

NABU 1988-54 Paul-Alain Beaulieu

An Early Attestation of the Word *hadru* – The word *hadru* [also read *haṭru* and henceforth referred to as *hadṭ(a)ru*] is so far only attested in documents from the Achaemenid period. As pointed out by M. Stolper (*Entrepreneurs and Empire. The Murašû Archive, The Murašû Firm, and Persian Rule in Babylonia*, Nederlands Historisch-Archaeologisch Instituut te Istanbul, 1985, p. 71), the word is in fact almost peculiar to the Murašû texts, which refer to that institution on no less than 130 occasions. Outside that archive, *hadṭ(a)ru* appears in only four texts, two of which were recently published by J.-M. Durand (Louvre Museum numbers AO 17637 and 17641, published as *TBER* pl. 50 and 51 and edited by F. Joannès as *TEBR* texts no.1 and 2). AO 17641 (= *TEBR* text no. 2) is dated in Nippur in the 37th year of Artaxerxes (Artaxerxes II according to Joannès : cf. *TEBR* pp. 5-6, section 1.3.2) ; the other one, AO 17637 (= *TEBR* text no. 1) has no date, but it obviously belongs to the same archive as AO 17641 and should therefore be roughly contemporaneous. These two documents come, just like the Murašû archive, from Nippur. The other two texts which mention *hadṭ(a)ru* are Moore, *Michigan Collection* 43, a document dated in Babylon in the 14th year of Darius II (Cardascia, in *RLA* IV p. 151, dates the document to the reign of Darius I, but Oelsner, in *WO* 8, 1976, p. 314, n. 10, includes it in a list of the texts which belong according to him to the reign of Darius II. One should note that the absence of the title « king of Babylon » from the titulary is an argument, though not absolutely conclusive, in favor of Darius II, as are the personal names formations found in the document, which are more characteristic of the late Achaemenid period), and the fragment *VAS* VI : 302, which bears no date, but contains in line 6 the Iranian personal name ^{Id}*Ba-ga-a'-sa-ru*, a fact which certainly points to the Achaemenid period, as noted by Cardascia (*RLA* IV, p. 151). The institution of the *hadṭ(a)ru* seems therefore to be a late Persian development in Babylonia, as it is attested only in the period covered by the Murašû archive (454-404 B.C.) and the reign of Artaxerxes II (404-359 B.C.).

It is quite surprising then that two occurrences of that word should turn up in a text dated to the 11th year of king Nabonidus (544 B.C.), that is, six years before the installation of Persian rule in Babylonia. This text belongs to the Yale Babylonian Collection and bears the museum number *NCBT* 1290. The copy

will be published by me as *YOS XIX : 125* together with the remaining unpublished Nabonidus texts at Yale with the permission of Prof. W. W. Hallo, to whom I wish here to express my thanks for having encouraged me to undertake the study of these documents. The provenience of the text is not stated explicitly, but the onomastic as well as the format point to Uruk as its place of origin. It would therefore belong to the archive of the Eanna temple. Here follow a transliteration and a translation of *YOS XIX : 125*.

obv. 1.	56 UDU.NITÁ
2.	šá I ^d Na-na-a-MU
3.	36 UDU.NITÁ šá I ^{Ri} -mut
4.	I ²¹ ka-lum 3
5.	I ²⁸¹ par-rat
6.	I ^{šá} ? x ¹ [SAL].ÁŠ.GÀR
7.	I ^{PAP} x x ¹ 11 UDU.HI.A
8.	erbi I ^{šá}
rev. 9.	MU-6 ħa-dar šá I ^{Ri} -I ^{mut}
10.	I ^{MU} - x ¹ ħa-dar šá KÁ šá I ^{Ana-É} -šú
11.	ⁱⁱⁱ ŠE U ₄ -4-I ^{KÁM}
12.	I ^{MU} 11-KÁM d ^{NÀ} .I
13.	LUGAL TIN.I ^{TIR} ^{ki}
14.	ina IGI I ^d UTU.I ^{NUMUN} .DÙ
15.	A I ^d UTU.SU ^{id} A.[KIN?]
16.	šá I ^{DÙ} -a A-šú
17.	šá I ^d NÀ.ŠEŠ.MEŠ.GI

« 56 male sheep belonging to Nanaya-iddin, 36 male sheep belonging to Rīmūt, 2 male lambs 3 years[?] old[?], 28 female lambs, I x x x¹ [young] she-goats. Total : I x x¹ + 11 sheep and goats, the income of the 6th year, *ħad/īru* of Rīmūt, of the I^x¹ year, *ħad/īru* of Ana-bīīšū. Month Addaru, 4th day, 11th year of Nabonidus, king of Babylon. At the disposal of Šamaš-zēr-ibni, descendant of Šamaš-ēriba, the mes[senger[?]] of Ibnā, son of Nabū-ahĥē-ušallim. »

It should be noted that the spelling *ḥa-dar*, which occurs twice in our document, is also attested at least in one instance for the late Achaemenid *ḥad/ṭ(a)ru* (see *PBS 2/1 128* : 2, ¹⁶*ḥa-dar*), and that the existence of a spelling *ḥa-da-ri*, attested a few times in the Murašû documents (*PBS 2/1 3* : 8, 18 ; 189 : 6 ; *BE 10 5* : 4 ; 14 : 4), proves that the word contained an alternative vowel *a*, thus proving beyond doubt that the word *ḥa-dar* of *YOS XIX* : 125 is one and the same with the *ḥad/ṭ(a)ru* of the Achaemenid period. Another similitude between the two words is that *ḥa-dar* is construed syntactically in our document in the same way as *ḥad/ṭ(a)ru*, which is almost always followed by *ša* and the name of its members.

In his study of the Murašû archive, M. Stolper has briefly reviewed the current hypotheses on the etymology of *ḥad/ṭ(a)ru* (Stolper, *Management*, p. 71, n. 6) : there is a consensus that the term is a loanword in Akkadian, but the language of origin is still subject to debate, Aramaic and Iranian being generally held as the only likely candidates. Now that the early date of *YOS XIX* : 125 makes the Iranian hypothesis rather improbable, the possibility that *ḥad/ṭ(a)ru* is derived from Aramaic should be more seriously considered. Von Soden originally suggested that it was connected with *ḥadiru*, a Neo-Babylonian word designating a variety of sheep and goats and derived itself from Aramaic ‘*edrā* “pen, fold » (*AHW* p. 307a s.v. *ḥadiru* and 337a s.v. *ḥaṭ(a)ru*, *ḥaṭiru*). This opinion he later abandoned (*OrNs* 35, 1966, p. 10-11) in consideration of the classification established by the *CAD*, which rigorously differentiates between *ḥadiru* “pen for small cattle », consistently written with an *i* vowel (*CAD* Ḥ, s.v. *ḥadiru* and *ḥadru*). Moreover the two words have seemingly totally different meanings and should therefore have different etymologies and origins. The disadvantage of this was to leave *ḥad/ṭ(a)ru* with no satisfactory Aramaic etymology, as was recognized by Von Soden, who consequently judged the word to be of unknown origin.

The connection between *ḥadiru* and *ḥad/ṭ(a)ru* was recently revived however by Cardascia, who pointed out that the meaning « pen, fold enclosure, park » of the former does well fit the semantic range of *ḥad/ṭ(a)ru*, which not only means « association, collectivity », but also, a fact often overlooked, « land, territory, domain ». This is shown by such texts as *BE IX 60*, in which *ḥad/ṭ(a)ru* clearly designates a portion of land, and especially *BE X 126*, in which the Aramaic endorsement translates the cuneiform « *ḥad/ṭru* of the Bannešai people » by

« land (= 'arqa) of the Bannešai people ». As pointed out by Cardascia the word *ḫad/!(a)ru* seems to possess the same nuance as the French word « commune », which designates as well a collectivity as the territory it inhabitates (Cardascia, in *Armées et Fiscalité dans le Monde Antique*, CNRS, Colloque no. 936, Paris, 1977, pp. 3-4). The new evidence from *YOS XIX : 125* allows us to go further in that direction. The context in which *ḫa-dar* occurs indeed strongly suggests that it designates a small territorial unit owned by private individuals, thus making a translation « park, enclosure » quite sensible. But the most interesting fact is that our document refers to the yearly increases in sheep and goats of these “enclosures », and this of course immediately calls to mind that Neo-babylonian word *ḫadiru* which either refers to the pen, as a substantive (*CT XXII 19 : 21 ; TCL XIII 189 : 15*), or is used as an adjective to designate a category of sheep and goats (*TCL XII 44 : 1 ; 49 : 2 ; YOS VII 81 : 1 ; BIN II 112 : 1*). The two words, *ḫadiru* and *ḫa-dar*, would in fact be one and the same word, and *ḫa-dar* would provide, so to speak, the « missing link » between *ḫadiru* and late Achaemenid *ḫad/!(a)ru*. Thus the etymology originally favored by Von Soden would be correct. The word was probably borrowed into Akkadian at some point in the first half of the first millenium from Aramaic 'dr (with original 'ayin and original dalet). Admittedly that root is attested yet neither in Old Aramaic, nor in Biblical and Imperial Aramaic, but it is well known in Jewish Palestinian and Talmudic Aramaic with the meaning « enclosure, pen, fold, herd, flock » (see Jastrow, *A Dictionary of the Targumim*, p. 1046, s.v. 'eder and 'a'edrā). The same root occurs in Biblical Hebrew with the meaning « flock, herd » ('eder). The passage of the root into Akkadian is reflected by the expected interpretation of the 'ayin as a ḫ. The uncertainty of the scribes about the quality of the second vowel (*ḫadiru/ḫadaru*) may also point to the foreign origin of the word, but not necessarily. In the Neo-Babylonian period *ḫadi/aru* apparently designated a privately or temple owned type of enclosure for breeding domestic animals. By extension, it also meant a variety of sheep and goats. It is unclear however how the word came to designate the territorial entities and associations, the *ḫad(a)ru*, found in the Murašû documents. It has long been suspected that the installation of Persian rule in Babylonia was accompanied by a gradual removal of control over large areas of land from such institutions as the temple to the benefit of the Persian aristocracy and the military colonies created by the Achaemenid rulers.

Perhaps the origin of the *had(a)ru* is to be sought in those Neo-Babylonian enclosures which belonged to the temple and to private landowners. A large portion of these enclosures would have been confiscated by the crown in the early Achaemenid period and gradually transferred to the military colonies created by the Persian rulers in Babylonia. This of course is highly speculative, and only the publication of more documents from the major temple archives of that period will allow us to investigate the matter further. For the time being only the etymology of the word can be ascertained, and consequently its Akkadian form, certainly *had(a/i)ru*, and not *hat(a/i)ru*.

Paul-Alain Beaulieu (12-09–88)