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PREFACE

About the same time when the children of Israel were invading the land of Canaan preparatory to their final conquest these letters ($DUB^{mes}k$) were inscribed on clay. They form part of the "Temple Archives" ($DUB M^{mes}$) of the Cassite period, situated on the west side of the Shatt-en-Nil. In all probability these Archives were found in one or several buildings (connected with each other), known as the Š.DUB šâ Š.GAL and including the Temple Library and the Temple School. The Cassite Kings at this time were the chief administrators of the affairs of the Temple of Enlil at Nippur; for they are known by the title shkkanakkku Enlil, characterizing them as the representatives of Enlil on earth, who had "to put the seal" (kanâku) of the god to each and every transaction made by and for the Temple. Nothing could be done without their consent, approval, or authority (seal). While the "Temple Archives" proper give us a picture of the business methods of the Temple administration, under the chief supervision of the King, these letters represent the correspondence about those methods.

Among them we find complaints from governors about non-delivery or delay in the delivery of goods by the chief bursar of the Temple, medical reports about the sickness of certain ladies connected with the sanctuary, complaints about goods asked for, but not received, accounts of the disposition of taxes gathered, requests for wages, building material, food, clothing, and the like.

The Temple of Enlil being a richly endowed institution, royal officers kept watch over its proper administration and welfare and reported about the various affairs of Enlil's property to his earthly representative, the King. Thus we find reports about the deplorable condition of canals, about the prospects of the harvests on the fields belonging to the Temple, about building operations with suggestions as to desirable improvements, about certain expeditions undertaken in defence of Enlil's earthly possessions, etc.

Though most of these letters are addressed to the "Lord," i.e., the "King" who had his residence at least temporarily in Nippur, some of them may be classified as part of an "official correspondence between Temple or State officers." There are even letters in these archives written by the kings themselves (comp. Nos. 75 and 93).
This collection of official letters from Nippur forms an exact parallel to the letters from the so-called Kuyunjuk collection of Nineveh, which constitutes the remains of the famous library of King *Ashshur-bēn-apal* excavated by Layard and Rassam.

The letters here published have been copied during the winter of 1906-07 from the originals to be found in the Babylonian Museum of the University of Pennsylvania. Nos. 33a, 59a, 60a, 73a and 95-99 have been added after the plates had been arranged and prepared for the press (November, 1907). With the exception of three (Nos. 33a, 84, 85) these letters are mostly fragmentary, badly damaged, and poorly preserved. This being the case, it was my aim to reproduce, as nearly as possible, all the marks and wedges of every sign in question, bearing in mind that a reliable copy must and ought to be an exact reproduction of the 'original' as it presents itself to the eyes of the copyist, and not of his 'thoughts' or of what he 'expects' to find in a particular passage. This principle having been strictly adhered to, I came to the result that the following signs are used interchangeably: (1) di and bi; (2) b, bi, ni, š, št, ša; (3) ib, ur, lu; (4) ish, ma, ba, zu, shag (lābu), su; (5) ku, šū, lu; (6) im, aššur, mur; (7) du, ush, ta, šá, ra; (8) az, ug; (9) ad, ši, mir; (10) be, nu; (11) al, šhit, etc., etc.

As the texts here submitted have been written by more than fifty scribes, and as each scribe has his own peculiar ductus, I tried to imitate that ductus in the best manner possible. This is the reason—apart from the copyist's own ability of writing cuneiform signs—for the varied execution of the copy of the letters here published. The copyist, in fact, did not try to give in the following pages an exhibition of his ability in copying inscriptions, but he rested content with a faithful reproduction of all the peculiar characteristics of the ductus of the several scribes. After the letters had been copied and translated, the copy was once more compared with the originals. In this wise I flatter myself to have obtained an absolutely reliable copy. It is, therefore, the fond hope of the copyist that the prospective decipherer will not commit a mistake like the one the writer of No. 45 complains of when he writes to his 'Lord': 'I have written concerning 'pots' that they be brought down, but they were 'straw'! What for has my 'Lord' sent this?' The 'Lord's' order-filler misread apparently the two signs: \[
\begin{align*}
\text{meš} & = \text{KAN.} \text{NI\text{meš}} = \text{digarātī} = '\text{pots}' \\
\text{IN\text{meš}} & = \text{tibnut\text{meš}} (\text{Hebr. [ב פ]} = '\text{straw}')
\end{align*}
\]

These letters forming, so to speak, the connecting link between those of the Hammurabi and Amarna periods on the one hand and those of the later Assyrian and Babylonian on the other, it is, of course, quite natural to find that they show the
several characteristic features of the periods mentioned. Thus the sign PI is still used, at least sometimes, for wi; a t does not yet exist; we have di-im, te-e-ma and NE-ma. The latter ought to be transcribed rather by de-ma than by te-ma. The q begins to make itself felt in quite a good many instances. Yet, wherever ki is written for qi, I transcribed accordingly.

It will be noticed that I read the name NIN.IB Errish(t). This reading I am still prepared to maintain, not only on account of the gloss urash, but also on account of the identity of "=NIN.IB and "=Errish, see The Monist, Vol. XVII, No. 1 (Jan., 1907), p. 142. The Aramaic transcription of NIN.IB is not (see also p. 41, note). Apparently does not represent the pronunciation (this is Errish(t)), but an attribute of "=NIN.IB and all those gods who, in the Babylonian "Trinity in Unity," at one time or another, played the rôle of the "Son." It is, therefore, not exclusively confined to "=NIN.IB, the "Son" of "En-tl. I propose to read ut uzi = en usati = "lord of help," an attribute ascribed, among others, also to "=Marduk, the "Son" of "=E.A; cf. the nom. propr. = "=Marduk-en-usati, quoted by Delitzsch, H. W. B., p. 107b, under usati. Instead of usati we find, at the time of the Cassites, also the writing u-za-ti, cf. B. E., XIV, 125:12, "En-uz-za-ti, a noteworthy peculiarity which shows that usati, usati has to be connected with the Sumerian A.ZU = usu = "helper, physician." We know that "=IB (gloss urash) is = "=NIN.IB (see Bel, the Christ, p. 16, note 8; p. 18, III; p. 19, 2), but IB (gloss urash) is also = baru (II R. 62, 36a), and baru is = A.ZU (Reisner, Hymnen, p. 7, 18. 19). From this it follows that IB = A.ZU, and "=NIN.IB = "=NIN.A.ZU (cf. II R. 57, 51a,b, where the star (mul) "=NIN.A.ZU is identified with "=NIN.IB). Again, "=IB is also = "=MASH, but mash changes with mash, cf. mash-pad = nash-pad (E. B. H., p. 256, note 16); nash-shu-gid (Cyl. A 20 : 5) = mash-shu-gid (Cyl. A 12 : 16, 17), and mash is likewise = baru = A.ZU. I take, therefore, utu to stand for ut en = NIN, and utusati = usati (the abstract for the concrete noun) = A.ZU = IB = MASH. In other words, "=IB or "=MASH is "the helper," "the physician" (hence the patron god of the physicians), and "=NIN.IB or "=NIN.A.ZU the "lord of help," the "helping lord." As such a "lord of help" he is the veriest "Saviour"—a saviour that saves not only from bodily or(!) spiritual harm (notice that sickness is the result of the evil spirits within a person; if these demons are cast out, the sick person recovers!), but also one who delivers mankind from death, destruction, and the grave. He is the "mer-
ciful one” (rêmênû, K 128—Jensen, Kosm., p. 470), the “merciful god” (îlu rêmênû, I R. 17 : 19), the “one who gives life” (qa-îsh TÎ.LA, I R. 17 : 19), “who gives the spirit of life” (qî’sh napsâtû, Jensen, l.c.), “who quickens the dead” (muballît mel[tûtî], Jensen, l.c.), who delivers the dead out of the nether world: “who has been brought down into the nether world, his body thou bringest back again” (sha ana arallê shûrûdû pagarshu tuterra, Bêl, the Christ, p. 45, note 2; cf. ¶ xlv. 15, “God will redeem my soul from the power of Sheol”; or ¶ xvi. 10, “For thou wilt not leave my soul to Sheol”).

From these considerations it follows that the “Son” of the Nippurian Trinity (Enlûl—NIN.ÎB—NIN.LIL = Bau) was the prototype not only of Nin.Girsu in the Girsu Trinity (Enlûl—Nîn.Gûrsu—NIN.LIL = Bau) or of Marduk in the Eridu Trinity (É.A—Mardûk—Damkina—Šarrpanûtûm), but even of Christ in the Christian Trinity (Father—Son—Holy Spirit); in each and every case the “Son” was the Saviour, the en usâtû; hence Christ was rightly called the “Jesus” and was greeted, when entering Jerusalem, with joyful “Hosannahs,” יושנן, “Save (now, O Lord)!"

While writing this Preface, there lies before me a copy of “The so-called Peters-Hilprecht Controversy.” Prof. Hilprecht’s critics make so much ado about the “probable” place of provenance of the so-called Lushtamar letter, all of them claiming that if the envelope were opened and the contents read, its place of origin would be settled for all time to come. This very clamor proves better than anything else that those gentlemen never have read a Babylonian letter! To help clear the atmosphere a little in this respect, I may be permitted to say a few words about the place of origin of letters in general.

1. In no letter thus far published is there ever found an absolute reliable indicium about its place of origin. The only thing in a letter which might possibly help solve such a question is the so-called invocation frequently found after the address. If, e.g., for the protection of his correspondent, a writer invokes certain gods worshipped in a certain city, it is probable that that writer hailed, resp. sent, his letter from that city to the gods of which he invoked. Cf. here No. 89, where the writer Pân-AN.GAL-lû-mûr invokes the gods of Dûr-îlu for the protection of the addressee; hence the probability is that the writer hailed and wrote from Dûr-îlu. But this, as I said, is and must remain a probability only, for we find in the letters here published another example in which the writer invokes the gods of Nippur. This letter (No. 38) has likewise been found in Nippur. Now it is not at all likely that the writer, when sending his letter to the “Lord” at Nippur, was himself in Nippur. If he were, he would most assuredly have appeared before the “Lord” in person, thereby saving himself the trouble of writing a letter, which had to be baked, encased in an envelope,
addressed, sealed and handed over to a messenger in order to be delivered. What then is the inference from this invocation? Does the invocation prove that the letter was sent from Nippur to Nippur, where it was found? Such a thought would be simply ridiculous. All we can say is this: the writer of No. 38, because he invokes the gods of Nippur, was in all probability a Nippurian, but was away from Nippur when writing that letter. The invocation of that letter, then, does not prove anything at all with regard to the place whence that letter has been sent.

2. Prof. Hilprecht has some very good, convincing, and absolutely reliable reasons why he assigns the Lushtamar letter to the business or administrative section of the Temple Library of Nippur. We believe his words a thousand times more than those of his accusers, which, at the very best, are merely hearsay. In fact, his critics have absolutely nothing to bring forward in corroboration of their claim that “the Lushtamar letter did not come from the ruins of Nippur, but from those of Sippar.” In corroboration of this hearsay talk Prof. Hilprecht’s critics now point out that the seal impression of the Lushtamar letter mentions certain persons who are known from tablets that have been found at Sippar. What is there on the envelope of the Lushtamar letter to justify such a strange conclusion? Besides the address “to Lushtamar (a-na Lu-us-ta-mar)”, I find a seal impression which reads: Ilu-shú-Ba-ni dam-qi Har I-bi-išNIN.SHAH | ardi išNIN.SHAH-ge. The same persons occur again on a tablet published in B. E., VI, 50: 19, 20, which tablet was “probably” excavated in Sippar. The critics draw the conclusion, it seems, that, because the same persons occur on both tablets (the Lushtamar letter and B. E., VI, 50), and because B. E., VI, 50, was “probably” found in Sippar, the Lushtamar must have been found in Sippar likewise. But can anyone imagine that Ilu-shú-Ba-ni, a resident of Sippar, would write to Lushtamar, another resident of Sippar, which he must have done if the letter had been found at Sippar? If Lushtamar had been a resident of Sippar, like Ilu-shú-Ba-ni, is it not much more probable that the latter would have gone in person to the former and communicated to him his wishes orally? Instead of this contention being against Prof. Hilprecht, it much rather speaks decidedly for him. We may admit that the Ilu-shú-Ba-ni of the Lushtamar letter and the Ilu-shú-Ba-ni of B. E., VI, 50, are both one and the same person; we also may admit that both were residents of Sippar; but from this it by no means follows that the addressee, Mr. Lushtamar, lived likewise in Sippar. On the contrary, the fact that Ilu-shú-Ba-ni, a possible inhabitant of Sippar, did write to Lushtamar would prove a priori that the latter was not a resident of Sippar, but was, as Prof. Hilprecht, for reasons given in his “Controversy,” quite rightly and correctly claims, a resident of Nippur.

In conclusion, I must apologize to the Editor and the Publication Committee for
the length of the Introduction to the letters here published. In view of the extra-
ordinary importance of these letters for the history, religion, language, grammar,
and lexicon of the Babylonians, but more especially for a correct understanding of
the terms "Temple Archives," "Temple School" and "Temple Library," it was
absolutely necessary that the wrong impressions created by those who hold a con-
trary view should be set aright. If I have done nothing else but created a basis
upon which to reconstruct the system of administration, education, and worship of
the Babylonians at 1500 B.C., I shall be more than repaid for my labors in connec-
tion with this volume.

It only remains to thank here the Provost of the University, Dr. C. C. Harrison,
and the Director of the Museum of Science and Art, Mr. S. F. Houston, for their
hospitality, kindness, and courtesies shown to me during my sojourn in the Museum.
To express my gratefulness to Mr. Eckley Brinton Coxe, Jr., through whose gen-
erosity the Museum is enabled to publish the following pages, gives me special pleasure.
I am sure I voice the sentiments of all Assyriologists when I say that this noble and
unselfish benefactor erects by these publications, the elegance of which is not attained
by any other similar works, much less surpassed, an everlasting monument upon
which all scholars look with admiration and gratefulness. To my friend and teacher,
Prof. Dr. H. V. Hilprecht, who so generously and freely assisted me in words and
deeds during the course of the preparation of this volume, whose valuable time,
profound scholarship, and learning were at all times most abundantly at my dis-
posal, who not only read the proof-sheets, but who constantly and continually helped
me most liberally with his valuable advice, I am especially most grateful. I only
hope and pray that the work of the pupil may be worthy of the master. It is a
special delight to be able to express publicly my sincere gratitude to Mrs. Sallie
Crozer Hilprecht for her most generous benefactions bestowed upon me during the
last two years while here in Philadelphia. Were it not for her help I never could
have written this book. May she graciously condescend to accept this work as a
very small token of my profound and lasting gratitude.

Philadelphia, Pa., May 1, 1908.

HUGO RADAU.
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TIME AND AGE OF THE LETTERS.

All the tablets here published are Letters—DUB, dup-pi, dup-pa, IM. They were excavated in Nippur during the second to fourth expeditions of the University of Pennsylvania (1889–1900), and form part of the so-called Temple Archives of Nippur, partly published by Clay, B. E., XIV and XV. The facts that these letters were found, when unpacked by Prof. Hilprecht, intermingled with the tablets of B. E., XIV and XV, which are all dated in the reign of certain Cassite Kings, that they are of the same peculiar "color of clay," have the same "form" and "writing" as those of the Temple Archives, would, a priori, make it reasonably certain that we have to assign them to the Cassite period. Apart from these criteria there are others which prove, beyond a doubt, that the letters here published did, and actually do, belong to the reigns of either one or the other of the following Cassite kings (see Hilprecht, B. E., XX, p. 52, note 1):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kings</th>
<th>Reigned According to &quot;List of Kings&quot;</th>
<th>Last Year Found on Nippur Tablets</th>
<th>About</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Burna-Buriash II</td>
<td></td>
<td>23 (or 27?)</td>
<td>1450–1423 B.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuri-Daluz U</td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1421–1396 B.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naaz-Marutash (son)</td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1396–1370 B.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kadashman-Turgu (son)</td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1369–1352 B.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kadashman-Enili II (son)</td>
<td>[1] or [1]</td>
<td>[1][1]</td>
<td>1331–1318 B.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shagaruki-Shuruish (3d(? son)</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1317–1309 B.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kashtiliashu II (son)</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2 "Temple Archives," to mention it here, were called at the time when all these documents were written: DUB MUmech, DUB ša-na-(a)-iti, DUB ŠA.RA, DUB MU.BI.M, DUB GISII, DUB za-kar-tum. For a discussion of these terms see below under "Results," p. 83.
3 The last year thus far known was the 25th. Cf. B. E., XIV, 9: 56. arēNGAR.GAB.A ūnu 12[kam] šattu 25[kam] Bur-ur-Buri-ia-dah LUGAL-E. But Prof. Hilprecht informs me that Burna-Buriash II seems to have ruled
LETTERS TO CASSITE KINGS

Among these criteria and indicia may be mentioned (a) that the persons introduced in these letters are to be found—to a great extent at least—also in the dated documents of the Temple Archives. The following few examples will illustrate it.

"In-na-an-ni, who figures so conspicuously in the texts of B. E., XIV, as one who transacts (i-na qāt) the business of the Temple's storehouses at Nippur and elsewhere during the 18th, 21st, and 23rd year of Kuri-Galzu and the 1st and 2nd

at least twenty-seven years, according to a fragmentary tablet of the Cassite period recently catalogued by him (No. 12807), which though insufficiently dated: "Shabānu, 12th day, 27th year," according to internal evidence must be assigned to the reign of Burna-Buriash or Kuri-Galzu, in all probability to the former. After an examination of the personal proper names occurring on this tablet I agree entirely with Prof. Hilprecht's conclusions.

That this Kuri-Galzu has to be identified both with "Kuri-Galzu, the son of Burna-Buriash," and with "Kuri-Galzu sēru, the son of Kadashman-Heber," will be shown below sub "Chronology," pp. 68ff.; hence the "gap" between Burna-Buriash and Kuri-Galzu.

1 B. E., XIV, 38 : 15f. [... = 1kgam shattu 2gdam 1gKur] = [Galk].
2 B. E., XIV, 56 : 15f. (Case) arbaASH.AAN ānu 1kgam shattu 2gdam Na-zi-Mu-ru-ut-ta-dosh.
3 B. E., XIV (pl. 61), 114a (= = B. H. H., 179) ; 5. arbaASH.EQ.0A ānu 3kgam shattu 16dam Ka-dāsh-mam-Tur-qu.
4 For this ruler see Clay, B. E., XIV, p. 4, and l.c., No. 116 : 8ff. arbaASH.AAN shattu 2kgam itu Ka-dāsh-mam-En-lil.

5 This is the last mentioned in the published texts from the Temple Archives that I can find. Clay, B. E., XIV, pp. 3, 71 (whom Hilprecht, B. E., XXI, p. 52, note 1, follows), gives the year 9 as the last, referring to l.c., No. 124: 18f. But here we have clearly the year 8, for we read: arbaASH.EQ.0A 1kgam sēru 2gdam itu Ka-dāsh-mam-En-lil.
7 Or possibly about 1280-1289 B.C. Cf. III R. 4, No. 2 (Sennacherib's capture of Babylon, i.e., either the first (702 B.C.) or the second (669 B.C.) took place). "900 years after Tukulti-NIN.1B," who reigned seven years over Babylon, following immediately upon Kasshushiliya.
8 B. E., XV, 11, 63 : 86. Kār-INTU-MU-VA, B. E., l.c., No. 99. Du-an-um-du-ahš, B. E., l.c., No. 112. 2gdam sēru Dār-gal-ahāli, l.c., No. 114, 128. 2gdam Mardukš, l.c., No. 120. Kār-UD.1N, l.c., Nos. 124, 135. Kār-ESP.KUR-MU-MU, l.c., Nos. 133, 139, etc., etc. See also pp. 81, 85, note 3, 110.
9 B. E., XIV, 29 : 303. The tablet, l.c., 23 : 8 (dated in the 13th year of Kuri-Galzu), where it is reported that KU.MUN was paid (nad-mu) to (or by?) In-na-an-ni, was not taken into consideration here.
10 B. E., XIV, 35 : 3.
11 B. E., XIV, 38 : 10, where it is stated that certain animals, which had been loaned out, are to be returned to (inamān ana) Innanni.
12 From the 22d year of Kuri-Galzu Innanni shared honors with his successor, Mar-tu-ku, B. E., XIV, 36 : 3.
13 B. E., XIV, 41a (pl. 58) : 3, 1. 12ff.; arbaASH. IN, 3gdam shattu 1kgam itu PI (= Nat.)-zi-Mu-ru-ut-ta-dosh.
14 B. E., XIV, 42 : 2, 19ff. arbaGUD.SI, 3aUG.1N, 2gdam itu Na-zi-Mu-ru-ut-ta-dosh LUGAL-E.
year of Nazi-Maruttash—i.e., during a period of at least ten years—is represented in our texts as the recipient of four letters, two of which have been addressed to him by *itu NIN.IB (resp. *itu MASH)-TUR.USHE-NA.* From the contents and the tone of these two letters it is apparent that Innanni was the “chief bursar” of the Temple’s storehouses, where nothing could be either received or expended without his knowledge and consent, and that Errish-apal-iddina was likewise a person of no mean rank; for he hires workmen, and dares to command Innanni: “Thou, hurry up, give the seed corn to the city.” Apparently then he was at the head of a city. More than this, he even had certain prefects (hażanndti) under him, for he requests Innanni in another letter: “Thou shalt not accept the sesame of the prefects.” This latter passage shows that Errish-apal-iddina, because he had authority over hażanndti, “city prefects,” must have been a “governor,” a “bēl paḫāti.” Comparing these results with the texts of B. E., XIV and XV, we learn that a certain place, called either Bit-Innanni or Bit-Innanniti, must have been a “barley depot” during the 13th year of Kuri-Galzu and the 19th, 22d, and 24th year of Nazi-Maruttash—i.e., during a period of at least thirty-two years, including

---

1 The statement in B. E., XIV, p. 8: “All the tablets in which this name (i.e., Innanni) occurs, with the exception of one, which is dated in the reign of Nazi-Maruttash, belong to the reign of Kuri-Galzu,” will have to be modified accordingly.

2 Of course also the Bit-In-anna-am-ni (situated in Nippur, B. E., XV, 115 : 5; 136 : 6) which flourished from at least the 22d year of Kuri-Galzu (B. E., XIV, 36 : 2, 11) to the 15th year of Nazi-Maruttash (B. E., XIV, 65 : 7, 14). Add here to Bit-Innanni of B. E., XV, the following references: 66 : 6 | 117 : 2 | 141 : 22 | 155 : 29, 22. A Mār-In-na-am-ni is mentioned in the 6th and the 7th year of Shagarakti-Shuriash (B. E., XIV, 132 : 22).

3 Nos. 58-66.

4 Nos. 53 and 84.

5 Possibly to be read Errish(t)-apal-iddina. For the possible reading of NIN.IB resp. MASH as Errish(t), see The Monist, XVII (January, 1907), pp. 140ff. Chay reads this name either NIN.IB-mār-iddina (B. E., XIV, p. 49a) or NIN.IB-apal-iddina (B. E., XV, p. 38a). Why this change, considering that in all the passages known to me the writing TUR-US-HE = apal is found?

6 No. 83 : 24 ša-ka-um-nu-ZER a-ma-a-si-du ki i-din, see p. 112.

7 No. 84 : 3, SHE.GISH.NI ša-ka-am-nu-a-ti la-ta-mar-šar at-ta, etc., see p. 114.

8 This follows also from a comparison of, e.g., B. E., XIV, 99a (pl. 56 = E. A. H., 195): 4, 7, 16, 26, 29, 41 with B. E., XIV, 168 : 59, 51, 26, and especially 1, 40, i.e., in this latter tablet, which is an “inventory of cattle,” the “ša-ka” of NIN.IB-TUR-US-HE-NA apparently stands (for pi-baš) as NIN.IB-TUR-US-HE-NA. B. E., XIV, 18 : 7 (notice that KI-11 refers back to Dūr- of 1, 6). In B. E., XIV, pp. 40a, 58b, this name is read NIN.IB-mār-iddina resp. NIN.IB-mār-iddina, but in i.e., p. 88a, Dūr-itu NIN.IB-mār (read: apal)-iddina.
the time during which Innanni was the “chief bursar” at Nippur. Hence Innanni and 𒉺𒆠𒅜𒆠𒆠, the founder, owner, and occupant of Dūr (resp. Bīt)—𒉺𒆠𒅜𒆠𒆠, were contemporaries.

Again in No. 9:21 a certain 𒉺𒆠𒅜𒆠𒆠-Marduk, when writing to his “Lord” (be-ī), states that he has, in order to corroborate the truthfulness of his communications, “made to be his witnesses” a certain 𒉺𒆠Nergal-Ba-ni, the prefect (ha-za-na) of Rakanu, and the prefect (ha-za-an-na) of Bīt-𒉺𒆠Kidinni, upon whom his “Lord” may call, if he desires confirmation of the truth. The “prefect” of Bit-Kidinni was, of course, Kidinni. This statement of Banā-sha-Marduk, no doubt, indicates that he stood in some kind of a relation to the prefect Kidinni. What this relation was we may gather from a tablet, dated in the 20th year of Kuri-Galzu, which reports that Banā-sha-Marduk received certain cereals “on the authority” or “by order” of 𒉺𒆠Kidinni— the latter apparently being the superior of the former. But we can go a step farther.

B. E., XIV, 99a (= E. A. H., 195): 35,4

1 Cf. here also B. E., XV, 124, where a certain 𒉺𒆠Ra-esh-Shamšu-šu or 𒉺𒆠Ra-esh-Shamšu-du (this reading preferable to Clay’s 𒉺𒆠Ra-est-šamšu-du (B. E., XV, p. 40b) or 𒉺𒆠Ra-esh-šamši-du (Z. A., XX (1907), p. 417.) in view of such names as 𒉺𒆠Ra-esh-na-um-ši, B. E., XV, 24:7; and 𒉺𒆠Ra-esh-ša-li-li, 1c., 19:16) receives from (ina qdt) Innanni a certain amount of grain as KU-QAR-wages, which grain was taken from that belonging to (ina kibš SHE ša) 𒉺𒆠MASH-TURUSH-ŠE-na. The tablet is dated in the 22d year (so. doubtless of Kuri-Galzu). In B. E., XV, 136 (dated the 23d year, so. of Kuri-Galzu), Innanni endorses the payment of GIG (= kibšu, “bouy,” Jensen, K. B., VI, p. 485) to certain pa-te-si ƃ.s “by order of” or “in the employ of”—thus receiving the amount specified “on the authority of,” i.e., “per” (= qdt; in this differing from Clay, B. E., XV, pp. 5, 6, who translated qdt “in the hands of” or “paid to”; qdt may or may not (as here) be expressed before the second name in “lists of payents”) 𒉺𒆠MASH-TURUSH-ŠE-na. These two tablets prove beyond a doubt that Innanni and Širish-apal-iddina were contemporaries during the 22d and 23d year (of Kuri-Galzu).

2 No. 9: 21, a-na ši-ba-ti-la 𒉺𒆠Nergal-Ba-ni ha-za-na šaš dšš Ra-ka-nu ̄ u ha-za-an-na šaš Bit-𒉺𒆠Kidinni abš-ta-ka-an, see p. 106.

3 Notice that in our letter the prefect of Bit-Kidinni is not mentioned by name, simply because there was no other prefect of the “house of Kidinni” than Kidinni himself—a fact quite well known to the “Lord.”


Thus I translate, because the name of Kidinni follows that of Banā-sha-Marduk.

Kidinni is a shorter form of Kidinn(u)a. The latter is, as the ša indicates, a hypocoristicon of some such name as Kidin(n)u.NIN IB,-Nergal,-Bāmμuš, etc. See “List of Names” in B. E., XIV, p. 46b. Cf. also 18:22, “Kidin-ni; 23:23, “Kidin-ša-Marduk, and B. E., IX, p. 61b, and l.c., X, p. 53b, “Kidin-ni.

6 Owing to the fact that the writer was in Europe while reading the proofs of his B. H. (thus having no access to the E. A. H. Collection), it happened that E. A. H., 105 was erroneously reckoned to the Neo-Babylonian period; it should have been read, E. B. H., p. 328 sub e: “The dynasty of the Cassites, 175–195,” instead of 194. Clay, B. E., XIV, p. 2, note 3, however, infers from this inaccuracy that the writer did not understand the nature of the tablet in question. Turning to the “Table of Contents” of B. E., XIV, p. 69, No. 99b, I find that its author does not give its contents either. I take this opportunity to state what I regard to be the contents of this and two exactly similar tablets (B. E., XIV, 168 and 99), which are interpreted somewhat differently by Dr. Clay, who sees in No. 168 a “record of
informs us that there lived in the 11th year of Kadashtman-Turgu (l. 46) a certain "Ki-di-nu-u" who was one of the prefects, hazannati (i.e., col. XV : 22), belonging to the pi-hat of = &En-lil-bel (= EN)-nishmek-shu (l. 41). Now, as "Ki-di-nu-u

collections" (see i.e., p. 73), while No. 99 in the same volume is pronounced to be a "record of the collection of taxes in animals" (see i.e., p. 69). All three tablets just referred to are inventories. Cf., e.g., 199a : 46 (and see 99 : 1), mi-nun LIT.GUD.JA is GANAM.JU.BA NIN.ANY.MEK, "the number of large and small cattle belonging to the NIN.ANY.MEK." The latter were two "beings"; one was called NIN.ANY.GAL, 18, 34, (cf. B. E., XIV, 89 : 1, 9; 104 : 3; 131 : 1), 18 : 16; 136 : 16; 138 : 31), and the other NIN.ANY.TUR, l. 44 (cf. B. E., XIV, 89 : 1, 16; 136 : 29 (?)), and, per analogy, we ought to expect a NIN.ANY.TUR also in l. 21. What these NIN.ANY.MEK were, cannot be made out as yet. From Letter No. 85 (see p. 115) I would like to infer that Inbi-Airi was such a NIN.AN or quidshu.

From the arrangement of the tablet in question we might draw the conclusion that the "large cattle" were under the chief supervision of the kash-shu (not = Cassite) "Ki-lun-du, "l. 1, 2, 14; while the "small cattle" were under that of the kash-shu "Amed-Ba-nu, (if kash-shu were = "Cassite," Amed-Ba-nu would be one with a good Babylonian name). l. 22, 23, 32 (the traces given in B. E., XIV, are, no doubt, wrong). Each kash-shu, it seems, had several (three or more?) bi-l pi-bdti under him. And as, according to our tablet, the three pi-hat included in the kash-shu of Kilamu are exactly the same as those of the kash-shu of Amed-Ba-nu, it is most likely that a kash-shu is the general overseer of all large or of all large cattle of a NIN.ANY.TUR of the different provinces (pi-bdti). I propose, therefore, to derive kash-shu from &q22, "to gather" (Jensen, K. B., VI, pp. 322, 622), here in the sense of "one under whose jurisdiction are gathered a number of bi-l pi-bdti," i.e., "government- or overseer-in-chief." A bi-l pi-bdti, on the other hand, is responsible for the flock of both the large and the small cattle reared in his territory, which responsibility is always expressed by qdi = "per," see ll. 11 (cf. l. 7); 12 (cf. l. 4); 17, 20 (cf. l. 16); 32 (notice the §§! and cf. ll. 29 and 26); 42 (cf. l. 41); hence we have to translate, e.g., l. 11, "total 10 (sc. oxen of six years) a-na zo-bul KU.QAR smaMErrIQ a KA.ZID.DA qdi (= SHU) mi-nun.Shamasash-kadin-shg (= shepherds) by "are employed" for the carrying (sabal = luf); cf., our No. 34 : 40, i-nun.Shab.MAR.GID.DA IN ki-az-si-bi-la, when I was bringing straw in the harvest (lit. "long") wagons, the horses, etc.) of the KU.QAR-wages of the vegetable and grain-grain arrivals "per" (sc. order, information) of Shamasash-kadin-shg (the bi-l pi-bdti, l. 17);" or l. 17, "total 83 cattle, the property (na-kam-tum) of Mard-Iddanni-Shamas, "per" (order, information) of Enlil-bel-nisheshu (the bi-l pi-bdti, l. 16)." The territory of a pi-hat was subdivided into two to six (cf. ll. 2, 3 and 35–40), or possibly more, hazannati, and each hazannu or "prefect" had one (cf. ll. 2, 3, etc.), two (cf. ll. 27, 28 and 36, 37) or more na-gid or "shepherds" under him. The na-gid, hazannu, bi-l pi-bdti, kash-shu of this tablet correspond exactly to the na-gid, mu-bandili-gud, PA, pa-to of the "inventory" lists of the Ur dynasty tablets, as published in B. E., XV, pp. 333–381 (for mu-bandili = hazannu see, e.g., Meissner, Ideogrammen, No. 1159). It will be noticed that the castle introduced by TA = itti or EN = adi are never counted, hence TA = itti cannot mean here "together with," nor can adi be translated by "in addition to," "besides," and EN = adi or "apart from." For TA cf. l. 43, TA 15 ki-bi-li-u, i.e., "besides (that were given for) sacrifice to the dead." For ki-bi-li see, besides Zimmer, Ritual., p. 160; 11; Jensen, K. B., VI, pp. 446, 517; also B. E., XV, 158 : 1, 5; 200 : 1, 6, ki-bi-li u ti-is-ku.

For EN = adi cf. l. 5, EN 1 shul (not kam, as Clay’s copy gives, see XIV, 108 : 16, EN 5 shul-ua-ni and cf., l. 15, shul-na-a-tum; XV, 199 : 21, 22; shul = DI-na-mu-ma-nu, i.e., "apart from one (that was given for) peace-offering." Cf., also l. 18, EN 2 GUD.MU-4 a1 LIT shu ina Kar.En.KUR.KUR.ku-ak-ku-na, i.e., "apart from two oxen, four years old, and one cow which are being taken care of in Kar-EN.KUR.KUR." For bukkurna cf. also XIV, 106 : 55, shu ina shut u &basm en-nu-qi(-ni) and E., 16, 19, tab-ki-ir-lu(-ti)jum shu ma-da-la u-pa(-ki)-nu-mi, that shows that we have here a verb baqurra = pargara = Hebr. "p23, Piel: "to cleave, discern, to look after a thing"; met with also in Neb., Winckler, l. 18 (quoted by H. W. B., p. 1816), where mu-ba-ak-ki-ir ga-ar-ba-u-tum should be translated "who looks after the fields," i.e., "who takes care of them," A tepiruru, accordingly, would be a "flock which requires special treatment," a "special looking after," and XIV, 168 : 16, quoted above, might be translated: "the flock(s) requiring a special looking after of the several shepherds they take care of them." Lastly cf. l. 43: EN 20 zo-bi-ti MU 11 &basm, i.e., "apart from 20 (special) ‘holdings’ of the 11th
(the haṣānu and superior of Banā-sha-Marduk\(^1\)) is only another writing for “Ki-
din-ni (the haṣānu of Bitu−Ki-din-ni and the high and influential witness of Banā-
sha-Marduk, the writer of Letter No. 9), there can be absolutely no reason against
our identifying both and establishing the fact that Banā-sha-Marduk, the writer
of No. 9, must have lived between the 20th year of Kuri-Galzu\(^2\) and the 11th of
Kadashman-Turgu,\(^3\) or during a space of about forty-three years.

In like manner we might go through the whole “List of personal names” or

---

1. Banā-sha-Marduk, the contemporary of Amel-Marduk, No. 3: 16, has probably to be differentiated from this one here. The former lived and flourished during the time of Šumu-ukin-Shuriash.

2. B. E., XIV, 34: 0.

‘scribes’
and show that they lived during the reign, or were contemporaries, of one or the other of the above mentioned Cassite kings. Seeing that such an investigation would lead too far here, we reserve it for Series C.

We need not, however, rely entirely upon the ‘persons’ introduced in these documents to establish for our letters a Cassite origin and age. There are other means at our disposal which lead to the same result. Among these might be enumerated:

(b) The Cassite names of the persons mentioned as, e.g., “Gu-za-ar-AN (= 3du?)”, “Si-ri-da-ash”, Mår-“3U-su(!)-ub-Shi-pak”, Mår-“3Ó-da-shá-ásh”, “Na-zi-“En-lil”,

1 Arm-DASHAN (= Belit), the writer of No. 5, is mentioned in B. E., XIV, 40 : 30 (dated in the 21st year of Kudur-Nahane, L 23) as DUBSAR or “scribe.” Cf. also the DUBSAR Enia-Marduk of B. E., XIV, 127 : 14 (dated the beginning of the reign of Shagwalti-Shu-ah) for the expression cf. The Monist, XVII (January, 1907), p. 150, with the writer(s) of Nos. 13, 14 (817), 82, and see pp. 14, note 7; 117; 121.

2 No. 87 : 3. Cf. “Gu-za-ar-AN-3u-ub-Shi-ásh, C. B. M., 3532 : 16 (quoted by Clay, B. E., XV, p. 31a, and l.c., p. xix), which, no doubt, is the same as “Gu-NI-3u-ub-Shi-ásh (thus read by Clay, B. E., XIV, p. 430, and quoted from C. B. M., 3046), seeing that that might be read 3z = 3er. The interchange of 1 and r in the different languages is too well known as to require further examples. Gu-za-ar resp. Gu-zi-ar “might” be an intensive form of Gu-za, which latter we find in our text. If AN be read ilu we would have here a “mixed” name—partly Cassite, partly Babylonian; for such names cf., e.g., Kudashman,32sEnil, Kudar-M3Enil, NIM gli-shar-ilil, etc. In view of such names as Gutzar-Bugshe, Gutazar-Bugush, we might be justified in reading our name here Gutzar-Bugush, thus identifying the Babylonian AN with the Cassite Bugush and attributing to the latter the rôle played by AN in the Babylonian pantheons.

3 No. 28 : 5 in [Bl]).33Si-ri-iu (or shò?)-ash. Is this name to be compared with Si-ri-iu, B. E., XV, 198 : 30, and Si-li-ta; for this cmentation cf. Clay, Z. A., XX (1907), p. 417f., l.c., 88 : 2, with interchange of l and r?

4 No. 55 : 2. For the reading Shi-pak, instead of Shi-la, see B. B., XV, 190, VI : 15, Mel-Shi-pa[-31], and Clay, i.e., p. 3, note 4. Cf. here the names 3U-su(!)-ub-Shi-pak, Scheil, Textes Êlam. Sem., I, p. 93, 1, 3; 3U-su-ab-HAL.A (sic, against Clay, i.e., XIV, p. 54b), B. E., XIV, 132 : 27, and 3U-su-ab-ShI-in-SAH, Clay, i.e., XIV, p. 459. For the interchange of 3 and r of, among others, also “3i-bi-ti, B. E., XIV, 96a : 30, with “3i-bi-li, l.c., 99 : 65, and “3i-bi-li, l.c., 99a : 32. In view of this interchange we cannot connect “3U-su-ab — “3U-su-ab with “333 and see in our name a formation similar to that of Nabu-uz-su-3u (“Nebu ist Entgel!”) quoted by Del., H. W. R., p. 355. “3a3i, Usu3, without doubt, is a side-form of “333-3u = e-perum, Del., Sprache der Kassiter, p. 20 : 42. For the interchange of 3 and l of, e.g., “333-shi-in-SAH, No. 35 : 33; “333-shi-in-SAH, 55 : 12, etc. “3U-su-ab-Shi-pak, then, is = “Enia-Marduk, i.e., “Protect, oh Marduk!” “3U-su-ab-HAL.A = “Protect my portion” (33. oh god!); “3U-su-ab-ShI-in-SAH = “Protect my face (= me), oh Shamash,” or possibly “the protector of my face is Shamash.” See here also the remarks to NIM.GI, introduction to No. 33a.

5 Thus to be read according to B. E., XV, 168 : 4, where we have ask for ask. According to 55 : 8, 16, 20 this person was the messenger of King Burna-Buriash, see p. 53, note 2.

6 No. 24 : 25. This half Cassite and half Babylonian name is found again in C. B. M., 3532 : 13 (B. E., XV, p. 38a). Whether the element Na-zi be the same as Na-ah-zì, which Clay, B. E., XIV, p. 4, note 2, thinks to be possible, cannot be made out as yet. It is, however, a fact that 3a and a’ very often change in these texts—a phenomenon overlooked by the author of Vols. XIV and XV, from B. E., XV, p. 37, note 1, where we have “333-3a-3a-an-an-an ( (= 3an) for “333-3a-3a-an-an. For this interchange of 3 and a’ cf. Ki-“333-3a-su-3u (34 : 1), resp. Ki-“333-3a-su-3u (35 : 1), with “333-Ki-“333-3a-su-3u, B. E., XV, 188, 1 : 25 (not registered by Clay), II : 13 (i.e., p. 49a, wrongly has “3a for a’); “333-Mâr-“333-3a-su-3u, B. E., XV, 159a : 5 (the “333-Mâr-“333-3a-su-3u and all others quoted under “333-3a-3u in B. E., XIV, p. 58b, and XV, p. 55b, have, of course, to be corrected into “333-Mâr-; cf. “333-3u-3a-3a-Mâr in Scheil, Textes Êlam. Sem., I, p. 100) with [Mâr] “333-3a-3u-3u, B. E., XV, 120 : 3. From this we might infer that Na-“333-3u could also be written Na-ah-zi and become Na-zi. But the intermediate form Na-‘zi has not yet been found; hence the diphthongization of Na-ah-zi and Na-zi must, at the present, be left open.
also the note on is occupied by the XIV, En-lilki and the great god of the lands.

Furthermore, it is well known that "the god" (B. E., Ninurta) is mentioned in B. E., XIV, 125; (1962), e.g., 136: 41; XIV, 136: 10.

1 On account of mär (not mär'esh), l. 14, I do not hold *Bu-an-na* NIN.IB, l. 12, to be a son of Mél-Suqa\-numuna.

2 No. 17: 32. Also mentioned in B. E., XIV, 125: 8 (13th year of Kudurri-Ubbi and l.c., XV, 190, VI 15.

3 No. 59: 14. In B. E., XV, p. 4, this name is considered to have a Babylonian origin. As Mél is correctly recognized as a Cassite god, the god Shuqa\-numuna is evidently regarded as a Babylonian divinity. The fact, however, that Shuqa\-numuna was not known in the Babylonian pantheon till the time of the Cassite proving, apart from other considerations, that he must be introduced by them. For Shu-also the writing Shá occurs, see B. E., XIV, 132: 41; XV, 136: 10.

(c) Certain cities or places peculiar to both, our letters here and the dated tablets of the Cassite kings. Among these may be mentioned šu-\-Arđi-GA\-SH\-AN\-ki (= Bél'it), Bél-\-Ki-\-di-ni, BĀR.TUR\-ki, šu-\-Dār-\-EN.KUR.KUR\-ki, šu-\-Dār-\-In\-En-

1 No. 15: 12. Also mentioned in B. E., XIV, 125: 8 (13th year of Kudurri-Ubbi) and l.c., XV, 190, VI 15.

2 No. 59: 14. In B. E., XV, p. 4, this name is considered to have a Babylonian origin. As Mél is correctly recognized as a Cassite god, the god Shuqa\-numuna is evidently regarded as a Babylonian divinity. The fact, however, that Shuqa\-numuna was not known in the Babylonian pantheon till the time of the Cassite proving, apart from other considerations, that he must be introduced by them. For Shu-also the writing Shá occurs, see B. E., XIV, 132: 41; XV, 136: 10.

1 On account of mär (not mär'esh), l. 14, I do not hold *Bu-an-na* NIN.IB, l. 12, to be a son of Mél-Shuqa\-numuna.

2 No. 17: 32. Also mentioned in B. E., XIV, 125: 8 (13th year of Kudurri-Ubbi and l.c., XV, 190, VI 15.

3 No. 59: 14. In B. E., XV, p. 4, this name is considered to have a Babylonian origin. As Mél is correctly recognized as a Cassite god, the god Shuqa\-numuna is evidently regarded as a Babylonian divinity. The fact, however, that Shuqa\-numuna was not known in the Babylonian pantheon till the time of the Cassite proving, apart from other considerations, that he must be introduced by them. For Shu-also the writing Shá occurs, see B. E., XIV, 132: 41; XV, 136: 10.

(c) Certain cities or places peculiar to both, our letters here and the dated tablets of the Cassite kings. Among these may be mentioned šu-\-Arđi-GA\-SH\-AN\-ki (= Bél'it), Bél-\-Ki-\-di-ni, BĀR.TUR\-ki, šu-\-Dār-\-EN.KUR.KUR\-ki, šu-\-Dār-\-In\-En-

1 No. 17: 32. Also mentioned in B. E., XIV, 125: 8 (13th year of Kudurri-Ubbi and l.c., XV, 190, VI 15.

3 No. 59: 14. In B. E., XV, p. 4, this name is considered to have a Babylonian origin. As Mél is correctly recognized as a Cassite god, the god Shuqa\-numuna is evidently regarded as a Babylonian divinity. The fact, however, that Shuqa\-numuna was not known in the Babylonian pantheon till the time of the Cassite proving, apart from other considerations, that he must be introduced by them. For Shu-also the writing Shá occurs, see B. E., XIV, 132: 41; XV, 136: 10.

1 On account of mär (not mär'esh), l. 14, I do not hold *Bu-an-na* NIN.IB, l. 12, to be a son of Mél-Shuqa\-numuna.

2 No. 17: 32. Also mentioned in B. E., XIV, 125: 8 (13th year of Kudurri-Ubbi and l.c., XV, 190, VI 15.
No. 39: 21, or written also Dāršu\(^{\text{ā}}\)En-li-šē-ki,\(^{\text{ā}}\) No. 3: 33, 38, 41, which latter is mentioned in B. E., XIV, 5: 10 (11th year of Burra-Burish) and l.c., 78: 4 (22d of Nari-Marattah). A \(\text{ā}\)Dāršu\(^{\text{ā}}\)En-li-šē-ki\(^{\text{ā}}\) we find in B. E., XIV, 118: 1, 30 (6th year of Kudur-Enlil), and a \(\text{ā}\)Dāršu\(^{\text{ā}}\)En-li-šē-ki\(^{\text{ā}}\) in l.c., XIV, 127: 4 (beginning of the reign of Shagarakti-Sharrukin). In this last passage the same city is mentioned in l. 7, where its name is \(\text{ā}\)Dāršu\(^{\text{ā}}\)En-lil-li-šē-ki—a most interesting writing, showing that even at the time of the Cassite kings \(\text{ā}\)li-šē-ki was pronounced and read Enlil resp. Enlil, or still better: Enlilu with a plural Enlül, the long š or š still betraying the fact that we have here a Semitized Sumerian word. For such formations cf., e.g., \(\text{ā}\)nu-za = \(\text{ā}\)kahš = Hbr. \(\text{ā}\)šar, "throne." Clay's view, A. J. S. L., XXIII, pp. 260f., that Enil was always pronounced Enil must be modified, as will be shown elsewhere.

The name Enil, signifying originally the chief god of Nippur, in time of course applied to every god that played the same rôle in the religious conception of the Babylonians as did Enil of Nippur. The same holds good of \(\text{ā}\)li-she-bi-l[am] (E. B. H., p. 272, l. 5) or as En-li-šē-ki\(^{\text{ā}}\)En-li-šē-ki (E. B. H., p. 269, note 11; p. 271, l. 5), i.e., "Enil of the Nippurians" or "the Nippuran Enil" (for the formation En-li-šē-ki\(^{\text{ā}}\) = Nippurian, see GISH, H. p. 18a (E. B. H., p. 79, l. 23; p. 81, l. 55) = \(\text{ā}\)GISH.HU\(^{\text{ā}}\) (E. B. H., p. 76, l. 5, 8; p. 81, note 1, et pass.). Be it noted, that we cannot yet follow that GISH.HU has to be read \(\text{ā}\)umma or \(\text{ā}\)uma is untenable. From the fact that the pronoun \(\text{ā}\)umma or \(\text{ā}\)uma, it does not yet follow that GISH.HU has to be read likewise \(\text{ā}\)umma or \(\text{ā}\)uma), there came to be known in Babylonia a "collection" (ḥaš) of Enilu, among them \(\text{ā}\)na (of \(\text{ā}\)nu, Degen (of \(\text{ā}\)✿, Shamsu (of \(\text{ā}\)✿, Mandušu (of Babyl.), \(\text{ā}\)N-SHAR = \(\text{ā}\)sha-šešer (of \(\text{ā}\)sha), and the Cassite Enilu = \(\text{ā}\)harb, thus demonstrating beyond a shadow of a doubt that Enil ceased very early to be a name and became a title. There is no \(\text{ā}\)bēl Enilu as over against a \(\text{ā}\)n or later \(\text{ā}\)bēl = ( \(\text{ā}\)Marduk), but all gods called Enilu have simply put on the jacket of the chief god of Nippur, i.e., they were identified with him—an observation clearly showing that the "religion" of Nippur formed the pattern after which the religious conception of all other Babylonian cities was formed. Cf. my remarks in Old Pena, February 16, 1907, p. 3. This latter statement is not contradicted by B. E., XV, 102: 13, 14, where we hear of two cities called Dāršu\(^{\text{ā}}\)MAR.TU-laburu = \(\text{ā}\)SHA\(^{\text{ā}}\) (Clay, l.c., p. 52b, Dār-\(\text{ā}\)umuru-šē-ki) and \(\text{ā}\)KU-11 (Dāršu\(^{\text{ā}}\)MAR.TU)-čahatā = \(\text{ā}\)BIL\(^{\text{ā}}\) (Clay, ibid., Dār-BIL(NE)\(^{\text{ā}}\), for here laburu, resp. esḫatā, does not refer to \(\text{ā}\)MAR.TU, but to Dāršu\(^{\text{ā}}\); i.e., we have here an "old" and a "new" Dāršu/\(\text{ā}\)Martu, or two parts (hence no items given for "new" Dāršu/\(\text{ā}\)Martu) of one city, cf. the German \(\text{ā}\)zil and \(\text{ā}\)unu/\(\text{ā}\)unu.

2 Nos. 46: 23 | 57: 15, 20, or only Dāršu-Ku-ri-Gal-zu, Nos. 13: 7 | 23: 29. From No. 13: 7 it is evident that this city cannot have been too far away from Nippur, it being connected with it by a \(\text{ā}\)ki-sir = (\(\text{ā}\)bu-šu)-ti or "stone dam," hence the same canal that passed by Nippur must have passed by Dāršu-Ku-ri-Galzu (and \(\text{ā}\)Ardu-Bēlēti) likewise. The ruins represented at the right of No. 1, below No. III (see the Plan of Nippur in Hilprecht, B. E., Series I, Vol. I, p. 306, and regarded by Hilprecht as covering the ruins of the fortified palace of the patesis of Nippur, which, like the palace of Sargon at Khorsabad, formed a bulwark in the fortification line of Nippur), in all probability represent those of Dāršu-Ka-ri-Galzu. Notice also that the "channel" which starts from the \(\text{ā}\)šat-ta-en-nil (for which see No. V), between Nos. I and IV, passes the lower part of the ruins to the right of No. 1. The first occurrence of this place is in an omen-tablet (inscription of a liver) from the 11th year of Burra-Burish, B. E., XIV, 4: 11, LU.ARDU\(^{\text{ā}}\)umur-ša = a-\(\text{ā}\)Dāršu-Ku-ri-Gal-zu \(\text{ā}\)she-ši-tam. This passage is not referred to in B. E., XIV, nor in the corrections, Z. A., XX (1907), p. 417f. It is again mentioned in B. E., XIV, 12: 42, dated \(\text{ā}\)hus\(\text{ā}\)KIN, \(\text{ā}\)um\(\text{ā}\)anna H-tu (i.e., \(\text{ā}\)unušu) \(\text{ā}\)shu-tu \(\text{ā}\)baš\(\text{ā}\) Kuri-Galzu. These two passages prove that this place was founded not by Kuri-Galzu \(\text{ā}\)šušu, but by the older Kuri-Galzu. Notice in this connection that the last quoted tablet gives us the first occurrence of a second Enilu for the Cassite period, being called there \(\text{ā}\)hus\(\text{ā}\)KIN, \(\text{ā}\)um\(\text{ā}\)anna H-tu. This month had its origin, as we know,
(d) Certain peculiarities which our letters here have in common not only with

at the instigation of Hammurabi, see King, Letters, No. 14:6, where it is called $\text{mr}^tu\text{KIN}-\text{snu}^tu\text{nnan}a\text{ I}^\text{ban}^\text{mu}$. It was not recognized in B. E., XIV, p. 62, No. 12, where the month is left out.

1 Nos. 22: 15(? ) | 37: 10 = $\text{mr}^tu\text{Tamun}$, the “sea country.” For the close relation between Babylonia and the sea country at the time of the Casses see Weisbach, Babybl. Miscellen, p. 7, where (B. E., 6405) a certain $\text{U}-\text{tu-Bir-il-\text{in-ash}}$ appears both as “king of $\text{mr}^tu\text{A.A.B.B.A.}” and as “son (TUR) of $\text{Ban-na-Bur-ri(!)-ti-in-ash}” (probably the same as Burna-Buriash II, the son of Kuri-Galzu I, see p. 71). Cf. now also King, Chronicles concerning Early Babylonian Kings, and Winckler, O. L. Z., November, 1907, where it is recorded that Ulu-Bur-Gissu, the brother of Kushišainu I, conquers the “sea country,” and that Abišu, the son of Kushišainu I, “goes out against” the same country and “captures Dûr-E. A.” For the occurrence of $\text{A.A.B.B.A.} =$ “sea” or “sea country,” see also B. E., XIV, 58: 56, 53 (13th year of Nazi-Marritash) | 168: 18, 22, 23 | XV, 199: 26, 27, 33, 38, 40, and the GII.RI A.A.B.B.A in B. E., XIV, 147 (= E. A. H., 182): 6. In connection with the reading and the signification of the last mentioned expression, Clay, B. E., XIV, p. 8, finds sufficient reason to correct a statement made in E. B. H., p. 329, where the question was asked, “Is this letter (i.e., GII.RI A.A.B.B.A) to be classed among the kings of this dynasty?” He, although admitting that “it is not impossible that it is a ruler’s name,” thinks, however, that “the fact that there is no gap in that part of the list of kings which these archives represent, into which it would fit, speaks against it being a ruler’s name.” However, what is assumed by Prof. Clay to be a fact, can only be regarded as a theory—a theory from which other scholars, the present writer included, beg to differ. No valid reason has as yet been brought forward to show that, e.g., Kuri-Galzu was the immediate successor of Burna-Buriash. On the contrary, there exists a great divergence of opinion with regard to the succession of Kuri-Galzu upon the reign of Burna-Buriash. To illustrate this I quote such prominent scholars as Winckler, Die alte West-Asien, p. 21; Delitzsch, Chronologische Tabellen; Weisbach, Babybl. Miscellen, p. 21; Hilprecht, B. E., XXI, p. 52, note 1. The latter, e.g., in speaking of the succession of Kuri-Galzu upon Burna-Buriash’s reign, expresses himself (i.e.) quite carefully, saying: “Kuri-Galzu, his (i.e., Burna-Buriash’s) son and possibly not his immediate successor.” From this divergence of opinion it will appear that it is by no means a “fact” that there is no gap in that part of the list of kings which these archives represent. For a full discussion of the questions here involved see pp. 599ff. Clay, however, is doubtless correct in denying to GII.RI A.A.B.B.A the title “king,” and likewise in seeing in him no “person” at all. I also accept his proposition to read Gir-ri Tamtu, but I am unable to agree with his interpretation of Giri-Tamnus as a “place name,” as we find it (i.e., p. 58a) mentioned in the list of “Names of Places.” For both his reading and its identification with the name of a “place” he invokes as “conclusive evidence” a passage in B. E., XIV, 132: 2, “where Girru ( = KAS) Tam-ta is written,” comparing this with Girru ( = KAS) Dûr-taški (i.e., B. E., XIV, 161: 7) and with Gir-ni (sic Clay) ir-ru, Mûq-ru (Trans. Dep. of Arch. U. of P., Vol. I, Part 3, p. 223f.). On account of the importance of this new interpretation proposed by Prof. Clay, it is necessary to examine that author’s “places” mentioned under Girru, B. E., XIV, p. 58a, a little more carefully. We begin with B. E., XIV, 134, which reads: 3 qa NI DUUG.GA | a-na KAS ( = gûru or harrûma) Tamm-ni | m $\text{mr}^tu\text{NIN.J.B.UDUG-SRESH}$ (sic copy; ac. $\text{mr}^tu\text{KUR}$-šu | GAR-nu | $\text{mr}^tu\text{SHEG-}$-a-an | shátu $\text{s}^\text{ban}$ | $\text{mr}^tu\text{SAG-}$-šar-geš-šaš-dan); i.e., either “3 qa of good oil for the sea (country) which N. is making,” or, possibly better, “3 qa of good oil which NIN.J.B.-Sîbu-šeš-šu ( = N. is the most important one of his brothers) has put up (GAR-nu = šaknu $\text{s}^\text{ban}$ = persimnacive, cf. in this connection m $\text{mr}^tu\text{H}^\text{d}^\text{a}^\text{r}$-ir = persimnacive, as e.g., B. E., XV, 86: 6) for (a-na) the KAS, i.e., the journey (lit. the way) to the sea.” Then follows date. ACCORDING TO TRANSLATION THE “PLACE” GIRRU-TAMTU RESOLVES ITSELF INTO A “JOURNEY TO THE SEA.” B. E., XIV, 161 reads: 17 qa 1 DUG GÜ.ZI.NI GISH.BAR-SHE.BA | 18 (qa) NI GISH.BAR-5-qa | 37 qa SHE.GISH.NI GISH.BAR-SHE.BA | $\text{mr}^tu\text{DULAZAQ}$ | ánum $\text{mr}^tu\text{s}^\text{ban}$ | shátu $\text{sh}^\text{ban}$ | KAS ( = gûru, harrûma) Dûr-taški | m $\text{mr}^tu\text{NIR.-I.DIL.BAT}$ IN.SAR; i.e., “17 qa (in one vessel, kinašu) Mesnurs, Iše-øer, No. 2048)-oil, GISH.BAR provender, 18 (qa in one vessel) sesame-oil, GISH.BAR-5-qa, 37 qa of sesame, GISH.BAR provender, month Thāter, the 18th, year 23. Journey to Dûr-ılı. Nûr-DIL.BAT has entered” (cf. shê i-na DUS.SHA.RA. . . . akku-ru, B. E., XIV, 168: 34, 43) as having paid out or received). B. E., XIV, 147 (= E. A. II, 182, cf. E. B. II, p. 332) reads: 28 (gur) ZID.DA | $\text{mr}^tu\text{SAG-}$-šar-geš-šaš-dan | $\text{mr}^tu\text{SHEKIN.KUD}$ | ánum $\text{mr}^tu\text{s}^\text{ban}$ | shátu $\text{sh}^\text{ban}$ | gir-ri A.A.B.B.A; i.e., “26 gur of flour Illushanna (sic. has received or put up or given). Adar, the 1st, year 10. Journey
the "Temple Archives," but also with the letters from the Hammurabi and the Amarna periods. Among these may be mentioned:

(a) The use of *álu-ki,* or *a-li-ki,* "city," for simple *álu.*

(b) The use of DISH before *be-hu*—a peculiarity so far met with only in tablets of the Amarna period.

to the sea." There is lastly a text which is of the highest importance in this connection here, but which has not been referred to by Clay; it being quoted by him neither under *Girru* (B. E., XIV, p. 58a) nor under *DISH* (i.e., p. 57b). Its importance consists in the fact that there is to be found between KAS (= *girru*) and BAR.TURI(?) the determinative for "city," *álu,* thus showing conclusively that KAS does not belong to BAR.TURI(?) if it did, such a place would have to be written *álu-KAS.BAR.TURI(?)* and not KAS *álu-BAR.TURI(?)* as we find it here. The text, B. E., XIV, 107, reads: 34 qa ZID.DA | 24 (pp. SHE.BAR | KAS (= girru, hamru) *álu-BAR.TURI(?)* 2 qa SHE.BAR a-na te-nI; | *álu-ki* anú te-ki | *álu-Kas.E.A-ka-Turi-gu* LUGAL.E; i.e., "34 qa of flour, 24 qa of barley (for the) journey to Parak-mári (and) 2 qa of barley for grinding" (ensi = HAR.BAR, HAM = GAZ = keššedu, cf. H. W. B., p. 698, and B. E., XIV, 84: 4 | 91: 4 | XV, 17: 11, KUQAR.GAZ ZID.DA). Then follows date. In the above given texts, then, the KAS Tam-tón, KAS Dúr-Iš, Gir-ri, A.AB.BA, KAS *álu-BAR.TURI(?)* are not "places," but "journeys" to the places named after KAS resp. Gir-ri, and the tablets in which these expressions occur do not represent "payments" (Clay, Table of Contents, B. E., XIV, p. 71ff.), but are what the Germans would call "Ververstanzungen-Bezeichnungen" resp. "Anoteiungen." As such they are exactly similar to, e.g., that published by Thureau-Dangin, R. T. Ch., No. 354, which reads: "X. qa zid-qa hugal | ud 2<sup>q</sup>̅<sup>st</sup> hugal uru | X. qa zid KAS(!)-ša | Gir[u]-ša bug[a] | IV-ki-sha duma mu-ba[d]a | A.AB.BA(!)-ša mu-ša-ša gin(- DU)-νu"; i.e., "so and so many qa of GU-flour, royal quality, for (a) three days (stay) in the city, so and so many qa of flour to Gimi-li, the sukal, and to Bikusha, the son of the mu-banda, for the journey (KAS-sha) to the sea (A.AB.Ba-sha) which they make (lit., 'go') for the purpose (ša) of fishing (mu-ša)." Here is KAS-sha A.AB.BA-sha exactly the a-na KAS Tam-tón of B. E., XIV, 134. A journey to the sea from Nippur demanded on account of its distance and duration some kind of "Vervestanzung." This, likewise, is true of a journey to Dür-ili on the Eblaitic boundary, and if so, then Parak-mári cannot be sought in the immediate neighborhood of Nippur, but must have been some distance away from the latter place. This note, I trust, will have shown the necessity of removing the KAS resp. Girru-Tantim and the Girru-Dúr-ša(?) from the list of "places," and of assigning to Girru-Mišru, i.e., "The Mišru-road" = "road to Mišru" its proper place among the "highways" of Babylonian.

1 Cf. Nos. 24: 22 | 27: 20 | 28: 17 | 34: 39 | 38: 6 | 52: 6, 20 | 96: 14, 27 | 83: 17, 26. See here also álu-ki kér(a) Ash-tab-gem-tug, B. E., XIV, 23: 2; álu-ki, B. E., XIV, 5: 3; álu-ki-Kalbi-éa, B. E., XV, 66: 2. Whether KA A.GUR.DA-álu-ki, B. E., XIV, 29: 2, may be mentioned in this connection, or whether álu be here = ri (cf. the god Zu-za-ru and Zu-ra), B. E., IX, p. 53, note 11, 10), i.e., whether we have to read Pl-núrri, must remain, in view of B. E., XIV, 35: 12; Pi-ja-nu-ri(?)², doubtfiil. For the Amarna period see the passages cited by Besold, Oriental Diplomacy, p. 71; for the Hammurabi period see e.g., C. T., VI, 27b: 17, 24, 34, ólu-ki; C. T., IV (Bu. 83-5-12, 689), pl. 45: 21, ólu-ki UD.KAR.USER(?)², and for the time of Naram-Sin, see Seholl, Textes Élam. Šékii, II, pp. 3, 13.

2 No. 29: 14. This is, however, doubtful, for álu-ki-be may be taken here also as a first pers. præct. (sic!) of še2 and he translated "(as many as) I have taken," see pp. 100, note; 108, note 1.

3 No. 20: 1 | 8, 9, 11, in 1. 1 it is omitted.

4 Besold, l.c., p. XVI, says that DISH is found in the Amarna letters of the L. collection before áššu "tree," *iššu "men," amelu "man," hamru "preface," mérú "son," ramü-ti "myself," and šarru "king," but he omits EN = bitu. In view of our letter, quoted above, we have to see in phrases like Amarna, L. 16: 1, 21 or L. 52: 1, pass., where the sign for EN has the peculiar form of *i-en,* the determinative DISH + EN and read either *EN = bitu* or *EN = bitu.* Knudtzon, Die El-Amarna-Tablet, has, quite correctly, recognized this DISH.
(y) The use of *hal,* also written *āsh-āsh,* to express the plural.

(e) Even *glosses* seem(!) to appear in our letters—an observation showing that we have to do here with an originally non-Babylonian people.

1 No. 33a: 3, 21, *ālu*hal; i.e., 1, 15, *an-nu-zi-tum* (→ plural) *ālu*hal. Clay, *B. E.,* XIV, p. 58e, is inclined to regard this in i.e., 166: 25 (read 24) as a new city, *ālu*HAL or Bārš, but there *ālu*hal is a plural, as a comparison with ll. 4, 8, 13, 16, 19 clearly shows. An *ālu*HAL (Clay, corrections in Z. A., XX (1907), p. 417f.) does likewise not exist in *B. E.,* XV, 132: 1, where we are told what amounts of grain were paid out (sul-nu) in the cities (ʿaluhal) of Ishtar-apal-iddina, who, therefore, must have been a *bīl* pāhibī with several ḫāzamūtu (city prefects) under his command. For other occurrences of *hal = āsh-āsh* see, e.g., *B. E.,* XIV, 18: 2, *ālu*āsh-āsh; *B. E.,* XV, 185 I : 6 | 200 I : 7, ʿANāsh-āsh; *B. E.,* XV, 178: 3 | 200 IV : 9, ʿMUāsh-āsh (Clay’s copy gives in the last quoted passage *xēr* for ʿMU, but this may be a peculiarity of the scribe). These passages quoted from Vols. XIV and XV for the use of *hal* as a plural sign may be compared with King, *Letters,* 39: 5, *Eši-*ālu*hal,* and Bezdorf, i.e., p. 71, under *ālu.*

2 While we have in No. 6 : 7 only *ISH,* and in No. 24 : 9 *ip-ru,* we find in No. 53 : 36, […] + 10 gur *ISH e-pi-ri,* with which cf. *Amarna,* L. 16 : 3, *ISH,* i.e., *e-bi-ri.* In No. 28 : 24, *A mu-ū mu-a’-du ʾu ʾi-na-ru ti-al-lu,* to be compared with *Amarna,* L. 31 : 10, *Amekh,* i.e., *mi-na?*
II.

LETTERS BETWEEN TEMPLE AND STATE OFFICIALS.

The letters published in this volume may be conveniently subdivided into three classes:

(a) Letters of diverse writers addressed a-na be-li-ia, "to my Lord," i.e., letters written by various royal and Temple officials and addressed to the king, Nos. 1-74.

(b) One letter from a king (LUGAL) to Amel-Marduk, or, more specifically, a letter of King Shagarakti-Shuriash to his sheriff-in-chief and attorney of state (GÚ.EN.NA), No. 75, see pp. 132ff.

(c) Letters of several writers to certain persons named in the address; in other words, letters constituting an official correspondence between officers of the Temple and the State, Nos. 76ff.

For the sake of convenience and in order to show the fundamental difference between the letters of Class (a) and those of Class (c), as regards their "address" and "greeting," we begin with the letters between Temple and State officials. Among these letters we find:

1. One addressed by a father to his son. Both hold official positions in storehouses (karā), but neither the name of the father nor that of the son is given.

2. One written by a certain = "A-shur-shum-ētir (KAR) to the governor = "En-lil-[bel(=EN)-nisē-suk]-sku," who flourished at the time of Kadashman-Turgu.

3. Two written during the reign of Burna-Buriash by the celebrated trader in slaves, = "En-lil-ki-di-mī," and addressed

---

1 In all probability No. 93 is a fragment of a royal letter.
2 No. 76. For a translation see below, p. 144.
3 No. 77.
4 The bel piqāṭi; this follows from the greeting in 1. 5, a-na pa-ha-[i]ka] lu-ū shu↓-ma.
5 Thus I propose to read his name, identifying him with the bel piqāṭi mentioned in B. E., XIV, 99a : 16, 41; cf. ibid., II. 17, 20, 42 (dated the 11th year of Kadashman-Turgu). He was a contemporary of the ḫuzina "Ki-di-mu-ši and of "Rama-a-shu-šu[Marduk], the writer of No. 9, see p. 5.
6 For further details see below, pp. 54ff.
4. Eight letters, addressed to certain officials, in which the writer calls himself "brother," Aḫu, of the one to whom he addresses his letters. Among these the following are to be mentioned:

(a) One written sometime between the 12th year of Nazi-Maruttash and the 14th year of Kadashman-Turgu and addressed by En-il-mu-kin-apal (= TUR.USH) to A-mi-[l]-i-a.⁴

(b) Two from Erba-Marduk⁵ and addressed

(1) To the sheriff-in-chief at the time of Kudurri-Enlil, Aḫu-ša-Ba-mi,
(2) To Da-ni-ti-i-a.⁶

¹ No. 78. An Aḫu-ši-ma is mentioned also in B. E., XIV, 25 : 12, 15, 23 (17th year of Kudi-Gala) and in l.c., 167 : 11, 12 (26th or better 26th year, which can refer only to the reign of Burna-Buriash, because Enlil-kidinni is mentioned in all other tablets as living only under that ruler's reign). From this we may infer that King Burna-Buriash reigned in fact at least twenty-five or twenty-six years. See also p. 1, note 3.

² No. 79. This person, although not mentioned in B. E., XIV, XV, has to be identified with Im-gur-um, the writer of Nos. 22, 23. See introduction to No. 23, below, p. 94.

³ This, no doubt, is to be understood cum grano salis and parallel to Burna-Buriash's calling himself "thy brother," when writing to the king of Egypt (cf., e.g., Amarna, L. 2). That we are in many cases forbidden to take the term "brother" literally is shown, e.g., by C. T., XXII, Pl. 3, No. 11, where the writer SHESHE)b-Mu-a-Marduk addresses his letter to his "brothers," SHESHE)b, among whom is to be found another SHESHE)b-Mu-a-Marduk. If "brother" were to be taken in its literal sense here, we would have two brothers of the same name—a thing impossible even among the Babylonians. Aḫu in this connection means probably nothing more than "friend."

⁴ No. 80.

⁵ Cf. B. E., XIV, 55 : 4 (12th year of Nazi-Maruttash); l.c., 56a : 24 (13th year of ditto); l.c., 60 : 2 | 62 : 2 (14th year of ditto); l.c., 65 : 12 (15th year of ditto); l.c., 99a : 20 (11th year of Kadashman-Turgu); l.c., 106 : 2 (14th year of ditto).

⁶ In this form it is found neither in B. E., XIV, nor XV. Is A-mi-la the ma(l)-hi-pu (sic! not ZU.HI.SU, Clay, B. E., XV, p. 266; cf. H. W. B., p. 400a, and Meissner, A. P., p. 115, note 1), l.c., XV, 37 : 15 (13th year of?) to be compared with Amal-ia as "Kosename"; cf. the German "mein Männchen."

⁷ Erba-Marduk, the author of No. 81, hailed either from Larsa or more probably from Sippar, while the writer of No. 82 was, no doubt, a Nippurian, see p. 23. The latter I would identify with the DUB.SAR Erba-Marduk of B. E., XIV, 127 : 14 (dated in the beginning of the reign of Shagarakti-Shuriah) and with the writer of Nos. 13, 14. The former, being a contemporary of Aḫu-ša-Ba-ni, lived during the time of Kadashman-Enlil (see following note) and Kudurri-Enlil. Cf. also Mār-Inšubû, B. E., XIV, 50a : 20 (13th year of Nazi-Maruttash) and Ibu-MU.TUK.A-rēmu (Meissner, Ideogr., No. 3857). 81 : 16, with the person of the same name in B. E., XIV, 116 : 6 (8th year of Kadashman-Enlil) and l.c., 124 : 17 (8th year of Kudurri-Enlil). For possibly still another Erba-Marduk, see introduction to No. 35, p. 121, and cf. p. 107.

⁸ No. 81. A son of Aḫu-ša-Ba-ni, Nūr-Suqamuna by name, is mentioned in B. E., XIV, 119 : 32 (6th year of Kudurri-Enlil). The father, then, probably lived during the time of Kadashman-Enlil and possibly was still alive during Kudurri-Enlil's reign.

⁹ No. 82. Before Damišis there is neither a DISH nor a SAL to be found. As in the texts of this period all nom, propr, have either the "male" or "female" determinative, it is apparent that Damiši-us must be a kind of "Kosename" or possibly one signifying a "profession." Notice in this connection the difference between TUR.SAL =(!)Mā-
(c) One from "Gu-za-ar-AN to the Temple official "In-nu-â-a. 

(d) One from "Pân(= SHI)-ANGAL-lu-mur," an inhabitant of Dâr-âlvî, to a high Temple and State officer of Nippur, "NIN-nu-â-a. This letter, although it had been sent to "UD.KIB.NUNXî, i.e., to Sippar, where "NIN-nu-â-a happened to be at that time, was found by the Expedition of the University of Pennsylvania at Nippur.

(e) One written during the time of Burna-Buriash and addressed by "l-â-îp-ppa-âsh-râ to ["]Da(?)-Î-li-â-shâ."

(f) One from "Sin(= XXX)-êrish(= ENGAR)" a storehouse official,
stationed, as it seems, at different points' at various t,imes, and addressed, no doubt,
to "Ir2m(Meissnerj Ideogr., No. 3857)-shu-"'"NIN.IB,"he chief bursar at Nippur
during the time of Kadashman-Turgu.
(g) One written by the royal official (probably it$) "Il-li-ia4 during the reign
of Nazi-Maruttash and addressed, as it seems, to the chief bursar of Nippur, Martuku."
5. Four"letters addressed to "In-na-an-ni,' the chief bursar of the Nippurian
Temple storehouses during the reign of Kuri-Cc
.a 1zu.
(a) T w o h f these were written by the governor " i'uNIN.IB (or MASH)T UR. USH-SE-nu.'
(b) And two%y a lady of high rank, in all probability aNIN.AN.GALl0 or high
priestess, 'In-bi-Ai-ri" by name.
6. Onelz from rn i'"D(T)ar-hu-ndr( = SAB)-gab-b~,'~
a merchant, to "[Dltn
=[DI]-KUD)-li-[mur]."
In B. E., XIV, 86 : 3 l l c appears as n witness a t s transaction in tho storcllouse of i < h r - ~ i - b a n ~in~ ;l.c.,
98 : 2 tlic eliief bursar of Nippnr, m Z r i ~ n - s l ~ ~ ~ - i i " trnnsnets
~ ~ ~ . ~ . ~ Bbusiness
,
for (ki 986) rn ilz'~ergnbn/idin-ahi."i.,sarl of
' l z i ~ i n ( =XXX)-~rish(~~")
a t ~ < d r - ~ l ~ B a -in
i i l~. c~. , ;106 : 12, he is found among ecrtnin witncss~sa t "uShn~-viash;
iz"Emlil-zu-lu-li and
in 111 : 6 " i i u ~ \ r e ~ g a l - n d d i ~ i i ~ ~ ~son
~ m pof
s h , " ii"~ir~-8risl~(i"h),
~ C C C ~ V Cgrnir~
S
from (ina qiit)
T ~ ~ . , - , S ~ ~ - ' " ' ~ V Z . a~ t~ tllr
. I B stor~liousc(i-nn bit 1~nrO)of Nippnr; aralin our letter he srems to have been eomicctrd with
"umv-[.. . . 1, !,O : 6.
.kllliough tlre rmmr is brokm o r , yet the rircumstnnees ot the tirrie and the contents of the letter justifysueli
an cmcnrlntion. For this official see also Clay, B. E., S I V , p. 8.
WO.02.
'&. pcrsorl will, this name occurs B. E., XIV, 48n : 7 (6th year of Nazi-Mnruttnsl~). That lie m.os n royal official

I conelud~from W2 : 24f., ha-mu-,~t-ta sh6-up-ra-am-na o-nn LUGAL ?ti(!)-tn-pu-zish iL niknsi(= NI(G).SHIT)-ni
il-ti a-bn-mi-ish i ?~i-pw-ush-ma,m ~ dtlmt llis position must lmre been n high rlnr, such as was that of a n itli, follo!vs
lrom 02 : 9, li SHE.ljAR ma-[ . . . . .cf. 1. 22!] bPl& ( =
pi-ba-[ti, ef. I. 20; . . .]ul i-ncn-gu-ru . . . .
The name is broken off. The oontcnts of tlteletter and the timc wl~eni t lvas written justify this emendation.
Nus. 83-86.

.

XOS.85, 86.
Nos. 83, 84.
Or possibly a NIN.AN.TUR. For both of tllese expressions see pp. 4, note 8 ; 115.
" This "fruit of Ijjnr" is not mentioned in JI. E., XIV, XV. Brrausc slir was writing to Innamri, she must liave
flourish~dduring the time of Kuri-Gnlou. For furthcr details see "Tntnsl;~tions," pp. 115f.
NO. 91.
' T l r r first sign in this name is the last vzriant given in the "Sign List" of B. E., XIV, No. 28; ef. B. R., XV,
I51 : 2, "L~L-dm(!)-bc-ii. Fur the identity of Tar-& Tor-ku, Tur-gu, see Hilpreclrt, Assyriaca, p. 110. l'a7-bu. being
called here "llie light of ererytliing ( = the whole = the world)", is as sucll identified, nu1 only with Shunzash (cf., c.g.,
Rznke, R . E., Series D, 111, p. 117a, Shamash-nu-*,r-ma-&), but slso with Sin (Ranke, l.c., p. 163q Sin-ndr-mdli;
see slso Clay, B. Ji., XIV, 10 : 23). ik~iiiin( = XXX) is according to I1 R. 48 : 33 = T'UR.I<U (gloss du-mu-gu),
herlee D(T)ar-btr = Sin = Tur-k(g)u. 4 s regards Llir linguistic diffiedties ef., for the ehangc of a and u in proximity
of a n r, IIilprccht, B. E., XX', p. 17, note 4, and for thc eliangs of k arid b, el. kammu nrld hammu, Jensen, K. B., VI',
pp. 386, 568. After -ba there i s hoke11 away x -ma.
"'s
the DZ and mur are missing, we possibly might read [mZ-na]-pil(=KUD)-li-[. . .I. With "[D]2n-li-[mu~],
i.e., "may he see judgment," cf. 27 : 18 Wi-in-ili(=AN)-lu-mur, "may I see the judgmcnt of god." Neither Tarbu'O

.

nzlr-yabba nor Din-limur is mentioned in 13. E., XIV, XV.


FROM THE TEMPLE ARCHIVES OF NIPPUt.

7. To this class have been added, after the plates and the MS. had been prepared for the press, several fragments, of some of which it may be doubtful whether they belong here or to the letters addressed "to my Lord."

As only one letter from this period has been published so far, it would seem advisable to treat of this class of literature in its general aspects more fully here.

Each and every letter consisted originally—as it does at our present time—of two integral parts: the ENVELOPE and the LETTER proper. None of the ENVELOPES of this class of letters has been preserved to us—an unmistakable sign that all these communications had been received and read by the addressee. From the analogy of other letters known to us and partly preserved in the collections of the University of Pennsylvania, we may, however, conclude that the envelope originally exhibited (a) an address, reading either (a) a-na = Y., i.e., "To Y." (here giving the name of the addressee)3 or (b) dup-pi X. a-na = Y., i.e., "Letter of X. (= writer) to Y." (= addressee),4 and (b) the seal impression of the writer. In no case, however, was a date or the place of the writer or addressee ever put on the envelope—an omission which seriously hampers us in determining the time when or the place where or to which each letter was written.

The fact that all of these letters have been found at Nippur does not yet justify us in maintaining that they have been originally addressed to that place; for it can be shown that at least one of them, though found in Nippur, was yet sent to Sippar, whence it was brought back to the city of Enlil and deposited there with the rest of the Temple Archives. The purpose of the envelope, then, was to insure (1) privacy, (2) safe delivery to the person named, (3) authenticity.

The contents of the LETTER PROPER divide themselves easily into three parts:

---

1 Nos. 93ff.
2 This is to be found in F. E. Peiser, Urkunden aus der Zeit der dritten babylonischen Dynastie in Umschrift, Umschrift und Ubersetzung, Berlin, 1905, under P. 114. Its introduction reads: A-na =A-mur-ri-ia ki-bi-ia = iinSin(- XXX)-MI-[SE]a SHESH-ka-ma = iisSin (- XXX) a-ob ANmesh kul-lat | nes-ka-ka li-iz-zu-ru, which cannot be rendered with Peiser by "Sin der Vater der Götter möge all deine Seden bewahren," but must be translated by: "Sin and(!) the father of gods may protect all thy souls"; this follows clearly from li-iz-zu-ru = plural! Although this letter is very fragmentary, yet this much can be made out with certainty: The boundary stone of a certain piece of property could not be found, and hence its boundaries could not be determined exactly. A certain = iisSin(- XXX)-tal-mi-apur knew the position of that stone; he, therefore, was asked: al-ka-ma mi-ir-iti kul-li-im â ku-du-[ir-ro . . .], i.e., "come, show the boundaries and the boundary stone." The rest of the letter is too fragmentary to warrant any translation.
3 Cf. the celebrated Lushtamar tablet with the address a-na =Lu-uzh-la-mar or the letter from the Sargonic period which is written a-na Lugal-usumgal.
4 Cf. per analogy the address of No. 24, dup-pi =Kal-[bu] a-na be-â-shi.
5 No traces of a seal impression are still discernible on No. 24. On the Lushtamar and the Sargonic tablets the seal is quite distinct and clear.
(a) address, (b) greeting, which is coupled in some instances with an invocation to the "gods" to bless and protect the addressee, (c) subject matter. With the exception of No. 76, where the subject matter of the communication is introduced quite abruptly by "thus (saith) thy father" (um-ma a-bi-ka), the address of these letters is clad, in sharp contrast to those published under Nos. 1-74, into one of the following two formulas:

Into (a) a-na² "Y. ki-bé-ma' um-ma "X.-ma," i.e., "to Y. speak, thus saith X." or

Into (b) a-na³ "Y. ki-bé-ma' um-ma "X. ahu'-ka-ma," i.e., "to Y. speak, thus saith X., thy brother."

In none of these letters, then, does the writer ever call himself "thy servant," nor does he ever express the humble petition, "before the presence of my Lord may I come!"—an observation which is, as we shall see, of the highest importance for the correct understanding of the nature of the letters here and those of Nos. 1-74.

The greeting, whenever it occurs in one of these letters, invariably takes its place after the emphatic -ma terminating the address. Its simplest form is a-na kás-sa² lā" šulmau," i.e., "unto thee greeting." If the addressee happens to occupy an especially high position in life, the writer may extend his greeting, as is done in No. 77, even to "the house" and the "domain" of his correspondent: a-na ka-a-shá

¹ This peculiar introduction of what the father had to say to his son is, no doubt, due not so much to the parental or any other relation as to the mental strain under which the father labored at the time when writing the letter. The son was negligent in making his report (di-e-ma) to the "barley overseer" (be-èl SH.E.B.A.R), who in turn caused the "father" to delay his report to the "Lord" or King. For a translation of this tablet see below, p. 144.

² Nos. 77, 78, 79, 83, 84, 85, 86, 91.

³ Also written ki-bé-ma, so in Nos. 77, 81, 82, 88, 91.

⁴ This emphatic -ma is invariably found at the end of the address, and as such a -ma lengthens the preceding syllable, the name of the writer of No. 85 cannot be 'IIn-bi-Aš-rī-am, but must be 'IIn-bi-Aš-rī.

⁵ This is also the stereotyped formula used by Hammurabi when writing to his subjects, such as, e.g., Sin-idinnam. For a justification of the above given translation of this formula see King, Letters of Hammurabi, Vol. III, p. XXV, note 1; Delitsch, B. A., Vol. IV, p. 435 below; Nagel, B. A., Vol. IV, pp. 477 ff.; Knudtzon's translation (Die El-Amarna-Tablet, pass.), "hat gesprochen," is out of place.

⁶ Nos. 80, 81, 82, 87, 88, 89, 90, 92.

⁷ In case the writer wishes to express his particular devotion to his correspondent he may add after a-na "Y. some such words as šul a-ra-mu-šu, "whom I love," cf. No. 89.

⁸ Written either SHER-ka-nu, Nos. 80, 81, 87, 88, 89, 90, 92, or a-šu-ka-nu, No. 82.

⁹ As ašu-ka is here the attribute to "X., hence an inseparable part of the latter, the emphatic -ma naturally takes its place after the attribute.

¹⁰ For the signification of this term see already above, p. 14, note 3.

¹¹ I.e., after "X.-ma or after ahu-ka-ma.

¹² Written either ka-ša₃, Nos. 82, 87, 88, 89 [80, 92], or ka-a-shá, Nos. 77, 81.

¹³ Written ū in Nos. 89, 89, or ke-ši in Nos. 77, 81, 82, 87.

¹⁴ Šul-mu in Nos. 77, 81, 82, 89 [90], or ša-a-šu in Nos. 87, 88, 92. Di-ma has not yet been found.
bi[i-ka] ù a-na pa-ba-[i-ka] lu-á shul-mu, i.e., “to thee, thy house, and to thy pahat 
greeting.” In many cases there is coupled with this greeting an invocation to 
the gods of the writer’s city in the form of a prayer for the well-being and protection of the 
addressee. These invocations are of the highest importance, both for determining 
the exact domicile of the writer and for a correct understanding of the 
religion of the Babylonians. To illustrate this by one example I may be permitted 
to quote the “invocation” of No. 89 in extenso, gathering from it the facts that (1) 
Pân-AN.GAL-lu-mur (i.e., “May I see the face of AN.GAL”), the writer, was a 
resident of Dâr-iluâki, whose gods he invokes, and that (2) the “divine court” of 
Dâr-iluâki was formed after the pattern of the Nippurian court, as such consisting 
of Father (AN.GAL), Son (TAR), and Mother (NIN.LIL)—three persons, though 
distinct, yet one: a veritable Trinity in a Unity. It reads (89 : 4f.):

4 AN.GAL ù ù NIN.LIL ù TAR ù AN.GAL and NIN.LIL, TAR and GU, 
ù GU

1 See also 89 : 24, 26.
2 Cf. The Monias, XVII (January, 1907), p. 148, and Old Penn, V, No. 21 (February 16, 1907), p. 3, col. III. 
3 That the divinity AN.GAL cannot be here = ù Ašî (II R. 57, 13a), the wife of ù SHAG.GU (= Enlil, Sin, 
Ramman, Shamash, Marduk), a female, but must be a male, is apparent from his being coupled with ù NIN.LIL. 
AN.GAL ù ù NIN.LIL are male and female, husband and wife. A male AN.GAL as god of Dâr-iluâki occurs also in 
Jensen, K. B., VI, p. 64, 21 (id. i.e., p. 62, 20, where the verb i-pu-la = masc. (not in-pu-la) refers back to AN.GAL). 
Among the tablets of the Ur dynasty, now being copied and published by Dr. Myhrman, I saw a variant of date No. 12 
(E. B. H., p. 255), reading mu AN.GAL [Dâr-râb-iluâki] e-a ba-tur, instead of, as it is commonly found, mu ù Kâ-di Dâr-
râb-iluâki e-a ba-tur, i.e., “in the year when AN.GAL was brought into his temple in Dâr-râb-iluâki,” see also Thureau-
Dangin, S. A. K. I., p. 229, 7. This proves that AN.GAL = ù Kâ-di, and if AN.GAL be a male, then ù Kâ-di must 
be a male likewise. Again, in an inscription translated in E. B. H., p. 255, note 12 (see Thureau-Dangin, i.e., p. 176, 2 
AN-me-tal, the shahbanakkû of Dâr-iluâki, calls himself the mi-gir ù Kâ-di na-ra-am ù Innana, i.e., “the favored 
one of Kadi, the beloved of Ishtar.” Here Kadi is coupled with and in opposition to Ishtar, hence must be a male 
and the husband of Ishtar (= NIN.LIL). Lastly, in II R. 57, 54a ù Kâ-di is identified with ù NIN.GIR-na and with 
ù NIN.LIB, both being male divinities and gods of thunder and lightning; hence Thureau-Dangin (i.e., p. 176, 2, and 
pasim), Huber (Die Personennamen in den Kellerschriften aus der Zeit der Könige von Ur und Isin, A. B. XXI, 
p. 174, note 14, who thinks that Kadi “war die Hauptgöttin von Dâr-ilu, die Gemahlin des ù G.I.AL”) and others, who see 
ù Kâ-di a female, are wrong. The pronunciation of the name of this god is neither Kâ-di nor Kâ-sîtûn (Huber, 
i.e.,) but ù [ù] Kâ-dî ([ù] Kâ-dî = ù G.I.A.L = ù NIN.LIB = ù NIN.LIB; as such he is the same as ù GU.NU-ra (= Gu-sir-ra). For the reasons of 
this identification see my forthcoming volume on the Religious Texts of Nippur. ù NIN.LIB, here coupled with 
AN.GAL, hence his wife, is, of course, the same who otherwise is known as “the wife of Enlil,” and who, as 
wife of Enlil, is “the mistress of Ea-ilûki,” i.e., ù NIN.EN.LI.LI. In R. 59 : 9. But in the passage just 
quoted she appears not as the wife of Enlil, but as that of ù NIN.LIB or ù MASH. We have seen above that AN.GAL 
or ù Kâ-di was identified with ù NIN.LIB. From this it follows that Kadi originally played the rôle of the “Son” 
(just as Enlil did in the Trinity: AN.EN.LI.LI-AN), but was, when he became the chief god of Dâr-ilu, identified also 
with the Father, i.e., with Enlil, whose wife now becomes also his (i.e., Kadi’s) wife. In the rôle of the “Son” we find Kadi 
also in such proper names as ù Kâ-di-da-bî bi (bi, ba; B. E., XIV, 14 : 4; XV, 39 : 18, etc.), i.e., “Kadi is speaking,” 
(or, through, or by means of, the thunder, ù Kâ-dî-da-bî Ea-ilûki (B. E., XV, 119 : 10). Omitted by Clay. Thus 
I read on account of the ù in bi), which name might be translated either by “Kadi is the good (= fâbi, sc. child) of Nippur”
(i.e., Enlil; cf. Marduk apil Eridu, where Eridu, the city of god Ea, stand for the god himself), or by “Kadi is the dalili (SHACH = hamurra = ‘pig,’ the emblem of NIN.JB, see The Monist, XVII (January, 1907), p. 145) of Nippur (— Enlil).” Again, if NIN.LIL, “the mistress or queen of Nippur,” becomes the wife of AN.GAL, the highest god of Dūr-iliu, she too facto acquires also the title “mistress or queen of Dūr-iliu.” This now helps us to understand the passage in Meissner, Bauinscbriften Assurzudru’s, B. A., III, p. 238, 421 (= i.e., p. 297, 42 (K. 2001), together with its parallel text and variants in i.e., p. 307, 34. (K. 221 + 2699), which has been completely misunderstood by all who took AN.GAL resp. Kadi to be a female. The passage reads: AN.GAL sharrat Dūr-iliuki iinSir iimBe-li-talātim (= TI.LA) iimDūr (= KU)-ru-ni-tum iimSAG ahiBu-bi-ia ki-ti6 bli6 a-na Dūr-iliuki 6i-shu-ru û-tir. It will be seen that in this passage the gods of Dūr-iliu are not connected by “and,” but are simply enumerated in their succession. From what was said above it follows that we have here “three pairs” consisting of husband and wife: have, therefore, to translate: “AN.GAL (and) the queen (= NIN.LIL = būtīt = shararat) of Dūr-iliu [variant: iimGASHIAN (= Būtīt, mistress of) Di-ri ( = Dūr-iliu), Siri (and) the Būtil-balutīt (= ‘mistress of life’); [variant: iimEN.TIL.A = ‘lord of life’)]. Dūr-ru-ni-tum (= sum of iimKU(du-rum)NA, III R. 68, 9a) (and) SAU in the month Bu-bi-e into the temple in Dūr-iliu, their city, I brought.”

According to the Nippurian pattern we can now establish the following Trinity for Dūr-iliu:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AN.GAL (Father)</th>
<th>Šir (Son)</th>
<th>Bēiltalātim (wife of the Son)</th>
<th>Šarrat Dūr-iliu (Mother)</th>
<th>Bēilti Di-ri</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

which corresponds exactly to that of Nippur, viz.:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EN.LIL (Father)</th>
<th>NIN.JB (Son)</th>
<th>NIN.JB (masculine)</th>
<th>NIN.EN.LILki</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Būtīt (Gula) (wife of the Son)</td>
<td>NIN.JB</td>
<td>NIN.DIN.DUGGA</td>
<td>NIN.EN.LILki</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the Nippurian pattern NIN.JB appears as the an-sag, “chief servant,” or nakkal, “prime minister, ambasador,” or apil, “son” of Enlil, and Šir is called in the Dūr-iliu Trinity the me-ru, “son” (or if read ship-ru, then = “messenger”) of (shā) iimKa-di, see Schäfl, Textes Élam. Sém., I, p. 91, 23 (= Plate 17). NIN.JB is the apil Ē-shsar-raa, and in V R. 52, I: 19, 20 iimŠir is identified with iimShei-ra-ah and termed the ra-bi-ia Ē-shsar-raa, “the watchman of Esharra,” i.e., of the house of the totality, the Universe. NIN.JB as iimL or as iimEn-kur-kur is the same as his father Enlil, and in V R. 31, 2, Rev. 30, iimŠir is identified with his father iimKa-di. NIN.JB is both male and female. As male he is the husband and called also iimL, and as female he is the wife, then known also as Būtīt, Gula, or NIN.DIN.DUGGA = muballitātim, “who restores the dead to life” (see also The Monist, XVII (January, 1907), p. 141f). The wife of Šir appears here likewise both as a female (Būtil-balutīt, “mistress of life”) and as a male (Būtil-balutīt, “lord of life”); hence she is paralleled exactly by NIN.DIN.DUGGA = Būtīt (wife of NIN.JB). From this we may infer (1) that Šir played the same role in Dūr-iliu as did NIN.JB in Nippur; (2) that Kadi must have been the “god of Esharra” according to the people of Dūr-iliu, just as Enlil was the “god of Esharra” according to the Nippurians, i.e., Kadi = Enlil, and the wife of Kadi = NIN.LIL (cf. here also the name AN.GAL = Kadi with AN.GAL.KALAM.MA, the name of Enlil of Nippur, B. E., XIV, 148 : 15, 18 | XV, 31 : 2); (3) that the “Son” in each and every case is the same as the “Father,” NIN.JB = Enlil; Šir = Kadi; (4) that the “wife of the Son” is = the “Son” (hence male and female); they are “one flesh.” Again, the “wife of the Son” is also identified with the latter’s “Mother”: iimNIN.EN.LILki = Ba-ū = NIN.DIN.DUGGA is also = iimNIN.LIL, the Būtīt son iimkū, who otherwise was known also as Ishkar. But Ishkar is, as is well known, male and female and appears in the inscription of AN-mutabil as also the wife of Ka-di, while in our letter the wife of AN.GAL (= Kadi) is called iimNIN.LIL; hence Ishkar is = iimNIN.LIL and both are male and female. (Cf. here also the iimGdū-rā = AN = Antum = NIN.LIL, the wife of iimĒ-kur = AN = AN = Enlil, hence Enlil = AN and NIN.LIL = AN: both are one—male and female; see Bel, the Christ of Ancient Times, p. 17). Now if the wife of Kadi = AN.GAL be male and female, then the same observation applies, mutatis mutandis, also to Kadi, i.e., Kadi, the husband of NIN.LIL = Ishkar must be also a female; as such she appears as II R. 57, 18a and in Sp. I, 331 (= Z. A., VI, p. 241) compared with Reinsen, Hymsm, p. 146, 44. The net result of this
last observation is this: (1) the wife of the Son is not only one with the Son, but is also the same as the "Mother"; (2) the Mother being identified with the Father, the Father is thus proven to be one with the Mother (or third person) and one with the Son (second person); in other words the divine court of one, and every city, though consisting of these persons, clearly distinct: the begotter (Father), the receiver (Mother), the bogotten (Son), are yet one: clearly and unmistakably a veritable Trinity in a Unity.

But how are we to account for the Dur-ru-ni-tum and the SAG on the one side, and the TAR and the GU on the other hand?

If the Dur-ru-ni-tum be not only a form of the Dur(r)nuna, but also the wife of the SAG, as was claimed above, it would follow that the SAG is the same as the Dur(r)nuna, the wife, of Durriumum. From III R. 68, 9a we learn that the Dur(r)nuna was the first (SAG) of the seven [gud]-beater (or is it a [gud]-beater to be read here — robiri)? AN.NA, i.e., "tambourines" (= tambourine-beaters, heralds, creatures who proclaim "the glory of God") of AN.NA. In Pincches, J. R. A. S., January, 1965, p. 145f. (— 81—30, 29), Obv. ed. II, 7, 5, the SAG is called SAG.GAR, i.e., "Hauptmacher" = captain, chief (= the first (SAG), cf. Dur(r)nuna, the first of the "seven") and is identified with MIR, which latter is according to i.e., II. 16, 29, not only MIM, "the god of lightning," but also SAG.GU = GU (Pincches, i.e., l. 4). Our letter GU is coupled with the TAR, who is to be read according to III R. 68, No. 2, 53, kิต-am-me, and is called there the "LUGH or sakhkali IA.Ka-di-ge, i.e., "the (chief) messenger of Ka-di." Taking all these passages together we might derive the following results:

1. God TAR, the messenger of Kadi, being coupled with GU, must be the latter's husband—in other words, GU is here a female.

2. GU, although a female, appears also as a male, being identified not only with MIR but also with IM—both male gods, and gods of thunder and lightning—nay, even with SAG.

3. SAG being coupled with the female Dur(r)nuna, and being identified with MIR, IM and GU, must be a male and the counterpart of Dur(r)nuna, i.e., he is the same as Dur(r)nuna.

4. GU, the wife of TAR, is the same as SAG, the husband of Durriumum—i.e., husband and wife are one, hence also male and female. (Cf. for TAR + GU also AN + KI = sham + irtipu = AN + AN = AN, Bel, the Christ, etc., p. 20f. Is the TAR-gu an artificial (foreign, Cassite? or Elamitic?) name, consisting originally of the TAR and GU, or both husband and wife = one: the TAR-gu?)

5. The SAG, because called "Hauptmacher" and identified both with the "god of storm and lightning," and with the Dur(r)nuna, the first of the seven gods of AN.NA, must have been the "Hauptmacher" or chief, the first of the "seven," which can only be the "sevenfold manifestations" of the powers of nature, i.e., of the lightning and storm. The "seven" correspond on the one hand to the "seven sons" of Bau (Creation Story, pp. 45 and 23, note 6), and on the other hand to the "seven gifts of the Holy Ghost" or the "seven archangels," or the "seven virgins," the emblem of the church, the sphere of the Holy Ghost, the "bride of the Lamb," "the seven (?) of Christ." These "seven" were in the Babylonian religion always identified not only with the "Son" whose "servants" (nu-bandda - ektu = haddnu) they were, but also with the Mother, resp. (the wife of the Son)—hence Laharin. (Márrnan, Z. A., XVI, 273, Weisbach, Babyl. Miscellen, p. 42) and Peters had "seven names" (Reinsm, Hymnen, p. 109, 57e), hence also the remarkable name of the SAG (NIN.LI) NIN.GAL in V R. 30, 46a, where she is called SIS-IV-li, i.e., "the goddess Seven." (Cf. also the seven names of the NIN.LI, III R. 68, 5c, all = III R. 67, 20a, the fourth of which is the Sa.kur-ra, who is identified in Thureau-Dangin, R. T. Ch., 10 : 3, with IM-gig-gu, a cognomen of the Nin.Gir-ru = Nin.NIN.GAL, the god of thunder and lightning. See further the "seven sons" of the Nin.KASLI or Nin.KASLI.BIQ (the wife of the Nin.KAL), in III R. 68, No. 1, 20c, all = the "seven sons" of the Nin.KASLI.BIQ (the wife of Nin.KAL) in III R. 67, No. 1, 25c, all = the "seven sons" of the Nin.KASLI.BIQ (the wife of Nin.KAL) in III R. 67, No. 3, 64a, etc., etc.). This name shows clearly that the "seven" were considered to be one (note also that in the religious texts very often the singular is used in connection with the VHI-li)—just as the "sevenfold gift" of the Holy Ghost is the Holy Ghost in her (true) feminine completeness, or as the "seven virgins" are the Church, the "bride of the Lamb." These "seven," when pictorially represented on seal-cylinders, etc., appear as seven weapons—six of them are to be found generally on the back of the god or goddess and one (the twin-rod = Shd-ar and Shd-ar, etc.) in his or her hand, as seven curls, braids (Gøxmeghi Samson: in the hair lies the strength?), or as seven rays or beams of light, etc., etc. And as these seven represent the fulness of the power of the divinity, the number seven became in course of time the "number of the fulness of the
LETTERS TO CASSITE KINGS

5 ANu^a-shib E-DIM.GAL-KALAM.MA
6 nap-shâ-ti-ka li-is-su-ru
7 ki-bi-is-ka li-shal-li-mu
8 libbi^a-ri-ka
9 is-sî-la-an-na
10 man-nu pa-ni-ka ba-nu-ti li-mu^a

11 it da-ba-ab [HI (= tâb)^b]
12 ki(?)-na NIN(?)-[ . . . ]

The gods that inhabit E-DIM.GAL-KALAM.MA, may protect thy life (lit. souls), keep thy steps! (How) my heart has urged me to see thee! Whosoever may be permitted to see thy gracious face and who is of “good words,”

godhead,” it became the divine and sacred number par excellence. Cf. the sevenfold candlestick, the emblem of the fulness of the divinity in the Old Testament. See here my article “The Latest Biblical Archaeology” in the Hymnistic Review, February, 1908 (written March, 1907), pp. 100ff. To make the certain doubly certain I may mention in this connection that there appears in III R. 68, 11a, as the third of the seven tambourines (heaters, heralds, angels) a certain iluGal-An-na, to be read in Assyrian ilâ-Amêl-ili, who is in Hebrew none other than the well-known Gabriel, “the man of El or ilu”—one of the seven archangels, the heralds and proclaimers of the glory of God when he appears under thunder and lightning and through whom he reveals himself! For a full discussion of all questions raised here see my forthcoming volume on the Religious Tests of the Temple Library of Nippur. In conclusion I shall give here the two parallel Trinitates of Dûr-îlu as gathered from our letter and from the building Inscriptions of Assarhaddon:

ANu-ANGAL (Father) ^
iinaTAR (Son) ^
iinaGU (wife of Son) = ^
iinaNIN.LIL (Mother) ^
iinaSîr ^
iinaBîlî - ^
iinaBîlî pari ^
iinaShar-rat Dûr-îlu^5 ^
iinaBîlî-Dîri ^
iinaSHAG (husband) ^
iinaDunnûnîtum (wife) ^
iinaGU ^
iinaMIR ^
iinaDUU (yruna)

The first of the seven manifestations of the powers of nature (- Son). ^

^1 If the Trinity of Dûr-îlu be formed after the pattern of the Nippurian, it follows that the temple of this city must bear the same or similar names as that of Nippur. E-DIM.GAL-KALAM.MA means “The temple (ê) which is the great (gal) firmament (lit. ‘band,’ DIM = rîksu) of the world (cf. here the ‘Babylonian world’ as microcosmos formed after the macrocosmos).” Among the names of Enlil’s temple at Nippur we find, e.g., Dur-an-kî, i.e., “the firmament (dur = rîksu) of heaven and earth (i.e., the world, the macrocosmos);” see also Bil, the Christ, etc., p. 21 and notes.


^3 That is, “all who are in thy immediate entourage, who have the privilege of appearing before thee, who are thy friends and equals.” Cf. the New Testament phrase, “to see the face of Christ” = “to be like Christ,” the highest honor conferred upon Christians.

^4 Those “of good words” (lit. “speaking”) are the friends outside the immediate environs of a person. All persons, near and far, who are not slanderers may listen.

^5 Supplemented according to 38 : 7f., ma-an-na pu-an ba-nu-tum šâ be-î-ia li-mu [s] man-nu da-ba-ba H1-ab (= tâb [a-na] be-î-ia li-ûle-mi um-ma-a a-na be-î-ia-ua.

^6 According to the quotation in the preceding note, we would expect here a-na abî-îa or better a-na mNIN-nu-î-a. The traces on the tablet are, however, as reproduced. The sign NIN(?)- looks rather like a SAL + ma = minma; besides, if NIN(?)- were the beginning of NIN-nu-î-a, we miss a DISH before the nom. propr.
FROM THE TEMPLE ARCHIVES OF NIPPU.

Marduk. Yet the fact that the writer of No. 81 invokes "Shamash and Marduk," while he of No. 82 implores "the significant lord," speaks, no doubt, in favor of a separation of both writers. I believe, therefore, that the author of No. 81 was an inhabitant of either Larsa or Sippar, and that the writer of No. 82 hailed from Nippur, being at the time when this letter was written away from his seat of residence. To deduce from the invocation in each and every case the exact domicile of the writer is, of course, not possible, because we do not know as yet all Babylonian cities with their chief gods. Thus it would, e.g., be useless trying to determine the habitat of the writer of No. 87, who invokes for the protection of the life of his brother "the gods that inhabit the great heavens." An argument ex silentio is rather precarious, yet the complete absence of any form of greeting or blessing or endearing term as "brother" in all letters addressed to "In-na-an-ni," the severe and sometimes disagreeable chief bursar of the Temple storehouses at Nippur, is significant.

The subject matter of a letter, following, as it does, immediately upon the address, or, if the address be coupled with a greeting resp. an invocation, upon the latter, is

1. lbish-te-[me] may listen!
2. um-+a-[a a-na ahi-ia-ma] The following to my brother:

Again, Nos. 81, 82 seemingly appear to have come from the same writer, Erba-Marduk. Yet the fact that the writer of No. 81 invokes "Shamash and Marduk," while he of No. 82 implores "the significant lord," speaks, no doubt, in favor of a separation of both writers. I believe, therefore, that the author of No. 81 was an inhabitant of either Larsa or Sippar, and that the writer of No. 82 hailed from Nippur, being at the time when this letter was written away from his seat of residence. To deduce from the invocation in each and every case the exact domicile of the writer is, of course, not possible, because we do not know as yet all Babylonian cities with their chief gods. Thus it would, e.g., be useless trying to determine the habitat of the writer of No. 87, who invokes for the protection of the life of his brother "the gods that inhabit the great heavens." An argument ex silentio is rather precarious, yet the complete absence of any form of greeting or blessing or endearing term as "brother" in all letters addressed to "In-na-an-ni," the severe and sometimes disagreeable chief bursar of the Temple storehouses at Nippur, is significant.

The subject matter of a letter, following, as it does, immediately upon the address, or, if the address be coupled with a greeting resp. an invocation, upon the latter, is

2. No. 82: 6, be-ia kab-tum (nap-sha-tier) li-ka li-is-per. Kolhu, when used figuratively, has the signification "heavy" (sic. in quality, not quantity); gewichtig, bedeutungswert, significant, weighty, important, foremost, first (= astaratlu), and when attributed to a god makes that god play the rôle of the "Son"; i.e., an ilu kolhu is in every case the god of "lightning, thunder, and storm." This title is attributed, among others, to Nabû (the preacher, or herald of the Father, IV R. 14, No. 3: 13, 14), NIN.IB (of the nom. prop. NIN.IB-kabtu (=: DUGUD)-ahe(-t)-shu, B. E., XIV, 134: 3. Only by reading ahe (even if written without me or mesh) instead of ahi (Clay) does this name give any sense: "NIN.IB is the weighty one among his brothers"), En-lil (IV R. 24, No. 2, 11, 12, 23, 24. Enlil is here not the "god of heaven and earth," but the "lord of the LIL or storm"—one of the few passages which betray the fact that Enlil originally played the rôle of the "Son," and this he did in the Trinity: AN (Father), Enlil (Son), AN = 111NIN.IIL (Mother).
3. Seeing that Larsa (UD.UNUG6) is mentioned neither in these letters nor in B. E., XIV, XV, while Sippar (UD.KIB.NUN6) occurs quite frequently (see, e.g., No. 89: 24, 26, and the Kri-UD.KIB.NUN6, B. E., XV, 109: 1), I prefer to regard Sippar as the home of the writer of No. 81.
4. Where NIN.IB was worshiped as the "Son," the be-ia kab-tum.
5. No. 87: 5, ANmesh shi a-ni-bu ina shi-me(e) robats. Thus I propose to read, and by doing so I take the sign looking like rot to stand for sha-me(e). Cf. here an analogous passage in B. E., X, 96: 5, where Clay, i.e., p. 68a, finds a city Kab-ni(i)Um-li-ri-im-me-shi, but where me-shi has to be separated from the name of the city and has to be read sha ina (= me) pini (= shi); see The Monist, XVII (January, 1907), p. 154.
7. This applies also to Ašunshina (78: 1), as the expression li-lu-um at-ta shows. The slave-dealer Enlil-kidinni was dissatisfied with the actions of Ašunshina.
8. In 39: 2 the introductory um-na-a a-na be-ia-ta-ma stands, quite strangely, before the greeting.
invariably introduced directly, either without or with the help of um-ma-a; or um-ma-a a-na ʾY.-ma. As most of the letters published in this volume do not deal with one subject only, but discuss, on the contrary, very often as many as ten different affairs, it is of the highest importance to be acquainted with certain particles and phrases that are employed to introduce either (a) a completely new subject matter, not referred to in a previous communication, or (b) the answer to a former inquiry or note.

Among the particles or phrases used by the writer in order to introduce his answer (um-ma-a)1 to a former note or inquiry may be found the following:

1. ʾash-shum; 2. šā; 3. i-na bu-ut; 4. šā ta-ash-pu-ra; 5. šā x.x. šā


2 Nos. 81: 5 | 83: 3. This introductory um-ma-a is not to be found in Nos. 1-74; cf. the following note.

3 Nos. 80: 4 | 82: 8 | 87: 7 | 92: 4. To the um-ma-a a-na ʾY.-ma corresponds in Nos. 1-74 an um-ma-a a-na bēušu-i-a-ma, which is most generally found in connection with the address: arāli-ka ʾX., a-na di-na-an bēušu-ul-li, where it follows either (a) immediately upon ul-li, so in Nos. 1: 3 | 4: 4 | 21: 3 | 29: 3 | 36: 2 | 40: 2 | 41: 2 | 45: 3, or (b) upon the "greeting," as in Nos. 9: 5 | 11: 3 | 26: 3 | 27: 3 | 34: 5—but in 39: 2 it stands before the greeting! (c) upon the "invocation," so in No. 38: 11. In connection with the address: a-na bēušu-ul-li the um-ma-a, or "replying to your recent letter," is not referred to in a previous communication; or (c) is not to be found in three passages only, viz., in Nos. 13: 4 | 14: 4 | 17: 6. In No. 26: 3 we have wrongly bēušu-ul-li for bēušu-i-a-ma.

4 Sometimes also um-ma, instead of um-ma-a, is found. Note here that the um-ma-a resp. um-ma, in connection with these particles or phrases, may (1) introduce the answer to an inquiry (= "I beg to state that"), (2) introduce a quotation from a previous communication (= "saying"), (3) may be left out altogether. For examples, see under the following notes, p. 26, and cf. below sub 11, pp. 26 and 27, note 8.

5 I.e., "as regards." Cf. 81: 6; ʾash-shum māqur-er akību-ul-li šā bēušu-ul-li šā. In connection with this particle in 39: 2 it stands before the greeting! (c) upon the "invocation," so in No. 38: 11. In connection with the address: a-na bēušu-ul-li the um-ma-a, or "replying to your recent letter," is not referred to in a previous communication; or (c) is not to be found in three passages only, viz., in Nos. 13: 4 | 14: 4 | 17: 6. In No. 26: 3 we have wrongly bēušu-ul-li for bēušu-i-a-ma.

6 With the same meaning as ʾash-shum, i.e., "as regards," Nos. 83: 8 | 86: 10 | 87: 8 (followed by šā ṣğ-ba-[a], cf. p. 25, note 30; p. 26, note 5). See also Nos. 3: 21, 24 | 17: 7, 8 | 31: 11, 15, 25, 27 | 34: 33 | 60: 9. With the same or similar meaning as šāš or ṣğ-ba, see also p. 25, note 4, and cf. 83: 19 (context mutilated), translation on p. 112. Among the letters addressed to the Lord we find it, e.g., in 44: 7, ʾi-na bu-ut KULI.-š bēušu-ul-li šā ṣğ-ba-[a] bēušu-ul-li šā ṣğ-ba-[a], or I.a. bu-ut di-ga-ra-di a-na ra-di-i a-bi-[a], cf. below p. 109. The i-na bu-ut di-ga-ra-di a-na ra-di-i a-bi-[a] of 45: 10 does not belong here; see p. 142.

7 With regard to what thou hast written," or "replying to your recent communication," so far not yet found in this class of letters. It corresponds in the letters, Nos. 1-74, to šā šāš-pu-ra, "with regard to what my Lord has written," which letter may be found either with, so in 3: 20 | 26: 3, or without following um-ma-a, cf. 38: 38, "xx. concerning which my Lord has inquired (sc. I beg to state that) = um-ma-a a-na bēušu-ul-li šāš-pu-ra, 'I have sent (it) to my Lord.'" Cf. also here 62: 7. Um-ma-a in 33a: 6 introduces a quotation from a previous communication, the answer to this quotation begins with um-ma-a a-na bēušu-ul-li, l. 9; for a translation see p. 137. Cf. also here 34: 18 and [i-na-a]na ki-i šā šāš-pu-ra] in 3: 60.
ta-àsh-pu-ra, or abbreviated, shà x.x. ta-àsh-pu-ra; (6) àsh-shum x.x. shà ta-àsh-pu-ra; (7) a-na bu-ut x.x. shà ta-àsh-pu-ra; (8) x.x. shà tash-pu-ra resp. taq-ba-t;

1 "With regard to x.x. concerning whom (which) thou hast written (lit. sent)," see No. 86: 18f: shà ?B-mi-da-

2 The a in ra shows that this is a relative clause, i.e., that a shà has to be supplied before ta-àsh-pu-ra. (For another similar abbreviation see below, note 3).

3 With the same signification as shà x.x. shà ta-àsh-pu-ra, cf. also shà and àsh-shum. Cf. 82: 9, àsh-shum amelA ZAGAGI (= kudâmûmu) [shà] ta-àsh-pu-ra; context mutilated. This phrase corresponds in Nos. 1-74 to (a) àsh-shum x.x. shà be-bi às-par-ra, so in 14: 16; 23: 19; 26: 15, for which see pp. 99, 119. Cf. also 27: 12, àsh-shum N.L.I.SH pish-shat bêt be-bi-ia shà be-bi às-par-ra 1 (gar) 24 (ga) N.L.I.SH pish-shat e-ta bêm ë 1 go N.L.I.SH ud-din, i., "as regards the oil, ointment for the house of my 'Lord,' concerning which my 'Lord' has written (sic). I beg to state that (of the 1 gar 24 go of oil, ointment for one year. I have not (yet) given (paid, delivered) a single go.

4 Or 27: 18, àsh-shum 

5 'This is used here in apparently the same sense as shà resp. àsh-shum x.x. shà ta-àsh-pu-ra—hence i-na or a-na (see instantly) bu-ut = shà resp. àsh-shum (cf. p. 24, note 7). See here 89: 15f.: a-na b[u-na] [= x., dînî amel]
(9) the 'object' concerning which there was a reference in a former letter, and to which now the answer is to be given, is placed at the beginning of the sentence without any introductory particle whatever; (10) *shum-ma la-sap-pa-ra* or *ta-al-ta-al-ma*; (11) *um-ma* or *um-ma-a*; (12) if more subjects than one are referred to in

shā ta-ash-pa-ra um-ma-a a-me-nu a K[U.DA] ki b'-u-[ni] il-ta-ash-sha-dī 'il-ta-on-na ša-ni-ti, i.e., "replying to your recent communication [concerning the judgment (or fate) of the men] I beg to state the following (um-ma-a): he has examined the men after they had taken (stolen) the wheat flour, and in consequence of this examination: al = result; the al may be translated here also by but; cf. for this al between sentences, Jensen, K. B., VI, pp. 235, 236, 337, 339, and Johnston, J. A. O. S., XIX, p. 30) acquit them."
For PŠALGU, used of Judicial cross-examination, see Jensen, i.e., p. 554. It-la-on-na-sha-ni-ti I take as PŠALGU (from which we have amnu, "Zeus's") a-na-nu, ittu-ama, this at the end indicates the third person of a chief sentence. A "possible" derivation from Hebr. "al" "to answer," which "might" seem to be preferable here on account of the following (1. 21) um-ma-a (see p. 27, n. 8), does not fit. Or should we derive it from [NKM, H. W. B., p. 98b (from which we have amnu, "Justice"), and translate "he impressed them?" The "he" according to the context must be some unnamed G[U.E.N.A], "sheriff," or possibly a judge or king. Among the "letters addressed to the "Lord" we find a similar expression, e.g., in 39:4, i-na bu-ā A.SHAAGmēshša Tub(= KU)-kal-li-Ė. KUR8 ša [t-ep]-la ša-pu-ra ša-tab-li-i(r)-ra?], see translation on p. 127.

5 As regards the x.x. concerning whom (which) thou hast written or spoken" is, after all, only a shorter form of šaš, deš-sham, or šaš (a-na) bu-ā x.x. šaš ta-ash-pa-ra, cf. (5)–(7). Although not to be found in Nos. 70ff., it does occur, e.g., in No. 27:33, a-anuSU.AKU.DA (= mašša, tax-gatherer) šaš be-li šaḫ [p]u-ra . . . ]-ma i-na-am-mi-[3y], and as regards the poll-gatherers concerning whom my Lord has written (I beg to state that) "he . . . and shall find out."
No. 34:17, a-SIG SIN šaš be-li ig-ba-a [ukn] ša-hi-li-ni, "and with regard to the 'good wood' about which my 'Lord' has spoken (sec., in a former letter, I beg to state that) 'I have sent it.'"

6 This is a still further abbreviation of (8); in other words, it is the same as (5)–(7) with both šaš, deš-sham, i-na (a-na) bu-ā and šaš tašh-pa-ra [resp. šaš be-li šaḫ-pa-ra] left out, so that only the x.x. = object remains. Cf. here 33:10, šaš 70 P][UHAD]Mēšša šaš be-li īa ig-ba-ū, "and as regards the 70 [gur] of kasū-root (see Meissner, Ideogr., No. 3796) belonging to my 'Lord' (sec. concerning which my 'Lord' has written, I beg to state that) 'they informed me that, etc.'"; see translation, p. 123. See also 42:4. A.SHAAGmēšša šaš be-li iš-di-na "U-bar-ra a-na bu-šaš iš-su-ša-UUMMA-ša A.SHAAGmēšša u-lu-ši šaš-a-nu a-na-ba ša tab-liš-ič, "as regards the fields, which my 'Lord' has given and concerning which (ig-ba-ū = relative) Ubarru has reported to my 'Lord' saying: 'he has forsaken (them),' (sec. I beg to state that) 'I have not forsaken (them).' A construction like this elucidates clearly the tenesmes and businesslike character of these letters.

7 "(And) when thou writest or askest" is found in the letters addressed to the "Lord" (Nos. 1–74) under the form šum-ma be-li šaš-pa-ra or šum-ma be-li iš-a-al-ni. For the former see 31:9, šum-ma be-li šaš-pa-ra li-sha-nim-ma? a-na-aš ši-li-shi-ma, i.e., "and when my 'Lord' writes: 'they (one) may repeat,' (sec. the treatment formerly applied to the sick person that her side (Hebr. הַיְמָנַּת) is too weak (sec. for such a repetition)."
In this connection notice the šaš after zi-li for šaš, due to assimilation, facilitated by the preceding ablatant and repeatedly known also from the tablets of the Murray archives. For the latter cf. 56:5, šum-ma be-li iš-a-al-ni šašP[UH] + SI šaš ri-aš šaš be-li šaš-pa-ra a-na-ba ša tab-liš a-na-ta lu-as-ba-al-ma lu-pa-su[a-ma], "when my 'Lord' asks that they make the pole(s) or shaft(s) for the elication of my 'Lord' (sec. may I beg my Lord that) I be permitted to take hold of it (them) and make it (them)."
All of which passages sh. w. that HU + SI has here the pronunciation śanān and that šašP[UH] + SI has to be read accordingly śanān-šaš. It must be here the "shaff" or "pole" of the wagon and is distinct from the śanān (not ušann) of a ship. Thus šaš-ša-li-ni of 91:5 was probably a stone of the shape of a "pole," i.e., "finger," and the 2 šaš-ša-li-ni ṣa-ši-of ste, IV, 116:2 (cf. i.e., 230:12, "ša-li-ni") are, therefore, "2 gold bars." This would prove that the Babylonians had besides "the money in rings" also that "in bars."
the letters, they are introduced either (a) directly or (b) by ʾu or (c) by ʾu and one of the above given particles or phrases.\textsuperscript{10}

Letters not in answer to a previous communication are much simpler in form and construction. In these the subject matter is stated either directly,\textsuperscript{11} or the

\textsuperscript{10} Whenever these particles are found they take up either (a) the um-ma after ki-bi-ma or (b) the um-ma-a of the introduction: um-ma-a ʾa-na ʾY-ma resp. um-ma-a ʾa-na be-li-a-ma-ʾa or (c) some other um-ma-a in the text of the letter; they are, therefore, nothing but particles that introduce direct speech by quoting either from a previous communication or by giving the answer to an inquiry or note; see p. 24 notes 2, 4. For um-ma 36 : 18f., is instructive. While l. 19 contains the “answer” (with um-ma-a omitted) to the ‘Lord’s’ inquiry concerning Emaš-Marduk, we still find another sentence introduced by um-ma in l. 20. This um-ma must take up a preceding um-ma-a, to be found either in the text of the letter or in the introduction, seeing that it otherwise stands quite isolated. I think we may translate this um-ma by: ‘(seeing that this is so) therefore, please (um-ma), grant him his petition (or will), i.e., let him do it (but cf. p. 25, note 1).’ For um-ma-a cf., e.g., 39 : 21f. L.c., li. 171 (see pp. 25, n. 4), contain the answer to an inquiry of “NIN-nu-a with regard to the fate (judgment) of certain men who had taken (stolen) wheat flour. L. 21f., introduced by um-ma-a, which latter takes up the [um-ma-a] of l. 14, contains an answer to another inquiry, resp. reprimand, which had been expressed (in a former letter addressed to Pūn-A.N.GAL-lāmar) in probably some such words as “Why hast thou not communicated by a messenger the result of the trial of these men long ere this?” Answer: l. 21f., um-ma-a mār shipri-ia ša-a ʾa-na ʾa.l.GIL.LI.KI ʾa-na muḫ sharri (- LUGAL) aš-pu-ra (creature) ki (emarri) i-na-ri-ka ma-la a-sap-rak-ku iq-ba-a um-ma-a ti-na ʾa.l.UD.KI.BU,NUN.KI ša-ši mār shipri-ia ul aš-pur-eb-ku mār shipri-ia a-na ʾa.l.UD.KI.BU,NUN.KI aš-ap-rak-ku um-ma-a ʾa-na ʾa.l.GIL.LI.KI ʾa-la-ši-ku aš-pur-ra; i.e., “(But as regards thy reprimand in thy letter of recent date I beg to assure thee of the following (um-ma-a): ‘my messenger whom I had sent to Nippur to the king was, when he saw (= would see) thee, to have told everything I had written thee. But he (the messenger, when he had returned to me) said (um-ma-a): ‘he (i.e., ‘NIN-nu-a) is in Sippar.’ This is the reason why) I have not sent my messenger to thee (and why) I have (now) dispatched my messenger to thee at Sippar with the following note (um-ma-a): ‘To ʾa.l.GIL.LI.KI. Naš-ši-a. Send thy news and thy greeting (i.e., with this letter, for an answer by ‘return mail!’’). The events discussed in this letter are the following: (a) NIN-nu-a of Nippur has written to Pūn-A.N.GAL-lāmar of Dūr-Šufl concerning the fate of certain men who had taken wheat flour, at the same time reprimanding him for his negligence in not having communicated to him by messenger the outcome of the trial long ere that. (b) Pūn-A.N.GAL-lāmar, wishing ‘to kill two birds with one stone’, entrusted the answer to the inquiry and reprimand to his messenger, whom he had to send to the king at Nippur anyhow. (c) The messenger found the king at Nippur, but not NIN-nu-a, being informed that the latter had left for Sippar, where he could be addressed. (d) Pūn-A.N.GAL-lāmar, anxious to avoid receiving a second reprimand and to show his “brother” (l. 3) that his accusation of negligence was unmerited, at the same time wishing to assure him that “he still loves him” (l. 1), and that “he wants to see him personally and explain matters to him” (l. 8f.), dispatches at once, in order not to lose further time, his messenger with this letter to Sippar, asking for a reply. (e) This letter was received by NIN-nu-a at Sippar, brought back with him to Nippur, deposited by him among the “Temple Archives,” where it was excavated by the Babylonian Expedition of the University of Pennsylvania, and carried thence to Philadelphia to the Museum of Science and Art. To the um-ma-a-a of these letters corresponds an um-ma-a-a ʾa-na be-li-a-ma-ʾa of Nos. 1-74. See 33a : 9, 12, 18 compared with l. 5 (see pp. 137f.); 45 : 18 compared with l. 3 [see p. 143]; 48 : 26 compared with l. 3.


\textsuperscript{12} U ša-a, 3 : 40 + fr. d. | 27 : 38 ; ša-a ša-bi-ta ša-pu-ra, 27 : 27 ; ša-a ša-bi-ta ish-pu-ra, 34 : 18, etc., etc.

writer may use as a kind of introduction some such words or phrases as: *enni*,\(^1\) *eninna*,\(^2\) *inanna*,\(^3\) *anumma*,\(^4\) *be-lî i-di ki*,\(^5\) etc., etc.

\(^1\) No. 40: 8, [enî]-ni, "behold."
\(^2\) "(Behold) now." Written either *e-nin*, 34: 6; or *e-nin-na*, 34: 41; or *e-ni-en-na*, 20: 6 | 43: 11 | 60: 5. Cf. also the following note.
\(^3\) "Now." Cf. 3: 19 (cf. with parallel passage in l. 30, where we have *i-na-an-na*(!), and see *a-na-an-an-a*, note 4). 40 | 24: 27 | 31: 35 | 58: 2 | 3: 60, [i-na-an-na] ki-i ñaš be-lî i-sha-ša pa-ša. See also 4 *i-na-en-na*, 11: 9; i-na-an-an-an be-lî ia al-tap-ra, 3: 23; i i-na-an-na be-lî ù-ti-di, 24: 26. Cf. also preceding note.
III.

LETTERS BETWEEN OFFICIALS OF THE TEMPLE OR STATE AND THE KING.

Even a most perfunctory perusal will and must convince the casual reader of the fundamental difference in language and address as exhibited in the "letters between Temple and State officials" and those to be discussed here. In the former the writer addresses his correspondent, whose name he always mentions, simply by "thou": "thou shalt do this and that," "to thee I have sent," "with regard to what thou hast written," etc., etc. In the latter the addressee is invariably "the Lord," without ever being mentioned by name, and is spoken of as "my Lord": "may my Lord do this and that," "to my Lord I have sent," "with regard to what my Lord has written," "the following to my Lord," etc. Surely such a formality must have a historic basis, must have been required by etiquette, must have been rigidly enforced, and must have been absolutely necessary. Considering, furthermore, the fact that the various writers who sent their letters to this "Lord" lived at diverse periods during a space of about 150 years, it at once becomes evident that the term "Lord" here employed cannot have meant a single person, but must have been applied to several individuals holding the office of "Lord." Taking these a priori considerations as my guide, I was able to collect and publish in this volume seventy-eight letters (Nos. 1-74) addressed to the "Lord"—fifty of them having the address "to my Lord," etc., either completely or partially preserved, while the rest (twenty-eight) refer to the "Lord" in their text.

In the Table of Contents has been given a complete list of all writers addressing their letters to the "Lord"; we may, therefore, dispense with a recitation of their names here, though this would, in many cases at least, help us materially towards a right appreciation of the exact position and relation of the various writers to their "Lord." An investigation of this kind would necessarily lead us far beyond the scope of these introductory remarks here; it must, therefore, be reserved for Series C. All we are concerned with here is to determine, if possible, the meaning of the expression "my Lord," be-li or EN-li; and by doing this we will, ipso facto, it is hoped, arrive at tangible results which are both absolutely necessary for a correct understanding of
the nature of these letters here published, and of the highest importance for determining the exact relation between Temple and State, or, to express it in more modern phraseology, "between Church and State," as represented by Enlil, the god of Nippur on the one hand, and the Cassite king or kings on the other.

The question, then, has to be asked and answered: Who is the BE.NI, i.e., be-li, or "Lord," of these letters?

When trying to answer this question it would seem necessary to discuss in extenso here all those passages which may or may not, as the case may be, shed any light upon this term. The most important among these passages are (1) the address; (2) the greeting; (3) such incidental references in the text of the various letters which elucidate the position of the "Lord" in his relation to the writer or the Temple.

All letters to be discussed in this paragraph, like those treated in the previous chapter, were originally enclosed in an envelope, which was sealed with the writer's seal and addressed, as may be gathered from No. 24,¹ where, fortunately, a portion of the envelope has been preserved, as follows:

dup-pi "X. (giving here the name of the writer) a-na be-li-shû; i.e., "Letter of X. to his Lord."

The fact that a letter could be addressed to and safely received by a person called simply "Lord" suffices to call our attention to the pre-eminence of the addressee: he must have been a "Lord" par excellence, a "Lord" like unto whom there was none other—a person who went and was known throughout the country by the title be-li.

Unfortunately for our investigation, there have not been published among the so-called "Letters of Hammurabi"² any that are written to King Hammurabi himself. If such letters were known to us, it would be a comparatively easy task to ascertain how he as king was addressed by his subjects. And yet, thanks to Hammurabi's well-known habit of quoting frequently from his correspondent's letters when answering them, we are able to establish the important fact that Hammurabi, though king, was yet addressed by his subjects³ not as LUGAL = sharru,

¹ Here we have to read: dup-pi "Kal-[ba], a-na be-li-shû. "Kal-ba was the writer, according to l.c., l. 9.
² L. W. King, The Letters and Inscriptions of Hammurabi, Vols. I–III.
³ In King, l.c., Vol. I, No. 1, l. 86, Hammurabi quotes from a letter of Sin-idinnam, saying: "And thou (i.e., Sin-idinnam) answered: 'Those four temple servants be (i.e., Ibni-ša-MAR.TU) caused me to construe as per his sealed contract, but one of them, a certain Gimillum, I (i.e., Sin-idinnam) sent a-na ma-ya-[r be-li-ia, before my Lord (i.e., Hammurabi.)' This is what thou hast written. Now they have brought before me (a-na ma-ya-ri-ia) that certain Gimillum whom thou hast sent." Cf. also the quotation from Sin-idinnam's letter, King, l.c., Vol. I, No. 4, l. 13: be-li-šaš-par-am, "my Lord (i.e., Hammurabi) may send," and also that in King, l.c., Vol. I, No. 8, l. 10 (compared with l. 14): šu-ma be-li ša-ša-ši, "if my Lord (again Hammurabi) takes." Tarabatum speaks to Hammurabi, King, l.c., Vol. III, p. 80 (No. 75), l. 6: "the crews of the ships šal be-li-šuḫ-ḫa-am, which my 'Lord' has desired," and šu-paš.N.ZU-ma-šir refers to the seal of Hammurabi as the ka-ni-li be-li-ia, "the seal of my 'Lord,' " King, l.c., Vol. I, No. 26, 7.
"King," but as be-ša or "Lord." It must, however, be conceded here that at the time of the Hammurabi dynasty the title be-ša was not exclusively used of a king. On the contrary, several letters are known to us, written by persons calling themselves "thy servant" (ardi-ka) and addressed to the "Lord," where the title be-ša expresses nothing but the position of a "higher" with regard to a "lower" person; i.e., where be-ša indicates simply the rank of the "master" as opposed to that of the "servant" (ardu).  

Again, when we examine the so-called Tell-Amarna letters (written at about the same time as those published here) with regard to the usus loquendi of the title "Lord," we find that both governors and kings may be designated by it.

The fact, however, that the title "Lord" might be and actually was used both during the Hammurabi and the Amarna periods as a title of the king is not yet proof sufficient to warrant a conclusion that the be-ša of our letters designates in each and every case a king likewise. Such a conclusion must, in order to stand the closest scrutiny and severest criticism, be absolutely beyond the pale of skepticism and

---

1 Cf., e.g., C. T., II, p. 19 (Bu 91-5-9, 293), a-na be-ša-ia ki-ši-ma um-ma Be-ša-sha-ru ardi-ka-na. C. T., II, p. 20 (Bu 91-5-9, 294), a-na be-ša-ia ki-ši-ma um-ma ši₄₅(-)u-ši₄₅ (sic! without ardi-ka-na). C. T., II, p. 38 (Bu 91-5-9, 2185), a-na be-ša-ia ki-ši-ma um-ma ši₄₅(-)u-ši₄₅ (without ardi-ka-na). C. T., II, p. 48 (Bu 91-5-9, 2186), a-na be-ša-ia ki-ši-ma um-ma ši₄₅(-)u-ši₄₅ (without ardi-ka-na). C. T., IV, p. 19 (Bu 88-8-12, 278), a-na be-ša-ia ki-ši-ma um-ma ši₄₅(-)u-ši₄₅ (without ardi-ka-na). C. T., VI, p. 27 (Bu 91-5-9, 413), a-na be-ša-ia ki-ši-ma um-ma ši₄₅(-)u-ši₄₅ (without ardi-ka-na). C. T., VI, p. 32 (Bu 91-5-9, 585), a-na be-ša-ia ki-ši-ma um-ma ši₄₅(-)u-ši₄₅ (without ardi-ka-na). Cf. also C. T., IV, p. 1 (Bu 88-8-12, 5), ki-ma be-ša a-ta ti-du-si, with C. T., II, p. 20 (see above), l. 4, ki-ma be-ša ti-du-si.

2 Cf., e.g., Amarna, B. 219, [en-aš] amēniqAL, mEN [in ki-ši-ma um-ma] Ba-P(= a)-di ardi-ka-na, to which title Winecker, K. B, V, p. xxiv, note 2, remarks: "Zu diesem wird hier garst so gesprochen, wie sonst zu den Königen. Man kommt auf die Verumtung, dass der Schreiber gemeint hat den 'grossen König' (sharru statt amēlu)." Seeing that we find the same address in B. 146, [en-aš] amēniqAL ETIN-[aš] ki-ši-ma um-ma HI-bt-PI(= iš) ardi-ka (cf. II, 8, 11; Rev. II, 7, 9) I do not think that amēniqAL is here a title of the king, but in all probability that of a high official (governor?) of the king. In Amarna, B. 40, Aziru addresses his "father," the governor of Amarna (I, 15, etc., with B. 92:1; amēniqAL aššur-ra) as follows: a-na mUN[IT a]-ši-ma um-ma mA-zi-ri šar-ka ardi-ka. Winecker, A. O. F., Vol. II, p. 312 (whom Johns, L. C., L., p. 330, follows) finds in the expression (a-na) a-P₂-tu ša ši₄₅Marišu aššur-aššur-šur-šum, i.e., "the man whom Marišu may keep alive" (V. A. Th., 793 = Meissner, B. A., II, p. 579?), the title of a (the) king during the Hammurabi dynasty. Though amēlu is used in the Code of Hammurabi for "nobleman," "one that lives in a palace," I cannot accept this view, simply and solely because we find in the phrase just quoted besides amēlu (see also C. T., II, p. 29; C. T., IV, p. 24) also ša-bi-ri-ša (C. T., IV, p. 12, cf. with tűša also our letters No. 52:11, ša-ša-ri-sha-am; 21:20, ša-ša-ri-ša...). Delitzsch, H. W. B., p. 6830; Johns, A. O. D., III, p. 327) and a-bi-ša (C. T., VI, p. 32).

3 See here, e.g., the letter of Akizi addressed to the king of Egypt in the following words (Amarna, L. 37), a-na mAmu[maš]aššu adu₄ U₄ AD be-ša-ia um-ma mA-zi-ri šar-ka ardi-ka-na, and cf. B. 29, a-na be-ša (sic!) LUGAL šar-ka. I. be-ša-ia ki-ši-ma um-ma mA-zi-ri-ša šar-ka ardi-ka-na; i.e., "to the Lord (sic! not 'my Lord,' which had to be-ša-ia), the king of the land of the Egyptians, my father, etc.," instead of the more commonly used a-na LUGAL be-ša-ia LUGAL šar-ka or a-na LUGAL šar-ka be-ša-ia.
reasonable doubt; in other words, it must be warranted by facts which cannot be controverted.

Somewhat farther we would advance, it seems, if we were to compare the "address" as exhibited in the letters to the "Lord" with that discussed in Chapter II. While the address in the "letters between Temple and State officials" runs simply "To Y. speak, thus saith X.,” it reads here either

(a) "To my Lord speak, thus saith X. (= name of writer), thy servant," which, with the exception of two letters (Nos. 8 and 46), is invariably followed by what might be called a "Häftlichkeit"-formula: 'before the presence of my 'Lord' may I come": a-na be-lu-la-ia ki-be-ma um-ma =X. ardi-ka-ma a-na di-na-an be-lu-la-ul (or lu-ul-li-ik (or lik)); or

(b) "Thy servant =X. (= name of writer). Before the presence of my 'Lord' may I come": ardi-ka-ma a-na di-na-an be-lu-la-ul (or lu-ul-li-ik)."

The difference in the address between the letters written to the "Lord" and those discussed in Chapter II is marked and fundamental and may be briefly summed up as follows:

(1) In the letters spoken of above the writer never called himself ardu or "servant," on the contrary, if he wanted to express any relation at all, he did so by applying to himself the term "brother," aḫu.

(2) He never addressed his correspondent by be-lu, "my Lord," but simply mentioned the name of the addressee without any title whatever.

(3) He never used the phrase "before the presence of my 'Lord' may I come." The last mentioned peculiarity is also the distinguishing feature between our letters here and those of the Hammurabi period, in which the writers, it is true, called themselves "ardu" and their addressee be-lu, but in which they never used the "Häftlichkeit"-formula a-na di-na-an be-lu-la-ul. On account of the absence of this phrase the letters of the Hammurabi period prove themselves at first sight—without even considering their contents—to be nothing but simple epistles of an inferior (servant) to a superior person (lord).

---

1 For a justification of this translation see below, pp. 58, note 2; 104, note 1.
2 Notice here the difference between the address of the letter proper and that of the envelope. While the former is always addressed "to my (?) Lord," a-na be-lu-la-ia, the envelope has "to his (?) Lord," a-na be-lu-shu.
3 That this emphatic -ma indicates the end of the address proper we have seen above, p. 18, notes 4, 9.
4 So always; a possible di-na-ni has not yet been found in these letters.
5 Nos. 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 19, 20, 25, 30, 37 [43, 44, 49, 50, 51].
6 For -ma cf. No. 4: 1 ["A-na-ku-ru-ma; die -ma in No. 21: 1, "Hu-MA.TU.KA-rēmu" (Meissner, Ideogr., No. 3857), may (!) be a phonetic complement to rēmu; for ma cf. Mašallām (Nos. 34, 38), Šērēqum (No. 38), Ubarumum (Nos. 39, 40), etc. This -ma or m terminates the address proper, see note 3.
7 Nos. 1, 4, 9, 11, 21, 22, 23, 26, 27, 28 29, 31, 32, 33, 33a, 34, 35, 36, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42 [45, 47, 48].
It would seem, then, that a correct interpretation of the words "before the presence of my 'Lord' may I come," as regards their application to persons, might bring us somewhat nearer to a valid understanding of the term "my Lord." Examining all letters so far published with regard to the usage of the phrase a-na di-na-an amēLUGH be-lī-tu lul-lik, we find that it may be employed in letters addressed either (a) to an official called amēLUGH = sukkallu or (b) to the King, LUGAL = šarru. Now, as the amēLUGH as "ambassador" or "chief representative" (for that is the meaning of the term sukkallu in those letters) shares the king's honors, we might suppose that the be-lī of our letters was such a chief representative of the king or kings of the Cassite dynasty. As representatives of the Cassite kings—especially with regard to the affairs of the Temple, resp. its storehouses—appear, as we learn from B. E., XIV, XV, a certain Innanni, the chief bursar during the time of Kuri-Galzu, and his successors Martuku (time of Kadashman-Turgu), Irīmšu-NIN.IB (time of Kadashman-Turgu and Kadashman-Enlil), etc. That none of the three chief bursars just mentioned can be meant by the be-lī here is obvious. Fortunately we possess four letters, addressed to Innanni, which are absolutely void of any of the three fundamental criteria; in them the writers do not call them-


2 In connection with a modified form of address (c)—see p. 32—we find it, e.g., in H., V, 516, a-na LUGAL be-lī-tu aridi-ka m inEN-ŠE-na a-na di-na-an LUGAL be-lī-tu lul-lik ilAG u inMarduk a-na LUGAL be-lī-tu lik-ru-bu um-ma-a a-na LUGAL be-lī-tu-a-ma. H., VIII, 793, a-na LUGAL be-lī-tu (= Ashshur-bēl-iliššū, son of Ashshur-bēl-iliššū) aridi-ka m inEN-il-ni a-na di-na-an(=) LUGAL be-lī-tu lul-lik ilAG u inMarduk a-na LUGAL be-lī-tu lik-ru-bu.

In connection with address (b)—see p. 32—it occurs, e.g., in H., IV, 422, aridi-ka m AD-IA-KI a-na di-na-an ilLUGAL.GI.NA (= Sharru-akkan) be-lī-tu [sc. lul-lik, left out here] in-[i [sc. šul-tim] a-na ilLUGAL.GI.NA be-lī-tu um-ma-a a-na LUGAL be-lī-tu-a-ma. H., VI, 542, aridi-ka m X... a-na di-na-an ilLUGAL.SIŠEŠ a-na LUGAL be-lī-tu um-ma-a a-na LUGAL be-lī-tu-a-ma. H., VI, 542, aridi-ka m X... a-na di-na-an ilLUGAL.SIŠEŠ (= Ashshur-bēl) be-lī-tu lul-lik ilAG u ilMarduk a-na LUGAL be-lī-tu um-ma-a a-na LUGAL be-lī-tu-a-ma. H., VII, 781, aridi-ka m ilIššū, a-na di-na-an LUGAL (= Ashshur-šarruša) be-lī-tu lik-ru-bu um-ma-a a-na LUGAL be-lī-tu-a-ma. H., IV, 878, aridi-ka m ilEN,BASHA a-na di-na-an LUGAL (= Sharru-akkan) be-lī-tu lik-ru-bu um-ma-a a-na LUGAL be-lī-tu-a-ma. H., VII, 721, (ordi-ka)m ilMarduk-MA-ŠE-na a-na di-na-an LUGAL be-lī-tu lik-ru-bu um-ma-a a-na LUGAL be-lī-tu-a-ma. H., VII, 747, 749, aridi-ka m ilAG-ilšul-tim (749 has m ilAG-DI-šū, cf. above, H., VII, 748, a letter by the same writer addressed to the amēLUGH a-na di-na-an LUGAL be-lī-tu lik-ru-bu um-ma-a a-na LUGAL be-lī-tu-a-ma. H., VIII, 803, aridi-ka m ilMarduk-MUSI,AM inEN, inNAM a-na di-na-an LUGAL be-lī-tu-a-ma. H., VIII, 832, 833, 838, 836, 837, aridi-ka m ilAG.MUSI,AM inNAM a-na di-na-an LUGAL be-lī-tu lul-lik um-ma-a a-na LUGAL be-lī-tu-a-ma.
selves "thy servant," nor do they beg to be permitted "to come before his presence," nor do they term him "my Lord."

Though we do not yet arrive at a positive result, we may claim at least a negative one, and that is: the be-li of these letters cannot have been a representative of the Cassite king, such as Innanni, the chief bursar of the Temple storehouses at Nippur, was at the time of Kuri-Galzu.

Trying to determine the exact significance of the expression be-li, we get, it would seem, a good deal farther in our investigation if we examine the formula of greeting, a-na . . . . skul-

1 With the exception of No. 39 to be found always after luilik and before the introductory um-ma-a a-na be-li-a-na. No. 39 has the greeting, quite strangely, after the last mentioned introductory phrase.

2 Always written either shul-mu or shul-mu; DI(-shed)-mu has not yet been found.


4 No. 11: 2 (writer "Be-la-ma-a a-na É be-li-ia shul-mu. For EDIN cf. p. 75, note 1.

5 No. 34: 2 (writer "Ki-sha-ab-bu-ut, cf. also note 3): a-na É be-li-ia lu-ki a (EDIN shul be-li-ia) shul-mu.

6 Cf. No. 46: 5, A.SHAQ-ta, "thy field," i.e., the Lord's.

7 No. 9: 3 (writer "Bi-a-sha-ta-Marduk): a-na lu-ki a EDIN shú be-li-ia shul-mu. No. 17: 5 (writer "IN.NI.BA.BU-AN" 2) a-na lu-ki a EDIN be-li-ia shul-mu.

8 Nos. 26: 2 a (27: 2 a (28: 3 (writer "Ka-du-ra-um): a-na lu-ki EDIN (26: 2, sīrī) a É be-li-ia shul-mu.

9 No. 51: 4 (name of writer broken away): [a-na LIT.GUD an a) GANAM.LU a s] shul (shul be-li-ia shul-mu). No. 16: 4 (writer "IN.NI.BA...): a-na LIT.GUD a a) GANAM.LU s] shul be-li-ia shul-mu, i.e., "to the large and small cattle, greeting; and to all that belongs to my Lord, greeting." For LIT.GUD a a) GANAM. LU a (alpē a pish) cf. also B. E., XIV, 99: 1 99a: 46; 192: 1.

10 No. 10: 4 (writer "... Marduk): [a-na LIT.GUD a (lu-mu-ru-ta)] a) GUD a (lu-mu-ru-ta). Cf. also No. 60.

11 No. 25: 4 (writer "UR.IA.IN.NI.BA.DUG.GA): a-na lu-ri šul [a-lat ti re] (7?) EDIN shul-mu.

12 He was at least co-owner, cf. No. 40: 21 (writer "U-bur-ram): me-šuran (= A.GUR) šul (AN) lu-ri a A.GUR. Nu-lu-a a-e šul be-li-ia; for translation see p. 132. Cf. also the Lu (-A) be-li-a in 1: 11.

13 No. 40: 15, ú ešu a-na pa-an nam-ga-ri šul be-li-ia a ši-īdī; i.e., 20, nam-ga-ri šul be-li-ia lu-mašshu-re.

ummnàni (= $AB^{3-4}$), šàdè (= $SAB^{mex}$); (13) "servants," ìrw"; (14) šhattam and amëlu PA.ENGAR; (15) ìtiî; (16) "tax-gatherers," màktisu; (17) "sheriffs,"

1 No. 30: 17 (writer ìU..ur-rum): $SAB^{k-a}$ šàdè ì.à-à-à. Cf. 46: 9, $SAB^{k-a}$ [kA] and SS 12, $SAB^{k-a}$ šàdè ì.à. From 9: 17, 100 $SAB^{k-a}$ (1) gî-in-na-ta ki-i-yu-na-na $SAB^{mex}$(1) šàdè ì.à-à-à, it is apparent that there seems to have been a difference between $SAB^{k-a}$ and $SAB^{mex}$; the former are = "men," while the latter are = "soldiers;" for a translation see p. 106. In B. E., XIV, XV, $SAB^{k-a}$ and $SAB^{mex}$ are used interchangeably; cf., e.g., i.e., XIV, 56: 28, PAD 27 $SAB^{mex}$ šàd̃ ì.qa-ìà-ì šà-pà-shu, i.e., "food (wages) for 27 'men' who have tilled (made) the fields;" and according to i.e., L 30, the amëluRIQ and K A. ZID.DA have $SAB^{mex}$.

2 This follows not only from the term "servant" within the various writers apply to themselves when writing to their "Lord," but also from the fact that very frequently other persons are referred to in these letters as "thy (i.e., the Lord's) servant," ordî-ta. Among the persons thus spoken of as the "Lord's" servant we find, e.g., "Erše-ti-Marduk, 27: 30, 32; 29: 4 [5] 35: 17 65: 9 (cf. here also: Erše-ti-Marduk, the writer of letters Nos. 13, 14, 81, 82; m îtuNIN.B-SHES-SHÀ-MA, 1: 16, 17; mRA.SHA-îtuMA, 34: 34, 35; mî-ta È KUR.GAL, 4: 28: 32; mîtuDIL.BAT-BA-ni, 14: 18; mKu-da-ra-ni, 35: 31 (cf. also the writer of Nos. 25, 27, 28); mMe-li-Shi-pak, 17: 32; mNu-ah-zi-[ù]-Marduk, 42: 12, 13; SHESH-thutik-m, 45: 7; È.SAG.GIL-ta-si-à-[ur]-ka, 9: 15. Cf. 21: 27, II ordî-ta.

3 No. 30: 3 (writer ìU..ur-rum): 45: 4, name of writer broken off]: a-na SHAG.TAM (or possibly better ASHAG, cf. 39: 4) ù amëluPA.ENGAR šàdè ì.à-à-a. To SHAG.TAM (= UD) = plural and without amelu, cf. 35: 33, be-à-a na SHAG.TAM kî-ì-ì-à-empty-na NI.GISH šàdè(= $RU$-ta ìhà-sà-nu) note, see translation p. 125. See also 21: 4, i-tu amëluSHAG.TAM šàd-a-na shà-à-na ì.à-à-à ìhà-sà-na-an, (original gives šà-à-na ìhà-sà-na-an, (original gives šà-à-na ìhà-sà-na-an (original gives šà-à-an, (original gives šà-à-an (original gives šà-à-an, (original gives ş...
GÜ.EN.NA; (18) na-'i-ri-e na-'i-ra-a-ti SAL E-di-ir-ti = bi-lu?; (19) “cities,” ālu [ba]q;
"guards," massartu; "fortress(es)," bi-ir-ta; "chariots," it-narkabtu and sak-shup-par; (20) "carriages," ru-lu-ba; and last, but not least, (21) "creatures,"

"lamentation"; Del., II. W. B., p. 188a, mentions only a baramma, syn. iskillum, "Wekktilae"; see also 47 : 4) while the lady was still under treatment (al māshi) and sick. No wonder, then, that she was seized with fever (awama) after these men and women had finished their lamentations. In the closing lines Malkillan reports that he will send out his messenger early at dawn of the 29th day, "as his 'Lord' had commanded," in order to learn through him how the sick person had passed the night (es-em-mu-shi) and how the su-ma-nu (= awama, the u on account of the m, H. W. B., p. 503; Jensen, K. B., VI, p. 574?) was progressing. Women, by the name SAL U-đi-ir-ta, are mentioned in B. E., XIV, 40 : 3, 12, 14, 19 (21st year of Kuri-Gula, II, 31, 23) and a TUR.S AL GAB U-đi-ir-tu in loc., 58 : 42 (13th year of Nazi-Maranštādi). As this lady is closely connected with the lamentation men and women, it seems probable that she was at the head of that profession. The real meaning of li-śi-ta an-ni-tum il-la-pa-as-si (or su? = il-a-pa-at-shi or iš-tu, i.e.,锲, so, no doubt, better than a "possible" 긹 and 긹) in No. 31 : 5 is, is not clear to me. With lipītu lāptāt el. Aramaic, B. 6, Rev. 3, 7, 9; B. 218, Rev. 3, 4. It is construed with double accusative, as here, also in IV R., 16a, col. I : 14, 15, ap-pa u šk-di št-a-a-šu lu-pu-ul-ma ana marši u-biški-su-su-a ai šk-a-u; but neither the signification given by Delitssch, H. W. B., p. 382a, "unmützen, anrühren," nor that by Jensen, K. B., VI, p. 379, "berühren, schlagen, verjagen," nor King's (Letters of Hammurabi, III, p. 279), "to overthrow, to destroy," nor Nagel's (B. A., IV, p. 479), "säigen, versperren," nor even Köhler's (Med. p. 75), "stossen, umstellen, vernichten, anläppen," seem to fit here. Cf. also the li-śi-ta il-lam (− AN), "visitation of god," Ham. Codex, XXXVIII, 77, and our letter No. 47 : 9, 14, a-dš ša-ma-em la-pa-di. Also this latter treat of sickness, cf., e.g., 1. 18, at šk-pa-pa ma-ča-a i-ni-ī-ša-iš i-na-an-an ul zī-ši—"an expression exactly parallel to šk-pa-pa i-gi-en-nil-šu i-na-an-an ul i-gi-en-nil-ši in Nos. 31 : 13 ; 32 : 13 ; hence estoš must signify a suffering from a certain malady and not merely a "Verwirren," Köhler, Med., pp. 137, 138 Delitssch, H. W. B., p. 143a. What sickness this is indicated in 1. 4, i-na ba-ra-ri (cf. above ba-ra-an-tum) ki zī-ši. Another letter that touches upon sickness, to mention it here, is No. 22 : 8 (writer ši-m-gu-um), di-im mar-ši-ši-ki šk-a šu-ia-a šiš-k-ši šiš-k-ši šup-par aš-k-ši-ak-ša-šu-ki. Mu-kal-tum, the writer of Nos. 31, 32, 33, and possibly of 47, was, no doubt, a physician. And as physicians are always under the patronage of goddess Gula, the azgallatu rābatu or "great physician," the one who mukallistitu miti, "quickens the dead" (sic!), I propose to identify our writer with the Mu-kal-tum mentioned after the bit iš-tu-la in B. E., XIV, 148 : 9 (the 17th year), who lived during the time of Burns-Buriash. As such a physician and priest in the temple of Gula he had to look after the welfare of "the ladies of the sanctuary," for notice that Malkillan sends not only greetings (shulmu) and good wishes (aš-ad = ša-ša, 31 : 8) for the well being (shı̂-ır-shi-ne), lit. their flesh, their body of "the daughter of Kurti" and "the daughter of Ahuni," who had, no doubt, recovered from their sickness under his care, but reports also about the sickness of the following women: (1) "the daughter of Mushhtal" (31 : 11 ; 32 : 7); (2) the daughter of Iš-ıppasahu" (31 : 15); (3) the lady La-ta (? or šk-a) (31 : 29); (4) the Aš-ıppa-tum l. "the nomad!" (31 : 25 ; 32 : 8). Cf. also B. E., XV, 186 V, 11, SAL Aš-la-mi-tum, and aš-la-mu-as, l.e., XIV, 16 : 6 ; XV, 151 : 29, besides the passages quoted by Clay in Lc., XV, p. 51a; and (5) the daughter (TU.R.S AL) of the lady (SAL) Uš (or Bu-la-bar[...]) (31 : 27).

1 No. 33a : 3, a-na iluḫuši napparatu (EN.NU.UN) šaš be-ta-asu šašu-[mla]. For šab[a] plural, see p. 12, note 13.
2 For EN.NU.UN = EN.NUN = napparatu = Delitssch, H. W. B., p. 478a, and cf., H. W., 11, 187, Rev. 5 (a letter of Išših šu-tam to the mr šurtatu be-ta-ta), ašmu-[u = DIŠ] [a-na] EN.NUN mesok gub-ga, "greeting to all the guards," and H., II, 180, Rev. 1 (by the same writer), EN.NUN ša LUGAL.
3 No. 33a : 31, 36, bi-ša šaš be-ta-ta.
4 No. 33a : 5, 10, 13, 22, 29, 31, 34, 35, Chariots are also mentioned in B. E., XIV, 124 : 10 ; XV, 13 : 2 ; 21 : 7; they are to be distinguished from the ru-la-bi and šišk MAR.GID.DA, see below, note 13.
5 No. 33a : 21f, un-una-a a-na be-ta-la-ma be-ta-la-a sak-shup(= RY)-par luši-[mla] II šaš narkabtu a-na gir-ša ša šeš ša-gub-ba-ilššu ša šeš ša-šu-la be-ta-la-ma iš-ni II šaš narkabtu bi-ša ša šeš ša-gub-ba lu-šu-šu-par; for translation see p. 139. Clay B. E., XV, 154 : 41 (not mentioned by Clay) a sak (SAG) ša-šu-par LU.GAL is mentioned, and from l.e., 13 : 5 (not mentioned by Clay) we learn that a certain šaš tа-a-tum, the [šaš ša-bašaš]-šaš-paš-paš, received (šaš-ša-ša) from (šaš-ša-ša)
NI(G)-GÂL-tum nap-ti. On account of the difficulties that are to be encountered in this expression it is necessary, in view of the passage in which it occurs in full. It is found in the "greeting" of a letter (No. 38) written by a certain "Shi-ri-iq-tum, an inhabitant of Nippur (âlu-ki, l. 6), whose gods he invokes for the protection of his 'Lord.' The writer, unfortunately, is not mentioned in any of the tablets published in B. E., XIV, XV. Though a "Shi-riq-[tum] is to be

 wład "Mar-tu-ka, the chief bursar of the Nippurian temple storehouses during the reign of Nasi-Marrattash. ¹ saa-ku ZAG.SA (a metal, or a kind of leather?) a-na a-d(ti) (or bit; bat; eis) shā ùmrâ-n̄u-tu; i.e., either for the "mounting" (metal) or "covering" (leather) of a chariot. Seeing that a sak-shep-par is in each and every case closely connected with "chariots," which he may command when they are sent out on an expedition (see p. 139, ll. 28ff.), we may conclude that a shep-par is a "charioteer," and a sak-shep-par, a "chief, commander, captain, general of the charioteers." The word shep-par has to be derived from šâš, "to govern," from which root, as Jensen, K. B., VI, p. 440, has shown, we have also the words ishepar (a form like ishîbu, irrasbu) = ṣiṣpar = (Sum. USH.BAR =) "Zaum, Zügel, schirpu, "Zaum, Gebiss," and ushparu = "Insigne des Könige" = "Zaum." With ishepar Jensen, i.e., quite correctly compares the Syrische Kûnûn = "Halfter," for such changes of radicals cf. e.g., Sum. SHU.NIR = Assyr. sharum; Assyr. lâqrê = Hebr. נון, etc. According to this a shepar would be "one who governs, directs the chariots" by having hold of the ishepar, ṣiṣpar, ushparu = Syr. Kûnûn, or "bridle" of the horses. Delitlisch, H. W. B., p. 685ff., mentions an officer called assâbah UD-SAG, "Oberst, General." That this cannot be read with Delitsch, i.e., shad-shepar, but must be transcribed with Winckler, Forschungen, I, p. 476, 2 (and before him Guyard, Notes de lexicographie Assyro-Persienne, Paris, 1883, § 33) by shu-par-sap (or better šáq) is evident from the passages quoted above. Furthermore, in view of the analogy that exists between sak-shep-par and shep-par-sap (or the one hand and gal + šal = šalgal (cf. gal + ušum = ušumgal, etc.) on the other hand, I propose to identify both. As gal + šal, "the great one among men" (cf. GALSAG = ras-sap = the great one among the šáq) becomes the "great man," šal ḫaṣṣēr, i.e., the šalgal or "king," so sak-shep-par, "the chief among the charioteers," becomes the shep-par-sap, i.e., "the charioteer of the chief," and as such the "chief's (i.e., of the kings) foremost charioteer," "the charioteer-in-chief." From this, however, does not yet follow that we have to correct with Hoffman, Z. A., II, p. 54 ff.; Marti, Gram. des Bibl. Aram., p. 53, the Kûnûn. Enna 5:6 (cf. also Enna 4:9, Kûnûn, Kûnûn) into Kûnûn in order to make it agree with shep-par-sap(k). A change from K into S is much harder to imagine than a simple alteration of the eye from one S to another Z, which took place if we suppose that Kûnûn stood for Kûnûn, i.e., ṣ̄afit, Colpat Kûnûn (which is the Syr.-Ar.Parm, word for "Halfter") (Jensen), better "bridle," "bridle-holder." In Enna 4:9, 40, 41, 45, the use of Kûnûn as insinuation of the king represents him as one who "holds the bridle," who "governs" the people (cf. Kûnûn; or Kûnûn). The Kûnûn is Kûnûn, then, were "the bridge-holders," "governors-in-chief." This also against Hinke, B. E., Skr. D, iv, p. 185.

² No. 56:6, šâsh MAR.HU + SI (= šâš, "pole, shaft," see p. 25, n. 7) šâš ra-su-ši-ša šâš be-lê-î-ta, e.l. also the šâš MAR.HU + SI. SI šâš be-lê-î-ta in 51:18. See in this connection also Friederich, O. L. Z., August, 1906, 463, on šâš ra-su-ša. Rabuki are to be distinguished from šâš MAR.GID.DA, which latter signify, at this time, either "harvest wagons" (lit. "long wagons") = ṣ̄əq̄, Meissner, Ideogr., No. 4118, cf. No. 34:39, i-na šâš MAR.GID.DA IN hi-i 6a-bi-la IMEK.KUR. RA₃meqâ, etc.; i.e., "while I was fetching the straw in the harvest wagons, the horses, etc." or "wagons"; cf. the šâš MAR.GID.DA meqâ te-li-tum = the wagon loads of the crop, harvest (ac. of grain). No. 52:33 and B. E., XIV, 118:1, 29, 30. In B. E., XV, 91:1, 2 (cf. our No. 54:7; 52:33), the harvest (te-li-tum) of the pa-te-si is computed according to šâš MAR.GID.DA, "wagons." For the various amounts of grain paid as "hire" (ID) for "harvest wagons," see, e.g., B. E., XIV, 144:6 [XV, 28:11 10:12 103:10. In B. E., XV, 155:36 a certain amount of grain is mentioned as bâ-lo-at šâš MAR.GID.DA as this here can mean nothing but "hire for harvest wagons," we have the proof that ID = "hire" has to be read bâ-lo-at, from bîtu, "Abgabe, Stetter, Tribut" (H. W. B., p. 282), and "hire." Cf. also the SHE šâš MAR.GID.DA meqâ napâr šâš a-na 6âr (= Nippur) šâš e-ta-su, B. E., XV, 107:6, and see the šâš MAR.GID.DA, (cf. in B. E.; XIV, 124:16, and the šâš MAR.ZAG.UD in our No. 28:16.
found in a letter of “Gu-sa-ar-AN to “In-nu-ú-a (87 : 8), we are still unable to assign No. 38 definitely. In all probability Shiriqtum lived sometime during the reign of Kuri-Galzu, i.e., somewhere between 1421–1396 B.C. That part of the letter with which we are concerned here reads (38 : 1ff.):

1 ardi-ka “Shi-ri-iq-tum a-na d[i-na-an] Thy servant Shiriqtum; before the presence
2 be-lu-ia lu-ú-ul-ul-[ik] of my ‘Lord’ may I come!
3 SUGH & shar-rat EN.LI[L][n] SUGH and the queen of Nippur

1 From a religious standpoint this greeting is most important. It teaches us that the Nippurian Trinity—Enil, Ninlil, Nippurian Gula (Bau)—was known as

SUGH (Father) NIN.IB (Son) Ninlil (Mother).

Without going into details here (see my forthcoming volume on the Religious Texts from the Library of Nippur), I may be permitted to show briefly that the gods mentioned in this letter form indeed a parallel “Trinity in Unity.”

2 SUGH (thus the sign has to be read, and not DAR [Jensen], see my forthcoming volume) was originally the name of a god playing the rôle of the “Son.” This is still evident from II R., 57, Obv. 1, 35, c, d, where SUGH (with the gloss Tishqa) is identified with Ninlil, who in our letter occupies the position of the “Son.” Cf. also SUGH EN wan-wa-a, “the lord of hosts,” Zimmerm., 42, p. 24, 74; SUGH (gloss usu) Ninlil = u-si-hu-tu-a-a, “the destroyer of the enemy,” K. 2107, 19—two attributes of the “Son,” who, as the personification of powers of nature (“the seven,” “the Igigi” and “the Anunnaki,” etc.), protects the faithful and destroys the wicked. Just as Ninlil is also — icIN, and this one = icIN.KUR, “the god of Eura,” i.e., Enil (see Bel, the Christ, p. 17), so SUGH (originally the Son) appears in this letter at the head of the Nippurian Trinity—is, therefore, here = Ninlil, the “Father” or “first person,” and as such clearly a male. SUGH = Enil, as the highest god of Nippur, is, of course, “the king of Nippur,” and his wife would naturally be called “the queen of Nippur,” shar-rat EN.lIQ. The latter is coupled in this invocation with SUGH; hence SUGH and shar-rat EN.lIQ are husband and wife. That the “queen of Nippur” was indeed none other and icIN.LIL follows also from other considerations, of which I shall mention only one: Ninlil, “the son of Enil,” is called in K. B., I, p. 175, 18, the ilittu Ke-ti-shar-belu, “the one borne by Kurushar, the mistress (belitu = Ninlil),” but Kurushar is according to III R., 38, 3 = shar-ra-ti-a “queen.” Hence shar-ratu must be the wife of Enil (= SUGH), i.e., she is Ninlil, the “queen of Nippur.” Furthermore, Enil, the “Father” or “first person of the Nippurian Trinity,” is in every case identified with his wife, the “Mother,” or the “third person of the Trinity”: they are, as “husband and wife,” “one flesh.” This Unity is still dearly attested by the inscriptions themselves. Above we saw that SUGH or Enil was a male divinity, but icIN.SUGH is according to II R., 35, 18a the same as “Ishtar of Eridu,” generally called An-nas (not ni-tum) or Anum. Again is identified with icIN.KUR, the wife icIN.KUR = Enil (see Bel, the Christ, p. 17). The wife of Enil is called also Ninlil or shar-rat EN.lIQ (our letter), hence icIN.SUGH is on the one hand the same as icIN.Enil and on the other — icIN.NIN.IB; i.e., the “Father” and the “Mother,” or the “first” and the “third person” of the Nippurian (and of any other Babylonian) Trinity are one: male and female in one person. What this Unity means we know: it is nothing but the Babylonian prototype of the Greek ἡ θεότης καὶ θάνατος, “the heaven and earth,” or “the firmament of heaven and earth”; the upper part, “the firmament of heavens,” or “heaven” is the husband or “Father,” and the lower part, the “firmament of earth” or “earth” is the “Mother’s,” “Mother earth.” This oneness, this unity, is also expressed in such names of Enil as icIN.Dur-an-ki or icIN.Dur-an en.AN, the Ekal al ša-nišir Bel-áššimara (see Bel, the Christ, p. 21).

The “heaven and earth” or cosmos had a son, called icIN.NIN.IB. The Babylonian name for cosmos is not only an-ki, but also E.KUR or E-shar-ra, hence Ninlil is termed the bu-ke-nu NIN.lIQ-ru E.KUR, K. B., I, p. 62 : 2; the apil E.KUR, I R. 15, VII : 55; the bu-ke-nu icIN.EN.lIQ-ru E-shar-ra; I R. 29, 10 (= K. B., I, p. 174 : 13, 10);
the dumu-ush (= apil) Ešhār-ra zi-ki-ša, Craig, Rel. Texts, I, p. 43 : 17; the apil Ešhār-ra, IV R. 1, 34a. Seeing that the "cosmos" is represented by Enlil (= SUGH) and Ninlil (= sharrat Enlil), NIN.IB appears also as the EN dumu.dingir En-ili-lal-ge = mār 4, Reinsner, Hymnen, p. 123 : 6l., or as the L dingir NIN.IB dumu dingir.L, K. 170, Rev. 14, and as the iluštu Ku-tu-šar (= sharratu, see above) belšu, K. B., I, p. 175 : 18. As such a "Son" he is his Father's "voice" (qebātu, cf. the 70 of Jahweh), III R. 67, 65c, d, through whom the Father speaks and reveals himself; he is his "messenger," the sukbat E.KUR, V R. 51 : 29c, whose business it is to enforce and guard the commands of his Father: 4 NIN.IB mārîq (SHBŠH) purrusē (ESH.BAR) a-bi ïššÉn-ili, II R. 57, Obv. 24, 25c, d. He can do it, for he is the ur-nag baš-uru, "the mighty hero" (lit. "head-servant"), "who has no equal" (gub-ri ma-tug-a), and he does it by means of his "seven sons" (cf. 4 NIN.IB = ïššPā-šu-in-gar-ra, II R. 57, Rev. 57b, who, according to III R. 67, No. 1 : 25c, d. (= II R., 55 : 59a, b), has "seven" sons, among whom (1.35) is to be found a certain ïššUr-NIN-to-a(d-du-a). The latter appears also among the "seven" sons of Bag and Nin-Gāru (Creation Story, p. 23 : 6, where Eššur must be read, instead of kalum), who are his TUR.DA or ešššiši (magnificent ones) (German: Recken). The chief one (NU or maššu) among these "seven mighty ones," since the time of the kings of Ur, is ïššPA.KU or Nusku, while ïššNIN.IB himself is the ïššUGAL.TUR.DA, "the king of the mighty ones." That these "seven sons" are nothing but the sevenfold manifestations of the powers of nature, i.e., of NIN.IB, the god of lightning and storm, has been indicated on p. 21, and will be proved in detail in my forthcoming volume. And as the "seven powers of nature," headed by Nusku, are simply manifestations of the "Son" or NIN.IB, through which he reveals himself, Nusku came to be identified with NIN.IB (see Bel, the Christ, p. 2, note 10, and p. 3, notes 18f.). NIN.IB, again, was, as "Son," identified with his "Father," Enlil; cf. here the names ïššL, ïššN.KUR.KUR, ïššSUḪ, all of which stand for Enlil and NIN.IB; hence the "Father" is = the "Son" and the latter is = Nusku, the (chief of the) "seven powers of nature: all are one and yet distinct. In this wise it happened that "the seven" came to stand for the "fulness of the Babylonian godhead," just as in the Christian religion the "seven gifts" of the Holy Ghost stand both for the "fulness of the Holy Ghost" and for "the godhead," or as the sevenfold candlestick represented the "fulness of the godhead" in the Old Testament. On account of this symbolic significance, the "seven" was looked upon as the most sacred and the most evil number: it being both holy and taboo. So is also the Holy Ghost. He is on the one hand the most gracious comforter, and on the other the only being that does not pardon a sin committed against him: the sin against the Holy Ghost being unpardonable (see here also my review of Prof. Hilprecht's B. E., XXI, in the Homiletic Review, February, 1908, pp. 100ff., which was written, however, in March, 1907).

NIN.IB, who appears also in III R. 68 : 21g, h (cf. ll. 19, 17) as the Dam.(Bi-SAL) of ïššNIN.IB, must be here likewise (because coupled with him) the wife of NIN.IB. But in II R. 50 : 19; III R. 68 : 19g, h (cf. l. 17) there appears as the wife of ïššMASH = ïššNIN.IB the goddess NIN.EN.LIL, i.e., the "mistress of Nippur," who was, as we saw above, the same as Ku-tu-šar, the "queen and mistress of Nippur." Again, in Reinsner, Hymnen, p. 47, No. 23, Rev. 22, 23, NIN.MAGH is called the A M (= ummâ), "mother," of ïššIB.A = ïššNIN.IB. From this it follows that the "wife of the Son" is the same as the "Mother" or the "third person" of the Babylonian Trinity; in other words, the "Son" marries or may marry his own "Mother"! The explanation of this extraordinary phenomenon is simple enough. The "Mother," we saw, was the earth, and the "Son" was said to be the powers of nature: the wind, rain, storm, lightning, etc. The "Son," although begotten by the "Father" and borne by the "Mother," marries every spring his own "Mother"; i.e., the rains of the spring unite themselves with "Mother" earth, in consequence of which she becomes, after the dead and barren season of the winter, fruitiferous, brings forth new life, quickens the dead (mišlarrât mišlî): the vegetation and the (seven) equinoxial storms (the seven sons). And because the "Son" marries his own "Mother" he now becomes "one flesh with her," hence ïššNIN.IB and ïššNIN.MAGH (sic! not NIN.EN.GA Appreciation!) are identified, are one: III R. 68 : 18g, h (cf. ll. 21, 17). Cf. also ïššNIN.MAGH = Antum, II. B. 54, No. 2, l. 2 (Hommel, S. L., p. 48, 36). Antum = ïššNIN.IB, Bel, the Christ, etc., pp. 16, 18. ïššNIN.MAGH is, therefore, a name signifying the "Son," the "wife of the Son," and the "Mother."

In conclusion I may add a few words about the pronunciation of ïššNIN.IB. In my review of Clay's volume...
6 ša₂ d₄-ki NI(G = GAR, sha)-GÅL
   (= i₄)₂-tum n₄p(sic')-ti-ka
7 li₄-a₄-su₄-tum ma-an-nu pa-an³
8 ba-nu₄-tum ša₂ be₄-ia li₄-mur
9 [ə?]₄ man-nu da-ba-ba t₄b(= H₁)₂₈
10 [a-n₄]₁ be₄-ia li₄-il-te-m₄
11 [um]₂-ma-a [na b]e₄-[i₄]-a-[ma]

the city (i.e., Nippur) may protect
ty thy creatures (subjects)!

Whosoever, may see the gracious face of my 'Lord'
and whosoever be of 'good words'
may listen to my 'Lord'!

The following to my 'Lord':

Two peculiarities of this text require some words of explanation. The first is
the word nap-ti in ll. 4 and 6. According to the greeting of 89 : 6⁴ we would expect

entitled Business Documents of Murash4 Sons of Nippur (= B. E., X) I tried to show (see The Monist for January,
1907 (Vol. XVIII, No. 1), p. 139) that NIN.IB was originally an Amurritic god coming from the westland,' where
he had been identified with ḪI₄ MARTU, and where he was called Irrīṣū, resp. Irrīštu. Three months after my review had
appeared, Dr. Clay read a paper before the American Oriental Society, on April 5, 1907, in which he had reached the
same conclusion, viz.: NIN.IB has to be identified with ḪI₄ MARTU. Though I naturally was sorry not to find in his
review any reference to my review, and to learn from p. 2 of the J. A. O. S. for 1907 that the reading Irrīṣū(ën) was
known to him only from 'private communication.' I still greeted Clay's discovery with rejoicing. Upon the basis of his
investigations Clay thought to be justified in rejecting any and all readings of the name ḪI₄MARTU as so far proposed.
He accordingly proceeded, being encouraged in this by Jansen's reading (namash = namashṭu = namartu), and identified
nāmḫēn (thus has to be read, see 'Preface') with En-namashṭu = Emnashtu = En-martu. The objections to such a reading,
however, are evident to every Assyriologist: MARTU, a Sumerian ideogram, cannot be treated as an Assyrian word,
martu, to which one applies Semitico-Babylonian phonetic laws (the change of r to s before t), making martu washtu.
Surely, every Assyriologist would unhesitatingly translate a word En-namashṭu (martu) by 'the lord of the daughter' or
'owner of a daughter.' A Sumerian ideogram MARTU, signifying 'westland,' according to Assyrio-Babylonian
grammar, cannot become a 'daughter,' or marṭu. The god MARTU played in the westland the same rôle as did, e.g., Enlil in
Nippur, or Sin in Ur, or Marduk in Babylon, i.e., he was the highest god among the Amurrites, hence being identified
not only with ḪI₄ KUR GAL, 'the god of the great mountain' or 'world' (an attribute of Enlil, Sin, Marduk, etc.;
this shows that KUR.GAL cannot be read in each and every case Amurru, but must be understood quite
frequently of Enlil or Anu or Sin or Marduk, cf. ḪI₄ BE₄ = bē₄ = Enlil and En), but also with 'Ur = ḪI₄ (cf. here
also C. T., II, 12 (Bu. 88-95, 212), 1. 30, ḪI₄ Marduk(!) & ḪI₄ En-namashṭu = MARTU, i.e., 'Marduk and Sin-Amurru')
There were known in Babylonian a 'Sin of Ur,' a 'Sin of Harran,' a 'Sin of Amurru,' a 'Sin of Nippur' (cf. here
the date of Dungi, E. B. H., p. 250, 15: \nu₄ ṭ₂₄-n₄-te₂₄ En₄-n₄-m₄₄ ḪI₄-b₂₄-bar-bar.
Of this Nippuran Sin we have quite a number of hymns and prayers in our Museum,' and many others. I also beg to differ from Prof. Clay's explanation of the dinu₄ dinu₄ in the name Warad-dingir-dingir-Martu, found in his paper referred to above (p. 7 of the reprint),
in which, upon the suggestion of Prof. Jastrow, he states with regard to dinu₄ dinu₄ that it is a pluralis majestatis
corresponding to the Heb. דִּינָא. That name has to be read Warad-AN₄ ḪI₄ MARTU and shows that MARTU was
identified, as is to be expected, with the highest and oldest Babylonian god AN. AN₄ ḪI₄ MARTU is, therefore, parallel
to the AN gi₂₄-nu₂₄ ḪI₄ EN₄ LII (Code of Hammurabi, I : 1, see The Monist, Vol. XVI (October, 1906), p. 634) or to the
well-known ḪI₄ EN₄ LII ḪI₄ Martu. Cf. also for the formation Warad-AN₄ ḪI₄ MARTU names like Galu₄ ḪI₄ Be₄-i₄-
Martu (or is Martu here a title?), Reisner, Tellah, 150, VI : 23; Galu₄ ḪI₄ DISH-AN₄, Reisner, l.c., 154, III : 4.
This last name is especially interesting, showing us that ḪI₄ DISH was not only ḪI₄-EN₄ A (br. 10068), but also AN₄; notice also
that DISH is 66, which is the number of AN, and AN is 66.

1 For this and the following see above, p. 22.
2 The traces visible seem to be against such an emendation, but the parallel text, 89 : 11, justifies it, see p. 22.
3 AN₄ = a₄-ash₂ B.DIM.GAL.KALAM MA n₄p-sha₂₄-d₄-h₄-t₄-pu₂₄.
here the word nap-shá-ti for nap-ti. Should the writer have made twice the same mistake of omitting šá, or have we to see in napishtu a synonym, resp. side form of napishtu? As I personally cannot imagine that our writer could be guilty of committing the same error twice in a space of only three lines, I prefer to consider nap-ti not as a mistake for nap-shá-ti, with the šá left out, but as a synonym of napishtu, from the root  goddess, “soul,” “life.” The second peculiarity is met with in the expression NI(G).GAL-tum nap-ti-ka. If these two words have to be connected, thus taking NI(G).GAL-tum as the nomen regens of nap-ti, we will have to admit that this is a rather singular status constructus relation. We would expect either NI(G).GAL-tum šá nap-ti-ka or NI(G).GAL-ti, -at nap-ti-ka. However, such status constructus relations may be paralleled, cf. e.g., ul-tu ūmu₃ (for ūm) sa-a-ti, Neb., V R. 64, I : 9; kima pārīm šērī, ḫarrānam namraṣa, quoted by Delitzsch, Gram., p. 192, note. If, then, NI(G).GAL-tum nap-ti-ka be one expression we may compare with it the well-known NI(G).ZI.GAL = shiknat napishti = NI(G).GAL-tum + ZI = shiktittum nap-ti = creatures—an attribute ascribed not only to is*NIN(var. SAL)-in-ātu-na, the ūm kalam-na ZI.GAL kalam ṣām-ṣīm-me, “the mother of the world, who creates the creatures (ZI.GAL = NI(G).ZI.GAL = shiknat napishti) of the world,” E. B. H., p. 202, note I, 1, but also to Shamash, the be-el shik-na-at napishtim Ş, IV R. 28, No. 1, 7, 8b. This gives us the important result that the writer Shiriqum ascribes in this passage divine attributes to his “Lord,” which would be not at all surprising if it can be proved that the “Lord” was in each and every case the “King”; for we know that the Cassite kings of this period, like their Egyptian contemporaries, were deified, as is indicated by the sign ilu, very often found before their names. The intended signification of this passage, then, is clearly this: “May SUGH and the queen of Nippur protect ‘the life of my Lord,’ i.e., my Lord himself, and may NIN.IB and NIN.MAGH that inhabit the city (sc. of Nippur) protect my ‘Lord’s’ creatures”—a prayer for the protection of the “Lord” and his “subjects.”

1 See Clay, List of Names, B. E., XIV, especially Hilprecht, B. E., Series A, Vol. XX, Part I, p. 82.

2 If it were possible to read instead of ki (in ilu-ki) = DUL (cf. Clay, List of Signs, B. E., XIV, No. 136) we might be tempted to transcribe l. 6, šá (is)DUL.NI(G).GAL-tum nap-ti-ka, and translate: “that inhabit the ‘mountain of creatures;” thus taking DUL.NI(G).GAL-tum to be another name for DULAZAG, “the holy mountain” of the nether world, of which is*NIN.IB was, as we know, the “king” (LUGAL). But this cannot be done, simply because is is absolutely certain. A third explanation might be suggested by taking NI(G).GAL-tum nap-ti (l. 6) as standing in opposition to nap-ti — “soul” (I. 4); SUGH and the queen of Nippur may protect the “soul” of my Lord, and NIN.IB and NIN.MAGH may protect “thy body.” This would fit very well, for we know that the wife of NIN.IB was the great physician, who cared for the “spiritual” (napši) and “bodily welfare” (NI(G).GAL-tum napishtu) of her people. However, a signification “body” — NI(G).GAL-tum napishtu is not known to me. Hence the only translation that seems linguistically justified is the one given above. For ZI.GAL cf. also Jensen, Z. A., VIII, p. 221, note 5.
Even though it be admitted that the "Lord" was in possession of all that has been enumerated above, it might still be objected that, e.g., a sukkallu or the "king's representative" was designated here by the title be-li, and this the more as he "apparently shared honors with his royal masters"; for we saw on p. 33 that certain writers used the phrase "before the presence of my 'Lord' may I come" not only in their letters to the king, but also in those which they addressed to his "representative." Surely such a high officer of the king would naturally have been in possession of cities, guards, houses, lands, wagons, chariots, fields, cattle, and servants. Or it might be said that a governor, bēl pahāti, was meant by be-li in our letters; for he as the head of a government and the superior of the hazannāti or city prefects had, as a matter of course, under his command cities, chariots, servants, houses, lands, etc., etc., and writers, addressing their letters to such an official, would quite naturally include in their greeting some kind of a wish for the prosperity and the safe-keeping of their "Lord's" possessions.

Fortunately for our investigation here we have a letter, published in this volume, that has been written to a governor. And how does the writer address the governor? By be-li or "Lord"? Does he beg to be permitted to "come before the face" of his Lord? Does he call himself "thy servant"? Nothing of the kind. The writer simply names his addressee by name and extends his greeting to him, his house, and his government. An address in a letter to a governor at this period, then, reads (No. 77 : i ff.):

1 a-na mā.En-til-[bēl (= EN)-nishē-shu] To Enlil-bēl-nishē-shu
2 ki-bi-[ma um-ma] speak, thus saith
3 mā.A-shur-shum-ētir (= KA[R]n-um-ma) Ashur-shum-ētir:
4 a-na ka-a-shā bū[ti-ka] to thee, thy house
5 ṣa-na pa-ša-t[i-ka] and thy government
6 lu-ū shul-[mu] greeting!

Again, in No. 24 Kalbu, the writer, itū, "dust and loving servant," after having reported to his "Lord" that a city and its gate had been destroyed, adds in l. 29ff.:

29 ụ Mār-[w [...]] Also Mār-[ [...]],
30 bēl pahāti (=-EN.NAM²) a-na ardī-ke ki-i ụ-li-ku um-ma-a the governor, when he had come to thy servant (i.e., to the writer), said:

¹ For this emendation and for the time when this governor lived (11th year of Kadushman-Turgu) see p. 13, n. 5.
² For EN.NAM = bēl pahāti see Delitzsch, H. W. B., p. 5196.
31. abulla(-KÂ.GAL)² = ma-ad-di² tu-
shá-an-na-ma taddan (= SE)-na³  "They make lamentations on account
(of the loss) of the gate. Duplicate
(it)."

In this passage the "governor" evidently is quite a different person from the
be-lù or "Lord"; nay, he, although a bēl paḫāti, has to go to the itē Kalbu with the
request, no doubt, that the latter report the loss of the gate to the "Lord," in
order that a new one be made.

That also a "representative" or sukkalu of the king cannot be meant by the
"Lord" in our letters is evident from a passage of No. 35 :

24. u libittu (= SHEG) ia-a'-nu  There are also no adobes!
25. ášb-shum a-na-ku i-tu be-lù-ia  As regards this that I, the itē of my
"Lord,"
26. al-li(? or la?)-ka a-na "Erba-ä=Mard-
duk
27. šû-ru-ur-ma a-na "Kudur-Ani
28. [lit]-ish-pu-ra-ma sukkalmahhu
( = PAP.LUGH.¹ MAGH) li-[q-br]
29. libittu (= SHEG)³mesh li-il-bi-nu  that adobes be made (lit. that they
make adobes)."

A beautiful example of "red tape" for this remote period! The sense of this pas-
sage is apparently the following: Kishahbut, the writer and itē (p. 35, n. 4), living in
Dūr-Nusku during the reign of Kadašmana-Turgu, had at some previous time gone
(up) to his "Lord" with the request that the sukkalmahhu (a higher officer than
a sukkal) Erba-Marduk be instructed to issue orders to Kudurāni
('the chief brick-

¹ In view of the fact that masî = LAL (S² 142), which latter in the Temple Archives of this period signifies
"a minus," "a loss," one might be inclined to translate "the gate is gone." Against this must be said, however, that
bab-GAL.LA = abullu, hence we would expect ia-ma-ad-di. I-ma-ad-di I take, therefore, as a third pers.
plur. for imaat. For 4, instead of 6, cf. Delitzsch, Gram., p. 252, and for the signification "klagen, stöhnen u. dergl."
Jensen, K. B., VI, pp. 394, 557: "They (i.e., the inhabitants, or the German indefinite man) make lamentations
on account of the gate," i.e., "they deplore its loss."

² By translating as given above I consider tushanna-ma taddan as a continuation of the "speech" of the governor,
and not as a request of the writer. If the latter were to be preferred we should expect a phrase be-lù ūshanna-ma
(= tushanna-ma), cf. 1. 34, be-lù a-na-as il-mur-ma. Tushanna-taddan is a šû deadline " thou shalt duplicate and
give" = " thou shalt give again."

³ For PAP.LUGH = LUGH = sukkalu cf. III R. 67, 55, tûPAP.LUGH = ditto (i.e., tûPAP.LUGH).
maker) that adobes be made. The writer, after having returned from his "Lord," and having waited for some time to see whether his request had been complied with or not, finds that this had not been done. He, therefore, takes in this letter another opportunity to remind his "Lord" once more of his former request. "May," he says, "the sukkalmahhu Erba-Marduk upon thy command now finally issue orders for the making of adobes. This is very urgent, seeing that there are absolutely no adobes at hand" (l. 24). The "red tape" in connection with this order (the iti writing to the be-lî that he give instructions to the sukkalmahhu that this one issue orders to the chief brickmaker that the latter induce his men to make adobes) shows clearly that the sukkalmahhu was the inferior of the be-lî: he had to receive instructions from his "Lord" before he could issue the necessary orders, and the writer, knowing this, does not write directly to the sukkalmahhu, but directs his request to the proper authorities, the be-lî. Only by doing this could he (the writer) expect that his wishes were ever conformed with. The be-lî, being here the superior of the sukkalmahhu, cannot possibly have been a sukkal.

There is, however, still another and last possibility to be considered in connection with this title. In Delitzsch, H. W. B., p. 457a, we are told that the manzas pâni, i.e., "one who takes his stand before the king," was the "Ranghöchster, höchster Würdensträger" (sc. of the king). Is not perhaps this highest of all royal officials intended by be-lî in our letters? The answer to this supposition is given by a letter (No. 48 : 27) in which the writer, whose name is unfortunately broken away, assures his "Lord," be-lî: "ul mu-shî-kî-lu3 a-na-ku lu man-za-az pa-ni a-na-ku, i.e., "not a mischief breeder, but a manzas pâni am I." Surely, no manzas pâni could or would ever speak to another manzas pâni in this manner, because (1) there was not or could not have been another highest(!) official by this name; (2) even if there were, no official would ever humiliate himself as far as to call his brother officer "my Lord," nor would he humbly beg "to be permitted to appear before his equal's face"! Such things might be possible at present, but they are absolutely excluded and wholly unthinkable, nay, absurd for a period to which these letters belong, the time of the Cassite kings, when petty jealousies reigned supreme. If, then, the "Lord" of this manzas pâni could not possibly have been a "brother" officer, but was, as the title indicates, that official's "Lord," then the only conclusion to be
arrived at under these circumstances is that the "Lord" of the manzaz pānī must have been and actually was the King.

We need not, however, content ourselves with emphasizing merely what the "Lord" was not or could not have been. Thanks to the wonderful collection of Babylonian letters preserved in the Museum, of which only a very small part is published here, there are abundant direct proofs at hand which, if correctly explained, establish once and for all the truth of the conclusion above arrived at by a process of elimination.

To enumerate all the data which furnish direct proof for our conclusion would lead me far beyond the scope of the present investigation. I must content myself, therefore, with the following:

(a) The address as it is found in No. 24 could never have been written to any official, high or low, but the King. It reads (No. 24 : 1ff.):

A-na be-bā-ia:

1 As-mi lu-ul-li-i zēr1 ishtu (= TA) shame (= AN)-[e]
2 la ma-ir2 an-ni gū-ra-di li-e-i it-pi-sh[i]\(^1\)
3 nu-ir abē (= SHESH) manš-shu PI-in-di-e na-ma-a-ri

\(^1\) In view of such forms as lu-ul-li-ik, No. 38 : 2, kiššu-pa-ira-[an]-mu, No. 39 : 23, and many others, one might be inclined to see in this sign a variant of is and read lu-ul-li-i-ik, "may I come." But against this is to be said that (1) in all texts of this period only the regular form for is, as given by Clay, Sign List, B. E., XIV, No. 257, is to be found; (2) the TA.AN [ + one sign] would be completely left in the air; (3) having examined this sign repeatedly, I am absolutely confident that it is none other but ZER — zēr, "seed." The TA.AN then is easily amended to 4štu šame-[e]. For an analogous attribute of a Cassite king cf. the inscription of Agum-Kakrimo (Jensen, K. B., III, p. 134, col. I : 3), where this king calls himself zēr šu-lum ša (šu)Shē-kə-ma-na, "the pure seed of Shuqamuna." Cf. also in this connection the sign of god, šu, before the names of the Cassite kings of this period.

(b) So rather than is be-ir an-ni, "who does not deny grace." The attribute here ascribed to the "Lord" has its origin in the fact that the writer had to report to his be-ā, rather sad news, which possibly might be attributed to his (the writer's) negligence, see II. 11ff.

(c) For it-pi-shi see Hilprecht, R. E., XXI, p. XII, note 7.

(d) In this expression two divine attributes fall together, viz., nār misti resp. nār ēli-shi or nār gab-ba, ascribed especially to Sin, Shamash, and D(T)ar-bu (p. 16, n. 13), and asharid abē-shu(shu), found in connection with Nin.I.B and Ishhtar, i.e., with all gods who played the rôle of the "Son" and "his wife."

(e) Delitzsch, H. W. B., p. 632a, mentions a word pünde, which he takes to be a plural, quoting III R. 65, 6b, "wenn ein neugeborenes Kind pi-in-di-e ma-li voll ist" son p." In our text PI-in-di-e is apparently a noun in the genitive (after ana, I, 1) and the regens of na-ma-a-ri. As such a noun it is a jītel of šīdi-e — šī-di-e — šin-di-e — šī-in-di-e, which latter, when graphically expressed, becomes PI-in-di-e. This "Lord," being the "light," i.e., the first and foremost of his brothers, has, of course, the power, authority, and right to "order," "appoint" the mesärni — a function of the sun in the early morn; he is, therefore, identified here with the moon, who as "Father" asks his "Son" (the sun) to do his bidding: "to lighten the world." Hilprecht takes PI-in-di-e as a ja'al form: suddaj = suddē — vëndē — vëndē (a with following n is often changed to e or i) = vëndē = "appointer, commander."
FROM THE TEMPLE ARCHIVES OF NIPPU.

4 ki-ib² kab-tu-ti²
5 e-pí-ir² um-ma-ni
6 e-tel ki-na-te-e-shá²
7 u³ Be-li-ti-l₃(=NI.NI)³
ra-ásh-ba-nu-ú-ti²
pa-ásh-shur ni-shi
sha³ ²En-li-u ²En ²É.A
ki-ib-ti² du-um-ki

¹ Ki-ib, ki-ib-tu = gášu, gášu. Delitzsch. H. W. B., p. 584a, defines a gášu to be one "der nit etwas betracht ist," and of gášu he says, i.e., that it is a "Darlehen, spec. eines freien Darlehen(?)" On the basis of our passages here it would be better to see in a gášu "one (may he be king, governor or common man) who holds something in trust as a gratuitous gift from a higher person (god or king), for whom he administers, rules, governs it." This "something" thus held, administered, governed is a kiptu. What this "something" in each and every case is to be determined by the context. It may be a city, or money (cf. here the faithful steward of the New Testament who used or administered the kiptu, i.e., the talents gratuitously given him, wisely, or even an empire. As the "Lord" here referred to is the King (see under b), the kiptu is the "kingship" held in trust by him as a gratuitous gift from the gods of the whole world, for whom he has to administer it in such a way as to tend towards "grace and righteousness," hence dumkák is mšnr³ are objective genitives. To take them as subjective genitives would be senseless, because everything that comes from the gods is in itself gracious and righteous. A king that administers his kiptu in such a way is a šar mšš-ni, Neb. Hot. 1, 1. For ki-ib-gášu, see also 46: 17, ki-ib-ka (i.e., the Lord's) a-a-um-ma ul-ti-ku-ur.

² A plural of rashshám, and this a form in -an (which forms adjectives and nouns, Delitzsch, Grum. § 65, p. 175, No. 56) of rashša.

³ E-pí-ir . . . . pa-ásh-shur. The correct explanation of these words depends upon whether we see in them participles or nouns. If e-pí-ir be the participle of ephú, "süttigen, versorgen" (Jensen, K. B., VI, pp. 438, 572) we might see in it a translation of the well-known title of, e.g., the kings of Isin, Larsa, Warka, who call themselves in their inscriptions Ú.A = ephú-bur, šári-sum (Delitzsch, H. W. B., p. 1155). Cf. for the kings of Isin: Sin-mági (Thureau-Dangin, A. S. K. I., p. 204, No. 4, 1, 2), Shime-Dagan (i.e., p. 206, No. 5, 1, 2); for the kings of Larsa: Sin-shílun (i.e., p. 208; No. 5, 1, 3), Arra-Sin (i.e., p. 212, 1, 6), Arru-Sin (i.e., p. 214, 1, 8), Rim-Sin (i.e., p. 216a, 1, 13; p. 218, 1, 10; p. 220, 1, 11 above; f. 1, 11); for the kings of Warka: Sin-gáshid (i.e., p. 222, 1, 8). If e-pí-ir be a participle then pasqal must be one likewise, in which case the latter might stand for pasqal = pasqar, Delitzsch, H. W. B., p. 5419: "Löser, der sich gnädig annimm, Erbarme" (cf. V R. 21, 53a, b; 65a, b, nöp-shá-rasyn of re-e-nu). As, however, a writing pa-ásh-shur for pasqar should be somewhat strange for this period, it is preferable to take pa-ásh-shur in the sense of pasqalša, "platter," and then, of course, e-pí-ir not as a participle, but, on account of the parallelism, as a stat. conj. of ephú (so also Hilprecht and Hommel in personal communications), "the food of people, the platter (παζάρ) of men," from which, i.e., from whose (the Lord's) grace they all eat. For ephú as a divine attribute cf. also the proper names in the En-li-e-pí-ir, B. E., XV, 181: 12; ²²En-li-e-pí-ir (stel neither tu, Cai, i.e., p. 259, nor "perhaps" tir, Cai, Corrections (!) in Z. A., XX (1907), p. 4717., i.e., 37: 9; "XXXII-e-pí-ru-ca-nu, i.e., 180: 17; ²²Bélk (= GÁSHĀN)-e-pí-ru-ca-nu, i.e., 155: 27; ²²ŠU.UD.DA.-e-pí-ir (sic! Clay, i.e., p. 538, wrongly Hu-shú-urru-e-pí-ir(?)), i.e., 156: 10. For SHU.UD.DU cf. the proper name in R. T. Ch., 330, Rev. 2, a name like ²²Mar-duk. From this it follows that the "Lord" e-pí-ir um-ma-ni has a divine attribute: he was dšday.


² Notice here the at before Bit-ili and the at between Ešill and É.A. The first three gods represent the "whole world," the cosmos as it was known since the time of the Enûma elish epic, i.e., since the time when Babylonia proper (Ki-en-pí-ki-BUR.BUR = Shumer and Akkad = kalûm = "high and lowland") had extended its confines south over the lowlands as far as and embracing the Persian Gulf ("the lower sea") and north over the Armenian mountains and the "westland" (notice that these two lands are likewise known as BUR.BUR = Akkad = highlands) up and including the Mediterranean Sea ("the upper sea"). In this wise it happened that the kalûm became a bar-iur and the dánut LUGAL KALAM.MA a dánut LUGAL KUR.KUR; in other words, the microcosmos became a macrocosmos which included the two oceans and was called É-shar-ra, being as such inhabited by Anu (heavenly ocean = upper sea),
8 ʿu mi-iš-ri-e
  
9 be-lu-ia ki-bi-ma um-ma *Kal-bu* ʾip-ru
10 ʿu ar-du na-ra-am-ka-ma³

**Translation.**

To my "Lord"—

1 Glorious in splendor,  
2 Not summoning punishment,  
3 Light of his brothers,  
4 Ruler of mighty,  
5 Food of the people,  
6 Hero of his clan,  
7 Together with Bēlit  
8 Tending towards grace And righteousness—

9 to my "Lord" speak, thus saith Kalbu, thy dust  
10 and thy loving servant:

The attributes here ascribed to the "Lord"—such as "the strong one, the powerful, the wise one," "the ruler of weighty and mighty ones," "hero of his family"; his being identified with the gods, as such being called "seed out of heaven," "light of his brothers," "the orderer of the dawn"; his holding in trust the administration of a "fief tending towards grace and righteousness", which was gratuitously given him by the gods of the whole world and not by any human being, shows absolutely and conclusively that we have here a divinely appointed ruler, who holds his king-

---

1 Though we have forms with e, instead of i, in the third pers. singl. or plur. (cf. e-si-ki-ir-ma, 3:18; e-pi-(i)-te-ma, 3:19, 30, 32; e-ri-ba-a, 26:13, etc.), yet we never find an e used as a pionicetic complement in these forms, hence I read here not e-isht-ru-ba-u-shu, but mi-iš-ri-e! isht-ru-ba-u-sha. Mi-iš-ri-e I take as a plural of mišaru = mišru (cf. epišu, epišu, girmesu, girmasu; Delitzsch, Gram., p. 105, § 4), "righteousness" (hence not of mišaru, "riches," H. B. W., p. 888a), and dumši, on account of the parallelism, in the sense of "grace." II. W. B., p. 222b (against Jensen, K. B., VI, p. 448, "Schönheit, Guteit, gute Beschaffenheit"). The e may(!), however, stand for i (cf. 92:27) = "behold!"

2 Neither the name of this writer nor that of any other person occurring in this letter (cf. "E-liš-bal našiš ʿUsha-bal, 1.12; "In-na-E.KUR.GAL, 1.32; "Na-ziš-En-bal, 1.27; and the city "Mar-ru-gibšūmi, II. 12, 18) is mentioned in B. E., XIV, XV. See now, however, the Bit-ʿUsha-bal, Neb. Nippur, III, 5 (= Hinle, B. E., Series D, IV, p. 148).

3 In view of 89:1, šū ar-ru-naššušu, "whom (the addressee) [or (the writer)] love," I prefer to translate ar-du na-ra-am-ka-ma as given above, and not as "thy beloved servant." It is hardly to be expected that the "Lord" loves the "dust," but the "dust" loves his "Lord," is delighted to come in contact with his Master.
ship by the special favor of, and governs his people, for his gods in order that graciousness, truth, and uprightness may forever reign supreme. As such a divinely appointed ruler, he has, of course, also the bodily welfare of his people at heart—he is both their "food" and their "platter": by him and through him the gods are both the "givers" and the "gift."  

(b) To make the certain doubly certain we may be permitted to consider briefly another section of this letter. The paragraph, important for our discussion here, reads (24 : 18ff.):

18 ut an-Mannu-gir-im-sha LUGAL ra-in ga-[ti]  
Even the city Mannu-gir-Rammân, with which the King is entrusting me (i.e., which I hold as fief of the king)

19 ut be-la a-na rid-sabê (= MIR.NIT. TA) an-nu-ti id-di-na  
and which my Lord has handed over to these conscribers,

1 A city called after the name of a person. In such cases the DISH before the proper name is, if preceded by a, always omitted, cf. a,Arad-GASHAN, 66 : 24; a, Gir-ra-ga-nil, 3 : 31; a,Gir-ra-ga-nil, 3 : 39; or only a,Gir-ra-ga-nil, 3 : 13, 17, 20; Ud-ku-kal-di, 16 : 8, 12, but Bit.#Ki-din-iti, 9 : 23, so always after Bit- in our letters. The name of the person means "who is like Rammân," and corresponds to the Sumerian A-ba, dinim gim. The gi-ir, therefore, in this name represents the Sumerian GIM or the regular Babylonian kina (or ki). As the a in a-na or ina may be omitted and the n assimilated to the next consonant, so the a of kina has been omitted here and the n assimilated itself (by first becoming an n) to the following 1, but this it could do only if a, was actually read a,Rammân. This writing, then, proves that a, was not read, at the time of the Casette, Aturd but a,Rammân. For the change of k to g cf. okanna — aganna, p. 53, note 6.

2 The ti which is broken away stood originally on the right edge of the tablet, in the break indicated in the copy. Ra-in = ra-in, m before q (even if the q belongs to another word, cf. ana, ina, kina above) may become an n, Delitzsch, Gram., § 49a. For zzi c, double acc. see H. W. B., p. 692a, 2, "Jem. mit etwem begaden, d. h. beschenken"; here lit.: "with which the king entrusted my hand." It is the term, technicus used in the so-called "boundary stones" for a "royal grant," cf. e.g., Scheil, Textes Élam. Sém., I, p. 89. Our writer Kalbu, then, has received the city Mannu-gir-Rammân by "royal grant."

3 MIR.NIT.TA. King, Letters of Hammurabi, III, p. 99, note 6, was the first to recognize that the sign which looks like $H$ has to read MIR. It is found with either two (Letters of Hammurabi, 3 : 7, 11 : 26 : 10, 15 : 36 : 14 : 43 : 4, 7, 19, 23, 27, 29) or three (p, 418 (= C. T., VI, 27 : 14) or four (Letters of Hammurabi, 1 : 19, 22) wedges at the beginning. Delitzsch, B. A., IV, 485, read this sign BARA which in our letters looks quite differently, cf. 3 : 13 : 41 : 8 (BAR = parabba $ka$-ba-ga-nil) 60 : 7 (parabba a,En-ni). Cf. also Z. A., XVIII, 202f. i.e., p. 393; Harper, Code of Hammurabi, List of Signs, No. 135. The latter quotation shows that the signs wrongly read IP.USH or TU.USH (E. B. H., p. 423 passim) are to be transcribed MIR.NIT. Although Delitzsch read wrongly BARA for MIR, yet he was the first to recognize its true meaning. While King, i.e., translated our signs by "captain of troops," "driver of slaves," and Nagel (B. A., IV, 437) by "Truppenführer," Delitzsch rendered it (i.e.) by "Militärhändere." The an-nu-li shows that MIR.NIT.TA must be noun: plur. TA apparently contains only the "overcharging" vowel of USH = NIT. MIR.NIT.TA is = rid-sabê — a compositive noun in the plural, in which case only the last noun has the plural form. Harper, Code of Hammurabi, p. 183, probably gives the best translation of rid-sabê, rendering it by "recruiting officer; one who impresses men for the corvée." In view of the fact that the phrase of the Hammurabi Letters, anu MIR.NIT.TA mšahu resp. mšali (Delitzsch, B. A., IV, 487 = conscribers), corresponds exactly to our an-na MIR.NIT.TA nadâna, I prefer to translate as given above. From this it is evident that Kalbu held the city Mannu-gir-Rammân by "royal grant," subject to military service. All royal "grants" were, therefore, fiefs.

4 a, = relative after $ka$, I, 18.
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20 i-na la-me-e1 na-di zu-un-na i-na
sha-me-e
is destroyed by inundations: rains out
of the heavens

21 ụ mi-la i-na nak-bi2 ki-i i-di-nu3
sha'-ku
and floods out of the depths are, when
(after) he had handed her over,
overflooding her!

22 ụbu-kì shà be-lì i-ri-man-ni i-na la-
me-e
Yes, the city with which my Lord has
entrusted me is destroyed

23 na'-di a-na ba-la-ad a-i-ka-a lul-lik
by inundations! Where shall I go to
save my life?

Kalbu, "the dust and loving servant," reports here to his Lord, who is gracious
and pardoning, that a great misfortune had overcome
the city with which he had been
endowed by royal grant: a tremendous flood has destroyed it. As a result of this
the writer is in danger of losing his own life, crying, therefore, out in despair:
"Where can I possibly go to save myself?" The change of tenses in 1. 18 (ra-in
gà-tì) and 1.22 (i-ri-man-ni) pictures quite vividly the progress of the flood. While
in 1. 18 Kalbu is still the possessor of the city, holding it in trust for his Lord, he
has lost it in 1. 22, appearing as one that has been holding it.

If we compare in this paragraph the words "the city Mannu-gir-Rammán
with which the KING is entrusting me" (1. 18) with those of 1. 22, "the city with
which my Lord has entrusted me," we will have to admit that the writer refers
in one sentence to the KING and in the other to his LORD as the one who had given
him (the writer) authority over the city. But if we admit this, then we will have
to admit also the other, viz., that the Lord (BE-LÌ) is the King (LUGAL).

(c) And because the "Lord" is the "King," therefore could our writer, in one
and the same letter, speak of his master as be-lì and as LUGAL, when he complained
in the closing lines as follows (24 : 36f.):

1 La-me-e is apparently used here in the same sense as edātu, l. 15. Literally translated it means "is cast into
encircling." What this encircling was the words that follow tell us: it was an encircling caused by "rain and floods,"
hence an "inundation, a deluge."

2 To "rains out of the heavens and floods out of the depths" cf. the parallel expressions of the biblical flood story,
Gen. 7 : 11.12 | 8 : 2.

3 To i-di-nu, which refers back to id-di-na, l. 19, hence = id-di-nu, cf. besides l. 37, id-di-na-an-ni, also 3: 29, la-
ta-di-in; 87 : 17, šà ta-di-na and 57 : 18, kímu (= KU) na-ad-gan (cf. B. E., XIV, 106c : 2; XV, 181 : 4; Delitzsch,
lu-tu, pl. lu-la-tu is a syn. of maršu = GIG.BA, which latter we find again in KU.GIG.BA = khibtu (Jenson, K. B., VI,
p. 485), hence lu-la-tu, a kind of coarse, dirty flour) a-na PAD R-AN i-di-nu. A possible derivation from di-na or
even dunus is out of place here.

4 This older form of šà I found, so far, only here. Cf., however, B. E., XIV, Sign List, No. 272. The permansive
expresses here the idea that the overflooding is still going on.

5 Nothing is missing before na-di.
36 a-na-ku i-tu l[a-lî]-ia a-na a-la-a-ki And I, the itû of my "Lord," though I
have written to the "King" concerning my going (away, i.e., leaving)
37 a-na LUGAL ki-i ash-[pu-rû]a LUGAL yet the "King" has not given me (an
ul i-di-na-an-ni answer or permission to do so).

Kalbu, who was looking out for the interests of his "Lord" continually and in all
directions (i'tû), feels somewhat slighted that he should be treated by the "King"
in the way he was. He had, in a previous note dispatched to the King, asked
"where to go" (cf. also l. 23), but the King had not advised him what to do, hence
his renewed complaint here.

(d) At the same result we arrive if we study another letter published under
No. 55. Though the beginning and the end of that letter are broken away, yet the
passage important for our investigation is, fortunately, preserved and clear. From
this epistle we learn that the King (LUGAL, l. 8), upon the instigation of "En-
lil-ki-din-ni, commanded his messenger Mûr-" En-da-shá-ásh to "go and send certain
persons" (l. 10f.). But in l. 20 of this very same letter the royal messenger refers
to his King's command by saying (l. 21f.), "when " En-lil-ki-din-ni had spoken
to my Lord (be-li-ia), my Lord (be-li) sent word to me saying: send the
persons, etc." (follow the exact words which the king had spoken to his messenger
and which the messenger now quotes, l. 9f.). Here, then, again one and the same
person is referred to as both King (LUGAL) and Lord (be-li). But this could
be done only if the Lord was indeed the King. The letter, as far as it concerns
us here, reads (55 : 2f.):

2 Mûr-" En-su-ub-Shi-pak i-di a lu-û Mûr-Usub-Shipak knows. And with
TUR.TUR[meš] regard to the young slaves
3 šá na-shá-nu tî-il-ta-a'-a-tu um-
a[a i-na a-[ma-as-su-nu] whom we are holding prisoners let them
 inquire as follows:

1 Or "adjudged me worthy of an answer," see p. 104, note 5.
2 On account of the absence of the address it is very doubtful whether this letter belongs to those "addressed to the 'Lord'" or whether it ought to take its place behind No. 75.
3 TUR.TUR[meš], to be read according to I. 5, si-dû-hi-ra-â, are here "youngsters," "young slaves." Cf., however,
H., III, 289, a-mat LUGAL a-na amelu adla[TAM.ti-m-a-a amelu]AB.BA[meš u TUR[meš] il] and[meš]-iš (see also H.,
III, 290, 297, V, 518) with H., III, 295, a-mat LUGAL a-na amelu adla[RAM.ha-a-a amelu]AB.BA[meš u Šiš(= NE!)]-
ru-siš.
4 Perm. 1', first pers. plur., for nasûd-ni of No?; here with the same meaning as, e.g., Letters of Hammurâbi, No.
1 : 23, ka-an-ti-im šád ib-ni-[ê] MARTHU na-shu-â, "the contract which Ibi-Martu holds," i.e., "which he has in his
possession, which he keeps"; it being above in opposition to mûshhûru, "dismiss." Il. 12, 13, requires here some such
signification as "to hold as prisoner;"
4 ma-ti šá-a'-ma-tu-ma' iš TUR.


5 Már-âi Ash(?)-pi-la-an-du ší-il-hi-


6 ki-i ni-il-ki-ku-a-na m šú-En-lil-ki-din-


7 ni-iq-la-bi m šú-En-lil-ki-din-ni a-na


8 ki-i iq-bu-ü TUR.MÁR-âi šá-a-lish-


9 di-ma' il-la-ka-an um-ma-a šá-pu-


10 amelu DAM.QAR mesh TUR.TUR mesh


1 Shimu c. ina, "to decide," "to determine the fate with regard to something," "to give a decision with regard to something," "to give an accounts." Also note 4, page 51.

2 The reading of this name is not certain. If the šá which is written here strangely at the lower end of DISH does not belong to the name we might read Már-âi Pi-la-an-du. Also some such readings as Már-âi Pi-la-šú-šú DU or Már-âi Pi-la-šú-šú DU might be possible. A reading Már-âi Na-aš-la-an-du (resp. šú DU) is, however, less probable.

4 For šépu (here c. double acc.), "to entrust something to somebody," see p. 47, note 1.

5 Jensen, K. B., VI, p. 412, doubts whether šá-anu may be construed with double accusative. Here and p. 123, n. 8, it is. Dimna (= šému) šá-anu c. acc., lit. "to make news to somebody," i.e., "to make them known to somebody," "to report," and as it is here the king who "makes these news known to his messenger," it is equivalent to "to order," "to command." It is interesting to observe that the following verbs may be used in connection with šá-anu:

(a) lamidu, "to learn news." Here only with the first pers. of the verb, hence = "to inform one's self of something." Cf. 57: 21, di-im K[N] a-la-ma-ad; 33: 28, tu(l)-e-im ma-šú a-tam-ma-ad; 33: 30, šé(-)-im su-ma-šú a-tam-


8 Shému (f). See 


9 di-im šá-anu a-la-šú a-tam-ma-ad. See also C. T., VI, 34: 24, a-na te-im a-na-tim šá-a-šú a-tam-di-im.

(b) šá-anu, "to give news," "to inform." Cf. B. E., XIV, 114: 4, šá HA (= fish) TUR.MÁL di-e-mi i-dîm[- . .].

(c) šá-anu, "to ask for news about something," "to inquire about it." Cf. 22: 8, di-im ma-šú-šú ki iš-a-la-šú.

(d) šá-anu, "to give news," "to report," "to command," "to order." Cf. 59: 10, di-e-ma i-shá-ak-ka-na; 67: 6, di-ma lu-šú-ku-a-na(?) 80: 13, di-ma šá-šú-šú-šú 92: 21, 31, tu(l)-e-ma šá-šú-šú 9: 16, šá-anu (= GAR) di(- NE)-mi (here not an "officer," but a permumative: "as reporting concerning (sha) Bit-iška-šúnu"). From this it will be evident that an amelu šá-anu(-in) šá-anu be-ma (-in) may be (a) either a "reporter," who keeps his "superior" informed about the affairs of certain cities or territories, etc., or (b) he may be (if he be, e.g., a king, etc.) one that "gives command" to his inferior. Cf. furthermore 55: 9, di-ma il-la-ka-an; 54: 25, di-ma šá-šú-šú-šú-šú. In view of the two latter phrases we cannot explain 34: 38, be-lí di-e-ma il-KU(?)-na-an-ni as standing for be-lí šúma il-šúma il-qu(?)-na-an-ni—which would be without any sense—but we must see, that the sign KU has also the value tak(g), postulate that value here and read šá-anu(-ina-ni, or we must suppose that KU could be read (besides tak(g)) also tak(g): šá-anu(-KU)-na-an-ni. In the latter case we would have here a new value for KU, viz., tak(g).

(e) šá-anu, "to send news." Cf. 53: 40, di-im ta-šú-pa-ra-am-ma; 54: 11, di-im la-šú-pa-ra; 57: 17, di-e-ma il-šú-pa-ra-am-ma; 76: 5, di-e-ma šá-up-ra-am-ma; 94: 8, te(l)-e-ma šá-up-ra; 89: 29, de(- NE)-im-ka šá-a-šú a-tam-ma a-tam-ka šá-up-ra—the latter phrase being used for "a request of a letter in answer to a note sent."

(f) šá-anu, "to return news," "to advise," "Bericht erstatten." Cf. 76: 9, di-e-ma a-na be-el lu-le-ir.
of Enlilkidinni—send, that
they dismiss them (i.e., set them free).”
(Now) when the royal messenger had
come for the purpose of dismissing
us (i.e., of securing our release) (then)
he, after he had seized us,
brought us before the KING.

Whereupon the KING said to Mār-
Udashash:

‘Have I not sent greetings (i.e., a letter
containing greetings) unto thee and
commanded thee saying:

‘Thou shalt send that they
dismiss the young slaves of Enlil-
kidinni?’”

Mār-Udashash answered under those
circumstances
as follows: ‘‘After Enlilkidinni had
spoken to ‘MY LORD,’
‘MY LORD’
commanded me saying:

‘Send [that they dismiss] the agents and
young slaves [of Enlilkidinni], etc.”’

1 Stands for lu + umaskhirû-ni. Lu + u- (if 3 pers.) or lu + i- = iî, we always! For the i in mi-isk — mash cf. also
li-isk-li-ta-shulshu, 58 : 11; e-di-li-ka-û, 40 : 7, etc., hence an emphatic a with i preceding or following may become
an i.

2 The royal messenger here referred to is Mār-m Ū-da-shā-âsh, L. 8.

Lit. “for our dismissal”; the infinitive being treated here as a noun, hence -ni for -nashi (ll. 14, 15).

4 Shā-al-ma-at here not a plur. of shalimu, but a permissive = (lu) shalmâdi(a), “peace (greeting) be unto thee.”
This would make it appear that the Cassite kings, when writing to their subjects and using any greeting at all, employed
the following formula: shalmânu iskiši la shalmatta, “I am well, mayest thou be well.” The later Babylonian resp. Assyrian
kings said, 3a is well known, in its stead, shalmânu iskiši lâbâka la lâbâka (resp. lâbâkanu la lâbâkanu).

5 Undishâkhirâ = undiaskhirâ. The long i in nî-i I take as the sign of a question, hence standing for original u; i
instead of u on account of the i in nî.

See also a-ka-an-na-an, 52 : 23, on the one and a-gam-anu, 21 : 9, 14; a-ga-an-nu, 71 : 9, on the other hand. For the
last cf. also Behrens, L. S. S., ll, p. 2.

7 To be completed and translated according to ll. 9f.
We need not, however, be satisfied merely with the result that the ‘‘Lord’’ is in each and every case the ‘‘King,’’ but we can go a step farther and identify definitely the King of No. 55. Enlilkidinni, who plays such an important rôle in this letter and who clearly must have been a person of influence and affluence, he being in possession of ‘‘young slaves and agents’’ and having access to the King (who listens to his entreaties and acts accordingly), appears also as the writer of the two letters, Nos. 78, 79, and is as such a contemporary of Usub-Shipak, of Már-Udashash, of Aḫushina (78 : 1). The last is mentioned as patesi in the 17th year of Kuri-Galzu (B. E., XIV, 25 : 12), receiving PAD LU.ARDU in the 26th(!) year (of Burna-Buriash, B. E., XIV, 167 : 12, cf. l. 11) and KU.QAR “narkabtu in the 3d year (of Kuri-Galzu, B. E., XV, 21 : 7), and is found together with a certain Murănu in a tablet from the time of Kuri-Galzu (cf. Innanni, l. 25), B. E., XV, 194 : 7, 8. This Murănū was a son of Meli-Shalī and a patesi, living during the 18th year of Kuri-Galzu, B. E., XIV, 28 : 5. A ‘‘son of Murănū,’’ Măr-“Mu-ra-ni, who likewise is a patesi, is mentioned not only during the 13th year of Ku[ri-Galzu, sic! against Clay], B. E., XIV, 125 : 6, 8,13, but he appears also in the letter No. 78 : 4 as a contemporary and ˘ū˘ä(!) of Enlilkidinni. From No. 79 : 1 we learn that Enlilkidinni was a contemporary of Imguri, who again, as writer of Nos. 22, 23, is contemporaneous with Huzalum (22 : 6) and Kidin-Marduk (23 : 23). But Huzalum as well as Kidin-Marduk figure as witnesses in certain business transactions executed between Enlilkidinni and some other parties at the time of Burna-Buriash, more particularly Huzalum is mentioned as witness in the 21st year of Burna-Buriash (B. E., XIV, 8 : 30) and Kidin-Marduk in the 19th (or 18th?) year of the same king, B. E., XIV, 7 : 34. Taking all these passages together, there can be absolutely no doubt that the Enlilkidinni of Nos. 55, 78, 79 is the same person as the one who appears in the tablets of B. E., XIV, as living during the 3d (l.c., 1 : 6, 30, Clay wrongly 1st) 6th (l.c., 2 : 7, 19, 29), 19th (l.c., 7 : 14, 38) and 21st (l.c., 8 : 22, 25, 33) year of Burna-Buriash. From this it follows that the ‘‘Lord’’ and ‘‘King’’ of No. 55, the contemporary of Enlilkidinni, was none other but King Burna-Buriash.

Having established the identity of the King, we can now more specifically determine the occupation of Enlilkidinni. Above we saw that Enlilkidinni was in
possession of agents (DAM.QAR), young slaves (TUR.TURmesh = și-iy-hi-ru-tî) and of an itâ, "one who looked out for his superior's interests." If we compare this with the tablets of B. E., XIV, we find that Enlilkidinni was the son of ùNIN. IB-na-din-SHESHmesh (l.c., 1 : 6 | 7 : 14, here: SE-SHESH.SHESH), living in Bît-nt En-lil-ki-di-nî (l.c., 2 : 8), where he kept slaves (NAM.GALU.LU . . . . kalu-â), l.c., 2 : 6, 8), whom he bought from (Ki . . . . IN.SHI.IN.SHAM, l.c., 1 : 4, 8 | 7 : 12, 15) other slave-dealers (DAM.QAR, l.c., 1 : 4); he had even his own agents (No. 55 : 10, DAM.QARmesh) and representatives (itâ, Măr-Murâni by name, No. 78 : 4) who had continually to look out for their employer's interests. Here it is especially interesting to note that one and the same person could be a pa-e-sî and at the same time also an itâ for a dealer in slaves, as was the case with Măr-Murâni. This business must have been quite profitable and must have carried with it a great influence at the King's court, for Enlilkidinni need only appear before King Burna-Buriash, requesting the release of his slaves, and his wishes are instantly complied with. No wonder then that the "house of Enlilkidinni" became rich and powerful, flourishing as late as the time of Rammân-shum-ûsûr and Meli-Shipak.

The boundary stone, London, 103, the provenance of which is unknown, has been stealthily abstracted (by some workmen employed by the B. E. of the University of Pa.) from the ruins of Nippur. On this stone are mentioned not only the GÛ.EN.NA or 'sheriff' of Nippur (I : 20, 48, III: 7) and the "pîhat of Nippur" (III: 42)—which by themselves would show whence that stone came—but also such names as Bît-nt îEn-lil-ki-di-nî (IV : 29, 44; V : 31) and Aḫu-da-ru-â, the "son" (mûr, i.e., "descendant") of îEn-lil-ki-di-nî (IV : 13, 40; V : 1), who was, as we just saw, a rich and influential slave-dealer at Nippur during the time of Burna-Buriash. Cf. furthermore the writer of No. 25: 2, ûUr-îNIN.DIN.DÜNGA, with the person bearing the same name in London, 103, I : 6; also the îParak-mûrî (l. c., V, 15, with our No. 53 : 38) and the "canal of Dûr-îEnlîd," Nam-gar-Dûr-îEnlîd, l. c., III, 23, with

2 For mûr = "descendant," see below, Chapter IV, pp. 64, 65.
3 The following members of the "House of Enlilkidinni" are known:

îNIN. IB-na-din-SHESHmesh (or SE-SHESH.SHESH).

îEn-lil-ki-di-nî, the founder of the house.

îmûr (mûr here "descendant")

îAḫu-da-ru-â (see K. B., III', pp. 158, 180, IV : 12, 45).

îEn-lil-shum-iddina (= MÛ.MÛ).

Aḫu-da-ru-â lived during the time of Rammân-shum-ûsûr and Meli-Shipak, and Enlî-shum-iddina during the latter's reign.
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our Nos. 3: 33, 34, 38, 41; B. E., XIV, p. 58a; XV, p. 52a; X, p. 70a.

Such identity of names and places cannot be accidental.

If now it be admitted, as it undoubtedly must be, that the ‘‘Lord’’ of our letters is always and invariably the ‘‘King,’’ then, of course, it is not at all surprising that we should find in this collection epistles written by the King himself. Prof. Hilprecht informs me that he has seen several of them (one of them sent by King Nazi-Maruttash) while examining in Constantinople the tablets of the Nippur find. Fortunately I am in the position to publish at least one of them here. It is a ‘‘royal summons’’ sent by King Burna-Buriash to his sheriff (GÜ. EN. NA), ‘‘Amel-ès-Marduk, to arrest certain men accused of lève majesté.’’

At last we are in a position to account for the peculiar characteristics of the Amarna Letter, B. 188—characteristics which put this letter into a class all by itself, as such separating it from all the rest of the Amarna Letters, whether they belong to the Berlin or the London collections. The peculiarities of this letter consist in the wording of its ‘‘address’’ and its ‘‘greeting,’’ forming, as it were, an exact parallel to the address and the greeting of all of our letters addressed to the ‘‘Lord,’’ be-lû. Seeing that this letter does form such a striking corroboration of our contention, I shall give it in full, though its lamentable condition would hardly warrant a complete and satisfactory translation. The letter (Amarna, B. 188) reads:

1 a-nu be-lû-ia
2 ki-bûma um-ma
3 TUR. SAL. LUGAL- ma
4 a-na ka-shâ ('narkabât)îmesâ)ka
5 [âluâ] ë bî-ti-ka
6 lu-â shû-âl-mu
7 ANîmesâ shû 'Bur-ra-Bur(!)-ia-âsh

To my ‘‘Lord’’
speak, thus
saith the princess:
Unto thee, thy chariots,
thy cities, and thy house

greeting!
The gods of Burra-Buriash

2 Another royal letter is possibly that published under No. 93.
3 No. 75. For a translation see below, p. 135.
4 Since the above has been written there appeared in the Vorderasiatische Bibliothek a new translation of the Amarna letters by J. A. Kundtzon. This scholar, when speaking of this letter in his Preface to his translation, says (Die El-Amarna-Tafeln, pp. 207): ‘‘Der erstere (i.e., No. 12 = B. 188) stammt nach seiner Schrift wohl am ehesten aus Babyloniem, was auch nach dem Ton möglich und nach dem wahrseheinlichen Inhalte von Z. 7 das Nächstliegende ist. . . .

Wenn mit dem, was über die Herkunft dieses Briefes gesagt ist, ungefähr das Richtige getroffen ist, so ist der ‘‘Herr,’’ an dem er gerichtet ist, kaum anderswo als in Ägypten zu suchen.’’ Kundtzon differs (i.e., p. 98, No. 12) in the following points from the translation (and emendation) as given above: 1. 5, [a]-m[l]-[u-t]î for âluâ[k] (but cf. Rev. 1. 5); 1. 11, ‘‘Ir-û-ma, wandele; Rev. 1. 3, gi-ir-pa he translates by ‘‘gefärbten Stoff,’’ but then Rev. II. 5f. is left in the air. Rev. II. 7f., ‘‘[a]-l[î]-[u]-kû, 8 [a] ta-[d][ê]-[î]-[ê]-[ê]-bû, 9 [a] te-te-en-da-ni which is rendered by ‘‘Mit deinem Herzen wirst (or sollst) du nê[î]t[e] (e)s . . . und mir wirst (od. sollst) du . . . nê[î]t errichten.”
8 it-ti-ka li-li-ku may go with thee!
9 shal-mi-ish a-ti-ik Walk in and out
10 ù i-na ša-la-me in peace!
11 ti-ar-na biti-ka a-mur Thy house, I behold, in former times [...]
12 i-na pa-[...]

Reverse:

1 a-ka-an-n[a [...]
2 um-ma-a ul-tum^aGi-[...]
3 mär ship-ri-ia ši-ir-pa
4 ú-shé-bi-lá a-na
5 álu^b-bášša bitiùm^a-ka
6 lu-ú [shí sic!]-ul-mu
7 it-ti-[nu, sic!] i-na bi-ka
8 [...]
9 ú ia-a-shi id ma-la
10 te-te-en-da-ní
11 ardi-ka "Ki-din^bIM
12 i-shá-ak-ní
13 a-na di(!)-na-an
14 be-ša-[q[a]] lu-ul-lik

...and with regard to me remember (know) all thou hast told me.”
Thy servant is Kidin-Ramman.
Before the presence of my “Lord” may I come!

The writer of this letter is a “daughter of a king,” a “princess.” She addressed her epistle to “my Lord.” This “Lord,” being the “Lord” of a “daughter of a king,” cannot be anyone else but a “king.” Now I cannot agree with Winckler, K. B., V, p. X, that this letter was addressed to the king of Egypt. On the contrary, the princess, by using a “greeting” and a “phrase” (ana dinân belâ-ia lullik) so far met with in no other Amarna Letter—a “greeting” and “phrase” paralleled only by our letters here published—shows that she was of Babylonian origin, i.e., she was a Babylonian princess, having been given in marriage to the king of Egypt.

We have to see, then, in this letter a “copy” of an original sent to her father, the

---

1 From Amarna, London, 1, e.g., we know that a sister of Kadashman-Enlil had been given in marriage by her father, the king of Babylon, to the Egyptian king. It may not be impossible that this princess is that very same sister about whom Kadashman-Enlil complains in a letter to the king of Egypt that “nobody has ever seen her, whether she is alive or dead,” and that this letter is an assurance on her part that she is still well and among the living.

2 Which happened to be preserved with the other Amarna tablets in the same way as was the “copy” of the letter of Ni-ib-ru-a-ri-ja, the king of Egypt, to Kadashman-Enlil (Amarna, L. 1). For its being a “copy” speaks also the hasty and careless in which it has been written, cf. e.g., ul-mu for šu-ul-mu (R. 6), be-ši for be-ti-ša (R. 14), id for i-di (R. 9), it-ti for it-ti-nu (Rev. 7). For several other Egyptian copies among the Amarna letters see also Knudtzon, i. e., p. 16.
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"Lord" and "King" of Babylonia. This princess, after having communica
ted her wishes to this "Lord," finds that, according to good woman fashion, a postscript
is proper and in order. She forgot to introduce Kidin-Rammān, who, no doubt,
brought this letter to the Babylonian king, as "thy servant," assuring in this wise
the king that the servant is reliable and may be entrusted with an answer to her
letter. Nay, more than this. The princess, finding, after her extended sojourn
in the land of the Nile, that she had not employed the correct form of address custom-
ary among Babylonians when writing to their "Lord" and "King," as we know
now, adds another postscript, saying: a-na di-na-an² be-lu-ia tul-lik, "before the
presence of my Lord may I come." And by using this phrase as well as the greeting,
"to the cities and thy house greeting" (a-na âlukal u bitimla-ka lu-â shâ-ul mu,
Rev. 5f.), the princess proves herself to be a real daughter of the Babylonian king,
who, when addressed by his subjects, is always called "my Lord," be-lu.

¹ When foreigners like, e.g., an Egyptian king write to a Babylonian king they never fail to mention the exact
title of the king of Babylonia, calling him invariably shar = (LUGAL) me-suš-ra-di-ni-ia-ash, Amarna L, 1, et
passim. For di-ni-ia-ash see Hāsing, O. L. Z., December, 1906, p. 664, on the one, and M. Streck, Z. A., January,
1908, p. 255f., on the other hand.

² For di-ni-ia-ash see 24 : 38, ask-šāl-di-na-[ni]-ša, "by my account" = ask-shumi-ša. Knowing, as we do, that the
highest honor conferred upon a servant of the king is to see the king's "face," and remembering that mortal beings
always pray for their being permitted "to see the face of such and such a god" (cf. "Pâs-A.N.GAL-lu-suur and the
New Testament promise that the faithful shall see the "face" of Christ, shall see him from "face to face," i.e.,
shall be admitted into Christ's presence), I translate di-ni by "presence," though its real significance is "Selbst,
Selbst-keit." By doing this I am, however, unable to find the difficulty which Behrens, L. S. & T., II, p. 27, thinks he finds;
for it is, of course, self-evident that the writer did not mean to imply in these words that he himself may be permitted to
appear before the presence of the Lord. All the writer wants to convey through those words is this: may I by and
through the mediation of this letter appear before the Lord; in other words, may the King himself graciously condescend
to listen to me by means of this letter when I speak as follows to my Lord (am-na-a a-na be-lu-ia-ma). The writer
thus pleads that his letter may not be prevented by the "red tape" surrounding the person of the King from reaching
his "Lord" and master. He wants a personal interview, he desires that the King himself shall see the letter, and if the
writer's wish be granted he, ipso facto, is admitted through his epistle to the presence of the King, to the King himself.
Now are the words mûr shûpir-ia ana shûdûm sharri šisê u giddul aššura, occurring in H., VII, 721 : 5 (writer m šîâMarduk-
MU-ŠE-na) and H., VIII, 832 : 5; 833 : 5; 835 : 5; 836 : 5; 837 : 5 (all written by m šîâAG-EN-MUmas) to be trans-
lated with Behrens, i.e., by "meinem Boten habe ich mit Gefeüge (Frende u. Krüger, d. i. herzliche Krüger?) zur Begrüns-
zung des Königs geschickt." The šisê u giddû belong, on account of their position, to the king, thus making him a king
of "horses" = cavalry (cf. the "horses" = cavalry of the Old Testament, as, e.g., in Deut. 11 : 4: the army of Egypt—
their "horses" (= cavalry) and their chariots) and of "men" = infantry—a veritable "war-lord."
IV.

RESULTS.

The fact that the be-û-û in all our letters is the KING is of the highest importance for a correct understanding of (a) The genealogy of the Cassite kings of this period; (b) Their seat of residence, and (c) The nature and purpose of the so-called Temple Archives.

(a) The various investigations conducted by scholars with regard to the genealogy of the kings of this period has, as was to be expected, led to widely divergent results. Without going into any controversy here, I shall confine myself to stating what seems to me the most probable solution of this rather difficult, tangled up, and knotty problem.

From the so-called Synchronistic History ( = S. H.) we learn that at the time of Ashshur-uballit, king of Assyria, the Cassites (SABₐₚₚ Ashšiš-biₚₚₚ) had revolted and killed *Ka-ra-Ḫa-ra-da-astₚₚ, the king of Babylonia; the son (TUR) of *Mu-bal-liₚₚₚₚₚ Sheₚₚₚₚₚ₁ₚₚ₁, a daughter of Ashshur-uballit, raising a certain *Naₚₚₚₚₚ₂ₚₚ₂ Bu-gₚₚₚₚ₁ₚₚ₁-ₚₚₚ₁ to the kingship over them. Whereupon Ashshur-uballit, to

---

1 Cf. e.g., Winckler, Das alte Westasiens, p. 21f.; Delitzsch, Chronologische Tabellen (not accessible to me); Weissenbich, Babylonische Miscellen, p. 2f. (Clay, B. E., XIV, p. 3 (see p. 10, note 3); Hilprecht, B. E., XXI, p. 52, note 1; and Thureau-Dangin in Z. A., XXI (1907-1908), p. 176ff., a reprint of which has just reached me. After a lengthy discussion of all historical data furnished, this last scholar established a chronology all his own and contested: "Seule la donnee de Nabonide, relative a Shagarakti-Shuriash serait inexplicable: si, en effet, suivant l'hypothese la plus probable, les 800 ans sont compree de la fin du reign de Shagarakti-Shuriash a l'avènement de Nabonide, ce chiffre serait trop fort du press d'un siècle (environ de 80 ans). Our scheme given on p. 1 does justice both to Nabonide's statement with regard to Shagarakti-Shuriash (sc. that the latter lived 800 years before him, i.e., 539 (end of the reign of Nabonide) + 800 = 1339; above we gave 1331-1318 as the probable time of Shagarakti-Shuriash), and to that of Sennacherib (p. 2, note 12). But, more than this, I believe, with Thureau-Dangin and Ed. Meyer (Das chronologische System des Berossos in Beiträge zur alten Geschichte, III, pp. 131ff.), that the beginning of the first dynasty of Babylon has to be placed at 2232, and Hammurabi, its sixth ruler, accordingly at 2130-2088. Now, if Nabonide informs us that Hammurabi lived 700 years before Burna-Bilash (II) (see Bezold, P. S. B. A., Jan., 1889), the latter ruler must be put somewhere between (2130—700 =) 1430 and (2088—700 =) 1388 B.C. On p. 1 we assigned to Burna-Bilash the time between 1450-1423; hence our chronology, given above, comes as near the truth as it is possible at the present.


³ Ashšurₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚportionally.

* A-na LUGALₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚₚportionally.

avenge [*Ka-r]a-In(!)-da-ash (notice this name), went to Babylonia, killed [*Na]-zi-Bu-qa-ash, made [*Ku-ru]-Gal-zu ši-ḫu, the son (TUR) of *Bur-na-Bur-ia-ash, to be king, and put him "upon the throne of his father" (ina šimGU.ZA AD-shu).

The questions to be asked and answered in connection with this text are the following:

(1) Why should the S. H. say that Ashshur-uballit went out to avenge Kara-Indash? We would expect that the king of Assyria went out to "avenge rather the murdered Babylonian King Kara-Hardash." Who is this Kara-Indash, that Ashshur-uballit should display such an interest? In what relation does he stand to the king of Assyria on the one hand and to the murdered king of Babylonia, Kara-Hardash, on the other?

(2) What do the words "put him (i.e., Kuri-Galzu šiḫru) upon the throne of his father" mean? Does "father" refer here to Burna-Buriash or to Kara-Hardash? If it refers to the former, then who was Burna-Buriash? In what relation did he stand to Kara-Indash or Kara-Hardash or to the Assyrian king that he (the latter) should be so anxious as to secure the Babylonian throne for his (Burna-Buriash’s) son, Kuri-Galzu? Why was the son and heir of the murdered Kara-Hardash not put upon the throne of Babylon? But if the term "father" refers, as we would expect, to Kara-Hardash, thus making Kuri-Galzu šiḫru the son and successor of his murdered father, then why should Kuri-Galzu be called here (and elsewhere) the "son (TUR) of Burna-Buriash"?

Some of these questions we can answer with the help of Chronicle P. (=Ch. P.),¹ where we are told that a certain *Ka-dāš-man-ḫar-be was the son (TUR) of *Kar-Inś-da-ash and of (sic! cf., l.c., 1. 12) Muballitat-Sherua;² the daughter of Ashshur-uballit,³ king of Assyria; hence Kara-Indash (S. H.) = Kar-Indash (Ch. P.) was the husband of Ashshur-uballit’s daughter, Muballitat-Sherua, and the father of Kadashman-Ḫarbe. Ashshur-uballit in avenging Kara-Indash acted, therefore, in the interests of his nearest relations—his daughter and his son-in-law—to preserve the Babylonian throne for the rightful heir. But the rightful heir in this case was the "son of the murdered King Kara-Hardash." This would force us to the conclusion that the term "father" of the S. H. meant Kara-Hardash and not Burna-

¹ So called after its discoverer, Theodore G. Pinches, J. R. A. S., October, 1894, p. 811 (= p. 816), l. 5f. Cf. also Winckler, Alterorientalische Forschungen, I Reihe, p. 298 (= p. 115f).
³ Written *Mu-bal-lat-ša-ta-hu EDIN-zi-šu.
⁴ Written *AN.SAR-DIN-šu.
Buriaš, and that Kara-
Hardash (S. H.) is only another name for Kadashman-
Harbe. This is corroborated by the further statement of Ch. P. which relates (col. I, 10f.) that the Cassites\(^1\) revolted against and killed "Ka-
dash-man-
Har-be\(^2\), and raised "Shu-
zi-
ga-
as\(^4\), a Cassite, "the son of a
nobody." Whereupon Ashshur-
uballi\(t\); the king of Assyria, went to Babylonia\(^5\) to avenge "Ka-
dash-man-
Har-be, "the son of his daughter,\(^6\) [killed] Shu-
zi-
ga-
as and put ["Ku-
ri-
Gal-
zu šīḥru, the son (sic!) of "Ka-
dash-man-
Har-be, upon the
throne [of his father]."

If we were to arrange the genealogies as given by S. H. and by Ch. P. in parallel columns we would have to do it as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Synchronistic History.</th>
<th>Chronicle P.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>BABYLONIA.</strong></td>
<td><strong>ASSYRIA.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Burna-Buriaš            | Ashshur-
uballi\(t\) |
| Kara-
Indash               | Kar-
Indash |
| Nazi-
Bugash               | Muballīṭ-
al-
Sherua |
| Kuri-
Galzu šīḥru          | Kadashman-
Harbe |
|                        | Shuzigash   |

All scholars have—and, no doubt, correctly—admitted the identity of Nazi-
Bugash and Shuzigaš\(^7\); we need, then, not lose any words about this point. But if we do admit their identity we cannot very well deny the other, viz., that Kara-
Hardash and Kadashman-
Harbe are likewise only two different writings of one and the same person. And here it is that I beg to differ from all the other scholars who either take Kara-
Hardash to be a mistake for Kara-
Indash (so Winckler), or who remove him altogether from the list of kings (so Weissbach). What might possibly

---

\(^1\) Here nisḫ (UN)\(m\) Kud-kul-
\(^2\) Notice that the šu in l. 10 refers back to l. 5.
\(^3\) A-na LUGAL-
u-tu a-na muḫ-shu-nu.
\(^4\) mētu Kar-
\(^5\) mētu Dun-
\(^6\) TUR TUR.
\(^7\) TUR TUR.ŠAŠ-šu = Muballīṭ-
Sherua. TUR TUR.ŠAŠ-šu = Muballīṭ-
Sherua.
\(^8\) The words in [—] are broken away, but they have been added here because they are the only rational and logical emendation of the text. See for this emendation also Winckler, Altorientalische Forschungen, i.e.
\(^9\) Denied now, as I see, among others, also by Knudtzon, Die El-
Amarna-
Tafeln, p. 38. The reasons—if they may be called so—adduced by Knudtzon against the identity of these two persons are not at all convincing, in fact, they are against both the S. H. and the Ch. P.
have been the reason of these two seemingly widely divergent readings, Kadashman-Harbe (Ch. P.) and Kara-Ibardash (S. H.)?

If I were to put before the various scholars in the realm of Assyriology a combination of signs, such as $\text{\textasciitilde KU} \text{\textasciitilde L}$, asking them to transcribe, read, and translate it, what would be the result? One would read it kakkur $\text{\textasciitilde NIN.IB}$, the other kakkur $\text{uEnil}$, the third kakkur $\text{\textasciitilde Nin-Girsu}$, and translate it "the (a) weapon is (of) NIN.IB, or Enil, or Nin-Girsu." A fourth, if he suspected a nomen proprium in that combination and knew that it was taken from a tablet belonging to the Cassite period and was aware that, at the Cassite period, the names of "cities called after a person" may be written without the determinative DISH (cf. $\text{\textasciitilde G\text{-r\textasciitilde a\text{-m\textasciitilde l}, \text{\textasciitilde UD\text{-}tu-kul-ti, etc., in \"List of Cities\"}, might read that very same combination Tukulti-$\text{\textasciitilde Enil}$ (NIN.IB, Nin-Girsu) and think it represents a "city." A fifth, again, would object seriously, pointing out that the "names of the Cassite kings" are likewise very often written without the DISH (cf. e.g., Burna-Buriash in B. E., XIV, 1 : 30 | 2 : 29 | 4 : 18, etc., etc.), and read accordingly (translating it back into Cassite) Kadashman-$\text{\textasciitilde Harbe}$ (or Enil, or NIN.IB, or Nin-Girsu). A sixth, lastly, would maintain that Cassite kings were gods or were identified with gods, hence a name $\text{\textasciitilde KU} \text{\textasciitilde L}$ should express the "name" or the "attribute" of a god, he accordingly would see in that combination such an attribute and would read and transcribe it by "weapon of god I,," which would be in Cassite—what? And why is there such a difference of opinion among scholars when reading and transcribing personal names? Answer: Any modern Assyriologist has, or he thinks he has, the privilege to transcribe ideograph-}

ally written names—be they those of persons or of gods—according to his own notions; thus one may see in the name $\text{\textasciitilde SUGH}$ a male, the other takes it to be a female, and the third declares both are wrong: $\text{\textasciitilde SUGH}$ is a "hen(-goddess)"). To be sure, all three are right and all three are wrong. What modern scholars do now, the old scribes did 3,000 years before them. The name Kadashman-Harbe means in Cassite "my support is Harbe," and Harbe translates the Babylonian $\text{\textasciitilde Enil}$. Kadashman-Harbe, when written ideographically, may be $\text{\textasciitilde KU} \text{\textasciitilde EN.LIL}$ (\$\text{\textasciitilde E.KUR, \textasciitilde L, etc., but this might, per se, be translated also by \"the (my, a) weapon is (of) Enil (E.KUR, L, etc.).\" Should the writer of the S. H. have mistaken the $\text{\textasciitilde KU} = \text{tukulti, \"support," for \text{\textasciitilde KU} = \text{kkaku, \"weapon," and have it translated back into the Cassite language by \text{\textasciitilde kar(a), \"weapon\"? If we knew the Cassite word for \"weapon\" it would be a comparatively easy task to ascertain whether this suggestion or supposition might hold, but unfortunately we do not know it—at least I do not; and as long as this word is not known to us just so long the hypothesis will have to stand that the writer of S. H. mistook the $\text{\textasciitilde KU} =$
tukultu = Kadashman, "support," thinking it was the same as *išKU = kakku = kar(a), "weapon". And if *išKU could have been mistaken for kar(a) (instead of tukulti), the ideogram expressing Harbe = Enlil might likewise have been mistranslated by Hardash. If Hardash be a composite word consisting of Hard + ask we might compare it with Bugash = Bug-ash. Should Hard + ask be = 5 (×) 10 = 50 = iš.L, and Bug + ask = 6 (×) 10 = 60 = AN or ītu (see p. 7, note 2, under Guzar-AN)? If this could be proved then the original ideographic writing of this name might have been *išKU-ššL: S. H. translating it by Kar(a)-Hard + ask = a weapon of (is) iš.L and Ch. P. by Kadashman-Harbe = my support is Enlil. For iš.L = ītu Enlil, see p. 40, note. (The ask in Hard-ash resp. Bug-ash is hardly the same as iash = mātu = KUR; if it were, Harash-ash might represent either Ē.KUR or KUR.GAL, likewise names of Enlil and AN). If, on the other hand, Hardash be a simple (not composite) name, it might translate such ideographs as *išNAB (- Enlil, V R. 44, 46c), *išAB (= Enlil, III R. 67, No. 1, Obv. 11a, b; cf. l. 20, *išNIN.LIL dam-bi-sal, i.e., of *išAB = *išEnlil; in Weissbach, Babyl. Miscellen, p. 7 (B. E., 6,405), l. 8, *išAB is = Anu (AN): *išAB (= AN) *išSAR.SAR (= Enlil) *išSUR.UD (= Ē.A) ù *išNIN.MAGH = fem. principle of the world, cf. No. 24:6 (p. 47, n. 5), Anu, Enlil, Ē.A, Bēlit-ūš), or *išIB (= Enlil, AN, NIN.IB). At any rate, the circumstance that we are not yet able, owing to our ignorance of the Cassite language, to say definitely which ideographic writing was before the eyes of the compiler of S. H. does not preclude the possibility that Kadashman-Harbe and Kara-Hardash are one and the same person. This much we can say, however, that the original ideographic writing consisted of *išKU + a name of a god which could be translated both by Harbe and by Hardash. We must maintain the identity of Kara-Hardash and Kadashman-Harbe till we know that it is wrong and absolutely impossible.

Somewhat more difficult is the task to reconcile the two genealogies of Kuri-Galzu. If we knew nothing about the S. H. and had only the Ch. P., in which Burna-Buriash is not mentioned with one syllable, nobody would ever have attempted to amend the broken text of Ch. P. differently from what was done above, viz., that Ashshur-uballit went out to avenge Kudashman-Barbe,1 "the son of his daughter (i.e., his grandson)," who had been killed by the Cassites and whose throne had

---

1 Notice here the difference between S. H. and Ch. P. According to the former Ashshur-uballit went out to avenge his "son-in-law, Kara-Indash"; and according to Ch. P. the same king wanted to avenge his "grandson, Kadashman-Harbe." As the latter statement is far more to the point, it shows that the narrative of Ch. P. is to be preferred to that of S. H. Cf. also the writing Kara-Hardash (S. H.) with Kadashman-Harbe (Ch. P.); the latter, no doubt, represents the better tradition.
been usurped by Shuzigash, in order to regain and preserve, of course, the Babylonian throne for the rightful heir of his grandson. But the rightful heir in this case was none other than the son of Kadashman-Ḫarbe, Kuri-Galzu, who naturally must have been still a "little child," a šihru, seeing that his great-grandfather, the Assyrian king Ashshur-uballit, was still living. But if Kuri-Galzu was according to Ch. P. the son and rightful heir to the throne, it follows that the words of S. H., "put him upon the throne of his father," can mean only that Ashshur-uballit put Kuri-Galzu šihru upon the throne of his murdered father, Kara-Ḫardash = Kadashman-Ḫarbe; hence the word "father" in S. H. does not refer to Burna-Buriash, as the interpreters want it, but must refer to Kara-Ḫardash. Thus, even according to S. H., Kuri-Galzu šihru may very well, yes, must have been the son of Kara-Ḫardash = Kadashman-Ḫarbe. And by being put upon the throne of his murdered father, Kuri-Galzu ipso facto was put also upon that of Burna-Buriash, seeing that the son of Burna-Buriash, Kar(a)-Indash, was his (Kuri-Galzu's) grandfather.

But if Kuri-Galzu was the "son of Kara-Ḫardash = Kadashman-Ḫarbe," as has been maintained, then he cannot have been, at the same time, the "son of Burna-Buriash," as S. H. informs us. Weissbach, who was the last to discuss the genealogies of this period, failed utterly, simply and solely because he did not recognize the true meaning of "son" (TUR) in Kuri-Galzu TUR Burna-Buriash. In the Black Obelisk of Shalmanassar II (858–824 B.C.), inscription to pictures II (cf. also III R., 5, No. 6, 11, 25, 26), we are told that Jehu (*Ia-ū-a) was the 'son' (TUR) of Omri (*Ḫa-um-ri-i). But according to what we know from the Old Testament, Jehu was by no means a son (II Kings 9:2), but simply a ruler in "the land of the house" of Omri, being the fourth in the succession of his so-called father. Hence the TUR = mār, "son," in Kuri-Galzu TUR Burna-Buriash does not necessarily have to signify "son," but may, and here must, mean "a later (descendant and) 'ruler of the house' of Burna-Buriash," "one that was of the 'line of reign' of Burna-Buriash." This follows also from the following consideration: from several inscriptions published by Hilprecht¹ we know that Nazi-Maruttash was the

¹ For šihru in this sense cf. also H., III, 289:2; 296:2; 297:3; H., V 518:3, anša.ḪA.BA = šihru = TUR, which changes in H., III, 295:2, with anša.ḪA.BA=ših (-NE)-ru-ši-ti, thus showing that šihru "young" is in opposition to AḪ.BA = šēbū, "old."

² It should be noticed, however, that there is, so far, no inscription known which states that Kar(a)-Indash was the "son of Burna-Buriash." The above conclusion is nothing but an inference from S. H.'s words: "Kuri-Galzu, son of Burna-Buriash," see below, pp. 65ff.

son of Kuri-Galzu, and from a boundary stone of Nazi-Maruttash\(^1\) we learn that this latter ruler was "the son (\textit{tur}) of Kuri-Galzu and the \textit{shag.bal.bal} of Burna-Buriash." Now \textit{shag.bal.bal} means in each and every case nothing but "one who is of the reigning (house) of," \textit{libbi palê}. Hence the \textit{mâr} (\textit{tur}) of the S. H., because it corresponds here to \textit{shag.bal.bal}, must likewise be taken in the signification of \textit{libbi palê}; in other words, the expression \textit{mâr} (\textit{tur}) \textit{Burna-Buriash} of S. H. designates Kuri-Galzu not as son, but as "one who belonged to the line of rulers of the house of Burna-Buriash." As such he may have been the third, fifth, tenth, or hundredth in the line.\(^2\) Kuri-Galzu was, and still is, the son of Kadashman-\textit{Harbe} = Kara-Hardash, and this he was and is not only according to B. E., XIV, 39:8f. (\textit{ish-tu Ku-ri-Gal-zi TUR} \textit{thuKa-da-\textit{ash-man-\textit{Har-be} a-di})

\footnote{\textit{Scheil}, \textit{Textes Élam. Sum.}, I, p. 56 (cf. plate 16), col. I, ll. 1-5.}

\footnote{Weissbach, \textit{Babyl. Miscell.}, pp. 2f., by first trying to establish for \textit{shag.bal.bal} an impossible meaning, "Enkel," puts the cart before the horse, and at the end of his investigations has to admit after all that \textit{shag.bal.bal} in all passages cited by him means either "Unenkel," "fremd Nachkommen," or "einen um Jahrhunderte späteren Nachkommen." This alone ought to have been sufficient to convince Weissbach that \textit{shag.bal.bal} in IV R., 38, i, 20-26, could likewise not have the signification "Enkel." Not heeding this warning, Weissbach arrived at results which were both impossible and disastrous: he had to maintain three Marduk-aplu-iddinas, three Kadashman-\textit{Harbes}, three Kuri-Galzus; had to remove Kara-Hardash altogether from the list of kings and make Kuri-Galzu \textit{gibhu}, "the son" of Burna-Buriash, the \textit{aqa abî}, the "brother of the father" of Kadashman-\textit{Harbe}, i.e., had to make him a brother of Kura-Indash. Such manipulations are altogether too subjective to be taken seriously, and overlook the fact that a person at this time is designated only as "X., the son of Y.," in no case is there ever mentioned a grandfather. "X. mêt Y. mêt Z." means at this time "X., the son of Y., belonging to (the house of) Z."(!) and stamps such a person as being of high, special, influential, or distinguished rank. Hinke's (B. E., Series D., IV, pp. 133, 174) \textit{nabû-zûr-lûhûr mêt itti-Marduk-balûtu mêt Ardi-\textit{EA}}, because parallel to \textit{Shapikur mêt itti-Marduk-balûtu SHAG.BAL.BAL. Ardi-\textit{EA}}, makes \textit{Ardi-\textit{EA}} the founder of the distinguished and celebrated surveyor family of which the two brothers, \textit{nabû-zûr-lûhûr} and \textit{Shapikur}, were later members (not necessarily grandchildren). Again, if \textit{mût ena} = \textit{shag.bal.bal} = "belonging to the reigning (house) of," then it is, of course, quite natural that Mesi-Shipak should call himself (B. E., 6378 = Weissbach, i.e., p. 2) \textit{mût Kuri-Galzu}. Why? Because Mesi-Shipak was an usurper. But someone might object that in London, 103 (Becker, B. A., II, p. 187.), = Peiser, K. R., IIP., p. 160), IV, 31, the immediate predecessor of Mesi-Shipak, Ramman-shum-usur, is referred to as "they (i.e., Mesi-Shipak's; cf. i.e., I, 17) father (\textit{aqa-\textit{ba})}"? How can he be an usurper if his father occupied the throne before him? Apart from the list of kings, where Mesi-\textit{Shi-\textit{pa}) is not designated by \textit{tur-shu} (i.e., the son of Ramman-shum-usur), the fact that a father, bearing a Babylonian name (as Ramman-shum-usur undoubtedly does), would call his son (Mesi-\textit{Shipak}) by a Cassite name is simply impossible in the history of the Cassites and without any parallel. Only the opposite may be admitted, i.e., a Cassite father may call his son by a Babylonian name; but never would a Babylonian degrade himself so far as to acknowledge his oppressors by naming his son with a name which was despised among them. Mesi-\textit{Shipak}, then, by calling himself \textit{mût Kuri-Galzu}, lays "rightful" claim to the inheritance of the throne of Babylon, which he would have as "one belonging to the house" (\textit{mût}) of Kuri-Galzu. The same desire is evidenced by Mesi-\textit{Shipak's son, Marduk-aplu-iddina} (notice the Cassite father and the Babylonianized son!), who does not call himself (IV R., 38, i, 20-25 = K. R., IIP, p. 162) grandson of Ramman-shum-usur, but "the son (\textit{tur}) of Mesi-\textit{Shi-\textit{pa}) ak (cf. also list of kings: m \textit{shuA-MU TUR-shu}, i.e., son of Mesi-\textit{Shipak}), the \textit{shag.bal.bal} of Kuri-Galzu \textit{lugal la-a sha-na-\textit{an})"? For a later example of \textit{mût} (\textit{resp. aqa}) = "of the," or "belonging to the, house," cf. Römät(\textit{mas}) \textit{apia shu Murûshu}, and see Hilsprech, B. E., IX, p. 15.}
66 LETTERS TO CASSITE KINGS

"Na-zi-Ma-ru-ul-ta-ul TUR "Ku-ri-Gal-zu"), but also according to Br. Mus., 831-18, where he (written here "Ku-ri-Gal-zu") calls himself "the mighty king, the king of Babylon, the son (TUR) of "Ka-dâsh-man-Har-be, the king without equal (LUGAL la ša-šu-ta-an)."

But though it might be admitted, as it must, that Kuri-Galzu, "the son" of Burna-Buriash of S. H., was de facto the "son of Kadashman-Harbe (Ch. P. = SHAG.BAL.BAL = šibbi pale*), we still owe an explanation of the fact that there are other tablets in existence in which this self-same Kuri-Galzu is not only called, but even calls himself "son (TUR) of Burna-Buriash."

The question is this: Why should this self-same Kuri-Galzu (šilru) call himself or be called on the one hand "son of Kadashman-Harbe = Kara-Hardash," and on the other "son of Burna-Buriash"? What were the reasons, if any, for this playing hide and seek?

We learned from S. H. and Ch. P. that the father of Kuri-Galzu, Kadashman-Harbe = Kara-Hardash, was killed by his own kinsmen, the Cassites, who had revolted against him, and who went even so far as to put a king of their own choice and liking, viz., Nazi-Bugash = Shuzigash, upon the throne of Babylon. We also heard that Kuri-Galzu did not occupy the throne of his murdered father by the wish and the consent of the Cassites, but, on the contrary, by and through the grace of his great-grandfather (on his mother's side), Ashshur-uballit, who forced him while still a child (sib4) upon the dissatisfied Cassites. Is it not more than natural to suppose that the Cassites would feel rather inimical towards their new king, who was in their eyes nothing but an usurper, occupying the throne of Babylon and swaying the royal scepter over them by the intervention and brutal force of a foreign king so inimical to their own interests? And was it not a wise and diplomatic stroke of

1 See Winckler, Z. A., II, p. 307f.
2 This very same attribute is ascribed to Kuri-Galzu also in a boundary stone (IV R., 38, I, 20-26 = K. B., III, p. 162) quoted p. 65, n. 2. Kuri-Galzu, "the son of Kadashman-Harbe," is identical with Kuri-Galzu, the predecessor of Mudi-Shipak and Marduk-apli-idilina (see p. 65, n. 2, end).
4 One of the maxims in Babylonian history is that whenever a ruler or king terms himself "the legitimate" this or that, such a ruler is invariably an usurper. The truth of this maxim is clearly established also in Kuri-Galzu's case. One of his favorite titles is rejanum šešera, "the legitimate shepherd," see Hilprecht, B. E., P., Nos. 41 + 46:3 (cf. Hilprecht, Lc., p. 32, and Zimmern, Z. A., XIII, p. 304); Lc., P. 133:5. 6 (Zimmern, Lc.). Also Kuri-Galzu's son, Nazi-Maruttash, claims this very same title, Hilprecht, B. E., P. Nos. 75 + 106 + 137 (Zimmern, Lc., p. 302): 5.

What Kuri-Galzu lacked in favor from his subjects he made up in empty assertions.
policy on Kuri-Galzu's part not to call himself "son of Kadashman-Harbe," thus avoiding to remind continually the enraged Cassites of their revolt and their murder committed? The Cassites hated any and every allegiance with the Assyrians, thrust upon them by the marriage of Kar(a)-Indash to Muballitat-sherua, knowing quite well that such a friendship would eventually lead—as it actually did—towards disaster. They preferred to have their country return to the status quo it occupied before this infamous intermarriage—to the first years of the reign of Burna-Buriash, "the ancestor" of Kuri-Galzu, when he warned the Egyptians, in a letter addressed to their king Ni-ip-šu-ur-ri-ri-ia ( = Amen-hotep IV; Amarna, London, No. 2 : 31f.), not to listen to the machinations of the Assyrians, "my subjects" (da-qi-il pa-ni-ia). Kuri-Galzu, knowing this and eager and willing to appease his dissatisfied Cassites, did not—great diplomat and "king without equal" who he was—call himself "son of Kadashman-Harbe," but "descendant (mār) of Burna-Buriash"; thus he maintained on the one hand his "rightful," "legitimate" (kīnum) succession to the throne, and on the other he avoided to remind the enraged Cassites of their revolt and murder.

From all this it would follow that Kuri-Galzu šiṣḫu was de facto a "son of Kadashman-Harbe," whom he followed upon the throne of Babylonia, but de arte diplomatica a "son of Burna-Buriash"; hence we have to place between the reigns of Burna-Buriash and Kuri-Galzu those of Kar(a)-Indash, Kadashman-Harbe = Kara-Hardash, and Nazi-Bugash = Shuzigash.  

With the publication of these letters the period just discussed receives some new and additional light. Above we showed that all letters addressed to the "Lord" were intended without any exception for the "king." Who this "king" is or was cannot be said, except it be determined in each particular case from the so-called "internal evidence" as gathered, e.g., from the names of persons occurring in a specific letter, from the circumstances of time and place, etc., etc. We also saw that the letter published under No. 24 was especially instructive in this respect. And this it was not only because of its wonderfully poetic introduction—an introduction such as may be found only in a letter addressed to a king—but also because we learned from it that the writer had been entrusted by a "grant" from his "Lord" and "king" with the supervision (ūṭā) and administration of the city Mannu-gir-Rammán.

1 I.e., at least "not generally."
2 Hilprecht's statement, B. E., XXI, p. 52, note 1, "Kuri-Galzu, his (i.e., Burna-Buriash's) son, but possibly not his immediate successor," I would like to modify by substituting: "Kuri-Galzu, the son of Kadashman-Harbe, the descendant of Burna-Buriash, the successor of his murdered father." Clay's view (B. E., XIV, p. 9), "there is no gap in that part of the list of kings which these archives represent," differs from what I have above stated, p. 19, n. 3.
Now it happens that the writer of No. 24, Kalbu by name, mentions in the course of his communication, addressed to his Lord and king, the latter's father, "Na-zi-lu-En-lil. A priori we are justified in assuming that if the "Lord" to whom Kalbu addressed his letter was a "king," the "Lord's" father was in all probability one likewise. If so, we would have to see in "Na-zi-lu-En-lil a new and, so far, unknown king of the Cassite period. The question then arises to what time of the known Cassite kings have "Na-zi-lu-En-lil, together with his son, the be-ī of No. 24, to be referred.

The passage which mentions this new king is unfortunately somewhat mutilated, so that its real sense has to remain, for the present at least, still doubtful. If I understand the paragraph in question correctly, it would seem that Kalbu, after having communicated to his "Lord" the news about the dreadful flood which had overtaken the city Mannu-gir-Rammân and himself, threatening him even with the loss of his own life, complains here that the same flood had destroyed also the "gates," together with the "herds" which were kept in their environs, in consequence of which destruction and loss he is left without any means of subsistence both for himself and for the inhabitants of the city. In fact there is nothing left that could be "taken" or "given." That portion of the letter which mentions the "Lord's" and "king's" father, "Na-zi-lu-En-lil, may be transcribed and translated as follows (24 : 24f.):

Also the mighty bronze-gates together with the two-year-old ewes which (were kept there) since the time of Nazi-Enlil, thy father, even unto (this) day,

1 Abulu er-mesh is a composite noun in the plural, for the formation of which see Delitzsch, *Gram.*, p. 133, § 73.
2 DA here to be taken probably in the sense of bē'a, Abel-Winceker, *Keilschrifttexte*, Sign List, No. 221; Meissner, *Ideogramme*, No. 4762.
4 Ish-tu bē-ē-na-ti...; adi (EN) umām. The ish-tu bē-ē-na-ti, standing here in opposition to adī umā, must signify in this connection some kind of "terminus a quo. Bēna-ti is, no doubt, related to bēnātu, which Delitzsch, H. W. B., p. 1800, translates by "father"; cf. also Zimmer, *Sharps*, p. 54, 35, who renders it by "Anheirere." If this be true, I would like to see in bēna-ti either a plural of bēnātu (= bēnātu = bēnātu) bēnātu, which latter word occurs also in Aramaic, B. 24 : 22, mār šep-ri-ka ē-ni bē-ē-na-ti [ki-š] bē-ē-ka, i.e., "when thy messenger came formerly," or a formation like šētā, aherē, ērēš, ruqātā, for which see Delitzsch, *Gram.*, p. 190, and *ibid.*, § 65, No. 57, on p. 177, above. Bēnātu in our passage refers undoubtedly to the "times of the father" of the "Lord," hence must mean something like "time of preceding generation," "the time when one's father was living." The root, then, would be bēnā, from which we have bēnā, "father, begetter." Adī umām stands here for adī umā an-ni-ē.
26 [e]-ka-ku(?)  ú i-na-an-na be-lú  ú-ti-[di šá]²

27 [i(l)-lu]-ka-an-ni i-na-an-na  ki-i  i-li-[ka-an-ni]³

28 [u  zu-un-n]a³ LU(?) mediums làhru (=GA-NAM) shattu-II  s-ši-rú  mi-na-a[?]¹

29 [lul]-qa-am-ma lu-ud-di-in² two-year-old ewes?

As the succession of the Cassite kings from Kuri-Galzu šihru down to Kashtiliashu is well known and absolutely controllable both by the publications of the B. E. and the "List of Kings," and as Nazi-Enlil cannot have reigned before Burna-Burias— for no documents of the Cassite period have been found at Nippur which antedate the last-named ruler—it is at once evident that Nazi-Enlil, together with his son, the be-lú of No. 24, must have reigned during the time that elapsed between Burna-Burias and Kuri-Galzu šihru.

We saw that the Cassites revolted during the reign of Kadashman-Ijarba = Kara-Hardash against their king, killing him, and selecting in his stead a king of their own choice, a certain Nazi-Bugash or Shuzigash. We also heard that Ashshur-

¹ E-ša-šu. One might expect e-ša-šu, but against this is to be said: (1) the ku, although somewhat doubtful, cannot be very well ku. Having examined the sign repeatedly I am unable to discover even the faintest indication of a middle perpendicular wedge; (2) if this were a form of akakú, one would look for i-ka-ka. A present tense, e-ša-šu = iška-ša, is senseless here. In view of these difficulties I am inclined to connect this form with akakú(?). H. W. B., p. 530, which Delitzsch, however, leaves untranslated. Seeing that akakú is a syn. of išyumšu-tum and this = IM.GU.LA resp. IM.RIGHA.MUN (Dd., i.e., p. 148, Orkan) I propose to translate akakú by storm-flood (cf. also RIGHA.MUN, an attribute of Anu, the bel akakú), used either literally or figuratively. In the latter sense it is used also of "spears," which are "thrown" in such numbers into a city that they practically "pour down upon" or "overflow" a city. In this meaning it is to be found in Sarg. Ann. 164, ana pušar dûnušu sša(?) ka-ú tu-ad-di-ma, "into all their cities I threw a veritable flood (of spears)." The root of e-ša-šu would be puššu or ššar, it standing for iškaššu = ṣhaklu, with a in the Preterit. The subject of ṣhaklu is the summu u-miša in 20, 21; the floods have overflowed = destroyed.

² These emendations are, of course, very doubtful, but they seem to me the most probable ones. For akakú c. acc., "to go, come to," see besides Delitzsch, H. W. B., p. 66a, also Jensen, K. B., VI, pp. 464, 475. If the emendations be correct, these forms would stand for i-la(resp. i-lu)-ku-in-ni.

³ The traces of these signs cannot possibly be amended to KA.GAL eramess DA.mesš, 1. 24. For LU = UDU = ʾN, see E. B. H., pp. 343ff.

¹ Eššāru, "to encircle," is here parallel to lūmū, used of "floods"; see above, 1. 29, i-na-la-as-tu na-di.

² Hardly anything missing after ni-in-a.

³ For the force of this la šuš šuš er., e.g., B. E., XIV, 38 : 9, 10, "that and that," "X. išq-ga-am-ma a-na "Y. i-nam-din," "X. shall take and give to Y.," i.e., "X. shall pay back to Y.," and i.e., 111 : 10, 11, "the grain . . . . . at harvest time," is-si-ra-am-ma i-nam-din-ma, "he shall put up and give," i.e., "he shall return."
uballit, king of Assyria, eager to secure and preserve the Babylonian throne for his great-grandchild, Kuri-Galzu, went out, killed Nazi-Bugash and put Kuri-Galzu upon the throne. Now it is not at all likely that the Cassites would have acquiesced in such a despotic act of the Assyrian king as to kill the king of their choice and liking; nor is it human nature to suppose that the enraged Cassites would have joyfully received the new child-king by the grace of Ashshur-uballit. On the contrary, they will have endured this insult only as long as they had to; they will have waited eagerly for the first moment, for the first opportunity to strike back and rid themselves of a king who was forced upon them. This opportunity came when Ashshur-uballit died, which he, no doubt, did soon after Kuri-Galzu had been seated upon the throne, seeing that he must have been well advanced in years if he could put a great-grandchild upon the Babylonian throne. With Ashshur-uballit out of the way and Kuri-Galzu still a child, the time was propitious to strike and to strike hard. And the Cassites did strike. The result of this “striking” is embodied in letter No. 24: they put up a king who was a king indeed—a king by the voice of the people. Et vox populi est vox dei: he was a divinely appointed ruler, a ruler “whom Anu, Enlil, E.A, and Belit-ili themselves had presented with a kingship excelling in grace and righteousness.” I see then in the be-lî of No. 24 a counter-king of Kuri-Galzu during at least the first years of the latter’s reign. But if the be-lî was a contemporary of Kuri-Galzu, then the Lord’s father, Nazi-Enlil, must have lived at the time of Nazi-Bugash. In view of the fact that both these names begin with Nazi, and considering how easy it is to misread and mistranslate the name of a god when ideographically written, I propose to identify both. The Synchonistic History is, as we saw above, rather arbitrary in transcribing names expressed by ideographs. Now as in Enûlî may also be written as É.KUR, which latter is according to II R. 54, No. 3, 10, identified with Anum, and as Anum changes with Bugash in such proper names as Gu-zar-AN and Gu-za-ar-za-ar-Bugash, Gu-zal-za-ar-Bugash, it is not unlikely that the name Nazi-Enûlî was written Na-zi-as É.KUR in the original from which S. H. compiled his story. This Na-zi-as É.KUR S. H. read Nazi-Bugash, and Ch. P. shortened it to Shuzigash.

Furthermore, Kalbu, the writer, praises his Lord and king as “light of his brothers,” which implies that the be-lî had brothers. It happens that there is mentioned in B. E., XIV, 10 : 56, a certain *Emid-ana-Marduk, who is termed TUR LUGAL, “son of the king,” and who lived, according to that tablet, in the first year of Kuri-Galzu (l. 1). This Emid-ana-Marduk cannot have been the son

---

1 See also my Bel, the Christ, pp. 17, 16.
2 Thus identifying as É.KUR according to II R. 54, No. 3, 10 with AN(-Bugash), instead of as EN.LIL. For AN as a name of see p. 80.
of Kuri-Galzu, because the latter was himself a child, nor can he have been a son of Kadashtan-Harbe, i.e., a brother of Kuri-Galzu, because if he were he would have to be a younger(?) brother; but a younger brother of a šiḫru, "a child," would not receive "salary," nor can he have been an Assyrian prince—his name speaks against such a supposition; hence the only conclusion at present possible to reach is that Emid-ana-Marduk was a son of Nazi-Bugash = Nazi-Enlil and a brother of the be-lī of No. 24.7

On the basis of the above-given investigations we are prepared to establish the following succession of the Cassite kings covering both periods, the Amarna and that which follows immediately upon it. During the latter our letters here published have been written.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ASSYRIA</th>
<th>BABYLONIA</th>
<th>EGYPT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ashshur-uballit</td>
<td>Kura-Indash I (?)</td>
<td>Nimmuria (= Amen-hotep III)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Burna-Buriash I (?)</td>
<td>daughter; Naphuria (= Amen-hotep IV)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kadashtan-Enlil I (?)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kuri-Galzu I; daughter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muballitš-Sherua</td>
<td>Burna-Buriash II, &quot;ancestor of Kuri-Galzu II&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(son ?)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kar(a)-Indash II; Ū-la- Bu-ri-ia-ash,2 king of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.A.A.B.BA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kadashtan-Harbe = Kura-Hardash</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nazi-Bugash = Shuzigash</td>
<td>&quot;Nazi-zi-En-līl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kuri-Galzu II, šiḫru,4 &quot;of the house of Burna-Buriash&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nazi-Marduk</td>
<td>be-lī (No. 24); Emid-ana-Marduk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(to be followed by the kings as given above, p. 1.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7For footnotes see page 72.
(b) The seat of residence of the Cassite kings at the time when the letters here published were written.

1 If he were the older brother, he (and not the child Kuri-Galzu) would have been the rightful heir to the throne of Babylon.

2 For a complete rendering of this letter see below under "Translations."

3 Mentioned in B. E., 6405 (Weissbach, Babylonische Miscellen, p. 7), where he is called the "son (TUR) of BURNA-BA-Ua(i)-ri-ia-ak." Cf. now also Thureau-Dangin, O. L. Z., January, 1908, Sp. 31f., who is of different opinion.

"Through the kindness of the Editor, Prof. Hilprecht, who gave me special permission (letter of June 22, 1908) to do so, I am enabled to add here a note about the several papers, treating of the same period discussed above, which have appeared since the MS. had been approved and sent to the press. These papers are (a) F. E. Peiser, Chronik P und synchron. Geschichte, O. L. Z., January, 1908, Sp. 7f., and again, l.c., Sp. 1401.; (b) A. Ungnad, Zur Chronologie der Kassitendynastie, l.c., Sp. 11f., and ibidem, Sp. 139f.; (c) J. A. Knudtzon, Die El-Amarna-Papyrus, pp. 34ff., especially p. 38 (reached me March, 1908); (d) Thureau-Dangin, Z. A., XXI (1907–8), pp. 17ff. (see also above, p. 59, note 1); O. L. Z., January, 1908, Sp. 31f.; Journal Asiatique, Janv.-Vér., 1908, pp. 117ff. (received July 1, 1908), and the corrections to the last-named paper, O. L. Z., June, 1908, Sp. 24ff. (not was not accessible to me till July 14, 1908)."

Peiser's and Knudtzon's genealogy of the kings of this period is nothing but Weissbach re-edited with some slight modifications, hence we need not dwell on their arrangement here. Ungnad omits BURNA-BARUSHK I (why?) and KURU-INDASH II. About the latter he remarks (l.c., Sp. 13): "Ein anderer Kassitenkreis war wohl der Gegenah der Maballibut-Sedru, ist aber dadurch kaum König geworden." It is hardly to be expected that the Assyrian king ASHKUR-Aballit with his pronounced intentions towards the Babylonian throne would give in marriage his daughter MULLABILIT-Shurma to a Babylonian prince who was not, at some time or another, destined to become the king of Babylonia, nor would he have been so anxious to arrange his "son-in-law" if it had not been for the fact that he wanted to preserve the throne of Babylon for "his own family," i.e., for the descendant of his own daughter. Ungnad's (and Knudtzon's) reading KADASHMAN-HARBE (instead of KADASHMAN-ENIL) is quite arbitrary. Though the Cassite HARBE was identified with ENIL, from this it does not yet follow that ENIL in Cassite names has always to be read HARBE. We know that ëšEniL = ëšEniL = An, but it would be preposterous to read ëšEniL = An, or An = ëšEniL (see also Thureau-Dangin, J. A., 1908, p. 121, 17). Though Ungnad establishes otherwise the same succession as the one given above, yet I cannot agree with him in details. His argument, l.c., Sp. 12, 2, based upon the expression ibsu . . . . udi of B. E., XIV, 39: 8, to show that KURI-GALZU, the son of KADASHMAN-HARBE, was the same as our KURU-INDASH I, the son of KADASHMAN-ENIL I, contemporaries of AMEN-HOTEP III, are contradicted by No. 24 : 24, ibsu bi-an-iru šabu "Na-zi-ëšEniL a-bi-ka(!) à adi šami, for which see above, p. 68, note 4. Ungnad's statement (l.c., Sp. 12, note 1) that abba (with double b) has to be always a plural is simply an assertion without any argument. Abba, like abba, is very often nothing but a graphic peculiarity of those times. With regard to the investigations of Thureau-Dangin the following: In his latest attempt (O. L. Z., 1908, Sp. 275) this scholar arranges the predecessors of KURI-GALZU (the father of NAZI-MARUSHAK), to whom he assigns the 22d place among the Cassite kings, in the following fashion: (15) KURU-HARDUSH I; (17) KADASHMAN-HARBE I, his son; (18) KURI-GALZU I, his son (contemporary of AMEN-HOTEP III); (19) KADASHMAN-ENIL I, his son; (20) BURNA-BARUSHK, his son (contemporary of AMEN-HOTEP IV); (21) KURU-INDASH II, "petit-fils(!) de BURNA-BARUSHK"; (NAZI-BAPASH, "unparented"); (22) KURI-GALZU, "second(!) fils de BURNA-BARUSHK" and father of NAZI-MARUSHAK. A comparison of this arrangement with the one postulated above will show the following differences: (a) KADASHMAN-HARBE = KURU-HARDUSH is left out. The reason for this omission is given by Thureau-Dangin, J. A., 1908, p. 127, in the following words: "KURI-GALZU et KURI-HARDUSH mentionnés par l'Histoire synchronique représentent le même personnage (but why?). On a supposé que KURI-HARDUSH pourrait être le père de KURI-GALZU, Mais le rédacteur n'a pu cacher qu'ASHUR-Aballit était venu pour venger le père du roi assassiné." But this is exactly what he did want to say, see above p. 60. (b) With regard to KADASHMAN-HARBE Thureau-Dangin (O. L. Z., 1908, Sp. 275) refers to Knudtzon, l.c., p. 34, note 2, to Ungnad, O. L. Z., 1908, pp. 12, 15, and to his own remarks in J. A., 1908, p. 128, where he says: "Introduction de ce personnage a peut-être son explication dans le fait que le rédacteur de la Chronique P auro confondre KURI-GALZU le Jeune, fils de BURNA-BARUSHK, avec KURI-GALZU 1er, fils de KADASHMAN-HARBE. Il faut sans doute restituer à
Prof. Winckler, when discussing the Elamite invasion under Kūtin-hutrutash at the time of "šu-EN.LI.IMU.MU" (i.e., Enlil-nādin-shumu, generally read Bēl-nādin-shumu), who is mentioned in the "List of Kings" immediately after Kashtiliashu II, says (Das alte Westasiens, p. 20): "Unter dem nur 1½ Jahre regierenden Bel-nadin-shumu, jüngster Sohn Enlil-nadin-shumu II, jüngstes Kind von Engures, in Babylonien ein, verwüstet Dur-ṣu . . . und erobert Nippur, das von den Kassiten Königen bevorzugt und wohl vielleicht als Residenz benutzt wurde."

Indeed, Nippur has been the favored city of the Cassites since they ascended the throne of Babylon, for already Gandash, the first of the Cassite kings, called Nippur "my city"; but that it ever had been used as a Cassite residence has, though it was surmised by Winckler, never been proved.

Without going into details here, I am prepared to maintain, upon the basis of the evidence furnished by these letters, that ever since the time of Burna-Buriash II till Kashtiliashu II, and possibly longer, as the campaign of Kūtin-hutrutash against Nippur would indicate, Nippur was, if not the, then at least a royal residence of the Cassite

\[\text{FROM THE TEMPLE ARCHIVES OF NIPPU.} 73\]

\[\text{U\' sứtore de Kadashman-\'nrbe, père de Kuri-gal"u I", le r\' ecit de la guerre contre les Suttens.} \]

\[\text{He accordingly assigns to this Kadashman-\'nrbe, the son of Kara-\'ndash (Ch. P., 1, 5t.), place No. 17, and identifies him with Kadashman-\'nrbe, the father of Kuri-Galuz, Z. A., II, p. 399. Though the latter identification is undoubtedly correct (see above, p. 64), yet Kuri-Galuz, the son of Kadashman-\'nrbe, is not Kuri-Galuz I, but Kuri-Galuz II, at} \]

\[\text{this ruler calls Ch. P. did not only not confound Kuri-Galuz, the son of Burna-Buriash, with Kuri-Galuz, the son of Kadashman-\'nrbe, but, on the contrary, knew that both Kuri-Galuz were} \]

\[\text{three and the same person. For the reason why Kuri-Galuz} \]

\[\text{should have called himself both "son of Burna-Buriash" and "son of Kadashman-\'nrbe" see above, p. 66. (c) With regard to No. 19 I may be permitted to ask: "On what} \]

\[\text{authority does Thureau-Dangin maintain his statement that Kadashman-Enlil I is the son of Kuri-Galuz I?" (d) Burna-Buriash, whom he mentions under No. 20, Thureau-Dangin identifies on the one hand with [. . .] Kuri-galuz, the son of Kadashman-\'nrbe (Hilprecht, O. B. I., 1, No. 68), and on the other with the Burna-Buriash known from Knudtzon, i.e., 9, 19 (cf. No. 11, 1er. 10), where this ruler calls Kuri-galuz "my father," a-bi-la, maintaining at the same time that the expression "father" has to be taken in the sense of "ancestor" (O. L. Z., 1908, Sp. 273). Though it is true that abu may, and very often does, mean "ancestor" (Teg.-PIS. I, col. VIII, 47, Knudtzon, i.e., 16 : 19, compared with M. O. G., No. 25, p. 40)—just as TUB = mu-ru very often means "descendant"—yet Thureau-Dangin still owes the arguments resp. convincing reasons that abu of Knudtzon, i.e., 9, 19, has to or must be taken in the sense of ancestor. Again, the name [. . .] Kuri-galuz of O. B. I., 1, No. 68, may be read with Hilprecht, B. E., XX, p. 52, note 1, [Sha-nu-gal-tu] Kuri-galuz (the space is large enough for this emendation), see above p. 1. Thirdly, following Thureau-Dangin's methods, we might as well maintain that the duma-sag of O. B. I., 1, No. 68, means "principal descendant," thus making Shagarashī-Shurashī a "grandson" (instead of a "second son") of Kadashman-Enlil. By the way, on what authority does Thureau-Dangin claim that Shagarashī-Shurashī was the son of Kadush-Enlil? (e) Why does Thureau-Dangin (following Ungnad) omit Burna-Buriash? Does he identify him with Burna-Buriash, the son (resp. grandson) of Kuri-Galuz I and ancestor (resp. father) of Kuri-Galuz II, at? What are his arguments for doing so? The result: Thureau-Dangin has failed to bring in any convincing arguments which would force us to modify the above-given arrangement.} \]

\[\text{1 See Ch. P., col. IV, 14t.} \]

\[\text{2 Written "Go-ad-dash (= UK).} \]

\[\text{3-li-nu N\'i-pu (sic), see Winckler, U. A. G., p. 156, No. 8, l. 11.} \]

\[\text{10} \]
kings. This follows (1) from the fact that these letters, having been addressed to the be-lä, i.e., to the king, were found in Nippur: letters, if discovered at Nippur and found to be addressed to the king, presuppose that the king must have lived at that place; (2) from internal evidence. (a) Kishahbut, when answering an inquiry of the king concerning ‘wool,” says, 35 : 13, áš-h-shúm SIG hi a-ña En-li it a-na be-lä-iä aq-ta-bi, i.e., ‘as regards the wool (I beg to say that) I have spoken about it to my ‘Lord’ in Nippur.” This shows that Kishahbut, although “out of town” when he wrote his letter, must have been at one time in Nippur, where he reported to his ‘Lord’ about the disposition of the wool; but this he could not do except the king himself was residing in Nippur. Now, as Kishahbut was a contemporary of Kadashman-Turgu (see below, pp. 120ff.), it follows that this king lived in Nippur. (b) Pdn-AN.GAL-lu-mur, a resident of Dūr-šarru-ka, when explaining to NIN-ni-il-a why he had not sent a messenger previously, says, 89 : 21f.: mār ship-ri-ia šá a-ña dug En-li ki a-na muḫ LUGAL ash-pu-ru ki i-ru-ka ma-lu-ka a-sap-rak-ku iq-ba-a, i.e., ‘my messenger whom I had sent to Nippur to the king was, when he would see thee, to have told everything I had written thee.” Nothing can show more plainly than this passage that the king actually did live and reside in Nippur, where he received not only the reports of his trusted servants, but where he also (γ) gave orders for the disposal of certain goods, see 27 : 20f.: 1 bilišu šá En-li ki šá be-lä ú-she-bi-la û XX ma-na šá ardi-ka = Erba-ám Marduk id-di-na ki-i ú-za-i-zu XL ma-na SIG hi iš-te-lu-ni-in-ni; i.e., “(and with regard to) the two talents (of wool) of (= for) Nippur which my ‘Lord’ has ordered to be brought and the 20 ma-na which thy servant Erba-Marduk has paid, (I beg to state that) after they had divided them, they left me (a rest of) only 40 ma-na.” The ‘Lord” to whom Kudur-aní sends this letter (No. 27) is again Kadashman-Turgu; hence also according to this epistle that king must have resided in Nippur.

The king, however, did not always stay in Nippur, but made, like every good “father of his country,” occasional visits to other towns, where he condescended to hear the complaints and grievances of his subjects; of such an incident we read in 23 : 33f.: áš-h-shúm an-ni USH.BAR mešh an-ni ti šá i-ña dug Pa-an-Ba-li ki ka-lu-ši i-ña Š-piši a-ña be-ši aq-ta-bi šá-la-shi šú a-ña mu-ulš be-ši a-ta-rn a-ši be-ši li-ish-pu-urma li-il-qa-nil-šú-ni ti, i.e., ‘as regards these weavers who are being held in Pān-Bali, (I beg to state that) I have not only spoken about them to my ‘Lord’ in Upl, but I have written three times to my ‘Lord.’ My ‘Lord’ may at last send that they take them away (i.e., that they be liberated).” According to
this the king was at one time in Upī, where he received the writer [Imgu]rum in audience. The king had promised him to "do something" for the imprisoned weavers, but had, after leaving Upī for Nippur, forgotten all about his promise. The writer was determined that the weavers should be liberated; he had written four times to his Lord, reminding him of his promise, by addressing this (No. 23) and three previous communications to him at Nippur. As Imgurum, the writer, was a contemporary of Burna-Buriash (see below, p. 94), it follows that also Burna-Buriash must have resided in Nippur.

In this connection a passage of Ch. P., col. III, 9, receives a new and welcome light. There it is recorded that Kuri-Galzu, after having conquered the mštu Tam-tíšu, col. II, l. 6], added also Babylon and Borsippa unto his country. How could this be done, seeing that Kuri-Galzu had been seated by Ashshur-uballit upon the throne of Babylon? How could he possibly have added Babylon and Borsippa to his land, if he resided, as "king of Babylon," in Babylon? Surely, if we are able to read between the lines, the succession of events during the reign of Kuri-Galzu must be reconstructed in the following fashion: Ashshur-uballit, after having killed Nazi-Bugash and after having proclaimed his great-grandson king of Babylon, foresaw, no doubt, some such event as was pictured on p. 70, i.e., he feared that the Cassites would arise again and, if possible, get rid of his "child-king." In order, therefore, to inscribe the safety of Kuri-Galzu he established him, not in Babylon, nor perhaps even in Nippur, but possibly in Dār-Kuri-Galzu—a fortress founded by the older Kuri-Galz, and situated near Nippur. Here he probably lived as long as the be-lā of No. 24 had power enough to maintain his independence. As soon as Kuri-Galzu felt that he was sufficiently strong to cope with his enemies, he went out and conquered them, first of all the Cassite party in allegiance with Nazi-Bugash or his sons, then the sea country, in order to prevent a possible attack from the rear, and last of all Babylon.

As soon as Kuri-Galzu had gotten rid of the be-lā of No. 24, he established, as is to be expected, his residence in Nippur, where he lived till he had conquered Babylon. After the conquest of Babylon he possibly might have resided also in that city, though there is as yet no proof to that effect.

1 Ch. P., III, 9, DING. TERA + 5 Būr-sap 5 muš širi (− EDIN) ta usu-ša-at-tik; i.e., "Babylon and Borsippa I caused to write (− I had them written, added by means of a treaty after a successful war) to my land (št. field)."

2 DING. TER + 5 Būr-sap 5 + 5 muš širi (− EDIN) ta usu-ša-at-tik; i.e., "Babylon and Borsippa I caused to write (− I had them written, added by means of a treaty after a successful war) to my land (št. field)."

3 Cf. B. E., XIV, 4:11f., where Dār-Kuri-Galzu is mentioned in the 11th year of Burna-Buriash. See already above, p. 9, note 2.

4 Who likewise must have resided—for a time at least—in Nippur, or else this letter could not have been excavated there.
As long, then, as we have such indisputable evidence as to the royal residence of the Cassite kings at this period we will have to look upon Nippur as a, if not the, residence of all Cassite kings from Burna-Buriash II to Kashtiliashu II; and if so, we will surely find, at some future time, if the excavations of the University of Pennsylvania are to be continued, as is to be earnestly hoped and desired, a royal palace befitting the glory and splendor of the "king without equal," of Kuri-Calzu šiḫru and his descendants. Prof. Hilprecht regards the largely unexplored lofty group of mounds forming the eastern corner (cf. the map in Series D, Vol. I, p. 305) of the temple complex as the probable site of the palace of the early patesis of Nippur and also of the Cassite rulers—a palace which, like the Sargon palace at Khorsabad, at the same time constituted the strongest bastion in the huge outer temple wall.\footnote{Cf. Hilprecht in B. E., Series D, Vol. I, p. 485, and "The So-called Peters-Hilprecht Controversy," p. 254. See also above, p. 9, note 2.}

(c) The nature and purpose of the "Temple Archives," including the letters here published, and their relation to "Royal Archives."

When I studied Prof. Clay's introduction to B. E., Vol. XIV, purporting to give a general survey of the nature of "Temple Archives," as far as they had been published by him, the questions uppermost in my mind, about which I hoped to receive some information and instruction, were: What are "Temple Archives"? What is their nature and purpose? What do they represent? Clay answers these questions in the following manner (B. E., XIV, p. 5): "With the exception of about fourteen documents these inscriptions (i.e., the 'Temple Archives') are records of the receipt of taxes or rents from outlying districts about Nippur; of commercial transactions conducted with this property; and the payment of salaries of the storehouse officials as well as of the priests, and others in the temple service. In other words, they refer to the handling and disposition of the taxes after they had been collected." If I understand his explanation of the contents of these tablets correctly, I gather that, according to his interpretation, "archives," such as have

---

\footnote{The fourteen documents which form the exception are enumerated, i.e., p. 2, note 1. They are Nos. 1, 2, 7, 8, 11, 39, 40, 41, 119, 123, 127, 128a, 129, 135. It will be noticed that, e.g., neither the "inventory" tablets nor the text published in B. E., XIV, 4, are enumerated among these exceptions. I therefore drew the natural inference from the above given enumeration that tablet No. 4 (B. E., XIV) was likewise regarded by the author of the volume as "a record of the handling and the disposition of the taxes," etc., especially as in the "Table of Contents," i.e., p. 61, sub 4, not a word was said with regard to the peculiar contents of this tablet. Cf. my statement in Old Penn, February 16, 1907, p. 3, col. III, below. However, in a later issue of Old Penn (February 23, 1907, p. 8, col. III), my attention was called to a passage occurring in Clay's "Light on the Old Testament from Babel," p. 312, from which I learned with pleasure that the true nature of the text in question was stated there. Cf. now also Jastrow, Die Rel. Bab., p. 277, note 4. As a religious text of a similar type as those known from the Library of Ashurbanipal it is preferable to exclude this tablet No. 4 from our present discussion.}
been published by him, are "records of the handling and the disposition of the taxes from outlying districts about Nippur after they had been collected!" Clay's reasons for calling these archives Temple Archives are the following (B. E., XIV, p. 6). The taxes are temple revenues because:

1. Payments are made out of the mashsharti ša ékalli (written Ê.GAL), "temple stipend" (XV, 47); out of the GISH.BAR.GAL bēl-idi, "full tax of the house of god" (XV, 37); to the ardu and amtu ékalli (= Ê.GAL), "male and female temple servants" (XV, 152 : 15 and 200, III(!) : 9, 38).

2. "Priests" (ishshaku), "the temple gateman" (a-bīl bābi bāl-a-ru (sic), XV, 93), "the temple shepherd" (nāqīdu ša bīti, XIV, 132 : 15), "the singer" (sammēru, XIV, 6 : 4) are salaried officers.

3. The property handled is spoken of as the possession of the god, cf. VI (sic, read I SHû)3 gur she'um GISH.BAR.GAL sha idi (XIV, 16 : 1); "60 gur of grain of the full tax the property of the god."

4. The temple in these archives is usually called bitīnu, "our house," cf. VI gur LXXXIV qa SHE.BA(!) a-mi-lu-ki ša ša bīti-ku, "VI gur LXXXIV qa, wages for the men of our house" (no reference given), or simply bītu, "house," cf. īpru mārē ša bīti(-tu), "wages for the sons of the house" (XV, 200, I : 38).

With regard to the relation of the Temple to the State, Clay, l.c., p. 6, comes to the following conclusion:

"There is little in the documents (i.e., the Temple Archives) to show that the revenues were collected in the interests of the State, or that the king was a beneficiary, unless perhaps tablet No. 26 : 3 of Vol. XV, which reads: ša a-na SHE.BA(!) Nippurki ù Dūr-Ku-ri-Gal-zu, "which is for the maintenance of Nippur and Dūr-Ku-ri-Gal-zu." This statement is made even in view of the fact (l.c., p. 7) that "amounts are also paid (XIV, 148), ša si-ri-bi-shu ša sharri, a-na nu-ri ša sharri, a-na sharri."

It was necessary to state Clay's views about Temple Archives at some length here, because I beg to differ from him upon important points. But before stating my own view with regard to the character and contents of the Temple Archives, it seems desirable to add a few words about two terms often occurring in these texts.

The chief reason why Clay did not recognize the true character and nature of

---

1 SHû is an abbreviation of šašu = suss = 60, just as ma is abbreviated from mana. For SHû cf. also B. E., XV, 19 : 20 | 73 : 15 | 140 : 44 | 154 : 45 | 199 : 29, 40, and see the later KU = ruḫī or "prince" among the numbers, which shows that KU has to be read šušu (shu).

2 But see B. E., XV, 41 : 3.
the "Temple Archives" is to be found in the fact that he failed to see any difference between Ē.GAL = ĕkallu = "palace," sc. of the king, and Ė-nu, "our house," "our temple."

Ē.GAL or ĕkallu in our letters as well as in B. E., Vols. XIV and XV, does not signify the "temple" (Clay, B. E., XIV, p. 6; XV, p. 18, transl. of No. 7, above), but always the "royal palace." This follows evidently from B. E., XV, 50—a tablet which I translate and interpret differently than Dr. Clay; see l.c., p. 17, No. 7. On account of its importance I may be permitted to reproduce it here in transcription, adding to it the translation as given by Clay:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>3 (GUR) 90 (Clay wrongly 84) (qa)</th>
<th>3 gur 84 qa of ashanna grain of the full tax,</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>ăbeth DUB Ē.GAL (= ĕkallā)</td>
<td>(under) the seal of the temple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>āshe-īṣ-ša-am-ma</td>
<td>carried away,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>a-na &quot;In-na-an-ni</td>
<td>and to Innannu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>i-na-an-din</td>
<td>he shall pay.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>āṭu ĀSH.A.AN</td>
<td>(Date.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>šatu 15šan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>9 3 (GUR) 90 (Clay again wrongly 84) (qa)</td>
<td>3 gur 84 qa of ashanna grain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>= ĕtu XXX-(i)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>ĀSH.A.N.A GISH.BAR.GAL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>ina SHE.BAR GUR LUGAL</td>
<td>in the royal seed gur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>En-litā</td>
<td>of Nippur [shall measure.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>= ĕtu XXX-is-sah-ra</td>
<td>[Seal of] Sin-issabra.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Against this translation is to be said: (1) The expression ina SHE.BAR GUR LUGAL En-litā (ll. 11, 12) can never mean "in the royal seed gur of Nippur," but would have to be translated, if En-litā really does belong to the preceding line, "in (or "according") to the grain-measure of (a) GUR of the king of Nippur”; (2) but this translation shows at once that Enlīti cannot belong to LUGAL, because, firstly, the Cassite kings, though residing at Nippur, do not take the title "king of Nippur,” and secondly, a royal gur was everywhere the same, the Nippurian did not differ from that of Babylon or Sippar; (3) the expression ābeth DUB Ē.GAL u-she-īṣ-ša-am-ma (ll. 3, 4) can be rendered only "per sealed order (ābeth DUB = anything that is sealed, "letter," "order," "decree," etc.) of the Ē.GAL (as such to be distinguished from the DUB Ė-nu, B. E., XV, 36:19) he caused to go out,” or “he caused to carry away.”
issahra comes to Innanni, the chief bursar of the Temple storehouse, with a sealed order of the Ė.GAL calling for 3 gur and 90 qa of wheat. Innanni honors this order at once and gives permission to Sin-issahra to have it removed, but stipulates that the wheat is to be returned or paid back to him again. Accordingly ll. 1-8 are a “statement” of Innanni in the “form of a note of indebtedness” (Schuldschein), and as such quite different from a simple “note of indebtedness.” (The latter would have to read: X gur of wheat Sin-issahra has per order of the Ė.GAL received (imḥur) from (ina qāt) Innanni. DUB = ūn-XXX-issahra). But any “statement in the form of a note of indebtedness” has, if it is to be valid, to be signed by the debtor. Sin-issahra, being the debtor, signs it in the briefest possible way: “3 gur 90 qa of wheat Sin-issahra (sc. has received) according to the GUR(barley)-measure of the king.—Nippur.—Sin-issahra.” Taking ll. 9ff. in this sense they contain the signature of the debtor in the form of a receipt, which makes the “statement of indebtedness” a regular “note of indebtedness.” But, and this is important here, Sin-issahra wants grain “per order of the Ė.GAL,” and receipts for it as having been given him “according to the king’s, i.e., the royal GUR.” This shows quite clearly that in orders for the Ė.GAL royal measures were or had to be used, hence Ė.GAL cannot be the “Temple,” but must have been the palace of the king. At the same conclusion we arrive when considering sundry other passages. Cf. e.g., B. E., XIV, 167 : 10, where the amount of grain designated as PAD Ė.GAL is differentiated from that intended for the BÂR (= parakkû) ūn-En-lil (l. 8), etc., etc. If, then, the Ė.GAL be the “royal palace,” we have to see in the kard Ė.GAL a “palace or royal storehouse.” Such a storehouse is mentioned in the archives and is called karā ASH.TAB.BA.GAN.TUGki.1 Wheat which was paid at the karā ASH.TAB.BA.GAN.TUGki is called in the closing paragraph (B. E., XV, 38c : 27), ASH.AN.NA šá i-na mah-ri-im i-mu-ru a-na ZER Ė.GAL nadnun; i.e., “wheat which they (= German ‘man’) received formerly and which was given (paid) for (as) seed-corn of the ‘palace.’” Again, B. E., XV, 96 is, as Clay correctly recognized (l.c., p. 22), “almost identical” with B. E., XV, 111, which was written two years later. As both tablets are payments of salaries to various officials whose names are identical, or nearly so, in both tablets, and as the one (No. 111) mentions ASH.TAB.BA. GAN.TUGki (l. 24) as the place where the payments to these officials were made, while the other (No. 96 : 1, 25) informs us that it was Kan-du-ru-[ū].2

1 B. E., XV, 135 : 7, 10 and so much flour (ki-mu), interest (HARR.RA), a-na karā Ė.GAL a-na karā ASH.TAB.BA.GAN.TUGki “Nu-na-ak-le ishi-ši,” “to the palace storehouse, i.e., to the storehouse of (or “called”) ASH.TAB.BA. GAN.TUG Namukki took.” Cf. also the ērušu Ė-am-ba-ba in Bu. 381 (C. T., II, 37), l. 6.
2 B. E., XV, 38c : 1, ASH.AN.NA šá i-na karā ASH.TAB.BA.GAN.TUGki ŠISH.BAR 5 qa nadnun;.
in identifying both: \( \text{ASH.TAB.BA.GAN.TUG}^\text{ki} \) is \( = \text{Kan-du-ru-}[\text{ak}^\text{ki}] \), maintaining at the same time that both were a "palace storehouse."\(^1\) As over against the \( \text{É.GAL} \) or "palace" (sc. of the king) the "Temple" is called \( \text{É.A-nu} \), i.e., "House of A-nu," \( \text{B. E.} \), XV, 93 : 5. Clay, \( \text{B. E.} \), XIV, p. 6, reads \( \text{bit-a-nu} \), "our house." But in view of the fact that (a) such a monstrous Babylonian form—half Sumerian and half Semitic: \( \text{É.A-nu} = \text{bit-a-nu} = \text{biti-nu}—would be, to say the least, very strange for this and later periods;\(^2\) (b) that in our letter, No. 35 : 15, \( \text{É.A-nu} \) is followed immediately by \( \text{bab A-n[u-um]} \),\(^3\) (c) that the determinative for "god," \( \text{ilu} \), is very often omitted before the names of gods in these texts, I prefer to read as given above. But in this connection it ought to be remembered that \( \text{A-nu} \) is simply the semiticized Sumerian for \( \text{itu} \), signifying in each and every case the \text{highest god of a city}, whether that god be \( \text{AN} \) or \( \text{Enlil} \), or whether the city be \( \text{Nippur} \) or \( \text{Babylon} \) or \( \text{Daru-itu} \), etc. In this way it happened that \( \text{Enlil} \), the god of Nippur, was simply called \( \text{AN} \) (\( \text{B. E.} \), XIV, 16 : 1 | 132 : 3, 4, 54; \( \text{XV} \), 97 : 3 | 115 : 11 | 143 : 2 | 163 : 28), and the Temple of Enlil at Nippur was termed not only \( \text{É.KUR} \) (\( \text{B. E.} \), XIV, 148 : 2), but also \( \text{É.AN.KALAM.GAL} \), "the temple of the great god of the (Babylonian) world" (\( \text{B. E.} \), XIV, 148 : 15, 18; \( \text{XV} \), 34 : 2), or merely \( \text{É.AN} \) (\( \text{B. E.} \), XIV, 24 : 16; \( \text{XV} \), 37 : 1). That this \( \text{É.AN} \) or "Gotteshaus" indeed the temple of Enlil of Nippur is evident from a passage in \( \text{B. E.} \), XV, 128 : 14, which mentions the \( \text{É.AN}(!)\) \( \text{An-lil}^\text{ki} \) \( \text{šá i-na libbi-nu} \), "the house of god (= temple) of Nippur which is in our midst." Of this house the Nippurians speak as the \( \text{É.AN} \) \( \text{É-nu} \), the "house of god our temple," \( \text{B. E.} \), XIV, 150 : 2, or simply as \( \text{É-nu} \), "our temple"; see, among other passages, also \( \text{B. E.} \), XIV, 148 : 45, 47; \( \text{XV} \), 38 : 2 | 44 : 6 | 71 : 6 | 73 : 10 | 77 : 5 | 79 : 4 | 89 : 3 | 92 : 16 | 127 : 5 | 154 : 21 | 168 : 26. As there was a \( \text{DUB} \) \( \text{É.GAL} \) (\( \text{B. E.} \), XV, 50 : 3) so there existed also a \( \text{DUB} \) \( \text{É-nu} \) (\( \text{B. E.} \), XV, 36 : 19), as there are mentioned \( \text{ardū} \) resp. \( \text{amat} \) \( \text{É.GAL} \) (see p. 77) so there occur also \( \text{a-mi-lu-ti} \) \( \text{šá Š-én} \) (\( \text{B. E.} \), XV, 41 : 3). All this, then, forces us to separate the \( \text{É.GAL} \) or

---

\(^1\) Also written \( \text{Kan-du-ri-ak}^\text{ki} \), see \( \text{List} \) in \( \text{B. E.} \), XV. It is also mentioned in our letters 18 : 38, \( \ldots \) \( \text{mash šá Kan-du-ri-ak}^\text{ki} [\ldots ] \text{ul-ta-nu-nu-mi} [\ldots ] \text{a-nu nu-ah-gi be-ta-[al-to-la]-a} \). Cf. here also \( \text{kadurā} = \text{kadurā} = \text{kandurā} \), Délitzsch, \( \text{H. W. B.} \), p. 319; \( \text{B. A.} \), IV, 485, and Nagel, i.e., p. 452 : (1) \( \text{Frohdienst} \), (2) \( \text{Frohrarbeiter} \), \( \text{Leibjäger} \). The city read by Clay, \( \text{B. E.} \), XV, p. 538, \( \text{Šek}^\text{ki} \) \( \text{šá [\ldots ]-nu-er-tu}^\text{ki} \) has to be transcribed, of course, \( \text{kan-du-nu-ak}^\text{ki} \).

\(^2\) For other occurrences of \( \text{É.GAL} \) cf., e.g., the archi \( \text{É.GAL} \) in letter No. 34 : 11 and \( \text{B. E.} \), XV, 84 : 2 | 152 : 15 | 209 III : 38; \( \text{v. 6; amat} \) \( \text{GIN} \) \( \text{É.GAL} \), \( \text{B. E.} \), XV, 200 II : 33, 37; \( \text{II} : 2, 9, 21; \text{libittu}^\text{ki} \) \( \text{É.GAL} \), letter No. 50 : 11; \( \text{šá-lam-ta-shá a-nu É.GAL} \) \( \text{šá-[h]i-lam} \), 50 : 4; \( \text{mash-[h]ar-ti} \) \( \text{šá É.GAL} \)—"special fund (of 10 GUR)" set aside by the palace for the payment of certain officers or otherwise;\(\text{B. E.} \), XV, 47 : 1. For \( \text{mash-bāri-tu} = \) "special fund," see p. 86, note 4.

\(^3\) Cf. here also the \( \text{amat} \) \( \text{šá muḫ É.A-nu} \), i.e., "overseer of the house of god," \( \text{H. VIII} \), 855 : 1, and see the \( \text{EN E} \) in \( \text{B. E.} \), XIV, 122 : 4.

\(^4\) And is differentiated from the \( \text{É.GAL} \) which precedes the \( \text{É.A-nu} \)
If we thus distinguish between E.GAL and E.A-nu, the tablet published in B. E., XV, 93, becomes of special importance. We learn from it that a certain "Amel-Ba-nu-û, who is a a-bil bābi E.A-nu, a "doorkeeper of the Temple," i.e., a Temple official, receives a certain amount of grain in ăš.Kan-du-ri-eši from Innanni, the chief bursar of the Temple storehouses during the time of Kuri-Galzu. But Kandurê was, as we saw on p. 80, the same as ASH.TAB.BA.GAN.TUG, the "Palace storehouse"—hence a Temple official is paid out of the Palace storehouse, and Innanni, the chief bursar of the Temple storehouses, appears here also as the chief bursar of the Palace storehouse; in other words, Innanni, the chief bursar, and Amel-Ba-nu-û, the gatekeeper of the E.A-nu, were both Temple and Palace, i.e., royal officials, otherwise Innanni could not have exercised authority over the royal storehouse, nor could Amel-Ba-nu-û have been paid out of it. No wonder, then, that Martuku, who succeeded Innanni in the capacity of chief bursar of the Temple storehouses during the reign of Nazi-Maruttash, is called in B. E., XIV, 56 : 9, a-rad LUGAL, "servant of the king."

Is it under these conditions to be wondered at that even the king himself—directly or indirectly—should appear as a beneficiary of the revenues of Enlil of Nippur? In proof of our contention that the king actually was such a beneficiary cf. the following expressions, occurring in the "Temple Archives": bil-la-ti ša LUGAL, B. E., XIV, 116 : 1; e-la LUGAL, l.c., XV, 33, 34; bronze a-na i-šer(hardly šul, kar, see p. 88, note 1)-ti ša aši.MAR LUGAL, l.c., XIV, 124 : 16; a-na LUGAL, l.c., XIV, 148 : (43), 44, 46; na-gid ša LUGAL, l.c., XIV, 132 : 17; sak-shup-par LUGAL, l.c., XV, 154 : 41; a-ra-ad šar-ri, l.c., XV, 199 : 30; a-rad LUGAL, l.c., XIV, 56 : 9; ašuša SAG LUGAL, l.c., XIV, 132 : 2; ĠU.EN.NA EN.LI[L], l.c., XIV, 136 : 1, etc., etc. Cf. also the facts indicated on p. 79, namely, that a royal measure (gur LUGAL) is employed in a Temple storehouse, and that Sin-issabra, though acting as the head of the Palace storehouse of Kandurê and as such giving grain a-na E-na, i.e., "to our Temple" (B. E., XV, 89 : 3), receives grain "per order of the Palace" (E.GAL) from Innanni, the bursar-in-chief of the Nippurian Temple storehouses. Cf. also the ina mush LUGAL, p. 84, note 9.

This result, derived solely from the "Temple Archives" as published by Clay, is more than corroborated by several passages from the letters here published.


The bēl E is, no doubt, the same as the amedu ša mush E.A-nu, cf. H., VIII, 885 : 1.
In Chapter III we have shown that all letters addressed to the be-li or ‘‘Lord’’ were intended for the king. Bearing this in mind I included in this collection, for definite reasons, the peculiar tablet published under No. 60. Whosoever merely glanced at the ‘‘Temple Archives’’ known from B. E., XIV, XV, will recognize a similar document in the Obverse of No. 60, while the Reverse apparently is a letter addressed to the ‘‘Lord’’ (be-li) or king, in which an unknown writer begs him to command that, among other things, certain oxen of the patesi’s be brought down. Now, as the Obverse is a record concerning the receipt of grain (SHE) from certain crops (har-bu) of the patesi’s, and as the Reverse contains a letter addressed to the king, the natural inference to be drawn from this letter is that the king was the person to whom such records had to be sent. In other words, this tablet proves that the Temple Archives were records made and kept for the king, as the highest official of the Temple of Enlil at Nippur. The ‘‘Temple Archives,’’ therefore, at the same time are Royal Archives.

What was the purpose of these archives? Kishahbut, when answering an inquiry of king Kadashman-Turgu whether sesame-oil had been forwarded or not, writes to his ‘‘Lord’’ as follows (35 : 30ff.): āšuš-shum šamnu ( = NI.GISH) ša be-lia na-shù-[ma?] il-la-na-su a-na ‘‘Ku-du-r[a-ni] [ardi]-ka ki-i aq-bi-ü um-ma-a šamnu (=NI.GISH) i-na qati-i [i-din] be-li a-na šatammi ( = SHAG.TAM) li-îsh-piu-ra-ma šamnu ( = NI.GISH) šub( = RU)-ta liš-ki-nu-[ma], i.e., ‘‘As regards the sesame-oil of my ‘Lord’ (I beg to report): ‘It has been removed’ they read, when I spoke to Kudurâni thy servant: ‘Give the sesame-oil to me.’ My ‘Lord’ may now send to the šatammi that they store up the oil.’’

The expression il-la-na-su (I of 7DU) refers here apparently to the action of consulting a tablet recording that such and such an amount of sesame-oil had been removed (nashù) by a certain person in the name of the king or ‘‘per order of the palace,’’ .validation DUB É.GAL. Everything that was either received from (ša i-na qât . . . malgù) or paid out to (ša i-na libbi šá . . . . ana . . . . naadnu) or removed (šá ištu . . . . nashù) or taken away from (šá ištu . . . . laqû) or delivered to (šá ana . . . . shulû) or taken to (šá ana . . . . nashù, resp. laqû) the different storehouses or possessions of the Temple under royal administration had to be faithfully recorded on tablets under the name of the donor or recipient, for future reference (as here) or for the examination by the king, resp. his representatives. Hence the Temple Archives primarily are ‘‘Records’’ embodying statements about many things in connection with the royal administration of the Temple property;

---

1 No. 60 : 9, ū šá alipurrash šá pate-sînurrash . . . . be-li li-îsh-puru-um-ma li-rî-id-du-[ . . . ].
they are "Administrative Records," more particularly "Royal Administrative Business Records in connection with the Temple property, resp. its revenues." As such they give us an insight into the methods employed by the king, resp. his representatives, while administering these revenues.

The action of recording a certain item under the name of a person, city, etc., or names of persons, etc., in the so-called "Temple Archives," is referred to in such expressions as xx. šaḫt-i-NA DUB.SHA.RA¹ . . . MU =X šaḫ-ru (B. E., XIV, 168: 34, 43) or [xx. šaḫ] i-NA DUB šaḫ ABETTI ( = GASHAN)² šaḫ-ru (B. E., XV, 199: 37). "To record," then, is šaḫaru ina, and "Temple Archives" are called DUB, resp. DUB.SHA.RA. Besides these two there occur still the following names for "Archives," viz., DUB shat-mi (B. E., XIV, 168: 34, 43) or [xx. shci]

¹1 If the document records that the items are for a certain period, say, e.g., a year, this is entered here, thus šaḫ šat-ti x̄a, i.e., "for the year so and so." cf., e.g., B. E., XIV, 168: 33.

²2 Or we might transcribe DUB.SHA.RI (= uru).

³3 This shows clearly that Ardi-Bêtû, because a tributary storehouse to that of Nippur, had to keep its own records.

¹⁴Cf. here also the interesting variant in B. E., XV, 59: 12, SHE.BA.BIH.RA GISH-ru[:m] which corresponds to i.e., ii, 1, 2, SHE.BA.RA . . . GISH, hence GISH = GISH-ru = zikarum = za-kar-tum.

¹⁵Cf. here also the MU.NE.NE in Cassito Tablets published by F. Pehle, e.g., P. 89: 15; P. 100: 6 (L. 5 only, MU.NE).
year, i.e., either in the second (so most generally), or the last, or the sixth, in other words, around the end of the first resp. sixth month, the different heads of the households or of the possessions (e.g., flocks, etc.) of the Temple were required, it seems, to make their yearly reports, i.e., "to draw the balance of accounts" (epēšīu nikāsī, resp. ri-ba-a-nu šā DUB.SHARmes) or "take the inventory" of the stock (mi-nu šād) in the presence of (šā u-kin-nu) a royal (i.e.) official, either the amēlu SAG LUGAL or the GŪ.NA, i.e., sheriff, of Nippur, when they (the shepherds or other parties

1 Cf. B. E., XIV, 57, SHERISHBAR 6 ga šá i-na lāti ti-te-šū šá šatiš 12êkam šu-šu Na-zi-Mu-ri-at-ti-šú i-na Za-nu-laški a-na pe-šēkam nānanu, but dated, l. 35, arbšuGUD.SIŠŠI šáttā šu 12êkam. B. E., XV, 23 : 7, ak-šu šatiš arbšuGUD.SIŠŠI šá šatiš 12êkam, B. E., XV, 25 : 6, ak-šu GISH.BAR SHER.BA šatiš arbšuGUD.SIŠŠI šá šatiš 12êkam. B. E., XV, 28 : 1, SHER.AS.IAN.NA šatiš l. 11(y)šam, but dated l. 12, arbšuGUD.SIŠŠI šáttā 12êkam. See here also B. E., XIV, 133 : 10, ak-šu 12 (Clay's copy is wrong and misleading) arbšu šá miši l. 16šam šá šatiš 12êkam šá šatiš 12êkam a-niši 30šam, arbšuBAR.ZAG.GAR šáttā 12êkam. The dup-pi ri-ba-a-ti (B. E., XIV, 42) was drawn up at the end of the year, i.e., at the time of the epēšīu nikāsī. Here probably belong also tablets like B. E., XIV, 48 : 20 | 52 : 1 | 80c : 9, B. E., XIV, 112 : 9. In view of these examples it is most likely that also at the time of the kings of Ur the yearly epēšīu nikāsī did not take place in the first (1STESÎILA) but in the second (2ND.MASH) month—just as at our present times, when the books resp. their accounts are balanced in February. Dr. Myhrman informs me that he has proofs which show that not GAN.MASH but SHE. IL.LA was the first month of the year at the time of the kings of Ur. GAN.MASH is mentioned so prominently in the tablets of the Ur dynasty because it was, as second month, that of the epēšīu nikāsī. See Dr. Myhrman's forthcoming volume.

2 B. E., XIV, 58 : 51, so and so much šá šatiš arbšuBAR šá šatiš 12êkam a-niši arbšuSHER.KIN.KUD šá šatiš 12êkam . . . . nānanu. As. Here tablets like B. E., XIV, 124 : 18, B. E., XV, Nos. 12, 52, 53, 119, 120, 130. In B. E., XIV, 123 : 2 the copyist (Clay) must have made some mistakes. While we read l. 1, 13, nīšipar 13 ma-na-19 TU (so, URUDU) ZIGA MU 8(y)šam, the copy reads in l. 1, 2, URUDU ZIGA . . . . šatiš arbšuKIN (so the traces given) šá šatiš 7(y)šam a-niši SHER šá šatiš 12êkam. According to this the ZIGA would extend over a space of one and a half years—a thing absolutely impossible and against l. 13 where the ZIGA is only for the 8th year; hence read in l. 2, šatiš arbšuBAR(!) šá šatiš 8(y)šam a-niši SHER šá šatiš 12êkam.

3 B. E., XV, 16 : 10, ak-lum . . . . šatiš arbšuKIN šá šatiš 9(y)šam a-niši arbšuKIN šá šatiš 9(y)šam, dated l. 13, arbšuKINši irananna šá šatiš 2(y)šam sha šatiš 1(y)šam—hence the last month excluded. B. E., XV, 10 : 11, šatiš arbšuKINši iknanna sha šatiš 1(y)šam a-niši arbšuNE.GAR šá šatiš 2(y)šam, i.e., both months included.

4 For half-yearly reports see, e. g., B. E., XIV, 50c : 31, šatiš arbšuDULAZAG a-niši arbšuBAR.ZAG.GAR. B. E., XV, 111 : 1, šatiš arbšu DULAZAG šá šatiš 20(y)šam a-niši arbšuBAR.ZAG.GAR šá šatiš 21êkam, i.e., the last month excluded, cf. l. 23; so also i.e., 96 : 1. But B. E., XIV, 117 : 1, šatiš arbšuDUL a-niši arbšuSHE, i.e., both included. B. E., XIV, 91a : 2, šatiš arbšuBAR a-niši arbšuKIN šá šatiš 3(y)šam, i.e., the last month included. For quarterly reports cf. e.g., B. E., XV, 7 : 10, šatiš arbšuAS.IAN a-niši arbšuGUD.SIŠŠI[y].


B. E., XIV, 136 : 1.


B. E., XIV, 136 : 1, ri-ba-a-nu šá DUB.SHARmes šá NIN.AN.MES šá amēlu SAG.LUGAL a-šiš-nu-na. For the signification of GŪ.NA ṣiš-iššu NE šá šatiš 9(y)šam Shedu ra-at-šiš-šar-ša i-na maši LUGAL a-šiš-nu-na. For the accentuation of GŪ.NA = sheriff, see "Translations," pp. 133f. Notice the sūma maši LUGAL = "for (in place of) the King."
concerned) had to testify to the truth of their statements before "God" (AN = Enlil). This having been done the "records" were sent to "headquarters," i.e., to Nippur. For how could it possibly happen, I ask, that, e.g., a document like that of B. E., XIV, 37, was found in Nippur—a document which records how much grain (SHE) was received (mah-rum) and stored up (tab-ku) in the storehouse (i-na karû) of Bu-un-na-îsu-Marduk during the 22d year of Kuri-Galzu? Surely, the fact that this document was excavated in Nippur shows that the "head" of the storehouse at Bu-nna-Marduk had to make his report and send it to Nippur. In this connection our letter published under No. 76 is especially interesting. In it the father asks his son, "Send the report to the 'lord of the barley'," i.e., the storehouse official, "in order that I may send my report to the 'Lord (be-el)'." No better evidence than the one contained in this letter could be expected to establish our contention that the archives are "administrative records." Or, I ask again, why should B. E., XIV, 65, have been dug up in Nippur, seeing that that tablet states the amount of grain (SHE) which Apil-Rammûn has removed (ish-sha-a) by means of ships (i-na iva MÂ) from (ish-tu) Du-un-ni-îh-îq? And again the answer has to be: It is a "record" of the expenditures in connection with the storehouse in Dunnî-Abû during the first month of the 15th year of Nazi-Maruttash which had been forwarded to headquarters. In this wise it happened that we found among these "Temple Archives" so appallingly many documents which apparently came from other places than Nippur. Nippur, therefore, must have been the central "recording office," the executive department of the administration of the Temple properties under royal supervision. Such documents, thus forwarded and excavated in Nippur, cannot but be records (yearly, half-yearly, etc., as the case might be) of the receipts, resp. expenditures of grain, etc., in connection with the particular "depot" or "storehouse" from which they come; in other words, they are business records giving us an insight into the administration of the several "depots" or "storehouses" connected with that of the Nippurian Temple under the chief supervision of the Cassite kings; they are administrative business records of the Temple properties, resp. its revenues, made and kept for the king.

These administrative records, having arrived at and been received by the executive

---

1 More particularly to three things: (a) shâ pi (=KA) ki-nî (= col. I); (b) [shâ a-na e-a]-ri nodnuu (resp. shâ a-na e-a ri kun-nu, col. II); (c) i KI.BE GA a-nigawaq a-na pi-n (=SHI) AN (= šîl - Enlil) shâ-ku (resp. shâ a-na mah-rî AN shap-ku, col. III), B. E., XIV, 132. Notice that amounts of cols. II + III are = col. I!

2 See below, under "Translations," p. 144.

3 Cf. here the "List of Places" as given in B. E., XIV, XV, and notice that Immânî, the chief bursar of Nippur, had authority not only over the Nippurian Temple storehouses, but also over all those mentioned above, Chapter I (p. 2, note 13); yes, even over the nardî B.GAL, ASH.TAB.BA.GAN.TUG, resp. KUDURÚ; see pp. 81, 110.
department in Nippur, had necessarily to have a place where they could be deposited for future reference, resp. for inspection by the king or his representatives. This place was the E *dub* DUB or also called E ku-nu-uk-ki, resp. E *dub* DUB šá É.GAL, where they have been excavated by the Babylonian Expeditions of the University of Pennsylvania. And as Hill VI (Hilprecht, B. E., Ser. D, Vol. I, p. 305, Plan of the Ruins of Nuffar) represents the place where all the ‘‘Temple Archives’’, together with the letters here published, have been found, there is nothing which might prevent us from identifying the ruins of Hill VI with the E *dub* DUB šá É.GAL, so called because the É.GAL or “Palace,” resp. its occupant, the be-lu or king, had to administer the temporal affairs, resp. earthly possessions, of the ‘‘Temple of Enlil at Nippur.’’ This he did either personally or through his trusted servants, the arad LUGAL (cf. Martušu, the ‘‘servant of the king,’’ who is the chief bursar at the time of Nazi-Maruttash, B. E., XIV, 56 : 8). Now we also understand the reason why the Cai-site kings of this period very often ascribe to themselves the title which precedes all others—even that of ‘‘king of Shumer and Akkad,’’ resp. that of ‘‘king of the four corners of the world’’—the title GIR.NITA or shakkanakku šu Enlil.

2 B. E., XV, 55 : 12. Notice in this connection the a-na En-til ki after E ku-nu-uk-ki, thus showing that this building was indeed situated in Nippur.
4 Cf., e.g., the inscriptions of Kari-Galzu (š琵r) in I R., 4, XIV, Nos. 1–3; Winckler, K. B., III, p. 154a–c. For other occurrences of shakkanaku see, e.g., Gudea, Cylinder B, VII : 20; VIII : 7; Statue B, IV : 13; E. B. H., p. 255, note 12 (AN-Mu-šu-il the shakkanakku of Dār-šub₂), and Hinke, B. E., Ser. D, Vol. IV, pp. 321a, 173. For the reading of the ideogram GIR.NITA (not NER.ARAD) see Thurau-Dongin, Z. A., XV, p. 467. With GIR.NITA is closely connected the well-known official title GIR, so often found in tablets from the second dynasty of Ur. In my E. B. H., p. 424, 1 said: “The GIR seems to have been an officer resembling very much a ‘quartermaster.’ He had to look after the food of the royal officers as well as that of the priests, and even of the royal flocks.” This will now have to be modified. The GIR who figures so conspicuously in the Ur tablets was what we might call an “auditor,” one who had to approve the expenditures, resp. receipts, mentioned in those tablets, who had to “O.K.” them—put, so to speak, his seal to them. Such a function of an “auditor” was also exercised by Imanni and his successors as chief bursars of the Nippurian Temple storehouses. This is evident not only from the “checkmarks,” but also from such tablets as B. E., XV, 1 and 2; i.e., XV, 8 and 9; l.c., 23 and 25. Clay, who translated the first two mentioned, thinks that they were “salary payments,” adding, “in this class of tablets the seal impression of another is frequently made upon the document, evidently by an officer who recorded the payment or delivered the goods mentioned” (B. E., XV, p. 19; cf. B. E., XIV, p. 14). This latter explanation contains the reason why Clay misunderstood the character of the tablets just mentioned. The seal found on a tablet always proves that the person to whom the seal belongs was the dēbitu, was the one who “received” the amount specified in the tablet. Payments of salary at the time of the Cai-site kings were well regulated, as is apparent from, e.g., B. E., XIV, 58. If B. E., XV, 1, 2 were, as Clay claims, such payments of salary, there would be, at least in Imanni’s case, no regulation whatever; i.e., the so-called salary received by Imanni for the fifth day of the first month (B. E., XV, 2) would be completely out of proportion to that received for the period extending from the first day of the tenth to the fourth day of the first month (B. E., XV, 1). No, not salary payments are those tablets, nor do they indicate that payments had to be or were made to Imanni. They are nothing but Anu Mustages, or “cheques” or “drafts” on certain storehouses endorsed by the chief bursar; they were “bills” “O.K.”ed by Imanni. When some
From the position the Cassite kings hold in relation to the administration of Enlil's earthly possessions, it is at once evident that shakkanakkū cannot be derived, with Delitzsch and others who follow him, from "sha" + "kanakkū" and be translated 'Verschliesser, Thürhüter, Vorsteher, Machthaber' (Delitzsch, H. W. B., p. 338a), or "the one of the door" (Jensen, Z. A., VII, p. 174, 1), but that it must be taken as standing for "sha" + "kanakku" (= qanāqu), i.e., "the one who exercises the function of the 'sealing,' one who 'seals,' the man of the 'seal' of Enlil." The Cassite kings of this period, then, are the authoritative representatives of Enlil, through whom Enlil, "the king of heaven and earth," exercises his power and his authority, through whom he administers his kingdom, through whom he shepherds and feeds his people—they are "the food of the people, the platter of man." Nothing could be done, nothing could be either removed from or be added to the possessions of Enlil, except the king first gave his authorization (seal); and if the king did, Enlil acted through and by him. The king's approval is the authoritative representatives of Enlil, through whom Enlil, "the king of heaven and earth," exercises his power and his authority, through whom he administers his kingdom, through whom he shepherds and feeds his people—they are "the food of the people, the platter of man."1 Nothing could be done, nothing could be either removed from or be added to the possessions of Enlil, except the king first gave his authorization (seal); and if the king did, Enlil acted through and by him. The king's approval is Enlil's seal and authority. In this sense the Cassite king, as shakkanakkū of Enlil, was but the earthly representative of his god—a representative whose business it was to administer and "regulate the tithes of E.KUR and Nippur."² Now, as the "Temple Archives," i.e., the Archives of the Temple E.KUR, the sanctuary of Enlil of Nippur, concern themselves with the administration of Enlil's possessions, and as the king as shakkanakkū Enlil has to seal, to approve them, it follows that these "Temple Archives" are at the same time

---

1 No. 24: 5.
Royal Archives; hence the Ḫ abnu-DUB is at the same time an Ḫ abnu-DUB šā Ḫ.GAL, because it contained the official administrative documents of the Temple as approved, sealed by the king.

Right here some one may object that the Ḫ abnu-DUB, resp. the Ḫ abnu-DUB šā Ḫ.GAL, if certain passages of B. E., XIV and XV, and Letter No. 84 are taken into consideration, was used also for “storehouse” purposes. Upon closer observation this objection will be found to be of no avail. In B. E., XIV, 104 : 3 we read of a certain amount of butter (NI.NUN) belonging to the NIN.A[Nasik] šā i-na šattii 13th Ka-dāš-man-Tur-gu ṢIr-im-shu-šu-NIN.IB im-ḫur-ma a-na Ḫ abnu-DUB ú-she-ri-bu a-na 4 šag(?)(?)(?)(?) šā-pi-ik, “which Irim-shu-NIN.IB received in (during) the 13th year of Kadashman-Turgu and which he (they?) caused to bring to the Ḫ abnu-DUB, having it put up (or putting it up) in 4 SAG-jars.” B. E., XIV, 124 : 6f. informs us of two amounts of bronze (erû) which Ḫalu-MU.TUG.A-ri-ma receives (ma-ḫi-ir). The first of these amounts is specified as šā Ḫ abnu-DUB šā Ḫ.GAL šu- khí šu-ṣa-a, i.e., “which the Ḫ abnu-DUB šā Ḫ.GAL caused to go (i.e., sent) out,” and the other as coming šā qāṭ Ṣa-ah-bi-šu-Mardu, “per order of Naḥzi-Marduk.” Both amounts were received a-na i-ter(?)-ti ša-ša MAR LUGAL “as an indemnity for the royal wagons (chariots).” B. E., XV, 53 : 11f. mentions wheat flour (ZID.DA Ṣa-ša NA) šā Ḫ ku-nu-uk-ki a-na En-ti-i iš(?) or na(?)-šu-ā, “due to (or belonging to) the Ḫ ku-nu-uk-ki (and which) they brought to Nippur.” Finally Letter No. 84 : 5f. contains the following exhortation addressed to Innanni: “ma-an-nu SHE.GISH.NI li-ḫu-tu-ū-ma NI.GISH a-na Ḫ abnu-DUB li-ša-ri-bu ṣa-at-ta SHE.GISH.NI-ka šu-ḫu-ul-ma NI.GISH a-na Ḫ abnu-DUB šu-ri-ib,” i.e., “All who press out sesame must bring oil (in) to the Ḫ abnu-DUB, therefore press out thy sesame and bring the oil (in) to the Ḫ abnu-DUB.”

Examining these passages we find that B. E., XV, 53, is an administrative record (having been forwarded to Nippur from Za-rat-IMKI), which enumerates the expenditures in wheat made during the course of a year, being therefore dated from the 29th day of the 12th month. At the end of the regular expenditures two additional notes are added, one of which, quoted above, implies that the ku-nu-uk-ki at some previous time must have sent orders to Za-rat-IMKI that they (=German “man”) take wheat flour to Nippur. The Ḫ ku-nu-uk-ki here apparently denotes as much as “the head of the Ḫ ku-nu-uk-ki,” and is as such exactly parallel to our “such and such a house has ordered these and those goods.” The same is

1 For ī-ter-turn, “indemnity,” see Hilprecht, B. E., IX, 41 : 7, e-ter-di ī-nam-di-a’ a-na, “shall pay an indemnity to.”
2 Cf. here p. 114, notes 3, 4.
true of B. E., XIV, 124, where the Ḩ sabnaDUB š š E.GAL, i.e., the head of the house mentioned, šušši šuša the bronze. These two passages, then, show that orders were sent out from the Ḩ sabnaDUB to certain men or branch storehouses. But this could be done only if the Ḩ sabnaDUB of Nippur was a building containing the administrative and executive department of the various branch storehouses connected with the Temple of Nippur. From here orders were sent out for the delivery of goods to this building, and, after having arrived there, they were distributed to wheresoever it was found necessary. It served, therefore, as a kind of a central clearing house, which again is paralleled at our present day by the fact that a great business corporation, such as the Temple of Enlil must have been, has likewise a central clearing house which is generally connected with the main office or executive department. In this sense B. E., XIV, 104, and Letter No. 84 have to be understood. Is it under these circumstances at all surprising that in this central executive office, from which the manifold possessions of the Temple of Enlil were administered, letters should be found which were addressed to the administrator-in-chief, the representative of Enlil, the be-ß or king?

We had to find such documents in this building, because each and every correspondence carried on about the administration, resp. methods in connection with the administration of Enlil’s property, had necessarily to be addressed (a) either to the highest official, i.e., “the king as ‘shakkanakkü of Enlil,’” or (b) to the king’s representative, i.e., his chief bursar, etc. And, if so, we had to find a correspondence also between “officials and officials,” i.e., between officials outside of Nippur and the king’s representatives at Nippur. Both classes of correspondence are represented: Nos. 1–74 contain letters addressed to the king, and Nos. 76ff. are those addressed to the king’s representatives in one capacity or another. With these facts before us, the title of this volume, “Letters to the Cassite Kings,” is not only justified, but is, in fact, the only proper one.

But the question may be asked, and quite rightly, how have we to account for the fact that letters written by the several kings themselves were recovered from this Ḩ sabnaDUB š š E.GAL, which was, as has been claimed, the administrative department (of the king as highest executive officer) of the Temple of Enlil? Then, again, numerous scientific, historic and religious texts, such as omens, hymns, prayers, incantations, etc., have been found in this “administrative building (resp. buildings connected with each other).” How, I ask, can we account for the presence of such texts in the Ḩ sabnaDUB š š E.GAL? A comprehensive answer to the latter

1 Resp. that the heads of the storehouses sent their “orders” to the “central” office at Nippur to have them “filled,” see No. 45, pp. 142f.
question will be given when the several classes of texts will be published. At the present only this much: At the time of the Cassite kings the E abzu DUB šá É.GAL embraced in its walls the administrative resp. the executive department of the Temple, by which and through which the shakkanakku of Enlil, the king, governed and officially directed both the temporal and the spiritual affairs of the worshippers of Enlil. In this wise it happened that the E abzu DUB šá É.GAL became the ‘’Ministerium’’ with its different departments—administrative, religious, educational—as such containing tablets which are either ‘’administrative records’’ (Temple Archives) or religious (Temple Library) or educational (Temple Library and Temple School) in character. This I maintain in the face of and notwithstanding the clamor of certain men who, on account of their inability to read and interpret cuneiform inscriptions or who on account of their lack of acumen to discern between the different classes of texts, can, in the ruins of Hill VI, not see anything but a ‘’kitchen midden,’’ and in the tablets there excavated, but so much ‘’dried mud,’’ ‘’potsherds,’’ ‘’dead, meaningless, insignificant bricks.’’

The tablets recovered from the E abzu DUB šá É.GAL form thus an exact parallel to those found in the rightly famous Library of Ashshur-bân-apal. To uncover here all the various parallels with regard to the several classes of texts would lead me too far, and is, in fact, beyond the scope of these introductory remarks. However, as we are concerned with the ‘’Letters’’ of the E abzu DUB šá É.GAL, I may be permitted to compare these briefly with those of the K. Collection, i.e., with those letters which form an integral part of the Royal Library of Ashshur-bân-apal.

1. Though we find in Ashshur-bân-apal’s Library some letters that are addressed to the ‘’prince,’’ TUR LUGAL, ‘’princess,’’ TUR.SAL LUGAL, or ‘’queen mother,’’ AM LUGAL, by far the greater number are written to the ‘’KING,’’ LUGAL. Of the one hundred and three letters here published seventy-eight are addressed to the be-lá or king.

2. In the Library of Ashshur-bân-apal, Royal Library as it undoubtedly was, we also find a correspondence between officials; thus we meet with letters addressed

---

1 Situated on the west side of the Shatt-en-Nil; see Hilprecht, B. E., Scr. D, I, p. 305, Plan of the Ruins of Nippur.
2 Here I take into consideration only those letters which are designated as ‘’K,’’ omitting the D, T, Bu, and all other collections.
3 Cf. K. 641 (H., I, 10); K. 629 (H., I, 65); K. 1101 + K. 1221 (H., II, 152); K. 614 (H., II, 175); K. 589 (H., II, 187); K. 1048 (H., II, 198); K. 1303 (H., V, 500).
4 K. 476 (H., I, 54).
5 K. 478 (H., III, 254); K. 825 (H., III, 263); K. 823 (H., III, 324); K. 980 (H., VI, 599).
6 Nos. 1–74 + 33a, 59a, 60a, 73a.
to the (a) anuna ENGAR\(^1\) or ikkaru, originally “farmer,” here probably a high official; (b) anuna[.]. A.B.A KUR\(^2\), “secretary of the State”; (c) anuna A.B.A EGAL\(^3\), “secretary of the Palace”; (d) anuna[.]. aqigir EGAL\(^4\), “major domo”; (e) anuna LUGH\(^5\) or sukkallu, “ambassador”; (f) amedu ITI\(^6\) or aabarakku; (g) amedu GAL* SAG\(^7\) or rab-shaq; (h) amedu EN.NAM\(^8\) or bél paḫāti, “governor”; (i) amelu šá nuḫ Š A-nu\(^9\), “man who is over the house of God,” i.e., “the Temple superintendent.” In the administrative department of the Temple under the Cassite kings we also have a correspondence between “Temple resp. State officials.”\(^10\) If it be objected to my including such letters into a volume ostensibly called “Letters to the Cassite Kings,” I ask my would-be critics why they do not object to calling the Library of Ashshur-bân-apal a Royal Library, seeing that it includes not only a correspondence between “officials and officials” but even such unmistakably “private” documents” as letters from m ina AG-EN SHU-nu to m Ashshur-mu-dam-me-ik\(^11\); from “Umma-ni-ia” to “A-MAZ-gu-nu\(^12\), “his brother”\(^13\) (SHESH-shu); from m ina Nergal-SHESH-ir to m ina AG-u-shal-im\(^14\), “his brother”\(^14\) (SHESH-shu); from m ina EN-ia-HU to “Ku-na-a, “his brother”\(^15\) (AD-shu); from “MU.GI.NA to m ina Nergal-SHESH-ir\(^16\); from “A-gar-[in EN-lu-mur] to “EN-ib-ni\(^17\); from an unknown writer to “PA-IK-shi\(^18\) and last, but not least, a letter to “XXX-man-nu-GAR- [... ] from “XXX-KAK-[ni?\(^19\), “thy servant” (ardi-ka), etc.\(^20\) If it be not objected

\(^{1}\) K. 568 (H., I, 4); K. 1197 (H., I, 15); K. 1049 (H., I, 38); K. 113 (H., II, 183); K. 112 (H., II, 233); K. 13,000 (H., III, 352); K. 88 (H., VIII, 816).

\(^{2}\) K. 547 (H., I, 62); K. 175 (H., II, 221).

\(^{3}\) K. 1274 (H., II, 220).

\(^{4}\) K. 485 (H., I, 112).

\(^{5}\) K. 1070 (H., I, 70); K. 655 (H., II, 132); K. 986 (H., VIII, 544).

\(^{6}\) K. 910 (H., II, 145).

\(^{7}\) K. 597 (H., III, 283).

\(^{8}\) K. 1376 (H., VIII, 580).

\(^{9}\) K. 1236 (H., VIII, 535).

\(^{10}\) Cf. Nos. 76-99.

\(^{11}\) Private(?), because both the writer and the addressee appear in these letters without any titles whatsoever.

\(^{12}\) K. 1396 (H., II, 185).

\(^{13}\) K. 831 (H., II, 214).

\(^{14}\) Cf. above, Part II, p. 14, note 3.


\(^{16}\) K. 1239 (H., II, 219).

\(^{17}\) Cf. our Letter No. 76, which is written by a “father” to his “son,” p. 144.


\(^{19}\) K. 1138 (H., VIII, 854).

\(^{20}\) K. 578 (H., III, 273).

\(^{21}\) K. 585 (H., V, 529).

\(^{22}\) Cf. K. 156 (H., II, 222).
to such apparently ‘private’ letters forming part of a Royal Library, it need not worry us to have included in our volume of “Letters to the Cassite Kings” twenty-four specimens representing a correspondence between officials and officials.

3. But the most remarkable of all is that there have been found in the Library of Ashshur-bân-apal letters—decrees—written either by himself or by other kings. We have “royal decrees” (a-mat LUGAL a-na) to “the Nippurians” (amētu EN. LI[(L)i-a-ta]); to “the people of the sea country, old and young, my servants” (amētu Wolu Tam-tim-a-a amētu AB.BA-namuk a TURmesh ardēmesh-iā); to “the Gambuleans” (amētu Gam-bu-la-a-a); to “the Nippurians” (EN.LUGAL a-NU); to “the people of the sea country, old and young, my servants” (melu melu Tam-tim-a-a ABBA-a-MA ra-TUR); to “the Gambuleans” (Gam-bu-la-a-a); to “the Rashwans, old and young” (Ra-sha-a-a ABBA-a-MA); to “Shadu and the people of Erech, old and young, my servants” (Sha-du u a-NUUG ki.meh ABBA-MA ra-TUR); to “Nabu-... and the people of Erech, old and young, my servants” (EN a-MA ki.meh ABBA-MA ra-TUR); to “the queen-mother” (SAL AM sharri); to “A-shi-pa-a” to “A-shi-pa-a” to “PA-shar (= SHUR)”; to the “queen-mother” (SAL AM sharri); to “Man-n-ki” to “Man-n-ki” to “A-shi-pa-a” to “PA-shar (= SHUR)”; to “Zēru-û-[a]”; and last, but not least, a royal decree to “the ‘Not-Babylonians’” (a-mat LUGAL a-na la amētu DIN.TER{mesh}iā). We furthermore find in this Library royal “orders” (or decrees, a-bitu LUGAL a-na) to “the Babylonians” (amētu KÂ.DINGIR{mesh}iā); to “A-shi-pa-a; to “PA-shar (= MAN)-aḫē (= PAP)mesh-shu†; to the “queen-mother” (SAL AM sharri (= MAN)); to “Man-n-ki-śī-IM” to “A-shi-pa-a”; to “PA-dūr (= BAD);
usur (= PAP); nay even an "order" of a "princess" to aššur šarrat (a-bit TUR.SAL LUGAL a-na SAL òššAG(= libbu).ER-shar-rat) and a letter of a "prince" (IM TUR LUGAL) to the ašmš Sha-na-v³. How have we to account for the presence of royal letters in a Royal Library? Did Ashshur-bān-apal extend his activity in procuring the best and choicest specimens of Babylonian and Assyrian literature as far as to have his scribes copy even royal letters? Or are we to suppose that those royal decrees have never been delivered to the various addressees, thus happening to be found in this Library, to which they really do not belong? Or, if they had been delivered, have we to maintain that it was customary to have copies' made of letters like these, and have those copies deposited in a Library, so that the king could "keep track" of his various orders and decrees? Or, lastly, did the messengers to whom these decrees had been entrusted go and communicate them to the several addressees and, after having read them to the persons named, bring them back with them and deposit them for future reference in the Royal Library of Ashshur-bān-apal? How, I ask again, could such royal letters possibly be found in a royal library? Whatever reply we may make to these questions, the same with equal force holds good of the royal letters—one or possibly two of which (Nos. 75 and 93) have been published here—to be found among the administrative records of the Temple under royal supervision. And as long as there is no objection made to the fact that the Royal Library of Ashshur-bān-apal may(!), as it actually does, include in its collection of documents both an official and private correspondence, just so long will I be justified in maintaining that the letters here published form a part, small and fragmentary though it be, of that collection of tablets now known as "Temple Archives," which with the tablets of the Temple Library and the Temple School constitute the contents of the ŠIM.DUB shá E.GAL, or simply ŠIM.DUB, the bit tapshušti, "the place of the appeasing" of Šušil.

1 K. 622 (H., III, 306).
2 K. 1619 B (H., III, 308).
3 K. M. 72 (H., IV, 430), probably belonging to Ashshur-bān-apal's Library.
4 Cf. here above, Chapter III, for the several copies to be found among the Amarna Letters, see p. 57, note 2.
6 I.e., then as now the favor of a god can be obtained only by contributing freely, in the form of tithes and taxes, towards the maintenance of the worship, ritual, and priesthood of the great Šušil of Nippur. A god can be appeased only by offerings—for the benefit of his (the god's) priests.
In order to illustrate more fully the general character of the letters here published I may be permitted to submit a few of them in transcription and translation, adding such critical notes as might be found necessary to elucidate their contents more clearly. While in the autograph plates the letters have been arranged alphabetically according to the names of the writers, I have followed here the, no doubt, more scientific method of giving them in their historical sequence.

I.

No. 23 (= C. B. M. 11,090). (Cf. photographic reproduction, Pl. V, 12, 13.)

*Imgurum*, a royal official stationed at *Dār-Kūrī-Galzu*, reports to his "Lord," King *Burna-Buriash*, about the affairs in connection with the administration of his office. About 1430 B.C.

The author of this letter, *Imgurum*, has to be identified not only with the writer of No. 22,¹ but also with the addressee "Im-gu-ri" of No. 79 : 1, a contemporary of the slave-dealer *mdu*"En-līl-ki-di-ni", who flourished, as we saw above (pp. 54ff.), during the time of King *Burna-Buriash*. From this it would follow that *Imgurum* was likewise a contemporary of *Burna-Buriash*. This result is corroborated by the following two considerations: (1) In 22 : 6 *Imgurum* mentions a certain *Hu-za-lum*, who appears in *B. E.*, XIV, 8 : 30 (dated the 21st year of *Burna-Buriash*) among the witnesses¹ at a legal business transaction executed by *mdu*"En-līl-ki-di-ni" (ll. 22, 25). (2) *Ki-din-*"Marduk*² referred to in our letter (l. 23) is mentioned, *B. E.*, XIV, 7 : 34 (dated the 18th, better 19th, year of *Burna-Buriash*), as the father of a certain *Ta-ki-shum*, who appears likewise as one of the witnesses at a slave sale executed between the two brothers *mdu*NIN.IB-SHESH and *mdu*NIN.IB-MU-MU (sellers) and *mdu*"En-līl-ki-di-ni" (buyer). According to l. 29 *Imgurum* was apparently sta-

¹ In both the greeting is the same and in both the writer records about the disposition of adobes, resp. burnt bricks.
² Called here *Hu-za-lum* mahr. *mdu*"En-līl-ki-di-ni (= EN)-iṭṭि (= AN)"mesh.
³ Cf. also the dmu shd *Ki-din-*"Marduk" in *B. E.*, XIV, 166 : 9.
tioned at Dūr-Kurigalzu, where he had charge both of certain building operations in connection with its palace or temple (cf. ll. 4–18) and of the weaveries and its personnel. The fact that No. 79 was found in Nippur would show, however, that the writer must have been living, for some time at least, also in Nippur.

The contents of this letter are the following:
(a) The disposition of adobes, ll. 4–10.
(b) The disposition of burnt bricks, ll. 11–13.
(c) Elul is the propitious time for transferring the resting chambers (of the god), ll. 14–18.
(d) Bēl-usāttum has not yet delivered the bleached wool, ll. 19–20.
(e) Accounting of the disposition of wool, ll. 21–28.
(f) Complaint, ll. 29–32.
(g) Request that certain weavers be finally dismissed out of the prison at Pān-Bali, ll. 33–39.

The letter reads:

1 [ardi-ka *Im-gu]-rum a-na di-na-an be-ī-ia
2 [lu-ul]-li-ik
3 [a-na bit be]-li-ia' shū-ul-mu
4 [. . .] + 6 M libittu (= SHEG-gunū)
a-di' āmī 4 ḫām la-ab-na-at
5 [. . .] M libittu (= SHEG-gunū)
a-na pi(i)-i na-ak-ba-ar

Thy servant Imgurum; before the presence of my "Lord"
may I come!
To the house of my "Lord" greeting!
x + 6000 adobes have been made during four days.
I caused to fetch y + 1000 adobes to the entrance of the excavation

1 As Imgurum reports (22 : 5) about the condition of Ga-ga-da-ni-tum, the summertu, who is sick, it would seem that he superintended also the personnel of the Temple or Palace, for a summertu or "songstress" was, no doubt, connected with both the Temple and the Palace.
2 Emendation according to 22 : 4—hence also our reading of the writer's name, *Im-gu*-rum. For this form of greeting see also 35 : 3, p. 121.
3 The space is too small for šak-shum. Here and in l. 5 a larger number has been broken away.
5 "Up to the fourth day," i.e., "during four days," "in the space of four days." Cf. II., IV, 392, Rev. 16, a-du āmāmah 7, 8, i-ba-la, "he will be well within a space of seven (or) eight days."
6 For the construction labātu, singl. after x + 6000 libittu, see Hilprecht, R. E., IX, p. 35, note to No. 6, li. 1, and cf. p. 137, note 3.
7 Here, of course, not Grab, Begräbnisse, Delitzsch, H. W. R., p. 590c, but "cellar," "excavation." The pi nagīr is the "entrance to the cellar," or that place where the cellar empties into the open air or into another room. A "mouth" (pi) is ascribed not only to a "cellar," as here, but also to a "canal" (No. 34 : 22; cf. H. E., XIV, 29 : 2, i-na pi(=KA) nātī(=A.GUR.DA) ilt-ki, i.e., "at the mouth of the canal of the city" or "at the mouth of the Shatt-en-Nil, the canal of the city (ac. of Nippur) par excellence," where the little hamlet, called Pi-nātī (kī), was situated) and to a nābaku, see 12 : 8, i-na pi(=KA) na-at-be-ak-di, cf. p. 96, note 5.
6 du-ul-li-ia' ù-ra-ad-da-ma \\
7 a-di i-na arbo Tashkit ( = DUL. \\
   AZAG) ush-shi a-na-an-du-ù \\
8 i-ga-ra shi i-na ku-tul (- RI)-li ad-
   du-ù-ma \\
9 20 na-at-ba-kur uyl-bu-ru  \\
   I am working at; \\
   and till I shall lay the foundations in 
   the month Tishri, \\
   I shall have torn down the wall which is 
   in the rear (palace). \\
   The remaining twenty heaps I shall

1 For the various significations of *dulla* see, besides Deltzisch, H. W. B., p. 219b, also Behrens, L. S. S., II, 
   p. 8. Here it is to be taken in the sense of "working at," e.g., IV, 471 : 18, du-li shi E.SAG, i.e., "the working at
   Beaug, to be compared with i.e., Rev. 7, which shows that the letter refers to building operations.

2 *Ur-ra-ad-bu-na*, because construed here with *a-na*, cannot be taken as a III of III TTI., Deltzisch, H. W. B., 
   p. 6136 (this has eilt). Jensen, K. B., VI1, p. 317, has shown that there is only one TTI, although the various significations
   assigned to this verb by him (floess, nachfolgen, hinterein gehem, treiben) ought to be enlarged so as to include
   also the meaning fuhren (Behrens, L. S. S., II, p. 6, note 2), and "to take," "to fetch," e.g., Nagel, A., IV, p. 480, 
   and see Letters of Hammurabi, No. 781, 18, izd-ta-gi-il-ka a-na Babilu, ti-ir di-a-shi-shi-ma-ti, "one of thy trusted servants
   may bring, take, fetch them to Babylon." The III of TTI is here "causative," i.e., "to cause to bring, fetch." Urada
   for uraddi because it stands in the chief sentence.

3 Usbi a-na-an-du-la = anadati, with the signification "to lay the foundations" sc. of my dulli (I. 0), i.e., of
   the building I am at present working at. Addu-ma, here of the "completed action in the future" = "I shall have torn
   down." "I have torn down."

4 For ku-tul see besides Deltzisch, H. W. B., p. 362a, also Jensen, K. B., VI1, p. 404, and below, 1, 13, ku-tul na-
   ka-ii. In No. 60 the a-t ku-tul is mentioned and in B. E., XV, 80 : 11 we are told of the mash-shar-ta-tum shi i-na 
   ku-tul bi(st) tab-hu, i.e., of the mashsharirt (pl. of mashsharatu) which are "poured out," i.e., stored up in the rear 
   of the "house." This latter passage shows that the translation "stipend" for mashsharitu (Clay, B. E., XIV, p. 30, 
   note below, who follows Deltzisch, H. W. B., p. 4336) is out of place here. A "stipend," surely, could not and was not 
   "stored up." Mashsharitu signifies at this time the "reserve fund," hence it is not only "stored up," but out of it 
   payments are made; e.g., B. E., XV, 76:2, SHE ... shi i-na li bi mash-shar-tu aU?Ar UI. ... nadmu a_u; i.e., XV, 
   199:1, SHE shi i-na li bi mash-shar-ti i-na di라도 Kal-is-i^b i-nu ( = "1") GISH.BAB.GAL nadmu a_u, i.e., 199:1, 
   SHE shi i-na li bi mash-shar-tum shi 1na-an-an-ti "Ta-ta-shi nadmu a_u" (notice here the reserve fund of Innanati). 
   In B. E., XIV, 92:2 the mash mash-shar-ta shi kud Kiet-zi-bank is mentioned and in B. E., XV, 47:1 we are told that 
   payments were made i-na li bi 10 GUR mash-shar-ti shi E.GAL, i.e., out of the Palace's reserve fund of 10 GUR. 
   B. E., XV, 40 :5 mentions the total of SHE nadmu a_u in li bi mash-shar-ti which SHE is according to i.e., 1, 1, that 
   shi i-na kud ASH.TAB. 3I.DAY,UKU nadmu a_u. From this it follows that the Palace, the several storehouses, officials 
   (like Innanati), and even months had each their special "reserve funds." In some passages, as e.g., Str., IV, 374:10, 
   mashsharitu might be translated by "collateral security." Mashsharitu, then, is "something that is left over (mash-
   sharu) to insure the payments of certain obligations."

5 Na-at-ba-ku here (and in 22 :15, [na]-at-ba-ku (at-[d]-ba-ak) apparently a sing. masc., although after the num-
   eral 20; for construction see p. 95, note 6. Also a fam. form of this word is found, see, e.g., 3 : 15, 21, shi na-at-ba-agti; 
   3 : 19, a-na na-at-ba-ak-t (so also I.e., II, 30, 32); 3 : 20, nau-ul-ku na-at-ba-agti shi 4Gir-ra-mi ( = a city) bi-za-nu-
   68: 26, equl ( = A.SHAG) shi na-at-ba-agti shi Kari-staAG; cf. also 12 : 6, 10. In 3 : 17, 55 we have na-at-ba-agti, 
   and according to 12 : 9, ina p( = KA) na-at-ba-agti, it has an "opening," a "mouth," an "access" to which one may 
   come. The plural of naebaktu is found in 12 :4, x na-at-ba-ak-ta. The root is, of course, tabaku, "to pour out"; here, because used of bricks, "to store, pile up." A nakhakku, nabaktu accordingly would be "something 
   that is stored, piled up," a "heap," "pile," comprising a certain number of bricks. For nabakku in this signification 
   cf., e.g., B. E., XIV, 37:2, SHE mash-shu shi i-na kud ... tab-hu; B. E., XV, 122:8, the grain which a-na li bi 
   SHE.GAL tab-hu, i.e., "which has been added to the great grain (das Stamm, Haupt-korn)." See also note 4 and 
   cf., B. E., XIV, 144 : 4, 10 GUR 1 PI (= 36 g月) tu-ba-shu-ku i-nu 1 GUR 1 PI, i.e., "10 gur and 36 gq "stored up" (extra)
10 e-ki-i\-ri-im-ma' a-tab-ba-ak

11 10 $M$ agarra( = SHEG-gunû AL')

$GUSHUR(or \ ŪR).RA.GAL,mešša$

$la-ab-na-at$

—for each gur (cf. l. 3) 1 PI (or 36 qa).” One gur of grain stored up at harvest time lost in volume during the time of its being stored up, i.e., it dried up, it shrunken—hence at the end of, say, one year 1 gur of grain would be equal not to 180 qa but only to 180 — 36, i.e., to 144 qa. The shrinkage of grain at this time, then, was computed at the rate of 1 PI or 36 qa to 1 GUR or 180 qa, i.e., at the rate of 1 to 5 qa. Grain or cereals thus stored up to insure against shrinkage were called BAL or ti-ib-ku or tab-ki, out of which, if not used, payments might be and were made. For (SHE) BAL cf. B. E., XV, 115 : 1 | 144 : 6 | 94 : 2; for (SHE) tab-ki see, e.g., B. E., XV, 10 : 7 | 29 : 6 | 115 : 1 : 4, and for (SHE) ti-ib-ku(ki), B. E., XV, 80 : 1 (here it is simply stated that a tabku was added to the different items of grain); B. E., XV, 80 : 3 (here we have GISH.BAR ti-ib-ki instead of the more commonly used GISH.BAR tab-ki, hence tabki = tabki). How many bricks such a natibaku or natibaktu comprised, cannot be made out as yet. In view of the fact that the bricks excavated at Nippur, and now preserved in the Babylonian Museum of the University of Pennsylvania, were at all times of a certain "standard size and thickness," and that tabki in the hieratic inscriptions signifies the "height" of a "brick" or "layer of bricks," then "a measure of length" (cf. the German "so und soviel Backsteinshelden hoch"). Prof. Hilprecht is inclined to see in a natibaku a quadrangle or rectangle comprising a certain number of tabki, hence a "brick which is of a certain height, length and breadth."  

17 Stands either for ša sluggura, mass. singl. on account of natbuku, or it may be taken as an adjective, Delitzsch, "Gram., p. 241b. Cf. here 68 : 34, zuru ša sluggura; 68 : 10, II hekē sluggura; 68 : 24, III (gur) zēr a-na ma-il-e sluggura; 31 : 9, mišešil išda-šiši ša šutu sluggura, i.e., I. 28, išda-šu ša ši-lī (- = 3¹²) ša sluggura; 37 : 16, II C SHE GUR ša sluggura, i.e., II. 20, 25, ša sluggura, . . . ša sluggura; 31 : 10, I išda-šu ša sluggura; see also 3 : 5 | 18 : 18 | 33 : 15 | 66 : 10. From these passages it will be evident that sluggura has the meaning "that which is left over," "the rest, balance in one's favor, which one either has or which is due him from another." This "rest in one's favor," if ideographically expressed, is called išk-KID and is to be distinguished from LAL.NI, "the rest, remainder still to be paid, which is against one, one's loss, debit, liability." In other words, in records that are epēth nīkē (balances of account) the items marked išk-KID represent the "assets," a plus, and those called LAL.NI are the "liabilities," a minus. For išk-KID or "assets," "amounts still outstanding in one's favor," cf. especially B. E., XIV, 33 : 2, col. III. Col. I gives the "whole amount due, coll. If that which has been received (mašrum)" and col. III the "amount still outstanding (išk-KID)—hence whenever we subtract from the "whole amount due" the "item(s) that have been received" we obtain the "išk-KID," i.e., "which is still due in one's favor, one's assets." For išk-KID cf. also B. E., XIV, 41a : 1 | 92 : 1 | 99 : 49; XV, 68 : 2 | 141 : 8, and for LAL.NI see B. E., XV, 65 : 27 | 99 : 40, 42 | 130 : 14 | 144 : 8; XV, 78 : 12 | 141 : 35 | 196 : 1 (similar to B. E., XIV, 33 : 2). A synonym, if not a translation, of (LAL.NI or?) išk-KID seems to be ri-ša-a-nu, B. E., XIV, 136 : 1, 4. Ungnad, W. Z., 1907, Sp. 141, by reading TUM.KAD (resp. šō-had) and translating "rest" is only partially correct.

20 E-ki-i-ri-im-ma', because parallel to a-tab-ba-ak, I propose to derive from išpu, i.e., ekirra-imma, hence išpu has a side-form (ispurrna), išprin for the usual išpur (Delitzsch, H. W. B., p. 590b). The i (for u) is due to the influence of the u, cf. 35 : 33, šubbi ( = RU)-ta šis-kī-ku(-nu) išpu išpur-nu. See also 120, note 8. For the i in ki-iru, see already above, p. 53, note 1, and for the e instead of a cf. ub-te-ir-ri-ib, 23 : 13; ši-ši-te-i-ir-[nu], 30 : 6; Delitzsch, "Gram., p. 86 and below, p. 119, n. 5. A possible derivation from išpu išpu ( = aqurr-nu) is less probable, and a form ekirra - akirrin (root ū-name, Delitzsch, H. W. B., 354c) is against context and parallelism.

21 Shortened form for SHEGAL.GUSHUR.RA = agarra, "burnt bricks." Cf. also 22 : 11, x M + 300 a-gur-ra ap-pa-ro-a, and see following note.

22 What kind of an office this name represents I do not know. Are we to suppose that the scribe misplaced the amēnu? If so, we might read GUSHUR.RA (which has to be connected with SHEGAL.AL, cf. note 8) amēnu.GUSHUR.RA. Or is it a shortened form of amēnu.SHEGAL.GUSHUR.RA.GAL,mešša, "chief brickmakers"—the SHEGAL being omitted either by mistake or to avoid repetition?
12 ʿa-lu ʾami 4šanaguru ( = AL-li)\(^1\)
ab-ta-ta-ar-ma\(^2\)

13  dụ-na ku-tal ( = RI) na-ka-st\(^3\) ul-te-
ir-ri-ab\(^4\)

14 ʾāsh-shum bit in-iršēl ( = N.AD)\(^5\)mēša
šā libbi a-su-up-pa-ba\(^6\)

15 šā be-li ᵂ( = NI) ša-a-aʾ iq-ba-ā

16 dup-pa ki a-mu-ru i-na arḫeUlulū ( = 
KIN-iš Inannanna) a-na ᵂ( = NI)-ši-e¹
da-ab\(^7\)

17 be-li li-ish-pu-ra-am-ma shum-ma šā

18 tu-aš-si

---

After having examined the burnt bricks during (the last) four days,
I brought them to the rear of the slaughtering house.

With regard to the resting chambers which are in the asuppata
(and) which my "Lord" has commanded to bring out (I beg to state that)
the month Elul is, as I learned from communications, propitious for
bringing them out.

My "Lord" may send word when I shall
bring them out.

---

\(^{1}\) AL-li = SHEG.ALI, l. 11? But cf. allū, Del., H. W. B., p. 706: "ein Gerät der Ziegelbrecher."

\(^{2}\) Ab-ta-ta-ar-ma I propose to take as a prez. 1° (circumstantial clause) of "N2, "to examine, " see Meissner, B. A., III, p. 523, and Nagel, B. A., IV, p. 478. By itself a form I of paḫuru (H. W. B., p. 555a) or paḫuru would likewise be possible, but with what meaning? Cf., however, Delitzsch, H. W. B., p. 522b, under paḫuru II: ogurri tabûtitiba up-ta-at-ḫi-ru-ma, "war geboren," and see p. 122, note 2. Or should we translate after all, "since the fourth day having loosened (departed from, set free) the allū ( = term. techn. for "to stop to make bricks," cf. meiruru paḫuru = "den Gurtel lösen," Jensen, K. B., VI, p. 474) I brought," etc.? This latter translation is preferred by Prof. Hilprecht.


\(^{4}\) A ʾIP ( = causative) of ʾIP. The common significance of qaršu ama, "to go, march against," is here
against the context. For other forms of qaršu, to be met with in these letters, see 26: 10, ši-ri-št; 3: 23, ʾul-ša-re-ni; 12: 16, ʾik-ri-ši-ab ama.

\(^{5}\) For ʾIP, AD ( = iršēl), as distinguished from NAD.KI ( = mašûlu), see Jensen, K. B., VI, p. 400, and for ʾIP, AD, cf., e.g., H., I, 65: 9, "the bed-chamber of šu-AG." A "bed-chamber," because it can be carried, etc., was, of course, not an E or bitu, "house," in its commonly accepted sense. Whose "chamber" is meant here, is not said.

\(^{6}\) Cf. bit a-zi-ud-du bit ka-ti, Str., II, 499: 1. For the interchange of š and z cf. on the one hand ʾĒ-ʾaš-Ski-pak ( = Ušub-Shipak), 65: 2, and on the other ʾĒša-li-su-ru [ni]. B. E., XV, 188 V: 18; [ʾIP]-li-su-mu, i.e., XV, 20: zu-bi-ti, B. E., XIV, 69c: 30, 31, 43, and its plural ʾi-bi-a-ti, B. E., XIV, 121: 6; 122: 6 (standing for ši-bi-ti, ši-bi-ši-ti = šibītu, šītu, see above, p. 6, note); qa-aza-za tur-(Clay's copy gives tab-ra-at, B. E., XV, 98: 5, for qit ( = SHŪ) aš tur-rat, B. E., XV, 99: 14 (cf. here also Lc., XV, 30: 5, qit "X. tur-rat; XV, 90: 45, ša ga-tu br-br-tum; XV, 6: 9 | 19: 12 | 124: 8, ga-ta ša-ti-ar, etc., etc.), I beg to differ from Prof. Clay, who reads MARRAT (instead of tur-rat) and regards this to be a profession (see B. E., XIV, 57a; XV, 51b). Qit resp. qit-su tur-rat evidently means "his portion is returned, has been paid."

\(^{7}\) ʾlu-ši (l. 16, 17), ʾlu-ši (21: 16) is the infinitive of ʾIP, cf. ʾaṭš and ʾiṭš, "to know."

\(^{8}\) For construction and meaning cf., e.g., H., IV, 406: 10f., ša maḫ LUGAL le-A šiḫ-pur-an-šu šašu ong-an-ri-ta de-ba a-na e-pa-ši, and H., I, 77, Rev. 3f., de-a-ša a-na a-la-ki ša-de H-KAM da-a-ša ša-de-le H-KAM a-dan-mišša da-a-ša. Any action undertaken by the Babylonians had to be determined by the bard priest with regard to its most propitious time.
19 [uš]-šum ta-bar-rē šá be-lī ish-pura

20 [kur]-šu-ra-ti ib-na gāt =Bēl (= EN)-ū-sa-tum ul am-šu-ur

21 [uš]-šum šá-a-ia ma-an-da-at-ti-ia

22 [al]-qu-ā

23 [šā be-lī]q-ba-a a-na =Ki-din-e-Marduk

24 [be-lī i-dī ki x.] + 10 ma-na ta-bar-rē an-da-bar

25 [ina libbi-shū x.] + 10 ma-na a-na du-ul-li-ia

26 [al-ta(?)-]ia-an

27 [x.] + 20 ma-na a-na mu-ulī be-lī-ia

28 [ul]-te-bi-la

29 [kur]-šu-ra-tum i-na Dūr-Ku-ri-Galzu

30 [šū(?)-]u-bi-'u-ū ia-nu

With regard to the tabarri(-wool) concerning which my “Lord” has inquired (I beg to state that) I have not yet received the bleached(? Wool from Bēl-ushatum.

As regards the bleached(?) Wool which I have kept as my due and concerning which my “Lord” has spoken to Ki-din-Marduk—

“my ‘Lord’ knows that I have received only x + 10 ma-na of tabarri(-wool), x + 10 ma-na of which I have applied as compensation for my work, and x + 20 ma-na I have sent to my ‘Lord.’”

There is no bleached(?) Wool to be gotten in Dūr-Kuri-Galzu.

1 Ta-bar-rē, here without the determinative SIG = shipātī, is a certain kind of “wool” (Delitzsch, H. W. B., p. 701a) or a “garment” (Tallqvist, Sproche, p. 142). Here, because measured according to ma-na (l. 24), it must be “wool,” more particularly “dirty(?) wool.”

2 So we have to read according to III, 29, 31 (not uš-šu-ra-tum). It is here a kind of wool. In Esth., 1: 6: 8: 15, we hear of a certain ŠA (LXX, δενες) and in Isa., 19: 9, of ŠA, in both of which passages the idea of “white(?) (garments) is predominant. ṭurbatūm accordingly I propose to explain as “wool that is washed, cleaned, bleached, white” (cf. also Arable hárm, hávar, “to wash white, bleached”), taking it to be a fem. pl. (sa, shipātī) of ṭurbatūm, and this a reduplicated form of šū = ŠA.

3 Cf. also 27: 28, man-da-at-tu ki-i ṭu-ga-tu-um a-ta-di; 35: 18, garments which a-na um-zi-usu ra-bar-ar a-kā-ē-ru ki-ti man-da-at-ti-sha-um a-ta-di; B. E., XV, 200, III: 9, nephem i (yur) 6 GIN (i.e., female servants) É.GAL a-na man-da-at-ti-sha-um, all of which passages show that man-da-ta was at this time a certain kind of “stipend,” “wages,” in the form of “wool,” “garments,” or “grain,” i.e., “food and clothing” for work performed (l. 25).

4 Shūtum e. acc. and ana, “to take something for something,” “to make something to be something” (cf. 9: 21, a-ne šuk-ti-ta ṭu-m, ṭa-ta-ka-an), here “to apply something as compensation for.”

5 If my emendation be correct—the traces visible speaking decidedly for šū (ba or a being out of question)—then šuk-šu-bi-‘u-um may be either (a) the infinitive III1 of ŠA, i.e., ṣhu-pu’u = šu-pu’u = šu-pā. But the signification of this verb does not fit into the context. Or, what is more probable, we may consider it (b) as an infinitive III1 of šu-pā, i.e., šu-pā-nis = šu-pā. If this be true, there remain two peculiarities to be explained, viz.: (1) the long š in šuk-šu and (2) the presence of the ū in bi. For the graphically (not morphologically) long š it, such forms as lu-su-at-tu-[h], 38: 2, and lu-su-pa-ru-tu-um[a]-ma, 30: 23, with regard to the presence of the ū in bi it should be noticed that we may have in Babylonian, resp. Assyrian, an euphonic ū or ū after the first radical in all those forms where this

FROM THE TEMPLE ARCHIVES OF NIPPUt.
May my “Lord” send bleached(?) wool!
I have no pleasure in my work.

who are being held prisoners in Pân-Bali

(I beg to remind my Lord that) I have spoken to my “Lord” in UML̄ (about them)

and that I have written three times to my “Lord”

about them:

my “Lord” may (finally) give orders that they take them away.

II.

Dispute about the exact words of a message sent by King Burna-Buriash with regard to the release of young slaves belonging to Enlil-Kidinni, a slave-dealer. About 1440 B.C.

For introduction, transcription, translation, and notes see above, Chapter III, pp. 51ff.

radical generally is vowelless. With regard to an euphonic i after the first radical cf. among other forms ši-kî-ri-šu(= šišrikā), H., I, 108: 6; ši-qu-ba-kî(= šibqāti), H., III, 311, R. 8; ši-qu-ba-ru-ša(= šibqarā), H., IV, 387, R. 24; ši-qu-ba-ri-šu
(= šibqarākā), H., V, 515: 9; ma-sha-kî(?)-ri(= mushākākî), H., I, 24, R. 1; ši-ša-ši-lîq(= ušiblīq), H., IV, 430: 7, and possibly a-li-kî(= aššu?). However, a-li-kî — city is likewise to be considered), No. 29: 14. With regard to the euphonic u after the originally vowelless first radical the following forms are interesting: i-su-šu-ru(= šulqarā), H., V, 515, R. 6; i-su-qu-pa(= šupappa), H., IV, 381: 7; lu-qu-ba-ši(= šulqāti), Mašš, I: 59. Cf. here also the Hebrew verbs with Chatel vowel under the first radical in the imperfect, Gen.-K., Gr., 19, 10, 2, notes a, b, on p. 39. Šu-kî-bi-ri-u-li, then, as infinitive III 1 of 363 stands for šubri, the i being inserted to prevent the assimilation of the guttural to the preceding b (šubritu — šubti — šubitā, which latter would be the infinitive II of 329, “to satisfy”). An infinitive III 1 of 363 (šubritu = šubti = šubitā) is less probable. Delitzsch, H. W. B., p. 161a, gives only a II 1 of 363 with the signification “to seek,” “to ask.” III 1 would be causative and the sense might be: “there is no bleached wool in D. to make one ask for it,” i.e., there is none that one might, could ask for — hence the request of I. 31.

1 See note 2 on preceding page.
2 For Isaiahbīlam = Ishahbīlam, see Chapter III, p. 53, note 1.
3 I.e., “I am disgusted with my job.”
4 “The face of Bāṭ” — an Amurruish name? Probably to be sought in the neighborhood of Dūr-Kurig-galzu.
5 Cf. B. E., XIV, 2: 8, five slaves of Enlil-kidinni who are ša-na Bāṭ-m. 6 Showing that the slave is not a ša-na Bāṭ-m. 7 i.e., XV, 152: 14, the slave. . . ša-na ša-baššamāški lā-bi-šu-ša; i.e., XIV, 152: 3, i-na ki-š. . . ša-baššamāški. In 3: 33, 42 | 15: 5, 14, kašu-nu resp. kašu-nu signifies “destruction by water,” cf. Delitzsch, H. W. B., p. 329b under II 362: kašu-nu ša-baššamāški.
6 Although not registered by Clay, yet a ša-na U-pi-i occurs, e.g., in B. E., XIV, 132: 43, 45, 52.
7 For II, 33ff. cf. Chapter IV, p. 74.
Official report about various occurrences, among which a disastrous flood, under a hitherto unknown Cassite King. About 1430 B.C.

The contents of this letter may be conveniently subdivided into the following parts:

(a) Introduction and address, poetic in its arrangement and conception, ll. 1–10.

(b) The complaint of the tenants of the fields of "The Lord of Lands" about the actions of Eitelbu màr "Ush-bu-là" in causing waters to overwhelm their possessions, ll. 11–17.

(c) The city Mannu-gir-Rammàn, which the writer held as fief of the crown, is deluged by "rains out of the heavens and floods out of the depths," ll. 18–23.

(d) Gates and cattle are destroyed; there is nothing left wherewith to keep alive or pay the inhabitants, ll. 24–29.

(e) Report about the request of the governor Mâr-[... ] for a new gate, ll. 29–31.

(f) Request that the King may look into the affairs of "Ia-É.KUR.GAL, ll. 32–34.

(g) The writer's urgent request to the King to act quickly and give an immediate answer, ll. 34–37.

For the personality of the King and of his father Nazi-íEnlú see above under Chapter IV, pp. 68ff., where also the notes to ll. 24–29 will be found. For the notes to ll. 1–10, ll. 18–23, ll. 29–31, ll. 36–37 see Chapter III, pp. 46ff., 49ff., 43ff., 51. The letter in its completeness reads:

1 a-na be-là-ia as-mì lu-ul-li-i zéri (= KUL) ishtu (= TA) shame-[ê]

2 la ma-ir an-nì quà-ra-di li-e-i it-pì-sh[i]

3 nu-ùr aḥē (= SHESH) mš-shu PI-in-di-e na-ma-a-ri

4 ki-ib kab-tu-ti ra-āsh-ba-nu-ú-ìi

To my "Lord"—:

Glorious in splendor,
Seed out of Heaven;

Not summoning punishment,
Strong, powerful, wise one;

Light of his brothers,
Ordering the dawn;

Ruler of mighty and
Terrible lords;

Cf. now also the Bit-"Ush-bu-la in B. E., Series D, IV, p. 118, col. III, 5, where it is reported that it adjoined a district "which had been given to the 'Lord of Lands,'"
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5 e-pi-ir um-ma-ni pa-ásh-shur ni-shi
Food of the people,
Platter of man;
6 e-tel ki-na-te-e-shú šá ṣa-A-nu ṣa-En-
Hero of his clan,
lil u ṣa-E.A
Whom the triad of gods
7 ū ṣa-Be-ti-il-ši(- NI.NI) ki-ib-ti
gathered together
du-um-ki
Presented a fief
8 ū mu-ésh-ri-e ish-ru-kù-ù-shú
Tending towards grace
9 be-ti-ia ki-bé-ma um-ma ṣa-Kal-bu ip-
to my Lord speak, thus saith Kalbu,
ru
thy dust
10 ū ar-du na-ra-am-ka-ma
and thy loving servant.
11 an-nu-un-ma-a' šú-ù ki-i ra-ma-ni
Behold that one, though I myself have
a-na
recommending him to my Lord, that
12 be-ti-ia ap-ki-du-ma ṣa-E-tel-bu măr
Etelbu, son of Ushbula,
=Ush-bu-la
has . . . his . . . even up to the city of
13 [ ]-mat(?)-su ū a-na pa-an
EN.KUR.KUR
has . . . which I possess. The ten-
ša-man-gi-ru eglu(-
ant of the field of "The Lord of
A.SHAG) šá EN.KUR.KUR
Lands"
14 [ ] šá-ab-ta-kù ash-bu eglu (=
"By means of water he has encir-
A.SHAG) šá EN.KUR.KUR
cled me."
15 [um-ma-a a-na . . . ]-mi-ia ma i-na
The cities which are with me—be they
me-e i-di-la-an-nì
inhabited
16 [dù?]sil šá it-ti-ia lu ash-bu-tu
or be they doomed—and which belong to
17 lu na-du-tuù šá EN.KUR.KUR i-na
1. An-nu-un-ma-a = um(a)numma. Cf. um-ma-a = um-ma and see also Hammurabi, 2 : 10; S. 273 : 17; C.T., IV, 27
(B 329) : 10. Jensen, K. B., VI, 475, 327, translates amnumma by "amount, so forth." A translation: "Grace (please grant
unto me) if I speak as follows (um-ma-a)" is likewise possible. Cf. the dialogue between Abraham and the "angel of
the Lord," Gen. 18, 16ff.
2. Edéa isit mi, not "to shut off from water," but edéa, because a synonym of enádu = "to shut in" (Jensen,
K. B., VI, p. 410), has to be translated here "has shut me in, encircled me, enclosed me with or by water." As such
it evidently points to the i-na la-me-e na-di, l. 20, é-ša-kù, l. 20, and i-ne-ru, l. 28. The tenant or inhabitant (notice
the sing. instead of the plural!) of the fields of god EN.KUR.KUR (i.e., either Edéa or NIN.LU), who received before names of
gods see p. 8, n. 8), which were situated in the immediate neighborhood of the city Manu-gir-Rammân,
complains of his being encircled by "waters" through the negligence or spite of Edéa, who failed to keep the canals
clean. These "waters" became so fierce that even Manu-gir-Rammân was surrounded (i-na la-me-e na-di). Added to
this "the rains and floods," the city's destruction was complete.
3. Root nádā. The sense is: The complaint is made by all inhabitants—by those who have and those who have
not yet suffered from the effects of the inundation. The šá EN.KUR.KUR is parallel to that of l. 14—belongs, therefore,
to [dù? or eglu?]sil, l. 16.
"The Lord of Lands" cry out on account of the waters!

Even the city Mannu-gir-Rammân with which the King is entrusting me and which my "Lord" has handed over to these conscribers is destroyed by inundations: rains out of the heavens and floods out of the depths are, when (or after) he (i.e., my Lord) had handed her (the city) over (sc. to the conscribers), overflooding her!

Yes, the city with which my "Lord" has entrusted me is destroyed by inundations! Where shall I go to save myself?

Also the mighty bronze-gates together with the two-year-old ewes which (were kept there) since the time of Nazi-Enlil, thy father, even unto (this) day, (the floods) have destroyed! And now my "Lord" knows that they will come to me; now, when they are there (i.e., have come), what shall I take and give, seeing that the floods have encircled the sheep and the two-year-old ewes?

And Mâr-[...], the governor, when he had come to thy servant, said:

"They make lamentations on account of the gate! Duplicate it!"

And Ina-E.KUR.GAL, thy servant, whom I have recommended
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33 ap-ki-du ash-shu' di-na-[ni]-ia
34 be-li a-ma-as li-mur-ma a-ki-ti-ia
35 mu-ush-shu-ra-ku\-
la-am-dish li-ta-
36 ita-na-ku i-tu b[e-li]-ia a-na a-la-a-ki
37 a-na sharri (= LUGAL) ki-i ash-
[pu-ra] sharru (= LUGAL) ul i-di-
a-na-an-ni.

IV.

No. 9 (= C. B. M. 11,335).

Banâ-sha-Marduk reports to King Kuri-Galzu about the revolt which has broken out in Bit-"m Sin-issabra. About 1390 B.C.

Above (pp. 4ff.) it has been shown that our writer, Banâ-sha-Marduk, lived between the 20th year of Kuri-Galzu and the 11th year of Kadashman-Turqu, i.e., during a space of about forty-three years. We may assign this letter, therefore, to the time of Kuri-Galzu, and thus the more because the Bit-"m Sin-issabra, so named after the head of the royal storehouse (karû) ASH.TAB.BA.GAN.TUG, situated in Kandurâ, flourished, in all probability, principally during the time of Kuri-Galzu. From ll. 19, 20 we may conclude that our writer was a master builder, who, while engaged in building a gate, received news about the revolt in Bit-"m Sin-issabra, which he, as faithful servant, communicated instantly to his Lord, King Kuri-Galzu. Is this revolt connected in one way or another with the uprising of the Cassites under the be-li, the son of Nazi-"Enlil, mentioned in No. 24?

The contents are the following:

1 Not ap-ki-du-ash-shu, but ash-shu di-na-[ni]-ia is to be read. Ash-shu di-na-ni-ia again is the same as the well-known ash-shum-mi-ia (27 : 44) = ana shu-mi-ia (S. 274 : 17, 4) = ash-shu-mi-ia (C. T., VI, 32 (= B' 834) : 4), of the Hammurabi period. From this it follows that din-um = shum, i.e., "all that which expresses the essence of a being."
2 The "being itself" (of יִדָּע), or, as Delitzsch, H. W. B., p. 224b, gives it, "das Selbst," see also p. 58, note 2.
3 For abhu etc., shintu, see H. W. B., p. 41b.
4 I.e., "if I am to leave and thus be out of it forever."
5 Not la + taliq but la + ta-liq, i.e., "hurry!"
6 In view of li-ta-lit, "may act (quickly)!" and albam, "hurry!" etc., we might translate here: "though I have written to my Lord to hasten (see the reply to my last letter), yet the King has not adjudged me worthy (see of an answer)."
7 In this case i-di-na-an-ni might be derived from |"m (= di-na-an-ni), instead of naddnu.
8 See pp. 79, 81, 110, 116.
(a) Exhortation to rejoice, ll. 6—?

(b) News about the revolt in Bit-šī Sin-issahra, upon information received from "ŠAG.IL-zu-ri-ia, ll. 15—19.

(c) The gate is finished, ll. 19, 20.

(d) The truth of the communications made in this letter may be verified by calling upon the prefects of Rakānu and Bit-šī Ki-dī-nī.

1 ardi-ka =Bana (= KAK)-ša-Mar-duk
2 a-na di-na-an be-lī-ia lul-li{k
3 a-na ábu-ki ̀a štri (= EDIN) ša be-
6-1

shù-ur-mu
5 um-ma-a a-na be-lī-ia-ma
6 ad-ru šhù-te-su-uk
7 ̀u ma(?)-bi-ṣa[...]-ma
8 si(?)-pi-[ri']. ...
9 um-m[a a-na be-lī-i]a-ma
10 [...] ša be-lī
11 [...]
12 a-[... m subscrip IM-ra]-im-zér
13 [...] ú-ba-ā[sh-shu?]
14 [...]-ú-ma ki-ki-i* ši(? or ad?)-[...]
15 "ŠAG.IL-zu-ri-ia ar[di-ka]

Thy servant Banâ-ša-Marduk;

before the presence of my “Lord” may I come!

To the city and the fields of my “Lord”

The following to my “Lord”:

Let the palace rejoice

and the soldiers let . . .

and the si-pi-ri let . . .

speaking thus to my “Lord”:

. . . which my “Lord”

. . .

. . .

. . .

. . .

. . .

. . .

. . .

. . .

. . .

. . .

. . .

. . .

. . .

. . .

. . .

. . .
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. . .

. . .

. . .

. . .
A letter of Marduk-mushallim, head of the storehouse at Dūr-Enlīl, to King Kuri-Galzu. About 1400 B.C.

A certain Marduk-mushallim endorses in B. E., XIV, 154:5, the payment of a specified amount of grain (SHE) as ri-mu-tum (a kind of wages) to a lady of the bit a-mi-lā-ti ("house of female [slave(s)]") and as SIGISSE.SIGISSE ("offerings") to "Sin. The position\(^1\) which the name of Marduk-mushallim occupies on this tablet makes it certain that he was the head of the storehouse at Dūr-"En-līl\(^1\). This tablet is dated simply the "16th year\(^1\)" (l. 7). As only the first four kings (Burna-Buriash to Kadashman-Turgu) reigned sixteen or more years each, it is reasonably certain that our letter belongs to the earlier Cassite kings known from the Temple Archives. We may, however, go a step farther. The person "A-na-tukulti (= KU)-ilu (= AN)-ma," mentioned in ll. 9, 15, I propose to identify with one of the witnesses mentioned.

---

1 If shakin dēmi were here a title, its position would have to be before arā-ka: shakin dēmi arā-ka. I take it, therefore, as a permissive: "is just now (while I am writing this) reporting about [shakin]." Cf. here also p. 52, note 5d. In l. 17, which contains the report, um-na-a has been left out, as is often the case in our letters.

2 To bring out the difference in writing between $\text{š}A\text{B}^{\text{ بي}}\text{ا}$ and $\text{š}A\text{B}^{\text{ ب}}\text{ا}$ transcribed as given above. Both ($\text{š}A\text{B}^{\text{ بي}}\text{ا}$ and $\text{š}A\text{B}^{\text{ ب}}\text{ا}$) signify, however, at this time very often, if not always, simply "men, workmen" (ummnāni), see p. 35, note 1.

3 Gī-nā-na-ta kī-i gī-nu-na = qinnuṭa (fem. plur.) kī gī-nu-na (3d plur. fem. of lē) — qinnuṭa qinnu kī, qinnu, i.e., "while the families (employed on the Temple properties) were building a nest," "were settling down." For the signification of qinnu, qinnū, at this time cf., e.g., B. E., XIV, 126:7; XV, 160:20; qin-nū; B. E., XIV, 111:7, qim-na-ā-ti.

4 Ṛapṣu here in the sense of "to kill" (sha da-ak), Delitzsch, H. W. B., p. 626a. The singular being employed, because "objects counted ($\text{š}A\text{B}^{\text{ بي}}\text{ا}$ are such objects) are construed as singulars," see p. 95, note 6.

5 P of patāqi (H. W. B., p. 554a; Jensen, K. B., VII, p. 319) here with passive signification: "it is built, finished."

6 See also the position of the name of Innanni in such tablets of "endorsement," Chapter IV, c, p. 86, note 4.
in a document from the 4th year of Ku-ri-Gal-zu, B. E., XIV, 11 : 16. Erba-Marduk of l. 4 would, therefore, have to be identified with Erba-Marduk, the son of Sin-nār-māti, B. E., XIV, 19 : 23 (dated in the 13th year of Kuri-Galzu). Taking all these facts into consideration I do not hesitate to see in the be-li of l. 2 and in the LUGAL of l. 6 King Kuri-Galzu, to whom this letter has been addressed. Marduk-mushallim, then, was during the reign of Kuri-Galzu the head of the storehouse at Dūr-ānu-Enlil₂, which place must have been situated at a river, resp. canal, deep and safe enough for the lālā-ships (i.e., "Fracht(?)-schiffe").

The contents of this letter are:

(a) The royal provender will be shipped per lālā-ships by the 16th of this month, ll. 4–8.

(b) Request that the king send certain men to remove the workmen and clients and to return them to their owner, ll. 9–18.

1 [ardi-ka "]Marduk-mu-[šal-][jim
2 [a-na di-n[a-an be-li-ia lul-lik
3 um-ma-a a] na be-li-ia-ma
4 [āš-shum GAR.LUGAL] šá "Erba
5 [ardi-ka i]kšu-da
6 [um-ma-a] akāši (= GAR) šarrī
7 a-na 
8 ummānī (= SAB) šur-šu-li
9 =A-na-tukulti (= KU)-ilu (= AN)-ma
10 ū ū= Sukal (= LUGAL)-šemī
11 ū ummānī (= SAB) šá a-la-ak-shū-ma
12 šu-ur-ra-am-la
13 li-sū-la-la-li-kū

Thy servant Marduk-mushallim;
before the presence of my "Lord" may I come,
speaking thus to my "Lord":
As regards [the royal provender] which
Erba-Marduk, thy servant, was to have taken,
(I beg to say that) the men shall bring
the royal provender
upon the lālā-ships
by the 16th (of this month).
Ana-tukulti-ilu-ma and Sukal-shemī
and the men of their company
send (give orders)
that they come,

₁ Kušur-Enlil is out of question, because he reigned only six resp. eight years, see p. 1.
² Emendation according to l. 6. Very doubtful. Cf., however, the MA.GAR.RA of the Hammurabi Letter, No. 34 : 16, which likewise was put upon the um-mā-lā.
³ For (sippu)-la-at-la-a see Deltarch, H. W. B., p. 414a (left untranslated) and King, Letters of Hammurabi, III, p. 7, note 2 (to No. 34 : 10), "processional boat."
⁴ Lit., "of their going" (šiš = infinitive), "their following."
⁵ Lit., "that they may go out and go (come)."

From the Temple Archives of Nippur.
14 ʿu ummāni (= ṢAB)mak u ki-din-na ma-la šāh a-li-ki
so that Ana-tukulti-ila-ma may return to him
15 "A-na-tukulli (= KU)-ila (= AN)-ma all the men and protégés (clients)
16 a-na pa-ni-shu li-ter-ra-am-ma which I have taken.
17 ha-ašm-di-šu Let them do it quickly.
18 lik-sá-ža-da

VI.

No. 44 (= C. B. M. 19,799).

The superintendent of the Temple weaveries reports to King Kuri-Galzu about the administration of his office. About 1400 B.C.

As the name of the writer is broken away, it is rather difficult to assign this letter to a definite period. If, however, the emendation of l. 16, Bt̄-n[din-ni], be correct, I would refer this letter to the time between the 20th year of Kuri-Galzu and the 11th of Kadashman-Turgu. Our writer was apparently the royal superintendent of the Temple weaveries. Where these weaveries were situated cannot be made out. Noteworthy in this letter is the statement that one weaver had been a fugitive for one whole year, until he was brought back from the "house of Kidinni." That the Temple employees fled very often from their place of service is well known from the Temple Archives; cf. e.g., Clay, B. E., XIV, p. 34. But that such a fugitive employee, when recaptured, would not be punished is new. Nothing, apparently, is said here of such a punishment of either the fugitive slave or of the man who harbored him, nor is the reward of the two shekels mentioned.

The contents are the following:

(a) The . . . . have been put up, ll. 4-7.
(b) The King must wait for the garments, ll. 8, 9.

1 As indicated by the translation, I consider this form to stand for šāh ašu; cf. p. 100, note. If one prefers he may take it in the sense of "as many as are of (in) the city (ašu-kī)," see p. 11, note 2.
2 Stands here for latēr-atu, lu + u of the 3d pers. becomes at this time always li. To "whom" shall he return the men? To Erēa-Marduk?
4 I.e., "May they (Ana-tukulti-ila-ma and the other men, ll. 9f.) come, take the men, and return them to him quickly." Likšudā = likšudā, so better than singular: "may he, i.e., Ana-tukulti-ila-ma, do it."
5 See the remarks to 9 : 21 above, Chapter I (p. 4ff.).
6 A recaptured slave was put to death at the time of Hammurabi, Code, 8 : 30-36. A man who harbors in his house a fugitive slave was likewise put to death, Hammurabi Code, 8 : 37-48. To him who captures a fugitive slave are awarded two shekels of money, Hammurabi Code, 8 : 49-58.
(c) The wool just sheared has been removed, ll. 10–12.
(d) The fine wool is all gone, l. 12.
(e) A fugitive weaver has been recaptured and returned by Bit-Kidinni, ll. 13–17.

(f) Only one workman bargained for has been received from K’ish,\(^1\) ll. 18–21.

1 [ardī-ka \(=\) X, ..., a-na di-na-an] Thy servant X.; before the presence of my “Lord” may I come!
2 [be-lī-ia lu-ul-[i]-ik] To the cattle and the house of my “Lord” greeting!
3 [a-na GANAM.LU] ù bit [be-lī-ia shul-mu] The . . .
4 [. . .] da[. . .]-ti which they (were to) have given, my “Lord” may behold, they have put up.
5 [sh]hī id-[dī]-nu-ni For the garments do not press me, my “Lord.”
6 be-lī li-mu-ūr ishten (\(=\) KU)”
7 id-du-ū-ni (\(=\) sign bi)\(^2\) The wool of the shepherds, as much as has been sheared, they have removed. Good (sc. wool) is not here.
8 i-na ba-ul lubushti (\(=\) KU)"
9 be-lī li-ib-bu ishtenen One weaver, who was a fugitive for one year, they have received from (out of) Bit-Kidinni. Only one of the stipulated workmen they have received from K’ish.
10 shipātu (= SIG)\(^{bi-a}\) shā na-gid\(\text{mas}\)\(^{bi}\) One weaver, who was a fugitive for one year, they have received from (out of) Bit-Kidinni. Only one of the stipulated workmen they have received from K’ish.
11 ma-la ba-ag-na\(^a\) i-na bu-ut lubushti (\(=\) KU)”
12 it-qu ba-ni-tum\(^b\) ia-nu

\(1\) For the different cities called K’ish, see Jensen, Z. A., XV, p. 214ff., and Hommel, Grundriss, pp. 338, 383–390.
\(2\) For the sign bi as variant for ni, li, see “Names of Professions” under Ha-bi()-gal-ba-ti-i. A possible derivation from \(\text{ba-nil}\) (cf. nišāu̯, ninābu) would be less probable and quite peculiar in formation, (1) because of the long \(\text{i}\) (but cf. p. 129, l. 23), (2) because of the \(\text{i}\) in \(\text{bi}\) (standing for \(\text{bd}\)). The object which was “put up” is unfortunately broken away.
\(a\) I.e., wait a little longer for them.
\(b\) For ba-nil-tum (as. shipūtu), lem. of bandi (syn. of damgu), in the sense of “good,” “nice,” “fine,” etc., see Jensen, K. B., VI, p. 412.
*For libbi, = ina libbi idaf cf. Delitzsch, A. G.\(^1\), \(\text{§}\) 108, pp. 220f.
\(a\) For bit-qu-ni (as. bit-qu-ni), lem. of bandi (syn. of damgu), in the sense of “good,” “nice,” “fine,” etc., see Jensen, K. B., VI, p. 412.
\(b\) For iiḫu = ina iiḫu idaf cf. Delitzsch, A. G.\(^1\), \(\text{§}\) 108, pp. 220f.

\(^1\) Cf. here the dup-pi ri-bi-USH.BAR ishtenen (\(=\) USH.BAR ishten\(\text{en}\))

\(^2\) For the sign bi as variant for ni, li, see “Names of Professions” under Ha-bi()-gal-ba-ti-i. A possible derivation from \(\text{ba-nil}\) (cf. nišāu̯, ninābu) would be less probable and quite peculiar in formation, (1) because of the long \(\text{i}\) (but cf. p. 129, l. 23), (2) because of the \(\text{i}\) in \(\text{bi}\) (standing for \(\text{bd}\)). The object which was “put up” is unfortunately broken away.

\(\text{i.e., }\) wait a little longer for them.

\(\text{Besides the passages quoted there cf. also B. E., XIV, 128 : 1, SIG}\(^{bi-a}\) ba-qu-na, and \(\text{i.e., }\) 42 : 12, i-ba-qu-na (said of akku, ablu, and mūr-mūru, hence here at least it cannot mean “to cut off” or “to shear”). See also a-ba-gu-um-na, 2 : 10.

\(\text{For bit-qu-ni (as. bit-qu-ni), lem. of bandi (syn. of damgu), in the sense of “good,” “nice,” “fine,” etc., see Jensen, K. B., VI, p. 412.}\)
A letter of complaints, requests, and threats written by the governor Errish-apal-idina to the bursar-in-chief, Innanni. Time of Kuri-Galzu, about 1400 B.C.

Above, pp. 2ff., it has been shown that Innanni, the chief bursar of the Nippurian Temple storehouses, lived and transacted business during a period extending at least from the 18th year of Kuri-Galzu to the 2d year of Nazi-Maruttash, and that Errish-apal-idina, the governor of Dûr resp. BitErrish-apal-idina,2 flourished from the 13th year of Kuri-Galzu to the 24th year of Nazi-Maruttash. Innanni, though frequently mentioned on tablets apparently emanating from the neighboring towns around Nippur, where he was at intervals looking after the interests or possessions of Enlil,1 was yet a resident of Nippur, cf. B. E., XV, 115 : 5 135 : 6, Bit-In-na-an-ni(în) Nippur (= En-lîl)î. We also saw that during the reign of Kuri-Galzu, i.e., at the time when In-na-an-ni was bursar-in-chief, a Sin-issabra was the head of the royal or Palace storehouse (karû), named ASH.TAB.BA.GAN.TUGî. But, though the head of that storehouse, he was still subordinate to Innanni. This follows not only from No. 85 : 8, 9, where Innanni is commanded to give to Sin-issabra the “wages for certain persons,” or from B. E., XV, 50, where he (Sin-issabra) receives grain from Innanni “per order of the Palace,” but more particularly from such passages as B. E., XIV, 35 : 3, where it is reported that a certain (PA.KU-ma-lik-Anm) receives in Karû ASH.TAB.BA.GAN.TUG a certain amount of grain as horse-feed from (ina qât) In-na-an-ni, which shows clearly that Innanni must have had and actually did have authority also over the Palace storehouses; in other words, Innanni, though bursar-in-chief of the Temple storehouses, was ipso facto also the chief bursar of the Palace storehouses—he was both a Temple and a royal official, hence his successor, Martuku, is expressly called an a-rad LUGAL (B. E., XIV, 56 : 9), a “servant of the king.” Innanni1 seems to have been a rather slow and stingy official; the only way to make him live up to his obligations was by threatening him (cf. ll. 12 and 27ff. and 85 : 5).

The contents of this letter are:

(a) Complaint over Innanni’s negligence, ll. 3, 4.
(b) Request to urge the workmen not to leave the city, ll. 5–7.

1 See above, p. 2, note 13.
2 If the term așu of No. 85 : 10 is to be taken in its literal sense, Innanni would be a brother of E-mi-da-Marduk, i.e., l. 18. See here the interpretation of that passage by Prof. Hilprecht, above, p. 25, note 1, and cf. E-mi-an-Marduk, p. 71! Is E-mi-da = E-mi + ana = an = am = a? If so, this would explain the exalted position of Innanni, i.e., Innanni would have been a brother of the așu of No. 24.
(c) Comply with the wishes of the RIQ officials, ll. 8, 9.
(d) Request coupled with threat, ll. 9-13.
(e) Give barley to Mūr-Tadu, l. 14.
(f) Pay the barley to the RIQ of Shelibī only in the "presence of the city," ll. 15-18.
(g) Thirteen oxen are missing, ll. 19-21.
(h) Pay the barley to Sin-apal-ēris, ll. 22, 23.
(i) Hurry up and pay the seed-corn to "the city," ll. 24-26.
(k) Complaint coupled with two threats in the form of accusations, ll. 27-37.

This letter reads:

1 [a-na "] In-na-an-ni ki-bō-ma
2 um-ma = ṢErrish(t) (= NIN.IB) apal (= TUR.USI) -iddina (= SE) "[ma]
3 um-ma-a a-mi-mi-ni ash-pu-r[a-ak-ku]
4 la ta-al-li-i-m[a?]?
5 um-ma-a ummāni (= ŠAB) tnu-ti[?]
6 šá ash-pu-ra-ak-ku tu-sh[e-ir-shū] ntu-ma3
7 ṣlu-ki la mu-ush-shū-ur[r]
8 šá 5 amēri-RIQ [meš] šá Nippur (= EN.LIL)k "[a]
9 ku-ri-ib-shū-na-ti-i-μa8 šá [um- māni (= ŠAB) tnu-ti-μa]
10 it-ti Ni-ib-bu-ri-i nam-[a-a]r-ta "comply with their wishes!
11 šū-um-ḥi-ir-shū-nu-ti

To Innanni speak,
thus saith ṢErrish-apal-iddina:
Why have I sent word to thee
and thou hast not come up?
Also the following: As regards these men
concerning whom I have sent to thee—
"(so) urge them not to leave the city."
As regards the 5 RIQ of Nippur—
"comply with their wishes!" As regards the workmen—
"let them, together with the Nippurians,
receive the namṣartu-vessels.

2 Tu-še-[ṭi-ak]-ni-ti is supplied according to l. 36, tu-šu-ir. Both forms may be taken (a) either as a 11' of ṣu ( = tu-ṭshur, tu’ashshur, tu’ashšir, tu-ṭshir), "in den richtigen Zustand versetzen," Delitzsch, H. W. B., p. 313a, or (b) they may be (and this is more probable) a 11' of Šu ( = tu’ashshur, etc., as above). According to Jensen, K. B., VI', p. 409, 410, ashdrutt is a synonym of both poqēdu and sandqu. For sandqu in the sense of "to press, to urge," see 41 : 8. Cf. also for Šu Meissner, Suppém., p. 13 (= K. 4587, Obv. 6); Delitzsch, A. L., Zimmer, K. A. T, p. 421. The sense apparently is: "urge them by putting them into the right frame of mind." A 11' of Šu is excluded here.
3 On account of šu-um-ḥi-ir-shū-nu-ti, l. 11, and tu-ṭi-li-ir-ṭi-is-nu-ti, l. 12, I take this form as a 11' of Ṣu, "Jemandem willfahren" (not as a 11' of Ṣu, "to bring near").
12 shum-ma an-ni-ta ul tu-ul-te-ki-ir-shu-nu-ti
13 ul at-tu-ta SHE.BAR ik-ka-lu
14 2 GUR SHE.BAR a-na Már-Ta-du i-di-in
15 shá &nulriQ dinShe-li-biši
16 9 a-mi-lu-us-su a-na pi-i a-mi-lu-t[i-shá]
17 ū-ti ash-shá-bi shá ālu-ki
18 SHE.BAR id-na-ash-shá-[?]
19 ar-di i-na bu-[ul . . . .]
20 ū alpu šá i-na ūm[. . . .]
21 13 alpu ia-a-nu ī 10 [ . . . .] ia-a-nu

If this thou doest not grant unto them, (then) they shall (no longer) 'eat my "food".' Give 2 gur of barley to Már-Tadu.

As regards the RİQ of Shelibi— "give him the barley for his 9 men upon the demand of his representatives in the presence of the 'city'."

I went down on account of . . . and the oxen which are in the city of . . . (and found) that 13 oxen are not there and 10 + . . . . . are not there.

Measure and pay the barley to Sin-apal-ērith so that he can take it away. . . Also hurry up and give the seed-corn to the "city".

And as regards the barley, the 10 gur GISH.BAR.GAL, due to Ibni-Marduk—
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1 $hā$ of $shābūn$ = $ṣubān$.

2 As SHE.BAR at this time is the "money" or "wages" in form of "barley" which an employee receives for his services, the phrase "to eat the barley of somebody" clearly means "to be in somebody's employ." According to this ū at-tu-ta a SHE.BAR ik-ka-lu would mean as much as: "my barley, i.e., food they shall no longer eat," "they shall no longer be in my employ," "I will dismiss them." But, and this is important, the threat is directed against Innanni. We have here clearly an indication that Emm'sbapal-iddina, the governor, employed these men upon the instigation of Innanni, i.e., they were given an office by and through the "political" influence of Innanni; and the governor, in order to force Innanni to comply with his (the governor's) wishes, threatens him with the dismissal of his (Innanni's) protégés. For SHE.BAR cf. also p. 113, note 4.

3 The translation of 11. 15f. depends upon whether we read, l. 18, $id-na-ash-shá$ or $id-na-ash-shá-nu$. As there was ample space on the O. of the tablet for the sign -nu it would seem strange that the writer, if he wrote -nu, should have put it on the R. E. We might translate accordingly: "as regards the RİQ . . . and his nine men . . . so give them (= idnashshuna, omilâš-shá-nu)" or "as regards the RİQ . . . so give him (idnashshu) with regard to his nine men (or for his nine men) . . . upon the demand of his representatives (omilâš-shá)."

4 The RİQ of Shelibi must have been a rather untrustworthy official seeing that grain shall be delivered to him in "the presence of the city (i.e., the city's (= Nippur) heads)."

4 The "city" in which Erriš-apal-iddina was stationed, i.e., "Bi-Erriš-apal-iddinašì."
Errish-apal-iddina, a governor, writes to Innanni, the chief bursar of the Nippurian Temple storehouses, demanding of him to comply with his several wishes. Time of Kuri-Galzu, about 1400 B.C.

For general introduction see preceding letter. The contents are the following:

(a) The sesame of the prefects must not be accepted, ll. 3, 4.

1. Permansive of JPSA.

Lit., "I shall not ordain it; I shall not cause it; it will not be my fault." The sense is: Do not blame me if he (Ibn-Marduk) accuses thee (Innanni), etc., but I would not be surprised at all if he does accuse thee.

2. It is here "against;" cf. dalab-imudda imdibu ugi, No. 75: 10, p. 135.

3. Um-ma-a ... um-ma-a introduces the twofold possible accusation with which Ibn-Marduk may, and Errish-apal-iddina does, threaten Innanni, viz., an accusation of neglect and one of fraud. It seems that Errish-apal-iddina had to threaten Innanni continually in order to make him live up to his agreements (cf. l. 13). The first accusation with which Errish-apal-iddina threatens Innanni is this: If thou dost not give to Ibn-Marduk the SHE.BAR he will accuse thee of neglect by saying there are "no onions, etc., to eat!" This shows that SHUM.SAR, etc., belong to, and form part of, SHE.BAR; hence "barley" at this time signifies everything that belongs to the sustenance, food, of the people, cf. our "bread." See also p. 112, note 2.


SUM.EL.SAR probably = "garlic!" Cf. also Meissner, Ideogramme, Nos. 2970-2972. Or is EL here = HUL?

If so, then cf. qisibdu = HUL(- si-ku-wa).SAR = "cucumber," H. W. B., p. 598a.

5. KAR indicates here a certain kind of SUM.EL.SAR.

6. The second accusation with which Innanni is threatened by the writer is that Ibn-Marduk will say: "Thou hast not only withheld from me what belongs to me, but hast even given an order on my barley to Mar-Tādu, and thus hast cheated me out of my own." Cf. here p. 87, note.

I. e., to take "from" my grain.


(b) Bring the oil into “the Tablet house,” ll. 5–10.
(c) Send the report about the barley, ll. 11, 12.
(d) Give three jars of Lager-beer to Hashmar, ll. 13–16.
(e) Make the GAR.RASH KU, ll. 17–19.

1 a-na “In-nu-an-ni ki-bé-ma
2 um-ma m à Errish(t)(= MASH)-apal-(TUR.USH)-iddina(= SE)m-
3 šešshamashshammu(= GISH.NI) shá ba-za-an-na-a-ti
4 la ta-ma-ša-ar
5 at-ta ma-an-naš šešshamashshammu (= GISH.NI)
6 li-is-bu-tu-šu-ma
7 šamnu(= NI.GISH) a-na Éšnu DUB
li-she-ri-bu4
8 ù at-ta šešshamashshamm(= GISH. NI)-ka
9 šu-bu-ut-ma šamnu(= NI.GISH)
10 a-na Éšnu DUB šu-ri-ib
11 ù di-im SHE.BAR

1 Ma-an-na, because construed with the plural (li-is-bu-tu-šu-ma, li-she-ri-bu), has here the signification “all those who.”
2 The root of li-is-bu-tu-šu-ma has to be, on account of the writing šu-bu-ut-ma (l. 9), नव. It having here an object, must show an a in the present, hence šahatu, šubat (præt.), šubat (præs.), šubatu (impræt.). Both Delitzsch, H. W. B., p. 564b (wrongly नव), and Miss-Arnoldt, p. 873, leave this verb untranslated. The action of the šahatu shall be applied to the šeššamashshammu; the result of this is NI.GISH, which shall be brought into the Éšnu DUB. From this it follows that šahatu means something like “to press,” “to squeeze out,” by chopping up the šeššamashshammu (hence šahatu parallel to šabāni, “klein machen,” see II. W. B., l.c.), and is as such the same as the German “kелtern.” “The oil of the wood,” i.e., the NI.GISH or šamnu, is, therefore, gained by chopping up, pressing, squeezing the šeššamashshammu. Now we understand also what a amēša NI.SUR is. From amēša GESHTIN. SUR.RA = ša-li-šu ka-ra-ni = “Weinkelterer”(!) we know that SUR = šahatu; hence a amēša NI.SUR is one who presses, squeezes, etc., the NI, i.e., the fat (sc. out of the milk); in other words he is the “butter-maker”; or if NI in NI.SUR be the same as the NI in NI.GISH, he would become the “sesame oil manufacturer.”
3 Cf. pp. 88ff. Whether this Éšnu DUB refers to that of Nippur or, what is more probable, to that of Där-Errish-apal-iddina, cannot be made out from this passage.
4 Ll. 5–7 contain a generally accepted law or custom: It is the rule that . . . . therefore (à introduces the apodosis) comply thou to this rule: press out, etc.
5 See introduction to No. 76, p. 143, and cf. pp. 84ff.
FROM THE TEMPLE ARCHIVES OF NIPPU.

12 mi-im-na ul ta-ash-pu-ra about the barley hast thou sent.
13 ū "Ha-ash-mař
14 šá ash-pu-rak-ku
15 3' labiru(= Ū') šikaru(- KASH) Furthermore as regards Hashmar
   a-na pi-v concerning whom I have sent to thee—
16 a-mi-li-e-shat i-din "give (him) upon the demand of his
   representatives
17 ū GAR.RASH KU5 šá a-di 3 jars of Lager-beer."
18 li-tu-â-â Also the . . . . which is for(?) my
19 e-pu-usu make.

IX.

No. 85 (= C. B. M. 3206).

Inbi-Airî, a lady of high rank, demands of Innanî, the chief bursar of the Nippurian Temple storehouses, the payment of barley and wages. Time of Kuri-Galzu, about 1400 B.C.

Inbi-Airî, "fruit of Ijjar," must have been a lady of very high rank, seeing that she dared to write to the bursar-in-chief, Innanî, in words which are equal to a peremptory order: "give." It may not be impossible that she was one of the many ladies connected with the Temple, and hence indirectly with the Palace—ladies who are in the "Temple Archives" quite frequently mentioned under the title NIN. AN*SÄT(= qadishitu?), but whose status quo can, however, not yet be defined more clearly. She, like the governor Errish-apal-iddina, experiences the same difficulties in her dealings with Innanî, having to warn him "not to act inimically towards her," but to do as told, or else she might lodge a complaint against him with the King! "Iddina."*Nergal is, no doubt, the same as the one mentioned in B. E., XIV,

1 DUK — karpatu is, like gar, etc., very often omitted.
2 The writer had first written BI (traces of which are still visible). He erased this and wrote over the partial erasure the sign Ū = labiru, intending, by doing so, to put special emphasis upon the "old." "Old beer" is, of course, "Lager-beer."
3 Here abbreviated from a-ne pi-i ši-pir-di, i.e., "upon the written order of."
4 Amedu used here (as at the time of Hammurabi) in the sense of "a certain one," i.e., a "representative."
5 GAR.RASH KU. Cf. B. E., XV, 44 : 6, "z. qa of flour (ZID.ĐA) as GAR.RASH for our house (E-nu) "Be-
   la-nu (has given or received?)"; similar is l.c., 150 : 2. In l.c., 79 : 5, we have: akhum E-nu GAR.RASH ūl(= NUN) -
   le-ha. In B. E., XIV, 117a : 3, we hear of 3 qa SHI GAR.RASH. These passages show that KU is not a part of the ideogram. KU, however, cannot be here = kēmu, "flour"; if it were, it had to stand before GAR.RASH; see p. 123, note 10. Is it possible to take GAR.RASH KU here(?) in the sense of abâlī (shá) ana harrâni—"Vermögensverwaltung," lit.
   "food for the journey"? The above-quoted passages are, however, against such a translation.
7 For another letter of Inbi-Airî see No. 86.
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14 : 6 (10th year of Kuri-Galzu), who appears there as the brother of "Nu-ri-e-a. For Sin-issaḥra,² the head of the royal storehouse, ÁSH.TAB.BA.GAN.TUG³, see pp. 79, 81, 104, 110.

The contents are:
(a) Request for payment of barley to
(b) "The wages for the persons" are to be handed over to Sin-issaḥra, ll. 8, 9.

1 a-na "In-na-an-ni ki-bé-ma To Innanni speak,
2 um-ma 'In-bi-A-a-rí-im-ma thus saith Inbi-Airi:
3 3 (gur) SHE.BAR a-na "Idin (= SE)Nergal
GIVE to Idin-Nergal
4 i-di-in
5 li-mu-ul-ta la te-ip-pu-shh-an-ni-ma" Do not act inimically towards me,
6 shá ag-ba-ásh-shá li-ish-am-ma⁴ but as I have told him let him take
7 li-il-pa-a" and carry away.
8 ipru( = SHE.BA) MUmesh a-na The wages (food) for the persons give to
9 i-di-in Sin-issaḥra.
10 4 (gur) SHE.BAR a-na 'Di-ni márât To Dini, the daughter of Abi-ia, give
( = TURⁿ) "Abi( = AD)-ia
11 i-di-in. 4 (gur) of barley.

X.

No. 26 ( = C. B. M. 19,785).

Kuduranni, the royal superintendent of the Temple storehouse at Pī-nārī, reports to King Kadashman-Turgu about the administration of certain affairs incumbent on his office. About 1360 B.C.

¹ Notice that this tablet contains in l. 5 the name " Sin-issaḥra( = NIGIN)".
² Cf. also the Bit-šu-Sin-issaḥra in No. 9 : 16.
³ Lit., Do not make enmity towards me, but do as told by him.
⁴ For nashu used in connection with the removal of barley, etc., cf., e.g., B. E., XV, 141 : 11, 16 | 100 : 3 | 55 : 3, etc.
⁵ For legs, "to remove barley, etc., from (= TA = ishtu) a place to (yet) another," cf., e.g., B. E., XV, 197 : 5, 7.
⁶ In view of the fact that the amount is invariably stated and not simply referred to as "that (MUmesh = shalatu) amount," I see in this MUmesh the same expression as that occurring in DUB MUmesh = DUB shumati, "Temple record"; in other words, I take MUmesh to stand here for shumati = "persons," as mentioned in the "Temple Archives," where they are generally introduced by the expression MU.BI.IM. See p. 83, note 9.
⁷ TUR for TUR.SAL; the SAL having been omitted here, because the gender was already indicated by the SAL which precedes the name Di-ni.
The writer of this and the following letters (Nos. 27, 28), "Ku-du-ra-nu, was a contemporary of Kishahbū.¹ If so, then Erba-Marduk of No. 27 : 27, 30, 32 is, no doubt, identical with the sukalmahhu of No. 35 : 28. Taking all other passages into consideration² I propose to identify our writer with "Ku-du-ra-nu, the son of "U-bar-ri (see below, p. 126). "Ku-du-ra-ni, being stationed, in the 12th year of Kadashman-Turgu, at Pi-nāri³, where a certain "Ta-ki-shū receives grain (SHE) from him (ina gāt),² must have been at that time the head of the storehouse at Pi-nāri³. In the same capacity he is mentioned among certain storehouse officials or superintendents who paid, in the 13th year of Kadashman-Turgu, SHE HĀR.RA (lit., "interest grain") to the city Dūr-"Gu-la³⁴. We may, therefore, identify the be-lū of our letter with King Kadashman-Turgu and assign the letter itself to about 1360 B.C.

The contents of this letter are the following:

(a) A plan as to how to pay barley to certain officials, ll. 3–8.

(b) Concerning fugitives, l. 9.

(c) The "stone eyes" will be taken to the gem-cutter’s, ll. 12–14.

(d) The ploughing has been begun two days ago, ll. 15, 16.

(e) The watering tank shall not extend to the King’s palace, ll. 17–19.

(f) Wells are few in number and pastures do not exist at all, ll. 19, 20.

¹ See introduction to No. 35, p. 120.

² Cf. e.g., "Nār-dū/Shammash (27 : 8, here called gū-gal-lum) is mentioned as pa-ri-si in the 11th year of Kadashman Turgu (B. E., XIV, 99a : 20). "Du-um-il-tu-mur (27 : 18) occurs again in the 3rd year of Kadashman-Turgu (B. E., XIV, 91a : 12), etc., etc. Meissner, G. G. A., February, 1908, pp. 139–143, thinks, because "Dīn-il-ba-tur is followed, in the latter passage, by da-ri-ta-as, that he must have been a “woman.”' That DISH, instead of SAL, may be placed before the name of a woman is apparent especially from B. E., XV, 155, 19: "30 SAL"⁵sī, among whom (ll. 1–18, 23–34) are to be found three (ll. 13, 14, 18) who are determined by DISH.

³ B. E., XIV, 112 : 7.

⁴ B. E., XIV, 101 : 14.

⁵ In Nos. 27, 28, written likewise by Kudurdmu, we have EDIN for sī-ri.

⁶ Only here without the emphatic -ma, see p. 24, note 3.

1 ardi-ka "Ku-du-ra-nu a-na di-na-an be-lu-ia bul-lik
2 a-na dù-ki ši-rē ū bit be-lu-ia šīu-ul-umu
3 um-ma-a a-na be-lu-ia ša be-lu ish-pu-ra
4 um-ma-a SHE.BAR ša šu Hī-ba-ri-ti ū šu Kār-ša Nabū (= AG)

Thy servant Kudurānu; before the presence of my “Lord” may I come!

To the city, the field, and the house of my “Lord” greeting!

The following to my “Lord”: With regard to what my “Lord” has written saying: “The barley of the city of Hibariti and of Kār-Nabū
5 a-na a-maRīQ̄ ʿu a-maKA.ZID(=KU).DA i-di-in

give to the riqqu and KA.ZID.DA
officers'

6 ki-i šā hu MUMhī-orange ga-am-rat
I C SHE.BAR GISH.BAR.GAL

"so may my 'Lord,' as soon as the city
MUM ma has paid up, (first) set
aside (the) 100 (gur) of barley,
GISH.BAR.GAL,

7 be-lā lī-mā-da-ma a-na a-maRīQ̄
a-maKA.ZID(=KU).DA

for the riqqu and KA.ZID.DA officers,

8 išt SHE.ZERlanguage lu-ud-di-in niš-šum
u-nummāni(=Dia BAT) abl. . .

in order that I may be able to pay the
seed-corn." As regards the men

9 šā hi-il-qi (?) [ . . . ]
[. . . large break . . . ]

who have fled (?) . . .

10 [ . . . . . . ]

. . .

11 a-na mu-aš be-lā inu-te-bi-la

"to my 'Lord' I have brought."

12 niš-shum abû SH[Hamit] šā abû[ . . . ]

With regard to the "eyes" of . . .

1 Probably the official who gathered the "vegetables" or "green things."

2 Lit., "the man who has the say (KA) over the flour (ZID.DA)," as regards its gathering and its disposition.

3 Kišt šāh, i.e., "when it is that," "as soon as."  

4 Written MUN, but has to be pronounced here, on account of the phonetic complement -ma, MUN; cf. am in amu, "statue," etc. dia MUN may be translated either by "Wä sectarian" or by "flour (cf. p. 123, note 10) city."

5 Notice that SHE.BAR GISH.BAR.GAL, which is "set aside," may be paid out as SHE.ZER.

6 The a-ma in lī-mā-da-ma indicates the chief sentence. Emābu c. acc. and ana, "eben für jemand jetzten, bestimmen," "to set aside."

7 Ą consonantum.

8 For SHE.ZER = šārū, see Meissner, Ideogramm, No. 5496.

9 Lit. G-S is quite a strange answer to the inquiry of the "Lord." In fact it is no answer at all, but a request on the part of the writer that if he is to pay barley to the riqqu and KA.ZID.DA, the "Lord" may first of all "set aside" the barley (i.e., give orders that the barley be "set aside")—not that of Hībārī and Kūr-Nābā, however, but that of dia MUN; i.e., the second and third, respectively, of the writer that, if . . .

10 The traces speak rather for ra, ta, shāh.

11 abû SH[Hamit], lit. "Augusteine," "pearls (?)". With regard to these "stone eyes of . . . stone" Prof. Hilprecht writes me under date of July 2, 1908, as follows:

"Among the numerous smaller votive objects left by the Cassite kings in Nippur (cf. Hilprecht, B. E., Series D, Vol. 1, pp. 33ff.) two classes are especially well represented in the museum of Constantinople and Philadelphia: (1) Lapis lazuli disks, known under the name of AŠM-ŠE[Hamit] (cf. Hilprecht, O. B. I, Nos. 58, 59, 61, and pp. 49ff., and Meissner, Ideogramme, No. 26). (2) Little plano-convex round or oval objects in polished agate, resembling eyes.

Cf. Hilprecht, i.e., Nos. 29, 31, 51, 52, 65, 73, 134, 135, 139. In my 'Description of Objects' I called them simply 'agate canes.' More exactly they are cut out of two-colored agate in such a manner that the lower white layer represents the white of the eyes, the upper smaller brown layer the pupil. As a rule the pupil alone bears the votive inscription, exceptionally it is engraved on the white layer (73), sometimes enameled signs are found on both (135). All the 'agate eyes' so far discovered in Nippur by the four expeditions, especially by the second and third, belong exclusively to the Cassite period. In Babylon similar 'eyes' in agate were found in a jeweler's shop of the Parthian period. From
13 a-na  "I-li-ah-hi-e-ri-ba a-[...]-ma
14 i-li-ik-ga-a
15 ash-shum šá-ba-shi šá be-lî ish-pu-ra
16 ūnu 2-ša a-na šá-ba-shi e-ki-ri-iib
17 ash-shum šu-k-i-šu šá i-tu-ú "Iz-gur-ṣa-Errish(ē) (= NIN.IB)
18 šá-ak-nu-ma be-lî ish-pu-ra a-na bābī
19 šá bit be-lî-ia ul i-la-ak ku-bur-ra

The inscriptions on some of them it becomes clear that they also belong to the Cassite period and originally came from Nippur. These are, however, known to identical, beautiful agate eyes (formed of three-colored agate, the lowest light-brown layer serving as a basis for the two upper layers), which date from the time of Nebuchadnezzar II, and according to the story of the Arabs, corroborated by the inscription (running in minute but very clear characters along the outer edge of the pupil), came from the ruins of Babylon. This inscription reads: 

| Na-ba-kudur-ur-sar šar Bitil, apil |
| Na-ba-apal-usur, ana Na-Mardu, bēli-shu iqīsh(-ēsh), 'N., king of Babylon, son of N., presented it to Mardu, his lord.

"In view of these characteristic votive objects of the Cassite kings we are scarcely wrong in interpreting 'the stone eyes of . . . ' stone' mentioned in the above passage as objects in the shape of eyes cut out of a certain stone, the name of which is unfortunately broken away, but which according to the results of the excavations in all probability was 'agate.'" 

1 In view of i-li-ik-ga-a (l. 14) one might be inclined to read here "I-li-ah-hi eriba-a[...]ma, but this would give no satisfactory sense.
2 We would expect here a "title" or the "name of the profession" of Hi-ah-hi-eriba: "goldsmith," "gem-cutter," etc. The traces, however, do not fit for ca'tinnu or kudittu.
3 By translating as given above, I take i-li-ik-ga-a to be a 3d pers. fem. plur. 4V: iliqqa = iliqqa, referring back to aššušhrēa, a fem. plural (asha is mois., but more frequently fem.). Cf. pp. 131, note 15, note 2.
4 The signification of šu-ba-shi is very doubtful. I would like to take it as an infinitive of šub = sabku, for which see Jensen, K. B., VI, pp. 385, 511, who assigns to this verb the significations "um-, umürken, dekhinâtûrûn, aufwähren." The last significiation is used not only of the "dust," but also of the "ground," i.e., "to plough." 5 K-ki-ri-iib = a-qa-ri-iib = a for a on account of the guttural ŋ, cf. p. 97, n. 7. Qardub e. ana here "to go at something," just as "a man goes at his enemy." 6 Reading, form, and significiation doubtful. The ši-ki-i must be something that is "put up" (ši-ak-ru), a kind of building. It must be long, "it shall not go to the house of the Lord." If ši-ki-i be a formation like šubu (root šubu, H. W. B., p. 640a) its root might be either šub or šub. Have we to see, therefore, in ši-ki-i a side form of šubu, "Tränke," Delitzsch, H. W. B., p. 685a? Shubu might be a ša-ūl form.
7 In view of ši-ki-i, "watering tank." I am inclined to see in ku-bur-ra the same word as qūbrû, a synonym of Shutattu, which latter Delitzsch, H. W. B., p. 697, translates by "Loch," and Jensen, K. B., VI, p. 416, by "Grube," "Pailgrube." Seeing, however, that Shutattu is the same as shu-ut-du, and that the latter has the ideograph n (Bu-ra), which also stands for bûrû, "well," I take ku-bur-ra = qubûrû in the sense of "well."
Report of the royal superintendent Kishahbut about his affairs. Time of Kadashman-Turgu, about 1355 B.C.

Kishahbut, the writer of this and the preceding letter (No. 34), has, if our combinations be correct, gradually worked himself up from a rather lowly position to that of an itâ (1. 25), an “inspector,” of the king. In the 11th year (of Nazi-Maruttash) he acted as na-gid, “shepherd,” for (ki shum) “Ku-du-ra-ri.” In the 12th year of Nazi-Maruttash we find him in Zarat-IM as one of the EN GAR, “farmers,” “irrigators,” receiving PAD or “wages.” In the 14th year of the same ruler (month Tishri) he is stationed as riqqu in Ki-“Ga-irki, receiving KU.QAR “wages” from Enlil-mukin-apal. Two months later (Kislev) we meet him in the same capacity, but in the city Du-un-ri-ti, receiving some more “KU.QAR wages” from Enlil-mukin-apal. In the 15th year of Nazi-Maruttash he is still in Du-un-ri-ti, where “KU.QAR wages” are “furnished” by him to Apil-“a-Rammân who is to transport them by ship to Nippur. While living in Kur (or Tar)-ri-ti he appears, during the 14th and 15th year of Kadashman-Turgu, again as a “payer of wages.” Finally in the 15th year (of Kadashman-Turgu) we find him in Dûr-“a-Nusku, apparently as a superintendent (itâ) of the Temple’s storehouse, receiving (mi-tab-ru-rum) grain (SHE) from (i-na qât) various persons. While in Dûr-“a-Nusku Kishahbut,

1 For amēgu = mēgu, “to be small, to be few in number (opp. ma‘du),” see Jensen, K. B., VI, p. 543.
2 As the last paragraph of this letter is apparently concerned with “watering tanks,” “wells”—things absolutely necessary for the pasturing of herds—1 see in mu-ra-ku a majal-form of (N) is, i.e., nānuq = nānuq = nānuq, “a place of green things,” “a pasture.”
3 For the different writings of this name see Chapter I, p. 7, note 6.
4 B. E., XIV, 168: 8.
5 This Kadashman is, no doubt, the same as the one mentioned in our letter, ll. 27, 31, and who appears as the writer of Nos. 26–28. For further details see introduction to No. 26, pp. 117f.
6 B. E., XIV, 57: 12.
7 B. E., XIV, 60: 4.
8 B. E., XIV, 62: 17.
11 B. E., XV: 48: 2. Thus I would supply the date, seeing that Kishahbut has attained at this time apparently his highest position; this date must, therefore, be the latest.
12 This city must have had a “palace” (E.GAL), an E A-nu and a bab A-mu-unum, cf. 1. 15.
no doubt, wrote the letter translated below. The writer's official life extended, therefore, over a period of thirty-one years (i.e., from the 11th year of Nazi-Maruttash to the 15th of Kadashman-Turgu), and supposing him to have been twenty years old when first mentioned, he would have been about fifty-one years when he wrote this letter. If our deductions be correct, the be-di of 1. 1 must have been King Kadashman-Turgu.

Erba-Marduk, † "the servant" and sukkalmahhu of the king (ll. 17, 26), I propose to identify with the one known from B. E., XIV, 19:23, as "the son of Sin-nar-mati." According to this passage Erba-Marduk was one of the Temple or Palace servants receiving wages due him for the last six months of the 13th year of Kuri-Galzu. Again supposing that Erba-Marduk was during the 13th year of Kuri-Galzu about twenty years old, he must have been eighty-four years of age in the 15th year of Kadashman-Turgu, when he had reached the exalted position of a sukkalmahhu. Need we wonder that Kishahbut should have been somewhat irritated about the slowness of this old and venerable official?*

The contents of this letter might be conveniently subdivided into the following parts:

(a) Report about a successful completion of building operations, ll. 6-9.
(b) Fifty-five out of seventy gur of kasia due to the King have been sent, ll. 10-12.
(c) The disposition of wool has been communicated to the King, while the writer was received, in Nippur, in private audience by his "Lord," ll. 13, 14.
(d) Certain buildings (in Dār-ŠuNusku²) need "strengthening" (?), ll. 15, 16.
(e) The garments have not been paid to the weavers and fullers,* ll. 17-19.
(f) Digression: Twofold complaint, ll. 20-24.
(g) Renewed request that adobes be ordered to be made, ll. 25-29.
(h) The sesame oil of the King has been sent, the shatammu must now store it, ll. 30-33.

1 ardi-ka "Ki-shaḫ-bu-ut[ ]
2 a-na di-na-an be-di-ia lu[l-luk]
3 a-na bi-šu-ia šū-u[l-mu]  }

Thy servant Kishahbut;
before the presence of my "Lord" may I
come!
To the house of my "Lord" greeting!

---

* Cf. here also above, pp. 7, note 1; 14, note 7; 23, 107.
² Clay, B. E., XIV, p. 43a, quotes two passages where this Erba-Marduk is supposed to have been mentioned, but the second passage (37:14) is wrong. Under Sin-nar-mati only one passage is quoted.
³ Cf. ll. 25ff., and see already above, Chapter III, pp. 44ff.
* Or complaint about Erba-Marduk in not sending the garments for the weavers and fullers, see notes to ll. 17f. 16
4 ulti (= TA) āmūm aš-shū-d[a]  
5 ish-te-en bīt a pa-ar-ha.us-sa-li-il  
6 ʾū biti ru-ak-ki šā be-li i-mu-ru-ma  
7 bu-us-suʿ na-pa-la ʾiq-ba-a  
8 ki-i a-mu-ru-ma bu-hu-ar-shu  
9 bu-ud-du-ra at-ta-pa-ak  

Since the day I began, I have covered one building with (flower) ornamentations.  
And the farther (away) building which my "Lord" has examined and whose front side he has commanded to tear down, I have, after I had examined it, torn it down to improve its ensemble.

1 Lit., "since the day when (ne. šā, hence the relative a in askuda) I went at it," i.e., when I began doing it, hence kashçu has here the signification of "to begin, to commence."
2 Pa-ar-ha. On account of the ish-te-en we cannot connect Bit pa-ar-ha, but must take pa-ri as object to uspillil, i.e., pa-ri must signify something with which the ishten bite was "covered." From Exod. 25 : 33; 37 : 20 we learn that a thus, generally translated as "flower," was an ornament, resp. ornamentation, of the "candelstick." There can be no doubt that we have the same word here, but whether the ornaments were in the shape of "flowers" has to remain, at the present, an open question.
3 Ibid. ʾaššu, double accent, "to cover something with something." Cf. also the II. (or I?) form in 66 : 22, "Raklaša ti-ša-te-li-su ma. For a different translation of pāšam II (a I? is not mentioned), see Delitzsch, H. W. B., p. 506a, and Jansen, K. B., VI, pp. 858, 943.

4 Ru-ak-ki seems to be here in opposition to ish-te-en. If so, we might translate ish-te-en bīt a . . . lāti ru-ak-ki by the first (= nearer) house . . . the farther (away) house." A place name Bit-Raqeq is out of question.

5 Either for pāšam (Delitzsch, H. W. B., p. 516a, "side"); Jansen, K. B., VI, pp. 411, 506, "back"); Kuchler, Mušrim, "shoulder") or for pāšam (Delitzsch, i.e., p. 517a, "front"); Jansen, i.e., pp. 506, 525f., 549, 555, "back," "body")

The signification "front side" seems to be here the most appropriate one. Cf. in this connection the strange expression, "X. (i.e., always the person who puts his seal to the document, the "recipient") bu-us-su im-ša-te-za ma im-šu (e.g., B. E., XIV, 11 : 6 | 127 : 6 | 135 : 6 of passim)—no doubt a religious ceremony (cf. the German "sich bekrümmen," the Hebrew yisraḥ, lit. to hit one's self seven times, "sich besiebenen"), indicating that the recipient "smote his breast" before he received the things mentioned in the "contract." This "smiting of the breast" on the part of the recipient was a kind of oath, signifying that he (the recipient or debtor) will abide by the terms of the contract. Mellers, M. V. A. C., 1905, p. 308, translates pāšam midgapu by "vermattieren."

6 Na-pa-la . . . at-ta-pa-ak, root ʾābīl-ʾā, "to destroy," here "to tear down," cf. Tgl., VI : 28, "the wall . . . as-na na-pa-li up-ba-šumu I commanded him to tear down." A possible derivation of al-ta-pa-ak from yāqūl (for signification see, besides H. W. B., p. 112b, also Delitzsch, B. A. IV, p. 51); Nagel, ibid., p. 478; Jansen, K. B., VI, p. 350) or from ṣāća (Jansen, i.e., p. 333) is, on account of na-pa-la, out of question here.

7 Lit., "completeness," "totality," here in the sense of "ensemble." Jansen, K. B., VI, pp. 507, mentions a buḥru = UD as signifying "argued etwa heller." If we have this buḥru here we might translate "in order to improve its light (-UD = buḥru)."

An infinitive II of ṣāća (cf. the imperative bu-ša-te-šir, C. T., IV, 32 (= B 598) : 17 and p. 98, note 2) is here, on account of the writing with d, excluded. It can, therefore, be only an infinitive II of either ʾābīl or ṣāća. The signification of ʾābīl does not fit here. Delitzsch, H. W. B., p. 516a, mentions a root ṣāća without giving a translation. Tulliquist, Sprache, p. 113, following the Hebrew ṣāća, "fat," translated yāqūl by "to be fat." From the context we would expect here some such meaning as "improve." According to this the alpa (immemu) tap-dir would be "improved" (in the sense of), "fattened," oxen (or sheep)—oxen that had gone through a special process of "improving" them.
10 ubeš [kasū (= PUHADU)mesh] šā
dub-ia

11 iq-bu-‘u 55 [kasū (= PUHADU)mesh]

12 ish-shū-ni-na id-dī-nu-ni

13 āš-shum šipat= (= SIG)bi-ina i-na

Nippur (= EN.LIL)k17

14 a-na be-bu-ia aq-ta-bi

15 āš-shum E.GAL E A-nu ut bāb A-
n[u-um]k11

16 ki-i-a-ša-mi ish [rī-[t-ta?k18]

17 ubeš [kasū (= KU)bi-ina] šā ardi-ka

Eber-ī-ia-Mardu

And with regard to the 70 (gur) of my
“Lord’s” kasia—
“they informed (me) that they have paid
out 55 (gur) of kasia.”

As regards the wool—“in Nippur

I have spoken to my ‘Lord’ about it.”

As regards the palace, the “Temple of
God” and the “gate of God”—

“.... one with the other.”

And as regards the garments which thy
servant Eber-ī-ia-Mardu

1 The measure GUR is (as is often done at this time) left out here; cf. also 37 : 8 and see Tallquist, Sprache, p. 21.

1 For 55 [PUHADU or 55 [PUHADU.SHAR or PUHADU.SHAR = kasā (e.g., B. E., IX, 29 cf. passim) see now Meissner, Ideogramme, No. 3796. Hilprecht in class lectures on B. E., IX, explained it (in 1898) as kasā.

A good example showing how the difference between be-bi-ia and be-bi—a difference which is of the highest importance
for a correct understanding of many passages in the letters here published. Be-bi-ia is always the genitive or
dative (used after prepositions or in a stat. constr.) and means either “of my Lord” or “to my Lord.” Be-ii, on
the other hand, is either the nominative or vocative and has to be rendered “Lord” or “my Lord.” This being true we
cannot translate here “the kasā wood about which my Lord has spoken” (this had to be 55 kasišt ša be-bi-ia or
iq-ba-ia), but must render as given above. That this difference is rigidly carried through even in the letters of the K.
Collection has quite correctly been observed by Behrens, L. S. S., II, p. 226.

4 “They,” i.e., the storehouse officials whom I asked about the kasia.

4 Lit., “they have taken (sc. ishta kart anni, i.e., from this storehouse) and they have given,” i.e., “55 gur have been
taken from and have been paid.” The payments here referred to were apparently made in installments. The “Lord,”
however, seems to have received none so far—hence his inquiry and the answer. For a similar er da ṣebū cf.
B. E., XIV, 159 : 2, ean gūt “w. ma-bu-anu annu”k13, i.e., “by X. was paid.”

6 For SIG = šipat, see Zehnpfund, B. A., I, p. 494. Wool is weighed according to ma-na, see, e.g., 27 : 31;
B. E., XIV, 6 : 11 : 11 : 1. For the different kinds of wool at this time cf., e.g., 44 : 19f. ; 23 : 19f. ; 44 : 12 : 38 : 15f. and
B. E., XIV, 94 : 1, 96 Rev., col. XII; i.e., XIV, 11 : 1, etc.

6 See Chapter IV, p. 74.

6 Traces of -erre are clearly visible. See also p. 80.

7 Emendation doubtful, but probable. ḫūtā — 1st imperative of ḫūtu, “to fortify, strengthen.”

8 Hardly KU, i.e., ZID or ZID.DA = qum or better kūmu, “flour,” see, besides Delitzsch, H. W. B., p. 5869, also
No. 14 : 5. If so, then compare B. E., XV, 181, where the following “kinds of flour” are mentioned: KU, DA
ri-du (l. 3), cf. B. E., XIV, 117 a : 6 and our No. 37 : 14 (here without KU); KU ma(-ad(-a)-gam(-) (l. 4), cf. No. 37 : 18;
B. E., XIV, 166 c : 2; H. W. B., p. 436c; KU pa-bi-du (l. 5), cf. B. E., 117 a : 2, KU.GIG (l. 6). The last is most
generally found without the determinative KU as, e.g., in l.c., XIV, 18 : 2 24 : 2, XV, 10 : 2 26 : 8, etc. For
GIG = ḫūtā, see Delitzsch, H. W. B., p. 317a; Jensen, K. B., Vf., p. 485f. With GIG, resp. GIG.BA (= GIB.BA?), cf.
also GIG.GUB. BA in B. E., XV, 46 : 12 : 117 : 1. Hilprecht, class lecture on B. E., IX, read (1898) GIG.BA = gubba
and translated “spelt”; KU shi-ve-ri (l. 7), cf. Hebrew ṣib; KU shi-še-tum (l. 8), cf. B. E., XIV, 117 a : 5. Besides
these I noted also the following: KU.MUN, B. E., XV, 19 : 10 104 : 2, 7; XIV, 23 : 11 65 : 13; also written KU.DA.
MUN, i.e., XV, 64 : 17, or only MUN, i.e., XV, 16 : 14 44 : 20, 22, 35 169 : 3 181 : 9, which shows that MUN at this
time was a certain kind of flour (not salt); KU ASH.AN.NA, i.e., XV, 140 : 1, or only ASH.AN.NA, our No. 37 : 8;
was to have given to the weavers and fullers as their due (I beg to state that) wherever one looks—none has been received: “not even a half shekel of gold do they bring.”

“(Surely), they are, one with the other, against the ‘house’ (sc. of my ‘Lord’).”

There are also no adobes!
25 ṣaḥ-shum a-na-ku i-tu be-li-ia

26 al-li(?)-ka a-na ṢErba-li-Marduk

27 šu-ṣu-ur-ma a-na ṢKu-du-ra-ni

28 [la]-iṣh-ṣu-ra-ma sukkalmahā(hu)(=PAP.LUGH.MAGH) li-[g-bi]

29 li₂ITTU ( = SHEG) nṣu li-il-bi-nu

30 aḥš-shu₂m šamnu(=NI.GISH) ša be₃₃-i₃₃ na-shu-[ma]?

31 il-la-na-su a-na ṢKu-du-[r-a-ni]

32 [a]rdi]-ka ki-i aq-bu-ü um-ma-a šamnu(=NI.GISH) i-na qāti-ia [i-din]?

33 be-li a-na šatamm₃i(=SHAG.TAM) li-iṣh-ṣu-ra-ma šamnu(=NI.GISH) shub(=RU)-la liṣḫ-kī-nu-[ma]

As regards this that I, the itū of my "Lord," have come (saying): "Send to ṢErba-Marduk that he send to Kudurāni"—

"so may the sukkalmahā(hu) (i.e., Erba-Marduk) finally give orders that adobes be made."

As regards the sesame-oil of my "Lord"—

"It has been removed" they read when I spoke to Kudurāni thy servant: "Give the sesame-oil to me."

My "Lord" may now send to the šatammní that they store up the oil.

1 See Chapter III, p. 3.  
2 The a in al-li-ka shows that it is dependent upon a suppressed ša after aššum. And because allīka is followed by the imperative shupārma (l. 27) we have to supply an uma before a-na ṢErba-li-Marduk, making it a direct speech.

3 From SA 8 it is apparent that NI.GISH, "the fat of the tree," i.e., šamnu or "oil," was obtained by "pressing" (gaḥtu) the SHE.GISH.NI, i.e., the shamashšammu or "sesame." NI.GISH is, therefore, at this time the "sesame oil." For other occurrences of NI.GISH in our letters see 13 : 14 | 21 : 32 | 27 : 12, 13, 15 | 35 : 32, 33, and for SHE.GISH.NI cf. 8 : 3 | 65 : 5 | 84 : 3, 5; B. E., XIV, 136 : 4. Cf. p. 114, note 2.  
4 Emendation doubtful, yet probable. For nashā in connection with the "removal" of goods "from" or "to" certain places cf. among other passages also B.E., XV, 53 : 12, ASH.AN.NA . . . ša E ku-nu-ku-ki a-na EN.LI₃₃ na-sha-a; i.e., 55 : 3, KU.DA . . . ša ı̄n hasta ša (i.e., "which from that of," Clay, Lc., p. 19, No. 14, wrongly "from") ḫaššed-lu na-sha-a; i.e., 100 : 1, SHE ša ı̄n hasta EN.LI₃₃ na-sha-a KI-II (i.e., SHE ša hasta) ḫaššed-lu (sc. nash-a); i.e., 115 : 25, ASH.AN.NA šuḫ-šum ša . . . a-na ṢKu-du ṢKu-du-mi; i.e., 181 : 2, KU.DA . . . a-na UNU₃₃ ı̄n ša-a-ul, etc., etc. Cf. already p. 116, note 4.  
5 This is, it seems to me, the best emendation according to the traces visible. 1-na qāti-ia i-din, "give into my hand," is as much as idirittum, "give unto me."

1 See Chapter III, p. 35, note 3.  
2 Shu₂b₃a šakī₃a, c. ace., "to put something on a place," "to make a resting place for something," i.e., "to store it." Here (and p. 52, n. 5) šakī₃a is construed with double ace., the possibility of which appeared to Jensen, K. B., VP, p. 412, doubtful. Notice also the vulgar preterit form ı̄n ša-a-ul (var. ı̄n ša-a-ul), dū, no doubt, to the influence of a, aided by the i of ūd; cf. also p. 97, n. 7. If one prefers, he may see in šu₂b₃a a III₃₃ of Ṣ2, uškī₃a (cf. ush₂b₃a of Ṣ30) + lú = Ṣu₂k₃a (or uškī₃a), taking it as a causative of ı̄n, for which see Delitzsch, H. W., B., p. 322, "stehos an einem Ort aufstellen, niedergelegen."
Ubarrum, a royal inspector, resp. superintendent, of rivers and canals reports to King Kudur-Enlil about the results of his various inspections. About 1335 B.C.

From No. 39:21 we learn that the writer of this and the following letter, Ubarrum, was in one way or another connected with the city Dûr-\textsuperscript{2}u-\textsuperscript{2}Enlil\textsuperscript{3}a-mesh-\textsuperscript{ki}. This very same city is mentioned, among other places, also in B. E., XIV, 118 : 1\textsuperscript{7} (5th year of Kudur-Enlil). It happens that this last-named tablet mentions, to a great extent, the same persons which occur again in No. 48. Among the names of No. 48 is to be found also that of "U-bar-rum (48:7). From this it would follow that both persons by the name of Ubarrum, because closely connected with one and the same city, are in all probability identical. If so, I propose to identify our writer with the father of both Kadushman, B. E., XIV, 112 : 7 (14th year of Kadashman-Turgu) and Zakirum, B. E., XIV, 114 : 17 (15th year of Kadashman-Turgu); in other words, Ubarrum, the writer of Nos. 39 and 40, is the father of Kudurâni, the writer of Nos. 26–28. Ubarrum, accordingly, must have lived at least from the 14th resp. 15th year of Kadashman-Turgu (when he appears as the father of the two sons just mentioned) till the 5th resp. 8th year of Kudurrî-Enlil (when he is introduced as contemporary of "Na-\textsuperscript{a}h-\textsuperscript{a}-\textsuperscript{zi}-\textsuperscript{i}uMarduk\textsuperscript{8}), i.e., during a space of at least twenty-three years. Supposing him to have been about forty years old when first mentioned, it would follow that he reached an age of at least sixty-three years, and wrote the letters in question sometime during the reign of Kudur-Enlil, i.e., about sixty years old (5th year of Kudur-Enlil). As both letters here published concern themselves with rivers and canals, it is safe to suppose that Ubarrum was, at the time of Kudur-Enlil, a royal inspector of canals and waterways, about the condition of which he had to and did report to his Lord and King.

\textsuperscript{1}Written here Dûr-\textsuperscript{2}u-\textsuperscript{2}Enlil\textsuperscript{3}a-mesh-\textsuperscript{ki}, see also p. 9, note 1.

\textsuperscript{2}Cf. e.g., 48:8, "Na-\textsuperscript{a}h-\textsuperscript{a}-\textsuperscript{zi}-\textsuperscript{i}uMarduk = B. E., XIV, 118 : 16; 124 : 14 (8th year of Kudur-Enlil); 48 : 11, mûlamâni (= IM)-\textsuperscript{3}a-mesh-\textsuperscript{ki} = B. E., XIV, 118 : 19; 120 : 7 (5th year of Kudur-Enlil); 48 : 20, mûlamâni-GIR-\textsuperscript{3}a-mesh-\textsuperscript{ki} = B. E., XIV, 118 : 12. Cf. also 48:22, mûlamâni-NIN,IB = B. E., XIV, 113 : 3 (here son of "In-ni-li, 1st year of Kadashman-Enlil). In 42 : 5, 7, "U-bar-rum appears as contemporary of "Be-la-\textsuperscript{u}-\textsuperscript{a}ru (1.17), which latter is likewise mentioned in B. E., XIV, 118 : 21 (5th year of Kudur-Enlil) as the son of KUR.GAR.\textsuperscript{9}RA. This last passage is, therefore, against the signification "eunuch" which Jensen, K. R., Y1, pp. 62, 9; 377, assigns to KUR.GAR.\textsuperscript{9}RA = kurpat.

\textsuperscript{3}I.e., our writer of Nos. 39, 40 and that of 48:7.

\textsuperscript{4}Cf. No. 48:7 with 1.8 and with B, E., XIV, 118 : 16 | 124 : 14.
The contents of this letter are the following:

(a) Concerning the fields of Tukulti-Š.KUR, ll. 4–6.
(b) Concerning a flooded district, ll. 7–12.
(c) Concerning the condition of the fields with crop belonging to Burratü, ll. 12–16.
(e) Ll. 27–39, too fragmentary.

This letter may be read and translated:

1 ardi-ka *U-bar-rum a-na di-na-an
be-[l][i-ia lul-lik]
2 um-m[a-a] a-na be-li-ia-ma
3 a-na eq[t(=A.SHAG?)] ü om₉akil
erish[=PA(?)].ENGAR]ša be-li-ia
4 šu-ul-mu i-na bu-[u] eq[t(=A.
SHAG)]mesh
5 ša Tuk(=KU)-kul-ti-Š.KUR
ša b[e-lu]
6 ṣiṣ-pu-ra ik-te-di-[ir-[ru]?
7 ü unn[m[n(=SAB)hi-a
ša pa-te-sîmesh
8 ü [ia-me-e?] 4 me-e
9 ṣiṣ-turn7 nardi[Tuk(=KU)-kul-ti-Š.KUR
9 a-di ṣiṣ-ga-rî-e(=SHAG)ša ta-mi-[ir-[i]i

Thy servant Ubarrum; before the presence of my “Lord” may I come, speaking thus to my “Lord”:

To the field and the chief irrigator of my “Lord”

greeting! With regard to the fields

of Tukulti-Š.KUR concerning which my “Lord” has written (I beg to state that) they have established their boundaries.

And as regards the workmen of the pa-te-sî and the [flood?] of waters extending from the canal Tukulti-Š.KUR to the plains in the neighborhood
10 ha-am-ri šá i-na mi-li ma-ša-ri-v  
11 mu-ú is-ba-tu-ma ipp-ii-nu-na  
12 iz-zi-zu  iy-ta-tu-ni  à ṣar-bač  
13 šá "Bu-te-ru-ti  šá i-na  
14 ta-mi-ir-ti  ha-am-ri  
15 za-kuš diù (= dul)-ul-la šú i-pu-usi  
16 mu-ú ma-ša-ru-ú-tum[ ....]  
17 ù  ummâni (šAB) šá be-li-ia  
18-20 [ ....]  
21 [ ....]  šá Dûr-šù En-lil bā-anš-kē  
22 [ ....]  

1 With ha-am-ri, cf. l. 14; 32 : 19, zér (?) eqši (= A.SHAŠ) ha-am-rum; B. E., XIV, 114 : 13, 14, Ha-am-riši. Delitzsch, H. W. B., p. 283a, mentions a šamra without giving a translation. Küchler, Medizin, p. 116, renders šamra by "sallem." In our passage here šamra is apparently a kind of field, more particularly a field that has been seized and cast into disorder by waters. Prof. Hilprecht (personal communication of July 9, 1908) compares with it, quite correctly, the Hebr. "בָשֳם," Hab. 3 : 15, Ex. 8 : 16, and suggests a translation "Ueberschümmungsgebiet."  
2 Ma-ša-ri (a side form of mašāši) has a plural ma-ša-ri-utum (l. 16); from this it follows that mu-ú (l. 16) must likewise be a plural.  
3 Ipp-ii-nu-um, root [PP]. The signification "to strengthen, support, protect" (Hilprecht, B. E., IX, p. 53, note 1), does not fit here, nor does any signification which Delitzsch, H. W. B., p. 553a, assigns to it. Patānum here is parallel to šabūtu, and, because it follows the former, expresses the result of the šabūtu. Delitzsch, i.e., mentions a āššu, "Schänder," i.e., lit. "a seizer," thus showing again that patānum is a synonym of šabūtu. The waters took (šabūtu) and seized (patānum) the fields during a former flood and, as a result of this, were cast into disorder (cf. Arab. patawn, c. i., exciter, séduire); pilnit, disordre, sédition, troubles, etc.). Still better it would be to derive this patānum, with Hilprecht, from patānum = abšu, "to eat, to devour," Delitzsch, H. W. B., p. 553a, hence patānum, āššu, āššan!  
4 Iz-zi-zu  ṣh-ta-tu-ni is (like is-ba-tu-ma ipp-ii-nu-ma) a šū xešer; lit.: "as regards the workmen . . . they arose, subdued the waters (sc. by leading them back into their dams, cf. 40 : 19)." Ṣh-ta-tu-ni I take as a I' of ṣamā, "to subdue," Delitzsch, H. W. B., p. 295b.  
5 For ṣar-bač see p. 130, note 6.  
6 Za-kuš I take as a permansive of ṣamā, "to be or become free of something" (Delitzsch, H. W. B., p. 254a). Translate: "with regard to . . . which (is situated) in . . . (and which) has become free (sc. from the water of the flood)."  
7 For duššu epšāša see also Behrens, L. S. E., II, p. 8.  
8 Cf. above, note 2.
23 [.....] li-ish-pu-ül-ra-[am-ma]1 may send
24-26 [.....] 
27 um-na-a a-na be-lî-ia i-na [.....] Also the following to my “Lord”: “In
28-37 [.....] concerning which my ‘Lord’ has in-
38 shá be-lî ish-pu-ra a-na be-lî-ia to say that) I have sent it to my ‘Lord.’”
39 ush-te-bi-la

XIII.

Ubarrum, the royal superintendent of rivers and canals, lodges a complaint against
the prefect of Dûr-Sukal-patrak. Time of Kudur-Enlil, about 1335 B.C.

For the general introduction see preceding letter, No. 39.

The contents of this letter, being similar to those of No. 39, may be subdivided
into the following parts:

(a) Complaint lodged against the prefect of Dûr-Sukal-patra for neglect of
a certain canal, ll. 3–20.

The answer to this complaint lodged with King Kudur-Enlil by Ubarrum is, no
doubt, contained in No. 42: 4f.: “As regards the fields, which my ‘Lord’ has given
and concerning which Ubarrum has reported to my ‘Lord’ saying: ‘he has
neglected (lit. forsaken) them,’ (s.c. I beg to state that) ‘I have not neglected
(forsaken) them,’ “ see above, p. 26, note 6. From this it follows that No. 42 is a
letter of the “prefect” (hazannu) of Dûr-Sukal-patra, addressed to the be-lî or King
Kudur-Enlil, teaching us that the prefect held Dûr-Sukal-patra as a fief of the crown
eqtlûsh shà be-lî id-di-na, 42 : 4, cf. below l. 11, shà i-na libriš–shù ü-ma-al-lu-ù), and
that royal officers never mention their titles when writing to their “Lord,” but have
to be content with the attribute “servant,” ardu.

(b) Request that the King issue orders to the sheriff2 that the waters of the
Ilu-ipush and Nalaḫ canals be led back into their dams, ll. 21–26.

1 Notice here the long û in üa and ef., e.g., 21 : 28, i-m-qu-ût–tu; 46 : 12, i-ra-’u-ù–ub (or i-ra-a’–u-ù)?; 38 : 2, ù-ù-
ùl-li-ik.

2 The fact that orders shall be given to the “sheriff” shows that the waters of these two canals, in which the
King has an interest, had been criminally put to misuse.
1 ardi-ka "U-bar-rum a-na di-na-tan be-ti[ alul-liki] 
2 um-ma-a a-na be-ti-ia-ama 
3 ba-za-an-nu shá Dár-m"Sukal (= 
PAP?)-pad-ra" 
4 nam-ga-ra is-si-[ki]-iš a-di ši-il-ta 
5 ta-mi-riš šá har-pi* i-sha-ag-qu-wú 
6 20 ḫar-bu* šá ub-bu-lí * 
7 [ish-shá(?)]-ak-nu ú i-di-ik-ku-wú 

Thy servant Ubarrum; before the presence of my "Lord" may I come, speaking thus to my "Lord": 

The prefect of Dár-Sukal-paṭra has shut off the canal so that they can irrigate (water) at the most only two fields with crops, while there are 20 (fields with) crops which are perfectly dry and hence are destroyed.

2 For the various occurrences and writings see under "Names of Rivers and Canals." 
3 Sahlul when used of "canals" means "to shut off, stop up, dam" (opp. pitû). Cf. is-hi-ir, 40 : 9; e si-hi-ir ma, 3 : 18; iši-si-â-îš 34 : 32; iši-si-ki-šîr 12 : 5. Iši-si-šîr = iši-sîr = tši-sîr (the i in the last syllable on account of the rř). For the construction of ši-kâd amē and še-li-li amē, Delitzsche, Gram., p. 333. 
4 Tamrâdi is the fields situated in the immediate neighborhood and environs of a city, or a flooded, inundated district, cf. No. 39 : 9, 14, pp. 127, 128. 
5 This writing here proves that ḫar-bu (1 : 6; Delitzsche, H. W. B., p. 283e) has to be read ḫarpu. Johns, A. D. D., p. 131, assigns to the word ḫarpu a meaning "waste," or "cropped," that is to say, "stubble" land. Myhrman, Z. A., XVI, p. 176, renders ḫar-šî by "Vervischung!?" In view of the fact that ḫarüa has to be read ḫarpu and that it renders the Sumerian EBUR.D4.DA, "the great (long) harvest," and is the same word as the Hebrew הָרַע, "harvest," the ta-mi-ra-šî ša-har-pi must be "fields" that are "with crops ready to be harvested." For ḫarbu, cf. 17 : 33 11 : 14, 18, 24 39 12 68 29; ḫar-bu c. numeral, 28 21 22 40 60 2 68 5 6; ḫar-šî, 8 18; ḫar-šî c. numeral, 3 21 37 34 28 33 34 63 10 14 15. See also P. 96 9 and Peiser, I.e., p. 7, note. 
6 *Iša-ag-quq may be taken either as 3d pers. plur. masc. prs. 1st: 'so that they (= German indefinite 'man') irrigate or can irrigate (= ein Feld trönten, bestässern, Delitzsche, H. W. B., p. 655a, b) only (up to) two fields with crops"; or, which is less probable, šishag may be considered a IV 1 = isša-ag-šî, dependent upon har-pi. In this case ta-mi-ra-šî ša-har-pi would have to be considered a "composite noun," the gender of which being determined by the word nearest to the verb, i.e., by har-pi, a plur. masc. Translate: "so that only two fields with crops are watered." 
7 Objects counted are construed as, and stand in, the singular. Cf. here note 6 and p. 95, note 6. 
8 U-ba-ba li here not "Zerstörung durch Insekten," Jensen, K. B., VI, p. 580, but "ein sehr trockener zeit," I.e., "to be very dry." Lit., "which exist" (IV šabba) as "very dry ones." Or have we to read ši-dā-ak-nu = Perm. P., with the same meaning? The size of the break would speak rather for the latter emendation. 
9 The same form occurs again in 66 : 6 (context mutilated). To derive it from ša₃₃ (i.e., ša₃₃(!), Delitzsche, H. W. B., p. 216b), "to overthrow, cast down, tear down," does not give any sense. We would expect here some such signification as "to perish," but this meaning is not yet established for sha₃₃. Delitzsche, H. W. B., p. 520, mentions a root ša₃₃₃, "darben, mengeln, etc., entbehren." This would fit very well here, but on account of the writing with d this root could not be ša₃₃₃, but had to be ša₃₃, I.e., ša₃₃ (related with postbiblical ša₃₃, "trouble, distress."
8 [be]-li me-e a-a-li-ti' ish-kim-\textit{ma}
9 [. . . ]-\textit{\textsuperscript{a}} nam-gar-ra is-kir\textit{r}
10 be-ti lish-pu-ra-am-\textit{ma} ia-mi-itr-ta
11 sh\textit{a} i-na libbi\textsuperscript{b}-sh\textit{u} ú-ma-al-tu-\textit{ti'}
\textit{lish-ki}
12 \textit{\textsuperscript{a}} ub-bu-la li-sh\textit{a}-ak-li-\textit{ma}\textit{a}
13 be-ti mi-ig-ra ú e-ri-\textit{sh\textit{a}}
14 la i-la-ad-d\textit{t} nam-gar-sh\textit{u} mush-shur\textit{a}
15 \textit{\textsuperscript{a}} sh\textit{u}-\textit{\textsuperscript{a}} a-na\textit{a} pa-an nam-ga-ri
16 sh\textit{a} be-ti-ia a-shi-ib mu-\textit{\textsuperscript{a}} i-na nam-ga-ri-shu
17 m[a]-\textit{\textsuperscript{a}}-du \textsuperscript{c} \textit{\textsuperscript{a}} sh\textit{u}-\textit{\textsuperscript{a}} a-na pa-an
18 nam-ga-ri an-mi-i a-shi-ib

My “Lord,” thus he has watered and . . . the canal he has shut off!

My “Lord” may give orders that he water the whole field with which he has been entrusted and thus put an end to its being dry.

My “Lord,” may not delight in a favorite and (or: i.e., in) an irrigator who neglects his canal!

Let either the superintendent of the canal of my “Lord”—if water be plentiful in his canal—
or the superintendent of this canal (sc., which has been neglected so shamefully by the prefect)

\textsuperscript{c} “to embarrass,” etc.). I propose, therefore, to take t-di-\textit{iq-qa} as standing for t\textit{\textsuperscript{a}}aq\textit{ma}, t\textit{\textsuperscript{a}}\textit{aq}, t\textit{\textsuperscript{a}}\textit{aq}, t\textit{\textsuperscript{a}}\textit{aq}, t\textit{\textsuperscript{a}}\textit{aq}, t\textit{\textsuperscript{a}}\textit{aq}, F of t\textit{\textsuperscript{a}}\textit{aq}, “to be in want.” The long a at the end is not the plural, but the relative in pause: t\textit{\textsuperscript{a}}aq\textit{ma}, after sh\textit{\textsuperscript{a}} (l. 6).

Hilprecht (letter of July 9, 1908) proposes to derive id\textit{\textsuperscript{a}}\textit{ki} from id\textit{\textsuperscript{a}}\textit{ki}, postulating the significations: 1, “stürzen, vernichten, zerstören” (transitive); 2, “umstürzen, umfallen, umkommen” (intransitive), translating “und verderben (kommen um),” and referring this expression to the “Getreide, das die Köpfe hängen lässt, das umfällt, umknickt.” However, if one prefers, he may see in t-di-\textit{ik-ka-ka} a F or IV (cf. No. 26 : 14, i-li-ik-ga-a, see p. 110, note 3) of t\textit{\textsuperscript{a}}\textit{aq} with passive signification: “and in consequence of which (= \textit{\textsuperscript{a}}\textit{aq} consecutivum) are cast down, destroyed!” The last derivation and translation is possibly better than the one mentioned above (“are in want”).

1 A-a-\textit{\textsuperscript{a}}-ti cannot be here translated by “wer, welcher” (H. W. B., p. 47b), but must be, on account of its position (after the noun), an adjective. A-a-\textit{\textsuperscript{a}}-ti me-e = “what waters?” me-e a-a-\textit{\textsuperscript{a}}-ti = “what kind of waters!” i.e., “such waters!” This line, therefore, is a complaint in the form of ridicule and scorn which the writer expresses with regard to the prefect’s doings: “My ‘Lord’! (or an-mi = an-na, “behold!”) in such a way, with such waters he has watered the fields!”

Read \textit{\textsuperscript{a}}\textit{sh\textit{u}}? For -\textit{\textsuperscript{a}}\textit{sh\textit{u}} cf. also p. 138, note 4. Translate: “Thus he has watered seeing that (\textit{\textsuperscript{a}}) ‘that one’ (sh\textit{\textsuperscript{u}}-\textit{\textsuperscript{a}}) has shut off the canal.”

2 lit., “with which he (i.e., my “Lord”) has filled his heart,” i.e., “which he has given him.” Hence i-na libbi\textsuperscript{b}-sh\textit{u} = ana (\textit{\textsuperscript{a}}\textit{na}) g\textit{\textsuperscript{a}}-\textit{sh\textit{u}} umal\textit{\textsuperscript{a}}, “with which he has filled his hand, which he has entrusted to him.”

3 I\textit{\textsuperscript{i}} of t\textit{\textsuperscript{a}}\textit{aq}, a synonym of t\textit{\textsuperscript{a}}\textit{aq}, and having the same meaning as so\textit{h\textit{a}}\textit{ps}, “to cover something, to suppress it, to bring to end, to end.”

4 Mu-a\textit{\textsuperscript{a}}-\textit{sh\textit{u}}, II\textit{\textsuperscript{i}} permansive in circumstantial clause: “leaving,” i.e., “who leaves.” This explains how the prefect “shut off” (is-it-ki-ir, l. 4) the canal: he left it, paid no attention to it, neglected it (Permansive II\textit{\textsuperscript{i}} = duration and intensity!). And by neglecting it, the canal was in course of time filled up with mud. This caused the dryness (ub-bu-li, l. 6).

5 A-na pa-an . . . a-shi-ib = \textit{\textsuperscript{a}}\textit{na} pa\textit{\textsuperscript{a}}\textit{sh\textit{u}}\textit{b}, one that 
\textit{\textsuperscript{a}}\textit{sh\textit{u}}\textit{b}, that dwells, is at the head of something, i.e., a superintendent.

 Cf. here also 13 : 9, a-shi-ib pa\textit{\textsuperscript{a}}\textit{na}-\textit{sh\textit{u}}\textit{b}. Or is it only “the one who lives near it”?
Royal summons issued by King Shagarakti-Shurishe to his sheriff Amel-Marduk. About 1325 B.C.

The King as shakkanakku $^{3c}$Enlil administered and looked after the Temple property of the god of Nippur, consisting of fields, flocks, taxes, revenues, etc. In the administration of such vast and extended holdings of god Enlil he had to depend, in a large measure at least, upon his officials: shepherds, farmers, collectors of taxes, prefects, governors, etc. It is only natural that such an army of officers, differing

1. lead (take) waters through (into) his canal and (in this case) let alone my “Lord’s” canal!
2. As regards the waters of the Ilu-ipush and the waters of the Nalakh—
3. waters in which my “Lord” has an interest—
4. “let my ‘Lord’ send greeting to the sheriff
5. that they lead (the waters) back into the dam
6. in order that the ‘irrigator’ do not complain.”

XIV.

No. 75 (= C. B. M. 12,582). (Cf. photographic reproduction, Pl. III, 89.)

Royal summons issued by King Shagarakti-Shurishe to his sheriff Amel-Marduk. About 1325 B.C.

The King as shakkanakku $^{3c}$Enlil administered and looked after the Temple property of the god of Nippur, consisting of fields, flocks, taxes, revenues, etc. In the administration of such vast and extended holdings of god Enlil he had to depend, in a large measure at least, upon his officials: shepherds, farmers, collectors of taxes, prefects, governors, etc. It is only natural that such an army of officers, differing
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in rank and influence, could not at all times work together in harmony and peace-
fulness. Then, as now, petty jealousies made themselves felt, which very often
took the form of slander. Wheresoever and whiensoever opportunity offered itself,
one official would accuse the other of all imaginable offenses in the administration
of his particular office. The result of such an accusation, which here is indignantly
referred to as “slander,” is this letter.

Banibi, son of Šami, a shepherd, had complained to the King, his highest
superior, of having been slandered by Errish-nudin-shum and others. The nature
of this slander is, unfortunately, not to be made out, as the passage in question is
very mutilated. It possibly referred to some wrong statements supposedly to have
been made by the complainant at the time when the inventory of the flocks was taken.
The King, knowing that the affairs of the Temple and State can best be administered
only if slanders, wrong accusations, and jealousies give way to peace, quietness, and
“brotherly love” among the several officials, dispatches this letter to Amel-Marduk,
summoning him to produce the originators of the slanders and bring them before
him (the King).

Two things become evident from this letter: (1) Every offense against an
official of the Temple or State is a crime against the King—a lèse majesté. The King,
therefore, appears not only as the person to whom the officials had to and did report
their grievances, but he, as good administrator, takes an interest in the happiness
and contentment of his subordinates by trying to do justice to both, offender and
offended. This he did by inquiring into the pro and con of the accusations and by
passing judgment thereon: the King becomes thus the highest judge, the court of last
appeal. (2) Amel-Marduk, to whom the royal summons was issued, is evidently an
official of the King, whose functions consisted in citing, resp. arresting, and bringing
before the King, for purposes of judgment (dīnu), slanderers or other criminal offenders.
From 81:6f. we learn that such an official was known by the title GÛ.EN.NA, i.e.,
lit. “strength of the Lord,” who may or may not have other GÛ.EN.NA’s, i.e., deputy
sheriffs, under him, for we read, l.c., ash-shum mārēnush Nī-ū-bu-ram šâ GÛ.EN.NA-ka
ash-shū-ni-ka im-ta-na-aḫ-ḫa-ram um-ma-a a-na Mār-”In-ni-bi a-na di-ni [. . . ], i.e.,
“as regards the Nippurians whom thy1 sheriff has seized (lit. has received) upon thy
command (I beg to state) the following: ‘To Mār-Innibi for the purpose of judgment
[he has taken them].’” Amel-Marduk, exercising here the functions of the GÛ.EN.NA,
has, therefore, to be identified with the Amel-šu-Marduk GÛ.EN.NA En-liṭš, B. E.,

1 l.c., “Aḫu-ū-e-BA-ni, the addressee of the letter, who, therefore, must have been a sheriff-in-chief.
2 See already above, p. 24, note 5.
XIV, 136 : 1. From B. E., XIV, we furthermore learn that Amel-Marduk lived during the 5th and 8th year of Kudur-Enlil; “the beginning of the reign,” and the 8th, 9th, and 10th year of Shagarakti-Shuriash. As sheriff (GU.EN.NA*) he had, of course, a prison (ki-li, B. E., XIV, 135 : 3), where such persons as "asErrish(t)-nadin-shum, the slanderer, were held (kalû) for judgment; he had to be present (h-kin-nu) when the several scribes made their final reports (ri-ḫa-a-nu šaḫ DUB. SHAR'NAN <NIN.AN'NAN>, B. E., XIV, 136 : 1) or “drew the balance of accounts.” In short, wherever and whenever the “affairs (amktz) of the King” were in need of the strong support of the “arm of the law,” the GU.EN.NA had to give it: he was “the Lord’s (EN-NA) strength (GU),” as such acting “for (or in place of) the King,” ina muḫ LUGAL, p. S4, note 9.

Amel-Marduk seems to have advanced to the office of a GU.EN.NA from that of a "SAG.LUGAL. In the latter position he is mentioned during the 6th and 7th year of Shagarakti-Shuriash. I read therefore, B. E., XIV, 132 : 2, [*Amel-šu]Marduk "SAG.LUGAL. In his capacity as SAG.LUGAL he was present (u-kin-nu) at the taking of the inventory of the flocks (mi-nu LIT.GUD ti GANAM.LU). This very same tablet mentions also "Ha-ni-bi már Sa-a-mi (I.c., 1. 12), the na-gid or “shepherd,” who appears in our letter as the complainant (1. 7). There can, then, be no doubt that the Amel-Marduk of our letter has to be identified with the GU.EN.NA of Nippur, and that the King who addressed this letter to his sheriff was none other than Shagarakti-Shuriash. Our letter has, consequently, to be placed at about 1325 B.C. For documents which are clearly official reports ("šinDUB) of the sheriff Amel-Marduk to his “Lord,” i.e., either to King Kudur-Enlil or to King Shagarakti-Shuriash, see No. 3 (report about the condition of canals, cf. 40 : 24 | 46 : 11); B. E., XIV, 123a : 15 (report about the royal (!) ZI.GA), and B. E., XIV, 137 (report about the liabilities, LAL.NI, of the prefects, ḫazannu). Our letter may be transcribed and translated as follows:

1 B. E., XIV, 118 : 19.
2 I.e., 123a : 15.
3 The Amel-šuMarduk mentioned in the 13th year of Ku[ ... ]; B. E., XIV, 125 : 4, belongs to the reign of Kudur-Enlil. This against Clay, I.e.
4 I.e., 127 : 3.
5 I.e., 135 : 3, 15.
6 I.e., 136 : 1.
7 I.e., 137 : 27.
8 For other occurrences see 40 : 24 | 45 : 19 | 46 : 11 | 59 : 5; B. E., XIV, 39 : 1 | 142 : 28; B. E., XV, 191 : 13; Meissner, Ideogramme, No. 2050; Hinke, B. E., Series D, IV, p. 2646. For the GU.EN.NA among the gods see my forthcoming volume on “The Religious Texts of the Temple Library.”
9 The šš-la-šš-shum after Amel-Marduk in B. E., XV, 171 : 6, which Clay, I.e., p. 206, takes to be a title, is, of course, an Imperat. III of ṣḫašš + šš + m(a).
1 a-na "Amel-[î]-Marduk ki-bi-ma
2 um-ma sharru (= LUGAL)-ma
3 um-ma-a a-na "Amel-[î]-Marduk
4 = "Errish(t) (= NIN.IB)-nâdin (= SE)-shum (= MU)
5 mär "A-p-pâ'-na-a-[a?] son of Appanâi,
6 šâ da-ba-ab [limnûtim] who has slandered
7 î-ti = Ha-ni-[bi ú-bu-ub] Hamibi;
8 ū = Dam-qi[mâr . . . .] and Damqu, the son of . . .
9 [šâ î]-li = ÎXX-. . . .] who has slandered Sin- . . .
10 [da-ba]-ab [limnûtim údbûb]
11 ū . . .
13-17 . . . .
18 . . . a bu(?) na(?) . . . .
20 . . .-da-ku . . . .
21 . . . be]-el da-ba-bi-shû . . . . his slanderer
22 a-na m[ub]-ia bring him
23 šû-bi-la-ash-shû. before me!

XV.

No. 33a (= C. B. M. 6123). ( Cf. photographic reproduction, Pl. IV, 10, 11.)

A general’s explanatory letter to the King. About 1400 B.C.

The expressions “guards,” “chariots,” “fortress,” “enemy,” “to campaign,” “to go on an expedition” (ana girri alâku resp. tebâ), “to plunder,” etc., etc., occurring in this letter, show that the writer must have been an officer, more especially a general commanding the chariots (cf. ash-ba-tu, l. 22) in his King’s army. Unfortunately for our investigation there occurs only one name in the whole letter, and this is not mentioned in any of the tablets published in B. E., XIV and XV. We are, therefore, at a loss to state definitely who the King here referred to was. The name of the writer and “general” was "NIM.GI-shar (= LUGAL)-išti (= AN)"mesh, i.e., "NIM.GI is the king of the gods"—a formation parallel to Râmmân-shar-išti.

1 Or "Išti (= Ezen)-na-a-[a]?
1 ardi-ka $^*$NIM.GI-shar($=\text{LUGAL}$)-$\text{ili}(=\text{AN})$[mean]

2 a-na di-na-an be-\text{li}-ia l[u-ul-li]:

Thy servant NIM.GI-shar-ili;

before the presence of my “Lord” may I come(!)
Unto the cities and the guards of my "Lord" greeting!

The following to my "Lord":

"Behold I have ordered out thy five chariots; have they started going to the place I have written thee?"

I beg to state the following to my "Lord":

"I am there at the head of the five chariots, as my 'Lord' knows—or hast the inspector not informed (my Lord) saying: he is?" Also the following to my "Lord":

"The five old chariots shall go to wherever my 'Lord' shall command."

---

1 For bel resp. ash-dah as plural sign cf. l. 15, an-ma-a-tum belu; and see Chapter I, p. 12, note 1.
2 EN.NU.UN = EN/NUN = massartu, H. W. B., p. 478. See also p. 37, note 9.
3 Objects counted stand in, and are construed as, singulars—hence tu-ši-i-ma tob-lak, l. 8—cf. i-ba-ash-shi, l. 12; it-be-ni, l. 24, and see p. 95, note 6. In l. 34, II šàšnarkabtu are treated, however, as a masc. singl.: bē-li-ik for bē talik. See also note 10.
4 Delitzsch, H. W. B., p. 428b, mentions a root š-n, expressing in the form of a circumstantial clause (Pret. plus Pret., Delitzsch, Gram., § 152, p. 362), might be taken as referring to the writer: "hast thou gone out" (then 2d pers. masc. singl.). In no event, however, can tu-ši-i-ma be taken in the sense of either "hast thou brought out" (this had to be bēšaššu) or "thou (they) shall (shall) go" (this required a form tēšip, cf. l. 26, us-pu-an-ma).
5 Literally: "As regards me I have come to the five chariots (and am now with them), as my Lord knows—or has the inspector not (informed my Lord) saying, 'he has come to them' (sc. and is now with them)?"
6 This may be either Pres. of bēšu, "to be," or Pret. of bēšu, "to come," plus ši, referring back to V šàšnarkabtu. For this-ma cf. 35 : 21, p. 124, note 8.
8 By translating as given above, I connect šiša with V-ma šàšnarkabtu, cf. l. 34 bē-li-ik, and see note 3. Narkabtu, therefore, is construed in our letter both as fem. and as masc. If this translation be objected to, we would have to render l. 13: "he shall go with the five chariots," etc., referring the "he" to a person well known to the
As regards these cities concerning which my "Lord" (has inquired, saying):
"With what (how) shall they guard the government?"

I beg to state the following to my "Lord":
"I shall be campaigning in the fields while they (are trying to) invade the fields up to the very cities the welfare of which my 'Lord' has at heart.

Now, the five chariots which I have commanded must be going out to wheresoever my 'Lord' shall command, only while they (the cities) guard the fortified camp.

"Lord," concerning whom the writer had received orders to send him out with five old chariots. Ḡalku ana gīrī c. acc., "to go (march) with something to," here apparently used of military expeditions. Cf. tebā ana gīrī, l. 24.

1 Undoubtedly a shortened sentence for asḥanum annātum āli̯bālī šā be-li iškūru ummā. Notice the position of annātum!

2 NAM = pōhātī, pēhātī is well known. For nārōru c. acc. and ino see p. 139, note 5.

3 Cf. the later in-a 4šun. ashe-ba-nu. Ashe-ba-nu a . . . it-te-ni-id-du-ma is, like in-a-şu-şu . . . . te-bo-at (note 7, q, c.), a circumstantial clause with a change of subjects. The subject of ashe-ba-nu is the writer in his capacity as "general" (i.e., his chariots and men) and that of it-te-ni-id-du-ma are the "enemies."

4 Notice the -ma! Cf. here "die Wagen seien gewaltsam gekrönt" (has inquired, saying) denen Wagenleiser gefallen war, während sie selbst verlassen waren und für sich selbst unverfroren," quoted by Delitzsch, Gram., p. 364, from Sānih, VI, 96.

5 Jensen, K. B., VII, p. 317, has shown (against Delitzsch, H. W. B., p. 612f., who enumerates four roots נבנ) that there is only one נבנ, but the significatures which he assigns to this verb (fietzen, nachholen, hinterhergehen, treiben) do not fit here. Nagel, B. A., IV, p. 480, argued on the basis of Letters of Hammurabi, 34 : 7, for a meaning "holen, nehmen," comparing it with Jud. 14 : 9, "and the honey מַרְפֶּה־אָרֵב was he took into his hands." The best translation of מַרְפֶּה, because construed c. acc. and anâ, would be, it seems to me, "they went (ac. to take, plunder, cf. also l. 27)," "they invaded," "swept down upon."

6 For shabat (shabbat, ašshabat), "treiben," see Jensen, K. B., VII, p. 533. Here, because applied to a "general" in connection with chariots -- "to command."

7 In-a-şu-şu . . . . te-bo-at is a circumstantial clause (Perf. plus Pres.,) with a change of subjects. The subject of in-a-şu-şu . . . . te-bo-at is šā be-li, while that of it-te-bo-at is V-ma 4šun narkabtu (cf. note 3). For such constructions see Delitzsch, Gram., § 153, pp. 364, 365 and above, note 3. The suggestion which the writer makes to his King's inquiry is this: "Let me defend the open country with the chariots, while the cities, resp. the inhabitants of the cities, must protect the fortress." To protect the open country chariots are absolutely necessary; with these the general can hurry quickly from place to place and thus drive away the enemy. For the protection of the fortified camp chariots are less needed than men, soldiers, and these the cities shall furnish.
25 it-ti a-na tur (= KU)-ru-ki-ia

26 ul it-ti a-na tur (= PA) di? us-so-am-ma

27 i-had(-PA) di? us-so-am-ma

28 be-ri a-na sak-shup-par? liq-bi-[ma]

29 II narkabtu a-na gir-ri shâ be-ri i-gab-bu-ú

30 lil-li-ik û a-na-ku lu-uk-ka-li-ma³

31 i-na II narkabtu bi-ir-ta shâ be-ri-ia

32 lu-us-grur û a-la-ka

33 be-ri ish-tap-ra-am-ma

34 II narkabtu it-ti-ia lil-li-ik³

35 û II narkabtu li-ik-ka-li-ma³

36 bi-ir-ta shâ be-ri-[a]

37 li-ış-sur³

And with regard to the one (chariot with
which I was) to smite (the enemy)
so that (the enemy)
may not (again) become fresh, go out, and
plunder, the following to my “Lord”:
“My ‘Lord’ may give orders to the sak-
shuppar
that he go with two chariots to where
ever my ‘Lord’ shall command,
while I may be kept behind (back)
and guard with two (other) chariots the
fortified camp of my ‘Lord’;
but if my ‘Lord’
should write, telling me to go,
then may two chariots accompany me,
while he may be kept behind with two
chariots
and guard the fortified camp
of my ‘Lord.’”

1 It-ti, sc. narkabtu, is the fem. of edu, “one.”

2 Inf. II of yânu. Jensen, K. B., VII, pp. 421, 436, 450, 498, zer-, nieder-schlagen; Delitzsch, H. W. B., p. 714a, entweinrissen, zerstreuen. Tururu is used here apparently in the sense of neq̄ašu, both as a means of “defense” and “offense.” Lit. translated this line would read: “And with regard to that one (chariot) which was (to serve) for my
smiting (see the enemy).”

3 A reading i-pa-di, from yânu, “to destroy” (cf. tapâ, “destruction,” Delitzsch, H. W. B., p. 515b), though possible, is against the succession of events—we would expect: go out, plunder, destroy! I-had-di = i-hat-fi from
ânu, “to sin”; and as each and every sin is a “Vermessenei (gegen Gott),” I translated as given above. Prof. Hilprecht suggests a translation, “mag sich nicht freuen (i-had-di = i-hat-fi, yânu),” d. h., “mag keines Vergnügens daran finden
auszukrücken,” in anderen Worten, “mag nicht fröhlich darauf losplaudern.” (Personal communication of July 9, 1908.)

4 For the sak-shup-par see above, Chapter III, p. 37, note 12.

5 Notice the difference between lukkalima, 1. 30 (= 1st person) and likkalima, 1. 35 (= 3d person). Both forms are IV of yânu, “to be kept back,” “to be retained.”


7 As narkabtu is fem. (p. 157, n. 3), we would expect here li-talâlik, cf., however, ibid., note 10.

8 The writer apparently has changed his mind since he addressed his last note to the King. He finds that one chariot will not be sufficient to cope effectively with the enemy. Two chariots must be sent against the enemy, while two others are needed to protect the fortified camp. (The bûra of 1. 31, 36 has, of course, nothing to do with that of 1. 23!) He leaves it, however, to the King as to whom to send out or to keep behind with the chariots requested.
A letter of Shiriqtum, a Nippurian, sent out by his Lord and King to look after the receipts of wool and provender. About 1400 B.C.

This letter has been translated chiefly on account of its manifold peculiarities:

1. $Tishhu$ generally read $Tishhu$ and identified either with $NIN.IB$ or with $Ishtar$, is here apparently a name for $\text{"En-lil}$;
2. The strange form $\text{nap-ti}$ for $\text{nap-sha-ti}$;
3. The unusual stat. constr. in $\text{shikittum}$ for $\text{nap-ti-ka}$;
4. The expression $\text{a-na li-ti}$ for single $\text{a-na}$;
5. The two new words $\text{a-da-tum}$ and $\text{i-hu}$;
6. The long $\text{li}$ in $\text{lu-G-ul-li}$.

Unfortunately there is no other person mentioned in B. E., XIV or XV, known by the name Shiriqtum. We are, therefore, at a loss to place this letter historically. This much, however, we may maintain, that our writer was a Nippurian, living probably at the time of Kuri-Galzu (cf. the invocation and see above, Chapter III, pp. 38ff.), who had been sent out by his "Lord" and King to look after the receipts of wool and provender.

The contents of that part of the letter which is preserved are the following:

(a) $\text{A-da-tum}$ and $\text{i-hu}$ have been sent, ll. 15-18.
(b) 12 qa of barley shall be removed, as per previous order, ll. 19-21.

1 ardi-ka $\text{Shi-ri-iq-tum a-na d[i-na-}\text{an}$. Thy servant Shiriqtum; before the presence
2 be-lia lu-\text{u-ul-li[ik]} of my "Lord" may I come!
3 $\text{Tishhu}$ and the queen of Nippur $\text{shar-rat}$ $\text{Ninib}$ $\text{NIN.ILI}$ may protect the life of my "Lord";
4 $\text{Errish}$ and $\text{NIN.MAGH}$ who inhabit $\text{Magh a-shib}$ the city (i.e., Nippur) may protect thy creatures!
5 $\text{shikittum}$ $\text{nap-ti-ka}$ Whosoever
6 $\text{li-\text{is-su-rum}}$ $\text{pa-an}$ may see the gracious face of my "Lord"
7 $\text{ba-nu-tum}$ $\text{be-lia li-mur}$

Notice here the long $\grave{a}$, out of lazy + a (of 1st person), in $\text{lu-ul-li-ik}$. Though this $\grave{a}$ may be called a graphically long $\grave{a}$, it need not be a morphologically long $\grave{a}$ (for $\text{lu-\text{u-ul-li-ik}}$ may stand for $\text{lu-\text{ul-li-ik}}$, a form well known from the inscriptions, but not yet found in tablets from the Cassite period, Hilprecht). But then $\text{u-ul-li}$ would have to be a PI, while in this and all other passages it is evidently a PI!

For introduction, ll. 3-11, see above, Chapter III, pp. 39ff.
FROM THE TEMPLE ARCHIVES OF NIPPU.

9 ū(?)(?) man-nu da-ba-ba ṭēb(= ḤI)v
10 [a-na] be-li-ia li-il-te-mi
11 [um-ma]a-a a-na be-li-ia- [ma]
   [. . . large break . . . .]
12 . . .
13 [ . . .] a-na li-ti' be-li-ia
14 a-na li-te-bi-la
15 i-li-qa-a 2 MA$ šā a-da-tum$meh$a

16 ū 2 il-hu-ū
17 a-na li-ti be-li-ia
18 il-te-bi-la
19 ū ši-di-tum a be-li li-mur

20 12 [SHE].BAR i-na-[šū-ū ki]

21 [ash-ṣu?] ra-ka.$

and whosoever be of “good words”
may listen to my “Lord”!
The following to my “Lord”:

. . . they say
to my “Lord”

they (he) will take. Two mana of dark-
red(? ) wool

and two ilhū

he has sent
to my “Lord.”

And as regards the provender, my “Lord”
may be assured

that they shall take away the 12 (qa) of
barley as
I have written thee(?).

1 For ḫu cf. King, Letters of Hammurabi, I, p. XLII; Nagel, B. A., IV, p. 479, and especially Jensen, K. B., VI,
pp. 357, 403, 466, who quite correctly recognized that a-na li-t (or, as in our letter, a-na li-ti') is as much as ana, “zu hin.”

2 As the context is mutilated, it is hard to tell whether this is the 3d pers. fem. (or masc.) plural (= ilqē = ilqē =
ilqē, for the vowel in, instead of a, see also Behrens, L. S. S., II', p. 53), or whether this is a singular, parallel to il-te-bi-la
(l. 18), the long d at the end indicating the chief sentence. By itself it might be also a 3d pers. plur. (or sing.) pretorit (ilqē = ilqē, see p. 9, note 5), or even a 1v = ilqē(ā), see above, p. 119, note 3.

3 MA is here an abbreviation of ma-na (cf. also B. E., XV, 6: 11), just as SHU is abbreviated from šu-šu
(i.e., rome), cf. B. E., XV, 199: 29, 40 | 19: 20 | 73: 15 | 154: 45 | 149: 44, etc.

4 See p. 77, note 1.

3 A-da-tum$meh$a must be something that was measured according to ma-na—a kind of wool? Strange is here the
šēd between MA and a-da-tum$meh$a, seeing that the “object measured” follows almost invariably directly (i.e.,
without a šēd) upon the “measure,” cf. 23: 24 | 27: 31, etc. The a-adatum mentioned in Delitzsch, H. W. B., p. 266, and i.e.,
p. 31b, are out of question here. The former means “Wohnställe,” and the latter “corbeil,” Thureau-Dangin,
Z. A., XVII, 196, 1. We may, however, consider it as standing for adatum, adatum, adatum, adatum (or shēpatu), i.e., “dunkelerteige, dunkelrote, braunrote Woll” (cf. 11 sīm, Delitzsch, H. W. B., p. 266).

If a-da-tum$meh$a be one kind, 2 (or ma-na) il-hu-ū might possibly be another kind of wool. The form (ilqē)
is, however, against this supposition, for we would expect a formation like ilqē (from on account of šēpatu) if this
existed. Or have we to suppose a reading like: 2 (=shēpatu) il-hu-ū?

$ši-di-tum, “provender” (Delitzsch, H. W. B., p. 563b: Reisefant, Proviant), occurs also in B. E., XV, 143: 3 | 154: 45 (Chay's copy gives here ad(?)-di-tum), and ši-di-aq (= šidi-aq) in B. E., XV, 168: 30, 33. (Cf. here also the
ši(?)-aq(?)-t of B. E., XV, 87: 10?)

Emendation is hardly correct! We would expect ki (ša) ana be-li-ia ashpūra.
An unknown writer complains to his "Lord" and King that, though he asked for "pots," "straw" has been sent to him—a mistake showing that even Babylonians could and actually did misread their own signs: \(IN^\text{mesh} (= \text{straw})\) was read instead of \(KAN.NI^\text{mesh} (= \text{pots})\). About 1370 B.C.

More particularly the contents of this letter are the following:

(a) The "good reeds" have been sent to the King, ll. 4–9.
(b) Complaint about the "straw" which has been sent instead of "pots," ll. 10–13.
(c) Request for (a) one talent of copper, ll. 14, 15; (b) for good ħulūp trees, ll. 16, 17.
(d) The affairs of the King are being well looked after by the sheriffs, ll. 18–22.

(c) Communication that the writer had gone to Dūr-Kurî-Galzu for one purpose or another, ll. 23–25.

1 [ardî-ka =X . . . .]
2 a-na di-[na-an be-lî-ia]
3 [lu]-liḵ u[m-ma-a a-na be-lî-ia-ma]
4 [āš]-shum sh]ā Ʌ[a-ash-pu-ra]
5 [. . . . ]-be(-?) ū GI DUG( = ɅH).GA
6 [. . . . ]-a ul-te-b[ī-l]a
7 ū[a] di-ka = "Abu-ra(?)-āš-shā(?)
8 GI DUG( = ɅH).GA a-na be-lî-ia
9 ul-te-bî-la
10 ū [a]-na bu-ul di-ğa-ra-ti
11 a-na ra-di-i al-la-p[ar]
12 ū ti[ba]u( = IN)^mesh be-lî
13 am-ma an-na-a ū-she-bi-la

Thy servant X . . . ;
before the presence of my "Lord"
may I come, speaking thus to my "Lord":
[With regard to thy inquiry(?) . . . . ]
[whether . . . . ] and the good reeds
. . . . has brought
(I beg to state that) thy servant
Aḥurashsha
has brought the good reeds
to my "Lord."
Furthermore I wrote that "pots"
be brought down,
but they were "straw"!
What for has my "Lord" sent this?

1 GI DUG.GA = ṣanā ħūbu, good, i.e., sound, reeds that are not rotten.
2 ū introduces here the apodosis.
3 Or "Aḥu-shā(?)-āš(?)-ra(?); both readings are very doubtful.
4 The only way to account for such a mistake in sending "straw" instead of "pots" is by supposing that our writer must have used in his former letter the ideogram KAN.NI for ḍiqarāti. The "order-filler" mistook KAN.NI for IN and sent, accordingly, "straw."
5 Am-ma = am-ame = ངཾ བ་. Mi, therefore, is an abbreviation for ṣēlu, "what," Jensen, K. B., VI, p. 472. For another mi = -ma, -ma, see p. 124, note 11.
A father's peremptory order to his son to send in his report. About 1400 B.C.

From this letter we learn that the "report" (di-e-ma, 1. 5) took its origin with the "son," who had to send it to the be-el SHE.BAR (1. 7). The latter again had to report to the "father," who turned it over to the King (be-el). As the report has to be sent by the "son" to the be-el SHE.RAR, we may, and this quite rightly, assume that the di-e-ma embodied a report about the receipts, resp. expenditures, of "barley" in connection with a sub-station of a branch storehouse of the Temple of Enlil, over which the "son" presided. This would give us the following classification of the various storehouses: (a) sub-station of a branch storehouse (son); (b) branch...
storehouse (be-el SHE.BAR); (c) main storehouse (father); (d) central office at Nippur (King, resp. bursar-in-chief). This letter, then, shows more than anything else that the so-called “Temple Archives” are nothing but administrative reports about the receipts, resp. expenditures, of the various branch storehouses of the Temple of Enlil—reports as they had to be made to the earthly representative of the god of Nippur, the King, the shakkanakku as Enlil!

Thus saith thy father:

1. um-ma-a a-bi-ka
   Thus saith thy father:
   “Give,
   be good,
   and send, as soon as ready,
   the report
   to the
   ‘lord of barley’
   so that I may send my own
   report to the ‘Lord’ (i.e., the King).”

XIX.

No. 89 (C. B. M. 19,764).

An official of Dūr-ili sends a messenger with a note to the King, then at Nippur. Another note, addressed to “NIN-nu-ú-a of Nippur, could not be delivered by the same messenger, because the addressee had gone on business to Sippar, fifty miles distant. Whereupon the official of Dūr-ili sent the present explanatory note to Sippar, whence it was brought back by “NIN-nu-ú-a to Nippur. About 1350 B.C.

For introduction, transcription, translation, and notes, see above, Chapter II, pp. 19–23; 25, note 4; 27, note 8.

1 Pa-nu-ú-ka might be, per se, connected either with i-din, “give thy face,” i.e., “set thyself about to do something, arouse thyself, be determined,” or with ul id-ba-ba-ku.

2 i-din pa-nu-ú-ka—a form of bablu. With the significance here given cf., besides Delitzsch, H. W. B., p. 1666, also Jensen, K. B., VI, pp. 320, 378, and B. A., 111, p. 541, ia bibi lāni, “freundlich, gut,” lit. “one who does not put his face upon, does not turn it towards (something else, i.e., upon or towards evil),” here “thy face (= plur.) must not be put (se, upon evil),” i.e., “be good,” “do not delay.” A bibi-lābi, accordingly, is something towards which one’s heart is turned continually, the fondest thought of one’s heart.

3 i-na mu-ú-lī — “to be at a thing,” “to be ready.”

4 SHE.BAR is here not only the “barley,” but everything that goes through the hands of the “lord,” as head of a branch storehouse. Cf. also pp. 112, note 2; 113, note 4.
CONCORDANCE OF PROPER NAMES.

Abbreviations.

addr., addressee; b., brother; “b.”, brother (in address); cf., confer; d., daughter; f., father; f., following page; fl., following pages; i.e., loco citato; p., page; pp., pages; q.v., quod vide; s., son; si., sister; wr., writer.

Determinatives: Bu, prep.; mesh, plural; m., masculine; f., feminine; [...] = text restored; [...] = interpretation of text; C. B. M., refers to the “Catalogue of the Babylonian and General Semitic Section of the Archæological Museum of the University of Pennsylvania,” prepared by Prof. Dr. H. V. Hilprecht. The numbers refer to the cuneiform texts of the autograph plates.

I. Names of Persons.

1. Masculine Names.

"Am-en-i, 47 : 3.
"Ab-[...], 69 : 4.
"Ab-(-AD)-ina, 1 of "Di-ni, 85 : 10.
"A-ba-Ba-ni, wr., 2 : 3.
"A-ba-ku-ru-ma, 54 : 11.
"Ame-l-Ba-ni-i, 85 : 16.
"Ame-ni, 1, wr., 72 : 3.
"Ame-ni, 2. addr. 75 : 1 3.
"Ame-ni(-in), "b." of "En-lil-na-kin-apal (= TUR.USH), 80 : 1, 5.
"Ame-ni(-in), "b." of "En-lil-na-kin-apal (= TUR.USH), 1, wr., 3 : 2.
"A-ne-la-ku, 4 : 1.
"A-ne-la-ku(= XXX)-lal-la-ku, 48 : 5.
"A-ne-lukulti (= KU)-tu-ka, 29 : 9, 15.
"Ardi-Beli (= GASHAN), 5 wr., 5 : 3.
"Ardi-Beli (= GASHAN), 6 wr., 5 : 3.
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Masculine Names

Ardi(?)-GAB(?)-BA(?)-ma(?r) in Bb-bArdi-GAB.BA-ma, 81: 14.
Ar-dri-Ban, 48: 9.
Ar-dri(?)-Marduk, wr., 6: 2.
Ar-ra-pa-a-a-[um], 53: 20, 27, 32.
Ar-shu-pi-ia-ma-di, 55: 5.
[?]-A-šu-[u-um], wr., 7: 2.
Bb(?)-Marduk, wr., 8: 2.
2. 3: 16.
Da-an-mu, 1.
1. 11: 1.
2. 42: 17.
Din-bi(-EN)[-l], 53: 16 | 69: 4.
Din(-EN)[-l], 69: 4.
Din(-EN)-a-sa-tum, 23: 20.
Hus[-l], 57: 4.
Hus[-l]-lu[rišh], 48: 22.
Hus[...]z, 50: 4.
Hus[...]z, 39: 13.
[?]Du(-l)-lu[rišh], addr., “b.” or “š(u)” of m-tu-ip-pa-...-a?a, 85: 1.
Du(b-ma), 75: 8.
Du-ba(-l), 69: 3, 6.
Du-bi(-l)U-rišh(-EN)-IB-gab-ba, wr., 91: 3.
Du-bi(D)I.L.BA-IB, 14: 18.

2 Also the following readings might possibly be suggested: m-pa-la-du, m-na-du-la-an-du, or m-ah-pi-le, resp.
3 Bir(-l), resp. m-na-du-la-la-du, see Chapter III, p. 52, note 3.
4 Or m-tum-ba-mil-nu-šik-šu?
5 Or m-...šik-
6 Or m-siš-ha(-l)u-šik-šu, see also pp. 35, note 1; 110, note 3.
7 Or m-tum-ba-mil-nu-šik-šu.
8 Or m-[]-šiš-ha(-l)u-šik-šu, q.v.
9 Or m-tum-ba-mil-nu-šik-šu?
10 According to l. 5 he is a šu-qa-nu-ša. A pišh m-tum-ba-mil-nu-šik-šu is mentioned in B. E., XIV, 99a: 41.
11 For the reading of NIN.IB – Errišh(i), see The Monist, XVII (January, 1907), p. 140ff. Cf. also “Preface.”
FROM THE TEMPLE ARCHIVES OF NIPPUR.

Masculine Names

m ti'Errish(i)( = MASH)-asp(- TUR USH)-iddina (= SE)16, wr., 84: 2.

m ti'Errish(i)( = NIN.IB)-GA.BU-AN24 =, wr., 17: 2, 18: 1 (?).

m ti'Errish(i)( = L)-GIR.AN26 48: 20.

m ti'Errish(i)( = NIN.IB)-nadin (= SE)-adgi (SHI'SH)9, 32: 13.

m ti'Errish(i)( = NIN.IB)-nadin (= SE)-shum (= MU), s. of

m Ap-pa-na-a-[a], 75: 4.

m ti'Errish(i) zir-dh-ni, wr., 15: 1 | 16: 2.

m E. SAG.,zu-usi-in, 9: 15.

m E-i-ti, s. of Uuh-bu-ta, 24: 12.

m tib(i)-KAR17-Marduk, wr., 12: 2.

m muGir-ra-ga-inil,s 3: 13, 17, 20.

m Ga-as-ar-AN, 1 "b. of "In-nu-ia-a, 87: 3.

m Ho-an-[ba?], 68: 23.

m Ho-ni-[bi], 75: 7.

m Ho-she-mar, 84: 13.


m Hu-pa-bi, 48: 16.

m Hu-er-pi-i, I. of Er-be18-Marduk, 58: 6.


m Hb-ni-12KUR, 3: 48.

m Hb-ni-12-Marduk, 21, 2.


2. 81: 13 83: 27.

1 Probably to be read Errish-ge-sir-ilI, i.e., "Errish is the fuller (qipiru = ashkaku, Moissner, M. V. A. G., IX (1904), p. 52) of the gods." Cf. II R, 57, 35c, d, ti'(Ti-is-h-ly) SUGH ditto (= ti'IN.IB) sika ram-ka-At. See also m ti'L-GIR.AN31, 48: 20.

2 Probably to be read Errish-shakkanak-tii. Cf. here for the present our note to GIR.NIT.A (Chapter IV, p. 86, n. 4) and see my forthcoming volume on the Religious Texts. Clay, B. E., XIV, p. 49a, reads NIN.IB KISH

(= kishkash)-tiil.

The traces speak rather for ba! Cf. ti'Zir-ba-ni-tum!

4 An Amurritic name: "E. is my rock!"

5 Here a city named after a person. Cf. dhuq[i]Gir-ra-ga-niil.

6 An here in all probability the same as the Cassite Bugash, see pp. 7, note 2; 63; 70.

7 Cf. B. E., XV, p. 32a, Hu-di-dh-dh-ill (= BE)-lo, a Mitanni name.

8 See MU.GHE.GAL.

9 Here a city, see under dhuq[i]Marduk.

10 Cf. "Il-ia, father of "Tukulti (= KU)20[2]-KUR, B. E., 48a: 7, and see below under "Il-li-a. Or is i' = ab?


12 Clay, B. E., XIV, p. 49a, reads MU.TUK.A = munnashšah. For the sign rimu see Michener, Ideogramme, No. 3857.

13 Clay, B. E., XIV, p. 49a, reads "Il-li-a and see Chapter II, p. 15, note 5.
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MA.AN.USH,a 37 : 9.

MiiMan-ru-gi=bili Ramamén (= IM), 24 : 13, 18.

Man-ru-ki=lül Sukal (= LUGH), s. of [. . . ]-shd, 18 : 23.

Mar.[. . . ], 24 : 29 (60 : 3, 5.

Mar.[. . . ]-LUGUL-se i-se-kur, 48 : 5.


Mar.[. . . ]-id-ka-dan, 55 : 5.


Mar.[. . . ]-id-an-[. . . ], 69 : 3, 6.

Mar.[. . . ]-nu-šu, 48 : 16.


Mar.[. . . ]-mu-ra-[. . . ], 78 : 4.


Mar.[. . . ]-šu-[. . . ], 57 : 4.

Mar.[. . . ]-šu, 83 : 14, 35.


Marduš-šu-šu, 50 : 1.

Marduš-[. . . ]-[iš]-šu-[. . . ], 21 : 9.

Marduš-[. . . ]-[iš]-šu-[. . . ], 21 : 9.

Marduš-[. . . ]-[iš]-šu-[. . . ], 21 : 9.

Marduš-[. . . ]-[iš]-šu-[. . . ], 21 : 9.

Marduš-[. . . ]-[iš]-šu-[. . . ], 21 : 9.

Marduš-[. . . ]-[iš]-šu-[. . . ], 21 : 9.

Marduš-[. . . ]-[iš]-šu-[. . . ], 21 : 9.

Marduš-[. . . ]-[iš]-šu-[. . . ], 21 : 9.

Marduš-[. . . ]-[iš]-šu-[. . . ], 21 : 9.

Marduš-[. . . ]-[iš]-šu-[. . . ], 21 : 9.

Marduš-[. . . ]-[iš]-šu-[. . . ], 21 : 9.

Marduš-[. . . ]-[iš]-šu-[. . . ], 21 : 9.

Marduš-[. . . ]-[iš]-šu-[. . . ], 21 : 9.

Marduš-[. . . ]-[iš]-šu-[. . . ], 21 : 9.

Marduš-[. . . ]-[iš]-šu-[. . . ], 21 : 9.

Marduš-[. . . ]-[iš]-šu-[. . . ], 21 : 9.

Marduš-[. . . ]-[iš]-šu-[. . . ], 21 : 9.

Marduš-[. . . ]-[iš]-šu-[. . . ], 21 : 9.

Marduš-[. . . ]-[iš]-šu-[. . . ], 21 : 9.

Marduš-[. . . ]-[iš]-šu-[. . . ], 21 : 9.

Marduš-[. . . ]-[iš]-šu-[. . . ], 21 : 9.

Marduš-[. . . ]-[iš]-šu-[. . . ], 21 : 9.

Marduš-[. . . ]-[iš]-šu-[. . . ], 21 : 9.

Marduš-[. . . ]-[iš]-šu-[. . . ], 21 : 9.

Marduš-[. . . ]-[iš]-šu-[. . . ], 21 : 9.

Marduš-[. . . ]-[iš]-šu-[. . . ], 21 : 9.

Marduš-[. . . ]-[iš]-šu-[. . . ], 21 : 9.

Marduš-[. . . ]-[iš]-šu-[. . . ], 21 : 9.

Marduš-[. . . ]-[iš]-šu-[. . . ], 21 : 9.

Marduš-[. . . ]-[iš]-šu-[. . . ], 21 : 9.

Marduš-[. . . ]-[iš]-šu-[. . . ], 21 : 9.

Marduš-[. . . ]-[iš]-šu-[. . . ], 21 : 9.

Marduš-[. . . ]-[iš]-šu-[. . . ], 21 : 9.

Marduš-[. . . ]-[iš]-šu-[. . . ], 21 : 9.

Marduš-[. . . ]-[iš]-šu-[. . . ], 21 : 9.

Marduš-[. . . ]-[iš]-šu-[. . . ], 21 : 9.

Marduš-[. . . ]-[iš]-šu-[. . . ], 21 : 9.
FROM THE TEMPLE ARCHIVES OF NIPPUX.

MASCULINE NAMES


[Mu]... 60:4.


[NADDIN(=MU)-naḫši (= GEGE.GAL), 59:14.

[Na]-aḫ(or a?)-zi-iš[Marduḫ, 42:12 | 43:8.

[NAMNARI(= SHESH.KI)]iš[Marduḫ, 34:11.


[NIM.GI]-shar (= LUGAL)-di-(= AN)šemšu, 33:1.


[N]-aḫ(-ŠABBU)-iš[Namšuš (= UD)], 1.

[U]-šAG-LUGAL, 1:5 | 18.

[2].-gI-gAl-šum, 27:8.


[iš[PA.KU]. see m iš[Namšuš],

[PA]-iš[SHI]-A.N.GAL-la-mA-rum, wr., "b." of m NIN.nu-št-a, 80:2.

[PI]-[...], wr., 43:1.

[PI]-la-an-daš, 55:5.

[iš[Ramman(= IM)-drinš (= ENGAR)ša, 48:11.

[iš[Ramman(= IM)-rašŠ]-en-šur, 9:12.

[iš[Ramman(= IM)-šar(= LUGAL)-di-(= AN)šemšu, wr., 36:1.

1 Probably to be read either išdin.GEGE.GAL or išdin-naḫši. The latter might be abbreviated from M išIM or NIN.I, etc.—naḫši.

2 See MUG.€.GA.L.

3 NIM.GI is probably to be read Éṭerr, see under Translations, pp. 135f.

4 See also mIN-nu-šIM and cf. Chapter II, p. 15, note 5.

5 See M An-paš-an-dašu.

6 For the pronunciation of iššIM = inšRammān, of. Man-nu-gī-in,iššIM, Chapter III, p. 49, note 1.

7 So in all names beginning with m inššIM.

8 Or m inšSin-shum(= MU)-iqlša(= BA-ša).

9 Or do?

10 See also p. 129.

11 Here the name of a city, cf. inšŠī-ra-ga-mul.

12 Or m Shu-śa-[šab]-Šī-ša-šašī.

13 Does No. 23:1 ["U-šar"] rum belong here? But see p. 94.

14 Cf. B. E., XV, 168:4, ashšu(e).
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Masculine Names

[...] =Shamash (= LUG), wr., 41: 1.
[...] =Sibar (= SIHSH), 22: 17.
See also 45: 7 | 60: 10.

2. Feminine Names.

A[- ...] 78: 8.
Ab-[u]-at-ta-ni, dr. of "Hs-[di-is-ti-i], 78: 6.
Ba(? or Us) ka(? or ku)-[ ... ], 31, 27.
Da-[u]-a, 34: 14(1) 41: 5.
Si=Da-ni-ta, addos, "a," (or "b,"?) of "Hrba-Marduk.
  82: 1, 8.
Di-ni, 4 of "Bi-ia, 85: 10.
E-dii-ir-i, 31: 5.
E-dii-ir-i, 32: 5: 33: 5.
Go-go-da-mi-lum, zamnertu (= LUL), 22: 5.

II. Professional and Gentile Names.

a-bi-ebbi, 86: 24.
ab-la-mi-ti, 31: 25.
a-mes-tu(= PA) "ENGAR, 39: 3.
a-bi-ak-pasu(= SHI), 37: 24.

1 I.e., "E. makes to rejoice."
2 Or [14]=Da-di-ia?
3 Cf. 1Ab-bu-sta-ni-lum, B. E., XV, 185: 11.
4 Here the da is doubtful; it might be also ra, then cf. 1(u)Da-ak-ra TURSAL = "A.D.T.AK, B. E.,
XV, 188: IV: 10.
5 Cf. TURSAL Da-la-la-sha, B. E., XIV, 58: 7. Here probably a "Kosename" which the writer applies to his
6 "sister."
7 A "Kosename."
9 Doubtful whether a nom. pr.
10 But see pp. 25, note 1; 110, note 3.
11 Might expect "La-la-ark, but no trace of rak is visible.
12 So also in all following names.
13 Cf. 1In-di-ak-A-a-ri.
14 See note to Mar-Ta-a-du.
15 Cf. B. E., XV, 154: 26, ab-la-mi-ti (not registered by Clay).
16 Cf. 1Ab-ka-da(?)-a, 54: 11.
17 Or better =ENGAR, i.e., marjabu, see pp. 35, note 3; 127, note 2.
From the Temple Archives of Nippur.

Professional and Gentilic Names


As-ra-pa-us-am, see "Proper Names.

amelu Azag-im, see kudimmu.

amelu-pu-ru (= SHU.GHA), 58:3.

amelu-pa, see amelu-MASH.

bél-pi-gilim, 1= EN.NAM, 24:30; 41:7; bél-bél-ENNAME = pi-ba-li, 92:19, 20.

be-el SHU.BAR, 76:7.

amelu-DAM.MAR, 35:10, 24:85:7, 11.

EN.GAR, see erriku.

EN.NAM, see bél-pi-gilim.

amelu-pri-shu (= EN.GARNAME, 11:10; amelu PA-EN.GAR.

amelu-pri-shu, 39:3. Cf. also erri-shu, 40:10; erri-shu, 40:25 et passim.

GAL, see ùtuk.

amelu-HAR, see šakku.

GUR (= NER), 22:5.

amelu = EN.GAR (= npar-bu), see amelu-nu-EN.GAR.


gu-gal-lum, 27:8.

amelu-GUSHUR.RA.GAL, see = amelu-UR.RA.GAL.

1 See also the address of Nos. 1-74 and cf. Chapter III, p. 35, note 2.
2 Cf. B. E., XV, 162:14, npár-bu 11 SHU.GHA (omitted by Clay).
3 Cf. pu-ara-li, 77:5; pu-gi, 3:41.
4 Doubtful; it may be LUL = zimmert, qv.
5 See introduction to No. 75 under "Translations," p. 133.
6 So clearly here. At this time the bi and NI = šu are very often written alike, cf. e.g., 44:6, šu-di-šu-šu (= 44:9) 9:23, Bu-šú-Ki (ún-mu: the sign looks like bi). See B. E., XV, 174:17, 175:45, URP.AN NI (so Clay, Z.A., XX (1907), p. 417f.) BI, which, when compared with I.Š., 84:5, USR-šušu (= PA)-te-su, has to be read against Clay, i.e., p. 415f. KALU (= USR-šušu) (PA) (PA-NI is, of course, the same as the USR-šušu, not bi-gal-ba-ta-šu of Schöll, Texte Älam. Sum., 1, pl. 20 (opp. p. 96), 2.

7 Šu omitted by scribe. Cf. B. E., XIV, 164:2, ŠU-BI-bi!-gal-ba-ta-šu (not registered by Clay).
9 Cf. DiKanduri in B. E., XIV, XV, and see Chapter IV, pp. 70f.
10 See p. 47, note 1.
11 Doubtful; might be a nasa. pr.: U-R.ŠU-ŠU.
12 See also Nis-šu-šu-šu.
13 Or DiK-andur-ma.
LETTERS TO CASSITE KINGS

Professional and Gentile Names

ŠAR, see ummânî.
pi-iḫ-ḫi-ru-š,5 55 : 5; TUR.TURmesh 55 : 2, 4, 10, 18, 24.
sù du₂-dù šu-šu₂-du₂-i₂₂-du₂₂,1 13 : 0.
ammuŠA KUD.DA, see maktu₂₂.
shakin( = GAR)m₄ d( = NE)₄₄, 9 : 16.
ammušakini( = GAR)m₄, 28 : 18; šu₂-ak-na, 65 : 4.
ammuŠAH(? or RA).KU₄₄, 50 : 15.
shu₂₂₂₂₂₂( = SHA(G).TAMm)₅₅, 35 : 33 | 39 : 3 (?); ammušAG(G).TAMm, 21 : 4 | 54 : 25; i₂₂₂₂₂₂ SHA(G).TAM-mi, 27 : 15.
ammušAH₁₂₄, see bê₂₂₂₂₂₂.
TUR.TURmesh, see pi-iḫ-ḫi-ru-š.
UD.DI.TA₁₂₄, 37 : 10.
ammušUR.RAGA₂₂₂, 23 : 11.
ammušŠUR.BAR, see ammušŠUR.paru₁₂₂.
ammušZADIM, see ammušZADIM.₁₂₂
zammerti( = LUL)m₄₂₂, 22 : 5.

1 See Chapter III, p. 36, note 7.
2 See also mihša₂₂₂₂₂₂.
3 Cf., however, pp. 123, note 10, and 49, note 3 .
4 See Chapter III, p. 37, note 12.
5 For this TI cf. also B, E, XV, 95 : 3, dom-šar TI, read by Chay, i.e., p. 51b, NIN.LIL-ti.
6 See p. 51, note 3.
7 Here the same as the muškipi₂₂₂ of the Šam, Letters.
8 Here, however, a permansive.
9 For LU = dub₂₂₂.
10 See p. 35, note 3.
11 Doubtful whether an official. Cf. here the ud-di₂₂₂₂₂₂ = KI, K, 2857, 27, 28 (= B, A, V, p. 533), hence not the title of an official, but a part (the lower?) of mihša₂₂₂₂₂₂?
12 See p. 35, note 1.
13 See p. 97, note 9.
14 Doubtful, might be GIR( = NER).
III. NAMES OF PLACES.

1 Here the is, no doubt, left out by the scribe.
2 Or. *Ardu-Belû.
3 Identical with the city TE, E. B. H., p. 95, note 1?
4 Or da.
5 Hardly ëlu-tak-tak.
6 See p. 9, note 2.
7 Cf. Chapter I, p. 11, note 1.
8 Or *Shamash-tak-tak.
9 Or ëlu-aššu-ma-na.
10 See p. 49, note 1.
11 Or *Uruk-ki?

1 Here the is, no doubt, left out by the scribe.
2 Or. *Ardu-Belû.
3 Identical with the city TE, E. B. H., p. 95, note 1?
4 Or da.
5 Hardly ëlu-tak-tak.
6 See p. 9, note 2.
7 Cf. Chapter I, p. 11, note 1.
8 Or *Shamash-tak-tak.
9 Or ëlu-aššu-ma-na.
10 See p. 49, note 1.
11 Or *Uruk-ki?

from the Temple Archives of Nippur, 153
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Names of Places

\(\text{alU} \text{Nippar} (= \text{EN.LIL})^6, \) 38 : 3 | 89 : 21; \(\text{EN.LIL}^6,\)
83 : 8 | 86 : 7 | 95 : 17. Cf. shur-\(\text{at}^6 \text{alU} \text{NIPPAR}^6,\)
38 : 3; \(\text{mad} \text{a'mash} \) \(\text{EN-LIL}^6, \) see "Professional
and Gentile Names."

\(\text{alU} \text{Pa-\text{an}-\text{Bu}-\text{l}^6,} \) 23 : 31.
\(\text{Pa-bu-l}^6, \) 6 : 5.
\(\text{Pa-bu-l}^6, \) 18 : 34.
\(\text{Pa-bu-l}^6, \) 53 : 38.
\(\text{alU} \text{Pa-bu-l}^6, \) 72 : 14.
\(\text{alU} \text{Ru-a-na-a}^6, \) 40 : 22.
\(\text{alU} \text{SAL.TU.KI^6,} \) 96 : 11.
\(\text{alU} \text{SIPPAR}^6, \) 89 : 24, 26.
\(\text{alU} \text{Shamash}^6, \) 16 : 8, 12.
\(\text{alU} \text{Shi-tu-na-l}^6, \) 83 : 15.
\(\text{alU} \text{Shi-tu-na-l}^6, \) 27 : 4.

IV. Names of Gates.

\(\text{ab} \text{U} \text{la-l}^6, \) 24 : 31; \(\text{K.A.GAL,} \) 66 : 24.
\(\text{ab} \text{U} \text{la-l}^6, \) 24 : 24.
\(\text{Ab} \text{U} \text{la-l}^6, \) 9 : 19.
\(\text{Ab} \text{U} \text{la-l}^6, \) 27 : 43; \(\text{Ab} \text{U} \text{la-l}^6, \) 35 : 15.

V. Names of Houses and Temples.

\(\text{Ab} \text{U} \text{la-l}^6, \) 36 : 37 | 23 : 66 : 27, 28.
\(\text{E.AN}^6, \) 57 : 19, 21 : 93 : 6; \(\text{E.AN}^6, \) 35 : 15.

\(^1\) Cf. B. E., XV, 128 : 8. \(\text{alU} \text{Pa-\text{an}-\text{Bu-l}^6,} \) thus to be read instead of \(\text{alU} \text{Pa-\text{an}-\text{Bu-l}^6,} \) Clay, i.e., p. 53a?

\(^2\) For pronunciation see ir., List, No. 6900.

\(^3\) Cf. P-i-n-a-ca-r, B. E., XIV, p. 59b.

\(^4\) Or Ru-bu-la?

\(^5\) Cf. \(\text{ الخدمات Ra-\text{U} \text{la-l}^6,} \) Clay.

\(^6\) Or Ru-bu-la?

\(^7\) Cf. \(\text{ الخدمات Ra-\text{U} \text{la-l}^6,} \) Clay.

\(^8\) See p. 10, note 3.

\(^9\) See Chapter IV, pp. 86ff.
VI. Names of Rivers and Canals.

\[\text{Namgar} \Leftrightarrow \text{Kur gal} \]
\[\text{Nam-ga-ra, B.KUR.GAL, } \]
\[\text{bit-ilu, see B.AN.} \]
\[\text{bit-mu} \text{[ah(NAD), } \]
\[\text{23 : 14}] \text{[ah} \]
\[\text{Kish Shir(NA)GAL, see Masculine Names.} \]
\[\text{KUR(mek), } \]
\[\text{66 : 23 ; } \text{KUR, see Tuk-kul-ti-} \text{KUR ki} \]
\[\text{and } \text{KUR KAL, see } \text{KUR GAL.} \]
\[\text{LUGAL, see bit sharri.} \]
\[\text{MAR.TU, 73a : 3.} \]
\[\text{Nergal(?)}, 54 : 20.} \]
\[\text{E.SALAZAG, 91 : 7.} \]
\[\text{Ku-lul-di, } \]
\[\text{ku-lul-di, } 23 : 8 ; \text{ku-lul nan-ku-di, } 23 : 13.} \]
\[\text{Parakh( = BAR) } \text{[ah} \]
\[\text{En-lil, 66 : 770 : 1.} \]

VII. Names of Gods.

\[\text{Amar, see DINGIR.RA; } \text{AN-}, \]
\[\text{an-un-} \text{[ah} \]
\[\text{Amar ud, see } \text{Mar ud.} \]
\[\text{AN(= AN), see } \text{AN} \]
\[\text{and AN GAL, } 89 : 4 ; \text{Pan-ANGAL-ta-mur.} \]
\[\text{AN.RA, see DINGIR.RA.} \]

1 See pp. 78f.
2 Hence "the Tigris of Nippur" is "the Tigris of the god(!) of Nippur," in other words, "the god of Nippur." Cf. also AN(= An)-Nippat(= R.LIL)=, B. E., XV, 128 : 14, and see p. 80.
3 Or Kud?
4 Clay, B. E., XIV, p. 7, says that the me-e Nam Na-dri-ah occur also on C. B. M. 3227; but this apparently is a mistake, as the tablet referred to has been published by Clay in B. E., XIV, 149 (see l.c., p. 72). Read c.e., C. B. M. 3134, instead of C. B. M. 3227.
5 Here dår looks like si-ši, while in 71 : 15 it has the appearance of si + sa= ( =sō).}
6 Cf. also 68 s.
7 See Delitzes, H. W. B., p. 555a.
8 Cf. Tuk(= KU)-kul-ti-\text{KUR ki, } 39 : 5.
9 Chief god of Dår-iliš; see Chapter II, p. 19, note 3, and cf. tia KAL.IDI.
Names of Gods

\[ \text{EN.GU} = 89 \times 4. \]
\[ \text{IN.GI-\text{\texttt{e}}} \text{\text{\texttt{r}}} \text{\text{\texttt{r}}} \text{\text{\texttt{r}}} \text{\text{\texttt{r}}} \text{\text{\texttt{r}}} \text{\text{\texttt{r}}} \text{\text{\texttt{r}}} \text{\text{\texttt{r}}} \text{\text{\texttt{r}}} \text{\text{\texttt{r}}} \text{\text{\texttt{r}}} \text{\text{\texttt{r}}} \text{\text{\texttt{r}}} \text{\text{\texttt{r}}} \text{\text{\texttt{r}}} \text{\text{\texttt{r}}} \text{\text{\texttt{r}}} \text{\text{\texttt{r}}} \text{\text{\texttt{r}}} \]
FROM THE TEMPLE ARCHIVES OF NIPPUR.

Names of Gods

**SUGH**, see **Tishedu.**

**Sakai**, see **Sakai.**

**Shamash** (—UD), 33: 25, 29 | 41: 1 | 81: 4; **Shamash**, see also **LUGH**; **PAP.**

**Sharraz**, see **Nippar** (—EN.LIL), 38: 3.

**SHESH.KI**, see **Nanjar.**

**Shi-pah**, see **Shi-pah.**

**Shu-qb-su**, see **Shu-qb-su.**

**Sim** (==PA.KU), see also **Sim.**

**Ska-rat-Niur**, see **EN.LIL.**

**Sukia(==PAP)**, see **Sukia.**


**USH**, see also **USH.**

---

1 See Chapter III, p. 39, note 1.
3 For this **qi-ir**, which proves that **IM** was pronounced **Ramman**, see Chapter III, p. 49, note 1.
4 Husband of **GU**; see Chapter II, p. 21.
### VII.

**DESCRIPTION OF TABLETS.**

---

#### Abbreviations.

- c., circa; C. B. M., Catalogue of the Babylonian Museum, University of Pennsylvania, prepared by the Editor, Prof. Dr. H. V. Hilprecht; **cf.**, confer; **Exp.**, Expedition; **f.**, following page; **ff.**, following pages; **fragm.**, fragment(s); **inscr.**, inscription; **L. E.**, Left Edge; **L.**, line(s); **Lo. E.**, Lower Edge; **No(s).**, Numbers; **O.**, Obverse; **p.**, page; **pp.**, pages; **R.**, Reverse; **R. E.**, Right Edge; **U. E.**, Upper Edge; **Vol.**, Volume.

Measurements are given in centimetres, width × length (height) × thickness. Whenever the tablet (or fragment) varies in size, the largest measurement is given. The Roman numbers under “description” indicate the several expeditions: I = first; II = second; III = third; IV = fourth expedition.

#### A. Autograph Reproductions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text. Plate.</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>Age.</th>
<th>C. B. M.</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 1</td>
<td>&quot;My Lord&quot; (a-na be-lu-a)</td>
<td><strong>Ab-idulma</strong>, Kuri-Galul,</td>
<td>about 1420 B.C.</td>
<td>11716</td>
<td>Baked. Light brown. Left part of R, and right lower corner broken off. 4 × 5.8 × 2. Inscr. 11 (O.) + 12 (R.) = 23 li. <strong>II.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 1</td>
<td>&quot;<strong>A-lu-Da-ni</strong>.</td>
<td>Kuri-Galul,</td>
<td>about 1400 B.C.</td>
<td>10830</td>
<td>Baked. Ruled. Light brown with occasional dark spots. Left part and lower half of tablet broken off. 4.5 × 4.5 × 2.6. Inscr. 7 (O.) + 4 (R.) = 11 li. <strong>III.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 4</td>
<td>&quot;<strong>A-na-li-rum-ma</strong>.</td>
<td>About 1400 B.C.</td>
<td>3669</td>
<td>Unbaked. Light brown. Lower part of tablet broken off. 4.5 × 6.5 × 2. Inscr. 9 (O.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEXT.</td>
<td>PLATE.</td>
<td>Tc</td>
<td>FROM</td>
<td>AGE.</td>
<td>C.B.M.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 5</td>
<td>&quot;My Lord&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;Ardi-Bēlātu.</td>
<td>Kuri-Gallu,</td>
<td>about 1400 B.C.</td>
<td>11149</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 6 6 | "| "Ardi-

Marduk. | Kuri-Gallu, | about 1400 B.C. | 12559 | Unbaked. Light brown. Ruled. Beginning and end of lines crumbled away. Lower part broken away. R. razed off. 7.5 × 8 × 2.7. Inscr. 9 li. II. |
| 10 8 | "| [... (nu)] Marduk. | Kuri-Gallu, | about 1380 B.C. | 3837 | Unbaked. Light brown. Ruled. Left half and lower part of tablet broken away. Remainder of R. not inscribed. 5.2 × 4.5 × 3. Inscr. 7 (O.) + 2 (R.) = 9 li. III. |
| 11 9 | "| "Be-ia-nu. | Kudur-Enlīi, | about 1335 B.C. | 19781 | Unbaked. Light brown, R. darker. O. crumbling and greatly obliterated. 4.8 × 7.3 × 2.2. Inscr. 14 (O.) + 2 (Lo. E.) + 14 (R.) + 1 (U. E.) = 31 li. IV. |
| 12 10 | "| "Ešur-ši-šu-Marduk. | About 1350 B.C. | 11929 | Baked. Light brown. Ruled. Beginning of lines on O. broken away. 4.5 × 7 ×
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text. Plate</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>C.B.M.</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13 11</td>
<td>&quot;My Lord&quot; (a-na be-li-la)</td>
<td>m\textit{Er-ba}-\text{\textit{a}}-\textit{Mar}d\textit{u}k, Shagarakti-Shurias,</td>
<td>about 1325 B.C.</td>
<td></td>
<td>10804 Unbaked. Light brown. Cracked. O. and R. dotted with dark spots. Lower part of tablet broken away. Lower part of R. not inscribed. 5 × 5.2 × 3. Inscr. 11 (O.) + 7 (R.) = 18 li. III.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 11</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>m\textit{Er-ba-am}-\text{\textit{a}}-\textit{Mar}d\textit{u}k, Shagarakti-Shurias,</td>
<td>about 1325 B.C.</td>
<td></td>
<td>11637 Baked. Dark brown. Lower half of tablet broken away. 4.5 × 3.8 × 2. Inscr. 9 (O.) + 8 (R.) + 3 (U. E.) + 1 (L. E.) = 21 li. II.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 12</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>m\textit{Si}\textit{Err}ish(\textit{\textit{a}})-\textit{\textit{z}}-\textit{ib}-\textit{ni}, Burna-Buriash,</td>
<td>about 1430 B.C.</td>
<td></td>
<td>10571 Baked. Light brown. Crumbling. Cracked. Beginning of lines and lower part of tablet broken away. 6 × 4.5 × 2.5. Inscr. 8 (O.) + 8 (R.) + 3 (U. E.) − 19 li. III.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 12</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>m\textit{Si}\textit{Err}ish(\textit{\textit{a}})-\textit{\textit{z}}-\textit{ib}-\textit{ni}, Burna-Buriash,</td>
<td>about 1430 B.C.</td>
<td></td>
<td>10961 Unbaked. Dark. Ruled. Badly effaced. Upper right and lower left corners broken away. Only upper part of R. inscribed. 5.8 × 9.5 × 2.5. Inscr. 15 (O.) + 3 (R.) = 18 li. II.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 13</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>m\textit{Si}\textit{Err}ish(\textit{\textit{a}})-\textit{\textit{G}}A\textit{BU}-\text{\textit{u}}\textit{m}\text{\textit{e}}\textit{sh}.</td>
<td>About 1350 B.C.</td>
<td></td>
<td>19760 Baked. Light brown. Very small script. The end of nearly all lines is broken away. Lower part of R. not inscribed. 4.3 × 6.7 × 2. Inscr. 20 (O.) + 2 (Lo. E.) + 14 (R.) = 36 li. IV.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 14</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>About 1350 B.C.</td>
<td></td>
<td>3655 Baked. Light brown. Most of O. and left part of R. broken away. 6 × 11.5 × 2.8. Inscr. 15 (O.) + 25 (R.) + 1 (U. E.) = 41 li. II.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 14</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>m\textit{L}b-\text{\textit{n}i}-\text{\textit{a}}-\textit{Mar}d\textit{u}k, Kudur-\text{\textit{E}}\text{\textit{n}}\text{\textit{u}}\text{\textit{l}}.</td>
<td>about 1335 B.C.</td>
<td></td>
<td>19787 Unbaked. Light brown. Ruled. Crumbling. Lower part of tablet broken away. Only upper part of R. inscribed. 4.3 × 6.8 × 2. Inscr. 12 (O.) + 1 (R.) = 13 li. IV.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEXT/PLATE.</td>
<td>TO</td>
<td>FROM</td>
<td>AGE.</td>
<td>G.B.M.</td>
<td>DESCRIPTION.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 15</td>
<td>&quot;My Lord&quot;</td>
<td>*Idin-*Errish(f).</td>
<td>Nasir-Maruttash, about 1375 B.C.</td>
<td>19798</td>
<td>Unbaked. Light. Lower part of tablet broken away. R. mostly crumbled off. 5.8 ( \times ) 6.3 ( \times ) 2.4. Inscr. 13 (O.) + 13 (R.) + 3 (U. E.) = 29 li. IV.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 16</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td><em>Hu-MU.TUK.Arīma</em></td>
<td>Kadašman-Entil, about 1345 B.C.</td>
<td>10806</td>
<td>Unbaked. Light brown. Lower right part of tablet broken off. 5.3 ( \times ) 8.4 ( \times ) 2.3. Inscr. 14 (O.) + 16 (R.) + 1 (U. E.) + 2 (L. E.) = 33 li. III.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 16</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>*Im-gu-tum.</td>
<td>Burna-Buriash, about 1430 B.C.</td>
<td>11101</td>
<td>Baked. Dark brown. Ruled. Lower left corner broken away. Lower part of R. not inscribed. 5.5 ( \times ) 7.5 ( \times ) 2. Inscr. 14 (O.) + 4 (R.) = 18 li. II.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 19</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>*Kali-*NIN.DIN.</td>
<td>DUGGA.</td>
<td>11096</td>
<td>Unbaked. Light brown. Left part and lower half of tablet broken away. Cracked. Glued together. R. crumbling and greatly mutilated. 6.2 ( \times ) 5 ( \times ) 2.5. Inscr. 8 (O.) + 4 (R.) + 4 (U. E.) = 16 li. II.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 19</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>*Ku-du-ra-nu.</td>
<td>Kadašman-Targu, about 1380 B.C.</td>
<td>19785</td>
<td>Baked. Dark brown. Lower half of tablet broken away. 6.2 ( \times ) 6 ( \times ) 2.6. Inscr. 9 (O.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text. Plate.</td>
<td>To</td>
<td>From</td>
<td>Age.</td>
<td>C.B.M.</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>&quot;My Lord&quot; (u-na be-li-ia)</td>
<td><em>Ku-da-ra-ri</em></td>
<td>12633</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Baked. Dark. Glued together. Upper and lower corners broken away. 6.5 × 10.5 × 2.5. Inscr. 20 (O.) + 4 (Lo. E.) + 20 (R.) = 44 li. II.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>&quot;<em>Marduk-nu-[shul]-lim</em></td>
<td><em>Kuri-Galen</em></td>
<td>11956</td>
<td>Unbaked. Light brown. Upper left corner broken away. 4 × 5 × 2. Inscr. 9 (O.) + 1 (Lo. E.) + 8 (R.) = 18 li. II. Translation, pp. 106ff.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>&quot;<em>Mush-hu-lim</em></td>
<td><em>Burna-Burash</em></td>
<td>11098</td>
<td>Unbaked. Light brown. Ruled. Crumbling. Cracked. O. partly covered with silica. R. upper left and lower right corners crumbled away. 6.8 × 12.4 × 3. Inscr. 19 (O.) + 21 (R.) + 1 (U. E.) = 41 li. II.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>&quot;<em>Mush-ki-lim</em></td>
<td><em>Burna-Burash</em></td>
<td>11497</td>
<td>Baked. Light brown. Ruled. Beginning and end of lines on O., lower part of tablet and nearly the whole of R. broken away. Lower part of R. not inscribed. 5.5 × 9.3 × 2.7. Inscr. 14 (O.) + 7 (R.) = 21 li. II.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text. Plate.</td>
<td>To</td>
<td>From</td>
<td>Age.</td>
<td>C.B.M.</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35a 26</td>
<td>&quot;My Lord&quot;</td>
<td>m.NIM.GI-shar-igmesh</td>
<td>About 1400 B.C.</td>
<td>6123</td>
<td>Unbaked. Light brown. Occasional dark spots on O. and R. Cracked. Signs on some places clipped off; otherwise well preserved. 5 × 7.2 × 2.2. Inser. 17: (O.) + 18 (B.) + 2 (U. E.) = 37 li. III. Translation, pp. 135ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 27</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>m.Ki-sha-ab-ir-ut</td>
<td>Kudashman-Targu, about 1355 B.C.</td>
<td>6058</td>
<td>Baked. Dark. Upper right and lower left corner broken away. 5.2 × 9.5 × 2.3. Inser. 21 (O.) + 21 (L. E.) + 3 (U. E.) + 1 (L. E.) = 36 li. II.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 20</td>
<td>[m šia]Ramun-šar-gimash</td>
<td>Kudashman-Targu, about 1350 B.C.</td>
<td>10900</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unbaked. Light brown. Only upper right corner of O. preserved, rest broken away. On R., is only a part of sign $e$ (?) visible. 3 × 3.3 × 2. Inser. 6 li. III.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 29</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>m.Sin-bar-bi-esh-me</td>
<td>Burna-Burûš</td>
<td>19783</td>
<td>Baked. Dark brown. R. cracked and lower right corner clipped off. Lower part of R. not inscribed. 5.5 × 9.5 × 3. Inser. 16 (O.) + 10 (R.) = 26 li. IV.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38 30</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>m.Shi-rî-qaš-mu</td>
<td>Kuri-Galu, about 1400 B.C.</td>
<td>10955</td>
<td>Baked. Light brown. Lower part and right upper corner of tablet broken away. 6 × 6 × 2.5. Inser. 11 (O.) + 9 (R.) + 1 (U. E.) = 21 li. II. Translation, pp. 140ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEXT. PLATE.</td>
<td>TO</td>
<td>FROM</td>
<td>AGE</td>
<td>C.R.M.</td>
<td>DESCRIPTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>&quot;My Lord!&quot;</td>
<td>Kudur-Enlil, about 1335 B.C.</td>
<td>5134</td>
<td>Baked, Dark. Cracked. Glued together. Lower half of R. not inscribed. 5.5 × 9.3 × 2.5. Inscr. 17 (O.) + 1 (Lo. E.) + 8 (R.) = 26 li. III. Translation, pp. 120ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>&quot;ţa.Jawāna of Dār-Sukal-</td>
<td>Kudur-Enlil, about 1335 B.C.</td>
<td>11408</td>
<td>Unbaked. Light brown. Lower half of tablet broken away. First line and some signs of R. chipped off. 5 × 6 × 2.5. Inscr. 10 (O.) + 11 (R.) + 2 (L.E) = 26 li. II.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>&quot;P(?)&quot;</td>
<td>About 1350 B.C.</td>
<td>19779</td>
<td>Unbaked. Light brown. O. has large black spot. Crumbling. End of lines on O. covered with silica. Lower part of R. not inscribed. Line at end of R. 5 × 7.2 × 2.3. Inscr. 13 (O.) + 4 (R.) = 17 li. IV.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>About 1350 B.C.</td>
<td>10952</td>
<td>Unbaked. Grayish brown. O. has occasional black spots. End of first two lines on O. broken off. 4.3 × 5.7 × 2. Inscr. 9 (O.) + 9 (R.) = 18 li. II.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text. Plate.</td>
<td>To</td>
<td>From</td>
<td>Age.</td>
<td>C.B.M.</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48 38</td>
<td>&quot;My Lord&quot; (a-na be-lia)</td>
<td>Kudur-Enlil</td>
<td>11809</td>
<td>Unbaked. Light brown.</td>
<td>Upper part of tablet broken away. Line after inscription on Lo. E. $5.7 \times 7.4 \times 2.3$. Inscr. 12 (O.) + 11 (R.) = 23 li. III.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49 38</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Nazi-Maruitash</td>
<td>1380</td>
<td>Unbaked. Light brown.</td>
<td>First two lines broken away. Cracked. Right upper corner of R. chipped off. 4.5 $\times$ 5.8 $\times$ 2. Inscr. 15 (O.) + 15 (R.) = 30 li. II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 39</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Kuri-Galen</td>
<td>1400</td>
<td>Baked. O. dark. R. light brown.</td>
<td>Unbaked. Light brown. Left and right side and lower part of tablet broken away. Line after O. 1.12 and at end of inscription. Greatly mutilated. Lower part of R. not inscribed. 6.2 $\times$ 8.5 $\times$ 2.5. Inscr. 13 (O.) + 5 (R.) = 18 li. II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>1350</td>
<td>Unbaked. Light brown.</td>
<td>About 1350 B.C. 10510 Unbaked. Light brown. Ruled. Crumbling. End of all lines broken away. 4.5 $\times$ 8 $\times$ 2.5. Inscr. 12 (O.) + 9 (R.) = 21 li. III.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text. Place.</td>
<td>To</td>
<td>From</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>C.R.M.</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>42 &quot;My Lord&quot; (a-na ba-Il-ia)</td>
<td>About 1350 B.C.</td>
<td>11654</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unbaked. O. light, R. dark. Upper part, left side, and lower half of tablet broken away. R. covered with silica. 5 × 5.5 × 2.6. Inscr. 14 (O.) + 12 (R.) = 26 li. II.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>42 &quot; (?)</td>
<td>Burna-Buriash, about 1440 B.C.</td>
<td>10497</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unbaked. Light. Upper half broken away. 7.8 × 5.9 × 3. Inscr. 10 (O.) + 2 (I.o. E.) + 12 (Rt.) = 24 li. III. Translation, pp. 51ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>43 &quot;</td>
<td>Kuri-Galzu, about 1400 B.C.</td>
<td>10622</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unbaked. Light brown. Ruled. Cracked. Crumbling. Upper half broken away. 7 × 5 × 2.5. Inscr. 7 (O.) + 7 (R.) = 14 li. III.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>43 &quot;</td>
<td>About 1350 B.C.</td>
<td>3668</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unbaked. Dark brown, R. dark. Upper part and left lower corner broken away. 5.4 × 5.3 × 2.5. Inscr. 11 (O.) + 11 (R.) = 22 li. II.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>44 &quot;</td>
<td>Shagaraki-Shuriash, about 1320 B.C.</td>
<td>19380</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unbaked. Dark brown. Ruled. Cracked. Upper and lower part as well as whole of O. broken away. End of lines missing. - 5.5 × 3 × 2.5. Inscr. 13 li. IV.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>44 &quot;</td>
<td>Kadashman-Enil, about 1340 B.C.</td>
<td>11703</td>
<td></td>
<td>Baked. Dark brown. O. completely crumbled away. R. covered with silica. 5.5 × 9.3 × 2.4. Inscr. 3 (I.o. E.) + 16 (R.) = 19 li. II.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59a</td>
<td>45 &quot;</td>
<td>Burna-Buriash, about 1430 B.C.</td>
<td>10919</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unbaked. Light brown. Cracked. Greatly mutilated. Upper part broken away. 5.3 × 3.8 × 2.3. Inscr. 6 (O.) + 3 (I.o. E.) + 8 (R.) = 17 li. III.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>45 &quot;</td>
<td>About 1350 B.C.</td>
<td>10914</td>
<td></td>
<td>Baked. Light brown. Ruled. Lower part and end of li. broken away. Temple Record with postscript in form of letter, cf. No. 61. 8 × 3 × 2.5. Inscr. 6 (O.) + 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text. Plate</td>
<td>To</td>
<td>From</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>C.B.M.</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60a</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>“My Lord” (?)</td>
<td></td>
<td>About 1350 B.C.</td>
<td>3694 Baked. Light brown. Left side and upper part of R. broken away. Line after 1. 1. Cloth impression at right lower corner of O. hence strictly speaking no text(?). 5 x 7 x 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>“</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12634 Baked. Brown. O. and upper part of R. broken away. Postscript, cf. No. 60. Lower part of R. not inscribed. 7 x 13 x 2.7. Inscr. 8 li. II.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>“</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10878 Baked. Light brown. Fragm. of right lower middle part of larger tablet. 5.2 x 6 x 4.2. Inscr. 12 (O.) + 8 (R.) = 20 li. III.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>“</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10931 Unbaked. Brown. Fragm. of larger tablet. Dark. Ruled. R. completely broken away. 5.5 x 3.7 x 1.5. Inscr. 7 li. III.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>“</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10935 Unbaked. Light brown. Crumbling. R. broken away. Fragm. of larger tablet. 3.5 x 4.7 x 1.8. Inscr. 10 li. III.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>Sagarakti-Shuripal, about 1320 B.C.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10954 Baked. Dark brown on O., light brown on R. Upper and lower part of tablet broken away. End of lines missing. Crumbling and greatly mutilated. 6 x 6.5 x 2.7. Inscr. 14 (O.) + 11 (R.) = 26 li. II.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>Kishur-Endil, about 1339 B.C.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11926 Unbaked. Dark brown. Upper and lower part of tablet broken away. End of lines missing. Part of larger tablet. Cf. No. 70. 8.5 x 8 x 3. Inscr. 15 (O.) + 17 (R.) = 32 li. II.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>“</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11999 Unbaked. Fragm. (lower right part) of larger tablet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text. Plate.</td>
<td>To</td>
<td>From</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>C.B.M.</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68 50</td>
<td>&quot;My Lord&quot; (a-na be-li-in)</td>
<td>Kudur-Enlil</td>
<td>about 1339 B.C.</td>
<td>11946 Unbaked. O. dark, R. light brown. Upper, lower, and right part of tablet broken away. Inscription on L. E. in two columns, Cf. No. 69, 8 × 8.5 × 4. Inscr. 17 (O.) + 13 (R.) = 30 li. II.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69 51</td>
<td>&quot;&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;&quot;</td>
<td>10621 Unbaked. Light brown. Fragm. (left lower part) of larger tablet. R. completely broken away. Cf. No. 68, 4 × 4.6 × 2.2. Inscr. 9 (O.) + 1 (L. E.) = 10 li. III.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71 51</td>
<td>&quot;&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;&quot;</td>
<td>10922 Unbaked. Light brown. Fragm. (right lower part) of larger tablet. Rulled. 4.5 × 5.5 × 3.8. Inscr. 10 (O.) + 8 (R.) = 18 li. III.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72 52</td>
<td>&quot;&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;&quot;</td>
<td>10858 Unbaked. Light brown. Crumbling. Occasional dark spots on O. and R. Upper part and end of lines broken away. 4.8 × 5.5 × 2.2. Inscr. 9 (O.) + 10 (R.) = 19 li. III.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73 52</td>
<td>&quot;&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;&quot;</td>
<td>10938 Unbaked. Light brown. Cracked. Fragm. (upper middle part) of larger tablet. Greatly mutilated. 3.8 × 5 × 2.3. Inscr. 8 (O.) + 10 (R.) + 2 (U. E.) = 20 li. III.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>734 53</td>
<td>&quot;&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;&quot;</td>
<td>10853 Unbaked. Dark brown.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Text.</td>
<td>Plate</td>
<td>To</td>
<td>From</td>
<td>Age.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
<td>54</td>
<td>&quot;Amel-$\text{é}$-Marduk.</td>
<td>&quot;The King&quot; (LUGAL) Shagarkiti-Shu-Ash, 12582</td>
<td>1325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td></td>
<td>55</td>
<td>&quot;Son.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;Father.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td></td>
<td>55</td>
<td>$m\text{š}u\text{šu}-\text{šu}$-li [biš-maš-tu]-šu].</td>
<td>$m\text{š}u\text{šu}$-ša-il-shum-šu.</td>
<td>1360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
<td>56</td>
<td>$m\text{š}u\text{šu}$-ša-il-šu.</td>
<td>$m\text{š}u$-ša-il-di-šu.</td>
<td>1430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td></td>
<td>56</td>
<td>$m\text{š}u\text{šu}$-ša-il-šu.</td>
<td>$m\text{š}u$-ša-il-di-[šu].</td>
<td>1430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
<td>57</td>
<td>$m\text{š}u\text{šu}$-ša-il-šu.</td>
<td>$m\text{š}u$-ša-il-su-kun-apal.</td>
<td>1350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td></td>
<td>57</td>
<td>$m\text{š}u\text{šu}$-ša-il-šu.</td>
<td>$m\text{š}u$-ša-il-su-kun-apal.</td>
<td>1335</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### References

1. Translation, pp. 132ff.
2. Translation, pp. 143ff.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text. Plate.</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>C.R.M.</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>82 57</td>
<td>Da-ni-ti-ia.</td>
<td>ĚErba-li-Marduk.</td>
<td>Shagerash-Sharrish, about 1325 B.C.</td>
<td>broken away. 4.5 × 5 × 2.3. Inscr. 10 (O.) + 10 (R.) = 20 li. II.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83 58</td>
<td>In-na-an-ni.</td>
<td>ĚErish(is) = MASH - Kuri-Galzu, apal-idлина.</td>
<td>Kuri-Galzu, about 1400 B.C.</td>
<td>Unbaked. Dark brown. Greatly mutilated. O. left lower corner broken away. R. completely crumbled off. 3.7 × 5.1 × 1.7. Inscr. 10 li. II.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84 59</td>
<td>In-na-an-ni.</td>
<td>ĚErish(is) = MASH - Kuri-Galzu, apal-idлина.</td>
<td>Kuri-Galzu, about 1400 B.C.</td>
<td>Baked. Light brown. Occasional black spots on O. Part of right side of O. and upper right corner of R. chipped off. Otherwise well preserved. Line after l. 2 and at end of O. 5.5 × 9.5 × 2.2. Inscr. 18 (O.) + 19 (R.) = 37 li. II. Translation, pp. 110ff.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86 60</td>
<td>In-bi-Ai-ri.</td>
<td>Kuri-Galzu,</td>
<td>Kuri-Galzu, about 1400 B.C.</td>
<td>Baked. Light brown. Lower part of tablet broken away. 4.8 × 5.8 × 2.3. Inscr. 13 (O.) + 11 (R.) + 3 (U. E.) + 4 (L. E.) = 31 li. II. Translation, pp. 115ff.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87 61</td>
<td>In-šu-li-šu.</td>
<td>ĚGuza-ar-AN.</td>
<td>About 1350 B.C.</td>
<td>Unbaked. O. light brown. R. darker. Occasional black spots. Lower part of tablet broken away. 5.5 × 6 × 2. Inscr. 11 (O.) + 9 (R.) + 3 (U. E.) + 2 (L. E.) = 25 li. II.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEXT.</td>
<td>PLATE.</td>
<td>TO</td>
<td>FROM</td>
<td>AGE.</td>
<td>C.B.M.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>&quot;Sin-ērišēkā.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>About 1350 B.C.</td>
<td>19799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>&quot;I-nā-qīs-ili-a-[lak].&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;DAR HU-nār-gab-ē.&quot;</td>
<td>About 1350 B.C.</td>
<td>19786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>&quot;Ur-ri-lat.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>About 1350 B.C.</td>
<td>19784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>About 1350 B.C.</td>
<td>3665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>&quot; &quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>&quot; &quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10775</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B. PHOTOGRAPHIC (HALF-TONE) REPRODUCTIONS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEXT. PLATE.</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>C.B.M.</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>O. of a letter from Amel-Marduk to the &quot;Lord.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>11426</td>
<td>Cf. description of text No. 3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>IX</td>
<td>R. of a letter from Amel-Marduk to the &quot;Lord.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>11426</td>
<td>Cf. description of text No. 3.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FROM THE TEMPLE ARCHIVES OF NIPPUR.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text.</th>
<th>Plate.</th>
<th>C. B. M.</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22, 23</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>10783</td>
<td>Cf. description of text No. 37.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24, 25</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>5134</td>
<td>Cf. description of text No. 40.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>XI</td>
<td>10560</td>
<td>Cf. description of text No. 52.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>XI</td>
<td>11101</td>
<td>Cf. description of text No. 22.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>XI</td>
<td>3660</td>
<td>Cf. description of text No. 76.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29, 30</td>
<td>XII</td>
<td>3315</td>
<td>Cf. description of text No. 83.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31, 32</td>
<td>XII</td>
<td>3258</td>
<td>Cf. description of text No. 84.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. Numbers of the Catalogue of the Babylonian Museum (Prepared by Prof. Dr. H. V. Hilprecht).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10930</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3206</td>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
<td>10382</td>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
<td>10931</td>
<td></td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3238</td>
<td></td>
<td>59</td>
<td>10497</td>
<td></td>
<td>59</td>
<td>10935</td>
<td></td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3315</td>
<td></td>
<td>58</td>
<td>10504</td>
<td></td>
<td>58</td>
<td>10938</td>
<td></td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3655</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10510</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10965</td>
<td></td>
<td>73a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3660</td>
<td></td>
<td>55</td>
<td>10514</td>
<td></td>
<td>55</td>
<td>10966</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3691</td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>10571</td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>10969</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3692</td>
<td></td>
<td>57</td>
<td>10575</td>
<td></td>
<td>57</td>
<td>10972</td>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3668</td>
<td></td>
<td>43</td>
<td>10600</td>
<td></td>
<td>43</td>
<td>10975</td>
<td></td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3669</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10604</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10978</td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3671</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10608</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10981</td>
<td></td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3674</td>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
<td>10774</td>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
<td>10984</td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3675</td>
<td></td>
<td>65</td>
<td>10775</td>
<td></td>
<td>65</td>
<td>10985</td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3692</td>
<td></td>
<td>57</td>
<td>10781</td>
<td></td>
<td>57</td>
<td>10986</td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3694</td>
<td></td>
<td>46</td>
<td>10782</td>
<td></td>
<td>46</td>
<td>10987</td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3757</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10783</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10988</td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3834</td>
<td></td>
<td>62</td>
<td>10784</td>
<td></td>
<td>62</td>
<td>10989</td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3836</td>
<td></td>
<td>51</td>
<td>10785</td>
<td></td>
<td>51</td>
<td>10990</td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3897</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10786</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10991</td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10895</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11036</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5134</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10913</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11037</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5242</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10914</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11038</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6056</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10915</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11040</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6057</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10919</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11041</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6068</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10922</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11042</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6123</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10924</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11043</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11833</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>12582</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>19784</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11925</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>12633</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19785</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11929</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12634</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>19787</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11931</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>19000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19793</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11946</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>19764</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>19793</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11956</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19779</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>19798</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11999</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>19780</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19799</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19781</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19800</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12659</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19783</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Cuneiform texts
KAIHU REPORTS TO THE KING ABOUT A DISASTROUS FLOOD, ABOUT 1430 B.C.
6-7. DISPUTE ABOUT THE EXACT WORDING OF A MESSAGE FROM KING BURIA-BURIAH, ABOUT 1440 B.C.
8-9. ROYAL SUMMONS FROM KING SHAGAGAKI-SHURIASH TO HIS SHERIFF AMEL-MARDUK, ABOUT 1325 B.C.
A GENERAL'S EXPLANATORY LETTER TO THE KING, ABOUT 1400 B.C.
16-17. A PHYSICIAN'S REPORT TO THE KING ABOUT THE RELAPSE OF A SICK TEMPLE WOMAN, ABOUT 1430 B.C.
18-19. REPORT TO THE KING ABOUT THE RECEIPT OF WOOL AND PROVENDER, ABOUT 1400 B.C.
A SHERIFF'S REPORT TO KING SHAGARAKTI-SHURIAH ABOUT THE CONDITION OF CERTAIN CANALS, ABOUT 1325 B.C.
A SHERIFF'S REPORT TO KING SHAGARAKI-SHURIASH ABOUT THE CONDITION OF CERTAIN CANALS, ABOUT 1325 B.C.
22-23. REPORT TO THE KING ABOUT THE PAYMENT OF GRAIN AND WHEAT, ABOUT 1430 B.C.
24-25. THE SUPERINTENDENT OF RIVERS AND CANALS COMPLAINS TO KING KUDUR-ENLIL ABOUT THE PREFECT OF DÛR-SUKAL-PATRA, ABOUT 1335 B.C.
26. REPORT TO THE KING ABOUT THE NON-ARRIVAL OF A CERTAIN SLAVE, ABOUT 1430 B.C.
27. REPORT TO THE KING ABOUT THE ILLNESS OF A WOMAN AND THE MAKING OF BRICKS, ABOUT 1430 B.C.
28. A FATHER'S PEREMPTORY ORDER TO HIS SON, ABOUT 1400 B.C.
29-32. TWO LETTERS OF COMPLAINTS, REQUESTS, AND THREATS ADDRESSED BY A GOVERNOR TO THE BURSAR-IN-CHIEF, ABOUT 1400 B.C.
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