variante einer modalen Umschreibung bedarf. Herr Oberstudienrat N. Kilwing, Freiburg, weist für das Griechische auf die Grammatik von Menge, Thierfelder und Wiesner, *Repetitorium der griechischen Syntax*,⁵ hin; dort heißt es § 138.2. (S. 188 f.):

Der **Imperativ**, der Modus des Befehls und der Aufforderung (...), kommt nur in der 2. und 3. Person vor.

Der **Imperat. Präsens** bezeichnet einen dauernden, für die Folge berechneten Befehl oder ein allgemeingültiges Gebot: Τοῦς θεοὺς φοβοῦ (= die Götter fürchte). [...]

Der **Imperat. Aorist** bezeichnet einen besonderen, auf unmittelbare Verwirklichung berechneten Befehl: Δόζ μοι τὸ βιβλίον (= gib mir das Buch). [...]

Ein an die zweite Person gerichtetes Verbot wird mit gleichem Bedeutungsunterschied entweder durch den **Imperat. Präs.** oder durch den **Konj. Aor.** mit μη, nicht durch den Imperat. Aor. mit μη ausgedrückt: Μηδένα τῶν ποιημάτων φίλον ποιοῦ (= mache dir keinen Tunichtgut zum Freunde!). Μη ἅθυμησητε ἐπὶ τοῖς πεπραμενοῖς (= verliert nicht den Mut in Anbeacht der Geschehnisse!).

---

I. INTRODUCTION

I would like to start this contribution with an apology: neither of the two types of texts that I discuss in this paper, the Hebrew Book of Genesis, on the one hand, and the Sumerian and Akkadian birth incantations, on the other, are texts in which I have done any original work, nor do I claim to be a biblical scholar. Nevertheless, I hope that my observations will be of interest.

This article presents another means of understanding the time frame of the biblical flood story as it is described in Genesis 7–8. The impetus for this approach originated during the course of the oral portion of Father Emmerich Vogt’s doctoral qualifying examinations in 1985, in which I participated. Father Vogt was at that time a student in the Joint Doctoral Degree Program sponsored by the Graduate Theological Union of Berkeley and the Department of Near Eastern Studies. He, in connection with examination questions on the Book of Genesis, had calculated the time span for the Noachic flood as follows:

150 days (Gen. 7:24) = 5 months (including the 40 days), calculated as 1 January to 1 June of Noah’s 600th year.

121 days = 4 months (Gen. 8:5) when the flood waters receded, calculated as 1 June to 1 October.

Total number of days = 271. If we add the 7 days (Gen. 8:12) after which the dove landed for good, the total is 278 days.

At the time of the oral examination, I asked those biblical scholars present whether anyone had noticed that the number of days, 270–80, is exactly the length of time for human gestation and that, as a result, one might suggest that the biblical ark be considered a uterine symbol. My query was met with surprise and received no answer. In the intervening years I have had very useful discussions with Francis I. Andersen, David Noel Freedman, Isaac Kikawada, and, more recently, with Sheldon Greaves and Mary

* This article was originally presented as a paper at the American Oriental Society’s annual meeting in Toronto in March 2001.
Frances Wogec. I thank all of them for their advice and their cautionary comments.\textsuperscript{1} Though warned that the Flood “calendar” was a “sticky wicket,” I decided to rethink my question and to try to discover whether the topic, viz., the comparison between the length of Noah’s Flood and the length of human gestation, had been discussed in the scholarly literature. Thus far I have not been able to find this specific suggestion anywhere, even though comparisons between the first creation of Genesis 1 and the Flood narrative have been made. I hope that what follows here will add a new perspective to the biblical narrative and to the Mesopotamian materials I adduce as comparanda as well.

\section*{II. NOAH AND THE ARK}

\textit{Duration of Stay in the Ark}

Noah and the animals were enclosed (perhaps “enwombed” or even “entombed” might be said) from 17 February (Gen. 7:11) to 1 October (Gen. 8:5), plus 40 days (Gen. 8:6), plus 14 days (Gen. 8:10–12). (The initial 7-day grace period of Gen. 7:4 and 10 are not counted because the rains had not yet started.) For the classical/antique traditional folkloric rationale behind not counting the first 7 days of pregnancy and the reasons that the significant subsequent 40 days are counted separately from the remainder of the gestation period (it concerns the physical substance of the fetal material), see the materials collected by M. Stol.\textsuperscript{2} All together, the stay in the ark was 278 days, or 9 months and 1 week, which is the normal length of human gestation. Gen. 7:16 tells us that YHWH “shut Noah in” (the ark), using the verb \textit{sgr}, which is also used in 1 Sam. 1:5 and 6 of the womb of Hannah.\textsuperscript{3} We might also note that the verb \textit{ys}$≥º$, “to come out,” used by YHWH in Gen. 8:16 in his command to Noah to leave the ark, is also used elsewhere in the Old Testament of babies emerging at birth, as \textit{wašû} is used in the cuneiform materials.

It appears, then, that Genesis offers us a rebirth or a re-creation of earth’s living creatures by means of their new gestation in the ark.

\footnotesize
\textsuperscript{1} Our former University of California, Berkeley, doctoral student, Sheldon Greaves, has been kind enough to supply me with a table (see table 1 below) of the biblical flood chronology taken from his article “Interpretation of the Biblical Ark and Chronology of the Flood,” in which he presents the many discussions in the secondary literature of the symbolism of the ark and the patterns of the flood chronology. The flood “calendar,” as it is often referred to, has been calculated in many different and confusing ways. Greaves’ article is an informative summary of the arguments among biblical scholars. I have relied on it very much. It has been published at Berkeley in the \textit{Journal of Associated Graduates in Near Eastern Studies} 11 (2005): 43–50.


\textsuperscript{3} I thank F. I. Andersen for this reference.
The same period of 278 days is that in which YHWH’s mayim overpowered ʿereṣ to which we may compare Adad’s ʿabūbu, which conquered earth’s creatures in the Atrahasis Epic. Essentially, earth is being re-created or reborn at the same time that the ark’s creatures are being saved or reborn. Note that just as the ruḥ Elohim in Gen. 1:2 played a role in the first creation of earth, YHWH’s ruḥ once again causes the waters to begin to disappear so that earth can reemerge (Gen. 8:5). This parallel and others (such as key vocabulary, the loading of animals) between the first Creation of Genesis 1 and the second Creation of Genesis 7–8 have been discussed by biblical scholars. Note also that Otto Rank, already in 1909, considered Moses’ ark/basket as a uterine symbol; furthermore, G. S. Kirk discusses, in passing, Freudian interpretations of “enclosure motifs” as uterine symbols. He alludes to Noah’s ark but makes no specific point.

The Significance of the 150 Days

The meaning of Gen. 7:24 and 8:3 must be that the flood waters reached their height and stayed at that level, covering even the highest mountains before they began to recede.

In human pregnancy, 150 days, or 20–22 weeks, is a highly significant time, for it is then that the fundus of the uterus reaches the umbilicus; this is measured by palpation and permits the midwife or obstetrician to determine whether the size of the fetus and progression of the uterus are adequate and “healthy.” The umbilicus is the fixed reference point by which one can measure the height of the fundus and is used as a benchmark by which to estimate the day of birth.

Thus when Gen. 7:18 tells us that “the water swelled and increased greatly,” it seems to be reporting that all was well “with mother and baby” at close to the halfway point in a normal pregnancy. I might also point out that the period of 150 days here is mentioned twice, once in Gen. 7:24 and again in 8:4, near the midpoint of the 278 days and at the halfway point of the 46 verses that comprise the Flood narrative of Genesis 7 and 8. Moreover, the fifth month is the middle month of nine. I consider this placement in the center as a sign of its significance in the story-telling pattern.
The Significance of the Seventh Month, Seventeenth Day

Likewise, the text of Gen. 8:4 seems to assure us that the ark and the creatures within had reached the time of certain viability; the ark had come to a secure rest on the mountain and was therefore safe.

Human fetuses (before incubators, etc.) are generally considered viable outside the womb after 7 months. Delivery may occur relatively safely for a 7-month or older fetus. As for the mountain tops that were seen in Gen. 8:5, perhaps they may be seen to symbolize the top of a baby’s head that appears at the start of birth; in this case, one thinks of the earth’s reemergence/rebirth.

The Safe Delivery of God’s Creatures from the Ark

On 1 January, Noah’s 601st year, Noah (who functions in some sense both as midwife and baby) is careful not to “deliver” his cargo too soon lest it come to harm. The 40-day wait (8:6) and the 14 days of trial flights of birds delay the “birth” until exactly the right time, 278 days.

In Gen. 8:13 we are told that, after an additional 36 days, “the earth was dry.” I would suggest that this could well refer to the normal period of postpartum menstruation, which, maximally, is considered to end at six weeks, or 42 days, after which the new mother may resume all normal activities.

As to the final count in Gen. 8:14, is it 10 days more than a lunar-solar year, or should it be corrected to one year exactly? If one should emend the reading bēšib‘āh wē’esrīm to bēšib‘āh-‘āšār yôm, then the biblical flood lasted from 17 February of Noah’s 600th year to 17 February of his 601st year. I find Hendel’s arguments about a textual error convincing.10

Selected Parallels with the Story of Adam and Eve

Reflections of the events in the garden may be seen in the following passages in Genesis:

(1) 6:19: the loading of the ark “two by two, male and female”; cf. 1:27: “male and female created he them.”

(2) 8:17: God gives instructions to Noah and family regarding their responsibilities to nature; cf. 1:28 f.

(3) 9:3–4: instructions as to what they can and cannot eat; cf. 2:16–17.

(4) 9:20–21: the wine of the vine that leads to Noah’s shame; cf. 3:10–13: the fruit of the tree that leads to Adam’s shame.

---

OF BABIES, BOATS, AND ARKS

(6) 9:25: the curse against Canaan as agent of the shame; cf. 3:14: the curse against the serpent as agent of Adam’s shame.

III. THE CUNEIFORM TEXTS

If it is indeed convincing to think of Noah’s ark as the dark womb (and perhaps also as a tomb) as well as the baby, which must survive the watery journey, then certain Sumerian and Akkadian parallels may be brought to bear on the question.11

Boats and Neonates

Cuneiform birth rituals and incantations regularly refer to the fetus as a boat that must find its way through dark waters and/or that must be untied from its mooring. J. Scurlock puts it this way: “The Mesopotamian woman was understood as the steerswoman of a boat formed inside her by the man’s semen. It was her [dangerous] duty to float this boat on her amniotic fluid.”12

I have counted eight, possibly nine, passages in the birth incantations that give us our information about the fetus being visualized or conceptualized as a boat loaded with the cargo that will determine its sex and that, I think, ensures that the baby has all its parts. The following examples should suffice for our purposes here.13

KAR 196 = Köcher BAM 248 ii 49–56: one text describes a difficult birth where the baby is “stuck”; it says “May her massive mooring rope be loosened, and may her locked gate be opened … may (the baby) come out promptly and see the light of the sun.”14 In another passage of the same text (Köcher BAM 248 ii 47 f.) we find “May the boat [here meaning the baby] come in safely from [the waters?], may the vessel proceed directly” (liššima eleppu lišṭēšera makurrū).

11 In the cuneiform flood accounts the duration was 7 days and 7 nights. Note the contribution by V. Emelianov on the calendar of the flood, its relation to the cultic calendar and royal ideology, and the probable timing as being the end of the year, thus January through February (“The Calendar Date of the Flood in Cuneiform Texts,” NABU 1999/41–45).
13 I thank our Berkeley student Mary Frances Wogec, who is currently finishing her doctoral dissertation on cuneiform childbirth incantations (under the supervision of Wolfgang Heimpel), for supplying me with pertinent references.
Note that the words used for the boats are *makurru* “cargo boat” and *eleppu* “boat”; both these Akkadian words are used of the arks in the cuneiform flood stories (in a late version of the Atrahasis Epic it is named the *nāšīr napištīm*, the “lifesaver”). Comparable to the loading of Noah’s ark, these baby-arks in the cuneiform birth incantations are loaded with a variety of things, notably with carnelian (for girls?) and lapis (for boys?); the texts also say that the mother does not know what is loaded with respect to these two items, which probably means that she does not know whether the baby yet to be born will be a girl or a boy.

In a Middle Assyrian medical text15 “the boat (i.e., the baby) is held at the quay of death; the vessel is held at the quay of distress” (*ina kār mūti kalāt eleppu, ina kār dannati kalāt makurru*).16 W. G. Lambert’s remark (p. 37) that this metaphor of a boat as a baby is “curious” (because “quays on the Tigris and Euphrates can rarely have been dangerous … to boats”) may be explained by the basic knowledge that in rising or sinking waters (whether slow or fast) a boat will come to harm unless the lines are loosened (i.e., lengthened) adequately before they break or unless the boat is cut loose to allow it to float safely and not be damaged against the docks. It may be germane to compare this to Old Babylonian Atrahasis III ii 55, where, as the storm becomes savage, the mooring rope is cut, thus releasing the boat.17 For a similar imagery of the baby as a shipwrecked sailor (as opposed to a boat), note the passage in Lucretius, *On the Nature of the Universe*: “Then again, an infant, like a shipwrecked sailor, cast up by the cruel sea, lies naked on the ground, speechless and helpless, when Nature first has thrown him forth with painful birth from his mother’s womb to the sunlit world…”18

**Loading and Unloading the Ark**

It may also be mentioned that the cuneiform flood hero, Utnapishtim (Gilg. XI 83), loaded into the ark “all the seed of living creatures,” thus the loading might be understood as being the equivalent of implanting seed in a uterine chamber.

Other small points of comparison exist between Mesopotamian language about human birth and Flood narratives that contrast the darkness of the womb with the light at its opening. For example, in Old Babylonian Atrahasis I 282 ff., at the birth of the baby, “the destined time opened the womb; light (*namru*) and joy were on her (the midwife’s) face.”19 In the birth incantation Köcher BAM 248 ii 56: “Let it (the baby) come out and see the light.” Cf. Gilg. XI: the flood hero recounts that at the end of the flood

16 Ibid., p. 36.
17 Lambert-Millard *Atra-hasīs*, pp. 92 ff., line 55.
18 I thank Denise Greaves for this reference.
when the ark was on the mountain, “I opened the nappašu ‘airhole’ and daylight (urru) fell upon my face (literally ‘on the side of my nose’).” I note the cognate relationship of nappašu with npš, the “baby’s first breath,” and with napištu, “life,” all of which surely includes wordplay. There is, in fact, quite a bit of wordplay in the birth incantations. ²⁰ Note, moreover, from an incantation to soothe a baby: “Oh little one who lived in the house of darkness, you have indeed come out (and) seen the light of day.” ²¹

Thus the flood hero may, as mentioned above, be seen as both midwife and as one of the “newborns” or “reborns.”

IV. CONCLUSION

The associative evidence would seem to favor an interpretation of Noah’s ark as a uterine symbol, the vessel that contained—for rebirth—representatives of all of earth’s creatures. The time frame can thus be explained in terms of human gestation. Putting it differently, the accounting of the passage of time in Genesis 7 and 8 should perhaps be seen as a “biological” and not solely “calendrical” reckoning, whether lunar or solar.

I conclude by quoting from an article by N. Lemche on the chronology of the Flood: “I have no intention of reviewing the various theses on the chronological system in the flood story. Nobody has achieved a coherent review and for very good reason, since most of the debate has been highly speculative and, strictly speaking, not very useful” ²²—I hope that the “biological” approach suggested here, however, will, at the very least, be considered a “useful” one.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE(S)</th>
<th>EVENT</th>
<th>INTERVAL</th>
<th>FLOOD: TOTAL NO. OF DAYS</th>
<th>YEAR: TOTAL NO. OF DAYS</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
<th>REFERENCE IN GENESIS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 January 600</td>
<td>600th year of Noah’s life</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 February</td>
<td>Flood begins</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>7:11–12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n.d.</td>
<td>“Waters 150 days”</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>Stated twice</td>
<td>7:24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 July</td>
<td>Ark “rests” on Ararat, waters abate</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>Waters begin to decline. This is the end of the “high-water mark”</td>
<td>8:4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 October</td>
<td>Tops of mountains visible</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>8:5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n.d.</td>
<td>Noah waits 40 days; sends out raven and dove</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>Estimated date is 11 November</td>
<td>8:6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n.d.</td>
<td>Noah sends dove again; it brings back an olive leaf</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>Estimated date is 17 November Noah knows flood is over</td>
<td>8:10–11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n.d.</td>
<td>Noah sends dove again; it does not return</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>Estimated date is 24 November</td>
<td>8:12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 January 601</td>
<td>Earth was dry</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>8:13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 February 601</td>
<td>Earth was dry</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>418</td>
<td>Added to bring the length of the Flood to one solar year?</td>
<td>8:14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
AN EXOTIC BABYLONIAN GOD-LIST

W. G. Lambert, University of Birmingham, England

VAT 10608 is a small fragment of a cuneiform tablet from Assur in the Vorderasiatisches Museum, Berlin, given in copy by E. Ebeling as KAR 339a, not previously edited. It has been recopied by the present writer courtesy of the then Director, L. Jakob-Rost, and is published here by kind permission of the present curators, B. Salje and J. Marzahn.

This fragment is literary and Middle Assyrian, though it is not mentioned in E. Weidner’s article on the supposed library of Tiglath-pileser I (“Die Bibliothek Tiglat-pileser I,” AfO 16 [1952–53]: 197–215), nor in the two volumes of O. Pedersén, Archives and Libraries in the City of Assur, Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis, Studia Semitica Upsaliensia, 6 (Uppsala, 1985–86). Ebeling entitled it “Rel. Fragment” and avoided committing himself on which side was obverse and which side reverse by labeling the side with the lower left corner “1. Seite” and the side with the upper left corner “2. Seite.” No line is completely preserved, only the beginnings of each line. Ebeling’s “1. Seite” is in fact the flat side, his “2. Seite” is more convex, but nevertheless the present writer takes the convex side as the obverse because of the content. The text is part of a list of gods, one in each short section as divided by rulings and arranged according to a ranking of the gods in the Babylonian pantheon. It was a small tablet when complete and possibly gives only the earlier parts of a longer list. If so, it is an extract tablet. For convenience we have numbered the text by sections, not by lines:

VAT 10608

Obv.

1 dlugal-du₄-kú-g[a ... zalsa-x-ri ki-ma x [... Lugal-dukuga [...] ... like […]

2 ḫa-mur-ni ḫa-nu [...] ra-šu-ba-te [...] Ħamurni: Anu [...] terror […]

3 ḫa-Ruašu-ḫu enlil(idim) [...] a-na [...] [... Ḫayašu: Enlil [...] to [...

167
Only three sections are sufficiently preserved to give an indication of the general pattern: obv. 2, 3, and rev. 4. Each begins with the name of a rare or foreign deity, and this is immediately followed by the normal Babylonian name of that deity. Descriptive epithets follow the names. Rev. 2 can be restored with some confidence to follow the same pattern.

Obv. 1 Elsewhere this god is either father or grandfather of Enlil, or a name of Ea; see RLA 7, pp. 133–34. His paternity of Enlil, however, appears comparatively late in our documentation. The Enki-Ninki pairs as ancestors of Enlil-Ninlil appear already in Early Dynastic Sumerian lists from Fara and Salahîkh (see P. Mander, Il Pantheon...
dukuga. He first appears with such listings in An = Anum II 137, but after Enmešarra
and Ninmešarra (themselves an addition to the older list) and their seven children; see
CT 24 4–5:26–37. In contrast, the pair En-dukuga–Nin-dukuga already occurs in the
Old Babylonian forerunner to An = Anum (TCL 15 10:1–24), in its listing of the Enkis
and Ninkis. As a name of Ea, Lugal-dukuga’s spread is far from limited to Marduk theology; for
example, Dumuduku is one of the fifty names of Marduk in En. el. VII 99–100. In our
list Lugal-dukuga appears as a prime mover, and probably he had this status in some
small place in Babylonia, and scholars of bigger and more important places in due
course incorporated him in their own theologies.

Obv. 2–3 The Marduk Prophecy begins: ḫa-mur-nim ḫa-a-a-šum, immediately
followed by Anu, Enlil, and Ea (R. Borger, “Gott Marduk und Gott-König Šulgi als
2–3 of VAT 10608 was compared). But the reading of the first name was uncertain,
and Borger wisely read ḫa-ḪAR-num. The present writer discovered in an unpublished
Late Babylonian copy of Tablet I of the god-list Anšar = Anum, line 6: ḫa-mu-ur-ni
= MIN (ḫa-nu-um) and so identified the pair with the Hurrian terms ḫawurni and
ešē, “heaven” and “earth,” though as a cosmic pair they occur in the opposite order:
ešē ḫawurni (E. Laroche, Glossaire de la langue Hourrite [= RHA 34–35 (1976–
77): 83–84 and 99]; G. Wilhelm, Grundzüge der Geschichte und Kultur der Hurriter
[Darmstadt, 1982], p. 80). This reverse order formerly resulted in giving the wrong
translation to each word, but from both Hurrian-Hittite and Babylonian material just
given, the correct meanings are now clear. The Babylonian material was presented in a
paper by the present writer to the 34ème Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale, 1987,
in Istanbul, but was not published. The spelling ḫay(y)ašū raises big questions about
Hurrian phonetics and etymology (is a development ḫayya- to e- normal in Hurrian?),
for which there is simply no evidence so far. ḫamurni also occurs in the Theogony of
Dunnu, CT 46 43 obv. 38: […] ši-ḫi-ir ḫa-mur-ni […]. The context is too damaged to
be explicable, but so far as can be judged, the creation of heaven has not been previ-
ously told in this story.

Obv. 4 One could read ḫi-la […] making Tila a foreign god like ḫamurni and
Ḥayašu, identified with a native Babylonian god. After Anu and Enlil one might think
of Ea, provided he is not meant by Lugal-dukuga in obv. 1, but no god Tila or Tila…
so far known suits Ea. As a foreign god the Hurrian Tilla could be compared. Mostly
he is one of the bulls that pulled Teššup’s chariot, but at Nuzi he was of similar status
to Teššup, and at Ulamme he was head of the pantheon; see V. Haas, Geschichte der
hethitischen Religion, Handbuch der Orientalistik I/15 (Leiden, 1994), pp. 318, 545. If
this is correct, our text should be restored: ḫi-la ḫ[adad…].
Rev. 2 dści-mu-ut was an Elamite god; see W. Hinz and H. Koch, *Elamisches Wörterbuch* (Berlin, 1987), pp. 1084–86, 1166–67. He is called “the strong herald of the gods,” if berir is correctly rendered “herald,” but his character is little known. In Akkadian he occurs in the Weidner God-List (A. Cavigneaux, *Textes scolaires du temple de Nabû ša harê*, vol. 1 [Baghdad, 1981], pp. 90–91), line 118, taken there as a name of Nergal, which is stated explicitly in the explanatory column of the two-column edition: dści-mu-ut = dU+GUR (*KA* 63 iii 20; 148+165 obv. 16). Nergal is appropriate to this position in the list.

Rev. 3 One could read dḥi-li-bat, etc., but with a foreign name the simpler and more common value is to be expected. No god Ḥilibe is so far known, but in lists the common noun “god” is seen in this or in a homophone:

\[
\begin{align*}
qā-ad-mu & = i-[lum] \\
ḏi-ḏi-ru-ū & = MIN \\
ḫi-ḫi-bu-ū & = <MIN> \\
e-ne & = MIN SU^{ki} \\
nap & = MIN eλam^{ki}
\end{align*}
\]

CT 25 18 rev. ii 9–11

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{ḥi-li-bu E.NUN} \\
\text{E.NUN}
\end{array} = \text{ilu}
\]

CT 19 19 iv 28 = *MSL* 17, p. 228: 283

The final long vowel in CT 25 18 could be explained from the preceding digirû: an Akkadianization of Ḥilibe. A particular deity could bear as a name a common noun; cf. West Semitic El and ancient Mesopotamian Inanna/Aštar/Ištar. If one dares to frame a hypothesis on such a narrow basis, one will conclude that Ḥilibe was a foreign god of this kind, equated with a Sumero-Babylonian of the same theological type. The context and what remains of these lines suggests as a possible restoration:

\[
dḥi-li-be \ d\langle\text{nunmāra ašarîdu}\rangle
\]

\[
ša \ d\langle\text{nunmāra ašarîdu}\rangle
\]

Ninurta would fit very nicely between Nergal and Ištar, but this is only speculation.

Rev. 4 For Zanaru as a name of Ištar, see W. G. Lambert in *Kraus AV*, p. 213, note on III 67–68. It is rare in texts, more common in lists glossing dMUX or dZA.MUX. The present writer hesitated there to accept the common identification of this name of Ištar with the Sumero-Akkadian musical instrument zannaru (see *CAD* s.v.) and the Proto-Hittite zinar (for the Hittite evidence, see S. de Martino, “Il lessico musicale ittita II. GIŞ dINANNA=cetra,” *Oriens Antiquus* 26 [1987]: 171–85). It now seems likely
that the two words are in origin unrelated. The instrument, in Akkadian and Sumerian, can be written with one -n- but is rightly normalized with two, but there seems to be no single example of the name of the goddess with a doubled -nn-. The lack of any known association of the goddess with the instrument is a serious problem, and another source is more probable. There is an Elamite noun written za-na “lady,” used as a divine name and written ḍza-na (W. Hinz and H. Koch, Wörterbuch, p. 1282). Elamite nouns occurring in Akkadian contexts bear the delocutive ending; note sū-uk-ki-ir in Akkadian texts from Susa of Old Babylonian times (passages in CAD S s.v. sukkir) and ki-ri-ir in a Late Assyrian copy of a god-list (CT 25 18 rev. ii 17), for sukkı/sunkı “king” and kiri “goddess.” Thus the word could have been loaned as Zanar, to which the Akkadian case ending was added. The sign KAXÉRIN, for the normal AGXÉRIN, seems to be specifically Assyrian.

Rev. 5 A restoration ḍ[bēlet-ilā]ni[mēš] N[E… is possible, and if correct then a good Mesopotamian name is offered, not followed by any other name. It is also possible to read ḍ[bēlet-ilā]nē[mēš][e… , which allows for another following divine name, now lost.

CONCLUSIONS

Despite its exiguous remains, this tablet strongly gives the impression of being a variety of triple-column god-list, for which see RLA 3, pp. 473–79, “Götterlisten,” though the text is not set out on the tablet as a list. Each section begins with a rare name of the deity, follows that with the ordinary name, and concludes with descriptive phrases. The longest and best-known example of such a list is drawn on in En. el. VIb and VII, though the literary format required the omission of the main name to avoid repetition. Parallels to VAT 10608 are scattered throughout K.4339 (CT 25 9–14) from which we cite a few lines as examples:

\[
\begin{align*}
d\text{en-bān-da} & \quad d\text{nīn-urta} & \quad śa-biṭ purussī(ēš.bar) ilānī(dingir)mēš \\
d\text{ḥal-ḥal-la} & \quad d\text{nīn-urta} & \quad nāšir(ūru) purussī(ēš.bar) a-bi d\text{en-līl} \\
d\text{me-maḥ} & \quad d\text{nīn-urta} & \quad ḫa-mi-im parsī(garza)mēš šīrūṭī(maḥ)mēš \\
d\text{zū-lum-ma} & \quad d\text{nīn-urta} & \quad a-ni-ku a-ni-ḥu \\
d\text{usu-maḥ} & \quad d\text{nīn-urta} & \quad bēl(en) e-mu-qī \\
\end{align*}
\]

CT 25 11 ii 17–24

En-banda Ninurta who holds the decree of the gods
HECKHalla Ninurta who guards the decree of father Enlil
Memaḥ Ninurta who controls the exalted ordinances
Zulumma Ninurta … he who strives(?)
Usumaḥ Ninurta master of strength
Most triple-column god-lists deal with one god only, or one god at a time in detail, but VAT 10608 apparently took an existing short god-list covering the whole pantheon and expanded that with some extremely exotic material, but not giving more than one section to each deity. As for date of origin, the parallel of Ḫamurri and Ḫayašu with the Marduk Prophecy, from the reign of Nebuchadnezzar I, strongly suggests a Middle Babylonian origin.
I. THE LEGAL DOCUMENT KT 94/K 1153

In a document recording a discussion between representatives of the Assyrian community and the king and queen of an Anatolian principality we hear for the first time of the Anatolian judicial custom of the river ordeal, “going to the river.” An Assyrian trader named Aššur-taklāku is accused of working for the king of neighboring Tawinia, an enemy of the rulers of Kanesh, and he has been thrown in jail. The Assyrian negotiators turn up at the palace and try to secure the release of their countryman; if the rulers simply refuse to set him free, he should be allowed either to swear an oath on the sword of Assur or “like a citizen of your city” to submit to the river ordeal in order to clear himself: lizziz <mahar> paṭrim ša Aššur litma ul kīma mera ālika ana Id lillik. These two possible courses of action clearly represent the Assyrian and the Anatolian practices.

To date, this is the only text we know of to mention this special legal procedure, but the legal document kt 94/k 1153 published here provides us with an interesting parallel. It is an unopened envelope that stems from an archive discovered at Kültepe in 1994.

Text

Obv.

Ša-lim-A-šūr DUMU I-sú-SUD₃ ū A-šù-wa-an-zi
DUMU Ha-ar-ša ša dî-nam ru-ba-um
ū GAL sî-ki-tim dî-nam i-dî-nu-ni-ma
šū-ha-ra-am ša Šál-ma-A-šūr a-na i-id

---


2 I thank Tahsin Özgüç for his permission to let me publish the texts from that year.

3 The sign is MU₃, which in Old Assyrian texts appears to have been conflated with SUD, arāku.
5  i-dî-nu-ni ša-lim-ašûr û A šu-wa-an
i-mî-ig-ru-ma ni-is A-na ni-is Ašûr
ni-is ru-ba-im ni-is GAL sî-ki-tim
Wa-li-iš-ra û ni-is e-ba1(RA)-ru-tim
ša a-wa-tišu-nu ig-mu-ru-ni

10  it-mu-û-ma
1 ma-na Kû.BABBAR û 1 TûG ku-ta-nam

lo. e. Ša-lim-Ašûr a-na A šu-wa-an
i-dî-in-ma A šu-wa-an û a-hu šu me-er-û Ha-ar ša-a

Rev.

15  a-na Ša-lim-Ašûr me-er-e-šu
û me-er-e l-dî-a-bi-im a-na mî-ma
šu-um šu û-lâ i-tû-ru
šu-ma
i-tû-ru lá-am-nu-ut A-na : Ašûr

20  ru-ba-im û GAL sî-ki-tim KÎSÎB Ku-ra-âš-mî-is
DUMU GAL na-pá-hi-im KÎSÎB Bu-li-na
u. e. DUMU ra-biša-qî-im KÎSÎB Še-šû-ur
DUMU Kà-zu-ba
KÎSÎB A šu-wa-an DUMU Ha-ar ša

25  KÎSÎB A-zu DUMU Kà-zu (over erasure)

l. e. KÎSÎB Ü-ra-a KÎSÎB dMAR.TU-ba-ni me-er-û Ma-na-na
KÎSÎB Zu-ba DUMU Ištar-pá-li-il3 KÎSÎB A-de₈-lá-at
DUMU dIM-ba-ni

seal A: A-mur-Ašûr / DUMU Šu-li+

4 The seal is no. 264 in B. Teissier, Sealing and Seals from Kûltepe Karum Level 2 (Istanbul, 1994) and probably used by Zuba.

seal B: A-šûr-ba-ni / DUMU Ma-na-na+

5 The seal is no. 646 (ibid.), used by Uraya son of Manana; see M. T. Larsen and E. Møller, “Five Old Assyrian Texts,” in Mélanges Garelli, p. 228.
Translation

Šalim-Aššur son of Issu-rik and Ašuwanzi son of Harša, for whom the king and the 
rabi sikkitim had given a verdict stating that they would hand over a servant of Šalim-
Aššur to the river (ordeal)—Šalim-Aššur and Ašuwan came to an agreement, and they 
swore an oath by Anna, Aššur, the king, the rabi sikkitim Wališra, and by the colleagues 
who had resolved their dispute, and Šalim-Aššur gave 1 mina of silver and 1 kutânu-textile 
to Ašuwan, and Ašuwan and his brothers, sons of Harša, will raise no claim whatsoever 
against Šalim-Aššur, his sons, and the sons of Iddin-abum. If they do raise a claim, it will 
be a crime against Anna, Aššur, the king, and the rabi sikkitim.

Sealed by Kurašmiš son of the overseer of smiths, Bulina son of the chief cup-
bearer, Šešur son of Kazuba, Ašuwan son of Harša, Azu son of Kazu, Uraya (and) 
Amurrum-bani sons of Manana, Zuba son of Ištar-pâlil, Adad-ellat son of Adad-bani.

Summary

An Assyrian, Šalim-Aššur, and an Anatolian, Ašuwan(zi), have appealed to 
the king (of Kanesh) and his chief officer, who have handed down a verdict. This 
involved sending a servant of the Assyrian merchant to the river ordeal, but rather than 
carrying out this verdict, the two men submitted their case to the mediation of a group 
of “colleagues,” who instead imposed a solution whereby the Assyrian paid 1 mina 
of silver and 1 textile to his adversary. He, in turn, relinquished the right to raise any 
 Further claims. The two men then swore an oath to uphold this agreement, swearing by 
the gods Anna and Aššur, by the king and by his chief officer, and, finally, by the men 
who had mediated the agreement. If this settlement should be violated, it would then 
constitute an “evil” to the gods, the king, and his officer.

Nine people have witnessed this agreement, four Anatolians and four Assyrians as 
well as Ašuwan(zi), the Anatolian litigant.

THE PLAYERS

The texts found at Kültepe in 1994 came from two houses that were some 60 
meters apart. The text under consideration here belongs to the second archive found 
that year, consisting of the texts numbered 569 to 1,789, a substantial archive that 
documents the activities of the family of Šalim-Aššur son of Issu-rik. The latter appears 
as a living person only in a few texts, and we know that he moved to Assur; since, 
however, there are no letters from him sent from Assur, we must assume he died soon 
after his move. He had three sons, Aššur-bêl-awâtim, Iddin-abum, and Šalim-Aššur; 
the first one held an official position in Assur as laputtâ’um, a member of the city

---

administration, and, as far as we know, he did not take an active part in the overland trade. The archive of Iddin-abum and his sons must be in another building at Kültepe, but these persons figure quite prominently in the 1994 archive as well. Šalim-Aššur had two sons, Ennam-Aššur and Alāhum, and he is known to have died in his house in Durhumit in the year KEL 104.7

The conflict with Āšuwan(zi) is not mentioned in any other text in the archive. Some of the Anatolians, however, are known from other contexts. Āšuwan(zi)8 appears in four other texts: Jankowska KTK 86:2, where he has a debt of 2 minas 10 shekels of silver to an Assyrian called Sahri-ilī; in a text from level 1b, kt 89/k 383:1, where he is said to be a priest of the local god Higīša;9 and in two unpublished texts, kt h/t 330:17, a witness, and kt 73/k 14:12, a list of personal names. The name of his father, Harša, appears in kt g/t 36:2, the well-known list of palace personnel under Turupani, the rabi simmīlitim, probably the local crown prince;10 here Harša is one of eight persons who are described as urki Halkiššu rabi huršātim “under Halki-āššu the chief of the storehouses,” but he cannot be identical with our man, Harša the father of Āšuwan(zi), since the text is from the 1b period. Written either Harša or Harši, the name appears in CCT 6 37b:2, ICK 1 30:18, and ICK 2 1:11 (in both cases as a witness) and in the unpublished text kt n/k 67:11, where Harša is involved in an affair concerning amūtim.

We are informed in our text that the name of the high official rabi sikkΩtim was Wallšra;11 persons with this name are found in JCS 14 12:3, 7, in TCL 4 87:13 as debtors, and in Matouš KK 38:10 in an unrevealing context; in a text from level 1b, kt n/k 31:7, a man with this name is a witness and said to be the priest of Adad, and in another text, kt 89/k 379:1, he is said to be the chief of the heralds.12

One of the names of the Anatolian witnesses, Bulina, recurs a number of times, twice referring to members of the local elite: in kt a/k 1263:9 Bulina is a member of the retinue (upatinnum) of the rabi sikkΩtim, and in kt n/k 32:12, another level 1b text, a man with this name is the head of the staff of Inar, the priest of Bēl-qablim. The name Azu is used by both Assyrians and Anatolians, and no Azu son of Kazu is otherwise attested; however, the father’s name appears once in JCS 14 12, where he and Wallšra are both debtors, and this may provide a link with our text. At least it clearly shows that the witness is an Anatolian.

---

7 KEL (Kültepe Eponym List); see K. R. Veenhof, The Old Assyrian List of Year Eponyms from Karum Kanish and Its Chronological Implications, Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları VI/64, (Ankara, 2003).
8 Only once in the present text is he called Āšuwanzi, and this may be a mistake, for all other occurrences give the form Āšuwan.
THE PROCEDURE

It can be assumed that the eight witnesses are identical with the “colleagues who resolved their dispute,” persons who are otherwise often referred to as gāmer awātim. These men were drawn into the affair, since the litigants wanted a compromise settlement instead of implementing the verdict of the king. Such a verdict could accordingly be disregarded or treated more as a suggested solution than as a binding decision if the parties to the conflict could agree on a different procedure.

The fact that the matter was originally brought before the king of Kanesh rather than the Assyrian authorities needs to be explained, for it is highly unusual for the Anatolian authorities to become involved in strictly legal decisions. Among the few examples, one may point to the last text mentioned above, kt n/k 32, which involves the dissolution of some kind of partnership between two Anatolian brothers, Tamunya and Šalkuata, and an Assyrian called Eddin-Aššur; the matter concerned the two kings Hurmeli and Inar of Kanesh, and although it deals with matters in both Kanesh and Mamma, it was concluded in Kanesh, where seven negotiators, three Anatolians and four Assyrians, “divided” their joint assets.

This text, from the level 1b period, belongs to the iqqāti genre, where Anatolian kings (sometimes the rabi simmutim) notarize a document with a legal decision or agreement. Such documents otherwise deal with matters of family law, mostly divorce cases, and they concern only Anatolians. These texts are accordingly a reflection of local Anatolian legal customs, despite the fact that they are written in Assyrian.

In cases where merchandise disappeared, stolen by brigands, the king was responsible in accordance with the treaties set up, and he had to recompense the firm, and if murder was involved in such a situation, the case would have to be dealt with by the king. One of Šalim-Aššur’s sons, Ennam-Aššur, was in fact murdered in the district of Tamnia; text kt 94/k 937, a draft of a letter that is unfortunately badly written and poorly preserved, informs us that the surviving son, Alāhum, went to Tamnia together with the envoys of the Kanesh colony to discuss this with the king, asking him to “search for the blood money for the man together with us.” Both Alāhum and the Tamnia colony insist that Ennam-Aššur was murdered because of a presumably large sum of money the king had paid him for a delivery of meteoric iron.

13 For a selection of such texts, including kt n/k 32, see V. Donbaz, “Some Remarkable Contracts of 1-b Period Kültepe Tablets,” in T. Özgüç AV, pp. 75–98; see also n. 8 above.

14 (1) iš-tí ši-ip-ri-ku-nu (2) a-na da-me-e ša a-hi-a (3) še-[a]-im a-ta-là-ak iš-tí (4) ru-ba-im Ta-am-ni-a-i-im (5) [ni]-na-me-er-ma um-ma š[i]-i[p]-ru (6) x i n a-[b]i-ri ša x (7) x a-hu-šu a-ba-ù-kà . iš-ti-[n]-ni (8) [da-mi]-e ša a-wi-lim . še-e “I left together with your envoys to claim the blood money for my brother. We met with the

King of Tamnia, and the envoys said: ‘...among the friends of ... his brother ... your fathers ... search for the blood money for the man together with us!’”

15 (16) a-hi-i a-šu-[<mi>] a-mu-tí-kà (17) [x] x KÙ.BABBAR ša šû-mi Lá-qé-ep (18 l.e.) [i]-t-bu-lu (erasure) KÙ.BABBAR (19 rev.) [a]-mu-tim sû-re-e . ša ta-di-[nu]-šu-ni (20) di-ik a-li-ik-ma (21) da-me-e ša a-hi-a . še-e (22) kà-rù-um iš-al-šu-ma (23) um-ma kà-rù-ma a-wi-lì , a-šu-mi (24) a-mu-tí-kà . di-ik a-li-ik-ma (25) da-me-e ša a-
Our text does not inform us about the background of the litigation, only that Šalim-Aššur had to accept a settlement that meant he had to pay 1 mina of silver and 1 piece of a textile. This is not a very large obligation for a very wealthy businessman, but the size of the payment itself does not tell us what the problem may have been.

THE OATH

The special oath that refers to both gods and to the Anatolian king and his chief officer appears once more in the available evidence, in Matouš Prag I 651. Apart from that, we have one document, ICK 1 32, where we find an oath by the gods Aššur and Anna and by the king; finally, in kt 91/k 282:19–21 an oath is sworn by “Anna, the king, and the queen”\(^{16}\) only Anatolians appear in that text, which is concerned with a division, perhaps of an inheritance.

Dercksen has suggested that we are in fact dealing with an oath by the Assyrian king in the first two cases\(^ {17}\) but that is clearly excluded in our text. Both the other two texts deal with divorce proceedings. The first, ICK 1 32, states that the Assyrian Pilah-Ištar has divorced his “maid” Walawala;\(^ {18}\) although this name is Anatolian, her family members who appear on her behalf at the proceedings have Assyrian names: her two brothers are called Nunu and Amur-Aššur, and her mother’s name is Šat-Ištar.\(^ {19}\)

The second text is Matouš Prag I 651, a badly broken divorce settlement involving a man called Pūšu-kēn and his wife, whose name is partly broken away but that may be Lamassī.\(^ {20}\) The text itself is in fact unusual, since it seems to begin with the statement that the two divorcees swore an oath; the editors have suggested that it was an oath by the City, that is, Assur, but other explanations are equally possible. We are told

\(^{16}\) CAD R s.v. rubātu usage a.

\(^{17}\) Dercksen, *Old Assyrian Institutions*, p. 71, n. 232.


\(^{19}\) We may be dealing with an Anatolian family that was closely associated with the Assyrian milieu that adopted Assyrian names.

\(^{20}\) The well-known Assyrian trader called Pūšu-kēn, whose extensive archive was dug up by the villagers at Kültepe before 1948, was in fact married to a woman called Lamassī, but there are very good reasons to think that she could not be meant in this text; for one thing, we know that she died in Assur as Pūšu-kēn’s wife (see TCL 4 30), and it seems clear that she never set foot in Anatolia. Dercksen has therefore suggested (*AfO* 48–49 [2001–2]: 191) that the text in question is concerned with the divorce of Pūšu-kēn II, the grandson of the famous man, and that seems reasonable. It is difficult, however, to believe that he too was married to a woman called Lamassī — however popular that name may have been. Since the name is only partially preserved, we should withhold an identification for the time being.
that the lady in question has received her divorce payment and therefore cannot raise further claims against Pūšu-kēn, his sons and daughters, or his donkey packers, but, confusingly, she cannot do so together with her husband. The two are then said to have sworn an oath by Aššur, Anna, the king, and the rabī sikkitim.  

It seems likely to me that both cases refer to divorces involving an Assyrian man and an Anatolian woman, and that could explain why the Anatolian authorities became involved in the oath ceremony. Dercksen’s objection that “after all, divorce of Assyrians in Kanesh will have fallen under Assyrian jurisdiction” is invalid if we assume that the women involved were Anatolians. There are many indications that the status of women differed significantly in the two societies, and intermarriage must under all circumstances have been a complex affair in which the two social and legal systems had to be brought into harmony with each other.

The king referred to must, accordingly, be the local one, and in line with the symmetrical structure of the negotiation process I suggest that the two gods mentioned, Aššur and Anna, represented the two groups involved, so that Anna is understood to be the main god of Kanesh.

II. “GOING TO THE RIVER”

The river ordeal may well have been a fairly common procedure in Anatolian legal practice. Among the texts found in 1994, there is one other reference in a text that records a conflict between the sons of Șalim-Ăşşur and an Anatolian called Harşumnuman: kt 94/k 1397 (and duplicate kt 94/k 1399).

Anu-pîya acting for the sons of Șalim-Ăşşur seized us (as witnesses) in the case against Galgalya and Harşu(mnu)man, and they heard the tablet concerning their debt of 10 minas of silver.

Anu-pîya said: “Is this the tablet with your seal?”

Galgalya answered: “It is my seal; however, it is Harşumnuman who paid the silver.”

Anu-pîya said: “We appear as inheritors. Bring evidence as to whether you paid the silver either to Șalim-Ăşşur or to the sons of Șalim-Ăşşur.”

---

22 Ibid.
23 This is not the place to pursue this idea. The god(dess) Anna occurs in quite a few purely Assyrian names, such as Puzur-Anna or Anna-li (written A-na-li/î), and the deity was clearly adopted by the Assyrians. There was, however, a festival in Kanesh for the god, mentioned in loan documents as the time for repayment. If the name is to be seen as Hittite in origin, it was probably a designation for a mother goddess (cf. annaš). See M. T. Larsen, *The Old Assyrian City-State and Its Colonies*, Mesopotamia 4 (Copenhagen, 1976), p. 46, n. 69.
Haršumnuman answered: “I personally paid the silver of our tablet in full to Šalim-Aššur. I will let myself be put to the river ordeal for you.”

The Kanesh colony gave us (as witnesses) to these proceedings, and we delivered our testimony before Aššur’s dagger.

Witnessed by Kura son of Ulaya; by Ennam-Aššur son of Hurāši.24

This text belongs to the time after the death of Šalim-Aššur, when his two sons were engaged in collecting old debts outstanding to their father; they are said to appear as mer’u mētim “sons of the dead man,” a phrase that indicates their status as heirs with special rights to question people. The substantial loan to the two Anatolians was recorded on a tablet found in Šalim-Aššur’s archive, and they have asked another person to find out whether the money has been paid. Under normal circumstances the original deed would have been handed over to the debtor once the loan was repaid, so the presence of the tablet in the archive would, of course, indicate that the money was still outstanding. One of the debtors, however, claims that he personally paid Šalim-Aššur, and he declares himself willing to submit to the river ordeal to prove this assertion.

The case is tried in accordance with Assyrian legal practices, using a standard textual format, and the declaration by Haršumnuman is therefore unusual and may indicate that in special cases such conflicts could be put before the local king, who would surely have been the one to authorize the river ordeal.

III. ANATOLIAN OR ASSYRIAN COURTS

In almost all disputes between Anatolians and Assyrians involving loans, debts of various kinds, and other commercial issues, the Assyrian legal institutions are directly involved in the decision-making process.25 Such matters are therefore only in special instances brought before the Anatolian king. No doubt the kings and queens had the right to intervene in cases where the Assyrians acted in contravention of the treaties and regulations governing the relationship between the two groups. For instance, people caught smuggling, thus avoiding paying taxes to the local palaces, could simply be thrown in jail.

---


The examples collected here indicate that matters of family law involving mixed marriages could become the concern of the local palace, and the Šālīm-Âšûr case could perhaps therefore be explained as having its background in a dispute involving family matters in which both Assyrians and Anatolians had a stake. It would, however, be expected that other texts in this large archive would give hints of such a relationship.

Another obvious possibility is that the rank of the Anatolians involved in a conflict with one or more Assyrians played a role. The merchants apparently had limited powers in their relations with local officials as shown by a verdict of the Kanesh colony in which Assyrians are prohibited from having dealings with the rabi simmiltim, perhaps the crown prince, until he has paid what he owes to an Assyrian called Ikūnum.²⁶ Obviously, there was no way in which Ikūnum could force the Anatolian official to appear before the colony, and he may not have been interested in having his case dealt with by the local palace.

Haršumnuman, the man who declared his willingness to undergo the river ordeal, is known from another text in the archive, kt 94/k 1756, in which he is said to be the priest of the sun-god.²⁷ He was accordingly a member of the absolute elite in Kanesh, like Âšûwan(zi) in the first text, and this raises the possibility that in cases involving high-ranking Anatolians, the Assyrians at least sometimes would have to accept that legal disputes were brought before the local king.

In general we are poorly informed about Anatolian legal procedures during the level 2 period. The material available from level 1b reflects a situation in which the king and his highest officials, the rabi simmiltim and the rabi sikkitim, functioned as judges, and the conflicts brought before them were almost exclusively related to family law. It would not be surprising if the Assyrians became increasingly dominated by the Anatolian system during the later period, and although there is little concrete evidence of this, one of the level 1b treaties published recently by Günbattı does refer directly to Assyrians involved in lawsuits brought before the king. The treaty with the ruler of Hahhum contains the following passage (col. ii, 1–10):

You (plural) shall not take a decision concerning any citizen of Assur or anyone from kārum Hahhum (based on) [the testi]mony of your followers, your slave-girls, your slaves, or any citizen of Hahhum. You shall not pass a verdict based on decrees, but you shall pass a verdict truthfully, in accordance with the law of Hahhum. The verdict of any citizen of Assur, a slave-girl, or anyone from the kārum Hahhum you shall pass truthfully.²⁸
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ESARHADDON’S EXILE: SOME SPECULATIVE HISTORY

Erle V. Leichty, University of Pennsylvania

One of the minor mysteries of Neo-Assyrian history is the location of Esarhaddon’s place of refuge when he fled the menacing threat posed by his brothers. I would like to offer a possible solution to this problem based on circumstantial evidence and what I hope is informed speculation.

In the institution of Assyrian kingship there were no formal rules of succession. While still on the throne, each king designated his own successor. Normally the successor whom the sitting monarch named was one of his own sons, but this was not hard and fast. Since the Neo-Assyrian kings had harems and large numbers of children with their numerous wives and concubines, the designation of a successor must have been the subject of intense infighting within the royal family.

Esarhaddon (680–669 B.C.) was the youngest son of Sennacherib (704–681 B.C.) and, in all probability, the sole son of Naqiya. While he was growing up, his father, Sennacherib, was deeply involved with his “Babylonian problem.” The Chaldean, Merodach-baladan, and his successors and their Elamite allies were continually stirring up rebellions in Babylonia, and Sennacherib struggled for a solution to the problem. In 700 B.C. Sennacherib seized Babylon and installed Assur-nadin-šumi, his eldest son and designated successor, as king of Babylon, but six years later Assur-nadin-šumi was captured and killed in an Elamite raid on Babylonia, leaving Sennacherib with no designated successor. Seven years later, in 683 B.C., Sennacherib named Esarhaddon, his youngest son, as successor and installed him in the bīt redûti “the house of succession.”

Faced with this fait accompli, Esarhaddon’s elder brothers plotted a coup. Esarhaddon somehow received warning of the plot, probably from his mother, who heard of it in the harem. He promptly sought refuge in a safe place in the west. This prompted

---

1 An interesting modern analogy is the recent succession in Jordan. King Hussein was critically ill at the Mayo Clinic in America, and there were rumblings of a coup in Amman. He flew home and designated a successor from among his sons.

2 In her recent book on Naqiya, The Role of Naqiya/Zakutu in Sargonid Politics, SAAS 9 (Helsinki, 1999), S. C. Melville plays down the power and position of Naqiya vis-à-vis the Neo-Assyrian monarch because she had not attained “first wife status.” I do not believe that such a thing as “first wife status” existed but, rather, that any ranking within the harem was informal and cannot be revealed by titles. I follow the more traditional view that Naqiya was a major power behind the throne, citing the fact that her son Esarhaddon, the youngest of Sennacherib’s sons, was named as successor, and that she remained prominent throughout the reign of Esarhaddon and well into the reign of Assurbanipal.

---
his brothers to assassinate their father, Sennacherib, and Esarhaddon had to march on Nineveh and seize the throne to which he was entitled. Over the years there has been extensive speculation as to where Esarhaddon took refuge, but the exact location of his exile has remained unknown. Here I will argue, albeit on inconclusive evidence, that this place of exile was Harran.³

The Sargonid dynasty was almost certainly West Semitic. I believe that Sargon and his successors were Arameans who took Akkadian throne names. The rapid and wide geographical spread of the use of Aramaic in this period is well attested,⁴ and I would also note that the Neo-Assyrian kings took West Semitic wives.⁵ There is no evidence that this was for diplomatic or political advantage.

Neo-Assyrian society was organized in groups of patriarchal extended families, and in such societies marriage was normally between cousins or between members of closely related family groups. Consequently, the Neo-Assyrian kings and their queens, in our case Sennacherib and Naqiya, probably came from the same geographical area. When Esarhaddon sought refuge, it must have been with his mother’s family. That would have been the only haven that was guaranteed, or nearly guaranteed, to be safe. Because Esarhaddon was only one of many children of Sennacherib, his father’s relatives would almost certainly have had divided loyalties and could not be trusted to protect him in such a situation.

My suspicion that Harran was the ancestral home of Naqiya, and perhaps of the whole of the Sargonid dynasty, was raised when I recently served as outside examiner for the excellent dissertation of Jamie R. Novotny.⁶ Novotny convincingly demonstrates that the major Assyrian building activity in Harran began in the last years of Esarhaddon’s reign and that the various temples were finished in the first part of Assurbanipal’s reign. I would like to suggest that this building activity was a thank-you gift from Esarhaddon to his relatives in Harran who had sheltered him. In the early part of his reign Esarhaddon was preoccupied with securing his throne and rebuilding Babylon, which his father had destroyed. The reconstruction of Babylon was a significant component of Esarhaddon’s policy to pacify the south of Mesopotamia. Any major

---

³ There have been several attempts to identify Naqiya’s place of birth or Esarhaddon’s place of exile. H. Lewy argued that Naqiya came from Lahiru in Babylonia (see “Nitokris-Naqêº’a,” JNES 11 [1952]: 273–74), but her thesis did not receive general acceptance. On the basis of ABL 1216 rev. 14, Schmidtke (AOTU 1/2, p. 107) identified Zaqqap as the village where Esarhaddon took refuge, but Labat (“Asarhaddon et la ville de Zaqqap,” RA 53 [1959]: 113–18) discredited this reading of the text. Nougayrol and Parrot suggested that Naqiya came from Harran. They based their argument on an art motif on Naqiya’s Louvre bronze implying that she came from the west but not specifically from Harran.

⁴ See, for example, H. Tadmor, CRRA 25, pp. 449 ff.

⁵ M. S. B. Damerji, Gräber assyrischer Königinnen aus Nimrud (Mainz, 1999), with bibliography, p. 11.

construction in a backwater such as Harran would, of necessity, have come toward the end of his rule when the vital concerns of his reign had been seen to.

When Esarhaddon left his place of exile to claim his throne, he tells us: “I followed the road to Nineveh with difficulty and haste and before my (arrival) in the land (of) Hanigalbat all of their crack troops blocked my advance.”\(^7\) Hanigalbat is on the road between Harran and Nineveh.

Another small tie to Harran lies in the Neo-Assyrian references to the moon-god, Sin. Three of the eight Sargonid kings use the theophoric element Sin in their throne names: Sennacherib, Sin-shumu-lisher, and Sin-shar-ishkun. This is unusual, as only four other Assyrian kings in the Assyrian king-list use this theophoric element, and all four lived in much earlier periods. The god Sin also figures prominently in Esarhaddon’s royal inscriptions. In lists of gods evoked by Esarhaddon, Sin is frequently listed immediately after Assur. Furthermore, one Esarhaddon prophecy states: “When your mother gave birth to you, sixty great gods stood with me and protected you. Sin was at your right side, Shamash at your left.”\(^8\)

Finally, it is probably not a coincidence that after the fall of Nineveh in 612 B.C., the last of the Sargonid kings made his final stand at Harran.

The historical hints listed above do not offer proof of anything, but taken all together they suggest that it is indeed possible that Harran was the home of the Sargonid kings and the place of refuge for Esarhaddon.

\(^7\) Thompson *Esarh.*, 12 i 69–70.

ŠAMAŠ OF SIPPAR AND THE FIRST DYNASTY OF BABYLON *

Jennie Myers, The University of Chicago

In the prologue to his famous collection of laws, Hammurapi describes himself as called by Anu and Enlil to “rise like Šamaš over the blackheaded ones, to illuminate the land,” ¹ and as “the sun of Babylon, who spreads light over the lands of Sumer and Akkad.”² In addition, like the god Šamaš, Hammurapi is šar mīšarim, “the king of justice,”³ begotten by the god Sîn.⁴ It is, of course, not surprising that Hammurapi would invoke Šamaš, the god of justice, on the stela that proclaims his just laws and whose relief depicts him receiving the emblems of kingship from the sun-god. The language Hammurapi uses, however, reveals that the image he wished to portray of himself was not simply that of the prototypical just king. Rather, Hammurapi casts himself in the role of human counterpart to the god Šamaš, who is, along with Marduk, the divine patron of his kingship.

The privileged position that Hammurapi accords to Šamaš on his stela represents the culmination of a special relationship that existed between the kings of the First Dynasty of Babylon and the patron deity of Sippar. Prior to this dynasty, kings had consistently legitimated their rule over Sumer and Akkad by claiming control over Nippur, the religious capital of southern Babylonia and the seat of Enlil, chief god of the Babylonian pantheon. While Hammurapi gives due nod to the supremacy of Enlil in his prologue by mentioning him first among the deities whose temples he has patronized and by claiming that he was selected by Enlil as shepherd, his inscriptions and year-names, as well as those of his predecessors and successors, in addition to evidence from legal and economic texts all suggest that these kings based their legitimacy primarily on Šamaš and his city Sippar rather than on Enlil and Nippur.

---

* This article was first presented at the 213th Meeting of the American Oriental Society, Nashville, Tennessee, in April 2003, as “The Importance of Sippar as a Religious and Cultural Center for the First Dynasty of Babylon.” Much of the material herein stems from my doctoral dissertation, “The Sippar Pantheon: A Diachronic Study” (Ph.D. diss., Harvard University, 2002).

¹ LH i 40–49: kīma Šamaš ana ṣalmāt qaqqadim waṣēmma mātim nuwwurim, in Roth Law Collections, pp. 76f.
² LH v 4–9: šāmšu Bābilim mušēzi nūrîm ana māt Sumerim u Akkadîm, in Roth Law Collections, p. 80.
³ LH xlvii 79; xlviii 96; xlix 13.
⁴ LH ii 14–15 (prologue); i 41–42 (epilogue).
It is indeed well known that one of the goals of the kings of this dynasty was to establish the city of Babylon as the capital of a unified Babylonia and to promote their city-god Marduk to an exalted position within the national pantheon. One of their main obstacles from the outset was the fact that the city of Babylon was quite insignificant politically, religiously, and culturally, its patron deity being but a minor player on the religious scene. In order to gain legitimacy for their cause, it was necessary for them to align themselves with a cult center whose importance was unquestioned. Their choice was the city of Sippar with its patron deity Šamaš.

While it could be argued that it was impossible for the kings of Babylon to align themselves with Nippur until Hammurapi had gained control of the south, there are strong arguments to suggest that their focus on Sippar was a deliberate choice that fit their political as well as religious agenda. It could also be argued that Sippar was a natural choice, since it was a northern Semitic city with a large Amorite population, situated on lucrative trade routes. These facts may indeed be true; however, there appear to have been other, more dominant, motivations leading to their choice of Sippar. I submit that the main motivating factor in the choice of the kings of Babylon to align themselves with Sippar was its reputation as the old religious “capital” of northern Babylonia—indeed, of the entire north, from Ebla in the west to the Diyala region in the east.

The great antiquity of Sippar is in no doubt; archaeological excavations reveal its existence as early as the Uruk period. According to the Sumerian King List, Sippar was the fourth antediluvian city to receive kingship, testifying to its reputation as āl šiātim—the ancient or eternal city—a designation for Sippar first attested in the reign of Hammurapi. Of the antediluvian cities, Sippar was the only one to retain its prominence throughout the history of Babylonia, serving as a religious and cultural center. We know that the sun-god UTU-Šamaš was the patron deity of Sippar by at least the mid-third millennium, as the earliest extant Semitic literary text—known from copies discovered at Abu Salabikh (R. D. Biggs, Inscriptions from Tell Abū Šalābikh, OIP 99 [Chicago, 1974], 326+342) and Ebla (ARET 5 6)9—concerns this god and his city Sippar.

---

5 I enclose the word capital in quotation marks, as this term carries ramifications that may not apply to Sippar.

6 I am grateful to P. Steinkeller for first pointing out to me the similarities between Sippar and Nippur and for encouraging me to investigate the importance of Sippar as an early religious center in the north.


8 D. Frayne, RIME 4, p. 335 (Ḫammu-rāpi 2): 56 ff. (Sum.), 58 f. (Akk.).

The widespread importance of Sippar as a northern religious center during the Early Dynastic period has not been duly recognized. The earliest known Semitic literary text (see above)—a hymn with mythological elements—attests to the worship of Šamaš of Sippar as far as Ebla in the northwest. Šamaš also appears as the recipient of offerings in the third-millennium royal archives of Ebla. And, in one scene from this literary text, Šamaš is described as meeting with, among other gods, Ištaran, the patron deity of Dēr—a city located in the far eastern reaches of Babylonia. In addition, according to Steinkeller, the majority of third-millennium seals with mythological scenes found in northern Mesopotamia—from Mari in the west to the Diyala region in the east—portray myths involving the god Šamaš. Finally, an Early Dynastic votive statue dedicated to Šamaš for the life of Ikūn-Šamagan, king of Mari, which was excavated at Sippar, demonstrates the active worship of Šamaš at Sippar by the Early Dynastic kings of Mari. All of this evidence points not only to the widespread popularity of the god Šamaš in northern Mesopotamia during this period, but also to the importance of Sippar as his cult center.

But the evidence does not end there. Significant similarities can be seen between Sippar and Nippur, the undisputed religious capital of southern Babylonia. Like Nippur, Sippar was never the seat of political power in historical periods. Further, Sippar was the only northern city whose main temple, the Ebabbar—like the Ekur at Nippur—served as a repository for royal inscriptions and monuments, legal documents, kudurrus, and literary texts. And, like Nippur, Sippar was an intellectual center, whose great scribal activity produced its own literary traditions. These similarities, in combination with the evidence from the Early Dynastic period, suggest that Sippar played a role in the north roughly parallel to that of Nippur in the south. Naturally, Sippar was not an exact duplicate of Nippur, for Šamaš was never proclaimed the chief deity of a “northern” pantheon. If, however, one accepts Steinkeller’s arguments for the existence of a sharp distinction between northern and southern Babylonia during the Early Dynastic period, in terms of political leadership and the organization of the pantheon, it is possible that the north had its own religious center—that is, Sippar—with its own distinctly northern character. Thus the sun-god, who was not particularly prominent in the south, appears to have played a supreme role in this northern tradition, and his city seems to have enjoyed the status of religious capital for the entire region of northern Babylonia.

---

12 See Gelb-Kienast Königsinschriften, p. 9.
Mesopotamia. The prominence of Šamaš in the inscriptions of the Sargonic kings and their enthusiastic patronage of his cult at Sippar also lend credence to this idea.

Later traditions may, in addition, contain a memory of Sippar as the religious capital of the north. In one of his inscriptions, Nebuchadnezzar I claims to be descended from Enmeduranki, the antediluvian ruler of Sippar, who, according to tradition, had learned the secrets of divination from the gods Šamaš and Adad and had taught them to the men of Sippar, Babylon, and Nippur. As Lambert points out, the grouping of these three together as cities with special status is found in additional texts from the first millennium. The literary piece Advice to a Prince concerns the protection of the special privileges of Sippar, Babylon, and Nippur and warns of divine retribution should the king revoke any of them. Neo-Babylonian kings, as well as Neo-Assyrian rulers who assumed the Babylonian throne, continued the tradition of grouping these three cities together in their inscriptions. Thus if Sippar can be accepted as having been the religious capital of the north, the motivation behind the grouping of Babylon, Sippar, and Nippur together as privileged cities by later Babylonian kings becomes clear: the three cities represent, respectively, the contemporary political capital, Babylon, and the two traditional religious capitals of Babylonia: Sippar in the north and Nippur in the south.

Returning to the Old Babylonian period, it is clear that the First Dynasty kings recognized the importance of a close relationship between Babylon and Sippar and used it to their advantage. It is likely that the ties between these two cities predate this period; indeed, Lambert has suggested that Babylon was probably “drawn into the cultural orbit” of the more important city of Sippar during the Early Dynastic period. Therefore it would not only be natural for the rulers of Babylon, whose own god, Marduk, was not important enough alone to grant them kingship over all of Babylonia, to turn to Šamaš of Sippar in this regard, but by aligning themselves with the religious capital of the north, they could draw upon its great importance and antiquity in order to legitimate their rule.

17 Nabopolassar (VAB 4, p. 58, Npl. 4:25) and Nebuchadnezzar II (VAB 4, p. 88, Nb. 9 i 3); cited in idem, “Enmeduranki,” p. 127; for Sargon II, see Winckler Sar. 164–165:2–3, 80 f.; 3, 174 f. i 9–12, cited in G. Frame and A. K. Grayson, “An Inscription of Ashurbanipal Mentioning the Kidinnu of Sippar,” SAA Bulletin 8 (1994): 7; for Esarhaddon, see Borger Esarh. 81:41, cited in Frame Babylonia, p. 75 and n. 53. It is interesting to note that Assyrian kings add Borsippa to the list of privileged cities; this is most likely due to the fact that Nabû was even more popular in Assyria than in Babylonia at this time. See F. Pomponio, Nabû: il culto e la figura di un dio del pantheon babilonese ed assiro, Studi semitici 51 (Rome, 1978), pp. 241–42. Notably, Sennacherib did not follow this tradition in his inscriptions; see Frame Babylonia, p. 35.
In addition to this motivating factor, there was every reason for these kings to focus their attention on Šamaš and Sippar rather than on Enlil and Nippur. Since, as noted earlier, one of their goals was to promote Marduk to an exalted position within the national pantheon—perhaps even at this early date to “king of the gods”—Enlil would naturally have been in competition with this agenda. Šamaš, on the other hand, posed no such threat.

Direct involvement by the kings of Babylon in the affairs of Sippar began early on in the Old Babylonian period. Sumu-abum is invoked along with Šamaš in the oath formula of a Sippar tablet, which also contains one of his year-names. In addition, several early Old Babylonian texts from Sippar invoke both the local ruler of Sippar and the contemporaneous king of Babylon, Sumu-la-el, in the oath formulas, possibly indicating co-rule of Sippar by the First Dynasty of Babylon at the beginning of this period. By at least the 29th year of Sumu-la-el, however, Sippar was under the full control of Babylon, as the name of this year commemorates his building of the wall of Sippar, and local rulers no longer appear in the oath formulas after this time. In a possibly political move, Sumu-la-el dedicated his daughter as a nadītu of Šamaš, a tradition that was followed by at least two later kings of this dynasty.

More direct influence by the crown on the cultic affairs of Sippar can be detected in the reign of Šabium, namely, in the creation of a second šangû of Šamaš, referred to by R. Harris as “junior” šangû, based on the order in which the two šangûs are listed as witnesses in the texts. While E. Woestenburg has shown that the position of “senior” šangû was held by the same Sipparian family from the period of local rule of Sippar

---

19 Of course, Marduk did not achieve this status until, most likely, during the reign of Nebuchadnezzar I, but it is possible that the Babylon I kings envisioned this development.
20 Given the etymology of Marduk as amar-utu-(a)k—whether this represents a folk etymology or the actual meaning—a connection between the god of Babylon and Šamaš is confirmed from early on in Babylonian history; see W. G. Lambert, “Studies in Marduk,” BSOAS 47 (1984): 7ff.
21 VAS 8 1 (tablet) / 2 (case): i.e., cited in Harris Sippar, p. 5 and n. 18.
22 Sumu-la-el and Immerum: CT 4 50a and BM 82437, cited in Harris Sippar, pp. 3, n. 9; 133, n. 76; and Dekiere OB Real Estate 12:19–20; Sumu-la-el and Buntaḥ-tun-ila: Waterman Bus. Doc. 31, cited in Harris Sippar, p. 4, n. 13. F. Al-Rawi and S. Dalley suggest, citing M. T. Larsen’s scenario for the Old Assyrian period, that “the presence of different ‘kings’ in oaths, year formulae and seals is due to economic cooperation and is not related to political and military circumstances”; al-Rawi and Dalley OB Sippar, p. 25, citing Larsen, The Old Assyrian City-State and Its Colonies, Mesopotamia 4 (Copenhagen, 1976), pp. 228–36, 242–43.
23 See A. Ungnad, “Datenlisten,” RLA 2, p. 176; see also Harris Sippar, p. 5.
24 For Ayalatum, daughter of Sumu-la-el, see R. Harris, “Nadītu Woman,” in Studies Oppenheim, p. 123. For Iltni, daughter of Sîn-muballit, and a second Iltni, daughter of either Samsuiluna or Abi-ēšuh, both attested at Sippar as nadinus of Šamaš (ibid. and idem, “Biographical Notes on the Nadītu Women of Sippar,” JCS 16 [1962]: 6–8).
25 For Šabium rather than Sabium, see M. Streck, Das amurritische Onomastikon der altbabylonischen Zeit, AOAT 271/1 (Münster, 2000), pp. 156f.
26 Harris Sippar, pp. 155ff.
down to the reign of Ammī-ṣaduqa, the “junior” šangûs appear to have been natives of Babylon, for several had names formed with the theophoric element Marduk or Nabû and referred to themselves in their seals as “servant of Marduk/Nabû.” Thus these individuals were most likely appointed to this position by the king and sent to Sippar to promote the interests of the crown in the affairs of the Ebabbar Temple. Šabium was also, as far as we know, the first king of Babylon to have rebuilt the Ebabbar.

Patronage as well as direct interference in the temple administration of Sippar continued and increased during the reigns of subsequent kings of the First Dynasty of Babylon, culminating, of course, in the reign of Hammurapi. Harris has shown that Hammurapi effected a change within the administration of the Ebabbar, transferring power over temple business from local temple administrators to city officials who represented the interests of the crown. The Ebabbar Temple appears to have grown extremely wealthy in the years leading up to the reign of Hammurapi, owing most probably to its involvement, through the gagûm, or “cloister,” in lucrative mercantile activity with the Assyrian colony Kanesh-Kültepe as well as with its own trade networks in Eānumma and Susa, as suggested by Al-Rawi and Dalley. Naturally, control of this wealthy institution would be beneficial to the king and his administration. Thus, a close connection with Sippar and its patron deity had the double advantage of lending cultural legitimacy to Babylon and of providing a regular income to the crown. While earlier kings of this dynasty appear to have recognized these advantages, it was Hammurapi who capitalized on them.

It is clear from his inscriptions and year-names that Hammurapi spent a great deal of energy on building-projects in Sippar and on patronizing the Ebabbar Temple there. But even more telling of his special relationship with Šamaš is the language he employs in the inscriptions commemorating his activities in Sippar in comparison to those concerning projects in other cities. In the latter, Hammurapi follows the traditional royal ideology in claiming to have been chosen by Anu and Enlil to rule Sumer and Akkad. In contrast, his inscriptions concerning Šamaš and Sippar mention only Šamaš and Marduk as his divine patrons. Significant, in this regard, is that Hammurapi’s inscription commemorating his restoration of the Ebabbar of Šamaš in Larsa follows

---

28 Šalim-pālîh-Marduk, “servant of Marduk” in his seal (TCL 1 69); and Etel-pî-Nabium, “servant of Nabium” in his seal (Dekiere OB Real Estate, pp. 132, 158); see again Woestenburg’s AfO review of Dekiere, pp. 356 ff.
32 Al-Rawi and Dalley OB Sippir, pp. 16 ff.
33 Frayne, RIME 4, p. 351 (Hammurāpi 14). There is also a stamped brick inscription commemorating this event: ibid., p. 350 (Hammurāpi 13); naturally, only the fact of the restoration is included.
the standard southern theology, naming An and Enlil first in his list of epithets; in addition, the language lacks the enthusiasm and intimacy with which Hammurapi speaks of Šamaš of Sippar. It appears that Hammurapi was well aware that once he had control of the south, it was incumbent upon him, as king of all of Sumer and Akkad, to adhere, at least in word if not in spirit, to the traditional theology, whereas he had felt no such restriction in the north.

It is also significant that Sippar was the only city, as far as we know, for which Hammurapi canceled corvée duty. In the inscription commemorating his reconstruction of the wall of Sippar, he claims, “In my gracious reign, which the god Šamaš called, I canceled corvée duty for the men of Sippar, the eternal city of the god Šamaš.” As noted above, the notion of Sippar as a special city recurs in the inscriptions of later Babylonian kings, where it is grouped with the two other cities of privileged status, whose citizens were also exempt from corvée duty, namely, Babylon, the political capital, and Nippur, the religious capital of the south.

Thus while Sippar aided the kings of the First Dynasty of Babylon in their struggle to make their city the capital of a unified nation and to promote their god Marduk within the Babylonian pantheon, the close relationship that subsequent Babylonian kings maintained with Sippar and its patron deity helped to ensure its continued importance throughout the history of Babylonia. Indeed, Sippar’s reputation as the eternal city may have survived even beyond this history, as it appears still to have been associated with the Flood by the local population when Rassam rediscovered the city at the end of the nineteenth century.

34 Ibid., esp. pp. 334 ff. (Ḫammu-rāpi 2).
35 Ibid., p. 335: 53 ff. (Sum.), 56 ff. (Akk.).
What is the hallmark of a golden age? For the Babylonians, it was a time when the gods gave reliable answers to the query of the diviner. Conversely, inauspicious times were those when the gods refused to answer the diviner’s query.

We know this from the description of the “blessed times,” or golden age, found in various details in a few omen apodoses, and of their opposite, the harsh and inauspicious times, attested, so far, more rarely in similar texts. It is fitting that a brief characterization of this golden age be offered in honor of Bob Biggs in whose work omen texts have played such a pivotal role.

The blessed times predicted in omen texts are bestowed by the gods as a mark of their favor toward the king; they are signaled by a significant celestial event. It is especially the heliacal rising of the two brightest planets, Venus and Jupiter, that is associated with these apodoses and that is a harbinger of the coming golden age.

In a few texts the apodoses that herald the golden age are preceded by those that predict times of hardship. Thus both K.10189 and Sm. 1234 (the latter included in the edition of Enûma Anu Enlil [EAE] Tablets 64–65) begin with two sections of opposite predictions. In the first six lines of Sm. 1234, three apparently unconnected, unfavorable omens predicted by the behavior of Jupiter are cited; then, after a ruling, comes the description of the golden age, predicted by the rising of Jupiter. The first section corresponds to Hunger, SAA 8 369:1–5¹ sent by Nabû-šumu-îškun; the author of the report comments only on the name of the constellation MUL.IN.DUB.AN.NA.

In the description of the golden age in K.10189, preceded by four lines that describe evil times (for which see below), the formulation is as follows:

```
8’ [¶ MUL Ni-bi-ru SAR-ma DINGIR.MEŠ SILIM].MA TUK.MEŠ me-šîr-tum GÂL [e-šá-a-ti i-nam-mi-ra]
9’ [dalḥâti izakkâ ŠÊG] u A.KAL TU.MEŠ-ni di-iš EBUR [ana EN.TE.NA di-iš EN.TE.NA]
10’ [ana EBUR uštabarri KUR] KI.TUŠ ne-eḥ-tû [TUŠ.MEŠ DINGIR.MEŠ SZIKUR mah-ru]
11’ [tas-li-ti še-mu]-¹[î]¹ uZU.HAR.MEŠ LÛ.H[AL i-ta-nap-pal]
```

¹ H. Hunger, Astrological Reports to Assyrian Kings, SAA 8 (Helsinki, 1992).
If Jupiter rises, the gods will show favor, there will be abundance, what is blurred will become bright, what is troubled will clear up, rain and flood will come (on time), the harvest-time grass will last until winter, the winter grass until harvest time, all lands will live in peaceful dwellings, the gods are accepting sacrifices, listening to prayers, they will always answer the diviner’s queries.

Restorations are from Sm. 1234 and its parallels.

Sm. 1234

7' [¶ MUL Né-bi]-ru SAR-ha-ma DINGIR.MEŠ SILIM.MA [TUK.MEŠ]
8' […-h]a? e-šá-a-tu i-na[m-mi-ra]
9' [dalhâtu i]-zak-ka-a ŠEG u A.KAL TU.[MEŠ]
10’ [diš EN.TE.NA ana] EBUR di-iš EBUR ana EN.TE.[NA uštabarra]
11’ [KUR].KIR TUŠ ne-eh-tú TUŠ.[MEŠ]
12’ [DINGIR.MEŠ SIZKUR mahru tas-[l]i-tú še-[mu-ú]

King Esarhaddon cites such a propitious rising of Jupiter when he describes, as favorable signs from the gods for the rebuilding of Babylon (Borger Esarh. p. 17 Ep. 13 A: 34–39), the omen given by the brilliant appearance of Jupiter in the month of Simûnu: it predicted that the gods that had been angry with Babylonia will become reconciled, that there will be copious rains and regular high water in Babylonia. He quotes, as we now know, the omen preserved on K.2341+, a tablet that is one of the sources of EAE 64, which lists, after omens about Jupiter as dSAG.ME.GAR, two omens designating Jupiter as the Marduk Star (MUL dAMAR.UD), the first of which depicts the golden age and the second the opposite.

K.2341+

12’ ¶ MUL dAMAR.UD ina ITI.SIG₄ ú-qar-[¹rib₁] ma a-šar dUTU ul-tap-pa-a dU-iz
13’ ba-il zî-μušû SÀ₄ SAR-šû GIM SA[R dUTU]-iš ga-mîr DINGIR.MEŠ zî-nu-tum KI KUR URI.KI SILIM.MEŠ
14’ ŠEG.MEŠ täh-du-tum u A.KAL.MEŠ si-[d-ru-¹] ina KUR URI.KI GÂL.ME ŠE u ŠE.GIŠ.Î ina KUR i-mad
15’ K İLLAM 1 SÌLA ana 1 GUR SUM-in DINGIR.MEŠ [ina AN-e ina] man-zal-ti-šû-nu DU.MEŠ BÁRA.MEŠ-šû-¹nu¹ tufh-du² IGI.MEŠ

This omen is also cited in Hunger, SAA 8 115:1–10 and 170:1–13.

---

The next omen, K.2341+ rev. 1–3, predicts evil times but in a less-detailed manner than the previously cited ones.

A similar golden age is predicted by the rising of Jupiter — under the name Nēbiru — in Hunger, SAA 8 323 and 254:

If Nēbiru rises: the gods will be reconciled, there will be abundance, confused things will become bright, blurred things will clear up, rain and high water will come, the summer grass will last until winter, the winter grass until summer, all the lands will dwell in peaceful settlements, the gods, accepting the sacrifices (and) listening to the prayers, will keep answering the diviner’s queries (Hunger, SAA 8 323:7–rev. 4).

The prediction in Report 254 rev. 2–10 differs only in replacing the participles “accepting (and) listening” (mahru, šemū) by the finite verb forms imahharu “they will accept” and išemmû “they will listen.” While it is not so specified in the protasis, the omen refers to the heliacal rising of Jupiter.

Not only Jupiter but also Venus can herald a golden age by her rising. If Venus rises in month VI and has a beard,

\[
ešātu\ uššešera\ (\text{written SI.SÁ})\ dalhātu\ izakkā\ arni\ māti\ ippaṭṭar\ libbi\ māti\ iṯāb\ ešēr\ ebūri\ napāš\ Nisaba
\]

What is confused will become straight, what is blurred will become clear, the sin of the land will be loosed, the land’s mood will be happy, the harvest will thrive, the grain will be plentiful (Labat Calendrier § 85:19–22).

This corresponds to the Venus omen \( ešātu\ SI.SÁ\ dalhātu\ izakkā\ arni\ māti\ ippaṭṭar\ mātu\ iṯāb\ libbi\ immar\ ešēr\ ebūri\ napāš\ Nisaba \) (K.137 rev. 19' ff., in BPO 3 151 rev. 6).

In contradistinction to these and similar propitious predictions, which are couched in general terms, and which, by the way, are also echoed in the so-called prophecy texts, a genre to which Bob Biggs has made valuable contributions over the years, there is a small group of texts that include more specific descriptions of the golden age. Two of the texts have been available in copy; a third one, an unpublished duplicate, is published here with the permission of the Trustees of the British Museum.
Of the three texts, source C, ND 5497/16, no. 22 in Wiseman and Black *Literary Texts*, pl. 19, contains the essential part of the description of the golden age in lines 13’–16’; the preceding lines 5’–12’ describe the locations of the planets Venus, Jupiter, Saturn, Mars, and Mercury, in that order. These lines 5’–16’ are preceded by two ruled sections, of which the first is almost completely destroyed, and the second mentions the series EAE and a šatu-commentary.

The second text, source B, *LBAT* 1556, duplicates ND 5497/16 over four lines, beginning with the location of Saturn; from lines 5’ to 9’ it duplicates the description of the golden age.

The third text, the so-far unpublished K.6444 (source A), begins, in line 2’, with a fragmentary subscript to the preceding section; lines 3’–11’ contain the descriptions of the planets and their locations and lines 12’–15’ the description of the golden age.

A 12’ [...D]I.KUD ina KUR id-da-an DINGIR.MEŠ KUR GALGA x
B 5’  […] KÛ kit-tu u mi-šá-ri ina KUR GAR-an ⁷AD u [DUMU kit-tú i-ta-mu-ú]
C 13’  DINGIR.MEŠ ana KUR ARHUŠ TUK.MEŠ
A 13’  [kit]-tum u mi-šá-ru ina KUR GAR.MEŠ-ma AD u [DUMU kit-tú i-ta-mu-ú]
B 6’  […] KÛ kit-tu u mi-šá-ri ina KUR GAR-an ⁷AD u [DUMU kit-tú i-ta-mu-ú]
C 14’  ina KUR GAR-an ⁷AD u DUMU [kit]-tú i-[ta-mu-ú]
A 14’  [taå-mu-ú u] SILIM.MU ina KUR GÁL-[ší] LÚ.ENGA R EGIR [GIÅ.APIN-šå DU-ak]
B 8’  taå-mu-ú u SILIM.MA ina KUR GÁL-[ší] LÚ.ENGA R EGIR GIÅ.APIN-šå DU-ak
C 15’  taå-mu-ú u SILIM.MU ina KUR GÁL-[ší] LÚ.ENGA R EGIR [GIÅ.APIN-šå DU-ak]
A 15’  [ ]-ma UZU.HAR.MEŠ LÚ.HAL.MEŠ i-[tap-pal]
B 9’  […] -m]a UZU.HAR.BAD.MEŠ LÚ.HAL ⁷-i-tap-pal
C 16’  […] x.MEŠ UZU.HAR.MEŠ LÚ.HAL ⁷ìî-[tap-pal]

[... judgment will be given in the land,⁵ the gods will have pity on the land, there will be justice and redress in the land, father and son will speak truthfully, there will be hearing (of prayers) and peace in the land, the farmer will walk behind his plow, [there will be …], they? will give an answer to the diviner’s query.

Note that lines 4’–13’ of A (K.6444) and lines 1’–9’ of its parallel B (*LBAT* 1556) are duplicated by the very fragmentary K.12216.

⁵ A lexical novum in this omen is the passive (N-stem) of the verb dânu “to judge.”
An exception among the descriptions of the blessed times is the specific reference to tilling the fields, which is made possible by peace reigning in the land; in contrast, abandoning agriculture is a sign of troubled times, as in omen 95 of VAT 10218, in BPO 3, p. 48: *errēšu arki epinnišu ul illak* “the farmer will not walk behind his plow.”

The times of hardship and loss of divine favor that in some of the exemplars cited precede the description of the golden age are signaled by the late sighting of Jupiter. Jupiter’s lateness is expressed with the verb *šadādu*; see CAD Š/1 s.v. *šadādu* v. mng. 6a. The latest edition of the text there cited, K.1551, is by Simo Parpola, SAA 10 362 (previous editions, cited in CAD Š/1, are ACh Supp. 2 Ištar 62 [copy], ZA 47 92 f., and Parpola LAS 289). The last of the Jupiter omens adduced in this letter runs:

*šumma Nēbiru išdudma ilû izennû mešer<tu> ibbašši namrâtî iššâ zakâtî iddallaha ilû šul[ê] ul <i>šemmû taslîtî ul ima[hharu] tērête bârî ul iî[anappalu]*

If Jupiter is late, the gods will become angry, there will be a *miširtu*-plague, what is bright will become confused, what is clear will become troubled, the gods will not heed prayers, will not accept supplications, will not answer the queries of the diviner.

At a time when both Venus and Jupiter shine brightly even among the city lights, it is indeed a propitious time to wish Bob Biggs many happy years of research in his busy retirement.

---

6 For *miširtu* signifying both a beneficial event and a calamity, see CAD s.v. At the time of Parpola’s commentary in LAS this omen was not known from any other source; it is likely that it occurs as the first partially preserved omen of K.3111+, edited in BPO 3, pp. 90 f.
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ON AMPUTATION, BEATING, AND ILLEGAL SEIZURE

Martha T. Roth, The University of Chicago

I

A Neo-Babylonian document published more than a century ago, ZA 3 (1898): 224 f., no. 2,1 records the receipt of silver to settle an extraordinary debt. Two compensations are referred to in the text: a) 140 shekels of silver paid in lieu of amputating the hand (ša ana kūm batāqu ša ritti, lines 2 and 7) of Marduk-rēmanni / Bēl-uballit / Iqīša // Šāhit-ginē, and b) 60 shekels of silver as compensation for the illegal seizure of property belonging to Itti-Nusku-înāja / Nusku-ajalu (kiṃ šībēti, line 5).2 The entire sum of 200 shekels of silver is paid by Marduk-rēmanni to Itti-Nusku-înāja. The unusual circumstances can now be elaborated by two more documents involving the same individuals and case.

ZA 3 (1898): 224 f., no. 2 (Text A in this article) has received remarkably little attention in the literature and that attention all only within the last few years.3 One of the principals, Marduk-rēmanni, is, however, well known. He is attested in documents for at least twenty-five years prior to this event.4 He was a member of a prominent family, known from both his involvements in private business affairs and with the economy of

---

1 J. N. Strassmaier, in E. A. Wallis Budge, “On Some Recently Acquired Babylonian Tablets,” ZA 3 (1898): 211–30, at pp. 216 f., copy pp. 224 f., no. 2. The tablet (Bu. 1888-5-12,27 = BM 78192) was collated by me in July 2003, with the permission of C. B. F. Walker and the Trustees of the British Museum. It dates to the reign of Darius I (8/XII/25 = 16 March 496 B.C.) and was written in Babylon.

2 The term šībēti (ZA 3 [1898]: 224, no. 2) has been understood by those commenting on the text (see following note) and by CAD S s.v. šībētu as “imprisonment,” “restraints.” Following an insight communicated to me by M. W. Stolper, however, I hold that it means “stolen goods,” possibly a plural of šību; see CAD S s.v. šību B mng. 5, and note the Old Babylonian pl. šībatū, and cf. qāt šībitti “stolen property (found in the thief’s possession)” in CAD S s.v. šībittu mng. 4.


the Ebabbar temple in Sippar. His temple-related activities included responsibility for herds of sheep and cattle and the obligations of the butcher’s prebend, and he bore the title tupšar Ebabbar.\footnote{Ibid., pp. 725–28, passim.} Itti-Nusku-ʾînāja / Nusku-ajalu, however, is otherwise unknown to me outside of the texts discussed here.

II

Text A does not indicate why Marduk-remanni’s hand was in danger of being amputated, nor why the sum of 140 shekels of silver was an acceptable amount for him to pay to avoid that amputation. It does not indicate what property of Itti-Nusku-ʾînāja’s was illegally seized, nor why the sum of 60 shekels of silver was an appropriate compensation for that seizure. As it happens, however, Text A is one of three extant documents dealing with the same, or an overlapping, set of circumstances.

The second text, Text B (AH 1882-9-18, 252a = BM 74529),\footnote{Collated by me in July 2003; published by Waerzeggers, “Het archief van Marduk-remanni,” vol. 2, pp. 166–68, no. 125.} has long been known to the editors of the \textit{CAD}.\footnote{Cited as 1882-9-18, 252a from notes made by A. Leo Oppenheim in the 1960s as well as from a Bertin copy (pls. 2561 f.) in \textit{CAD} M/2 s.v. miḫṣu mng. 2 and in \textit{CAD} R s.v. rittu A mng. 1a-3’.} The text (15/XII/25 Darius I = 23 March 496 B.C.) is dated only seven days later than Text A and makes reference to three sets of compensation and punishment. There is again mention of a payment to avoid amputating Marduk-remanni’s hand (ša kūm la batāqū rittu, lines 1, 2 f., 7 f., 20),\footnote{Note the presence or absence of the negation la in these clauses: Text A omits it (silver ša ana kūm batāqū ša rittum, etc.), while Text B adds it (silver ša kūm la batāqū rittum, etc.). Similar variation occurs with guarantee clauses such as pūt (la) našā, etc., passim; for a discussion, see M. W. Stolper, “Fifth Century Nippur: Texts of the Murašûs and from Their Surroundings,” \textit{JCS} 53 (2001): 83–132, esp. pp. 121 f. with n. 45.} although this time the sum specified is seven-fold greater than the amount in Text A: 980 shekels of silver. The new punishment mentioned is a flogging or beating of 21 strokes (21 miḫṣū, later simply ūrûtu “a beating”), to avoid which (ša kūm, line 2) Marduk-remanni must pay 63 shekels of silver. The total for these compensations is 1,043 shekels. As of the writing of Text B, Itti-Nusku-ʾînāja has received 149 shekels, as well as another compensation of 60 shekels to compensate for (kūm, line 6) goods stolen from his brother, Baʾ-ʾIlteri-ahattu. Thus according to Text B, Itti-Nusku-ʾînāja has received for himself and his brother a total of 209 shekels of silver from Marduk-remanni “for not amputating the hand, (for) the beating, and (for) the stolen property” (kūm la batāqū ritṭu ūrûtu u šıštēti).\footnote{It is clear now that the preposition kūm is used differently with various payments: the amounts of silver paid to Itti-Nusku-ʾînāja by Marduk-remanni are (1) ša (ana) kūm threatened bodily harms (the amputation of Marduk-remanni’s hand, a beating inflicted on Marduk-remanni, thus (ša) kūm signifies “in place of”); and (2) kūm losses suffered (the improper seizure of animals belonging to Itti-Nusku-ʾînāja and his brother; thus kūm signifies “in consideration for”). Note two or all three compensations or punishments in one summary clause, as in Text A: 7 f., ša ana kūm batāqū ša rittum … u šıštēti; Text B: 2 f., ša kūm la batāqū ritṭu u 21 miḫṣū; 7 f. and 20 f., ša kūm la batāqū ritṭu ūrûtu u šıštēti.}
A third text, now published in Waerzeggers’s study, provides more information. The date of Text C (Bu. 1882-9-18, 4183 = BM 64208)\(^{10}\) is only partially preserved, but it was written in Babylon in the 25th year of Darius I. From the contents, it is certain that it was composed within days of Texts A and B and probably in the intervening days. Text C allows a deferral of that payment imposed upon Marduk-rēmanni of the 140 shekels in lieu of the amputation (\([kūm (lā)]\ batāqa ša ritti\) — the payment we saw imposed in Text A and identified as paid in Text B — until the end of the first month of the following year, that is, for a matter of only a few weeks; if my sequencing of the texts is correct, Marduk-rēmanni did not take all the time allowed him. Furthermore, Text C indicates that Marduk-rēmanni has already made yet another payment, of an unspecified amount, to compensate Itti-Nusku-īnāja for stolen goods (šibṭēti). The crucial new information in Text C concerns this last compensation (lines 8 ff.): \(kaspū šēnu ša šibṭē[t]i ša Itti-Nusku-īnāja Itti-Nusku-īnāja [ina qātē] Marduk-rēmanni 
\(ē[t]ir\) “Itti-Nusku-īnāja has been paid by Marduk-rēmanni the silver, the equivalent of the herds that are Itti-Nusku-īnāja’s stolen property.”

Now, finally, with the mention of the herds in Text C, there is a clue to the nature of the events and circumstances. First, comparison of the amounts indicated for avoiding the amputation in Text A (140 shekels) and Text B (980 shekels), and the specification of 21 strokes in Text B, suggest that the penalties and payments in Text B were totaled with seven persons in mind. That is, the brothers Nusku-īnāja and Ba’-Ilteri-ahattu and five other persons (perhaps all kinsmen) held claims against Marduk-rēmanni. Second, the mention of silver paid as the equivalent of stolen animals suggests that at least part of Marduk-rēmanni’s offense involved his misappropriation of animals properly belonging to Nusku-īnāja and Ba’-Ilteri-ahattu (and probably to the other five persons as well). The seven persons were therefore entitled to inflict specific and limited physical mutilations upon his person: each was entitled to cut off his hand, each was entitled to deliver three blows, and two (and possibly all seven) were entitled to payment for the seized animals. Obviously, Marduk-rēmanni had only two hands to lose, making any literal execution of the mutilations problematic. But in any event the physical punishments were commuted to monetary ones: each person was awarded (or accepted) 140 shekels instead of exercising the right to amputate a hand and 9 shekels instead of inflicting three stripes; the compensation for the seized animals was set at 60 shekels.

We are not given any indication of what Marduk-rēmanni did to warrant these extraordinary physical punishments. For the misappropriated animals he paid an amount of silver; 60 shekels (1 mina) is a considerable amount indeed.\(^{11}\) But that misappropri-

---


\(^{11}\) Compare the penalties imposed upon Gimillu / Innin-šum-ibni, who collected animals from the chief herder and the shepherds of the Lady-of-Uruk but then failed to turn the animals over to the Eanna temple (YOS 7 7 [−/−/1 Cyrus (538 B.C.), Uruk]); for animals, the authorities ordered a thirty-fold compensation in kind; for a siriam garment, 10 shekels. See further Wells, “Neo-Babylonian Period,” pp. 962 ff. at 8.4–8.9 for various offenses and remedies, almost always simple or multiple compensation or fines.
appropriation could not have been his only offense against these seven persons; there had to be something more that led to the threat of amputation and beating.

The amputation and beating here were almost certainly punishments imposed by a court authority; note the reference in Text C to judges (albeit in a fragmentary clause). I know of no other instances in the Neo-Babylonian period in which there was a physical punishment (short of death\(^\text{12}\)) imposed by a court. In a few contractual agreements, however, we do find the threat of physical punishment.\(^\text{13}\) Cyr. 307 (3/IV/8 Cyrus [531 B.C.], Sippar) and Cyr. 312 (11/V/8 Cyrus [531 B.C.], Babylon) both include threats of slave-marking for the young women who continue prohibited relationships with their paramours,\(^\text{14}\) and three contracts from the Murašû archives call for beatings, imprisonments, and/or fines for failure to perform contracted services.\(^\text{15}\) The first, Stolper, *Entrepreneurs*, no. 91 (28/--/5 Darius II [419/418 B.C.], Til-Gabbara), concerns arable land for which two men are responsible for completing the ground-breaking work by the first day of the first month of the following year. The relevant passage (lines 5–10) is:\(^\text{16}\)

> If they have not completed the ground-breaking work by the first of Nisannu, they will be beaten 100 blows, (their) beards and heads will be plucked, and they will be imprisoned in the prison of RiBat / Bēl-erība, the servant of Rimūt-Ninurta.

Stolper, *Entrepreneurs*, no. 90 (12/VIII/39 Artaxerxes I [426 B.C.], Nippur) and Donbaz and Stolper, *Istanbul Murašû Texts*, no. 98 (–/VI(?)/39 Artaxerxes I [426 B.C.], Nippur) are both contracts in which Enlil-šum-iddin arranged for a contractor to deliver 500 pairs of split wood; for failure to meet this commitment, 1 ME immahhiṣ u 10 MA.NA KU‹.BABBAR inamdin "he (the contractor) will be beaten 100 (strokes), and he will pay ten minas of silver."

In these few contracts cited, the physical punishments are merely threatened; we do not know if there was ever an attempt to enforce them. But the amputations and beatings faced by Marduk-rēmanni were most likely real, imposed penalties, which were

---

\(^{12}\) See E. Weidner, “Hochverrat gegen Nebukadnezar II., ein Großwürdenträger vor dem Königsgericht,” *AfO* 17 (1954–56): 1–5; see F. Joannès, in *Rendre la justice en Mésopotamie* (Saint-Denis, 2000), pp. 203 f., no. 147 (slitting the throat for treason); note also LNB § 7 (death for witchcraft).

\(^{13}\) And note the threat of death in the contractual clauses in marriage agreements, for which see M. T. Roth, “‘She Will Die by the Iron Dagger’: Adultery and Neo-Babylonian Marriage,” *JESHO* 31 (1988): 186–206, and Roth *Marriage Agreements*, p. 15 (death by iron dagger for female adulterer).


commuted, perhaps by negotiation, to monetary payments. Nonetheless, the threatened punishments in contracts and the imposed punishments by courts would have all had deterrent and punitive effects. And these should not be confused with physical abuse construed as a wrong to be remedied.\(^\text{17}\)

The two punishments in the texts under discussion—amputating the hand and beating—are not unique punishments. Amputation of the hand (like that of the tongue) is often a sympathetic punishment: the offending member is targeted.\(^\text{18}\) Thus, for example, the offending hand is cut off for the child who strikes a parent (LH § 195),\(^\text{19}\) the unsuccessful surgeon (LH § 218), the barber who removes the abbuttu slave-mark (LH § 226), the farmhand who pilfers grain or seed (LH § 253), and the thief (Wiseman Alalakh 2). Commonly, too, amputation of the hand and tongue figures in the standard penalty clause in Susa for one who violates a contract (passim in MDP 22, 23, 24, and 28).\(^\text{20}\)

---


\(^{18}\) See \textit{CAD} R s.v. rittu A mng. 1a-3’ for other, nonsympathetic, punishments involving cutting off the hand. Citations below from the law collections are from Roth \textit{Law Collections}.

\(^{19}\) See M. T. Roth, “Elder Abuse,” in A. Guinan et al., eds., \textit{If a Man Builds a Joyful House: Essays in Honor of Erle Verdun Leichty} (Leiden and Boston, 2006), pp. 349–56.

\(^{20}\) For a discussion of the sympathetic element in punishments, see S. Franke, ‘‘Magische Praktiken’ im Codex Hammurapi,” \textit{Zeitschrift für altorientalische und biblische Rechtsgeschichte} 6 (2000): 1–15. For cutting off of other body parts (ear, nose, tongue, lip, breast, foot), see \textit{CAD} B s.v. batāgu mngs. 1a, 8a, 9; \textit{CAD} N/1 s.v. nakāsu mngs. 2b-1’ and 6b; and the entries under uznu, appu, lišānu, etc. Such “punishments” can serve ulterior motives as well, as in ARM 14 78, ‘‘imšaunu līlputuma [na nepārim] lišēnu uluma lišānašunu [linnaka] awassunu la uṣṣi ‘they should blind them and have them grind in the workhouse, or
“Beating” (miḫṣu, ū[rûtu in our texts] is a vague term that could include many forms of physical torture. The law collections include the penalties of flogging (naṭū, LH § 127, MAL A §§44, 59) and beating with an instrument (x ina ḫaṭṭāte imahhuṣšī šu “they shall beat her/him x blows with rods,” MAL A §§7, 18, 19, 21, 40; B §§7–10, 14, 15, 18; C §§2, 3, 8, 11; E §1; F §1; N §1; MAPD §§17, 18, 21).

III

In conclusion, returning to the three texts involving Marduk-rēmanni, we have a better understanding of the case but remain ignorant about at least one essential point: the precise or complete scope of Marduk-rēmanni’s offense. But the limiting of the harms here is noteworthy. In these texts, there is a calculated correlation between compensation and harm: 140 shekels to avoid the amputation of one hand, 3 shekels for each stripe or blow, 60 shekels for misappropriated animals. These amounts are those agreed to by the parties, and there is no reason to expect that the same amounts of silver per amputation, stripe, or particular number of animals might apply to other cases. The commutation of the physical harms into monetary sums solves the logical absurdity of carrying out multiple claims — Marduk-rēmanni having seven hands amputated or seven persons participating in a single amputation — but more importantly offers the wronged parties tangible redress rather than solely emotional satisfaction. While we might have suspected that corporal punishments were commutable by mutual agreement or by court order before, the commutation of corporal punishments into monetary payments has never been so clearly demonstrated.

APPENDIX

Text A: BM 78192 (ZA 3 [1898]: 224 f., no. 2) and duplicate BM 64196+

1 2 MA.NA KU3, BABBAR UD-ú šá ina 1 GIN2 bit-qa nu-uh-hu-tu
2 šá a-na ku-um ba-ta-qa (dupl. -qu) šá rii-tum šá ša AMAR+UD-re-e-man-ni
3 DUMU šá ša EN-TIN-iṭ A LU2,12,ŠUR-gi-ni-e a-na ma-la
4 HA.LA šá 1KI-dNUSKU-IGI-ia DUMU šá 1dNUSKU-a-a-lu
5 ū 1 MA.NA KU3, BABBAR UD-ú ku-um šib-te-e-ti šá 1KI-dNUSKU-IGI-ia
6 PAP 3½ MA.NA KU3, BABBAR UD-ú šá ina 1 GIN2 bit-qa nu-uh-hu-tu
7 šá a-na ku-um ba-ta-qa šá rii-tum šá ša AMAR+UD-re-e-man-ni
8 ū šib-te-e-ti šá 1KI-dNUSKU-IGI-ia 1KI-dNUSKU-IGI-ia

else their tongues should be cut out so that their secret does not get out”; see K. van der Toorn, “ARM XIV 78 (= TCM I 78),” RA 79 (1985): 189–90. According to C. Zaccagnini, “Nuzi,” in Westbrook, History of Ancient Near Eastern Law, p. 611: “Death and corporal punishment are attested [in Nuzi], but not as punishments for criminal offences. Mutilation is sometimes mentioned as a special sanction for breach of contract or other misconduct, but always related to the sphere of civil law.”
Translation

(1–4) 2½ minas of white silver, with one-eighth alloy per shekel, of nuhhutu-quality, which is in lieu of the cutting off of the hand of Marduk-rēmanni, son of Bēl-uballit, descendant of Šāhit-ginē, for the portion (of the total agreed compensation) owed to Itti-Nusku-ÎnΩja, son of Nusku-ajalu, (5) and also 1 mina of white silver as compensation for Itti-Nusku-ÎnΩja’s stolen property — (6) a total of 3½ minas of white silver, with one-eighth alloy per shekel, of nuhhutu-quality, (7–8) which is in lieu of cutting off of the hand of Marduk-rēmanni and (as compensation for) Itti-Nusku-ÎnΩja’s stolen property — (8–11)
Itti-Nusku-īnāja, son of Nusku-ajalu, has received from Marduk-rēmanni, son of Bēl-uballit, descendant of Šāhit-ginē; he is paid.

(11–14) Itti-Nusku-īnāja has made final settlement with Marduk-rēmanni in regard to the cutting off of Marduk-rēmanni’s hand and Itti-Nusku-īnāja’s stolen property. (15–18) There is no cause for suit on the part of Itti-Nusku-īnāja against Marduk-rēmanni in regard to the cutting off of Marduk-rēmanni’s hand or Itti-Nusku-īnāja’s stolen property. (18–19) Their suit is settled by mutual agreement. They shall not return (with suits) against each other.

(20 –31) Witnesses: Bulṭaṭa, son of Ṛīmut-Bēl, descendant of Nūr-Marduk; Marduk-erība, son of Linūh-libbi-ili; Adad-šēzib, son of Rībāṭu; Nidintu, son of Eṭillu, descendant of Šangū-Šamaṣ; Iqūpu, son of Bēl-īddīn, descendant of Ėa-ilūta-bani; Bēl-rēmanni, son of Bēl-īddīn, descendant of Rab-bani; Bēl-uballit, son of Šamaš-īddīn, descendant of Šāhit-ginē; Bēl-ittannu, son of Marduk-šār-uṣur; Bēl-iksūr, son of Nabū-balāṣsu-iqbi; Bēl-ittannu, son of Nidintu; Nidintu, son of Šīn-ili, descendant of Bēl-ēṭīr; Gimillu, son of Rīmūt-Bēl, descendant of Šangū-Šamaṣ; Nabū-ahē-bullit, son of Bēl-īddīn, descendant of Pahhārū; Šamaš-īddīn, son of Kiriibtu, descendant of Bā‘iru; Iddīn-Nabū, son of Liblūt, descendant of Šiḡūa; Ubaru, son of Šillā, descendant of Eppē-ili; Bēl-īddīn, son of Šīn-ili, descendant of Aškannu; Bēl-uṣallīm, son of Niqūdu, descendant of Lē‘ea; Nabū-uṣallīm, son of Nabū-mukīn-apli, descendant of Ilija; (32– 33) Minū-ana-Bēl-dūnu, the scribe, son of Mušēzib-Marduk, descendant of Imbu-īnīja.

(33– 34) Babylon, month XII, day 8, year 25 of Darius, King of Babylon, King of the Lands.

Text B: BM 74529

1 16£ (text: 16∞) MA.NA KU₃.BABBAR šá ku-um la ba-ta-qu rit-tum ū 1 MA.NA 3 (text: 2) GIN₂.KU₃.BABBAR
2 šá ku-um 21 mi-ih-šu PAP 17½ MA.NA 3 (text: 2) GIN₂ šá ku-um la ba-ta-qu
3 rit-tum ū 21 mi-ih-šu šá ina UGU¹₆ thBABBAR ku-um šib-te-e-ti šá
4 DUMU LU₂₂.I₃,ŠUR-gi-ni-e šak-nu ina ŠA⁻₂ bi 2½ MA.NA 9 GIN₂ KU₃.BABBAR a-na ma-la
5 zi-it-ti šá 1ba₂⁺ il-te-ri-a-ha-at-ta DUMU-shá šá 10NUSKU-a-a-lu
6 ŠEŠ šá 10NUSKU-IGI₁⁻ia ū 1 MA.NA KU₃.BABBAR ku-um šib-te-e-ti šá
7 1ba₂⁺ il-te-ri-a-hat-tum PAP 2½ MA.NA ū 9 GIN₂ KU₃.BABBAR šá ku-um
8 la ba-ta-qu ri-it-tum ti-ru-ú-tu u šib-te-e-ti a-na
9 ma-la HALA šá 1ba₂⁺ il-te-ri-a-ha-at-tum DUMU-shá šá 10NUSKU-a-a-lu
10 10NUSKU-IGI₁⁻ia (text, in error: 10NUSKU-a-a-lu) ŠEŠ šá 1ba₂⁺ il-te-ri-a-ha-at-tum ina ŠT¹¹ thAMAR+UD-ri-man-an-ni
11 DUMU-shá šá 10EN-TIN-įš DUMU LU₂₂.I₃,ŠUR-gi-ni-e ma-hi-ir e-ṭīr KU₃.BABBAR a’
12 3½ MA.NA ū 9 GIN₂ 10NUSKU-IGI-ma it-ti 1ba₂⁺ il-te-ri-a-ha-at-tum
13 ŠEŠ-ši ū-ša-az-ti-i₃-e a-na 10AMAR+UD-ri-man-an-ni i-nam-din pu-uṭ
14 la (text: KU) da-ba-bu di-i₃-ni šá 1ba₂⁺ il-te-ri-a-ha-at-tum ŠEŠ-ši ana UGU ba-ta-qu
15 ri-it-tum ti-ru-tum ū ši-i₃-te-e-tum 10NUSKU-IGI₁⁻ia ŠEŠ
16 šá 1ba₂⁺ il-te-ri-a-ha-at-ta na-ši a-ha-ra-ti 10NUSKU-IGI₁⁻ia
ana lUGU ba-ta-qu ri-it-tum ti-ru-ú-tu ù šib-te-e-ti

l-a-na ma-la zi-it-ti šā l-ba-š-il-te-ri-a-ha-at-ta lšÈš-sā

l-it-ti lAMAR+UD-ri-man-an-ni i-te-pu-uš e-lat lšāl-ta-ru mah-ru-ú


[ù šib-te]-e-tum šā a-na lml-la H Ala šā lEn[NUSKU-IGI]-a ina ŠU

lEn[lAMAR+UD]-ri-man-an-li in-ni-it-ru ú 9 (text: 8) GIN₂ KU₃.BABBAR šā ina šā-ta-ru

l[3]NUSKU-IGI-ia ba-ab-tu 3½ MA.NA 9 GIN₂

KU₃.BABBAR l[a] [ina ŠU] lEn[lAMAR+UD-ri-man-ni DUMU-šā šā lEn-TIN-it DUMU šā L₂₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁¹

L₂₁十一kin₁ lli-i-b-lu-ti (copy: -ba-ši?) DUMU-šū šā lURU-ba-lAMAR+UD DUMU lARAD=BE lSUM.NA-a


lsi-lim-mu DUMU-šū šā lba-ni-ia DUMU lši-gu-ú-a lEn-TIN-it DUMU-šū šā lEn-i-ri-ba

DUMU lgi₂=-bi lše-ri-ia DUMU-šū šā lM[U-X]=MU-KI DUMU lEn[ILLAT]-I

lEn-[URU-ba DUMU-šū lmbi=30 lbul-[ta]-a DUMU-šū šā lri-e-mut=lEn

DUMU lZALAG₂=šū lAG-MU-DU DUMU-šū šā lEn[x]=SUM-na DUMU šā lša-na-biši-šū

lEn-KAR-ir DUMU-šū šā lšil-la-a DUMU lmu=[...] lšā=lEn-ata-ta DUMU šā lEn-kasiri

DUMU L₂₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁¹

DUMU-šū šā lEn-TIN-śi [ ] x DUMU-šū šā lEn-AG-DU-MU DUMU lša-na-biši-šū

lša=lEn-at-ta DUMU šā lSUM]-na-lAG DUMU E₂₂ BAR-dUTU lEn-SUM-na DUMU-šū šā lšil-la-a

DUMU ba-bu-tu lgu-za-nu DUMU-šū šā lAG-MU-MU DUMU L₂₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁¹

DUMU-šū šā lni-din-tū lEn-A-MU DUMU-šū šā lšad-din-nu DUMU lZALAG₂=30 lEn-it-tan-nu

DUMU-šū šā lEn-TIN-śi [ ] lni-din-[ ] DUMU-šū šā lARAD-gu-la DUMU lZALAG₂=30 lni-din-tū

DUMU-šū šā lkal-ba-a lha-ba-ru-šu (for habasāri?) DUMU-šū šā lna-lAG-APIN-eš lú-bar DUMU-šū šā

lAG-ŠES.MEŠ-GI DUMU L₂₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁¹

lAG+GUR-MU DUMU šā lri-mut DUMU L₂₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁₁¹

UD 15.KAM₂ MU 25.KAM₂ lda-ri=šuš LUGAL EKI u KUR.KUR.MEŠ
Translation

(1–2) (Concerning) 16½ minas of silver, which is in lieu of not cutting off the hand, and 1 mina and 3 shekels of silver, which is in lieu of the 21 blows, (2–4) a total of 17 minas and 23 shekels, which is in lieu of both not cutting off the hand and the 21 blows that are imposed upon Marduk-rëmanni, son of Bēl-uballit, descendant of Šāhit-ginē:

(10–11) Nusku-ïnāja, brother of Ba’-Iltēri-ahattu, received from and is paid by Marduk-rēmanni, son of Bēl-uballit, descendant of Šāhit-ginē: (4–7) 2 minas and 29 shekels of silver for the portion (of the total agreed compensation) owed to Ba’-Iltēri-ahattu, son of Nusku-ajalu, brother of Nusku-ïnāja, and 1 mina of silver in compensation for Ba’-Iltēri-ahattu’s stolen property — (7–9) a total of 3 minas and 29 shekels of silver, in lieu of not cutting off the hand, the beating, and the stolen property, for the portion (of the total agreed compensation) owed to Ba’-Iltēri-ahattu, son of Nusku-ajalu.

(11–13) That silver, 3 minas and 29 shekels, Nusku-ïnāja entered into the ledger of his brother Ba’-Iltēri-ahattu to the credit of Marduk-rēmanni.22 (13–16) Nusku-ïnāja, the brother of Ba’-Iltēri-ahattu, bears responsibility that there be no complaint or suit on behalf of his brother Ba’-Iltēri-ahattu in regard to the cutting off of the hand, the beating, or the stolen property. (16–19) Nusku-ïnāja has made final settlement with Marduk-rēmanni for the portion (of the total agreed compensation) owed to Ba’-Iltēri-ahattu in regard to the cutting off the hand, the beating, and the stolen property.

(19–22) (This transaction is) apart from (that recorded in) a prior document for [3½] minas of silver, which was in lieu of not cutting off the hand, the beatings, and the stolen property, which has been paid by Marduk-rēmanni for the portion (of the total agreed compensation) owed to Nusku-ïnāja. (22–23) And the 9 shekels of silver that were in a prior document were (also) paid. (23–25) Nusku-ïnāja has received from Marduk-rēmanni, son of Bēl-uballit, descendant of Šāhit-ginē, the amount due, the aforementioned 3 minas and 29 shekels of silver; he is paid.

(25–40) Witnesses: Libluţ, son of Erība-Marduk, descendant of Arad-Ea; Iddīnaia, son of Kāšir, descendant of Nappāhu; Nīntu, son of Šīn-ilīšu, descendant of Bēl-ētīr; Šilimmu, son of Banija, descendant of Šīgūa; Bēl-uballit, son of Bēl-erība, descendant of Ėqībī; Zērija, son of ..., descendant of Balīhu/Illatu; Bēl-erība, son of Imbi-Šīn; Bulṭaja, son of Rīmūt-Bēl, descendant of Nūr-Marduk; Nabū-šum-ukīn, son of ..., iiddīna, descendant of Ša-nāšišu (text: -nabišišu); Bēl-ētīr, son of Šīlaja, descendant of MU-[-...]; Ša-Bēl-atta, son of Bēl-kāšir, descendant of Pahhāru; Bēl-iddīn, son of ..., descendant of Dābibī; Mušēzīb-Marduk, son of Bēl-uballit; ..., son of Nabū-mukīn-šumī, descendant of Ša-nāšišu (text:

22 For a review of the discussions of the Neo-Babylonian expression šuzzuzu-ma nadānu, see M. Weszeli, “Eseleien, II,” WZKM 87 (1997): 233–36, and see Stolper, “Fifth Century Nippur,” p. 120, who reiterates his contention that the clause “is to assure that the transaction is final from the point of view of the principals”—certainly the correct interpretation here, given the subsequent clauses in lines 13–19 stressing that Nusku-ïnāja is responsible for any question about the payments. (Note ušazzizma instead of the expected present form ušazzazma.)
-nabišīšu); Ša-Bēl-atta, son of Iddin-Nabû, descendant of Šangû-Šamaš; Bēl-iddina, son of Šillaja, descendant of Babûtu; Guzānu, son of Nabû-šum-iddin, descendant of Pahhāru; Bēl-ittannu, son of Nidintu; Bēl-apla-iddin, son of Šaddinну, descendant of Nur-Sîn; Bēl-ittannu, son of Bēl-uballitl; Nidintu, son of Arad-Gula, descendant of Nur-Sîn; Nidintu, son of Kalbaja; Habasîru, son of Ana-Nabû-ĉreš; Ubâr, son of Nabû-ahhē-šullim, descendant of Pahhāru; Hâşdaja, son of Nergal-uballitl; Nergal-iddin, son of Rîmû, descendant of Rē’i-sîsē. (40–41) Scribe: Bēl-ahhē-iddin, son of Nabû-x-usûr, descendant of Šangû-Šamaš.

(41–42) Babylon, month XII, day 15, year 25 of Darius, King of Babylon and the Lands.

Text C: BM 64208

1 [2£] MANA KU‹.BABBAR UDUŠÁ ŠÁ INA 1 GIN₂ bit-q[a nu-uh-hu-tu]
2 [šá 1] KI-₄DUスキ-IGI-ia DUMU ŠÁ IDNUスキ-a-a-[lu]
3 [ina] UGU-hi IDAMAR+UD-ri-e-man-ni DUMU ŠÁ ID EN₁-[TIN-î]
4 A LU₂₁, IL, SUR-gi-ni-e ina ITIBARA₂₁ ina SAG.[DU-šá]
5 i-na-ad-di-in KU₂₁ BABBAR 2½ MA.NA ŠÁ [ku-um (la)]
6 ba-ta-qa šá rit-tum šá IDAMAR+UD-ri-e-man-ni
7 a-na ma-la HALA šá KI-₄DUスキ-[IGI-ia]
8 KU₂₁ BABBAR ŠAM₂ še-e-nu ŠÁ sib-te-e-[ti šá]
9 [KI-₄DUスキ-IGI-ia] KI-₄DUスキ-IGI-[ia]
10 [ina ŠU₁] IDAMAR+UD-ri-e-man-ni e-[ti-îr]
11 [x x x x LU₂₁].DLKUD MEŠ a-na x [...]
12 [KI-₄DUスキ-IGI-ia] IDAMAR+UD-ri-e-man-ni
13 [i-na-āš-šā]-am-ma a-na [KI-₄DUスキ-IGI-ia]
14 [DUMU ŠÁ IDNUスキ-a-a-lu i]-na₁-ad-din
15 [LU₂₁ mu-kin]-nu IDAMAR+UD-MU-[x DUMU ŠÁ 1…]
16 1ni-din-tum DUMU ŠÁ NUMUN-TU [...]
17 ID EN-DIB-<UD.DA> DUMU ŠÁ [... 1…]
18 DUMU ŠÁ 1la-ba-ši [...]
19 1šu-lum-[TIN].TIR[KI DUMU ŠÁ 1…]
20 ID-ri-e-man-ni [DUMU ŠÁ [...]
21 ID-ri-e-man-ni [DUMU ŠÁ [... DUMU]
22 ID EN-e-te-ru TIN.TIR[KI ITU.X UD X.KAM₂]
23 MU 25.KAM₂ 1da-ri-iá-muš [LUGAL E.KI LUGAL KUR.KUR.MEŠ]

Translation

(1–4) (Concerning) 2 minas 20 shekels of white silver, with one-eighth alloy per shekel, of nuhhutu-quality, owed to Itti-Nusku-šina, son of Nusku-ajalu, by Marduk-remanni, son of Bēl-uballitl, descendant of Šahit-ginē — (4–5) he (Marduk-remanni) will pay in month I, without interest. (5–7) The aforementioned 2 minas 20 shekels of silver, which is in lieu of (not) cutting off the hand of Marduk-remanni, is for the portion (of the total agreed
compensation) owed to Itti-Nusku-īnāja. (8–10) Itti-Nusku-īnāja has been paid by Mar-
duk-rēmānī (another sum of) silver, the equivalent of the herds that are Itti-Nusku-īnāja’s
stolen property. (11–14) [...] the judges to [...] of Itti-Nusku-īnāja—Marduk-rēmānī will
fetch and deliver to [Itti-Nusku-īnāja, son of Nusku-ajalu].

(15–20) Witnesses: Marduk-mu-[…, son of …]; Nidintu, son of Zērūtu, [descendant
of …]; Bēl-mušētiq-uddi, son of […; …], son of Lābāši, [descendant of …]; Šulum-Bābili,
son of […]; Bēl-rēmānī, [son of …]; (21–22) Basija, the scribe, son of […, descendant of]
Bēl-ēṭir.

(22–23) Babylon, month x, day x, year 25 of Darius, King of Babylon, King of the
Lands.
ON SAND DUNES, MOUNTAIN RANGES, AND MOUNTAIN PEAKS*

Piotr Steinkeller, Harvard University

I. SAND DUNES

MVN 4 1, an Ur III text of unknown origin, lists field-allotments of the military organization settled in the town or village Al-Šu-Šuen-re‘i-nîšû.1 Some of the fields listed there include plots described as duš-mun, while others have small lots of land designated as IÅ. The first designation, meaning “saline hummock,” is otherwise documented,2 but, to the best of my knowledge, the other term appears as a qualification of arable land/soil only here. Of the two readings of IÅ that are possible in this context—sahar and iš(i)—the first may safely be excluded, since sahar means “dust, loose earth, soil, debris” (Akk. eperu). This leaves us with iš(i), whose Akkadian equivalents are: (1) bāšu (later baššu) “sand”; (2) issû (a loanword from iš(i)) “excavated sand”; and (3)—at first sight inexplicably—“mountain” (Akk. šadû).3 But

---

1 A detailed discussion of this text will be offered by me elsewhere.
2 Closely related (if not identical) soil designations are (ki-)mun “saline hummock” (DP 573, 577; Nikolski 1 31; Contenau Contribution 100 i 5, ii 8, and passim in this text) and mun-mun “saline” (DP 575 i 2; UET 3 1372:4). When used alone as a soil designation (as in Contenau Contribution 100 i 4, v 18’), duš describes various small elevations in a field, such as hillocks, mounds, and the remains of ancient habitations. [N.B.: duš “mound” is actually dudrš, as shown by Ebla Ṣyllabary 23: duš = [d]u-tum, and spellings such as duš-duš-da (Lamentation over Šumer and Ur 346, Temple Hymns 530, etc.), duš-duš-dam (Inana’s Descent 34), duš-dè (Ninmešara 35), duš-duš-rá (Šulgi X 136), and duš-duš-ra (Uruk Lament 4.25, RIME 4 149 Nur-Adad 7:80).]
3 See iš iš = šā-du-u, iš = ba-aš̄-šu (Ea IV 82, 89, in MSL 14 358); i-ši iš = ba-[aš̄-šu], i-ši iš = i-š[u-u] (MSL 12 105:48–49); iš = ba-ššu (Proto-Iz 1 289, in MSL 13 27); i-ši iš = šā-du-u (Š 120); i-ši iš = ša-du-u (A IV/2); iš iš = ša-du-u (Ea IV 82). As is shown by the fact that the basic Sumerian correspondents of issû are pû and tûl, when corresponding to issû, iš(i) means literally “sand from a pit.” In that sense iš(i) also corresponds to the Akk. šatpum “pit, excavation,”
since the basic Sumerian term for “mountain” is kur,\(^4\) iš(i), whose attestations with this particular meaning are quite rare (see below), must describe some type of a mountain-like natural formation. That formation, as is strongly indicated by the context of MVN 4 1, is almost certainly “sand dune.”\(^5\)

This conclusion is confirmed by the fact that bāšu, one of the correspondents of iš(i), in many instances specifically means “sand dune.”\(^6\) Furthermore, notice the following passages from literary sources where the sense “sand dune” of iš(i) is quite evident:

(1) \(iš(i) \text{i-zi-zi iš(i) i-gá-gá = ba-as-su i-na-as-sa-āh tam-la-a ú-mál-li}\)

(The storm) raises sand, it sets up dunes. (Lugale 84)

In this example, iš(i) is additionally equated with Akk. tamlû, which describes various types of earth-fills and embankments.\(^7\) Significantly, tamlû is in turn a lexical correspondent of iš(i)/sahar ... gá-gá “to pile up sand/earth,”\(^8\) thus confirming that iš(i) is an accumulated, or piled-up, mass of sand.

---

\(^4\) See in detail section II of this article below.

\(^5\) For dune fields as one of the dominant landforms of Iraq’s central floodplain, see R. McC. Adams, *Heartland of Cities: Surveys of Ancient Settlement and Land Use on the Central Floodplain of the Euphrates* (Chicago, 1981), pp. 22, 30–32. Note, especially, ibid., p. 22: “Shown in stippling on the base map are areas of dunes. In large part these lie outside the cultivation perimeter, although in places farmers have sought to stabilize some of the looser, less actively moving dune groups and to extend field canals and cultivation into their midst. There has been no systematic study of dune formations in this area, but the dune fields whose outlines have been traced from the air photographs generally consist of symmetrical, lunate forms of *barchans*, sometimes closely grouped into oscillating, wavelike ridges with alternating barchanoid and linguid elements. In this region individual dunes are generally small, though some can cover a hectare or more and rise to a height of 7 or 8 meters. It is not the individual, isolated dune that furnishes the principal obstacle to archaeological survey, but rather the much larger, dense grouping that may extend almost impenetrably over several square kilometers ... Low hummocks or *nebkhas* that have formed around desert shrubs also occur over vast areas, continuing a very rough microtopography within a contour interval of 50 centimeters or less even after the surface vegetation has disappeared and the roots have been reduced to a brittle skeleton lacing the sand together.” Further, see J. A. Armstrong and M. C. Brandt, “Ancient Dunes at Nippur,” in H. Gasche et al., eds., *Cinquante-deux reflexions sur le Proche-Orient ancien offertes en hommage à Léon De Meyer*, Mesopotamian History and Environment, Occasional Publications 2 (Leuven, 1994), pp. 255–63, who offer a detailed description of the mechanics of dune formation, emphasizing the point that “the unusual large dune fields found in the southern alluvial plain of Iraq are a distinctive feature that seems to relate directly to the practice of irrigation agriculture” (p. 258).

\(^6\) This is true of many of the examples listed in *CAD* B s.v. *baššu*, esp. usage a. Cf. also the GN Bāsum (*Rép. géogr.* 3, p. 39), which evidently means “sand-dune.”

\(^7\) See *AHw.* p. 1316a.

\(^8\) See sahar-gá-gá = *tam-[lu-ū]* (*MSL* 12 105:50).
(2) maš-gán á-dam-bi mu-fun-gul-gul-lu-uš du₄-du₄-ra mi-ni-in-si-ig-eš Ki-en-gi sag-e iš(i)-gim mu-un-dub-bu-uš

They (i.e., the enemies) destroyed its villages and hamlets; they turned them into tells; (the land of) Sumer they heaped up high like sand dunes.

(Uruk Lament 4.25–26)

(3) erim₆-ma-mu iš(i) ba-da-dub-dub sahar ba-da-šú-šú erim₆-ma-mu sahar-gar ild-da-ke₄ šu àm-ši-nigin

In my storehouse sand dunes have formed, it has been covered with dust; in my storehouse river silt⁹ has accumulated.

(Krecher Kultlyrik 55 ii 39–40)


(Cohen Eršemma 32:47–48)

The fact that iš(i) is “sand dune” elucidates the question of the mysterious toponym iš(i) Za-bu(ki), which is documented in three literary sources:¹⁰

(5) dI-bi₄-Suen kur Elam₄₈-ma-šè gišbúr-ra tūm-mu-dè iš(i) Za-bu₄₈ gaba a-ab-ba-ka-ta (var.: gaba hur-sag-gá-ta) zag An-ša₄₈-an₄₈-šè

That Ibbi-Suen will be taken to the land Elam in fetters from the sand dunes of Zabu on the coast of the Sea (var.: on the border of the mountain ranges¹¹) to the border of Anšan.

(Lamentation over Sumer and Ur 35–36)

(6) dLugal-bànda₅₆₈-kur ki sud-rá / su-ùd-da gá-la ba-ni-in-dag iš(i) Za-bu₄₈-a nir ba-ni-in-gál / iš(i) Sa-a-bu-a ň[ir …] = dMIN ana šadi(KUR)₇ a-šar ru-ú-qi […] ina šadi(KUR)₇ Sa-a-bi […]

Lugalbanda ran off to the faraway mountain, he trusted his lot to the sand dunes of Zabum.

(Lugalbanda Epic I 1–2)

⁹ For sahar-gar ild-a(k), Akk. šapik nāri “heaped-up / accumulated river silt” (CAD Š/1 s.v. šapiku), see sahar-gar = šá-pi-[i]k ild (Igituh I 287); sahar-gar ild-da (Proto-Izi I 298, in MSL 13 27); ³⁶pisan ninda ėrмma kalam-ma-ka ³⁶Nanšē-er sahar-gar ild-da-gim ki mu(-un)-na-ab-ūς / mu-un-ši-ib-ūς “in the storehouses of the Land baskets with food have been set up (lit.: densely packed) for Nanšē like the heaped-up river silt” (Nanse Hymn 15–16); sahar-gar ild-gim = ki-ma ša-pi-ik na-a-ri (AfO 23 [1970]: 44 Section III 16–17). For ki … ēs, see n. 19 below.


¹¹ For hur-sag = “mountain range,” see in detail section II below.
In both examples 5 and 6 the “sand dunes of Zabu” mark the starting point of a journey to the Iranian plateau when departing from the southernmost section of Babylonia: Ur in the case of Ibbi-Suen, Uruk in the case of Lugalbanda. Significantly, in example 5 that point is located specifically “on the coast of the sea,” i.e., on the Persian Gulf. Since sand dunes are a ubiquitous feature of the coastal landscape of the Gulf, iš(i) Za-bu(˚) could theoretically be found at any place along the northern section of the Gulf; a location to the east of the present-day Iraqi-Iranian border seems to be favored by the context of both examples 5 and 6. There is reason to think, however, that the “sand dunes of Zabu” are a very specific topographical point. In his discussion of the southern margins of the Tigris-Euphrates floodplain,13 H. T. Wright notes the presence in that area of a long belt of large sand dunes, probably dating to the Pleistocene era, which extends for almost three hundred kilometers along the southern edge of the alluvium. The belt is over ten kilometers wide, with some dunes reaching over fifty meters in height.14 One may be certain that this impressive “mountain” chain was well known to the ancients. If, as appears likely, Ibbi-Suen was transported to Anšan via the sea route (which one would expect would begin on the coast to the south of Eridu), those dunes may have been the last glimpse of his homeland he carried with him, never to return there again.

12 Another likely attestation of iši with the meaning “sand dune” is found in an Ur III incantation: muš kur-ta zi ĝir iš(i)-ta 1-zī “the snake rose from the mountain, the scorpion rose from the sand dune” (see J. J. A. van Dijk and M. J. Geller, *Ur III Incantations from the Frau Professor Hilprecht-Collection, Jena*, TuM 6 [Wiesbaden, 2003], p. 110, no. 2 ii 14–15).


14 Cf. also *Iraq and the Persian Gulf*, Geographical Handbook Series, Naval Intelligence Division (London, 1944), p. 118: “Along the northern border of the Dibdibba and Hajara regions is a belt of sand varying in width from 5 to 15 miles and lying parallel to the Euphrates. As a continuous belt of undulating sand it begins about 10 miles south-west of Shinafiya and reaches south-eastwards almost to the Batin until held up by the ridges of Makhazuma and Matiyaha. North-west of Shinafiya it breaks up into low isolated dunes separated by hard ground; before reaching Makhazuma it changes in character and becomes a level area of soft sand which banks up against every bush to form numerous small tufted hill-ocks.”
II. MOUNTAIN RANGES AND MOUNTAIN PEAKS: 
THE MEANINGS OF HUR-SAG AND KUR

Throughout his long Sumerological career, Thorkild Jacobsen insisted that the topographical term hur-sag means “foothills” or “piedmont.” The last — and also the most extensive — elaboration of this position is found in his Harps: “Hur-sağ, literally ‘head of the valleys’, denotes the near mountains, the foothills, and contrasts with the more daunting, less accessible high mountains farther in, the ‘highland’ (kur).”

While it is true that hur-sag and kur are opposing terms, the contrast between them does not rest on the “nearer/lower” and “farther/higher” distinction. Instead, the underlying contrast is between “multiple/continuous” and “single/punctual,” meaning that hur-sag denotes “mountain range/chain,” whereas kur means “(single) mountain, mountain peak” (and “mountains, mountain peaks” in the plural). This is shown most emphatically in the contexts describing the traversing of mountains, in which the noun used is invariably hur-sag and never kur. Here note especially the following example, where both terms are employed:

hur-sag 5 hur-sag 6 hur-sag 7 im-me-re-bala-bala

By mountain low (lit.: the base of the mountain), by mountain high, (and) over the plain he crossed five, six, seven mountain ranges, from the border of Anšan to the top of Anšan.

(Lugalbanda Epic I 343–44)

And see also these occurrences:

hur-sag 5 hur-sag 6 hur-sag 7-e im-me-ri-bala

Five, six, seven mountain ranges he crossed.

(Enmerkar and the Lord of Aratta 170, 509)

hur-sag 1-e in-ti-in-bala … hur-sag 7-kam-ma bala-e-da-ni

He crossed the first mountain range … as he crossed the seventh mountain range.

(Gilgameš and Huwawa Version B 60–61)

Further evidence that hur-sag denotes “mountain range” is provided by the passages in which hur-sag is said to be “wide” and to have “plateaus” and “meadows”:

kur Gú-bí-na-šè igi na-ni-ñ l hur-sag dagal téš-bí nam-ta-an-si-ig

He (i.e., Enlil) looked as far as the land of Gubin; he scoured all of the wide mountain ranges.

(Curse of Akkade 152–53)


She (i.e., Ninhursag) made them (i.e., Summer and Winter) eat like wild bulls fresh grass on the mountain plateaus, she reared them on the mountain meadows.

(Summer and Winter 17–18)

Equally characteristically, hur-sag frequently serves as a simile for city walls, as in the following examples:

bàd-bí hur-sag-gim an-né an-úš

Its city wall touched the sky like a mountain range.

(Curse of Akkade 42)

ur₅-ta kalam gi-né sig nim GAM-e-dè ñàd gal za-pa-ág-ba šu nu-ku₄-ku₄ hur-sag sig₇-ga-gim uru₅-né im-mi-dab₉

In order to submit the lower and upper countries to the ‘true’ land, he installed at his city a great wall, which, like a verdant mountain range, cannot be penetrated when it roars (lit.: in its roaring).

(RIME 3/2, pp. 368–69 Ibbi-Sin 1:11–17)

bàd gal hur-sag ĝł-la-gim šu nu-ku₄-ku₄-dè ní-bi-šè è-a mu-na-dù

He erected for him a great wall, which like a mountain range raised high cannot be penetrated, which came forth by itself.

(RIME 4, pp. 237–38 Warad-Sin 19:13–16)

bàd Sippar₅₉ hur-sag gal-gim mi-ni-ñ l

I raised the city wall of Sippar like a great mountain range.

(RIME 4, pp. 374–78 Samsuiluna 3:65–66 [Sumerian])
Lastly, note that in the royal Ur III correspondence the mountain ranges of Jebel Hamrin (ancient Ebih) are consistently referred to as hur-sag:

\[
\]

As I was constructing this wall to the length of 26 danna, and reached the (plateau) between the two mountain ranges, I learned, as a result of my building activity, about the Amorites camping in the mountain ranges. The Simurreans had come to their assistance. Thus I went up (the plateau) between the mountain ranges of Ebih in order to smite (them).

(Ṣarrumbani to Šusin 12–16)

Sumerian is not unique in sharply distinguishing between “mountain” and “mountain range.” Various other languages make the same distinction, for example, Spanish, which uses separate words for each meaning: montaña as opposed to sierra and cordillera. On the other hand, Akkadian differs in this respect, since šadû means both “mountain” and “mountain range.” Significantly, however, Akkadian also knows the loanword ḫuršānu, which is used strictly in the sense of “mountain range.”¹⁷ It seems certain that this borrowing had been motivated by the absence of an unequivocal term for “mountain range” in Akkadian.

That hur-sag and kur meant two distinctly different things to the Sumerians is best illustrated by the contrasting usage of both terms in a single literary composition. Here the prime case is Gudea’s cylinders, where hur-sag and kur serve as similes of temples and related structures:

\[
kun \text{na₄ é-a nú-a-bi hur-sag ul nun-né-ēš nú-àm}
\]

Its stone stairway set down in the temple is (like) a mountain range laid with princely flowers.¹⁸

(A xxviii 19–20)

---


He made (the temple) grow like a mountain range of lapis lazuli; he set it up to be admired like a mountain range of white alabaster.

(\textit{A} xxiv 15–17)

The temple raised its top like a mountain range between heaven and earth.

(\textit{A} xxi 23)

They make the temple grow like a mountain range.

(\textit{A} xxi 19)

(The temple is) like a verdant mountain range full of allure.

(\textit{A} xxx 10–11)

(The temple) is a green mountain range set up to be admired; it stands out above all the mountains; the temple is a great mountain indeed!

(\textit{B} i 4–6)

He made (the temple) grow like a great mountain.

(\textit{A} xxii 10)

Its chariot house is a mountain standing on the earth.

(\textit{A} xxviii 15–16)

The temple whose front is (like) a great mountain set up\textsuperscript{19} on the earth.

(\textit{A} xxvii 11)

\textsuperscript{19} For \textit{ki} ... \textit{ús}, “to compact (earth), to pile up / accumulate (by wind), to pack densely, to set up, to trample,” corresponding to Akk. \textit{kabāsu}, see especially \textit{IŠ.DU₆.TAG₄-bi eden-na ki ba-ni-ús-ús} “he set up burial mounds on the plain” (H. Steible, \textit{Die altsumerischen Bau- und Weihinschriften}, Freiburger altorientalische Studien 5/1 [Wiesbaden, 1982], Ent. 28 i 30–31); \textit{bād-gal} An-
ON SAND DUNES, MOUNTAIN RANGES, AND MOUNTAIN PEAKS

 kur a-ta ĭl-la Nimîn

Nimin, a mountain rising from among the waters.

(A iii 19)

And note also Kêş Hymn 15–17:

hur-sag-da mú-a an-da gû lá-a
É-kur-da mú-a kur-ra sag fl-bi
Abzu-gim gûn-a / ri-a hur-sag-gim sig‡-sig‡-ga

(The temple of Kêş) grown together with the mountain ranges, embracing the sky,
grown together with the Ekur, lifting its top among the mountains,
multicolored / springing up like the Abzu, verdant like a mountain range.

My insistence on this terminological distinction is not just philological pedantry. The knowledge of what hur-sag and kur precisely mean is essential for the proper understanding of how the Sumerians visualized and conceptualized the natural landscape and of how they used that mental imagery to speak about and to relate emotionally to man-made structures. As shown in the passages just cited (and amply confirmed by other sources), in Sumerian literature “mountain range” takes precedence over “mountain” as a preferred figurative description of temples. From this, one might infer that the horizontal, curtainlike aspect of a mountain range was particularly pleasing visually to the Sumerians, possibly also influencing their architectural aesthetics and actual building practices. If so, the “ideal” Sumerian temple (by which I mean the entire temple complex) was meant to look more like a massive, cragged wall than an isolated, upward-thrusting structure (of the Tower of Babel type).

On a more basic level, an appreciation of the contrast between hur-sag and kur is absolutely essential for the understanding of temple topography and its (still extremely opaque) technical terminology. One of the most important parts of the temple of Ekur was the structure called Hur-sag-galam-ma, “stepped mountain range.” 20 Although it

né ki ús-sa-a-ba “its great walls set up by An” (Gilgameš and Akka 33); kur gal-e muša(1M. DUGUD)-e ki hé-úš-sa-a-ba “in the great mountain which was set up by the sand storm” (Lugalbanda Epic II 82); 8[If-id-ga mah-a-ni ki 1ba]-an]-ús (Enmerkar and the Lord of Aratta 324), è ûkur-ra sahar ki ús-sa-a-ba (Sheep and Grain 59).

20 Written Hur-sag-ga-lam-ma in Ur III sources. For the Ur III attestations, see W. Sallaberger, Der kultische Kalender der Ur III-Zeit (Berlin, 1993), Teil 1, pp. 99, 112; Teil 2, p. 191. For the later attestations, see Sjöberg Temple Hymns, p. 50; George Temples, p. 100, nos. 480–81; Hymn to Ekur 9; Ur-Namma B 29.

Although George Temples, p. 100, translates galam in this name as “skillfully-built,” it is certain that the word involved is galam “stair, step” (and thus not galam = nakālu “to be clever,” nikiltu “skillful work,” naklu “clever, skillful, ingenious”). This point was demonstrated long ago by Landsberger, in B. Landsberger and H. G. Güterbock, “Das Ideogramm für simmiltu (‘Leiter, Treppe’),” AfO 12 (1937–39): 55, based on the following evidence: (1) lexical entries that equate galam with simmiltu “ladder, staircase, stair, step”; 8[galam = si-mil-tu, “ladder” (Hh. VI 107 = MSL 6 92); 8[galam-ma = MIN (= sim-mil-tū) šu-pa-li “ladder (leading to) cellar/
is thought by some Sumerologists that Hursag-galama is a poetic term for *ziqqurratu*, “temple tower,” 21 this term is hardly a generic one, since it is documented exclusively in connection with Ekur.22 Moreover, since *u₅-nir*, the standard Sumerian word for “temple tower,” does otherwise appear as the description of Ekur,23 one can be confident that Hursag-galama did not signify Ekur’s entire temple tower (which apparently was known as *u₅-nir*), but only a part of it. Speculating along those lines, A. R. George concluded that Hursag-galama was the cella on the top of Ekur’s zikkurrat,24 but, as far as I know, there is no evidence to support this view. In my opinion, the best explanation was provided by Jacobsen,25 who described Hursag-galama as the stairway leading to Ekur’s upper temple, which, according to him, bore the name of *gigunû*. For this interpretation, of particular importance is Ur-Namma B 29–30, where Hursag-galama and a *gigunû* building are mentioned side by side:

Hur-sag-galam-ma gi-gun النفس kug kur-gal-la-ra u₁₈-ru-gim [š]ag₄-bi-a
ki èm-ma-ni-in-ús

basement” (Erimhuš II 275); galam = *si-mi-il-tu* (M. Krebernik, “Wörter und Sprichwörter: Der zweisprachige Schultext HS 1461,” ZA 94 [2004]: 240 i 19); galam-galam-ak-a = *su-um-mu-lu* “to provide with stairs, to form a stairway,” *g̣i₄-kun₄* = *si-nil-tu* “ladder,” galam = 2 ša *nak-ba-s[i] “ladder/staircase with steps,” *[k]un-sag = ʃ₃+g̣i₄*- “main staircase of the *gigunû*” (Nabnitu VII 284–87, in MSL 17 113). For *nakbasu*, see ʃ₃*ₕ-kun₄*-tur = maš₃-ḥa-[tu] = [na]k-ba-su (Hg. I 38, in MSL 5 187). For kun-sag, see especially Enki and the World Order 151: kun-sag Eridug₃-ga kar dug₄-ga im-nil-ib-galam-e-ne “they put in place the main stairway of Eridu, the sweet quay”; (2) the fact that ga-lam means “step of a ladder” in Pre-Sargonic Lagaš sources: 104 ʃ₄-ga-lam ʃ₃*ₕ-kun₃ “104 ladder steps” (Genouillac TSA 26 iv 1); 100 ʃ₄-ga-lam ʃ₃*ₕ-TE₅₄<,₅₃>E (DP 436 iv 4); 40 ʃ₄-ga-lam kun₃ (DP 446 i 6).

Cf. Th. Jacobsen, “Notes on Ekur,” Eretz-Israel 21 (1990): 44 and n. 23, who translates Hur-sag-galam-ma as “the stairwise rising foothill,” deriving it from galam “to rise in steps.” Although it would seem that galam “stair” is a separate lexeme from galam = *nakalu*, nkittu, naklu, this is by no means certain. Here note especially galam-ak-a = *na-ak-lu* (Nabnitu VII 166, in MSL 17 110), which seems to match galam-galam-ak-a = *su-um-mu-lu* (see above)! Is it possible, then, that the meaning “skillful, ingenious work” derives from “stair, staircase”? In this connection, note also the unclear Šu-ga-lam, the name of the main gate of Eninnu (W. Heimpel, “The Gates of the Eninnu,” JCS 48 [1996]: 20–21, 25–28; cf. Ur III PNš Šu-ga-lam-zi-mu and Ur-Šu-ga-lam-ma in Limet *Anthroponymie*, pp. 531, 561, and É-igi₃-šu-galam of Ninurta at Nippur [George *Temples*, p. 105, no. 524]). A. Falkenstein, *Die Inschriften Gudeas von Lagaš*, AnOr 30 (Rome, 1966), p. 140, assumed that Šu-ga-lam involves galam “stair” (“die sich erhebende ‘Hand’”), but a connection with the other galam cannot be excluded (“skillful hand”). So also Heimpel, “Gates of Eninnu,” p. 21, who suggests the meaning “ingeniously fashioned hand.”

21 Sjöberg *Temple Hymns*, p. 50: “A poetical expression for *ziqqurratu* is ḫur-sag-galam-ma ‘storied tower’.”

22 The only possible exception here is Ur-Namma EF 9, where Ekiṣnugal is qualified as hur-sag-galam-ma “stepped (or here: ‘skillfully made’) mountain range.” But this is almost certainly a free simile, rather than a proper name. Cf. E. Flückiger-Hawker, *Urnamma of Ur in Sumerian Literary Tradition*, Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis 166 (Fribourg and Göttingen, 1999), pp. 276–77. See also Gudea Fragments 8+3+5+4 iii’ 6’ (RIME 3/1, p. 102), where hur-sag-ga-lam is a simile of Eninnu: hur-sag ga-lam-ma is a simile of Eninnu: hur-sag ga-lam-ma-gim an ki-a bad-bad-e “it is like a stepped mountain range separating heaven from earth.”


24 George *Temples*, p. 100, no. 480 ("cella of Enlil on the ziqqurat at Nippur")

Like a huge whirlwind he (i.e., Ur-Namma) set up within it (i.e., the Ekur) the Hursag-galama (and) a gigunû as the holy dwelling of Great Mountain.²⁶

Since it is conclusively known that the gigunû building customarily stood on the temple’s upper level,²⁷ the most likely interpretation of the above passage is that Hursag-galama was the monumental stairway of Ekur’s temple tower (u₇-nir), on top of which a gigunû with the cella of Enlil was situated. This solution agrees with the earlier-cited passage from Gudea Cylinder A xxviii 19–20, where the stone stairway of Eninnu is compared to a flowery “mountain range.” It finds still further corroboration in the fact that the specialized meaning of Akkadian ḫuršānu, a loanword from hur-sag, is “siege ramp.”²⁸

Another illustration of the need to render hur-sag and kur precisely may be found in the passage describing the creation of Summer and Winter by Enlil in Summer and Winter 12: hur-sag gal-gal-la ḡi₂₂₄-bí-in-dug₄ kur-re ha-la ba-an-sum. In H. L. J.

²⁶ Cf. Lugalbanda Epic II 82 cited in n. 19 above.
²⁷ Of particular significance here are the following examples, which identify the gigunû with the top of the temple tower or connect the two structures together: u₇-nir gi-gun₄-na mah-a-ni sag-bi an-gim ʾl-i-dè = u₇,NIR gi-gu-na-šu ʾši-ra-am re-ši-ša ki-ma ša-me-e ul-la-a-am “to raise as high as the sky the top of the temple tower, his lofty gigunû” (RIME 4, pp. 374–78 Samsuiluna 3:11–12 [Sumerian] = lines 13–16 [Akkadian]; cf. also ibid., lines 68–69 [Sumerian] = lines 83–87 [Akkadian]); u₇-nir gi-gun₄-na mah-a-ni sag-bi an-gim ʾši-a mi-ni-in-ū₄-sa (Samsuiluna 18, RLA 2, p. 183); ē-gi-gun₄-na u₇-nir nibru₄ “the gigunû building of the temple tower of Nippur” (Streck Asb., p. 353, no. 4); ʾša zi-qu-ra-ti gi-gu-[na]-šu re-e-ši-ša ʾša pa-ni₄ ul-li-ma “to raise higher than before the top of the temple tower, his gigunû building” (H. Schaudig, Die Inschriften Nabonids von Babylon und Kyros des Großen samt den in ihrem Umfeld entstandenen Tendenzschriften, AOAT 256 [Münster, 2001], p. 401 Nabonid 2.11 ii 3–4). Further, note that kun-sag “main stairway” is explained lexically as simmiltu ša gigunû “main stairway of the gigunû” in Nabnitu VII 287 (see n. 20 above). For gigunû as the upper temple, see now the extensive discussion by H. Waetzoldt, “Tempelterrassen und Ziqqurrate,” in Y. Sefati et al., eds., “An Experienced Scribe Who Neglects Nothing”: Ancient Near Eastern Studies in Honor of Jacob Klein (Bethesda, Maryland, 2005), pp. 323–39.

In the same study (pp. 329–34), Waetzoldt identifies u₇-nir as the “temple tower” but still thinks (following Sjöberg and others) that Hursag-galama is but an alternative term for the temple tower (Stufenturm).
²⁸ See CAD Ḫ s.v. ḫuršānu A usage b. A similar use of hur-sag to describe an oblong elevation is found in the Ur III field plan RTC 416 = RA 4 (1897): 13, 15, where hur-sag uniquely designates the quality of land. Since this designation is confined to five contiguous plots along the left edge of the field, with the hur-sag totaling 6.5 bùr or ca. 42.12 ha of land, it is clear that the field in question adjointed a massive ridge or a similar kind of longitudinal elevation. Referring to this text, J. Black, “The Sumerians in Their Landscape,” in T. Abusch, ed., Riches Hidden in Secret Places: Ancient Near Eastern Studies in Memory of Thorkild Jacobsen (Winona Lake, Indiana, 2002), p. 46, wrote that “the [field] plans use ḫursaḡ for the ‘hilly’ parts of the fields, which are difficult to cultivate (so that ḫursaḡ can be translated as ‘hill(s)’), and dul for areas of fields which are unproductive because they are tell-ground (that is, ground untillable because it is the site of ruined habitations).” This is largely incorrect, however, since: (1) RTC 416 is the only Ur III administrative source where hur-sag is employed in this manner; (2) the hilly sections of fields are consistently described by the term du₅₄ “hillock, hummock, mound” (see above n. 2).
Vanstiphout’s translation this passage appears as: “With the great Hursag-hill he copulated, yes, gave that mountain her share.”29 A similar translation is offered in Oxford’s Electronic Text Corpus: “He copulated with the great hills, he gave the mountain its share.” But the “mountain” (kur) is of course Enlil! Apart from the grammar (the agentive case -e marking kur), this is confirmed by the fact that Ninhursag is never referred to as “mountain.”30 Accordingly, the passage should be translated: “With the great mountain ranges (= Ninhursag) he copulated, the Mountain allotted (his) share (to her).”

A similar confusion surrounds the meaning of hur-sag in the beginning lines of Sheep and Grain, which are of great interest for the Sumerian concepts of the creation of the universe: hur-sag an ki-bi-da-ke₄ An-nē dingir-dingir ₄A-nun-na im-tu-dē-eš-a-ba. Some scholars translate hur-sag in this passage as “hill.” Thus, for example, J. Black stated that “in The Debate between Sheep and Grain the landscape location where that creation occurred is described as ‘the huršaḡ (hill) of Heaven-and-Earth’ — neither a flat plain nor a mountain, but a hilly landscape.”31 Taking into account my earlier conclusions, however, the translation has to be: “After An had created the Anuna gods on the mountain range (between) heaven and earth,” where hur-sag denotes a huge mountainous barrier separating the sky from the earth. This, in fact, is the proper (and expected) context of the creation of the gods, which, as other compositions tell us, occurred following the original separation of heaven and earth.32 Quite possibly it is this cosmic hur-sag, which separates — but also links together — heaven and earth, that the Sumerian temple is meant to represent when it is compared to a “mountain range.”

30 For Ninhursag = hur-sag, see especially ₄Nin-
gī[{-s]} a zi ₄En-l[{-il-lā}] hur-sag-e tu-da māš-
lum-e ga zi kū-a “Ning[rsu], the true seed of En[il], given birth by the mountain ranges, fed with genuine milk by the deer” (Gudea Fragments 8+3+5+4 iv’ 3’–4’), where “mountain ranges” and “deer” are images of Ninhursag. Cf. ū-tu-
ud-da hur-sag-gā ū-mu-un-e Ė-ninnu in CT 15 11
line 3 = VAS 2 2 iii 25. Finally, note the eti-
ology of Ninhursag’s name in Lugale 393–94, 408
(Ninurta addressing Ninnah): gu-ru-um gar-ra-
gā / gu-ru-un gar₄₇-ra-mu [hur-s]ag mu-bi hē-em
hur-sag-mu-bi hē-em za-e nin-bi hē-me-en = ina
gu-ru-un-ni ša ag-ru-mu KUR-ú [lu šu]m-šu at-ti
lu be-let-su ... munus-zi (₄)nin hur-sag ki-sikil

“let the name of the burial mound I have heaped up be ‘mountain range,’ and be you its ‘mistress’! ... faithful woman, the ‘mistress of the mountain range,’ the virgin place.”
31 J. Black, “Sumerians in Their Landscape,” p. 45. Cf. also B. Alster and H. L. J. Vanstiphout,
“Lahar and Ashnan: Presentation and Analysis
of a Sumerian Disputation,” Acta Sumerologica
(Japan) 9 (1987): 15, who translate the passage
in question: “Upon the Hill of Heaven and Earth /
When An had spawned the divine Godlings.”
32 See Sjöberg, “In the Beginning,” in Abusch,
and nn. 9–12. And note also Gudea Fragments
8+3+5+4 iii’ 6’: hur-sag ga-lam-ma-gim an ki-a
bad-bad-e “(Eninnu) is like a stepped mountain
range separating heaven from earth.”
III. CONCLUSION

I close with some comments on kur. As has already emerged from the preceding discussion, kur, when referring to mountains, invariably signifies a single mountain or a mountain peak. More broadly, kur means “mountain land” or “highland,” hence also “foreign land,” because from the Sumerian geographical perspective foreign lands were predominantly mountainous regions. When used with that meaning, kur is the opposite of kalam, which means “native land,” roughly identical with the alluvial plain of the Euphrates and the Tigris; kur’s meaning of “foreign,” also “strange, alien”—and hence “hostile”—is also evident in the word kúr, “strange, hostile, foreign(er), enemy” (Akk. nakru), which in all probability is a semantic disjunct of kur. 33

Not only used in descriptions of foreign lands, kur is also one of the terms designating the netherworld. Such usage is not surprising since, on the one hand, it reflects the understanding of the netherworld as a place that is not only physically distant but also hostile and totally alien. This image of the netherworld is most eloquently expressed by the appellative kur-nu-giš, “land of no return.” On the other hand, this usage palpably connects the netherworld with the mountains to the west and east of Babylon, where, according to the native beliefs, the gates to the netherworld were situated. Thus, although the Babylonian netherworld was located directly below the Land of the Living and, as a virtual copy of the latter, was devoid of mountainous character, the descent to the netherworld commenced in the western mountains (with the ascent taking place in the eastern mountains), which made a comparison with kur, “mountain,” totally logical and convincing. In fact, it is this double meaning of kur—“foreign land” and “mountain”—that makes it such a rich and powerful metaphor of the netherworld.

In making these comments about the Babylonian netherworld, I stress the point that ancient ideas about it—whether Sumerian or Akkadian—consistently and unequivocally placed it beneath the Land of the Living. The recent study by Dina Katz—otherwise an exceptionally fine work—revives the unfortunate notion that the Sumerian concept of the netherworld differed radically from the Akkadian one in that the Sumerians considered the universe to be horizontal, believing that the netherworld was situated “beyond the mountains, outside the land of Sumer.” 34 But as I have re-

34 D. Katz, The Image of the Netherworld in the Sumerian Sources (Bethesda, Maryland, 2003), pp. 43–61.
cently discussed elsewhere, there is no evidence whatsoever to support such a view. Although statements about the netherworld are exceedingly rare among third-millennium documentation, enough evidence survives to indicate that the Sumerians also imagined the universe to be vertical. As for the Sumerian sources that, according to Katz, allegedly attest to the horizontal perspective of the netherworld, they are without exception of Old Babylonian and later date and, as such, in no way permit extrapolations about the “pristine” Sumerian cosmological concepts of earlier times. In other words, how is one to distinguish between “Sumerian” and “Akkadian” ideas among this evidence? Moreover, all of the examples Katz cites in this connection are the descriptions of travel to the netherworld in which one “walks” or “rides” to get there. But, since the route to the netherworld began in horizontal space, such statements do not contradict the idea that the netherworld itself was subterranean. Even more important, one needs to make allowance for at least some imprecision in such matters. It is unrealistic and unfair to expect total exactness from the Sumerians in their statements about the netherworld, since we too are on occasion lax in this respect, as, for example, when we tell someone “to go to hell,” even though we understand that “to descend” is meant. In fact, equally imprecise in their choice of words were the “vertical” Akkadians, who “went,” and did not “descend,” “to their fate” (ana šîmti alâku).

---


36 See, in particular, Abu Salabikh Temple Hymns, lines 30–32 (= R. D. Biggs, Inscriptions from Tell Abâ Šalâbîkh, OIP 99 (Chicago, 1974), p. 47), which identify and physically connect the netherworld with the subterranean Abzu, the abode of Enki: Abzu kur ki-gal men nun an ki En-nu-dim̃(TE)-mud, zà-mî “Abzu, the land of the netherworld, the crown of the Prince of Above and Below — Lord Nudimmud be praised.”
REMARKS ON SOME SUMEROGRAMS AND AKKADIAN WORDS

Marten Stol, Vrije Universiteit, Amsterdam

Lexicographers love the study of words, and in their work they follow the order of the alphabet. In this contribution for Bob Biggs I will present some remarks on a few words, following that hallowed order, harking back to the abecedaries of Ugarit and visible in the Sumerogram for the scribe in Ugarit, A.BA, according to Simo Parpola the “ABC-man.”

ālum “city”

Royal women are sometimes portrayed with headgear that looks like the crenellated wall of a city. This headdress is called a “Mauerkrone” in German (English “mural crown”).1 The Akkadian word for it is simply ālum “city.” It is attested in a list of precious gifts, a dowry for the queen, after four pairs of golden šuqallulu (earrings?): “One golden city (URU KÙ.GI), its weight (is) 215.”2 A second reference is found in a Hittite text, an URU-lum (= ālum) made of silver as a votive offering to the gods.3 A third reference is found in a namburbi text: “That malformed birth, you put a golden city (URU KÙ.GI) on its head.”4 Can we explain the epithet of the goddess Tašmētum ša dūri “that of the city wall” as “she who wears the Mauerkrone”?5


ebīhu “a big rope”

The dictionaries offer few references and give some more under ibīlu. An update: the verb ebēhu “to fasten, to gird” is associated with the rope eblu.6 A letter from Mari speaks of bringing down by boats (neqelpûm Š) ropes (Ēš.Ḫ.L.A, eblû) that bind together (e-bi-ḫi) siege towers and a battering ram.7

Sumerian Ėš.MAḪ is to be read ebih, as the variant EN.TI-gim for Ėš.MAḪ-gim in Inanna and Ebih, line 41, shows. This has been central in the discussion of whether e-bi-ḫi dan-nu-um in a royal inscription, a metaphor for a city wall, means the “belt-cord, cincture” (A. R. George), or Mt. Ebih (W. Farber), or both (H. L. J. Vanstiphout).8 In the Sumerian context it is a big rope made mostly of goat hair.9 Ropes made of wool or palm fibers (KA×SA) are also known.10

This Sumerogram is attested in two Old Babylonian texts from Nippur (ēš.maḫ.še al.sur.ru.e.dè); see below, under SUR.GIBIL, at the end of this article (n. 58).

In Middle Babylonian it is goat hair, 9 minas for normal ropes (a-na eb-le-e), 1 mina for big ropes (a-na e-bi-ḫe-e).11 In Neo-Babylonian it belongs to the harness of a horse (silver a-na eb-bi-ḫi šá ANŠE.KUR.RA), and we read in a letter, “Do not be negligent about the ši-ip-re-ti ū e-bi-ḫi.MEŠ that I sent to my brother.”12

---


9 MVN 20 64, with comments by F. d’Agostino: “una funa assai spessa (del peso di ca. 1 kg.) per un baldacchino di carro o di nave”; T. Gomi, “Kollationen zu den von T. Fish in Manchester Cuneiform Studies…,” Orient 17 (1981): 42, BM 105417 (length 15 ninda, 90 meters). Its weight is also indicated in Waetzoldt Textilindustrie, no. 50 and JTT 3 6228.


Nimrud letter NL 39 we read: “You will quickly bind (rakāsu) your rope (e-bi-iḫ-ka) on them” (H. W. F. Saggs).\(^{13}\)

\(ḥarāsu\)

The dictionaries first assumed that this word is the infinitive of a verb.\(^{14}\) Cognate words in Hebrew (ḥĕrēṣ) and Syriac (ḥarsingā, ḥrāsā) suggest a skin disease, and this must be true in Akkadian too.\(^{15}\) This word is poorly attested in the texts. It shares the Sumerogram GAN with garābu. It is a gloss on GĀN in a school exercise; it produces boils, etc., on the skin; I cite this text in full:\(^{16}\)


In a later “group vocabulary” it follows garābu, but here both words have unusual Sumerograms: [x].gar.ra = ga-ra-bu, [x x] SAR = ḥa-ra-su.\(^{17}\)

In the Diagnostic Handbook we read: “If the appearance of his wound (GIG, simmu) is black: ḥa-ra-su is its name. If the skin of a man is full of birdu marks, his flesh stings him, and redness (rišātu) falls upon him: ḥa-ra-su is its name.”\(^{18}\)

Elsewhere, we find the disease together with ekketu “itch” and rišātu “redness.”\(^{19}\)

---

\(^{13}\) Parpola, SAA 1 1 rev. 50 (“you will ‘snap your belt’ on them”), CAD R s.v. rakāsu (“soon you will tie your belt on them”), H. W. F. Saggs, The Nimrud Letters, 1952 (London, 2001), p. 191. W. von Soden, AHw., discovered [i-n]a e-bi-ḫi rak-su-ma […] in a Sennacherib inscription; R. C. Thompson, “A Selection from the Cuneiform Historical Texts from Nineveh (1927–32),” Iraq 7 (1940): 89, fig. 4 A 9; see now E. Frahm, Einleitung in die Sanherib-Inschriften (Vienna, 1997), p. 92 IV 29”.

\(^{14}\) CAD Ḥ s.v. ḥarāsu “to itch,” partly based on Sumerian sa.kū; s.v. ḥarāsu C. AHw., p. 323b “kratzen”; p. 1559a “Krätze” (substantive!). MSL 9 82: neither ḥarāsu nor garābu can be derived from verbs; cognates in Hebrew and Aramaic are given.


\(^{17}\) K.4177+, 2R 44 no. 2 rev. iii 17–18.


\(^{19}\) CT 19 49 K. 26 rev. 4 = Antagal E IV 4–6, in MSL 17 212.
\*hi\*tu “\*sin\*”

Tablet I of *Enûma Anu Enlil* has a mysterious apodosis that can be explained by its older version, attested in Emar. We begin with this earlier omen. “Two men will be seized (DIB.BA, șabātu N) in their sin (\*hi\*tu); they will not be beaten (ma\*hā\*su N); they will be released (wa\*šā\*ru Dt).”\(^{20}\) “Two men” is striking, and I believe that the “\*sin\*” of the two men refers to homosexual activities. The forecasts of omens are often unexpected, and one may assume that normally the two men were not left alone unharmed.\(^{21}\) The later canonical version indeed reflects a severe judgment. Without an introduction it says: “The king will make the men go out (UD.DU, wašū Š) for burning (ana qalè), and those men who have been summoned (zakāru) without being guilty (ina la annišunu) will be saved (KAR, eřēru N).”\(^{22}\) Death by being burnt alive (qalū; see *CAD* Q s.v. qalū mng. 2c) is a severe punishment meant for people who endanger society by, for example, breaking a taboo.\(^{23}\)

Does the omen in the later canonical series still refer to homosexual men, or did the scribes no longer understand its original meaning? I think that the omen was still aware of its original intent; the “being burnt alive” is suggestive. It wished to reinterpret the unexpected release of the men in the older omen by stating that this happens to only the “innocent” men.

\*hunzù\*

In the first tablet of *Șumma ălu* the ominous significance of various types of weak or handicapped people seen in the city is given: “the lame” (pessû), “the idiots” (lillû), “the soft” (rabbu), “the wise men.” They are followed by people with warts and pocks, the deaf, and the blind.\(^{24}\) Why do we encounter here “wise men”? The text offers KÛ.ZU.MEÅ.\(^{25}\) I would suggest that this is a writing for \*hunzù “lame, limping” (CAD H),

---


\(^{24}\) Freedman *Alu*, p. 32, Tablet I 85–89.

\(^{25}\) CT 38 4:70 (copy); Freedman *Alu*, p. 32, line 90; manuscripts: ibid., p. 52:90.
Æunzu “etwa lahm”? (W. von Soden, AHw.). This word has been hitherto attested only as a personal name. One commentary now equates a lame person, LÚ BA.AN.ZU, with ḫu-uzu-[u].26 In the Seleucid personal name KU-zu-u the sign KU stands for ḫun, and here again we have the name Ḫunzû.27

The Sumerogram KÙ.ZU stands for emqu “wise,” according to the most modern sign list. On closer inspection, it is attested as such only in bilingual texts. In our passage, however, it must be a playful elaboration on KU-zu-u.

V. Haas has commented on our omen saying, “Mir nicht ganz verständlich ist die Nennung der Weisen (emqùtu [line] 70) an dieser Stelle; ist etwa an eine den antiken Wanderphilosophen vergleichbaren Gruppe zu denken?” 28

maklalu (a garment)

A. R. Millard discovered the Akkadian word dannu “vessel” in corrupted form in the list of merchandise of Tyre given by the prophet Ezekiel by reading “the vessels of wine from Izalla” in Ezek. 27:19.29 Another Babylonian item in the list is easier to identify, maklûl (Ezek. 27:24; there the plural is given). The standard Hebrew dictionary translates it “Prachtgewand (unbestimmter Art)” and is not aware of the Akkadian word maklalu.30 The Practical Vocabulary Assur gives precisely this variant, TŪG ma-ak-lul. The Hebrew word settles the question of the quality of the k or q in the middle of the Akkadian word: k is best.

The Akkadian garment is listed among the precious gifts given by the royal house of Egypt to that of the Hittites. The Akkadian letters found in Ḫattuša qualify them as “royal clothing” (lubulti LUGAL), “good” (SIG₃) and “dyed” (ṣapû). Egyptian texts


offer instead of “royal clothing” the qualification “made of byssos” (sšr-nsw). A letter from Egypt found in Ugarit indicates that the ma-ak-la-ru are made of linen ([GAD]A); they are “thin” (SIG.MEŠ) and “good” (SIG₅.MEŠ).

A Middle Babylonian list of garments mentions [TÜG ma-a]k-la-ru BABBAR (?). It is made of colored wool (takiltu). The word TÜG ma-ak-lu-ru is attested in a Middle Assyrian list at the end of which we read “good clothing” (lubultu da ‘ıqtu, line 12).

Other Assyrian texts speak of muk-lal, mu-uk-lal, muk-lul, and ma-ak-lil garments.

**masdaru B “knife”**

According to the dictionaries, this word is attested only in the lexical tradition. We now have references in context. In a fragmentary line of an incantation on the treatment of wounds: “[...] of healing, your scalpel (karzillu), your masdaru (written mas-dàra)”; “your” is feminine and refers to the goddess of medicine Gula. In the hymn to Gula she says: “I am carrying the knife of healing (našāku mas-da-ru ša šalāmu)” and “May the mas-da-ra not come near to you.” In the Tukulti-Ninurta Epic mal-ţa-rat a-su-ti né-peš na-as-[a-da-te [...] is commonly translated as “medical texts, procedure for bandaging.” I admit that “scalpels of healing” is somewhat less probable.

---

33 PBS 2/2 135 i 23, as restored by Aro, Kleidertexte, pp. 27, 34; AHw., p. 1425 s.v. uppusu: etwa “(mit Wolle) säumen”?
34 MARV 1 (= VAS 19) no. 24:7. I thank W. Farber for the following observation: “I think that the amounts and types of wool in this list might be materials and prefabricated parts for the ‘good clothing’, since makkalu is also part of a garment in KAV 99:16 and possibly in VAS 19 24:3” (personal communication). KAV 99:16, cited in CAD; see S. Jacob, Mittelassyrische Verwaltung und Sozialstruktur: Untersuchungen (Leiden, 2003), p. 427. For Neo-Assyrian, see 1 TÜG muk-lul GIBIL, in Radner, Ein neusyrisches Privatarchiv, no. 39, with a copy in J. Jakob-Rost, K. Radner, and V. Donbaz, Neuassyrische Rechtsurkunden II (Saarbrücken, 2000), no. 39:1; this text is VAT 8659, quoted by K. Deller, in “Drei wiederentdeckte neuassyrische Rechtsurkunden aus Aššur,” Bagh. Mitt. 15 (1984): 239 ff.
38 K.6057+ ii 23, courtesy M. J. Geller; line 2 mentions the cautery, nakmû. For that word, see M. Stol, review of H. Avalos, Illness and Health Care in the Ancient Near East (Atlanta, 1995), in BiOr 54 (1997): 409.
nannû “order, command”

According to the CAD, this word is attested only in En. el. VI 132 and in two other texts, one of them an Old Babylonian literary text. It refers to the word of a god. It is possible to see in this word an artificial loan from a Sumerian verbal form, attested in a Pre-Sargonic letter(?), na-na-e-a, meaning: “What NN says to him.” In the address formulas in other letters, na-e-a “What NN says,” which is less precise, is also known. In later Sumerian letters it is normally na-(ab-)bé-a.40 I admit that the Pre-Sargonic “letter” is in fact a text of obscure contents, but E. Sollberger has pointed out that the address formula e-na-dug4 follows some lines later.41

There is another argument in favor of my proposition. A similar loan from Sumerian, ù-na-dug, “say to him,” is unnedukkum “letter” in Southern Old Babylonian.42 This Sumerian word again is part of the standard address in Sumerian letters.

šinnu “ivory”

A dowry in Ugarit lists “three beds, overlaid with ivory (ZÚ.GUL GAR.RA), together with their footstools (kilzappu).”43 The Sumerogram for ivory, ZÚ.GUL, is found here and in a list from Amarna.44 Earlier in Assyriology the sign GUL was taken to be sún, rîmtu “wild cow.” Thus ivory was understood as the tooth of an exotic animal by J. Nougayrol, H.-P. Adler, and W. von Soden (AHw.). The discussion section in CAD R s.v. rîmtu rejects this interpretation and says, “read ZÚ.GUL.” I prefer this proposal.

I explain the element GUL as “worked” (i.e., “chiseled” or “carved”); the verb is naqāru in Akkadian. In most cases, the verb indicates work on stone, for example, “to recondition millstones” (M. Civil). In a year-name and an inscription of Abi-sare, na₄.ni.gul.da means “des pierres à tailler” (J.-M. Durand).45 The verb gul is an element in the words bur.gul, parkullu “seal-cutter”; gul.me, qulmû (an ax) (used for hewing stone); ni.gul, akkullu (a hammerlike tool) (CAD). The lexical tradition (naqāru ša ērī in Antagal III 199) and the Sumerian myth Inanna and Enki (urudu.gul.la) show that gul also refers to working copper. H. Waetzoldt understands it as follows: “gul bei...”

40 Sollberger Correspondence, pp. 2 f. (6.1.2, example a.2). For this address formula, see Kienast-Volk SÀB, pp. 4 ff.
41 “Burrows UET II Supplement 25,” in A. Alberti and F. Pomponio, Pre-Sargonic and Sargonic Texts from Ur Edited in UET 2, Supplement, Studia Pohl, Series Maior 13 (Rome, 1986), p. 73, no. 25 rev. i 8. See also Sollberger Correspondence, p. 3.
Metall-, Holz- und Steingegenständen heißt wohl ‘(roh) bearbeiten’.” 46 I would add “bei Elfenbeingegenständen.”

There is another zú.gul = šinnu ḫasirtu “chipped tooth.” 47

At the end of this discussion, I confess that I still like zú.sún “tooth of a wild cow.” Here the hippopotamus could be meant. And in the case of GUL, do we not expect zú.gul.la?

šum ili šulû

In one Middle Babylonian and in several Neo-Babylonian and Neo-Assyrian texts we find this expression for “to swear an oath.” B. Landsberger established this meaning, literally, according to him, “den Namen Gottes (zum Himmel) emporsteigen lassen,” and in this graphic rendering he was quickly followed by the standard work San Nicolò-Ungnad NRV, “Berichtigungen und Nachträge” and its glossary. 48 The expression must have been frozen because in cases where the verbal form is followed by a suffix, we have to translate “to make (him) swear.” 49

Everybody who is familiar with the Ten Commandments will now be reminded of the third commandment, the prohibition against using God’s name in vain; in Hebrew, “to raise (nášā‘) the name of the Lord in vain” (šāw‘) (Exod. 20:7). Landsberger saw this too and said, “Vgl. vielleicht hebr. הָשָׁם יִהוָה [náš ’ šm jwh]”: 50 “to raise” the name of God in Hebrew, “to make go up” in Akkadian. The Hebrew dictionaries do not point out this similarity.

The standard Hebrew dictionary assumes that the expression refers to swearing an oath.51 This is in line with Jewish tradition (Targum and later). Oblique references to the Ten Commandments in the Bible itself explicitly speak of an oath (Lev. 19:12, Jer. 7:9).

The modern commentaries do not say much and even seem to avoid the interpretation “to swear an oath.” 52 These remarks are useful in a modern commentary: “Es soll eine von ihrer Bedeutung durchdrungene feierliche Handlung sein, wie das Erheben der Hand zum Schwur. Daher das Wort náš = den Namen mit gehobener Stimme aus-

47 Kagal 246 Section 6:7; zú.gul.gul = ḫussuru follows.
48 B. Landsberger, review of San-Nicolò-Ungnad NRV, in ZA 39 (1930): 289. See CAD E s.v. elû mng. 12; Ś/3 s.v. šumu mng. 1c–1’; T. Abusch, Babylonian Witchcraft Literature: Case Studies (Atlanta, 1987), p. 103; another meaning is “to summon to court.”
49 M. P. Streck, review of Cole Nippur in ZA 89 (1999): 290, no. 2:8. Note the translation “swear to us/them” and the aberrant explanation “to evaluate by the life (nišu) of god” in ABL 502 by Fuchs and Parpola, in SAA 15 no. 162 rev. 3, 8, with note. CAD Š/3 s.v. šumu translates rev. 8: “I will make them take an oath.”
50 Landsberger, review of San-Nicolò-Ungnad NRV, p. 289, n. 2.
sprechen.” One is still at a loss: should one raise the hand or the voice? But we can appreciate the two Denkanstöße.\(^{53}\)

**turru’u**

This is attested only once: *Ahìw*, p. 1373 s.v.: “ein Ruf? jB. (in das kranke Ohr) *tu-ru-’a [iš]assi* (ruft er) AMT 36, 1, 8.”

The passage has been recopied as Köcher *BAM* 503 iii 8. I would suggest that this word is identical with Hebrew *t’rū’āh* “battle cry.” A book has been written on it.\(^{54}\)

**SUR.GIBIL**

This Sumerogram haunted Assyriology for a long time until I. F. Finkel was able to reconstruct its context: Esagil-kîn-apli’s declaration on his editorial work of scattered diagnostic and physiognomic texts. They had “from old time not received an [authorised] edition” (*ultu ulla SUR.G[IBIL] la ṣabtu*), Finkel translates,\(^{55}\) following W. G. Lambert. This word, here clearly a Sumerogram, is not mentioned in R. Borger’s new *Mesopotamisches Zeichenlexikon*.\(^{56}\) Let me attempt an explanation.

The Sumerian verb sur has the meaning “to spin.” A telling passage is found in the bilingual series Sa.gig.ga: “Let a menopausal woman (*paristu*) spin (*sur*, *øamû*) with the right hand and twine (*tab*, *esṭêpu*) with the left hand.”\(^{57}\) It is also said of twisting a rope.\(^{58}\) The word sur also has the general meaning “to weave.”\(^{59}\)

---

\(^{53}\) Benno Jacob, *Das Buch Exodus* (Stuttgart, 1997), p. 566.

\(^{54}\) Paul Humbert, *La *‘terouªa*: analyse d’un rite biblique* (Neuchâtel, 1946).


\(^{57}\) Von Weiher *Uruk* 2 ii:75f. The duplicate CT 17 20:75 offers kešda “to knot” instead of sur. But kešda, kasâru, is the next activity in lines 77 f.: “Knot seven knots, two times.”


\(^{59}\) B. L. Eichler, in T. Abusch, J. Huehnergard, and P. Steinkeller, Lingering over Words: Studies in Ancient Near Eastern Literature in Honor of William L. Moran (Atlanta, 1990), pp. 166–69. To Eichler the verb basically indicates a wringing or twirling motion. I will not examine the activity sur or sirî (NU) with the spindle; see Šurpu V/VI 150 and “Two Women” B 69; see *PSD* B, p. 64 and K. Volk, “Methoden altesopotamischer Erziehung nach Quellen der altbabylonischen Zeit,” *Saeculum* 47 (1996): 191, n. 77.
For us it is interesting that the Sumerian Kesh Hymn says that words are “spun like a net (sa)” (line 11). Its first editor, G. B. Gragg, remarked: “the verb seems to refer to the artful construction of Enlil’s praise by comparing it to the intricate weaving of a net.” Th. Jacobsen saw the same imagery in the preceding line (line 10); “Nidaba was its spinner (NU) of a single statement (NU inim.dili.bi.im),” and he translated the following line (line 12) as “it was written on its tablet and was being laid to hand.” He concluded: “The recording of an oral poem or formal statement in writing seems thus here to imply (1) establishing of a single authoritative text (2) editing for poetic form—or perhaps even rendering it in poetic form—and (3) writing it down for ready reference.”

It now becomes obvious that SUR.GIBIL can mean “new text,” whereby we have to understand the word “text” in its original meaning: Latin textus “woven,” “textile.” Lambert’s translation “(authorised) edition” seems to reflect the same line of thought.

---


KASR TEXTS: EXCAVATED—BUT NOT IN BERLIN*

Matthew W. Stolper, The University of Chicago

Time and events were not kind to the Babylonian legal documents that recorded acquisitions and activities of the Achaemenid governor Bēlu-šunu, son of Bēl-usur-šu, and of his forebears, his son, his servants, and his associates. The texts had belonged to an archive, in the loose Assyriological sense of the word, and the archive had once been deposited near one of the centers of power of the Achaemenid Empire, the palaces on the Kasr mound of Babylon. But at some time in or after the early fourth century B.C. a severe fire damaged the tablets terribly, leaving many of them partially vitrified, some partially or wholly melted, and many shattered. Various later agencies, including burials in the Parthian period and brick quarries in the modern era, broke still more of the tablets and scattered the pieces widely over the Kasr and even to other mounds at Babylon. Visitors and collectors took some of them away, especially after Western

* My work on these and other late Achaemenid Babylonian texts was supported by a summer stipend from the National Endowment for the Humanities, a grant from the American Council of Learned Societies, and by a subsequent Fellowship from the National Endowment for the Humanities.

I am indebted to W. W. Hallo, Ulla Kasten, P.-A. Beaulieu, and F. Joannès for help with the texts in the Yale Collections; to Erle V. Leichty and Pamela Gerardi for help with the text in the Free Library of Philadelphia; to Cornelia Wunsch and Miguel Civil for help with the texts at Montserrat; to C. B. F. Walker, Julian Reade, and Irving Finkel for help with the Kasr texts from various sources in the British Museum; to John G. Pedley, Elaine Gazda, Pam Reister, and Robin Meador-Woodruff for help with texts in the Kelsey Museum, Ann Arbor; and to Liane Rost, Joachim Marzahn, Evelyn Klengel-Brandt, Beate Salje, and Olof Pedersén for help with texts in the Vorderasiatisches Museum, Berlin.

Babylon excavation numbers, cited with the prefix “Bab” (rather than “BE”), and Babylon photograph numbers are drawn from O. Pedersén, Archive und Bibliotheken in Babylon: Die Tontafeln der Grabung Robert Koldeweys 1899–1917, Ausgrabungen der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft 25 (Saarbrücken, 2005). Texts with known excavation numbers are arranged in order of those “Bab” numbers. Unless otherwise noted, comparanda cited in comments to the texts are from texts of the Kasr group, whether from the excavated N6 group or from other sources.

Dates are cited in this form: day (in arabic numerals) / month (in roman numerals) / regnal year (in arabic numerals) king’s name. Conversions from Babylonian dates to Julian dates follow Richard A. Parker and Waldo H. Dubberstein, Babylonian Chronology 626 B.C.—A.D. 75, Brown University Studies 19 (Providence, Rhode Island, 1956). Personal names are sometimes cited in this form: name/patronym(//ancestor’s name or family name).

The editions of these twenty-three texts and citations of other Kasr texts reflect repeated collations. Errors of substance, judgment, expression, and citation are my own responsibility.
attention to the remains of Mesopotamian antiquity grew in the late eighteenth century. The hundreds of tablets and fragments that the archaeologists of the Deutsche Orient-Gesellschaft (DOG) eventually found on the Kasr, beginning in the spring of 1913, among layers of trash disturbed by pits, were the sorry remains of this archive. But even the DOG’s painstaking work of collecting and recording these remains did not put an end to the archive’s travails, for the remains were disturbed and scattered yet again by the aftermath of World War I.¹

Most of the DOG team left for the war soon after it broke out in August 1914, and some of them were already dead or wounded by the time Robert Koldewey recovered the last of the Kasr fragments in 1915.² Koldewey and Gottfried Buddensieg first withdrew ahead of the British advance to the Diyala, then returned to work at Babylon after the British had been besieged and defeated at Kut al-Amara by von der Goltz and the Ottoman army. By the time Koldewey and Buddensieg withdrew again to Aleppo ahead of the final British advance on Baghdad in March 1917, some 1,022 pieces from the Kasr N6 group had been recorded, and 957 of them had been photographed. They were put in storage with the other excavated collections in the sealed excavation house.³

In 1926, after negotiating a division of the excavated material under the terms of the new antiquities law, Walter Andrae came to Babylon with Julius Jordan to pack finds for shipment to the new Pergamon Museum in Berlin. They were dismayed by the condition of the stores. When Koldewey and Buddensieg had left the site in 1915, the household goods had been pillaged, but the stores of excavated material were untouched. Since 1917, however, the finds had also been raided and picked over. When the Germans and Mr. Cooke, the Honorary Director of Antiquities after Gertrude Bell’s death, broke open the sealed door, they saw finds partially unpacked, scattered, and water-damaged, eliciting the feelings of archaeologists who had opened a tomb that seemed intact, only to find it already violated and plundered.⁴

¹ I have referred to these texts loosely as the Kasr texts or the Kasr Archive in various publications (cited below). Olof Pedersén first labeled the group “Babylon 8” (Archives and Libraries in the Ancient Near East 1500–300 B.C. [Bethesda, Maryland, 1998], p. 184) and now labels it more precisely “N6: Archiv des Statthalters Bēlšunu,” to distinguish it from other texts that were also excavated on the Kasr (Archive und Bibliotheken in Babylon, pp. 144–84). I am indebted to Pedersén for making this comprehensive study of the excavation records, photographs, texts, and fragments in Berlin and elsewhere available to me for citation in advance of publication. The counts and descriptions of Kasr N6 texts given here rely primarily on Pedersén’s work.

² For an account of the site, the excavation house, and the excavators in spring 1916, see S. Hedin, Bagdad, Babylon, Ninive (Leipzig, 1918), pp. 211–83. W. Andrae, in Babylon, die versunkene Weltstadt und ihr Ausgräber, Robert Koldewey (Berlin, 1952), pp. 238 f., gives the impression that Buddensieg was drafted and captured after he went to Aleppo with Koldewey in 1915 and that Koldewey returned to Babylon alone, but Hedin’s account and photographs show Buddensieg at the site in 1916, still in civilian dress.

Writing specifically to rebut their expressions of dismay, H. R. Hall viewed the situation with a victor’s condescending tolerance for disorder, expressed in terms that seem sad and ludicrous under today’s postwar conditions. He had occupied rooms in the Babylon excavation house in January 1919, he said, and found the place “in better condition than might have been expected. It is not always that during such interregna in war-time, when the sense of meum and tuum is blunted, so little untoward happens.” In 1923, he said, an examination of the house by Gertrude Bell and J. M. Wilson, and another by Sidney Smith, confirmed the orderly condition of the museum stores. Repeating that “it is an extraordinary thing that in lawless southern ‘Iraq in war-time the contents of the ‘Museum’ [of the German excavation house] were preserved, more or less, intact from the day of Koldewey’s flight to that of the first walling-up,” he admitted that while the house was still open “some of the stupider and more ignorant type of British or Indian soldier ... may have pocketed an occasional small ‘souvenir’ from its shelves,” but he rejected the idea of any major loss to looting.5

The Babylon finds that reached Berlin in 1927, at any rate, included only 701 pieces from the Kasr N6 archive. More than 300 went somewhere else. Only a few have been relocated for study.

Seventeen Kasr N6 pieces that appear on the excavation photos have been identified in other collections: eleven in the Yale Babylonian Collection, three in the collection of the Kelsey Museum of Ancient and Medieval Archaeology at the University of Michigan, and one each in collections at the Free Library of Philadelphia, the British Museum, and the Museu Bíblic of the monastery of Montserrat, Spain. The certainty that these pieces came from the DOG excavation creates a strong presumption that other pieces in the same collections that can be assigned to the Kasr group on the basis of their appearance and contents, if they do not have a known pre-World War I provenance, also stem from the DOG excavations, even though they cannot be identified among the excavation photographs: two more texts in the Yale Babylonian Collection, one in the Nies Babylonian Collection at Yale, one in the collection of the Kelsey Museum, and two in the Montserrat collection.

I present here terse editions of these twenty-three scattered texts and fragments. Hundreds of other excavated Kasr N6 texts remain unaccounted for, and it is likely that some will be recognized in other private and public collections.

These texts are, of course, a sample formed only by the vicissitudes of war, occupation, and the antiquities trade, without meaningful implication for the structure of the archive or the history behind it. Some of the fragments, preserving nothing more than partial lists of witnesses, have no intrinsic interest except as comparanda with other Kasr texts. Nevertheless, even as an accidental sample, this is a fair representation of

5 H. R. Hall, A Season’s Work at Ur, al-‘Ubaid, Abu Shahrain (Eridu), and Elsewhere (London, 1930), pp. 50–53. See comments to no. 19, below.

Wiege früher Gelehrsamkeit, Mythos in der Moderne, Colloquien der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft 2 (Saarbrücken, 1999), pp. 242f.
the general appearance, contents, and characteristics of the archive as a whole. Almost all show severe fire damage, especially on one face (nos. 15, 17, and 19 are exceptions). Most are contracts involving the governor Bēlšunu, his subordinates, or associates, mostly recording various transactions connected with agricultural contracting, and these are on tablets in “horizontal” format (that is, with larger horizontal dimension than vertical dimension). A few are fragments of large tablets, originally in “vertical” format (that is, with larger vertical dimension than horizontal dimension), of the kind usual for sales, divisions, and conveyances of real estate (e.g., nos. 13, 21), and these are older than the texts involving Bēlšunu, by a few years or by a generation. Some have seal impressions with Hellenic or Greco-Persian styles and motifs (nos. 6, 16), and several have Aramaic epigraphs (nos. 3, 7, 8, 12) in a ductus surprisingly different from that of the nearly contemporary Murašû texts from Nippur.

**Yale Babylonian Collection**

*With Known Excavation Numbers*

1. YBC 11555 (fig. 1)  
   Hurbat-Šīhu  
   7/IX/5 Darius II  
   Bab 49388  
   Bab. Photo 2995  
   Pedersén N6 13  
   
   (reverse 1') LÚ mu-kin-nu m^KI-dAG-nu-ru (2') DUMU šá m^Ku-šur-a mŠEŠ.MEŠ-MU (3')  
   DUMU šá m^GI-a m^dAG-DIN-su (4') DUMU šá m^Nî-din-tum  
   
   (5') mBa-la-tu DUB.SAR DUMU šá m^dEN-it-tan-nu (6') [Hur1]-bat-Šī-i-ḫu ITI.GAN UD <<UD>>.7.KÂM MU.5.KÂM (7') mDa-a-ri-i-a-a-muš LUGAL KUR KUR  
   The obverse is entirely vitrified.

2. YBC 11552 (fig. 2)  
   Bab 54593  
   Bab. Photos 3101–2  
   Pedersén N6 86  
   
   (1) 20 MA.NA KÙ.BABBAR qa-lu-ú ina ŠÂM ŠE.NUMUN šá ina URU?[…] (2) šá m^dAMAR.UTU-NUMUN-DÙ DUMU šá m^EN-šú-na (3) a-na KÙ.[BABBAR] a-na m^EN-šú-na LÚ.NAM E.KI (4) DUMU šá m^dEN1-URU-[šú] il-din-nu m^dAMAR. UTU-NUMUN-DÙ (5) DUMU šá m^EN-šú-na i-na qa-av (6) m^EN-šú-na LÚ.NAM E.KI DUMU šá (7) m^dE[N]-URU-[šú ma-ḫi]-ir
(obverse) NA₂.KIŠIB / md-AMAR.UTU-NUMUN-DU (left edge) NA₂.KIŠIB / [...] (right edge) NA₂.KIŠIB / [...] (lower edge) [...]-MU.NA // [NA₂].KIŠIB / [...] (upper edge) NA₂.KIŠIB / md-AG-DIN-su-E

(1–7) Marduk-zêr-ibni, son of Bêlšunu, has received from Bêlšunu, governor of Babylon, son of Bêl-usuršu, 20 minas of fine silver as part of the purchase price of arable land located in the town of [...], which Marduk-zêr-ibni, son of Bêlšunu, sold to Bêlšunu, governor of Babylon, son of Bêl-usuršu.

Notes

1 The line continues around the right edge. The end is lost on the vitrified reverse.

2 I see no reason to surmise (as Pedersén, Archive und Bibliotheken in Babylon, p. 147, appears to do) that Marduk-zêr-ibni/Bêlšunu, the seller of the field and recipient of the payment, was the son of Bêlšunu/Bêl-usuršu, the buyer and payer. This Marduk-zêr-ibni, however, was a witness to one of the texts in the Murašû archive (BE 9 84:12 and upper edge = TuM 2–3 202, drafted at Nippur, 4/I/41 Artaxerxes I = 25 April 424 B.C.). His distinctive seal impression on that tablet (TuM 2–3 pl. 100 no. LXXVIII; see L. Bregstein, “Seal Use in Fifth Century B.C. Nippur, Iraq: A Study of Seal Selection and Sealing Practices in the Murašû Archive” [Ph.D. diss., University of Pennsylvania, 1993], no. 208) was made by the same seal as the impression on this one (M. W. Stolper, “The šaknu of Nippur,” JCS 40 (1988): 141, n. 32; “The Kasr Archive,” in H. Sancisi Weerdenburg and A. Kuhr, eds., Centre and Periphery: Proceedings of the Groningen 1986 Achaemenid History Workshop, Achaemenid History 4 [Leiden, 1990], p. 198).

The reverse is entirely vitrified.

3. YBC 11558 (fig. 3) Ālu ša Bêl 12/VIII/– Darius II
Bab 54693
Bab. Photos 3105–6
Pedersén N6 89

(obverse) (fragments of signs from the ends of two lines)

(reverse 1') LÚ mu-kin₄-nu mSILIM-E.KI A-šú šá (2) mKa-ṣîr mRî-bat DUMU šá (3) mBE-MU mRî-bat DUMU šá (4) mEN-ik-ṣur
Notes

FuB 14 13 f. no. 3 was written at the same place by the same scribe and before at least one of the same witnesses (Ribt/Bêl-ikṣur [sic]) on 21/VIII/14 Darius II = 1 December 410 B.C.

The Aramaic docket is very lightly incised, although the strokes are broad. Judging from the docket, the document is a receipt for a payment of barley.

The obverse and edges are entirely vitrified.

4. YBC 11586 (fig. 4) — —/—/— Darius II
Bab 55388
Bab. Photos 3164–65
Pedersén N6 372

(1) 1 GUR 3 (PI 2 (BÁN) ŠE.NUMUN me-re-šu šá ina URU Ń Ap-la-a (2) ni-din-tú LUGAL šá a-na mEN-šú-nu na-din (3) ŉ GIŠ.BAR šá mDURš-PAP A-šú šá mDÛ-a (4) mDURš-PAP ŠE.NUMUN a-na GIŠ.BAR (5) a-di 5 MU.AN.NA.MEŠ a-na MU.AN.NA (6) 5 GUR ŠE.BAR a-na mDEN-ku-šúr-šú (7) A-šú šá mDAG-EN-TUR id-din šá MU.AN.NA (8) ina ITI.SIG4 ŠE.BAR a4 5 GUR GIŠ.BAR A.ŠÁ (9) gam-mir-tum ina ma-ši-ḫu šá mDURš-PAP (10) ina İD EŠ-šú mDEN-ku-šúr-šú (11) a-na mDURš-PAP i-nam-din (lower edge 12) 1-en TA.ÅM šá-ta-ri TI-ū

(reverse 1') [...].KÁM (2') [...] mDa-ri-id-a-muš (upper edge 3') LUGAL KUR.KUR

(1–3) 1½ gur of cultivated arable land that is located in Bit Aplâ, a crown grant that was given to Bêlšunu, property leased to Uraš-šušir, son of Ibnâ—(4–7) Uraš-šušir leased the arable land to Bêl-kušuršu, son of Nabû-bêl-šêhri, for five years, for 5 gur of barley yearly. (7–11) Each year in month III, Bêl-kuşuršu will pay Uraš-nâšir those 5 gur of barley, the full rent for the field, determined by the measure of Uraš-nâšir, on the New Canal. (12) Each (party) has taken one copy of (this) document.

(reverse 2'–3') [... ] Darius, King of Lands.

Notes

**Notes**

1’ Continued from obverse.

2” Bertin 2312 rev. 3 (witness, year 14, Darius II, Dilbat).

The obverse and edges are entirely vitrified.

---

6. YBC 11562 (fig. 6)  

Bab 55045  

Bab. Photos 3141–42  

Pedersén N6 243

(1) 1 ME 50 GUR 1.ZÜ1.LUM.MA GIŠ.BAR A.ŠÀ.IMEŠ šá MA.7.KÁM MU.8.1.KÁM u MU.9.[KÁM šá] mDA-ra-ia-a-muš LUGAL  

(2) šá ŞE.NUMUN šá mŠi-ri-ia-a-muš šá AN.TA  

(3) URU GABA-šá-x-x-x ni-din-tú LUGAL šá a-na  

(4) mIs-si-pi-ta-am-ma 1.SUM.XA1 É GIŠ.BAR  

(5) šá mEN-šú-nu LÚ.NAM DIN.TIR. 

KI A-šú šá mDEN-ŠÉ-LAM.7.KÁM MU.8.KÁM šá mPA-ad-di-ia A-šú šá mHar]-ra]-ši-e-bi]  

(6) LÚ.ARAD šá mIs-si-pi-ta-am-ma ina ŠUL  

(7) mEN-šú-nu LÚ.NAM DIN.TIR. KI A-[šú šá] mDEN-ŠÉ-LAM ma-ži-ir e-šir  

(8) a-di ZÚ.LUM.MA 1.MU.17.KÁM MU.8.KÁM 1.MU.9.KÁM (12) šá mPA-ad-di-ia (reverse 13) 1.LÚ mu-kin-ni mDA-šá šá mDA-É-KÁD  

(14) mAG-ŠÉ.MEŠ-GI A-šú šá mDEN-MU.NU  

(15) mŶ-bal-liš-su-mdEN A-šú šá mMU-DU  

(16) mDU-MA 1.MU  

(17) mPa-ad-di-ia  

(18) 1.MU  

(19) 1.MU  

(20) mDA-ra-ia-a-muš LUGAL KUR.KUR  

(1–5) 150 gur of dates is the rent on fields for the years 7, 8, and 9 of King Darius, due on arable land of Siridiamuš3, located above the town of ..., (land) given to Issipitamma as a crown grant, a property leased to Bēšunu, governor of Babylon, son of Bēl-šuršu. (6–9) Paddija, son of Harrahēbi3, servant of Issipitamma, has received all those 150 gur of dates from Bēšunu, governor of Babylon, son of Bēl-šuršu; he is paid in full. (11–12) (The payment) includes dates owed to Paddija (himself?) for years 7, 8, and 9.

(13–17) Witnesses: Nabû-ittannu, son of Mār-Bētī-kāšir; Nabû-ahhē-ušallim, son of Nabû-ittannu; Ubāllissu-Bēl, son of Šum-ukīn; Šamaš-iddin4, son of Bēleš-x; Balātu, son of Bēl-ittannu.


(lower edge) <<[NA3.KIŠIB mPA-ad]-di-ia / A-šú šá mHar]-r]-a]-e-bi]>> (all erased)  

(upper edge) NA3.KIŠIB / mPA-ad-di-ia

(lower edge) Seal of Paddija, son of Harrahēbi3) (all erased), (upper edge) Seal of Paddija.
Notes

2 Siridiamuš (or: Sirikiamuš): presumably an Iranian name, perhaps compounded with -vaḫuš “good” (like Dārya-vaḫuš); conceivably compounded with *srī- “beauty, pride.” Tavernier (personal communication) suggests the possibility *Srīdiya-vaush- “challenging the good,” with srī- “to challenge.”

3 Perhaps URU Ē¹ GAR-MU¹, as in line 18.


The tablet is smoke-blackened. The reverse is partly vitrified.

7. YBC 11537 (fig. 7) Halpattu –/–/≠4∑± Artaxerxes II Bab 55760 401/400 B.C. Bab. Photos 3175–76 Pedersén N6 506

(1) 16 GUR 2 (PI) 3 (BÁN) ZÚ.LUM.MA ZAG.LU EBUR A.ŠÀ (2) šá ŠÈ.NUMUN šá DUMU LÚ.GĪ.R.LAL ū e-du-ū-tu (3) šá Ḥal-pat-tum.MEŠ È GIŠ.BAR šá mdUraš-PAP (4) A ṭDU-a ina muḫḫ-ḫī ṭmdEN-URU-šu A šá ṭmdEN-ana-mi-rî-[i]:l-tum (5) ina ITI. APIN MU.4.KÁM ZÚ.LUM.MA a ᵈ 16 GUR 2 (PI) 3 (BÁN) (6) gam-ru-tu <ina> Dilbat.KI ina GIŠ ma-ši-ḫu (7) šá mdUraš-PAP KI 1 GUR 1 (BÁN) 3 QA (8) i-piš-tum lib-lib-bi man-ga-ga (9) ū bil-tum šá ḫu-sab ina-an-din

(reverse 10) [LÚ.MU.KIN,] […] ṭdiːn(11) […] ṭnaʔ(12) […] ṭd trochę(13) […] μ[.] μ[.] μ[.] μ[.] μ[.]

(13) μ[.] μ[.] μ[.]

(14) Ḥal-pat-tum.KI […] ṭMU.4. KÁM(15) ṭĀr-tak-šat-lsu LUGAL KUR.KUR

(upper edge) Špūʿ tmrn krn 26 / zyʔ x k x zy br …

(1–4) 16½ gur of dates (is) the rent assessed on the crop for the land of the “swordbearer(s)” and the isolated palms of the people of (the town) Halpattu, (properties) held on lease by Uraš-nâṣîr, son of Ibnâ, (rent that is) owed by Bēl-ūṣuršu, son of Bēl-ana-mîrîtu. (5–9) In month VIII, year 4, he will pay those 16 gur of dates, all of them, <in> Dilbat, using the measure of Uraš-nâṣîr, (and)
with each gur (he will also pay) a premium of 1½ sātu, palm fronds, fiber, and a load of pieces of wood.

(10–12) Witnesses: […]-Bēl; […]

(13–15) [Scribe: …] Halpattu, [month x, day y], year 4?, Artaxerxes, King of Lands.

(upper edge) Document concerning 26 [sic] gur of dates, of ... , son of ... 

Notes

2 DUMU LŪ.Gīr.LAL = mār nāš paṭri or mār ṭābiḥi? The translation of this ambiguous writing reflects these conjectures: that DUMU is not genealogical but classificatory; that the term is honorific rather than professional; that the noun-phrase is a collective; and that it refers to a land-holding group, like the haṭru of “swordbearers” found in Murašû texts (see M. W. Stolper, Entrepreneurs and Empire: The Murašû Archive, the Murašû Firm, and Persian Rule in Babylonia, Uitgaven van het Nederlands Instituut voor het Nabije Oosten te Leiden, voorheen Publications de l’Institut historique-archéologique néerlandais de Stamboul 54 [Leiden, 1985], pp. 54 f. with n. 12). Moore Michigan Coll. 43:3 (no. 16 below) refers to “people of Halpattu” as members of a haṭru.

3 The ghost word edūtu should be stricken from the dictionaries; see Jursa Landwirtschaft, p. 38.

3 For the gentilic, see LŪ Ḥal-pat-ú-a Moore Michigan Coll. 43:3 (no. 16 below); for the place-name, see BM 40066:6 and VAT 15610:1.

6 For Dilbat in connection with Uraš-nāšir, see Stolper, “Late Achaemenid Texts from Dilbat,” pp. 120 f.

8 ipištu: see Landsberger Date Palm, p. 44; Stolper, “Late Achaemenid Texts from Dilbat,” pp. 130, 134; Jursa Landwirtschaft, p. 152. Since gimru, elletu, and ipištu appear in nearly identical phrases, and are identified by identical amounts, it is difficult to accept the disparity of meanings in the usual translations gimru = (transportation) expenses, elletu = upward adjustment (of the repayment measure), and ipištu = downward adjustment (of the measure).
8. YBC 11585 (fig. 8)  
Bab. Surru  
Bab 57468  
Pedersén N6 927  
Bab. Photo 3341  

(Reverse 1') LÚ.MU.KIN₇ m₀EN-ana-NE-tum A-šú šá mBu-na-nu (2') m₀AG-SUR  
A-šú šá m₀EN-MU (3') m₀EN-PAP A-šú šá m₀Bu-lat-a (4') m₀Bar-zip.KLa-a-a A-šú šá  
m₀AG-GAR.NU

(5) [m₀]AG-DIN-su-E LÚ.SID A-šú šá m₀Ri-bat (6') [UrU KÁ] lSur-ru¹ ITIBÁR  
UD.11.KĀM MU.9.KĀM (7) […]-x-x-muš LUGAL KUR.KUR.MEŠ

Notes

Rev. 1’ Bēl-ana-mīriḥtum/Bunānu: FuB 14 12 f. no. 2 rev. 2 (coll.), 24 f. no. 15 rev.  
3, 26 f. no. 18 rev. 4; Bab. 55038 rev. 8 (Pedersén N6 236); Bab. 55761:15  
(Pedersén N6 507).

Rev. 3’ Bēl-nāšir / Bulṭā: FuB 14 28 no. 20 rev. 2.

Rev. 5’ The same scribe recurs in FuB 14 19 no. 8 (coll.), Dar. 78, VAT 15714  
(Pedersén N6 252) (all at Bāb Surru), and Bab. 56340 (Pedersén N6 745) and  
55767 (Pedersén N6 513).

The obverse is entirely vitrified, with a green crust, showing illegible traces of  
4+x lines. The reverse is heavily burned and has a green surface. The upper left  
corner is melted, deformed, and broken. The Aramaic docket is lightly incised.

9. Oelsner AV 469 (fig. 9)  
YBC 11560  
Bab 57799  
PhBab 3341  
Pedersén N6 932

(1) MU.AN.NA 2 (Pl) 3 (BĀN) SUM.SAR m₀EN₁-[šú-nu] (2) A-šú šá m₀ŠEŠ-ú-nu  
kur-fūl la e-pe-Išú₁ (3) šá piš-ki-šū a-na m₀Uš-kar-ri (4) LÚ.ARAD šá m₀EN-šú-nu  
i-nam-din (5) pu-ut la e-pe-šú šá piš-ki šá! (6) m₀EN-šú-nu A-šú šá m₀ŠEŠ-ú-nu  
m₀Uš-kar-ri (7) na-ši

(reverse 8) LÚ m₀[u-kin-nu …]

(1–7) Each year Bēlšunu, son of Ahūnu, will pay Uškarri, servant of Bēlšunu,  
½ gur of onions in compensation for no unwarranted assessment being made
against him (lit. no harm being done him). Uškarri guarantees that no unwarranted assessment will be made against Bēlšunu, son of Ahunu.

(8) Witnesses: ....

Notes


The reverse (not copied) is vitrified. The obverse is an even medium gray with some incrustation in the signs. There is a green crust over the reverse and edges. On the upper edge are black marks, possibly traces of a faded or effaced Aramaic docket.

The excavation photographs of the Kasr N6 texts show another guarantee against pisku (Bab. 55156, Pedersén N6 280, present whereabouts unknown), only partially legible to me:

(1) MU.AN.NA 1-en TÜG gu-la-nu (2) ana ku-ú pi-iš-ki-šú ḫi-x (3) DUMU.SAL šá mdAG-GAR.NU TA ŠU x x x (4) a-na ḫdBa-ni-tum UŠ.BAR x x (5) x šá mŠU-a ta-nam-din (6) ḫpu?-ur1 LÚ x-tum šá ḫdBa-ni-tum? x (7) ḫpu?-ur1 pi-iš-ki šá ḫHi-x (8) ḫdBa1-ni-tum UŠ.BAR ŠU x x x (reverse destroyed)

(1–5) (Each) year, Hi-..., daughter of Nabû-iškunu, ... will give Banītu, the weaver, ... of Eriba, one outer garment. (6–8) Banītu, the weaver ..., (guarantees) against7 (claims of x) against Banītu, (and) against unwarranted assessment (lit. harm) against Hi-x.

10. YBC 11554 (fig. 10) — /XII/2 Artaxerxes II

Bab 58307

Bab. Photos 3395–96

Pedersén N6 950

(1) mim-ma dib-bi di-nim u ra-ga-mu šá mRi-bat (2) A-šú šá mĦa-ri-ša-nu ana muh-хи 3.TA GIŠ.BAN.MEŠ (3) šá LÚ Ta-lab?1-ba-še-e šá ina URU É Da-di-ia (4) šá ina URU É GIŠ.GU.ZA šá ina URU E-bu-ri-ia (5) šá ina SU II šá1 mŠU-a LÚ.NAM DIN.TIR.KI šá ana GIŠ.BAR (6) [TA?] MU.1.KÅM mAr-tak-sat-su LUGAL TA ŠU II (7) [...] NUMUN-SI.SÁ <KI?> mŠU-a ana u₂-mu ša-a-tim (8) [ia-a-nu ...] MU.MEŠ mRi-bat i-na CGI mŠU-a (9) [...] x Iša-ḫar1 šá e-lat 2] MA.NA KU.BABBAR (10) [...] x x

(reverse 11) [...] x-a (12) [(...)] (13) [...] x mdEN-da-nu (14) [...] mNi-din-tum.dAG (15) [...] m[... BE-KÁD
KASR TEXTS: EXCAVATED—BUT NOT IN BERLIN

(16) [...] A-šú šá mMu-šal-lim-d AMAR.UTU (17) [...] [ITI.ŠE] [IGI-ú] MU.2.KÁM
(18) mAr-tak-sát-šu LUGAL KUR.KUR

(upper edge) un qa / mRi-bat // NA₄.KIŠIB / mdAG-MU.NU

(1–7) [There will be no] lawsuit, legal action, or complaint [brought] by Rìbat, son of Harišánu, regarding three bow properties, which belong to the … , which are located in the towns of Bît Dádiya, Bît Kussê, and Bît Eburûja, which are in the possession of Erîba, governor of Babylon, which were leased from …-zêr-lîšir as of² year 1 of King Artaxerxes—against Erîba, ever. (8–10) Rìbat […] this […] in the presence of Erîba […] document’ that is aside from 2½ minas of silver.…

(11–15) [Witnesses: …] Bèl-dànu; […] Ni[dintu-Nabû; […] Ea-kâšir.

(16–18) [Scribe: …] son of Mušallim-Marduk. [….] first month XII, year 2, Artaxerxes, King of Lands.

(upper edge) Ring of Rìbat. Seal of Nabû-ittannu.

Notes

3 Ṭabbašê or Dabbašê: presumably a gentilic.

5 Erîba piḫat Bâbîlî = mSU-a LÚ.NAM DIN.TIR.KI A-šú šá mEN-šú-nu Bab 55767:1 f. (Pédersén N6 513; date and place lost); mdAMAR.UTU-SU LÚ.NAM E.KI VAT 15946:3 (Pédersén N6 123; date and place lost); mdAMAR.UTU-SU […] A-šú šá mEN-šú-nu LÚ pa-ha-ti DIN.T[IR.KI] Aula Orientalis 15 185 no. 36:3’ f. (see no. 23 below, year 4, Darius II). In the last, the title “governor of Babylon” applies to the father, Bêlšunu. His son (Marduk)-erîba succeeded as governor of Babylon when Bêlšunu became governor of Syria early in the reign of Artaxerxes II, 407 B.C. or earlier.

This succession may have been a stage in a long history of the family’s service in Achaemenid provincial administration, if Pédersén is right to identify Aḫušunu/Lâbâši, governor (LÚ.GAR.KU, šakin ūmû) of Borsippa, as the grandfather of Bêlšunu (Archive und Bibliotheken in Babylon, p. 146). For reasons to hesitate over this identification, however, see M. W. Stolper, “Achaemenid Legal Texts from the Kasr: Interim Observations,” in Renger, ed., Babylon: Focus, p. 371.

17 Intercalary Addaru occurs in year 2 of all three Artaxerxeses. There is no space for the indication of a day between the month and the regnal year.

The left side and almost all of the reverse are vitrified.
11. YBC 11550 (fig. 11) — –/(2) Darius II
Bab 58594
Bab. Photos 3398–99
Pedersén N6 961

(1) 2 (PI) 3 (BÁN) saḫ-le-e šá mEN-šú-nu (2) pi-ḥat E.KI A-šú šá mDE-EN-UBU-šú
re-ḫi GIŠ.BAR (3) saḫ-le-e šá MU.2.KÁM mDa-ri-ia-muš (4) ina muḫ-ḫi
mDAG-i-di-šu A-šú šá mDE-EN-DIN-iš (5) ina ITIL.SIG4.MU.3.KÁM saḫ-le-e a₄ (6) 2
(PI) 131 (BÁN) ina GIŠ ma-šī-hu šá mEN-šú-nu (7) mDAG-i-di-šu a-na mDE-EN-MU.
NU (8) LÚ.ARD šá mEN-šú-nu i-nam-din

(reverse 1') [...] (2') [...] muḫ-niššu šú-re-šú-ba (3'–5') [...] (vitrified)

(1–4) ½ gur of cress-seed is owed to Bēšunu, governor of Babylon, son of Bēlu-
ùršu, as the balance of the rent due in cress-seed for year 2 of Darius, by
Nabû-idšu, son of Bēl-uballit. (5–8) In month III, year 3, Nabû-idšu will pay
that ½ gur of cress-seed, using the measure of Bēlušunu, to Bēl-ittannu, servant of
Bēšunu.

(9–17) [...] servant of Bēšunu [...] Notes

7f. Bēl-ittannu, servant of Bēšunu: FuB 14 12 f. no. 2:1; Iraq 4 17:2 f.; K.8485:1 f.
(= Rich 109); Pedersén, Archive und Bibliotheken in Babylon, p. 147.
The reverse is entirely vitrified.

Without Known Excavation Numbers

12. YBC 11532 (fig. 12) — Kār-Nabû 19/XII/16 Darius II
4 April 407 B.C.
(1) 1 GUR 1 PI ŠE.BAR bab-ba-šu-tum (2) šá mDE-URAS-na-šir A-šú šá mDŪ-a
(3) ina muḫ-ḫi mDE-EN-AXA-UBU (4) A-šú šá mDE-AG-DIN-su mRI-bat (5) A-šú šá
mDE-DUMU-È-MU (6) ina ITIL.GUD MU.17.KÁM (7) ŠE.BAR a₄ 1 GUR 1 PI (8) ina GIŠ
ma-šī-hu šá mDE-Urš-PAP (lower edge 9) ina URU KAR-ri-dAG (10) i-nam-din-nu-
(reverse 11) pu-ut e-tē-ru šá ŠE.BAR a₄ (12) 1 GUR 1 PI mNI-hiš-tum-dEN-ta-bat (13)
A-šú šá mDE-DUMU-È-MU na-šī

(14) LÚ mu-kīn-nu mDE-EN-DIN-su (15) A-šú šá mLib-lat (16) mNU.UR A-šú šá mDE-
MU.NU (17) mARAD-dEDIN-ù-a A mDE-EN-MU.NU (18) mDE-DŪ LÚ.SID a mDE-AG-DIN-su (upper edge 19) URU KAR-ri-dAG ITIL.ŠE UD.120
1-LAL.1.KÁM (20) MU.16.KÁM mDa-ri-ia-imuš (21) LUGAL KUR.KUR
1 gur, 1 *pānu* of fine barley is owed to Uraš-nāšir, son of Ibnâ, by Bēl-apil-ušur, son of Nabû-bullissu (and) Ribat, son of Mār-Bīti-iddin. They will pay that 1 gur, 1 *pānu* of barley, using the measure of Uraš-nāšir, at Kār-Nabû. Nīhišṭu-Bēl-ṭābat, son of Mār-Bīti-iddin, assumes warranty for the repayment of that 1 gur, 1 *pānu* of barley.

Witnesses: Bēl-bullissu, son of Libluṭ; Lābāšī, son of Bēl-ittannu; Arad-Šerūa, son of Bēl-ittannu.


Nīhišṭu-Bēl-ṭābat, year 16.

Notes

Cf. Dar. 364 with the same creditor, written by the same scribe, at the same place, three days earlier.


The tablet is burned. The right side of the obverse is vitrified. The Aramaic docket was incised with an instrument that caused some strokes to appear as double strokes.

13. YBC 11600 (fig. 13) Borsippa 30/XI/27 Artaxerxes I

15 February 437 B.C.
Notes

The obverse and the upper, left, and right edges are entirely vitrified. There are illegible traces of ten or more lines on the obverse. The lower edge and corners are deformed, the reverse cracked. The upper part and left side of the reverse are vitrified and deformed, the remainder of reverse burned black, red, or pale gray.

NIES BABYLONIAN COLLECTION

14. NBC 8394 (fig. 14) — [−/−/36−39 Artaxerxes I] (430–426 B.C.)

(1) 3 ME 30 GUR ŠE.BAR šá mEN-šú-nu A-šú šá mDE-n-ÚRU-šú (2) ina muḫ-ḫi mRÎ- 
bat A-šú šá mDA.G-di-i-ni-an-na TA UD.1.KÁM (3) šá İT.APIN šá MU.39.<KÁM> 
ŠE.BAR a₄ 3 ME 30 GUR (4) a-di 3 MU.AN.NA.MEŠ ina SAG.DU-šú KI GIŠ.BAR 
šá (5) GIŠ.APIN šá ina IG-I-šú mRÎ-bat a-na mEN-šú-nu (6) i-nam-din ki-i a-di 3 
MU.AN.NA.MEŠ ŠE.BAR a₄ (7) 3 ME 30 GUR mRÎ-bat a-na mEN-šú-nu (8) la ır-
ta-din ḫib-bu-ū a-ra-na-tum šá (9) İT.APIN šá MU.39.KÁM a-na ṭup₁-pu 10 GUR 
ŠE.BAR (10) a-na 1 MA.NA KÜ.BABBAR mRÎ-bat a-na mEN-šú-nu (11) i-nam-din 
e-lat GIŠ.APIN šá GIŠ.BAR šá ina IG-I-šú

(1–2) 330 gur of barley is owed to Bēlšunu, son of Bēl-usuršu, by Ribat, son 
of Nabû-dinianna. (2–6) Beginning day 1, month VIII, year 39, Ribat will pay 
Bēlšunu that 330 gur of barley in its full original amount, along with the rent for 
the plowing unit that is in his possession, over the course of 7 three years. (6–11) 
If Ribat has not paid that 330 gur of barley to Bēlšunu over the course of 7 three 
years, Ribat will pay Bēlšunu (in silver) at the rate of exchange prevailing in 
month VIII of year 39, paying 10 gur of barley per mina of silver for the extra 
time. (11) (This obligation) is over and above (the matter of) the plowing unit 
that he holds on lease.

Notes

5, 11 GIŠ.APIN refers to a rented package including land, plow, team, and workers; see 
Stolper, “The Kasr Texts, the Rich Collection, the Bellino Copies and the Grote-
fend Nachlass,” p. 532 to Bellino Q 1.


9 I know of no exactly comparable clauses, but ṭuppu in ana ṭuppi can only have 
the same sense as ṭuppu in adi ṭuppišu and ina ṭuppišu in clauses referring 
to extended terms of payment; see M. Rowton, “Ťuppu and the Date of
旅途之地：发掘——但不在柏林


Formally, the text is a promissory note. The note must be a companion to a lease issued at about the same time. Bēlšunu leased to Rîbat a property referred to simply as a plow, presumably for a term of three years. This note obligates Rîbat either to pay a further 110 gur of barley per year along with the annual rent stipulated in that lease or else to pay a larger amount after the term of the lease has expired. In the latter case, he is to pay in silver, at the rate of equivalence that pertained at the beginning of the lease, and with a premium for the extension of the terms of payment. To calculate the premium, the 330 gur of barley are to be converted into silver at the specified exchange rate, then for each mina of silver that results, 10 more gur of barley are to be converted into silver at the same rate and added to the original amount. The premium of 10 gur per mina = 3 qû per shekel is well below the 12 qû per shekel found in Nbk. 82 and 112, VAS 4 22 and 28, and the 18 qû per shekel in OECT 10 70 (all from the reign of Nebuchadnezzar).

The reverse is entirely vitrified. The source from which the text was acquired is unknown; it was entered in the catalogue of the NBC in 1944.
KELSEY MUSEUM OF ANCIENT AND MEDIEVAL ARCHAEOLOGY, ANN ARBOR, MICHIGAN

With Known Excavation Numbers

15. Moore Michigan Coll. 46 Borsippa 22/-3 Artaxerxes II
KM 89396 Bab 55039
Bab. Photos 3141–42
Pedersén N6 237


(reverse 1') […] x A x […] (2') […]-ŪRU A mEN-DIN-su E […] (3') […]-dUraš A mARAD-dUraš […] (4') [m]dEN]-AD-ŪRU A mHaš₃'-da-a m[…]

(5') mAG-AXA-ŪRU DUB.SAR A mEN-ib-ni [([…])] (6') BÁR.SIPA.KI ÍI'TI₁[X] UD.22. KÁM MU.3.KÁM (7) mAr-tak-shat-su LUGAL KUR.KUR

(reverse) un-qu mEN-e-te-[ru] (upper edge) NA₄.KIŠIB mAG-AD-ŪRU

(1–3) 1 gur of undeveloped arable land, which is part of the arable land belonging to Ispaºudu, son of [AtebagΩ], located in (the district called) the Dais of MΩr-BÏti, adjoining the field of BËl-Ëøir, son of […] and adjoining the field of RÏm'út-BËl, son of Iddinâ—(4–5) Ispa’udu, son of Atebagã, turned (that) property over to Nabû-bullissu, son of Nabû-iddin, for 20 years, for the planting of a date orchard. (6–9) Until the end of those 20 years, however much (of an orchard) Nabû-bullissu, son of Nabû-iddin, plants, every year Nabû-bullissu [will pay] Ispa’udu, son of Atebagã, 6 shekels of silver in lieu of the crop from the property. (10–11) [The property is in the possession of Nabû-bullissu as of] month I, year 4 of King Artaxerxes.

7 Digital images of the Kelsey tablets are available (as of December, 2006) at http://128.97.154.154/cdli/kelsey/km_browse.html.
KASR TEXTS: EXCAVATED—BUT NOT IN BERLIN

(1–4') Witnesses: ... ...]-uœur, son of Bēl-balāssu-iqbi; [...]-Uraš, son of Arad-Uraš; [Bēl]-ab-uœur, son of Hašdā; [...].


(reverse) Ring of Bēl-ẹtēru. (upper edge) Seal of Bēl-ab-uœur.

Notes

1 bar-rat: see Stolper, “Late Achaemenid Texts from Dilbat,” pp. 132–34.

1, 4, 9 Is-pa-ū?–du: in all three places -ū?– looks unlike -ū in lines 6 (mi-nu-ū) and 8 (ku-ū). The same name appears in FuB 14 15 no. 4 lower edge (coll.), in the caption of a seal in Hellenic style, where the sign resembles LŪ more than Ū, but the clearly Iranian patronym argues against a name containing -l-. If correctly read, Ispa’uudu represents Iranian *Vispa-vada- or *Vispa-vāda- (R. Zadok, review of M. A. Dandamayev, *Iranians in Achaemenid Babylonia*, Columbia Lectures on Iranian Studies 6 [Costa Mesa, California, 1992], in *BSOAS* 58 [1995]: 158; Tavernier, “Iranica in de Achaemenidische Periode,” p. 610).


5, 7 Nabû-bullissu/Nabû-iddin: *FuB* 14 15 no. 4 rev. 4 (scribe).

The tablet had no clear fire damage, beyond a faint orange discoloration on the upper part of the obverse and some incrustation on the reverse; prior to modern baking, the core was unfired.

16. Moore Michigan Coll. 43 Babylon 15/IV/14 Darius II
   KM 89392 28 July 410 B.C.
   Bab 55044
   Bab. Photos 3141–42
   Pedersén N6 242

(1) 3 MA.NA KÜ.BABBAR a-na taš-li-in-du (2) šá 14 MA.NA KÜ.BABBAR ina il-ki
(3) šá LŪ Ḥal-pat-ū-a šá LŪ ḫa-at-ri (4) šá LŪ ú-ra-šū šá É LŪ,IGI+DUB (5) šá
ina ŠU\[1]\ m[5]EN-SU LŪ šak-nu šá LŪ <ū>-ra-šū (6) šá É LŪ,IGI+DUB DUMU šá

(1–12) Idanni-Nabû, the […], son of Nanâ-iddin, and [Bēl-ittanna], servant of Bēl-erîba, acting on the instruction of Bēl-erîba, have received [from Uraš-nāšir, son of] Ibnâ, 3 minas of silver as the final installment on 14 minas of silver, for the taxes due from the people of Halpattu who belong to the æaøru-association of urΩåu-workers of the mašennu-official’s estate, who are under the control of Bēl-erîba, the overseer of the urΩåu-workers of the mašennu-official’s estate, son of Bēl-ittanna, (taxes due) for year 14 of King Darius. (12–14) They will [enter the receipt of the said 3 minas of silver] in the records of Bēl-erîba and provide (confirmation of the entry) to Uraš-nāšir.

(14–17) Witnesses: [(…)]; Bēl-ēreš, son of Hašdâ; Bēl-lûmur, son of Iqîpu; Iddinâ, son of Iqîšâ; Itti-Bēl-nuḫšu, son of Bēl-ētîr.


Notes

3 See YBC 11537:3 and 14 (no. 7 above).
5 Bēl-erîba/Bēl-ittanna: FuB 14 25 no. 16 rev. 3 (witness).
15 Bēl-ēreš/HAšdā: FuB 14 11 no. 1 rev. 1, Moore Michigan Coll. 45:8 (see no. 17 below).

Upper Edge, Right Edge The seals of Itti-Bēl-nuḫšu and Iddinâ are both Hellenic in motif and style, both showing standing, naked male figures (fig. 15).

The tablet was burned but not vitrified. The upper edge, upper part of the obverse, and lower part of the obverse were deep red before modern baking, the lower part of the obverse, lower edge, and upper part of the reverse green and dark gray-green, the core dark red.
Kelsey 89395 25 June 409 B.C.
Bab 58069
Bab. Photos 3395–96, Pedersén N6 946

(1) 8 GUR ŠE.BAR šá ṭuš?? ū tu² 1 tum (2) GIŠ.BAR A.ŠA šá ŠE.NUMUN É GIŠ.BAN šá TA¹ (text: GUD) MU.13.KÁM MU.14.KÁM MU.15.KÁM [MU.16¹.KÁM]³ šá mNa-za-zi-ú DUMU šá mEN-Nú-nu (4) ina <na>–dš–par-tum šá mUraš-PAP DUMU šá mIb-na-a (5) mNa-za-zi-ú DUMU šá mEN-šu-nu (6) ina ŠUL² mEN-inà-E-sag-il-IGI (7) [u mš-x₃-lg⁴-mÉ-PAP ma-ḫi-ir (erasure)

(reverse 8) [LÚ.MU.KIN² mÉN-KÁM DUMU šá mHaš-da-a-a (9) [ ...-f]l A-šú šá mARAD-dU.GUR (10) [mÉN-xl⁴ DUMU šá mBE-MU (11) mÉN-DÚ DUMU šá mDIN (12) mÉN-ŠE.NUMUN³ DUMU šá mMU-dÉN

(13) mÉN-inà-E-sag-il-IGI LÚ.SID (14) A-šú šá mSILIM-E.KI URU É Gir¹-da²? (upper edge 15) ITI.SIG⁴ UD.23.KÁM MU.15.KÁM (16) mDa-ri-ia-a-muš LUGAL

(left edge) un-qu / […]

(1–7) Nazaziu, son of Bēlšunu, acting on an authorization of Uraš-nāšir, son of Ibnā, has received from Bēl-inà-Esagil-lumur and …-Bēl-usur 8 gur of barley of …, rent for fields, due on the arable land of a bow-tenancy, (rent) that is from² years 13, 14, 15, and 16, that is owed to Nazaziu, son of Bēlšunu.

(8–13) [Witnesses:] Bēl-èreš, son of Ḥašdaja; [ …]-il, son of Arad-Nergal; Bēl-x, son of Ea-iddin; Bēl-ibni, son of Balātu; Bēl-zēri, son of Iddin-Bēl.


(left edge) Ring [of Nazaziu³].

Notes

1 Abraded; the signs are not as clear as in Moore’s copy. Cf. AHw., p. 1253 and CAD Š/III s.v. šištu.

2 The line continues around the edge to the reverse, as in YBC 11562:1 (see no. 6 above). [MU.16¹.KÁM] if correctly read) is on the right edge, below the level of line 2, partially obscured by the final -a of mIb-na-a, line 4.

4 Authorizations termed našpartu (našpaštu) ordinarily come from the ultimate creditor, and the recipient acting on the authorization is a servant (ardu, qallu) or bailiff (paqdu) of the creditor. Here, therefore, Uraš-nāšir is the ultimate creditor,
Nazaziu a tenant, and the payer a subtenant. Alternatively, the *našpartu* may be of a different sort, not an authorization from the creditor, but a letter-order from a tenant (*Uraš-nāšir*) authorizing his agent (*Bēl-ina-Esagil*) to pay the creditor (*Nazaziu*) on his behalf. The choice depends in part on the correct reading of line 7, where collation does not support, for example, ŠLÚ¹ *paq*-¹ *du*¹ šá¹¹ md*URAŠ¹*-PAP.

8  Bēl-ēreš/Ḫašdā: *FuB* 14 11 no. 1 rev. 1; Moore Michigan Coll. 43:15 (see no. 16 above).


Left Edge Impression of a ring, indistinct, half preserved.

The tablet was burned, but not vitrified, with (before modern baking) black and red discoloration across the obverse and a gray core.

Without Known Excavation Number

18.  Moore Michigan Coll. 49 — — /-/– Darius II

KM 89401

(1)  a-*lna?* UD¹.3 KÁM šá ITI.[X MU.Y.KÁM šá] (2)  mDa-ri-a-muš [LAGAL (…)]

(3)  A-šá šá mdEN-MU.NU ID-[… mdUraš-PAP] (4)  A-šú šá mDÚ-a a-na

(5)  muḫ-ḫi ŠE NUMUN [zaq-pu¹] šá GÚ īD [dTaš]-me-tum <*<ana’>*> mdEN-DÚ

(6)  iq-bu¹ šú-šú-šú-(9) um-ma ŠE NUMUN at-ta-šu-šu-[šú-šú-šú-(7) ār-ki mdEN-DÚ mu-kal-lim-tum

(7)  iš-šá-am-ma (8)  it-ti mdUraš-PAP la? [(x)] īr² šú² šú² (9) ŠE NUMUN šú-a-tim šá

(10)  mI(text IM)-ma di-i-ni u ra’-ga-m[u šá] (lower edge 11)

(11)  mdEN-DÚ A-šú šá mdEN-MU.[NU (…)] (12)  ina muḫ-ḫi ŠE NUMUN zaq-pi šá [GÚ]

(reverse 13) īD dTaš-me-tum it-ti [(…)] (14) mdUraš-PAP A-šú šá mDÚ-a a-na u₄-mu

(15)  ša-a-tum ia-a-nu

(16)  LÚ.MU.KIN₇ mdEN-MU A-šú šá mdAG-ŠEŠ-MU.NU (17) md[…]-MU-MU A-šú šá

(18)  mX-X-X

(19)  NA₄,KI[ŠIB] / m[…]

(reverse)  šṭr […]

(1–6) On² day 3 of month [x, year y of King] Darius […] Bēl-ibnī, son of Bēl-

iteitannu, <lodged a complaint? > a[gainst] Uraš-nāšir, ] son of Ibnā, concerning arable land planted with date palms that is located on the bank of the Tašmētu Canal, (and) Bel-ibni said: “That property belongs to me”– (7–9) subsequently, Bēl-ibnī produced a document to demonstrate (his claim), but … not² with Uraš-nāšir. (9–15) That property belongs to Uraš-nāšir. Bēl-ibnī, son of Bēl-
ittannu, will have no complaint or legal claim against Uraš-nāšir, son of Ibñā, regarding the arable land planted with date palms that is on the [bank] of the Tašmētu Canal, ever.

(16-17) Witnesses: Bēl-iddin, son of Nabû-ah-ittannu; [...]¬um-iddin [...].

Notes

The issue and outcome are clear, but the terms in which the issue is introduced are not. I am unable to find convincing restorations of the phrasing of lines 1–4, or the apparent verb at the end of line 8.

1  a-Ina(?): traces, like the published copy, allow a-Idīl.

3  ID-[…]: restoring id-[bu-ub-ma] or another form of dabābu, puts the verb in an odd position that would make the phrase difficult to understand. Restoring it-[ti (…)], in addition to leaving a space unaccounted for in the middle of line 3, also leaves no place for an accompanying form of dabābu or another verb.

5  Before the Personenkeil of ñdEN-DŪ is another sign, perhaps ana (DIŠ), less likely šā. If it is šā, I see no plausible interpretation. If it is ana, it requires an unlikely change of subject from the apparent plaintiff, Bēl-ibni, to the respondent, Uraš-nāšir: “[Bēl-ibni lodged a complaint] and Uraš-nāšir said as follows about the field….”

6  at-ta-ú-a as in copy.

Reverse The traces of an Aramaic docket, not represented in the published copy, are lightly incised.

Left edge The impression of a circular stamp seal shows a standing bearded figure facing right, holding a standing winged lion by the throat with his left hand, stabbing it in the belly with a weapon in his right hand.

The lower half and right side of the reverse, the upper edge, and the upper part of the obverse are vitrified. The edges are burned green, and most of the obverse is burned red.
19. BM 116622 (fig. 16) Bit Bârê 28/-/13 Darius II
1924-5-6, 1 411/410 B.C.
Bab 55126
Bab. Photos 3146–47
Pedersén N6 267

(1) […] (2) x […] x (3) šá x […]-x-dAG (4) 2x x […] ÌD Ri-bat (5) É GIS.BAR šá mdUrâš-PAP A-šú šá m]DÚ-a u mGu-zi-ia (6) mdUrâš-PAP u mGu-zi-ia SES.NUMUN. MEŠ a4 zaq-pî (7) u bar-rat-tum. MEŠ NIG.GA LUGAL a-na GIS.BAR a-di-i (8) 4.TA MU.AN.NA.MEŠ a-na MU.AN.NA 1 ME 50 GUR (9) [ZÜ.LUM.MA …] x-ru-ni-mu a-na (10) […]-I LUGAL-DÚ1 u mdEN-ISUM.NA1

(reverse 1') x […] (2') ina muḫ-ḫi ìD Eš-Îšú1 [i.-nam]-I din-nu-’ TA IT1.x šá1 (3') MU.13.KÁM SES.NUMUN ina IGI-šú nu ina MU.13.KÁM (4') 1 ME 60 GUR ZÜ.LUM. MA i-nam-din-nu-’ 1-en pu-ur (5') šá-ni-e na-šu-ú šá qê-reb i-ti-ir a-šar (6) mdUrâš-PAP u mGu-zi-ia še-bu-ú in-na-⟨te⟩-ru’-

(7) LÚ.MU.KIN10 mNi-din-tú,dUrâš A-šú šá mARAD.dUrâš (8') mdEN-lu-mur A-šú šá mNi-din-tú mdEN-KAM3 A-šú šá (9') [mdx-x]1 mTab-tan-ni-e-a A-šú šá mDIN

(10') […] LÚ.SUMER A-šú šá mdEN-DIN-īt URU É LÚ.ḪAL.ME (11') [IT1.x UD].28.KÁM MU.13.KÁM mDar-ia-a-muš (12') [LUGAL KUR.KUR]

(1–5) [(Arable land) … … (located on)] the Canal of Ribat, held on lease by Urâš-nâṣir, son of Ibnâ, and Güzîja: (6–10) Urâš-nâṣir and Güzîja have [given] that arable land, planted with date palms and undeveloped parcels, property of the king, [on lease] to x-šar-ukin and Bîl-itanna […] for four years, for an annual (rent) of 150 gur [of dates] …

(1–3') [They will pay (the annual rent) …] on the New Canal. The land is at their disposal [as of month x.] year 13. (3'–4') In year 13, they will pay 160 gur of dates. (4–6) Each assumes warranty for the other. Whoever is available will pay. Urâš-nâṣir and Güzîja will be paid wherever they wish.

(7–9') Witnesses: Nidintu-Urâš, son of Arad-Urâš; Bîl-lîmur, son of Nidintu; Bîl-eresh2, son of …; Tabtannêa, son of Balûtû.

(10'–12') Scribe: […] , son of Bîl-uballit. Bit Bârê, [month x], day 28, year 13, Darius, [King of Lands].

oi.uchicago.edu

MATTHEW W. STOLPER

BRITISH MUSEUM
Notes

The text was obtained by Sir Arnold T. Wilson, Chief Civil Commissioner in Iraq in the period immediately after World War I. It was presented to the British Museum by C. L. Woolley.

6 Cf. Gùzija ardu ša Bëlšunu (= Gwzy) (tenant of date orchard) TCL 13 208:5 and reverse.

6’ For the spelling of the verb, cf., e.g., ašar PN şebû in-na-te-<ru>- ’ K.8485:8, ašar PN şebû i-na-ṭir Bab. 55387:14 (Pedersén N6 371). Here, as in, e.g., FuB 14 11 no. 1:10, the clause overrides the previous specification of the time and place at which the rent is to be paid.

10’ BÏt BΩrê in Kasr texts, e.g., FuB 14 11 no. 1; OECT 10 140.

The tablet has no visible fire damage, apart from a faint red patch on the obverse.
An obligation for 5 gur of barley owed to Hûru, son of Iltagubâti, by Bêl-balâssu-iqbi, son of Bêl-etêru: Haådâ, son of Bêl-usuršu, acting on an authorization from Hûru, has received 1 gur of barley of it from Bêl-balâssu-iqbi.

Witnesses: Nabû-nâšir, son of Bêl-ibni; Mînû-Bêl-dânû, son of Nabû-balâssu-iqbi; Bêl-ittija-silim, servant of Erîba.


Notes


10 Bêl-ittija-silim: ZA 79 93:7, 10, with note on p. 95.

12 ZA 79 93:22.

The tablet shows no sign of severe fire damage.
With Known Excavation Number

21. Aula Orientalis 15 187 no. 38

Museum Biblíc, Monsterrat 8

The obverse, edges, and most of the reverse are entirely vitrified, black and green.

Without Known Excavation Numbers

22. Aula Orientalis 15 186 no. 37

Bab Surru

(12'-15') Nabû-balāssu-iqbi, scribe, son of Bēl-u[...]. Bāb Surru. Month XI, day 10+x, [year x ..., King of Land].

The obverse and edges are vitrified, dark green to black.

23. Aula Orientalis 15 185 no. 36 — –/I/4 Darius II

MM 1145  420/419 B.C.

(1') TA ITI.BÁR MU.4.KÁM mDa-[ri-ia-a-muš LUGAL] (2') Agiatan ina? Ilkišu ina MU.AN.NA […] (3') 5 GIN KÚ.BABBAR a-na mndAMAR,UTU-SU [(…)] (4') A-šū šá mEN-šú-ru LÚ pa-ḫa-ti DIN.T[IR.KI] (5') i-nam-din

(1'-5') Beginning in month I, year 4 of Darius [the King], the field is in his possession. He will pay to Marduk-erība, son of Bēšunu, governor of Babylon, 5 shekels of silver per year for his ilku obligation.

2’ The reading of the first signs, over erasures, is uncertain. Also possible is ḤAR. ilkišu, hence “he will pay 5 shekels of silver as interest on his ilku obligation.”

3’f. See comments to YBC 11554:5 (see no. 10 above).

All preserved surfaces are black. The reverse and most edges were melted and cooled into a convex blob with rough, bubbled surface.
Figure 1. YBC 11555

Figure 2. YBC 11552
Figure 3. YBC 11558
Figure 4. YBC 11586
Figure 5. YBC 11557
Figure 6. YBC 11562
Figure 7. YBC 11537
Figure 8. YBC 11585

Figure 9. Oelsner AV 469 (YBC 11560)
Figure 11. YBC 11550
Figure 13. YBC 11600
Figure 14. NBC 8394

Figure 15. Moore Michigan Coll. 43, Upper Edge, Right Edge
Figure 16. BM 116622
SISTERLY ADVICE ON AN ENDANGERED MARRIAGE IN AN OLD ASSYRIAN LETTER

K. R. Veenhof, Universiteit Leiden

I. INTRODUCTION

Most of the tablets found in the archives of the Old Assyrian traders settled in the commercial district of the ancient Anatolian city of Kanesh concern their business, overland trade. Because the traders belonged to family firms, relatives also appear in their records, including mothers, wives, sisters, daughters, and daughters-in-law. Many references to the latter reflect their involvement in trade, notably as producers of woolen textiles, which they sent to Anatolia; thus women took part in and supported their husbands’ and fathers’ businesses and were also able to earn some silver for their own purses.1 Moreover, letters show that during the frequent, and at times prolonged, absence of their husbands, wives of traders had to manage their households and were often burdened by financial or legal problems.2

---

1 See the data presented in Veenhof Old Assyrian Trade, pp. 103–23. Their activities are marked by the word *tadmiqtum*, which denotes an interest-free loan, without fixed or guaranteed profit, usually entrusted to a relative or friend (who will “make the best of it,” *dammuqum*); it normally refers to the textiles entrusted as *tadmiqtum*, but it was also used for the amount of silver expected in return.

2 For a translation of 100 letters written by Old Assyrian women, see C. Michel, Correspondance des marchands de Kaniš au début du IIe millénaire avant J.-C., Littératures anciennes du Proche-Orient 19 (Paris, 2001), chap. 7, “La correspondance féminine.”
Women figure also in texts not directly related to trade, however, such as records dealing with marriage, divorce, and wills, which document the legal aspects of the life of well-to-do, literate families, where contracts were made and cases brought before the courts. Other topics, such as houses, children, slaves, health, death, religion, and domestic problems, are mainly attested in the correspondence of women. Differences in the nature and availability of this evidence are due to the status of the women (married wives, widows, unmarried ugbabtu-priestesses, daughters) and where they lived. Several wives, especially those married to traders during the early period, stayed behind in Assur when their husbands went to Anatolia, the latter making only occasional visits to Assur. Others lived in Kanesh, having accompanied or later having joined their husbands, who had settled there. Legal records documenting the family life of the former are rare, presumably because the records were kept in Assur, but we know these women through their correspondence with their husbands. Evidence concerned with the women living in Anatolia has generally been found in their husbands’ archives in Kanesh and consists of a variety of records. Some of these records were drawn up in connection with important events, such as marriage, death, and inheritance; others reflect the women’s usually small-scale business activities (the granting of small loans, dealings with slaves, petty commerce, etc.). In addition, we have letters written by women to their husbands when the latter were on business trips in Anatolia (and which the men apparently took home with them when they returned to Kanesh), and there are also some letters received from or sent to female relatives in Assur.

The letter presented in this article belongs to the last-mentioned category and was written by a woman in Assur called Ummi-Išhara to her sister in Kanesh, most probably Šalimma, in a last attempt to solve the problems between the latter and her unhappy husband, Irmā-Ăšur, who had moved back to Assur. Written to a sister with problems, the letter is personal and emotional, presents acute observations about the situation and the emotional states of the main characters, and contains pleas, criticism, and warnings. The letter from Ummi-Išhara is meant to convince her sister that the situation is serious and that she must change her mind. Moreover, her rhetoric makes this document also syntactically and lexically interesting. I offer this study as a tribute to Bob Biggs, known for his interest in the intellectual and domestic life of ancient Mesopotamia, as demonstrated by his publication of an interesting Old Assyrian letter containing the plaint of a woman.

---


4 We have the will of a (remarried) Assyrian widow who died in Kanesh (ibid., p. 457, n. 136) and references to those of others, including Lamassatum.

II. PROSOPOGRAPHY AND ARCHIVAL MATTERS

The letter belongs to the archive of the trader Elamma, son of Iddin-Suen, which was excavated in 1991 and given to me for publication by the director of the excavations of Kanesh-Kültepe, Tahsin Özgüç. Some background information is necessary in order to identify the four persons involved and to explain the letter’s presence in Elamma’s archive; it will illustrate the importance of prosopographical analysis and reconstruction of the family structure but also the problems that emerge, even with officially excavated texts, if we wish to explain their presence in or scattering over different archives and houses.

The letter acquaints us with four persons: its writer, Ummi-Išhara; its addressees, Lamassatum and Šalimma; and a man who is always referred to as “the gentleman” (awīlum), who, as the envelope indicates, is Šalimma’s husband Irma-Aššur. 6

Ummi-Išhara was the (eldest?) daughter of Elamma and Lamassatum; she became an ugbatbu-priestess and lived permanently in Assur. Kt 91/k 421, which quotes Lamassatum’s final dispositions, speaks of Ummi-Išhara as “my daughter, the priestess” (meriti NIN.DINGIR). In kt 91/420 (undated) she concludes an agreement with her three brothers about the division of certain assets left behind by their father, and kt 91/k 377:9 ff. refers to her as “their sister, the gubabtu” in a settlement “after (the death of) Lamassatum, her mother” (warka L. ummiša).

Lamassatum is Ummi-Išhara’s mother, and the fact that her husband Elamma is not mentioned suggests that he had already died, probably in eponym year 104 or 105, 7 after a career of nearly forty years as a trader in Kanesh. Lamassatum survived him (the latest dated record in which she occurs is from eponym year 106) and presumably continued to live in his house, which she may have inherited from him. Lamassatum’s contacts with her daughter Šalimma’s husband, Irma-Aššur, are documented in the letter kt 91/k 455:25 f., which mentions the possibility that his tablets “are with Lamassatum.” In kt 91/k 503 (presumably after Elamma’s death) a sum of silver belonging to Elamma’s (eldest) son has to be sent to Assur and is entrusted to Lamassatum and to Irma-Aššur; kt 91/k 421:15–17 mentions among the assets left behind by Lamassatum: “1 mina of silver that I gave to Irma-Aššur for making purchases (in Assur).”

---

6 I maintain the conventional renderings of the names: Lamassatum, though forms with (Lamassatum) and without “vowel harmony” are attested, and Irma-Aššur (cf. Ir-ma-aššur in AKT 3 73:19), though this name was pronounced Irmaššur < Irēm-Aššur, or < Ir’am-Aššur (for ir’am in theophoric names, see MAD 3 230, with the ideas proposed by M. Hilgert, Akkadisch in der Ur III-Zeit [Münster, 2002], pp. 249 ff.).

7 The eponym years are counted from the first year of Erišum I, ruler of Assur, on the basis of KEL. A record dated to eponym year 106 deals with the division of part of his inheritance.
Šalimma, whose father’s name is never mentioned, must be one of Lamassatum’s daughters. Elamma’s son, Ennum-Aššur, in a letter to Irma-Aššur in Assur (kt 91/k 290:33 ff.) quotes the latter’s words: “If your sister comes to the city (of Assur), give her the price of the textiles and let her come here.” Irma-Aššur’s reaction is: “Since there is severe cold here and it is not feasible for her to come, I will therefore not give her the silver. It is up to you, there, to decide what to do.”8 “Your sister” cannot refer to the priestess Ummi-Išhara, who remained in Assur,9 and hence must be another sister; Šalimma is the only candidate, and we know she indeed did not travel to Assur and while in Kanesh needed money for her expenses. In our letter Irma-Aššur is quoted as saying that she could have asked for the silver she needed from her mother and brothers there (in Kanesh, lines 22–24), apparently from Lamassatum and her sons. One problem is that Šalimma’s brother, Ennum-Aššur, in his letter kt 91/k 366:34 f., appeals to Irma-Aššur with the words: “Please, my father, my lord, whom else can I trust but you?” and in lines 7 f., in a more neutral way, writes: “He is my father; he will go and send me from Assur 10 minas of tin and so give me courage.” We may explain these lines by assuming that Ennum-Aššur’s brother-in-law was his senior (see the observation made in n. 22 below), both in age and in business, and that Ennum-Aššur needed his help.

Šalimma’s stay in Kanesh is suggested by the discovery of some of her records in Elamma’s archive, a debt-claim on two Anatolians (kt 91/k 518) and the contract kt 91/k 522, wherein she buys a house in Kanesh for 2½ minas of silver from (her aunt) Ištar-lamassi and her brother or her uncle, Aššur-ṭab.10 It may have been the house where she lived together with her husband when the latter was living in Anatolia. Another legal document, excavated in 1986, kt 86/k 155A/B,11 may deal with this same house, though it cannot be identified with certainty because neither the seller nor the price are mentioned. This document is a verdict of kārum Kanesh, issued when the ownership of the house was disputed, probably by Lamassatum, and states that the house will count as Šalimma’s property if Amur-Ištar (Elamma’s brother and hence one of Šalimma’s un-

8 umma attama: šumma (34) ahatka ana ʾalim tallakam kaspam (35) šim šubātī diššimma lu tallikam (36) annakam kîma kuṣṣū dannūnīma la naṯūma (37) la tallakanni adī kiam kaspam la usšaršīm (38) atta ammakam malaka.

9 In kt 91/k 366:13–14 Irma-Aššur tells Ennum-Aššur about the silver he had taken to Assur to pay the latter’s creditor: “your sister needed the silver, and so I gave it to her in accordance with your letter” (kaspam ahatka tahšahma ana ʾaṭṭippika attidiššim), and this must refer to the ugbabtu Ummi-Išhara.

10 I have edited this text; see G. J. Selz, ed., Festschrift für Burkhart Kienast zu seinem 70. Geburtstage dargebracht von Freunden, Schülern und Kollegen, AOAT 274 (Münster, 2003), pp. 693–95. The handing over of the title of the house by the seller to the buyer, mentioned in this contract, makes sense, since the house had originally been sold by its Anatolian owner. Possession of the original deed of sale offered protection to a new owner, who lived in it in Kanesh.

11 This record is an isolated one in the group of records numbered kt 86/k 153 to 229, the majority of which concern Šu-Suen and Idnaya, sons of Šu-Hubur. This tablet must have been found in debris and may originally have come from a neighboring house, as must also be true of kt 86/k 204, a fragment of the case of the contract kt 87/k 39, an Anatolian slave sale.
icles) swears “that the house was bought with Šalimma’s silver and that he does know that it was Lamassatum’s silver.” If he refuses, “Lamassatum will swear by Ištar’s tambourine (?) h uppum 12) that the house was bought with the silver of Iddin-Suen” (the father of her husband Elamma, from whom she must have inherited money), and thus the house counts as hers.13 Whichever house the disputed house may be, this document confronts us with the problems that arose in the family, probably after Elamma’s death. References to Šalimma in the archival texts of the Elamma family are not numerous, presumably because she had married and thus no longer lived in Elamma’s house, was more involved in her husband’s business, and did not appear in the records dealing with her father’s inheritance because she had been given a dowry when she was married off.

Irma-Aššur, Šalimma’s husband, occurs in about twenty texts found in Elamma’s archive dated to eponymies ranging from eponymy year 91 to 108. I assume that he was the son of Nidebani (perhaps read Í-di-ba-ni), a patronymic attested in Dalley Edinburgh 7 = EL 93:1 (eponym 93),14 AKT 1 40:17 (eponymy 94), and TC 3 213:11 (eponymy 108), where Irma-Aššur figures as a witness.15 The name of his son most probably occurs as “Í-di-ba-ni, son of Irma-Aššur,” witness to the undated contract kt 91/k 505. He was active in Anatolia, where he traveled, traded, and acted as a witness to a number of contracts, but he also regularly journeyed to Assur, as is clear from kt 91/k 503 and kt 91/k 421, mentioned above. He must have lived in Kanesh for some time but later seems to have settled more permanently in Assur. There he was involved in a legal dispute (kt 91/k 494), and Elamma’s son apparently wanted to meet him there, when he wrote (in kt 91/k 366:45 f.): “Allow me to see the eyes of (the god) Assur and your own eyes.” There he also, together with Ummi-Išhana and some other young woman, received a dramatic letter written by Lamassatum and her eldest son about the death of three family members.16 His move from Kanesh to Assur could explain why records involving him have been found in Elamma’s archive and,

12 The verdict, referred to in n. 19 below, also obliges women to swear by this symbol.
13 Lines 3 ff.: itamma Amur-Ištar ina patrim ša Aššür (5) bētu ina kasap Šalimma (case adds lū) šašumi libbušu la ide’u kimā kasap Lamassitinni (10) šumma Amur-Ištar itamma bētu ša Šalimma šumma la itamma tatamma Lamassutum ina huppim ša Ištar (15) bētu ina kasap Iddin-Suen lū šašum (case: la šašum ina kapisša lū šašum) šumma tatama bētum bēssa.
14 The case alone was edited as EL 93, where in line 1 one should read [KIÅIB Ir-m]a-A-šûr; the tablet does not give his father’s name. It is now clear that seal 2 in Dalley’s edition is that of Irma-Aššur, since the same seal occurs on kt a/k 462 (AKT 1 40) and on kt 94/k 179 (courtesy of Cécile Michel), which Irma-Aššur sealed as debtor. Its inscription was discussed by M. V. Tonietti, “Le cas de mekum: continuité ou innovation dans la tradition éblaïte entre IIIe et IIe millénaires?” MARI 8 (1997): 230, and while the reading of the last two lines, ša me-ku-um / i-ra-mu-šû is certain, that of the first two, which should identify its owner, is problematic. It does not mention our Irma-Aššur, who must have acquired the seal from someone else.
15 Irma-Aššur, son of Aššur-malik, who occurs once as witness in another text in the archive (kt 91/k 370:31), must be a different man. There are more than thirty references to Irma-Aššur in texts from other archives, but without knowing the fathers’ names it is not easy to distinguish our man from his namesake.
16 This implies that the letter found in Elamma’s archive is a copy kept in Kanesh.
after the latter’s death, “are with Lamassatum” (kt 91/k 455:25 f.). Texts of his found in Elamma’s archive consist of a few letters, a debt-note in which he was the creditor (kt 91/k 504), a few in which he was the debtor (kt 91/k 523, 525), a sealed quittance (kt 91/k 516), and some texts recording be’ulâtu-loans supplied by him (kt 91/k 325, 480). These texts do not constitute an archive but must be records that had been deposited and left behind (in a separate container?) in Elamma’s house, perhaps when Irma-Aššur left for Assur.

My introductory remarks could end here, but there is one archival complication that should be mentioned because it sheds further light on our couple, Irma-Aššur and Šalimma. Irma-Aššur figures prominently also in texts excavated in the beginning of the 1994 season, especially in those numbered kt 94/k 119 to 182. They include five letters written to him, ten debt-notes in which he is the creditor (between eponymies 86 and 108), two where he is debtor (eponyms 101 and 102), and one quittance. There are also fifteen legal records, among them a contract by which a certain Aššur-malik marries Irma-Aššur’s daughter Suhkana and a verdict by the kūrum authorizing Irma-Aššur to make some men and women swear an oath in order to obtain information about losses he has suffered. These records also contain references to Irma-Aššur’s brother, Aššur-malik; to Elamma’s wife, Lamassatum (three debt-notes in which she is the creditor); and to Irma-Aššur’s wife, Šalimma. The discovery of records belonging to the same persons in two separate houses (excavated in 1991 and 1994) is remarkable. Speculation on the mixing of texts from two (neighboring?) houses due to destruction and later rebuilding is premature in the absence of a detailed excavation report. The presence of so many of Irma-Aššur’s debt-notes and legal documents in the house excavated in 1994 strongly suggests that this was his house, the house where he lived with Šalimma as long as he was in Kanesh (the latest eponym year attested for him is 108) and the house where later she perhaps lived alone, since its archive also contained a letter, a debt-note, and a contract connected to the purchase of one of her slaves. It may have even been the house bought by Šalimma, mentioned in the (undated) contract kt 91/k 522 discussed above. The close links with Elamma’s family may explain that some records belonging to Lamassatum ended up in the house of her daughter Šalimma, perhaps after Lamassatum’s death.

Finally, we have a letter written by Šalimma herself, kt 91/k 499, addressed to “my sons” Šu-Ištar and Aššur-imitti, who are asked to take out of the coffers containing

---

17 I thank Cécile Michel for telling me about these texts.
20 The house described by Tahsin Özugç in Veenhof AV, pp. 369 f., and whose rooms 5–6 contained 947 texts, as Özugç has kindly told me, was excavated in 1994. These texts constitute the second archive excavated in that year (kt 94/k 280 ff.) and will be edited by M. T. Larsen.
her tablets, in (her house? in) Kanesh, a particular debt-note and to bring it “here” because the debtor has started a legal dispute.\textsuperscript{21} The letter must have been sent from Assur and ended up in Elamma’s archive, perhaps because her sons (after the departure of Šalimma’s mother) lived in Elamma’s family’s house. The existence of grown-up sons implies that she must have been married to Irma-Aššur for quite some time, as does the contract found in 1994, whereby Irma-Aššur marries off his (their?) daughter Suhkana.\textsuperscript{22} Both texts must reflect circumstances later than our letter, which, instead, speaks of Šalimma’s “(young) children” (šerrū) in Assur, who suffer because of her absence (lines 31 f. and 46). In any case, Šalimma’s letter does show that she eventually returned to Assur, and her stay in that city is also clear from a few texts recording shipments of silver from Kanesh to Assur, where, in three cases, she figures among the (mostly female) recipients of small amounts of silver.\textsuperscript{23} This suggests that the crisis responsible for the writing of our letter was finally over.

\textbf{III. The Letter}

A piece of the case kt 91/k 386 (1-240-91; 6.3 × 5.9 cm)

\begin{verbatim}
1  [KIŠIB Um-mi-Iš-ha-ra] [Seal of Ummi-Ishara]
 [a-na Lá-ma-sà-tim] [To Lamassatum]
 [seal impression A] [seal impression A]
 rev. ≠seal impression A±
  û Ša-lim-ma and Šalimma,
  a-ša-at the wife of
 5  Ir-ma-A-šur Irma-Aššur.
          seal impression A
\end{verbatim}

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{21}\textit{annakam šaltam} (15) \textit{ištia ĕpušma} (16) \textit{libbī} (17) \textit{danniš} (18) \textit{ušāmarīš}.
\item \textsuperscript{22} This marriage (see n. 18 above) must have been concluded in Kanesh, since the contract also mentions that the groom was to marry a girl in Assur, in addition to Suhkana, and that he would be able to take her with him on his journeys. The bride is identified as “the daughter of Irma-Aššur,” without mention of her mother, but I am not sure what this implies. The contract is undated, and the marriage might have been concluded after Šalimma’s death or even before Irma-Aššur had married her if he had children from a previous marriage. If the latter were the case, he would have been (much) older than Šalimma, possibly one of the reasons for the problems discussed in our letter and perhaps an explanation for Šalimma’s brother referring to Irma-Aššur as “my father, my lord.”
\item \textsuperscript{23} P. Garelli, “\textit{Tablettes cappadociennes de collections diverses (1)},” \textit{RA} 58 (1964): 23, no. 4:9; EL 235:34; kt 87/k 386:21 (courtesy of K. Hecker).
\end{itemize}
Tablet kt 91/k 385 (1-239-91; 5.1 × 5.0 cm; word-dividing wedge indicated by “.”)

Text

1  a-na Lá-ma-sà-tim ú Ša-lim-ma qì-bì-ma
   um-ma Um-mi-Iš-ha-<ra>-ma a-dí-i na-áš-pé-er-tim
   ša ta-áš-pu-ri-ni um-ma a-tí-ma mi-šu-um
   ma-ma-an lá i-ṭa-ra-dam śi-pá-ar-šu

5  i-li-kam-ma : a-na-ku aṭ-ru-ud : a-dí ma-lá
   ú ši-ní-šu aq-bi-šu-ma li-bu-šu : i-ta-na-aṣ-ra-áp
   um-ma šu-ut-ma : a-dí : ma-lá : ú ši-ní-šu
   na-áš-pé-er-tí : i-li-ik-ši-im-ma a-lá-kam
   lá ta-mu-a : ša a-ša-pá-ru-ší-ní-BA i-ṣé-er

10 na-áš-pé-ra-tí-i is-té-et : ú ši-ta : ša i-li-ká-ši-ní
   a-wi-lúm : a-wa-tim : i-ta-ah-dar
   [u]m-ma šu-ut-ma is-tú a-lá-kam lá ta-mu-u
   lá ta-tú-ri-ma : lá ta-qa-bi-im
   šu-ma : a-ha-tí : a-tí : a-wa-tim sa-ra-tim

15 lá ta-áš-ta-na-pá-ri-im : a-na KÙ.BABBAR mì-ma
   lá ta-ša-pá-ri-šu-um : a-šu-mi KÙ.BABBAR aq-bi-šu-ma
   um-ma šu-ut-ma : ma-lá-ma-a : KÙ.BABBAR ½ ma-na
   gám-ri-ša : gi₃-mi-lam₂ : i-ṣé-er um-mi-ša
   ú-ul a-hi-ša lá-áš-ku-un ú-ul

20 l. e.  i-na ba-áb-tí-a : KÙ.BABBAR 10 GÍN lá i-ba-ší
   ú šu-ma : i-na ba-áb-tí-a lá-šu

rev. KÙ.BABBAR 10 GÍN : ma-lá : gám-ri-ša
   išt-um-mi-ša : ū «ta» a-hi-ša
   lu té-ri-iš-ma : a-na-ku a-na-kam : lu-ta-er-šu-ma

25 lu ta-ta-al-kam : mì-ma : a-wa-tim
   ú na-áš-pé-ra-tim : lá ta-áš-ta-na-pá-ri-im
   i-na pá-ni : a-wi-lim : tú-uš-ta-zí-zí
   um-ma šu-ut-ma išt-tú-ma lá am-tí-ni : ši-it
   a-lá-kam lá ta-am-tú-a-ni : lá ta-tú-ar-ma

30 šu-um-ša : lá ta-za-ká-ri-im : ú a-tí
   lá a-ha-tí mi-šu-um šé-re-ki ú É bé-et-ki
   ša-ni-ú-tum : i-bé-e-lu : ú a-tí : a-ma-kam
   ú i-a-tí i-na É a-wi-lim : lá tú-re-qí-ni

35 šu-ma : a-lá-ki : i-ba-ší : ti-ib-e-ma a-tal-ki-im
   lá-ma a-wi-lúm li-bu-šu : išt-ní-ú
   i-na  INTERRUPTION : Pi-lá-ah-Ištar : e-ru-ba-ni

oi.uchicago.edu
Translation

To Lamassatum and Šalimma, thus says Ummi-Išhara.

As for the letter (3) that you sent me, in which you wrote: “Why does he not send someone to me?” A messenger of his (5) did arrive, and it was I who sent him. I talked to him several times, but every time he bursts out, (7) saying: “Several times a letter of mine went to her, but she refused to come here! Could what I should send her then surpass (10) the messages that already reached her several times?” (11) The gentleman has become very annoyed by the matter and said: “Because she refuses to come, (13) you must not speak to me again.” (14) If you are my sister, do not keep writing me things that are not true, and certainly do not write to him for silver. I talked to him because of the silver (17), and he said: “Should I really oblige her mother or her brothers for no less than half a mina of silver for her expenses? Or (19) are there not 10 shekels of silver available from my outstanding claims? (21) And if there are not, let her ask for 10 shekels of silver for her expenses (23) from her mother or her brothers, which I promise I will pay back here, if only (25) she leaves for here.” (26) Do not keep writing me all kinds of things and messages. (27) You have brought me into conflict with the gentleman. (28) He tells me: “Since, not being my amtu-wife, she refuses to come here, (30) you must not mention her name again to me, lest you will no longer be my sister.” Why are others ruling your children and your household, while you are staying there? (33) Please, do not make your children perish, and do not estrange me from the gentleman’s house. (35) If you see a possibility to come, get ready and leave for here (36) before the gentleman gets different ideas. (37) The day Pilah-Ištar arrived here, since you had not come with him, (39) he felt very unhappy, and for five days did not leave his house. If you are looking for another husband, write me so; I wish to know it. (42) If not, get ready and leave for here. (43) If you do not come, you will bring me into conflict with the gentleman, (46) and you will make your children perish, and I, (47) I will never mention your name again; you will no longer be my sister, and (49) you must not write me anymore.
Lexical and Grammatical Notes

4–5 We cannot take šiparšu ... aṭrud as the continuation of Šalimma’s words, “A messenger of his did arrive, and it was I who sent him,” since that would flatly contradict the complaint in lines 3–4. I therefore understand it as Ummi-Isnara’s reaction to her sister’s contention: she herself was instrumental in sending the messenger and hence knows that her sister is not telling the truth (see line 14).

6 šarāpum is lexically attested and used metaphorically with kabattum and lalûm as subjects (CAD § s.v. šarāpu A mng. 2, and CAD L s.v. lalû A mng. 1b), meaning “to burn with desire, to spend one’s emotion” (Lambert’s translation in Lambert-Millard Atra-hasî), also “to crave, have a craving for” (with ana). The form here is an Ntn and may be compared with the (ingressive?) N-stem in Ludlul I 108, libbi ʾissarip “I had a burning heart,” equivalent to ʾsurup libbim rašûm (CAD § s.v. ʾsurpu mng. 2b). B. Landsberger, “Über Farben in Sumerisch-Akkadischen,” JCS 21 (1967): 146, nn. 34–36, pointed out the problems of derivation and meaning of intransitive šarāpum and ʾsurup libbim (equated with Sumerian ša.šig.ga), which, in many cases, seem to imply a shrill or loud noise, as made by wailing women. But this is not always obvious; see, for example, Tukulti-Ninurta Epic ‘iii’ 28 (CAD L s.v. lalû A mng. 1b) and YOS 11 24:24, where a lover is told ina šeria šurup lalâka, probably something like “vent your passions upon me.” In our letter the expression is connected by means of -ma with what Irma-Aššur said: his words are the manifestation of his anger.

9–10 The beginning of the sentence ša ašapparušinni-BA ṣṣēr naṣperātia ... ša illikaššinni is difficult. It contains the postfix -BA, thus far attested only in Old Assyrian, where it is used to express surprise or indignation, to give emphasis to a statement, to express a contrast, or frequently in a question. Identification of the underlying lexeme is difficult, since neither the accusative of pûm “mouth” nor the imperative of bāʿûm (Old Assyrian, with ventive baʿam) is convincing. I would rather compare the Ugaritic conjunctive particle p (vocalization unknown), which is also used in letters, with an asseverative and explicative meaning. BA is frequently linked to interrogatives such as mînûm, mannum, and miššum, and occasional spellings of the type mi-nim/nam-BA suggest that the final consonant of the interrogative was assimilated to the initial labial -BA, yielding mînappa, mînuppa. Examples of this are Michel

---

24 Cf. also von Weiher Uruk 225:16, lallāri ša šurrupu nubûša, comparable to šarpīš nabbûm/ bakûm “to wail/weep bitterly.” The Š-stem, with qubê as the object, according to the CAD, means “to groan loudly.”
and Garelli *Kültepe* 1 166:21, *kasapka leqe umma P.-ma mi-na-BA kaspam lalqe* “(S. said:) ‘Take your silver!’ P. answered: ‘What silver then should I take?’”; kt 87/k 551 (courtesy of K. Hecker), *uzanni pete mi-na-BA anāku uzakku lupe* “(You said:) ‘Inform us!’ Why should I be the one to inform you?’”; CCT 4 27a:15, *mi-nam-BA teʾertī lillikakkum* “What instruction of mine then should come to you?”; kt n/k 501:17 (courtesy of C. Günbattı), *a-mi-nim-BA ana šērišu ettīq* “(He said: ‘The silver does not belong to PN), why then should it travel on to him?’”; Matouš *Prag* I 521:12, *mi-šu-BA našpertam … la tublam* “Why then did you not bring me a message?”; kt n/k 94:3 f. (courtesy of S. Bayram), *a-le-BA awūtuka (4) ša umma attāma (5) mannum mīnam eppaški* “To what, then, has your (reassurance), ‘Who could do you any harm?’ come?” (lit. “where, then, are your words?”).

In addition, there are some, mostly unpublished, examples of šu-ma-BA “if then / really / however...” followed by a perfect tense to express an unexpected, less likely action. Nice examples are found in the letter kt 88/k 97b: 31,25 where brothers discuss how to finance the expenses for their sister’s marriage. One brother offers to borrow the money and asks: šu-ma-BA kaspam … *la alteqe … ana kaspim la tazzazānim* “If, however, I have been unable to obtain the silver, will you then not accept responsibility for it?” In line 39 his brothers ask him: *kī ma-šī-BA kaspam tagammar* “How much silver, then, are you going to spend?” Other examples, always in questions, show that the particle can be added to another word, which has emotional emphasis. Cf. P. Garelli, “Tablettes cappadociennes de collections diverses (2),” *RA* 59 (1965): 160, no. 25:34, *nēnu-BA ana māri neppaš* “(Since you left PN has now already built two houses), but we, when will we finally build (one)?”; kt 93/k 482:27 (courtesy of Cécile Michel), *anāku-BA ana mīnim … ulappatakkim, “Why should I keep writing to you?; AKT 3 47:29, ann”ti-subătē (30) la ana bēt A. ubbal, “(A. took the black donkey along, whereupon D. said): ‘And these textiles then, should I not bring them to A.’s house?’.”

The use of -BA in our letter fits the emotional context and suggests taking lines 9b–10 as a desperate or angry question. The sentence, which compares (iṣṣēr) a possible future action (*šapārum* in the present-future tense) with a previous one (“messages that went to her”), is basically a nominal clause with ša ašapparušīni as subject: “Could then the message that I am going to send her surpass the ones that have already reached her several times?” We might render it as: “Should/Could I really send her still another message apart from (or: better than) the ones she already received from me?”

---

12 *ta-mu-ū* is a preterite in the subjunctive (after *illiššimma*), *ta-mu-a* (9) a present describing the current situation (“she refuses”); and *tamtu ’anni* (line 29) is a perfect (see below, notes to lines 28 f.) in the subjunctive with a ventive ending, added because the infinitive *alâkam* cannot take one.

17–19 *ma-lá-ma-a* is the first occurrence in Old Assyrian of the enclitic particle with lengthened vowel, -mā, always written -ma-a, used to mark questions and added to the word that has the main stress (hence not in Hecker *Grammatik* § 128–29;²⁶ BIN 4 22:28 f., quoted in von Soden *GAG* § 153g, does not have *mannum-ma* but *mannum-BA*). It is common in Old Babylonian and in particular in Mari; cf. von Soden *GAG* § 123b, *AHw.*, p. 570b, and my remarks in “Observations on Some Letters from Mari (ARM 2, 124; 10, 4; 43; 84; 114),” *RA* 70 (1976): 156, on line 33.²⁷ For the use of the precative in questions (“should/could I …”), see von Soden *GAG* § 153g and Hecker *Grammatik* § 129c. Irma-Aššur’s indignation about the amount of money expected from him is further expressed by the inversion of the normal word order: ḫ mana follows kaspam, “silver, no less than half a mina.”

27, 44 f. *ina pāni awilim tuštazzizi*. The verb *izuzzum* combines with various prepositions or prepositional expressions,²⁸ and with *ana / ina pāni / mahar* it has various meanings, depending on whether the verb is fientic “to take one’s stand” or stative “to stand” and whether *ina pāni* has a neutral, locative meaning or refers to a positive or a negative attitude toward the person confronted. A stative meaning with *ina pāni* matches a fientic one with *ana pāni*, as in, for example, AbB 3 11:5–8. A man who first worked elsewhere is told “At the moment you serve (or: manage) my household” (*ina pāni bitia tazzaz*), since “I have now transferred you (back) to manage my household” (*inanna ana pāni*).
The verb *izuzzum* with *ina pāni* frequently has the neutral meaning of “to be in the service of,” as does Sumerian *igi—gub*. Its Š-stem is used for the appointment of officials who are permitted to serve, are “taken into the entourage” of the Assyrian king (SAA 4 152:7, 154:4, 155:6’, SAA 10 228:5). A clearly positive meaning occurs in AbB 8 102:5, *kīma attī ina pānia tazzizi u tagmilinne* “Since you supported/protected me and did me a favor,” and in the Old Assyrian letter ICK 1 14:10, “I sent PN a textile …, but you did not assist him (*IGI-åu la tazzizΩ*) and did not sell it as well as you could,” where the verb is used with *mahar* with the same meaning. In our text it must be negative because Ummi-Išhara obviously means that her intercession for her sister has annoyed and antagonized the latter’s husband, who no longer wants to hear Ummi-Išhara’s name mentioned. The same is true in AKT 1 14:17 f., where a woman writes: “Who talked to you with the result that you confronted/opposed my brother Š.?” (*appāni Š. ahia tazzizi*). In AbB 12 45:23 W. van Soldt translates *ana pānišu iziz* with “confront him (as if I myself had come),” but the last words rather suggest a positive reception for the man sent by the writer. This is in line with AbB 8 141:18, where *mādiš ana pānišu iziz* must mean “come to his assistance without any reserve” (*fientic*, with *ana pāni*). The best parallel for our letter is in AbB 3 2:17, where *ana pāni* is used: *attīma la tadabbubi ana pāniki la tušazzinni[āti]* “You, you must not keep complaining, lest you bring us into conflict with you!”

28 *ištuma*, according to *CAD I/J* s.v., means “if indeed, really” and occurs in connection with a prevailing situation (a stative), a future action, and (with a perfect) a past action (also in Old Babylonian, AbB 6 188:32’ f. and AbB 14 116:25). But at times its meaning is simply causative, “since,” for example, in CCT 2 48:24, kt 94/k 549:15 (with a past tense, courtesy of M. T. Larsen), *ištuma la tublušunni parakannē šāmamma* “Since you have not brought him (the silver), buy for me *parakannu*-textiles” and VAS 26 71:8, *ištuma kaspum ... irtqannini* “Because silver has become unattainable for me,” because being an *amūm* is a fact used as an argument. This argument consists of two asyndetic elements, the second a form of the typically Old Assyrian verb *muṣum* “to be willing” with a t-infix. *CAD M/1* s.v. *mā ’u* lists only two examples of such forms and apparently considers CCT 3 49b:8 (*la imtūnim*) a perfect (mng. 2a end) and KTS 1 42a:1 (*ula amtuwa*) a Gt (see the heading

---

29 I ignore examples from the legal sphere, such as CCT 5 1a:25, where a disputed slave “should be placed at the disposal (under the control) of the *wabartum* (ina *IGI wabartim šazzizāma*), so that nobody can touch him” or kt n/k 1502:8–11, “They have made PN₁ in Kanesh ‘stand before PN₂’” (*IGI PN₂₅ ušazzizu*), where representa-

...
of the lemma, p. 435); Hecker *Grammatik* §98b, adding two more examples, takes them as perfects but von Soden, *AHw.*, p. 665a, as Gtn-stems. In an earlier analysis I observed that there is no lexical argument for a Gtn-stem and that a syntactical one for a perfect tense is not that clear, so that a lexical Gt remains a possibility. But in our letter there must be a difference between the forms without infixed -t- in lines 9 and 12, and the syntax suggests a connection between Šalimma’s status and her refusal to come; *tam tua* in line 29 can only be syntactical, and the latter must be a perfect (which does occur after *ištuma*), which indicates a logical *consecutio*; because she is not an *amtum*, it is possible for Šalimma to refuse to come to Assur (see further below).

30 *u attī* could be taken as the beginning of a new sentence in which Ummi-Išhara begins to speak, her first words abrupt and emotional: “And you, you….,” Though syntactically not easy to justify, I prefer to understand this, instead, as the conclusion of Irma-Aššur’s words, which spell out what the continuation of Ummi-Išhara’s pleading on behalf of her sister might entail for her.

34 *CAD* R s.v. *rēqu* mng. 4 mentions only two Old Assyrian occurrences of *rēqu* in the D-stem, both with an impersonal object (silver), to which we can add L 29-561 = *POAT* 8:51, *kaspam tū-ur-Dī-IQ*¹, and kt 94/k 524:13, *kaspī mādamma tū-ur-Dī-IQ*. There is also one example with a double accusative, AKT 1 17:25: “By all means prevent the creditor from taking away (the copper), so that it gets out of reach for me” (*e itbalma e tū-Rī-i-qá-ni*), in line with the frequent use of the G-stem with a personal ablative accusative. But the D-stem *re’uqum* may also have a direct personal object, as it does, for example, in the Old Babylonian letter BIN 7 27:10, *ina ekallia la turēqanni* (with *CAD* R s.v. *rēqu* mng. 4; in contrast to AbB 9 214:9 f., which derives it from *riΩqum* “to be idle,” as in an unpublished Old Babylonian letter, quoted in *CAD* R s.v. *rāqu* mng. 6). Another question is how to interpret our form phonetically, for which I profit from some of N. J. C. Kouwenberg’s observations. For Old Assyrian mediae aleph verbs, the question is (cf. Hecker *Grammatik* §91) whether we have to assume a strong form (with laryngeal) or a weak form (without one). For the G-stem, Hecker lists several examples of weak forms of the preterite (§91c), but not all are convincing, notably those of *beʾālum*, as I pointed out in my *Old Assyrian Trade*, pp. 407 ff. (where some of them were also identified as N-stems). According to him, the D-stem is apparently (“anscheinend”) always strong (§91f), and this indeed applies to the examples

---

given, including the present tü-re-a-aq in CCT 4 3b:10, where the extra -a- indicates the syllable boundary. But it is less clear for the preterites tü-RI-i-qá-ni in AKT 1 17:25 and (ba-a-<ba>-tí-a) ú-RI-i-qú-ma in kt c/k 443 rev. 4’ and for the two perfects tü-ur-DI-IQ quoted above. All four could be considered strong, (t)ureºiq(anni), turte ’iq, or weak, with—as occasionally happens in Old Assyrian—indication of the long, contracted vowel, (t)urêq(anni), turêq. This last interpretation is required for the present tense tü-re-qí-ni = turêqqîni “do not remove me” in our letter and seems not impossible for the other forms because already during the Ur III period (Hilgert, Akkadisch in der Ur III-Zeit, pp. 255 f.) this verb seems to show weak formations or, to put it differently, formations patterned after the mediae infirmae verbs. But this does not settle the case for Old Assyrian, since there are phonetic complications and its spelling conventions are equivocal. The form in our letter goes back to a strong *tureºaqíni, which with Old Assyrian vowel harmony becomes tureºiqíni and by contraction turêqqîni, due to the vocalic ending after the third radical (which also requires the doubling of the final consonant of the root). The effect of a vocalic ending is indicated by the apparently weak formations of mediae aleph verbs in the N-stem: *libbi ºil+anni > li-bi-lá-ni = libbîlanni (TC 1 26:28), while forms without a vocalic ending remain strong: li-biº-i-ilz = libbiºil (CCT 2 1:13) and i-mî-HI-id = immiºid “it has become much” (CCT 4 3b:6). Tü-RI-i-qá-ni and ú-RI-i-qú have vocalic endings and still write -RI-i-, which may indicate strong forms, such as (t)ureºiq, with indication of the syllable boundary, or weak ones, due to the vocalic ending, with plene writing of the contracted vowel, turêq-, as in tü-re-qí-ni in our letter, where, however, the long contracted vowel is not marked. The plene writing with -RI-i does not necessarily render /reºî/, in an attempt to indicate the difference in quality between both vowels (tureºiq), since in Old Assyrian there is an indiscriminate use of spellings with e and i. To assume weak, contracted forms is attractive because it would mean the same phonetic change in all Old Assyrian forms with vocalic endings, but we have to take into account that the spellings allow different interpretations.

For Old Assyrian attestations of šanā ’um with libbum as the subject, see CAD Š/1 s.v. šanû B mng. 2a–3’. “Change of mind” in Jankowska KTK 18:4 (D-stem) leads to “fighting” (tešêtum) and in line 8’ (G-stem) to “contempt, discredit” (qulâlû). In TC 3 6:6 the rumor that a man’s “mind has changed” is refuted by observing that “he harbors no inimical thoughts; he is your true, reliable brother” (mimma awatum šanîtum (8) illibbišu la ibašši (9) awîlum ahuka ša kenîtimma).
Interpretation

The issue dealt with in the letter explains the frequent, almost thematic, use of *alâkum* “to go” and *atlukum* “to depart” (occasionally preceded by *tabâ ‘um* “to get into motion”), used in various modes, with mention of the possibility (*šumma alâkki ibašši*, line 35), failure (line 38), or the refusal (*la muΩºum*) to go or depart, with a clear distinction between the forms with and without the ventive (lines 8 f., 12, 25, 29, 35, 38, and 42 f.). Communication in the world of Old Assyrian traders was by letter or messenger, hence the repeated use of the verb *šapârum* and its derivatives *naâpertum* “message” (note *awâtim u naâperΩtim* in lines 25 f.) and *šiprum* “messenger” (in lines 2–5, 8, 10, 15, 25 f., 41, and 46). At times the communication as such is at stake (lines 25 f., 48 f.), at times its contents, since Šalimma’s messages contain lies (line 14) or make irritating demands on her husband (lines 15 f.).

The letter does not tell us why Šalimma refused to go to Assur. Even her sister seems uncertain (lines 40 f.). One cannot speculate about the reasons for her refusal to go (see n. 22 above), but a letter cited above (kt 91/k 290, if it stems from this period) indicates that weather conditions also played a role. We also do not know how long the problem lasted, but the iteratives (in lines 6, 15, and 26, and “several times” in line 7) imply a lively correspondence. Our letter is the only one preserved, but it was found in Elamma’s archive, which could mean that it was the copy delivered to Lamassatum, and it may even have remained unopened, since part of the envelope is preserved. If that is the case (unless we assume that Šalimma had moved in with her widowed mother), we suppose that another copy existed, delivered to Šalimma herself, to her own house. But apparently neither that copy nor any other relevant letter was found in the couple’s house, which was excavated in 1994. Letters, of course, may have been discarded after some time, and we do not know what happened when Šalimma eventually returned to Assur.

Ummi-Išhara plays the role of the wise older sister in Assur (particularly after the death of her father?), acting as mediator for the couple and concerned about the family. One may compare her role to that played by Pušûken’s daughter Ahaha, who became involved when her brothers had problems with the liquidation of their father’s business after he had died and when tensions arose between them. Ummi-Išhara corresponds with her sister in Kanesh and talks to her brother-in-law in Assur (lines 6, 13, 16), interceding for her (lit. “mentions her name,” lines 30, 47), a meaning that

---

31 For the question of letters in more than one copy, of unopened letters, and of (pieces of) envelopes found together with tablets in an archive, see my remarks in M. Brosius, ed., *Ancient Archives and Archival Traditions* (Oxford, 2003), pp. 90 and 98. I find it hard to believe that incoming letters were opened in an (usually dark!) archive room and that the fragments of their envelopes were simply dropped.

32 See texts such as CCT 4 31b, CCT 5 8a, Matouš *Prag* I 437, I 652, I 680, *KT Hahn* 7, TC 2 46, and the unpublished letter Ankara 1938. Some of them are translated in Michel, *Correspondance des marchands de Kanesh*, as nos. 312 ff.
SISTERLY ADVICE ON AN ENDANGERED MARRIAGE

šumi PN zakārum also has in kt 93/k 145:36f. (see C. Michel and P. Garelli, “Heurts avec une principauté anatolienne,” WZKM 86 [1996]: 278), where the representatives of the kārum are told by a local Anatolian ruler not to do this on behalf of an Assyrian he had imprisoned. Lines 16f. suggest that Šalimma approached her angry husband via her sister, and indeed none of her letters to Irma-Aššur are mentioned or preserved. All this irritates Šalimma’s husband so much (lines 6, 11) that he tells Ummi-Išhara to stop approaching him on behalf of his wife (her sister) (lines 13, 29f.); she will follow his wishes if her sister does not come to Assur (lines 47f.), and she states she will cut off relations with her sister (lines 48f.) in order to avoid a conflict with her brother-in-law (lines 27, 44f.), who might otherwise cut off relations with her too (u attī la ahatī, lines 30f.), which would mean that she would no longer be welcome in his home (line 34). I note that Ummi-Išhara never refers to Irma-Aššur by name or as “your husband”\footnote{The use of such terms in general is rare, and I have noted only a few occurrences of “your husband” (mutki) used by a father (VAS 26 33:9), a relative or friend (BIN 6 17:9), and a colleague (EL 292 = CCT 5 17a:6 // TC 3 266) of a married woman.} but that she always uses the formal awīlum “the gentleman” (lines 11, 24, 29, 36, and 44), but I am not certain whether this is a deliberate choice, since the use of awīlum and awīltum to refer to members of the Old Assyrian trading community was common.

To encourage her sister to change her mind, Ummi-Išhara uses three arguments. In the first place, she states the already mentioned negative consequences for her herself; they are stated emphatically several times by adding a separate first-person-singular personal pronoun to verbal forms already having a pronominal suffix (lines 34, 44, 46, and 48). She then warns her sister that her frustrated husband might “change his mind” (line 36), which is presumably a euphemistic way of saying he might want a divorce. This links up with her own question about whether her sister wants to (divorce and) find a new husband (line 40). Ummi-Išhara’s third argument is one that would appeal to her sister in her role as mother and is remarkable in the mouth of a woman who, as a priestess, had to remain unmarried and childless. Šalimma’s behavior, she points out, is detrimental for her young children (šerrū; we know from other texts that Šalimma had at least two sons), who are living in Assur and being raised without their mother in a household managed by others (lines 31–33, repeated in line 46). “Others” presumably means the family of her husband, since this statement is immediately followed by her fearful remark that she herself will no longer be welcome in Irma-Aššur’s house. The letter concludes with lines 43 ff., a summary of her three arguments and a final warning.

Ummi-Išhara vividly describes Irma-Aššur’s emotional reactions to his wife’s behavior, presumably in order to make clear to her sister that the situation is very serious. She uses three expressions: libbušu ittanaşrap (line 6), awātim ittahdar (line 11), and libbušu imraş (lines 38f.). Of these, libbušu ittanaşrap, as pointed out above, is unique.
34 The latter meaning is frequent when a period or time limit is mentioned and patience is asked for. The CAD for CCT 3 38:27 translates “to become apprehensive,” but this is dubious because the sentence “I showed him your letters and up to thirty times I tried to reassure him” follows. If one opts for this meaning, interpreting adārum B “to fear,” as an N-stem, would be more likely.


37 See recently also M. T. Larsen, OAA 1, p. xxv, at his text no. 176 (I 490), where a daughter of a prominent Old Assyrian trader, Aššur-nada, born of his amtum-marriage with an Anatolian woman in Kanesh, is married off as an amtum to the son of another prominent trader, Imdilum.
SISTERLY ADVICE ON AN ENDANGERED MARRIAGE

from an amtu in Anatolia was somewhat easier, or at least more acceptable, if a trader wished to return to Assur, where he might also have a wife. For that same reason there may have been differences in the position of the children of both wives regarding inheritance, but this is not yet clear. Irma-Aššur’s remark in lines 28 f., read against this background, must mean that since Šalimma had not been married as an amtu-wife, she could not be obliged to travel to Assur to join her husband or, perhaps more fundamentally, that as aššatum she enjoyed more independence, but we need more evidence to make this assumption. In any case, the situation as described in the letter creates problems, since Šalimma, alone in Kanesh, needs money from her husband to cover her expenses, which he is ready (perhaps even obliged38) to give her, but not more than is really necessary. A divorce cost money, money that allowed a divorced wife her freedom and the right to remarry,39 and, of course, it entailed all kinds of arrangements concerning property and children. With a warning that Irma-Aššur might want to divorce her, Ummi-Išhara encourages her sister to consider the consequences of her behavior very carefully. Her own question of whether Šalimma wants to look for a new husband serves the same purpose but is at the same time presented as the only acceptable alternative, since the present situation cannot continue (line 42).

It would be nice to assume that this honest, emotional, and well-argued letter was responsible for Šalimma’s eventual return to her husband in Assur (see above). Written over four thousand years ago, this letter acquaints us with very personal aspects of the lives of Assyrian traders and their families. It is an impressive document, written by a skilled hand, in a small script, but we do not know who in fact wrote this tablet. Perhaps it was Ummi-Išhara herself. Her seal is impressed on the envelope, and as a businesswoman and priestess, just like a so-called naṣītu, one of the religious women in contemporary Babylonia who were devoted to the sun-god and were businesswomen at the same time, she may have been trained in the writing of cuneiform.

38 The kārum verdict kt 88/k 269 (Çeçen, “mūtu in den Kültepe-Texten,” pp. 57 f.; cf. the reference in Veenhof, “Old Assyrian Period,” p. 453, §5.1.4) obliges an Assyrian husband to give his wife, who (as a pledge?) is detained somewhere in Anatolia, a monthly allowance in copper (for buying food, oil, and firewood) and a new garment once a year.

39 “To go after a husband of her choice,” as kt 91/k 240 states it. Note that the combination aššatum šanītu, as used in Old Assyrian marriage contracts, means a second wife alongside the first one (some contracts use the expression ina šakātiša šēṣubum). The option open to Šalimma, however, is a second husband after divorcing the first. In this respect, Assyrian women who belonged to the society of traders and businessmen did not enjoy the same rights as men.
THE TRUE SHEPHERD OF Uruk

Joan Goodnick Westenholz, Bible Lands Museum Jerusalem

It is a distinct pleasure to have the opportunity to contribute to a volume in honor of Robert D. Biggs. A quiet, erudite scholar, Bob has contributed much to our understanding of the oldest periods of Sumerian and Akkadian literature, the interpretation of medical texts, and the explication of prophetic literature. In this article I hope to add some new insights into a text that Bob has studied and of which he has published a translation.¹

The unique tablet W 19900,1 was discovered in the palace of Sîn-kāšid during the eighteenth campaign of the archaeological excavations at Warka in the winter of 1959/60.² It was found in locus Dc XIV,² among the Old Babylonian archives containing letters and administrative documents, which were discovered scattered within the palace site, with the greatest number in the neighborhood of the western outer wall, in corridor 12.³ From the contents of the associated letters, some from the royal correspondence of Anam, it is assumed that W 19900,1 belonged to the palace archives. This palace was apparently destroyed in a conflagration and was not rebuilt.⁴


³ U. Finkbeiner, Uruk: Analytisches Register zu den Grabungsberichten; Kampagnen 1912/13 bis 1976/77 (Berlin, 1993), p. 149 § 3.3.4.1 and p. 259 (reference courtesy W. Farber, who also provided several other suggestions and helpful comments while editing the manuscript of this article).

The conflagration is attributed to Rim-Sin of Larsa, who conquered Uruk in his 20th year. It should be noted that the palace was robbed from antiquity onward, and thus the contents of various rooms had been disturbed.

Tablet W 19900, 1 bears reports of oracular statements given by the goddess Nanaya through the medium of an unnamed person who speaks in the first person referring to the “true/legitimate shepherd” and the revival of “dead Uruk.” The identity of the intended recipient of the message is not known; he may or may not have been an unnamed ruler (note bēlu in line 28). Information about the historical and religious context is utterly lacking. The most peculiar characteristic of this text is that it is written in northern orthography and exhibits late grammatical features.

W 19900, 1 is anomalous among Akkadian prophetic texts, since it is the only Old Babylonian oracular text from southern Babylonia alongside the many Mari examples and the two from Ešnunna. It claims to be an oracular message given by the goddess Nanaya through an unspecified medium of prophetic transmission. It is generally assumed from the context that the speaker is a cleric in the service of the Eanna temple. The prophecy is directly related by the prophet rather than being a report of

5 For the distinction between Akkadian prophecies and Akkadian oracles, see Grayson BHLT, pp. 13–14. According to Grayson, the oracle is oral in nature, a single divine utterance, usually through a medium, to a single individual and related to a specific time and event, whereas Akkadian prophecies are literary productions containing generalized predictions usually after the event, concerning unspecified situations and persons and set in unspecified time periods. Under “oracles” Grayson includes our example as well as the Mari and Neo-Assyrian “prophecies.” M. deJ. Ellis (“Observations on Mesopotamian Oracles and Prophetic Texts: Literary and Historiographic Considerations,” JCS 41 [1989]: 127–86) refined these definitions and introduced the new term “literary predictive texts” to refer to the literary prophecies vis-à-vis oracular reports of divine communications. For another usage of the term “oracle” in Assyriological convention, see S. M. Maul, “Omina und Orakel,” RLA 10, pp. 45–51. Maul defines an unprovoked event as an omen, while a provoked event (i.e., those elicited through the techniques used in various types of divination) is an oracle (“Verfahren, den göttlichen Willen zu erfragen”). According to Maul’s definition, if a question was not posed, the answer could not be an oracle.


8 Although Pongratz-Leisten has stated that the king incubated the dream and that the text records the dialogue of the king and the goddess (Herrschaftswissen in Mesopotamien: Formen der Kommunikation zwischen Gott und König im 2. und 1. Jahrtausend v. Chr., SAAS 10 [Helsinki, 1999], pp. 49–50), she implies that the recipient of the divine message was a prophet (“When the Gods Are Speaking,” pp. 155–57).
a prophecy heard secondhand as are the prophecies in the Mari corpus. The gender of the prophet of the divine message in W 19900,1 is not apparent. One unusual feature is the narration of the conversations between the cleric and the goddess. The mode of communication is not specified nor whether it was elicited, provoked, or spontaneous. Biggs has suggested that the message was probably communicated through a dream.9 Messages from a deity are commonly transmitted through dreams or during trances experienced by a person in a temple.10 Such an experience by the cleric seems to be implied in our text in lines 7 ff. A nocturnal vision of the goddess Gula was experienced by the royal letter-writer in the historiographical literary composition, the so-called Weidner Chronicle.11

The text of W 19900,1 begins with an invocation to the rēʾû kīnu “true/legitimate shepherd.” There are two aspects to the riddle of rēʾû kīnu—the referent of the term and the term itself. The title rēʾû kīnu “true/legitimate shepherd” is a calque on the Sumerian sipa zi “true/legitimate/faithful12 shepherd,” an epithet ascribed to the ruler.13 This epithet first occurs in an Early Dynastic period personal name En-an-na-tūm-sipa-zi “Enannatum(king of Lagash)-is-the-true-shepherd.”14 Among the Sumerian kings who assume this epithet are Gudea, who is chosen sipa-zi-sē kalam-ma “as the legitimate shepherd in the land” (Statue B iii 9; see Edzard, RIME 3/1, p. 32); Šulgi, who is the sipa-zi-ki-en-gi-ra “faithful shepherd of Sumer” (see, for example, Šulgi D refrain in lines 287–320, “With Šulgi the faithful shepherd of Sumer, he [a deity] walks on the road”; see Klein, Šulgi, p. 54); and Išme-Dagan, who is the sipa-zi-tu-da-ni “the true shepherd whom he (Enlil) engendered” (Išme-Dagan S 28, Ludwig, millennium; see J. G. Westenholz, “The Good Shepherd,” in A. Panaino and A. Piras, eds., Schools of Oriental Studies and the Development of Modern Historiography, Melammu Symposia 4 (Milan, 2004), pp. 281–310.

12 On the question of the translation of zi, an exact one-to-one equivalent of zi in our languages is impossible, since it covers a range of meanings—true, faithful, righteous, legitimate. It is “true” in the sense of “in accordance with the divine order” and “reliable,” “steadfast” in social relationships. In the idiom sipa-zi, it has been mistranslated “good shepherd” in conformity with biblical phraseology.
14 There are two occurrences of this personal name: a) Sollberger Corpus 46 vii 4 = Enz. 1 vii 4; see J.-P. Grégoire, La province méridionale de l’état de Lagash (Luxembourg, 1962), pp. 9–11 (who dates the letter to the fifth year of Enannatum II); Michalowski Letters, pp. 11–12, no. 1:36; Kienast-Volk SAB, pp. 25–29 (both date the letter to the fifth year of Ukg.); and b) Cros Tello, p. 181 AO 4156 iii 1’ (time of Entemena). If both occurrences relate to the same individual, then the individual could be named after Enannatum I (see the discussion in J. Bauer “Der vorsargonische Abschnitt der mesopotamischen Geschichte,” in J. Bauer, R. K. Englund, and M. Krebernik, eds., Mesopotamien: Späturuk-Zeit und frühdynastische Zeit, Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis 160/1 [Fribourg and Göttingen, 1998], p. 474).
In the city of Larsa, an unusual new epithet, sipa níg-gi-na “shepherd of righteousness,” is borne by two kings: Nûr-Adad ([sipa níg-gl]-na, see Frayne, RIME 4, p. 148, E4.2.8.7:18) and Sîn-iddinam (a contemporary of Sîn-kâšid; Frayne, RIME 4, p. 176, E4.2.9.14:33). The first known instance of the epithet sipa gi-na, the exact Sumerian equivalent of rû kînu, is that of Rûm-Sîn of Larsa, who bears it in his year-dates 26 and 28.16

In Akkadian, the adjective kînu is more commonly attached to šarru “king.” The royal image, šarru kînu “the true (and legitimate) king” is the traditional epithet going back to the name of Sargon of Akkad. An innovative title, ikkarum kînum occurs in an inscription of Lipit-Ištar of Isin: ikkarum kînum ša Urim “the true farmer of Ur.”17 Remarkably, the epithet rû kînu “the true shepherd” occurs for the first time in this composition and does not reappear until Middle Babylonian and Middle Assyrian royal inscriptions.18 This epithet, for instance, was the leitmotiv of the inscriptions of Nebuchadnezzar I. He used it in the bilingual literary text Seed of Kingship.19 This leitmotiv was further developed in the hymn to Enlil in a contemporaneous kudurru. In this hymn, Enlil bears the title nāhû rû kînu “the one who calls by name the faithful shepherd” (Hinke Kudurru i 21 [Nbk. I]), and Nebuchadnezzar I is referred to as rû kînu (Hinke Kudurru ii 15), which reiterates his function of shepherding Sumer and Akkad (ana rû‘at màt Šumerî u Akkâdî, ii 1).20 Thus the epithet rû kînu is a topos of royal legitimation, the divine selection of the king, which is a major theme of the oracular and prophetic texts.21

Why, however, is the king in our text unnamed? Contemporaneous and Sargonid prophecies designate the royal recipient, whereas later literary prophecies are vague as to the name of the king. On the basis of the context of the find, the referent of the “true shepherd” should be Sîn-kâšid, since he came to the throne by less than legitimate means and thus needed legitimation.22 Foster has supported this identification by

---

16 M. Sigrist, Larsa Year Names (Berrien Springs, Michigan, 1990), pp. 54 and 56.
17 Lipit-Ištar sipa-sunš-ña Nibru kišša Uru-iššu : Lipit-Ištar rûjûm pâlîh Nibru ikkarum kînum ša Urim “Lipit-Ištar, humble shepherd of Nippur (Sum.) / shepherd who is reverent towards Nippur (Akk.), true farmer of Ur” (Frayne, RIME 4, p. 48, E4.1.5.1:1–5 [Sum.]; p. 51, E4.1.5.3:1–7 [Akk.]).
22 This is the common opinion; see van Dijk (“Die Inschriften,” pp. 61–62), Biggs (“An Old Babylonian Oracle from Uruk,” p. 604), Ellis (“The Goddess Kititum Speaks,” p.138), Pongratz-Leisten (“When the Gods Are Speaking,” pp. 156–57), and Foster (Before the Muses, p. 122), whereas Metzler (Tempora, p. 866, n. 15) suggests the first section may be addressed to an official of the Šîn temple.
etymologizing the king’s name to mean “The-God-Sin-Is-Arriving (in triumph)” by rendering poetic allusions in line 15 to the arrival of the true shepherd and by reading in line 19 that the promised ruler came out of the city of Sîn (Ur). There are, however, at least two other possible candidates for the unnamed ruler: Anam (see possible restoration in line 21) and Hammurabi (cf. bēlum muballît Uruk CH ii 37–38). Hammurabi is also mušēpû kînātim (CH iv 53, B vi 12, C rev. “ii” 71),23 and this attribution might explain the northern orthography in which this text is written. One might imagine a scribe from Uruk sending this oracle to his Babylonian overlord and using the Babylonian way of writing. The tablet we have might then be a file copy or a draft.

Another strange aspect of the prophecy of W 19900,1 is the dating of the beginning of the blessed reign of the “true shepherd” from the day he entered the Eanna. The entering or passing over the threshold may express a rite of passage. Perhaps this refers to a coronation ceremony that may have included a “sacred marriage” ritual. Ellis has suggested that there was a proclamation of an oracular message at the coronation of the king.24 On the basis of our tablet, Pongratz-Leisten proposed that the kings of the Sîn-kâšid dynasty chose the framework of prophecy to convey their close relationship with Inanna/Ištar and the divine world in place of the ritual of the “sacred marriage.”25 Another probability is that the entrance of the king into the temple refers to his involvement in specific religious rites. Certain livestock were designated in Sumerian as lugal ku-ra “the king having entered,” which can be understood as animals for sacrifices performed in the presence of the king or by the king.26 These offerings were presented in the Inanna temple in Uruk as well as in Nippur.

In the introduction to the oracular text W 19900,1, the goddess Nanaya is also said to have made an entrance. In the city of Ur in the Ur III period the cult of Anunnîtum and Ulmašîtum included observances called the u₄ erubbatum “Day (of) Entering.”27


24 Ellis, “Mesopotamian Oracles and Prophetic Texts,” pp. 174, 177, and 181. Moran (“An Ancient Prophetic Oracle,” p. 254) also suggests that the temporal context of the Kitîtum oracle might be the accession of the king. For a similar proposal, i.e., that the oracles were delivered at the coronation ceremonies of Esarhaddon, see S. Parpola, Assyrian Prophecies, SAA 9 (Helsinki, 1997), p. lxiv.

25 See Pongratz-Leisten, “When the Gods Are Speaking,” p. 147, who defines the role of Inanna/Ištar as a prophesying deity for the crown prince and future king but builds her argument on this text, which is less than supportive.

26 W. Sallaberger, Der kultische Kalender der Ur III-Zeit (Berlin, 1993), Teil 1, p. 30 and n. 124 (where he negates the idea that lugal ku₄-ra refers to a specific ritual) and p. 113. Note also the Ur III ritual text, UET 3 57 (see J. J. A. van Dijk, “VAT 8382: Ein zweisprachiges Königslistuhl,” Studien Falkenstein, pp. 235–36), which describes a ritual in which the king enters various temples.

Such an observance was also held in the temple of Dagan and Išhara. Although it is not clearly stated, it can be deduced from the context that the place where Nanaya entered is also the Eanna. The Eanna was the traditional precinct of Inanna, but it was shared with Nanaya before and even after the building of her separate temple. This can be seen in the words of a tigi-song to Nanaya by Išbi-Erra of Isin (Išbi-Erra C, lines 2–4):

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{Joan Goodnick Westenholz} \\
&\text{310} \\
&\text{JOAN GOODNICK WESTENHOLZ} \\
&\text{oi.uchicago.edu} \\
&\text{310} \\
&\text{JOAN GOODNICK WESTENHOLZ} \\
&\text{oi.uchicago.edu} \\
&\text{310} \\
&\text{JOAN GOODNICK WESTENHOLZ} \\
&\text{oi.uchicago.edu} \\
&\text{310} \\
&\text{JOAN GOODNICK WESTENHOLZ} \\
&\text{oi.uchicago.edu} \\
&\text{310} \\
&\text{JOAN GOODNICK WESTENHOLZ} \\
&\text{oi.uchicago.edu} \\
&\text{310} \\
&\text{JOAN GOODNICK WESTENHOLZ} \\
&\text{oi.uchicago.edu} \\
&\text{310} \\
&\text{JOAN GOODNICK WESTENHOLZ} \\
&\text{oi.uchicago.edu} \\
&\text{310} \\
&\text{JOAN GOODNICK WESTENHOLZ} \\
&\text{oi.uchicago.edu} \\
&\text{310} \\
&\text{JOAN GOODNICK WESTENHOLZ} \\
&\text{oi.uchicago.edu} \\
&\text{310} \\
&\text{JOAN GOODNICK WESTENHOLZ} \\
&\text{oi.uchicago.edu} \\
&\text{310} \\
&\text{JOAN GOODNICK WESTENHOLZ} \\
&\text{oi.uchicago.edu} \\
&\text{310} \\
&\text{JOAN GOODNICK WESTENHOLZ} \\
&\text{oi.uchicago.edu} \\
&\text{310} \\
&\text{JOAN GOODNICK WESTENHOLZ} \\
&\text{oi.uchicago.edu} \\
&\text{310} \\
&\text{JOAN GOODNICK WESTENHOLZ} \\
&\text{oi.uchicago.edu} \\
&\text{310} \\
&\text{JOAN GOODNICK WESTENHOLZ} \\
&\text{oi.uchicago.edu} \\
&\text{310} \\
&\text{JOAN GOODNICK WESTENHOLZ} \\
&\text{oi.uchicago.edu} \\
&\text{310} \\
&\text{JOAN GOODNICK WESTENHOLZ} \\
&\text{oi.uchicago.edu} \\
&\text{310} \\
&\text{JOAN GOODNICK WESTENHOLZ} \\
&\text{oi.uchicago.edu} \\
&\text{310} \\
&\text{JOAN GOODNICK WESTENHOLZ} \\
&\text{oi.uchicago.edu}
\end{align*}
\]

We have royal dedications of various cultic installments to Nanaya from the members of the Sîn-kâšid dynasty — Sîn-kâšid built an ib-oval for her, Sîn-gâmil built her first temple in Uruk, the E₂-me-ur₄-ur₄, which was completed by his successor Anam. The close relationship among the kings of Uruk, Nanaya, and the Eanna finds the following expression in the royal hymn of Anam (lines 34–36):

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{[bî]-in-dug₄ an-ki-a ig-é-an-na-ka} \\
&\text{nîn ummeda-a ūna-na-a bàd-gal ba-gub-bu} \\
&\text{zi numun hi-li giš-šub-zu-šè mu-e-gar} \\
&\text{The lady, the nurse, Nanaya, who stands there like a great wall at the door of Eanna, has decreed throughout heaven and earth and she has fixed life, progeny, and luxury as your lot.}
\end{align*}
\]

It is interesting to note again that Nanaya is standing at the liminal location of the doorway.

---


29 Nanaya’s chapel in the Eanna, the é-ḫi-li-an-na, is first mentioned by the Kassite king Nazi-Maruttaš; see George Temple, *Temples*, pp. 98 f., no. 459.


32 Ibid., pp. 466–67, E4.4.3.1.


34 For this royal hymn of Anam, see ibid., p. 81.
The genealogy of Nanaya is now known—she is the daughter of An and Inanna. While Inanna is the daughter of Sîn (specified first in Old Babylonian), Nanaya becomes the daughter of Sîn only in first-millennium texts as a result of her syncretism with Inanna. Thus, Sargon II in his hymn declaims: “Hear O regions of the world, the praise of queen Nanaya … daughter-in-law of the Esagil, spouse of Muati,… daughter of Sîn.” Consequently, an explanation is needed to answer the question of why Nanaya waits at the gate of Sîn, “her father” in this Warka text. Other than it being a scribal error, there seems to be only one justification for this unusual filiation—that “father” is used here to designate “ancestor.” In other words, Nanaya’s mother’s father, her grandfather, the god Sîn, is replacing her father, An. While a gate of Sîn might be found in Uruk, a heavenly gate of Sîn is known from the composition Etana, in which Etana dreams of passing through the gate of Sîn, Šamaš, Adad, and Ištar before proceeding to the palace of Ištar. Thus the vision of the prophet in W 19900, 1 might be one of a scene in heaven rather than on earth.

One of the central questions in this oracular text is its divine source, that is, whether it is imparted by one or two goddesses. Because of the confusion in the writing of the logogram U.DAR and of the conjunctive particle ʾ, the reading depends on the subjective analysis of the text with one exception. In line 27, a-wa-tim ša U.DAR iq-ta-bi-a is the only possible reading. The question is whether to read U.DAR as a proper noun, the name of the goddess Ištar, or as a common noun, the generic word for goddess, which could refer back to Nanaya. In references to this text in the secondary literature,
some scholars believe that the goddess who divulges the oracle is the goddess Ištar,\textsuperscript{40} while others think that it is Nanaya.\textsuperscript{41} As already pointed out by Bob Biggs, Nanaya is probably to be preferred, since she is specified by name and it is possible to refer to her under the sobriquet “goddess” ištaru.\textsuperscript{42} The designation ištaru as a common noun, the generic word for goddess, is already found in Early Dynastic texts in which the name Inanna could be applied to other manifestations of female goddesses.\textsuperscript{43} An Old Babylonian example of ištaru as a common noun in the singular is:

\begin{quote}
\textit{lizziz ina muttiki ili abiša}
\textit{lišann[iak][im] iš-ta-ri-i a-la-ak-ti limdi}
\end{quote}

Let the god of my father stand before you,
let him tell you, my goddess, learn my way.


Note the contrast between the named goddess and the generic use of ištaru in the plural:

\begin{quote}
\textit{U.DAR rittušša šerret nišši uki ‘al}
\textit{[iq]ullā iš-ta-ra-ta-ši-im [siqr]ušša}
\end{quote}

Ištar holds in her hand the nose-rope of the people,
their goddesses attend to her word.

(Groneberg \textit{Ištar}, p. 75 ii 10–13 [Agušaya])

\textsuperscript{40} van Dijk, “Die Inschriften,” pp. 61–62; Metzler, \textit{Tempora}, p. 867; Pongratz-Leisten, \textit{Herrschaftswissen in Mesopotamien}, p. 49; Pongratz-Leisten, “When the Gods Are Speaking,” p. 155. One reason for this assumption is the close connection between Assyrian prophecy and the cult of Ištar (of Arbelai!); see Parpola, SAA 9, pp. xlvi f. Among the many prophecies given in Mari, however, there is only one single mention of an Ištar figure, Ištar of Ninēt (Nineveh?) (ARMT 26/1 192:16).

\textsuperscript{41} Charpin, “Prophètes et rois,” p. 43; Ellis, “Mesopotamian Oracles and Prophetic Texts,” p. 138; Beaulieu \textit{Uruk}, p. 184; and Foster, \textit{Before the Muses}, p. 122.


\textsuperscript{43} In the Early Dynastic collection of praise-hymns, the praise-hymn to Inanna of Zabalam addresses her as Inanna-kur, Inanna of Uruk, and Inanna-hu-ud but in the final line invokes her as dNin-um; in the praise hymn to Inanna of Dilmun, the name Inanna is used parallel with the name of the goddess of Dilmun, Nin-ab-KID. KID (lines 143–44). For a discussion, see J. G. Westenholz, “Great Goddesses in Mesopotamia: The Female Aspect of Divinity,” \textit{Bulletin of the Canadian Society for Mesopotamian Studies} 37 (2002): 18–20.
A similar example is seen in a late second-millennium composition:

\[\textit{kamsāši kullassin  ficken me nišima}\]

All the goddesses of the peoples bow down to her.

(Lambert, \textit{Kraus AV}, p. 202 iv 21 [Śarrat-Nippuri Hymn])

Of the many examples of \textit{ištaru} as a common noun in first-millennium texts, note this parallelism from Gilgamesh:

\[\textit{išassı ficken kina ālititi} \]
\[\textit{unambi Bēlet-ilī tābat rigma}\]

The goddess began screaming like a woman in childbirth,
Bēlet-ilī wailed, so sweet of voice.

(George \textit{Gilg.}, XI 117 f.)

The Old Babylonian flood story contains a similar couplet, with the Akkadian word \textit{iltum} “goddess” in the first line and the mother goddess \textit{dMami} in the second. In Mari rituals, the named goddess is also commonly designated by the generic term \textit{iltum}. In the last line of this Uruk text, the goddess is simply referred to as \textit{DINGIR “god,”} a term unmarked for gender (but see the discussion in the notes to line 30 below).

The words uttered by the goddess contain allusions to “dead Uruk” and wishes for its brighter future. The phrase \textit{Uruk mītum} “dead Uruk” is an extraordinary designation and an expression apparently unique to Uruk. There are two periods in the history of the city of Uruk in which it could be said to be “dead.” The first and earlier period of demise was after the fall of the Ur III dynasty, when the city of Uruk seems to have suffered more than any other urban center — it was destroyed and then abandoned for almost a century. During that period, Uruk endured the hegemony of Isin through the reign of Lipit-Ištar, after which it gained independence. Following a short-lived Amorite dynasty that left no records in Uruk, the Šin-kāšid dynasty arose in the mid-

\footnotesize
44 See also the comments George \textit{Gilg.}, p. 886.
45 Lambert-Millard \textit{Atra-hasīs}, pp. 94–95 iii 32 f.
nineteenth century to reclaim Uruk. As far as we know, however, the theme of the revival of dead Uruk occurs with only one Old Babylonian king — Hammurabi — who according to his stele was bēlum muballit Uruk “lord who revives Uruk” (Hammurabi stele, CH ii 37–38). The second period of demise occurred after the post-Samsuiluna disintegration of the southern Mesopotamian cities, resulting in centuries of abandonment. During this later period, wishes for the revival of Uruk are encountered in late Old Babylonian personal names from Kiš, such as Uruk-ñiblu.47

While the term “dead city” is found once in Akkadian (TIM 2 16:63; see further, notes to lines 11 and 17 below), the Sumerian adjective most commonly given in relation to uru “city” is gul “destroyed” (see, for example, Nippur Lament 43 and passim).48 The refrain in the Lamentation over the Destruction of Sumer and Ur put into the mouths of the goddesses is: a uru gul-la é gul-la-mu “Alas, the destroyed city, my destroyed temple!” (line 118 and passim).49

To revive dead Uruk, the “true shepherd” in this Uruk prophecy is accompanied by šulmu and balātu “well-being and life.” A similar promise is made at the end of the Uruk Lament:

\[
\begin{align*}
lú-uru-bi & \text{ nam-}tì níg-dù_{10} \text{-ge} \\
gù zig-mu-na-}i\text{-ib} & \text{ me-}tēš ḫē-i-i \\
zi-da & \text{ gūb-}bu-na ḫē-bi-in-dirig \\
dlamma & \text{ gā-la nu-dag-} \text{-ge} \text{ sag-} \text{ gā-} \text{ na tuku-bī-ib} \\
nam-tar-} \text{-} \text{ fral-[ni] } \text{ ūn} \text{-} \text{ nim} \text{-} \text{ zid} \text{ du}_{11} \text{-gā-} \text{ a-ba} \\
inim & \text{ an-[n]a} \text{ } \text{ dēn-līl-lā-} \text{-} \text{ šē} \text{ sud-} \text{-da-} \text{-} \text{ šē} \text{ nu-kūr-} \text{ ru} \\
\end{align*}
\]

Man and city! Life and well-being! —
Proclaim it for him. Let praises ring out!
Let him be made surpassing above all, to his right or left!
Tireless lamma deity, take hold of his head,
pronounce his fate in charitable words —
By the command of An and Enlil it will remain forever unaltered!

(Uruk Lament 12.33–38)50

Note, moreover, that in the Uruk Lament, Uruk is referred to as ki-gīg-ga “the aggrieved place” (Green, “Uruk Lament,” p. 276, 12.26), a description that may reflect

49 P. Michalowski, The Lamentation over the Destruction of Sumer and Ur (Winona Lake, Indiana, 1989), p. 82, note to line 118. For other examples, see Tinney, Nippur Lament, p. 139, note to line 43.
its suffering and destruction at the end of the Ur III period. This composition is dated to the reign of Išme-Dagan of Isin, who is mentioned in line 12.14 and who bears the epithet sipa-zi in his hymns and inscriptions.

The major issue concerning the contents of the oracle is the message it brings. Commonly, messages contained in oracles deal with specific public matters, affairs of cult and temple or king and state. Is the message the promise of a rosy future for Uruk or just a pledge for the continuous presence and support of Nanaya? Does the oracle convey instructions for the restoration of the cult of the goddess, be it of Ištar or of Nanaya? The message is unfortunately partially destroyed.

The uncertainties of the contents of the text are mirrored in the problems of its form — its paleography, orthography, grammar, and vocabulary. Regarding paleography, for example, the scribe wrote the sign ū and the logogram U.DAR identically (see above).  

The northern orthography of this early text from Uruk can be seen in the following examples: BI for both /bi/ and /pi/ (bi-tim, line 3; pí-ki, line 19); TU for /tu/ (ba-la-tū, line 5; ū-ba-al-la-tū, line 11). For comparison, note the orthography of the letter of Anam to Sinmuballit of Babylon, bi-tum (Bagh. Mitt. 2 56 ii 2), pi-i-im (ibid., iii 28), na-tū-u (ibid., 57 ii 6). Another peculiarity is the use of DI for /te/ (te-te-en, line 12) rather than TE, which is the common Old Babylonian trait; cf. ū-te-em-am (ibid., 56 i 23 [Uruk], CT 52 3:30 [north], Tell Rimah 20:15) and ū-te-em-ka (YOS 13 161:13 [Dilbat]), but note the mixture in Šamaš-ḫāzīr letters: ša-še-en (OECT 3 52:21) and i-te-eh-hi (OECT 3 52:27). TE for /te/ occurs even in late Old Babylonian letters from Babylon (the period of Samsuditana): ip-še-en (VAS 22 84:29). The orthography gives no evidence, however, of the typical Middle Babylonian shifts, such as š > l before a dental (ištu vis-à-vis ultu; see line 4), w > m in intervocalic position (a-wa-tim, line 27), or w > Ō in initial position (wa-ar-ki-šu, line 5). The Old Babylonian spelling convention of the type V₁-V₁C is found in this text to write monosyllables of the type VC (i-ib-ta-lu-ṭ, line 17) and monosyllabic alternants of disyllabic words, such as ū-ul (line 27) — supporting the Old Babylonian dating of the text. As is common in Old Babylonian and Middle Babylonian orthography, the double consonants are consistently indicated in the script, but as expected in Old Babylonian, the final vowels i + a are not contracted (ū?-ši-a-am, line 19; iq-ta-bi-a, line 27). There is, however, an utter lack of consistency in the handling of mimation (a-di ra-a-am ki-na [line 10] as opposed to aš-šum ri-i ki-nim [line 22]). The absence of mimation is unambiguous as

---

51 Metzler, Tempora, p. 866.
53 Cf. lines 7 and 27, and for a discussion of the problem, see Metzler, Tempora, pp. 866–67, n. 18.
seen in the use of VC and V signs but may be even more prevalent, since it is difficult to assess its absence because of the conventional use of CVm signs as the final sign of a word. Thus, -nim, -qum, -tum, and -tim are commonly disregarded in studies of mimation.\(^\text{55}\) The poor quality of the writing and the variations in orthography are, according to Pongratz-Leisten, due to the prophet’s lack of training in writing.\(^\text{56}\)

The grammatical rules of nominal declension, nominal and verbal agreement, and verbal sequence are kept. The vocabulary is restricted and words are repeated for effect. Poetic devices include the fronting of the *nomen rectum* of the inverted genitive (see line 1), parallelism (see lines 4–5), and literary repetition. This same type of simplicity of diction and repetition of phrases is to be found in the oracle of Kitītum of Nerebtum (modern Ishchali).\(^\text{57}\) Note the inverted repetition and expansion of lines 10–11 in lines 17–20.

The structure of the composition can be outlined as follows:

- Lines 1–5 (prophet addresses the king in praise)
- Lines 6–14 (prophet tells of first vision)
- Lines 15–20 (prophet tells of first vision fulfilled)
- Lines 21–27 (prophet tells of second vision)
- Lines 28–30 (prophet addresses the king directly)

Metzler breaks down the structure of this text differently because of his assessment of the language: he believes that the beginning lines (1–6) and the final lines (28–30) of the text are poetic in form, while the middle section (lines 7–27) was composed in prose.\(^\text{58}\) He analyzes lines 1–6 as two distichs, leaving the subordinate clause of line 6 hanging.

Thus this oracular text is problematic: it is rare to find a literary text with a definite archaeological find-spot whose orthography and language seemingly contradict that archaeological information. If the archaeological details were lacking, this oracular text would be dated to the late Old Babylonian or perhaps even to the early Kassite period, conceivably related to the revival of Uruk under Kara-indaš. It is, consequently, difficult to place this text in its literary context and to determine its political agenda and historical value.

\(^{55}\) Certain forms with mimation could be explained as pausal forms, such as those found in the first two lines of W 19900,1. On the other hand, Sh. Izre’el (“Linguistics and Poetics in Old Babylonian Literature: Mimation and Meter in Etana,” *ANES* 27 [2000]: 57–68) analyzed the apparent mimation problem in Etana and concluded that mimation is not rendered consistently in pausal forms, indicating mimation in pausal forms is deleted, whereas it is retained in other environments. He based his conclusions solely on the distribution of forms using final -Vm signs to render mimation. See also K. A. Metzler, “Restitution der Mimation im altbabylonischen Atram-ḥāsis-Epos,” *UF* 26 (1994): 369–72.


\(^{58}\) Metzler, *Tempora*, p. 867.
THE TRUE SHEPHERD OF Uruk

1. re-e-ú ki-nu šum-šu dam-qum
2. la-ma-sà-šu da-ri-tum
3. a-na bi-tim é-an-na i-te-ru-ub
4. iš-tu i-na-an-na a-na pa-ni-šu šu-ul-mu
5. a-na wa-ar-ki-šu ba-la-ṭú
6. iš-tu u₄-um ́Na-na-a i-ru-ba-am’
7. ù¹ i-na KÁ ́DEN.ZU a-bi-ša
8. ú-še-ši-ba-an-ni-ma
9. um-ma ši-(i)-ma
10. a-dì ra-a-am ki-na a-ša-ak-ka-nu
11. ù¹ Uruk.KI mi-ta-am ú-ba-al-la-tú
12. su-ut Uruk.KI te-te-en
13. Uruk.KI ra-bu-ú i-na-aṭ-ṭa-la’-an-ni
14. a-la-am ú bi-tam ú-za-[k[a]]
15. ki-ma re-ḫu-ú ki-nu a-na ma-ti lˇša’-ak²-nu²
16. um-ma a-na-ku-ma
17. Uruk.KI mi-tum i-ib-ta-lu-út
18. ú re-ḫu-ú ki-nu
19. ša i-na pi-ki a-w[a]-t[um] u³-ši-a-am
20. i-ta-aš-ka-an ša¹-la-am-[š]u tu¹¹,-uš¹,-te-eš₁₅,-še-ri
21. um-ma ši-ma i-nu-ma a x An-a¹-an Uruk³-a-am (or: A-nim (d)INANNA¹ DIN-GIR.URU DINGIR ad-ki-a-am)
22. ú aš-šum re-i ki-nim a-[ša-al-šu-nu]-ti
23. ir-bi-ta i-id-na-a ki a-ši²-ra-ni (or: a-na i-si-ni)
24. i-na mu-uḥ-ši-ia i¹-ta-na-ap-ḫu¹-ur
25. ta-ša-ab la ta-na-aš a-wa-[tu]-ú-a ú-ut¹-ra
26. ú-šu-úr-tu eṣ-ra-at¹(wr. am)-m[a x] l[x x (x)]¹
27. ú-ut a-la-ak a-wa-tim ša U.DAR iq-ta-bi-a
28. be-li pí-ia li-iš-me-e-ma
29. a-wa-ti-ia i-na qá-ti li-ki-il
30. ú ši-bu-út DINGIR li-ik-šu-ud
TRANSLATION

(prophet addresses the king in praise):
1 True shepherd—his repute is good,
2 his guardian angel is everlasting—
3 he has entered the Temple Eanna.
4 From now on well-being is before him,
5 health behind him.

(prophet tells of first vision):
6 From the day when Nanaya entered
7 and in the gate of Sîn, her father,
8 had me sit down and
9 spoke:
10 “Until I shall establish a true shepherd
11 and revive dead Uruk,
12 you will grind the sütu-measure of Uruk.
13 Great Uruk will look toward me.
14 Town and temple I will liberate/free.”

(prophet tells of vision fulfilled):
15 When the faithful shepherd was established for the land,
16 I spoke saying,
17 “Dead Uruk has revived
18 and the faithful shepherd,
19 about whom the word (oracle) was promulgated from your mouth,
20 has been established. You ensure that his welfare prospers!”

(prophet tells of second vision):
21 She spoke saying, “When … Anam the Urukean (or: I summoned Anu and Inanna, gods of the city)
22 and regarding the faithful shepherd I asked them.
23 Give the team of four as helpers(?)! (or: as for my festival)
24 Around me, it continually will assemble.
25 Sit down! Do not shake/move! My words are preeminent,
26 the plan is drawn for you and …
27 I will not go.”

(prophet addresses the king directly):
The words (pl. oblique) that the goddess spoke to me
28 let my lord hear (from) my mouth, and
29 let him retain my words,
30 so he may fulfill the wish of the deity.
PHILOLOGICAL NOTES

1 The writings of rēʾûm in this text show a variety of renderings: re-e-ú, ra-a-am, re-ḫu-ú, re-i. Old Babylonian writings vary between rēʾûm (re-i-im Gilg. P ii 33) and rējûm (re-ḫu-ul CH i 51), but re-ḫu-tim (YOS 12 438:8) and re-e-ú-tim (Szlechter Tabletes, p. 90, MAH 16431:7) both occur for the abstract.

For šumum damqum, commonly used in wishes in the greeting formulas of Old Babylonian letters, see W. Sallaberger, “Wenn Du mein Bruder bist...” : Interaktion und Textgestaltung in althbabylonischen Alltagsbriefen, Cuneiform Monographs 16 (Groningen, 1999), p. 85.

2 For the importance of the lamassum of the king, cf. lamassam nāširtam aštaknakkum “with a protective spirit I have provided you,” FLP 1674:24b-5; see Ellis, “The Goddess Kititum Speaks,” pp. 265–66. For the phrase lamassum darīṭum in Old Babylonian letters, cf. ša ilšu bānīšu lamassam darīṭam iddinušu “to whom the god who created him gave a permanent protective spirit,” TCL 17 37:1–2. In the late Uruk prophecy, the guiding spirit of the city is called lamassu (wr. .printStackTrace) Ûrukki darītu, Hunger Ûruk, 3:4f.; see H. Hunger and S. Kaufman, “A New Akkadian Prophecy Text,” JAOS 95 (1975): 371–75, who suggest that the lamassu is that of Ištar in the Eanna. In Old Babylonian letters, lamassum and šumum damqum can occur in parallel phrases; see, for example, Kraus AbB 1 15:1–4 and, further, Sallaberger, “Wenn Du mein Bruder bist,” p. 82.

3 The most laudable feat of the reign of Sîn-kāṣid was the restoration of the Eanna temple in Uruk; see Frayne, RIME 4, p. 440. There is no extant dedication of the Eanna but only short brick inscriptions (ibid., pp. 440–41, E4.4.1.1) with no mention of the goddess or any deities of the Eanna. He did build separate temples both for An and Inanna and for Nanaya. For Nanaya, he built the Ešahulla (ibid., pp. 451–52, E4.4.1.6), and for An and Inanna, he built the Epapah, possibly a papāḫum cella adjacent to the courtyard of the Eanna (ibid., pp. 452–53, E4.4.1.7).

For the form of the verb as a Gt preterite “für die Dauer eintreten,” see Metzler, Tempora, p. 869.

4–5 For šulmu and balāṭu as parallel terms in greeting formulas of Old Babylonian letters, see Sallaberger, “Wenn Du mein Bruder bist,” pp. 78–81. An enigmatic administrative text listing expenditures for various rites (IM 10135:11–12) contains the words níg.šu ina šēpišu šulmu u ina šēpišu balāṭu; see J. J. A. van Dijk, “VAT 8382: Ein zweisprachiges Königsritual,” Studien Falkenstein, p. 241 and n. 43, where he relates the phrase to the legal clause šalmu-balṭu. In the lines of the present text, however, šulmu and balāṭu are personified as if they were the divine bodyguard of the king; cf. V. Hurowitz and J. G. Westenholz, “LKA 63: A Heroic Poem in Celebration of Tiglath-Pileser I’s Muṣru-Qumanu Campaign,” JCS 42 (1990): 30–33.
While I earlier read the last sign as -kum “to you” (J. G. Westenholz, “Nanaya, Lady of Mystery,” p. 66), the sign seems rather to be -am (compare -kum in line 1 with -am in line 10). Such a reading seems to fit the context better and avoids the introduction of a second person. See, however, the discussion in Metzler, Tempora, p. 867 and n. 19.

The reason for the scribe’s erasure of the i in śi-(i)-ma indicated in the copy by van Dijk is not evident, but he was consistent in regarding the vowel as short. In line 21, he wrote śi-ma without the addition of the -i-.

For the phrase Uruk mītum, cf. the occurrence of ālam mītam (TIM 2 16:63) in a text recording the vitriolic diplomatic exchange between the official representative of Rīm-Sīn in the Diyala region, Śamaš-magir, and the local authority, Ibqu-Īštar, the šakkanakku of the city of Diniktum, regarding a fugitive who abducted two slave-girls. The immediate context for the phrase ālam mītam is at the conclusion of the affair. The text reads: rabiānum ša Maškan-šāpir ana kīma jāti iškunu ālam mītam Maškan-šāpir ana kīma Diniktum tašakkan, which is translated by the CAD as “have they made the r. [rabiānum] of Maškan-šāpir as (important as) I am? – you want to turn(?) a dead city, GN [Maškan-šāpir], into the semblance(?) of Diniktum” (CAD R s.v. rabiānu usage a-3’). While the CAD clearly assumes that the “dead city” stands in apposition to Maškan-šāpir, this is most unlikely. Not only does it seem not to follow from the preceding records, since Maškan-šāpir is not mentioned except in these lines, but also during this period Maškan-šāpir was enjoying the heyday of its existence. Perhaps “dead city” is a proverbial phrase whose meaning has been lost in the passage of time.

For a metaphorical interpretation of this line, which relates the lowly task of grinding to the kingly duty of taxing the country, see M. Stol, “State and Private Business in Larsa,” JCS 34 (1982): 155. See further W. R. Mayer, “Akkadische Lexikographie: CAD S, I. Babylonisch,” Or., n.s., 60 (1991): 116, who suggests the translation: “du wirst die Uruk (auferlegte) Abgabe zermalmen.” The figurative image is not obvious. The equation could be with subservience or with hard labor. A pledged slave-girl had to grind one sūtu per day (UET 5 366:9–11), while in Old Babylonian marriage contracts, the junior wife is obligated to grind a sūtu of barley flour for the senior wife (see, for example, CT 2 44:25). The divine dictate enjoined on the prophet(ess?) is that she will be the submissive attendant of Nanaya until the revival of Uruk under the true shepherd.

Uruk rabû is a rather unusual appellative. The more common designations are *ribûtu* or *supûrum*. Uruk is also referred to as uru-ul “primeval city” and úru-sag / âli rëšti “first (foremost) city” (for references, see George Topographical Texts, pp. 245–46). The adjective *rabû* does occur with cities, especially *Sippar rabûm*, now identified with Sippar-Amnûnum (Tell ed-Deîr); see Harris *Sippar*, p. 13; D. Charpin, “Sippar: deux villes jumelles,” RA 82 (1988): 13–32; D. Charpin, “Le point sur les deux Sippar,” NABU 1992/114; C. Janssen et al., “Du chantier à la tablette: Ur-Utu et l’histoire de sa maison à Sippar-Amnûnum,” in H. Gasche et al., eds., Cinquante-deux réflexions sur le Proche-Orient ancien offertes en hommage à Léon De Meyer, MHEO 2 (Leuven, 1994), p. 102. The question here is whether the designation *rabû* in relation to Uruk reflects the type of specificity as that of Sippar. Another possibility is that *Uruk rabû* should be understood in the context of the oracle in which it parallels *Uruk mûtum*. Thus a meaning such as “risen Uruk” might be appealing, but the source of such meaning for *rabû* is elusive; according to CAD, *rabû* B is “to set, to disappear (said of celestial bodies).”

As for the verb, there is a problem concerning the reading of the third from last sign, which is misformed. The suggested reading *i-na-ad-da-na∑-an-ni* “wird mir gegeben werden” by Metzler, Tempora, p. 866, is grammatically impossible. The correct form of the -i- class verb in the N-stem with dative suffix would have been *innaddinam*. For this reason, the reading *i-na-aø-li-aø-øa-la∑-an-ni* is offered. For the use of the verb *naøΩlu* in the sense of looking toward the deity, cf. *šatu kîma arîhm annaøΩlim* “she (Nanaya) is like the moon to look upon,” VAS 10 215:3 (Old Babylonian Hymn to Nanaya).

Foster (*Before the Muses*, p. 122) translates: “A great man will give me Uruk.” While “great man” as the subject is very appropriate, the verb *nadΩnu* cannot take a double accusative. The first-person indirect object should be a dative form.

While *ú-œa-ba-[at]* (Metzler, Tempora, p. 866) is a possible reading, the sense of *şubbutu* “to conquer a city” or “to seize” (as given in all the translations) does not seem to fit the context. Perhaps a nuance such as “to take possession of” might be possible, referring to the return of the goddess after her abandonment of the city. This withdrawal of the deity and of his/her favor leaves any city vulnerable to its destruction—a common motif of the Sumerian city laments. The range of meanings of the D-form are limited compared to that of the G-form. Other possible meanings of the G-form range from the Old Akkadian phrase “to take a stand in GN”^{60} to the Neo-Assyrian phrase *âlu šuâatu ašbat*, meaning “I (re)organized the city” (*CAD* s.v. *şabûtu* mng. 3f), which co-

---

^{60} Aage Westenholz (personal communication).
occurs with an *ana* phrase (for example, *ana eššūti, ana āl šarrūti*), as well as “to take up a position” (mng. 4a).

There is a problem with this reading, however, because there seems to be no space for the [-at] at the end of the line, according to the photograph on *UVB* 18, pl. 20. Thus, van Dijk’s translation “je libérerai” (*Dictionnaire de la Bible*), probably reading *ū-za-k[a]*, seems more appropriate. Most likely reading, similarly, *ū-za-ku-[x]*, Foster (*Before the Muses*, p. 122) translates: “They will purify(?)”.

15 Foster’s translation (*Before the Muses*, p. 122), “Since the true shepherd has ‘arrived’ in this land,” is based on *ikšudu* in the traces at the end of this line (see Foster, *NABU* 2002/82, on wordplay in this text).

19 This clause is awkward. While the space is seemingly too short for a phrase *ana* + noun before the verb, the traces match the signs of line 15. Metzler (*Tempora*, p. 866) reads *a-w[ā]-š[u]*? (“bezüglich dessen ein Wort aus deinem Mund erging”), while van Dijk (*Dictionnaire de la Bible*) translated “que sur ton ordre An [a fait sor]tir” and Foster (*Before the Muses*, p. 122) “he who came out hither from the city of the god Šin to [Uruk?]” (reading *ina Urimki ā-ši-a-am*, Foster, *NABU* 2002/82). Another possibility might be that this clause may refer back to Nanaya’s command to the prophet in line 12, and the traces would fit *a-na-k[u]*. Perhaps the best restoration would be *a-w[a]-t[um]*, although a problem does exist regarding the space for the signs. A comparable example is: *amat ippiša uššia* “the word that comes out of her mouth,” VAS 10 214 vi 13 (Old Babylonian Agušaja).

20 The traces in the middle of the line do not seem to yield an easy solution. Metzler (*Tempora*, p. 866) reads: *ta-la-kā-iš*i-x x x eššiš-še-ri* “Auf den Wegen? von? [oder: auf meinem Weg?] ... kommst? du (nun?)”. Since the sign is clearly *-uš-* rather then *eššiš* (IŠ), the last word could be *uš-še-ri* as an imperative feminine expressing a plea to Nanaya by the speaker to release him from the “grinding” imposed on him in line 12, but that does not account for the signs in the middle of the line. I have followed a suggestion made to me by Walter Farber that makes sense of the line, although it calls for seriously emending several signs.

21 The traces of the signs in the subordinate clause depending on *ināma* are also unwieldy. Although the signs could be construed as *a-ša-ša-ša-ša-an* “when I reestablish,” this is unlikely, since the verb does not have a subjunctive marker and the object would have to follow the verb. This precludes a translation such as “When I establish Uruk” (Pongratz-Leisten, “When the Gods Are Speaking,” p. 156). The traces at the end of the line might be interpreted as *An-a-ša-ša-ša-an Urukki-a-am* “Anam, the Urukean,” while van Dijk (*Dictionnaire de la Bible*) suggested reading “Anum, le fort(?) d’Uruk,” which would indicate
that he presumably read the signs at the end of the line as A-nim da-an-na\(^1\)-an Uruk\(^{ki-a-am}\). Metzler (Tempora, p. 866) does not attempt any reading. The problem is that this clause does not continue onto the next line and so should end in a verb. Thus it is probably better to read ad-ki-a-am “I summoned.” For the persons summoned, the reading A-nim seems most likely. The traces after A-nim could give É\(^1\)-an-na\(^1\), but “Anum (of/in the) Eanna of divine(?) Urk” is slightly awkward, and A-nim (\(^{d}\)INANNA\(^{11}\) DINGIR.URU is perhaps better. A similar phrase is known from a juridical text recording that an oath was sworn by two of the claimants at the gate of AN \(^{u}\) INANNA i\(^{2}\)-li a-li-šu-nu “An and Inanna, gods of their city,” AO 5421:48; see C. Wilcke, “Nanāja-šamḫats Rechtsstreit um ihre Freiheit,” in B. Pongratz-Leisten, H. Kühne, and P. Xella, eds., Ana šadi Labnāni lū allik, Beiträge zu altorientalischen und mittelmeerischen Kulturen: Festschrift für Wolfgang Röllig, AOAT 247 (Kevelaer and Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1997), pp. 413–29. This suggestion, unfortunately, leaves the last DINGIR sign unaccounted for. Metzler offers no solution for the traces. Logically, Nanaya might be relating that she enlisted the help of her father (despite the mention of Sîn in line 7) and mother. Anu is well known as her father, and a new inscription of Lipit-Ištar of Isin (Pettinato, “Lipit-Eštar e la dea Nanaja,” pp. 274–75) recognizes Nanaya as the daughter of Inanna in Isin, but whether this is true of Nanaya in Uruk is not yet known.

23 The last phrase seems to be a prepositional phrase dependent on kî. For the writing of kî with a short i, which is found elsewhere in Old Babylonian literature, see J. G. Westenholz Akkade, pp. 206–7, to which many other examples could be adduced. Since the preposition kî and the suffix -āni are both simile markers, a simile might be expected. Metzler (Tempora, p. 866) reads the last two signs as one: I\(^{LU\text{GAL}}\)?, while van Dijk (Dictionnaire de la Bible) translated “quatre feux(?) comme pour la fête(?),” which would indicate that he presumably read the signs as: ir-bi-ta i-ša-ti a-ki a-na i-si-ni. The simile marker akî, however, is known only from the first millennium.

24 One possible reading of this line could be: i-na mu-uḥ-ḫi-ia i-bi\(^\text{I1}\) ku\(^\text{I1}\) x (x) ši-ib “into my presence, they brought(?) ….” For nabâkû, possibly a by-form of abâku, see CAD N/1. Nevertheless, although it seems obvious that the last word should be a form of wašābu, the traces do not yield any coherent form. van Dijk (Dictionnaire de la Bible) suggested reading “Au-dessus de moi il s’assemble continuellement,” which would indicate that he presumably read the signs at the end of the line as: i-\(^{1}\)ta-na-ap-ḫu\(^{1}\)-ur, an Ntn present, thus taking into consideration all the signs. It is a most attractive solution.

25 Since awâtûa is in the nominative case, it should be followed by a static or predicate adjective describing the words in parallel with the beginning of the next line. Despite the extra vertical wedge after û, one possible reading of the last three signs yields û-ut-ra for watrâ (fem. pl.). The lack of the initial wa-,
which should have been preserved (cf. \textit{wa-ar-ki-šu}, line 5), and the Assyrian vocalization of the verb could be said to negate this suggestion.  

26 For the reference of \textit{ušurtu}, Metzler (\textit{Tempora}, p. 867) proposes a plan of the temple. van Dijk (\textit{Dictionnaire de la Bible}) rendered this line: “observe! fais approcher … [ ],” which would indicate that he presumably read the signs at the beginning of the line as: \textit{ú-šū-úr tu-qé-ra-am-[a]} for \textit{ušur tuqerrab-ma}.  

27 For the form of the verb as an exceptional Gt reciprocal preterite, see Metzler, \textit{Tempora}, pp. 869 f.  

28–30 For these lines, see the transcription by van Dijk (“Die Inschriften,” p. 61) and note he transcribed \textit{DINGIR} as \textit{iltim}. Pongratz-Leisten (“When the Gods Are Speaking,” p. 157) conjectures that it should have been written either \textit{ištartu}, denoting the goddess, or \textit{DINGIR MEŠ}, alluding to the gods as the divine counsel. She is manipulating this text, however, in order to maintain the thesis of Inanna/Ištar’s role as mediatrix between the divine counsel and the king from the Sumerian tradition to the Old Babylonian tradition. Her first interpretation explains \textit{šibûtu} as the “wish or objectives of the god (= Ištar),” while her second interpretation construes the “‘wish or objectives of the gods’ in the sense of a general ‘divine plan in harmony with the cosmic order’” (ibid.). While it is conceivable that \textit{DINGIR} could signify the goddess, it is not expected that a king can achieve the objectives of the gods. Rather, it is possible that \textit{DINGIR} does not refer to any specific deity or deities but that it is a general statement to “fulfill the wish of the god,” an indispensable part of any successful king’s rule.
THE PALEOGRAPHY AND VALUES OF THE SIGN KIB*

Christopher Woods, The University of Chicago

I

When a comprehensive study of cuneiform paleography is eventually undertaken, this ambitious task will depend in large part upon in-depth studies of individual signs which balance the values attributed to a given sign against its graphic evolution. Only in this way will progress be made in elucidating the relationship between the writing systems of the Uruk, Fara/Abu Salabikh, and Pre-Sargonic periods. This particular study of the sign KIB grows out of a larger investigation devoted to the writing of the name of the Euphrates.¹ As it is concerned with early cuneiform writing, it relies in large part upon the cuneiform record from Abu Salabikh, the mere mention of which evokes the name of Robert D. Biggs, who so masterfully presented this important but difficult corpus. It is only fitting that I dedicate this modest contribution to Bob at the time of his retirement.

II

The complex graph that we transliterate as KIB and that, in Sumerian orthography, is quite rare outside of the writing of Zibir/Buranuna, represents the fusion of at least two distinct third-millennium graphs. In the lexical tradition of the first and second millennia, the signs in question are analyzed as giš-minabi-gilimû, i.e., GIŠ×GIŠ (LAK, no. 276) and gāna-minabi-gilimû, i.e., GÂNAXGÂN (LAK, no. 278);² the organization of signs in certain lexical lists suggests that GÂNA and GIŠ were interpreted, at this late date, as graphically related, that is, GÂNA serving as a gunû-type counterpart

---

* I am deeply grateful to Piotr Steinkeller for reading several drafts of this paper and making a number of critical observations and corrections. This study has also greatly benefited from a long and continuing correspondence that I have had with Niek Veldhuis concerning matters of third-millennium paleography and writing. I also would like to thank Miguel Civil, Jennie Myers, and Joan Westenholz for their assistance and suggestions. Finally, I would like to acknowledge the assistance of Tonia Sharlach, who generously provided me with the KIB lexical files of the Pennsylvania Sumerian Dictionary.

to GIŠ. It is clear that the paleographic analyses of the late lexical lists lack historical merit—based on contemporaneous sign shapes, they cannot accurately reflect paleographic origins. As we shall see, this is obviously the case with LAK, no. 278, allegedly GÁNA≈GÁNA. Yet for the sake of convenience, I will refer to the two signs in question as KIB (LAK, no. 276) and KIB-gunû (LAK, no. 278) respectively; I reserve KIB in quotation marks, i.e., “KIB,” to refer to the two collectively, without distinction.

The important point to be stressed here is that, regardless of label or paleographic origins, these two signs are not mere allographs in early cuneiform writing. Rather, the differences between them are distinctive—or better graphemic—with KIB and KIB-gunû being rigorously distinguished in third-millennium sources. It is only in the Old Babylonian period that the two collapse into a single graph. To be sure, this catch-all sign boasts a number of distinct allographs, including gunû and non-gunû forms, but by this time the values are no longer graphically distinguished.

The sign KIB can be shown to have an Uruk period ancestry—the problem lies in identifying the number of archaic forebears. ZATU identifies two signs that belong to the KIB family, ZATU, nos. 522 and 290. For the first, ZATU, no. 522, two orthographic variants are given: GIÅ×GIÅ, ÅENNUR, and a form closer to GIÅ≈GIÅ, ÅENNURb, cited as ÅENNURb.5 It is quite doubtful, however, that these two signs are allographs, as assumed by Green and Nissen. In the archaic copies of the so-called Tribute List all texts agree that the sign form of entry 62 is ÅENNURa,7 and there are no contexts in which ÅENNURb can be shown to be in free variation with the former. Further, the two graphs are differentiated more than simply by an additional GIÅ element. ÅENNURa displays an oblique 45-degree angle from vertical that is diagnostic of “KIB” in later periods, while ÅENNURb is upright and may be related to EZEN and similar signs.8 Indeed, further studies of early cuneiform may demonstrate that variations in the orientation of otherwise identical graphs are graphemic rather than merely allographic. Similarly,
the identification of ZATU, no. 290, as KIB is doubtful. The sign—which represents an unknown countable item in archaic administrative texts and which occurs also in a Lu forerunner—is likewise written vertically without the distinctive 45-degree tilt. Thus the only certain Uruk predecessor to KIB is GIŠ×GIŠ×GIŠ, which I discuss further below.

KIB- –gunû, on the other hand, appears by all indications to be an Early Dynastic invention, first attested at Fara. This graph, despite its later interpretation as GÁNA×GÁNA, is actually, in origin, related to KÁR or, more precisely, ŠÈ. As already suggested by Steinkeller, it seems probable that there was no graphic distinction between ŠÈ or, more precisely, ŠÈ-tenû₉₀ (i.e., horizontal ŠÈ, rotated 90 degrees from vertical and to be distinguished from ŠÈ-tenû rotated roughly 45 degrees) and KÁR in the Uruk script. Among the sign forms given in ZATU, a number of those claimed for KÁR are indistinguishable from their ŠÈ-tenû₉₀ counterparts. Moreover, an assumption of a single sign for the early script would clarify the alternation between the two graphs noted by Green and Nissen already for the archaic lexical lists. In this connection, it must be observed that a graph distinct from ŠÈ and representing kár does not occur until the Sargonic period. At Fara, ŠÈ, ŠÈ-tenû, and ŠÈ-tenû₉₀, are in free allographic variation, with respect to representing kár. By the Early Dynastic IIIb period, however, ŠÈ-tenû₉₀ displaced ŠÈ in this role, with the latter sign being maintained only as an archaic feature of the monumental script. With this development, the distinction between ŠÈ-tenû₉₀ and GÁNA that had been maintained throughout the Early Dynastic period disintegrated, so that by the Sargonic period GÁNA and a tenû-graph, identified in the sign lists as KÁR, were used to express kár for the remainder of the third millennium. This latter sign may have been understood paleographically as GÁNA-tenû by
the contemporaneous late third-millennium scribal tradition but was historically related to SÈ and functionally represented SÈ-tenû.\textsuperscript{17} Interestingly, Ea I (see below) displays a historical consciousness in describing this sign as SÈ-tenû and attributing to it the values /kara/ and /kiri/. What all of this demonstrates is that SÈ, in its various orientations, originally represented kár and that the writing with GÁNA was a secondary development, representing a reanalysis or paleographic drift of kár away from SÈ(-tenû\textsubscript{90}) and toward GÁNA between the Early Dynastic and Sargonic periods.\textsuperscript{18} Many of the values that are later attributed to “KIB,” as we shall see, reflect the interwoven histories of SÈ and GÁNA in the third millennium.

The precise form of the graph KIB-gunû (LAK, no. 278) at Fara is uncertain, insofar as it is appropriate to analyze every complex sign as a composite of simpler graphs after the fashion of the analytical apparatus of the first- and second-millennium lexical tradition. Clearly related to SÈ and SÈ-tenû\textsubscript{90} is a “slanted” SÈ, \begin{itemize}
\item SÈ-
\end{itemize} (note, however, the formal differences from SÈ-tenû), which is often employed to write zîd and dabin at Fara.\textsuperscript{19} In at least one case, KIB-gunû resembles the crossing of these signs, \begin{itemize}
\item KIB-
\end{itemize} but, more commonly, the form appears to be based on a gunû-form of SÈ-tenû, e.g., \begin{itemize}
\item GÁNA-
\end{itemize}, \begin{itemize}
\item LAK-
\end{itemize}, and \begin{itemize}
\item GÁNA-
\end{itemize}.\textsuperscript{20} Indeed it is this second shape that gives rise to the simplified allographs, which make their appearance already in the Abu Salabikh corpus, e.g., \begin{itemize}
\item GÁNA-
\end{itemize}, although an allograph derived from SÈ-tenû\textsubscript{90}, such as, \begin{itemize}
\item GÁNA-
\end{itemize}, is also well attested.\textsuperscript{21} In turn, it is this first Abu Salabikh form that is the ancestor of the KIB-gunû graph, \begin{itemize}
\item GÁNA-
\end{itemize}, encountered at Nippur and northern Babylonia at the end of the Early Dynastic period.\textsuperscript{22} The
decomposition of the single front wedge into two wedges resulted in the Ur III shape of the sign that begins with a Winkelhaken, e.g., ꜩ (also the GIŠ×GIŠ form ꜩ). At the end of the Early Dynastic period, the graph assumed a new shape in the south as witnessed in the royal inscriptions, e.g., ꜩ and lapidary/monumental: ꜩ. This graph survived through the Sargonic and Ur III periods as a sign distinct from KIB (GIŠ×GIŠ). No doubt, it is upon this form of the graph that the analysis of KIB-gunû as GÁNA×GÁNA, first attested in the Old Babylonian lexical texts, is based. Interestingly, and in no small part owing to the simpler geometry, the prolific paleographic variation exhibited by KIB-gunû, apparent already in the Fara period, is not shared by the graphs GIŠ×GIŠ×GIŠ (LAK, no. 277), ꜩ, and GIŠ×GIŠ (LAK, no. 276), ꜩ, which, by comparison, are stable in the third millennium.

### III

KIB-gunû is used consistently in the writing of Buranuna and Zimbir in third-millennium sources with only rare exceptions. It is, in fact, the orthographic root of Buranuna, i.e., Ṣbd̃bunanû(KIB-gunû)nu, with the spelling of the Euphrates, UD.KIB. NUN, employed secondarily to write Sippar. This close association with the Euphrates may have contributed to the understanding, or reanalysis, of the sign as GÁNA×GÁNA, there being a transparent semantic relationship between the river and cultivated land that it makes possible (note that this graph is equated with qerbetu “pasture land” and mērištu “cultivable land” in the lexical tradition; see below). As will be discussed further, the only other use of this sign is to write a noun with uncertain meaning in the compounds KIB-gunû—dim/dug₄, which occur in a number of Pre-Sargonic royal inscriptions.

KIB, on the other hand, writes the phonetically related values ùl and hùl. Whether in origin hûl represents the primary lexical item, meaning “reins, leash,” and ùl a sec-

---

24 V. Scheil, Recueil de signes archaïques (Paris, 1898), p. 40, no. 96; graph after LAK, no. 278. Note also the graph used to write šennur in TuM 6, no. 20:6 (see pl. 48); the Winkelhaken is so pronounced that the editors translate ǧšennur(U.KIB).
26 For example, Enmetena: H. Steible, Die altsumerischen Bau- und Weihinschriften, Freiburger altorientalische Studien 5/1 (Wiesbaden, 1982), Ent. 44 ii 10; Gudea: Cyl. B xvii 10; graph after TCL 8, pl. 47:10.
27 For example, Lugalzagesi: BE 1/2, no. 87 ii 7; Narâm-Sîn: A. H. Ayish, “Bassetki Statue with an Old Akkadian Royal Inscription of Naram-sin of Agade (B.C. 2291–2255),” Sumer 32 (1976): 76 ii 20 (Bassetki Statue, inscribed in metal); graph after LAK, no. 278.
28 Graph after Deimel Fara 2, Schultexte, no. 13 iv 4.
29 Graph after LAK, no. 276.
30 For example, YOS 4, no. 76 rev. 1, where the copy shows Buranuna written with KIB rather than KIB-gunû. That by the Old Babylonian period the gunû and non-gunû forms were merely allographs can be seen in the writing of Zimbir with KIB in CH ii 25.
31 On the possibility that Ṣbd̃ stands for d here, see Woods, “On the Euphrates.”
ondary syllabic value is difficult to ascertain, given the Sumerian loanwords with these meanings, i.e., ḫullu and ulla, which are by-forms. Paradoxically, it is KIB and not KIB-gunû, the ŠE-based graph, which is assigned the meanings “reins, leash.” These values occur most commonly in the PN Īr/īr-(h)ūl(-l-a) and syllabically in the writing of the Diyala, Īd-Dur-ūl, and the PN Šu-Dur-ūl. As already observed by Landsberger, the signs GIŠ×GIŠ and GIŠ×GIŠ×GIŠ appear diachronically to be in complementary distribution. GIŠ×GIŠ×GIŠ is attested only through the Sargonic period, where it occurs with the value ūl, for example, Ī-me-Dur-ūl, Šu-dur-ūl, Na-bē-ūl-maš, and Me-ūl-maš, as well as with the value šennur in early lexical texts, while GIŠ×GIŠ cannot be verified for pre-Ur III sources. It is therefore reasonable to assume that GIŠ×GIŠ derives from GIŠ×GIŠ×GIŠ.

The writing of the fruit šennur—identified as a medlar (Mespilus germanica) by Thompson and, more convincingly, as a plum by Landsberger—is more complex than the above discussion suggests. The earliest attestation of the lexeme is in the Uruk version of the Tribute List (line 62). There, šennur is written GIŠ×GIŠ×GIŠ; it also occurs with this writing in the Fara version. The identification of the sign in the archaic version of the Tribute List would appear to be assured by the surrounding entries—being immediately preceded by “kišik” and followed by giš—and, moreover, by the Old Babylonian exemplars; the two Old Babylonian texts that sufficiently preserve en-

---


33 ḫūl is also used syllabically in the PN Ṣag,(-h)ūl-lā (AnOr 7, no. 153 rev. 4).

34 MAD 2, p. 81 no. 142; note the exception AUCT 1 212:3, where Šu-Dur-ūl is written with KIB-gunû.

35 MAD 2, p. 81 no. 142.


37 MSL 2, pp. 79–80 ad 643f; the Sargonic attestation of the sign cited in REC, no. 170 is uncertain, resting as it does on a text that was unpublished at the time of the appearance of REC.


39 The rationale behind the note to ZATU, no. 522, namely, that the sign may possibly be read ulul instead of šennur in the Uruk version of the Tribute List, is unclear, since ūl and šennur are distinguished in third-millennium sources.

40 Deimel Fara 2, Schultexte, no. 13 iv 4.

41 See LATU, p. 117.
try 62 again give the writing KIB, i.e., GIŠ×GIŠ.\textsuperscript{42} GIŠ×GIŠ×GIŠ as apparently a writing of šennur is also preserved in Ebla Word List B.\textsuperscript{43}

Curiously, however, the few extant attestations of šennur from the Ur III period differ in employing KIB-gunû.\textsuperscript{44} In all likelihood šennur was originally written with GIŠ×GIŠ×GIŠ, and at some point in the third millennium the two signs were confused with regard to this value; KIB-gunû came to acquire the value šennur, and the original writing was preserved only in the lexical tradition, as shown not only by the later versions of the Tribute List, but by Proto-Ea as well.\textsuperscript{45} The roots of this confusion run as deep as the Fara and Abu Salabikh corpora, as there is evidence that šennur—in addition to the tradition preserving the writing GIŠ×GIŠ×GIŠ—could be written with the same graph as that employed in the writing of Sippar and the Euphrates.\textsuperscript{46} Interestingly, in the Waterways lexical list (Deimel \textit{Fara} 2, \textit{Schultexte}, no. 72), the graph \textsuperscript{47} occurs in the entry giå-KIB SAR.MIN/SAR.MIN (iv 4), while the rotated sign \textsuperscript{48} appears in the same text (iv 14) in the writing of the divine Euphrates, i.e., KIB.NUN.MIN.\textsuperscript{49} Thus the question may be raised whether in this particular lexical list the 90-degree change in orientation distinguishes the writing of the Euphrates from that of šennur, since the inclusion of GIŠ and SAR in iv 4 strongly suggests the latter reading in this context; cf. GIŠ. KIB-gunû.SAR nú “bed of šennur-wood” (Deimel \textit{Fara} 2, \textit{Schultexte}, no. 20 v 11 // R. D. Biggs, \textit{Inscriptions from Tell Abū Šalābiḫ}, OIP 99 [Chicago, 1974], no. 34 iv 2’).

\footnote{42} I thank J. Westenholz, who is preparing an edition of this text, for providing me with these attestations. The two Old Babylonian exemplars have [KI]B KIB (Ni 1597 iv 7, per M. Civil’s copy) and KIB (private collection). According to Westenholz, this entry is broken in the Early Dynastic versions, while that of the Ur III text (6N-T 676 ii 4) is damaged.

\footnote{43} GIŠ×GIŠ×GIŠ (MEE 3, nos. 45–46 rev. iv 4 [p. 148] and pl. 18 [see n. 45 below]): the sign, with uncertain reading, also occurs in another Ebla word list in the entry ga-GIŠ×GIŠ×GIŠ (MEE 3, no. 53 iv 11 [p. 207]); it also appears with uncertain reading in several earlier contexts, for instance, the Uruk period Geographical Lists 1, 2, and 3 (\textit{LATU}, pp. 160–61) and the Abu Salabikh word list OIP 99, no. 39 vi 14’ // OIP 99, no. 42 ii 5’.

\footnote{44} J.-P. Grégoire, \textit{Archives administratives sumériennes} (Paris, 1970), no. 200 v 1’; Bab. 8, pl. 9 no. 36 rev. 6; MVN 5, no. 289 rev. 10 (quasi-duplicate of Bab. 8, pl. 9, no. 36; see Sollberger’s comments on MVN 5, pl. 73) and now TuM 6, nos. 19:6 and 20:6 (see pl. 48, reference courtesy of M. Civil). See also Postgate, “Notes on Fruit,” pp. 122, 137, n. 26a; however, in HSS 4, no. 6 rev. i 31 and iii 14 (see HSS 4, p. 7, n. 7) the sign refers to the wood rather than the fruit and is written with šeššig- rather than gunû-marks—the sign is possibly a precursor to one of the Old Babylonian forms of this sign (see n. 4 above).

\footnote{45} še-nu-ur : GIŠ×GIŠ×GIŠ (Proto-Ea 644 [MSL 16, p. 57]).

\footnote{46} For example, GIŠ-KIB-gunû-SAR nú “bed of šennur-wood” (Deimel \textit{Fara} 2, \textit{Schultexte}, no. 20 v 11 // OIP 99, no 34 iv 2’ [= Archaic Hh. B; see Civil, “The Early History of HAR-ra,” p. 133]; KIB-gunû is translated as LAM by Deimel; cf. the photograph provided by the CDLI project: http://cdli.ucla.edu/dl/photo/P010595.jpg). The identical sign for šennur is found in the Ebла Sumerian version of Word List B (MEE 3, nos. 45+46 ii 11’ [p. 144]; read šennur, not peš; see Civil, “The Early History of HAR-ra,” p. 143:39; photo = MEE 3/A, pl. 19). The equivalent line in the Ebла Semitic version reads: ša-lu-ra (MEE 3, no. 61 iv 1 [p. 248]; photo = MEE 3/A, pl. 34a). But observe that, as pointed out in n. 42 above, this same text elsewhere writes GIŠ×GIŠ×GIŠ, suggesting a meaningful distinction between the two writings in this text.

\footnote{47} Graphs after \textit{LAK}, no. 278.
Given that K IB- gunû is the logographic base of Buranuna/Zimbir, the question naturally arises whether the fruit(-tree) šennur or the kib-bird enjoys a semantic relationship with the Euphrates or Šamaš — whether the tree or the bird was symbolic or totemic of the river, Šamaš, or his cult center, similar to the origins of the writings for the major southern cities. But this appears not to be the case. In Z ATU it is claimed that the ancestor of IDIGNA is a sign with clear pictographic origins, specifically representing a bird (Z ATU, no. 261). While this identification appears at best dubious, clearly for K IB no avian motivation can be posited, however speculatively. Moreover, the graph “K IB” for the spelling of the kib-bird is a post-Old Babylonian development. As Veldhuis has shown, this web-footed water bird is spelled ki in third-millennium sources, ki-ib/ib beginning in the Ur III period, with the CVC spelling kib being a Middle Babylonian development. Quite possibly, the designation /kib/ for the bird is simply onomatopoeic; note kibkibbu/kipkippu as well as kib-kib-mušen (cf. kabb-kab-mušen attested in the Fara and Ebla bird lists). In one religious text a kib-bird is mentioned in connection with the Euphrates, but the reference is vague and not specific to the Euphrates, as the Tigris is also mentioned. In fact, Green connects the kib-bird not with Larsa, Sippar, or the Euphrates but with Eridu, based on a passage from Lugalbanda — ki-ibmušen ki-ibmušen-engur-ra sug-gíd-i-gim “Like a kib-bird, a freshwater kib-bird, as it flies over the marsh” — although here, in all likelihood, the reference to the engur simply refers to freshwater, i.e., a freshwater as opposed to saltwater kib-bird, as already suggested by Wilcke.

48 Appearing in lexical lists as ki-ibmušen, kib[kil]-ib-múšen = ŠU (kibšu, kipšu) = si-nun-du, ki-ib-d Nin-kilimmušen, kib-kibmušen = kibkibbu, kipkippu in Hh. and related forerunners (Hh. XVIII 235–38 [MSL 8/2, pp. 133–34]; Hh. B IV 269 [MSL 8/2, p. 168]; Hh. XVIII 270 [MSL 8/2, p. 140]); the bird sporadically occurs in literary texts; see J. Black, Reading Sumerian Poetry (Ithaca, New York, 1998), pp. 94–96; Green, “Eridu in Sumerian Literature,” p. 196; A. Salonen, Vögel und Vogelfang im alten Mesopotamien, AASF 180 (Helsinki, 1973), pp. 209–10; Wilcke Lugalbanda, pp. 177–78. For discussion of this bird, see now N. Veldhuis, Religion, Literature, and Scholarship: The Sumerian Composition Nanše and the Birds, with a Catalogue of Sumerian Bird Names, Cuneiform Monographs 22 (Leiden and Boston, 2004), pp. 260–61. That the bird has webbed feet is suggested by the following passage: f[k1]-mušen-a gir-kuk-a [kuk-m]u ki-ibmušen-mu šu-šè ba-a-lá-e “(has) the [...] of a bird, the feet of a fish, my kib-bird, will catch you in (his) claws, my fish” (M. Civil, “The Home of the Fish: A New Sumerian Literary Composition,” Iraq 23 [1961]: 164, lines 145–46 [see the discussion on p. 175]). The kib-bird has been tentatively identified as a gull (Wilcke Lugalbanda, p. 178) or cormorant (Heimpel apud Wilcke Lugalbanda). Walter Farber, however, notes (personal communication) that neither the gull nor the cormorant hunts with its claws.

49 Written šID-mu-BU (Nabnitu XXI [= J] 88 [MSL 16, p. 156]).

50 See Veldhuis, Nanše and the Birds, pp. 260–61. That the bird has webbed feet is suggested by the following passage: f[k1]-mušen-a gir-kuk-a [kuk-m]u ki-ibmušen-mu šu-šè ba-a-lá-e “(has) the [...] of a bird, the feet of a fish, my kib-bird, will catch you in (his) claws, my fish” (M. Civil, “The Home of the Fish: A New Sumerian Literary Composition,” Iraq 23 [1961]: 164, lines 145–46 [see the discussion on p. 175]). The kib-bird has been tentatively identified as a gull (Wilcke Lugalbanda, p. 178) or cormorant (Heimpel apud Wilcke Lugalbanda). Walter Farber, however, notes (personal communication) that neither the gull nor the cormorant hunts with its claws.

51 Written šID-mu-BU (Nabnitu XXI [= J] 88 [MSL 16, p. 156]).

52 Hh. XVIII 270 (MSL 8/2, p. 140).

53 MEE 3, no. 39 ii 18 // Deimel Fara 2, Schultexte, no. 58 vii 21; see MEE 3, p. 111 ad 36. If not onomatopoeic, possibly related to kap-kapu “powerful(-bird)” (see CAD K s.v.).

54 CT 36, pl. 38 rev. ii 20–22.

55 Wilcke Lugalbanda, p. 178 ad 159; cf. Black, Reading Sumerian Poetry, p. 95.
For the fruit šennur the question has marginally greater validity in light of the ambiguities surrounding the writing of this lexeme and the one tradition, outside of the lexical lists, in which šennur is written KIB- gunû. But again, unlike, for instance, the case of the NUN sign—which may have depicted a tree associated with Enki (mes-tree or kiškanû-tree?)—and thereby became the writing of his epithet and cult center—there is nothing to suggest that the šennur-tree was part of an early Utu or Šamaš mythology.

Ultimately, if the relationship between graph and meaning is more than arbitrary, the writing of the Euphrates, and from there Sippar, with a graph paleographically derived from ŠÈ (EŠ) may be based on a metaphor that envisioned the river as a rope—a particularly apt image for the Euphrates, knotted, sinuous, and branching as it is. As we have seen, in at least one Fara attestation of the graph, it appears to consist of “slanted” ŠÈ×ŠÈ, i.e., two crossed ropes.  

IV

What remains to be discussed is the evidence from the first- and second-millennium lexical texts and its correlation with the third-millennium data. Not surprisingly, the later lexical sources are not entirely consistent with the earlier evidence. Many of the older values survive but are supplemented by secondary values that stem from the late interpretation of KIB- gunû as GÁNA×GÁNA and, more generally, the semantic and iconic associations that typified scribal erudition. Necessarily, many of these values have a reality only within the lexical tradition.

In Proto-Ea (643–44) the values hu-ul and še-nu-ur are attributed to the GIŠ×GIŠ composition, which is in accord with the third-millennium evidence discussed above. Proto-Aa agrees, adding the respective Akkadian loanwords šallurum and ḫullum. The form GÁNA×GÁNA does not occur in these lists, but it does appear in an Old Babylonian Ea IV forerunner, which displays a particularly close agreement with canonical Ea. This marks the earliest distinction between GIŠ×GIŠ and GÁNA×GÁNA in the lexical tradition, although here the two signs are not associated through sequential ordering as they are in the later texts. It is to this text that we now turn.

---


57 Deimel Fara 3, Wirtschaftstexte, no. 4 rev. i 3; graph after LAK, no. 278. This observation stems from a number of conversations I had with Piotr Steinkeller. See Woods, “On the Euphrates,” pp. 37–38, n. 139, where it is further suggested that the toponym Buranuna originally referred to the riverain system around Sippar, where the river is particularly dynamic and from whence a number of major branches stem.


59 See the comments in MSL 14, p. 107; for this text, see also R. T. Hallock, The Chicago Syllabary and the Louvre Syllabary AO 7661, AS 7 (Chicago, 1940), pp. 32 ff.
Ea IV forerunner no. 4 (CT 41, pls. 47–48 [MSL 14, pp. 113–16])

1 gu-ru GIŠ-tenû
2 al-al GIŠ GIŠ
3 hu-ul GIŠ GIŠ
4 li-rum GIŠ GIŠ

Following the GESTIN and GÁ combinations the list continues:

42 e-qé-el GÁNA
43 ga-na GÁNA
44 ka-ra GÁNA-tenû
45 gír-re GÁNA GÁNA

Continued by KAL forms.

The reduplicated value al-al in line 2 would appear to be related to the primary third-millennium values ùl and hùl. The primacy of the assignment, however, is complicated by evidence presented below for GÁNA≈GÁNA.

The value /lirum/ (line 4) is a curious case. The standard writing in Old Babylonian is ÅU.KAL, but in Ur III this value could be written with a crossed sign identified by modern scholars as “KIB,” i.e., lirum. In Šulgi C, with its archaizing orthography, the sign appears without gunû marks, according to the copy. At least two Ur III attestations appear to agree, writing KIB for lirum. But in two other Ur III texts the graph indicating this value is quite different, copied as and ;63 the former resembles UR≈UR, while the latter is likely a distortion of the former. The appearance of lirum in the Ur III copy of the Curse of Agade, to judge from the photograph provided by

---

60 Cf. ul-ul, al-al : KIB (Ea IV 209 f. [MSL 14, p. 363]). See also Hallock’s comments in Chicago Syllabary, p. 61. Note that in Nik. 2, no. 389 the entries 4 ma-na al-la (4) and 4 ma-na (h)ùl-la (rev. 2) may represent simple variants, although two spellings of the same lexeme in one text would be somewhat unexpected.
62 MVN 3, no. 331:2; UET 9, no. 1050:2 (N.B.: partially effaced in both cases).
63 UET 3, no. 191 rev. 9 and UET 3, no. 189 rev. 4 respectively.
Cooper, again suggests a graph that could be interpreted as $\text{UR} \times \text{UR}$. The interpretation finds support in Ea and Reciprocal Ea, where the graphically similar composites KIB($\text{GIÅ} \times \text{GIÅ}$) (GÁNA×GÁNA in Reciprocal Ea, Section C 3'), UR×UR, and KIB.ZA are all claimed to have the value /lirum/. What these assignments in the lexical lists attempt to account for is the various late-third-millennium allographs that wrote lirum, reanalyzing these complex signs in terms of simpler, well-known graphs. Apparently, lirum, aside from KIB, could be represented by a distinctive graph; whether this graph was merely an allograph of KIB that was used to write this value (and was later reinterpreted as UR×UR) or was in origin graphically distinct from KIB, perhaps UR×UR, which secondarily merged with “KIB,” remains an open question. In favor of the second possibility is the clear semantic association between ur “young man” and lirum “strength”—although UR×UR has not been acknowledged outside of the lexical lists.

In line 45 GÁNA×GÁNA, or KIB-\text{gunû}, is assigned the reading /giri/. This value is a phonetic variant of /kara/, which belongs to KÁR occurring in line 44 and so implicitly preserves the graphic origins of KIB-\text{gunû} as deriving from KÁR, or better, ŠÈ. Interestingly, in what possibly represents an accurate understanding of the graphic histories of ŠÈ and KÁR—if not simply a confusion between two similarly shaped graphs—Ea I attributes ka-ra and ki-ri to ŠÈ-\text{tenû}.

Ea I 186–88 (MSL 14, p. 186)

\begin{align*}
186 & \text{ka-ra ŠÈ-tenû} & \text{[šē]te-nu-u} & \text{ri-ik-su} \\
187 & \text{ku-ru-su (var.: ūa-pa-lu)} \\
188 & \text{ki-ri ŠÈ-tenû} & \text{MIN} & \text{ki-ri-tum šá GIÅ.MÁ (var.: ka-ra-su)}
\end{align*}

The equation with Akk. riksu “binding, knot,” kurussu “strap,” kirîtum ša GIÅ.MÁ “mooring rope,” and karâsu “to tie, fasten” is clearly based on ēše “rope,” the likely pictographic referent of the graph ŠÈ.

---

64 Line 104 (6N-T 76: 5; see J. Cooper, The Curse of Agade [Baltimore, 1983], pl. xix).
65 See Reciprocal Ea, Tablet A Section C 3′–7′ (MSL 14, p. 530 with notes); Ea IV 216 (MSL 14, p. 363).
66 In this regard, compare KIB.ZA to UET 3, no. 189 rev. 4 given above.
68 Of course, the values /kara/ and /kiri/ are also attributed to GÁNA(-\text{tenû}) in Ea I 186–89 (MSL 14, p. 221) and Ea IV 299 (MSL 14, p. 367), cited below.
69 Two of the three copies (texts A and B) display the common graphic confusion between KÁR, GÁNA, and ŠÈ, describing the sign as GÁNA and GÁNA-\text{tenû} respectively.
In canonical Ea distinction between GIŠ×GIŠ and GÁNA×GÁNA is made explicit. KIB — given the sign name kib-bu instead of expected giš-minnabi-gilimû — is listed as a GIŠ composite, occurring after GIŠ, GIŠ×BAD, and GIŠ-tenû and before GESȚIN; the following values are given:

Ea IV 206–16 (MSL 14, p. 363)

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>206</td>
<td>ul</td>
<td>KIB(GIŠ×GIŠ)</td>
<td>kib-bu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207</td>
<td>a-da-min</td>
<td>KIB</td>
<td>MIN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>208</td>
<td>hu-ul</td>
<td>KIB</td>
<td>MIN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>209</td>
<td>ul-ul</td>
<td>KIB</td>
<td>MIN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210</td>
<td>al-al</td>
<td>KIB</td>
<td>MIN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>211</td>
<td>ki-ib</td>
<td>KIB</td>
<td>MIN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>212</td>
<td>še-en-nu-ur</td>
<td>KIB</td>
<td>MIN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>213</td>
<td>du-ru</td>
<td>KIB</td>
<td>MIN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>214</td>
<td>da-ru</td>
<td>KIB</td>
<td>MIN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>215</td>
<td>pu-uh-rum</td>
<td>KIB</td>
<td>MIN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>216</td>
<td>li-rum</td>
<td>KIB</td>
<td>MIN</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The value /ul/ for “leash,” as in ullu šá kalbu “dog leash,” is certainly expected in light of the third-millennium evidence discussed above. The crossing of two signs in cuneiform often took on reflexive or negative associations and the composite was interpreted as “one against the other,” hence the attaching of the value /adamin/ = tešētu “to contest, quarrel” to KIB. Parallels are found in the equations gu-ug : LUGAL×LUGAL = nukurtu;72 ku-ku : LUGAL×LUGAL = nu-kur-tu;73 [a]-da-min : LÚ×LÚ = te-še-[i][um];74 a-da-min : LUGAL×LUGAL = te-š[e-e-tu];75 note also [KÁ×KÁ] (sign name) : šá KÁ×KÁ = nak-ri.76 Further, the fact that both the signs PAP and BAR are equated with nakru(m)
“foreign, hostile, enemy” speaks to an understanding of these graphs as composed of two crossed AÅ signs, i.e., “one against the other.” The association of ideas behind these values finds its counterpart in the metaphorical language of omens, where the notion of crossing often has negative connotations. The attribution of the value /puhrum/ to KIB perhaps also stems from the graphic composition of the sign—the crossing or doubling of two signs possibly connoting the idea of “assembly” or “gathering”; compare gá-gá = puhrum. The motivations behind the assignment of the values /daru/ and /duru/ to KIB with the meanings sihtu and parriku are, however, more uncertain. The equivalences given in Ea IV are related to the fuller entries given in Diri, i.e., du-ru: KU.KIB = sihtu, da-ra: KU.KIB = parriku and, particularly, in Hh., i.e., giš-KU-du/ru KIB = sîh-tum (var. ki-ib-su), giš-KU-da-ra KIB = par-ri-ka (see n. 70 above). parriku (see CAD P s.v. parriku B) and kibsu “footstrap” are saddle parts; presumably sihtu is synonymous with kibsu, although there are difficulties concerning the etymology of the former. As parriku derives from parakkû “to lie across,” this object may have resembled a cross, and so this assignment may be graphically motivated as well; if so, the assignment to du-ru = sîhtum/kibsu could then be explained by homonymy; cf. da-ra and, by semantic similarity, all lexemes belonging to a common semantic field.

According to Ea IV, kib, the flagship value of this graph judging from the sign name kib-bu, belongs to the GIS×GIS rather than GANAXGANA composition. The attribution of the value kib to GIS×GIS is also supported by Diri III 75, which reads ki-ib (S18: ūl-ūl): GIS.GIS×GIS (S18:GIS×GISA) = kippu (A: MIN giš min-na-bi igi-lîmmu-u)—the first GIS graph representing, perhaps, either a confusion with gišennur or an attempt to analyze the extra GIS graph of early GIS×GIS×GIS as a determinative. But in light of the fact that Ea IV 206–16 attributes values to KIB that, as we shall see, are elsewhere, and, perhaps, more convincingly, connected with KIB-gunû, specifically ul-ul and al-al (209–10), the primacy of the assignment is open to question. It may be significant that ki-ib directly follows the suspect values ul-ul and al-al. Ea IV 206–12 may represent a catch-all in this regard, incorporating values once attached to archaic KIB-gunû.


Relevant, in this regard, is the following pair of omens: šumma padānî šinâ-ma kîma pappi itgûrî nakaru inâ rī ti’i šna ma ma tiâlî ihabbat “If there are two paths and they are crossed like the sign PAP: the enemy will steal cattle from the pasture land”; šumma padānî šiňâ-ma kîma pallurti itgûrî râbi sikkati bēlšu ibâr “If there are two paths crossed like the sign BAR: the general will revolt against his lord” (CT 20, pl. 3:20–21; Koch-Westenholz Liver Omens, p. 195).

CT 18, pl. 30 iii 9’.

N.B.: the sign in copies 5R pl. 22 and CT 12, pl. 28 does not closely resemble GIS×GIS, but it is nonetheless distinguished from the “KIB” of UD.KIB.NUN occurring elsewhere in these texts.
In line 208 the well-known value /hul/, i.e., hùl, is equated with lemu under the homophonous influence of hul = lemu and the semantic influence of a-da-min : KIB = tešētu.  

81 As already touched upon, the values al-al (cf. Ea IV forerunner no. 4:2) and ul-ul would appear to belong, unremarkably, to GIÅ≈GIÅ, based on the third-millennium evidence for (h)ùl and, more directly, Ea IV 209–10 discussed above, but the equation with the near synonyms qerbetu “pasture land” and mērištu “cultivable land” suggests, on the other hand, a primary association with the graph understood to be GÁNA×GÁNA, i.e., KIB-gunû.  

82 Indeed, it is with KIB-gunû that Ea IV 300–301 (see below) connects these values. What is at work here, evidently, is the free exchange of values between a sign and its gunû-counterpart, but the question still remains as to which assignment is primary and which is secondary.

Ea IV 298–301 (MSL 14, p. 367)

298 eq-qel GÁNA MIN (ga-nu-ú) MIN (eq-lu)  
299 ka-ra GÁNA-tenû ga-na te-nu-ú na-pa-hu ša A.MES  
300 ul-ul GÁNA GÁNA × ga-na min-na-bi gi-li-mu-u qer-bi-tú  
301 al-al GÁNA GÁNA × MIN MIN MIN mi-riš-tú

A similar picture emerges from vocabulary Sᵇ, where, as elsewhere, šennur is taken as GIÅ≈GIÅ, but, again, the value ulul, equated with qerbetu, is attributed to GÁNA×GÁNA.

Vocabulary Sᵇ I 303 f. (MSL 3, p. 123; corrections and additions in MSL 4, p. 207)

303 ge-eš GIŠ i[y-s]u  
304 gu-ur (var.: gu-ru) GIŠ-tenû [na]-šú-u  
305 še-en-nu-ur KIB (= GIŠ×GIŠ) [šal-lu-rum]  
306 ga-a GÁ [bi]-e-tú  
307 ga-na GÁNA eq-lum  
308 ul-lul (var.: ul-ul) GÁNA GÁNA qir-bi-tum

81 A variant to Šulgi O 105 (B) writes hûl as a syllabic spelling for hul (J. Klein, “Šulgi and Gilgameš: Two Brother-Peers (Šulgi O),” in Kramer AV, pp. 280:105; p. 292 ad 105). Note also the syllabic use of the sign in the PN Šag₄-(h)ùl-la (AnOr 7, no. 153 rev. 4) mentioned above.  

82 See already Hallock, Chicago Syllabary, p. 68 ad 282 f.

83 Note that šá dUTU (or MUL) is expected in place of A.MES, as already pointed out by Hallock, Chicago Syllabary, p. 68, noting kár-kár = (n[a-pa-hu]) šá M[U]₄(U) UTU) (Nabnitu XXII 3’ [MSL 16, p. 206]).

84 The entry is GÁNA and not GÁNA as given in MSL 3 (see the correction in MSL 4, p. 207 ad 308; also OECT 4 37:295).
Finally, in light of the above evidence, I return to the problem of the referent of $\text{KIB}-\text{gunû}$ in the compounds $\text{KIB}-\text{gunû} – \text{dim}/\text{dug}_a$, which appear in seven royal inscriptions belonging to Enanatum I and Enmetena. Without exception, these inscriptions are written on clay nails, hence the assumption that $\text{KIB}-\text{gunû}$ designates a word meaning clay nail. As obvious as this solution may appear at first glance, it faces a number of obstacles, namely, the limited number of attestations and the restriction of these to the consecutive reigns of two Lagaš rulers — puzzling facts indeed for a word with allegedly as basic a meaning as “clay nail” (cf. the usual term $\text{kak} = \text{sikkatu}$). The object denoted by $\text{KIB}-\text{gunû}$ is not dedicated $\text{ex voto}$ ($\text{nam-ti-la-ni-šè…a — ru}$), nor would we expect an unremarkable clay object to be so. Further, with the exception of statues, which fulfill an entirely different function, it is not often the case that the name of the object is noted in the inscription it bears. The phrases $\text{KIB}-\text{gunû} – \text{dim}$ and $\text{KIB}-\text{gunû} – \text{dug}_a$ denote activities carried out at the conclusion of the building of a temple, conveying meanings along the lines of “to fashion $\text{KIB}-\text{gunû}$ objects” and “to decorate with $\text{KIB}-\text{gunû}$ objects” respectively. Enanatum I assigned this duty to his son or an official, while Enmetena apparently took this cultic responsibility upon himself. The referent of $\text{KIB}-\text{gunû}$ in this compound is possibly part of the temple adornment or furnishing.

As for as the phonetic shape of $\text{KIB}-\text{gunû}$ in this context, the lexical evidence given above yields a number of possibilities, all of which are problematic in light of the historical ambiguities surrounding the sign “KIB.” And, of course, there may be other values belonging to this sign that are not preserved by the lexical sources at hand. Based on Ea IV forerunner no. 4 cited above, Hallo suggested that we are to read $\text{giri}_3(\text{KIB})$ with the meaning “clay nail.” This value, /giri/, as we have seen, derives from $\text{KÁR}$ (ultimately $\text{ŠE}$) and the interpretation of $\text{KIB-} \text{gunû}$ as $\text{KÁR} \approx \text{KÁR}$ (cf. the value $\text{giri} / \text{fl}$ of $\text{KEÅDA}$, which is in origin $\text{ÅÈ} \approx \text{ÅÈ}$). Unfortunately, it cannot be confirmed by canonical Ea, let alone corroborated, with or without this claimed meaning, by contemporaneous third-millennium sources. Yet the reading remains a possibility. Elsewhere in the lexical tradition, as previously discussed, the sign is assigned the values ul-ul and al-al.

---

85 Steible, Die altsumerischen Bau- und Weih-inschriften, En. I 10, 28, 30, 32, Ent. 44, 45–73, 80. Incidentally, note that in the Hittite column of Izi Bogh. A kib is equated with Hittite $\text{gangala}$—“weigh scale, scale plate,” i.e., $\text{kib} = \text{kib-bu} = \text{ga-an-ga-la-aš}$, but, as noted by J. Puhvel (Hittite Etymological Dictionary, vol. 4 [Berlin, 1997], p. 50), the equivalence may be a mistake based on the phonetically similar $\text{kappu} = \text{Ugar.}, \text{Heb. kp “scale (of a balance),” lit. “hand” (Izi Bogh. A I 308 [MSL 13, p. 142]).}$

86 W. W. Hallo, “The Royal Inscriptions of Ur: A Typology,” HUCA 33 (1962): 9–10, n. 67; see also Sollberger and Kupper Inscriptions Royales, p. 63. M. Lambert suggested that “KIB” — $\text{dug}_a$ is an older writing for $\text{še-er-ka-an…dug}_a$ (“Le quartier Lagash,” RSO 32 [1957]: 137, n. 5), a suggestion doubted by A. Falkenstein, “Sumerische religiöse Texte,” ZA 56 [1964]: 93, n. 63). J. van Dijk proposed the reading $\text{àdamin/lìrum}$ for $\text{KIB}$ in this context. Aside from the obvious contextual problems, these values, as has been shown, belong in origin to $\text{GIÅ} \approx \text{GIÅ}$ or, in the case of $\text{lìrum}$, to $\text{UR} \approx \text{UR}$ (see J. van Dijk, “La ‘confusion des langues’; Note sur le lexique et sur la morphologie d’Enmerkar,” Or., n.s., 39 [1970]: 304–5, n. 2; also A. Alberti, review of Biggs Al-Hiba in Or., n.s., 50 [1981]: 254).
But any connection with these values would have to be homophonous, as the meanings
certainly do not apply in this context. Finally, there is the value kib. While Ea IV 211
assigns this value to the GIŠ×GIŠ composition, it can be plausibly argued that kib was
first attributed to KIB-gunû, since the preceding two entries, ul-ul and al-al, may have
belonged in origin to the latter graph by virtue of their meanings. Of course, there is
the additional hurdle that the sign name kibbu is specifically given to GIŠ×GIŠ, but with
KIB and KIB-gunû collapsing into a single sign by the Old Babylonian period, this too
may not be insurmountable.

The one factor that recommends the value kib in this context is the existence, al-
beit with poorly understood meaning, of the loanword kibbu. The earliest evidence for
this lexeme is of Old Babylonian date, from Mari, where it apparently denotes some
type of ornament cast in gold.87 In two of the three Enmetena inscriptions referring to
KIB-gunû objects, the passage immediately follows a mention of decoration in gold
and silver.88 That these objects were manufactured in some numbers is indicated by the
reduplicated hamtu form KIB-gunû mu-dîm-dîm, which occurs twice.89 Conceivably,
KIB-gunû could refer to a specific type of decorative element that was cast—quite
fittingly—in gold or silver and applied at the conclusion of a temple construction
project. And herein would lie the bond between the text and its bearer, the clay nail, for
clay nails are invariably associated with building activities. And if these Early Dynastic
clay nails were disposed in a similar manner as their later counterparts, being placed
horizontally into the upper walls of temples,90 then these nails played a decorative
function themselves, so again uniting message with medium.

V

The principle conclusions of this study may be summarized as follows:

1. The sign known to second- and first-millennium cuneiform as “KIB” repres-
ents the merger of two distinct third-millennium graphs, KIB (LAK, no. 276)
and KIB-gunû (LAK, no. 278).

2. The only certain Uruk ancestor of KIB is GIŠ×GIŠ×GIŠ (LAK, no. 277), which
was simplified to GIŠ×GIŠ, i.e., KIB (LAK, no. 276), between the Sargonic and
Ur III periods. KIB-gunû was apparently an Early Dynastic invention, attested
first in the Fara and Abu Salabikh corpora; the sign has its graphic origins in ŠE.

87 See CAD K s.v. kibbu A usage a–1’. Reciprocity
may be involved in the graph AL acquiring an
equivalence with kibbu, i.e., al : AL = ki-ib-bu (A
VII/4 18 [= JCS 13 (1959): 120 i 4]), based on
KIB having the value âl (ùl).

88 Steible, Die altsumerischen Bau- und Weih-
inschriften, Ent. 44–73ii 7–9, Ent. 80: 3–4.

89 Ibid., En. I. 30 ii 7, En. I. 32 ii’ 3’.

90 R. S. Ellis, Foundation Deposits in Ancient
Mesopotamia, Yale Near Eastern Researches 2
3. In the third millennium KIB writes ùl and hùl, while KIB-\textit{gunû} is used in the writing of Buranuna and Zimbir and first attested in the Early Dynastic IIIb period to represent the object denoted in the compounds KIB-\textit{gunû} — dím/dug₄; śennur was originally written with GIȘ×GIȘ×GIȘ (later KIB), a writing that was preserved in the lexical lists; however, there was a parallel tradition that ascribed this value to KIB-\textit{gunû}.

4. In the lexical tradition of the second and first millennia, KIB-\textit{gunû} was reanalyzed as GÁNA×GÁNA in accord with the development that saw kár drift from ŠE to GÁNA. The reanalysis gave rise to new values and Akkadian equivalences that took their place alongside the primary, third-millennium ones. Additional, presumably late, values are accounted for by a variety of semantic, iconic, and graphic associations, the learned play of scribes.

5. KIB-\textit{gunû} in the compounds KIB-\textit{gunû} — dím/dug₄ in all likelihood does not denote “clay nail” as is often assumed but, rather, some unidentified temple ornamentation. The reading of KIB-\textit{gunû} in this context remains uncertain — /kib/ and /giri/ remain possibilities, although both readings encounter difficulties.
CLAY SEALINGS FROM THE EARLY DYNASTIC I
LEVELS OF THE INANNA TEMPLE AT NIPPUR:
A PRELIMINARY ANALYSIS*

Richard L. Zettler, University of Pennsylvania

I. INTRODUCTION

The administrative records of Early Dynastic institutions include not only tablets, but also clay sealings that had secured doors, boxes, bags, bundles, ceramic jars, etc. Such records have been found in situ on the floors of buildings but more commonly have been recovered in large numbers from trash dumps represented, for example, by the Ur Seal Impression Strata1 and the Abu Salabikh 6G Ash-Tip.2 While written records are often privileged in reconstructing administrative structures and socioeconomic organization, more generally, archaeologists have contributed a number of studies over the last decade or so utilizing clay sealings to the same end.3 The methodology, pioneered by Enrica Fiandra, involves recording both the seal(s) rolled on the surface of the clay (obverse) and the back (reverse) of the sealings, which preserves an impression of the object on which the clay had been pressed.4 Correlating

---

* I would like to thank Donald P. Hansen of the Institute of Fine Arts, New York University, and Holly Pittman of the University of Pennsylvania for their insights into early Mesopotamian (and Iranian) sealing practices as well as for bibliographical references and access to unpublished material from Nippur, al-Hiba, and Malyan.

1 L. Legrain, *Archaic Seal Impressions*, UE 3 (London and Philadelphia, 1936). At least some of the Ur “Archaic Tablets” may have been found in situ on the floors of structures built of plano-convex bricks. As the buildings were abandoned, they were filled with and in time covered by debris (Sir Leonard Woolley, *The Early Periods*, UE 4 [London and Philadelphia, 1956], pp. 70–71).


seals and their iconography with objects sealed makes it possible to reconstruct areas of individual or collective administrative responsibility. This article supplements such studies by more fully documenting a small corpus of clay sealings from the Early Dynastic I levels of the Inanna Temple at Nippur.5

It is a pleasure—and particularly appropriate—to dedicate this study to Robert D. Biggs at his retirement. The eighth season at Nippur (1962/63), when the sealings analyzed here were found, was his first time in Iraq. As Annual Fellow of the American Schools of Oriental Research’s Baghdad School, Bob arrived in the Iraqi capital in November 1962. He was already on the Chicago Assyrian Dictionary staff and officially in Baghdad to work on tablets in the Iraq Museum. Still, Bob took the opportunity to visit Nippur and other excavations in Iraq and Iran. In spring 1963 he joined Donald P. Hansen’s excavations at Tell Abu Salabikh, a site with which he would become closely identified, and he spent a good part of the rest of his career in the field serving as epigrapher and, not infrequently, supervising excavations. Bob Biggs’s contributions to the archaeology of the “cradle of civilization” are as real as his contributions to our understanding of its ancient languages and history, and those of us who spent time with him on site will always recall his unique ability to bring good cheer to life in the field.

II. EARLY DYNASTIC I CLAY SEALINGS FROM THE INANNA TEMPLE AT NIPPU
R

The Inanna Temple excavations yielded the longest continuous stratigraphic sequence available to date for Mesopotamia, with more than twenty building levels spanning the Middle Uruk through the late Parthian periods. Levels XI–IX date to Early Dynastic I or the first half of the third millennium B.C.6 Plans and descriptions of those buildings have appeared in various publications.7 Figure 1 shows an early building phase of the Level IX temple.

Of the forty-three sealings from the Early Dynastic I levels of the temple (table 1), one was from Level XI, thirty-three were from Level IXB, and five were from Level IXA; the remaining four sealings were also from Level IX but were not attributed to a

Figure 1. Plan of Inanna Temple, Level IXB
specific building phase. The Level IX sealings were in situ on the floors of two rooms (Loci 395–96) with kilns and ovens to the east of the main temple building. The work area was separated from the cellae complex by a narrow corridor or alley. Since the area of Loci 395–96 was incorporated into the temple precinct in Level VIIA, dated to the end of the Early Dynastic period, the excavators assumed that the rooms were appendices of the earlier temple as well.8

### TABLE 1. CLAY SEALINGS FROM THE EARLY DYNASTIC I LEVELS OF THE INANNA TEMPLE AT NIPPUR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIELD NO.</th>
<th>MUSEUM NO.</th>
<th>FIND-SPOT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8 N 168</td>
<td>Chicago (A32229)</td>
<td>IXB, 395, fl. 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 N 169</td>
<td>Chicago (A32230)</td>
<td>IXB, 395, fl. 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 N 170</td>
<td>Chicago (A32231)</td>
<td>IXB, 395, fl. 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 N 171</td>
<td>Chicago (A32232)</td>
<td>IXB, 396, fl. 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 N 172</td>
<td>Chicago (A32233)</td>
<td>IXB, 396, fl. 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 N 173</td>
<td>Baghdad</td>
<td>IXB, 396, fl. 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 N 174</td>
<td>Baghdad</td>
<td>IXA, 395, fl. 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 N 175</td>
<td>Baghdad</td>
<td>IXA, 395, fl. 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 N 176</td>
<td>Chicago (A32235)</td>
<td>IXA, 395, fl. 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 N 177</td>
<td>Chicago (A32236)</td>
<td>IX General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 N 178</td>
<td>Chicago (A32237)</td>
<td>IXA, 395, fl. 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 N 179</td>
<td>Baghdad</td>
<td>IXA, 395, fl. 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 N 180</td>
<td>Chicago (A32238)</td>
<td>IX, 395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 N 181</td>
<td>Chicago (A32239)</td>
<td>IX, 395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 N 182</td>
<td>Baghdad</td>
<td>IXB, 396, fl. 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 N 183</td>
<td>Baghdad</td>
<td>IXB, 396, fl. 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 N 184</td>
<td>Baghdad</td>
<td>IXB, 396, fl. 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 N 185</td>
<td>Chicago (A32240)</td>
<td>IXB, 395, fl. 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 N 186</td>
<td>Chicago (A32241)</td>
<td>XIB, 391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 N 187</td>
<td>Chicago (A32242)</td>
<td>IXB, 396, fl. 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 N 188</td>
<td>Chicago (A32243)</td>
<td>IXB, 396, fl. 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 N 189</td>
<td>Baghdad</td>
<td>IXB, 396, fl. 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 N 190</td>
<td>Chicago (A32244)</td>
<td>IXB, 396, fl. 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 N 191</td>
<td>Baghdad</td>
<td>IXB, 396, fl. 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 N 192</td>
<td>Baghdad</td>
<td>IXB, 396, fl. 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 N 193</td>
<td>Baghdad</td>
<td>IXB, 396, fl. 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 N 194</td>
<td>Chicago (A32245)</td>
<td>IXB, 396, fl. 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 N 195</td>
<td>Baghdad</td>
<td>IXB, 396, fl. 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 N 196</td>
<td>Baghdad</td>
<td>IXB, 396, fl. 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 N 197</td>
<td>Baghdad</td>
<td>IXB, 396, fl. 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 N 198</td>
<td>Chicago (A32246)</td>
<td>IXB, 396, fl. 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 N 199</td>
<td>Chicago (A32247)</td>
<td>IXB, 396, fl. 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 N 200</td>
<td>Baghdad</td>
<td>IXB, 396, fl. 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 N 201</td>
<td>Baghdad</td>
<td>IXB, 396, fl. 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 N 202</td>
<td>Baghdad</td>
<td>IXB, 396, fl. 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 N 203</td>
<td>Baghdad</td>
<td>IXB, 396, fl. 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 N 204</td>
<td>Baghdad</td>
<td>IXB, 396, fl. 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 N 205</td>
<td>Baghdad</td>
<td>IXB, 396, fl. 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 N 206</td>
<td>Baghdad</td>
<td>IXB, 396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 N 207</td>
<td>Chicago (A32248)</td>
<td>IXB, 396, fl. 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 N 208</td>
<td>Baghdad</td>
<td>IXB, 396, fl. 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 N 209</td>
<td>Chicago (A32249)</td>
<td>IXB, 396, fl. 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 N 216</td>
<td>Baghdad</td>
<td>IX</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

8 Hansen, “Some Early Dynastic I Sealings from Nippur,” p. 48, n. 3.
Level IXB, Loci 395–96 were only partially cleared, but three floors (3–1) were traced. A doorway in the south corner of Locus 395 connected the two rooms at all three floors. In Locus 395 two large rectangular ovens or kilns existed at the two lower floors; five sealings were on those floors. In Locus 396 twenty-seven sealings were on floor 3. In Level IXA, four floors (floors 4–1) were recorded. At floor 4 the dividing wall between Loci 395 and 396 was still in existence; at floor 3 the two rooms were a large, presumably open, space (Locus 395). All of the sealings from Level IXA, as well as three tablets (8 NT 14–16), were on floor 3. Two of the tablets probably record distributions; one was poorly preserved. A doorway in Locus 395’s northwest wall connected it with unnumbered rooms. A large circular oven stood in the northeastern portion of that space; two troughlike fireplaces were located along the southwestern wall.

The sealings from Level IX carry impressions of nineteen cylinder seals and four stamp seals. Five of the sealings have incised markings. Hansen described the best and most completely preserved cylinder seal impressions. I have given six additional

---

9 G. Buccellati, “The Eighth Season,” in G. Buccellati and R. D. Biggs, eds., *Cuneiform Texts from Nippur: The Eighth and Ninth Seasons*, AS 17 (Chicago, 1969), p. 5. The text 8 NT 14 is a list of commodities and personal names; 8 NT 16 includes references to professions, including nu-kirifi (gardener) and nagar (carpenter) on the reverse.

sealings numbers (nos. 14–19) that continue Hansen’s sequence\textsuperscript{11} and have given the four stamp seals letter designations (Stamps A–D). Stamps A–C have roughly similar geometric designs (figs. 2–4). Stamp D is fragmentary but was a round seal depicting animals. Figure 5 shows the sealings with incised markings. As for the sealings’ reverses, I examined the twenty-two sealings in Chicago in the Oriental Institute Museum but was not able to gain access to those in Baghdad in the Iraq Museum.

\textsuperscript{11} Of the six sealings, I have examined only three (in Chicago); I have worked with photographs of the others: (1) No. 14 (8 N 183) shows heroes with skirts partially pulled up and animals. (2) The photograph of No. 15 (8 N 183) is unclear. I cannot make out the details. (3) No. 16 (8 N 207) shows the head of a horned animal framed by elongated ovals, probably representing the leaves of a bush or tree, and the lower portion of a human figure. (4) No. 17 (8 N 185) preserves two rollings of a single(?) cylinder seal with a combat scene. To the left, a human hero,
Figure 5. Sealing with Incised Markings in Place of Cylinder- and/or Stamp Seal Impressions: (a) 8 N 188, (b) 8 N 187, (c) 8 N 173, and (d) 8 N 174. Scale 1:1
The small number of sealings and incomplete documentation of their reverses make an analysis of the corpus such as I completed for the sealings from the later Ur III (Level IV) Temple of Inanna impossible. The sealings nevertheless merit more detailed description.

None of the cylinder or stamp seals impressed on the Inanna Temple sealings were found in more than one building level/building level subphase or locus. Hansen, nos. 3, 6, 17, and Stamp D were in Level IXB, Locus 395; Hansen, nos. 1–2, 4–5, 14–16, and Stamps A–C in Locus 396; and Hansen, nos. 8, 12–13, and 18 in Level IXA. In contrast, sealings with incised markings occurred in all three find-spots.

Table 2 summarizes the data available for sealings that come from Level IXB, Locus 396, floor 3 (or 60 percent of the total number of sealings).

Table 2. Clay Sealings from the Inanna Temple at Nippur, Level IXB, Locus 396, Floor 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIELD NO.</th>
<th>SEAL</th>
<th>OBJECT SEALED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8 N 172</td>
<td>Hansen, No. 1</td>
<td>door(?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 N 182</td>
<td>Hansen, No. 1</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 N 189</td>
<td>Hansen, No. 1</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 N 192</td>
<td>Hansen, No. 1</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 N 199</td>
<td>Hansen, No. 1</td>
<td>door</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 N 201</td>
<td>Hansen, No. 1</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 N 205</td>
<td>Hansen, No. 1</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 N 196</td>
<td>Hansen, No. 2</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 N 200</td>
<td>Hansen, No. 2/Stamp B</td>
<td>door</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 N 203</td>
<td>Hansen, No. 2/Stamp B</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 N 194</td>
<td>Hansen, No. 4</td>
<td>not preserved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 N 191</td>
<td>Hansen, No. 5</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 N 209</td>
<td>Hansen, No. 7</td>
<td>door(?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 N 195</td>
<td>Hansen, No. 7(?)</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 With skirt partially pulled up, grasps the tail of a lion(?) with his right hand and raises his left arm; a lion’s head, shown frontally, is in the field below the lion’s body. To the right is a bull-man(?) with one arm raised holding a lance. (5) I cannot make out the details of No. 18 (8 N 179) from the photograph. (6) No. 19 (8 N 177) shows the lower portion of an animal, its front legs bent down.

1. Seven (one quarter) of the twenty-seven sealings bear impressions of Hansen, No. 1, a cylinder seal showing two lions attacking a bull and a human hero attacking, in turn, one of the lions with a lance. Two of the seven fragments had sealed a door.

2. Four sealings carry impressions of Stamp A, a rectangular seal with a central diamond in which a cross is inscribed (fig. 4). The diamond is surrounded by hatched triangles. Two of the four sealings had secured a door.

3. Three fragments have impressions of Hansen, No. 2, a seal showing a combat with two “heroes” and two animals alongside a boat carrying two figures, one seated and one standing in the prow with a punting pole(?). The boat moves through water teeming with fish. Two of the three sealings (8 N 200 and 8 N 203) also have one or more impressions of Stamp B over the cylinder seal (fig. 2). Stamp B is a subrectangular seal with a geometric design similar to Stamp A. One of the sealings (8 N 200) had secured a door.

Two other sealings (8 N 198 and 8 N 204) have impressions only of Stamp B (fig. 3). One (8 N 198) had sealed a door.

4. Of the remaining eleven sealings, two have impressions of Hansen, No. 7, a sealing showing a horned animal leaping. One had secured a door.

5. Hansen, nos. 4–5, 14–16, and Stamp C, a geometric seal with a design similar to the designs of Stamps A–B (fig. 4), each occur on a single sealing.

6. Three sealings have incised designs. One of the three had sealed a door.

The sealings from Level IXB, Locus 396, floor 3 document two unusual sealing practices with parallels in some other Early Dynastic corpora: the use of stamp seals alone and impressed over rollings of cylinder seals and the use of incised markings perhaps in place of seals.

**STAMP SEALS AND “OVERSTAMPING”**

In the absence of contemporary textual documentation of the practice, our interpretation of stamps struck over cylinder-seal impressions depends largely on intuition and the evidence of comparable practices in roughly contemporary data sets. In the case of the Early Dynastic I Inanna Temple corpus, the occurrence of three stamp seals with nearly identical geometric designs on sealings from a single locus may provide a clue as to their significance. In contrast to cylinder seals’ more complex designs, the elementary geometric pattern, as Nissen proposed apropos of simple patterned Uruk seals, would not have identified a specific individual. The seals would

---

have been used by multiple parties in instances where sealing had to be traced back to a generic authority, perhaps the institution or some administrative subunit within the institution. If so, the control and use of such seals stand as a key question. Did the stamp seals belong to low-ranking persons, persons whose legal identity was tied to the institution? Or did the stamp seals belong to the temple and were they used by high-ranking administrators or those acting on their behalf? If stamp seals were held and used by low-ranking members of the institution, sealings such as 8 N 200 and 8 N 203 might imply, for example, that a subordinate had used the cylinder seal of a higher-ranking individual in sealing and that he/she had impressed his/her stamp over the cylinder seal to indicate that fact. The action would have been similar to the modern practice of signing a superior’s name to a document and initialing it. If, on the other hand, the stamp seals belonged to the temple and were used by high-ranking administrators, a stamp impressed over the rolling of a cylinder seal might be taken as having a validating function. In other words, the stamp seal would have formally “authorized” the sealing activity of the cylinder seal’s holder.

The limited functional data available for the Inanna Temple sealings provide little insight into the context(s) in which the stamps were used. Only one (Hansen, No. 2) of the eleven cylinder seals from Level IXB, Locus 396, floor 3 and only two out of three extant impressions were “overstamped.” One of the sealings had secured a door. The same stamp seal was used by itself on two other sealings, one of which had secured a door.

Origins of Overstamping and Other Early Dynastic I Corpora

The origins of the practice of overstamping remain uncertain. In the Late Uruk period (ca. 3500–3100 B.C.), stamp seals or the butt ends of cylinder seals were sometimes impressed over cylinder seals on spherical bullae and lenticular sealings from Uruk, Habuba Kebira South, Susa, Chogha Mish, and Tepe Farukhabad. The
butt end of a cylinder seal was used to notch the end of a numerical tablet from Susa. At least at Susa the same cylinder seals impressed on these recording devices were also used to stamp or notch them.17 Somewhat later in time, a single tablet from Jemdet Nasr has a square stamp with a six-petaled rosette impressed over a cylinder seal.18

By Early Dynastic I, written documents apparently ceased to be sealed, but stamp seals continued to be used on clay sealings either by themselves or for overstamping cylinder seals.19 An Early Dynastic I(?) sealing from Nippur, excavated during the University of Pennsylvania’s Fourth Expedition (1899/1900), has a circular stamp with a rosette over an impression of a cylinder seal with an animal combat scene.20 Many of the sealings from the lower Seal Impression Strata (SIS 8–4) at Ur have stamps impressed over rollings of cylinders.21 R. J. Matthews has described a subset of the Ur SIS sealings, the so-called city seals, but it would be worthwhile more fully documenting the corpus of sealings from the lower SIS housed in the University of Pennsylvania Museum (hereafter UPM).22

Forty-four (or 20 percent) of the roughly two hundred sealings from SIS 8–4 in the UPM have impressions of a stamp or a cylinder and stamp (table 3).23 The largest

---

21 Idem, Archaic Seal Impressions, p. 8.
22 Matthews, Cities, Seals and Writing. Matthews’s catalogue of the Ur city seals includes seven or so of the sealings in the UPM that have impressions of stamp seals.
23 In his “Analysis of Decorative Techniques” Legrain records four sealings that have impressions of two cylinder seals (cf. Legrain, Archaic Seal Impressions, p. 13). Two of the sealings are in the UPM: U.18400 (889), UE 3, 135 and 169, 33-35-307 and U.18407 (813), UE 3, 160 and 254, 33-35-371 (for an explanation of field and museum catalogue numbers on the Ur SIS sealings, see table 3 below, n. a). At n. 15 above I argue that the application of multiple cylinder seals and overstamping on Late Uruk spherical
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIELD NO.</th>
<th>PUBLICATION NO.</th>
<th>UPM REG. NO.</th>
<th>FIND-SPOT</th>
<th>MOTIF / SEALING TYPE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U.13912</td>
<td>UE 3, 424</td>
<td>31-16-675</td>
<td>SIS 4</td>
<td>Rosette. Door. Knob and thong?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.13972</td>
<td>UE 3, 404</td>
<td>31-16-674</td>
<td>SIS 4?</td>
<td>Rosette. Door(?). Knob(?) and cord</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.13982</td>
<td>UE 3, 272</td>
<td>31-16-658b</td>
<td>SIS 4</td>
<td>Butt end of unperforated cylinder. Door. Peg and cord</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.14140</td>
<td>UE 3, 198</td>
<td>31-16-619</td>
<td>SIS 4</td>
<td>Butt end of unperforated cylinder. Door. Peg and cord</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.14597</td>
<td>UE 3, 368</td>
<td>31-16-603</td>
<td>SIS 4</td>
<td>Rosette. Door. Peg and cord</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.14625</td>
<td>UE 3, 385</td>
<td>31-16-657</td>
<td>SIS 4</td>
<td>Butt end of perforated cylinder with attached string? Door. Peg and cord</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.14825</td>
<td>UE 3, 281</td>
<td>31-16-671</td>
<td>SIS 4</td>
<td>Rosette. Door. Knob or peg and thong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.14896A</td>
<td>UE 3, 431</td>
<td>31-16-604</td>
<td>SIS 4</td>
<td>Rosette. Door(?). Reverse broken, but traces of peg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.14896B</td>
<td>UE 3, 431</td>
<td>31-16-654</td>
<td>SIS 4</td>
<td>Rosette. Door(?). Peg and cord. Peg has squared edge and shows traces of wood grain; base has straw impressions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.15045</td>
<td>UE 3, 421</td>
<td>31-16-676</td>
<td>SIS 4</td>
<td>Rosette. Door(?). Reverse broken; base flat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.18397(918)</td>
<td>UE 3, 395</td>
<td>33-35-290</td>
<td>SIS 4–5</td>
<td>Rosette. Reverse broken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.18398(849)</td>
<td>UE 3, 431</td>
<td>33-35-298</td>
<td>SIS 4–5</td>
<td>Indistinct traces of stamp? Door. Knob or peg and cord</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.18402(754)</td>
<td>UE 3, 275</td>
<td>33-35-324</td>
<td>SIS 4–5</td>
<td>Geometric design: square inscribed in circle inscribed in square. Impression of cord; reed mat on base</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.18402(755)</td>
<td>UE 3, 376</td>
<td>33-35-325</td>
<td>SIS 4–5</td>
<td>Animal stamp. Cord and flat base with traces of grass or straw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.18402(767)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>33-35-327</td>
<td>SIS 4–5</td>
<td>Stamp impressions only: eight-petaled rosette. Dm 2.15 cm. Door. Knob or peg and cord</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.18402(768)</td>
<td>UE 3, 129</td>
<td>33-35-328</td>
<td>SIS 4–5</td>
<td>Only stamps. Eight-pointed star or eight-petaled rosette. Jar. Leather and cord over mouth, neck, and shoulder of jar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.18402(772)</td>
<td>UE 3, 469</td>
<td>33-35-329</td>
<td>SIS 4–5</td>
<td>Rosette. Traces of cord</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.18402(773)</td>
<td>UE 3, 223</td>
<td>33-35-330</td>
<td>SIS 4–5</td>
<td>Rosette. Door(?). Impression of cord and flat base; cord probably around knob or peg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.18404(716)</td>
<td>UE 3, 306</td>
<td>33-35-337</td>
<td>SIS 4–5</td>
<td>Rosette. Door. Knob or peg and cord</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{a}\) Sealings in the UPM from the Seal Impression Strata carry several registration numbers that may vary from sealing to sealing. These include field numbers (prefixed with a “U” and underlined in white ink); what I take to be a preliminary catalogue number, given here in parentheses; Legrain’s publication number from *Archaic Seal Impressions*, written in white ink or occasionally the note “Not in Legrain”; and, the UPM’s registration number. When I initially sorted the sealings in the late 1980s only a few sealings had museum registration numbers written on them. Since that time, all of them have been assigned museum numbers.  

\(^{b}\) Legrain, *Archaic Seal Impressions*, p. 29, mistakenly lists the UPM registration number as 31-16-858.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIELD NO.</th>
<th>PUBLICATION NO.</th>
<th>UPM REG. NO.</th>
<th>FIND-SPOT</th>
<th>MOTIF / SEALING TYPE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>U.18407 (778)</td>
<td>UE 3, 248?</td>
<td>33-35-360</td>
<td>SIS 4–5 Butt end of perforated cylinder; cord through perforation visible. Impression of cord</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>U.18410 (859)</td>
<td>UE 3, 297</td>
<td>33-35-387</td>
<td>SIS 4–5 Animal stamp. Boar(?). Door(?). Impression of thong or strap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>U.18413 (783)</td>
<td>UE 3, 142</td>
<td>33-25-391</td>
<td>SIS 4 Butt end of seal. Leather and cord. Jar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>U.18413 (797)</td>
<td>UE 3, 378</td>
<td>33-35-394</td>
<td>SIS 4–5 Rosette. Door. Peg and cord</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>U.18413 (803)</td>
<td>UE 3, 369</td>
<td>33-35-401</td>
<td>SIS 4–5 Butt end of perforated cylinder. Door. Knob or peg and cord</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>U.18413 (863)</td>
<td>UE 3, 281</td>
<td>33-35-408</td>
<td>SIS 4–5 Rosette. Door. Knob or peg and thong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>U.18413 (899)</td>
<td>UE 3, 214</td>
<td>33-35-417</td>
<td>SIS 4–5 Stamp with animal, perhaps a scorpion or spider. Reverse broken; flattened base</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.</td>
<td>U.18414 (928)</td>
<td>UE 3, 256</td>
<td>33-35-452</td>
<td>SIS 4–5 Stamp seal design uncertain. Face looks like stamp struck into one impression, with a second rolling made over stamp. Cord impressions on reverse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.</td>
<td>U.20083</td>
<td>UE 3, 216</td>
<td>35-1-667</td>
<td>SIS 4 Rosette. Door. Knob or peg and cord</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.</td>
<td>U.20083</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>35-1-713</td>
<td>— Butt end of perforated cylinder. Door. Knob and cord</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
number of stamp seals on the Ur sealings are circular and have a rosette or star design. Twenty-seven of the sealings in the UPM have stamp seals with such designs. Six stamps show animals, including a boar carved in high relief, and one has a geometric design; two impressions are indistinct. Eight of the sealings in the UPM have rollings of a cylinder seal and impressions of an uncarved “stamp,” probably the butt end of a cylinder, some perforated and others unperforated. Legrain argued that in fact all of the stamp seals on the Ur sealings, including those with rosettes, animals, and geometric designs, were made with the butt ends of cylinder seals.

Though few examples of such cylinder seals survive, Legrain’s suggestion is of particular significance for the meaning of overstamping within an administrative system. If he is correct, the occurrence of stamp seals would imply that no more than a single person need have been involved in the sealing activities represented by the SIS sealings. Several observations suggest that the stamp impressions on the SIS sealings could have been made with the butt ends of the cylinder seals over which they were impressed.

Matthews observed that on a sealing in the British Museum the butt end of a cylinder seal had been “pressed deeply enough into the clay to leave the impression of part of the cylinder design on the side,” and Legrain observed that in general the

bulvae, lenticular sealings, and tablets represented distinct administrative activities. Sealing that had secured doors and various sorts of containers, however, are intrinsically different from such account records, so the question of the relationship between “compound” sealing and “overstamping” needs to be raised again. The large number of SIS sealings with stamps or the butt ends of cylinder seals struck over cylinder impressions as well as the small number of sealings with multiple cylinder seals, and the fact that none of them have evidence of “overstamping” might suggest that in some cases a second cylinder seal could be applied in place of a stamp.

25 Ibid., p. 8. Cylinder seals with carvings on their butt ends could not have been bored through. Legrain speculated that such seals would have been suspended by means of a lug or boss carved in the stone at the opposite end, and he cited several examples. Additional examples are known from the Diyala excavation (H. Frankfort, *Stratified Cylinder Seals from the Diyala Region*, OIP 72 [Chicago, 1955], pp. 13–14).
26 For cylinder seals with designs carved on their butt ends, see Coll. de Clercq, vol. 1, pl. 1: 6–6bis, a Jemdet Nasr “brocade”-style seal; Frankfort, *Stratified Cylinder Seals*, pls. 2p and 84, a crude Early Dynastic I cylinder seal from the Diyala; and, Amiet, *Glyptique susienne*, no. 1080, a fragmentary Proto-Elamite cylinder seal from Susa. The latter two seals have drill holes forming a rosette on their butt ends.
27 Matthews, *Cities, Seals and Writing*, p. 46
28 Ibid., pp. 46 and 67. I have not examined the sealing in question (U.13902 = P. R. S. Moorey, “Unpublished Early Dynastic Sealing From Ur in the British Museum,” *Iraq* 41 [1979]: 109–10, no. 568), but such impressions would likely be rare and could only be created by impressing the end of a cylinder seal down and laterally against the clay. I have examined a number of sealings in the UPM with stamp seals or the butt ends of cylinder seals impressed 5–10 mm deep into the clay but could find no unambiguous traces of designs that might have been carved on the faces of cylinder seals. Instead what I observed—or, more accurately, what I think I observed—on the sides of the stamp impression U.14825 (31-16-671) are remnants of the design of the seal impressed on the clay. The design had been pushed down and distorted when the stamp was applied.
diameters of the stamps struck over cylinder-seal impressions had “some relation to the cylinder itself.” I have attempted to confirm Legrain’s observation by measuring the length of one complete rolling of various cylinder seals and calculating the circumference of the stamp that had been impressed over them. If the round stamp impressed in the clay was carved on the butt end of the cylinder used to make the impression on the sealing, its circumference ought to be more or less the same as the length of one complete rolling.

I was able to measure the length of one complete rolling of five sealings in the UPM (see table 4). In each case the length is roughly the same as the circumference of the stamp impressed over it. In no case is the difference greater than 6 mm, inconsequential given the distortions caused in rolling seals.

Four—or possibly five—sealings with impressions of the same cylinder seal (UE 3, 281) have impressions of the same stamp, 1.8 cm in diameter, with an eight-pointed star or simplified rosette that looks like the AN/DINGIR-sign. UE 3, 281 is particularly complex, and I was not able to determine the length of a complete rolling from any of the UPM impressions to compare to the circumference of the stamp. The four sealings in the UPM had secured the same door fixture, however, a knob or peg with a smooth surface, ca. 3.6 cm in diameter and wrapped with a leather thong or strip.

**Table 4. Correspondence between the Length of Cylinder-Seal Scenes and the Circumference of Stamp Seals Impressed over Them on UPM Sealings**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEALING</th>
<th>UE 3</th>
<th>LENGTH (CM)</th>
<th>CIRCUMFERENCE (CM)</th>
<th>DIFFERENCE (CM)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U.14597/31-16-603</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.14625/31-16-657</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>5.02</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.18405/33-35-344</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>7.06</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.18407/33-35-367</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.18413/33-35-401</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The evidence of the SIS 8–4 sealings, then, would seem to suggest that overstamping had little to do with “initialing” or “authorizing” a sealing activity. If it was not a random activity, then overstamping may have been an administrative practice specific

---

30 U.14825, 31-16-671; U.18402 (757), 33-35-326; U.18413 (863), 33-35-408; and, U.18413, 807, 33-35-415. According to numbers on the artifact, U.18413 (807), 33-35-404 also has impressions of UE 3, 281, but the cylinder- and stamp-seal rollings are indistinct. Cf. Matthews, *Cities, Seals and Writing*, p. 67, no. 39. Matthews lists two of the four or five UPM sealings in his catalogue. He gives the length of a rolling of the seal in question as 5.65 cm; the circumference of the stamp as calculated from its diameter is roughly the same.
to an individual or an individual’s administrative responsibilities or perhaps related to a particular sealing context. As for the former, among the Ur SIS sealings in the UPM, overstamping does not appear to correlate with seal iconography, one commonly cited referent of identity or responsibilities. Overstamping occurs with cylinder seals of all the major scene categories among the lower SIS sealings: animal combats, herding scenes, erotic scenes, abstract or geometric designs, cuneiform inscriptions such as the so-called city seals, and so on. As Matthews observed in his study of city seals from the Ur SIS, however, overstamping may have been related to what was sealed. The use of stamp seals on Ur SIS city seals strongly correlated with door sealings, and the overwhelming majority of the SIS 8–4 sealings in the UPM that have a stamp over a cylinder seal had secured doors (see table 3 above). Not all of the Ur SIS door sealings, however, evidence overstamping. More detailed measurement of the reverses of the sealings might be able to determine whether stamp seals or the butt ends of seals were routinely impressed on those that secured a specific door fixture(s) or, by implication, a single storeroom or limited number of magazines.

In contrast to Nippur and Ur, sealings from Early Dynastic I trash pits at Jemdet Nasr and Fara show no evidence of the use of stamp seals or overstamping in administrative activities. The contrast is hard to explain. It might be due to sampling. The overwhelming majority of the more than four hundred Fara sealings Matthews studied had secured doors, so if the practice had been in widespread use there, it might be expected to have been in evidence in that corpus.

Later Early Dynastic Period

The use of stamp seals and overstamping continued at least in some parts of southern Mesopotamia in the later part of the Early Dynastic period. The Early Dynastic III sealings from the Tell Abu Salabikh 6G Ash-Tip, for example, have thirteen or fourteen different stamp seals commonly impressed over cylinder seals. For example, twelve sealings have a rectangular stamp depicting a lion’s face impressed over two different cylinder seals, while two sealings have a second stamp with a lion’s face impressed by itself. A pyramidal stamp seal (AbS 704) with a lion’s face was found at Abu Salabikh in the Southeastern Complex (Area E), Room 52. Three sealings from

---

32 Matthews, Cities, Seals and Writing, p. 46.
the 6G Ash-Tip have impressions of different stamp seals showing a scorpion or scorpions. On one sealing the stamp was impressed over a cylinder seal. 38

Martin and Matthews offered several possible explanations for the practice at Abu Salabikh: (1) the cylinder seal belonged to the supplier of goods and the stamp to a storeroom supervisor; (2) the cylinder and stamp belonged to storeroom supervisors of different status; or (3) the cylinder seal belonged to the storeroom overseer and the stamp to an official withdrawing goods. 39

Published sealings from the upper Seal Impression Strata (SIS 2–1) at Ur show no evidence of overstamping nor do sealings from Fara. 40 The largest corpus of Fara sealings was found, along with tablets, on the floor of a large well-preserved and recorded building in XIII f–i. Martin was able to identify more than half of the two hundred forty-three sealings from the building, and Matthews noted that of the seventy or so whose function could be determined, 75 percent had secured doors.

At al-Hiba, ancient Lagash, the late Early Dynastic III Area C Administrative Building yielded more than one hundred fifty sealings. 41 A round stamp seal showing a recumbent(?) animal occurred on a single sealing, but there were no instances of overstamping. 42

For the following Akkadian period, a number of stamp seals are known. 43 The majority have an abbreviated presentation scene with a standing figure, usually a woman, before a seated deity, in one case identifiable as Inanna/Ishtar or a seated human. No impressions of such stamps exist in the sizable corpus of Akkadian sealings. 44

In summary, the evidence regarding the use of stamp seals, in particular for overstamping cylinder seals, in Early Dynastic Mesopotamia is perplexing. Stamp seals, perhaps a remnant of protohistoric practices, were apparently in use throughout the period but seem to have been more commonly used at some sites than at others. While this finding could be an artifact of our sample, regional differences on the

38 Ibid., pp. 48–49.
39 Ibid., p. 27.
40 Legrain, Archaic Seal Impressions; Matthews, “Fragments of Officialdom from Fara”; Martin and Matthews, “Seals and Sealings,” p. 27.
42 Donald P. Hansen (personal communication, 14 April 2004).
44 The sealing U.15061 (UE 3, 534), from the northeast corner of the Royal Cemetery area, has an impression of what is likely an Akkadian stamp seal. It depicts a female pouring a libation before a seated human, also female. Legrain’s drawing of the scene makes its identification as an Akkadian stamp seal tentative; no photograph of it exists, and the original is in the Iraq Museum.
southern floodplain may also have existed in political and socioeconomic organization, as well as in administration. We can only speculate about the significance of the practice of overstamping. The cylinders and stamps used on the Nippur Inanna Temple sealings were separate instruments, and overstamping could have involved multiple parties at differing levels of authority or with discrete responsibilities, whereas the cylinder- and stamp-seal impressions on the Ur SIS 8–4 sealings could have been made by one and the same device, thus not requiring more than an single sealer. Such seemingly contradictory data can be reconciled by assuming, for example, that the stamp seals impressed on the Nippur and Ur sealings encode information extrinsic to specific individuals or administrative hierarchies. Stamps might have been necessary on storerooms housing specific sorts of comestibles or commodities or could have been used as mnemonics to indicate quantities added or removed from magazines on specific occasions, such as religious festivals, to certify the contents of specific storerooms in inventories at the beginning or end of accounting cycles, etc.  

CLAY SEALINGS WITH INCISED DESIGNS

The second distinguishing feature of the Early Dynastic I Inanna Temple clay sealings, incised markings, is as puzzling a practice as overstamping. Incised markings might have been made by individuals without seals, but their potential variability suggests that markings would not have served to identify an institution/subunit of an institution or a specific individual as responsible for a particular sealing activity unless they were made in the presence of witnesses.

Incised markings occur not only on the Inanna Temple sealings, but also on the sealings from the lower SIS at Ur. Legrain lists roughly seventy-five incised designs out of the more than four hundred seal designs published, some much more complex than the pattern of incisions on the Inanna Temple sealings. They include incised cuneiform, for example, UE 3, 118 and naturalistic representations, such as UE 3, 475. Seventeen of the more than two hundred sealings at the UPM have incised designs (though in sorting through them I was able to join two fragments). Several of the Ur sealings have both a cylinder-seal impression and an incised design, suggesting some similarity between the practice and overstamping. Four of the sealings with incised markings in the UPM had secured doors; the remainder served as jar stoppers.

In addition to Ur, a single sealing from Fara, whose find-spot is uncertain, appears to have incised lines. Though none of the sealings from the Abu Salabikh 6G Ash-Tip have incised lines, Martin and Matthews noted fingernail marks over cylinder- and stamp-seal impressions on several sealings. The relationship of the practice, if any,

47 Martin, *Fara*, p. 218, no. 585.
48 Martin and Matthews, “Seals and Sealings,” p. 27.
to the drawings on Proto-Elamite tablets, 49 Abu Salabikh and Fara tablets, 50 and Ebla tablets 51 is unclear.

III. CONCLUSION

Until Enrica Fiandra’s ground-breaking research, clay sealings were consigned to art historians, who focused almost exclusively on the seals impressed on them. Advances have been made over the last thirty-five years in exploiting sealings to reconstruct administrative practices and structures as well as socioeconomic organization. The full documentation of clay sealings is now a routine part of excavation reports as the exemplary publications of sealings uncovered at the key northern Mesopotamian site of Tell Brak demonstrate. 52 But work remains to be done if we are to understand the role of sealing activities in institutional administration, the meaning of specific sealing practices, seal iconography, and so on. For one, the Ur SIS sealings, though found in secondary contexts, remain an underexploited resource. The sealings from that context—those in Baghdad, London, and Philadelphia—need to be reunited, reexamined, and fully documented with the aim of delineating the administrative practices of the institution(s), the Temple of Nanna, whose discarded debris they represent. Furthermore, such studies ought to be carried out in conjunction with a reanalysis of the “Archaic Texts” from the same debris. Along the same lines, detailed analyses need to be undertaken of in situ corpora of sealings from historical periods, where information drawn not only from context, but from names and titles on seals as well as written records can help elucidate institutional organizations and the role of sealings in their administration. As Postgate noted, Mesopotamia’s historical—literate—periods provide robust models for explicating behavior in

pre- and protohistoric periods. A secure foundation of such studies, supplemented by cross-cultural comparisons—not limited to “sphragistics” in the Mediterranean or Near Eastern worlds—will help us better understand and exploit the information potential of clay sealings.

---