Stefan Zawadski

38) A New Text from Tīl-qaqulli – BM 65180 (82-9-18, 5162)¹ (4.4 × 7.4 cm)

- 1. [ŠE.BAR] šá lúENGAR.MEŠ šá a-na
- 2. 「DU₆1-qa-qu-ul-lu a-na pa-ni
- 3. mdEN-GI na-šá-a-ta

4.	「21 me 26	ma-ši-hu ^m Ú-pa-qu
5.	「21 me 24	KI.MIN ^m EN-babbar-ra-DÙ
6.	「31 me 60	KI.MIN ^{md} U+GUR-ŠEŠ-MU
7.	1 me 60	KI.MIN ^{md} AG-DÙ-ŠEŠ
8.	3 me 60	KI.MIN ^m ŠEŠ-šú-nu A-šú šá
9.		^m NIGIN-DINGIR
10.	2 [me] 78	KI.MIN ^{md} EN-AD-ŠEŠ
11.	2 me 77	KI.MIN ^{md} U+GUR-da-a-nu
12.	2 me 18	KI.MIN ^{md} Bu-ne-ne-AD-ŠEŠ
13.	4 me 80	KI.MIN ^m Di-hu-um
14.	「2 [?] 1 me 20	KI.MIN ^{md} EN-AD-ŠEŠ
15.	「2 [?]] me 10	KI.MIN ^m ŠEŠ-šú-nu
16.		A-šú šá ^m Šá- ^d AG-šú
17.	PAP 6 「lim/me¹ 40 ma-ſši-hu šá ŠE.BAR¹	
18.	^{md} EN-ΓGI1 α-n[α]	
19.	IGI-[tú] ŠUKU.HI.「A¹ []	
20.	8 KÙR la-[IGI]	
21.	3 lim [8] me 45 [?] [x x x] ŠE.BAR	
22.	šά ^{lú} ENGA[R.ME]Š [x] Γ x x l	
23.	a [!] -na ^{m-d} >EN-GI 「it-tan¹-nu	

24. 4 lim 2 [me] [.....

(Blank space for ca. two-three lines)

Rev.

 $[\]ensuremath{\mathbf{1}}$ The tablet is published with the kind permission of the Trustees of the British Museum.

25. 2 lim [x x] 3 [.....

[Barley] that the peasants have brought to Tīl-qaqulli to Bēl-ušallim.

^[2] ¹²⁶ *mašihu*-measures (from) Upaqu

T2124 ditto(from) Bēl-Ebabbar-ibniT3160 ditto(from) Nergal-ah-iddin160 ditto(from) Nabû-ban-ahi364 ditto(from) Ahūšunu, son of

Upahhir-ili

son of Ša-Nabû-šū

Total 640(?) mašihu-measures of barley

Bēl-ušallim [has received from? in addition to]

of an earlier, the rations

8 kur be[fore

Rev. 3^[755]

from the peasants

to Bēl-ušallim was given.

4200 ...

3 thousand ... 42 ...



The text concerns the payment by eleven temple tenants delivering barley to Bēl-ušallim in Tīl-qaqulli. Beginning from l. 17 the text is badly preserved and its sense is not fully clear. However, although the numerals in lines 4-15 are sometimes badly preserved, it is probably wrong to see the total in l. 17 as a total of all above data (the possible reconstruction of the wedge following the numeral 5 as $\lceil lim \rceil$ makes the total much too high, while $\lceil me \rceil$ much to low). For these reasons it seems that lines 18ff. concern the distribution of barley received by Bēl-ušallim also in previous year or years. The phrasing of the heading raises some doubts whether Tīl-qaqulli was the place where the tenants' plots were situated or only where they have to deliver barley. The answer is given by the prosopographical analysis, the only basis for establishing the approximate time of composition of the text.

Most of the persons mentioned in the text are known from the data gathered by M. Jursa, *AfO Beih.* 25:

Ahūšunu/Iphur-il, *id.* p. 26 ([Nbk 18)], an *ikkaru*); Ahūšunu/Ša-Nabû-šū, *id.* p. 26 (between Nbk 8 and ca. Nbk 10; an *ikkaru*); (Bēl)-Ebabbar-ibni, *id.* p. 27 (between Nbk 9 and Nbk 20); Bēl-aba-uṣur, *id.* p. 27 (most probably the first one, active between ca. Nbk 10 and Nbk 22; in one text he is mentioned in Āl-Šamaš);

Bēl-aba-uşur, probably person different from the one mentioned above;

Bunene-aba-uṣur, id. p. 27 (before Nbk 9 and ca. Nbk 10);

Dihum(mu), id. p. 28 (between Nbp 17 and [Nbk] 19; according to BM 78091 from Āl-Šamaš);

Nabû-bān-ahi, *id.* p. 30 (between Nbk 20 and Nbk 22; in one text he is mentioned in Āl-Šamaš);

Nergal-aha-iddin; maybe identical with Nergal-aha-iddin/Libluṭ (id.p. 31) (between Nbk 8 and Nbk 30+; in one text he is a witness in Āl-Šamaš);

Nergal-dânu, id. p. 31 (ca. Nbk 10; probably the same person is mentioned in BM 49422: 11 (5.6.Nbk 11). In CT 57, 339 rev. 2 he or his father is mentioned in $\bar{A}l$ -Šamaš;

Upaqu, id. p. 34 (end of the first decade of Nebuchadnezzar II).

The identification of Bēl-ušallim, the recipient of barley is difficult because of the lack of his father's or family name. Two persons with such a name might be taken into consideration, i.e. Bēl-ušallim/Šamaš-iddin, known from two texts from Tīl-qaqulli (id. p. 235) written in the time of Cyrus, and Bēl-ušallim/Šamaš-unammir//Miṣiraya, known from the period between the first year and 41st year of Nebuchadnezzar (id. p. 76), but his relation with Tīl-qaqulli or Āl-Šamaš are not known. However, the prosopographical data presented above suggest that almost all tenants were active in the early period of Nebuchadnezzar's rule (first and second decade) and for this reason a similar date should be postulated for the new text from Tīl-qaqulli. The very long gap (ca. 40-50 years) between the composition of BM 65180 and the time of activity of Bēl-ušallim/Šamaš-iddin (time of Cyrus) seems to exclude the identification of Bēl-ušallim with the son of Šamaš-iddin but makes it possible to identify him with the son of Šamas-unammir of the Miṣirāya family.

Five of eleven tenants might be identified with individuals known previously from $\bar{A}l$ -Šamaš, which makes it probable that they lived in that village and delivered barley to $T\bar{\imath}l$ -qaqulli, most probably a settlement near to $\bar{A}l$ -Šamaš, both lying on the *Mašennu*-canal (so already Jursa, id. p. 235).

Stefan Zawadski (14-12-2005)

ul. Szeherezady 21, 60-195 Poznán (Pologne)