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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\textsuperscript{akk}) were inscribed on clay. They form part of the "Temple Archives" (DUB MU\textsuperscript{akk}) 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 \( \text{É}.\text{DUB s} \text{á} \text{É}.\text{GAL} \) 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 \textit{Enlil} at Nippur; for they are known by the title \textit{shakkanakku Enlil}, characterizing them as the representatives of Enlil on earth, who had "to put the seal" (\textit{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 \textit{Enlil} being a richly endowed institution, royal officers kept watch over its proper administration and welfare and reported about the various affairs of \textit{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 \textit{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-bêê-ê-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 ki; (2) li, bi, ni, ibr, lit, sha; (3) ib, ur, lu; (4) ish, ma, ba, zu, shag (libbu), su; (5) ku, shâ, lu; (6) im, ahi, a', mur; (7) du, ush, ta, shâ, ra; (8) az, ug; (9) ad, si, mir; (10) be, nu; (11) al, shit, etc., etc.

As the texts here submitted have been written by more than fifty scribes, and as each scribe has his own peculiar dactus, I tried to imitate that dactus 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 dactus 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: \[\text{mash} = K\text{AN.NI.mash} = diqarâti = 'pots'\] for \[\text{mash} = I\text{N.mash} = \text{tibnu.mash}\ (\text{Hebr. [27]} ) = 'straw'!\]

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 $^\text{ii}NIN.IB$ and $^\text{ii}Er(r)ish$, see The Monist, Vol. XVII, No. 1 (Jan., 1907), p. 142. The Aramaic transcription of $NIN.IB$ is not $\text{אַנוֹרִיהַ, אֶרִישָן}$, but אַנְוָרִיהַ אֶרִישָן, as is now beyond question, it being plainly written in the latter fashion on several unpublished tablets in Constantinople, and also on an ostracon from Nippur preserved in the Babylonian Section of the Museum of the University of Pennsylvania (private communication of Prof. Hilprecht; see also p. 41, note). אַנְוָרִיהַ אֶרִישָן apparently does not represent the pronunciation (this is $\text{Errish(t)}$), but an attribute of $^\text{ii}NIN.IB$ 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 $^\text{ii}NIN.IB$, the "Son" of $^\text{ii}En-lil$. I propose to read $\text{אַנְוָרִיהַ אֶרִישָן} = \text{en usåti = "lord of help," an attribute ascribed, among others, also to $^\text{ii}Marduk, the "Son" of $^\text{ii}En.A;b; cf. the nom. propr. in $^\text{ii}Marduk-en-usåti, quoted by Delitzsch, II. W. B., p. 107b, under usåti. Instead of usåti we find, at the time of the Cassites, also the writing $\text{â-za-ti}$, cf. B. E., XIV, 125 : 12, "En-â-za-ti, a noteworthy peculiarity which shows that usåti, uzåti has to be connected with the Sumerian $A.ZU = \text{áså} = \text{"helper, physician."} We know that $^\text{ii}IB$ (gloss $urash$) is $= ^\text{ii}NIN.IB$ (see Bêl, the Christ, p. 16, note 8; p. 18, III; p. 19, 2), but $IB$ (gloss $urash$) is also $\text{barå}$ (II R. 62, 36a), and $barå$ is $A.ZU$ (Reisner, Hymnen, p. 7, 18. 19). From this it follows that $IB = A.ZU$, and $^\text{ii}NIN.IB = ^\text{ii}NIN.A.ZU$ (cf. II R. 57, 51a,b, where the star (mul) $^\text{ii}NIN.A.ZU$ is identified with $^\text{ii}NIN.IB$). Again, $^\text{ii}IB$ is also $= ^\text{ii}MASH$, but mash changes with $måsh$, cf. $måsh-pad = \text{måsh-pad}$ (E. B. II., p. 256, note 16); $måsh-shu-gid$ (Cyl. A 20 : 5) = $måsh-shu-gid$ (Cyl. A 12 : 16, 17), and $måsh$ is likewise $= \text{barå} = A.ZU$. I take, therefore, אַנְוָרִיהַ אֶרִישָן to stand for $\text{אַנְוָרִיהַ אֶרִישָן} = \text{en} = NIN$, and אַנְוָרִיהַ אֶרִישָן = usåti $= uzåti$ (the abstract for the concrete noun) $A.ZU = IB = MASH$. In other words, $^\text{ii}IB$ or $^\text{ii}MASH$ is "the helper," "the physician" (hence the patron god of the physicians), and $^\text{ii}NIN.IB$ or $^\text{ii}NIN.A.ZU$ 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" (rēmēnu, K 128—Jensen, Kosm., p. 470), the “merciful god” (īlu rēmēnu, I R. 17:19), the “one who gives life” (qaʾish TIL.A, I R. 17:19), “who gives the spirit of life” (qāʾish naphšātī, Jensen, l.c.), “who quickens the dead” (muballīṭ me[tūtī], 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 arallē shārudu pagarshu tuterra, Bêl, the Christ, p. 45, note 2; cf. ψ ixl. 15, “God will redeem my soul from the power of Sheol”; or ψ xvi. 10, “For thou will not leave my soul to Sheol”).

From these considerations it follows that the “Son” of the Nippurian Trinity (Enlil—NIN.IB—NIN.LIL = Bau) was the prototype not only of Nin.Girsu in the Girsu Trinity (Enlil—Nin.Girsu—NIN.LIL = Bau) or of Marduk in the Eridu Trinity (É.A—Marduk—Damkina—Šarpanitum), but even of Christ in the Christian Trinity (Father—Son—Holy Spirit); in each and every case the “Son” was the Saviour, the en usātī; hence Christ was rightly called the “Jesus” and was greeted, when entering Jerusalem, with joyful “Hosannahs,” ἀνάστησις, “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 the gods of which he invoked. Cf. here No. 89, where the writer Pān-AN.GAL-lu-mur invokes the gods of Dār-ilu for the protection of the addressee; hence the probability is that the writer hailed and wrote from Dār-ilu. 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-ush-ta-mar),” I find a seal impression which reads: Ilu-shu-Ba-ni dam-qar | már I-bî-išuNIN.SIAH | arût išuNIN.SIAH-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-shu-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-shu-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-shu-Ba-ni of the Lushtamar letter and the Ilu-shu-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-shu-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 extraordinary 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 contrary 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 connection 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 generosity 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 disposal, 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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I.

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\(^1\) of the University of Pennsylvania (1889–1900), and form part of the so-called Temple Archives\(^2\) 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\(^1\), 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>25 (or 27?)</td>
<td>1450–1423 B.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuri-Galzu(^2) II</td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1421–1396 B.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nazi-Maruttush (son)</td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1396–1370 B.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kadasman-Turgu (son)</td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1309–1325 B.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kadasman-Enli II (son)</td>
<td>[1] or [2]</td>
<td>9(^a)</td>
<td>1332–1340 B.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kadasman-Enil (1st(? son)</td>
<td></td>
<td>8(1)(^b)</td>
<td>1339–1331 B.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shagarakti-Shurialsh (2nd(? son))</td>
<td></td>
<td>12(1)(^a)</td>
<td>1331–1318 B.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kashiliashu II (son)</td>
<td></td>
<td>6(^a)</td>
<td>1317–1300(^a) B.C.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---


2 "Temple Archives," to mention it here, were called at the time when all these documents were written: DUB MUMesh, DUB shum-a-(a)-ti, DUB SHA.KA, DUB MU.BI.IM, DUB GIS.H, DUB za-kar-um. For a discussion of these terms see below under "Results," p. 83.

2 The last year thus far known was the 25th. Cf. B. E., XIV, 9: 5ff. arku ENGARGABA u[u]n 10kam shattu 25kam Bur-nu-Bi-ri-ia-dub 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 qâd) 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. 12907), which though insufficiently dated: "Shabatu, 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.

b That this Kuri-Galzu has to be identified both with "Kuri-Galzu, the son of Burna-Buriash," and with "Kuri-Galzu grû, the son of Kadashman-Harbe," will be shown below sub "Chronology," pp. 63ff.; hence the "gap" between Burna-Buriash and Kuri-Galzu.

b B. E., XIV, 38 : 15f. [argb(...) ònu 16[ka]m šattu 23[ka]m lû[|][Kur]-[Gullo-].


b B. E., XIV (pl. 61), 114e ( = E. A. H., 179): 5f. argb.SHAR.GA ònu 3[ka]m šattu 10[ka]m Ka-dish-man-Tur-âsh.

b For this ruler see Clay, B. E., XIV, p. 4, and l.c., No. 116 ; Sf. argb.AS.KA.NU šattu 6[ka]m lû[|][KA]-dîsh-man-ì. En-ìl.

b This is the last year 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: argb.SHE šattu 8(5[ka]m lû[|][Ku-]dû-ri-En-ìl). Cf. here l.c., 123 : 24 and P. 135 : 22—all of which are likewise dated in the 8th year.

b Hilprecht, B. E., XXI, p. 52, note 1, has shown that the tablet B. E., XIV, 139, is not dated from the 22d (Clay, l.c., pp. 3, 72), but from the 2d year; hence the last recorded date is found in B. E., XIV, 138 : 32, argb.GA.V ònu 1[ka]m šattu [22] (cf. l. 2) kâm Shâ-go-ru-ak-û-Shur-î-û-ash LUGAL. Cf. also P. 111 : 15 (131 : 18, and especially 77 : 14f. argb.ENGAR.GARA ònu 5[ka]m [šattu] 12[ka]m [Shâ-gar]-ak-û-Shur-û-ash ( = 6) [LUGAL KI-]SHAR-RA (= kishhâbî).


b Or possibly about 1296-1289 B.C. Cf. III R. 4, No. 2 (Sennacherib's capture of Babylon, i.e., either the first (702 B.C.) or the second (689 B.C.) took place), "600 years after Tukulti-NIN.IB," who reigned seven years over Babylon, following immediately upon Kashtiliashu.

b E. g., Za-ra-tÌMâ bâ, B. E., XV, Nos. 3, 63, 80. Kâr-SùNIN.IBâ bâ, B. E., l.c., No. 99. Du-un-na-â-tîlâ bâ, l.c., No. 112. âunu Z+a-ro-t-ù-Ga-la-kâ bâ, l.c., Nos. 114, 128. âunu Dûr-ù-Mardu-kâ bâ, l.c., No. 120. KûR-UD.NUN yîlâ, l.c., Nos. 124, 135. Bi-fê-MEU.KUR-MU-MU, l.c., Nos. 138, 139, etc., etc. See also pp. 81 ; 85, note 3 ; 110.

b B. E., XIV, 29 : 3; 30 : 3. In the tablet, l.c., 23 : 8 (dated in the 13th year of Kuri-Galzu), where it is reported that KU.MUN was paid (nûd-û) to (or by?) In-na-an-û, was not taken into consideration here.

b B. E., XIV, 35 : 3.

b E. g., B. E., XIV, 38 : 10, where it is stated that certain animals, which had been loaned out, are to be returned to (inandard ùna) Innanni.

b From the 22d year of Kuri-Galzu Innanni shared honors with his successor, Mâr-tu-tu, B. E., XIV, 36 : 3.


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 = \( ^{i}i^{i}NIN.IB (resp. \, ^{i}i^{i}MASH)-TUR.USH-SE-na. \) 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 (hazannätî) 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 hazannätî, "city prefects," must have been a "governor," a "bēl paḫattâ." Comparing these results with the texts of B. E., XIV and XV, we learn that a certain place, called either Dûr-\( ^{i}i^{i}NIN.IB-TUR.USH-SE-na \) or Bûl-\( ^{i}i^{i}MASH \) (resp. \( ^{i}i^{i}NIN.IB \)) -TUR.USH-SE-na, flourished as 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 Cf. here also the Bûl-\( ^{i}i^{i}NIN.IB-an-an-ni \) (situated in Nippur, B. E., XV, 115 : 5; 135 : 6) which flourished from at least the 224 year of Kuri-Galzu (B. E., XIV, 36 : 2, 11) to the 15th year of Nazi-Maruttash (B. E., XIV, 65 : 7, 14).

3 Add here to Bûl-Innanni of B. E., XV, the following references: 66 : 6 | 117 : 2 | 141 : 22 | 155 : 20, 22. A Mâr."\( ^{i}i^{i}NIN.IB-an-an-ni \) is mentioned in the 6th and the 7th year of Shagarakiti-Shuriash (B. E., XIV, 132 : 22).

4 Nos. 83-86.

5 Nos. 83 and 84.

6 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. Clay 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.USH = apal is found?

7 No. 83 : 24 û at-ta la-ku-ut-ta al-ka-am-na SHE.ZER a-na ålu-ki i-din, see p. 112.

8 No. 84 : 3, SHERI.SHIUR ña la la-ma-šar la-šar, etc., see p. 114.

9 This follows also from a comparison of, e.g., B. E., XIV, 99a (pl. 39 = E. A. H., 195): 4, 7, 16, 26, 29, 41 with B. E., XIV, 168 : 59, 51, 26, and especially l. 40, i.e., in this latter tablet, which is an "inventory of cattle," the "šal Bûl-\( ^{i}i^{i}NIN.IB-TUR.USH-SE-na\)" apparently stands for pi-ḫat = \( ^{i}i^{i}NIN.IB-TUR.USH-SE-na. \)

10 B. E., XIV, 18 : 7 (notice that KI-II refers back to Dûr- of l. 6). In B. E., XIV, pp. 49a, 58b, this name is read NIN.IB-mār-iddina, resp. NIN.IB-mār-iddina, but in l.c., p. 58a, Dûr-\( ^{i}i^{i}NIN.IB-mâr\) (read: apal)-iddina.

11 B. E., XIV, 76 : 2.


13 B. E., XIV, 18 : 7, 1.

14 B. E., XIV, 76 : 2, 8.

15 B. E., XIV, 79 : 4, 11.

16 B. E., XIV, 84 : 2, 9.
the time during which Innanni was the "chief bursar" at Nippur. Hence Innanni and 𒈠𒈨𒊏𒊏𒈠𒈙𒈯𒊏𒈦𒊏𒊏, the founder, owner, and occupant of Dûr (resp. Bit). 𒈠𒈨𒊏𒊏𒈠𒈙𒈯𒊏𒈦𒊏𒊏 were contemporaries.\(^1\)

Again in No. 9 : 21 a certain ṬNana-a-ša-𒈠𒈨𒊏𒊏-Marduk, when writing to his "Lord" (be-ḫ), states that he, in order to corroborate the truthfulness of his communications, "made to be his witnesses" a certain 𒈠𒈨𒊏𒈦𒈠𒈬-Nergal-Ba-ni, the prefect (ḫa-za-na) of Rakanu, and the prefect (ḫa-za-an-na) of Bit-𒈠Ki-din-ni,\(^2\) upon whom his "Lord" may call, if he desires confirmation of the truth. The "prefect" of Bit-Kidinni was, of course, Kidinni.\(^3\) This statement of Banâ-ša-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,\(^4\) dated in the 20th year of Kuri-Galzu, which reports that Banâ-ša-Marduk received certain cereals\(^5\) "on the authority" or "by order" of 𒈠Ki-di-nu-ū—the latter apparently being the superior of the former. But we can go a step farther. 𒈡 E., XIV, 99a (= E. A. H., 195) : 35,

\(^1\) Cf. here also 𒈡 E., XV, 124, where a certain ṬNri-esh-Shamsu(-šu) or ṬNri-esh-Shamskišu (this reading preferable to Clay's Ri-eshtu-šu (B. E., XV, p. 406) or Ri-eshtu-šu (Z. A., XX (1907), p. 417)) in view of such names as ṬNri-esh-na-pa-aḫ-šaš, ṬNri-esh-nu-pa-aḫ-šaš, ṬNri-esh-šu-ḫaš, i.e., 19 : 16 receives from (ina qat) Innanni a certain amount of grain as KU.QAR-wages, which grain was taken from that belonging to (ina ākkī SIE šaš) ṬNra-MASH-TUR.USH-ŠE-na. The tablet is dated in the 23d year (sc. doubtless of Kuri-Galzu). In ṬNri E., XV, 136 (dated the 23d year, sc. of Kuri-Galzu), Innanni endorses the payment of GIG (= ki-bōtu, "flour," Jensen, K. B., VI, p. 485) to certain pa-te-si hē "by order of" or "in the employ of"—thus receiving the amount specified "on the authority of," i.e., "per" (= qat; in this differing from Clay, ṬNri E., XV, pp. 5, 6, who translated qat "in the hands of" or "paid to"; qat may or may not (as here) be expressed before the second name in "lists of payments") ṬNra-MASH-TUR.USH-ŠE-na. These two tablets prove beyond a doubt that Innanni and Eriššapal-iddina were contemporaries during the 22d and 23d year (of Kuri-Galzu).


\(^3\) 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."

\(^4\) 𒈡 E., XIV, 31 : 6.


\(^6\) Thus I translate, because the name of Kidinnu follows that of Banâ-ša-Marduk.

\(^7\) Kidinni is a shorter form of Kidinnu(š). The latter is, as the long š indicates, a hypocoristicon of some such name as Kidin-ŠIN-AB, -Nergal,-Ramman (cf. No. 33 : 12), -Sis-, -Ubarsak, etc. See "List of Names" in ṬNri E., XIV, p. 469. Cf. also 18 : 22, ṬNki-di-ni; 23 : 23, ṬNki-din-[šu] Marduk, and ṬNri E., IX, p. 61b, and i.e., X, p. 53b, ṬNki-din.

\(^8\) Owing to the fact that the writer was in Europe while reading the proofs of his E. H. (thus having no access to the E. A. H. Collection), it happened that E. A. H., 195 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, ṬNri 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 ṬNri E., XIV, p. 69, No. 99a, 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 (ṬNri E., XIV, 168 and 99), which are interpreted somewhat differently by Dr. Clay, who sees in No. 168 a "record of
inform us that there that lived in the 11th year of Kadashman-Turgu (l. 46) a certain "Ki-di-nu-ū who was one of the prefects, ḫazzumāti (l.c., col. XV : 22), belonging to the pi-ḥat of "=En-īl-bēl(=EN)-nīški-nēṣeš-shu (l. 41). Now, as "Ki-di-nu-ū
collections" (see l.c., p. 78), while No. 99 in the same volume is pronounced to be a "record of the collection of taxes in animals" (see l.c., p. 69). All three tablets just referred to are inventories. Cf., e.g., 99a : 46 (and see 99 : 1), mi-nu LIT.GUDHIA = GĀNAM.LUGAL = NIN.ANmesh, "the number of large and small cattle belonging to the NIN.ANmesh." The latter were two "beings"; one was called NIN ANGAL, l. 13, 34 (cf. B.E., XIV, 89 : 1, 9; 104 : 3; 131 : 11, 18; 138 : 31), and the other NINAN.TUR, l. 44 (cf. B.E., XIV, 89 : 1, 16; 136 : 29 (l.)), and, per analogy, we ought to expect NINAN.TUR also in l. 21. What these NINANmesh were, cannot be made out as yet. From Letter No. 85 (see p. 115) I would like to infer that Inbi-Ari was such a NINAN or qadishi. 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-lam-du, l. 1, 2, 14; while the "small cattle" were under that of the kash-shu "Amel-Ba-nu-ū (cf. kash-shu were = "Cassite," Amel-Banū would be one with a good Babylonian name), l. 22, 23, 35 (the traces given in B.E., XIV, are, no doubt, wrong). Each kash-shu, it seems, had several (three or more?) bēl piḫati under him. And as, according to our tablet, the three piḫati included in the kash-shu of Kilandu are the same as those of the kash-shu of Amel-Banū, it is most likely that a kash-shu is the general overseer of either the large or the small cattle, irrespective of territory; in other words, a kash-shu has the supervision of all small or of all large cattle of a NINAN scattered over all the different provinces (piḫati). I propose, therefore, to derive kash-shu from ṭuwa, "to gather" (Jensen, K. B., VI, pp. 322, 552), here in the sense of "one under whose jurisdiction are gathered a number of bēl piḫati," i.e., "government or overseer-in-chief." A bēl piḫati, on the other hand, is responsible for the flocks of both the large and small cattle herded in his territory, which responsibility is always expressed by qatî = "per," see l.l. (cf. l. 7); 12 (cf. l. 4); 17, 20 (cf. l. 16); 32 (notice the ṭi(ī) and cf. l. 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 za-baKU.QAR amaliRIQ ù KAZ.DA qatî (= SIHU) = "Shamash-nādin-ālēmesh," by "are employed" for the carrying (za-bal = inf.; cf. our No. 31 : 40, i-na 20MAR.GID.DA IN ki-i az-bi-da, when 1 was bringing straw in the harvest (lit. "long") wagons, the horses, etc. of the KUQAR-wages of the vegetable- and grain-gatherers "per" (sc. order, information of) Shamash-nādin-ālē (the bēl piḫati, l. 7)"; or l. 17, "total 83 cattle, the property (nu-kam-tum) of Mār-Idunnī-Shamash, "per" (order, information of) Enlil-bēl-nāšiš-shu (the bēl piḫati, l. 1, 16)." The territory of a bēl piḫati was subdivided into two six (cf. l. l. 2, 3 and 35-40), or more possibly, ḫazzumāti, and each ḫazzumu or "prefect" had one (cf. l. l. 2, 3, etc.), two (cf. l. l. 27, 28 and 36, 37) or more na-gīd or "shepherds" under him. The ṭaḫū, ḫazzumu, bēl piḫati, kash-shu of this tablet correspond exactly to the ṭaḫū, nē-banda (gud), PA, pa-te-sī of the "inventory" lists of the UR dynasty tablets, as published in E. B. II, pp. 333-361 (for nē-banda = ḫazzumu see, e.g., Meissner, Idolographie, No. 1159). It will be noticed that the cattle introduced by TA = itī or EN = adī are never counted, hence TA = itī cannot mean here "together with," nor can adī be translated by "besides" and EN = adī by "apart from." For TA cf. e.g., l. 43, TA 15 ki-is-du, i.e., "besides 15 (that were given for a) sacrifice to the dead." For kisū see, besides Zimmermann, Ritualt., p. 100, 11; Jansen, K. B., VII, pp. 446, 517; also B. E., XV, 185, 1 : 5; 200, l. 6; ki-is-du a ri-im-ku. For EN = adī cf. l. 15, EN 1 shu (not lam, as Clay's copy gives), see XIV, 168 : 16, EN 5 shul-ma-nū and cf., l.c., l. 15, shul-ma-na-a-tum; XV, 199 : 21, 22; shul(=DD)-ma-na=ma-na, i.e., "apart from one (that was given for a) peace-offering." Cf. also l. 18, EN 2 GUD MU-4 a 1 LIT ša i-na Kār-EN.KUR.KUR bēl-ša-ukku-ra, i.e., "apart from two oxen, four years old, and one ewe which are being taken care of in Kār-EN.KUR.KUR." For bukkuru cf. also XIV, 108 v 55, ša i-na šabtu kūnuma bu-nu-qa-šu-laš, and l.c., l. 16, tab-ki-ir-(XIV, 96a : 10, tab-ki-ir(=)-tiyannu ša ma-bi-lu-šu ni-pat(ā) ak-ki-ra-ni, which shows that we have here a verb ba-patru = paptaru = Hebr. נְפָר; Piel; "to cleave, discern, to look after a thing;" met with also in Neb., Winckler, l. 18 (quoted by H. W. B., p. 181b), where ma-ba-ki-(ā) goto-ba-a-tum should be translated by "who looks after the fields," i.e., "who takes care of them." A topqipiru, accordingly, would be a "flock which requires special treatment," a "special looking after," and XIV, 108 v 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 za-bi-ti MU 11km, i.e., "apart from 20 (special) 'holdings' of the 11th
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(the ḥazānu and superior of Banā-sha-Marduk) is only another writing for "Ki-din-ni (the ḥazānu of Bit=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-Galzū and the 11th of Kadashman-Turgu, or during a space of about forty-three years.

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

year" (cf. l. 32, sī-bi-er-ti = special holdings of the 10th and the 11th year—here, because not introduced by EN, they are counted. Cf. also 99 : 65, GALAM.LUGAL ša sī-bi-er-ti ša dišTaKūl-lī-Be-līšī, i.e., "small cattle of the special holdings of the city T."). The root of sa-bi-lī = sī-bi-er-ti = sī-bi-er-ti is N2Y, and we have here the same word as sī-bittu, which Delitzsch, H. W. B., p. 562b, 2, translates by "Eigenanun." These examples show that the different shepherds herding the cattle of the NIN.ANmek had among their herds very often animals belonging to other people, which animals were designated either by nakantu, "property" (XIV, 99 : 17), or by sī-bittu, "special holdings"; cf. here also XIV, 99 : 16, i-na MU 11šum kIši Ka-dāšman-Tur-gu a-di LIT.GUD anšša i-na dišEn-līšī it-an-ns-unár [follows enumeration], i.e., "in the 11th year of K, there were seen in Nippur in addition to his (i.e., of m uš[...], 1) cattle also the following." Clay, B. E., XIV, p. 52b, also mentions a title or office, ki-wu, as occurring after the name Shamash-nūdin-ahā in 99 : 11, 32. These two references are an evident mistake, yet KI MU does occur in 99 : 38 (after m ušShamash-nūdir) and in l. 40 (after m ušShamash-igabha). For still other occurrences of KI MU after proper names see, e.g., B. E., XV, 132 : 23, mDišannu Mardak KI MU mEN (= Adi or Bit=ma-ti-ilu (notice that we have two names in this line only!); i.e., 174 : 11 (again in this line only two names!); i.e., 96 : 14, mBu-um-nu, mAG KI MU UB.DAR-ga; B. E., XIV, 168 : 25, etc., etc. The meaning of this expression we gather from B. E., XIV, 168 : 34, 3 LIT.GAL ša i-na DUB.SHA.RA ša šattu 10šum MU (= sham) mQu-an-nu-ni šaf-ra, i.e., "3 large cows which are entered (shafra) in the inventory tablet(s) (which form part of the "Temple Archives") for the year 10 under the name of Qunnuni, KI.MU, when standing between two (proper) names, has to be transcribed ki šum and must be rendered by "for the name"; hence "X nūgīl ki šum mY nūgīl is a "shepherd whose name is entered in the inventory tablet 'for' that of another, the real or original, shepherd who, at the time when the inventory was taken, happened to be away from his flock"; in other words, "X ki šum mY is as much as "X, the substitute for Y." In conclusion I may mention here that several mistakes are to be found in this tablet, as, e.g., col. VII : 8, read "19" instead of "20" (cf. 8, cols. I–V only 19 cattle are enumerated; the mistake has probably its origin in l. 8, col. 1); col. X : 31 gives as "grand total" 376, but if we add together the totals of col. X, as given in the copy, we receive the sum 386, or 10 too many. These 10 "too many" are found in col. X : 25, where we ought to read, according to the different items of cols. I–IX, 83 instead of 93, as the copy gives it. As the grand total is correctly given as 376, we must suppose that the mistake is not attributable to the original, but to the抄写ist. These notes, I hope, will convince the reader that we have to see in B. E., XIV, 99a (and all similar tablets, called in Vol. XIV "records of the receipt of taxes in animals") an "inventory" of the flocks (including at the same time an inventory of the "butter" (NI.NUN, col. VIII, 1b.,) and "wool" (SIGBerti, col. XII, Rev.) yielded by them) of the great and small cattle of the NIN.ANmek under the chief supervision of two knuš-shu. This inventory includes such additional notes as might be found necessary to account for certain "absent" or "present" cattle that originally did, or did not, form a component part of the flocks mentioned. For inventory tablets from the time of the kings of Ur cf. Hilprecht, B. E., Vol. I, part 2, Nos. 124, 126, and my E. B. II., pp. 333–361.

1 Banâ-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 Shagaraktu-Shuruppuk.


3 B. E., XIV, 99a (= E. A. H., 193) : 35.
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 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 (= ilu?), "Si-ri-da-ash, "Mar- unchanged U-sh-a-sh, "Na-zi," Ardi-GASHAN (= Bbêl), the writer of No. 5, is mentioned in B. E., XIV, 40:30 (dated in the 21st year of Kuri-Galzu, I, 23) as DUBSAR or "scribe." Cf. also the DUBSAR Erô-Marduk of B. E., XIV, 127:14 (dated "the beginning of the reign of Shagaraki-Shariash"); for the expression cf. The Monist, XVII (January, 1907), p. 130), with the writer's(s) of Nos. 13, 14 (817, 82, and see pp. 11, note 7; 117, 121.

1 Ardi-GASHAN (= Bbêl), the writer of No. 5, is mentioned in B. E., XIV, 40:30 (dated in the 21st year of Kuri-Galzu, I, 23) as DUBSAR or "scribe." Cf. also the DUBSAR Erô-Marduk of B. E., XIV, 127:14 (dated "the beginning of the reign of Shagaraki-Shariash"); for the expression cf. The Monist, XVII (January, 1907), p. 130), with the writer(s) of Nos. 13, 14 (817, 82, and see pp. 11, note 7; 117, 121.

2 No. 87:3. Cf. "Gu-za-ar-AN-Ba-ga-ash, C. B. M., 3522:16 (quoted by Clay, B. E., XV, p. 315, and l.c., p. ix), which, no doubt, is the same as "Gu-ZU(-1)-AN-Ba-ga-ash (thus read by Clay, B. E., XV, p. 43b, and quoted from C. B. M., 3646), seeing that XI might be read zul = zor. The interchange of l and r in the different languages is too well known to require further examples. Gu-zar-zar resp. Gu-zar-zar "might" be an intensive form of Gu-zar, which latter we find in our text. If AN be read we would have here a "mixed" name—partly Cassite, partly Babylonian; for such names cf., e.g., Kadashman, Enlil, Kudur, Enlil, NIM.GI-shar-III, etc. In view of such names as Guzarar-Bagash, Guzalzor-Bagash, we might be justified in reading our name here Guzar-Bagash, thus identifying the Babylonian AN with the Cassite Bagash and attributing to the latter the rôle played by AN in the Babylonian pantheon.

3 No. 28:5 in [B]; "Si-ri-da(or shat?)-ash. Is this name to be compared with Si-ri-la, B. E., XV, 198:30, and Si-li-[is; for this emendation 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. E., XV, 190:15, Me-ri-Shi-pa-[la]k, and Clay, l.c., p. 3, note 4. Cf. here the names U-su(1)-ub-Shi-pak, Schliit, Textes Élam. Sém., I, p. 93, 1, 3; U-su-ab-HALAl (sir, against Clay, l.c., XIV, p. 54b), B. E., XIV, 132:27, and U-su-ab-SHIL-I-I-SH, Clay, l.c., XIV, p. 43b. For the interchange of z and l, cf., among others, also za-bit-ti, B. E., XIV, 99a:30, with si-bit-l, l.c., 99:65, and si-bit-ru, l.c., 99b:32. In view of this interchange we cannot connect U-su(1)-ub = U-su-ub with 28 and see in our name a formation similar to that of Nebaa-su-su ("Nebo ist Entwelt?") quoted by Del., H. W., B., p. 35b. Uzub, Uzub, no doubt, is a side-form of u-zi-Ib = e-te-rum, Del., Sprache der Kassiter, 26:42. For the interchange of i and u cf., e.g., Isib-ki(1)-nu, No. 35:3; li-ul-ishi-shi-ru-ru, 55:12, etc. U-su-ab-Shi-pak, then, is = Efîr-Marduk, i.e., "Protect, oh Mardu!

5 In the Babylonian AN we cannot connect U-su(1)-ub = U-su-ub with 28 and see in our name a formation similar to that of Nebaa-su-su ("Nebo ist Entwelt?") quoted by Del., H. W., B., p. 35b. Uzub, Uzub, no doubt, is a side-form of u-zi-Ib = e-te-rum, Del., Sprache der Kassiter, 26:42. For the interchange of i and u cf., e.g., Isib-ki(1)-nu, No. 35:3; li-ul-ishi-shi-ru-ru, 55:12, etc. U-su-ab-Shi-pak, then, is = Efîr-Marduk, i.e., "Protect, oh Mardu!" Uzub-HALAl = "Protect my portion" (i.e., oh god); Uzub-SHIL-I-I-SH = "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.

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

7 No. 24:25. This half Cassite and half Babylonian name is found again in C. B. M., 3320:13 (B. E., XV, p. 37c). Whether the element Na-zi be the same as Na-ah-si, which Clay, B. E., XV, p. 4, note 2, thinks to be impossible, cannot be made out as yet. It is, however, a fact that ah and a' very often change in these texts—a phenomenon overlooked by both Vols. XIV and XV, as seen from B. E., XV, p. 37, note 1, where we have M-a-ma-a-1'-di-an-na-LV (- ilu) for Mind-ah-zi-na-ili. For this interchange of ah and a' cf. Ki-she-ah-I-fu-ili (34:1), resp. Ki-sheh-bu-ili (35:1), with Mar-ki-sheh-I-fu-ili, B. E., XV, 188:1, 25 (not registered by Clay), 1:13 (i.e., p. 48a, wrongly has ah for a'); 6aMar-ki-sheh-bu-ili and all others quoted under 6aSi-gru in B. E., IV, p. 58b, and XV, p. 53b, have, of course, to be corrected into 6aMar-; cf., 6u sheh Mar-Shebili in Seheli, Textes Élam. Sém., I, p. 100) with (Mar)-ba'-a-ili, B. E., XV, 129:3. From this we might infer that Na-ah-si could also be written Na-zi'a and become Na-zi. But the intermediate form Na-a'zi has not yet been found; hence the denotation of Na-ah-si and Na-zi must, at the present, be left open.
LETTERS TO CASSITE KINGS

"Me-li-Shi-pak," and lastly "Me-li-šu-Sha-qa-ma-na," who, as regards his name, is a thorough Cassite, but who, as regards his national sentiments, was a good Babylonian citizen, for his son bears the unmistakably Babylonian name = šu.PA.KU-SHESH-SE-na = Nusku-ah-iddina.4

(c) Certain cities or places peculiar to both, our letters here and the dated tablets of the Cassite kings. Among these may be mentioned dšuArdu-GASHAN®i (= Bēlū), 5 Bīt-šu.Ki-din-ni, 6 BĀR.TUR®i; 7 dšuDār-EN.KUR.KUR®i; 8 Dār-šu.En-

1 No. 17 : 32. Also mentioned in B. E., XIV, 125 : 8 (13th year of Kūr-ri-Gula) and Lc, XV, 190, VI : 15.

2 No. 59 : 14. In B. E., XV, p. 4, this name is considered to have a Babylonian element. As Mēl is correctly recognized as a Cassite element, the god Shuqamuna is evidently regarded as a Babylonian divinity. The fact, however, that Shuqamuna was not known in the Babylonian pantheon till the time of the Cassites proves, apart from other considerations, that he must have been introduced by them. For Shu- also the writing Shu- occurs, see B. E., XIV, 132 : 41; XV, 130 : 10.

3 On account of mār (not mār-smart), l. 14, I do not hold =šu-un-naššu.NIN.IB, l. 12, to be a son of Meli-Shuqamuna.

4 No. 59 : 13.

5 Nos. 13 : 7 | 66 : 21. In 18 : 10 we have dšuArdu-NIN (= Bēlū) and in 11 : 20 dšuArdu-GASHAN®i. The latter writing is found also in B. E., XIV, 123a (= E. A. H., 180) : 5 (8th year of Kudurri-Enlil, l. 13).

6 Nos. 9 : 23 | 41 : 15. For the bazinnu =šu.Ki-din-ni = Ki-din-ni see above, pp. 4ff.

7 No. 53 : 38, to be read (according to Br. 6900) Pa-rak ma-ra®i (so also Clay, Z. A., XX (1907), p. 417f., correcting B. E., XIV, p. 57b, passim). The mār is, of course, the Nippurian mār var šumur, i.e., =šuNIN.IB. From B. E., XIV, 133 : 5, 6 we learn that it existed in "the seventh year of Shagarakti-Shurash," l. 13. Cf. here also the KAS dšu.Par-ak-mār®i in B. E., XIV, 107 : 3, and see below, p. 10, note 3.

8 No. 17 : 18, 26. EN.KUR.KUR in our letters is used either of =šuNIN.IB or of =šuEn-ilu, never of Marduk of Babylon, see, e.g., No. 24 : 14, 17, and cf. =šuNam-go-ri-shā-EN.KUR.KUR in No. 59 : 9. For the omission of =šu before names of gods cf., among others, also la-na-as-ši, B. E., XV, 163 : 38 (the city mentioned in B. E., XV, 159c : 12 has to be read =šuEn-ilu.Ki-gi.BARRA, i.e., "Enlil looks favorably upon," and not (Clay, l. c., p. 52c) dšu.Kudurri-ilm-usu(?)); šebtar (U.DARR), l. e., 183 : 36 | 188, I : 13 | V : 12; Sarpinum, l. c., 163 : 31; Shami (= Šāši), l. c., 96 : 10; Shamshu = udKur®i, l. e., 167 : 33; 34; 59.AZ.AZ.MU, l. e., 186 : 24; Sin (= XXX), l. c., 164 : 7 | 166 : 5; Š. A., l. c., 186 : 6; En-ilu, l. c., 132 : 16 | 175 : 65 | 154 : 27; Marduk, l. c., 96 : 20; Nusku, C. M., 3472, etc., etc. A Dār-EN.KUR.KUR®i is mentioned in B. E., XIV, 5 : 6 (11th year of Burra-Durash). Cf. also dšu-Dār-be-ššu.KUR.KUR in B. E., XV, 61 : 1 and the Dār-EN.KUR.KUR.GAL, l. c., 158c : 10. The correct reading of the different writings would be dšu.Dār-bēl-mātātī-(ra-štī), "the fortress (wall) of the (great) lord of lands," i.e., of Enlil of Nippur. Now we know from such passages as B. E., XV, 37 : 1, that the temple of Enlil as the bēl-mātātī-šaštī is very often referred to simply as E.AN = bit-ilu, i.e., "the house of the god" par excellence, and that Enlil himself is very often spoken of as the AN or ilu, i.e., "the god" (B. E., XIV, 16 : 1, see below, p. 80); hence Enlil, "the great lord of lands," might also be called "the great god of lands." Furthermore, it is well known that KUR.KUR = mātātī = lands = "world," "cosmos" is also = KALAM = mātātī = lands (= Babylonian world = Shumer and Akkad), hence the reading Bīt-šu.UNGAL. En-ilu®i defended in Z. A., XX (1907), p. 419, must be abandoned in my judgment. There is no god UNGAL. B. E., XIV, 148 : 15, 18, to be read Bīt-šu.KAL.AM.GAL.ENG.III®i = Bit-ilu-KALAM.GAL.ENG.III®i, i.e., "the temple of the great god of the lands at Nippur," which temple is the É.KUR inhabited by Enlil-NIN.IB-Nusku or better, which is occupied by the Nippurian Trinity in Unity: Enlil (Father) = NIN.IB (Son); Ninlil = Gula (Mother, resp. wife of the Son), cf. for the latter also B. E., XV, 34 : 2, Bit-šu.Gula. A N.KALAM.GAL.ENG.III®i, i.e., "the temple of Gula and NIN.IB" (= Enlil; the temple of the god standing for the god's name, cf. apil-É-shār-ra = NIN.IB). Cf. here also the note on AN.GAL = šu.KA.DI = Enlil farther below, p. 20.
FROM THE TEMPLE ARCHIVES OF NIPPU.

Dür-Ku-ri-Gal-zu, and lastly mutu A.A.B.B.A.²

1 No. 29: 21, or written also Dür-śu-En-lil-li-a-kī, No. 3: 33, 38, 41, which latter is mentioned in B. E., XIV, 5: 10 (11th year of Burra-Burish) and Le., 78: 4 (22d of Nazi-Maruttash). A δļśu-Dür-śu-En-lil-li-a-kī we find in B. E., XIV, 118: 1, 30 (5th year of Kudur-Enili), and a δļśu-Dür-śu-En-lil-li-a-kī in B. E., XIV, 127: 4 (beginning of the reign of Shagaraki-Sharrish). In this last passage the same city is mentioned in 1: 7, where its name is δļśu-Dür-śu-En-lil-li-a-kī—most interesting writing, showing that even at the time of the Cassite king δļśu-EN-LIL, was pronounced and read Enili resp. Enilī, or still better: Enilī with a plural Enilī, the long ā or ē still betraying the fact that we have here a Semiticized Sumerian word. For such formations cf., e.g., gu-an = kwatā = Hebr. 822, "throne." Clay's view, A. J. S. L. L., XXII, pp. 296f., that Enili was always pronounced Enilī must be modified, as will be shown elsewhere.

The name Enili, signifying originally the chief god of Nippur, was in course of time applied to each and every god that played the same rôle in the religious conception of the Babylonians as did Enilī of Nippur. The same holds good of NIN.LIL = Bēlēlī, E.KUR = temple, Išnma = Ishtar = goddess; AX = ālu = god; cf., the German word "Kaiser" = Cæsar, etc. In other words: Enili, originally the name of a god, became later on a title, as such signifying "the highest lord," the bet sir ʾišqam, just as AX became later on "the god par excellence." Enili, when a name, is read and pronounced Enilī, resp. Enili, but when a title, it must be pronounced bēlī. Not only linguistically, however, but also from a religio-historic standpoint is this name and writing important. It shows us that ever since the time of the "kings of Ur and of the four corners of the world," when Enilī of Nippur was referred to as δļśu-En-lil-li-a-kī (E. B. H., p. 272, 1: 5) or as En-lil-li-a-kī δļśu-En-lil-li (E. B. H., p. 209, note 11; p. 271, 1: 5), i.e., "Enilī of the Nippurians" or "the Nippurian Enilī" (for the formation En-lil-li-a-kī = Nippurian, see GISH-UJ δŭt-a (E. B. II., p. 79, 1: 28; p. 81, 1: 55) = ḡōblish-UJ-Ūkī (E. B. H., p. 76, 5, 8; p. 81, note 1, et pass.). Hrozny's theory, Z. A., XX (1907), p. 42ff., to read GISH-UJ = Umina or Abna is untenable. From the fact that UJ has the pronunciation Umina or Abna, it does not yet follow that GISH-UJ has to be read likewise Umina or Abna, there came to be known in Babylonian a "collection" (ûlana) of Enilī, among them Sin (of Ur), Dagan (of Isin), Shamas (of Larsa), Marduk (of Babylon), AN-SHAR = Asshurur (of Asshur), and the Cassite Enili = Ḥarbe, thus demonstrating beyond a shadow of a doubt that Enili ceased very early to be a name and became a title. There is no old Enili or Bēl asover against a new or later Bēl (= Marduk), but all gods called Enili 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 religion of all other Babylonian cities was formed. Cf. my remarks in Old Pers., 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 Dür-śu-MAR.TU-labīrū (šûlā-kī) (Clay, L., p. 529, Dür-Amuriu-a4kī) and KI-III = Dür-śu-MAR.TU-eshkendū (šûlā-kī) (Clay, ibid., Dür-BIL(U)Nēkī), for here labīrū, resp. eshkendū, does not refer to šubu-MAR.TU, but to Dür; i.e., we have here an "old" and a "new" Dür-śu-Martu, or two parts (hence no items given for "new" Dür-śu-Martu) of one city, cf. the German Alt- and Neu-Stattin.

² Nos. 45: 23 | 57: 15, 20, or only Dür-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 ki-sir (BU)-ti or "stone dam," hence the same canal that passed through Nippur must have passed by Dür-Kuri-Galzu (and δļśu-Ardī-Belēlī) likewise. The ruins represented at the right of No. I, below No. III (see the Plan of Nuzzar in Hilprecht, B. E., Series I, Vol. I, p. 305, and regarded by Hilprecht as covering the ruins of the fortified palace of the potesis of Nippur, which, like the palace of Sargun at Khorsabad, formed a bulwark in the fortification line of Nippur), in all probability represent those of Dür-Kuri-Galzu. Notice also that the "canal" which starts from the Shatt-en-Nil (for which see No. V), between Nos. I and IV, passes the lower part of the ruins to the right of No. I. The first occurrence of this place is in an omen-tablet (inspection of a liver) from the 11th year of Burra-Burish, B. E., XIV, 4: 11, LU.ARDUMES bī-mar-ma a na Dûr-Ku-ri-[Gal-zu] bī-she-bi-[šarm]. 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 i-na arbašIN-Sũma-šunu I-tu (i.e., shanūta) šé šaitaš ša kale KUR-ri-Gal-zu. These two passages prove that this place was founded not by Kuri-Galzu šeššu, but by the older Kuri-Galzu. Notice in this connection that the last quoted tablet gives us the first occurrence of a second Enili for the Cassite period, being called there not arbašIN-Sũma-šunu II-tu (B. E., XIV, 46: 34) nor arbašIN-Sũma-šunu I-tu, but arbašIN-Sũma-šunu II-tu. This month had its origin, as we know,
(d) Certain peculiarities which our letters here have in common not only at the instigation of Hammurabi, see King, Letters, No. 14:6, where it is called årba KIN Išinnanna Ishamma. It was not recognized in B. E., XIV, p. 62, No. 12, where the month is left out.

2 Nos. 22 : 15(? ) | 37 : 10 = mišta Tamtim, the "sea country." For the close relation between Babylonia and the sea country at the time of the Cassites see Weisbach, Babyl. Missellen, p. 7, where (B. E., 4605) a certain Ú-kaa-ri Ra-iš-ash appears both as "king of mišta A.A.B.A.BA" and as "son (TUR) of Bur-na-Ba-m(i)-ri-ia-ak" (probably the same as Burna-Buriaš 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 Ulum-Bur(i)ash, the brother of Kusinakishu I, conquers the "sea country," and that Agum, the son of Kusinakishu I, "goes out against" the same country and "captures Där-E.A." For the occurrences of A.A.B.A.BA = "sea" or "sea country," see also B. E., XIV, 58 : 50, 53 (13th year of Nasi-Ma'arratshu) | 168 : 18, 22, 23 | XV, 199 : 26, 27, 33, 38, 40, and the GIR.RI A.A.B.A.BA in B. E., XIV, 147 (= E. A. H., 182) : 6. In connection with the reading and the significance of the last mentioned expression, Clay, B. E., XIV, p. 3, finds sufficient reason to correct a statement made in E. B. H., p. 329, where the question was asked, "Is this latter (i.e., GIR.RI A.A.B.A.BA) 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-Buriaš. On the contrary, there exists a great divergence of opinion with regard to the succession of Kuri-Galzu upon the reign of Burna-Buriaš. To illustrate this I quote such prominent scholars as Winckler, Das alte West-Assyrien, p. 21; De
tsach, Chronologische Tabellen; Weisbach, Babyl. Missellen, p. 31; Hilprecht, B. E., XX, p. 52, note 1. The latter, e.g., when speaking of the succession of Kuri-Galzu upon Burna-Buriaš's reign, expresses himself (i.e.) quite carefully, saying: "Kuri-Galzu, his (i.e., Burna-Buriaš's) son and possibly not his immediate successor." From this divergence of opinion it will be apparent 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. 39ff. Clay, however, is doubtless correct in denying to GIR.RI A.A.B.A.BA the title "king," and likewise in seeing in him no "person" at all. I also accept his proposition to read Girir Tamma, but I am unable to agree with his interpretation of Girir-Tamma 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, 134 : 2, "where Girru ( = KAS) Tam-tim is written," comparing this with Girru ( = KAS) Dür-itu (= i.e., XIV, 161 : 7) and with Giruru(i.e. Clay)-iru, Mi-iš-ru (Trans. Dep. of Arch. U. of P., Vol. I, Part 3, p. 223c). 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. 586a, a little more carefully. We begin with B. E., XIV, 134, which reads: 3 qa NI DUG.GA | a-na KAS ( = gürü or (a)ra-rūnu) Tam-tim | išta NIN.JI.BUGUD-SHEŠ|-SHESH (sic copy; see, mesh)-ahu] GAR-ru | arba SHEGA-a-ru | shattu šam | š̄uša-garab-te-Shur-ta-ah; i.e., either "3 qa of good oil for the journey to the sea(-country) which N. is making," or, possibly better, "3 qa of good oil which NIN.JI.Ba-habtu-ahš-ahu (= N. is the most important one of his brothers) has put up (GAR-ru = šakaru = persimmon; cf. in this connection na-biš-er = persimvasive, as e.g., B. E., XV, 86 : 6) for (a-no) the KAS, i.e., the journey (lit. the way) to the sea." Then follows date. According to this translation the "place" GIRRU-TAM-TIM resolves itself into a "journey to the sea." B. E., XIV, 161 reads: 17 qa I DUG GÜ.ZIN.NI GISH.BAR-SHE. BA | 18 (qas) NI GISH.BAR-5-qi | 37 qa SHE.GISH.NI GISH.BAR-SHE.BA | arba DUL.AZAG | šùmati 26šam | šattu 23šam | KAS ( = gürü, (a)ra-rūnu) Dür-itu [ = "N. = DUR.DIL.BAT IX.SAR; i.e., "17 qa (in) one vessel, kubus (sc. Mesnner, Ideograf., No. 2048) -oil, GISH.BAR provender, 18 (qa in one vessel) sesame-oil, GISH.BAR-3-qi, 37 qa of sesame, GISH.BAR provender, moth Tishri, the 18th, year 23. Journey to Dür-itu. Nûr-DIL.BAT has entered" (sc. in the "Temple Archives," (cf. abû-i-nu DUB.SHA.KA ... abû-i-nu, B. E., XIV, 168 : 34, 43) as having paid out or received). B. E., XIV, 147 (= E. A. H., 182, cf. E. B. H., p. 329) reads: 28 (qas) ZID.DA | išta-ši-iš-man-ani | arba SHE.KI.NI.KUD | šùmati 1šam | šattu 10šam | gir-ri A.A.B.A.BA; i.e., "28 gur of flour ili-imagin (sc. 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 ålu-ki, or a-li-ki, "'city,'" for simple ålu.

(b) The use of DISH before be-ti—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. 53a) nor under ålu.BAR.TURê (i.e., p. 57b). Its importance consists in the fact that it has been found between KAS (= girrus) and BAR.TURê the determinative for "city," ålu, thus showing conclusively that KAS does not belong to BAR.TURê; if it did, such a place would have to be written ålu.KAS.BAR.TURê, and not KAS ålu.BAR.TURê, as we find it here. The text, B. E., XIV, 107, reads: 34 go ZID.BA | 24 go SHE.BAR KAS (= girrus, harıını) ålu.BAR.TURê | 2 go SHE.BAR a-na te-e-nì | åmu 17.74.e. | 38'EN.GAR shatu 14.4.5. | ålu.Ka-dut-man-Tur-qa LUGAL.E; i.e., "34 qa of flour, 24 qa of barley (for the) journey to Parak-nāri (and) 2 qa of barley for grinding" (öni = UAR.JAR = KkuA = qa-mu-a = GAZ = šašu, cf. II. W. R., p. 688a, and B. E., XIV, 84 : 1 | 91 : 4 | XV, 171 : 11, KU.QUAR GAZ.ZID.BA). Then follows date. In the above given texts, then, the KAS Tam-tim, KAS Dûr-îluê, Gir-ri A.Â.B.A, KAS ålu.BAR.TURê 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. 71f.), but are what the Germans would call "Verprovisierungs-Bezeichnungen" resp. "Anweisungen." As such they are exactly similar to, e.g., that published by Thureau-Dangin, R. T. Ch., No. 351, which reads: "X. qa zid-gu lugal | ud 34.e. shag uru | X. qa zid KAS(!) shu | Girî-1-dugh | u 1b-u-sha dumu nu-banda | A.Â.B.A(!)-shu mu-ga-sha gin( = DU)-na"; i.e., "so and so many qa of GU-flour, royal quality, for (a) three days (stay) in the city, and so and so many qa of flour to Girî-Illi, the sukal, and to Ikushu, the son of the nu-banda, for the journey (KAS-shu) to the sea (A.Â.B.A-shu) which they make (lit. 'go') for the purpose (shu) of fishing (mu-ga)." Here is KAS-shu A.Â.B.A-shu exactly the a-na KAS Tam-tim of B. E., XIV, 134. A journey to the sea from Nippur demanded on account of its distance and duration some kind of "Verprovisierung." This, likewise, is true of a journey to Dûr-îlu on the Elamite boundary, and if so, then Parak-nāri 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-Tamtim and the Girru-Dûr-îluê 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 Babylonia.


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

3 No. 20 : 1, 8, 9, but in 1. 4 it is omitted. Bezold, i.e., p. XVI, says that DISH is found in the Amarna letters of the L. collection before atêb "(oe," išši "me," amēlu "man," hāzišu "prefect," māru "son," rami-nâ "myself," and sharru "king," but he omits EN = bêlu. In view of our letter, quoted above, we have to see in places like Amarna, L. 16 : 1, 21 or L. 52 : 1, passa., where the sign for EN has the peculiar form of L-en, the determinative DISH + EN and read either "EN = bêlu or EN = bêla. Knudtzon, Die El-Amarna-Texte, has, quite correctly, recognized this DISH.
LETTERS TO CASSITE KINGS

(γ) The use of *hal*, also written *dsh-dsh*, 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, dılu₂₅; l.c., l. 15, an-nu-u-tum (= plural) dılu₂₅. Clay, B. E., XIV, p. 58a, is inclined to regard this in l.c., 166 : 25 (read 24) as a new city, *dısuHAL* or *Bêlûša*, but there dılu₂₅ is a plural, as a comparison with l.l. (read 24) 8, 13, 16, 19 clearly shows. An *dısuHAL* (Clay, corrections in Z. A., XX (1907), p. 4171.) does likewise not exist in B. E., XV, 132 : 1, where we are told what amounts of grain were paid out (nad-nu) in the cities (dılu₂₅) of Ishtar-apal-iddins, who, therefore, must have been a *bel pihûti* with several *hazannûti* (city prefects) under his command. For other occurrences of *hal = dsh-dsh* see, e.g., B. E., XIV, 18 : 2, dılu₂₅; B. E., XV, 185 1 : 6 | 200 I : 7, 6 ANaš,šah; B. E., XV, 178 : 3 | 200 IV : 9, MUaš,šah (Clay’s copy gives in the last quoted passage *zi₇* for MU, 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, 6 ḫlu₂₅, and Boeckx, l.c., p. 71, under dılu.

2 While we have in No. 6 : 7 only *ISII*, and in No. 24 : 9 *ip-su*, we find in No. 53 : 36, […] + 10 gur ISII e-pi-ri, with which cf. Amarna, L. 16 : 3, ISII, i.e., e-li-ri. Is No. 28 : 24, A mu-su ma-a'-du ši-nu-ru it-taš-kulu, to be compared with Amarna, L. 31 : 10, Amash, i.e., mi-ma?
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-di-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 (GÜ.ÈN.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 (karû), but neither the name of the father nor that of the son is given.

2. One written by a certain ù.A-shur-shum-êtir(KAR) to the governor En-lil-[bêl( = EN)-nishe'nsak-shu], who flourished at the time of Kadashman-Turgu.

3. Two written during the reign of Burna-Buriash by the celebrated trader in slaves, ù.En-lil-ki-di-ni, 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 bêl pitâti; this follows from the greeting in l. 5, a-ua pa-[ke]-[ê]-ka la-ua shul-mu.
5 Thus I propose to read his name, identifying him with the bêl pitâti mentioned in B. E., XIV, 90a : 16, 41; cf. ëbid., ll. 17, 20, 42 (dated the 11th year of Kadashman-Turgu). He was a contemporary of the hazinnu Ki-di-mu-û and of Bama-a-sha-ì6Marduk, the writer of No. 9, see p. 5.
6 For further details see below, pp. 54ff.
(a) To "A'-lu-shi-na.1
(b) To "Im-gu-ri.2

4. Eight letters, addressed to certain officials, in which the writer calls himself "brother," abu,3 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 m 1.ru En-lil-mu-kin-apal (= TUR.USHI) to "A-uni-[l]u-ia.6
(b) Two from "Erba-abi-Marduk2 and addressed
(a) To the sheriff-in-chief at the time of Kudurri-Enlil, "Alu-ù-a-Ba-ni,8
(b) To (sic) Da-ni-ti-ia.8

1 No. 78. An "A'-lu-shi-na is mentioned also in B. E., XIV, 25 : 12, 15, 23 (17th year of Kuri-Galzu) and in l.c., 107 : 11, 12 (25th or better 26th year, which can refer only to the reign of Burna-Burial, because Enlil-kidimmu is mentioned in all other tablets as living only under that ruler's reign). From this we may infer that King Burna-Burial 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-gu-ru, 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-Burial'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, PI. 3, No. 11, where the writer "SHESHŠ-ŠE blasts MU-°™Marduk addresses his letter to his "brothers," SHESHŠ-ŠE blasts, among whom is to be found another "SHESHŠ-ŠE blasts 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. Alu 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 Kadushman-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-uni-[l]u the ma(?)-hi-šu (sic) not ZU·H1·ŠU, Clay, B. E., XV, p. 206; 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 Amli-lu as "Kose-name"; 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 Shagaraktu-Surish) and with the writer of Nos. 13, 14. The former, being a contemporary of A'-lu-ù-a-Ba-ni, lived during the time of Kadushman-Enlil (see following note) and Kudurri-Enlil. Cf. also Mār-Imnēu, 81 : 9, with Imnēu, B. E., XIV, 56a : 20 (13th year of Nazi-Maruttash) and Ilu-MU.TUK.A-rešu (Meissner, Ideogr., No. 3857), 81 : 16, with the person of the same name in B. E., XIV, 116 : 6 (6th year of Kadushman-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 A'-lu-ù-a-M[a-n-š], Nār-Shaqamunu by name, is mentioned in B. E., XIV, 119 : 32 (5th year of Kudurri-Enlil). The father, then, probably lived during the time of Kadushman-Enlil and possibly was still alive during Kudurri-Enlil's reign.
9 No. 82. Before Danūtī 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 Danūtī-ia must be a kind of "Kose-name" 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-u-ä."

(d) One from "Pän(= SHI)-AN.GAL-lu-mur," an inhabitant of Dûr-ilu, to a high Temple and State officer of Nippur, "NIN-nu-u-ä." This letter, although it had been sent to "UD.KIB.NUN," i.e., to Sippur, where "NIN-nu-u-ä 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 "I-ri-ip-pa-åš-ru" to ["]Da(?)-li-li-sh[ä?].

(f) One from "Sin(= XXX)-ērâsh( = ENGAR)" a storhouse official,
stationed, as it seems, at different points at various times, and addressed, no doubt, to "Irīm (Meissner, *Ideogr.*, No. 3857)-šu-du-NIN.IB, the chief bursar at Nippur during the time of Kadašman-Turgu.

(y) One written by the royal official (probably itā) "Il-ši-ar, during the reign of Nazi-Maruttash and addressed, as it seems, to the chief bursar of Nippur, Martu-ku.²

5. Four letters addressed to "In-na-an-ni, the chief bursar of the Nippurian storehouses during the reign of Kūri-Galzu.

(a) Two of these were written by the governor du-NIN.IB (or MASH)-TUR.USH-SE-na.³

(b) And two by a lady of high rank, in all probability a NIN.AN.GAL⁴ or high priestess, 'In-bi-AI-rā⁵ by name.

6. One from du(D)ar-šu-nūr (ṣAB)-gab-ba,⁶ a merchant, to "[DI]n (= [DI]-KUD)-li-[mur]."¹⁴

¹ In B. E., XIV, 86:3 it appears as a witness at a transaction in the storehouse of Kār-Zi-baš; in loc., 98:2 the chief bursar of Nippur, "Irīm-šu-du-NIN.IB, transacts business for (ēš qīṭ) m dū-Nergal-nādi-āgē mes, son of m dūSin (xxx)-trīš (lab) at Kār-dīš-Baš; in loc., 106:12, he is found among certain witnesses at du-Shar-maṣš; in 111:6 dū-Nergal-nādi-āgē mel, son of m dū-Sin-trīš (lab), receives grain from (ina qīṭ) m dūEn-lil-zu-lu-īī and "Irīm-šu-du-NIN.IB at the storehouse (in-na bit kor) of Nippur; and in our letter he seems to have been connected with dušādī₄. . . , 90:5.

² Although the name is broken off, yet the circumstances of the time and the contents of the letter justify such an emendation. For this official see also Clay, B. E., XIV, p. 8.

³ No. 92.

⁴ A person with this name occurs B. E., XIV, 48a:7 (6th year of Nazi-Maruttash). That he was a royal official is concluded from 92:24, hē-mu-ut-ta šu-šu-rum-um-na a-na LUGAL lu-(!)-ta-pu-um u ni-kas (= NI.G), SII(T)-ni dūši-a-ša-šu-līš i ni-pa-um-ma, and that his position must have been a high one, such as was that of an itā, follows from 92:9, șu SIE.BAR ma(. . ., cf. 1.22) bēlē (= EN)ša mel pi-ḫaš (Gil, cf. 1.20; . . .) nu i-ma-pa-re . . .

⁵ The name is broken off. The contents of the letter and the time when it was written justify this emendation. See pp. 38ff.; 110ff.

⁶ Nos. 85, 86.

⁷ Or possibly a NIN.AN.TUR. For both of these expressions see pp. 4, note 8; 115.

⁸ This "fruit of Ifar" is not mentioned in B. E., XIV, XV. Because she was writing to Imanni, she must have flourished during the time of Kūri-Galzu. For further details see "Translations," pp. 115f.

⁹ No. 91.

¹° No. 22.

¹¹ The first sign in this name is the last variant given in the "Sign List" of B. E., XIV, No. 28; cf. B. E., XV, 151:2, "Lu-dar(!)-he-r. For the identity of Tar-lu, Tar-ku, Tur-gu, see Hilprecht, *Assyriaca*, p. 119. Tar-lu, being called here "the light of everything (= the whole = the world)", as such identified, not only with Shamash (cf., e.g., Ranke, B. E., Series D, III, p. 147a, Shamash-ār-ma-tim), but also with Sin (Ranke, loc., p. 163a, Sin-nār-māti; see also Clay, B. E., XIV, 19:23). duSin (xxx) is according to II R. 48:33 = TUR.KU (gloss du-nu-gu), hence D(T)ar-lu = Sin = Tar-k(g)u. As regards the linguistic difficulties cf., for the change of a and u in proximity of an r, Hilprecht, B. E., XXI, p. 17, note 4, and for the change of k and ã, cf. kammu and ūammu, Jensen, *K. R.*, VI, pp. 385, 508. After-ka there is broken away a-mo.

¹² As the DI and mur are missing, we possibly might read "[NI-na]-pi[ll(=KUD)-li-] . . . . With "[DI]-ni-[mur], i.e., "may he see judgment," cf. 27:18 "DÉ-ni-[ll(= AN)-lu]-mur, "may I see the judgment of god." Neither Tar-k(u)-nār-gabbu nor Din-limur is mentioned in B. E., XIV, XV.
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) 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 Urnschrift, Umschrift und Uberersetzung, Berlin, 1905, under P. 114. Its introduction reads:
A-na =A-nur-ri-ta ki-i-ku-na | [um]-ma = iSin(= XXX)-MU-[SE]a SHESH-ka-ma | iSin (= XXX) a-ab AX-mesq kel-lat | nap-sha-ka li-iz-ru-ru, which cannot be rendered with Peiser by "Sin der Vater der Götter möge all deine Zeden bewahren," but must be translated by: "Sin and(!) the father of gods may protect all thy souls!"; this follows clearly from li-iz-ru-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 iSin(= XXX)-lab-ni-urur knew the position of that stone; he, therefore, was asked: ak-ka-ma mi-li-ni ti kal-li-im = ku-du-[ur-ru] . . . ], 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-ush-ta-mar or the letter from the Sargonic period which is written a-na Lugal-ushtumgal.
4 Cf. per analogy the address of No. 24, dup-pi = Kal-[ba] a-na be-lu-shá.
5 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),1 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-na\(^{2}\) Y. ki-bé-ma\(^{3}\) um-ma =X.-ma, i.e., "to Y. speak, thus saith X."\(^{4}\)

or

Into (b) a-na\(^{2}\) Y. ki-bé-ma\(^{3}\) um-ma =X. aḫu\(^{5}\)-ka-ma, i.e., "to Y. speak, thus saith X., thy brother."\(^{5}\)

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.\(^{6}\) Its simplest form is a-na kâsha\(^{7}\) lâ\(^{8}\) shulmu,\(^{9}\) 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-shâ...
b[i-ti-ka] ụ a-na pa-ša-[i-ka] lu-ū 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) Pān-AN.GAL-lu-mur (i.e., "May I see the face of AN.GAL"), the writer, was a resident of Dār-šul-ḫu, whose gods he invokes, and that (2) the "divine court" of Dār-šulḫu 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.GAL2 ū ṣarsNIN.LIL ṣarsTAR ū AN.GAL and NIN.LIL, TAR and GU, ṣarsGU

1 See also 89 : 24, 26.
2 Cf. The Monist, 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 śarsšu (I R. 57, 15e), the wife of śarsšuSHAG.ZU (= Enlit, Sin, Rammān, Shamash, Marduk), a female, but must be a male, is apparent from his being coupled with śarsšuNIN.LIL. AN.GAL ū śarsšuNIN.LIL are male and female, husband and wife. A male AN.GAL as god of Dār-šulḫu occurs also in Jensen, K. B., VI, p. 64, 21 (cf. Ipc., p. 62, 20, where the verb śarsšu-pa-la = masc. (not ta-pa-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. II., p. 255), reading mu AN.GAL (Dār-rab-šul-ḫu) e a ba-tar, instead of, as it is commonly found, mu śarsšuKa-di Dār-rab-šul-ḫu e a ba-tar, i.e., "in the year when AN.GAL was brought into his temple in Dār-rab-šulḫu," see also Thureau-Dangin, S. A. K. J., p. 229, 7. This proves that AN.GAL = śarsšuKa-di, and if AN.GAL be a male, then śarsšuKa-di must be a male likewise. Again, in an inscription translated in E. B. II., p. 255, note 12 (see Thureau-Dangin, Ipc., p. 176, 2) AN-mutabīl, the shakkanakku of Dār-šulḫu calls himself the mi-gir śarsšuKa-di na-ra-an śarsšu[jnanna, 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, 5a śarsšuKa-di is identified with śarsšuNin-Girau and with śarsšuNIN.LIT, both being male divinities and gods of thunder and lightning; hence Thureau-Dangin (i.e., p. 176, 2, and passim), Huber (Die Personennamen in den Keilschriftkunden aus der Zeit der Könige von Ur und Isin, A. B., XXI, p. 171, note 14, who thinks that Kadi "war die Hauptgöttin von Dār-šul, die Gemahlin des d. GAL") and others, who see in śarsšuKa-di a female, are wrong. The pronunciation of the name of this god is neither Ka-di nor Kū-sīlim (Huber, i.e.,) but śarsšuGu (Ka-si ir=Di=NU)!; as such he is the same as śarsšuGU.NU-ra (= Gu-si-ru). For the reasons of this identification see my forthcoming volume on the Religious Texts of Nippur. śarsšuNIN.LIL, here coupled with AN.GAL, hence his wife, is of course, the same person who otherwise is known as "the wife of Enlit," and who, as wife of Enlit, is "the mistress of En-šīt" i.e., śarsšuNIN.EN.LIL. I R. 59 : 9. But in the passage just quoted she appears not as the wife of Enlit, but as that of śarsšuNIN.LIL or śarsšuMASH. We have seen above that AN.GAL or śarsšuKa-di was identified with śarsšuNIN. From this it follows that Kadi originally played the role of the "Son" (just as Enlit did in the Trinity: AN.EN-LIL-AN), but was, when he became the chief god of Dār-šulḫu, identified also with the Father, i.e., with Enlit, whose wife now becomes also his (i.e., Kadi's) wife. In the role of the "Son" we find Kadi also in such proper names as śarsšuKa-di-da-bi-iš (bi, ba; B. E., XIV : 4; XV, 36 : 18, etc.), i.e., "Kadi is speaking," sc. through, or by means of, the thunder; śarsšuKa-di-da-bi-En-lilḫu (B. E., XXV, 119 : 10. Omitted by Clay. Thus I read on account of the ši in ši, which name might be translated either by "Kadi is the good (= šābi, sc. child) of Nippur"
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(i.e., Enil; cf. Marduk apal Eridu, where Eridu, the city of god E.A. stands for the god himself), or by "Kadi is the husband (= SALACH = hurumùru = "pig," the cunobleg of NIN.IB, see The Monast, XVII (January, 1907), p. 143) of Nippur (= Enil)."

Again, if NIN.III, "the mistress or queen of Nippur," becomes the wife of AN.GAL, the highest god of Dur-ilu, she ipuo facto acquires also the title "mistress or queen of Dur-ilu." This now helps us to understand the passage in Meisner, Bauinschriften Assurhaddout's, B. A., III, p. 238, 42f. = Lc., p. 297, 42 (K. 2801), together with its parallel text and variants in Lc., in p. 307, 34f. (K. 221 + 2608), which has been completely misunderstood by all who took AN.GAL resp. Kadi to be a female. The passage reads: AN.GAL shar-at Dür-ilu = ÍTÁ sickness ÍTÁ Udú-bilú-babilú ( = T.L.A) ÍTÁ Dür (= KU)ra-ni-tum ÍTÁ SAG ar bé-bi-e ki-ri bili a-na Dür-ilu = ÍTÁ-shur-na véir. It will be seen in this passage the gods of Dur-ilu 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.II = belit = sharat) of Dür-ilu [variants: ÍTÁ.GASHAN = belit, mistress of Dur-ru-ni-tum, Di-ri. (Dür-ilu), Sír (and) the Bélit-babilú ( = "mistress of life") [variant: ÍTÁ.EN.TILA = "lord of life"] Dür-ru-ni-tum ( = fem. of ÍTÁ.KU(dar-ra-nu)NA, III R. 68, 9e) (and) SAG in the month Bu-bi-e into the temple in Dür-ilu, their city, I brought."

According to the Nippurian pattern we can now establish the following Trinity for Dür-ilu:

$$
\begin{align*}
\text{AN.GAL (Father)} & \quad \text{Sír (Son)} \quad \text{Sharat Dür-ilu (Mother)} \\
\{ \text{Bélit-babilú (wife of the Son)} \} & \quad \{ \text{Bélit-Díri} \}
\end{align*}
$$

which corresponds exactly to that of Nippur, viz.:

$$
\begin{align*}
\text{EN.LIL (Father)} & \quad \text{NIN.IB (Son)} \\
\{ \text{Sír (wife of the Son)} \} & \quad \{ \text{Bélit-Díri (nasc.)} \}
\end{align*}
$$

In the Nippurian pattern NIN.IB appears as the ur-sag, "chief servant," or sukkal, "prime minister, ambassador," or apil, "son" of Enil, and Sír is called in the Dür-ilu Trinity the me-ra, "son" (or if read šip-ra, then = "messenger") of (ah) ÍTÁ.Ka-di, see Scheil, Textes Élam. Sém., I, p. 91, 23 (= Hale 17). NIN.IB is the apil Ê-shar-ra, and in V R. 52, I : 19, 20 ÍTÁ.Sír is identified with ÍTÁ.She-ra-qib and termed the ra-bi-ì Ê-shar-ra, "the watchman of Esarra," i.e., of the house of the totality, the Universe. NIN.IB as ÍTÁ.L or as ÍTÁ.gn-kur-kur is the same as his father Enil, and in V R. 31, 2, Rev. 30, ÍTÁ.Sír is identified with his father ÍTÁ.Ka-di. NIN.IB is both male and female. As male he is the husband and called also ÍTÁ.IB, and as female he is the wife, then known also as Bo-ù, Gula, or NIN.DIN.DUGGA = naballat mil, "who restores the dead to life" (see also The Monast, XVII (January, 1907), p. 11f.). The wife of Sír appears here likewise both as a female (Bélit-babilú, "mistress of life") and as a male (Bélit-babilú, "lord of life"); hence she is parallelized exactly by NIN.DIN.DUGGA = Bo-ù = NIN.IB: female and male! From this we may infer (1) that Sír played the same rôle in Dür-ilu as did NIN.IB in Nippur; (2) that Kadi must have been the "god of Esarra" according to the people of Dür-ilu, just as Enil was the "god of Esarra" according to the Nippurians, i.e., Kadi = Enil, and the wife of Kadi = NIN.II; (cf. also the name AN.GAL = Kadi with AN.GAL.KALAM.MA, the name of Enil of Nippur; B. E., XIV, 145 : 18, 15 | XV, 34 : 2); (3) that the "Son" in each and every case is the same as the "Father," NIN.IB = Enil; Sír = 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": ÍTÁ.NIN.EN.LIL = Bo-ù = NIN.DIN.DUGGA is also = ÍTÁ.NIN.LIL, the Bélit ur-sag-xir, who otherwise was known also as Ishtar. But Ishtar is, as is well known, male and female and appears in the inscription of AN-mutabil as the wife of Ka-di, while in our letter the wife of AN.GAL (= Kadi) is called ÍTÁ.NIN.LIL; hence Ishtar = ÍTÁ.NIN.LIL and both are male and female. (cf. here also the ÍTÁ.Ga-ra = AX = Antum = NIN.LIL, the wife of ÍTÁ.Ekur = AX = Anu = Enil, hence Enil = AN and NIN.II = 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.III = Ishtar must be also a female; as such a female he appears in II R. 57, 18 and in Sp. I, 331 ( = Z. A., VI, p. 241) compared with Reisner, Hymnen, 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 each and every city, though consisting of three persons, clearly distinct: the begetter (Father), the conceive (Mother), the begotten (Son), are yet one: clearly and unmistakably a veritable Trinity in a Unity.

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

If Dùr-ru-ni-tum be not only a term, but also the name of Dùr(r)una, the name of Durumutum. From III R. 6, 9a we learn that Dùr(r)una was the first (SAG) of the seven [gu?]-balanga (or is [gu?]-balanga to be read here = rabig?) A.N.?A-ge, i.e., "tambourines" (= tambourine-beaters, heralds, creatures who proclaim the "glory of God") of A.N.A. In Pinches, J. R. A. S., January, 1935, p. 143. (= 81-8-30, 25), Obsv. col. 11, 7, 6, SAG is called S.A.G.GAR, i.e., "Hauptmacher" = captain, chief (= the first (SAG), cf. Dùr(r)una, the first of the "seven") and is identified with MI?H, which latter is according to i.e., II. 19, 20, not only = IM, "the god of lightning," but also = EN-di-zu-gin = GU (Pinches, i.e., l. 4). In our letter SAG is coupled with TAR, who is to be read according to III R. 68, No. 2, 53, Kitum-na, and is called there the LU?G or subhalla (K)?A-di-ge, i.e., "the (chief) messenger of Kadi." 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 Dùr-ru-ni-tum, and being identified with MIR, IM and GU, must be a male and the male counterpart of Dùr-ru-ni-tum, i.e., he is the same as Dùr(r)una.

4. GU, the wife of TAR, is the same as SAG, the husband of Durumutum—i.e., husband and wife are one, also male and female. (Cl. for TAR + GU also AN + KI = šamaš + šīlim = Anu + Antum = husband and wife = AN + AN = AN, Bel, the Christ, etc., p. 26f. Is the Tar-gu an artificial (foreign, Cassite? or Elamite?) name, consisting originally of the Tar and GU = husband and wife = one? Tar-gu?)

5. SAG, because called "Hauptmacher" and identified both with the "god of storm and lightning," and with Dùr(r)una, the first of the seven heralds of A.N.A, must have been the "Hauptmacher" or chief, the first of the "seven," which seven 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. 65 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 "mystical (or) of Christ." These "seven" were in the Babylonian religion always identified not only with the "Son" whose "servants" (nu-bahda = ēlāiti = ḫaduwa) they were, but also with the "Mother," resp. "the wife of the Son"—hence Lābaris (Myhrman, Z. A., XVI, 153 = Weissbach, Babyl. Miscellen, p. 42) and Ishtar had "seven names" (Reisner, Hypomn., p. 109, 57f.), hence also the remarkable name of NIN.LLI = NIN.GAL in V R. 30, 46a, where she is called Sargon, i.e., "the goddess Seven." (Cl. here also the seven names of NIN.LLI, III R. 68, 5e, diff. = III R. 67, 20a, b., the fourth of which is Sargon-ru, who is identified in Turouq-Dangin, R. T. Ch., 10 : 3, with IM-qqi-ga, a cognomen of NIN.GIR = NIN.IB, the god of thunder and lightning. See further the "seven sons" of NIN.KA.SI or NUNU-ri-tIJO (the wife of Ka-di), III R. 68, No. 1, 20e, II, "the seven sons" of NIN.PAP-NU-GAR-RA and NUNU-PAP-NU-GAR-RA (i.e., of NIN.NA and Gula) in III R. 67, No. 1, 25c, diff.; the seven sons of NUNU-ES-ŠAR-AR, III R. 69, No. 3, 64a, b, etc., etc.). This name shows clearly that the "seven" were considered to be "one" (notice also that in the religious texts very often the singular is used in connection with the SAG)—just as the "sevenfold gift" of the Holy Ghost is the Holy Ghost in her (tūdūg is 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-god = Šarr-ur and Šarr-gaz, etc.) in his or her hand, or as seven curls, braids (Gilgamesh: 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
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5 ANša-shib É-DIM.GAL-KALAM.MA
6 nap-sha-ti-ka li-iš-šu-ru
7 ki-bi-iš-ka li-shal-li-mu
8 libbiš a-na a-ma-ri-ka
9 iš-ši-ša-an-ni²
10 man-nu pa-ni-ka ba-ru-ti li-mur³

11 ù da-ba-ab³[H1 (= ṭáb)⁴]
12 ki(?)-nu NIN(?)-[ . . . ]

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

godhead," it became the diviae 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 Homi-
lotic 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 tambourine-beaters, heralds,
angels) a certain ṭAššu-An-na, to be read in Assyrian ṭAššu-šu-di, who is in Hebrew none other than the well-known
Gabriel, "the man of El or ittu"—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 Texts of the Temple Library of Nippur. In conclusion I shall
give here the two parallel Trinities of Dār-ilu as gathered from our letter and from the building inscriptions of
Assur-Réddan:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AN.GAL (Father)</th>
<th>Tār (Son)</th>
<th>Gū (wife of Son)</th>
<th>NIN.LIL (Mother)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AN.GAL</td>
<td>Tār</td>
<td>Gū</td>
<td>NIN.LIL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Šir</td>
<td>Gū</td>
<td>NIN.LIL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Da-r†una</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

³ If the Trinity of Dār-ilu be formed according to the pattern of the Nippurian, it follows that the temple of É-DIM.
GAL-KALAM.MA means "The temple (É) which is the great (gal) firmament (lit. 'band,' DIM = ṭakšu) of the world (sc. here the 'Babylonian world' as macrocosmos formed after the macrocosmos)." Among the names of Enil's temple at Nippur we find, e.g., Dur-an-ki, i.e., "the
firmament (dur = ṭakšu) of heaven and earth (i.e., the world, the macrocosmos)"); see also Bilit, the Christ, etc., p. 21
and notes.


⁵ That is, "all who are in thy immediate entourage, who have the privilege of appearing before thee, who are
thy friends and equals." Cf. here the New Testament phrase, "to see the face of Christ" = "to be like Christ," the
highest honor conferred upon Christians.

⁶ 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.

⁷ Supplemented according to 38 : 7f., ma-an-nu pa-an ba-nu-tum ša-ba-li ri-mur [i] man-nu da-ba-ba II-ab
(= ṭáb) [a-na] be-ta-iš li-ta-te-ti um-na-a a-na be-ta-iš-ma.

⁸ According to the passage quoted in the preceding note, we would expect here a-na qab-ša or better a-na M NIN-
u-a. The traces on the tablet are, however, as reproduced. The sign NIN(?), looks rather like a SAL + ma =
minna; besides, if NIN(? were the beginning of NIN-nu-a, we miss a DISH before the nom. propr.
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13 lish-te-[me] may listen!
14 um-ma-[a a-na aḫi-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 N'ppur, 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 No. 81 : 4, "UD à Marduk nap-sha-ti-ka li-ig-su-rum.
2 No. 82 : 6, be-ā kab-tum [nap-sha]-ti-ka li-ig-su. Kaldu, when used figuratively, has the signification "heavy" (sc. in quality, not quantity), gewichtig, bedeutend, significant, weighty, important, momentous, first (= asharidu), and when attributed to a god makes that god play the rôle of the "Son"; i.e., an ilu kaldu 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 (cf. the nom. prp. m IN NIN.IB-kaldu (= DUGUD)-aḫī(i)-shu, B. E., XIV, 134 : 3. Only by reading aḫē (even if written without me or mesh) instead of aḫē (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), "EN En-lil (Son), AN = IN LIL Mother.
3 Seeing that Larsa (UD.UNUG) is mentioned neither in these letters nor in B. E., XIV, XV, while Sippar (UD.KIB.NUN) occurs quite frequently (see, e.g., No. 89 : 24, 26, and the Kûr-UD.KIB.NUN, B. E., XV, 199 : 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-ā kab-tum.
5 No. 87 : 5, AN mesh ša a-si-šu ša-me-[e rabāli]. Thus I propose to read, and by doing so I take the sign looking like rat to stand for ša-me-[e]. Cf. here an analogous passage in B. E., X, 90 : 5, where Clay, l.c., p. 69a, finds a city Kab-ri(li)-li-ri-im-me-shi, but where me-shi has to be separated from the name of the city and has to be read ša-inu (= me) pōni (= šiši); see The Monist, XVII (January, 1907), p. 151.
6 Nos. 83–86.
7 This applies also to Ašshubina (78 : 1), as the expression li-ša-am at-ta shows. The slave-dealer Enil-kiidišm was dissatisfied with the actions of Ašshubina.
8 In 39 : 2 the introductory um-ma-a a-na be-ā-a-ša-ma stands, quite strangely, before the greeting.
invariably introduced directly, either without1 or with the help of *um-ma-a,"2 or *um-ma-a a-na "Y.-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*) to a former note or inquiry may be found the following:

1) *ash-shum*; 2) *shâ*; 3) *i-na bu-ul*; 4) *shá la-ash-pu-ra*; 5) *shá x.x. shá*

---


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 "Y.-ma* corresponds in Nos. 1-74 an *um-ma-a a-na be-ta-in(a)-me,* which is most generally found in connection with the address: *ardi-ka "X. a-na di-na-an be-ta-in bul-lik,* where it follows either (a) immediately upon *bul-lik,* in which case, as in Nos. 1: 3 | 4: 4 | 21: 3 | 29: 3 | 30: 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 30: 2 it stands before the greeting!—or (c) upon the "invocati"on," so in No. 38: 11. In connection with the address: *a-na be-li-ia ki-bê-uma um-ma "X.-ma ardi-ka-ama a-na di-na-an be-ta-ia bul-liik* it is found in three passages only, viz., in Nos. 13: 4 | 14: 4 | 17: 6. In No. 26: 3 we have wrongly *be-ta-ia for be-ta-ia-ma.*

4 Sometimes also *um-ma,* instead of *um-ma-a,* is found. Notice 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, passim, and cf. below sub 11, pp. 26 and 27, note 8.

5 I.e., "as regards." Cf. 81: 6 f., *ash-shum nârâtu*|*Nï-bu-rum shâ GÜ:EN.NA-ka ash-shi-ni-ka im-to-na-ab-la-ram um-ma-a a-na Mâr-á-rum-ni-bi a-na di-ni [. . .] i.e., "as regards the Nippurians whom thy (deputy) sheriff has received on thy account (= upon thy command) (sc. for the purpose of holding them as prisoners), the following: "To Mâr-Innîl for judgment [they have been brought, or he has brought them]."" Cf. here also Nos. 11: 4 | 14: 5 | 23: 33 | 26: 8 | 12: 17 | 27: 15 | 28: 5 | 34: 10 | 35: 13, 15, 25, 30 | 57: 2, 4 | 60: 8 | 69: 3.

6 With the same meaning as *ash-shum,* i.e., "as regards," Nos. 83: 8, 15 | 86: 16 | 87: 8 (followed by *shâ i-ib-ba-[u],* cf. p. 25, note 36; p. 26, note 5). See also Nos. 3: 21, 24 | 17: 7, 8 | 31: 11, 15, 25, 27 | 34: 33 | 60: 9.

7 With the same or similar meaning as *shâ* or *ash-shum,* 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, *i-na bu-ul KU^b^a be-ta-*la i-sa-an-ni-iq-an-ni, cf. below, p. 109. The *i-na bu-ul di-qa-ra-lû a-na ra-di-i al-ta-[per] of 45: 10 does not belong here; see p. 142.

8 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 *shâ be-li ash-pu-*ra, "with regard to what my Lord has written," which latter may be found either with, in 3: 29 | 26: 3, or without following *um-ma-a,* cf. 39: 38, "xx. concerning which my Lord has inquired (sc. I beg to say that = um-ma-a) a-na be-ta-ia ash-te-bi-la, 'I have sent (it) to my Lord.'" Cf. here also 62: 77 *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 be-li-ia-ma,* 1, 9; for a translation see p. 137. Cf. here also 34: 18 and [i-na-a-pu-ka ki-i shâ be-hi i-shá-pu-[r]a] in 3: 60.
ta-äš-šu-pu-ra', or abbreviated, šá x.x. ta-äš-šu-pu-ra'; (6) äš-šum x.x. šá ta-äš-šu-pu-ra'; (7) a-na bu-ut x.x. šá ta-äš-šu-pu-ra'; (8) x.x. šá tash-pu-ra resp. taq-ba-a';

1 "With regard to x.x., concerning whom (which) thou hast written (lit. sent)," see No. 86: 18f. šá]"E-ni-ä-ša-du-là-Marduk šá ta-äš-pu-ra ul na-ka-ruš šá-šu a-da-sa um-ä-sa a-tä-a šá pi-ia-su a-ba-aši am-mi-ni ki-i ar-ä-li ite-pu-sa-šu; i.e., 'as regards Emidá-Marduk concerning whom thou hast written (ie. I beg to state = um-ma-a) 'he is not the enemy (evil person), he is my brother,' (therefore), please (um-ma) grant him his wish, etc." Notice in this connection that tu is connected here with the Imperative. Or we have to suppose that šupissu is = šupissu, Permanent II?

Prof. Hilprecht translates differently, regarding the tu as a mistake for ku(=ka), 'thy,' and taking aššu in the sense of command, order, edict, in which it generally appears in the letters of the Kuyunjuk Collection: 'As regards Emidá-Marduk, concerning whom thou hast written: 'he is not the enemy, he is my brother,' (I beg to state) thus: 'make him execute thy order (ababak).'"]' Cf. in this connection p. 110, note 3.

2 The an r. shows that this is a relative clause, i.e., that a šá has to be supplied before ta-äš-pu-ra. (For another similar abbreviation see below, note 3). Cf. 86: 1-4, šá]"AZAG.GI ta-äš-pu-ra um-ma-a šá mér-šaši E-N.I.I.I.; AZAG GI hûš(!)-pu-ra(!) šá-šu i-nà E-N.I.I.I.; amêš DAM.QAR mark, etc.; i.e., 'as regards the gold (hûšu) concerning which thou hast written I beg to say (um-ma-a), so better than 'saying,' and making what follows a quotation): 'he of the Nippurians who keeps the gold is in Nippur, may the merchants, etc.'" Notice here the form hûš-su=ma=relative clause as indicated by the a of na. It must be a Permanent II; but how is the a of hûš to be explained? We would expect hûš-pu-ra. Have we to suppose that hûš had also the value hûš? The forms ba'i = ba'î, Delitsch, Gram., p. 270; Jensen, K. B., VI, p. 350, or ba'ammu = ba'u'mmu, Jensen, I.c., p. 372, are hardly analogous here, because in these latter forms the u is due, no doubt, to the b. In the view of the imperative rammik, Gr., I.e., for rammik, we might see in hûšûma a dialectical Neo-Babylonian of the Permanent for hûšûma. Prof. Hilprecht regards hûšûma as being differentiated from the regular hûšûma, Perm. II, under the influence both of the final 'u' of this word and of the 'û' in the preceding hûšû, to facilitate the pronunciation of the two words (containing both b and g) by avoiding three 'u' words immediately following each other. Per analogy, we would expect in Nos. 1-7 a phrase like: šá x.x. šá be-li ish-pu-ra, but this is not found in our letters. Instead of it we have, so far, only äš-šum x.x. šá be-li ish-pu-ra; see the following note.

2 With the same signification as šá x.x. šá ta-äš-pu-ra, cf. also šá and äš-šum. Cf. 82: 9, äš-šum amêši AZAG.GI (=kudimmu) [šá]ta-äš-pu-ra, context mutilated. This phrase corresponds in Nos. 1-74 to (a) äš-šum x.x. šá be-li ish-pu-ra, so in 14: 16 / 23: 19 / 26: 15, for which see pp. 99, 119. Cf. also 27: 12, äš-šum NI.GISH pisî-šat bit be-li in šá be-li ish-pu-ra 1 (gu) 24 (gu) NI.GISH pisî-šat shatti kinam 1 x.x. NI.GISH ul-ad-in, i.e., 'as regards the oil, cement for the house of my 'Lord,' concerning which my 'Lord' has written (ie. I beg to state) that of the 1 gu 24 gu of oil, cement for one year, I have not (yet) given (paid, delivered) a single qa.' Or 27: 18, äš-šum "Dî-in-Bilu-nûr šá be-li ish-pu-ra um-ma-a a-ba-ú-sa-šu ù a-ba-ta-ta i-nà ádu-ki i-na a-sha be-li a-na be-li-[a] x.x. [u]-[qil]-bi; (or bit)-ma; i.e., 'as regards Din-ililumur, concerning whom my 'Lord' has written, saying (= um-ma-a, introduces here quotation from previous communication, not the answer: 'Art thou interceding for him?' (the long ū in a-ba-ú-sa-šu indicates a question, Gr., p. 215, g) (ie. I beg to say that = um-ma-a = answer to inquiry) 'I have spoken in the 'city' (i.e., Nippur) in the presence of my 'Lord' to my 'Lord,' etc.' See also here also 27: 27 / 57: 2 / 59: 16. (b) To äš-šum x.x. šá be-li qî-ša-a, 23: 11, 24, see pp. 98, 99. (c) To äš-šum x.x. be-li ish-pu-ra (sec. šá before be-li and cf. above, note 2). Cf. 26: 17 (see p. 119). (d) äš-šum "Ig-gur-dil.BAT šá i-na Bit[.] Si-ri-du-ask be-li [ish-pu-ra] [u]-um-ma-a IM.ER.KUR.[RA mark,-a li]-li-a-ša-ra-nû ù [u]-um-ma-a i-ta-a-a šá um-ma-a IM.ER.KUR.RAM mark am-ma-ar-ma màr šipî-pi-ia i-li-ki-ša i-tak; i.e., 'as regards Ig-gur-DIL.BAT (= Išitak), who is (at the present) in Bit-Širidûsh, concerning whom my 'Lord' has written, saying (um-ma-a = quotation): 'let him receive my horses' (I beg to say, sec., um-ma-a): 'Belkí he spoke as follows (um-ma-a): 'I shall (will) examine the horses, but my messenger shall (will) take (them) and go.'" Notice the peculiar form i-tak = ihak! (A reading i-shet = 'he shall run, i.e., go away, leave instantly with the horses,' might also be possible.)

4 This is used here in apparently the same signification as šá resp. äš-šum x.x. šá ta-äš-pu-ra-hence i-na or a-na (see instantly bu-ut = šá resp. äš-šum (cf. p. 24, note 7). See here 89: 15f.; a-na lu-wu[...] (sec. dini amêši)
(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 part "etc 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

shâ ta-ash-pu-[ra um-ma]-a an-mi-lê K[U.DA] ki il-qu-â-[nu] il-ta-al-shâ-nu-ti û il-ta-an-na ša-nu-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: û result; the û may be translated here also by but cf. for this û between sentences, Jensen, K. B., VI, pp. 325, 336, 337, 339, and Johnston, J. A. O. S., XIX, p. 50, acquitted them." For P šâ-âšu, used of judicial cross-examination, see Jensen, i.e., p. 531. It-ta-an-na-shâ-nu-ti I take as P 28 (from which we have annu, "Zusagen"); il-ta-nu-nu, il-ta-nu-nu, il-ta-nu; the a at each indicates the third person of a chief sentence. A "possible" derivation from Hebr. "doj, "to answer," which "might" seem to be preferable here on account of the following (l. 21) um-ma-a (see p. 27, n. 8), does not fit. Or should we derive it from Rûm, H. W. R., p. 95b (from which we have mânu, "Rubehager") and translate "he improvised it"? The "he" according to the context must be some unnamed GÎ,K,E+N,N,A, "sheriff," or possibly a judge or king. Among the letters addressed to the "Lord" we find a similar expression, e.g., i: 30: 4, i-na bu-at A SHÂAGmêsh šâ Tuk(= KU)-kul-dê-ê. KURâš šâ [ê]-ê shu-pu-ra ù-tu-dê-ê-[à]-ra; see translation on p. 127. 4 "(As regards the x.x. concerning whom (which) thou hast written or spoken" is, after all, only a shorter form of šâ, šâ-šu-ma, or i-na (a-na) bu-at x.x. šâ ta-ash-pu-ra, cf. (5)−(7). Although not to be found in Nos. 76f., it does occur, e.g., in No. 27: 35, ú annâ+6 SÎA.KU.DA (= mâkûnu, tax-gatherer) šâ be-hî shu-pu-ra . . . -ma il-ša-an-mi-îlû, and as regards the poll-gatherers concerning whom my Lord' has written (I beg to state that) 'he . . . and shall find out.' No. 31: 17, ú SIG SHÎG šâ be-hî il-še-a [ush]-še-bî-lu, "and with regard to the 'good wool' about which my Lord' has spoken (sc., in a former letter, I beg to state that) 'I have sent it.' 4 This is a still further abbreviation of (8); in other words, it is the same as (5)−(7) with both šâ, šâ-šu-ma, i-na (a-na) bu-at and šâ toshpûra (resp., šâ be-hî toshpûra) left out, so that only the x.x. = object remains. Cf. here 35: 10, i 70 gîsh(PU)JADUMêsh šâ be-hî in il Bu-û, "and as regards the 70 (gur) of kaš-šu (see Meissner, Ideogr., No. 3796) belonging to my Lord' (sc. 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 SHÂAGmêš šâ be-hî in-di-na mU-bar-ro a-nu be-hî in il Bu-û um-ma-a A SHÂAGmêš um-di-šî-šir a-nu-ku ut šu-šî-shî-ir: "as regards the fields, which my Lord' has given and concerning which (îp-be-nû = relative) Ubarru has reported to my Lord' saying: he has forced (them),' (sc. I beg to state that) 'I have not forced (them),' A construction like this elucidates clearly the terseness and businesslike character of these letters. 4 "(And) when thou writest or askest" is found in the letters addressed to the "Lord" (Nos. 1−74) under the form shum-ma be-hî i-sap-pa-ra or shum-ma be-hî il-ta-al-ma. For the former see 31: 9, shum-ma be-hî i-sap-pa-ra li-sha-nim-ma(? a-na-ôl zî-li-shî-ma; i.e., "(and) when my Lord' writes: they (one) may repeat." (sc. the treatment formerly applied to the sick person, I must tell my Lord that) 'her side (= Hebr. P'X) is too weak (sc. for such a repetition)." In this connection notice the šî after zî-li for šâ, due to assimilation, facilitated by the preceding šîlant and repeatedly known also from the tablets of the Mursûš archives. For the latter cf. 56: 5, shum-ma be-hî il-ta-al-ma gîsh[U]. 5 = SI šâ ru-ka-û šâ be-hî in il-pu-shû a-nu-ku hu-ne ba-at ma bu-pu-shu-[ma]; "when my Lord' asks that they make the pole(s or shafts) for the chariot of my Lord' (sc. may I beg my Lord that) I be permitted to take hold of it (them) and make it (them)!' For gîsh[U]. 5 SI cf. B., E., XV, 32: 1, gîshâ-gû-nu; for U+ SI see Meissner, Ideogr., No. 1266 = bûnu, and for bûnu, Del., II, W. B., 284a: gîsh[U] + SI MA = bû-in(-nu, siel) e-hi-pi = "ein Theil eines Schiffes." All of which passages sh. w that U+ SI has here the pronunciation bûnu and that gîsh[U]. 5 SI has to be read accordingly bûnu-šî-šî. It must be here the "shaft" or "pole" of the wagon and is distinct from the bûnu (not uûnu!) of a ship. The abnâ-li-šî-nu of 91: 5 was probably a stone of the shape of a "pole," i.e., "finger," and the 2 ni-šî-in-nu hûrûti of Str., IV, 116: 2 (cf. i.e., 220: 12, "5 šî-šî-nu") 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 it or (c) by ī and one of the above given particles or phrases.6

Letters not in answer to a previous communication are much simpler in form and construction. In these the subject matter is stated either directly,7 or the

6 Whenever these particles are found they take up either (a) the um-ma after ki-be-ma or (b) the um-ma-a of the introduction: um-ma-a a-na nu-ma-ra resp. um-ma-a a-na be-fa-ia-ma 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. 21 notes 2, 4. For um-ma 86 : 18ff., is instructive. While I. 19 contains the “answer” (with um-ma-a omitted) to the ‘Lord’s’ inquiry concerning Enida-Marduk, we still find another sentence introduced by um-ma in I. 20. This um-ma must take up a preceding um-ma (a), to be found either in the text of the letter, 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., 59 : 21f. I.e., li. 17ff. (see p. 25, n. 4), contain the answer to an inquiry of N天nu-u-a with regard to the fate (judgment?) of certain men who had taken (stolen?) wheat flour. I. 21f., introduced by um-ma-a, which latter takes up the (um-ma-a) of I. 14, contains an answer to another inquiry, resp. reprimand, which had been expressed (in a former letter addressed to Pšen-A.N.GAL-lámur) 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: I. 21f., um-ma-a mōr shi-pi-ia ša a-na 4Ns.111.1 a-na ma šarr ( = LUGAL) ash-pu-ru (erasure) ki (erasure) i-nu-ru-ka ma-la a-sap-rak-ku in-î qa-um-a i-na 4Ns.UD.KIB.NUN ša sī mōr shi-pi-ia 1š aš-pu-ru-ka nīr shi-pi-ia a-na 4Ns.UD.KIB.NUN al-ta-p-rak-ku um-ma-a a-na N天nu-u-a ma-de (= NE)-im-ka ša ši-um-ka ša ash-up-ra; i.e., “(But as regards thy reprimand in thy letter of recent date 1 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): ‘I (i.e., N天nu-u-a) is in Sippur.” (This is the reason why) I have not sent my messenger to thee (and why) I have (now) dispatched my messenger to thee at Sippur with the following note (um-ma-a): “To N天nu-u-a. Send thy news and thy greeting (i.e., with this letter, asking for an answer for “return mail”).’” The events discussed in this letter are the following: (a) N天nu-u-a of Nippur has written to Pšen-A.N.GAL-lámur of Dūr-iiu 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) Pšen-A.N.GAL-lámur, 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. (e) The messenger found the king at Nippur, but not N天nu-u-a, being informed that the latter had left for Sippur, where he could be addressed. (d) Pšen-A.N.GAL-lámur, anxious to avoid receiving a second reprimand and to show his “brother” (I. 3) that his accusation of negligence was unmerited, at the same time wishing to assure him that “he still loves him” (I. 1), and that “he wants to see him personally and explain matters to him” (I. 8f.), dispatches at once, in order not to lose further time, his messenger with this letter to Sippur, asking for a reply. (e) This letter was received by N天nu-u-a at Sippur, 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 for the Museum of Science and Art. To the um-ma-a of these letters corresponds an um-ma-a a-na be-fa-ia-ma of Nos. 1-74. See 33a : 9, 12, 18 compared with I. 5 (see pp. 137f.); 45 : 18 compared with I. [3] (see p. 143); 48 : 26 compared with I. 3.


8 ḫb, 3 : 40 + fr. d. | 27 : 38; ṣ x.x, ᵐa₄ ᵢ₄u₄ iḥ-pu-ra, 27 : 27; ṣ ᵢ₄a₄ ᵢ₄u₄ iḥ-pu-ra, 31 : 78, etc., etc.

9 Cf. 76 : 2, ᵢ₄u₄ pe-nu-la₄a; 78 : 5, ᵢ₄u₄a₄ pa₄am at₄u₄; 84 : 4, 1a tracked at₄u₄t₄u₄; 85 : 4, 9, 11, i₄l₄t₄i₄a; 83 : 5 begins with a question expressing a surprise: ᵢ₄u₄n₄i₄i₄u₄u₄ ᵢ₄u₄a₄, which is introduced by um-ma-a, p. 111.
LETTERS TO CASSITE KINGS

writer may use as a kind of introduction some such words or phrases as: *enni,*
*eninna,* *inanna,* *anumma,* *be-di ki,* etc., etc.

1 No. 40 : 8, [en]-ni, "behold."

also the following note.

3 "Now." Cf. 3 : 19 (cf. with parallel passage in J. 30, where we have i-na-an-na-a(3), and see a-nu-um-na-a,
ote 4). 40 | 24 : 27 | 31 : 35 | 38 : 2 | 3 : 60, [i]-na-an-na ki-i ša ši be-di i-ša-pa-[a]. See also i-i-na-an-no, 11 : 9;

4 "Now." See 86 : 8, and cf. a-nu-um-ma-a, 21 : 11, with i-na-an-no-a, note 3.

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-ňá**, 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,* where, fortunately, a portion of the envelope has been preserved, as follows:

**dúp-pi** = *X.* (giving here the name of the writer) **a-na be-ňá-shu**; *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-ňá**.

Unfortunately for our investigation, there have not been published among the so-called "Letters of Ḫammurabi"1 any that are written to King Ḫammurabi 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 Ḫammurabi's well-known habit of quoting frequently from his correspondent's letters when answering them, we are able to establish the important fact that Ḫammurabi, though king, was yet addressed by his subjects2 not as **LUGAL** = *sharru*,

---

1 Here we have to read: **dúp-pi** "Kál-[bu], a-na be-ňá-shu. **Kál-bu** was the writer, according to *i.e.*, l. 9.

2 I. W. King, The Letters and Inscriptions of Ḫammurabi, Vols. I-III.

3 In King, *i.e.*, Vol. I, No. 1, ll. 8 f., Ḫammurabi quotes from a letter of Sin-idinnam, saying: "And thou (*i.e.*, Sin-idinnam) answeredst: 'Those four temple servants he (*i.e.*, Ibn-[š]-MARTU) caused me to conscribe as per his sealed contract, but one of them, a certain Gimmilum, I (*i.e.*, Sin-idinnam) sent a-na ma-tar be-ňá-šu, before my Lord (*i.e.*, Ḫammurabi).' This is what thou hast written. Now they have brought before me (a-na ma-tar-ri-šu) that certain Gimmilum whom thou hast sent." Cf. also the quotation from Sin-idinnam's letter, King, *i.e.*, Vol. I, No. 4, l. 13: *be-ňá aš-šur-pur-am,* "my Lord (*i.e.*, Ḫammurabi) may send," and also that in King, *i.e.*, Vol. I, No. 8, l. 10 (compared with l. 14): *šurn-na be-ňá i-ga-ab-bi,* "if my Lord (again Ḫammurabi) thinks." Tarībatum speaks to Ḫammurabi, King, *i.e.*, Vol. III, p. 62 (No. 75), l. 5: "the crews of the ships šur be-ňá i-šu-ša-šu, which my ‘Lord’ has desired," and *EN.ZU*-ma-gir refers to the seal of Ḫammurabi as the *ka-šu-ša be-ňá-šu,* "the seal of my ‘Lord,’" King, *i.e.*, Vol. I, No. 26, 7.
'King,' but as be-lî or 'Lord.' It must, however, be conceded here that at the time of the Hammurabi dynasty the title be-lî 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-lî expresses nothing but the position of a 'higher' with regard to a 'lower' person; i.e., where be-lî indicates simply the rank of the 'master' as opposed to that of the 'servant' (ardu). 1

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 loquenti of the title 'Lord,' we find that both governors 2 and kings 3 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-lî 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 scepticism and

---

1 Cf., e.g., C. T., II, p. 19 (Bu. 91-5-9, 290), a-na be-lî-ia ki-bê-ma um-ma Be-el-sha-ru ardi-ka-rua. C. T., II, p. 20 (Bu. 91-5-9, 294), a-na be-lî-ia ki-bê-ma um-ma \textit{\textit{ili}} UD-ra-si-rua (sic) without ardi-ka-rua. C. T., II, p. 48 (Bu. 91-5-9, 281), a-na be-lî-ia ki-bê-ma um-ma Ta-tu\{1\)-ur-ma-tum-ma without ardi-ka-rua. C. T., IV, p. 19 (Bu. 88-8-12, 278), a-na be-lî-ia ki-bê-ma um-ma Ardi-\textit{\textit{ili}} U-ni-sha-rua (without ardi-ka-rua).

2 Cf., e.g., Amarna, B, 219, [a-na] emel\textsuperscript{a} GAL \textit{\textit{ili}} EN-[nu ki-bê-ma um-ma] Bu-P\{1\}-di ardi-ka-rua, to which title Winckler, K. B., V, p. xxxiv, note 2, remarks: "Zu diesem wird hier gerade so gesprochen, wie sonst zu dem König. Man kommt auf die Verwaltung, dass der Schreiber gemeint hat den 'grossen König' (sharru statt amelu)." Seeing that we find the same address in R. 146, [a-na amel\textsuperscript{a}] GAL EN-[nu ki-bê-ma um-ma] \textit{\textit{ili}} P\{1\}-di ardi-ka (cf. II, 8, 11; Rev. II, 7, 8) I do not think that amel\textsuperscript{a} GAL is here a title of the king, but in all probability that of a high official (government) of the king. In Amarna, B, 40, Aziri addresses his "father," the governor of Amurrû (l. 15, cf. with B. 92:1, amelu \textit{\textit{di}} Amur-\textit{\textit{rua}}) as follows: a-na \textit{\textit{di}} U-ni-di EN-in a-bi-ia um-ma \textit{\textit{Am}}-zi-ri mûr-ar-ku ardi-ka. Winckler, A. O. F., Vol. II, p. 312 (whom Johns, I. C. L., p. 330, follows) finds in the expression (a-na) a-\textit{\textit{di}} um-ma shu \textit{\textit{du}} LUGAL a-bi-ia tu-shu, i.e., "the man whom Marshuk may keep alive" (V. A. Th., 703 = Meissner, B. A., I, p. 579), the title of (the) king during the Hammurabi dynasty. Though amelu 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 amelu (see also C. T., II, p. 29; C. T., IV, p. 24) also shu-berti-ia (C. T., IV, p. 12; cf. with this title also our letters No. 52:11, shu-pi-ri-shi-ru; 21:20, shu-pi-ri-\. . .); Delitzsch, II, p. 4836; Johns, A. D. D., III, p. 327) and a-bi-ia (C. T., VI, p. 32).

3 See here, e.g., the letter of Akizzî addressed to the king of Egypt in the following words (Amarna, L, 37), a-na nam-nûr-[nu] mûr \textit{\textit{ili}} UD be-lî-ia um-ma \textit{\textit{Am}}-[ki-\textit{\textit{di}}] \textit{\textit{rua}} amel\textsuperscript{a} ardi-ka-rua, and B. 20, a-na be-lî (sic) LUGAL mûru ka \textit{\textit{du}}\textsuperscript{a}. Mû-\textit{\textit{di}}-ri-a a-bi-ia ki-bê-ma um-ma \textit{\textit{Zi}}-[ki-\textit{\textit{di}}]-rua mûr LUGAL mûr-ku-rua; i.e., "to the Lord (sic not 'my Lord,' which had to be be-lî-ia), the king of the land of the Egyptians, my father, etc.," instead of the more commonly used a-na LUGAL be-lî-ia LUGAL Mûri or a-na LUGAL Mûri be-lî-ia.
reasonably 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 "Höflichkeit"-formula: "before the presence of my 'Lord' may I come": a-na be-li-ia ki-bé-ma um-ma =X. ardi-ka-ma a-na di-na-an be-li-ia lu-ul(lu)(or lu-ul)-li-ik(lu); or

(b) "Thy servant =X. (= name of writer). Before the presence of my 'Lord' may I come": ardi-ka =X.-m(a) a-na di-na-an be-li-ia lul-lik(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," abu.

2 He never addressed his correspondent by be-li, "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-li, but in which they never used the "Höflichkeit"-formula a-na di-na-an be-li-ia lul-lik. 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-li-ia, the envelope has "to his(!) Lord," a-na be-li-shi.
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-ka-ram-ma]; the -ma in No. 21 : 1, "H}-MU.TUK.A-ríma" (Meissner, Ideogr., No. 3857), may(!) be a phonetic complement to ríma; for m cf. Mukallim (Nos. 31, 32, 33), Shíriqhum (No. 38), Uburrum (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].
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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 be-li-ia lul-lit, we find that it may be employed in letters addressed either (a) to an official called amelu LUGH = sukkallu or (b) to the King, LUGAL = sharru. Now, as the amelu sukkallu 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-li 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 Kasslushman-Targru), Irizmu-NIN.IB (time of Kasslushman-Targru and Kasslushman-Enil), etc. That none of the three chief bursars just mentioned can be meant by the be-li 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 (a)—see p. 32—we find it, e.g., in H., V, 516, a-na LUGAL be-li-ia ardi-ka m iSiEN-SE-na a-na di-na-an LUGAL be-li-ia lul-lit iSiAG u iSiMarduk a-na LUGAL be-li-ia lik-ru-bu um-ma-a a-na LUGAL be-li-ia-a ma. H., VIII, 793, a-na LUGAL be-li-ia (=Ashshur-til-ilmash, son of Ashshur-bas-apal) ardi-ka m iSiEN-ib-ni a-na di-na-an LUGAL be-li-ia lul-lit iSiAG u iSiMarduk a-na LUGAL be-li-ia lik-ru-bu um-ma-a a-na LUGAL be-li-ia-a ma. 

In connection with address (b)—see p. 32—it occurs, e.g., in H., IV, 422, ardi-ka m A.D-ia-KI-ia a-na di-na-an zik LUGAL.GINA (=Sharru-aklu) be-li-ia [se, lul-lit, left out here] iSiAG iSeLUGAL.GINA be-li-ia um-ma-a a-na LUGAL be-li-ia-a ma. H., VI, 542, ardi-ka m X. . . . a-na di-na-an zik LUGAL-GI-lakin LUGAL SHU (=kishshatu) be-li-ia lul-lit iSiAG u iSiMarduk a-na LUGAL be-li-ia-a ma a-na LUGAL be-li-ia-a ma um-ma-a a-na ba-laqi Zi-ismash (=nepheshit) sha LUGAL be-li-ia iSiAG u iSiAG iSiUN (=N)-i. H., VII, 698, ardi-ka m iSiEN.BASHA a-na di-na-an LUGAL [sic! H., but nothing is missing] sha be-li-ia (=the king of the lords) be-li-ia lul-lit iSiAG u iSiMarduk a-na LUGAL be-li-ia lik-ru-bu um-ma-a a-na LUGAL be-li-ia-a ma. H., VII, 721, [ardi-ka m iSiMarduk-MU-SE-na [ar]-na di-na-an LUGAL be-li-ia lul-lit um-ma-a a-na LUGAL be-li-ia-a ma. H., VII, 747, 749, ardi-ka m iSiAG-i-shal-ilin (749 has m iSiAG-DI-im, as also above, H., VII, 748, a letter by the same writer addressed to the amelu LUGH) a-na di-na-an LUGAL be-li-ia lul-lit um-ma-a a-na LUGAL be-li-ia-a ma. H., VIII, 803, ardi-ka m iSiMarduk-MU-SE-na [ar]-na di-na-an LUGAL be-li-ia lul-lit um-ma-a a-na LUGAL be-li-ia-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 did not yet arrive at a positive result, we may claim at least a negative one, and that is: the be-šu of these letters cannot have been a representative of the Cassite king, such as Inanni, 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-šu, we get, it would seem, a good deal farther in our investigation if we examine the formula of greeting,1 a-na . . . . shu-ul-mu2 (which here, as in the letters above, is very often coupled with an invocation), and all those incidental references in the text of the letters which allude to the personality of the bearer of this title. In doing this we learn that the Lord was in possession of (1) a "house," bitu3; (2) a "house and field," bitu uth̓ širu; (3) a "house, city, and field," bitu ālu-ki uth̓ širu; (4) a "field," eqlu; (5) a "city and field," ālu-ki uth̓ širu (resp. širu)4; (6) a "city, field, and house," ālu-ki širu (resp. širu) uth̓ bitu; (7) "large and small cattle," LIT.GUD5 a GANAM.LU6 shu-ul-mu, (8) "young cows and oxen," lūti bu-ru-ti uth̓ alpē bu-ru-ti; (9) "harvests of the land and [pastures] of the field," i-bu-ri ša m[a-ti uth̓ ri-ti][i?7] širu; (10) "canals and ditches," nāru8, nam-ga(r)-ra9; (11) "messengers," mār šip̓ r-ri; (12) "workmen," resp. "soldiers,"

1 With the exception of No. 39 to be found always after bulilīk and before the introductory um-mu-a a-nu be-šu-ia-na. No. 39 has the greeting, quite strangely, after the last mentioned introductory phrase.
2 Always written either shu-ul-mu or shul-mu; DI(=shūl)-mu has not yet been found.
3 Nos. 22:4 23:3 (writer "Im-ru-rum"); 35:3 (writer "Ki-sha-šu-ut"); cf. also note 5: a-na Ė be-šu-ia shu-ul-mu.
4 Cf. also the bitu ša Ė be-šu-ia in 27:19 and the N.GIŠIŠI piššašat Ė be-šu-ia in 27:12.
5 No. 11:2 (writer "Be-la-nu"): a-na Ė uth̓ EDIN ša be-šu-ia shul-mu. For EDIN cf. p. 75, note 1.
7 No. 46:5, A.SHAG-ka, "thy field," i.e., the Lord's.
8 No. 9:3 (writer "Hana-a-sha,Marduk"): a-na ālu-ki uth̓ EDIN ša be-šu-ia shu-ul-mu. No. 17:5 (writer mšiuNIN.BU-ANmesh): a-na ālu-ki uth̓ EDINša be-šu-ia ša[t-mu].
9 Nos. 26:2 27:2 28:3 (writer "Ku-da-ra-mu"): a-na ālu-ki EDIN (26:2, ši-ri) uth̓ Ė be-šu-ia shu-ul-mu.
10 No. 51:4 (name of writer broken away): [a-na LIT.GUDbl.a a1 GANAM.LUbl.a ša be-šu-ia shu-ul-mu]. No. 16:4 (writer mšiuNIN.BU . . . . ). a-na LIT.GUDbl.a a GANAM.LUbl.a ša[ul-mu] ša be-šu-ia shu-ul-mu, i.e., "to the large and small cattle, greeting; and to all that belongs to my Lord, greeting!" For LIT.GUDbl.a a GANAM.LUbl.a (= alpē uth̓ me) cf. also B. E., XIV, 59:1 99a: 46 132:1
12 No. 25:4 (writer "UR,šiuNIN.DUG,GA"): a-na i-bu-ra ša [a-ti uth̓ ri-ti?] EDIN ša-ul-mu.
13 He was at least co-owner, cf. No. 40:21 (writer "U-ber-ram"); me-e uth̓ nāru (= A.GUR) Ila(-AN)-i-pu-ush uth̓ me-e nāru (= A.GUR) Na-la-um me-zi-ti-ša ša be-šu-ia, for translation see p. 132. Cf. also the mš (=A) be-šu-ia in 1:11.
14 No. 40:15, uth̓ ša-ša a-nu nam-gaša ša ša be-šu-ia-a ša-ši-ši; i.e., 1, 29, nam-gaša ša be-šu-ia li-naah-shi-ir.
15 No. 8:17 (writer "Ba-il,šiuMarduk"): mār šip̓ r-ša ša be-šu-ia. Cf. [34:21] 53:37, mār šip̓ r-ša.
ummânī ( = ȘAB\textsuperscript{bī-a} ), sābê ( = ȘAB\textsuperscript{mērah} )\textsuperscript{1}; (13) "servants," ardu\textsuperscript{2}; (14) shattām and amēlu PA.ENGAR\textsuperscript{3}; (15) itū\textsuperscript{4}; (16) "tax-gatherers," màkisû\textsuperscript{5}; (17) "sheriffs,"

\textsuperscript{1} No. 30 : 17 (writer mU-bar-rum); ȘAB\textsuperscript{bī-a} ša še-bī-ia. Cf. 46 : 9, ȘAB\textsuperscript{bī-a}[k]-na and 58 : 12, ȘAB\textsuperscript{bī-a} ša še-bī im-hu-ra. From 9 : 17, 100 ȘAB\textsuperscript{bī-ta} ki-ig-nu-na ȘAB\textsuperscript{mērah} ša še-bī-ia ita-pi-ia, it is apparent that there seems to have been a difference between ȘAB\textsuperscript{bī-a} and ȘAB\textsuperscript{mērah}, the former are = "men," while the latter are = "soldiers," for a translation see p. 106. In B. E., XIV, XV, ȘAB\textsuperscript{bī-ta} and ȘAB\textsuperscript{mērah} are used interchangeably; cf., e.g., l.c., XIV, 56a : 26, PAD 27 ȘAB\textsuperscript{mērah} ša șa-ga-ri-ec i-pa-sha, i.e., "food (wages) for 27 [men] who have tilled (made) the fields," and according to l.c., 1, 30, the amēlu RIQ and K.A.ZI.D.D.1 have ȘAB\textsuperscript{mērah}.

\textsuperscript{2} This follows not only from the term "servant" which 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," ardi-ka. Among the persons thus spoken of as the "Lord's" servant we find, e.g., mErba-[tī]a Marduk, 27 : 30, 32 : 29 ; 4 [5] : 35 : 17 | 65 : 9 (cf. here also mErba-[tī]a Marduk, the writer of letters Nos. 13, 14, 81, 82); m\textit{tu}NIX.JB-SHEŠI-SE-na, 1 : 16, 17; mBA.SHA-[tī]a.M, 34 : 34, 35; m\textit{tu}U.DIL.BAT-BA-ni, 14 : 18; K\textit{u}-na-ra-ni, 35 : 31 (cf. also the writer of Nos. 26, 27, 28); mNa-š[i]-[tī]a Marduk, 12 : 12, 13; SHEŠI-ša-ga-sha-rni, 45 : 7; mESAGIL-zu-ri-ia [ardi-ka], 9 : 15. Cf. 21 : 27, II ardi-ka.

\textsuperscript{3} No. 30 : 3 (writer mU-bar-rum); 45 : 4, name of writer broken off: a-na SHAG.TAM (or possibly better A.SHIAG, cf. 39 : 4) amēlu PA.ENGAR ša še-bī-ia ša-um nu. To SHAG.TAM (=UD) is plural and without amēlu, cf. 35 : 33, be-ā-nu SHAG.TAM li-ud-șa-ra-na-ma NI.GISH ša-bi (BU)-tia-ki-ša-nu-ma, see translation p. 125. See also 21 : 4, ita amēlu SHAG.TAM ša-a-nu šal-šu-ša al-li-ku ša-še-ia na (original gives ir), "the ita of the shattām for whose welfare (interest) I have asked, as in de-im à šaš-tem = 'good news' of my 'Lord' "; 27 : 15, as-sham NI.GISH ita-ā SHAG.TAM mi e-she-ir, "as regards the oil (sec. concerning which my Lord has written) I beg to state that 'the ita of the shattām (so, no doubt, better than: 'as regards the oil of the ita, the shattām, etc.' and this because (1) the letter is addressed to the 'Lord'; (2) shattām, terminating in it, requires a noun on which it is dependent; (3) if shattām were the subject we would expect a form esh(l)i-ir) as taking care of it?)" 54 : 25, amēlu SHAG.TAM. The SHAG.TAM, in all passages quoted, being closely connected with the watching, guarding, taking care of (27 : 15) or storing (35 : 33) of the GISH or sesame oil, must have been an official in charge of the oil of the Temple or Palace. Delitzsch, H. W. B., p. 696a, "ein Berufsnamer"; Meissner-Rost, B. S. S., III, p. 359, and Zimmern, Ritualt., p. 93 = zumitru, "Sänger"; Jensen, K. B., VI, pp. 531, 532 = šukku, gēpu, "Statthalter"; King, Letters of Hammurabi, III, p. 57 : 3, "sower of cattle"; Delitzsch, B. A., IV, p. 486, on the basis of Letters of Hammurabi, 39 : 5, SHAG.TAM, amēlu SHA[26]tān nil-ka compared with l.c., 37 : 7 and No. 15 = "Tempelverwaltung, ein höheres Tempelverwaltungamt." amēlu PA.ENGAR is hardly better than amēlu giskENGAR, seeing that the sign PA looks rather like GISH, amēlu PA.ENGAR = akīl cirištā, iškārē, "sower of the farmers or irrigators." If read amēlu giskENGAR, this official would be one who had charge of the "works of irrigation; amēlu marbita, see also p. 127, note 2.

\textsuperscript{4} mKi-shašb-bu-ul, the writer of No. 33, after having passed through the positions of na-gid, ENGAR, RIQ, calls himself, l.c., 1, 23, a-na-ku itu be-ša. As itū he was in charge (of the storehouse affairs) of the city Dār,\textsuperscript{1}aPA.KUK\textsuperscript{b} (see below, p. 120). mKal-ul, the writer of No. 24, who had been entrusted by royal grant with the administration of the city Mana-ša-la, calls himself, l.c., 1, 36, a-na-ku itu [be-ša]-la. In 26 : 17 the i-tu-ia m\textit{lu}gur-[tī]aNIN.IB "puts up" shū-kī-ia; as-sham ša-kī-ia ša ši-ia ita-mī m\textit{lu}gur-[tī]aNIN.IB ša-ak-na-ma be-ši-pa-ra a-na bīb ša bī be-ša-ia ul i-ta-ak; for translation see p. 119. Cf. also 21 : 27, GAL (it)?-iš? Also other persons had an itū. The writer of No. 11, m\textit{lu}ši-ša-na (78 : 4), Mās\textit{r}M\textit{u}-ma-ra-ni ita-ia-li-ša-ra-ni at-la. In 21 : 4 we have an ita amēlu SHAG.TAM, and in 27 : 15 an ita-ia SHAG.TAM (see preceding note). Delitzsch, H. W. B., p. 157a, gives only "itū, ein Berufsnamer." The root of this word is 7ūš, "to see," to the same root belongs also another itū, "side, boundary." A side of a house (or of a piece of land, etc.) is any of its four extremities which "looks" towards a certain direction, either north, south, east, or west. The extremities of a piece of land which look towards or in the different directions are its itū, pl. itū, or "boundaries"; hence the person called itū is "one who looks out towards or in the different directions, or sides or bound-
GÜ.EN.NA; (18) na-‘i-ri-e na-‘i-ra-a-ti SAL E-di-ir-ти ù bitu; (19) “cities,” ʧû[baš];

aries—may they be those of property or of other business interests—of his master,” “one who looks out that the various sides of his master's interests be protected.” Such a person who “looks out” for his master's interests (as did Kalbu, after having been entrusted by royal grant with the administration of Manna-girs[IM] at the time of Ur-Ninna, king of Shurnura, was called an Ḡ.Z.ID: “one who is at his side.” The latter, then, is the exact Sumerian counterpart of the Semitic-Babylonian ita ù āpu = “one who is at the side of somebody, who guards his interests” (cf. Nippur = Nippur-āpu, one who lives at, belongs to, Nippur, a Nippurian), “his administrator, his representative”: just as the sides (itā) represent a piece of property, guard it against trespassing, so an itā represents and guards and looks out for the interests of his master.

8 No. 27: 35 (writer "Ku-du-ra-mu"); anēša SHA (-NG) KUD DA ša-bi ʧiš.pu-ra. For SHA KUD DA cf., besides the passages quoted in B. E., XIV, XV, also Lc., XIV, 5:5 | 18:2 | 125:14 | XV, 122:7 | 131:17 | 157:25 | 166:18, etc.

9 For this offer see introduction to No. 75, below, pp. 133f.

1 The passages in which this phrase occurs as part of the greeting are the following, No. 36: 3 (writer "Ma-id-tim.
ka-tim"): [a-na] na-‘i-ri-e na-li-ta-ti [sal] E-di-ir-ti [iš] Ši-ši-lu-ša-[u]-mu; 33: 4 (writer "Mu-ka-tim"): [a-na] na-‘i-ri-e na-li-ta-ša-ša-ša-ul-mu. nā-ra, nā-ra-nil are participle substantives in question, fem. plur. of “na,” which Delitzsch, H. W. B., p. 4396, translates by “schreiben, brüllen.” Jeussen, K. B., VI, p. 588, assigns to nāra a significance “klangend.” We have to combine both significations here and translate nā-ra, nā-ra-nil by “howlers (masc. and fem.) of lamentations” = “lamentation men and women,” who began their operations, as is well known, at the time of sickness, death, or funeral of a person. This is apparent also from the texts quoted above, for all of them are nothing but reports of a physician about the progress of the sickness of certain ladies connected, no doubt, with Enhil’s sanctuary. Cf., eg., 31: 9f., ša-šu-ul-mi i-si-pa-ra li�-mi-ni-na a-na-ʤu ši-li-shi(?)-mu (for translation see p. 26, n. 7) ša TUR.SAL “Mušk-ta-li” (cf. 32: 7) i-ša-la-tu ba-ad-da šaḫ (cf. 32: 13) pa-na i-gi-en-ni-šu i-na-an-na ul i-gi-en-ni-diš ša TUR.SAL “Hul = AN)-i-pa-sha ra II i-ša-la-tu šaḫ uḫ-ša-li-tu-ta-ša-ša-ul-mi, ša iš-ta-li, ete. For i-ša-la-tu, II i-ša-la-tu cf., Ic., 1. 26, mi-šaši i-ša-la-tu ?(ḫa) uḫ-ša-li-tu; 1. 28, i-ša-la-ta šaḫ ši-li (cf. zul-lī, 16. 20. iš-aš-ul-ša-ro); 32: 24, i-ša-la-ta. Išša-li-tu (ti, tum) is either a plural of isšatu = “fire, fever” (for formulation cf. Delitzsch, Gr., p. 183), or, less probably, a plural of șašu, “an exclamation.” For gesh-ša cf. the Talmudic lexicon sub 722 = “to suffer from argina pecoris,” and for šeša “to grow, become old,” see Jeussen, K. B., VI, p. 511; here, because used of sickness, it has the meaning “to become chronic.” The passage, then, might be translated: “With regard to the daughter of Mushallı (I beg to report that) the fevers were not improving; thus was suffering before is not improving any more. With regard to the daughter of Ilu-ippudra (I beg to report that) the ‘double fever’ which is remaining (is the third person, fem. Perm. II after i-ša-la-ta = sing.) has become chronic,” i.e., it appears at regular intervals. Cf. also 33: 7f., 28(γ) 7aš mu-shi šaša-ša-le-a-men-a a-ša-la-ša-li ša-la-pa-si uš-ul-ša-at-lu ba-ra-ša-an-tum ki i-gi-ta-ši um-mu [iš]-ša-ba-si, and Ic., 1. 34b., 29(γ) 7aš mu-shi šaša-ša-le-a-men-a a-ša-la-pa-si uš-ul-ša-at-lu ba-ra-ša-an-tum ki i-gi-ta-ši um-mu [iš]-ša-ba-si, and Ic., 1. 25f., 29(γ) 7aš mu-shi šaša-ša-le-a-men-a a-ša-la-pa-si uš-ul-ša-at-lu ba-ra-ša-an-tum ki i-gi-ta-ši um-mu [iš]-ša-ba-si, and Ic., 1. 34b., 29(γ) 7aš mu-shi šaša-ša-le-a-men-a a-ša-la-pa-si uš-ul-ša-at-lu ba-ra-ša-an-tum ki i-gi-ta-ši um-mu [iš]-ša-ba-si, and Ic., 1. 25f., 29(γ) 7aš mu-shi šaša-ša-le-a-men-a a-ša-la-pa-si uš-ul-ša-at-lu ba-ra-ša-an-tum ki i-gi-ta-ši um-mu [iš]-ša-ba-si, and Ic., 1. 34b. With the exception of šaša-ša-le-a-men-a itti papasi everything is possible. Is this a food prepared with the papasi? For papasi cf. also B. E., XIV, 163: 42, III Ḡeršušatu = "R1" pa-pu-su Ḡa.MUN.ABUR, which shows that papasi was taken from the river, and is probably the “alms” of the river; cf. also Müller, Medicin, p. 128, "Brei, Sekhunam," Also in B. E., XV, 44: 23 it is paid, like MUN, GUD.GAL, GUD.TUR, šiš-ša-li, to certain (work)men; is, therefore, different from papasi, Delitzsch, H. W. B., p. 534a (against Clay, B. E., XIV, p. 28, note to No. 8, 1. 4). From the above given passage it appears that the nā-ra-nil and nā-ra-nil became their operations (ba-ša-ar-tam =
"lamentation"; Del., II. W. B., p. 188a, mentions only a bararum, sym. ikkillum, "Wehklage"; see also 47:4) while the lady was still under treatment (ul upaitt) and sick. No wonder, then, that she was seized with fever (unuma) after those men and women had finished their lamentations. In the closing lines Mukallim 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 (ke-eim mu-shi) and how the su-na-na (= samu, the u on account of the m, II. W. B., p. 503; Jensen, K. B., VI, p. 517) was progressing. Women, by the name SUL E-di-ir-tum, are mentioned in B. E., XIV, 49: 3, 12, 14, 19 (21st year of Kurigalzu, II, 31, 23) and a TUR.SAL GAB E-di-ir-tum occurs in L., 38: 42 (13th year of Nair-Maruttash). As this lady is closely connected with the lamentation men and women, it seems probable that she was at the head of that profession. What the real meaning of il-pa an-ni-tum il-ta-pa-as-si (or su?) = il-ta-pa-at-shi or -shu, i.e., /narkat/ or /narka/ in No. 31: 5 is, not clear to me. With ilpitu lappatu cf. Amarna, B. 6, Rev. 3, 7; B. 218, Rev. 3, 4. It is construed with double accusative, as here, also in IV B., 157, col. 2, 14, 15, ap-pa u ish-di i-sha-a-ti lu-pa-at-ma ana marshi si-bit-ti-shu-na ai it-ku-u; but neither the signification given by Delitzsch, II. W. B., p. 382a, "umütirun, anürhun," nor that by Jensen, K. B., VI, p. 379, "beruhren, schlafen, werfen," nor King's (Letters of Hammurabi, III, p. 270), "to overthrow, to destroy," nor Nagel's (B. A., IV, p. 477), "zögern, verzögern," nor even Köchler's (Med., p. 75), "tobenen, anredessen, beruhren, umstauen, vernichten, antippen," seem to fit here. Cf. also the li-bi-il-im ( = AV), "visitation of god," B. M. Code, XXXVIII, 77, and our letter No. 47: 9, 14, a-di ša-m me-lu-pa-ti. Also this letter treats of sickness, e.g., l. 18, 8 ša-pa-na ma-a-da in-ti-ta-shi i-na-an-na ul i-iš— an expression exactly parallel to ša-pa-na igi-en-ni-šu i-na-an-na ul iga-en-ni-li in Nos. 31: 13 | 32: 13; hence šaš must signify a suffering from a certain malady and not merely a "Verwirren," Köchler, Med., pp. 137, 138; Delitzsch, II. W. B., p. 143a. What sickness this was is indicated in l. 4, i-na ba-ra-rí (cf. above be-ra-ar-tum) ki i-iš. Another letter that touches on sickness, to mention it here, is No. 22: 8 (writer *im-gu-rum, di-im mar-shi-ša ki ish-a-du-shi ri-ik-ãš ki e-si-šu ˘u-rn-ak-su-su-shi. *Mukal-lim, the writer of Nos. 31, 32, 33, and possibly of 47, was, no doubt, a physician. And physicians are always under the patronage of goddess Gula, the aṣu-gāl ˘a-riba or "great physician," the one who muballitit mūtī, "quickens the dead" (sīl), I propose to identify our writer with the *Mukal-lim mentioned after the bit il-gu-la in B. E., XIV, 148: 9 (the 17th year), who lived during the time of Burna-Buriaš. 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 Mukallim sends not only greetings (shalma) and good wishes (da-ab = ta-ta-ab, 31: 8) for the well being (šaš-er-shi-na, lit. their flesh, their body) of "the daughter of Kirtu" and "the daughter of Ahum," who had, no doubt, recovered from their sickness under his care, but he reports also about the sickness of the following women: (1) "the daughter of Mushtabī" (31: 11 | 32: 7); (2) "the daughter of Išu-kappam" (31: 15); (3) the lady Lā-ta (? or šaš) (31: 20); (4) the *Ab-la-mi-štī (i.e., "the nomad") (31: 25 | 32: 8. Cf. also B. E., XV, 188 V: 11, SUL Ab-la-mi-tum, and Ab-la-ma-šu, I.e., XIV, 16: 6; XV, 154: 26, besides the passages quoted by Clay in I.e., XV, p. 51a); and (5) the daughter (TUR.SAL) of the lady (SAL) Ušh (or Ba)-ba-šu... (31: 27). 4 For No. 33a: 3, a-n a di-šul-massartu (EN.NU.UN) ša-bi-la-lu ša-ša-ul-[mu]. For di-šul-massartu see below. 5 For šaš-massartu see Delitzsch, II. W. B., p. 478a, and cf. II., II, 187, Rev. 5 (a letter of *Išdu: di-ša-ta to the mār sharri be-fi-šu), šalma (= DI) a-na EN.NUN eššak gab-ba, "greeting to all the guards," and II., II, 186, Rev. 1 (by the same writer), EN.NUN ša-lUGAL. 6 No. 33a: 31, 36, bi-ša-ta ša-bi-la-la. 7 No. 33a: 6, 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-ta and *Abi.MARGIDDA, see below, note 13. 8 No. 33a: 27l, un-na-a a-na be-fa-ša-na be-fa-a-na šaš-šup-par (= RU)-par šu-bi-[ma] I ˘u-narkabtu a-na gir-ri ša-ša be-fa-ta-gab-ga-la li-li-li ši a-na-na tu-ak-kas-ša i-na II ˘u-narkabtu bi-iš-la ša-bi-la-ta tu-su-par; for translation see p. 130. In B. E., XV, 154: 41 (not mentioned by Clay) a šurš ( = SAQ)-šup-par LUGAL) is mentioned, and from l.e., 13: 5 (not mentioned by Clay) we learn that a certain *Er-la-a-tum, the [3]-aš=s3]-šup-par, received (im-šu-ur) from (i-na
LETTERS TO CASSITE KINGS

NI(G)-GAL-tum nap-ti. On account of the difficulties that are to be encountered in this expression it is necessary, it would seem, to give 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 (ālu-ki, l).” 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-ri-iq-tum” is to be

qilibiMar-tu-ku, the chief bursar of the Nippurian Temple storehouses during the reign of Nāṣir-Marutashšū, ‘‘mar-na ZA.G.S.A. (a metal, or a kind of leather?) = na-ha-dittil (or-bit; bit; ziz) ša(d)maratu; i.e., either for the ‘‘mounting’’ (metal) or ‘‘covering’’ (leather) of a chariot. Seeing that a sak-shup-saq 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 shup-saq is a ‘‘charioteer,’’ and a sak-shup-saq, a ‘‘chief, commander, captain, general of the charioteers.’’ The word shup-saq has to be derived from ṣaq, ‘‘to govern,’’ from which root, as Jensen, K. B., VI, p. 440, has shown, he also the words ispar (a form like ḫirḥa, ḫiršu) = espar = (Sum. ESī.B.A.R.) = ‘‘Zaum, Zügel,’’ šipru, ‘‘Zaum, Gebiss’’ and ushparu = ‘‘Insignie des Königs’’ = ‘‘Zaum.’’ With ispar Jensen, i.e., quite correctly compares the Syriac ḫirṣīn = ‘‘Halter’’ (for such changes of radicals cf. e.g., Sum. SHū.NIR = Assyr. shurina; Assyr. šhuru = Hebr. נין, etc.). According to this a shup-saq would be ‘‘one who governs, directs the chariots by having hold of the espar, ushpar, shup-saq = Syr. ḫirṣīn, or ‘‘bridle’’ of the horses. Delitzsch, H. W. B., p. 685n, mentions an officer called amšu-NIDUD-SAG, ‘‘Oberst, General.’’ That this cannot be read with Delitzsch, i.e., shud-shq, but must be transcribed with Winckler, Forschungen, I, p. 376, 2 (and before him Guyard, Notes de lexicographie Assyrienne, Paris, 1853, § 33) by shu-pa-shaq (or better saq) is evident from the passage quoted above. Furthermore, in view of the analogy that exists between sak-shup-saq and shup-saq on the one hand and gaš-gaš = lugal (cf. gaš-gaš = ushparu = ushmu-gal), etc.) on the other hand, I propose to identify both. As gaš = (gašu), ‘‘the great one among men’’ (cf. GAL.SAG = ra-saq = the great one among the saq) becomes the ‘‘great man,’’ sar ḫirṣu, i.e., the lugal or ‘‘king,’’ so sak-shup-saq, ‘‘the chief among the charioteers,’’ becomes the shup-saq-saq, 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 Hoffmann, Z. A., II, p. 54f.; Marti, Gram. des Bild. Aroman., p. 53, the ḫirṣīn, Ezra 5:6 (cf. also Ezra 4:19, ḫirṣīn, ḫirṣīn) into ḫirṣīn in order to make it agree with šup(p)ar-saq(k). A change from ṣ into ṣ is much harder to imagine than a simple abbreviation of the eye from one ṣ to another ṣ, which took place if we suppose that ḫirṣīn stood for ḫirṣīn, i.e., ḫirṣīn, emphatic ḫirṣīn (which is the Syr.-Armen. word for ‘‘Halter’’ (Jensen), better ‘‘bridle,’’ ‘‘bridle-holder’’ = Assyr. at, ašpar—the ushpar as insignia of the king represents him as one who holds the bridle = who ‘‘governs’’ the people) = (s)aq(k). The ḫirṣīn = ḫirṣīn, then, were ‘‘the bridles-holders,’’ ‘‘governors-in-chief.’’ This also against Hinke, B. E., Ser. D, IV, p. 185.

II. No. 56: 6, giššU.U + SI = uğin, ‘‘pole, shaft,’’ see p. 26, n. 7 ša-ru-ku-bi ša be-li-ia, cf. also the giššU + SI ša be-li-ia in 51:18. See in this connection also Friedrich, O. L. Z., August, 1906, 465, on uğin-ša. Rukubi are to be distinguished from giršMAR.GIRD.DA, which latter signify, at this time, either ‘‘harvest wagons’’ (lt. ‘‘long wagons’’) = eriqqu, Meissner, Ideogr., No. 414, cf. No. 34:39, i-na giššMAR.GIRD.DA IN bi-ši az-bi-la IMER.KUR.ūR. 1[4]mers, etc.; i.e., ‘‘while I was fetching the straw in the harvest wagons, the horses, etc.’’) or ‘‘wagon loads,’’ cf. the giššMAR.GIRD.DA mers te-li-tum = ‘‘the wagon loads of the crop, harvest (se. of grain),’’ No. 52:35 and B. E., XV, 118:1, 29, 30. In B. E., XV, 01:1, 2 (cf. our No. 54:7, 52:33), the harvest (te-li-tum) of the pa-te-si is computed according to giššMAR.GIRD.DA, ‘‘wagon loads,’’ for the various amounts of grain paid as ‘‘hire’’ (UD) for ‘‘harvest wagons,’’ see, e.g., B. E., XIV, 144:6; XV, 28:11; 101:12; 103:10. In B. E., XV, 155:36 a certain amount of grain is mentioned as bi-la-at giššMAR.GIRD.DA; as this here can mean nothing but ‘‘hire for harvest wagons,’’ we have the proof that ID = ‘‘hire’’ has to be read bi-ša-at, from bištu, ‘‘Abgabe, Steuer, Tribut’’ (H. W. B., p. 232), and ‘‘hire.’’ Cf. also the SIE ša giššMAR.GIRD.DA mers ša-šu ša-a-na 3(d) (= Nippur) ša-nu-ba, B. E., XV, 107:6, and see the giššMAR.LUGAL (?) in B. E., XVII, 124:16, and the giššMAR.AZAG.UD in our No. 28:16.
found in a letter of "Gu-za-ar-AN to "In-nu-ū-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-li-ia lu-ū-ul-li-[i[k] of my "Lord" may I come!
3 ""SUGH ti shar-rat diNEN.LIL[k] SUGH and the queen of Nippur

1 From a religious standpoint this greeting is most important. It teaches us that the Nippurian Trinity—Enlil, NIN.IB, Ninil or Gula (Bau)—was known also as

SUGH (Father) NIN.IB (Son) diNIN.MAGH (wife of the Son) = shar-rat diEn.IIL (Mother).

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

""SUGH (the sign has to be read), and not DAR (Jensen), see my forthcoming volume) was originally the name of a god playing the role of the "Son." This is still evident from II R., 57, Obv., I, 35, e, d, where ""SUGH (with the gloss Tishkhu) is identified with diNIN.IB, who in our letter occupies the position of the "Son." Cf. also ""SUGH EN um-ma-ni, the "lord of hosts," Zimmern, Sharpu, IV, p. 24, 74; ""SUGH (gloss sud) NIGIN = mu-belu-li-ā al-li, the "destroyer of the enemy," K. 2107, 19—two attributes of the "Son," who, as the personification of the powers of nature ("the seven," "the Igigi," and "the Anunnaki," etc.), protects the faithful and destroys the wicked. Just as diNIN.IB (the Son) was also diIB, and this one = diEn.KUR, the "god of Ekur," i.e., Enlil (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 = diEn.KUR, the "Father" or "first person," and as such clearly a male. SUGH = Enlil, 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-IIL. The latter is coupled in this invocation with SUGH; hence SUGH and shar-rat En-IIL are husband and wife. That the "queen of Nippur" was indeed none other but diNIN.LIL follows also from other considerations, of which I shall mention only one: NIN.IB, "the son of Enlil," is called in K. B. 1, p. 175, 13, the illiti Kus-sar-bil-itu, "the one borne by Kutushar, the mistress (bil-itu = NIN)." But Kutushar is according to III R., 38, 3a = shar-ra-tu or "queen." Hence shar-ratu must be the wife of Enlil (= SUGH), i.e., she is diNIN.LIL, the "queen of Nippur." Furthermore, Enlil, the "Father" or "first person of the Nippurian Trinity," is in every case identified with his wife, the "Mother," or "third person of the Trinity": they are, as "husband and wife," "one flesh." This Unity is still clearly attested to by the inscriptions themselves. Above we saw that SUGH or Enlil was a male divinity, but ""SUGH is according to II R., 35, 180 the same as "Ishar of Eridu," generally called An-nu-l (not ni)-tum or Antum. Antum again is identified with diGur-ru, the wife diEn.Kur = Enlil (see Bel, the Christ, p. 17). The wife of Enlil is called also Ninil or shar-rat En-IIL (our letter), hence ""SUGH is on the one hand the same as diEnil and on the other = diNinil; 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 Θεοί και Γῆς, "the heaven and earth" or "the firmament of heaven and earth"; the upper part, "the firmament of heaven," or "heaven" is the husband or "Father," and the lower part, "the firmament of earth" or "earth" is the "Mother": "Mother earth." This oneness, this unity, is also expressed in such names of Enlil as diEn-an-ni or diDur-an-ni or AN, the Son of god, God, etc. (see Bel, the Christ, p. 21).

The "heaven and earth" or cosmos had a son, called diNIN.IB. The Babylonian name for cosmos is not only an-kī, but also E.KUR or E-shar-ra, hence NIN.IB is termed the ba-kur Nu-gim-mut i-tu-ti E.KUR, K. B., 1, p. 52 : 2; the apil E.KUR, I R. 15, VII : 53; the ba-kur diEn-IIL bi-nu-uat E-shar-ra; I R. 29, 16 (= K. B., 1, p. 174 : 15, 16);
4 nap(sic)-ti be-lu-ia li-is-su-rum may protect the life (lit. souls) of my "Lord";

5 ḫuNIN.IB u ḫuNIN.MAGH a-shib NIN.IB and NIN.MAGH who inhabit

the dumu-ush = (apīl) E-šar-ra zi-ki-shu, Craig, Rel. Texts, I, p. 43:17; the apīl E-šar-ra, IV R. I, 34a. Seeing that the "cosmos" is represented by Enlil (= SUGH) and Ninil (=šarrat Enlil), NIN.IB appears also as the EN dumu dînu-Enlil-laq = mā ṭu₄u₄, Reinscher, Hymnen, p. 123: 6f., or as the L dînu-rīNIN.IB dumu dînu-rīL, K. 170, Rev. 14, and as the ṭubātu Ku-ša-shar (=šarratu, see above) ṭubātu, K. R., I, p. 175: 18. As such a "Son" he is his Father's "voice" (qultī, of. the ṭubātu of Jahveh), III R. 67, 68c, d, through whom the Father speaks and reveals himself; he is his "messenger," the sukīku E.KUR, V R. 51 : 26a, whose business it is to enforce and guard the commands of his Father; ḫuNIN.IB nāṣir (SHESH) purussē (ESH.BAR) abì ḫuEn-lil, II R. 57, Obv. 24, 25c, d. He can do it, for he is the ur-sag kal-qa, "the mighty hero" (lit. "head-servant"), "who has no equal" (gab-rī nu-tug-a), and he does do it by means of his "seven sons" (cf. ḫuNIN.IB = ḫuPap-nāṣir-gor-ra, II R. 57, Rev. 57b, who, according to III R. 67, No. 1 : 25c, dff. (= II R., 55: 60b), has "seven" sons, among whom (l. 35) is to be found a certain ḫuNIN.IB NUN-ta-v[d-du-a]. The latter appears also among the "seven" sons of Bau and Nin-Girsu (Creation Story, p. 23: 6, where Ē-nu-nun must be read, instead of kalānum), who are his TUR.DA or ekūṭtā, "mighty ones" (German: Recken). The chief one (NU or na-lik) among these "seven mighty ones," since the time of the kings of Ur, is ḫuPA.KU or Nusku, while ḫuNIN.IB himself is the ḫuLUGAL.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 Bēl, the Christ, p. 2, note 10, and 3, notes 1ff.). NIN.IB, again, was, as "Son," identified with his "Father," Enlil; of, here the names ḫuN, ḫuEN.KUR.KUR, ḫuSUGH, 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 tabu. 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., XX, in the Homiletic Review, February, 1908, pp. 100ff., which was written, however, in March, 1907).

KHRU.NIN.MAGH, who appears also in III R. 68 : 2tg, h (cf. ll. 19, 17) as the DAM[BI-SAL] of ḫuNIN.IB, must be here likewise (because coupled with him) the wife of NIN.IB. But in II R. 59 : 19; III R. 68 : 19g, h (cf. l. 17) there appears as the wife of ḫuMASH = ḫuNIN.IB the goddess NIN.EN.LIL Ki, i.e., the "mistress of Nippur," who was, as we saw above, the same as Ku-ša-shar, the "queen and mistress of Nippur." Again, in Reinscher, Hymnen, p. 47, No. 23, Rev. 22, 23, NIN.MAGH is called the A M (= ummu), "mother," of ḫuBA = ḫuNIN.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 born 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, fructified, brings forth new life, quickens the dead (mukallatt al nīltī): the vegetation and the (seven) equinoctial storms (the seven sons). And because the "Son" marries his own "Mother" he now becomes "one flesh with her," hence ḫuNIN.IB and ḫuNIN.MAGH (sic not NIN.ENGAR?) are identified, are one: III R. 68 : 19g, h (cf. ll. 21, 17). Cf. also ḫuNIN.MAGH = Antum, II R. 54, No. 2, 1, 2 (Hommel, S. L., p. 48, 36). Antum = ḫuNIN.IB, Bēl, the Christ, etc., pp. 16, 18. ḫuNIN.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 ḫuNIN.IB. In my review of Clay's volume
6 šá įša-ki NI(G = GAR; sha)-GAL
(= û)-tum napis(siç)-ti-ka
7 li-iš-su-rum ma-an-nu pa-an
(i.e., she may protect the city (i.e., Nippur) may protect thy creatures (subjects)!
Whosoever
8 ba-nu-tum šaš be-lu-ia li-mur
9 [û?'] man-nu da-ba-ba ūtab (= H1)ab
10 [a-n]a be-lu-ia li-il-te-mi
11 [um]-ma-a a-[na b]e-[l]-i-a-[ma]

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 : 6\(^2\) we would expect

entitled Business Documents of Murashı Sons of Nippur (= B. E., X) I tried to show (see The Monist for January, 1907 (Vol. XVII, No. 1), p. 139) that NIN\textsubscript{J}BS was originally an Amurritic god coming from the “westland,” where he had been identified with Ḫ\textsubscript{M}AR.TU, and where he was called Irrisku, resp. Irsiktu. 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\textsubscript{J}BS has to be identified with Ḫ\textsubscript{M}AR.TU. Though I naturally was sorry not to find in his treatise any reference to my review, and to learn from p. 2 of the J. A. O. S. for 1907 that the reading Irrish(t)u was known to him only from “private communication,” I still grate 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 Ḫ\textsubscript{M}AR.TU so far proposed. He accordingly proceeded, being encouraged in this by Jensen’s readings (“wusht = namushtu = namurtu”), and identified Ḫ\textsubscript{A}N\textsubscript{J} (thus has to be read, see “Preface”) with En-washtu = Enmashtu = En-martu. The objections to such a reading, however, are evident to every Assyriologist: MARTU, a Semitic ideogram, cannot be treated as an Assyrian word, martu, to which one applies Semitic-Babylonian phonetic values (the change of r to sh before t), making martu mashtu. Surely, every Assyrian would unhesitatingly translate a word En-washtu (martu) by “the lord of the daughter” or “owner of a daughter.” A Semitic ideogram MARTU, signifying “westland,” according to Assyro-Babylonian grammar, cannot become a “daughter,” or martu. The god MARTU played in the westland the same rôle as did, e.g., Enil in Nippur, or Sin in Ul, or Marduk in Babylon, i.e., he was the highest god among the Amurrites, hence being identified not only with Ḫ\textsubscript{K}UR.GAL, “the god of the great mountain” or “world” (an attribute of Enil, Sin, Marduk, etc.; this shows that KUR.GAL cannot be read in each and every case Amurru, but must be understood quite frequently of Enil or Anu or Sin or Marduk, cf. Ḫ\textsubscript{K}US = šal = Enil and En), but also with Ul = Ḫ\textsubscript{US} (cf. here also C. T., II, 12 (Bu, 88–5–12, 212), 1.30, Ḫ\textsubscript{M}arduk(!) û Ḫ\textsubscript{M}artu-Ḫ\textsubscript{M}AR.TU, i.e., “Marduk and Sin-Amurru”). There were known in Babylonia a “Sin of Ul,” a “Sin of Ḫ\textsubscript{S}arran,” a “Sin of Amurru,” a “Sin of Nippur” (cf. here the date of Dungi, E. B. II., p. 256, 15: mu Ḫ\textsubscript{N}ašir(U)ri-ul-ki Ḫ\textsubscript{N}i-d\textsubscript{N}u-ki ë-a-bu-tur. Of this Nippurian 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 dingir dingir in the name Warad-ANḪ\textsubscript{A}NḪ\textsubscript{M}AR.TU and 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 dingir dingir that it is a pluralis majestatis corresponding to the Hebr. Ḫ\textsubscript{M}AN. That name has to be read Warad-ANḪ\textsubscript{A}NḪ\textsubscript{M}AR.TU and shows that MARTU was identified, as is to be expected, with the highest and oldest Babylonian god AN. ANḪ\textsubscript{A}NḪ\textsubscript{M}AR.TU is, therefore, parallel to the AN ši-ru-um Ḫ\textsubscript{A}NḪ\textsubscript{E}N.LIL (Code of Hammurabi, I : 1, see The Monist, Vol. XVI (October, 1906), p. 634) or to the well-known Ḫ\textsubscript{E}N.LIL ışı Ḫ\textsubscript{M}arduk. Cf. also for the formation Warad-ANḪ\textsubscript{A}NḪ\textsubscript{M}AR.TU names like Gaba.Ḫ\textsubscript{A}NḪ\textsubscript{A}NḪ\textsubscript{M}AR-Ď\textsubscript{M}aru (or is Martu here a title?), Reisner, Tellah, 159, VI : 23; Gaba.Ḫ\textsubscript{A}NḪ\textsubscript{A}NḪ\textsubscript{D}ISH-AN, Reisner, Le., 154, III : 4. This last name is especially interesting, showing us that Ḫ\textsubscript{A}NḪ\textsubscript{A}NḪ\textsubscript{D}ISH was not only Ḫ\textsubscript{A}NḪ\textsubscript{A}NḪ\textsubscript{E}A (Br. 10068), but also AN; notice also that DISH is = 60, which is the number of AN, and AN is = Ḫ\textsubscript{A}NḪ.\(^1\) 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.\(^3\) ANḫmek a-shib ESSAGE Prob. GALKALAM MA nap-šk-ti-ka li-la-pa-ru.
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 nap-tu a synonym, resp. side form of napšá-ti? 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 ܢ(^)ܢܢ^2, soci,” “life.” The second peculiarity is met with in the expression NI(G).GÁL-tum nap-ti-ka. If these two words have to be connected, thus taking NI(G).GÁL-tum as the nomen regens of nap-ti, we will have to admit that this is rather singular status constructus relation. We would expect either NI(G).GÁL-tum šá nap-ti-ka or NI(G).GÁL-ti -at nap-ti-ka. However, such status constructus relations may be paralleled, cf. e.g., ul-tu antium (for antium) sa-ati, Neb., V R. 64, I : 9; kima pûrim šéri, ḫarānam namraṣa, quoted by Delitzsch, Gram., p. 192, note. If, then, NI(G).GÁL-tum nap-ti-ka be one expression we may compare with it the well-known NI(G).ZI.GÁL = šiknati napishti = NI(G).GÁL-tum + ZI = shiktum nap-ti = creatures—an attribute ascribed not only to inaNI(var. SAL)-in-si-na, the antium kalama ZI.GÁL kalama gim-gim-me, “the mother of the world, who creates the creatures (ZI.GÁL = NI(G).ZI.GÁL = šiknati napishti) of the world,” E. B. H., p. 202, note I, 1, but also to Shamash, the be-el šik-qa-at napishtim, IV R. 28, No. 1, 7, 8b. This gives us the important result that the writer Shiriqtum 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.”

2 If it were possible to read instead of ki (in du-ki) = DUL (cf. Clay, List of Signs, B. E., XIV, No. 136) we might be tempted to transcribe l. 6, šá ܕшу DUL.NI(G).GÁL-tum nap-é-ka, and translate: “that inhabit the ‘mountain of creatures,’” thus taking DUL.NI(G).GÁL-tum to be another name for DULAZAG, “the holy mountain” of the nether world, of which ܐܒܢ NIN.IB was, as we know, the “king” (LUGAL). But this cannot be done, simply because ki is absolutely certain. A third explanation might be suggested by taking NI(G).GÁL-tum nap-é (l. 6) as standing in opposition to nap-ti = “soul” (l. 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” (napé) and “bodily welfare” (NI(G).GÁL-tum napé) of her people. However, a signification “body” = NI(G).GÁL-tum napé is not known to me. Hence the only translation that seems linguistically justified is the one given above. For ZI.GÁL 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-hi, 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-hi 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-hi 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 m.āu En-lil-[bēl (= EN)-nishē-sū]-shu]
2 ki-bī-[ma um-ma]
3 m.āu A-shur-shum-ētir (= KA[R]a-ma]
4 a-na ka-a-shā bī[i-ka]
5 ū a-na pa-ha-[l[i-ka]
6 tu-ū shul-[mu]

To Enlil-bēl-nishē-shu

speak, thus saith

Ashur-shum-ētir:

to thee, thy house

and thy government

greeting!

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

29 ū Mār-.m[. . . ]

Also Mār-. . . .

30 bēl pahāti (=EN.NAM') a-na ardi-

ka ki-i il-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 Kadashtu-Turgu) see p. 13, n. 5.

2 For EN.NAM = bēl pahāti see Delitzsch, H. W. B., p. 5196.
31 abulla (=KÁ.GAL)\(^1\) i-ma-ad-di tu-shá-an-na-ma taddan( = SE)-na\(^2\) "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-li or "Lord"; nay, he, although a bel paḫati, has to go to the itū 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 sukkallu of the king cannot be meant by the "Lord" in our letters is evident from a passage of No. 35: 24ff., which reads:

24 ī libittu (= SHEG) īa-"a'-nu
25 āš-shum a-na-ku i-tu be-li-ia
26 al-li( or la?)-ka a-na =Erba-ỉšu-Marduk
27 shu-pu-ur-ma a-na =Ku-du-ra-ni
28 [li]-ish-pu-ra-ma sukkalmahhu (=PAP.LUGH.\(^3\) MAGH) li-[q-bi]
29 libittu (= SHEG)\(^4\) li-il-bi-nu

There are also no adobes!

As regards this that I, the itū of my "Lord," have come (gone up to thee saying):

"Send to Erba-Marduk that he send to Kudurāni"—

"so may the sukkalmahhu (i.e., Erba-Marduk) finally give orders (sc. to Kudurāni)

that adobes be made (lit. that they make adobes)."

A beautiful example of "red tape" for this remote period! The sense of this passage is apparently the following: Kishahbut, the writer and itū (p. 35, n. 4), living in Dûr-Nusku during the reign of Kadashman-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 maṭu = LAL (§5 142), 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 bûb-GAL.LA = abulla is feminine, hence we would expect ia-ma-ad-di. I-ma-ad-di I take, therefore, as a third pers. plur. for išmaṭu. For I, instead of 𒊩, cf. Delitzsch, Gram., p. 252, and for the signification "klagen, stöhnen u. dergl.," Jensen, K. B., VI, pp. 361, 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 tushannama taddana 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-li lišanna-ma (= lišanna-ma), cf. 1. 34, be-li a-ma-as li-mur-ma. Tushannama taddana is a 𒈦 be-lu ěšú = "thou shalt duplicate and give" = "thou shalt give again."

\(^3\) For PAP.LUGH = LUGH = sukkallu cf. III R. 67, 55, ỉšLUGH = ditto (i.e., ỉšPAP.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 itū writing to the be-li 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-li: 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-li. Only by doing this could he (the writer) expect that his wishes were ever conformed with. The be-li, 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 manzaz pānī, 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-li 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-li: ul mu-shá-ki-lw a-na-ku lu man-za-az pa-ni a-na-ku, i.e., "not a mischief breeder, but a manzaz pānī am I." Surely, no manzaz pānī could or would ever speak to another manzaz pānī in this manner, because (1) there was not or could not have been another highest(1) 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 manzaz pānī could not possibly have been a "brother" officer, but was, as the title indicates, that official's "Lord," then the only conclusion to be

1 Cf. Scheil, Textes Élam. Sém., 1, p. 97 : 13, ma-an-za-az pānī (= SII) LUGAL.
2 Cf. 48 : 2, a-na di-[na]-m a-bi-lum lu-[lik], and i.e., ll. 3, 26, um-ma-a a-na be-li-iš-ia-ma.
3 III of ašlu = muzuš'kīšu, sc. qarā, lit. "one that nourishes false impressions." Cf. here also No. 20 : 6, emi-e-nu an-ru-ta ma-kar-sú-ú-a šá a-na dishe-bi-lum i-kum um-ma-a dishe-be-li-a na pā-ni-shu ul-te-ti-bi-an-ni, etc.
arrived at under these circumstances is that the "Lord" of the manzaz päni 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.):

\[ A-na be-fr-ia: \]

\[ 1 \text{ As-mi lu-ul-li-i } \]
\[ 2 \text{ la ma-ir² an-ni } \]
\[ 3 \text{ nu-urb ahê( =SHESH)meš-shu² } \]

\[ = \text{SHESH} \]
\[ = \text{AN} \]
\[ = \text{AN} \]
\[ = \text{AN} \]

1 In view of such forms as lu-ul-li-ik, No. 38: 2; li-ish-pu-â-ra-\{am-\}tua, No. 39: 23, and many others, one might be inclined to see in this sign a variant of ik and read lu-ul-li-ik, "may I come." But against this is to be said that (1) in all texts of this period only the regular form for ik, 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 = zuru, "seed." The TA.AN then is easily amended to ishtu shame-[r]. For an analogous attribute of a Cassite king cf. the inscription of Agum-Kakrime (Jensen, K. B., III, p. 131, col. I : 3), where this king calls himself zuru el-lum ša dumšii Shuqamuna, "the pure seed of Shuqamuna." Cf. also in this connection the sign of god, šubu, before the names of the Cassite kings of this period.

2 So rather than la be-ir an-ni, "who does not dey grace." The attribute here ascribed to the "Lord" has its origin in the fact that the writer had to report to his be-ši rather sad news, which possibly might be attributed to his (the writer's) negligence. See II. 1ff.

3 For it-pi-shi see Hilprecht, B. E., XXI, p. XII, note 7.

4 In this expression two divine attributes fall together, viz., nár mati resp. nár āšišu or nár gub-ša, ascribed especially to Sin, Shamash, and D\(\)T\(\)ar-hy (p. 16, n. 13), and asharid āšišu-sha(sha), found in connection with NIN.IB and Ishtar, i.e., with all gods who played the rôle of the "Son" and "his wife."

5 Delitzsch, H. W. B., p. 532a, mentions a word pindê, which he takes to be a plural, quoting III R. 65, 9b, "wenn ein neugeborenes Kind pi-in-di-e ma-li voll ist von p." In our text PI-in-di-e is apparently a noun in the genitive (after ana, l. 1) and the regens of na-ma-ar-ri. As such a noun it is a fill of the of vi-nil-e = vi-nil-e = vin-nil-e = vi-nil-e, which latter, when graphically expressed, becomes PI-in-di-è. 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 namâri—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 fa'at form: vaddaj = vaddê = vaddê = vaddê (a with following ū is often changed to ū or i) = vindê = "apitôtter, commander."
1 Ki-ib, ki-ib-tu = qipu, qipitu. Delitzsch, H. W. B., p. 584a, defines a qipu to be one "der mit etwas betracht tet," and of qipitu he says, i.e., that it is a "Darlehen, spec. zinsenfreies Darlehen(?)." On the basis of our passages here it would be better to see in a qipu "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 has 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 dumkê ú mishri 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 kibtu in such a way is a shar mi-shù-ri-im, Neb. Grot., I, 1. For ki-ib = qipu, see also 46:17, ki-ib-ka (i.e., the Lord's) a-a-um-ma ul-i-nu-ur.

2 A plural of rashbânu, and this a form in -an (which form signifies adjectives and nouns, Delitzsch, Gram., § 65, p. 175, No. 35 of rashbu.

3 Epí-ir . . . pa-ash-shur. The correct explanation of these words depends upon whether we see them participle or nouns. If epí-ir be the participle of eπéρεν, "sättigen, 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 Υ.Α. = επέρου, zonínum (Delitzsch, H. W. B., p. 115b). Cf. for the kings of Isin: Sin-māgir (Thureau-Dangin, A. S. K. I., p. 204, No. 4, l. 2), Isilume-Dagan (i.e., p. 206, No. 5, l. 2); for the kings of Larsa: Sin-iddînum (i.e., p. 208; No. 5, l. 3, p. 210, l. 8 above; d, l. 3), Arad-Sin (i.e., p. 212b, l. 5; e, l. 7; p. 214d, l. 8), Rim-Sin (i.e., p. 216a, l. 13; p. 218e, l. 10; p. 220, l. 11 above; 9, l. 11); for the kings of Warka: Sin-gashid (i.e., p. 222e, l. 8). If epír be a participle then pashešhar must be one likewise, in which case the latter might stand for pîškûr = pîšhîr, Delitzsch, H. W. B., p. 549d: "Löser, der sich gnädig annimmt, Erbauer" (cf. V R. 21, 53a, b; 65a, b, naph-shâ-ra syn. of re-em-na). As, however, a writing pa-duk-shur for pāshhîr would be somewhat strange for this period, it is preferable to take pa-dāsh-shur in the sense of pāshshahur, "platter," and then, of course, e-pi-r not as a participle, but, on account of the parallelism, as a stat. const. of eπéρα (so also Hipprecht and Hommel in personal communications), "the food of people, the platter (xorē) of men," from which, i.e., from whose (the Lord's) grace they all eat. For eπéρα as a divine attribute cf. also the proper names as Epí-lîth-e-pír, B. E., XV, 181 : 12; as En-lîl-e-pír, B. E., XVI, 181 : 12; as En-lîl-e-pír (sic! neither tu, Clay, i.e., p. 28b, nor "perhaps" tir, Clay, Corr. (1907), Z. A., XX, 417f.), I.e., 37 : 9; XXX-i-pi-ra-an-û, i.e., 180 : 17; Bêlit (= GASHAN)-e-pir-ra-at, i.e., 155 : 27; as SHU.UD.DA-e-pi-r(î) (sic! Clay, i.e., p. 33b, wrongly Ilu-shur-er-e-pîr(î)), I.e., 156 : 10. For SHU.UD.DU of the proper name in R. T. Ch., 330, Rev. 2, a name like Mar-duk. From this it follows that the "Lord" as e-pi-r um-ma-an has a divine attribute; he was deified.


5 Notice here the ù before Bēlit-il and the u between Enlil and É.A. The first two gods represent the "whole world," the cosmos as it was known since the time of the Enuma elish epiê, i.e., since the time when Babylonia proper (Ki-en-pi-ki-BUR.BUR = Shumer and Akkad = kalâm = "high and lowland") had extended its confines south over the lowlands as far as and embracing the Persian Gulf ("the lower sea" = a-pu) and north over the Armenian mountains and the "westland" (notice that these two lands are likewise known as BûR.BûR = Akkad = highlands) up to and including the Mediterranean Sea ("the upper sea"). In this wise it happened that the kalâm became a kur-kur and the dâniš=LUGAL.KALAM.MA a dâniš=LUGAL.KUR.KUR; in other words, the microcosmos became a macrocosmos which included the two oceans and was called É-shû-ru, being as such inhabited by Anu (heavenly ocean=upper sea),
LETTERS TO CASSITE KINGS

8 ut mi-ish-ri-e
9 ish-ru-ku-ú-shú
10 be-li-ia ki-bé-ma um-ma "Kal-bu' ip-ru

Translation.

To my "Lord"—

1 Glorious in splendor, Seed out of heaven;
2 Not summoning punishment, Strong, powerful, wise one;
3 Light of his brothers, Ordering the dawn;
4 Ruler of mighty, Terrible lords;
5 Food of the people, Platter of man;
6 Hero of his clan, Whom the triad of gods
7 Together with Bélit Presented a fief
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 Eslil (kur-lur = kalam, the terra firma, as consisting of the upper (= BUR.BUR) and the lower (ki-en-gi) firmament), Ê.A (terrestrial ocean = apu = Persian Gulf), see Bel, the Christ, p. 14, note 3. Bélit-ili, because identified in the inscriptions with Antum, Nisilil, and Damkina, represents here the feminine principle of the "world," "cosmos," Esharrah. What the writer, then, wants to say with these words is this: "the whole world, as represented by its triad of gods, united in bestowing upon the Lord the ki-lú-ti du-um-ki ú mi-ish-ri-e"—not a ruler made by man, but a divinely appointed sovereign is the "Lord" of the writer Kalbu.

1 Though we have forms with e, instead of i, in the third pers. sing. or plur. (cf. e-si-ki-ar-ma, 3 : 18; e-pi-(il)-te-ma, 3 : 19, 30, 32; e-ri-ba-a, 26 : 13, etc.), yet we never find an e used as a phonetic complement in these forms, hence I read here not e-ish-ru-ku-ú-shú, but mi-ish-ri-e(!) ish-ru-ku-ú-shú. Mi-lishér-i-e I take as a plural of misharu = mishru (cf. epur, epu; gimur, gimur; Delitzsch, Gram., p. 105, § 45), "righteousness" (hence not of mehru, "riches," H. B., W., p. 688a), and dumqi, on account of the parallelism, in the sense of "grace," H. W. B., p. 222b (against Jensen, K. B., VI, p. 448, "Schönheit, Gutheit, gute Beschaffenheit"). The e may(1), however, stand for i (cf. 92 : 27) = "behold!"


1 In view of 89 : 1, ša-ku-aa, "whom (the addressee) I (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 "dü-Man-nu-gi-ir-ša IM shá LUGAL ra-in ga-[lî]

19 "be-lî a-na rid-šabé (= MIR.NIT. TA) an-mu-ti id-di-na"" Even the city Mannu-gir-Rammán, with which the King is entrusting me (i.e., which I hold as fief of the king) 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 ša, always omitted, cf. ša Ardi-GASHAN, 66 : 24; ša iš-Gir-ra-ge-mil, 3 : 31; iš-Gir-ra-ge-mil, 3 : 39; or only ša-Gir-ra-ge-mil, 3 : 13, 17, 20; ša UD-ta-kul-ti, 16 : 8, 12, but Bit-ša-Ki-din-ni, 9 : 23, so always after Bit- in our letters. The name of the person means "who is like Rammán," and corresponds to the Sumerian A-ba-ša-ša IM-gim. The gi-ir, therefore, in this name represents the Sumerian GIM or the regular Babylonian kima (or kl). As the ša in ana or ina may be omitted and the n assimilated to the next consonant, so the ša of kima has been omitted here and the n assimilated itself (by first becoming an) to the following r, but this it could do only if ša IM was actually read ša Ramman. This writing, then, proves that ša IM was not read, at the time of the Cassites, Adad but ša Rammán. For the change of k to q cf. abanna = 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-im, m before q (even if the q belongs to another word, cf. ana, ina, kima above) may become an, Delitzsch, Gram., § 49a. For the c, double ace, see H. W. B., p. 604a, 2, "Jem. mit etwas begunden, d. h. beschenkten"; 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., Schell, Textes Élam. Sém., I, p. 89. Our writer Kalbu, then, has received the city Mannu-gir-Rammán by "royal grant."

3 MIR.NIT.TA. King, Letters of Hammurabi, III, p. 99, note 5, was the first to recognize that the sign which looks like ȘI has to be read MIR. It is found with either two (Letters of Hammurabi, 3 : 7, 11 | 26 : 10, 16 | 30 : 14 | 43 : 4, 7, 19, 23, 27, 29) or three (lP, 418 (= C. T., VI, 27 : 14) or four (Letters of Hammurabi, 1 : 19, 22) wedges at the beginning. Delitzsch, B. A., IV, 455, read this sign BARA which in our letters looks quite differently, cf. 3 : 13 | 41 : 8 (BAR = parakkku ša-la-um-pi) | 66 : 7 (parakkku ša-lu-ti). Cf. also Z. A., XVIII, 202f. and i.e., p. 393; Harper, Code of Hammurabi, List of Signs, No. 135. The latter quotation shows that the signs wrongly read IP.USII or TU. USII (E. B. II., 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 "Militärbehörde." The an-nu-ti shows that MIR.NIT.TA must be masc. plur. TA apparently contains only the "overhauling" vowel of USII = NIT. MIR.NIT.TA is = rid-šabè = a composite 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-šabè, rendering it by "recruiting officer; one who impresses men for the corvée." In view of the fact that the phrase of the Hammurabi Letters, ana MIR.NIT šakāru resp. mutša (Delitzsch, B. A., IV, 487 = conscribere), corresponds exactly to our a-na MIR.NIT.TA naddān, I prefer to translate as given above. From this it is evident that Kalbu held the city Mannu-gir-Rammán by "royal grant," subject to military service. All royal "grants" were, therefore, fiefs.

4 šiddina = relative after šá, l. 18.
20 i-na la-me-e na-di zu-un-na i-na sha-me-e

is destroyed by inundations: rains out of the heavens.

21 ù mi-la i-na nak-bi² ki-i i-di-nu² sha¹-ku

and floods out of the depths are, when (after) he had handed her over, overflooding her!

22 ālu-ki šá be-li i-ri-man-ni i-na la-me-e

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

23 na¹-di a-na ba-la-ad a-i-ka-a lul-lik

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 l. 18 (ra-in ga-ti) and l. 22 (i-ri-man-ni) pictures quite vividly the progress of the flood. While in l. 18 Kalbu is still the possessor of the city, holding it in trust for his Lord, he has lost it in l. 22, appearing as one that has been holding it.

If we compare in this paragraph the words “the city Mannu-gir-Rammân with which the KING is entrusting me” (l. 18) with those of l. 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-li and as LUGAL, when he complained in the closing lines as follows (24 : 36f.):

1 Lo-me-e is apparently used here in the same sense as edlu, 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, וטף נָתָן אֶל הָאָרֶץ, 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, i-di-na-an-ni, also 83 : 29, lu ta-di-in; 87 : 17, ša ta-di-na and 57 : 18, kina (= KU) ma-ad-gan (cf. B. E., XIV, 106c : 2; XV, 181 : 4; Delitzsch, H. W. B., p. 366c, Jensen, K. B., VI, p. 442. Notice that lu’tu, pl. lu-ta-tu is a syn. of nuru = GIG.BA, which latter we find again in KU.GIG.BA = kibitu (Jensen, K. B., VI, p. 485), hence lu-ta-tu, a kind of coarse, dirty flour) a-na PAD E-AN li-di-nu. A possible derivation from dinu or even danu is out of place here.

4 This older form of šaš 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.
And I, the itû of my "Lord," though I have written to the "King" concerning my going (away, i.e., leaving) yet the "King" has not given me (an answer or permission to do so').

Kalbu, who was looking out for the interests of his "Lord" continually and in all directions (itû), 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 the En-lil-ki-din-ni, commanded his messenger Már.Ü-da-shá-ash 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-di-ni had spoken to my Lord (be-l-ia), my Lord (be-l) 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-l). 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 Már.Ü-su-ub-Shi-pak i-di ù lu-ú TUR.TUR[mešk]
3 šá na-shá-nu' li-il-la-a'-a-lu um-ma-a i-na a-[ma-as-su-nu]

Már-Usub-Shipak knows. And with regard to the young slaves 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[mešk], to be read according to l.5, pi-il-ḫi-ru-ši, are here "youngsters," "young slaves." Cf., however, l. 289, a-mat LUGAL a-na amelu màšuTaK-tim-ši-a amelu AB.BA[mešk u TUR[mešk]1 arduš-miš, iš (see also H., III, 296, 297, V, 518) with H., III, 295, a-mat LUGAL a-na amelu màšuRa-sha-a-a amelu AB.BA[mešk u šiš (= NE!)]-ša-ši.
4 Perm. I', first pers. plur. for nashá-ni of NE; here with the same meaning as, e.g., Letters of Hammurabi, No. 1: 23, ka-an-ki-im šá bī-ni-[TA.MARTU na-sha-ši, "the contract which Ibni-Martu holds," i.e., "which he has in his possession, which he keeps"; it being above in opposition to mushšaru, "dismiss," II, 12, 13, requires here some such signification as "to hold as prisoner."
4 ma-ti šu-a’-ma-tu-nu 1 u TUR. TURmek na-sha-nu-ma 2

"When are ye finally going to decide their affairs, seeing that we are holding the young ones as prisoners?" After Már-Ash(?)-pilandu had committed to us the young ones and we had gone we spoke (as commanded) to Enlilkidinni.

And after Enlilkidinni had informed the KING, the KING gave orders to Már-Udasha as follows: 'Send the agents and the young slaves

1 šinbu c. ina, "to decide," "determine the fate with regard to something," "to give a decision with regard to something," "to decide an affair."

2 See note 4, page 51.

3 The reading of this name is not certain. If the ūsh which is written here strangely at the lower end of DISH does not belong to the name we might read Már-pi-la-an-du. Also some such readings as Már-Ash-pi-la-ulipDU or Már-pi-la-ulipDU might be possible. A reading Már-Na-ashtu-du-an-du (resp. ulipDU) is, however, less probable.

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

5 Jensen, K. B., VI, p. 412, doubts whether shakānu may be construed with double accusative. Here and p. 125, n. 8, it is. Dima (=šima) shakānu 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 šima:

(a) lamātu, "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 É[aAN] a-la-ma-ad; 33: 28, te(!)-e-im nu-shi a-lam-ma-ad; 33: 30, [te-e]-im su-ma-nu a-lam-ma-ad. See also C. T., V, 31: 24, a-na te-im a-ra-ti ši-a-ti la-ma-di-im.

(b) naddānu, "to give news," "to inform." Cf. B. E., XIV, 114: 4, šašu HA (= flat) LUGAL di-e-mi i-di-[ ].

(c) shu-tašu, "to ask for news about something," "to inquire about it." Cf. 22: 8, di-im mur-gi-ša kis aš-u-la-shi.

(d) šakānu, "to give news," "to report," "to command," "to order." Cf. 50: 10, di-ša-[šiš]-aš-ka-nu; 67: 6, di-mi lu-aš-ki-nu; 80: 13, di-mi šaši-kun-ma; 92: 21, 31, te(!)-e-ma šaši-kun; 9: 16, šakānu (= GAR)de(= NE)-ni(here not an "officer," but a permisive: "is reporting concerning (sha) Buš-Sin-issašra"). From this it will be evident that an asmaišakān(-in)šima 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 commands" to his inferior. Cf. furthermore 55: 9, di-ma aš-ša-ni; 55: 23, [di-ša]-ša-ak-ni. In view of the two latter phrases we cannot explain 34: 38, be-li di-e-ma il-KU(1)-na-an-ni as standing for beli šima il-qu(1)-na-an-ni—which would be without any sense—but we must, seeing that the sign KU has also the value tuk(g), postulate that value here and read il-tuk(1)-na-an-ni, or we must suppose that KU could be read (besides tuk(g)) also tak(g): il-tuk(= KU)-na-an-ni. In the latter case we would have here a new value for KU, viz., tak(g).

(c) ša-šāru, "to send news." Cf. 53: 40, di-im šaš-iš-pa-ra-an-ma; 81: 11, di-im ta-asher-pu-ra; 57: 17, di-e-ma li-šaš-pa-ra-an-ma; 76: 5, di-e-ma šaši-up-ra-an-ma; 94: 8, te(!)-ma šaši-up-ra; 59: 29, de(= NE)-im-ku šaši-kun-ka šaši-up-ra—the latter phrase being used for "a request of a letter in answer to a note sent."

(f) turrū, "to return news," "to advise," "Bericht erstatten." Cf. 76: 9, di-e-mi a-na be-šl lu-te-ir.
11 šá m šú En-lil-ki-di-ni šú-pu-ur-ma
12 li-mi-ish-shi-ru-ni
13 már šip-ri LUGAL a-na mu-ush-shú-ri-ni
14 ki-i il-li-ka šú-â ki ú-ši-bi-ta-na-shi
15 a-na mu-ul LUGAL ul-te-bi-la-na-shi
16 LUGAL a-na Már-ul-da-shá-âsh um-ma-a
17 šá-al-ma-at' aq-ta-ba-ak-ku um-ma
18 ta-al-ta-pa-ar-ma TUR.TURmesh
19 šá m šú En-lil-ki-di-ni un-di-ish-shi-ru-ni-ê
20 Már-ul-da-shá-âsh a-ka-an-na-a' iq-ta-li
21 um-ma-a m šú En-lil-ki-di-ni a-na be-li-ia
22 ki-i iq-bu-ú be-li a-na ia-a-shi
23 [di-ma û]la-ak-na-an-ni um-ma-a
24 [šú-pu-ur-ma] a Nem DAM.QARmesh
\[ù TUR.TUR\mesh[\]]

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 Már-
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 Enil-
kidinni'?

Már-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 + umashkhirâ-ni. Lu + u- (if 3 pers.) or lu + i- = i, so always! For the i in mi-ish = mash cf. also
li-si-bi-tu-shs-nu-ti, 58 : 11; i-di-ši-ku-á, 40 : 7, etc., hence an emphatic a with i preceding or following may become
an i.

2 The royal messenger here referred to is Már-ul-da-shá-âsh, l. 8.

3 Lit. "for our dismissal!"; the infinitive being treated here as a noun, hence -ni for -na-shi (ll. 14, 15).

4 Šá-al-ma-at' here not a plur. of shalimmu, but a permissive = (la) shalmita(a), "peace (greeting) be unto thee."
This would make it appear that the Cассite kings, when writing to their subjects and using any greeting at all, employed
the following formula: shalimu inshi lâ shalmita, "I am well, mayest thou be well." The later Babylonian resp. Assyrian
kings said, as is well known, in its stead, shalimu inshi liâbaka lâ tabka (resp. libbakunu lâ tâbkanûsu).  

5 Undishširâ = umdashširâ. The long û in ni-û I take as the sign of a question, hence standing for original u: û
instead of u on account of the û in ni.

See also e-ka-an-na-an, 52 : 25, on the one and a-qa[n],a, 21 : 9, 14; a-qa-an-na, 71 : 9, on the other hand. For the
last cf. also Behrens, L. S. S., III, 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 Mār-Udashiš, of Ahushina (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 mw.narkabtu in the 3rd year (of Kuri-Galzu, B. E., XV, 21:7), and is found together with a certain Murānu in a tablet from the time of Kuri-Galzu (cf. Innanni, l. 25), B. E., XV, 194:7, 8. This Murānu was a son of Meli-Shāh and a patesi, living during the 18th year of Kuri-Galzu, B. E., XIV, 28:5. A "son of Murānu," Mār-Mu-ra-ni, who likewise is a patesi, is mentioned not only during the 13th year of Kuri-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 itū(!) 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

---

1 Written either m En-li-ki-din-ni, 55:6, 7, 19, or m En-li-ki-di-ni, 55:11, 21 | 78:3 | 79:3.
2 Identical with Usub-Shipak in Sehul, Textes Élam. Sém., I, p. 93, 1:3 (a kudurrû from the time of Kashtilashu).
3 The name of this royal messenger is, so far, not mentioned again.
4 The Murānu of B. E., XIV, 128:8, living at the time of Shagarakti-Shurîsh (1st year) is another person.
5 Son of m En-li-bel (= EN)-ANmesh.
6 The father of m Ta-ki-shum.
possession of agents (DAM.QAR), young slaves (TUR.TUR mâk = ši-ih-ki-ru-ti) and of an itû, "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 m šà NIN. IB-na-din-SHESH mâk (l.c., 1 : 6 | 7 : 14, here: SE-SHESH.SHESH), living in Bit-šû En-lil-ki-di-ni (l.c., 2 : 8), where he kept slaves (NAM.GALU.IÙ . . . ka-lu-u, 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.QAR mâk) and representatives (itû, Mâr-Murânî 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-si and at the same time also an itû for a dealer in slaves, as was the case with Mâr-Murânî. 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-usur and Melî-Shipak.

The boundary stone, London, 103,1 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 "pihat of Nippur" (III : 42)—which by themselves would show whence that stone came—but also such names as Bit-šû En-lil-ki-di-ni (IV : 29, 44; V : 31) and Aḫu-da-ru-û, the "son" (mâr; i.e., = "descendant") of šû En-lil-ki-di-ni (IV : 13, 40; V : 1),2 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, m Ur-šû NIN.DIN.DÛ.GA, with the person bearing the same name in London, 103, I : 6; also the šû Parak-mârî (l. c., V, 15, with our No. 53 : 38) and the "canal of Dûr-šû Enlil," Nam-gar-Dûr-šû Enlil, l. c., III, 23, with

2 For mâr = "descendant," see below, Chapter IV, pp. 64, 65.

The following members of the "House of Enlilkidinni" are known:

m šû NIN.IB-na-din-SHESH mâk (or SE-SHESH.SHESH).

m šû En-lil-ki-di-ni, the founder of the house.

? (mâr here "descendant.")


m šû En-lil-shum-idîna (= Mû.Mû).

Aḫu-dara lived during the time of Rammân-shum-usur and Melî-Shipak, and Enlil-shum-idîna during the latter's reign.
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our Nos. 3: 33, 34, 38, 41 | 39: 41; B. E., XIV, p. 58a; XV, p. 52a; X, p. 70a. Such identity of names and places cannot be accidental.

(c) 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^{(1)}-Marduk, to arrest certain men accused of lèse majesté."

(f) 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-ti. 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\(^3\) (Amarna, B. 188) reads:

1. a-na =be-li-ia
2. ki-bé-ma um-ma
3. TUR.SAL LUGAL-ma
4. a-na ka-shá =narkabát{mash}-ka
5. {[álu|al] ụ bá-ti-ka]
6. lu-ú šú-ul-mu
7. AN{mash} šá =Bur-ra-Bur(!)-ia-āsh

To my "Lord"
speak, thus
saieth the princess:
Unto thee, thy chariots,
thy cities, and thy house
greeting!
The gods of Burra-Buriash

\(^1\) Another royal letter is possibly that published under No. 93,
\(^2\) No. 75. For a translation see below, p. 135.
\(^3\) Since the above has been written there appeared in the Vorderasiatische Bibliothek a new translation of the Amarna letters by J. A. Knudtzon. This scholar, when speaking of this letter in the Preface to his translation, says (Die El-Amarna-Tafeln, pp. 20f.): "Der ersterer (i.e., No. 12 = B. 188) stammt nach seiner Schrift wohl am ehesten aus Babylonien, was auch nach den Ton möglich und nach dem wahrscheinlichen Inhalt von Z. 7 das Nächstelegende ist. . . . Wenn mit dem, was über die Herkunft dieses Briefes gesagt ist, ungefähr das Echte getroffen ist, so ist der "Herr," an den er gerichtet ist, kaum anderswo als in Ägypten zu suchen." Knudtzon differs (i.e., p. 98, No. 12) in the following points from the translation (and emendation) as given above: l. 5, [á]-m[í]-[ú]-l[í] for [á]-ul[lí] (but cf. Rev. l. 5); l. 11, *(l)-ir-ma, wandele* Rev. l. 1, l. 3, pi-in-pa he translates by "gefärbten Stoff," but then Rev. l. 5f, is left in the air. Rev. ll. 7f, *tu-ti* tu-ti-(l) tu-(l)-bi-ka, 8 [(a) to-[d]á-[ñ]-[ñ]-ñ]-9 to a-šíš iš-ku [a] še-ša-ka-du-ša-ní which is rendered by "Mit deinem Herzen wirst (oder sollst) du n[ic]ht r[e]f[ñ]-[ñ] . . . , und mir wirst (od. sollst) du . . . n[ic]ht errichten."
8  it-ti-ka  li-li-ku
9  shal-mi-ish  a-li-ik
10  u  i-na  shá-la-me
11  ti-ir-ma  biti-ka  a-mur
12  i-na  pa[-. . .]

Reverse:
1  a-ka-an-n[a  . . .
2  um-ma-a  ul-tum"Gi-[. . . .
3  mār  ship-ri-ia  gi-ir-pa
4  ú-she-bi-la  a-na
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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  dinān  belī-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.¹ 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 Babylonia, 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-il-mu-ar-i-na, the king of Egypt, to Kadashman-Enlil (Amarna, L. 1). For its being a "copy" speaks also the hastiness and carelessness in which it has been written, cf. e.g., ul-mu for shu-ul-mu (R. 6), be-li-i for be-li-ia (R. 14), id for i-di (R. 9), it-li for it-ti-nu (Rev. 7). For several other Egyptian copies among the Amarna letters see also Knudtzon, l. c., p. 16.
"Lord" and "King" of Babylonia. This princess, after having communicated her wishes to this "Lord," finds that, according to good woman fashion, a postscript is proper and in order. She forgot to introduce Kidin-Rammán, 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 customary among Babylonians when writing to their "Lord" and "King," as we know now, adds another postscript, saying: a-na di-na-an² be-lī-ia lul-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 āluši lū bitinšim-ka lu-ū shū-ul mu), 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-lī.

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) mētu Ka-ru.-tilDu-ni-in-ash, Amarna L, 1, et passim. For ḪaDu-ni-in-ash see Hüsing, 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 dinānu cf. also 24:33, ash-shā di-na-[ni-]a, "on my account" = ash-shāmi-a. 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. Pān-An.GAL-ku-mur 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 dinānu by "presence," though its real signification is "Selbst, Selbstheit." By doing this I am, however, unable to find the difficulty which Behrens, L. S. S., 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 these 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 (um-ma-a a-na be-lī-ia-na). 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. Nor are the words mōr shipi-ia ana šulmu šarrī siš lā šābi-ālāpiš occurring in H., VII, 721:5 (writer m ili Marduk-MU-ŠE-na) and H., VIII, 832:5; 833:5; 835:5; 836:5; 837:5 (all written by ili AG-EN-MU mešš) to be translated with Behrens, i.e., by "meinen Boten habe ich mit Gefolge (Pferde u. Krieger, d. i. berittene Krieger?) zur Begrüßung des Königs geschickt." The siš lā šābi 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."
The fact that the be-ta in all our letters is the KİNG 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-uballiṭ, king of Assyria, the Cassites (§ABmash Kass-shi-e) had revolted and killed "Ka-ra-Har-da-ash, the king of Babylonia, the son (TUR) of "Mu-bal-li-ta-at"She-ru-u-a, a daughter of Ashshur-uballiṭ, raising a certain "Na-zi-Bu-ga-ash to the kingship over them. Whereupon Ashshur-uballiṭ, to

1 Cf. e.g., Winckler, Das alte Westasien, p. 21f.; Delitzsch, Chronologische Tabellen (not accessible to me); Weissbach, Babylonische Misellen, p. 21f.; Clay, B. E., IV, p. 3 (see p. 10, note 3); Hilprecht, B. E., XXV, 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 confesses: "Seule la doctrine de Nabonide, relative à Shagarakti-Shuriash serait inexpliçable; si en effet, suivant l'hypothése la plus probable, les 800 ans sont comptés de la fin du règne de Shagarakti-Shuriash à l'avènement de Nabonide, ce chiffre serait trop fort de près d'un siècle (exactement de 90 ans). Our scheme given on p. 1 does justice both to Nabonid's statement with regard to Shagarakti-Shuriash (so, that the latter lived 800 years before him, i.e., +580 (end of the reign of Nabonid) = +1380; 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 Nabonid informs us that Hammurabi lived 700 years before Būrua-Buriash (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 Būrua-Buriash the time between 1450-1423; hence our chronology, given above, comes as near the truth as it is possible at the present.

2 See Winckler, U. A. G., p. 148 (= K. B., 1, p. 194), ll. 8ff.
3 "Ashshur-ub-TI.LA MAN mētu-Ashshur.
4 Not necessarily "Cassite soldiers," for §ABmash at this time is used simply for ummānī, "people," changing frequently with §ABmash, see also p. 35, note 1.
5 MAN mētu-Kar-Du-ni-ash.
6 A-na LUGAL-ū-te a-na mētu-shu-nu ish-shu-si.
avenge \[ "Ka-r\]a-In(da-ash \) (notice this name), went to Babylonia, killed \[ "Na\]-zi-Buqa-ash, made \[ "Ku-r\]i-Gal-zi-ih-ru, the son \( (TUR) \) of \[ "Bur-na-Bur-ia-ash, to be king, and put him "upon the throne of his father" \( (\text{ina} \, \text{sih} \, \text{GU.ZA \ AD-shu})\).

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 \( (i.e., \text{Kuri-Galzu sihru}) \) 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 Babylonia? But if the term "father" refers, as we would expect, to Kara-Hardash, thus making Kuri-Galzu sihru 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. \( (=\text{Ch. P.})\), where we are told that a certain \[ "Ka-dash-man-Har-be \) was the son \( (TUR) \) of \[ "Kar-In2-da-ash \) and of \( (\text{sic! cf., l.c., l. 12}) \) Muballitat-Sherua, the daughter of Ashshur-uballit, king of Assyria; hence Kara-Indash \( (S. H.) = \) Kar-Indash \( (\text{Ch. P.}) \) was the husband of Ashshur-uballit's daughter, Muballitat-Sherua, and the father of Kadashman-Harbe. 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. 810), II. 56. Cf. also Winckler, Altorientalische Forschungen, I Reihe, p. 298 (= p. 115).
3 Written \[ "Mu-bal-li-ti-\, \text{sih}\, \text{AD-shu}.\]
4 Written \[ "AN-SHAR-DIN-ti.\]
FROM THE TEMPLE ARCHIVES OF NIPPU.

Buriash, 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 revoluted against and killed "Ka-dâsh-man-Har-be," and raised to the kingship over them a certain "Shü-zi-ga-ash, a Cassite, 'the son of a nobody.' Whereupon Ashshur-uballit, the king of Assyria, went to Babylonia to avenge "Ka-dâsh-man-Har-be, 'the son of his daughter;'" [killed] "Shu-zi-ga-ash and put "Ku-ri-Gal-zu šigru, the son (sic!) of "Ka]-dâsh-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:

**Synchronistic History.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BABYLONIA</th>
<th>ASSYRIA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Burna-Buriash</td>
<td>Ashshur-uballit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kara-Indash</td>
<td>Muballitāt-Sherua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kara-Hardash</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nazi-Bugash</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuri-Galzu šigru</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BABYLONIA</th>
<th>ASSYRIA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ashshur-uballit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kar-Indash</td>
<td>Muballitāt-Sherua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kadashman-Harbe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shuzigash</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Kuri-Galzu]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All scholars have—and, no doubt, correctly—admitted the identity of Nazi-Bugash and Shuzigash; we need, then, not lose any words about this point. But if we do admit their identity they 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 nishé (UN)mek Kash-ši.
2 Notice that the šu in l. 10 refers back to l. 5.
3 A-nu LUGAL-ü-tu a-na muḫ-shu-nu.
4 mitu Kar-ši-šu-šu-nu.
5 TUR TUR.SAL-šu = Muballitāt-Sherua.
6 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.
7 Denied now, as I see, among others, also by Knudtzon, Die El-Amarna-Tajeln, 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-Hardash (S. H.)?

If I were to put before the various scholars in the realm of Assyriology a combination of signs, such as 𒈗𒈠 KU 𒆠 L, asking them to transcribe, read, and translate it, what would be the result? One would read it ḫakkû ḫa Nin-ÎB, the other ḫakkû ḫa Enûlî, the third ḫakkû ḫa Nin-Gûrsû, and translate it “the (a) weapon is (of) Nin-ÎB, or Enûlî, or Nin-Gûrsû.” 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. ḫ̄aGu-r-ra-ga-miš, ḫ̄aUD-tu-kul-û, etc., in “‘List of Cities’”), might read that very same combination Tukulti-Ḫa Enûlî (Nin-ÎB, Nin-Gûrsû) 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-Bûrûsh in B. E., XIV, 1 : 30 | 2 : 29 | 4 : 18, etc., etc.), and read accordingly (translating it back into Cassite) Kadashman-Ḫa Harbe (or Enûlî, or Nin-ÎB, or Nin-Gûrsû). A sixth, lastly, would maintain that Cassite kings were gods or were identified with gods, hence a name 𒈗KU 𒆠 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 L,” 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 ideographically written names—he they those of persons or of gods—according to his own notions; thus one may see in the name 𒈗SUGH a male, the other takes it to be a female, and the third declares both are wrong: 𒈗SUGH 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 ḫa Enûlî. Kadashman-Harbe, when written ideographically, may be 𒈗KU-Ḫa EN.LIL (𒈗E.KUR, ḫa L, etc.), but this might, per se, be translated also by “the (my, a) weapon is (of) Enûlî (E.KUR, L, etc.).” Should the writer of the S. H. have mistaken the 𒈗KU = Tukulti, “support,” for 𒈗KU = ḫakkû, “weapon,” and have it translated back into the Cassite language by 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 𒈗KU =
tukultu = Kadashman, "support," thinking it was the same as šiš.KU = kakku = kar(a), "weapon". And if šiš.KU could have been mistaken for kar(a) (instead of tukultu), the ideogram expressing Harbe = Enlil might likewise have been mistranslated by Hardash. If Hardash be a composite word consisting of Hard + ash we might compare it with Bugash = Bug-ash. Should Hard + ash be = 5 (×) 10 = 50 = šš.L, and Bug + ash = 6 (×) 10 = AN or šš.u (see p. 7, note 2, under Guzar-AN)? If this could be proved then the original ideographic writing of this name might have been šš.KU.šš.L.: S. H. translating it by Kar(a)-Hard + ash a weapon of (is) šš.L and Ch. P. by Kadashman-Harbe = my support is Enlil. For šš.L = šš.Enlil, see p. 40, note. (The ash in Hard-ash resp. Bug-ash is hardly the same as iash = mātu = KUR; if it were, Hard-ash might represent either E.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 ššu.NAB (= Enlil, V R. 44, 46c), ššu.AB (= Enlil, III R. 67, No. 1, Obv. 11a, b; cf. 1. 20, ššu.NIN.I11 dim-bi-sal, i.e., of ššu.AB = šš.Enlil; in Weissbach, Babyl. Miscellen, p. 7 (B. E., 6,405), 1. 8, ššu.AB is = Anu (AN): ššu.AB (= AN) ššu.SAR.SAR (= Enlil) ššu.SUR.UD (= É.A) ū ššu.NIN.MAGH = fem. principle of the world, cf. No. 24 : 6 (p. 47, n. 5), Anu, Enlil, É.A, Bēl-il-il), or ššu.IB (= 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 šš.KU + 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 Kadashman-Harbe;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-Harbe, Kuri-Galzu, who naturally must have been still a "little child," a šiḫru, 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. II., "put him upon the throne of his father," can mean only that Ashshur-uballit put Kuri-Galzu šiḫru upon the throne of his murdered father, Kara-Hardash = Kadashman-Harbe; hence the word "father" in S. II. does not refer to Burna-Buriash, as the interpreters want it, but must refer to Kara-Hardash. Thus, even according to S. II., Kuri-Galzu šiḫru may very well, yes, must have been the son of Kara-Hardash = Kadashman-Harbe. 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-Hardash = Kadashman-Harbe," 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, ll. 25, 26), we are told that Jehu ("Ia-ū-a") was the "son" (TUR) of Omri ("Hw-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 Hilprecht² we know that Nazi-Maruttash was the

---

¹ For šiḫru in this sense cf. also II, III, 289:2; 296:2; 297:3; II, V 518:3, ṣiḫru AB.BAmešk u TURmešk, which changes in H., III, 295 : 2, with ṣiḫru AB.BAmešk u šiḫ(N.E.)ru-ū-šti, thus showing that šiḫru "young" is in opposition to AB.BA = šēḫu, "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 we learn that this latter ruler was "the son (TUR) of Kuri-Galzu and the SHAG.BAL.BAL of Burna-Buriash." Now SHAG.BAL.BAL means in each and every case nothing but "one who is of the reigning (house) of," libbi palē. Hence the mār (TUR) of the S. H., because it corresponds here to SHAG.BAL.BAL, must likewise be taken in the signification of libbi palē; in other words, the expression mār (TUR) 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-Harbe = Kara-Ḥardash, and this he was and is not only according to B. E., XIV, 39:8f. (ish-tu Ku-ri-Gal-zu TUR \(\text{ni}^2\)Ka-da-āš-man-Har-be a-di

---

1 Siebel, Texte ŠEAM, Šem., I, p. 86 (cf. plate 16), col. I, II. 1–5.

2 Weissbach, 
Babyl. Miscellen, pp. 2f., by first trying to establish for 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 SHAG.BAL.BAL in all passages cited by him means either "Urenkel," "fernen Nachkommen," or "einen um Jahrhunderte späteren Nachkommen." This alone ought to have been sufficient to convince Weissbach that SHAG.BAL.BAL in IV B., 38, I, 20–26, could likewise not have the signification "Enkel." Not heeding this warning, Weissbach arrived at results which were both impossible and disanswerable: he had to maintain three Marduk-aplu-iddinas, three Kadashman-Harbes, three Kuri-Galzus; had to remove Kara-Ḥardash altogether from the list of kings and make Kuri-Galzu šišru, "the son" of Burna-Buriash, the abu abi, the "brother of the father" of Kadashman-Harbe, i.e., had to make him a brother of Kara-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. mār Y. mār 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) Nabû-zēr-tīahir mār Išti-Marduk-ba-latû mār Ardi-E.A, because parallel to Šapiku mār Išti-Marduk-ba-latû SHAG.BAL.BAL Ardi-E.A, makes Ardi-E.A the founder of the distinguished and celebrated surveyor family of which the two brothers, Nabû-zēr-tīahir and Šapiku, were later members (not necessarily grandsons). Again, if mār be = SHAG.BAL.BAL = "belonging to the reigning (house) of," then it is, of course, quite natural that Mesi-Shipak should call himself (B. E., 4378 = Weissbach, i.e., p. 2) mār Kuri-Galzu. Why? Because Mesi-Shipak was an usurper. But someone might object that in London, 103 (Bélisier, B. A., II, p. 187f. = Peiser, K. B., III, p. 160), IV, 31, the immediate predecessor of Mesi-Shipak, Ramman-shum-usur, is referred to as "thy (i.e., Mesi-Shipak's; cf. I., 1, 17) father (a-ba-ka)." How can he be a usurper if his father occupied the throne before him? Apart from the list of kings, where Mesi-Shipak is not designated by 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-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-Shipak, then, by calling himself mār Kuri-Galzu, lays "rightful" claim to the inheritance of the throne of Babylon, which he would have as "one belonging to the house" (mār) of Kuri-Galzu. The same desire is evidenced by Mesi-Shipak's son, Marduk-aplu-iddina (notice the Cassite father and the Babylonianized son), who does not call himself (IV B., 88, I, 20–26 = K. B., III, p. 182) grandson of Ramman-shum-usur, but "the son (TUR) of Mesi-Shi-pan-a-nak (cf. also List of Kings): \(\text{ni}^2\)SHU-A-MU TUR-shu, i.e., son of Mesi-Shipak), the SHAG.BAL.BAL of Kuri-Galzu LUGAL ba ša ša-na-an!" For a later example of mār (resp. abī)= "of the," or "belonging to the, house of," cf. Rimût(\(\text{ni}^2\)MASIL) abī ša Murâšhu, and see Hilprecht, B. E., IX, p. 15.
"Na-zi-Ma-ru-ul-ta-âsh TUR "Ku-ri-Gal-zu), but also according to Br. Mus., 83-1-18, 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 shâ-na-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.) = Kara-Hardash, as such belonging to the reigning house of Burna-Buriash (TUR = SHAG.BAL.BAL = libbi palê), we still owe an explanation of the fact that there are other tablets in existence in which this selfsame Kuri-Galzu is not only called, but even calls himself 'son (TUR) of Burna-Buriash.' The question is this: Why should this selfsame Kuri-Galzu (sîrî) 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 (sîrî) 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 Windler, Z. A., II, p. 307f.

2 This very same attribute is ascribed to Kuri-Galzu also in a boundary stone (IV R2, 38, I, 20-26 = K. B., III, p. 162) quoted p. 65, n. 2. Kuri-Galzu, "the son of Kadashman-Heibe," is identical with Kuri-Galzu, the predecessor of Meli-Shiptak and Maribak-aplu-iddina (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, 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 rjum kînum, "the legitimate shepherd," see Hilprecht, B. E., II, Nos. 41 + 46 : 3 (cf. Hilprecht, Ic., p. 32, and Zimmerm, Z. A., XIX, p. 39); Ic., I, 133 : 5, 6 (Zimmerm, Ic.). Also Kuri-Galzu's son, Nazi-Maruttash, claims this very same title, Hilprecht, B. E., II, Nos. 75 + 136 + 137 (Zimmerm, Ic., 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-ku-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-ri-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 (mar) of Burna-Buriash"; thus he maintained on the one hand his "rightful," "legitimate" *(kinum)* 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 ſihru 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.²

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 *(išdi)* and administration of the city Mannu-gir-Rammān.

---

¹ *I.e.*, at least "not generally."

² Hilprecht's statement, *B. E.*, XX, 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. 10, 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-\text{"is}\text{"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-\text{"is}\text{"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-\text{"is}\text{"En-lil, together with his son, the be-\text{"is} 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-\text{"is}\text{"En-lil, may be transcribed and translated as follows (24: 24f.):

\begin{verbatim}
24  ù abullu (= K.A.GAL) erù (URU-DU)mesh u labru (= GA-NAM) shattu-II shù ish-tu b[\text{"e]}-na-tì
25  shù "Na-zi-\text{"is}\text{"En-lil a-bi-ka ù adì (= EN) ùmì\text{"i}
\end{verbatim}

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 Abullu erùmesh is a composite noun in the plural, for the formation of which see Delitzsch, Gram., p. 193, § 73.
2 DA here to be taken probably in the sense of le\text{"u}, Abel-Winckler, Kellschreibungte, Sign List, No. 221; Meissner, Ideogramme, No. 4762.
3 For GANAM = labru, "ewe," see E. B. H., p. 343, and for MU-II, ibidem, pp. 399ff.
4 Ish-tu b[\text{"e]}-na-tì . . . ù adì (= EN) ùmì\text{"i}. The ish-tu bi-na-tì, standing here in opposition to adì ùmi, must signify in this connection some kind of a terminus a quo. Ûnati is, no doubt, related to bennu, which Delitzsch H. W. B., p. 180b, translates by "father"; cf. also Zimmer, Sharpa, p. 54, 55, who renders it by "Ahiherr." If this be true, I would like to see in Ûnati either a plural of bìnattu = (binnatù = biniätù =) binnatu, which latter word occurs also in Amarna, B. 24:22, nòr ship-\text{"u}-ka t-na bi-nu-
ti [kî-\text{"i}] il-li-ka, i.e., "when thy messenger came formerly," or a formation like sìtu, Ûnati, dûnati, rûnati, for which see Delitzsch, Gram., p. 189, and I.E., § 65, No. 37, on p. 177, above. Ûnati 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 bònu, "father, begetter." Adì ùmì\text{"i} stands here for adì ùmi an-ni-\text{"i}.  

Digitized by Microsoft®
26 [e]-ka-ku(?) ù i-na-an-na be-li ithub-[di šāš]3
27 [i(l)-la]²-ka-an-ni i-na-an-na kí-i i-li-[ka-an-n]²
28 [ù zù-un-n]a³ LU(?)wemki lahrur (=GA-NAM) shattu-II i-si-rw mi-na-a[?]
29 [lu]-ga-am-ma lu-ud-di-in⁴

As the succession of the Cassite kings from Kuri-Galzu šīhruru 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-Buriash—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-li of No. 24, must have reigned during the time that elapsed between Burna-Buriash and Kuri-Galzu šīhruru.

We saw that the Cassites revolted during the reign of Kadashman-Ḫarbe = 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-ka-ku. One might expect e-ka-du, but against this is to be said: (1) the ku, although somewhat doubtful, cannot be very well lu. 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 akūtu, one would look for i-ka-ku. A present tense, e-ka-tu = ik-ka-tu, is senseless here. In view of these difficulties I am inclined to connect this form with akākūtim(?). H. W. B., p. 530, which Delitzsch, however, leaves untranslated. Seeing that akākūtim is a syn. of as-šam-shab-tum and this is IM.GHUL.LA resp. IM.RL.GHA.MUN (Del., I.e., p. 146a, Orbita) I propose to translate akākūtim by storm-flood (cf. also IM.RL.GHA.MUN, an attribute of Ramman, the bel ababa), 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 "overflood" a city. In this meaning it is to be found in Sarg. Ann. 164, ana pākur āšāniskatu a-ku(?)-ku-zi ał-dim-ma, "into all their cities I threw a veritable flood (of spears)." The root of e-ka-ku would be PPP or P², it standing for i'zakā = etsakā, with a in the Preterit. The subject of ēkašu is the sunna u nila in l. 20, 21: the floods have overflooded = destroyed.

2 These emendations are, of course, very doubtful, but they seem to me the most probable ones. For aλakū e. acc., "to go, come to," see besides Delitzsch, H. W. B., p. 660, also Jensen, K. B., VI, pp. 464, 475. If the emendations be correct, these forms would stand for i-a=lu(resp. i-li)-ku-in-ni.

3 The traces of these signs cannot possibly be amended to K.A.GAL eru­wemki Da­mekh, l. 24. For LU = UDU = [3], see E. B. II., pp. 313ff.
4 Enkišu, "to encircle," is here parallel to lamā, used of "floods"; see above, l. 20, i-na la-me-er na-di.
5 Hardly anything missing after mi-na-a.
6 For the force of this in da elūr cf., e.g., B. E., XIV, 38 : 9, 10, "that and that," "X. i-liq-qa-am-ma a-na mY, 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," i-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, É.A, and Bêlit-ili themselves had presented with a kingship excelling in grace and righteousness." I see then in the be-lâ of No. 24 a counter-king of Kuri-Galzu during at least the first years of the latter's reign. But if the be-lâ 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 *Synchronistic History* is, as we saw above, rather arbitrary in transcribing names expressed by ideographs. Now as *Éa* Enlil may also be written *ÉaÉ.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-Enlil was written Na-zi-*Éa* É.KUR in the original from which S. H. compiled his story. This Na-zi-*Éa* 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-lâ had brothers. It happens that there is mentioned in *B. E.* XIV, 10 : 56, a certain *Émid-a-na-*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 Émid-ana-Marduk cannot have been the son

---

1 See also my *Bel, the Christ,* pp. 17, 16.
2 Thus identifying *ÉaÉ.KUR* according to *II R.* 54, No. 3, 10 with AN (= Bugash), instead of *ÉaÉ.LIL.* For *AN* as a name of *Éa* Enlil see p. 80.
of Kuri-Galzu, because the latter was himself a child, nor can he have been a son of Kadashman-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 *siḫru*, "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-*ššu*Marduk* was a son of *Nazi-Bugash = Nazi-Enlil* and a brother of the *be-tā* of No. 24.²

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><strong>Ashshur-uballit</strong></td>
<td><strong>Kara-Indash I</strong></td>
<td><strong>Nimmuria (= Amenhotep III)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Muballit-at-Sherua</strong></td>
<td><strong>Burna-Buriash I</strong></td>
<td>daughter; <strong>Naphuria (= Amenhotep IV)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Kadashman-Enlil I</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Kuri-Galzu I; daughter</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Burna-Buriash II, &quot;ancestor of Kuri-Galzu II&quot; (son ?)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Kar(a)-Indash II; Ù-la-Bu-ri-ia-asḥ², king of mštu A.AB.BA</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Kadashman-Harbe = Kara-Hardash</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Nazi-Bugash = Shuzigash</strong></td>
<td>= <em>Na-zi-<em>ššu</em>En-lil</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Kuri-Galzu II, siḫru, &quot;of the house of Burna-Buriash&quot;</strong></td>
<td><em>be-tā</em> (No. 24); <strong>Emid-ana-Marduk</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Nazi-Maruttash</strong> (to be followed by the kings as given above, p. 1.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ For 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-Buria(r)-ri-ai-ash." Cf. now also Thureau-Dangin, O. L. Z., January, 1908, Sp. 31ff., who is of different opinion.

4 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 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. Peters, Chronik P und synchron. Geschichte, O. L. Z., January, 1908, Sp. 7f., and again, i.e., Sp. 140f.; (b) A. Ungnad, Zur Chronologie der Kassiten Dynastien, i.e., Sp. 11f., and Ibidem, Sp. 130f.; (c) J. A. Knudtzon, Die El-Amarna-Tafeln, pp. 34ff., especially p. 38 (reached me March, 1908); (d) Thureau-Dangin, Z. A., XXI (1907-8), pp. 176ff. (see also above, p. 59, note 1); O. L. Z., January, 1908, Sp. 21f.; Journal Asiatique, Janv.-Févr., 1908, pp. 117ff. (received July 1, 1908), and the corrections to the last-named paper, O. L. Z., June, 1908, Sp. 275ff. (was not accessible to me till July 14, 1908).

Peters'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-Buria(r) I (why?) and Kadashman-Enlil II. About the latter he remarks (i.e., Sp. 13): "Ein anderer Ka-ratek measured wohl der Gemahl der Mashallnit-Šerā, ist aber selbst kaum König gewesen." It is hardly to be expected that the Assyrian king Ashokur-Abadillich with his pronounced intentions towards the Babylonian throne would give in marriage his daughter Mashallnit-Sherua to a Babylonian prince who was not, at some time or another, destined to become the king of Babylon, 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-Ḫarbe (instead of Kadashman-Enlil) is quite arbitrary. Though the Cassite Ḥarbe was identified with Enlil, from this it does not yet follow that Enlil in Cassite names has always to be read Ḥarbe. We know that "two Enlils are Ḫarbe = An, but it would be preposterous to read ḥu Enlil = An, or An = Ḫarbe" (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, i.e., Sp. 12, 2, based upon the expression ṣu-ḫu ... adi of B. E., XIV, 39 : 8, to show that Kuri-Galzu, the son of Kadashman-Ḫarbe, was the same as our Kuri-Galzu I, the son of Kadashman-Enlil I, contemporaries of Amen-hotep III, are contradicted by No. 24 : 24, iššu bē-na-ti šaḫa ṣu-ḫu Enlil a-bi-[ka()] ḫu adi unī, for which see above, p. 68, note 4. Ungnad's statement (i.e., Sp. 12, note 1) that abbû (with double b) has to be always a plural is simply an assertion without any argument. Abbû, like Ḫabû, is often nothing but a graphic peculiarity of these 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-Maruttash) to whom he assigns the 22d place among the Cassite kings, in the following fashion: (16) Kara-Iadinash I; (17) Kadashman-Ḫarbe I, his son; (18) Kuri-Galzu I, his son (contemporary of Amen-hotep III); (19) Kadashman-Enlil I, his son; (20) Burna-Burias, his son (contemporary of Amen-hotep IV); (21) Kara-Iadinash II, "petit-fils(? de Burna-burias") (Nazi-Bugash, "wurpateur"); (22) Kuri-Galzu, "second(? fils de Burna-burias") and father of Nazi-Maruttash. A comparison of this arrangement with the one postulated above will show the following differences: (a) Kadashman-Ḫarbe = Kuri-Hardash is left out. The reason for this omission is given by Thureau-Dangin, J. A., 1908, p. 127, in the following words: "Kuri-hardash et Kara-iudash mentionnés par l'Histoire synchronique représentent le même personnage (but why?). On a supposé que Kara-iudash pourrait être le père de Kuri-hardash. Mais le rédacteur n'a pu vouloir dire qu'Abur-abadillich 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-Ḫarbe Thureau-Dangin (O. L. Z., 1908, Sp. 275) refers to Knudtzon, i.e., 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: "L'introduction de ce personnage a peut-être son expansion dans le fait que le rédacteur de la Chronique P aura confondu Kuri-galzu le Jeune, fils de Burna-burias, avec Kuri-galzu 1er, fils de Kadashman-Ḫarbe. Il faut sans doute restituer à
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Prof. Winckler, when discussing the Elamite invasion under Kitin-štrutashši at the time of "EN.LIL.MU.MU" (i.e., Enlil-nadin-shumu, generally, read Bêl-nadin-shumu), who is mentioned in the "List of Kings" immediately after Kashiššašu II, says (Das alte Westasien, p. 20): "Unter dem nur 1½ Jahre regierenden Bel-nadin-shumu I, fällt Kitin-štrutashši, König von Elam, in Babylonien ein, verwüstet Dur-šu . . . und erobert Nippur, das von den Kassiten Königen bevorzugt und wohl vielfach 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 Kashššaššu II, and possibly longer, as the campaign of Kitin-štrutashši against Nippur would indicate, Nippur was, if not the, then at least a royal residence of the Cassite

"l'histoire de Kadashman-šarbe, père de Kuri-galzu 1er, récit de la guerre contre les Sutéens." He accordingly assigns to this Kadashman-šarbe, the son of Kara-šindash (Ch. P., I, 5f.), place No. 17, and identifies him with Kadashman-šarbe, the father of Kuri-galzu I (B. E., XIV, 39:8; Winckler, Z. A., II, p. 309). Though the latter identification is undoubtedly correct (see above, p. 64), yet the Kuri-galzu, the son of Kadashman-šarbe, is not Kuri-galzu I, but Kuri-galzu II, sīkru (see above, p. 64). From this it follows that Ch. P. did not only not confound Kuri-galzu, the son of Burna-Buriash, with Kuri-galzu, the son of Kadashman-šarbe, but, on the contrary, knew that both Kuri-galzu were one and the same person.

For the reason why Kuri-galzu sīkru should have called himself both "son of Burna-Buriash" and "son of Kadashman-šarbe" see above, p. 66. (c) With regard to No. 19 I may be permitted to ask: "On what authority does Thureau-Dangin maintain his statement that Kadashman-šarbe I is the son of Kuri-galzu I?" (d) Burna-Buriash, whom he mentions under No. 20, Thureau-Dangin identifies on the one hand with [...], the son of Kadashman-šarbe (Hilprecht, O. B., I, No. 68), and on the other with the Burna-Buriash known from Knudtzon, i.e., 9, 19 (cf. No. 11, Rev. 19), where this ruler calls Kuri-galzu "my father," a-bi-šu, maintaining at the same time that the expression "father" has to be taken in the sense of "ancestre" (O. L. Z., 1908, Sp. 273). Though it is true that a-bi-šu, and very often does, mean "ancestor" (Tigl.-Phil. I, col. VIII, 47; Knudtzon, i.e., 16: 19, compared with M. D. O. G., No. 25, p. 40)—just as TUR = māru very often means "descendant"—yet Thureau-Dangin still owes the arguments resp. convincing reasons that a-bi-šu of Knudtzon, i.e., 9, 19, has to or must be taken in the sense of ancestor. Again, the name [...]-aš-šu of O. B. I., P., No. 68, may be read with Hilprecht, B. E., XXI, p. 52, note 1, [Sha-garab-ti-Sšu]-aš-šu (the space is large enough for this emendation), see above p. 1. Thirdly, following Thureau-Dangin's methods, we might quite as well maintain that the a-bi-šu-sag of O. B. I., P., No. 68, means "principal descendant," thus making Shaššraššu a "grandson" (instead of a "second son") of Kadashman-šarbe. By the way, on what authority does Thureau-Dangin claim that Shaššraššu was the son of Kadashman-šarbe I? (c) Why does Thureau-Dangin (following Ungnad) omit Burna-Buriash I? Does he identify him with Burna-Buriash, the son (resp. grandson) of Kuri-galzu I and ancestor (resp. father) of Kuri-galzu II, sīkru? 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.

1 See Ch. P., col. IV, 14f.
2 Written "Gu-ad-dáš (= UR).
3 Ali-la Ni-iš-pu (sic!), see Winckler, U. A. G., p. 156, No. 6, l. 11.
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kings. This follows (1) from the fact that these letters, having been addressed to the be-lu, 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, āšš-sum SIG₄ i-na En-lil₃ a-na be-lu-ia 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. (3) Pân-AN.GAL-du-mur, a resident of Dûr-ilu, when explaining to NIN-nu-ū-a why he had not sent a messenger previously, says, 89 : 21f.: mār ship-ri-ia shá a-na a₄En-lil₃ a-na mu₄LUGAL ash-pu-ru ki i-mu-ru-ka ma-la 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 gave orders for the disposal of certain goods, see 27 : 29f.: I biltu šá En-lil₃ šá be-lu ｕ-she-bi-la ｕ XX ma-na šá ardi-ka *Erba-₄Marduk id-di-na ki-i ú-za-i-zu XL ma-na SIG₄ ur-te-hu-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 Kudurānī 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.: āšš-sum a₄USH.BAR₄ an-nu-₄i šá i-na a₄Pa-an-Ba-b₄ i₄ka-lu-ū i-na Ḫ-i₄ši₄ma be-l₄ia a₄q-ta-bi ｕ šā-la-shi-shu a-na mu₄lu₄i be-l₄ia a₄l₄t₄ Nap-ur₄ be-lu Ḫ-i₄ši₄ma be-l₄ia a₄l₄t₄ma Ḫ-i₄ši₄ma be-l₄ia a₄l₄t₄ma; i.e., "as regards these weavers who are being held in Pân-Bali, (I beg to state that) I have not only spoken about them to my 'Lord' in Upi, 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

1 Cf. here also such passages as 27 : 20: i-na Ḫ-i₄ši₄be-l₄ia a₄n₄ma be-l₄ia a₄q₄ta-b₄ma; i.e., "in the city (i.e., Nippur) in the presence of my 'Lord' I have spoken to my 'Lord.'" See also 3 : 22.
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this the king was at one time in Upi, where he received the writer [Imgur]um in audience. The king had promised him to "do something" for the imprisoned weavers, but had, after leaving Upi 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 must Tam-ši[m, col. II, 1. 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 insure 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-Galzu and situated near Nippur. Here he probably lived as long as the be-šu 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-šu 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, DIN.TER[24] u Bār-saph[24] muḫ šēri( = EDIN)-ia lu-uša-at-tīr; 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 (lit. field)."

To EDIN cf. here the greeting, "to the field (EDIN), etc., of my 'Lord' greeting," which shows that EDIN in the passages given above (p. 34) means the whole territory over which the "Lord" was king.

2 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.

3 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-Galzu šiliṟu 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 Khorsabād, at the same time constituted the strongest bastion in the huge outer temple wall.  

(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


2 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 Ashurbanapal it is preferable to exclude this tablet No. 4 from our present discussion.
been published by him, are 'record 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 mashharti šá ēkalli (written Ė.GAL), ‘temple stipend’ (XV, 47); out of the GISH.BAR.GAL bit-ilî, ‘full tax of the house of god’ (XV, 37); to the ardu and amtu ēkalli (= Ė.GAL), ‘male and female temple servants’ (XV, 152 : 15 and 200, III(!) : 9, 38).

2) ‘Priests’ (ishshaku), ‘the temple gateman’ (a-bû bâbi bit-a-nu (sic), XV, 93), ‘the temple shepherd’ (nâqiâdû šá bûti, XIV, 132 : 15), ‘the singer’ (zammêru, XIV, 6 : 4) are salaried officers.

3) The property handled is spoken of as the possession of the god, cf. VI (sic, read I SHU)¹ gur šer’um GISH.BAR.GAL ša ildi (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 bitinu, ‘our house,” cf. VI gur LXXXIV qa SHE.BA(!) a-mi-lu-ti ša bûti-nu, ‘VI gur LXXXIV qa, wages for the men of our house” (no reference given), or simply bitu, ‘house,” cf. ipru mârê bûti-ti, ‘wages for the sons of the house” (XV, 200, I : 38).

With regard to the relation of the Temple to the State, Clay, I. E., 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(!) Nippuršu i Dûr-Ku-ri-Gal-zu,” “which is for the maintenance of Nippur and Dûr-Ku-ri-Gal-zu.” This statement is made even in view of the fact (I. E., p. 7) that ‘amounts are also paid (XIV, 148), ša si-ri-bi-šu ša šarrri, a-na nu-ri ša šarrri, a-na šarrri.”

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 SHU is an abbreviation of šu-šû = soss = 60, just as ma is abbreviated from ma-na. For SHU cf. also B. E., XV, 19 : 29 | 73 : 15 | 149 : 44 | 154 : 45 | 199 : 29, 40, and see the later KU = rubâ or “prince” among the numbers, which shows that KU has to be read šû (šu).

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 É.GAL = ēkallu = "palace," se. of the king, and É-nu, "our house," "our temple."

É.GAL or ēkallu 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 i.e., 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:

1 3 (GUR) 90 (Clay wrongly 84) (qa)
ASH.A.N.A GISH.BAR.GAL
2 3. is-sah-ra
3 abnu DUB É.GAL (ēkallī)
4 u-she-īs-ṣa-am-ma
5 a-na īn-na-an-ni
6 i-na-an-din
7 abu ASH.A.AN
8 shaltu 15
9 3 (GUR) 90 (Clay again wrongly 84) (qa) 3 gur 84 qa of ashanna grain of the full tax,
ASH.A.N.A (eig) is-sah-ra
10 ina SHE.BAR GUR LUGAL 3 gur 84 qa of ashanna grain
11 En-lēlki
12 3 is-sah-ra
13 m is-sah-ra

Against this translation is to be said: (1) The expression ina SHE.BAR GUR LUGAL En-lēlki (ll. 11, 12) can never mean "in the royal seed gur of Nippur," but would have to be translated, if En-lēlki 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 En-lēlki 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 Sippur; (3) the expression abnu DUB É.GAL u-she-īs-ṣa-am-ma (ll. 3, 4) can be rendered only "per sealed order (abnu DUB = anything that is sealed, "letter," "order," "decree," etc.) of the É.GAL (as such to be distinguished from the DUB Ê-nu, B. E., XV, 36:19) he caused to go out," or "he caused to carry away." Sin-
issahra comes to Innanni, the chief bursar of the Temple storehouse, with a scaled order of the E.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 E.GAL received (imhur) from (ina qâl) Innanni. DUB = "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 E.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 E.GAL royal measures were or had to be used, hence E.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 E.GAL is differentiated from that intended for the BÂR (= parakkû) "En-lil (l. 8), etc., etc. If, then, the E.GAL be the "royal palace," we have to see in the karû E.GAL a "palace or royal storehouse." Such a storehouse is mentioned in the archives and is called karû ASH.TAB.BA.GAN.TUGšī.1 Wheat which was paid at the karû ASH.TAB.BA. GAN.TUGšī is called in the closing paragraph (B. E., XV, 38c : 27), ASH.AN.NA šâ i-na mah-ri-im ūm-hu-ru a-na ZER E.GAL nadna"; 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.TUGšī (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-[šī], we are justified

---

1 B. E., XV, 135 : 7, so and so much flour (šī-mu), interest (ifar.ra), a-na karû E.GAL a-na karû ASH.TAB. BA.GAN.TUGšī "Nu-na-ak-te šak-ski," "to the palace storehouse, i.e., to the storehouse of (or "called") ASH.TAB.BA. GAN.TUG Nunakte took." Cf. here also the ḫarrûn Ashi-la-ba in Bu. 91-5-9, 381 (C. T., II, 37), l. 6.

2 B. E., XV, 38c : 1, ASH.AN.NA šâ i-na karû ASH.TAB.BA.GAN.TUGšī GISH.BAR 5 qa naddin."
in identifying both: ASH.TAB.BA.GAN.TUG\(^{\text{ki}}\) is = Kan-du-ru-[\(u^{kij}\)], maintaining at the same time that both were a "'palace storehouse.'" As over against the \(\dot{E}.GAL\) or "'palace'" (sc. of the king) the "'Temple'" is called \(\dot{E}.A-nu\), i.e., "'House of A-nu,'" B. E., XV, 93 : 5. Clay, B. E., XIV, p. 6, reads bit-a-nu, "'our house.'" But in view of the fact that (a) such a monstrous Babylonian form—half Sumerian and half Semitic: \(\dot{E}.A-nu = bit-a-nu = biti-nu—\) would be, to say the least, very strange for this and later periods; (b) that in our letter, No. 35 : 15, \(\dot{E}.A-nu\) is followed immediately by \(\text{bàb} A-[u-nu]\)\(^4\) (c) that the determinative for "'god,'" \(\dot{ilu}\), 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 \(A-nu\) is simply the semiticized Sumerian for \(\dot{ilu}\), signifying in each and every case the highest god of a city, whether that god be \(A.N\) or \(\dot{En}lil\) or Marduk, or whether the city be Nippur or Babylon or Dur-ilu, etc. In this way it happened that \(\dot{En}lil\), the god of Nippur, was simply called \(A.N\) (B. E., XIV, 16 : 1 | 132 : 3, 4, 54; XV, 97 : 3 | 115 : 11 | 143 : 2 | 163 : 28), and the Temple of Enlil at Nippur was termed not only \(\dot{E}.KUR\) (B. E., XIV, 148 : 2), but also \(\dot{E}.A.N.KALAM.GAL\), "'the temple of the great god of the (Babylonian) world'" (B. E., XIV, 148 : 15, 18; XV, 34 : 2), or merely \(\dot{E}.A.N\) (B. E., XIV, 24 : 16; XV, 37 : 1). That this \(\dot{E}.A.N\) or "'Gotteshaus'" was indeed the temple of Enlil of Nippur is evident from a passage in B. E., XV, 128 : 14, which mentions the \(\dot{E}.A.N(\!)\) \(\dot{En}-\dot{il}^{\text{ki}}\) \(\text{shà} \ i-na \ libbi-nu, \) "'the house of god (= temple) of Nippur which is in our midst.'" Of this house the Nippurians speak as the \(\dot{E}.A.N(\!)\dot{En}-\dot{il}^{\text{ki}}\) \(\text{shà} \ i-na \ libbi-nu, \) "'the house of our temple,'" B. E., XV, 159 : 2, or simply as \(\dot{E}-\dot{nu}, \) "'our temple';" see, among other passages, also B. E., XIV, 148 : 45, 47; 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 \(\text{DU}B \ \dot{E}.GAL\) (B. E., XV, 50 : 3) so there existed also a \(\text{DU}B \ \dot{E}-\dot{nu}\) (B. E., XV, 36 : 19), as there are mentioned \(\text{ardî} \) resp. \(\text{amat} \ \dot{E}.GAL\) (see p. 77) so there occur also \(\text{a}-\text{mi}-\text{tu}-\text{ti} \ \text{shà} \ \dot{E}-\dot{nu}\) (B. E., XV, 41 : 3). All this, then, forces us to separate the \(\dot{E}.GAL\) or

---

\(^{1}\) Also written \(\text{Kan-du-ri-}\text{ki}^{\text{ki}}, \) see \(\text{List in B. E., XV.}\) It is also mentioned in our letters 18 : 38, [\(\ldots\) ‘\(\text{meš} \ \text{shà} \ \text{Kan-du-ri-}\text{e} \ldots\) it-\(\text{a}-\text{al}-\text{ku} -\text{ni} \ldots\) a-na mu-\(\text{um} -\text{bi} \ \text{be}-\text{ni} -\text{ta} \ [\text{ul-te-la} -\text{a}].\) Cf. here also \(\text{kudurrà = kudurrà = kudurû,}\) Delitzsch, \(H. W. B.\), p. 319a; B. A., IV, 483, and Nagel, i.e., p. 482: (1) \(\text{Frohdiest},\) (2) \(\text{Frohrbalt},\) \(\text{Lembjøgner.}\) The city read by Clay, B. E., XV, 53b, \(\text{Sh(e)\text{-du-ru-}\text{-ir-du-ki}^{\text{ki}}\text{ has to be transcribed, of course, ‘kan-du-ru-}u^{\text{ki}} \text{UD}^{\text{ki}}.\)}

\(^{2}\) For other occurrences of \(\dot{E}.GAL\) e\(\text{t},\) e.g., the \(\text{ardî} \ \dot{E}.GAL\) in letter No. 34 : 11 and B. E., XV, 84 : 2 | 152 : 15 | 200 III : 38; V : 6; am\(\text{at} \ \text{GIN} \ \dot{E}.GAL,\) B. E., XV, 200 II : 33, 37; III : 2 | 9, 21; \(\text{lib}^{\text{ti}}\text{tu}^{\text{ki}} \dot{E}.GAL,\) letter No. 50 : 11; \(\text{shà-lam-ta-shà a-na} \ \dot{E}.GAL \ \text{shà-bi-} \ \text{lam},\) 59 : 4; mask-shar\(\text{ti} \ \text{shà} \ \dot{E}.GAL = ‘special fund (of 10} \text{GUR} \) set aside by the palace for the payment of certain officers or otherwise," B. E., XV, 47 : 1. For \(\text{maskshàrûra} = \text{‘special fund}," \) see p. 96, note 4.

\(^{3}\) Cf. here also the \(\text{amenu} \ \text{shà} \ \text{nuh} \ \dot{E}.A-nu,\) i.e., "'overser of the house of god,'" H., VIII, 855 : 1, and see the \(\text{EN} \ \dot{E}\) in B. E., XIV, 122 : 4.

\(^{4}\) And is differentiated from the \(\dot{E}.GAL\) which precedes the \(\dot{E}.A-nu.\)
"palace" from the É-nu resp. É.AN, É.A-nu or "Temple." If we thus distinguish between É.GAL and É.A-nu, the tablet published in B. E., XV, 93, becomes of special importance. We learn from it that a certain "Amel-Ba-nu-ú, who is a a-bîl bābī É.A-nu, a "doorkeeper of the Temple," i.e., a Temple official, receives a certain amount of grain in 𒆙Kan-du-ri-ën 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<sup>82</sup>, 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-Banû, the gatekeeper of the É.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-Banû have been paid out of it. No wonder, then, that Martuku, who succeeded Innanni in the capacity of chief bursar of the Temple stores during the reign of Nazi-Marattash, 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 Enlî of Nippur? In proof of our contention that the king actually was such a beneficiary cf. the following expressions, occurring in the "Temple Archives": 𒆕l-la-ti šá LUGAL, B. E., XIV, 116 : 1; e-lî LUGAL, l.c., XV, 33, 34; bronze a-na i-ṭer (hardly šul, kar, see p. 88, note 1)-ti ša.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-sîl.har.ti LUGAL, l.c., XV, 154 : 41; a-ra-ad šar-ri, l.c., XV, 199 : 30; a-rad LUGAL, l.c., XIV, 56 : 9; 𒀀𒆜SAG LUGAL, l.c., XIV, 132 : 2; GU.EN.NA EN.LI[L<sup>3</sup>], 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-issalra, though acting as the head of the Palace storehouse of Kandurê and as such giving grain a-na É-nu, i.e., "to our Temple" (B. E., XV, 89 : 3), receives grain "per order of the Palace" (É.GAL) from Innanni, the bursar-in-chief of the Nippurian Temple storehouses. Cf. also the ina muḫ 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.

1 See here also the É<sup>ti</sup> = bûti in B. E., XV, 200 I : 17, and the ku-tal É<sup>ti</sup>, "the rear palace of the É<sup>ti</sup>" in l.c., XV, 80 : 11 (cf. Letters, No. 23 : 13, ku-tal; 23 : 8, ku-tal-li, and 60 : 8, zûr ku-tal). An EN É = biti occurs, e.g., in B. E., XIV, 122 : 4. Whether this É<sup>ti</sup> means "palace," or more probably "temple" cannot be made out as yet with certainty. The bit É is, no doubt, the same as the amelu ša muḫ É.A-nu, cf. H., VIII, 855 : 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.\(^1\) 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? Kishnahbut, when answering an inquiry of king Kadashman-Turqu whether sesame-oil had been forwarded or not, writes to his "Lord" as follows (35 :30ff.) : ásh-shum šammu (= NI.GISH) šá be-li-ia na-shú-[ma?] il-ta-na-su a-na "Ku-du-ri[a-ni] [ardi]-ka ki-i aq-bu-u um-ma-a šammu (=NI.GISH) i-na gāt-i-ia [i-din] be-li a-na šatammi (=SHAG.TAM) li-ish-pu-ra-ša šatammi (= NI.GISH) shub(= RU)-ta liš-ki-ni-[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-ta-na-su (P of 𒈺𒅁) refers here apparently to the action of consulting a tablet recording that such and such an amount of sesame-oil had been removed (nashî) by a certain person in the name of the king or "per order of the palace," abû DUB É.GAL. Everything that was either received from (šá ina qât . . . . mahru) or paid out to (šá ina lūbbi šá . . . . ana . . . . nadhu) or removed (šá ishtu . . . . nashâ) or taken away from (šá ishtu . . . . laqû) or delivered to (šá ana . . . . shulâ) or taken to (šá ana . . . . nashû, 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, šá alта بالمش šá pā-te-š.imshow ... be-li li-ish-pu-ra-am-ma li-ri-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 \( xx. \text{shá} i-na \text{DUB.SHA.RA} \) . . . . \( \text{MU} \ = X \text{shaf-ru} \) (B. E., XIV, 168 : 34, 43) or \( xx. \text{shá} i-na \text{DUB shá } \text{Ardi-Bêlût} (= \text{GASHAN}) \text{shá-at-ru} \) (B. E., XV, 199 : 37). "To record," then, is \text{shatár}i ina, and "Temple Archives" are called DUB, resp. DUB.SHA.RA. Besides these two there occur still the following names for "Archives," viz., DUB \( \text{shú-ma-ti} \) (thus especially where several items are recorded under various names), or \( \text{[DUB]} \text{shú-ma-ti} \), or \( \text{dup-pi shú-ma-ti} \), or \( \text{dup-pi } \text{shú-ma-ti} \), or DUB \( \text{MU} \text{mēsh} \) or only \( \text{MU} \text{mēsh} \); thus apparently designated on account of the expression \( \text{MU.BI.IM} \ = \text{shumāti} \), found so often on tablets of this character. And as we meet instead of \( \text{MU.BI.IM} \) also \( \text{GISIH} \) or za-kar(1)-tum \( ^{12} \) we may not be wrong in saying that "Temple Archives" were termed also DUB \( \text{MU.BI.IM} \); DUB \( \text{GISIH} \); DUB za-kar-tum; DUB \( \text{MU.BI.} \). At the end of each

1 If the document records that the items are for a certain period, say, e.g., a year, this is entered here, thus shá \( \text{shattu} z^{kun} \), i.e., "for the year so and so," e.g., B.E., XIV, 168 : 33.

2 Or we might transcribe DUB.SHA.RA (\( = \text{uru} \)).

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

4 B. E., XIV, 168 : 55; XV, 199 : 33, 37, 38, 44.

5 B. E., XIV, 168 : 22, 58.


8 B. E., XIV, 168 : 17.

9 \( \text{Hun-bi-A-a-ri} \) writes to the chief bursar Iimmanni, 85 : 8, \( \text{SHE.BA MU} \text{mēsh} a-na \ = \text{šá.XXX-taš-ra i-dī-in} \), "the wages for those persons (\( = \text{MU} \text{mēsh} \)) give to Sin-issaţra," i.e., the wages as recorded on the tablet giving the "names" of the persons hand over to Sin-issaţra; so, no doubt, better than \( \text{shu'at} \)a, because in business transactions the amount of wages must always be specified. But the specification was to be found on a tablet containing the \( \text{MU} \text{mēsh} \ = \text{MU.BI.IM} \) or "names." See p. 116, note 6.

10 See B. E., XIV; XV passim. For \( \text{MU.BI.IM} \) we have also \( \text{MU.BI} \), e.g., B.E., XIV, 51, 1.

11 B. E., XV, 59 : 2.

12 B. E., XIV, 89 : 3.

13 Cf. here also the interesting variant in B. E., XV, 59 : 12, \( \text{SHE.HAR.RA GISIH-rum} \) which corresponds to i.e., II, 1, 2, \( \text{SHE.HAR.RA} \) . . . . GISH, hence GISH = GISIH-rum = zikarum'\( ^{\text{m}} \) = za-kar-tum.

14 Cf. here also the \( \text{MU.NE.NE} \) in Cassite Tablets published by F. Peiser, e.g., P. 89 : 15; P. 100 : 6 (I. 5 only, \( \text{MU.NE} \)).
year, i.e., either in the second\(^1\) (so most generally), or the last,\(^2\) or the sixth,\(^3\) in other words, around the end of the first resp. sixth month, the different heads of the storehouses or of the possessions (e.g., flocks, etc.) of the Temple were required, it seems, to make their yearly\(^4\) reports, i.e., "to draw the balance of accounts" (epēsh nikasi,\(^5\) resp. ri-ba-a-nu ša DUB.SHAR\(^6\)meše) or "take the inventory" of the stock (mi-nu ša)\(^7\) in the presence of (ša ʿu-kin-nu) a royal(!) official, either the \(\text{šešt} \) SAG LUGAL\(^8\) or the GŪ.E.N.NA, i.e., sheriff,\(^9\) of Nippur, when they (the shepherds or other parties

---

\(^{1}\) Cf. B. E., XIV, 57, SHE GISH.BAR 6 qa šē šē ba-un na te-li-ti ša šatti 12\(^{1}\)šē šē ba-un na te-li-ti ša šatti 12\(^{1}\)šē šē ba-un na te-li-ti ša šatti 12\(^{1}\)šē šē ba-un na te-li-ti ša šatti 12\(^{1}\)šē šē ba-un na te-li-ti ša šatti 12\(^{1}\)šē šē ba-un na te-li-ti ša šatti 12\(^{1}\)šē šē ba-un na te-li-ti ša šatti 12\(^{1}\)šē šē ba-un na te-li-ti ša šatti 12\(^{1}\)šē šē ba-un na te-li-ti ša šatti 12\(^{1}\)šē šē ba-un na te-li-ti ša 12\(^{1}\)šē šē ba-un na te-li-ti ša šatti 12\(^{1}\)šē šē ba-un na te-li-ti ša šatti 12\(^{1}\)šē šē ba-un na te-li-ti ša šatti 12\(^{1}\)šē šē ba-un na te-li-ti ša šatti 12\(^{1}\)šē šē ba-un na te-li-ti ša šatti 12\(^{1}\)šē šē ba-un na te-li-ti ša šatti 12\(^{1}\)šē šē ba-un na te-li-ti ša šatti 12\(^{1}\)šē šē ba-un na te-li-ti ša šatti 12\(^{1}\)šē šē ba-un na te-li-ti ša šatti 12\(^{1}\)šē šē ba-un na te-li-ti ša šatti 12\(^{1}\)šē šē ba-un na te-li-ti ša šatti 12\(^{1}\)šē šē ba-un na te-li-ti ša šatti 12\(^{1}\)šē šē ba-un na te-li-ti ša šatti 12\(^{1}\)šē šē ba-un na te-li-ti ša šatti 12\(^{1}\)šē šē ba-un na te-li-ti ša 12\(^{1}\)šē šē ba-un na te-li-ti ša šatti 12\(^{1}\)šē šē ba-un na te-li-ti ša šatti 12\(^{1}\)šē šē ba-un na te-li-ti ša šatti 12\(^{1}\)šē šē ba-un na te-li-ti ša šatti 12\(^{1}\)šē šē ba-un na te-li-ti ša šatti 12\(^{1}\)šē šē ba-un na te-li-ti ša šatti 12\(^{1}\)šē šē ba-un na te-li-ti ša šatti 12\(^{1}\)šē šē ba-un na te-li-ti ša šatti 12\(^{1}\)šē šē ba-un na te-li-ti ša šatti 12\(^{1}\)šē šē ba-un na te-li-ti ša šatti 12\(^{1}\)šē šē ba-un na te-li-ti ša šatti 12\(^{1}\)šē šē ba-un na te-li-ti ša šatti 12\(^{1}\)šē šē ba-un na te-li-ti ša šatti 12\(^{1}\)šē šē ba-un na te-li-ti ša šatti 12\(^{1}\)šē šē ba-un na te-li-ti ša šatti 12\(^{1}\)šē šē ba-un na te-

---
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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 \(Bu-un-na-\text{**}Marduk\text{**}\) 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 \(Bunna\text{-}Marduk\) 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 \(Apil\text{-}Rammân\) has removed \((ish-sha-a)\) by means of ships \((i-na \text{nî} MÂ)\) from \((ish-\text{tu})\) \(Du-un-ni-\text{**}A\text{**}-\text{**}hê\text{**}\)? And again the answer has to be: It is a "record" of the expenditures in connection with the storehouse in \(Dunni\text{-}A\text{**}hê\text{**}\) 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.\(^3\) 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: \(a\) shā pi (=KA) ki-ni (= col. I); \(b\) [shā a-na e-î-rî ku-nu, col. II]; \(c\) \(\text{**}R.I.R.G.A\text{**} na-gi\text{-}\text{**}mas\text{**} a-na pîn (=SH) AN (= ili = Enlil) ish-\text{pu-rû} (=SH) Nippur, 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 \(I\text{nannû\), 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 karâ \(E.GAL\), ASH.TAB.BAGAN.TUG, resp. Kandurî; 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 ŠE₄ DUB or also called ŠE₄ ku-nu-uk-ki, resp. ŠE₄ DUB šá ŠE₅ 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 Nippur) 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 ŠE₄ DUB šá ŠE₅ GAL, so called because the ŠE₅ GAL or "Palace," resp. its occupant, the bešu 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. Martuku, 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 Cassite 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.NETA or šakkanakku šE₄ Enlil.

2 B. E., XV, 53 : 12. Notice in this connection the a-na En₄-li₅ dug₄ after ŠE₄ ku-nu-uk-ki, thus showing that this building was indeed situated in Nippur.

4 Cf., e.g., the inscriptions of Kuri-Galzu (gil.GU) in I R., 4, XIV, Nos. 1-3; Winckler, K. B., III, p. 154a-c. For other occurrences of šakkanakku see, e.g., Goede, Cylinder B, VII : 20; VII : 7; Statue B, IV : 13; E. B. H., p. 255, note 12 (AN-Mu₃-tab₃ the šakkanakku of Dūr-₃u₅₉), and Hinke, B. E., Ser. D, Vol. IV, pp. 312a, 173. For the reading of the ideogram GIR.NETA (not NER.A.KAD) see Thureau-Dangin, Z. A., XV, p. 46f. With GIR.NETA is closely connected the well-known official title GUR, so often found in tablets from the second dynasty of Ur. In my E. B. H., p. 421, I said: "The GHR 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 "ok." them put, so to speak, his seal to them. Such a function of an "auditor" was also exercised by Innanni 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; i.e., 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 debtor, was the one who "received" the amount specified in the tablet. Payments of salary at the time of the Cassite 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 Innanni's case, no regulation whatever; i.e., the so-called salary received by Innanni 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 Innanni. They are nothing but Anweisungen, or "cheques" or "drafts" on certain storehouses endorsed by the chief bursar; they were "bills" "O. K."-ed by Innanni. 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 *shakkanakku* cannot be derived, with Delitzsch and others who follow him, from "*sha*" + "*kanakku*" 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*" (= *ganāgu*), *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 Enlil's seal and authority. In this sense the Cassite king, as *shakkanakku* 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." 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 *shakkanakku* of Enlil has to seal, to approve them, it follows that these "Temple Archives" are at the same time

---

1 No. 24 : 5.

*Sudar DI.KA* (1 = *satuk*) *E.KUR à EN.LIL*<sup>1</sup> Binke, B. E., Ser. D, IV, p. 144, II : 3.
Royal Archives; hence the $E^{\text{abu}}DUB$ is at the same time an $E^{\text{abu}}DUB$ shá $E.GAL$, because it contained the official administrative documents of the Temple as approved, sealed by the king.

Right here some one may object that the $E^{\text{abu}}DUB$, resp. the $E^{\text{abu}}DUB$ shá $E.GAL$, 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[N\text{men}] shá i-na shattu 13$^{\text{ka}}$ Ka-dâsh-man-Tur-gu $\text{Irín-shu}^{\text{gù}}\text{NIN.IB} \text{im-hur-ma a-na} E^{\text{abu}}DUB û-she-ri-bu a-na 4$^{\text{toppaya}}SAG(?) shá-pî-ik, "which Irím-shu-NIN.IB received in (during) the 13th year of Kadashman-Turgu and which he (they?) caused to bring to the $E^{\text{abu}}DUB$, 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 $\text{Ilú-MU.TUG.A-ri-ma}$ receives ($\text{ma-hi-ir}$). The first of these amounts is specified as shá $E^{\text{abu}}DUB$ shá $E.GAL$ shu-uš-ši shu-sa-a, i.e., "which the $E^{\text{abu}}DUB$ shá $E.GAL$ caused to go (i.e., sent) out," and the other as coming shá qât $\text{Na-aš-zí}^{\text{gù}}$Marduk, "per order of Nahzi-Marduk." Both amounts were received a-na i-ter(?)-ti' $\text{Mar} LUGAL$ "as an indemnity for the royal wagons (chariots)." B. E., XV, 53 : 11f. mentions wheat flour (ZI.DA ASH.AN.NA) shá $E$ ku-nu-uk-ki a-na $\text{En-lil}^{\text{ki}}$ ish(?) or na?)-shú-ú, "due to (or belonging to) the $E$ ku-nu-uk-ki (and which) they brought to Nippur." Finally Letter No. 84 : 5f. contains the following exhortation addressed to Innanni: "$\text{ma-an-nu SHE}GISH.NI$ li-îs-ḫu-tu-ú-ma $\text{NI.GISH}$ a-na $E^{\text{abu}}DUB$ li-she-ri-bu û at-ta SHE.GISH.NI-ka $\text{su-ḫu-ut-ma NI.GISH}$ a-na $E^{\text{abu}}DUB$ shú-ri-ib," i.e., "All who press out sesame must bring oil (in) to the $E^{\text{abu}}DUB$, therefore press out thy sesame and bring the oil (in) to the $E^{\text{abu}}DUB$."

Examining these passages we find that B. E., XV, 53, is an administrative record (having been forwarded to Nippur from Za-rat-IM$^{\text{ki}}$), 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 $E$ ku-nu-uk-ki at some previous time must have sent orders to Za-rat-IM$^{\text{ki}}$ that they (=German "man") take wheat flour to Nippur. The $E$ ku-nu-uk-ki here apparently denotes as much as "the head of the $E$ 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 i-ter-tum, "indemnity," see Hilprecht, B. E., IX, 41 : 7, e-ter-ti i-nam-dû-nû a-na, "shall pay an indemnity to.

2 Cf. here p. 114, notes 3, 4.
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true of B. E., XIV, 124, where the Ẹ ṣₚum-DUB šá Ẹ.GAL, i.e., the head of the house mentioned, ụshsị ụshsị the bronze. These two passages, then, show that orders were sent out from the Ẹ ṣₚum-DUB to certain men or branch storehouses. But this could be done only if the Ẹ ṣₚum-DUB 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-lu 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 "shakkanakku 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 Ẹ ṣₚum-DUB šá Ẹ.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 Ẹ ṣₚum-DUB šá Ẹ.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 Eₐᵇₐˢ DUB šá Œ.GAL embraced in its walls the administrative resp. the executive department of the Temple, by which and through which the shakkannaku ˹šEnlil, 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 Eₐᵇₐˢ DUB šá Œ.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 Eₐᵇₐˢ DUB šá Œ.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 Eₐᵇₐˢ DUB šá Œ.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 Library² some letters that are addressed to the "prince," TUR LUGAL,³ "princess," TUR.SAL LUGAL,⁴ or "queen mother," ÁM LUGAL,⁵ by far the greater number are written to the "KING," LUGAL. Of the one hundred and three letters here published seventy-eight⁶ are addressed to the be-š 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 Šhalt-en-Nil; see Hilprecht, B. E., Ser. D, I, p. 305, Plan of the Ruins of Nuffar.
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, 189); K. 1303 (H., V, 500).
⁴ K. 476 (H., I, 54).
⁵ K. 478 (H., III, 254); K. 825 (H., III, 263); K. 523 (H., III, 324); K. 980 (H., VI, 569).
⁶ Nos. 1–74 + 33a, 59a, 60a, 73a.
to the (a) amelu ENGAR\(^2\) or ikkaru, originally "farmer," here probably a high official; (b) amelu \(A.B.A\) KUR\(^2\), "secretary of the State"; (c) amelu A.BA \(É.GAL\), "secretary of the Palace"; (d) amelu nāgir \(É.GAL\), "major domo"; (e) amelu LUGB\(^6\) or sukkallu, "ambassador"; (f) amelu ITI\(^8\) or abbarakkū; (g) amelu GAL.SAG\(^2\) or rab-shaq; (h) amelu EN.NAM\(^3\) or bēl pāhāti, "governor"; (i) amelu šá muḫ \(É.A\)-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-bān-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 \(m\) \(iš\)AG-\(EN\)-\(shu\)-\(nu\) to \(Ashshur\)-\(nu\)-\(dam-me-ik\); from \(m\) \(Um\)-\(na\)-\(ni\)-\(ù\) to \(sē\)\(ma\)-\(qa\)-\(nu\), "his brother"\(^{11}\) (\(SHESH\)-\(shu\)); from \(m\) \(iš\)Nergal-SHESH-\(i\)\(r\) to \(m\) \(iš\)AG-\(ù\)-\(shal\)-\(lim\), "his brother"\(^{12}\) (\(SHESH\)-\(shu\)); from \(m\) \(iš\)EN-\(ù\)-\(HU\) to \(m\)\(Ku\)-\(na\)-\(a\), "his father"\(^{13}\) (\(AD\)-\(shu\)); from \(m\) \(MU.GI.NA\) to \(m\) \(iš\)Nergal-SHESH-\(i\)\(r\); from \(m\) \(A\)-\(gar\)-\(i\)\(šu\)-\(lu\)-\(mur\) to \(EN\)-\(ù\)-\(ni\); from an unknown writer to \(m\) \(iš\)PA-\(IK\)-\(shī\),\(^\text{16}\) and last, but not least, a letter to \(m\) \(XXX\)-\(man\)-\(nu\)-\(GAR\)-\(\ldots\) from \(m\) \(XXX\)-\(KAK\)-\(ni\)?,\(^{17}\) "thy servant" (\(ardī-ka\)), etc.\(^{22}\) If it be not objected

---

1. K. 568 (II, I, 4); K. 1197 (II, I, 15); K. 1049 (II, I, 38); K. 113 (II, II, 183); K. 112 (II, II, 223); K. 13,000 (II, III, 332); K. 88 (II, VIII, 816).
2. K. 547 (II, I, 62); K. 175 (II, II, 221).
5. K. 1070 (II, I, 70); K. 635 (II, II, 132); K. 986 (II, VIII, 844).
8. K. 1376 (II, VIII, 830).
11. *Private(1)*, because both the writer and the addressee appear in these letters without any titles whatsoever.
17. Cf. our Letter No. 76, which is written by a "father" to his "son," p. 144.
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" (āmeša EN. LI[ši-a]); to "the people of the sea country, old and young, my servants" (āmeša meša Tam-tim-a-a āmeša ABBAmek u TUMmek ardemek-iu); to "the Gambuleans" (āmeša mētu Ra-sha-a-a āmeša ABBAmek u stib (=NE)-ru-û-ti); to "Shadu and the people of Erech, old and young, my servants" (mša-dušu āmeša UNUGmekšu āmeša ABBAmek u TUMmek ardemek-iu); to "Nabu . . . . and the people of Erech, old and young, my servants" (mša-ta AG-[. .] āmeša UNUGmekšu āmeša ABBAmek u TUMmek ardemek-iu); to mša EN-ib-mi (or KAK); to mša XXX-tab-ni-usur (=SHESH); to mša AG-ibash (=IK)-šišī; to "A-shi-pa-a"; to mša EN-ētir (=SHUR); to mša XV-[nā'id (=I)]; to "Zēru-û-[a]"; and last, but not least, a royal decree to "the 'Not-Babylonians'" (a-mat LUGAL a-na la āmeša DIN.TERmekšu). We furthermore find in this Library royal 'orders" (or decrees, a-bīt LUGAL a-na) to "the Babylonians" (āmeša K.A.DINGIRmekšu); to mša PA-shar (=MAN)-ahē (=PAPmekšu); to the 'queen-mother" (SAL ÂM sharri (=MAN)); to mša Man-nu-ki-du IM; to mša A-shi-pa-a; to mša PA-dūr (=BAD)-

1 K. 94 (H., III, 287).
2 K. 313 (H., III, 289).
3 K. 1054 (H., III, 293).
4 K. 1139 (H., III, 295).
5 Cf. K. 5457 (H., VII, 754).
6 K. 1162 (H., III, 296); cf. 83-1-18, 27 (H., V, 518).
7 K. 1271 (H., III, 297).
8 K. 95 (H., III, 288); K. 828 (H., III, 291); K. 938 (H., III, 292). Cf. also 67-1-2, 1 (H., IV, 399); 82-5-23. 97 (H., IV, 400); 83-1-18, 31 (H., IV, 402).
9 K. 824 (H., III, 290).
10 K. 1085 (H., III, 294); cf. 82-5-22, 91 (H., V, 517).
11 K. 1883 (H., III, 298); cf. a-bīt LUGAL a-na =A-shi-pa-a, K. 592 (H., III, 305).
12 K. 13135 (H., III, 299).
13 K. 13154 (H., III, 300); cf. a-bīt LUGAL a-na = ḫu XV-nā'id (=I), S. 1942 (H., IV, 417).
14 83-1-18, 30 (H., IV, 401).
15 Bu, 91-5-9, 210 (H., IV, 403). Though numbered "Bu," this tablet undoubtedly belonged originally to the K. Collection.
16 K. 84 (H., III, 301).
17 K. 96 (H., III, 302).
18 K. 486 (H., III, 303).
19 K. 533 (H., III, 304).
20 K. 592 (H., III, 305); cf. a-mat LUGAL a-na =A-shi-pa-a, K. 1883 (H., III, 298).
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usur (= PAP); nay even an "order" of a "princess" to Iaššušur-sharrat (a-bit TUR.SAL LUGAL a-na SAL aššag (= libbu).ER-shar-rat)⁲ and a letter of a "prince" (IM TUR LUGAL) to the aššagSha-na-i. 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 Eššušu DUB šá E.GAL, or simply Eššušu DUB, the bit tapšulṭi,⁴ "the place of the appeasing"⁷ of Enlil.

¹ K. 622 (H., III, 306).
² K. 1619 B (H., III, 308).
³ R. 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 En-lil of Nippur. A god can be appeased only by offerings—for the benefit of his (the god's) priests.
V.

TRANSLATION OF SOME SPECIMEN LETTERS.

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.

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

Imgurum, a royal official stationed at Dûr-Kurigalzu, 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 "En-lîl-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 22:8 Imgurum mentions a certain "Hu-zu-lum, who appears in B. E., XIV, 8:30 (dated the 21st year of Burna-Buriash) among the witnesses2 at a legal business transaction executed by "En-lîl-ki-di-ni (ll. 22, 25). (2) "Ki-din-""Marduk3 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 "NIN.IB-SHESH and "NIN.IB-MU-MU (sellers) and "En-lîl-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-zu-lum mār "En-lîl-îil(= EN)-iil(= AN)mēn.
3 Cf. also the dlu šá "Ki-din-""Marduk in B. E., XIV, 166:9.
tioned at Dār-Kurī-Galzu, 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-usātum 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-h-ia
2 [lu-ul]-li-ik
3 [a-na bit be]-h-ia2 šhú-ul-mu
4 [. . . ] + 6 M libittu (= SHEG-gunâ) 4 dēlî ûmî 4²m la-ab-na-at
5 [. . . ] M libittu (= SHEG-gunâ) a-na pi(=) 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

As Imgurum reports (22 : 5) about the condition of 7Ga-ga-da-ne-tum, the summerru, who is sick, it would seem that he superintended also the personnel of the Temple or Palace, for a summerru or “songstress” was, no doubt, connected with both the Temple and the Palace.

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.

The space is too small for deh-shum. Here and in l. 5 a larger number has been broken away.

4 For SHEG-gunâ (not given by Clay, List of Signs) cf. Thureau-Dangin, R. E. C., No. 129. Cf. also ll. 5, 11. In 35 : 29 the simple SHEG occurs.

5 “Up to the fourth day,” i.e., “during four days,” “in the space of four days.” Cf. H., IV, 392, Rev. 16, a-du amēnesh 7, 8, i-ba-lat, “he will be well within a space of seven (or) eight days.”

6 For the construction labnāt, singl. after x + 6000 libittu, see Hilprecht, B. E., IX, p. 35, note to No. 6, li. 1, and cf. p. 137, note 3.

1 Here, of course, not Grab, Begräbniss, Delitzsch, H. W., B., p. 580a, but “cellar,” “excavation.” The pi nagbar 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. B. E., XIV, 29 : 2, i-na pi(=KA) nār(=AKUR.DA) di-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 (of Nippur) par excellence,” where the little hamlet, called Pi-nār(=), was situated) and to a nabāktu, see 12 : 9, i-na pi(=KA) na-al-bi-ak-dī, cf. p. 96, note 5.
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 dūlu see, besides Dehnejdvi, 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," cf. H., V, 471 : 18, dul-li šaš E.SAG.IL, "the working at Esagil," to be compared with I.c., Rev, 7, which shows that the letter refers to building operations.

2 E-ra-ad-da-ma, because construed here with a-na, cannot be taken as a II of III, Delitzsch, H. W. B., p. 613b (this has el). Jensen, K. B., KV, p. 317, has shown that there is only one III, although the various significations assigned to this verb by him (liesen, nachfolgen, hinterhergehen, treiben) ought to be enlarged so as to include also the meaning führen (Behrens, L. S. S., II, p. 6, note 2), and "to take," cf. Nagel, R. A., IV, p. 480, and see Letters of Hammurabi, No. 78 : 18, šiše-te-en ta-ki-ka a-an ḫab-bišš{ši-i-ša-ku-aDi, "one of thy trusted servants may bring, take, fetch them to Babylon." The II of III is here "causative," i.e., "to cause to bring, fetch." Uradda for uraddi because it stands in the chief sentence.

3 Usšak i-na-an-dul-li = anadda, with the signification "to lay the foundations" sc. of my dul-ša (l. 6), i.e., of the building I am at present working at. Adda-na, here of the "completed action in the future" = "I have torn down" = "I have torn down.

4 For ku-tal see besides Delitzsch, H. W. B., p. 302a, also Jensen, K. B., KV, p. 46d, and below, l. 13, ku-tal na-ka-aI. In No. 60 : 8 the ūr ku-tal is mentioned and in B. E., XV, 50 : 11 we are told of the mask-shar-ta-tum ši-a.i-ku-tal bēlit tab-ka, i.e., of the masksharrtti (= pl. of masksharrti) which are "poured out," i.e., stored up in the rear of the "house." This latter passage shows that the translation "stipend" for masksharrti (Clay, B. E., XIV, p. 30, note below, who follows Delitzsch, H. W. B., p. 433b) is out of place here. A "stipend," surely, could not and was not "stored up." Masksharrti signifies at this time the "reserve fund," hence it is not only "stored up," but also it is payments are made; cf. B. E., XV, 76 : 2, SHE... was i-na li-bi mask-shar-ti arba AR.UD.UL..., nadun; i.e., XV, 106 : 1, SHE was i-na li-bi mask-shar-ti i-na at Kal-bit išš{ši i-na "GISH.BARGAL, nadun; i.e., XV, 164 : 1, SHE... was i-na li-bi mask-shar-tim was "In-na-an-at "To-ki-sha nadun (notice here the reserve fund of Inanna!). In B. E., XIV, 92 : 2 the mask-shar-ti ša kara Kür-Zi-bar išš{ši mentioned and in B. E., XV, 47 : 1 we are told that payments were made i-na li-bi 10 GUR mask-shar-ti ša E.GAL, i.e., out of the Palace's reserve fund of 10 GUR. B. E., XV, 40 : 5 mentions the total of SHE nadun i-na li-bi mask-shar-ši which SHE is according to I.c., l. 1, that she i-na kara ASH.TAB.AN.UTU išš{ši. From this it follows that the Palace, the several storerooms, officials (like Inanna), and sometimes had each their special "reserve funds." In some passages, as e.g., Str., IV, 574 : 10, masksharrti might be translated even by "collateral security." Masksharrti, then, is "something that is left over (mask-sharrti) to insure the payments of certain obligations."
FROM THE TEMPLE ARCHIVES OF NIPPUR.

10  c-ki-ir-ri-im-ma't a-tab-ba-ak

pile and store up.

11 10 M agurr(u) = SHEG-gunu ALI

10,000 burnt bricks of (by?) the úr-ru-gal

amal. GUSHUR(or ÚR).RA.GAL,mešu

la-ab-na-at

—for each gur (cf. 1. 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 shrank—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 | 15 : 1, 4, and for (SHE) ti-ib-ku(ti), B. E., XV, 80 : 1 (here it is simply stated that a tišku was added to the different items of grain); B. E., XV, 66 : 3 (here we have GISII.BAR ti-ib-ki instead of the more commonly used GISII.BAR tab-ki, hence tabki = tabki).

How many bricks such a nattaku or našaku 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 historic inscriptions signifies the "height" of a "brick" or "layer of bricks," then a "measure of length" (cf. the German "so und zowie Bachtbeischichten hoch"), Prof. Hilprecht is inclined to see in a nattaku a quadrangle or rectangle comprising a certain number of tabki, hence a "pile which is a certain height, length and breadth."

⁸ Stands for šaḫ uḫḫuru, mass. singl. on account of nattaku, or it may be taken as an adjective, Delitzsch, Gram., p. 241b. Cf. here 68 : 34, ṣuṣu šaḫ uḫḫu-ra; 68 : 10, II ḫar-ki ṣaḫ-šu-ra; 68 : 24, III (gur) zēr a-na ma-lī-e uḫḫu-ur; 31 : 26, mi-še-dī lī i-šaḫ-te-li [šaḫ(?)]-la-ru; i.e., 1. 28, i-šaḫ-te-ta šaḫ gī-li (= yTV) šaḫ uḫḫu-ra; 37 : 16, II C SHE GUR šaḫ uḫḫu-ram, i.e., II. 20, 25, šaḫ-a-a-di . . . šaḫ uḫḫu-ram; 31 : 16, II i-šaḫ-te šaḫ uḫḫu-ram; see also 3 : 5 | 18 : 18 | 33 : 15 | 66 : 10. From these passages it will be evident that uḫḫuru 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 IB.KID and is to be distinguished from LAL.NI, "the rest, remainder still to be paid, which is against one, one's loss, debt, liability."

In other words, in records that are epēš ukašt (balances of accounts) the items marked IB.KID represent the "assets," a plus, and those called LAL.NI are the "liabilities," a minus. For IB.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," col. II that "which has been received (maḫ-ram)" and col. III the "amount still outstanding (IB.KID)"—hence if we subtract the "whole amount due" the "item(s) that have been received" we obtain the "IB.KID," i.e., "which is still due in one's favor, one's assets." For IB.KID cf. also B. E., XIV, 41a : 1 | 92 : 1 | 99 : 49 | XV, 68 : 2 | 141 : 8, and for LAL.NI see B. E., XIV, 65 : 27 | 99 : 40, 42 | 136 : 14 | 144 : 8; XV, 78 : 12 | 141 : 25 | 196 : 1 (similar to B. E., XIV, 33 : 2). A synonym, if not a translation, of (LAL.NI or ?) IB.KID seems to be ri-ha-a-nu, B. E., XIV, 130 : 1, 4. Ungnad, O. L. Z., 1907, Sp. 111, by reading TUM.KAD (resp. šaḫ-kaš) and translating "rest" is only partially correct.

⁷ E-ki-ir-ri-im-ma, because parallel to a-ta-ba-ak, I propose to derive from กיו, i.e., ekirrim-ma stands for original agarrin-ma, hence กיו has a side-form (garrin), garrin for the usual igarrin (Delitzsch, H. W. B., p. 596b). The i for (u) is due to the influence of the n, cf. 35 : 33, šabīh = RU-ta lišh-k[i]-na (for lišh-ku-nu). See p. 125, note 8. For the in ki-ir, see already above, p. 53, note 1, and for the e (instead of a) cf. uk-te-ir-ri-ib, 23 : 13; ik-te-di-ir-[ru]-a, 39 : 6; Delitzsch, Gram., p. 35 and below, p. 119, n. 5. A possible derivation from garrin = agarrin-ma is less probable, and a form ekirrim = akarrin (root יִכָּר, Delitzsch, H. W. B., 351a) is against context and parallelism.

⁸ Shortened form for SIEGAL.GUSHUR.RA = agurr(u), "burnt bricks." Cf. also 22 : 11, x M + 330 a-gur-ra ag-ga-ra-ak, and see following note.

⁹ What kind of an office this name represents I do not know. Are we to suppose that the scribe misplaced the amešaš. If so, we might read GUSHUR.RA (which has to be connected with SIEGAL.gunu ALI, cf. note 8) amel.SIEGAL,mešu. Or is it a shortened form of amel.SIEGAL.GUSHUR,RA.GAL,mešu, "chief brickmakers"—the SIEGAL, being omitted either by mistake or to avoid repetition?
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 asuppatai (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 = SPEGAL, i. 11? But cf. allu, Del., H. W. B., p. 70: "ein Gericht der Ziegelstreicher."

2. AL-la-a-ar-ma I propose to take as a prs. 1. (circumstantial clause) of N72, "to examine," see Meissner, B. A. III, p. 523, and Nagel, R. A. IV, p. 478. By itself a form of potaru (H. W. B., p. 5556) or pataru would likewise be possible, but with what meaning? Cf., however, Delitzsch, H. W. B., p. 522, under pataru IP: agurru inlubialshu up-te-af-iti-ir-ma, 'war geborsten,' and see p. 122, note 8. Or should we translate after all, "since the fourth day having loosened (departed from, set free) the allu (= term. techn. for "to stop to make bricks," cf. mesirru pataru = "den Gärtel lösen," Jensen, K. B., VI, p. 474) I brought," etc.? This latter translation is preferred by Prof. Hüpfeld.


4. A IP (= causative) of N77. The common significance of qaraba ana, "to go, march against," is here against the context. For other forms of qaraba, to be met with in these letters, see 26: 10, ki-ri-bu; 3: 25, u-gar-ri-bu; 12: 16, 1-teri-lu ana.

5. For 3aNaD (= irḥabu), as distinguished from NaD.KI ( = mašalu), see Jensen, K. B., VI, p. 499, and for 3aNaD, cf., e.g., H., I, 65: 9, "the bed-chamber of 17.16 AG." A "bed-chamber," because it can be carried, etc., was, of course, not 6 or blu, "house," in its commonly accepted sense. Whose "chamber" is meant here, is not said.

6. Cf. bit a-za-ul-ba bit ka-ar-ri, Str., II, 499: 1. For the interchange of z and z cf. on the one hand US-un-ab-Shi-pek ( = Usub-Shipek), 55: 2, and on the other 3Sha-la-zu-[nu], B. E., XV, 188 V: 18; [IV]-la-zu-nu, i.e., IV: 20; za-bil-ti, B. E., XIV, 90a: 30, 31, 43, and its plural zii-a-ti, B. E., XIV, 121: 6 | 122: 6 (standing for zi-bi-ti, zi-bi-dil = zibattu, ibibtu, see above, p. 6, note); qa-az-zu tur-Clay's copy gives tabra-at, B. E., XV, 158: 5, for qet (= SIU)-su tur-lat, B. E., XV, 99: 14 (cf. here also i.e., XV, 39: 5, qat = X. tur-lat; XV, 90: 45, a-ba-tum tur-lat-tum; b. E., XVI, 6: 9 | 19: 12 | 124: 8, go-za u-la-ar, etc., etc.). I beg to differ from Prof. Clay, who reads MAR.RAT (instead of tur-lat) and regards this to be a profession. B. E., XIV, p. 57a; XV, p. 51b). Qat resp. qat-su tur-lat evidently means "his portion is returned, has been paid.

7. I-gar, i-zi-e (ll. 16, 17), i-gar (21: 16) is the infinitive of 831, cf. addu and iddu, "to know."
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 Bêl-usâtum.

As regards the bleached(?) wool which I have kept as my due and concerning which my "Lord" has spoken to Kidin-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 Dûr-Kuri-Galzu.

---

1 Ta-bar-ri, here without the determinative SIG = shipiti, is a certain kind of "wool" (Delitzsch, H. W. B., p. 701n) or a "garment" (Tallquist, Sprache, p. 142). Here, because measured according to ma-na (1 : 24), it must be "wool," more particularly "dirty(?) wool."

2 So we have to read according to B. 29, 31 (not ul-û-ra-tum). It is here a kind of wool. In Esth., 1 : 6 : 15, we hear of a certain WEEN (LNX, βεβος) and in Issa., 19 : 9, of WEEN, in both of which passages the idea of "white" (garments) is predominant. Hurûraturum accordingly I propose to explain as "wool that is washed, cleaned, bleached, white" (cf. also Arabic hàra, haçara, "to wash white, bleach"), taking it to be a fem. pl. (ex. shipiti) of hurûru, and this a reduplicated form of hur = WEEN.

3 Cf. also 27 : 28, man-da-at-ta ki-i du-ga-ta-û at-ta-din; 35 : 18, garments which a-na ameduUSH.BAR à ka-qii-ri ki-i man-da-at-ti-shâ-û-nu id-di-nu; B. E., XV, 200, III : 9, nephâr 1 (gur) 6 GIN (i.e., female servants) Ë.GAL a-na man-da-at-ti-shi-nu, all of which passages show that mundatts was at this time a certain kind of "stipend," "wages," in the form of "wool," "garments," or "grain," i.e., "food for clothing" for work performed (I. 25).

4 Shûkunu e. acc. and ana, "to take something for clothing" for work performed (I. 25).

5 If my emendation be correct—the traces visible speaking decidedly for shû (ku or û being out of question)—then shàl-îl-îa may be either (a) the infinitive III of 291, i.e., shùpu-u = shùpu'-u = shùpi. 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 III of 292, i.e., shùbu'-u = shùb.' If this be true, there remain two peculiarities to be explained, viz.: (1) the long û in shû-û and (2) the presence of the û in bi. For the graphically (not morphologically) long û of such forms as lu-û-at-ti-[kî], 38 : 2, and li-û-û-û-[am]-ma, 39 : 23, With regard to the presence of the û in bi it should be noticed that we may have in Babylonian, resp. Assyrian, an euphonic ê or u after the first radical in all those forms where this
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31 [ḥu]-ḥu-ra-ti be-li she-bi-lam-ma May my “Lord” send bleached(?) wool!
32 [d]u-ul-li la a-ḥa-ad-di I have no pleasure in my work.
33 ʾash-shum ʾaneš-isparṭ( = USH.
BAR) an-nu-ti
34 shā i-na ʾuPa-an-Ba-li₇₂ ka-lu-ič who are being held prisoners in Pān-
Balí
35 i-na ʾU-pi-i₈₄ a-na be-li-ia aq-ta-bi (I beg to remind my Lord that) I have
spoken to my “Lord” in Uplt (about them)
36 ʾu shā-la-shi-shū a-na mu-uḥ be-li-ia and that I have written three times to
my “Lord”
37 al-tap-ra about them:
38 be-li-ši-pu-ur-ma my “Lord” may (finally) give orders
39 li-il-qu-ni-ish-shú-nu-ti⁰⁰ that they take them away.

II.

No. 55 (= C. B. M. 10,497). (Cf. photographie reproduction, Pl. III, 6, 7.)

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 li-ki-ri-ku( = likrikū), H., I, 100: 6; i-qi-ba-ni( = ʾiqḥāni), H., III, 311, R. S; i-qi-ra-ru( = ʾiqhrū), H., IV, 387, R. 24; i-qi-ba-ni-šu ( = ʾiqḥānini), H., V, 515: 9; mu-ša-ki( = mushakriḵ), H., I, 21, R. 1; u-ša-ši-liṣu( = usheššūq), H., IV, 430: 7, and possibly a-li-ki( = ʾalqū? However, a-li-ki( = 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-ḥu-ra( = ʾisqūr), H., II, V, 515, R. 6; i-su-qu-pa( = ʾisqūpa), H., IV, 381: 7; li-qu-ba-ki( = luqūkhi), Magšā, I : 59. Cf. here also the Hebrew
verbs with Chaldean vowel under the first radical in the imperfect, Ges.-K., Gr. 310, 2, notes a, b, on p. 49. Shā-u-
bi-ʾu-ʾa, then, as infinitive III1 of ʾiškū stands for shubʾā, the i being inserted to prevent the assimilation of the guttural
to the preceding b (shubʾīnu = shubʾā = shubbā, which latter would be the infinitive II of ʾiškū, “to satisfy”). An
infinitive III1 of ʾiškū (shubʾuʾa = shubʾa = shabbā) is less probable. Delitzsch, H. W. B., p. 161a, gives only a III1
of ʾiškū with the signification “to seek,” “to ask.” III1 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 īshebelum = bushebūlam, see Chapter III, p. 53, note 1.
3 I.e., “I am disgusted with my job!”
4 “The face of Bēlt”—an Amurritish name? Probably to be sought in the neighborhood of Dūr-Kurigalzu.
5 Cf. B. E., XIV, 2: 8, five slaves of Enlil-kidinni who are i-na Bit-m ʾluEnil-ki-di-ni ka-bu-ʾa; i.e., XV, 152: 14, the slave...shā i-na ʾāluššub’a ka-lu-išu; i.e., XIV, 135: 3, i-na ki-li...ib-la-šaššu. In 3: 33, 42 15: 5, 14, ka-
6 Although not registered by Clay, yet a māšu ʾU-pi-i occurs, e.g., in B. E., XIV, 132 : 43, 46, 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 Etelbu mār "Ush-bu-la" in causing waters to overwhelm their possessions, ll. 11–17.

(c) The city Mannu-gir-Rammān, 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 Mār-"[... ]" for a new gate, ll. 29–31.

(f) Request that the King may look into the affairs of "Ina-Š.UR.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-"šš-Enlil 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-l-i-ia as-mi lu-ul-li-i zēri(= KUL) ishtu(= TA) shame[=]
2 la ma-ir an-ni gu-ra-di li-e-i it-pli-sh[i]
3 nu-uir aḫê(= SHESH)meš-shu PI-\in-dî-e na-na-a-ri
4 ki-ib kab-tu-tî ra-ásh-ba-nu-ú-tî

1 Cf. now also the Bit."Ush-bu-la in B. E., Series D, IV, p. 148, col. III, 5, where it is reported that it adjoined a district "which had been given to the 'Lord of Lands.'"
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 shá  
10; my e-pi-ir  
Root Jensen,  
possess.  
The 10.

7 ù  
15.  
The 10.  
ù mi-lish-ri-e ish-ru-ku-ú-shú

8  
102

9 be-li-ia ki-bé-ma um-ma = Kal-bu íp
tu  
10.  
ù ar-du na-ra-am-ka-ma

11 an-nu-um-ma-a  
shú-ú ki-i ra-ma-ni  
a-na

12 be-li-ia ap-ki-du-ma = E-tel-bu már  
= Ush-bu-la

13 [ ]-mat(?)-su  
14 [ ] sa-ab-ta-ku ash-bu eqlu (=  
A.SHAG) shá EN.KUR.KUR

15 [um-ma-a a-na ....] mi-i-a-ma i-na  
me-e i-di-la-an-ni

16 [âlu?] šá i-ti-ia lu ash-bu-tu

17. lu na-du-tu  
shá EN.KUR.KUR i-na

1 An-nu-um-ma-a = an(n)umma.  
Cf. um-ma-a = um-ma and see also Hammurâbî, 2 : 10; 8. 273 : 17; C. T., IV, 27  
(B' 329) : 10.  
Jensen, K. B., VI, 475, 527, translates anumma by “nun, so far.”  
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 Edêlu ina ma, not “to shut off from water,” but edêlu, because a synonym of samûgu = “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, e-ku-ku, l. 26, and i-si-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 Edil or NIN.IR; for omission of lù  
before names of gods see p. 8, n. 8), which were situated in the immediate neighborhood of the city Mannu-gir-Rammân,  
complains of his being encircled by “waters” through the negligencv or spite of Etelbu, who failed to keep the canals  
clean.  
These “waters” became so fierce that even Mannu-gir-Rammân was surrounded (i-na in-me-e na-di).  
Added to this “the rains and floods,” the city’s destruction was complete.

3 Root naddò.  
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 shá EN.KUR.KUR is parallel to that of l. 14—belongs, therefore,  
to [âlu? or eqlu?]  
l. 16.
pa-an me-e i-ka-bu-bu

18 ū "Man-nu-gi-ir-IM" šá šarru (= LUGAL) ra-in ga-[ti]
19 ū be-li a-ná MIR.NIT.TA an-nu-ti id-di-na
20 i-na la-me-e na-di zu-un-na i-na sha-me-e
21 ū mi-la i-na nak-bi ki-i i-di-nu ša-ku

"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-É.KUR.GAL, thy servant, whom I have recommended
33 ap-ki-du ash-shū di-na-[ni]-ia
34 be-li a-ma-as li-mur-ma a-li-ti-ia²
to my "Lord"—on my account,
my "Lord," look into his affairs! If I
am to get out
of my predicament then (my Lord) may
act (lit. come) quickly.
And I, the itù of my "Lord," though I
have written to the "King"
concerning (my) coming, yet the "King"
has not given me (an answer or
permission).

IV.
No. 9 (= C. B. M. 11,635).

Banà-sha-Marduk reports to King Kuri-Galzu about the revolt which has broken out
in Bil-ŠuSin-issahra. About 1390 B.C.

Above (pp. 4ff.) it has been shown that our writer, Banà-sha-Marduk, lived
between the 20th year of Kuri-Galzu and the 11th year of Kadashman-Turgu, i.e.,
during a space of about forty-three years. We may assign this letter, therefore, to the
time of Kuri-Galzu, and this the more because the Bil-ŠuSin-issahra, so named after the
head of the royal storehouse (karâ) ASH.TAB.BA.GAN.TUG, situated in Kandurât,
Šin-issahra, 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 Bil-ŠuSin-issahra,
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-šuEnil, mentioned in No. 24?

The contents are the following:

1 Not ap-ki-du-ash-shū, but ash-shū di-na-[ni]-ia is to be read. Ash-shū di-na-ni-ia again is the same as the
well-known ash-shum-mi-ia (27 : 44) = ana šù-mi-ia (S. 274 : 17, 4) = ash-shù-mi-ia (C. T., VI, 32 (= B 334) : 4), of the
Hammurabi period. From this it follows that di-imšu = šumu, i.e., "all that which expresses the essence of a being,"
"the being itself" (cf. divisor), or, as Dehmetics, H. W. B., p. 224b, gives it, "das Selbst," see also p. 58, note 2.
2 For ABIŠU AC šibtu, see Il. W. B., p. 416.
3 I.e., "if I am to leave and thus be out of it forever."
4 Not la + tališ but la + itališ, P alaku.
5 In view of li-ta-al-lik, "may act (quickly)" and akam, "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 (sc. of an answer)."
In this case i-di-na-an-ni might be derived from i-di-ni (= idin-anni), instead of nadùnu.
6 See pp. 79, 81, 110, 116.
FROM THE TEMPLE ARCHIVES OF NIPPUR.

(a) Exhortation to rejoice, ll. 6—?
(b) News about the revolt in Bit-šuSin-issahra, upon information received from E.SAG.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 Rakanu and Bit-šuKi-din-ni.

1 ardi-ka "Bana (= KAK)-a-sha-šuMar-duk
2 a-na di-na-an be-li-ia lul-lik
3 a-na ālu-ki ū širī (= EDIN) šá be-li-ia
4 šu-ul-mu
5 um-ma-a a-na be-li-ia-ma
6 ad-ru' šu-ul-te-su-uk
7 ū ma(?)-li-sa[...]-ma
8 si(?)-pi-[ri'...]
9 um-ma(a a-na be-li-i]a-ma
10 [... ] šá be-li
11 [...]
12 a[-...₇]IM-ra]-im-zēr
13 [... ] ū-ba-āš[šu-shu?]
14 [...]-a-ma ki-ki-i₆ ši(?) or ad?][...]
15 E.SAG.IL-zu-ri-ia ar[di-ka] E.SAG.IL-zu-ri-ia, thy servant,

Thy servant Banâ-sha-Marduk;
before the presence of my "Lord" may I come!
To the city and the fields of my "Lord"
greeting!
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"

1 For adru cf. Johnson, J. A. O. S., XIX, p. 52, perhaps "enclosure"; Behrens, L. S. S., II', p. 47, note 1, "Palast-
genach."
2 So is to be connected, not ad-ru-sha te-su-uk (which latter had to be in this case tesik). Shu-ul-te-su-uk, either
infinitive or permanive III' of ṣēm, "to glorify" (Delitzsch's ṣēm, H. W. B., p. 108b, and ṣēm, l.c., p. 110b, belong
together).
3 Ma(?)-šu-ša might stand here for mundanešu, "soldier."
4 Cf. with this the amruši-pi-ri, Delitzsch, H. W. B., p. 5096. A reading e-pi-ri seems to be against the
context.
5 Very doubtful. Might be II' of ṣēšu, "to seek," or possibly a II' of either ṣēšu or ṣēšu.
6 The context being mutilated, it is difficult to tell whether to connect [...]-ma ki-ši-[... or [...]-ma ki-ši-ši(?) or ad?][...].

Digitized by Microsoft®
A letter of *Marduk-mushallim*, head of the storehouse at *Dūr-Enlil*, to King *Kurigalzu*. 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-la-ti* ("house of female (slave)s") and as *SIGISSE.SIGISSE* ("offerings") to *dūSin*. The position in which the name of *Marduk-mushallim* occupies on this tablet makes it certain that he was the head of the storehouse at *Dūr-Šu.En-lil*<sup>1</sup>. This tablet is dated simply the "16th year" (l.7). As only the first four kings (*Burna-Buriash to Kadashtaman-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)-iulu (= AN)-ma*, mentioned in ll. 9, 15, I propose to identify with one of the witnesses mentioned below.  

---

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

2. To bring out the difference in writing between *SABšu* and *SABmesh* I transcribed as given above. Both *SABšu* and *SABmesh* signify, however, at this time very often, if not always, simply "men, workmen" (*um-mâmî*), see p. 35, note 1.

3. *Gî-in-na-ta ki-i ig-nu-na = qinnûta* (fem. plur.) *ki ignûti* (3d plur. fem. of *pP* = *qinnûta qinnû ki ignûti*, i.e., "while the families (employed on the Temple properties) were building a nest," "were settling down," *for the signification of qinnû* (*qinnût* at this time cf., e.g., *B. E.*, XIV, 126:7 | XV, 160:29, qin-ni; *B. E.*, XIV, 111:7, qin-na-ati.

4. *Râ-pânu* here in the sense of "to kill" (*sha da-ak-i*), Delitzsch, *H. W. B.*, p. 626c. The singular being employed, because "objects counted (*SABšu* are such objects) are construed as singulars," see p. 95, note 6.  

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

6. See also the position of the name of *Innannâ* in such tablets of "endorsement," Chapter IV, e, p. 86, note 4.
in a document from the 4th year of Ku^[-ri-Gal-zu], B. E., XIV, 11 : 16. Erba-Marduk of 1. 4 would, therefore, have to be identified with Erba-Marduk, the son of Sin-nür-mâti, 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-lî of 1. 2 and in the LUGAL of 1. 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 Dûr-^'^Enlil, which place must have been situated at a river, resp. canal, deep and safe enough for the lallâ-ships (i.e., "Fracht(?)-schiffe").

The contents of this letter are:

(a) The royal provender will be shipped per lallâ-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-[shal-]ym
2 [a-na di-]a-an be-lî ia lul-lik
3 um-ma-a a]-na be-lî ia-ma
4 [âš-shum GAR.LUGAL] shá = Erba
   (= SU)-št^a=Marduk
5 [ardi-ka i]k-shú-da
6 [um-ma-a] akâli (= GAR) sharri
   (LUGAL) ámu 16[kam]
7 a-na šu mû-lâ ( = la) al-la-a
8 ummâni (= SAB) bi-šu-ú-ni
9 šA-na-tukulti (= KU)-alu (= AN)-ma
10 ū ša Sukal (= LUGH)-she-mi
11 ū ummâni (= SAB) mish shá a-la-ak-
    shû-nu
12 shû-um-ra-am-ma
13 li-zu-ú-ma lí-lî-ku

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 lallâ-ships
by the 16th (of this month).
Ana-tukulti-ifu-ma
and Sukal-shemi
and the men of their company
send (give orders)
that they come,

1 Kudur-Enlil is out of question, because he reigned only six resp. eight years, see p. 1.
2 Emendation according to 1. 6. Very doubtful. Cf., however, the MA.GAR.RA of the Hammurabi Letter,
No. 34 : 16, which likewise was put upon the šumû-lâ.
3 For šumû (= elippu)-la-la-a see Delitzsch, H. W. B., p. 414a (left untranslated) and King, Letters of Ham-
murabi, III, p. 7, note 2 (to No. 34 : 10), "processional boat."
4 Lit., "of their going" (alâk = infinitive), "their following."
5 Lit., "that they may go out and go (come)."
14 ụ ummâni(= ȘAB)mak u ki-dîn-na ma-la šá a-li-ki

so that Ana-tukulti-ilu-ma may return to him

15 "A-na-tukulti(= KU)-īl(= AN)-ma

all the men and protégés (clients)

16 a-na pa-ni-shú li-ter-ra-am-ma³

which I have taken.

17 ha-a)m-di-îsh²

Let them do it quickly.

18 lik-shú)ü-da⁴

VI.

No. 44 (= C. B. M. 19,709).

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, Bù-"Ki[din-ni], be correct, I would refer this letter to the time between the 20th year of Kuri-Galzu and the 11th of Kadeshman-Turgu.⁵ 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 Kûtinni." 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.⁶ 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 šá alqu; cf. p. 100, note. If one prefers he may take it in the sense of "as many as are of (in) the city (of Ëli-ki)," see p. 11, note 2.
² Stands here for luṭra-ma, lu + u of the 3d pers. becomes at this time always lu. To "whom" shall he return the men? To Erba-Marduk?
⁴ I.e., "May they (Ana-tukulti-ilu-ma and the other men, ll. 9f.) come, take the men, and return them to him quickly." Likshudá=likshudá, so better than singular: "may he, i.e., Ana-tukulti-ilu-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-Kidinnu, ll. 13–17.

(f) Only one workman bargained for has been received from Kish,1 lls. 18–21.

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

To the cattle and the house of my
“Lord” greeting!

The . . .

which they (were to) have given,
my “Lord” may behold,
they have put up.

For the garments
do not press me, my “Lord.”

The wool of the shepherds,
as much as has been sheared,
they have removed. Good (sc. wool) is
not here.

One weaver,
who was a fugitive
for one year,
they have received
from (out of) Bit-Kidinnu.

Only one of
the stipulated workmen
they have received
from Kish.

1. For the different cities called Kish, see Jensen, Z. A., XV, p. 214ff., and Hommel, Grundriss², pp. 338, 383–390.

2. For the sign bi as variant for ni, ë, see “Names of Professions” under ëa-bi(ï)-gal-ba-ti. A possible derivation
from ën (cf. ni-in, ninda-ba) would be less probable and quite peculiar in formation, (1) because of the long ë (but
cf. p. 129, 23), (2) because of the i in bi (standing for bi). The object which was “put up” is unfortunately broken away.

³ i.e., wait a little longer for them.

⁴ For ba-qu = bâqmu, “to cut off,” “to shear,” see now Hinke, B. E., Series D, IV, pp. 263–6, 177. Besides the
passages quoted there cf. also B. E., XIV, 128 : 1, SIG²šš a-ba-ku-ru, and l.c., 42 : 12, i-ba-qa-nu (said of akkû, shikaru,
and mi-rî-ush-tum, hence here at least it cannot mean “to cut off” or “to shear”). See also a-ba-ra-um-ma, 2 : 10.

⁵ For ba-ni-tum (sc. shi-pitu), fam. of banâ (syn. of damu), in the sense of “good,” “nice,” “fine,” etc., see Jensen,
K. B., VI, 1911, pp. 412.


⁷ Cf. here the dup-pi ri-ki-esh(ï)-ti šad “In-nn-an-na a-na amulu RIQmesh a KA.ZID.DA ili-ku-ru (B. E., XIV, 42 : 1),
ì.e., “the (tablet of) stipulations upon which I. has agreed with the R. and K.”
VII.

No. 83 (= C. B. M. 3315). (Cf. photographic reproduction, Pl. XII, 29, 30.)

A letter of complaints, requests, and threats written by the governor Errish-apal-iddina 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-iddina, the governor of Dâr(resp. Bûl)-Errish-apal-iddinaki, 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, Bûl-"In-na-an-nu(ni) Nippur (= En-lîl)ki. We also saw that during the reign of Kuri-Galzu, i.e., at the time when "In-na-an-ni was bursar-in-chief, m\ab Sin-issalra was the head of the royal or Palace storehouse (karû), named ÁSH.TAB.BA.GAN.TUGki.2 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-issalra the "wages for certain persons," or from B. E., XV, 50, where he (Sin-issalra) 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 m\ab.PA.KU-ma-lik-ANmek receives in ábâ Karâ ÁSH.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." Innanni3 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.
3 If the term abû of No. 86 : 10 is to be taken in its literal sense, Innanni would be a brother of "E-mi-da-štâMar-duk, i.e., 1. 18. See here the interpretation of that passage by Prof. Hilprecht, above, p. 25, note 1, and cf. Emid-ana-Marduk, p. 71! Is Emida = Emid + ana = an = am = a? If so, this would explain the exalted position of Innanni, i.e., Innanni would have been a brother of the bel 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 Mār-Tadu, l. 14.
(f) Pay the barley to the RIQ of Shelibi 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-erish, 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 m] In-na-an-ni ki-bé-ma
2 um-ma m anErrish(t) (= NIN.IB) apal (= TUR.USH) -iddina (= SE)
3 um-ma-a am-mi-ni ash-pu-r[a-ak-ku]
4 la ta-al-li-i-m[a?]?
5 um-ma-a ummānī (= SAB)h a an-nu-ti[?]
6 shā ash-pu-ra-ak-ku tu-sh[e-ir-shū]-nu-ti-ma
7 ḥu-li la mu-ush-shū-u[r]
8 shā 5 anneh RIQmesh šā Nippur (= EN.LIL)4[f]
9 ku-ri-ib-shū-nu-ti-i-ma2 shā [um-mānī (= SAB)h a mesh]
10 it-ti Ni-ib-bu-ri-i nam-š[a-a]r-ta
11 shū-um-lī-īr-shū-nu-ti

To Innanni speak, thus saith Errish-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 namšarto-vessels.

2 Tu-še-[ir-sh]u-nu-ti is supplied according to l. 36, tu-še-îr. Both forms may be taken of še' (= tu-ashšir, tu'ashšir, tuššir, tu-sh-ir), “in den richtigen Zustand versetzen,” Delitzsch, H. W., B., p. 311a, or (b) they may be (and this is more probable) a II of še (= tu'ashšir, etc., as above). According to Jensen, K. B., VI, p. 409, 410, ashšura is a synonym of both papâdu and sumāq. For sumāq in the sense of “to press, to urge,” see 44 : 8. Cf. also for šaš Meisner, Supplem., p. 13 (= K. 4587, Obv. 6); Delitzsch, A. L. 4; Zimmer, K. A. T. 4, p. 421. The sense apparently is: “urge them by putting them into the right frame of mind.” A II of šaš is excluded here.
3 On account of šaš-um-lī-īr-shū-nu-ti, l. 11, and tu-al-laššu-nu-ti, l. 12, I take this form as a II of šaš, “Jemandem willfahren” (not as a II of šaš, “to bring near”).
12 shum-ma an-ni-ta ul tu-ul-te-hi-ir-shù-nu-ti³
13 ul at-tu-ul-a SHE.BAR ik-ka-lu⁴
14 2 GUR SHE.BAR a-na Mār-Ta-a-du i-di-in
15 š,a³ ₁₃₄ RİQ śa She-li-bi⁵
16 a-mi-lu-us-su a-na pi i a-mi-lu-t[i-shù]
17 tiś ash-shá-bi ša ālu-ki
18 SHE.BAR id-na-ash-shá-[(?]
19 ar-di i-na bu-[u [. . . ]
20 ū a-alp shá i-na ₄u[. . . ]
21 13 alp ia-a-nu ū 10 [. . . ] ia-a-nu
22 SHE.BAR a-na mūSin(= XXX)-apal(= TUR.USH)-[éris]
23 mu-du-ud-ma i-din-ma li-ish-shá-a
24 ū at-ta ḫa mu-ul-ta
25 al-ka-am-ma SHE.ZER
26 a-na ālu-kī i-din
27 ū SHE.BAR 10 GUR GISH.BAR GAL ša "Ib-ni" = Marduk

If this thou doest not grant unto them, (then) they shall (no longer) ’eat my “food’.’’ Give 2 gur of barley to Mār-Tādu.

As regards the RIQ of Shelibī—
"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 + x . . . . are not there.

Measure and pay the barley to Sin-apal-érish 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—

¹ IF of saḫāru = saḥāru.
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 ul at-tu-ul-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 Errish-apal-iddina, the governor, employed these men upon the instigation of Innanni, i.e., they were given an office by and through the help of 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 ll. 15f. depends upon whether we read, 1. 18, id-na-ash-shu or id-na-ash-shu-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 RIQ . . . and his nine men . . . so give them (= idnashshu, amilātih-shu-nu)” or “as regards the RIQ . . . so give him (idnashshu) with regard to his nine men (or for his nine men) . . . upon the demand of his representatives (amilātih-shu).”
⁴ The RIQ of Shelibī 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).”
⁵ The “city” in which Errish-apal-iddina was stationed, i.e., “Bit-Errish-apal-iddinib”.
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28 na-da-na aq-ba-ak-ku  "I have told thee to pay it, why hast thou not paid it?"
29 am-mi-ni la ta-di-in He is angry with me.
30 šu-ú-ú i-li-ia te-bi³ It will not be my fault, if he does not accuse thee, saying:
31 ul a-shi-im-ma³ ú-ti-ka 'No onions and garlic(?)
32 ul ï-da-bu-ub are there to eat,' and: 'thou hast given to Már-Tâdu
33 um-ma-a SUM.SAR² ù SUM.EL. an order on my barley.'"
            ŠAR° KAR;
34 a-na a-ka-li ia-a-nu I told him to depart (= "to keep quiet")?
35 um-ma-a² a-na Már-Ta-a-du
36 ï-na libb³ (= SHAG) SHE.BAR at-
            tu-ú-a tu-she-ir⁶
37 na-ha-sa¹ aq-ba-ash-shu Nos. 64 (= C. B. M. 3258). (Cf. photographic reproduction, Pl. XII, 31, 32.)

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 Persianic of ḫūn.
2 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 (Ibni-Marduk) accuses thee (Innanni), etc., but I would not be surprised at all if he does accuse thee.
3 It-ti here "against:" cf. dohôb innamātin dohôb ìtti, No. 75: 6, p. 135.
4 Um-ma-a... um-ma-a introduces the twofold possible accusation with which Ibni-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 Ibni-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.
5 For SUM.SAR = šumu, "onions," see II. W. B., p. 647.
6 SUM.EL.SAR probably "garlic!" Cf. also Meissner, Ideogramme, Nos. 2970-2972. Or is EL here =YUL? If so, then cf. qishšu = ḫUL(=u-ku-ush),SAR = "cucumber," H. W. B., p. 598a.
7 KAR indicates here a certain kind of SUM.EL.SAR.
8 The second accusation with which Innanni is threatened by the writer is that Ibni-Marduk will say: "Thou hast not only withheld from me what belongs to me, but hast even given an order on my barley to Már-Tâdu, and thus hast cheated me out of my own." Cf. here p. 87, note.
9 I.e., to take "from" my grain.
10 See p. 111, note 2.
11 Na-ha-sa = infinitive (cf. nihēsu, H. W. B., p. 458a, and Jensen, K. B., VI, pp. 388, 496).
12
(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-na-an-nil ki-bê-ma
2 um-ma  ã³Errish(t) (= MASH)-
apal-(TUR.USH)-iddina (= SE)ma-
3 ššshamashshammu (= GISH.NI) shá
  ha-za-an-na-a-ti
4 la ta-ma-la-ar
5 at-ta ma-an-mu  ššshamashshammu
   (= GISH.NI)
6 li-îs-hu-tu-â-ma
7 shamnu (= NI.GISH) a-na ÉšumDUB
   li-she-ri-but
8 û at-ta ššshamashshammu (= GISH.
   NI)-ka
9 šu-hu-ut-ma shamnu (= NI.GISH)
10 a-na ÉšumDUB šu-ri-ib
11 û di-im SHE.BAR

To Innanni speak,
thus saith Errish-apal-iddina:
The sesame of the prefects
thou must not accept.
All who press out

the sesame
must bring the oil (in) to the "Tablet
house,"
therefore press out thy sesame

and bring the oil (in) to
the "Tablet house."
Also no report whatever

1 Ma-an-mu, because construed with the plural (li-îs-hu-tu-â-ma, li-she-ri-but), has here the signification "all those who."
2 The root of li-îs-hu-tu-â-ma has to be, on account of the writing šu-hu-ut-ma (I. 9), ã³nu. It having here an object, must show an a in the present, hence ṣaḥâtu, ṣēḥut (præt.), ṣēḥatum (pres.), ṣēḥut (imperat.). Both Delitzsch, H. W. B., p. 561b (wrongly ã³nu), and Muss-Arnoldt, p. 573, leave this verb untranslated. The action of the ṣaḥâtu shall be applied to the ššGISH.NI; the result of this is NI.GISH, which shall be brought into the ÉšumDUB. From this it follows that ṣaḥâtu means something like "to press," "to squeeze out," by chopping up the ššGISH.NI (hence ṣaḥâtu parallel to ṣēḥâru, "klein machen," see H. W. B., i.e.), and is as such the same as the German "keltern." "The oil of the wood," i.e., the NI.GISH or shamnu, is, therefore, gained by chopping up, pressing, squeezing the ššGISH.NI or "sesame leaves (resp. bark)," and is, in fact, nothing but the "oil of the sesame"; hence the GISH in NI.GISH is the same as the ššGISH in ššGISH.NI. Now we understand also what a amēniNI.SUR is. From amēniGESHTIN.
SURA = su-ki-it ka-ra-ni = "Weinkelterer"(!) we know that SUR = saḥâtu; hence a amēniNI.SUR is one who presses, squeezes, etc., the NI, i.e., the fat (w. 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 ÉšumDUB refers to that of Nippur or, what is more probable, to that of Der-
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 (â introduces the apodesis) 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-ma ul ta-ash-pu-ra
13 ḫa-ash-mar
14 šâ ash-pu-rak-ku
15 3' labiru(= ḫâ) shikaru(= KASH) a-na pi-i²
16 a-mi-li-e-shâ i-din
17 ḫa GAR.RASH KU⁵ shâ a-di
18 li-tu-û-a⁶
19 e-pu-usk

about the barley hast thou sent.
Furthermore as regards ḫashmar concerning whom I have sent to thee—
"give (him) upon the demand of his representatives
3 jars of Lager-beer."
Also the . . . . which is for(?) my
make.

IX.

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

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

Inbi-Airi, "fruit of Ijjar," must have been a lady of very high rank, seeing that she dared to write to the bursar-in-chief, Innami, 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. ANmesh(= qadishtu?), 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 Innami, 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! ḫiddina=ḫer-ṣer-šu Nergal is, no doubt, the same as the one mentioned in B. E., XIV,

1 DUK = karpata is, like gur, 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 Ü = labiru, intending, by doing so, to put special emphasis upon the "old." "Old beer" is, of course, "Lager-beer."
3 Here abbreviated from a-na pi-i shî-pâr-ti, i.e., "upon the written order of."
4 Amelu 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, "2. qa of flour (ZID.DA) as GAR.RASH for our house (Ē-nu) ḫen-ke-na (has given or received?)"; similar is i.e., 156:2. In Lc, 79:5, we have: aklim É-nu GAR.RASH ũil(= NUN)-li-ša. In B. E., XIV, 117a:3, we hear of 3 qa SHH GAR.RASH. These passages show that KU is not a part of the ideogram. KU, however, cannot be here = kēnu, "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 akšš (shd) anu harrâni = "Verproviantierung," lit. "food for the journey"? The above-quoted passages are, however, against such a translation.
7 For another letter of Inbi-Airi 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-issahra,\(^2\) the head of the royal storehouse, \(\text{ÅSH.TAB.BA.GAN.TUG}^\star\), see pp. 79, 81, 104, 110.

The contents are:

(a) Request for payment of barley to

(a) Idin-Nergal, ll. 3-7, and to

(b) "The wages for the persons" are to be handed over to Sin-issahra, ll. 8, 9.

1 a-na "In-na-an-ni ki-bé-ma
2 um-ma 'In-bi-A-a-ri-im-ma
3 3 (gur) \(\text{SHE.BAR} \ a-na \ "\text{Idin} (= SE)"-\text{Nergal}
4 i-di-in
5 li-mu-ut-ta la te-ip-pu-shá-an-ni-ma\(^3\)
6 shú aq-ba-íš-shú li-ish-am-ma\(^4\)
7 li-il-qa-a\(^5\)
8 ipru (= \(\text{SHE.BA} \ MU\text{mesh} \ a-na\)
\(\text{m} \ "\text{Sin}(= XXX)-is-sah-ra\)
9 i-di-in
10 4 (gur) \(\text{SHE.BAR} \ a-na \ 'Di-ni \ màrat (= TUR) \ "\text{Abi}(= AD)-ia\)
11 i-di-in.

To Innanni speak,

thus saith Inbi-Airi:

Give to Idin-Nergal

3 (gur) of barley.

Do not act inimically towards me,

but as I have told him let him take

and carry away.

The wages (food) for the persons give to

Sin-issahra.

To Dini, the daughter of Abi-ia, give

4 (gur) of barley.

X.

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

Kudurání, the royal superintendent of the Temple storehouse at Pi-nári, 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 \(\text{m} \ "\text{Sin}(= XXX)-\text{issahra}(= NIGIN)"\).

2 Cf. also the \(\text{Bir} \ "\text{m} \ "\text{Sin-issahra} in No. 9: 16.

3 Lit., Do not make enmity towards me, but do as told by him.

4 For nashú 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 laqá, "to remove barley, etc., from (= \(\text{TA} = \text{ishtu}) a place to (ano) 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 (\(MU\text{mesh} = shu'atu) amount," I see in this \(MU\text{mesh} the same expression as that occurring in DUB \(MU\text{mesh} = DUB \text{shumûtu}, "Temple record"; in other words, I take \(MU\text{mesh} to stand here for \text{shumûtu} = "persons," as mentioned in the "Temple Archives," where they are generally introduced by the expression \(MU.BIL, 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-ru, was a contemporary of Kishalbut. If so, then Erba-Marduk of No. 27:27, 30, 32 is, no doubt, identical with the sukalmahlu of No. 35:28. Taking all other passages into consideration I propose to identify our writer with "Ku-du-ra-ni, 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-nāri, where a certain "Ta-kī-shū receives grain (SHE) from him (ina qāt), must have been at that time the head of the storehouse at Pi-nāri. In the same capacity he is mentioned among certain storehouse officials or superintendents who paid, in the 13th year of Kadashman-Turgu, SHE ḤAR.RA (lit., "interest grain") to the city Dār-ālu-ku." We may, therefore, identify the be-hū 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 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 ardi-ka. "Ku-du-ra-nu a-na di-na-an be-li-ia lul-lik
2 a-na ālu-ki šī-rē û bit be-li-ia shū-ul-mu
3 um-ma-a a-na be-li-ia šā be-li ish-pu-ra
4 um-ma-a SHE.BAR šā diš Hī-ša-rī-ti û diš Kār-ālu-Be-nu (= 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 Ḥībarī and of Kār-Be-nu

1 See introduction to No. 35, p. 120.
2 Cf. e.g., "Nūr-īlu-Shamash (27:8, here called gā-gal-lum) is mentioned as pa-te-si in the 11th year of Kadashman-Turgu (B. E., XIV, 99a : 20). "Dū-bū-lālu-mur (27:18) occurs again in the 3d year of Kadashman-Turgu (B. E., XIV, 91a : 12), etc., etc. Meissner, G. G. A., February, 1908, pp. 130–143, thinks, because "Dū-bī-lālu-mur is followed, in the latter passage, by du-mi-lum = šā-tim-lum, 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, 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 Kudurānu, we have EDIN for šī-ri.
6 Only here without the emphatic -ma, see p. 24, note 3.
5 a-na amēnas.RIQ i-ē amēnu KA.ZID(=KU).DA ści-ini
6 ki-i šá dlu MUMki-ma ga-am-rat
I C SHE.BAR GISH.BAR.GAL,
7 be-li li-mi-da-ma amēnu a-na amēnas.RIQ
amēnu KA.ZID(=KU).DA
8 iŠ SHE.ZER aš-šu-mum ummnāni(=SAB)bi-a [...]
9 šá li-il-gu(?) [...]
[...... large break .....]
10 [... ......]
11 a-na mu-ul be-li-ia [ul-te-bi-la]
12 aš-šum ūnšu SHIanna šá ūnšu[......]

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 Ki-i šá, 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, MUM; cf. alan and alant, “statue,” etc. ūnšu MUM may be translated either by “Wäterstadt” 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-na in li-mi-da-ma indicates the chief sentence. Emīdu c. acc. and ana, “etwas für jemand festsetzen, beitimmen,” “to set aside.”
7 Ü consecutivum.
8 For SHE.ZER = zuru, see Moissner, Idschr. No. 5106.
9 ll. 6-8 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 Hubariti and Kûr-Nabû, however, but that of ūnšu MUM!
10 The traces speak rather for ra, ta, shâ.
11 ūnšu SHIanna, 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. I, pp. 335f.) two classes are especially well represented in the museums of Constantinople and Philadelphia: (1) Lapis lazuli disks, known under the name of ASH-ME ūnšuškû (cf. Hilprecht, O. B. I, Nos. 58, 59, 61, and pp. 49ff., and Moissner, Idschr., No. 28). (2) Little plano-convex round or oval objects in polished agate, resembling eyes. Cf. Hilprecht, I., Nos. 29, 31, 34, 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 cuneiform signs are found on both (133). 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-qa-a
15 ásh-shum šá-ba-shi šá be-li  ish-pu-ra

I beg to state that they will be taken
(shall take them?)
to Ili-ahhi-eriba, the . . .
With regard to the ploughing, concern-
ing which my "Lord" has inquired,
(I beg to say that)
I am at the ploughing for the last two
days.
With regard to the watering tank(?)
which the itù Izpur-Errish
is putting up (and) concerning which
my "Lord" has written (I beg to
assure my Lord that)
it shall not go up (extend to) the gate

the inscriptions on some of them it becomes
clear that they also belong to the Cassite period and originally came
from Nippur. There are, however, known two 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 Nebuchadrezzar 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: \( \text{Niba-kudurru-nuṣur šar Bībīlī, apīl} \)
\( \text{Nabā-apal-ṣuṣur, ana Mandu, héli-shu qipsh(-esh), } \)"N., king of Babylon, son of X., presented it to Marduk, his lord."

"In view of these characteristic votive objects of the Cassite kings we are scarcely wrong in interpreting 'the
stone eyes' 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 proba-

dmibility was 'agate.'" Cf. in this connection the "eye of God" which sees everything!

1 In view of \( i-li-ik-qa-a \) (l. 14) one might be inclined to read here "I-li-Ab-ki-e-ri-ba-[...]-ma\), but this would
give no satisfactory sense.
2 We would expect here a "title" or the "name of the profession" of \( Ili-ahhi-eriba: \) "goldsmith," "gem-cutter,"
etc. The traces, however, do not fit for \( \text{zidimmu or kudimmu.} \)

3 By translating as given above, I take \( i-li-ik-qa-a \) to be a 3d pers. fem. plur. IV: \( \text{illiqqi = illaqqi, referring back to} \)
\( \text{nAbA-jm} \), a fem. plural (\( \text{abnu} \) is masc., but more frequently fem.). Cf. pp. 131, note 141, note 2.

The signification of \( \text{shu-ba-shi} \) is very doubtful. I would like to take it as an infinitive of \( \text{shu} = \text{shubu} \),
for which see Jensen, K. B., VI, pp. 383, 511, who assigns to this verb the significations "um-, anrähen, dahinstürmen,
aufwühlen." The last signification is used not only of the "dust," but also of the "ground," i.e., "to plough."

4 \( E\ ki-ri-bu = a-qa-ri-ib-e \) for a on account of the guttural \( \text{Q} \), cf. p. 97, n. 7. \( \text{Qarabu} \) c. ana here "to go at
something," just as "a man goes at his enemy."

Reading, form, and signification doubtful. The \( \text{shu-ki-i} \) must be something that is "put up" (\( \text{shu-ak-nu} \),
a kind of building. It must be long, for "it shall not go to the house of the Lord." If \( \text{shu-ki-i} \) be a formation like \( \text{shugā} \)
(root \( \text{ṣug} \), H. W. B., p. 640a) its root might be either \( \text{sug} \) or \( \text{ṣug} \). Have we to see, therefore, in \( \text{shu-ki-i} \) a side
form of \( \text{sugū} \), "Tränke," Delitzsch, H. W. B., p. 685? \( \text{Shugā} \) might be a \( \text{ṣug} \) form.

In view of \( \text{shu-ki-i}, \) "watering tank," I am inclined to see in \( \text{ku-bu-ra} \) the same word as \( \text{qubaru} \), a synonym of
\( \text{shuttatu} \), which latter Delitzsch, H. W. B., p. 697, translates by "Loch," and Jensen, K. B., VI, p. 416, by "Grube,"
"Fallgrube." Seeing, however, that \( \text{shuttatu} \) is the same as \( \text{šu-ut-šu} \), and that the latter has the ideograph \( \text{u} \) (\( \text{bu-ru} \),
which also stands for \( \text{bāru}, \) "well," I take \( \text{ku-bu-ra} = \text{qubaru} \) in the sense of "well."
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a-mi-is

of the house of my "Lord." Of

wells there are only a few

and of pastures there are none.

XI.

No. 35 (= C. B. M. 6957).

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 (l. 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-ni." In the 12th year of Nazi-Maruttash we find him in Zarat-IM as one of the ENGAR, "farmers," "irrigators," receiving PAD or "wages." In the 14th year of the same ruler (month Tishtir) he is stationed as riqqu in KL = Ga-rik, 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-ni-a-hi, receiving some more "KU.QAR wages" from Enlil-mukin-apal. In the 15th year of Nazi-Maruttash he is still in Du-un-ni-a-hi, where "KU.QAR wages" are "furnished" by him to Apil-ramman, 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 Dâr-Nusku, apparently as a superintendent (itâ) of the Temple's storehouse, receiving (mi-tah-lu-rum) grain (SHE) from (i-na gât) various persons. While in Dâr-Nusku is Kishahbut,

1 For amê uu = mêsù, "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—I see in nu-ra-ku a maf'-al form of mû, i.e., mûraqu = nûruqu = mâraqu, "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 Kudurim is, no doubt, the same as the one mentioned in our letter, l. 27, 31, and who appears as the writer of Nos. 20-28. 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 bâb A-nu-um, cf. l. 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-Marultash 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-lī of l. 1 must have been King Kadashman-Turgu.

Erba-Marduk,₁ “the servant” and sukklmahḥu 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-nūr-māṭī.”² 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 sukklmahḥu. Need we wonder that Kishahbut should have been somewhat irritated about the slowness of this old and venerable official?³

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-ᾱNusku) need “strengthening” (?), ll. 15, 16.
(e) The garments have not been paid to the weavers and fullers,¹ 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-shah-bu-u[l]
2 a-na di-na-an be-lī-ia lu[l-lik]
3 a-na bit be-lī-ia shū-u[l-mu]

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

¹ 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 (27 : 14) is wrong. Under Sin-nūr-māṭī only one passage is quoted.
³ Cf. ll. 25ff., and see already above, Chapter III, pp. 44ff.
⁴ Or complaint about Erba-Marduk in not sending the garments for the weavers and fullers, see notes to ll. 17f.
4 ultu (= TA) `amw ak-shu-d[a] Since the day I began, I have covered
5 ish-te-en bita pa-ar-la2 us-sa-li-il2 one building with (flower) ornamenta-
6 `u biti ru-ak-ki2 shá be-lí i-mu-ru-ma tions.
7 bu-us-su2 na-pa-la2 iq-ba-a And the farther (away) building which
8 ki-i a-mu-ra-ma bu-bu-ar-sha2 my "Lord" has examined
9 bu-ul-du-ru2 at-ta-pa-at2 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 (as, shá, hence the relative a in akhshu) I went at it," i.e., when I began doing it, hence kashtu has here the signification of "to begin, to commence."
2 Pa-ar-la. On account of the ish-te-en we cannot connect Bit-pa-ar-la, but must take parha as object to respilil, i.e., parha must signify something with which the ishten bita was "covered." From Exod. 25 : 33; 37 : 20 we learn that a meas, generally translated by "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 H 113 c. double acc., "to cover something with something." Cf. also the H (or IP?) form in 66 : 22, £ sikhN A Dmesh ši-ši-lí-tu-ma. For a different translation of šiššu H (a H is not mentioned), see Delitzsch, Hw.B., p. 568a, and Jensen, K. B., VI, pp. 343, 343.

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

5 Either for pūš-su (Delitzsch, Hw.B., p. 516a, "side"); Jensen, K. B., VI, pp. 414, 506, "back"); Köchler, Medizin, "shoulder") or for pūš-su (Delitzsch, i.e., p. 517a, "front"); Jensen, 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, "i.e., always the person who puts his seal to the document, the "recipient") bu-us-su im-ša-ar-ma im-hur (e.g., B. E., XIV, 11 : 6 127 : 6 135 : 6 et passim)—no doubt a religious ceremony (cf. the German "sich bekreuzen," the Hebrew ṣešeš, lit. to hit one's self seven times, "sich bescheiden"). 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. Meissner, M. V. A. G., 1905, p. 308, translates pūš-su mahbasu by "garantieren.

6 Na-ša-lá ... at-ta-pa-al, root 392 = 243, "to destroy," here "to tear down," cf. Tg., VI : 28, "the wall ... a-na na-pa-li ap-ba-shum-ma I commanded him to tear down." A possible derivation of at-ta-pa-al from apālu (for signification see, besides Hw.B., p. 112b, also Delitzsch, B. A., IV, p. 81; Nagel, ibid., p. 478; Jensen, K. B., VI, p. 360) or from ṣešeš (Jensen, i.e., p. 353) is, on account of na-pa-la, out of question here.

7 Lit., "completeness," "totality," here in the sense of "ensemble." Jensen, K. B., VI, p. 507, mentions a bahru = UD as signifying "irgend etwas helles." If we have this bahru here we might translate "in order to improve its light (-UD = bahru)."

8 An infinitive H of 340 (cf. the imperative bu-ut-te-ir, C. T., IV, 32 (= B 508) : 17 and p. 96, note 2) is here, on account of the writing with d, excluded. It can, therefore, be only an infinitive H of either 392 or 340. The signification of 340 does not fit here. Delitzsch, Hw.B., p. 516b, mentions a root 340 without giving a translation. Tallquist, Sprache, p. 113, following the Hebrew 340, "fat," translated pedašu by "to be fat." From the context we would expect here some such meaning as "improve." According to this the alpu (tummeru) tap-il-ru would be "improved" (in the sense of), "fattened," oxen (or sheep)—oxen that had gone through a special process of "improving" them.
10 ú 70 śu kiššu = PU.HADU = bash shá be-lá-ia³
11 iq-bu-út 55 śu kiššu = PU.HADU = bash
12 Ish-shú-ni-ma iš-di-nu-út
13 aš-shum shipátu = SIG = i-na Nippur = EN.LIL
14 a-na be-lá ia aq-la-bi
15 aš-shum É.GAL É Anu ú báb Anu [u-anu]
16 ki-i a-la-mi-šis ri-[i-la-bi]?
17 ú lubushiti = KU bash ardi-ka mErba-na-Marduk

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

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 Erba-Marduk

³ The measure GUR is (as is often done at this time) left out here; cf. also 37 : 8 and see Tallqvist, Sprache, p. 21.
³ For śu.PU.HADU or sham.PU.HADU.SHAR or PU.HADU.SHAR = kasiá (e.g., B. E., IX, 29 et passim) see
now Meissner, Ideogramme, No. 3796. Hilprecht in class lectures on B. E., IX, explained it (in 1898) as kasia.
⁴ A good example showing the difference between be-lá-ia and be-lá—a difference which is of the highest
importance for a correct understanding of many passages in the letters here published. Be-lá-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-lá, 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 kasia wood about which my Lord has spoken" (this had to be śu.kasiá shá be-lá-ia or
iq-ba-út) 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. 22f.
⁵ "They,” i.e., the storehouse officials whom I asked about the kasia.
⁶ Lit., "they have taken (s. ishta kari ãanni, 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 šu.bá éšuá cf.
B. E., XV, 159 : 2, i-na qaš "M. ma-ša-ma na-danu”, i.e., "Iy X. was paid.”
⁷ For SIG = shipátu, see Zehntfund, B. A., I, p. 494. Wool is weighed according to ma-na, see, e.g., 27 : 31; B. E.,
XV, 4 : 11 : 11:1. For the different kinds of wool at this time cf. e.g., 44 : 10f.; 23 : 19f.; 41 : 12 : 38 : 15f. and
B. E., XIV, 9 : 1 : 90; Rev., col. XII; i.e., XV, 11 : 1, etc.
⁸ See Chapter IV, p. 74.
⁹ Traces of -um are clearly visible. See also p. 80.
¹⁰ Emendation doubtful, but probable. Rítha = P imperative of 7577, “to fortify, strengthen.”
¹¹ Hardly KU, i.e., ZID or ZID.DA = qunu or better kemu, “flour,” see, besides Delitzsch, II. W. B., p. 586b, 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 : 6 and our No. 57 : 14 (here without KU): KU ma(l)-at(l)-ge(n)l) (l. 4), cf. No. 57 : 18; B. E., XIV, 106 : 2; II. W. B., p. 430a; KU pa-kišdu (l. 5), cf. B. E., 117a : 2; KU.GIG (l. 6). The last is most
generally found without the determinative KU as, e.g., in Le., XIV, 18 : 2 : 24 : 2; XV, 10 : 2 : 36 : 3, etc. For
GIG = kibatu, see Delitzsch, II. W. B., p. 317a; Jensen, K. B., VII, p. 485f. With GIG, resp. GIG.BA (= GIB.BA?), cf.
also GIG.GIG.BA in B. E., XV, 46 : 12 : 117 : 1. Hilprecht, class lecture on B. E., IX, read (1898) GIG.BA = qalba
and translated “spelt”; KU ši-ši-ri (l. 7), cf. Hebrew "šew; KU ši-ši-ti (l. 8), cf. B. E., XIV, 117a : 5. Besides
these I noted also the following: KU.MUN, B. E., XV, 19 : 16 : 104 : 4 : 7; XIV, 23 : 1 : 65 : 13; also written KU.DA,
MUN, i.e., XV, 6 : 7, or only MUN, Le., XV, 16 : 8 : 44 : 20, 22, 35 : 169 : 3 : 181 : 9, which shows that MUN at this
time was a certain kind of flour (not silt); KU ASH.AN.A, i.e., XV, 149 : 1, or only ASH.AN.A, our No. 37 : 8;
18 a-na *anatishparu (= USH.BAR) *um
         ka-ši-ri
19 ki-i man-da-at-ti-shú-nu* ū di-di-nu* *um
20 a-shar* ū kal-lum* ma-am-ma* ū im(-)ma-ha-ar
21 um-ma-*a ½ shiqlu (= T U)-ma* šaráši
      (= AZAG.GI)
22 ū ub-ba-lum
23 um-ma-*a* a-na biti ki-i a-ba-mi-
     [ish]
24 ū(t)*-la-shá-ab* ū libittu (= SHEG)*
      ia-a*-nu*1

Notes:

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!

1 For kaspiru = qasiru = “fuller,” see Meisser, M. V. A. G., IX (1904), p. 52.
2 See p. 99, n. 3.
3 The translation of ll. 17–21 depends entirely upon what view one takes with regard to the beginning of the
apodosis or answer. Thus per se the following translations might be suggested: (a) “as regards the garments
of thy servant—Erba-Marduk has given,” etc.; (b) “as regards the garments of thy servant Erba-Marduk—they have
given,” (c) “as regards the garments which thy servant Erba-Marduk . . . has given (was to have been given)”—answer
1. 20f., i.e., “wherever one looks (where they keep them), none are (have been) received.”
4 For this signification of a-shar cf., e.g., C. T., VI, 3: 12, a-shar iv-qa-ab-bu-ú, i.e., (I will give it) “wherever he
shall say.”
5 Ū-kal-lum by itself might be taken either as a II4 of 77 (i.e., ukalla-ma, cf. ša-ka-a-a, Ḫum. L., 37: 6; 1P uktali,
Jensen, K. B., VI, p. 350), “to lift up” (synonym of nashā), used not only of “the head” but also of “the eyes,”
i.e., “to see”; cf. kullū ša minah(-t), II 11: 27: 39, 40e, f. Or, if one prefers, he might see in uktallum a II4 of 77(4
(i.e., ukallā-ma) with the signification of “to shut up,” “to keep,” e. ina, “something,” cf. C. T., II, 19 (= 1P 200): 4,
ka-dī-ka, “I am shut up, kept (in the house of the abarakku)”; B. E., XIV, 135: 3, ina ki-li . . . ik-la-shá-ma. If
taken in the latter sense, ll. 20 might be translated: “where they keep them (sc. the garments) none have been received.”
6 Here “neuter” as in S. 273: 22, akolda (= GAR) ma-am-ma a-na a-ba-li-a, “something to eat”; V. A. Th.,
809: 8, a-na ma-am(?)-ma, “for anything,” i.e., “at all events,” kaspa šu-bi-lam. See also Delitsch, Gram., p. 142.
7 Introduces here the direct speech of the implied complaint of ll. 20.
8 Stands here for A.AN, “viz.” For the signification of A.AN behind numerals see now Hilprecht, B. E., XXI,
p. 22, note 2, and cf. No. 33a: 13, p. 137.
9 Il-ta-sha-ab, though parallel to ub-ba-lum, is here in the singular on account of the subject “one” implied in
ki-i a-ba-mi-ish.
10 See p. 95, n. 4.
11 Besides ia-a*-nu (so also 11: 22, 28 | 13: 15 | 28: 20 | 57: 14, 18) there occur the following variants in these
letters: ia-a*-nu um, 26: 20; ia-a-nu, 18: 28 | 66: 27, 20 | 71: 16 | 53: 21; ia-na, 14: 13 | 23: 30 | 44: 11 | 57: 13,
14 | 81: 12 | 95: 14; ia-a-na-ma, 95: 18; ia-a-na-um-Ši, B. E., XIV, 8: 8. For the -mi (= -nu, -ma) cf. now Hinke,
B. E., Series D, IV, p. 282a. For this and the following lines cf. pp. 44f.
25 áš-shum a-na-ku i-tu 1 be-lī-ia
26 al-li(?)-ka 2 a-na "Erba-3īsMarduk
27 šu-pu-ur-ma a-na "Ku-du-ra-ni
28 [li]-ish-pu-ra-ma sukkašmahākū (= PAP.LUGH.MAGH) li-i[q-bi]
29 li-bitu (= SHEG) meš li-il-bi-nu
30 áš-shum 3 šamma (= NI.GISH) šá be-lī-ia na-shū-[na?]
31 il-ta-na-su a-na "Ku-du-ra-[a-ni]
32 [ardi]-ka ki-i aq-bu-ū um-ma-a šamma (= NI.GISH) i-na qātī-ia [i-din] 4
33 be-li a-na šatammi (= SHAG.TAM) li-ish-pu-ra-ma šamma (= NI.GISH) šub (= RU) ša-tiš-ki-nu-[ma]

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

"so may the sukkašmahāku (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 šatamma that they store up the oil.

---

'1 See Chapter III, p. 35, note 4.
'2 The a in al-li-ka shows that it is dependent upon a suppressed šat after šaš-sham. And because allika is followed by the imperative šišūrma (1. 27) we have to supply an ummā before a-na "Erba-3īsMarduk, making it a direct speech.
'3 See Chapter IV, p. 82.
'4 From 84 : 6 it is apparent that NI.GISH, "the fat of the tree," i.e., šamma or "oil," was obtained by "pressing" (šagšūtu) the SHEG.MUSH.NI, i.e., the šamashšammu 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 SHEG.MUSH.NI cf. 8: 3 : 65 : 5 : 84 : 3 : 5; B.E., XIV, 136 : 4. Cf. p. 114, note 2.

Emendation doubtful, yet probable. For nashū in connection with the "removal" of goods "from" or "to" certain places cf. among other passages also B.E., XV, 53 : 12, ASH.LAN.NA . . . ša E ku-nu-uk-ki a-na EN.LUZI na-shu-zi; i.e., 55 : 3, KU.DA . . . ša ildu ša (i.e., "which from that of."

(2) Clay, L., p. 19, No. 14, wrongly "from") dššEššu-bi na-sha-a; i.e., 100 : 1, SHE ša ildu EN.LUZI na-sha-a KI-II (i.e., SHE ša ildu) duKali-bi-ta (sc. na-ša-a); i.e., 115 : 25, ASH.LAN.NA šiššu-sham ša . . . a-na karā šiš-shu-zi; i.e., 181 : 2, KU.DA . . . a-na UNUGI šiš-shu-zi, etc., etc. Cf. already p. 116, note 4.

This is, it seems to me, the best emendation according to the traces visible. I-na qātī-ia i-din, "give into my hand," is as much as idlinim, "give (unto me)."

'5 See Chapter III, p. 35, note 3.

'6 Shaššu šakšēnu, c. acc., "to put something on a place," "to make a resting place for something," i.e., "to store it." Here (and p. 52, n. 5) šakšēnu is construed with double acc., the possibility of which appeared to Jensen, K. B., VP, p. 412, doubtful. Notice also the vulgar preterit form (i)ish-ki(-nu) for (i)ish-kū(-nu), due, no doubt, to the influence of n, aided by the i of iš; cf. also p. 97, n. 7. If one prefers, he may see in šakšēnu a II1 of šakšēnu (cf. ushum of 370) + 1 w šakšēnu (for šakšēnu), taking it as a causative of II, for which see Delitzsch, H. W. B., p. 322a, "etwas an einem Ort aufstellen, niederlegen."
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 Dār-\textsuperscript{š}Enlil\textsuperscript{a-šu} ma\textsuperscript{a}. This very same city is mentioned, among other places, also in B. E., XIV, 118:11 (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 \textsuperscript{š}U-bar-\textsuperscript{š}rum (48:7). From this it would follow that both\textsuperscript{a} 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 Kudurāni, B. E., XIV, 112:7 (14th year of Kadashman-Turqu) and Zakirum, B. E., XIV, 114:17 (15th year of Kadashman-Turqu); in other words, Ubarrum, the writer of Nos. 39 and 40, is the father of Kudurāni, the writer of Nos. 26–28. Ubarrum, accordingly, must have lived at least from the 14th resp. 15th year of Kadashman-Turquē (when he appears as the father of the two sons just mentioned) till the 5th resp. 8th year of Kudurri-Enlil (when he is introduced as contemporary of \textsuperscript{š}Na-\textsuperscript{š}hu-\textsuperscript{š}Marduk\textsuperscript{a}), 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., when 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{a}Written here Dār-\textsuperscript{š}Enlil\textsuperscript{a-šu} ma\textsuperscript{a}, see also p. 9, note 1.

\textsuperscript{b}Cf. e.g., 18:8, \textsuperscript{š}Na-\textsuperscript{š}hu-\textsuperscript{š}Marduk = B. E., XIV, 118:16; 124:14 (8th year of Kudur-Enlil); 48:11, m\textsuperscript{š}u Rammâni (= 1YM) ĕrîâ = B. E., XIV, 118:19; 120:7 (5th year of Kudur-Enlil); 48:20, m\textsuperscript{š}u L-GR.A\textsuperscript{š}mek = B. E., XIV, 118:12. Cf. also 48:22, m\textsuperscript{š}Bu-no \textsuperscript{š}NIV.\textsuperscript{š}B = B. E., XIV, 115:3 (here son of m\textsuperscript{š}In-ni-šlu, 1st year of Kadashman-Enlil). In 42:5,7, m\textsuperscript{š}U-bar-\textsuperscript{š}rum appears as contemporary of m\textsuperscript{š}Be-la-\textsuperscript{š}nu (1.17), which latter is likewise mentioned in B. E., XIV, 118:21 (5th year of Kudur-Enlil) as the son of m\textsuperscript{š}kur\textsuperscript{š}garâ. This last passage is, therefore, against the signification "eunuch" which Jensen, K.B., VI, pp. 62, 9; 377, assigns to KUR.GAR.RA = kurgarâ.

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

\textsuperscript{d}See introduction to No. 26, p. 117.

\textsuperscript{e}B. E., XIV, 112:7 | 114:17.

\textsuperscript{f}Cf. No. 48:7 with 1, 8 and with B. E., XIV, 118:16 | 124:14.
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-l-ia-ia-ma
3 a-na eqli (= A.SHAG?) ū amelī akil erishēt (PA²(?).EN GAR) ša be-l-ia
4 šú-ül-mu i-na bu-ut eqélī (= A. SHAG)mesh
5 ša Tuk(= KU)-kul-ti-Ē.KUR₷]*
shā b[c-ū]
6 ish-pu-ra ik-te-di-ir-[ru?]*
7 ū ummānī (= SAB)⁴ša pa-te-sîmek
ū [la-me-e?] me-c
8 ish-tum² nāra Tuk(= KU)-kul-ti-Ē.
KUR⁴*
9 a-di ā-ga-ri-eš ša ta-mi-ir-ti

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" greetings! With regard to the fields

of Tukulti-Ē.KUR concerning which my "Lord" has written (I beg to state) they have established their boundaries.

And as regards the workmen of the pa-te-si and the [flood?] of waters extending from the canal Tukulti-Ē.KUR

to the plains in the neighborhood

1 Doubtful, supplied according to l. 4. Might be SHA(G).TAM., for which see Chapter III, p. 35, note 3.
2 The PA = akīl is uncertain. We possibly might have to read amēlu gishENGAR, i.e., "one that tends the watering machine." For gishENGAR, i.e., norjah, "Schäpfwerk," see Hilprecht, B. E., IX, p. 40, note to 1. 2, cf. Codex of Hammurabi, 38:11, 14, and above p. 35, note 3. A greeting "to the field and irrigator(s)" would be, it seems, more in accord with the position of Ubarrum, the royal inspector of canals and waterways.
3 I-na bu-ut = ina mulū: = ša or ánkum, see Chapter II, p. 24, note 7.
4 Cf. here "Tukulti(= KU)⁴-Ē.KUR, father of "Hitli-ia, B. E., XIV, 48:7 (6th year of Na-zi-Mu-ra-tash), As KU has also the value tukulti, we might transcribe Tukulti(= KU)⁴kultü.
5 For the double r cf. Behrens, L. S. S., IP, pp. 47, 11; 29, 4; 35. As P has also passive signification (Delitzsch, Gram., p. 232) we might translate: "their boundaries are established."
6 So according to No. 24:20 (see p. 50, note 1)? An emendation [a-]me-e or me-te-ṣaq me-e, Hinke, B. E., Series D, Vol. IV, p. 146, 1. 31, is, according to the traces visible, impossible.
7 Notice the m in ish-tum .... a-di.
8 For ugārā, i.e., "die zur Stadt gehörenden Ländereien," see Meissner, A. P., p. 123.
10 ha-am-ri sá i-na mi-li ma-ša-ri-ta
11 mu-ú is-ba-tu-ma ip-ti-nu-ma
12 iz-zi-zu ith-a-tu-ni ụ har-bu
13 shá "Bu-ur-ru-ti shá i-na
14 ta-mi-ir-ti ha-am-ri
15 za-ku dū(= dul)-ul-la ul i-pu-usu
16 mu-ú ma-la-ra-tu-tum[...]
17 ụ ummnáni (= SAB)ha shá be-h-i-a
dū(= dul)-ul-la
18-20[...]
21[...] shá Där-šu En-ši,am-še-kī
22[...]

1 With ha-am-ri, cf. I. 14; 52 : 19, zêr(?) eqî(= A.ŠAG) ha-am-rum; B. E., XIV, 114:13, 14, Ha-am-rī. Delitzsch, H. W. B., p. 283a, mentions a hamru without giving a translation. Küchler, Medizin, p. 116, renders hamaru by "swollen." In our passage here hamru 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. ṭāḇ, Hab. 3:15, Ex. 8:10, and suggests a translation "Uberschwemmungsgeladet."

2 Ma-la-rī (a side form of mahrī) has a plural ma-la-ra-u-tum (l. 16); from it follows that mu-ú (l. 16) must likewise be a plural.

3 Ip-ti-nu-ma, root ṭāv. 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. 553b, assigns to it. Patānu here is parallel to ụbōtu, and, because it follows the latter, expresses the result of the ụbōtu. Delitzsch, i.e., mentions a πάτω, "Schlingen," i.e., lit. "a seizing," thus showing again that patānu is a synonym of ụbōtu. The waters took (ụbōtu) and seized (πάτω) the fields during a former flood and, as a result of this, were cast into disorder (cf. Arab. ụbānu, c. i., exciter, séduire); pisnat, discorde, régradation, troubles, etc.). Still better it would be to derive this patānu, with Hilprecht, from patānu = ụbōtu, "to eat, to devour," Delitzsch, H. W. B., p. 553b, hence patānu, īpīn, īpītan!

4 Iz-zi-zu ith-ta-tu-ni is (like is-ba-tu-ma ip-ti-nu-ma) a ụr ṭà ẹsuwàr; lit.: "as regards the workmen . . . they arose, subdued the waters (sc. by leading them back into their dams, cf. 40:19)." Ith-ta-tu-ni I take as a ụr of nōn, "to subdue," Delitzsch, H. W. B., p. 295b.

5 For har-bu see p. 130, note 6.

6 Za-ku I take as a permansive of nōn, "to be or become free of something" (Delitzsch, H. W. B., p. 254a).

7 For du-delha see also Behrens, L. S. S., II, p. 8.

8 Cf. above, note 2.
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23 [. . . ] li-ish-pu-ú-ra-[am-]ma¹ .... may send
24–26 [. . . ] ....
27 um-ma-a a-na be-lı-i-a i-na [. . . ] Also the following to my "Lord": "In ....
28–37 [. . . ] ....
29 shá be-lı ish-pu-ra a-na be-lı-i-a concerning which my 'Lord' has inquired (I beg
to say that) I have sent it to my 'Lord.'"
30 ush-te-bi-la

XIII.

Ubarrum, the royal superintendent of rivers and canals, lodges a complaint against
the prefect of Dûr-Sukal-patra². Time of Kudur-Enlîl, 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-patra² for neglect of
a certain canal, ll. 3–20.

The answer to this complaint lodged with King Kudur-Enlîl by Ubarru is, no
doubt, contained in No. 42 : 4f.: "As regards the fields, which my 'Lord' has given
and concerning which Ubarru 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-lı or King
Kudur-Enlîl, teaching us that the prefect held Dûr-Sukal-patra as a fief of the crown
(eql'ahsh shá be-lı id-dı-na, 42 : 4, cf. below l. 11, shá i-na libbi²³-shú ú-ma-al-lu-ú), and
that royal officers never mention their titles when writing to their "Lord," but have
to be content with the attribute "servant," arду.

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

¹ Notice here the long ú in bá and cf., e.g., 21 : 28, im-pu-ú-tu; 46 : 12, ibr-ú-un-ub (or ibr-ú-un-ub?); 38 : 2, lu-ul-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-an be-
   li-li[a bul-lik]
2 um-ma-a a-na be-h-ia-a-ma
3 ša-za-an-nu šá Dûr-Šukal (= PAP?)-pad-ra
4 nam-ga-ra is-si-[ki-]ir a-di ši-šī-la
5 la-mi-ra-tē šá hr-ar-pi i-sha-ag-qu-ūʾ
6 ū 20 har-bu šá ub-bi-li
7 [ish-shá(?)]-ak-nu ut i-di-ik-ku-ūʾ

Thy servant Ubarrum; before the presence of my "Lord" may I come,
speaking thus to my "Lord":
The prefect of Dûr-Sukal-patra 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.

1 For formation cf. Dûr-Kurī-Galzu and Dûr-m[aErrish]-i-apal-idin, B. E., XIV, 18:7.
2 For the various occurrences and writings see under "Names of Rivers and Canals."
3 Sakûra when used of "canals" means "to shut off, stop, dam" (opp. pitā). Cf. is-ki-ir, 40:9; e si-ki-ir-ma,
   3:18; is-si-ki-ir, 34:32; us-si-ki-ir, 12:5. *šuṭikīr = šuṭikīr = šuṭikīr (the i in the last syllable on account of the
   r) see p. 67, note 7) = šuṭilār, a P, so far known only from this passage.
4 Shi-šīla here hardly the same as sketti (= L.A.SAR), "field" (Hommel, S. L., p. 76 to 80, 146), but the fem.
   of ški-nā, "two"; as such in opposition to "20," 1. 6. For the construction cf. škinā ūmē and šedalti ūmē, Delitzsch,
   Gram., p. 333.
5 Tamirāti are the fields situated in the immediate neighborhood and environs of a city, or a flooded, inundated
   district, cf. No. 30:9,14, pp. 127, 128.
6 This writing here proves that bar-bu (I:6; Delitzsch, H. W. B., p. 289a) has to be read harpu. Johns, A. D. D.,
   p. 131, assigns the word bar-būtu a meaning "waste," or "cropped," that is to say, "stubble" land. Myhrman, Z. A.,
   XVI, p. 176, renders har-būtu by "Verwüstung!" In view of the fact that har-bu has to be read harpu and that it renders
   the Sumerian EBUR.IG.11.1.DA, "the great (long) harvest," and is the same word as the Hebrew הַר, "harvest,"
   the ta-mi-ti šaš bar-pi must be "fields" that are "with crops ready to be harvested." For bar-bu, cf. 17:33 | 11:14,18,
   24 | 39:12 | 68:20; har-bu e. numeral, 28:21, 22 | 40:6 | 60:2 | 68:5, 6; har-bī, 8:18; har-bi e. numeral, 3:21,
   37 | 34:28, 33, 34 | 64:10, 14, 15. See also P. 96:9 and Feisser, i.e., p. 7, note.
7 I-sha-ag-qu may be taken either as 3d pers. plur. masc. pres. 1: "so that they (= German indefinite 'man')
   irrigate or can irrigate (= ein Feld tränken, bewässern, Delitzsch, H. W. B., p. 685v, b) only (up to) two fields with crops";
   or, which is less probable, ishāqqu may be considered a IV₂ = ishāqqu, dependent upon bar-pi. In this case ta-mi-ti šaš bar-pi
   would have to be considered as a kind of "composite noun," the gender of which being determined by the word nearest to the verb,
   i.e., by bar-pi, a plur. masc. Translate: "so that only two fields with crops are watered."
8 Objekts counted are construed as, and stand in, the singular. Cf. here note 6 and p. 95, note 6.
9 Ub-bi-li here not "Zersetzung durch Insekten," Jensen, K. B., VI, p. 580, but "ein sehr trocken sein," i.e., "to
   be very dry." Lit., "which exist" (IV šakānu) as "very dry ones." Or have we to read šaḫal-ak-nu = Pern. I, with
   the same meaning? The size of the break would speak rather for the latter emendation.
10 The same form occurs again in 66:6 (context mutilated). To derive it from ṣama (i.e., ṣāma (?), Delitzsch,
   H. W. B., p. 216b), "to overthrow, cast down, tear down," does not give any sense. We would expect here some such
   significations as "to perish," but this meaning is not yet established for daqā. Delitzsch, H. W. B., p. 52a, mentions a
   root ṣaḥi, "darben, mangeln, etc., zurecken." This would fit very well here, but on account of the writing with d
   this root could not be ṣaḥi, but had to be ṣaḥi, i.e., ṣuṣu (related with postbiblical ṣucc, "trouble, distress,
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8 [be]-li me-e a-a-ú-ti ish-ki-ma
9 [. . .]ú nam-gar-ra is-ki-ir
10 be-li liš-pu-ra-am-ma ta-mi-ir-la
11 našù i-na liškiššù ú-ma-al-úš lish-ki
12 ú ub-bu-la li-shá-ak-li-maš
13 be-li mi-ig-ra ú e-ri-shá
14 la i-ša-ad-di nam-gar-shú mush-shur
15 ú šú-ú a-na p-a-an nam-ga-ri
16 šá be-li-ia a-shi-ib mu-ú i-na nam-ga-ri-shú
17 m[a]-a'-du ú šú-ú a-na p-a-an
18 nam-ga-ri-an-ni 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)

"to embarrass," etc.). I propose, therefore, to take i-di-iq-shu as standing for šu-qiššu, šu-qiššu, šu-qiššu, šu-uppu, šu-uppu, Il p. 96, "to be in want." The long ú at the end is not the plural, but the relative in pause: šu-qiššu, after ša (1.6). Hilprecht (letter of July 9, 1908) proposes to derive dił-káš from diš-ká, postulating the significations: 1, "umstürzen, 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 i-di-iq-šu-š a p or IV (cf. No. 26: 14, i-di-ik-ga-a, see p. 119, note 3) of šu-š as šu-š with passive signification: "and in consequence of which (= a consequevum) are cast down, destroyed!" The last derivation and translation is possibly better than the one mentioned above ("are in want").

1 A-a-ši-la cannot be here translated by "wer, welcher" ("H. W. B., p. 476), but must be, on account of its position (after the noun), an adjective. A-a-ši-la me-e = "what waters?" me-e a-a-ši-la = "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 es-ni = es-ni, "behold"): in such a way, with such waters he has watered the fields!"

2 Read [u šu]-ša? For -ma ú cf. also p. 138, note 4. Translate: "Thus he has watered seeing that (in) 'that one' (šu-ša) has shut off the canal."

3 Lit., "with which he (i.e., my 'Lord') has filled his heart," i.e., "which he has given him." Hence i-na liššiššù mašša ša-en, "and having the same meaning as šub-iššu, "to cover something, to suppress it, to bring to end, to end."

4 Mu�-šu-šaš, Il p. permansive in circumstantial clause: "leaving," i.e., "who leaves." This explains how the prefect "shut off" (ša-ši-ki-šu, 1, 4) the canal: he left it, paid no attention to it, neglected it (Permansive Il = 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, 1, 6).

5 A-na pa-an . . . a-shi-ib ina pán ōšaš, one that dwells, is at the head of something, i.e., a superintendent. Cf. here also 13: 9, a-shi-ib pa-ní-šiš-nu. Or is it only "the one who lives near it?"
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19 i-na-nam-ga-ri-shú(?) me-e lī-ki-ma
20 nam-gar-ra šá be-li-ia lī-maš-shi-iš

lead (take) waters through (into) his canal and (in this case) let alone my "Lord's" canal!

As regards the waters of the Ilu-ipush and the waters of the Nalah—

21 me-e nār'lu Išu-ipu-usu
22 ū me-e nār'lu Na-la-āš
23 me-e zi-iti šá be-li-ia

waters in which my "Lord" has an interest—

24 be-li a-na GÛ.ÈN.Å shulmu (= DI) li-ɪq-ɪl-ma
25 a-na ki-sir(= BU)-ti līsh-pu-ru-ni-im-ma
26 līd-di-nu-ma e-ri-shú la i-ma-ad-di.

"let my 'Lord' send greeting to the sheriff that they lead (the waters) back into the dam 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-Shuriash to his sheriff Amel-Marduk. About 1325 B.C.

The King as shakkanakku šu 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 I.e., into the canal of the ḫazunu (l. 3) who had neglected it by forsaking it (l. 14).
2 I.e., my Lord may command that either he . . . or he lead (take).
3 Seeing that the ḫazunu has forsaken and neglected his canal, the king shall issue orders to the "superintendent" (who apparently is a higher official than the "prefect") that the latter lead waters through (into) the neglected canal and in this case do without the waters from the "Lord's" canal.
4 For the situation of this canal cf. the topographical map of Nippur in T. D. A. of U. of Pa., II, p. 223f., and see Clay, B., XIV, p. 7, comparing with it what has been said under nār'lu Nalah in "Names of Canals and Rivers," below.
6 For this title cf. introduction to No. 75, p. 133.
7 Lit., "speak greeting."
9 līš-pu-ru-ni-im-ma līd-di-nu-ma, in šak ēmūr: that they (the men instructed by the sheriff, i.e., the deputy sheriffs) may send or give orders that the waters of the two canals (l. 21, 22) be given back, returned, led back into their dams.
10 For i-ma-ad-di = i-ma-aḫ-ḫi, root šūš, see Jensen, K. B., VI, pp. 364, 557, "klagen, stöhnen, Wehklage erheben u. dergl.,” and cf. 13 : 18, u-ma-da = u-maštu.
in rank and influence, could not at all times work together in harmony and peacefulness. Then, as now, petty jealousies made themselves felt, which very often took the form of slander. Wheresoever and whensoever 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.

Hanibi, son of Sāmi, a shepherd, had complained to the King, his highest superior, of having been slandered by Errish-nādīn-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 (dimu), slanderers or other criminal offenders.

From 81 : 6f. we learn that such an official was known by the title GŪ.EN.NA, i.e., lit. "strength of the Lord," who may or may not have other GŪ.EN.NA's, i.e., deputy sheriffs, under him, for we read, i.e., ásh-shum mărēnušk Ni-ib-bu-rum shá GŪ.EN.NA-ka ash-shá-mi-ka im-ta-na-ah-ša-rum um-na-a a-na Măr-"In-ni-bi a-na di-ni [. . . ], i.e., "as regards the Nippurians whom thy sheriff has seized (lit. has received) upon thy command (I beg to state) the following: 'To Măr-Innibi for the purpose of judgment [he has taken them']."' Amel-Marduk, exercising here the functions of the GŪ.EN.NA, has, therefore, to be identified with the Amel-Marduk GŪ.EN.NA En-lītu, B. E.,

1 i.e., "Aku-ū-a-Bu-ni, the addressee of the letter, who, therefore, must have been a sheriff-in-chief.
2 See already above, p. 24, note 5.
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XIV, 136 : 1. From B. E., XIV, we furthermore learn that Amel-Marduk lived during the 5th and 8th year of Kudur-Entil; "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 "Errish(l)-nādin-shum, the slanderer, were held (kālū) for judgment; he had to be present (ū-kin-nu) when the several scribes made their final reports (ri-ša-a-nu šá DUB. SHAR<sup>mek</sup> šá NIN.AN<sup>mek</sup>, B. E., XIV, 136 : 1) or "drew the balance of accounts." In short, wherever and whenever the "affairs (amāti) of the King" were in need of the strong support of the "arm of the law," the GÜ.EN.NA had to give it; he was "the Lord's (EN-NA) strength (GÜ)," as such acting "for (or in place of) the King," ina muḫ LUGAL, p. 84, note 9.

Amel-Marduk seems to have advanced to the office of a GU.EN.NA from that of a amēnu 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 amēnu SAG.LUGAL. In his capacity as SAG.LUGAL he was present (ū-kin-nu) at the taking of the inventory of the flocks (mī-nu LIT.GUD ú GANAMLU). This very same tablet mentions also "Ha-ni-bi már Sa-a-mi (l.c., l. 12), the na-gid or "shepherd," who appears in our letter as the complainant (l. 7). There can, then, be no doubt that the Amel-Marduk of our letter has to be identified with the GÜ.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 (šaknu DUB) of the sheriff Amel-Marduk<sup>3</sup> to his "Lord," i.e., either to King Kudur-Entil 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, LÂ.LI, of the prefects, hazannu). Our letter may be transcribed and translated as follows:

1 B. E., XIV, 118 : 19.
2 L.c., 133a : 15.
3 The Amel-šu Marduk mentioned in the 13th year of Kū[a ...] B. E., XIV, 125 : 4, belongs to the reign of Ku[ri-Galzu]. This against Clay, l.c.
4 L.c., 127 : 3.
5 L.c., 135 : 3, 15.
6 L.c., 130 : 1.
7 L.c., 137 : 27.
8 For other occurrences see 40 : 24 | 45 : 19 | 46 : 11 | 50 : 5; B. E., XIV, 39 : 1 | 142 : 28; B. E., XV, 191 : 13; Meissner, Ideogramme, No. 2050; Hinke, B. E., Series D, IV, p. 264b. For the GÜ.EN.NA among the gods see my forthcoming volume on "The Religious Texts of the Temple Library."
9 The šlu-la-daš-shum after Amel-Marduk in B. E., XV, 171 : 6, which Clay, l.c., p. 266, takes to be a title, is, of course, an Imperat. III of ŠLU + šlu + m(a).
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1 a-na "Amel-šu-Marduk ki-bi-ma
2 um-ma sharru (= LUGAL)-ma
3 um-ma-a a-na "Amel-šu-Marduk
4 "Errish(t) (= NIN.IB)-nādin (= SE)-shum (= MU)
5 mār "Ap-pa'-na-a-[a]?
6 šá da-ba-ab [limnātim]
7 î-ši "Ha-ni-[bi ʾi]-bu-ub
8 "Dam-qu [mār ......]
9 [shá i]t-iš m [XXX-......]
10 [da-ba]-šab [limnātim ʾiḥub]
11 [......]
12 [......] "Errish- YYYY-......
13-17 [......]
18 [......] a bu(?) na(?)
19 [......]-di-in
20 [......]-da-kul
21 [......] be]-el da-ba-bi-shú
22 a-na m[uh]-ia
23 šú-bi-la-ash-shú.

To Amel-Marduk speak,
thus saith the King.
The following to Amel-Marduk:
Errish-nādin-shum,
son of Appanai,
who has slandered
Hanibi;
and Damqu, the son of ....
who has slandered Sin-......
and ....
...... Sin-......
......
......
......
......
......
......
......
......
......
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 alāku resp. ʾebū), “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)-šar (= AN)mēš, i.e., “NIM.GI is the king of the gods”—a formation parallel to Rammān-shar-šar

1 Or "Isin(= Ezen)-na-a-[a]?
(No. 36 : 1; B. E., XIV, 101 : 5 et passim), Marduk-shar-ili (B. E., XIV, 121 : 3), etc. Clay, B. E., XIV, p. 48b, mentions a NIM.GI-ra-bi (l.c., 142 : 5), and in B. E., XV, p. 38a, a NIM.GI-ra-bu (l.c., 130 : 3), adding in both cases: "(Cassite)". This addition he, no doubt, made on the strength of Delitzsch, Die Sprache der Kossäer, p. 26 : 41, where the Cassite nim-gi-ra-ab is explained by the Assyrian e-te-rum, "to protect." As, however, NIM.GI-ra-bi, resp. NIM.GI-ra-bu, corresponds to such names as Shamash-rabû (B. E., XV, 183 : 3) or Ilu-ra-bi (B. E., XIV, 39 : 7), resp. Ilu-rabu (l.c., 106 : 4), we have to understand the so-called Cassite vocabulary cum grano salis! NIM.GI-ra-ab (ra-bi, rabû) must be translated by "NIM.GI is (the) great one (sc. among the gods)." This "great one" was, like NIN.IB, a god of lightning, "one who smites the enemies," and also "one who protects (ētir) the faithful." In this wise it happened that NIM.GI-ra-ab came to be looked upon as the e-te-rum, the "protector" par excellence. Such an E-di-ru we find among the gods of Š-saq-il, III R., 66, Rev. 13b. And as NIN.IB was identified with Enlil, so NIM.GI, resp. NIM.GI-ra-bi, was considered to be one with Har-be (= Enlil); hence the name NIM.GI-ra-Har-be (C. B. M. 3446, Clay, B. E., XIV, 48b) has to be read Étir-ra-Harbe, "a protector is Harbe." NIM.GI becomes thus the name of a Cassite god who played originally the rôle of the "Son," but who, later on, was identified with the "Father," with Harbe.

The several subject matters of this letter are clearly indicated by the stereotyped repetition of the um-ma-a a-na be-li-ia-ma and are the following:

(a) Answer to an inquiry of the King as to whether the chariots have gone out to the place previously designated, ll. 5–12.
(b) The five old chariots shall go out on the expedition as commanded, ll. 12–14.
(c) Suggestion as to how the gouvernement and the fortress may be protected by the cities and by the writer, ll. 15–24.
(d) Rectification of the writer's former suggestion as to the use of one chariot, coupled with the request that the King command either the sak-shup-par or the writer to go out with two chariots, while other two are to be left behind to guard the fortified camp, ll. 25–37.

The letter reads:

1 ardi-ka "NIM.GI-shar (= LUGAL)-
   di(= AN)[mesh]
2 a-na di-na-an be-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":

With regard to what my "Lord" has written, saying:

"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, and the five old chariots shall go to wheresoever my 'Lord' shall command."

1 For bal resp. askash as plural sign cf. I, 15, am-nas-tum askulu and see Chapter I, p. 12, note 1.
2 EN.NU.UN = EN.NUN = nassantu, H. W. B., p. 478a. See also p. 37, note 9.
3 Objects counted stand in, and are construed as, singulars—hence tu-si-im ma-tal-lak, 1, 8—cf. i-ba-ash-shi, I, 12; te-bo-at, I, 24, and see p. 93, note 6. In I, 34, I swarkabtu are treated, however, as a masc. singl.: til-li-ik for la talik. See also note 10.
4 Delitzsch, H. W. B., p. 425b, mentions a root sw without giving its signification. According to the context maridu may have some such meaning as "to ask for," "summon," "(to command) to go or bring out" (cf. Arab. marada, "pousser"), "to be in need of." This passage shows that maridu has an in the Pret. and Pres.: amurad, amurad.
5 By itself this in e₂₋₂₇, expressed in the form of a circumstantial clause (Pret. plusPres., 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-si-im be taken in the sense of either "hast thou brought out" (this had to be tushēgi) or "thou (they) shalt (shall) go" (this required a form tuss, cf. I, 26, i-sa-am-ma).
6 Literally: "As regards me 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)?"
7 This may be either Pres. of basku, "to be," or Pret. of basu, "to come," plus ski, referring back to V swarkabtu.
8 For this -ma cf. 35 : 21, p. 124, note 8.
10 By translating as given above, I connect ûlak with V-ma swarkabtu, cf. I, 34 lit-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 I, 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 gouvernement?"

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. Alaku ana girri e. acc., "to go (march) with something to," here apparently used of military expeditions. Cf. tebā ana girri, I, 24.

1 Undoubtedly a shortened sentence for ashokura annatum alubal shā beiti ishpara umma. Notice the position of annatum!

2 NAM = polhāti, phāhi is well known. For naubu e. acc. and inu see p. 139, note 6.

3 Cf. the later kii-i i-na aluX, us-ba-ku-ni. Ash-ba-ku-ma a . . . ir-te-ni-id-du-ma is, like i-na-aš-sa-ru . . .

te-ba-at (note 7, q. v.), a circumstantial clause with a change of subjects. The subject of ash-ba-ku-ma is the writer in his capacity as "general" (i.e., his chariots and men) and that of ir-te-ni-id-du-ma are the "enemies."

4 Notice the -ma at. Cf. here "die Wagen sha rākhšāhun dikíuma u shinu muskāhurāma rāmākhūshāhin ūtanāllākhā, deren Wagenleiber gefallen war, während sie selbst verlassen waren und für sich selbst umherfuhren," quoted by Delitzsch, Gram., p. 364, from Sunh., VI, 87.

5 Jensen, K. B., VI, p. 317, has shown (against Delitzsch, H. W., B., p. 612f.), who enumerates four roots šāli that there is only one šāli, but the significations which he assigns to this verb (fliesen, nachfolgen, hinterhergehen, treiben) do not fit here. Nagel, B. A., IV, p. 489, argued on the basis of Letters of Hammurabi, 34:7, for a meaning "holen, nehmen," comparing it with Jud. 14:9, "and the honey yāyāyā yāyā yāyā he took into his hands." The best translation of פָּלַל, because construed e. acc. and aut, would be, it seems to me, "they went (sc. to take, plunder, cf. also I, 27)," "they invaded," "swept down upon."

6 For shabatu (asshata, asshata), "treiben," see Jensen, K. B., VI, p. 533. Here, because applied to a "general" in connection with chariots = "to command."

7 I-na-aš-sa-ru . . . te-ba-at is a circumstantial clause (Perm. plus Pres.), with a change of subjects. The subject of i-na-aš-sa-ru is alubal, while that of te-ba-at is V-ma šimarkabtu (cf. note 3). For such constructions see Delitzsch, Gram., I, 152, pp. 364, 363 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  và  it-šu  a-na  tur (= KU)-ru-ki-ta²
    aneme=nakru (= PAP)
26  ul  i-had (= PA)-di²  us-sa-am-ma
27  i-hab-ba-at  um-ma-a  a-na  be-li-ia-ma
28  be-li  a-na  sak-shu-par⁴  liq-bi-[ma]
29  Il  izzî-narkabtu  a-na  gir-ri  ša  be-li³
    i-gab-bi-ū
30  li-lî-ik  à  a-na-ku  lu-uk-ka-li-ma³
31  i-na  Il  izzî-narkabtu  bi-ir-ta  ša  be-li³
32  lu-us-sur²  à  a-la-ka
33  be-li  ish-tap-ra-am-ma
34  Il  izzî-narkabtu  it-ti-ia  lil-li-ik⁴
35  ù  Il  izzî-narkabtu  li-ik-ka-li-ma³
36  bi-ir-ta  ša  be-li-i[α]
37  li-is-sur⁴

And with regard to the one (chariot with
which I was) to smite (the enemy)
so that (t)he (enemy)
may not (again) become fresh, go out, and
plunder, the following to my “Lord”:
“My ‘Lord’ may give orders to the sak-
shuppur
that he go with two chariots to whereso-
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 Il-šu, sc. narkabtu, is the fem. of edu, “one.”
2 Inf. Il° of ssql.  Jensen, K. B., VI, pp. 421, 436, 450, 498, zer-, niederschlagen; Delitzsch, H. W. B., p. 714a,
etzweireisen, zerzerrten.  Turraktu is used here apparently in the sense of mahātu, 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 (sc. the enemy).”
3 A reading i-po-di, from sslk, “to destroy” (cf. tapši, “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-di from
sslk, “to sin”; and as each and every sin is a “Vermessheit (gegen Gott),” I translated as given above. Prof. Hilprecht
suggests a translation, “mögliche sich nicht freuen (i-had-di = i-hat-di, v. sslk),” d. h., “mögliche kein Vergnügen davon
finden auszuräcken,” in anderen Worten, “mögliche nicht freilich darauf losplündern.” (Personal communication of July 9, 1908.)
4 For the sak-shuppur see above, Chapter III, pp. 37, note 12.
5 Notice the difference between lukkalima, l. 30 (= 1st person) and liikalima, l. 35 (= 3d person). Both forms
are IV° of sslk, “to be kept back,” “to be retained.”
7 As narkabtu is fem. (p. 137, n. 3), we would expect here là ballik, 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 birth of ll. 31, 36 has, of course, nothing to do with
that of l. 28?) He leaves it, however, to the King as to whom to send out or to keep behind with the chariots requested.
LETTERS TO CASSITE KINGS

XVI.

No. 38 (= C. B. M. 1955). (Cf. photographic reproduction, Pl. VII, 18, 19.)

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) ṢUGH, generally read Tish₄u and identified either with NIN.IB or with Ishtar, is here apparently a name for iš-En-lil; (2) the strange form nap-ṭi (ll. 4, 6) for nap-sha-ṭi(?); (3) the unusual stat. constr. in shikittum (=NIG.GÈL)₄ for nap-ṭi-ka (l. 6); (4) the expression a-na li-ti for single a-na (ll. 14, 17); (5) the two new words a-da-tum₄ and il-ḥu-u; (6) the long ṣ in lu-ā-ul-li-i₄ (l. 2).

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) A-da-tum₄ and il-ḥu-u have been sent, ll. 15–18.
(b) 12 qa of barley shall be removed, as per previous order, ll. 19–21.

1 ardi-ka "Shi-ri-iq-tum a-na d[i-na-an]
2 be-ši-ia lu-ā-ul-li-i₄
3 ṢUGH ṣ har-rat
din Nippur (= EN.I.L)[*]
4 nap-ṭi be-ši-ia li-šu-su-rum
5 ṢUSH(NIN.IB) u ṢUSH NIN. MAGH a-shib
6 ša-ału-ki shikittum (=NIG.GÈL)₄
7 li-šu-su-rum ma-an-nu pa-an
8 ba-nu-tum ša be-ši-ia li-mur

Thy servant Shiriqtum; before the presence
of my "Lord" may I come!
Tish₄u and the queen of Nippur
may protect the life of my "Lord";
Errish and NIN.MAGH who inhabit
the city (i.e., Nippur) may protect thy creatures!
Whosoever
may see the gracious face of my "Lord"

¹ Notice here the long ṣ, out of ša + a (of 1st person), in lu-ā-ul-li-i₄. Though this ṣ may be called a graphically long ṣ, it need not be a morphologically long ṣ (for lu-ā-ul-li-i₄ may stand for ša + Ša-ul-li-i₄, a form well known from the inscriptions, but not yet found in tablets from the Cassite period, Hilprecht). But then Ša-ul-li-i₄ would have to be a 4th, while in this and all other passages it is evidently a 1st.

² For introduction, ll. 3–11, see above, Chapter III, pp. 39ff.
FROM THE TEMPLE ARCHIVES OF NIPPU.

9  ú(?!) man-nu da-ba-ba ṭaḥ( = H)\textsuperscript{b} \\
10 [a-na] be-ši-lia li-ū-te-mi \\
11 [um-ma-a a-na be-ši-lia-[ma] \\
[... large break ...] \\
12 ... \\
13 [...]mesh i-qa-bu-ū \\
14 a-na li-ti be-ši-lia \\
15 i-li-qa-a\textsuperscript{2} 2 MA\textsuperscript{a} ša-a-da-tum\textsuperscript{mesh} \\
16 ū 2 il-šu-ū\textsuperscript{a} \\
17 a-na li-ti be-ši-lia \\
18 il-te-bi-ta \\
19 ū ši-di-tum\textsuperscript{a} be-ši li-mur \\
20 12 [SHE].BAR i-na-[šu-ū ki] \\
21 [ash-pu?] ra-ka.\textsuperscript{7} \\

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 ilḫū \\
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(?)

---

\textsuperscript{1}For šitu cf. King, Letters of Hammurabi, I, p. XLII; Nagel, B. A., IV, p. 479, and especially Jensen, K. B., VI, pp. 337, 403, 466, who quite correctly recognized that a-na šitu (or, as in our letter, a-na šitu) is as much as ana, "zu hin."

\textsuperscript{2}As the context is mutilated, it is hard to tell whether this is the 3d pers. fem. (or masc.) plural (=iliqd = iliqt = iliqt(ā); for the vowel ā, instead of a, see also Behrens, L. S. S., II, p. 53), or whether this is a singular, parallel to it-te-bi-ta (l. 18), the long ā at the end indicating the chief sentence. By itself it might be also a 3d pers. plur. (or sing.) preteterit (iliqt = iliqt, see p. 19, note 5), or even a IV\textsuperscript{1} = iliqt(ā), see above, p. 119, note 3.

\textsuperscript{3}MA is here an abbreviation of ma-na (cf. also B. E., XV, 6:11), just as SHŪ is abbreviated from shu-shū (i.e., soss), cf. B. E., XV, 199:29; 40\textsuperscript{1}19:20; 73:15; 154:45; 149:44, etc. See p. 77, note 1.

\textsuperscript{4}A-da-tum\textsuperscript{mesh} must be something that was measured according to ma-na—a kind of wool? Strange is here the šaš between MA and a-da-tum\textsuperscript{mesh}, seeing that the "object measured" follows almost invariably directly (i.e., without a šaš) upon the "measure," cf. 23:21; 27:31, etc. The adattu mentioned in Delitzsch, II, W. B., p. 26a, and i.e., p. 31b, are out of question here. The former means "Wohnstätte," and the latter "corbeille," Thureau-Dangin, Z. A., XVII, 196, 1. We may, however, consider it as standing for adatum, adatum, adatum, adatum (sc. šipitu), i.e., "dunkelfarbige, dunkelrote, braunrote Wolle" (cf. IS\textsuperscript{a}, Delitzsch, II, W. B., p. 26a).

\textsuperscript{5}If a-da-tum\textsuperscript{mesh} be one kind, 2 (sc. ma-na) il-šu-ū might possibly be another kind of wool. The form (ilḫū) is, however, against this supposition, for we would expect a formation like ilḫī (eum. on account of šipitu) if this existed. Have we to suppose a reading like: 2 (šipitu) ilḫū-ū?

\textsuperscript{6}Ši-di-tum, "provender" (Delitzsch, II, W. B., p. 563b: Reisekost, Proviant), occurs also in B. E., XV, 143:3 | 154:45 (Clay's copy gives here ad(!)-di-tum), and ši-di-su(= šidit-su) in B. E., XV, 168:30, 33. (Cf. here also the ši(!)-ši(!)-ti of B. E., XV, 87:10?)

\textsuperscript{7}Emendation is hardly correct! We would expect kt (sha) ana be-ši-lia ashpu.
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: $IN_{mekh} (= straw)$ was read instead of $KAN.NI_{mekh} (= pots)$. 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 ūluup 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 Dûr-Kuri-Galzu for one purpose or another, ll. 23–25.

1 [ardi-ka = X . . . .]
2 a-na di-[na-an be-ši-ia]
3 [lu]-tik a[m-ma-a a-na be-ši-ia-ma]
4 [aššum šu] ti[a-ash-pu-ra]
5 [. . . . .] be(?) ú GI DUG( = ḪI).GA
6 [. . . . .] a uš-te-b[i-l]a
7 ú3 [ar] di-ka = Aḫu-ra(?)-ašša(?)

8 GI DUG( = ḪI).GA a-na be-ši-ia
9 uš-te-bi-la
10 ú i-na bu-ul di-qa-ra-ti
11 a-na ra-di-i al-la-p[a]r
12 ú šum ú = IN_{mekh} be-ši
13 am-mi an-na-ša še-bi-la

Thy servant X . . . . ;

before the presence of my "Lord"

may I come, speaking thus to my "Lord":

[With regard to thy inquiry(?) . . . .]

and the good reeds

. . . . has brought

(I beg to state that) thy servant

Aḫurashša

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 = qumû šubû, good, i.e., sound, reeds that are not rotten.
2 ú introduces here the apodosis.
3 Or "Aḫu-ašš(?)-ašš(?)-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 $diqariti$. The "order-filler" mistook $KAN.NI$ for $IN$ and sent, accordingly, "straw."
5 Am-mi = ana-mi = mi₇. $Mi₇$, therefore, is an abbreviation for $minu$, "what," Jensen, K. B., VI', p. 472. For another $mi₇$ = $minu$ = $mi₇$, see p. 121, note 11.
14 1 billu (= GUN) erû (= URUDU) be-tî
15 li-she-bî-lam-ma
16 si-il lu(?) 1-lu-ub da-a-a-bî?
17 lu-shal-li-imî
18 um-ma-a a-na be-tî-ia-ma
19 a-ma-ti shâ GÛ.ÉN.NA
20 ma-la t-ba-ash-shu-â
21 a-na be-tî-ia
22 pa-aq-da-at
23 a-na a-Dûr-Ku-ri-[Gal-zu]
24 [at-ta]-lak [ . . . ]
25 [. . . ]

My "Lord" may send one talent of copper.
May I bring the rest of the good hulup trees?
Also the following to my "Lord": "The affairs of the GÛ.ÉN.NA, as many as there are, are entrusted safely to my 'Lord.'
To Dûr-Kuri-Galzu I went . . . ."

XVIII.

No. 76 (= C. I. M. 3660). (Cf. photographic reproduction, Pl. XI, 28.)

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, l. 5) took its origin with the "son," who had to send it to the be-el SIE.BAR (l. 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 SIE.BAR, 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

---

1 The sign lu looks here like si in si-il, but a word si-lu-ub does not exist; or is si-lu-ub = su-la-up, "dates"? As, however, the things here mentioned are apparently building materials (reeds, bronze, hulup trees), I prefer to read as given above. If si-lu-ub = su-la-up be preferred, we might translate: "Shall I bring the rest of the good dates?"
2 The bi has here the appearance of TUR resp. I. Dailbi is a ja'nv form, expressing quality or occupation. Delitzsch, Gram., p. 168 (§ 65), No. 24. Cf. also the stress laid upon the quality of the GI, II, 5, 8.
3 On account of the in lu-shal-li-im, this form cannot be the third (which had to be lišallim), but must be the first person. But whether it be a I or II is doubtful. I take it to be a II, for which see King, Letters of Hammurabi, XI, p. 292.
4 See introduction to No. 75, p. 133.
5 It ought to be noticed here that the King, when addressed by his subjects, is called be-tî or EN-(lî), but when spoken of to a third person, is referred to as either LUGAL or be-el.
6 Cf. here also the request for such a report in No. 81 : 11, see pp. 114, 84ff.
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 ëšEnlil!

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 Dûr-îlu sends a messenger with a note to the King, then at Nippur. Another note, addressed to "NIN-nu-û-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 Dûr-îlu sent the present explanatory note to Sippar, whence it was brought back by "NIN-nu-û-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 Po-nu-û-ka might be, per se, connected either with i-dîn, "give thy face," i.e., "set thyself about to do something, arouse thyself, be determined," or with 1l 3-ba-ba-ûa.

2 IV1 of babâlu. With the signification here given cf., besides Delitzsch, H. W. R., p. 166b, also Jensen, K. B., VP, pp. 320, 378, and B. A., III, p. 541, le babîl pûna, "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 (sc. upon evil)," i.e., "be good," "do not delay." A babîl-libbî, accordingly, is something towards which one's heart is turned continually, the fondest thought of one's heart.

3 ëš, e. i-nu mu-unh-hi = "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.
VI.

CONCORDANCE OF PROPER NAMES.

ABBREVIATIONS.

addr., addressee; b., brother; "b.," brother (in address); cf., confer; d., daughter; f., father; f., following page; ff., following pages; l.c., loco citato; p., page; pp., pages; q.v., quod vide; s., son; si., sister; wr., writer.

Determinatives: ilu, god; 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 Archeological 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.

mA-a-ri, 47:3.
mA'i...], 69:4.
mAbi (= AD)-ia, 1. of Di-ni, 85:10.
mAhu (= SHESH)-i-a-a-Ba-ni, addr., "b." of Erba-

mA-hu-Ba-ni, wr., 2:3.
mAhu (= SHESH)-ni, 31:7.
mAhu (= SHESH)-shad(?)-ro, 45:7.
mA-shu-shi-na, addr., 78:1.
mA-shu-shi-shu-na, 54:11.
mA-en-Ba-ni-i, 86:16.
mA-en-Ba-ni-i, 1:2.
mA-ne(= SHESH)-shu(?), 48:1.
mA-ne-ki, 54:1.
mA-ne-ki, 75:5.
mA-ne-ki, 10:2.
mA-ne-shi, 75:5.
mA-ne-ri, 47:5.
mA-ne-shad(?)-ro, 45:7.
mA-ne-shi, 75:5.
mA-ne-shu(?), 54:1.
mA-ne-ri, 47:5.
mA-ne-shad(?)-ro, 45:7.
mA-ne-shi, 75:5.
mA-ne-shu(?), 54:1.
mA-ne-ri, 47:5.
mA-ne-shad(?)-ro, 45:7.
mA-ne-shi, 75:5.
mA-ne-shu(?), 54:1.
mA-ne-ri, 47:5.
mA-ne-shad(?)-ro, 45:7.
mA-ne-shi, 75:5.
mA-ne-shu(?), 54:1.
mA-ne-ri, 47:5.
mA-ne-shad(?)-ro, 45:7.
mA-ne-shi, 75:5.
mA-ne-shu(?), 54:1.
mA-ne-ri, 47:5.
mA-ne-shad(?)-ro, 45:7.
mA-ne-shi, 75:5.
mA-ne-shu(?), 54:1.
mA-ne-ri, 47:5.
mA-ne-shad(?)-ro, 45:7.
mA-ne-shi, 75:5.
mA-ne-shu(?), 54:1.
mA-ne-ri, 47:5.
mA-ne-shad(?)-ro, 45:7.
mA-ne-shi, 75:5.
mA-ne-shu(?), 54:1.
mA-ne-ri, 47:5.
mA-ne-shad(?)-ro, 45:7.
mA-ne-shi, 75:5.
mA-ne-shu(?), 54:1.
mA-ne-ri, 47:5.
mA-ne-shad(?)-ro, 45:7.
mA-ne-shi, 75:5.
mA-ne-shu(?), 54:1.
mA-ne-ri, 47:5.
mA-ne-shad(?)-ro, 45:7.
mA-ne-shi, 75:5.
mA-ne-shu(?), 54:1.
mA-ne-ri, 47:5.
mA-ne-shad(?)-ro, 45:7.
mA-ne-shi, 75:5.
mA-ne-shu(?), 54:1.
mA-ne-ri, 47:5.
mA-ne-shad(?)-ro, 45:7.
mA-ne-shi, 75:5.
mA-ne-shu(?), 54:1.
mA-ne-ri, 47:5.
mA-ne-shad(?)-ro, 45:7.
mA-ne-shi, 75:5.
mA-ne-shu(?), 54:1.
mA-ne-ri, 47:5.
mA-ne-shad(?)-ro, 45:7.
mA-ne-shi, 75:5.
mA-ne-shu(?), 54:1.
mA-ne-ri, 47:5.
mA-ne-shad(?)-ro, 45:7.
mA-ne-shi, 75:5.
mA-ne-shu(?), 54:1.
mA-ne-ri, 47:5.
mA-ne-shad(?)-ro, 45:7.
mA-ne-shi, 75:5.
mA-ne-shu(?), 54:1.
mA-ne-ri, 47:5.
mA-ne-shad(?)-ro, 45:7.
mA-ne-shi, 75:5.
mA-ne-shu(?), 54:1.
mA-ne-ri, 47:5.
mA-ne-shad(?)-ro, 45:7.
mA-ne-shi, 75:5.
mA-ne-shu(?), 54:1.
mA-ne-ri, 47:5.
mA-ne-shad(?)-ro, 45:7.
mA-ne-shi, 75:5.
mA-ne-shu(?), 54:1.
mA-ne-ri, 47:5.
mA-ne-shad(?)-ro, 45:7.
mA-ne-shi, 75:5.
mA-ne-shu(?), 54:1.
mA-ne-ri, 47:5.
mA-ne-shad(?)-ro, 45:7.
mA-ne-shi, 75:5.
mA-ne-shu(?), 54:1.
mA-ne-ri, 47:5.
mA-ne-shad(?)-ro, 45:7.
mA-ne-shi, 75:5.
mA-ne-shu(?), 54:1.
mA-ne-ri, 47:5.
mA-ne-shad(?)-ro, 45:7.
mA-ne-shi, 75:5.
mA-ne-shu(?), 54:1.
mA-ne-ri, 47:5.
mA-ne-shad(?)-ro, 45:7.
mA-ne-shi, 75:5.
mA-ne-shu(?), 54:1.
mA-ne-ri, 47:5.
mA-ne-shad(?)-ro, 45:7.
mA-ne-shi, 75:5.
mA-ne-shu(?), 54:1.
mA-ne-ri, 47:5.
mA-ne-shad(?)-ro, 45:7.
mA-ne-shi, 75:5.
mA-ne-shu(?), 54:1.
mA-ne-ri, 47:5.
MASCULINE NAMES

Adii(?)-GAB(?)-BA(?)-mo(? in Bāb-Adii-GAB.BA-ma (g.v.), 81: 14.

mAdii-la-á, 48: 9.

mAdii-Marduk, wr., 6: 2.

Ar-rap-ka-a-a-[um],1 53: 20, 27, 32.


mTit A-shur-shum (= MU)-tír (= KAR), wr., "h,” of mTit En-li-[bi]-nisheš-[šu], 77: 3.

[^]mAdii-šír-[ur], wr., 7: 2.

mBan-šî Marduk, wr., 8: 2.

mBan= (KAK)-a-sha-kîs Marduk, 1. wr., 9: 1.

2. 3: 16.

mBe-lu-á, 1. wr., 11: 1.

2. 42: 17.

mTit En(-) (= EN)-[ ... ]]= 53: 16 | 69: 4.

mBil (= EN) -[ ... ] = 69: 5.

mBil (= EN)-sa-tam, 23: 20.

mBil, 1. 57: 4.

mBun-ni-šî Errish(î) (= NIN.JB), 48: 22.


mBun-nu-â, 39: 13.

[^]mDu(?)-šî-šî-in, addr., "h,” or "ši,?” of miani-pa-taš-ma, 88: 1.

mDum-qu, 75: 8.

mDum-[ ... ]= 90: 3, 6.

mTit DUR-ši-nâr (= SÂB)-gab-ba, wr., 91: 3.

mTit DIL.BAT-Ba-ni, 14: 18.

1 "The Arca')pachasan.” Cf. B. E., XIV, 22: 15. "Ar-rap-ka-a-a-[um]. In our letter the sign rap looks very much like LUGAL, cf. also Clay, Sign List, B. E., XIV, Nos. 158 and 89. For the interchange of rap and LUGAL cf. dâ慕rap[b]-kam-me-ir and dâ慕Lugal-kam-me-ir.

Also the following readings might possibly be suggested: mPâ-la-an, mNâ-šâ-lu-[i]BU, see Chapter III, p. 52, note 3.

2 Or mTit En[ ... ]? 3 Or mTit En-ši.[ ... ]?

4 Or mTit En-ša-tam? 5 Or mTit En-ši.[ ... ]?

6 On account of the mér (not mérâ), 59: 14, I do not consider this person to be a brother of mTit PA.KU.SHESH.

SF-na and a son of mMel-šî Shu-qa-mu-na.

7 Cf. Donnu-Nergal in B. E., XIV, p. 42b.

8 Or mTit En-ša-li-a-[bak], q.v.

9 See also pp. 25, note 1; 110, note 3.

10 According to 1. 5 he is a bêl pa-ba-ti. A pêhêp mTit En-li-[bi]-nisheš-[šu] is mentioned in B. E., XIV, 99a: 41.

11 For the reading of NIN.JB = Errish(î), see The Monist, XVII (January, 1907), p. 140ff. Cf. also "Preface."
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Masculine Names

m išu Errish(t) (= MASI)-a-pal (= TUR. USII)-iddina (= SE)-mu, wr., 81 : 2.

m išu Errish(t) (= NIN.IB)-GA-BU-AN-NA=machel, wr., 17 : 2 | 18 : 1(?)

m išu Errish(t) (= L)-GIR-AN=machel, 48 : 20.

m išu Errish(t) (= NIN.IB)-n-edin (= SE)-abê (SIIESII)=machel, 52 : 13.

m išu Errish(t) (= NIN.IB)-n-edin (= SE)-ahum (= MU), s. of

m 1-pu-na-a-[a], 75 : 4.

m išu Errish(t)-zér-ib=il, wr., 15 : 1 | 16 : 2.

m si5i6.tu=zi-ri=ia, 9 : 15.

m Er-tcl=bu, s. of Ush-bu-la, 24 : 12.

m šīr=t = KAR, šīt=Marduk, wr., 12 : 2.

m Gi Gir-ga-mil, 3 : 13, 17, 20.

m Gu-za-AN, s. of m Ia-ua-a-a, 87 : 3.

m Ia=an-[bu], 68 : 23.

m 11a=na-[b], 75 : 7.

m Hū-ash-mur, 84 : 13.

m 11a-[di-ib-ib]-i, I. of I.1b[a]-a-[t]-u-ni=ta, 78 : 7.

m Hū-na-bi, 48 : 16.

m Hū-um-ji, s. of m Er=sa-[a]-Marduk, 58 : 6.


m Išu=Marduk, 19 : 4.

m 81 : 13 | 83 : 27.

1 Probably to be read Errish-qa-gir-ill, i.e., "Errish is the fuller (qāuru = ashlaku), Meissner, M. V. A. G., IX (1904), p. 52 of the gods." Cf. II R, 57, 35c, d, išu(Ty-šš-ša) SUGH | ditto (= iš[NIN.IB] sha rama-ku-li. See also m išu[GIR-AN]=machel, 48 : 20.

2 Probably to be read Errish-ahkkanak-ti. Cf. here for the present our note to GIR.NITA (Chapter IV, p. 86, n. 4) and see my forthcoming volume on the Religious Texts. Clay, B. E., XIV, p. 49a, reads NIN.IB.KISII (= kashkash)-išši.

8 The traces speak rather for 1šl Cl. išu-Za-ru-na-tum!

4 An Amurritish name: "fj. is my rock!"

5 Here a city named after a person. Cl. išu[GIR-RA]=machel.

4 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, Hū-di-ib-til (= BE)-la, a Mitannian name.

8 See m MUG.HEGAL.

9 Here a city, see under išši Išši=Marduk.

10 Cf. m II-li-ia, father of m Tukulti (= KU)-Š.E.KUR, B. E., 48a : 7, and see below under m II-li-ia. Or is išši=?

11 Cf. B. E., XIV, 30 : 6, 14, m iš[NIN.IB]-na-diš-ib.

i2 Clay, B. E., XIV, p. 45a, reads MUK.TUK.A = mmurashšad. For the sign rašu see Meissner, Ideogramme, No. 3857.

13 Cf. m II-li-ia, father of m Tukulti (= KU)-Š.E.KUR, B. E., XIV, 48a : 7, and see also m I-li-š-[a] above.

14 Or here [MUR]-tam? Cf., however, introduction to No. 23 sub "Translations," p. 94.

15 Or Dūn-li-[ ... ], q.v.

18 Cf. m NIN-nu-a-a and see Chapter II, p. 15, note 5.
LETTERS TO CASSITE KINGS

Masculine Names

\[\text{MA.AN.USH},^* 37 : 9.\]
\[\text{Man-nu-gi-ir}^* \text{Rammân} (= IM), 24 : 13, 18.\]
\[\text{Man-nu-ki-}^* \text{Sukal} (= LUGH), \text{ s. of } \ldots \text{shd}, 18 : 23.\]
\[\text{Mār.}^* \text{A-na-}^* \text{Sin} (= XXX)-\text{ak-la-ku}, 48 : 5.\]
\[\text{Mār.}^* \text{Ar-di-Ta-}^* 48 : 9.\]
\[\text{Mār.}^* \text{Lah-pi-}^* \text{an-du},^* 55 : 5.\]
\[\text{Mār.}^* \text{Bu-u}^* \text{Bu-}^* \text{Bu-}^* 57 : 4 | 60 : 6.\]
\[\text{Mār.}^* \text{Da-an}^* \ldots 69 : 3, 6.\]
\[\text{Mār.}^* \text{Hu-nu-bi}, 48 : 16.\]
\[\text{Mār.}^* \text{In-ni-bi}, 81 : 9.\]
\[\text{Mār.}^* \text{Man-nu-ki}^* \text{Sukal} (= LUGH), 18 : 23.\]
\[\text{Mār.}^* \text{Mu}^* \ldots 60 : 4.\]
\[\text{Mār.}^* \text{Mu-ra-ni}, \text{ itd}, 78 : 4.\]
\[\text{Mār.}^* \text{Sin} (= XXX)-\text{ka-la-it},^* 49 : 6.\]
\[\text{Mār.}^* \text{Shēb},^* 57 : 4.\]
\[\text{Mār.}^* \text{Ta-a-du},^* 83 : 14, 35.\]
\[\text{Mār.}^* \text{U-da-shd-ash},^* \text{ messenger of King Burna-Buriash,} 55 : 8, 16, 20.\]
\[\text{Mār.}^* \text{U-su-}^* \text{Shi-pak}, 55 : 2.\]
\[\text{Mār.}^* \text{Marduk-erbu} (= SU), 15 : 13.\]
\[\text{Mār.}^* \text{Marduk-ib-}^* \text{Shih}, \text{ wr.}, 50 : 1.\]
\[\text{Mār.}^* \text{Marduk-}^* \text{ba-}^* \text{ba-}^* \text{ba},^* 29 : 1.\]
\[\text{Mār.}^* \text{Marduk-nāgir} (= SHESH), 3 : 22, 26 | 15 : 12.\]
\[\text{Mār.}^* \text{Marduk-ra-an-}^* \text{im-}^* \text{ti},^* \text{ wr.}, 30 : 3.\]
\[\text{Mār.}^* \text{Marduk-shum} (= MU)-iddi-\text{mu} (= MU), \text{ amelu SAG,} 93 : 7.\]

1 Notice that we find in this connection generally \(\text{gsh} \text{MAR.GID.DA} \text{Shd x} (= \text{numeral}) \text{pa-te-gnesh}.\) Should we, therefore, read \(\text{"m"} = 1 \text{ or 60?"} \text{See under pa-te-gnesh}.\)


3 Or \(\text{MA.AN.USH}, \text{ doubtfull whether a nom. pr.; it might be an official's title}.\)

4 For a writing \(a\) instead of \(d\), see Chapter I, p. 7, note 6.

5 Or is this a woman? If so, then cf. p. 117, note 2.

6 Or \(UR\) (= \text{Kalbui}^* \text{USH}, \text{ doubtfull whether a nom. pr.; it might be an official's title}.\)

7 The \(\text{gi-ir for ki}, \text{ kin(a), gim shows that \text{gsh} \text{IM} \text{was pronounced at this time \text{gsh} \text{Rammân}}, \text{see Chapter III, p. 49, note 1. Here this name is that of a city, see \text{gsh} \text{Gir-}^* \text{ra-ga-mil}.}\)

8 See under \(\text{Ab-shi-la-an-du}.\)

9 See under \(\text{Bu-}^* \text{Bu-}^* \text{Bu-}^* \text{Erresh},(\text{.}\)

10 Doubtful whether \(\text{Mār}-\text{belongs to the name}.\)

11 A reading \(\text{Mār.}^* \text{Sin-shum} (= \text{MU})\)-\text{aqlaha} (= BA-sha) \text{might also be possible}.\)

12 Or \(\text{Msh}^* \text{hit}.\)

13 Thus I propose to read this name. This, no doubt, is preferable to \(\text{Mārat-Ta-a-du}. \text{ If the latter reading were adopted the absence of } \text{SAL} \text{ would be without parallel, cf. } \text{Mārat} (= \text{TUR.SAL})\)-\text{ba(? or Usht)-ba(? or ka)\ldots}.\)

14 Cf. B. E., XV, 168 : 4, \(\text{U-da-shd-ash}^* \text{!}\)

15 "M, exists." So better than \(-ni-shd" ?
Masculine Names

1 Probably to be read either "Idin-GHE.GAL" or "Nadin-nušši." The latter might be abbreviated from m iduIM (or NIN, 1B, etc.)-nadin-nušši.

See m MUGHE.GAL.

2 NIM.GI is probably to be read Éfir, see under Translations, pp. 135f.

3 See also m In-nu-ā-a and cf. Chapter II, p. 15, note 5.

4 See Also Aš-pi-la-an-du.


6 So in all names beginning with m iduSin.

8 Or m iduSin-sham = (MU)-igšak = BA-sha).

8 Or da?

10 See also p. 129.

11 Here the name of a city, cf. iduGir-ra-ga-mil.

12 Or (U-šu-[sub-ši-ši-pak]).


14 Cl. B. E., XV, 168:4, ashw(?).
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Masculine Names

[...]{Marduk}, wr., 10: 2.
[...]{mi-il-kish-sha-la(?)}, 3: 5.
[...]{NIN.GAL}, 50: 9.
[...]{Nin.zer, s. of {Max-nu-ki-Marduk, = LUGAL}, 18: 23.}
[...]{Shamsuk=(UD), wr., 41: 1.}
[...]{mur=(SHEŠI), 22: 17.}
See also 43: 7 | 60: 10.

2. Feminine Names.

{In-bi-A-ri, wr., s. of {Mi-mi-di-Marduk, 85: 2 | 86: 3.}
{La-ba(? or shd, ra)?}, 31: 20.
{Mardit=(TUR.SAL)}{Mardit-Mardit, 47: 3.}
{Mardit-Mardit=(SHESI)-shad, 31: 7.}
{Mardit-Ba(? or Ush(?)-ba(? or ka?)-[...], 31: 27.}
{Mardit-Mardit=(AN)-i-pa-shad, 31: 15.}
{Mardit-Mardit=(Ki-din-[...], 97: 5.}
{Mardit-Mardit=(Ku-ri-i, 31: 7.}
{Mardit-Mardit=(Mardit-Mardit-li, 31: 11 | 32: 7.}
{Mardit-Mardit-Ta-a-du, 83: 14, 35.}
{Mardit-Ush(? or Ba(?)-ba(? or ka?)-[...], 31: 27.}
{Ri-shad-tum, 95: 9.}
{Ta-a-du?), 83: 14, 35.}
{Ush(? or Ba(?)-ba(? or ka?)-[...], 31: 27.}

II. Professional and Gentilic Names.

a-bil bōbi, 86: 24.
a-bi-ni-li, 31: 25.
[a]lim-mi-i, 32: 8. treatments

1 i.e. "E. makes to rejoice."
2 Or {Hun-di-li-i-ja-i?}
3 Cf. {Abu-ut-la-ni-tam}, B. E., XV, 185: 11.
4 Here the da is doubtful; it might be also ra, then cf. {Da-ak-ra TUR.SAL = pi-AG.DI.TAR, B. E., XV, 188, IV: 10.}
5 Cf. TUR.SAL Da-ak-la-shad, B. E., XIV, 58: 7. Here probably a "Koename" which the writer applies to his "sister."
6 A "Koename."
8 Doubtful whether a nom. pr.
9 But see pp. 25, note 1 | 110, note 2.
10 Might expect {La-ka-ra}, but no trace of rak is visible.
11 So also in all following names.
12 Cf. {In-bi-A-ri.}
13 See note to Mardit-Ta-a-du.
14 Cf. B. E., XV, 154: 26, aš-la-mu-š (not registered by Clay).
15 Cf. {Ak-ka-du-il, 54: 11.}
16 Or better aššu ENGAR, i.e., nargašu, see pp. 35, note 3; 127, note 2.
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Professional and Gentile Names

amelu( = GALU), 44 : 17; a-P1-la, 67 : 7; a-mi-la, 66 : 25; a-mi-li, 42 : 9; 72 : 10; a-mi-li-e, 89 : 17; a-mi-la-ti, 83 : 16; a-ame-la-shu, 92 : 17; a-mi-lu-shu, 84 : 16; a-mi-la-us-su, 83 : 16; a-P1-la-us-su-nu, 51 : 17, 29 : 67 : 13.

A-r-mu-la-us-su-um, see "Proper Names,"
amelu ZAG.GIM, see kudimmu.
ameluqeritu ( = SHU.GHA)
45. 29. 58 : 3.
amelu barar, see amelu MASH.
bil pilibli( = EN.NAM), 21 : 30 ; 41 : 7 ; 41 : 7 ; bil(i( = EN) mesh pi-ha-ti, 92 : 10, 20.
be-el SIE.BAR, 76 : 7.
EN.GAR see errishu.
EN.NAMA, see bil pilibli.
amelQARUHil( = EN.GAR)mesh, 11 : 10; ameluPAM.EN.GAR, 39 : 3. Cf. also e-ri-shu, 40 : 13; e-ri-shu, 40 : 26 et passim.

GAL, see itu.
amelu QAR, see shaknu.
GH( = NER), 22 : 5.
amelu ghE.NGAR ( = narhabu), see amelu nahku-EN.GAR.
gula-lum, 27 : 8.
SU-ship-ri, see amelu UR.RAG.

[4] Doubtful; it may be LUL = zammertu, q.v.
[6] So clearly here. At this time the bi and N1 = ti are very often written alike, cf., e.g., 44 : 6, id-du-ni-ni(i=bi); 9 : 23, Bit-N1.Ki-din-ni(i, the sign looks like bi!). See B. E., XV, 171 : 17, 175 : 45, UR.PA.N1 (so Clay, Z.A., XV (1907), p. 417(i).) bi, which, when compared with i-e, 81 : 5, UR-ka( = PA)-te-ni, has to be read (against Clay, i.e., p. 45B) kalbi( = UR)-ka(< = PA)-i< (= BI = N1). Ha-biti(= N1 = li)-gal-ke-tu-um is, of course, the same as the Ha<biti(on, not li)-gal-ke-tu-ni of Semell, Textes Elam. Sum., I, pl. 20 (opp. p. 96), 2.
[11] Doubtful; might be a nom. pr.: UR-<uUSH.
[12] See also Ni-ib-ur-in-i.
[13] Or shum.me.
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Professional and Gentile Names

MIR.NIT.TA, see ridu.
ameluMU, see nuqatimmu.
nagA, 68: 8; nagÁmesh, 45: 9.
amelu nakiru (= PAP), 33: 25; na-ka-rum, 80: 19.
amelunasaru, 59: 16.
Ni-bu-ri, 18: 21 | 83: 10; móre (= TURmesh) Ni-bu-rum, 81: 6; móre (= TURmesh) Endid, 86: 5.
amelu NIG.KUD.DA, see mukkisu.
amelu nuqatimmu (= MU)mesh, 21: 23.
amelu PA, see ašla.
pakati, pākisti, see bel.
g qi₃pu, see laqi₃ru.
qipu, see ki₃sh.
re₃(= ŠIB)mesh, 17: 27.
ri₃ri, 16: 7; (?)³; rid šibl(= MIR.NIT.TA), 24: 19.
amelu RIQ, 26: 5: 7 | 83: 13; amelu RIQmesh, 83: 8.
amelu SAG, 93: 7; amelu SAG LUGAL, 1: 5 | 13: 5, 17.
amelu ša₃saru, 81: 18.
ŠIB, see re₃.
šir( or e?)š[-ri], 9: 8.
su-ma-ak TI, 9: 37: 22.

1 See Chapter III, p. 36, note 7.
2 See also na₃shÁ-bi-
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, dam-gur TI, read by Clay, i.e., p. 516, NIN.LIL-ti.
6 See p. 51, note 3.
7 Here the same as the mu₃hÁp₃lu of the Ham. Letters.
8 Here, however, a permanissive.
9 Or LU = dub?
10 See p. 35, note 3.
11 Doubtful whether an official. Cf. here the ud-dil-ti = KI, K. 2875, 27, 28 (= B. A., V, p. 533); hence not the title of an official, but a part (the lower?) of nu₃t₃mum?
12 See p. 35, note 1.
13 See p. 97, note 9.
14 Doubtful, might be GJR(= NER).
III. Names of Places.

mātu A.A.B.B.āki, see mātu\textsuperscript{ā}āmām.


ālu A-ma(or bat)\textsuperscript{ā}a-ki, 96 : 4, 11, 21, 28; cf. 1, 7, ālu A-ma\textsuperscript{ā}a-ki,\textsuperscript{1}

ālu Ardi-Bēlīt(= GASHIAN),\textsuperscript{2} 13 : 7; 66 : 24; ālu Ardi-GASHIAN\textsuperscript{ā}a-ki, 11 : 20; ālu Ardi-NIN\textsuperscript{ā}a-ki, 18 : 19.


ālu Bāb-ili( = KA.DINGIR.RA), 60a : 6 | 95 : 3; KA. DINGIR.RA\textsuperscript{ā}a-ki, 62 : 7 | 71 : 8.

ālu Balbīti( = TIT\textsuperscript{ā}a-ki), 65 : 19.

BA.R.TUR\textsuperscript{ā}a-ki, see Parak-māra\textsuperscript{ā}a-ki.

Bil\textsuperscript{m} Ki-din\textsuperscript{ā}a-ša, 9 : 23 | 44 : 15.

Bu\textsuperscript{m} iš Sin\textsuperscript{ā}i-saš-ā-rā, 9 : 16.

Bu\textsuperscript{m} iš Sin\textsuperscript{ā}i-saš-ma-gir, 11 : 25 | 59 : 6.

Bil\textsuperscript{m} Si-ri-shā-ša-uš, 28 : 5.

Dēr (= Dār\textsuperscript{ā}a-ša), 5 : 6.

ālu Dilmun( = DIL.BAT\textsuperscript{ā}a-ki), 67 : 5.

ālu DUL-sā-ša-ša(=?)-si-la-ab-sha-ša-riš-ša, 50a : 11.

ālu Dār(=...), 90 : 5.

ālu Dār-sīlī( = EN\textsuperscript{ā}a-ša)-mātaššu( = KUR.KUR\textsuperscript{ā}a-ša), 17 : 18, 26;\textsuperscript{7}

Dār\textsuperscript{a}i En-ši-lit\textsuperscript{ā}a-ki, 3 : 31; Dār\textsuperscript{a}i En-ši-lit\textsuperscript{ā}a-ša, 33, 38, 41; Dār\textsuperscript{a}i En-ši-lit\textsuperscript{ā}a-ša, 39 : 21.

Dār-ša-uš\textsuperscript{ā}a-ša,\textsuperscript{8}

Dār-Ištar( = U.DAR)-šīrat( = MAGIL), 65 : 28.


Dār\textsuperscript{a}i Nu-šu( = PA.KU), 3 : 40.

Dār\textsuperscript{a}i Sab[i( = PAP)-pa šu-maš\textsuperscript{ā}a-ša, 40 : 3.

Dār-U.DAR.MAGIL, see Dār-Ištar-šīrat.

Ér, see Bit-tu.

E-ka-laš\textsuperscript{ā}a-ša, 1 : 18.

ālu E-šu-gal\textsuperscript{ā}i-aš-Mardu\textsuperscript{ā}, 66 : 3 | 67 : 3.

ālu-ki\textsuperscript{ā}i En-ši-SAH\textsuperscript{ā}, 73a : 15.

En-ši\textsuperscript{ā}a-ša, see Nippur\textsuperscript{ā}a-ša.

ālu GAL-IM[...], 65 : 22.


ālu Idin\textsuperscript{ā}i ( = E\textsuperscript{a}a)Mardu\textsuperscript{ā}, 59 : 18.

ālu IM-MA, see ālu Ki-im\textsuperscript{ā}a-ša.

ālu Kār-šu Ashu( = AG), 26 : 4; Kār\textsuperscript{šu}AG, 68 : 26, 30, 36.

Kār\textsuperscript{šu}NIN.LIL, see Nan-gar-Kār\textsuperscript{šu}NIN.LIL.

ālu Ki-im\textsuperscript{šu}a-ša, 96 : 20, 25.

Kūsh\textsuperscript{ā}a-ša, 44 : 19.

ālu Lu-[...], 51 : 5.

ālu Lu-ub-ši\textsuperscript{ā}a-ša, 99 : 6.

ālu Man-su-šu-iš-ša-ša Ramm\textsuperscript{ā}a, 24 : 13, 18.

ālu MASH-IM\textsuperscript{ā}a-ša, 27 : 5.

ālu MUM( = MUN),\textsuperscript{10} 14 : 13; ālu MUM\textsuperscript{ā}a-ša, 27 : 5, 33 | 41 : 15; ālu MUM\textsuperscript{ā}a-ša, 26 : 6.

Nin\textsuperscript{ā}a-ša,\textsuperscript{11} 17 : 24.

---

1 Here the la is, no doubt, left out by the scribe.
2 Cf. ālu Ardi-Bēlīt.
3 Identical with the city TE, E. B. II., p. 95, note 1?
4 Or da.
5 Hardly ālu\textsuperscript{ā}a-ša-ša.
6 See p. 9, note 2.
7 Cf. here the E-šu-gat( = SHU)-ālu En-ši\textsuperscript{ā}a-ša in B. E., XIV, 18 : 4 | 31 : 11, which Clay, i.e., p. 58, reads erroneously E-šu-gat-ša\textsuperscript{ā}a-ša, registering the second passage quoted under ālu Nippur\textsuperscript{ā}a-ša.
8 For ālu-ki see Chapter I, p. 11, note 1.
9 Cf. ālu Shamash-su-kul-ti.
10 Or ālu IM-MA.
11 See p. 40, note 1.
12 Or ālu MUM, g. v.?
13 For this city cf. e.g., B. E., XIV, 167 : 29 (omitted by Clay), and above, p. 118, note 4.
14 This is doubtful. Here a reading ālu MASH-I\textsuperscript{ā}a-ša is likewise possible. As, however, this city occurs in a letter of Kadārānu, who was closely connected with the ālu MUM\textsuperscript{ā}a-ša, I prefer to read as indicated.
15 Or Uru\textsuperscript{ā}a-ša-ša.
Names of Places

\[\text{di}u\text{Nippur} (= \text{EN.LIL}^k), \ 38 \ : \ 39; \ 21; \ \text{EN.LIL}^k,\]
\[11 \ : \ 19; \ 13 \ : \ 6; \ 18 \ : \ 20; \ 27 \ : \ 29; \ 35 \ : \ 13; \ 58 \ : \ 4; \]
\[83 \ : \ 8; \ 86 \ : \ 7; \ 95 \ : \ 17. \text{ Cf. shar-rat} \text{di}u\text{EN.LIL}^k,\]
\[38 \ : \ 3; \ 6\text{march } \text{EN.LIL}^k, \text{ see } \text{ "Professional} \]
\[\text{and Gentile Names."}\]

\[\text{di}u\text{Pa-an-Be}l^k, \ 23 \ : \ 34.\]
\[\text{Pa-lak}^k, \ 6 \ : \ 5.\]
\[\text{di}u\text{Pa-la}^k, \ 18 \ : \ 34.\]
\[\text{Parak} = \text{BAR}-\text{mar}^k, \ 53 \ : \ 38.\]
\[\text{di}u\text{Pi} = \{ \ldots \}, \ 72 \ : \ 14.\]
\[\text{di}u\text{Ra-ha-nu}^k, \ 9 \ : \ 22.\]
\[\text{di}u\text{SALTUK}^k(?) \ 96 \ : \ 11.\]
\[\text{di}u\text{Sippar} = \text{UD.KIB.NUN}^k, \ 89 \ : \ 24; \ 26.\]
\[\text{di}u\text{Shamash} = \text{UD}-\text{tu-kul}^k, \ 16 \ : \ 8, \ 12.\]
\[\text{di}u\text{She-lil}^k, \ 83 \ : \ 15.\]
\[\text{di}u\text{Shi-i-tu-na} = \{ \ldots \}, \ 27 \ : \ 4.\]

IV. Names of Gates.

\[\text{bab} = \text{KA} \ A-nu, \ 27 \ : \ 43; \ 66 \ A-nu-um, \ 35 \ : \ 15.\]

V. Names of Houses and Temples.

\[\text{EB, see introduction to } \text{Nos. 1--74, pass.}, \text{ and Chapter III,}\]
\[\text{p.} \ 34.\]
\[\text{EB}^3, \ 31 \ : \ 36; \ 37 \ : \ 23; \ 66 \ : \ 27, \ 28.\]
\[\text{EB}^3, \ 57 \ : \ 19, \ 21; \ 93 \ : \ 6; \ 6\text{A-nu,} \ 35 \ : \ 15.\]

\[\text{1 Cf. B. E., XV, 128 : 3, } \text{di}u\text{Pa-la}^k; \text{ thus to be read instead of } \text{di}u\text{Pa-ra}^k(?) \text{ Clay, i.e., p. 53a?}\]
\[\text{2 For pronunciation see Br., } \text{List}, \text{ No. 6900.}\]
\[\text{3 Cf. Pi-i-na-a-ri, B. E., XIV, p. 56b.}\]
\[\text{4 Or Ra-ka-be?}\]
\[\text{5 Cf. diuGir-ra}^k.\]
\[\text{6 Cf. the preceding name. Both are, no doubt, identical.}\]
\[\text{7 See p. 10, note 3.}\]
\[\text{8 Cf. } \text{ma\text{ra}Tak-kul-ti}^k, \text{KUR}^k, \ 39 \ : \ 8.\]
\[\text{9 Cf. } \text{ma\text{ra}U-pi-i} \text{ in B. E., XIV, 132 : 43, 46, 52 (not registered by Clay).}\]
\[\text{10 Or } \text{Ninak}^k?\]
\[\text{11 Cf. B. E., XV, 102 : 13, } \text{Dnr-di}u\text{MAR.TU}^k( = \text{laburu}^k) \text{ and } \text{i.e., l. 14, } \text{KI-II} = \text{Dnr-di}u\text{MAR.TU}^k \text{BIL}^k \text{ (cansa)hu}^k. \text{ This passage, then, would testify to the existence, at the time of the Cassite kings, of an "Old" and a "New Erech or Warka."}\]

\[\text{12 Cf. } \text{a-bi}l \text{bab} = \text{KA}.\]
\[\text{13 Or bab Ardi-Tab-tu-ma?}\]
\[\text{14 See pp. 80f.}\]
\[\text{15 See p. 22, note 1.}\]
Names of Houses and Temples

É:tuEN.ZU-[?], 53 : 22.
bit-ush, see É.AN.

É.ŠIŠI.SÍ'R(- = N)UGAL, see Masculine Names.
É.KURmeš, 66 : 23 ; É.KUR, see Šuk-tul-ti-É.KURki, and náru Šuk-tul-ti-É.KURki.
É.KUR.GAL, see ná-mo-É.KUR.GAL.

É.LUGAL, see bit sharri.
É.šuMAR.TU, 73a : 3.
É.šuNergal(?), 51 : 20.
É.SAG.GI, see Masculine Names.
É-SAL.AZAG, 91 : 7.
É.šuSin-, see É.šuEN.ZU-

VI. NAMES OF RIVERS AND CANALS.
náru Šičuš, see náru šu[NIN.LIL.
náru Da-lita-ma-na-[?], 6 : 4.
náru Diqalšu( = MASH.TIK.QAR), 34 : 26.
náru Diqalšu( = MASH.TIT.KAR)šu( = AN)-Nippur
( = EN.LIL)ki, 3 : 18.
náru Tiš-tel-bi-[?], 3 : 8 | 66 : 6, 12.
náru Diqalšu, see náru Diqalšu.
náru Diqalšu( = AN)šu-pu-usḫi, 40 : 21.
náru MASH.TIK.QAR, see náru Diqalšu.
náru Na-la-aḫ, 40 : 22.
na-šu-ru-ri, 40 : 14 | 68 : 22 ; nam-gar-ru,
40 : 9, 29 ; nam-kaš, 3 : 16 ; nam-gar, 66 : 8.

Nam-gar(- = kuš)-Duš( = EN-šušiš, 3 ; 6 | 71 : 15.
Nam-kaš-Šičuš( = BU), 27 : 33 ; Nam-šuš-Šičuš( = BU),
66 : 12.
Nam-gar-Kaššuš( = NIN.LIL, 68 : 22.

náru Nam-šuš-šuš-biš( = EN)-šušiš( = KUR.KUR),
50 : 9.

nam-kaš, nam-gar, see nam-kaš-Šičuš.
náru Nannar( = SHESH.KI)-gù-gal, 3 : 14.
náru šu[NIN.LIL, 67 : 2.
náru Tut-tiššuš( = NIN.LIL, 28 : 11.
náru SHESH.KI-gù-gal, see náru Nannar-gù-gal.
náru Tutšuš( = KU)-šuš-šuš-šuš( = É.KUR)ki, 39 : 8.

VII. NAMES OF GODS.
A-an-ri, m.A-an-ri, šu-In-bi-
šu AG, see šu.Nabu.
A-šuš, m.A-šuš, šu.Ašu-as-
šu A.A.R.A, see šu.Marduk.
A.N, AN.RA, see DINGIR.RA, m.AN-, see šu.MA-šuš-
šu A.MAR.U, see šu.Marduk.
A.N, AN.RA, see DINGIR.RA, m.AN-, see šu.Mašuš-
šu A.MAR.U, see šu.Marduk.
A.N, AN.RA, see DINGIR.RA, m.AN-
šu A-MAR.U, see šu.Marduk.
A.N, AN.RA, see DINGIR.RA,
šu A.MAR.U, see šu.Marduk.
A.N, AN.RA, see DINGIR.RA,
šu A.MAR.U, see šu.Marduk.
A.N, AN.RA, see DINGIR.RA,
šu A.MAR.U, see šu.Marduk.
A.N, AN.RA, see DINGIR.RA,

1 See pp. 578f.
2 Hence “the Tigris of Nippur” is “the Tigris of the god(?) of Nippur,” in other words, “the god of Nippur” is “Nippur.” Cf. here also É.AN( = šu)-Nippur( = EN.LIL)ki, B. E., XV, 128 : 14, and see p. 80.
3 Or Kud?
4 Clay, B. E., XIV, p. 7, says that the me-e náru Na-la-aḫ occur also on C. B. M. 3527, but this apparently is a mistake, as the tablet referred to has been published by Clay in B. E., XIV, 149 (see i.e., p. 72). Read i.e., C. B. M. 5134, instead of C. B. M. 3527.
5 Here dûr looks like ši-bi, while in 71 : 15 it has the appearance of ši + sal( = șîl). 6 Cf. also 66 : 8.
7 See Delitsch, H. W. B., p. 555a.
8 Cf. Tuk( = KU)-šuš-šuš-šuš( = É.KUR)ki, 39 : 5.
9 Chief god of Dûr-šuš( = É.KUR)ki; see Chapter II, p. 19, note 3, and cf. šu.KAD.
LETTERS TO CASSITE KINGS

Names of Gods

GHE-GAL: "Mun-

Lu-ni [if indeed name of a god and not the hypocorist ending ka + nominative ending u frequently attached to names without regard to their last element]: "Ardis-

I-gi-gi: "Egi-gi-

I-li (= NIN) * ilu, ilu Be-li; cf. "I-li-, "I-li-

Hu, see AN; "Hu, Jil-Jum, Ba-bi, Dâr, naru Hu-d-pu-ush.

M, see "Banam.

A-ni Shur, see "DIL.BAT, U.DAR.


KADÎ, 5 : 21.

"Mirror.

KUR.GAL: "KUR.GAL-


La-ta-rak: "La-ta-rak(?)

LUGH, = "LUGH (= Sukal), "Man-ru-ki-

Marduk(= AMAR.UD), 10 : 2 | 51 : 4; ili Marduk,


"Na-ah-z, "Nannari-

MARTU: "Er-

MASH, see "Errishhil-

Nabâ (= AG), 7 : 18, ili Kâr, Kâr.

Nannari (= SHESH.KI)(?) = "Nannari, ili Marduk; naru Nannari (= SHESH.KI)-ga-gal. See also ili EN.ZU.

Sin (= XXX).

Nergal; ili Nergal-, "E, "Idi-

NIN.GI [if name of a god]: NIN.GI-shar-ilt.

NIN, see ili.

"INNUNU (= L), see ili Erris(?)

NIN: ili Ardi-NIN(?)k, see also Bû, GASHAN, ili NIN.

LIL, ili NIN[,] 3 : 62.

"IN.DIN,DU.GA: "Kalbî-

1See p. 47, note 5.

2See p. 8, note 8.

3 For this pronunciation of ili NIN.IB, ili IB, ili MASH, ili L, etc., see The Monist, XVII (January, 1907), p. 140ff, and cf. "Preface".

4 Cf. ili Ardi-NIN(?)k.

5 Wife of ili TAR; see Chapter II, p. 21.

6 For this element in proper names see The Monist, XVII (January, 1907), p. 144e.

7 Is to be pronounced ili Gâ-xfr; see Chapter II, p. 19, note 3. He was the chief god of Dûr-ilu(?)k, a male and also called AN.GAL.
FROM THE TEMPLE ARCHIVES OF NIPPU.

Names of Gods

\[ tu\text{SUGI}, \text{see tuTishhu.} \]
\[ tu\text{Sukal,} \text{ see also tuLUUGI; PAP.} \]
\[ tu\text{Shamash (-UD), 33:25, 29; 41:1; 81:4; tm tuShamash,} \text{mNur.} \]
\[ Shur-\text{rat-tuNippu (= EN.LIL)ki, 38:3.} \]
\[ SHESI.KI, \text{ see Nannar.} \]
\[ Shi\text{-pak (= lu}: \text{Um-ub, mMe-l.} \]
\[ tu\text{Shu-qa-na-na: mMe-l.} \]
\[ tu\text{TAR, 89:4.} \]
\[ tu\text{TAR.HU, see tuDAR.HU.} \]
\[ tu\text{Tishku (= SUGI), 38:3.} \]
\[ tu\text{UD, see tuShamash.} \]
\[ U.DAR (= Ishtar): \text{Dur-U.DAR-girat (= MAGH), 68:28.} \]
\[ tu\text{UR.BA, see tuGir-ra.} \]
\[ tu\text{USII: sic Kalbi-tuUSII(?).} \]

1 See Chapter III, p. 39, note 1.
3 For this gi-ir, which proves that \text{tuIM} was pronounced \text{tuRammân, see Chapter III, p. 49, note 1.}
4 Husband of \text{tuGU; 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; ff., following page; ff., following pages; fragm., fragmentary; inscr., inscription; L. E., Left Edge; li., 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 \times length (height) \times 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.</th>
<th>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</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&quot;My Lord&quot;</td>
<td>m\textsuperscript{a}Ab-iddina\textsuperscript{a}\textsuperscript{a}\textsuperscript{a}\textsuperscript{a}Mar\textsuperscript{a}duk.</td>
<td>11716</td>
<td>Kuri-Galzu, about 1420 B.C.</td>
<td>Baked. Light brown. Left part of R. and right lower corner broken off. 4 \times 5.8 \times 2. Inser. 11 (O.) + 12 (R.) = 23 li. II.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>m\textsuperscript{a}A-lu-Ba-ni.</td>
<td>10930</td>
<td>Kuri-Galeu, about 1400 B.C.</td>
<td>Baked. Ruled. Light brown with occasional dark spots. Left part and lower half of tablet broken off. 4.5 \times 4.5 \times 2.6. Inser. 7 (O.) + 4 (R.) = 11 li. III.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2, 3</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>m\textsuperscript{a}Amel\textsuperscript{a}\textsuperscript{a}Marduk.</td>
<td>11426</td>
<td>Shagaraktu-Sherdash, about 1325 B.C.</td>
<td>Baked. Ruled. Light brown. Cracked. Crumbling. Several fragments glued together. Insertion of fragments a and b on place indicated very doubtful. 14 \times 8.4 \times 3.2. Inser. 29 (O.) + 32 (R.) + 3 (U. E.) + 2 (L. E.) + 4 (fragm. c) + 4 (fragm. d) = 74 li. II.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>m\textsuperscript{a}A-na-ku-rum-ma.</td>
<td>3660</td>
<td>About 1400 B.C.</td>
<td>Unbaked. Light brown. Lower part of tablet broken off. 4.5 \times 6.5 \times 2. Inser. 9 (O.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FROM THE TEMPLE ARCHIVES OF NIPPUR.

<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>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>&quot;My Lord&quot; (a-na be-li-in)</td>
<td>Ardi-Bilili.</td>
<td>Kuri-Galzu, about 1400 B.C.</td>
<td>Baked. Dark brown. Cracked. Right lower corner of O. broken off. Lower part of R. not inscribed. 5.5 x 10 x 2.8. Inser. 16 (O.) + 7 (R.) = 23 li. I (stray tablet found out of place).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>&quot;Ardi-Hu Marduk.</td>
<td>Kuri-Galzu, about 1400 B.C.</td>
<td>12559</td>
<td>Unbaked. Light brown. Ruled. Beginning and end of lines crumbled away. Lower part broken away. R. razed off. 7.5 x 8 x 2.7. Inser. 9 li. II.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>&quot;. . . . Marduk.</td>
<td>Kuri-Galzu, about 1390 B.C.</td>
<td>3837</td>
<td>Unbaked. Light brown. Ruled. Left half and lower part of tablet broken away. Remainder of R. not inscribed. 5.2 x 4.5 x 3. Inser. 7 (O.) + 2 (R.) = 9 li. III.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>&quot;Be-lo-nu.</td>
<td>Kudur-Elil, about 1333 B.C.</td>
<td>19781</td>
<td>Unbaked. Light brown, R. darker. O. crumbling and greatly obliterated. 4.8 x 7.3 x 2.2. Inser. 14 (O.) + 2 (L.E.) + 14 (R.) + 1 (U. E.) = 31 li. IV.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>&quot;Pi-ta-Uu Marduk.</td>
<td>About 1350 B.C.</td>
<td>11929</td>
<td>Baked. Light brown. Ruled. Beginning of lines on O. broken away. 4.5 x 7 x 2.5.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3837 Unbaked. Light brown. Ruled. Left half and lower part of tablet broken away. Remainder of R. not inscribed. 5.2 x 4.5 x 3. Inser. 7 (O.) + 2 (R.) = 9 li. III. |
<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-ia)</td>
<td>&quot;Er-ša-šu-Marduk. Shagaraki-Shuriash</td>
<td>10804 about 1325 B.C.</td>
<td></td>
<td>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. Ins. 11 (O.) + 7 (R.) = 18 li. III.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 11</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;Er-ša-šu-Marduk. Shagaraki-Shuriash</td>
<td>11637 about 1325 B.C.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Baked. Dark brown. Lower half of tablet broken away. 4.5 × 3.8 × 2. Ins. 9 (O.) + 8 (R.) + 3 (U. E.) + 1 (L. E.) = 21 li. II.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 12</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;Errish-[š]-ib-ni. Burna-Buriash</td>
<td>10951 about 1430 B.C.</td>
<td></td>
<td>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. Ins. 20 (O.) + 2 (L. E.) + 14 (R.) = 36 li. IV.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 13</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;Errish-[š]-ib-ni. GA.BU-\textit{mesh}.</td>
<td>About 1350 B.C.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Baked. Light brown. Most of O. and left part of R. broken away. 6 × 11.5 × 2.8. Ins. 15 (O.) + 25 (R.) + 1 (U. E.) = 41 li. II.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 14</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>unnamed</td>
<td>About 1350 B.C.</td>
<td>3655</td>
<td>Unbaked. Light brown. Ruled. O. crumbling. Lower part of tablet broken away. Only upper part of R. inscribed. 4.3 × 6.8 × 2. Ins. 12 (O.) + 1 (R.) = 13 li. IV.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 14</td>
<td>&quot;Rh-ša-šu-Marduk.</td>
<td>Kudur-\textit{Enlil},</td>
<td>about 1335 B.C.</td>
<td>19787</td>
<td>Baked. Light brown. Most of O. and left part of R. broken away. 6 × 11.5 × 2.8. Ins. 15 (O.) + 25 (R.) + 1 (U. E.) = 41 li. II.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEXT. PLATE.</td>
<td>FROM</td>
<td>AGE</td>
<td>C.B.M.</td>
<td>DESCRIPTION.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>&quot;My Lord&quot; (a-na be-li-ia)</td>
<td>Nazi-Maruttash</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>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>&quot;Ilu-M.BUK.A-réma&quot;</td>
<td>Kudashman-Ettil,</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 (I. E.) = 33 li. III.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>&quot;Im-gu-ram.&quot;</td>
<td>Burna-Buriash,</td>
<td>1101</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>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>&quot;Kalbi-Du.NIN.DIN. DUGGA.&quot;</td>
<td>Koshtiliashu,</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>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>&quot;Ku-du-ru-ru.&quot;</td>
<td>Kudashman-Turpu,</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>
<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>29 22</td>
<td>&quot;&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;Marduk-um-[chal-]&quot;</td>
<td>Kuri-Galzu, about 1400 B.C.</td>
<td>11956</td>
<td>Description. Unbaked, Light brown. Upper left corner broken away. 4 × 5 × 2. Inser. 9 (O.) + 1 (Lo. E.) + 8 (R.) + 1 (U. E.) = 29 li. I (stray tablet found out of place).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 22</td>
<td>&quot;&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;Marduk-ra-im-kit-[ti].&quot;</td>
<td>About 1350 B.C.</td>
<td>10629</td>
<td>Description. Baked. Dark. Ruled. Crumbling. Lower part, end of lines, and R. broken away. 4.6 × 5 × 2.4. Inser. 6li. III.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 25</td>
<td>&quot;&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;Mu-kal-[lim].&quot;</td>
<td>Burna-Buriash, about 1430 B.C.</td>
<td>10514</td>
<td>Description.</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>33e 26</td>
<td>&quot;My Lord&quot;</td>
<td>mNIM.GI-shar-ittéesh.</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 chippe, otherwise well preserved. 5 × 7.2 × 2.2. Inser. 17 (O.) + 18 (R.) + 2 (U. E.) = 37 li. III. Translation, pp. 135ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 27</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>mKi-sha-ah-ut.</td>
<td>Kudashman-Turgu, 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 (R.) + 3 (U. E.) + 1 (L. E.) = 46 li. II.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 29</td>
<td>&quot;[m iš]Raumán-shar-ittéesh</td>
<td>Kudashman-Turgu, about 1350 B.C.</td>
<td>10600</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>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 29</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>mSin-ba-ra-ah-me.</td>
<td>Burna-Buriash, about 1430 B.C.</td>
<td>19783</td>
<td>Baked. Dark brown. Ruled. R, cracked and lower right corner chipped off. Lower part of R, not inscribed. 5.5 × 9.5 × 3. Inser. 16 (O.) + 19 (R.) = 26 li. IV.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38 30</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>mShi-ri-iq-tum.</td>
<td>Kuri-Galeh, 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.B.M.</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 32</td>
<td>&quot;My Lord&quot;</td>
<td>mU-bar-rum.</td>
<td>about 1335 B.C.</td>
<td>5134</td>
<td>Baked. Cracked. Glued together. Lower half of R. not inscribed. 5.5 × 9.3 × 2.5. Inser. 17 (O.) + 1 (Lo. E.) + 8 (R.) = 26 li. III. Translation, pp. 120ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 32</td>
<td>&quot;[Nār?]₄šu-Shamash.&quot;</td>
<td>Kudashman-Targu,</td>
<td>about 1350 B.C.</td>
<td>11787</td>
<td>Baked. Dark brown. Cracked. Left part and lower half of tablet broken away. Glued together. 5.2 × 5 × 2.5. Inser. 11 (O.) + 12 (R.) + 3 (U. E.) = 26 li. II.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42 33</td>
<td>ḫazannu of Dār-Sukal-poṭro, cf. p. 129.</td>
<td>Kudur-Enlil,</td>
<td>about 1335 B.C.</td>
<td>11498</td>
<td>Unbaked. Light brown. Lower half of tablet broken away. First line and some signs of R. chipped off. 5 × 6 × 2.5. Inser. 10 (O.) + 11 (R.) + 2 (U. E.) + 3 (L. E.) = 26 li. II.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43 34</td>
<td>&quot;mP[i(?)]-&quot;</td>
<td>About 1350 B.C.</td>
<td></td>
<td>19779</td>
<td>Unbaked. Light brown. O. has large black spot. Crumbling. End of lines on O. covered with silt. Lower part of R. not inscribed. Line at end of R. 5 × 7.2 × 2.3. Inser. 13 (O.) + 4 (R.) = 17 li. IV.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 36</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>About 1350 B.C.</td>
<td></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. Inser. 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>about 1335 B.C.</td>
<td>11893</td>
<td>Unbaked. Light brown. First two lines broken away. Cracked. Right upper corner of R. chipped off. 4.5 × 5.8 × 2. Inser. 15 (O) + 15 (R) = 30 li. II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49 38</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nazi-Maruttah</td>
<td>about 1380 B.C.</td>
<td>10913</td>
<td>Unbaked. Light brown. Cracked. Upper and lower part of tablet broken away. Lower part of R. not inscribed. Line at end of inscription. 4.5 × 4.8 × 2.5. Inser. 8 (O) + 3 (R) = 11 li. III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 39</td>
<td></td>
<td>Kuri-Galzu</td>
<td>about 1400 B.C.</td>
<td>3662</td>
<td>Baked. O. dark, R. 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 × 8.5 × 2.5. Inser. 13 (O) + 5 (R) = 18 li. II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 39</td>
<td></td>
<td>About 1350 B.C.</td>
<td>10510</td>
<td>Unbaked. Light brown. Ruled. Crumbling. End of all lines broken away. 4.5 × 8 × 2.5. Inser. 12 (O) + 9 (R) = 21 li. III</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52 40</td>
<td></td>
<td>Burna-Buriash</td>
<td>about 1430 B.C.</td>
<td>10504</td>
<td>Unbaked. Light. Cracked. Upper part broken away. Script almost obliterated. 5 × 9 × 2.5. Inser. 18 (O) + 22 (R) + 1 (U. E.) = 41 li. III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text. Plate.</td>
<td>From</td>
<td>Age.</td>
<td>C.B.M.</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54 42</td>
<td></td>
<td>About 1350 B.C.</td>
<td>11654</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>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 42</td>
<td></td>
<td>Burna-Buriash, about 1440 B.C.</td>
<td>10497</td>
<td>Unbaked. Light. Upper half broken away. 7.8 × 5.9 × 3. Inscr. 10 (O.) + 2 (Lo. E.) + 12 (R.) = 24 li. III. Translation, pp. 51ff.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56 43</td>
<td></td>
<td>Kuri-GaUm, about 1400 B.C.</td>
<td>10822</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>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57 43</td>
<td></td>
<td>About 1350 B.C.</td>
<td>3668</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>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58 44</td>
<td></td>
<td>Shagarakti-Shuriash, about 1320 B.C.</td>
<td>19800</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 × 8 × 2.5. Inscr. 13 li. IV.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59 44</td>
<td></td>
<td>Kodashman-Enlil, about 1340 B.C.</td>
<td>11703</td>
<td>Baked. Dark brown. O. completely crumbled away. R. covered with silica. 5.5 × 9.3 × 2.4. Inscr. 8 (Lo. E.) + 16 (R.) = 19 li. II.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59a 45</td>
<td></td>
<td>Burna-Buriash, about 1430 B.C.</td>
<td>10919</td>
<td>Unbaked. Light brown. Cracked. Greatly mutilated. Upper part broken away. 5.3 × 3.8 × 2.3. Inscr. 6 (O.) + 3 (Lo. E.) + 8 (R.) = 17 li. III.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 45</td>
<td></td>
<td>About 1350 B.C.</td>
<td>10914</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>
<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>60a</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>&quot;My Lord&quot; (?)</td>
<td>[...]-im.</td>
<td>About 1350 B.C.</td>
<td>3694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11999</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;</td>
<td>(a-na be-ili)</td>
<td>Kudur-Enlil</td>
<td>about 1339 B.C.</td>
<td>O. dark, R. light brown. Upper, lower, and right part of tablet broken away. Inscription on L. E. in two columns. Cf. No. 69, S × 8.5 × 4. Inser. 17 (O.) + 13 (R.) = 30 U. II.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69 51</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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. Inser. 9 (O.) + 1 (L. E.) = 10 li. III.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70 51</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3836 Unbaked. Fragm. of larger tablet. Light brown. Cf. No. 66. 4 × 4 × 3.8. Inser. 5 + 6 = 11 li. III.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71 51</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1032 Unbaked. Light brown. Fragm. (right lower part) of larger tablet. Ruled. 4.5 × 5.5 × 3.8. Inser. 10 (O.) + 8 (R.) = 18 li. III.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72 52</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10924 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. Inser. 9 (O.) + 10 (R.) = 19 li. III.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73 52</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10658 Unbaked. Light brown. Crumbling. Fragm. of larger tablet. Only on one side is the inscription preserved. 3.8 × 6.5 × 3.2. Inser. 14 li. III.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73a 53</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10938 Unbaked. Light brown. Cracked. Fragm. (upper middle part) of larger tablet. Greatly mutilated. 3.8 × 5 × 2.3. Inser. 8 (O.) + 10 (R.) + 2 (U. E.) = 20 li. III.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74 53</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10553 Unbaked. Dark brown.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text. Plate.</td>
<td>From</td>
<td>Age.</td>
<td>C.B.M.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75 54</td>
<td>&quot;Amel-^tu^Marduk. &quot;The King&quot; (LUGAL) Shagaraki-Shuriash, 12582 (cf. No. 93).</td>
<td>about 1325 B.C.</td>
<td>Fragm. (middle part) of tablet. Only one side preserved. 5.5 × 6.8 × 2.4. Insr. 14 li. III.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76 55</td>
<td>&quot;Son.&quot;</td>
<td>About 1400 B.C.</td>
<td>3560</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77 55</td>
<td>m^ti^uEn-il-[^ni]-shur-shum-^u^i^r. Kadashman-Turpu,</td>
<td>about 1360 B.C.</td>
<td>&quot;Father.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78 56</td>
<td>m^ti^uEn-il-k[di-ni. Burnu-Buriash,</td>
<td>about 1430 B.C.</td>
<td>Unbaked. Light brown.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79 56</td>
<td>m^ti^uEn-il-ki-di-[ni]. Burnu-Buriash,</td>
<td>about 1430 B.C.</td>
<td>Cracked. Covered with black spots. Line after O, 1. 1. R. has only one line of inscription, rest not inscribed. 5 + 7.5 × 2.3. Insr. 9 (O.) + 1 (R.) + 3 (U. E.) = 19 li. III.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 80 57 | m^ti^uEn-il-mu-^[ni-
| 81 57 | m^tu^uEn-il-mu-^[ni-
| 82 57 | m^tu^uEn-il-mu-^[ni-
| 83 57 | m^tu^uEn-il-mu-^[ni-
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Fragment (middle part) of tablet. Only one side preserved. 5.5 × 6.8 × 2.4. Inscription 14 lines. III.

Unbaked. Light brown. End of lines and lower part of tablet broken away. R. almost completely crumbled off. 3.9 × 4.8 × 1.7. Inscription 10 (O.) + 10 (R.) + 3 (U. E.) = 23 lines. III.

Translation, pp. 132ff.

Unbaked. Light brown. Cracked. Covered with black spots. Line after O, 1. 1. R. has only one line of inscription, rest not inscribed. 5 + 7.5 × 2.3. Inscription 9 (O.) + 1 (R.) + 3 (U. E.) = 19 lines. III.

Translation, pp. 132ff.

Unbaked. Light brown. Lower part of tablet broken away. Only upper part of R. is inscribed. 4.7 × 6.5 × 2.4. Inscription 10 (O.) + 3 (R.) = 13 lines. III.


Unbaked. Light brown. Lower half of tablet broken away. Right upper corner of O. was pressed downward while tablet was still soft, 4 × 4 × 2. Inscription 8 (O.) + 7 (R.) + 2 (U. E.) = 17 lines. II.

Baked. O. light brown, R. darker. Occasionally black spots. Lower part of tablet.
<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>82 57</td>
<td>Da-ši-ti-ia.</td>
<td><strong>Eerba</strong>-[<strong>it</strong>]î<strong>Marduk.</strong></td>
<td>Shagarakhi-Shur-Ush</td>
<td>about 1325 B.C.</td>
<td>Broken away. 4.5 ( \times ) 5 ( \times ) 2.3. Inscription (O.) + 10 (R.) = 20 li. 11.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83 58</td>
<td><strong>In-na-an-ni.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Eer-<strong>ïï</strong>NIN.</strong></td>
<td>Kuri-Galzu, ( IB )-api-iddina**[<strong>a</strong>]**.</td>
<td>about 1400 B.C.</td>
<td>Unbaked. Dark brown. Greatly mutilated. O. left lower corner broken away. R. completely crumbled off. 3.7 ( \times ) 5.1 ( \times ) 1.7. Inscription 10 li.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84 59</td>
<td><strong>In-na-an-ni.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Eerish</strong>-[<strong>it</strong>]î<strong>NIN.</strong></td>
<td>Kuri-Galzu, ( IB )-api-iddina**[<strong>a</strong>]**.</td>
<td>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. clipped off. Otherwise well preserved. Line after 1. 2 and at end of O. 5.5 ( \times ) 9.5 ( \times ) 2.2. Inscription 18 (O.) + 19 (R.) = 37 li. 11. Translation, pp. 110ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85 59</td>
<td><strong>In-na-an-ni.</strong></td>
<td>In-bi-Ari.</td>
<td>Kuri-Galzu, about 1400 B.C.</td>
<td>3296</td>
<td>Baked. Light brown. Perfect. Line after 0. 1. 10. Lower part of R. not inscribed. 4.8 ( \times ) 9 ( \times ) 2.3. Inscription 14 (O.) + 5 (R.) = 19 li. 11. Translation, pp. 113ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86 60</td>
<td><strong>In-na-an-ni.</strong></td>
<td>In-bi-Ari.</td>
<td>Kuri-Galzu, about 1400 B.C.</td>
<td>3675</td>
<td>Baked. Light brown. Lower part of tablet broken away. 4.8 ( \times ) 5.8 ( \times ) 2.3. Inscription 13 (O.) + 11 (R.) + 3 (U. E.) + 4 (L. E.) = 29 li. 11.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87 61</td>
<td><strong>In-na-an-ni.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Gu-za-ar-AN.</strong></td>
<td>About 1350 B.C.</td>
<td>3663</td>
<td>Unbaked. O. light brown. R. darker. Occasional black spots. Lower part of tablet broken away. 5.5 ( \times ) 5 ( \times ) 2. Inscription 11 (O.) + 9 (R.) + 3 (U. E.) + 2 (L. E.) = 25 li. 11.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88 62</td>
<td><img src="https://example.com/image.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><strong>Ee-<strong>ïï</strong>ip-pa-dsh-ra.</strong></td>
<td>Burma-Buriash,</td>
<td>about 1430 B.C.</td>
<td>Baked. Light brown. Greatly effaced. Lower part of tablet broken away. R. blank. 4 ( \times ) 4 ( \times ) 2.2. Inscription 8 li.</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>90 63</td>
<td>m ilašluš. Kodashmon-Targu,</td>
<td>about 1350 B.C.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Baked. Dark. Fragm. (left upper part) of tablet. 4 × 5 × 2.3. Inscr. 7 (O.) + 7 (R.) = 14 li. III.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91 63</td>
<td>[f]AR.ḪU-nūr-gab-ba.</td>
<td>About 1350 B.C.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Baked. Light brown. 3 lines on tablet. Beginning of first section broken away. O. 1.5 is continued over the whole of R. Lower part of R. not inscribed. 5 × 5 × 2. Inscr. 10 (O.) + 2 (Lo. E.) + 3 (R.) = 15 li. IV.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92 64</td>
<td>m ilašluš. Nazi-Maruttash,</td>
<td>1390 B.C.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Baked. Light brown. Lower right part of tablet broken away. 4.5 × 7.5 × 2. Inscr. 14 (O.) + 2 (Lo. E.) + 15 (R.) + 3 (U. E.) = 34 li. IV.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94 65</td>
<td></td>
<td>About 1350 B.C.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unbaked. Light brown. Crumbling. Line at end of O. and R. Upper part of tablet broken away. O. completely effaced. Lower part of R. not inscribed. 5.8 × 8.8 × 2.3. Inscr. 3 (O.) + 5 (R.) = 8 li. II.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95 66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Baked. O. light brown, R. dark. Large black spot on R. Ruled. Crumbling. Upper part of tablet broken away. 5.2 × 5 × 2. Inscr. 6 (O.) + 10 (R.) + 2 (U. E.) = 18 li. II.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96 67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unbaked. O. very light, R.</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>98 68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>About 1350 B.C.</td>
<td>10895</td>
<td>Unbaked. Fragm. of larger tablet. Dark brown. Ruled. Upper part and right side of tablet broken away. Last line and all of other side not inscribed. 3.8 × 5.5 × 2.7. Inser. 7 li. III.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99 64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10915</td>
<td>Unbaked. Brown. Fragm. (middle part) of larger tablet. The other side of tablet completely crumbled away. Cracked. 5.4 × 6 × 2. Inser. 10 li. III.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**B. Photographic (Half-tone) Reproductions.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text. Plate.</th>
<th>C. B. M.</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1, 2 I</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cf. description of text No. 24.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3, 4, 5 II</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cf. description of text No. 24.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6, 7 III</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cf. description of text No. 55.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8, 9 III</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cf. description of text No. 75.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10, 11 IV</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cf. description of text No. 33a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12, 13 V</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cf. description of text No. 23.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14, 15 VI</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cf. description of text No. 31.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16, 17 VII</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cf. description of text No. 33.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18, 19 VII</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cf. description of text No. 38.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 VIII</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cf. description of text No. 3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 IX</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cf. description of text No. 3.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FROM THE TEMPLE ARCHIVES OF NIPPUR.


26 XI R. of a letter showing the fragmentary condition of the collection.

27 XI O. of a letter from Imgurum to the "Lord." Cf. description of text No. 22.

28 XI O. of a letter from a "father" to his "son." Cf. Translation on pp. 143ff.


31, 32 XII O. and R. of a letter from Errish(h)-apal-iddina to Innanni. Cf. description of text No. 84.

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>10000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10302</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>10497</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>10504</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10510</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>10614</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10614</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10571</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10575</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>10600</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10621</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>10629</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10658</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10774</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>10775</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>10781</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10804</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10806</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10816</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10822</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>10853</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>10857</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10895</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>10914</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>10914</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10915</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>10919</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>10919</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10922</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>10924</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>10924</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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>11893</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>12582</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>19784</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11926</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>46</td>
<td>19787</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11931</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>19000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19788</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11946</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>19764</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>19796</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>38</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12559</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>
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PL. I

OBVERSE AND REVERSE OF NO. 24

KALIBU REPORTS TO THE KING ABOUT A DISASTROUS FLOOD, ABOUT 1430 B.C.
KALBU REPORTS TO THE KING ABOUT A DISASTROUS FLOOD, ABOUT 1430 B.C.
6-7. Dispute about the exact wording of a message from King Burna-Buriash, about 1440 B.C.

8-9. Royal summons from King Shagarakti-Shuriasht to his sheriff Amel-Marduk, about 1325 B.C.
A GENERAL'S EXPLANATORY LETTER TO THE KING, ABOUT 1400 B.C.
A PHYSICIAN'S REPORT TO THE KING ABOUT THE CONDITION OF SICK TEMPLE WOMEN, ABOUT 1430 B.C.

PL. VI
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 SHAGARAKTI-SHURIAH 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 DÜR-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.