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## EDITORIAL PREFACE.

In addition to the tablets dated in the reigns of kings of the first dynasty of Babylon, there have been included by Dr. Poebel in the present work nine cuneiform texts bearing the names of Rim-Sin and Wardi-Sin, of Larsam, which with several hundred others excavated in Nippur will constitute Volume V of Series A. Upon his application Dr. Poebel had likewise been entrusted with the publication of this volume, but unfortunately found it later impossible to carry out his original plans. In order to express their appreciation of Dr. Poebel's work done while in Philadelphia, the Committee granted him permission to include in the present publication the nine tablets referred to, reserving for themselves, however, the right of republishing them in the proper volume.

February 18, 1909.
H. V. Hilprecht.

## PREFACE.

The present book has grown out of a dissertation presented in 1906 by the writer to the Faculty of Philosophy of the University of Pennsylvania, as a candidate for the degree of Ph.D., under the original title: Sechsundzwanzig Altbabylonische Rechtsurkunden aus der Zeit Hammurabis und Ammizadugas in Umschrift, Uebersetzung und Kommentar, mit 8 Kopien. Since it had been determined that the thesis should form the basis for a volume of The Babylonian Expedition of the University of Pennsylvania, I have considerably enlarged the work, the original portion of which, in the main, forms the contents of Chapter II of the present volume.

The autograph copies have been made in Philadelphia and in Constantinople in the years 1906 and 1907. In the winter of 1907-08 I collated a large number of tablets in the Berlin Museum, which I made use of in the list of date-formulas. Unfortunately my time did not allow me to complete this undertaking, nor did I, as was my purpose, have an opportunity to collate the date-formulas on tablets in the British Museum, which undoubtedly would have yielded important results. The manuscript of this volume had been completed and delivered to the Editor in May, 1908; but owing to the fact that not only the writer, but also the Editor and the Committee were absent from Philadelphia during the summer months, the printing could not begin before November, 1908.

It is a pleasant duty for me to publicly acknowledge here my heartiest thanks to those who have taken a kind interest in my studies, and who have supported me in the difficult and wearisome researches, a fruit of which is this work. I name especially the late Mr. Julius von Eichel-Streiber in Eisenach, Mr. Friedrich Georg von Eichel-Streiber in Eisenach, the Grossherzoglich Saechsische Staatsministerium, Departement des Kultus, and the Provost of the University of Pennsylvania, Dr. C. C. Harrison, the founder of the Harrison Research Fellowship, the occupancy of which I have greatly enjoyed.

My sincere thanks are due also to Mr. W. L. King, for collating a number of passages on tablets in the British Museum; to his Excellency Hamdi Bey, and Dr.

Halil Bey, and to Prof. Fr. Delitzsch, for allowing me to copy and collate tablets in the Museums of Constantinople and Berlin, and besides the other members of the Publication Committee of The Babylonian Expedition of the University of Pennsylvania, especially to Mr. Eckley Brinton Coxe, Jr., through whose generosity the Fund has been founded and maintained which made possible the publication of this volume.

Finally I feel greatly indebted to my friend, Prof. Albert T. Clay, of the University of Pennsylvania, who undertook to revise the English portions of my manuscript, and to the Editor, Prof. H. V. Hilprecht, who by his advice and kind assistance greatly facilitated my stay in Philadelphia as well as in Constantinople.

Arno Poebel.

Eisenach, January 28, 1909.
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## TRANSCRIPTION OF SIGNS.

The numbers refer to Bruennow, Classified List.


|  |  | TRANSCRIPTION OF S | SIGNS. |  | xiii |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| nà... | 5225 | sig.................................... ( | (11189) | $t u(r) \ldots$ | 1066 |
| ne. | 4573 | sig......... | 10775 | T |  |
| né... | 9181 | sir... | 7507 | ta | (8200) |
| ni... | 8353 | suı....... | 7593 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | U |  |
| P |  | SH |  | u.... | 6020 |
| pa..................................... | 5564 | sha... | 7046 | ù. | 9459 |
| $p i(d) \ldots$ | 9410 | sha, shag... | 7983 | u. | 7773 |
| pà... | 2048 | shág... | 7286 | $\bar{u}$ (' $u$ or $u^{\prime}$ ).... | 10244 |
| Q |  | sham... | 4678 |  | 10478 |
|  | 6533 | sham (Scm.).......................... | 6019 |  | 4830 |
|  |  | shar. | 8208 | itr. | 5491 |
| R |  | shar. | 4297 |  | (955) |
| rá.... | 4865 | shí. | (1720) | $\breve{u} r$... | 11887 |
| $r i .$. | (889) | shig.......... | 9443 | uri. | 7304 |
| $r u ̀$ (?).................................. | (6016) | shu... | 7065 | uri.. | 6446 |
|  |  | shứ... | 10509 | uru. | 890 |
|  |  | shutug(?)...... | (8327) | urú. | 1018 |
|  | 2289 | T |  | тrıัи... | 6436 |
| $s \bar{s}_{\text {a }}^{\text {a }}$. | 424 |  |  | urudu. | 3877 |
| sar....................................... | 4296 | tag...................................... | - 1404 | us. | 5024 |
| si......................................... | 3375 | tum.................................... | . 9057 | usan.. | 8189 |
| sì. | 4403 | tum (Sem.) ........................... | 4953 | uz | 7587 |
| ¢ั̌....................................... | 7007 | túm...................................... | . 4867 | Z |  |
| sig..................................... | 5565 | từr............................... ...... | 2663 | zum.................. | 10977 |

## MEANING OF THE THREE KINDS OF BRACKETS USED IN CHAPTER IV, PAGES 56ff.

[.], large brackets refer to all the references in the right column.
[ ], small brackets placed somewhat higher (cf., e.g., p. 66, li. 4) refer only to the first reference.
[ ], small brackets placed somewhat lower (cf., e.g., p. 92, li. 13) refer only to the second reference.
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## I. INTRODUCTORY REMARKS.

Of the cuneiform texts published here Nos. 1-7 and 10-69 were excavated at Nippur. They are dated in the reigns of Warad-Sin, Rim-Sin, Hammu-rabi, Samsuiluna and Ilima-ilum, and embrace a period of about eighty or ninety years. As Prof. Hilprecht informs me, they were found for the greater part in the southwest section of Mound IV (cf. the map of the ruins of Nippur in Hilprecht, B. E., Series D, Vol. I, p. 305) during the first and second expeditions of the University of Pennsylvania. There are several documents among them belonging to one and the same person (Nos. 32-35 to Abil-ilishu, Nos. 64, 66 and 68 to NinIB-rahim-s.irim, Nos. 40 , 47 and 58 to Enlil-izzu, Nos. 10, 14 and 30 to Mar-irsitim and Nos. 17, 21, 25 and 27 to Nabi-Shamash), from which we may conclude that the tablets were found in the houses of their owners. It is of interest to notice that the persons named in the contracts to a large extent are connected with the temple of Enlil or with the houses or small temples of other gods. ${ }^{1}$

No. 8 (and 9 ?), which is dated in the reign of Rim-Sin, was excavated by Dr. Peters at Yokha (cf. Peters, Nippur, Vol. II, p. 283 ff.). While resembling the Nippur tablets in important features, it differs from them in various respects.

Nos. $69 a$ and $b$, giving the seal imprints on two earlier documents from Nippur, have been added because they furnish us additional evidence for our conclusions on the burgul seals.

Of the tablets published in the Appendix, Nos. 70, 72b, 78, 80, 137 and 138 were bought by the second expedition of the University of Pennsylvania from Arabs who stated that they came from $A b u-H a b b a$ and $E l$-Birs. These statements seem to be correct; but notice that No. 80, said to have come from El -Birs, ${ }^{2}$ mentions Sippar as the place of payment. The other tablets are the fruit of a gleaning of the early legal documents of the Khabaza, Shemtob and Prince Collections of the University of Pennsylvania, from which Ranke already has published a selection of 119 tablets in Vol. VI, Part 1. With the exception of the undated texts,

[^0]Nos. 137 and 138, the documents are dated in the reigns of Hammu-rabi, Samsu-iluna, Ammi-ditana, Ammi-zaduga and Samsu-ditana. Of a large number of tablets I have published only the date formulas, the contents of the document being either too much broken or of little interest. One of these documents (No. 130), however, which is provided with a date belonging to the time of Ammi-zaduga, is of great historical value, as it is a copy of a grant of land by an earlier king, who in the introductory lines enumerates his titles and his exploits. See p. 123.

The following sketches and remarks are intended to elucidate some questions connected with the contracts of the time of the first dynasty.

# II. THE SCHEME OF LEGAL DOCUMENTS FROM NIPPUR. 

## I. Purchase Documents.

1. Purchase of House Property (6, 12, (18), 33, 34, 35, 38).

No. 33.
A. a. $\frac{1}{3} \operatorname{sar} 6$ gìn é-d $\bar{u}-a$
da é $E$-a-i-din-nam pà-D $\vec{U}$
$\dot{e}^{d}$ Mar-tu-ma-lik
dumu E-ri-ish-su-ma-tum
b. ki ${ }^{d} M a r-t u-m a-l i k-t a$
$\nabla$ A-bil-d ${ }^{\text {d }}$ Mar-tu shesh-gal-a-ni
in-shi-in-sham ${ }^{1}$
B. sham-til-la-bi-shú

9 gìn kú-babbar
in-na-an-lá (l)
C. a. $\breve{u}$-kúr-shúu ${ }^{d}$ Mar-tu-ma-lik
ù ibila-ni a-na-me-a-bi
é-bi-shú gù-nu-um-mà-mà-a ${ }^{2}$
b. mu lugal-bi in-pá(d)

No. 12.
A. a. 1 sar 10 gìn é- $d \bar{u}-a$
shag-ba $1{ }^{\text {gish }} i g$
gub-ba
${ }^{1}$ The scribes in Nippur distinguished between the verb 全敏 shamu, "to buy", and the noun shimu, "purchase price." As the phonetic value sham given to the latter sign in $S b, 4: 3$ seems to have originated from she-a-an, it is possible that the sign without a-an had some other pronunciation, perhaps she. Cf. also the complement $a$ instead of $m a$ in $45: 4$.
${ }^{2}$ For the pronunciation gù-numama compare gù -nu-mà-mà, 10:36. The closing $l$ of $m a l$ has disappeared by first becoming mouillé and finally being dropped. The $l$ mouillé is still preserved in writings like gù-nu(-um)-mà-mà-ia, C. T., II, $14: 15$, IV, $17: 15$ (cf. Ranke, $P . N .$, p. 12, note 2) and gù-nu-mà-mà-a-a( $=m a i a a$ ), $P ., 18: 13$. The last furnishes a new instance for the reading of $a-a$ as aiia. For another new example see note to Ennugi-inaiia.

> da é Ṣi-lí- ${ }^{d} N i n-I B$ dumu E-lù-ti
> $\dot{u}^{d}$ Sin-e-ri-ba-am dumu ${ }^{d}$ En-lil-ni-shu
> sag-bi Si-li- ${ }^{d}$ Nin-IB dumu Si-li-Ishtar.
> $k i$-è-bi e-sir ${ }^{d}$ Sin-li-di-ish dumu Azag- ${ }^{d}$ Nin-IB-shúu
> é Im-gur-d Nin-IB dumu I-ba-shar-ru-um shesh-gal
> $\nabla^{d}$ Nin-IB-a-bi ${ }^{d}$ Nin-IB-ga-mil shesh-a-ni
> dumu-mésh Là-ga-tum
> ̀̀ Ma-nu-tum ama-ne-ne
> b. ki Im-gur-d Nin-I $B^{d}$ Nin-IB-a-bi
> $\nabla^{d}$ Nin-IB-ga-mil ѝ Ma-nu-tum ama-ne-ne-ta
> $\nabla^{d}$ Sin-li-wi-ir dumu ${ }^{d}$ En-lil-ma-an-si-ge
> in-shi-in-sham
> B. sham-til-la-bi-shu
> $\frac{1}{2}$ ma-na 1 gìn kú-babbar
> in-ne-en-lá(l)
> C. a. й-kúr-shú Im-gur-d Nin-IB ${ }^{d}$ Nin-IB-a-bi
> $\nabla^{d}$ Nin-IB-ga-mil $\nabla$ Ma-nu-tum ama-ne-ne
> ù ibila-a-ne-ne a-na-me-a-bi
> é-bi-shúu gù-nu-um-mà-mà-a
> b. mи lugal-bi in-pá(d)

One sar 10 gin of built house, ${ }^{1}$ in which a door . . . . is standing, on one side adjoining the house of Silli-NinIB, son of E-lu-ti, and Sin-eribam, son of Ellil-nishu, the front side towards Silli-NinIB, son of Silli-Ishtar, the exit into the lane of Sin-lidish, son of Azag-NinIB: the house of Imgur-NinIB, son of Ibasharrum, the eldest brother, of NinIB-abi (and) NinIB-gamil, his brother, sons of Lu-ga-tum, and of Manutum, their mother; from Imgur-NinIB, NinIB-abi, NinIB-gamil and Manutum, their mother, Sin-liwir, son of Enlil-mansi, has bought it. As the complete purchase price he has paid them half a mine. In future Imgur-NinIB, NinIB-abi, NinIB-gamil, Manutum, their mother, and any heir of theirs shall make no claim to the house: by the name of the king they have sworn.

[^1]2. Purchase of Field Property $(31,68)$.

No. 68.
A. a. $\frac{1}{3}$ (bur) gan a-shag gúg-she shag a-shag Dul-d ${ }^{\text {Sinn}}$-na sag-bi id A-bar-ri sag-bi min-kam-ma id Ba-i-kum us-a-rád ${ }^{d} \operatorname{Sin}-h \mathrm{~h} a-z i-i r ~ d i ́ m$ a-shay ${ }^{d}$ Babbar-an-dùl dumu ${ }^{\text {d }}$ Nin-IB-ya-mil ц̀ I-da-tum dumu ${ }^{d}$ Nin-IB-ni-shu
b. $k i^{d}$ Babbar-an-d̀̀l ̀̀ I-da-tum-ta
$\nabla^{d}$ Nin-IB-ra-hi-im-si-ri-im
dumu ${ }^{d}$ Nin-IB-ma-an-sì-ge
in-shi-in-sham
B. sham-til-la-bi-shúa

12霊 gìn kú-babbar
in-na-an-lá (l)
C. a. й-kúr-shú ${ }^{d}$ Babbar-an-dùl I-da-tum
ù ibila-ne-ne a-na-me-a-bi
a-shay-bi-shu $\frac{1}{3}$ (bur) gan
g $\grave{u}-n u-u m-m \grave{a}-m \grave{a}-a$
b. mu lugal-bi in-pá(d)-dé-esh

Six acres of gug-she-field, in the field Till-Sin, the front side (adjoining) the canal Abarri, the other front side the canal Baikum, with the long side adjoining Sin-hazir, the builder: the field of Babbar-andul, son of NinIB-gamil, and of Idatum, son of NinIB-mansi; from Babbar-andul and Idatum, ete.
3. Purchase of Endowed Temple Offices (7, 36).

No. 36.
Purchase of Temple Offices and House Property.
A. a. nam-shutug ${ }^{1}$ nam-PA-é nam-lù-SHIM $+G A R$
nam-NI-dŭ nam-kisal-luh ̀̀ nam-bur-shu-ma
éd Mar-tu mu-a i[ti]-2-ud-20-kam
bal-gub-ba El-lu-m[u-u]-shu

[^2]$\frac{1}{3}$ sar 5 gìn é-dū-a da é A-bil-d Mar-tu
nam-shutug ̀̀ é ha-la-ba
₹ El-lu-mu-u-shu dumu Ṣi-lí-dShamash
b. ki El-lu-mu-u-shu dumu Si-li-d Shamash-ta
$\nabla$ I-li-i-din-nam dumu Si-li-dShamash-ge in-shi-in-sham
B. sham-til-la-bi-shúu
$4 \frac{1}{2}$ gìn kú-babbar in-na-an-lá(l)
C. a. ǔ-kúr-shú El-lu-mu-u-shu
ù ibila-a-ni a-na-me-a-bi
nam-shutug é-d ${ }^{d}$ Mar-tu
mu-a iti-2-ud-20-kam
ù $\frac{1}{3} \operatorname{sar} 5$ gìn é-bi-shúu
b. gù-nu-um-mà-mà-a mu lugal-bi in-pá(d)

The offices of the pashishu, the temple superintendent, the caterer, the doorkeeper, the court-cleaner and the stone-jar bearer (?) of the temple of Mar-tu for 2 months and 20 days in the year, the . . . . ${ }^{1}$ of Ellumushu, $\frac{1}{3}$ sar 5 gin of built house, the long side adjoining the house of Abil-Martu; the pashishu-office and the house, the inheritance of Ellumushu, son of Silli-Shamash: from Ellumushu, son of SilliShamash, etc.

An analysis of the purchase documents shows that they always consist of three parts which follow each other in this order:
A. The purchase proper; technical term: in-shi-in-sham.
B. The payment of the purchase price; technical term: in-na-an-lá $(l)$.
C. The agreement regarding future claims concerning the object purchased, including the oath.
A. The part which treats of the purchase proper gives
a. A description of the object bought, namely

1. With reference to its character as house property, garden, field, income, etc.
2. When real estate is in question, as to its site, by designating one or more of the boundaries and in some cases also the landmark, etc., where the object purchased is situated.

[^3]3. As to the owner.
b. Describes the transaction with the formula $k i-Y$-ta $\mid Z$-ge $\mid$ in-shi-in-sham.
B. The payment of the purchase price is in all known instances recorded by the formula, sham-til-la-bi-shúu $\mid \mathrm{x}$ gìn $k u ́$-babbar $\mid$ in-na-an-lá $(l)$.
C. a. The agreement as to future claims is, that the seller, as well as his legal heirs, shall make no claim to the property in question.
$b$. The oath is taken on the name of the king with the usual formula, mu lugal-bi in-pá $(d)$. The name of the king is never given, and besides no allusion is made to the fact that a god was invoked. ${ }^{1}$

The scribes who drew up the documents made a very mechanical use of this scheme. Not only did they never change the order of the three parts and employed the same phrases, but even the succession of the single groups of words was very rigidly observed, ${ }^{2}$ so that the scheme took, as it were, the place of a mental formulary, ${ }^{3}$ into which it was only necessary to put the names of persons and objects, the numbers and measures, etc. It is unnecessary to comment upon the great advantages which such a method had for the authorities and officials.

The documents of this character from Nippur record the purchase of houses, fields and temple offices. The variations in the description of the object purchased are shown by the following:
a. Purchase of house: So many sar and gìn é-dū-a (é-kis-lah)
$d a$ é $\mathrm{X}^{4}$
$e ́ \mathrm{Y}$
b. Field: So many gan a-shag...... (= species of field)
shag $a$-shag....... ( $=$ name of the landmark)
$s a g-b i$.

[^4]```
sag-bi min-kam-ma. . . . . .
us-a-rá ..........
a-shag Y
c．Temple office：nam－x，nam－y，etc．
\(e^{d} \ldots .\). ，mu－a iti－m－ud－n－kam
bal－gub－ba Y
```

The scheme which was employed in Nippur corresponds closely to those used in other parts of Babylonia，but it shows minor characteristic differences from them， as well as these latter schemes from each other，which the following table will demon－ strate．

Nippur．
A．a．Description of object
b．$k i$－Y－ta
Р Z－ge
in－shi－in－ 䇤 $^{-1}$（－esh）
B．sham²－til－la－bi－shú
x gìn kú－babbar
in－na－an－lá（l）（－esh）
C．$a$ ．й－kúr－shú Y
$\grave{u}$ ibila（－a）－ni a－na－me－a－bi
Obj．－bi－shú gù－nu－um－mà－mà－a
b．mu lugal－bi in－páa（d）（－dé－esh）
Sippar（since Hammurabi）．
A．a．Description of object
b．$k i \mathrm{Y}$
$\quad$ Z
in－shi－in－sham
B．sham－til－la－bi－shú
x gìn kú－babbar
in－na－an－lá（l）
C．shag－ga－a－ni al－dug
i－bi al－til

Babylon（C．T．，VIII，22c）．
A．a．Description of object
b．$k i \mathrm{Y}$
קZ
in－shi－in－
B．－til－la－bi－shús
x gìn $k u ́$－babbar
in－na－an－lá（l）
 gù－nu－um－mà－mà－a
b．mu ${ }^{d}$ Marduk ì K
in－pá（d）－dé－me－esh
Sippar（before Hammurabi）．
A．a．Description of object
b．$k i \mathrm{Y}$
PZ in－shi－in－sham
B．sham－til－la－bi－shú kú－babbar in－na－an－lá（l）
C．${ }^{\text {gish }} k a n-n a ~ i ́ b-t a-b a l$
（shag－ga－a－ni al－dug） i－bi al－til

[^5]D. a. $\check{u}-k u ́ r-s h u ́ ~ l \grave{u}-l u ̀-r a ~$
gù-nu-um-mà-mà-a
b. mu ${ }^{d}$ Shamash ${ }^{d}$ Marduk ̀̀ K
in-pá(d)-dé-me-esh

gù-nu-um-mà-mà-a
b. mu ${ }^{d}$ Shamash ${ }^{d}$ Marduk K
ù uru Zimbiri in-pá(d)-dé-me-esh

Sippar( Ili-ma-ila, Immerum, Bunutah- P.S.B.A., XXIX, Nov. 13, 1907, Pl. III tun-ila).
(Sumulail). ${ }^{3}$
A. a. Description of object
b. $k i \mathrm{Y}$

Р $/$
in-shi(-in)-sham ${ }^{1}$
B. sham¹-til-la-ni-shúu
kú-babbar in-na-lá (l) ${ }^{2}$
C. ${ }^{\text {gish } k a n-n a ~ i ́ b-t a-b a l ~}$
(i-bi al-til)
B. ristkan-na ib-ta-bal
C. a. ü-kúr lù-lù
D. $a$. $\breve{u}$-kúr lù-lù
nu-mu-un-gi-gi-dam
b. mu ${ }^{d}$ Babbar ${ }^{( }$Marduk) ù $K$ in-pá(d)-dé-esh
A. a. Description of object
sham-til-la-ni-shú
x gìn kú-babbar in-na-lá(l)
b. $k i \mathrm{Y}$

Z
in-shi-sham
nu-mu-un-gí-gí-dam
b. $m u{ }^{d}$ Urash $\mid \grave{u} \mathrm{~K}$
in-pá(d)-dé-esh

## Tell Sifr.

A. a. Description of object
b. ki Y (lugal-a-ni-ir, S. $37: 7$ )

## २ Z

in-shi (-in)-shum,
C. T., VI, $38 b$.
A. a. Description of object
b. $k i \mathrm{Y}$

Z
in-shi-sham
${ }^{1}$ C. T., VIM, 446 (Sin-muballit) distingushes between the verl) and the noun mirn
${ }^{2}$ C. T., VIII, 47b:9, kù-babbar shag-ga-ni ba-an-SHU.
${ }^{3}$ This seleme corresponds in its first part to the following scheme used in Nippur at the time of Bur-Sin of Isils:
A. a. Description of object sham-til-la-bi-shui
x gin kut-babbar in-na-an-la(l)
b. ki-Y-ta
$\nabla Z_{1} \dot{u} Z_{2}$, dam-a-ni
$i n-s h i-i n$ - 坞
B a. $\breve{u}$-kúr-shú $l \grave{u}-\vec{u}-\dot{u}(r)$
gù-nu-mù-mè-a
b. mu lugal-bi in-pa(d)-dé-esn
B. x gìn $k u ́-b a b b a r$
sham-til-la-ni-shú
in-na (-an)-lá(l)(-e-me-esh)
C. a. $\check{u}$-kur-shú $\check{u}$-na-me-a-ka ${ }^{1}$
gù-gar-ra é-ni-shúu
P Z
$b a-n i-i b-g i-g z^{3}$
b. nu-mu-un-da-B $\hat{U} R-e$
c. mu ${ }^{d}$ Nannar ${ }^{d}$ Babbar
ı̀ K lugal
in-pá (d) (-dé-me-csh)

$$
C . T ., I V, 43 .
$$

$P$., 18 (from Nippur).
A. a. Description of object
b. $k i \mathrm{Y}$

Y Z
in-she-sham
B. sham ti-la-ni-shúu
x gìn $k u$-babbar in-[ ]
gishkan-na ib-ta[ ] lù-lù-rí [ ] [ ]
B. SHAM-ga-ti-la-ni-shú
x gìn $k u ́-b a b b a r$ in-na-la
C. a. ひ̌-kúr-kúr lì-lù nu-mu-un-gí-gí-dam
b. mu lugal-bi in-pá(d)-esh ${ }^{4}$
A. a. Description of object
b. ki Y|lugal é-a-ge

PZ
in-shi-sham
B. sham til(-la)-bi-shúu x gìn kú-babbar in-na-al
C. $a$. $\check{u}-k u ́ r-s h u ́ u$ ibila a-na-me-a-bi é gù̀-nu-mà-mà-a-a ${ }^{5}$
b. mu lugal-bi in-pá(d)-dé-esh
P., 83 (Si 13).
A. a. Description of object
b. $k i \mathrm{Y}$
₹ Z

```
in-shi-
```

B. til-la-ni-shú
x gin $k u ́-b a b b a r n i-l a ́(l)-e$
${ }^{1} S ., 39: 12 ; \breve{u}$-na-me-a-ak-kam, $S ., 51: 12 ; \check{u}$-nu-me-a-ak, S., $53: 15 ; n u-m e-k a m, 8: 11$; often wanting.
${ }^{2} S ., 8: 12 ;$ gù-gar-ra é-e-shú, S., $53: 16 ;-$ ée-ge, S., $60: 14$; gù-gal-la é-a-na, S., $85: 11 ;-e ́, S ., 27: 12$;

- é-bi-shu, S., 84:10.
${ }^{9} S ., 8: 14 ;$ - in-na-ab-gí-gí, S., $51: 12 ;$ gù-gál-la|Y|Z-ra|in-na-gubb-bu, S., $85: 11$; nam-gù-gar-ra in-na-gub, S., 41, case; $\check{u}$-kưr-shú lù-rí nu-mu-un-gí-gí-dé, tablet.
${ }^{4}$ The copy shows mu lugal in bi (p)ad-esh $\mid$ di-mu(?)-úr.
${ }^{5}$ Cf. p. 3, note 2.

```
C. a. \(\check{u}\)-kúur-shh́u ǔ-nu-me-ak
    ba-gi-ra-nam i-ta-na-pa-a[l]
    b. \(m u^{d}\) Babbar \({ }^{d}\) Marduk
    \(\grave{u} \mathrm{~K}\) lugal
    in-pá (d)-esh
```

The most conspicuous grammatical peculiarities of the Nippur documents are the use of $k i-t a$ instead of the simple $k i,^{1}$ and the use of $-g e$ to denote the grammatical subject. Characteristics which the Nippur documents have partially in common with those from other Babylonian cities are the use of $b i$ as a determination (sham-til$l a-b i-s h u ́, e ́-b i-s h u$ ) instead of $n i$ (sham-til-la-ni-shú, é-ni-shú; Tell Sifr.), the pleonastic accusative $-n$ after infixes (in-na-an-lá (l) instead of in-na-lá $(l)$ ), the verbal plural ending esh instead of me-esh (Babylon, Sippar, etc.), ŭ-kúr-shú instead of ŭ-kír-kúr (C. T., VI, 38b). Other differences arise from the different provisions as to future claims and certain ceremonies observed in other cities. In Nippur only the seller takes the oath. He alone, therefore, seems to have had the right to undo the contract, while from the fact that in Sippar and Babylon both parties swear ( $l \grave{u}-l \grave{u}-r a$ gù-nu-um-mà-mà-a), it would follow that the purchaser as well as the seller could exercise this privilege. The phrases shag-ga-ni al-dug, i-bi al-til and gish-kanna $i b-t a-b a l$ (Sippar, and some northern cities?) are not found in Nippur documents, and probably the custom which the last phrase describes had not existed in Nippur or had passed into disuse.

> II. Redemption Documents (45, 64, 66).
> No. 45.
> Redemption of Field Property.
> A. a. 5 gan $a$-shag gúg-she
> shag a-shag ${ }^{d} N i n-u n u$
> us-a-ráa ${ }^{d}$ En-lil-na-da
> $k u$-ta-sham-a ${ }^{2}$ ki La-ma-zum SAL $+I S H I B{ }^{d} N i n-I B$
> dumu ${ }^{a}$ En-lil-ma-an-si

[^6]ù Su-hu-un-tum SAL+ISHIB ${ }^{d}$ Nin-IB
duти Na-am-ra-am-sha-ru-ur
a-shag Be-el-ta-ni SAL $+I S H I B{ }^{d}$ Nin-IB
dumu ${ }^{d}$ En-lil-gal-zu
b. ki Be-el-ta-ni SAL +ISHIB "Nin-IB-ta
$\nabla$ La-ma-zum $S A L+I S H I B{ }^{d}$ Nin-IB dumu ${ }^{\text {a }}$ En-lil-ma-an$s i(-g e)$
a-shag é ad-da-ni in-dŭ ${ }^{1}$
B. 7 gìn kú-babbar in-na-an-lá(l)
C. a. й-kúr-shú Be-cl-ta-ni
ù ibila-ni a-na-me-a-bi
5 gan a-shag ${ }^{d} N i n-u n u-s h u ́ u$
gù-nu-um-mà-mà-a
b. mu lugal-bi in-pá(d)

Five acres of gug-she field, in the field of Nin-unu, on one long-side adjoining Enlil-nada, bought from Lamazum, priestess of NinIB, daughter of Enlil-mansi, and from Suhuntum, priestess of NinIB, daughter of Namram-sharur; the field of Beltani, priestess of NinIB, daughter of Enlil-galzu: from Beltani, priestess of NinIB, Lamazum, priestess of NinIB, daughter of Enlil-mansi, has ransomed it as the field of the house of her father. Seven shekels of silver she has paid her. In future Beltani and any heir of hers shall make no claim to the 5 acres of the field of Nin-unu; by the name of the king she has sworn.

No. 64.
Redemption of house property.

> A. a. $1 \frac{1}{3}$ sar é $-k i(z)-l a ́ h b^{2}$
> da é ${ }^{\text {d }} N i n-I B-r a-h i-i m-z i-r i-i m$
> dumu ${ }^{d}$ Nin-IB-ma-an-si

[^7]> kí-ta-sham ki dumu-mésh E-a-i-din-nam-ta
> マ Ma-an-nu-um-me-shu-li-sur dumu A-wi-li-ia-ge
> kú-shú in-sham-a
> b. $k i{ }^{d} N i n-I B-m u-b a-l i-i t$ dumu A-wi-li-ia
> ₹ I-din-Ish-tar dumu Ma-an-nu-um-me-shu-li-sur
> «̀ Na-ru-ub-tum ama-ni-ta
> $\nabla^{a}$ Nin-IB-ra-hi-im-zi-ri-im
> dumu ${ }^{a}$ Nin-IB-ma-an-sì-ge
> é ad-da-na in-dŭ
> B. sham til-la-bi-shía
> 6立 gin lét-babbar in-ne-en-lá(l)
> C. a. ̆̌-kúr-shúu ${ }^{d} N i n-I B-m u-b a-l i-i t$
> $\nabla$ I-din-Ishtar $\nabla$ Na-ru-ub-tum ama-ni
> ù ibila-ne-ne $a-n a-m e-a-b i$
> 11 $\frac{1}{3}$ sar é-ki(z)-láh-bi-shú gù-nu-um-mà-mà-a
> b. mu lugal-bi in-pá(d)-dé-esh.
> No. 66.
> Redemption of temple offices.
> A. $a$.
> nam-shutug nam-PA-é nam-lì-SHIM $+G A R$
> nam-NI-dŭ nam-kisal-luh ̀̀ nam-bur-shu-ma
> éd En-ki ${ }^{a}$ Dam-gal-nun-na mu-a ud-15-kam
> bal-gub-ba ${ }^{\text {d }}$ En-ki-mash-zu dumu Dam-ki-i-li-shu
> kú-ta-sham ${ }^{d} E n-k i{ }^{d}$ Dam-gal-nun-na in-sham-a
> b. ki ${ }^{d}$ En-ki ${ }^{d}$ Dam-gal-nun-na-ta
> $\nabla^{d}$ Nin-IB-ra-hi-im-si-ri
> dumu ${ }^{\text {d }}$ Nin-IB-ma-an-sì-ge
> garza é ad-da-na in-dŭ
> B. sham til-la-bi-shú
> 18 gìn kú-babbar in-na-an-lá(l)
and built anew．＂Perhaps kikal has the more special meaning of＂levelled site，＂and ki－lah that of＂cleaned，i．e．， cleared site，＂of a collapsed house．

As the walls of Babylonian houses were usually built of sun－dried brieks，with layers of reed without a wooden frame，presumably many buildings collapsed in the rainy season．The site of the old house was levelled，upon which the new house was erected．By the frequent occurrence of this process（we must remember that the city mounds have risen to a considerable height by the débris of such poorly constructed houses），it will be easily understood that kikal，etc．，first received the meaning＂building ground＂and subsequently even that of＂unbuilt ground，＂in distinction to $\hat{e}-d \bar{u}-a$ ，＂built ground．＂

## C. $\check{u}$-kúr-shú nam-shutug ud-27-kam

 mu gú-gál-la kishib in-na-an-tag1A variation of the purchase deeds is represented by those documents which record the purchase of property formerly in the possession of the purchaser's family. The scheme corresponds therefore to that of the purchase documents, except that in-shi-in-sham is replaced by the technical term in-dŭ, "he has ransomed," and that this term is given a short rationale by the addition of é ad-da-na, resp. a-shag é ad$d a-n i$ or garza é ad-da-na, which refers to the ransomed object. With a view of making this relation between the latter and the ransomer more expressive, it is often stated in the description of the ransomed object how it passed from the ransomer or his family into the possession of the present seller by means of the apposition of $k u$-ta-sham ${ }^{2} k i$-X-ta Y-ge kú-shú in-sham-a, "purchase by money, which from X, Y has bought for money," 64:4-6 (cf. R. 50b: 7-9, shi-ma-at X sha itti Y $i$-sha-mu), or shortened: kí-ta-sham-a $k i-\mathrm{X}$, "'purchase by money from X, " $45: 4-7 .{ }^{4}$ The character of the redemption as purchase is made still more evident from the scheme employed at Tell Sifr, which is exactly that of the deeds of purchase, apart from the addition of the phrase é $a d-d a-a-n i$ in- $d \breve{u}$ which occurs after the payment of the purchase price. The scheme of Sippar documents seems to have been the same as in Nippur, apart from the known grammatical differences.

Nippur.
A. $\quad \mathrm{O}|k i-\mathrm{Y}-\mathrm{ta}| \mathrm{Z}-g e$
é ad-da-ni in-dŭ
B. sham-til-la-bi-shú
x gìn kú-babbar in-na-an-lá(l)
C. a. $\check{u}-k u ́ r-s h u ́ u ~ Y ~$
ù ibila-ni $a-n a-m e-a-b i$
O-bi-shúu (|) gù-nu-um-mà-mà-a
b. mu lugal-bi in-pá(d)

Tell Sifr.
A. $\quad O|k i-Y| Z$ in-shi(-in)-sham(-me-esh)
B. x gìn $k u ́-b a b b a r$
sham-til-la-ni-shú in-na(-an)-là (l)
C. é $a d-d a-a-n i$ in- $d \check{u}(-m e-e s h)$
D. $\check{u}-k u r-s h u ́ u ̆-n a-m e-k a$, ete.
${ }^{1}$ The line is written over an erasure. The translation seems to be: One has given him a title deed to the pashishuoffice for all times on account of a (future) complainant.
${ }^{2}$ Thus also II 13, 20a, b (ana ittishu) and Reisner, Telloh, 49:3; Tell Sifr contracts have sham-kú ( = shimatu).
${ }^{3}$ When a substantive is connected with another in the sense which in verbal expressions is designated by ki-ta the Sumerian does not seem to have employed ki-ta, but only $k i$; cf. shu-ti-a ${ }^{d} D a$-mu-i-din-nam $k i{ }^{d} E n$-lil-ma-lik, $54: 11$, 12), but $k i$-Y-ta shu-ba-an-ti.
${ }^{4}$ Cf. R., $50 b: 7-9$, shi-ma-at X sha itti Y i-sha-mu.

What the exact provisions of the law were with regard to the ransoming is still unknown. It is not likely that the ransomer possessed the right to compel the owner to sell his property to him at any time. From the analogy which the gô'èl in the book of Ruth presents, we may conclude that his privilege became valid only as soon as the property changed owners. The oath not to make a claim in future to the property sold (gù-nu-um-mà-mà-a) most probably, therefore, does not imply the renunciation to the right of redemption, but effectuates only the loss of the right to undo the contract as long as the purchaser and his family shall own the bought property themselves.
III. Exchange Documents (kishib ki-ba-gar-ra) (11, 37, 39, 59).

No. 39.
Exchange of temple offices for field property; supplementary payment in money.
A. a. nam-shutug nam-lù-SHIM $+G A R$ nam-PA-é
nam-NI-ď̆ nam-kisal-luh ̀̀ nam-bur-shu-ma
é d$K u$-sú mu-a-an itu-2-kam bal-gub-ba Ilu-shu-ba-ni dumu Ut-ta-gàl-lu-me-DU
b. $\nabla$ Ilu-shu-ba-ni dumu Ut-ta-gàl-lu-me-DU-ge ${ }^{1}$
$\nabla^{d}$ En-lil-lù-shág nu-ésh dumu ${ }^{d}$ Sin-i-din-nam-ra in-na-an-si
B. a. ki-ba-gar-ra-bi-shú
$\frac{4}{18}$ bur gan $a$-shag gúg-she shag $a$-shag ${ }^{\text {a }}$ Nin-unu us-a-rá kúr-e Im-gur-d ${ }^{\text {Sin }}$
b. $\nabla^{d}$ En-lil-lì-shag nu-ésh-ge

Y $I l u$-shu-ba-ni-ra
in-na-an-si
C. a. mu $a$-shag nam-shutug éd ${ }^{\text {Kít}}$-sú
sá-nu-ub-dúg-ga-ash
b. 5 gìn kú-babbar ${ }^{\text {a }}$ En-lil-lù-shág nu-ésh-ge
$\nabla$ Ilu-shu-ba-ni-ra in-na-an-bír
D. a. $\check{u}-k u ́ r-s h u ́ ~ l u ̀-l u ̀-\grave{u}-r a$
gù-nu-um-mà-mà-a
b. mu lugal-bi in-pá(d)

The offices of the pashishu, of the riqqu (caterer), of the house superintendent, of the doorkeeper, of the court-cleaner and of the purshumu in the temple of Kusu
${ }^{1}$ The tablet by mistake draws together lines 4 and 5 to bal-gub-ba Ilu-shu-ba-ni dumu Ut-ta-gitl-lu-me-DU-ge.
for two months per year, the . . . . . of Ilushu-bani, son of Uttagallu-meDU, Ilushu-bani, son of Uttagallu-meDU, to Enlil-lushag, the priest, son of Sin-idinnam, has sold. As the equivalent Enlil-lushag, the priest, has sold to Ilushu-bani 4 acres of gug-she-field in the field of Nin-unu, on one long side adjoining the lode of ImgurSin. Because the field does not equal (in value) the pashishu office at the temple of Kusu, Enlil-lushag, the priest, has paid 5 shekels of silver to Ilushu-bani. In future shall one against the other make no claim; by the name of the king he ( = either of them) has sworn.

No. 37.
Exclumge of temple offices and fields.
A. a. [nam-PA-é é-d $N u s k u$ mu-a . . . . . . . . . . .]
[nam-lù-nig-KU-ba é éd $N u s k u . . . . . . . .$. . ]
[1 gan a-shag] gúg-she shag $a$-shag ${ }^{d}$ Nin-lil-lá
[bal-gub-]ba Shu-mu-um-li-ib-shi dumu Ur-Dù-azag-ga
b. ki-ba-gar-ra-bi-shúu

3 gan a-shag a-gár a-tu-GAB +LIS
us-a-rá Shu-mu-um-li-ib-shi shesh-a-ni
dити Ur-Dì-azag-ga
a-shag Lì-É-shu-me-DU
c. a-shag PA-lugal-dim-nam
lù-lù-ra in-shi-in-gar-ri-esh
B. a. mu a-shag PA-lugal sá-nu-ub-dúu-ga-ash
b. 2 gìn kú-babbar
$\nabla$ Lù-E E -shu-me-DU-ge
РShu-mu-um-li-ib-shi-ra in-na-an-búr
C. $\check{u}-k u ́ r-s h u ́ l ~ l u ̀-l u ̀-r a ~ g u ̀-n u-m \grave{a}-m a ̀-a ~$ mu lúgal-la ur-bi in-pá(d)-dé-esh

The office of the house superintendent of the temple of Nusku for months in the year, the office of the master of the wardrobe of the temple of $N u s k u$ for . . . . months in the year, 1 gan of gúg-she field in the field of Ninlil, the . . . . of Shumum-libshi, son of Ur-Duazagga; as the equivalent 3 gan of field of the sarbatu landmark, with a longside adjoining Shumum-libshi, his brother, son of Ur-Duazagga,
${ }^{1} S \hat{a}-d u ́ g=k a s h a ̂ d u$; as compound substantive $s a b-d \hat{u} g=s a t u k k u$, "assessment," "tax," originally perhaps kishittu, "spoil."
the field of $L u$-EshumeDU : field like ${ }^{1}$ royal preferment ${ }^{2}$, they have exchanged, one to the other. Because the field does not equal the royal preferment, Lu-EshumeDU has paid 2 shekels of silver to Shumum-libshi. In future shall one against the other make no claim; by the name of the king they have sworn.

$$
\text { No. } 59 .
$$

Exchange of field and house.

```
B. a. [ki-ba]-gar[-ra-bi-shú]
    [ ] sar 11 \(\frac{1}{2}[g \grave{n} n\) é-dū-a ù-ra]
    \(d a e^{d} \operatorname{Sin}-[i]-t[u-r a-a m\) shesh-a-ni]
    \(\frac{1}{2}\) sar \(\dot{e}-d \bar{u}-a \quad b i l-l[a]\)
    \(d a e^{d}\) Sin-i-tu-ra-am shesh-a[-ni]
    shag kú-ta-sham ki Lugal-nig-si-(sá)(?) dum[u ]
    é Ad-da-dingir dumu Ilu-sukkal
    c. éee a-shag-ga-dim-nam
    lù-lù-ù-ra in-gar
C. \(a\). \(\check{u}\)-kúr-shú lù-lù-ra
    nu-gí-gí-dé
    b. mu lugal-la \([u r-b] i\)
        \(i[n-p a ́(d)\)-dé-esh]
```

            , No. 11.
            A. a. 10 gìn \(e ́-d \bar{u}-a\)
        da é Im-gu-u-a
        ush[ ]-bi-shú
        ४ \(D[a-m i-i q]-i-l i-s h u\)
        ѝ [Na-ru-u]b-tum dam-a-ni
            b. nam \([N a-b i]{ }^{d}\) Shamash
            ki-bi-[gar-r]a-bi-shú
            mu-na-an-sì-mu-ne
            B. a. 10 gìn é-dū-a túr-é-a
            da éd Babbar-he-gal
            \(\nabla\) Na-bi-dShamash dumu Im-gu-u-a
    \({ }^{1}\)-dim-nam = dim-na-a-an; or does nam = pihatu mean "object of exchange?"
    \({ }^{2} P A-L U G A L\) corresponds to PA-DINGIR, which either designates parşu sha ili ( \(=k u s h\) ) or parṣu sha sharri
    (= garza) ; cf. garza (or kush), $66: 9$.
3

> b. nam Da-mi-iq-i-lí-shu
> ù $N a-r u$-ub-tum dam-a-ni
> ki-bi-gar-ra-bi-shú in-na-an-si
> C. a. mu túr-é shu-ba(?)-ti(?)-esh
> b. $\nabla N a-b i-{ }^{2}$ Shamash
> nam Da-mi-iq-i-lí-shu
> ì Na-ru-ub-tum dam-a-ni
> 1 gìn kú-babbar in-na-an-búr
> D. a. $\check{u}-k u ́ r-s h u ́ u ~ l u ̀-l u ̀-\grave{u}$
> gù-nu-um-mà-mà-a
> b. mu lugal-bi in-pá(d)

After Damiq-ilishu and Narubtum, his wife, had given 10 gin of a built house, adjoining the house of Imgua, for exchange to Nabi-Shamash, Nabi-Shamash, son of Imgua, has given 10 gin of a built house (and) courtyard for exchange to Damiqilishu and Narubtum, his wife. (But) because they have received the courtyard, ${ }^{1}$ Nabi-Shamash has paid 1 shekel of silver to Damiq-ilishu and Narubtum, his wife. In future shall one against the other make no claim; by the name of the king he ( $=$ each one) has sworn.

The general plan of the documents of exchange differs considerably from that of the purchase and redemption documents, inasmuch as the exchange is not conceived as a twofold purchase, but as a mutual sale. Notice the authentication of the exchange in No. 39 by a repeated in-na-an-si, "he has given," the technical term for "to sell." There were two schemes in use at Nippur, one which keeps the two parallel actions of the exchange separate, and another which conceives both as one dihedral act.



Compare the schemes of documents from Tell Sifr and Sippar:

> Tell Sifr (M. 46).
A. a. First obj. of exchange. sham-kú Y sha itti. . . . . . ishâmu
b. bu-ha-ti-shu second obj. of exch. sham-kú Z sha itti. . . . . .ishâmu
c. i-na mi-it-gur-ti-shu-nu
é-é-dim
Y a-na Z in-gar
C. $\check{u}-k u ́ r$-shú, etc.

Sippar.
A. a. A-na bu-uh (itti) first obj. of exch. eqil Y
b. Second obj. of exchange. eqil Z
c. $u-b i-i h-h u(a-n a ~ Z ~ u-b i-i h-h h u)$
B. $a-n a \ldots \ldots \mid$ wa-tar-ti $b \hat{b} t \mathrm{Y}$
. . . .shiqlu kaspu
Z a-na Y.
C. $\check{\text {-kíkur-shúu, etc. }}$

Since the two objects of exchange seldom represent the same value, this class of documents usually adds the statement, that the party which gave the less valuable object paid an additional sum of money (or real estate, etc.). The technical term for "to pay" in such instances is not in-na-an-lá(l), but in-na-an-búr." The same use of the term occurs in division documents. ${ }^{2}$

The oath is a mutual one, since both parties waive their rights. In the formula l $\grave{u}$-lìu- $\grave{u}$-ra gì-nu-um-mà-mà-a, the scriptio plena $\grave{u}(r)$ may be cited as a (not always occurring) characteristic of Nippur tablets. No. 59 has the formula lù-lù-ra nu-gí-gi-dé, "they shall not turn against one another."
${ }^{1}$ Literally "to loosen, solve," pashâru; the corresponding noun is nam-bir-ru.
${ }^{2} M u-s h u$, $m u$-sh, which introduces this part of the scheme, corresponds entirely to ashshum $=$ ana shum, which probably has been formed under the influence of the Sumerian. The enclosed sentence is changed into a nominal expression by adding $a$.
IV. Partition Documents ( $1,23,26,32,43,44$ ).

No. 44.
Division of house and money among two brothers.
A. 1 sar é-dū-a (gi)bil
da é dumu. $\dot{E}-a-b a-n i ~ p a ̀(g)-D \bar{U}$
1 sar é- $d \bar{u}-a \grave{u}$-ra
da é Igi-shág nu-ésh
7 gin kú-babbar
ha-la-ba ${ }^{d} N i n-I B-n i r-g a ́ l$
B. 1 sar é-dī-a (gi)bil
da éd ${ }^{a}$ in-IB-nir-gál shesh-a-ni
1 sar é-dū-a ù-ra
$d a e^{d} N$ in-IB-nir-gál shesh-a-ni
7 gìn $k u ́$-babbar
ha-la-ba Ri-im-Ishtar shesh-a-ni
C. ibila Lugal-á-zi-da-ge-ne
she-ga-ne-ne-ta
in-ba-esh
D. mu lugal-bi in-pá(d)-dé-esh

1 sar of (a) new built house, on one side adjoining the house of the son of Ea-bani the mudu, 1 sar of (an) old built house, on one side adjoining the house of Igi-shag the priest, (and) 7 shekels of silver, the inheritance portion of NinIB-nirgal,

1 sar of (a) new built house, on one side adjoining the house of NinIB-nirgal his brother, 1 sar of (an) old built house, on one side adjoining the house of NinIBnirgal his brother, (and) 7 shekels of silver, the inheritance portion of Rim-Ishtar, his brother,
the sons of Lugal-azida, by mutual agreement have divided. By the name of the king they have sworn.

No. 23.
A. $\frac{1}{3} \operatorname{sar} 5$ gin é-dū-a
da é ${ }^{\text {d }}$ Babbar ${ }^{\text {den }}$ Elil-lá
40 sar gish-sar a-shag igi-nim-ma
u-sal igi-bi-shú nig a-an-ě-ne-a

FROM THE TIME OF THE FIRST DYNASTY OF BABYLON.
zag gish-sar El-li-tum
$\nabla A$-li- $a$-ḩu-sha sag-sal
$\nabla^{d}$ Ishkur-ri-im-ì-li sag-nita
ha-la-ba Na-ru-ub-tum dumu-sal Mi-gir-d En-lil
B. $\frac{1}{3} \operatorname{sar} 5$ gìn é-dū-a
da é $\mathrm{Ib}-\mathrm{ku}{ }^{d} \mathrm{Da}$-mu
40 sar gish-sar igi-nim-ma
$u$-sal igi-bi-shú nig a-an-ĕ-ne-a
zag gish-sar Ib-ku-u-a-tum
$1 \frac{1}{2}$ gan $a-s h a g ~ u z-a$
ki-búr-ru ${ }^{d}$ Ishkur-ri-im-i-li sag-nita
$\nabla$ Dum-ki-Ishtar sag-sal
४ Ta-ri-bu-um sag-nita
C. ha[-la Ur- $\left.{ }^{d} P a-b i l-s a g-g a ́\right] ~$
$\frac{1}{3}$ nam Na-ra-am-tum ama Mi-gir-d ${ }^{\text {d }}$ En-lil
₹ Na-ru-ub-tum dumu-sal Mi-gir-d ${ }^{\text {d }}$ - $n$-lil
í Ur-d Pa-bil-sag-gá egir dam-a-na-ka
nam-ibila-ni-shú ba-da-an-ri-a
ur-a-sì-ga-bi in-ba-esh
D. $\check{u}$-kúr-shú lù-lù-ra nu-gí-gí-dé mu lugal ur-bi in-pá (d)-dé-esh
$\frac{1}{3}$ sar 5 gin of built house, on one side adjoining the house of Babbar and Enlil; 40 sar of upland garden, which slopes down into the marsh before $i t(?)^{1}$, the side of the garden adjoining Ellitum; Ali-ahusha, the maid-slave; Ishkur-rim-ili, the man-slave; inheritance portion of Narubtum, daughter of Migir-Ellil; $\frac{1}{3}$ sar 5 gin of built house, on one side adjoining the house of Ibku-Damu, 40 sar of upland garden, which slopes down into the marsh before $i t(?)$, the side of the garden adjoining Ibkuatum; $1 \frac{1}{2}$ acres of us $\hat{u}$ field, (additional) payment for Ishkur-rim-ili, the man-slave; Dumqi-Ishtar, the maid-slave; Taribum, the manslave; inheritance portion of Ur-Pabilsagga, a third of the fortune ${ }^{2}$ of Naramtum, mother of Migir-Enlil; Narubtum, daughter of Migir-Enlil and Ur-Pabilsagga, whom he has adopted as heir after the death ${ }^{3}$ of his wife, have divided into equal

[^8]parts. In future neither shall have power to revoke this agreement. By the name of the king they both have sworn.

No. 43.
A. Nam-nu-ésh den-lil-lá mu-a itu-6-a-an
ù burmin gan a-shag shuku-bi
1 gishbanshur zag-gú-lá sib-ta nam-shesh-gal-lá-shúu
1 sar é-dū-a ki-è ash-a a-an-è-ne
3 gan a-shag da-ab-ta da é dumu Sa-al-lu-u ha-la-ba Igi-shág dumu I-na-E -kur-ra-bi
B. 2 sar é-dū-a da é Igi-shág
ki-è ash-a a-an-è-ne
$2 \frac{1}{3}$ sar é-ki(z)-láh da é dumu-mésh Da-du-um
9 gan a-shag da-ab-ta
us-a-rá dumu-mésh d?-urú
6 gìn kú-babbar gab-ri 1 sar é-dū-a
u 3 gan $a$-shag da-ab-ta
$\nabla$ Igi-shág-ge ha-la-ba-na-shúu shu-ba-an-ti-a-ash
gab-ri nam-nu-ésh-shúu
$\nabla{ }^{a}$ Sin-ish-me-a-ni dumu ${ }^{a}$ En-lil-ma-an-si
shesh ad-da-na-ra
in-na-an-búr
nig-gú-na é-a-gál-la shu-ri-a-bi
ha-la-ba ${ }^{d} \operatorname{Sin}-i s h-m e-a-n i$

$$
\text { dumu }{ }^{d} E n-l i l-m a-a n-s \grave{\imath}
$$

C. é $a$-shag gish-sar a-shag a-an-ĕ-ne-a ur-a-sì-ga-bi ni-ba-e-ne
D. $\breve{u}-k u ́ r-s h u ́ l u ̀-u ̀-l u ̀-r a^{1} n u-g i ́-g i ́-d e ́ ~$
she-ga-ne-ne-ta mu lugal-bi in-pá(d)-dé-esh ${ }^{2}$
The office of a priest of Enlil for six months per year and its 36 acres of field for livelihood, one zag-gula bowl: as the privilege of the elder brother; 1 sar of built house from which one goes out by one (common) exit, ${ }^{3} 3$ acres of dabta land, on one

[^9]side adjoining the house of the son of Sallu; the inheritance portion of Igi-shag, son of Ina-Ekur-rabi.

Two sar of built house, on one side adjoining the house of Igi-shag, from which one goes out by one (common) exit; $2 \frac{1}{3}$ sar of waste ground, on one side adjoining the house of the sons of Dadum; 9 gan of $d a b t a$ field, on one long side adjoining the sons of ........;6 shekels of silver as equivalent to the one sar of built house and the three acres of dabta field which Igi-shag has taken in addition to his inheritance; (the whole) as equivalent to the priest office he has paid to Sin-ishmeani, son of Enlil-mansi, the brother of his father; the half of the furniture which is in the house: the inheritance of Sin-ishmeani, son of Enlil-mansi.

House, field and garden which turns into field they shall divide into equal parts.
In future neither shall have power to revoke the agreement. Mutually they have sworn by the name of the king.

No. 26.
Division of an inheritance among four brothers.
Col. I (beginning wanting; li. 1-5 fragmentary): 6. 1 gan 36 sar a[-shag........] 7. us-a-rá E-la-[lú] 8. 51 $\frac{1}{2}$ sar gish-sar a-[........] 9. zag gish-sar dumu-mésh Lù${ }^{d}[\ldots \ldots \ldots]$ 10. shuku gar-gu-la shu-r[i-a-bi] 11. ̀̀ she ̀̀ ka-lum $a-I G I+E[-a$ $\left.{ }^{d} \mathrm{Mah}\right]$ 12. shu-ri-a-bi 13. sib-ta nam-gala ù nam-shutug é-d $[$ Nin-sun] 14. 2 gìn kú-babbar shag sham Warad-dinin-SHAH s[ag-nita] $15.1{ }^{\text {gishbanshur }}$ zag-gú-lá 16. sib-ta mu-nam-shesh-gal-lä-shúu

Col. II: 21. $5 \frac{1}{2}$ gan $a$-shag ${ }^{\text {gish }} g i-m a h ~ g a b-r i ~ e ́-d \bar{u}-a ~ 22 . ~ u s-a-r a ́ ~ E-l a-l i ́ ~ s h e s h ~$ $a d-d a-n i$

Col. III: 1. 6 gan a-shag ib-ba-ta-nu-um 2. us-a-rá ${ }^{d} \operatorname{Sin}-i$-din-nam nu-ésh 3. 3 gan a-shag igi-nim-ma ki-ta 4. us-a-rá ${ }^{d}$ Nannar-a-rá-mu-un-gi-en 5 . $4 \frac{1}{2}$ gan 11 sar a-shag 6. sur ${ }^{\text {d gish }}$ GIBIL-ga-mes 7 . us-a-rá ${ }^{d}$ En-lil-lù-shág shesh-a-ni 8. nam-shutug é ${ }^{d}$ Nin-sun mu-a ud-10-kam 9. gab-ri a-shag uz-za 10. $12 \frac{1}{3}$ sar gishsar $a$-shag...... 11. zag gish-sar ${ }^{d}$ Nannar-a-rá-mu-un-gi-en shesh[-a-ni] 12. shu-ri-a shuku gar-gu-la igi-4-gál-bi 13. shu-ri-a she ù ka-lum a-IGI + E-a ${ }^{\text {d}}$ Mah igi-4-gál[-bi] 14. gar nam-gala igi-te ad-da-ne-ne igi-4-gál[-bi] 15. ₹Ishtar-na-ah-ra-ri sag-sal kú-bi 11 gìn 16. shag-ba $5 \frac{1}{2}$ gìn kú-babbar shu-ri-a-[bi] 17. Ur-Dì-azag-ga-ge shag ha-la-ba[-na] 18. $\quad$ U Ur-d $D U N-P A-e ̀-a-r a ~ i n-n a[-a n-b u ́ r] ~ 19 . ~ 1 ~ g i s h g a ́ l ~ m i-~$ rí-za kú-bi 1 [ $\frac{1}{2}$ gìn] 20. $1{ }^{\text {aishbanshur sag-DU kú-bi } \frac{1}{2} \text { [gìn] 21. igi-4-gál kú-babbar }}$ $m u^{d a g} h a r-z i[-g a]$ 22. $\nabla^{d}$ En-lil-lù-shag-ge in-na-a[n-búr] 23. $1^{\text {aish }}$ ig și-na 1 gish-ùr ${ }^{1}$
1 [ ] 24. nig-gú-na é-e igi-4[-gál-bi] 25. ha-la-ba Ur-Dù-azag-ga[ ]
${ }^{1}$ Perhaps gish-SUG.

Col. I: 1 acre 36 sar of . ..... field, lengthwise adjoining Elali; $5 \frac{1}{2}$ sar of garden of the field ......., one side of the garden adjoining the sons of $L u \ldots .$. ; of the victual prebend (consisting of) the "great food," the half, and' of the corn and dates of the ......... of Mah, the half: the choice portion from the offices of the kalk and of the pashishu of the temple of Ninsun; 2 shekels of silver from the purchase price for Warad-NinSHAH; 1 zag-gula bowl: the pivilege of the elder brother.

Col. II, 21-III, 25: 52 gan of "great reed" field as equivalent to the built house, lengthwise adjoining Elali, his uncle; 6 acres of ibbatanum field, lengthwise adjoining Sin-idinnam, the priest; 3 acres of lower highland, on one side adjoining Nannar-ara-mungin. $4 \frac{1}{2}$ acres 11 sar of the of Gilgamesh, lengthwise adjoining Ellil-lushag, his brother; the office of the pashishu of the temple of Ninsun as equivalent for the $u s \hat{u}$ field; $12 \frac{1}{3}$ sar of garden in the field, the side of the garden adjoining Nannar-ara-mungin, his brother; of the half of the victual prebend (consisting of) the "great food" the fourth part; of the half of the corn and dates of the $\qquad$ . of Mah, the fourth part; of the food of the kalu office, the compensation ${ }^{2}$ of their father, the fourth part; Ishtar-nahrari, the female slave, her value in money 11 shekels; therein (comprised) $5 \frac{1}{2}$ shekels of silver, the half, which Ur-Duazagga from his inheritance has paid to Ur-DUN-PA-ea; 1 miriza door, its money value $1 \frac{1}{2}$ shekel, 1 'head" bowl, its money value $\frac{1}{2}$ shekel; a fourth (of a shekel) of silver which on account of the . . . . . . . . ring Ellil-lushag has paid him, 1 și-na door, 1 beam(?) $1 \ldots \ldots$. , of the house furniture the fourth part: the inheritance portion of $U r$ Duazagga.....

The scheme of the partition documents is shown by No. 36 in a very precise form:
A. Enumeration of the inheritance: ha-la-ba X
B. Enumeration of the inheritance: $h a-l a-b a \mathrm{Y}$
C. ibila-Z-ge-ne she-ga-ne-ne-ta in-ba-e-esh
D. (ư-kúr-shí lù-lù-ù-ra nu-gí-gí-dé) mu lugal-bi in-pá(d)-dé-esh

The parts A., B. represent the grammatical object to the verb in-ba(-(e)-esh at the end of $c$; ibila-Z-ge-ne refers as apposition to the persons who are named at the

[^10]end of their respective inheritance. The oath, the contents of which is not stated expressly in No. 44, is a mutual one: lù-lù-ù-ra nu-gí-gí-dé. The scriptio plena $l \grave{u}-l \grave{u}-\grave{u}(r)-r a$ is a (not always occurring) characteristic feature of the Nippur tablets, while those from Sippar have $l \grave{l}-l \grave{u}-r a$. With the exception of No. 32, no use is made of the formula $g \grave{u}$ - mà -mà, "to make a claim to some object," since the purpose of the document is primarily to fix the mode of dividing, which shall not be altered again (gi-gi, "to turn, to upset, to undo"). Cf. later.

A special feature of the partition documents is the use of a separating line which marks off the portions of the different heirs, and thus makes the document more perspicuous. On No. 44 the line, for which there was no room left on the reverse, is even placed on the uninscribed lower edge. This shows that the line was considered to form a part of the scheme. Usually it seems to have been placed below the line of writing which begins with ha-la-ba, but on Nos. 1, 23 and 32 it is above the line, from which on Nos. 1 and 23 it is moreover separated by a small blank space. On No. 32 it is written only after the last portion; while on No. 43 it is in that place omitted.

Of special interest is the document No. 43, because it partly records the mode of a division already effected (the enumerated heterogeneous portions of the two heirs, nephew and uncle, are to balance each other), and partly fixes the mode of the future division of the rest of the inheritance (consisting of house, field and garden, which shall be divided into equal parts): ni-ba-e-ne, "they shall divide." But it seems that all partition documents more or less were of a similar preliminary character. Apparently their aim was in the first place to furnish the legal forms which authorized the heirs to dispose of their inheritance without being thwarted by the rights of the co-heirs, while a definitive settlement was left to later agreements between the different parties. For this fact an instructive example is found in the group of contracts Nos. 32-35. No. 32, dated Tashritu 17th, records the division of a house among four brothers, but in Nos. 33-35, dated Arah-samna 9th and 21st and Kislimu 5th respectively, the eldest brother buys back all the shares of the house that had fallen to his co-heirs. ${ }^{2}$ This accounts also for the fact that in division documents we find the houses quite mechanically dissected into as many pieces of equal size as, it seems, was desirable. Thus in No. 44 a new house and an old one are koth divided into

[^11]halves. In No. 32 one house is first divided into two halves, and then one of these halves again into four parts of equal size. ${ }^{1}$

Attention may be called to the part which the eldest brother plays in the partition documents. He has an equal share with his brothers, but receives in addition a preference portion which in the document always heads the enumeration of his inheritance. In No. 26 it is even separated from the portion due him as a son, by means of a line. The technical term is sib-ta mu-nam-shesh-gal-la-shí, "preference title on account of the position as eldest brother." For the Semitic equivalent (zittu) elâtu see II R.9, 76, and Meissner in A. P. R., p. 2.

The proportional amount of the preference portion cannot be exactly determined because of the broken condition of the tablets in question; but from No. 32, provided we are allowed to generalize because of this instance, it would seem that it amounted to one-half of the inheritance; the number in li. 1 is probably to be restored as $1 \frac{1}{3}$, equal to 4 times $\frac{1}{3}$, i.e., the sum of the regular portions of all heirs. The same mode of dividing we find in $26, \mathrm{I}, 10-13$ (shu-ri-a-bi), compared with $26, \mathrm{I}, 29-31$; II, 10-12; III, 12-13 (shu-ri-a-igi-4-gál-bi), but our right to quote this instance may be questioned because the item given there figures as the sib-ta from another item; the amount of the other items of the sib-ta in this document, as far as they are preserved, differs considerably and is much less than the regular portions. Though it is thus impossible to arrive at a definite result in this question, this much seems to be certain, that the amount of the sib-ta was in some way or other a fixed one, because in adoption documents where two persons are adopted as brothers, it is provided that they shall divide the inheritance into equal parts after the eldest brother has taken his preference portion; no information being given as to the amount of the latter.

While the sib-ta generally was rated from the various items of the inheritance, ${ }^{2}$ one object seems to have formed an integral part of the sib-ta, viz., the ${ }^{\text {gish }}$ banshur $z a g-g u-l a$, written also zag-gú-lá, in Akkadian pashshur sakki. This kind of bowl (plate or kind of table?) occurs in the preference portion of the eldest brother in all documents except No. 1, its place being always at the end ( $26, \mathrm{I}, 15 ; 32: 3,43: 3$ ). Notice furthermore that in no document its money value is noted, while this is done 26, III, 20, with a ${ }^{\text {gish }}$ banshur sag-DU given to a younger brother.

[^12]Apart from the privilege of the eldest brother, the principle was followed that brothers divided the remainder into equal parts: ur-a-si-ga-bi in-ba-esh (ni-ba-e-ne); ur-a-shú sì-ga-bi in-ba-esh, $23: 23,43: 34,16: 10 .^{\text {. }}$

The following scheme of partition documents from Tell Sifr (S. 25 and 26, 52, 91) corresponds in its construction on the whole to that used in Nippur:
A. a. Enumeration of the inheritance: ha-la $\nabla \mathrm{X}$
b. Enumeration of the inheritance: ha-la $\nabla \mathrm{Y}$
c. (dumu-me-esh Z, S. 52, 21)
i-na mi-it-gu-ur-ti-shu-nu iz-ga-am i-du-u-ma ha-la é ad-da-a-ni ni-ba-e-ne
B. $\check{u}-k u ́ r-s h u ́ u, ~ e t c . ~$

Here the future actual division is distinguished from the legal fixing of the respective shares. 'In mutual agreement they allotted the shares and shall (later on) divide the inheritance of the house of the fathers."

At Sippar, however, it was the custom to furnish the heirs with deeds, in which the portions of all persons participating in the division were not put down, but only the portion of the person for whom the document was drawn up, followed by an addition like this: mi-im-ma an-ni-im $\mid$ ha-la $\mathrm{X} \mid$ sha itti $\mathrm{Y}, \mathrm{Z}$, etc. $\mid a-a h$-hi-shu $i$-zu-zu zi-zu ga-am-ru|i-na ba-shi-tim sha $i$-li-a-am|mi-it-ha-ri-ish $i$-zu-uz-zu $\mid$ ŭ-kúr-shú lù-lù-ra gù-nu-um-mà-mà-a mu ${ }^{d} B a b b a r{ }^{d} M a r d u k ~ K ~ l u g a l ~ i t-m u-u-' " a l l ~$ this, the inheritance of X, which he divided with Y, Z, etc., his brothers, has been definitively allotted. The property which (later) shall turn up, they shall divide into equal parts," etc. (R.28), or mi-im-ma an-ni-im $\mid$ ha-la X um-mi-shu $\mid$ sha Y itti ah-hi-shu il-ku-u ah-hu-shu |u-ul i-ra-ga-mu-shum, $R .50 b, 11-15$, or the like.
V. Adoption Documents (4, 24, 28, 57).

No. 24.
A. a. $\overline{\text { I-li-i-din-nam shesh-gal }}$
ù Il-lí-um-ma-ti shesh-a-ni
マ Ea-i-din-nam dumu Ib-ku-Ishtar

[^13]```
            ̀̀ Ku-ri-tum dam-a-ni
            nam-dumu-ni-shú ba-da-an-ri
        b. nam-ibila-a-ni-shú in-gar(-ri-esh?)
B. é a-shag nig-ga a-na-me-a-bi
        shesh-gal sib-ta-na
        shu-ba-ab-te-gá-e-en
        ur-a-shú si-ga-bi ni-ba-e-ne
    C. a. ü-kúr-shú tukundi-bi
        [ Y] İ-li-i-din-nam shesh-gal
        ù I-li-um-ma-ti shesh-a-ni
        ४ \(E\)-a-i-din-nam ad-da-na-ra
        ц. Ku-ri-tum ama-na-ra
        nu ad-da-mu nu ama-mu
        ba-an-na-gù-esh
        é \(a-s h a g\) nig-ga a-na-me-a-bi
        ba-ra-ĕ-ne-esh
        ù kú-shú ba-ab-sì-mu-ush
        b. 亠̀ tukundi-bi \(\bar{E}-a-i\)-din-nam
        ̀ \(K u-r i-t u m\) dam-a-ni
        \(\Varangle\) I-lí-i-din-nam dumu-na-ra
        u I-li-um-ma-ti shesh-a-ni
        nu dumu-me ba-an-na-gù-esh
        é a-shag nig-ga a-na-me-a-bi
        ba-ra-ĕ-ne-esh
        ù 1 ma-na kú-babbar ni-lá(l)-e-ne
    D. she-ga-ne-ne-ta
        mu lugal-bi in-pá(d)-dé-esh
```

Ili-idinnam, the elder brother, and Iliummati, his brother, Ea-idinnam, son of Ibku-Ishtar with Kuritum, his wife, has adopted as his children; his heirs he has made them. House, field and all property they shall divide into equal parts after the elder brother shall have received his preference portion. In future when Ili-idinnam, the elder brother, and Iliummati, his brother, say (either of them) to Ea-idinnam, his ( = their) father, and to Kuritum, his ( = their) mother: 'Not art thou my father," "not art thou my mother," they shall forfeit house, field and all property and shall be sold for money. But also when Ea-idinnam or Kuritum, his wife, say (either of them) to Ili-idinnam, his ( $=$ their) child, and to Iliummati, his brother: 'Not art
thou our child," they shall forfeit house, field and all property, and, in addition, shall pay one mine of silver. In mutual agreement they have sworn by the name of the king.

No. 28.
A. [Ib-]ku-sha dumu An-a[zag-sha]

É-a-ta-a-a-ar dumu . . . . . [. . . .]
nam-ibila-ni-shú ba-an-d[a-ri]
B. a. ud nam-ibila-ni-shú ba-an-da-ri-a 4 she-gur(?) har(?)-ra Ib-ku-sha ad-da-ni ₹ $E$ - $a-t a-a-a-a r$ in-SU
b. a. gibil-bi-shú-a-an Ib-ku-sha ad-da(?)
$\nabla$ E-a-tu-ra-am dumu sal-nitalam-ni (........)
ѝ E-a-ta-a-a-ar dumu shu-ti-ra (. . . . . ) ha-la in-ne-en-ba
ß. 15 gìn é-dū-a da é Ib-ku-É-a dumu An-azag-sha 1 gan a-shag ${ }^{\text {d }}$ En-lil-gar-ra us-a-rá Ib-ku-ÉE-a nig-gú-na é-a shu-ri-a-bi-shúu ha-la-ba E-a-tu-ra-am子. 15 gìn é-dü-a da é É-a-tu-ra-am shesh-a-ni 1 gan $a$-shag ${ }^{d}$ En-lil-gar-ra us-a-rá Éa-tu-ra-am shesh-a-ni nig-gú-na é-a shu-ri-a-bi-shú h $a-l a-b a \operatorname{E}-a-t a-a-a-a r$ shesh-a-ni
C. a. $2 \frac{2}{5}$ she-gur 3 ma-na sìg 3 qa iá-gish á $m u-\bar{u}-a-s h u ́ u$
22 $\frac{2}{5}$ she-gur 3 qa iá-gish 3 ma-na sìg á $m u-\bar{u}-a-s h u ́ u$ Р E-a-tu-ra-am ̀̀ E-a-ta-a-a-ar ₹ Ib-ku-sha ad-da-na-ra in-na-ab-kal-la-gi-ne
b. ibila lù nu-mu-na-ab-kal-la-gi nam-ibila-ni-ta ba-ra-ĕ-ne
D. she-ga-ne-ne-ta mu lugal-bi in-pá (d)-dé-esh

Ibkusha, son of Anazagsha, has adopted Ea-taiiar, son of (?) ......, as his heir. At the time when he adopted him as his heir, Ibkusha, his father,
has given(?) to Ea-taizar four gar of interest grain. Again, ${ }^{1}$ Ibkusha, the father, has distributed the inheritance to Ea-turam, the son by his wife, and to Ea-taiaar, the adopted son. 15 gin of built house, on one side adjoining the house of $I b k u-E a$, son of Anzagsha; 1 acre of Enlil-garra field, lengthwise adjoining Ibku-Ea; of the property in the house one-half: ${ }^{2}$ the inheritance portion of Ea-turam. 15 gin of built house, lengthwise adjoining the house of Ea-turam, his brother; 1 acre of Enlil-garra field, lengthwise adjoining Ea-turam, his brother; one-half of the property in the house: inheritance portion of Eataiiar, his brother. $2 \frac{2}{5}$ gur of grain, 3 mines of wool and 3 qa of oil as yearly payment ${ }^{3}$ Ea-turam and Ea-taiiar shall each pay to Ibkusha, their father. The heir who will not pay his sustenance shall forfeit his heirship. In mutual agreement they have sworn by the name of the king.

## No. 57.

A. $\quad \nabla T a^{4}-a b-b a-l a-d u d u m u E-t i l-b \hat{l}^{-d}$ Shamash
$\nabla$ Be-el-ti-ia dam-a-ni
$\nabla$ Ha-bil-a-hi nam-dumu-ne-ne-shú ba-an-da-ri
В a. é a-shag nig-ga é-a-gál-la a-na-me-a-bi
$\nabla^{d}$ Nin-IB-ga-mil shesh-gal sib-ta-na
$s h u-b a-a b-t e-g a ́$
ur-a-sì-ga-bi ni-ba-e-ne
b. a-na kishib nam-ibila $\nabla$ Ab-lum gala
garza a-shag é ù gish-sar $\nabla$ Ha-bil-a-hi
$\nabla^{d}$ Nin-IB-ga-mil shesh-a-ni
gù-nu-um-mà-mà-a
C. a. tukundi-bi Ṭa-ab-ba-la-du
ù Be-el-ti-ia dam-a-ni
Р Ha-bil-a-hi dumu-ni-ra

[^14]dumu nu-me-en ba(-e)-ne-in-gù-ush
$\frac{1}{2}$ ma-na kú-babbar ni-lá (l)-e-ne
b. ̀̀ tukundi-bi $\mathrm{H} a$-bil-a-hi $i$
$\nabla T \underline{T} a-a b-b a-l a-d u$ ѝ Be-el-ti-ia
ad-da nu-me-en ama nu-me-en
ba-ne-en-gù-ush
DUBBIN-al-tar-ru-ne
kara-an-ni-ib-dū-e
ù $k u ́$-shú $b a$-ab-sì-mu-ne
Ţab-balatu, son of Etel-bî-Shamash, (and) Beltia, his wife, have adopted Habil-ahi as their son. House, field and all property that exists in the house, after NinIBgamil, the elder brother, shall have received his preference portion, they shall divide into equal parts. To the sonship document of Ablum, the kal̂$\hat{\text {-priest, the temple }}$ income, the field, the house and the garden of Habil-ahi, NinIB-gamil, his brother, shall make no claim. When Ṭab-balaṭu and Beltia, his wife, say to Habil-ahi, their son: "Son not art thou," they shall pay half a mine of silver. But when Habil-ahi says to Tab-balatu and Beltia: "Father not art thou, mother not art thou," they may mark him with the thumb-nail mark(?), put an unsalable slave's mark upon him or even sell him for money. ${ }^{1}$
$$
\text { No. } 4 .
$$
A. a. $\nabla$ A-wi-ir-tum dumu-sal $\mathrm{Hu} u$-pa-tum
ki Hu-pa-tum ad-da-ni
ù Ru-ba-tum ama-a-ni-ta
Р Sha-lu-ur-tum dam $\bar{I}(n i m)-{ }^{d}$ Nannar-ge
nam-dumu-sal-a-ni-shú
$b a-d a-a n-r i$
b. $1 \frac{2}{3}$ gìn kú-babbar
kú-nam-ehi-a-ni-shú
P Sha-lu-ur-tum-ge
LU u-pa-tum-ra
in-na-an-lal

[^15]```
B. a. \(\nabla A\)-wi-ir-tum-ge
KARA-LIL al-dū-ni-ma
b. \(\nabla\) Sha-lu-ur-tum ama-a-ni gar-an-ni-ib-kí-a
C. a. tukundi-bi \(\nabla A\)-wi-ir-tum-ge
Sha-lu-ur-tum ama-a-ni(-ra)
ama-mu nu-me-en ba-na-an-gù
kú-shú sì-mu-dam
b. \(\grave{u}\) tukundr-bi
マ Sha-lu-ur-tum-ge
\(\nabla A\)-wi-ir-tum dumu-sal-a-ni-ra
dumu-sal-mu nu-me-en ba-na-an-gù
10 gìn kú-babbar ni-lá(l)-e
ù kú-nam-eḩi-a-ni-shúu
ba-ra-ě-ne
D. mu lugal-bi in-pá(d)
```

Awirtum, the daughter of Hupatum, from Hupatum, her father, and Rubatum, her mother, Shalurtum, wife of $I($ nim $)$-Nannar, has adopted as her daughter. $1 \frac{2}{3}$ shekels of silver as money (compensation) for her adoption Shalurtum has paid to Hupatum. Awirtum shall be made a votary and then she shall let Shalurtum, her mother, eat her prebend. ${ }^{1}$ When Awirtum says to Shalurtum, her mother: "My mother not art thou," she shall be sold for money. ${ }^{2}$ But when Shalurtum says to Awirtum, her daughter: "My daughter not art thou," she shall pay 10 shekels of silver and shall forfeit the money for her adoption. By the name of the king she has sworn.

The scheme of adoption documents consists of (1) the adoption proper; (2) the regulation of the position of the adopted with regard to the property; (3) provisions concerning the solution of the adoption contract; (4) oath.
A. The technical term for "to adopt" is nam-dumu-ni-shú (No. 57), nam-ibila$n i$-shú (No. 28) or nam-dumu-sal-a-ni-shú (No. 4) ba-da-an-ri or ba-an-da-ri. No. 24 distinguishes expressly between nam-dumu-ni-shú $b a-d a-a n-r i$ and nam-ibila-a-ni-shú in-gar, and it is evident that a difference "in re" corresponds to this distinc-

[^16]tion of terms, the first kind of adoption giving the person concerned only the right to be brought up and kept like a child (dumu, mâru) in the house, the latter conferring also the right of inheriting; ibila, ablu therefore has the meaning of "heir." In No. 28 we find the contracted formula nam-ibila-ni-shú ba-an-da-ri.

Instead of the usual formula: $\mathrm{X}\left|\mathrm{Y}^{2}\right|$ nam-dumu-ni-shú, etc., ba-da-an-ri, No. 4, exhibits a scheme closely corresponding to a deed of purchase:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { a. } \mathrm{X}(=\text { object of adoption }) \mid k i-Y \text { ad-da-ni-(etc.)-ta } \mid Z \text {-ge } \mid \text { nam- } \\
& \quad \text { dumu-sal-a-ni-sú } \mid b a-d a-a n-r i \\
& \left.b . \times \text { gin kú-babbar }\left|k u ́-n a m-c h i-a-n i-s h u^{3}\right| Z-g e|\mathrm{Y}-r a| \text { in-na-an-lút( }\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

This is explained by the different legal position held by the adopted, who as a girl, and probably still a child, does not possess the right of disposing of herself, and therefore is rated rather like a useful help, for whose cession an indemnification must be paid: technical term ku-nam-ehi, "money (indemnification) for the bringing up."
B. The regulation of the rights of the adopted to the property was subject to agreement, but in most cases the general rule concerning the right of inheritance seems to have been applied also to the adopted, i.e., it was provided that the brothers divide the inheritance into equal parts after the eldest had received a preference portion. Therefore in our documents the adopted, when more than one, and provided there was not already a natural heir, are introduced at once as X shesh-gal and Y shesh-a-ni. This formula seems to be peculiar to Nippur contracts, for in Sippar we find the express statement that of more than one adopted, one shall be the abu resp. $m \hat{a} r u$ rabû. Cf. $M ., 94: 13$. No. 4 contains at this place a provision as to the employment of the adopted girl, and the use to be made of her income. Sce for a similar provision made in Cassite times, Clay, B. E., Series A, XIV, 40:6-8: shum-ma a-na mu-tim i-nam-din-shi|shum-ma ha-ri-mu-ta ib-bu-us-si| $a$-mat-sa u-ul i-sha-ak-ka-an, "be it that she gives her to a husband, be it that she makes her a votary, her slave she shall not make her."
C. The provisions as to the solution of the adoption contract show the casuistic form of the laws in the Code of Hammurabi, known in Sumerian also from the socalled Sumerian family laws. The various directions of these latter reoccur in our documents, although with considerable grammatical and often material variations.

[^17]5

They were evidently put together either for accomplished scribes or for those who were learning to write, to serve as patterns for the corresponding parts in adoption documents (law 1-4), marriage contracts (law 5 and 6) and contracts of hiring (law 5). This is very evident from the line which heads the collection of laws: $\check{u}$-kur-shiu $\check{u}$-na-me-shú, "in future, always," which is not quite suitable for a collection of laws, since laws are given in the first place for the present, (Hammurabi begins his code of law with $i$-nu-mi-shu, 'now," C. H., $5: 25$ ), not for the future.
D. The oath which is omitted in No. 57 is a mutual one (she-ga-ne-ne-ta) when the adopting and the adopted are the negotiating parties (Nos. 24, 28) ; in No. 4 it is taken only by the adopting priestess who concludes the contract with the parents of the adopted.

The great number of adoptions and the fact that adults, and often more than one, are adopted show that in Babylonia adoption formed a kind of business transaction by which not only the adopted, but also the adopting person gained an advantage. This consisted primarily in the help which he had from the adopted, and which he needed especially at his age when he could no longer earn his sustenance himself. This becomes very evident from No. 28 , which determines the exact amount of the sustenance which the adopted, and the legitimate son have to give to their father, and from No. 4 where the adopting priestess secures for herself the benefit of her adopted daughter's sustenance.

The document No. 57 combines adoption, division of an inheritance, and obligation to pay annuities. Such combinations are a characteristic feature of Nippur documents, while in or near Sippar, as we have seen already in connection with the division contracts, soparate documents for each party were drawn up, in which only the individual rights that a person had secured were set forth. As an example of such an independent document of the character last mentioned, see C.T., VIII, 37a: 1. she-gur-ba 2. 3 qa iä-gish-ba 3. igi-4-gảl kú-babbar sìg-ba 4. i-na mu-1-kam 5. a-di A-bi-ra-tum 6. ba-al-ta-at 7. 3 isin $\frac{1}{30}$ zid-da 1 uzu(?) 8. P Erish-ti-d Shamash 9. mârat A-lí-wa-aq(-rim) 10. i-ta-na-di-shi-im 11. mu ${ }^{d} B a b b a r{ }^{d} A-a{ }^{d}$ Marduk 12. ѝ Ha-am[-mu-ra-bi] 13. in-pá $(d)$; i.e., a rate of 1 gur of grain, a rate of 3 qa of oil, a rate of $\frac{1}{4}$ (shekel) of silver for wool (and) at three feasts (of Shamash) 10 qa of flour and 1 piece of meat, as long as Abiratum shall live, Erishti-Shamash shall give her.
VI. Marriage Contracts (40 and 58).

No. 40.
A. $\quad \quad^{d} E n-l i l-i d-z u \quad n u$-ésh ${ }^{d}$ En-lil-lá dumu Lugal- $\alpha-z i-d a$
$\nabla$ Ama-sukkal dumu-sal ${ }^{d}$ Nin-IB-ma-an-sì-ge nam-dam-shú ba-an-tug
B. 19 gìn kú-babbar $\nabla$ Ama-sukkal-ge
$\nabla^{d}$ En-lil-id-zu dam-a-ni-ra
in-na-ni-in-tur
C. $a$. $\check{u}$-kúr-shúu tukundi-bi $\nabla^{d}$ En-lil-id-zu-ge
$\nabla$ Ama-sukkal dam-a-ni-ra
dam-mи nu-me-en ba-na-an-gù
19 gìn kú-bi gur-ru-dam
$\grave{u} \frac{1}{2}$ ma-na kú-dam-tág-ni-ra ni-lá(l)-e
b. ѝ tukundi-bi $\nabla$ Ama-sukkal-ge
$\nabla^{a}$ En-lil-id-zu dam-a-ni-ra
dam-mu nu-me-en ba-na-an-gù
19 gìn kư-bi ba-ra-ĕ-ne
ù $\frac{1}{2}$ ma-na kú-babbar ni-lá (l)-e
D. she-ga-ne-ne-ta
mu lugal-ur-bi in-pá (d)-dé-esh
Enlil-idzu, priest of Enlil, son of Lugal-azida, has taken Ama-sukkal, daughter of NinIB-mansi, ${ }^{1}$ to wife. 19 shekels of silver Ama-sukkal has brought in to Enlil-idzu, his wife. In future, when Enlil-idzu says to Ama-sukkal, his wife: ' My wife not art thou," he shall return the 19 shekels of money, and, in addition, pay half a mine as her divorce money. And when Ama-sukkal says to Enlil-idzu, her husband: 'My husband not art thou," she shall forfeit the 19 shekels of money, and, in addition, pay half a mine of silver. In mutual agreement they have both sworn by the name of the king.

No. 48.
A. 1. $\nabla$ A-wi-li-ia dumu Warad-d ${ }^{d}$ Sin
$\nabla$ Na-ra-am-tum dumu-sal ${ }^{d}$ Sin-na-tum.. nam-dam-shú in-tug
2. $\nabla I$-bi-d En -lil ibila shesh-gal Ilu-shu-ib-ni-shu shesh-a-ni
ù İ-li-ma-a-bi shesh-a-ne-ne $\nabla A$-wi-li-ia-ge
$\nabla$ Na-ra-am-tum dam-a-ni-ra nam-ibila-ni-shú in-na-an-si

[^18]B. 2. PI-bi-d En-lil ibila shesh-gal Ilu-shu-ib-ni-shu shesh-a-ni
ù I-li-ma-a-bi shesh-a-ne-ne
é $\alpha$-shag gish-sar geme arad nig-ga é-a-gál-la
Р $A$-wi-li-ia ad-da-ne-ne-ge
shesh-gal sib-ta-na shu-ba-ab-te-gá-a-an ur-a-sì-ga-bi ni-ba-e-ne
C. 1. tukundi-bi $\nabla A$-wi-li-ia Na-ra-am-tum dam-a-ni-ra dam-mu nu-me-en ba-na-an-gù $\frac{1}{2}$ ma-na kí-babbar ni-lá(l)-e tukundi-bi $\nabla$ Na-ra-am-tum A-wi-li-ia dam-a-ni-ra dam-mu nu-me-en ba-na-an-gù dubbin al-tar-ru-ne kú-shú ne-ib-sì-mu-ush
2. tukundi-bi $\nabla$ I-bi-d En-lil Ilu-shu-ib-ni-shu
̀̀ I-li-ma-a-bi shesh-a-ne-ne Na-ra-am-tum ama-ne-ne-ra ama-me nu-me-en ba-na-an-gù-ush nig-ga A-wi-li-ia ad-da-ne-ne-ge ba-ra-ě-ne-en-ne-en tukundi-bi $\nabla \mathrm{Na}$-ra-am-tum I-bi-d ${ }^{\text {d }} \mathrm{En}$-lil Р Ilu-shu-ib-ni-shu ù I-li-ma-a-bi dumu-ne-ne-ra dumu-mu-mésh nu-me-en ba-na-an-gù nig-ga A-wi-li-ia dam-a-na-ge ba-ra-ĕ-ne
D. $\quad \nabla$ Na-ra-am-tum shag g[a .]
[.....n]am-ibila [ ] [mu-a 22 ${ }_{5}^{5}$ she-gur 6 [ma-na sig . . . qa iü- $]$ gish マI-bi-d En-lil ibila shesh-gal Ilu-shu-ib-ni-shu ù I-li-ma-a-bi [shesh-a-ne-]ne ४ Na-ra-am-tum ama-ne-ne-ra in-na-ab-kala-gi-ne ibila she-ba iá-ba ù sìg-ba nu-mu-na-ab-kala-gí nig-ga A-wi-li-ia ad-da-na-ge ba-ra-ë-ne
E. she-ga-ne-ne-ta mu lugal-bi in-pá (d)-dé-esh

Awilia, son of Warad-Sin, has taken Naramtum, daughter of Sinatum, to wife. Ibi-Enlil, the heir (and) elder brother, Ilushu-ibnishu, his brother, and Ilima-abi, their brother, Awilia ${ }^{1}$ has given to Naramtum, his wife, as sons. Ibi-Enlil, the heir (and) elder brother, Ilushu-ibnishu, his brother, and Ilima-abi, their brother, shall divide house, field, garden, maid-slave, man-slave and the property that exists in the house of Awilia, their father, into equal parts after the eldest brother shall have taken his

[^19]preference portion. When Awilia says to Naramtum, his wife: "My wife not art thou," he shall pay $\frac{1}{2}$ mine of silver. When Naramtum says to Awilia, her husband: "My husband not art thou," they shall mark her with the thumb-nail mark(?) and sell her for money. When Ibi-Entil, Ilushu-ibnishu and Ilima-abi, their brother, say to Naramtum, their mother: "Our mother not art thou," they shall forfeit the property of Awilia, their father. When Naramtum says to Ibi-Enlil, Ilushu-ibnishu and Ilima-abi, her children: "My sons ye are not," she shall forfeit the property of Awilia, her husband. Naramtum ............... In the year $2 \frac{2}{5}$ gur of grain, 6 mines of wool and . . . . . qa of oil Ibi-Enlil, the heir (and) elder brother, Ilushu-ibnishu and Ilima-abi, their brother, shall give to Naramtum, their mother, as sustenance. If a son will not give her the grain, oil, and wool installments as sustenance, he shall forfeit the property of his father. In mutual agreement they have sworn by the name of the king.

The scheme of the marriage contracts corresponds in its four parts-(1) the marriage proper (treating of the persons) ; (2) the dowry (treating of the property); (3) the break of the contract; (4) oath-as well as by the formulating of the single parts, entirely to that of the adoption documents, both kinds of treaties being also " in re" closely related to each other, as they both belong to the family law.
A. The technical term for "to marry," nam-dam-shú in-tug (48:3), "he has taken into wifehood," nam-dam-shú ba-an-tug, "he has taken for himself," etc., shows the same formation as nam-dumu-shú ba-da-an-ri.
B. The technical term for "to bring as a dowry" is in-na-ni-in-tur, "she has brought in," the same as in German, "einbringen;" in Sippar documents, the more explicit term, ana bît X (R., $101: 18$, husband; $R ., 84: 39$, father of the husband), usherib, ${ }^{3}$ is used.
C. Cf. the adoption documents.
D. The oath is a mutual one (she-ga-ne-ne-ta mu lugal(-ur-)bi in-pá(d)-dé-esh). ${ }^{4}$

No. 48 is a combination of marriage contract, adoption document and obligation to pay annuities, inasmuch as the wife is given by her husband also the legal rights of a mother over the sons of his former marriage by making them her children (dam-a-ni-ra nam-ibila-ni-shú in-na-an-sì). The principle followed in this

[^20]combination is the juxtaposition of corresponding parts (A. 1, and 2, 1, C. 1 and 2). The mother acquires the right to be sustained by her sons after they have inherited the property of their father. The amount of the sustenance is fixed (D).
VII. A Manumission Document.

No. 8.
A. a. $\nabla \quad D u$-shu-ub-tum NIN(EL, SAL-?)-DINGIR (?)
d Shu-zi-an-na
dumu-sal Dúg-ga-a.
$\nabla$ Ishtar-ra-bi-a-at geme-ni-im ${ }^{1}$
ama-ar-gi-ni in-gar
b. sag-ki-ni in-láhá-láh
c. $B I($ ?) nam-geme-ni in-bi
d. kishib nam-el-la-ni-shú in-na-an-tág
B. • P Ishtar-ra-bi-a-at-ge
$\nabla$ Du-shu-ub-tum nin-a-ni-ra
10 gìn kú-babbar
in-na-ni-in-tur
C. $\check{u}$-kúr-shúu $\nabla I-b i-{ }^{-d} E n-l i l$

й $A$-me-ir-tum $S A L+K U$ - $a-n i$
ibila $\nabla^{d} N a n n a(r)-z i-m u$
ù Du-shu-ub-tum-ge-ne
$\nabla$ Ishtar-ra-bi-at-ra
gù-nu-um-mà-mà-a
D. mu lugal-ur-bi
in-pá(d)-dé-esh
Dushubtum, the priestess(?) of Shuzi-anna, the daughter of Duggâ, has manumitted Ishtar-rabiat, her maid-slave; her forehead she has cleansed; the ...... of her slavedom she has pronounced; a document on her cleansing she has given her. Ishtar-rabiat has brought in to Dushubtum, her mistress, ten shekels of silver. In future shall Ibi-Enlil and Amertum, his sister, the heirs of Nanna(r)-zimu and Dushubtum, make no claim against Ishtar-rabiat. By the name of the king they both have sworn. ${ }^{2}$

[^21]The scheme consists of four parts: 1. The freeing. 2. The paying of a compensation in money. 3. Provision as to future claims. 4. Oath.
A. The technical term for to "set free" is ama-ar-gi-ni in-gar = andurarshu ishkun, "he has made his liberty." As formalities connected with this act are enumerated the following:

1. A religious ceremony, the cleansing of the forehead: ${ }^{1}$ sag-ki-ni in-láh-láh, Sem. bu-zu u-li-il, C. T., IV, $42 a$; only ullil, $R ., 96: 7$; C.T., II, $33: 4$; VIII, $29 a: 6 ; 29 b$ : $3 ; 48: 5$. The cleansing, which in all these cases appears as correlative to an adoption ${ }^{2}$ of slaves, in the Yokha document, however, to a manumission, refers to religious cleanliness, as is also shown by the phrase $a-n a{ }^{d}$ Shamash u-li-il-shi-na-ti, C. T., VIII, 29a:6. This is a very important fact, because therefrom it would follow that slaves were not allowed to participate in the cult of free Babylonians. In VR.47: $32 b$ the same ceremony is described as a removing the muttutu, i.e., the slave mark which was placed on the forehead (muttatu), and as a removing the abuttum.
2. Whether the pronouncing of the dissolution of servitude represents a legal formality or a further religious act, perhaps the reciting of an exorcism, is difficult to say.
3. The legal formality of giving a document which authenticates the cleanliness. The term kishib-tág corresponds to, or, more correctly, was the model for the Semitic kishippam or kunukkam ezêbu, literally "to leave one's seal impression" (in the possession of the other party).
B. The 10 shekels of silver, the equivalent paid for the manumission, represent about the value of a maid-slave, who, e.g., in $20, \mathrm{III}, 15,16$, is estimated at 11 shekels. In the other cases of "cleansing" the equivalent consists in the obligation to care for the adoptive parents. The term in-na-ni-in-tur, "she has brought in," is the same as that used in connection with the bringing of a dowry; here most probably "the bringing in" is meant in the commercial sense of yielding proceeds, returns, from which we may conclude that the maid-slave had to earn money for her mistress in such a way that part of the proceeds were credited to her.

C and D. Like in similar documents, the provisions against future claims are directed against the heirs of the former mistress. In this instance also the oath has been taken by them (mu lugal-ur-bi in-pá(d)-déesh). ${ }^{4}$

[^22]VIII. Deeds of Loan. ${ }^{1}$

No. 22.
Loan of money.
A. 1 gìn kú-babbar másh-an-tug
$\frac{2}{3}$ gìn 12 she shemir (?)
másh nu-ub-tug
ki Da-mi-iq-i-lí-shu
duти Na-ra-am- ${ }^{d}$ Sin-ta
$\nabla$ Lì- ${ }^{d} A m a-a-r a-z u$
duти Ad-da-dug-ga nu-ésh-ge
shu-ba-an-ti
B. $m u-D U$ ud-ebur-ka
kú ù másh-bi gur-ru-dam
No. 16.
Loan of grain with interest due in money.
A. 25 she-gur

15 gìn kú-babbar másh-in-tug
$k{ }^{d} N i n-I B-m a-a n-s i$
dumu Da-mi-iq-i-li-shu-ta
Р Hुa-ba-na-tum $\grave{u}^{-d} D a-m u[-\ldots .$.
dumu-ni-ge
shu-ba-an-ti-esh
B. mu-DU ud-ebur-ka
she-bi ù kú-babbar-bi
shag-ga-ni ne-ib-dug-gi-esh
25 gur of grain bearing an interest of 15 shekels of silver, from NinIB-mansi, son of Damiq-ilishu, Habanatum and Damu-...... , his son, have received. At the $\ldots . .$. . of the harvest time they shall pay him the grain and the money.

No. 15.
Loan of grain.
A. 12 she-gur
másh nu-ub-tug
ki Ib-ku-ir-si-tim
dumu ${ }^{d}$ Sin-li-di[-ish]-ta

[^23]\[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Zi-ia-tum dumu Ur- }{ }^{\text {d }} \text { En-nu-gi } \\
& \text { ù I-bi-d } N \text { in-shah } \\
& \text { dumu } N u \text {-ur- }{ }^{d} \text { Nin-shah-ge } \\
& \text { shu-ba-an-ti-esh } \\
& \text { B. } m u-D U \text { ebur-ka } \\
& \text { kara-Nibruki-ka } \\
& \text { she-al-ág-e }
\end{aligned}
$$
\]

No. 21.
Loan of bricks.
A. $\frac{1}{2}$ sar 1 gìn sig
sig Na-bi- ${ }^{\text {d }}$ Shamash
ki Na-bi-dShamash
४ Igi-d $N a n n a(r)$-shú-al-gin
shu-ba-an-ti
B. itu sig-a sag
sig ki-gar-ra-bi-shí
gur-ru-dam
$\frac{1}{2}$ sar 1 gin of bricks, ${ }^{1}$ the bricks of Nabi-Shamash, from Nabi-Shamash Igi-Nannar-shu-algin has received. At the beginning of the month of Siwan he shall return bricks for exchange.

Deeds of loan, hire, rent and lease form a group of legal documents by themselves, inasmuch as they transfer a right to the concerned object of treaty only for a time. We therefore find in such documents neither provisions as to future claims nor the oath. Thus of the four parts of the deeds of purchase only the first two are left, which treat of the passing of the property into other hands and the equivalent given in exchange, here the payment of interest, rent, etc. Cf. the following schemes of deeds of loan and of hire:

Loan (money or grain).
A. Object of the loan.
$k i$-Y-ta
₹ Z-ge
shu-ba-an-ti

## Hire.

A. $\quad \mathrm{XX}$ (object of hire).
ki-Y-ta
マ Z-ge
in-KU

[^24]B. $m u-D U(u d-) e b u r-k a$
O ( ̀̀ másh)-bi
al-ág-e
B. $\dot{a}-b i i d-d a-s h u ́ u$
x she-ta-a-an
al-ág-e
A. The technical term for "to take as a loan" is shu-ba-an-ti, "he has taken, received," pl. shu-ba-an-ti-esh (Sippar: shu-ba-an-ti-me-esh). The object, when grain or money, is always accompanied by an apposition denoting whether the loan shall bear interest - másh-in-tug (an-tug) - or not - másh nu-ub-tug -: that is to say, whether the interest has still to be added to the amount noted in the document, or whether it is already included in it, respectively has been paid already. Instead of másh-in-tug we find in Sippar documents másh . . . . dah-he (i)-dam, e.g., másh 1 gur $\frac{1}{5}+{ }_{30}^{4}$ dah-he-dam, "as interest from 1 gur he shall add 100 qa," $R ., 38: 2$; in Semitic, e.g., sibat ${ }^{\text {d }}$ Shamash $u-z a-a p$, "the interest of Shamash he shall add," $R ., 27: 2$. Contrary to the documents from Sippar, those from Nippur do not indicate the rate of interest. Probably there has been in use at Nippur only one rate which was understood in all cases. Only No. 16 indicates the amount of interest for grain, because it shall be paid in money.
B. Since the compensation for the loan has been determined before by the statement concerning interest, this part contains only provisions as to the time and the place of returning loan and interest. The verbs used to denote the returning are gur-ru-dam, "he shall return"; al-ag-e (Sippar: ni-ág-e), "he shall measure" of grain; and shag-ga-ni ne-ib-dug-gi-en,' $20: 8$, plur.: ne-ib-dug-gi-esh, $16: 10$, "he shall satisfy his heart."

The usual time for the return of grain and money is at harvest. For bricks, in No. 21, the month of brick-making, Siwân, is designated. Instead of ud-ebur-shú, which occurs on the Sippar tablets, our tablets show $m u-D U(u d-) e b u r-k a$. As $k a$ denotes the ablative of a genetive combination (cf. kara-Nibru'ki-ka, 'in the granary of Nippur," $15: 6$ ), mu-DU should be connected with ebur or ud-ebur. But it is difficult to determine the precise meaning. ${ }^{2}$ Only in the one instance just quoted (15:: 6) we find a statement concerning the place of the payment. A statement as to a certain grain measure, corresponding to i-na gish-shis ${ }^{\text {d }}$ Shamash on Sippar documents, is not found.

[^25]
## IX. Contracts of Hire (51). <br> No. 51.

A. $\quad$ VI-din-Ishtar
dumu Na-bi-d Shamash
ki Na-bi-dShamash-ta
$\nabla$ Lù- ${ }^{d} N i n-s i-a n-n a$
itu sig-a ud-21-ta
itu she-gùr-kud ud-30-shú
in-KU
B. $a_{1}-b i \grave{i} d-d a-s h u ́ u$
$\frac{1}{5}+\frac{2}{30}$ she-ta-a-an
al-ág-e
Idin-Ishtar, the son of Nabi-Shamash, from Nabi-Shamash Lu-Nin-si-anna has hired (for the time) from Siwan 21st to Adar 30th. As his hire he shall pay 80 qa of grain every month.
A. The technical term is in-KU, igur, "he has hired." The duration of the hiring is indicated by -ta-shú.
B. Cf. the deeds of loan. The wages (technical term $\hat{a}^{1}=i d u$ ), which in this instance do not represent a great amount, are probably paid at the end of the time of hiring, since a specified term is not mentioned.
X. Leases (Nos. 29 and 61).

No. 29.
Lease of a field.
4 gan á-shag gúg-she
shag a-shag ${ }^{d}$ Nin-unu
us-a-rá A-qu-u-a
a-shag Ib-ga-tum
dumu Ur-Dì-azag-ga
ki Ib-ga-tum dumu Ur-Dù-azag-ga-ta
$\nabla^{\text {d }}$ Da-mu-i-din-nam-ge
nam-urú-lá-shú
igi-3-gal-shú
[á]-mu-u-a-shúu
[ib-]ta-an-è

[^26]4 gan of $g \dot{u} g$-she field in the field of Nin-unu with one long-side adjoining Agua, the field of Ibgatum, son of Ur-Duazagga, from Ibgatum, son of Ur-Duazagga, Damuidinnam has rented for the purpose of cultivating, at the rate of one-third (of the returns) as yearly rent.

The documents of lease from Sippar (and other cities) show, like the deeds of loan and hire, the characteristic two parts. Cf. e.g., R. 74 (Sippar Am-na-num):
A. $\frac{1}{3}$ bur 3 gan eqlum ugar na-bil(?)-tum $\mid$ itti Be-li-tum SAL(+ISHIB) ${ }^{d}$ Shamash mârat Ilu-shu-ib-ni-shu $\mid$ be-el-ti eqlim $\mid \nabla I b-n i-{ }^{d}$ Shamash mâr Ilu-na-ṣi-ir|eqlam a-na ir-ri-shu-tim a-na biltim | u-she-zi.
B. ud-ebur-shúu | 4 she-gur gish-shí "Shamash $\mid$ i-na Kar-Sipparic Am-na-na $\mid$ $n i-a ́ g-e$.

Or P. 77:
A. 1 bur $\frac{1}{5}$ bur 3 gan $a$-shag $\mid a$-shag $A$-bi-ia-tum $\mid$ ki $A$-bi-ia-tum $\mid$ lugal $a$-shag-ge $\mid$ $\nabla$ Warad- ${ }^{d}$ Mar-tu $\mid$ nam-urú-lá-shú $\mid i b-t a-e ̀-a .{ }^{1}$
B. ki-ma $i$-mi-it-ti-shu $\mid \grave{u}$ shu-mi-li-shu $\mid$ she ni-ág-e. ${ }^{2}$

The only completely preserved deed of lease from Nippur, however, unites the two parts into one.

The technical term for "to take in lease, to rent," is $\langle 6-t a-a n-\grave{e}$, "he has brought out." The addition nam-urú-lá-shú $=$ ana irrishutim is not superfluous, because the lessor, even if the rent was not dependent upon the returns, had a great interest in his land being properly cultivated, in order to keep it from waste.

## XI. Acquittance.

No. 65.
Receipt for the purchase money of a house.
A. 3 gìn $k u ́ u-b a b b a r$ sham-é(? kisal) Р Ki-ish-ti-d $N i n-I B$
duти ${ }^{\top} a b-b a-l a-d u$
ki Ba-li-lum
$\grave{u}^{d}$ Sin-ma-lik
dumu Zi-ia-tum
shu-ba-an-ti
B. shag-ga-na ba-ab-dug-gi-en

[^27]3 shekels of silver, the purchase money of a house, Kishti-Nin-IB, son of Tabbalaṭu, has received from Balilum and Sin-malik. His heart shall be satisfied.

The technical term of these receipts is shu-ba-an-ti=mahir, "he has received." The phrase shag-ga-na $b a-a b-d u g-g i-e n$ is, it seems, the passive equivalent to ne-ib$d u g-g i-e n$ and, like this and shu-ba-ab-te-gá-en, future, although one should more expect a perfect, "it has been satisfied."
XII. Memorandum of Grain.

No. 55.
$\left[\frac{1}{5}+\frac{1}{30}\right.$ she shu-]ti-a Ba-ba-a
$\frac{3}{30}$ she shu-ti-a
lù-su ${ }^{\text {su }}$ san-sur
$\frac{1}{5}+\frac{4}{30}$ she sham su-e-sir-zun
$\frac{1}{5}$ she ki-dish(?)
$\frac{1}{5}+\frac{1}{30}$ she $i$-na gish-ba-an
lù-gash-tin-na
shu-ti-a
Ut-ta-gàl-lu-ma-an-sì
shu-kil $1 \frac{3}{30}$ she-gur
shu-ti-a ${ }^{\text {a }}$ Da-mu-i-din-nam
ki ${ }^{\text {d}}$ En-lil-ma-lik
$\frac{7}{30}$ gur of grain which $B a b \hat{a}$ has received; $\frac{3}{30}$ gur of grain which the harnessmaker has received; 100 qa of grain, the price for shoes; 60 qa of grain ditto(?); 1 gur 10 qa of grain in the $\ldots$. . of the wine-maker which Uttagallu-mansi has received; in all 1 gur 30 qa of grain which Damu-idinnam has received from Enlilmalik.

Annotation: The verbal adjcctive shu-ti-a, "received," from shu-ti, stands instead of a relative clause, which we find, e.g., C. T., VI, $25: 5: \frac{1}{2}$ she sha at-ta te-el-ku-u, "which thou hast taken," li. 2, 1 she-gur sha . . . . ta-am-hu-ru, "which thou hast received." Shu-ti-a has passed into the Semitic Babylonian as shutu, gen. shu-ti-i, 130:11.
XIII. Confirmation Document.

No. 42.
A. a. $\nabla^{d} \operatorname{Sin}-a-b u-s h u$
dumu ${ }^{d}$ Nannar-lù-ti
kishib-ash-ash nam-gala

> u ha-la-ba-ni $\nabla^{d} N a n n a r-t u m ~ n u-e s h-? ~$ shu-na ba-an-si-ma b. $\quad$ mu-2-kam-du-ù-bi egir ${ }^{d}$ Sin-a-bu-shu ba-IDIM-a-ta $\nabla A-b a-d$ En-lil-dim shu ${ }^{d}$ Nannar-tum-ta kishib-ash-ash ${ }^{d}$ Sin-a-bu-shu  Ba-an-tum B. $\quad \check{u}-k u ́ r-s h u ́ u ~ g \grave{u}-g a ́ l-l a ~ k i s h i b-a s h-a s h ~$  $\nabla A-b a-d$ En-lil-dim ba-an-ni-gí-gí

Two years after the titles to the kal̂ office and the inheritance of Sin-abushu, son of Nannar-luti, have been conferred upon Nannartum, the priest, (now)after Sin$a b u s h u$ has died, Aba-Enlit-dim has received the titles of Sin-abushu from the hand of Nannartum. In future a complainant on account of the titles, Aba-Enlil-dim shall satisfy.

The document authenticates to a person the receipt of titles to a temple office. It is not sealed by the person from whom the titles are received, but by the witnesses, i.e., a collegium of the chief kalû and the chief temple superintendent, besides a riqqu, a pashishu and a scribe. From this fact we may conclude that the temple, perhaps on account of the death of the former owner, had to dispose of the titles. It is not stated what the recipient had to give as an equivalent.

Annotation: Li. 8 presents an example for the substantivation of sentences, inasmuch as ${ }^{d}$ Sin-a-bu-shu $b a-I D I M$, "Sin-abushu died," is made dependent on egir-ta, literally "from after," i.e., "since." Exactly the same construction we find Urukagina, Clay tablet, Rev. II, 11-12, the GISH-HU-ite is guilty of guilt with Ningirsu, egir Lagash ${ }^{k i} b a$-hul-a-ta, "since Lagash is destroyed."
XIV. Agrefments Connected with Proceedings before a Court of Law.

## 1. No. 10.

Cession of a house.

1. $\nabla$ Ma-ri-ir-sì-tim shesh-gal 2. ̀̀ Mu-tum-ilum shesh-a-ni 3. ibila- ${ }^{d}$ Ishkur-ra-bi-ge-ne 4. ${ }^{d}$ Ha-am-mu-ra-bi lugal-e 5. gab-i-ib-ri-esh igi-ne-ne-in-gar-ri-esh-ma 6. $\frac{1}{3}$ bur 3 gan $a$-shag gan-da kú-bi 10 gìn 7 . gab-ri nam-shutug ${ }^{\text {d }}$ Nin-lil-lá ̀̀ a-shag shuku 8. $\left\ulcorner\breve{U}\right.$-dú-dú shutug ${ }^{d}$ Nin-lil-lá shesh ad-da-me-e 9. $\nabla^{d}$ Ishkur-ra-bi ad-dame in-sum 10. ne-in-bí-esh
2. Lugal-e ${ }^{d}$ Ishkur-shar-ru-um ukush lugal 12. dumu ${ }^{d} I-s h u m-a-b i \quad$ 13. da-
ne-ne-ta mu-un-sar-ri-esh-ma 14. di-bi bu-uh-ru-um Nibruki-ka 15. dur-bi-ne-ne-in-dúg 16. bu-uh-ru-um Nibru ${ }^{k i}-k a$ 17. i-i-ma igi-ne-in-dŭ-esh-ma 18. 1 sar é-dū-a gab-ri $\frac{1}{3}$ bur 3 gan a-shag gan-da 19. sì-ma-ab ne-in-bí-esh
3. Gibil-bi-esh-á-an 21. lù-lù-ù(r) ba-e-ne-gin 22. she-ga-ne-ne-ta 23. 1 sar é-dū-a ù kizlahh-bi 24. 4 gìn kizlah diri mu é-dū-ù-dé 25. sag-bi é ${ }^{a}$ Nin-IB-ri-im-i-li 26. da é ${ }^{d}$ Nin-IB-qar-ra-ad mu 27. ̀̀ da é $W a-r a-z u-n u ~ n a g a r ~ 28 . ~ ₹ ~ T s h k u r-~$ RUSH-ra shutug ${ }^{d}$ Nin-lil-lá 29. ̀̀ Ib-ga-tum shesh-a-ni 30. ibila-Ŭ-dú-dú-ge-ne-e 31. ₹ Ma-ri-ir-sititim ѝ Mu-tum-ilu-ra 32. ibila ${ }^{\text {d }}$ Ishkur-ra-bi-ge-ne 33. gab-ri namshutug ${ }^{d}$ Nin-lil-lá in-ne-en-sì $(m)$-ush 34. ŭ-kúur-shú ${ }^{d}$ Ishkur-RUSH-ra Ib-ga-tum shesh-a-ni 35. ù ibila-a-ni a-na-me-a-bi. 36. é-bi-shú gù nu-mà-mà mu lugal-bi in-pá(d)-esh

Mar-irsitim, the elder brother, and Mutum-ilum, his brother, the sons of Ishkur-rabi, went before Hammurabi, the king ................ and spoke as follows: " 9 acres of cultivated land worth in money 10 shekels, the equivalent of the pashishu office of Ninlil and the prebend field, Ududu, the pashishu of Ninlil, the brother of our father, has sold to Ishkur-rabi, our father."

The king and Ishkur-sharrum, the soldier messenger of the king, the son of Ishum-abi, on their part wrote that the council of Nippur should render them justice. In the council of Nippur they considered the case and ordered to give one sar of built house as equivalent for the 9 acres of cultivated land.

Again one with the other has agreed. In mutual consent 1 sar of built house and waste ground, (and) additional 4 gin of waste ground on account of the house having still to be built with the front adjoining the house of NinIB-rim-ili, on one side adjoining the house of NinIB-qarrad, the baker, on the other side adjoining the house of Warazunu, the carpenter, Ishkur-RUSHra, the pashishu of Ninlil, and Ibgatum, his brother, the sons of Ududu, have given to Mar-irsitim and Mutumilum, the sons of $\ s h k u r$-rabi, as equivalent for the pashishu office of Ninlil. In future shall Ishkur-RUSHra, Ibgatum, his brother, and any heir of his make no claim to this house; by the name of the king they have sworn.

The document consists of three parts: (1) Record of the appeal to the king, li. $1-10$; (2) Remittal of the case to the council of Nippur, and decision of the council, li. 11-19; (3) Acceptance and execution of the decision by the parties, li. 20-36. The principal interest of the document as such centres in the last part, the authentication of the assignment of real estate. The account of the previous history of this
cession is of less interest for the document. . This expresses itself in the tenses of the verbs, only those of the last part being in the perfect (ba-lal, li. 21; e-lal, li. 33, 36), while those of the first two parts are in the historical tense (mu-lal, li. 13; ne-lal, li. $5,10,15,19$; $i$ - $i b-l a l(?)$, li. 5$)$.

Of direct appeals and complaints to the king we know a good many instances from the letters of Hammurabi, and one from S. 1 (to Nur-Ishkur). In the latter instance the king renders judgment himself, while here, as in the letters of Hammurabi, the king turns the case over to the home authorities. The puhrum of Nippur is the city council. As a subaltern officer of this council appears the rêd puhrum, who is mentioned, $53: 37$ ( $=34: 36$ ), beside a rabis daiuani. ${ }^{1}$ It is likely that this council represented the administrative and executive authority as well as the regular court of justice for Nippur, thus corresponding to the college of judges in Sippar, who, together with the shakanakku, are often called upon in the royal letters with regard to administrative matters. In smaller towns, like, e.g., Tell. Sifr, a rabiânu, "mayor," exercised the executive functions of the government, while judgment was rendered in the neighboring city of Larsam.


#### Abstract

Annotations: ${ }^{d} \mathrm{Ha} a \mathrm{am}=\mathrm{mu}=r a=\mathrm{bi}$ lugal=e, li.4. It is unlikely that we should read dingir, ete., "God and Hammurabi." The "auslaut" $e$ does not denote the nominative, but is most probably due to the influence of the $l$. To gab= $\mathrm{i}=\mathrm{i} \mathrm{b}=\mathrm{ri}=\mathrm{esh}$, li. 5 , cf. S., $1: 10$ : lugal-e gab-in-ne-ri-esh; gab-ri means "to be or stand face to face." The meaning of igi=ne=ne=in=gar is not clear. Supposing that $i g i-g a r$ is a compound verb (cf. igi-mu-na-ni-gar, Gud., Cyl. A, $1: 20$ ), we should analyze nenen as prefix $n e+$ dative $n e+$ accusative $n$ and translate "they made eye to them" = they looked upon them, which might be understood of a favorable acceptance at the court. But then the ehange of subject would present some difficulty. On the other hand a translation, "their lace they (the complainants) have turned" (igi-ne-ne in-gar-ri-esh $=$ panishunu ishkunu), would require the indication of some object towards wlich they turned their faces. $=\mathbf{m a}$ after verbs stands in li. 5,13 and 17 , before direct speech or an order in the infinitive; but I do not venture to conclude from these instances that it is its function to introduce the speech ( $=u m m a ; m a$ ). Apparently it is the equivalent of the copulative $m a$, "and then," the surprising treatment as postposition of which and its difference from $\dot{u}$ might thus be casily explained by its Sumerian origin. Shesh ad=da=me=e, li. 8: the "cuuslaut" $e$ denotes the nominative; cf. ibila- $\breve{U}$ - $d u-d u-g e-n e-e$, li. 30. In=si, li. 9, perfect tense, because they assert that it is now their property. Ne-in= bi=esh, li. 10 and 19, bí for bi, qibu, "to speak." Dur=bi ne=ne=in=dí(g), li. 15, (dur-dúg-ga = qibu. $\operatorname{sha}$ ameli, $B r$. 10574) contains the command of the king. We would expect that this should be indicated in mood or tense, but as far as we can judge durbi nendu(g) is the historical pretcrit tense in the indicative mood, and we may thercfore think of a mistake of the scribe, so much the more as after munsarresh-ma and the direct speech we would expect a verb like "to order": they wrote and ordered that, etc. Sj=ma=ab ne=in=bi=esh, li. 19, for the construction of bi with infinitive, compare $49: 29$ : shib̂̂zunu gabâm iqbûshunushi; Gud., Cyl. A, 1:19: ê-a-ni dū-ba mu-na-dúg; and Warad-Sin, Clay cone $2: 5$ (quoted below). Mu é=du-ùdé, li. 24 , the 4 gin of waste ground are added to the 1 sar mentioned in li. 23 , because this 1 sar does not wholly consist of $\dot{e}-d \bar{u}-a$, but partly also of kizlah, and therefore a part of the house must be built before it becomes 1 sar $e ́-d \bar{u}-a$. Compare the similar case in $11: 16-20$. To $\hat{e}-d \bar{u}-\hat{u}$ - $d e ́ c o m p a r e ~ e ́-a-n i ~ d u ̄-i u-d e ́, ~$


[^28]"to build his house (he bade me)," Warad-Sin, Clay cone 2:5; and Canephore, 1:14. Instead of mu-shî we have here only $m u$ (or $m u-d e$ ). The apposition ibila ${ }^{d}$ Ishkur=ra=bi-ge=ne, li. 33 , is not included in the complex of words joined together by the postposition ra.

## 2. No. 14.

Cossion of a boundary wall.

> A. a. $I z-z i r i-b a-n a$
> nig ${ }^{d}$ Sin-ish-me-a-ni nagar
> dumu Wa-ra-zu-nu
> й Ma-ri-ir-si-tim
> dumu Da-ma(?)-gu-gu
> b. $>$ Ma-ri-ir-si-tim
> kú-babbar igi-te-bi
> shag ${ }^{\text {d }}$ Sin-ish-me-a-ni nagar
> $n e-i b-d u g-g i$
> c. nig na-me muh-na nu-tug
> B. a. $\breve{u}$-kúr-shú ${ }^{d} \operatorname{Sin}-i s h-m e(-a)-n i$
> iz-zi ri-ba-na im-mu-ta
> $n i$-dū-e
> gish-d $\bar{u} n u-u b-d \bar{u}-e$
> gish-ùr-ra nu-ub-nitahu-e
> $\nabla^{d}$ Sin-ish-me-a-ni-ge
> Р Ma-ri-ir-ṣi-tim-ra
> nu-mu-na-ab-bi
> C. she-ga-ne-ne-ta
> mu lugal-bi in-pá(d)-dé-esh

On account of the boundary wall, the property of Sin-ishmeani, the carpenter, the son of Warazunu, and also of Mar-irsitim, the son of Dama(?)-gugu, Mar-irsitim shall satisfy the heart of Sin-ishmeani, the carpenter, with a sum for acquittance, so that he has no claim whatever against him. In future shall Sin-ishmeani build a boundary wall of his own. "A peg he shall not drive in, a beam he shall not lay on," shall Sin-ishmeani not say to Mar-irsitim. In mutual assent they have sworn by the name of the king.

No. 44.
Payment of money.
5 shiqlu $k$ [aspim $]$
e-zu-ub 19 sh[iqlu kaspim]
sha ina kishib $n[a m-\quad]$
$\nabla$ Ama-sukkal $[$
$\nabla{ }^{d}$ Nin-IB[-ma-an-si
$a-n a{ }^{d} E n-l[i l-i d-z u$
$a-n a$ te- $[r-h a-t i ? \quad] i m \ldots$.

Five shekels of silver in addition to the 19 shekels of silver, which in the marriage(?) document $A m a-$ sukkal has . . . . . . . . . . NinIB-mansi shall(?)

The two documents are decisions of a court of justice, as is evident from the fact that in No. 14 the rêl $\hat{u}$, and in No. 44 the rabis daizani are found among the witnesses, and that the documents are not sealed by the party upon whom the obligation rests, but by the witnesses, respectively the judges. The seals employed are temple seals.

[^29]
## III. THE SEALS.

A characteristic feature of the Nippur documents are the seal impressions, which differ in various respects from those on tablets from other parts of Babylonia. As I have shown in another place, ${ }^{1}$ the seals employed in Nippur in connection with documents that were sworn to were not those usually borne by the persons who sealed the contract, but were made expressly for the occasion by an official, the bur-gul, who as such is associated in the closest connection with the dub-sar, either in the succession dubsar-burgul or burgul-dubsar, after the names of all other witnesses are recorded. ${ }^{2}$ The seals made by the burgul were not engraved on such small cylinders of a very hard material as have been found abundantly in the mounds of Babylonian cities, but on small rectangular slabs, or on the rectangular side of more handy pieces of a soft material which could be cut easily. These seals, of course, could not be rolled over the tablet, but were stamped upon them, as can be seen clearly from the impressions on the case of No. $49 .^{3}$ It should be mentioned also that they never contain pictorial representations. The script of the inscription is larger and less carefully made than on the cylinders. ${ }^{4}$ The seal was placed on the tablet in such a way that the inscription traversed the uninscribed parts of the surface in longitudinal direction (see Nos. 4, 10, etc., left edge; No. 35, upper edge; Nos. 33 and 32, reverse). ${ }^{5}$ The name of the sealing person is therefore usually reproduced in full, while on the Sippar tablets the inscription, because of its latitudinal direction, is impressed only partially, it being often impossible to make out the name (see Nos. 83 and 134, Vol. VI, Plates X and $\mathrm{VIII}^{\beta}$ ). The inscription never contains an addition to the name

[^30]denoting a religious confession, like "servant of this or that divinity," which is so frequently found on cylinders, but confines itself, on account of its official character, to strictly legal designations, i.e., the kunya; and not infrequently the statement of the vocation, which stands before the kunya, e.g.:


The most remarkable feature, however, is that the names of all the persons forming one party of the treaty, and in connection with division documents the names of all parties concerned, are united on one seal, which would have been an impossibility if the seal had not been made for the one special occasion. A very instructive example we have in the division document No. 32, the seal impression of which reads:

| A-bil-d ${ }^{d}$ Mar-tu |
| :---: |
| Li-bi-it-d Mar-tu |
| Li-bi-it--d ${ }^{d} n-$-lil |
| ${ }^{d}$ Mar-tu-ma-lik |
| dumu-mésh E-ri-ish-su-ma-tum |

The deeds of purchase Nos. 33-35, in which the eldest of these brothers buys back the shares of his co-heirs, however, are sealed respectively:

| ${ }^{{ }^{\prime}}$ Mar-tu-ma-lik |
| :---: |
| dumu E-ri-ish-zu-ma-tum |



Compare also the adoption document No. 24:

| E-a-i-din-nam |
| :---: |
| dumu Ib-ku-Ishtur |
| it $K u$-ri-fum dam-a-ni |

It is remarkable that such seals were cut by the burgul even for the temples, or, using the Babylonian way of expressing it, for the gods, when they were the parties on whom the obligation rested. Thus No. 66, where the temple of Enki and Damgalnunna sells offices of the temple, is sealed:

$|$| $d^{d}-E n-k i$ |
| :---: |
| ${ }^{d}$ Dam-gal-nun-na |

For those contracts, however, in which both parties undergo obligations the burgul made two different seals. Cf., e.g., the seal impressions on the marriage contract No. 40 :

| ${ }^{d_{E n}}$ Elil-id-zu |
| :---: |
| dumu Lugal-a-zi-da |
| $\frac{\text { Ama-sukkal }}{\text { dumu-sal }^{d} \text { Nin-IB-ma-an-si }}$ |

and on the deed of exchange No. 39 :


The seals used with contracts that were not sworn to, or such documents as were sealed by the witnesses, were private seals (cf. 22, 62, on page 55 , etc.). It is a fact, well known from Sippar tablets, that only a comparatively small number of persons carried seals containing their own names, ${ }^{1}$ but most of them such as either had formerly belonged to other persons, containing the names of these, or had no inscription at all. ${ }^{2}$ A considerable number of seal impressions shows only the picture and the name and the titles of a god. ${ }^{3}$ The scanty material at our disposal does not permit us to decide with absolute certainty whether this peculiarity explains itself simply by the character of the seal as a charm, or whether they, like the above mentioned burgul seal of Enki and Damgalnunna, are temple seals, and were used by the persons who held office in the respective temples. But the frequent occurrence of one and the same god on different seals leaves but little doubt that the first view is the right one. ${ }^{4}$

With some tablets the whole surface is covered with seal impressions, the traces of which can clearly be seen between the script. ${ }^{5}$ These seal impressions were made before the tablets were inscribed, because the script shows no sign of derangement. This seems to be the case also with those tablets on which the seal impressions are
${ }^{1}$ (CR., e.g., No. 62, seals $a$ and $b$.
${ }^{2}$ For the first kind see No. 62, seal $c$; for the second No. 25 (and No. 83).
${ }^{3}$ No. 29: ${ }^{d}$ She-tir (lease of field); No. 30: ${ }^{d}$ Nin-shab and ${ }^{d}$ Pa-bi(l)-sag; No. 14: ${ }^{d}-?-a-u b-g a l$ and ${ }^{d}$.
( $=$ seals of two witnesses); No. 42: ${ }^{d}$ Lugal-esh-a ( $=$ seal of the witnesses); No. 47: twice ${ }^{d}$ Nin-shah and ${ }^{d}$ Lugal-esh-a (seals of three witnesses), besides the seal of the scribe; No. 58: one scal of the witnesses and one of ? ; compare also No. 74, seal $a:{ }^{d}$ Nin-shah $\mid$ sukkal-zi-an-na $\mid$ geshdar-azag shu-. . . . , and similar ones in De Clercq, Collection.
${ }^{4}$ It is of some interest to notice that the seal of No. 29 with the picture and the name of the god of grain, ${ }^{d}$ She-tiv, belongs to a farmer. Especially frequent are seals with the name of Nin-shah, the god who listens to the prayer (cf. Rim-Sin, Clay cone 7).
${ }^{5}$ See the photographic reproductions on PI. I, II and III.
made only on the blank spaces. Contrary to the custom prevailing at Sippar of sealing only the case and leaving the tablet unsealed, in Nippur the inner tablet was sealed also.

The following gives a list of the inscriptions of burgul seals on tablets in the Imperial Ottoman Museum, which my time did not permit me to copy:

No. 11.
Deed of Exchange.
a. Na-bi-d Shamash
dumu Im-gu-u-a
b. Da-mi-iq-i-li-shu
ù Na-ru-bi-tum dum-a-ni

No. 12.
Deed of Purchase.
Im-gur- ${ }^{d}$ Nin-IB
dити I-ba-shar-ru-um
${ }^{d} N i n-I B-a-b i$
${ }^{d}$ Nin-IB-ga-mil.
dumu-mísh Lù̀-ga-tum Ma-nu-[tum ama-ne-ne]

No. 23.
Division Document.
Na-ru-ub-tum
dumu-sal Mi-gir ${ }^{d}$ En-lil
........
...........

No. 26.

## Division Document.

En-lil-lù-shág
$d_{N a n n a}(r)-a-r a ́-m u-u n-g i$
Ur-Dù-azag-ga
$U r-{ }^{d} I D U N-P A-\dot{e}-a$
dumu-mésh ${ }^{d}$ Ninni-ma-an-sì

No. 31.
Deed of Purchase.
Ni-shi-ni-shu
dumu-sal $N u-u r_{-}^{d} K a b-t a$

No. 36.
Deed of Purchase.
El-lu-mu-u-shu
dumu Şi-li-d Shamash

No. 37.
Deed of Exchange.
a. Shu-mu-um-li-ib-shi duти Ur-Dù-azag-ga
b. Lù-仑̂-shu-me-DU
dumu ${ }^{d}$ Shamash-d ${ }^{d} n-l i l$

No. 41.
Deed of Purchase.
${ }^{d} N u s k u-n i-s h u$ $d u m u^{d}$ Nin-IB-mu-sha-lim

No. 45.
Deed of Ransoming.
Be-el-ta-ni
$S A L-I S H I B{ }^{d} N i n-I B$
dumu ${ }^{d_{\text {En-lil-gal-zu }}}$

No. 46.
Adoption Document.
a. $L e-m a-. . . . . . .$. SAL-ISHIB ${ }^{d} N$ in-IB dumu ${ }^{d}$ En-lil-ma-an-s̀
b. Sha-at- ${ }^{d}$ Shamash
dam I-li-. . . . . . . . .

No. 49.
Payment of an Indemnity.
Shu-mu-um-li-ib-shi
dumu ${ }^{d} N a n n a(r)-m a-a n-s i$

No. 62.
Private Seals:
a. İ-li-ma-ilum dumu Ab-lum $\operatorname{arad}^{d}$ de-...... ${ }^{d_{I M-b i} \ldots . .}$.
b. $\bar{U} r$-ra-i-din-nam dumu İ-li-ish-me-a-ni $\operatorname{arad}^{d} N e-u n u-g a l$
c. $[M] a-r i-i r-s i-[t i m]$ $\left.[d u m u] B A-s h a-r^{d}[\ldots]\right]$
$\left[\right.$ arad] ${ }^{d}$ Nin-si-an-na
(kishib Dam-kum mar Ur-d ${ }^{d}$ â-láa)

## No. 64.

Deed of Ransoming.
${ }^{d}{ }_{N i n-I B-m u-b a-l i-i t}$
dumu A-wi-li-ia
I-din-Ishtar
dumu $M a-a n-n u-u m-m e-s h u-l i[-s u r]$
[ $u$ Na-ru-ub-tum ama-a-ni]

# IV. LIST OF DATE FORMULAS of THE TIME FROM HAMMU-RABI TO SAMSU-DI'TANA. 

## Hammu-rabi.

1. [m]u Ha-am-mu-r[a-bi lugal-e]

- mи Ha-am-mu-ra-bi lugal-e

ти Ha-am-mu-ra-bi lugal
ти Ha-am-mu-ra-bi
2. [m]u nig-si-sá [kala]m-m[a
mu nig-si-sá kalam-ma in-gar
ти Ha-mu-ra-bi | nig-si-sá gar-ra
ти Ha-mu-ra-bi lugal-e shag-ga kalam-ma nam-si-sá
The year in which Hammu-rabi who establishes (var.
has established) righteousness in (the midst of) the land, — ——'
3. [mu] ${ }^{\text {aish }} g u-z a^{d}$ Nann $[a r$
. . ........... . ] ]
mu ${ }^{\text {gish }}$ gu-za bara-mah̆ ${ }^{d}$ Nannar Ká-dingir-ra mu-un-na-dim
mu gu-za ${ }^{d}$ Nannar
$m u{ }^{\text {gish }}$ gu-za ${ }^{d}$ Nannar $\mid K a ́$-dingir-ra
mu ${ }^{\text {gish }} \mathrm{gu}$-za ${ }^{d}$ Nannar Ká-dingir-ra ${ }^{k i}$ mu-na-an-dim
(?) shattu ${ }^{d}$ Nannar $\mid \dot{e}-{ }^{d}$ Nannar | Ká-dingir-ra $a^{k i} \mid{ }^{m} H a-$ mu-ra-bi |u-she-bi-shu

The year in which (Hammu-rabi), after having made the throne for (the great chamber of) Nannar of Babylon, - -
The year in which Hammu-rabi, after having caused to make the Nannar(?) in the house of Nannar in Babylon, - -
A.

D; VIII, $37 b$.
VIII, $48 b$.
VI, $49 a$; VIII, $8 c$.
A.
D.

VIII, $50 a$.
M. 49 (Sippar).
4. mu bád Gá-gi-a $[b a-d \bar{u}]$
mu bád Gá-gi-a ba-dū
mu bád Gá-gí-a ne? mu-un(?)-dū
mu bád-gal Gá-gí-a
A.
D.

VIII, $18 b$.
M. 40.

The year in which (Hammu-rabi) after having built the wall of the Gagu, ${ }^{1}$ $\qquad$
5. mи en(?) KA-ash-bar-ra[................ $]$
A.
[mu.......................... $] u-u n-[n] a-a n-d i m$
D.

The year in which (Hammu-rabi), after having made........., - - -
6. mu bád? ${ }^{d}[$
A.
[mu bád? ${ }^{d}$ ] La-az
C.
[mu $. m u-] u[n-n a]-d i m$
D.

The year in which (LIammu-rabi), after having made
the $\qquad$ of Laz, - -
7. $m u\left[U n u g^{k i}\right] I$-si-in- $[$
]
A.
$\left[\right.$ mu Unug $\left.{ }^{k i}\right]$ I-si-in-na ${ }^{k i}$
C.
mu Unugki $\overline{1}$-si-in-na $a^{k i}$
R. 24 and 25 . [note 3 ).
mu Unug ${ }^{k i} \grave{u}$ I-si-i $n^{k i} b a-a n$-dib
Par.4481(S.A.K.I., XIX,
The year in which (Hammu-rabi), after having taken
Erech and Isin, - - - ${ }^{3}$
8. mu $m[a-d] a$ gú id $n u-h u-[\ldots . . . . . . .$. . . $]$
A.
$m u[$. . . . . . . . . . .] E-mu-ut-ba-lum
C.
[year).
$m u[\ldots . . . . . .$.$] Ia-mu-ut-ba-lu[m$
IV, 31 (but cf. the 31 st

[^31]The year in which Hammu-rabi, after having -.. -
the land on the bank of the river......... --
The year in which [the ] of Emutbal
9. mu id Ha -am-mu-ra-bi-h[e-gal ]
A.
[ mu id] Ha-am-mu-ra-bi-he-gal
C.
mи id Ha-am-mu-ra-bi
M. 48, 106 .
mu id Ha-am-m $\left.{ }^{[ } u-r{ }^{]}{ }_{[a-b i}\right]$
II, 7; VI, 45.
mu id-da Ha-am-mu-ra-bi
IV, 25b. (cf. M. 12).
The year in which (Hammu-rabi, after having dug)
the canal Hammurabi-hegal, - - -
10. [mu $_{\mathrm{J}}$ erim $\mathfrak{a}-\mathrm{dam} \mathrm{Mà}-a l-y i-a^{1}$
A.; C.
mu uru á-dam-bi Mà-a[l(?)-gi-a $\left.{ }^{k i}\right]$
II, $25 .{ }^{\text {. }}$
mu uru ${ }^{k i}$ á-dam-bi Mal-gí-a $a^{k i}$
R. 26.
mu uru á-dam Malgâ $\left.{ }^{[k i}\right]$
Phil. 1652.
mи urи á (-dam) Malgâ ${ }^{k i}$
R. $37 .{ }^{1}$

The year in which (Hammu-rabi the king), after having -) the city (var. army ${ }^{2}$ ) and the population of Malg $\hat{u}, \ldots — \longrightarrow^{3}$
11. $m u[R] a-b[i]-k[u m]^{k i}$
A.
mu Ra-bi-kum ${ }^{k i}$ ù Sha-li-bi
mu Ra-bi-kum
C.
mu uru Ra-bi-kum ${ }^{k i}$
(?) $т и$ Ra-bi-kum ${ }^{k i} \mid \nabla I-b i-i q-{ }^{d}$ Ishkur ba-dib(?)
, $41 a$.
VIII, $48 a$.
Bu. 91-5-9, 2515.
The year in which (Hammu-rabi), after having -, (var. the town of) Rabikum and Shalibi, - - -
The year in which, etc., Rabikum which Ibiq-Ishkur
had taken(?), -- -
12. $m u^{\text {gish }} g u-z a a^{\lfloor d} Z a{ }^{\dagger} r$-pa-ni-tum
A.; C.; VIII, $22 b$.

ти gu-za ${ }^{d}$ Zar-pa-ni-tum M. 30 .
${ }^{1}$ In R., $37: 16,17$ and C.T., II, $25: 13,14$ the same persons occur: Sin-eribam (s. of Ikun-p̂̂sha) and Bur-Sin, s. of Zilikum, both times as first and second witnesses.
${ }^{2}$ Confusion of erim and eri $=u r u$.
${ }^{3}$ Cf. C. H., $4: 12-14$, mu-ush-pa-ctz-zi-ir ni-shi Mù-al-ka-a ${ }^{k i}$ in $k a-r a-s h i-i m$. On the probable position of Mari on the middle Euphrates, see p. 65, note 1.

The year in which (Hammu-rabi has -) a throne for Sarpanitum.
$\begin{array}{ll}\text { 13. } m u^{\text {urudu } k i[-l u g a l-g u b]-b a ~ d u ̆-m a h-b i ~} & \text { A. } \\ m u^{\text {rrudu } k i-l u g a l-g u b ~ d u ̆-m a h-b i ~} & \text { C. }\end{array}$
The year in which (Hammu-rabi has -) a brazen royal standing place and a ........... ${ }^{1}$
14. mu ${ }^{\text {gish }}$ gu-za ${ }_{[ }{ }^{d} N i n n i_{1} K a ́$-dingirr-r $a^{k i}$
C.; A. (B. some traces)
$m u^{\text {gish } g u-z a ~}{ }^{d} N i n n i$
mu gu-za ${ }^{d}$ Ninni
VIII, 13a; Bu. 88-5-12, 322 ( = M. 94), Fr. 2.
mu gu-za ${ }^{d}$ Ninni Kádidingir-ra ${ }^{k i}$
mu gu-za ${ }^{d}$ Ninni Ká-dingir-ra
VIII, 18a; M. 13.
VIII, 13c, ${ }^{2} 18 c$; Fr. 3, 4. M. 13 case.

The year in which (Hammu-rabi) has - - a throne for Ninni of Babylon
15. mu alam-b[i]imin-na
[ mu alam-bi] imin-a-an
mu alam-bi imin-a-an
mu alam imin-bi
mu alam-bi imin- $[a]-a n$
A.
B.
C.

II, 45; IV, $48 a$ (Sippar).
R. 27 (Sippar) (cf. Bu.
[91-5-9, 780).

The year in which the seven images -...
${ }^{1}$ As $k i-g u b-b a$ means "manzazu," ki-lugal-gub-(b)a and $k i-B A D-g u b-(b) a$ probably denote the places where the king and the ....... have their stands or seats, which is confirmed by the fact that in Ad. $6 \mathrm{ki}-B A D-g u b-(b) a$ appears as apposition to ${ }^{\text {gish }}$ gu-za. Lugal refers evidently to the chief god of the temple (cf. Gud., Cyl. B, 16:16). According to Si .8 , Ad. 15 and Az .13 , the stand of the god was or contained a representation of mountains and rivers that carry cxuberance and abundance (Si. 8). Compare to this the representations of gods sitting on a throne, below which there runs a river with fish in it. (An explanation, "a brazen vessel or the like, erected in the ki-lugal, corresponding to the construction of gu-za gú-en-na gub-ba-bi, na(d)-bi $k i-n a(d)-a g u b-b a-b i$ and $z i(d)-d a \quad B I-d a-b a g u b-b a-b i$, Gud., Cyl. $\mathrm{B}, 16: 17,19 ; 17: 9$, seems to be out of question, because urudu is wanting several times, e.g., IV, 17c, VI, $33 a$; P. 80 and M. 9, and ki-lugal-gub therefore must be considered as the principal idea. Besides, there is no a after ki-lugal or ki-BAD indicating the idea of locality, and also the co-ordination with d $\check{u}$-mah and $u r u d u d \breve{u}-m a h$ speaks for urudu being a determinative.)

The $d \breve{u}-m a h$, which here is closely connected with the ki-lugal-gub (bi denoting a close connection, while $\dot{u}$ expresses a contrast $=$ "not only, but also"), is in Az. 14 mentioned alone as an object of dedication. In this passage it likewise is or contains a representation of mountains and rivers,
${ }^{2}$ See $I_{1} I, H .$, III, p. 233, note $51 ;$
16. $m u^{\text {gish }} g u-z a{ }_{[ }{ }^{d} N a-b i-u m_{1}$
C.; A.
$\left[m u^{\text {gish }} g u-z a\right]^{d} N a-b i-u m$
B.
mu gu-za ${ }^{d} N a-b i-u m$
IV, 12b; M. 11; Fr. 6.
mu gu-za ${ }^{d} N a-b i-u m \mid m u-n a-d i m$
P. 70 .

The year in which (IIammu-rabi), after having made
a throne for Nabium, ——
17. [mu] alam ${ }^{d}$ [Ninni] ki-bal mash-d $\bar{u}-k i$
A.
[mu alam ${ }^{d}$ Ninni] ki-bal mash-du-ki
B.
mu alam ${ }^{d} N i n n i ~ k i-b a l ~ m a s h-d u ̄-k i$
C.
mu Ha-am-mu-ra-bi lugal[-e]|alam "Ninni ki-bal
P. 71.
mash-dü-ki | sag an-shu mu-un-il(?)-la(?)
mu alam ${ }^{\text {d }}$ Ninni ki
mu alam ${ }^{d}$ Ninni ki-bal $\mid$ mash-dü-ki
Berl. 974 (= M. 71).
Berl. 975.
The year in which Hammurabi the king, after having raised to heaven the image of Ninni, ${ }^{1}$ who throws
down the land of the enemies, - - -
18. [mu. .] ${ }^{d} E n-l i l-r a$
A.
$[m u K A K+G I S H-m a] h^{d}$ En-lil-ra
B.
mи KAK + GISH-mah ${ }^{\text {a }}$ En-lil-ra
C.
mи KAK+GISII-mah ${ }^{\text {d }}$ En-lil mu-na-dim (cf. H. 24).
VIII, $43 c$ (Sippar).
The year in which (Hammu-rabi), after having made the sublime battlemace ${ }^{2}$ for Enlil, -- - -
19. [mu bád I]gi-har-sag-gá
A.
[mu bád] En-igi-har-sag-gá
B.
mu bád Igi-h̆ar-sag-gá
C.

The year in which (Hammu-rabi), after having - the
fortress (En-)Igi-har-sag, - - -
20. ${ }_{[ } m u{ }^{g i s h} g u-z a{ }^{d}{ }_{\mathrm{J}} I \operatorname{shk} u r-r i$
C.; A.
$\left[m u{ }^{g i s h} g u-z\right] a^{d}$ Ishkur-ri
B.
mu gu-za ${ }^{d}$ Ishkur
IV, $20 c$.
mи us-sa E-igi-har-sag-gá
Bu. 91-5-9, 364.

[^32]The year in which (IIammu-rabi, after having made)
the throne of Ishkur, - - -
The year after that, in which, etc.
21. [mu bád $\hat{A l} l-B] a-z i^{k i}$
${ }^{\prime} m u$ bád $\hat{A}^{l} l-B a-z u m^{k i}$
mu bád Âl-Ba-lum (sic!)
mu bád ( $\hat{A l} l$-) Ba-zum ${ }^{k i}$
mu bád $\hat{A l} l-B a-z u m b a-d u ̈$
A.
B. ; Bu. 88-5-12, 241, 746
C. [case.

Bu. 88-5-12, 746.
P. 72 .

The year in which (Hammu-rabi), after the wall of Al-Bazum ${ }^{1}$ has been built, -. -
22. [mu alam Ha-am-]mu-ra-bi
[mu alam H]a-am-mu-ra-bi
mu alam Ha-am-mu-ra-bi
[mu a]lam Ha-am-mu-ra-bi lugal nig-si-sá
The year in which (Hammu-rabi, after having--)
the statue " $H a m m u-r a b i$ is the king of righteousness, ${ }^{\prime 2}$ - - -
23. [mu........................... Zimbi]r $r^{k i}$
[mu.........] Zimbirik-ra
mu APIN bád Zimbiri ${ }^{k i}$
The year in which Hammu-rabi after having - the foundation of the wall of Sippar, - - -
24. [ $\left.m u^{3} . . . . . ..\right]^{d} E n$-lil-ra
(?) mu bara-mah ${ }^{d}$ En-lil mu-na-dim (cf. H. 18).
A.; B.
C.
[(Sippar).
M. 31 ( $=$ VIII, 13b)

The year in which (Hammu-rabi) ——— for Enlil.

[^33]25. [mu bád Zimbir] ${ }^{k i}$
[mu bád Z]imbiri ${ }^{k i}$ ba-dū
[mu bád Zimbirin-ra
A.
B.
C.

The year in which (Hammu-rabi, after having built)
the wall of Sippar, - .-..-
26. $\begin{aligned} & {[m u . ~ . ~ . ~ . ~ . ~ . ~ . ~ . ~ . ~ . ~ . ~ . ~ . ~ . ~ . ~ . ~ . ~ g a] l-l a ~ } \\ & {[m u . ~ . ~ . ~ . ~ . ~ . ~ . ~ . ~ . ~ . ~ . ~ . ~ . ~ . ~ . ~ . ~}\end{aligned}$ gal-la ${ }^{1}$
A.
B.

The year which $\qquad$
27. $[m u$
.]-mah
A.
[mu . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . ]-mah gushkin rush-a B.
The year in which (Hammu-rabi has - - ) a sublime. . . . . . . of red shining gold.
28. [mu E]-nam-[he]
A.
[mu Énam]-he
B.
mu E-nam-he ${ }^{d}$ Ishkur
Fr. 8.
mu $\bar{E}-(n a m-)$ he ${ }^{d} I s h k u r$
VIII, $12 c$.
mu É-nam-he é- ${ }^{\text {d }}$ Ishkur
VIII, $40 a$.
The year in which Hammu-rabi, after having -E-nambe (the temple) of Ishkur, — $\cdots-\cdots$
29. [mu al]am ${ }^{d} S h a-[l a]$
[mu alam] ${ }^{d}$ Sha-la
mu alam ${ }^{d}$ Sha-la
The year in which Hammu-rabi, after having -- the statue of Shala, - - -
30. mu ugnim Nim-ma[ ]
[mu ugni]m Nim-ma
mu (case: Ha-am-mu-ra-bilugal-e) ugnim Nim-ma ${ }^{k i}$
mu erim ugnim Nim-ma (case: ${ }^{k i}$ )
A.
B.

IV, $40 a ;$ R. 28.

The year in which Hammu-rabi, after naving - the army of Elam, ———

[^34]31. mu ma-da E-mu-ut-[ba-lum ]
[ $п и ~ m a-d a ~ E-m] ~]-u t-b a-l u m ~$
ти ma-da Ia-mu-ut-ba-lum
mu Ha-am-mu-ra-bi lugal $\mid S H I+D U B-t i \quad A n a-{ }^{d} E n-$ lil-bi-ta | igi erim-na-shú ni-gin-na-a|ma-da Ia-mu-ut-ba-lum ${ }^{\left({ }^{(i)}\right) \mid \grave{u}}$ lugal Ri-im- ${ }^{d} \operatorname{Sin} \mid$ shu-ni ki-ne-dúg[ ]
mи Ha-am-mu-ra-bi lugal $\mid S H I+D U B-t i A n a^{1}{ }^{d} E n-$ lil-bi-ta $\mid$ igi erim-na ni-gin-na-a

The year in which Hammu-rabi, the king, after his hand with the help of Anum and Ellil who marched before his army, had struck to the ground the land Emutbal and king Rim-Sin, - - -
32. mu ugnim Ásh[-nun-na $\left.a^{k i}\right]$
[mu] ugnim Esh-nun-[naki]
mu erim Esh-nun-naki gishtukul ba-sig
mu ugnim Esh-nun-na ${ }^{k i}$
mu ugnim Esh-nun ${ }^{k i}$
The year in which the army of Ashnunnak was slain with the weapon.
33. mu id Ha-mu-ra-b[i ]
mu id Ha-am-mu-ra-bi nu-hu-ush ni-shi
mu id nu-hu-ush-ni-shi
ти Ha-am-mu-ra-bi lugal |id ELa-am-mu-ra-bi nu-huush ni-shi | shag-gi-rá-a ${ }^{\text {a }}$ En-lil-lá mu-un-ba-al
The year in which Hammurabi, the king, after having dug the canal, "Hammurabi is the abundance of the people," which brings the flood for Enlil" - - - ${ }^{3}$
${ }^{\text {: }}$ Strassmaier's copy has $A n a A n a{ }^{d} E n$-, etc.

${ }^{3}$ Compare the partly parallel passage, Louvre Inscr. Obv. 17-22: nôr Ha-am-mu-ra-bi nu-bu-ush ni-shi ba-bi-la-at me-e he-gal a-na mât Shu-me-ri-im $\dot{u} A k$ - $k a$ - $d \dot{i}-i m$ lu ah-ri. According to the attribute of the canal in the above date formula, it seems to have run past Nippur on its way to Shumer. The compound substantive shag-gi-ra-a forms a genetive (status cons'ructus) conncetion with ${ }^{d}$ En-lil-lid. The same construction, e.g., limestone tablet of Hammu-rabi
 ${ }^{d}$ Nin-lil, IV R., $12: 9,10$.
34. mu Ana ${ }^{d} N i n{ }^{〔} n i{ }^{d} N a-n a-a{ }^{〕}$
mu Ana ${ }^{d}$ Ninni $\grave{u}{ }^{d} N a-n a-a$
mи Ha-am-mu-ra-bi lugal-e | Ana ${ }^{d}$ Ninni $\grave{\text { u }}{ }^{d} N a-n a-a$
mи Ha-am-mu-ra-bi lugal-e Ana ${ }^{d}$ Ninni ${ }^{d}$ Na-na-a mu-un-dim-ma
[mu] Ha-am-mu-ra-bi lugal-e | [Ana] ${ }^{d}$ Ninni ù ${ }^{d} N a$. na-a e-ne-bi-da
mи Ha-am-mu-ra-bi lugal-e Ana ${ }^{d}$ Ninni $\grave{u}{ }^{d} N a-n a-a \mid$ $e-[n e]-b i-t a$
ти Ha-am-mu-ra-bi lugal-e | Ana ${ }^{d}$ Ninni ${ }^{d}$ Na-na-a e-ne-bi-ta $\mid$ E-túr-kalam-ma mu-un-(gi)bil-a-an(?)

The year in which Hammu-rabi, the king, after having caused Anum, Ninni and Nanâ to be made(?), -
The year in which Hammu-rabi, the king, after having restored E-túr-kalama for Anum, Ninni and Nanâ,
$\qquad$
35. mu bád $[$
(?) mu bád Kara-d ${ }^{\text {d }}$ Babbar
mu bád-gal Kara-d ${ }^{\text {d }}$ Babbar ${ }^{k i}$ M. 51)
mu bád-gal Kara- ${ }^{d}$ Babbar (|) mu-un-dū-a
mu Ha-am-mu-ra-bi lugal | bád-gal Kar-ra-dBabbar
$m u-u n-d \bar{u}-a$
mu Ha-am-mu-ra-bi lugal | bád-gal gú Id-digna | har-
sag-dim mu-un-il-la
mи Ha-am-mu-ra-bi lugal [ ]|bád-gal gú Id-digna
har-sag-dim mu[-un-il-la] | Kara-dBabbar mu-ni
$n e-i n-s[\grave{d}-a]$
mu ${ }^{\text {d}} H a-a m-m u-r a-b i$ lugal-e | bád-gal gú Id-digna $\mid$
sag-bi har-sag-dim mu-un-il-lá | Kar-ra- ${ }^{\text {d }}$ Babbar
$m u-b i$ ne-in-[sà $\mid$ mu-un-dū-a
mu bád Kara- ${ }^{d}$ Babbar $\mid \grave{u}$ Ra-bi-kum
mu bád-gal Kara-d Babbarki $\mid$ ù bád Ra-bi-kum ${ }^{k i}$
mu Ha-am-mu-ra-bi lugal | bád-gal gú Id-digna(-a?)-
ta $\mid$ Kara-d Babbar mu-ni ne-in-sà-a| $\grave{u}$ [bád Ra-b]i-kum ${ }^{k i} \mid$ gú id Buranunu-ka $\mid$ mu-un-dū-a
${ }^{1}$ Friedrich's copy shows an additional sign before $k a r$.
A.; S. 38 ( $=$ M. 39).

IV, $25 a$; Fr. 41.
II, $27: 14,15$.
Brit. Mus. 33230 case; M.

$$
78(=\text { S. } 44)
$$

R. $61: 7,8$.
M. 82 .
M. 109 ( $=$ S. 35) (Tell Sifr.).
A.
R. 41 ; 42 case ; Fr. 11.
M. 51 ; VI, $41 b$; Fr. 27 (? $)^{1}$
P. 13 (Nippur) ; M. 34
S. 47 .
[(Tell Sifr.).
P. 11.
P. 12.
S. 28.
R. 40; M. 62.

IV, $42 b$.
P. 12 case.

The year in which Hammurabi, the king, after having built a great castle on the bank of the Tigris whose summit (var. which) he made high like unto a mountain, and whose name he called 'Wall of Shamash," and (after having built) the wall of Rabikum on the bank of the Euphrates, - - -

```
36. \(m u\) [ \({ }^{d}\) Tash-me-tum]
```

A.
$m u{ }^{d}$ Tash-me(S. 40 var. -mi)-tum (Nippur)
P. 17. S. $33,36,39,40$,
108. R. $34 b ; 36 a ;$ VIII,
mu Ha-am-mu-ra-bi ${ }^{\text {d Tash-me-tum }}$
S. 43 (Tell Sifr). [5a; 37d.
mu ${ }^{d}$ Tash-me-tum gushkin
R. $35 a$ (Sippar).
mu ${ }^{d}$ Tash-me-tum gushkin-?-a(?)
mu ${ }^{\text {a }}$ Tash-me-tum KA-shág-shág-ga(S. 40 add. -a)-ni
R. $34 a$.

ти Ha-am-mu(39 adds -um)-ra-bi lugal-e (m. 39)|
VIII, $43 b$; S. 40.
${ }^{\text {d }}$ Tash-me-tum KA-shág-shág-ga(36 case and 43 add. $-a$ )-ni
S. 33 case; 36 case; 39 case; 43 case.

The year in which Hammu-rabi, the king - - Tashmetum, who - - his prayer.

mu bád Má-ríci
A.
mu bád Má-ríki ba-gul
R. 23; M. 52.
mu bád Má-riki ba-gul-la
R. 22.
mu bàd Má-riki $\grave{u}$ Mà-al-ka-aki ba-an-gul
M. 105 .
mu Ha-am-mu-ra-bi lugal-e| (dúg Ana ${ }^{d} E n-l i l-l a ́-t a$,
S. 31 (Tell Sifr).
case) | bád Má-riki | ù bád Mà-al-ka-a|ba-an-gul-la
mu Ha-am-mu-ra-bi lugal-e|dúg ${ }^{d} A n a-{ }^{d} E n-l i l-t a \mid$ VIII, 22c (Babylon). bád Má-ríki $\mid \grave{u}$ Mà-al-gí-a ${ }^{k i}$ mu-un-gul ${ }^{1}$

[^35]9

The year in which IIammu-rabi, after having destroyed the wall of Mari and Malk $\hat{a}$ upon the command of
Anum and Ellil, - - -

$$
\text { [p. } 35 .
$$

38a.mu 'Esh-nun-na ${ }^{k i}$ a-gal'-gal-la
A.; M. 87 ; R. T., XVII,
mu Esh-nun-na ${ }^{k i}$ a-gal-gal-la mu-un-gul
S. 46 ; M. 29 ; R. $30 a$.
[mu E[sh-nun-na a-gal-gal mu-un-gul-la
II, 41.
mu La-am-mu-ra-bi lugal Ésh-nun-na ${ }^{k i}$ a-gal-gal-la
S. 46 case; P. 15.
mu-un-gul-la
mu Esh-nun-na ${ }^{k i}$ a-gal-gal-la $\mid m u$-un-gul-bi R. $30 b$.
mu Ésh-nun-na ${ }^{k i}$ a-gal-gal-e| mu-un-gal-e
S. 41 (M. 47) case.
b.mu IIa-am-mu-ra-bi lugal | ugnim Tu-ru-uk-ku|Ka-
S. 41 (M. 47) tablet.
$a g-m u-u m^{k i} \grave{u}$ Su-bi-e $e^{k i}-b i-t a$
ти Ha-am-mu-ra-bi| ugnim Tu-ru-uk-kum | Ka-ag- P. 14.
mu-u
mu ugnim Tu-ru-kum M. 64.
mu ki-sulúb-pa-tim | awil Tu-ru-kum
M. 70 .

The year in which (Hammu-rabi), after having - -
Ashnunnak, which a great flood had destroyed, - - -
The year in which the army of Turukkum, Kagm $\hat{u}$ and
Subê- -
39. $m\left[u\right.$ kilib gú-dá-]a-bi ${ }^{1}$
A.
mu kilib gú-dáa-a-bi
P. 75, 76; VIII, $50 b$.
mu kilib gú-dá-a-bi|dù(?)-EDIN $N^{k i}-n e(?)$
P. 74.
mu kilib gú-dá-bi| kur dù(?)-EDIN ${ }^{k i}-g e(?)-n a$
P. 73 .

ти Ha-am-mu-ra-bi lugal-e kilib gú-dá-a-bi(?) kur
P. 16 (Nippur).
$d \grave{u}(?)-E D I N^{k i}[-n] e(?) \mid s[a g-g i s h-n e]-i n-r[a-] a$
mu kilib gú-dá-a-bi|kur dù(?)-EDIN ${ }^{k i}-n e \mid$ sag gish-ne-ri-a
$m u$ kilib gú-dá-a-bi|kur dù(?)-EDIN-ge(?)-ne ${ }^{2}$

Sifr).
M. 7 .

The year in which Hammu-rabi, the king, after having subdued the totality of the land of the enemies in the desert district(?), - ---

[^36]40. [mu $\qquad$ .] [........]
(?) $m u$ id $T i-s h i-i t-{ }^{d} E n-l i l(-l a, ~ V I, ~ 47 b)$
mu id T[i-shi-i]t-d En-lil |id Zimbirik $\mid$ mu-un-ba-al-la mu id Ti-shi-it ${ }^{d}$ En-lil $\left.\right|^{d}$ En-lil-lá id Zimbir ${ }^{k i}$

The year in which (Hammu-rabi), after having built the canal Tishit-Enlil, the canal of Sippar, - - -
41. [mu É-me-te-u] $] r-s[a g]$
mи Ha-am-rnu-ra-bi lugal-e (M. 46 om.) E-me-te-ursag mu-un-bil-a (var. -lá, P. 18; -la, P. 18 case)

ти LLa-am-mu-ra-bi lugal-e $\mid$ E-me-te-ur-sag-gá $\mid m u$ -un-bil-lá |IGI + ÉE-nir ki-KU-mah| ${ }^{a} Z a-m a ̀-m a ̀$ ${ }^{d}$ Nin-ni $\mid$ sag-bi an-dím-il-la $\mid$ mu-un-dū-a
mu Ha-am-mu-ra-bi lugal-e| $\tilde{E}^{-}$me-te-ur-sag mu-un-bil-a $\mid I G I+E$ Énir kí-KU-mah| ${ }^{d} Z a-m \grave{a}-m a ̀{ }^{d} N i n n i-$ ge $\mid$ sag-bi an-dim-il-la $\mid$ mu-un-d $\bar{u}-a$
mu $\vec{E}$-me-te-ur-sag-gá $\mid$ mu-un-bil-lá $\mid \hat{E}+I G I-n i r k i$ -KU-mah $\mid{ }^{d} Z a-m a ̀-m a ̀{ }^{d} N i n n i$

The year in which Hammu-rabi, the king, after having restored E-mete-ursag and having built the temple tower, the sublime abode of Zamama and Ninni, so that its head rises as high as heaven, -- - -
42. [mu $\qquad$ $]^{k}[i \cdot \ldots]$
mu bád[
(?) mu bád Shi-ra-mahb ${ }^{k i}$
mu bád Shi-ra-mabh ${ }^{k i}$ ba-du
mu bád Shi-ra-mah ${ }^{k i} m u-u n-d[\bar{u}-a]$
The year in which (Hammu-rabi), after having built the fortress Shiramah, - - -
43. [mu sahar Zimbirini] uru-dú ${ }^{d}$ [Babbar]
mu sahar Zim[birki uru-dú ${ }^{d}$ Babbar $]$
mu sahar ZimL ${ }^{\text {birii }}$ uru-du ${ }^{\text {a }}$ Babbar $]$
mu sahar Zimbiri ${ }^{k i} \mid$ uru-du ${ }^{d}$ Babbar-ta
mu sahar-gal Zimbir ${ }^{k i}$
mu Zimbirik uru-dú | ${ }^{d}$ Babbar-ge | bád-bi sahar-gal-ta

encere
A.
M. 110 case ; VI, $47 b$; Bu.
M. 110. $\quad[88-\kappa-12,211$.

Fr. 25.
A.
M. $45,46(=$ B. 56 and 61) ; S. 25,42 ; P. 18 (Tell Sifr, Nippur).
S. 26 (Tell. Sifr).
M. 46 (case of B. 61)
(Tell Sifr).
S. 26 ( $=$ case of 25 )
(Tell Sifr).
A.
C.
R. 38; VI, $36 b$.
R. 39 .
l2, $39 b$..
A.
C.

VI, $44 a$.
R. 33.
R. 31.
mu Zimbirki uru-dú
(?) mu Zimbir ${ }^{k i}$
shattum epir Sippar ${ }^{k i}$ ish-sha-ap-ku

Fr. 7.
VI, 48c. R. 32.

The year in which Hammu-rabi, the king, after having thrown up the wall of Sippar, the beautiful city ${ }^{1}$ of
Shamash, with great masses of earth, ${ }^{2}$

## Samsu-Iluna.

1. mu Sa-am-su-i-lu-na lugal-e
mu Sa-am-su-i-lu-na lugal
mu Sa-am-su-i-lu-na lu[gal-e (dúg-ga zi-da ${ }^{d}$ Marduk-
A.; VIII, 9a; R. 45, 48;

Fr. 15; M. 66 (tablet).
VI, 3, 40a, 48b; P. 20;
$k a-t a)] \mid$ nam-en-bi kur-kur-r[a ]
mu Sa-am-su-i-lu-na lugal(-e M. 66) dúg-ga zi-da
${ }^{d}$ Marduk-ka-ta
mu Sa-am-su-i-lu-na lugal | dúg-ga zi-da ${ }^{a}$ Marduk $\mid$
ka-ta| nam-en-bi kur-kur-ra PA-è-shú(?)-ag-a
The year in which Samsu-iluna, the king who at the true command of Marduk makes shine his dominion in the lands, ${ }^{4}$
2. $m u[a m a-a] r-g i$ Ki-en-gi $K i[]$
A.
mu ama-ar-gi Ki[ ]
[mu ama-]ar-gi Ki[-en-gi Ki-uri] in-gar
mu ama-ar-gí
mи ama-ar-gí
mи ama-ar-gi Ki-en-gi Ki-uri
ти ama-ar-g[i]
mu Sa-am-su-i-lu-na lugal ama-ar-gi i-ni-gar-ra
[R. 47.
P. 62 ; M. 66 case ( $=\mathrm{S}$.
$68)^{3}$ (Nippur, Tell Sifr).
S. 51 (Tell Sifr).

The year in which Samsu-iluna, the king who has
liberated Shumer and Akkad, - — -
3. [mu id Sa]-am-su-i-lu-na (na-)ga-[ ]
mu id Sa-am-su-i-lu[-na na-ga-ab]| nu-uh-shi
mu id Sa-am-su-i-lu-u[na nagab nu]-hu-ush |ni-shi mu-un-ba-al
mu id Sa-am-su-i-l[ $u-n a$
$m u$ id $S a-a m-s u-i-l u-n a \mid n a-g a-a b$ nu-h̆u-ush ni-shi mu-ba-al
mu (Sa-am-su-i-lu-na lugal, 64) id Sa-am-su-i-lu-na na-ga-ab nu-uh-shi mu-un-ba-lá
mu id Sa-am-su-i-lu-na lugal-e | na-ga-ab nu-uh-shi
The year in which Samsu-iluna, the king, after having dug the canal, "Samsu-iluna is the spring of the abundance of the people," $\qquad$
4. mu id Sa-am-su-i-lu-na he-gál
B. ; Fr. 18.
D.
C.
mu id $S a-a m-s u-i[-l u-n a \quad . . .$. .
P. 21.
mu id Sa-am-su-i-lu-na | he-gal | mu-un-ba-al-la
P. 23; S. 52, 53, 57, 58, 60.
id Sa-am-su-i-lu-na he-gál $\mid m u$-un-ba-al(58 om.)-la (S. 53, 58, 60, var. -lá; 57 om.?)
mu Sa-am-su-i-lu-na lugal |id-he-gál-la(|)mu-un-ba-
P. 24, 22. al-la (22 om. or -láa)
The year in which Samsu-iluna, after having dug the canal, "Samsu-iluna is the abundance of the people," - —
5. $m u^{\text {gish } g u-z a ~}{ }^{\text {「 }} b a^{1} r a-g e$
B. ; IV, $11 b$.
mu ${ }^{\text {gish }} g u-z a b[a r a-g e \quad]$
mu Sa-am-su-i-lu-na lugal | gishgu-za ....
C.
mu ${ }^{\text {gish }}$ gu-za bara-ge mu-un-na-dim-ma
mu Sa-am-su-i-lu-na lugal ${ }^{\text {gish }}$ gu-za bara-ge [d $\left.{ }^{d}\right] N a n n a r$
A.
B.
D.
C.

VIII, $6 b$.
S. 64, 71 (Tell Sifr).

II, 15; cf. M. 59 and 56.
mu id Sa-am-su-i-lu-na he-gál $\mid m u-u n-b a-a l$ p
S. 72 ; M. 83 (Tell Sifr).
S. 48 (Tell Sifr).
S. 48 case (Tell Sifr).

[^37]```
dingir SAG-DU-ga-ni-shú(?-ra or -ge) mu-un-na-an-dim-ma
\(\left.m u^{\text {gish } g u-z a ~ i l[~}{ }^{d} N a n\right] n a r\) dingir SAG-DU \(\quad \mathrm{D}\).
\(m u^{\text {gish}} g u-z a\) il mu-na-an-dim M. 55.
\(m u^{\text {gish }} g u-z a\) il
VI, 7; S. 72.
mu Sa-am-su-i-lu-na lugal-e \({ }^{\text {gish }}\) gu-za gushkin \({ }^{d}\) Nannar
R. 56 .
```

The year in which Samsu-iluna, the king, after having made a portable(?) throne for Nannar, the god who begat him, ${ }^{\text {i }}$ $\qquad$
6. mu alam $K A+S H U{ }^{d}[$ lamma gushkin-ash $]-a s h-b i-d a$
D. mu alam $K[A$
C.
mu allalm $K A(+S H U)-n e$
B.; IV, $46 a$.
mu alam $K A(?)-B I L(?)-E(?){ }^{\text {d }}$ lamma(?) |gushkin
ти Sa-am-su-i-lu-na lugal(-e, 59)|alam KA +SHU-
VIII, 42c.
$K A+S H U-n e^{2}$ damma gushkin ash-ash-bi-ta
mu Sa-am-su-i-lu-na lugal-e alam $K A(+S H U)$-ne
S. 56, 66 (Tell Sifr).
${ }^{\text {d}}$ lamma gushkin $\mid$ ash-ash-bi-ta (om. 56)
mu Sa-am-su-i-lu-na lugal-e | ${ }^{d}$ Babbar ${ }^{d}$ Marduk e-ne-bi-da-ra(?) |nig-dim-dim-ma-bi al-in-na-an-gù-ush-a-an $\mid$ alam $K A+S H U-K A+S H U-n e^{d} l a m m a ~ g u s h-~$ kin ash-ash-bi-ta | E-babbar igi-d Babbar-shú E-sag-il igi-d Marduk-shú | ki-gub-ba-ne-ne mi-ni-gi-na
mu Sa-am-su-i-lu-na lugal-e | . . . . . . . ${ }^{d}$ Babbar ${ }^{d}$ Marduk e-ne-bi-ta-ge | nig-dim-dim-ma-bi al-in-na-an-gù-u[sh-a-an] | alam KA +SHU-KA+SHU-ne(?) ${ }^{\text {d}}$ lamma gushkin ash-ash-bi-ta | E-babbar igi${ }^{d}$ Babbar-shúu E-sag-il igi-d Marduk-shúu in-in-tu-ri

The year in which Samsu-iluna, the king, whose deeds both Shamash and Marduk after having erected their standing places (i.e., of
${ }^{1}$ Cf. ${ }^{d}$ Nannar $\mid$ dingir $S A G-D U-m u-s h u ̀ ~=a-n a{ }^{d} S i[n] \mid i l u$ ba-ni $[-i a]$. Samsu-iluna, Col. II, 50, 51 (similarly $a-n a$ ${ }^{d}$ Marduk ili ba-ni-shu, limestone tablet of Ham. from Borsippa, 31, 32); dingir SAG-DU-gu-dim = ki-ma ili ba-ni shu, II $R$., 17f, IV, 48. The phonetic value of $S A G-D U$ ended in $g$.
${ }^{2} \mathrm{Cf} .13 ., 44 a(=\mathrm{S} .18)$ and $B ., 44$ (S. 17), which Thureau-Dangin transcribes with alan-shá $(g)$-sha $(g)$-ne.
${ }^{3} B$., according to King, traces like unu.
the statues), has brought praying statues of guardian gods of gold, into $E$-babbar before Shamash, and into $E$-sagil before Marduk.


The year in which Samsuiluna, the king, after having dedicated to Marduk a mazrahu-weapon, a shining one, of gold and silver, the ornament of and after having it . . . . . . . in $E$-sagil, the house of Marduk, - - -

```
8. mu uruduki-lugal-gub har-sag ida ash-ash[ ]
B.
mu gishtukul ki-lugal-gub har-sag ida'
D.
mu uruduki[-lugal-gub ......
C.
mu Sa-am-su-i-luna lugal-e | uruduki-lugal-gub har-sag P. 28; Fr. 25.
    id-da-ash-ash
```

[^38]mu Sa-am-su-i-lu-na lugal uruluki-lugal-gub har-sag-id- S. 69, 70 (73) (Tell Sifr). ash-ash-bi
mu Sa-am-su-i-lu-na lugal|uruduki-lugal-gub|har-sag id-ash-ash-bi | hi-nun he-gal-bi tum-tum
mu Sa-am-su-i-lu-na lugal| urudu[k]i-lugal-gub-ba id-har-sag-ash-ash-bi
mu ${ }^{\text {uruduki-lugal-gub har-sag } \mid \text { ida-ash-ash-bi-ta(?) }}$
mu ki-lugal-gub (har-)sag ${ }^{1}$
mu ki-lugal-gub har-sag-id-ash-ash(?)-bi
mu sha-di-i ù na-ra-tim
The year in which Samsu-iluna, the king (after having made) a (brazen) lordly manzâzu (which represents) mountains and rivers carrying exuberance and abundance, - - - ${ }^{2}$

9a. mu us-sa uruduki-lugal-gub ${ }^{3}$
ти us-sa ki-lugal-gub-ba
b. mu ugnim Ka-ash-shu-u
mu Sa-am-su-i-lu-na lugal-e ugnim Ka-ash-shu-u
mu Sa-am-su-i-lu-na lugal-e ugnim ${ }^{4} \mathrm{Ka}$-ash-shu
The year in which Samsu-iluna, the king, after having

-     - the hordes of the kashsh $\hat{u}$, - - -

10. ${ }^{[ }$mu ugnim $I^{\text {I }}$-da-ma-ra-az
mи erim I-da-ma-ra-az
mu erim I-da-ma-ra-az ${ }^{k i}$
mu Sa-am-su-i-lu-na lugal-e | ugnim I-da-ma-ra-az
The year in which (Samsu-iluna, the king, after having - -) the hordes of Idamaraz, - .-.
11. $[m u$ ${ }_{k i}$
mu bád Uríki $U n u g^{k i}$
ти Sa-am-su-i-lu-na lugal(-e P. 35) bád. Uriki P. 35; 37 (case); 30.
Unug ${ }^{k i}-g a$ mu-un-gul-la

[^39]mи Sa-am-su-i-lu-na lugal-e bád Uriki ù Unugki mu- P. 36. un-gul-la
mu ${ }^{d} S a-a m-s u-i-l u-n a ~ l u g a l ~ b a ́ d ~ U r i k i ~ u ̀ ~ U n u g k i ~ m u-~ P . ~ 31 . ~$
un-gul
mu ${ }^{d} S a-a m-s u-i-l u-n a ~ l u g a l-e ~ b a ́ d ~ U r i{ }^{k i}-m a ~ U n u g^{k i}-g a$
P. 32.
mu-un-qul-e
mu Sa-am-su-i-lu-na lugal-e dúg-ga Ana ${ }^{\text {d }}$ En-lil-bi-da
P. $33 ; 34$ (36 case).
(P. 33 var. -ta) bád Uriki ù Unugki-ga mu-un-gul-la
mu bád Uri ${ }^{k i}$
R. 58.

The year in which Samsu-iluna, the king, after having destroyed at the command of Anum and Ellil the wall of Ur and Uruk, ———
12. mu kur gú-si-a
[mu kur gú-]si-a
mu kur gú-si-a an-ga-a
mu Sa-am-su-i-lu-na lugal | kur gú-si-a an-ga-a-an | mu-da-bal-esh
mu Sa-am-su-i-lu-na lugal-e | kur gú-si an-ga-a-an
B.; VI, $49 c$.
A. $\quad[(=\mathrm{VI}, 49 c)$.

Case of Bu. 91-5-9, 2518
P. 38 (Nippur).
P. 39.
mu-un-da-bal-e-esh-a-an
The year in which Samsu-iluna, the king, after all(?) the . . . . . lands had revolted from him, - - -
13. [mu Ki-sur-ra] ù $S a-b u-b i-d a-g e$
mи Ki-sur-ra ̀̀ $S a-b[u \quad]$
mu Sa-am-su-i-lu-na lu[gal]|Ki-sur-ra $S a$-bu-um $\mid$
A.
B.
P. 42 (Nippur). bi-da-ge
mu Sa-am-su-i-lu-na lugal-e | Ki-sur-ra ${ }^{k i} S a-b u-u m^{k i-}$
P. 43.
$b i-d a-g e$
mu Sa-am-su-i-lu-na lugal-e | dúg ${ }^{\text {d }}$ En-lil-lá-ta Ki-sur$r a^{k i} \mid S a-b u$-um ${ }^{k i}-b i-d a-g e \mid K A$-si-il-lá-ash ne-in-tu-ra
mu Sa-am-su-i-lu(-na) lugal|Ki-sur-ra $a^{k i}$ Sa-bu-um
P. 40.
mu-un-gul-la
The year in which Samsu-iluna, the king, after having brought to obedience (var. destroyed) Kisurra and Sabum, — — -
14. [mu lugal-im-gi] gú-[ba]r-ra
mu lugal-im-gi gú-b[ar-ra]
mu Sa-am-su-i-lu-na lugal | lugal-im-gí gú-bar-ra
$. m u S a-a m-s u-i-l u-n a \operatorname{lugal} \mid$ lugal-im-gí (case: -gй(g)) gú-bar-ra $\mid$ lù-Ki-uri-ge eb-ta-bal-bal $\mid$-e-esh-a
mu lugal im[- ]
The year in which king Samsu-iluna, the subduer of the illegal king whom the Accadians had seduced to make a rebellion, - - -
15. [mu bád] I-si-in-na ${ }^{k i} b a-g u l-l a$
mu bád I-si-in [-nakic ]
mu bád $I$-si-inin ${ }^{k i} \mid k i-b i-s h u ́ u[n e]-i n-g i-a$
$m u[S a-a m-s u-i-l u-n a ~ l u g a l]$ bád $I-s i-i n[-n a]^{k i} k i-b i-s h u ́ u$ ne-in-gí-a
$m u S a[-a m]-s u-i-l u-n a l u g a l \mid$ bád I I-s[i-]in $n^{k i}-n a ~ b a-g u l-$ $l a \mid k i$-bi-shú $[n]$ e-in-gi-a $\mid \ldots \ldots \ldots$. $] \mid$ $n e(?)-i n-K U(?)-a$
The year in which Samsu-iluna, the king, after having restored to its place the destroyed wall of $I \sin$ and having settled(?)
16. mu bád $]$ an-da-[s]á-a
mu bád an-d[a-sá-a ]
mu Sa-am-su-i-lu-na lugal-e | bád an-da-s[á-a]
mu bád an-da-sá-a Zimbirki $\mid a-d u ́-e^{1}$
A.
B.
R. 59.
mu Sa-àm-su-i-lu-na lugal-e |bád an-da-sá-a Zimbiri ${ }^{k i} \mid$
II, 13.
$a(?)-d u ́-e^{1} \mid m u-u n-d \bar{u}-a$
The year in which Samsu-iluna, the king, after having built the wall of Sippar that equals the heaven
17. [mu] bád-ash-ash gal-gal-la
A.
mu bád-ash-ash[ ]
]
B.
mu Sa-am-su-i-lu-na l[ugal] | bád-ash-ash gal-la
R. 60 .
[...............]
${ }^{1}$ Or nig-dù-e?
mu Sa-am-su-i-lu-na lugal[ ]|bád-ash-ash gal-gal P. 47.
E-mu-ut-ba[-al]| ba-gul-lu-ush-a ki[-bi-shúu ne-in-gi-a]
The year in which king Samsu-iluna, after having restored to their place the great castles of Emutbal which had been destroyed, - - -
18. mu E-babbar ${ }^{d}$ Babbar Zimbir(?)-ra ${ }^{k i}$
A.
B.

Fr. 26.
P. 48 .

Zimbir ${ }^{k i}-t a \mid$ shu-bil ne-in-ag $\mid I g i+E$-nir gigun-na-mah-a-ni | sag-bi an-shú mi-ni-in-us-sa
The year in which king Samsu-iluna, after having renovated $E$-babbar, the temple of Shamash in Sippar, and after having raised to heaven the head of the stage tower, his sublime gigun $\hat{u},-$ - -
19. mu ${ }^{\text {gish }}$ gu-za bara(?)-b[ar]a(?) gushkin min-na-bi
[mu Sa-a]m-su-i-lu-na lugal-e | ${ }^{\text {gish }}$ gu-za b]ara gushkin min-a-bi| $\mid{ }^{d}$ Marduk $\left.{ }^{d}\right] Z a r-p a-n i-t u m \mid-b i-d a$
mu Sa-am-su-i-lu-na lugal-e $\left.\right|^{\text {gish }}$ gu-za bara gushkin-na min-a-bi $\left.\right|^{d}$ Marduk Zar-pa-ni-tum-bi-da-ge | in-ne-shi-in-dim-ma

The year in which king Samsu-iluna, after having made two golden thrones for the sanctuary of Marduk and Zarpanitum, - -
20. mu kur nu-she-ga-ne
mu Sa-am-su-i-lu-na lugal-e | lugal sag-kal kur nu-she-ga-ni $\mid n e-i n-s i-s i-g a-a$
mu Sa-am-su-i-lu-na lugal sag-kal|kur nu-she-ga-ni P. $53(52,54)$. ne-in-si-si-ga

The year in which king Samsu-iluna, the supreme king, after having thrown down the unruly land, - .-.
${ }^{1}$ To the determination of the locality by means of -ta after a nominal expression cf. ba-dim $E$-babbar $\hat{e}^{d} B a b b a r$ Larsam ${ }^{k i}$-ma-ta, Brick of Hammu-rabi from Larsam.
21. $m\left[u^{g}\right]^{i s h} g u-z a$ bara-gu-l[ $\left.a \quad\right]$
$m u^{\text {gish } g u-z a ~ z a g(?) ~ g u s h k i n ~ g u[-l a-t a ?] ~ \mid ~ m u l-m u l[~}$
mu Sa-am-su-i-lu-na lugal-e $\mid$ gishgu-za bara gu-la gushkin-ta $\mid$ mul-dim¹ mul-mul-lá $\mid{ }^{d}$ Nin-gal-ra mu-na-dim-ma
mu Sa-am-su-i-lu-na lugal-e | gu-za bara gu-la gushkinta | mul-dim mul-mul-la [ $\left.{ }^{d}\right]$ Nin-gal-ra | [mu-n]a-dim-ma
mu Sa-am-su-i-lu-na ${ }^{\text {gish }}$ guza gushkin-ta
The year in which king Samsu-iluna, after having made for Ningal a throne in the great golden chamber which sparkled like the stars, -- -
22. mu $I G^{[I} I^{]}+$É-nir ki-KU-mah
mu Sa-am-su-i-lu-na lugal-e |IGI + É-nir ki-KU-mah|
${ }^{d} Z a-m a ̀-m a ̀{ }^{d}$ Ninni-bi-da-ge | shu-bil ne-in-ag
mu Sa-am-su-i-lu-na lugal-e |IGI + ÉE-nir ki-KU-azag ${ }^{2}$ ${ }^{d} Z a-m \grave{a}-m \grave{a}$

The year in which king Samsu-iluna, after having renovated the stage tower, the sublime (var. clean) dwelling place of Zamama and Ninni, -
23. mu á-kal[ ]
mu Sa-am-su-i-lu-na lugal-e á-kal RUSH-ra ${ }^{\text {d }}$ En$l i l-l i \mid m u-n a-a n-s i ̀-m a-t a$
mu Sa-am-su-i-lu-na lugal-e | á-kal RUSH-ra ${ }^{d}$ En-lilli mu-na-an-sì-ma-ta|Sha-a'-na ${ }^{k i}$ Za-ar-ha-nu-um mu bád Sha-a'-na-a mu Sha-a'-na-a

The year in which king Samsu-iluna, after having in the formidable might which Ellil had given him, (destroyed) Sha'na and Zarhanum, - - -

[^40]A.

VIII, $41 c$.
VIII, $32 b$.
P. 55.

VIII, $15 a$.
A. $;$ IV, $7 b ; 17 b ;$ VIII, $15 a$.
P. 57 .
P. 56 .
A.
P. 58 .
R. 46.

VIII, $32 a$.
VIII, $6 a$.
24. mu bád $K[i s h] \quad\left[{ }^{k i}\right]$
mu Sa-am-su-i-lu-na lugal nam kalam-ma | mu-un-ŭr-ra | bád Kish ${ }^{k i}$ mu-un-dü-a
mu Sa-am-su-i-lu-na lugal nam kalam-ma mu-ŭr-ra bád Kish ${ }^{k i}$ gú id Buranunu mu-un-dū-a

The year in which Samsu-iluna, the king, who determined ${ }^{1}$ the destiny of the land, after having built the wall of Kish on the bank of the Euphrates,
25. mu alam [
$]$
ти Sa-am-su-i-lu-na lugal-e| alam (?) ${ }^{\text {aish} t u k u l(?)-s i g-~}$ gi ki(?)-sag(?)- . . . . . | mu-un- . . . . - -a

The year in which Samsu-iluna, the king, after having $\qquad$ a statue(?) with a striking weapon(?) in the $\qquad$ place, - -
26. mu har-sag[ ]
mu har[
mu Sa-am-su-i-lu-na lugal-e | har-sag-gal kur Mar-tu
mu Sa-am-su-i-lu-na[ ]| har-sag-gal kur Mar-tu-$a[-t a]$
mu Sa-am-su-i-lu-na lugal-e | har-sag-gal kur Mar-tu-$a[-t a] 1 \frac{1}{2}$ gar 4 u 10 da-ush[ ]|nà sag-gí-a$b a[\quad]$

The year in which king Samsu-iluna, after having (brought) from the great mountain of the westland a ........ stone measuring $1 \frac{1}{2}$ gar 4 cubits and 10 inches(? $)^{2}$ $\qquad$
27. mu nig-babbar-ra ${ }^{3}$
mu Sa-am-su-i-lu-na lugal[ ]| nig-babbar-ra sakkur-sakkur-(?) | . . . . . . . . ki shag dú-shar-ra
${ }^{\prime} \breve{U}_{r}\left(B_{r}, 11890\right)=$ bamâmu, "to direct."
${ }^{2}$ That is, about 11 metres.
${ }^{3}$ As the text in lines 18 and 19 mentions the 26th year of Samsu-iluna, and as the formulas from the 28th year to the last year of Samsu-iluna are known, it follows that the above given formula is that of the 27th year
${ }^{4}$ The transcription of this line is a mere attempt.

# mu Sa-am-su-i-lu-n[a lugal ]| nig-babbar-ra sakkur- P. 90. sakkur[-ra?] ............. [ ] 

The year in which Samsu-iluna, the king after having - --
28. [mu á]-ág[-gá ]
mu Sa-am-su-i-lu-na lugal | $\dot{a}$-ág-gáa ${ }^{\text {d }}$ En-lil-lá-ta(?) P. 60.
mu Sa-am-su-i-lu-na lugal |áág-gá ${ }^{d}$ En-lil-lá
[mu Sa-am-su-i-lu-n]a lugal | á-ag-gá ${ }^{\text {d}}$ En-lil-lá | IV, 11a.
[..............] $t a$
mu nam á-ág-gá $\mid{ }^{d}$ En-lil-lá-ta
P. 61.

The year in which king Samsu-iluna, after having
-upon the (decision of the) oracle of Ellil, - -
29. $m u[u s-s] a$ á-á $[g-g \dot{a} \quad]$
mu Sa-am-su-i-lu-na lugal-e us-sa á-ág-gá ${ }^{\text {den En-lil-láa }}$
A.

VI, $20 a$.
The year after that in which, etc.
30. mu us-sa us-sa á-ág-gá [ ]

ти us-sa us-sa á-ág-gá
A.

IV, $39 a$.
mu Sa-am-su-i-lu-na lugal-e | us-sa us-sa-bi á-ág-gá
P. 86 .
${ }^{d}$ En-lil-lá [ ]
mu bil min-kam-ma|[sh]a egir mu á-ág-gáa ${ }^{\text {a }}$ En-lil-láa VIII, $9 b$.
The second year after that in which, etc.
31. mu alam-a-ni gish-nim mu[- ] A
mu Sa-am-su-i-lu-na lugal | alam ${ }^{\text {gishtukul gushkin }}$
R. $70: 26,27$. rush- $a^{1}$

The year in which king Samsu-iluna, after having (made) a statue with a weapon of red shining gold,-
32. mu id Qar(?)[-
A.

The year in which Samsu-iluna, after having - the canal, ........., - -
${ }^{1}$ This date has to be consigned to the 31st year, because $R .70$ stands between the 28 th year of Samsu-iluna and a year of $A b i e s h u^{\prime}$, and no other formula of the intermediate years begins with alam.
33. $m u \hat{A} l-K a-m a ̀(?)-r a-t u m[]$

The year in which Samsu-iluna, after having -Al-Kamaratum, - - -
34. [mu] gish-gal nam-nun-na
[m]u Sa-am-su-i-lu-na lugal-e | gish-gal nam-nun-na É-he-dú | [.............] $]$ mu-un[- -a]

The year in which king Samsu-iluna, after having - a manzâzu of grandeur in E-he-du
35. mu A-ma-al ${ }^{k i} A r-k u-u m^{k i}$
A.

The year in which (Samsu-iluna, after having--)
Amal and Arkum, - -- -
36. mu erim Mar-tu-a

The year in which (king Samsu-iluna, after having
-) the people of the West land, - - -
37. mu $m[a-d] a$ Ki-uri- $a$

The year in which (king Samsu-iluna, after having -) the land of Akkad, - -
38. $m u ~ U d-b a-n u-i l-l a$
mu Sa-am-su-i-lu-na lugal-e $\mid{ }^{d} U d-b a-n u-i l-l a S A L+$
A.
P. 88.

GISH kala-ga $\dagger^{d}$ Nin-IB ur-sag-gal | in-na-an-bil-a
The year in which king Samsu-iluna has renovated the "unsparing storm," the mighty battle mace, for NinIB the great hero.

## Uncertain Dates.

a. $\quad$ mu us-sa $S a-a m-s u-i-l u-n a \quad$ lugal-e | $\quad$ Ia-di-ha-bu ì
Mu-ti-hu-ur-sha-na $\mid K A K+G I S H$ rush-a-na gishhash ne-in-ag-a
The year following that in which king Samsu-iluna, after having destroyed with his fierce battle mace Iadih-abu and Mutihurshana(?), - - -

[^41]b. $\quad m u \quad S a$-am-su-i-lu-na lugal $\mid$ ki-in-gin nig ud-ul(?)- P. 63. $l i(?)-t a(?) \dot{a}(?)-s h u b-b a(?)$

The year in which king Samsu-iluna, after havingthe ki-in-gin, which since old times had been in ruins(? ?), ${ }^{1}$ - - -
c. $\quad[m u S a-a m]-s u-i-l u-n a l u g a l-e \mid[\quad] \ldots b a \ldots$.... P. 89.

$$
\ldots \mid[\quad] \text { Mash-gan-shabra }(?)^{k i}
$$

The year in which king Samsu-iluna, after having -
Mashgan-shabra, ${ }^{2}$ - —

## ILI-MA-ILUM.

mu bil I-li-ma-ilum lugal-e P. 68.

The year after that in which Ili-ma-ilum - - -
Abi-Eshu'.

1. mи A-bi-e-shu' lugal-e

Fr. 29.
a. ${ }^{3}$ mu A-bi-e-shu-u' lugal-e | gù-gù-ga á mah ${ }^{\text {a }}$ Marduk-ge

IV, $15 b: 3,4$.
The year in which king Abi-eshu', who trusts in the great might of Marduk, - - -
a +1. mu A-bi-e-shu-u' lugal-e | sib ki-ág Ana ${ }^{d} E n-l i l-b i-\quad$ IV, 15b; VIII, $1 c: 3,4$. $d a-g e$
The year in which king Abi-eshu', the beloved shep-
herd of Anum and Ellil, - - -
$\mathrm{a}+2$. mu A-bi-e-shu-u' lugal-e | dúg-mah Ana ${ }^{\text {d }}$ En-lil-bi-
da-ge $\mid$ VIIII, $1 c$ (Sippar). gal-gal ${ }^{d}$ Marduk-bi-da ${ }^{4}$-ge
mu A-bi-e-shu-u' lugal-e $\mid$ dug-mah Ana ${ }^{d}$ En-lil-lá(?)- VIII, $33 c$ (Sippar).
ta|á-kal gal-gal d Marduk-ka-ta

[^42]mи A-bi-e-shu-u’ lugal-e | dúg-mah Ana ${ }^{\text {d}}$ En-lil-bi- VIII, 33c:8, 9 (Sippar). $d a(?)-g e(?)$
mи A-bi-e-shu-u lugal-e | dúg-mah Ana ${ }^{\text {d En-lil-lá-ta } \mid ~}$
R. 70 (Sippar).
$$
\text { alam² gal-gal-la }{ }^{d} \text { Marduk-ge }
$$

The year in which king Abi-eshu', after at the sublime command of Anum and Ellil the great battle forces of Marduk - - - - -
b. mu alam-a silim(?)-ma sá(?)-a-ge(?) VIII, 38c :12.

The year in which (king Abi-eshu' has -) a statue which procures prosperity.

```
b +1. mu É-kish-shir-gál é-dNannar-kam(?)
    VIII, 38c.
    mи A-bi-e-shu-u' lugal-e | E-kish-shir-gál
    R. 66, 67.
    The year in which king Abi-eshu', after having -
        E-kish-shir-gal, the house of Nannar, - - -
c. mu A-bi-e-shu-u' lugal-e | id GAM-A-bi-e-shu-u' |
    R. 72:4-6;73.
        mi-ni-in-dun-na
    mu A-bi-e-shu-u' lugal-e | id GAM-A-bi-e-shu-u'-ge |
    R. 73:4-6.
        mi-in-dun-na
```

    The year in which king Abi-eshuh, after having dug
        the canal "splendor of Abieshu'," - - -
    
mи A-bi-e-shu-u' lugal-e |nimgir-nimgir-a KU-GI-ga| R. 73; VI, $24 b$.
kú-babbar-ra-bi-da-ge
mи A-bi-e-shu-u' lugal-e | nimgir-nimgir(-a?) K ̂́-GI- VIII, $17 b$.
ga kú-bàr-ba-ra|-bi-da-ge
mи A-bi-e-shu-u' lugal-e | nimgir-nimgir-a K Ú-GI-ga-
ge
ти A-bi-e-shu-u' lugal-e | nim-gir-nim-gír-a KÚG-GI- R. 76.
$g a-g e(?)$
${ }^{1}$ The variant reading alam for $a$-kal makes it probable that $I D-K A L$ has to be pronounced $a$-lama. As long as the continuation of the formula does not disprove it, a translation "the great images of Marduk" is not out of question either.

```
mи A-bi-e-shu-u' lugal-e | nim-gir-nim-gir-a | KUG-GI- P. 94.
    ga-ge
```

The year in which king Abi-eshu' has - - lightnings
of gold and silver.
$\mathrm{c}+1+\mathrm{x}^{1}$ mи $A$-[bi]-e-shu-u’ lugal-e | Ad-na-tum-ma R. 119, Rev. II, 30.
The year in which king Abi-eshu', after having -
Adnatum,- - -
d. mu A-bi-e-shu-u' lugal-e|[nun] BÚR-na, lù ${ }^{d}$ Babbar-ge
P. 96 .
mи $A$-bi-e-shu-u' lugal-e | nun BÚR-na lù dBabbar-
P. $55(=$ R. 78).
ge $\mid$ gish-in-na-an-tug-tug-a $\mid$ har-kin kalam-ma-nita

The year in which king Abi-eshu', the humble prince,
whom Shamash hears, the giver of direction in his
land, - - -
e. mu $A$-bi-e-shu-u' lugal | sag-D $\bar{U}-D \bar{U}$ gu-la ${ }^{d} M a r d u k \mid$
R. 77.
[ ]
The year in which Abi-eshu', after he had in the great
wisdom of Marduk - - - , - - -
f. mu A-bi-e-shu-u' lugal-e | Bád-A-bi-e-shu-u' lugal-e| VIII, 27a. $i d(?) . . . . .$.

The year in which king Abi-eshu', after having (built) Dur-Abi-eshu' — -, — - -
g. mu A-bi-e-shu-u' lugal-e |[á-]-kal-mah(?) ${ }^{d}$ Marduk-? | VIII, 33a. Id-(1 $\frac{1}{2}$-)digna gish-ne-in-gi(?)-gi(?)

The year in which king Abi-eshu', after having dammed up, in the sublime power of Marduk, the river Tigris, ${ }^{2}-$ - - -

[^43]h. mu A-bi-e-shu-u' lugal-e | ${ }^{d}$ Nannar ${ }^{d}$ Marduk-bi-da P. 92 (tablet + case).

KA in-ne-en-dú(g)-dúg-ga|sha-mu-[ . . . . dia-sar-sar-(?) . . . . . ] | KAK + GISH (?)- . . . . [
The year in which king Abi-eshu', after Nannar and
Marduk had . . . . . the word which he had addressed
to them, - - a battle-mace .....
i. mu A-bi-e-shu-u' lugal-e | sag-mah gushkin-rush-a 'R. $69: 5,6$. mu A-bi-e-shu-u' lugal-e | sag-mah gushkin rush-a |
R. 69.
...... -ta ......
The year in which king Abi-eshu' has - a gamiru of red shining gold ...
k. mu A-bi-e-shu[u' lugal-e] | á-kal shag ash-[. ]| R. 68. ?-kalam-ma(?)-shú ASH-ME[ ]
cf. $m и$ A-bi-e-shu-u' lugal-e | .......... shag-ash-GUB| II, 24.
mu A-bi-e-shu-u' lugal-e | á-kal shag-ash-GUB Fr. 31.
The year in which $A b i$-eshu', the king; the perfect one in power, ${ }^{1}$

1. muA-bi-e-shu-u'lugal-e $\left.\right|^{\text {gish }}$ ash-te bara-zagba-ni-ge-ne| VIII, $27 b$.
ni-mah-esh- $a^{2}$
The 'year in which king Abi-eshu' has - thrones of the. .chamber that are shining.
m. mu A-bi-e-shu-u' lugal-e $\mid{ }^{d}$ Nannar en IGI + DUB-ti- VIII, $1 b$.
la-ni-shù(?) | shu-nir gal-gal-la K $G$-GI-ga(?)-ge(?) | $a-m u-n a-R U-a$

The year in which king Abi-eshu', after having consecrated great emblems of gold for Nannar the lord, his helper, - - -
n. mи A-bi-e-shu-u' lugal-e | alam-gal-gal shu-sar-sar VI, 38.

The year in which king Abi-eshu' has - great praying statues.

[^44]${ }^{2} \mathrm{Cf}$. Ad. 13 (in connection with Sd.a: ni-lah-gi-esh-a and mah-bi, and notice the note to Si. 22).
o. mu A-bi-e-shu-u' lugal-e |alam-a-ni gish(?)-?-ge |E- VIII, $17 c$.
kish-shir-gál é-ki-mah ${ }^{\text {d }}$ Nannar-kam
The year in which king Abi-eshu' has - his statue of ........ $\operatorname{wood(?)~into~} E$-kishshirgal, the house of the sublime place of Nannar.
p. mu A-bi-e-shu-u' lugal-e | alam ${ }^{d}$ Marduk ${ }^{d}$ Zar-pa-ni- P. 91:8, 9.
tum [-bi-.....]
mи A-bi-e-shu-u’ lugal-e | alam [ ${ }^{d}$ Marduk] ${ }^{d}$ Zar-pa-ni- P. 91.
tum|-bi-da-ge
The year in which king Abi-eshu' has ——a statue of Marduk and Zarpanitum.
q. $m u$ A-bi-e-sh[u-u' lugal-e]|alam nig-si(?)-sá(?) ...... P. 93.
... gar-ra | A-bi-e-shu-u' nam-nun-shú .......
The year in which king Abi-eshu' has - a statue of justice(?) for the highness of (?) Abi-eshu'.
r. [mu A-bi-]e-shu-u' lugal-e alam-a-ni GAB + LIS abP. 97.
 shú igi- ${ }^{d}$ Babbar-shú i-ni-tù-ra
The year in which king Abi-eshu' has brought his statue which . . . . . . , into . . . . . . . . . . . . the stage tower of E-babbar before Shamash.
s. mu A-bi-e-shu-u' lugal-e | alam ${ }^{\text {a }}$ En-temen-na-a $\mid$ namVIII, $33 b$.
dingir-ra-ni-shú ba-ab-UL-a
The year in which king Abi-eshu' has -- the statue of En-temena which . . . . for his divinity.

```
28. mu A-bi-e-shu-u' lugal-e | alam-a-ni MUD-NIG-
        SHAG-a(min?)
    mu A-bi-e-shu-u' lugal-e | alam-a-ni MUD-[NIG- R. }75
    SHAG-a] | alam-a-ni gish(?)-kal(?)-......
    mu A-bi-e-shu-u' lugal-e | alam-a-ni MUD-NI[G- M. 2.
    SHAG-a] |GAB te in-ne-da(?)-an[ ]
    The year in which king Abi-eshu' has - his statue
        and his statue
        R. 71:3f., 9f., 74; 82 :
        15, }16
            ...........
```


## Ammi-ditana.

```
1. mu Am-mi-di-ta-na lugal-e | ad-gi-a gu-la d Marduk-ge
E.
mu A[m-mi-di-ta-na lugal-e |a[d]-gi-[a ..........] B.
mu Am-mi-di-ta-na lugal-e | ad-gi gu-la VI, 24a:3,4 (Sippar).'
mu Am-mi-di-ta-na lugal-e | ad-gi-a gu-la "Babbar- VI, 24.
    \mp@subsup{}{}{d}Marduk-bi-da-ge
mu Am-mi-di-ta-na lugal-e | ad-gí-a gu-la 'Babbar- VI, 29 (Babylon).'
    \mp@subsup{}{}{d}Marduk | -bi-da
mи Am-mi-di-ta[-na lugal-e]| ad-gi ga-la d[Babbar]| P. 98.
    \mp@subsup{}{}{4}Marduk ...[ ]
mи Am-mi-di-ta-na lugal-e VI, 26b.
```

The year in which king Ammi-ditana, upon the great
resolution of Shamash and Marduk
......... . , -- -
2. mu sib ni-tug[ ]
B.
mu sib ni-tug she-ga Ana ${ }^{d}$ En-lil-ge
E.
mu sib ní-tug she-ga [ $\left.{ }^{d}\right] B[a b b a r]$
R. $91: 3$.
mu Am-mi-di-ta-na lugal-e sib ni-tug she-ga ${ }^{d}$ Babbar
M. 68 .
mи Am-mi-di-ta-na lugal-e sib ní-tug she-ga ${ }^{d}$. . . . . . . . Bu. 88-5-12, 271.
bi-da
mu Am-mi-di-ta-na lugal-e | sib nítug she-ga R. 81; Berl. 1260: 6.
mи Am-mi-te-ta-na lugal-e sib ni-tug she-ga
B. 88-5-12, 197 .
mu sib ni-tug
R. 82 .

The year in which king Ammi-ditana, the reverent shepherd, who is obedient ${ }^{3}$ to Shamash (var. to
Anum and Ellil), - - -
3. mu esh-bar-mah-[..........].] nam-á-[...........] B.
mu nam-á-gal-la ${ }^{d}$ Marduk-ge E.
mu nam-á(-gal)-la ${ }^{d}$ Marduk-ge VI, 6:13.
mu Am-mi-di-ta-na lugal-e | esh-bar mah-a dingir- Bu. 88-5-9, 393. gal-gal
${ }^{1}$ Mentions kar Sippar ${ }^{k i}$ Ia-ah-ra-rum and bît d Shamash.
${ }^{2}$ Cf. 1. 7; oath by the name of Marduk, 1. 22.
${ }^{3}$ she-ga $=$ shem $\hat{\text {, migru }}=$ obedient; like shem $\hat{u}$ also migru has active force; it has never the sense of "favorite, darling." Cf. nu-she-ga $=$ la ma-gi-ri.
mи Am-mi-di-ta-na lugal-e | esh-bar-ta dingir-gal-gal- M. 19.
la sag-ga-a-ni an-la-al nam-á-gal d Marduk-ge
mи Am-mi-di-ta-na lugal-e | nam-á-gál-la ${ }^{\text {d }}$ Marduk- IV, 15a. ge | in-ne-en-gar-ra-ta
mu Am-mi-di-ta-na lugal-e | nam-á-gál d Marduk-ge | Berl. 1184. uku kalam-ma-na

The year in which king Ammi-ditana, who by the sublime decision of the great gods ..... his head with the power of Marduk (var. which Marduk had given him) (or them $=$ the people of his land(?)), ———
4. mu-bil [egir ]
mu-bil egir nam-á-gál d Marduk-ge
B.
mu Am-mi-di-ta-na lugal-e mu-bil $\mid$ egir | nam-á-gál-
R. 119, III: 8.
la ${ }^{d}$ Marduk-ge
mu Am-mi-di-ta-na lugal-e | mu-bil | egir mu nam-
R. 91.
(á-)gál-la ${ }^{d}$ Marduk-ge
[mu-bil] egir nam-á-gál-la ${ }^{\text {d }}$ Marduk-ge in-ne-dū(?)-shu
mи Am-mi-di-ta-na lugal-e | mu-bil egir mu nam-ágál ${ }^{\text {d }}$ Marduk-ge
mи Am-mi-di-ta-na lugal-e $\mid$ mu-bil sha egir mu nam-á-gál-la
mu-bil | sha egir mu nam-á-gál-la ${ }^{d}$ Marduk-ge
mu-bil sha egir nam-á-gál-la ${ }^{d}$ Marduk
The new year (which is) after that in which, etc.
5. mu alam na[m
mи alam nam-nun-na-ni E-sag-il-la-shú in-ni-tu-ri(?)
mu Am-mi-di-ta-na lugal-e | alam nam-nun-na-ni
mu Am-mi-di-ta-na lugal-e alam nam-nun-na-ni ${ }^{\text {sish }} g u$ za bara-mah-a an-da-ri-a E-sag-il-la-shú in-ni-tu-ra
[mu Am-mi-di-ta-n]a lugal-e |[alam nam-nun-n]a-ni |
(é) E-sag-íl-la-shúu | i-ni-in-tu-ra ([ ]-en-tu-ra Berl. 1545)
The year in which king Ammi-ditana has brought into E-sagil the statue of his highness which is borne by a throne of the sublime chamber.
P. 100 .

IV, $37 b$.
P. 99 .
B.
E.
R.82:4,20f.,27f.; VIII, $8 a$.

Berl. 803.

Berl. 1502., Berl. 1545
Berl. 1545 : 2.
R. $91: 5,6$.
> 6. $m u u^{a i[s h} g u-z a$
> $m u^{\text {gish }} g u-z a$ ki-BAD-gub-a
> mu Am-mi-di-ta-na lugal-e ${ }^{d}$ Babbar lugal shig(?)na | ${ }^{\text {gish }} g u-z a ~ k i-B A D-g u b-b a ~ K G U-G I-g a-y e$
> The year in which king Ammi-ditana has - a throne, a ..... stand, of gold, for Shamash, the lord his favourer.
B.
E.
7. mu alam-a-ni $K A+S H U(?)-K A+S H U(?)-n e$ an- E. sá-sá-a
mu Am-mi-di-ta-na lugal-e | alam-a-ni KA +SHU-a P. 102. an-sá-sá-a $\mid[\check{u}]$ alam-a-ni másh igi-dǔ-a | E-sag-ilshú i-ni-in-tu-ra
The year in which king Ammi-ditana has brought into $E$-babbar his statue (which represents him as) saying prayers and his statue (which represents him as) beholding a (sacrificial) lamb. ${ }^{1}$
> 8. mu alam nam-lugal-a-ni E-babbar-ra-shú in-ni-tu-ra
> mu Am-mi-di-ta-na lugal-e alam nam-lug[al-a-na] |
> E. alam KÚ-GI-ga-ge
> mu Am-mi-di-ta-na lugal-e | alam nam-lugal-la-na ${ }^{2} \mid$ VIII, $36 c$. alam KU-GI-ga-ge | shu-ne-in-dŭ-a
> mи Am-mi-di-ta-na lugal-e | alam nam-lugal-la-na Berl. 6091. alam KU-GI-ga-ge shu-a ne-in-dŭ-a E-babbar-raash in-na-ni-tu-ra

The year in which Ammi-ditana, the king, after having caused the statue of his royalty, a statue of gold, to be formed, brought it into $E$-babbar.
9. mи Mash-gan-Am-mi-di-ta-na ${ }^{k i}$
E.

The year in which (Ammi-ditana, the king, after having - ) Mashkan-Ammiditana, - - -
${ }^{1} I . e .$, for the purpose of soothsaying. Perhaps we are to supply shu-a an-da-gal-la (see Az.5) after mash igi-dŭ-a, and therefore should translate: holding (in his hands) a lamb for soothsaying, igi-dŭ-a being in this case a substantive =tamartu, "observation."
${ }^{2}$ Alam namlugalani because it is dependent on innitura (construed with the accusative); alam namlugalana because it is dependent on $s h u(a) n e n d \check{u} a$ (construed with localis). Cf. Gud., Cyl. A, $4: 25: g i-d u b-b a a z a g-g \grave{l}(=g \check{a})-a \operatorname{sh} u-i m-$ $m i-d \check{u}$ (see St. Langdon, "Syntax of Compound Verbs in Sumerian" (Babyloniaca, II, pp. 64-101), a 11),
10. mu-bil egir Mash-gan-Am-mi-di-ta-na ${ }^{k i}$
mu Am-mi-di-ta-na lugal-e | bil egir Mash-gan-Am-miE.
di-ta-na
The year of king Ammi-ditana, the new one after (that in which), etc.
11. mu bád Kara-d ${ }^{d}$ Babbarki
mu Am-mi-di-ta-na lugal-e Kara- ${ }^{\text {ª }}$ Babbar gú id Kib-nun-na-ge bad-a-ni in-d $\bar{u}^{1}-a-a n$
mu Am-mi-di-ta-na lugal[ ]!Kara- ${ }^{d}$ [Babbar ] | bád-[a]-[ni i]n-dū-a

The year in which king Ammi-ditana, after he had built the wall of Kar-Shamash on the bank of the river $\qquad$
12. mu alan-a-ni másh-gè(g)-a
mu Am-mi-di-ta-na lugal-e | alan-a-ni másh-gè(g)-ga
E.

The year in which king Ammi-ditana has -- his statue (representing him as having) a vision of the night ( = dream).
13. mu ASH-ME gal-gal-la nàdŭ-shi-a-ge
[mu Am-mi-di-t]a-na lugal-e |[ASH-ME gal-gal-la-]a ${ }^{d a}$ dǘ-shi-a
mu Am-mi-di-ta-na lugal-e | ASH-ME gal-gal-la dŭ-shi-a-ge ${ }^{2}$
mu Am-mi-di-ta-na lugal-e | ASH-ME gal-gal-la nà dǔ-shí-a-ge | shu-nir-ra ni-mah-esh-a $\mid \dot{E}$-babbar-ra-shúu in-ne-en-tu-ra

The year in which king Ammi-ditana has brought into $E$-babbar huge sun disks of $D u s h \hat{u}$ stone, emblems that were sparkling.

[^45]IV, $40 b$.
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
E.

Berl. 5943.

VIII, $7 b$ (Sippar).
P. 105.
E.

IV, $8 b$ (Borsippa?).
Berl. 1102.

```
14. mu alam-a-ni nam-shul-a-ni \(\dot{E}\)-sag-il-la-shú in-ni-tu-ra E. ти Am-mi-di-ta-na lugal-e |alam nam-shul-a-ni | za-e P. 106.
\(D U-D U\)-ne | E-sag-il-a-shú in-na-an-dur-ra mи Am-mi-di-ta-na lugal-e | alam nam-shul-a-ni P. 107.
```

The year in which king Ammi-ditana has brought into
Esagil the statue of his heroship, 'thou art their(?)
shepherd. ${ }^{1}$
15. mu ${ }^{\text {uruduki-lugal-gub-ba gal-gal kur-har-sag-gá | [ . . . . E. }}$ ..........].............. -shúu nam-nin
ти Am-mi-di-ta-na lugal-e ${ }^{\text {uruduki-lugal-gub ni-mah- VIII, } 30 b .}$
$\left.a\right|^{\text {uruduki-lugal-gub kur-ash-ash-a }}$
mu Am-mi-di-ta-na lugal-e | ${ }^{\text {uruduki-lugal-gub gal-gal-. VIII, } 8 \text {, }}$
$l a \mid[\quad] n a ́-n a$ kur-har-sag-gá|[ ? ] id-id(?)
............ [ ]
The year in which Ammi-ditana, the king, has great lordly stands, (representing) a mountain land .................. (var. a brazen royal stand that sparkled, (and ?) a royal stand (representing) mountains).
16. mu Bád-Am-mi-di-ta-na ${ }^{k i} \mid$ gú id Zi-lá-kum-ma-ta ne- E. $i n-d \bar{u}-a$
mи Am-mi-di-ta-na lugal-e | Bád-Am-mi-di-ta-na
Berl. 5932.
The year in which Ammi-ditana, the king after having built Dur-Ammiditana on the bank of the canal
Zilakum, ${ }^{2}$ - — -
17. mu á-kal-mah-a dBabbar ${ }^{d}$ Marduk-bi-da-ge
E.
mи Am-mi-di-ta-na lugal-e | á-kal-mah-a ${ }^{\text {d }}$ Babbar P. 108.
${ }^{d}$ Marduk|-bi-da-ge

[^46]```
mи Am-mi-di-ta-na lugal-e á-kal-mah̆ \({ }^{d}\) Babbar \({ }^{d}\) Mar- Berl. 1187.
    duk-bi-da-ge
mu Am-mi-di-ta-na lugal-e á-kal-mah \({ }^{d}\) Babbar \({ }^{d}\) Mar- Berl. 5914.
    \(d u k-b i-d a-g e ~ A-r a-h a-a b ~ l u ̀-m a-d a\)
mu Am-mi-di-ta-na lugal-e | á-kal-mah-a \({ }^{d} B a b b a r ~ B e r l . ~ 5963 . ~\)
    \({ }^{d} M[a r d u k-b i-d a-g e]\left|{ }^{m} A-r a-a h(?)-a[-? \quad l \grave{u}-\ldots . .]^{1}\right|\)
    [ ]
```

The year in which king Ammi-ditana, after having, with the great (battle) forces of Babbar and Mar$d u k$, (vanquished) Arahab, the Sumerian, - - -
18. mu Gá-gí-a túr dagal-la ${ }^{\text {a }}$ Babbar-ge
E.

The year in which Ammi-ditana, the king, after having - the Gayû, the wide court of Shamash, -
19. mu gish-gal $K \hat{U}-G I-g a$
mu Am-mi-di-ta-na lugal-e $\mid$ gish-kal KÚ-GI-ta $\mid$ meE. te ki-BAD-gub
mu Am-mi-di-ta-na lugal-e gish-gal KÛ-GI-ga me-te ki-BAD-gub-a
mи Am-mi-di-ta-na lugal-e | gish-gal KÚ-GI-ga me-te ki-BAD-gub-a $\mid \grave{u}$ alam-a-ni KAB ab-sar-sar-ri- $\left[a^{]} \mid\right.$ Énam-ti-la-shúu in-ne-(1227: E-nam-ti-la-ta(?) i$n i-) t u-r a-a$.

The year in which king Ammi-ditana has brought into E-namtila a golden chair, as the ornament of the ....... manzâ̂zu, and his statue (representing him as)
20. mu Ki-KU-shag-dug-ga $a^{k i}$
mu Am-mi-di-ta-na lugal-e $\mid K i$-KU-shag-dug-ga-ta
gù id A-ra-ah-tum-ma-ta $\mid$ ne-in-dū-a
mu Am-mi-di-ta-na lugal-e $\mid$ Ki-KU-shag-dug-ga-ni $\mid$
gù id A-ra-ah-tu[m-m]a-[ta]: ne-in-dū-[a ]
E.

Berl. 625.

Berl. 1580.

[^47]mи Am-mi-di-ta-na lugal-e $\mid$ Ki-KU-shag-du[g-ga $\left.{ }^{k i}\right] \mid$ Berl. 1470.
gù id $A$-[ra-ah-tum-ma-ta] $|[\ldots . . . . . . . .]$. é-gal.............[ [ ]
The year in which king Ammi-ditana, after having built Ki-KU-shag-dugga (var. his pleasure dwelling place) on the bank of the canal Arahtum, (and after having - a palace ........ , - - -
21. mu en NI-ÍB ki-ág ${ }^{d} B a b b a r-g e \mid h a r-r a ~ m a-d a-n i b a-d a-~ E . ~$ $a n-d u ̆-a$
mu Am-mi-di-ta-na lugal-e |en ib-ul-la ki-ág ${ }^{d} B[a b b a r-\quad$ R. 90. ge] har-ra ma-da-an-n[i ]|ab-ag-ag-da
The year in which Ammi-ditana, the lord, the beloved ........ ${ }^{1}$ of Shamash, by whom the oppression of his land has been broken, - - --
22. mu en shag-ash-DU id Am-mi-di-ta-na E.
mu [ ] | id Am-mi-di-ta-na B.
mu Am-mi-di-ta-na lugal-e| id Am-mi-di-ta-na mu-ni Berl. 839. ne-in(?)-shi-a-an(? mash ?)
mи Am-mi-di-ta-na lugal-e id Am-mi-di-ta-na mu-un- Berl. 5971. $b a-a[l]$
mи Am-mi-di-ta-na lugal-e | id Berl. 776. Am-mi-di-ta-na

The year in which Ammi-ditana, the king, the strong lord, after having dug the Ammi-ditana canal (var. a canal the name of which he called(?), Canal of Ammi-ditana)
23. mu alam-alam-a-ni| $\grave{u}^{d}$ lamma ${ }^{d} \operatorname{lamma} a(?)$
mи Am-mi-di-ta-na lugal-e | alam-alam-a-ni
mи Am-mi-di-ta-na lugal-e | urudualam-alam-a-ni
E.; B.
(mu Am-mi-di-ta-na lugal-e alam-alam-a-ni ù damma (sic!) E-babbar-ra-shú in-na-RU(?)-a)

Berl. 795, 725 : 2.
Berl. 6002.
According to Johns (P.
S. B. A., 1907, p. 110).

The year in which Ammi-ditana, the king, has -- his brazen statues and the guardian gods - -
${ }^{1}$ To NI-fiB compare perhaps MI-fB, var. MI-NI-IB and tukul MI-IB, the designation of a weapon, Gud., Cyl. B, $7: 14,24,13: 23$ and date of Gudea. Hammu-rabi calls himself the NI-fB of Dagan, C. H., $4: 27$.
24. $m u \mathrm{x}^{1}$ tukul-la ib-dirig-gi-esh-a
$m u \mathrm{x}^{\mathrm{m}^{\text {gish }} t u k u l} i b(?)-d i[r i g(?)$
]
mu Am-mi-di-ta-na lugal-e | $\mathrm{x}^{\text {aishtukul-la[-a?] (5804 }}$ var. -a) (|) ib-dirig-gi[-esh-a]
mu Am-mi-di-ta-na lugal-e | $\mathrm{x}^{1}{ }^{\text {gishtukul gushkin Berl. 693:10ff. }}$ ${ }^{n \grave{ }} d \breve{u}$-shi-a-bi-[da-ge]| ${ }^{d}$ Marduk lugal-a-na| E - sag-il-la-shú i-ni-in-tu-ra

The year in which Ammi-ditana, the king, has brought into $E$-sagil a battle-mace (and) a weapon which were gigantic ${ }^{2}$ (var. of gold and $d u s h \hat{u}$ stone) for Marduk, his king.
25. mu us-sa $\mathrm{x}^{1}{ }^{\text {gish }}$ tukul-la ib-dirig-gi-esh-a
$m u{ }^{〔} u s-s a^{〕} \mathrm{x}^{1}{ }^{\text {aisht}}$ tukul $i(b$ ? ]
]
E.
mu Am-mi-di-ta-na lugal[-e] mu us-sa $\mathrm{x}^{1}{ }^{\text {gish}} t u k u l$
mи Am-mi-di-ta-na lugal-e us-sa $\mathrm{X}^{1 \text { gish }}$ tukul-la ib-dirig-gi-esh-a

The year after that in which, etc.
26. mu alam-a-ni igi-gin erim KA-kesh-kesh-da
mи Am-mi-di-ta-na lugal-e $\left.\right|^{\text {urudu }}$ alam-a-ni igi-gin erim VIII, 36a, d.
KA-kesh-[(kesh-)da
mu Am-mi-di-ta-na lugal-e |alamla-na-ni ${ }^{3}$ igi-gin erim VI, $39 a$.
$K A-$ ?
mи Am-mi-di-ta-na lugal-e alan-na-ni
ти Am-mi-di-ta-na lugal-e | alan-na-ni-na (sic!) igi- Berl. 6008. gin er $[\mathrm{im}] \mid K A$-kesh-da-ge
mu Am-mi-di-ta-na lugal-e urudualan-na-ni igi-gin Berl. 5901. erim KA-kesh |-?
mu Am-mi-di-ta-na lugal-e | alan-na-ni igi-gin | erim Berl. 845.
. $K A$ (?)-kesh-da
mи Am-mi-di-ta-na lugal-e | alan-na-ni igi-gin KA- Berl. 5912. kesh-da-ge
${ }^{1}$ R.E.C., 318; the forms of the sign on the above cited tablets vary much. E. : $S A L+K U$; Berl. 693, 725, 983:
$S A L+G U R$; Berl. $5804: S A L+G I S H$; Berl. $5964: S A L+$ perpendicular wedge $+G I S H$; Berl. $937: S A L+T U(?)$.
${ }^{2}$ Ifb-dirig-gi-esh-a, ib-dirig-ga, Ad. $24, \hat{b}$-dirig-ga-mésh, etc., Az. $17(+a)$, corresponds to the verbal adjective sh $\hat{t} t u r u$.
${ }^{3}$ Perhaps we have to read in all following instances lana for alam $=$ lânu.

The year in which Ammi-ditana, the king, has - his stele (which represents him as) leader of a regiment of soldiers.
27. mu ${ }^{d}$ Urash ur-sag-gal-la
mu ${ }^{d}$ Urash ur-sag-gal-[ ]
mu ${ }^{\text {d }}$ Urash ur-sag-gal-la-ash
mи Am-mi-di-ta-na lugal-e ${ }^{\text {a }}$ Urash ur-sag-gal-la
mи Am-mi-di-ta-na lugal-e | ${ }^{d}$ Urash ur-sag-gal-la-a
mи Am-mi-di-ta-na lugal-e | ${ }^{d}$ Urash ur-sag-gal-la
[. . . . . ]-GI rush(?)-a NIM(?)-SUR(?)
mu Am-mi-di-ta-na lugal-e | ${ }^{d}$ Urash ur-sag-gal-[l]a $\mid$ ..... -mah $\dot{u}$ dib-bu-na-[. . . . . . . ] $\mid$ gu-la

The year in which Ammi-ditana, the king, has - for Urash, the great hero
28. mu alam-a-ni másh-da-ri-a
mи Am-mi-di-ta-na lugal-e alam-a-ni másh-da-ri-a
The year in which Ammi-ditana, the king, has - his stele (which represents him as) bringing tribute(?).
29. mu damma damma mash-sú-ga-ge
mu ${ }^{\text {d }}$ lamma ${ }^{\text {d }}$ lamma-a mash-sú-ga(?)-ge
mu Am-mi-di-ta-na lugal-e dlamma ${ }^{\text {d }}$ lamma mash-sú-ga-ge
mu Am-mi-di-ta-na lugal-e| ${ }^{\text {d }}$ lamma ${ }^{\text {d }}$ lamma-a mash-sú-ga
mu Am-mi-di-ta-na lugal-e ${ }^{\text {d }}$ lamma ${ }^{\text {d }}$ lamma-a-ni $\mid$ mash-sú-ga-ge
mu Am-mi-di-ta-na lugal-e | ${ }^{\text {d }}$ lamma ${ }^{\text {d }}$ lamma-a-ni
mash-sí-ga-ge(??) ${ }^{d}$ Ninni nin-gal RUSH-aki
mu Am-mi-di-ta-na lugal-e| ${ }^{\text {d }}$ lamma ${ }^{\text {d }}$ lamma-a mash-sú-ga-ge | nam-ti-la-ni-shù shu-a an-sar-sar-ne-a
mи Am-mi-di-ta-na lugal-e dlamma ${ }^{\text {d }}$ lamma mash-sú-ga-ge | nam-ti-la-ni-shú shu-a an-SAR-SAR-a-an | gushkin hush-a nà-kal-la bi-da-ge | shu-a-an ne-in$d a-r a-d u ́-a|n e-i n-d i m-d i m-m a-a|{ }^{d}$ Ninni nin-gal
E.
B.

VIII, $2 b: 17$.
P. 109; IV, 31b; Berl. 791.

Fr. 33.
Berl. 5835.

VIII, $36 b$.
E.; B.; VIII, $2 b: 18$.

Berl. 773, 909, 951, 969.
E.
B.
R. $105: 15,16$.

Berl. 906.

VI, $37 c$.
P. 110.

Berl. 670.
$R U S H^{k i}-a \mid \operatorname{sag}(n a m)^{1}-l u g a l-l a-n a-g e ~ a n-s h i-i n-i b-$ il-la-ash in-ne-en-tu-ra
sha-at-tu sha Am-mi-di-ta-na shar-rum | ${ }^{\text {d }}$ la-ma-zaat mésh-ri-e | sha a-na ba-la-di-shu i-kar-ra-bu | i-na hurâzim rù-shi-im ù abnim a-qar-tim | ib-ni-ima $\mid a-n a{ }^{d}$ Ninni nin-gal RUSH ${ }^{k i}-a \mid m u-u l-l i-a-a t$ shar-rı̀-ti-shu $u$-she-lu-u.

The year in which Ammi-ditana, the king, after having caused (var. his) colossal ${ }^{2}$ guardian goddesses who pray for his life, to be made to perfection with red shining gold and precious stones, has brought them in to Ninni nin-gal RUSH-a ( $=$ the great mistress of $R U S H$ ), who raises unto heaven his kingdom.
30. mu alam-a-ni nam-nun-na-ni-dim
mи Am-mi-di-ta-na lugal-e | alan-na-ni nam-nun-na-ni-dim
mи Am-mi-di-ta-na lugal-e alam-a-ni nam-nun-na-ni-a
ти Am-mi-di-ta-na lugal-e alam-a-ni nam-nun-na-nidim É-IM-te-en-shar-shú in-ne-en-tu-ra.
E.; B.

Berl. 731, 836.

Berl. 792.
Berl. 5887.

The year in which Ammi-ditana, the king, has brought into $\dot{E}-I M$-te-en-shar his stele, (which is) like (that of) his majesty. ${ }^{4}$
31. $m u^{d}$ Nin-IB am-sag á-daha-a-ni-shú
mu Am-mi-di-ta-na lugal-e dNin-IB am-sag $\mid a \operatorname{a}$-dah-a-ni-shú
mu Am-mi-di-ta-na lugal-e ${ }^{d}$ Nin-IB am-sag á-dah-nishú
mи Am-mi-di-ta-na lugal-e $\mid{ }^{d}$ Nin-IB am-sag á-dah-a-
E.; B.; VIII, $2 b: 24$.
R. 83.

Berl. 838.
R. 84 (cf. Bu. 88-5-9,
${ }^{1}$ Omitted by the scribe.
${ }^{2}$ For mash-sû-ga compare the adjective mash-súu$=$ mass $\hat{u}$ and mashsh $\hat{u}$, Br. 1928, 1929; it occurs in the same connection Sanh. Const., 80, Asarh., V, 52, in flamazât ${ }^{p l \cdot}$ erê ma(sh)-sha-a-ii(e) (Del., H. W., under שum $=$ shining).
 Sanh. Kuy. 4 : 14, Lay. $40: 52$ (Del., H. W., 688b).
${ }^{4}$ The statue which this new statue resembled is mentioned in the 5 th year of Ammi-ditana.

```
ni-shú | 'ishgu-za mah-a ............... | E-nam- 359, 895; Berl. 5876).
```

til-la-shú i-ni-in-tu-ra

The year in which Ammi-ditana, the king, has brought into E-namtilla to NinIB, the great bull, his helper, a shining throne
32. mu bád Ish $_{[-}-k u-u n-{ }^{d}$ Marduk-ge ${ }_{1}$
mu bád Is-ku-un- ${ }^{d}$ Mardukki
mu Am-mi-di-ta-na lugal-e bád Is(5821, var. Ish)-ku-un-d Marduk-ge
mи Am-mi-di-ta-na lugal-e |bád Ish(M. 25, var. Is)- VIII, 7a, 40d, M. 25. ku-un-d Marduk-ge | gú id(-da(?), M. 25) Zi-la(VIII, $7 a$, var. -lá)-kum-ma (M. 25 om. )
ти Am-mi-di-ta-na lugal-e | bád Ish-ku-un-d Mardukge 1 gú id $Z(i-l a ́)-k u m-m a-t a$.

The year in which Ammi-ditana, the king, after having - the wall of Ishkun-Marduk on the bank of the canal Zilakum, 一 - -
33. mu egir bád Ish-ku-un- ${ }^{d}$ Marduk
mu-bil egir ${ }_{1} b a ́ d ~ I s h-k u\left(-u n-{ }^{d}\right.$ Marduk) ${ }_{1}$
mu Am-mi-di-ta-na lugal-e | mu-bil | egir bád Ish-ku-un- ${ }^{d}$ Marduk ${ }^{k i}$-ge
mu Am-mi-di-ta-na lugal-e $\mid$ mu-bil egir bád Ish-ku-un${ }^{d}$ Marduk
mu Am-mi-di-ta-na lugal-e | bil egir bád Ish-ku-un[ ${ }^{d}$ Marduk ... ]

The new year after that in which, etc.
34. mu alam nam-ur-sag-gá Sa-am-su-i-lu-na(?)
mu [alam nam-u]r-sag-gá Sa-am-su-i-lu-na(?)
mu alam nam-ur[-sag-gá Sa-am-su-i-lu-na] | pab-bil-$g[a-$
mu alam Sa-am-su-i-lu-na . . . .
mu alam Sa-àm-su-i-lu-na pab-bi(l)-ga-ni
mu Am-mi-di-ta-na lugal-e alam nam-ur-sag-ga pab$b i(l)-$ ?
E.

VIII, $2 b: 3$.
E.; C.
B.

Berl. 852, 860, 5821.
R. 85 .
E.
B. ; C.
P. 111.
P. 112.
M. 76 (cf. Berl. 5821).
B.
C.

VIII, $2 b: 25$.
Berl. 5906.
mu Am-mi-di-ta-na lugal-e |alam nam-u[r-s]ag-ga(?)| M 69.
Sa-am-su-i-lu-na|pab-bi(l)-ga(?)-na(?)
mи Am-mi-di-ta-na lugal-e | alam Sa-am-su-i-lu-na VIII, $2 b$. pab-bi(l)-ni(?) | E-nam-ti-la-shú
mи Am-mi-di-ta-na lugal-e | alam nam-ur-sag-yá Sá-$a[m-s u-i-l u-n a] \mid p a b-b i(l)-g a-n a$ E-nam-t[i-la-ash $]$ ù alam nam-en-na[-ni $\quad] \mid E$ E-me-te-ur-sag-gá-ash $i[n \ldots . . . .] \mid$.
mu Am-mi-di-ta-na lugal-e | alam nam-ur-sag-gá Sa-am-su-i-lu-na $\mid$ pab-bi(l)-en-na E-nam-ti $[-l a]-s h u ́ u ̀ u$ alam nam-en-na-ni [ ]|E-me-te-ur-sag-gá-shú[ ] | in-ne-en-tu-r $[a]$
mи Am-mi-di-ta-na lugal-e | alam nam-ur-sag-ga Sa-am-su-i-lu-na $\mid$ pab-bil-ga-ni | ̀̀ alam-a-ni alam KU-GI-ga-ge | É-me-te-ur-sag-gá-ash(-shú) in-ne-in-dur-r[a](?)
The year in which Ammi-ditana, the king, has brought into $E$-namtila the stele of the heroship of Samsu-iluna, his grandfather, ${ }^{1}$ and into $E$-meteursag the stele of his lordship (var. his stele, a statue of gold).
35. mu Bád-Am-mi-di-ta-na ${ }^{k i}$ gú id Me-e-d ${ }^{d}$-lil
mu Bád-Am-mi ${ }_{\left[-d i-t a-n a^{k i}{ }_{]}\right.}$
E.
B.; C.
mu Am-mi-di-ta-na lugal[-e] | Bád-Am-mi-di-ta-na
VIII, $8 e$.
[ ] | gú id Me-d En-lil-lá-ta ne-in-dū-a
mu Am-mi-di-ta-na lugal-e | Bád-Am-mi-di-ta-na | gú id Me-e-d $E n-l i l-l a ́-t a ~ n e-i n-d u^{2}-a$

The year in which Ammi-ditana the king, after
M. 21 (cf. Bu. $88-5-12$, 435 and 864 , and Bu.
[91-5-9, 1203). having caused Dur-Ammi-ditana to be built on the bank of the canal M $\hat{e}-E n l i l^{3}{ }^{3}$ - — -
${ }^{1}$ Cf. pa-BIL-ga b-kam-ma-mu $=a-b i$ a-bi-ia hatam-shum, Si. 64; his grandfather, pa-gish-BIL-ga-ni, is $U r$-Nina, Ean., stone A, 8:4 (see $S A K I$, p. 22, note f). For the first part of the Sumerian compound cf. [mpa-a]b|pap $\mid a-b u$, Sb, 1, Col. II, 18; for the second gish-BIL $=a-b u, \mathrm{II}, R ., 32: 60 d$ ( $\mathrm{gish}=$ edlum, zikarum $=$ "male") and GIN $(=T U)$ in ama-GìN|a-bu um-mu (gish-GìN interchanges with gish-BIL-ga in the name ${ }^{d}$ Gish-BIL-ga-mes $=$ Gish-Gl̀N-mash).
${ }^{2}$ Wrong writing for $d \bar{u}$. Cf. $d u$ for $d u, C . T ., X V, 19: 17$.
${ }^{3}$ Cf. also Berl. 1120: mu Am-mi-di-ta-na lugal-e |bad gal-gal-la-ge gù id ${ }^{d}$ En-lil. The year in which Ammi-ditana, the king, after having - the great castles on the bank of the canal of Ellil,
36. [mu-bil e]gir Bád Am-mi-di-ta-na ${ }^{k i}$
$m u$-bil egir $B_{[ } a_{d} A m-m i(-d i-t a-n a)^{k i}{ }_{3}$
mu Am-mi-di-ta-na [lugal-e]| mu-bil egir | Bád-Am- R. 87. mi-di-ta-na[ki] | gú id Me-d En-lil[ ]
The new year after that in which, etc.
37. [mu bád
] ... ${ }^{k i}$-e Dam-ki-ì-li-shu-ge
E.
mu bád $-d a \quad B \dot{A} D^{k i}-g e(?)$
B.
mи Am-mi-di-ta-na lugal-e | bád-da BÁD-maki-ge(?) |
P. 116.

Dam-ki-ì-li-shu-ge | in-dū-a|ne-[g]u[l(?) ]
mu Am-mi-di-ta-na lugal-e $\mid$ bád-da $\left.B \dot{A} D^{k i}\right|^{m}$ Dam- P. 115.
ki-i-lli-shu-ge | ne-in-gul-la
mu Am-mi-di-ta-na lugal-e | bád BÁA ${ }^{k i}$ Dam-ki-ìllí- R. 86.
shu-ge | ne-in-dū-a ne-in-gul-la
[mu Am-mi]-di-ta-na lugal-e $\mid[b a ́ d-\quad] d a B A D^{k i_{-} ?-} \quad$ P. 114.
ge $|[\ldots . . . .]|.[\ldots . . .$.$] ]-a ne-in-gul-la$
mи Am-mi-di-ta-na lugal-e $\mid$ bád( $-d a, 2716$ ) BÁ $D^{k i-m a ~ B e r l . ~ 2716, ~ 5833, ~} 6131$. (var. 2716 -e(?)) Dam-ki-i-li-shu-ge (ne-in-dū-a in-gul-la, 6131)

The year in which Ammi-ditana, the king, after having destroyed the wall of $B \dot{A} D^{k i},{ }^{1}$ which Damkiilishu had built, - — -

## Uncertain Year.

```
mu Am-mi-di-ta-na lugal-e | dúg-ga gu-la \(\mid{ }^{d}\) Babbar P. 104.
        lugal-a-ni-ta
    mu Am-mi-di-ta-na lugal-e | dúg-ga gu-la \({ }^{d} B a b b a[r \quad\) VIII, \(30 a\).
        lugal \(]-a-n i[-t a] \mid[\quad] \ldots-l a\)
```

Ammi-zaduga.

1. $m u A^{〔} m-m i^{\top}-z a-d u-g a{ }_{\left[l u g a l-e_{]} \mid\right.}{ }^{d} E n-l i l-l[i \quad$ nam-en-na- E.; C. $n i]$
mu ${ }^{d}$ En-lil nam-en-na-ni ?-? F.
${ }^{1}$ On Berl. 5833 the sign is made the same as the preceding $b a d$, but in all other instances it is made differently, on P. 116 the second sign of R. 86 being used first, and the first second. In other instances the second sign seems to be $H I R$, in the last, not the middle, part of which is placed a horizontal wedge, the sign thus resembling um-ma. The transcription $B A \bar{A} D^{k i}$ therefore is doubtful.
```
mu Am-mi-za-du-ga lugal-e \(\mid{ }^{\text {d }}\) En-lil nam-en-na-an-ni \(\mid\)
    R. 103 (Sippar).
    ne-íb-gu-la
    mи Am-mi-za-du-ga lugal-e \({ }^{d}\) En-lil nam-en-na-ni ne- Berl. 5967.
    ib-gu-la
    mи Am-mi-za-du-ga lugal-e| \({ }^{d}\) En-lil-li nam-en-na-ni Berl. 6115.
    \(n e-i b-g u-u l-l a-a\)
    mu Am-mi-za-[du-ga lugal-e] | \({ }^{\text {d }}\) En-lil-lá nam-[ ]| P. 117.
    ne-ib-gu-ul-[la]
mи \(A m^{1}-m i-z a-d u-g a \operatorname{lugal-e}\)
R. 92; Berl. 5884, 5935.
```

The year in which Ammi-zaduga, the king, (has - for) Ellil who makes great his lordship.
2. mu sib $B_{\mathrm{I}} \hat{U} R-n a$ Ana ${ }^{d} E n-l i l-b i-d a-g e_{]}$
E.; C.
$m u$ sib $B \mathscr{U} R-n a$
F.
mu Am-mi-za-du-ga lugal-e sib BÚU-na Ana ${ }^{d}$ En-lil
VI, $35 c$.
mu Am-mi-za-du-ga lugal-e sib BÛR-na Ana ${ }^{d}$ En-lil-
P. 118, 119; Berl. 729.
bi-da(-a, Berl. 729)-ash
mu Am-mi-za-du-ga lugal-e| sib BÚR-na Ana ${ }^{d} E n-l i l-$
bi-da-ge [. . . . . . . .] in-ne-da(?)-gál-la
The year in which Ammi-zaduga, the king, the humble shepherd of (var. for?) Anum and Ellil,
3. mu egir $s_{i} i b B \hat{U} R-n a_{1}$
E.; C.
[mu-bil] egir sib BUR-na
B.
mu Am-mi-za-du-ga lugal-e $\mid$ mu-bil sha egir $\mid$ sib $B \hat{U} R$ -
IV, $14 a$; VIII, $3 b$; M. 3. na Ana ${ }^{d} E n-l i l \mid-b i-d a-a-a s h$
mи Am-mi-za-du-ga lugal-e | mu-bil egir mu sib B ̂́R-
Berl. 5899, 5799.
na Ana ${ }^{d} E n-l i l-b i(5799$, var. -bi)-da-a-ash
mu Am-mi-za-du-ga lugal-e | mu-bil egir sib B仑̂R-na |
R. 94. Ana ${ }^{d}$ En-lil-bi-da-ash
mu Am-mi-za-du-ga lugal-e | mu-bil egir sib BÚR-na Fr. 39.
The year after that in which, etc.
4. mu shu-nir gal-gal-la E-sag-il
E.
mu shu(?)-nir(?)-? [ . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . ]
C.
[mu shu-]nir gal-gal-la
F.
${ }^{1}$ By mistake of the scribe omitted R. 92,
mu Am-mi-za-du-ga lugal-e shu-nir gal-gal-la
[mu Am]-mi-za-du-ga lugal-e | [shu]-nir-nir gal-gal-la mu Am[-mi-za-du-ga lugal-e] | shu-nir gal-ga[l-la]| $\dot{E}$-sag-il-la-shúu in-ne-in-tu-ra
mu Am-mi[-za-du-ga lugal-e] | ${ }^{d}$ Marduk e[n(?) . . . . . .]
${ }^{d}$ shu-nir ga[l?-gal-la] |gushkin kú-babbar nà-[kal-la $\ldots . .].|E-s a g-i l-l a-a|$ en-ne-in-tu-ra

The year in which Ammi-zaduga, the king, has
brought unto Marduk, the lord who
into Esagil huge emblems of gold, silver and precious stones.
5. ${ }_{[ } m u$ ala $a_{1} m-a-n i$ másh igi-dŭ-a; mu alam[ ]

ти Am-mi-za-du-ga lugal-e | alam-a-ni másh igi-dŭ-a
mи Am-mi-za-du-ga lugal-e | alam-a-ni másh igi-dǔ-a shu-a an-da-gál-la
mи Am-mi-za-du-ga lugal-e $\mid{ }^{d}$ En-lil en-gal-la mu.... $\ldots . . . .{ }^{2}$-in-sà -a | alam-a-ni másh igi-dŭ-a shu-a an-da-gál-la | ù alam-a-ni KA $+S H U-N E$ $a b-b i-a \mid E$-nam-ti-la-shú i-ni-in-tu-ra

The year in which Ammi-ditana, the king, has brought into E-namtila to Enlil the great lord who has called him with a ........ name, his stele (which represents him as) holding (in his hands) a lamb for soothsaying, and his stele (representing him as) saying prayers.
6. mи ASH-ME ni-mah-a
${ }^{{ }^{5}} m u A S H{ }^{1}-M_{[ } E n i-m a h-a_{]}$
mu Am-mi-za-du-ga lugal-e ASH-ME ni-mah-a
mu Am-mi-za-du-ga lugal-e | ASH-ME ni-mah-a shu-nir-ra
mu Am-mi-za-du-ga lugal-e | ASH-ME ni-mah-a $\mid$ É-babbar-ra-shú in-ne-e[n-tu- .... ]
mu Am-mi-za-du-ga lugal-e |ASH-ME nii-mah-a | Berl. 5829.
${ }^{1}$ A clear $N I$.

Berl. 2717, 6001.
P. 121.
P. 122.
P. 120 .

shu-nir-ra $\check{u}(?)$-dim | E-babbar-ra-shúu in-ne-en-tu-ra (not rum!)
mи Am-mi-za-du-ga lugal-e ASH(?)-ME ig-gal gu-l[a] Berl. 6151.
$\hat{E}(?)-b a b b a r-r a-s h u ́$ in- . . . [. . . . . . . . . . . . ]
The year in which Ammi-zaduga, the king, has brought into $E$-babbar a solar disk that sparkles (var. for the great door), an emblem which (shines) like the sun.
7. ${ }_{i} m u^{d}{ }^{\text {lamma }}{ }_{1}$ ash-ash-a; $m u^{d}[$ E.;F. C. ти Am-mi-za-du-ga lugal-e | ${ }^{\text {d }}$ lamma ash-ash-a | Р. 127.
${ }^{d}$ Shú-nir dam-mah-a
mu Am-mi-za-du-ga lugal-e| ${ }^{\text {d }}$ lamma ash-ash-a P. 126. ${ }^{d}$ Shú-nir-da dam-mah-a | E-babbar-ra-shú in-en-tu* $r a(?)$

The year in which Ammi-zaduga, the king, has brought into $E$-babbar for Aia the sublime spouse, guardian god(desse)s.

```
8. [ mu gish}KU-GAR\mp@subsup{}{1}{}\mp@subsup{}{]}{}KG\-GI-ga
    mu Am-mi-za-du-ga lugal-e | gish}KU-GAR KÓ-GI-ga
        a (om., Berl. 770)
    mu Am-mi-za-du-ga lugal-e gish}KU-GAR KÔ-Gİ- Berl. 5825
        ga ki-BAD-gub-a-ash | ni-túum-ma}\mp@subsup{}{}{2
    mu Am-mi-za-du-ga lugal-e | gish}KU-GAR KUG-GI- Berl. 808
        ga-a ki-BAD-gub-a-ash ni-túm-ma | | \grave{ alam-a-ni}
        KAB-ab(?)-SHG(?)-SHG(?)-e-a | E-nam-ti-la-shú
        in-na-an-tu-ra
    mu Am-mi-za-du-ga lugal-e | gish}KU-GAR KUG-GI-ga-a Berl. 5959.
        ki-BAD-gub-a \grave{u} alam-a-ni KAB-ab(?)-[...-e-a]
        E-nam-ti-la-shú in-ne-en-[ ]
    mu Am-mi-za-du-ga lugal-e | ',}\mp@subsup{}{}{\mathrm{ gish}KU-GAR K\U-GI- P. }128
        ga[-a]| \grave{u} alam-a-ni KAB-ab(?)-SH U[. ....-a]
```

[^48]The year in which Ammi-zaduga, the king, has brought into $E$-namtila a golden throne fitting the ....... manzazu, and his stele (representing him as)
9. mu alam-a-ni nam-nir-gál-la-a-ni
[mu al]am-a-ni nam-nir-gál
mu Am-mi-za-du-ga lugal-e | alam nam-nir-gál-la-an$n i \mid z u b(u)-b i K G-G I-g a-a-g[e]$
mu Am-mi-za-du-ga lugal-e | alam nam-nir-gál-la-an$n i \mid$ zubu KÓ-GI-ga-a-ge | E-babbar-ra-shú en-n[e-in-tu-ra]
mu Am-mi-za-du-ga lugal-e |alam nam-nir-gál-la-ni $\mid$ zubu K U-GI-ga-ge shu-a an-da[-gál-la $] \mid \vec{E}$-babbar-ra-shú in-ne-en-tu-ra(-an erasure?)
mu Am-mi-za-du-ga lugal-e | ${ }^{d}$ Babbar en-na-an-ta-gál $\mid$ Berl. 796 (= M. 75). alảm nam-nir-gál-la-ni zubu KOG-GI-ga-ge

The year in which Ammi-zaduga, the king, has brought into Ebabbar to Shamash the exalted lord, the stele of his lordship, (representing him as) holding a gamlu-weapon of gold in his hand.
10. $m u$ sib she-ga ${ }^{d} B a b b a r{ }^{d}$ Marduk-(bi-)da-ge E.
[mu sib]-zi she-ga|[har-ra] ma-da-na F.
[mu sib-zi] she-ga ${ }^{d} B\left[a b b a r^{d} M a r d u k-b i-d a-g e\right] \mid[h a r-r a]$ B. kalam-ma-na | [shu-ne-]in-dŭ-a
mu Am-mi-za-du-ga lugal-e | sib-zi she-ga
mи Am-mi-za-du-ga lugal-e sib-zi she-ga ${ }^{d}$ Babbar ${ }^{d}$ Mar-
duk-bi-da-ge (om. VIII, 21c)
mu Am-mi-za-du-ga lugal-e | sib-zi she-ga ${ }^{\text {d }}$ Babbar
${ }^{d}$ Marduk-bi-da-ge | [ha]r-ra kalam-ma-an shu-ne-in$d \check{u}-a$
mu Am-mi-za-du-ga lugal-e sib-zi she-ga ${ }^{d}$ Babbar Bu. 88-5-12, 158, 215, ${ }^{d}$ Marduk-bi-da(-ge)
mи Am-mi-za-du-ga lugal-e | har-ra kalam-ma-na | (shu-)ne-in-dŭ-a
R. 106.
E.
F.
P. 129.

IV, $17 a$.

Berl. 5955.

VIII, $10 b$ ( = VIII, 14a);
M. 4 ; VIII, $21 c$.

Berl. 6146.

283; Bu. 91-5-9, 753;
Berl. 633, 1496, 58383.
Fr. 34.

The year in which Ammi-zaduga the king, the right shepherd who is obedient to Shamash and Marduk, after he had broken the oppression of his land, -
11. mu Bád-Am-mi-za-du-ga ${ }^{k i} k a$ id Buranunu ${ }^{k i}$
[mu Bád]-Am-mi-za-du-ga-a
mи Am-mi-za-du-ga lugal-e Bád-Am-mi-za-du-ga ${ }^{k i}$
mu Am-mi-za-du-ga lugal-e | Bád-Am-mi-za-du-ga|ka id Buranunu ${ }^{k i}$
mu Am-mi-za-du-ga lugal-e | Bád-Am-mi-za-du-ga ${ }^{k i}$ (om. 5885) ka id Buranunu ${ }^{k i}-t a$
mи Am-mi-za-du-ga lugal-e Bád-Am-mi-za-du-ga ${ }^{k i}$ ka id Buranunu ${ }^{k i}-t a$ [ ] ne-in-dū-a
mu Am-mi-za-du-ga lugal-e | Bád-Am-mi-za-du-ga ${ }^{k i} \mid$ ka id Buranun ${ }^{k i}-n[a]-t a \mid n e-i n-d i m-m a-a$ (R.T., XX, in-ne?-en?-dim-ma-a)
mи Am-mi-za-du-ga lugal-e | igi-gál gu-la ${ }^{d}$ Marduk lugal-bi in-na-an-gar-ra | Bád-Am-mi-za-du-ga-a(?) ka Buranunu | mu-un-d $\bar{u}-a$
mu Am-mi-za-du-ga lugal-e Bád-Am-mi-za-du-gak ${ }^{k i}$ ka id Buranunu ${ }^{k i}$-ta | [ ] an-dim-dim-a
The year in which Ammi-zaduga, the king, after in the great wisdom which Marduk, his king, has given him, he had built Dur-Ammi-zaduga at the mouth of the river Euphrates, - - -
12. [mu alam- $a-n i_{1}$ másh gab-tab-ba
mи Am-mi-za-du-ga lugal-e alam-a-ni másh gab-tab-ba mu Am-mi-za-du-ga lugal-e | alam-a-ni másh gab-tab$b a \mid s h u-a$ an-da-a
mu Am-mi-za-[du-ga lugal-e]| alam-a-ni másh [gab$t a b-b a] \mid \grave{u}$ alam-a-ni ba-di[ [ ]|ab-bi-e-a
mu Am-mi-za-du-ga lugal-e alam-a-ni másh gab- Phil. 1343, 1414. $t a b-(?)$ shu-a an-da-a

The year in which Ammi-zaduga, the king, has his statue (representing him as) carrying (with his

[^49]E.
F.

Berl. 5838, 59866.
VIII, $19 b$.

Berl. 1098, 5885.

Berl. 5596.

VIII, $3 a$; cf. R.T., XX, p. 58.

VI, 6.

Berl. 5986.
E.; F.

IV, $30 a$; Berl. 5880, 6132.
R. 99.

Berl. 5989.
hands) a lamb with coloured breast(?), and also his statue (which represents him as) saying.
13. $m u^{u r u d u k i-l u g a l-g u b-b a ~ n i-m a h-a ~}$
$m u^{u r u d x}[k i$.
$n] i-m a h-a$
ти Am-mi-za-du-ga lugal-e | uruduki-lugal-gub-ba ni-mah-a
mи Am-mi-za-du-ga lugal-e | ${ }^{\text {urudu }} k i-l u g a l-g u b ~ n i-~$ mah-a har-sag id-ash-ash-a ni-me-esh-a-b[i]
mu Am-mi-za-du-ga lugal-e | uruduki-lugal-gub ni-mah$a \mid$ har-sag-ash-ash-a id-da ni-me-esh-a-bi | é-mah Énam-he-a-ta | me-te-a-ash mi-ni-in-gar-ra
The year in which Ammi-zaduga, the king, after having placed in the sublime house of $E$-namhe, as an adornment a splendid ${ }^{1}$ lordly manzazu (representing) a mountain and rivers (var. mountains and a river) which are many, - - -
14. mu ${ }^{\text {urudu }} d \check{u}-m a h$ gal-gal-la
mи Am-mi-za-du-ga lugal-e | urududǔ-mah gal-gal-la
mи Am-mi-za-du-ga lugal-e | urududŭ-mah gal-gal-
la |har-sag id-da .......... -a-bi| E-nam-ti-la-shúu in-ne-en-tu-ra

The year in which Ammi-zaduga, the king, has brought into $E$-namtila great brazen .... (with a representation of) a mountain and rivers, which
15. mu alam-a-ni shu-silim-ma ab-DI-D[I-a]
mu Am-mi-za-du-ga lugal-e | alam-a-ni shu-silim-ma (var. -a, R. 100)
mu Am-mi-za-du-ga lugal-e | alam-a-ni shu-silim-ma $a b-D I-D I-n e ; ~-a b-D I-D I-a ; ~-a b-D I-D I-n e-a ;$ -ab-DI-DI-e-a
E.
F.

VIII, $21 a$; Berl. 654.
M. 74.
R. 95 (Sippar) ; cf. Berl. 5741.
E.

VIII, 11a, 14b; Berl. 5686 ; Phil. 1136.
M. 42 .
E.

IV, $23 b$; Berl. 5597, 5952;
R. 100 .

II, 18; VIII, 14c; Berl.
5894, 5972.
1.1. In Sumerian "which is splendid." Translate before perhaps "in $E$-mah, the house of abundance." Cf. also Az. $17+\mathrm{a}$.

ти Am-mi-za-du-ga lugal-e |alam-a-ni shu-silim-ma-| VIII, $10 a$. $a b-D I-D I-e(?)-n e-a \mid{ }^{d} Z a-m a ̀-m a ̀{ }^{d} N i n n i ~ e-n e-b i-d a$
mи Am-mi-za-du-ga lugal-e | alam-a-ni shu-silim-ma$a b-D I-D I-n e-a$-ash ${ }^{1}{ }^{d} Z a$-mà-mà ${ }^{d}$ Ninni-bi-da-ash $\mid$ E-me-te-ur-sag-shú in-ne-en-tu-ra

The year in which Ammi-zaduga, the king, has brought into E-mete-ursag to Zamama and Ninni his stele (which represents him as)
16. mи id Am-mi-za-du-gakiz
mи Am-mi-za-du-ga lugal-e | id Am-mi-za-du-ga (nu-hu-ush ni-shi, 5910)
mи Am-mi-za-du-ga lugal-e | id-da Am-mi-za-du-ga | nu-h̆u ush-ni-shi
mи Am-mi-za-du-ga lugal-e | dúg-ga mah ${ }^{\text {d }}$ Babbar lugal-a-ni-ta $\mid$ id Am-mi-za-du-ga $\mid$ nu-h̆u-ush ni-shi mu Am-mi-za-du-ga lugal-e | dúg-ga mah ${ }^{d}$ Babbar. lugal-a-ni-shú id Am-mi-za-du-ga |nu-ȟu-ush
ти Am-mi-za-du-ga lugal-e | dúg-ga mah-a ${ }^{\text {d }}$ Babbar lugal-a-ni-ta | id Am-mi-za-du-ga nu-hu-ush ni-shi mi-ni-in-ba-al-la-a

The year in which Ammi-zaduga, the king, after having, at the sublime command of Shamash, his lord, dug the canal: Ammi-zaduga is the abundance of the people, - - -

17(+a) mu Am-mi-za-du-ga lugal-e | uruduki-lugal-gub ib-dirig-ga | me-te ne-sag-gá-shúu | é-mah ÉE-IM-te-en-shar-shú | ki-a ne-íb-us-sa
mu Am-mi-za-du-ga lugal-e | uruduki-[lu]gal-gub-ba ib-dirig-ga | é-mah É-IM-te-en[...........]|ki-a $n e-i b-u s-a$
mи Am-mi-za-du-ga lugal-e | uruduki-lugal-gub ib-dirig (5898, ? var. -si)-ga $\mid$ me-te ne-sag-gá-shú(?) ; — ne-sag-ga-ta; - (ne?-)sag-di(ki?).

[^50]${ }^{2}$ Mistake.
E.

Berl. 5896, 5905, 5925, 5910.

II, 8 ; IV, 31a.
M. 107.

IV, $26 c$.
Berl. 5897.
R. 96 .

II, 32.
R. 97, Berl. 5898; 5949, 5978; 5931.
mu Am-mi-za-du-ga lugal-e |uruduki-lugal-gub ib-diri- R. 98, Fr. 38, Berl. ga; - ib-si-ga; - ib-si-i; - ib-diri-ga-mésh; - 5928(?); 5879, 5889, ib-dirig-ta; - ib-diri-me-ésh ${ }^{1}$ 5895; 6010; 5450, 5842, 5847, 5869, 5870; 5907; 5928(?).
mи Am-mi-za-du-ga lugal-e | ${ }^{\text {uruduki-lugal-gub-ba ib- Berl. 5817(?), 6133(?). }}$ $\operatorname{diri}(6133$, var. $-s i)-g a$
mи Am-mi-za-du-ga lugal-e $\mid$ ki-lugal-gub-ba-a $\mid$ ib-diri- M. 9.
ga

The year in which Ammi-zaduga, the king, after having set up a very great ${ }^{2}$ brazen lordly manzazu as an ornament for the ne-sag ${ }^{3} \mathrm{in}^{4}$ the sublime house of E-IM-ten-shar (cf. Az. 13), ———

> 17(+b) mu Am-mi-za-du-ga lugal-e | alam-a-ni DIN-BI KAK-USLAN ${ }^{5}-a \mid{ }^{d} P a b-n u n-n a$ nun-ash-D $U-a \mid E$ E-babbar-ra-shú in-na-an-tu-ra
mи Am-mi-za-du-ga lugal-e |alam-a-ni DIN-BI KAKBerl. 5900. USLAN-a E-babbar-ra-shú in-ne-en-tu-ra mи Am-mi-za-du-ga lugal-e |alam-a-ni DIN-BI KAK Berl. 5810, 5816, 5836, (om., 5816)-USLAN-a (om., 5900; Sipp. 60) 5841, 5904; Sipp. 60.
ти Am-mi-za-du-ga lugal-e |alam-a-ni DIN- ...... -a V, $30 d$.
mu alam-a-ni DIN-BI-...... . -a
Berl. 5812.
The year in which Ammi-zaduga, the king, has brought into E-babbar to Pab-nunna ...... his statue $\qquad$
17(+c) mu Am-mi-za-du-ga lugal-e | ${ }^{d}$ Babbar-dim kalam- VIII, 11c; Berl. 1241.
ma-ni-shú zi-bi-esh im-ta-è-a | sag(?) ${ }^{6}-s h a r-r a-b a(?)$
$s i-n e-i b-s a ́-s a ́-a$

[^51]The year in which Ammi-zaduga, the king, who, like Shamash, has brought to his land ....... , and directs.........

17 $(+\mathrm{d})$ mu Am-mi-za-du-galugal-e $\mid I G I+$ Énir sag..... Berl. 5909.
$\ldots{ }^{d}$ Babbar-ge E-babbar-ra E-ul-mash-a-bi[ ]
The year in which Ammi-zaduga, the king, after
having - the stage tower, the of Shamash in E-babbar and E-ul-mash, — — -

17(+e) mu Am-mi-za-du-ga lugal-e $\mid{ }^{d}$ En-lil pab(?)- IV, $29 a$. mah-a
mu Am-mi-za-du-ga lugal-e $\mid{ }^{d}$ En-lil pab(?)-mah-a VI, $23 b$.
The year in which Ammi-zaduga, the king, (has - - )
Enlil the sublime father(?).

## Samsu-ditana.

a [sha-at-tum] esh-she-tum sha i-ru-ba
Berl. 1200.
${ }^{\text {inuba] }} \mathrm{ra}$-zag-gar
ud-1-kam

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { [mu Sa]-am-su-di-ta-na lugal-e } \\
& {[A S H-M] E \text {-ash-ash-a }{ }^{n a} d \check{u} \text {-shi-a-ge }} \\
& \text { shu-nir-ra ŭ-gim ni-lah-gi-esh-a } \\
& { }^{n i ̀ z} z a-y i ́ n-n a \text { gushkin rush-a kú-me-a-bi-da-ta }{ }^{1} \\
& \text { shu-a mah-bi eb-ta-an-dú-ush-a } \\
& \text { ne-in-dim-ma-a-an } \\
& { }^{\text {d }} \text { Babbar en an-ta-gál-la-ash }{ }^{2} \\
& \text { nam-lugal-a-ni ne-ib-gu-la-ash }{ }^{3} \\
& \text { E-babbar-ra-shú in-ne-en-tu-ra }
\end{aligned}
$$

$\bar{a} k-\cdots \quad k a-\quad d u-\quad s h a$
sha-at-tum sha Sa-am-su-di-ta-na shar-rum
sha-am-sha-a-tim sha ${ }^{\text {abni }} d u s h \hat{\imath}$

[^52]shu-ri-ni sha ki-ma ǔ-mi nam-ru
i-na ${ }^{\text {abni }} u k n \hat{\imath}$ hुurâzi rushshı̂ ̀̀ kaspi mi-e
și-ri-ish shu[-uk-]lu-la
ib-nu-u-ma
$a-n a{ }^{d}$ Shamash be-lim sha-ki-i
mu-shar-bi shar-ru-ti-shu ${ }^{3}$
a-na $\hat{E}$-babbar-ri u-she-lu-u
$\overline{[k i-a-a] m} \quad l i$-ish-sha-di-ir
[mu Sa-am]-su-di-ta-na lugal-e
[ASH-M]E-ásh-ash-a ${ }^{\text {nà } d[\check{u}-s h i-] a ~}$
${ }^{\text {[n] }}$ g za-gín-na gushkin RUSH-a kú-[ ]a bi-da-ge ${ }^{\perp}$
$\left.{ }^{[ }{ }^{d}\right]$ Babbar en an-ta-gál-la-ash
[E-bab]bar-ra-shú in-ne-en-tu-ra
[ $k] i-a-a m ~ l i-i s h-s h a-d i-i r$
The year in which Samsu-ditana, the king, after having made solar disks of dush $\hat{u}$ stone, emblems which shine like the day, which ${ }^{1}$ they have made perfect (in Accadian: have been made perfect), with lapis lazuli, red shining gold and me-a silver, brought them in( in Accadian: up ) to E-babbar to Shamash, the high lord, who makes high his kingdom.
b) mu Sa-am-su-di-ta-na lugal-e | ${ }^{d}$ Marduk nun-gal-la
R. 114, 118.

The year in which Samsu-ditana the king has -. for(?) Marduk, the great prince.
$\mathrm{b}+1$ mu Sa-am-su-di-ta-na lugal-e | mu-bil egir ${ }^{d}$ Marduk
R. 112, 113.
nun-gal-la
The new year after that in which, etc.
c mu Sa-am-su-di-ta-na lugal-e | ${ }^{d}$ Pab-nun-an-ki nin
R. 115.
an-ta-gál-la $\mid$ gunni kú-babbar ù-tu-da | É-sag-il-shú
in-tu-ra
${ }^{1}$ Refers to the shamshatim.

The year in which Samsu-ditana, the king, has brought into Esagil a perfuming pan, made of silver, for Pab-nun-anki, ${ }^{1}$ the high mistress.
d mu Sa-am-su-di-ta-na lugal-e |á-kal gal-gal-la ${ }^{\text {d }}$ Babbar IV, 23c; R. 109.
${ }^{d}$ Marduk-bi-da-ge (R. 109: bi-d(a .... ))
The year in which Samsu-ditana, the king, after having with the great forces of Shamash and Marduk - --, -- -
e mu Sa-am-su-di-ta-na lugal-e | ${ }^{d}$ Urash en gir-ra VI, 23c.
The year in which Samsu-ditana, the king, has - for Urash the strong lord. ${ }^{2}$
i mu Sa-am-su-di-ta-na lugal-e ${ }^{d}$ Babbar ${ }^{d}$ Ishkur-bi $\mid$ P. 132. sag-ba-an-shú
mu Sa-am-su-di-ta-na lugal-e | ${ }^{d}$ Babbar ${ }^{d}$ Ishkur-bi R. 110.
$s a g-b a-a n[-s h u \bar{u}] \mid i b-t a-a n-i[l-e s h-a]$
mu Sa-am-su-di-ta-na lugal-e $\mid{ }^{d}$ Babbar ${ }^{d}$ Ishkur-bi $\mid$ R. 111; VIII, $23 b$.
[sag-ba]-an-[sh]úu | [ib-]ta-an-il-esh-a; - sag-ba(?)-
. . . . . . ib-ta-an-il(i)-esh-a
The year in which Samsu-ditana, the king, whose
head Shamash and Ishkur have raised to heaven,
g mu Sa-am-su-di-ta-na l[ugal-e]| ${ }^{d} N a-b i-u m e n(?)-?-$
[ ]|alam-a-ni ....-a an-[ ]|E-sag-
il-la-shú i[n-ni-tu-ra]
mu Sa-am-su-di-ta-na lugal-e ${ }^{d} N a$-bi-um en....-gal- P. 131.
la-ash | alam-a-ni ....... -a an-DIB-..[ ]-a | [E-sag-il]-la-shú in-ni-tu-ra
R. 116.

The year in which Samsu-ditana, the king, has brought into $E$-sagil for $N a b i u m(?)$ the great lord(?), his stele (which represents him as) $\qquad$
${ }^{1}$ According to V R., $46: 35$, this goddess is identical with Zarpanitum; which is here corroborated by her abiding in $E$-sagil.
${ }^{2}$ Cf. a-na ${ }^{d}$ Urash ga-ash-ri-im, C. II., $3: 22,23$.

## V. THE NAMING OF THE YEAR AFTER EVENTS.

1. In the explanation of the date formulas some difficulty has been found with regard to the time of the events mentioned therein. The question has been asked whether they fall within the year which is named after them, or whether they occurred in the preceding year. Closely connected with this is the question as to the time of the naming, resp. the possibility of a renewed naming in the later part of a year.

A priori we may consider it a necessity for a land with such a highly developed commerce and law as Babylonia was, that the formulas were made known as early as possible, at least no later than the first day of the new year. This assumption is fully corroborated by the observation that a number of tablets dated on the first of $N i s a n^{1}$ show the new formula. Therefore there can be no doubt that such tablets as have been preserved of the 29th year of Ammi-ditana and of one year of Samsuditana, ${ }^{2}$ which contain the full and in the one case also an abbreviated formula of the year in Sumerian, with a translation in "Akkadian," were sent to the various cities and temples before the beginning of the year.

The events after which the years were named may be classed into two kinds, such as consist of an act that could be performed on one single day, and at any desirable time, as, e.g., the dedication of a votive statue, of a weapon, or of a throne for a god; and, on the other hand, such as either it was beyond one's power to fix on a certain day or that needed a long time for completion, as, e.g., historical events, the capture of hostile cities and princes, or the digging of canals, the building of city walls and fortresses, of temples and stage-towers. The explanation of date formulas referring to events of the first kind presents no difficulty, e.g., Az. 4: mu Ammizaduga lugale shunir galgalla Esagillashu innentura, "The year in which Ammi-
${ }^{1}$ Ungnad in Die Chronologie der Regierung Ammiditana's und Ammisaduga's ( $=$ B. A., VI, pt. 3), p. 7, enumerates R. 31 (H. 43); IV, $44 c$ (Si. 7); Fr. 19 ( $=$ Scheil, 267!; Ad. 34); Berl. 5833 (Ad. 37); 5875 (Az. 5); M. 63 (Az. 10?); Berl. 5910 (Az. 16) ; $5900($ Az. $17+b) ; 6115(A z .16+c)$; to which may be added P. 84 (S. 15). Ungnad (l.c., p. 7) considers it a possibility that for some reason or other the documents might have been dated back, but considering the character of the documents as bcing sworn to and sealed in the presence of the parties and witnesses, this is scarcely plausible.
${ }^{2}$ Berl. 670 (published by F. E. Peiser, Zur altbabylonischen Datierungsweise, O. L. Z., 1905, 1; by A. Ungnad, B. A., VI, pt. 3, p. 47) and Berl. 1200 (published by L. Messerschmidt, Zur altbabylonischen Chronologie, O. L. Z., 1905, 268ff.).
zaduga, the king, has brought into $E$-sagil great emblems." This phrase clearly implies that the act referred to took place within the year in question. Now we know that in later times in Babylon the beginning of the year was celebrated with great religious ceremonies, and that the king himself took a prominent part in them. Therefore, we are hardly wrong in assuming that the king dedicated the statue, throne or the like on New Year's day, the event being thus within the year to which it gave its name, and, nevertheless, so early that not one day of the year was left unnamed. This assumption becomes very reasonable from the fact that by far the greater number of formulas refer to actions of a religious character. Undoubtedly the royal authorities and the priesthood knew the program of the New Year's celebration, with the acts planned by the king, a sufficient time before, and could make use of it in the naming of the coming year. ${ }^{1}$

The difficulties arise with those formulas which refer to events of the second class. The building of temples, the digging of canals, etc., could not be achieved within the year except after considerable time, and although these works might have been planned, it would nevertheless have been rather hazardous to name a year after a future event, the completion or even the beginning of which might be interfered with sometime during the year by some unlooked-for condition of affairs, quite apart from the fact that such an explanation is impossible where historical events are concerned. There is a possibility, and in some few cases it is even likely, that the formula was promulgated in a later part of the year after the historical event had taken place, but as a general custom this procedure is very improbable, and at least in one case impossible, because the formula which mentions the historical fact is found on a tablet of the first of Nisan. ${ }^{2}$

The solution of the difficulties is that the date formulas mentioning events of the second class are incomplete, and that they recorded in the missing part some religious act, probably the offering of some votive object which alone took place on New Year's day, and thus in the year of the formula, while the events mentioned before this religious act had occurred in the past, i.e., in the previous ycar. We should therefore not translate "year in which Hammu-rabi vanquished Rim-Sin," but "year in which Hammu-rabi, after having vanquished Rim-Sin, brought before Anum and Ellil some object of the booty or some votive object." The correctness

[^53]of this explanation is proved by the observation that the verbs relating the dedication, etc., of objects on New Year's day stand in the perfect tense, ${ }^{1}$ those relating historical events, however, in the historical tense, ${ }^{2}$ which, as I have tried to show in $Z . A ., \mathrm{XXI},{ }^{3} \mathrm{p} .224 \mathrm{ff}$., denotes the difference of time when it is contrasted with perfect tenses. An illustration for this we have in the complete date formulas of Ammiditana, Berl. 670 ( = Ad. 29), and Samsu-ditana, Berl. 1200. There the dedication of the tutelary deities and of the sun-disks on New Year's day is recorded in both instances by the perfect in-ne-en-tu-ra, but the making of the votive objects, which took place before New Year, i.e., in the preceding year, by the preterit ne-in-dim-dim-ma-a (Berl. 670) and ne-in-dim-ma-a-an (Berl. 1200). ${ }^{4}$ As a still more instructive example Ad. 8 may be referred to, because there we have abbreviated formulas closing with a perfect and with a historical tense, besides the full formulas. It would certainly be wrong to translate mu Ammi-ditana lugale alam namlugalana. shunendŭa by "the year in which Ammi-ditana caused his image, etc., to be formed," since not this action, but, as is shown by the other formulas, mu alam namlugalani E-babbarrashu innitura (E) and mu Ammi-ditana lugale alam namlugalana shua nendŭa E-babbarrash innanitura (Berl. 6091), only the dedication took place in the year designated by the formula. By reversing this observation we obtain, therefore, the rule that all the actions expressed by a verb in the perfect occur in the year of the formula; those in the historical tense, however, in the previous year (or years).

From this discrimination it follows that, e.g., the capture of I $\sin$ by $\operatorname{Sin}-m u b a l l i t$, which is related by the formula $m u I \sin ^{k i}$ indib (M. 32), occurred in the 17 th, not in the 16 th year of Sin-muballit, ${ }^{5}$ and similarly the conquest by $\operatorname{Rim}$-Sin in the year designated as $m u \ldots .$. . Isin ${ }^{k i}$ uru namlugalla indibba. Of a considerable number of formulas containing historical facts, as, e.g., Si. 9, mu ugnim Kashshû; Si. 10, mu ugnim Idamaraz, etc., unfortunately the verb is still wanting, and a definite decision is consequently not possible.
2. The first year named after a king was not the year of his accession to the

[^54]throne, but that which began with the first of Nisan after his accession. The year of accession, which practically in all cases had been named after the then still living former king, probably continued to be designated with its old name even after the death of the king, ${ }^{1}$ the formula mu $K$ ana bît abishu irubu, which corresponds to the later mu sag namlugalla $K$, being either employed only during the earlier time of the First Dynasty or besides the regular formulas.

The year beginning with the following first of Nisan was not called officially mи $K$ lugal-e, but was designated by a complete formula like all other years. Compare

Sumu-abu:
Sumu-lail: mu Sl. lugale id ${ }^{\text {d }}$ Babbar-hegal munbàl
Zabium: $\qquad$
Abil-Sin: mu A-S. lugale [ba]d Barz[ici badū]
Sin-muballit: mu Sm. lugale bad Rubatum badü
Hammu-rabi: mu $H$ lugale (D)
Samsu-iluna: mu Si. lugale dugga zida ${ }^{\text {d }}$ Mardukkata namenbi kurkurra (PAea) (C)
Abi-eshu': $\qquad$
Ammi-ditana: mu Ad. lugale adgia gula ${ }^{d}$ Mardukge (E, B)
Ammi-zaduga: mu Az. lugale ${ }^{\text {a }}$ Enlilli namennani (nebgulla) (E)
The formula $m u K$ lugale is therefore only an abbreviation. Its shortness, in comparison with the abbreviations of the following years, is accounted for by the fact that it is the first formula that mentions the name of the respective king. This observation furnishes us with a principle to assign to their proper years contracts dated, e.g., mu id Hammu-rabi, where we have the choice between the id Hammu-rabi-hegal and the id Hammurabi-nuhush-nishi. Such formulas can only refer to the first date that mentions a canal or a statue, etc., of the king or god; mu id Hammurabi being thus the 9th, not the 33d year of Hammu-rabi.
${ }^{1}$ See Ungnad, l.c., pp. 8, 9.

## VI. OU'TLINE OF THE POLITICAL HISTORY FROM SINMUBALLITTS SEVENTEENTH YEAR TO THE END OF THE FIRST DYNASTY.

The political development during the second half of the First Dynasty forms a very interesting chapter of the history of Babylonia, showing us how in those times the North and South rivalled each other with changing luck in the endeavor to win the supremacy of Babylonia. Unfortunately our sources for a reconstruction of the history of this time are still very scanty, and in many instances it will only be possible to arrive at a more or less great probability. Nevertheless, the recent discovery of historical references bearing on the subject, the realization of the statements of the date lists and dated contracts, and not least the fact that in some few cities we can ascertain the succession of kings by means of tablets dated in their reign, enable us even now to establish an outline which in the main will prove correct.

We take our start from the facts, gathered from dated tablets and Date List A, that Sin-muballit, king of Babylon, in his 17th year, and likewise Rim-Sin, king of Larsam, some time later, took possession of Isin, which city in former times had been the capital of kings of Shumer and Akkad for 225 years. There is not the slightest indication that these two events should be considered one and the same, and that Sin-muballit achieved his deed either as the vassal or as the ally of Rim-Sin. As the date Sm. 20: mu ugnim Larsam ${ }^{k i}$, 'when (Sin-muballit defeated) the army of Larsam," shows, and as can be seen from the later development, the king of Babylon was rather the political adversary of the king of Larsam, and his rival for the dominion over all of Babylonia. ${ }^{1}$ The events prior to and following the first conquest seem to have been these: In the 13th year of Sin-muballit the army of Ur, which of course is not identical with that of Larsam, invaded the territory of Babylon, but was driven back by Sin-muballit, whose political influence in the course of the following four years rose to such an extent that in his 17 th year he could occupy the city of Isin. That Sin-muballit's power had been growing steadily for a long time is indicated by the fact that he built or fortified anew quite a number of fortresses. ${ }^{2}$ As Sin-muballit never mentions military conquests, undoubtedly the rise

[^55]of his power had its origin in advantageous political constellations, for which the temporary independence of $U r$, besides the kingdom of Larsam, which we must infer from its military enterprise against Sin-muballit, accounts sufficiently. But there can be no doubt that also Kesh and Uruk, before they were conquered by Rim-Sin, were independent kingdoms, ${ }^{1}$ Babylonia thus being divided into several small states.

After Sin-muballit's conquest the kingdom of Larsam under Rim-Sin had risen to a dominating position, and made this felt by an attack on the kingdom of Babylon. The campaign was successful inasmuch as the old renowned city of Isin, occupied before by Sin-muballit, fell into the hands of Rim-Sin, who regarded this success, it seems, as his greatest deed, because thenceforth he counts his years of reign after the capture of I $\sin$. But, on the other hand, he failed in his endeavor to overthrow the kingdom of Babylon. The invading army was routed by Sin-muballit, over which deed this king glories in the date of his 20th year.

In consideration of this we should place the capture of $I \sin$ by Rim-Sin in Sinmuballit's 19 th year, and from the following calculation it will be seen that this is indeed approximately the right time. For Hammu-rabi conquered Southern Babylonia in his 30th year, and dated tablets from Nippur and Tell Sifr show that from that time he actually ruled over these cities at least in his 31st, $33-39$ th and 41 st years, while Rim-Sin ruled over the same cities (and Yokha) in the 18th, 21st, 23d, 25 th -28 th and 30 th years after the capture of $I \sin .^{2}$ These facts can be combined only by placing Rim-Sin's thirty years of reign before Hammu-rabi's 30th year. The conquest of $I \sin$ would then have occurred no later than the last year of $\operatorname{Sin}$ muballit, and may have actually occurred in his 19th year.

In consequence of his method of dating his years of reign, we know practically nothing of Rim-Sin's enterprises during the thirty years after the conquest of $I \sin$. The first five years of Hammu-rabi went by either without an important event, or with such events as were not favorable for Hammu-rabi, so that he could not boast of them in the names of years. But in his 6 th year he conquered or occupied Uruk

[^56]and $I \sin$, thus repeating the attempt of his father to extend his power over the South. In the following year he even directed, it seems, an expedition against Emutbal, the land of Rim-Sin's father. This expedition, though somehow successful, was probably far from humiliating Rim-Sin, since we have tablets dated in the 9th, 11th and 13th years of this king. How long Hammu-rabi could maintain his conquest we do not know, but we may conclude that at least in his 9 th year he still maintained it, since the canal Hammurabi-hegal, which he built in this year, was probably intended to procure, like later the Hammurabi-nuhush-nishi canal, prosperity to a newly acquired devastated territory.

In the 9 th year, Hammu-rabi seems to have destroyed the town and the people of Malgu, the city of Ea and Damkina, which at some time was the seat of a kingdom. ${ }^{1}$

The 10th year is marked by an enterprise against or in the cities of Rabikum and Shalibi, the former being described in the date of the 35th year as situated on the bank of the Euphrates. The notice of this enterprise, although most fragmentary, is of eminent value for us, because it opens up for us a view into the close connection of the middle Euphrates valley with Babylonia. Rabikum and Shalibi, the latter of which seems to be represented by the present ruins of Zeleb̂̀ye on the left bank of the Euphrates, half way between the mouths of the Balih and of the Habur, commanded the water-course of the Euphrates, the important natural commercial route between the Westland and Babylonia, and it is easy to understand that the Babylonian rulers strove to maintain control of the river by occupying the chief towns along its course. A tablet in the British Museum is dated after the capture of Rabikum by a certain Ibiq-Ishkur. ${ }^{2}$ If we are allowed to see in this the beginning of a fuller form of the date of the 11th year, it would appear that Hammu-rabi was prompted to take his action because Ibiq-Ishkur, by means of this fortified town, could control the Euphrates against the Babylonian merchants.

The dates from the 12 th to the 29th year record no military success, a sure sign that Hammu-rabi's position had suffered a total change. Without doubt Rim-Sin had won back his former power and possessions. Only gradually Hammu-rabi's influence rose again, as can be observed from his building fortresses in his 19th(?), 21 st and 27 th years, and his fortifying Sippar in his 23d, 24 th(?) and 25 th years, the latter presupposing perhaps a previous destruction or devastation in warfare.

The period of Hammurabi's great and lasting successes begins with his 29 th year. In this year he defeated an army of the Elamites, the people that since the oldest
${ }^{1}$ See the inscription of Ibiq-Ishtar in Vorderasiatische Schriftdenkmäler, I, No. 32.
${ }^{2}$ According to King in L. I. II., III, pp. 238f., note 72.
times ${ }^{1}$ had invaded and ransacked Babylonia. That they came as allies of Rim-Sin is an unproved assumption, and is very unlikely, since Rim-Sin's mother-country was Emutbal, not Elam. The real state of affairs was undoubtedly this, that RimSin's empire, as being nearest to Elam, had to suffer the first attack from the invaders. After they had overthrown Rim-Sin's army, but probably had suffered themselves through the resistance of the South-Babylonians, it may have been easy for Hammurabi to rout them and expel them from Babylonia. Never before, it seems, was Hammu-rabi offered such occasion to realize his and his father's aspirations, the dominion over all Babylonia, as now by Rim-Sin's weakness and his own success. He exploited fully his advantage. In the following year, with the help of Anum and Enlil, as we read in the date formula of the 31st year, his hand slew to the ground the land Emutbal and king Rim-Sin. From this time Hammu-rabi was ruler over all Babylonia. The chronicle records the same event with the words: "Hammu-rabi, king of Babylon, summoned his people and against Rim-Sin, king of Ur, he marched. Ur and Uruk did his hand conquer and their property he took to Babylon."

It seems that A shnunnak, which probably also at that time was ruled by patesis, made likewise an attempt to profit from the troubles in Babylonia; for in the following year an army of Ashnunnak appears in Babylonia, but is defeated by Hammu-rabi. From the next year Hammu-rabi begins his works of peace. He dug (in the 32d year) the canal Hammurabi-nuhush-nishi, which from Akkad went past Nippur down to Shumer, carrying waters of exuberance along with it. He tells us; and we may well believe him, that the people of Shumer and Akkad had been scattered; ${ }^{3}$ he gathered and settled them in towns and cities along this canal. He rebuilt temples, e.g., E-mete-ursag (41st year) in Kish, the temples in Larsam, in Halab, etc. ${ }^{4}$ He built new fortresses, like Dur-Sinmuballit at the head of the Hammurabi-nuhush-nishi canal (i.e., where this canal leaves the Euphrates), the great castle Kar-Shamash on the bank of the Tigris, and refortified the city of Rabikum on the bank of the Euphrates in the 36 th (or a later) year.

This latter notice shows us that Hammu-rabi's power extended far beyond the boundaries of Babylonia proper. The possession of Rabikum proves that the middle Euphrates valley was again in his power, and undoubtedly Kar-Shamash, which is mentioned with Rabikum in the same date formula, occupied the same position in the upper valley of the Tigris ${ }^{5}$ as Rabikum in the valley of the Euphrates, i.e., it

[^57]secured the other natural commercial route down the Tigris; for we know from his Code of Laws that Hammu-rabi ruled over the city of Ashshur, to which he returned its tutelary god, and over Nineveh, where he richly endowed the temple of Ishtar; moreover, the directions in the letters to Sinidinnam in Larsam as to the employment of a detachment of Ashshurites, give evidence that the king actually exercised his power over these cities.

Other military enterprises of Hammu-rabi are the conquest of Mari and Malg $\hat{u}$ in the 36th year, an expedition against (or the achievement of some work in) Ashnunnak in the east in his 37 th year, and the subjugation of the whole steppe, i.e., Mesopotamia with its hostile tribes, in the 38 th year. These tribes perhaps are also to be identified with the people of Turukkum, Kagmum and Subê, whose bands were defeated in the 38th year. For the people of Mera and Tutul see C. H., $4: 30$.

Thus at the end of Hammu-rabi's reign his dominion extended over the whole territory from the Persian Gulf as far northwest, perhaps, as Charchemish and Diarbekr.

When Samsu-iluna inherited his father's kingdom, he took also the charge upon himself to maintain Hammurabi's conquests. This was no easy task, and his reign is, as we shall see, largely filled up with suppressing revolts and warding off attacks from outside. His very year of accession to the throne and his first year are marked by conflicts, for in the date of the first year he glorifies in having made his dominion shine over the lands, at the true command of Marduk, which implies that he had first to establish it outside of Babylonia proper; and in the date of the second year he asserts that he liberated Shumer and Akkad, which presupposes that it was occupied by a foreign power. Probably at that time the events recorded by the chronicle took place, in which either the old Rim-Sin ${ }^{1}$ or one of his family played a part. Apparently it was an attempt to regain the kingdom of Shumer and Akkad. At any rate it failed. Samsu-iluna conquered the city of his foe and captured him alive in his palace. Unfortunately the continuation of the chronicle is only fragmentary.

Samsu-iluna, as was customary after successes, endeavors to make his land prosperous by digging two canals, Samsuiluna-nagab-nuhshim and Samsuiluna-hegal. As far as we have any knowledge, peace and prosperity reigned in the land up to the 8th year, when a period of war sets in that extends over a time of six years, and is marked by the defeat of Cassite invaders in the 8 th or 9 th, of an army of the city of Idamaraz in the 9 th, the capture of $U r$ and $U r u k$ in the 10th, the subjugation of insurgent lands in the 11th, the capture of Kisurra and Sabum in the

[^58]12th, and the suppression of an insurgent king in Akkad in the 13th year. This long war or series of wars, the details of which unfortunately are unknown to us, ended, it seems, with the complete success of Samsu-iluna. But Babylonia in all likelihood lay waste when peace was again established in the land. Besides the cities conquered by the king also Isin and the fortresses of Emutbal had been destroyed either by Samsu-iluna or his foes. Their fortifications were restored in the 14th and the 16 th year, and the construction of a wall of Sippar in the 15 th year may suggest that even this city had suffered devastation. Nor can it be accidental that the tablets from Tell Sifr; existing abundantly for the first decade of Samsu-iluna's reign, cease completely after the 10th year-a sure indication that the small town was destroyed and abandoned by its inhabitants.

The period of peace from the 14th to the 26th year is only interrupted by the suppression of an uprising in one of the foreign lands in the 19th ${ }^{1}$ and an expedition against the foreign(?) cities $S a^{\prime} n \hat{a}$ and Zarhanum in the $22 d$ year. In connection with the last achievement Samsu-iluna calls himself lugal sag-kal, "the supreme king." We also receive the impression that at that time Samsu-iluna stands at the height of his power, and moreover reigns in peace, from his statement in the date of his 25 th year, that he caused a stone of about eleven metres in length to be brought to Babylonia from the great mountain of the Westland. ${ }^{2}$

Some great disturbance seems to have occurred in Samsu-iluna's 28th year; for the 29 th as well as the 30th year are dated after the formula of the 27 th year, which indicates that in those years the king was prevented from dedicating a votive object, or even from participating in the New-Year's celebration. Probably he was engaged in an unfortunate war. The 27th year perhaps still brought success, as we conclude from the formula of the 28th year: 'year in which Samsu-iluna after having - upon the oracle of Enlil, - -." Unfortunately we do not possess as yet the continuation of this formula, but if the date of P. 40 is to be assigned to the 29 th year, ${ }^{3}$ Samsu-iluna in his 27 th year vanquished a certain Iadih-abu and perhaps one

[^59]Mutihurshana. The issue of the struggles of these years was certainly unfavorable for Samsu-iluna, because also the date of the 31st year makes, as far as we know, no allusion to political events. It is, therefore, not improbable that this is the time of the unfortunate conflict with Iluma-ilum, the first king of the so-called Second Dynasty.

The very fragmentary report on this and the immediately preceding events in the Chronicle opens with a battle on the shore of the Persian Gulf, which ended with a victory for Samsu-iluna. We may conclude this from the words: their dead bodies (i.e., of the enemies) the sea [carried away]; for we would not expect such a detailed feature if the Babylonians had been defeated. As the passage is incomplete we are left in doubt as to whether Samsu-iluna was already at that time fighting Ilumailum, or if our previous calculations should prove correct, Iadih-abu and Mutihurshana. The chronicle continues: "A second time Samsu-iluna [went to the Sealand(?)]"; but Iluma-ilum approached and defeated him.

A tablet (P.68) found at Nippur and dated mu-bil I-li-ma-ilum lugal-e gives evidence that Ilima-ilum, as he is called on this tablet, more correctly, actually reigned over Southern Babylonia as far north as Nippur for at least two years, but probably he ruled over these districts the last nine years of Samsu-iluna's reign. The latest Nippur tablets from the reign of Samsu-iluna are dated in the 27th, 28th and 29th ${ }^{1}$ years, and it is possible that Ilima-ilum took possession of Nippur already in the last mentioned year. ${ }^{2}$

No tablets of rulers of the First Dynasty from Nippur dated later than the 29th year of Samsu-iluna have come to light as yet, and although according to an oral communication by Hilprecht there exists a building inscription of Ammi-ditana from Nippur, nevertheless the absence of tablets can be sufficiently accounted for only by the assumption that Nippur was destroyed, and that for a long period all or most of the mounds of Nippur remained uninhabited.

[^60]The unfortunate outcome of the fight of Samsu-iluna with Ilima-ilum seems to have crippled his power for the rest of his reign. The date list informs us of another success against invaders(?) from the Westland in his 35 th year, and of the suppression of an uprising(?) in Akkad in his 36th year. Particulars about these events are not known.

Samsu-iluna's son and successor Abi-eshu' again made an energetic effort to get rid of the rival in the South. We learn from the chronicle that he tried to capture Ilima-ilum and, therefore, even planned the damming up of the Tigris. He indeed achieved the latter work, but he did not capture Ilima-ilum. The statement concerning the damming up of the Tigris is borne out by the date: 'year in which Abi-eshu', the king, after in the great power of Marduk, he had dammed up the Tigris, - .-..." The Tigris, or more correctly that part of the Tigris in question, is undoubtedly the Shatt-el-Hai, the influx of which at Kut-el-Amara Abi-eshu' seems to have diverted, thus depriving the land on the banks of the river of the life-giving power, the water. From this we may safely conclude that Ilima-ilum had his stronghold in one of the cities on the banks of this canal. That Abi-eshu' succeeded in getting control of Southern Babylonia we may also conclude from his building(?) the temple E-kish-shirgal and dedicating his statue to this temple, provided that the sanctuary in $U r$ is meant.

Apart from the instance mentioned above, the dates, as far as they are known at the present, ${ }^{1}$ furnish little material for the history of Abi-eshu'. From one we learn the name of a certain Adnatum, but are kept entirely in doubt as to the rôle he played. Perhaps he was vanquished by Abi-eshu'.

Scanty also are the data gathered from the formulas for the history of the last three kings, Ammi-ditana, Ammi-zaduga and Samsu-ditana. With rare exceptions they relate the dedication of votive objects; sometimes the building of a temple, or of a fortress. The impression is, therefore, forced upon us that the political activity of these kings was on the whole a limited one. The new political centre in the South checked the movements of his neighbor in the North. Unfortunately we have, with one exception, no positive knowledge of the continuous contest we must necessarily assume existed between the last kings of Babylon and the first kings of the Second Dynasty. The names and the number of years of the reign of these kings are known from two chronological lists, and we can thus calculate that, after Ilima-ilum, the contemporary of Samsu-iluna and Abi-eshu', Itti-ili-nibi was contemporaneous with Abi-eshu' and Ammi-ditana, Damqi-ilishu with Ammi-ditana, Ammi-zaduga and Samsu-ditana, and Ishkibal and Shushshi with Samsu-ditana.

[^61]Perhaps we may see the traces of a continued war with changing results between the two rival kingdoms in the fact that a number of years of the reign of Ammiditana have no formula of their own, which always is a sign of turbulent times, while the immediately preceding year in all cases is marked either by some military success or by the construction of a fortress. This apparently means that Ammi-ditana several times made an attack upon foreign territory and endeavored to secure it for himself by building fortresses, whereupon the enemy very soon reconquered the lost territory or at least tried to do so. Thus the three first years of Ammi-ditana are all designated with formulas that suggest some military or political success. The fourth year, however, has no formula of its own, nor those denoting the second year after the construction of the fortresses Mashkan-Ammiditana in the 8th, Ishkun-Marduk on the Zilakum in the 31st and Dur-Ammiditana on the canal MêEnlil in the 34th year. Another fortress, Dur-Ammiditana on the Zilakum, Ammiditana had built in his 15 th year; the construction of Ishkun-Marduk on the same river (or canal) in the 31st year, represents perhaps a renewed attempt to subdue the regions around this river. A royal castle KiKU-shag-dugga was built on the Arahtum canal in the 19th year.

In the 16th year Ammi-ditana vanquishes a certain Arahaum, who is called a lù-ma-da. ${ }^{1}$ Nothing more concerning this event is known.

A most important historical notice, however, is contained in the date of Ammiditana's last year, because it mentions the name of Damqi-ilishu, the third king of the Second Dynasty. We learn that Ammi-ditana in his 36 th year conquered a fortress which Damqi-ilishu had built, exactly the reverse of what we concluded above for several years of Ammi-ditana. The political course of things in the last period of Ammi-ditana's reign seems to have been this: in his 34th year Ammi-ditana advanced towards the South and built a fortress on the canal Mê-Enlil, which, judging from its name, was not very far from Nippur; in the 35th year apparently Damqi-ilishu drove Ammi-ditana back and erected his own fortress, but in the 36th year Ammiditana conquered this fortress, ${ }^{2}$ and again extended his dominion over the South.

[^62]That Ammi-ditana, at least at times, actually ruled over Southern Babylonia we see from his title, "king of Shumer and Akkad," which he holds in the inscription published by King.' From the same inscription we learn that he was also king of Kish, and that he had subdued the Westland. ${ }^{2}$

Ammi-zaduga received from his father, who died the year after his success over Damqi-ilishu, the dominion over Southern Babylonia. We see this clearly from the date of the first year, in which he refers to Enlil who makes great his dominion, and from the formula of the second year, in which he calls himself the humble shepherd of Anum and Enlil. But, perhaps, in the latter year he lost the southern part of his dominion. In his inscription the judge, Gimil-Marduk, calls Ammi-zaduga simply king of Babylon, a sure sign that he did not rule over Shumer. In his 9th year, however, Ammi-zaduga broke, as he asserts, the oppression of his land and in his 10th year he built a fortress at the mouth of the Euphrates, which proves that in this year his power extended as far south as the Persian Gulf. From the formulas of the following years we do not receive the impression that Ammi-zaduga maintained this powerful position.

From the reign of Samsu-ditana, the last king of the First Dynasty, as yet only few date formulas ${ }^{3}$ are known. We may conclude that before the year whose formula mentions the great battle forces of Shamash and Marduk, Samsu-ditana won some military success, while the fact that one year was named after the preceding year, again points to some political trouble. A short notice in the chronicle, made by way of addition, informs us that at the time of Samsu-ditana the Hittites invaded Akkad. From all appearance this people made an end to the kingdom of Babylon and the dynasty of Hammu-rabi.

The short historical notice is the more valuable as by combining it with the fact that Ilima-ilum is the conuemporary of $A b i$-esh $h$ ' we are able to determine the synchronism between the First and the Second Dynasty in such a way that there is left only a play of about five years. See my tables of the corresponding rulers in "Das zeitliche Verhältnis der ersten Dynastie von Babylon zur zweiten Dynastie" in Z. A., XX, p. 445, and "Das zeitliche Verhältnis der zweiten Dynastie der grösseren Königsliste zur dritten Dynastie" in Z. A., XXI, p. 175.
${ }^{1}$ L. I. M., Vol. II, p. 215 (No. 100).
${ }^{2}$ Lugal da-ga-m[u] kur Mar-tu ${ }^{k i}=$ (I am) the king who has made the Westland obey me.
${ }^{3}$ Eight out of thirty.

## VII. AN EARLY KING.

No. 130.
Obv.: 1. ${ }^{d}$ Nin-s $[u n(?)]$ ama kalam-ma dam nun(?)-[....] dam-gal ${ }^{d} E n(?)$ [...........] .......-ni-ir(?) 2. Lugal-[.....]-ni-mu-un-gin (zi-ka.rum $)$ nitah-[kal]a-ga 3. ú-a Nibru ${ }^{k i}-a\left({ }^{z a-n i-i n}\right.$ Nippur $\left.{ }^{k i}\right)$ lugal UD-[.....] $]^{k i}-a-g e \quad$ 4. lugal an-ub-da-tab-tab-ba-ge 5. All-HZa-lim ${ }^{k i}$ ( ${ }^{\text {Ha-ti-im }}$ u-te-ir) $)$ LI-UM (?)- ....gur-ru-dam 6. gú-kalam kur-kur-ra-ge mi-ni-in-gi-gi 7. uku-e kur-kur-ra u-sal-la mi-ni-in-ná-a 8. é dingir-
 10. [nam-en] ki-shar-ra ( ${ }^{\text {ki-ssh-sha-tim }[i-b u-s h b u)}$ mu-un-ag-a 11. [gu]b-ba Mi-gir-d ${ }^{d}$ En-lil pa-te-si A Al-Ha-lim ${ }^{k i}$ 12. ${ }^{m}{ }^{d}$ En-lil-iz-zu pa-te-si $S_{I R}{ }^{k i} \quad$ 13. ${ }^{m}{ }^{d}[\ldots .]-.k i-e-e l(?)$ pa-te-si Ki-e-el ${ }^{k i}$ 14. ${ }^{m} Q a t-{ }^{d} N u-[n u ?]$ pa-te-si Ká-gal-la ${ }^{k i}$ 15. ${ }^{m} L i[-\ldots .$. . $]$-lum pa-te-si Am-da-ma ${ }^{k i}$ 16. ${ }^{m} I-b i-M a-m a \quad p a-t e-s i ~ A r-d a-m a^{k i} \quad$ 17. ${ }^{m} N u$-útr-shu-e-li pa-te-si $A(Z A ?)-S U H-U N U(?)^{k i} \quad$ 18. ${ }^{m} M a-a t-g a-n u$ pa-te-si [........] 19. ${ }^{m}{ }^{d}$ Ishkur-sharrum $[\ldots . . . .$.$] 20. { }^{m} Z u$-zum-ta-nu [......]. 21. ${ }^{m} T a-i m-s h u-n u$ [.........] 22. $A$-bi-[........]

Rev.: 4. ${ }^{d}$ Mah dúg-azag-ga-ni-ta $\left({ }^{(i-b i-a}\right)[\ldots . . . . .$.$] 6. gish-nam-GIN-gish ù$ ${ }^{u r u d u}$ gish-har-bi $5 .\left({ }^{(a-n a}\right)$.... 6. [UD .......] 7. $1 \frac{1}{3}$ bur gán a-shag é(?)-[...] mu [......] 9. kalam-na ká-bi a-shag-ga ib(?)-ne [.........]

To Nin-...., the mother of the land, the august lady ...., the great lady of $\ldots . . . . .$. . Lugal $[\ldots .$.$] ni-mungin, the strong hero, who endows Nippur,$ king of $U D \ldots .$. , king of the four corners of the world, who gained back Al-Halim ......., who shielded the totality of the territory of the lands and caused the people of the lands to dwell in safety, who built the house of the great gods, who restored the land to its place, who exercised lordship over the totality, in the presence of Migir-Ellil, governor of Al-Halim; Ellil-izzu, governor of SIR;
. .kiel, governor of Kiel; Qat-Nunu(?), governor of Kagalla; Li. . .elum, governor of Amdama; Ibi-Mama, governor of Ardama; Nurshu-eli, governor of Hallab(?); Matganu, governor of ..... ; Ishkur-sharrum, governor of .... ; Zuzumtanu, governor of ; Taimshunu, governor of $\qquad$ ; Abi governor of

Annotations. To li. 1. compare ${ }^{d}$ Nin-in-si-na nin-gal ama kalam-ma ...... nin-a-ni-ir, Warad-Sin, Stone tablet, Obv., 1-5. Should the appellation ama kalamma, common to both divinities, be an indication that Nininsina $=$ Ninsunna? The situation of AI-Halim, li. 5, is unknown. Gur-ru-dam is here translated with u-te-ir; the formation lali-dam, which elsewhere also denotes the future, seems to become detcrmined as to the time only by the context. To gu-kalam cf. sib gí-kalam $k i-N i$ - $b r u^{k i}$, Rim-Sin, Clay, part II. As to the meaning, sib corresponds to mi-ni-in-gi-gi, ef. gi-gi $=$ paqidu, shullumu. LL. 6, 7 seem to form a unity, since the enclosing $a$ stands only after the last verb.

The document No. 130, which is dated by a colophon in the reign of Ammizaduga, is the copy of a transfer of land (see Rev. li. 29) by an earlier king, probably to the temple of the goddess who is mentioned Obv. li. 1. Unfortunately the name of the king as well as that of his capital is only partially preserved. The latter, consisting of two signs, the first of which is $U D$, can be neither Unug nor Larsam, because of the complement $a$, possible readings being perhaps Adab, Larak or Upi. The Sumerian name of the king and the mentioning of the goddess $M a h$, who elsewhere appears associated with $A n u, E l l i l$ and $E a$, seem to point towards the South, while the title, King of the Four Corners of the World, the prominent place of Nippur in the titles of the king and the names of the first two mentioned patesis, compounds with Ellil, render it probable that the king in question ruled over a territory in the centre of which Nippur was situated. But, judging from the other predicates which he assumes, his dominion extended also over districts outside of Babylonia (kur$k u r-r a$ ), and over the regions north(east) of Akkad (ki-shar-ra). Akkad itself and the great southern cities are not under his rule.

As to the time of this king all indications as yet are wanting, except perhaps that the title $u$-a Nibru ${ }^{k i 1}$ held by Ishme-Dagan, might place him near this king of Isin, especially as after the reign of his son a usurper founded a new branch of the dynasty, and Gungunum of Ur and Larsam, who calls himself also king of Shumer and Akkad, is a contemporary and liege lord of another son of Ishme-Dagan, the time being thus al variously disturbed one.
${ }^{1}$ But ef. the similar phrase $\tilde{u}^{-} a^{d}$ Ninni, Lugal-zaggisi, I, 25.

## VIII. CONCORDANCE OF PROPER NAMES.


#### Abstract

Abbreviations. b., brother; c., cousin; d., daughter; f. father; gd., granddaughter; gf., grandfather; gm., grandmother; gs., grandson; h., husband; m., mother; n., nephew; s., son; S., seal; si., sister; u., uncle; w., wife. Determinative: d., deus, dea. $\dagger$ denotes feminine names.


## I. Names of Persons from the Nippur Texts.

A-ab-ba
f. of Nannar-zi nu-ésh, $10: 37$.
$A-a b-b a-a$
s. of Dingir-mansi, $12: 27$.

A-ab-ba(?)-..... .
**nagar, $9: 3$.
A-ab-ba-tum
bur-gul, $37: 19$
$A-b a(?)-a$
*1. f. of Manum-(ma)hirshu.
2. \{. of Sin-imguranni, $52: 18|53: 33| 54: 33$.

A-ba-d ${ }^{\text {d }}$-lil-dim
*1. s. of SHESH-SIIESH, $5: 23$.
2. $42: 9,14$.

A-bi-ia-tum
f. of Taribum, $32: 27$.

A-bil-ia-tum
*1. f. of Ali-waqrum, $7: 24$.
2. f. of Nish-inishu, 31: 19.

A-bil-i-li-shu

1. s. of NinIB-gamil; arad ${ }^{d}$ Da-gan, 22, S.
2. s. of Nusku-nishu, 41:22.
3. s. of $U r_{-\ldots \ldots,} 49: 4,10,11,17$.
4. f.-in-law of Elali, $52: 9|53: 20| 54: 21$.
5. akil ér ${ }^{d} \mathrm{Mah}, 30: 1|42: 16| 64: 20$.
6. $l u \stackrel{u}{u}-S H I M+G A R^{d} E n-l i l, 47: 12 \mid 58: 1 \mathrm{j}$. A-bil-ilu
s. of Damiq-ilishu, $11: 25$.

A-bil ${ }^{d}$ Mar-tu

1. s. of Abil-Shamash, n. of Martu-malik, LibitEnlil and Libit-Martu, gs. of Enishsumatum $32: 7,9, \mathrm{~S} .|33: 6| 34: 2,6 \mid 35: 7$.
2. s. of Silli-Shamash, b. of Ili-idinnam, Ellumushu and Ili-turam, $36: 20$, Case, 6.
3. s. of Taribum, $48: 36$.

A-bil- ${ }^{d}$ Shamash
f. of Libit-Martu, $32: 14 \mid 35: 4,6, \mathrm{~S}$.

A-bil-d [..........]
$19: 2$.
A-bil-[. . . . . .]
$47: 8$.
$A-b i[\ldots . .$.
61:9.
Ab-lum

1. f. of $L u-N \operatorname{in} I B, 31: 20$.
2. gala, $57: 8$.

A-bu-um-wa-qar

1. f. of Mar-irsitim, $30: 5$.
2. bur-gul, $49: 49$.

Ad-da-dingir
s. of Dingir-sukkal, b. of Sin-ituram, 59:7.

Ad-da-dug-ga (a good father, abbreviated) ${ }^{2}$

1. f. of $I($ nim $)$-Nannar and Shesh-ki, $44: 26$
2. nu-ésh, f. of Lu-Ama-arazu, $22: 7$.
3. nu-ésh, f. of Nusku-nishu, h. of Ishtar-lamazi, $28: 13 \mid 40: 25,26$.
${ }^{1}$ Names marked with * occur on Nippur tablets dated in the reigns of Warad-Sin and Rim-Sin (Nos. 1-7); those marked with ** on the Yokha tablets (Nos. 8 and 9).
${ }^{2}$ Cf. Ama-dug-ga, B. E., Series A, VI, 1, $6: 6$; Shesh-dug-ga, C. T., IV, $45: 29$; VIII, $47: 19$; in Semitic $A$-bu-um-ta-bu-um, A-bu-ta-bu-um, P. N.

## A-gu-u-a

*1. f. of $I b k u$-Damu, $6: 3$.
2. $29: 3$.

A-hi-lu-mu-ur
63 : 5.
A-bi-sha(-gi)-ish
s. of Nannar-zimu, 11:26

A-hi-sha-gí-ish
*1. bur-gul, $7: 25$.
2. f. of Nimia, $12: 29$.

A-hu-um
*f, of ......., $4: 28$.
A-bu-shu-nu

1. s. of Ur-Ennugi, b. of Ziatum and Nabi-Shamash, *7:5, 7, 14, S.| $14: 22$.
**2. b. of Nannartum and Dingir-mansi, $9: 4,9$.
$\dagger A-l i-a-b u-s h a$
female slave of Narubtum, $23: 6$.
$\dagger A-l i-b a-a s h-t i^{\mathrm{I}}$
female slave, $49: 2$.
$A-l l-i l u$
s. of Rish-Ea, $48: 21$.

A-li-wa-aq-ru-um
*1. s. of Abiliatum, $7: 24$.
*2. s. of Lu-Nannar, 7:21.
*3. b. of Ur-Duazagga, $5: 10,15$.
4. $n u$-ésh, $44: 20$.
$\dagger$ Ama-sukkal
d. of NinIB-mansi, w. of Enlil-idzu, $40: 2,4,8.12$,

$$
\mathrm{S} .|47: 4| 58: 4 .
$$

Amar-Shuba (young bul of Shuba ${ }^{2}$ )
f. of Mar-irṣitim, $53: 29 \mid 54: 29$.
$\dagger$ A-me-ir-tum (cf. Awirtum)
**d. of Nannar-zimu and Dushubtum, si. of Ibi-Enlil, $9: 14$.
An-azag ${ }^{3}-s h a$

1. f. of Ibkusha, $28: 1, \mathrm{~S}$.
2. f. of Ibku-Ea, $28: 11$.
$A N-B A-l \grave{l}-t i\left(A N-B A\right.$ quickens mankind) ${ }^{4}$ f. of Mar-irsitim, 22:13.
$A n-n i-b a-a b-U L^{5}$ (or Dingir-ni-ba-ab-UL?)
(*) f. of Enlil-dingir, $6: 21$ \10:11.
A-ap-pa-a-tum
bur-gul, $35: 21$.
A-pa-ma(?)-kal(?)-... 51: 12.
Arad- ${ }^{d}$ En-lil-la gala-mah, 26, IV : 17.
Arad- ${ }^{d}$ Imin-bi

$$
\text { s. of Zaria? } 65: 10
$$

Arad-mu (my servant; abbreviated) red pubrum, 52:26|53:37|54:36.
Arad- ${ }^{d}$ Nannar
*1. f. of Ata, 9: 15.
2. f. of Ilima, $23: 29$.
3. f. of Sin-magir, $64: 22$.

Arad-d Nin-shah-ka
male slave, $26, I: 14,34$.
A-at-ta-a

1. s. of Naram-Sin, $40: 19$.
2. f. of Sin-erish, $10: 45$.

A-ta-a
**1. s. of Arad-Nannar, 9:15.
2. dub-sar, $38: 23,63: 13$.
3. f. of Warad-Sin, $32: 29$.

A-wi-ia-tum

1. $l u \grave{u}-S H I M+G A R^{d}$ En-lil-lá, $42: 17 \mid 57: 25$.
2. f. of Lugal-azida, $12: 33$.

A-wi-li-ia, a-wi-il-ia ( $=$ *)

1. s. of Warad-Sin, h. of Naramtum, f. of Ibi-Enlil, Ilushu-ibnishu and Ilimu-abi, 50:1, 4, 10, 13, $15,20,24$.
2. bur-gul, s. of Ur-Bau, 10:48|*23:34|24:36| $32: 30|33: 21| 34: 20|38: 22| 40: 30 \mid 41:$
$21|43: 33| * 44: 27|48: 43| * 68: 26$.
3. f. of Mannummeshulisur, $38: 10,64: 5$.
${ }^{1}$ On bashti in female names see Ranke, P. N., p. 224.
${ }^{2}$ II $R .50: 12 c,{ }^{d}(s h u-b a) S h u b a$. The $b i$ in $54: 29$ seems to be rest of an erasure, not phonetic complement to sub(a).
${ }^{3}$ Notice the frequent an-azag-ga ( = shamêelluti), e.g., Warad-Sin, Stone tablet, Obv. 4, and an-azag-gi, WaradSin, clay cone, $1: 3$.
${ }^{4}$ Compare $A N-B A-N I-N I$ (C.T., XIII, 41, Obv. 18), which probably is likewise Sumerian, conciuding from the names of the wife and the sons of this king (perhaps AN-BA-zal-zal). Does the name An-nu-ba-NI-NI (ef. inscription of this king) suggest a reading $a n u-b a$ for $A N-B A$ ?
${ }^{5}$ Cf. An-ni-ba-UL, $\bar{U} r-r i-b a-U L$ and $\bar{U} r-r i-b a-a b-U L$, Reisner, Telloh.
4. $16: 10$.
5. $65: 12$.

A-wi-il- ${ }^{d}$ Ishkur
shutug ${ }^{d} N i n I B, 62: 19$.
A-wi-il-............
$20: 4$.
$\dagger A$-wi-ir-tum
*d. of Hupatum and Rubatum, adopted by Shalurtum, $4: 1,12,16,22$,
Azag- ${ }^{d}$ Nannar
f. of $L u-N i n I B, 13: 6$.

Azag- ${ }^{d}$ Nin-gal
f. of Ibgatum and Nidnusha 26, IV : 20.

Azag- ${ }^{d}$ NinIB
f. of Sin-lidish, $12: 8$.

Azag- ${ }^{d}$ Nin-sĭ
dub-sar 22:15|28:34|30:12.
Ba-ba-a

$$
55: 1
$$

$d_{\text {Babbar-an-dùl }}$
s. of NinIB-gamil, $68: 6,8,15$.
${ }^{d}$ Babbar-gal-zu

1. f. of Shamash-erbam uku-ush, $49: 47$.
2. f. of Shamash-magir, 26, IV : 22 .
${ }^{d}$ Babbar-he-gal
11: 10.
${ }^{d}$ Babbar-mu-pá(d)-da (who has been called with name by Shamash)
$50: 8$.
Ba-li-lum
$65: 5$.
Be-ll-i-din-nam
$62: 1,9$.
$\dagger B e-l i-z u-n u$
*SAL + ISHIB ${ }^{d} N i n I B 1: 3$.
$\dagger$ Be-el-ta-ni
*1. d. of Dingir-uru, 6:29.
3. SAL + ISHIB ${ }^{d}$ NinIB, d. of Enlil-galzu, $45: 8$, $10,14$.
*3. d. of $L u-N \operatorname{in} I B, 6: 28$.
4. SAL + ISHIB ${ }^{d} N i n I B$, d. of Naram-Sin, $13: 3$.
5. d. of Warad-Sin, 21:7.
$\dagger$ Be-el-ti-ia w. of Tab-balatu, $57: 2,13,18$.

Be-lum
*f. of Nannar-mansi, 6:22.
$\dagger$ Be-ta-ni ( = Beltani?) *6:14.
$\dagger$ Be-ta-tum $*_{S A L}+I S H I B{ }^{d}$ NinIB, d. of Ziatum, si. of Enlilnishu, 6:6, S.

Da-da-kabla
*f. of IM-URUDU?-a, 5:25.
Da-du-um 43:9 (dumu-mésh Da-du-um).
${ }^{a^{\prime}}$ Da-gän-ma-an-si
f. of Ili-ibniani, $39: 22$.

Da-ma(?)-gu-gu
f. (by adoption) of $M a r$-irṣitim, $14: 5 \mid 30: 15$.

Da-mi-iq-i-li-shu, Dam-ki-i-li-shu ( $={ }^{*}$ )

1. lul-sa, si. of Lugal-he-gul, 48:40.
*2. s. of Lu-shagga, $8: 26$.
2. s. of Naram-Sin, $22: 4$.
3. s. of Ur-Duazagga, 12:30.
4. h. of $N a r u b(i) t u m, 11: 4,12,18, \mathrm{~S}$.
5. f. of Abil-ilum, 11:25 (identical with the preceding?).
6. 7. of Ea-idinnam, *14:21, L.E.
1. f. of Enlil-galzu, $38: 2 \mid * 22: 8$.
2. f. of Ili-naplizam, $45: 22$.
3. f. of NinIB-mansi, $16: 4$.

Dam-kum

1. s. of $U r$-Gula, $62: 15$.
2. §. of Nuskutum, $49: 48$.
3. f. of Munawirum, $13: 13$.
${ }^{d}$ Da-mu-e-ri-ba-am
shutug ${ }^{d}$ Nin-lil(-lá), $44: 21$.
$\left[^{d} D\right] a-m u-h ̧ e-g a l$
$37 b: 9$.
${ }^{d}$ Da-mu-i-din-nam
4. dub-sar, $10: 47 \mid 14: 32$
5. $17: 11$.
6. $29: 7$.
7. $43: 31, l \mathfrak{u}-S H I M+G A R^{d} E n-l i l-l u ́$.
8. $55: 12$.
9. f. of Mutum-ilum, h. of Hidutum, $41: 4$.
${ }^{d}$ Da-mu-ma-an-[si]
f. of $\ldots \ldots$. . tum, $47: 19$.
${ }^{d} D a-m u-s h e-m i$
*s. of $\ldots \ldots \ldots, 5: 22$.

- ${ }^{d} D a-m u-\ldots .$.

$$
\text { s. of } H a-b a-n a-t u m, 16: 5
$$

Dak-kum f. of Ubaiatum, $23: 27$.

Da-ak-kum $53: 2,54: 2$.

Dingir-ma-an-sì, dingir-ma-sì ( $=$ *)

1. s. of Iluni, $40: 22$.
2. dub-sar, s. of $L u-A$ ma-arazu, $40: 24$.
3. f. of $A b b a, 12: 27$.
4. f. of Ennugi-naplizam, $68: 24$.
*5. f. of Iluni, $6: 23$.
5. f. of Nannar-mansi, $30: 6$
**7. b.(?) of Abu-shunu and Nannartum, $9: 5,10$.
6. $18: 4$.
7. $29: 15$.
8. $53: 3,5,11|* 54: 3,12| 54: 5$.

Dingir-urú (=Ilum-erish)
*f. of Beltani, $6: 29$.
Díg-ga-a
${ }^{*}{ }^{*} \mathrm{f}$. of Dushubtum, $8: 3$.
( $\dagger$ ) Dum-ki-Ishtar

1. f. of NinIB-muballit, $40: 29$.
2. female slave, $23: 16$.

Dum-ku-a-a
f. of Lamazum, $45: 23$.

Dumu-ki (see Mar-irṣitim)
${ }^{d}$ DUN-PA-è-a-na-ṣir
$30: 7$.
$\dagger D u$-shu-ub-tum
**NIN(?)-DINGIR(HAL?) ${ }^{d}$ Shu-zi-an-na, d. of Duggá, w. of Nannar-zimu, m. of Ibi-Enlil and Amertum; geme ${ }^{d}$ Shu-zi-an-na, $8: 1,10,16, \mathrm{~S}$.

ज-a-ba-ni
$p a ̀-D \bar{U}, 44: 2, \mathrm{~S}$.
E-a-ba-li-it
$63: 11$.
É-a-i-din-nam (Ea has given me (an heir))

1. s. of Damqi-ilishu, $10: 21$, L.E.
2. pà-D $\bar{U}$, s. of Ea-tukulti, $32: 16 \mid 33: 2$.
3. s. of Ibku-Ishtar, h. of Kuritum, f. (by adoption) of Ili-idinnam and Iliummati, $24: 3,14,15,21, \mathrm{~S}$.
4. s. of Ibkusha, $28: 32$.
5. f. of EshumeDU-lumur shutug, $67: 22$.
6. f. of Etel-bt-Sin, $52: 22|53: 35| 54: 35$.
7. f. of Lugal-hegal and NinIB-emuga, 38:6|64:4.

$$
\text { 8. } M U, 62: 23 .
$$

$\hat{E}-a-m u-b a-l \hat{l}-i t, \hat{E}-a-m u-b a-a l-l i-i t(=*)$
s. of Sin-eriba, 52:24 |53:34\54:34.

E-a-na-ṣir
**1. s. of Nabi-Enlil, $8: 23$.
2. f. of Sin-ishmeani, $66: 17$.

E-a-ta-a-a-ar
s. of .........., by adoption s. of Ibkusha and $b$. of Ea-turam, $28: 2,6,9,18,23$.
É-a-tu-kul-ti
f. of Ea-idinnam pà-DU, 32:17.

É-a-tu-ra-am
s. of Ibku-sha, b. of Ea-taiar, $28: 8,14,15,16,23$.
$E-l a-l i, E-l a-l i(=*)$
**1. s. of Nabia, 7:22.
2. s.-in-law of Abil-ilishu, *52:8, 12, (13) |*53:6, $19,24,25]^{*} 54: 6,20,25,(26)$.
3. f. of $I z k u r-S h a m a s h, 67: 19$.
4. b. of Ninni-mansi, u. of Enlil-lushag, Nannar-ara-mungin, Ur-Duazagga and Ur-DUN.PAea, 26, I : 7, 24|II: 22.
E-li-tum
s. of $\ldots \ldots \ldots . . \operatorname{ga-a-a,16:12.}$

El-li-tum

1. s. of Ilu-nashi, $30: 4$.
2. s. of NinIB-meDU, $49: 22$.
3. f. of Idin-Ishtar, $13: 11$.
4. f. of Lab-Nannar-zal-zal-shar, $10: 26$.
5. $23: 5$.

El-lu-mu-u-shu
s. of Silli-Shamash, b. of Ili-idinnam and Abil-Martu, $36: 4,7,8,13$.
$\hat{E}-l u ̀-t i$

1. f. of Lu-Enlilla, $41: 19 \mid 64: 21$.
2. f. of Șilli-NinIB, 12: 4.
3. f. of Taribum, 12:25.
${ }^{d}{ }_{E n-k i-m a s h-z u}$
4. s. of Damqi-ilishu, $67: 5$.
5. f. of Lushtalim-ilu, $12: 34$.
${ }^{d} E n-k i-a \imath-n i r-g a l$
f. of Sin-shamuh and Ibgatum, 27:30|62:17.
${ }^{d_{\text {En-lil-be-el-i-li }}}$
$18: 2,17$.
${ }^{d_{E n}}$-lil-gal-zu
6. s. of Damiq-ilishu, $30: 8 \mid 38: 2$.
7. f. of Beltani, $45: 9$.
8. gala, $15: 12$.
9. $29: 15$.
${ }^{d}$ En-lil-ha-zi-ir
s. of Dingir-sukkal, 62 : 14.
${ }^{d} E n-l i l-i d-z u,{ }^{d} E n-l i l-i z-z u\left(={ }^{*}\right)$
nu-ésh ${ }^{d}$ En-lil-la, s. of Lugal-azida, h. of Ama-sukkal $32: 1,5,7,13, \mathrm{~S} .\left|{ }^{*} 47: 6\right| * 58: 5,8,9 \mid * 66:$ 16.
${ }^{d}$ En-lil-ilum (or dingir)
${ }^{*}$ ) s. of Anni-babUL, $6: 21 \mid 16: 11$.
${ }^{d}$ En-lil-lá-ne-gù
dub-sar lugal, s. of $I($ nim $)-N i n I B, 32: 25|33: 15|$ $34: 16$.
${ }^{a^{2}}$ En-lil-li-wi-ir
s. of Enlil-mansi, 12:15.
${ }^{d}$ En-lil-mu-lik
10. s. of Şilli-NinIB, $40: 23$.
11. s. of Ziatum, 65:6.
12. $55: 12$.
${ }^{d}$ En-lil-ma-an-si
13. shutug ${ }^{d}$ [Nin-lil-la], s. of $L u-N i n I B, 41: 17$; probably identical with the shutug ${ }^{d}$ Nin-lil-la, $59: 14$.
*2. s. of Ur-Duazagga, $6: 8$.
14. f. of Enlil-liwir, $12: 15$.
15. f. of Lamazum, $45: 5,11 \mid 46: 3, \mathrm{~S}$.
16. f. of Sin-ishmeani, $43: 17,21, \mathrm{~S}$.
17. $l u-S H I M+G A R, 10: 44$.
${ }^{d}$ En-lil-me-DU $U^{1}$
**1. f. of Inbulum, $9: 14$.
18. f. of Lu-Nannar, $40: 21$ | $41: 9$.
${ }^{d}$ En-lil-mu-ba-lì-il
dub-sar, $58: 23 \mid 64: 25$.
${ }^{d}$ En-lil-mu-da-mi-iq

$$
\text { s. of Rim-Ishtar, b. of } \ldots \ldots, 47: 17 \mid 58: 18 .
$$

${ }^{d}$ En-lil-lìu-shag

1. s. of Ninni-mansi, b. of Nannar-ara-mungin, Ur-

Duazagga and Ur-DUN.PAea, u. of Elali, 26, III : 6, $22 \mid$ IV : 9 , S.
2. nu-ésh, s. of Sin-idinnam, $39: 5,10,15 \mid 44: 17$.
${ }^{d^{E n}-l i l-l i u-i} i$
f. of Watar-Shamash, $57: 26$.
$d_{\text {Etn-lil-na-da }}$

1. s. of Naram-[......], $22: 11$, L.E.
2. lù-ISH, $24: 31$.
3. $45: 3$.
${ }^{d}$ Ein-lil-na-shi
$65: 11$.
${ }^{d}$ En-lil-ni-shu
*1. s. of Ziatum, 6:5.
4. f. of Sin-eribam, 12:5.
${ }^{d}$ En-lil-ta-a-a-ar
$l u ̀ S H I M+G A R^{d} E n-l i l, 58: 15$.
${ }^{d_{\text {En-lil-za-me-en }}\left(\text { thou art Enlil) }^{2}\right.}$
$25: 10$.
${ }^{d}$ En-lil [.......]
51: 11.
${ }^{d}$ En-lil [......]
$39: 2$.
$a_{\text {Lin-nu-gi-na-ap-li-za-am (look lavorablly at me, } 0}$ Ennugi)
s. of Dingir-mansi, $68: 22$.
${ }^{d}{ }_{E n-n u-g i-i-n a-a-a,}{ }^{d} E n-n u[-g i-] i-n a-a(=)^{3}$
rabis daiani, *47:21|53:36|54:37 (omits ${ }^{d}$ ).
${ }^{d}$ En-nu-gi-zi-urŭ-kalam-ma (Ennugi is the preserver of the life of the land)
$d u b$-sar, $48: 44$.
E-ri-ib-sin-lu-mur?
63: 12.
E-ri-(ish-)su-ma-tum, E-ri-(ish-)zu-ma-tum, E-ri-su-um-matum, $E$-ri-sum-ma-tum
5. f. of Abil-Martu, Martu-malik, Libit-Enlil (and Abil-Shamash?), g.-f.? of Iibit-Martu, $32: 19$, S. $|33: 4,19, \mathrm{~S}$.$| Case 6|34: 4,6, \mathrm{~S}| 35: 7,12$.
6. f. of Sin-napsheram, $62: 13$.

É-shu-me-DU-lu-mur

1. shutug, s. of Ea-idinnam, $67: 22$.
2. $21: 10$.

E-te-el-b̂t- ${ }^{(d)} \operatorname{Sin}, E$-te-b $\hat{\imath}-\operatorname{Sin}(=*)^{4}$
s. of Ea-idinnam, $48: 35|56: 22| * 57: 35$.

E-til-b $\hat{-}{ }^{d}$ Shamash
f. of TTab-balatu, $53: 1$.

Gra-mi-lum
s. of KAL-KAL-bani, 52:20|53:31|54:31.

Gimil(or Qât) ${ }^{d}$ En-lil
$d u b-s a r, 33: 20 \mid 34: 21$.
Gimil(or Q $\hat{a} t)-\grave{-}-l i-s h u$
s. of Gir-ni-ni-shag, $48: 41$.
${ }^{1}$ The Sumerian character of names compounded with me-DU is proved by ${ }^{d}$ Nannar-me-DU.
${ }^{2}$ Cf, also Nannar-zal-men, Ranke, P. N., p. $246 b$.
${ }^{3}$ Cf. Ilum-i-na-ia and ${ }^{d}$ Shamash-i-na-ia, Ranke, P. N., $a-a=a^{i i} a$. For the change of $a^{i i} a$ with $a$ sce p. 3 , note 1 .
" Verschleifung" of the 1; cf. E-te-bu-um, $81: 17$, instead of Etelbum.
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Gir-ni-ni-shág (his way is bright) ${ }^{1}$
f. of Gimil-ilishu, 48:41.

Gir(?)-ni-ni-za
s. of $L u$-shag, $21: 9$.

Ha-ba-na-tum
f. of Damu- ......, $16: 5$.

Ha-bil-a-bi
adopted s. of Tab-balatu and Beltia, $57: 3,14,17$.
Ha-bil-ki-nu-um
22: 14.
${ }^{d} H a-a m-m u-r a-b i$
king, $10: 4$ (with the determinative for gods) and in the dates of 1-3, 5-10.
$H a-a b-s i$
**f. of Shumum-libshi, 8:32.
$\dagger$ Hi-du-tum
w. of Damu-idinnam, m. of Mutum-ilum, 42:5.

Hu-pa-tum

1. s. of .....-ganum (?), h. of Rubatum, f. of Awir-
tum, $4: 2,10, \mathrm{~S}$.
2. f. of Sin-erish, $10: 42$.

1-ba-lu-ut I-ba-al-lu-ut ( $=$ *)

$$
\text { s. of } U d \text {-ullu, } 52: 19|* 53: 30| * 54: 30
$$

$I-b a-s h a r-r u-u m$ (abbreviated) ${ }^{2}$
f. of Imgur-NinIB, s. of Lugatum, $12: 9, \mathrm{~S}$.

Ib-ga-tum

1. s. of Azag-Ningal, b, of Nidnusha, 26, IV : 20.
2. s. of Enki-a-nirgal, b. of Sin-shamuh, $23: 31$.
3. s. of Liburrum, $10: 38$.
4. s. of Ududu, b. of Ishkur-girra, u. of Ishkurrabi, c. of Mar-irṣitim and Mutum-ilum, $10: 29$, $34 \mid 14: 27$, L. $\mathrm{E} \mid 30: 17$.
5. s. of Ur-Duazagga, 29:4,6.
6. s. of Warad-Sin, $13: 2$.
7. f. of Dingir-sukkal, $28: 30$.
8. $25: 4$.

I-bi-d En-lil

1. s. of Awilia, b. of Ilushu-ibnishu and Ilima-abi, . $48: 4,7,17,21,23$.
2. $l \grave{u}-S H I M+G A R{ }^{d} E n-l i l-l a$, s. of Nannartum, 48: 45.
**3. s. of Nannar-zimu and Dushubtum, b. of Amertum, $8: 13,21$.
3. s. of Sin-lidish, $32: 26|33: 17| 34: 17$.
4. s. of Sin-magir, $28: 33$.
5. lù-SHMM + GAR ${ }^{a} E n$-lil-lá (identical with 2 ?).

I-bi- ${ }^{d} \operatorname{Nin} I B$ (or shah?)
s. of Nur-Ninshah, 14:6.

I-bi-d $N i n-s h a h$
*1. $l \grave{u}-S H I M+G A R^{d} E n-l i l-l a ́, ~ s . ~ o f ~ N a b i-E n l i l, ~ 7: ~ 19 . ~$
2. s. of Sin-liram, $48: 34$.

Ib-ku-u-a-tum (abbreviated)
23: 13.
Ib-ku- ${ }^{d} D a-m u$

1. dub-sar, s. of Imgur-Sin, $47: 5$.
*2. s. of $I($ nim $)$-Damu, $7: 23$.
*3. f. of $A g \hat{u} a, 6: 4$.
2. $23: 10$.
$I b-k u-E-a$
3. s. of An-azag-sha, $28: 11,12$.
4. s. of Sharuh-ili, $68: 20$.

Ib-ku- ${ }^{d} E n-l i l$

$$
n u-e ́ s h, 43: 30
$$

Ib-ku-ir-si-tim
s. of Sin-lidish, $15: 3$

Ib-ku- ${ }^{\text {d }}$ Ishkur
$49: 2$.
Ib-ku-Ishtar

- 1. s. of Lugal-azida, $68: 25$.

2. s. of Taribum, $12: 26$.
3. f. of Ea-idinnam, $24: 3, \mathrm{~S}$.
$I b-k u-s h a$
4. s. of An-azag-sha, f. of Ea-turam and (by adoption) of EA-taiar, $28: 1,5,7,11,24$.
5. s. of Sin-magir, $35: 17$.
6. f. of Ea-idinnam (identical with Iblu-Ishtar, No. 3 ?), $28: 32$.
Ib-ni-E-a
s. of $[\ldots \ldots], 38: 21$.

Ib-ni- ${ }^{d}$ En-lil
dub-sar, $43: 34|44: 28| 61: 10 \mid 68: 27$.
$I b-n i-{ }^{d} I s h k u r$
*s. of Idin-Ishkur, 4:33.
$I(n i m){ }^{d} D a-m u$
*f. of Ibku-Damu, $7: 23$.
${ }^{1}$ The same name occurs Reisner, Telloh, 139, II : 14, and in the name of a small town Al-Gir-ni-ni-shagki in the domain of Sin-idinnam, the governor of Larsam, L.I.H., 42:19. See also Nammani-nishag, 10:46; E-turra-nishag, Rsn., Tel., 164, IV, 2 from below; ${ }^{d} P a$ - ${ }^{\text {gish }}$ BIL-sag-ka-ni-shag, Rsn., Tel., 125, I : 15, 16.
${ }^{2}$ Cf. Ili-ipashar.

I-da-tum

1. s. of NinIB-nishu, $68: 7,9,16$.
2. f. of Nabi-Enlil, $47: 20$.

I-din- ${ }^{d}$ En-lil

1. nu-ésh, s. of Sin-er(i)bam, $10: 40|39: 20| 49: 43$
2. f. of Ur-Kusuga, $49: 44$.
$3 l u ̀-S H I M+G A R, 57: 24$.
I-din- ${ }^{d}$ Ishkur
3. shutug ${ }^{d}$ Nin-lil-la, s. of Ishkur-girra, $40: 20$.
*2. f. of Ibni-Ishkur, 4:33.

## I-din-Ishtar

1. s. of Ellitum, $13: 11$.
2. s. of Lugal-EZEN, $49: 23$.
3. s. of Mannummeshuliṣur and Narubtum, $64: 8,16$.
4. s. of Nabi-Shamash; $51: 1$.
5. s. of Sin-magir, $32: 28$.
6. dub-sar, $35: 25$.
7. $27: 3$.

I-din- ${ }^{d} I$-shum
*bur-gul, $6: 24$.
$[I]-d i n^{d} \operatorname{Sin}$

$$
\text { s. of } \ldots \ldots . . \text { tum, } 16: 14
$$

I-di-shum
bur-gul, $39: 24 \mid 64: 14$.
Igi-shag
nu-ésh, s. of Ina-Ekur-rabi, $43: 6,7,14$, S. $44: 4$.
Igi- ${ }^{d}$ Nannar-shú-al-gub (before Nannar he (or I) went)
21:4.
I-li-a-wi-li

1. f. of Sag-nin-bi-zu, $49: 20,39$.
2. $9: 28$.

Ì-li-e-ri-ba-am

1. bur-gul, $36: 22 \mid 45: 24$.
2. pashishu, $62: 20$.
3. h. of Shat-Shamash, $46: 5$, S.

I-li-i-ba-shar (my god will loosen)
I-l $l i-i b-n i-a-n i$
s. of Dagan-mansi, $39: 21$.

I-li-i-din-nam

1. adopted s. of Ea-idinnam and Kuritum, b. of Iliummati, 24 : 1, 12, 23.
2. s. of Șilli-Shamash, b. of Ellumûshu and AbilMartu, $36: 9$.
İ-li-i-ki-sham s. of $I l i . \ldots \ldots, 68: 23$.

I-li-ip-pa-al-za
s. of NinIB-........, $41: 20$.

Ì-li-ip-pa-al-za-am
s. of Sherum-ili, $62: 24$.

İ-li-ish-me-a-ni, -ish-me-a-an-ni $\left(={ }^{*}\right)^{1}$

1. f. of Ili-ibashar, $33: 18$.
2. $330: 10$.

İ-li-ma

1. s. of Sin-idinnam, $49: 46$.
2. s. of Arad-Nannar, $23: 29$.
3. ? lù-bara ${ }^{d}$ Babbar, $37: 18$.

İ-li-ma-a-bi
s. of Awilia, b. of Ibi-Enlil and Ilushu-ibnishu, 48 : $5,8,18,22,24$.
i-li-ma-ilum

1. King, $68: 29$.
2. $P A-P A, 62: 2,8$.

İ-lí-ma-lu-lim ${ }^{2}$
bur-gul, $31: 21$.
İ-li-ma?-ma?-lik
f. of Ili-ikisham, $68: 23$.

Ì-li-na-ap-li-za-am
s. of Damiq-ilishu, $37: 21$.

7-li-tu-ra-am

1. s. of Shagia, $12: 31$.
2. kui-dim, b. of Abil-Martu, s. of Silli-Shamash, $36: 19$.
$\bar{l}-l i-u m-m a-t i$
adopted s. of Ea-idinnam and Kuritum, b. of Iliidinnam, $24: 2,13,24$.
Ì-li-u- ${ }^{d}$ Shamash
**1. s. of Imgur-Sin, $8: 30$.
3. dub-sar, $24: 37 \mid 32: 31$.
4. $27: 10$ (identical with the preceding?)

Ilu-bî-d Shamash
s. of Lugal-azida, $50: 17$.

Ilu-na-shi
f. of Ellitum, $30: 4$.
r-lu-ni
*1. s. of Dingir-mansi, $6: 23$.
2. f. of Dingir-mansi, $40: 22$.
3. $48: 3$.
$I-l u$-[ni?]
f. of Ur-Sadaranun, 59:17.

Ilu-sukkal (see Dingir-sukkal)
${ }^{1}$ Notice the use of $a$ to denote the hiatus,
${ }^{2}$ Cf. Ilum-lu-lim, Ranke, P. N.

Ilu-shu-ba-ni
s. of Uttagallu-meDU, $39: 4,11,16$.

Ilu-shu-ib-ni-shu

1. s. of Awilia, b. of Ibi-Enlil and Ilima-abi, $48: 4$, $7,12,22,23$.
2. f. of Ninni-mansi, $67: 20$.

Im-gu-u-a

1. f. of Nabi-Shamash, $11: 6,11, \mathrm{~S} . \mid 23: 25$.
**2. f. of Sin-lidish, $9: 17$.

## Im-gur- ${ }^{\text {dinIB }}$ IB

1. s. of Ibasharrum, $12: 9,13,20, \mathrm{~S}$.
2. s. of $I \mu-N i n I B, 6: 19$.

Im-gur- ${ }^{d} \operatorname{Sin}$
f. of $1 b k u-$ Damu, $47: \mathrm{S}$.

Im-gu-ru-um, Im-gur-rum ( = *)

1. f. of Mannu-mahirshu, $10: 43$.
2. f. of NinIB-mushtal, *60, case 23 .
3. 4. of Sin-rhum and Sin-cribam, $48: 38$.

Im-gu[. . . . . . . . . .]
26, III : 32.
IM-URUDU?- $a$
*s. of Dada-kalla, $5: 25$.
I-na-é-kur-ra-bi
29:13.
$\mathcal{I}($ nim $){ }^{d}$ Nannar

1. s. of Adda-dugga, br. of Shesh-ki, $44: 25$.
2. f. of Sin-lidish, h. of Shalurtum, $5: 1, \mathrm{~S} . ; \mathrm{h}$. of Shalurtum, $4: 4$, S.
In-bu-lum
**s. of Enlil-meDU, $9: 13$.
$\bar{I}(n i m){ }^{d} N i n I B$
3. f. of Enlilla-negu, $32: 25|33: 16| 34: 16$.
4. UM?-MI, $50: 13$.
${ }^{d}$ Ishkur ${ }^{\mathrm{B}}$-RUSH-ra
5. s. of Ududu, b. of Ibgatum, n. of Ishkur-rabi, c. of Mar-irsitim and Mutum-ilum, $10: 28,34$.
6. 7. of Idin-Ishkur, $40: 20$.
${ }^{d_{I s h}}$ 保-ra-bi
f. of Mar-irșitim and Mutum-ilum, b. of Ududu, $10: 3,9,32$.
${ }^{d}$ Ishkur-ri-im-i-li
male slave of Narubtum, 23:7, 15.
${ }^{d}$ Ishkur-shar-ru-um
uku-ush lugal, s. of Ishum-abi, 10:11.
${ }^{d}$ Ishkur-ta-a-a-ar dub-sar, $18: 22$.
$\dagger$ Ishtar-la-ma-zi
1. w. of $A d d a-d u g g a$ nu-ésh, $40: 26$.
2. w. of Lugal-azido nu-ésh, $40: 27$.
$\dagger$ Ishtar-na-ab-ra-ri female slave, 26 , III : 15 .
$\dagger$ Ishtar-ra-bi-a-at
**slave of Dushubtum, $8: 4,9,17$.
${ }^{d} I-s h u m-a-b i$ f. of Ishkur-sharrum, $10: 12$.

Iz-kur- ${ }^{d}$ Shamash s. of Elali shutug, 67: 19.
${ }^{d} \mathbf{K} A L-K A L-b c-n i^{2}$ f. of Gamilum, $52: 20|53: 31| 54: 31$.
K.A-shág- ${ }^{d}$ En-lil-lá $50: 4$.
$K e s h(?)^{k i-i-d i n-n a m^{3}}$ dub-sar, $62: 26$.
$\operatorname{Kir} u(=g i s h-s a r)-g a-m i l$ s. of Warazunu, b. of Sin-ishmeani, Kumbulum and Nurum-lisi, $14: 30$.
$K i-i s h-t i-{ }^{d} N i n I B$
s. of Tab-balatu, $65: 3$.

Ku-bu-tum lù-SIIIM $+G A R^{d}$ En-lil-láa, s. of Sin-eriba $(m), 52:$ $11,16|53: 23,28| 54: 24,28 \mid 67: 15$.
Ku-um-bu-lum
s. of Warazunu, b. of Sin-ishmeani, Nurum-lisi and

Kirâ-gamil, $14: 28$.
$\dagger K u$-ri-tum
w. of Ea-idinnam, adoptive m. of Ili-idinnam and Ili-ummati, $24: 4,15,22$, S.

Lah- ${ }^{d}$ Nannar-zal-shar (ef. the following name) dub-sar, $15: 14$.
Lah- ${ }^{d}$ Nannar-zal-zal-shar (the light of Nannar enlightens the universe) ${ }^{4}$
s. of Ellitum, $10: 25$.
${ }^{1}$ For this reading see Hrozny in Z.A., XX, pp. 424ff.; but cf. C.T., XXIV, $32: 149 b, D I N G I R-m u-u r-I M$, and Thureau-Dangin in S.A.K.I., p. 208, note $\mathrm{c}\left({ }^{d} I M={ }^{d}\right.$ Immer because of the name Immerum. The last would point to a reading ${ }^{d} I m i$-, ${ }^{d} I m i-r a$ (cf. Sc. $288, I M=i-m i$ ),
${ }^{2}$ Cf. ${ }^{d} K A L-K A L-m u-b a-l \grave{\imath}-i t$, Ranke, $P . N$.
${ }^{3}$ The name occurs also in L.I.H., Vol. I, $17: 9$ (King: SHI-HAL-IIAR ${ }^{k i}$ )
${ }^{4}$ Lut ef. Us-set-NI-NI-D UG, Reisner, Tclloh.
$\dagger[1 / a]-m a-z a-t u m$
1．（w．or d．of）$L u-B a u, 31: 20$ ．
＊2．d．of Lu－Enlilla， $6: 27$.
$\dagger$ La－ma－zum
1．$S A L+I S H I B^{d}$ Nin $1 B$ ，d．of Dumkuaia， $45: 23$.
2．$S A L+I S H I B^{d} N i n I B$ ，d．of Enlil－mansi， $46: 2$ ，S． Li－bi－it－${ }^{d} E n-l i l$
s．of Erissumatum，b．of Abil－Martu，ete．，32：10， 12 ，S．$|33: 19| 34: 3,5,11, \mathrm{~S}$.

## Li－bi－it－Ishtar

1．s．of Sha－Emah， $37: 20$.
2．s．of Shuma－ilu， $30: 9$ ．
3．dub－sar， $35: 20$.
4．$M U, 58: 21$.
Li－bi－it ${ }^{d} M a r-t u$
s．of Abil－Shamash，gs．（？）of Erishsumatum， $32: 13$ ， S． $\mid 35: 3,5,13, \mathrm{~S}$ ．
Li－but－ru－am
f．of Ibgatum， $10: 38$.
$L \grave{u}^{d} A m a-a-r a-z u$
1．s．of $A d d d a-d u g g a ~ n u-e ́ s h, 22: 6$ ．
2．f．of Dingir－mansi， $40: 24$.
$L \dot{u}^{d} B a-u$
h．or f．of Lamazatum， $31: 21$.
$L \grave{u}^{d} E n-k i-g a$
s．of Nannar－a－dah， $49: 21$.
Lì ${ }^{d}$ En－lil－Lá
1．$S H I+D U B$ ，s．of $E-l u t i, 38: 20|41: 19| 64: 21$.
2．f．of Sin－imguranni， $48: 37$ ．
＊3．f．of Lamazatum， $6: 27$.
4． $47: 9$ ．
5． $52: 6|53: 15| 54: 16$ ．
＊6．（？） $1: 4$.
$L \grave{u}-\hat{E}-\mathrm{sh} u-m e-D U$（cf．L⿳亠口u－shu－me－DU）
s．of Shamash－Enlil， $37: 8,13, \mathrm{~S}$ ．
Lugal－a－ma－ru
1．shutug ${ }^{d}$ Nin－lil－la， $59: 15$.
2． $32: 2$ ．
Lugal－$\alpha-z i-d a$
1．s．of Awiatum， $12: 33$ ．
2．f．of Enlil－idzu nu－ésh den－lil－lá， $40: 1$ ，probably identical with Lugal－á－zi－da nu－ésh，h．of Ishtar－ lamazi， $40: 27$.
3．f．of Ibku－Ishtar， $68: 25$.
4．f．of Ilu－b $\hat{-}^{-d}$ Shamash， $50: 17$ ．
5．f．of $L u-N i n I B, 23: 26$.
6．f．of NinIB－nirgal and Rim－Ishtar．

## Lugal－dumugu

$50: 5$.

## Lugal－EZEN

1．s．of Nannar－adah， $23: 28$ ，perhaps identical with
2．f．of Idin－Ishtar， $50: 23$ ．

## Lugal－begal

1．s．of Ea－idinnam，b．of NinIB－emugaia， $38: 4$ ， $7,15, \mathrm{~S}$.
2．f．of Damiq－ilishu， $48: 40$ ．
Lugal－mu－pá $(d)-d a$
dub－sar， $57: 48$.
Lugal－nig－si？（－sá）？

$$
\text { s. of } \ldots \ldots \ldots, 59: 6
$$

Lù－ga－tum
h．of Manutum，f．of NinIB－abi and NinIB－ga－ mil， $12: 10, \mathrm{~S}$.

Lu－ul－li－tum
$60: 5$.
Lù－${ }^{d}$ Nannar
1．shuluy ${ }^{d}$ Nin－lil－la，s．of Enlil－meDU， $40: 21$ । $41: 8|47: 10| 59: 16$.
2．s．of Nammani－nishag， $10: 46$ ．
3．dub－sar， $29: 14$.
＊4．f．of Ali－waqrum， $7: 21$.
$L u^{d}{ }^{d} N$ in－IB
1．s．of Ablum， $31: 20$.
2．s．of Azag－Nannar， $13: 5$ ．
3．s．of Lugal－azida，23：26．
＊4．f．of Beltani，6：28．
5．f．of Enlil－mansi shutug Ninlilla，41：18．
＊6．f．of Imgur－NinIB，6：20．
＊＊7．f．of Nannartum， $8: 25$.
$L \stackrel{u}{-}{ }^{d} N i n-s i-a n-n a$
$51: 4$.
Lù－shag
f．of Gir？－ni－ni－za， $21: 9$.
$L u ̀-s h a g-g a$
＊＊f．of Damiq－ilishu， $8: 27$.
$L \grave{u}-s h u-m e-D U$（cf．Lù－E－shu－me－DU）
＊s．of Sin－wa？－du？，5：24．
$L \grave{u}^{-d}[\ldots \ldots .$.
dumu－mésh－，18：9．
Lu－ush－ta－lim（－im）－ilum（or－shi－im－？）（cf．Lushalim－beli， P．N．）
s．of Enki－mashzu，12：34．
Lu－ush－ta－mar
1．s．of Taribum， $52: 23 \mid 67: 18$.
2．nagar， $31: 3$ ．
3． $52: 1,7|53: 7,9,17| 54: 7,10,18$.

Ma-an-na-tum, Ma-na-tum ( $=$ *) (abbreviated)

1. f. of NinIB-mushtal, $*_{52}: 21|53: 32| * 54: 32$.
2. $d u b-s a r=$ Mannum-mahirshu dubsar.
$M a-n i-i a, M a-a n-n i-i a$ (case)

$$
\text { s. of Ubaia, } 12: 32 .
$$

Ma-an-nu-um-ma-hir-shu, Ma-an-nu-ma-hir-shu ( $=$ *)

1. s. of Imgurum, *10:43.
2. dub-sar, $36: 23$; case Ma-an-na-tum.

Ma-an-nu-um-me-shu-li-şur

1. s. of Awilia, f. of Idin-Ishtar, h. of Narubtum, b. of NinIB-muballit, $38: 9 \mid 64: 5$.
2. s. of NinIB-qarrad, $14: 23$.

## Ma-a-nu

18: 15.
Ma-nu-um-(ma-)bir-shu
*s. of $A b a, 5: 28$.
$\dagger$ Ma-nu-tum
w. of Lugatum, m. of NinIB-abi and NinIB-gamil, $12: 12,14,21, \mathrm{~S}$.
Ma-ri-ir-si-tim, Ma-ri-ir-zi-tim $(=*)$, Mâr-irṣitim $(=* *)$, Mâr-ir-sit-tim (=***)

1. s. of Abum-waqar, **30:5.
2. s. of Amar-Shuba, **53:29|*54:29.
3. s. of $A N . B A-l u-t i, * * 22: 13$.
4. s. of $B \vec{A}-$ sha- ${ }^{d}[\ldots .],. * * * 62: \mathrm{S}$.
5. s. of Ishkur-rabi, b. of Mutum-ilum, n. of Ududu, c. of Ishkur-girra and Ibgatum, $10: 1,31$;identical with Mar-irṣitim, s. of $\operatorname{Dama}(?)-g u g u, 14: 4,6$, $\left.17\right|^{* * 30: 15 .}$
6. f. of Sin-ahum, ${ }^{* * * 64: 23 .}$
${ }^{d_{M a r-t u}{ }^{1}-m a-l i k}$
s. of Erishsumatum, b. of Abil-Martu, Libit-Enlil (and Abil-Shamash?); u. of Libit-Martu, 32:18, $\mathrm{S} .|33: 3,5,11, \mathrm{~S}| 35:. 2,18$.

## Ma-ru-ut-Ishtar

s. of Sin-lidish, 48:42.

Mi-gir-d En-lil
f. of Narubtum, s. of Naramtum, $23: 8,19,20$.

Mu-mu-he-gub (my name he may establish; cf. Shamash-shum-ukîn)
gala, 26, IV : 19.
Mu-mu-ni-pad (my name has been called)
$n u$-ésh, $43: 28 \mid 44: 18$.

Mu-na-wi-rum
s. of Damqum, $13: 13$.

Mu-tum-ilum

1. s. of Dumu-idinnam and II Idutum, 41:5.
2. s. of Ishtwur-rabi, b. of Mar-irsitim, n. of Ududu,
c. of Ishkur-girra and Ibgatum, $10: 1,31 \upharpoonleft 30: 16$.
$\mathbf{N} a-b i-i a$
*f. of Elali, $7: 22$.
$N a-b i-{ }^{d} E n-l i l$
3. s. of Idatum, $47: 20 \mid 58: 19$.
**2. f. of Ea-nasir, $8: 28$.
*3. f. of Ibi-Ninshah, $7: 20$.
4. f. of Sin-eribam, $24: 33$.

Na-bi- ${ }^{d}$ Shamash

1. s. of Imgûa, 11:6, 11, 17, S. $\mid 23: 25$.
*2. s. of Ur-E゙nnugi, b. of Ahushunu and Ziatum, $7: 8$.
2. f. of Idin-Ishtar, $51: 2,3$.
3. $17: 3 \backslash 21: 3,4 \mid 25: 3 \backslash 27: 4$; probably identical with No. 3; cf. Idin-Ishtar, $27: 3$.
$N a-{ }^{d} E n-l i l$
4. s. of NinIB-mushallim, $68: 22$.
5. $27: 9$.

Nam-ma-ni-ni-shag (his fate is bright) ${ }^{2}$ f. of Lu-Nannar, $10: 46$.

Nam-ra-am-sha-ru-ur
f. of Subuntum, $45: 7$.

Nam-rum-ì-li ${ }^{3}$
f. of Nur-Shamash, $62: 22$.
${ }^{d}$ Nannar- $\mathfrak{d}-d a h$ (Nannar is a helper)

1. f. of Lugal-EZEN
2. f. of Lu-Enkiga, 49 : 21.
${ }^{d}$ Nannar-a-rá-mu-un-gi-en (seal seems to omit-en; Nannar made the way steady)
s. of Ninni-mansi, b. of Enlil-lu-shag, Ur-Duazagga and Ur-DUN.PAea, 26, II : $20 \mid$ III : 4, 11, 27. Seal.
${ }^{d}$ Nannar-ibila-ma-an-sì (Nannar has given me an heir) nu-е́sh, $43: 26$.
${ }^{d}$ Nannar-ma-an-s̀̀
*1. s. of Belum, $6: 22$.
3. s. of Dingir-mansi, $30: 6$.
4. f. of Shumum-libshi, $49: 7$, S.
5. shutug, $44: 22$.
${ }^{1}$ MAR-TU, perhaps mar-uru , although the form of $T U$ does not seem to allow a reading ur $\bar{u}$; but ci. $a-m a-r u$ $m a r-u r \bar{u}(\hat{e}-m a r-u r \bar{u}, a-m a ́-u r \bar{u})=a b \hat{u} b u$, kur-mar-TU $=$ A $\quad$ мurru.
${ }^{2} \mathrm{Cf}$. Girni-nishag.
${ }^{3}$ To the ending um compare Zanqum-Warad-Sin (a lord is Warad-Sin!), P. N.
${ }^{d}$ Nannar-me-DU
*s. of Pahahum, 5:21.
${ }^{d}$ Nannar-lù- $i \grave{ }$
6. f. of Sin-abushu, 42 : 2.
*2. f. of ........, $4: 29$.
${ }^{d}$ Nannar-sha(g)-lá-sú (Nannar is merciful) $50: 13$.
${ }^{d}$ Nannar-tum
7. f. of Ibi-Enlil lù-SHIM $+G A R^{d \text { Enlilla, } 49: 45 .}$
**2. s. of $L u-N i n I B, 8: 24$.
8. f. of Nidin-Ishtar, $28: 30$.
9. f. of NinIB-mushallim, $49: 9$.
10. $n u$-ésh, $42: 10$.
11. b. (?) of Abushunie and Dingir-mansi.
${ }^{d}$ Nannar-zi
$n u$-ésh, s. of $A b b a, 10: 37$.
${ }^{d}$ Nannar-zi-mu
12. f. of Ahisha[g]ish, $11: 26$.
**2. f. of Ibi-Enlil and Amertum, h. of Dushubtum, 8: 15, 21.
13. f. of Idiniatum, $11: 24$.
14. f. of Sin-idinnam, 10:39.
$N a-r a-a m-{ }^{d} \operatorname{Sin}, \quad-\operatorname{Sin}(=*)$
15. f. of Atta, $40: 19 ;$ perhaps also $47: 15$.
16. f. of Beltani, *13:4.
17. f. of Damiq-ilishu, $22: 5$.
18. Na-ra-am- ${ }^{d}[$ ], f. of Enlil-nada, $22: 11$, I.E.
$\dagger$ Na-ra-am-tum
19. m. of Migir-Enlil, gm. of Narubtum, $23: 19$.
20. d. of Sinatum, w. of Awilia, by adoption m . of Ibi-Enlil, Ilushu-ibnishu and Ili-abi, 57:2, 5, 13, $15,18,21,25,30$.
$\dagger N a-r u-u b-t u m, N a-r u-b i(?$ or $u b)$-tum $(=*)$
21. d. of Migir-Enlil, gd. of Naramtum, $23: 8,20$.
22. $S A L+I S H I B{ }^{d}{ }^{d}$ in-IB, $31: 16$.
23. w. of Damiq-ilishu, $11: 5,13,19, * \mathrm{~S}$.
24. w. of Mannummeshuliṣur, m. of Idin-Ishtar, $64: 9$, 16.
${ }^{d} N \hat{e ́-u n u-g a l-m a-a n-s i ̀ ~}$ bur-gul, $3: 26 \backslash 26$, IV : 24.
Ni-din-Ishtar
s. of Nannartum, $28: 30$.

Ni-id-nu-u[m]
$d u b-s a r, 16: 15$.
Ni-id-nu-sha
s. of Azag-Ningal, b. of Ibgatum, 26, IV : 21.

## Ni-mi-ia

s. of Abishagish, $12: 29$.
${ }^{d}$ Nin-IB- $a-b i$

1. s. of Lugutum and Manutum, b, of NinIB-gamil, $12: 10,13,20, \mathrm{~S}$.
2. ukush, $14: 31$.
${ }^{d}$ Nin-IB-ga-mil
3. s. of Lugatum and Manutum, b. of NinIB-abi, $12: 10,14,21, \mathrm{~S}$.
4. s. of Sin-bel-ili, $12: 28$.
**3. s. of Silli-Ishtar, $8: 24$.
5. s. of Tab-balatu and Beltia, b. of the adopted Habil-ahi, 57:5, 10.
6. s. of Ur-Duazagga, $30: 11$.
7. f. of Abil-ilishuc, $22: \mathrm{S}$.
8. f. of Babbar-andul, 68: 6 .
9. dub-sar, 37: 21.
10. $25: 12$.
${ }^{d}$ Nin-IB-e-mu-ga-a-a
s. of Ea-idinnam, b. of Lugal-begal, $38: 5,8, \mathrm{~S}$.
$\dagger^{d}$ Nin-IB-la-ma-zi slave, 26, II : 14.
$d_{\text {Nin-IB-ma-an-si }}$
11. s. of Damiq-ilishu, 16:3.
12. f. of Ama-sukkal, f.-in-law of Enlil-idzu, $47: 5$.
13. f. of NinIB-ra'im-sirim, $40: 28\} 52: 25 \mid 64: 3$, $11|67: 9| 68: 10$.
14. PA-é, $24: 34$.
15. h. of Ummi-wagarat, $63: 4$ and probably $63: 10$.
${ }^{d}$ Nin-IB-me-IUU
16. f. of Ellitum, $49: 22$.
17. f. of Shumum-libshi nu-ésh, 50: 15.
${ }^{d}$ Nin-IB-mu-ba-li-it
18. s. of Awilia, b. of Mannummeshulisur and Idin. Ishtar, 64 : 7, 15.
19. s. of Dumqi-Ishtar, $40: 19$.
${ }^{d_{N i n}-I B-m u-s h a-l i m}$
20. nu-ésh, s. of Nannartum, $48: 9,14,36,38,40$.
21. f. of $N a$-Enlil, $68: 22$.
22. f. of Nusku-nishu, $41: 3,6,7$.
23. gala-mab, 26, IV : 18| $42: 15$.
24. lù-SHIM $+G A R^{d}$ En-lil-lá
25. shutug ${ }^{d}$ Nin-lil-la, $10: 41$.
${ }^{d}$ Nin-IB-mu-ush-ta-al
26. s. of Imgurrum, 68 case : 22.
27. s. of Mannatum, $52: 21|53: 32| 54: 32$.
28. s. of Ubarrum, $34: 18$.
${ }^{d_{N i n-I B-n i r-g a l}}$
s. of Lugal-azida, b. of Rim-Ishtar, $12: 6,8,10$.
${ }^{d}$ Nin-IB-ni-shu
f. of Idatum, 68:7.
${ }^{d}{ }^{\text {Nin-IB-qar-ra-ad }}$
29. $m u, 10: 26$.
30. f. of Mannummeshulisur, $14: 24$ (probably identical with the preceding).
${ }^{d}$ Nin-IB-ra-hi-im-sit-ri-im, -şi-ri, -zi-ri-im $\left(={ }^{*}\right)$, -ra-i-im$z i-r i-i m\left(=*^{*}\right)^{1}$
31. s. of Nin-IB-mansi, ${ }^{* * 40: 28|52: 25| 64: 2,10 \mid}$ $66: 8 \mid 68: 9$.
32. ${ }^{*} 60: 4 \mid 61: 6$ (probably identical with the preceding).
${ }^{d}$ Nin-IB-ri-im-i-li
$10: 25$.
${ }^{d}$ Nin-IB-[.......]
f. of Ili-ippalza, $3 \mathbf{1}: 20$.
${ }^{d}$ Ninni-ma-an-sì
33. s. of Ilushu-ibnishu, $67: 20$.
34. f. of Enlil-lushag, Nannar-ara-mungen, Ur-Duazagga and Ur-DUN.PAea, 26, IV : 13.
35. $d u b$-sar, $39 b: 23$.
$\dagger N i$-shi-ni-shu
36. $S A L+$ ISHIB $^{d^{N}}{ }^{\text {inII }}$, d. of Abiliatum, $31: 18$.
37. SAL + ISHIB ${ }^{d}$ NinIB, d. of Nur-kabta, 31:4, 6, 12.
$N u-\hat{u}_{-}{ }^{d} A-b a$
dub-sar, $12: 35$.
Nu -ra-tum
38. f. of Sin-eribam, $5: 27$.
39. shutug ${ }^{d}$ Nin-lil-lá, $42: 18$.
$N[u-i \bar{u}]-i-d i, N u-r i-d i(=*)$
f. of Shunuma-ilu, $16: 13 \mid * 25: 35$.
$N u$ - $\hat{u r}_{-}{ }^{d} K a b-t a$
40. f. of Nish-inishu, $31: 5$ (S), probably identical with $N u$ - $\hat{r-}{ }^{d} K a b-t a d u b-s a r, 31: 22$.
41. f. of Sin-ikisham, $45: 20$.
42. $17: 4$.

Nu-ur- ${ }^{d}$ Nin-shah

1. ukush, $58: 22$.
2. f. of Ibi-NinIB (or Ninshah), $15: 6$.

Nu-uir- ${ }^{d}$ Shamash

1. s. of Namrum-ili, 62:22.
2. bur-gul, $28: 35$.

Nu-rum-li-si
s. of Warazunu, b. of Sin-ishmeani, Kumbulum and Kirû-gamil, $14: 29$.
${ }^{d_{N u}}{ }^{\prime} k u-n i-s h u$

1. s. of $A d d a-d u g g a, 28: 31 \mid 40: 25$.
2. s. of NinIB-mushallim, $43: 3,6,7$.
3. $25: 13$.
${ }^{d}$ Nusku-tum
s. of Damqum, $49: 48$.
$\mathbf{P} a-h a-h u-u m$
*f. of Nannar-meDU,5:21.
Qat-d En-lil and all names beginning with $S H U$ (possible reading qat-) see under Gimil-.

Ri-ba-tum
25:5.
Ri-im-Ishtar

1. s. of Lugal-azida, b. of NinIB-nirgal, $44: 12$, s.
2. s. of Enlil-mudammiq and [.....], $47: 16 \mid 58:$
3. 
4. $19: 9$.

Ri-ish-É-a
f. of Ali-ilum, 67:21.
$\dagger R u$-ba-tum
*w. of Hupatum, m, of Awirtum, $4: 3$.
${ }^{d} \mathbf{S}$ $a$-dara-nun-[.........]-zi
slave, $50: 3$.
Sag-nin-bi-zu
s. of Ili-awili, $49: 1 \dot{1}, 20,39$.

Sa-al-lu-u
$43: 5$.
${ }^{(d)}$ ) $S a-a m-s u-i-l u-n a$ (with determinative for gods, $31: 24$ । $32: 33$ ) king, in the dates of $12-52,54-58,60$.
${ }^{d}$ Sin-a-bu-shu
s. of Nannar-luti, $42: 1,8,11$.
${ }^{a} \operatorname{Sin}-a-b a-a m-i-d i n-n a m$ (Sin has given me a brother)
s. of Sin-magir, $62: 21$.
${ }^{d} \operatorname{Sin}-a-b u t-u m, \operatorname{Sin}-\left(={ }^{*}\right)$

1. s. of Imgurvum, b. of Sin-eribam, *4s:38.
2. s. of Mar-irṣitim, 64:23.
${ }^{d}$ Sin-be-el-i-l $l$ f. of NinIB-gamil, 12:28.
${ }^{d} \operatorname{Sin}-e-r i-b a-a m, \operatorname{Sin}\left(={ }^{*}\right)-e-r i-b a\left(={ }^{* *}\right)$
3. s. of Enlil-nishu, 12:5.
4. s. of Imgurrum, b. of Sin-ahum, *48:39.
5. s. of Nabi-Enlil, $24: 33$.
*4. s. of Nuratum, $5: 27$.
6. f. of Ea-muballit, $51: 24|* * 52: 34| * * 53: 35$.
7. f. of Idin-Enlil nu-ésh, $10: 40|39: 20| 49: 43$.
[^63]
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7. f. of $K u b u t u m ~ l u ̀-S H I M+G A R{ }^{d_{E n-l i l-l a, ~}} 52$ : $16|53: 28| 54: 28$.
**8. dub-sar, $8: 33$.
8. lul-gal, $44: 24$ (omits -ba-).
9. nu-ésh, $43: 27 \mid 44: 19$.
${ }^{d}$ Sin-erish
10. s. of Atta, $10: 45$.
11. s. of Hupatum, $10: 42$.
${ }^{d}$ Sin-ba-zi-ir
$\operatorname{dim}, 68: 5$.
${ }^{d}$ Sin-i-din-na-am
12. s. of Nannar-zimu, 10:39.
13. f. of Enlil-lushag nu-ésh, 39:5.
14. f. of Ilima, $49: 46$.
15. f. of STilli-Shamash, 62: 18.
16. nu-ésh, 26 , III : 2 .
17. $18: 16$.
${ }^{d}$ Sin-i-ki-sha-am
s. of Nur-Kabta, $45: 19$.
${ }^{d} \operatorname{Sin}-i m-g u r-r a-a n-n i,{ }^{d} \operatorname{Sin-im-gur-an-ni}(=*), \operatorname{Sin}-\left(={ }^{*}\right)$
18. s. of Abaia, $52:\left.18\right|^{* *} 53: 33 \mid 54: 33$.

19. dub-sar, $11: 28 \mid * 42: 19$.
${ }^{d}$ Sin-ishmeani
20. s. of Ea-nasir, $66: 17$.
21. s. of Enlil-mansi, b. of Ina-Ekur-rabi, u. of Igishag, $43: 17$.
22. s. of Warazunu, b. of Kumbulum, Nurum-liṣi and

Kirû-gamil, $14: 2,8,11$ (omits $a$ ), 16.
${ }^{d}$ Sin-i-tu-ra-am
s. of Dingir-sukkal, b. of Adda-dugga, $59: 3,5$.
${ }^{d}$ Sin-li-di-ish

1. s. of $A z a g-N i n I B, 12: 7$.
*2. s. of Imgûa, 9:16.
*3. s. of $I(n i m)$-Nannar and Shalurtum, $5: 1,8,15$.
2. f. of Ibi-Enlil, $32: 26|33: 17| 34: 17$.
3. f. of Ibku-irsitim, $15: 4$.
4. f. of Marut-Ishtar, $57: 42$.
${ }^{d}$ Sin-li-ra-am
f. of Ibi-Ninshah, $48: 34$.
${ }^{d}$ Sin-ma-gir
5. s. of Arad-Nannar, $64: 22$.
6. f. of Ibi-Enlil, $28: 33$.
7. f. of Ibkusha, $35: 17$.
8. f. of Idin-Ishtar, $32: 28$.
9. f. of Sin-aham-idinnam, $62: 21$.
10. $\left[{ }^{d}\right.$ Sin-ma-g]ir shutug ${ }^{d} N i[n-l i l-l a d], 47: 11$.
11. $18: 3,4$.
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${ }^{d}$ Sin-na-ap-she-ra-am

$$
\text { s. of Erishsumatum, } 62: 13
$$

${ }^{d}$ Sin-na-tum
f. of Naramtum, $48: 2$.
${ }^{d}$ Sin-ni-ia
*f. of Shat-Yshtar, 6:26.
${ }^{d}$ Sin-pi-la-ah
$61: 4,5$.
${ }^{d} \operatorname{Sin}-p i-\ldots .\left(\right.$ see $^{d}{ }^{d}$ Sin-wa-du)
${ }^{d}$ Sin-ri-me[-ni]

$$
\text { f. of }[\ldots \ldots \ldots], 47: 18
$$

${ }^{d} \operatorname{Sin}-s u(?)-k a r(?)-r i$

$$
25: 11
$$

${ }^{d}$ Sin-sha-mu-uh s. of Enki-a-nirgal, b. of Ibgatum, $23: 30 \mid 62: 17$.
${ }^{d}$ Sin-wa-du?(-pi-dim?, -pi-lu[h]?)
*f. of $L u$-ShumeDU, $5: 24$.
${ }^{d} \operatorname{Sin}-[\ldots \ldots]$

$$
\text { s. of Shumum-libshi, 26, IV : } 26 .
$$

Su-hu-un-tum
SAI $A_{-I S H I B}{ }^{d}$ Nin-IB, d. of Namram-sharar, $45: 6$.
Şi-li-Ishtar
**1. f. of NinIB-gamil, $8: 29$.
2. f. of Şilli-NinIB, 12:6.

Si-ll- $^{d_{N i n-I B}}$

1. s. of E-luti, $12: 4$.
2. s. of Şilli-Ishtar, 12:6.
3. f. of Enlil-malik, $40: 23$.
*4. dub-sar, 7:26.
Si-li-d ${ }^{d}$ Shamash
4. s. of Sin-idinnam, $62: 18$.
5. f. of Ellum $\hat{\text { s.shu }}$ and Ili-idinnam, $36: 7,8,9,21$. 3. $18: 6$.

Sha-É-mab

$$
\text { f. of Libit-Ishtar, } 37: 20 \text {. }
$$

Sha-gi-ia
f. of Ili-turam, $12: 31$.
$\dagger$ Sha-lu-ur-tum
*w. of I (nim)-Nannar, m. of Sin-lidish, 5:2; w. of $I(n i m)$-Nannar, m. (by adoption) of Awirtum, $4: 4,9,14,17,21, \mathrm{~S}$.
Sha-lu-ru-um
*s. of Warad-EA, $5: 26$.
${ }^{d}$ Shamash-a-bi
f. of [.......]-tum, $15: 13$.
${ }^{d}$ Shamash ${ }^{d}$ En-lil (?)
f. of $L u$-EshumeDU, 37 : S.
${ }^{d}$ Shamash-er-ba-am
$u k u-u s h$, s. of Babbar-galzu, $49: 47$.
${ }^{\text {d Shamash-ma-gir }}$
s. of Babbar-galzu, 26, IV : 22.

Shar-shar-d Ishkur
bur-gul, $11: 27$.
Sha-ru-ihl- ${ }^{d}[\operatorname{Sin}]$
f. of $I b k u-E a, 68: 20$.
$\dagger$ Sha-at-Ishtar
*d. of Sinnia, 6:26.
$\dagger$ Sha-at-d Shamash
w. of Ili-eribam, $46: 4, \mathrm{~S}$.

She-rum-iे-li

1. f. of Ili-ippalzam, $62: 24$.
2. $18: 21$.

Shesh-kal-la
*f. of $\ldots \ldots . ., 4: 31$.
Shesh-ki
lul-la, ${ }^{1}$ s. of Adda-dugga, b. of $I$ (nim)-Nannar, $42: 25$. SHESH-SHESH
*?. of Aba-Enlil-dim, $5: 23$.
Shu-ma-a-bu-um
f. of Narubtum, 31: 17.

Shu-ma-ilum
f. of Libit-Ishtar, $40: 9$.

Shu-mu-um-li-ib-shi,-lib-shi( $=*)$, Shu-mu-lib-shi( = **)
**1. s. of Habsi, 8:31.
2. s. of Nannar-mansi, $49: 7,30,35,36,40$.
3. nu-ésh, s. of NinIB-meDU, $50: 14$.
4. s. of $U_{\gamma}$-Duazagga, $37: 2,6,14$.
5. f. of $\operatorname{Sin}-[\ldots . .],. * 26$, IV : 26.
6. $l i t-S H I M+G A R\left({ }^{d} L n-l i l\right), 44: 23|47: 13| * * 58: 16$.
7. . . ......., $50: 12$.

Shu-nu-ma-ilum
s. of Nur-idi, 16:13|24:35.
'Ta-kum
**f. of Warad-Ishtar, $8: 22$.
Ta-ri-bu-um

1. s. of $A$-bi-ia-tum, $32: 27$.
2. s. of $E-l u-t i \quad 12: 25$.
3. f. of Abil-Martu, $48: 36$.
4. f. of Ibku-Ishtar, 12:26.
5. f. of Lushtamar, $52: 23 \mid 67: 18$.
6. slave, $23: 17$.
7. $m u, 62: 25$.
8. PA-é(?)-gi-a, $16: 16|24: 32| 30: 2$.
9. shutug ${ }^{d}$ Nin-lil-la, $30: 3$.

Ta-ab-ba-la-du, T$T a b-(=*)$

1. s. of Etel-b $\hat{\imath}$-Shamash $57: 1,12,18$.
2. t. of Kishti-NinIB, *65:4.

Thb-wa-sha-ab-shu
ukush lugal, $23: 32$.
$\mathbf{U}-b a-a-a^{2}$
f. of Mannia, $12: 32$.
$U-b a-a-a-t^{2} m^{2}$
s. of Daqqum, $23: 27$.

U-bar-ru-um, u-bar-rum $\left(={ }^{*}\right)$

1. f. of NinIB-mushtal, $34: 19$.
2. ukush, *30: 12.

U-bar-d Shamash

$$
18: 19
$$

Ud-ul-lu, $u d-u l-l u-u\left(={ }^{*}\right)$
f. of Iballut, *52:19|53:30|54:30.
$\ddot{U}-d u \hat{u}-d \hat{u}$
shutug ${ }^{d}$ Nin-lil-lá, f. of Ishkur-RUSHra and Ibgatum, b. of Ishkur-rabi, u. of Mar-irsitim and Mutumilum, $10: 8,30 \mid 14: 27$, I.E. | $30: 17$.
$\dagger$ Um-mi-va-qar-at
w. of NinIB-mansi, $63: 3$.
$U$-si-na-wi-ir (he went forth shining ${ }^{3}$ )
17:9.
$U_{r--}^{d} B a-u$

1. of Awilia bur-gul, $10: 48$.

Ur-Dì-azag-ga

1. s. of Ninni-mansi, b. of Enlil-lushag, Nannar-ara-mungen and Ur-DUN.PAea, 26, III: 17, $25,30,35 \mid$ IV : $6, \mathrm{~S}$.
2. f. of Damiq-ilishu, 11:30.
*3. f. of Enlil-mansi, $6: 9$.
3. f. of NinIB-gamil, $30: 11$.
4. f. of Shumum-libshi, $37: 2,7$.
5. b. of Ali-waqrum, $5: 9$.
6. $27: 10$.
$U r-{ }^{d} D U N-P A-\dot{e}-a$
s. of Ninni-mansi, b. of Enlil-lushag, Nonnar-mungen and Ur-Duazagga, 26, III : 18|IV:12, S.
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${ }^{u} S_{p} p^{-p p . l v} M$


A-ba-a[m-......]
f. of Mud-jumil-Vinni(?), $77: 11$, S.

1-bi-ia
s. of Taluhum, $70: 29$.

A-hi-hu-m[u-ur]
f. of . ..... shu-but(?) Sippar ${ }^{k i}, 131: 5$.

A-hu-um-ki-nu-um
s. of Sin-rimeni, 72:16, S.

A-bu-um-wa-qar
f. of Warad-Ishtar, $88: 5$.

A-hbu-shi-na
s. of Ibiq-Shumash, $88: 8$.

Am-mi-di-ta-na
king, in the dates of $98 ; 100-116$.
Am-mi-za-du-ga
king, in the dates of 117-130.
A-na-tum
f. of Ettirum, 138:5.

AN-[.......]-ki-e-el[ ]
pa-te-si Ki-e-ck ${ }^{k i}, 130: 13$.
Ar-di-ia

$$
\text { s. of Bulu ....... , } 116: 6 .
$$

A-wi-li-ia
$77: 15$.
A-wi-il- ${ }^{d} \operatorname{Sin}$

1. s. of Clushu-ibnishu, 91:4.
2. mârat -, 130: 1 .

A-wi-il-d Shamush
s. of Sin-imyuranni, 1. of Ishkur-sharrum and Ilushuibnishu, $109: 6,13$.
${ }^{d} \mathbf{B}$ abbar-lugal-an-ki-a
134: 4.
${ }^{d}$ Babbar-zi-mu
s. of Sin-idinnam, $83: 6,7$.
$B \Lambda-s h a{ }^{d} S a k-k u d$
f. of Sin-bilah, $70: \mathrm{S}$.

Ba-at-ga-nu

$$
p a-t e-s i[\ldots . . .], 130: 18
$$

Be-la-nu-um
s. of Sin-ma ..., $85: 27$.
$\dagger B e-l i-s u-n u$

$$
\text { d. of Ziatum, } 75: 5 .
$$

Be-el-shu-nu
$15: 11$.
Be-. . [. . . . . . .]
f. of $W$ arad-[.....], $120: 8$.
$B u-l u(?)-\ldots .$.
f. of Ardia, 16:6.
${ }^{d_{B u}}{ }^{2}-n i-n i-i q-b i$
f. of Iluni $78: 2$.

Dam-ki-i-li-shu
(king), 114, $115: 16 \mid 116: 17 ;$ Vol. VI, Part $1,86: 18$.
${ }^{d} \mathbf{E} n$-lil-iz-zu $p a-t e-s i S I R^{i i}, 130: 12$.
E-te-bu-um ${ }^{1}$
s. of fbalum, $81: 11$.
$E-t i l-b \hat{\imath}-{ }^{d} \operatorname{Sin}$

$$
\text { s. of } \operatorname{Sin}-m[a \ldots \ldots], 115: 4, \text { L. E. }
$$

$\dagger E$ - $t i$-ir-tum
133: 6.
E-ti-rum

1. s. of A nutum, 138:5.
2. mûrat 一, $138: 3$.

E-x²-an-na-ma-an-sı̀ $72 a: 17 ; b 15 ; c$.

Gimil(or Qât)- ${ }^{d} N u ?[. . .$.$] (Gimil-an-nu-um?)$ pa-te-si Ká-gal-lá ${ }^{k i}, 130: 14$.
$\mathbf{H} a-a b-b a-[t u m ?]^{3}$ 85:3.
Ha-ia-am-di-du-um (70:30, -ki-du-um) s. of (omitted), $70: 30$, case, Lo. E.

На-am-mu-ra-bi king, $70: 24$ and in the date of 71.
Hu-za-mi $138: 18$.

I-ba-(zu?)-ni (li?)-im (gen. of Ibanum) f. of Etebum, $81: 12$.

Ib-ga-tum

1. f. of Ribatum, $73: 3$; Vol. VI, Part 1, 30:2, 4 and often.
2. $66: 2$.
${ }^{1}$ To the Verschleifung of $l$ compare Etebi-Sin, p. 00.
${ }^{2} 72 c$ shows $B A D$, but $72 a: 17$, case, and $72 b: 15$ show more correct forms, the latter and 72 case $A S H+$ inverted $A S I$, the former $A S I I+$ inverted and inclined $A S H$. It is one of the signs that have been confounded into the one $\operatorname{sign} B A D$, but it can neither be identified with $R . E . C .11$ nor 278 . For x-an-na cf. perhaps Br. $1544=$ maliku, but more hkely $\hat{E}-\mathrm{x}-a n-n a$ is " the house of the ..... of heaven."
${ }^{3}$ Cf. Ha-ap-pa-tum, P. N.

1-bi- ${ }^{d} E n-l i l$
dub-sar, $131: 6$; Vol. VI, Part 1, $110: 7|112: 5,15|$
$115: 4 \mid 118: 3,6$; Berl. $1176: 4$ ( $=$ K. B., VI, p. 44).
$I(?)-b i-m a-m a$
pa-te-si Ar-da-ma ${ }^{k i}, 130: 16$.
$1-b i{ }^{-d} N a-[b i-u m]$
dub-sar, $135: \mathrm{S}$.
$I-b i-^{d} N i n-B U \dot{U} R(?)^{1}$
$72 a: 4 \mid b 19$.
I-bi- ${ }^{d}$ Nin-nam-?
$78: 12$.
I-bi- ${ }^{d}$ Nin-shah 88:9.
$1 b i q^{2}-A n-n u-n i-t u m$

1. s. of $[I b-k u]-\operatorname{sh} a, 85: 20$.
2. s. of Iluma-ilum, 74:14.

Ibiq- ${ }^{\text {d }}$ Ishkur
f. of Mar-Shamash, $88: 10$.

## Ibiq-Ishtar

s. of Mar-irșitim, $85: 24$.

Ibiq ${ }^{d}$ Mar-tu
marat - , 138:7.
I-bi-iq- ${ }^{\text {d }}$ Shamash
f. of Ahushina, $88: 8$.

I-bi-iq- ${ }^{d}[\ldots \ldots$.
$d u b-s a r, w a r a d^{d} N a[-b i-u m], 135: \mathrm{S}$.
[Ib-ku-]sha
f. of Ibiq-A nnunitum, $85: 20$.
$I b-n i-E \in-a$
77:16.
Ib-ni-d Marduk
s. of Sin-bel-ili, $80: 5$.

Ib-ni- ${ }^{d}$ Shamash

1. f. of Kubburum, $4: 6$.
2. f. of Samu, $73: 17$.
$I-\operatorname{din}-{ }^{d} \dot{E}-a$
daianu, s. of Ibni-Shamash, b. of Taribusha, 115:3|
$116: 3|119: 3| 120: 5,7|124: 3,4| 126: 3 ;$ Vol. VI, Part 1, $94: 5,6 \mid 95: 4,6$.
I-din-ilum
f. of $K i-i-h a-b i l, 85: 28$.

I-di-shum (abbreviated) ${ }^{3}$
f. of Sin-ludlul, 70 case: (25).
$\bar{I}-l i-b a-a s h-t i$
s. of Nakimum, $81: 9$.

İ-li-um-[ma]-ti
slave of Shamash-muballit, $80: 1$.
$\dagger I l u$-bi-sha d. of [.........], 83:18.

Ilu-da-mi-iq
f. of Ilushu-ibnishu, 110, 3,5.

Ilu-ma-ilum
f. of Ibiq-Annunitum, $74: 14$.

I-lu(?)-ni
s. of Bunini-iqbi, 78:1.

Ilu-ra-b[i]
f. of Marduk-nasir, $85: 26$.
$\dagger^{\text {sat }}$ Ilu-sha-he-gal
123: 10.
Ilu-shit-ct-bu-shu
f. of $A b i$-ludari, $126: 5$.

Ilu-shu-ba-ni

1. s. of $\operatorname{Ibi}-\mathrm{NinBUR}, 72: 3$.
2. $72: 19$.

Ilu-shu-ib-ni
136 : L. E.
Ilu-shu-ib-ni-shu

1. s. of $I l u-d a m i q, 110: 3,5$.
2. s. of Sin-imguranni, b. of Ishkur-sharrum and

Awil-Shamash, $123: 4$.
3. PA-PA, $123: 9,12$.
4. f. of Awil-Sin, $91: 4$.
5. $138: 16$.

Im-gur-d ${ }^{\text {d }}$ Sin

1. $78: 11$.
2. $80: 16$.
$\dagger$ In-na-ba-tum
$70: 4$.
${ }^{d}$ Ishkur-i-din-nam

$$
\text { s. of }[\ldots \ldots \ldots], 83: 17
$$

${ }^{d_{\text {Ishkur-ni-shu }}}$
s. of Minam-epush-ilum, $66: 11$, case.
${ }^{1} \mathrm{Cf}, N u-u r-{ }^{d} N i n-B U R(?)$, II, $28: 24$.
${ }^{2}$ It seems that $S I G$ was always read $i b i k$, and $i b k u$ only when followed by $k u$; cf. $I b k u(-k u)$-Sin, s. of Lugal${ }^{d}$ Babbar, B. E., Series A, VI, 1, $58: 23$, and $I b-k u-d$ Sin, s. of Lugal- ${ }^{\text {d Babbar, ibid., } 60: 2 \text {; Ibiq-Ishtar, s, of Ku-ta-tum, }}$ M. $30: 29$, and $I$-bi-iq-Ishtar mâr Ku-ta-tum, ease.
${ }^{3}$ Instead of I-di-shum the tablet gives the name Shum-ma- ${ }^{d}$ Shamash, Evidently both names are abbreviations of Idi-shumma-Shamash . "I know when Shamash
${ }^{\text {d }}$ Ishkur-shar-rum

1. s. of Sin-imyuranni, b. of Ilushu-ibrishu and A wil-Shamash, $123: 6,11,14$.
2. pa-te-si [.......... $\left.{ }^{k i}\right], 130: 19$.
3. $83: 21$.

Ish-me- ${ }^{\text {d }}$ Ishkur
77: 17.
I-.........- ${ }^{d}$ Shamash
f. of Sin-idinnam 74: 15.
$\dagger$ Kal-i-mi-za (he holds(?) her right hand)
$S A L+$ ISIIIB ${ }^{d}$ Shamash, d. of Sin-ra'im-Urum, si. of Shamash-eribam, Sharrum-Ishkur and Shamash-idinnam, $70: 10,14$.
$\dagger$ †i-ish-tum
qadishtum, d. of Rish-Shamash, $85: 17$.
Ku-ub-bu-rum
s. of Ibni-Shamash 124:6.

Lugal-[gir(?)]-ni-mu-un-gin (he steadjed the way of the king ${ }^{1}$
king of $U D-[\ldots]^{k i}, 130: 2$.
$L \grave{u}^{d}$ Ishkur-ra
127: 4.
$\mathbf{M} a-b u(?)-b u(?)$
f. of Shamash-bani, 89:7.

Ma-ad-gi-mil-be-el-ti (many is the benefaction of my mistress)
81:1.
Ma-ad-gi-mil- ${ }^{d} N i n n i$
s. of Aham-......... ; warad d $N$ é-unu[-gal], $77: 11, \mathrm{~S}$.

Ma-ni-um
f. of Taribatum, $123: 8$.
$\dagger$ Ma-an-na-tum (on unpublished texts also Ma-na-tum)
$\left(S A L+I S H I B^{d}\right.$ Shamash, d. of Iasi-ilu), $72: 2$.
Ma-an-nu-um-ki-ma- ${ }^{d}$ Ishkur
s. of Warad-Martu, $77: 13$.
${ }^{d}$ Marduk-mu-sha-lim

$$
\text { s. of Ibi-Ninshah, } 88: 9 .
$$

${ }^{d_{M a r d u k-n a s i r}}$
s. of $I l u-r a[b i], 85: 26$.
${ }^{d} M a r d u k-n i[s h u]$
s. of Martu-kur-[....]; [wara]d A-bil- ${ }^{d} S[$ in $], 72: \mathrm{S}$.
${ }^{d}$ Marduk-qar-ra-ad s. of Mar-irsitim, $88: 7$.

Mâr-ir-si-tim, Mûr-irsitim ( $=$ *)

1. s, of Nur-Ishara, *83:8.
2. f. of Ibiq-Ishtar, $85: 24$.
3. f. of Marduk-qarrad, $88: 7$.
4. pa-te-si, $89: 8$.

Mâr- ${ }^{d}$ Shamash

$$
\text { s. of Ibiq-Ishkur, } 88: 10 .
$$

${ }^{d}$ Mar-tu-kur[......]
f. of Marduk-nishu, 72 : s.
$d_{M a r-t u-[. . . . . .] ~}^{\text {. }}$ f. of Warad-Martu, $85: 23$.

Ma-shum
138: 14.
Mi-gir-d En-lil pa-te-si Al-ha-lim ${ }^{k i}, 130: 11$.
Mi(?)-lik- ${ }^{d}$ Shamash (perh. $N u-u r-$ ) 72 : 20.
$\dagger(?) M u-u l-l u-u k-t u m$ (gen. Mulluktim, P. N.) 85:2.
${ }^{d}[\mathbf{N} a]-b i-u m-[\ldots . . . . . . .$. s. of Warad-ilishu, 88:4.

Nab-she-me-a ${ }^{2}$

$$
\text { s. of }[\ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots, 83: 16,19
$$

Na-ki-mi-im (gen.; cf. Nakimum, P. N.) 81:10.
$\dagger$ Na-wi-ir-tum $75: 4$.
Ni-id-nu-um $72: 18$.
Ni-di-it-l[um] s. of Sin-ibni, $85: 25$.

Ni-....... f. of Sin-mu?.......... $110: 7$.
$N u$-ur- ${ }^{d} I s h-h a-r a$ 83: 8.
$N u$-ür-shu-e-li $p a-t e-s i A-\ldots .\left[\ldots .{ }^{k i}\right], 130: 17$.
Pa-ak-na-na[ ] ${ }^{3}$ f. of Shat-Aia, $81: 14$.

Pir-bu-um $r a-b i-a-n u, 85: 21$.

[^65]$\dagger \mathbf{R}$-ba-tum
SAL + ISHIB ${ }^{d}$ Shamash, d. of Ibgatum, $73: 2$;
$$
\text { Vol. VI, Part 1, } 30: 1,3 \text {, etc. }
$$

Ri-ish- ${ }^{d}$ Marduk
91:14.
Ri-ish-dShamash
f. of Kishtum 85: 18.
$\mathbf{S} a-a l-l u-h i$ (gen.)
marat -, $138: 2,5$.
Sa-am-su-di-ta-na
king, in the dates of 131 and 132.
Sa-am-su-i-lu-na
king, in the dates of 77,83 and $85-90|83: 5| 113: 3$.
Sa-mu-u(?)
s. of Ibni-Shamash, $73: 16$.

Sa-ni-iq-bi- ${ }^{d}$ Shamash ${ }^{1}$
138: 15.
${ }^{d}$ Sin-a-bu-shu
$d u b$-sar, $78: 13$.
${ }^{d}$ Sin-a-sha-ri-id
f. of ${ }^{d}$ Sin-i-din-nam, $91: 3$.

Si-na-tum
138: 12.
${ }^{d}$ Sin-be-el-i-l-li
f. of Ibni-Marduk, $80: 6$.
${ }^{d}$ Sin-bi-la-ah
dam-qar, s. of BAsha-Sakkud, 70 :S.
Sin-e-ri-ba-am
s. of Sin-ikisham, $73: 14$, L. E.

Sin-ib-ni
f. of Nidittum, $85: 55$.
${ }^{d}$ Sin-i-din-nam

1. s. of $I \ldots \ldots$. -Shamash, $74: 15$.
2. s. of Sin-asharid, $91: 3$.
3. (s. of Sin-eribam), $105: 1$.
4. s. of [.......], $115: 12$.
5. f. of Balbar-zimu, $83: 6,7$.
6. f. of Warad-Sin, 124: 14.
${ }^{d}$ Sin-i-ki-sha-am, Sin- $(=*)$
7. f. of Sin-eribam, ${ }^{*} 73: 15$.
8. f. of Sin-ra'im-Urum, gf. of Shamash-eribam, etc., $70: \mathrm{S}$.
${ }^{d}$ Sin-im-gur-an-[ni]
f. of Ilushu-ibnishu, Ishkur-sharrum and AwilShamash, 123 : 4, 6, 14.

Sin-li-ra-am

$$
\text { f. of Urra-gamil, } 73: 13 .
$$

Sin-lu-ud-lu-ul
s. of Idishum (Shumma-Shamash), $70: 26$.
${ }^{d}$ Sin-ma-gir
80: 4.
Sin-ma-[......]

$$
\text { f. of Belanum, } 85: 27 \text {. }
$$

${ }^{d}$ Sin-ma-...........[ ]
f. of Sin-nasir, $85: 22$.
${ }^{d} \operatorname{Sin}-m[a-\ldots \ldots]$ f. of Etil-ot̂-Sin, $115: 15$.
${ }^{d} \operatorname{Sin}-m u(?)-[\ldots \ldots$.

$$
\text { s. of } N i \ldots \ldots, 110: 7 .
$$

$\operatorname{Sin}-[\ldots \ldots \ldots]$

$$
\text { s. of } I b-[\ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots], 89: 4 .
$$

$\operatorname{Sin}-[\ldots . . . . .$.

$$
89: 5 .
$$

${ }^{d} \operatorname{Si}[n \ldots \ldots \ldots]$
f. of Warad-Sin, $110 \cdot 16$.
${ }^{d} \operatorname{Sin}[$-ish-me-]-a-ni PA-é, $131: 11$.
${ }^{d}$ Shamash-ba-ni s. of Mabubu?, $89: 7$.
${ }^{d}$ Shamash-e-ri-ba-am

1. s. of Sin-ra'im-Urum, b. of Sharrum-Ishkur, etc., $70: 13$.
2. $81: 3$.
${ }^{d}$ Shamash-ga-mil $73: 1$.
${ }^{\text {d }}$ Shamash-i-din-nam s. of Sin-ra'im-Urum, b. of Sin-eribam, etc., $70: 17$.
${ }^{d}$ Shamash-ma-ti
f. of Taribatum, $73: 11$.
${ }^{d}$ Shamash-mu-ba-li-it, -mu-ba-al-li-it $\left(={ }^{*}\right)$
3. f. of Ubar-Shamash, $70: 27$.
4. owner of Iliummati, *80:3.
${ }^{d}$ Shamash-na-si-ir
5. PA-dam-kar, $91: 20$.
6. $83: 22$.
${ }^{d}$ Shamash-nu-ur-ma-tim

$$
80: 17
$$

Shar-rum- ${ }^{a}$ Ishkur
s. of Sin-ra'im-Urum, b. of Sin-eribam, etc., $70: 16$.
$\dagger$ Sha-at- ${ }^{d} A-a$
d. of Paknana [ ], $81: 13$.

[^66]Shesh-ni-pa(d)
$d u b-s a r, 70: 31$.
Shu-mi-ir-si-tim, -irṣitim ( $=$ *)
$73: 4, *$ L. E.
Shum-ma- ${ }^{d}$ Shamash ( $=$ Idi-shum)
f. of Sin-ludlul, variant of case to $70: 25$.
[Shu]-mu-um-li-ib-shi, Shu-mu-li-ib-shi ( $=$ *)

1. shang $\hat{,} 126: 8$.
2. $* 123:$ U. E.

Shu-mu-um-li-şi
dub-sar, $116: 14 \mid 124: 15 ;$ dumu-gish-dub-ba-a, $126:$

$$
9 ; \text { Shu-mu-um-[ . . . . . .], } 120: 13 .
$$

$\mathbf{T} a(?)-i m-s h u-n u[]$
[pa-te-si ............ $\left.{ }^{k i}\right], 130: 21$.
Ta-la-hu-um
f. of Ahia $80: 29$.

Ta-ri-ba-a-tum (cf. the following name) 83: 23.
Ta-ri-ba-tum, gen. Ta-ri-ba-tim ${ }^{1}$

1. s. of Manium, $23: 8$.
2. s. of Shamash-mati, $73: 10$, L. E.
3. $81: 2$.

Ta-ri-bu-um
$77: 12$.
$T a-r i-b u-s h a$
s. of Ibni-Shamash, b. of Idin-Ea daianum, 119:4,
L. E.

Ú-bar-d Shamash
s. of Shamash-muballit, $70: 27$.
$\bar{U} r$-ra-ga-mil
s. of Sin-liram, $73: 12$, L. E.
$\bar{U} r-r a-i a$
s. of Warad-Kubi, 70:28.

U-tul-Ishtar
dub-sar, 120:4; Vol. VI, Part1, $93: 4|94: 4| 95: 3 \mid$
C.T., VI, $35: 5|37: 2|$ VIII, $11: 4 \mid 36: 5$.

Warad-i-lk-shu

1. f. of Nabium $-[\ldots .], 88:$.4 .
2. f. of Warad-Marduk, $116: 5$.
3. $138: 17$.

Warad-Ishtar
s. of Ahum-waqar, $88: 5$, I. E.

Warad-Ku-bi
f. of Urraia, $70: 28$.

Warad ${ }^{d}$ Marduk(?)
s. of Warad-ilishu, $116: 4, \mathrm{I}$. E.

Warad- ${ }^{d}$ Mar-tu

1. s. of Martu-[. ..... .], $85: 23$.
2. f. of Mannum-kima-Ishkur, $77: 14$.
3. $47: 5$.
4. $83: 20,24$.

Warad ${ }^{d}$ Sin
s. of Sin-idinnạm, 110:16| 116:12| 124:14; Vol. VI, Part 1, $86: 12 \mid 101: 34 ;$., $74: 28$; $C . T$., VIII, $2 a: 10$.
Warad- ${ }^{d}[\ldots . . .$.
s. of $B e-\ldots \ldots, 120: 8$.
$\mathbf{Z} i$-ia-tum
f. of Belisunu, 75: 6.

Zu-hu-tum
85:5.
Zu-mur(?)-ta-nu[ ]
[pa-te-si ........ ${ }^{k i}$ ], 130: 20.
[......]-e-ri-ba[ ], 119:12.
[......]-d Marduk, $123: 16$.
[.....] $]^{d}$ Mar-tu, $89: 3$
[I-bi?]- ${ }^{d}$ Mar-tu, $123: 15$.
[. . . . .]-sha
f. of Ibiq-Annunitum, $85: 20$.
[.........]-dShamash, $89: 9$.
${ }^{1}$ Ish erasure.

## TABLE OF CON'IEN'TS AND DESCRIPTION OF OBJEC'TS.


#### Abstract

Abbreviations. B. E. F., Collection acquired and presented by the Babylonian Exploration Fund of Philadelphia; C. B. M., Catalogue of the Babylonian Museum of the University of Pennsylvania and Musée Impérial Ottoman, prepared by H. V. Hilprecht; Exp., Expedition; H. V. H., Collection presented by Prof. H. V. Hilprecht; Inscr., Inscription; J. D. P., Collection presented by Prof. J. D. Prince of Columbia University, New York; J. S., Joseph Shemtob Collection; Kh., First Khabaza Collection; Kh²., Second Khabaza Collection; li., lines; L. E., Left Edge; Lo. E., Lower Edge; M. I. O., Babylonian Collection of the Musée Impérial Ottoman, Constantinople; Ni., Nippur; O., Obverse; R., Reverse; U. E., Upper Edge; Yo. = Yokha.

Names of rulers abbreviated: Ad., Ammi-ditana; Ae., Abi-eshub; Az., Ammı-zaduga; H., Hammu-rabi; Ii., Ilima-ilum; R.-S., Rim-Sin; Sd., Samsu-ditana; Si., Samsu-iluna; W.-S., Warad-Sin.

Measurements are given in centimetres, length (height) $\times$ width $\times$ thickness. Whenever the tablet (or fragment) varies in size, the largest measurement is given.


## 1. Autograph Reproductions.

| Text. | Plate. | King. | Year. | Montrf. | Day. | Provenance. | $\begin{gathered} \text { Collef- } \\ \text { tron. } \end{gathered}$ | C.B.M. | Descriftion |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 1 | W.-S. | ? | ? | - | Ni. | B.E.F. | 11499 | Fragment. Lower part of tablet wanting. Unbaked. $5 \times 5 \times$ 2.6. Inscr. $8(+x)(0)+$. $(x+) 5(\mathrm{R})=.13(+x) \mathrm{li}$. Partly effaced seal impressions. II Exp. |
| 2 | 1 | W.-S. | ? | 11 | 2 | Ni. | B.E.F. | 11237 | Two pieces of the same size glued together. Somè small parts scraped and chipped off. Unbaked. $5.7 \times 4.4 \times 2.2$. Inser. $8(\mathrm{O})+$.5 (R.) +2 (U. E.) $=$ 15 li. I Exp. |
| 3 | 1 | - | ? | (6) | (16) | Ni. | H.V.H. | 10166 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { O. damaged. Unbaked. } 3.9 \times \\ & 2.9 \times 1.6 \text {. Inscr. } 8(0 .)+2 \\ & (\text { R. })=10 \mathrm{li} \text {. III Exp. } \end{aligned}$ |
| 4 | 2 | R.-S. | ? | 6 | - | Ni. | B.E.F. | 11152 | R. partly destroyed. Small pieces chipped off. Unbaked. $8.9 \times$ $5.1 \times 2.5$. Inscr. 17 (O.) +18 (R.) +1 (U. E.) $=36$ li. Seal impressions. I Exp. |


| Text. <br> 5 | Plate. $2$ | Kıng. R.-S. | Year. <br> ? | Month. <br> 1 | DAy. | ProveNANCE. Ni . | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Collec- } \\ & \text { 'IION. } \\ & \text { B.E.F. } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { C.B.M. } \\ 10882 \end{gathered}$ | Description. <br> Effaced and pieces chipped off especially on 0 . Unbaked. $10.6 \times 5.3 \times 2.7$. Inscr. 14 (O.) +15 (R.) +1 (U. E.) $=$ 30 li. Seal impressions. I Exp. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 6 | 3 | R.-S. | $11^{1}$ | 4 | - | Ni. | B.E.F. | 9045 | Well preserved. Partially baked. Blackish. $8.4 \times 5.3 \times 3$. Inser. 16 (O.) +16 (R.) $=32$ li. Scal impressions. Reported to have come from Yokha. II Exp. |
| 7 | 3 | R.-S. | $18^{1}$ | 9 | - | Ni. | B.E.F. | 11980 | Some few particles of $R$. chipped off, otherwise well preserved. Baked. Reddish brown. $7.3 \times$ $4.8 \times 2.9$. Inscr. 15 (O.) +14 $($ R. $)=29 \mathrm{li}$. Seal impressions. II Exp. |
| 8 | 4 | K.-S. | $22^{1}$ | 5 | - | Yo. | B.E.F. | 9183 | Hew particles of U. and Lo. Es. chipped off, otherwise well preserved. Slightly baked. Blackish, $8.8 \times 4.8 \times 2.5$. Inscr. 15 (O.) +20 (R.) +3 (U. E.) $=38 \mathrm{li}$. Seal impressions. II Exp. |
| 9 | 4 | R.-S. | $25^{1}$ | 1 | - | Yo. | B.E.F. | 11640 | Well preserved. Baked. Brown. $8.1 \times 5.2 \times 2.7$. Inscr. 12 (O.) $+9(\mathrm{R})=.21 \mathrm{li}$. Not sealed. <br> Case: Fragmentary. $9.3 \times 6.5 \times 4$. <br> Seal impressions. Reported to have come from Nippur. II Exp. |
| 10 | 5 | H | 33 | 10 | - | $\mathrm{Ni}^{\text {a }}$, | B.E.F | 3425 | Well preserved. Brown. Baked. $10,35 \times 5,3 \times 3$. Inser. 22 (O.) +26 (R.) +3 (U. E.) $=$ 51 li. Seal impressions. I Exp. |
| 11 | 6 | II. | 35 | 9 | - | Ni. | M.I.O. | 1916 | Part of O. chipped off. Unbaked. $\begin{aligned} & 7.7 \times 4.7 \times 2.5 . \quad \text { Inser. } 14(\text { O. }) \\ & +16(\mathrm{R} .)+2(\mathrm{U} . \mathrm{E} .)=32 \text { li. } \end{aligned}$ <br> Seal impressions. |
| $12 a$ | 6 | H. | 35 | 11 | - | Ni. | M.I.O. | 1994 | Grayish brown. Unbaked. Inser. $\begin{aligned} & 19 \text { (O.) }+19 \text { (R.) }+1 \text { (U. E.) } \\ & =39 \text { li. Seal impressions. } \end{aligned}$ |
| $12 b$ | 7 | H. | 35 | 11 | 一 |  |  |  | Case of the preceding, fragment ary. |
| 13 | 7 | H. | 35 | 11 | - | Ni. | B.E.F. | 3384 | Several portions of O, and U. E. glued on. Unbaked. $3.9 \times 2.7$ $\times 1.7$. Inscr. 8 (O.) +2 (Lo. |

[^67]| Text. | Plate. | King. | Year. | Month. | Day. | ProveNANCE. | CollafeTION. | C.B.M. | Deschiptron. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 14 | 7 | H. | $38 a$ | 11 | - | Ni. | B.E.F. | 3426 | E. $)+8($ R. $)=18 \mathrm{li} . \quad$ Seal impressions. II Exp. <br> U. E. broken. Brown. Baked. $7.2 \times 4.5 \times 2.6$. Inser. 15 (O.) +17 (R.) +3 (U. E.) +2 (Lo. E. $)+1$ (L. E.) $=36$ li. Seal impressions. I Exp. |
| 1.5 | 8 | H | 383 | 12 | 16 | Ni. | M.I.O. | 439 | Scratched and partly effaced. <br> Unbaked. $5.6 \times 3.9 \times 2.1$. <br> Inser. 10 (O.) +9 (R.) $=19$ li. <br> Seal impressions faint. |
| 16 | 8 | II. | 39 | 6 | - | Ni. (?) | B.E.F. | 3803 | Considerable portions of $R$. wanting. Baked. Light brown and blackish. $7.4 \times 5 \times 2.7$. Inscr. 10 (O.) +10 (R.) $=20$ li. Seal impressions without name. I Exp. |
| 17 | 8 | H. | ? | 11 | - | Ni . | M.I.O. | 1845 | Well preserved. Baked. Yellowish brown and dark brown. 4.4 $\times 3.3 \times 2.15$. Inser. 8 (O.) $+6($ R. $)=14 \mathrm{li}$. Seal impressions. |
| 18 | 9 | H. | 41 | 7 | - | Ni. | M.I.O. | 1998 | Tablet well preserved. Unbaked. $8.9 \times 4.7 \times 3$. Inser. 12 (O.) +14 (R.) $=26 \mathrm{li}$. Seal impressions. <br> Case: Fragments glued together. $9.2 \times 5.95 \times 4.2$. Inser. 14 (O.) +13 (R.) $=27 \mathrm{li}$. |
| 19 | 9 | H. | - | 6 | 14 | Ni. | B.E.F. | 11715 | U. E. with adjoining part of $O$. and lower L. E. broken. Unbaked. $4.4 \times 3.8 \times 1.9$. Inser. 8 (O. and Lo. E.) +5 $(+\mathrm{x})($ R. $)=13(+\mathrm{x})$ li. II Exp. |
| 20 | 10 | Si. | 1 | 7 | 20 | Ni. | B.E.F. | 11596 | Partly effaced,small pieces chipped off. Unbaked. $3.4 \times 3 \times 1.9$. Inscr. 6 (O.) +5 (R.) +2 ( U . E.) $=13$ li. II Exp. |
| 21 | 10 | Si. | 4 | 6 | 22 | Ni. | M.I.O. | 1846 | Well preserved. Baked. Brown. $4.8 \times 3.4 \times 1.9$. Inser. 8 (O.) $+6(\mathbf{R})=$.14 li. Seal impressions with picture. |
| 22 | 11 | Si. | 4 | 7 | ? | Ni. | M.I.O. | 1918 | Lo. E. broken. Unbaked. Inscr. $10(\mathrm{O})+.8(\mathrm{R})=$.18 li. Seal impressions. |
| 23 | 11 | Si, | 4 | 10 | 21 | Ni. | M.I.O. | 1917 | Lo. E. wanting. Baked. Red- |


| Text. | Plate. | King. | Year. | Month. | Day. | ProveNANCF. | CollecTION. | C.B.M. | UESCRIPTION. <br> dish brown. Darker spots. 10.4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $20($ R. $)=38$ li. Seal impressions. |
| 24 | 12 | Si. | 4 | 11 | - | Ni. | B.E.F. | 10891 | Well preserved. Baked. Whitish yellow. $10.3 \times 5.1 \times 2.9$. Inser. 17 (O.) +2 (Lo. E.) + 19 (R.) +2 (U. E. $)=40 \mathrm{li}$. Seal impressions. I Exp. |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 25 | 14 | Si. | 4 | 12 | $\rightarrow$ | Ni . | M.I.O. | 1842 | Well preserved. Baked. Brown and blackish. $4.75 \times 3.5 \times$ 2.2. Rough script. Inser. 7 (O.) +8 (R.) +2 (U. E. $=17$ li.). Seal impressions without inscription. |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 26 | 13 | Si. | 6 | 6 | 14 | Ni. | M.I.O. | 45 | Fragment. Unbaked. $17(+x)$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\times 8.5 \times 4.35 . \quad \text { Inser. } 36(+x)$ <br> (O. Col. I) $+22(+\mathrm{x})(\mathrm{O} . \mathrm{Col}$. |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | II) $+36(+\mathrm{x})(\mathrm{R}, \mathrm{Col} . \mathrm{III})+$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 31 ( +x ) (R. Col. IV). Seal impressions. |
| 27 | 14 | Si, | 7 | 12 | - | Ni . | M.I.O. | 1848 . | Well preserved. Baked. Light brown. $3.5 \times 2.7 \times 1.6$. |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Inscr. 7 (O.) $\times 7$ (R.) $=14 \mathrm{ii}$. Seal impressions. |
| 28 | 15 | Si. | 8 | 3 | - | Ni. | B.E.F. | 11173 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { U. E. damaged. } \text { Unbaked. } 10.4 \\ & \times 5.5 \times 3.1 . \\ & \text { Inscr. } 19(0 .) \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $+18(\mathrm{R}$. $)=37 \mathrm{li}$. Seal impressions. I Exp. |
| 29 | 16 | Si. | 11 | 3 | - | Ni. | B.E.F. | 10890 | Part of Lo. E. wanting. Baked. Whitish yellow. $7.4 \times 4.7 \times$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2.6. Inscr. 11 (O.) +10 (R.) <br> $=21 \mathrm{li}$. Seal impressions. |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Exp. |
| 30 | 16 | Si. | 11 | 4 | - | Ni . | B.E.F. | 10883 | Well preserved. Baked. Reddish brown. Somewhat irregu- |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | lar shape. $8.8 \times 4.9 \times 2.5$. |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Inscr. 17 (O.) +12 (R.) $=29$ li. <br> Seal impressions. I Exp. |
| 31 | 17 | Si. | 11 |  |  | Ni. | M.I.O. | 1492 | Considerable portions broken. |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Unbaked. 11 (O.) +15 (R. and U. E.) $=26 \mathrm{li}$. Seal impressions. |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Case: Broken pieces glued to- } \\ & \text { gether. } 13(\mathrm{O} .)+13(+\mathrm{x})(\text { R. }) \\ & =26(+\mathrm{x}) \text { li. }=\text { C.B.M.,Cast } 9764 . \end{aligned}$ |
| 32 | 17 | Si. | 11 | 7 | 17 | Ni. | B.E.F. | 9182 | O. considerably broken. Unbaked. |



| Text. | Plate. | King. | Year. | Month. | Day. | Phovenance. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Collec- } \\ & \text { tion. } \end{aligned}$ | C.B.M. | Description. $\begin{aligned} & (\text { Io. E. })+11 \text { (R.) })+2 \text { (U. E.) } \\ & =27 \text { li. Seal impressions. I } \\ & \text { Exp. } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 39 | 22 | Si | 12 | 5 | 15 | Ni. | B.E.F. | 11565 | Some parts of O. chipped off, somewhat pressed, otherwise well preserved. Baked. Red. dish brown. $7.4 \times 4.6 \times 2.6$. Inscr. 12 (O.) +13 (R.) +3 (U. E.) $=28$ li. Seal impressions. II Exp. <br> Case: Fragments $7.2 \times 4.8 \times 0.7$. Inscr. 11 (O.) $+2(+x)(\mathrm{R})=$. $13(+\mathrm{x}) \mathrm{li}$. |
| 40 | 23 | Si . | 13 | 1 | 28 | Ni. | B.E.F. | 7018 | Some small picces chipped off, otherwise well preserved. Slightly baked. Dark brownish gray. $11.75 \times 6.3 \times 3.45$. Inscr. 17 (O.) $+18(\mathrm{R})=.35 \mathrm{li}$. Seal impressions. II Exp. |
| 41 | 24 | Si. | 13 | 3 | 25 | Ni. | M.I.O. | 2003 | U. and Lo. E. wanting. Unbaked. Inscr. $(x+) 15(\mathrm{O})+.12(\mathrm{R}$. $=27(+x)$ li. Seal impressions. |
| 42 | 24 | Si. | 13 | 12 | - | Ni . | B.E.F. | 6055 | Slightly pressed, otherwise well preserved. Unbaked. $5.9 \times$ $3.95 \times 2.4$. Inscr. 9 (O.) + 10 (R.) +3 (U. E.) +1 (L. E.) $=23 \mathrm{l}$. Faint seal impressions. I Exp. |
| 43 | 25 | Si. | 13 | 12 | - | Ni. | B.E.F. | 7016 | Left edge of O. pressed or scratchcd, otherwise well preserved. Slightly baked. Blackish brown. $11.55 \times 5.9 \times 3.8$. Inscr. 20 (O.) +2 (Lo. E.) +17 (R.) $=39$ li. Seal impressions. II Exp. |
| 44 | 26 | Si. | 14 | 11 | - | Ni. | B.E.F. | 3430 | Well preserved. Slightily baked. Blackish gray. $9.35 \times 4.8 \times 3$. Inscr. 12 (O.) +15 (R.) +2 $(\mathrm{U} . \mathrm{E})=.29 \mathrm{li}$. Seal impressions. II Exp. |
| 45 | 27 | Si. | 14 | 12 | $\cdots$ | Ni. | M.I.O. | 2001 | Some small pieces chipped off, otherwise well preserved. Unbaked. Inscr. 13 (O.) +13 $($ R. $)+2(\mathrm{U} . \mathrm{E})=.28 \mathrm{li} . \quad$ Seal impressions. <br> Case: Fragmentary. |




\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline Text. 63 \& \begin{tabular}{l}
Plate. \\
39
\end{tabular} \& King. si. \& Year. \& \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { MONTH } \\
9
\end{gathered}
\] \& \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Day. } \\
20 ?
\end{gathered}
\] \& ProveNANCE. Ni . \& \[
\begin{aligned}
\& \text { Collec- } \\
\& \text { Tron. } \\
\& \text { B.E.F. }
\end{aligned}
\] \& \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { C.B.M. } \\
11563
\end{gathered}
\] \& \begin{tabular}{l}
Description. \\
Rather well preserved. Enbaked.
\[
5.25 \times 3.8 \times 2.1 . \quad \text { Inser. } 9(0 .)
\]
\end{tabular} \\
\hline 64 \& 39 \& Si. \& ? \& 2 \& 20 \& Ni. \& M.I.O. \& 174 \& \begin{tabular}{l}
\[
+7(\text { R. })+1 \text { (U. F. })=17 \mathrm{li} .
\] \\
l'aint seal impressions. II Exp. \\
Piece of 1. E. broken off, otherwise \\
wh preserved. Inbaked. 7.3 \\
\(\times 4.8 \times 2.85\). Inser. 12 (O.) \\
\(+13(\mathrm{R})+.4(\mathrm{U}, \mathrm{E})=.29 \mathrm{li}\). \\
Seal impressions.
\end{tabular} \\
\hline 65 \& 39 \& Si. \& ? \& 9 \& 14 \& Ni. \& M.I.O. \& 1852 \& Well preserved. Baked. Reddish brown, \(2.8 \times 2.8 \times 1.75\). Inser. \(5(0)+\geq(\) Lo. E. \()+5\) \((\) R. \()+3(\) L. E. \()=15 \mathrm{li}\). Seal impressions. \\
\hline 66 \& 40 \& Si. \& ? \& ? \& ? \& Ni. \& M.Y.O. \& 1483 \& Cpper part wanting. Baked. Light brown. \((\mathrm{x}+) 6.8 \times 5 \times\) 2.85. Inser. \((\mathrm{x}+\) ) \(10(0)+\). \(13(+\mathrm{x})(\mathrm{R})=.23(+\mathrm{x})\) li. Seal impressions. \(=\) C.B.M., (Vast 9787. \\
\hline 67 \& 40 \& Si. \& 27 \& 1 \& ? \& Ni . \& M.I.O. \& 26.3 \& Pressed and effaced. Slighty baked. Illackish. \(3.12 \times 3 \times\) 1.65. Seal impressions (in Sippar fashion). \\
\hline 68 \& 40 \& Ii. \& 21 \& 8 \& 20 \& Ni. \& H.V.H.
B.E.F. \& 11013

6002 \& | iVell preserved. Baked. Brown. $8.2 \times 5.1 \times 2.8 . \quad$ Inser. 14 (O.) $+16(\mathrm{R})=.30 \mathrm{li}$. Scal impressions. III Exp. Long ridge to the west of Shate en-Nil. |
| :--- |
| (ase: Broken pieces glued together. Hlackish spots. II Exp. Long ridge to the west of Shatt en-Nil. | <br>

\hline $69 a$ \& 22 \& \& \& \& \& Ni. \& B.E.F. \& 11191 \& Talbet of the time of Sin-ikisham. II Exp. Long ridge to the west of shatt en-Nil. <br>
\hline 696 \& \& \& \& \& \& Ni. \& B.E.F. \& 11560 \& Tablet of the time of Sin-ikisham. III Fxp. Long ridge to the west of Shatt en-Nil. <br>

\hline 70 \& 41 \& H. \& 16 \& 13 \& \& \& B.E.F. \& 7017 \& | Cracked, otherwise well preserved. |
| :--- |
| Baked. Light and blackish brown. $8.9 \times 4.8 \times 2.7$. Inser. $16(\mathrm{O})+$.3 (L.o. E.) +16 (R.) $=35 \mathrm{li}$. |
| Case of the preceding tablet: Fragmentary. 6 different seal impressions. Purchased by II Exp. | <br>

\hline
\end{tabular}





| Text. $97$ | 1'late. <br> 50 | King. <br> Ae. | Yeair. <br> $?$ | Month. 5 | $\begin{gathered} \text { DAY. } \\ S \end{gathered}$ | ProveNANCE. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Collec- } \\ & \text { Thon. } \\ & \text { Kh. }{ }^{2} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { С.В. } \mathrm{B} \text {. } \\ 1537 \end{gathered}$ | Description. <br> L and L.o. F. entirely, R. amost chtircly broken. Baked. Reddish browı. $11.8 \times 6.5 \times 4.6$. Inscr. 16 (O.) +19 (R.) +5 $(U . E)=.40 \mathrm{li}$. Seal impressions. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 93 | 50 | Ad. | 1 | 7? | 5 ? |  | kin. ${ }^{2}$ | 1353 | Fragment. Baked. Liglat brown and black. $10.8 \times 6.4 \times 3$. Inser. $19(0)=.19(+x)$ li. Seal impression. |
| 99 | 50 | Ad. | 4 | 4 | 15 |  | Kh. ${ }^{2}$ | 1284 | Well preserved. Sliglaty baked. Brown. $3.7 \times 3.7 \times 2.2$ Inser. $5(\mathrm{O})+2($ Lo. E. $)+3(\mathrm{R})=$. 10 li. Seal impression. |
| 100 | 50 | Ad. | 4 | 7 | 16 |  | Kい, ${ }^{2}$ | 1680 | Fragment. Baked. Lower part of L. E. and adjoining portions broken away. $4.2 \times 4.5 \times 2.2$. Inscr. 6 (O.) +6 (R.) +2 $($ R. E. $)+3$ (L. E. $)=17(+\mathrm{x})$ li. |
| 101 | 50 | Ad. | ? | 5 | 5 |  | Kı, ${ }^{2}$ | 1196 | Two pieces of same size glued together. Small pieces chipped off. Baked. Grayish brown. $6.4 \times 4.4 \times 2.3$. Inscr. 9 (O.) +3 (Lo. E.) +9 (R.) +2 $($ L. E. $)=23$ Ii. Seal impres~ sions. |
| 102 | 50 | Ad. | 7 | 2 | $20 ?$ |  | Kh. ${ }^{2}$ | 1700 | Two pieces glued together. Very slightly baked. Clay brown. $8.6 \times 5.4 \times 2.4$. Inscr. 16 (O.) +5 (Lo. E.) +14 (R.) + 1 (U. E.) = 36 li. |
| 103 | 51 | Ad. | 10 | 10 | $13 ?$ |  | Kh. | 505 | Fragment, lower part of tablet. Baked. Brown. $4.7 \times 7.3 \times$ 3.1. Inscr. 7 (O.) +6 (R.) $=$ 13 li. |
| 104 | 51 | Ad. | ? | 10 | 10 |  | Kh. ${ }^{2}$ | 1140 | Some small pieces chipped off. Baked. Light brown changing into black. $4.4 \times 4.3 \times 2$. Inscr. 6 (O.) +2 (Lo. E.) + 3 (R.) +3 (U.E.) $=14$ li. Seal impressions. |
| 105 | 51 | Ad. | 13 | 5 | 20 |  | Kh. ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 1513 | Considerable portions chipped off. Baked. Light brown changing into reddish brown. $\quad 13.3 \times 6.8$ $\times$ 3.3. Inser. 23 (O.) +3 (I.o. E.) +24 (R.) +2 (U. E.) +2 (L.E.) $=54 \mathrm{li}$. Seal impressions. |


| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Text. } \\ & 100 \end{aligned}$ | Plate. <br> 51 | King. Ad. | Year. 14 | Monthe. <br> 8 | DAy. $\qquad$ | ProveNANCE. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Colleb- } \\ & \text { mion. } \\ & \text { Khl. } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { C.B.H. } \\ 1632 \end{gathered}$ | Deschiption. <br> 'lwo fragments glued together. Slighty baked. Blackish brown. $6.7 \times 4.7 \times 2.2 . \quad$ Inser, 9 (O.) +1 (Lo. F.) $+5(\mathrm{R})=.15 \mathrm{li}$. seal impressions. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 107 | \%1 | Ad. | 14 | 11 | $\because 6$ |  | Lin.2 | 1507 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Damaged, especially R. Tubaked. } \\ & 7.9 \times 4.7 \times 2.4 . \quad \text { Inser. } 7(0 .) \\ & +1 .(\text { R. })+2(\text { U. E. })=20 \mathrm{li} \end{aligned}$ |
| 108 | 51 | Ad. | 17 | 5 | 18 |  | Kı, | 1650 | Pragmentary. Part of $O$. and R. E. wanting. Baked. Blackish brown. $5.8 \times 4.4 \times$ 2.3. Inscr. 7 (O.) +1 (Lo. H.) $+8(\mathrm{R})+.1(\mathrm{O} . \mathrm{E})=.17 \mathrm{li}$. seal impressions. |
| 109 | 51 | Aci. | 27 | 13 | $\begin{gathered} 20 \\ (30 ?) \end{gathered}$ |  | Kh. | 363 | Three pieces gilued together. Unbaked. $3.8 \times 3.4 \times 2$. Inser. 5 (O.) +1 (Lo. E.) +3 (R.) +1 (U. E.) $=10 \mathrm{~h}$. Seal impressions. |
| 110 | 52 | Ad. | 29 | 2 | 2 | , | Kh, ${ }^{\text {2 }}$ | 1670 | Two fragments glued together. <br> Baked. Light brown. $8 \times 4.8$ $\times$ 2.6. Inscr. 12 (O.) +10 $($ R. $)+1$ (U. E. $)=23$ li. Seal impressions. |
| 111 | 52 | Ad. | 33 | 4 | ? |  | Kh. | 473 | O. somewhat effaced. Part of upper left corner wanting. Baked. Light brown. $13.7 \times$ $6.3 \times 3$. Inser. $32(\mathrm{O})+$. $($ Lo. E. $)+7(\mathrm{R})=.40 \mathrm{li}$. |
| 112 | 52 | Ad. | 33 | 13 | 10 |  | J.s. | 146 | Fragmentary. Effaced and pieces <br> chipped off. Unbaked. $6.2 \times$ <br> $5.1 \times 2.4$. Inscr. $9(0)+$. <br> $($ R. $)+1$ (U, E. $)=19 \mathrm{li}$. |
| 113 | 52 | Ad. | 34 | 10 | 10 |  | Kh. ${ }^{2}$ | 1214 | Five pieces glued together. Considerable portions chipped off. Baked. Light brown. $12.9 \times$ $6.5 \times 3.2$. Inscr. 27 (O.) +3 (Lo. E.) +20 (R.) +3 (U. E.) $+1($ L. E. $)=54$ li. Seal impressions. |
| 114 | 53 | Ad. | 37 | 10 | 15 |  | $\mathrm{K} \mathrm{h}^{2}{ }^{2}$ | 1222 | Many pieces chipped off. Left. lower and upper corners wanting. Sliglitly baked. Light brown. $8.2 \times 4.7 \times 2.6$. Inscr. 13 (O.) +12 (R.) +2 $(\mathrm{U} . \mathrm{E})+$.2 (L. E.) $=29 \mathrm{li}$. Scal impressions. |





## 2. Halftone Reproductions.

| No. | Plate. |  |  | Corresponding <br> Autograph |
| :---: | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Reproductions. |  |  |  |  |

## X. NUMBERS OF THE CATALOGUES OF THE BABYLONIAN COLLECTIONS (PREPARED BY PROF. H. V. HILPRECHT).

1. Tablets in the University Museum, Philadelphia.

| C. B. M. | Text. <br> 81 | Plate. <br> 45 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { C. B. M. } \\ & 1200 \end{aligned}$ | Text. | Plate. | C. B. м. $1667$ | Text. <br> 121 | Plate. <br> 55 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 67 | 118 | 54 | 1214 | 113 | 52 | 1670 | 110 | 52 |
| 70 | 117 | 54 | 1217 | 130 | 57 | 1679 | 90 | 48 |
| 100 |  |  | 1222 | 114 | 53 | 1680 | 100 | 50 |
| 114 | 87 | 47 | 1228 | 71 | 42 | 1700 |  |  |
| 146 | 112 | 52 | 1245 | 124 | 55 | 1700 | 102 | 50 |
| 150 | 96 | 50 | 1250 | 116 | 53 | 1716 | 115 | 53 |
| 167 | 79 | 44 | 1259 | 73 | 43 | 1796 | $72 c$ |  |
| 300 |  |  | 1284 | 99 | 50 | 1800 |  |  |
| 355 | 88 | 48 | 1300 |  |  | 1804 | 75 | 43 |
| 358 | 136 | 59 | 1301 | 135 | 58 | 3300 |  |  |
| 366 | 109 | 51 | 1303 | 76 | 43 | 3384 | 13 | 7 |
| 400 |  |  | 1306 | 74 | 43 | 3400 |  |  |
| 432 | 132 | 58 | 1315 | 129 | 56 | 3425 | 10 | 5 |
| 453 | 127 | ${ }_{56}$ | 1318 | 133 | 58 | 3426 | 14 | 7 |
| 454 | 131 | 58 | 1322 | 119 | 54 | 3430 | 44 | 26 |
| 464 | 91 | 49 | 1353 | 98 | 50 | 3800 |  |  |
| 473 | 111 | 52 | 1362 | 84 | 47 | 3803 | 16 | 8 |
|  |  |  | 1382 | 77 | 44 | 4400 |  |  |
| 500 |  |  | 1395 | 85 | 47 | 4485 | 86 | 47 |
| 505 | 103 | 51 | 1500 |  |  | 6000 |  |  |
| 528 | 122 | 55 | 1504 | 94 | 49 | 6055 | 42 | 24 |
| 565 | 82 | 45 | 1507 | 107 | 51 | 6062 | 68 | 40 |
| 566 | 92 | 49 | 1513 | 105 | 51 | 7000 |  |  |
| 571 | 134 | 58 | 1537 | 97 | 50 | 7002 | 33 | 18 |
| 580 | 83 | 46 | 1550 | 93 | 49 | 7006 | 138 | 60 |
| 1100 |  |  | 1588 | $72 a$ | 42 | 7009 | 137 | 60 |
| 1140 | 104 | 51 | 1600 |  |  | 7010 | 78 | 44 |
| 1153 | 125 | 55 | 1613 | 123 | 55 | 7011 | 726 |  |
| 1170 | 120 | 54 | 1632 | 106 | 51 | 7013 | 80 | 45 |
| 1184 | 128 | 56 | 1647 | 88 | 48 | 7016 | 43 | 25 |
| 1187 | 95 | 50 | 1656 | 108 | 51 | 7017 | 70 | 41 |
| 1196 | 101 | 50 | 1657 | 128 | 56 | 7018 | 40 | 23 |


| $\begin{gathered} \text { C. 13. M. } \\ 9000 \end{gathered}$ | 'lext. | Plate. | $\begin{gathered} \text { С. B. M. } \\ 10889 \end{gathered}$ | Text. 38 | Peate. <br> 21 | $\begin{gathered} \text { C. B. M. } \\ 11560 \end{gathered}$ | Text. $69 b$ | Plate. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 9045 | 6 | 3 | 10890 | 29 | 16 | 11561 | . 58 | 36 |
| 9047 | 47 | 28 | 10891 | 24 | 12 | 11562 | 35 | 19 |
| 9100 |  |  | 10892 | 54 | 34 | 11563 | 63 | 39 |
| 9182 | 32 | 17 | 11000 |  |  | 11565 | 39 | 22 |
| 9183 | 8 | 4 | 11013 | 68 | 40 | 11596 | 20 | 10 |
| 10000 |  |  | 11152 | 4 | 2 | 11640 | 9 | 4 |
| 10166 | 3 | 1 | 11173 | 28 | 15 | 11660 | 35 | 19 |
| 10882 | 5 | 2 | 11191 | $69 a$ | 22 | 11715 | 19 | 9 |
| 10883 | 30 | 16 | 11237 | 2 | 1 | 11980 | 7 | 3 |
| 10886 | 53 | 33 | 11499 | 1 | 1 | 12000 |  |  |
| 10887 | 52 | 32 | 11558 | 34 | 18 | 12698 | 52 | 32 |

2. Tablets in the Imperial Ottoman Museum, Constantinople.

| M. I. O. 45 | Text. $26$ | Plate. $13$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { M. I. O. } \\ 1800 \end{gathered}$ | Text. | Plate. | $\begin{gathered} \text { M. I. O. } \\ 1919 \end{gathered}$ | Text. <br> 48 | Plate. <br> 29 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 100 |  |  | 1842 | 25 | 14 | 1920 | 37 | 20 |
| 174 | 64 | 39 | 1845 | 17 | 8 | 1994 | $12 a$ | 6 |
| 182 | 49 | 30 | 1846 | 21 | 10 | 1995 | 57 | 35 |
| 200 |  |  | 1847 | 51 | 31 | 1996 ? | 46 | 27 |
| 263 | 67 | 40 | 1848 | 27 | 14 | 1997 | 62 | 38 |
| 300 |  |  | 1849 | 55 | 35 | 1998 | 18 | 9 |
| 325 | 60 | 37 | 1852 | 65 | 39 | 1999 | 36 | 19 |
| 400 |  |  | 1900 |  |  | 2000 |  |  |
| 439 | 15 | 8 | 1905 ? | 56 | 35 | 2001 | 45 | 27 |
| 1400 |  |  | 1915 | 50 | 31 | 2003 | 41 | 24 |
| 1454 | 61 | 38 | 1916 | 11 | 6 | 2004 | 59 | 37 |
| 1483 | 66 | 40 | 1917 | 23 | 11 |  |  |  |
| 1492 | 31 | 17 | 1918 | 22 | 11 |  |  |  |
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1. CESSION OF HOUSE PROPERTY AS INDEMNITY FOR A TEMPLE OFFICE AFTER AN APPLICATION TO KING HAMMURABI, WHO TURNS THE



[^68]

5. LEASE OF A FIELD FOR PAYMENT OF ONE-THIRD OF THE CROP. $13 T H$ YEAR OF SAMSU-ILUNA.
6. DIVISION OF INHERITANCE. THE SEAL CONTAINS THE NAMES OF ALL FOUR DIVIDING PERSONS. I3TH YEAR OF SAMSU-ILUNA.

7. division of inheritance. 14th year of samsu-iluna.
8. SEE PL. VII.

8. PURCHASE OF A PORTION OF A HOUSE BY THE ELDEST FROM A YOUNGER BROTHER. 13TH YEAR OF SAMSU-ILUNA.

9. CASE OF THE PREVIOUS TABLET (PL. VII).



12-13. TWO TABLETS RECORDING LOANS OF MONEY, 37TH YEAR OF AMMI-DITANA. THE DATES MENTION KING DAMQI-ILISHU.
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[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ Enki and Damgalnunna, Babbar and Enlil(?), Kusu, Lugal-esh-a, Mah, Martu, Ninsun and Nusku.
    ${ }^{2}$ According to a slip attachod to the tablet.

[^1]:    ${ }^{1} E \cdot-d \bar{u}-a=b \hat{t} t u$ epshu (passive-intransitive adjective formation like bêtu abtu, b̂̂tu nadu ) designates the ground as fur as it is covered with buildings. For its relation to $\hat{e}$-kankal and $\dot{e}-k i$-shub-ba see p. 12, note 1 . For the expression "so much area of built house," see remarks on Babylonian houses, pp. 25 and 26.

[^2]:    ${ }^{1}$ For this reading see Thureau-Dangin, S. A. K. I., p. 48, note 1.

[^3]:    ${ }^{1}$ Bal-gub-ba, the exact meaning of which is not clear, resumes the temple offices and the income attached to these. Perhaps it must be analyzed balgub-ba (or baldu-ba), "the inherited . . . . .," a term which would correspond to hala-ba.

[^4]:    ${ }^{1}$ Nevertheless we may consider it beyond doubt that Ellil, the god of Nippur, played just the same rôle in oaths as Shamash in Sippar and Larsam, Marduk in Babylon, Urash in Dilmun, i.e., that he was mentioned in close connection with the king who officiated as lis plenipotentiary. Perhaps mentioning the latter made all allusion to the god superfluous. But it is also possible that lugal here designates the chief god (of a city or a person, as, e.g., Gud., Cyl. A, Col. V, l. 10), although in Semitic it is rendered by sharru (cf. No. $30: 251$, nîsh sharrim itm $\hat{u}$ ), not bĉlu. But notice the expression lugal-ur-bi, which might be translated "the lord of both."
    ${ }^{2}$ Cf. the phrase: sham-til-la-bi-shû $\mathbf{x}$ gin $k \dot{u}-b a b b a r ~ i n-n a-a n-l a(l)$, and the equally constant Tell Sifr formula: x gin $k \hat{a}$-babbar sham-til-la-ni-shúu in-na-lúl $l)$.
    ${ }^{3}$ A more distinct arrangement was arrived at by placing grammatical units (words or word groups) each on one line (e.g., sham-til-la-bi-shu, in-shi-in-sham), or by indenting the lines when the grammatical group covered more than one line (as especially with the kunya). A more extensive use of the indenting of lines seems to have been practised at Babylon, judging from the purchase deed C. T., VIII, 22c, where the verbs which close the divisions of the document-in-si-in-sham, in-na-an-la(l), in-pá(d)-dé-me-esh-are warped.
    ${ }^{4}$ No. 12 adds sag-bi $\mathrm{X}_{1}$, ki-è-bie-sir $\mathrm{X}_{2}$-shú.

[^5]:    ${ }^{1}$ The same sign also Sin－gashid，cone of clay， 20 ；Uruk．，cone B， $11: 23$ ，ete．See note 1 on p． 3.
    ${ }^{2}$ A全至前平

[^6]:    ${ }^{1}$ It may be questioned whether the dropping of the postposition ta after $k i$ must be considered as an error on the part of Semitic scribes; at least the possibility cannot be denied that the use of $k i$ as an independent preposition was a characteristic of the local Sumerian dialects which formerly were spoken in the respective localities, and which, when no longer spoken, were handed down in schools and temple rituals.
    ${ }^{2}$ See note 2 , on p. 3. The affixed $a$, the function of which it is to group the preceding ideas into a grammatical unit, and thus especially to substantivate verbal expressions, is placed here directly after $k i z$-ta-sham, although there follows still a modification by $k i$. In $64: 6$ and $66: 5$, however, it is placed behind the verbal modification (ku-ta-sham .....in-sham-a). Compare the similar positions of the temporal $a$ in $u d d a$ inlal and ud inlala.

[^7]:    ${ }^{1}$ C. T., XII, 11, Rev. $1: 17, d u, 1: 19, t u-u h=p a-d a-r u m$.
    ${ }^{2} k i z l a h$, ,ki-kal or $k i$-gal (pronounced with nasalization kankal) and $k i$-skub-ba have practically all the same meaning of uncultivated ground, or ground not coyered with buildings, against $\hat{e}-d \bar{u}-a$, built house or land covered with buildings. The identity of the first two terms can hardly be doubted, since both are rendered with teriktu and nidutu, but it is roo less certain that nidutu is the direct translation of $k i$-shub-ba. As kal denotes "to take down a house" (cf. II $R$., $15: 32 a$ : the house in-kal $\grave{u} i n-d \bar{u}=i q-q u r i$ - $p u-u s h$, "he has taken down and built anew"; [kal]-la dito ( $=n a-q a-r u)$ sha biti, Del., $H$. W., 480b), ki-kal denotes the place where a house has been taken down, and this is evidently also the general meaning of nidutu (= place of a ruined house; cf. é-shub-ba = bittu na-du-u, IV $R$., $30: 31,32$ ) and teriktu (from tarâku, "to break, crack"). In Neo-Babylonian contracts we find also bîtu ab-tu(same formation as bittu nadû and bîtu epshu), followed in the deed of purchase, Weissb., Misc., No, 15, by the addition: sha na-ka-ru ù e-pi-shu, "which must be taken down

[^8]:    ${ }^{1}$ Cf. gish-sar a-shag a-an-ĕ-ne-a, 43:23. The correct meaning seems to be: a garden which turns into field or marsh.
    ${ }^{2}$ Instead of $\frac{1}{3}$ nam perhaps one must read $\frac{1}{3}$-nam, i.e., shushshan-nam $=$ shushshan-a-an. Or does nam $=$ pilatu also here mean "object of exchange"?
    ${ }^{3} \mathrm{Cf}$. the same meaning of $a r k i$ in Semitic Babylonian.

[^9]:    ${ }^{1}$ Mistake of scribe for $l \grave{u}$-lù-ù-ra.
    ${ }^{2}$ The witnesses of this contract are introduced with the older (and more correct) igi-shu.
    ${ }^{3}$ I.e., the exit of the house is used by two or more parties.

[^10]:    ${ }^{1}$ The $\dot{u}$ indicates that the apposition in li. 13 refers to li. 10 , as well as to li. 11 and 12 .
    ${ }^{2}$ Cf. kù-babbar igi-te-bi, $14: 7$.

[^11]:    ${ }^{1}$ Cf. the similar provision in adoption documents. Ni-ba-e, plur. ni-ba-e-ne, is the future to in-ba, pl. in-ba-esh. Cf. ni-lá (l)-e, ni-lá(l)-e-ne, $56: 16$, and $i n$-lá $(l)$; ni-ág-e (in Nippur texts only al-ag-e, $15: 11,17: 8,50: 10,63: 9$ ) and $i n-a g ; n i-d \bar{u}-e$, "he shall build," $14: 13$, and $i n-d \bar{u}$.
    ${ }^{2}$ Compare the similar case in M. 49 where two brothers exchange parts of their inheritance.
    4

[^12]:    ${ }^{1}$ Nevertheless this custom would not have arisen unless it had been founded on actual conditions, and we must, therefore, conclude that the Babylonian houses, which as far as we can judge from the present remains consisted of walls of sun-dried bricks, over which the beams of the roof were spread, could easily be divided into several parts by building boundary walls across them. That this procedure was actually practiced we may infer from the fact that several times mention is made of boundary walls in the common possession of two neighbors.
    ${ }^{2}$ This is expressly stated in adoption documents, where it shall be taken from house, field and all household furniture; cf. also sib-ta nam-gala ù nam-shutug $\dot{e}^{d}{ }^{d}[\mathrm{Nin}$-sun], $26: 13$.

[^13]:    ${ }^{1}$ IV $R ., 13: 1 . b, u r-a-s i-g a=$ mitharish, "in the same way," ishtenish (ur-bi=mitharish), "in one (and the same) way" ( $B r .11259$ and 11261); cf. mi-it-ha-ri-ish $i-z u-u z-z u, S ., 105: 5,6 ; R ., 28: 19,23 ; C . I I ., 16: 21,22$. The connection ur-sig occurs also in $k a-u r-a n e-i n-s i-g a$, "who made them one mouth, subdued them" $=m u$-ush-te-esh-mi, Samsu-iluna, li. 38 and 39 (more closely rendered by the phrase pa ishten ushashkin); cf. also bal ka-ur-sig-ki, Warad-Sin, Canephore, 2:10. For the signification of mitharish cf. mibru, "the equivalent, the same as." For the reading ur see ur-ri-esh=ish-te-nish, Reisner S. B. H., No. 44, Rev., $29: 30$.

[^14]:    ${ }^{1}$ Gibil-bi-shú-a-an, $10: 20$ gibil-bi-esh-a-an, is composed of gibil-bi-shu' (= ana eshshûtishu = "aufs neue") and the iterative element $a$-an $=$ ám. The simple "auslaut" $s h(u)$ as well as the compound "auslaut" shuan-sham passed over into the Semitic Babylonian, the former as the common adverbial ending ish, ash, the latter as the iterative ending sham (ma) in esh-shi-sha-am-ma, "again, anew," R. 6:13; in umisham, "daily" and shattisham, "yearly." Compare also bar-shú-a-an, "on account of all this," Samsu-iluna, 24.
    ${ }^{2}$ Shuria-bi-shui is an adverbial expression formed like gibil-bi-shú with the postposition shú. The Sumerian construction can be rendered more closely in German: "Das Hausgeraet zur Haelfte." The determinative element bi in such adverbial formations is rendered in the Semitic Babylonian by means of the possessive pronoin, e.g., ana silirtishu (to which compare in Hebrew lebaddô)
    ${ }^{3}$ Cf. a-mu-u-a, $29: 10$.
    ${ }^{4}$ The value $t a$ for $S H A R$ (from the Semitic $t(\hat{b} b u$ ) ensues from the often occurring $b a$-al-ta-at $=$ perm. fem. sing. Cf. No. $70: 15 ; C . T$, VI, $26 a: 14 ; 30: 20$; VIII $20 c, g$., etc.

[^15]:    ${ }^{1}$ Cf. dubbin mi-ni-in-AG-a|gar-ra-ni (thus instead of ash?) mi-ni-in-dū-e $\mid \grave{u} k u(-b a b b a r)-g a-a s h m i-n i-i n-s i, V R$. 25, III, $26: 28=u-g[a-l a]-a b-s h u|a b-b u-u t-t u m ~ i-s h a-a k-k a n-s h u| \dot{u}$ a-na kaspi i-na-am-din-shu. The enumerated procedures represent punishments of rising severity. C.H., $8 a: 43-59$ forbids in the case in question to sell for money and allows only the abuttam shakânu. The grammatical correctness of the verbal forms in lis. 21-23 may be doubted. Cf. also the wrong plural infix, resp. the wrong plural ending in banengush, lis. 15 and 20 . Perhaps we should read. altarrude and babsimude and correspondingly alter the translation.

[^16]:    ${ }^{1}$ To the combination of gar and kú compare the compound gar-ku-a (Reisner, Telloh, 101, IV, 7) and Br. 11997 and 11954.
    ${ }^{2}$ The formation lali-dam is not determined as to the genus verbi; it usually designates a future action; dam is to be analyzed as de-a-an.

[^17]:    ${ }^{1}$ Cf. Ungnad, O. L. Z., IX, col. 462-465.
    ${ }^{2}$ The ge denoting the grammatical subject is found in No. 4 , but not in the other adoption documents, which moreover are very careless in the distinction of plural and singular endings, infixes and suffixes.
    ${ }^{3}$ The following and the preceding lines differ from that of the corresponding lines in purchase deeds.
    ${ }^{4} E 九 i=l \hat{q} \hat{u} t u$, tarbutu, concr, the child which is brought up; nam-ebi$=l i q \hat{u} t u$, tarbêtu, abstr. the adoption, the bringing up of a child.

[^18]:    ${ }^{1}$ The postposition ge makes $A m a-s u k k a l$ the subject. But this can hardly have been the intention of the scribe, he probably having misplaced $g e$, intending it to follow ${ }^{d}$ En-lil-id-zu, etc.

[^19]:    ${ }^{1}$ This document uses ge only here (but not, e.g., in li. 1, 13, 15, etc.) to denote the subject, while else it designates with ge the genetive (li. 10, 20, 24, 32).

[^20]:    ${ }^{1}$ Cf. Z. A., XXI, p. 220.
    ${ }^{2}$ On the infix $n i$, "therein, thereinto," cf. Z. A., XXI, pp, 232-236.
    ${ }^{3}$ Subject the father of the bride; R. 101:19, u-she-ri-bu-shi (object $=$ the bride).
    ${ }^{4} u r=$ mitbarish, ishtenish, Br., 11259, 11261, is as adjective connected with mu-lugal (object), not with the predicate.

[^21]:    ${ }^{1}$ The scribe intended perhaps mu-ni-im.
    ${ }^{2}$ This document from Yokha shows several peculiarities. Notice the habit of leaving a blank space between wedge and name (li. 4, 9, 10 and 17) and between $i g i$ and name (li. 21-34); DAM(?)-DINGIR(?) instead of SAL + ISHIB; the mentioning of Shuzianna and the absence of the bur-gul.

[^22]:    ${ }^{1}$ Ranke's view (B. E., Series A, VI $a$, p. 29) that bu-zu refers to the pudenda is confuted by the Sumerian sag-ki $=p \hat{t u}$, panu. $\quad$ Lab-lahb-ga, Br., $7927=$ ellu.
    ${ }^{2}$ So expressly stated $R$., 96, sha X u-da-am-mi-ku-shi-ma a-na ma-ru-ti-sha ish-ku-nu-shi.
    ${ }^{3}$ Kunukkam ezêbu (C.H.) shows that we have to read kiship-pa-am, not dup-pa-am ush-te-zi-ib, C.H., $9 a: 34$.
    ${ }^{4} U r$ does not refer to mistress and maid-slave, since the latter enters into no obligation, in which case we would also expect she-ga-ne-ne-ta. Moreover the parts C (no claim shall be made against the former slave) and D belong, like in purchase documents, closely together, and thus ur refers to the two children of the mistress.

[^23]:    ${ }^{1}$ Loans of grain, Nos. 13, 15, 16, 17, 25 and 63; loans of money, Nos. 20 and 22; loan of bricks, No. 21.

[^24]:    ${ }^{1}$ Bricks were measured, as we see from M, 82 and this instance, by superficial measures. This seems to presuppose that they had a fixed diameter,

[^25]:    ${ }^{1}$ Shag-(ga-ni) ne-ib-dug-gi, $27: 7,14: 9$.
    ${ }^{2}$ Perhaps "in the present (current) year." Compare for the connection of $m u$ and $d u, m u-2-k a m-d u-\grave{u}-b i, 42: 7$.
    ${ }^{3}$ For $G I S H-B A R$ we find $80: 10$, gish-shi; as BAR interchanges with shi in nadutu-shi-a (cf., e.g., the date Ad 13), where the reading shi is proved by the Semitized form dush $\hat{u}$, it follows that gish-BAh is to be read gish-shi.

[^26]:    ${ }^{1}$ Cf. also $a-m u-\bar{u}-a$ and $a-m u-u-a, 28: 20,22 ; 29: 10$.

[^27]:    ${ }^{1} \hat{I} b-t a-\grave{e}-a=i b-t a-\dot{a}-a$.
    ${ }^{2}$ Like right and left he shall pay, i.e., the harvest shall be divided between lessor and lessee into equal parts.

[^28]:    ${ }^{1}$ In the third duplicate, $52: 26$, the rêd pubrum is designated only as rêd $\hat{u}$, from which we may conclude that witl) the rêdu in $14: 31,28: 12$ and $58: 22$ likewise the rêd puhrum is meant. This shows that also in 14,28 and 58 the council of Nippur rendered judgment,

[^29]:    Annotations to No. 14.--The signification of iz=zi ri=ba=na, li. 1, is-síg) ri-ba-na, C. T., IV, $22 b: 1, i z-z i$ ri-ba-an-na, II $R ., 15: 22 a(=i$-gar bi-ri-tim), can be no other than boundary wall, as is evident from the facts that here, C. T., IV, $22 b$, and $R .44$ it is the common property of two neighbors, and that an izzi ribana can be sold to a neighbor (e.g., $44: 14-16$ ). For kú=babbar igi=te-bi, cf. 26, III, 14, where a nam-gala is called the igi-te ad-da-ne-ne. Cf. also the Hebrew kestul'enajim, Gen. 20: 17. Nig=na=me = mimma or mimma bashu, V R., $11: 41$, corresponds in formation and signification to $a-n a-m e(-a-b i)=$ mamman. The phrases of li. 12-14 are among others set down in II $R$, 14,15 , Col. IV, $36-39$ for the use of scribes who had to draw up legal documents. We find there, instead of $n u-u b-d \bar{u}-e$, $n u-u b-d \bar{u}-a, i . e ., n u-u b-d a-a$, the original ending $e$ having been contracted with the preceding vowel to $\hat{a}$; cf. mi-ni-in$A G-a$, p. 31, note 1. Gish urara $\mathbf{n u}=\mathbf{u b}=\mathrm{du}=\mathrm{e}$ refers to the laying of the roof beams upon the wall, which the neighbor has of course an interest in forbidding, because the brick wall would be impaired by the additional weight. She=ga= ne=ne=ta in=pá(d)=dé=esh, li. 19: the oath is a mutual one, because both parties assume obligations, that of Mâr-irṣitim being not to revoke the compensation which he paid.

[^30]:    ${ }^{1}$ Der bur-gul als Nolur in Nippur, O. L. Z., 1907, col. 175-181.
    ${ }^{2}$ But before the female witnesses, ef. $6: 24,25$. Exceptions to the rule we find only on Nos. 39 and 40. In the first instance the burgul is separated from the dubsar by but one person; in the second he occupies the rezular place of the official persons at the end of the list of witnesses. Compare also C. T., 32c:18 and 19 (Sippar), where the hazann (i. 18) and the dubsar (li. 19) follow the male witnesses (li. 14-17), but precede the female witnesses (li. 20 and 21 ); the same persons occur $R ., 22: 25$ and 26 after the witnesses $17-24$. In the Tell Sifr documents the bazâmu is usually the first witness and in one case also the scribe.
    ${ }^{3}$ See Plate II and compare with Vol. VI, 1, Plate X.
    ${ }^{4}$ Cf., e. g., No. 6 with Nos. 29, 70, etc.
    ${ }^{5}$ Only then the inscription has a latitudinal direction when so much space was left that the inscription could be reproduced in full (or nearly so). Cf. No. 34.
    ${ }^{6}$ On the tablet from Yokha (No. 8) the seal impressions show the same direction as on the Nippur tablets, and likewise (but sometimes only partially) on a considerable number of tablets in the Berlin Museum which I have examined. This fact should be noticed in the determination of their provenance.

[^31]:    ${ }^{1}$ Part of the temple precincts of Shamash in Sippar; called the wide court of Shamash, Ad. 18. It is often men-
     there are lhouss in the $G a-g \hat{a}$ ( $\mathrm{P} ., 70: 2, i-n a(a-g i-i-i m$ ), inlabited, as it seems, if not exclusively but principally by women. C. T., XII, 22, 36991, Rev. I, 14, 15, MAL + inserted $G \hat{T}=g a ́(?)-g i ́-a=b \hat{\imath} t ~ n a-a k-m i-t u m, b \hat{t} t$ nit. . . .], b̂̂t te-lil-tum, bût ki-lu-t[um]; "house of lustration," and "house of seclusion" seems to point towards a meaning like "cloister."
    ${ }^{2}$ Perhaps "for the lord who decides the decisions," or " a chamber for the deciding of the decisions."
    ${ }^{3}$ Or more likely: The year in which Erech and Isin has been taken.

[^32]:    ${ }^{1}$ Perhaps we should connect and translate: "Alter Ninni . . . . . raised him," i.e., Ifam-mu-rabi.
    ${ }^{2}$ (. shows the sign as $N I N$; VIII, $43 c$ has buru(?).

[^33]:    ${ }^{1} \bar{A} l u$ is never used as a mere determinative; here it seems to be a part of the name of the town which means "town of Bazum" (notice the genetive Ba-zi; Bazum= personal name), likc A-al- ${ }^{d}$ Gat- ${ }^{d}$ Sin, doorsocket of Arad-Nannar, 2:2; Al-Ur-d $M A S H, B . E$., Serics A, XIV, 114: 11; Al-Tukul-ti-E-kur $k i, 128: 2$, etc. For the personal name Bazum compare Ba-a-zi (genctive ol Bazum, Cassite time), B. $b$., Scries A; XIV, $16: 3$, the hypocoristic $B a-z i-a, P . N$., and the feminine name $B a-z a-t u m, P . N$.
    ${ }^{2}$ It was before this statue that $H$ ammurabi set up the stele on which was written his code of laws. A-wa-ti-ia shu-ku-va-tim i-na na-ru-ia ash-țu-ma i-na ma-bar salmi-ia shar mi-sha-ri-im u-ki-in, C. H., 24:74-78. This statue of II ammu-rabi stood in Babylon in the temple E-sagil (cf. C. II., 24:59-25:58; see A. H. Godby, "The Place of the Code of IIammu-rabi," in The Monist, ed. P. Carus, Vol. XV, No. 2, pp. 199-226, Chicago, 1905).
    ${ }^{3}$ A. space for one sign; C. for two. B. has before this line still another one: [............ Z]imbir ${ }^{k i}-$ ra.

[^34]:    ${ }^{2}$ The formula for this year cannot be restored as mu Esh-nun-na a-gal-gal-la, because this formula is found on tablets from Tell Sifr.

[^35]:    ${ }^{1}$ That this date belongs to the later part of Hammurabi's reign ensues because of the following reasons: 1. C.T., VIII, $22 c: 3,5$, a married woman bears the name "Hammurabi-sharri"; this points to a time after, at least, the 14th year of Hammurabi. 2. The Tell Sifr contracts S. 31 and M. 27 are dated in this year; but Southern Babylonia came definitely under the sway of Hammurabi only after his $29 t h$ or $30 t h$ year. 3. Sin-rimeni bazanu and $I b i q-A$ ïa dub-sar ( $R, 22: 25$, 26) oecur C. T., VIII, $32 c: 23,24$ (10th year of Samsu-iluna), and the latter also C. T., II, 5:31 (9th year of Samsuiluna).

    On the geographical position of Mari see Weissbach, Miscellen, p. 13. From the inscription of Shamash-resh-usur it ensucs that it is near the territory of Subi, of the position of which on the middle Euphrates not far from the mouth of the Habur the inscriptions of Assyrian kings leave no doubt. As a special kind of boats was named after Mari, it was evidently situated on the Euphrates, probably somewhat farther down the river.

[^36]:    ${ }^{1}$ The formula occurs on Nippur and Tell-sifr contracts and is therefore to be assigned to Hammu-rabi's later years. Mu-ha-du-um mâr ${ }^{d} \operatorname{Sin}-a-z u$ (S. 103, S. 13) occurs also on S. $71: 21$ (3d year of Si) and on $97: 26$ ( 8 th year of Si ). The correctness of the transcription and translation of the first part of the formula may be doubted.
    ${ }^{2}$ Meissner's copy shows kur-ne-ra-ge-ne.

[^37]:    an-ki-a PA-è-mu-ag-ge, Gud. Cyl. A, 1:11. Kur-kur designates the foreign hostile lands, in opposition to kalam $=$ matu, Thureau-Dangin in S. A. K. I., p. 40, note c, and Z. A., XVI, p. 354, note 3.

[^38]:    ${ }^{1}$ Confusion of the dates for the 7th and the 8th year. So according to Messersehmidt's copy in O. L. Z., X, p. 174; but judging from the copy in King, Chronicles, which shows a clear urudu instead of ${ }^{g i s h} l u k u l$, the scribe has simply omitted the formula of the 8th year.
    ${ }^{2}$ The copy has $\hat{\varepsilon}$-dingir-dingir-Marduk $=\bar{e}$ Ana- ${ }^{-d}$ Marduk?

[^39]:    ${ }^{1}$ First part of $s a g$ written over bar.
    ${ }^{2}$ Cf. $H 13$, note.
    ${ }^{3} \mathrm{D}$. was composed in this year.
    ${ }^{4}(k i)-{ }^{3}{ }^{2}$ lúb-gar.

[^40]:    ${ }^{1}$ After a copy by King.
    ${ }^{2}$ Cf. IV R., $9: 24 a$, ki-KU-mah $=$ shub-tu ellî-tim.

[^41]:    ${ }^{1}$ Before this divine weapon of NinIB it was a custom in Nippur to take an oath; cf.P. $49: 29, m a-h a r{ }^{d} U d-b a-n u-i l-l a$ ga-ba-am, and $58: 1,2$, er $\hat{a} K A G+G I S I I-{ }^{d} N i n-I B$ $i z-z i-i z-m a$ "the brazen battle mace of $N i n I B$ stood as witness."

[^42]:    ${ }^{1}$ Transcription and translation are mere attempts. Is this formula identical with that of the 28th year?
    ${ }^{2}$ Mentioned C. H., 4:3. Or Mashgan-sharri? The sign is much effaced.
    ${ }^{3}$ The three consecutive years a $-\mathrm{a}+2$ seem to belong to the earlier time of $A b i$-eshu', since $R$. 70 records a purchase of fields in the a +2 d year of $A b i$-eshu' in connection with such purchases in the 28 th and 31st years of Samsu-iluna.
    ${ }^{4} b i$-da probably mistake of the scribe.
    ${ }^{5}$ The copy shows ba-e for the two last signs.

[^43]:    ${ }^{1}$ The consecutive years 0 and $o+1$ (cf. R. 72; 73) and the year $o+1+x$ probably belong to the later time of Abi-eshu's reign, as the two latter years in R. 119 are mentioned together with the 4 th year of Ammi-ditana.
    ${ }^{2}$ This was done with a view of capturing king Ilima-ilum. See King, Chronicles, II, p. 105, li.9, ${ }^{\text {nar }}$ Idiylat is-kirma, etc.; gish-gi-gi from gish-gi-gi = sahirum, sakirum.

[^44]:    ${ }^{1} A$-kal shag-ash-GUB corresponds to git-ma-lu e-mu-ki, Gilg., $12: 38,45$. Cf. Ad. 22 and Az. $17+\mathrm{b}$.

[^45]:    ${ }^{1}$ The tablet shows $n i$; but the line is written over an erasure.
    ${ }^{2}$ Perhaps ${ }^{d a g} d \check{u}$-shi-a-ge instead of $d \breve{u}$-shi-a-ge.

[^46]:    ${ }^{1}$ Za-e $D U-D U-n e$ is the beginning of the inscription on the statue. For the second person in inscriptions on statues compare the bilingual hymn inscription on the statue of Hammu-rabi beginning ${ }^{d} E n$-lil e-te-lu-tam id-di-ik-kum at-ta ma-an-nam tu-ga-a; this statue, moreover, shows us what an alam nam-shul-a-ni (edlutishu, Ad. 14), nam-ur-sag-gà (qardûti, Ad. 34), nam-nir-gal-la-ni (etellûtishu, Az. 9), nam-lugal-a-ni (sharrûtishu, Ad. 8), nam-nun-na-ni (rubutishu, Ad. 5) was, viz., a statue with an inscription which glorifies the exploits of the king.
    ${ }^{2}$ Cf. Mar- ${ }^{n a t} Z i-l a-k u, ~ V I I I, ~ 32 b: 10 . ~$
    12

[^47]:    ${ }^{1}$ In this line only the heads of the signs are visible.
    ${ }^{3}$ Probably mistake under influence of the ta in the next line.

[^48]:    ${ }^{1}$ This reading ensues from Ad. 19; also there a golden throne for the $k i-B A D-g u b$ and a similar statue is dedicated.
    ${ }^{2}$ The reading $b a$ (Ungnad) seems to be excluded by the form of the signs; ni-tum-ma corresponds to shaluku in the sense of "to correspond with, to be fit, to adorn."

[^49]:    ${ }^{1}$ Br. 6651: $d a=$ nashu sha ameli.

[^50]:    ${ }^{1}$ Probably a mistake.

[^51]:    ${ }^{1}$ The plural is probably due to the wrong connection of $\{b$-diri-ga with the following me-te.
    ${ }^{2}$ Cf. Ad. 24.
    ${ }^{3}$ The ne-sag is one of the temple buildings or rooms. Cf. Gud., Cyl. A, 28:10.
    ${ }^{4}$ The postposition $-s h i$ seems to be caused by the verb intura at the end of the formula.
    ${ }^{5}$ The identification of these signs is difficult.
    ${ }^{6}$ On Berl. 1241, according to Ungnad; VIII, 11c, $\ldots-a(?)=u k u$ ?
    14

[^52]:    ${ }^{1}$ For the construction of shu-du with -ta, ef. mu ${ }^{\text {gish } g u-z a ~ b a r a-m a h ~ g u s h k i n-k u ́-b a b b a r-t a ~ s h u-d u ́-a ~}{ }^{d}$ Marduk-ra $m u$-un-na-dim-ma, A, Sl. 22; and similarly A, A.-S. 3 , etc. In the shorter formula which drops the verb shu-dú, nàza gin-na, etc., becomes a genetive modifier to ASH-ME-ash-ash-a just as nàdŭ-shi-a; therefore we find here, after $b i$-da, ge instead of $t a$, while the $g e$ after $n \grave{a} d \check{u}-$-shi-a has been dropped.
    ${ }^{2}$ Ash probably mistake.
    ${ }^{3}$ Cf: ${ }^{d}$ Lugal-gish ${ }^{\text {attu-GAB }}+$ LIS $\mid m u$ (mistake? or: the name of my kingdom) nam-lugal-la-mu-um $\mid$ ne-eb-gu-
    

[^53]:    ${ }^{1}$ That a solemn ceremony was performed in which the year was named, besides the regular New-Year's celebration (Ranke, B. E., Series A, VI, 1, p. 13), it is unnecessary to assume, and such is by no means likely to have taken place.
    ${ }^{2}$ Berl. $5833=$ Ad. 37 ; Ungnad should not conclude from this fact that the forcible capture of a fortress which another king had fortified is not an historical event. On the contrary, his assumption that historical events mentioned in dates must have occurred in the year of the formula is to be modified.

[^54]:    ${ }^{1} I$-ni-in-tu-ra, ete.; in-na-an-dur-ra, Ad. 14; in-nu-an-bil-a, Si. 39.
    ${ }^{2}$ Mu-un-gul-la; mu-un-dū-a; mu-un-ba-la; mu-un-il-la, mu-un-bil-a-an(?), H. 34; ne-in-gul-la, Ad. 37; ne-in-dū-a, Ad. 20; ne-in-sà-a, H. 35; gish-ne-in-ra-a, H. 39; gish-hash ne-in-ag-a, Si. 29; ne-in-bil-a, Si. 15; ne-in-tu-ra, Si. 13; ne-in-sì-sì-ga(-a), Si. 20; ki-ne-dug, H. 31; mi-ni-in-dun-na.
    ${ }^{3}$ "Das Verbum im Sumerischen," Z. A., XXI, 216-236.
    ${ }^{4} \mathrm{Cf}$. the translation $i b-n i-i-m a$ and $i b-n u-u-m a ; m a$ denotes the difference of time.
    ${ }^{5}$ The observation of Ranke, who concluding from the occurrence of the formula mu us-sa gu-za bara-mah ${ }^{d}$ Lugal$g u$-dŭ-a, places the conquest of Isin by Sin-muballit in the time between Nisan(!) 6th (or perhaps better 1st) and Adar 13th, is thus fully corroborated.

[^55]:    ${ }^{1}$ Cf. the remarks of Thureau-Dangin in $O . L . Z ., \mathrm{X}, 256 \mathrm{f}$.
    ${ }^{2}$ In his 1st, 7 th, 10 th, 11 th, $12 \mathrm{th}, 15$ th and 18 th years.
    15.

[^56]:    ${ }^{1}$ Compare the date of Rim-Sin, in which he states that in the temple of Nin-mab in Kesh he was raised to the kingdom over the totality of the land, corresponding to the sharrut kishshati, and notice, morcover, the fact that Upi $k i$ occurs frequently as part of personal names instead of a divinity during the time from Zabium to IIammu-rabi (and partly Samsu-iluna). This presupposes that $U p \hat{\imath}$ was during the time from Sumulail to the end of Sin-muballit's reign the capital of a kingdom and as such was worshiped as a divinity.
    ${ }^{2}$ The years of Hammurabi and Samsu-iluna, as late as the latter's second year, which occur on tablets from Tell Sifr and Nippur, will be seen from the following list: H. $30-,-; 31 \mathrm{~T} .-\mathrm{S} .,-; 32-, \cdots, 33-$, N. ; 34 T.-S., -; 35 T.-S., N.; 36 T.-S., N.; 37 T.-S., 一; 38 T.-S., N.; 39 T.-S., N.; $40-\ldots-; 41$ T.-S., N.; $42-,-; 43-,-;$ Si. 1 T.-S., N.; 2 - - . There are tablets dated in the reign of $\operatorname{Rim}-\mathrm{Sin}$ of the $1-9 \mathrm{th}, 11 \mathrm{th}, 13 \mathrm{th}, 18 \mathrm{th}, 21 \mathrm{st}-23 \mathrm{~d}, 25 \mathrm{th}-28 \mathrm{th}$ and 30 th years after the occupation of $I \sin$.

[^57]:    ${ }^{1}$ Cf. Thureau-Dangin, Une incursion élamite en territoire sumérien à l'époque présargonique, R. A., VI, 4, pp. 7-10.
    ${ }^{2}$ The following line is partly broken. The title king of $U r$ is of course a mistake.
    ${ }^{3}$ Louvre, I, 2:1-16. Cf. also mupab̌ir n̂̂sĥ̂ saphâtim sha Isin${ }^{k i}$, C. H., $2: 49-51$.
    ${ }^{4}$ Sce the inscriptions on bricks.
    ${ }^{5}$ The date formula states that $K a r$-Shamash is situated on the bank of the Tigris.

[^58]:    ${ }^{1}$ At that time Rim-Sin would have been at least about $20+6+2+43+1=70$ years.

[^59]:    ${ }^{1}$ In the 20th year some catastrophe seems to have befallen Nippur, because the three baked duplicate tablets, Nos. $52-54$, were found at one place, and moreover one of them is broken into two pieces, only one of which is burnt. Perhaps this fact points towards a conflagration of the city caused by enemies.
    ${ }^{2}$ Like the Westland mountains Basalla and Tidanum, from where Gudea procured certain stones, Stat. B., $6: 15$, 13, this great mountain of the Westland may be sought for somewhere in the vicinity of the Amanum, Gud., Stat. 13., $5: 28$. Should it be the Taurus? From there almost the entire trip could be made on rafts down the Euphrates and the canals in Babylonia.
    ${ }^{3}$ The date of this tablet is later than the 12 th year, because Mannummeshulisur, who buys a building lot according to No. 38 (Du'uzu 6, 12th year), is already dead according to No. 64 (a house, perhaps erected on that building lot, is sold by the brother, the son and the wife of Mannummeshulisur). As all the following years are named with official formulas that do not seem to allow an identification with ours, and as there is only the one ussa date of the 29th year, we should

[^60]:    probably assign it to this year. The occurrence of names (Abil-ilishu PA é-dMab, 11th and 13th years; Lu-Enlilla, 12th and 13th years; Idishum, 12th year; NinIB-rahim-şirim, 13 th, 20 th and 27 th years, II., 2 d year, and Enlil-muballit, 23d year) would, it is true, at first sight point rather toward a year near the 13 th , in which case one might identify the lugal im-gi (14th year) with Iadih-abu. But notice that NinIB-rahim-sirim occurs as late as the 27 th year of Samsuiluna and the second year of Ilima-ilum.
    ${ }^{1}$ P. 64.
    ${ }^{2}$ The 29 th or 30 th year would be an extreme limit, because the burgul A wilia is mentioned as early as forty years before, in the 33d year of Hammu-rabi. The last occurrence of his name on other tablets is in the 18 th year. The three persons mentioned also elsewhere are Awilia burgul (4, 33; Si. 4, 11, 12, 13 and 18); Ibni-Enlil dubsar (Si. 13, 14 and 28) ; NinlB-rahim-sirim (Si. 13, 20 and $29(=$ No. 64)). From this one could be inclined to think again of some year near the 13th or 14th; notice especially the juxtaposition of Awilia and Ibni-Enlil in Nos. 43 (13th year) and 44 (14th year). But cf. the occurrence of Ibni-Enlil in the 28th year.

[^61]:    ${ }^{1}$ We know the formulas of 25 (or 26 ) out of the 28 years of Abi-eshu'.

[^62]:    ${ }^{1}$ Perhaps the Sumerian(?).
    ${ }^{2}$ The opinion of Ungnad that the formula does not refer to the conquest of a fortress held by the enemy, but to the razing of a wall of a fortress in Ammi-ditana's own possession, cannot be maintained, because a king does not boast of such an event and mark a year after it, quite apart from the fact that the kings in order to secure their dominion tried to build as many fortresses as they could. Moreover, "to destroy the wall of a city" is the technical term for "to take a city by force," "to conquer a city."

    It is likewise impossible to assume that the words, "which Damqi-ilishu had built," do not refer to a contemporancous event, but to a construction of the wall by Damiq-ilishu, king of $I \sin$, at a much earlier time; for a wall of sun-dried bricks and beaten clay, as usually the Babylonian city walls were, would long since have been destroyed by rain and rendered unfit for the defense, even if it had not been devastated in the previous turbulent periods,

[^63]:    ${ }^{1}$ Notice the use of the $i$ to denote the hiatus before a syllable beginning with $i$.

[^64]:    ${ }^{1}$ If read correctly, this would prove the value $l u l$ for $L U L=$ zammeru.
    ${ }^{2}$ Ubaria(tum) with Verschleifung of the $r U b a^{i i} a(t u m)$; cf. $U$-bar-(ri-)ia; U-ba-ict-tum, P. N.
    ${ }^{3}$ I.e., as new moon; cf. namra-sit.

[^65]:    ${ }^{1}$ Cf. Nannar-ara-mungen and gir-gin-na $=$ sha tal-lak-ta-shu sha-qu-at, Del., H.-W., p. 69b.
    ${ }^{2} N a b=A N . A N$; cf. Nab-she-me-a at the time of Sin-gamil of Uruk. NAB is identified with Enlil, but a reading Enlil (or Bêl) for $N A B$ is not possible.
    ${ }^{3}$ Cf. Paknanum, P. N.

[^66]:    ${ }^{1}$ Cf. Za-ni-iq-bì ${ }^{d}$ Shamash, etc., P. N.

[^67]:    ${ }^{1}$ After the capture of $I \sin$.

[^68]:    3. ADOPTION OF two PERSONS, ONE OF WHOM HAS THE RIGHTS OF THE ELDER BROTHER. 4TH YEAR OF SAMSU-ILUNA,
