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The Murašû archive dominates the published textual record of late Achaemenid Babylonia. The 740 published Murašû texts and fragments come from a short span of time, 454-404 B.C., with most of them concentrated between 440 and 416 B.C. Most are products of a narrow range of operations, agricultural contracting and related short-term credits. Evidence of other sorts of enterprise and activity are present, but scarce and scattered. In comparison, published legal and administrative texts and fragments of all kinds from all other sources in the interval between the reigns of Xerxes and Alexander, 486-330 B.C., amount to only about 500 items. No other known late Achaemenid archive, whether excavated or reconstructed, includes more than a hundred items.
published pieces, so no single source compares in density or range with the Murašu texts. The Murašu archive is a rich philological and historical source of historical and philological. It is an indispensable term of comparison for synchronic study of other late Babylonian evidence and for diachronic study of late Babylonian conditions and trends. But its exceptional place in the preserved and published record forces one to ask whether its evidence is representative, and whether inferences drawn from it are historically specific or broad.

The texts published here, all from Nippur, add to the Murašu archive in two ways. Nos. 1-6 supplement it, adding to the archive’s contents. Their principals are members of the Murašu family or the agents of family members. Nos. 7-13 complement it, adding to the archive’s setting. They have prosopographic, circumstantial, or formal connections to the archive or to other texts connected with the archive.

In the first group, Nos. 1-3 belong to a formal category that is all but unattested and all but unrecognized in the Murašu archive, representing an unnoticed part of the Murašus’ business, investment in small joint ventures. No. 4, a bailment of cattle with no formal parallel among known Murašu texts, bears on a crucial part of the Murašus’ capital, livestock. Nos. 5-6 add to well-represented formal categories. In the second group, Nos. 7-8 bear on the status of the men entitled šaknu of Nippur and the city-governors entitled šandabakku under Achaemenid rule. Nos. 9-12 have prosopographic connections to the Murašu texts (uncertain in No. 10). No. 13 is older than the Murašu texts but it is linked to them by its use of an odd clause whose only parallels are in Murašu texts.

Much of these texts’ interest lies in matters of detail treated at length in the accompanying commentaries. Some of these details are pertinent to broader interpretive questions: the range and rise of the Murašus’ business (Nos. 1-4); competition or stress among contractors at Nippur (Nos. 7, 12); the organization of local government (No. 7-8); and the recruitment and recording of service for the crown (No. 13). Others have to do with uncommon or problematic items of late Babylonian lexicon (Nos. 9:1, 3 etc., 12:2, 3, 6) or poorly understood legal phrases (Nos. 8:10ff., 9:5, 13:9ff.).

Nos. 7 and 9 have seal impressions in common with Murašu texts. Comments on the two extraordinary seal impressions on No. 9 are excerpted from notes generously supplied by Linda B. Bregstein.

A. Murašu Texts

The four texts edited here as Nos. 1-4 are among the few Murašu tablets that do not belong to the main groups that can be traced from the excavations of 1893 to the collections at Istanbul, Jena and Philadelphia. Other published isolates are UCP 9/3 275ff. (given to the Museum of Anthropology of the University of California at Berkeley by Phoebe Hearst), Entrepreneurs and

---

3 The Kasr texts found at Babylon form the largest group, both published (about 65 items) and unpublished (about 900 items). See M. W. Stolper, “Achaemenid Legal Texts from the Kasr: Interim Observations,” in Babylon: Focus mesopotamischer Geschichte, Wiege früher Gelehrsamkeit, Mythos in der Moderne, ed. J. Renger, Colloquien der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft 2 (Saarbrücken: Saarbrücker Druckerei und Verlag, 1999), 365-69.
4 See especially van Driel, JESHO 32 203-229.
6 Identified by Beaulieu, CBCY 1, 90.
Empire Nos. 34, 40, 44 and 94 (bought by the British Museum in 1894), and a promissory note to be published in a forthcoming volume of Cuneiform Texts in the Metropolitan Museum of Art accessioned in 1983. Clay mentioned “a number of Murašû texts dated in the reign of Darius II which are in private possession,” so more isolates may still appear.

Nos. 1-4 belong to types of contracts that are well known in Neo-Babylonian private archives, but they are extraordinary in the Murašû archive. In this respect, the Nies texts resemble the Berkeley text, a document with unique contents and purpose, but they differ from the British Museum texts, all examples of common types.

If the Nies and Berkeley texts were accidentally or surreptitiously lost to the excavators, their extraordinary character is a surprising coincidence. If they were knowingly set aside by the excavators or the curators of the excavated tablets, it is a surprising oversight. The irregular character of the texts takes on importance in the light of van Driel’s observation that the excavated group of Murašû texts represents a narrow range of business, affording only glimpses of other concerns, and his related surmise that the excavated group was a “dead archive” of stale documents set aside from current files and from records of durable legal value. Are these isolates, then, the traces of some livelier segment of the firm’s records? Perhaps they do not belong to the Murašû archive in the narrowest sense, that is, to the group of texts excavated in 1893. Perhaps they belong rather to other sub-archives, recording other segments of the firm’s operations, kept by the Murašûs or their successors apart from the excavated archive, or else kept separately by servants of the family and subordinates of the firm.

On a closer look, that conjecture does not account for the Nies tablets. Nos. 1-4 have no more durable legal value than the promissory notes, receipts and short-term leases that make up the bulk of the excavated archive. They come from the early years represented in the archive, so they were not useful records for current operations decades later, in the time of the latest texts of the archive. Their early dates explain, at least in part, why there are not many prosopographic links between them and the few contemporary texts from the excavated group. Why they were kept at all remains a question, but they were surely not in a file of current operations at the time of the closing of the archive. On the contrary, if the known archive was a dead file, these long-stale records of outstanding claims would have belonged in it.

Nos. 5 and 6, on the other hand, can be confidently assigned to the group excavated in 1893. The herd inventory No. 5, has close parallels among known Murašû texts. It belongs to the “Hilprecht Bequest” of tablets on permanent loan to the University of Pennsylvania Museum. No. 6 is a sublease of familiar type. It was catalogued with the main group of the Murašû tablets in the Collection of the Babylonian Section of the University of Pennsylvania Museum but overlooked by other publications of texts from the Murašû archive.

---

7 PBS 2/1, p. 7.
9 Identified by Bregstein “Seal Use,” 334 n. 46.
10 Identified by “Geographical Notes,” NABU1996/79.
11 No. 6 = CBS 5316, in numerical series with similar texts that were published in BE 9 and 10 (CBS 5313 = BE 9 28a, CBS 5314 = BE 9 54, CBS 5315 = BE 9 40; and CBS 5317 = BE 9 95, CBS 5318 = BE 10 17, etc.).
1. NBC 6148

Bit Arzāʾ

CBCY 1 55

26/VI/18 Artaxerxes I

26 September 447 B.C.

12 Gur Zú Lúm. Mā šá Kaskal

šá mUr-ra-šu-ú A-šú šá mḪa-tin

šá mŠú mArad-Še-nîl A-šú šá mMu-a

ina muḫ-ḫi ṁEN.l protection of A-šú šá mBa-[as]-si-ia

u mḪa-an-ni-ia A-šú šá mMu.ŠEN

u mŠEŠ-šú-nu Lú qal-la šá mMu.ŠEN

ina ITILAPIN Zú Lúm. Mā aʾ12 Gur

(1-6) 12 Gur of dates invested in a business venture by Murašū, son of Ḫātin, by the agency of Arad-Enlil, son of Iddinā, is owed by Bēl-ušallim, son of Bassija, and Ḥannija, son of Iddin-Bēl, and Ašušunu, servant of Iddin-Bēl. (7-9) In month VIII they [will pay] those 12 Gur of dates, (measured) [by] the 1-pānu measure of Iddin-Bēl, at the village [...]. (10) [They assume warranty for one another.]

(11-13) (Fragmentary.)

(14-16) (Witnesses).

(17-20) Scribe: [...], son of Šamaš-erība. Bit Arzāʾ. Month VI, day 25[+x], year 18, Artaxerxes, King of Lands.

(Left Edge) Fingernail mark of Bēl-ušallim?

2f. Arad-Enlil/Iddinā, here the agent of Murašū/Ḫātin, recurs in No. 2 as the agent of Enlil-šum-iddin/Murašū. His principals can only be the like-named members of the Murašū family. If so, this is the latest known appearance of the family’s namesake as an active party to a transaction. Arad-Enlil/Iddinā does not recur in other known texts from the Murašū archive.

5. A-šú šá mMu- over erasures.

5-6. Ḥannija/Iddin-Bēl recurs as debtor in No. 2. Neither he nor the other debtors recur in other known texts from the Murašū archive.
2.  NBC 6206  
CBCY 1 58  
Nippur 2/436 B.C.  
2/I/29 Artaxerxes I

(1) 10 GUR ŠE.BAR šá mARAD-dEn-lîl A šá  
(2) mSUM.NA-a šá KASKAL.u šá mōEn-lîl-MU-MU  
(3) A šá mMu-ra-šu-ú ina muh-ḫi  
(4) mHa-an-ni-ia A šá mMU-dEN!  
(5) ina ITIL.GU₄ šá MU.29.KÁM ŠE.BAR a’  
(6) 10 GUR ina EN.LIL.KI ina GIŠ.BAR  
(7) šá mARAD-dEn-lîl ina KA ka-lak-ki¹  
(8) i-nam-din e-lat ū-lil-tim¹.MEŠ  
(lower edge)  
(9) IGI.MEŠ šá ina muh-ḫi-šú ǃu?1 [ina muh-ḫi]  
(10) mMU-dEN¹ AD-šá  
(reverse)  
(11) LÚ.MU.KIN₇ mŠi-lim-DINGIR A šá mKa-šir  
(12) mEN-šu-nu A šá mARAD-dMAŠ mdMAŠ-MU?  
(13) A šá mARAD-dMAŠ MR-bat A šá mKa-šir  
(14) mdMAŠ-PAP A šá mdAG-ti-tan-nu  
(15) mMU-dEn-lîl A šá mBA-šá-a  
(16) LÚ.SID mNi-šu-ḫur-dEn-lîl A šá mEN-šu-nu  
(17) EN.LIL.KI ITLIBAR UD.2.KÁM  
(18) MU.29.KÁM mA r-tah-šá-as  
(19) LUGAL KUR.KUR  
(right edge) šu-pur / mHa-ša-ni-ia¹

(1-4) 10 gur of barley, invested in a business venture by Enlil-šum-iddin, son of Murašû, is owed to Arad-Enlil, son of Iddin-â, by Šannija, son of Iddin-Bêl. (5-8) In month II of year 29 he will pay that 10 gur of barley, (measured) by the measure of Arad-Enlil, at the granary gate in Nippur.  
(8-10) (This obligation is) in addition to previous promissory notes debited against him or [against] Iddin-Bêl, his father.  
(11-15) Witnesses: Silim-li, son of Kâšir; Bêlišunu, son of Arad-Ninurta; Ninurta-iddin⁷, son of Arad-Ninurta; Rîbat, son of Kâšir; Ninurta-nâsir, son of Nabû-îttannu; Iddin-Enlil, son of Iqîšâ.  
(Right Edge) Fingernail mark of Šannija.

4. Šannija: see No. 1:5.  
13. Rîbat/Kâšir: a witness in two texts from the Murašû archive (BE 8/1 126, 6/XII/37 Artaxerxes I; Entrepreneurs and Empire No. 103, 21/II/38 Artaxerxes I). The other witnesses do not recur in known texts from the Murašû archive.  
16. Cf. Ni-is-sa-ḫur-Enlil/Bêlišunu, a witness in three texts from the Murašû archive, all written at Nippur on the same day, 18/X/27 Artaxerxes I (BE 9, Istanbul Murašû Texts Nos. 66 and 67).
3. NBC 6122 Nippur 10/31 Artaxerxes I
CBCY 1 53 22 April 434 B.C.

(1-4) \(3\) gur of barley, invested in a business venture by Enlil-šum-iddin, son of Murašu, is owed to Arad-Ninurta, son of Nabû-kišir, by Rìbat, son of Ninurta-uballiṭ. (4-6) In month II of year 31 he will pay that \(3\) gur of barley, (measured) by the measure of Arad-Ninurta, in Nippur.

(6-8) Enlil-šum-iddin, son of Libluṭ, assumes warranty for the full payment of \(3\) gur of barley. (9) (This obligation) is in addition to a previous promissory note for silver held by Enlil-šum-iddin.

(10-13) Witnesses: Ninurta-mutirir-gimilli, son of Ninurta-uballiṭ; BèlŒunu, son of A¾uŒunu; A¾¾è-utìr, son of Ninurta-uballiṭ; Enlil-iddin, <son of> Enlil-kišir.


The creditor, the debtor, the guarantor, and the scribe do not appear in other known texts from the Murašu archive. Of the witnesses, BèlŒunu/A¾uŒunu appears in seventeen Murašu texts, always as a witness (earliest: Istanbul Murašu Texts, No. 72: 17/VI/41 Artaxerxes I; latest: PBS 2/1 161, --IX/[1] Darius II); the others do not appear in other texts from the Murašu archive.

One of the ways in which the Murašu archive differs from the largest early Achaemenid private legal archives is in its dearth of records arising from \(harrānu\) enterprises. There are no agreements creating the partnerships, no receipts, and no records of the division of income or assets arising from the enterprises. This dearth is probably why the only other example of a promissory note for assets invested in a \(harrānu\) enterprise, \(BE\) 9 61 (dated 19/I/38 Artaxerxes I), has been overlooked. \(^{12}\) Like Nos. 1-3, \(BE\) 9 61 implies a situation in which the Murašuš were the source of capital but were not directly involved in the investments made by their subordinates or

---

\(^{12}\) I owe the characterization of \(BE\) 9 61 to A. Leo Oppenheim’s marginalia on Cardascia Murašu, 63-64 (see p. 56 n. 6c). The text begins: (1) 3 GUR 1 P 3 QA ŠE.BAR (2) šá \(m\)ARAD-\(m\)AŠ A šá (3) AG-ki-šir šá KASKAL\(^{10}\) (not: \(qib\) \(m\)Ri-mut A šá \(m\)Mu-ra-šú-ú (5) ina muḫ-ḫi \(m\)ARAD-\(m\)AŠ A šá \(m\)EN-šú-nu (3) šá KASKAL\(^{10}\) (not: \(qib\) \(m\)Ri-mut A šá \(m\)Mu-ra-šú-ú (5) ina muḫ-ḫi \(m\)ARAD-\(m\)AŠ A šá \(m\)EN-šú-nu (3) šá KASKAL\(^{10}\) (not: \(qib\) \(m\)Ri-mut A šá \(m\)Mu-ra-šú-ú (5) ina muḫ-ḫi \(m\)ARAD-\(m\)AŠ A šá \(m\)EN-šú-nu (3) šá KASKAL\(^{10}\) (not: \(qib\) \(m\)Ri-mut A šá \(m\)Mu-ra-šú-ú (5) ina muḫ-ḫi
in the conduct of the enterprise by the recipients, and did not profit directly from the eventual return.

Bailment of Livestock *ana zitti*

4. NBC 6147  
    Nippur  
    3/1/28 Artaxerxes

CBCY 1 55  
    16 April 437 B.C.

(1) GU₄.ÅB.GAL sa-an-du MU₆-i-tum šá-ši-in-du
(2) šá ṅEN-bul-li₇-su A šá ṅMU₄-dAG a-na tik-kî₇?-š[ú]
(3) na-šá-a-tú ṅEN-bul-li₇-su GU₄.ÅB.GAL MU.MEŠ
(4) a-na ḪA.LA a-na ½ MA.NA KÙ.BABBAR qa-lu-ú
(5) a-di-i 3-ta MU.AN.NA.¹MEŠ¹ a-na ṅt̄am-meš-di-Ô1-[ni]
(6) LÚ qal-la šá ṅEn-lîl-ḥa-tin id-din KÙ.BABBAR a₁
(7) 15 GÎN qa-lu-ú a-na ma-la ḪA.LA-šú
(8) ṅEN-bul-li₇-su A šá ṅMU₄-dAG ina ŠU²
(9) ṅt̄am-meš-di-i-ni ma-ḫi-ir e-tir ina iš⁻-kw-[ra-tum]
(10) u tam-lit-tum a-ḫa-a-tú šá-nu pu-ut re⁻-I i-tum¹
(11) su-ud-du-du u EN.NUN šá GU₄.ÅB.[GAL MU.MEŠ]
(lower edge)
(12) ṅt̄am-meš-di-i⁻ni¹ [na-ši 1-en.TA.ÂM]
(reverse)
(13) ṣá-ṭa-ri TÏ⁻[ú ...]
(14) GU₄² [ ...]
(15) ṅi²⁻-lx₁-kâ[ ...]
(16) ṅx-x-a-št² [ ...]
(17) A šá lx₁⁻-En-li²[ ...]
(18) ṅARAD-iâ¹[ ...]
(19) LÚ.ŠID ṅEN-GI² A šá ṅTÏ⁻[nì-e-Î EN.L[ĪL.KI]
(20) TÏI.BAR UD.3.KÂM MU.28.KÂM
(21) ṅ[...] r-ṭab⁻-šá-as-su LUGAL KUR.KUR
(reverse)  ṣu-pur [ ...]

(1-3) A red six-year-old cow which bears the mark of Bêl-bullissu, son of Iddin-Nabû, on its neck—(3-6) Bêl-bullissu turned over that cow to IltammeŒ-dìnì, servant of Enlil-ḥătin, for shared ownership in (a total value of) a half mina of refined silver for three years. (6-9) Bêl-bullissu, son of Iddin-Nabû, has received that 15 shekels of silver from IltammeŒ-dìnì for his share; he is paid. (9-10) They are to have equal shares in the … and offspring. (11-12) IltammeŒ-dìnì assumes (sole) responsibility for pasturage, care, and protection of [that] cow. (12-13) [Each has taken] one (copy of this) document.

(14-18) (Fragmentary).


(Reverse) Fingernail of [...].

The bailor, the bailee, and the scribe do not occur in other texts from the Murašû archive. It is not certain that the Enlil-ḥătin named in line 6 is the like-named member of the Murašû family, who apparently died within six months of the date of this text; see *Istanbul Murašû Texts*, p. 118. *CAD*’s rendering of *ana zitti nadâmû* as “to give in bailment” (zittu mng. 2e 3’) reflects the opinion that
Where animals are delivered to be taken care of for a certain time, and at the expiration of that time the same number of animals is to be returned, and any increase is to be enjoyed by both parties, there is a bailment, not a partnership.\(^{13}\)

The conditions noted in this remark being exactly those ordinarily found in Neo-Babylonian contracts for transmission of livestock *ana zitti* (see von Bolla-Kotek, *Untersuchungen zur Tiermiete und Viehpacht im Altertum*, 2nd rev. ed., Münchener Beiträge zur Papyrologie und Antiken Rechtsgeschichte 30 [Munich: C.H. Beck, 1969], 129ff., Lanz *Harrānu*, 183ff.).

No other contract of this kind is found among the known texts from the Murašš archive. This appears to be the latest known text of the type. Other late Achaemenid documents arising from the same contractual relationship are *OECT* 10 181+ (Xerxes, year 17), pursuant to a division of assets in a bailment of a heifer and a female calf (*ana zitti iddinu arki ... itti aḫāmeš ū-Za-zi- ’*), and *OECT* 10 209 (Hursagkalama, Artaxerxes, year 34), an agreement in which two partners provide two oxen each on mutual bailment (*itti aḫāmeš ana zitti iškunu*).

1-3. Cf. *BE* 9 20:1-3 (1/VIII/30 Artaxerxes I), using similar terms to describe a cow leased for fixed annual rental (*ana sāti*).

3, 7. The first amount is the entire value of the animal, the basis on which the half shares are calculated, and the second amount is the cost of the bailee’s half share, *mala zittišu*. The same relationships appear in Wunsch *Iddin-Marduk* No. 151, in which 60 sheep and goats are given *ana zitti ana 1 mana ½ šigil kaspi*, “for shares in 1½ mina of silver,” the first installment (*pūt zitti*) of ½ mina being paid at the time of the contract, the balance (*rēḥet*), ½ mina, to be paid after two months; see Wunsch *Iddin-Marduk*, p. 55.


Animal Inventory

5. L-29-554 10/III/6 [Darius II] 22 June 418 B.C.

(1) 14 UDU *pu-hal* 46 SILA₄
(2) 2 ME 31 U₉ GAL-ti a-lit-tum
(3) 75 UDU *par-rat* DUMU.SAL.MU.AN.NA
(4) 18 MĀŠ GAL 10 MĀŠ MU 2-ū
(5) 28 MĀŠ TUR 1 ME 5 ÚZ GAL-ti a-[l]it-tūl
(6) 48 SAL.ĀŠ.GAR DUMU.SAL.MU.AN.NA
(7) PAP₁ PAP 5 ME 75¹ Š-e-en BABBAR-ti
(8) MI-in-du GAL-ti u qal-lat šā *mRī-bat*
(9) A šā *mEN-SU LŪ.ARAD šā *mRī-mu₂dMAŠ* (lower edge)
(10) *ana GIŠ.BAR ina IGI *mA b-da- ’LŪ.SIPA(reverse)
(11) LŪ.ARAD šā *mRī-bat UD.10.KĀM šā ITI.SIG₄
(12) šā MU.6.KĀM e-piš nik-ka-su
(13) e-pu-uš ŠI-sū a-mi-ir ma-nu
(14) u paq-da-āš-šū (reverse) *un-qu / mA b-da- ’* NA₉.KIŠIB *mA b-da- ’*

1-3) 14 rams; 46 (male) lambs; 231 full-grown ewes fit to bear young; 75 yearling female sheep. (4-6) 18 full-grown he-goats; 10 two-year-old he-goats; 28 male kids; 105² full-grown she-goats fit to bear young; 48 yearling she-goats.

(7-11) Grand total: 575 head of livestock, sheep and goats (lit. white and black), adult and young, belonging to Rībat, son of Bēl-erība, servant of Rìmāt-Ninurta, are held on lease by the

---

shepherd Abdā’, servant of Ribat. (11-14) On day 10, month III, year 6 accounts were settled with him; (the herd) was inspected, counted, and turned over to him.

(Reverse) Ring of Abdā’. Seal of Abdā’.

Formally identical texts from the Murašu archive are BE 10 105f. and PBS 2/1 118, all written on 10/III/6 Darius II, all recording herds of sheep and goats committed by Ribat/Bel-eriba to men called “shepherd of Ribat.” See Cardascia Murašu, 187; Joannes Textes économiques, 68 n. 2; van Driel, JESHO 32 225; Bregstein “Seal Use,” 334 n. 46.

1. BE 10 105f. and PBS 2/1 118 enter parru lambs between puḫālu and puḫādu (UDI.SILIA).

10. Of several individuals called Abdā’ in Murašu texts, the most plausible candidate for identification with the man in this text is the Abdā’ who is named with Bel-ittannu (both without patronyms) as an agent of Rimūt-Ninurta/Murāšu in promissory notes for barley issued in outlying settlements during the first regnal year of Darius I (BE 10 119 and 120, PBS 2/1 221 [all drawn up in Al Balšam]; PBS 2/1 222 [drawn up in Al Enlil-aššu-iqbi]).

Reverse. There is no visible Aramaic epigraph (as on the animal inventories BE 10 105f. and PBS 2/1 118) or fingernail mark (as on BE 10 105). PBS 2/1 118 has a single impression of the shepherd’s ring. BE 10 105 and 106 have no seal impressions.

Sublease

6. CBS 5316

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>9 July 434 B.C.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sublease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;Nippur&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30/III/31 Artaxerxes I</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Ṣê. NUMUN KA šul-pu ša A.ŠA ša mEN-DIN-it u Ṣû-ita ȘE.NUMUN ša LUGAL
(2) u ša LÚ ga-ar-du ša ina muḫḫi ĪD ka-sal e-lat da-lu. MEŠ
(3) ša GÚ ID ka-sal ŠE.NUMUN ša LUGAL ŠE.NUMUN ša mEŠ.MEŠ-MU u ŠE.NUMUN
(4) ša ‘Kl En-līl-DIN ša ina muḫḫi ĪD Ša-ši-‘-du u 1-en GĪŠ.APIN
(5) 1ʿṣ4 GUR ŠE.BAR a-na ŠE.NUMUN 1 GUR ŠE.GIG.BA 7 GUR ŠE.ZĪZ.ĀM aī-4 BĀN ŠE.GĪŠ.ī-a
(6) [...]. GĪŠ.GAL 1 (PI 4) (BĀN) GŪ.TUR 1 PI duh-nu a-na GĪŠ.BAR
(7) [bi-i]n-nam-ma ina MU.AN.NA 2 ME 80 GUR ŠE.BAR
(8) [...]. GŪ.TUR 20 GUR ŠE duh-nu 10 GUR ka-as-si-ia aī-2 GUR.ŠE.GĪŠ.ī-a
(9) 2 GUR PM EGU EBAR lu-ud-dak-ka ār-ki mE[En-līl]-MU-MU
(10) 1ʿṣ-me-šu-ma ŠE.NUMUN MU.MEŠ GĪŠ.APIN a4 1-en u EBUR ša a-na ŠE.NUMUN
(11) a-na MU.AN.NA 4 ME GUR EBUR id-daš-šu
(lower edge)
(12) ina ITI.GU šE.BAR a4 2 ME 80 GUR GĪŠ.BA a4
(13) 7 GUR ŠE.ZĪZ.ĀM a4 70 GUR GĪŠ.GAL a4 12 GUR(reverse)
(14) GŪ.TUR 1 a4,1 GUR duh-nu a4 20 GUR ka-as-si-ia a4,10 GUR ŠE.GĪŠ.ī a4 2 GUR-
(15) 4 GUR PM EGU i-nam-din ul-tu ITI.DU ša MU 31.KĀM
(16) GĪŠ.BAR MU.MEŠ 1EN 31-4 MU.AN.NA.MEŠ ina IGÎ-šu GU₄ ǦīLA ša ina lib-bi
(17) i-mut-tu₄ i-ṣaq-qap
(18) 1ʿṣ. LŪ.MU.KIN, mBa-ni-ia DUMU ša mBa-rîk-DINGIR.MEŠ mRî-bat A ša mNî-qud
(19) mE[Maš-na]-din-MU A ša mU-bal-liš-su-dŠU mE[UTU]-ŠEŠ-MU
(20) A ša mE[Maš]-SUR mE[Mu-MU] A ša mKâ-šīr mARAD-d₄50 A ša
(21) mE[En-līl]-mARAD-d₄mE[Maš]-dIn-ît
(22) MU.AN.NA ša [qi-ib (…) mE[En-līl]-MU-MU im-mid
(23) mE[Enšada]-MU L[Ú.SID A ša mE[ARAD-d]ME.ME ITILSIG₄ UD.30.KĀM
(upper edge) Ṣu-pur mE-x-x-šu₁-lu-ū-nu
Qarḥānu, servant of Enlil-šum-iddin, voluntarily addressed Enlil-šum-iddin, son of Murašu, as follows:

(3-9) "Lease to me arable land for cereal cultivation, the field of Bēl-uballit and Ukittu, arable land of the king and the gardu-workers, located on the drainage ditch—but excluding properties irrigated from wells that are located on the drainage ditch—(as well as) arable land of king, arable land of Aḫḫē-iddin and arable land of Itti-Enlil-balatu that are (all) located on the Saḫīdu canal, along with one plow, 34 gur of barley for seed, 1 gur of wheat, 7 gur of emmer, 4 sētu of sesame, [x] chickpeas, 1½ pānu of lentils, 1 pānu of millet, and (9-12) each year I will pay you 280 gur of barley, 7 gur of wheat, 70 gur of emmer, 12 gur of chickpeas, 1 gur of lentils, 20 gur of millet, 10 gur of kasū, 2 gur of sesame, altogether 400 gur of crops." (12-14) Then Enlil-šum-iddin acceded to his request and gave him that arable land, the aforesaid one plow, and crops for seed, for 400 gur of crops (as rent) per year. (15-18) In month II he will pay the barley, namely 280 gur, the wheat, namely 7 gur, the emmer, namely 70 gur, the chickpeas, namely 12 gur, the lentils, namely 1 gur, the millet, namely 20 gur, the kasū, <namely 10 gur>, the sesame, namely 2 gur, altogether 400 gur. (18-19) That rental (is effective) as of month VII of year 31, for three years. (19-20+25) He (the tenant) will pay, in whatever year Enlil-šum-iddin’s order may require it, an indemnity for any of the oxen that die.


(Left Edge) [Fingernail mark] of Qarḥānu.


3. Cf. mŪ-kit-tū, one of several proprietors of land for which Naqqūṭu, daughter of Murašu, paid rent on 9/N/29 Artaxerxes I in Entrepreneurs and Empire No. 46:3 (= JCS 28 196).3f. Despite occasional mention of royal property characterized with an Iranian loanword in the phrase uzbara ša arri (e.g., BE 9 67:4, 8, 10 and 12 and 73:1), property characterized simply as arable land (ŠE.NUMUN) of the king is surprisingly absent from other known texts from the Murašu archive. Arable land (ŠE.NUMUN) of gardu workers: BE 9 101:3, BE 10 92:4 (and haṭru ša LÚ gardu ibid. 7); fields (AŠ.A MEŠ) of gardu workers: PBS 2/1 2:1 and 13 and 204:8.


7. 11. a– ... a written on the right edge in small, shallow script.19-20+25. Cf. BE 9 29:22f. and 30:26f., both leases drawn up by the same scribe as this text on 12/N/32 Artaxerxes I, hence about fourteen months later than this text, but before some of the same witnesses; Entrepreneurs and Empire No. 17, a near-duplicate of BE 9 30, and BE 9 26, both drawn up by a different scribe on the same day as this text and before the same witnesses. The second part of the clause, in line 25, echoing Entrepreneurs and Empire No. 17 r. 4r and BE 9 26:12ff., was a belated addition, distributed on the tablet where space was available.
B. The šaknu and the šandabakku of Nippur

7. YBC 11564

Lease

Nippur 22+/--/4 Darius II

420/19 B.C.

(1) ŠE NUMUN.MEŠ LÚ pa-½-ši-še MEŠ šá EN.LÍL.KI
(2) šá ina URU ID eš-šedu-tum A URU É ša-[T]a-ma-baš [bi]-[x]
(3) mdENKÁM LÚ šak-nu šá EN.LÍL.KI A šá mSi-lim-DINGIR
(4) a-na GIŠ.BAR a-di-10 ta MU.AN.MEŠ
(5) a-na MU.AN.MA 5 GUR ŠE.BAR a-na mMU-da-AMAR.UTU
(6) A šá mDIN-su-AMAR.UTU û-da-din ina MU.AN.MA
(7) ina ITI.GU4 ŠE.BAR a 5 GUR mMU-da-AMAR.UTU
(8) [a]-na mdENKÁM ina-an-din TA ITIL.BÁR
(9) MU.4.KÁM a-di-10 ta MU.AN.MEŠ
(10) ŠE NUMUN.MEŠ DM1 MEŠ ana GIŠ.BAR ina IGÍ mMU-da-AMAR.UTU
(reverse)

(11) mdEn-líl-MU-líl-bir A šá mNa-[di-š]
(12) LÚ.MU.KIN4 mKAL-a A šá mNa-di A mA.BA-da-50-da-ri
(13) mdEn-líl-ŠEŠ-it-tam-nu A šá mEN-shú-nu mLa-ba-ši A šá
(14) mK-di-n mSUH-SUR A šá mMDASH DA mdKÁ-SUR A šá
(15) m[k]-a-sír mDIN A šá mdEn-líl-KÁD mDŠU-MU A šá [x]
(16) mTT-tam-nu A šá mÚ-bar
(17) mDU-A A šá mdMDASH-PAP mDIM-MU A šá
(18) mdMDASH-na-di-š
(19) LÚ.SÍD mARAD-MAŠ A šá mNIGÍN-EN-líl EN.LÍL.KI ITI [x]
(20) UD.22.[x.KÁM] MU.4.KÁM mDar-a-muš LUGAL KUR.KUR
(reverse)

NA4 KISIB mMD50-MU-líl-bir A šá mNa-di NA4 KISIB mLa-ba-ši A šá mKi-dí
(left edge)
un-qu AN.BAR mMD50-ŠEŠ-it-tam-nu A šá mEN-shú-nu
(upper edge)
un-qu AN.BAR A šá mdENKÁM LÚ šak-[nu šá EN.LÍL.KI] A šá mSí-[lim-DINGIR]
(lower edge)
[ ... ] / mdMDASH-ana-ša-ša-šaši A šá MLu-[i-di-š]

(1-6) Bél-ēreš, the šaknu of Nippur, son of Silim-II, leased fields of unassigned holdings of people of Nippur that are in the village of Nāru-ešetu and the village of Bīt Tābat-gabbi-x to Iddin-Marduk, son of Uballisu-Marduk, for ten years, for 5 gur of barley per year. (6-8) Each year in month II Iddin-Marduk will pay that 5 gur of barley to Bél-ēreš. (8-10) Those fields are under Iddin-Marduk’s control, on lease, for ten years as of month I, year 4.

(11-18) Witnesses: Aqara, son of Nādin, descendant of Mannu-Enlil-dāri; Enlil-šum-lilīr, son of Nādin; Enlil-āḫ-ittānū, son of Bēlšunu; Lābāšī, son of Kidīn; Ina-tēšē-ētīr, son of Ninurta-lēʾī; Bābu-ēṭēṭ, son of Kāṣī; Balātu, son of Enlil-kāṣī; Marduk-iddīn, son of [...] Tattānū, son of Ubār; Mukīn-apli, son of Ninurta-nāsīd; Addu-iddīn, son of Ninurta-nādīn.

(19-20) Scribe: Arad-Ninurta, son of Upaḫḫir-Enlīl. Nippur. Month V, day 22[+x], Year 4, Darius, K[ing of Lands].

(Reverse) Seal of Enlil-šum-lilīr, son of Nādin. Seal of Lābāšī, son of Kidīn. (Left Edge) Iron ring of Enlil-āḫ-ittānū, son of Bēlšunu. (Upper Edge) Iron ring of Bél-ēreš, the šak [nu of Iddīn], son of Sī[lim-II]. (Lower Edge) […] Ninurta-ana-bitīsī, son of Lu-[idīja].

1. Cf. ŠE NUMUN.MEŠ ša LÚ pa-ši-ševen-si ša LÚ EN.LÍL.KÍ. MEŠ TuM 2-3 145+Entrepreneurs and Empire No. 27:2, and ŠE NUMUN.MEŠ LÚ pa-ši-ševen-si ša ina mühḫī ŠE NUMUN.MEŠ ša LÚ EN.LÍL.KÍ. MEŠ BE 9 65:3. For the extraordinary masculine form cf. GIŠ.BAN ša PN pa-[ši-ši] (listed after fractional shares of bow lands of named individuals and before unqualified bow lands of named individuals) BE 9 8:7, 8, and 9, and ana mühḫī 4-ša pa-ši-ši [ša PN] (listed after unqualified bow lands of named individuals).
GIŠ.BAN ša PN pa-ši-ti [line 6], and quarter-shares of named individuals) BE 9 23:11. Otherwise, the adjective is regularly feminine, even with determinative LÚ (apparently not = ša, to judge by ša LÚ p. in TuM 2-3 145+, above). It is usually plural (but GIŠ.BAN [pa]-ši-tu ša PN ša ḫatru ša NN BE 10 90:3, 2-ta GIŠ.BAN pa-ši-tu ša PN u PN, PBS 2/1 76:9). It appears most often in the phrase uṣuzzāʾēti (uṣuzzājēti) u (LÚ) pa-ṭṣēti (paṭšēti). The phrase describes bow lands constituting a named ḫatru organization (BE 9 60:6 and 14 and dupl. Istanbul Murašû Texts No. 33; BE 10 15:2; PBS 2/1 114:4, 117:4, 120:4f., 188:3, 205:2, 217:5). In Murašû texts, the adjective uṣuzzāʾēti occurs only in this phrase, but p. appears occasionally without u. (GIŠ.BAN PN ša iina GN 2-ta pa-ši-še-e-ti [after fractional bow lands, before unqualified bow lands] BE 9 44:10, GIŠ.BAN PN [...] pa-ši-še-e-ti Istanbul Murašû Texts No. 52:12). Elsewhere, u. appears once without p., at the head of a fragmentary list of bow lands constituting a ḫatru (VAS 6 302:1).

In sum, u. and p. appear in complementary parallelism. Together, they have comprehensive meaning, to describe all bow lands belonging to ḫatru s. Like the term “bow land” itself and some terms for fractional holdings, p. appears with determinative LÚ and sometimes even construed with a masculine form, but u. does not. The word u. indicates a usual, general condition, the word p. a special, marked condition.

Given the limited contexts, proposed translations have rested on etymological connection with uṣuzzu, “stand” (rather than šuzzuzu, “register”) and paʾšu, “crush,” and on suppositions about socio-economic conditions and administrative practices. Pognon’s suggestion that u. described land conferred on archers in military service, and p. lands granted to other sorts of beneficiaries (“Notes lexicographiques et textes assyriens inédits,” JA 1917 387 n. 1) has been generally ignored and forgotten. Poebel’s similar proposals “Dienst- und Zinslehen, socages and copyhold fiefs” (Studies in Akkadian Grammar, AS 9 [1939] 80 n. 1), were cited with apparent approval by Falkenstein (review of Cardascia Murašû, ZSS70 [1953] 410) and von Soden (review of Cardascia Murašû, BiOr 11 [1954] 206f., suggesting as an alternative “intact and not intact,” leaving open the question of what those qualifications might really mean as applied to land holdings). More convincingly, Joannes (Textes économiques 35) proposed that characterizations of bow lands as “existing and dissolved” resulted from the practical need for foremen (šaknu) of ḫatru to maintain current records of the status of constituent bow lands. The records would indicate whether the bow lands were assigned and to whom, whether they were leased or pledged, and whether they were producing required revenues. With a different emphasis, van Driel (JESHO 32 219) saw the occasional mentions of “unoccupied” bow lands (GIŠ.BAN.MES pa ṣaṭēti) beside occupied ones as a sign that foremen had difficulty finding suitable tenants to hold and exploit the properties, a special case of a more general shortage of rural labor.

If p. has an administrative sense such as “vacant” or “unassigned,” such phrases as GIŠ.BAN ša PN paʾšil-pa ṣaṭēti etc. must refer to currently unassigned properties that were still identified by the names of past occupants. In a similar vein, Aršam, the sratap of Egypt, referred to “property of PN, his (deceased) father . . . that was abandoned and not made over [to my estate] and not given by me to another servant” that was to be granted to PN’s son (Driver Aramaic Documents No. 8, see Porten, Textbook of Aramaic Documents from Ancient Egypt 1: Letters [Jerusalem: The Hebrew University, 1986] No. A6.11).

and Upper Edge. Bēl-ēreš/Silim-II, šaknu of Nippur: witness, with the same title, in TuM 2-3 204 (7/VI5 3 Darius II).

5f. Iddin-Marduk/UBallissu-Marduk: thirty-five times in Murašû texts dated between 436/5 and 431 B.C., four times with the title šaknu of Nippur (see JCS 40 131 n. 20 and 135); and, without title, as the tenant of bow lands supervised by another šaknu of Nippur, in JCS 40 132, dated about ten months before this text (15/VII3 3 Darius II).

11. Enil-šīmu-lilur/Nādin: see JCS 40 136 comment to line 11.

12. Aqara/Nādin//Mannu-Enlil-dārī: with ancestor’s name, as a witness in six Murašû texts dated between 29/III1 3 Darius II (PBS 2/1 175) and 19/X4 3 Darius (PBS 2/1 202); without ancestor’s name, as a witness in eight Murašû texts dated between 8/VI3/35 Artaxerxes I (BE 9 41) and 8/IV3/3 Darius II (PBS 2/1 62); once as a scribe (BE 9 7a, 19/X6 26 Artaxerxes I); seal = PBS 14 No. 962, TuM 2-3 pl. 99 No. 68, Bregstein “Seal Use” No. 254.


14f. Ina-tēšē-ēš/Ninurta-lē’ē: six times in Murašû texts dated between 436/5 and 425/4 B.C., and as one of three collectors (dēkū) of rent paid for bow lands under the supervision of the šaknu of Nippur in JCS 40 132; see JCS 40 135. Bābuʾ-ēšēret/Kāṣir and Balātu/Enil-Kāṣir are the other two collectors. Bābuʾ-ēšēret/Kāṣir: likewise (i.e., 4KĀ, not 4AMAR.UTU) in JCS 40 132:4 and obv. (coll.); see below No. 11:16.

15. Tattannu/Ubīr: scribe in Entrepreneurs and Empire No. 97+Istanbul Murašû Texts No. 96 (9f–34 Artaxerxes I) and thirteen other Murašû texts dated between 7/VII4 3 Artaxerxes I (BE 9 100,
Entrepreneurs and Empire No. 78, *Istanbul Murašu Texts* Nos. 77 and 78) and 2/1/1 Darius II (*PBS* 2/1 23).

   Reverse. Seal of Enlil-šum-lilbir/Nādin apparently = *TuM* 2-3 pl. 99 No. 38, Bregstein “Seal Use” No. 436; see *JCS* 40 136.
   Upper Edge. Ring of Bēl-ēreš/Silim-Il, šaknu of Nippur = *TuM* 2-3 pl. 100 No. 80, Bregstein “Seal Use” No. 605.
   Lower Edge. Poorly preserved impression of stamp seal with two scorpion-men, face to face, with censer between them, similar to *PBS* 14 Nos. 893-6.

No. 7 comes from the same ancient source as *JCS* 40 132 (= YBC 11551), that is, from the records of Iddin-Marduk/Uballiṣussu-Marduk. On the basis of *JCS* 40 132, a receipt for Iddin-Marduk’s payment of rent in silver to agents of a man entitled šaknu of Nippur, I proposed that the šaknu of Nippur occupied the same functional role as the foremen (šaknu) of ḫāṭru-organizations. He was not a civil “city governor” with wide administrative powers. He was the short-term foreman of an organization that included some townsmen of Nippur who held properties assigned by the crown, an organization that had all the attributes of a ḫāṭru. No. 7 supports this proposition. It documents explicitly what was implicit in *JCS* 40 132, that šaknu of Nippur leased farmland to Iddin-Marduk (himself a former šaknu of Nippur). Furthermore, here the leased property is qualified with a term, paššu, that is otherwise specific to bow lands organized in ḫāṭru s. All the elements of a “ḫāṭru of people of Nippur” are attested except the actual phrase naming the association.

“Šaknu of Nippur,” then, was not a replacement for the traditional title held by earlier civil governors of Nippur, šandaḫakkû. As Ran Zadok has observed (review of Frame, *Babylonia* 689-627 B.C., *WO* 25 [1994]152 and “Notes on Babylonian Geography and Prosopography, 2. Central Babylonia,” *NABU* 1997/6 No. 2), the title šandaḫakkû survived under late Achaemenid rule and probably even under Parthian rule, although the contexts in which the title appear give no useful information on the political or administrative powers associated with it. Zadok points to Sachs-Hunger *Diaries* No. -72:10’, from 73 B.C., presumably composed at Babylon, and to the following text, drawn up at Nippur not long after the compilation of the Murašu archive.

**Date-Gardening Contract**

8. CBS 7961

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>ŠE.NUMUN zaq-pi u KA šul-pu A.UD 150 GÚ ÍD Šap-dUTU</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>Ė ANŠE.KUR.RA «KUR» UŠ.SA.DU ŠE.NUMUN šá mdEn-lil-NUMUN-DÙ ŠLÚ šu-šá-an-nu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>UŠ.SA.DU ŠE.NUMUN šá mdMAŠ-ga-mil LÚ šá-na-&lt;da-1&gt;ba-1ka</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>u mŠNUM.A-a šá Ė qa-šu-ut-tum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>ŠE.NUMUN šá mdMAŠ-ŠES-MU A mMu-[&lt;ir²]-x]-ŠES-MU ŠE.NUMUN MU.MEŠ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>a-na LÚ.NU.GIŠ.SAR-ú-tú a-dí 3²-[&lt;a&gt;] MU.AN.MEŠ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| (7) | a-na mdEn-lil-SIG²-ÚRû A šá mdMAŠ-MU u mdMAŠ-KÁM² A šá md²[x]-x id-[<in dul-lu ina šu-pal GIŠ.GIŠIMMAR>]
| (8) | ip-pu-u²š-<lib-bi ḫa-ru-ut-tum í-nam-šar-<a-s[<a-a-tú] |
| (9) | šáš¹ ina lib-bi i-ḫar-ri mim-ma ma-la ina šu-pal GIŠ.GIŠ[IMMAR ip-pu]-uš-[ ] |
| (10) | [a-na] ram-ni-šá-nu ik-kal-<ZÚ.LU.MA ina muḫ-ḫi man-[<a-ga] |
| (11) | [im]-mi-du-šá-nu-ú-tu i-nam-dí-nú-[<i-i ZAG.LU la [i-ta-ši]-1zu¹-[ ] |
| (12) | [an] 1 GUR ŠE.NUMUN ri-ip-qí 5 GUR ZÚ.LU.MA sis-[<šin-ni] |
| (13) | [i-nam-daš]-šá-nu u₃-mu a-di la²-<MU.AN.MEŠ 1a⁻¹ |
| (14) | [3²-ta] i₁šal-lim-<ŠE.NUMUN MU.MEŠ un-daš-[šîr- ] |
(15) [dul-lu ina] lib-bi la ṣte-ēp-ṣu-[ḫ] n
(16) [...] x x TI[1] 2 u₄-mu [...] ]
(17) [...] x x

(reverse)
(1') [TI]NE 1 [...] ]

(upper edge) [un qa m]ARHUŠ-GAR / A šá mMu-[r[a'...] // un qa mX-[...] // A šá mŠEŠ-[...] // un qa m²MAS-na-[dīn?] / A m²MAS-x [...] ]
(left edge) (traces of captions accompanying partial impressions of two rings)

(1-5) Arable land, both orchard and grain field, ... on the left bank of the Šappputtu canal, a horse-property adjoining arable land of Enlil-zēr-ibni the šušānu, adjoining arable land of Ninurta-gāmil the šandabakku and Iddinā the person in charge of the livestock pen, arable land belonging to Ninurta-aḫ-iddin, son of ...-aḫ-iddin—

(5-7) He (the proprietor) turned that property over to Enlil-uppultuʔ-ūṣur, son of Aḫ-iddin, and to Ninurta-ērēšʔ, son of ... for three years, for growing dates.

(7-10) They will do [work under the palms.] They will protect the fronds and flowers. He? will clean the drainage canals that flow out of (the property). They may take for their own consumption whatever they raise beneath the palms. (10-13) An assessment of the date crop will be made? (while it is still) on the spathes, (and) they will pay it. If they do not concur in? the assessment, he will pay them 5 gur of dates as sissinnu payment for each gur of ground that has been broken and cultivated.

(13-15) If they abandon that property before those three? years are complete, (or if) they do not do the work on it ...

(Remainder fragmentary.)

(14) Ring of Rēme-šukun, son of Mura[...]. Ring of ... son of Aḫi—... Ring of Ninurta-nādinʔ, son of Ninurta-x. (Left Edge) (Traces of captions.)

2. Zadok WO 25 152 and NABU 1997/6 No. 2 (p. 5), identifies Ninurta-gāmil the šandabakku with Ninurta-gāmil L.U.GU.[...] in a text from the reign of Artaxerxes II, Durand, Textes babylonienspl. 50 AO 17637:1 (= Joanna’s Textes économiques, 31 No. 1). He restores the latter’s title as L.U.GU.[EN.NA] = šandabakku, despite the reservations of Joanna’s Textes économiques, 32 and 35 (reading L.U.GU.[GAL] = gugallu). If this identification (the plainest and most parsimonious reading of the texts) is correct, then it points to a date for this text in the reign of Darius II or Artaxerxes II.
3. Cf. ina ṣmu ina šu-pālu gišimmari ippus ana ramnišu ikkal qalī jānu saluppī ina mūḫī manaša imnissama inakkis “he (the tenant) will take for his own consumption whatever he raises beneath the palm(s), there will be no share of the yield (paid to the landlord), he (the landlord) will make an assessment against him (the tenant) on the dates while they are still on the spathes, and (the tenant) will cut (them)” BE 9 99:8ff. and near-duplicate Istanbul Murašša Texts No. 31:8ff.; ZŪ.LUM.MA ina mūḫī man[gaga] iim-mid-da-na inakkisma inandin BE 8/1 132:11ff.; [ZŪ.LUM.MA ina mūḫī manaša] iml-mid-su-ma inakkis] PBS 2/1 215:8ff.; see Coquerillat Palméraies, 63 with n. 143, Landsberger Date-Palm, 46 with n. 158, and Ries Bodenpachtformulare, 93f.

10f. Restored and emended after mimma mālu ina šu-pālu gišimmari ippus ana ramnišu ikkal qalī jānu saluppī ina mūḫī manaša imnissama inakkis “he (the tenant) will take for his own consumption whatever he raises beneath the palm(s), there will be no share of the yield (paid to the landlord), he (the landlord) will make an assessment against him (the tenant) on the dates while they are still on the spathes, and (the tenant) will cut (them)” BE 9 99:8ff. and near-duplicate Istanbul Murašša Texts No. 31:8ff.; ZŪ.LUM.MA ina mūḫī man[gaga] iim-mid-da-na inakkisma inandin BE 8/1 132:11ff.; [ZŪ.LUM.MA ina mūḫī manaša] iml-mid-su-ma inakkis] PBS 2/1 215:8ff.; see Coquerillat Palméraies, 63 with n. 143, Landsberger Date-Palm, 46 with n. 158, and Ries Bodenpachtformulare, 93f.

\( \text{sí-iz\[a-na]} \) 1 \( \text{GUR ŠE.NUMUN} \) \( \text{f\[3 \times 1 \text{GUR súluppí sissinn\[u inanda\[šu]} \text{BE 8/1 132:12f.}; \text{and ina ūmu imittu} \text{la it-ta\[\text{-}3\text{-}iz\text{-zu}\text{-zu]} 3 \text{\text{GUR súluppí [sis\[súm\[u ... inandina\[šan\[tútú}} \text{PBS 2/1 81:11ff.} \text{The translation and interpretation of these clauses have been a matter of disagreement. Ries Bodenpachtformulare, 107ff. provides a review and critique of the discussion, to which may be added Cardascia’s partial rebuttal \text{(review of Ries Bodenpachtformulare, Revue Historique de Droit Français et Étranger 55} [1977] 645ff. There has been little serious disagreement, however, over how the passages are to be read. Editors and commentators have read perfect forms of \text{našu in PBS 2/1 215:10} \text{ ([it-ta\[\text{-}ši\[\text{-}lma\[\text{-}3\text{-}an...}} \text{PBS 2/1 215:10 ([it-ta\[\text{-}ši\[\text{-}lma\[\text{-}3\text{-}an...}} \text{Augapfel 79 ignores the sign between} \text{-ši and} \text{-an...}}, \text{in BE 9 99:10 and Istanbul Muraş\[u Texts No. 31:10} \text{ (it-ta\[\text{-}ši} \text{\text{GIS sis\[súm\[u ...}} \text{in...}}, \text{and in BE 8/1 132:12} \text{ ([it-ta\[\text{-}ši\[\text{-}lma...}} \text{PBS 2/1 81:11 editors have read a problematic form id-nam-ma, perhaps a scribal lapse for a form of} \text{našu}, \text{not open to convincing translation.} \text{The alternative proposed here, reading perfect forms of} \text{ušuzzu} \text{(not of} \text{našu}) \text{, draws on extraordinary clauses in two earlier leases of date-orchards: sābi ina šeṭi Šamaš i-mi imidušu ina libbi i-za-ac “the team}} \text{(of assessors) will establish his assessment openly} \text{ (lit. in full daylight) and with his concurrence} \text{(lit. he}} \text{will be there)” \text{VAS 11:12ff.; and [ša]bū ina še\[-e\[-ši Šamaš [imitt\[u imidušu ina libbi iz-za-zu} \text{VAS 5} 26 \text{left edge; see San Nicolò-Ungnad NRV, Nos. 374 and 377, CAD s.v. šeṭu meaning 1f, Ries Bodenpachtformulare, 91. On this interpretation, the clauses in the late Achaemenid leases were written to the advantage of the tenant, although it is a minimal advantage. They anticipate the possibility that the assessment of the crop is made without the presence and concurrence of the tenant, so that the tenant is not assured of receiving a share of the crop he produced, the amount left after the assessed rent has been deducted. They assure the tenant instead that he will have a minimal compensation for his work on the palm grove, called as usual \text{sissinnu} and specified not as a share but as a flat rate based on the area under cultivation. (The rate specified here, 5 gur per gur, conforms to a long-established norm, endorsed by the “Edict of Belshazzar” with respect to temple properties, though not often obtained by date gardeners of the Ebabbar at Sippar; see Jursa Landwirtschaft, 126, 148ff., and 194). Hence, clauses beginning ina ūmu \text{(ina imittu la it-taši...}, may be translated “if he (the tenant) does not concur in” \text{(lit. is not present at)} \text{the assessment, he (the landlord) will pay him the tenant} \text{x gur of dates for each gur of arable land as sissinnu} \text{or “will pay him sissinnu at the same rate as applies to the adjoining properties.”} \text{This reading has the paleographic advantage of accommodating the traces found in the published copies better than proposed readings of} \text{našu}. \text{It has the orthographic advantage of obviating the determinative GIS before sissinnu in BE 9 99 and Istanbul Muraş\[u Texts No. 31, a determinative that is otherwise absent when sissinnu refers to a payment. It has the advantage of eliminating the implausible writing GIS\[-3 in PBS 2/1 81:12 for the implausible quantity 63 (gur), where the expected writing of the numeral would be KU\[(1+su)+3 (see also Cardascia Muraš\[u, 139 n. 1 and Ries Bodenpachtformulare 94 n. 628). It has the advantage of logical economy, finding the same verb in PBS 2/1 81 as in comparable contexts in the other passages, eliminating an “inexplicable” form idnamma at the cost of an emendation that does less violence to the passage than other proposed interpretations do. It has the semantic advantage of avoiding the false translation of imittu as “yield,” or “payment,” with concrete reference to the dates themselves rather than with juridical reference to the act of assessment or the assessed amount. It has the further semantic advantage of avoiding an anomalous use of našu without našanu to indicate “deliver, give,” rather than “get, take” (indeed, našu is the verb ordinarily used for the gardener’s “taking, drawing” his sissinnu payment, not for “giving, delivering” his assessed rent). On the other hand, this reading has the disadvantage of translating a preposition that is absent before imittu in all the texts but BE 8/1 132. This problem could be evaded by taking imittu as the subject of ušuzzu but then imittu ušuzzu in late Achaemenid Nippur texts cannot be associated with ina libbi (scil. imitti) ušuzzu in VAS 5 11 and 26, and the meaning of the phrase is harder to guess: “in the event that no assessment takes place” is unlikely, since forms of imittu nemmu\[u would be expected; “in the event that the assessed amount is not available (to be paid at harvest time)” is possible but unverifiable. In any event, imittu ought to be construed with feminine verb forms, taṭṭašīz etc.} 13f. In other late Achaemenid texts from Nippur similar clauses express sanctions against the lessor in case of abrogation of the terms of the lease (ina ūmu aadi lā šanāšu 5-\text{ta išallimu} u PN \text{SE.NUMUN} \text{ana PN2 itekim “in the event that PN [the lessor] takes the property away from PN2 [the tenant] before the five years [of the lease] are complete [the lessor will pay 5 minas of silver]} “PBS 2/1 182:9ff. and parallel passages PBS 2/1 30:21f.; 96:9ff.; BE 10 99:11ff.; and BE 9 48 = TuM 2-3 144:16, see Ries Bodenpachtformulare, 139 with n. 897). Here the clause instead expresses a sanction against the tenant in case of abandonment. Edges. The number of seal impressions, the fact that all the impressions were made by rings, and the preference for the spelling un-\text{qa} in the accompanying captions all agree with the likely appearance of the
C. Texts with Prosopographic Connections to the Murašû Texts

Sale of Slaves

9. CBS 1594  Bīt Minû-ana-Bēl-dānu  22/XII/9 Darius II
(Kh2 594)  24 March 414 B.C.

(1)  mdAG-di-li-ni- Lû ql-xl mMi-nu-ú-a-na-dEN-da-nu
(2)  ina ḫu-ud lib-bi-šu ʾA-t-tar-dan-na-ar  GEMÉ-su šá  RIT
(3)  UZU ZAG.LU-ša a-­na MU šá mdTây-ḫu-ú-a Lû ši-pîr DUMU šá  «m»
(4)  mdEN-GI EN-šá šat-ra-tum ʾI₃Na-na-a-DIN-it-nin-ni
(5)  DUMU.SAL-su e-nil-iq-tum ʾši-î-bi šá  tup-pi-i-ša ʾa-na
(6)  I₃MA.NA Kû.BABBAR qa-lú-ú-a ši-mi gam-ra-tu
(7)  ʾa-na mdAMAR.UTU-MU-DÛ DUMU šá mdEN-SU id-din Kû.BABBAR ʾa’ 1 ½ MA.NA
(8)  ši-mi ʾA-t-tar-dan-na-tum ʾI₃Na-na-a-DIN-it-nin-ni
(9)  LÛ-ut-ti-ša kas-pi ga-mir-tum mdAG-di-li-ni- ʾI₃na ŠU¹
(10)  mdAMAR.UTU-MU-DÛ ma-ḫi-ir e-tîr u₃-mu pa-qa-ri ʾa-na muḫ-ḫi
(11)  ʾA-t-tar-dan-na-ar ʾI₃Na-na-a-DIN-it-nin-ni GEMÉ.MEŠ
(12)  šu-a-tim it-taab [šu-ú …] ʾu-mar-ra qa-am-ma
(13)  ʾa-na md[AMAR.UTU-MU-DÛ i-nam-din]
(14)  LÛ x-[…]

(reverse)

(1’)  x […] mdMinû-ana-Bēl-dānu A šá mdTây-ḫu-ʾa?]    
(2’)  mA na-dAG-di-li-ni-? na-din LÛ-ut-tim]
(3’)  mA-na-dEN-KÂM[ A-šu šá m […]
(4’)  mdAG-na-din-ŠEŠ A-šu šá mdAMAR.UTU-­x-MU
(5’)  mdBE-MU A-šu šá mdEN-DIN-su mKI-dAG.AMAR.UTU-DIN A-šu šá md[…]
(6’)  mdEN-NUMUN-GIS A-šu šá mdEN-ú-sur mdMU,­dEN A-šu šá md[…]
(7’)  mKAR-dAMAR.UTU A-šu šá mdEN-BA-ša mdMU,­dEN A-šu šá mdAG-ŠEŠ-[…]
(8’)  mA-ḫu-ši-ia-x-x […]-ṣu mŠIL-a-a A-šu šá m […]
(9’)  md[E]N-MU A-šu šá mdEN-šu-nu mLû-šu DUMU-šu₃ md₃-x-₃[ …]
(10’)  mdAG-URU-ša [LÛ . DUB.SAR] lDUMU šá mdAG-ú-še-zib¹
(11’)  URU E[mMi-nu-[ú-a-na]-dEM[N-da-nu ITI] . ŠE UD.22 KÂM
(12’)  MU.9.KÂM md[Da-rî-[i-a]-a-muš LUGAL KUR.KUR MEŠ

(reverse)  NA₄,­KIŠIB / mA na-dAG-di-li-ni-? na-nil / na-[din LÛ-ut-tim]
(upper edge)  NA₄₃,KIŠIB / mKAR-dAMAR.UTU // NA₄₃,KIŠIB / mŠIL-a-a  // NA₄₃,KIŠIB / mdAG-URU-ša LÛ . DUB.SAR¹
(left edge)  NA₄₃,KIŠIB / mMi-nu-ú-a-na-dEN-da-nu / EN šá mdAG-[di-li]-ni-? na-nil / LÛ-ut-tim // NA₄₃,KIŠIB / mdBE-MU
(right edge)  NA₄₃,KIŠIB / mA-ḫu-ši-ia-x […]

Matthew W. Stolper

Journal of Cuneiform Studies 53 (2001)
(1-7) Nabû-dilûni, servant of Minû-ana-Bêl-dûnu, voluntarily sold Attar-dannat, her slave woman, whose right hand is inscribed with the name of her master, Taḥḫuṣa, the scribe, son of Bêl-usallîm, and (he also sold) Nanâ-bullûtinînîni, her (Attar-dannat’s) suckling daughter ..., for 1½ minas of pure silver as the entire price, to Mardûk-šûm-ukîn, son of Bêl-erîba.

(7-10) Nabû-dilûni has received the silver, namely 1½ minas, the price of his slaves Attardannat and Nanâ-bullûtinînîni, all the money, from Mardûk-šûm-ukîn; he is paid in full.

(10-13) Should a claim to those slave women, Attar-dannat and Nanâ-bullûtinînîni, arise, [...] will clear it in favor of [Mardûk-šûm-ukîn]. [...]
No. 366 A ii 9 [Babylon, 25/II/38 Artaxerxes III]) and none have Iranian names suggests that the status was provincial, not imperial.

If MacGinnis is right to see rab ummu as a military title, it may be connected not with ummānu (otherwise in Late Babylonian “craftsmen,” not “troops” = aqû) but with ummu “quiver or bowcase” (only in GIS.E.BAN = E.MIN qâl-tu, um-mu, iš-pa-[t]u] Hh, VII A 49ff., see MSL 6 87:50. Then the title may belong in the same semantic range as rab qašṭi, “chief of bowmen.” There is no obvious basis for making or excluding an identification with the LŪ.GAL UD in PBS 2/1 84:11.

1 etc. Cf. mûAG-di-li-in-ni-½ Ninurta-ētīr, one of several debtors in Istanbul Mūrasû Texts No. 94:5, 23/XII/40 Artaxerxes I)—the same name, but presumably not the same man. For di-li-(i)-ni, from West Semitic dly, in Neo-Assyrian personal names, see Zadok West Semites 96, etc.

5. ša tuppīšu is without parallel in comparable contexts. The signs on the tablet are clear, excluding emendation to ša tulišu, “(suckling) at her breast” (cf. 1PN u LŪ.DUMU-sū ša UGU tu-lu-ū Nbk. 67:3; 1PN ša mārassu u māršu ša mujhī ti-lu-ū Nbn. 832:2 and 9), or to ša ap-½-pi-sū for appi tulišu, “tip of her breast, her nipple” (cf. TDP 222:40). Postulating a meaning “nipple” for tuppī (Ahw. tuppī II), “wartz?” (see CAD s.v. sissu) a word known otherwise only from Izbu (and meriting ancient commentary there), would be adventurous.

This phrase may be formed with the same element as the chronological expressions tuppī tuppī, tuppī anu tuppī, tuppī u tuppī, adi tuppī(šu), adi tuppī (u) tuppī, (ina) tuppī anu tuppī, etc., found in Neo-Babylonian legal texts in clauses that state the duration of leases, promissory notes, apprenticeships, and warranties (see M. Rowton, “Tuppī and the Date of Hammurabi,” JNES 10 [1951] 184ff.; B. Landsberger “Assyrische Königsliste und ‘Dunkles Zeitalter,’” ICS 8 [1954] 111ff.; J. Boese and G. Wilhelm, “Aššur-dāğ I, Ninurta-apil-ekur und die mittelassyrische Chronologie,” WZKM 71 [1979] 21ff.; Wunsch Iddin-Marduk, II, p. 4; Gwyneth Hueter, “Grammatical Studies in the Akkadian Dialects of Babylon and Urk, 556-500 B.C.,” Ph. D. Dissertation, Oxford University, 1996, 96f.). In that case, the usage ša tuppīšu, rare in Neo-Assyrian (KAV 79 r. 4 [despite SAA 12, 80], Postgate Royal Grants Nos. 42-44 r. 28, 30, 31), would be unique in Neo-Babylonian, and an appropriate translation would be hard to find. It would add nothing to describe a suckling child as “of appropriate age” or “of uncertain age.”

To hazard a more elaborate conjecture, perhaps this tuppī is just a “tablet,” and this phrase refers to an earlier bill of sale for the slaves. That document is now handed over to the new owner along with the slaves. The child is described as “Nanā-nullititinni, (who was not named, but described only as) her (previous sale).Ó Unweaned children sold with their mothers are sometimes unnamed in bills of sale (e.g., Neb. 67:3 and Nbn. 832:2 and 9; cf. Nbn. 772:5, referring to a pledged slave woman, her three unnamed daughters, and an unnamed six-month-old son), but more often named (e.g., AnOr 8 19:4, Camb. 365:3 and 388:2f. with dupl. OECT 10 131, and PBS 2/1 65:5f. (LŪ.DUMU e-ñiq GA <∞>).

Two of the eight seal impressions—the impression from the Greco-Persian gem of the witness Ētīr-Marduk, and the military image from the Achaemenid cylinder of the seller Minū-Bēl-dānu—are exceptional and striking.15

The impression of Ētīr-Marduk was produced by a large oval gem, probably a scaraboid, like other Greco-Persian seals.16 It shows a Persian woman facing proper left, leaning on a pillar, with her left arm

---

15 Full discussion and illustration of the eight impressions on this tablet is to come from Linda Bregstein, to whose efforts I owe these comments.

16 The designation “Greco-Persian,” coined by A. Furtwängler, Die antiken Gemmen, III: Geschichte der Steinschneidekunst im klassischen Altertum (Leipzig and Berlin: Biesecke and Devrient, 1903), 116-123, refers to a group or style of seals that exhibit a combination of iconographic and stylistic elements of both Greek and Achaemenid Persian origin. This group includes a large number of chiefly unprovenienced seals, as well as some relief sculptures and painted tombs (e.g., at Elmalı). A full treatment is in J. Boardman, Greek Gems and Finger Rings (New York: Harry N. Abrams, 1970), 303-357 with further thoughts by Boardman in Persia and the West (London and New York: Thames and Hudson, 2000), 156-58. An evaluation of the “Greco-Persian problem” from the perspective of the Achaemenid specialist is M. Root, “From the Heart: Powerful Persiansisms in the Art of the Western Empire,” in Achaemenid History VI: Asia Minor and Egypt, ed. H. Sancisi-Weerdenburg and A. Kuhr (Leiden: Nederlands Instituut voor het Nabije Oosten, 1991) 1-29, especially 13-15. See also C. Tuplin, Achaemenid Studies, Historia.
extended to hold something. The image is well attested in the Greco-Persian corpus. Greco-Persian seals, thought to have been produced and used in Western Anatolia, are rare in Mesopotamia. There are only two certain examples in the Murâsû corpus of 657 seal impressions.

The cylinder seal impression of Minû-ana-Bèl-dûnu shows a man wearing the dentate crown and folded robe of the Persian king facing three enemies who wear Scythian headgear. He holds a kneeling bowman by the hair or headgear in his left hand while stabbing him with the sword held in his right hand. The Scythian raises his right arm toward the king in supplication and holds his bow and arrows behind him in his left hand. Behind the kneeling figure are two prisoners whose hands are bound or shackled behind them. An oversized bee or wasp hovers above the kneeling bowman.

Minû-ana-Bèl-dûnu’s seal is comparable to Achaemenid seals with military scenes featuring Persian warriors leading prisoners and killing enemies. Unlike other types of contemporary glyptic, such as contest or worship scenes, which exist in dozens of nearly identical copies, the Achaemenid military seals are unique and particular. Their specificity suggests that they were individually commissioned and may commemorate historic events. Furthermore, the fact that some seals and seal impressions of this category bear royal name inscriptions and the fact that most of the seals were large and expensive suggest that their owners were wealthy or powerful.

Elements of Minû-ana Bèl-dûnu’s seal are also to be seen in other Achaemenid seals. OIP 22 No. 453, from the Newell Collection, shows Scythian bowmen with the same costumes. It shows a Persian soldier stabbing a Scythian bowman with his short sword, while a Persian spearman attacks a kneeling Scythian from behind, and a large, carefully formed winged disk hovers above the four figures. An Old Persian inscription of Artaxerxes accompanies the scene. The inscription is contained in a cartouche topped by addorsed falcons wearing the Egyptian Double Crown. Similar Scythian soldiers appear on other cylinder seals in private collections.

---


The cap with a point at the front—shown either as pointing straight up or flopping forward—has been identified with Scythians (called Cimmerians in Babylonian and Saka in Old Persian) in Achaemenid art: G. Walser, Die Völkerschaften auf den Reliefs von Persepolis, Teheraner Forschungen 2 (Berlin: Mann, 1966), 84-86.

Elsewhere, Scythians are shown wearing bowcases (Walser, Die Völkerschaften, pl. 18, 56; compare the Scythian with pointed headgear and bowcase shown in the act of being speared by a Mede with round headgear and bowcase on a sealing from Egypt illustrated by Boardman, Persia and the West, 164 fig. 5.21).


E. Porada, “Achaemenid Art, Monumental and Minute,” in Highlights of Persian Art, eds. R. Ettinghausen and E. Yarshater, Persian Art Series 1 (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1979), Fig. 45. Ward, Seal Cylinders of Western Asia No. 1051. Akbar Tadjvidi (“Survey of Excavations: Persepolis,” Iran 8 [1970] 187) describes an impression excavated at Persepolis in which, “one sees a fight between a Persian officer and a Scythian general. The Persian grasps his enemy by both hands and forces him to the ground in hand to hand combat.”
A seal impression from the Persepolis Treasury archive and two seals in Russian museum collections offer parallels for the composition featuring the Persian king and bound prisoners. Persepolis Treasury Seal no. 28, known from three sealing fragments, depicts three prisoners with bound wrists and a neck rope, walking behind a figure dressed in the kandys. The captor thrusts a spear into the neck of a kneeling enemy.24 The two cylinders in Russian collections similarly feature three to four prisoners with wrists bound behind them and tied together at the neck with a rope held by the Persian king.25 In the Persepolis seal impression and the two Russian cylinders, in contrast to the seal of Minû-ana-Bêl-dàyu, all of the figures face right (proper left) and the Persian king is shown on a scale larger than the prisoners. Both Russian cylinders are decorated with the palm tree terminals characteristic of the Achaemenid Court Style.

The obvious compositional referent for these military scenes is the Bisitun relief, which features nine enemies of Darius I with their hands bound behind them and their necks tied together by a rope, while a tenth enemy, Gaumata, lies prostrate beneath the left foot of the Great King and raises his arms in supplication. As on the seals, the king is depicted on a larger scale than the prisoners. If the rock relief itself was not the inspiration for the seal scenes, monuments that echoed the Bisitun relief, such as the one at Babylon, may have been the means through which Achaemenid iconography was transmitted to local artisans.26

The feature of Minû-ana-Bêl-dàyu’s seal that is without artistic parallel is the insect flying above the scene. Any fifth-century artisan—Persian or Babylonian—would have known that the winged disk normally occupies the field where the insect appears. There can be no doubt that the substitution was deliberate, but the reason for the bee(?), a motif unattested in the Achaemenid glyptic repertoire, is not apparent. Perhaps the seal cutter or seal owner was making an irreverent comment about his Persian overlords or Persian religion by replacing the hovering disk of Ahuramazda with a flying insect.27 Perhaps the representation of the insect was a reference to Egypt, for the honey bee was a symbol of Lower Egypt, but a political occasion that would connect Scythian captives and an Egyptian motif is unknown.

If the military seals are commemorative, the historic event recorded is seldom clear. In the case of Minû-ana-Bêl-dàyu’s seal, the inspiration might have been Darius II’s troubled accession, and the bound

24 Schmidt, OIP 69, Plate 9.
25 The Moscow Artaxerxes seal: Strelkov, Bulletin of the American Institute for Iranian Art and Archaeology 5 (1937) 17-21 see Fig. 2. The seal bears the Old Persian inscription, “I am Artaxerxes the Great King.” Strelkov, M. Root (The King and Kingship in Achaemenid Art Acta Iranica 19 [Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1979], 122) and R. Schmitt (SOAW 38(1981) 36 and fig. 5, SA’b) attribute this seal to Artaxerxes III. The Zvenigorodsky seal in the Hermitage: Strelkov, Bulletin of the American Institute for Iranian Art and Archaeology 5 (1937) 17-21, and fig. 3. This seal was acquired in Kerch in the late nineteenth century. On the basis of iconography, Strelkov dates it to Artaxerxes I.
27 But would the Babylonian audience have identified the winged disc (with or without the inscribed figure), a Mesopotamian image that predates the Achaemenids, as a symbol of Ahuramazda or as a symbol of a native Mesopotamian god? See S. Dalley, “The God Šalmu and the Winged Disc,” Iraq 48 (1986) 85-101.
28 One of the titles of the king of Lower Egypt was “He-of-the-bee.” E. Neufeld, “Insects as Warfare Agents in the Ancient Near East,” Or, NS 49 (1980) 39. Babylonians in the Achaemenid period (and the people of Nippur in particular) were familiar with Egyptian motifs, in glyptic and other arts. At Nippur, the image of the Egyptian dwarf god Bes appears frequently in seals (e.g., Bregstein “Seal Use,” Nos. 206-210, see K. Abdi, “Bes in the Achaemenid Empire,” Ars Orientalis 29 (1999) 116 and fig. 3) and on an unpublished terracotta plaque (University Museum UM B 9454, excavated in the third campaign at Nippur, like the Murašu archive). Another plaque that shows the Egyptian god Horus/Harpocrates and the head of Bes was uncovered in an Achaemenid context by later excavations at Nippur: M. Gibson, Excavations at Nippur. Eleventh Season, OIC 22 (1975), 40 sub 11N 61, 51 fig. 3, and Johnson, OIC 22 143-50. Egyptian and Egyptianizing finds dating to the Achaemenid period are also known from Ur: C. L. Woolley, UE 9 103.
prisoners, so reminiscent of the defeated enemies on the Bisitun relief, perhaps mimic the great Darius I’s portrayal of his troubled accession.

This is the first known military scene to appear in a seal impression on a dated tablet. The similarity in iconography between the seal of Minû-ana-Bêl-dânâ, the Newell Collection seal and the Moscow Artaxerxes seal suggests that they are all close in date, hence that the latter two date to the reign of Artaxerxes I, not Artaxerxes III.

Receipt for Rent

10. UM 29-13-729

Nippur 3/IX/24 Artaxerxes I or II

23 November 441 B.C. or 21 November 381 B.C.

1. GIŠ.BAR A.ŠÁ TIL-tim šá MU.24.KÂM mAr-tah-šá-as-su LUGAL
2. šá ŠE.NUMUN zaq-pu ū KA šul-pu UŠ.SA.DU ŠE.NUMUN
3. šá mBA-šá-dâKÂ u ŠEŠ-šá DUMU.MEŠ šá mLa-ba-ši
4. u UŠ.SA.DU ŠE.NUMUN šá mRU-tim-dâMAŠ A šá mdME.ME.ME-GIŠ
5. u ŠEŠ.MEŠ-šú É A.KAL šá mMAŠ-na-din LÚ.ARAD
6. šá mBa-ga- -UD-da-a-tú šá ina IGI šá Na-na-a-id-ri-'
7. LÚ šir-ki? A šá mEN-šú-nu GIŠ.BAR A.ŠÁ MU.MEŠ TIL-tim šá MU.24.KÂM
8. [mMâ-a.] ri-1-li-ti- ' LÚ.ARAD šá mdBa-ga- -UD-da-a-tú
9. [ina ŠU m]Na-na-a-id-ri- ' A šá mdEN-šú-nu
10. [ma-hir e-]'ir
(reverse)
11. LÚ.MU.KIN, Š  
12. mNdEn-lîl-na-dîn-MU A šá mKAL-a mNa-dîn A šá mdEn-lîl-Dû-uš
13. mTat-tan-nu A šá mEN-šú-nu mARHUŠ-GAR A šá mDIN-su-dÂMÂR.UTU
14. mMU.d50-En-lîl A šá mMAŠ-DIN-ît mTa-giš-dÂME.ME A šá mARAD-dMAŠ
15. LÚ.ŠID mdMAŠ-MU A šá mEN-šú-nu EN.LÎL.KI ITI.GAN UD.3.KÂM
16. MU.24.KÂM mAr-tah-šá-as-su LUGAL KUR.KUR

(1-7) The entire rental for a field that is due for year 24 of King Artaxerxes on arable land, including grain field and orchard, adjoining the arable land of IqìŒa-B½bu and his brother, sons of Lábâši, and adjoining the arable land of Širikti-Ninurta, son of Gula-šum-lišir, and his brothers, the ... of Ninurta-nâdin, servant of Bagâdâtu?, that is in the possession of Nan‰-idrì¼, the oblate?, son of Bêlšunu—

(7-10) Mâri-liši, servant of Bagâdâtu?, [has received] that entire rental for the field for year 24 from Nanâ-idrì', the oblate?, son of Bêlšunu—

(11-14) Witnesses: Enlîli-nâdin-šuni, son of Aqara; Nâdin, son of Enlîl-êpuš; Tatannu, son of Bêlšunu; Réme-suñkun, son of Uballissu-Marduk; Iddin-Enlîl, son of Ninurta-uballit; Taqîš-Gula, son of Arad-Ninurta.


(Reverse) Fingernail mark of Mâri-liši.
Ring of Ta[qiš-Gula], son of Arad-Ninurta. (Lower Edge) [Ring of Enlil-nādin-
šumi, son of Aqara]. [Ring] of Tattannu / son of Bēlšunu. (Upper Edge) Ring of Nādin, son of
Enlil-ēpuš. Ring of Iddin-Enlil, son of Enlil-uballit. Ring of Rēme-šukun, son of [Uballissu]-
Marduk.

5. É A.KAL : perhaps bit mīlī for É A.MEŠ = bit mē, “waterlogged land” or “flooded land”
(Cocquerillat Palmeraies, 27).

6 etc. Cf. Nanâ-idd-ri /Saḫ-ma- Š E 9 20:5, 7, 10, 12, left edge (1/VIII/30 Artaxerxes I).

6, 8. mO Ba-ga- .DAO-da-a-tū ; despite the repetition, probably an erroneous spelling of the common
Bagādūtu. A reading mO Ba-ga- ‘pir-da-a-tū, transcribing an otherwise unattested Persian *
Baga-fradāta, “commanded by the god,” is improbable, though Persian *fradāta is attested in Babyl. Ip-ra-da-a-tatū (see
M. A. Dandamayev, Iranians in Achaemenid Babylonia, Columbia Lectures on Iranian Studies 6 [Costa
Mesa, CA: Mazda, 1992], 86 and Walther Hinz, Altiranisches Sprachgut der Nebenüberlieferungen,
Göttinger Orientforschungen, III. Reihe, 3 [Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1975], 96, both with earlier
literature. (But in VAT 15609, cited by Dandamayev, Iranians in Achaemenid Babylonia, 114 s.v. Piridātu,
read Iš(!)-pi(!)-ri-da-a-ta [coll].)


13 and lower edge. Tattannu/Bēlšunu: witness in
BE 9 46f. (15/VI/36 Artaxerxes I ) and 86a (--/--/4a
Artaxerxes I). The seal impression, showing a grotesque composed of human and animal heads, closely
resembles LE 1 No. 720, from the “coffin” hoard of clay impressions, deposited in or after the early
fourth century; cf. Boardman, Greek Gems and Finger Rings, 322; Boardman in Ancient Art in Seals, ed. E.
Porada (Princeton, 1980) 114; Boardman, Persia and the West, 157 fig. 54c, 158; Bregstein “Seal Use,”
65-69.

The exclusive use of signet rings rather than stamp or cylinder seals, and the spelling unqa rather than
unqu are surprising if the text is to be dated to the reign of Artaxerxes I, as the prosopographic links would
otherwise imply; cf. Entrepreneurs and Empire No. 51, and see Bregstein “Seal Use,” 362.

Lease

11. UM 29-15-511

Nippur

23/V/2 Darius II

19 July 422 B.C.

(Left Edge) Ring of Ta[qiš-Gula], son of Arad-Ninurta. (Lower Edge) [Ring of Enlil-nādin-
šumi, son of Aqara]. [Ring] of Tattannu / son of Bēlšunu. (Upper Edge) Ring of Nādin, son of
Enlil-ēpuš. Ring of Iddin-Enlil, son of Enlil-uballit. Ring of Rēme-šukun, son of [Uballissu]-
Marduk.
(21) ITI.NE U.D.23.KÁM.MU.2.KÁM
(22) mDa-ri-*a-μuš LUGAL KUR.KUR

(left edge) 

(21) ITI.NE UD.23.KÁM.MU.2.KÁM
(22) mDa-ri-*a-μuš LUGAL KUR.KUR

(left edge) 

(1-4) Arable land, including orchard and grain field, on the bank of the Salla canal, a bow
land, the whole of the share that Aḫ-iddin, Ninurta-ab-usur and Ninurta-aḥḫē-ibni, sons1 of
Iddina, hold with their co-proprietors—(4-6) he2 gave that property to Arad-Ninurta, son of Arad-
Enlil, for an annual rent of 7 gur of dates. (6-8) He will pay that 7 gur of dates, measured by the
kuruppû measure, in month month VII, at the storage enclosure. (8-11) He will protect the
fronds and offshoots (of the palm trees). He will perform the (necessary) work under the palm
trees, and (9-12) in compensation for the work he has done on it (the orchard), he will
receive one mina of silver. (13) Arad-Ninurta will pay ... to (the temple) Ekur ... x+3 qū of
dates .... (14) Anyone who violates (these terms) will pay one mina of silver. (15) With each gur
(of dates) he (the tenant) will give tuḫallu-baskets, fronds, fibers, and a load of wood.

(16-19) Witnesses: Bābu-ētīret, son of Kāṣīr; Erib-Enlil, son of Bēl-Eunu; Bēl-eṭēru, son of
Bēl-Eunu; Ribat, son of Aḥšunu; Aḥḫē-iddin, son of Nāṣīr; Ribat, son of Taddinnu.

(20-22) Scribe: Ninurta-gûmil, son of Dummuq. Nippur, month V, day 23, year 2, Darius,
King of Lands.

(Left Edge) Fingernail mark(s) of Aḫ-iddin and Ninurta-ab-usur.

17. Erība-Enlil/Bēl-Eunu: Durand Textes babyloniennes pl. 49 AO 17636:18 (= Joannès Textes
Économiques, 64 No. 18) (witness, 13/III/10 Darius II).
20. Ninurta-gûmil/Dummuq: witness in BRM 1 86:13; scribe in JCS 40 147 and seven Muraḫḫû texts
(BE 10 24 and 38; PBS 2/1 14, 26, and 153; Entrepreneurs and Empire Nos. 64 and 69).

Mandate of Fields

12. YBC 11668

Nippur --/--[31] Artaxerxes I
(434-33 B.C.)

(1) [... -du]k2-a ina ḫu-ud lib-bi-šu a-na mTat-ta[n-nu LÛ.IGH+DUB]
(2) [... ki-a-am iq]-bi um-ma GIS.BAR šá ra-qa-ra-qanu i -[...]
(3) [... in]-du šá MU.31.KÁM mÂr-tak-šat-su LUGAL ma-la[a? [...]
(4) [... u]3 id-di-nu x un di x en-na-1 u si3-[t'-ti'-(...)]
(5) [... in-du šá LU.GAL ú-sal-lam 1 LIM 6 ME 40 [GUR ŠE.BAR]
(6) [... ŠE].GIS.Ì 1 ME 150 GUR GÌG.BÀ 76 GUR bu-ṭu-ṭu-tum
(7) [... ] 3 (BÂN) sah-li-e 347 ar-da-bi šá su-um-mi-de-tum
(8) [... ] x ÎGIS 33 GUR 3 (P! 3 (BÂN) 3 QA ka-si-ia
(9) 1re-ḫi šá MU.30.KÁM1 mi-šiš ina ITI.GAN u IT LAB a-nam-din u mi-šil
(10) 1ina ITI.SIG1.MU.32.KÁM it-ti in-di-ia a-nam-din mTat-ta-nu
(11) 1LÛ.IGH+DUB1 iš-me-e-šu-ma GIS.BAR a4 lub-bu-u in-di-šu id3-di3-šu3-šu2
(12) [EBUR] u sa-ah-ḥa-ri in-dû šá MU.31.KÁM re-eh-ṭum EBUL
(13) [ša MU.30].KÁM ina a-da-ni-ši ina-an-din 1-en TA.ÂM TI-ú šá

(reverse)
(1') [... E]N.LÏL.[KI]
(2') [... ] KUR.KUR

(upper edge) [N]A4.KÌŠIB / [mde]N-ÛRU-šū / [...] x Bar-sip.KI // [...] / [...] x / A x [...]
The proposed translation of lines 5-9 tries to account for the mention in line 9 of an unpaid “balance for year 30” and in line 10 of “my assessment” distinct from the specified payment that the tenant offers to make, and for the use in line 5, in the offer of payment, of the verb šullamu, “make good,” rather than nadānu, “give, pay.” If the translation is correct, this text is a tantalizing indication of competition and stress in contract agriculture at Nippur. A previous contractor for the use of royal land was unable to meet the terms of his contract and the mašennu-official had to obtain a bid from a competitor to make up the deficit and keep the land under production.

29 Otherwise Herodotus 1.192 giving one māndmēn = 1 medimnos 3 choinikes, about 55 liters; see V. A. Livshits, “New Parthian Documents from South Turkmenistan,” Acta Antiqua 25 (1977) 173.
Similar conditions seem to lie behind a Murašû text from the same year. BE 9 28 (= TuM 2-3 179) is a receipt for rent paid on properties attached to the Queen’s Estate, written at Nippur on 18/VII/31 Artaxerxes I. The rented lands are said to be “under the control” (ina qaṭê) of an ustaβar-official, Zababa-iddin, acting for the estate; they are “in the possession” (ina pānî) of Ninurta-nādin-šumi/Ubaliṣṣu-Marduk; but the rent is actually paid by Enlil-šum-iddin/Murašû. Ninurta-nādin-šumi appears in texts from the early attested years of the Murašû archive, but otherwise always as a witness, never as an active party.30 His brothers, Aḫi-nūrī, Iddin-Marduk, and Ninurta-mutirri-gimilli also appear as frequent witnesses throughout the recorded life of the archive.31 One of the brothers, Iddin-Marduk, served for a time as šaknu of Nippur. He also rented bow lands from another šaknu of Nippur.32 The clearly documented role of the younger brother, Iddin-Marduk, as an agricultural contractor supports Cardascia’s interpretation of BE 9 28, that the older brother, Ninurta-nādin-šumi, was also a contractor who had turned to the Murašûs to pay rent for him. That some trouble lay behind this arrangement emerges from BE 9 50, drawn up five years later, in which Enlil-šum-iddin again pays rent for the same properties, now said to be in his own hands.33 On this view, Istanbul Murašû Texts No. 2 need not be supposed to antedate year 31 of Artaxerxes I (as I suggested, ibid. p. 79). Instead, it may be the contract that reassigned to the Murašûs properties of the Queen’s Estate that had formerly been leased to another contractor, Ninurta-nādin-šumi. Perhaps Ninurta-nādin-šumi’s default arose from the same stress that required the reassignment of properties treated in No. 12. But if his default was the occasion for reassigning the lease, it was not fatal to the contracting business of the sons of Ubaliṣṣu-Marduk, still operating in the hands of his brother Iddin-Marduk in the early years of Darius II.34

Of particular interest in No. 12 is the collocation of the royal estate (bît šarrî) as the apparent destination of payments and the mašennu as the controlling authority. In the Murašû texts, officials entitled mašennu held authority over the operations of men entitled ša muḫḫi sītī ša ID NN, “in charge of rents of such-and-such a canal (district),” who in turn leased crown land, temple land and other assets to the Murašûs. A still vexing matter is the status and domain of these men “in charge of rents” of named canals. I have treated them in terms of power relationships, as “agents of the crown,” because of the assets they controlled and the authorities to whom they were responsible. Van Driel has treated them as contractors, like the General Contractors (fermiers généraux, Generalpächter) with similar titles in texts from the Uruk and Sippar temple archives.35 In the titles of the General Contractors of sixth-century Uruk and Sippar, “in charge of rents/revenues of Ištār” or “of Šamaš,” the divine name plainly refers to a corporate economic person, the temple estate (makkûr Ištār, makkûr Šamaš), and the controlling institution is the temple, Eanna or Ebabbar. The titles from fifth-century Nippur, however, do not

30 Earliest: Entrepreneurs and Empire 106:34 (6/IV/20 Artaxerxes I) (restored), BE 9 7a:7 (19/X/26 Artaxerxes I). Latest: BE 9 33:6 (9/X/33 Artaxerxes I); and fifteen other texts, including No. 6, above.
32 JCS 40 132 and No. 7, above.
33 Cardascia Murašû 77-78 and 194 n. 1.
34 BRM 1 101, drawn up at Sippar in the early reign of Darius I, reflects a generally comparable problem and solution. A General Contractor (fermier général) who held land of the temple Ebabbar under the authority of the satrap of Babylon and Across-the-River, was unable to make his payment. He brought in a secondary contractor to assume part of his overdue payment and take over half of his holding. See Jursa Landwirtschaft, 103-106.
35 Entrepreneurs and Empire, pp. 40-45; van Driel, JESHO 32 215-16 etc.
refer to gods and temples but to canals, not to institutions but to geography. The canal names in the title refer to the practical subdivision of arable land into tracts sustained by particular watercourses, and probably to the administrative subdivision of the region as well. The Contractors for Canal Districts controlled property called “land of Bēl,” that is, temple land at least in name, but they also controlled other property, including crown land as well as land described only by location, not by ownership. The texts that involve them do not mention “land of Enlil.” A “temple estate of Enlil” of the Ekur temple in Nippur do not figure as proprietors or as institutions involved in the use and management of these properties. Rather, a few texts mention mašennus, Contractors for Canal Districts, or their agents in connection with a “royal storehouse” or “treasury” (bīt nakkandu ša šarrī). These texts suggest (though the evidence is sparse and equivocal) that this “treasury” was the controlling institution that corresponds to the temples in the earlier texts that deal with large-scale contracting. No. 12 suggests that the corporate person at fifth-century Nippur that corresponded to the god’s estate (makkûr DN) of the sixth-century temple texts was the royal estate (bīt šarrī). And these suppositions further suggest that the “hierarchy of farms” around fifth-century Nippur represented an adaptation, an extension or supercession, and a secularization of the contracting regimes developed in the sixth-century temples.

D. The King’s Man

13. A. 34117 Nippur 10/I/13 Xerxes (1N 2 84 = 1NT3) 1 May 473 B.C.

(1) LÜ.ERÎN LUGAL šá 2 ITI.MEŠ šá ITI.GU₄
(2) u ITL.SIG₂ šá m⁵BA-šá-a m⁷Taḥ-bi-ti-ia
(3) A.ME₄ šá m⁵Pa-qid-su-nu m⁷En-lîl-SIPA-â-a <<KI>>
(4) LÜ qal-la šá m⁵EN-šá-nu LÜ.x šá EN.LÎL.KI

A comparable usage in sixth-century Uruk is ša muḫḫi sūṭi ša muḫḫi Nār Piqûdu, TCL 13 150, see Kümmel Familie 105.

The same administrative geography is presumably reflected in the title “judge of the Sîn Canal (district),” frequent in the Murašû texts (Entrepreneurs and Empire, pp. 40-41, with previous literature); cf. the “judge of the irrigation district Bît Ukânu” (GARIN E Ukânu) ZA 79 96:19.

Istanbul Murašû Texts No. 9 implies that “royal treasury land” (zēr nakkandu šarrî) otherwise controlled by agents of the prince Manušţânu was held on contract (bīt sūṭî) by a “General Contractor for the Sîn Canal” otherwise under the mašennu. Istanbul Murašû Texts No. 40 implies that Manušţânu had authority over the temple property (zēr Bēl) that was under the oversight of a mašennu and “supervisor in charge of the Sîn Canal” (piḫâtu ša ana muḫḫî Nâr Sîn). Entrepreneurs and Empire No. 59 implies that a member of the mašennu’s staff (sepiîru ša bīt mašennî) also worked for Manušţânu. That is: the satrap’s son, Manušţânu, held authority over mašennus; he held authority over the “royal treasury” (bīt nakkandu šarrî); and “royal treasury” land was held on contract by the mašennu’s subordinate.

Cf. BE 9 32a, in which a mašennu’s deputy authorizes collection of rents from “all fields that are crown property” (zērû gabbi makkûr šarrî; see Entrepreneurs and Empire, p. 48). Nevertheless, there was also a contemporary “temple estate of Enlîl” (makkûr Enlîl) that rented out property. CBS 5481 (4/V/8 Artaxerxes II), a fragment of a lease from Nippur, refers to property held “on lease, corresponding to (the terms of) lease from the estate of Enlîl” (ana GIS.BAR [lib]-bu-û GIS.BAR šá NG.GA 4Enlîl, lines 5-⁶).

And a partial Iranization: one of the Contractors for Canal Districts (Mitrēnē/Marduk-Œum-iddin), and two of the known mašennus (Artabara and Ḥurrunatu) had Iranian names; the “royal storehouse” and the group of smallholders nominally attached to it were controlled by members of the imperial court (Manušţânu, a cousin of Artaxerxes I, and Artaḥṣaru, an ally of Darius II. See Entrepreneurs and Empire, pp. 38, 46-49, 89-93).
(5) ina ŠU₅BA-šá-a u mTar-bi-ti-ia A.MEŠ
(6) šá mPa-qid-su-nu ma-hi-ir LÚ.ERIN LUGAL md50-SIPA-ú-a
(7) úšá-az-za-sú-nu-ti-ma it-tí mEN-šú-nu
(8) a-na mBA-šá-a u mTar-bi-ti-ia
(9) i-nam-din pu-ut la šá-ka-nu

(lower edge)
(10) šá DÍM(LUGAL+KÁM).ME md50-SIPA-ú-a
(11) na-ší
(reverse)
(12) LÚ.MU.KIN₉ mMu-še-zib₇EN A šá mARAD-íá
(13) m₇En-lil-ŠES.MEŠ-MU A šá mARAD-íá
(14) m₇MA₇Š-ŠES.MEŠ-KÁM A šá mRì-mut
(15) m₇MA₇Š-ŠES.MEŠ-MU A šá mKì-na-a
(16) mDINGIR-ka-ba₇-ni-ZI-DÚ A šá lmLa-ba-ši
(17) m₇En-lil-EN-a-ni LÚ.JSID A šá
(18) m₇En-lil-ŠES.MEŠ-SU EN.l⁺LIL.K1
(19) ITI.BAR UD.10.KÁM MU.13.KÁM
(upper edge)
(20) mHi-šī₉ U-ar-šá₉ LUGAL KUR.KUR
(left edge) ṣu-pur ša md50-SIPA-ú-a

(1-3) The King’s Man for two months, (namely,) for months II and III, (an obligation) of Iqšà and Tarbițija, sons of P½qissunu—(3-6) Enlil-rê’ú’a, servant of BèlŒunu, the … of Nippur, has received (it) from Iqšà and Tarbițija, sons of Pqissunu. (6-9) Enlil-rê’ú’a will register them, (that is, their) King’s Man (service), with BèlŒunu to the credit of Iqšà and Tarbițija. (9-11) Enlil-rê’ú’a guarantees that no shortfall(?) will be caused.

(12-16) Witnesses: Mušeziβ-Bèl, son of Ardija; Enlil-a¾¾è-iddin, son of Ardija; Ninurta·-a¾¾è-eriŒ, son of Rìmãt; Ninurta-a¾¾è-iddin, son of Kìn‰; Ilka-b½ni-napiŒti-ibni, son of L½b½Œi.


3-7. Written over erasures.
4. Perhaps LÚ.¹NAM¹ = pîhātu, “governor,” over erasure, or LÚ.¹JAR¹-nuí, “foreman,” over erasure?
4f. The name Tarbițija, literally “My Foster Child,” and the patronym P½qissunu, literally “Their Caretaker,” are extraordinary. I am not aware of other Neo- or Late Babylonian personal names compounded with tarbițu, “fosterling,” even though “founding” names like Súqaja, “From the Street,” Abî-ul-idi, “Don’t Know my Father,” or Šà-pì-kalbi, “From a Dog’s Mouth,” are frequent. Names compounded with paqïdu are also surprisingly rare, to judge from entries in Stamm Namengebung (none), Tallqvist NBN (only the uncertain Pa⁻qad-na-nu Dar. 500:2), and Tallqvist APN (only A dad-ip-qid and Ninurta-pa-qi-da-at), the latter not a person’s name but a scholarly gloss, both also cited in Tallqvist NBN 328; Ap-qiS-Ésu Stolper Records of Deposit No. 7:16, is perhaps an error for Ab-dê’-). The nearest comparable items are m₉Tar-PA-ti-bi Â-[šá šá] m₉Pa-qid₉-nuí IM 55085:4f. (= 1N285, Nippur, 2/I/21 Xerxes; not year 13 as in OIP 78 76; recollated from cast), perhaps referring to the same people mentioned in this text. If so, Tar-bi-ti-ia and Tar-PA-ti-bi may both be erroneous spellings of a hypocoristic name containing tartìbì “you (fem.) replaced.”

6-9. M. Weszeli, “Eseleien, II” WZKM87 (1997), 233-36 reviews discussion and disagreements over the interpretation of šazzuzu-manadânu. She rejects the interpretation of Ries, “Bemerkungen zur neubabylonischen Rechtspraxis der Stellvertretung,” WO 8 (1976) 308, according to which the clause requires an agent to produce his principal in person so that the principal can confirm the transaction recorded in the document at hand, on the grounds that it calls for an implausible, even self-defeating procedure. She also rejects my interpretation that the clause gives the agent responsibility for entering the transaction in his principal’s records (Entrepreneurs and Empire, p. 33 n. 119 and elsewhere), on the grounds that it does not account for cases in which the payment is said to be entered in favor of the agent,
not in favor of the principal (citing BE 10 127 and CT 49 46 as examples). She recurs to the interpretation proposed by San Nicolò-Ungnad NRV, 255-56 and followed by Cardascia Murašû, 70, according to which the clause requires the recipient (whether principal or agent) to record the payment and give the payer (whether principal or agent) confirmation that it has been recorded. She adds that confirmation of the act of registering the payment need not be in written form.

But if this interpretation implies that every receipt containing the clause is provisional and conditional, not valid except with further confirmation, it still seems implausible. It would mean that we are left with an incomplete record of an incomplete transaction, a receipt whose legal value in case of a dispute is unreliable. The payer or his agent (in my view) do not require certain knowledge that the transaction has actually been properly recorded. They require only immunity from whatever trouble may arise if it is not properly recorded. I continue to suppose that the purpose of the clause is to assure that the transaction is final from the point of view of the principals. It places responsibility for any lapse in transmission or recording on the agents. I continue to interpret the verb-phrase šuṣzu-šu ma naṭana as a semantic unit, following Landsberger’s suggestion on this and similar verb-phrases compounded with naṭana (‘Bemerkungen zu San Nicolò und Ungand, Neubabylonische Rechts- und Verwaltungsurkunden, Bd. I 12.’, ZA 39 [1930] 288).

17. The same scribe wrote BE 8/1 120 (3/X/12 Xerxes).

This document is twenty years older than the oldest of the Murašû texts. Its connection with the Murašû archive is not prosopographic but formal. The peculiar clause in lines 9-10 has only one exact parallel, in a Murašû text (pūt la šakānu ša DîM ME ša Lû.ERîN LUGAL ašu 2 PN u PN₂ naštā TuM 2-3 183:15-16, collated by Joachim Oelsner) and a near-parallel in another Murašû text written by the same scribe (pūt la šakānu ša me-KU-tū PN naši UCP 9/3 276:17-18, collated by Benno Landsberger). The reading and interpretation of both passages are matters of conjecture and disagreement. TuM 2-3 183 (edited by Cardascia Murašû, 117-18) is a receipt for silver and flour paid as provisions for King’s Man service due from two bow lands (iddi u šiditu [ša 2 Lû.ERîN LUGAL], line 1; cf. iddi u šiditu ša 2 Lû.ERîN LUGAL ... ša imuḫḫi qašāti šuāti , lines 11-12). The payer is Rîmût-Ninurta/Murašû, who was in control of the properties on which the obligation lay. The payment was made in response to a written order (šipištu u kunukku, line 9) from the foreman of the ḫāṭrû-organization to which the properties belonged. The recipients of the silver and flour were the two proprietors of the bow lands. The receipt requires them to register the payment (šuṣzu-šu ma naṭana, lines 14-15) with their foreman. As in No. 13, the clause pūt la šakānu ša DîM ME ... naštā follows this requirement and concludes the body of the receipt. The subjects of the clause are the recipients, that is, the proprietors of the bow lands who were subject to the service obligation.⁴¹ Here, Cardascia (Murašû, 117-18) read pūt la šakānu ša tim-me ... naštā. He understood tim-me as a spelling of the substantive tēmu. He translated “la responsabilité de ne pas rendre compte des ‘soldats du roi’ en question, (savoir) 2, [ils] portent.” He commented that the reading and translation were open to some question, but the intent was certain. He also commented that the negative phrasing la šakānu was tantamount in meaning and effect to an affirmative phrasing. UCP 9/3 276, the Berkeley text (above), is an extraordinary “dialogue” document. A man named Gadal-Jāma proposes to perform the royal service (ana šeštūt ša šarri ... alāku , lines 11-12, cf. lines 15-16). The service was due from a share of a horse property that the Murašû family held by adoption (ana muḫḫi bīt šīšī mala zittika, line 13,}

⁴¹ PBS 2/1 114 is a receipt of the same kind (see Augapfel 18 [collated], cf. Entrepreneurs and Empire , p. 61 [incorrectly characterizing the text as the record of a loan]). The payer is Rîmût-Ninurta. The recipient is the foreman of the ḫāṭrû-organization to which the bow lands required to provide the King’s Men belong. The fact that the payer and recipient are the principals, not agents, accounts for the absence of the registration clause (šuṣzu-šu ma naṭana). The fact that the proprietors of the bow lands are not actually named perhaps accounts for the absence of the clause at issue here, pūt la šakānu ... naštā. On PBS 2/1 114 and TuM 2-3 183, see also C. Tuplin, “The Administration of the Persian Empire,” in Coinage and Administration in the Athenian and Persian Empires, ed. Ian Carradice, BAR International Series 343 (Oxford: Archæopress, 1987), 156 n. 153.
The clause at issue, pūt la šakānu ... našu, precedes the registration clause. The subject of the clause is Gadal-Jāma, the recipient of the supplies, who is to perform the service. Here, Cardascia (Murašū, 180-81) read pūt la šakānu ša pi-qū-ud Gadal-Jāma našu. He translated “la responsabilité de ne pas présenter ce qui (lui) a été confié, Gadal-Jāma porte.” He commented that ša piqūd refers to the horse, equipment and arms detailed earlier in the text. Ebeling (ZA 50 209-11) also read ša pi-qū-ud, but translated “Garantie dafür, dass er den Auftrag nicht (einem andren) gibt, trägt Gadaljāma.” He commented that the parallel dim-me(sic) = ūme in TuM 2-3 183:15 shows that pi-qū-ud is to be interpreted as Aram. piqqūdā, “Gebot.” The most recent translation by Joannès and Beaulieu has “Gadaliama bears responsibility for presenting the equipment given to him,” evidently following Cardascia’s interpretation, but replacing the negative rendering of la šakānu with an affirmative counterpart. Von Soden rejected both the reading ša ūme in TuM 2-3 183 and the reading ša piqūd in UCP 9/3 276. He offered alternative readings and translations that are nonsensical. The CAD rejected von Soden’s reading of UCP 9/3 276 and cited but emended Landsberger’s collation, reading pūt la šakānu ša me-ti (text KU)-tū PN naši, and translating “PN guarantees that no shortage will occur.” The CAD’s translation of the phrase as a negative guarantee is proper. The phrase pūt la šakānu ša DIM.ME našu in No. 13 and TuM 2-3 183 and pūt la šakānu ša me-KU-tū in UCP 9/3 276 must express guarantees that something undesirable will not happen. They do not assign responsibility for the possibility that something desirable will not happen, amounting to a guarantee that something desirable will happen. Interpretations of the kind that Cardascia suggested, resting on the assumption that negative and affirmative formulations of the guarantee are interchangeable, with equivalent meaning and effect, are untenable.

No. 13 now shows that the phrase pūt la šakānu ša DIM.ME


43 In TuM 2-3 183:15-16 pūt la šakānu NINDA.DIM.ME ša šab-šarrā-ā’, “(they guarantee) that pannigu(-bread) will not be put away for the royal personnel” (“Seltene akkadische Wörter,” SïOr 46 [Festschrift A. Salonen] [1975] 328). In UCP 9/3 276:17 la šakānu ša-pi-ku-tū, “(he guarantees that) depositing (of grain?) will not be done” (AHw.1172 s.v. šapikütu, cf. “Aramäische Wörter in neuassyrischen und neu- und spätbabylonischen Texten. Ein Vorbericht. II (n-z und Nachträgè),” Or. NS 37 [1966] 263).

44 CAD S/I 451 s.v. **šapikütu.** The entry points to occurrences of the phrase mišṭu šakānu cited under mišṭu ming 1g. In normal Neo-Babylonian usage, mišṭu refers to shortages in measurable items (herds, crops, produce, materials, irrigation water, or accomplishment of measured work quotas), not to deficient behavior.

45 The example that Cardascia gave to show the equivalence of negative and affirmative guarantees (Murašū 35) is erroneous. The guarantee in BE 10 77:8 is not pūt la-a šE.BAR ... naši, “porte la responsabilité, (si) l’orge n’(est) pas (payé),” but pūt etér (KAR1) uttari ... naši, “guarantees payment of the barley.” It is true that negative guarantees may take either negative form (pūt la x našū, “guarantee that x will not occur”) or non-negative form (pūt x našū, “guarantee against x”): e.g., pūt la šēšī la pāqîrāni našū “guarantee that there will be no legitimate or illegitimate claimant (to the slave)” = pūt šēšī pāqîrāni našū “guarantee against legitimate or illegitimate claimants” (examples in CAD s.vv. arad-šarrātu, mārbanâtu, šēšī); pūt la epēšu ša pišku našū “guarantee that no p. will be done” YBC 11560:5 = pūt piški našū “guarantee against p.,” PBS 2/1 28:3-4 and 8, PBS 2/1 107:5 and 8, BE 10 43:10-12 and 16, Entrepreneurs and Empire No. 112:3-4 and 6 (see Stolper, Festschrift Oelsner [forthcoming].) The converse, however, is not true, that positive guarantees may take either positive form (pūt x našū, “guarantee x”) or non-positive form (pūt la x našū “take responsibility in case x does not occur”). The
was an established usage. Its occurrence in *TuM* 2-3 183 is not a scribal idiosyncrasy or an error to be emended. Despite the formal differences among No. 13, *TuM* 2-3 183 and *UCP* 9/3 276, the close functional correspondence among them indicates that šakānu ša me-KU-tú and šakānu ša DIM.ME (ša šāb šarri’) are synonymous. Hence, DIM.ME and me-KU-tú are writings of the same word, from the hand of the same scribe. Then if the CAD’s suggested emendation, šakānu ša miṭītu, is correct, *TuM* 2-3 183 implies that the phrase envisions a “shortfall” in the length of service, not a loss of the equipment or supplies issued. But in that case the equivalence between DIM.ME and miṭītu is unexplained. The signs DIM.ME also occur in one other Murašu text, but in an entirely different context. In *BE* 9 45 (= *TuM* 2-3 143), a lease in dialogue form, the rented items include the whole length of a canal and arable land on it. The land is described by juridical status (bīt ešāri, bīt ritti, lines 9-10 and 19-20). The rented items also include zēru ša šumēli ša ID GN u 3-ta DIM.ME.MEŠ ša ina imni ša ID GN elat zēru ša mē ultu ID GN₂ išattu “arable land on the left side of the Milidu Canal and 3 ....-s on the right side of the Milidu Canal, but not including arable land that draws water from the Enlil Canal” (lines 11-13 and 21-23, collated by Joachim Oelsner). The dictionaries, following a conjecture of Meissner, cite this passage under makūtu, “pole, beam (of a waterlift).” But in the context a topographic feature, something in contrast parallel to zēru, “arable land,” is expected, as Cardascia observed.44 This passage probably refers to “plots irrigated by waterlift,” with makūtu (DIM.ME) for *bīt makūti, like dālu, “bucket,” above No. 6:4, for bīt dāli, “plot irrigated with drawn water” (*BE* 9 7:10).45 The uncertain reading of DIM.ME as makūtu in *BE* 9 45 suggests a way to account for the likely equivalence between DIM.ME in No. 13 and *TuM* 2-3 183 and me-KU-tú in *UCP* 9/3 276: perhaps the equivalence DIM.ME = me-KU-tú arises from near-homophony between makūtu (DIM.ME), “pole,” and mēkūtu, “lack, deficiency.” In that case, šakānu ša mēkūtu would mean something close to the CAD’s suggestion, “cause a deficiency (i.e., in the number of men or length of service).”46 Since this explanation requires the supposition that two scribes working a generation apart used a rare logogram to write a rare word on the basis of homophony with a still rarer word, it is open to doubt.47 Even so, however the writing is to be explained, the form and

---


45 The same meaning would suit the Old Babylonian reference to a field ina makāti iki DN Gautier Dilbat 5:1, cited *CAD* s.v. makūtu hamstring 1.

46 Thus mi-ku-ti ša šābē “lack of soldiers,” *PRT* 10:8 (see SAA 40.31).

47 Equating DIM.ME with a postulated substantive *mekūtu, “negligence, idleness” is attractive, but less plausible. The Neo-Assyrian form of the cognate adjective mēkūti carries not only the moral nuance of laziness (la ūmmāni miaṭītu ša anāhānī isseni la illsikī “the shortfall (arising from) the dead and idle troops who did not come with us on campaign” *ABL* 1180 r. 8). But neither the adjective nor the cognate verb mekū “be negligent, idle,” occurs in Neo-Babylonian. The meaning is ordinarily conveyed by the verb šelā (common in letters, but rare in legal texts). And if the guarantee were against “commission of negligence,” referring to the guarantor’s behavior, rather than to “causing a shortfall,” referring to the measurable effect of his behavior, it could be
meaning of the word in question are corroborated by an earlier Achaemenid text that refers specifically to a deficiency in man-months of compulsory service: (promissory note for 7½ minas of silver,) kaspē ša ma-ku-tu ša Ė LŪ.GAL.MEŠ ša 50 šābi ša 3 arbi ša ekallī ša GN itti qipī la īpušū “silver for the deficit owed to the office of the overseers(?) for fifty men who did not work with the qipū officials for three months at the palace at GN” YOS 166:5 (Uruk, 18/XII/4 Cambyses).50

No. 13 is not explicit about what was actually received, that is, whether šāb šarrī, the King’s Man, refers here to the actual performance of required service or to a payment in lieu of service. The fact that the receipt does not mention an amount or commodity is not decisive in itself. The dictionaries and recent discussions are not entirely clear on this point. Although šāb šarrī may refer in Neo-Babylonian and Achaemenid texts either to men performing compulsory service for the crown or to money payments, the two nuances are unevenly distributed. In the Murašū texts, šāb šarrī refers mostly to payments.51 The wording of some receipts implies that the payments were understood to replace service,52 but only two texts use the term for the men serving 53. In other texts from the period between Xerxes and Alexander, the term šāb šarrī itself is scarce, perhaps absent.54 In Neo-Babylonian and earlier Achaemenid texts, šāb šarrī regularly refers to men performing the service. In texts where money was paid or owed to or for a šāb šarrī, it was not a “tax” paid to an official in place of service. The obligation to provide a King’s Man lay on the proprietor of a holding granted by the crown, and perhaps on others.55 Proprietors

expressed with a simple infinitive, (la) mekūšēlū, rather than with a cumbersome phrase, (la) šaḵānu ša meḵūtu.

50 One of the two debtors in the note is named Šamaš-eriba/Nabû-muddammiq. Cf. YOS 154, requiring two men to provide fifty temple slaves to serve as archers at fortified outposts, adding ITIL.TA.ÂM širkā ā’ 50 . . . ina kadānu isseniqqāma ana Šamaš-eriba rab kadānu . . . inandinā “every month they will inspect those fifty temple slaves in the outposts and turn them over to Šamaš-eriba, chief of the outposts” (lines 7-12).

51 In about fifty receipts in the Murašū archive, šāb šarrī indicates one of the obligations included under the general heading ilkū (usually plural), paid mostly in silver. The usual phrase is ilkū gamraṭū šāb šarrī qēme ša šarrī bāru u mimma nadenntu ša biṭ šarrī , “taxes in full, the King’s Man, the King’s Flour, the bāru tax, and any gifts to the royal estate.” In one, the relationship between the heading and the components is explicit: ilkū gamraṭū šāb šarrī , etc., “taxes in full, consisting of the King’s Man, etc.” BE 10 64:1. Only one Murašū text refers to the šāb šarrī as something separate from the other components: zēru šūṭu ana qēme ša šarrī u šarrī ša la šāb [šarrī] . . . idānu “he turned over that arable land on (condition of payment of) the King’s Flour and the bāru tax, but not the King’s Man,” PBS 2/1 34:5, see İstanbul Murašū Texts, p. 77. In general, see Cardascia Murašū, 99, Joannès Textes économiques 21-25, and van Driel, JESHO 32 210-12.

52 Silver is sometimes described as kūm šāb šarrī . . . ilkī gamraṭū “in lieu of the King’s Man, etc., taxes in full” (PBS 2/1 76:17, 188:1, cf. [šutu] gamrī kūm šāb šarrī . . . , “(silver as) full payment, in lieu of the King’s Man, etc.” PBS 2/1 66:1).

53 In addition to the two King’s Men provided for in TuM 2-3 183, only BE 9 50:4, where the twenty-five šābī šarrī tendered with rent are probably men, not unspecified units of an unspecified commodity (despite CAD S s.v. šāb šarrī mng. 2 and Entrepreneurs and Empire, p. 62). Other Murašū texts that refer to active service do not use the term šāb šarrī (e.g., the promissory notes for the expense of equipping men to serve at Uruk in the second year of Darius II; see Cardascia Murašū, 40, 99, 174-75; Entrepreneurs and Empire, p. 123; Joannès Textes économiques 19; and add İstanbul Murašū Texts, No. 83).

54 I know only VAT 15848, a fragment of uncertain date from the Kasr of Babylon, perhaps from a lease, referring in broken context to 5 LŪ.ERIN LUGAL ina Barsipa.

55 On the existence of pre-Achaemenid tenancies of this kind, see Jursa, Der Tempelzehnt in Babylonien, AOAT 254 (Kevelaer and Neukirchen-Vluyn: Butzon & Bercker and Neukirchener Verlag, 1998), 13-18; “Bogenland schon unter Nebukadnezar II.,” NABU 1998/1214; Bèl-rèmanni 105, Jursa (ibid., 103-04, 109-10) corroborates and amplifies other observations (e.g., van Driel, JESHO 32 207; Stolper, “Late Achaemenid Legal Texts from Uruk and Larsa,” Bagh. Mitt. 21 [1990] 583; Beaulieu and Stolper, “Two
sometimes turned to suppliers of credit to underwrite the cost of service. The money was the cost of equipment (rikis qabli) or provisions (idd û sidîtu) for a man who served. It was paid to the man who served or to members of his family. It was paid by the man who was obliged to provide the worker or soldier, or else paid by his creditor, that is, paid on his behalf and recorded in a promissory note to his debit. In promissory notes, the relationships among proprietor (P), King’s Man (KM), and creditor (C) are expressed x kaspu ša C ina muḫḫi P... kaspu ša ana KM nadnu “x silver owed to C by P, silver that was given to KM.” In receipts, the relationships are expressed x kaspu KM šāb šarri ša P ina qāt C muḫḫi ana muḫḫi P “KM, the King’s Man of P, received from C x silver debited against P.” From the payer’s point of view, the general term ilkū included the money paid for outfitting a man, but from the crown’s point of view the money did not replace the man.  

More Late Achaemenid Texts from Uruk,” “NABU1995/77) that obligations to pay and serve fell not only on farmland, but also on urban property; and not only on new segments of the population created by the Neo-Babylonian and Achaemenid empires—e.g., members of ethnic or professional groups settled on their allotments by the crown—but also on social groups within cities, without explicit reference to allotments of land.

Despite Oppenheim, “Studies in Akkadian Lexicography, II,” Or. NS 14 [1945] 239-40, reflected in CAD $ s.v. šāb šarri mng 2. The text Iraq 59 128 No. 47 is a receipt for silver paid as part of a man’s fiscal obligations (kaspu ša išk ša PN, lines 1-2), for outfitting a King’s Man to serve for him (kaspu riksu qabli ša PN, šāb šarri, lines 5-6), to the wife and (probably) the father of the King’s Man. Other texts refer explicitly to silver paid for outfitting King’s Men (kaspu ša ana rikissi qabli ša šābi šarri nadnu “(promissory note for) silver that was given (i.e., by the creditor) for outfitting King’s Men,” Nbn. 103:15, see Wunsch Iddin-Marduk No. 112, kaspu riksu qabli ša PN šāb šarri ša PN, “(receipt for) silver (for) outfitting PN, the King’s Man of (i.e., serving for) PN,” Dar. 481:3). Others refer elliptically to silver paid to the King’s Man (kaspu ša ana šābi šarrišu ina muḫḫišu iddīnu “(promissory note for) silver that he (the creditor) paid to his (the debtor’s) King’s Men on his (the debtor’s) behalf” AnOr 14:13-15, see Beaulieu, “A Finger in Every Pie: The Institutional Connections of a Family of Entrepreneurs in Neo-Babylonian Larsa,” in Interdependency of Institutions and Private Entrepreneurs, ed. A.C.V.M. Bongenaar, MOS Studies 2 = Uitgaven van het Nederlands Historisch-Archaeologisch Instituut te Istanbul 87 (Leiden: Nederlands Historisch-Archaeologisch Instituut te Istanbul, 2000), 51-52 with similar texts from the same archive. Other texts cited CAD $ s.v. šāb šarri mng 2, do not support the interpretation “tax.” For Strassmaier & Congrès International No. 13, see van Driel, JESHO 32 210 and Wunsch Iddin-Marduk No. 85; for the problematic Camb. 13, see Joannès Textes économiques 19, M. Streck, Zahl und Zeit, Cuneiform Monographs 5 (Groningen: Styx, 1995), 139, Weszeli, “Eseleien,” WZKM 86 (1996) 473. For TCL 9 125 and TuM 2-3 242, see below.

Van Driel, JESHO 32 212, on Dar. 220 and 481, two contracts involving the same payer and the same man serving, separated by twelve years. In UCP 9/3 276, the man proposing to do the service, Gadal-Jāma, was the son of the nominal proprietor of the holding from which the service was due, Barīk-Jāma; he was also the brother by adoption of one of the Mūrasū, Enlil-šūm-iddin, and therefore the uncle by adoption of the man who provided the equipment, supplies and money for his service, Rimūṭ-Ninurta/Muṣū. Despite R. Zadok, The Jews in Babylonia during the Chaldean and Achaemenian Periods [Haifa: University of Haifa, 1979], 55.) An unpublished text in a private collection dated in the reign of Cambyses records the hiring (ana idīšu ušēazzu) of a man to perform royal service (palāḫ šarri) as if he were a co-proprietor (akī kinattatu), the term of the contract being indefinite (for the full year from 15/VI/5 to 15/VI/6 ṭuppī u ṭuppī “[and] until further notice”).

Joannès Textes économiques, 26.
service. But the extraordinary clause in No. 13:9-11 recurs only in later Achaemenid texts that deal explicitly with underwriting active service. Hence, No. 13 must also be a receipt for completed service. Iqišā and Tarbītiya completed two months of compulsory service under an official of Nippur. A subordinate of the official, Enlil-rēšūa, gave them this acknowledgment of their service, a sort of record of discharge. He also assumed responsibility for having their service accurately recorded in the official’s records, protecting them against additional claims either to their service or to their compensation for it. The final clauses of No. 13 reflect these circumstances. In most receipts, the object of the verb-phrase šuzzuzu-ma nadānu is the item and amount paid. In No. 13:7-9, however, the phrase has two objects: not only šāb šarri, “the King’s Man,” but also -šunūti, “them,” the obliged parties. In most cases, a tangible object would be entered (šuzzuzu) in the principal’s record, an item like “½ mina of silver” (corresponding to a phrase like kaspu ā ½ mana in a matching receipt). Here, what was received was an intangible, service, so what was entered in the principal’s record was the names of the men who performed the service (corresponding to -šunūti in this receipt), perhaps in a column headed šāb šarri or a list summarized as šābī šarri. In fact, there is an example of such a list from Achaemenid Nippur. TuM 2-3 242 concludes with the summary PAP 14.KÁM LÚ.RIN LUGAL ša ITILBAR u ITILGU4 (r. 6-7), “a total of 14 King’s Men for months I and II.” The entries at the beginning, in the form BAN ša PN PN2 u PN3, appear to mean “(For) the bow land of PN, (the men doing royal service are) PN2 and PN3.” The names of Tarbītiya and Iqišā were to be recorded in entries like this.

Another interpretation of TuM2-3 242 is also possible. Jursa describes fragmentary administrative texts from Sippar that array comparable information in different form. They list groups of ten names, summarized as “total 10 men (LÚ.RIN.(MEŠ)) for one bowman (LÚ.BAN) of PN” or “for the bow (GIŠ.BAN) of PN.” The name of the summary is also the first name in the group of ten. It indicates the man responsible for the whole group, and the group is identified by his name. It is possible that in the entries of TuM 2-3 242, the unit labeled “bow of PN” refers to a similar group under a similar kind of organization, that is to a social unit rather than to a parcel of land and its proprietors.

But the Sippar texts are lists of men who were obligated to serve (or to pay instead of serving). They are the elements of muster rolls, indicating the prospect of service. TuM 2-3 242, however, specifying a two-month period, is a record of completed service. It is the administrative counterpart of No. 13, a receipt for two King’s Men—more accurately, for four King’s Man-Months.

Finally, the objects of the verb-phrase šuzzuzu-ma nadānu in No. 13 express the equivalent of the commodity received, but not the amount. That is, service by “them” corresponds to silver, kaspu ā, in the hypothetical example. But the explicit objects of the verb-phrase do not completely express the amount received, that is, in place of “a half mina” in the hypothetical example, the...
number of man-months served. The usual syntax of the verb-phrase does not permit crediting Iqšā and Tarbītiya specifically with the two months of service mentioned in lines 1-2. Instead, the extraordinary clause in No. 13:9-11 confers on the recipient specific responsibility for any “deficiency” in man-months recorded to their credit.62

No. 13, then, represents the final step in the process of recording service obligations assessed and discharged. First, groups that were required to supply a man to serve were registered in lists of the kind represented by the fragments from Sippar discussed by Jursa (n. 60); similar texts are what is meant by a reference in an often-cited letter, probably from the Egiți archive, to troops who are “written down with you”.63 Second, men who performed the service were registered in lists of the kind represented b TuM 2-3 242; similar texts may be what is meant by the clause requiring intermediaries to enter the service (šuzzuzu-ma nadānu) in the records of their superiors, as in, e.g., UCP 9/3 276:18-20. Third, the obliged men received confirmation that the obligation was discharged with receipts of the kind represented by No. 13.

No. 13 also indicates that compulsory service of this kind was organized city-by-city. The “… of Nippur” named in line 4 has the same place in this regard as the šakin ťemi of Babylon in texts from earlier reigns.64

In an environment where manpower was an object of competition, the people on whom the King’s Man obligation lay and the people who discharged it were bound to be anxious about anything that would expose them to greater liability. A letter from Uruk expresses this concern:

\[
\text{ina šatti }\frac{1}{2} \text{ mana ina qât PN išima ana PN₂ u [PN₃] LÜ.ERÍN LUGAL-šú ša izzizzu idin ina qātešu lu tumaššar maamma'1 pirku ititišu lu idabbub u mimmušu ana pirki lu inašši amur }\frac{1}{2} \text{ mana kaspu ana LÜ.ERÍN LUGAL-šú }[\text{ }]\text{din}
\]

(PN and the people of his household are under your charge,) get a half mina (of silver) per year from PN and give it to PN₂ and [PN₃], the King’s Man who served for him, do not let it get away7 from them, no one1 must raise improper claims against him (PN) or take any illicit appropriation from him, see here, you are to pay the half mina of silver (only) for his (PN’s) King’s Man.65

An often-cited letter from Babylon expresses similar concerns in the similar terms:

\[
\text{u mārī šiši tašlišāni u LÜ.ERÍN.MEŠ LUGAL? (copy: DUMU DÛ.MEŠ) ina qātešu la tumaššar pirki ana rab dūri itti šabija la idabbub}
\]

62 In each of the three uses of this clause, the subject, that is, the person who assumes the responsibility that the clause mentions, plays a different role in bringing about the performance of service for the king. In TuM 2-3 183, it is the proprietors who were to supply King’s Men for service. In UCP 9/3 276, it is the prospective King’s Man. In No. 13, it is an agent of the man under whose command the King’s Men served. But in all three, the subject plays the same role in the contract itself, as the recipient of what was paid, loaned, or done. In all three the purpose of the clause is to protect the payer against specific liability, and if so, the clause is at least partially redundant with the preceding šuzzuzu-ma nadānu clause.

63 PN mār šiši u tašlišāni itišu šatu CT 22 74:7; see, most recently, Wunsch, in Interdependency of Institutions and Private Entrepreneurs , 114.

64 Ibid., 114.

65 TCL 9 125:10-24, from Šum-ukīn, perhaps the General Contractor (ša muḫḫī sāti) of that name, to Nabū-sar-ūṣur, perhaps the Royal Commissioner in Eanna (ša rēš šarrī bel piqitti ) of that name; if so, from the reign of Nabonidus.
Do not discharge the charioteers, the chariot-fighters and the King’s Men from his command, he must not raise improper claims against my men with the fortress commander.\textsuperscript{66}

The same anxiety motivated the final clauses of No. 13, fastidious to the point of being redundant or cumbersome in an effort to assure that Iqiššā and Tarbitija were credited with the time they served and that someone else was liable if they were not credited.

\textsuperscript{66} CT 22 74:18-22, from Güzānu, perhaps the governor (šakin ṭēmi) of Babylon of that name, to Širku, perhaps the homonymous member of the Egibi family, otherwise called Marduk-nāsīr-apli (Wunsch, in \textit{Interdependency of Institutions and Private Entrepreneurs}, 114); see Ebeling \textit{Neubab. Briefe} No. 74, A. Leo Oppenheim, \textit{Letters from Mesopotamia} (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1967), 143; Joannès \textit{Textes économiques}, 24.
PERSONAL NAMES

Abbreviations: br. = brother; dau. = daughter; f. = father; gf. = grandfather; GN = geographical name; gs. = grandson; mas. = master; s. = son; svt. = servant.

Addu-iddin (dIM-MU) s. of Ninurta-nādin: 7:17
Aḥḥē-iddin (ŠEŠ.MEŠ-MU)
 1) s. of Nāšir: 11:18
 2) 6:5
Aḥḥē-utīr (ŠEŠ.MEŠ-GUR) s. of Ninurta-
uballiț: 3:12
Aḥ-iddin (ŠEŠ-MU)
 1) f. of Enlil-uppaltu?-uṣur: 8:7
 2) 11:2
Aḫušunu (ŠEŠ-ša-nu)
 1) svt. of Iddin-Bēl: 1:6
 2) f. of Bēlšunu: 3:12
 3) f. of Rībat: 11:18
A-na-Bēl-ēreš (A-na-dEN-1-KĀM! A-na-dEN-
APIN-eš) s. of [ ... ]: 9:3’, rev.  
Aqara (KAL-ū-
 1) s. of Nādin, gs. of Mannu-Enlil-dāri: 7:12
 2) f. of Enlil-nādin-šumi: 10:12, lo. ed.  
Arad-Enlil (ARAD-dEN-līl)
 1) s. of Iddina: 1:3, 2:1, 7
 2) s. of Iddin-Enlil: 6:23
 3) f. of Arad-d-Ninurta: 11:6  
Arad-Gula (ARAD-dME.ME) f. of Nusku-
iddin: 6:26
Arad-Ninurta (ARAD-dMAŠ)
 1) s. of Arad-Enlil: 11:5, 13
 2) s. of Nabû-kišir: 3:1, 5
 3) s. of Ninurta-uballiț: 6:24
 4) tupašaru, s. of Upaḫḫir-Enlil: 7:19
 5) f. of Bēlšunu: 2:12
 6) f. of Ninurta-iddin: 2:13  
 7) f. of Taqiš-Gula: 10:14, le. ed.  
Arđiša (ARAD-ia, ARAD-iā)
 1) s. of [ ... ]: 4:18
 2) f. of Enlil-ahḥē-iddin: 13:13
 3) f. of Mušezib-Bēl: 13:12  
Arṭalḫassu (Ar-taḫ-ša-as-su, Ar-taḫ-sa-su,
Ār-tak-šat-su): 1:19, 2:18, 3:16, 10:1,
16; 12:3
Arzā ’(A-rzā-’) in GN Bīt Arzā: 1:18
Attar-dannat (At-tar-dan-na-at, At-tar-
dan-na-tum) svt. of Nabū-dîlîni: 9:2, 8,
11
Bābu-ētīr (dKĀ-SUR) s. of Kāšir: 7:14,
11:14
Bagādātu? (dBa-ga-’-UD-da-a-tū): 10:6, 8
Balâtu (DIN) s. of Enlil-kāšir: 7:15
Banīja (Ba-ni-ia) s. of Barīk-līl: 6:21
Barīk-līl (B-a-rīk-DINGIR.MEŠ) f. of Banīja: 6:21
Bassija (Ba-[as]-si-ia) f. of Bēl-uṣallim7:
1:4
Bēl-bullissu (dEN-bul-liš-su, dEN-DIN-su)
 1) s. of Iddin-Nabû: 4:2, 3, 82) f. of Ea-
iddin: 9:5’
Bēl-ēreš (dEN-KĀM!), šaknu of Nippur, s. of
Silim-ll: 7:2, 8, up. ed.
Bēl-erība (dEN-SU) f. of Marduk-šum-ibni:  
9:7
Bēl-etēru (dEN-e-tē-ru) s. of Bēlšunu: 11:17
Bēl-iddin (dEN-MU) s. of Bēlšunu: 9:9’
Bēl-iqēša (dEN-BA-šā) f. of Ėtīr-Marduk:  
9:7’
Bēlšunu (EN-ša-nu)
 1) LÚ.x of Nippur: 13:4, 7
 2) s. of Aḫušunu: 3:11
 3) s. of Arad-Ninurta: 2:12
 4) f. of Bēl-etēru: 11:18
 5) f. of Bēl-iddin: 9:9’
 6) f. of Enlil-ah-ittannu: 7:13, le. ed
 7) f. of Erība-Enlil: 11:17
 8) f. of Nānā-īdīr’: 10:7, 9
 9) f. of Ninurta-iddin: 10:15
 10) f. of Nîshur-Enlil: 2:16
 11) f. of Tattannu: 10:13, lo. ed.
Bēl-uṣallīt (dEN-DIN-it): 6:3  
Bēl-usur (dEN-ū-sur) f. of Bēl-zēr-lišir: 9:6’
Bēl-uṣallim7 (dEN-GI)
Matthew W. Stolper

1) s. of Bassija: 1:4, le. ed.
2) ṭuḥšarru, s. of Tabnēa?: 4:19
3) f. of Tāḥẖūa: 9:4

Bēl-zēr-lišir (dEN-NUMUN-GIŠ) s. of Bēl-
ušur: 9:6

Dārīmuš (Dar-a-muš, Da-ri-‘a-muš, Da-ri-[ia]-muš): 7:20, 9:12’, 11:22

Dummuq (Du-um-muq) f. of Ninurta-gāmil: 11:20

Ea-iddin (dBE-MU) s. of Bēl-bullissu: 9:5’, le. ed.

Enlil-aḫḫē-erība (dEn-l’l-ŠEŠ.MEŠ-SU) f. of
Enlil-bēlānī: 13:18

Enlil-aḫḫē-iddin (dEn-l’l-ŠEŠ.MEŠ-MU) s.of
Ardiya: 13:13

Enlil-ah-ittannu (dEn-l’l-ŠEŠ-ît-tan-nu, d50-
ŠEŠ-ît-tan-nu) s. of Bēlšunu: 7:13, le. ed.

Enlil-bēlānī (dEn-l’l-EN-a-ni), ṭuḥšarru, s. of
Enlil-aḫḫē-erība: 13:17

Enlil-ḫātin (dEn-l’l-ḫa-tin) mas. of
Ilûmmes-đinē: 4:6

Enlil-iddin (dEn-l’l-MU) s. of Enlil-kišir:
3:13

Enlil-ipuš (dEn-l’l-DU-uš, d50-DU-uš) f. of
Nādin: 10:12, up. ed.

Enlil-kāšir (dEn-l’l-KĀD) f. of Balātu: 7:15

Enlil-kišir (dEn-l’l-ki-šir) f. of Enlil-iddin:
3:13

Enlil-nādin-šami (dEn-l’l-na-din-MU) s. of
Arqa: 10:12, [lo, ed.]

Enlil-rē ‘aqa (dEn-l’l-SIPA-û-a, d50-SIPA-û-
a) svt. of Bēlšunu: 13: 3, 6, 10, le. ed.

Enlil-šum-iddin (dEn-l’l-MU-MU)
1) s. of Lībru: 3:7, 9
2) s. of Mūrašū: 2:2, 3:2, 6:1, 2, 12, 25

Enlil-šum-lībir (dEn-l’l-MU-š-šir, d50-
MU-š-šir) s. of Nādin: 7:11, rev.

Enlil-uppułtu- ‘ušur (dEn-l’l-SIG7-URU) s. of
Aḫ-iddir: 8:7

Enlil-zēr-ibni (dEn-l’l-NUMUN-DU),
šûsânu: 8:2

Erība-Enlil (SU-dEn-l’l) s. of Bēlšunu:
11:17

Ēṭir-Marduk (KAR-dAMAR.UTU) s. of Bēl-

Gula-šum-lišir (dME.ME-MU-GIŠ) f. of
Šīrikti-Ninurta: 10:4

Ḥannīja (Ḫa-an-ni-ia) s. of Iddin-Bēl: 1:5,
2:4, ri. ed.

Ḫātīn (Ḫa-tin) f. of Mūrašū: 1:2

Iddina (MU-a, SUM.NA-a)
1) s. of Iqṣīša: 2:15
2) s. of Ninurta-aballītu: 10:14
3) f. of Arad-Enlīl: 6:24

Iddin-Marduk (MU-dAMAR.UTU) s. of
Uballiṣu-Marduk: 7:5, 7, 10

Iddin-Nabū (MU-dAG) f. of Bēl-bullissu:
4:2, 8

Ilka-banī3-napisti-ibni (DINGIR-ka-ba3-ni-
ZI-DŪ) s. of Lābāši: 13:16

Ilûmmes-đinē (Il-tem-meš-di-i-ni) svt. of
Enlil-ḫātin: 4:5, 9, 12

Ina-tēšē-ēṭi (SŪH-SUR) s. of Ninurta-lē ‘i:
7:14

Iqṣīša (BA-šā-a)
1) br. of Tarbītiya, s. of Pāqissunu: 13:2,
5, 8
2) f. of Iddin-Enlīl: 2:15

Iqṣīša-Bābu (BA-šā-KĀ) s. of Lābāši: 10:3

Itti-Enlīl-balātu (KI-dEn-lill-DIN): 6:6

Itti-Marduk-balātu (KI-dAMAR.UTU-DIN) s.
of [ ... ]; 9:5’

Kāšir (Ka-ṣir)
1) f. of Bābu-ēṭir: 7:15, 11:16
2) f. of Rībat: 2:13
3) f. of Silim-Il: 2:11
4) f. of Šum-iddin: 6:23

Kidīn (KI-din) f. of Lābāši: 7:14, rev.

Kīnā (KI-na-a) f. of Ninurta-āḫḫē-iddin:
13:15

Lābāši (La-ba-šī)
1) s. of Kidīn: 7:13, rev.
2) f. of Ilka-banī3-napisti-ibni: 13:16
3) f. of Iqṣīša-Bābu: 10:3
Líluṭ (Lib-lút)
1) s. of x-áṭ: 9:9'
2) f. of Enlil-šum-iddin: 3:8

Lu-idija (Lu-[i-di-ia]) f. of Ninurta-ana²-bitišu²: 7 lo. ed.


Mardu-iddin (dšû-MU) s. of [x]: 7:15

Mardu-x-iddin (dAMAR.UTU-x-MU) f. of Nabû-nādin-aḥi: 9:4'

Mardu-šum-ibni (dAMAR.UTU-MU-DŪ) s. of Bēl-eriba: 9:7, 10, [13]

Māri-liṭi (Ma-ä-ri-i-li-ti², Ma-a-ri-li-ti²) svt. of Bagādu: 10:8, rev.

Minₐ-ana-Bēl-dānu (Mi-nu-ä-a-na-dEN-da-nu) s. of Taḥḫūra: 9:1, [1'], 11', le. ed.

Mukin-apli (DU-[A]) s. of Ninurta-nāṣir: 7:17

Murašū (Mu-ra-šu-u) s. of Ḥaṭin, f. of Enlil-šum-iddin: 1:2, 2:2, 3:3, 6:2

Mušēzib-Bēl (Mu-šē-zib(dEN)) s. of Ardiya: 13:1

Mutī-[x]-x-āḥ-iddin (Mu-[x]-x-ŠEŠ-MU), f. of Ninurta-ah-iddin: 8:5

Nabû-ah-[ ... ] (dAG-ŠEŠ-[x]) f. of Iddin-Bēl: 9:7'

Nabû-dīlīni (dAG-di-li-ni²) svt. of Minₐ-ana-Bēl-dānu: 9:1, 9, rev., le. ed.

Nabû-it-tammu (dAG-it-tan-nu) f. of Ninurta-nāṣir: 2:14

Nabû-kišīr (dAG-kiš-ir) f. of Arad-Ninurta: 3:2

Nabû-nādin-ahi (dAG-na-din-ŠEŠ) s. of Marduk-x-iddin: 9:4'

Nabû-uṣurṣu (dAG-URU-šū), ṭupšarru, s. of Nabû-ušēziḥ: 9:10', up. ed.

Nabû-ušēziḥ (dAG-ù-še-zib) f. of Nabû-uṣurṣu: 9:10'

Nādin (Na-din)
1) s. of Enlil-ippuš: 10:12, up. ed.2) s. of Mannu-Enlil-dārī, f. of Aqara: 7:123) f. of Enlil-šum-illibīr: 7:11, rev.

Nanâ-bullîtinimmī (dNâ-Šu-DIN-it-nin-ni) dau. of Attar-dammat: 9:4, 8, 11

Nanâ-idri² (dNa-na-a-id-ri²), širku², s. of Bēšum: 10:6, 9

Nāṣir (Na-ṣir) f. of Aḥḫē-iddin: 11:19

Ninurta-ab-ùsîr (dMAŠ-AD-ÛRU): 11:2, le. ed.

Ninurta-aḥḫē-ēriš (dMAŠ-ŠEŠ.ŠEŠ.MEŠ-KĀM) s. of Rîmût 13:14

Ninurta-ahḫē-ibni² (dMAŠ-ŠEŠ.ŠEŠ.ib²-ni) s. of Iddina: 11:3

Ninurta-ahḫē-iddin (dMAŠ-ŠEŠ-MEŠ-MU) s. of Kīnâ: 13:15

Ninurta-ahḫē-iddin (dMAŠ-ŠEŠ-MU) s. of Mut[u²]-x-ah-iddin: 8:5

Ninurta-ana²-bitišu² (dMAŠ-ana²-ŠEŠ-šu) s. of Lu-idija: 7 lo. ed.

Ninurta-ēriš² (dMAŠ-KĀM) s. of dš-x: 8:7

Ninurta-ētiš (dMAŠ-SUR) s. of Šamaš-ah-iddin: 6:23

Ninurta-gāmil (dMAŠ-ga-mil)
1) šandabakku: 8:3
2) ṭupšarru, s. of Dummuq: 11:20

Ninurta-iddin (dMAŠ-MU)
1) s. of Arad-Ninurta: 2:12
2) ṭupšarru, s. of Bēšum

Ninurta-nāṣir (dMAŠ-DA) f. of Ina-tēšē-ētiš: 7:14

Ninurta-mušētiq-uddē (dMAŠ-muše-tiq-UD.MU) s. of Rîbat: 3:14

Ninurta-mutirri-gimilli (dMAŠ-muširri-MU) s. of Ninurta-uballiš: 3:10

Ninurta-nāṣir (dMAŠ-NA-dIN)
1) svt. of Bagādu: 10:5
2) f. of Addu-iddin: 7:18

Ninurta-nādin-šumī (dMAŠ-na-din-MU) s. of Ubalissu-Marduk: 6:22

Ninurta-nāṣir (dMAŠ-PAP)
1) s. of Nabû-ittammu: 2:14
2) f. of Mukin-apli: 7:17

Ninurta-uballiš (dMAŠ-DIN-it)
1) f. of Aḫḫē-uṭir: 3:13
2) f. of Arad-Ninurta: 6:24
3) f. of Iddin-Enlil: 10:14, up. ed.
4) f. of Ninurta-mutirri-gimilli: 3:11
5) f. of Rîbat: 3:4

Niṣqu (Ni-qu) f. of Rîbat: 6:21

Niṣḫur-Enlil (Ni-šu-Enlil), ṭupšarru, s. of Bēšum: 2:16

Nusku-iddin (dENSADA-MU), ṭupšarru, s. of Arad-Gula: 6:26

Pâqiṣunu (Pa-qid-su-nu), f. of Iqīša and Tarbîtiya: 13:3, 6
Qarhanu (Qár-ḫa-nu, Qár-ḫa-an-ni) sv. of Enlil-šum-iddin: 6:1, le. ed.

Rême-šukun (ARHUŠ-GAR) s. of Uballissu-Marduk: 10:13, up. ed.

Ribat (Rî-bat, Rî-ba-a-tû)  
1) s. of Aḫušunuc: 11:18  
2) sv. of Rîmût-Ninaruta, mas. of Abdâ{s. of Bêl-erîba: 5:8, 11  
3) s. of Kāšir: 2:13  
4) s. of Ninurta-uballi: 3:3  
5) s. of Niqud: 6:21  
6) s. of Taddinnu: 11:19  
7) f. of Ninurta-muṣêtiq-uddê: 3:15

Rîmût (Rî-mut) f. of Ninurta‘aḥḫē-ēreš: 13:14
Rîmût-Ninaruta (Rî-mut-MAŠ) mas. of Ribar: 5:9

Silim-Ili (Si-lim-DINGIR) f. of Bêl-erēse: 7:3, up. ed.
Sûqaja (ŠIL-a-a) s. of [ ... ]; 9:8, up. ed.

Šamaš-aḫ-iddin (dUTU-ŠEŠ-MU) s. of Ninurta-ētīr: 6:22
Šamaš-erība (dUTU-SU) f. of [ ... ]; 1:17
Širikti-Ninaruta (RU-tim-MAŠ) s. of Gulašum-lišir: 10:4
Šum-iddin (MU-MU) s. of Kāšir: 6:23

Tabnēa (Tab-ni-e-a) f. of Bêl-ûšallim?; 4:19
Taddinnu (Tad-din-nu) f. Ribat: 11:19
Taḥhîa (Taḥ-ḫu-ū-a), sepîru, s. of Bêl-ûšallim: 9:3
Taqiš-Gula (Ta-qiš-AMAR.UTÜ, Ū-bal-liṭ-su-ASû)  
1) f. of Iddin-Marduk: 7:6  
2) f. of Ninurta-nâdîn-šumi: 6:22  
3) f. of Rême-šukun: 10:13, up. ed.
Ubûr (Ū-bar) f. of Tattannu: 7:16
Uktîti (Ū-ktî-tî): 6:3

Upahhîr-Enlil (NIGIN-En-lîl) f. of Arad-Ninaruta: 7:19

PLACE NAMES

Bît Arzâ’ (URU É Ar-za-’): 1:18
Bît Mînum-ana-Bêl-dànu (URU É Mi-nu-[à-a]-na-Æ[N-da-nu]): 9:11
Bît Tābat-gacbî’i-x (URU É Tā-bat-gâbî’i-x): 7:2

Ekur (É-kur): 11:13

Nâru-eṣetu (URU É Eṣ-šet-um): 7:2

WORDS DISCUSSED

Kasaš (ÍD Ka-saš): 6:4, 5
Nâr Saḫîdu (ÍD Saḫ-‘atu): 6:6
Nâr Šal-la (ÍD Šal-la): 11:1
Nâr Šapputtu (ÍD Sap-AMAR.UTÜ): 8:1
Nâru eṣṣētu (ÍD Eṣ-šet-um) in GN Nâru-eṣṣētu: 7:2

ardabu to No. 12:6
bît nakkaŋdu ša šarri to No. 12
bît šarri to No. 12
buṭṭutu to No. 12:6
DÎM.ME to No. 13
É A.KAL to No. 10:5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ḥarrānu</td>
<td>to No. 3</td>
<td>sissinnu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>idī u šidītu</td>
<td>to No. 13</td>
<td>šāb šarri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>indu</td>
<td>to No. 12:3</td>
<td>šaknu ša Nippur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>makkūr Enlil</td>
<td>to No. 12, n. 39</td>
<td>šandabakku</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>makkūtu</td>
<td>to No. 13</td>
<td>šuzzuzu-ma nadānu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mākātu, mēkātu</td>
<td>to No. 13</td>
<td>ūppu (ša ı̇-šu)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mašennu</td>
<td>to No. 12</td>
<td>ūmmu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>me-KU-tú</td>
<td>to No. 13</td>
<td>ušuzzā’u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>paʾṣu</td>
<td>to No. 7:1</td>
<td>ušuzzu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rab ūmmu</td>
<td>to No. 9:1</td>
<td>zēru ša šarri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>raqaṣaḫānu</td>
<td>to No. 12:2</td>
<td>zittu (ana z. nadānu)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rikis qabli</td>
<td>to No. 13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Texts Cited (Selected)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>References</th>
<th>Pages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ABL</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>to No. 13, n. 49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1180</td>
<td>No. 31 to No. 8:10, 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AnOr 9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>to No. 13, n. 49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>56</td>
<td>No. 40 to No. 12, n. 38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BE 8/1</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>Iraq 59 128 No. 47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>JCS 40 132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>to No. 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>OECT 10 181+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>48</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>61</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>99</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>105</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>106</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BE 9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>to No. 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>to No. 6:19, 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
<td>PBS 2/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>48</td>
<td>to No. 8:13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>61</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>99</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>105</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>106</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRM 2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>to No. 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBS 5481</td>
<td></td>
<td>to No. 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT 22</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>to No. 8:13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT 56</td>
<td>481+</td>
<td>to No. 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>566</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dar.</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>TCL 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>481</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durand</td>
<td>Textes babyloniennes</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pl 50 AO 17637</td>
<td></td>
<td>= BE 9 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrepreneurs No. 17</td>
<td>to No. 6:19</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and Empire No. 59</td>
<td>to No. 12, n. 38</td>
<td>UCP 9/3 275-77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. 112 to No. 13, n. 45</td>
<td>VAS5 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IM 55085</td>
<td>to No. 13:4</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Istanbul Murašū</td>
<td>VAT 15848</td>
<td>to No. 13, n. 52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texts No. 2</td>
<td>to No. 12</td>
<td>Wunsch Iddin-Marduk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 9</td>
<td>to No. 12, n. 38</td>
<td>No. 151</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>to No. 13, n. 45</th>
<th>to No. 13, n. 50</th>
<th>to No. 13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YOS7</td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>154</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>166</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CBS 1594 Upper Edge
Seal of Ėṭir-Marduk

CBS 1594 Left Edge
Seal of Minû-ana-Bēl-dānu