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89) “The place of the native lords” : notes on gi7, ki-en-gi and the DN šin-ki-en-gi-ŠE3 — The Sumerian word ki-en-gi is commonly translated as “(the land of) Sumer”, understood as a social, political, or perhaps ethnic entity in Southern Babylonia during the 3rd millennium BC. The earliest written sources in which this meaning is unambiguous date to the Early Dynastic IIIb period1). The origins of this term and its relationship to the Akkadian šumēru have been discussed multiple times in the literature. In this article, I focus on a particular aspect of the complex problem that is ki-en-gi - the theory which postulates that the final GI is an alternative writing for the word gi7 (šE3).

The current scholarly consensus seems to be that the word ki-en-gi originated as a name of an individual, small site of some significance, either strategic or religious, for the Old Sumerian city-state koinē as early as the ED IIIa period. Originally, this site was identified with Nippur (JACOBSEN 1939: 488; KRAUS 1970: 48-51), however several researchers currently believe that the ki-en-gi is an archaic spelling of the name Enegi (POMPONIO & VISICATO 1994; BAUER et al. 1998: 242; FRAYNE 2008; COOPER 2012). There are two main lines of evidence which support this theory. Firstly, mentions of en2) or ensi3) of ki-en-gi in the ED IIIa texts from Abu Salabikh would indeed suggest that the word refers to an individual site rather than a greater polity. Given that ki-en-gi is mentioned in the Vulture Stele inscription4) with other sites destroyed by Eanatum, one may speculate whether ki-en-gi still existed as an independent state at that time. Secondly, several references to the god Ninazu, the deity of death and the Underworld, in both literary5) and administrative6) texts from the Early Dynastic period led many to read ki-en-gi as ki-en(e)-gi, the god’s main cultic centre (RIA IX: 333).

The interpretation ki-en-gi as a spelling of Enegi poses some problems. In several instances7), the word ki-en-gi is written with an additional KI sign, probably acting as a determinative, suggesting that the initial KI was read out as an integral part of the word. Moreover, the later spellings of the word as ki-in-gi8) may reflect an assimilation of the original /e/ to the preceding /i/. On the other hand, a tablet from the Yale Babylonian Collection quoted by STEINKELLER (2005: 308-309 fn. 37; YBC 2124 iii’ 16) gives an unusual spelling of a common ED PN Ama-kiengi (POMPONIO 1984: 553): ama-ški-EN×GI10-re-si. If the redundant signs EN and GI are indeed a pair of phonetic complements bracketing the ki-en-gi, KI may have indeed been silent. While the Abu Salabikh za3-mi3 hymns indeed associate ki-en-gi with
Ninazu, they also mention two Urukean deities, Ninsun and Messaḫa-Uunu\(^9\). The relationship Enegi ← ki-en-gi → Uruk remains therefore unclear.

The spelling ki-en-gi\(_4\) is yet another source of confusion. POMPONIO & VISICATO (1994: 11) claim that the ki-en-gi\(_4\) mentioned in the administrative texts from the time of Iriinimgina is a different site, unrelated to the ki-en-gi of the Fara texts, but provide no reasoning for this statement. ESPAK (2015: 18-19 fn. 36) interprets it as a burial place in the state of Lagaš, translating the literal meaning of the word ki-en-gi\(_4\) as “the place where dead ens are brought”. It is unclear which element is meant to carry the meaning of “dead” - perhaps the final gi\(_4\) through its association with the much later name for the Underworld, kur-nu-gi\(_4\). Two mentions of Ninazu in association with ki-en-gi\(_4\) leads me to believe that the word is indeed an alternative spelling of ki-en-gi. One may also wonder whether the spelling ki-en-gi\(_4\) is a pun on kin-gi\(_4\)\(^{10}\).

The sign ŠE₂ and its different readings, including ġiš(ā) and ege, were discussed in detail by STEINKELLER (2005). The exact meaning of the word remains something of an enigma, as its semantic value seems to vary depending on the genre of the text and the context. Three competing translations have been put forward:

2) ġiš = “noble, princely, elite”, as attested in several lexical lists\(^{11}\) relating ġiš to Akk. rubû; see COOPER (2012). Perhaps also having the meaning of “free citizen”, as opposed to slaves and dependants (KOSLOVA 2008)
3) ġiš = “manly, masculine”, with eme-ġiš juxtaposed to eme-sal (“fine/soft/feminine language”).

I do not see these different theories as mutually exclusive. STEINKELLER (2005: 308) notes that during the Early Dynastic period, the word ġiš may be used attributively, probably already conferring the meaning of “noble” and “valiant”. Imagining that a word can espouse the meaning of geo-ethnic identity (“Sumerian”), social status (“noble”) and positive personal attributes (“masculine, manly, valiant”) is not at all difficult. One can give several examples of ethnonyms being used to describe a person’s demeanor and attributes (e.g. Frankish → franc), as well as positively-charged words becoming associated with ethnonyms, usually through folk etymologies (e.g. slava, “glory, fame”, also used as a greeting → Slavs etc.). As for the relationship between ġiš and rubû, one does not have to look far for parallels: the English words such as noble, majestic, chivalrous and regal offer good examples of an elite class of citizens giving its name to a set of particular qualities seen as desirable by a given society. There remains the question of how ġiš relates to sal. In his discussion of the social dimension of the dichotomy eme-ġiš/eme-sal, MICHALOWSKI (1987: 50-52) suggests that with Sumerian already in retreat as the dominant language from the middle of the 3\(^{rd}\) millennium BC, the “proper” written Sumerian would only be available to high-status male members of the community who could afford schooling, effectively becoming a “male language”, as opposed to the Sumerian spoken in family context, whose speakers would be women excluded from elite education and socio-political life. In short, we may be unable to find a single word which would cover to the full semantic range of the Sumerian ġiš. Just like the Sumerian concept of me, often translated as “divine powers” or left in its original form, ġiš may have been an idea which cannot be extracted from its socio-cultural context and should be left untranslated. Depending on the context, ġiš may be understood in a variety of ways: from “local” and “domestic”, through “civilised”, “elite”, “noble”, all the way to “valiant”, “chivalrous” or perhaps even “macho”.

STEINKELLER (2005: 308-309 fn. 37) suggested that the final GI of ki-en-gi may stand for the already discussed ġiš. His suggestion, however, that EN.GI could represent an archaic spelling of the phoneme /g/ based on the “ligature” writing of the two signs\(^{12}\) (GI inscribed into EN) is rather tenuous. Rather, the particular shape of the sign EN, characteristic for the negative space in the upper left corner, dictated this particular choice of calligraphy. As evident from the common writings of divine names starting with EN (EN×DIGIR) and words such as ensi₂ (EN×ME), or burû₄ (EN×GAN₂), secondary signs were inscribed into EN for purely aesthetic reasons. Nonetheless, I find the suggestion of GI being used for ġiš very convincing. COOPER (2012: 294) argues against it, with the /g/-~/g/ alteration going against our understanding of the Sumerian orthography. Indeed, /g/-~/g/ alteration in writing would be rather peculiar, as one would rather expect the nasalised /ğ/ to be replaced by /m/ or perhaps /n/. Still, one
cannot dismiss this possibility given the alteration gi-ĝi7 in the writing of eme-ĝi7, as well as other poorly understood behaviours of the Sumerian /g/, studied in more detail by GELLER (2000). In my opinion, the reading /ĝi/ for the sign GI in ki-en-gi finds support in the form of a divine name from the Fara God List, which has so far gone largely unnoticed (RIA IX p. 448). The name ₅nin-ki-en-gi-ŠE₅ appears in the list (SF 1 obv vi 29) in the category of other deities whose names begin with the NIN component. The sign ŠE₅, usually used as a terminative marker on nominal forms, is rather surprising in the final position on an uninflected DN in a lexical context. The only other examples of DNs from this period ending with ŠE₅ come from the so called Abu Salabikh God List (ALBERTI 1985): ₅nin-la-aš-bar-ŠE₅ in line 129, and ₅me-ŠE₅ in line 281. I would postulate that while in the latter examples the final sign has the independent meaning of ĝi7, the reading of the former DN should be: ₅nin-ki-en-ĝi7(GI)ŠE₅, i.e. the final ŠE₅ acting as a phonetic complement. Perhaps the use of the sign GI as a way of spelling ĝi7 was already archaic by the Fara times, and it was as confusing to the ancient scribes as it is to modern Sumerologists. So much so that the divine name of the patron goddess (god?) of the site warranted the use of a phonetic complement. By extension, I would argue that ĝi7 indeed formed a part of the original word ki-en-gi, whatever its original meaning may have been.

This brief note is meant to raise more questions rather than provide answers. The exact nature and history of the ki-en-gi during the Early Dynastic times continues to elude us, and equating it with the site of Enegi fails to explain several problematic observations - most notably the evidence for the sign KI being a vocalised element of the word and the possible value /ĝi/ for the sign GI. While the god Ninazu was certainly closely associated with the ki-en-gi, so were the patron gods of Uruk. The different spelling variants of ki-en-gi with the signs GI, GI₄ and ŠE₅ for rendering the final syllable /ĝi/ may reflect either a certain lack of rigidity in the spelling conventions during this early period of Sumerian writing, or deliberate wordplays and references to entities or practices which remain obscure.

1) E.g. RIME 1.12.06.02 (CDLI P431197) a 9; RIME 1.14.17.01 (CDLI P431228) a 4; RIME 1.14.17.03 (CDLI P431230); RIME 1.14.20.01 (CDLI P431232).
2) IAS 247 ii’ 7’; this being an UD.GAL.NUN text, EN is spelled with the GAL sign.
3) TSŠ 627 (CDLI P010869) Obv iv 7.
4) RIME 1.09.03.01 (CDLI P431075) 603’.
5) OIP 99 za3-mi3 hymns 137, 139.
6) DP 46 (CDLI P220696) rev. ii 5; DP 51 (CDLI P220701) re. iii 5.
7) DP 46 (CDLI P220696) Rev ii 5; DP 203 (CDLI P220853) Rev iv 5; VS 25 72 (CDLI P020278) Rev iv 5; OSP 2 100 (CDLI P216254) Rev iv 4; RIME 3/2.01.01.21 (CDLI P432131) Rev iii 7; CDLI P469698: Obv 209, 210, 218.
8) E.g. MSL 12, 91 (CDLI P373780) ii 7; MSL 16, 79; RIME 4.02.14.2007 (CDLI P448451) a 12’.
9) OIP 99 za3-mi3 hymns 78-79; 83-84.
10) E.g. STEINKELLER 1995: 49; HEIMPEL 1993: 131; also potentially RIME 2.13.06.04 (CDLI P433096).
12) YBC 2124 iii’ 16 and YBC 11202 iv 6’; OIP 99 247 ii’ 6’-7’.
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90) **Idadu, son of the governor of Egula** — In Sumerian Economic Texts from the Third Ur Dynasty (= SET), a pioneering study of the Puzriš-Dagan organization by JONES & SNYDER (1961), the text SET 66 records that livestock were disbursed (ba-zi) by Zubaga for cultic purposes, the kitchen (e₂ muhaldim), and various foreigners dating to AS 9 ii 26 (for Zubaga, see most recently LIU 2015). Among these foreigners, the last one who is attested and listed in this text is Idadu, the son of Bili-ibba the governor of Egula (I-da-du dumu BI₂-li₂-ib-ba ensi₂ E₂-gu-la₂₃). JONES & SNYDER (1961), followed by OWEN (1997), transliterated and read the name of the son of Bili-ibba as Bandadu (Ban₃-da-du or Banda₃ da-du) inaccurately. The photograph of this text available on CDLI (P129476) shows clearly that the first cuneiform sign of the name of the son of Bili-ibba is "I" (not "DUMU"). This personal name is undoubtedly to transliterate as I-da-du (Idadu).

Coincidentally, the name I-da-du is homonymous with the famous ruler of the Dynasty of Šimaski (Idadu I, who was the son of Kindadu; see STEINKELLER 2014). However, it is impossible that the individual Idadu in this case is identical with either Idadu I (son of Kindadu) or Idadu II (son of Tan-Ruhurater), the rulers of the Dynasty of Šimaski.

The father of Idadu and the governor of Egula, Bili-ibba, is only attested in the text SET 66. His chronology and achievements have remained obscure for us.

According to YOSHİKAWA (1992), the toponym Egula (E₂-gu-la₂₃), which is also exclusively attested in the text SET 66, is identical with Bitum-rabiium, which has been mentioned in the year name of the seventh regnal year of Amar-Suen (mu₄ Ama₄-EN ZU lugal-e BI₂-tum-ra-bi₂-um₃₄ IA₁-ab-ru₂₃ ma-da-ma-da-bi₁ U₁ u₂-uh₂-nu-ri₂₄ mu-hul "The year Amar-Suen, the king, destroyed Bitum-rabiium, Iabru, and their territories, together with Huhnuri", see FRAYNE 1997: 239). The accurate location and identification of Egula/Bitum-rabiium are unknown; however, it was probably located near Huhnuri (the site of Tappeh Bormi near Ramhormoz, MOFIDI-NASRABADI 2005 and STEINKELLER 2013: 294).
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91) The First Triad of Personal Names in the ‘PN List Ur-Nanše’ — In the cuneiform tablet collection of the late Shlomo Moussaieff there is one lenticular tablet (numbered 046) of the type C-5 containing the following three theophoric personal names:

Moussaieff Collection 046

1. ur-dnanšAḪ
2. ur-nin-ĝír-su/-ka
3. ur-ĝá-túm-dûg-g[a

The somewhat damaged theophoric element in line 1, is no doubt dnanše (ABxHA), yielding the Ur III PN ur-dnanše. It has been long recognized that one of the OB lexical PN lists began with the above PN, the so called ‘PN List Ur-Nanše’, recently discussed by Peterson in his comprehensive description of the PN lists in the OB scribal curriculum. A careful examination of the prism YRL SC 1826-Bx4-2, one of the two prisms containing the Ur-nanše PN list, begins with the same three PNs (collated from photo): ur-[DIĜ]IR. nanše, ur-[DIĜ]IR.nin-ĝír-su/-ka, ur-ĝá-túm-dûg-ga (col. i 1-3). The two other tablets containing the first three lines of this PN list in intact state, are MS 2718 (CUSAS 12, p. 283 = CDLI P251731) and MS 4835 (CUSAS 12, p. 383 = CDLI P253865).

It is not fortuitous that this PN list began with Ur-Nanše, who was the first important ruler of the ED Lagaš dynasty. Indeed, this PN was extremely popular in the Ur III period. The second PN of this triad, Ur-Ningiršu(ka), a name of two Lagaš II rulers, was much less popular in the Ur III period. As to the rest of the names in the first column of the Ur-Nanše PN List, the following observations can be made: ur-teš (4) is a very common PN in ED III Šuruppak, but in the Lagaš area it was also popular. Ur-GAR (5), the name of the seventh ruler of Lagaš II, is an extremely common PN in third millennium documents, overwhelmingly stemming from the Lagaš area. Ur-âb-ú (6) is a moderately common PN, used almost exclusively in the Lagaš region. Ur-âNin-marška (9) is a fairly common PN, also almost exclusively attested around Lagaš area. Ur-âBa-ba6 (10), the name of the third (or fourth) ruler of the Lagaš II dynasty, who seems to have dominated the city of Ur, was used in this city more than anywhere else; nevertheless, it was a very common PN also in the Lagaš area. Ur-nu (11) is a moderately popular name in the pre-Ur III period, primarily common in the vicinity of Lagaš. Ur-âšara2 (12) was again a very popular PN, used almost exclusively in the territory of Lagaš-Umma. Finally, Ur-šu (13) was again a quite popular name, especially around Lagaš.

The fact that the first 13 names of the Ur-nanše PN List are attested primarily in the Lagaš area, seems to indicate that this particular list was the creation of the Lagaš II scribal school. It is reasonable to assume that the OB teachers were familiar with this and other PN lists, which were composed for didactic purposes. In a survey of lenticular tablets from Nippur, and from Tell-Harmal, we were able to find a considerable number of lentils inscribed with three PNs. Some of these PNs were derived from triads, found in OB PN lists. Frequently, these PN triads are of similar distribution: usually, two PNs in the lentil are relatively popular, attested in a great number of Ur III administrative documents, whereas the third PN is usually a hapax, or very rarely attested elsewhere. We see here a clear didactic system, with progress from the light to the heavy, and from the familiar to the unfamiliar. This indicates that the authors of those lists compiled them intentionally for use in teaching Sumerian writing on the basic level represented by these three-line lenticals. As a matter of fact, we could find in the first column of the PN List Ur-nanše another triad of the same nature: Ur-igi, [U]r-igi-bar-ra and U[r]-
dili\(^{26}\) (ll. 21-23). The same triad is attested also in a lentil from Kiš.\(^{27}\) While Ur-igi is a fairly common PN, attested primarily in the Lagaš area,\(^{28}\) Ur-igi-bar-ra cannot be found in administrative documents,\(^{29}\) and Ur-dili is an extremely rarely attested PN.\(^{30}\) On the other hand, in there is a lentil of similar nature from Ur with a four-line extract from the first column of the PN list under discussion, reading: Ur-ba, Ur-ba-ba, Ur-za, Ur-za-za (ll. 17-20).\(^{31}\) Here again, while the first two PNs (Ur-ba and Ur-ba-ba) are fairly common in 3\(^{rd}\) Millennium administrative documents,\(^{32}\) the last two PNs (Ur-za and Ur-za-za) seem not to be attested elsewhere.

1) We are in the last stage of a study of 33 lenticular tablets of unknown provenance from this collection. Our study will be included in a forthcoming volume, containing a variety of texts from other genres.

2) For the generally accepted typology of the lenticular tablets from the point of view of their format, marked by the sigla C-1 to C-5, see Gordon, SP, pp. 7-8.


4) Published in CDLI, under the No. P387605.

5) The other prism is UM 29-16-274+N 5969+N 6085 (see Peterson ibid.; photo CDLI P230963).

6) See e.g. H. Limet, L'anthroponymie 553; A. Falkenstein, Die neusumerischen Gerichtsurkunden 1956, p. 77. This PN is listed in CDLI more than 1790 times; out of these, more than 1550 are in documents from Lagaš-Girsu.

7) Cf. Edzard, RIME 3/1.1.1 (pp. 7f.); RIME 3/1.1.8 (pp. 18ff.).

8) Cf. Limet, ibid. 555; Falkenstein, ibid. p. 77. This PN is listed in CDLI more than 430 times, in ca. 380 documents; out of these, only ca. 60 are from the ED III period.

9) For this PN see e.g. Limet, ibid. p. 545. It is listed in CDLI 56 times in 47 documents.


11) Listed in CDLI 194 times; out of these 99 are attested in ED III Šuruppak; otherwise, the place where this PN was popular is the Lagaš area (39 occurrences).

12) See RLA 14, pp. 41ff.

13) Listed in CDLI 950 times; out of these documents 812 stem from Girsu, Lagaš and Umma.

14) Listed in CDLI 109 times; out of these 89 from Girsu, Lagaš and Umma.

15) Listed in CDLI 343 times; out of these 328 from Lagaš and Umma.

16) He appointed there his daughter En-anne-pada as en-priestess (cf. RLA 14: 410).

17) This PN is listed in CDLI 9595 times; out of these it is attested in the Lagaš area 2596 times.

18) Listed in CDLI 137 times; out of these attested in Girsu, Lagaš and Umma no less then 71 times.

19) Listed in CDLI 2183 times; out of these attested in Girsu, Lagaš and Umma no less then 2093 times. It is interesting to note that this theophoric PN cannot be found as a ruler’s name in Umma.

20) Listed in CDLI 935 times; out of these attested in Girsu, Lagaš and Umma no less then 464 times (close to 50%).

21) A cursory look at the second column of this PN list may indicate that this column also contained PNs primarily in Lagaš area documents. This is clearly indicated by the PN ur-\(^{3}\)š-ninnu (ii 5). As to ur-dili (ii 2), out of a total of 7 provenanced occurrences of PNs with this component listed in CDLI, 4 are from Girsu and Umma.


23) In the Nippur corpus, we found 60 lentils with PNs, each containing only 2 names; and only 3 lentils with PN triads (CBS 14191, UM 29-13-159, UM 29-16-336). In the Tell-Harmal corpus, on the other hand, all 14 lentils containing PNs are triads (Nos. 17, 20, 49, 53, 62, 85, 92, 102, 105, 116, 117, 118, 120).

24) As to the Nippur corpus, see the triads UM 29-13-159; UM 29-16-336 (both derived from PN list Inana-tēš). As to the Tell-Harmal corpus, see the following triads: Nos. 17, 92 (both derived from PN list Ur-nanshe); nos. 49, 85, 102, 116 and 117 (all derived from PN list Ur-me; for further 3 lentils, containing PNs from the same PN list, see Sigrist, AUCT 5, 199 and 210; Civil, CUSAS 12 8.5 21 [cf. CDLI P251492]).

25) As to the Nippur lentils, see UM 29-13-159, where the first PN (DLKU.LU) is attested only in the PN list Inana-tēš, similarly, in UM 29-16-336, the second PN Ri-izzi-ē-a, is attested only in the above PN list. As to the Harmal lentils, while the first two PNs (ur-da, ur-da-mu) in TIM 10 No.17 are relatively fairly documented elsewhere, the third PN, ur-giš, seems not to be documented outside PN list Ur-nanshe.

26) The text seems to have an IGI corrected to Aš (reading assured by the source MS 2718 [CUSAS 12, p. 283 = CDLI P251731], i.23).


28) Listed in CDLI 47 times; out of these attested in the Lagaš area no less then 39 times.
29) Listed in CDLI 47 times; out of these attested in the Lagaš area no less than 39 times.
30) For Ur-dili see Salmanticensis 28, 396; rev i 14; SNAT 393; rev i 7.
31) UET 6/3, 800 (=CDLI P346837).
32) While Ur-ba is attested primarily in the Lagaš area, Ur-ba-ba (which seems to be the full form of the former) is attested in Lagaš only in four documents out of 42 (this PN is documented primarily in Nippur and Šuruppak).

Jacob KLEIN <jacob.klein@biu.ac.il> & Yitschak SEFATI <Yitschak.Sefati@biu.ac.il>
Bar-Ilan University, RAMAT-GAN, ISRAEL

92) A seal naming Hanun-Erā, shakkanakku of Mari — In the collection of Jonathan and Jeannette Rosen1 is a seal inscribed with the name of a hitherto unknown shakkanakku of Mari. The inscription appears to read as followsː²

\begin{verbatim}
'a2-nun₀-iṣ-ra
gir3-nit₂-ma-ra₅
ri₃-im-si₂-ma-ma
ma-zi-zi șa₅₃-bi₄-su
\end{verbatim}

The scene is an interesting variant of the “presentation scene” ubiquitous in Mesopotamian glyptic of the third and second millennia B.C. This particular variant is an introduction scene, in which the worshiper (representing the seal owner) stands behind the king, who pours a libation into a date palm altar before a seated goddess, who holds the upturned knife characteristic of the Sun God. The seal owner and the king wear similar garments, with elaborate fringes. The primary figure, apparently representing a female form of the Sun God, is not uncommon on seals from Mari (Collon, First Impressions, figs. 119 and 120).

The 2.4 x 1.6 cm serpentine seal is finely carved, but as a result of wear to the surface of the seal the outlines of the figures are no longer sharply defined. Also for this reason, many smaller details, such as the feet of the seated goddess and some facial features of the figures, have completely disappeared.

The seal was formerly in the collection of the Green Lake Conference Center, sold by Sothebys New York in 1997³. It had previously belonged to James Lewis Kraft (1874–1953) who had acquired it from Ada Small Moore (1858–1955).

1) I am extremely grateful to Mr. and Mrs. Rosen for their permission to study and publish this seal, and to Sidney Babcock for facilitating my study.
2) I am indebted to J-M Durand for his help with the inscription, and especially for the tentative reading of the seal owner’s title.
3) Sotheby’s New York Sale 6999 (May 31, 1997), lot 378.

R. H. MAYR <rudimayr@gmail.com>
93) La prise en compte d’actifs comptables dans les archives de l’entrepôt du kârum de Sippar —
Les actifs, en comptabilité moderne, désignent l’ensemble du patrimoine, matériel et immatériel, d’un agent économique : c’est-à-dire les fonds liquides propres, les capitaux disponibles réellement, mais aussi les capitaux disponibles fictivement sous la forme de dettes dont l’agent économique est créancier et dont il considère, par suite, posséder la somme. Jusqu’ici, l’opinion commune au sujet de la comptabilité mésopotamienne voulait qu’un agent économique, généralement le palais, un temple ou des membres du kârum, comptabilisent dans leur patrimoine uniquement les biens qu’ils possédaient en propre et qu’ils inventorieraient parfois : c’est-à-dire la différence entre les biens reçus (namhartum) et les biens dépensés (ZI.GA). Or l’étude des archives concernant la gestion et la comptabilité du grain, menée actuellement par G. Chambon (ouvrage à paraître début 2016 et dont son auteur nous a très généreusement permis une première consultation, pour la partie qui concerne les actifs comptables), révèle qu’il vaut mieux réfléchir non en terme de biens reçus et dépensés, mais en terme d’actifs et de passifs. Il s’appuie en cela sur une première proposition terminologique de D. CHARPIN (1985) pour le terme baššûtum, qu’il traduisait par « solde », c’est-à-dire la différence, en comptabilité, entre les actifs et les passifs. G. Chambon propose alors de nuancer, à Mari, la « simple opposition “crédits/débit” » en montrant que le terme est à comprendre comme un « bilan comptable », car il prend en compte la différence entre les actifs et les passifs.

Lors des recherches menées pour mon mémoire de Master 2 portant sur l’emploi de la mesure de Marduk à l’époque de la Première Dynastie de Babylone, il m’est apparu qu’on retrouvait ce phénomène à Sippar. On peut le constater en mettant en relation deux textes provenant de Sippar : il s’agit de CT 8, 21b, datant du 11/XII/Âṣ 05, et CT 8, 10c, datant du 12/XII/Âṣ 05. Dans chacun des ces documents on voit qu’un chef des marchands nommé Utu-šumundib est en charge d’une certaine quantité de grain, appartenant au palais (l. 4 : ŠÈ 180, 0.0 ŠÈ.GUR ša ŠÈ.GAL), et qu’il en fait crédit en employant la mesure de Marduk. Dans le premier, il prête 0, 4.0 GUR en mesure de Marduk à deux particuliers, dans le second, il prête 3, 0.0 GUR en mesure de Marduk à un seul particulier. Or cette mesure était fréquemment employée par l’administration royale babylonienne, dont il semble qu’elle dépendait exclusivement, de la même manière que la mesure de Šamaš dépendait de l’administration royale dans le Royaume de Haute-Mésopotamie sous Samsi-Addu (cf G. CHAMBON, 2011, p. 137ss). Elle était surtout employée pour les transferts de grain depuis la capitale vers ses dépendances, afin de contrôler qu’il n’y ait pas eu de malversations : il est donc logique que du grain appartenant au palais soit mesuré avec la mesure de l’administration royale. Dans ces deux textes, le grain est stocké dans l’entrepôt de Sippar-Amnânum, probablement dans l’entrepôt du kârum, et laissé sous le contrôle du chef des marchands, principal interlocuteur économique des souverains paléo-babyloniens tardifs à Sippar en tant qu’il dirigeait le kârum (ce fait est devenu apparent dès R. HARRIS, 1975, p. 71ss). La conclusion la plus intéressante qu’on puisse retirer de la mise en parallèle de ces deux textes, c’est que le second, alors même qu’ont été retirés 0, 4.0 GUR pour les prêter à des particuliers, indique que l’entrepôt contient la même quantité de grain (180 GUR dits « du palais » dans les deux textes), que la veille ! Cela ne peut signifier que deux choses : ou bien l’on raviotaît constamment l’entrepôt pour qu’il conserve toujours la même quantité de grain ou alors, c’est bien plus vraisemblable, la somme de grain d’où est issue la ration est toujours celle de départ, c’est-à-dire celle comptabilisée et mesurée au moment de l’arrivée du grain (180 GUR). On ne tenait pas compte de la quantité réelle de grain dans l’entrepôt à ce moment là, inférieure à ce qui est exprimé dans le texte CT 8, 10c puisqu’une partie du grain a déjà été prêtée dans le texte CT 8, 21b, sans pour autant qu’on prenne en compte cette soustraction. La quantité mentionnée est celle qui a été envoyée du palais vers l’entrepôt à l’origine, et non celle qui est dans l’entrepôt au moment où l’on rédige le texte.

La somme de 0, 4.0 GUR est minime, on pourrait alors penser à une erreur du scribe, ou à la décision de ne pas remesurer le grain après cette opération, si l’exemple de ces deux textes était unique, mais il ne l’est pas. On rencontre le même phénomène économique dans deux autres textes : CT 8, 21d et CT 4, 29b. Dans le premier texte, ce sont surtout les l. 18 à 24 qui sont intéressantes et qui sont reproduites ici :
Dans le second texte, on s’intéresse surtout aux l. 9-14, données ci-après :

Dans le second document, la quantité de grain en mesure de Marduk gardée dans l’entrepôt n’a pas changé (1200, 1.1.5 SILA₃), alors même que l’on voit clairement que des dépenses ont été réalisées. On peut donc supposer qu’il en allait de même pour le grain mesuré en parsiktu de 72 SILA, ce qui implique alors qu’il faut corriger la l. 19 du premier texte : on distingue un signe <600> dans la cassure, suivi d’un clou oblique, puis des signes pour 1 BARIGA, 1 BAN et 5 SILA, les mêmes qui terminent la quantité indiquée à la l. 11 du second. Logiquement, on devrait trouver dans ces deux documents une quantité de grain identique en parsiktu de 72 SILA, comme c’est le cas pour la quantité en mesure de Marduk. En effet, si l’on considère que le clou oblique de la l. 19 du premier texte est précédé d’un vertical, qui aurait disparu ou n’aurait pas été vu par le copiste puisque cette ligne est abîmée, on trouve bien la quantité de 1200, 1.1 GUR et 5 SILA, comme à la l. 11 du second. Si cette hypothèse est correcte, on voit qu’on enregistrait la quantité de grain reçue au moment de son arrivée, mais que l’on ne modifiait pas les estimations du grain dans l’entrepôt au fur et à mesure des dépenses faites au sein de celui-ci.

Tout cela n’est en rien lié à une erreur de scribe : cela révèle simplement que les comptables mésopotamiens raisonnaient parfois effectivement en matière d’actif et de passif, considérant que du grain qui était physiquement absent de l’entrepôt y était présent du point de vue économique, selon une fiction propre à la comptabilité. Ce grain était considéré présent dans l’entrepôt car il avait été prêté, et devait donc logiquement être retourné, toute dette ayant vocation à être remboursée. On comprend alors mieux la mention habituelle à la fin de ce genre de contrats : ana natbâk ilqû Še’âm Utâr, voulant que le débiteur rende le grain « dans l’entrepôt où il l’a pris », car s’il le rendait à un autre entrepôt, même si celui-ci appartenait à la même institution, il fausserait ce faisant la comptabilité.


Ninety-nine years after Ḫammurabi’s work, his great-grandson Ammiditana commemorated the excavation of his only canal: Ammiditana’s 22nd year-name (Ad 22 = 1661 BC) identified the construction of a waterway called the Ammiditana canal (𒂊𒂊𒂊𒂉). The location of this canal is unknown, and its name is absent from the many hundreds of post-Ad 22 texts of northern Babylonian. However, a new variant of the Ad 22 year name on unpublished YBC 10859 now equates the Ammiditana and Ḫ-n-n watercourses. The fragmentary tablet preserves only a few weathered lines on its obverse, just enough to indicate that it concerned a house (12 ديدة) owned by an otherwise unknown man named Maququm [ma-qa-i-qum]; nothing beyond this can be read on the tablet—except for the very last lines of the reverse, which give:

rev. [iti ab].ʾe’ u₄ 15.kam
2ʾ [mu-am-mi]-di-ta-na lugal.e
[hi₄]-a-am-mu-ra-bi
4ʾ [nu-h₄]-u-us-ni-ši mu.un.ba.al[.la]

The restoration of Ammiditana’s name in line 2ʾ (rather than Samsuditana’s name, the other possibility) rests on the fact that Samsuditana had no year names claiming to have built any canals at all. And its identification as a variant of Ad 22 derives from the fact that, among Ammiditana’s year-names, only variants of that one use the verbal chain mu.un.ba.al.la. Thus this appears to be a new, third variant of the same year-name (i.e., Ad 22c), identifying the two hydronyms. Notwithstanding, the Ḫ-n-n name was plainly preferred long after Ḫammurabi’s time, and even four decades past Ad 22; and indeed, that we have only this one exemplar implies that Ammiditana’s work was altogether unimpressive by Ḫammurabian standards.

Ammiditana’s decision to attach his name to Ḫammurabi’s most famous civic project in the south, however, was otherwise very much in line with his other efforts to develop a “southern strategy” to win back the hearts and minds of south Babylonian citizens. The new variant does not necessarily indicate that Ammiditana re-opened the channel all the way to Eridu (though neither is that excluded); only that he worked in that direction, and specifically in emulation of his royal ancestor. But the allusion is also more than incidental, as it is consistent with a wider programme of Ammiditana’s cultic reforms and ideological maneuvers advancing the idea of a Babylonian renaissance in the south, geared specifically towards southern audiences, whether resident in the north, or remaining in the south.

1) K. Van Lerberghe and G. Voet, however, make the persuasive case that, by the Late OB, the canal was essentially fed by the Tigris River (A Late Old Babylonian Temple Archive from Dūr-Abišub, CUSAS 8 [Bethesda, MD: CDL Press, 2009] pp. 4-6). RIME 4 3.6.7, the only inscription of Ḫammurabi’s to mention the canal, adds only that he built Dūr-Sîn-muballit-abim-wâliya at its “intake” (ka), and hymnifies Anum and Enlil, suggesting Uruk and Nippur as major nodes along its route.

2) Cf. CUSAS 8 pp. 58-59; van Lerberghe, pers. comm., now agrees with Andrew George that the sign before the FN is kun(.hi.a) and not ġū.

3) CUSAS 8 38; CUSAS 8 80 further suggests that deep-water boats continued to reach Nippur in these years, attesting to the vitality of the system down to the end of the period; but, strictly speaking, the text is not either dated or clearly datable.

4) I would like to thank the Yale Babylonian Collection for its kind permission to cite this unpublished text.

5) Though it is interesting that the exemplar dates to the tenth month; that is, the variant was not simply made in an early month and quickly discarded.

6) See my analysis of these efforts, forthcoming as “Re-forging ‘Sumerian’ kingship in the Late Old Babylonian Period,” in Conceptualizing Past, Present and Future, Melammu Symposia 9, ed. S. Fink and R. Rollinger.

Seth RICHARDSON, <seth1@uchicago.edu>

95) Contrast through ironic self-citation in Atra-šis — The Old Babylonian epic of Atra-šis is divided into two parts: the Iğigu-myth, describing the creation of humanity, and the Flood-myth, describing the near annihilation of humanity (see MORAN 1987:245). The two parts form each other’s mirror image, creation becoming destruction. They were two separate mythical threads and reappear in
different contexts: the Flood-myth appears at the end of the *Gilgameš* epic, while the scene describing the creation of humanity appears at the end of *Enûma Eliš*.

What has not been noted so far, is that the contrast between the two parts of *Atra-šašis* is expressed through ironic citations of earlier lines. In at least three and possibly four cases, a line from the first part is cited in the second, but with the opposite meaning of its first appearance.

The four cases are:
- When the gods decide to create humanity, they summon the birth-goddess Bēlet-ili with the following words:
  \[
  \textit{attī-ma šassīrū bāniat awīlāti}, \textit{“You are the birth-goddess, creator of humanity!”} (I 194)
  \]
  But when, after the Flood, the gods decide to limit human procreation, they again summon Bēlet-ili, saying:
  \[
  \textit{attī-ma šassīrū bāniat šīmāti}, \textit{“You are the birth-goddess, creator of destinies!”} (III vi 47)
  \]
  Lambert (1980:57-8) has interpreted the broken context of this line to mean that Bēlet-ili is being summoned to create natural death. The word šīmūtu, “destiny”, is often used as a euphemism for death. Thus, the creation of human life and the creation of human death are mirrored in the appeal to Bēlet-ili.

- After humanity is created, the text describes how the people begin to multiply, eventually disturbing Enlil with their noise. This noise is described with a metaphor:
  \[
  \textit{māṭum kīma l ḫappu}, \textit{“The land bellowed like a bull.”} (II i 3)
  \]
  After humanity is created to take over the hard work of the Igīgū-gods, Bēlet-ili declares that she has accomplished this task at the prompting of Enki.

  \[
  \textit{apṭur ulla andurāra ašku}, \textit{“I have untied the neck ring and established freedom!”} (I 243)
  \]
- When the humans are created to be diminished by the plagues of the gods, and Enki keeps helping the humans to escape those plagues, the gods turn from gratefulness to accusation:
  \[
  \textit{taḥṭur ulla andurāra taškun}, \textit{“You have untied the neck ring and established freedom!”} (II vi 28 = II v 19 = [II v 1’?])
  \]
  To create the humans and to stop the humans from being killed is thus celebrated and condemned with the very same sentence.

- The last example is less clearcut. Humanity is created as a mixture of clay and blood, which Bēlet-ili divides into fourteen lumps. Fourteen birth-goddesses then shape these lumps into seven women and seven men.

  \[
  \textit{šinašām ukallalā maḥrāša}, \textit{“They completed them in pairs before her.”} (S iii 12)
  \]
  Gender in Atra-ḫaṣṣ is thus appears to be dichotomous, but it is exactly this pairing into genders which leads to procreation, multiplication, noise, the disturbance of Enlil and the destruction of humanity. When the gods create death, they also create a series of other measures to keep down childbirth:

  \[
  \textit{al[pūna šalušum li[b]ī ina niši}, \textit{“In addition, let there be a third category among the people”}. (III vii 1)
  \]
  This line has most often been understood in connection with the following line, which reads, “Let there be women who give birth and women who do not give birth.” However, I would read the two as separate injunctions, with the “third category” as a contrast to the earlier creation of genders. I would argue that šinašam and šalušum, “in pairs” and “a third” mirror each other as do the other lines described above.

  In a forthcoming article, I discuss the discursive structure of gender in cuneiform cultures, arguing that there were not necessarily three genders (cf. GABBAY 2008), but that gender was arranged according to a three-part structure (Helle, forthcoming). Therefore, it would not be surprising to see the
dichotomous genders created in the beginning of Atra-ḫāšīs supplemented by the creation of a third category.

However the last example is interpreted, there is clearly a pattern of ironic self-citation in Atra-ḫāšīs, where a line is repeated with only minor alterations but with the opposite meaning. However, this form of self-citation is not unique to Atra-ḫāšīs. For example, it can be found also in the Gilgamesh epic. MORAN (2001:173-4) described how the phrase šeššet urri u sebe muṣṭāti, “six days and seven nights” (I 194 = X 58, 135, 235) = XI 209) serves as a pivot in the epic: it marks first the transformation from non-human to human, then from human to non-human, and finally from non-human back to human. The same phrase thus carries out opposed movements.

Another example of ironic self-citation in Gilgameš is the line šittīnšu ilum-ma šallultāšu amēšūtu, “two thirds of him is a god but a third of him is human” (I 48 = IX 51). This line appears first in a long praise of Gilgameš, where the emphasis is clearly on his divinity. The fact that he is two thirds divine is highlighted as an example of his exceptional status. But when the line reappears, it is spoken by the scorpion woman to her husband. The two are discussing whether to let Gilgameš enter the tunnel that will lead him to Ut-napišti, and the scorpion man has just stated: ša ilikkannāšiIRRī līlī zumuršu, “The one who has come to us: His body is the flesh of the gods” (IX 49). Standing against this line, the scorpion woman’s statement that Gilgameš is two thirds god, but one third human, reverses the original emphasis: she highlights the part of his body that is human, and not made of the flesh of the gods.


HELLE, S. forthcoming. ‘The Dynamics of a Three-Sex Model’.


Sophus HELLE, <clh887@alumni.ku.dk>, University of Copenhagen

96) An Alternate Ending to an Akkadian Letter-Prayer to Amurrum (AbB 12, no. 99) — Twenty-five years ago W. H. van Soldt published an interesting letter-prayer from a man named Ardum to the god Amurrum.13 In this short note, I offer an alternative translation of the prayer’s final sentence, which explains how a bed-ridden man delivered his prayer to the god and granted others the authority to lay the petition before the deity.

Van Soldt gives the Akkadian text as follows:23

Obv. 1 a-na be-ēl-ia 4mar.«mar».tu
2 3a i-na ma-ḫar 4uttu qī-bi-is-sā ša-ma-at
3 qī-bī-ma
4 un-ma ar-du-um sag.ēr-ka-ma
5 it-tī: a-ni-lī ta-ab-na-an-ni-ma su-qā-am
6 tu-šē-te-qā-an-ni
7 ü ša-at-ti-ša udu siskur.siskur.re a-la-qē-ku-ma
8 a-na i-lu-ti-ka ka-bi-it-tim
9 i-ip-pu-u
10 i-na-an-na na-ak-ruākā-ša-da-an-ni-ma
11 mu-āṣ-ke-nē-ka-ku-ma a-āl-ḫu-a
12 ü-ul i-a-ri-ru-ni

Rev. 13 šum-ma AN ka3 ra-bi-tum ša ra am
14 i-na 4nā na-da-a-ku di-ki-an-ni
15 udu siskur.siskur.re ṭā-āl-ṣa-ša-da-am
meronlookers may have diametrically opposed reactions to what they see, ranging from annoyance (eli). The next step is to consider briefly the role of suggestion that the letter is a scribal exercise (p. 84, note a). By van Soldt (marked above but also including two erasures, one between the final two signs in line 11 and/or acquaintances of Ardum, though apparently not his brothers (lines 11–12).

Although some of the signs have resisted decipherment, leaving small gaps in our understanding of the letter, van Soldt’s lively translation captures well the pathos of Ardum’s dire situation:

Speak to my lord Amurrum whose pronouncement is heard before Šamaš: Thus says Ardum, your servant. You have created me among men and you have made me pass (safely) along the street. Also, I used to bring you a sheep offering every year and I prepared (it) in honor of your venerable divine rank. (But) now an enemy has befallen me and I am miserable. (Even) my brothers do not come to my help. I suggest the letter is a scribal exercise (p. 84, note a).

The next step is to consider briefly the role of āmirū in prayers and other texts. Although onlookers may have diametrically opposed reactions to what they see, ranging from annoyance (eli āmerīya anrus anāku, “I annoy the one who looks upon me,” Maqlû 1 7) to jubilation (āmirīya anā dārāti daltīka lidlūlu, “may those who look upon me sing your praises forever,” as found in incantation-prayers), in all cases āmirū must be people who are proximate and/or acquainted with the person they are looking upon. Although āmirū were not limited to friends and family (see, e.g., āmiršu ina sūqi litta’id ilātu, “may the one who looks upon him in the street praise your divinity”), āmirū would certainly have included them. Finally, given the fact that āmirū are at times the ones said to have rejoiced at the recovery of a supplicant, it is not unreasonable to consider the idea that they were also concerned enough to act on a supplicant’s behalf. I therefore suggest that āmirū in our letter are family, friends and/or acquaintances of Ardum, though apparently not his brothers (lines 11–12).

Another important element in justifying the alternative translation is the content of the letter, which clearly describes Ardum as bedridden. His condition at the time of writing the letter contrasted sharply with his former abilities, when he passed along the street and brought offerings to the deity (lines 5–9), an action that he promises to resume if the deity would grant his petitions (15–17). If Ardum was in fact bedridden, he could not possibly have brought the letter to Amurrum; others would have needed to help him. I suggest the āmirū are those people.

In his article “Two Letter-Prayers to Amurrum” Hallo discusses the “mailing instructions” of our letter, as he calls the final lines, and compares them to what he believes is a similar phrase in a Sumerian letter-prayer to Amurrum. He translates the final sentence in our letter in a similar manner as van Soldt: “May whoever sees me forward (my message) to your well-disposed godliness.” I agree that the sentence concerns itself with the delivery of the supplicant’s prayer. But this is not expressed as a wish, as Hallo’s translation would suggest. The verb is clearly a preterite. As is well known, preterites may function performatively in some contexts, including OB letters. This is precisely how I believe the verb is working here.
In light of these observations, I suggest that the last sentence of this letter-prayer is not a petition or mailing instructions. Rather, it explains how a bed-ridden supplicant delivered his letter-prayer to the deity and performatively authorized his āmirū as his proxies in laying the supplication before the deity’s feet: “those who look upon me (hereby) submit (this petition) to your beautiful divinity.”11)


2) No copy has been published but a photograph of the tablet is available on the British Museum’s website (see http://goo.gl/wrcJQR).

3) As van Soldt notes (p. 85, note k), the understanding of AN ka as dingir-ka is problematic, since we would expect an intervening phonetic complement, as is found in the other instances of ilatu plus pronominal suffix in the letter (see lines 16 and 20); thus, we expect DINGIR-ut-ka. In light of this, it may be best to read dingir-ut-ka here, though this does little to clarify the context.

4) Might this sign be a malformed SU?

5) Including the present attestation, we now have three instances of qerēbu in the Š-stem that also occur in contexts in which presenting a request makes contextual sense (see CAD Q, 239–240 and AHw, 917 for references). Although the meaning is not absolutely certain, I see no warrant to contest the semantics of the verb. Hallo’s translation agrees (see below). Van der Toorn renders the final sentence quite differently, “Then I shall make those who see me speak highly of your friendly divinity,” without comment (Family Religion, 131).


10) See Mayer, Untersuchungen zur Formensprache der babylonischen „Gebetsbeschwörungen.“ 192 and GAG §79b.

11) I thank Prof. van Soldt for corresponding with me about this letter and providing me with his decipherment notes. I alone am responsible for the suggested translation.

Alan LENZI, <alenzi@pacific.edu>, University of the Pacific (Stockton, CA)

97) Kār-Šamaš as a south-western palace town of the Sealand I kingdom — The publication of unprovenanced archival, divinatory, and literary texts from the Sealand I kingdom has renewed interest in this second millennium polity and its geographic extent (DALLEY 2009; GEORGE 2007; 2013; GABBAY 2014). The administrative palace archive published by Dalley has been suggested to come from the area (east) of Nippur, and possibly the divinatory and literary texts as well (DALLEY 2009: 9; GEORGE 2013: 142; GABBAY 2014: 147 n.9). There is, however, some evidence for a south-western origin of the palatial archive. A town by the name of Kār-Šamaš figures fairly prominently in these documents; it was either the very palace town where the archive comes from or one located in its immediate vicinity. I suggest to identify it with a town of the same name associated in earlier documents with Ur and the Old Babylonian kingdom of Larsa.

In the Sealand I material Kār-Šamaš, written KAR-ÅUTU(1), appears in three contexts:

1- it was a place of some importance in the state administration, at least provincially, since one letter says that captured thieves were sent there, perhaps for judgment (CUSAS 9, 7: 28’);

2- it was a town where agricultural taxes were collected for the palace (CUSAS 9, 428; 443);

3- it was also a town mentioned in several administrative records pertaining to palatial malting and brewing (CUSAS 9, 190; 192; 206; 209; 211; 212; 213-220; 224; 244). In the latter context, the name of the town often appears in the rubric indicating where the barley and the malt were delivered, namely a-na Ê.GAL ša KAR-ÅUTU “to the palace of Kār-Šamaš”. Many more documents record similar deliveries to the palace without further specification1; the maltsters and brewers being always the same
Although Groneberg identified only two Kār-Šamaš in the Old Babylonian period, both of them in northern Babylonia (RGTC 3: 134), there must have been at least one southern Babylonian town of the same name at that time, as was justly noted by Charpin in his discussion of the text UET V 268 from Ur which refers to a worker sent to KAR-RA-ŠUTUKI in the year Samsu-iluna 11 (1986: 156 n.1). This town could also be the one referred to in a letter from Hammurapi to Sin-iddinam concerning neglected hydraulic works, including at KAR-ŠUTUKI (AbB XIII, 5: 5); the letter states that the repair work will result in filling the marshes of Ur (rev. 5'-6'); both Larsa and Ur are mentioned in that letter. This clearly bespeaks a location of this Kār-Šamaš upstream from Ur. In addition, an early Old Babylonian royal inscription from Ur suggests that Kār-Šamaš, written KAR-RA-ŠUTUKI, was part of the kingdom of Larsa and was of some importance: Kudur-mabuk claims to have retaken it from enemies, along Maškan-šāpir (Frayne 1990: Warad-Sîn E4.2.13.10 line 20). While the wording could suggest that this Larsean Kār-Šamaš was near Maškan-šāpir, the fact that it figures in an inscription dedicated to the god Nanna and deposited at Ur certainly makes it possible that this town was in fact near the latter.

That the Sealand I kingdom controlled south-western Babylonia in the period shortly following the fall of Babylon is now certain since recent excavations at Tell Khaiber near Ur have unearthed a number of texts, one of which bore a complete year name of Ayadaragalama, the Sealand I king to whom most texts in the CUSAS 9 archive date (Moon et al. 2015: 2). I would not go as far as suggesting that Tell Khaiber is the find spot of this archive since no trace of looting has been noted by the archaeologists, but it appears highly likely that Kār-Šamaš, and the palace which produced the archive – should they be the same, were located in the same general area. Control of the lower Euphrates is certainly cogent with the fact that a year name of the last Sealand I king Ea-gâmil is attested at Dilmun (Cavigneaux & André-Salvini forthcoming).Ur also stands curiously in the stead of Uruk in a Sealand I tablet of the Gilgameš Epic (George 2007), which may indicate a will to exalt the name of this city. In addition, Enki appears twice in the few year names of Ayadaragalama that we know, once in conjunction with Enlil (Dalley 2009: 12, years I and J), an association which is also reflected in records of offerings (in CUSAS 9, 42 and in unpublished BC 365 cited in Dalley 2009: 72). This relative importance of Enki in the cult in that period and his association with Enlil are reminiscent of year names of Rim-Sîn I (between his twenty-second and thirty-first year) and of a rare “Temple of Enlil and Enki” mentioned in an Old Babylonian letter from Larsa (HMA 9-01849; Veldhuys 2008: text 10).

All these elements point toward a south-western Babylonian origin of the Sealand I archival documents published in CUSAS 9, at or near the Old Babylonian settlement of KAR(-RA)-ŠUTUKI, which was probably located between Larsa and Ur.

1) A number of records also refer to a giparu involved in palatial brewing.
2) Otherwise, Kār-Šamaš must have been either a town in close vicinity or a quarter of the same town where the other palace was located, close enough to allow for the circulation of beer and brewers between both palaces.
3) On the same text, see also Kraus 1984: 288 n.465. For a brief summary of the various towns called Kār-Šamaš, see Charpin 2005: 137 n.5. That the orthographies KAR and KAR-RA were interchangeable in such a toponym is shown by the fact that the forty-second year name of Hammurapi features both variants (Horsnell 1999: vol.II p.164).
4) In addition, Dalley considered that the texts YOS XII, 80; 166; 536; 537 which mention a Kār-Šamaš are presumably all from Larsa (2009: 10). This can hardly be true for 536 and 537 since they are dated to the year Samsu-iluna 30, while Samsu-iluna dates stop at Larsa at the end of his eleventh year; also, the theophoric element Irra in one individual’s name in text 166 makes a northern origin somewhat more likely; as for text 80, the short and tersely formulated document does not offer much to decide one way or the other. Dalley also notes that a Kār-Šamaš may have been located in the area of Nippur in the Middle Babylonian period (2009: 10, incl. n.84); this or other towns of that name are not well attested in that period (RGTC 5: 160; also CBS 10973) and seem to vanish altogether from later Babylonian records.
5) In addition, Enki immediately follows Enlil in a number of lists: CUSAS 9, 59; 79; 82.
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98) A Fragment Of a Royal Building Inscription from the Kassite Period — The cuneiform fragment belongs to a Sumerian building inscription on clay brick dated to the Middle-Babylonian period, during the reign of the Kassite king Kurigalzu.

The brick was originally part of a private collection which was assembled after several trips to Palestine and other neighbouring countries and which belonged to Monsignor Salvatore Garofalo, an eminent scholar of biblical studies. Unfortunately, the present whereabouts of the brick is unknown, since it was lost immediately after the death of the owner.

The present study was made possible thanks to some photographs taken by Prof. G. Lacerenza (Università di Napoli “L’Orientale”) years ago, when the same Monsignor Garofalo entrusted him with the publication of its collection. According to the heir of the late Monsignor Garofalo, the collection also included six further bricks and various cuneiform tablets. Regrettably, I have not succeeded in finding any trace of these objects or their current location.

1. 𒀭En-lil<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<
2.lugal-kur-kur-ra
3. lugal-a-ni-ir
4."š ciągu" […]
5."šagina" […]

1. To Enlil
2. lord of the land
3. his lord
4. Kurigalzu
5. the general […]

The clay fragment is 8.3 cm in width and 5.5 cm in depth, while the length of the preserved section is 12.5 cm. Despite some minor damage on the top of the brick, it is reasonable to assume that no line is missing at the beginning, especially considering that the name of the addressee of the dedicatory
inscription, the god Enlil, appears in the first visible line. The edge of the right side is slightly cut, nonetheless, the overall width of the brick has not been much compromised. On the contrary, at least a few lines have been lost from the bottom, which is considerably damaged. Neither the building or the intended location of the brick are known. The inscription is ruled and was created by incision.

Considering the incipit of this inscription, which is abruptly interrupted at line 5, the best parallels known to me so far are BEHRENS 1985: 242 no. 68G from Ur, HILPRECHT 1893 no. 38 from Nippur, GRÉGOIRE 1981 no. 54\(^4\) and a series of bricks kept in the British Museum, all from Dūr-Kurigalzu.

Both the bricks from Ur and the ones from Nippur record the building activities of Kurigalzu on the E-kur-igibara.

The brick from Ur arranges the inscriptions into nine lines, out of which only line 8 features two segments within the same spatial unit.\(^6\) Similarly, the brick from Nippur also arranges the text into nine lines of which only line 8 is indented.

On the other hand, both Grégoire MVN 10 054 and the bricks from the British Museum commemorate Kurigalzu’s activities in the E-u-gal in Dūr-Kurigalzu.

As regards all the inscribed bricks from Dūr-Kurigalzu related to the E-ugal, their texts are either stamped or inscribed and their \textit{ductus} is fairly neat yet, on the whole, more archaising than that found on bricks from other locations or bricks that are linked to other temples.\(^7\) However, despite these minor variations, which are, nevertheless, an important clue which helps to identify the various \textit{ateliers} of production, the text is always arranged into eight lines, of which lines 5 and 6 are indented.

Although broken, line 5 in the Garofalo fragment is wider than the lines preceding it, and this was probably caused by the indentation of the line in question. It can be assumed, therefore, that the Garofalo fragment records the E-u-gal as the temple restored by Kurigalzu.

Kurigalzu mentioned in the fragment could be Kurigalzu I, the great builder and founder of Dūr-Kurigalzu, as has been proposed by Clayden and then by Veldhuis and Bartelmus, and in contrast to Grégoire’s assumption that the king referred to was Kurigalzu II.\(^8\)

1) For a discussion on this collection see NIGRO 2008. For a more recent outline of S. Garofalo’s profile see MOSETTO 2014: 140-147.

2) Later on, Prof. G. Lacerenza kindly provided me with the photographs through Prof. S. Graziani (Università di Napoli “L’Orientale”). I would like to thank them and Mr De Luca, heir of Monsignor Garofalo and former curator of the Reparto di Antichità Egizie e del Vicino Oriente of the Musei Vaticani, for having authorised the publication of the fragment.

3) Personal communication of Mr De Luca.

4) This brick belongs to the French private collection \textit{de Serres} in Paris [GRÉGOIRE 1981: 13 and pl.16].

5) WALKER 1981: 60 BM 090022, BM 090028, BM 090045, BM 090046, BM 090049, BM 090051, BM 090052, BM 090057, BM 090339, BM 090583, BM 090818. For a detailed overview and discussion about the cuneiform royal sources from the Kassite period see BRINKMAN 1976.

6) Noteworthy, the brick HILPRECHT 1893 no. 081 from Nippur, which also records the king’s activities in the E-igi-bar, features a more neat and archaising \textit{ductus} and a disposition of the text into ten single lines.

7) See for instance the difference between the texts from Dūr-Kurigalzu and the ones from Ur and Nippur mentioned above or between BM 090051 and BM 090295, both from Dūr-Kurigalzu but addressed to different temples.
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An inscribed bead with a votive inscription of Kadašman-Turgu (L-29-449)

The early excavations of the University of Pennsylvania (1889-1900) discovered a vast amount of inscribed objects from Kassite times. The lapis lazuli bead L-29-449 was already included in Brinkman’s catalogue of Kassite inscriptions as L.2.7. It contains a short votive inscription of which a translation is given here. To my knowledge it is the only documented Kassite object from the Ekur which John H. Haynes, excavator of Nippur from 1893-1900, recovered from a filling sealed by a pavement in the ziggurat courtyard. All the other inscribed lapis lazuli objects were found within constructions of the Parthian period in secondary context.

Haynes gives the following description of the object in his report of 7 December 1895 sent to Philadelphia:

“The ball or sphere of Lapis Lazuli is flattened at its two poles and perforated in the direction of its short diameter, which measures 1.2 centimeters. The average measurement of its greater diameter, measured at right angles to its lesser diameter or axis, is 2.5 centimeters. The flattened ball or sphere is not wholly symmetrical, though the lack of symmetry does not offend the eye. The inscription, as you will judge from the above pencil rubbing, passes entirely around the sphere in the line of its greatest circumference.”

The findspot of L-29-449 can be reconstructed in connection with the results of the 1948-50 excavations of the Joint Expedition. It was found to the southeast of the “Enlil Temple” below a mudbrick pavement, which was laid as a continuation of the burnt brick pavement in street 22. The date of the archaeological context can be narrowed down to a time span from about the late 12th century to the 11th century BC. The bead was probably donated for the statue of the goddess “Lady of Nippur”. A comparable object exists with the unpublished inscribed lapis lazuli bead UM L-29-448 in the same collection without known context. It was not included into Brinkman’s catalogue.

A pencil rubbing of L-29-449 was sent to Philadelphia by J. H. Haynes with his report:

The Babylonian inscription reads as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
1a-na^\dagger \text{NIN!} \text{ EN.LIL}^\ddagger & \text{ be-el-ti-šu Ka-dašš-man-túr-gu i-qí-iš} \\
\text{ana}^\ddagger \text{Bēlet-Nibrā}^\ddagger & \text{ ki Běltišu Kadašman-Turgu iqtiš}
\end{align*}
\]

To the Lady of Nippur, his lady, Kadašman-Turgu dedicated.

1) The author wants to thank Alex Pezzati (Senior Archivist, University of Pennsylvania Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology, Philadelphia, PA) for his assistance and permission to publish the rubbing of this inscription here.

2) CLAYDEN 2011: 1-56.


4) Several votive objects from the Kassite period were found within the large mud bricks of “Parthian Phase II/III”. For the objects found in the so-called “Nippur Hoard” see CLAYDEN (2011b:1-56).

5) Haynes’ report of 7 December 1895 (NE 8/6), preserved in the archive of the University of Pennsylvania Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology, Philadelphia, PA.

6) MCCOWN & HAINES 1967, 16-17. The findspot is further described with a summary of the archaeological evidence of the Ekur in Kassite times in SCHNEIDER forthcoming. In this paper I could exclude construction work of
Kadašman-Turgu at the ziggurat which was solely based on a mix-up by H.V. Hilprecht with the name of Kadašman-Enlil. Furthermore the so-called “Kadašman-Turgu pavement” bears no single brick of this king. See Hilprecht 1903: 332, 371-373, 377 and 394, Brinkman 1976: 164, L.5.1.

7) Ibid. Pl. 16.
8) See photo at http://www.cdli.ucla.edu/dl/photo/P461863.jpg.
10) For a photo of the object see http://www.cdli.ucla.edu/dl/photo/P461864.jpg.
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balu qaṣī šī ṣābīṣu [qin]nūṣu zēr bit abīṣu ummānātīša rapasūtu tuklat idišu šīši kūdanī inā lā mēni ina mil[ki ra]mānīša ina ʾṣṣālānī ina mēt Aššur

Ohne Bogen und Pferde (einzusetzen) ließen sich seine Brüder, Familie, die Nachkommenschaft seines Vaterhauses, sein umfangreiches Heer, die Stütze seiner Armee, Pferde und Maultiere ohne Zahl aus eigenem Antrieb nach Assyrten fortführen.


Hätten die Leute und die Tiere sich freiwillig nach Assyrten abtransportieren lassen? Landsberger, Sam’al 82 Anm.214 gibt Z.144f. wie folgt wieder: „Seine ganze Sippe und sein Heer fliehen waffenlos nach Assyrten“. Ähnlich J. Bing, A history of Cilicia during the Assyrian period (Dissertation Indiana University 1969) 145: „The rebellious king of Tabal died mysteriously, and disruption spread throughout his kingdom with many seeking refuge in Assyrten“. Wenn diese Deutung zutrifft, so wären die Tiere wohl auf unelegante Weise in den Text eingebaut worden.

Obwohl man die Interpretationen von Landsberger und Bing grundsätzlich als eine Möglichkeit sehen kann, lässt sich auch vermuten, dass sich die wegen des unerwarteten Tods des [M]ussi in Konfusion geratenen Sippe des [M]ussi angesichts ihrer nachteiligen Situation Assyrten ergaben, ohne zu kämpfen, um so das schlimmste Schicksal, d.h. die Annexion ins assyrische Reich nach der Eroberung zu vermeiden und ein assyrischer Vasallenstaat bleiben zu können. Aus dieser Perspektive flohen sie vermutlich nicht nach Assyrten, sondern kamen zusammen mit dem Heer und dem Tribut nach Assyrten, um ihren Willen zur Unterwerfung zu zeigen. Die Pferde und Maultiere, die sie nach Assyrten gebracht hatten, stellen wahrscheinlich diesen Tribut dar. Während [M]ussi davor Pferde als Tribut bezahlt hatte (Fuchs 1996, 284, 294 IIT 138-140), brachten seine Söhne und das Gefolge jetzt also über den
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lokalisieren. Sicher ist nur, dass Jakinlū vor seinem Tod seine Tochter nach Assyrien brachte, um damit seine Loyalität zu demonstrieren.
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Zwar sagt Zawadzki: „Sometimes, most probably whenever there was no distinct local center of power, hostages were chosen from the aristocracy or from rich burghers.” (ZAWADZKI 1995, 456), doch seine Hypothese basiert auf einem Missverständnis des folgenden Beispiels in der Zeit Aššurnasirpals II.: Angesichts der assyrischen Belagerung schickte die Elite der Stadt Madara ihre Söhne als šaprātu. Zawadzki versteht wie die Übersetzung von Grayson („sons as hostages”) (GRAYSON 1991, 209 A.0.101.1. ii 99; 250 A.0.101.17. iv 46; 259 A.0.101.19.65) anā šaprātē irtümlich als “be sent as hostages to Assyria” (ZAWADZKI 1995, 450, 452). šaprātu bedeutet jedoch nicht “Geiseln”, sondern “Abgesandte” (AHw 1175b), daher kann man hier keinen Zusammenhang zwischen den Söhnen und Geiseln herstellen.
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103) “If the river is red like blood” — The common cultural background of the ancient Near East is reflected in many contexts of Mesopotamian literature and the Hebrew Bible. The significance of such commonalities has long been a matter of discussion. Were these similarities simply the result of a shared milieu, or do they reflect a closer connection? Without entering into such speculation, I call attention to the following striking and unusual references in the Babylonian omen series Shumma Alu.

Shumma Alu is a huge compendium of omens taken from occurrences in nature and everyday life (see Sally M. Freedman, If a City Is Set on a Height, vols. 1 and 2 [University of Pennsylvania Museum, 1998 and 2006] and www.academia.edu). Compiled over many centuries, the corpus was organized in antiquity into more than 100 chapters, or Tablets, dealing with specific topics in as few as 30 omens or as many as 200. Several thousands of such omens are at least partially preserved. Prototypes of the omens in this series date to as early as the Old Babylonian period (c. 18th century BCE); the standard series was probably completed in the 8th century BCE.

Tablet 61, which consists of omens taken from observations of a river in flood, includes a number of omens and predictions that are startlingly and exceptionally evocative of events in the Hebrew Bible, especially the plagues associated with the Exodus from Egypt (Exodus 7-9).

Omens 1 and 2 of Tablet 61 immediately call to mind the biblical plague of blood: “If, in the month of Nisan, flood comes and the river is dark like blood, there will be death in the land” and “If the river is red like blood, there will be much sickness in the land.” Omen 27 evokes the plague of frogs and the following two plagues of insects: “If the river water is full of frogs, there will be insects in the land.” Omen 28 specifies that the presaged insects will affect cattle, suggesting the cattle plague that follows the plagues of insects in the Bible: “If the flood comes and the water is covered with much foam, there will be insects of herds and flocks.”

The flood referred to in these omens is the regular yearly inundation that occurs in Mesopotamia with the Tigris and Euphrates, as it does with the Nile in Egypt. The month Nisan is the first month of the year in Babylonia, and Exod 12:2 refers to Passover occurring in the first month of the year.

In general, the predictions associated with Babylonian omens are formulaic and occur repeatedly in the corpus. Predictions of death and sickness, for instance, are common, and predictions of a “rising of locusts” (ZI.(GA) BUR₃.HLA₃, tibūt erebi) are not extraordinarily rare. But the predictions cited here are unique in referring to the insects called šassuru, as is the association of insects with flood and with cattle.

Two other predictions in Tablet 61 are also strongly suggestive of a recurrent motif in Genesis, where residents of Canaan migrate to Egypt as the result of famine. Omens 49 and 50 predict, “the harvest of a great land will prosper, and a small land will go to a great land, or a great land to a small land, for sustenance.” In addition, omen 89 predicts, “there will be diminution of grain and straw in the land; a great land will go to a small land for sustenance” (K.2319+ (CT 39 5) r.15: ŠA₂,SU₃, ŠE u IN.NU ina KUR GAL₂ KUR GAL ana KUR TUR ana TIN-ţi DU), but this is the only other example I know of.

Shumma Alu includes a few other omens that are reminiscent of situations in the Hebrew Bible, such as the omens in Tablet 12 that refer to discolorations on the walls of a house and recall portions of Leviticus 14, but the omens of Tablet 61 are much more specific, more concentrated, and seem much closer to the biblical text.

**Tablet 61 (hand copy CT 39 14-18)**

1. DIŠ ina ITI.BAR₅ A.KAL DU-ma ID₂ GIM UŠ₂ sa-ri₃ ina KUR UŠ₂ GAL₂
   – If, in the month of Nisan, flood comes and the river is dark like blood, there will be death in the land.

2. DIŠ ID₂ GIM UŠ₂ pi-li-i GIG.MES₃ ina KUR GAL₂ MEŠ
   – If the river is red like blood, there will be much sickness in the land.

27. DIŠ ID₂ A-ša₂ BIL₃ ZAZA ma-lu₃ sa-as-su₂ ru₃ ina KUR GAL₂
   – If the river water is full of frogs, there will be insects in the land.

28. DIŠ A.ZI.GA DU-ma A-šu₂ ūḫu₃-um₃-ma₃ ta₃ ma₂-at₂-ta₂ u₃-kal₃ lu₃ sa-as-su₂ AB₂,GU₃,HLA u U₃,UDU
   HLA ina KUR GAL₂
   – If the flood comes and the water is covered with much foam, there will be insects of herds and flocks.
49. DĪŠ a šāz.GIM.ZE₂ IGI-ša₂-šu₂ ina ID₂ DU-ma iš-tu ša₂-ša₂-ša₂-[ID₂ [...] it-ta-na-ab-ḥi₂-is na-pa-aš EBUR KUR GAL SLSA₂₅-ma KUR TUR ana KUR GAL: KUR GAL ana KUR TUR ana DIN-tU DU] – If water whose surface is like bile runs in the river and [...] keeps receding from the side of the river, the harvest of a great land will prosper, and a small land will go to a great land (or) a great land to a small land, for sustenance.

50. DĪŠ a šāz.GIM.ZE₂ ina ID₂ DU-ma iš-tu MURU₂ ID₂ A-ša₂-a-ša₂-[ID₂] im-lu-ma ki-sal ID₂ na-ḥi₂-is A ša₂-ša₂-ša₂-[ID₂] KIMIN A ša₂-ša₂-[ID₂] u₂-ṣu₂-šu₂ EBUR KUR GAL SLSA₂₅-ma KUR TUR ana KUR GAL ana bu-tal-šu₂-[ID DU] – If water like bile runs in the middle of the river its water fills the banks of [the river] and the ‘courtyard’ of the river is withdrawn (and) the water at the side—alternatively, water at the side of [the river]—coagulates, the harvest of a great land will prosper, and a small land [will go] to a great land for sustenance.

89. [DĪŠ ina ITLAB KI]}MIN KUR ša₂₂ ma-[na-ah-tu₂] IGI pa₂₂-ša₂-[IGI] KUR TUR ana KUR GAL KIMIN KUR GAL ana [KUR TUR GUR]
– If dit[to [in Tebetu], a country that [has seen] mi[sery will see respite;] a small land [will turn into] a great land; alternatively, a great land into [a small one.]

Sally FREEDMAN, <smfstan@princeton.edu>

104) SIG₇.ALAN = nabnītu Tablet B Source B (K. 4165+) Joined to K. 14889 — In his edition of the series SIG₇(ALAN = nabnītu (MSL XVI; 1982), Irving Finkel used two clear and two presumed sources for his reconstruction of Tablet B (pp. 257–64). Source B is a large but fragmentary six-column tablet from Nineveh, of which columns i and vi are completely lost. The tablet has been re-joined from seven pieces, K. 4165 (RA 17, 133) + 4313 + 10045 (RA 17, 167) + 11190 (CT 19, 39) + 13586 (RA 17, 170) + 13632 (RA 17, 171). Now, one more fragment can be added to this list: K. 14889 (RA 17, 174), which joins the upper edge and thus restores lines 1 and 121–22 on the second and third columns of obverse, and lines 238–240 on the fourth column of reverse. Since a photograph of K. 4165+ as it was used by Finkel is available on the British Museum’s website (http://www.britishmuseum.org/research/collection_online/collection_object_details.aspx?objectId=308808&partId=1&museumno=K,4165+&page=1) and on CDLI (http://cdli.ucla.edu/dl/photo/P373792.jpg), a transliteration and copy just of the now completed lines will be offered here.

The scribe drew a double line as divider not only as column divider but also as a divider between all entries, using a twisted string for these lines.

61 obv. ii 1 [x] DUG₄.GA.DU₈.[A] || du-u₂š-su₂-u
62 2 [x (x)]₅th.ME₂[Š] || [MIN] šá ŠD₁
   (K. 14889 obverse breaks off)
121 obv. iii 1 IM.SIG₇.[S]IG₇ || ḫa-a-pu
122 2 ṬIM₇.DAL₂.HA₂.NU₂.UM || MIN
   (K. 14889 obverse breaks off)
237 rev. iv 34’ ŠU₃.BAR || MIN (sc. ṭe-pu₂-u)
238 35’ ŠU₃.DUB || MIN
239 36’ UG[U]₂.SIG₂.GA || MIN šá ṭu₂-pi
240 37’ DUB₂.NU₂.NA || dup-ni-in-nu
   (end of column)

Obv. ii 1 du₂šša₂, D-stem from del₅a₂, “to be or become abundant”, with the meaning of “to make abundant, fertile, to provide abundantly, lavishly” has been equated with lu₂šša₂ LU in Ea = nā₂qu₂ 1 189, with ME₂.DUG₂.GA in the Sibenalphabet A 97, with ša₂-ar ŞARP₂ in ša₂₂ = nā₂qu₂ V/2:50 and with ŠĀR₂.ŠARP₂ in Proto-IZI b 5 (see CAD 129).

Obv. ii 2 For dušša₂ in connection with water see the bilingual text published in 4R 9 (K.2861 +4999₇+5088+5297) ll. 61–2: e-ne-ṃ₂-zu₂… u₂₂-a₂₂-a ka₂₂-n₂₂-g₂₂-ga₂₂ mu₂₂-un₂₂-šu₂₂ (62) [ša₂₂₂-r]i₂₂-tam₂₂ u ma₂₂₂-q₂₂-tum₂₂ u₂₂₂-da₂₂₂-d₂₂₂-sa₂₂₂, “(your word) creates abundance in pasture and water supply”. Rev. iv 239 CAD T 100 quotes this line under ṭep₅u₂₂, “to add, to attach, append”, restoring the logogram to [DUB₂].SIG₂.GA, which now needs to be corrected.

Rev. iv 240 For DUB₂.NU₂.NA see also the Late Babylonian writing in a literary text: LÚ.NAGAR GI₂₂.DUB₂.NU₂.NA DU₂₂-sa₂₂, “the carpenter who made the chest” (4R 25 [K. 63] ii 25). In fact, DUB₂.NU₂.NA seems to be a loanword.
105) “An Aramean (or Israelite) in the Service of the Crown Prince Amēl-Marduk” — The cuneiform tablets in the possession of the Detroit Institute of Arts have recently been uploaded on the CDLI Web Site. One of the tablets is of particular interest in that it names an individual serving in the household of the crown prince in the 42nd year of Nebuchadnezzar II. The museum number of the tablet is DIA 19.024.23 and the CDLI number is P461521 (thus accessible at <http://cdli.ucla.edu/P461521>). The digital images are very clear and permit a full transliteration and translation of the document, which is published here with the kind permission of the Institute. I wish to thank Lina Meerchyad, Collection Research Associate at the Detroit Institute of Arts, for her help.

The Detroit Institute of Arts (Gift of Henry G. Stevens, 19.24.23)

Obverse
1. 54½ MA.NA ʾKŪ.BABBAR
2. šd l.NA-ŠEŠ.MEŠ-GI
3. ina pa-ni lba-ti-DINGIR.MEŠ-šu-ru
4. šd É l.DUMU-LUGAL a-na dul-lu
5. ina ŠÀ-bi 11 MA.NA 1/3 GÌN
6. gam-mar l.NA-ŠEŠ.MEŠ-GI
7. IGI-lu’1

Reverse
8. ITI DU, UD 25-KAM
9. MU 42-KAM
10. ʾPA-NĪ.G.DU-ŪRI
11. LUGAL TIN.TIR2

“54 ½ minas of silver belonging to Nabû-ahḫē-šullim at the disposal of Baytil-šūr, (officer) of the household of the crown prince, for work; from it 11 minas and 1/3 shekel have been received (as) complete (installment) by Nabû-ahḫē-šullim; month of Tašritu, 25th day, 42nd year of Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon.”

The tablet contains too little information to be assigned to a specific archival context. For the same reason, the nature and circumstances of the transaction it records cannot be ascertained. The name
Baytīl-šūr is Aramean and means “the god Baytīl is a protective wall” (PEARCE, WUNSCH 2014: 48). The same name carried by other individuals appears with various spellings in the recently published texts from Al Yahudu and other localities (PEARCE, WUNSCH 2014: 268); ḫī-E-DINGIR-šu-ru, ḫī-E-DINGIR-shā-ū-ur, and ḫī-E-DINGIR-ša-ru. Syllabic spellings of the theophoric element Baytīl are attested in other Neo-Babylonian documents (ZADOK 1977: 61): some fully preserve the diphthong (e.g. ḫī-ba-i-tī-DINGIR-<...>; ḫī-ba-i-ī-DINGIR-da-la-a); while others seem to denote it with the sign BA alone, although this could also indicate contraction (e.g. ḫī-ba-tī-il-ḫa-ra and ḫī-ba-tī-il-še-zib). While the name Baytīl-šūr is linguistically Aramean, the matter of the ethnicity of its bearer remains open. The god Baytīl, better known as Bethel according to its Biblical form, was worshipped over a wide area in Syria and the southern Levant (RÖLLIG 1999; DALGLISH 1992). It also appears in the Bible, notably in the name of the important cultic center Bethel (GOMES 2006). Jeremiah 48:13 suggests that the god Bethel occupied a prominent place in the religion of the northern kingdom of Israel, his status being comparable with that of the god Chemosh in Moab. The evidence from Elephantine shows that Bethel was worshiped there by Jews under the names Ešem-Bethel and Anath-Bethel alongside Yahweh and that Bethel was seen probably as another name for the god of Israel, although opinions are divided on the significance of this data.

Although Bethel appears as theophoric element in names that are linguistically Aramean, it cannot be excluded that some of these names belonged to Jews; the exilic onomasticon of Israelites and Judeans shows many interferences, religious and linguistic, with the people among whom they lived, and this already quite early after their deportation (ZADOK 2015). Thus, although the name Baytīl-šūr in our document could be that of an Aramean, it could alternatively belong to an Israelite who lived in Judea and was then deported to Babylonia; a name with Bethel seems indeed more likely to have been borne by someone originating from the northern kingdom given the importance of that god there, and many Israelites moved to the kingdom of Judah after the fall of Samaria. The rise of deported Judeans to official positions is also documented by a family of royal merchants attested under Nabonidus and Cyrus (JURSA 2007). We may also note in this connection that according to the Hofkalender of Nebuchadnezzar the Chief of the Royal Merchants (rab tamkārī ša šarrī) in his seventh year, the year of the first campaign against Judah, bore the name Hanunu, very probably Phoenician (DA RIVA 2013: 203).

The Detroit tablet is dated to the penultimate year of the reign of Nebuchadnezzar and the crown prince is therefore almost certainly Amēl-Marduk, the Evil-Merodach of the Bible who released Jehoiachin from captivity (II Kings 25: 27-30):

“In the thirty-seventh year of the exile of King Jehoiachin of Judah, in the twelfth month, on the twenty-seventh day of the month, King Evil-Merodach of Babylon, in the year that he began to reign, released King Jehoiachin of Judah from prison; he spoke kindly to him, and gave him a seat above the other seats of the kings who were with him in Babylon. So Jehoiachin put aside his prison clothes. Every day of his life he dined regularly in the king’s presence. For his allowance, a regular allowance was given him by the king, a portion every day, as long as he lived.”

According to the Book of Kings Jehoiachin was released by Amēl-Marduk “in the year that he began to reign.” The expression seems to refer to his accession year, which fell in the 43rd year of his father Nebuchadnezzar II. His reign started at the end of the month of Ulūlu of that year (early October 562), therefore about a year after the Detroit tablet was written. However, the Book of Kings claims that Jehoiachin’s release took place on XII/27 in the 37th year of his exile, which seems slightly at variance with a date in the accession year of Amēl-Marduk if the computation started precisely at the first capture of Jerusalem in 597. If we rely on the Nebuchadnezzar Chronicle, Jerusalem fell on the second day of Addaru in the seventh year of Nebuchadnezzar, which is March 16, 597 in the Julian calendar (GRAYSON 2000: 100):

“The seventh year: In the month Kislimu the king of Akkad mustered his army and marched to Hattu. He encamped against the city of Judah and on the second day of the month Addaru he captured the city (and) seized (its) king. A king of his own choice he appointed in the city (and) taking the vast tribute he brought it into Babylon.”
This should mark the beginning of Jehoiachin’s exile, but counting thirty-seven years from that date brings us to the first full regnal year of Amēl-Marduk (561-560). Thus the Book of Kings may in fact refer to the first year rather than the accession year. At any rate, Amēl-Marduk succumbed to a palace coup later in that year. We know for certain that Jehoiachin was held captive in Babylon because among administrative texts from the Southern Palace dated 595-570 (year 10 to 35 of Nebuchadnezzar) we find him listed as recipient of foodstuffs together with members of his retinue (COGAN 2013: 141-143). The importance of the Detroit tablet lies in the fact that it provides evidence that a man of Aramean (or perhaps Israelite) origin occupied an official position in the household of the crown prince Amēl-Marduk shortly before he succeeded his father Nebuchadnezzar. The presence of a Westerner among his household’s staff might explain his leniency toward the captive Judean king, who could finally be released from captivity now that his conqueror had passed away.

Bibliography

M. COGAN, (2013), Bound for Exile. Israelites and Judeans under Imperial Yoke. Documents from Assyria and Babylonia (Jerusalem: Carta)
J. F. GOMES, (2006), The sanctuary of Bethel and the configuration of Israelite identity (BZAW 368; Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter)
A. K. GRAYSON, (2000), Assyrian and Babylonian Chronicles (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns)
L. E. PEARCE & C. WUNSCH, (2014), Documents of Judean Exiles and West Semites in Babylonia in the Collection of David Sofer (CUSAS 28; CDL Press, Bethesda, Maryland)
R. ZADOK, (1977), On West Semites in Babylonia During the Chaldean and Achaemenian Periods: An Onomastic Study (Jerusalem)

106) An Iranian slave in Babylon during the reign of Amēl-Marduk?1) — In a Neo-Babylonian document (ROMCT 2 3:2) a female slave with the name ₂Am-ma-ta-ú-ta-a is sold by Rakal, the son of Ammalemu, to Iltabija, the son of Ammajabibi. The name of the unfortunate slave has only been commented upon by the editor of the text, G.J.P. MCEWAN (1982, 7), who compared it to the names Am-ma-‘-ta-‘ (TALLQVIST 1914, 22) and Am-ma-da-ud-da (HALLOCK 1969, 666a). The name does not appear in ZADOK’s (2009, 77) catalogue of Iranian names mentioned in Neo- and Late Babylonian sources.

The first name, discussed by McEwan, is actually written Am-me-‘-ta-‘ (ABL 260 rev.3 = SAA 18 149 rev.3) and refers to an Arab, more precisely the father of a man named Aya-kabar (cf. VILLARD 1998, 104). Here one is dealing with an Arabic name, as already TALLQVIST (1914, 22) noticed.

The second name is the Elamite rendering of the Iranian anthroponym *Amadāta- “given by Ama”. This name is also attested in Aramaic (spelled “Mdt; also in a text from Persepolis) and in Babylonian, where it is spelled Am-ma-da-a-tú and Um-ma-da-a-tú (TAVERNIER 2007, 103-104 no. 4.2.38).

Unfortunately for McEwan, the name discussed cannot be linked to any of the two names he cited. The main reason for this is the presence of the sign Ú, which implies a /u/ or a /w/ in the original name. Only in his connecting it with an Iranian name McEwan was right, as it is indeed an Iranian anthroponym.

More precisely, ₂Am-ma-ta-ú-ta-a is the Babylonian rendering of an Iranian name *Amatavāta-“With the strength of Ama”2). More precisely, this name can be split up in three parts: *Ama-*, *tavah-*, “strength, power” (cf. Av. tawuah-) and -āta-*, a suffix reinforcing the meaning of the word it determines.
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(TAVERNIER 2007, 571). Ama- is a minor Zoroastrian divinity (BOYCE s.d.), who, however, enjoyed some popularity with the common population, given the not so low number of names containing his name (cf. TAVERNIER 2007, 575). This popularity may very well have been connected with the military aspect of Ama-.

Interestingly the text is dated to 29 Ululu, year 1 of the reign of Amēl-Marduk, the king of Babylon. This corresponds with 28 September 561 BC, which puts the presence of this Iranian slave well in the pre-Achaemenid area, when Babylonia was still independent. This makes *Amatavātā- one of the first attestations of an individual bearing an Iranian name in the Babylonian documentation (the oldest being one Median and two Elamites in a ration-list from 592-591, cf. ZADOK 1976, 62 and 66).

In all likelihood, *Amatavātā- was ethnically an Iranian woman. Two reasons plead for this. First of all, it was not yet common for Babylonians to adopt Iranian names in the Neo-Babylonian period. In the Achaemenid period, when Babylonia was ruled by Iranian-speaking Persians, some Babylonians did this in the hope that this would enhance their chances to a career in the Achaemenid administration. Secondly, her status as a slave also induces one to believe that she was ethnically Iranian. Possibly, she had been captured by a Babylonian raid along the Iranian border and was brought to Babylon to be sold as a slave. It is this last phase of which ROMCT 2 3 is a testimony.

1) This research has been funded by the Interuniversity Attraction Poles Programme initiated by the Belgian Science Policy Office (IAP VII/14: “Greater Mesopotamia: Reconstruction of its Environment and History”).

2) This analysis has already been briefly mentioned by me in a recently published thorough research on female slave names in the Neo-Babylonian and Achaemenid periods (HACKL 2013, 181 n.149).

Bibliography


HALLOCK, R.T. 1969, Persepolis Fortification Tablets (OIP 92), Chicago.


TALLQVIST, K.L. 1914, Assyrian Personal Names (Acta Societatis Scientiarum Fennicae 43/1), Helsinki.


Id., 2009, Iranische Namen in der neu- und spätbabylonischen Überlieferung (IPNB 7/1B), Wien.

Jan TAVERNIER

Université catholique de Louvain, FIAL/INCAL/CIOLE, Place Blaise Pascal 1 bte L3.03.32 B-1348 LOUVAIN-LA-NEUVE, BELGIQUE

107) An Irano-Elamo-Aramaic Note1) — In various Fortification Texts from Persepolis (Fort. 00X2-101:2’ (Ir-du-maš-[da]),4’, 1290-102+2177-101:39,45, 2287-102-101:39,45; PF 679:4, 1801:4; PFNN 1074:5, 2135:4, 2358:1) a name Ir-du-maš-da occurs. This is clearly the rendering of an Iranian name and this fact was already quickly recognized.

The first to analyze this name was Émile BENVENISTE (1966: 84), who argued that Ir-du-maš-da renders the Old Iranian name *Rta-vazdā, the nominative singular of *Rta-vazdah- “possessing endurance through Arta”. This proposal was generally accepted by modern scholarship (MAYRHOFER 1970, 229 n.35 and 1973, 167 no. 8.617; HINZ 1975, 217; BOGOLJUBOV 1976, 211; SCHMITT 2002, 45).

This name is well-established by its occurrences in other languages: Avestan Ašauuazdah-, Middle Persian Ašavyazd, Armenian Artawazd, Greek Ἀρτάβαζης, Αρτάβαζος, Αρτάβασδης, Αρτάοζος, Αρταουάζης and Αρταουάσδης, Latin Artabazus, Artabazes, Artabases, Artavasdes and Artavazdes. It is also attested as Ardavasti in the medieval Testamentum of the hypatus of Gaeta (Docibilis I; cf. MAYRHOFER 1970, 228-229).
In 2002, however, SCHMITT (2002, 45 n.17) cast doubts on this analysis in a footnote, when he
rightfully referred to the Aramaic gloss on the tablet PF 1801 (rev.). There the Aramaic spelling is
'Rmt\(\bar{z}\)d', a spelling clearly contradictory to an analysis *Rtavzdā, as such a name would have been
written 'Rtw\(\bar{z}\)d in Aramaic.

Schmitt’s remark was picked up by TAVERNIER (2007, 297-298 no. 4.2.1484; cf. also
SCHMITT 2011, 99) who proposed to see Elamite Ir-du-maš-da as a rendering of Old Iranian *Rta-
Mazdā, the nominative singular of *Rta-Mazdah-, a dvandva-compound of the two divine names *Rta-
and *Mazdah-.

Nevertheless, this solution is not unproblematic either. The Elamite cuneiform sign DU is
frequently attested in Elamite renderings of Old Iranian proper names and loanwords, but never is it the
rendering of Ir. -/tā/- in medial position. The only exceptions to this occur when -/tā/- is followed by Ir.
/w/, causing vowel colouring, as a result of which the expected El. sign DA was replaced by DU. Two
examples are:

(1) El. Da-ad-du-man-ia for Ir. Dātavahyāh- (Old Persian d-a-t-v-h-y-, in the well-known
Bisitun Inscription.

(2) El. Ir-du-mar-ti-ia for Ir. Rtvardīyā- (Old Persian A-r-t-v-r-di-i-y, also in the Bisitun
Inscription).

Summarizing, it is sure that El. Ir-du-maš-da and Aram. 'Rmt\(\bar{z}\)d refer to the same name (one
individual), but hitherto both the proposed etymologies are problematic.

In order to solve this problem, one has to change his strategy. It is therefore suggested here that
the Aramaic spelling is an orthography influenced by the Elamite one. In other words, Aramaic -m-
appears here because of the Elamite use of the cuneiform sign MAŠ.

Although strange at first sight, this feature is not isolated. In an article on the use of languages in
the Persepolis Fortification and Treasury Archives, TAVERNIER (2008, 74-75) has listed four similar
examples, where the Aramaic spellings are most probably influenced by the Elamite ones (for example
where the Aramaic makes mistakes against the distinction of voiced and voiceless consonants, a feature
unknown in Elamite). The nicest example is PF 1791 where the Aramaic has Mšbd for *Miçapāta-
“Protected by Mithra”, written as such under influence of the Elamite spelling Mi-iš-šā-ba-da, attested
in the same text and thus securing the identity of both names.

If this is accepted, then the real Iranian name behind both El. Ir-du-maš-da and Aram. 'Rmt\(\bar{z}\)d
must be *Rta-vazdah- and so it can be established that Benveniste after all was right in his analysis. The
name *Rta-mazdah- should accordingly be removed from the Irano-Elamite onomastical corpus.

1) This research has been funded by the Interuniversity Attraction Poles Programme initiated by the Belgian

2) Please note the following codes for the Elamite texts:
   Fort. = Persepolis Fortification tablets, mostly unpublished, cited from draft editions by M.W. Stolper,
some available via the Online Cultural and Historical Research Environment (https://ochre.uchicago.edu/); images of
some available via InscriptiFact (http://www.inscriptifact.com/).
   PF-NN = Persepolis Fortification texts in draft editions by R. T. Hallock, cited from collated and corrected
editions by W.F.M. Henkelman, some available via the Online Cultural and Historical Research Environment
(https://ochre.uchicago.edu/); images of some available via InscriptiFact (http://www.inscriptifact.com/).

3) And not 'Rtm-\(\bar{z}\)-[d], as previously read (source : OCHRE, PF 1801Ar, consulted on 01/09/2015).
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*Id.* 1973, *Onomastica Persepolitana: das altiranische Namengut der Persepolis-Tafelchen* (Sitzungs-
108 On seven Ebla fragments (MEE 3 27, 41, 42, 60; MEE 15 77, 79) —
      I read: I:1-4; NE-sumaš(LA-226) / GAM.GAM-zugud(LA-352) / sumaš(LA-226)kūtu / [...]kūtu [...] II:1-3, tūg'(KU)-gūn / [gū]-[gū] / [...] / [...]. However, it seems to me that this fragment belongs to the reverse of the tablet.
      I am not sure it includes the upper edge, as implied by its editor.
      I read: I:1'-2'-3', [...] / gū-bal[a] / hī-tūm' / [...] II:1'-2'-5', su-dīn[a][k][en]mūs / numm[a][NG.NU]mūs / buru₃mūs / [...] / [...]. However, it seems to me that this fragment belongs to the reverse of the tablet.
      — [3] TM.75.G.11256 = MEE 15 79, published in PICCHIONI 1997:145 among the “frammenti e scaglie non localizzabili” (ibid., p. XVI), is rather a fragment belonging to the acrographic section šu of a Sumerian lexical list of the ęš-bar-kinš kind, the first column of the obverse.
      Its text runs parallel to TM.75.G.5629 = MEE 15 22 obv. IV:3-10 (as for the first two terms see Piccioni 1997:167 n. 231). I read: [...] / e-sag-[eš]-ša / e-dur-šag'-[a][KAK] / 'e' / [...] / [...] / [...] / [...] / [...] / [...]. However, it seems to me that this fragment belongs to the reverse of the tablet.
      — [6] TM.75.G.20326 = MEE 3 60, published in PETTINATO 1981:246 among the lexical lists (but see ibid., p. 243), is rather a fragment of an administrative text.
      The personal name in II:1 is certainly to be read Zi-ib-da-mu: as Sag-da-mu, Ip-te-da-mu and Il-zi-da-mu, Zi-ib-da-mu was one of the Ebla princes, dumu-nita en (see Archi et al. 1988:222-232). In I:2 [...]-nu-ba is a rather unlikely reading; it is instead to be read [...]-nuš-
      — [7] TM.75.G.20595 = MEE 3 42, was published in PETTINATO 1981:123 among the “altre liste di uccelli”.
      In my opinion is a fragment belonging to the so-called source C of the Ebla bilingual lexical list, with the four Sumerian bird-names, lacking their Semitic equivalents, which are attested in VE 913-916 (for these entries see the synopsis in PETTINATO 1982:302).

Note that neither photographs nor handcopies of these seven fragments have been published.
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Découvertes épigraphiques à Ur (octobre-décembre 2015) — La reprise de l'exploration archéologique d’Ur à l’automne 2015 lors d’une campagne dirigée par E. Stone a donné des résultats très intéressants : ayant été invité à y prendre part comme épigraphiste, je suis heureux d’en rendre compte ici brièvement, une communication plus longue étant prévue à la RAI de Philadelphie en juillet 2016.

L’époque paléo-babylonienne est représentée par 6 tablettes : 4 documents d’archives, dont un texte daté de Rim-Sin 24 et un prêt d’argent daté de Samsu-iluna, ainsi que 2 exercices scolaires (listes de noms propres). La période d’Ur III a livré 4 tablettes, datées de Šulgi 21 et 43 ainsi que d’Amar-Sin 8 et 9 ; il s’agit notamment de comptes d’or. De nouveaux exemplaires de briques de cette époque, déjà connues, ont également été retrouvés.

Le plus intéressant est la découverte dans le quartier AH, à environ 4 m de profondeur, d’un lot d’archives datable de l’époque d’Akkad (aucun des textes n’est daté). Cette période était jusqu’à présent fort mal représentée dans l’épigraphie du site d’Ur : dans le supplément à UET II, 9 tablettes ont été datées de l’époque sargonique par F. Pomponio et A. Alberti. La fouille a permis, entre le 4 et le 12 décembre, de retrouver un lot de 18 tablettes de comptabilité : listes de denrées avec leur prix, documents relatifs à l’arpentage, comptes d’argent, comptes de vêtements et de laine, comptes de poissons, comptes de filets... Leur intérêt vient surtout du fait que ces tablettes ont été retrouvées dans un contexte bien stratifié, avec de la céramique et même deux empreintes de sceau.
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