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 BC, with most of them concentrated between 440 and 416 BC. 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.² 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 BC, amount to only about 500 items. No other known late Achaemenid archive, whether excavated or reconstructed, includes more than a hundred published pieces, so no single source compares in density or range with the Murašû texts.³ The Murašû archive is a rich philological and historical source. 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.⁴

The texts published here, all from Nippur, add to the Murašû archive in two ways. Nos. 1–6 supplement it, adding to the archive’s contents. Their principals are members of the Murašû 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 Murašû archive, representing an unnoticed part of the Murašûs’ business, investment in small joint ventures. No. 4, a bailment of cattle with no formal parallel among known Murašû texts, bears on a crucial part of the Murašûs’ 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.⁵ Nos. 9–12 have prosopographic connections to the Murašû texts (uncertain in No. 10). No. 13 is older than the Murašû texts but it is linked to them by its use of an odd clause whose only parallels are in Murašû 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 Murašûs’ 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 Murašû texts. Comments on the two extraordinary seal impressions on No. 9 are excerpted from notes generously supplied by Linda B. Bregstein.

### A. Murašû Texts

The four texts edited here as Nos. 1–4⁶ are among the few Murašû 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 Anthro-

---

⁶. Identified by Beaulieu, *CBCY* 1, 90.
pology of the University of California at Berkeley by Phoebe Hearst), *Entrepreneurs and Empire* Nos. 34, 40, 44 and 94 (bought by the British Museum in 1894), and a promissory note in the collection of the Metropolitan Museum of Art (*CTMMA* 3 126). Clay mentioned “a number [of Murašû texts dated in the reign of Darš 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.

---

9. Identified by Bregstein “Seal Use,” 334 n. 46.  
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.).
Promissory Notes Arising from ḫarrānu Enterprises

1. NBC 6148 - CBCY 1 55

Bit Arzāʾ

267/VI/18 Artaxerxes I (26 Sept. 447 BC)

(1) 12 GUR ZÚ.LUM.MA šá KASKALII
(2) šá mMu-ra-ša-ú A-šá šá mḪa-tin
(3) šá ŠU mARAD-ıtEn-ši A-šú šá mMU-a
(4) ina muḫ-ḫi m̄EN-I GI?/1 A-šú šá mBa-[as]-si-ia
(5) u mḪa-an-ni-ia A-šá šá mMU-dEN
(6) u mŠEŠ-ša-nu LÚ qal-la šá mMU-dEN
(7) ina ITI.APIN ZÚ.LUM.MA a ’12 GUR
(8) ina GIÅ šá-šiš-šu šá 1 PI šá mMU-dEN?1

(lower edge)
(9) ina U[RU ... ] x [ina-an-di]-nu
(10) [1-en pu-ut 2-i na-šu]-ú
(reverse)
(11) [ ... ] G UR ZÚ.LUM.MA
(12) [ ... ]-tan-nu [ ... ] [x x x x]
(13) [ ... ] ina ITI.ḪIZ1 [ ... ]
(14) [ ... ] mMU-dEN A-šá šá m x x 1-im?
(15) [ ... ] [x x x]
(16) [ ... ] x x x 1-tan-nu
(17) LÚ.ŠID ... A-šú šá mUTU-SU
(18) URU É mAr-za-ʾ ITI.KIN UD.26?,[KĀM]
(19) MU.18.KĀM mAr-taḫ-sa-su
(20) LUGAL KUR.KUR

(left edge) Lšu-pur1 mÈN-G[1?

(1–6) 12 gur of dates invested in a business venture by Murašû, son of Ḫātin, by the agency of Arad-Enlil, son of Iddina, is owed by Bēl-ušallim, son of Bassija, and Ḫannija, son of Iddin-Bēl, and Aḫušunu, 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/Iddina, here the agent of Murašû/Ḥātin, recurs in No. 2 as the agent of Enlil-šum-iddin/ Murašû. His principals can only be the like-named members of the Murašû family. If so, this is the latest known appearance of the family’s namesake as an active party to a transaction. Arad-Enlil/Iddina does not recur in other known texts from the Murašû archive.

5. A-šú šá mMU- over erasures.

5-6. Ḫannija/Iddin-Bēl recurs as debtor in No. 2. Neither he nor the other debtors recur in other known texts from the Murašû archive.

2. NBC 6206 - CBCY 1 58

Nippur

2/I/29 Artaxerxes I (5 April 436 BC)

(1) 10 GUR ŠE.BAR šá mARAD-ıtEn-ši A šá
(2) mŠUM.NA-a šá KASKALII šá mEn-liL-MU-MU
(3) A šá mMu-ra-šu-ú ina muḫ-ḫī
(4) mḪa-an-ni-ia A šá mMU-dEN1
(5) ina ITI.GU šá MU.29.KĀM ŠE.BAR a ’
(6) 10 GUR ina EN.LĪL.KI ina GIŠ.BAR
(7) šá mARAD-ıtEn-liš ina KA ka-lak-ki1
(8) i-nam-din e-lat ū-li-tim1,MEŠ

(lower edge)
(9) IGI.MEŠ šá ina muḫ-ḫi-šu ū?1 [ina muḫ-ḫi]
(10) mMU.d1EN1 AD-šú
(reverse)
(11) LŪ.MU.KIN, mŠi-lim-DINGIR A šá mKa-šîr
(12) mEN-šú-nu A šá mARAD.dMAŠ mRD.MAŠ-MU?
(13) A šá mARAD.dMAŠ mRi-bat A šá mKa-šîr
(14) mMAŠ-PAP A šá mAG-it-tan-nu
(15) mMU-d1EN-liš A šá mBA-ša-a

(16) LŪ.ŠID mN1-is-hur-dEn-líL A šá mEN-šú-nu
(17) EN.LĪL.KI ITI.BĀR UD.2.KĀM
(18) MU.29.KÁM mAr-taæ-ša-as
(19) LUGAL KUR.KUR

(right edge) šu-pur / mHa-ta-an-ia

(1–4) 10 gur of barley, invested in a business venture by Enlil-Åum-iddin, son of Muraåû, is owed to Arad-Enlil, son of Iddina, by Šannija, son of Iddin-Bël. (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-Bël, his father.

(11–15) Witnesses: Silim-ilî, son of KÁœir; BËlåunu, son of Arad-Ninurta; Ninurta-iddin, son of Arad-Ninurta; Ribat, son of KÁœir; Ninurta-nâšir, son of Nabû-ittannu; Iddin-Enlil, son of Iqiša.


(Right Edge) Fingernail mark of Šannija.

4. Šannija: see No. 1:5.

13. Ribat/KÁœir: a witness in two texts from the Muraåû 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 Muraåû archive.

16. Cf. Ni-is-sa-æar-Enlil/BËlåunu, a witness in three texts from the Muraåû archive, all written at Nippur on the same day, 18/X/27 Artaxerxes I (BE 9 9, Istanbul Muraåû Texts Nos. 66 and 67).

3. NBC 6122 - CBCY 1 53
Nippur
10/I/31 Artaxerxes I (22 April 434 BC)

(1) 4 (PI) 1 (BÁN) ŠE.BAR šá mARAD-dÝMAŠ A šá
(2) mðAG-ki-šir šá KASKAL mðEn-llã-MU-MU
(3) A šá mMu-ra-šu-ú ina muň-ši mRi-bat

(4) A šá mðMAŠ-DIN-ìt ina ITI.GU4 MU.31.KÁM
(5) ŠE.BAR a4 (PI) 1 (BÁN) ina GIŠ.BAR šá mARAD-dÝMAŠ
(6) ina EN.LIL.KI i-nam-din pu-ut e-ṭer
(7) šá ŠE.BAR a4 (PI) 1 (BÁN) mðEn-llã-MU-MU
(8) A šá mLib-luṭ na-ši
(lower edge)
(9) e-lat ú-il-tim šá KÙ.BABBAR šá ina IGI mðEn-llã-MU-MU
(reverse)
(10) LÚ mu-kin-nu mðMAŠ-mu-tir-ri-ŠU
(11) A šá mðMAŠ-DIN-ìt mðEN-Ši-nu
(12) A šá mŠEŠ-šu-nu mðŠEŠ.MEŠ-GUR A šá
(13) mðMAŠ-DIN-ìt mðEn-llã-MU A šá, mðEn-llã-ki-šir
(14) LÚ.ŠID mðMAŠ-mu-še-tig-UD.DA
(15) A šá mRi-ba-a-ti E[N.L]ÍL.KI ITILBÁR
(16) UD.10.KÁM šá MU.31.KÁM mAr-taæ-ša-as-su
(17) LUGAL KUR.KUR

(1–4) ½ gur of barley, invested in a business venture by Enlil-šum-iddin, son of Muraåû, is owed to Arad-Ninurta, son of Nabû-kišir, by Ribat, son of Ninurta-uballiø. (4–6) In month II of year 31 he will pay that ½ 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 ½ 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-mutirri-gimilli, son of Ninurta-uballiø; BËlåunu, son of Aæuâunu; AææË-utÏr, son of Ninurta-uballiø; Enlil-iddin, <son of> Enlil-kišir.


The creditor, the debtor, the guarantor, and the scribe do not appear in other known texts from the Muraåû
archive. Of the witnesses, Bēlšunu/Aḫušunu appears in seventeen Murašû texts, always as a witness (earliest: *Istanbul Murašû 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 Murašû archive.

One of the ways in which the Murašû archive differs from the largest early Achaemenid private legal archives is in its dearth of records arising from ḥarrānu 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 ḥarrānu 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 Murašûs were the source of capital but were not directly involved in the investments made by their subordinates or 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 - CBCY 1 53

Nippur

3/1/28 Artaxerxes (16 April 437 BC)

(1) GU₄.ÁB.GAL sa-an-du MU.6-i-tum ša ši-in-du

(2) ša MD-EN-bul-liṭ-su A ša MD AG a-na tik-ki³-[š[u]

(3) na-šá-a-tú MD-EN-bul-liṭ-su GU₄.ÁB.GAL MU.MEŠ

12. I owe the characterization of *BE* 9 61 to A. Leo Oppenheim’s marginalia on Cardascia Murašû, 63–64 (see p. 56 n. 6c). The text begins: (1) 3 GUR 1 PI 3 QA ŠE.BAR (2) ša MD-EN-liḷ-šu A ša MD-EN-šá-du (3) šá KASKAL (not: qib) MD-REN A šá MD-MAš-SUR, “3 gur 1 pūna 3 qū of barley, invested in a business venture by Rimūt-Ninurta, son of Murašû, is owed to Iddin-Enlil, son of Bēlšunu by Nabû-iddin, son of Ninurta-aṭīr.”

(4) a-na ḤAL.A a-na ½ MA.NA KÛ.BABBAR qa-lu-ú

(5) a-di-i 3-ta MU.AN.JEŠI a-na MD-ill-tam-meš-di-i-l[i-ni]

(6) LÚ qal-la šá MD-EN-liḷ-ša-tin id-din KÛ.BABBAR a’

(7) 15 GÍN qa-lu-ú a-na ma-la ḤAL.A-šú

(8) MD-EN-bul-liṭ-su A šá MD AG ina ŠU III

(9) MD-ill-tam-meš-di-i-ni ma-ḫi-ir e-ṭir ina iš³.ḥu-[ra-tum]

(10) u tam-li-tum a-ḫa-a-tú šú-nu pu-ūt re-À i-[ritum]

(11) su-ud-du-du u EN.NUN šá GU₄.ÁB.[GAL MU.MEŠ]

(lower edge)

(12) MD-ill-tam-meš-di-i-ni II [na-ši I-en.TA.ÂM]

(reverse)

(13) [ša-ta-rī TII-[ū ...]

(14) GU₄ [ ... ]

(15) MDš³.I-ta-kā-[ ... ]

(16) mx-x-a-l[u? [ ... ]

(17) A šá Ix-Œū-lill[ ... ]

(18) MDARAD-ia [A šá I ... ]

(19) LÚ.ŠID MD-EN-GI? A šá MD Tab-[1]-ni-e-a EN.L[ÌL.KI]

(20) ITI.BÁR UD.3.KÁM MU.28.KÁM

(21) [MD]r-tab-šá-as-su LUGAL KUR.KUR

(reverse) šu-pur [ ... ]

1–3 A red six-year-old cow which bears the mark of Bēl-bullissu, son of Iddin-Nabû, on its neck?—(3–6) Bēl-bullissu turned over that cow to Ilṭammeš-dīnī, servant of Enlil-ḥattīn, for shared ownership in (a total value of) a half mina of refined silver for three years. (6–9) Bēl-bullissu, son of Iddin-Nabû, has received that 15 shekels of silver from Ilṭammeš-dīnī for his share; he is paid. (9–10) They are to have equal shares in the ... and offspring. (11–12) Ilṭammeš-dīnī 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 Muraåû archive. It is not certain that the Enlil-âΩtin named in line 6 is the like-named member of the Muraåû family, who apparently died within six months of the date of this text; see Istanbul Muraåû Texts, p. 118.

CAD’s rendering of ana zitti nadΩnu as “to give in bailment” (zittu mng. 2e 3’) reflects the opinion that

[w]here 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 Papyrusforschung und Antiken Rechtsgeschichte 30 [Munich: C.H. Beck, 1969], 129ff., Lanz Harrânu, 183ff.).

No other contract of this kind is found among the known texts from the Muraåû 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 'a-hâmeš ú-za-zi-'), and OECT 10 209 (Hursagkalama, Artaxerxes, year 34), an agreement in which two owners each on mutual bailment (itti 'a-hâmeš 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 sütû).

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 ½ mana qišiq kaspî, “for shares in ½ mina of silver,” the first instalment (pît 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.

9. Or: ikê-ku-[ra-tum]: cf. CAD s.v. iškurâtu, AHw. s.v. išikkârratu.

Animal Inventory

5. L-29-554
10/III/6 [Darius II] (22 June 418 BC)

(1) 14 UDU pu-ḥal 46 SILA₄
(2) 2 ME 31 U₈ GAL-ti a-lit-tum
(3) 75 UDU par-rat DUMU.SAL.MU.AN.NA
(4) 18 MÂŞ GAL 10 MÂŞ MU 2-á
(5) 28 MÂŞ TUR 1 ME 5 ÛZ GAL-ti a-1lit-tûl
(6) 48 SAL.ÂŚ.GÂR DUMU.SAL.MU.AN.NA
(7) PAP İPAP 5 ME 75½ š.e-en BABBAR-ti
(8) MI-in-du GAL-ti u qal-lat šå mî-ri-bat
(9) Ašå ma[ED-EN-SU LÚ.ARAD šå mî-ri-mut-]³ MAŞ
(lower edge)
(10) ana GIÅ.BAR ina IGI mAb-da- LÚ.SIPA
(reverse)
(11) LÚ.ARAD šå mî-ri-bat UD.10.KÂM šå ITI.SIG₄
(12) šå MU.6.KÂM e-piš nik-ka-su
(13) e-pu-uÅ KI-šû a-mi-ir ma-nu
(14) u paq-da-a-áš-šû
(reverse) un-qu / mAb-da- // NA₄.KIÅIB mAb-da-

(1–3) 14 rams; 46 (male) lambs; 231 full-grown ewes fit to bear young; 75 yearling ewes. (4–6) 18 full-grown he-goats; 10 two-year-old he-goats; 28 male kids; 105 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 Ribat, son of Bēl-erība, servant of Rimūt-Ninurta, are held on lease by the shepherd Abdūº, 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 Abdūº. Seal of Abdūº.

Formally identical texts from the Muraû 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/Bēl-erība to men called “shepherd of Ribat.” See Cardascia Muraû, 187; Joannès Texts 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 parrū lambs between puₐΩlu and puₐΩdu (UDU.SILAº).

10. Of several individuals called Abdūº in Muraû texts, the most plausible candidate for identification with the man in this text is the Abdūº who is named with Bēl-ittannu (both without patronyms) as an agent of Rimūt-Ninurta/Muraû 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 SETTINGS]; PBS 2/1 222 [drawn up in SETTINGS]).

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

<Nippur>

30/III/31 Artaxerxes I (9 July 434 BC)

(1) mQår-ḫa-an-ni LÚ.ARAD šā m₄En-lîl-MU-MU ina ḫu-ud lib-bi-šū
(2) aₐ-na₄ m₄En-lîl-MU-MU A šā m₄Mu-ra-šu-ú ki-a-am iq-bi um-na
(3) ŠE.NUMUN KA šul-pu šā A.ŠA šā m₄En-DIN-it u m₄Ū-kit-ti ŠE.NUMUN šā LUGAL
(4) u šā LÚ ga-ar-du šā ina muḫ-ḫi ÍD ka-sal e-lat da-lu.MEŠ
(5) šā GÚ ÍD ka-sal ŠE.NUMUN šā LUGAL ŠE.NUMUN šā mŠEŠ.MEŠ-MU u ŠE.NUMUN
(6) šā mKL₄En-lîl-DIN šā ina muḫ-ḫi ÍD Saḫ-ṣu-du u 1-ën GIŠ.APIN
(7) 134 GÚ BAR a-na ŠE.NUMUN 1 GUR ŠE.GIG.BA 7 GUR ŠE.ZİZ.ÅM +4 BÁN ŠE.GIŠ.Iº
(8) [... ] GÚ.GAL 1 (PI) 4 (BÁN) GÚ.TUR 1 PI ḫu-ṣu a-na GIŠ.BAR
(9) [bi-i]n-nam-ma ina MU.AN.NA 2 ME 80 GUR ŠE.BAR
(10) 171 GÚ.GAL 70 GUR ŠE.ZİZ.ÅM 12 GUR GÚ.GAL
(11) 1 GUR GÚ.TUR 20 GUR ŠE ḫu-ṣu 10 GUR ka-as-si-ia =2 GUR GIŠ.Iº
(12) PAP 4 ME GUR EBUR lu-dak-ka ár-ki m₄En-lîl-MU-MU
(13) iš-me-šu-ma ŠE.NUMUN MU.MEŠ GIŠ.APIN a₄ 1-en u EBUR šā a-na ŠE.NUMUN
(14) a-na MU.AN.NA 4 ME GUR EBUR id-daš-šú

(lower edge)

(15) ina ITI.GU₄ ŠE.BAR a₄ 2 ME 80 GUR GIG.BA a₄
(16) 7 GUR ŠE.ZİZ.ÅM a₄ 70 GUR GÚ.GAL a₄ 12 GUR

(reverse)

(17) GÚ.[TUR] a₄ 1 GUR ḫu-ṣu a₄ 20 GUR ka-as-si-ia a₄ 10 GUR GIŠ.Iº a₄ 2 GUR
(18) PAP 4 ME GUR¹ i-nam-din ul-tu ITI.DU₆ šá MU.31.KÁM
(19) GIŠ.BAR MU.MEŠ IEN? 31-ta MU.AN.NA. MEŠ ina IGI-šú GU₄.HI.A šá ina lib-bi
(20) i-mut-t₄ i-zaq-qap
(21) LÚ.MU.KIN₄ ma₄ša-ri₄ DUMU šá m₄Ba-rîk-DINGIR.MEŠ m₄Ra-bat A šá m₄Ni-qud
(22) m₄Ma₄š-na-din-MU A šá m₄Ū-bal-šu₄-ŠU m₄TU-ŠE-MU
(23) A šá m₄Ma₄š-SUR m₄MU-MU A šá m₄Ka-sir m₄ARAD₅₅ A šá
(24) m₄MU₄ En-lîl m₄ARAD₄₅Ma₄š A šá m₄Ma₄š-DIN-it
(25) MU.AN.NA šá [qi-bi (…) m]dE[n-lîl]-MU-MU im-mid

(26) [m]dENŠADA-MU L[Ú-ŠID A šá mARAD-d]ME.ME ITI.SIG5 UD.30.KÂM

(27) [MU].I31.K|ÁM m[Ar-tah-ša-as-su] LUGAL KUR.KUR

(upper edge) [šu-pur m|x-x-x-ḫu]-lú-ú-nu
(left edge) [šu-pur] mQár-ḫa-nu

(1–2) Qarḥānu, servant of Enlil-šūm-iddin, voluntarily addressed Enlil-šūm-iddin, son of Murašû, 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 Itti-Enlil-balû that are (all) located on the Saḫţû canal, along with one plow, 34 gur of barley for seed, 1 gur of wheat, 7 gur of emmer, 4 sūtu of sesame, [x] chickpeas, 1½ pânu of lentils, 1 pânu 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 kasû, 2 gur of sesame, altogether 400 gur of crops.” (12–14) Then Enlil-šūm-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 kasû, 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.

(21–24) Witnesses: Banija, son of Barîk-Il; Ribat, son of Niqud; Ninurta-nādin-šumi, son of Ubališu-Marduk; Šamaš-āl-iddin, son of Ninurta-ētîr; Šum-iddin, son of Kāsîr; Arad-Enlîl, son of Iddîn-Enlîl; Arad-Nûrta, son of Ninurta-uballît.


(Left Edge) [Fingernail mark] of Qarḫānu.


3. Cf. mÚ-ki-tŭ, one of several proprietors of land for which Naqqîtu, daughter of Murašû, paid rent on 9/V/29 Artaxerxes I in Entrepreneurs and Empire No. 46:3 (= JCS 28 1996).

3f. Despite occasional mention of royal property characterized with an Iranian loanword in the phrase uzbara ša šarrī (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 Murašû archive. Arable land (ŠE.NUMUN) of gardu-workers: BE 9 101:3, BE 10 92:4 (and ḫāṭru ša LÛ gardu ibid. 7); fields (AŠÂ.MES) of gardu-workers: PBS 2/1 2:1 and 13 and 204:8.


7. 11 “…*+ 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
B. The šaknu and the sandabakku of Nippur

Lease

7. YBC 11564
Nippur
22+/—/4 Darius II (420/19 BC)

(1) ŠE.NUMUN.MEŠ LÚ pa-˘-i-še.MEŠ šá EN.LÍL.KI
(2) šá ina URU ÍD eš-še-tum u URU É Ša-bat-gab˘-bi?-[x]
(3) mdEN-KÁM LÚ šak-nu šá EN.LÍL.KI A šá mŠi-lim-DINGIR
(4) a-na GIŠ.BAR a-di 10-ta MU.AN.NA.MEŠ
(5) a-na MU.AN.NA 5 GUR ŠE.BAR a-na mMU.dAMAR.UTU
(6) A šá mdDIN-su-dAMAR.UTU id-din ina MU.AN.NA
(7) ina ITI.GU₄ ŠE.BAR a 5 GUR mMU-dAMAR.UTU
(8) l₂-na mdEN-KÁM ina-an-din TA ITI.BÁR
(9) MU.4.KÁM a-di 10-ta MU.AN.NA.MEŠ
(10) ŠE.NUMUN.MEŠ mMU₁.MEŠ ana GIŠ.BAR ina IGI mdMU.dAMAR.UTU
(reverse)
(11) mdEn-lil-MU-lil-bir A šá mNa-[din]
(12) LÚ.MU.KIN₇ mKAL-a A šá mNa-din A mBA₅0-da-ri
(13) mdEn-lil-ŠEŠ-it-tan-nu A šá mEN-šá-nu mLa-ba-ši A šá
(14) mKi-din mŠUH-SUR A šá mdMAŠ-DA mKÁ-SUR A šá
(15) m[K]a-šir mDIN A šá mdEn-lil-KÁD mŠU-MU A šá [x]
(16) m[Tat-tan-nu A šá mÚ-bar
(17) mDU-A A šá mdMAŠ-PAP mdIM-MU A šá
(18) mdMAŠ-na-din

(1–6) Bēl-ēreš, the šaknu of Nippur, son of Silim-II, leased fields of unassigned' holdings of people of Nippur that are in the village of NΩru-eååetu and the village of BÏt ØΩbat-gabbi-x to Iddin-Marduk, son of Uballissu-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 Bēl-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 NΩdin, descendant of Mannu-Enlil-dΩri; Enlil-åum-lilbir, son of NΩdin; Enlil-aæ-ittannu, son of BËlåunu; LΩbΩåi, son of Kidin; Ina-tËåê-Ëøir, son of Ninurta-l˺i; BΩbu-Ëøiret, son of KΩœir; BalΩøu, son of Enlil-kΩœir; Marduk-iddin, son of [...] Tattannu, son of UbΩr; MukÏn-apli, son of Ninurta-nΩœir; Addu-iddin, son of Ninurta-nΩœir.


(reverse) Seal of Enlil-åum-lilbir, son of NΩdin. Seal of LΩbΩåi, son of Kidin. (Left Edge) Iron ring of Enlil-åum-lilbir, son of Bēlšunu. (Upper Edge) Iron ring of Bēl-ēreš, the šak[nu of Nippur], son of Si[lim-II]. (Lower Edge) [...] Ninurta-ana-bitšu, son of Lu-[idija].

1. Cf. ŠE.NUMUN.MEŠ ša LÚ pa-˘-še-e-tú ša
LÚ.EN.LÍL.KI.MEÅ TuM 2-3 145+ Entrepreneurs and Empire No. 27:2, and SE.NUMUN.MEÅ LÚ pa-’se- e-ti ša ina muḫḫi ŠE.NUMUN.MEÅ ša LÚ.EN.LÍL.KI.MEÅ BE 9 65:3. For the extraordinary masculine form cf. GIÅ.BAN ša PN pa-’ṣi-ši (listed after fractional shares of bow lands of named individuals) BE 9 8:7, 8, and 9, and ana muḫḫi 4-ū pa-’ṣi-ši [ša PN] (listed after unqualified bow lands of named individuals) 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 GIÅ.BAN [pa]-’ṣi-ṭu ša PN ša ḫatra ša NN BE 10 90:3, 2-ta GIÅ.BAN pa-’ṣi-ṭu ša PN u PN2 PBS 2/1 76:9). It appears most often in the phrase ušuzzá ’ēti (ušuzzáµeitī) u (LÚ) pa ṭṣēti (paṭṣēti). The phrase describes bow lands constituting a named ḫatra organization (BE 9 60:6 and 14 and dupl. Istanbul Muraåû Texts No. 33; BE 10 15:2; PBS 2/1 114:4, 117:4, 120:4f., 188:3, 205:2, 217:5). In Muraåû texts, the adjective ušuzzáµu occurs only in this phrase, but p. appears occasionally without u. (GIÅ.BAN PN ša ʾna GN 2-ta pa-’ṣi-ṭu [after fractional bow lands, before unqualified bow lands] BE 9 44:10, GIÅ.BAN PN […] pa-’ṣi-ṭu Istanbul Muraåû Texts No. 52:12). Elsewhere, u. appears once without p., at the head of a fragmentary list of bow lands constituting a ḫatra (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 ḫatra. 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 ušuzzu, “stand” (rather than šuzzu, “register”) and pa’āšu, “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 textesassyriens inédits,” JA 1917 387 n. 1) has been generally ignored and forgotten. Poebe’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 Muraåû, ZSS 70 [1953] 410) and von Soden (review of Cardascia Muraåû, BtOr 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, Joannès (Textes économiques, 35) proposed that characterizations of bow lands as “existing and dissolved” resulted from the practical need for foremen (šaknuš) of ḫatra 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 (GIÅ.BAN MEÅ pa ṭṣēti) 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 GIÅ.BAN ša PN pa ṭṣēti pa ṭṣēti etc. must refer to currently unassigned properties that were still identified by the names of past occupants. In a similar vein, Aršam, the satrap 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).

3 and Upper Edge. Bêl-êreš/Silîm-II, šaknu of Nippur: witness, with the same title, in TuM 2-3 204 (7/VI/5 Darius II).

5. Iddin-Marduk/Ubajïsu-Marduk: thirty-five times in Muraåû texts dated between 436/5 and 413 BC, 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/VII/3 Darius II).

11. Enlîl-šum-lîlê/Šûnûn: see JCS 40 136 comment to line 11.
12. Aqara/Nadîn/Mannu-Enlîl-dāri: with ancestor’s name, as a witness in six Muraû texts dated between 29/III/1 Darius II (PBS 2/1 175) and 19/X/4 Darius (PBS 2/1 202); without ancestor’s name, as a witness in eight Muraû texts dated between 29/III/1 Darius II (PBS 2/1 175) and 19/X/4 Darius (PBS 2/1 202); once as a scribe (BE 9 7a, 19/X/26 Artaxerxes I), seal = PBS 14 No. 962, TuM 2–3 pl. 99 No. 68, Bregstein “Seal Use” No. 254.


14f. Ina-teš-eṭîr/Ninurta-lû: six times in Muraû texts dated between 436/5 and 425/4 BC, and as one of three collectors (dektû) of rent paid for bow lands under the supervision of the šaknu of Nippur in JCS 40 132; see JCS 40 135. Bûbu'-eṭîret/Kâṣîr and Balû/Enlîl-kâṣîr are the other two collectors.

Bûbu’eṭîret/Kâṣîr: likewise (i.e., ḫA, not ḫAMAR.UTU) in JCS 40 132:4 and obv. (coll.); see below No. 11:16.

15. Tattannu/Ubûr: scribe in Entrepreneurs and Empire No. 97+Istanbul Muraû Texts No. 96 (9/—/40 Artaxerxes I) and thirteen other Muraû texts dated between 7/VII/41 Artaxerxes I (BE 9 100, Entrepreneurs and Empire No. 78, Istanbul Muraû Texts Nos. 77 and 78) and 2/XI/1 Darius II (PBS 2/1 23).


Reverse. Seal of Enlîl-ṣum-liibîr/Nadîn apparently = TuM 2–3 pl. 99 No. 38, Bregstein “Seal Use” No. 436; see JCS 40 136.

Upper Edge. Ring of Bêl-êreš/Silîm-II, 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 Iddîn-Marduk/Ubâlissû-Marduk. On the basis of JCS 40 132, a receipt for Iddîn-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 (šaknus) of ḫâtru-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 ḫâtru. No. 7 supports this proposition. It documents explicitly what was implicit in JCS 40 132, that šaknu of Nippur leased farmland to Iddîn-Marduk (himself a former šaknu of Nippur). Furthermore, here the leased property is qualified with a term, pa ṯê, that is otherwise specific to bow lands organized in ḫâtru. All the elements of a “ḫâtru 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, šandabakku. As Ran Zadok has observed (review of Frame, Babylonia 689–627 bc, WO 25 [1994] 152 and “Notes on Babylonian Geography and Prosopography, 2. Central Babylonia,” NABU 1997/6 No. 2), the title šandabakku 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 bc, presumably composed at Babylon, and to the following text, drawn up at Nippur not long after the compilation of the Muraû archive.

Date-Gardening Contract
8. CBS 7961
[Nippur]
—/N/—

(1) ŠE.NUMUN zaq-pi u KA šul-pu A.UD 150 GÚ ÍD Šap.-gUTU
(2) É ANSÈ.KUR.RA «KUR» UŠ.SA.DU ŠE.NUMUN šā mdEn-lîl-NUMUN-DU LÚ šu-šā-an-ša
(3) UŠ.SA.DU ŠE.NUMUN šâ mdMAŠ-ga-mil LÚ ša-na-da1-ha-la ka1

3. Zadok WO 25 152 and NABU 1997/6 No. 2 (p. 5), identifies Ninurta-gâmil the årandabakku with Ninurta-gâmil Lû.Gû.[...] in a text from the reign of Artaxerxes II, Durand, Textes babyloniens pl. 50 AO 17637:1 (= Joannès Textes économiques, 31 No. 1). He restores the latter’s title as Lû.Gû.[EN.NA] = årandabakku, despite the reservations of Joannès Textes économiques, 32 and 35 (reading Lû.Gû.[GÀL] = 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.

7f. The restoration, on the model of BE 8/1 132:9, assumes that the line continued around the edge to the reverse of the tablet.
Restored and emended after mimma mala ina šupālu gišimmari iippuša ana rammišu ikkal ziti ānu suluppī ina muḫḫi mangaga immissuma 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 he (the tenant) will cut (them)” BE 9 99:8ff. and near-duplicate Istanbul Murašū Texts No. 31:8ff.; ZÜ.LUM.MA ina muḫḫi man[gaga] l-im-mid-[a]-nu inakkisma inandin BE 8/1 132:11f.; [ZÜ.LUM.MA ina muḫḫi m]āngaga l-im-l-mid-su-[ma ina[kkus] PBS 2/1 215:8ff.; see Coquerillat Palmeraies, 63 with n. 143, Landsberger Date-Palm, 46 with n. 158, and Ries Bodenpachtformulare, 93f.

11f. Cf. ina ina ina imittu [la it-ta]-ši-iz a-na 1 GUR ŠE.NUMUN Ė ri-ip-[qf] [x GUR ZÜ.LU]M.MA sissi-in inandaššu PBS 2/1 215:9–12; ina ūmu ZAG.LU l-it-[ta]-ši-iz sissi-in aki LŪ.UŠ.SA.DU MES inandaššu BE 9 99:10f. and near-duplicate Istanbul Murašū Texts No. 31:10f.; ina ūmu ina imittu la ir-[ta]-ši-iz2 a-na 1 GUR ŠE.NUMUN [Ē3 x 1 4] GUR suluppī sissinnu inandaššu BE 8/1 132:12f.; and ina ūmu imittu la ir-[ta]-ši-iz2 zu 3 GUR suluppī [sis]sinnu ... inandimāšunītu PBS 2/1 81:11ff. 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 (review of Ries Bodenpachtformulare, Revue Historique de Droit Français et Étranger 55 [1977] 645f. There has been little serious disagreement, however, over how the passages are to be read. Editors and commentators have read perfect forms of našū in PBS 2/1 215:10 ([it-ta]-ši-ši[ma]1 a-na ...; Augapfel 79 ignores the sign between -ši and a-na), in BE 9 99:10 and Istanbul Murašū Texts No. 31:10 ([it-ta]-ši GIS sissi-in ...), and in BE 8/1 132:12 ([it-ta]-ši a-na ...). These readings underlie interpretations of the phrase as ina ūmu imittu la itašī “if he has not delivered the assessed rent.” In PBS 2/1 81:11 editors have read a problematic form id-nam-ma, perhaps a scribal lapse for a form of nadānu, not open to convincing translation.

The alternative proposed here, reading perfect forms of išazzu (not of našū), draws on extraordinary clauses in two earlier leases of date-orchards: šābī ina šeṭi Šamaš i-miš immiḏašū ina libbi i-ṣa-[az “the team (of assessors) will establish his assessment openly (lit. in full daylight) and with his concurrence (lit. he will be there)” VAS 5 11:12ff.; and šābī ina se-eš-ti Šamaš [imittu] immiḏašū ina libbi i-ṣa-[zu VAS 5 26 left edge; see San Nicolò-Ungrad NRV, Nos. 374 and 377, CAD s.v. šētu 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 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, 148f., and 194). Hence, clauses beginning ina ūmu (ina) imittu la itašī, may be translated “if he (the tenant) does not concur in’ (lit. is not present at’) the assessment, he (the landlord) will pay him (the tenant) x gur of dates for each gur of arable land as sissinnu” or “will pay him sissinnu at the same rate as applies to the adjoining properties.”

This reading has the paleographic advantage of accommodating the traces found in the published copies better than proposed readings of forms of našū. It has the orthographic advantage of obviating the determinative GIS before sissinnu in BE 9 99 and Istanbul Murašū Texts No. 31, a determinative that otherwise is absent when sissinnu refers to a payment. It has the advantage of eliminating the implausible writing DIŠ+3 in PBS 2/1 81:12 for the implausible quantity 63 (gur), where the expected writing of the numeral would be KU(1+šu)+3 (see also Cardascia Murašū, 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 *naâû* without *nadΩnu* to indicate “deliver, give,” rather than “get, take” (indeed, *naâû* 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 1132. This problem could be evaded by taking *imittu* as the subject of *uâuzzu*; but then *imittu uâuzzu* in late Achaemenid Nippur texts cannot be associated with *ina libbi* (scil. *imitti uâuzzu*) 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* *nenmudu* 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, *tattaåiz* 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 “mu adi lΩ åanΩte 5 tu-it-tum a-na PN ÅE.NUMUN ana PN Åtekim” in the event that PN [the lessor] takes the property away from PN [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 30:21ff.; 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-qa* in the accompanying captions all agree with the likely appearance of the governor Ninurta-gâmil in a text from the reign of Artaxerxes in suggesting that this tablet was written in or after the reign of Artaxerxes II. See J. Oelsner, “Zur neu- und spâáhbabylonischen Siegelpraxis,” in *Festschrift Lubor Matouåš*, ed. B. Hruåška and G. Komoróczy (Budapest, 1978), II, 172, and Bregstein “Seal Use,” 359–63.

### C. Texts with Prosopographic Connections to the Muraåû Texts

#### Sale of Slaves

9. CBS 1594 - (Kh2 594)
Bit Minâ-ana-Bêl-dânû
22/XII/9 Darius II (24 March 414 BC)

1. *mdAG-di-li-ni-º LÚ qal-la mMi-nu-ú-a-na- dEN-da-nu*
2. *ina łu-ud lib-bi-sâ 3 At-tar-dan-na-at GEMÉ-su šâ RIT*
3. *UZU ZAG.LU-sù a-na MU šâ mTa4-hu-ú a LÚ si-pir DUMU šâ “m”*
4. *mdEN-GI EN-sū ša4-ťa-tum ü 3Na-na-a-DIN-it-nin-ni*
5. *DUMU.SAL-su e-ni-įq-tum ši-iz-bi šâ ćup-pi-i-šâ a-na*
6. *1 3 MA.NA KÙ.BABBAR qa-lu-ú a-na ši-mi gam-ru-tu*
7. *a-na *mdAMAR.UTU-MU-DÙ DUMU šâ mdEN-SU id-din KÙ.BABBAR a 3 1 3 MA.NA*
8. *ši-mi 3 At-tar-dan-na-tum ü 3Na-na-a-DIN-it-nin-ni*
10. *mdAMAR.UTU-MU-DÙ ma-hi-ir e-þir u₄ pu pa-qa-ri a-na mu-hi-hi*
11. *šu-a-tim it-tab-[šu-ú ...] ú-mar-ra-qa-am-ma*
12. *a-na *md[AMAR.UTU-MU-DÙ i-nam-din]*
13. *LÚ x-[...]*

(reverse)

1. *x [... mdMinâ-ana-Bêl-dânû A šâ mTa4-hu-a?]*
2. *EN šâ m[DAG-di-li-ni-º na-din LÚ-ut-tim]*
3. *mA-na-dEN-IKÁM 3 A-šâ šâ m[...]*
4. *mdAG-na-din-ŠES A-šâ šâ mdAMAR.UTU-x-MU*
5. *mdBE-MU A-šâ šâ mdEN-DIN-su mKI-dAMAR.UTU-DIN A-šû šâ md[...]*
(6') m³EN-NUMUN-GIŠ A-šū šá m³EN-ú-ṣur
mMU.³EN A-šū šá m³[...]
(7') m³KAR.³AMAR.UTU A-šū šá m³EN-BA-šá
mMU.³EN A-šū šá m³AG-ŠEŠ-[..]
(8') m³A-ḫu-ši-ia-x-x [...]-ṣu³ m³ŠIŁ-a-a A-šū šá
m[...]
(9') [m³E]N-MU A-šū šá m³EN-šú-nu m³Lib-luṭ
DUMU-šú³ m³x-at [...]
(10') m³AG-ŪRU-šú [LÚ.DUB.SAR]¹DUMU šá
m³AG-ú-še-zib³
(11') URU ³M³nu-[ú-a-na]-³EN[N-da-nu
ITI].ŠE UD.22.KÁM
(12') MU.9.KÁM ³Da-ri-[ia]-a-muš LUGAL
KUR.KUR MEŠ

(reverse) NA₄.KIŠIB / m³An₃-dEN/-APIN-êš /
/ NA₄.[K]IŠIB¹ m³AG-dî-li-[ni-³] /
[na-] [din LÚ-ut-tum]
(upper edge) NA₄.KIŠIB / m³KAR.³AMAR.UTU
// NA₄.KIŠIB / m³ŠIŁ-a-a // NA₄,
KIŠIB / m³AG-ŪRU-šú LÚ.¹DUB.
SAR¹
(left edge) NA₄.KIŠIB / m³Mi-nu-ú-an₃-dEN-
da-nu/EN šá m³AG-[di-li]-ni-³ / na-
din / LÚ-ut-tum // NA₄.KIŠIB / 
m³BE-MU
(right edge) NA₄.KIŠIB / m³A-ḫu-š[i-ia-x …]

(1–7) Nabû-dilînî, servant of Minû-ana-Bêl-
dânî, voluntarily sold Attar-dannat, his slave
woman, whose right hand is inscribed with the
name of her master, Ṭaḥḫūa, the scribe, son of Bēl-
ushallim, and (he also sold) Nanâ-bulliṭininni, her
(Attar-dannat’s) suckling daughter …., for 1½
minas of pure silver as the entire price, to Marduk-
šum-ukīn, son of Bēl-serība.

(7–10) Nabû-dīlīnī has received the silver,
namely 1£ minas, the price of his slaves Attar-
dannat and Nanâ-bulliṭininni, all the money, from
Marduk-šum-ukīn; he is paid in full.

(10–13) Should a claim to those slave women,
Attar-dannat and Nanâ-bulliṭininni, arise, […] will
clear it in favor of [Marduk-šum-ukīn]. […]

(Reverse 1’–9’) [Witnesses: (…) Minû-ana-
Bēl-dΩnu, son of Øaææua∑, master of [Nabû-
dilīnī, the seller of the slaves]; Ana-Bēl-ēreš∑, son
of […]; Nabû-nādin-aḫî, son of Marduk-x-iddin/
šumī; Ea-iddin, son of Bēl-bullissu; Itti-Marduk-
balātu, son of …; Bēl-zēr-līšir, son of Bēl-ūṣur;
Iddin-Bēl, son of …; Ėṭîr-Marduk, son of Bēl-
qîṣa; Iddin-Bēl, son of Nabû-āl- […]; Aḥuṣia-x-
x, [son of …]-ṣu∑, Sūqaja, son of […]; Bēl-iddin,
son of Bēl-šunu; Libluṭ, son of …

(10’–12’) Nabû-ūṣūrṣu, [scribe], son of Nabû-
ūṣēzib. Bit Minû-[ana]-Bēl-[l-dānu]. Month XII, day
22, year 9, Darius, King of Lands.

(Reverse) Seal of Ana-Bēl-ēreš. Seal of Nabû-
dilīnī, seller of [the slaves]. (Upper Edge) Seal
of Ėṭîr-Marduk. Seal of Sūqaja. Seal of Nabû-
ūṣūrṣu, [scribe]. (Left Edge) Seal of Minû-ana-Bēl-
dānu, master of Nabû-[dilīnī], seller of the slaves. Seal
of Ea-iddin. (Right Edge) Seal of Aḥuṣia-x
…]

1, 3, r. 1 etc.: Minû-ana-Bēl-dānu/Ṭaḥḫu’a recurs
as a witness to BE 10 101 (18/VII/5 Darius II): on
the lower edge, in the caption accompanying a poorly
preserved impression of the same seal that is impressed
on the left edge of this text; and in line 23, with his name
abbreviated to Minû; both passages give him the title
LÚ.GAL um-mu. He is named again as the superior of
one of the witnesses to PBS 2/1 207 (10/VI/5 Darius
II), in line 13 and in a seal caption on the upper edge;
both passages omit his patronym but give him the title
LÚ.GAL UM. BM 61513 (—/—/18 Artaxerxes, place
not preserved), a fragmentary promissory note for sil-
ver at interest, also names a Minû-ana-Bēl-dānu, but it
is perhaps rather to be connected with the archive of
Minû-ana-Bēl-dānu/Bēl-bullissu (Zadok, review of
Sigrist, Figulla and Walker, Catalogue of the
Babylonian Tablets in the British Museum 2, AfO 44-
45 [1997-98] 294), despite witnesses including Ana-
Bēl-ēreš (name or patronym?) and […] / Murašū.

Versions of the title LÚ.GAL UM recur in other
Murašū texts. PBS 2/1 196 (29/VI/3 Darius II), is a
receipt for taxes paid to Lābašī/Muṣēzib-Bēl, entitled
šaknu ša sepiš ša bt LÚ.GAL um-ma, “foreman of
scribes of the rab ummu’s estate” (lines 7, 13, and left
ing), for bow lands under his control. It implies that
rab ummu labeled an office that was supported by
landed property. Clerks under the control of the office
were supported by holdings organized as a ḫatu. BE 9
72 (15/VI/40 Artaxerxes I) refers to land of “priests∑
of Larak,” under the control of the LÚ.GAL um-ma
(line 2). It implies that the holder of the office also
controlled property-holding groups that were not nomi-
inally associated with the office, as did holders of some
other offices found in the Murašū texts (Entrepreneurs
and Empire, p. 44 n. 30). Otherwise, the title appears
in texts dated as early as the reign of Nabonidus and as
late as the reign of Artaxerxes III (MacGinnis, “BM
64707 and rikis qabli in the Ebabbara,” WZKM 88

Translation of the title is elusive. Augapfel 114 pro-
posed “Vorsteher der Leute∑” (similarly Ebeling
Glossar, 39, taking LÚ.GAL um-mu in YOS 3 171:9 as
“offenbar = ummāni”; MacGinnis, WZKM 88 180 n. 7
also attributes to Jursa the suggestion that ummu is de-
rived from ummānu). Cardascia Murašū, 12 n. 5 sug-
gested “chancelier∑.” Bongenaar Ebabbar 139 refrains
from translation. MacGinnis, WZKM 88 180 n. 7
also attributes to Jursa the suggestion that ummu is de-
rived from ummānu). Cardascia Murašū, 12 n. 5 sug-
gested “chancelier∑.” Bongenaar Ebabbar 139 refrains
from translation. MacGinnis, WZKM 88 180 n. 7
also attributes to Jursa the suggestion that ummu is de-
rived from ummānu). Cardascia Murašū, 12 n. 5 sug-
gested “chancelier∑.” Bongenaar Ebabbar 139 refrains
from translation. MacGinnis, WZKM 88 180 n. 7
also attributes to Jursa the suggestion that ummu is de-
rived from ummānu). Cardascia Murašū, 12 n. 5 sug-
gested “chancelier∑.” Bongenaar Ebabbar 139 refrains
from translation. MacGinnis, WZKM 88 180 n. 7
also attributes to Jursa the suggestion that ummu is de-
rived from ummānu). Cardascia Murašū, 12 n. 5 sug-
gested “chancelier∑.” Bongenaar Ebabbar 139 refrains
from translation. MacGinnis, WZKM 88 180 n. 7
also attributes to Jursa the suggestion that ummu is de-
rived from ummānu). Cardascia Murašū, 12 n. 5 sug-
gested “chancelier∑.” Bongenaar Ebabbar 139 refrains
from translation. MacGinnis, WZKM 88 180 n. 7
also attributes to Jursa the suggestion that ummu is de-
rived from ummānu). Cardascia Murašū, 12 n. 5 sug-
gested “chancelier∑.” Bongenaar Ebabbar 139 refrains
from translation. MacGinnis, WZKM 88 180 n. 7
also attributes to Jursa the suggestion that ummu is de-
rived from ummānu). Cardascia Murašū, 12 n. 5 sug-
gested “chancelier∑.” Bongenaar Ebabbar 139 refrains
from translation. MacGinnis, WZKM 88 180 n. 7
also attributes to Jursa the suggestion that ummu is de-
rived from ummānu). Cardascia Murašū, 12 n. 5 sug-
gested “chancelier∑.” Bongenaar Ebabbar 139 refrains
from translation. MacGinnis, WZKM 88 180 n. 7
also attributes to Jursa the suggestion that ummu is de-
rived from ummānu). Cardascia Murašū, 12 n. 5 sug-
gested “chancelier∑.” Bongenaar Ebabbar 139 refrains
from translation. MacGinnis, WZKM 88 180 n. 7
also attributes to Jursa the suggestion that ummu is de-
rived from ummānu). Cardascia Murašū, 12 n. 5 sug-
gested “chancelier∑.” Bongenaar Ebabbar 139 refrains
from translation. MacGinnis, WZKM 88 180 n. 7
also attributes to Jursa the suggestion that ummu is de-
rived from ummānu). Cardascia Murašū, 12 n. 5 sug-
gested “chancelier∑.” Bongenaar Ebabbar 139 refrains
from translation. MacGinnis, WZKM 88 180 n. 7
also attributes to Jursa the suggestion that ummu is de-
rived from ummānu). Cardascia Murašū, 12 n. 5 sug-
gested “chancelier∑.” Bongenaar Ebabbar 139 refrains
from translation. MacGinnis, WZKM 88 180 n. 7
also attributes to Jursa the suggestion that ummu is de-

Babylonian names (Nabû-kībsu-šarrī-ūsu BM 63871 [17/II/14 Nabonidus], Bēl-ušallim/Bēl-etîr BM 74502 [Sippar, 24/V/5 Cyrus, see Bongenaar Ebabbar, 139], Lābāši/Balāštu OECT 10 197 [Kish², 16/VI/13 Artaxerxes], Tattuannu Sachs-Hunger Diaries No. -366 A 11 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” = uqu) but with ummu “quiver or bowcase” (only in GIŠ.É.BAN = É.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 qaāšti, “chief of bowmen.” There is no obvious basis for making or excluding an identification with the LÚ.GAL UD in PBS 2/1 84:11.

1 etc. Cf. ṣMAP-di-li-in-nil-辋Niunrutu-ētir, one of several debtors in Istanbul Muraštu 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. ṣa ḫu:mmu is without parallel in comparable contexts. The signs on the tablet are clear, excluding emendation to ṣa ṭu:li:šu, “(suckling) at her breast” (cf. ʾPN u LÚ.DUMU-šû ṣa UGU tu-lu-û NbNk. 67:3; ʾPN ʾPN, mārāssu u mārāšu šà muḫḫi ti-lu-û NbNk. 832:2 and 9), or to ṣa ap•-pi-i-ša for ṣappu ṭu:li:šu, “tip of her breast, her nipple” (cf. TDP 222:40). Postulating a meaning “nipple” for ḫu:mmu (Ahw. ḫu:mmu I), “wart?” (see CAD s.v. siggû) a word known otherwise only from Izu (and meriting ancient commentary there), would be adventurous.


4; Gwyneth Hueter, “Grammatical Studies in the Akkadian Dialects of Babylon and Uruk, 556-500 bc,” Ph. D. Dissertation, Oxford University, 1996, 66f.). In that case, the usage ṣa ṭu:mmu, 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 ḫu:mmu 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 “Nanâ-bullitīnumni, (who was not named, but described only as) her suckling daughter on the tablet (recording) her (previous sale).” Unweaned children sold with their mothers are sometimes unnamed in bills of sale (e.g., NbNk. 67:3 and NbNk. 832:2 and 9; cf. NbNk. 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. (LÚ.DUMU e-niŋ GA □□□□□□□□)).

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

The impression of ´ōr-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 extended to hold something. The im-

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), 116–23, 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 mostly
age 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 Muraåû corpus of 657 seal impressions.

The cylinder seal impression of Minû-ana-Bël-dânu 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-Bël-dânu’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 therefore probably expensive suggest that their owners were wealthy or powerful.

Elements of Minû-ana Bël-dânu’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

---


19. 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.

20. 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).

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.

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. The two cylinders in Russian collections similarly feature three or four prisoners with wrists bound behind them and tied together at the neck with a rope held by the Persian king. In the Persepolis seal impression and the two Russian cylinders, in contrast to the seal of Minû-ana-Bêl-dânu, 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.

The feature of Minû-ana-Bêl-dânu’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. Perhaps the representation of the

---

23. 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.”
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 381 [1981] 36 and fig. 5, SA3b) 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
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-dûnu’s seal, the inspiration might have been Darius II’s troubled accession, and the bound prisoners, so reminiscent of the defeated enemies on the Bisitun relief, perhaps mimic the great Darius I’s portrayal of his own 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-dûnu, 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 Nov. 441 BC or 21 Nov. 381 BC)

(1) GIŠ.BAR A.ŠA TIL-tim šá MU.24.KÁM mAr-tah-ša-as-su LUGAL
(2) šá ŠE.NUMUN zaq-pu ū KA šul-pu UŠ.SA.DU ŠE.NUMUN
(3) šá mBA-sa-d KÁ u ŠEŠ-šu DUMU.MEŠ šá mLa-ba-ši
(4) u UŠ.SA.DU ŠE.NUMUN šá mRU-tim-d MaÅš A šá mDb.ME.ME-MU-GIŠ
(5) u ŠEŠ.MEŠ-šu Ė A.KAL šá mDb.MAŠ-na-din LÚ.ARAD
(6) šá mBa-ga- U-Da-d-a-tú šá ina IGI mDan-na-a-id-ri-
(7) LÚ šir?-ki A šá mEN-šú-nu GIŠ.BAR A.ŠA MU.MEŠ TIL-tim šá MU.24.KÁM
(8) [mMa-a]^{-1}ri-i-l-li-ti- LÚ.ARAD šá mDb.Ba-ga-
(9) [ina ŠUll] mDb.Na-na-a-id-ri- A šá mDb.EN-šú-nu
(10) [ma-ir e-t]ir
(reverse)
(11) LÚ.MU.KIN
d(12) mDb.En-líl-na-din-MU A šá mKAL-a mNa-din A šá mDb.En-líl-DÚ-nš
(13) mTat-tan-nu A šá mEN-šú-nu mARHUŠ-GAR A šá mDb.DIN-su-d AMAR.UTU
(14) mMU-dEn-líl A šá mDb.MAŠ-DIN-iš mTá-qíš-d ME.ME A šá mARAD-d MAŠ
(15) LÚ.ŠID mDb.MAŠ-MU A šá mEN-šú-nu EN LÍL.KI ITI.GAN UD.3.KÁM
(16) MU.24.KÁM mAr-tah-ša-as-su LUGAL KUR.KUR

(reverse) šu-pur mMa-a-ri-li-ti-
(left edge) un-qa mTá-[qíš-d ME-ME] / A šá mARAD-d MAŠ
(lower edge) [un-qa m50-MU-MU] / [A šá
(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 Iqîša-Bâbû and his brothers, sons of Lâbâši, and adjoining the arable land of Širiktî-Ninurta, son of Gula-šum-lišîr, and his brothers, the ... of Ninurta-nâdin, servant of Bagâdâtu, that is in the possession of Nanâ-idrî, the oblate, son of Bêlûnu—

(7–10) Mâri-liîti, servant of Bagâdâtu, [has received] that entire rental for the field for year 24 from Nanâ-idrî, son of Bêlûnu. It is paid in full.

(11–14) Witnesses: Enlîl-nâdin-šumi, son of Aqara; Nâdin, son of Enlîl-êpuš; Tattannu, son of Bêlûnu; Rême-šukun, son of Uballissu-Mardu; Iddîn-Enlîl, son of Ninurta-uballitî; Taqît-Gula, son of Arad-Ninurta.


(Reverse) Fingernail mark of Mâri-liîti.

(Left Edge) Ring of Ta[qîš-Gula], son of Arad-Ninurta. (Lower Edge) Ring of Tattannu / son of Bêlûnu. (Upper Edge) Ring of Nâdin, son of Enlîl-êpuš. Ring of Iddîn-Enlîl, son of Enlîl-uballît. Ring of Rême-šukun, son of [Uballissu]-Mardu.

5. É A.KAL: perhaps bît mîli for Ê A.MEŠ = bît mé, “waterlogged land” or “flooded land” (Cocquerillat Palmeraeas, 27).

6 etc. Cf. Nanâ-id-ri/Saḥ-ma- BE 9 20:5, 7, 10, 12, left edge (1/VIII/30 Artaxerxes I).


13 and lower edge. Tattannu/Bêlûnu: witness in BE 9 46f. (15/VI/36 Artaxerxes I) and 86a (——/—/40 Artaxerxes I). The seal impression, showing a grotesque composed of human and animal heads, closely resembles UE 10 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 BC)

1. išE.NUMUN1 zaq-pi u KA šul-pu GÚ ÍD Šal-la

2. GîŠ.BAN ma-la ḤA.LA šā mŠEŠ-MU mĎMAŞ-AD-ŪRU

3. u mĎMAŞ-ŠEŠ-ib(?)-ni A.<XMEŠ> šā mĎMU-a šā it-tî

4. LÚ.EN BAN-šù-nu a-na GîŠ.BAR a-na MU.JAN.NA1
(5) 7 GUR ZÛ.LUM.MA a-na m[ARAD]-d MAŠ A šá
(6) m[ARAD]-d En-lîl id-din ina ITI.DU₆ ZÛ.LUM.MA a
(7) 7 GUR ina GÎŠ ma-si-ḫu šá ku-l₅-ru-up¹-pu
(8) ina ḫa-ša-ri ina-an-din lib-bi u [a-ru-tut-tum]
(9) i-nam-šar¹ dul-lum šu-pal¹ [GÎŠ.] GIŠIMMAR²
   ip-pu-uš¹
(10) ku-um dul-lum ina lib-l₅-[šá] l₇-te-ep-šú
(11) 1 MA.NA KÙ.BABBAR i-[…]
   (lower edge)
(12) x x x […]-tum² i₇-x […]
(13) [x₃] QA ZÛ.LU[M.MA … mAR]-d MAŠ a-na É-kur ina-an-din
   (reverse)
(14) na-bal-kát-ta-[nu] [³] MA.NA KÙ.BABBAR ina-an-din
(15) KI 1 GUR tu-ḫal-la lîb-l₅-bi man-ga-ga u GUN šá ḫu-ša-ša ina-an-din
(16) LÛ.Ú.KIN₇, mdKÁ-SUR A šá mKa-šir
(17) mSU₇ En-lîl A šá mEN-šú-nu mdEN-e-ṭe-ru A šá
(18) mEN-šú-nu mRI-bat A šá mŠES-šú-nu mŠES.MEŠ-MU A šá
(19) mNa-šir mRI-bat A šá mTad-din-nu
(20) LÛ.ŠID mdMAŠ-ga-mil A šá mDu-um-muq EN.LÎL.KI
(21) ITI.NE UD.23.KÂM MU.2.KÂM
(22) [Da-ri⁻⁻⁻⁻ a-muš LUGAL KUR.KUR
   (left edge)  l₃-su-pur¹ mŠES-MU² u mdMAŠ-[AD]/-ÚRU
   (1–4) Arable land, including orchard and grain field, on the bank of the Šalla canal, a bow land, the whole of the share that Aḥ-iddin, Ninurta-ab-ussur and Ninurta-āḫḫē-ibni, sons of Iddina, hold with their co-proprietors—(4-6) he 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 kurupp measure, in 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 ... x₃ qû of dates .... (14) Anyone who violates (these terms) will pay ½ mina of silver. (15) With each gur (of dates) he (the tenant) will give tuḫallû-baskets, fronds, fibers, and a load of wood.
   (16–19) Witnesses: Bâbû-ṭetret, son of Kâṣir; Erîb-Enlil, son of Bêlšunu; Bêl-ṭērû, son of Bêlšunu; Rîbat, son of Aḥûšunu; Aḥḫē-iddin, son of Nāṣîr; Rîbat, son of Taddinnu.
   (Left Edge) Fingernail mark(s) of Aḥ-iddin and Ninurta-ab-ussur.

2. Cf. mŠEŠ-MÛ/mSUM-na-a Istanbul Murašû Texts No. 20:21 (15 VII/— Artaxerxes I).
17. Erîb-Enlil/Bêlšunu: Durand Textes babyloniennes pl. 49 AO 17636:18 (= Joannès Textes économiques, 64 No. 18) (witness, 13/III/10 Darius II).
20. Ninurta-gâmil/Dummuq: witness in BRM 1 86:13; scribe in JCS 40 147 and seven Murašû 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 BC)

(1) [...-da₅-k²-a ina ḫu-ṭd lib-bi-šú a-na mTat-
   ta[n-nu LÛ.IGI-DUB]
(2) [...] ki-a-am iq]-bi um-ma GÎŠ.BAR šá ra-
   qa-ra-na-i-…
(3) [... in]-du šá MU.31.KÂM mÂr-tak-šat-su
   LUGAL ma-[l₅/a² …]
(4) [... u]17 id-di-nu x un di x en-na-’u si’-i[t2-ii’ (...)]
(5) [... ] in-du a-na Ė LUGAL ú-sal-lam 1 LIM 6 ME 40 [GUR ŠE.BAR]
(6) [... ŠE.GIŠ.Î 1 ME 150 GUR GÍG.BA1 76 GUR bu-tu-ut-tum
(7) [... ] 3 (BÁN) sah-li-e 34² ar-da-bi ša su-un-mi-de-tum
(8) [... ] x Î.GIŠ 33 GUR 3 (PI) 3 (BÁN) 3 QA ka-si-ia
(9) vre-hi ša MU.30.KÁM1 mi-siš ina ITIL.GAN u ITI.AB a-nam-din u mi-siš
(10) ima ITI.SIG4 MU.32.KÁM it-ti in-di-ia a-nam-din um-Tat-tu-nu
(11) lLÚ.GIŠ-DUB1 is-me-e-šu-ma GIŠ.BAR a₄ lib-bu-ú in-di-šá id²-din²-šá?
(12) EBUR u sa-ah-ja-rí in-du ša MU.31.KÁM re-el-tum EBUR
(13) [šá MU.30].KÁM ina a-dan-ni-šá ina-an-din 1 en TA.AM TI-ú

(reverse)
(1’) [... E][N.LÍL.[KI]
(2’) [... ] KUR.KUR
(Left edge) [NA₄.KIŠIB’] / [...-DIN’]-iš
(upper edge) [N]A₄.KIŠIB / [m]E[N]-ÚRU-šu’t [...] x Bar-sip.KI // [...] / [...] x A x [...]}

(1–5) [PN, son of Mardu]ka², spoke of his own free will to Tatta[nnu, the mašennu official, ... ], as follows: ‘(Turn over to me) the rented property of ...., (for which) the assessment[ ... for year 31 of King Artaxerxes has not² been paid in the full¹ [...] and I will make full payment of the balance³ of the assessment to the royal estate. (5–9)

Of 1,640 [gur of barley], [x gur of] sesame, 150 gur of wheat, 76 gur of spelt³, [x]+3 sūtu of cressseed, 34² artabe of groats², x oil, 33 gur 3 pānu 3 sūtu 3 gū of kasā, (and?) the unpaid balance² for year 30², (9–10) I will pay half in months IX and X (sciil. of the current year, 31), and I will pay (the other) half in month III of year 32, along with the assessment made on me.

(10–11) Tattannu, the mašennu official, heard him and gave him the leased property on terms of an assessment (to be) made against him. (11–13) He (the tenant) will pay the cereals and the lesser crops, (including) the assessment for year thirty-one and the unpaid balance of the assessment for [year 30], at the time specified for him.

(13) Each took one copy (of this document).

(Reverse 1¹–2¹) [... ] Nippur, [month x, day y, year z, Artaxerxes, King of] Lands.
(Left Edge) [Seal of …]-uballi².
(Upper Edge) Seal of Bēl-ušuršu, the […] of Borsippa. [Seal of …] son [ of …].

1 and 10f. Tattannu, mašennu in years 24–37 of Artaxerxes I: see Stolper Entrepreneurs and Empire, p. 47.

2. raqraraqunu: perhaps a topographic term, seemingly a plural; perhaps a synonym or partial synonym of raqqu (indicating a field of low quality in Cyr. 99:5f., CT 56 77:6 and 697:8f., see Jursa Landwirtschaft, 165); or a place name connected with laqlaqqu, raqrarqqu, “stork”?

3. 5, 10, 12: indu, referring to an annual payment assessed in dates or cereal, as the word does here, is otherwise found only in NB texts from Urûk, and only in the spelling NIN-du. See CAD and Ahw. s.v. indu.

4. For in-di-x, perhaps e-i-te-ra⁴; en-na-‘perhaps for inna ‘idnam? But if so, syntax is unclear.

6f. buuttu: see Butz apud Stol On Trees, 22–24. Here, given the amount, probably the cereal (CAD B s.v. buuttu B) rather than the cereal product (“Grünkernmehl,” cf. CAD B s.v. buuttu C), and surely not pistachio nuts (Ahw. 145 s.v. buûnûlu/buuttu meaning 3). The words buuttu and summiðētu are otherwise known from comparable contexts only in texts from the Murašû archive.

In BE 10 9, groats are measured in conventional Babylonian units. On the Iranian loanword ardabu (cf. Ir. *ardaba-, corresponding to Aram. ṣrb dib, Demotic ṣrbd, Greek ἀρράβες, Achaemenid Elamite rîtiba etc.) see R. Schmitt, ‘“Méconnaissance” altiranischen Sprachgutes im Griechischen,” Glotta 49 (1971) 100–102; Hinz, Altiranisches Sprachgut der Neben-überlieferungen, 204. The word appears early in Achaemenid Babylonian, but it is surprisingly rare considering its
common use in Achaemenid Elamite administrative texts from Persepolis: *Camb.* 316 lists payments, apparently of flour (cf. [elat] 1 GUR 4 PI qé-me line 17, cf. line 15), in amounts between 12 and 231 a., totaling 424 a. In Achaemenid Elamite texts 1 irtiba = 30 QA²⁹; if the same ratio holds for Babylonian ardabu, the amount here is 34 × 30 = 1,020 qû = 5 ½ gur (5 GUR 3 PI 2 BÁN).

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 åullumu, “make good,” rather than nadΩnu, “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.

Similar conditions seem to lie behind a Muraåû text from the same year. *BE* 9 28 (=q 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 qΩtË) of an ustarbar-official, Zababa-iddin, acting for the estate; they are “in the possession” (ina pΩni) of Ninurta-nΩdin-åumi/Uballissu-Marduk; but the rent is actually paid by Enlil-åum-iddin/Muraåû. Ninurta-nΩdin-åumi appears in texts from the early attested years of the Muraåû archive, but otherwise always as a witness, never as an active party.³⁰ His brothers, Aḫi-nūri, 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 Muraåûs 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 Muraåû 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 Muraåûs 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 Uballissu-Marduk, still operating in the hands of his brother Iddin-Marduk in the early years of Darius II.³⁴


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.


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*, 103–6.
Of particular interest in No. 12 is the collocal-
tion of the royal estate (bīt šarrī) as the apparent
destination of payments and the mašennu as the
controlling authority. In the Murašū texts, officials
titled mašennu held authority over the opera-
tions of men entitled ša muḫḫī sūti ša ĪD 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 Murašūs. 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 Gen-
eral Contractors (fermiers généraux, General-
pächter) 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 Ištar” or
“of Šamašt,” the divine name plainly refers to a
corporate economic person, the temple estate
(makkūr Ištar, makkūr Šamašt), and the control-
ing institution is the temple, Eanna or Ebabbar.
The titles from fifth-century Nippur, however, do
not refer to gods and temples but to canals, not to
institutions but to geography.36 The canal names
in the title refer to the practical subdivision of ar-
able land into tracts sustained by particular water-
courses, and probably to the administrative subdi-
vision of the region as well.37 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” or 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 con-
trolling institution that corresponds to the temples
in the earlier texts that deal with large-scale con-
tracting.38 No. 12 suggests that the corporate per-
son at fifth-century Nippur that corresponded to
the god’s estate (makkūr DN) of the sixth-century
temple texts was the royal estate (bīt šarrī).39
And these suppositions further suggest that the “hi-
erarchy of farms” around fifth-century Nippur rep-
resented an adaptation, an extension or supercession,
and a secularization of the contract-

35. Entrepreneurs and Empire, pp. 40–45; van Driel,
JESHO 32 215–16 etc.
36. A comparable usage in sixth-century Uruk is ša muḫḫī
sūti ša muḫḫī Nār Piqûdu, TCL 13 150, see Kümmel Familie
105.
37. The same administrative geography is presumably re-
lected in the title “judge of the Sīn Canal (district),” fre-
quent in the Murašū texts (Entrepreneurs and Empire, pp.
40–41, with previous literature); cf. the “judge of the irri-
gation district Bīt Ukānu” (GARIN É Ukānu) ZA 79 96:19.
38. Istanbul Murašū Texts No. 9 implies that “royal trea-
sury land” (zēr nakkandu šarrī) otherwise controlled by agents
of the prince Manuššānu was held on contract (bīt sūti) by a
“General Contractor for the Sīn Canal” otherwise under the
mašennu. Istanbul Murašū Texts No. 40 implies that
Manuššānu had authority over the temple property (zēr Bēl)
that was under the oversight of a mašennu and “supervisor in
charge of the Sīn Canal” (pīḫātu ša anā muḫḫī Nār Sīn).
Entrepreneurs and Empire No. 59 implies that a member of
the mašennu’s staff (sepīru ša bīt mašennu) also worked for
Manuššānu. That is: the satrap’s son, Manuššānu, held au-
thority over mašennus; he held authority over the “royal trea-
sury” (bīt nakkandu šarrī); and “royal treasury” land was
held on contract by the mašennu’s subordinate.
39. Cf. BE 9 32a, in which a mašennu’s deputy authorizes
collection of rents from “all fields that are crown property”
(zēru gabbī makkūr šarrī; see Entrepreneurs and Empire, p.
48). Nevertheless, there was also a contemporary “temple
estate of Enlil” (makkūr Enlil) that rented out property. CBS
5481 (4/N/8 Artaxerxes II), a fragment of a lease from Nippur,
refers to property held “on lease, corresponding to (the terms
of) a lease from the estate of Enlil” (ana GIS.BAR [lib]-bu-
ū GIS.BAR ša NIG.GA 4Enlil, lines 5–6).
ing regimes developed in the sixth-century temples.\textsuperscript{40}

D. The King’s Man

13. \textit{A.} 34117 - (1N 2 84 = 1 NT 3)

10/1/13 Xerxes (1 May 473 BC)

(1) LÚ.ERÍN LUGAL šá 2 ITI.MEŠ šá ITI.GU\textsubscript{4}

(2) u ITI.SIG\textsubscript{4} šá mBA-šá-a u mTar-bi-ti-ia

(3) A.MEŠ šá mPa-qid-su-nu mdEn-lîl-SIPA-ú-a «KI»

(4) LÚ.ERÍN LUGAL šá 3 mEN-šú-nu LÚ.x šá EN.LÎL.KI

(5) uña SU\textsubscript{11} mBA-šá-a u mTar-bi-ti-ia A.MEŠ

(6) šá mPa-qid-su-nu ma-ṣhi-ir LÚ.ERÍN LUGAL md50-SIPA-ú-a

(7) ú-šá-az-sú-nu-ti-ia it-ti 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 DÌM(LUGAL+KÁM).ME md50-SIPA-ú-a

(11) na-šî

(reverse)

(12) LÚ.MU.KIN\textsubscript{7} mMu-še-zib-ð EN A šá mARAD-iá

(13) mdEn-lîl-ŠEŠ.MEŠ-MU A šá mARAD-iá

(14) mdMAS\textsubscript{7}.ŠEŠ-KÁM A šá mRî-mut

(15) mdMAS-ŠEŠ.MEŠ-MU A šá mKi-na-a

(16) mDINGIR-ka-ba\textsuperscript{1} ní-ZI-DÛ A šá 1 mLa-ba-šî

(17) mdEn-lîl-EN-a-nî LÚ.ŠID A šá

(18) mdEn-lîl-ŠEŠ.MEŠ-SU EN.1.LÎL.KI\textsubscript{1}

(19) ITI.BÁR UD.10.KÁM MU.13.KÁM

(upper edge)

(20) mḪi-šî' - 'ar-šá- ' LUGAL KUR.KUR

(left edge) su-pur md50-SIPA-ú-a

(1–3) The King’s Man for two months, (namely,) for months II and III, (an obligation) of IqÏåa and TarbÏtija, sons of PΩqissunu—(3–6) Enlil-rûúa, servant of Bêlšunu, the … of Nippur, has received (it) from Iqïša and Tarbitija, sons of Pâqissunnu. (6–9) Enlîl-rûúa will register them, (that is, their) King’s Man (service), with Bêlšunu to the credit of Iqîša and Tarbitija. (9–11) Enlîl-rûúa guarantees that no shortfall\textsuperscript{11} will be caused.

(12–16) Witnesses: Mušêzib-Bêl, son of Ardija; Enlîl-ał̄hê-iddin, son of Ardija; Ninurta-ał̄-êrîş, son of Rimût; Ninurta-ał̄hê-iddin, son of Kînâ; Ilkâ-bâni-napištî-ibni, son of Lâbâši.


3–7. Written over erasures.

4. Perhaps LÚ.\textsuperscript{1}NAM\textsuperscript{1} = pîhâtu, “governor,” over erasure, or LÚ.\textsuperscript{1}GAR\textsuperscript{1}nu\textsuperscript{1}, “foreman,” over erasure?

2f., 5f. The name Tarbitija, literally “My Foster Child,” and the patronym PΩqissunu, literally “Their Caretaker,” are extraordinary. I am not aware of other Neo- or Late Babylonian personal names compounded with tarbÏtu, “fosterling,” even though “foundling” names like S”qaja, “From the Street,” AbÏ-ul-idi, “Don’t Know my Father,” or Åa-pî-kalbi, “From a Dog’s Mouth,” are frequent. Names compounded with paqΩdu are also surprisingly rare, to judge from entries in Stamm Namengebung (none), Tallqvist \textit{NBN} (only the uncertain Pa’-qad-da-na Dar. 500:2), and Tallqvist \textit{APN} (only Adad-ip-qid [ADD App. 3 ii 19] and Ninurta-pa-qi-da-at, the latter not a person’s name but a scholarly gloss, both also cited in Tallqvist \textit{NBN} 328; otherwise, \textit{Ilî-pa-qi-di} \textit{CT} 48 13: 4, 7, 15, and Greengus \textit{Ishchali} 268 i 3. \textit{Ap-qid-Esu} Stolper \textit{Records of Deposit No.} 7:16, is perhaps an error for \textit{Ab-di}’). The nearest comparable items are mTar-PA-ti-bi A-[šá šá] mPa-qid-su-nu IM 55085:4f. (= 1N285, Nippur, 2/21 Xerxes; not year 13 as in OIP 78 76; recollated from cast), per-
haps 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 tartibī “you (fem.) replaced.”

6–9. M. Weszeli, “Eseleien, II” WZKM 87 (1997), 233-36 reviews discussion and disagreements over the interpretation of šuzzuzu-ma nadānu. 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 šuzzuzu-ma nadānu as a semantic unit, following Landsberger’s suggestion on this and similar verb-phrases compounded with nadānu (“Bemerkungen zu San Nicolò und Ungand, Neubabylonische Rechts- und Verwaltungsurkunden, Bd.1 1.2.,” 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 (piš la šakānu ša DIM.ME ša LÚ.ERÎN LUGAL ḫ 2 PN u PN2 našû TuM 2-3 183:15–16, collated by Joachim Oelsner) and a near-parallel in another Murašû text written by the same scribe (piš la šakānu ša me-KU-tú PN našû 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 (idi u šiditu ša 2 LÚ.ERÎN LUGAL, line 1; cf. idî u šiditu ša 2 LÚ.ERÎN LUGAL ... ša ina muḫḫi qašāti šuāṭi, 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 (šištipu u kunukku, line 9) from the foreman of the ḫaṭru-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 (šuzzuzu-ma nadānu, lines 14–15) with their foreman. As in No. 13, the clause piš la šakānu ša DIM.ME ... našû 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

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
Here, Cardascia (Murašā), 117–18) read pūt la šakānu ša țim-me ... našū. He understood țim-me as a spelling of the substantive țēmu. 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 sebūtu ša šarrī ... alāku, lines 11–12, cf. lines 15–16). The service was due from a share of a horse property that the Murašā family held by adoption (ana muḫḫi bît sīš mala zittika, line 13, cf. zittu ... ša ana marūtu ... ilqû u kullāta, lines 4–5).

Gadal-Jāma asks for a horse, clothing, arms and silver for provisions (kaspu ana șiddītu, lines 10–11, 15–16) for service at a royal call-up at Uruk. The text requires him to register something with the foreman of the ḫatrau-association in favor of Rimūt-Ninurta/Murašā (ṣuzzuzu-ma nadānu, lines 18–19), but what he is to register—whether receipt of the items or performance of the required service—is not explicit. The clause at issue, pūt la šakānu ... našū, 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 (Murašā, 180–81) read pūt la šakānu ša pi-qū-ud Gadal-Jāma našī. He translated “la responsabilité de ne pas présenter ce qui (lui) a été confié, Gadal-Jāma porte.” He commented that ša piqûd 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) = tēme in TuM 2–3 183:15 shows that pi-qū-ud is to be interpreted as Aram. piqquddā, “Gebot.” The most recent translation by Joannès and Beaulieu has “Gadaliama bears responsibility for presenting the equipment given to him,”42 evidently following Cardascia’s interpretation, but replacing the negative rendering of la šakānu with an affirmative counterpart.

Von Soden rejected both the reading ša tēme in TuM 2–3 183 and the reading ša piqûd in UCP 9/3 276. He offered alternative readings and translations that are nonsensical.43 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-ṭi(text KU)-tū PN našī, and translating “PN guarantees that no shortage will occur.”44

The CAD’s translation of the phrase as a negative guarantee is proper. The phrase pūt la šakānu

42. Francis Joannès, “Private Commerce and Banking in Achaemenid Babylonia,” trans. Paul-Alain Beaulieu, in Civili-

43. In TuM 2–3 183:15–16 pūt la šakānu NINDA DĪM ME ša ṑab-šarra-ā: “(they guarantee) that panngu(bread) will not be put away for the royal personnel” (“Seltene akkadische Wörter”, StOr 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. šapikku, cf. “Aramäische Wörter in neuassyrischen und neu-

44. CAD ȘI 451 s.v. **šapikku. The entry points to oc-
currences of the phrase miṯitu šakānu cited under miṯitu mng 1g. In normal Neo-Babylonian usage, miṯitu refers to short-
ages in measurable items (herds, crops, produce, materials, irrigation water, or accomplishment of measured work quotas), not to deficient behavior.
The signs DÌM.ME also occur in one other Murašû 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 (bît ešrû, bît ritti, lines 9–10 and 19–20). The rented items also include zêrû ša šumêli ša ÍD GN u 3-ta DÌM.ME. MEŠ ša ina inni ša ÍD GN elat zêrû ša mê ultu ÍD GN₂ išattû “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 Enûl Canal” (lines 11–13 and 21–23, collated by Joachim Oelsner). The dictionaries, following a conjecture of Meissner, cite this passage under makûtû, “pole, beam (of a waterlift).” But in the context a topographic feature, something in contrasting parallel to zêrû, “arable land,” is expected, as Cardascia observed. 46 This passage probably refers to “plots irrigated by waterlift,” with makûtû (DÌM.ME) for *bît makîtû, like dûlu, “bucket,” above No. 6:4, for bît dâlî, “plot irrigated with

---

45. The example that Cardascia gave to show the equivalence of negative and affirmative guarantees (Murašû, 35) is erroneous. The guarantee in BE 10 77:8 is not pût la-a SE.BAR ... naši, “porte la responsabilité, (si) l’orge n’est pas (payé),” but pût ejûr (KAR’ îṭṭati ... naši, “guarantees payment of the barley.” It is true that negative guarantees may take either negative form (pût la x naši, “guarantee that x will not occur”) or non-negative form (pût x naši, “guarantee against x”): e.g., pût la sêhû la pâqrûnû našû “guarantee that there will be no legitimate or illegitimate claimant (to the slave)“ = pût sêhû la pâqrûnû našû “guarantee against legitimate or illegitimate claimants (examples in CAD s.vv. arad-šarrûtu, mûrânûtu, sêhû); pût la epûšu ša pisku našû “guarantee that no p. will be done” YBC 11 560:5 = pût pisku našû “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, “No Harm Done: Late Achaemenid pišku Guarantees.” Pp. 467–77 in

46. Meissner, Babyloniun und Assyricon, Kulturgeschichtliches Bibliothek I.3 (Heidelberg: Carl Winter, 1920), I, 192, AHw. 591 s.v. makûṭû mng 3, with query, cf. von Soden, BiOr 11 207; CAD M/1 143; Cardascia Murašû 130.
drawn water” (*BE* 7:10). The uncertain reading of DÌM.ME as *makātu* in *BE* 9:45 suggests a way to account for the likely equivalence between DÌM.ME in No. 13 and *TuM* 2-3 183 and *me-KU-tú* in UCP 9/3 276: perhaps the equivalence DÌM.ME = *me-KU-tú* arises from near-homophony between makātu (DÌM.ME), “pole,” and mēkātu, “lack, deficiency.” In that case, šakānu ša mēkātu would mean something close to the CAD’s suggestion, “cause a deficiency (i.e., in the number of men or length of service).”

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. Even so, however the writing is to be explained, the form and meaning of the word in question are corroborated by an earlier Achaemenid receipt: “silver for the deficit owed to the office of the overseers(?) for fifty men who did not work with the *cipû* officials for three months at the palace at GN” (*YOS* 7 166:5 (Uruk, 18/XII/4 Cambyses)).

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 Muraš texts, šāb šarrī refers mostly to payments. The wording of some receipts implies that the payments were understood to replace service, but only two texts use the term...
for the men serving.\textsuperscript{53} In other texts from the period between Xerxes and Alexander, the term \textit{sāb šarrī} itself is scarce, perhaps absent.\textsuperscript{54} In Neo-Babylonian and earlier Achaemenid texts, \textit{sāb šarrī} regularly refers to men performing the service. In texts where money was paid or owed to or for a \textit{sāb 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.\textsuperscript{55} Proprietors sometimes turned to suppliers of credit to underwrite the cost of service. The money was the cost of equipment (\textit{rikīs qabli}) or provisions (\textit{idī u šidītu}) 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 \textit{x kaspu ša C ina muḫḫīḫī 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 \textit{x kaspu KM sāb šarrī ša P ina qāṭī C maḫīr ana muḫḫīḫī 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 \textit{idī} included the money paid for outfitting a man, but from the crown’s point of view the money did not replace the man.\textsuperscript{56}

\textsuperscript{21} 76:17, 188:1, cf. [sātu] gamrī kūm sāb 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 \textit{TuM} 2–3 183, only \textit{BE} 9 50:4, where the twenty-five \textit{sāb šarrī} tendered with rent are probably men, not unspecified units of an unspecified commodity (despite \textit{CAD} \textit{S} s.v. \textit{sāb šarrī} mgg. 2 and \textit{Entrepreneurs and Empire}, p. 62). Other Murašu texts that refer to active service do not use the term \textit{sāb 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 \textit{Murašu}, 40, 99, 174–75; \textit{Entrepreneurs and Empire}, p. 123; Joannes \textit{Textes économiques}, 19; and add \textit{Istanbul Murušu 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 LÜ.\textit{ERIN LUGAL} ina \textit{Barsipa}.

55. On the existence of pre-Achaemenid tenancies of this kind, see Jursa, \textit{Der Tempelzehnt in Babylonien}, AOAT 254 (Kevelaer and Neukirchen-Vluyn: Butzon & Bercker and Neukirchener Verlag, 1998), 13–18; “Bogenland schon unter Nebukadnezar II.,” \textit{NABU} 1998/124; \textit{Bēl-rēmanni} 105. Jursa (ibid., 103–4, 109–10) corroborates and amplifies other observations (e.g., van Driel, \textit{JESHO} 32 207; Stolper, “Late Achaemenid Legal Texts from Uruk and Larsa,” \textit{Bagh. Mitt.} 21 [1990] 583; Beaulieu and Stolper, “Two More Late Achaemenid Texts from Uruk,” \textit{NABU} 1995/77) 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.

56. Despite Oppenheim, “Studies in Akkadian Lexicography, II,” \textit{Or.} NS 14 [1945] 239–40, reflected in \textit{CAD} \textit{S} s.v. \textit{sāb šarrī} mgg 2. The text \textit{Iraq} 59 128 No. 47 is a receipt for silver paid as part of a man’s fiscal obligations (\textit{kaspu ša ilī ša PN}, lines 1–2), for outfitting a King’s Man to serve for him (\textit{kaspu rikū qalīšī ša PN}, \textit{sāb šarrī}, 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 (\textit{kaspu ša ana rikissī qalīšī ša sāb šarrī nadnu}, “(promissory note for) silver that was given (i.e., by the creditor) for outfitting King’s Men.” \textit{Nbn.} 103:15, see Wunsch \textit{Iddin-Marduk} No. 112, kaspu rikū qalīšī ša PN sāb šarrī ša PN, “(receipt for) silver (for) outfitting PN, the King’s Man of (i.e., serving for) PN,” \textit{Dar.} 481:3. Others refer elliptically to silver paid to the King’s Man (\textit{kaspu ša ana sāb šarrīšī ina muḫḫīšu iddinu “(promissory note for) silver that he (the creditor) paid to his (the debtor’s) King’s Men on his (the debtor’s) behalf”}. \textit{AnOr} 9 14:13–15, see Beaulieu, “A Finger in Every Pies: The Institutional Connections of a Family of Entrepreneurs in Neo-Babylonian Larsa,” in \textit{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 \textit{CAD} \textit{S} s.v. \textit{sāb šarrī} mgg. 2, do not support the interpretation “tax.” For \textit{Strassmaier 9e Congrès International} No. 13, see van Driel, \textit{JESHO} 32 210 and Wunsch \textit{Iddin-Marduk} No. 85; for the problematic Camb. 13, see Joannes \textit{Textes économiques} 19. M. Streck, \textit{Zahl und Zeit}, Cuneiform Monographs 5 (Groningen: Styx, 1995), 139, Weszeli, “Eseleien,” \textit{WZKM} 86 (1996) 473. For \textit{TCL} 9 125 and \textit{TuM} 2–3 242, see below.
The relationship between the proprietor and his King’s Man, whether it was only contractual or a relationship of kinship or of patronage and clientage, could endure for many years.57 In the uses of the term šāb šarrī, the nuance of active service is constant throughout Neo-Babylonian and Achaemenid texts, but the nuance of payment instead of service is isolated in the Murašû texts, perhaps because the practice of commuting service to payment became common only in late Achaemenid reigns.58 In this respect the King’s Man seems to differ from the obligation and service that Neo-Babylonian and early Achaemenid texts label as “bow” (qaltu, GIŠ.BAN) or “bowman” (ša qalti, LÚ.BAN), terms that indicate both payment and service.59

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. Iqīša and Tarbitija completed two months of compulsory service under an official of Nippur. A subordinate of the official, Enlil-rēša, 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 naddānu is the item and amount paid. In No. 13:7–9, however, the phrase has two objects: not only šāb šarrī, “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 “3½ mina of silver” (corresponding to a phrase like kaspū 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 šarrī or a list summarized as šābi šarrī.

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.ERÍN LUGAL ša ITI.BAR u ITI.GU.u (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 Tarbitija and Iqīša were to be recorded in entries like this.

Another interpretation of TuM 2–3 242 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.ERÍN.(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.60 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.

57. Van Driel, JESHO 32 212, on Dur. 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 Murašûs, Enlil-šum-iddin, and therefore the uncle by adoption of the man who provided the equipment, supplies and money for his service, Rimūt-Ninurta/Murašû. (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 šuzzuzu) of a man to perform royal service (palāḥ šarrī) as if he were a co-proprietor (aktu kinattatu), the term of the contract being indefinite (for the full year from 15/N/5 to 15/N/6 τuppī u τuppī “[and] until further notice”).
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 Iqīša and Tarbītja 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.

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 a letter, probably from the Egibi archive, to troops who are “written down with you.” Second, men who performed the service were registered in lists of the kind represented by *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 ūmi of Babylon in texts from earlier reigns.

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:

\[
\text{ina šatti} \frac{1}{4} \text{mana ina qāt } \text{PN išima ana } \text{PN}_2 \text{ u [PN]}_3 \]  
\text{LÚ.ERÍN LUGAL-ši } \text{ša izzizz } \text{idin ina qātšumu la tumaššar mamma } \text{pirku ittišu la idabbub u minmušu ana pirki la inašši amur } \frac{1}{4} \text{mana kaspu ana } \text{LÚ.ERÍN LUGAL-šu [i]din}
\]

61. Michael Kozuh draws my attention to comparable administrative texts from the Ebabbar archive. *CT* 56 566 lists groups of four or five men, identified as agnates, each group ending “total x bowmen”; these are perhaps familyunits which were to provide a single bowman each. *CT* 56 481 + (Jursa *Landwirtschaft* 8) is a list of temple farmhands, organized in families identified as working parties, each under a “plow master” (*rab epinni*); the summary, in addition to totals by age category includes an entry for seventeen “bowmen,” evidently indicating men on active service. Wunsch describes comparable “Musterungslisten” in the Babylon collections, perhaps connected with the Egibi archive (Wunsch, in *Interdependence of Institutions and Private Entrepreneurs*, 113).

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 Men. 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 sīši u tašlišānika ittika šatru CT 22 74:7; see n. 66, below.

64. Ibid., 114.
(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 PN and [PN], the King’s Man who served for him, do not let it get away from them, no one 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

A letter from Babylon expresses similar concerns in the similar terms:

u mārī sīsi taššīšāni u LÚ.ERÍN.MEŠ LUGAL!? (copy: DUMU DÛ.MEŠ) ina qāṭēšu la tumaššarpirki ana rab dāri iti șābijā la idabbub

65. TCL 9 125:10–24, from Šum-ukīn, perhaps the General Contractor (ša mēlī sūtī) of that name, to Nabû-šar-usur, perhaps the Royal Commissioner in Eanna (ša rēš šarrī bēl piqittī) of that name; if so, from the reign of Nabonidus.

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 Iqiša and Tarbitija were credited with the time they served and that someone else was liable if they were not credited.

66. CT 22 74:18–22, from Gūzānu, perhaps the governor (šakin ēmi) of Babylon of that name, to Åirku, perhaps the homonymous member of the Egibi family, otherwise called Marduk-nāṣir-apli (Wunsch, in Interdependency of Institutions and Private Entrepreneurs, 114); see Ebeling Neubab. Briefe No. 74, A. Leo Oppenheim, Letters from Mesopotamia (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1967), 143; Joannès 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.

---

**Personal Names**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Father</th>
<th>Mother</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abdā’ (Ab-da-’), rē ’ū, svt. of Ribat</td>
<td>5:10, rev.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addu-iddin (نم–MU)</td>
<td>s. of Ninurta-nādin: 7:17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aḫḫē-iddin (ŠES.MEŠ-MU)</td>
<td>1) s. of Nāṣir: 11:18</td>
<td>2) 6:5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aḫḫē-utīr (ŠES.MEŠ-GUR)</td>
<td>s. of Ninurta-uballiṭ: 3:12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aḫ-iddin (ŠES-MU)</td>
<td>1) f. of Enlil-ṣuppultä-usur: 8:7</td>
<td>2) 11:2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aḫu-ši-ia-x-x: 9:8’, ri. ed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aḫušumu (ŠES-šu-nu)</td>
<td>1) svt. of İddin-Bēl: 1:6</td>
<td>2) f. of Bēlšumu: 3:12</td>
<td>3) f. of Ribat: 11:18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ana-Bēl-ērēš (Ana-EN-lKÁM1, Ana-EN-APIN-eš)</td>
<td>s. of [ ... ]: 9:3’, rev.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aqara (KAL-a)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2) f. of Enlil-ahhe-iddin: 13:13
3) f. of Mušṣib-Bēl: 13:12
Artāḫšassu (Ar-taḥ-sā-as-su, Ar-taḥ-sa-su, Ār-taḵ-sat-su): 1:19, 2:18, 3:16, 10:1, 16: 12:3
Arzā' (Ar-za'-) in GN Bīt Arzā': 1:18
Attar-dannt (Attar-dan-na-at, Attar-dan-na-tum) svt. of Nabū-dīlim: 9:2, 8, 11
Bēbu-erōre (EN-KĀ) s. of Kāṣir: 7:14, 11:14
Bagēdātu' (EN-BA-gē-da-tu): 10:6, 8
Balātu (DIN) s. of Enlil-kāṣir: 7:15
Banīja (Ba-nī-ia) s. of Barīk-Il: 6:21
Barīk-Il (Barīk-DINGIR.MEŚ) f. of Banīja: 6:21
Bassīja (Ba-[as]-si-ia) f. of Bēl-uššālim: 1:4
Bēl-bullīssu (EN-bul-li-su, EN-DIN-su)
1) s. of Iddin-Nabû: 4:2, 3, 82) f. of Ea-iddin: 9:5
Bēl-erēš (EN-KĀM), šaknu of Nippur, s. of Silim-Il: 7:2, 8, up. ed.
Bēl-erība (EN-SU) f. of Marduk-šum-ibni: 9:7
Bēl-etēru (EN-e-tē-ru) f. of Bēlšunu: 11:17
Bēl-iddin (EN-MU) s. of Bēlšunu: 9:9
Bēl-īqīša (EN-BA-ša) f. of Ēṭīr-Marduk: 9:7
Bēlšunu (EN-šá-šu)
1) LŪ.x of Nippur: 13:4, 7
2) s. of Aḫušumu: 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-āh-ittannu: 7:13, le. ed.
7) f. of Ērība-Enlil: 11:17
8) f. of Nanā-iddī: 10:7, 9
9) f. of Ninurta-iddin: 10:15
10) f. of Nīshr-Enlil: 2:16
11) f. of Tattannu: 10:13, lo. ed.
Bēl-uβallītu (EN-DIN-i-it): 6:3
Bēl-uṣur (EN-u-šur) f. of Bēl-zēr-lišir: 9:6
Bēl-uṣsuru (EN-URU-su): 12 up. ed.
Bēl-uššālim (EN-GI)
1) s. of Bassīja: 1:4, le. ed.
2) tupsarru, s. of Taḫnēr: 4:19
3) f. of Taḫhītu: 9:4
Bēl-zēr-lišir (EN-NUMUN-GIŠ) s. of Bēl-uṣur: 9:6
Dummuq (Du-um-muq) f. of Ninurta-gāmil: 11:20
Ea-iddin (EN-MU) s. of Bēl-bullīssu: 9:5', le. ed.
Enlil-ahhe-erība (EN-līl-ŠEŠ.MEŠ-SU) f. of Enlil-bēlānī: 13:18
Enlil-ahhe-iddin (EN-līl-ŠEŠ.MEŠ-MU) s. of Ardīja: 13:13
Enlil-bēlānī (EN-līl-EN-a-ni), tupsarru, s. of Enlil-ahhe-erība: 13:17
Enlil-hātin (EN-līl-ḫa-tin) mas. of Iltammeš-dīnī: 4:6
Enlil-iddin (EN-līl-MU) s. of Enlil-kīšir: 3:13
Enlil-ipuš (EN-līl-DŪ-uš, 50-DŪ-uš) f. of Nādin: 10:12, up. ed.
Enlil-kāṣir (EN-līl-KĀD) f. of Balātu: 7:15
Enlil-kīšir (EN-līl-ki-šir) f. of Enlil-iddin: 3:13
Enlil-nādin-šumi (EN-līl-na-din-MU) s. of Agara: 10:12, [lo. ed.]
Enlil-rē'ūa (EN-līl-SIPA-ū-a, 50-SIPA-ū-a) svt. of Bēlšunu: 13: 3, 6, 10, le. ed.
Enlil-šum-iddin (EN-līl-MU-MU)
1) s. of Lībūt: 3:7, 9?
2) s. of Mūrašu: 2:2, 3:2, 6:1, 2, 12, 25
Enlil-šum-lišir (EN-līl-MU-liš-su, 50-MU-liš-su) s. of Nādin: 7:11, rev.
Enlil-uppultaš-ūasur (EN-līl-SIG-š-ÂR-U) s. of Ah-iddin: 8:7
Enlil-zēr-ibni (EN-līl-NUNUM-DŪ), šušānu: 8:2
Ērība-Enlil (SU-līl-līl) s. of Bēlšunu: 11:17
Ēṭīr-Marduk (KA-AMAR.UTU) s. of Bēl-īqīša: 9:7', up. ed.
Gula-šum-lišir (ME.ME-MU-GIŠ) f. of Šīrīkti-Ninurta: 10:4
Ḥannīja (Ḫa-an-nī-ia) s. of Iddin-Bēl: 1:5, 2:4, ri. ed.
Ḫātin (Ḫa-tin) f. of Mūrašu: 1:2
Iddina (MU-a, SUM.NA-a)
1) ša bit gabutti: 8:4
2) f. of Arad-Enlil: 1:3, 2:2
3) f. of Ninurta-ahhê-ibni: 11:3

Iddin-Bêl (MU-d.EN)
1) s. of Nabû-ah-[…]: 9:7'
2) s. of x-x-x-im: 1:14
3) s. of […]: 9:6'
4) f. of Ḫannija, mas. of Aḫušumu: 1:5, 6, 8'; 2:4, 10

Iddin-Enlil (MU-d.În-lîl)
1) s. of Īqiša: 2:15
2) s. of Ninurta-uballit: 10:14
3) f. of Arad-Enlil: 6:24

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

Iddin-Nabû (MU-d.AG) f. of Bêl-bullissu: 4:2, 8

Ilka-bani7-napišti-ibni (DINGIR-ka-ba-7-ni-ZI-DÛ) s. of Lábaši: 13:16

Ittameš-dinî (Ît-tam-mes-di-i-ni) sv. of Enlîl-ḫâtin: 4:5, 9, 12

Ina-tēšē-ētur (SÛH-SUR) s. of Ninurta-lē-â: 7:14

Īqiša (BA-sâ-a)
1) br. of Tarbitija, s. of Pâqissunu: 13:2, 5, 8
2) f. of Iddin-Enlil: 2:15

Īqiša-Âbâ (BA-sâ-d.KÁ) s. of Lábaši: 10:3


Itti-Marduk-balâtu (KL-d.AMAR.UTU-DIN) s. of […]: 9:5'

Kāšir (Ka-šîr)
1) f. of Bâbu-ētur: 7:15, 11:16
2) f. of Ribat: 2:13
3) f. of Silîm-Iî: 2:11
4) f. of Šum-iddin: 6:23

Kîdîn (Ki-dîn) f. of Lâbâši: 7:14, rev.

Ki-nâ (Ki-na-a) f. of Ninurta-ahhê-iddin: 13:15

Lâbâši (La-ba-šî)
1) s. of Kîdîn: 7:13, rev.
2) f. of Ilka-bani7-napišti-ibni: 13:16
3) f. of Īqiša-Âbâ: 10:3

Libluḫ (LIB-lût)
1) s. of x-at: 9:9'
2) f. of Enlîl-šum-iddin: 3:8

Lu-iddia (Lu-[i-di-ia]) f. of Ninurta-â-aha7-bîtîšu7: 7 lo. ed.

Mannu-Enlîl-dârî (A.BA-d.50-da-ri) gf. of Aqara, f. of Nâdîn: 7:12

Marduk-iddîn (d.SÛ-MU) s. of [x]: 7:15

Marduk-x-iddîn (d.AMAR.UTU-x-MU) f. of Nabû-nâdi-im: 9:4'

Marduk-šum-imnî (d.AMAR.UTU-MU-DÛ) s. of Bêl-erîba: 9:7, 10, [13]


Minû-ana-Bêl-dânu (Mi-nu-â-na-d.AMAR.UTU-d-nu) s. of Tahhûa: 9:1, [1'], 11', le. ed.

Mukîn-apli (DU-A) s. of Ninurta-nâṣîr: 7:17

Murašû (Mu-ra-šû-û) s. of Háttin, f. of Enlîl-šum-iddîn: 1:2, 2:2, 3:3, 6:2

Mušêzib-Bêl (Mu-šê-zib-d.EN) s. of Ardîja: 13:1

Mutîr7-[x]-a-ah-iddîn (Mu-tîr7-x-SE-SM-MU) f. of Ninurta-aḥ-iddîn: 8:5

Nabû-ah-[…] (d.AG-ŠE-Š-[x]) f. of Iddin-Bêl: 9:7'


Nabû-întannu (d.AG-it-tan-û) f. of Ninurta-nâṣîr: 2:14

Nabû-kišîr (d.AG-ki-šîr) f. of Arad-Ninurta: 3:2

Nabû-nâdi-im (d.AG-na-din-ŠE) s. of Marduk-x-iddîn: 9:4'

Nabû-uṣûrû (d.AG-ŪR-U-Šû), ṯupšarru, s. of Nabû-uṣežib: 9:10', up. ed.

Nabû-ušežib (d.AG-û-še-zib) f. of Nabû-uṣûrû: 9:10'

Nâdîn (Na-dîn)
1) s. of Enlîl-îpušt: 10:12, up. ed.
2) s. of Mannu-Enlîl-dârî, f. of Aqara: 7:12
3) f. of Enlîl-šum-liîbir: 7:11, rev.

Nanû-bullûtinînînî (d.Nanû-DIN-it-nin-ni) dau. of Attar-dannat: 9:4, 8, 11

Nânû-idri7 (d.Na-na-id-ri7), širku7, s. of Bêlšumu: 10:6, 9

Nâṣîr (Na-šîr) f. of Aḥhê-iddîn: 11:19

Ninurta-ab-ûsrû (d.MAŠ-AD-ŪRU): 11:2, le. ed.

Ninurta7-aḫ-ērēš (d.MAŠ7-ŠEŠ-KÂM) s. of Kînûr: 13:14

Ninurta-aḥhê-ibni7 (d.MAŠ-ŠEŠ.MEŠ-ib7-ni) s. of Iddîna: 11:3

Ninurta-aḥhê-iddîn (d.MAŠ-ŠEŠ.MEŠ-MU) s. of Kînû: 13:15
Ninurta-ah-iddin (.postMessage(MAS-ŠEŠ-MU)) s. of Mut[i̱r²-x]-x-ah-iddin: 8:5
Ninurta-ana²-bitišu² (.postMessage(MAS²-ana²-É²-šú)) s. of Luidija: 7 lo. ed.
Ninurta-éreš² (.postMessage(MAS-KÂM)) s. of ²x-x: 8:7
Ninurta-éqir (.postMessage(MAS-SUR)) s. of Šamaš-ah-iddin: 6:23
Ninurta-gamil (.postMessage(MAS-ga-mil)) 1) šandabakku: 8:3
2) ṭupšarru, s. of Dummuaq: 11:20
Ninurta-iddin (.postMessage(MAS-MU)) 1) s. of Arad-Ninurta: 2:12
2) ṭupšarru, s. of Bēlšunu: 10:15
Ninurta-êreš (.postMessage(MAS-DA)) f. of Ina-tešé-êqir: 7:14
Ninurta-mušētiq-uddē (.postMessage(MAS-mušētiq-uddē)) s. of Ribat: 3:14
Ninurta-mutirri-gimilli (.postMessage(MAS-mušētiq-uddē)) s. of Enlil-ummiddin: 6:1, le. ed.
Ninurta-nādin (.postMessage(MAS-na-din)) 1) svt. of Baṣṣādana: 10:5
2) f. of Addu-iddin: 7:18
Ninurta-nādin-šumi (.postMessage(MAS-na-din-MU)) s. of Ubalissu-Marduk: 6:22
Ninurta-nāsir (.postMessage(MAS-PAP)) 1) s. of Nabû-ittannu: 2:14
2) f. of Mukin-apli: 7:17
Ninurta-uballit (.postMessage(MAS-DIN-ij)) 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 Ribat: 3:4
Niqud (NetMessage(Ni-qud)) f. of Ribat: 6:21
Nisḫur-Enlil (NetMessage(Ni-isḫur-En-lil)), ṭupšarru, s. of Bēlšunu: 2:16
Nusku-iddin (NetMessage(ENŠADA-MU)), ṭupšarru, s. of Arad-Gula: 6:26
Pāqissunu (NetMessage(Pa-qid-su-nu)), f. of Iqiṣa and Tarbitija: 13:3, 6
Qarḫunu (NetMessage(Qar-ḫa-nu, Qar-ḫa-an-ni)) svt. of Enlil-šumu-iddin: 6:1, le. ed.
Ribat (NetMessage(Ri-bat, Ri-ba-a-tú)) 1) s. of Aḫḫēunu: 11:18
2) svt. of Rimūt-Ninurta, mas. of Abdá, s. of Bēl-eriba: 5:8, 11
3) s. of Kāṣir: 2:13
4) s. of Ninurta-uballit: 3:3
5) s. of Niqud: 6:21
6) s. of Taddinnu: 11:19
7) f. of Ninurta-mušētiq-uddē: 3:15
Rimūt (NetMessage(Ri-mašu)) f. of Ninurta-ē-ah-ēreš: 13:14
Rimūt-Ninurta (NetMessage(Ri-mašu-MAS)) mas. of Ribat: 5:9
Silim-Il (NetMessage(Si-lim-širum)) f. of Bēl-ēreš: 7:3, up. ed.
Sūqaja (NetMessage(SI-l-a-a)) s. of […]: 9:8', up. ed.
Šamaš-ah-iddin (NetMessage(UTU-ŠEŠ-MU)) s. of Ninurta-ēqir: 6:22
Šamaš-erība (NetMessage(UTU-SU)) f. of […]: 1:17
Širikti-Ninurta (NetMessage(Ri-tim-MAS)) s. of Gula-šum-lišir: 10:4
Šum-iddin (NetMessage(MU-MU)) s. of Kāṣir: 6:23
Tabnēa (NetMessage(Ta-bn-e-a)) f. of Bēl-ušallim: 4:19
Taddinnu (NetMessage(Ta-din-nu)) f. of Ribat: 11:19
Taḥḫūa (NetMessage(Taḫḫu-î-a)), seปịrû, s. of Bēl-ušallim: 9:3
Taqiš-Gula (NetMessage(Ta-qiš-ME.ME)) s. of Arad-Ninurta: 10:14, le. ed.
Tarbitija (NetMessage(Ta-bi-ii-ia)), br. of Iqiṣa, s. of Pāqissunu: 13:2, 5, 8
Tattannu (NetMessage(Ta-tan-nu)) 1) mašenna: 12:1, 10
2) s. of Bēlšunu: 10:13, lo. ed.
3) s. of Ubār: 7:16
Taḫbat-gabbi-x (NetMessage(Taḫbat-gabbi-[x])) in GN Bīt Taḫbat-gabbi-x: 7:2
Ubalissu-Marduk (NetMessage(DIN-su-MAR.UTU, Ù-bal-liš-su-MU)) 1) f. of Iddin-Marduk: 7:6
2) f. of Ninurta-nādin-šumi: 6:22
3) f. of Rēme-šukun: 10:13, up. ed.  
*Ubār* (Ú-bar) f. of Tattannu: 7:16  
*Uktiti* (Ú-kit-it): 6:3  
*Upāhḫir-Enlil* (NIGÍN-În-lîl) f. of Arad-Ninurta: 7:19  
x-at, f. of Liblūt: 9:9’  
[*...-du]kî-a: 12:1  
x-În-lîl: 4:17  
x-x-x-ḫu-łu-ú-nu: 6 up. ed.

**Place Names**

*Bīt Arzā’* (URU É mAr-zâ’): 1:18  
*Bīt Minû-ana-Bēl-dānu* (URU É mMi-nu-[ú-a-na]- ÎN-da-nu): 9:11’  
*Bīt Ṭabat-gabbi-x* (URU É mṬa-bat-gab-bi-[x]): 7:2  

*Ekur* (É-kur): 11:13  
*Nārû-eššetu* (URU ÍD eš-šē-tum): 7:2  

**Canal Names**

*Kasal’* (ĪD Ka-sal): 6:4, 5  
*Nār Ṣaḥīdu* (ĪD Ṣa-ḥī-du): 6:6  
*Nār Ṣal-la* (ĪD Šal-la): 11:1  
*Nār Sappuṭtu* (ĪD Sap-UTU): 8:1  
*Nāru eššetu* (ĪD eš-šē-tum) in GN Nāru-eššetu: 7:2

**Words Discussed**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ardābu</td>
<td>to No. 12:6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bīt nakkan-du ša šarri</td>
<td>to No. 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bīt šarri</td>
<td>to No. 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>buṭantu</td>
<td>to No. 12:6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DĪM.ME</td>
<td>to No. 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ŭ A.KAL</td>
<td>to No. 10:5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ḫarrānu</td>
<td>to No. 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ḫar-šaši-tu</td>
<td>to No. 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>indu</td>
<td>to No. 12:3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>makkûr Enlil</td>
<td>to No. 12, n. 39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>makātu</td>
<td>to No. 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mākātu, mēkātu</td>
<td>to No. 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mašēnu</td>
<td>to No. 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>me-KU-tu</td>
<td>to No. 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pa ūṣu</td>
<td>to No. 7:1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>rab ummu</td>
<td>to No. 9:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>raqaraqānu</td>
<td>to No. 12:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rikis qabli</td>
<td>to No. 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sissinmu</td>
<td>to No. 8:11f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>šāb šarri</td>
<td>to No. 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>šaknu ša Nippur</td>
<td>to No. 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>šandabakkû</td>
<td>to Nos. 7, 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>šuzzzuzu-ma nadānu</td>
<td>to No. 13:6f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ūppu (ša t.-šu)</td>
<td>to No. 9:5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ummu</td>
<td>to No. 9:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ūṣuūzu</td>
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