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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 (DUBsumer) were inscribed on clay. They form part of the "Temple Archives" (DUB MUsumer) of the Cassite period, situated on the west side of the Shatt-en-Nil. In all probability these Archives were found in one or several buildings (connected with each other), known as the Š.Š.Š. and including the Temple Library and the Temple School. The Cassite Kings at this time were the chief administrators of the affairs of the Temple of Enlil at Nippur; for they are known by the title šakkānakkū Enlil, characterizing them as the representatives of Enlil on earth, who had "to put the seal" (kanāku) of the god to each and every transaction made by and for the Temple. Nothing could be done without their consent, approval, or authority (seal). While the "Temple Archives" proper give us a picture of the business methods of the Temple administration, under the chief supervision of the King, these letters represent the correspondence about those methods.

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

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

Though most of these letters are addressed to the "Lord," i.e., the "King" who had his residence at least temporarily in Nippur, some of them may be classified as part of an "official correspondence between Temple or State officers." There are even letters in these archives written by the kings themselves (comp. Nos. 75 and 93).
This collection of official letters from Nippur forms an exact parallel to the letters from the so-called Kuyunjuk collection of Nineveh, which constitutes the remains of the famous library of King Ashshur-bēl-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, 81, 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) b, bi, ni, ir, tit, sha; (3) ib, ur, lu; (4) ish, ma, ba, za, shag (libbu), su; (5) ku, šib, lu; (6) im, al, a', mu; (7) du, ǔsh, ta, šá, ra; (8) az, uy; (9) ad, ši, mir; (10) be, mu; (11) al, šib, etc., etc.

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

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-c-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 Erriš(h). This reading I am still prepared to maintain, not only on account of the gloss urash, but also on account of the identity of $aNIN.IB$ and $aNEn(r)išh$, see The Monist, Vol. XVII, No. 1 (Jan., 1907), p. 142. The Aramaic transcription of NIN.IB is not $aEnš-AŠšRNA$ but $aEnš-ANšRNA$, as is now beyond question, it being frankly written in the latter fashion on several unpublished tablets in Constantinople, and also on an ostraca 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). $aEnš-ANšRNA$ apparently does not represent the pronunciation (this is Erriš(h)), but an attribute of $aNIN.IB$ 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 $aNIN.IB$, the "Son" of $aNEn-lil$. I propose to read $aEnš-ANšRNA = en-usāti = 'lord of help,'" an attribute ascribed, among others, also to $aNMarduk$, the "Son" of $aNÉ.A;" cf. the nom. propr. $maNMarduk-en-usāti$, quoted by Delitzsch, H. W. B., p. 107b, under usāti. Instead of usāti we find, at the time of the Cassites, also the writing $ú-za-ti$, cf. B. E., XIV, 125:12, "En-ú-za-ti, a noteworthy peculiarity which shows that usāti, uzāti has to be connected with the Sumerian A.ZU = $ášu = 'helper, physician.'" We know that $aNIB$ (gloss urash) is $aNIN.IB$ (see Böl, the Christ, p. 16, note 8; p. 18, III; p. 19, 2), but $IB$ (gloss urash) is also $barù$ (II R. 62, 36a), and barù = A.ZU (Reisner, Hymnen, p. 7, 18. 19). From this it follows that $IB = A.ZU$, and $aNIN.IB = aNIN.A.ZU$ (cf. II R. 57, 51a,b, where the star (mul) $aNIN.A.ZU$ is identified with $aNIN.IB$). Again, $aNIB$ is also $aNMASH$, but mash changes with máš, cf. mask-pad = máš-pad (E. B. H., p. 256, note 16); mash-shu-gid (Cyl. A 20:5) = máš-shu-gid (Cyl. A 12:16, 17), and máš is likewise $barù = A.ZU$. I take, therefore, $aEnš-ANšRNA$ to stand for $NX = en = NIN$, and $aEnš-ANšRNA = uzāti = uzāti$ (the abstract for the concrete noun) = A.ZU = $IB = MASH$ in other words, $aNIB$ or $aNMASH$ is "the helper," "the physician" (hence the patron god of the physicians), and $aNIN.IB$ or $aNIN.A.ZU$ 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-
ciuf one" (rûmûnû, K 128—Jensen, Kosn., p. 470), the "merciful god" (ilû rûmûnû, 1 R. 17:19), the "one who gives life" (qâ-ûsh TI.L.1, 1 R. 17 : 19). "who gives the spirit of life" (qâ-ûsh nûpsûtû, Jensen, i.e.), "who quickens the dead" (unûbalûlû mûlûtû), 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 arûllû shûrûlu payarshu tутerû, Bîl, the Christ, p. 45, note 2; cf. qî xli. 15, "God will redeem my soul from the power of Sheol"; or qî xvi. 10, "For thou wilt not leave my soul to Sheol").

From these considerations it follows that the "Son" of the Nippurian Trinity (Enûlu—XîNIB—XîNI.II.1—Bau) was the prototype not only of Nin.Girsu in the Girsu Trinity (Enûlu—XîN.Girsu—XîNI.II.1—Bau) or of Marduk in the Eridu Trinity (É.A—Mardûk—Damkina—Šarpanilûm), but even of Christ in the Christian Trinity (Father—Son—Holy Spirit); in each and every case the "Son" was the Saviour, the en usûtû; hence Christ was rightly called the "Jesus" and was greeted, when entering Jerusalem, with joyful "Hosannas," נֵסָנָה, "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 Lushyumûr 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 correspondant, 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 PûN-AN.GAL-la-mur invokes the gods of Dûr-îlu for the protection of the addressee; hence the probability is that the writer hailed and wrote from Dûr-îlu. But this, as I said, is and must remain a probability only, for we find in the letters here published another example in which the writer invokes the gods of Nippur. This letter (No. 38) has likewise been found in Nippur. Now it is not at all likely that the writer, when sending his letter to the "Lord" at Nippur, was himself in Nippur. If he were, he would most assuredly have appeared before the "Lord" in person, thereby saving himself the trouble of writing a letter, which had to be baked, encased in an envelope,
addressed, sealed and handed over to a messenger in order to be delivered. What then is the inference from this invocation? Does the invocation prove that the letter was sent from Nippur to Nippur, where it was found? Such a thought would be simply ridiculous. All we can say is this: the writer of No. 38, because he invokes the gods of Nippur, was in all probability a Nippurian, but was away from Nippur when writing that letter. The invocation of that letter, then, does not prove anything at all with regard to the place whence that letter has been sent.

2. Prof. Hilprecht has some very good, convincing, and absolutely reliable reasons why he assigns the Lushtamar letter to the business or administrative section of the Temple Library of Nippur. We believe his words a thousand times more than those of his accusers, which, at the very best, are merely hearsay. In fact, his critics have absolutely nothing to bring forward in corroboration of their claim that “the Lushtamar letter did not come from the ruins of Nippur, but from those of Sippar.” In corroboration of this hearsay talk Prof. Hilprecht’s critics now point out that the seal impression of the Lushtamar letter mentions certain persons who are known from tablets that have been found at Sippar. What is there on the envelope of the Lushtamar letter to justify such a strange conclusion? Besides the address “to Lushtamar (a-na Lu-ush-ta-mar)”, I find a seal impression which reads: Ḫu-shē-Ba-ū captured | mār 1-bī-iš INN.SHAŠ | ardī iš INN.SHAŠ-ge. The same persons occur again on a tablet published in B. E., VP, 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., VP, 50), and because B. E., VP, 50, was “probably” found in Sippar, the Lushtamar must have been found in Sippar likewise. But can anyone imagine that Ḫu-shē-Ba-ū, 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 Ḫu-shē-Ba-ū, 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 Ḫu-shē-Ba-ū of the Lushtamar letter and the Ḫu-shē-Ba-ū of B. E., VP, 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 Ḫu-shē-Ba-ū, 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 of the University of Pennsylvania (1889–1900), and form part of the so-called Temple Archives of Nippur, partly published by Clay, B. E., XIV and XV. The facts that these letters were found, when unpacked by Prof. Hilprecht, intermingled with the tablets of B. E., XIV and XV, which are all dated in the reign of certain Cassite Kings, that they are of the same peculiar "color of clay," have the same "form" and "writing" as those of the Temple Archives, would, a priori, make it reasonably certain that we have to assign them to the Cassite period. Apart from these criteria there are others which prove, beyond a doubt, that the letters here published did, and actually do, belong to the reigns of either one or the other of the following Cassite kings (see Hilprecht, B. E., XX, p. 52, note 1):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kings</th>
<th>Reigned according to &quot;List of Kings.&quot;</th>
<th>Last Year found on Nippur Tablets</th>
<th>About</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Burna-Buriash II</td>
<td></td>
<td>25 (or 27)</td>
<td>1450–1425 B.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuri-Bulu I</td>
<td></td>
<td>25 23</td>
<td>1421–1398 B.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nazi-Maruttash (son)</td>
<td></td>
<td>26 24</td>
<td>1396–1370 B.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kadašman-Targu (son)</td>
<td></td>
<td>17 16</td>
<td>1369–1332 B.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kadašman-Enil II (son)</td>
<td>[1] or [1] 2</td>
<td>6 6</td>
<td>1332–1340 B.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kudur-Enil (1st son)</td>
<td>6(1) (Notice discrepancy)</td>
<td>8 8 12(1) 10</td>
<td>1331–1318 B.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shagarakti-Šariash (2d son)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1317–1309 B.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kashtiliashu II (son)</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2 "Temple Archives," to mention it here, were called at the time when all these documents were written: DUB MUL.KA, DUR shuudu-tam, DUR.SHI.RA, DUB.MU.BLI.M, DUB.GISH, DUB.KUR.KUN. For a discussion of these terms see below under "Results," p. 83.
3 The last year thus far known was the 25th. Cf. B. E., XIV, 9 : 55. airša-EN.GAR.GA.BA.tum 16.kušu 25.kušu Burna-Buri-ša-ša LUGAL-E. But Prof. Hilprecht informs me that Burna-Buriash II seems to have ruled
Among these criteria and indications 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.

"I-nu-an-ni, who figures so conspicuously in the texts of B. E., XIV, as one who transacts (i-nu qil) the business of the Temple's storehouses at Nippur and elsewhere during the 18th, 21st, 13, and 23rd year of Kuri-Galzu and the 1st and 2d

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.

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

1 B. E., XIV, 38 : 15f. (arku) āmmu 16th šum šattu 22šum šām [Kur]-e-[Ga]-lzu.
3 B. E., XIV (pl. 61), 11f. (= E. A. H., 179): arkuUSHI-GA āmmu 3šum šattu 1šum Kudish-ša-ta-šu.
4 For this ruler see Clay, B. E., XIV, p. 4, and I.e., No. 116 : šī. arkuUSHI-Assu šattu 1šum šām [Kudish-ša-ta-šu].

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 (where Hilprecht, B. E., XX, p. 52, note 1, follows), gives the year 9 as the last, referring to I.e., No. 124 : 18f. But here we have clearly the year 8, for we read: šām [SHE] šattu 8šum [Kudish-ša-ta-šu]. Cf. here I.e., 123 : 21 and P. 155 : 22—both of which are likewise dated in the 8th year.

Hilprecht, B. E., XX, p. 52, note 1, has shown that the tablet, B. E., XIV, 139, is not dated from the 23rd Clay, I.e., pp. 3, 72), but from the 2nd year; hence the last recorded date is found in B. E., XIV, 138 : 32, arkuGAIM ąmmu 16šum šattu 1šum (cf. 1. 2)šum Sha-ger-en-ali-Sha-ir-ta-šu LUGAL. Cf. also P. 111 : 15 131 : 18, and especially 11f. arkuUSHI-MAŠ-MAŠ-šu šattu 3šum [Shat-tar-ak-šir-ta-šu] (= 6) LUGAL KT-SHARR-1 ša-ša-šu.)


If possibly about 1296-1289 B.C. Cf. 111 R. 4, No. 2 (Sennacherib's capture of Babylon, i.e., either the first 792 B.C.) or the second (659 B.C.) of the two (690 B.C.) which he reigned seven years over Babylon, following immediately upon Kasballashu.


B. E., XIV, 29 : 3, 33 : 3. The tablet, i.e., 23 : 8 (dated in the 13th year of Kuri-Galzu), where it is reported that Kudashman-Ishchu paid (mabila) to (or by) "KUDASHMAN-UNUAN, was not taken into consideration here.

B. E., XIV, 35 : 3.

B. E., XIV, 38 : 10, where it is stated that certain animals, which had been loaned out, are to be returned to (gāmānāmu) Imanān.

From the 22nd year of Kuri-Galzu Imanān shared honors with his successor, "Mar-tu-ku, B. E., XIV, 36 : 3.


B. E., XIV, 12 : 2, 19f. arkuKI-nu-šu Imanān šattu 3šum Ima-nil-Ma-re-ak-ta-shu LUGAL-E.
year of Nazi-Maruttash—i.e., during a period of at least ten years—is represented in our texts as the recipient of four letters, two of which have been addressed to him by NIN.IB (resp. 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 (hazannāti) 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 hazannāti, "city prefects," must have been a "governor," a "bēl pahātī." Comparing these results with the texts of B. E., XIV and XV, we learn that a certain place, called either Dūr-apal apal-iddina or Bit-mash (resp. 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., Innanna) 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 Bit-in-na-ant (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).


Nos. 83-86.

Nos. 83 and 84.

Possibly to be read Errish-apal-iddina. For the possible reading of NIN.IB resp. MASH as Errish(1), see The Monist, XVII (January, 1907), pp. 140ff. Clay reads this name either NIN.IB-mār-iddina (B. E., XIV, p. 49b) or NIN.IB-apal-iddina (B. E., XIV, p. 38a). Why this change, considering that in all the passages known to me the writing TUR.USH = apal is found?

9 No. 83: 24 a ta ta ha an at ta a la an ma shezer a na a šu ki di, see p. 112.

10 No. 84: 3, SHE.GISH.NI ša ta ha an an a at ta a ma ha a, etc., see p. 114.

11 This follows also from a comparison of, e.g., B. E., XIV, 99b (pl. 59 = E. A. H., 195): 4, 7, 16, 26, 29, 41 with B. E., XIV, 168: 50, 51, 26, and especially 40, i.e., in this latter tablet, which is an "inventory of cattle," the "ša Bit-ŠE.NIN.IB.TUR.USH-SE-na" apparently stands for pi-hot m in NIN.IB.TUR.USH-SE-na.

12 B. E., XIV, 18: 7 (notice that KI-IH refers back to Dār-e of l. 6). In B. E., XIV, pp. 49b, 58b, this name is read NIN.IB-mār-iddina, but in i.e., p. 58a, Dār-m NIN.IB-mār (read: apal)-iddina.

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


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

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

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

18 B. E., XIV, 81: 2, 9.
the time during which Inanna was the "chief bursar" at Nippur. Hence Inanna and "Errish-apal-iddina, the founder, owner, and occupant of Dur (resp. Bit)," were contemporaries.1

Again in No. 9 : 21 a certain "Bana-a-sha-[1u] Marduk, when writing to his "Lord" (br-lu), states that he has, in order to corroborate the truthfulness of his communications, "made to be his witnesses" a certain "Vergal-Ba-ni, the prefect (ha-za-an-na) of Rakanu, and the prefect (ha-za-an-na) of Bit-"Ki-din-ni, 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 Ban š-a-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 Ban š-a-Marduk received certain cereals5 "on the authority," or "by order" of "Ki dł-u li¬-u—the latter apparently being the superior of the former. But we can go a step farther. B. E., XIV, 99a (= E. A. H., 195): 35,8

1 Cf. here also B. E., XY, 124, where a certain "Ri-esh-Shamsu-sha(h)-du) or "Ri-esh-Shamash-sha(h) (this reading preferable to Clay's ""Ri-esh-š
du-sha(h) (B. E., XV, p. 106) or "Ri-esh-š
du-sha(h) (Z. A. XX (1907), p. 117.) in view of such names as "Ri-esh-na-pur-š
du-sha(h), B. E., XV, 21 : 7, and "Ri-esh, [1u]-Eš-lu, i.e., 19 : 16) receives from (ina n=) Inanna a certain amount of grain as KU-QAR-wages, which grain was taken from that belonging to (ina n=līši SHE šaš) MASH-TUR-USH-ŠE-na. The tablet is dated in the 22d year (sc. doubtless of Kuri-Galzu). In B. E., XV, 136 (dated the 23d year, sc. of Kuri-Galzu), Inanna endorses the payment of GIG (= kiblu, "flour," Jensen, K. B., VI, p. 485) to certain psa-dši hša "by order of" or "in the employ of"—thus receiving the amount specified "on the authority of," i.e., "per" (n=q ši) in this differing from Clay, B. E., XV, pp. 5, 6, who translated q ši "in the hands of" or "paid to"; q ši may or may not (as here) be expressed before the second name in "lists of payments," MASH-TUR-USH-ŠE-na. These two tablets prove beyond a doubt that Inanna and Errish-apal-iddina were contemporaries during the 22d and 23d year (of Kuri-Galzu).

2 No. 9 : 21, a-nu ši-ba-ši-im mšša Šer-gal-Ba-ni ha-za-an-na šaš. 1u 1u-ša ha-za-an-na šaš Bit-šša Ki-din-ni n=š-la-ka-na, p. 106.

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


5 AŠH.Á.V.

6 Thus I translate, because the name of Kidinni follows that of Ban š-a-Marduk.

7 Kidinni is a shorter form of Kidin(n)i. The latter is, as the long i indicates, a hypocoristicon of some such name as Kidin(n)i-XIV.48B, -šer-pal.-pau-rai (cf. No. 33 : 12), -šin,-u-ma(r), etc. See "List of Names" in B. E., XIV, p. 469. Cf. also 18 : 22, "Ki-din-ni; 23 : 23, "Ki-din-[1u] Marduk, and B. E., IX, p. 61b, and i.e., X, p. 536, "Ki-din-ni.

8 Owing to the fact that the writer was in Europe while reading the proofs of his E. B. 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. 528 sub e: "The dynasty of the Cassites, 175-195," instead of 191. Clay, B. E., XIV, p. 2; note 3, however, refers from this inaccuracy that the writer did not understand the nature of the tablet in question. Turning to the "Table of Contents" of B. E. IV, 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 (B. E., XIV, 168 and 99), which are interpreted somewhat differently by Dr. Clay, who sees in No. 168 a "record of
informus that there that lived in the 11th year of Kadašman-Targu (l. 46) a certain "Ki-di-nu-ú who was one of the prefects, ḫazānāti (l.c., col. XV : 22), belonging to the pi-hát of "t{sEn-lil-bēl (= EN)-nish°emesh-shu (l. 41). Now, as "Ki-di-nu-ú collections" (see l.c., p. 73), while No. 99 in this entire 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), na-ru LIT.GUD.11A & G.I.A.M.LULU.M.XXVIII, "the number of large and small cattle belonging to the X.V.X.11\°emesh." The latter were two "beings"; one was called X.V.X.A.GAL, l. 12, 34 (cf. B.E., XIV, 80 : 1, 9, 101 : 3, 131 b, 136 : 16, 138 : 31), and the other X.V.X.A.TUR, l. 44 (cf. B.E., XIV, 89 : 1, 16, 136 : 29 (3) and, per analogy, we ought to expect X.V.X.A.TUR also in l. 21. What these X.V.X.\°emesh were, cannot be made out as yet. From Letter No. 85 (see p. 115) I would like to infer that Hubi-Áiri was such a X.V.X.A or q̃išulhu. 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-šam-da, l. 1, 2, 14; while the "small cattle" were under that of the kash-shu "Ameš-šu-nu-ú (if kash-shu were = "Cassite," Amul-Bum 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?) bel piḫāti under him. And as, according to our tablet, the three piḫāti included in the kash-shu of Kilihadu are exactly the same as those of the kash-shu of Amul-Bum, it is most likely that a kash-shu is the general averessor of either the large or the small cattle, irrespective of territory; in other words, a kash-shu has the supervision of all small or all large cattle of a X.V.X.11 scattered over all the different provinces (piḫāti). I propose, therefore, to derive kash-shu from šum, "to gather" (Jensen, K. B., VI, pp. 322, 562), here in the sense of "one under whose jurisdiction are gathered a number of bel piḫāti," i.e., "governor- or averessor-in-chief." A bel piḫāti, 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 qit = "per," see l. 11 (cf. l. 7); 12 (cf. l. 4); 17, 20 (cf. l. 16); 32 (notice the š(!) and cf. l. 29 and 26); 42 (cf. l. 41); hence we have to translate, e.g., l. 11, "total 10 (or, even of six years) a-na za-bal KU.KAR amsu.RIQ = K.A.ZID.1,11 qit = (SHU) m\°WMShamas-umûn-ah\°emesh," by "(are employed) for the carrying (zabēl = iš; cf. our No. 34 : 40, i-si MARG.D1A X.I.3-aḫ-bi-šu, when I was bringing straw in the harvest (lit. "long") wagons, the horses, etc.) of the KU.KAR-wages of the vegetable- and grain-gatherers 'per' (or, order, information of) Shamas-umûn-ah\°e (the bel piḫāti, l. 7)"; or l. 17, "total 53 cattle, the property (ma-kun-tam) of Mār-Ilumman-Shamas, 'per' (order, information of) Ealil-bēl-nāšušu (the bel piḫāti, l. 16)." The territory of a piḫāti was subdivided into two to six (cf. l. 2, 3 and 35-40), or possibly more, ḫazānāti, and each ḫazānāni or "prefect" had one (cf. l. 2, 3, etc.), two (cf. l. 27, 28 and 36, 37) or more qaikt or "shepherds" under him. The n.oyg, ḫazānāni, bel piḫāti, kash-shu of this tablet correspond exactly to the n.oyg, ni-branda(q)-qad., P.A., etc., of the "inventory" lists of the Ur dynasty tablets, as published in E.B., II, pp. 333-361 (for ma-brēnu = ḫazānā see, e.g., Meissner, Iddongannu, No. 1159). It will be noticed that the introduction taken by T. 1 = 1i or EN = adu are never counted, hence T. 1 = 1i cannot mean here "together with," nor can adu be translated by "in addition to." T. 1 = 1i has to be rendered by "besides," and EN = adu by "apart from." For T. 1 cf. e.g., l. 43, T. 15 ki-in-bu, i.e., T. 15 (that were given for a) sacrifice to the dead." For kishu see, besides Zimmer, Rituals, p. 160, 11; Jensen, K. B., VI, pp. 446, 517; also B. E., XV, 185, l. 5; 200, l. 6, kis-šu n. ri-in-ku. For EN = adu cf. l. 15, 5, EN 1 shal (not lam, as Clay's copy gives, see XIV, 168 : 16, EN 5 shal-na-ni and cf., l. 15, skal-na-na-na-tam; XV, 199 : 21, 22; skal( = DI-na-na)-mu, i.e., "apart from one (that was given for a) peace-offering." Cf. also l. 18, EX 2 GUD MU-4 1 LIT šu i-na Kār-EN.KUR.KUR(2) ba-uk-kur-m, i.e., "apart from two oxen, four years old, and one ewe which are being taken care of in Kār-EN.KUR.KUR." For bakkara cf. also XIV, 168 : 53, šu 1-na šakkata tumu ba-ag-qu(-ra), and l.c., l. 15, tab-ki-ir(XIV, 99a : 10, tab-ki(-ti)šum šu ma-ku-ta ū-pek(-i)ak-ki-ra-ni, which shows that we have here a verb bēgur = bēgur = Hebr. "p2, Vel; "tocleave, disem, to lookafter a thing;" met with also in Hel., Winckler, l. 18 (quoted by H. W. R., p. 1816), where na-ak-ki-ir-ga-ar-br-ar-tim should be translated by "who looks after the fields," i.e., "who takes care of them." A tāppinu, accordingly, would be a "flock which requires special treatment," a "special looking after," and XIV, 168 : 16, quoted above, might be translated: "the flock(s) requiring a special looking after of the several shepherds they take care of them." Lastly cf. l. 13: EX 20 za-bi-tu MU 11\°am, i.e., "apart from 20 (special) 'holdings' of the 11th
(the hazium and superior of Bania-sha-Marduk\(^1\)) is only another writing for “Ki-diu-ni (the hazium of Bit-“Ki-diu-ni and the high and influential witness of Banisha-Marduk, the writer of Letter No. 9), there can be absolutely no reason against our identifying both and establishing the fact that Bania-sha-Marduk, the writer of No. 9, must have lived between the 20th year of Kuri-Galzu and the 11th of Kadashman-Turgu,\(^2\) or during a space of about forty-three years.

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

\(^{\text{1}}\) Bania-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 Shugurkiki-Shurinsh.


\(^{\text{3}}\) B. E., XIV, 99a (= E. A. H., 195) : 35.
"scribes") and show that they lived during the reign, or were contemporaries, of one or the other of the above mentioned Cassite kings. Seeing that such an investigation would lead too far here, we reserve it for Series C.

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

(b) The Cassite names of the persons mentioned as, e.g., "Gu-za-ar-AN ( = ilu?), 1 "Si-ri-da-ash," 2 Mār-ši-UB-shi-pak, 3 Mār-ši-UB-shi-ash, 4 "Na-zr,-" 5 "En-ul, 6

1 "Pāršt 4ASHAV ( = Ḫūh)," the writer of No. 5, is mentioned in B. E., XIV, 40:30 (dated in the 21st year of Kūn-Galal, i. 23) as DUB.SAR or "scribe." Cf. also the DUB.SAR Erû-Marduk of B. E., XIV, 127:11 (dated i."the beginning of the reign of Shagarkiti-Sharriššu"); for the expression cf. The Monist, XVII (January, 1907), p. 150, 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-Bu-akash, C. B. M., 3352:16 (quoted by Clay, B. E., XV, p. 365, and i.e., p. ix), which, no doubt, is the same as "Gu-XL(-)ar-AN-Bu-asb (thus read by Clay, B. E., XIV, p. 439, and quoted from C. B. M., 3614), seeing that XI might be read zul = zur. The interchange of i and r in the different languages is too well known as to require further examples. Gu-zur-zur resp. Gu-zal-zar "might" be an intensive form of Gu-zur, which latter we find in our text. If IY be read ilu we would here have a "mixed" name—partly Cassite, partly Babylonian; for such names cf., e.g., Kudur-summa, 11th Enil, Kudur-pāršt, 11th Enil, NIM Gil-sharrull, etc. In view of such names Guazar-Bagash, Guazar-Bagash, we might be justified in reading our name here Guzar-Bagash, thus identifying the Babylonian IY with the Cassite Bagash and attributing to the latter the rôle played by AN in the Babylonian pantheon.

3 No. 28:5 in [Rī]-"Si-ri-de(or shil)u-ash. Is this name to be compared with Si-ri-i, B. E., XV, 108:30, and Si-li-du; for this emendation cf. Clay, Z., A., XX (1907), p. 417f., i.e., 88:2, with interchange of i and r; 7

4 No. 55:2. For the reading Shi-pak, instead of Shi-hu, see B. E., XV, 190, VI:13, Medi-Shi-pak, and Clay, i.e., p. 3, note 4. Cf. here the names Ū-zi-ul-ab-Si-pak, Schell, Textes Élam., Sem., I, p. 93, i. 3; Ū-zi-ul-BAL.LI (sir, against Clay, i.e., XIV, p. 54f), B. E., XIV, 132:27, and Ū-zi-ul-SHI-in-SHIY, Clay, i.e., XIV, p. 456. For the interchange of i and r, cf., among others, also zu-ul-bii, B. E., XIV, 996:30, with si-bii, i.e., 99:65, and si-bi-de, i.e., 99:54:2. In view of this interchange we cannot connect Ū-zi-ul = U-zi-ul with 28 and see in our name a formation similar to that of Nāšān-zu-bi ("Nebû is Entangled"), quoted by Del., H., B., 356. Usb, Ushb, no doubt, is a side-form of uz-zu = er-temum, D.A., Sprache der Kassiter, p. 26:42. For the interchange of i and r, etc., i.e., išši-ku(?)-mu, No. 35:33, išši-ul-shi-ra-zi, 55:12, etc. Ū-zu-ul-Shi-pak, then, is = Ešir-Marduk, i.e., "Protect, oh Marduk!" Ūzub-BAL.LI = "Protect my portion" (or, oh god!); Usb-ul-SHI-in-SHIY = "Protect my face (= me), oh Shamash," or possibly the protector of my face is Shamash." See here also the remarks to NIMGI, introduction to No. 33a.

5 Thus to be read according to B. E., XV, 168:1, where we have ash for ilu. According to 55:8, 16, 20 this person was the messenger of King Dur-Rima, see p. 3, note 2.

6 No. 21:25. This half Cassite and half Babylonian name is found in C. B. M., 3520:13 (B. E., XV, p. 355). Whether the element Na-zi be the same as Na-ah-zi, which Clay, B. E., XV, p. 4, note 2, thinks to be possible, cannot be made out as yet. It is, however, a fact that aḥ and aš very often change in these texts—a phenomenon overlooked by the author of Vols. XIV and XV, as seen from B. E., XV, p. 37, note 1, where we have Mi-aa-a-lu-an-AN ( = ilu) for Min-ah-šu-iran-AN. For this interchange of aḥ and aš cf., Kudur-ah-bun-ut (33:1), resp. Kish-br-abu-ut (33:4), with Mār-ši-Ki-šu-iran-ut, B. E., XV, 188:1:25 (not registered by Clay). II:13 (i.e., p. 48f, wrongly has aš or aš''), 34:4; Kudur-ah-bun-ut, B. E., XV, 150:5 (the aššu-mu-kudur-lu-ti and all others quoted under aššu-mu-kudur-lu-ti in B. E., XIV, p. 586, and XV, p. 536, have, of course, to be corrected into aššu-mu-kudur-lu-ti). For the present, be left open.
"Me-ši-Shu-pak," and lastly "Me-ši-[šu]-qu-ap-mu-nu," 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 "štšPA.KU-SHES-SÉ-tu = Nišku-ul-iddina."

(c) Certain cities or places peculiar to both, our letters here and the dated tablets of the Cassite kings. Among these may be mentioned "ššArši-GASHAN" (-Bilīti). Bil'-"Ki-din-uni, BÁ.R.TUR.ii: "ššDūr-EX.KUR.KUR.i, Dūr-"štšEn-

1 No. 17 : 32. Also mentioned in B. E., XIV, 125 : 8 (13th year of Ka'rt-Galzu) and LC, XV, 190, VI : 15.
2 No. 59 : 11. In B. E., XV, p. 1, this name is considered to be of Babylonian element. As Meši is correctly recognized as a Cassite element, the god Shupanna is evidently regarded as a Babylonian divinity. The fact, however, that Shupanna 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 Shi- occurs, see B. E., XIV, 132 : 24; XV, 136 : 10.
3 The account of moș(i) (not moș/mark), I. 14, I do not hold "štšEšn-an-mūšNX.1B, l. 12, to be a son of Meli-Shupanna.
4 No. 59 : 13.
5 Nos. 13 : 7 = 66 : 21. In 18 : 10 we have "ššArši-ŠIN (= Bilīti)" and in 11 : 20 "ššArši-GASHAN." The latter writing is found also in B. E., XIV, 1230 = (E. A. H., 180) : 5 (8th year of Kidurri-Enlil, I. 13).
6 Nos. 9 : 13 = 11 : 15. For the "ššKudūni-uni = ššKi-din-uni" see above, pp. 41ff.
7 No. 53 : 8b, to be read (according to Be, 6900) Pa-rak ma-ši(2) (so also Clay, Z. 1., XX (1907), p. 417f, correcting B. E., XIV, p. 57b, passim). The mūši, of course, the Nippurian mar sar 'zišaš, i.e., "štšNX.1B. From B. E., XIV, 133 : 3, 6 we learn that it existed in "the seventh year of Shagarakti-Shurriash," I. 13. Cf. here also the KAS "štšParak-mūši" 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 "štšNX.1B or of "štšEnlil, never of Marud of Babylon, see, e.g., No. 24 : 14, 17, and cf. "štšNam-gur-šaš-EN.KUR.KUR in No. 59 : 9. For the omission of lū in before names of gods cf. among others, also hana-nas-il, B. E., XV, 163 : 38 (the city mentioned in B. E., XV, 150 : 12 has to be read "štšEnlil-GL.BAR.K1, i.e., "Enlil looks favorably upon," and not (Clay, i.e., p. 52a) "ššEnlil-ûmu-nas(em)?") Lohar (U. DOR), i.e., 183 : 36 = 188 : 1 : 13 = 15 : 15: Sarpisum, i.e., 163 : 31; Shum = (i)-ši, i.e., 96 : 10; Shmansu = (UD)ši, i.e., 167 : 33, 31; NX.1B.AG.BR, i.e., 154 : 24; Súm (= XXX), i.e., 164 : 7 166 : 5; E., i.e., 166 : 6; Enlil, i.e., 132 : 16 : 175 : 65 : 154 : 27; Marud, i.e., 166 : 20; Šumu, C. B. M., 3472, etc., etc. A Dūr-EN.KUR.KUR is mentioned in B. E., XIV, 5 : 6 (11th year of Burra-Burriash). Cf. also "ššDūr-beš-et-ŠKUR.KUR in B. E., XV, 64 : 1 and the Dūr-EN.KUR.KUR.GAL, i.e., 159 : 10. The correct reading of the different writings would be "ššDūr-beš-et-ŠKUR.KUR, 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: 4, the temple of Enlil as the bit-mūštāti-rābā is very often referred to simply as Š.E.AN = bit-ilu, i.e., "the house of the god" per excellence, and that Enlil himself is very often spoken of as the AX or LU, i.e., "the god" (B. E., XIV, 16 : 1, see below, p. 50); hence Enlil, "the great lord of lands," might also be called "the great god of lands." Furthermore, it is well known that KUR.KUR = muštāti = lands (= Babylonian world = Shumer and Akkad), hence the reading "ššEnlil-UX.GAL. En-lūti(?)" defended in Z. A., XX (1907), p. 44, must be abandoned in my judgment. There is no god UX.GAL. B. E., XIV, 14 : 15 : 19, has to be read "štšEnlil-KAL.MAL.GAL.UX.LU. = bit-mūštāti-rābā Nippurši, i.e., "the temple of the great god of the lands at Nippur," which temple is the E.KUR inhabited by Enlil-XI.B-Nišku or better, which is occupied by the Nippurian Trinity in Unity: Enlil (Father) = XI.B (Son) = Enlil = Hubu (Mother, resp. wife of the Son), cf. for the latter also B. E., XV, 34 : 2, Bit(šš)Udu = A.X.KAL.MAL.GAL.UX.LU.1, i.e., "the temple of Gula and NIS.BN." ( = Enlil; the temple of the god standing for the god's name, cf. apil Eš-šar-ra = NX.1B). Cf. here also the note on UX.GAL. = ššKAD = Enlil farther below, p. 20.
From the temple archives of Nippur.


1. No. 39:21, or written also Dâr-š[-Enli]-bâ-kâ, No. 3:33, 38, 41, which latter is mentioned in B. E., XIV, 5:10 (11th year of Burra-Burash) and L., 78:4 (22d of Nāzi-Marutash). ašša Dâr-š[-Enli]-bâ-kâ we find in B. E., XIV, 118:1:30 (5th year of Kudur-Enlî), and ašša Dâr-š[-Enli]-bâ-kâ in L., XIV, 127:4 (beginning of the reign of Shagaraki-Sharash). In this last passage the same city is mentioned in 1:7, where its name is ašša Dâr-š[-Enli]-bâ-kâ-

a most interesting writing, showing that even at the time of the Cassite kings Dâr-Ku-ri-Gal-zu was pronounced and read Enlî, resp. Ellî, or still better: Enlîlī with a plural Enlîlī; the long ù or ū still betraying the fact that we have here a Semiticized Sumerian word. For such occurrences cf., e.g., gur-zu = kassâ = Heb. 582, "thoros." Clay's view, J. S. L. L., XXIII, pp. 299f., that Enlîl was always pronounced Ellîl must be modified, as will be shown elsewhere. The name Ellîl, signifying the chief god of Nippur, was in course of time applied to each and every god that played the same rôle in the religious conceptions of the Babylonians as did Enlîl of Nippur. The same holds good of Dâr-Ku-ri-Gal-zu (= Dur-Kurri-Galzu). (Clay, p. 272, l. 5) or as Entiš-ša-a=Enlîl-bât (E. B. H., p. 269, note 11, p. 274, l. 5), i.e., "Enlîl of the Nippurians" or "the Nippurian Enlîl." (For the formation Entiš-ša-a = Nippurian, see GISH-šša[ki] (E. B. H., p. 79, l. 28, p. 81, l. 55) = abûa GISH-šša[ki] (E. B. H., p. 76, ll., 5, 8; p. 81, note 1, l. pass.). Hrozny's theory, Z. A., XX (1907), p. 421f., to read GISH-šša[ki] = Umma or Almah is untenable. From the fact that Hû has the pronunciation U-nma or Almah, it does not yet follow that GISH-šša[ki] has to be read likewise U-nma or Almah), there came to be known in Babylonia a "collocation" (biša) of Ellîl, among them Sin (of Ur), Inanum (of Ištar), Shamash (of Larsa), Marduk (of Babylon), AX-SHARP = Ashkur (of Ashur), and the Cassite Enlîl = Harâbe, thus demonstrating beyond a shadow of a doubt that Ellîl ceased very early to be a name and became a title. There is no old Ellîl or Ellîl as over against a new or later Ellîl (= Manduk), but all gods called Ellîl 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 Peru, 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 Dâr-š[-MAR.TU]-obârû (SHA) (Clay, l. e., p. 259, Dur-šâmar-tukî) and KI-Šâ[-Dâr-š[-MAR.TU]-obârû] = [BIL] (Clay, ibid., Dâr-BIL[¥]EB[¥]E) for here laburu, resp. esubû, does not refer to Dâr-š[-MAR.TU], but to Dâr, i.e., we have here an "ohl" and a "new" Dâr[¥]š[-MAR.TU], or two parts (here no items given for "new" Dâr[¥]š[-MAR.TU]) of one city, e.g., the German Idil-š and AX-SHARP.

2. Nos. 45:23 = 57:15, 20, or only Dâr-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 kisûr ( = BU)-hil or "stone dam," hence the same canal that passed by Nippur must have passed by Dâr-Ku-ri-Galzu (and ašša Berdi-šili) likewise. The ruins represented at the right of No. I, below No. III (see the plan of Xunbar in Hilprecht, B. E., Series D, Vol. I, p. 305, and regarded by Hilprecht as covering the ruins of the fortified palace of the patesir of Nippur, which, like the palace of Sargon of Khorsabad, formed a bulwark in the fortification line of Nippur), in all probability represent those of Dâr-Ku-ri-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 uncertain tablet (inscription of a river) from the 11th year of Burra-Burash, B. E., XIV, 4:11, L.(MAR.TU)-is-ra-m[a-šu-ma-a]-ma-a-šu ma Dâr-š[-Ku-ri-Gal-zu]-is-hebû-šamu. This passage is not referred to in B. E., XIV, nor in the corrections, Z. A., XX (1907), p. 417. It is again mentioned in B. E., XIV, 12:12, dated ša-šu šam-l[a] Dâr-š[-Ku-ri-Gal-zu]. These two passages prove that this place was founded not by Kυri-šu-ša[li]-gū, but by the older Kυri-šu-ša[li]. Notice in this connection that the last quoted tablet gives us the first occurrence of a second Ellîl for the Cassite period, being called there ašša Kυrîš-išša[li]-gū (B. E., XIV, 46:3) ma ašša Kυrîš-išša[li]-gù mana Kυrîš-išša[li]-gù mana, for this month had its origin, as we know,
;
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the “Temple Archives,” but also with the letters from the Hammurabi and the Amarna periods. Among these may be mentioned:

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

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

to the sea.” There is hardly a text which is of the highest importance in this connection, but which has not been referred to by Clay, it being quoted by him neither under Gicra (B. E., XIV, p. 58a) nor under KAS BAR.TVR (i.e., p. 57b). Its importance consists in the fact that there is to be found between KAS (= girru) and BAR.TVR the determinative for “city,” álu, thus showing conclusively that KAS does not belong to BAR.TVR; if it did, such a place would have been KAS BAR.TVR, and not KAS á lu BAR.TVR, as we find it here. The text, B. E., XIV, 167, reads: 31 qa ZID.BAR: 24 (qo) SHE.BAR: KAS (= girru, barri) 2 lu BAR.TVR 1 lu 2 lu (as-ki | ánu 1 kam a ni EN.KI ili ša-anna 1 km a a lu KAS-barri-man Tar-qa LU.GAL: E., “34 qa of flour, 24 qa of barley (for the) journey to Parak-mari (and) 2 qa of barley for grinding” (txi = BAR.HAR = KAR = qu-an-a = GAZ – keshâ, cf. II., IV., p. 6989, and B. E., XIV, 81: 1: 91: 4: XV, 171: 1: KUQAI GAZ ZID.BAR). Then follows date.

In the above given texts, then, the KAS-Tam-lum, KAS Dâr-lu-gi, Gir-ri, A.A.BB.I, KAS á lu BAR.TVR are not “places,” but “journeys” to the places named after KAS resp. Gicra, and the tablets in which these expressions occur do not represent “payments” (Clay, Table of Contents, B. E., XIV, p. 714), but are what the Germans would call “Vertretungsurkunde-Bescheinigungen” 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-nu layal | id 3 kam šag arum | X, qa zid KAS(!)-shâ | Girud Dâr-lu-gi | 60 lu-ki dânu n-un-landa | A.A.BB.I(?)-shâ mu-gash-baši giš = (D)-ma” (Clay), “so and so many qa of GL-flour, royal quality, for (a) three days (stay) in the city, so and so many qa of flour to Girud, the sukal, and to Bkшла, the son of the un-landa, for the journey (KAS-shâ) to the sea (A.A.BB-I-shâ) which they make (lit. ‘go’ for the purpose (šâl) of fishing (mu-gash)).” Here is KAS-shâ A.A.BB.I-shâ exactly the same KAS Tam-lum of B. E., XIV, 151. A journey to the sea from Nippur demanded on account of its distance and duration some kind of “Vertretungsurkunde.” This, likewise, is true of a journey to Dûr-ihl on the Elamite boundary, and if so, then Parak-mari 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. Gicra-Tam-lum and the Girud-Dâr-lu-gi from the list of “places,” and of assigning to Gicra-Mišû, i.e., “Mišû-read” = “read to Mišû,” the proper place among the “highways” of Babylonia.


2 No. 29: 11. This is, however, doubtful, for a-li-ki may be taken here also as a first pers. præt. (scl!) of NPI and be translated “as many as I have taken.” See pp. 100, note 108, note 4.

3 No. 20: 1, 8, 9, 11, but in 1. 4 it is omitted.

4 Bizio, i.e., p. XVI, says that DISH is found in the Amarna letters of the L. collection before anâm “of, in,” inâ “me,” amâ “man,” izzî “pretend,” mânâm “myself,” and sharru “king,” but he omits EX = bila. In view of our letter, quoted above, we have to see in places like Amarna, L. 16: 1: 21 or L. 52: i, pass., where the sign for EX has the peculiar form of a-ru, the determinative DISH + EX and read either *EX = bila or EX = bila. Knudtzon, Die El-Amarna-Texte, has, quite correctly, recognized this DISH.
The use of ħal, also written ʾish-ʾish, to express the plural.

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, ʾalḥal; i.e., ṣa-ʾmu-ʾmum ( = plural) ālḥal. Clay, B. E., XIV, p. 58a, is inclined to regard this in i.e., 186 : 25 (read 21) as a new city, ʾabḫal, or Bušā, but there ālḥal is a plural, as a comparison with 11, 4, 8, 13, 16, 19 clearly shows. An alḥal (Clay, corrections in Z. J., XX (1907), p. 417f.) does likewise not exist in B. E., XV, 132 : 1, where we are told what amounts of grain were paid out (ʾud-ʾnī) in the cities (ālḥal) of Ishn-napli-iddina, who, therefore, must have been a hilt pihiti, with several huzanniti (city prefects) under his command. For other occurrences of ħal = ʾish-ʾish see, e.g., B. E., XIV, 18 : 2, ʾalʾishš; B. E., XV, 185 1 : 6 | 200 1 : 7, ῤ. ʾaššš; B. E., XV, 178 : 3 | 200 1 : 9, MUššš (Clay's copy gives in the last quoted passage zīr for MU, but this may be a peculiarity of the scribe). These passages quoted from Vol. XIV and XV for the use of ħal as a plural sign may be compared with King, Letters, 39 : 5, Ῥkiʾa ʾalḥal, and Bezd, i.e., p. 71, under ʾalḥa.

2 While we have in No. 6 : 7 only ʾishš, and in No. 24 : 9 ip-ʾrū, we find in No. 33 : 36, [...] + 10 gar ʾish šqīʾi, with which cf. Amarna, L. 16 : 3, ʾishš, i.e., ʾšqīʾi. As No. 28 : 21, ʾa mu-ʾa mu-ʾm-u ʾa ši-n-an ši-baš, to be compared with Amarna, L. 31 : 10, ʾaššš, i.e., mi-nu?
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-fi-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 (Gű.EN.NA), No. 75, see pp. 132ff.

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

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

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

2. One written by a certain m in A-shur-shum-čtir(KAR) to the governor in En-lil-[bel (= EN)-nishêmê-šu], who flourished at the time of Kadashman-Turgu.

3. Two written during the reign of Burna-Buriash by the celebrated trader in slaves, m 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 bel pihitî; this follows from the greeting in 1. 5, u a-na pu-ka-ki-ka le-a shu-šu.
5 Thus I propose to read his name, identifying him with the bel pihitî mentioned in R. E., XIV, 99a: 16, 41; cf. ibid., II, 17, 20, 12 (dated the 11th year of Kadashman-Turgu). He was a contemporary of the king Ki-di-nu-â and of En-lil-šu.Marduk, the writer of No. 9, see p. 5.
6 For further details see below, pp. 54ff.
(a) To "A-li.-u-shi-na,"
(b) To "Im.-gu-ri?"

1. Eight letters, addressed to certain officials, in which the writer calls himself "brother," alf, 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 Kudurri-Enlil, addressed to "A-mi-[l]-i-in, 6
(b) Two from "Erba-ah"Marduk 8 and addressed
(a) To the sheriff-in-chief at the time of Kudurri-Enlil, "A-li.-a-Ba-ui, 9
(b) To "Dum-[l]-ti-ia."

1 No. 78. An "A-li.-u-shii-na" is mentioned also in B. E., XIV, 25 : 12, 15, 23 (17th year of Kurei-Gahar) and in l.e., 167 : 11, 12 (23rd or better 26th year, which can refer only to the reign of Bion Bia-ushar, because Enil-kishinni is mentioned in all other tablets as living only under that ruler's reign). From this we may infer that King Bion Bia-ushar 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-ram, the writer of Nos. 22, 23. See introduction to No. 23, below, p. 24.

3 This, no doubt, is to be understood ram ganno salik and parallel to Bion Bia-ushar's calling himself "thy brother," when writing to the king of Egypt (cf., e.g., Amarna, L. 2). That we are in many cases forbidden to take the term "brother" literally is shown, e.g., by C. T., XXII, Pl. 3, No. 11, where the writer "SHESSmash.MU,IMM, Marduk addresses his letter to his "brothers," SHESSmash, among whom is to be found another "SHESSmash.MU,IMM, 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. Alf in this connection means probably nothing more than "friend."

4 No. 80.

5 Cf. B. E., XIV, 55 : 1 (12th year of Nazi-Maruttash); l.e., 56r : 24 (13th year of ditto); l.e., 69 : 2 ; 62 : 2 (14th year of ditto); l.e., 65 : 12 (15th year of ditto); l.e., 99v : 20 (11th year of Kudashman-Turgu); l.e., 106 : 2 (14th year of ditto).

6 In this form it is found neither in B. E., XIV; nor XV. 1 is "A-li.-u the mana(t) "gi-su (sic) not ZU HU SHU, Chay, B. E., XV, p. 269; cf. H. W. B., p. 400v, and Meissner, J. P., p. 115, note 1), l.e., XV, 35 : 15 (13th year of ?) to be compared with Imil-mu as "Konsname;" cf. the German "mein Mannchen."

7 Erba-Marduk, the author of No. 81, hailed either from Larsa or possibly from Sippar, while the writer of No. 82 was, no doubt, a Nippurian, see p. 23. The latter I would identify with the DU HAMAR Erba-Marduk of B. E., XIV, 127 : 14 (dated in the beginning of the reign of Shagarakhot-Suruq) and with the writer of Nos. 13, 14. The former, being a contemporary of A-hu-ub-ub, lived during the time of Kudurri-Elnil (see following note) and Kudurri-Elnil. Cf. also Mardum-bi, 81 : 9, with Dumu, B. E., XIV, 56v : 20 (13th year of Nazi-Maruttash) and Hu-MU,TUK.A-rum (Meissner, Ideogramm, No. 3657), 81 : 10, with the person of the same name in B. E., XIV, 116 : 6 (6th year of Kudurri-Elnil) and l.e., 124 : 17 (8th year of Kudurri-Elnil). For possibly still another Erba-Marduk, see introduction to No. 33, p. 121, and l.e., p. 167.

8 No. 81. A son of A-li.-a-ka-ki, Dir-Sharumanna by name, is mentioned in B. E., XIV, 119 : 32 (5th year of Kudurri-Elnil). The letter, then, probably lived during the time of Kudurri-Elnil and was still alive during Kudurri-Elnil's reign.

9 No. 82. Before Dumili there is neither an ABAR 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 Dumili-in must be a kind of "Konsname" or possibly one signifying a "profession." Notice in this connection the difference between TUR.SAL "(!)Mü-
(c) One from *Gu-zar-AN* to the Temple official *In-nu-â-a*.

(d) One from *Pâ'û (= SHI)-ANGAL-la-mur,* an inhabitant of Dûr-ilu*ki*, to a high Temple and State officer of Nippur, *NIIN-nu-â-a.* This letter, although it had been sent to *DUKIB.NUN* *ki*, i.e., to Sippar, where *NIIN-nu-â-a* happened to be at that time, was found by the Expedition of the University of Pennsylvania at Nippur.

(c) One written during the time of Burna-Buriash and addressed by *I-li-ip-pu-â-sh-ia-â* to [*Du(?)-li-î-sibâ]*.

(j) One from *I-Sin (= XXX)-êrîsh (= EN.GAR)*, a storehouse official,

*Du-idû (B. E., XV, 103 : 13), on the one hand, and TUR.SAL (sic) mu-an-di-di (B. E., XV, 155 : 7 : 164 : 4) resp. TUR shâ-an-gi-e (B. E., XV, 168 : 17) on the other. Cf. also our "Smith" and "smith." Notice further that whenever a noun, proper is found without the determinative DISH (or SÍJ) it does not signify the name of a person (kings are excepted because they are gods), but a place called after that person, see, e.g., *Shamas(=UD)-ta-kul-ti (sic) without atu, DISH, and ki, 16 : 8, 12; NiGir-ra-gim-il, 3 : 13, 17, 20, but also NiGir-ra-gim-il, 3 : 38, 40 + fr. d, resp. A.\|NiGir-ra-gim-il, 3 : 31. The name Dumilti-in by itself looks like a feminine of Dumit (for which cf. H. W. B., p. 223a + ia, but if it were a feminine then the ku-šâ (I, 5) and tešp-pa-ra = second pers. (I, 10) would be, to say the least, quite strange; we would expect kùššš resp. tashpuri. The name is not to be found in B. E., XIV, XV.

1 No. 87.
2 For this name see p. 7, n. 2.
3 No. 80. 4 See pp. 19ff., 28, n. 2, 8.

5 In view of the fact that XI has very often not only the pronunciation XI but also that of IX, we should be justified in identifying *NIIN-nu-â-a* (No. 89) with *In-nu-â-a* (No. 87). For XI = IX cf., e.g., *Iš=H(NI)NIX, Iš=H(NI)NIX* *ki*; H. R. 68, No. 3, 51, and see H. R. 69, 23e + 22b; *Iš=H(NI)NIX* *ni-â-a*, H. R. 69, No. 5, 61; *Iš=H(NI)NIX* *ki*, G.e.K. 18, H. R. 69, No. 1, 64 (see also *Iš=H(NI)NIX* *ni*, G.I.KAS in H. R. 68, 21e); *Iš=H(NI)NIX* *Pišh* has the gloss *ni (=NIIN) + ki-lïde (= Pišh)*; H. R. 68, No. 3, 36. For XI = IX cf., e.g., *Iš=H(NI)NIX* *ni-gišl* *ni-a-ne=Iš=H(NI)NIX* *ki*-lïle-kîti, A. K. T., No. 11, col. H. R. 68, No. 3, 36, with *Iš=H(NI)NIX* *ni-gišl* *ni-a-ne=Iš=H(NI)NIX* *ki*-lïle-kîti, A. K. T., No. 11, col. H. R. 68, No. 3, 36. This shows conclusively that XI = IX, and hence *NIIN-nu-â-a* might be read *Iš=H(NI)NIX* and be identified with the addressee of No. 87. Neither *Iš=H(NI)NIX* nor *Iš=H(NI)NIX* are to be found in B. E., XIV, XV. Comparing these two names with such formations as *Ašu-ia na(Ba-ni, No. 81 : 1), Iš=H(NI)NIX* and regard the *ni* as the pron., suffix of the first person, "my." In that case these two names would be either "Kosennuna" or hypocoristica.

6 No. 88.
7 For the writing XI, XI = Iš=H(NI)NIX, a plural of majesty signifying always the highest god, whether he be Ann, Enil, Sin, Dagan, Shamas, Marduk, Ashshur, etc., see *The Manš parental* (October, 1906), p. 637, and *Iš=H(NI)NIX* (January, 1907), p. 145. It was also shown that XI may change with *EN.GAR.ÉN* and *EN.GAR.SÁ.* An *Iš=H(NI)NIX* *ni-a-ne=Iš=H(NI)NIX* *ki*-lïle-kîti, the father of XI, is Ba-ni, is mentioned in B. E., XIV, 2 : 9 (6th year of Burna-Buriash).

8 The *Du* might possibly be *Iš=H(NI)NIX, and the šàš in. To judge from ku-šâ (not kùšš), 1, 5, this name is that of a male person. A *Iš=H(NI)NIX*-šâ (male) occurs in B. E., XV, 156 : 23, but in *Iš=H(NI)NIX* *ni-â-a* (13th year of Nazi-Maratash); XV, 163 : 8, H. R. 17 (here *ni = XI*) that very same name is a female. If, after all, this name should have to be read as given above and should prove to be (notwithstanding the ku-šâ (i.e., 1, 5) a female, then cf. B. E., XV, 163 : 8, *ni*a-nu-â-a (not *In-nu-â-a* as given by Clay, List of Names, *Iš=H(NI)NIX* *ni-a-ne=Iš=H(NI)NIX* *ki*-lïle-kîti, indicated by itself, might be taken as a hypocoristica and be translated "my obedience" or "that towards that or that god"—a name applicable to both male and female persons.

9 No. 90.

10 According to B. E., XIV, this person lived during the 24th year of Nazi-Maratash (i.e., 86 : 14) and the 7th (i.e., 91 : 3), 10th (i.e., 98 : 4), and 11th year of Kadashman-Tingu (i.e., 106 : 12 : 111 : 6). From these passages we learn that he was the son of *Nâr[ . . . ] and the father of Ahadatum and Nergal-nôdin-ôkî.
stationed, as it seems, at different points at various times, and addressed, no doubt, to "Irim(Leissner, Ideogr., No. 3857)-shu-a11-NIN.IB," the chief bursar at Nippur during the time of Kadashtman-Turgu.

(a) One⁹ written by the royal official (probably itū) "Il-li-itū" during the reign of Nazi-Maruttash and addressed, as it seems, to the chief bursar of Nippur, Martuknu.⁴

5. Four⁶ letters addressed to "In-na-anunī," the chief bursar of the Nippurian Temple storehouses during the reign of Kūri-Galzu.

(a) Two⁰ of these were written by the governor "Ina-NIN.IB" (or MASHI)-TUR.USH-SE-MA.⁹

(b) And two⁰ by a lady of high rank, in all probability a NIN.AX.GAL⁶ or high priestess, "In-bi-Ar-ra"²¹ by name.

6. One²² from "Di(D)(ar)lu-ūnīr (= SAB)-gab-ba,"²³ a merchant, to "[Di]-[KUD]-[lu]-[muru].²²²¹

¹ In B. E., XIV, 86:3 he appears as a witness at a transaction in the storehouse of Kūr-Zi układ³¹; in l.c., 98:2 the chief bursar of Nippur, "Irim-shu-a11-NIN.IB," transacts business for (ki qit) "Irim-nūnad-alam," son of m ³ NaSūt = XXXxviirth(³h) at Kūr-Zi układ³¹; in l.c., 106:12, he is found among certain witnesses at "Sharrum-dash; in 114:6, "Irim-nūnad-alam," son of m ³ NaSūt (³h), receives grain from (im qaš) "En-lil-šu-šu-la-aq-šu-la-aq-šu-la-aq-šu-la and "Irim-shu-a11-NIN.IB at the storehouse (i-na bit kūri) of Nippur; and in our letter he seems to have been connected with "Irim-dar[. . .]. 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 Chay, B. E., XIV, p. 8.

³ No. 92.

⁴ A person with this name occurs B. E., XIV, 18a:7 (6th year of Nazi-Maruttash). That he was a royal official I conclude from 92:22f, "ku-na-ba šun-um-al-um-a a-nu LUGAL liša-lu-ur-lu ši-il-ba (= XI(G)-SĪH)-nu il-li lā-šu-ur-ur i-ni-pa-um-asama, and that his position must have been a high one, such as that of an itū, follows from 92:9, a SIE, e.g., clip[. . . . , cf. 1.22] "šu-lī (= EN)nīmeh pi-ša-ti, cf. 1.20; . . . ] at i-naš-gušu . . . .

⁵ The name is broken off. The contents of the letter and the time when it was written justify this emendation.

⁶ Nos. 83, 80.

⁷ No. 83, 81.

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

⁹ This "fruit of Ijar" is not mentioned in B. E., XIV, XV. Because she was writing to Iannni, she must have flourished during the time of Kūri-Galzu. For further details see "Translations," pp. 115f.

¹⁰ No. 91.

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, 131:2, "La-bēk(k)ī-la-lat. For the identity of Tur-ša, Tur-ša, Tur-ša, see Hilprecht, Aegypten, p. 119. Tur-ša, being called here "the light of everything (= the whole = the world)," is as such identified, not only with Shamash (cf., e.g., Banke, B. E., Series D, III, p. 175a, Shamash-um-ad-tum-lim), but also with Sin (Banke, l.c., p. 153b, Sin-na-ra-mā-ši; see also Chay, B. E., XIV, 19:23). "[Di]-[KUD]- [lu]-[muru]" is according to H. R. 88:33 = TUR.KU (gloss du-um-gu), hence [Di]-[Tur]-ku = Sin = Tur-ša-gu. As regards the linguistic difficulties cf., for the change of a and u in proximity of r, Hilprecht, B. E., XV, p. 17, note 4, and for the change of k and h, of kamma and χamma, Jensen, K. R., VI, pp. 385, 368. After šeṭ there's broken away a-nu.

¹² As the Di and nu₃r are missing, we possibly might read ["I-na]-šil (= KUD)-lu-[. . . .] With "[Di]-[lu]-[muru]," i.e., "may he see judgment," cf. 27:18 "Di-li-li-ša (= AX)-lu-muru," "may I see the judgment of god." Neither Tur-ša-nār-gaba nor Din-imur is mentioned in B. E., XIV, XV.
FROM THE TEMPLE ARCHIVES OF NIPPU.

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 m Y., i.e., "To m Y." (here giving the name of the addressee) or (b) dup-pi m X. a-na m Y., i.e., "Letter of m X. (= writer) to m Y." (= addressee), 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 Sippur, whence it was brought back to the city of Enil 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. 936.
2 This is to be found in F. E. Peiser, Ueber einen aus der Zeit der dritten babylonischen Dynastie in Umschrift und Ubersetzung, Berlin, 1905, under P. 114. Its introduction reads:
A-na m A-mar-ri-in kib-3a-mu | [um]-ma m iliSin (= XXX)-MU-[SE] SESH-ka-ma | iliSin (= XXX) a-ab AXmush kuh-lat | naps-sha-tu ka li-iz-zu-ru, which cannot be rendered with Peiser by "Sin der Vater der Götter unge alle seine Selen bewahren," but must be translated by: "Sin and(!) the father of gods may protect all thy souls"; this follows clearly from li-iz-zu-ru = plural! Although this letter is very fragmentary, yet this much can be made out with certainty: The boundary stone of a certain piece of property could not be found, and hence its boundaries could not be determined exactly. A certain iliSin (= XXX)-tab-il-apar knew the position of that stone; he, therefore, was asked: al-ka-ma mi-ig-ri-di ku-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 Lushatar tablet with the address a-na m La-ushtu-mar or the letter from the Sargonic period which is written a-na m Lugal-ushumgal.
4 Cf. per analogy the address of No. 24, dup-pi m Kat-[bu] a-na be-3a-shu.
5 Traces of a seal impression are still discernible on No. 24. On the Lushatar 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 formulations:

Into (a) a-na6 = Y. ki-bi-ma7 um-ma "X.-ma," i.e., "to Y. speak, thus saith X."

or

Into (b) a-na8 = Y.2 ki-bi-ma7 um-ma "X. a-hu-ka-ma," i.e., "to Y. speak, thus
saith X., thy brother."9

In none of these letters, then, does the writer ever call himself "thy servant,"
or 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.10 Its simplest form is a-na
ki-sha11 lá1 shalmu,12 i.e., "unto thee greeting." If the addressee happens to occupy
an especially high position in life, the writer may extend his greeting, as is done in
No. 77, even to "the house" and the "domain" of his correspondent: a-na ka-a-shá

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


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

4 This emphatic -ma is invariably found at the end of the address, and as such a -ma lengthens the preceding
syllable, the name of the writer of No. 83 cannot be i-kš-bal-di-š, but must be i-kš-bal-aš-

5 This is also the stereotype formula used by Hammurabi when writing to his subjects, such as, e.g., Sin-idimmum.
For a justification of the above given translation of this formula see King, Letters of Hammurabi, Vol. III, p. XXV,
note 1; Delitzsch, B. A., Vol. IV, p. 135 below; Nagel, B. A., Vol. IV, pp. 177ff. Knudtzon's translation (Die El-Amarna-
Tablet, pse.), "hat gesprochen," is out of place.

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

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

8 Written either sIššI-ha-ša, Nos. 80, 81, 87, 88, 89, 90, 92, or a-hu-ka-ma, No. 82.

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

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

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

12 Written either kašá, Nos. 82, 87, 88, 89, 90, 92, or ka-a-shá, Nos. 77, 81.

13 Written lu in Nos. 88, 89, or lu-á in Nos. 77, 81, 82, 87.

14 Shal-ma in Nos. 77, 81, 82, 89, or šáš-ma in Nos. 87, 88, 92. Dm-ma has not yet been found.
bi[i-ka] u a-na pa-ha-t[i-ka] lu-ù 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 catenso, gathering from it the facts that (1) Pān-AN.GAL-la-mur (i.e., "May I see the face of AN.GAL"), the writer, was a resident of Dūr-ilu{{1}}, whose gods he invokes, and that (2) the "divine court" of Dūr-ilu{{1}} 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.\(^2\) It reads (89 : 4f.):

4 AN.GAL\(\text{\^{a}}\) NIN.LIL\(\text{\^{a}}\) TAR\(\text{\^{a}}\) AN.GAL and NIN.LIL, TAR and GU,\(\text{\^{a}}\)

\(\text{\^{a}}\)GU

\(^1\) See also 89 : 24, 26.

\(^2\) C. The Monist, XVII (January, 1907), p. 148, and Old Penn, Y, No. 21 (February 16, 1907), p. 3, col. III.

\(^3\) That the divinity AN.GAL cannot be here \(\text{\^{a}}\)SHAMU.ZU (= Enlil, Sin, Ra.mānī, Sīnash, Marsûk), a female, but must be a male, is apparent from his being coupled with \(\text{\^{a}}\)NIN.LIL. AN.GAL\(\text{\^{a}}\) NIN.LIL are male and female, husband and wife. A male AN.GAL as god of Dūr-ilu{{1}} occurs also in Jensen, K. B., VI, p. 64, 21 (\(\text{\^{a}}\)). See, e.g., p. 62, 20, where the verb \(\text{\^{a}}\)pa-ha - masc. (not \(\text{\^{a}}\)pa-hat) 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 (\(\text{\^{a}}\)), reading \(\text{\^{a}}\)AN.GAL\(\text{\^{a}}\) [\(\text{\^{a}}\)DUR-RAB.BAB] \(\text{\^{a}}\)ba-tur, instead of, as it is commonly found, \(\text{\^{a}}\)AN.GAL\(\text{\^{a}}\) [\(\text{\^{a}}\)DUR-RAB.BAB] \(\text{\^{a}}\)ba-tur, i.e., "in the year when AN.GAL was brought into his temple in Dūr-ilu{{1}}," see also Thureau-Dangin, S. J. K. I, p. 229, 7. This proves that AN.GAL = \(\text{\^{a}}\)Ka-di, and if AN.GAL is a male, then \(\text{\^{a}}\)Ka-di must be a male likewise. Again, in an inscription translated in E. B. H., p. 255, note 12 (see Thureau-Dangin, I.E., p. 176, 2) \(\text{\^{a}}\)AN.GAL, the akkadiana of Dūr-ilu{{1}}, calls himself the \(\text{\^{a}}\)mi-\(\text{\^{a}}\)ka-di wa-ra-am \(\text{\^{a}}\)DIMANU, 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 H R. 57, 5th \(\text{\^{a}}\)Ka-di is identified with \(\text{\^{a}}\)NIN.LAŠ-sum and with \(\text{\^{a}}\)NIX.B, both being male divinities and gods of thunder and lightning; hence Thureau-Dangin (I.E., p. 176, 2, and passim), Huber (Die Personenamen in den Kellschriftenaus der Zeit der Könige von Ur und Isin, 3. B., XXI, p. 174, note 11), who thinks that Kadi "war die Hauptgöttin von Dūr-ilu, die Gemahlin des d.GAL") and others, who see in \(\text{\^{a}}\)Kadi di a female, are wrong. The pronouncement of the name of this god is neither Kadi nor Ku-sîlim (Huber, I.E., but \(\text{\^{a}}\)GUR=KA)-sir=DI=NU\(\text{\^{a}}\)]; as such he is the same as \(\text{\^{a}}\)GU.NU-ra (= GU-sir-ra). For the reasons of this identification see my forthcoming volume on the Religious Texts of Nippur. AN.GAL, hence coupled with AN.GAL, his wife, is, of course, the same who otherwise is known as the "wife of Enlil," and who, as wife of Enlil, is the "mistress of En-di\(\text{\^{a}}\)k\(\text{\^{a}}\), i.e., \(\text{\^{a}}\)AN.GAL\(\text{\^{a}}\)EN.LIL\(\text{\^{a}}\), H R. 59 : 9. But in the passage just quoted she appears not as the wife of Enlil, but as that of \(\text{\^{a}}\)NIX.IB or \(\text{\^{a}}\)MASH. We have seen above that AN.GAL or \(\text{\^{a}}\)Kadi was identified with \(\text{\^{a}}\)NIX.IB. From this it follows that Kadi originally played the rôle of the "Son" (just as Enlil did in the Trinity: AN.GAL-EN.LIL-AXU), but was, when he became the chief god of Dūr-ilu, identified also with the Father, i.e., with Enlil, whose wife now becomes also his (i.e., Kadi's) wife. In the rôle of the "Son" we find Kadi also in such proper names as \(\text{\^{a}}\)Kadi-dub-di-bi (bi, bi; B. E., XIV, 14 : 1, XV, 50 : 18, etc.), i.e., "Kadi is speaking," etc., through, or by means of, the thunder, \(\text{\^{a}}\)KAD-DUB-DUB-AN.LIL\(\text{\^{a}}\) (B. E., XV, 119 : 10. Omitted by Clay. Thus I read on account of the i in bi), which name might be translated either by "Kadi is the good (= fah, sc. child) of Nippur"
LETTERS TO CASSITE RINGS

(i.e., Evil, cf. Marduk apil Eridu, where Eridu, the city of god Ea, stands for the god himself), or by “Kadi is the

(Yu 1421) = Nippur,” see The Monist, XVIII (January, 1907), p. 142 of Nippur (= Evil). Again, if MAN.LI, “the mistress or queen of Nippur,” becomes the wife of AN.GAL, the highest god of DUR-ilu, she is a female, and the title “mistress or queen of Durant.” This now helps us to understand the passage in Meissner, Bauinschriften Assurpaladus’s, ii, 1, 1, III, p. 258, 123. (cf. p. 297, 12 (K. 298)), together with its parallel text and variants in i.e., p. 257, 35, (K. 221 + 2690), which has been completely misunderstood by all who took AN.GAL resp. Kadi to be a female. The passage reads: AN.GAL: shararat Dur-ilu:= Sir = Belit-balatî (= TILA) Dur-rum-ni-tum (= SAG) = KU-nu-ka-ki-un biti a-um DUR-ilu-il iš-sha-šu udiš. It will be seen that 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 (= MAN.LI = Belit = sharrot of Dur-ilu [variant: NIN.ISH.AX (= Belit, mistress of Dur-ilu), Sir (and) the Bilî-balâtî (= mistress of life)]” [variant: iš.KU.TI.LI.Á = “lord of life”] Dur-ru-ni-tum (= fem. of šisinKU(nu-ku-ni)) 11, 14, 17 (R. 68, 5a) (and) SAG in the month Iš-bi-šu into the temple in Dur-ilu, their city, I brought.”

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

AN.GAL (Father) = Sir (Son) = Belit-balatî (wife of the Son) = Belit-balati (masc.) = Sharrot Dur-ilu (Mother) = Belit Di-ri

which corresponds exactly to that of Nippur, viz.:

EX.II. (Father) = NIX.II.B (Son) = Ba-â (Gula) (wife of the Son) = NIX.IB (masc.) = NIX.DIN.DUG.GA = NIX.IN.II. = NIX.LI. (Mother)

In the Nippurian pattern NIX.IR appears as the ar-sag, “chief servant,” or sukkal, “prime minister, ambassador,” or apil, “son” of Evil, and Sir is called in the Dur-ilu Trinity the meera, “son” (or if read shipper, then = messenger) of (shau) Ku-di, see Scholl, Textes Élam. Sém., 1, p. 91, 23 (= Plate 17). NIX.IR is the apil ESحار-را, and in V R. 32, 1-19, 21 šis Sir is identified with šisinKU-nu-ku-nu, “the watchman of Esharra,” i.e., of the house of the Universe. NIX.IB as iv.L or as iv.Eš-kur-kur is the same as his father Evil, and in V R. 31, 2, Rev. 30, šis Sir is identified with his father šisinKU. NIX.IB is both male and female. As male he is the husband and called also šisinI, and as female he is the wife, then known also as Ba-â, Gula, or NIX.DIN.DUG.GA = mulâtta, “who restores the dead to life” (see also The Monist, XVIII (January, 1907), p. 141). The wife of Sir appears here likewise both as a female (Belit-balati, “mistress of life”) and as a male (Belit-balati, “lord of life”); hence she is paralleled exactly by NIX.DIN.DUG.GA = Ba-â = NIX.IB: female and male! From this we may infer (2) that Sir played the same role in DUR-ilu as Sir in Nippur; (2) that Kadi must have been the “god of Esharra” according to the people of Dur-ilu, just as Evil was the “god of Esharra” according to the Nippurians, i.e., Kadi = Evil, and the wife of Kadi = NIX.II. (cf. here also the name AN.GAL = Kadi with AN.GAL, KAL.I.M, I, the name of Evil of Nippur, B. E., XIV, 18 : 15, 18 : XV, 34 : 2); (3) that the “Son” in each and every case is the same as the “Father,” NIX.IB = Evil; Sir = Kadi; (4) that the “Son” is the “Son” (herein male and female); they are “one flesh.” Again, the “wife of the Son” is also identified with the latter’s “Mother”; iv.IX.NIX.II. = Ba-â = NIX.DIN.DUG.GA is also iv.IX.NIX.II., the Belit sor’ iššit, who otherwise was known also as Ishtar. But Ishhtar is, as is well known, male and female and in the inscription of AN-nabûtu the wife of Ka-li, while in our better letter of the wife of AN.GAL (= Kadi) is called iv.IX.LLI; hence Ishhtar is iv.IX.NIX.II. and both are male and female. (cf. here also the iv.KU-nu-ku-nu = AX = Antum = NIX.II., the wife of iv.Eš-kur-kur = AX = Anu = Evil, hence Evil = AX and NIX.II. = AX: both are one—male and female; see Bel, The Christ of Ancient Times, p. 17.) Now the wife of Kadi = AN.GAL be male and female, then the same observation applies, maleis iššit, also to Kadi, i.e., Kadi, the husband of NIX.III = Ishhtar must also be a female; as such a female he appears in H R. 57, 16a and in Sp. 1, 331 (= Z. J., VI, p. 211) compared with Reisner, Hymnec, p. 146, 11. The net result of this
last observation is this: (1) the wife of the Sun is not only one with the Sun, 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 (third person) and one with the Sun (second person); in other words the divine court of each and every city, though consisting of three persons, clearly distinct: the begetter (Father), the conceiver (Mother), the begotten (Son), are yet one: clearly and unmistakably a veritable Trinity in a Unity.

But how are we to account for 𒈨Ann and 𒈨SAG on the one hand, and 𒈨TAR and 𒈨GU on the other hand?

If 𒈨Ann was not only a term, of 𒈨SAG, but also the wife of 𒈨SAG, as was claimed above, it would follow that 𒈨SAG is the same as 𒈨Šu, which, in turn, identified with Durrunim. From 𒈨Šu we learn that 𒈨Šu is the first (SAG) of the seven (goddess) of the seven (goddess) to be read here = robigu? A.V.N.A, i.e., "tambourines" (= tambourine-totem, hered, creatures who proclaim the glory of God) of A.V.N.A. In Pines, J. R. A. S., January, 1965, p. 125f. (= 81-8-30, 25), Oly. col. II. 7, 6, 𒈨SAG is called SAG.GAR, i.e., "Hauptmacher" = captain, chief (= the first (SAG), cf. Du(r)ruvn, the first of the seven!) and is identified with 𒈨MIR, which latter is according to i.e., II. 19, 20, not only = 𒈨U, "the god of lightning," but also = En-li-sun-gin = GU (Pines, i.e., I. 1). In our letter 𒈨GU is coupled with 𒈨TAR, who is to be read according to H. R. 68, No. 2, 53, kim-tum-um, and is called there the LUGI or substella 𒈨Kadlogan, 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—may, even with SAG.

3. SAG being coupled with 𒈨Duren-im-tum, and being identified with MIR, IM and GU, must be a male and the feminine counterpart of 𒈨Duren-im-tum, i.e., he is the same as Du(r)ruvn.

4. GU, the wife of TAR, is also the same as SAG, the husband of Durrunum—i.e., husband and wife are one, hence also male and female. (Cf. for TAR+GU is also AX + KI = sham = irigita = Aum = Atunum = husband and wife = AX + AX = AX, Bit, the Christ, etc., p. 286. Is the 𒈨Tan an artificial (foreign, Cassite or Elamitic?) name, consisting originally of 𒈨Tan and 𒈨GU = husband and wife = one: 𒈨Tan."

5. 𒈨U, because called "Hauptmacher" and identified both with the "god of storm and lightning," and with 𒈨Šu, the first of the seven (goddess) of A.V.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 Baf (Creation Story, pp. 15 and 23, note 6), and on the other hand to the "seven gods 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 "feminine" of Christ. These "seven" were in the Babylonian religion always identified not only with the "Son" whose "servants" (av-bardu = edil = haziina) they were, but also with the "Mother," etc., the wife of the Son "— hence Lahabta (Myhrman, Z. A., XVI, 153 = Weissbach, Babyl. Miscellen, p. 12) and Ishkor had "seven names" (Reiner, Hymn., p. 109, 57f.), hence also the remarkable name of 𒈨(MIX,LIX) = NIN.GAL in 8 R. 30, 66c, where she is called 𒈨(SI)-HUB, i.e., "the goddess Seven." (Cf. here also the seven names of 𒈨(MIX,LIX), III. 68, 5c, d., III. 67, 20a, b., the fourth of which is 𒈨Sumuru, who, identified in Tchouen-Dungin, R. T. Ch., 195, 3, with Uran-gi-gus, a cognomen of 𒈨Nin-Girsu = UR.MIN, the god of thunder and lightning. See further the "seven sons" of 𒈨(MIX)KAN or 𒈨(SIN)BABIQ the (wife of Kadi), III. 68, No. 1, 25c, b.; the "seven sons" of 𒈨Nin-pup-nin-gara-er and 𒈨Nin-pup-nin-gara-er (i.e., of NIN.MAR and IN, in III. 67, No. 1, 25c, d., the seven sons of 𒈨Ene-meshe-er, III. 69, No. 3, 16b, a, 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 𒈨(SIN)BABIQ—just as the "sevenfold gift" of the Holy Ghost is the Holy Ghost in her (rather 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 = Shar-ar and Sharazag, 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
the gods that inhabit Ḫ-DIM.GAL-KALAM.MA,
may protect thy life (lit. souls),
keep thy steps!
(How) my heart has urged me
to see thee!
Whosoever may be permitted to see thy
gracious face
and who is of "good words,"
to . . .

| 5 AXnas a-shib Ḫ-DIM.GAL-KALAM.MA² |
| 6 nas-ša-li-ka li-ī-su-su |
| 7 ki-lu-is-ka li-shal-li-mu |
| 8 iibli³ a-nu a-nu-ri-ka |
| 9 iš-li-a-a-an-nil |
| 10 man-nu pa-ni-ka ba-nu-ti li-mur¹ |

godhead," it became the divine and sacred number per excellcnse. 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 Homiletic Review, February, 1908 (written March, 1907), pp. 190ff. To make the certain doubly certain I may mention in this connection that there appears in 1 R. 68, 14, as the third of the seven tambourine-beaters, heralds, angels a certain Dār-ilu, to be read in Assyrian Deni-di, who is in Hebrew none other than the well-known Gabri-el, "the man of El or ila" - 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 Assiraddan:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AX.GAL (Father)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AX.GAL (Mother)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iš.TAR (Son)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iš.SIP (wife of Son)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iš.KA-di</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iš.MIR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iš.Da(r)na</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ If the Trinity of Dār-ilu be formed after the pattern of the Nippurian, it follows that the temple of that city must bear the same or similar names as that of Nippur. Ḫ-DIM.GAL-KALAM.MA means "The temple (Ḫ) which is the great (gall) firmament (lit. 'band,' DIM = rēshu) of the world (or, here the 'Babylonian world' as macrocosmos formed after the macrocosmos"). Among the names of Eal's temple at Nippur we find, e.g., Dur-an-ki, i.e., "the firmament (dur = rēshu) of heaven and earth (i.e., the world, the macrocosmos"); see also Bel, the Christ, etc., p. 21 and notes.


³ That is, "all who are in thy immediate confidence, 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.

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

⁵ Supplemented according to 3N : 71, man-nu pa-an ba-an-tum šūl be-lu li-mur [a] man-nu da-ba-ba [Ḫ]-šab (= šāb = šī-šī-šā) be-li-ša il-il-tešši um-mu-a a-nu be-li-ši-mu.

⁶ According to the passage quoted in the preceding note, we would expect here a-nu aḫē-ša or better a-nu a-NIN-na-ša. The traces on the tablet are, however, as reproduced. The sign NIN (?) looks rather like a SÁL + a-nu = minma; besides, if NIN (?) were the beginning of NIN-na-ša, we miss a DISH before the nom. propr.
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-um-ux,” the severe and sometimes disagreeable chief bursar of the Temple storehouses at Nippur, is significant.

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

1 No. 81: 1, "UD in Marduk nap-sha-ti-ki li-ig-sa-um.
2 No. 82: 6, bes-ti kob-tum [nap-sha] ti-ki li-ig-sa. Kobta, when used figuratively, has the signification “heavy” (or, in quality, not quantity), gewichtig, bedeutungsvoI, significant, weighty, important, foremost, first (= asharida), and when attributed to a god makes that god play the rôle of the “Son”; i.e., an ibu kobta 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), XIV, 1B (cf. the same, prop., "NIX-IB-kobta (= UUGUD)-ahki(?)-shu, B. E., XIV, 131: 3. Only by reading ahki (even if written without me or mesh) instead of ahki (Clay) does this name give any sense: "NIX-IB is the weighty one among his brothers”), En-dûl (IV, R. 24, No. 2, 11, 12, 23, 24). Endûl 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 Endûl originally played the rôle of the “Son,” and this he did in the Trinity: AN (Father), "Endûl (Son), AN = "NIX-LIL (Mother)).
3 Seeing that Larsa (UD.UVUG4) is mentioned neither in these letters nor in B. E., XIV, XV, while Sippar (UD.KIB.XUX4) occurs quite frequently (see, e.g., No. 89: 21, 26, and the KUR-KIB.XUX4, B. E., XV, 169: 1), I prefer to regard Sippar as the home of the writer of No. 81.
4 Where NIX-IB was worshiped as the "Son," the bes-ti kob-tum.
5 No. 87: 5, ANmek ša aš-ša iva ša-a-me-[re]-me ša-bi-it. Thus I propose to read, and by doing so I take the sign looking like rat to stand for ša-a-me-[re]. Cf. here an analogous passage in B. E., X, 95: 5, where Clay, i.e., p. 69e, finds a city Kabri(tal)-li-ri-um-ak-shu, but where meshhi has to be separated from the name of the city and has to be read sha-lu (= me) pini (= shi); see The Mesopot., XVII (January, 1907), p. 154.
6 Nos. 83-86.
7 This applies also to Alushina (58: 1), as the expression li-tiga-am at-ta shows. The slave-dealer Endûl-kiddini was dissatisfied with the actions of Alushina.
8 In 39: 2 the introductory um-na-na a-na be-li-in-ša stands, quite strangely, before the greeting.
invariably introduced directly, either without or with the help of um-ma-a, or um-mu-ta um-ma "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-mu-ta) to a former note or inquiry may be found the following:

(1) aššu-ni-čiš; (2) šaš; (3) i-ša lu-)<u-ša; (4) šaš lu-<u-ša-pa-raš; (5) šaš x.x. šaš

1 See among other places also in Nos. 76:2, 78:4; 81:3; 85:3. Cf. here for the letters discussed under Chap. III, Nos. 3:1, 7:18; 3:12; 21:1; 22:5; 23:1; 33:7; 35:1; 37:7; 10:3; 19:2; 52:3.

2 Nos. 81:5; 93:3. This introductory um-ma-a is not to be found in Nos. 1-71; cf. the following note.

3 Nos. 80:1; 82:8; 87:7; 92:1. To the um-ma-a um-ma corresponds in Nos. 71:1 an um-ma-a um-ma bi-fi-in(u) um-ma, which is most generally found in connection with the address: arca-liš.iš X-anum bi-fi-in bi-lúlik, where it follows either (a) immediately upon lúlik, so in Nos. 1:3; 1:21; 3:29; 3:19; 2:10; 2:11; 2:14; 3:15; 19:3, or (b) upon the "greeting," as in Nos. 9:5; 11:3; 26:3; 27:3; 31:5; but in 39:2 it stands before the greeting! or (c) upon the "invocation," so in No. 38:11. In connection with the address: a-na be-liši-šiš-em um-ma um-ma X-anum arca-liš.iš a-na di-um(a) um-ma bi-fi-in bi-lúlik it is found in three passages only, viz., in Nos. 13:1; 11:1; 17:6. In No. 26:3 we have wrongly bi-fi-in for bi-fi-in-um-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. S1:68, aššu-ni-čiš Xišiš-barum šaš GIP. EX.X:1-ka aššu ni-šiš-em in-sta-aška-rum um-ma-a um-ma Mšr. Iššiš-iš a-na dišem [... \ldots ] i.e., "as regards the Nippurians whom thy (deputy) sheriff has received upon thy command (under thy command) (or, for the purpose of holding them as prisoners), the following:

"To Mšr-Inšišiš-em for judgment [they have been brought, or he has brought them]." Cf. here also Nos. 11:1; 11:5; 23:15; 26:8; 12; 17; 27:15; 28:1; 31:19; 33:15; 13, 25, 30:57; 2:14; 60:8; 69:3.

6 With the same meaning as aššu-ni-čiš, i.e., "as regards," Nos. 83:8, 15; 86:16; 87:8 (followed by šaš in-ša-[a], cf. p. 25, note 38; p. 26, note 5). See also Nos. 3:21, 21:17; 7:8; 31:11, 13, 25, 27:31:33; 60:9.

7 With the same or similar meaning as šaš or aššu-ni-čiš, see also p. 25, note 4, and cf. S3:19 (context unalterable), translation on p. 112. Among the letters addressed to the "Lord" we find it, e.g., in 11:7, iš-an ba-št the kaššiš lušš-ša šaš em-a-ni-ni-ni-an, cf. below, p. 169. The iš-an ba-št di-qa-ra-li a-na en-di-i at-[a] of 15:10 does not belong here, see p. 142.

"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. 1-71, to šaš kešiš pash-pu-ru, "with regard to what my Lord has written," which latter may be found either with, so in 3:29; 26:3; or without following um-ma-a, or, 39:28, "xx, concerning which my Lord has inquired (w.e. I beg to say that um-ma-a) um-ma kešiš pash-pu-ru, I have sent (lt) to my Lord," Cf. here also 62:7: Um-ma-a in 33c: 6 introduces a quotation from a previous communication; the answer to this quotation begins with um-ma-a um-ma kešiš-pash-pu-ru in 3:60.
ta-lish-pu-ra), or abbreviated, šá x.x. ta-lish-pu-ra; (6) ʾash-shum x.x. šá ta-ash-pu-ra; (7) a-na bu-ut x.x. šá ta-ash-pu-ra; (8) x.x. šá tash-pu-ra resp. laq-ba-a;
(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 particular introductory phrase: (10) shum-ma šá-šap-pa-ra or šá-la-lal-al-ma?; (11) um-um or um-um-a; (12) if more subjects than one are referred to in

Note: The reference to the letter, "object," or "answer," is placed at the beginning of the sentence. The subjects referred to are "shum-ma šá-šap-pa-ra or šá-la-lal-al-ma?" and "um-um or um-um-a."
the letters, they are introduced either (a) directly or (b) by *ū* or (c) by *ū* and one of the above given particles or phrases.\(^7\)

Letters not in answer to a previous communication are much simpler in form and construction. In these the subject matter is stated either directly,\(^8\) or the

---

\(^7\) Whenever these particles are found they take up either (a) the *um-na* after ki-bi-*ma* or (b) the *um-na-a* of the introduction: *um-na-a a-na*\(^9\) *Y.*-ma resp. *um-na-a a-na be-lés*-*na-a* or (c) some other *um-na-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-na* S 60: 18ff. is instructive. While 1. 19 contains the "answer" (with *um-na-a* omitted) to the 'Lord's' inquiry concerning Enid-Marduk, we still find another sentence introduced by *um-na-a* in 1. 20. This *um-na-a* must take up a preceding *um-na-a*, to be found either in the text of the letter or in the introduction, seeing that it otherwise stands quite isolated. I think we may translate this *um-na-a* by: '(seeing that this is so) therefore, please (*um-na*) grant him his petition (or will), i.e. let him do it (but cf. p. 25, note 1).' For *um-na-a* cf., e.g., S 90: 21ff. I.e., II. 17ff. (see p. 25, n. 4), contain the answer to an inquiry of *UM*-*NI-a-a* with regard to the fate (judgment?) of certain men who had taken (stolen?) wheat flour. I. 2ff., introduced by *um-na-a*, which latter takes up the *(um-na-a)* of 1. 14, contains an answer to another inquiry, resp. reprimand, which had been expressed (in a former letter addressed to *PâN-IX*-*GAL-bumur*) 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: 1. 21ff., *um-na-a* nár ship-*ri*-in šáš a-na\(^10\) EN-LIL\(^k\) a-na naḫu šarrī (= LUGAL) as-*pa*-ra (erasure) kl (erasure) i-*ma*-*ra*-ka ma-la a-sap-ru-kā išt-ša-a um-*ma-a i-*ma* di-U-D.KIB.\(^{NI}x\) šáš-a nár ship-*ri*-in šáš a-na, ship-*ri*-ka ma-na a-na di-U-D.KIB.\(^{NI}x\) el-tap-ru-kā um-*ma-a* a-na *UM*-*NI-a-a* ma le (= NE) im-*ku* à šáš-lam-ku šáš-ur-pa; i.e., "(But as regards thy reprimand in thy letter of recent date 1 beg to assure thee of) the following *(um-na-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-na-a)*: 'he (i.e., *UM*-*NI-a-a*) is in Nippur.' (This is the reason why) I have not sent my messenger to thee (and why) I have (now) dispatched my messenger to thee at Sippar with the following note *(um-na-a)*: 'To *UM*-*NI-a-a*. Send thy news and thy greeting (i.e., with this letter, asking for an answer by "return mail").'\(^11\) The events discussed in this letter are the following: (a) *UM*-*NI-a-a* of Nippur has written to *PâN-IX*-*GAL-bumur* of Dár-ilu 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) *PâN-IX*-*GAL-bumur*, wishing "to kill two birds with one stone," entrusted the answer to the inquiry and reprimand to his messenger, whom he had to send to the king at Nippur anyhow. (c) The messenger found the king at Nippur, but not *UM*-*NI-a-a*, being informed that the latter had left for Sippar, which he could be addressed. (d) *PâN-IX*-*GAL-bumur*, anxious to avoid receiving a second reprimand and to show his "brother" (I. 3) that his accusation of negligence was undervalued, 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 Sippar, asking for a reply. (c) This letter was received by *UM*-*NI-a-a* at Sippar, brought back with him to Nippur, deposited by him among the "Temple Archives," where it was excavated by the Babylonian Expedition of the University of Pennsylvania, and carried thence to Philadelphia to the Museum of Science and Art. To the *um-na-a* of these letters corresponds an *um-na-a a-na be-lés*-*na-a* of Nos. 1-71. See S 39: 9, 12, 18 compared with 1. 5 (see pp. 137f.); 15: 18 compared with 1. [3] (see p. 143); 48: 26 compared with 1. 3.


\(^9\) Cf. iš-ha: 3: 40 | iš-ti: 27: 38; *u* x-x. iš-ha be-lés *as-pa*-ra, 27: 27; *u* iš-ha be-lés *as-pa*-ra, 31: *ši*, etc., etc.

\(^10\) Cf. 76: 2, *iš*-šu pa-nu-ši-ku; 5, *iš*-šu pa-nu-ši-ku; 81: 1, *ša* ta-an-be-lē-er a-ta-ta; S 3: 4, 9, 11, *i*-i; S 3: 3 begins with a question expressing a surprise: *um-na-ši* *as*-pa-*ša*-ku 4 *ša* ta-an-be-lē-er [a-ši?], which is introduced by *um-na-a*, e.g., p. 111.
writer may use as a kind of introduction some such words or phrases as: *enun,1 eninna,2 inanna,3 anumma,4 be-li i-di ki,5 etc., etc.

1 "No. 30: 7, ["n"]-ni, "behold."
2 "(Behold) now." Written either *enin, 31 : 6; or *enun-na, 31 : 11; or *enin-na, 20 : 6 | 13 : 11 | 19 : 5. Cf. also the following note.
3 "Now." (Ch. 3 : 19 (cf. with parallel passage in J. 30, where we have *i-na-an-na-a(!), and see a-an-un-an-an, note 4). 10 : 24 : 27 | 31 : 35 | 58 : 2 | 5 : 60, [*i-nu-an-an ki-i sh-a be-li i-sha-pa-a]. See also 5 i-na-an-an, 11 : 9; [a] *i-na-an-an a-an be-li-in al-tap-ra, 3 : 23; h i-na-an-an be-li it-ti-di, 21 : 26. Cf. also preceding note.
4 "Now." See 86 : 8, and cf. a-an-un-an-an, 21 : 11, with i-na-an-an, 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," bc-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 Enil, 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-lu, 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:

dup-pi = N. (giving here the name of the writer) a-na be-lu-shù; i.e., "Letter of N. 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-lu.

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

---

1 Here we have to read: dup-pi "Kal-kâ; a-na be-lu-shù. "Kal-kâ was the writer, according to I.e., 1, 9.
2 L. W. King, The Letters and Inscriptions of Hammurabi, Vols. I, III.
3 In King, I.e., Vol. I, No. 1, H. St., Hammurabi quotes from a letter of Sin-idinnam, saying: "And thou (i.e., Sin-idinnam) answeredst: 'Three four temple servants he (i.e., Dum-Sarru-Martu) caused me to conscribe as per his sealed contract, but one of them, a certain Gimillum, I (i.e., Sin-idinnam) sent a-na ma-bur be-lu-in, before my Lord (i.e., Hammurabi)." This is what thou hast written. Now they have brought before me (a-na ma-ah-ki-in) that certain Gimillum whom thou hast sent." (I.e., also the quotation from Sin-idinnam's letter, King, I.e., Vol. I, No. 4, 1, 13: be-lu-kiš-šu-par-am, "my Lord (i.e., Hammurabi) may send," and also that in King, I.e., Vol. I, No. 8, 1, 10 (compared with 1, 10): shum-ma be-lu-kiš-šu-par-am, "if my Lord (i.e., Hammurabi) thinks." Tarbati notes to Hammurabi, I.e., Vol. III, p. 62, No. 79, 1, 5: "the crown of the ships shu be-lu-kiš-šu-par-am, which my 'Lord' has desired," and $\text{EN.ZU}-\text{na-gir}$ refers to the seal of Hammurabi as the ki-ni-ik be-lu-in, "the seal of my 'Lord,'" King, I.e., Vol. I, No. 26, 7.
"King," but as be-li or "Lord." It must, however, be conceded here that at the time of the Hammurabi dynasty the title be-li 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-li expresses nothing but the position of a "higher" with regard to a "lower" person; i.e., where be-li indicates simply the rank of the "master" as opposed to that of the "servant" (ardi-ka).

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

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


3 See here, e.g., the letter of Akizzi addressed to the king of Egypt in the following words (Amarna, L. 37), a-na "Nam-un-riša màr LUGAL be-li-in um-ma] u-ki-in anamardika-ma, and cf. B. 20, a-na be-li (sic!) LUGAL mi-teki(?) Mi-šir-e a-bi-in ki-še-na um-ma] "Zi]-ša]ni màr LUGAL màr-ka-ma, i.e., "to the Lord (sic! not 'my Lord,' which had to be be-li-in), the king of the land of the Egyptians, my father, etc.," instead of the more commonly used a-na LUGAL be-li-in LUGAL Mišir or a-na LUGAL Mišir be-li-in.
reasonable doubt; in other words, it must be warranted by facts which cannot be controverted.

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

(a) "To my Lord speak, thus saith "X. (- name of writer), thy servant," which, with the exception of two letters (Nos. 8 and 46), is invariably followed by what might be called a "Hoflichkeit"-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/id(or lu-ul-li-ik)(or lik); or

(b) "Thy servant "X. (- name of writer). Before the presence of my 'Lord' may I come": ardi-ka "X.-m(u)" a-na di-na-an be-li-ia lu-ul-li (or lu-ul-li-ik)." The difference in the address between the letters written to the "Lord" and those discussed in Chapter II is marked and fundamental and may be briefly summed up as follows:

(1) In the letters spoken of above the writer never called himself ardu or "servant," on the contrary, if he wanted to express any relation at all, he did so by applying to himself the term "brother," 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 "Hoflichkeit"-formula a-na di-na-an be-li-ia luul-li. 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-sha.
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-an 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 [13, 41, 19, 50, 51].
6 For -ma cf. No. 4: 1 ["lu-ul-li-up-ma; the -ma in No. 21:1, "alu-MU.TUK.1-rišena-ma" (Meissner, Ideogr., No. 3857), may be] be phonetic complement to rišna; for -ma cf. Mabulliu (Nos. 31, 32, 33), Shirum (No. 38), Charum (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, 31, 33, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42 [45, 47, 48].
It would seem, then, that a correct interpretation of the words "before the presence of my 'Lord' may I come," as regards their application to persons, might bring us somewhat nearer to a valid understanding of the term "my Lord." Examining all letters so far published with regard to the usage of the phrase a-na di-na-an be-li-a lu-lIq; we find that it may be employed in letters addressed either (a) to an official called amdu-LUGH = sukkalù4 or (b) to the King, LUGAL = sharrû.2 Now, as the amdu-sukkalù as "ambassador" or "chief representative" (for that is the meaning of the term sukkalù 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 Martukú (time of Kadashman-Turgu), Irimshú-Nín.IB (time of Kadashman-Turgu and Kadashman-Enlil), etc.2 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-

---

1 See e.g., H., VII, 748, ardi-ka m \textsuperscript{1}luš.G-uš-shak-lim (cf. also below, H., VII, 747, a letter by the same writer addressed to the king) a-na di-na-an amdu-LUGH be-li-a lu-lIq um-ma-a a-na be-li-a-a-ma. H., VIII, 781, ardi-ka m \textsuperscript{1}luš.Marduk-ŠHEŠ-[ir] a-na di-na-an amdu-LUGH be-li-a lu-lIq \textsuperscript{2}luš-an-im u \textsuperscript{3}luš-shak-lim. a-na amdu-LUGH be-li-a lu-lIq lik-ru-bu um-ma-a a-na amdu-LUGH be-li-a-a-ma. H., VIII, 805, ardi-ka m \textsuperscript{1}luš.Marduk a-na di-na-an amdu-LUGH be-li-a, a-na a-na \textsuperscript{1}luš-an-im u \textsuperscript{2}luš-shak-lim, a-na a-na \textsuperscript{1}luš-an-im u \textsuperscript{2}luš-shak-lim. a-na amdu-LUGH be-li-a-a-ma. H., VIII, 844, ardi-ka m \textsuperscript{1}luš.EXšaš-sum a-na di-na-an amdu-LUGH be-li-a lu-lIq um-ma-a a-na be-li-a-a-ma.

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-a ardi-ka m \textsuperscript{1}luš.EX-SU a-na di-na-an LUGAL be-li-a lu-lIq \textsuperscript{2}luš-im u \textsuperscript{3}luš-Marduk a-na LUGAL be-li-a lik-ru-bu um-ma-a a-na LUGAL be-li-a-a-ma. H., VII, 793, a-na LUGAL be-li-a (= Ashshar-šaš-šaš-meš, son of Ashshar-ba-un-apal) ardi-ka m \textsuperscript{1}luš.EX-il.un a-na di-na-an LUGAL be-li-a lu-lIq \textsuperscript{2}luš-im u \textsuperscript{3}luš.Marduk a-na LUGAL be-li-a lik-ru-bu um-ma-a a-na be-li-a-a-ma.

3 In connection with address (b)—see p. 32—it occurs, e.g., in H., IV, 422, ardi-ka m \textsuperscript{1}luš-SAŠ-aš-KI a-na di-na-an sLUGAL.GIL.NA (= Sharru-šakûn) be-li-a [sc., lu-lIq, left out here] luš [sc., šal-ma] a-na a-ni LUGAL.GIL.NA be-li-a um-ma-a a-na LUGAL be-li-a-a-ma. H., VI, 542, ardi-ka m \textsuperscript{1}luš.X ... a-na di-na-an a-ni LUGAL.GIL.NA be-li-a um-ma-a a-na LUGAL.GIL.NA be-li-a-a-ma. H., VII, 747, ardi-ka m \textsuperscript{1}luš.EX, BRASHI a-na di-na-an LUGAL [sic! H., but nothing is missing] šu be-li (1 = the king of the lords) be-li-a lu-lIq \textsuperscript{2}luš-im u \textsuperscript{3}luš-Marduk a-na LUGAL be-li-a um-ma-a a-na LUGAL be-li-a-a-ma. H., VII, 721, [ardi-ka m \textsuperscript{1}luš-Marduk-MU-ŠE-[na (a)] a-na di-na-an LUGAL be-li-a lu-lIq um-ma-a a-na LUGAL be-li-a-a-ma. H., VII, 747, 749, ardi-ka m \textsuperscript{1}luš.Iššaš-shak-lim (749 has \textsuperscript{1}luš.IM.DI-šu, cf. also above, H., VII, 748, a letter by the same writer addressed to the amdu.LUGH) a-na di-na-an LUGAL be-li-a lu-lIq um-ma-a a-na LUGAL be-li-a-a-ma. H., VIII, 803 [ardi-ka m \textsuperscript{1}luš-Marduk-MU-ŠE-[na (a)] a-na di-na-an LUGAL be-li-a lu-lIq um-ma-a a-na LUGAL be-li-a-a-ma. H., VII, 812, ...
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-ši of these letters cannot have been a representative of the Cassite king, such as Imanni, 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-ši, we get, it would seem, a good deal farther in our investigation if we examine the formula of greeting, a-na . . . shul-mu (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," bitu; (2) a "house and field," bitu šišatu; (3) a "house, city, and field," bitu ālu-ki šišatu; (4) a "field," eqatu; (5) a "city and field," ālu-ki šišatu (resp. tošišatu); (6) a "city, field, and house," ālu-ki šišatu (resp. šišatu) bitu; (7) "large and small cattle," LIT.GUD[^a] šišatu GANAM.LU[^b,^c]; (8) "young cows and oxen," ša-rošitu u alpē ba-rošitu; (9) "harvests of the land and [pastures] of the field," i-bī-ri šašu ā-ti ut ri-l][=]šišatu; (10) "canals and ditches," šaru[^d]; nam-ga(r)-ra[^e]; (11) "messengers," mār šip-ri[^f]; (12) "workmen," resp. "soldiers;"
unmmanu ( = SABm, sābē ( = SAB\textsuperscript{ecc}) \textsuperscript{(13)} 'servants,' ardu\textsuperscript{*}; (14) shattam and anēma\textsuperscript{a} PA.ENGAR\textsuperscript{b}; (15) itū\textsuperscript{b}; (16) 'tax-gatherers,' mākisūr; (17) 'sheriffs,"

\textsuperscript{1} No. 39: 17 (writer "U-bar-rum"); S:\textsuperscript{b} S:\textsuperscript{b} shi be-taš. Cl. 46: 9; S:\textsuperscript{b} S:\textsuperscript{b}[\textsuperscript{a}][\textsuperscript{a}] and 38: 12, S:\textsuperscript{b} S:\textsuperscript{b} shi be-ta im-mér-uru. From 9: 17, 100 S:\textsuperscript{b} S:\textsuperscript{b} gi-in-na-ta ki-i igi-ru-anu S:\textsuperscript{b} S:\textsuperscript{b} (1) shi be-taš iš-ta-pi-ši, it is apparent that there seems to have been a difference between S:\textsuperscript{b} S:\textsuperscript{b} and S:\textsuperscript{b} S:\textsuperscript{b}; the former are = "men," while the latter are = "soldiers"; for a translation see p. 106. In B. E., XIV, XV, S:\textsuperscript{b} S:\textsuperscript{b} and S:\textsuperscript{b} S:\textsuperscript{b} are used interchangeably; cf., e.g., XIV, 56a: 26, PA\textsuperscript{D} 27 S:\textsuperscript{b} S:\textsuperscript{b} shi a-ge-še i-pa-shu, i.e., "four (wages) for 27 'men' who have fulfilled (made) the fields," and according to L., c. 1, 30, the anēma\textsuperscript{a} RIQ and K. 1 Zipp. 4 have S:\textsuperscript{b} S:\textsuperscript{b}.

\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-ku. Among the persons thus spoken of as the "Lord's" servant we find, e.g., "Ebreš\textsuperscript{a} Maradak, 27: 30, 32; 29: 4; cf. also "Ebreš\textsuperscript{a} Maradak, the writer of letters Nos. 13, 14, 81, 82;" i-tu-u XIX.B-SHEŠI-ŠE-ria, 1: 16, 17; "BAŠ.I, 3: 31, 35;" "I-ur-ER-KUR-UGAL, 21: 32;" m:\textsuperscript{a} DUR.BAT-Bu-ri, 11: 18; K\textsuperscript{a} da-ca-ri, 35: 31 (cf. also the writer of Nos. 26, 27, 28);" od-ri-zi-ti\textsuperscript{a} Maradak, 17: 32; "Na-ug-zi-ti\textsuperscript{a} Maradak, 12: 43, 13: "SHEŠI-sha-a-ri-šu, 45: 7;" E:\textsuperscript{a} S:\textsuperscript{a} U-zi-ti-šu (arid-kāš), 9: 15; Cl. 21: 27, H\textsuperscript{a} arid-ku.

\textsuperscript{3} No. 39: 3 (writer "U-bar-rum"); [15: 4, name of writer broken off] a-ma ŠI\textsuperscript{a} I.TAM (or possibly better AŠI\textsuperscript{a} I.TAM, cf. 39: 34) a anēma\textsuperscript{a} PA.ENGAR shi be-taš šāla-ni-šu. To ŠI\textsuperscript{a} I.TAM (= UD) is plural and without anēma, cf. 35: 33, be-ti a-ma ŠI\textsuperscript{a} I.TAM, iš-ta-pa-šu, i.e., "the oil of the shackan for whose welfare (interests) I have come, has asked me about the welfare (here = "news," as in de-ti a šālu-šum = "good news") of my 'Lord'." 27: 15, iš-ta-šu ŠI.GISH I-ur-ša šaša I.TAM, e-shir, "as regards the oil (zew, concerning my Lord, I have written, I beg to state that "the šia of the shackan [as, no doubt, better than: "as regards the oil of the šia, the shackanum, etc.,] and this because (1) the letter is addressed to the "Lord;" (2) shackanum, terminating in ū, requires a noun on which it is dependent; if ŠI\textsuperscript{a} I.TAM were the subject we would expect a form esu(šētu) is taking care of it, 54: 23, anēma\textsuperscript{a} ŠI\textsuperscript{a} I.TAM. The ŠI\textsuperscript{a} I.TAM, in all cases quoted, being closely connected with the watching, guarding, taking care of (27: 13) or storing (35: 33) of the ŠI.GISH or sesame oil, must have been an official in charge of the oil of the Temple or Palace, Delitzsche, H. W. B., p. 1695, "ein Berufsname;" Meissner-Istel, R. S. H., III, p. 359, and Zimmern, Rituš, p. 93 = zumānū, "Stanger;" Jensen, K. B. VY, pp. 531, 552 = šaša, qipu, "Staatsheld;" King, Letters of Šumumab, I, p. 57: 3, "overseer of cattle;" Delitzsche, B. A., IV, p. 486, on the basis of Letters of Šumumab, 39: 5, ŠI.GISH I.TAM = šaša E\textsuperscript{a} šaša I.TAM compared with Lc. 35: 7 and No. 15, = "Tempelverwaltung, ein höheres Tempelverwaltungsglied," anēma\textsuperscript{a} PA.ENGAR = akīl ešir, ikkar, "overseer of the farmers or irrigators." If read anēma\textsuperscript{a} gis\textsuperscript{a} ENGAR, this official would be one who had charge of irrigation: anēma\textsuperscript{a} maršaš, see also p. 127, note 2.

\textsuperscript{4} Kiššam-bat, the writer of No. 35, after having passed through the positions of ma-gis\textsuperscript{a} ENGAR, RIQ, calls himself, i.e., 1: 25, a-ma-kā iš-ta be-taš. As itū he was in charge (of the stornehouse affairs) of the city Dāš\textsuperscript{b}.PA. KU\textsuperscript{a} (see below, p. 120). "Kul-bal, the writer of No. 21, who had been entrusted by royal grant with the administration of the city Murē-an-gis\textsuperscript{a} I.TAM, calls himself, i.e., 1: 30, a-ma-kā iš-ta [be-lu]-tuš. In 20: 17 the iš-ta-šu "mā-gis\textsuperscript{a} XIX.B, "puts up" šaši-šā; šaši šaši-šā ša iš-ta-šu "mā-gis\textsuperscript{a} XIX.B, šaša iš-ta-šu ma be-taš iš-ta-šu ma be-taš iš-ta-šu, iš-ta-šu; for translation see p. 119. Cf. also 21: 27, GIL i(?) ša; Also other persons had an itū. The writer of No. 11, "Buk-bal, says, i.e., 1: 21, iš-ta-šu ma-ma-an iš-ta-šu, and m:\textsuperscript{a} En-im-ki-li-ša, the slave dealer, commands "Akššu-šēka (78: 4);" Mār\textsuperscript{a} iš-ta-šu iš-ta-šu ma iš-ta-šu ma. In 21: 4 we have an iš-ta anēma\textsuperscript{a} I.TAM, and in 27: 15 an iš-ta ŠI.GISH-šaša-ni (see preceding note), Delitzsche, H. W. B., p. 157a, gives only "šaša, ein Bernamnace." The root of this word is 3916, "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 the left, right, south, or which look towards the left, right, south, or which looks towards the right, south, or boundaries; hence the person called itū is "one who looks out towards or in the different directions, or sides or bound-
GÜ.EN.X.4: (18) "nu'-i-ri-e nu'-i-ra-a-ti SAL, E-di-ir-ti ̀ û biitu; (19) "cities," ̀âlu bals;
"guards," maṣṣarītā; "fortress(es)," bi-ir-tašu; "chariots," š[u]narkabtišu and suk-š[u;p-šar]; (20) "'carriages,' ru-ku-bišu; and last, but not least, (21) "creatures,"

"lamentation": Del., H. W, B., p. 188a, mentions only a bārūru, syn. ikkiltum, "Wehklage;" see also 27: 1, while the lady was still under treatment (al uṣurri) and sick. No wonder, then, that she was seized with fever (umma) 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 (te-īm mu-ški) and how the umma-um (syn. umma, the u on account of the m, H. W, B., p. 563). Jensen, K. B., VII, p. 5717 was proceeding. Women, by the name S.LI. E-li-ir-tum, are mentioned in R.E., XIV, 40: 3, 12, 11, 19 (21st year of Kurī-Galua, II, 31, 23) and a TUR.SAL GAR E-di-ir-tum occurs in, l.e., 58: 42 (13th year of Nazi-Marruttah). As this lady is closely connected with the lamentation men and women, it seems probable to suppose that she was at the head of that profession. What the real meaning of li-piša an-ul-tum il-la-pa-asi (or su = il-la-pa-ul-shki or suhu, i.e., ʾ557), so, no doubt, better than a "possible" ʾ552 or ʾ552) in No. 31: 5 is, is not clear to me. With lipītu lipītu cf. Journu, B, 6, Rev. 3, 7, 9; B, 219, Rev. 3, 1. It is construed with double accusative, as here, also in IV R, 138, col. 1: 14, 15, ap-pu a ištu liša-šti la-pa-ul-sha ana marqi aššu-liša-ul-na aš lu-ški-šu, but neither the signification given by Delitzsch, H. W, B., p. 382, "unstūrē, unstūrē," nor that by Jensen, K. B., VII, p. 579, "berühren, schlagen, werfen," nor King's (Letters of Hammurabi, II, p. 279), "to overthrow, to destroy," nor Nagel's (B. A., IV, p. 149), "zögern, verzögern," nor even Kühler's (Marg., p. 75), "stassen, unstauen, berühren, unstauen, verneichen, ankippen," seem to fit here. Cf. also the lišli-liššiti (= XIX), "visitation of god," Jum. Code, XXXVIII, 77, and our letter No. 47: 9, 14, asli liša nē e-lu-pertu. Also this letter treats of sickness, cf., e.g., I, 18, ʾas ša ir-ša û-sa-ta tē niš-šu ša-an-um uš ʾiz-šiti—an expression exactly parallel to ša ir-ša tē gis-em-ul ša u-an-an-um uš gis-em-ul-ši in Nos. 31: 13 : 32: 13; hence esli must signify a suffering from a certain malady and not merely a "Verwicen," Kühler, Marg., pp. 137, 138; Delitzsch, H. W, B., p. 134g. What sickness this was is indicated in l. 1, iš-ša ša-an-rē (cf. above be-an-arum) ki ʾiz-šiti, Another letter that touches upon sickness, to mention it here, is No. 22: 8 (writer Im-ga-rum), dišim mar-ši-ši ki išu-ašškā rikīšat kē ʾešli ša-an-ašškā. "Maškal-dim, the writer of Nos. 31, 32, 33, and possibly, of 17, was, no doubt, a physician. And as physicians are always under the patronage of goddess Gula, the azczyllata rabitu or "great physician," the one who unbelīlīfattīt, "quickens the dead" (sic!), I propose to identify our writer with the "Maškal-dim mentioned after the bit ʾuGirda in B, E, XIV, 118: 9 (the 17th year), who lived during the time of Bumma-Buniash. As such a physician and priest in the Temple of Gula he had to observe the welfare of the "ladies of the sanctuary," for notice, at Mukallim sends not only greetings (shalātu) and good wishes (labab-ʾa ša ū-pašab, 31 : 8) for the well being (šiši-ši-mu, lit. their flesh, their body) of "the daughter of Kurt" and "the daughter of Aguni," 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 Wushkeliti" (31: 11 : 32: 7); (2) "the daughter of Hustipshara" (31: 15); (3) the lady La-li (or šš) (31 : 20); (4) the ʾaššu-līššiti (i.e., "the normal"), 31: 25 : 32: 8. Cf. also B, E, X V, 188 V: 11, S.LI. A-liššiti-šum, and aššu-līššiti, i.e., XIV, 16: 6; XV, 151: 26, besides the passages quoted by Clay in l.e., XV, 5: 23b; and (3) the daughter (TUR.SAL) of the lady (S.LI. Ušk (or Hu)-bašu···) (31: 27).

"No. 33a : 3, a-an dilābša maṣṣaritu-EN.XU.XUN ša be-li ša-ta ška-an[wu]. For dilābša = plural, see p. 12, note 1.

"For EN.XU.UN = EN.XU.N = maṣṣaritu see Delitzsch, H. W, B., p. 157a; and cf. H., I, 118, Rev. 5 (a letter of ʾIššu, p.1 to the nār šāri be-li-šišti), šalātu (= Dil) a-an EN.XU.N ša-šu-gab-bašu, "greeting to all the guards," and H, II, 186, Rev. 1 (by the same writer). EN.XU.N ša-li-GAL.

"No. 33a : 33, 36, bi-lišša ša bi-lišša,

"No. 33a : 6, 10, 13, 22, 29, 31, 31, 35. Chariots are also mentioned in B, E, XIV, 124 : 10 X XV, 13 : 2 : 21 : 7; they are to be distinguished from the ru-ka-lišu and KUB.MARGID.DA, see below, note 13.

"No. 33a : 72f., u-an-ma a-an be-li-ša-li ša be-li-šu-gab-bašu šu šiš-šu-kī ša u-an-ma be-li-šu-gab-bašu ša be-li-šu-gab-bašu šiš-šu-kī ša u-an-ma be-li-šu-gab-bašu ša be-li-šu-gab-bašu; for translation see p. 130. In B, E, XV, 151: 41 (not mentioned by Clay) a ššu (ŠU).TAR ša-pur LUG; LUG is mentioned, and from l.e., 13: 5 (not mentioned by Clay) we learn that a certain "Er-ša-ša-ul-tum, the suš-su-gab-bašu, received (im-šša-ur) from (i-na

FROM THE TEMPLE ARCHIVES OF NIPPU
XI(G)-GAL-tum náp-tí. 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. 6), whose gods he invokes for the protection of his "Lord." The writer, unfortunately, is not mentioned in any of the tablets published in B. E., XIV, XV. Though a "Shi-ri-iq-[tum]" is to be
found in a letter of "Gu-za-ar-AN to "In-um-â-u (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-a]n

Thy servant Shiriqtum; before the presence

2 be-li-ia ibu-â-ul-li-[ik]

of my "Lord" may I come!

3 SUGH: u shar-rai 4EN.LIL[ik]

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, Ninlil or Gula (Ran)—was known also as SUGH (Father) NIN.IB (Son) 11NIN.MAGH (wife of the Son) = shar-rai 11En-Ikki (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."

12SUGH (thus 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., 1. 35, c, d, where 12SUGH (with the gloss Tishkpu) is identified with 11NIN.IB, who in our letter occupies the position of the "Son." Cf. also 12SUGH EN-un-ma-ai, "the lord of hosts," Zimmer, Sharpu, IV, p. 21, 74; 12SUGH (gloss jud) NING = mu-bel-la-ti-â-i-bi, "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 Annunaki," etc.), protects the faithful and destroys the wicked. Just as 12NIN.IB (the Son) was also 11IB, and this one = 11É.KUR, "the god of Ekur," i.e., Enlil (see Bel, the Christ, p. 17), so 12SUGH (originally the Son) appears in this letter at the head of the Nippurian Trinity—is, therefore, here = 11Enlil, 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 naturally would be called "the queen of Nippur," shar-rai En-Ikki.

The latter is coupled in this invocation with SUGH; hence SUGH and shar-rai En-Ikki are husband and wife. That "queen of Nippur" was indeed none other than 12NIN.LIL follows also from other considerations, of which I shall mention only one: NIN.IB, "the son of Enlil," is called in K. R, I, p. 175, 18, the ilitli Kutushar beltu, "the one born by Kutushar, the mistress (beltu = NIN);" but Kutushar is according to II R., 38, 3a = shar-ra (or "queen.") Hence sharraitu must be the wife of Enlil (= SUGH), i.e., she is 12NIN.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 by the inscriptions themselves. Above we saw that SUGH or Enlil was a male divinity, but 12SUGH is according to II R., 35, 1a the same as "Ishar of Eridu," generally called Am-nu=zi (not in)-tan or Antum. Antum again is identified with 12Gur, the wife of 12É.KUR = Enlil (see Bel, the Christ, p. 17). The wife of Enlil is called also Ninlil or sharraitu En-Ikki (our letter), hence 12Enlil is on the one hand the same as 11Enlil and on the other = 11Ninlil; 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 ἀθανάτιος καὶ θάνατος, "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 12Dar-an-ki or 12Dar-an AN, the kari = ódēn Babādōn (see Bel, the Christ, p. 21).

The "heaven and earth" or cosmos had a son, called 12NIN.IB. The Babylonian name for cosmos is not only an-ki, but also É.KUR or É-shar-ra, hence NIN.IB is termed the baškur Na-gimmut bit-ti É.KUR, K. B., 1, p. 52 : 2; the apil É.KUR, I R, 15, VII : 55; the baškur 11En-il bi-nant É-shar-ra; I R, 29, 16 (= K. B., I, p. 174 : 15, 16);
4 map(sic!)-ti be-lita li-ig-su-rum

5 in NIN.IB u in NIN.MAGH a-shib

may protect the life (lit. souls) of my

"Lord"

NIN.IB and NIN.MAGH who inhabit

the dama-umu (= apiti) E-shar-ra zi-kur-shu, Craig, Rel. Texts, 1, p. 43: 17; the apiti E-sharrum, IV R. I, 38r. Seeing that the "cosmos" is represented by Enlil (= SUGH) and Ninlil (= sharrat Enlil[2]), NIN.IB appears also as the EN dumm důdr=En-il-il-ge = nar inādītu, Reinsen, Hymnen, p. 123: 68, or as the L dūm NIN.IB dūm dūmge, K. 170, Rev. 11, and as the illitu Kǔ-ta-shur (= sharrat, see above) īlitu, K. R. I, p. 175: 18. As such a "Son" he is his Father's "voice" (paldi, cf. the "372 of Jahve", HI R. 67, ûse, d, through whom the Father speaks and reveals himself; he is his "messenger," the sakkulu E.KUR, V R. 51: 26r. whose business it is to enforce and guard the commands of his Father: in NIN.IB nūtim (SHESH) purasū (ESH BAR) ašši in Enlil, HI R. 57, Obv, 21, 22e, d. He can do it, for he is the ar-šu₃₃ baq-um, "the mighty hero" (lit. "head-servant"), "who has no equal" (qab-ri na-tug-ug), and he does it by means of his "seven sons" (cf. in NIN.IB = in PAP nūtim-gišer, HI R. 57, Rev. 57b, who, according to HI R. 67, No. 1: 25r, dūl, (= H R. 56: 58b, b), has "seven" sons, among whom (1, 35) is to be found a certain in NIN.IB nūtim-gišer, the latter appears also among the "seven" sons of Baal and Nin-Girsu (Creation Story, p. 23: 6, where E-nun must be read, instead of ishānum), who are his TUR. D.A or e-kulti, "mighty ones" (German: Reeken). The chief one (XU or mo-liš) among these "seven mighty ones," since the time of the kings of UR, is in NIN.IB and NIN.MAGH, 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 Rel. the Christ, p. 2, note 10, and p. 3, note 10). NIN.IB, again, was, as "Son," identified with his "Father," Enlil; cf. here the names in NIN.IB = in NIN.KUR.KUR, in NIN.MAGH, 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 signification, the "seven" was looked upon as the most sacred and the most evil number; it being both holy and taboo. So is also the Holy Ghost. He is on the one hand the most gracious comforter, and on the other the only being that does not partake of sin committed against him: the sin against the Holy Ghost being unpardonable (see here also my review of Prof. Hilprecht's B. E., XXI, in the Hymnical Review, February, 1908, pp. 100ff., which was written, however, in March, 1907).

in NIN.MAGH, who appears also in HI R. 68: 21g, h (cf. li. 19, 17) as the D.M.(HI-SAL) of in NIN.IB, must be here likewise (because coupled with him) the wife of NIN.IB. But in HI R. 50: 19; HI R. 68: 21g, h (cf. li. 17) there appears as the wife of in NIN.IB the goddess NIN.EX.LII briefly, i.e., the "mistress of Nippur," who was, as we saw above, the same as Ku-ta-shur, the "queen and mistress of Nippur." Again, in Reinsen, Hymnen, p. 17, No. 23, Rev. 22, 23, NIN.MAGH is called the A.M. (= umma), "mother," of in NIN.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 the "Mother" earth, in consequence of which she becomes, after the dead and barren season of the winter, fruitless, brings forth new life, quickens the dead (u należyxlabel miš): 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 in NIN.IB and in NIN.MAGH (sic! not NIN.ENAR?) are identified, are one: HI R. 68: 21g, h (cf. li. 21, 17). Cf. also in NIN.MAGH = Autum, HI R. 54, No. 2, 1, 2 (Hommel, S. L., p. 48, 35). 

Autum = in NIN.IB, Bel, the Christ, etc., pp. 16, 18. in NIN.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 in NIN.IB. In my review of Clay's volume
the city (i.e., Nippur) may protect thy creatures (subjects)!

Whosoever may see the gracious face of my "Lord" [and] whosoever be of "good words" may listen to my "Lord"

The following to my "Lord":

Two peculiarities of this text require some words of explanation. The first is the word mapiti in ll. 4 and 6. According to the greeting of 89 : 62 we would expect...
here the word *nap-shā-ti* for *nap-ti*. Should the writer have made twice the same mistake of omitting *šā*, or have we to see in *naplu* a synonym, resp. side form of *napshāti*? 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-shā-ti*, with the *šā* left out, but as a synonym of *napishtu*, from the root 𒂗𒂗(?), “soul,” “life.” The second peculiarity is met with in the expression *NI(G).ÂL-tum nap-ti-ka*. If these two words have to be connected, thus taking *NI(G).ÂL-tum* as the *nomen regens* of *nap-ti-ka*, we will have to admit that this is rather a singular *status constructus* relation. We would expect either *NI(G).ÂL-tum shā nap-ti-ka* or *NI(G).ÂL-(4i, -at) nap-ti-ka*. However, such *status constructus* relations may be paralleled, cf. e.g., *al-tu ūmum“* (for *ūm* =a-a-tî, Neb., V R. 64, 1:9; *kîma pûrim šeri, harânam namrâsa*, quoted by Delitzsch, Gram., p. 192, note. If, then, *NI(G).ÂL-tum* nap-ti-ka be one expression we may compare with it the well-known *NI(G).ZI.G.ÂL = shiknat napishti = NI(G).ÂL-tum + ŽI = shikhitum nap-ti = creatures* an attribute ascribed not only to *Èn*<SUP>NIN</SUP>(var. *SÂL*)-*in-sî-na*, the *âm kalam-ma* *ZI.G.ÂL* kalam *gim-gim-me*, “the mother of the world, who creates the creatures (*ZI.G.ÂL = NI(G).ZI.G.ÂL = shiknat napishti*) of the world.” E. B. H., p. 202, note 1, 1, but also to Shamash, the *be-êl shik-na-at napishtimm“*<SUP>en</SUP>, IV R. 28, No. 1, 7, 8b. This gives us the important result that the writer Shiriqum ascribes in this passage *divine attributes to his* “Lord,” which would be not at all surprising if it can be proved that the “Lord” was in each and every case the “King”: for we know that the Cassite kings of this period, like their Egyptian contemporaries, were *deified*, as is indicated by the sign *îlu,“* so 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.”<SUP>3</SUP>


<sup>2</sup> If it were possible to read instead of *ki ūm(?âlu-ki) = DUL (cf. Clay, List of Signs, B. E., XIV, No. 130) we might be tempted to transcribe 1. 6, *šā* diš*DUL.NI.GâL-tum* nap-ti-ka, and translate: “that inhabit the mountain of creatures,” thus taking *DUL.NI(G).GâL-tum* to be another name for *DUL.AZAG*, “the holy mountain” of the nether world, of which diš*NIN.IB* was, as we know, the “king” (*U.GÂL*). But this cannot be done, simply because *ki* is absolutely certain. A third explanation might be suggested by taking *NI(G).GâL-tum nap-ti* (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 bodily.” This would fit very well, for we know that the wife of *NIN.IB* was “the great physician,” who cared for the “spiritual” (nap-ti) and “bodily welfare” (NI(G).GâL-tum nap-ti) of her people. However, a signification “bodily” = *NI(G).GâL-tum nap-ti* is not known to me. Hence the only translation that seems linguistically justified is the one given above. For *ZI.GâL* cf. also Jensen, Z. A., VIII, p. 221, note 3.
Even though it be admitted that the "Lord" was in possession of all that has been enumerated above, it might still be objected that, e.g., a sukkallu or the "king's representative" was designated here by the title be-li, and this the more as he "apparently shared honors with his royal masters"; for we saw on p. 33 that certain writers used the phrase "before the presence of my 'Lord' may I come" not only in their letters to the king, but also in those which they addressed to his "representative." Surely such a high officer of the king would naturally have been in possession of cities, guards, houses, lands, wagons, chariots, fields, cattle, and servants. Or it might be said that a governor, bēl pahātī, was meant by be-li in our letters; for he as the head of a government and the superior of the bažannāti 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 safekeeping of their "Lord's" possessions.

Fortunately for our investigation here we have a letter, published in this volume, that has been written to a governor. And how does the writer address the governor? By be-li or "Lord"? Does he beg to be permitted to "come before the face" of his Lord? Does he call himself "thy servant"? Nothing of the kind. The writer simply names his addressee by name and extends his greeting to him, his house, and his government. An address in a letter to a governor at this period, then, reads (No. 77: 1 ff.):

1 a-na mu En-lil-[bēl(=EN)-nishēmesh-
    shu]
2 ki-bi-[mu um-ma] To Enlil-bēl-nishē-shu
3 mu A-shur-shum-ētiš(=KA[R]-mu) speak, thus saith
4 a-na ka-a-shā bī[tī-ka] Ashur-shum-ētiš:
5 ū a-na pa-ha-[tī-ka] to thee, thy house
6 lu-ū šēl-[nu]
   lu-ū šēl-[nu] and thy government
greeting!

Again, in No. 24 Kalbu, the writer, iū, "dust and loving servant," after having reported to his "Lord" that a city and its gate had been destroyed, adds in l. 20ff.:

29 ū Mār-[. . .] Also Mār-[. . .].
30 bēl pahātī (=EN.NAM) a-na ardi-
   ka ki-ī il-ki-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 Kadashman-Turgu) see p. 13, n. 5.
2 For EN.NAM = bēl pahātī see Delitzsch, H. W. R., p. 5196.
31 abulla (K₃.GAL)₁² i-ma-ul-di₈ tu-
shā-an-na-ma haddan (= NE)₈-na²

"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-lī or "Lord": may, he, although a bēl pabātī, 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 "libītu (= SHEG) ia-a'-nu
25 aš-shum a-na-kū i-tu be-lī-ia
26 al-li(?) ka a-na "Erba₃-Mard-
duk
27 šū-pu-ar-ru a-na "Ku-du-ra-ni
28 (l)ish-pu-ra-ra ma sukkalmahhû
(= PAP.LUGH = MAGH) lī-[g]₈-br
29 libītu (= SHEG)₈meš 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 sukkalmahhû (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 pas-
sage is apparently the following: Kishahbut, the writer and itū (p. 35, n. 4), living in
Dūr-Nusku during the reign of Kadashman-Turgu, had at some previous time gone
(up) to his "Lord" with the request that the sukkalmahhû (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 matā = LML (8b 112), 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
bīh₃-L.L.₁ = abulla is feminine, hence we would expect tu-ma-₃-ad-li. I-ma-₃-ad-li I take, therefore, as a third pers.
plur. for imatū. For i₈, instead of a, cf. Delitzsch, Gram., p. 252, and for the signification "klagen, stöhnen u. dergl."
Jensen, K. B., VII, pp. 361, 557: "They (i.e., the inhabitants, or the German indefinite man) make lamenta-
tions on account of the gate," i.e., "they deplore its loss."

² By translating as given above I consider tashannahhû tashanna 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-lī lishanna-na
(= lishanna-na), cf. l. 34, be-lī a-na-as li-mar-na. Tashannahhû tashanna is a tu-bā dēṣer = "thou shalt duplicate and
give" = "thou shalt give again."
³ For PAP.LUGH = LUGH = sukkallu cf. III R, 67, 55, līt₃-LUGH = ditto (i.e., līt₃-PAP.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" (I. 24). The "red tape" in connection with this order (the itā 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 "Raunghöchster, hochster Würtdensträger" (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-li2 ul mu-shā-ki-li a-na-ku la 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 (!) 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. Sumer., I, p. 97:13, ma-an-za-az pānī (= SH) LUGAL.
2 Cf. AS:2, an-na di-[mā]-ma in be-[ki]-i4a til-[ik], and Lc., II, 5, 36, am-ma a nu be-li-ia-nu.
3 HI of akīlu = muškālītu, sc. qarpā, lit. "one that nourishes false accusations." Cf. here also No. 20:6, e-ni-ia an-an-ta-nu a ku-ar-zi a-nu shī a-nu di[š]e-[li]-ia i-lu-an-an-um ma dīše-ši-a ma pa-niššu x-[t]e-shī-lu-an-ul, etc.
arrived at under these circumstances is that the "Lord" of the manzaz pani 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-li-ia:

1 As-mi lu-ul-li-i
2 la ma-i-i² an-ni
3 nu-ar ah-e(=SHESH)m-eš-shu³

1 In view of such forms as buv-ul-li-ik, No. 38 : 2; li-isk-pu-ir-e-am-expa, No. 39 : 23, and many others, one might be inclined to see in this sign a variant of ik and read bu-ul-li-ul-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 is left, as given by Clay, Sign list, B. E., XIV, No. 257, to be found; (2) the T.1.A.X (± 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 = ziru, "seed." The T.1.A.X then is easily amended to ishu shem-c[i]. For an analogous attribute of a Cassite king cf. the inscription of Agum-Kakrima (Jensen, K. B., 111, p. 131, col. 1 : 3), where this king calls himself zirin el-um-ša [10]Shu-qam-una, "the pure seed of Shu-pamana." ² Y. also in this connection the sign of god, ila, before the names of the Cassite kings of this period.

2 So rather than lu ba-i²r an-ni, "who does not deny grace." The attribute here ascribed to the "Lord" has its origin in the fact that the writer had to report to his be-lu rather sad news, which possibly might be attributed to his (the writer's) negligence, see ll. 11ff.

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

4 In this expression two divine attributes fall together, viz., nār màti resp. nār diššu or nār gal-bu, ascribed especially to Sin, Shamash, and B(T)ur-ku (p. 16, n. 13), and ashurid aḫiš-sha(šu), found in connection with AN/IB and Ishtar, i.e., with all gods who played the rôle of the "Son" and "his wife."

5 Dehme, H. W., B., p. 325, mentions a word pinid, which he takes to be a plural, quoting 111 R. 45, 96, "wenn ein neugeborenes Kind pi-in-di-e ma-di voll 'at von p.' In our text PI-in-di-e is apparently a noun in the genitive (after ann, I. 1) and the regens of na-ma-a-ri. As such a noun it is aḥšal of 111: vid-di-e = vid-di-em = vid-di-e = vi-in-di-e, vi-in-di-em, which latter, when graphically expressed, becomes PI-in-di-e. This "Lord," being the "light," i.e., the first and foremost of his brothers, has, of course, the power, authority, and right to "order," "appoint" the namari—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 ʾpēl form: raddaj = radd = candi = candi = rendi (a with following n is often changed to c or k) = vindi = "appointer, commander."
FROM THE TEMPLE ARCHIVES OF NIPPU.

4 ki-ib' kab-tu-ti  
5 e-pi-i'r² um-ma-ni  
6 c-ê.l ki-na-te-e-shù²  
7 ù³Ba-li-ti-b³(=NI.NI)³  

1 Ki-ib, ki-î-bu = qipu, qipu. Deitersch, H. W. B., p. 584a, defines a qipu to be one "der mit etwas betraut ist," and of qipu he says, i.e., that it is a "Darlehen, spez. zinsfreiues 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 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), 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 damuš is mišštir are objective genitives. To take them as subjective genitives would be senseless, because everything that comes from the gods is itself gracious and righteous. A king that administers his kîbsa in such a way is a shur mišššt-rî-ûm, Nip. Grot., 1, 1. For ki-ib-ki-pu, see also 16: 17, ki-î-ba (i.e., the Lord's) u-nu-ma-ma ní-ma-ur.

2 A plural of rashbaanu, and this a form in -nu (which forms adjectives and nouns, Delitzsch, Gram., § 65, p. 175, No. 35 of rashba.)

3 E-pi-i'r . . . pa-ásh-shur. The correct explanation of these words depends upon whether we see in them participles or nouns. If e-pi-i'r be the participle of e-piru, "sättigen, versorgen" (Jenson, K. B., VP, pp. 438, 572) we might see in it a translation of the well-known title of, e.g., the kings of Isin, Larsa, Warka, who call themselves in their inscriptions Ú.A = e-pirum, zinzinum (Deitersch, H. W. B., p. 1156). Cf. for the kings of Isin: Sin-mâgir (Tudmaini-Danggan, A. S. K. I., p. 204, No. 4, l. 2), Ishme-Dugan (i.e., p. 206, No. 5, l. 2), for the kings of Larsa: Sin-idimman (l.c., p. 208), No. 5, l. 3; p. 210, l. 8 above; d, l. 3), Arad-Sin (i.e., p. 2126, l. 5, 7), l. 7, p. 214d, l. 8), Rim-Sin (i.e., p. 216c, l. 13, p. 218c, l. 10; p. 220, l. 11 above; j, l. 11); for the kings of Warka: Sin-gâshid (i.e., p. 222e, l. 8). If e-pir be a participle then paššîr must be one likewise, in which case the latter might stand for paššîr = paššîr, Deitersch, H. W. B., p. 589f: "Löser, der sich qualig annahmt, Erbarmen" (cf. V. R. 21, 55a; b; 65a, b, nas-kî-ra syn of re-e-nu).

As, however, a writing pa-ásh-shur for paššîr would be somewhat strange for this period, it is preferable to take pa-ásh-shur in the sense of paššîr, "platter," and then, of course, e-pi-i'r not as a participle, but, on account of the parallelism, as a nàt. contr. of e-piru (so also Hilprecht and Hommel in personal communications), "the food of people, the platter (zauv) of men," from which, i.e., from whose (the Lord's) grace they all eat. For e-piru as a divine attribute cf. also the proper names mâš(Eu-li-e-pir), B. E., XV, 184 : 12; mâš(Eu-li-e-pir(inc. without tu), Clay, i.e., p. 286, nor perhaps itir, Clay, Corrections(!) in Z. A., XX (1907), p. 421.), i.e., 37 : 9; mâš(Eu-li-e-pir-in-î, i.e., 150 : 17; 

Bâtli (G.S.I.1404) e-pir-un-at, i.e., 155 : 27; mâšSH.U.DU.DU=e-pir(inc. Clay, i.e., 33b, wrongly Raschaw-ersa-e-pir(inc.), i.e., 186 : 10. For SH.U.DU.DU cf. the proper name in R. T. Ch., 33O, Rev. 2, a name like "Mar-shuk."

From this it follows that the "Lord" as e-pi-i'r um-ma-ni has a divine attribute: he was deified.

The long े in ki-na-te-e-shù is noteworthy. I take kiññà as a plural of kinnà, H. W. B., p. 3386. Cf. also H. Ill, 333 : 1, LUGAL ki-na-â-te. Besides this plural the B. E. publications give us two others: ki-na-ta-ti, B. E., IX, 5 : 3; 22 : 7, and ki-na-at-ti, i.e., 45 : 6 ; 106 : 5. Hilprecht ascribes the long े to the open syllable under the verse accent.

Notice here the à before Bëlti-à and the à between Eblîl and É.A. The first three gods represent the "whole world," the cosmos as it was known since the time of the Enuma elish epic, i.e., since the time when Babylonia proper (Kì-en-gî-kì-BUR.BUR = Shumer = "high and lowland") had extended its confines south as far as the borders as that and as far as the Persian Gulf ("the lower sea" - àpat) and north over the Armenian mountains and the "westland" (notice that these two lands are likewise known as BUR.BUR = Akkad = "highlands") up to and including the Mediterranean Sea ("the upper sea"). In this wise it happened that the bablon became a kur-kur and the dìnûÎ' LUGAL.KALAM.MA a dìnûÎ' LUGAL.KUR.KUR; in other words, the microcosmos became a macrocosmos which included the two oceans and was called Ê-shùr-ca, being as such inhabited by Ann (heavenly ocean =upper sea).
8  nib mi-ish-ra-er  
    ish-ru-ku-uu-shii
9  be-ri-a ki-ba-ma mu-ma "Kal-ba" ip-ru
10  ni-ar-lum-ra-am-ku-ma

Translation.
To my "Lord"—

1 Glorious in splendor.
2 Not summoning punishment, Strong out of heaven;
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 Belit 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, such as 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 kings-

Edil (kur-ku = kalam, the term firma, as consisting of the upper (= BUR. BUR) and the lower (ki-uen-iq) firmament), É.A (terrestrial ocean = apsu = Persian Gulf), see BJ, the Christ, p. 11, note 3. Belit-ili, because identified in the inscriptions with Antum, Nidil, and Damkina, represents here the feminine principle of the "world," "cosmos, Esharrā. 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-ilā swarm-ki a mi-ish-ra-er"—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. singl. or plur. (cf. es-ši-ki-ir-ma, 3 : 18; e-pi-(B)š-ma, 3 : 19, 30, 32; er-ši-ša, 26 : 13, etc.), yet we never find an e used as a phonetic complement in these forms, hence I read here not e-lish-ra-ku-ua-sha, but mi-lish-ra-e(!) ish-ru-ku-ua-sha. Mi-lish-ra-e I take as a plural of mishru = mishru (cf. piri, piku; gimuru, gimeru; Delitzsch, Gimm., p. 105, § 45). "Righteousness" (hence not of meshrā), the "polished," W. B. W., p. 686), and damqi, on account of the parallelism, in the sense of "beauty." H. W. B., p. 2226 (against Jensen, K. B. VII, p. 418, "Schatheit, Guthett, gute Beschaffenheit"). The e may(!), however, stand for i (cf. 92 : 27) = "the beloved!"

2 Neither the name of this writer nor that of any other person occurring in this letter (cf. "E-ta-ba-maš "Uš- 
    bu-ba, I, 1, 12, "M-me-E, KUR-GI, I, 32; "Nuzi; "Éla-KI, I, 25, and the city "Ušru-Ma-um-gi-la, =M, II, 13, 18) is mentioned in 
    R. E., XIV, XIV. See now, however, the Bit-šu-šubašu, Neh, Nippur, III, 5 (=Hilke, B. E., Series D, IV, p. 148).

3 In view of 80 : 1, šeš-um-um-sha, "whom (the addressee) I (the writer) love," I prefer to translate asšu-um-um-ka-um 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.):

Even the city Mannu-gir-Rammān, 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 consiers,

1 A city called after the name of a person. In such cases the DISH before the proper name is, if preceded by $glu$, always omitted, cf. $glu\, Arildi-Assilu, 36: 24; glu $gir-nu-ga-nil, 3: 33; glu $gir-ra-ga-nil, 3: 39; or only $gir-ra-ga-nil, 3: 13, 17, 20, $hba $ba-kal $ba, 16: 8, 12, but Bit. $din $ni, 9: 23, so always after Bit in our letters. The name of the person means "who is like Rammān," and corresponds to the Sumerian $A$Ju,$A$Ju $gim. The gir-$gir, therefore, in this name represents the Sumerian $gim$ or the regular Babylonian $kina$ (or $kθ$). As the $a$ in $anu$ or $ina$ may be omitted and the $n$ assimilated to the next consonant, so the $u$ of $kina$ has been omitted here and the $m$ assimilated itself (by first becoming an $n$) to the following $r$, but this it could do only if $gim$ was actually read $gim$. This writing, then, proves that $gim$ was not read, at the time of the Cassites, $Adad but $Ramān. For the change of $k$ to $g$ cf. akkana = 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.

3 $ra-im, m$ before $q$ (even if the $q$ belongs to another word, cf. $anu, ina, kina above) may become an $n$, Delitzsch, Gram., § 490. For sCONNECTOR c. double acc. see H. W. B., p. 604et, 2, "Jew. mit etwas begangen, d. h. beschungen"; here lit.: "with which the king entrusted my hand." It is the term, technique used in the so-called "boundary stones" for a "royal grant," cf. e.g., Scheil, Textes Élam. Semi., I, p. 89. Our writer Kallon, then, has received the city Mannugir-Rammān 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 $SI$ has to be read $MIR$. It is found with either two (Letters of Hammurabi, 3: 7, 11: 26, 10: 16, 36: 14), often (B, 26: 11), 26: 14, 11: 26, 11: 34, 13: 19, 23, 27, 29) or three (B, 11: 26: 11), 26: 14, 11: 26, 11: 34, 36: 14) wedges at the beginning. Delitzsch, B. A., IV, 485, read this sign $BA\tilde{R}$ which in our letters looks quite differently, cf. 3: 13, 11: 8 ($BAR = parakkku $shad $lu-ap-pa$) 36: 7 ($BAR = En $lil).$ Cf. also Z. A., XVIII, 1926, and I. S., p. 308; Harper, Code of Hammurabi, List of Signs, No. 135. The latter quotation shows that the signs wrongly read $IP.\, USH$ or $TU.\, USH$ (E, B. H., p. 425 passim) are to be transcribed $MIR.\, NIT$. Although Delitzsch read wrongly $BA\tilde{R}$ 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 Nagél (B. A., IV, 437) by "Truppenführer," Delitzsch rendered it (i.e.) by "Militärränge." The $an-na-ti$ shows that $MIR.\, NIT$ is $93$ must be made, plur. $\tilde{TA}$ apparently contains only the "overhanging" vowel of $USH = NIT$. $MIR.\, NIT\tilde{TA}$ is $93$ $sid $shad $lu$, a composite noun in the plural, in which case only the last noun has the plural form. Harper, Code of Hammurabi, p. 188, probably gives the best translation of $sid $shad $lu$, rendering it by "recruiting officer; one who impresses men for the corvee," In view of the fact that the phrase of the Hammurabi Letters, ann $MIR.\, NIT$ shapara resp. miltū (Delitzsch, B. A., IV, 36: 17, 13: 17), corresponds exactly to our $an-na $MIR.\, NIT\tilde{TA}$ naddānu, I prefer to translate as given above. From this it is evident that Kallon held the city Mannugir-Rammān by "royal grant," subject to military service. All royal "grants" were, therefore, fiefs.

4 uddima = relative after $shā$, 1. 18.
is destroyed by inundations: rains out of the heavens

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

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

Kalbu, "the dust and loving servant," reports here to his Lord, who is gracious and pardoning, that a great misfortune had overcome the city with which he had been endowed by royal grant: a tremendous flood has destroyed it. As a result of this the writer is in danger of losing his own life, crying, therefore, out in despair: "Where can I possibly go to save myself?" The change of tenses in l. 18 (ru-in ya-li) 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-Rammán 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-LI) 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 La-me-e is apparently used here in the same sense as edelu, 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, סֵפֶר הַנָּס (Genesis 7:11,12) and פֶּתֶר הָקָנַת (1 Kings 18:46).

3 To id-di-ru, which refers back to id-di-ru, l. 19, hence = id-di-ru, cf. besides l. 37, i-di-nu-an-ni; also 83:29, la ta-di-ru, 57:17, šub ta-di-ma and 57:18, kimu ( = KU) ma-ud-gur (cf. B. E., XIV, 106c:2; XV, 181:4; Delitzsch, H. W. B., p. 436a) šub ta-di-du (root 7877?); Delitzsch, H. W. B., p. 360c, Jensen, K. B., VP, p. 412. Notice that lalu, pl. la-ta-ta is a syn. of mar-ga = GIG.BA, which latter we find again in KU.GIG.BA = kibitu (Jensen, K. B., VP, p. 485), hence la-ta-ta, a kind of coarse, dirty flour) a-na PAD E=4X il-di-ru. A possible derivation from diva or even domi in is out of place here.

4 This older form of šub 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 ma-di.
Kalbu, who was looking out for the interests of his "Lord" continually and in all directions (ittu), 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 I. 23), but the King had not advised him what to do, hence his renewed complaint here.

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

2 Mar-nU-su-ub-Shi-pak i-di uth lu-utu TUR.TUR[mesh]  
3 sadda na-sha-nu li-il-la-a'a-la um-na-a i-na a-[ma-as-su-nu]  

Már-Usab-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[mesh], to be read according to I. 5, i.e., bi-bru, is here "youngsters," "young slaves." Cf., however, H., 111, 289, a-nu LUGAL a-an amelu m.Health[um][amal-im]-a-an amelu.AB.BA[mesh] u TUR[mesh](!) ard[mesh]-i (see also H., 111, 296, 297, V, 518) with H., 111, 295, a-nu LUGAL a-an amelu m.Health[um][amal-Ra-sha]-a-an amelu.AB.BA[mesh] u šiḫ (= NE)-ru-day.  
4 Perm. P, first pers. plur. for mashā-ni of SÉ 2; here with the same meaning as, e.g., Letters of Hammurabi, No. 1 : 23, ba-an-ki-im ša Ib-i₅₃₉₅ MARDU mashu-ni, "the contract which Ibu-Martu holds," i.e., "which he has in his possession, which he keeps"; it being above in opposition to mushkara, "dismiss," II. 12, 13, requires here some such signification as "to hold as prisoner."
4 ma-ti ša-a'-(ma-tu-ma) i Tür.
Tür

5 Màr-m. Ish(-)?-pi-la-an-du št-ih-hi-rut-ti ki i-ki-ba-na-shi

6 ki-i ni-il-li-ku-an mEn-lil-ki-diin-ni

7 ni-šu-ta-bi mEn-lil-ki-diin-ni an-ma Lugal.

8 ki-i šu-ta-bi Lugal Màr-m Šù-da-shà-šish

9 di-ma il-ta-ka-an um-ma-a šú-pa

10 anebi DAM.qar

‘When are ye finally going to decide their affairs, seeing that we are holding the young ones as prisoners?’

After Màr-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 Màr-Udashash as follows: ‘Send the agents and the young slaves

1 Shimu. c. im, ‘to decide,’ ‘to 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.

The reading of this name is not certain. If the Šsh which is written here strangely at the lower end of DISH does not belong to the name we might read Màr-m.Pi-la-an-du. Also some such readings as Màr-m.Šsh-pi-la-an-du or Màr-m.Pi-la.an-du might be possible. A reading Màr-m.Nu-šul-la-an-du (resp. 14DU) is, however, less probable.

3 For ḟīna (here c. double acc.), ‘to entrust something to somebody,’ see p. 47, note 1.

4 Jensen, K. B., VI, p. 412, doubts whether šakina may be construed with double accusative. Here and p. 125, n. 8, it is. Dimma (-šima) šakina c. acc., lit. ‘to make news to somebody,’ i.e., ‘to make them known to somebody,’ ‘to report,’ and as it is 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) lamūda, ‘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 E.[X] a-la-ma-at; 33; 28, te(?)-ši-im ma-ši a-lam-ma-ad; 33; 30, [te-či]-im a-a-na a-lam-ma-ad.

(b) nādānu, ‘to give news,’ ‘to inform.’ Cf. B. E., XIV, 114; 4, ša H.(= Ish) Lugal di-e-ma i-ši.[...]

(c) šuti-dāna, ‘to ask for news about something,’ ‘to inquire about something.’ Cf. 22; 8, di-im ma-r-pi-shi ki ish-a-ta-shi.

(d) šakina, ‘to give news,’ ‘to report,’ ‘to command,’ ‘to order.’ Cf. 39; 10, di-e-ma š̄-ša-ak-ka-nu; 67; 6, di-ma ša-a-ka-nu-ni; 80; 13, di-ma ša-a-ka-nu-ni; 92; 21, 31, te(?)-e-ši-aš-ka-nu; 9; 16, shakina (= G.A.) de (= NE)-mi (here not an ‘officer,’ but a permissive: ‘is reporting concerning (shi) Bit-Sin-intu).’ From this it will be evident that an anšušakin(-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-im [ta-ta-ka-nu]; 55; 23, [di-im su-šu-ka-nu]. In view of the latter phrases we cannot explain 34; 38, beši di-e-ma il-KU(-)na-an-ni as standing for beši šima il-qu(-)na-an-ni—which would be without any sense—but we must, seeing that the sign KU has also the value tak(g), postulate that value here and read il-tak(-)na-an-ni, or we must suppose that KU could be read (besides tak(g)) also tak(g); il-tak(-KU)-na-an-ni. In the latter ease we would have here a new value for KU, viz., tak(g).

(e) shaparā, ‘to send news.’ Cf. 53; 40, di-im ta-šu-pa-ra-an-na; 84; 11, di-im ta-ša-pa-ra-nu; 57; 17, di-e-ma ši-šu-pa-ra-an-na; 76; 5, di-e-ma ši-šu-pa-ra-an-na; 91; 8, te(?)-ma ši-šu-pa-ra-nu; 80; 29, de (= NE)-im-ka u ša-la-im-ka ši-šu-pa-ra—the latter phrase being used for ‘a request of a letter in answer to a note sent.”

(f) barra, ‘to return news,’ ‘to advise,’ ‘Bericht erstatten.’ Cf. 76; 9, di-e-ma a-na be-er la-te-ir.
of Enlilkidinni—send, that they dismiss them (i.e., set them free)."

(Now) when the royal messenger had come for the purpose of dismissing us (i.e., of securing our release) (then) he, after he had seized us, brought us before the KING.

Whereupon the KING said to 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 Enlilkidinni?’"

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.’"
We need not, however, be satisfied merely with the result that the "Lord" is in each and every case the "King," but we can go a step farther and identify definitely the King of No. 55.

Enlilkidinni, who plays such an important rôle in this letter and who clearly must have been a person of influence and affluence, he being in possession of "young slaves and agents," and having access to the King (who listens to his entreaties and acts accordingly), appears also as the writer of the two letters, Nos. 78, 79, and is as such a contemporary of Usub-Shipak, of Már-Udashash, of Mushina (78 : 1). The last is mentioned as patesi in the 17th year of Kuri-Galzu (B. E., XIV, 25 : 12), receiving PAD L.U'.ARDU in the 26th (!) year (of Burna-Buriash, B. E., XIV, 167 : 12, cf. l. 11) and KU.QU.LR smarkabtu in the 3d 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. Imanī, l. 25), B. E., XV, 194 : 7, 8. This Murānu was a son of Meli-Shaḥ and a patesi, living during the 18th year of Kuri-Galzu, B. E., XIV, 28 : 5. A "son of Murānu," Mār-"Mū-ra-ni, who likewise is a patesi, is mentioned not only during the 13th year of Ku[ri-Galzu, sic! against Clay], B. E., XIV, 125 : 6, 8, 13, but he appears also in the letter No. 78 : 4 as a contemporary and ilū(!) of Enlilkidinni. From No. 79 : 1 we learn that Enlilkidinni was a contemporary of Ingūri, 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 Enlikidinni 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 Enlikidinni, was none other but King Burna-Buriash.

Having established the identity of the King, we can now more specifically determine the occupation of Enlikidinni. Above we saw that Enlikidinni was in

---

1 Written either m iš Enlik-i-di-ni, 55 : 6, 1, 19, or m iš Enlik-i-di-ni, 55 : 11, 21 : 78 : 3 | 79 : 3.
2 Identified with Usub-Shipak in schol. Töröken Élam. Sém. I, p. 93, l. 3 (a kudurru from the time of Kashtilasha).
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-Shuriaš (1st year) is another person.
5 Son of m iš Enlik-di-bīlu = EN-XY.LIMš'
6 The father of m To-ki-sham.
possession of agents (DAM.QAR), young slaves (TUR.TUR\textsuperscript{mesh} = \textit{gi}-\textit{ih}-\textit{ri}-\textit{ru}-\textit{ti}) and of an \textit{itū}, "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 \textit{m} \textit{i}\textit{n} \textit{NIN}, \textit{IB-na-din-SHESH\textsuperscript{mesh}} (l.c., 1 : 6 \mid 7 : 14, here: SE-SHESH.SHESH), living in Bit-\textit{m} \textit{i}\textit{n} \textit{En}-\textit{il}-\textit{ki}-\textit{di}-\textit{ni} (l.c., 2 : 8), where he kept slaves (N.A.M.GALU.LU 	extellipsis \textit{ka}-\textit{lu}-\textit{ū}, l.c., 2 : 6, 8), whom he bought from (KI \textellipsis \textit{IN.SHI.IN.SHAM}, l.c., 1 : 4, 8 \mid 7 : 12, 15) other slave-dealers (DAM.QAR, l.c., 1 : 4); he had even his own agents (No. 55 : 10, DAM.QAR\textsuperscript{mesh}) and representatives (\textit{itū}, Mār-Murānī 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 \textit{pa-č-si} and at the same time also an \textit{itū} for a dealer in slaves, as was the case with Mār-Murānī. 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 Rammān-sham-ūsār and Meli-Shipak.

The boundary stone, London, 103,\textsuperscript{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 \textit{GU.EV.NA} or "sheriff" of Nippur (I : 20, 48, III : 7) and the "\textit{piḥat} of Nippur" (III : 12)—which by themselves would show whence that stone came—but also such names as Bit-\textit{m} \textit{i}\textit{n} \textit{En}-\textit{il}-\textit{ki}-\textit{di}-\textit{ni} (IV : 29, 44; V : 31) and \textit{Abū-da-ru-ū}, the "son" (\textit{mār}, i.e., "descendant") of \textit{m} \textit{i}\textit{n} \textit{En}-\textit{il}-\textit{ki}-\textit{di}-\textit{ni} (IV : 13, 40; V : 1),\textsuperscript{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, \textit{Ur}-\textit{i}\textit{n} \textit{NIN.DIN.DUG.GA}, with the person bearing the same name in London, 103, I : 6; also the \textit{i}\textit{n} \textit{Parak-mār} (l. c., V, 15, with our No. 53 : 38) and the "canal of Dūr-\textit{ia} Enlīl," \textit{Nam-gar-Dūr-\textit{ia} Enlīl}, l. c., III, 23, with

\textsuperscript{1} Preserved in the British Museum, No. 103 of the Nimroud Central Salon, and published by Belser, B. A., II, p. 187f. A translation was given by F. E. Peiser in K. B., III, p. 151f.

\textsuperscript{2} For \textit{mār} = "descendant," see below, Chapter IV, pp. 64, 65.

\textsuperscript{3} The following members of the "House of Enlilkidinni" are known:

\textit{m} \textit{i}\textit{n} \textit{NIN IB-na-din-SHESH\textsuperscript{mesh}} (or SE-SHESH.SHESH),

\textit{m} \textit{i}\textit{n} \textit{En}-\textit{il}-\textit{ki}-\textit{di}-\textit{ni}, the founder of the house.

\textit{?} (\textit{mār} here "descendant.")

\textit{i}\textit{n} \textit{Abū-da-ru-ū} (see K. B., III, pp. 158, 190, IV : 12, 45).

\textit{m} \textit{i}\textit{n} \textit{En}-\textit{il}-\textit{sham}-\textit{iddina} (= \textit{MU.MU}).

\textit{Abū-da-ru-ū} lived during the time of Rammān-sham-ūsār and Melī-Shipak, and Enlīl-sham-\textit{iddina} during the latter's reign.
our Nos. 3: 33, 34, 38, 41; B. E., XIV, p. 58a; XV, p. 52a; N. 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 one1 of them here. It is a
"royal summons" sent by King Burna-Buriash to his sheriff (GÜ. E. N. A),
"Amel-â-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-ê. 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 letter2 (Amarna, B. 188)
reads:

1 a-na "be-hi-ia
2 ki-bé-ma um-ma
3 TUR.SAL LUGAL-ma
4 a-na ka-slu (morkabati)[mek]-ka
5 [âlu-ba] ût biti-ka
6 lu-û shit-ul-mu
7 AXmek šû ="Bur-ra-Bur(!)-ia-âsh

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

1 Another royal letter is possibly that published under No. 93.
2 No. 75. For a translation see below, p. 135.

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-Amarnatexte, pp. 20f.), "Der erstere (i.e., No. 12 = B. 188) stammt nach seiner Schrift wohl am ehesten aus
Babylonien, wo auch nach dem Ton möglich und nach dem wahrscheinlichen Inhalt von Z. 7 das Nächerliegende ist. . . .
Wenn mit dem, was über die Herkunft dieses Briefes gesagt ist, ungefähr das Richtige 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: 1. [i]-m[...]-a-[u-a] for ålu-ba] (but cf. Rev. 1. 5); 1. 11, 'i(-)ir-ma,
wandele; Rev. 1. 3, si-ir-pa he translates by "geführten Stoff," but then Rev. 11. 11, is left in the air. Rev. II. 7f., it-î(-)
lî(-)-hi-ku, s [a] or-[fb][fb]-[w]-8 û ia-a-ši it-ku [u] te-te-e-še-ni which is rendered by "Mit deinem Herzen wirst
(or sollst) de [i-ê] û [e]ê[ê]n . . . . , und mir wirst (od. sollst) de . . . ."
may go with thee!
Walk in and out in peace!
Thy house, I behold, in former times [ . . . ]

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 bel-ia lūlik) so far met with in no other Amarna Letter—a "greeting" and "phrase" paralleled only by our letters here published—shows that she was of Babylonian origin, i.e., she was a Babylonian princess, having been given in marriage to the king of Egypt. We have to see, then, in this letter a "copy" of an original sent to her father, the

1 From Amarna, London, 1, e.g., we know that a sister of Kadašman-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 Kadašman-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-li-na-a-ti-a, the king of Egypt, to Kadašman-Enlil (Amarna, 1, 1). For its being a "copy" speaks also the hastiness and carelessness in which it has been written, cf. e.g., al-na for shu-al-na (R. 6), be-li-ia for be-li-ia (R. 14), id for ili (R. 9), it-li for it-li-na (Rev. 7). For several other Egyptian copies among the Amarna letters see also Knudtzon, 1, e.g., 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-Rammân, 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 Xile, 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-anā be-li-ia lu-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 idlu-ba3i li bitim-tim-ka lu-ia shâ-ul ma, Rev. 5:1), 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-li.

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 sha-rî (= LU.GAL) mulâ Kiri-er-er=Du-ni-ia-ash, Anarna L., 1, et passim. For 1Du-ni-ia-ash see Hüsing, O. L. Z., December, 1906, p. 661, on the one, and M. Streck, Z. A., January, 1908, p. 255f., on the other hand.

2 For dinâni cf. also 21:33, as-sâh di-um[ni]-ia, ‘on my account’ = ash-shamâ-ia. 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. 1Pa-HE.GAL-in-ma 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 dinâni 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-li-ia-ma). The writer thus pleads that his letter may not be prevented by the ‘red tape’ surrounding the person of the King from reaching his ‘Lord’ and master. He wants a personal interview, he desires that the King himself shall see the letter, and if the writer’s wish be granted he, ipso facto, is admitted through his epistle to the presence of the King, to the King himself. Nor are the words mûr shi-pi-[ia ana shalâ-ni sharâ sel‘ u gabâ al-lâma, occurring in H., VII, 7:15 (writer 1Marduk-MU-NAB-EN) and H., VIII, 3:5; 5:53; 5:5; 5:53; 5:57:5 (all written by 1Marduk-MU-NAB-EN), to be translated with Behrens, i.e., by ‘meinen Boten habe ich mit Gefolge (Pferde u. Krieger, d. i. berittenen Krieger) zur Begrüßung des Königs geschickt.’ The sel‘ u gabâ belong, on account of their position, to the king, thus making him a king of ‘horses’ = cavalry (cf. the ‘horses’ = cavalry of the Old Testament, as, e.g., in Deut. 11:4: the army of Egypt—their ‘horses’ = cavalry) and their chariots and of ‘men’ = infantry—a veritable ‘war-lord.’
IV.

RESULTS.

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

(a) The various investigations conducted by scholars with regard to the genealogy of the kings of this period has, as was to be expected, led to widely divergent results. Without going into any of this 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. II.* we learn that at the time of Ashshur-aballit, king of Assyria, the Cassites (SABmesh Kash-shi-e) had revolted against *Ka-ra-Har-da-ash*, the king of Babylonia, the son (TUR) of Ma-bal-li-ta-at-She-ra-ù-a, a daughter of Ashshur-aballit, raising a certain Na-zi-Bu-ga-ash to the kingship over them. Whereupon Ashshur-aballit, to
avenge ["Ka-r]-a-In(!)-da-ash (notice this name), went to Babylonia, killed ["Na]-zi-Bu-qa-ash, made ["Ku-ri]-Gal-zi-ri-a-shi-ru, the son (TUR) of "Bur-na-Bur-ia-ash, to be king, and put him "upon the throne of his father" (iina śi?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-Indash." 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-Indash, on the other?

(2) What do the words "put him (i.e., Kuri-Galzu śihru) upon the throne of his father" mean? Does "father" refer here to Burna-Buriash or to Kara-Indash? If it refers to the former, then who was Burna-Buriash? In what relation did he stand to Kara-Indash or Kara-Indash 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-Indash not put upon the throne of Babylonia? But if the term "father" refers, as we would expect, to Kara-Indash, thus making Kuri-Galzu śihru the son and successor of his murdered father, then why should Kuri-Galzu be called here (and elsewhere) the "son (TUR) of Burna-Buriash"?

Some of these questions we can answer with the help of Chronicle P. (=Ch. P.), where we are told that a certain "Ka-dash-man-Har-be was the son (TUR) of "Kar-In"-da-ash and of (sic! cf., I.C., 1, 12) Muballitat-Sherua, the daughter of Ashshur-uballit, king of Assyria; hence Kara-Indash (S. H.) = Kar-Indash (Ch. P.) was the husband of Ashshur-uballit's daughter, Muballitat-Sherua, and the father of Kadashman-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-Indash." This would force us to the conclusion that the term "father" of the S. H. meant Kara-Indash and not Burna-

4 Written "AX.SILAR-DIN-it."
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. 1, 10f.) that the Cassites¹ revolted against and killed "Ka-dāsh-man-I-Var-be," and raised "to the kingship over them" a certain "Shū-zi-ga-ash, a Cassite, "the son of a nobody." Whereupon Ashshur-uballit, the king of Assyria, went to Babylonia¹ to avenge "Ka-dāsh-man-I-Var-be, "the son of his daughter," [killed] "Shu-zi-ya-ash and put ["Ku-ri-Gal-zu šihru, the son (sic!) of "Ka]-dāsh-man-I-Var-be, upon the throne [of his father]. ²

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>Mahalli-tat-Sherna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kara-Hardash</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nazi-Bugash</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuri-Galzu šihru</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Chronicle P.**

<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>Mahalli-tat-Sherna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kadashman-Ibarbe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shuzi-gash</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 Shuzi-gash⁷; we need, then, not lose any words about this point. But if we do admit their identity we cannot very well deny the other, viz., that Kara-Hardash and Kadashman-Harbe are likewise only two different writings of one and the same person. And here it is that I beg to differ from all the other scholars who either take Kara-Hardash to be a mistake for Kara-Indash (so Winckler), or who remove him altogether from the list of kings (so Weissbach). What might possibly

---

¹ Here nīshī (UN)mesh Kassši.
² Notice that the šu in l. 10 refers back to l. 5.
³ A-ia LUGAL-ūtu u-na muḫ-su-šu-šu.
⁴ mina Kar, ita Dan-iš-šu.
⁵ TUR TUR.SAM-šu = Mahalli-tat-Sherna.
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, Alterorientaliche Forschungen, l.c.
⁷ Denied now, as I see, among others, also by Knudtzon, Die El-Amarna-Tafeln, p. 38. The reasons—if they may be called so—adduced by Knudtzon against the identity of these two persons are not at all convincing, in fact, they are against both the S. H. and the Ch. P.
have been the reason of these two seemingly widely divergent readings, Kadashman-Harbe (Ch. P.) and Kara-Hardash (S. H.)?

If I were to put before the various scholars in the realm of Assyriology a combination of signs, such as śušKU āšL, asking them to transcribe, read, and translate it, what would be the result? One would read it kakku āšNIN.IB, the other kakku āšEnlil, the third kakku āšNin-Girsu, and translate it "the (a) weapon is (of) NIN.IB, or Enlil, or Nin-Girsu." A fourth, if he suspected a nomen proprium in that combination and knew that it was taken from a tablet belonging to the Cassite period and was aware that, at the Cassite period, the names of "cities called after a person" may be written without the determinative DISH (cf. ʾāšGir-ra-ga-nil, ʾāšUD-ta-kul-ti, etc., in "List of Cities"), might read that very same combination Takultī- āšEnlil (NIN.IB, Nin-Girsu) and think it represents a "city." A fifth, again, would object seriously, pointing out that the "names of the Cassite kings" are likewise very often written without the DISH (cf. e.g., Burna-Buriash in B. E., XIV, 1:30 | 2:29 | 4:18, etc., etc.), and read accordingly (translating it back into Cassite) Kadashman- āšHarbe (or Enlil, or Nin.IB, or Nin-Girsu). A sixth, lastly, would maintain that Cassite kings were gods or were identified with gods, hence a name śušKU āšL 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—be they those of persons or of gods—according to his own notions; thus one may see in the name śušSUGH a male, the other takes it to be a female, and the third declares both are wrong: śušSUGH 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 āšEnlil. Kadashman-Harbe, when written ideographically, may be śušKU- śušEN.L (šušE.KUR, šušL, etc.), but this might, per se, be translated also by "the (my, a) weapon is (of) Enlil (E.KUR, L, etc.)." Should the writer of the S. H. have mistaken the śušKU = takultī, "support," for śušKU = kakku, "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 śušKU =
tukultu = Kadashman, "support," thinking it was the same as axk KU = kalku = kur(a), "weapon". And if axk KU could have been mistaken for kur(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 = ÍšaL, and Bug + ash = 6 (×) 10 = 60 = AN or ilu (see p. 7, note 2, under Guzar-AN)? If this could be proved then the original ideographic writing of this name might have been axk KU:ÍšaL ; S.H. translating it by Kar(a)-Hard + ash = a weapon of (is) ÍšaL and Ch. P. by Kadashman-Harbe = my support is Enlil. For ÍšaL = ašEnlil, 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 Ê.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 ÍšAB (= Enlil, V R. 44, 46c), ÍšAB (= Enlil, III R. 67, No. 1, Obv. 11a, b; cf. l. 20, ÍšNIN.LIL. dam-bi-sal, i.e., of ÍšAB = ašEnlil; in Weissbach, Baby. Miscellen, p. 7 (B. E., 6,405), l. 8, ÍšAB is = Anu (AN): ÍšAB (= AN) ÍšAB.SAR.SAR (= Enlil) ÍšSUR.UD (= E.A.) ÌšNIN.MAGH = fem. principle of the world, cf. No. 24 : 6 (p. 47, n. 5), Anu, Enlil, E.A, Bēlīt-ilī), or ÍšIB (= 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 axk 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; 3 "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-Hardash"; 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 Kadashtman-Harbe, Kuri-Galzu, who naturally must have been still a “little child,” a šihru,1 seeing that his great-grandfather, the Assyrian king Ashshur-uballit, was still living. But if Kuri-Galzu was according to Ch. P. the son and rightful heir to the throne, it follows that the words of S. H., “put him upon the throne of his father,” can mean only that Ashshur-uballit put Kuri-Galzu šihru upon the throne of his murdered father, Kara-Hardash = Kadashtman-Harbe; hence the word “father” in S. H. does not refer to Burna-Buriash, as the interpreters want it, but must refer to Kara-Hardash. Thus, even according to S. H., Kuri-Galzu šihru may very well, yes, must have been the son of Kara-Hardash = Kadashtman-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 son2 of Burna-Buriash, Kar(a)-Indash, was his (Kuri-Galzu’s) grandfather.

But if Kuri-Galzu was the “son of Kara-Hardash = Kadashtman-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, II. 25, 26), we are told that Jehu (*Ia-ū-a) was the “son” (TUR) of Omri (*Hu-un-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 = már, “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 Hilprecht3 we know that Nazi-Maruttash was the

1 For šihru in this sense cf. also H., III, 209:2; 296:2; 297:3; H., V 518:3, 𒉩𒀀𒉩𒈗𒍊𒍊 = TURmēš, which changes in H., III, 206:2, with 𒉩𒀀𒉩ᨕ𒍊𒍊 u ših(=NE)-ru-ū-ḫi, thus showing that šihru “young” is in opposition to AB.BA = šihru, “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. 60ff.

son of Kuri-Galzu, and from a boundary stone of Nazi-Maruttash 1 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 már (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 már (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-Hardash, and this he was and is not only according to B. E., XIV, 39: Sf. (ish-tu Ku-ri-Gal-zu TUR ka-da-âsh-man-î Har-be a-li

1 Schulz, Textes Élam., Sém., 1, p. 86 (cf. plate 16), col. 1, ll. 1-5.

2 Weissbach, Babylon. Miscellen, pp. 2f., by first trying to establish for SHAG.BAL.BAL an impossible meaning, "Ebel," 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 "Uwekel," "fierer Nachkommen," or "einen um Jahrhunderte späteren Nachkommen." This alone ought to have been sufficient to convince Weissbach that SHAG.BAL.BAL in IV R?, 38, 1, 20-26, could likewise not have the signification "Ebel." Not heeding this warning, Weissbach arrived at results which were both impossible and disastrous: he had to maintain three Marduk-aplu-idilina, three Kadashman-Harbes, three Kuri-Galzas; he had to remove Kara-Hardash altogether from the list of kings and make Kuri-Galzu šēhrā, "the son" of Burna-Buriash, the aḫn abi, the "brother of the father" of Kadashman-Harbe, i.e., had to make him a brother of Kara-Hardash. 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. mar Y., mar Z." means at this time "X., the son of Y., belonging to (the house of) Z."(1) and stamps such a person as being of high, special, influential, or distinguished rank. Hinke's (B. E., Series D., IV, pp. 153, 174) Nebā-zēr-ilīšū mar Itti-Marduk-balatū mar Ardi-ēa, because parallel to Skāğıku mar Bit-Marduk-balatū SHAG.BAL.BAL Ardi-ēa, makes Ardi-ēa the founder of the distinguished and celebrated surveyor family of which the two brothers, Nebā-zēr-ilīšū and Skāğıku, were later members (not necessarily grandchildren). Again, if már = SHAG.BAL.BAL = "belonging to the reigning house of," then it is, of course, quite natural that Meli-Shipok should call himself (B. E., 6378 = Weissbach, i.e., p. 2) már Kuri-Galzu. Why? Because Meli-Shipok was an usurper. But someone might object that in Loubon, 103 (Becker, B. A., II, p. 157f. = Peiser, K. B., I1, p. 160), IV, 31, the immediate predecessor of Meli-Shipok, Rammān-shum-ur, is referred to as "thy (i.e., Meli-Shipok's; cf. i.e., 1, 17) father (a-ba-la)." How can he be a usurper if his father occupied the throne before him? Apart from the list of kings, where Melī-Shī-pēk is not designated by TUR-shu (i.e., the son of Rammān-shum-ur), the fact that a father, bearing a Babylonian name (as Rammān-shum-ur undoubtedly does), would call his son (Meli-Shipok) 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. Melī-Shī-pēk, then, by calling himself már Kuri-Galzu, lays "rightful" claim to the inheritance of the throne of Babylonia, which he would have as "one belonging to the house" (már) of Kuri-Galzu. The same desire is evidenced by Meli-Shipok's son, Marduk-aplu-idilina (notice the Cassite father and the Babylonianized son), who does not call himself (IV R?, 38, 1, 20-26 = K. B., I1, p. 162) grandson of Rammān-shum-ur, but "the son (TUR) of Meli-Shī-pē-ak (cf. also List of Kings: māsinSHUT-A-MU TUR-shu, i.e., son of Meli-Shipok), the SHAG.BAL.BAL of Kuri-Galzu LUGAL-lu šama-an-nu." For a later example of már (resp. apla) = "of the," or "belonging to the house of," cf. Kimât(māsinMASH) apla šuna Marišku, and see Hilprecht, B. E., IX, p. 15.
LETTERS TO CASSITE KINGS

Na-zi-Ma-ru-ul-ta-ush TUR ẞu-Ku-ri-Gal-zu), but also according to Br. Mus., S3-1-18, where he (written here ẞu-Ku-ri-Gal-zu) calls himself “the mighty king, the king of Babylon, the son (TUR) of ẞu-Ka-dáš-man-Ḫar-be, the king without equal (LUGAL la šá-nu-an).”

But though it be admitted, as it must, that Kuri-Galzu, “the son” of Burna-Buriash of S. H., was de jure the “son of Kadashman-Harbe (Ch. P.) = Kara-Hardash”, as such belonging to the reigning house of Burna-Buriash (TUR = SIA mô.BAL.BAL = šibbi palê), we still owe an explanation of the fact that there are other tablets in existence in which this self-same Kuri-Galzu is not only called, but even calls himself “son (TUR) of Burna-Buriash.” The question is this: Why should this self-same Kuri-Galzu (šihru) 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 (šihru) upon the dissatisfied Cassites. Is it not more than natural to suppose that the Cassites would feel rather inimical towards their new king, who was in their eyes nothing but an usurper, occupying the throne of Babylon and swaying the royal scepter over them by the intervention and brutal force of a foreign king so inimical to their own interests? And was it not a wise and diplomatic stroke of

---

1 See Winckler, Z. A., II, p. 397.
2 This very same attribute is ascribed to Kuri-Galzu also in a boundary stone (IV R, 38, I, 20-26 = K. B., III, p. 162) quoted p. 65, n. 2. Kuri-Galzu, “the son of Kadashman-Harbe,” is identical with Kuri-Galzu, the predecessor of Meli-Shipak and Marduk-apla-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, such a ruler is invariably an usurper. The truth of this maxim is clearly established also in Kuri-Galzu’s case. One of his favorite titles is ri-pumu kingum, “the legitimate shepherd,” see Hilprecht, B. E., F, Nos. 41 + 46: 3 (cf. Hilprecht, I.e., p. 32, and Zimmern, Z. A., XIII, p. 301); I.e., F, 133 : 5, 6 (Zimmern, I.e.). Also Kuri-Galzu’s son, Nazi-Maruttash, claims this very same title, Hilprecht, B. E., F, Nos. 75 + 136 + 137 (Zimmern, I.e., p. 392): 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-shernu, 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-hu-ur-ri-ri-ia (= Amen-hotep IV; Amarna, London, No. 2; 31f.), not to listen to the machinations of the Assyrians, “my subjects” (da-qr-il pa-ru-ia). Kuri-Galzu, knowing this and eager and willing to appease his dissatisfied Cassites, did not—great diplomat and “king without equal” who he was—call himself “son of Kadashman-Harbe,” but “descendant (mār) of Burna-Buriash”; thus he maintained on the one hand his “rightful,” “legitimate” (kīnum) succession to the throne, and on the other he avoided to remind the enraged Cassites of their revolt and murder.

From all this it would follow that Kuri-Galzu šīyru 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 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 (īlū) and administration of the city Mannu-gir-Rammān.

¹ I.e., at least “not generally.”
² Hilprecht’s statement, B. E., XXI, p. 52, note 1, “Kuri-Galzu, his (i.e., Burna-Buriash’s) son, but possibly not his immediate successor,” I would like to modify by substituting, “Kuri-Galzu, the son of Kadashman-Harbe, the descendant of Burna-Buriash, the successor of his murdered father.” Clay’s view (B. E., XIV, p. 9), “there is no gap in that part of the list of kings which these archives represent,” differs from what I have above stated, p. 10, n. 3.
Now it happens that the writer of No. 24, Kalbon by name, mentions in the course of his communication, addressed to his Lord and king, the latter’s father, "Na-zi-li\textsuperscript{su}En-lil. A priori we are justified in assuming that if the "Lord" to whom Kalbon 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-li\textsuperscript{su}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-li\textsuperscript{su}En-lil, together with his son, the be-\textit{fi} 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 Kalbon, after having communicated to his "Lord" the news about the dreadful flood which had overtaken the city Mammu-gir-Rammun 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-li\textsuperscript{su}En-lil, may be transcribed and translated as follows (24 : 24f.):

\begin{quote}
24 i\textit{u} abull\textit{u} ( = K.A.GAL) cr\textit{u} (URU-DU)\textsuperscript{merk} i\textit{u} takh\textit{u} ( = GA-N.A.M)\textsuperscript{a} shattuHI sh\textit{a} i\textit{s}h-\textit{tu} b\textit{[c]}-na-li\textit{i}
25 sh\textit{a} "NA-zi-li\textsuperscript{su}En-lil a-bi-ka i\textit{u} adi ( = EN) \textit{ämîm}\textsuperscript{a}
\end{quote}

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,

\begin{enumerate}
\item \textit{Abulu} cr\textit{u}\textsuperscript{merk} is a composite noun in the plural, for the formation of which see Delitzsch, Gram., p. 143, § 73.
\item D1 here to be taken probably in the sense of \textit{tê'ê}, Abel-Winckler, \textit{Keltischen Texte}, Sign List, No. 221; Meissner, \textit{HebrewGramm}, No. 4762.
\item For GA-N.A.M = \textit{hala}:, "ewe," see E. B. II., p. 343, and for MU-\textit{HI}, \textit{ibidem}, pp. 369ff.
\item \textit{Ish-tu} b\textit{[c]}-na-li\textit{i} . . . i\textit{u} adi ( = EN) \textit{ämîm}\textsuperscript{a}. The \textit{ishhu} bi-na-li, standing here in opposition to \textit{adi} \textit{ämî}, must signify in this connection some kind of a terminus a quo. \textit{Binnīti} is, no doubt, related to \textit{bennu}, which Delitzsch H. W. B., p. 1906, translates by "father"; cf. also Zimmern, \textit{Sharpu}, p. 54, 35, who renders it by "\textit{binnim}". If this be true, I would like to see in \textit{binnīti} either a plural of \textit{binnītu} = (\textit{binnītu} = \textit{binnītu} =) \textit{binnatta}, which latter word occurs also in \textit{Amarna}, B, 24:22, mi\textit{r} shipri-ka i-na bi-na-at-si [kiri]\textit{[i]}-li-ku, i.e., "when thy messenger came formerly," or a formation like s\textit{itu}, a\textit{gri}, s\textit{irīti}, r\textit{ipitu}, for which see Delitzsch, Gram., p. 180, and i.e., § 65, No. 37, on p. 177, above. \textit{Binnīti} in our passage refers undoubtedly to the "time 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 \textit{binnu}, from which we have \textit{bin\textsuperscript{u}}, "father, begetter." Adi \textit{ämîm}\textsuperscript{a} stands here for \textit{adi} \textit{ämî} an-ni-\textit{i}.
\end{enumerate}
(E-k-ballu. One might expect e-ballu, but against this is to be said: (1) the ballu, 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 akuka, one would look for i-ballu. A present tense, e-ballu = ik-e-ballu, is needless here. In view of these difficulties I am inclined to connect this form with akakku(?), H. W. B., p. 53a, which Deitsch, however, leaves untranslated. Seeing that akakku is a syn. of a-bum-da-tum and this = IM.GHUL.LA resp. IM.RI.GHA.MUN (Del., i.e., p. 106a, Orkan) I propose to translate akakku by storm-flood (cf. also RIGHA.MUN, an attribute of Ramman, the bel ababa), used either literally or figuratively. In the latter sense it is used also of "spear," 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 Sury. Ann. 161, ana pahar abumshuna u-kaqku(?)-kva-ti abal-a-ma, "into all their cities I threw a veritable flood (of spears)." The root of e-ballu would be ## or #, it standing for i-ballu = akakku, with a in the Preterit. The subject of akakku is the zuzu u-ni in ll. 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 abulu e. acc., "to go, come to," see besides Deitsch, H. W. B., p. 66a, also Jensen, K. B., VI, pp. 464, 475. If the emendations be correct, these forms would stand for i-balu resp. i-balu-ka-in-ii.

3 The traces of these signs cannot possibly be amended to KAGAL or mesh D'mesh, I. 21. For LU = UD = #, see E. B. II., pp. 343f.

4 Esuna, "to encircle," is here parallel to kunn, used of "floods"; see above, I. 20, i-sa-ka-me-e-mali.

5 Hardly anything missing after mi-ka-an.

6 For the force of this # de do e. e. g., B. E., XIV, 38 : 9, 10, "that and that." "X. i-ig-nu-am-ag-an-an "Y. i-nam-din, " X. shall take and give to Y.," i.e., "X. shall pay back to Y.," and i.e., 111 : 10, 11, "the grain . . . at harvest time," i-si-ru-am-na i-nam-din-na, "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. El vox populi est vox dei: he was a divinely appointed ruler, a ruler "whom Anu, Enlil, É.A. and Bēl-ili themselves had presented with a kingship excelling in grace and righteousness." I see then in the be-li of No. 24 a counter-king of Kuri-Galzu during at least the first years of the latter's reign. But if the be-li 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 ÊEnil may also be written ÊÉ.KUR, which latter is according to H R. 54. No. 3, 10, identified with Anum,1 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-ÊÉ.KUR in the original from which S. H. compiled his story. This Na-zi-ÊÉ.KUR S. H. read Nazi-Bugash,2 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-li had brothers. It happens that there is mentioned in B. E., XIV, 10 : 56, a certain "E-mid-a-na-ÊMarduk, who is termed TUR LUGAL, "son of the king," and who lived, according to that tablet, in the first year of Kuri-Galzu (l. 1). This Emid-ana-Marduk cannot have been the son

1 See also my Bel, the Christ, pp. 17, 16.
2 Thus identifying ÊÉ.KUR according to H R. 54, No. 3, 10 with AN (=Bugash), instead of ÊÉ.EX.LIL. For AN as a name of ÊÉ.Énili see p. 50.
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 šihru, "a child," would not receive "salary," nor can he have been an Assyrian prince—his name speaks against such a supposition; hence the only conclusion at present possible to reach is that Emid-ana-Marduk was a son of Nazi-Bugash = Nazi-Enlil and a brother of the be-li of No. 24.\(^1\)

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>Askshur-uballiš</td>
<td>Kuri-Galzu I; daughter</td>
<td>Nazimria ((=) Amen-hotep III)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muballitš-Sherua</td>
<td>Burna-Buriash II, &quot;ancestor of Kuri-Galzu II&quot; (son ?)</td>
<td>daughter; Naphuria ((=) Amen-hotep IV)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>मुबलियत-शराक</td>
<td>कार(उ)-इन्दूश II; (=) उ-बु-रियाउ-अश्म,(^2) king of (=) आ.आ.ब.आ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kadashman-Harbe = Kara-Hardash</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nazi-Bugash = Shuzigash</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kuri-Galzu II, šihru,(^1) &quot;of the house of Burna-Buriash&quot;</td>
<td>(=) (=) Nazi-Marrattash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nazi-Marattash</td>
<td>be-li (No. 24); Emid-ana-Marduk</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., 6105 (Weissbach, Babylonische Miscellen, p. 7), where he is called the "son (TUR) of Burna-Buria (TUR) ki-ur-ur-ur-ur." Cf. now also Thureau-Dangin, O. L. Z., January, 1908, Sp. 31f., 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 the several papers, treating of the same period discussed above, which have appeared since the MS. had been approved and sent to the press. These papers are (a) F. E. Peters, Chronik P und synchron Geschichte, O. L. Z., January, 1908, Sp. 71f., and again, i.e., Sp. 140f.; (b) A. Ungnad, Zur Chronologie der Kassitensagen, i.e., Sp. 111f., and ibidem, Sp. 136f.; (c) J. A. Knudtzon, Die El-Amarna-Tafeln, pp. 31ff., especially p. 38 (reached me March, 1908); (d) Thureau-Dangin, Z. A., XXI (1907-8), pp. 170ff. (see also above, p. 59, note 1); O. L. Z., January, 1908, Sp. 31f.; Journal Asiatic, Janv.-Fév., 1908, pp. 117f. (received July 1, 1908), and the corrections to the last-named paper, O. L. Z., June, 1908, Sp. 275f. (was not accessible to me till July 14, 1908).

Peiper'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# (why?) and Kuralindsh II. About the latter he remarks, i.e., Sp. 131: "Ein anderer Kuralindsh war wohl der Gemahl der Muballit-Serka, ist aber selbst kein König gewesen." It is hardly to be expected that the Assyrian king Ashur-Abi'll with his pronounced intentions towards the Babylonian throne would give in marriage his daughter Muballit-Serka to a Babylonian prince who was not, at some time or another, destined to be the king of Babylon, nor would he have been so anxious to avoide his "son-in-law" if it had not been for the fact that he wanted to preserve the throne of Babylon for "his own family," i.e., for the descendant of his own daughter. Ungnad's (and Knudtzon's) reading Kadashman-Harbe (instead of Kadasman-Enlil) is quite arbitrary. Though the Cassite Harbe was identified with Enlil, from this it does not yet follow that Enlil in Cassite names has always to be read Harbe. We know that Enlil = Enlil = An, but it would be preposterous to read An = Enlil = An (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 idha ... adi of B. E., XIV, 30:8, to show that Kuri-Galzu, the son of Kadashman-Harbe, was the same as our Kuri-Galzu I, the son of Kadashman-Enlil I, contemporaries of Amen-hotep III, are contradicted by No. 21: 24, idha bē-nu a-bi abi a-ku-dal miti ahi amu, for which see above, p. 68, note 1. Ungnad's statement, i.e., Sp. 12, note 1 that obhu (with double b) has to be always a plural is simply an assertion without any argument. Abhu, like ahhu, is very 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 Nāzi-Maratta), to whom he assigns the 224 place among the Cassite kings, in the following fashion: (16) Kuralindsh I; (17) Kadashman-Harbe I, his son; (18) Kuri-Galzu I, his son (contemporary of Amen-hotep III); (19) Kadashman-Enlil I, his son; (20) Burna-Buria#2, his son (contemporary of Amen-hotep IV); (21) Kuralindsh II, "petit-fils(?) de Burna-buria#2." (Nāzi-Bapah, "nephew(?);" (22) Kuri-Galzu II, "second(?) fils de Burna-buria#2") and father of Nāzi-Maratta. A comparison of this arrangement with the one postulated above will show the following differences: (a) Kadashman-Harbe = Kuralindsh is left out. The reason for this omission is given by Thureau-Dangin, J. A., 1908, p. 127, in the following words: "Kuralindsh et Kuri-Galzu mentionnés par l'histoire synchrone représentent le même personnage (but why). On a supposé que Kuralindsh pourrait être le père de Kuri-Galzu. Mais le rédacteur n'a pu cependant dire qu'Auru-buria# était venu pour venger le père du roi assassiné." But this is exactly what he did want to say, see above p. 68. (b) With regard to Kadashman-Harbe 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 explication dans le fait que le rédacteur de la Chronique I avait confondu Kuri-galzu le Jeune, fils de Burna-buria, avec Kuri-galzu I, fils de Kadashman-Harbe. Il faut sans doute restituer à
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Prof. Winckler, when discussing the Elamite invasion under Kitin-lutrutash at the time of *EN.III.MU.MU* (i.e., Enlil-nadin-shumu, generally read Bel-nadin-shum), who is mentioned in the "List of Kings" immediately after Kashtiliashu II, says (Das alte Wesenien, p. 20): "Unter dem neun 1½ Jahre regierenden Bel-nadin-shum I, fällt Kitin-lutrutash, König von Elam, in Babylonien ein, verwüstet Dur-ili . . . 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 Bel, never been proved.

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

Histoire de Kadashman-herbe, père de Kuri-galzu II, le récit de la guerre contre les Suteens."

He accordingly assigns to this Kadashman-herbe, the son of Kura-ladas (Ch. P., 1, 5 f.), place No. 17, and identifies him with Kadashman-herbe, the father of Kuri-Galzu I (B. E., XIV, 39 f.; Winckler, Z. J., H., p. 300). Though the latter identification is undoubtedly correct (see above, p. 61), yet the Kuri-Galzu, the son of Kadashman-herbe, is not Kuri-Galzu I, but Kuri-Galzu II, sihru (see above, p. 61). 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-herbe, but, on the contrary, knew that both Kuri-Galzu were one and the same person. For the reason why Kuri-Galzu sihru should have called himself both "son of Burna-Buriash" and "son of Kadashman-herbe" 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-Enil I is the son of Kuri-Galzu II?" (d) Burna-Buriash, whom he mentions under No. 20, Thureau-Dangin identifies on the one hand with [. . . ]-ri-in-ash, the son of Kadashman-Enil (Hilprecht, O. B. L., I, No. 68), and on the other with the Burna-Buriash known from Kunzton, i.e., 9, 19 (cf. No. 11, Rev. 19), where this ruler calls Kuri-Galzu "my father," a-biia, maintaining at the same time that the expression "father" has to be taken in the sense of "ancêtre" (O. L. Z., 1908, Sp. 275). Though it is true that allu may, and very often does, mean "ancestor" (Tigl.-Pil. I, ed. V.H., 17; Knudtzon, i.e., 16: 19, compared with M. 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 allu of Knudtzon, i.e., 9, 19, has to or must be taken in the sense of ancestor. Again, the same [. . . ]-ri-in-ash of O. B. L., I, No. 68, may be read with Hilprecht, B. E., XXY, p. 52, note 1, [Sha-gar-paša-Siš]-ri-in-ash (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 danna-sag of O. B. L., I, No. 68, means "principal descendant," thus making Sha-paša-Siš a "grandson" (instead of a "second son") of Kadashman-Enil. By the way, on what authority does Thureau-Dangin claim that Sha-paša-Siš was the son of Kudur-Enil? (e) Why does Thureau-Dangin (following Ungnad) omit Burna-Buriash? Does he identify him with Burna-Buriash, the son (resp. grandson) of Kuri-Galzu I and ancestor (resp. father) of Kuri-Galzu II, sihru? 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., ed. IV, 11 f.
2 Written "Go-ad-di-šash (= Ur).
3 Ali-in Ni-ep-pa (sic!), see Winckler, U. A. G., p. 156, No. 6, 1, 11.
kings. This follows (1) from the fact that these letters, having been addressed to the be-li, 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, ʾaš-shum SIG₂ i-na En-lil i-na be-li-a a-na be-li-a ʾa-l-tu-bi, i.e., "as regards the wool (I beg to say that) I have spoken about it to my "Lord" in Nippur." This shows that Kishahbut, although "out of town" when he wrote his letter, must have been at one time in Nippur, where he reported to his "Lord" about the disposition of the wool; but this he could not do except the king himself was residing in Nippur. Now, as Kishahbut was a contemporary of Kadashman-Turgu (see below, pp. 120ff.), it follows that this king lived in Nippur. (b) Pān-AX.GAL-lu-mur, a resident of Đūr-ilu, when explaining to NIN-ur-ur why he had not sent a messenger previously, says, 89 : 21f.: mār ship-rī-ia šā a-na ʾaš En-lil a-na maštu LUGAL ʾaš-pu-ru kī i-ma-rū-ka ma-la a-sap-ri-kā ʾa-la-la-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,3 but where he also (γ) gave orders for the disposal of certain goods, see 27 : 29f.: Hi bītu ša En-lil ʾaš be-li-aš-bi-bi-ru ʾa XX ma-na šā ardī-ru ʾa Erba-ša Marduk iš-di-na kī iš-za-i-ru XL ma-na SIG₃ iš-ša-lu-ni-in-ni; i.e., "(and with regard to) the two talents (of wool) of (= for) Nippur which my "Lord" has ordered to be brought and the 20 ma-na which thy servant Erba-Marduk has paid, (I beg to state that) after they had divided them, they left me (a rest of) only 40 ma-na." The "Lord" to whom Kudurāni 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 descended to hear the complaints and grievances of his subjects; of such an incident we read in 23 : 33f.: ʾaš-shum ʾa-baša USH.BAR ʾa-baša an-na-ti šā ʾa-ašu Pa-an-Ba-ti ʾa-l-tu-ru ʾa-ru Ē-pi-il i-na be-li-ia ʾa-l-tu-bi it šā-la-shi-shu a-na ma-ḫi be-li-ia al-ta-ni-bar be-li-išša-ur-ru ma-li-išša-ur-ru išša-ur-ru išša-ur-ru, i.e., "as regards these weavers who are being held in Pān-Bali, (I beg to state that) I have not only spoken about them to my "Lord" in 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)."

1 Cf. here also such passages as 27 : 20: i-na ilišri i-na ʾaššu be-li-ia a-na be-li-ia ʾa-l-tu-bi ma, 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 [Imgu]rum 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 Imgu[rum], 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 *mēta Tam-li[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-lū 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-lū 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, DINTERTIi a Bār-sapkī muḫ šēriḥ( = EDIN)-iša lu-ša-at-šur; 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. R., XIV, 4: 11 ff., 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 Kashtilimushu 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 sibru and his descendants. Prof. Hilprecht regards the largely unexplored lofty group of mounds forming the eastern corner (cf. the map in Series D, Vol. I, p. 305) of the temple complex as the probable site of the palace of the early patesis of Nippur and also of the Cassite rulers—a palace which, like the Sargon palace at Khorsabad, at the same time constituted the strongest bastion in the huge outer temple wall.

(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, 1, are enumerated among these exceptions. I therefore drew the natural inference from the above given enumeration that tablet No. 1 (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. Beb., p. 277, note 4. As a religious text of a similar type as those known from the library of Ashur-Adad-apal it is preferable to exclude this tablet No. 4 from our present discussion.
been published by him, are "records of the handling and the disposition of the taxes from outlying districts about Nippur after they had been collected!" Clay's reasons for calling these archives Temple Archives are the following (B. E., XIV, p. 6). The taxes are temple revenues because:

1. Payments are made out of the mashšartu šá ėkalli (written E.GAL), "temple stipend" (XV, 47); out of the GISH.BAR.GAL bitili, "full tax of the house of god" (XV, 37); to the ardu and amlu ėkalli (= E.GAL), "male and female temple servants" (XV, 152 : 15 and 200, III(!) : 9, 38).

2. "Priests" (ishshaku), "the temple gate man" (a-bil bābī bit-a-nu (sic), XV, 93), "the temple shepherd" (māqīdu šá biti, XIV, 132 : 15), "the singer" (zammēru, XIV, 6 : 4) are salaried officers.

3. The property handled is spoken of as the possession of the god, cf. VI (sic, read I SHŪ) 4 gur še'um GISH.BAR.GAL ša ili (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 biti-u, "our house," cf. VI gur LXXXIV qa SHE.BA(!) a-mi-lu-li ša biti-nu, "VI gur LXXXIV qa, wages for the men of our house" (no reference given), or simply bitu, "house," cf. ipu mārē biti(-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(!) Nippur"4 4 Dūr-Ku-ri-Gal-zu, "which is for the maintenance of Nippur and Dūr-Ku-ri-Gal-zu." This statement is made even in view of the fact (i.e., p. 7) that "amounts are also paid (XIV, 148), ša si-ri-bi-ša ša sharri, a-na nu-ri ša sharri, a-na sharri."

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

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

1 SHŪ is an abbreviation of šašįššu = sussu = 60, just as nu is abbreviated from na-na. For SHŪ cf. also B. E., XV, 19 : 29 | 73 : 15 | 109 : 44 | 151 : 15 | 199 : 29, 10, and see the later KU = rabā or "prince" among the numbers, which shows that KU has to be read šaššu(-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 Ė.G.A.L = ĕkallu = "palace," sc. of the king, and Ė-nu, "our house," "our temple."

Ĕ.G.A.L or ĕkallu in our letters as well as in B. E., Vols. XIV and XV, does not signify the "temple" (Clay, B. E., XIV. p. 6; XV. p. 18, transl. of No. 7, above), but always the "royal palace." This follows evidently from B. E., XV, 50--: a tablet which I translate and interpret differently than Dr. Clay; see 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 S4) (qt)

ASH.A.N.NA GISH.BARGAL

2 4šuXXX-is-sah-ra

3 abšuDUB Ė.G.A.L (= ĕkalli)

4 ū-she-is-ša-am-ma

5 a-na "In-na-an-ni

6 i-na-an-din

7 4ššuASH.A.N.A

8 Šašdū 15šam

9 3 (GUR) 90 (Clay again wrongly S4) (qt) 4šuXXX-(nic)

10 ASH.A.N.NA (nic) is-sah-ra

11 ina SHE.BAR GUR LUGAL

12 En-šilki

13 4šuXXX-is-sah-ra

3 gur 84 qa of ashanna grain of the full tax,

Sin-issahra

(under) the seal of the temple
carried away,
and to Innana
he shall pay.
(Date.)

3 gur 84 qa of ashanna grain

Sin-issahra

in the royal seed gur

of Nippur [shall measure.]
[Seal of] Sin-issahra.

Against this translation is to be said: (1) The expression ina SHE.BAR GUR LUGAL En-šilki (ll. 11, 12) can never mean "in the royal seed gur of Nippur," but would have to be translated, if En-šilki 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-šilki cannot belong to LUGAL, because, firstly, the Cassite kings, though residing at Nippur, do not take the title "king of Nippur," and secondly, a royal gur was everywhere the same, the Nippurian did not differ from that of Babylon or Sippar; (3) the expression abšuDUB Ė.G.A.L u-she-is-ša-am-ma (ll. 3, 4) can be rendered only "per sealed order (abšuDUB = anything that is sealed, "letter," "order," "decree," etc.) of the Ė.G.A.L (as such to be distinguished from the DUB Ė-nu, B. E., XV, 36 : 19) he caused to go out," or "he caused to carry away." Sin-
issahra comes to Innanni, the chief bursar of the Temple storehouse, with a sealed order of the É.GAL, calling for 3 qur 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 qur of wheat Sin-issahra has per order of the É.GAL received (imḥur) from (ina qit) 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 qur 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 É.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 É.GAL royal measures were or had to be used, hence É.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 É.GAL is differentiated from that intended for the BĀR (= parakku) En-lil (I. 8), etc., etc. If, then, the É.GAL be the "royal palace," we have to see in the karū É.GAL a "palace or royal storehouse." Such a storehouse is mentioned in the archives and is called karū ASH.TAB.BA.GAN.TUG\(^{\text{1}}\). Wheat which was paid at the karū ASH.TAB.BA.GAN.TUG\(^{\text{2}}\) is called in the closing paragraph (B. E., XV, 38c : 27), ASH.LAN.NA ša i-na mah-ri-im im-hu-ru a-na ZER É.GAL nadna\(^{\text{3}}\), 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 (I.e., 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.TUG\(^{\text{2}}\) (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 Kαuu.nu-ru[=\(\text{kū}\)].

1 B. E., XV, 135 : 7, so and so much flour (ki-mu), interest (ù.BAR.RA), a-na karū É.GAL a-na karū ASH.TAB.BA.GAN.TUG\(^{\text{1}}\) "Nū-umakke ish-shi, "to the palace storehouse, i.e., to the storehouse of (or "called") ASH.TAB.BA.GAN.TUG Nānēkē took." Cf. here also the karūn Ash-tu-er in Bu. 91-5-9, 381 (C. T., H, 37), l. 6.
2 B. E., XV, 38c : 1, ASH.LAN.NA ša i-na karū ASH.TAB.BA.GAN.TUG\(^{\text{2}}\) (ASHH.BA.R 3 qa nadnu\(^{\text{3}}\)).
in identifying both: \textit{AS/H.TAB.BAGAN.TUG} (sc. 2) is \emph{Kan-du-ru-[a]\textsuperscript{b}}, maintaining at the same time that both were a "palace storehouse."\textsuperscript{2} As over against the \textit{\textit{E.GAL}} or "\emph{palace}" (sc. of the king) the "\emph{Temple}" is called \textit{\textit{E.A-nu}}, i.e., "House of A-nu." B. E., XV, 93 : 5, Clay, B. E., XIV, p. 6, reads \textit{bit-a-nu}, "our house." But in view of the fact (a) such a monstrous Babylonian form—half Sumerian and half Semitic: \textit{E.A-nu} = \textit{bit-a-nu} = \textit{biti-a-nu}—would be, to say the least, very strange for this and later periods;\textsuperscript{2} (b) that in our letter, No. 35 : 15, \textit{E.A-nu} is followed immediately by \textit{bib A-nu[a-um]};\textsuperscript{2} (c) that the determinative for "\textit{god}," \textit{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 \textit{A-nu} is simply the semiticized Sumerian for \textit{ilu}, signifying in each and every case the highest god of a city, whether that god be \textit{AN} or \textit{Enlil} or Marduk, or whether the city be Nippur or Babylon or Dür-\textit{ilu}, etc. In this way it happened that \textit{Enlil}, the god of Nippur, was simply called \textit{AN} (B. E., XIV, 16 : 1 | 132 : 3, 4, 54; XV, 97 : 3 | 115 : 11 | 143 : 2 | 163 : 28), and the Temple of \textit{Enlil} at Nippur was termed not only \textit{E.KUR} (B. E., XIV, 148 : 2), but also \textit{E.AN.KALAM.GAL}, "the temple of the great god of the (Babylonian) world" (B. E., XIV, 148 : 15, 18; XV, 34 : 2), or merely \textit{E.AN} (B. E., XIV, 24 : 16; XV, 37 : 1). That this \textit{E.AN} or "\textit{Gotteshaus}" was indeed the temple of \textit{Enlil} of Nippur is evident from a passage in \textit{B. E., XV}, 128 : 14, which mentions the \textit{E.AN}(1) \textit{En-lil\textsuperscript{2}} \textit{shá i-na libbi-nu}, "the house of god (= temple) of Nippur which is in our midst." Of this house the Nippurians speak as the \textit{E.AN E-nu}, the "house of god our temple." B. E., XIV, 159 : 2, or simply as \textit{\textit{E-nu}}, "our temple"; see, among other passages, also B. E., XIV, 148 : 15, 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 \textit{DUB E.GAL} (B. E., XV, 50 : 3) so there existed also a \textit{DUB E-nu} (B. E., XV, 36 : 19), as there are mentioned \textit{ardí} resp. \textit{amat E.GAL} (see p. 77) so there occur also \textit{a-mi-la-ti} \textit{shá E-nu} (B. E., XV, 41 : 3). All this, then, forces us to separate the \textit{E.GAL} or

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{1} Also written \textit{Kan-durri-\textsuperscript{a}}, see List in \textit{B. E., XV}. It is also mentioned in our letters 18 : 38, \ldots \textit{E.A-\textit{n-kur}}.\textsuperscript{2} Cf. here also \textit{kudurā} = \textit{kudurā} = \textit{kudurā}, Delitzsch, H. W. B., p. 319a; B. A., XIV, 485, and Nagel, I.e., p. 182 : (1) Frohdeuwst, (2) Frohdeuweis, (3) Weisgewnery. The city read by Clay, B. E., XV, p. 53b, \textit{shá}\textsuperscript{2} \textit{du-\textit{n-\textit{kur}}} has to be transcribed, of course, \textit{kudur-\textit{n-\textit{d}}.\textsuperscript{2}}

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{2} For other occurrences of \textit{E.GAL} cf., e.g., the \textit{ardí} \textit{E.GAL} in letter No. 34 : 11 and B. E., XV, 81 : 2 | 152 : 15 | 200 III : 38; V : 6; \textit{amat} (\textit{Glx}) \textit{E.GAL}, B. E., XV, 290 I : 33, 37; III : 2, 9, 21; \textit{tibi}\textsuperscript{2} \textit{E.GAL}, letter No. 50 : 11; \textit{shá\textit{-\textit{m\textit{n\textit{a\textit{-\textit{a\textit{-\textit{n\textit{-\textit{k\textit{u}}}}}}}}} \textit{E.GAL} \textit{shá\textit{-\textit{b\textit{i\textit{-\textit{a\textit{-\textit{u}}}}}} \textit{E.GAL} \textit{shá\textit{-\textit{b\textit{i\textit{-\textit{a\textit{-\textit{u}}}}}} \textit{E.GAL} = \textit{special fund} (of 10 GUR) set aside by the palace for the payment of certain officers or otherwise," B. E., XV, 47 : 1. For \textit{mashā\textit{-\textit{shd\textit{-\textit{r}}}}}} = \textit{special fund}," see p. 96, note 4.

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{4} Cf. here also the \textit{amaru shá makh E.A-nu}, i.e., "overseer of the house of god," H., VIII, 835 : 1, and see the \textit{EN E} in B. E., XIV, 122 : 1.

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{5} And is differentiated from the \textit{E.GAL} which precedes the \textit{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-bil bābi É.A-nu, a ‘doorkeeper of the Temple,’ i.e., a Temple official, receives a certain amount of grain in ḍu Ka-nu-ri-ēki 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.TUGēki, 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 storehouses during the reign of Nazi-Maruttash, is called in B. E., XIV, 56 : 9, a-rad LUGAL, “servant of the king.”

Is it under these conditions to be wondered at that even the king himself—directly or indirectly—should appear as a beneficiary of the revenues of Enil of Nippur? In proof of our contention that the king actually was such a beneficiary cf. the following expressions, occurring in the “Temple Archives”: bi-la-tî šâ LUGAL, B. E., XIV, 116 : 1; e-li LUGAL, l.c., XV, 33, 34; bronze a-na i-ter(hardly šul, kar, see p. 88, note 1) -ti UL MAR LUGAL, l.c., XIV, 124 : 16; a-na LUGAL, l.c., XIV, 148 : (43), 44, 46; na-gal šâ LUGAL, l.c., XIV, 132 : 17; sak-shup-par LUGAL, l.c., XV, 154 : 41; a-ra-ad shar-rê, i.e., XV, 199 : 30; a-rad LUGAL, l.c., XIV, 56 : 9; amēdu-SAG LUGAL, l.c., XIV, 132 : 2; GU.EN. NA EN.LI[Lēki], l.c., XIV, 136 : 1, etc., 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-issahra, 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.

In Chapter III we have shown that all letters addressed to the be-ū 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-ū) 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-but) of the patesi's, and as the Reverse contains a letter addressed to the king, the natural inference to be drawn from this letter is that the king was the person to whom such records had to be sent. In other words, this tablet proves that the Temple Archives were records made and kept for the king, as the highest official of the Temple of Enlil at Nippur. The "Temple Archives," therefore, at the same time are Royal Archives.

What was the purpose of these archives? Kishahbut, when answering an inquiry of king Kudashman-Turqa whether sesame-oil had been forwarded or not, writes to his "Lord" as follows (35:30ff.): áš-shum šammu (=NIGISH) šá be-ū-ia na-shú-[ma?] il-ta-na-su a-na = Ku-du-r[a-ni] [ardi]-ka ki-i qe-ri-ū úm-na-a šammu (=NIGISH) i-na qáti-ia [i-din] be-ū a-na šatammi (=SHAG.TAM) li-ışpu-ram-a šàmmu (=NIGISH) šub(=RU)-tà li-shū-ri-[ua], i.e., "As regards the sesame-oil of my 'Lord' (I beg to report): 'It has been removed' they read, when I spoke to Kudurání 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 7029) refers here apparently to the action of consulting a tablet recording that such and such an amount of sesame-oil had been removed (nashi) by a certain person in the name of the king or "per order of the palace," after DUB É.GAL. Everything that was either received from (šá i-na qâl . . . . maḫru) or paid out to (šá i-na šabbi šá . . . . ana . . . . naḫšu) or removed (šá ištu . . . . nashá) or taken away from (šá ištu . . . . laqû) or delivered to (šá ana . . . . šubû) or taken to (šá ana . . . . nashá, 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;

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 xr. ša'-i-na DUB.SHAR.A("...MU 𒉌 X šat-ru (B. E., XIV, 168 : 34, 43) or [xr. ša'-i-na DUB ša'-dub Ardi-Bēlūtu (= GASHAN) k1a ša'-at-ru (B. E., XV, 199 : 37). "To record," then, is šatār ina, and "Temple Archives" are called DUB, resp. DUB.SHAR.A. Besides these two there occur still the following names for "Archives," viz., DUB šu'-ma-ti (thus especially where several items are recorded under various names), or [DUB] šu'-ma-a-ti, or ḏu-pi šu'-ma-ti, or ḏu-pi šu'-ma-a-ti, or DUB MU[mesh] or only MU[mesh]; thus apparently designated on account of the expression MU.BLI.M[10] = šumâtāti, found so often on tablets of this character. And as we meet instead of MU.BLI.M also GIS.I[11] or za-ka[r(?)]-tum[12] we may not be wrong in saying that "Temple Archives" were termed also DUB MU.BLI.M; DUB GIS.I[13]; DUB za-ka[r]-tum; DUB MU.BLI.[14] 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 ša'-šu laḫaš-bā, i.e., "for the year so and so," cf., e.g., B.E., XIV, 168 : 33.


[3] Thus shows clearly that Ardi-Bēlūtu, because a tributary storehouse to that of Nippur, had to keep its own records.


[9] ḫu-bi-zi-ati writes to the chief bursar Iimmāmi, S 8 : 8, SHE.BA MU[mesh] a-um 𒊉XXX-zi-ur-ru i-dī-ina, "the wages for these persons (= MU[mesh]) give to Sin-issara," i.e., the wages as recorded on the tablet giving the "names" of the persons hand over to Sin-issara; so, no doubt, better than ša'tu, because in business transactions the amount of wages must always be specified. But the specification was to be found on a tablet containing the MU[mesh] = MU.BLI.M or "names." See p. 116, note 6.

[10] See B. E., XIV, XV passim. For MU.BLI.M we have also MU.BI, e.g., B. E., XIV, 51, 1.


[14] Cf. here also the MU.NE.NE in Cassite Tablets published by F. Peiser, e.g., P. 89 : 15; P. 100 : 6 (1. 5 only, MU.NE).
year, i.e., either in the second (so most generally), or the last, or the sixth, in other words, around the end of the first resp. sixth month, the different heads of the storehouses or of the possessions (c.g., flocks, etc.) of the Temple were required, it seems, to make their yearly reports, i.e., "to draw the balance of accounts" (epêš nikasi, resp. ri-hu-a-nu shá DUB.SHIAR aka) or "take the inventory" of the stock (mi-nu shá) in the presence of (šá-a-kin-nu) a royal(!) official, either the anêš SAG LUGAL or the G.E.N.A. i.e., sherîf, of Nippur, when they (the shepherds or other parties

1. Cf. B. E., XIV, 57, SIE GISIJ.BAR 6 po ša m i-na l̄i-ki-te-li šašu šattû 12tham 14th Na-zi-Ma-ra-ul-ta-asp i-na Za-ri-IM.sI.xi-nu net-sêš.nu nadanunu, but dated l. 35, ak-šu.GISIJ.BAR šašu šattû 12tham. B. E., XV, 23 : 7, ak-šu ishtu aḫi-šu.GISIJ.BAR šašu šattû 15tham, but dated l. 42, aḫi-šu.GISIJ.BAR šašu šattû 12tham. See likewise B. E., XIV, 133 : 10, ak-šu 12 (Chay's copy is wrong and misleading) arû ishtu umi šašu aḫi-šu.GISIJ.BAR šašu šattû 15tham. The dup-pi ri-ki-ši-ti (B. E., XIV, 42) was drawn up at the end of the year, i.e., at the time of the epêš nikasi. Here probably belong also tablets like B. E., XIV, 18 : 20, 52 : 1, 56 : 9; B. E., XV, 112 : 9. In view of these examples it is most likely that also at the time of the kings of Ur the yearly epêš nikasi did not take place in the first (šašu.SII.LA) but in the second (šašu.GAN.MAS) month—just as at our present times, when the books resp. their accounts are balanced in February. Dr. Myhman informs me that he has definite proofs which show that not GAN.MASII but SIE. II.LA was the first month of the year at the time of the kings of Ur. GAN.MASII is mentioned so prominently in the tablets of the Ur dynasty because it was, as second month, that of the epêš nikasi. See Dr. Myhman's forthcoming volume.

2. B. E., XIV, 58 : 31, so and so much šašu aḫi-šu.GAN.MASII šašu šattû 15tham adî aḫi-šu.SIE.GAN.KUD šašu šattû 15tham... nadanunu. Cf. here tablets like B. E., XIV, 121 : 18; B. E., XV, Nos. 12, 52, 53, 119, 120, 130. In B. E., XIV, 123 : 2 the copyist (Chay) must have made some mistakes. While we read l. 13, nału-še 13 ma-an 19½ T.C (or UCUDU) ZIGA 15tham, the copy reads in l. 1, 2, UCUDU ZIGA... ishtu aḫi-šu.KIN (so the traces given) šašu šattû 7tham adî aḫi-šu.SIE šašu šattû 8tham. According to this the ZIGA would extend over a space of one and a half years—i.e, absolutely impossible and against l. 13 where the ZIGA is only for the 8th year; hence read in l. 1, 2, ishtu aḫi-šu.GAN.MASII šašu šattû 7tham adî aḫi-šu.SIE šašu šattû 8tham.

3. B. E., XV, 16 : 10, akšum... ishtu aḫi-šu.KIN šašu šattû 15tham adî aḫi-šu.KIN šašu šattû 15tham, dated l. 13, aḫi-šu.KIN:Inanna 1mu 20tham šattû 15tham—hence the last month excluded. B. E., XV, 10 : 11, ishtu aḫi-šu.KIN:Inanna šašu šattû 15tham adî aḫi-šu.KIN:Inanna šašu šattû 15tham, i.e., both months included.

4. For half-yearly reports see, e.g., B. E., XIV, 56 : 31, ishtu... DUL.AZ.GAR adî aḫi-šu.GAN.MASII in nanna 15tham, i.e., the last month excluded, cf. l. 23, as also l. 96 : 1. But B. E., XIV, 117 : 1, ishtu aḫi-šu.GAN.MASII adî aḫi-šu.GAN.MASII, i.e., both included. B. E., XIV, 94 : 2, ishtu aḫi-šu.GAN.MASII adî aḫi-šu.GAN.MASII, i.e., both months included. For quarterly reports cf. e.g., B. E., XV, 7 : 10, ishtu aḫi-šu.GAN.MASII [SIE.GAN.MASII].

5. Cf. Letter XV. 86 : 2, á at-ba [NXG.SHIH-šiši-ši] re-usu-bum; 92 : 26, á NXG.SHIH-ni it-di a-a-ra-mi-iski i ni-pa-us-nu-um; B. E., XIV, 99 : 36, NXG.SHIH-šiši-ši; i.e., 149 : 4, ishtu NXG.SHIH-šiši-ši; i.e., 168 : 23, i-nu NXG.SHIH-šiši-ši. For the month included. 6. For half-yearly reports see, e.g., B. E., XIV, 56 : 31, ishtu... DUL.AZ.GAR adî aḫi-šu.GAN.MASII in nanna 15tham, i.e., the last month excluded, cf. l. 23, as also l. 96 : 1. But B. E., XIV, 117 : 1, ishtu aḫi-šu.GAN.MASII adî aḫi-šu.GAN.MASII, i.e., both included. B. E., XIV, 94 : 2, ishtu aḫi-šu.GAN.MASII adî aḫi-šu.GAN.MASII, i.e., both months included. For quarterly reports cf. e.g., B. E., XV, 7 : 10, ishtu aḫi-šu.GAN.MASII [SIE.GAN.MASII].

7. For the month included.
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-naŠ-Marduk during the 22d year of Kuri-Galzu? Surely, the fact that this document was excavated in Nippur shows that the "head" of the storehouse at Bunnâ-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-êl').' 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 Apûl-Rannûn has removed (ish-sha-a) by means of ships (i-na ši-Mû) from (ish-tu) Du-un-ni-A-bû? And again the answer has to be: It is a "record" of the expenditures in connection with the storehouse in Dunnû-Ahû during the first month of the 15th year of Nazi-Marattash which had been forwarded to headquarters. In this wise it happened that we found among these "Temple Archives" so appallingly many documents which apparently came from other places than Nippur. Nippur, therefore, must have been the central "recording office," the executive department of the administration of the Temple properties under royal supervision. Such documents, thus forwarded and excavated in Nippur, cannot but be records (yearly, half-yearly, etc., as the case might be) of the receipts, resp. expenditures of grain, etc., in connection with the particular "depot" or "storehouse" from which they come; in other words, they are business records giving us an insight into the administration of the several "depots" or "storehouses" connected with that of the Nippurian Temple under the chief supervision of the Cusite 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 these things: (a) ša-pû (= KA) ki-nû (= col. 1); (b) ša a-na e-a-risku Nippur, col. II; (c) ̀ÌRÈ.ba ù-mû e-súû, a-na más (= Shû) AN (= li = Enlil) ish-pu-ru (resp. ša a-na mah-ri AN șa-šu, col. III). B. E., XIV, 132. Notice that amounts of cols. II + III are col. II!

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

3 Cf. here the "List of Phases" as given in B. E., XIV, XV, and notice that Innarrû, 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 karû E.G.A.L, ASIRD.B.A.B.A.N.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 E\textsuperscript{â}\textsubscript{ab} \textit{DUB} or also called E\textit{ ku-nu-ak-ki},\textsuperscript{2} resp. E\textsuperscript{â}\textsubscript{ab} \textit{DUB šaḷ E.GAL},\textsuperscript{3} where they have been excavated by the Babylonian Expeditions of the University of Pennsylvania. And as Hill VI (Hilprecht, \textit{B. E.}, Ser. D, Vol. I, p. 305, Plan of the Ruins of Nusfar) represents the place where all the "Temple Archives", together with the letters here published, have been found, there is nothing which might prevent us from identifying the ruins of Hill VI with the E\textsuperscript{â}\textsubscript{ab} \textit{DUB šaḷ E.GAL}, so called because the \textit{E.GAL} or "Palace," resp. its occupant, the bc-\textit{Ti} 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 \textit{arad LUGAL} (cf. Martu\textsuperscript{a}, the "servant of the king," who is the chief bursar at the time of Nazi-Maran\textit{t}ash. \textit{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 \textit{GIR.NITA} or \textit{shukkanakku} \textsuperscript{4}\textit{Enlil}.\textsuperscript{4}


\textsuperscript{2} \textit{B. E.}, XV. 33 : 12. Notice in this connection the a\textit{-ma Enl\textit{ij}ki} after E\textit{ ku-nu-ak-ki}, thus showing that this building was indeed situated in Nippur.

\textsuperscript{3} \textit{B. E.}, XIV. 124 : 6.

\textsuperscript{4} Cf., e.g., the inscriptions of \textit{Kuri-Galzu (gigen)} in \textit{L.R.} I, IV, Nos. 1–3; Winckler, \textit{K. B.}, III, p. 154a–c. For other occurrences of \textit{shukkanakku} see, e.g., Gudea, Cylinder B, VII : 20; VIII : 7; Statue B, IV : 13; E. B. H., p. 255, note 12 (AN-\textit{Mar-ta-bal} the \textit{shukkanakku} of \textit{Dur-\textit{ibki}}), and Hinke, \textit{B. E.}, Ser. D, Vol. IV, pp. 312a, 173. For the reading of the ideogram \textit{GIR.NITA} (not \textit{VIR.13AD}) see Thurner-Dandjin, \textit{Z. A.}, XV, p. 46f. With \textit{GIR.NITA} is closely connected the well-known official title \textit{GIR}, so often found in tablets from the second dynasty of \textit{Ur}. In my \textit{E. B. H.}, p. 424, I said: "The \textit{GIR} seems to have been an officer resembling very much a "quartermaster." He had to look after the food of the royal officers as well as that of the priests, and even of the royal flocks." This will now have to be modified. The \textit{GIR} who figures so conspicuously in the \textit{Ur} tablets was what we might call an "auditor," one who had to approve the expenditures, resp. receipts, mentioned in those tablets, who had to "O. K." them—put, so to speak, his seal to them. Such a function of an "auditor" was also exercised by Inanna 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 \textit{B. E.}, XV, 1 and 2; \textit{etc.}, XV, 8 and 9; \textit{etc.}, 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." (\textit{B. E.}, XV, p. 19; cf. \textit{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., \textit{B. E.}, XIV, 58. If \textit{B. E.}, XV, 12 were, as Clay claims, such payments of salary, there would be, at least in Inanna’s case, no regulation whatever; \textit{i.e.,} the so-called salary received by Inanna for the fifth day of the first month (\textit{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 (\textit{B. E.}, XV, 1). No, not salary payments are those tablets, nor do they indicate that payments had to be or were made to Inanna. They are nothing but \textit{Jarri-meke}, or "cheques" or "drafts" on certain storehouses endorsed by the chief bursar; they were "bills" "O. K."-ed by Inanna. When some
From the Temple Archives of Nippur.

From the position the Cassite kings hold in relation to the administration of Enil’s earthly possessions, it is at once evident that shakkanakkû cannot be derived, with Delitzsch and others who follow him, from “sha” + “kanakkû” and be translated “Verschliessser, 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” + “ka-mu” (= qanâqu), i.e., “the one who exercises the function of the ‘sealing,’ one who ‘seals,’ the man of the ‘seal’ of Enil.” The Cassite kings of this period, then, are the authoritative representatives of Enil, through whom Enil, “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 Enil, except the king first gave his authorization (seal); and if the king did, Enil acted through and by him. The king’s approval is Enil’s seal and authority. In this sense the Cassite king, as shakkanakkû of Enil, 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 Enil of Nippur, concern themselves with the administration of Enil’s possessions, and as the king as shakkanakkû of Enil has to seal, to approve them, it follows that these “Temple Archives” are at the same time

governor or other person sent his mûr shipri to the chief bursar with the request that certain amounts of grain or certain cattle were to be given to the writer, the chief bursar, after having satisfied himself that the request was justified, sat down, wrote an Anweissung to the storehouse, stating what was to be given to the bearer of the draft or Anweisung (who in this case was the mûr shipri), at the same time “endorse” it (that it was “O. K.”) by putting his name to it. The head of the storehouse, not knowing the mûr shipri, thus not being sure that the thing asked for would fall into the right hands, asked for identification. The mûr shipri identified himself by producing the endorsed or “O. K.”-ed draft of the chief bursar. Whence he (the mûr shipri) received the goods, but had to give up the draft, which now insured the head of the storehouse against any loss or fraud, for he (the head) could cover the expenditure with the certified draft of the chief bursar. These drafts, together with the DUB MIPPAD to which they belong, were sent to the executive department and, after having been examined, were deposited in the E. ū$$dum$$dUR. In case where such a draft bears the “seal” of a certain person, this seal proves that person, thus represented by it, to be the one who “had actually received” the goods specified in the tablet or draft, and served thus as a safeguard not only for the chief bursar, but also as a means of preventing the head of a storehouse from “cheating”—from saying that certain goods had been delivered to a certain party, while in fact they were not—for the head of a storehouse might possibly imitate an endorsed draft, but he could not very well imitate a “seal impression.” Lastly, the “recipient” by putting his seal on the draft could not venture to deny the receipt of the goods, which he otherwise might possibly do by saying that the head of the storehouse had delivered the goods to another party or had forged the “draft.” Cf. in this connection the interesting passage in 83: 35, 36, where Innanum is threatened with an accusation, “thou hast given to Mûr-Tiida (i.e., to another person) an order on my barley.”

1 No. 24: 5.

Sa-dar DI.KA (1 = suûtu) E.KUR à EN.LIL, Hinke, B. E., Scr. D, IV, p. 144, II : 3.
Royal Archives; hence the $E_{\text{abnu}}$ DUB is at the same time an $E_{\text{abnu}}$ DUB shâ $\acute{E}.GAL$, because it contained the official administrative documents of the Temple as approved, sealed by the king.

Right here some one may object that the $E_{\text{abnu}}$ DUB, resp. the $E_{\text{abnu}}$ DUB shâ $\acute{E}.GAL$, 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 (NIN.A[N] ) belonging to the NIN.A[N] shû a-na shattâ 1$^{\text{3}}$ Kû-dâsh-man-Tur-qu $\sim$ Im-rîm-shu-$\nu$-NIN.IB im-hur-ma a-na $E_{\text{abnu}}$ DUB û-she-rî-bu a-na 4 $\text{corpus}$ SAG(?) shû-pi-ik, "which Im-rîm-shu-NIN.IB received in (during) the 13th year of Kadashman-Turqu and which he (they?) caused to bring to the $E_{\text{abnu}}$ DUB, having it put up (or putting it up) in 4 SAG-jars." B. E., XIV, 124 : 6f. informs us of two amounts of bronze (esû) which $\sim$ E.MU.TUG A-ra-ma receives (ma-$\mu$-$\mu$-$\mu$). The first of these amounts is specified as shû $E_{\text{abnu}}$ DUB shû $\acute{E}.GAL$ shu-û-sî shu-$\mu$-$\mu$-$\mu$-$\mu$, i.e., "which the $E_{\text{abnu}}$ DUB shâ $\acute{E}.GAL$ caused to go (i.e., sent) out," and the other as coming shû qât $\sim$ Marduk, "per order of Nahrîr-Marduk." Both amounts were received a-na î-têr(?)-ti $\sim$ MAR LUGAL "as an indemnity for the royal wagons (chariots)." B. E., XV, 53 : 11f. mentions wheat flour (ZID.DA ASIL.A.N.A) shû $E_{\text{ku-uk-ki}}$ a-na En-têlî îsh(?) or ma?-shû-û, "due to (or belonging to) the $E_{\text{ku-uk-ki}}$ (and which) they brought to Nippur." Finally Letter No. 84 : 5f. contains the following exhortation addressed to Innâmi: "mâ-an-ûa SHE.GISH.NI li-îs-hu-hi-$\mu$-ma NÎ.GISH a-na $E_{\text{abnu}}$ DUB li-she-rî-bu û a-tu SHE.GISH.NI-kû su-hu-$\mu$-ma NÎ.GISH a-na $E_{\text{abnu}}$ DUB shû-rî-$\mu$-$\mu$-$\mu$-i,$"$ i.e., "All who press out sesame must bring oil (in) to the $E_{\text{abnu}}$ DUB, therefore press out thy sesame and bring the oil (in) to the $E_{\text{abnu}}$ DUB."1

Examining these passages we find that B. E., XV, 53, is an administrative record (having been forwarded to Nippur from Zarat-IM$^{2}$), 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 $E_{\text{ku-uk-ki}}$ at some previous time must have sent orders to Zarat-IM$^{2}$ that they (=German "man") take wheat flour to Nippur. The $E_{\text{ku-uk-ki}}$ here apparently denotes as much as "the head of the $E_{\text{ku-uk-ki}}$," and is as such exactly parallel to our "such and such a house has ordered these and these goods." The same is

---

1 For î-ter-tam, "indemnity," see Hilprecht, B. E., IX, 41 : 7, e-ter-tî î-nam-din-a' a-na, "shall pay an indemnity to."

2 Cf. here p. 114, notes 3, 4.
true of B. E., XIV, 124, where the \( \dot{E} \text{\textit{abu}} \text{\textit{DUB} sh\' \dot{E}.GAL}, \) \textit{i.e.}, the head of the house mentioned, \( \text{\textit{shus\'u}} \text{\textit{shu\'u}} \) the bronze. These two passages, then, show that orders were sent out from the \( \dot{E} \text{\textit{abu}} \text{\textit{DUB}} \) to certain men or branch storehouses.\(^1\) But this could be done only if the \( \dot{E} \text{\textit{abu}} \text{\textit{DUB}} \) 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 \textit{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\-\textit{lu} or king?

We \textit{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\textquoteleft s property, had necessarily to be addressed \textit{a} \textit{either} to the highest official, \textit{i.e.}, the king \textit{as \textquoteleft \textquoteleft shakkanakku of Enil,"} or \textit{b} \textit{to the king\textquoteleft s representative, \textit{i.e.}, his chief bursar, etc.} And, if so, we \textit{had} to find a correspondence also between \textit{"officials and officials," \textit{i.e.}, between officials outside of Nippur and the king\textquoteleft s representatives at Nippur. Both classes of correspondence \textit{are} represented: Nos. 1–74 contain letters addressed to the king, and Nos. 76ff. are those addressed to the king\textquoteleft s representatives in one capacity or another. With these facts before us, the title of this volume, \textit{"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 \( \dot{E} \text{\textit{abu}} \text{\textit{DUB} sh\' \dot{E}.GAL}, \) which was, as has been claimed, the administrative department of the king as highest executive officer) of the Temple of Enlil? Then, again, numerous scientific, historic and religious texts, such as omens, hymns, prayers, incantations, etc., have been found in this \textquoteleft \textquoteleft administrative building (resp. buildings connected with each other).\textquoteleft \textquoteleft How, I ask, can we account for the presence of \textit{such} texts in the \( \dot{E} \text{\textit{abu}} \text{\textit{DUB} sh\' \dot{E}.GAL}? \) A comprehensive answer to the latter

\(^1\) Resp. that the heads of the storehouses sent their \textquoteleft orders\textquoteright\ to the \textquoteleft central\textquoteright\ office at Nippur to have them \textquoteleft filled,\textquoteright\ see No. 45, pp. 142f.
question will be given when the several classes of texts will be published. At the present only this much: At the time of the Cassite kings the E abo>DUB šá E.GAL embraced in its walls the administrative resp. the executive department of the Temple, by which and through which the shakkanakku 44Enil, the king, governed and officially directed both the temporal and the spiritual affairs of the worshippers of Enil. In this wise it happened that the E abo>DUB šá E.GAL became the "Ministerium" with its different departments—administrative, religious, educational—as such containing tablets which are either "administrative records" (Temple Archives) or religious (Temple Library) or educational (Temple Library and Temple School) in character. This I maintain in the face of and notwithstanding the clamor of certain men who, on account of their inability to read and interpret cuneiform inscriptions or who on account of their lack of acumen to discern between the different classes of texts, can, in the ruins of Hill VI, not see anything but a "kitchen midden," and in the tablets there excavated, but so much "dried mud," "potsherds," "dead, meaningless, insignificant bricks."

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

1. Though we find in Ashshur-bân-apal's Library 2 some letters that are addressed to the "prince," TUR LUGAL, 3 "princess," TUR.SAL LUGAL, 4 or "queen mother," ÂIM LUGAL; 5 by far the greater number are written to the "KING," LUGAL. Of the one hundred and three letters here published seventy-eight 6 are addressed to the be-lī or king.

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

---

1 Situated on the west side of the Shatt-er-R; see Hilprecht, B. E., Corr. D, i, p. 305, Plan of the Ruins of Nippur.
2 Here I take into consideration only those letters which are designated as "K," omitting the D, T, Ru., and all other collections.
3 C. K. 611 (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. 1393 (H., V, 500).
4 K. 576 (H., I, 54).
5 K. 478 (H., III, 254); K. 825 (H., III, 263); K. 523 (H., III, 324); K. 989 (H., VI, 569).
6 Nos. 1-71 + 336, 399, 609, 73a.
to the (a) *Engar*; or *ikkaru*, originally "farmer," here probably a high official; (b) *A.B*a KUR, "secretary of the State"; (c) *A.BA* É.GAL, "secretary of the Palace"; (d) *mágir* É.GAL, "major domo"; (e) *LUGH* or sukallu, "ambassador"; (f) *ITI* or abbarakkū; (g) *GAL.SAG* or rab-shaq; (h) *EN.NAM* or bèl pahati, "governor"; (i) *shá nau* É.A-*nu", "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." 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-bani-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 *á AG-ÉN-shu-NU* to *Ashshur-mu-dam-mu-ili*; from *Um-ma-ni-iₜu* to *A-ma'-gu-nu*, "his brother" (SHESH-shu); from *á Nergal-SHESH-ir* to *á AG-á-shal-liₜu*, "his brother" (SHESH-shu); from *á EN-á-HU* to *Ku-na-a*, "his father" (AD-shu); from *MU.GI.NA* to *á Nergal-SHESH-ir*; from *á A-qar-[á EN-la-nuₜ] to *EN-ib-ₜu*; from an unknown writer to *á PA-IK-shi*, and last, but not least, a letter to *XXX-man-nu-GAR-[ ... ] from *XXX-KA-K-[ni?]*, "thy servant" (ardi-ka), etc. If it be not objected

1 K. 568 (H., I, 4); K. 1197 (H., I, 15); K. 1049 (H., I, 38); K. 113 (H., II, 153); K. 112 (H., II, 223); K. 13,009 (H., III, 322); K. 88 (H., VIII, 816).
2 K. 547 (H., I, 62); K. 175 (H., II, 221).
3 K. 1271 (H., II, 220).
4 K. 485 (H., I, 112).
5 K. 1070 (H., I, 70); K. 655 (H., II, 132); K. 986 (H., VIII, 814).
6 K. 910 (H., II, 145).
7 K. 597 (H., III, 283).
8 K. 1376 (H., VIII, 850).
9 K. 1226 (H., VIII, 855).
10 Cf. Nos. 76-99.
11 *Private*(†), because both the writer and the addressee appear in these letters without any titles whatsoever.
12 K. 1396 (H., II, 185).
13 K. 831 (H., II, 214).
16 K. 1239 (H., II, 219).
17 Cf. our Letter No. 76, which is written by a "father" to his "son," p. 144.
19 K. 1153 (H., VIII, 854).
20 K. 578 (H., III, 273).
21 K. 585 (H., II, 523).
22 Cf. K. 186 (H., II, 222).
to such apparently ‘private’ letters forming part of a Royal Library, it need not worry us to have included in our volume of ‘Letters to the Cassite Kings’ twenty-four specimens representing a correspondence between officials and officials.

3. But the most remarkable of all is that there have been found in the Library of Ashshur-bani-apal letters—decrees—written either by himself or by other kings. We have ‘royal decrees’ (a-mat LUGAL a-na) to ‘the Nippurians’ (a-melu EN, LII[18]-a); to ‘the people of the sea country, old and young, my servants’ (amelu mèsu Tum-idim-a-a a-melu AB.BA a-nurum u TUR a-nurum arlu maru arlu -i-a); to ‘the Gambuaens’ (amelu Gam-bu-la-a-a); to ‘the Rashaeans, old and young’ (amelu mèsu Ra-sha-a-a melu AB.BA a-nurum u shu (= NE)-ru-á-ti); to ‘Shadu and the people of Erech, old and young, my servants’ (m melu UNUG a-nurum melu AB.BA a-nurum u TUR a-nurum arlu mašri -i-a); to ‘Nabu- . . . and the people of Erech, old and young, my servants’ (m m melu AG-[. . .] u melu UNUG a-nurum melu AB.BA a-nurum u TUR a-nurum arlu mašri -i-a); to m melu EN-ib-ni (or K.A.K.); to m melu XXX-anu-nu-urur (= SHESH); to m melu AG-ib-ni (= IK)-shi; to m melu A-shi -pa-a; to m melu EN-ë-ti (or SHUR); to m melu XV na'id (= I); to m melu Zér-á-ti; and last, but not least, a royal decree to ‘the ‘Not-Babylonians’’ (a-mat LUGAL a-na la a-melu DIN.TER ki a-nurum)15. We furthermore find in this Library royal ‘orders’ (or decrees, a-bil LUGAL a-na) to ‘the Babylonians’ (a-melu KÁ.DINGIR ki a-nurum)15; to m melu PA-shar (= MAN)-aši (= PAD) a-nurum shu; to the ‘queen-mother’ (SAL -IM sharri (= MAN))16; to m melu NA-ki-dùLM a-na; to m melu A-shi -pa-a; to m melu PA-ašu (= BAD)-
nšur (= PAP); may even an "order" of a "princess" to ḫšš Sharrat (a-bit TUR.SAL LUGAL a-na SAL ḫšš SHAG (= libbu).ER-sharrat) and a letter of a "prince" (IM TUR LUGAL) to the a-na Sha-na-ī². 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 copies¹ 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 E abnu DUB ša E.GAL, or simply E abnu DUB, the bit tapšuhtī³ "the place of the appeasing" of Enlil.

¹ K. 622 (H., III, 306).
² K. 1619 B (H., III, 308).
³ R. M. 72 (H., IV, 130), 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 E-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.

I.

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

Imgurum, a royal official stationed at Dūr-Kurî-Galzu, reports to his “Lord,” King Burna-Buriash, about the affairs in connection with the administration of his office. About 1430 B.C.

The author of this letter, Imgurum, has to be identified not only with the writer of No. 22, but also with the addressee "Im-gu-ri" of No. 79 : 1, a contemporary of the slave-dealer "En-lil-ki-di-ni, who flourished, as we saw above (pp. 54ff.), during the time of King Burna-Buriash. From this it would follow that Imgurum was likewise a contemporary of Burna-Buriash. This result is corroborated by the following two considerations: (1) In 22 : 6 Imgurum mentions a certain "Hu-za-lum, who appears in B. E., XIV, 8 : 30 (dated the 21st year of Burna-Buriash) among the witnesses to a legal business transaction executed by "En-lil-ki-di-ni (ll. 22, 25). (2) "Ki-din-zi-Marduk referred to in our letter (I. 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-lil-ki-di-ni (buyer). According to I. 29 Imgurum was apparently sta-

1 In both the greeting is the same and in both the writer records about the disposition of adobes, resp. burnt bricks.
2 Called here "Hu-za-lum mār "En-lil-bēl( = En)-il( = AN)mesh.
3 Cf. also the dū ša "Ki-din-zi-Marduk in B. E., XIV, 166 : 9.
tioned at Dūr-Kuri-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-usātu m 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-Balī, ll. 33–39.

The letter reads:

1 [ardi-ka ] **Im-gu**-rum a-na di-na-an be-lú-a
2 [lu-ul]-i-ik
3 [a-na bit be]-lú-i̱ úsh-ul-mú
dé-um i̱ wa-lú-a-at
4 [ . . . ] + 6 M libittu (= SHEG-gumû)
a-di-um i̱ na-ab-na-at
5 [ . . . ] M libittu (= SHEG-gumû)
a-na pi(?)-i na-ak-ba-ar

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

1 As Imurum reports (22 : 5) about the condition of ḫa-ga-da-ni-lum, the summētu, who is sick, it would seem that he superintended also the personnel of the Temple or Palace, for a summētu or "songstress" was, no doubt, connected with both the Temple and the Palace.

3 Emendation according to 22 : 1—hence also our reading of the writer’s name, "Im-gu-rum." For this form of greeting see also 35 : 3, p. 121.

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

4 For SHEG-gumû (not given by Clay, List of Signs) cf. Thureau-Dangin, B. 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-da šum-enib 7, 8, i-ba-lat, "he will be well within a space of seven (or) eight days."

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

7 Here, of course, not Grab, Begräbniss, Delitzsch, H. W. B., p. 586 b, but "cellar," "excavation." The pi muṣur 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) nārī =A.GUR.DA) šé-li, 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 (sc. of Nippur) per excellencia," where the little hamlet, called Pi-nārīkî, was situated) and to a naḫabtu, see 12 : 9, i-na pi (= KA) na-at-ba-ak-tu, 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 dulla see, besides Delitzsch, H. W. B., p. 2106, also Behrens, L. S. S., I, p. 8. Here it is to be taken in the sense of "working at," cf. II., V, 471 : 18, dül-li ša šE.SAG.Ba, "the working at Esgal," to be compared with T. VII, 7, which shows that the letter refers to building operations.

2 ḫ-ma, mentioned here with a-na, cannot be taken as a 11th of III 377, Delitzsch, H. W. B., p. 639 (this has dî). Jensen, K. B., VII, p. 317, has shown that there is only one 377, although the various significations assigned to this verb by him (glassen, nachdinen, hingeben, treiben) ought to be enlarged so as to include also the meaning fâhen (Behrens, L. S. S., I, p. 6, note 2), and "to take," "to fetch," cf. Nagel, B., I, IV, p. 180, and see Letters of Hammurabi, No. 78 : 18, šub-er-ta baskî-il-ka a-na libbi iši-ba-ad-da-ma, "one of thy trusted servants may bring, take them to Babylon." The II of 377 is here "causative," i.e., "to cause to bring, fetch." Uradhos for naddû because it stands in the chief sentence.

3 Uskhi n-a-n-an-ša-li = asūshlû, with the signification "to lay the foundations" sc. of my dûli (I, 6), i.e., of the building I am at present working at. Adda-ma, here of the "completed action in the future," = "I shall have torn down." = "I have torn down."

4 For ku-tal see besides Delitzsch, H. W. B., p. 362a, also Jensen, K. B., VII, p. 461, and below, I, 13, ku-tal ma-ka-ši. In No. 68 : 5 the zîr ku-tal is mentioned and in B. E., XV, 80 : 11 we are told of the mashšar-Ša-tam ša ina ku-tal ša(a) tab-ku, i.e., of the mashšardatî (pl. of mashšardatû) which are "poured out," i.e., stored up in the rear of the "house." This latter passage shows that the translation "stipend" for mashšardatû (Clay, B., E., XIV, p. 59, note below, who follows Delitzsch, H. W. B., p. 1330) is out of place here. A "stipend," surely, could not and was not "stored up." Mashšardatû signifies at this time the "reserve fund," hence it is not only "stored up," but out of it payments are made, e.g., B. E., XV, 75 : 2, SHE...ša i-na libbi mashšar-ta ša(a) tâb-ku...iši-ba-ad-da-ma, i.e., XV, 106 : 1, SHE ša ina libbi mashšar-ta ša (a) tâb-ku...iši-ba-ad-da-ma (like) GISH.BAR.GAL ina-ad-da-ma, i.e., 164 : 1, SHE...ša i-na libbi mashšar-ta ša ina-ad-da-ma (like) GISH.BAR.GAL ina-ad-da-ma (like). (Note here the reserve fund of Tannur). In B. E., XIV, 92 : 2 the mashšardatû ša karû Kî-rû-bakû is mentioned and in B. E., XV, 47 : 1 we are told that payments were made ina libbi 10 GUR mashšar-šaשקא (like) E.GAL, i.e., out of the Palace's reserve fund of 10 GUR. B. E., XV, 40 : 5 mentions the total of SHE ina-ad-da-ma ina libbi mashšar-ša (like) which SHE is according to B. E., XV, 1, that ša ina karû AS.TAB.BI.GI IN.TUG.GI ina-ad-da-ma. From this it follows that the Palace, the several storerooms, officials (like Tannur), and even months had each their special "reserve funds." In some passages, e.g., Str., IV, 374 : 10, mashšardatû might be translated even by "collateral security." Mashšardatû, then, is "something that is left over (mashšar-) to insure the payments of certain obligations.

5 Na-at-ba-kaš here (and in 22 : 15, [na] at-ba-ki [at-ta-ba-ak] apparently a sing'l. mas., although after the num. 20) for construction see p. 95, note 6. Also a few forms of this word is found, see, e.g., 3 : 15, 21, ša ina-at-ba-ak; 3 : 19, a-na na-at-ba-ak (so also B., H. 30, 32); 3 : 20, na-ši at-ba-ak di ša(s) Gir-ra-ri-mil(k) = a city f. ina-ši; 6s : 26, cuša (as A.SHAQ) ša ina-at-ba-ak ša Kür-ša ri-mi, cf. also 12 : 6, 10. In 3 : 17, 55 we have na-at-ba-ak, and according to 12 : 9, i-na piš (for K.,1) na-at-ba-ak, it has an "opening," an "entrance" to which one may come. The plural of naškaš is found in 12 : 4, 4 na-at-ba-ak-ši. The root is, of course, tabakku, "to pour out," here, because of words, "to store, pile up." A našbak, našakka accordingly would be "something that is stored, piled up," a "heap," "pile," comprising a certain number of bricks. For tabakku in this signification cf. e.g., B. E., XIV, 32 : 2, SHE na-at-ba-ak ša ina karû...tabakku; B. E., XV, 122 : 8, the grain which a-na libbi SIE.GAL tab-ku, i.e., "which has been added to the great grain (das Stamm-, Haupt-korn)."

See also note 4 and cf. B. E., XIV, 114 : 4, 10 GUR 1 PI (iši ša-tuk-ku-šu ina ina 1 GUR 1 PI, i.e., "10 gur and 36 qa 'stored up' (extra)"
10 e-ki-ir-ri-im-ma? a-tab-ba-ak

11 10 M agurru = SHEG-gumâ AL

a.m. GUSHUR or ÙK.R.A.GA.L meku

la-ab-na-at

— for each pur (cf. l. 3) 1 PI (or 36 qr). "One pur of grain stored up at harvest time lost in volume during the time of its being stored up, i.e., it dried up, it shrunk—hence at the end of, say, one year 1 pur of grain would be equal not to 180 qr but only to 180 — 36, i.e., to 144 qr. The shrinkage of grain at this time, then, was computed at the rate of 1 PI or 36 qr to 1 GUR or 180 qr, i.e., at the rate of 1 to 5 qr. Grain or cereals thus stored up to insure against shrinkage were called B.A.I or ti-bik-ku or tab-ki, out of which, if not used, payments might be and were made. For (SHE) B.A.I cf. B. E., XV, 115:6 | 144:6:91:2; for (SHE) tab-ki see, e.g., B. E., XV, 10:7 | 29:6 | 115:1:4, and for (SHE) ti-bik-ku (ki), B. E., XV, 66:13 (here we have GUSH.BAR ti-bik-ku instead of the more commonly used GUSH.BAR tab-ki, hence ti-bik-ku = tab-ki).

Now many bricks such a matbaku or matbaktu 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 tab-ki in the historic inscriptions signifies the "height" of a "brick" or "layer of bricks," then a "measure of length" (cf. the German "and societ Berckheisickenh hoch"), Prof. Hilprecht is inclined to see in a matbaku a quadrangle or rectangle comprising a certain number of tab-ki, hence a "pile which is of a certain height, length and breadth."

* Stands either for šâ ûh-guru, masc. singl. on account of matbaku, or it may be taken as an adjective, Delitzsch, Gram., p. 241b. Cf. here 68:31, zi-a šâ ūh-guru; 68 : 10, 11 šâ ūh-bi ūh-guru; 68 : 24, III (pur) zi-râ-a ma-nî ūh-bi-ur; 31 : 26, mi-si-Iî i-ši-ta-ti [šâ (?)] ūh-bi-ur; i.e., l. 2s, i-ši-ta-tu šâ ši-li (< = 72x?) šâ ūh-guru; 37 : 16, H C SHE GUR šâ ūh-bi-ram, i.e., l. 20, 25, šâ-um-ti . . . šâ ūh-bi-ram; 31 : 16, H i-ši-ta-tu šâ ūh-bi-tam; see also 3 : 5, 18 : 18 | 33 : 15 | 66 : 10.

From these passages it will be evident that ûh-guru 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." Thus "rest in one's favor," if ideographically expressed, is called ÙK.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 epiš nikâši (balances of accounts) the items marked ÙK.KID represent the "assets," a plus, and those called LAL.NI are the "liabilities," a minus. For ÙK.KID or ÙK.KIDS, "assets," amounts still outstanding in one's favor," cf. especially b. E., XIV, 33:2; col. III, Col. 1 gives the "whole amount due," cf. 31 that "which has been received (mûm-rum)" and col. III the "amount still outstanding (ùk.KID)"—hence if we subtract from the "whole amount due" the "item(s) that have been received" we obtain the "ùK.KID," i.e., "which is still due in one's favor, one's assets." For ÙK.KID cf. also b. E., XIV, 41:1 | 92 : 1 | 99 : 40, XIV, 68 : 2 | 141 : 8, and for LAL.NI see b. E., XIV, 65 : 27 | 99 : 40, 12 : 136 : 14 | 114 : 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 ?) ÙK.KID seems to be šâ-um-nu, b. E., XIV, 136:1, 4. Ungnad, O. L. Z., 1907, Sp. 141, by reading TUM.KID (resp. l.-kud) and translating "rest" is only partially correct.

6 E-ki-ir-ri-im-ma, because parallel to a-tab-ba-ak, I propose to derive from "a pur," i.e., ekirrim-na stands for original apkurrim-na, hence "a sides-form (ipkurrim), lûrim for the usual igurum (Delitzsch, H. W. B., p. 690b). The l (for a) is due to the influence of the n, cf. 35:33, šâši-d = Rî'-nu lish-kì(-)nu (for lishku-nu). See p. 125, note 8.

For the eki-ir-ri-im-ku, see above, p. 53, note 1, and for the e (instead of a) cf. uk-te-ir-ri-ib, 23:13; ik-te-di-ir-ku, 39:6; Delitzsch, Gram., p. 85 and below, p. 119, n. 5. A possible derivation from "a pur" (= apkurrim-na) is less probable, and a form ekirrim = akurrim (root akûrû, Delitzsch, H. W. B., 351b) is against context and parallelism.

Shortened form for SHE.GAL.GUSHUR.RA = agurr ("burnt bricks.") Cf. also 22:11, x M + 300 a-agurrim ar-su-mu-ak, and see following note.

What kind of an office this name represents I do not know. Are we to suppose that the scribe misplaced the a(m)etaq. If so, we might read GUSHUR.RA (which has to be connected with SHEG-gumâ AL, cf. note 8) ametaq.GAL meku. Or is it a shortened form of ametaq SHE.GAL.GUSHUR.RA.GAL meku, "chief brickmakers"—the SHEG.GAL 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 *asuppati* (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 me when I shall bring them out.


2 *Ab-ab-la-ar-num* I propose to take as a prs. 1p (circumstantial clause) of "to examine," see Meissner, B. 1, 111, p. 523, and Nagel, B. 1., IV, p. 478. By itself a form V of *patru* (H. W. B., p. 555a) or *patru* would likewise be possible, but with what meaning? Cf., however, Delitzsch, H. W. B., p. 522a, under *patru* IP: *apirri tukukhanka ap-hir-at-fl-ir-ma, "war gebrochen," and see p. 122, note 8. Or should we translate after all, "since the fourth day having loosened (departed from, set free) the *ala* (= term, term, for "to stop to make bricks," cf. modern *patru* = "den Gart el horen," Jensen, K. B. VII, p. 474) I brought," etc.? This latter translation is preferred by Prof. Hilprecht.


4 A IP (= causative) of  *

5 For +NAD *ad=lu* (= *ishlu*), as distinguished from *NAD.KI* (= *umida*), see Jensen, K. B., VII, p. 409, and for *E* +NAD, cf., e.g., H. 1, 65: 9, "the bed-chamber of *Ilush*." A "bed-chamber," because it can be carried, etc., was, of course, not an *E* or *bītu, house," in its commonly accepted sense. Whose "chamber" is meant here, is not said.

6 (T. bI I=za-ab=bu bI ku-er-er, Str., H. 499: 1. For the interchange of *s* and *z* etc., on the one hand "Uzab-Shi-pak (= Uzab-Shi-pak), 55: 2, and on the other "Shin-la-za-[uru], B. E., XV, 188 V: 18; [By]-la-za-[uru, l.e., IV: 29; zw-ša-bi, B. E., XIV, 996: 30, 31, 13, and its plural zi-ba-atl; B. E., XIV, 121: 6; 122: 6 (standing for *siš-te, si-bi-li-ti = šibita, šibiu, see above, p. 6, note); *ga-az-su tur* (Clay's copy gives *ti-ra-nat, B. E., XIV, 158: 5, for *qat = ShU*)-su tur-at, B. E., XIV, 40: 14 (cf. here also l.e., XV, 30: 5, qat "N. tur-at; XV, 40: 45, ša ga-tum tur-ra-tam; XV, 6: 9; 19: 12; 121: 8, ga-zi-za-ar, etc., etc.). I beg to differ from Prof. Clay, who reads M.lIr.RAT (instead of *tur-at*) and regards this to be a profession (see B. E., XIV, 57a; p. 51b). "qat resp. qat-su tur-at evidently means "his portion is returned, has been paid.

7 *I=za-at, ša-zu* (ll. 10, 17), *I=za-u* (21: 16) is the infinitive of *Ištu akk. 15. 19* and *bā* to know.

8 For construction and meaning cf., e.g., H. 1, 476 (bI, *lu-mu* 1Ulu=šuš šu SUGAL be-ša-šu-an-ni ili arki anun-a de-ba a-na e-pašši; and H. 1, 77, Rev. 36, *da-neša a-na-ašši-šu ana 1šam da-ba ana IVašam a-da-nušh dān=bu. Any action undertaken by the Babylonians had to be determined by the *baru* priest with regard to its most propitious time.

9 See above, p. 6, note.
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-usâtim.

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

---

1 Ta-bar-ri, here without the determinative SIG = shipûlû, is a certain kind of "wool" (Delitzsch, H. W., B., p. 701a) or a "garment" (Tellpûšt, Sprache, p. 142). Here, because measured according to ma-na (l. 21), it must be "wool," more particularly "dirty (?) wool."

2 So we have to read according to ll. 29, 31 (not uh-hura-tum). It is here a kind of wool. In Esth., 1 : 6 | 8 : 15, we hear of a certain  ảnh (LXX, βεσσε) and in Isa., 19 : 9, of  ảnh (i.e., forbearing) E.GAL a-na man-da-[at-ti-shi-mu], all of which passages show the idea of "white" (garments) is predominant. Hûruhamat accordingly I propose to explain as "wool that is washed, cleaned, bleached, white" (cf. also Arabic šam, hawaara, "to wash, to white, bleach"), taking it to be a fem. pl. (sc. shipûlû) of hûrûha, and this a reduplicated form of hûr =  ảnh.

3 Cf. also 27 : 28, man-da-at-la ki-i u-qu-tu-û at-ba-li; 35 : 18, garments which a-na amelû (USH.BAR at-bi-ri ki-i man-da-at-ti-shà-û mu-û-da-la); B. E., XV, 298, III : 9, nephar 1 (gur) 6 gîn (i.e., female servants) E.GAL a-na man-da-[at-ti-shi-mu], all of which passages show that manadatta was at this time a certain kind of "stipend," "wages," in the form of "wool," "garments," or "grain," i.e., "food and clothing" for work performed (l. 25).

4 šibikuša e. cce. and ama, "to take something for something," "to make something to be something" (cf. 9 : 21, a-na ši-bu-di-ia; X, aš-ba-la-an), here "to apply something as compensation for."

5 If my emendation be correct—the traces visible speaking decidedly for šaši (ku or ši being out of question)—then šaši-shûlû-a-û may be either (a) the infinitive Hû of 9û, i.e., šawpa'-a = šašpa'-a = šašpa'. 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 Hû of 7û, i.e., šapâ'ina = šašpa'. If this be true, there remain two peculiarities to be explained, viz.: (1) the long ši in šaši and (2) the presence of the ši in bi. For the graphically (not morphologically) long ši, cf. such forms as lu-la-li-ši-[k], 38 : 2, and li-isk-pa-a-ram-[a]-naa, 30 : 23. With regard to the presence of the ši in bi it should be noticed that we may have in Babylonian, resp. Assyrian, an euphonic ši or ū after the first radical in all those forms where this
May my “Lord” send bleached(?) wool! I have no pleasure in my work.

As regards these weavers who are being held prisoners in Pan-Bali (I beg to remind my Lord (that) I have spoken to my “Lord” in Upi (about them) and that I have written three times to my “Lord” about them: my “Lord” may (finally) give orders that they take them away.

II.

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

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

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 már “Ush-bu-la” in causing waters to overwhelm their possessions, ll. 11–17.

(c) The city Mannu-gir-Rammân, 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 Măr-“[...]” for a new gate, ll. 29–31.

(f) **Request that the King may look into the affairs of “Ina-Ē.KUR.GAL,** ll. 32–34.

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

For the personality of the King and of his father Nazi-3nu 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-lī-ia as-mi tu-ul-li-i zēri (= KUL) ishtu (= TA) shame-[e] To my “Lord”—:

Glorious in splendor,
Seed out of Heaven;

2 la ma-īr an-ni gi-rā-di li-ē i-it-pi-sh[i] Not summoning punishment,

Strong, powerful, wise one;

3 nu-ūr aḥē (= SICEHH) mēn-shu PI-in-di-e na-na-a-ri Light of his brothers,

Ordering the dawn;

4 ki-īb kab-tu-li ra-ūsh-ba-nu-ū-li Ruler of mighty and

Terrible lords;

1 Cf. now also the Bit-Ush-bu-la in R. E., Series D, IV, p. 118, col. III, 5, where it is reported that it adjoined a district “which had been given to the ‘Lord of Lands.’”
5 e-pi-ir um-ma-ni pa-ásh-shur ní-shi

Food of the people,
Platter of man;
Hero of his clan,
Whom the triad of gods
Together with Bēlīt
Presented a fief
Tending towards grace
And righteousness—
to my Lord speak, thus saith Kalbu,
thy dust
and thy loving servant.
Behold that one, though I myself have
recommended him to my Lord, that
Etelbu, son of Ushbula,
has ... his ... even up to the city of
Mannu-gir-Rammān
he has ... which I possess. The tenant
of the field of "The Lord of Lands"
[came and spoke thus before my ... ]
"By means of water he has encircled me."
The cities which are with me—be they
inhabited
or be they doomed—and which belong to

1]um-um-ma-a = am(an)amma. Cf. um-ma-a = um-ma and see also ninnuru, 2:10; S:273:17; C.T., IV, 27 (P.329):10. Jensen, K., K., VI, 475, 527, translates anamma by "man, servant." 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 Edīlu ina ma, not "to shut off from water," but edīlu, because a synonym of anāya = "to shut in" (Jensen, K.B., VI, p. 119), has to be translated here "has shut me in, encircled me with or by water." As such it evidently points to the i-na la-mec-a ma-di, I. 20, eko-ku, I. 28, and i-si-su, I. 28. The tenant or inhabitant (notice the singl., instead of the plural!) of the fields of god EN.KUR.KUR (i.e., either Enlil or NIN.UR; for omission of iku before names of gods see p. 8, n. 8), which were situated in the immediate neighborhood of the city Mannu-gir-Rammān, complains of his being encircled by "waters" through the negligence or spite of Edīlu, who failed to keep the canals clean. These "waters" became so fierce that even Mannu-gir-Rammān was surrounded (i-na la-mec-a ma-di). Added to this "the rains and floods," the city's destruction was complete.

2 Root nādu. 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 shā EN.KUR.KUR is parallel to that of l.14—belongs, therefore, to [išu? or cīru?] 16, 16.
"The Lord of Lands" cry out on account of the waters!

Even the city Mannu-gir-Rāmmān 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 Mār-"[. . .]", the governor, when he had come to thy servant, said:

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

And Ina-E.KUR.GAL, thy servant, whom I have recommended
33 ap-ki-du ash-shū2 di-na-[ni]-ia
34 be-li a-na-as li-mur-ma a-li-ti-i2

35 mu-ush-shū-ra-ku3 ba-an-dish li-ta-al-līk
36 û a-na-ku i-tu b[ê-li]-i2 a-na a-la-a-kr
37 a-na sharrī(= LUGAL) ki-i ash-[pu-ra] sharru(= LUGAL) nî i-di-na-an-ni.

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 îtu 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).

Banū-sha-Marduk reports to King Kuri-Galzu about the revolt which has broken out in Bit-û Sin-issahra. About 1390 B.C.

Above (pp. 4ff.) it has been shown that our writer, Banū-sha-Marduk, lived between the 20th year of Kuri-Galzu and the 11th year of Kadašman-Turga, 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 Bit-û Sin-issahra, so named after the head of the royal storehouse (karû) AŠH.TAB.BA.GAN.TUG, situated in Kandurâkī, Sin-issahra, flourished, in all probability, principally during the time of Kuri-Galzu.6 From ll. 19, 20 we may conclude that our writer was a master builder, who, while engaged in building a gate, received news about the revolt in Bit-û Sin-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-û Eulil, 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 šá-mi-i2 (6, 274 : 17, 4) = ash-shū-mi-ia (C, T., VI, 32 (= B. 534) : 4), of the Hammurābī period. From this it follows that dinānu = shunn, i.e., "all that expresses the essence of a being," "the being itself" (cf. nû yû), or, as Delitzsch, H. W. B., p. 224b, gives it, "das Selbst," see also p. 58, note 2.
2 For alûtu sc. akīntu, see H. W. B., p. 41b.
3 I.e., "if I am to leave and thus be out of it forever."
4 Not lâ + tallik but lâ + tallik, V alûku.
5 In view of li-ta-a[llik], "may act (quickly)!" and alkam, "hurry!" etc., we might translate here: "though I have written to my Lord to hasten (sc. the reply to my last letter), yet the King has not adjudged me worthy (sc. of an answer)."
6 In this case i-di-na-an-ni might be derived from i-ta ( = idin-anni), instead of nadûnu.
7 See pp. 79, 81, 110, 116.
(a) Exhortation to rejoice, ll. 6—?
(b) News about the revolt in Bit-\textsuperscript{m} E\textsuperscript{u}Sin-\textsuperscript{d}al\textsuperscript{r}a, upon information received from \textsuperscript{m}E.SAG.IL-zu-\textsuperscript{r}i-\textsuperscript{i}a, 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-\textsuperscript{m}Ki-\textsuperscript{d}in-\textsuperscript{n}i.

1 ardi-ka "Bana (= KAK)-a-sha-\textsuperscript{u}Mar-duk
Thy servant Banâtsha-Marduk;
2 a-na di-na-an be-li-iâ lid-liK
before the presence of my "Lord" may I come!
3 a-na âlu-ki ê šîri (= EDIN) shâ be-li-ia
To the city and the fields of my "Lord"
4 shú-ul-mu
greeting!
5 um-ma-a a-na be-li-iâ-ma
The following to my "Lord":
6 ad-ru\textsuperscript{1} shú-ul-su-uk
Let the palace rejoice
7 û ma(?)-ki-ša\textsuperscript{2} [. . . ]-ma
and the soldiers let . . .
8 ši(?)-pi-[ri\textsuperscript{3} . . . ]
and the ši-pi-ri let . . .
9 um-m[a a-na be-li-i\textsuperscript{t}a-ma
-speaking thus to my "Lord":
10 [. . . ] shâ be-li
. . . which my "Lord"
11 [. . . ]
12 a-[. . . ]-\textsuperscript{m}IM-ra]-im-zâr
. . .
13 [. . . ] û-ba-ā[sh-shu?]\textsuperscript{4}
. . .
14 [. . . ]-ù-ma ki-ki-\textsuperscript{t} ši(? or ad?)-[. . . ],
. . .
15 =E.SAG.IL-zu-\textsuperscript{r}i-ia ar[di-ka]
E.SAG.IL-zuri-\textsuperscript{i}a, thy servant,

\textsuperscript{1} For adru cf. Johnson, J. A. O. S., XIX, p. 52, perhaps "enclosure"; Behrens, L. S. S., II, p. 47, note 1, "Palast-
gemach."
\textsuperscript{2} So is to be connected, not ad-ru-shâ te-su-uk (which latter had to be in this case tesik). Shû-te-su-uk, either
infinitive or permissive III of \textsuperscript{m}uš, "to glorify" (Delitzsch's \textsuperscript{m}uš, H. W. B., p. 106b, and \textsuperscript{m}uš, i.e., p. 110b, belong
together).
\textsuperscript{3} Maš(?)-ši-ṣa might stand here for mundahṣiṣu, "soldier."
\textsuperscript{4} Cf. with this the amelši-pi-ri, Delitzsch, H. W. B., p. 590f. A reading e-pi-ri seems to be against the
context.
\textsuperscript{5} Very doubtful. Might be III of \textsuperscript{m}uš, "to seek," or possibly a III of either \textsuperscript{m}uš or \textsuperscript{m}uš.
\textsuperscript{6} The context being mutilated, it is difficult to tell whether to connect [. . . ]-ši(?) ki-ši-\textsuperscript{t} [. . . ] or [. . . ]-ma
ki-ki-\textsuperscript{t} pi(or ad?)-[. . . ].
A letter of Marduk-mushallim, head of the storehouse at Dūr-Enlil, to King Kuri-Galzu. About 1400 B.C.

A certain Marduk-mushallim endorses in B. E., XIV, 154 : 5, the payment of a specified amount of grain (SHE) as ri-ma-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 which the name of Marduk-mushallim occupies on this tablet makes it certain that he was the head of the storehouse at Dūr-Enlil. This tablet is dated simply the "16th year" (l. 7). As only the first four kings (Burna-Buriash to Kadashman-Enlil) 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-lukulli (= KU)-ilu (= AN)-ma, mentioned in ll. 9, 15, I propose to identify with one of the witnesses mentioned

16 shakin( = GAR)ma de( = NE)-mi
shā. Bit-n a śîn( = XXX) is-salih-ru
17 l C ummāni( = SAB)bi-sa: gi-in-na-la?
18 ki-i ig-nu-na sābê( = SAB)mēsh shā
be-lî-ia
19 ši-ta-pi-islû bâbâ a-la-ti-d(?)-ish
20 ib-ta-ta-ak
21 a-na shi-bu-ti-ia = ab Nergal-Bâni
22 lu-za-na shâ d. Ra-ka-ru
23 ši ba-za-an-na shā Bit-m Ki-di-û-nî
24 aš-ta-ka-an

is reporting about Bit-Sin-issahra (saying):
"100 men killed, while the families were settling down, the soldiers of my Lord."

As regards the gate—I renewed it, it is finished.
Nergal-Bâni,
the prefect of Rakanu,
and the prefect of Bit-Kulinni I have made to be my witnesses.

V.

No. 29 (= C. B. M. III 966).

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

A certain Marduk-mushallim endorses in B. E., XIV, 154 : 5, the payment of a specified amount of grain (SHE) as ri-ma-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 which the name of Marduk-mushallim occupies on this tablet makes it certain that he was the head of the storehouse at Dūr-Enlil. This tablet is dated simply the "16th year" (l. 7). As only the first four kings (Burna-Buriash to Kadashman-Enlil) 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-lukull( = KU)-il( = AN)-ma, mentioned in ll. 9, 15, I propose to identify with one of the witnesses mentioned

1 If shakin dēmi were here a title, its position would have to be before ardi-ka: shakin dēmi ardi-ka. I take it, therefore, as a possessive: "is just now (while I am writing this) reporting about (shā)." Cf. here also p. 52, note 5d.
2 In l. 17, which contains the report, an-na-a has been left out, as is often the case in our letters.
3 To bring out the difference in writing between S1.B₃₅:₄ and S₁.B₄₅ I transcribed as given above. Both (S₁.B₃₅:₄ and S₁.B₄₅:₅) signify, however, at this time very often, if not always, simply "men, workmen" (ummānī), see p. 35, note 1.
4 Gi-in-na-la ki-i ig-nu-na = qinnātu (fem. plur.) ki ipunā (3d plur. fem. of [P]) = qinnātu qīna ki ipunā, i.e., "while the families (employed on the Temple properties) were building a nest," "were settling down." For the signification of qinnu, qinnātu at this time cf., e.g., B. E., XIV, 126 : 7 ; XV, 160 : 29, qinni; B. E., XIV, 111 : 7 qinn-um-āti.
5 Reproved here in the sense of "to kill" (sha de-ak), Delitisch, H. W. B., p. 626a. The singular being employed, became "objects counted (S₁.B₃₅:₄ are such objects) are construed as singulars," see p. 95, note 6.
6 Of patāq (H. W. B., p. 554a; Jensen, K. B., VI, p. 319) here with passive signification: "it is built, finished."
7 See also the position of the name of Innanai in such tablets of "endorsement," Chapter IV, c, p. 86, note 4.
in a document from the 4th year of Kudur-Enlil", B. E., XIV, 11 : 16. Erba-Marduk of l. 4 would, therefore, have to be identified with Erba-Marduk, the son of Sin-nar-matti, B. E., XIV, 19 : 23 (dated in the 13th year of Kuri-Galzu). Taking all these facts into consideration I do not hesitate to see in the be-li of l. 2 and in the LUGAL of l. 6 King Kuri-Galzu, to whom this letter has been addressed. Marduk-mushallim, then, was during the reign of Kuri-Galzu the head of the storehouse at Dūr-{Enlil"}, which place must have been situated at a river, resp. canal, deep and safe enough for the lallā-ships (i.e., "Fracht(?)-schiffe")

The contents of this letter are:

(a) The royal provender will be shipped per lallā-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 μ]Ar-Marduk-mu-[shal-][šim
2 [a-na di-n]a-an be-li-ia lal-līk
3 um-ma-a a]-na be-li-ia-ma
4 [śit-šum GAR.LUGAL] shā = Erba (= SU = Marduk
5 [ardi-ka i]k-shā-da
6 [um-ma-a] akāli (= GAR) sharri (LUGAL) ūmu 16
7 a-na 2mā-lā (= lab)-al-la-a
8 ummānī (= SAB) li-su-ú-ni
9 = A-na-tukulti (= KU)-ilu (= AN)-ma
10 ū = Sukal (= LUGH)-še-mi
11 ū ummānī (= SAB) meš shā a-la-ak-shū-nu
12 šū-up-ra-am-ma
13 li-zu-ú-ma lil-li-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 lallā-ships
by the 16th (of this month).
Ana-tukulti-ilu-ma
and Sukal-shenī
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 l. 6. Very doubtful. Cf., however, the MAGAR.RA of the Hammurabi Letter,
No. 31 : 16, which likewise was put upon the 16th-lā-lāt.
3 For ṣimat (= clipper)-lā-al-la-a see Delitzsch, II. W. B., p. 414a (left untranslated) and King, Letters of Ham-
4 Lit., “of their going” (alik = infinitive), “their following.”
5 Lit., “that they may go out and go (come),”
14 ū unnāni(- SAB)meh u ki-din-ma
    ma-la ša' a-li-kī
15 "A-na-tukulti(- KU)-ilu(- AÑ)-ma
16 a-na pa-ni-shū li-ler-ra-an-ma2
17 ḫa-a ḫa-lī-lish2
18 lik-sh]ū-da4

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

all the men and protégés (clients)
which I have taken.
Let them do it
quickly.

VI.

No. 14 (= C. B. M. 19,769).

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, Bit-[Ki[dl-ni],
be correct, I would refer this letter to the time between the 20th year of Kuri-Galzu
and the 11th of Kadashman-Turgu.5 Our writer was apparently the royal superin-
tendent of the Temple weaveries. Where these weaveries were situated cannot
be made out. Noteworthy in this letter is the statement that one weaver had been
a fugitive for one whole year, until he was brought back from the "house of Kidinni.”
That the Temple employees fled very often from their place of service is well known
from the Temple Archives; cf. e.g., Clay, B. E., XIV, p. 34. But that such a fugitive
employee, when recaptured, would not be punished is new.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 ša apqi; cf. p. 100, note. If one prefers
he may take it in the sense of “as many as are of (= in) the city (= 4li-kī),” see p. 11, note 2.
2 Stands here for latro-ma, be + u of the 3d pers. becomes at this time always li. To “whom” shall he return
the men? To Erba-Marduk?
92 : 24.
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.” ḫikūdū ḫikūdū, so better than singular: “may be, 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.
FROM THE TEMPLE ARCHIVES OF NIPPUR.

(c) The wool just sheared has been removed, ll. 10–12.
(d) The fine wool is all gone, l. 12.
(e) A fugitive weaver has been recaptured and returned by Bit-Kidinni, ll. 13–17.

(f) Only one workman bargained for has been received from Kish,² ll. 18–21.

1 [ardi-ka =X__ a-na di-na-an] Thy servant X.; before the presence
2 [be-ti-ia lu-ul]-l[i-i-ak] of my “Lord” may I come!
3 [a-na GANAM.LU] ù bit [be-ti-ia] To the cattle and the house of my
  shad-ma] “Lord” greeting!
4 [. . .] da[. . .]-ti which they (were to) have given,
5 [sh]i id-[di-]nu-mi my “Lord” may behold,
6 be-ti li-nu-ix they have put up.
7 id-du-.temperature( i ! sign bi)² For the garments
8 i-na bu-ul lubushti( = KU)⁵-i-a do not press me, my “Lord.”
9 be-ti la i-sa-am-qi-an-qi they
10 shkipatu( = SIG)³-i-a shá na-gid(mesh) The wool of the shepherds,
11 nu-la ba-aq-na⁴ as much as has been sheared,
12 it-qu ba-ni-tum² ia-uu they have removed. Good (sc. wool) is
13 amelu-ishparu( = USH.BAR) ishten⁵ not here.
14 shä al-tu ishten shattu( = MU) One weaver,
15 ba-al-qu who was a fugitive
16 al-tu Bit-²Ki-[di-ni] for one year,
17 il-te-qu-ni they have received
18 ishten⁶ amelu li-ib-bu⁶ (out of) Bit-Kidinni.
19 ummāni( = SAB)⁵-i-a ra-ak-su-ú-ti⁵ Only one of
20 al-tu Kish⁵ the stipulated workmen
21 il-te-qu-ni 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, li, see “Names of Professions” under Ha-bi(1)-gal-ba-ti-i. A possible derivation from 2ni (cf. midibä, mindabä) would be less probable and quite peculiar in formation, (1) because of the long û (but cf. p. 129, l. 23), (2) because of the i in bi (standing for bû). The object which was “put up” is unfortunately broken away.
³ I.e., wait a little longer for them.
⁴ For bapimu = bapina, “to cut off,” “to shear,” see now Hinke, B. E., Series D, IV, pp. 263ff., 177. Besides the passages quoted there cf. also B. E., XIV, 128 : 1, SIG⁶-i-a ba-qu-uu, and I.e., 42: 12, isbe-qu-uu (said of akīlu, shikaru, and mi-ê-esh-tum, hence here at least it cannot mean “to cut off” or “to shear”). See also a-ba-qu-an-uu, 2 : 10.
⁵ For ba-ni-tum (sc. shipdtu), form. of barna (syn. of chanap), in the sense of “good,” “nice,” “fine,” etc., see Jensen, K. B., VI, p. 112.
⁷ I.e. here the dup-pi ri-ki-lish(1)-ti šd “In-na-am-na-an-an-an-imel(i) i-biNOT mere K.A.ZID,DA in-ku-su (B. E., XIV, 42: 1), i.e., “the (tablet of) stipulations upon which I. has agreed with the R. and K.”
VII.

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 Dûr (resp. Bit)-Errish-apal-iddina, 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, was yet a resident of Nippur, cf. B. E., XV, 115 : 5 | 135 : 6, Bit—\textsuperscript{a}In-na-an-ni\textsuperscript{b} Nippur (= En-lil)\textsuperscript{c}. We also saw that during the reign of Kuri-Galzu, i.e., at the time when \textsuperscript{a}In-na-an-ni was bursar-in-chief, \textsuperscript{m}Sin-issab\textsuperscript{d}ra was the head of the royal or Palace storehouse (karû), named \textsuperscript{a}ASH.TAB.BA. GAN.TUG\textsuperscript{e}. 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-issab\textsuperscript{f}ra the “wages for certain persons,” or from B. E., XV, 50, where he (Sin-issab\textsuperscript{g}ra) 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 \textsuperscript{m}PA.KU-na-lik-AN\textsuperscript{h} receives in \textsuperscript{a}Karû \textsuperscript{a}ASH.TAB.BA.GAN.TUG a certain amount of grain as horse-feed from (ina qât) \textsuperscript{a}In-\textsuperscript{a}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 \textit{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.” Innanni seems to have been a rather slow and stingy official; the only way to make him live up to his obligations was by threatening him (cf. ll. 12 and 27ff. and 85 : 5).

The contents of this letter are:

(a) Complaint over Innanni’s negligence, ll. 3, 4.

(b) Request to urge the workmen not to leave the city, ll. 5–7.

1 See above, p. 2, note 13.
2 See Chapter IV, c, pp. 79; 81; cf. p. 116.
3 If the term \textit{a}pa of No. 56 : 19 is to be taken in its literal sense, Innanni would be a brother of E-mi-da-\textit{m}aMarduk, 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 + ann — an — am — a? If so, this would explain the exalted position of Innanni, i.e., Innanni would have been a brother of the \textit{beli} of No. 21.
(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 Shelibī only in the "presence of the city."
ll. 15–18.

(g) Thirteen oxen are missing, ll. 19–21.
(h) Pay the barley to Sin-apal-ērīsh, ll. 22, 23.
(i) Hurry up and pay the seed-corn to "the city," ll. 24–26.
(k) Complaint coupled with two threats in the form of accusations, ll. 27–37.

This letter reads:

1 [a-na = ] In-na-an-ni ki-bé-ma
2 um-ma = dāErrish(t)( = NIN.IB)-apal ( = TUR.USH) -iddina ( = SE)
3 am-ma-a am-mi-mi ash-pu-a-r[a-ak-ku]
4 la ta-al-li-śi-m[a?]?
5 um-ma-a ummâni( = SAB) hr-a an- nuti[?]
6 ša ash-pu-ra ak-ku tu-sh[e-ir-shū] -nu-ti-
7 ālu-ki la mu-ush-shū-n[u]r
8 ša 5 an=RIQ memesh ša Nippur ( = EN.LIL)[?]
9 ku-ri-ib-shū-nu-ti-i-maš ša [um-
10 il-li Ni-ib-bu-rī-i nam-s[a-a]r-ta
11 šu-um-bi-ir-shū-nu-ti"
12 shum-ma an-ni-qa  a-tu-ud-te-hi-ni-ir-shā-ns-nu-tu-
13  a-tu-ud-te-hi-ni-ir-shā-ns-nu-tu-
14 2 GUR SHE.BAR a-na Mār-Ta-ad-du i-di-in
15 shā2 amē4 RIQ 1i3 Sē-li-bī2
16 9 a-mi-lu-su-su a-na pi-i a-mi-lu-
17 it-ta i-ti
18 SHE.BAR id-na-ash-shū-[?]
19 ar-di i-na bu-[? . . . . ]
20 4 al-pu shā i-na 4u[ . . . . ]
21 13 al-pu 4a-4-nu 10 [ . . . . ] 4a-4-nu
22 SHE.BAR a-na = in4 Sin( = XXX)-
23 mu-du-ud-ma i-din-ma li-ish-shā-a
24 4 al-ta ha-nu-ut-ta
25 al-ka-am-ma SHE.ZER
26 a-na 4u-4-kē 4i-4-din
27 4 SHE.BAR 10 GUR GISH.BAR
28 GAL shā in1 Ib-ni-14 = 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 Shelībī—
"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-
črisī
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 Ibnī-Mar-
duk—

The translation of 115. 156. depends upon whether we read, 1. 18, id-na-ash-shā or id-na-ash-shā-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 (= idnēashkanna, amēlti-shā-nu)" or "as regards the RIQ . . . so give him (idmēshkanna) with regard to his nine men (or for his nine men) . . . upon the demand of his representatives (amēlti-shu)."

The "city" in which Errish-apal-iddina was stationed, i.e., "Bit-Errish-apal-iddina".
From the Temple Archives of Nippur.
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28 na-da-na aq-ba-ak-kü
29 am-mi-ni la ta-di-in
30 šu-ū it-ti-ia to-bī
ti
31 1 a-shi-im-ma" it-tī-ka
32 1 1-la-ba-ub
33 um-na-a³ SUM.SAR² ù SUM.EL.
SAR² KAR²
34 a-na a-kā-li iā-a-nu
35 um-na-a³ a-na Māt-Ta-a-du
36 i-na li-bi² (= SHAG) SHE.BAR al-
lu-ī-a lu-shē-ir²
37 na-ša-sa¹ aq-ba-ash-shū

"I have told thee to pay it,
why hast thou not paid it?
He is angry with me.
It will not be my fault, if he does not
accuse thee, saying:
'No onions and garlic(?)
are there to eat,'
or: 'thou hast given to Mār-Tādu
an order on my barley.'"

I told him to depart (= "to keep quiet")?

VIII.

No. 84 (= C. B. M. 3258). (Cf. photographic reproduction, Pt. 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 Permansive of 225.
2 Lit., "I shall not obtain it; I shall not cause it; it will not be my fault." The sense is: Do not blame me if
he (Ibn-Marduk) accuses thee (Innanni), etc., but I would not be surprised at all if he does accuse thee.
3 It is here "against"; cf. ḫubbi liummu diškuru itti, No. 75: 6, p. 435.
4 Um-ma-a ... um-ma-a introduces the twofold possible accusation with which Ibn-Marduk may, and Errish-
apal-iddina does, threaten Innanni, viz., an accusation of neglect and one of fraud. It seems that Errish-apal-iddina
had to threaten Innanni continually in order to make him live up to his agreements (cf. l. 13). The first accusation
with which Errish-apal-iddina threatens Innanni is this: If thou dost not give to Ibn-Marduk the SHE.BAR he will
accuse thee of neglect by saying there are "no onions, etc., to eat!" This shows that SHUM.SHAR, etc., belong to,
and form part of, SHE.BAR; hence "barley" at this signification everything that belongs to the sustenance, food,
of the people, cf. our "bread." See also p. 112, note 2.
5 For SUM.SAR = ḫāmu, "onions," see H. W. B., p. 647.
6 SUM.EL.SAR probably = "garlic!" Cf. also Meissner, Idolonommen, Nos. 2670—2672. Or is EL here = ḫUL?
If so, then cf. āqinša = ḫUL (= 1-ku-ash).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 Ibn-Marduk will say: "Thou hast
not only withheld from me what belongs to me, but hast even given an order on my barley to Mār-Tādu, 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.
15
(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 G.A.R.RASH KU, ll. 17–19.

1 a-na "In-na-ana-ni ki-bé-ma
2 um-ma = ššErieš(li)(= MASH)-apal-(TURUSH)-iddina(= SE)\(^{\text{a}}\)
3 šš\(^{\text{b}}\)shamashshammu(= GISH.NI) shá
la-za-ana-na-ar
4 ta-ša-ud-ša-ar
5 at-la ma-a-sha-ma  šš\(^{\text{c}}\)shamashshammu
( = GISH.NI)
6 li-šš-hu-tu-ša-ma
7 shammu(= NI.GISH) a-na E\(^{\text{abn}}\)DUB\(^{\text{a}}\)
li-shš-reš-li
8 iš at-la šš\(^{\text{d}}\)shamashshammu(= GISH, NI)-ka
9 šš-hu-ut-ma shamnu(= NI.GISH)
10 a-na E\(^{\text{abn}}\)DUB šš-reš-li
11 iš di-im SHE.BAR\(^{\text{a}}\)

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-na, because construed with the plural (li-šš-hu-tu-ša-ma, li-shš-reš-li), has here the signification "all those who.
2 The root of li-šš-hu-tu-ša-ma has to be, on account of the writing šš-hu-ut-ma (ll. 9, 11), ššhu. It having here an object, must show an a in the present, hence šahitu, šiḫat (prat.), šaḫat (pres.), šaḫat (imperf.). Both Delitzsch, H. W. B., p. 561 (wrongly ššhu), and Muss-Arnoldt, p. 573, leave this verb untranslated. The action of šahitu shall be applied to the šš\(^{\text{b}}\)GISH.NI; the result of this is NI.GISH, which shall be brought into the E\(^{\text{abn}}\)DUB. From this it follows that šahitu means something like "to press," "to squeeze out," by chopping up the šš\(^{\text{b}}\)GISH.NI (hence šahitu parallel to šaḫḫur, "klein machen," see H. W. B., i.e.), and as such the same as the German "kelteln." "The oil of the wood," i.e., the NI.GISH or shamnu, is, therefore, gained by chopping up, pressing, squeezing the šš\(^{\text{b}}\)GISH, 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 šš\(^{\text{b}}\)GISH in šš\(^{\text{b}}\)GISH.NI. Now we understand also what a "ššhu\(^{\text{c}}\)Š̄UR\(^{\text{c}}\) is. From ššhu\(^{\text{d}}\)GESHTIN, ŠUR.\(^{\text{c}}\)a = ma-šš- karşı-aš = "Winkeltier" (!) we know that ŠUR = šahitu; hence a "ššhu\(^{\text{d}}\)Š̄UR\(^{\text{c}}\) is one who presses, squeezes, etc., the NI, i.e., the fat (i.e. out of the milk); in other words he is the "butter-maker"; or if NI in Š̄UR be the same as the NI in NI.GISH, he would become the "sesame oil manufacturer."
3 Cf. pp. 88ff. Whether this E\(^{\text{abn}}\)DUB refers to that of Niqqu or, what is more probable, to that of "Dár-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 (it introduces the apodosis) comply thou to this rule: press, out, etc.
Furthermore Delitzsch, 3, in his "representative." Gar.Rash, representatives must take the "give (him) upon the demand of his representatives 3 jars of Lager-beer." Also the . . . . which is for (?) my make.

IX.

No. 55 (= C. B. M. 3206).

Inbi-Airi, a lady of high rank, demands of Innanni, 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 Ijar," must have been a lady of very high rank, seeing that she dared to write to the bursar-in-chief, Innanni, 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 NIV. AX\textsuperscript{mash}(= 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 Innanni, 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! \textsuperscript{4}Iddina\textsuperscript{2}Nergal is, no doubt, the same as the one mentioned in B. E., XIV,

1 DUK = karpata is, like gar, etc., very often omitted.

2 The writer had first written BI (traces of which are still visible). He erased this and wrote over the partial erasure the sign Û = labiru, intending, by doing so, to put special emphasis upon the "odd." "Old beer" is, of course, "Lager-beer."

3 Here abbreviated from a-na pi-i šiš-pîr-ti, i.e., "upon the written order of."

4 Amdu used here (as at the time of Hammurâbî) in the sense of "a certain one," i.e., a "representative."

5 Gar.Rash KU. Cf. B. E., XV, 44: 6, "z. qu of flour (ZID.D1) as Gar.Rash for our house (È-mu) "Rê-šul (has given or received)?"; similar is i.e., 156: 2. In i.e., 79: 5, we have: akkum È-mu Gar.Rash pl(= NUN)-li-ha. In B. E., XIV, 117a: 3, we hear of 3 qu SHI Gar.Rash. These passages show that KU is not a part of the ideogram. KU, however, cannot be here = kima, "flour"; if it were, it had to stand before Gar.Rash; see p. 123, note 10.

6 Is it possible to take Gar.Rash KU here(1) in the sense of akalli (shd) ana bârêni="Verproviantirung," lit. "food for the journey?" The above-quoted passages are, however, against such a translation.


8 For another letter of Inbi-Airi see No. 86.
LETTERS TO CASSITE KINGS

14:6' (10th year of Kuri-Galzu), who appears there as the brother of “Nu-ri-e-a. For Sin-issahra, the head of the royal storehouse, ĠŠ.T.A.B.B.A.G.A.V.TUG, see pp. 79, 81, 104, 110.

The contents are:
(a) Request for payment of barley to
(b) “The wages for the persons” are to be handed over to Sin-issahra, II. 8, 9.

To Inanna speak,
thus saith Inbi-Airi:

Give to Idin-Nergal

The wages (food) for the persons give to Sin-issahra.

To Dini, the daughter of Abi-ia, give

4 (gur) of barley.

In view of the fact that the amount is invariably stated and not simply referred to as “that (MUmesh = šu'atu) amount,” I see in this MUmesh the same expression as that occurring in DUB MUmesh = DUB šumotti, “Temple record”, in other words, I take MUmesh to stand here for šumotti = “persons,” as mentioned in the “Temple Archives,” where they are generally introduced by the expression MUBLIM. See p. 53, note 9.

1 Notice that this tablet contains in 1. 5 the name: μίμSin(= XXX)-issahra( = MUgIn)".
2 Cf. also the BR, /ilu Sin-issahra in No. 9 : 16.
3 Lit., Do not make enmity towards me, but do as told by him.
4 For Nashu used in connection with the removal of barley, etc., cf., e.g., B. E., XV, 141 : 11, 16 | 100 : 3 | 55 : 3, etc.
5 For lagû, “to remove barley, etc., from (= T1 = šilatu) a place to (another),” cf., e.g., B. E., XX, 197 : 5, 7.
6 For Dini, the daughter of Abi-ia, give

4 (gur) of barley.

X.

Kudurúni, 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.

Kadashman-Turgu reports to King Kadashman-Turgu about the administration of certain affairs incumbent on his office. About 1360 B.C.
The writer of this and the following letters (Nos. 27, 28), "Ku-du-ra-nu, was a contemporary of Kishakhbut. If so, then Erba-Marduk of No. 27: 27, 30, 32 is, no doubt, identical with the sukalmahha of No. 35 : 28. Taking all other passages into consideration I propose to identify our writer with "Ku-du-ra-nil, the son of "U-bor-rī (see below, p. 126). "Ku-du-ra-nil, being stationed, in the 12th year of Kadashman-Turgu, at Pī-nārī3, where a certain "Ta-ki-shū receives grain (SHE) from him (ina qāṭ), must have been at that time the head of the storehouse at Pī-nārī3. In the same capacity he is mentioned among certain storehouse officials or superintendents who, in the 13th year of Kadashman-Turgu, SHE HAR.RA (lit., "interest grain") to the city Diur-āš-Gula2. We may, therefore, identify the be-li of our letter with King Kadashman-Turgu and assign the letter itself to about 1360 B.C.

The contents of this letter are the following:
(a) A plan as to how to pay barley to certain officials, ll. 3-8.
(b) Concerning fugitives, l. 9.
(c) The "stone eyes" will be taken to the gem-cutter's, ll. 12-14.
(d) The ploughing has been begun two days ago, ll. 15, 16.
(e) The watering tank shall not extend to the King's palace, ll. 17-19.
(f) Wells are few in number and pastures do not exist at all, ll. 19, 20.

1 ardi-ka "Ku-du-ra-nu a-na di-na-an be-li-ia bal-lik
2 a-na ālu-ki ši-rē ulla be-li-ia šú-ul-nu
3 um-ma-a a-na be-li-iaš šú be-li ish-pu-ra
4 um-ma-a SHE.BAR šá diš ḫi-ba-ri-li a diš Kār-āš.Nabā (= AG)

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

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

The following to my "Lord": With regard to what my "Lord" has written saying: "The barley of the city of Hibariti and of Kār-Nabā

---

1 See introduction to No. 35, p. 120.
2 Cf., e.g., "Nār-šāmash (27: 8, here called gh-gol-šum) is mentioned as pa-te-si in the 11th year of Kadashman Turgu (B. E., XIV, 99a : 20). "Da-in-il-la-nu (27: 18) occurs again in the 3rd year of Kadashman-Turgu (B. E., XIV, 91a : 12), etc., etc. Meissner, G. G., 1, February, 1908, pp. 139-143, thinks, because "Dūris-tumur is followed, in the latter passage, by da-mi-lum—tumurı̅̄, that he must have been a "woman." That Dūris instead of SIL, may be placed before the name of a woman is apparent especially from B. E., XV, 155, 19: "30 SIL-mesh," among whom (ll. 1-18, 23-31) are to be found three (B. E., IX, 18, 19) who are determined by Dūris.
3 B. E., XIV, 112: 7.
4 B. E., XIV, 101: 11.
5 In Nos. 27, 28, written likewise by Kudurānu, we have EDIX for gis-ti.
6 Only here without the emphatic -sun, see p. 21, note 3.
LETTERS TO CASSITE KINGS

5 a-na umuRiq ši KAZID(= 

KU).DA i-di-im

6 ki-i ša-šu UMUM-šu a-na u-ma ru-am-rat

1 C SHE.BAR GISHBARGAL.

7 ba-li li-mi-da-um a-na umuRiq

ša KAZID(= KU).DA

8 UI SHE.ZER naks lu-uš-di-im èš-šu mûmmû-ni(= SAŠ)(ba)[...]

9 ša hi-il-qum(?)[...]

[... large break ...]

10[...]

11 a-na mu-ub ba-li-ia [al-te-hi-la]

12 èš-šu-um abum SII[mesh] ša abum[...]

give to the riqqu and KAZID.DA officers—

"so may my 'Lord,' as soon as the city 

UMUM-šu has paid up, (first) set 

aside (the) 100 (qur) of barley, 

GISHBARGAL,

for the riqqu and KAZID.DA officers, 

in order that I may be able to pay 

the seed-corn." As regards the men 

who have fled(?)... 

... 

... 

... 

"to my 'Lord' I have brought."

With regard to the "eyes" of ... stone:

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

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

3 Ki-i ša-šu, i.e., "when it is that," "as source." 

4 Written MUN, but has to be pronounced here, on account of the phonetic complement -uma, UMUM; cf. akan and akanum, "statue," etc. ÆtuUMUM may be translated either by "Wästenstadt" or by "flour (cf. p. 123, note 10) city."

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

6 The use of li-mi-da-um indicates the chief sentence: Emdu c. acc. and ansu, "etwas für jemand festsetzen, bestimmen," "to set aside." 

7 U consecutium.

8 For SHE.ZER = šu-šu, see Meissner, Idkgr., No. 5106.

9 Lit. 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 KAZID.DA, the "Lord" may first of all "set aside" 

the barley (i.e., give orders that the barley be "set aside")—not that of Êbarit and Kür-Yabûl, however, but that of 

ÆtuUMUM!

10 The traces speak rather for mu, ta, ša-šu. 

11 abum SII[mesh], lit. "Augensteine," "pearls(?)." With regard to these "stone eyes of ... stone" Prof. 

Hilprecht writes me under date of July 2, 1908, as follows: 

12 Among the numerous smaller votive objects left by the Cassite kings in Nippur (cf. Hilprecht, R. E., Series D, 

Vol. 1, pp. 335 ff.), two classes are especially well represented in the museums of Constantinople and Philadelphia: (1) 

Lapis lazuli disks, known under the name of ASH-MA abumšu (cf. Hilprecht, O. B. I, Nos. 58, 59, 61, and pp. 49 ff., 

and Meissner, Ideogramme, No. 28). (2) Little plano-convex round or oval objects in polished agate, resembling eyes. 

 Cf. Hilprecht, i.e., Nos. 29, 31, 32, 33, 40, 52, 63, 73, 131, 134, 135. 

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 uniform signs are found on both (135). All the "agate eyes" so far discovered in Nippur by the four expeditions, especially by the second and third, belong exclusively 

to the Cassite period. In Babylon similar "eyes" in agate were found in a jeweler's shop of the Parthian period.
I beg to state that they will be taken (shall take them?) to hli-ahh-i-eriba, the ..... With regard to the ploughing, concerning 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 itá Izgur-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 Nebuchadnezzar II, and according to the story of the Arabs, corroborated by the inscription (running in minute but very clear characters along the outer edge of the pupil), came from the ruins of Babylon. This inscription reads: 4Nebukadnesar-asur shab Bibli, apil 4Nabukapal-asur, ana 4Marduk, hli-sha išáš什 "N., king of Babylon, son of N., 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 of ..... stone' mentioned in the above passage as objects in the shape of eyes cut out of a certain stone, the name of which is unfortunately broken away, but which according to the results of the excavations in all probability was 'agate.' " Cf. in this connection the 'eye of God' which sees everything!

1 In view of ʾi-li-ik-qua-a (l. 14) one might be inclined to read here ʾI-li-ahh-i-erib-a[....]-ma, but this would give no satisfactory sense.

2 We would here the title or the "name of the profession" of hli-ahh-i-eriba: "goldsmith," "gem-cutter," etc. The traces, however, do not fit for zakfin or gadinu.

3 By translating as given above, I take ʾi-li-ik-qua-a to be a 3ds pers. fem. plur. IV: ʾihlipš - ʾihlipš, referring back to ʾabbaš[HIÍ]eshu, a fem. plural (abba is mas., but more frequently fem.). Cf. pp. 131, note; 141, note 2.

4 The signification of ṣha-basi is very doubtful. I would like to take it as an infinitive of ṣa-basi, for which see Jensen, K. R., VI, pp. 383, 511, who assigns to this verb the significations "anu, auskären, dachsteinrücken, aufwenden." The last signification is used not only of the "dust," but also of the "ground," i.e., "to plough;" ʾE ki-ri-bi = ʾa-qa-ri-bi -a for a on account of the gutturals p, cf. p. 97, n. 7. Qarba c. ana here "to go at something," just as "a man goes at his enemy.""

5 Reading, form, and signification doubtful. The ṣhā-ki-li must be something that is "put up" (šā-ak-nu), a kind of building. It must be long, for "it shall not go to the house of the Lord." If ṣhā-ki-li be a formation like šagšā (root š[a]ša, II. B., p. 696a) its root might be either š[a]ša or š[a]ša. Have we to see, therefore, in ṣhā-ki-li a side form of šaga, "Tränke," Deltachich, H. W., B., p. 685? Šagšā might be a ša²/i form.

6 In view of shā-ki-li, "watering tank," I am inclined to see in ku-bar-ra the same word as qubān, a synonym of shattātu, which latter Deltachich, H. W., B., p. 697, translates by "Loch," and Jensen, K. R., VI, p. 416, by "Grube," "Folggrube." Seeing, however, that shattātu is the same as šā-šat-tu, and that the latter has the inscription a (ba-ra), which also stands for bāra, "well," I take ku-bar-ra = qubān in the sense of "well."
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receiving PAD or "wages." In the 14th year of the same ruler (month Tishri) he is stationed as riqqu in Kl-"Gu-irki, receiving "KU.QAR wages" from Enil-mukin-apal. Two months later (Kislev) we meet him in the same capacity, but in the city Du-un-ni-a-hi\textsuperscript{b},\textsuperscript{c} receiving some more "KU.QAR wages" from Enil-mukin-apal. In the 15th year of Nazi-Maruttash he is still in Du-un-ni-a-hi\textsuperscript{b}, where "KU.QAR wages" are "furnished" by him to Apil-\textsuperscript{d}Rammān who is to transport them by ship to Nippur. While living in Kur (or Tar)-ri-t\textsuperscript{e} he appears, during the 14th and 15th year of Kadashman-Turgu,\textsuperscript{f} again as a "payer of wages." Finally in the 15th year (of Kadashman-Turgu)\textsuperscript{g} we find him in Dūr-\textsuperscript{h}Nusku\textsuperscript{i}, apparently as a superintendent (itū) of the Temple's storehouse, receiving (mi-tah-hurum) grain (SHE) from (i-na qūt) various persons. While in Dūr-\textsuperscript{h}Nusku\textsuperscript{i} Kishalḥuθ,

\textsuperscript{1} For amiṣu = miṣu, "to be small, to be few in number (opp. ma'du)," see Jensen, K. B., VP, p. 543.
\textsuperscript{2} As the last paragraph of this letter is apparently concerned with "watering tanks," "wells"—things absolutely necessary for the pasturing of herds—1 see in mu-ru-ku a naššal-form of \textsuperscript{3} P\textsuperscript{3} S\textsuperscript{3}, i.e., ma'arqa = ma'arqa = nīrqa, "a place of green things," "a pasture."
\textsuperscript{3} For the different writings of this name see Chapter I, p. 7, note 6.
\textsuperscript{4} B. E., XIV, 108 : 8.
\textsuperscript{5} This Kadarmi is, no doubt, the same as the one mentioned in our letter, II. 27, 31, and who appears as the writer of Nos. 26-28. For further details see introduction to No. 26, pp. 117f.
\textsuperscript{6} B. E., XIV, 57 : 12.
\textsuperscript{7} B. E., XIV, 60 : 4.
\textsuperscript{8} B. E., XIV, 62 : 17.
\textsuperscript{9} B. E., XIV, 65 : 6.
\textsuperscript{10} B. E., XIV, 111 : 6.
\textsuperscript{11} B. E., XV : 18 : 2. Thus I would supply the date, seeing that Kishalḥuθ has attained at this time apparently his highest position; this date must, therefore, be the latest.
\textsuperscript{12} This city must have had a "palace" (É.GAL), an É.A-nu and a bāb A-nu-unu, et. 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-Maruttash to the 15th of Kadashman-Turgu), and supposing him to have been twenty years old when first mentioned, he would have been about fifty-one years when he wrote this letter. If our deductions be correct, the be-lī of l. 1 must have been King Kadashman-Turgu.

*Erba-Marduk,*

"the servant" and *sukkalmahḫu* of the king (l. 17, 26), I propose to identify with the one known from B. E., XIV, 19 : 23, as "the son of Sin-nūr-māti." 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 *sukkalmahḫu*. Need we wonder that *Kishahbut* should have been somewhat irritated about the slowness of this old and venerable official?

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

(a) Report about a successful completion of building operations, ll. 6–9.
(b) Fifty-five out of seventy *gur* of *kasîa* 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 *Dur-*₂楠šu₆) need "strengthening" (?), ll. 15, 16.
(e) The garments have not been paid to the weavers and fullers, ll. 17–19.
(f) Digression: Twofold complaint, ll. 20–24.
(g) Renewed request that adobes be ordered to be made, ll. 25–29.
(h) The sesame oil of the King has been sent, the *shatammu* must now store it, ll. 30–33.

1 *ardi-ka Ki-shah-bu-u[t]*  
2 *a-na di-na-aa bē-li-ia lu[l]-lik*  
3 *a-na bit be-li-ia shū-ų[l-mu]*  

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

---

1 Cf. here above, pp. 7, note 1 ; 14, note 7 ; 23, 107.
2 Clay, B. E., XIV, p. 13r, quotes two passages where this *Erba-Marduk* is supposed to have been mentioned, but the second passage (27 : 14) is wrong. Under Sin-nūr-māti only one passage is quoted.
3 Cf. ll. 25ff., and see already above, Chapter III, pp. 41ff.
4 Or complaint about *Erba-Marduk* in not sending the garments for the weavers and fullers, see notes to ll. 17f.
Since the day I began, I have covered one building with (flower) ornamentations.

And the farther (away) building which my "Lord" has examined and whose front side he has commanded to tear down

I have, after I had examined it, torn it down to improve its ensemble.
And with regard to the 70 (gur) of my "Lord's" kasia—

they informed (me) that they have paid out 55 (gur) of kasia."

As regards the wool—"in Nippur"

I have spoken to my 'Lord' about it."

As regards the palace, the "Temple of God" and the "gate of God"—

"... one with the other."

And as regards the garments which thy servant Erba-Marduk

---

1. "They," i.e., the storehouse officials whom I asked about the kasia.

2. Lit., "they have taken (i.e., for me and the household) 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 i.e. be ša či-eš ci e-nu, B. E., XV, 159:2; 3:6, and elsewhere, Be-li, on the other hand, is either the nominative or vocative and has to be rendered "my Lord" or "my Lord.

3. For SIG = shipitu, see Zabara, B. A., I, p. 194. Wool is weighed according to ma-na, see, e.g., 27:31; B. E., XV, 6:11:1.1. For the different kinds of wool at this time cf., e.g., 41:90; 23:190; 44:42:38:15; IV, B. E., XIV, 94:1:98a, Rev., ed., XIV, 1:1, etc.

4. See Chapter IV, p. 74.

5. Traces of -nu are clearly visible. See also p. 80.


7. Handly KU, i.e., ZID or ZID.DA = qimû or better ki-inu, "flour," see Delitzsch, H. W., B., p. 327, also No. 14:5. If so, then compare B. E., XV, 181, where the following "kinds of flour" are mentioned: KU.DA ri-da (1.3), cf. B. E., XIV, 117a:6 and our No. 57:14 (here without KU); KU nu-^-at(d)-gum (1.1), cf. No. 57:18; B. E., XIV, 106:2; H. W., B., p. 438a; KU pa-ki-du (1.5), cf. B. E., 117a:2; KUGIG (1.6). The last is most generally found without the determinative KU as, e.g., in XIV, 18:2:24:2; XV, 10:2:23:3, etc. For GIH = ki-šib-a, see Delitzsch, H. W., B., p. 317c; Jensen, K. B., VP, p. 185f. With GIG, resp. GIG.B1(=GIR.B1.2), cf. also GIG.GIG.B1 in B. E., XV, 46:12:117:1. Hilprecht, class lecture on B. E., IX, read (1898) GIG.GIG = [gūduš] and translated "spelt?"; KU ki-bi-šu (1.7), cf. Hebrew 337, KU ki-ši-šu-tu (1.8), cf. B. E., XIV, 117a:5. Besides these I noted also the following: KU.KU.MUN, B. E., XIV, 19:16:161:4; 7; XIV, 23:1:65:13; also written KU.DA, MUX, i.e., XV, 61:7, or only MUX, i.e., XV, 16:8:41:20, 22, 35:169:3:181:9, which shows that MUX at this time was a certain kind of flour (not salt); KU A-ŠIḪ.AN.NI, i.e., XV, 140:1, or only A-ŠIḪ.AN.NI, our No. 37:8;
18 a-na ܡܕܒܥšparr(= USH.BAR) ȗ
ka-ši-rî
19 ki-i ma-na-âl-li-shű-nu2 ȗḑ-di-nu3
20 a-shar4 ȗ-kul-lan4 ma-a-ma4 ul
im(?)-ma-ḫu-ar
21 um-ša-ar4 ½ šiqlu(=TU)-maš hûrâ šî
 (= AZAG.GI)
22 ul ub-ba-lum
23 um-ša-ar4 a-na biti ki-i a-ḫu-mi-
[iš]
24 ȗ têm(?)-ta-shû-abîr ȗ libûtu(= SIEG)10
ȗ tài-a2-mi

was to have been given to the weavers and
fullers
as their due (I beg to state that)
whenever 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!

KU UD, i.e., XV, 110 : 2; KU mi-im-ap, i.e., XV, 110 : 3; XIV, 117a : 4; KU USH, i.e., XV, 110 : 4; KUD.A GISH.
BAR SIEG, i.e., XV, 110 : 5; KU arki-i (“rickstaniced?” Meissner”), i.e., XV, 110 : 20; ki-šu, i.e., XV, 59 : 20 111 : 4,
5 not to be identified with ki ŠU (= Sham) between two proper names, for which see p. 6, note); ki-šu HARR.B1,
i.e., XV, 115 : 7. KU QAR, for which see Clay, B. E., XIV, p. 28, note to No. 8 : 4, does probably not belong here.
Are also the gi-ki-rum, SIEG GARBASIS of B. E., XIV, 117a, II, 3, to be referred to here? With KU5.20 cf. 109, 1, 8.

1 For kûša = qāša = “filler,” see Meissner, W. U. A., 6, IX (1904), p. 52.
2 See p. 99, n. 3.
3 The translation of the 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 given)”—answer l. 206, 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 i-ga-šab-ba-â, i.e., (I will give it) “wherever he
shall say.”
5 U-kul-lum by itself might be taken either as a IP of 572 (i.e., akabbage, cf. ša-ša-âl, Hamm. L., 37 : 6; 111 ašti,
Jensen, K. B., VI, p. 336), “to hit up” (synonym of ṣasā), used not only of “the head” but also of “the eyes,”
i.e., “to see”; cf. kal-šā shinnum, II, 27 : 49 and cf. J. Or, if one prefers, he might see in akuliam a IP of 572
(i.e., akabbage) with the signification of “to shut up,” “to keep,” etc.. ṣa, “in something,” cf. C. T., II, 19 (18 : 290) : 1,
kuša-šum, “I am shut up, kept (in the house of the aburukku);” B. E., XIV, 135 : 3, šu ni-ši-li . . . ik-lu-šu-nu. If
taken in the latter sense, l. 20 might be translated: “where they keep them (sc. the garments) none have been received.”

4 Here “neuter” as in S. 273 : 22, akabbage (= GAR) ma-a-ma an-a a-ki-li-â, “something to eat;” G. T.,
809 : 8, a-na ma-a-ma(?)-ma, “for anything,” i.e., “at all events,” ṣuša ša-ša-šu-lam. See also Delitzsch, Gram., p. 112.
5 Introduces here the direct speech of the implied complaint of l. 20.
6 Stands here for A.AN, “viz.” For the signification of A.AN behind numerals see now Hilprecht, B. E., XXV,
p. 22, note 2, and cf. on No. 33a : 13, p. 137.
7 ṣa a-sha-ša-ah, though parallel to ū-ba-ba-lum, is here in the singular on account of the subject “one” implied in
ki-i a-ḫu-mi.
8 See p. 95, n. 4.

11 Besides im-ša-an (so also 11 : 22, 28 : 13 : 15 : 28 : 20 : 31 : 14 : 18) there occur the following variants in these
14 : 8 : 12 : 95 : 11; in-a-an-an, 95 : 18; in-a-an-an-an, B. E., XIV, 8 : 8. For the šši (= ša-na) cf. now Hinke,
B. E., Series D, IV, p. 282a. For this and the following lines cf. pp. 44f.
25 ashtra-ana-ku i-tu be-li-ia
26  al-li(?)-ka a-na = Erba-Marduk
27 shu-pu-ur-ma a-na = Ku-du-ra-ni
28 [li]-ish-pu-ur-ma surkalmahhu (= PAP.LUGI.MAGH) li-i[q-bi]
29 turbatta (= SHEG)messi li-il-bi-nu
30 ashtra-shum shamnu (= NI.GISH) šá be-li-ia na-shu-[ma?]
31 it-ta-na-su a-na = Ku-du-ra-[a-ni]
32 [ardi]-ka ki-i aq-bu-ia um-ma-a
shamnu (= NI.GISH) i-na qâti-ia
[i-din]
33 be-li-ana shatummi (= SHAG.TAM)
li-ish-pu-ra-ma shamnu (= NI.GISH)
shub (= RU)-ta a-ni šu-šu-[ma]

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

"so may the surkalmahhu (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

My "Lord" may now send to the shatummi 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 šá after ʾashtra-shum. And because allika is followed by the imperative shaparum (1.27) we have to supply an umma before a-na "Er-ba-Marduk, making it a direct speech.
3 See Chapter IV, p. 82.
4 From 54 : 6 it is apparent that NI.GISH, "the fat of the tree," i.e., shamnu or "oil," was obtained by "pressing" (baḫānu) the SHEG.NI, i.e., the shamashshumamu or "sesame." NI.GISH is, therefore, at this time the "sesame oil." For other occurrences of NI.GISH in our letters see 13 : 11 | 21 : 32 | 27 : 12, 13, 15 | 35 : 32, 33, and for SHEG.NI cf. 8 | 3 | 65 | 5 | 84 | 3, 5 | B. E., XIV, 136 : 4. Cf. p. 114, note 2.
5 Emendation doubtful, yet probable. For nasāk in connection with the "removal" of goods "from" or "to" certain places cf. among other passages also B. E., XV, 53 : 12, ASH.LXIV.1 . . . ša šá É kown-ak-ki a-na EX.LII.mas-ba-ia; i.e., 55 : 3, KU.D.1 . . . ša ishtu šá (i.e., "which from that of," Clay, i.e., p. 19, No. 11, wrongly "from") ʾillas-si-ni mas-ba-ia; i.e., 100 : 1, SHE šá ishtu EX.LII.ni-sa-a KI.1 (i.e., SHE šá ishtu) ša קבֶּל-קֵיא (ac. mas-ba-ia); i.e., 115 : 25, ASH.LXIV.1 ʾashtra-shum ša . . . a-na kud ša-ba-ni; i.e., 181 : 2, KU.D.1 . . . a-na UUG ki-is-ba-ia, etc., etc. Cf. already p. 116, note 4.
6 This is, it seems to me, the best emendation according to the traces visible. I-na qâti-ia i-din, "give into my hand," is as much as šilimami, "give (unto) me."
7 See Chapter III, p. 35, note 3.
8 Shabta shabtina, e. c., "to put something on a place," "to make a resting place for something," i.e., "to store it." Here (and p. 52, n. 5) shabtina is construed with double ace, the possibility of which appeared to Jensen, K. B., VI, p. 112, doubtful. Notice also the vulgar preterit form (li)-ish-k(i)-nu for (li)-ish-k(u)-nu, due, no doubt, to the influence of n, added by the i of liš, e. c. also p. 97, n. 7. If one prefers, he may see in liškina a Hps of p2, nakkin (cf. asurit of 702) + tu = liškina (for liškina), taking it as a causative of Hps for which see Delitzsch, H. W. B., p. 322a, "etwas aus einem Ort auszuliefern, niederlegen."
XI.

No. 39 (= C. B. M. 3661).

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 Dűr-šum-Enlil. 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 "U-bar-ruin (48 : 7). From this it would follow that both persons by the name of Ubarrum, because closely connected with one and the same city, are in all probability identical. If so, I propose to identify our writer with the father of both Kudurani, B. E., XIV, 112 : 7 (14th year of Kadashman-Turgu) and Zakirum. B. E., XIV, 114 : 17 (15th year of Kadashman-Turgu); in other words, Ubarrum, the writer of Nos. 39 and 40, is the father of Kudurani, the writer of Nos. 26-28. Ubarrum, accordingly, must have lived at least from the 14th resp. 15th year of Kadashman-Turgu (when he appears as the father of the two sons just mentioned) till the 5th resp. 8th year of Kudurri-Enlil (when he is introduced as contemporary of "Na-adzi/Marduk"). 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.

1 Written here Dűr-šum-Enlil, see also p. 9, note 1.
2 Cf. e.g., 48 : 11, "Nar-bal-zi/Marduk = B. E., XIV, 118 : 16; 121 : 11 (8th year of Kudur-Enlil); 18 : 11, "U-bar-ruin = B. E., XIV, 118 : 19; 120 : 7 (5th year of Kudur-Enlil); 18 : 20, "Nar-bal-zi/Marduk = B. E., XIV, 118 : 12. Cf. also 48 : 22, "Bar-bal-li/NIXIB = B. E., XIV, 115 : 3 (here son of "Jal-nibi, 1st year of Kadashman-Enlil). In 12 : 5, 7, "U-bar-ru appears as contemporary of "Na-adzi, 1st year of Kudur-Enlil, which latter is likewise mentioned in B. E., XIV, 118 : 21 (5th year of Kudur-Enlil) as the son of "KUR.GAR.RA. This last passage is, therefore, against the signification "enlil" which Jensen, K. B., XV, pp. 62, 9, 377, assigns to KUR.GAR.RA = kurgarā.
3 I.e., our writer of Nos. 39, 49 and that of 48 : 7.
4 See introduction to No. 26, p. 117.
5 B. E., XIV, 112 : 7 | 114 : 17.
6 Cf. No. 48 : 7 with 1, 8 and with B. E., XIV, 118 : 16 | 121 : 11.
The contents of this letter are the following:

(a) Concerning the fields of Tukulti-É.KUR, ll. 4–6.
(b) Concerning a flooded district, ll. 7–12.
(c) Concerning the condition of the fields with crop belonging to Burrúti, ll. 12–16.
(d) Concerning Dūr-Engur, ll. 17(?)–26.
(e) Ll. 27–39, too fragmentary.

This letter may be read and translated:

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

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

greeting! With regard to the fields of Tukulti-É.KUR concerning which my “Lord” has written (I beg to state that) they have established their boundaries.

And as regards the workmen of the pa-te-si and the [flood?] of waters extending from the canal Tukulti-É.KUR to the plains in the neighborhood

1 ardī-ka = U-bar-rum a-na di-na-an be-t[ka kul-lik]
2 um-m[a-a] a-na be-tia-ma
3 a-na eqlīt (= A.SHA(G)) = û anašqikil erishê (= PA(?).ENGAR) shû be-tia
4 shû-ul-ma i-na bu-ut eqlêt (= A. SHA(G)mesh)
5 shû Tuk(= KU)-kul-ti-É.KURk3,4 shû b[ê-lì]
6 ish-pu-ra i-kte-di-ir-[ru?]
7 û ummâni (=SAB)k3,4 shû pa-te-si, mesh û [la-me-e?]* me-e
8 ish-tum? nîra Tuk(= KU)-kul-ti-É. KURk4
9 a-di û-ga-ri-e* shû ta-mi-ir-ti

1 Doulatbádi, supplied according to l. 4. Might be SHA(G).T.I.M., for which see Chapter III, p. 35, note 3.
2 The P.4 = akil is uncertain. We possibly have to read amēna gishe ENGAR, i.e., “one that tends the watering machine.” For gishe ENGAR, i.e., napi, “Schöpfwerk,” see Hilprecht, B. E., IX, p. 40, note to l. 2, cf. Code 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 =N.la bu-ut = ina mahkki = šûg or šâdhum, see Chapter II, p. 21, note 7.
4 Cf. here 6Tukulti(= KU)šk, É.KUR, father of 6U-ka-ia, B. E., XIV, 48r : 7 (= 6th year of Xâ-zi-Ma-ru-tâsh). As KU has also the value Tukulti, we might transcribe Tukulti(= KU)šk, É.KUR.
5 For the double r cf. Behrens, L. S. S., IV, pp. 47, 1 ; 29, 4 ; 35. As F has also passive signification (Deltzsch, Gram., p. 232) we might translate: “their boundaries are established.”
6 So according to No. 21 : 20 (see p. 50, note 1) ? An emendation [la]-me-e or me-te-iq me-e, Hinke, B. E., Series D, Vol. IV, p. 166, l. 31, is, according to the traces visible, impossible.
7 Notice the wîn ish-tum . . . a-di.
8 For auâra, i.e., “die zur Stadt gehörigen Landereien,” see Meissner, A. P., p. 123.
of the hamri—the district which during a former flood
the waters had seized and devoured (I beg to state that)
they have subdued (sc. the [flood] of
waters of that district). And with regard to the (field with) crop
belonging to Burrūti, which
in the inundated district has become free
(sc. from the waters of the flood, I beg
to state that) nothing is being (has
been) done.

The former waters . . .

And as regards the workmen of my
"Lord," (I beg to say that) the work

. . . . of Dūr-Enlil.

. . . .

1 With ha-am-ri, cf. l, 11; 52 : 19, zir(?) cpl( = A.S.IAG) ha-am-ram; B. E., XIV, 111 : 13, 11, Ifa-am-ribi.
Delitzsch, H. W. B., p. 283e, mentions a hamru without giving a translation. Küchler, Medizin, p. 116, renders
hamāra by "volente." 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 Heb. *סבב, Hab. 3 : 15, Ex. 8 : 19, and suggests a translation "Uberschwemmungsgebiet."

2 Ma-ha-ri-i (a side form of mahri) has a plural ma-ha-ra-ā-tum (1 : 16); from this it follows that muni (1 : 16)
must likewise be a plural.

3 Ip-ti-uu-na, root *Š. The signification "to strengthen, support, protect" (Hilprecht, B. E., IX, p. 35,
ote 7), does not fit here, nor does any signification which Delitzsch, H. W. B., p. 553e, assigns to it. Patānu here
is parallel to șabatu, and, because it follows the latter, expresses the result of the șabatu. Delitzsch, I.c., mentions a șabīn;
"Schlinge," i.e., lit. "a seizer," thus showing again șabānu is a synonym of șabatu. The waters took (șabatu) and
seized (șabānu) the fields during a former flood and, as a result of this, were cast into disorder (cf. Arab, patānu, c. i.,
exeter, šadair); plent, discord, sedition, troubles, etc.). Still better it would be to derive this patānu, with Hilprecht,
from patānu = akēni, "to eat, to devour," Delitzsch, H. W. B., p. 553b, hence patānu, iṣṭin, iṣṭānu!

4 Iz-zī-za ihša-tu-ni is (like īš-ba-tu-uu ipp-ta-na) a īši āni dāir; lit.: "as regards the workmen . . .
they arose, subdued the waters (sc. by leading them back into their dams, cf. 40 : 19)." Iḥša-tu-ni I take as a P of
Ḥṣa, "to subdue," Delitzsch, H. W. B., p. 293e,

5 For ḫar-šu see p. 130, note 6.

6 Za-ku I take as a permissive of 723, "to be or become free of something" (Delitzsch, H. W. B., p. 254a).
Translate: "with regard to . . . which (is situated) in . . . (and which) has become free (sc. from the water of the
flood),"

7 For ḫulla ēpēša see also Behrens, L. S. S., IV, p. 8.

8 Cf. above, note 2.
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23 [.....] lí-ish-pu-á-ra-[am-]na
24-26 [.....]
27 um-na-a a-na be-li-ia i-na [.....]

. . . . may send

Also the following to my "Lord": "In

28-37 [.....]

. . . .

38 shá be-li ish-pu-ra a-na be-li-ia

concerning which my 'Lord' has in-
quired (I beg
to say that) I have sent it to my 'Lord.'"

XIII.

No. 40 (= C, B. M. 5134). (Of photographic reproduction, Pl. X, 24, 25.)

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

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

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

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

The answer to this complaint lodged with King Kudur-Enlil 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" (ḥazannu) of Dúr-Sukal-patra, addressed to the be-li or King
Kudur-Enlil, teaching us that the prefect held Dúr-Sukal-patra as a fief of the crown
(eqšlšmak shá be-li id-di-na, 42 :4, cf. below l. 11, shá i-na libbišeššú ʾu-ma-al-tu-ū), and
that royal officers never mention their titles when writing to their "Lord," but have
to be content with the attribute "servant," ardu.

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

1 Notice here the long ā in bā and cf., e.g., 21 :28, im-qu-â-tu; 40 :12, i-ra-aš-šub (or i-ra-aš-šub?); 38 :2, lu-šu-
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.
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 ardi-ku "U-bar-rum a-na di-aa-anu be-lil-lik]
2 um-ma-a a-na be-lil-ia-a-ma
3 ba-za-aa-an-nu shâ Dûr-Sukal( =
PAP")-pad-râ"(t
4 nam-ga-ra' is-si-[ki-]ir a-di shi-il-ta'
5 ta-ni-ra-tâ shâ har-pi' i-sha-aq-qu-ir"
6 â 20 har-bu' shâ ub-bu-tâ
7 [ish-shâ(?)]-ak-nu â i-di-ik-ku-â

---

2 For the various occurrences and writings see under "Names of Rivers and Canals."
3 Sukiru when used of "canals" means "to shut off, stop up, dam" (opp. pitâ). Cf. is-kî-ir, 10:9; es-si-kî-ir-ma, 3:18; is-si-kî-ir, 31:32; wessi-kî-ir, 12:5. Iškîr = īškîr = īškur (the i in the last syllable on account of the r! see p. 57, note 7 = īškur, a P, so far known only from this passage.
4 Ški-štu here hardly the same as šdttu(= LA.L.SAR), "field" (Hommed, S. L., p. 76 to S', 146), but the fem. of škînî, "two"; as such in opposition to "20", I. 6. For the construction cf. škȋnî āmî and šeloštî āmî, Delitzsch, Gram., p. 333.
5 Tamûritî are the fields situated in the immediate neighborhood and environs of a city, or a flooded, inundated district, cf. No. 30: 9, 11, pp. 127, 128.
6 This writing here proves that har-bu (I. 6; Delitzsch, H. W. B., p. 289a) has to be read harpu. Johns, J. D. D., p. 131, assigns to the word harbu a meaning "waste," or "cropped," that is to say, "stubble" land. Myhrman, Z. A., XVI, p. 176, renders har-bu by "Vermüngung"? In view of the fact that harbu has to be read harpu and that it renders the Sumerian ERBURGID.D1, "the great (long) harvest," and is the same word as the Hebrew פַּרְדָּס, "harvest," the ta-ni-ra-tî šhâ har-pi must be "fields" that are "with crops ready to be harvested." For harbu, cf. 17:33 : 11 : 14, 18, 24:39 : 12 : 68 : 29; har-bu e, numeral, 28 : 21, 22 : 10 : 66 : 60 : 2 : 68 : 5 : 6; har-bi, 8 : 18; har-bi e, numeral, 3 : 21, 37 : 34 : 28, 33, 34 : 65 : 19, 14, 15. See also P, 90 : 9 and Peiser, I.e., p. 7, note.
7 Īsh-ša-aq-qa may be taken either as 3d pers. plur. masc. pres. P: "so that they (= German indefinite 'man') irrigate or can irrigate (= ein Feld tränken, bewässern, Delitzsch, H. W. B., p. 685e, b) only (up to) two fields with crops"; or, which is less probable, iskoppî may be considered a IV = ishšappa, dependent upon har-pî. In this case ta-ni-ra-tî šhâ har-pî 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 har-pî, a plur. masc. Translate: "so that only two fields with crops are watered."
8 Objects counted are construed as, and stand in, the singular. Cf. here note 6 and p. 95, note 6.
9 It-bu-ti here not "Zerstörung durch Insekten," Jensen, K. B., VII, p. 589, but "ein sehr trocken sein," i.e., "to be very dry." Lit., "which exist" (IV šakahum) as "very dry ones." Or have we to read [ish]-ak-nu = Form. P, 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 šaš (i.e., šaš (0), Delitzsch, H. W. B., p. 210b), "to overthrow, cast down, tear down," does not give any sense. We would expect here some such signification as "to perish," but this meaning is not yet established for došli. Delitzsch, H. W. B., p. 528, mentions a root šabna, "darben, mangeln, etc., emberekven:" This would fit very well here, but on account of the writing with d this root could not be šabna, but had to be šabna, i.e., šabna (related with postbiblical šabna, "trouble, distress,"
8 [bec]-ti me-c a-a-ú-té ish-ki-ma
9 [. . . ]-u nam-gar-ra is-ki-ir
10 be-ší lish-pu-ra-am-ma la-mi-ta-ta
11 šá i-na libbi-eššár-a ù-ma-al-lu-ša lish-ki
12 ù ab-ba-la li-shá-ak-li-ma
13 be-ší mi-iya-ra ù e-ri-shá
14 la i-ša-ad-di nam-gar-shá musch-shar
15 ù šá-ú a-na pa-an nam-ga-ri
16 šá be-ší-i-a a-shi-ib mu-ú i-na nam-ga-ri-shu
17 w[a]-a'-du ù šá-ú a-na pa-an
18 nam-ga-ri an-ni-i a-shí-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)
19 $i$-na $n$-$ami$-$ga-ri-shu$\text{(?)}$ $mi$-$ni$-$li$-$ki$-$mu$\text{a}
20 $n$-$am$-$ga$-$ra$ $shu$ $be$-$li$-$ni$-$a$ $li$-$ma$-$shu$-$shu$-$i$-$ri$\text{a}
21 $mi$-$ni$ $n$-$ru$-$tu$ $Hu$-$i$-$pu$-$ash$
22 $\bar{i}$-$nu$ $mi$-$ni$ $n$-$ru$ $Nu$-$la$-$ah$\text{a}
23 $mi$-$ni$ $zi$-$il$-$ti$ $shu$ $be$-$li$-$ni$-$a$
24 $be$-$li$-$a$-$nu$ $GU$.$EN$.$NA$ $shul$-$m$-$nu$ ($= DI$)
   $\text{li}$-$ni$-$bi$-$ni$-$a$
25 $an$-$ma$ $ki$-$si$-$ir$ ($= BU$)-$ti$ $lish$-$pu$-$ru$-$ni$-$im$-$ma$\text{a}
26 $li$-$il$-$di$-$nu$-$ma$ $e$-$ri$-$shu$ $la$ $i$-$ma$-$ad$-$di$.$\text{a}$

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

As regards the waters of the Hu-ipush and the waters of the Xalâh —

waters in which my "Lord" has an interest—

"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 $\ddot{u}$-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 $hazenna$ (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 $hazenna$ 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. E., XIV, p. 7, comparing with it what has been said under $n$-$ru$ Xalâh in "Names of Canals and Rivers," below.
6 See for this title cf. introduction to No. 75, p. 133.
7 Lit., "speak greeting."
9 $Lish$-$pu$-$ru$-$ni$-$im$-$ma$ $li$-$il$-$di$-$nu$-$ma$, $vr$ $\bar{i}$-$ni$ $\text{a}$$-\text{r}$: 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 (ll. 21, 22) be given back, returned, led back into their dams.
10 For $i$-$ma$-$ad$-$di$ = $i$-$ma$-$at$-$hi$, root $\text{7227}$, see Jensen, K. B., VP, pp. 361, 557, "klägen, stöhnen, Wohlklage erheben u. dergl." and cf. 13 : 18, $u$-$ma$-$da$ = $umal$-$ta$. 
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 whenever 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 indigantly 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-nādīnu-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-Marduḵ, 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 lǐse majestī. 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-Marduḵ, to whom the royal summons was issued, is evidently an official of the King, whose functions consisted in citing, resp. arresting, and bringing before the King, for purposes of judgment (dīnu), slanderers or other criminal offenders. From 81 : 6f. we learn that such an official was known by the title GU.EN.NA, i.e., lit. "strength of the Lord," who may or may not have other GU.EN.NA's, i.e., deputy sheriffs, under him, for we read, i.e., ash-shām màṣ-mash Nî-ib-bu-rum šá GU.EN.NA-ka ash-shū-mi-ka im-ta-na-ah-ša-rum um-ma-a a-nu Mār-um-ni-bi a-na di-ni [ . . . . ], i.e., "as regards the Nippurians whom thy[1] sheriff has seized (lit. has received) upon thy command (I beg to state) the following: 'To Mār-Inanibī for the purpose of judgment [he has taken them']" Amel-Marduḵ, exercising here the functions of the GU.EN.NA, has, therefore, to be identified with the Amel-lm-Marduḵ GU.EN.NA En-lîtu[2], B. E.,

1 i.e., "Ahašu-um-Bo-ni, the addressee of the letter, who, therefore, must have been a sheriff-in-chief.
2 See already above, p. 24, note 5.
XIV, 136 : 1. From B. E., XIV, we furthermore learn that Amel-Marduk lived during the 5th and 8th year of Kudur-Enlil, "the beginning of the reign," and the 8th, 9th, and 10th year of Shagarakti-Shuriash. As sheriff (GU.EN.NA) he had, of course, a prison (ki-li, B. E., XIV, 135 : 3), where such persons as 𒈷𒈴Errish(i)-nādin-shum, the slandering, were held (kalā) for judgment; he had to be present (u-kin-nu) when the several scribes made their final reports (ri-hu-a-nu ša DUB. SIIARmesh šá XIV.ANmesh, 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 GU.EN.NA had to give it; he was "the Lord's (EN.NA) strength (GU)," as such acting "for (or in place of) the King," ina mah LUGAL, p. 84, note 9.

Amel-Marduk seems to have advanced to the office of a GU.EN.NA from that of anamēt\textsuperscript{a} SAG.LUGAL. In the latter position he is mentioned during the 6th and 7th year of Shagarakti-Shuriash. I read therefore, B. E., XIV, 132 : 2, "Amel-Marduk anamēt\textsuperscript{a} SAG.LUGAL. In his capacity as SAG.LUGAL he was present (u-kin-nu) at the taking of the inventory of the flocks (mi-nu LIT.GUD à GANAML.LU). This very same tablet mentions also "Ḫa-ni-bi mār Sa-a-ni (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 GU.EN.NA of Nippur, and that the King who addressed this letter to his sheriff was none other than Shagarakti-Shuriash. Our letter has, consequently, to be placed at about 1325 B.C. For documents which are clearly official reports (anamē DUB) of the sheriff Amel-Marduk\textsuperscript{b} to his "Lord," i.e., either to King Kudur-Enlil or to King Shagarakti-Shuriash, see No. 3 (report about the condition of canals, cf. 40 : 24 | 46 : 11); B. E., XIV, 123a : 15 (report about the royal (!) ZI.GA), and B. E., XIV, 137 (report about the liabilities, L.ÍL.NI, of the prefects, lāzanû). Our letter may be transcribed and translated as follows:

\begin{itemize}
  \item[1] B. E., XIV, 118 : 19.
  \item[2] L.c., 123c : 15.
  \item[3] The Amel-Marduk mentioned in the 13th year of Kal[ ... ] , B. E., XIV, 125 : 4, belongs to the reign of Kal[i-Galzu]. This against Clay, i.e.
  \item[4] L.c., 127 : 3.
  \item[5] L.c., 133 : 3, 15.
  \item[7] L.c., 137 : 27.
  \item[8] For other occurrences see 40 : 21 | 45 : 19 | 16 : 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 GU.EN.NA among the gods see my forthcoming volume on "The Religious Texts of the Temple Library."
  \item[9] The šāda-dša-shu-mu after Amel-Marduk in B. E., XV, 171 : 6, which Clay, i.e., p. 266, takes to be a title, is, of course, an Imperat. III of 𒀭𒀭 + šud + m(a).
\end{itemize}
FROM THE TEMPLE ARCHIVES OF NIPPUR.

1 a-na  "Amel-Marduk ki-bi-ma
2 um-ma šarratu (= LUGAL)-ma
3 um-ma-a a-na  "Amel-Marduk
4 = šu Errish(t) (= NIN,IB)-nadin (= SE)-shum (= MU)
5 már = Ap-pa'-na-a-[a?] 
6 šâ da-ba-ab [limnūtim]
7 it-ti = [Ha-ū-[bi it-bu-ab]
8 ù = Dam-qu [mâr . . . ]
9 [šâ 'i]-t-i = šu XXX-[. . . . ]
10 [da-ba]-ab [limnūtim ilbab]
11 ù [. . . . ]
12 [. . . . ] = šu XXX-[érish]
13-17 [. . . . ]
18 [. . . . ] a bu(?) na(?)
19 [. . . . ]-di-in
20 [. . . . ]-da-ku
21 [. . . . ]-et da-ba-bi-shû
22 a-na m[lu]-ia
23 šû-bi-la-ash-shû.

To Amel-Marduk speak,
thus saith the King.
The following to Amel-Marduk:
Errish-nadin-shum,
son of Appanâi,
who has slandered
[Janîbî;
and Damqu, the son of . . .
who has slandered Sin-. . .
and . . .
. . . Sin-. .
. . .
. . .
. . .
. . .
. . .
. . . his slanderer
bring him
before me!

XV.

No. 33rr (= 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 gîrri alûku resp. tēbû), “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)-ili(= AN)-mesh,
"i.e., "NIM.GI is the king of the gods"—a formation parallel to Rammân-shar-ilâ

1 Or "Isîn(= Ezen)-na-a[a]?
(No. 36 : 1; B. E., XIV. 101 : 5 et passim), Marduk-shar-illi (B. E., XIV. 121 : 3), etc. Clay, B. E., XIV, p. 48b, mentions a NIM.GI-ra-bi (i.e., 142 : 5), and in B. E., XV, p. 38a, a NIM.GI-ra-bu (i.e., 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-rabû (i.e., 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 (Ēṭir) 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-set-rum we find among the gods of Esag-il, H. 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 Ēṭir"-Haarbe, "a protector is Haarbe." 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 Haarbe.

The several subject matters of this letter are clearly indicated by the stereotyped repetition of the am-ma-a a-na be-lia-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 fire old chariots shall go out on the expedition as commanded, ll. 12–14.

(c) Suggestion as to how the government 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-shap-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)-
illi (= AN) [mesh] Thy servant NIM.GI-shar-illi;

2 a-na di-na-an be-lia l[u-ul-li]k: before the presence of my "Lord" may I come(!)
Unto the cities and the guards

of my "Lord" greeting!

The following to my "Lord":

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

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

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

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

For a. IT.Sa. beg Pret. a-na be 10, 1.34; 21, my have lu-u the:/,•;».

With the is'?
tdu' V-ma* connect 95, my 15, 8ia By EN.NU.Un Delitzsch, the 8 what This the slid on have and 42; slid on.

In have and 42; slid on.

See '21, i!U p. um-ma-a root In have and 42; slid on.

The translation be-li-ia therefore, is construed in our letter both as fem. and as masc. If this translation be objected to, we would have to render l. 13: "he shall go with the five chariots," etc., referring the "he" to a person well known to the
As regards these cities concerning which my "Lord" (has inquired, saying):

"With what (how) shall they guard the government?"

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

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

Now, the five chariots which I have commanded must be going out to whereasover my 'Lord' shall command, only while they (the cities) guard the fortified camp.
And with regard to the one (chariot with which I was) to smite (the enemy) so that (the) (enemy) may not (again) become fresh, go out, and plunder, the following to my “Lord”:

“My ‘Lord’ may give orders to the sak-shuppar

that he go with two chariots to whereas-over 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 Hit-ti, ac. markabi, is the fem. of edu, “one.”

2 Int. II of 110. Jensen, K. B., VI, pp. 121, 136, 150, 198, zwr., niederschlagen; Delitzsch, H. W. B., p. 74ff. entsprechen, zerstören. Tarnku is used here apparently in the sense of maḫṣu, 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 cunning (as the enemy).”

A reading i-pu-di, from i-ṣu-n, “to destroy” (cf. taplu, “destruction,” Delitzsch, H. W. B., p. 514), though possible, is against the succession of events—we would expect: go out, plunder, destroy! 1-bad-di = i-bad-di from 8šaš, “to sin”; and as each and every sin is a “Vermessensheit (gegen Gott),” I translated as given above. Prof. Hilprecht suggests a translation, “nöge sich nicht freuen (ib-bad-di = i-bad-di, 41111),” d. h., “nöge keine Vergangen darum finden auszurächen,” in anderen Werten, “nöge nicht fröhlich darauf hofft und.” (Personal communication of July 9, 1908.)

For the sak-shup-par see above, Chapter III, p. 37, note 12.

Notice the difference between lakhdūmu, 1. 30 (= 1st person) and lakhaluma, 1. 35 (= 3rd person). Both forms are IV3 of 1112, “to be kept back,” “to be retained.”


As markabi is fem. (p. 137, n. 3), we would expect here bi lā lālik; cf., however, ibid., note 10.

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 birta of II. 31, 36 has, of course, nothing to do with that of I. 233) He leaves it, however, to the King as to whom to send out or to keep behind with the chariots requested.
A letter of Shiriqtum, a Nippurian, sent out by his Lord and King to look after the receipts of wool and provender. About 1400 B.C.

This letter has been translated chiefly on account of its manifold peculiarities: (1) *SUGH*, generally read *Tishhu* and identified either with *NIN.IB* or with *Ishtar*, is here apparently a name for *En-lil*; (2) the strange form *nap-ti* (ll. 4, 6) for *nap-shú-ti(?)*; (3) the unusual stat. constr. in *shikittum (=NIG.G.ÁL)* *nap-ti-ka* (l. 6); (4) the expression *a-na li-li* for single *a-na* (ll. 14, 17); (5) the two new words *a-da-tum* and *il-šu-u*; (6) the long *ū* in *lu-ū-ul-li-ik* (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-tum* and *il-šu-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]" Thy servant *Shiriqtum*; before the presence


3 *(Tishhu)* (= *SUGH*) *a* shar-rat *Tishhu* and the queen of *Nippur*

4 *Nippur* (= *EX.LIL*)[5] may protect the life of my “Lord”;

5 *Errish(t)* (= *NIN.IB*) *u* *NIN.* *Nippur* and *NIN.MAGH* who inhabit the city (i.e., *Nippur*) may protect thy creatures!

6 shá-šu-ki shikittum (= *NIG.G.ÁL*) *nap-ti-ka* Whosoever may see the gracious face of my “Lord”

7 *Ma-an-nu* ma-an-na pa-an

8 be-nu-tum shá be-lišu li-mur

---

1 Notice here the long *ū*, out of *lu-ū-ul-li-ik*. Though this *ū* may be called a graphically long *ū*, it need not be a morphologically long *ū* [for *lu-ū-ul-li-ik* may stand for *lu-ū-al-li-ik*], a form well known from the inscriptions, but not yet found in tablets from the Cassite period, [Hithechti]. But then *ū-al-li-ik* would have to be a P, while in this and all other passages it is evidently a P!

2 For introduction, ll. 3–11, see above, Chapter III, pp. 38ff.
FROM THE TEMPLE ARCHIVES OF NIPPU.

9  ú(?) man-nu da-ba-ba ti'ab( = [H])
10 [a-nu] be-ši-ia li-ii-te-mi
11 [um-ma] a-na a-na be-ši-ia-[ma]

[... large break ...]

12 ...
13 [
14 a-na li-ši be-ši-ia
15 i-ši-qa-a 2 MA₁ šú a-da-tum₁

16 ú 2 il-ha-ú
17 a-na li-ši be-ši-ia
18 il-te-bi-la
19 ú ši-di-tum₂ be-li li-mur

20 12 [SHE].BAR i-na-[šú-ú ki]

21 [ash-pu?]-ra-ka.

and whosoever be of "good words"
may listen to my "Lord!"
The following to my "Lord":

... they say
to my "Lord"

they (he) will take. Two mana of dark-
red(?) wool
and two ilbü

he has sent
to my "Lord."

And as regards the provender, my "Lord"
may be assured

that they shall take away the 12 (qa) of
barley as

I have written thee(?).

1 For tīa cf. King, Letters of Hammurabi, I, p. XLII; see also Behrens, L. S. S., IV, p. 533, 534, 556, who quite correctly recognized that a-na li' (or, as in our letter, a-na li-di) is as much as ana, "zu hin."

2 As the context is mutilated, it is hard to tell whether this is the 3d pers. fem. (or masc.) plural (= ilüši = ilüš = ilüši; for the vowel i, instead of u, see also Behrens, L. S. S., IV, p. 533), or whether this is a singular, parallel to il-te-bi-la (I, 18), the long ä at the end indicating the chief sentence. By itself it might be also a 3d pers. plur. (or sing.) preterit (iüši = iši, see p. 53, note 5), or even a 1₁ = ilüši(ša), see above, p. 119, note 3.

3 MA₁ is here an abbreviation of ma-na (cf. also B. E., XV, 6:11), just as SHU₁ is abbreviated from šu-shü (i.e., nass), cf. B. E., XV, 199:29, 10 | 19:20 | 73:15 | 154:45 | 149:11, etc. See p. 77, note 1.

4 A-da-tum₁ must be something that was measured according to ma-na—a kind of wool? Strange is here the ši between MA₁ and a-da-tum₁, seeing that the "object measured" follows almost invariably directly (i.e., without a ša) upon the "measure." cf. 23:24 | 27:31, etc. The adatu mentioned in Delitzsch, H. W. B., p. 268, and I.E., p. 318, are out of question here. The former means "Wohnstatte," and the latter "corbeille." Thureau-Dangin, Z. J., XVII, 196, 1. We may, however, consider it as standing for adatum, adatum, adatum, adatum (or, shipat), i.e., "dunkelfarbige, dunkelrote, braunrote Wolle" (cf. H 578, Delitzsch, H. W. B., p. 268).

5 If a-da-tum₁ must be one kind, 2 (or ma-na) il-ha-ú might possibly be another kind of wool. The form (išü) is, however, against this supposition, for we would expect a formation like ilüš (fem. on account of shipatu) if this existed. Or have we to suppose a reading like: 2 (shipatu)ii-ha-ú?

6 ši-di-tum, "provender" (Delitzsch, H. W. B., p. 568; Reiser-Out, Provinc), 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. (For here also the ši(ša)?-di(-ša) of B. E., XV, 87:107)

7 Emendation is hardly correct! We would expect ki (ša) ana be-li-ša ashpura.
An unknown writer complains to his "Lord" and King that, though he asked for "pots," "straw" has been sent to him—a mistake showing that even Babylonians could and actually did misread their own signs: $IN^\text{nerkh}$ (= straw) was read instead of $KA.N.MI^\text{nerkh}$ (= 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 $lulup$ 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 $Dâr-Kuri-Galzu$ for one purpose or another, ll. 23-25.

1 [ardî-ka "X . . . .
2 a-na di-[ma-a]n be-li-ia 
3 [lu]-tlik u[ma-a]n be-li-ia-ma 
4 [ish]-shum shî]â [a-ash-pu-ra 
5 [. . . .] be-(?) û GI DUG( = II).GA 
6 [. . . .] a ul-dc-b[i-îa 
7 û² [ar]di-ka "Ahu-ra(?)-ish-shâ(?)
8 GI DUG( = II).GA a-na be-li-ia 
9 ul-dc-bi-la 
10 û i-na bu-ul di-qa-ra-li 
11 a-na ra-dî-i al-a-p[a] 
12 û tinku( = IN^\text{nerkh} be-lî 
13 am-mi² an-na-a â-she-bi-la

Thy servant X . . . . ;
before the presence of my "Lord"
may I come, speaking thus to my "Lord":
[With regard to thy inquiry(?) . . . .]
[whether . . . .] and the good reeds . . . . has brought
(I beg to state that) thy servant $Ahu-\text{ras}ka$
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 = qamû $\phi$ba, good, i.e., sound, reeds that are not rotten.
2 û introduces here the apodosis.
3 Or "1ahu-shâ(?)-ash(?)-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 $KA.N.MI$ for $\text{diqarîl}$. The "order-filler" mistook $KA.N.MI$ for $IN$ and sent, accordingly, "straw."
5 Am-mi = am-mi = $\pi²$ $\phi$. $\phi$ therefore, is an abbreviation for $mim\nu$, "what," Jensen, K. B., VI, p. 472. For another $\phi$ = $\pi² = \pi²$, see p. 121, note 11.
A father's peremptory order to his son to send in his report. About 1400 B.C.

From this letter we learn that the "report" (di-e-ma, l. 5) took its origin with the "son," who had to send it to the be-el SHE.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 SHE.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.4 This would give us the following classification of the various storehouses: (a) sub-station of a branch storehouse (son); (b) branch

1 The sign ha looks here like si in si-it, but a word si-tu-ub does not exist; or is si-tu-ub = su-ta-ub, "dates"? As, however, the things here mentioned are apparently building materials (reed, bronze, hu-lup trees), I prefer to read as given above. If si-tu-ub = su-ta-ub be preferred, we might translate: "Shall I bring the rest of the good dates?"

2 The bi has here the appearance of TUR resp. l. Dubhi is a plural form, expressing quality or occupation. Delitzsch, Gram., p. 168 (§ 65), No. 21. Cf. also the stress laid upon the quality of the G1, II, 5, 8.

3 On account of the bi in lu-shal-li-im, this form cannot be the third (which had to be li-shallim), but must be the first person. But whether it be a P or HP is doubtful. I take it to be a HP, for which see King, Letters of Hammoumi, III, 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-li or EN-(li), but when spoken of to a third person, is referred to as either LUGAL, or beel.

6 Cf. here also the request for such a report in No. 84 : 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 "Enlil!  

Thus saith thy father:  
"Give, be good, and send, as soon as ready, the report to the 'lord of barley' so that I may send my own report to the 'Lord' (i.e., the King)."

XIX.

No. 89 (C. B. M. 19,764).

An official of Dūr-ilu sends a messenger with a note to the King, then at Nippur. Another note, addressed to "NIN-nu-ū-a" of Nippur, could not be delivered by the same messenger, because the addressee had gone on business to Sippar, fifty miles distant. Whereupon the official of Dūr-ilu sent the present explanatory note to Sippar, whence it was brought back by "NIN-nu-ū-a" to Nippur. About 1350 B.C.

For introduction, transcription, translation, and notes, see above, Chapter II, pp. 19–23; 25, note 4; 27, note 8.

1 Pa-nit-wa-ca might be, per se, connected either with i-din, "give thy face," i.e., "set thyself about to do something, arouse thyself, be determined," or with ıl ı-l-ba-ba-la.

1 W. of bibili. With the signification here given cf., besides Delitzsch, H. W. B., p. 1660, also Jensen, K. B., VP, pp. 320, 378, and B. A. III, p. 541, la bibil pātīl, "liebfriedlich, 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 (sr., upon evil)," i.e., "be good," "do not delay." A bibil-bīblī, accordingly, is something towards which one's heart is turned continually, the fondest thought of one's heart.

3 Fr. ı-l-a mu-uk-ki = "to be at a thing," "to be ready."

"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; fl., following pages; l.c., loco citato; p., page; pp., pages; q.v., quod vide; s., son; sl., sister; wr., writer.

Determinatives: ilu, god; mesh, plural; 111., masculine; f., feminine; [ ] = text restored; (....) = interpretation of text; C. B. M., refers to the "Catalogue of the Babylonian and General Semitic Section of the Archaeological 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.

mAmelššMarduk, 1. wr., 3 : 2.
2. addr., 75 : 1 3.

mAmelššMarduk, 1. wr., 3 : 2.
2. addr., 75 : 1 3.

mAmelššMarduk, 1. wr., 3 : 2.
2. addr., 75 : 1 3.

mAmelššMarduk, 1. wr., 3 : 2.
2. addr., 75 : 1 3.

mAmelššMarduk, 1. wr., 3 : 2.
2. addr., 75 : 1 3.

mAmelššMarduk, 1. wr., 3 : 2.
2. addr., 75 : 1 3.

mAmelššMarduk, 1. wr., 3 : 2.
2. addr., 75 : 1 3.

mAmelššMarduk, 1. wr., 3 : 2.
2. addr., 75 : 1 3.

mAmelššMarduk, 1. wr., 3 : 2.
2. addr., 75 : 1 3.

mAmelššMarduk, 1. wr., 3 : 2.
2. addr., 75 : 1 3.

mAmelššMarduk, 1. wr., 3 : 2.
2. addr., 75 : 1 3.

mAmelššMarduk, 1. wr., 3 : 2.
2. addr., 75 : 1 3.

mAmelššMarduk, 1. wr., 3 : 2.
2. addr., 75 : 1 3.

mAmelššMarduk, 1. wr., 3 : 2.
2. addr., 75 : 1 3.

mAmelššMarduk, 1. wr., 3 : 2.
2. addr., 75 : 1 3.

mAmelššMarduk, 1. wr., 3 : 2.
2. addr., 75 : 1 3.

mAmelššMarduk, 1. wr., 3 : 2.
2. addr., 75 : 1 3.
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Masculine Names

_masculine Names_

1. The Ar€(ra-parcean. Cf. B. E., XIV, 22: 15, "ar-hop-ha-an-aa-[um]. In our letter the sign rap looks much very much like LUGAL, cf. also Clay, Sign List, B. E., XIV, Nos. 15x and 89. For the interchange of rap and LUGAL cf. dingirrap-bi-[um-an-ir and dingirlugal-kam-um-ir.

2. Also the following readings might be suggested: _m^1_ "Pi-an-du, _m^2_ "Na-dh-sha-an-du, or _m^3_ "A$-pi-he, resp.

3. On account of the m€(r (not m€\(r\), 50:11, I do not consider this person to be a brother of _m^4_ "PAKU, SHERISH.

SE-an and a son of _m^5_ "Shu-an-nu-an.


5. For _m^6_ "Si-an-an, q.r.

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

7. According to 1. 5 he is a bit p€(a-ti. A pilâ at _m^1_ "En-hi-bi-ni-shu-ku is mentioned in B. E., XIV, 99r: 41.

8. For the reading of _m^2_ "En-er-bi(=p-um, see The Monist, XVII (January, 1907), p. 110ff. Cf. also "Preface."
FROM THE TEMPLE ARCHIVES OF NIPPUK.

Mascutine Names

m’m Ennish(0) = MASH(0)-apal (= TUR.USHI)-addina (= SE)², wr., 81: 2.

m’Ennisk(0) = NIN.IB.GIR, 4:1, 3, 19, 20.

m’tEnnisk(0) = NIN.IB.-aiddina (= SE)-akē (SHESH)-makh, 52: 13.

m’tEnnisk(0) = NIN.IB.-addina ( = SE), s. of m’sAr-ku-ta-[u], 75: 1.

m’tEnnisk(0)-zi-rī-bi-lu, wr., 15: 1 | 16: 2.

m’Es.16.II-zu-ri-im, 9: 15.

m’tEs-ri-su, s. of m’tUsh-ša-ba, 24: 12.

m’tEs-ri-[u], wr., 12: 2.

m’tEs-ri-[u], s. of m’tUsh-ša-ba, 78: 7.

m’tEnnisk(0)-mu-ri, 48: 16.

m’tEnnisk(0)-mu-ri, 58: 6.

m’tEnnisk(0)-mu-ri, 22: 6.

m’tEnnisk(0)-KUR, 3: 48.

m’tEnnisk(0)-Marduk, 1, wr., 19: 4

2, 81: 13 | 83: 27.

1 Probably to be read Ennisk-ga-zi-rī-il, i.e., “Ennisk is the father (qi’pir = addada, Meissner, M. V. I. C. IX (1901), p. 52) of the gods.” Cf. HI H, 57, 55c; d”(Tish-ša b-U). SUGH][dirro (= m’tNIN.IB) shu ram-ku-ri. See also m’tGIR, 48: 20.

2 Probably to be read Ennisk-shakkanak-ili. 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.KISH (= bashkash)-kili.

3 The traces speak rather for bar! Cf. m’tEnnisk-ba-ta-tum!

4 An Amurritish name: “Eš, is my rock!”

5 Here a city named after a person. Cf. m’tEnnisk-ba-ta-tum.

6 AN here in all probability the same as the Casilite Bapust, see pp. 77, note 2; 63, 70.

7 Cf. B. E., XV, p. 32a, HAD-AL-tā[=BE]-la, a Mitanni name.

8 See m’tMU.GHE.GAL.

9 Here a city, see under m’tEnnisk-ba-ta-tum.

10 Cf. m’tEnnisk-šu, father of m’tTukulti( = KU)², 48a: 7, and see below under m’tEnnisk-šu. Or is i = aḫ? See also below.

11 B. E., XIV, 39: 6, 14, m’tNIN.IB-ud-dih-ša-bi.

12 Clay, B. E., XIV, p. 49a, reads MUK.TUK.A = m’tmuRashšā. For the sign ruṣu see Meissner, Ideogramme.

No. 3587.

13 Cf. m’tEnnisk-šu, father of m’tTukulti( = KU)², 48a: 7, and see also m’tEnnisk-šu above.

14 Or here “U-bar”[=BE]? Cf. however, introduction to No. 23 sub “Translations,” p. 94.

15 Or DIN-[i-], q.v.

16 Cf. m’tNIN-un-ša-a and see Chapter II, p. 15, note 5.
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Masculine Names


Mun-ru-ki-in[bro]Sakal (—UGH), s. of [..]shu, 18: 23.


Mar-ru, In-a-[..], 60: 2, 3, 6.

Mar-ru, Bu-ste, 48: 16.


Mar-ru, Mu-[..], 60: 1.


Mar-ru, Sha-[..], 57: 4.

Mar-ru, Ta-ša-du, 83: 14, 35.


Marduk-sha(=SU), 15: 13.

Marduk-[..]ša, 50: 1.

Marduk-ša-[..]ša, 29: 4.

Marduk-ma-šir (= SHESH), 3: 22, 26: 15: 12.

Marduk-[..]-ši-[..], 30: 3.

Marduk-[..]-ša(=MU)-[..]-ša, = AMEš, 93: 7.

1 Notice that we find in this connection generally giš[bro]M.A.I.X.USH, 37: 9. Should we, therefore, read "mu" = 1 or 60? See under pa-te-sā.mesk.


3 Or M.A.I.X.USH, doubtful whether a nom. pr.; it might be an official's title.

4 For a writing a instead of aš, see Chapter I, p. 7, note 6.

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

6 Or UR (= Kalatu), [bro]USH, doubtful whether a nom. pr.; it might be an official's title.

7 The gi-šir for ki, kiš[u], gim shows that itš[bro]M. was pronounced at this time [sic]Ramman, see Chapter III, p. 40.

1 Here this name is that of a city, see [bro]Gir-ru-ga-nil.


9 See under [bro]Ba-an-ša-[bro]Ertēch().

10 Doubtful whether Mār- belongs to the name.

11 A reading Mār-[bro]Sin-ša-kum(=MU)-ipša(=BA-ša) might also be possible.

12 Or [bro]Bar-.

13 Thus I propose to read this name. This, no doubt, is preferable to Mār-at-Tur-ku-du. If the latter reading were adopted the absence of S.A.L. would be without parallel, cf. Mār-at(=TUR,SAL)-ł(?)Ba(? or Usk(?)-ba(? or ka?):[..]).

31: 27. Here the descent is apparently reckoned through the mother.


15 "M. exists." So better than -ni-šu?
FROM THE TEMPLE ARCHIVES OF NIPPU.

149

Masculine Names

mIšdši-Shiapk, 17: 32.
mIšdšišmShu-qi-mū-nu, f. of mIšdšu-ša-z ib-di-li,
59: 14.
mIš-ul, 60: 4.
mIš-ul-tum, wr., 31: 1; 32: 1; 33: 1.
mIš-ru-šu, 78: 1.
mIššu-ša-ša (M), 59: 14.
mIššu-ša-ša, 31: 11; 32: 7.

Nādšu (= M) našši (= GHE.GAL), 59: 14.
Nāšu (or a?)-zišša Marduk, 42: 12; 48: 8.
Nunnari (= SHESH.KI)c, Marduk, 34: 11.
Nū-ti, Eannīl, 24: 25.


NIM.GU-shar (= LUGAL)-ili (= AN) mašša, 33: 1.
mIš NIM.IB, see mIš Eridšu-


mIš NIM-SHAR-līšša-lī-ša-mu, 34: 12.

Nār (= ŠAB) išša Shamash (= UD),
1. anšaš.SAG LUGAL, 1 : 5, 18.
2. gš-gal-lum, 27: 8.


mIš PA.KI, see mIš Nāšu-

mIš Pāšu (= SHH)-AN.LUGAL-ša-mur, wr., "b" of mIš An-ša-
ša, 89: 2.

mIš [. . .], wr., 43: 1.

mIš-a-an-da, 55: 5.

mIš Rumān (= LM) Ur-su (= EXGAR) šš, 48: 11.
[mIš Rumān (= LM) Ur-su (= EXGAR) šš, 9: 12.

mIš Rumān (= LM) Ur-su (= LUGAL)-ili (= AN) mašša,
wr., 36: 14.

1 Probably to be read either mIšdšu-GHE.GAL or mNādšu-naissance. The latter might be abbreviated from mIšdšI (or NIM.IB, etc.) našši-naissance.

2 See "MU.GHE.GAL.

3 NIM.GI is probably to be read Ešš, see under Translations, pp. 135.

4 See also mIš-mu-ša-a and cf. Chapter II, p. 15, note 5.

5 See mIš šag-ša-ša, lu-stu-ra šah ša Re-kurnu.


7 So in all names beginning with mIšSin.

8 Or mIš Sin-shum (= LM) šišša (= BA-sha).

9 Or da?

10 See also p. 129.

11 Here the name of a city, cf. mIš Gir-ra-ga-ša.

12 Or mIššu-[ub-Shia-ša]?


14 Cf. R. E., XV, 168: 1, aššu(!).
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"Uš-il-šu-Šu-pi-li, 55; 2.
"Uš-šu-Šu, i.e. "E-li-šu, 21: 12.
[""Iššu-Šu, 21: 12.
[""Sukal(= LUGÂ), 18: 8.
[... ] di-ni-lum, 5: 3.
[... ] šus₂₂₄₄, 6: 2.
[... ] šus₂₂₄₄, i.e. 8: 4.
[... ] 11: 5.
[... ] 11: 5.
[... ] Vi, 11: 5.

[... ] 3: 5.
[... ] 41: 1.
See also 13: 7 | 60: 10.

2. Feminine Names.

"Uš-il-šu, wr, š. of "E-li-šu, 55: 2 | 86: 3.
"Lěš(= xšaši, ra?), 31: 20.
"Mirat(= TUR.SAL), 47: 3.
"Mardus(= SESH), 31: 27.
"Mardus, 31: 15.
"Mardus, 97: 5.
"Mardus, 31: 7.
"Mardus, 31: 14, 32: 7.
"Mardus, 31: 27.
"Riš-kš-tum, 93: 9.
"Ta-a-dū, 31: 14, 35.
"Ta(a)? or Ba(?)-šaši(= xšaši, ra?), 31: 27.

II. Professional and Gentilic Names.

a-bil biba, 86: 21.
a-bil mi-di, 31: 25.
a-bil mi-di, 32: 78.

[""I.e., "E. makes to rejoice."
2 Or [""Dad-us₂₂₄₄?
4 Here the da is doubtful, it might be also ra, then cf. [""Dad-us₂₂₄₄ TUR.SAL = "E-li-šu.G.D.TAR, B. E., XV, 185: 10.
5 Cf. TUR.SAL Da-il-šaši, B. E., XIV, 58: 7. Here probably a "Kosename" which the writer applies to his "sister."
6 A "Kosename."
8 Doubtful whether a nom. pr.
9 But see pp. 25, note 1; 110, note 3.
10 Might expect [""Ha-šu-ni, but no trace of n is visible.
11 So also in all following names.
13 See note to Mār-Ta-a-du.
14 Cf. B. E., XV, 151: 26, aššu-ma-Šu (not registered by Clay).
16 Or better gib ENGAR, i.e., nargala, see pp. 35, note 3; 127, note 2.
FROM THE TEMPLE ARCHIVES OF NIPPPUR.

Professional and Gentilic Names

amelu (= GALU), 44, 17; a-PIL-la, 67, 17; a-ma-ti, 66: 25; a-mi-li, 42, 9; 72, 10; a-mi-li-en, 59, 17; a-mi-la-ti, 56, 36; a-mi-la-shi, 56, 17; a-mi-la-su-ad, 52, 16; a-PIL-la-us-


amnu, 31, 11; 50, 11.

Arar押-ma-us-am, see "Proper Names."
amluZAG.GIM, see kudimmu.
amlu'atirm (= SHU.GHA.), 55, 3.
amlu'atiru, see ameluAMASH.
hîl pibil(= EX.NAM), 21, 20: 41, 7; hîl(= EX)mesh pi-bî-ki, 92, 10, 20.
la-el SHE.BAR, 76, 7.
ameluPAM/Q(A)mesh, 55, 10, 24: 56, 7, 11.
ENGAR see erissu.
EX:NAM, see hîl pibil.
amelu'erissu(= ENGAR)mesh, 11, 10; ameluPAM, ENGAR.
39, 3. (It. also e-ris-shi, 10: 13; e-ri-shi, 10: 26
c prasim.
GAL, see til.
ameluQAR, see shaknu.
GHR(= XER)4 22, 5.
amelu'gikENGAR(= merhuba), see amelu'gik-ENGAR.
gi-gudum, 27, 8.
ameluUSHUR.RAGAL, see ameluUR.RAGAL.

ba-za-an, 9: 22; ba-za-an-um, 9: 23: 72, 11: ba-za-an-nu, 40, 3; 56, 3; ba-za-an-nu-li, 37, 21; ba-za-an-
nu-adi, 51, 14; 56, 8: 81, 3.
"la-im-nu-um, see "Proper Names" under "A-p-pa-ma-us-am.
amelu'shipara (= USHRBAR), 35, 18: 41, 12; ameluUSH.
BARKmesh, 23, 33.
isikdaku, see par-te-al.
i-ta, 21, 36: 33, 11: 25: 22: i-ta ameluSH, (G), T.M.
kan-durier, 48, 18.
ak-si-ri, 35, 18.
amelu'KA ZID(= KU), 4A, 26, 5, 7.
šin-dh, 24, 4: 46, 17.
amelu'kudimmu(= AZAG.GIM), 82, 9.
KU-ta-a, 87, 14.
LUL, see zamaertu.
am(?)-ka-na, 9, 7.
amelu'nikku(= N1(G), KUD, D), 27, 33: 57, 7.
non-za-nu pa-ni, 48, 27.
MAR.U(=USHR, or NIT), 40, 37, 9.
shi-bi-a, 8: 47: mîr shipiper LUG.IL, 55, 13.
mâr(= TUR)mesh En-dugki, 56, 5, S: mîr(= TUR)mesh
Ni-bu-buran, 51, 6.
mâr(= TUR)mesh šu-KU-im-um, 96, 20, 25.
ameluMAŠ, 72, 4.

1 See also the address of Nos. 1-74 and cf. Chapter III, p. 33, note 2.
2 Cf. B. E., XV, 16294: 11, naphar 11 SHU.GHA,mesh (omitted by Clay).
3 Cf. pu-ba-ta-la, 77, 5; pl-lat, 3, 41.
4 Doubtful; it may be LUL = zamaertu, q.v.
5 See Introduction to No. 75 under "Translations," p. 133.
6 So clearly here. At this time the bU and XI = bi are often written alike, cf. e.g., 11: 6, bi-da-ri-mi(= bi); 9: 23, Bii=Ki-dim-ni(!), the sign looks like bi.
7 See B. E., XV, 174: 17, 175: 45, UR.PA.MI (so Clay, Z.A., XX
(1907), p. 417), bi, which, when compared with l.e., 84: 5, UR-la(= P.1)-te-in, has to be read (against Clay, i.e., p. 153) Balâti(= UR)-la(= P.1)-te-in(= bi = XI). Ha-bi(!)=XI = bi=gal-ba-ti- is, of course, the same as the Ha-bi(!)=
8 Be omitted by scribal. Cf. B. E., XV, 164, 2, Ha-bi(!)-gal-ba-ta-ti (not registered by Clay).
9 Is ita(?), 55, 12; GAL ili-ita(?), 21, 27, to be conferred here? Cf. here p. 35, note 4.
10 Cf. luKusuru in B. E., XIV, XV, and see Chapter IV, pp. 796f.
11 See p. 47, note 1.
12 Doubtful; might be a nom. pr.; UR-itaUSH.
13 See also Nî-ba-ru-ri-.
14 Or šu-kīM-mu.
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Professional and Gentilic Names

SHAR see ummânî.
ši-hâ-ê-râ-ti,² 53 : 5 ; TUR.TURmash, 55 : 2, 4, 10, 18, 24.

See also "Ish-Shî-ê-ê-ê-

1 See Chapter III, p. 36, note 7.
² See also "Ish-shî-ê-

3 See also "Ish-shî-ê-ê-

4 See Chapter III, p. 37, note 12.
5 For this TI cf. also B. E., XV, 95 : 3, sumû-rê TI, read by Clay, etc., p. 51b, M.IX.LI-ê-ti.
6 See p. 51, note 3.
7 Here the same as the mûshî-pîshu of the Ham. Letters.
8 Here, however, a perman-i-ê-ê-
9 Or LU = dâ-
¹⁰ See p. 33, note 3.
¹¹ Doubtful whether an official. Cf. here the ad-dî-ti = KI, K, 2875, 27, 28 (= B. A., V, p. 533) ; hence not the title of an official, but a part (the lower) of mînu-Tâmûmî?
¹² See p. 35, note 1.
¹³ See p. 97, note 9.
¹⁴ Doubtful, might be GâR (= ÑER).
III. Names of Places.

1 Here the he is, no doubt, left out by the scribe.
2 Cf. Ardi-B'lit.
3 Identical with the city TE, E. B. II, p. 95, note 17.
4 Or da.
5 Hardly dluAsh, ash.
6 See p. 9, note 2.
7 Cf. here the E-ma-uqal (= SHû) dluEn-iški in B. E., XIV, 18:14–11, which Chay, i.e., p. 58, reads erroneously E-ma-sha-Riški, registering the second passage quoted under dluNippurškí.
8 For dku see Chapter I, p. 11, note 1.
9 Cf. šumShamash-ša-kal-š.
10 Or dkuIM, mu.
11 See p. 49, note 1.
12 Or dušUM, q. e.?
13 For this city cf. e.g., B. E., XIV, 167:29 (omitted by Chay), and above, p. 118, note 4.
14 This is doubtful. Here a reading dluMASš-šIMškí is likewise possible. As, however, this city occurs in a letter of Kuduršun, who was closely connected with the dluMUMškí, I prefer to read as indicated.
15 Or Urukškí.
Names of Places

Names of Gates.

Names of Houses and Temples.
FROM THE TEMPLE ARCHIVES OF NIPPU.

Names of Houses and Temples

Étu EX.ZU-[?7], 53 : 22.
bit-lu, see É.AV.


É.KISH.RI [N.U], see Masculine Names.
É.KURmešš, 66 : 23 : É.KUR, see Tub-kal-ti-É.KURki
and náru Tub-kal-ti-É.KURki.
É.KUR.GAL, see náru É.KUR.GAL.

É.LUGAL, see bit šarru.
É.MAR.TU, 73a : 3.
É.Ker[gal(?), 54 : 20.
É.SAG.LU, see Masculine Names.
É.SAL.AZAG, 91 : 7.
É.S₂ [S], see É.S₂ EX.ZU.


paradiku (= BAR) in[li], 66 : 7 : 70 : 1.

VI. Names of Rivers and Canals.

náru it[a]-šuh, see náru ilu NÚ.XII.

náru [A]-lu-[il-šu=na-], 6 : 1.

náru Dig[a]-l[a]-[A]-SH.TIK.QAR, 34 : 26.

náru Dig[a]-l[a]-[A]-SH.TIK.QAR = (AY)-Nippur
(É.LUGAL), 3 : 18.

náru E-teš-š[a]-[?7], 3 : 8 | 66 : 6, 12.


náru Di-l[a]-g[a]-l[a] = náru Di-l[a]-g[a]-l[a].

náru [A]-lu-[il-šu=na-], 40 : 21.

náru [A]-SH.TIK.QAR, see náru Di-l[a]-g[a]-l[a].

náru Na-il-[u]-[u]-li, 40 : 22.


Nom-ge-ra-Bil (= BE), 27 : 33 ; Nom-ge-ra-Bil (= BE), 66 : 12.

Nom-ge-rA-Bil (= EN) -mul-iti (= KUR.KUR), 50 : 9.

nom-sar, nám-ger, see nom-sar-ra.

náru Nam-ge-ša-bil (= E.N.LU)-šarri, 3 : 14.

náru [ilu] NÚ.XII, 67 : 2.

náru Pat-[a]-š[a]-[?7], 28 : 11.

náru Shesh.KI-ga-gal, see náru Nam-ge-ša-gal.

náru Tuk(= KU)-kal-li-É.KURki, 39 : 8.

VII. Names of Gods.

A-an-ri ; [A]-an-ri ; Iš-šu-.[i].

[ilu] AG, see ı[im] Nabû.

Alu [A]-lu-[u]-I-šu-l[-u]-.[i].

[ilu] AMAR UD, see ı[im] Marduk.

AX : A.VR.A, see DINGIR.A, ı[im] ÁX,[i] ; see ı[im] Isu-.[i] ; [ilu] Isu-.[i].

AX.GAL, 59 : 4 ; [ilu] Iš-šù-ÁX.GAL-šar-

A.VR.A, see DINGIR.A.

1 See pp. 81.

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.AX (= ilu)-Nippur (= EN.LU)81, 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 Ya-la-aš 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 š[i]-šu, while in 71 : 15 it has the appearance of š[i] + ais(= iti).

6 Cf. also 66 : 8.

7 See Delitsch, H. W. B., p. 555a.


9 Chief god of Dûr-ilu; see Chapter II, p. 19, note 3, and cf. itu KADDi.
Names of Gods

\[\text{See note 5.} \]

\[\text{See note 8.} \]

\[\text{See The Monist, XVII (January, 1907), p. 144c.} \]

\[\text{See The Monist, XVII (January, 1907), p. 144d.} \]

\[\text{See The Monist, XVII (January, 1907), p. 144e.} \]
Names of Gods

\( {\text{ilu}} \text{MIN}(?) \text{GAL} \), 50 : 9.

\( {\text{ilu}} \text{MIN}, \text{IL} \): m \( {\text{ilu}} \text{Errish} \), \( {\text{m}} \text{Bu-nu}, \text{mBu-an-nu}, \text{mIdin}, \text{mIz-gur} \).

\( {\text{ilu}} \text{MIN}, \text{IL} \); 89 : 4; \text{Num-gar-Kur, n} \text{na} {\text{ilu}} \text{MIN}, \text{IL}.

\( {\text{ilu}} \text{MIN}, \text{AGH} \); 38 : 5.

\( {\text{ilu}} \text{MIN}, \text{SHAR} \): m \( {\text{ilu}} \text{MIN}, \text{SHAR} \).

\( {\text{ilu}} \text{Nusku} = \text{PA.KU} \); m \( {\text{ilu}} \text{Nusku}, \text{Dür} \).

\( {\text{ilu}} \text{PA.KU}, \text{see} {\text{ilu}} \text{Nusku} \).

\( {\text{ilu}} \text{Sabul} = \text{PA.PAP} \), \text{Dür} = \text{PA.PAP}.

\( {\text{ilu}} \text{Rammin} = \text{IM} \); m \( {\text{ilu}} \text{Rammin}, \text{mIqsha} = \text{BA-sha} \), \( {\text{mKi-gin}}, \text{mMishu-gi-ir, mMA.SHI.IM} \).

\( {\text{ilu}} \text{KI}, \text{see} {\text{ilu}} \text{Iktar} \).

\( {\text{ilu}} \text{Iku} = \text{EX.KI-SAU} \).

\( {\text{ilu}} \text{Sin} = \text{XXX} \); m \( {\text{ilu}} \text{Sin}, \text{mA-nu, iluXXX-tak-bu-ku, E = iluXXX} \). \text{See also} {\text{ilu}} \text{EN.ZU}, \text{Nammar}.

\( {\text{ilu}} \text{SUGH}, \text{see} {\text{ilu}} \text{Tishhu} \).

\( {\text{ilu}} \text{Sabul}, \text{iluSabul, see also iluLUHu, PAP} \).

\( {\text{ilu}} \text{Shamash} = \text{UD}, \text{33 : 25, 29} \text{SH} \text{11 : 1} \text{SH1 : 1; m} \text{iluShamash}, \text{mNir} \).

\( \text{Shar-rat, iluNippur} = \text{EN.LIL} \), 38 : 3.

\( \text{SHESH.KI, see Nammar} \).

\( \text{Shi-pak = luU-su-ab}, \text{mMedi} \).

\( \text{iluShu-gam-ma-nu, mMedi} \).

\( \text{iluTAR = 89} : 4 \).

\( \text{iluTAR-HU}, \text{see iluDAR-HU} \).

\( \text{iluTishhu = SUGH} \), 38 : 3.

\( \text{iluUD, see iluShamash} \).

\( \text{UDAR} = \text{Iktar} ; \text{Dür-UDAR-shirat} = \text{MAGH} \), 68 : 28.

\( \text{iluURRA, see iluGir-ra} \).

\( \text{iluUSH, as Kalbi, iluUSH} \).

1 \text{See Chapter III, p. 39, note 1.}

2 \text{See Chapter III, p. 40, note.}

3 \text{For this gi-ir, which proves that iluIM was pronounced iluRammin, see Chapter III, p. 49, note 1.}

4 \text{Husband of iluGU; see Chapter II, p. 21.}
### V. I.

**DESCRIPTION OF TABLETS.**

#### ABBREVIATIONS.

c., circa. C. B. M., Catalogue of the Babylonian Museum, University of Pennsylvania, prepared by the Editor, Prof. Dr. H. V. Hilprecht; cf., confer; Exp., Expedition; f., following page; ff., following pages; fragm., fragmentary; inscr., inscription; L. E., Left Edge; R. E., Right Edge; Lo., Lower Edge; No(s.), Numbers; O., Obverse; p., page; pp., pages; R., Reverse; U. E., Upper Edge; Vol., Volume.

Measurements are given in centimetres, width x length (height) x thickness. Whenever the tablet (or fragment) varies in size, the largest measurement is given. The Roman numbers under “description” indicate the several expeditions: I = first; II = second; III = third; IV = fourth expedition.

#### A. AUTOGRAPH REPRODUCTIONS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text. Plate</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>C. B. M.</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 1</td>
<td>“My Lord” (a-na be-lis-ia)</td>
<td>a-na-id-din-ma. KURU-GULU.</td>
<td>11716</td>
<td>1420 B.C.</td>
<td>Baked, Light brown, left part of R. and right lower corner broken off, 4 x 5.8 x 2. Insr. 11 (O.) + 12 (R.) = 23 li. II.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 1</td>
<td>“a-na-bu-ani”</td>
<td>KURU-GULU.</td>
<td>10950</td>
<td>1400 B.C.</td>
<td>Baked, Ruled, Light brown with occasional dark spots, left part and lower half of tablet broken off, 4.5 x 4.5 x 2.6. Insr. 7 (O.) + 4 (R.) = 11 li. III.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 2, 3</td>
<td>“A-na-id-din ma. KURU-GULU. SHAGARKHTI-SHURISH.</td>
<td>11426</td>
<td>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, 4.5 x 8.4 x 3.2. Insr. 29 (O.) + 32 (R.) + 3 (U. E.) + 2 (L. E.) + 4 (fragm. e) + 1 (fragm. d) = 74 li. II.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 4</td>
<td>“a-na-ku-um-ma.</td>
<td>About 1400 B.C.</td>
<td>3969</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unbaked, Light brown, lower part of tablet broken off, 4.5 x 6.5 x 2. Insr. 9 (O.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text. Plate</td>
<td>To</td>
<td>From</td>
<td>Age.</td>
<td>C.R.M.</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 5</td>
<td>&quot;My Lord&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;Ardî-Bilit.&quot;</td>
<td>Kuri-Golzu,</td>
<td>11149</td>
<td>Baked. Dark brown. Cracked. Right lower corner of O, broken off. Lower part of R, not inscribed. 5.5 × 10 × 2.8. Insr. 16 (O.) + 7 (R.) = 23 li. 1 (stray tablet found out of place).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 6</td>
<td>&quot;Ardî-îlu Marduk.&quot;</td>
<td>Kuri-Golzu,</td>
<td>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. raised off. 7.5 × 8 × 2.7. Insr. 9 li. II.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 7</td>
<td>&quot;Ba'il-îlu Marduk.&quot;</td>
<td>Nazi-Maruttash,</td>
<td>about 1370 B.C.</td>
<td>10816</td>
<td>Unbaked. Dark brown. Ruled. Left half and lower part of tablet broken away. Remainder of R, not inscribed. 5.2 × 4.5 × 3. Insr. 7 (O.) + 2 (R.) = 9 li. III.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 8</td>
<td>&quot;Buru-ashîlu Marduk, Kuri-Golzu,&quot;</td>
<td>about 1390 B.C.</td>
<td></td>
<td>11635</td>
<td>Unbaked. Light brown. Ruled. Left half and lower part of tablet broken away. Remainder of R, not inscribed. 4.8 × 7.3 × 2.2. Insr. 14 (O.) + 2 (R.) + 1 (E.) = 31 li. IV.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 9</td>
<td>&quot;Be-la-anu.&quot;</td>
<td>Kadur-Enlil,</td>
<td>about 1335 B.C.</td>
<td>19781</td>
<td>Unbaked. Light brown. R. darken. O, crumbling and greatly obliterated. 4.8 × 7.3 × 2.2. Insr. 14 (O.) + 2 (R.) + 1 (E.) = 31 li. IV.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 12 10      | "Ehir-îlu Marduk." | About 1350 B.C. |               | 11929  | Baked. Light brown. Ruled. Beginning of lines on O, broken away. 4.5 × 7 ×
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<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;</td>
<td>Shagaraki-Shuriah,</td>
<td>10804</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 x 5.2 x 3. Inser. 11 (O.) + 7 (R.) = 18 li. III.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 11</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Shagaraki-Shuriah,</td>
<td>11637</td>
<td></td>
<td>Baked. Dark brown. Lower half of tablet broken away. 4.5 x 3.8 x 2. Inser. 9 (O.) + 8 (R.) + 3 (U. E.) + 1 (L. E.) = 21 li. II.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 12</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Burna-Burash,</td>
<td>10571</td>
<td></td>
<td>Baked. Light brown. Crumbling. Cracked. Beginning of lines and lower part of tablet broken away. 6 x 4.5 x 2.5. Inser. 8 (O.) + 8 (R.) + 3 (U. E.) = 19 li. III.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 12</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Burna-Burash,</td>
<td>10951</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unbaked. Dark. Ruled. Bolly effaced. Upper right and lower left corners broken away. Only upper part of R. inscribed. 5.8 x 9.5 x 2.5. Inser. 15 (O.) + 3 (R.) = 18 li. II.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 13</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>About 1350 B.C.,</td>
<td>19780</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 x 6.7 x 2. Inser. 20 (O.) + 2 (L. E.) + 14 (R.) = 36 li. IV.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 14</td>
<td>[....]</td>
<td>About 1350 B.C.</td>
<td>3655</td>
<td></td>
<td>Baked. Light brown. Most of O. and left part of R. broken away. 6 x 11.5 x 2.8. Inser. 15 (O.) + 25 (R.) + 1 (U. E.) = 41 li. II.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 14</td>
<td>[....]</td>
<td>Kudur-Enil,</td>
<td>19787</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unbaked. Light brown. Ruled. O. crumbling. Lower part of tablet broken away. Only upper part of R. inscribed. 4.3 x 6.8 x 2. Inser. 12 (O.) + 1 (R.) = 13 li. IV.</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>20 15</td>
<td>&quot;My Lord&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;Idin-lu-Errish(l)&quot;.</td>
<td>Nazi-Maruttash, about 1375 B.C.</td>
<td>19798</td>
<td>Unashed. Light. Lower part of tablet broken away. R. mostly crumbled off. 5.8 ( \times ) 6.3 ( \times ) 2.4. Inscr. 13 (O.) + 13 (R.) + 3 (U. E.) = 29 li. IV.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 16</td>
<td>&quot;Hu-MU.TUK.A-rima-ma.&quot;</td>
<td>Kishashmon-Enlil, about 1345 B.C.</td>
<td>10806</td>
<td>Unashed. Light brown. Lower right part of tablet broken off. 5.3 ( \times ) 8.4 ( \times ) 2.3. Inscr. 14 (O.) + 16 (R.) + 1 (U. E.) + 2 (L. E.) = 33 li. 11.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 16</td>
<td>&quot;Im-ga-rum.&quot;</td>
<td>Burna-Buriash, about 1430 B.C.</td>
<td>11001</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. 11.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 17</td>
<td>&quot;Im-ga-rum.&quot;</td>
<td>Burna-Buriash, about 1430 B.C.</td>
<td>11099</td>
<td>Baked. Light brown. Ruled. Upper and lower left corners broken away. Beginning of lines on R. mutilated. Lower half of R. not inscribed. 7 ( \times ) 11 ( \times ) 2.5. Inscr. 24 (O.) + 15 (R.) = 39 li. II. Translation, pp. 94ff.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 19</td>
<td>&quot;Kabzi-ilu,NIN,DIN, DÜG.GA.&quot;</td>
<td>Kudshiliashu, about 1309 B.C.</td>
<td>11096</td>
<td>Unashed. 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 19</td>
<td>&quot;Ku-da-ra-ru.&quot;</td>
<td>Kudshashmon-Targu, about 1300 B.C.</td>
<td>19785</td>
<td>Baked. Dark brown. Lower half of tablet broken away. 6.2 ( \times ) 6 ( \times ) 2.6. Inscr. 9 (O.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Plate</td>
<td>To</td>
<td>From</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>CBM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12633</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>&quot;My Lord&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;Kudur-Adad&quot;</td>
<td>about 1360 B.C.</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11956</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>m ili Marduk-nu-ki-[k]i-ku</td>
<td>&quot;Kuruk-Gallu&quot;</td>
<td>about 1400 B.C.</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11956</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>m ili Marduk-ri-im-kiri-</td>
<td>About 1360 B.C.</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11956</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>m ili Marduk-ri-im-kiri-</td>
<td>&quot;Burna-Buriash&quot;</td>
<td>about 1400 B.C.</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text. Plate.</td>
<td>To</td>
<td>From</td>
<td>Agk.</td>
<td>C.R.M.</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33a 26</td>
<td>&quot;My Lord&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;NIM.GI-shar-ilq\textsuperscript{mesh.}&quot;</td>
<td>About 1300 B.C.</td>
<td>6123</td>
<td>Unbaked. Light brown. Occasional dark spots on O. and R. Cracked. Signs on some places chipped off, otherwise well preserved. $5 \times 7.2 \times 2.2$. Inser. 17 (O.) + 18 (R.) + 2 (U. E.) $= 37$ li. III. Translation, pp. 135ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 27</td>
<td>&quot;Kis-\text{shak}u-bu-\text{at.}&quot;</td>
<td>Kudashman-Targu, about 1355 B.C.</td>
<td>6058</td>
<td></td>
<td>Baked. Dark. Upper right and lower left corner broken away. $5.2 \times 9.5 \times 2.3$. Inser. 21 (O.) + 21 (R.) + 3 (U. E.) + 1 (L. E.) $= 46$ li. II.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 28</td>
<td>&quot;Kis-\text{shak}u-bu-\text{at.}&quot;</td>
<td>Kudashman-Targu, about 1355 B.C.</td>
<td>6057</td>
<td></td>
<td>Baked. Light brown. Upper right corner chipped off. On R. occasional dark spots, $4.8 \times 7.3 \times 2.2$. Inser. 13 (O.) + 1 (L. E.) + 15 (R.) + 3 (U. E.) + 2 (L. E.) $= 33$ li. II. Translation, pp. 120ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 29</td>
<td>&quot;\text{Ramman}\text{-shar-ilq}\text{\textsuperscript{mesh.}}&quot;</td>
<td>Kudashman-Targu, about 1350 B.C.</td>
<td>10000</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unbaked. Light brown. Only upper right corner of O. preserved, rest broken away. On R. is only a part of sign c(?) visible. $3 \times 3.3 \times 2$. Inser. 6 li. III.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 29</td>
<td>&quot;Sin-\text{kari-\text{li}-\text{e}sh-\text{\textsuperscript{a}}ue}&quot;</td>
<td>Burna-Buriask, about 1430 B.C.</td>
<td>19783</td>
<td></td>
<td>Baked. Dark brown. Baked. Cracked and lower right corner chipped off. Lower part of R. not inscribed. $5.5 \times 9.5 \times 3$. Inser. 16 (O.) + 10 (R.) $= 26$ li. IV.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38 39</td>
<td>&quot;\text{Shi-\text{ri-li-tum.}}&quot;</td>
<td>Kuri-Galzu, about 1400 B.C.</td>
<td>10935</td>
<td></td>
<td>Baked. Light brown. Lower part and right upper corner of tablet broken away. $6 \times 6 \times 2.5$. Inser. 11 (O.) + 9 (R.) + 1 (U. E.) $= 21$ li. II. Translation, pp. 140ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39 31</td>
<td>&quot;\text{U-bar-\text{\textsuperscript{a}}ue}&quot;</td>
<td>Kudur-\text{\textsuperscript{a}}ue, about 1335 B.C.</td>
<td>3061</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unbaked. Light brown. Crumbling. Greatly mutilated. R. almost entirely crumbled away. $5 \times 8.4 \times 2.3$. Inser. 17 (O.) + 19 (R.) + 3 (U. E.) $= 39$ li. II. Translation, pp. 126ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Text</td>
<td>To</td>
<td>From</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>CBM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>&quot;&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;Pi(?)&quot;</td>
<td>About 1350 B.C.</td>
<td>19779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>About 1350 B.C.</td>
<td>10652</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-ši-ša)</td>
<td>Kudur-Enlil</td>
<td>about 1335 B.C.</td>
<td>11856</td>
<td>Unbaked, Light brown. Upper part of tablet broken away. Line after inscription on Lo. E. 5.7 x 7.1 x 2.3. Inscri. 12 (O.) + 11 (R.) = 23 li. III.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49-38</td>
<td>&quot;&quot;</td>
<td>Nazi-Marutash</td>
<td>about 1380 B.C.</td>
<td>10913</td>
<td>Unbaked, Light brown. First two lines broken away. Cracked. Right upper corner of R. chipped off. 4.5 x 5.8 x 2. Inscri. 15 (O.) + 15 (R.) = 30 li. III.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-39</td>
<td>&quot;&quot;</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. I. 12 and at end of inscription. Greatly mutilated. Lower part of R. not inscribed. 6.2 x 8.5 x 2.5. Inscri. 13 (O.) + 5 (R.) = 18 li. III.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-39</td>
<td>&quot;&quot;</td>
<td>About 1350 B.C.</td>
<td>10510</td>
<td>Unbaked, Light brown. Ruled. Crumbling. End of all lines broken away. 4.5 x 8 x 2.5. Inscri. 12 (O.) + 9 (R.) = 21 li. III.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52-40</td>
<td>&quot;&quot;</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 x 9 x 2.5. Inscri. 18 (O.) + 22 (R.) + 1 (U. E.) = 41 li. III.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEXT</td>
<td>PLATE</td>
<td>TO</td>
<td>AGE</td>
<td>C.R.M.</td>
<td>DESCRIPTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(a-na be-lu-a)</td>
<td>left side, and lower half of tablet broken away. R. covered with silica. 5 x 5.5 x 26. Inser. 14 (O.) + 12 (R.) = 26 li.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>(?)</td>
<td>1410 B.C.</td>
<td>19097</td>
<td>Unbaked. Light. Upper half broken away. 7.8 x 5.9 x 3. Inser. 10 (O.) + 2 (Lo. E.) + 12 (R.) = 24 li.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Translation, pp. 51ff.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 56   | 43    |   | 1400 B.C. | 10822 | Unbaked. Light brown. Ruled. Crum
|      |       |   |                        |       | bing. Upper half broken away. 7 x 5 x 2.5. Inser. 7 (O.) + 7 (R.) = 14 li. |
| 57   | 43    |   | About 1350 B.C. | 3668 | Unbaked. Dark brown, R. dark. Upper and lower corners broken away. 5.4 x 5.3 x 2.5. Inser. 14 (O.) + 11 (R.) = 25 li. |
|      |       |   |                        |       | |
| 58   | 11    |   | About 1320 B.C. | 19800 | Unbaked. Dark brown. Ruled. Crum
<p>|      |       |   |                        |       | bled. Upper and lower part as well as whole of O. broken away. End of lines missing. 5.5 x 8 x 2.5. Inser. 13 li. |
| 59   | 44    |   | About 1340 B.C. | 11703 | Baked. Dark brown. O. completely crumpled away. R. covered with silica. 5.3 x 9.3 x 2.4. Inser. 3 (Lo. E.) + 16 (R.) = 19 li. |
| 59a  | 45    |   | 1430 B.C. | 10919 | Unbaked. Light brown. Cracked. Greatly mutilated. Upper part broken away. 5.3 x 3.8 x 2.3. Inser. 6 (O.) + 3 (Lo. E.) + 8 (R.) = 17 li. |
| 60   | 45    |   | About 1350 B.C. | 10914 | Baked. Light brown. Ruled. Upper part and end of li. broken away. Temple Record with postscript in form of letter, cf. No. 61. 8 x 3 x 2.5. Inser. 6 (O.) + 5 li. |</p>
<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>61 46</td>
<td>“”</td>
<td>“”</td>
<td>“”</td>
<td>12634</td>
<td>Baked. Brown. O. and upper part of R. broken away. Postscript, cf. No. 60. Lower part of R. not inscribed. 7 × 13 × 2.7. Inscr. 8 li. II.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62 47</td>
<td>“”</td>
<td>“”</td>
<td>“”</td>
<td>10878</td>
<td>Baked. Light brown. Fragment (right lower middle part) of larger tablet. 5.2 × 6 × 4.2. Inscr. 12 (O.) + 8 (R.) = 20 li. II.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63 47</td>
<td>“”</td>
<td>“”</td>
<td>“”</td>
<td>10931</td>
<td>Unbaked. Brown. Fragment of larger tablet. Dark. Ruled. R. completely broken away. 5.5 × 3.7 × 1.5. Inscr. 7 li. III.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61 47</td>
<td>“”</td>
<td>“”</td>
<td>“”</td>
<td>10935</td>
<td>Unbaked. Light brown. Crumbling. R. broken away. Fragment of larger tablet. 3.5 × 4.7 × 1.8. Inscr. 10 li. III.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 47</td>
<td>“”</td>
<td>“”</td>
<td>“”</td>
<td>10954</td>
<td>Baked. Dark brown on O., light brown on R. Upper and lower part of tablet broken away. End of lines missing. Crumbling and greatly mutilated. 6 × 6.5 × 2.7. Inscr. 14 (O.) + 11 (R.) = 25 li. II.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66 48</td>
<td>“”</td>
<td>“”</td>
<td>“”</td>
<td>11926</td>
<td>Unbaked. Dark brown. Upper and lower part of tablet broken away. End of lines missing. Part of larger tablet. Cf. No. 70. 8.5 × 8 × 3. Inscr. 15 (O.) + 17 (R.) = 32 li. II.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67 49</td>
<td>“”</td>
<td>“”</td>
<td>“”</td>
<td>11999</td>
<td>Unbaked. Fragment. (lower right part) of larger tablet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Tablet</td>
<td>To</td>
<td>From</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>C.R.M.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>&quot;My Lord&quot;</td>
<td>Kudar-Enil,</td>
<td>about 1339 B.C.</td>
<td>11046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>&quot;&quot;</td>
<td>About 1330 B.C.</td>
<td></td>
<td>3836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>&quot;&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>&quot;&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>&quot;&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73a</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>&quot;&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>&quot;&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LETTERS TO CASSITE KINGS**

O. dark, R. light brown. R. badly mutilated. 8 × 8.5 × 4. Ins. 17 (O.) + 13 (R.) = 30 li. II.

Unbaked. O. dark, R. light brown. Upper, lower, and right part of tablet broken away. Inscription on L. E. in two columns. Cf. No. 69, 8 × 8.5 × 1. Ins. 17 (O.) + 14 (R.) + 9 (L. E.) = 30 li. II.

Unbaked. Light brown. Fragm. (left lower part) of larger tablet. R. completely broken away. Cf. No. 68. 4 × 4.6 × 2.2. Ins. 9 (O.) + 1 (L. E.) = 10 li. III.

Unbaked. Light brown. Fragm. (right lower part) of larger tablet. Ruled. 4.5 × 5.5 × 3.8. Ins. 10 (O.) + 8 (R.) = 18 li. III.

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. Ins. 9 (O.) + 10 (R.) = 19 li. III.

Unbaked. Light brown. Crumbling. Fragm. of larger tablet. Only on one side is the inscription preserved. 3.8 × 6.5 × 3.2. Ins. 11 li. III.

Unbaked. Light brown. Cracked. Fragm. (upper middle part) of larger tablet. Greatly mutilated. 3.8 × 5 × 2.3. Ins. 8 (O.) + 10 (R.) + 2 (U. E.) = 20 li. III.

Unbaked. Dark brown.
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>75</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>&quot;Incl.</td>
<td>&quot;The King&quot; (LUGAL) Shagratki-Shuriash, 12582 (cf. No. 93).</td>
<td>about 1325 B.C.</td>
<td>Fragm. (middle part) of tablet. Only one side preserved. 5.5 x 6.8 x 2.1. Inser. 14 li. III.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>&quot;Son.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;Father.&quot;</td>
<td>About 1400 B.C.</td>
<td>3966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>&quot;En-il-li-shum-er-[ri].</td>
<td>Kadoshman-Turga, about 1360 B.C.</td>
<td>10575</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>&quot;En-lil-li-di-ni.&quot;</td>
<td>Borna-Bariash, about 1430 B.C.</td>
<td>10774</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>&quot;En-gu-er.&quot;</td>
<td>Borna-Bariash, about 1430 B.C.</td>
<td>11931</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>&quot;En-lil-ma-ki-apad.</td>
<td>Nazi-Marattah, about 1350 B.C.</td>
<td>6056</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>&quot;Ahu-a-Enlil.</td>
<td>Kadoshman-Enlil, about 1335 B.C.</td>
<td>3092</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Description.

Fragment (middle part) of tablet. Only one side preserved. 5.5 x 6.8 x 2.1. Inser. 14 li. III.

Unbaked. Light brown. End of lines and lower part of tablet broken away. R. almost completely crumbled off. 3.9 x 1.8 x 1.7. Inser. 10 (O.) + 10 (R.) + 3 (U. E.) = 23 li. III. Translation, pp. 132ff.

Unbaked. Light brown. Cracked. Covered with black spots. Line after 0. 1, 1. R. has only one line of inscription, rest not inscribed. 5 + 7.5 x 2.3. Inser 9 (O.) + 1 (R.) = 10 li. II. Translation, pp. 136ff.

Unbaked. Dark brown. Cracked. Crumbling. Right side and lower part of tablet broken away. 4.8 x 6.8 x 2.2. Inser. 10 li. III.

Unbaked. Light brown. Cracked. Crumbling. Left side and lower part of tablet broken away. Only upper part of R. is inscribed. 4.7 x 6.5 x 2.4. Inser. 10 (O.) + 3 (R.) = 13 li. II.

Baked. Brown. Left side broken away. Badly mutilated. Crumbling. Lower part of R. not inscribed. 1 x 6.8 x 2.5. Inser. 9 (O.) + 1 (R.) = 13 li. II.

Unbaked. Light brown. Lower half of tablet broken away. Right upper corner of O. was pressed downward while tablet was still soft. 4 x 1 x 2. Inser. 8 (O.) + 7 (R.) + 2 (U. E.) = 17 li. II.

Baked. O. light brown, R. darker. Occasional 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>57</td>
<td>Da-ud-da.</td>
<td>Erba.(a)Marsh.</td>
<td>Shagarakti-Shuripal.</td>
<td>11582</td>
<td>about 1325 B.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>In-na-an-ri.</td>
<td>il'Enrish(1)=XIN.</td>
<td>Kuri-Galzu,</td>
<td>3315</td>
<td>about 1400 B.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>apal-iddina”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>In-na-an-ri.</td>
<td>il'Enrish(1)=MASH.</td>
<td>Kuri-Galzu,</td>
<td>3258</td>
<td>about 1400 B.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>apal-iddina”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>In-na-an-ri.</td>
<td>In-bi-Ari.</td>
<td>Kuri-Galzu,</td>
<td>3206</td>
<td>about 1400 B.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>In-na-an-ri.</td>
<td>In-bi-Ari.</td>
<td>Kuri-Galzu,</td>
<td>3675</td>
<td>about 1400 B.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>In-na-an-si.</td>
<td>In-bi-Ari.</td>
<td>Kuri-Galzu,</td>
<td>3663</td>
<td>About 1350 B.C.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DESCRIPTION.**
- Broken away. 4.5 × 5 × 2.3. Inscr. 10 (O.) + 10 (R.) = 20 li. II.
- Unbaked. Dark brown. Greatly mutilated. 0, left lower corner broken away. R. completely crumbled off. 3.7 × 5.1 × 1.7. Inscr. 10 li. II.
- Baked. Light brown. Occasional black spots on O. Part of right side of O. and upper right corner of R. chipped off. Otherwise well preserved. Line after l. 2 and at end of O. 5.5 × 9.5 × 2.2. Inscr. 18 (O.) + 19 (R.) = 37 li. II. Translation, pp. 110ff.
- Baked. Light brown. Perfect. Line after O. l. 10. Lower part of R. not inscribed. 4.8 × 9 × 2.3. Inscr. 11 (O.) + 5 (R.) = 19 li. II. Translation, pp. 113ff.
- Baked. Light brown. R. covered with silica. Lower half of R. not inscribed. 5.5 × 4.3 × 2. Inscr. 7 (O.) + 4 (R.) = 11 li. II. Translation, pp. 115ff.
- Baked. Light brown. Lower part of tablet broken away. 4.8 × 5.8 × 2.3. Inscr. 13 (O.) + 11 (R.) + 3 (U. E.) + 4 (L. E.) = 31 li. II.
- Unbaked. O. light brown. R. darker. Occasional black spots. Lower part of tablet broken away. 5.5 × 6 × 2. Inscr. 11 (O.) + 9 (R.) + 3 (U. E.) + 2 (L. E.) = 23 li. II.
- Baked. Light brown. Greatly effaced. Lower part of tablet broken away. R. blank. 4 × 4 × 2.2. Inscr. 8 li. III.
<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>90</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>&quot;Sin-erishkil.&quot;</td>
<td>Kudoshman-Targu, about 1350 B.C.</td>
<td>10936</td>
<td>Baked. Dark. Fragm. (left upper part) of tablet. 4 × 5 × 2.3. Inser. 7 (O.) + 7 (R.) = 14 li. III.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>[&quot;I-na]-gil-li-[a].&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;tul.PAR.[UU]-mar-gal-[a].&quot;</td>
<td>About 1350 B.C.</td>
<td>19796</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. Inser. 10 (O.) + 2 (Lo. E.) + 3 (R.) = 15 E. IV.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>&quot;R-li-la.&quot;</td>
<td>Nazi-Marattah, 1300 B.C.</td>
<td>19784</td>
<td>Baked. Light brown. Lower right part of tablet broken away. 4.5 × 7.5 × 2. Inser. 11 (O.) + 2 (Lo. E.) + 15 (R.) + 3 (U. E.) = 31 li. IV.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
<td>About 1350 B.C.</td>
<td>3665</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. Inser. 3 (O.) + 5 (R.) = 8 li. II.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3671</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. Inser. 6 (O.) + 10 (R.) + 2 (L. E.) = 18 li. II.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10775</td>
<td>Unbaked. O. very light, R.</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>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>Kadashman-Targu</td>
<td>10922</td>
<td>Unbaked. Dark brown. Ruled. Upper part and right side of tablet broken away. Last line and all of other side not inscribed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>About 1350 B.C.</td>
<td>10895</td>
<td>Unbaked. Fragn. of larger tablet. Dark brown. Ruled. Crumbling. R. completely broken away. 6.3 x 5.8 x 1.5. Inser. 8 li. III.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>“</td>
<td>10915</td>
<td>Unbaked. Brown. Fragn. (middle part) of larger tablet. The other side of tablet completely crumbled away. Cracked. 5.4 x 6 x 2. Inser. 10 li. III.</td>
<td></td>
<td></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</td>
<td>19793</td>
<td>Cf. description of text No. 21.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3, 4, 5</td>
<td>19793</td>
<td>Cf. description of text No. 21.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6, 7</td>
<td>10497</td>
<td>Cf. description of text No. 55.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8, 9</td>
<td>12582</td>
<td>Cf. description of text No. 75.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10, 11</td>
<td>6123</td>
<td>Cf. description of text No. 33a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12, 13</td>
<td>14090</td>
<td>Cf. description of text No. 23.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14, 15</td>
<td>11698</td>
<td>Cf. description of text No. 31.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16, 17</td>
<td>10514</td>
<td>Cf. description of text No. 33.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18, 19</td>
<td>10955</td>
<td>Cf. description of text No. 38.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>11126</td>
<td>Cf. description of text No. 3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>11126</td>
<td>Cf. description of text No. 3.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FROM THE TEMPLE ARCHIVES OF NIPPUR.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text.</th>
<th>Plate.</th>
<th>C. B. M.</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>XI</td>
<td>R. of a letter showing the fragmentary condition of the collection.</td>
<td>10504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>XI</td>
<td>O. of a letter from Imgurum to the &quot;Lord.&quot;</td>
<td>11101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>XI</td>
<td>O. of a letter from a &quot;father&quot; to his &quot;son.&quot; Cf. Translation on pp. 113ff.</td>
<td>3669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31, 32</td>
<td>XII</td>
<td>O. and R. of a letter from Errish()-apal-idlima to Innanni. Cf. Translation on pp. 113ff.</td>
<td>3258</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. Numbers of the Catalogue of the Babylonian Museum (Prepared by Prof. Dr. H. V. Hilprecht).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3000</td>
<td>3206</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>10000</td>
<td>16592</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>11000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3258</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>10497</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>10935</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3315</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>10504</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>11093</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3653</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10510</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>11098</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3660</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>10514</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>11091</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3661</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>10571</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11092</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3662</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>10575</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>11093</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3663</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>10699</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>11094</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3665</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>10621</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>11095</td>
<td>10972</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3668</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>10629</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11096</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3669</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10658</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>11098</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3671</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>10774</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>11101</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3674</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>10775</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>11119</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3675</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>10781</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>11126</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3692</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>10804</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11149</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3691</td>
<td>60a</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>10806</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11198</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3787</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10816</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11199</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3834</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>10822</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11198</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3836</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>10833</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>11201</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3837</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10878</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>11335</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000</td>
<td>5134</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>10895</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>11357</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6000</td>
<td>5134</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>10913</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>11357</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6056</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>10914</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>11357</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6057</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>10915</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>11357</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6058</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>10919</td>
<td>30b</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>11357</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6123</td>
<td>33a</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>10922</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>11357</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. R. M</td>
<td>Text.</td>
<td>Plate.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11903</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11920</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11921</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11931</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11941</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11951</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11999</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12000</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12559</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C. R. M</th>
<th>Text.</th>
<th>Plate.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12362</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12533</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12631</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12680</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12720</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12750</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12741</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12783</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C. R. M</th>
<th>Text.</th>
<th>Plate.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19784</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19785</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19787</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19788</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19796</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19798</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19809</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19880</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LETTERS TO CASSITE KINGS.
"Erasure."
Obverse.

Reverse.

U. E.
L. E.

Erasures.
Obverse.

Reverse.

75
Pl. 56

Obverse.

Reverse.

Erasure.

78

79
KALBU REPORTS TO THE KING ABOUT A DISASTROUS FLOOD, ABOUT 1430 B.C.
6-7. Obverse and reverse of No. 55

8-9. Obverse and reverse of No. 75

6-7. Dispute about the exact wording of a message from King Burna-Buriash, about 1410 B.C.

8-9. Royal summons from King Shagaraki-Shuriash to his sheriff Amel-Marduk, about 1325 B.C.
A GENERAL'S EXPLANATORY LETTER TO THE KING, ABOUT 1400 B.C.
16-17. A PHYSICIAN'S REPORT TO THE KING ABOUT THE RELAPSE OF A SICK TEMPLE WOMAN, ABOUT 1430 B.C.
18-19. REPORT TO THE KING ABOUT THE RECEIPT OF WOOL AND PROVENDER, ABOUT 1400 B.C.
A SHERIFF'S REPORT TO KING SHAGARAKTI-SHURIASH ABOUT THE CONDITION OF CERTAIN CANALS, ABOUT 1325 B.C.
A SHERIFF'S REPORT TO KING SHAGARKTI-SHURIASH ABOUT THE CONDITION OF CERTAIN CANALS, ABOUT 1325 B.C.
22-23. OBVERSE AND REVERSE OF NO. 37

22-23. REPORT TO THE KING ABOUT THE PAYMENT OF GRAIN AND WHEAT, ABOUT 1430 B.C.

24-25. OBVERSE AND REVERSE OF NO. 40

24-25. THE SUPERINTENDENT OF RIVERS AND CANALS COMPLAINS TO KING KUDUR-ENLIL ABOUT THE PREFECT OF DUR-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.
29-30. OBVERSE AND REVERSE OF No. 83

31-32. OBVERSE AND REVERSE OF No. 84

29-32. TWO LETTERS OF COMPLAINTS, REQUESTS, AND THREATS ADDRESSED BY A GOVERNOR TO THE BURSAR-IN-CHIEF, ABOUT 1400 B.C.