

A Document Concerning Work in Elam : BM 49718 –

(I should like to thank the Trustees of the British Museum for permission to publish this document)

1. ^{md}IB-DIŠ-É-šú DUMU šá ^{md}IB-IMU¹
2. *a-na pa-da-qat/kat₆-tu₄ šá* ^{md}IB-DA
3. DUMU šá ^mmu-še-zib a-na ^{kur}ELAM^{ki} il-lak
4. 3 ITI^{mes} *dul-lu* AŠ ^{kur}ELAM^{ki} ár-kat₃
5. ^{md}IB-DA <<*dul-lu** (over erasure)^a>> ^{md}IB-DIŠ-É-šú
6. *ip-pu-uš ki-i la it-tal-ku-ma dul-lu*
7. *a-di* ^{iu}KIN AŠ ^{kur}ELAM^{ki} *la i-te-ep-šú*
8. *a-ki-i* ^{lu}T[U].Émeš šá ^{kur}ELAM^{ki}
9. *dul-lu ip-pu-šú KÙ.BABBAR šá* 3 ITI^{mes}

rev.

1. ^{md}IB-MU *a-na* ^{md}AG-TIN-su-E *in-ad-din*
2. ^{lu}f *mu-kin¹-nu* ^mKI-^dAG-TIN DUMU šá ^mDU₁₀-GA-ia
3. ^mni-qu-du DUMU šá ^mMU-DU ^mir/sa-ki-e-a
4. DUMU šá ^{md}IB-MU-ú-[ki]n ^{md}IB-hu-šá-ni
5. DUMU šá ^mMU-DU
6. ^md¹[(DN-)S]IG₆-ŠEŠ ^{lu}ŠID DUMU šá ^mšá-ri^d
7. [DUMU] ^{lu}E.BAR ^dGAŠAN *ni-ná-a* ^{ur}di[l?]-bat^{?ki}
8. [i^uŠ]E U₄ 27 KÁM MU 10 KÁM ^md[a(?)-...]
9. LUGAL E^{ki} *u* KUR.KUR ^{iu}fNE¹ [x(x)]
10. ^{iu}išŠU AŠ *is-qí* (or *kir-ki*?) šá AŠ *dil-bar*^{kfi} x(x)]

Provisional rendering :

Uraš-ana-bītišu son of Uraš-iddina will go to Elam in the service(?)^b of Uraš-le'i son of Mušēzibu. He (*scil.* Uraš-ana-bītišu) will perform three months of work in Elam for the estate/fortune(?)^c of Uraš-le'i. If he (*scil.* Uraš-ana-bītišu) will not go and will not perform the work in Elam until Elul, and if(?) the

ērib-bīti's (the persons admitted to all parts of the temple) of Elam will perform the work, Uraš-iddina will give the money of three months to Nabû-balassu-iqbi.

Witnesses, scribe, place and date (27.XII.512/1 BC)

(In) Ab, (in) Tammuz, at x^d in Dilbat [x(x)].

Notes :

a. Confirmed by Dr. Cornelia Wunsch.

b. It resembles NA *pa-da-ku* « ein Durchgang ?? » and SB *pa-tàk-ka-a-ti, pa-tak-[...]* (AHw., pp. 807b, 848b, cf. CAD K, p. 176b), but the form of latter is hardly identical with the form here as *TĀK* does not have the value *dāk* in SB and *TAK* has no value with an initial voiced dental. The rendering is very doubtful ; one would expect here an equivalent of *našpartu* (a synonym of *harrānu* seems less likely in view of the type of the document).

c. *arkatu* « estate, inheritance, family » (CAD A/2, p. 274a ; « Nachlass », cf. NRV Gl. 29 : *arkat* PN), but this sense is not clear here.

d. « roll » or « regulated water in a canal » (as a topographical designation or location). Or to (Aram.) *krk* « fortification » (of Dilbat) ?

The situation may be surmised as follows :

Uraš-ana-bītišu had to go to Elam for three months in order to perform a certain work (for Babylonians in Elam see M.A. Dandamayev, *Iranians in Achaemenid Babylonia*, Costa Mesa 1992, p. 151f.). It is conceivable that this work was organized (*inter alios*?) by Nabû-balassu-iqbi who might have been somehow connected with Uraš-le'i. Both parties were in all probability from Dilbat. The work in Elam was presumably to be executed in some sort of cooperation with Elamites who were of a certain elevated status (*ērib-bīti*, individuals admitted to all parts of a temple, cf. CAD E, p. 291b, b, 4', but it should be pointed out that the *ērib-bīti*'s are always identified by Babylonian cities and temples, never by countries). The document was issued as early as Addar in order to ensure that the work will be terminated not later than Elul, i.e. in three months notice (presumably from Tammuz ; it is not clear why this month is mentioned after the following Ab in a broken context). Uraš-ana-bītišu's father guarantees that his son will compensate Nabû-balassu-iqbi if his son will not perform the work. It is not impossible that the son had to perform the work in lieu of his father.

Ran Zadok (24-01-95)