

## 55) Miscellanea Sipparica –

1. The *tašlišu* in the Neo-Babylonian text from Sippar

A.C.V.M. Bongenaar in his *The Neo-Babylonian Ebabbar Temple at Sippar: Its Administration and its Prosopography*, Istanbul 1997, pp. 45-46 presented the opinion, supported with strong arguments, that the titles *kizû* and *tašlišu* had the same meaning, at least in the Neo-Babylonian period, and were used interchangeably. The most important arguments were the lexicographical (in MSL 12, 226 the *ki-zu-ú* in the Sumerian column is translated in Akkadian column as *taš-li-šu*) and geographical (URU-šá-lú*ki-zu-ú* in one text and URU-šá-lú*taš-liš-meš* in other) and the observation that the context of GCCI I 36 in the Uruk archives, where provisions were given “to workmen of the resident of Eanna and the *tašlišu*” are in fact the same as in the texts from Sippar, where the provisions were given to “the *kizû* and the workmen of the resident of Ebabbar”. Additionally a few persons in the texts from Sippar, whose identity is highly probable, are described as the *tašlišu* or as the *kizû*. The text presented below contains the first attestation of the *tašlišu*, exactly in the same place and number, where in all previously known texts from the Sippar archives the *kizû* are mentioned.

It should be stressed that the *kizû/tašlišu* are never included in the group of 50 workmen “doing the work of the resident”, i.e. they were not considered as ordinary workers, but rather as “specialists”, just like the carpenters or the smith(s), the members of the resident’s team in some period. If, as suggested by Bongenaar, the *tašlišu* attending the resident was his personal guard,<sup>1</sup> the function of ten *tašlišu* in the texts such as the one published below might have been similar,<sup>2</sup> i.e. they could prevent “the workmen doing work of the resident” from escaping because of the heavy work they have done (first of all digging canals, and making bricks). The proportion of 50 workmen vs 10 *kizû*, i.e. 5:1, suggests that attachment to the “workmen of the resident” was compulsory and that the strong custody was needed.

BM 83478 (83-1-13, 641)<sup>3</sup>

4.0 x 4.0 cm

1. 50 KÛR ŠE.BAR ŠUKU.ĪI.[A šá]
2. 50 *e-peš dul-lu* 10 [KÛR *a-na*]

	3.	10 lú <sup>1</sup> taš-li-šú [PAP 60 KÙR ŠE.BAR šá]
	4.	la-IGI <sup>m</sup> A-na-a-[mat- <sup>d</sup> EN-at-kal]
	5.	a-na <sup>md</sup> UTU-DU-A [lú <sup>1</sup> GAL šir-ki]
	6.	u lú <sup>1</sup> GAL 10-tim <sup>meš</sup> [TA É NÍG.GA]
	7.	šá UGU ÍD.UD.K[IB.NUN.KI]
Edge	8.	SUM <sup>na</sup>
	9.	e-lat 1 KÙR ŠE.BA[R šá]
	10.	lú <sup>1</sup> qí-i-pu [É-babbar-ra SUM <sup>na</sup> ]
Rev.	11.	ITI.SIG <sub>4</sub> UD.6.KÁM MU.12.[KÁM]
	12.	[ <sup>md</sup> 1AG-I LUGAL.TIN.TI[R.KI]

Concerning Ana-amat-Bēl-atkal, see M. Jursa, *Die Landwirtschaft in Sippar in neubabylonischer Zeit (AfO, Beih. 25)*, Wien 1995, pp. 87-95; cf. also p. 92 about the storehouses situated in Sippar at the bank of Euphrates.

Šamaš-mukīn-apli was the chief of the oblates in the time of Nabonidus, see Bongenaar, *The Neo-Babylonian Ebabbar Temple at Sippar*, p. 54.

“50 kur of barley, the provision for 50 workers of [the resident, 10 kur for] 10 tašlīšu, [total 60 kur of barley which was at disposal of Ana-a[mat-Bēl-atkal], were given to Šamaš-mukīn-apli, [the chief of the oblates] and the foremen [from the storehouse] at the bank of the Euphrates. In addition to 1 kur of barley which [was given] to the resident [of the Ebabbar].

Month of Simānu, sixth day, twelfth year of Nabonidus, king of Babylon.”

## 2. The akītu temple at Sippar

In 1995 M. Jursa in his study of agriculture in Sippar postulated the existence of an akītu temple near Sippar. This idea was based on the observation that BM 75133 : 2 expressly mentions the akītu gate (bāb akīti) which, as he demonstrated, was mentioned also in other texts, but simply as the gate (bābu). Near this gate the hallatu garden of the rab-banê gardeners were situated, just as in other cities in which the akītu temples are attested (M. Jursa, *Die Landwirtschaft in Sippar*, p. 66 ff., see also p. 57 and Notes 107-108). Five additional texts, three were published before; two of them till now unknown, could support this idea.<sup>4</sup>

An administrative document BM 93006 (84-2-11,1) from the fourteenth year of Kandalanu, published by E. Weidner according to T.G. Pinches’

copy (*AfO* 16, 1952-53, p. 5, No 6), mentions ten *nisippu* jars of oil given at disposal of Nabû-kuzub-ilāni *ana tabnītu* (“for making beauty”) *šá a-(ki!)-ti*. A similar text Nbn 238 (not dated!), also concerns oil used for smearing (*ana lapātu*) of different cultic objects, among other also [*šu-b*]a-at *šá a-ki-tu<sub>4</sub> šá* <sup>d</sup>GAŠAN *Sip-par*<sup>ki</sup>. The third text is an account concerning the animal offerings for gods, goddesses and personified cultic objects dated to the nineteenth year of Nabopolassar (E. Sollberger, *RA* 74, 1974), where in l. 16 *gi-né-e a-ki-tu<sub>4</sub>* “regular offering (for) the *akītu* temple” is mentioned.

The hitherto unknown tablet, BM 49565, a list of expenditures of beams, is not dated ; however, it has typical features of the tablets of the early archives of the Ebabbar temple. If this memorandum really belonged to the Ebabbar temple, the mention of the *šatammu* makes it possible to suggest a *terminus ante quem* for 626 BC when Sin-šum-lišir replaced *šatammu* with the *šangû* (R. da-Riva, Sippar in the Reign of Sin-šum-lišir (626 BC), *AoF* 28 (2001) 40-64, esp. pp. 55-59).

BM 49565 (82-3-23,556)

4.1 x 2.7 cm

1. GIŠ.ÛR.MEŠ *te-lit-tu<sub>4</sub>*

2. 3 lúšà-tam

3. 3 <sup>md</sup>UTU-ŠEŠ-MU

4. 1 <sup>m<sup>f</sup></sup>DINGIR1-MU

5. 2 <sup>m<sup>A</sup></sup>A-a

6. 3 *ina* UGU *a-ki-tu<sub>4</sub>*

Edge 7. 2 <sup>m<sup>N</sup></sup>ÍG.DU

8. 1 <sup>m<sup>EN</sup></sup>ú-šib-ši

9. 1 <sup>m<sup>Ú</sup></sup>qu-pu

10. 1 <sup>md</sup>AG-NUMUN-ib-ni

11. *tah-sis-tu<sub>4</sub>*

“Beams expenditure :

3 (beams for) the administrator ;

3 (beams for) Šamaš-ah-iddin ;

1 (beam for) Ilu-iddin ;

2 (beams for) Aplā

3 (beams) for the benefit of the *akītu* temple ;

2 (beams for) Kudurrānu ;  
 1 (beam for) Bēl-ušibši ;  
 1 (beam for) Uqūpu ;  
 1 (beam for) Nabû-zēr-ibni.  
 Memorandum.”

The second text mentioning *akītu* concerns issue of barley or dates for a few persons, among whom is Šula, son of Šamaš-ah-iddin, a person well known from Sippar.

BM 63244 (82-9-18, 3213)

1'. [x]<sup>r</sup>x x x<sup>l</sup> LUGAL TIN.TIR.[KI]  
 -----  
 2'. 2 (PI) 3 BÁN 2 *qa* ŠE.BAR <sup>md</sup>UTU-  
 3'. *ù*<sup>m</sup>Ni-qu-du  
 4'. 1 (PI) 5 BÁN 4 *qa* <sup>m</sup>Ba-ku-ú-a  
 5'. 1 (PI) 5 BÁN 4<sup>l</sup> *qa* <sup>m</sup>Bul-liṭ-a  
 6'. 1 (PI) 5 BÁN 4<sup>l</sup> *qa* <sup>m</sup>IR-d<sup>l</sup>Bu-ne-ne  
 Rev. 7'. 1 (PI) 5 BÁN 4<sup>l</sup> *qa* <sup>m</sup>rAG<sup>l</sup>-MU  
 8'. 1 (PI) 5 BÁN 4<sup>l</sup> *qa* [<sup>md</sup>xx]-šir  
 9'. 5 BÁN ŠE.BAR a-<sup>r</sup>na<sup>l</sup> [<sup>l</sup>úx].MEŠ  
 10'. a-na a-ki-tu<sub>4</sub> il-li-ki  
 11'. a-na <sup>m</sup>šū-la-a A <sup>md</sup>UTU-ŠEŠ-MU  
 Rest lost

Before the title we expect in l. 1' the king's name, most probably Nabonidus, because Šula, son of Šamaš-ah-iddin, the oil-presser, is known from his activity during his reign (cf. Bongenaar, *The Neo-Babylonian Ebabbar Temple at Sippar*, p. 284-85). However, the small rest of bottom part of three signs does not remember any writings of the Neo-Babylonian and Persian kings.

“.... king of Babylon.

2 *pān* 5 *sūtu* 2 *qū* of barley (for) Šamaš-[x x] and Niqūdu ;

1 *pān* 5 *sūtu* 4 *qū* (for) Bakûa ;

1 *pān* 5 *sūtu* 4<sup>l</sup> *qū* (for) Bulluṭa ;

1 *pān* 5 *sūtu* 4<sup>l</sup> *qū* (for) Arad-Bunene ;

1 *pān* 5 *sūtu* 4<sup>l</sup> *qū* (for) Nabû-iddin ;

1 *pān* 5 *sūtu* 4 *qū* (for) [x x]-šir ;

1 *pān* 5 *sūtu* 4 *qû* for [worker]s(?), which came to the *akītu*-temple, were given to Šūla, son of Šamaš-ah-iddin ...”.

The data, as scanty as they are, indicate clearly that Sippar has its own *akītu* temple where the rituals were celebrated, probably without interruption at least in the time of the Assyrian domination as well as in the Neo-Babylonian period.

### 3. The mutual warranty for paying rent

The document presented below, probably from Sippar, shows a highly atypical situation where four persons who are at disposal of three or four different people take mutual responsibility for regulation of their rents.<sup>5</sup> The formula *pūt sūtišūnu našū* probably means that the lessors could exact their rents from any of the four leases who is able to pay, i.e. it was used instead of the full formula *pūt sūtišūnu našū ša qerbi iṭṭir* “they assume warranty for each other, whoever is present, will pay (in full)”. In up to now published documents such a formula was one of the most important clauses in contracts between lessor and lessee, precisely describing the subject of the lease and the terms (see G. Ries, *Die neubabylonischen Bodenpachtformulare*, Berlin 1976 and p. 122 ff. concerning the discussed formula). Obviously, our text is not a contract and the question arises why it was written. Possibly, we can see in this text a supplement to a previous contract imposing on leases the condition of mutual warranty for paying rent.

The identification of the persons mentioned in the text is not easy because they bear typical Babylonian names. We know, however, that they worked in the agriculture and that they were active at the same time. Basing on M. Jursa, *Die Landwirtschaft in Sippar in neubabylonischer Zeit*, AfO Beih. 25, Wien 1995, we can try to identify them with the following persons :

Šamaš-ah-iddin, the *rab epinni* active in the time of Nabonidus (p. 32 in Jursa’s study) ;

Nabû-ban-ahi, the *ikkaru* in Āl-Šamaš, known from the texts dated to 20 and 22nd year of Nebuchadnezzar (p. 30) ;

Erēšu, the *ikkaru* active between Nbp 13-Nbk 22 in Āl-Šamaš (p. 28) ;

Kalbā. Two *rab epinni* of this name active in the time of Nabonidus are known (pp. 28-29).

If these identifications are valid, the text might have been written between about Nbk 20 and Nabonidus’ reign. The position of Šamaš-ah-iddin

as the *rab epinni* makes it possible to see in Kīnā a member of his team. However, the relations between other pairs are even less certain. Nabû-ban-ahi is known as *ikkarû*, but till now we do not know Erēšu, the *rab epinni*. Further, if we identify Kalbā as the *rab epinni*, we could expect that the position of our Erēšu was higher than the one of Erēšu, who is known only with the title of *ikkaru*. I cannot suggest any identification of persons from l. 4. Irrespective of the position of these people, it seems that the text was written to express that all individuals mentioned in the text were personally responsible for fulfilment of the obligation.

BM 77827 (85-4-30, 18)

6.0 x 3.6 cm

1. <sup>m</sup>Ki-na-a ina IGI <sup>md</sup>UTU-ŠEŠ-M[U?]
2. <sup>md</sup>AG-DÛ-ŠEŠ ina IGI <sup>mE</sup>ri-šú
3. <sup>m</sup>Kal-ba-a ina IGI <sup>mE</sup>ri-šú
4. <sup>md</sup>UTU-NUMUN-MU ina IGI <sup>mI</sup>-q[u-pu]
5. pu-ut su-ú-ti-šú-nu
6. na-šu-ú

Edge 7. ITI.BAR ina IGI ʿ3ʿ [lúGAL GIŠ.APIN.MEŠ] (?)

l. 1 from MU only one horizontal wedge is preserved.

l. 7 instead *ina IGI ʿ3ʿ* [lúGAL GIŠ.APIN.MEŠ] (?) one can read *lim ʿ3*[....., what seems less probable.

“Kīnā, at the disposal of Šamaš-ah-iddin ;

Nabû-ban-ahi, at the disposal of Erēšu ;

Kalbā at the disposal of Erēšu ;

Šamaš-zēr-iddin, at the disposal of Iq[ūpu] ; they are responsible for (paying) their rent.

Month of Nisanu, in the presence of 3 [*rab epinni*](?).”

4. Šamaš of Sippar or Šamaš of Larsa in BM 82563?

R. da-Riva in her important article concerning Sippar at the very end of Assyrian domination (“Sippar in the Reign of Sîn-šum-lišir (626 BC)”, *AoF* 28 (2001) 40-64) links the text BM 82563, written in the city of Ru’a in the accession year of Sîn-šum-lišir, with the Ebabbar temple at Sippar.<sup>6</sup> The idea is based on her reading of the first line of the text, i. e. “Šamaš of Si[ppar]” (<sup>d</sup>UTU šá UD.K[IB.NUN.KI]). However, the reading is not certain because in the preserved part of the alleged KIB only one *Winkelhaken* is extant (see copy

on p. 63). An alternative reading is UD.U[NUG.KI], i.e. Larsa, the cult centre of Šamaš in the south Babylonia. Because both readings are acceptable we have to search for other arguments to support one of these possibilities. It seems reasonable to place the city of Ru'a on the territory of the Ru'a, an Aramaic tribe, and although its precise location is not established, members of Ru'a are never mentioned in texts from the Ebabbar temple. Additionally, the Aramaic names from BM 82563 are almost completely unknown from Sippar and the shepherds from Ebabbar temple in Sippar bears usually typical Babylonian names (see van Driel, *BSA* 7, 1993). It should be stressed that ABL 287, where three Ru'a tribesmen are mentioned has a clear relation with Nippur – one of a few place under the power of Šin-šum-lišir. <sup>m</sup>Na-ṭè-ru <sup>lú</sup>Ru'a appears in the unpublished text NBC 6142, also from Nippur (see J.A. Brinkman, *Prelude to the Empire: Babylonian Society and Politics*, 747-626 B.C., Philadelphia 1984, pp. 12-13, note 46; S. Cole, *Nippur in Late Assyrian Times c. 755-612 BC*, SAAS IV, Helsinki 1996, p. 29, note 46 and P.-A. Beaulieu, *Catalogue of the Babylonian Collections at Yale* 1, Bethesda 1994, p. 55). Ru'a appears also between the Puqudu and Litamu tribes, i.e. again in southern Babylonia in the Neo-Assyrian Nimrud Slab 1 (J.A. Brinkman, *A Political History of Post-Kassite Babylonia 1158-722 B.C.*, *Analecta Orientalia* 45, Roma 1968, p. 275, note 1781). The only text which could suggest the location of Ru'a in the vicinity of Sippar is BM 77453 (84-2-11, 193) which transliteration is presented here with the kind permission of the Trustees of the British Museum.

BM 77453 (84-2-11, 193)

3.7 x 2.6 cm

- |      |     |   |
|------|-----|---|
|      | 1.  | <sup>m</sup> Šu-ur-la-a-a   |
|      | 2.  | šá ina IGI <sup>md</sup> DI.KUD.ŠEŠ-MU                                  |
|      | 3.  | <sup>lú</sup> pu-ša-a-a   |
|      | 4.  | NINDA.HI.A ik-ka-la   |
|      | 5.  | ṛih-te-lik  |
|      | 6.  | ina UGU <sup>m</sup> ṛ <sub>x</sub> x <sup>l</sup> -da <sup>?</sup> -ṛi |
| Edge | 7.  | ina Ru-ú-a  |
|      | 8.  | ši-mu-ú-su  |
|      | 9.  | ni-il-te-me   |
|      | 10. | <sup>md</sup> U+GUR-da-nu   |
|      | 11. | a-na KÙ.BABBAR it-ta-din-su   |
|      | 12. | <sup>m</sup> Al-li-ja   |

13. ŠEŠ-šú šá<sup>md</sup>AG-da-la-a'  
 14. iq-ta-bi

l. 6. This line is badly preserved, the sign following UGU looks like written over erasure and its identification is highly uncertain while the next one is fully damaged. We can expect here the name of a person or a topographical name (canal?).

“Šurlaya, who ate bread of Madānu-ah-iddin, the bleacher, escaped. In Ru’a ... we heard a rumor concerning him (that) Nergal-dānu had sold him. Aliya, the brother of Nabû-dala’ has told (us that).”

Madānu-ah-iddin, known from a few texts from the archives of the Ebabbar temple in Sippar, was active in the time of Nabopolassar and probably at the early years of Nebuchadnezzar (A.C.V.M Bongenaar, *The Neo-Babylonian Ebabbar Temple at Sippar*, p. 331). However, even this letter does not tell us the location of Ru’a in the vicinity of Sippar. We would rather suppose that Šurlaya, known at least to some people in Sippar, escaped quite far from the city, where he could have expected that nobody could recognize him. Accidentally, the persons who went to Ru’a had met there the brother of Nabû-dala’, who informed them that Šurlaya was sold by a certain Nabû-dānu. The presentation of Aliya as brother of Nabû-dala’ suggests that the latter could have been a person well known in Sippar.

These arguments (mostly known already to da-Riva), although none is conclusive, speak for the connection of BM 82563 with a region south or south-east of Nippur, where the flocks of sheep and goats of the temple of Šamaš of Larsa could have been pastured. For this reason the reading <sup>d</sup>UTU šá UD.UN[UG.KI], “Šamaš of La[rsa]” instead of <sup>d</sup>UTU šá UD.K[IB.NUN.KI], “Šamaš of Si[ppar]” in BM 82563 : 1 seems to me more probable.

1. Note also the *tašlīšu ša šarri* (BM 49437 : 3 as owner of the slave, who delivered bitumen and BM 51013 : 2 as the recipient of bitumen) and *tašlīšu ša simmagir* (BM 52810 : 2 and BM 53453 : 2 as the deliverers of bitumen). From BM 43439 (30.VII.Nbk 11) where Balātu, the *kizû* received supply (money, flour, salt, *sahlu*, and oil) *ana ma-dak-ti a-na pa-ni* LUGAL is clear that *kizû/tašlīšu* took part in the military expeditions.

2. It is interesting to note that only one text mentions the *kizû* receiving sickles (*niggallu*), cf. Bongenaar, *The Neo-Babylonian Temple at Sippar*, p. 46, but there is no clear evidence that they used them personally. More about the *kizû*, see J. MacGinnis, *Kizû’s of the Ebabbara*, RA 91 (1997) 81-87.



3. This and a few other texts presented here are published with the kind permission of the Trustees of the British Museum.

4. The texts published previously are cited and discussed by A. C. V. M. Bongenaar, *The Neo-Babylonian Ebabbar Temple at Sippar*, p. 228 and 230. I am indebted to John MacGinnis who paid my attention to BM 63244.

5. It is not clear if Erēšu from line 2 is identical, or not, with Erēšu from line 3, see, however, the reconstruction of l. 7.

6. The provenience of the tablet is unknown because it was bought together with 49 other tablets from J. M. Shemtob in London in 1893. The texts are dated from Old-Babylonian through Kassite until Neo-Babylonian period (Artaxerxes), see C. B. F. Walker, *Catalogue of the Babylonian Tablets in the British Museum, vol. VIII : Tablets from Sippar 3*, London 1988, p. XXV. The Neo-Babylonian tablets come at least from Babylon, Dilbat, and Sippar.

Stefan ZAWADZKI (29-06-2002)  
ul. Szeherzady 21