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EDITORIAL PREFACE.

This volume of cuneiform texts from the archives of Murashā Sons of Nippur forms the direct continuation of Series A, Vol. IX, by H. V. Hilprecht and A. T. Clay. In accordance with a resolution of the Publication Committee of the Babylonian Expedition, the authors of that volume had originally planned to edit Vol. X likewise together. With this aim in view, the undersigned had even gone to Constantinople and transliterated and translated all the texts of the same archives preserved in the Imperial Ottoman Museum. But, in consequence of the remarkable success of the University's fourth campaign at Nippur, which soon afterwards led to the founding of the Clark Research Professorship of Assyriology by Messrs. Edward W. and Clarence H. Clark, it became necessary to rearrange the work of the Babylonian Section of the University in accordance with the new conditions and regulations. The time and attention of the occupant of this new chair being required principally for the study of the thousands of earlier documents, which unfortunately for the greater part are unbaked and therefore often in a deplorable condition,' he readily accepted the friendly offer of his co-laborer to continue the publication of the Murashā archives alone, reserving for himself only the right to make his previous researches on the proper names of this class of tablets, as far as not presented by Prof. Clay, accessible to Assyriologists through additional notes characterized by the letters Ed. (= Editor). With the exception of these, Prof. Clay is alone responsible for the preparation of this entire volume and for the views expressed therein. Since he has devoted the best part of the last three years to the study of these texts and is already favorably known to Assyriologists from his conspicuous share in preparing Vol. IX, he does not need any introduction to the scientific world from his former teacher and present colleague. His work will speak for itself.

As already indicated, my additional notes refer chiefly to the identification and elucidation of proper names. Since the appearance of Vol. IX, in 1898, the investigation of Semitic proper names has made considerable progress. Among the recent notable publications in this line I mention only Johns, Assyrian Deeds and Documents, and the

same author’s Assyrian Doomsday Book; Lidzbarski, Handbuch der Nordsemitischen Epigraphik, and his contributions to the Ephemeris für Semitische Epigraphik, edited by himself; Littmann, Zur Entzifferung der Safait Inschriften; Dussaud and Macler; Voyage archéologique au Safait et dans le Djebel ed-Drâz, and the same two authors’ Mission dans les Régions désertiques de la Syrie Moyenne—all of which have rendered valuable service in helping to identify West-Semitic names contained in the Babylonian cuneiform texts here published. Suffice it to state expressly, that Araniean and Kana’anean names unaccompanied by a reference to an inscription are taken from the collections of Lidzbarski, while the Safaitic material as a rule goes back to the last-mentioned publication of Dussaud and Macler, and the Iranian names quoted for comparison are given on the authority of Justi’s Iranisches Namenbuch.

Greatly facilitated as the researches of the Assyriologist occupied with a study of proper names at present are, compared with what they were but a few years ago, the difficulties confronting him at every step, as indicated in the Introduction to Vol. IX, p. 9, are still extraordinary. In some cases, therefore, no effort was made to analyze the names published in the following pages. In other instances the view set forth must be regarded merely as a first attempt to offer a solution, while in still other cases several theories have been proposed, each of which will have to be examined with regard to its own merits. In scarcely another branch of Semitic philology we have to confess our ignorance as often as in the interpretation of proper names, which to a certain degree may be compared with geological stratifications and petrifactions reflecting the Werdproces of by-gone ages. We see the results of this process before us, but we are frequently at a loss to understand the causes which led to peculiar developments in certain directions, and to fix the historical order of the different stages through which it passed.

The different nations and races represented by proper names from the archives of Murashû Sons are almost as numerous as those referred to in Acts 11, 8-11. The Babylonia of the time of Arataxerxes I. and Darius I. evidently contained more foreigners than direct descendants of the earlier inhabitants. To judge from the material published in Vols. IX and X, the population of the small but rich alluvial country was a thorough mixture of native Babylonians and Cassites,1 Persians and Medians (IX, pp. 26, ff.), and even Indians; including also members of the mountainous tribes of Asia

1As to Cassite influence, cf. mNa’id-dShipak (IX), divBit-mTaribilmas-Harze (X) and divBit-mMarudda(u), IX and X.

2Whom I am inclined to recognize in Ai-hindai (IX), “settlement of the Indians,” and other expressions occurring in both volumes.
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Minor—among them the Tabalites\(^1\) or Tibarensians and the Hittites\(^2\)—inhabitants from Syria\(^3\) and the shores of the Mediterranean,\(^4\) Ammonites\(^5\) and Moabites,\(^6\) Jews and Edomites (cf. IX, pp. 26, ff.), Egyptians,\(^7\) and other nations.\(^8\) Considering how little we know of the language and history of most of these ancient peoples, it is only natural that Assyriologists should differ with regard to the meaning of certain proper names.

In Vol. IX, p. 19, I referred to a palaeographical peculiarity of the Murashāl tablets, according to which the plural sign MESH is generally written after ilu and *Shamash* in connection with the Babylonian transliteration of West-Semitic proper names, arriving at the result “that in either case MESH cannot indicate a plurality of gods, but must have been employed for expressing a sound which appeared to the Babylonian mind as one of their own plural endings,” and that this sound possibly was the pronominal suffix of the first person (*tō*), because other Semitic languages frequently have "šN, where the scribes of the Murashāl tablets have *ilu*\(^a\). For reasons given below, pp. 12 f, the correctness of this view, adopted since by several Assyriologists, has been challenged by Prof. Clay, who at the same time revives Prof. Barton’s view, as published in the *Proceedings Am. Or. Soc.* of April, 1892. To my regret, I am still unable to accept that theory and to hold with Dr. Clay, “that the scribes when they wrote *ilu*\(^a\) did not intend to represent anything that even had the appearance of the suffix.” For certain reasons which will become clear in the course of the following discussion, it will be wiser to treat *ilu*\(^a\) and *Shamash*\(^a\) separately.

As I cannot attempt here to enter into a full examination of a most important and interesting question, I confine myself to submitting some of the material at my disposal in support of my former view, viz., that *ilu*\(^a\) was employed by the Babylonian scribes for expressing a West-Semitic sound similar to their plural ending *ē*, resp. *tā*, in other words, that they wrote *ilu*\(^a\) to render "šN. The question arises, what does "šN in proper names


\(^2\) Cf. *Āl-Hāttai* (X), “settlement of the Hittites” or “Khatians.”

\(^3\) Cf. *m-lam(m)atai* (X), probably “man from Hamath” (on the Orontes).

\(^4\) Cf. the place *du-Inšāri-šulunu* (IX, X), and *Marratu* (IX), apparently named after the two famous cities or the Philistines. Cf. also *du-Bīl-*Srāru (IX, X), unless Srāru be a *hypokoristikon* of a name containing "šN “rock.”

\(^5\) Cf. *Hāshā* (IX, X, = Ḫāshā), with the dissolution of final *n*) and *ABA*-Hāshā (IX), “settlement of the Heshbonites.”

\(^6\) Cf. the personal proper names containing *Amunu* (IX, X, = Ḫāmu-nu) and *d-Esu* (IX, X, = Ḫāsu-nu), in X and the canal *Nūru ilu h-Miširai* (X).

\(^7\) Cf. e.g., Ḫū-Mānārā, “settlement of the Mandarans” (IX), and *kū-mi-rā-ai*, “the Kimmerians” (X, 97: 2).
signify? According to a view widely prevailing among Semitists, prominently including Nödeke, and formerly also shared by the present writer, it means “my god.” In many of the well-known cases, however, this translation cannot well be accepted. Apart from other reasons, I call attention to the fact that many of the personal names compound with "my god," etc., as first element, in several Semitic dialects offer parallel formations with only "my god," etc., in the same position, and, moreover, that sometimes even the same person is written either way, that, furthermore, in such cases where these nouns appear as the final element of full names, as a rule only the latter (shorter) forms are found in Hebrew and other Semitic dialects, the short vowels a, i, u according to a general tendency being commonly dropped; and that, above all, in the Babylonian transliteration of both classes of West-Semitic names we find the ideographic writing AN, AD, SHESH (or PAP), LUGAL (or MAN), which cannot be rendered “my god,” “my father,” “my brother,” “my king,” etc., but only “god,” “father,” “brother,” “king,” etc., side by side with the phonetic writings ili (NI-NI), a-bi a-bi, mil-ki, etc. The most natural solution of the whole question seems, therefore, to be to assume that at least in many of the cases, "my god," etc., is only the scriptio plena for ili, “god,” abi, “father,” etc., and that the common early Babylonian use of NI-NI (which, like the single Ni, according to § 20, 21, can only be read ili) instead of AN, must be regarded as an evident endeavor on the part of the scribes to reproduce that ancient pronunciation ili (not ilu) "god," which they actually heard, in cuneiform writing.

This points to a very extensive use of the vowel i as an ending of the absolute case, among certain West-Semitic tribes, instead of the u generally preferred in Arabic and Assyrian. The cuneiform texts from the time of the Hammurabi Dynasty down to the end of the fifth century corroborate it. For the earlier period the collection of proper

---

1 Cf. Cheyne and Black, Encyclopaedia Biblica, Vol. III (1903), col. 3279: "MY, which can scarcely be translated otherwise than "my God." On the other side cf. Gray, Studies in Hebrew Proper Names, pp. 75-88, for the view now also held by the present writer. The literature on the whole subject is given by Gray.

2 Cf. especially Gray, loc. cit., p. 85.

3 Cf. the Hebrew Dictionaries. For my purpose it will be sufficient to quote "MY" alongside of "MY" and "MY," 1 Sam. 25:4, and "MY," 1 Sam. 14 (cf. Babylon. SHESH-nure') below, which can only mean "A. is my light." = A (1 Kings 15) and = A (2 Chron. 11, also Gray, loc. cit., p. 84); = A (1 Chron. 3:15); = A (Nu. 3:20) and = A (Ex. 6:28), etc.

4 Cf. however the traces of a final in the Greek transliteration of certain Semitic proper names, below.

5 A D does not necessarily mean Abi. As shown below, p. 38, it sometimes may be transcribed Ad, being a shortened form from Adad or Addu.

6 I must therefore decline Delitsch's proposition (B.A., vol. IV, p. 487): "Das doppeltliche NIN(NIN) ist vielleicht am besten zu, nicht D (Nagel) oder H (King) zu umschreiben,"—a method also adopted by Daiches. Altbabylonische Rechnungskunden, p. 13, or the view held by other Assyriologists, according to which ili, when written NI-NI, is meant for ili = "my god."
names to be published by Dr. Ranke in Series D, Vol. 111, will furnish the necessary material. The lists of proper names given by Zimmern, K. A. T., and Johns, U. A., in addition to the Assyrian lists of the eponyms, enable us to trace this peculiarity during the 'Amarna period and the first half of the first millennium. It will, therefore, be sufficient for my purpose to prove it in connection with the West-Semitic proper names of Vols. IX and X of our own publication.

Excluding all the cases in which the first element may possibly be interpreted as standing in the construct case, and the very numerous cases in which the name itself stands in the genitive (cf. Nabd-a-qa-ab-bi, Nabd-ha-qa-bi, Nabd-qa-ta-ri, Ilb4-ga-ba-ri, Shamash-na-da-ri, Bit-ili-a-dir-ri, Za-hi-ni, Gab-ba-ri, Hu-bi-si; or ends in ilb4, as e.g., A-qa-bi-ilb4, A-dar-ri-ilb4, Ra-hi-mi-ilb4, Ra-ab-bi-ilb4, etc., where the final i of the first element may be due to the first i of the second element (ilb4), I quote only such examples in which the i is attached as a case ending to the entire name, being regarded as a compound substantive (cf. IX, p. 24) and standing in the nominative, or such examples in which i is joined to the first element standing in the absolute case. Cf. Qasu-ia-a-ba-bi, Bel-ia-a-hab-bi, Bel-ba-rak-ki, Ilb4-qa-lar-ri (qatari must be a verbal form 3 p. m. sing. perf., like the three preceding verbs, and ga-ba-ri in other names), Shamashb4-la-din-ni,1 Mi-in-ia-mi-in, on the one hand, and 4Mi-hi-abu-u-sur, 4It-to-ilb-ri-nari, 4Il-to-bi-r-i-a-bi, etc., on the other. These examples could easily be multiplied from our own inscriptions. It must surely be regarded as remarkable that the original i has been so often preserved, notwithstanding the fact that the Babylonian scribes were induced to attach the case ending u even to foreign names, especially when abbreviated (cf. Ilb4-ba-rak-ru (rare!), Ilb4-ba-had-du (common), Ilb4-na-tam-nu, Mi-na-bi-mu, Ra-hi-mu, Za-bu-du, A-qa-bu,2 Na-tu-nu, etc.), or to drop the final vowel altogether, in accordance with a general tendency noticeable in connection with proper names (cf. Nabd-xab-ad, Anmu-la-din, Ilb4-ga-bar, Nashwu-qa-tar (Johns), Mi-in-ia-a-me-en, Mi-na-bi-im). This much is sure, that the i found so commonly in connection with West-Semitic names is seen only exceptionally in the pure Babylonian names of our inscriptions. The use of this i in the absolute case must, therefore, be regarded as a peculiarity of West-Semitic proper names.

1The final element, la-din-at, written also la-din, and (with dissolution of final n, cf. Vol. IX, p. 27, note 3) even la-di (V R, § 15, and Johns, A. D. B., p. 52) probably is a prepositive form of the verb 3\textsuperscript{n}Ib. Cf. Bi-in-dar (Ilb4-in-dar, Shamashle-in-dar, IX and X) from 3\textsuperscript{v}la-rim (Marla-rim-mu(=mu), Marla-ar[me] with syncope, Mo-ri-la-rim, Mar-la-rim, Abi-la-rim, Abi-la-rim, etc., (Johns, A. D. D., Vol. III, p. 100), Abi-la-rim (X, below). Hif. from 3\textsuperscript{v}ra, and perhaps la-ki-mu (cf. 3\textsuperscript{v}la-ki-mu-dar (IX) = la-qi-im, Hif. from 3\textsuperscript{v}pi. For other verbal forms (Imper. Perf., Part.) of these four verbs are commonly found as an element of certain West-Semitic proper names. Cf. Il-la-la-mu (p. 50, note 3), Nt-di-tu, Na-di-ti, Shamash-na-da-ri (IX and X), Addu-ra-am-mu(a) (IX), Mila-kro-mu (Johns, A. D. D., Vol. III, p. 180), Nab-rimmu (Winckler, Assyriology, Shamash-la-me, Atar-qa-mu (Johns, A. D. E.), and Bi. 3\textsuperscript{v}ba-lat, etc.

2In some cases final u may be due to a preceding labial.
In view of what has been stated, it is clear that ilu used by the Babylonian scribes of our tablets exclusively in connection with West-Semitic proper names to express the idea of “god,” generally rendered by ilu alone in Babylonian proper names, must have been chosen intentionally to discriminate between the West-Semitic pronunciation of “god” (ili) and that of the Babylonian (ilu). In other words, the Semitic Babylonian ilu (also the lugal of the ‘Amarna tablets) and the Sumerian NI (doubling of the single NI, which itself means ili) of the earlier inscriptions are to be viewed in the same light as a kind of scriptio plena, in either case the plural writing being chosen to secure a pronunciation for the last vowel of AN(ilu) or LUGAL(sharru) or Ni(ili) similar to that of the Babylonian plural ending e, resp. ে. But the length of the last vowel of ili, etc., follows from this peculiar writing in Babylonian as little as it does from in the Hebrew proper names, or from the use of the scriptio plena in Semitic paleography in general. We are accustomed to designate as phonetic complement in Assyrian what is known as mater lectionis in other Semitic languages. Cf. my remarks on this peculiar use of MESH in Assyrian (Assyriaca, pp. 55, f., note) and the similar use of the vowels a, i, u, especially (but not exclusively!) at the beginning of words (i-isch-talal, e-ik-du, u-ush-ziz, e-ip-she-tu-ḥ-a (as epshétuwa or epshétan), ā-ul-bi-ū, etc.). In the ‘Amarna tablets this use of the plural sign MESH, the “Hauchlaut,” and the vowels a, i, u as mater lectionis or phonetic complements, is much more extensive than in pure Babylonian and Assyrian texts (cf. Bezold, Oriental Diplomacy, pp. xiii, xvii, f., xxiii, f.).

To establish the pronunciation of AN as ili = IN, beyond any reasonable doubt, it will only be necessary to examine the two names from the Neo-Babylonian literature quoted by me, p. 50, below. In the Concordance of Proper Names of Vol. X we find the name Il-insar written in the following three ways: ANA-il-in-dar, AN-il-in-dar (with syncope of the second vowel between identical consonants) and AN-in-dar. In order to read the last writing correctly, we have to read AN as ili (Il-indar, i.e., Hindar = Il-indar = Il-indar). The second example is even more instructive. In Johns, Assyr. Deeds, No. 345, E, 1 and 361, R, 12, we read the name AN-a-di-nu, which evidently is identical with ANA-a-di-nu (Evetts-Strassmaier, Neriglissar, 66, 7). It shows that AN must be read Ili to complete the verbal form iadnu required by the first writing.

The evidence adduced is regarded as ample to show that the correct transliteration of AN in the West-Semitic names of our texts must be ili = IN, “god.” The fact that MESH is omitted a few times in the Murashu texts and very frequently in other inscriptions (e.g., in those published by Johns and Strassmaier’) would indicate either that AN

---

1 Cf. e.g., Strassmaier, Nabuchod. 346, where the same person is written either Bu-ri-ki-ili (l. 3) or Bu-ri-ki-il (l. 7), and Nabuchod. 364, where the same person is written I-di-il-il (ll. 8, 4) or I-di-il-il (l. 9).
when appearing in West-Semitic names was also pronounced *ili*,1 or that it stood for *il*—*ili*, the final vowel being frequently dropped, as in Hebrew proper names (cf. *אֵל* and *אֶל* at the end of names). It may, however, seem strange that in our texts *ANPl* = *ili* appears also at the end of West-Semitic names, where the Old Testament and the *Corpus Inscriptionum Semiticarum* have only *ilu*. As stated above, the general tendency of dropping short case vowels at the end of names is largely responsible for the defective writing *ilu*. At the same time there are traces in the Greek transliterations of Semitic names which show plainly that even at a very late time the final *i* of *ili* when standing at the end of proper names was pronounced occasionally. Cf., e.g., the names given by Dussaud and Macler, *Mission dans les Régions Désertiques de la Syrie Moyenne*, pp. 301, 303: 'אָברֵיכָלוֹן, 'אָברִיכָלוֹס 'אָברִיכָלָּס (אֲבַרֵיכָלוֹן, שמוֹרַע אֲבַרֵיכָלוֹן), alongside of 'אָברַטָלָּס (אֲבַרַטָלָּס), פֵּיָהֲלוֹן (פֵּיָהֲלוֹן), etc. Noldeke found difficulty in explaining this *i* satisfactorily (*B. B. A.*, 1880, p. 768), while Lidzbarski was inclined to ascribe it to Roman influence (*אֲבַרֵיכָלוֹס אָבֵיֲלָלוֹן*, etc., cf. *Ephemeris*, I, p. 331). In order to distinguish *ANPl* and *AN* sufficiently in my transliteration, I rendered the former by *ili* and the latter by *ili*, at the same time now regarding the final *i* of *ANPl* as short.

Johns (Assyr. *Doomsday Book*, p. 15) in examining into the question as to how the people about *Harran* pronounced their word for “god,” came to the conclusion that they said “*AZ. Alla*, not *ilu*, nor *El*,” basing his rendering of *Al* principally upon the writing of *Al*-Nashhu-milki, *Al*-Sé-milki, etc. But where did the Assyrians ever pronounce the word for “god” (*ילא*) in connection with the god’s name immediately following in their inscriptions? I do not believe that the people about *Harran* pronounced it either. *Al* in the names quoted can scarcely be anything else than the article *āl* or *eł*, known from Lidzbarski’s list of proper names to have been used in connection with certain deities. Cf. *Nashhu*, נָשְׁהוּ ("The Ba’al"), נָשְׁהוּ, נָשְׁהוּ, נָשְׁהוּ ("The Moon-god"), etc. The fact that *Nashhu* and *Sin* are here still used as appellatives is interesting and important with regard to their meaning and origin. The Ar. article *āl* or *eł* is also known to occur in certain West-Semitic proper names of the *Murashu* archives. Cf. 4*Il-te-ki-ri-abi* (אֵל-תֵּ-קֵּי-רֵי-אֶבִי, “The Moon-god is father”), 5*Il-te-eḥ-ri-nāri-’* (אֵל-תֵּ-עֶ-קֵּי-רֵי-אֶנָרְי, “The Moon-god is my light,” the final *i* in this case being long), and *Ba-ri-ki*4*Il-tam-mesh*, occurring alongside of *Bā-rik-ki*4*Shāmēs-mesh*, i.e., “Blessed of the Sun-god.” The Sun-god 4*Il-tam-mesh* = שַׁמְשֵׁים, hitherto not identified, occurs in quite a number of West-Semitic proper names. Cf. 4*Il-la-mesh-di-i-nē* (Strassmaier, *Nabuchod.*, 363, 4), and (without the det. of *ilu*) 4*Il-tam-mesh-na-ta-nu* (Nabon. 497 : 4), 4*Il-tam-mesh-i-la-ai*

---
1 As AD = *āl*, *BESHEV* = *al* in West-Semitic proper names.
2 Observe the *scriptio plena* of the final *i* in elakhebi and my remarks in connection with *ili* above.
(Cyr. 34:14, cf. also Nubon. 583:18), Il-tam-mesh-nu-ur (Cyr. 58:6), and Abi-Il-te-
mesh (Nubon. 638:4), and (without the article el) \(^4\) Tam-mesh-i-la-ai (Nubon. 554:4),
\(^{d}\) Tam-mesh-nârî (82–823, 271.1), and (without the det. ilu) Tam-mesh-ju-tunu (K.
961:15) and Tam-mesh-îd-ri.\(^2\) In the last four mentioned names we may also read
idig. #names(-mesh) instead of the phonetic Tam-mesh. I furthermore call attention to
such names as \(^4\) Il-te-ri-ha-na-na (Strassmaier. Cyr. 177, 3), Te-ri-hi-li-ia (Vol. X,
below), and even the pure Babylonian name Te-ir\(^5\)-nadin-aplu (Johns, l.c., pp. 17, 53,
76) occurring alongside of She-ir-nadin-aplu. It seems almost certain that Tèr and
Iléri are identical with the god Shér(um), known as a local deity of Harran (Johns,
l.c., p. 16), but it must remain doubtful for the present, whether in view of the hypok.
name Te-ir (VR, 8:31) or Te-er (VR, 8:65), borne by a prince of Qidri and
apparently representing Ar. שֶׁרָשׁ. Shèr is to be regarded as a contraction of שׁיר,
“Moon,” or is identical with the Assyrian Shèru = šîr, “Morning-red.” In all prob-
ability the two different words were frequently mixed by the Assyrian scribes. Cf.
šèh-ri, as a synon. of šè-e-ri, quoted in Delitzsch, Assyrr. Handwörterbuch, p. 635.

The promiscuous use of šh (pronounced h?) and t (pronounced th?) as the first radical
of šîm and šîr, though written with a sibilant in all the Semitic dialects, affords us a
welcome glimpse into the historical process which at an early time in many instances
led to definite laws as to the corresponding use of the sibilants and dentals in the
different Semitic dialects. At the same time the peculiar writing of the Sun-god as IZ-tu-mesh
and Il-te-mesh is important, as it allows us to transliterate \(^{d}\) UD-MESH in West-Semitic
proper names (rendered in Vol. IX as Shamshi = Shamshi in view of the peculiar use
of MESH as a phonetic complement discussed above in connection with in), and in
consideration of such frequent writings as S(h)am(û)-si-ia-a-bi (doubtless = דַּוְיָיָשְׁם שם),
S(h)am-si-id-ri, S(h)am-si-ila-aï, etc.) also as Shà(m)esh(-mesh) or even Turn-mesh,
corresponding to Hebrew שֶׁמֶשׁ, rather than to Arab. šamsi.

Besides ilî (and il) occurring most frequently in West-Semitic proper names, as
shown above, the Murashû tabûta know of two other West-Semitic words for god, viz.,
ilâi or ilâhi, corresponding to Aram. אל and Arab. ilâhi (Gen.), and ilâha, correspon-
ding to Hebr. אלהים (cf. Baethgen, Beiträge zur Semitischen Religionsgeschichte, pp.
270, ff., 297, ff.). For the word ilâi “god” (not “my god”), cf. already the names
quoted by Johns (A. D. B., p. 15), I-la-i-a-ði, written also I-la-î-ði, Nûku-ilâ-î, Na-ðî-ilâ-î,
S(h)a-si-ilâ-î, and also Ila-î-ða-nâ (Sanh. II, 54). As to ilâhi, cf.

\(^1\) Cf. Pinches in Recueil de Travaux, XIX. pp. 104, f.
\(^3\) Cf. the “form” of 4Te-ir, Johns, l.c., p. 17, and the same author’s attempt to “read Tèr, a variant of
Ilâhi(-a) or Ilî-ði, i.e., ‘god of mercy.’”
Mannu-ki-la-bi-i, abbreviated (therefore, the last i lengthened) from a name like Mannu-ki-ila-bi-i, "Wo is strong like god?" (cf. Man-nu-ki-Ishlar-lü and Mannu-El-Ashur-lü, Johns, A. D. D., Index). As to iluha, cf. Mannu-ru-ha-a (abbreviated' from a name like Mannu-ki-ila-bi-i) and also Ha-ma-ri-li-i-ru-a.

In the list of gods found in Vol. IX, pp. 76, f., Iāma occurring frequently at the end of Hebrew names (cf. IX, p. 27), and regarded by Prof. Clay "as the Babylonian equivalent of ₯, the contracted form of the tetragrammaton," was left out intentionally. Notwithstanding all that has been said in favor of such a comparison, I am unable to recognize any god in iāma. Frequently as it occurs, not even once the det. for ilu precedes it. Whenever the cuneiform inscriptions transliterate a Hebr. י, whether at the beginning or end of a name, they invariably write la-u, la-a-u, la-a-hu, la-a-hu-u, la-a-hu-u (cf. Zimmerm, K. A. T., pp. 466, ff.). Iāma at the end of West-Semitic names, like Abi-la-a-ma, is nothing but the Hebrew ending י which in all probability is a "Weiterbildung" of י or י by adding an emphatic ב or ma. For, cf. Hebr. י (Kings) alongside of י (Chronicles), a name borne by the same person. In a number of cases י doubtless is an abbreviation of the god י, but in many instances it is surely nothing else than the common Semitic Rufe-suffix י, which at the bottom may be identical with the vocative particle id in Arabic. As I expect to develop my view with regard to Semitic hypokoristika more fully at another place, I abstain from entering into a discussion of this subject in this Preface, being satisfied with the general statement that abbreviated Semitic names are commonly characterized by a lengthening of the last vowel of the last retained element of the name or by the addition of the particle id (corresponding to our "he (da)" in German) frequently strengthened by an additional emphatic consonant m, n, t. This Rufe-suffix apparently has nothing to do with the suffix of the first person sing. (so-called "Kose-suffix"). It rather originated in connection with an effort on the part of the speaker to reach the ear of a person somewhat distant from him. In order to attract his attention he necessarily held the last vowel longer, i.e., emphasized it.\footnote{Instead of the lengthening of the last vowel (Abdi, Abdā, Zabdi, Zabdā, Zabi, י or י, etc.) we also find the Rufe-suffix י or י (cf. e.g., 1A-di-ia-a, V R. 8:24, Abdi-ia (IX) י, י, י, י and י. Cf. also Mannu-abdi-Ishlar-ia, p. 55, below, which should not be translated "who is like my Ishtar," the י not belonging to Ishar, but to the whole name in its shortened form).}

\footnote{The lengthening of the last vowel א again is the substitute for the dropping of the last word. The Aram. docket ל has preserved the א of י. For the frequent omission of א in this class of proper names, cf. Mannu-Bel-letin, below. Mannu-aḫē (Johns, Assy. Deeds, Vol. III, p. 406) alongside of Mannu-ka-aḫē, and Johns, Assy. Doomsday Book, p. 42.}

\footnote{Therefore to be separated from pure Babylonian names like Bel-ānu-a, Nergal-ri-su-ū-a.}

\footnote{On this whole question cf. Jastrow, reprint from Journal of Biblical Literature, pp. 114, ff.}

\footnote{In many important details my view is identical with that of Lidzbarski, Ephemeris, II, pp. 1-28.}
A word remains to be said with regard to the three Aramaic docketts containing the pronunciation of the god *NINIB*, for which we searched hitherto in vain (cf. pp. 8, f.). Prof. Clay pointed out certain difficulties which prevented his arriving at more positive results. There are a few tablets more which show very faint traces of one or more of the letters constituting the god’s name. From a careful examination of the three inscriptions here treated, I have come to the conclusion that the third character can only be י, while the last letter is not ר, but probably מ, the eighth letter in the Hebrew alphabet. On No. 29 of the cuneiform texts it is well preserved. If the scribe had made the mistake assumed on p. 8, he would doubtless have erased the very pronounced additional line on the tablet. I am also inclined to read a מ on the original of No. 87, while the unpublished tablet (C. B. M., No. 5508), where the character seems a more pronounced י, cannot be regarded as decisive, because the very faint inscription is not incised but only drawn with a black fluid (partly covered by other black spots) on the surface. It is so faint that it could not be reproduced satisfactorily by means of photography.

I therefore propose to regard יְלדָש as the Aramaic equivalent of *NINIB*, which at once recalls the ideograph-writing *NIN-SHAN “lord of the boar”* and the Syriac יְלדָש (on which cf. Jensen, *Kosmologie*, and Hrozný, *Mythen von dem Gotte Ninrag*. If this reading be accepted, the Biblical *Nisrok* seems to be the same god, the two letters י and מ being transposed in order to facilitate the pronunciation. As to the relation of the god *NINIB* to the wild boar, cf. Zimmern, *K. A. T.* and Jensen in *K. B. V.*, 1, p. 538, and Kuchler, *Assyr. Medicin*. A votive object in terra-cotta from Nippur representing a wild boar was published in Vol. IX. Another very remarkable terra-cotta was discovered there in the course of the fourth expedition. It represents a sow with her litter of sucking pigs and on her a wild boar. There can be little doubt that this strange votive object, which I expect to discuss in another place, stands in close relation to Ninib, after Bēl the most important god worshiped at Nippur.

June 1, 1904.

H. V. Hilprecht.
PREFACE.

Volume IX of Series A of the Babylonian Expedition of the University of Pennsylvania has been in the hands of Assyriologists for over six years. The special title of the volume, “Business Documents of Murashū Sons of Nippur,” is also used for this volume, as the material here published is a continuation of that which appeared in Vol. IX. The work had been announced to appear under the same names, but the Editor, after I had copied the texts, granted me the privilege of publishing these inscriptions under my own name.

As was stated in the Introduction to Vol. IX (p. 26ff.), the names of foreign peoples mentioned in these texts are very numerous. By the help of Lidzbarski’s Handbuch der Nordsemitischen Epigraphik, which gives an extended list of Semitic, Egyptian and other names, written in the Aramaic character, and also Justi’s Iranisches Namenbuch, I succeeded in identifying a large number of these foreign names. The Index to the latter work even enables one who has no knowledge of Persian to give an approximately close transliteration. The Editor succeeded in adding also a goodly number to this list. His identifications and comparisons are distinguished from my own by being inclosed in brackets, thus: [—Ed.]. Several were also identified by Dr. Enno Littmann, of Princeton, whose valuable assistance is duly indicated. I want to acknowledge also my indebtedness to the list of names in John’s Assyrian Deeds and Documents, and also his Doomsday Book, which offer extensive material for unlimited comparison and the elucidation of these names.

On April the ninth, 1904; Mr. Edward W. Clark, the honored Chairman of our Babylonian Section of the Department of Archaeology, who has also been in recent years the Chairman of the Babylonian Expedition of the University of Pennsylvania, was called to his rest. Mr. Clark was a pioneer, and a very generous promoter of this work. In grateful appreciation and profound respect is this volume dedicated to his memory.

It affords me pleasure to express my heartfelt gratitude to the Provost, Dr. C. C. Harrison; the Vice-Provost, Prof. Edgar F. Smith; the President of the Department,
Mrs. Cornelius Stevenson, Sc.D., and all the members of the Board of Managers of the Archæological Department, for their kind support and interest in facilitating the preparation of this volume; and especially to Mr. Eckley B. Coxe, Jr., for his generosity in providing the funds necessary to publish it.

I desire also to acknowledge here, with gratitude, the painstaking oversight, and the many helpful and important suggestions of the Editor, Prof. H. V. Hilprecht, whereby the value of this work has been enhanced; the many acts of kindness on the part of Prof. Morris Jastrow, Jr., the Librarian of the University, and the profitable discussions and delightful associations of Dr. Hermann Ranke, the Harrison Research Fellow in Assyriology.

My thanks are also due Dr. Victor Dippell for furnishing desired passages from his list of unpublished Neo-Babylonian proper names, referred to as [Dippel Name List]; to Prof. Amos P. Brown for his analysis of Babylonian clay; Prof. E. G. Conklin for determining the species of animals mentioned; Dr. W. H. Ward for his kindness in loaning photographs of Oriental water machines; E. Aug. Miller, Esq., for valuable assistance rendered in connection with legal terms; Dr. Julius F. Sachse for some photographic experiments, endeavoring to secure results not visible to the eye, and to Mr. William Witte, our Assistant, for his untiring efforts to obtain the excellent photographs used for the half-tone plates. To all I extend my hearty thanks.

After the Introduction and most of the Concordance of Proper Names had gone through the press, I found a fourth tablet (C. B. M., No. 5514), which contains the name of the god Ninib in Aramaic. As there is a difference of opinion as to the reading of two of the characters it may be convenient for the reader to see the four different writings placed together for comparison.

No. 29  ![Character Image]
No. 87  ![Character Image]
No. 5508  ![Character Image]
No. 5514  ![Character Image]

As to the possibility of the last character being anything else but a ܢ I have never entertained a thought (cf. the list of characters, p. 72). The third character cannot so easily be disposed of. The former two, owing to the slight effacement at the left corner...
of the second and the peculiar character of the first, left me in doubt. Preference was given to " for No. 29, and 1 for No. 87 (see p. 8). But I now feel after a final consideration that the character in question is in each case, in all probability, a 1. In No. 87 " in is made different (cf. also the enlarged photograph on Pl. IX). The character in the last three is 1 (cf. the list of characters, p. 72). The peculiarly made one in the first (which can really be either 1 or 1), I now also regard as a 1. In fact it is the usual way " appears not only in the Old and Middle Phcenician, and Punic, but in the Aramaic inscriptions from Egypt, Arabia, Asia Minor and Mesopotamia, cf. Lidzbarski's *Nordsemitische Epigraphik Atlas*. Furthermore, it is the way " usually appears in Aramaic endorsements on clay tablets, exclusive of the Murashū documents, cf. Stevenson, *Ass. and Bab. Contracts*, pp. 115,117, 122,129, 133,145 and especially 148. Cf. also C. B. M., 3552. Until, therefore, more light is thrown upon the subject I prefer to read that character as and the name " . Even after this I am unfortunately not prepared to express a more definite opinion as to the understanding of this curious Aramaic equivalent of Ninib. In the search for an explanation it must be kept in mind that 1 may represent the Babylonian m.

At the last moment also I was able to determine a cuneiform sign, in doubt, read UR(?). Cf. Ashur-UR(?)-ibni. The name occurs besides 23:17, on C. B. M. No. 5515:2, and Const. Ni. 605:14. In the absence of anything better, although UR(LIK) in not a single instance is made like this sign, I read it UR?, but placed it in the Sign List as a different character, cf. No. 214. The editorial note at the bottom of p. 41 prompted a further investigation of the subject, and I now pronounce it to be the Neo-Babylonian form of the sign given in Delitzsch's *Ass. Les.* 4, p. 135, as No. 327". This character has the value hamāmu, and as there is a name Nabū-ša-um-me-ibni, "Nebo is the regent of the gods," II., Rawlinson, 64:48, until something better is proposed, I offer as the reading of the name in question: Ashur-hamme-ibni, "Ashur has created a regent," which is similar in meaning to the common Bēl-shar-ibni.

In connection with my explanation, in the *Introduction*, that AN-MESH in West Semitic names was read  and that they do not contain the first person pronominal suffix, I want to call attention to the readings *Ia-ash-ma-ah-3-el*, C. B. M. 1352:17; also *Ia-ah-za-ar-ilu(AN)*, Ranke, *Personal Names*, with *Ia-ah-za-ar-il*, C. B. M., 1235, which show that el was the pronunciation of the word for god also in the West Semitic names of the early Babylonian period.

On the last page, beside the corrections and additions to this volume, I have added a number of corrections to the text of Vol. IX.

Albert T. Clay.
INTRODUCTION.

The account of the discovery of these tablets by Dr. J. H. Haynes, in 1893, at the beginning of the third campaign of the Babylonian Expedition of the University of Pennsylvania, is related by Professor Hilprecht in his *Introduction* to Series A, Vol. IX (p. 13), and in Series D, Vol. I, *The Excavations in Assyria and Babylonia* (pp. 408, ff).

'The tablets, which are simply sun dried, are made of a very smooth clay. It is free from grit, which was removed by washing, preparatory to its use for tablet making. This has increased its adhesive power, so that the tablets have the appearance of being baked, offering an exceedingly smooth surface for the writing. ¹

Most of them are more or less covered with black spots or stains. These do not affect the legibility of the cuneiform writing, but, unfortunately, when they cover the Aramaic “dockets,” which are written with a similar color, they render them valueless. The color used for the dockets, under the microscope, appears to be other than that which caused the stains. ²

A large number of the tablets are more or less flat on the obverse, while the reverse is convex. This is especially noticeable in the larger documents, and is due to the fact that the scribe rested the clay tablet, which increases in thickness towards the

¹ In Vol. IX it was stated that they were baked, cf. pp. 13 and 79.

³ Examined by Professor Amos P. Brown, of the University of Pennsylvania, to whom I submitted tablets spotted with the black substance, and also several kinds of clay from Nippur. He writes: “The black stain that appears upon the tablets seems to be composed of hydroxides of manganese and iron, probably somewhat like the mineral called wad. It is probably formed upon the surface of the tablet by the precipitation of the iron and manganese from solution in water from the soil; the precipitation being brought about by the composition of the clay of the tablet. I have examined the clay of the Murashâ fragments. It contains 32.73% of calcium carbonate. This has caused the precipitation which is merely superficial, and only penetrates the tablets when they are porous.”

“The use of a clay containing chalk (a marl) was no doubt due to the observation that such clay did not contract strongly or shrink and crack upon drying out. This is due to the fact that the chalk is not hydrous, and will not take up water in combination. The clay weight of the same age, which was submitted, showed 29.05% of chalk and was made of crude natural clay, containing much grit and sand, which, however, if washed out would show about the same percentage of chalk as the Murashâ fragments. The clay of the Cassite period, while thoroughly washed, showed but 28% of chalk, which indicated that it was from a different source.”
center, upon something, while it was soft, when he inscribed it. In writing the obverse, with the tablet lying upon a stand, the under side was flattened out. When the tablet was turned over, and the reverse written, the obverse was flattened, in which shape it remained.

In Vol. IX a tablet is dated on the seventeenth day of Shabāṭu in the forty-first year of Artaxerxes I. Of the tablets here published, one is dated on that day, and three previous to it, in the year of the accession of his successor, Darius II. In other words, the first tablet of the latter's reign was written on the fourth day of Shabāṭu, i.e., thirteen days previous to the seventeenth, given as the last date known in the reign of Artaxerxes I. How can this apparent discrepancy be explained? The scribe made a mistake. Either the tablet belongs to the fortieth year, and, by mistake, he began to write the determinative for man before he had written kan, which he neglected to erase; or having been accustomed, for so many years, to date tablets in the reign of Artaxerxes, in writing this tablet he failed to remember that a new king had begun to reign. Not taking this tablet into consideration, therefore, the last of those published in Vol. IX, dated in the forty-first year of Artaxerxes, was written on the twelfth day of Kislimu. Another unpublished tablet, however, of the forty-first year of Artaxerxes (C.B.M. 5310) is dated on the third of Shabāṭu, which is the day previous to the one on which the first tablet was dated in the reign of Darius II., i.e., the fourth of Shabāṭu. If this dating is correct Darius II., in all probability, began to reign on the third or fourth day of Shabāṭu.

It was stated in Vol. IX that all the tablets of these archives were written during the reign of Artaxerxes I. (464–424 B.C.) and Darius II.¹ (423–405 B.C.). This is true with the exception of one tablet, Vol. IX, No. 1, which belongs to the reign of Artaxerxes II., as can now be proved by the new material at our disposal. The name of the scribe who wrote Nos. 130, 131 and 132 of the present volume is Nidintum-Bīl, the son of Ninib-naديدة. These are leases of sheep and goats, written for Bēl-supē-muḫur, agent of Arsham (cf. p. 4), and dated in the eleventh and thirteenth years of Darius II. One of the witnesses mentioned is Bēl-dānu, son of Bēl-bullišu. The contents of Vol. IX, No. 1, dated in the first year of Artaxerxes II., are quite similar to these documents. The name of the scribe is the same. The names of the agent, his master or employer, and the witness mentioned are the same. Between the first year of Artaxerxes I. and the thirteenth of Darius II. there are fifty-three years. That the same combination of agent, client, scribe and witness should occur in documents relating to the same kind of affairs,

¹For the different ways the name is written, cf. "The Concordance of Proper Names." Dā-ri-ia-a-muṣ, in these documents, occurs most frequently. Considering that the Babylonian m here stands for v (cf. Haupt, Z.A., II, p. 269), this closely reproduces the Persian Darāya(m)uṣ. Cf. also Δαραμος, and the Biblical שְׁרוֹם. A docket on No. 78 contains שָרוֹם, which more closely represents the pronunciation of the Persian than the Biblical.
which were dated fifty-three years apart from each other, is a coincidence too peculiar to be probable. Then, also, every tablet discovered in these archives can be shown to belong either to the Murashti family, or to those who were in some way connected with their business. Bél-supé-muḫur, in Vol. IX, 99 : 5, is referred to as the ardu and paqdu of Bél-nādin-shumu. In Vol. X, 126 : 10, he is the ardu sha Rimūt-Niniḫ. In the texts under consideration, which are dated several years later than any belonging to the Murashti Sons, he appears as the paqdu of Aršam, as in Vol. IX, 1:2. The relations of these documents with those of the Murashû Sons, and the similarity of their contents, are certainly not compatible with the idea that Bél-supé-muḫur leased sheep while in the service of Aršam; afterwards became the servant of Bél-nādin-shumu, and later of Rimūt-Niniḫ; and again is found in Aršam’s service and business fifty-three years after the time he is first mentioned. If Darius I, ruled twenty years, only eight years would intervene between the date of the last tablet of these texts and the first year of Artaxerxes II., which, in consideration of the above, is without doubt the time when the tablet in question was written. In other words, instead of placing this document as the first in chronological order, it must be regarded as being the last.

All the tablets published in the following pages were written during the reign of Darius II., including Nos. 105 and 106, which do not bear the name of the ruler in whose reign they were inscribed. That the latter, however, are properly classified as belonging to the time of Darius II., becomes evident from the following considerations. In the text proper of both tablets, reference is made to the sixth year of a king, whose name is not given, because well-known to the parties concerned. The tablets themselves were written in the interests of Rib-dāt, servant of Rimūt-Niniḫ. As neither Rib-dāt nor Rimūt-Niniḫ is mentioned in the documents dated before the thirty-fifth year of Artaxerxes I., while both figure prominently in the contracts belonging to the early years of Darius II., it follows that the sixth year referred to is that of Darius II.

In the introduction to Vol. IX (p. 14, f.) it was shown that most of the business transacted in the tablets, dated in the reign of Artaxerxes I., was in the interest of two sons of Murashti, Bél-ḥāṭin and Bél-nādin-shumu; that the former is not mentioned in the documents after 437 B.C.; that eight years later his son Rimūt-Niniḫ, referred to on the same tablet as the son of Murashû, as well as of Bél-ḥāṭin, appears for the first time as a creditor in those transactions; that a son of Bél-nādin-shumu, whose name was Murashû, is referred to as the creditor in two tablets, and finally that a son of Bél-ḥāṭin, who also bore the name of Murashû, is mentioned in Const. Ni. 525.

In the texts here published, dated in the reign of Darius II., Bél-nādin-shumu, the most prominently mentioned in Vol. IX, continues to appear as the chief creditor, until

Business Documents of Murashû Sons.

the second day of Tishri of the eighth year (416 B.C.), after which his name does not again occur. In other words, with the exception of six documents, the first fifty-seven are written in his interest. Of these six documents, four, Nos. 29, 43, 44 and 52, belong to Rîmût-Ninib. The name of Rîmût-Ninib, after the disappearance or death of Bêl-nâdin-shumu, occurs in fifty-seven of the remaining documents as the chief creditor. The others, namely, thirteen, with the exception of No. 129, which is written in the interest of Murashî, son of Bêl-nâdin-shumu, are ascribed to his servants and his servant’s servant.

The last three tablets here published (130, 131 and 132) not only introduce a different kind of business, but they also are written in the interest of a man, Arsham by name, who apparently was not connected with the family. The only way to account for the presence of these documents among the archives of this family is to identify his agent Bêl-supê-mahur with the ardu and pagdu of Bêl-nâdin-shumu, and later the ardu of Rîmût-Ninib (cf. p. 2). The first of these tablets is dated three and one-half years after the last one of the Murashû family.

As stated, most of the documents were written for members of the Murashû family. A number of them were inscribed in the interest of their servants. Whether they transacted business entirely for themselves, or in the interest of their employers is not stated. Each document is drawn up in the interest of one particular person. The fact, however, as was stated in Introduction to Vol. IX, p. 14, “that an officer who presents an order to Bêl-hâtin receives his payment from Bêl-nâdin-shumu;” the sons of Murashû acted as agents for the crown; that the employees of one member of the family are found later in the service of another, and also that a number of documents were written in the interest of their servants, some of whom we know acted as agents, show not only that most of these archives belong to the different members of the Murashû family and their servants, but also that intimate business relations existed among them.

1 No. 10 is a bond for the release from prison made with Tirîrakamma, the bond-servant of Bêl-nâdin-shumu. No. 55 is a partnership contract between Ninib-muballî, son of Mushêzû and Adgishiri-zabdû, son of Bêl-êrîh. In No. 78, we learn that Ninib-muballî paid the taxes of h’dau sho Rîbôt, son of Bêl-êrîh, servant of Rîmût-Ninib, son of Murashû, which shows that he was connected with the business transactions of the family. In No. 87, a certain Ninib-muballî is mentioned as a servant of Rîbôt. In all probability, by reason of the fact that the tablet was found in the archives of the Murashû sons, Ninib-muballî and his master Rîbôt are the same individuals as those figuring prominently in these documents under the same names as the servants of Rîmût-Ninib.

2 The names of the creditors, ardu sho Rîmût-Ninib in 87, and also in 116, the tablets being fragmentary, are wanting. Tablet 129 was written in the interest of Murashû, the son of Bêl-nâdin-shumu, and grandson of Murashû.

3 Cf. No. 74, however, written in the interest of Bêl-îtunnû, and 105 and 106 for Rîbôt, servants of Rîmût-Ninib.
SEALS AND ARAMAIC ENDORESEMENTS.

The number of seal impressions found on the contracts of this volume is far in excess of those of Vol. IX. A great many are of rare beauty, and indicate remarkable skill in the execution of the seal, or seal-cylinder, by the lapidary of this age. Familiarity with the seal impressions of certain individuals, which occur more than once, has aided in the determination, or restoration, of quite a number of names which were broken away from the tablets. In some instances where names of persons have been abbreviated, an acquaintance with the impressions of their seals enables us to identify them. For example, the same seal was used by Mukín-aplu, 82 : Lo. E., and Bél-mukín-aplu, 88 : U. E. In the text of tablet 83, the scribe, by mistake, reversed the names, making the son the father, and the father the son; but by the side of the seal, the proper order is given. This latter is determined by comparing the seal impression with those of the same individual, found on other tablets.

It was customary for the obligor, judge or witness first to make his seal impression, after which the scribe wrote in proximity, either to the right of it, or above and below it, the name of the man to whom it belonged. In quite a number of instances it can be shown that before the names of the witnesses were regularly affixed, the obligors or debtors had made their seal impressions. Cf. 9 : R., and 102 : R. The same is true with regard to the witnesses, who frequently made their seal impressions before all their names were attached to the document. Cf. the reverse of 88 and 130. In some instances, unless a number of witnesses, or the judge or judges left their seal impressions, the person or persons who received the benefits involved in the document, or upon whom the obligation rested, either left their seals upon the tablet, or, instead, made an impression in the soft clay with their thumb-nails. The individual in whose interest the tablet was made, whether as a receipt for a cancelled debt, a lease, due bill, mortgage, etc., has not in a single instance left his seal or mark upon the tablets of the Murashû archives.

The thumb-nail marks of both volumes, with but three exceptions, e.g., Vol. X, 9 : U. E., 40 : L. E., and 132 : L. E., when accompanied by the name of the individual who made them, belong to the recipient, debtor or obligor. This fact enables us, in some instances, to restore their names when the tablets have been injured, as, for example, in the

1 Cf. "Table of Contents" under Nos. 6, 28, 49, etc.
2 It is to be observed, however, that some persons had in use more than one seal at the same time. Cf. Vol. IX, Intro., p. 10 (No. 32, Lo. E.). When the seal impressions vary, therefore, we cannot always assume that there was more than one person by the same name.
3 The open space to the left of the name, in connection with the kunukku, is where the seal impression was made (cf. Pl. II). The scribe continued to write around the impression.
case of No. 28, where the supur of Nā'id-Bēl is given, and in the contract the writing of his name has been defaced. It also enables us to determine to whom thumb-nail marks belong when unaccompanied by names, simply supurahu or supurshunu being written to the left of them, or occasionally above or below them, namely, to the man upon whom the obligation rests.

In these tablets an unusually large number of endorsements’ in Aramaic are found. Besides the twenty-five tablets, the legends of which are here published, several others contain inscriptions, which I have made no attempt to reproduce, because the black color used as the writing material has become so faint, that only the familiar 𒈹 or 𒈩, or here and there a character, indicate the former existence of an inscription. These endorsements are either lightly or heavily incised, or are written with black fluid. Quite a number were incised at the time they were written with color.

It can scarcely be said that the black fluid was filled in after the tablet was incised, but rather that the scribe with his stylus, which had been dipped into the color, incised, or at least scratched, the surface of the tablet as he wrote upon it. That this is true, and also that some of the endorsements were written at the time when the cuneiform inscriptions were made, or rather before the tablet was allowed to dry, can be determined by the fact that on the same tablet, here and there, color is visible, while the inscription is only partially incised; and that in several instances the surface of the tablet, on either side of the groove made by the stylus, is slightly raised. This could not have been caused by a tool upon the hard clay. The same is further determined by what follows.

Three tablets (cf. Pl. VI), written on the same day, two of which are here published, Nos. 105 and 106, enable us to obtain some interesting facts concerning the writing of “dockets.” The same scribe wrote the cuneiform inscriptions, although he did not append his name. This follows from the similarity of the writing and the contents. As above, it can be definitely asserted that the “dockets” were written before the tablets were allowed to dry; also, that the same stylus was in all probability used to write the “dockets” on all three tablets. These facts are proved by an examination of the impressions made by the stylus, which show that it was slightly worn, or rough at the point where it came into contact with the clay, and in consequence left the same delicate traces of the instrument throughout the inscription. These characteristic

1 This is the proper legal term for the so-called Aramaic “docket.”
2 Notably Nos. 8, 12, 22, 66, 77, 86, 90, 96, 128, 130.
4 These are the only tablets of the Murashû archives thus far published, which omit the name of the scribe and date (cf. p. 3).
5 The characters being so small it has not been found practicable to attempt with the pen a reproduction of these delicate lines (cf., however, Pl. VI).
marks are plainly discernible upon all three tablets. But, what is more important, a close examination reveals the fact that the three “dockets” were very likely written by the same hand. This is determined by comparing the general appearance of the writing, the depth of the incision, and, in particular, the characters which the inscriptions have in common. It is quite probable that the scribe who wrote the documents in cuneiform, added the endorsements in Aramaic.  

In every instance where the name or names written in Aramaic are preserved on the tablets, we learn that they belong to the individuals who receive the benefits mentioned in the documents, or upon whom the obligations rested. Naturally, as in the case of No. 99, the name of the second party might appear as well, but where a single name is given, it always belongs to the obligor or recipient, the same as referred to, above, in connection with the thumb-nail marks. This fact is important with respect to what follows.

Several of the dockets throw very welcome light upon the pronunciation of the names of two gods hitherto not determined. Unfortunately, absolute certainty in the case of one cannot, as yet, be established.

Below the sipur, on the reverse of No. 105 (cf. Pl. VI), by the side of which is written דKUR-GAL-u-pah-hir, the following Aramaic characters appear: רנו. In view of what has been stated above, namely, with reference to the fact that in every instance where an Aramaic “docket” is written it contains the name of the debtor or recipient, and is the same that appears in connection with the thumb-nail marks, no other conclusion can be reached, but that the name in Aramaic characters stands for דKUR-GAL-u-pah-hir, or in other words נ is the Aramaic writing of the deity דKUR-GAL. Two other tablets, C. B. M., Nos. 5505 and 5417 (cf. Pl. V), contain these fragmentary dockets.

From the contents of the former, if a name is written on the tablet in Aramaic, it should be that of דKUR-GAL-MU(nādin or iddina), and on the latter דKUR-GAL-ētir. Notwithstanding both the tablets are fragmentary, and the Aramaic “dockets”

 Tablets Nos. 119 and 120 were written by a scribe on the same day. The writing of the “dockets” has the same general appearance, but being in color and exceedingly faint, they are of little value in this connection. The same is true of Nos. 131 and 132, although there is a difference of two years in the dating; the writing, however, presents the same general characteristics. Nos. 99 and 115 were also written by one scribe, but while the docket of the former is very heavily incised, that of the latter is lightly, hence also of little value for comparative purposes.

The single exception is No. 56, but as the tablet is fragmentary, the probably been broken away. The legend preserved enables us to date the tablet, as it has been injured in the text, ימ את ימי: “In the first year the document concerning the house.”
only partially preserved, the name of the deity on both fortunately remains. In view of what is written above, in each case רא stands for קUR-GAL. In the "docket" of No. 5505 the beginning of an additional character is seen, which appears to be הק. As iddina(MU) is written לה on tablets 29 and 60, and as it-tan-nu is written לה, Vol. IX, 71, in all probability this is the first letter of the second element.

^KUR-GAL in proper names in some periods was identified with ב21, cf. V. R., 44, Col. III, 41. These dockets show, however, that such was not the case in this period. The question now arises, how is רא to be pronounced? If the י is vocalic, names like ע-ru-mi-li-ki (cf. K. B., 11, p. 90), etc., might be compared. If it is to be considered consonantal, the reading Amurr = Amurr (cf. Jensen, Z. A., XI, 303 f.) is called ב5ל-שהד (cf. KUR-GAL = shaddā-rabā). Besides names like קUR-GAL-na-tu-nu, Nbn., 497 : 3 (Dippel, Name List), קUR-GAL-sha-ma, Nbk., 42 : 5, seem to show that רא, just like קMAR-TU = Amurr, was a foreign deity. But since at present no conclusive evidence is at hand, I prefer to transliterate the name of the deity קUR-GAL.

The names to be expected in Aramaic, if endorsements are preserved on Nos. 29 and 87, are קIN-IB-uballit and קIN-IB-iddina respectively. The former contains ו and the latter י. (Cf. also Pl. IX.)

Another tablet, which is unpublished (C. B. M., No. 5508), gives one of the same names, written with black fluid,

Unfortunately, a black stain has obliterated the character in doubt, but what remains gives us additional assurance that the first letter is א, and that the last two are surely י. Between these two characters, on tablet 29, there is a shortline. Apparently the scribe, in writing י after he had begun to make the extreme left line, appreciated the fact that it was too far removed from the balance of the character, so he drew a fine line in the proper position to complete it. Taking no account of this line, the character which follows is a perfect י, as it is also on the other two documents (cf. Nos. 29 and 87, also Pl. IX). It is to be noted that the character before י is not made exactly the same on the two tablets, upon which it is preserved. In No. 29 it appears to be a י or perhaps י; in No. 87 it is either a י or י. Up to the present I have searched in vain for something in the cuneiform literature with which to compare this name. However, this much

is certain, the Aramaic endorsements show that the pronunciation of the name of the god, in this age, has nothing to do with Adar, Ninib, Ninrag or Nisrok.1

It may be urged by some that the names of these gods, reproduced in Aramaic, represent foreign deities which were considered as equivalents to the Babylonian gods, NIN-IB and KUR-GAL. As we have in these “dockets” a faithful reproduction of the pronunciation of the names of Babylonian gods with which we are familiar, e.g., Bēl, in names, is written בֵּל (Nos. 60, 99, 104, 115, 116 and 131); Marduk, מְרַדּוּכֵל (No. 121); Nabu, נַבּוּ (Nos. 119, 120 and IX, 71); Nana, נֲנָאִ (No. 106); Shamash, שַמָּשׁ (No. 116),2 it is not very likely that such would be the case, and especially with regard to NIN-IB, one of the patron deities of Nippur, where the tablets were found.

What is the purpose of these inscriptions scratched or written upon the tablets? Rawlinson, who published the first collection as early as 1864,3 said: “The docket as might be supposed usually describes the nature of the deed, but sometimes it merely gives the name of the party disposing of his property.” While there are no deeds of sale among these documents containing Aramaic inscriptions, the idea expressed by Rawlinson seems to be in strict accordance with the contents of the “dockets.” They were filing endorsements or ready references for the keeper of the archives. But why are these “dockets” not written in cuneiform, the regular script of the Babylonian language?

As mentioned above, traces of Aramaic writing are seen on at least thirty-five of the tablets here published, or in other words nearly one-third of the entire number. As some of those written with a black fluid have almost completely disappeared, there is every reason to believe that a great many more originally contained “dockets.” Naturally, after the tablet was hard, it would be difficult to make such a “reference note” in cuneiform, but, as has been shown, at least the incised “dockets” were written at the same time when the documents were made. Then, also, it is quite possible to conceive of the desirability of having such a “docket” in another writing which would be readily recognized, and at the same time offer no confusion in the closely written document. This would imply, however, a knowledge of an additional language on the part of the archivarius. But does it not rather point more strongly to the fact that the endorsements

1 Hrozny, Mythen von dem Gotte Ninrag, p. 81, f.
2 Cf. also ניב, Lidzbarski, Nordsemitische Epigraphik, p. 295.
3 Consisting of seventeen short inscriptions and docket, Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society, 1864, Vol. I, N. S., p. 189; cf. also Corpus Inscriptuum Semiticarum, Pars Secunda, Tomus I. Stevenson, in a handy volume, Assyrian and Babylonian Contracts, has collected all “dockets” published, with a few exceptions, and in addition presents for the first time ten not previously published. His volume contains in all forty-seven “dockets” and short inscriptions.
are written in the tongue of the record keeper, or even in the language of the man in whose interest the documents were inscribed?

In connection with the above, the facts which follow should be taken into consideration. The Assyrian officials in the time of Sennacherib spoke Aramaic, according to the episode with the representatives of Hezekiah, related in 2 Kings, 18:26, f. The Hebrews, in all probability, spoke the Aramaic language after their return from Babylonia. Aramaic was used for filing endorsements as above, some of which are dated as early as the time of Sennacherib. Bricks, containing legends of kings in Aramaic, similar to those inscribed in cuneiform, besides quite a number of inscribed seals, weights, etc., have been found in Babylonia and Assyria. More than one-half of the contracts, in connection with the Murashû Sons, were made with persons bearing West Semitic names. The lists of names in the documents of both volumes show that about one-third of them are foreign, a goodly number of which are West Semitic. Taking these things into consideration, are we not impressed with the fact that the Aramaic language was very extensively used in Babylonia at this time? Furthermore, it is quite natural to conjecture, at least, that the Aramaic in this period was the language of a large percentage of the common people in Nippur, and that the Babylonian language, while still spoken, was on the decline, although for centuries it continued to some extent to be the literary and legal language of the country, as was the case with the Sumerian, long after it ceased to be spoken.

PALEOGRAPHY.

A list of all the signs and variants, giving the ideographic and syllabic values in use in the documents of both volumes, will be found immediately preceding the plates containing the texts. The values are attached so that a comparison as regards the use of the signs in this period may be made with those of other periods. Naturally in some cases, when the position of the wedges in a character was only slightly altered, discretion as to its value in the list was exercised. Completeness as regards the values attached to the signs has also been aimed at, but as there are certain passages and combinations of characters in both volumes as yet not intelligible to me, especially as regards their pronunciation, I do not claim that the list is perfect.

1. In the Introduction to Vol. IX, p. 20, attention was called to the peculiar writing

[A great many Western Semites adopted Babylonian names (cf. Intro., Vol. IX, p. 28, f.).]

[The Editor holds with Kautzsch (Grammatik des Biblisch-Aramäischen, § 4, Wilhelm Gesenius' Hebräische Grammatik, § 2, section 7) and other scholars, that the Hebrew continued to be spoken in Palestine till the third pre-Christian century.—Ed]
of the sign $\dd(t)$ in the words “min-$\dd$-$t$-$t$,” “ib-$\dd$-$t$-$q$,” and the frequently occurring name (‘Ad-dun-$nu$.) Kotalla, in the Beiträge zur Assyriologie, Vol. IV, p. 569, proposed to read the character, $Bèl$. The latter does not need refutation, as the usual characters for the god are frequently found alongside the sign in question. The following definitely shows that the sign is not the one having the value $\dd(t,f)$, and that it must be considered altogether differently.  

(a) If the characters were to be read $\dd$ in the name Ad-dun-$nu$, we should expect to find the ordinary sign having the value $\dd(t,f)$ used at least once in this name, which occurs in these texts fully one hundred times.  

(b) With the value $\dd$, the name is rightly considered foreign, but then we should expect to find more than two or three persons with foreign names mentioned, either as fathers or sons, among the thirty-five or more different names of persons recorded as being thus related.  

(c) The writings $ib$-$\dd$-$q$ (≡ ibataqa) and min-$\dd$-$t$-$t$ while possible, are not the ordinary ones.  

(d) In short the usual sign $\dd(t,f)$, written in the usual way in these texts, is altogether different. Compare, 5 : 4 and the Sign List No. 5.

In these inscriptions the character under consideration must have the value $tad$, $tat$ and $dat$. (a) Only such values are applicable in the names and words mentioned. For instance, the names $Bèl$-$tad$-$dun$-$nu$-$bul$-$lit$-$su$, Vol. IX, 79 : 12, Lo. E., or Nabû-$tad$-$dun$-$nu$-$usu$-$ur$, Strass., Dar., 264 : 6, would seem to have no exact parallel in formation, but transliterating them $Bèl$-$tad$-$dun$-$nu$-$bul$-$lit$-$su$, and Nabû-$tad$-$dun$-$nu$-$usu$-$ur”, “Bèl, grant him life whom thou hast given,” and “Nabû, protect that which thou hast given” (cf. $Bèl$-$ta$-$ad$-$dun$-$nu$-$usu$-$ur$, Strass., Nbk., 21 : 8, passim), the difficulty is removed.  

(b) The reading man-$dat$-$ti$, cf. man-$da$-$at$-$ti$-$shu$, Strass., Camb., 379 : 14, and ib-$tat$-$qa$ (II of batâq), would also be in accordance with what would be expected.  

(c) A similar value $tat$ can only be used in the rendition of this sign, which appears as a variant for the name $Lu$-$u$-$bal$-$ta$-$at$, Strass., Dar., 379 : 15, written $Lu$-$u$-$bal$-$tat$, Strass., Dar., 319 : 4, 8’ (d) Cf. also tat-$ta$-$sha$-’(A-AN), 9 : 4, parallel with ta-$ah$-$t$$+$-$p$’$+$, line 3.

This character appears in quite a number of variations, as will be observed in the Sign List, No. 22. The one most commonly found very closely resembles the sign $KAD$.  

In this period the character with the value $kad(t)$ is unknown to me. The values $tad$, $tat$, etc., as far as I can ascertain, were not used in earlier periods in connection with this sign. Probably the smaller sign having the same values, i.e., $kad(t)$, supplanted the other; but how can the selection of it for the new values $t(d,f)at(d,f)$ be explained?

In the Cassite age, by some arbitrary decision, the scribes in writing names like Ka-dash-man-tur-gu introduced, or resurrected the value dash for the sign, which consists of a single perpendicular wedge. In the late period the value $gi$ was used for this same

\[1\] Cf. Peiser, Aus dem Babylonischen Rechtleben, III, p. 33.
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sign' in the name 𒈺𒀀-bi. In both instances, doubtless, the introduction, or resurrection of these values was for practical purposes, and is due to the frequent occurrence of these names. Is it not possible also to account in this way for the introduction of 𒉀 in connection with the sign under consideration? Taddannu had become a very common name. No cuneiform character with the value 𒉀 existed, unless the sign in question in some unknown period had this value; and instead of writing ṭu-ad each time, is it not reasonable to assume that in the guild or school of scribes the masters, or teachers of cuneiform orthography, found it expedient to select a sign for this and similar values? If we are right in identifying the sign as KAD, and that this value was introduced for it, then doubtless its selection is due to the fact that it was rarely, if ever, used in connection with its original values, kad(t), in this period. This may throw light on what follows.

2. The explanation which has been offered (Introduction, Vol. IX, p. 19) for the peculiar use of AN-MESH in foreign names, is that it was “employed for expressing a sound which appeared to the Babyl. mind as one of their own plural endings,” and that “it may be that the Babyl. scribes mistook ṯ, pron. suff., for their own plur. ending ṣ, resp. Ṱ.” This explanation meets with serious difficulties. (a) Although in both volumes there are ten different names having AN-MESH as the final element, cf. Na-tan-iluš, Rab-bi-iluš, A-dar-ri-iluš, A-na-zi-iluš, Aq-hi-iluš, Ba-ri-ki-iluš, Ia-adi-ḫu-iluš, Ia-ḫaḫ-ḫi-iluš, Ra-hi-im-iluš, Shi-kin-iluš, there is not a single West Semitic name of a similar formation having ṣN in the same position. (b) That the scribes when they wrote ʾluš did not intend to represent anything that even had the appearance of the suffix, is conclusively shown by two Aramaic dockets. For Ra-hi-im-iluš the scribe wrote ʾHD'h7 on tablet No. 68; and on No. 5506 (Catalogue, B. M.) for Ha-xa-ʾišu, is written in Aramaic ʾH;7ṭṭ, exactly as in the Old Testament. In other words AN-MESH in these names, which in Hebrew have ʾIN as the second element, stands for nothing else than ʾIN. Is there any plausible explanation for this peculiar writing?

It is to be observed also that Assyrian scribes in writing these foreign names, whether ṣN is the first element or the final, made no effort to indicate that there was a suffix, e.g., Ilu-ṭa-bi, Ilu-a-ka-bi, Ilu-ud-ri, Ilu-na-la-ni, Ṭab-ri-ilu, Ṭa-đi-ilu, etc., cf. lists in John's Doomsday Book, and Deeds and Documents. Taking into consideration also the fact that ṣN in West Semitic names of these texts is found more frequently than Rammān, Gula, Nanâ, etc., in Babylonian names; and that the scribes, in all probability, knew that ידכ, the Hebrew word for God, was plural, 2 is it not natural to suppose that the Babylonian scribes in their efforts to distinguish between ʾlu and

2 Cf. the use of ʾḥiš as singular in the Tell-el-Amarna letters, Barton, American Oriental Society's Proceedings, April, 1892, p. cxcvi.
the Hebrew ܢﬁ introduced this combination of signs, ܢ-MESH, which carried with it the idea of plurality? In the light of what precedes in connection with the introduction of new values for signs, this theory finds support and becomes plausible.¹

3. In Strassmaier’s publications of contract literature a character very similar in appearance to GISHT occurs several hundred times.² Tallyquist reads it PreferredSize, “Holz.” He also quotes a passage in which it occurs, Strass., Nbn., 164 : 8, which he reads “ushparu piša,” cf. Die Sprache der Contracte Nabú-nâid’s, pp. 49, 140. Zehnpfund reads the name ушparu šu, “Bastweber,” cf. B. A., Vol. I, p. 496. In another place he reads šu “Werg.,” cf. B. A., Vol. I, p. 498. This sign appears as a determinative for the frequently occurring kibsu, shalhu and hullau. Delitzsch, reading the sign as the determinative šu, translates “Schemel,” “holzernes Tempelgerath” and “Ruhelager” respectively; cf. also Meissner, Supplement, p. 14, šu = “Werg.” Peiser, Keilinschriftliche Bibliothek, IV, p. 236, f, reads three hundred qâtiti sha šu, “drei-hundert Spannen Holz.” The failure to recognize that this so-called character GISHT is none other than the Babylonian GAD has caused the difficulties. In the passages quoted, and in many others, it has the value kitd, “clothing material.” Zehnpfund rightly says, notwithstanding he reads the sign as the determinative šu, that “alle drei Wörter bezeichnen Teile der babyl. Kleidung,” for they frequently appear in the “Weberrechnungen.” With kitd Hu-ul-la-nu, Strass., Nbn., 78 : 3, 8, compare 𒈶𒌓𒈬𒈵𒈬𒈵𒈬𒈵, V. R., 61, col. V, 45. That GAD is made in early Babylonian texts in a similar manner, cf. Z. A., III, p. 210. That it is exactly the Neo-Babylonian form of the sign, cf. Vol. IX, 866: line 15, with line 24. The few occurrences of the sign in these texts would indicate that perhaps a distinguishing characteristic is to be recognized in the lower horizontal wedge protruding more to the left than the upper. This is also noticeable in a number of instances in Strassmaier’s texts. It is probable that Strassmaier, according to his method of copying, after having recognized the sign as šu, usually wrote it without any regard for its actual form.

4. Hommel, in his Sumerische Lesestücke, rightly wrote the ideogram for uniku, SAL-ASH-QAR. Delitzsch later, in his Handwörterbuch, reads SU-QAR. Radau, Early Babylonian History, p. 348, follows Hommel, but says SAL-ASH in modern Babylonian script are written together and pronounced SU. If he meant that SAL-ASH in Assyrian being considered as one sign was equal to SU, he would be correct. In Neo-Babylonian SU is written differently (cf. Sign List, No. 236). That Hommel is

¹[A different theory from that of Prof. Clay will be found in the Editorial Preface.—Ed.]

²[This character was already identified as kitd in my former lecture courses on Strassmaier’s text publications, and again in my first interpretation of Vol. IX, winter 1898–99, which, however, were not attended by Dr. Clay, as he was instructor in O. T. Theology in Chicago during these years; cf. also Vol. IX, 65 : 20, f. for another occurrence of the sign.—Ed.]
right in his disposition of the signs is determined by the writing of the ideogram in these texts. *SAL-ASH-QAR*, cf. 130:4, *passim*.

5. In the name list of Vol. IX the son of *Ardi-Ninib*, occurring 49:18 and 53:18, is read *Ninibai* (*BIL-DAR-ai*). The same name occurs 108:14 (where the text was not given correctly'). In the inscriptions here published the name occurs 45:20 and 61:20. The second character, however, does not seem to be *DAR*, which is made quite differently in these texts. Cf. *Sign List*, No. 32 with 222. It might be urged that as the sign in question is approximately similar to *DAR* of the old Babylonian texts, or the so-called “hieratic” of the Neo-Babylonian period, cf. *C. T. B. T.*, 3:14 (13891), *C. T. B. T.*, 3:39,2 *I. R.*, 56:47:25, and Hilprecht, *O. B. I.*, Part I, 84:16, it was made in imitation of these. While several of the scribes who wrote the tablets, occasionally increased or decreased the number of parallel wedges, which made them similar, in some respects, to signs of an earlier period,3 this would be the only instance where an older or “hieratic” character was imitated if it had a different form. Throughout the whole list of characters used in these texts there is not a single sign which is made in two entirely different ways. Then, also, five different scribes wrote this name, and in the five texts where it occurs, none of the above peculiarities exist. The sign which most closely resembles the one under consideration is *KIRRUD*. Cf. Delitzsch, *Ass. Lesestücke*, 3d Ed., §5, p. 58, also Strass., *Dar.*, 430:6. For *KIRRUD* in names of gods, cf. *DU-KIR-RUD-KU*, King, *Babylonian Magic and Sorcery*, 12:24, and *LUGAL-KIRRUD(?),* 12:25.

6. The ideogram for *abarakkhu* (cf. *Sign List*, No. 162) is not to be read *SHI-UM* (Delitzsch, *Handwörterbuch*, p. 12), nor *shium* (*Introduction*, Vol. IX, p. 47), as it is composed of *SHI-DUB*. In Assyrian the latter sign occasionally has only three perpendicular wedges, making it similar to *UM*, cf. *II. R.*, 31, 56, c., but cf. Delitzsch, *Ass. Les.*, 3d Ed., p. 134. In Neo-Babylonian *UM* and *DUB* cannot be confused as they are made quite differently. In these texts *SHI* in several instances is accompanied by the dual sign, cf. 60:3; 124:4. This may throw some light on the meaning of the word. As has been known the *abarakkhu* was a royal officer, cf. also Vol. IX, 59:14. In the same volume, tablet No. 32, he gives an order for the restitution of property, and in No. 39, for the collection of rent. Taking the ideogram into consideration it seems possible that originally the office was something like “Archivarius” or “Keeper of the Seal.”

---

1 Cf. *Sign List*, No. 86 for *BIL* as it appears on the tablet.
2 I am indebted to Professor Hommel for these two references.
PROPER NAMES.

The same general rules observed in Vol. IX for the transliteration of verbal forms in proper names written ideographically, are followed in the Concordance of this volume. The transliterations of certain hypokoristica, however, have been made to conform according to what follows.

Throughout the Neo-Babylonian contract literature there are hundreds of names containing a verbal form, to which is attached the sign having the value aplu, etc., e.g., XU-A, BA-SHA-A, SE-NA-A, KAK-A. Some Assyriologists read these names Erba-aplu, Iqisha-aplu, Iddina-aplu, Ibnii-aplu, while others read Iqishá, Iddiná, etc. Very strong reasons speak against the transliteration of aplu in these names. There is a possibility that names of this class are abbreviations of those which contained verbal form + substantive + deity, like Li-nu-ulh-lib-bi-îlānī, 91 : 18; Lu-mur-duam-qañ-âBél, Strass., Nbn., 509 : 3; or, U-sur-a-mal-âEa, Strass., Carnb., 245 : 14, but formations of this character are exceedingly rare, and the verb is usually the imperative or the preterite. It cannot be said that they represent names, which originally contained verb + deity + substantive, the middle element of which has been dropped, because such formations do not occur. The same is true, if it should be urged, that in the shortening of names the order of the elements was reversed, as such a change has not been proved to have occurred. If they were originally theophorous names, and represent the common formation, deity + verbal forms + substantive, of which the deity has been omitted and two elements remain, then the form of the verb should be the participle,' and the names in question should be read Erïb-aplu, Kâ’isha-aplu, Nâdina-

The only exceptions known to me in Neo-Babylonian literature which cannot be satisfactorily explained are, the frequently occurring Nab-deeblūn-sa-lūm- ابن, and a peculiar name written Nab-e-tan-a-gū, Strass., Dar., 57 : 14. [Dippel, Name List.] Cf. also the reading of a strange name in Meissner. Althab. Proo., 97 : 22, Ilir-ism-îmoni, “Gött erhorte die Elenden,” by Hommel, Altisr., Uh., p. 71. This statement requires the consideration of the following:

1. Bél-tash-me-e-ri-ih-tu, O Bél, thou hast granted the desire -- (Introod., Vol. IX, p. 22), if correctly transliterated and translated would represent a formation which, as far as I know, has no parallel in cuneiform literature. In this connection another name, Bél-tass-šur-šu, Vol. IX, p. 22, must also be considered. Even if the reading were correct, I do not know of an analogous formation, except perhaps Tiqish-šur-Gula, Strass., Nbk., 435 : 18, if shu is the suffix. In view of the fact also that the sign has not been shown, so far as I know, in this period, to have the value tash and tash, this name should be read Bél-ana-mošti-šu, a formation similar to Anum-ana-kussi-šu, 101 : 5, or Nab-tan-an-šu, 26 : 2. The final elements of these names are omitted according to IX, p. 66, note. Cf. Nab-e-an-bi-arum, Strass., Cyr., 67 : 11; or, Bél-ib-nipran-ana-ashri-shu-iṭ, 117 : 15. Another objection must be urged against the reading ish-me-e, because the vowel would not be long if considered as a separate element.

Cf. Nab-ta-a-ni-arum, Strass., Nbn., 116 : 27; Nâb-ta-bi-arum-lis, Strass., Nbk. 161 : 5, etc. [With regard to the writing ish-me-e, cf. the very name quoted above, Illi-ism-me-e-a-ni-e, which I interpret, however, as 'Illi-ism-me-e-a-ni-e.] Finally, the proper reading for the name is Bél-ana-me-e-fi-ba-ṭu, as determined by the variant Bél-ana-me-e-re-fi-ba-ṭu, Strass., Dar., 379 : 38 [Dippel, Name List] and Bél-ana-mi-mi-ri-ka-ṭu, Strass., Dar., 14, 24. 2. John's in saying that Sin-nâdina-aḥu and Sin-iddina-aḥu are both possible readings (cf. American Journal
Aplu and Bāni-aplu, e.g., Sha-kin-shunu, Strass., Cyr., 297 : 9. This same character also is attached to abbreviated names having the imperative, and is also read aplu by some Assyriologists, e.g., Ku-sur-aplu. In view of what is written above, while it is not an impossible transliteration, yet this name also is more likely to be explained, with many of the others mentioned, especially those containing the preterite + A, according to what follows.

In all periods of Babylonian literature, from the earliest to the latest, there are found abbreviated names containing a verbal form, to which is attached an ending, not the labial. That this is correct, cf. the almost always is attached to abbreviated names having common family found abbreviated names containing a verbal form, to which is attached an ending, This being true, ia

This necessitates the reconsideration also of the reading Epish-AN ("’a is the artisan") introduced for this name in Introduction, Vol. IX, p. 25, which has since been adopted by several Assyriologists. In opposition to the arguments advanced for it, and also those against the reading Epish-AN, I offer the following: (a) In not a single instance, in the many occurrences of this name, or its abbreviated form, is it written like the word for "artisan" referred to, e.g., E-ša-sha-nu, E-pesh-a-ni, Epish-sha-nu or Epish-nu. (b) The form AN is not only found once but frequently. Cf. Strass., Nbn., 116 : 18, Nbl., 293 : 13, Camb., 388 : 19, Dar., 73 : 10, 224 : 14, etc. (d) That the determinative amlu is used before Epish-AN, when it stands in the third place, offers no difficulty, as it indicates the family name. Then, also, Epish-AN is an abbreviation for Epish-AN. Cf. the same name written both ways, Strass., Dar., 404 : 13, and Dar., 403 : 10. Further, Epish-AN is an abbreviation of Epish-AN. Cf. the same name also written both ways, Strass., Dar., 169 : 3, and Dar., 224 : 4. Certainly Epish-AN could not be a "professional designation," and yet cf. the name amlu-Epish-AN, when it is the name of the third, which is not imperative, and is also read in the same individual's name, in Strass., Dar., 224 : 4. This expression is in full accord with their religious ideas, cf. the names with similar meanings : Bāni-aplu, 160 : 12 : Bāni-ka-šu-epish(KAK), Nbl., 345 : 15 : Bāni-ka-šu-epish(KAK), Dar., 278 : 10 : Bāni-ka-šu-epish(KAK), Dar., 551 : 23.

4 Assyrian E-sag-ila-ki-in-ab-li, Y., R., 44, 440, etc. The explanation of the form kīn, which is not imperative, is as follows : Muškin-aplu(DU-A), Vol. I, 71 : 1. L. E. is written in I. 8, Ki-na-aplu or Ki-na-a. Muškin-aplu(DU-A), 82 : 13, Lo. E. is an abbreviation of Bēl-mukin-aplu, 88 : U. E., as determined by a comparison of the seals. Taking into consideration the fact that the performatives u or ra is frequently dropped in Assyrian names, e.g., shaššum for shaššīlim, in Ashur-bēl-shāššēm, Johns, A. D. D., 163 : 1, or for mušhal-lin in Nabb-shaššā-lin, Johns, A. D. D., 102 : 1: there is every reason to believe that the element in question is to be regarded as the participle in a shortened form. Cf. the docket on tablet 781, 19 : 1, for Bēl-mukin-aplu. This being true, Ki-na-a is an abbreviation for a name like Bēl-mukin-aplu, or, in other words, it is a hypokoristicon, with the "kīn" suffix. This explanation, however, will not justify the transliteration of DU as kīn (imperative) instead of mukîn in such full names as Bēl-mukîn(DU-a), as has been done generally in Babylonian names by some Assyriologists.
resembling the first person pronominal suffix of the noun, such as *Im-bi-ia*, 24 : 16; *Ib-ni-ia*, Strass., *Nbn.*, 62 : 3; *Ba-ni-ia*, Vol. IX, 26 : 15; *Tab-ni-e-a*, 4 : 5; 80 : 17. It is apparent at a glance that this ending cannot be regularly regarded as the pronominal suffix of the noun, for it is here found in connection with verbal forms.

The explanation of this peculiar combination of a verbal form, with this ending, is as follows: One of the elements of a name was used for the sake of brevity, to which was added this afformative, or “kose” suffix. In some instances it was the common noun, e.g., *Shumi-ia*, 51 : 3; *Shu-ma-a*, 45 : 10, etc., in others it was the deity, as *Mar-dulc-a*, 39 : 12; *Anum-ai*, 101 : 10, etc., and again it was the verbal form, as above, to which this ending was attached. For example, instead of calling the child by his full name, *Marduk-zér-ibni*, he could be called *Marduka*, or *Zeria*, or *Ibnía*. Cf. *Ṣillai*, 130 : 32, abbreviated from *Ina-ṣillii-Ni nib*, 8 : 12 (cf. *Introduct.*, Vol. IX, pp. 24, f.). Cf. the name *Nabî-tab-ni-usur*, the son of *Egibi*, Strass., *Nbn.*, 13% 4, written *Tab-ni-e-a*, Strass., *Nbn.*, 133 : 4. Cf. Peiser, *Bab. Rechti.*, I, p. 11. Cf. also the name of an Aramaic docket, *Ḳūn*, for *Ardi-Ištar*, John’s *Deeds and Documents*, III, p. 448, and *Ḳūn* for *Rēmu-shukun*, C. B. M., 5172. That the transliteration of this character is a and not *apa* in these names is proved by Aramaic *dockets* on tablets, where we find written for the names, *XU-A*, *Ḳūn*, Vol. IX, 66, and *BA-SHA-A*, *Ḳūn*, Stevenson, *Assyrian and Babylonian Contracts*, 34 : 3.

In the Neo-Babylonian period this afformative is ḫa, ḫa, ḫa, a or ai (A-A.). The endings, except ḫa, are the same in form as the first person pronominal suffix of the noun. It is quite possible that originally it was the pronominal suffix which was attached to the element selected for the sake of shortness, e.g., *E-saq-gi-Zi-ia*, “My Esagila”; *Ibnía*, “My Ibi,” without any regard for the meaning of the word. However, I prefer to regard it merely as a “kose” suffix, even though the same rules that usually govern the nominal suffix are applied when this afformative is appended to name elements. This fact gives rise to what follows.


4 To distinguish between this ending and those names which originally had the pronominal suffix is in every instance impossible. *Ḫit-ia*, Strass., *Nbn.*, 365 : 6, might be an abbreviation with the “kose suffix” of a name like *Ḫit-ḫi-ḫa*, Strass., *Vol. IX*, 4 : 2, or of a name like *Ḫiḫi-ti-ia*, Strass., *Nbn.*, 736 : 7, which contains the pronominal suffix. A still more difficult problem would be to distinguish between those names composed of a deity with this “kose suffix” and those that may have the patronymic ending.

In the transliteration of these names I have made the vowel, when there is one, which joins this affirmative ending or suffix to the element used, long or short, in accordance with the rules which govern the suffix. A number of Assyriologists invariably make it long, e.g., Nārēa, Ardīa, Riğūa; others transliterate like Ardīa, Bānīa, Zērīa.

Three classes of names containing either this "kose" suffix, or the pronominal suffix of the noun, must be recognized.

1. Those for which there is a reason why the joining vowel should be made long, namely, those elements which are in the plural, or are tertīce: inīmara, e.g., Ahē-e-a (Ahēa), Strass., Nb., 122 : 6; Tab-nī-e-a (Tabēa), 4 : 5; Ib-nī'-i-a (Ibēia), Strass., Nb., 62 : 3; Muk-kī-e-a (Makkēa), Strass., Nb., 553 : 3; Bēl-shadā-ū-a (shadda), Strass., Nb., 897 : 2; Shamash-re'ú-ū-a (re'ūa), Strass., Nb., 231. This being true, the joining vowel in names of this class, though its length is not indicated, must be considered long, e.g., Im-bī-ia = Imbīa, 24 : 16; Bānī-ia = Bānīa, 2 : 3, etc.

2. Those in which there is no reason whatever for the reading of a long vowel, e.g., Shum-īa, 51 : 3; A-tī-ia, Strass., Nb., 365 : 6; Ardī-ia, 4 : 26; Nūr-e-a, Strass., Nb., 34 : 9; Nūr-ū-a, Strass., Nb., 47 : 10; Itī-shār-i-nil-ia, Strass., Nb., 282 : 3; Itī-Nabā-pān-i-ia, Strass., Camb., 201 : 1, etc. There is absolutely no reason why some Assyriologists should consider the vowel long.¹ In not a single instance that I know of does the phonetic writing show that the vowel is long. When it is the pronominal suffix, grammatically there is no reason why it should be considered long. If a vowel is used to join a to the word, it is in every instance in this class a short vowel. It is either short ʾe or ʿa (perhaps also ʿā). Even though an occasional name of this class were found written like Nu-ri-e-a, of which I have no knowledge, I would explain it, according to the following, as having a short vowel.

3. There is a large number of names ending in u, not tertīce inīmara, to which is attached the suffix ʿū-a, e.g., Ra-mu-ʿū-a, Strass., Nb., 990 : 9; Nergal-ri-šu-ʿū-a, Strass., Nb., 466 : 2; Bēlīt-kudurr(ū)-ʿū-a, Strass., Nb., 1039 : 7; Sharru-il(u)-ʿū-a, Strass., Nb., 419 : 5, etc. Those written ideographically, as the last two examples, need offer no difficulties, and yet the explanation of the former may also be applicable to the latter. It must be kept in mind that the scribe did not write Babylonian and Assyrian names necessarily according to their exact pronunciation, but rather according to the elements of which they were composed. Ideographic writing is doubtless responsible for this. The meaning of the names must, therefore, have been well understood by the scribes. This being true, it is scarcely possible that in names containing the nominal suffix, they would have violated their rules concerning the length of the joining vowel. Can any plausible explanation for this peculiarity in writing be offered?

On examination it will be found that, with a very few exceptions, e.g., Gi-lu-u-a, Strass., Nbk., 54 : 12, in the hundreds of cases where such names occur, the sign SHAM(u) is always used as the joining vowel. This applies to all periods of Babylonian literature. In Assyrian texts, on the other hand, so far as I have been able to ascertain, the small sign for u is used. If any significance, therefore, is to be attached to this orthographical peculiarity, what applies concerning the one sign in Babylonian should apply to the other in Assyrian. For those Babylonian names, not tertia infirma, which end in u, to which are attached 'u-a, I desire to suggest, either, that it is an effort to write phonetically w, which is a secondary development from j, under the influence of the preceding vowel u, in which case the pronunciation would be like rišuwa (a form parallel to ardiia, etc.); or that u is to be regarded as a phonetic complement with the value o, ri-šu(-u)-a rišua (a form parallel to nārea).  

It is now well recognized that a phonetic complement precedes or follows a phonogram as well as an ideogram. Taking this fact into consideration, also that the one particular sign u is commonly used in this connection in Babylonian; that in the Hebrew names compounded with יִלֶשָׁ, as  יִלֶש旅游景区, יִלֶש-יִלֶש, יִלֶש-יִלֶש, יִלֶש-יִלֶש (C. B. M., No. 5510), u represents the o sound; that u as a joining vowel, unless it has the accent, would be rather difficult to pronounce, and as a short joining vowel to connect a to any consonant, o is to be preferred to u, are we not justified in suggesting that perhaps we have here the o vowel represented by the sign SHAM, and that in words of this class it serves as a phonetic complement? If this were true, then, the phonetic writing of names like Nergal-ri-su-zi-a (r̥š̥u-a), Nergal is my helper,” would do no violence to the rules which regularly govern the pronominal suffix of the noun. The same might be true, also, in the case of words not in proper names which have this suffix, such as zēru-ā-a, Vol. IX, 48 :2. Moreover, with this one difficulty out of the way, all suffixes or afformatives discussed, which end in the vowel a, can regularly come under the rules regulating the nominal suffix, and there is no need for confusion as regards the length of the joining vowel.

From the Concordance of Proper Names, it will be observed that a large number of names which occurred in the tablets dated in the reign of Artaxerxes I., continue to appear in these documents. Notwithstanding this fact, the large list of foreign names, which did not occur in Vol. IX., shows that in proportion the number of foreigners entering into contract relations with the Murashû family or acting as witnesses was perhaps greater than in the preceding reign.

1 Prof. Hilprecht informs me that in his lectures on the nouns (followed by a suffix), he has suggested these two theories, and also a third possibility, viz., that it really is a long vowel to be translated by a preposition = rišu-a, “as (like) my helper.”

2 Cf. Hilprecht, Assyriano, p. 70, note 4, and p. 105 (l. 17 from end).

*Ia-a-ma = Iâwa* as the second element of Hebrew names I have placed in the list of gods, regarding it as the Babylonian equivalent of יהוה, the contracted form of the tetragrammaton. Pinches, long ago, identified the element as such; cf. *Proceedings Soc. Arch.*, Vol. XV, p. 14, f. The first occurrence of Iâwa (Ia-a-hu-â, Iâ-a-hu-â) as an element in Hebrew names I found in copying the texts for *Vol. IX*. Iâwa was introduced in the list of gods as יהוה (cf. *Intro.*, p. 76). In view of the fact that the traditional pointing is יהוה; that the Septuagint invariably reads ὸτ, and because of what is said with reference to *SHAM* and the value o in Babylonian proper names (cf. p. 19), I am inclined to think that Iâ-a-hu-â was pronounced Iâu-ho. Iâma was not placed in the list of gods. Zimmern, in his treatment of the subject says, “Ob dieses schliessende Jâma den Gottesnamen Jahwe repräsentirt, ist iiicht so sicher als dies beidem beginnenden Jâhu der Fall ist” (*K. A. T.*, p. 466). While efforts have been made to show that יהוה as the final element of Hebrew names does not represent יהוה, this question I will not discuss as I accept the position taken by most scholars, including the savant Nödke (cf. *Encyclopaedia Biblica*, Col. 3279), who consider it as such.

As is well understood the most common formations of theophorous names of the late Hebrew period, are, deity + verb or substantive; and verb or substantive + deity. The latter is either יה or יהוה (contracted into יהוה or י and יה or יהוה). Among the Hebrew names found on Babylonian tablets both formations with יהוה are commonly recognized as well as יהוה as the first element. Is it not reasonable to expect the other very common formation also to be represented? The element which precedes יהוה in these and other texts are: Abî, 6 A-qi-bî, A-zi, 4 Bu-li, Ba-nu, Ba-ri-ki, Ga-du-al, Ga-mar, 5 Hâ-na-nu, Ia-a-da-ab, Iu-she, 4 Ig-da-al, Ish-ri-bi, Mo-tan-ni, Mu-la-ki, Nu-tu-nu, Ni-rî, 5 Pa-da-a, Pi-il-Iu, Ti-ri, Tu-ub, Shu-bu-nu, 4 Zn-bud, etc. Every element can be considered to represent a Biblical word. Twenty-one of the twenty-three given are found in the Old Testament as the first element of names compounded with the verb or substantive. With the other name A-qi-bi-Ia-a-ma, which is not found, cf. *Journal of Biblical Literature*, Vol. XIV, p. 114. If יהוה does not represent יהוה, there are no other Old Testament names with which to compare these twenty-three, most of which are unquestionably Hebrew; and *vice versa*, we look in vain in the Neo-Babylonian literature for Hebrew names of this very common formation. יהוה as the final element in the Assy-

---


2 The names not otherwise indicated are found in *Vol. IX* and the present texts.
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Assyrian historical texts was written Jâu and Iâu, e.g., Ḥu-za-ki-ia-a-u(ia-u, a-u), Az-ri-ia-a-u(ia-u, a-u). In Neo-Babylonian, in every instance that I know of, the element is written Iâma (ia-a-ma). It is unnecessary to repeat here that the Babylonian m = Hebrew 1, cf. pp. 2, 9. In what manner Jdwa represents יי I am not prepared to say.

There is a possibility that Jdwa is the actual pronunciation of Jahwe, as proposed by Sayee and Hommel¹ years ago, in which case it would seem that perhaps the scribes arbitrarily introduced it, as they very likely did in the case of AN-MESH = בֵּית (cf. p. 12f.). Again, יי, contrary to the pointing of the Massorites, which is not supported by the Septuagint, may have been pronounced י or Jdwa.² The Assyrian Jâu may also have been pronounced Jdw (cf. p. 19). Moreover, I simply want to emphasize the fact that Iâma (≡ Jdwa) represents יי, the contracted or apocopated form of יי, and justify my placing the element in the list of gods.

TRANSLATIONS OF SELECTED TEXTS.

The complete transliteration and translation of these texts, as was announced in Vol. IX, p. 30, are expected to appear in Series C. Conforming with Vol. IX, and for the same reasons, the transcriptions and translations of a few representative texts, in order to illustrate the general character of these documents, are given. With the exception of one or two, which contain docketts, I have selected those which belong to a different class of contracts, or bear upon subjects altogether different, from those published in Vol. IX.

1.

No. 54, Darius II., year 1st, Marchesvan 2nd.

Contents: A lease of certain fish pools, in which the lessee, besides paying a stipulated sum, agrees to furnish the agent daily with a mess of fish.

Transliteration:

1. Ri-bat mdru sha md Bêl-érib istru sha md Bêl-nâdin-shumu ina lu-ud lib-bi-shu
2. a-nu md Bêl-nâdin-shumu mdru sha m Mu-ra-shu-ú ki-a-am iq-bi
3. um-ma bûrê sha núî̂ xal. sha ina bii-rû ăb-ša-a-nu u ăb-ši-šu
4. sha md Bêl-ab-usur sha ina abezérâti ša ḫa-šâ-ri] sha ı̂ m-gârê 5. bûrê ša núî̂ xal. ša ina abezérâti ša ḫa-pâhâtû ša bi-in-da-nu bûrê ša núî̂ xal. 6. ša ina ab Bê-ba Nâ-tu-zi-nin a-na ḫâna BAR a-nu šhatti

³ The final short vowel as in Jââ, would not be represented in Hebrew.
Translation:

Ribát, son of Bél-érîb, servant of Bél-nádîn-shumu, of his own free will spoke to Bél-nádîn-shumu, son of Murashû, thus: the fish ponds which are between the towns Ahshânû and Gîshshu, belonging to Bél-âbû-ûzûr, those which are in the fields of the chief of the brokers; the fish pools which are in the field of the prefect of the hindanû (professional name); the fish pools which are in the town NattuÎ let me have for rent, for one year. For the year, one-half of a talent of refined (?) silver; in addition, from the day I am given possession of those fish ponds for fishing, daily, a mess (lit. fixed amount) of fish for thy table I will furnish. Thereupon Bél-nádîn-shumu complied with his request, and rented him those pools of fish, for the year, for one-half talent of silver. For the year the silver, i.e., one-half talent, rent for those pools, Ribát shall pay to Bél-nádîn-shumu, and the fish for his table he shall furnish. From the first day of Marchesvan, year first, those pools are at the disposal of Ribát.

In the presence of Bélshunu and Umardûtû, judges of the canal Nár-Sîn.

Names of six witnesses and the scribe. Seal impressions of five witnesses including that of Rimûl-Nînîb, son of Murashû.

2.

Contents: Lease of a house. The stipulated sum is paid in advance for a certain term. In case possession of the house is demanded before the expiration of the lease, the full amount of rent is to be returned.

Transliteration:


Annotations: No. 4, L 4. "a-dîmuh-hi a-si-e sharri" is an expression not found elsewhere, so far as I know. The tablet is the first dated in 1 the new reign, in fact it was written either on the first or second day, cf. p. 2. It may refer to the time when the new king officially visited the cities; or perhaps the house was rented for the uncertain period terminating with the reign, for a representative of the crown, or for the use of a prince who lived in Nippur.
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Translation:

The house, situated upon the rampart(?) of Bel, alongside the house of Zatumé, which is the property of Apil, son of Harmahv, he gave for house rent to Bél-nadin-shumu, son of Murashá, from the fourth day of Shebat unto the going out of the king, for one and a half mine of refined(?) silver. The silver, i.e., one and a half mine, his house rent for the period, until the going out of the king, Apil has received from Bél-nadin-shumu. Apil, son of Harmahv, bears the responsibility for not repossessing that house. If the house from Bél-nadin-shumu is demanded, the money, namely one and a half mine, Apil shall return to Bél-nadin-shumu, and there shall be no claim on his part against Bél-nadin-shumu concerning the rent of the house.

Names of seven witnesses and the scribe. Thumb-nail mark of Apil.

3.

No. 131, Darius II., year 11th. Elul 21st.

Contents: A rental of sheep and goats.

Translations:


Annotations: No. 6, L 1. CLIV-ta. When ta accompanies numerals it doubtless is to be regarded as a phonetic complement, like it in išshnu(-i). Throughout these texts tu is added to numerals only when found in connection with substantive, e.g., CLIV-ta lbhru rabiti a-lit-tum. Cf. naphar IV-ta baqashtu, 107: 5; a-pa Y-ta shanat, 107: 10, etc. In the sheep and goat leases, 130, 131, 132, besides Vol. IX: 1 and five similar unpublished texts, the only words in which the gender varies as determined by the numerals is mu-ut-tu-tu and m Quinn-tu (see below). L 4, enr=r= the female goat, but stands as well for goat in general, just like enu does for sheep and goats. L 5, 7, en-piétu u zgalmáti. Piétu refers to the sheep and zgalmáti to the goats in Vol. IX, 1: 4, where naphar 228: 3-6 piétu follows the enumeration of sheep, and naphar 228: 2-5 en-piétu, 1, 4, the goats. After the sum total is given, the above phrase, en-piétu u zgalmáti, follows. L 6, mi-il-du is used interchangeably with tam-lit-tu in the 6o texts. For the former cf. 130: 5, 15; for the latter 130: 7, 8, 21. Tallquist, Die Sprache der Contrakte Naba'nidás', reads Nbn. 28: 7: zai-lit-tu. Delitzsch, Handwörterbuch, p. 136b, reads tam-lit-tu, but does not translate. Peiser, K B 1, p. 194, and Bab. Revue, III, p. 44, rightly translates "Geburten." The context of Nbn. 286 as well as the Murashá texts require a translation like this. A flock of sheep, two-thirds of which are bearing ewes, could almost be doubled within a year's time. It is to be expected that in a

contract of this kind, provisions should be made for the return of a large percentage, at least, of the flock’s natural increase. Goats being more productive, for the females rented 100% of “offspring” was required, while only 60% for the sheep. Tišitu = tašitu = tashitu from תִּישָׁתּ, translated “gestant,” Delitzsch. Handwerker, is doubtless the same word. Does tashitu = tašitu = tašitu, or does tashitu by some analogous formation = tavšitu? Mithu, having the same meaning, “offspring” or “born” — see above. Cf. Heb. תִּישֵׁת and the modern Arabic والد. This is a notable example if ט, written מ, is preserved at the beginning of a word. In the earlier periods the character ט usually represents this sound. L, 9. mu-ul-tu-taum “dead” is fem. Inf. II, of מז and is here used as a substantive with a passive signification. Cf. Delitzsch, Ass. Grammar, § 64: 24. Cf., mu-ta-ti, 74: 17. For similar formations cf. wašša, PI, = waššaah, šeddu, šētu, etc. It is used interchangeably with mi-pi-ta, cf. 132: 9, 17 and Vol. IX, 14: 24. Both terms refer to the dead of the flock. If provisions were made for the return of a certain percentage of the flock’s increase it is reasonable to expect to find the same made also for the losses through death and accident. 10% would be a reasonable allowance, as the ordinary life of a sheep is about ten years. The gender of mutattam as well as miššitu did not seem to be clearly fixed (see above). Cf. ishtûn mutattam, 130: 10, ishtûn, ii. 20; ishtûn, 131: 10; ishtûn miššitu 132: 9; ishtûn miššitu, 132: 17. Vol. IX, 1: 24. L, 10, mi-da-ša-ša means something like “sinews” or “muscles.” SA is used as a variant of gishtat, its variant. SA is in this connection seen to mean. L, 21. su-ul-du-du, “folding,” occurs 130: 21, 131: 21, 132: 18, 78: 17, 12. Vol. IX, 1: 25, and Dav. 257: 9, 348: 9. On examination of tablet, Vol. IX, 20: 9, the last two characters should also read Nun-tum instead of ŠHAM-DU. Peiser, Babylonischen Rechtshelden, III: 24, translates “zählen.” The root in Arabic “to stop,” “to shut up with a bar,” points to the meaning of the word, which doubtless is in this connection “to fold,” “to enclose the flock in a fold.”
Translation:

Abushunu, son of Bēl-ēṭīr, of his own free will spoke to Bēl-supē-muḥur, the overseer of Arsham, thus: nine male sheep, twenty-seven two-year-old male sheep, one hundred and forty-four large bearing sheep, thirty-seven one-year-old male lambs, thirty-eight one-year-old female lambs, twenty-five large male goats, nine two-year-old male goats, fifty large bearing goats, seventeen male kids, seventeen female kids, in all three hundred and seventy-three sheep and goat ("Kleinvieh"), white and black, the property of Arsham, rent me. In a year, I will give thee, as rent for those sheep: for one hundred (female) sheep, sixty-six and two-thirds (\(= 66\frac{2}{3}\%\)) offspring; for one (female) goat, one offspring; for one sheep, \(1\frac{1}{2}\) mine of wool; for one goat, \(\frac{5}{8}\) mine of sheared goat wool; for one bearing sheep, one *dunatum* \(\varphi\) for one hundred sheep, one *pa* of butter. Reckon ten dead for every hundred sheep. For one dead, I will give thee one hide and 2\(\frac{1}{2}\) shekels of sinews. Whereupon Bēl-supē-muḥur granted his request, and nine male sheep, twenty-seven two-year-old male sheep, one hundred and forty-four large bearing sheep, thirty-seven one-year-old male lambs, thirty-eight one-year-old female lambs, twenty-five large male goats, nine two-year-old male goats, fifty large bearing goats, seventeen male kids, seventeen female kids, in all three hundred and seventy-three sheep, white and black, large and small, gave him for rent. In a year Abushunu shall give to Bēl-supē-muḥur at the rate of one hundred female sheep, sixty-six and two-thirds offspring (\(= 66\frac{2}{3}\%\)); for one female goat, one offspring; for one sheep, \(1\frac{1}{2}\) mine of wool; for one goat, \(\frac{5}{8}\) mine of sheared goat wool; for one bearing sheep, one *dunatum* \(\varphi\) for one hundred bearing sheep, one *pa* of butter, as rent for those sheep. For one hundred sheep, ten dead Bēl-supē-muḥur shall allow him. For one dead, he shall give one hide and 2\(\frac{1}{2}\) shekels of sinews. For the shepherding, folding and guarding of those sheep Abushunu bears the responsibility. From the twenty-first day of EM, year the eleventh, those sheep are at his disposal. Those sheep [shall be obtained] from Shabahṭani, the head animal keeper, son of PA-SHE\(^{\text{a}i}\)-ai.

Names of twelve witnesses and the scribe. Wine of the witnesses, besides Shabahṭani, left impressions of their seals. Abushunu made a thumb-nail mark instead of his seal. On the reverse is found an endorsement in Aramaic, "The document of Abushunu, the son of Bēl-ēṭīr."
4.

No. 106 [Darius II], year 6th, Sivan 10th.

Contents: Record of sheep and goats delivered to an individual for stock raising.

Transliteration:

1. II immurbu-bal
2. VII immurubu-hadu
3. XV immulah-rat
4. IV urig ubi iihten urig u shatu shanwa
5. III urig jihr XX enzu rabiti a-lit-turn
6. VII uniku marat shatti
7. napharu CIX gi-en rabiti qal-lat
8. piittit(-ti) salindu(-in-du) sha "Ri-bat aplu sha mBél-érib
9. kardi sha "Ri-mul- Ninig ana BAR ina pan
10. Za-bid-2Na-za a-plu sha "Ha-am-na-ru-ru
11. Ümu 10 hanna emu Semanu sha shattu "
12. e-pish nis-ka-su e-pu-ush itti-shu

Aramaic endorsement: "Zabid-Nanâ concerning that which he acquired."

Translation:

Two male sheep, four sheep (two-year-old males), eight male lambs, forty-five large bearing sheep, fifteen one-year-old female lambs, four large male goats, one two-year-old goat, [three] male kids, twenty large bearing goats, seven one-year-old female kids, in all, one hundred and nine sheep, large and small, white and black, belonging to Ribdat, son of Bél-érib, servant of Rimâl-Ninig, for rent, are at the disposal of Zabid-Nanâ, son of Hammurânu. On the 10th day of Sivan of the sixth year, he concluded the business transaction with him. The sheep are (is) inspected, counted and entrusted to him.

Impression of the seal of Zabid-Nanâ. Aramaic endorsement: "The document of Zabid-Nanâ concerning that which he acquired."

5.

No. 99, Darius II., year 5th, Iyyar 18th.

Contents: A lease of certain fields, situated in a number of towns which are owned by a certain organization. Their representative, an overseer, is empowered to rent these lands for a period of three years.

Annotations: No. 106, Li. 1. lâb-ri. In Nos. 131 and 132, as well as Vol. IX, I, three different ages of male goats and sheep are specified, while only two of the female are given. In this tablet, as well as in No. 105, the same is true with respect to the goats, but exactly the reverse would be the case as regards the sheep if leqâru is construed as feminine, as GÂNÂMÂM usually is elsewhere. Taking into consideration all the sheep and goat leases the word can only mean here the two-year-old male sheep = immurru mar shatu shanâ. For an illustration of a species of sheep and goats of early Babylonia, cf. Hilprecht, O. B., I., Part 2, Vol. I, p. 47f. L. 8, salindu(-in-du) is an example of two phonograins used as a phonetic complement. Cf. also 8B-in-nu-" = inamâdinnâ, 132: 18. Endorsement. The reading of the stroke inserted between the P and N as Dr. Littmann has kindly suggested.
Dated in the Reign of Darius II.

Transliteration:

1. akeZerati zag-pu u pi shul-pu sha ba-at-ri sha b'angaré sha ina da Tarbašu-unmanu
2. sha ina da Hu-us-gi-e-tu sha "Ad-ra-lu-ú sha ina da Na-ki-di-[ni sha ina du]
Xu-uk-ki-ia
3. Sha ina da Hu-us-gi-e-tu sha Qa'-ma-nu sha qdt 3 "Ba-la-tu aplu sha
4. mHi-du-ri2 kshak-nu sha b'angaré aplu-sha mHab-grirardu sha "Ba-la-tu
5. aleZerati
6. shuñtu a-na inu BAR a-di III-ta shattu a-nu sh[attu] 2½ ma-na kaspw
7. ishtën(-en) karpatu-dan-nu shikaru ma-Zu-qi ishténi(-en) immeru LX ga ki-me sha in
[pánm] Ri-bat aplu sha Bél-érir bardu 7. sha "Ri-mul2 Nini2 id-din. Ina shattu ina
archu Kislimu kaspw ma(A. AN) 2½ ma-na karpatudan-nu[a ishténi(-en)] 8. immeru a'
ishtën(-en) ki-me a' LX ga inu BAR egaliti shu'tu "Ri-bat a-na mHi-du-ri[-i] 9.
shattu Všn 1 aleZerati shu'átu ina pdm "Ri-bat. Ishtën(-en) TA-A-AN sha-ta-rí
ilkuk(-u) [ki-zu shandati a] III-1a lo i-shat-lim2 [mHi-du-ri][-i] [aleZerati shu'átu paq-ri]
V ma-na kaspw i-nam-din.

Translation:

The cultivated and uncultivated fields, belonging to the overseer of the Carpenters, which are located in the towns Tarbašu-unmanu, Hu-sešu-sha-Adrašu, Nakidini, Sukkia and Hu-sešu-sha-Qa'manu, Hi'duri, the overseer of the Nangaré, son of Habsir, servant of Balduš, by order of Balduš, son of Sīha', gave those fields for rent to Ribát, son of Bél-érir, servant of Rimát-Ninib, for three years; at the rate of per year, two and one-half mine silver, one jar full of wine, one sheep, and sixty qa of flour. Each year, in the month Kislev, the silver, namely, two and one-half mine; jar, i.e., [one] sheep, i.e., one; flour, i.e., sixty qa, Ribát shall pay to Hi'duri as rent for those fields. The responsibility for [not] reclaiming those fields Hiduri bears. [From the month Ajar of the seventh year] those fields are at the disposal of Ribát. One document both have taken. [If those fields are demanded] before the expiration of the three years Hiduri shall pay five mines of silver.

Names of eight or more witnesses and scribe. Seal impressions of three or more witnesses, also of Hi'duri.

Aramaic endorsement: The document of the land of the Nangaré (Carpenters), which Hi'duri, son of Habsir, gave to Ribát, son of Bél-érir, for (lit. in) rent.

Annotations: No. 5, J. 70C. For the use of the so-called 2 prdtu, in Hebrew, cf. Gesenius, Hebrew Grammar, § 119 16. 70C in Intro, Vol. IX, p. 24, is regarded as equivalent to 25 or 26 Babylonian GUR. In this text, as well as the two of V0, IX, in which it occurs, it seems to me to mean something like rent, in this case for silver, sheep, wine and flour.
6.

No. 29, Darius II., year 1st, Tammuz 20th.

Contents: A contract made with an individual for the gathering of a harvest, with a penalty attached in case the work has not been accomplished at a specified time.

Transliteration:


Translation:

Unto the second day of the month Ab, year first of Darius, king of countries, the harvest (namely), which as the apportionment of Rimdt-ʾNinib, son of Murashti, had been set apart, he gave to Ninib-iddina, son of Ninib-ʾēṭir, to gather in. If on the second day of the month Ab, year first of Darius, that harvest he did not completely gather in, the produce as niuch of it as should have been delivered, Ninib-iddina shall turn over to Rimdt-ʾNinib from his own possessions, and there shall be nothing for him, together with the farmers, as regards the balance of the harvest.

Names of four witnesses and the scribe. Seal impression of one witness.

Aramaic endorsement: " testament "

7a.

No. 55, Darius II., year 1st, Adar 28.

Contents: A partnership agreement made by two individuals to farm certain lands, and divide equally the profits.

Transliteration:

Translation:

*Ninib-muballit*, son of Mushedib, and Adgishiri-zabdu, son of Bel-erib, who had spoken to one another as follows: Let us sow five gur of seed in the field of $hvâb-mun(?)-gu$ along the bank of Nár-Batîa, in the town Bit-Hadîia, agreed thereupon together, and the seed, i.e., five gur, for a crop they planted. The seed, i.e., five gur, Adgishiri-xabaddu shall measure and deliver (lit. show) to Ninib-muballit. They have sworn by the king that whatsoever grows on it shall be equally divided with regard to their tithe and their profit.

Five witnesses and the name of the scribe follow; also the seal of Adgishiri-xabaddu, and his name written in Aramaic characters אשתרבר.

No. 44, Darius II., year 1st, Elul 24th.

Contents: An agreement and its acceptance embodying a proposition to farm certain fields on equal shares.

Transliteration:


Translation:

Shum-iddina, son of Puḫḫuru, spoke to Rimât-Niniḫ, son of Murashd, thus: Let me put two of my oxen with two of thine oxen into thy pasture lands, and everything, as much as in those fields grows, by our work of irrigation, is ours in common. Afterwards Rimât-Ninib complied with his request and gave him oxen and seed; ox for ox, seed for seed. They have sworn by the king that whatsoever grows in it, shall be divided equally among them,

Names of four witnesses and the scribe. Seal impressions of three witnesses.

Annotations: No. 7b, L. 2. *alpu.* For an illustration of the oxen used at the present time in Babylonia to work the *narțabu* cf. Pl. XVI. The water buffalo (cf. same plate) is also used for this purpose. On the former cf. also Hilprecht. *Assyrica,* Tafel I. L. 4. On *narțabu* cf. *Introduction* to Vol, IX. p. 40, and also the illustrations Pl. XV and XVI.
Contents: A release given by an individual to Bél-nadin-shumu for and on account of a claim for damages arising from trespass committed by the latter and his servants. The charge of trespass, followed by its denial, and then payment of consideration for settlement or release, is analogous to similar transactions of the present day.

Transliteration:

1. *mB*-ga-za-da-a-ta-za *h*-us-ta-ri-ba-*ri* aplu sha *mB*-Bél-nadin sha a-nu *mB*-Bél-nadin-shumu aplu sha

2. *mB*-ru-ra-shá-ú *i*-q-ba-*ú* un-nú *mB*-Ra-bi-*ia* sha *k*asp*u* ul-*tu* lîb-*bi* na-*shá-ú* 6*Bu*-za-*tu* u 6*Bu*-áni sha li-*mi-ti*-shu

3. tu-âb-*ti*-pi *kasp*u *lu*ra-*gú* al-*p*ê*ê* 6li-*a* yi-*e-nu-*ia* u 6mîm*ma* sha ni-*ka-*i* *g*ab-*bi* at-*ta* 6*Bu*-nâr[a]-ka 6*Bu*-ardâni-*ka* 6*Bu*-Nippurâ*ê*pi tat-*ta*-sha-a-an. 6*Bu*-ku 5. *mB*-Bél-nadin-shumu*ê*bb(-*u*) um-*ma* *mB*-Ra-*bi-*ia 6*Bu*-áni ka ul-*tu* lîb-*bi* na-*shá-ú* 6. 6*Bu*-áni sha Zi-*mi-tu-nu 6*Bu*-Ra-*bi-*ia ul ni-*ib-*pu* *kasp*-ka *lu*ra-*gú* al-*p*ê*ê* 6li-*a* yi-*e-nu-*ia* u 6mîm*ma* ni-*ka-*i* *g*ab-*bi* an-*ka* 6*Bu*-mârê-bi *[t*â-*i*] 6*Bu*-*a-*lik* na-*ash-par-tu-tu-ia 8. 6*Bu*-ardâni-*ia* u 6*Bu*-Nippurâ*ê*pi ul ni-*ib-*shu.

8. *mB*-Bél-nadin-shumu ku-*um* la ru-*gu-mi*-e dinu sha anô *mû*-bi di-*ib-*bi an-*nu-*tu sha

9. *mB*-Ba-*g*â-*a*-da-a-ta-za 6*Bu*-a-*bi*-is-*h*-tu CCCL gur *ê* BAR 11 gur ku-*um* mi-*i*-dit-*tu*n L gur *ê*kipâtu 11. *mB*-kar*pat*u-*d*n-nu kurunni la-*bi-*ri ma-*la-ú* 6sa-*a*-bi a-*di-*i gu-*rab* L *ê*kar*pat*u-*d*n-nu kurunni 12. esh-*shu* ma-*la-ú* 6tâ-*a*-bi a-*di-*i gu-*ra-*bi CC gur su-*lu*ppu CC lâkhâpi-*e-*nu* 13. *mB*-XX al-*p*ê*ê* 17*Bu* V billu *ê*kipâtu 17*Bu* a-*na* 

14. *ê* BAR a (A-AN.) CCCL gur ku-*um* (mi-*i*-d*ê*-t*um* a) (A-AN.) I gur *ê*kipâtu a (A-AN.) I gur 15. dan-*nu-*tu a (A-AN.) L *ê*kar*pat*u kurunni la-*bi-*ri ma-*la-ú* 6tâ-*a*-bi a-*di-*i gu-*rab* dan-*nu-*tu a (A-AN.) 16. L *ê*kar*pat*u kurunni esh-*shu* ma-*Zu-*u 6tâ-*a*-bi a-*di-*i gu-*rab* su-*lu*ppu a (A-AN.) CC gur 17. si-*e-*nu-*a* (A-AN.) CC lâkhru al-*p*ê*ê* (A-AN.) 17*Bu* XX] *ê*kipâtu a (A-AX.) V billu *ê* Ba-*g*â-*da-*a-ta-*za* 18. ina gât 17. *mB*-Bél-nadin-shumu **a**-*hêr* e-*tîr*. Dinu u ra-*ga-*mu sha *mB*-Ba-*g*â-*da-* (a-ta-*za*) 19. *B*marê *bitâti*-shu *B*ar-*lik* na-*ash-par-ti-*shu *B*ardâni-*shu u *gab-*husha *â*áni shu-*â*tu [ul-*mi-ti*-shu-nu] 20. *g*hu-*tu* u sha *ê*Ra-*bi-*ia* du *ê*Ha-*za-*tu* u *â*áni sha li-*mi-tu-m-ti-shu u . . . . . 21. *g*ab-*bi* itti *mB*-Bél-nadin-shumu *B*marê *bitâti*-shu *B*ar-*lik* na-*ash-par-ti-* [shu *B*ardâni-*shu)] 22. u *B*Nippurâ*ê*pi na-*a*-âmu(-*nu*) sa-*a-*tu ia-*a-nu* ul (i)âtâr-*m*a *mB*-Ba-*g*â-[a-*d*a-*ta*-*za*] 23. *B*-marê *bitâti*-shu *B*ar-*lik* na-*ash-par-ti-*shu u *B*ardâni-*shu u *B*ab-*hu* sha *â*áni shu-*â*tu sha anô *mû*-bi-i *q*-bâ-*u* 24. sha du *ê* Ra-*bi-*ia* du *ê*Ha-*za-*tu* *â*áni sha Zi-*mi-*tu du *ê*Ra-*bi-*ia* u 6mîm*ma* 

DATED IN THE REIGN OF DARIUS II.

Baga’dda’, the ustaribarî, son of Bêl-nâdin, who spoke to Bêl-nâdin-shumu, son of Murashti, as follows: The town Rabia, from which silver was taken, Hazatu, and its suburbs, thou hast destroyed; silver, gold, my cattle and my sheep and everything belonging to me, all, thou, thy bond servants, thy messengers, thy servants and the Nippurians carried away. Thereupon Bêl-nâdin-shumu spoke as follows: We did not destroy Rabia, thy town, from which thy money was carried, and the suburbs of Rabia; thy silver, thy gold, thy cattle, thy sheep and everything that is thy property, all, I, my bond servants, my messengers, my servants and the Nippurians, did not carry away. Bêl-nâdin-shumu gave to Baga’dda’, on condition that no legal proceedings on account of those claims which Baga’dda’ and one with the other made, three hundred and fifty gur of barley, one gur of spelt(?), fifty gur of wheat(?), fifty good large jars full of old wine, including the bottles, fifty good large jars full of new wine, including the bottles, two hundred gur of dates, two hundred female sheep, twenty oxen, five talents of wool. Baga’dda’ received from Bêl-nâdin-shumu barley, i.e., three hundred and fifty gur; spelt(?), i.e., one gur; wheat(?), i.e., fifty gur; jars, i.e., fifty good vessels full of old wine, including the bottles; jars, i.e., fifty good vessels full of new wine, including the bottles; dates, i.e., two hundred gur; sheep, i.e., two hundred females; oxen, i.e., twenty; wool, i.e., five talents he has been paid. There shall be no legal proceedings in perpetuo on the part of Baga’dda’, his bond servants, his messengers, his servants and the men of those cities, and their suburbs, which were entered, i.e., of Rabia, Hazatu and the suburbs. . . . . by any of them, against Bêl-nâdin-shumu, his bond servants, his messenger, his servants and the Nippurians. Baga’dcita’, his bond servants, his messengers, his servants and the men of those cities on account of that which they said concerning Rabia, Hazatum, the suburbs of Rabia, and everything pertaining to that property, none of them shall bring suit again, in perpetuo, against Bêl-nâdin-shumu, his bond servants, his messenger, his servants and the Nippurians. By the gods and the king they have sworn that they will renounce all claims as regards those charges. Baga’dda’ bears the responsibility that no claim shall arise on the part of the men of those cities against Bêl-nâdin-shumu, his bond servants, his messengers, his servants and the Nippurians.
Names of ten witnesses and the scribe. Four seal impressions and a thumb-nail mark of witnesses; also seal of Baga’dáta.

9.

Contents: A receipt for the rent of fief lands paid to an official who represented the people that held them, including an acknowledgment of what was given to the crown.

Transliteration:

1. $1 ma-nu kasp$$u$$ il-ki gamrùti $g$$ah sharri ki-me sha sharri bar-ra u mimma na-da-na-
   a-tu-w 2. sha $b$$ò$$t$$i sharri gab-bi sha ultu ar$$ku$$ Nisanna shattu VII$$k$$an a-di Li-it ar$$ku$$ Addaru
   shattu VII$$k$$an mDu-ri-i-a-mush sharru sha ina mu$h-$$h$$i shêzérô 4. xaq-pu u pî shul-pu
   imuqashu sha $m$$Bè$$l-ba-ti u $h$$bè$$l-$$e$$muqashit-shu 5. sha ina dhu Bit $m$$Tàr-bi-il-im-ma$$-$$$$h$$ar-be
   sha ina shu-pal du, . . . . 6. sha kishâd n$$k$$ Purat Nippu$$k$$a sha $h$$ba$$-$$at$$-$$ri sha $h$$ba$$-$$na-
   nesha-ai 7. sha ina pân $m$$Rî$$m$$u$$l$$-$$Ninîb $$a$$plu $$sha $$m$$Mu$$-$$ra-shû$$-$$â kasp$$u$$ 4 ma-na il-ki
   shu’âtu gamrûti sha shattu VII$$k$$an sha ina mu$h-$$h$$i imuqashî shu’âtu $m$$Bè$$l-$$a$$-$$su$$r$$-$$shu $h$$shak$$-$$nu
   sha $h$$ba$$-$$na$$-$$nesha$$-$$ai $$a$$pZiv$$k$$u$$ $m$$Bè$$l$$-$$a$$-$$$$u$$s$$u$$r$$ ina qâl 10. $m$$Bè$$l$$-$$su$$p$$e$$-$$mu$$hur $$k$$ardu $$sha
   $m$$Rî$$m$$u$$l$$-$$Ninîb ma$$-$$hir e$$-$$$$ì$$r.$$

Translation:

Half a mine of silver, the complete taxes; a soldier for the king, flour for the king, barrâ and all kinds of gifts for the royal palace, all of it, which, from the month Nisan, year seventh, unto the end of Adar, year seventh of King Darius, is due from the seed field, cultivated and uncultivated, the fief land, held by Bél-hài$n$in and the owners of his fief land; which is in the town Turbilîmmahárbe; under the . . . . . which is along the bank of the Euphrates of Nippur, belonging to the overseer of the Banneshâja, which is leased to Rî múl-Ninîb, son of Murâshû. The silver, i.e., half a mine, those complete taxes for the seventh year, which rest upon that fief land, Bél-a$$-$$şîr$shu$, the chief of the Banneshai, son of Bél-ab-$u$$s$$u$$r$, has received from Bél-su$p$$ê$$-$$muhur, the servant of Rî múl-
Ninîb; he has been paid.

Names of six witnesses, four of whom left impressions of their seals. On the obverse is the following endorsement: “the document of Bél-şîr$shu$, the chief of the Banneshâja [concerning] the silver which is for (from) the land(?) of the Banneshâja.

Annotations: קנב, gentilic for Ba-na-$n$$e$$sh$$u$. Cf. also נירא, from הinar, artist or carpenter. Dr. Littmann suggested the reading of the uncertain character in $3$. Sign of masculine.
10.

No. 62, Darius II., year 2nd, Tebet 24th.

Contents: A mortgage. Certain lands are pledged as security for the payment of a debt. Record is also made of the payment of expenses incurred by the obligor in going on a mission for the king, and in addition the cancellation of a former debt, doubtless his payment.

Transliteration:


Translation:

Twenty gur of dates due to Rimût-Ninû, son of Murashd, by Bîbâ, son of Bêlshunu, who is the overseer of Bit-Sin-mâgir. In the month Tishri of the third year, the dates, namely, twenty gur, he shall pay according to the measure of Rimût-Ninû, in the town Bit-Ikla'. His field, cultivated and uncultivated, his fief estate situated on the bank of the canal Harrippûd, which is in Bit-Ikla', is held by Rimût-Ninû as a pledge for the dates, namely, twenty gur. Another creditor shall not have power over it until the claim of Rimût-Ninû has been satisfied. Dates, the price of food, clothing and an outfit in going to Erech, on a mission, according to the request of the king, are given him besides a former debt which was against him.

Names of seven witnesses and the scribe. Seal impressions of three witnesses, and the thumb-aail mark of Bîbâ.

11.

No. 94, Darius II., year 4th, Sebat 8th.

Contents: An assignment of a debt, with the security which was pledged for its payment, to another; with a penalty attached should the original creditor seek to recover against the security pledged.

Transliteration:

1. Ima-na kaspu sha mûa-da-aḫa-Ia-a-ma aplu sha mûd Shamesh-la-di-in 2. ša ina mûh-li mûSha-d Marduk-ul-ûni aplu sha mûd Bêl-nûdi nû bêlê šaqhi-shu 3. u eqi-shu-nu,
One mine of silver is the claim of Jadah-Iama, son of Shamesh-ladin, which against Sha-Marduk-ul-ini, son of Bel-nadin, and the tenants of his fief land, and their field. Their bit-qashti, cultivated and uncultivated, situated in the town Bit-rab-uratu, at the bank of the canal Harrapiqud, is held as a pledge. The silver, i.e., one mine Jadah-Iama, son of Shamesh-ladin, has received from Rimut-Ninib, son of Murashu, charged against Sha-Marduk-ul- ini, and the tenants of his fief land; he has been paid. There shall be no legal proceedings whatsoever in perpetuuo with Rimut-Ninib by Jadah-Iama on account of the field of Sha-Marduk-ul-ini. If Jadah-Iama institutes legal proceedings against that field he shall pay ten mana of silver without legal process. The certificate of debt which was taken out against Sha-Marduk-ul- ini and the field, the pledged estate, on the name of Jadah-Iama, is a guarantee (namely for Rimut-Ninib).

Names of eight witnesses and the scribe. Seal impressions of four witnesses, besides the thumb-nail mark of Jadah-Iama.

No. 59. Darius II., year 2nd, Marchesvan 3rd.

Contents: An inventory concerning two hundred jars of wine which Rimut- Ninib, empowered by his clients, and according to the advice received, delivered to the employé of another, who had the latter's order.

Translation:

One mine of silver is the claim of Jadah-Iama, son of Shamesh-ladin, which against Sha-Marduk-ul-ini, son of Bel-nadin, and the tenants of his fief land, and their field. Their bit-qashti, cultivated and uncultivated, situated in the town Bit-rab-uratu, at the bank of the canal Harrapiqud, is held as a pledge. The silver, i.e., one mine Jadah-Iama, son of Shamesh-ladin, has received from Rimut-Ninib, son of Murashu, charged against Sha-Marduk-ul-ini, and the tenants of his fief land; he has been paid. There shall be no legal proceedings whatsoever in perpetuuo with Rimut-Ninib by Jadah-Iama on account of the field of Sha-Marduk-ul-ini. If Jadah-Iama institutes legal proceedings against that field he shall pay ten mana of silver without legal process. The certificate of debt which was taken out against Sha-Marduk-ul-ini and the field, the pledged estate, on the name of Jadah-Iama, is a guarantee (namely for Rimut-Ninib).

Names of eight witnesses and the scribe. Seal impressions of four witnesses, besides the thumb-nail mark of Jadah-Iama.
sharri 9. ḫak-nu sha mdNab-n-din ina qālā mBēl-kāṣîr u mQu-um-na-a 10. u ḫi-na-at-ti-shu-nu ma-hi-ir-e-ti̯r 11. U-sha-az-azu mdNab-n-din dan-nu a’ CC karpatū
12. it-ti mLo-ba-shi apalu sha mdNab-bēl-uballīt(-i̯t) 13. u ḫam-ma-ri a-kal-la-nu sha mRi-mu t-Ninib 14. a-na mBēl-kāṣîr mQu-um-na-a u ḫi-an-at-ti [shu-nu] 15. ū-nam-din sha e-ti̯r dan-nu a’ CC karpatū.

Translation:

Two hundred good jars full of old wine, of which there shall be twenty jars of one gur and one pi-size of first class three-year-old wine, held by Rimūt-Ninib, son of Murashū, empowered by Bēl-kāṣîr, son of Ah-ērish and Quum, son of Bēl-āsu’a and their families. According to the message of Ninib-nādin, son of Ninib-ēri̯b, the jars, i.e., two hundred, Nabā-nādin, son of Bēl-kāṣîr, by the authority of Lābāshi, son of Nabā-bēl-uballīt, superintendent of the house of the prince and master of Nabā-nādin, has received from Bēl-kāṣîr, Quum and their families. Nabā-nādin shall leave the jars, i.e., two hundred, with Lābāshi, son of Nabā-bēl-uballīt, and Rimūt-Ninib’s inspector of food, delivering them for Bēl-kāṣîr, Quum and their families, that which is paid for, namely two hundred jars.

Names of ten witnesses and the scribe. Seal impressions of four witnesses, and of Nabā-nādin.

Aramaic endorsement: šemar šélu ʾalāsh, “document of Lābāshi.”
CONCORDANCE OF PROPER NAMES.

ABBREVIATIONS.

*a*, brother; *cf.*, confer; *d.*, daughter; *det.*, determinative; *f.*, father; *l.*, following page; *la.*, following pages; *cf.*, grandfather; *gs.*, grandson; 1. *c.* loco citato; *m.*, master, mistress (employer); *mo.*, mother; *n.*, nephew; *p.*, page; *pp.,* pages; *q.,* *quod vide*; *s.,* son; *sc.*, scribe; *si.,* sister; *u.*, uncle; *w.,* witness.

Ar.: *Arab.,* Arabic; *Bib.,* Biblical; *Eg.,* Egyptian; *He.,* Hebrew; *Na.,* Nabatean; *Ns.,* Neo-Punic; *Pa.,* Palmyrene; *Pe.,* Persian; *Ph.,* Phenician; *Pu.,* Punic; *Sa.,* Sabaean; *Th.,* Thomudian.

B. A., Beiträge zur Assyriologie; Ed., Editor; Z. A., Zeitschrift für Assyriologie.

Dterminatives: *d.,* deus, dea; *f.,* femina; *h.,* homo (amēna); *m.,* masa; *pl.,* plural.

[ ] = text restored. * before a name indicates foreign origin of the same. The numbers refer to the cuneiform texts of the autograph plates. Names known from Vo. I X are underscored. An additional IX following the name indicates that the peculiar writing is confined to Vol. IX. To avoid repetition, all such matters referring to their interpretation as given in Vol. IX, is omitted in Vol. X.

I. NAMES OF PERSONS.

1. Masculine Names.

*Ab-da-*, 119: 2, 9 | 120 : 2.

Abu-nilidi
2. 38 : 8.

AddanauIX, to be read Taddanu, q. v.


† For AN-MESH = Heb. *I* have transliterated *ll* as in Vol. IX. *El* would have been better, cf. Intro., pp. 12 f. Cf. *Ian-sha-ah-*i, C. B. M., 1382 : 17 also *Ian-sha-ah-ia,* Ranke, Personal Names, with *Ian-sha-ia,* C. B. M., 1235. [cf. also Edit. Preface. This Aram. name must be interpreted in connection with *Ian-sha-ia,* below. In view of the latter writing (and *ll*) the root can only be *Ph.* From the same root I derive (with Johns, Assy. Deeds, III, p. 198) the name of the Assyrian Eponym *A-aar-ri-llu* (which Zimmern (K. A. T. 2, p. 435) would compare with *Watar-*i-llu). The name, however cannot be translated as "the help of the god" (Johns), but "The god has helped" (Perf. of *ll*). It corresponds exactly with Bi. and *Ph.* That *A-aar-ri-llu, taken by itself, could be read also *A-aar-ri-llu, "Atar is god." fol.

Ion. from Strassmaier, Camb. 145 : 12 (A-tar-ri-id-r), the "pi" in both cases probably being due to the "i" following.—Ed.

‡ [Apparently the text had 1 (Addi). As to the writing *Addi* alongside of *Ad, Addu, Adad,* cf. Zimmern. K. A. T. 3, p. 444.—Ed.]
BUSINESS DOCUMENTS OF MURASHI" SONS.

1. f. of Barhili-a, 123 : 87.
3. f. of Ninib-nadda, 48 : 18 | 49 : 2. Id. with No. 2.
Abē, Ba-A. or Abē-qisna(a)-
2. f. of Taddanna, 114 : 15.
Abē-bar (GUR)
1. f. of Bēl-ittannu, 26 : 3.
2. f. of Ninib erba, 4 : 4.
*Abē-ma-nu-" (or Abē-ma-na-"), cf. Bi. [227] [probably to be read Abē-ma-na-", and identical with U-ba-ma-na-"]. g. s. = Ed., s. of ... b. of Barhili-Bēl, 53 : 1, 14, 18, U. E.
Abē(u)-a-nu-mu (cf. He. 2578), s. of Zobû-läta, 93 : 4.
*Abē(u)-a-nu-mu, m. of Manna-iqish, 84 : 17 | 85 : 4, 10, U. E.
Abē(u)-i-dādina
2. s. of Iddina, 48 : 4.
3. s. of Iddina-Bēl, 9 : 34.
4. s. of Iddina-Bēl, 57 : 16, 63 : 12.
5. s. of Nidānum-Bēl, 1, b. of Na-bā-tē'ashum, b. of Zabdiia, b. of ... za-a, 25 : 2.
6. s. of Rē-anu, 26 : 10.
7. s. of Shum-iddina, 29 : 16.
8. s. of Zutu, 100 : 11, Lo. E.
9. f. of Iddina-Bēl, 10 : 4.
10. 96 : 7, R.
Abē(u)-i-tam, s. of Bēl-nā-dā, 27 : 4.
Abē-li'-i, in nāru Abē-li'-i, 43 : 4 | 112 : 4, 10.
Abē-li-ti'-a, Abē-li-ti'-a (cf. Abē-li-ti'-i)
1. f. of Na-bē-μu-bu-i-lu, 51 : 5.
Abē nu ur'-, Abē-nū-rī (cf. Bi. 227 — Ed.)
1. s. of Qudā, 115 : 18, R. E.
2. s. of Ubâli-latnu-Marduk, b. of Idēnu-Marduk, 45 : 16 | 130 : 25, Lo. E. | 131 : 24, Lo. E.
Abē-ša-anu (Ar. docket 131 : 13, R., also on an unpublished docket, Vol. IX, No. 2)
2. s. of Abē-tīr, 131 : 1, 18, 21, R.
5. f. of Bēl-Abē-ur-ur, 37 : 19. Id. with No 4.

†[cf. the female name Ad-ra-ši (Johns, Assy. Deeds, 245 : 7). In view of such names as Ad-ra-ši and Adad-ra-ša-a-u (Johns, l. e., 745, Obv. 28) and Na-bē-ša-i and Na-bē-ša-i, below, it is clear that Ad represents a deity which may have been Abē ("father") or Ad. I prefer the reading of Ad in view of Adad(u)-raahān, for names like Bi. 227, Na. 227, and Pu. 227 (Lidzbarski, Handbuch, pp. 209, 292) point to the existence of a Semitic deity 227, which evidently is only shortened from Abē or Adad. Cf. the name Ad-ra-me-e, 18, Ad-dumē, below, alongside Adad(du)umē, also 227 alongside of 227 in Ar. proper names (Lidzbarski, l. e., 358), and 227 alongside 227 (cf. Pa. 227, transcr. omna-omna, Lidzbarski, l. e., p. 291), 227 and 227 alongside of Abē and Abē (cf. 227, below), etc. Cf. also Dadda(f, u) and Adad; — Ed.]

†B A is igish a in proper names is usually accompanied by sha, sha in these texts is frequently written like A. (cf. Sign List, and also Introd., Vol. IX, p. 17), yet on the two tablets in which this name appears this peculiarity does not exist. [The Editor is inclined to transliterate Abē-igish a and to regard it as the fuller form of Iqish a, both being abbreviated (therefore a at the end instead of a) from "Abē-igisha + Deity." In support of this theory he points out that both are called "father of Taddanna," and that according to the Aram. docket Bēl-muin-umīn (76 : R.) may be read Bēl-kīnām. From this it would follow that also abbreviated names consisting of two elements may receive the ending of a or a. Cf. Manush-i, below.]

§[Cf. also Ahi-ia-nu-nu, Johnson, Assy. Deeds, 625, Obv. 12. Cf. also Johnson. Doomsday Book, p. 61. In all probability, however, the two parts must be separated, the latter being Semitic, while Ahi-ia-nu-nu (= Ahamo-nisī, for which cf. Hissings, Die irān. Eigennamen, p. 42) is Iranian = Hākimanīsh. The Iran. element manīsh appears here as manāš in Babylonian, just as manū (instead of the regular manū or manu) [in the Greek Χαμαθάς. — Ed.]}

DATED IN THE REIGN OF DARIUS II.

7. f. of Belisahnu, 22:12.
10. f. of Taddannu, 37:19. Identical with No. 5.
11. f. of *-a, 28:13.
AH(u)-a-me-shu,‡ 33:11.
AHū'na-a (cf. Ar. *unnār).
1. f. of Nabū-baluw-ibbi, 1:17.
2. šekhaknu ša kākkaddānu, 63:4, 5, 8.
AH(u)-a.
2. s. of Zimakku, 37:18.
Ak-li-dub-ibni, t. of Milku-abu-asur, 75:5.
Amēl Bēl,‡
1. s. of Aḫuḫuanu, 11:7.
2. f. of Bēl-nādin, 16:19 | 17:2 | 110:3.
*A-ma-anāšt (cf. bi. ṣabbi and *shūμ), 33:11.
An-nu Bēl-ša-qa, also written Bēl-ša-qa, 51:16, L. E.
(“Upon Bel I wait, patiently “) šekhaknu ka-um-šan-išt ša bii Zuzu, šekhānu šu ḫizzazāpī ša bii Zuṣu, s. of Bil-štīr, gs. of Ninib-nāṣir, 58:11 | 65:15, L. E.
An-um-diš-u (not Teg-bur-šu, Vol. IX)
1. s. of Taqīši, 10:12.
2. f. of Ninib-nāṣir, 45:2.
*A-na-šu, ša šekhānu mutu-pa šaḫāni, s. of Zabadda, 128:20, L. E.
A-num-nu-šum-līš (šišu)
1. f. of Šum-middina, 34:2.
Anūnum Apalā
1. s. of Bau-nadin, 11:8.
2. f. of Bazuzu, b. of Navū-rājišu, 31:2, L. E.
4. s. of Ea-ilbi, maršaššušu, 93:14.
5. s. of Ṣarrāmaššu, 1:2 | 2:7, 9 L. E.
8. s. of Ṣarrīšu, 86:14.
8. s. of Marduk-bēlušu, b. of Bēlšar-šur, 61:16, U. E.
12. s. of Šūm-Bēl, 35:16.
13. s. of Šūm īlāti, 8:11 | 24:16 | 88:19 | 94:20 | 125:19, L. E.
14. s. of Bēl, 77:2, 8.
15. s. of ... | 37:16 | 49:16.
17. f. of Bēl-šak, 47:20.
18. f. of Bēlšak-šiš, 48:3 | 49:17.
19. f. of Bēlšak-štīr, 126:14, L. E.
20. f. of Bēl-šak, 104:9 | 123:12.
21. f. of Bēlšavašu, 32:19 | 70:14, L. E.
22. f. of Lēbēššu, 128:19.
24. f. of Nebû-nāššu, 52:18.
25. f. of Ninib šḫar, 104:9. Identical with No. 20.
26. f. of Taddannu, 71:8, 11, U. E. | 101:24, L. E.
27. kašinnu ša bēsu ša Gubaru, 128:14, U. E.
28. 69:5.
*A-qā-biš (A-aq-biš, Aq-šu-bi-šu IX)
1. f. of Ṣuqta, 18:23.
2. f. of Nabû-nāsušu, 64:7.
3. *ispīrī ša ... | 113:15.
*A-qā-bu
1. f. of Ḡaṣumni, 64:4.
2. f. of Manum-ša-lahā, 64:4.
Arē-Bānu (dšūnu)
1. s. of Shamash-šu-šu-šu, 33:10.
Arē-Bēl
1. s. of Bēl-šak, 8:4 | 24:13.
2. s. of Bēlšu, b. of Ninidin, 61:3.

§[aššušu, “God has answered (my prayer),” cf. Ilī-nu-šu, Vol. IX.—Ed.]
BUSINESS DOCUMENTS OF MURASHû SONS.


Ardi-E-GAL-MAIr (not Ardi-E-an-na-robû, Vol. IX)*
2. of Ninib-ah-iddina, 12 : 12, 1 : 19.

Ardis-Gula (dGišula or dME-ME)
1. s. of Lâbrita, 55 : 15.
2. s. of Ninib-shir, 130, 12, U. E. 131 : 26, U. E.
3. s. of Ninib-nâdîn, 4 : 26, 50 : 17, 90 : 12, U. E. 102 : 19, L. E.
7. b. of ardû shu Bit-šip, 117 : 4, 7, 9, R.

Ardis-ia and Ardis-ia
2. s. of Kidîna, 2 : 11, 11 : 9, R, U. E.
4. s. of Tâkla, 7 : 12.
5. s. of Umar, b. of Lâbrita, 2 : 15, 3 : 17, 128 : 14, L. E.
6. s. of â, 8 : 15.
7. f. of Ninib-ah-iddina, 68 : 10, L. E.

Ardis-ia-robû
1. s. of E-nâdîn, 42 : 2, L. E.
2. 101 : 11.

Ardis-Marûdâ (dSHû), f. of Bêl-nêd闷iddêna, 111 : 17.

Ardi-Ninib $^+$
1. s. of Dabbû, 54 : 16.
2. s. of Berbû, 45 : 3.
4. s. of Ninib-Bêl, 35 : 20.
5. s. of Bél-1ûmû, 68 : 9, 122 : 16.
6. s. of Dûû, b. of Dûû-nišû, 23 : 2.
7. f. of Dûû-nâdûn-dûnû, 77 : 16.
8. f. of Ninib-nâdûn, 15 : 20, 16 : 12.
9. f. of Dûû, 47 : 3.
10. f. of Shamash-nûrî, 130 : 1.
12. 70 : 51, 127 : R.


1. f. of 1ûmû-dûlûrû (or Â), 128 : 4, 10, 12, R.
2. m. of Dûû-nûmû-mûnu, 130 : 2, 131 : 2, 132 : 2, 5, 13, L. E.

Ar-šam-ra', Ar-šam-rû (u)
1. m. of Barû-bûma, 60 : 3, 8, 11.

Ar-šam-ra' (u) (Pe. 'Ar-tu-6-pa-am), 111, p. 3.
1. m. of Bârû, 58 : 11, 12, R.
2. m. of Dûû-dûrû-mûnu, 58 : 13.
3. m. of Dûû-nûmû-mûnu, 88 : 9.

Arû-sùru (Pe. 'Ar-tu-6-pa-am), 114 : 14.

Ar-šam-ra' (u) (Pe.) m. of Arû-sùru, 129 : 18, U. E. Ar-šam-ra' (Pe. 'Ar-tu-6-pa-am), s. of 'Ham-nûmu', 89 : 16, R.

Ar-šam-ra' (Pe.) Dûû-nûmû-mûnu, 129 : 17, L. E.


$^+$E-GAL-MAIr is identified with Nippur as well as Ur and Nisân, Code of Hammurabi, Col. 11, and the name of a gate in Nippur, abûlba E-GAL-MAIr. In Vol. IX it is abbreviated abûlba MAIr read 'abûlbal' in Intro. L. E. Letters and Inscriptions of Hammurabi, Vol. 111, p. 36. Cf. hamû-â Dûû-Ni-šû-dûnû (C. B. M., 5016), also connected with the temple at Nippur. According to Prof. Hilprecht, E-GAL-MAIr on Const. NI. 611 : 11 has the determ. d.

$^+$The god Ninib in this period was pronounced quite differently. Cf. Introduction, p. 8. The usual transliteration, Ninib, however, is retained, because a definite reading Ninib is not as yet been ascertainment.

§§[Arta + apûm, change of a into u (o) caused by the following labial, cf. 'irpûdû-pûma' = Frûta-farmûnach. — Ed.]

||[cf. also Ar-za', a slave of Dûû-dûrû-mûnu, Strassmaier, Nabûnûbûdû, and Ar-ri-zû, Johns, Assyrian Doomsday Book, p. 45. This and the following name, Ashkula', are probably Semitic, cf. Bi.]
Dated if the Reign of Darius 11.

1. s. of Bel-nadin, kushitarabi, 9:1, 9, 13, 17, 18, 22, 29, R.
2. s. of Kaka', 66:6, 9, R.
3. f. of Bel-nadin, 111:12, L. E.

*Ba-ga' (=Aspa-zanta), Ba-ga'-su-an-da-ki, of Nabu-bal-tu-lum, L:417.

Nanib-nadin, of Handwcrterbuch, Raga'-ma-ni-ri, 50:16.

A-ta-mar-da-an-nu-su, s. 'I saw his divinity,' s. of Nidin-

turn, 21:13.

*Addana, s. of Addanna, first correct text into Bil-kurrub-dai, q. v.

*Ba-ga'-da-a-alti, Ba-ga'-da-alti, 1. s. of Bel-nadin, kushitarabi, 9:1, 9, 13, 17, 18, 22, 29, R.
2. s. of Kaka', 66:6, 9, R.
3. f. of Bel-nadin, 111:12, L. E.

*Ba-ga'-ma-ni-ri, Ba-ga'-ma-ni-ri IX, Ba-ga'-a-ma-ni-ri IX, s. of Aspa'data, 50:5, L. E.

*Ba-ga'-sa-ta (Po, Ba-ga'-sa-ta, Ba-ga'-za-da-an-da-ki, Ba-ga'-za-da-an-da-ki, of Nabu-bal-td-lum, Ba-ga'ra-abu, Ba-ga'pa-tu, Ba-ga'raa-su, Ba-ga'-pita, kushitarabi, Ba-ga'-pita, kushitarabi, Ba-ga'-pita, kushitarabi, 58:24, L. E. 70:6, 9, R.

*Ba-gi'as-su, Ba-gi'as-su IX, s. of Taddanna, 100:8, L. E.

*Ba-gi-en-na (=cf. Ba-gi'as-su IX), s. of .......si-hu., 70:17.


*Ba-ga'-r, in Pe. Bakari, Ba-ga'-r, in Pe. Bakari, 46:12.

Ba-ka-ba-shi, 82:15, mistake of sc. for Balasha, cf. U. E., also Balasha, 8, of Baddunu.

Ba-lat-su, in the House of Balasha, 35:4, 9.

*Ba-lat-su, Balasha.
1. s. of Aptu, 47:19.
2. s. of Bel-igasha, 41:18 [57:17.
4. s. of Ningir-sahli, 56:15.

5. s. of Sib'a, 99:3, 4.
7. f. of Bel-bal-abubu, 1:16.
8. f. of Erba Bel, 17:4.
11. f. of Luluf, 66:9.
12. f. of Nebu-bel-balabi, 7:4, 7, L. E.
13. f. of Zabina, 102:37, 118:U. E.
14. f. of Zamana-nadin, 1:16. Id. in No. 7.
15. in Naru-bal-tu, 112:4, 10.

*Ba-ki-ba-usa (cf. Bi. 122), s. of Zabina', 118:5, 37.

*Ba-ru-da-ru-ru, s. of Zamana, 72:5.

*Ba-ru-da-usa ma (cf. He. 67:22), s. of Nebu-lama, s. of Hana'n, s. of Zabu-lama, s. of Zabina', 118:1, 11,13, 25, 29, R. E.

*Ban-an-na-nadin, 8, of Nana-nadin, 50:20.

Bani-ia
1. f. of Addanna, 2:3.
3. f. of Minshumen, 76:14, U. E.
4. f. of Ningirsu, 52:23.


Bo-nu-nu, s. of Taddanna, 29:17.

*Barik-bi, Barik-bi IX (cf. Pe. Bari)
1. s. of Hudashkakud, 86:3, 7, 5.
2. s. of Rashnu-pitu, b. of Bal-ihhiddina, 7:14.

*Barik-bi, Barik-bi (Ar. Barik-bi)
1. Bauq-ga-da, shi mibalibshu, 103:5, S. L. E.

*Barik-bi, Barik-bi IX (cf. Ph. Barik-bi)
1. s. of Balshunu, 1:18.
2. s. of ... Bani, s. of Barik-bi, 53:1, 14, 18, U. E.

*Barik-bi, Barik-bi IX (cf. Pe. Bari-bi, Bari-bi, Bari-bi, S. L. E.


2. s. of Bēl-šērītu, 117 : 18, L. E.
3. s. of Rushnapātu, b. of Bāriḫša, 7 : 14.
4. s. of Zammū-brish, 125 : 21.
5. f. of Zabaddak, 25 : 3.
7. s., ...., 69 : 12.
8. 69 : 5.

Bēl-šērītu-[a]-šar-šu

1. s. of Bēl-šērītu, 104 : 8.
2. s. of Bēl-nāṣer, 118 : 36, R. E.
3. s. of Ninibtu-Bēl, 9 : 30.

Bēl-šērītu-[a]-uṣur, a. of Bēl-mubarrit, 20 : 3.

Bēl-šērītu-[a]-uṣur, a. of Bēl-mubarrit, 20 : 3.

†[cf. Ba-ruši-lu, Strassmaier, Nabuahdonosor, 361 : 7, and Ba-ruši-lu, Johns, Assyr. Deeds, 255 : ob. 2; and the probable reading of a city Bar-šu-lu, Johns, 1, c., 70 : R. 5.—Ed.]
DATED IN THE REIGN OF DARIUS II.

14 51:19 57:14 65:19 76:17 81:14 85:

Bél-bil-id-da-anu
1. s. of Mahšušt-Bél, hsiširru sha kyardu, 95 : 6, 10, Lo. E.
2. s. of Tilmû, 15 :18.
3. f. of Bâawenu, 58 :9.
4. f. of Bél-dûnu, 8 :10 [24 :14] (38 :12) 38 :13]
5. f. of Bél-iddînu, 60 :5, 10.
6. f. of Bilshunu, 7 :11, U. E.
7. f. of Bél, ...., 28 :12.
8. f. of Kidin, 67 :17.
10. f. of Nîdintu-Bél. (l. of Bél-ka-ittanna), 9 :32.
12. f. of Zamamân-dûnî, 19 :3.

Bél(Bél)1-da-anu. Bél-da-anu
2. s. of Lââbâhî, 47 :2.
3. s. of ...., 42 :15.
4. f. of Bél-ittanna, 118 R.

Bél(Bél)2-epâl-um shâ-â-ni
1. s. of Añûshûna, 114 :16.
2. s. of Iqâshû, 26 :3.
3. f. of Shaltumûm, 19 :3.

Bél-ê-ê-ni (Ar. docket Shûmûlûqû, 99 :R.)
1. s. of Bél-ê-ê-ni, 64 :12 R. 67 :12, Lo. E.
2. s. of Shamânu-ê-ê-ni, 82 :18.
5. f. of Sham-ê-ê-ni, 32 :4.
6. f. of Zubina’, 32 :3, 4. Same as No. 5.

Bél-ê-ni
1. s. of Bél-ê-ê-ni, kahanu sha Lâbabû, khâshku sha 
2. s. of Bél-mu-babilû, 2 :12.

+Bél-ê-ê-ni(Bél-ê-ê-ni)1-ê-pû-bi, Bél-(ê-ê-ni)2, 554 :14, Bél-(ê-ê-ni)3 gab bî-Nabû, 483 :5.

---

Bêl-iddina (Ar. docket نوره), s. of Bêl-bullûtum, šašparî ša šaka-rabû, 60 : 4, 9, R.

Bêl(Heb.)-šarîahu
1. s. of Ubab, 35 : 18.
2. f. of Arûz-Bêl, 8 : 9 | 24 : 14.
3. f. of Balûta, 41 : 18 | 57 : 17.
Bêl-šarîahu, f. of Naḇi-šarîahu-lûmu, 1 : 20.

Bêl(Bbl.)-Hi-tas-nu
1. s. of Âḫī-uṣir, 26 : 3.
2. s. of Barakku-Shamaalk, 40 : 2.
3. s. of Bêl-bullûtum, 12 : 10.
4. s. of Bêl-dûnum, 118, R.
5. s. of Bêl-ittanna, b. of Bêlû, 22 : 2.
6. s. of Bêl-muballit, hušтарbari, 64 : 11, L. E. | 80 : 14, L. E.
7. s. of Lakiš, 60 : 5.
9. s. of Ninib-ana-Bêl-dûnum, 6 : 15.
10. s. of Nûdûl-Bêlû, 18 : 2.
11. s. of Ninib-âšir, 45 : 2.
12. s. of Shalaš-Bêlûšu, b. of Ardi-Ninib, 23 : 2 | 67 : 5.
13. s. of Zauam, kašaknu ša Linadush-ana-Bêlû, 75 : 11, L. E.
18. f. of Marduk-šarîahu, 54 : 17, U. E.
20. f. of Ninib-âšir-šarîahu, 56 : 5, 10.
21. 104 : 2 | 119 : 3, 10 | 120 : 3.


Bêl-Šarîahu, Bêl-šarîahu
1. s. of Âḫī-uṣir, b. of Âḫī-iddina, 4 : 1, 13, L. E. | 59 : 4, 9, 14.

Bêl(Bbl.)-kišir†
2. s. of Bêl-šašum-šamûnu, 50 : 18, cf. of No. 3.


3. f. of Ninib-âšir-šarîahu, 50 : 18, gs. of No. 2.
4. f. of Ninib-nahhâshû, 180 : 90, L. E. | 131 : 25, L. E.

Bêl(Bbl.)-muballit (-ci)
6. s. of Libâšušu, b. of Ninib-Ninibû, 130 : 28 | 131 : 26 | 132 : 23, L. E.
8. f. of Bêl-âšir-šarîahu, 75 : 15, U. E.
9. f. of Bêl-šarîahu, 20 : 3.
10. f. of Bêl-šarîahu, 2 : 13.
11. f. of Bêl-ittanna, 12 : 10 | 64 : 11, L. E. | 80 : 14, L. E.
13. f. of Bêlûšu, 122 : 15, U. E., 130 : 30 | 131 : 30, b. of No. 12, cf. IX, 41 : 1. (Id. with No. 8, cf. Vol. IX.)
15. f. of Shum-akûnî, 122 : 15, U. E.
16. f. of... 56 : 3.

3. s. of Ninib... 112 : 16.
4. f. of Ebbû-Bêlû, 96 : 15.
5. f. of Rîbabû, 47 : 2.
DATED IN THE REIGN OF DARIUS II.

1. 4. 8. 9. 38:1, 6. 9. 11. 39:1, 5. 8. 9. 40:1, 4. 7. 8. 41:1, 6. 10. 42:1, 5. 7. 9. 45:1, 5. 11. 12. 48:1, 7. 14. 49:1, 7. 13. 50:1, 4. 7. 11. 51:1, 1. 11. 53:1, 2. 9. 14. 16. 54:1, 2. 10. 13. 57:1, 4. 7. 8. 5.


9. of Nibir, 54:6. Identical with No. 3 (cf. IX. 68:1, 5. 8).

Beb-ra-shi, Beb-nari
1. f. of Beb-ra-ittana, 118:36, R. E.
2. f. of Nabu-naddi, 118:35, R. E.
3. of Hayani, b. of Nabu-ittana, 84:11, L. E.

Bil-Nippuru-anashir-sha-er (Bil-EN-LI-LI-ki-ki-Bili-Gift) ("Bil, restore Nippur to its place").

s. of Ninid, 117:15, R. E.

Bil-ra-shi-il, Beb-ra-shii.
1. s. of Bisbu, b. of Nabu-ittana, 58:4.
2. of Ninid, 69:16.

Bil-EN-ru-tum-Bil ("The Lord of shepherding is Bil"), s. of Ninid, 121:10? 125:19.

Bil-ra-eri, s. of Bil-ittana, 107:11.

Bil-EN-ru-tum-Mu-nu (Bil-EN-ru-tum-mu-nu) ("The Lord of shepherding is Bil")

s. of Bil-ittana, 107:11.
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2. ḫapaqdu ša Aršâh, 130:1, 11, 18, 19 | 131:1, 11, 18, 19 | 132:2, 10. Apparently identical with No. 1.

Bēl-shar-ebi, f. of Kiršti-Bēl, ushtarbari. 89:15, Lo. E.

Bēl-shar-usur
1. s. of Marduk-bēlšanna, b. of Apīš, hšakum Ša šummanid mari apšišuma (ḫišanu), 61:16, U. E. | 65:16, Lo. E.
2. 14:11.


Bēl-shum... s. of Dānni, 77:14.

Bēl-shu-šu
1. s. of Aššur-sumu, 22:12.
3. s. of Bēl-maballā, 130:29, R. | 131:29, R. E.
5. s. of Di-e-e-ba-... | 50:6, 10, R.
7. s. of Kāʾal, 4:2, 14.

8. s. of Lābāšu, 88:13, R.
9. s. of Mannu-bēl Wālā, 9:33.
11. s. of Nāšu-ushur, 123:12.
12. s. of Nāṣir (identical with Ninib-nāṣir, No. 13, as their seals are the same), b. of Ninib-nāṣir, 4:23, U. E. | 41:15.


17. f. of Bēl-bēl-tātina, 35:18.
18. f. of Bēl-hētāni, 125:2.
19. f. of Belāš, 62:22 | 125:2. Same as No. 47.
20. f. of Ḫaš-Ḫeš and his brother, Ḫeš-Ḫēš-Bēl, tādāniš-Ḫēš, 11:3.
21. f. of Ninib-erib, 4:12.
23. f. of Ninib-nāṣir, 83:12.
24. f. of Ninību, 122:14, Lo, E.
25. f. of Ninību, 78:11.
30. f. of ...ittānu, 30:11.
33. ḫurdu ša ...lak-ti, 58:12.
34. 121:2.

Bēl-pu-e-eš-lē-šu ("Bel, hear the prayer"), s. of Lābāšu, b. of Sham-tātina, 55:12.

Bēl-bēl-ef-tāštu, (IX), read Bēl-annin-māššu, q. v., see Intro.

Bēl-ša-pa-pa, abbrev. from Ana-Bēl-sūpaq, 1. s. of Bēl-āššu, see Ana-Bēl-sīpiqqa.
2. s. of Ḫaš-Ḫēš, 123:10.

† The præf. of ṭabānu is formed on ṭ as well as обыти. Delitzsch, Handworterbuch, only on stantiate. Conside Dicē, p. 471, questions 1. Cf., however, Ḫu-e-eš-šu-tā-iššu-a, V R. 66:13, and Ina-Ḫa-sag-laḫ-lē-šēn, Dar. 7:15, alongside of Ina-Ḫa-sag-laḫ-lē-šēn, Dar. 128:4.
‡ Subā, "prayer," a formation similar to susā, from ṭā笈, "to implore," which is a synonym of ṭā笈. Cf. Delitzsch, Handworterbuch, p. 567.
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Bīl(Bīl')-u-ur-shu. Bīl(u)-ur-shu (Ar. docket 122, 125: R.), Bīl-u-ur-shu
1. s. of Bīl-āb-ur, hshaknu sha ha-hu-shan-ništ ša ḫāb štā, also hshaku sha ḫāb-īn-šā-biš, gentilic from Bani-neshu, 90:9, L. E. | 126:8, L. E.
2. s. of Bīl-tēr, hshaknu sha ḫāb-am-qa-du-aš, 82:16.
3. f. of Bīl-nášim, 12:18.


Bīl-ša-ti-šša
1. f. of Zabdiia, 54:18, Lo. E. | 70:18, Lo. E.
2. f. of Ubaid-šu-Bīl, 102:5.
3. f. of Ubaid-šu-Neb, 102:5.
4. hshaknu sha Aš 91:17, R. E.
Bīl., . . . . . , s. of Ninib-šīr, 110:11.
Bīl (?), . . . . . , s. of Ninib-šīr, 51:20.
Bīl(y), . . . . . , s. of Sham-šidda, 125:19.
Bīl., . . . . . , s. of . . . . . , 87:12.
Bīl., . . . . . , s. of Bīl-ša-ti-šša, 117:18, L. E.
Bīl., . . . . . , s. of . . . . . , 56:17.

Bīl-a-na (Ar. docket 122, 125: R.), Bīl-a-na IX
1. s. of Bīl(u)-u-ur-shu, b. of Bīl., . . . . -ša-ti-šša, 22:2.
2. s. of Bēšākunnu, b. of Bīl-ša-ta, hshaknu ša šu ša bit ḫān-nāšir, 62:2, Lo. E. | 125:2.
3. s. of Eb-shān, 51:17, U. E.
4. a. of Idiš-bēl, b. of Ninib-mubišši, 47:3.
5. s. of Sham-š Further details on the text, including footnotes, are provided.
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*Da-ša-ša-ta-ta.* (Ar., abbrv.—Ed.) 8, of Bêbî-šûna, 77:15.

*Da-la-ša-ta.* (Ar.) Thou hast saved (i.e.) me.—cf. *Našâ-ba-da-ta.* (IX), *Našâ-ba-ni-lîn* (Johns)—Ed.)

1. s. of Sulhûnd, 119:13; 120:9.
2. of *Hannâ-Bêl, 43:1.
3. of *Shamash-tunnanu, 38:3.
4. 80:3.

Da-mi-ia (“My child”), hupiri h u ša ša i gubbar, 12a:18, U. E.

Danniâ, a-i-a


6. Lo. E.


3. 8:16; 17:16; 17:17.

4. 23:10; 4:25; 20:20; 30:34; 34:5.

5. of *Ardi-Ninâ, 54:27.

6. f. of *Bêl-kum. . . . . 77:14.


8. in *al-Hâšîti* šu *Danniâ, 37:5, 6.

Dâm-mu-âb-dûnâ,a.i. s. of *Nînib-nâdûl, 9:34, U. E.

Dâm-mu-Nergâl, t. of *Nergâl-zar, 18:18.


*Da-rim-ša-ba,* 8:2; 29:17; 1:20.

*Da-ša-ša-ta.* 120:15.

[Di-rî, kî, *Bilhûnu, 50:6, R.*]

*Di-rî-a-ša-a-ba* (cf. *Bêl-ša-a-ba-bi*), s. of *Ašdaga, 19:11, 120:12.

*Dû-nu, t. of *Ninib-nâdûl, 24:19; 38:15.*

† [Unless *khopkar,* of a name containing the god Damu (cf. footnote to *D(T) ab-dama*)—Ed.]

‡ Written without the determ. *D., Dar. 313:3.

§ As to the original pronunciation of the name “Darius,” and the different ways in which it is rendered in cuneiform writing, cf. Z., A., II, pp. 50, f., and Hissong. *Die iranischen Eigennamen in den Aššurmedesinschriften,* p. 32.

DATED IN THE REIGN OF DARIUS II.


5. *Gul-kur IX, read Renu-shakhu, q. v.


1. f. of Aavamu, 114 : 14.

2. f. of Naas-nadim, 91 : 20, U. E.

3. m. of Bil-bab-upur,hipsat sha muDaakkudim, 101 : 25.

4. m. of Domika, 128 : 18, U. E.

5. m. of Marduka, 97 : 10, Lo. E.

6. m. of Pakiki, 84 : 5, 9, 11, Lo. E. 85 : 15.

7. in Bibu shum Gabara, 127 : 14, U. E.

8. 118 : 14.


15. f. of Aavamu, 114 : 14.

16. f. of Naas-nadim, 91 : 20, U. E.

17. m. of Bil-bab-upur, hipsat sha muDaakkudim, 101 : 25.

18. m. of Domika, 128 : 18, U. E.

19. m. of Marduka, 97 : 10, Lo. E.

20. m. of Pakiki, 84 : 5, 9, 11, Lo. E. 85 : 15.

21. in Bibu shum Gabara, 127 : 14, U. E.

22. 118 : 14.


27. f. of Naas-nadim, 91 : 20, U. E.

28. m. of Bil-bab-upur, hipsat sha muDaakkudim, 101 : 25.

29. m. of Domika, 128 : 18, U. E.

30. m. of Marduka, 97 : 10, Lo. E.

31. m. of Pakiki, 84 : 5, 9, 11, Lo. E. 85 : 15.

32. in Bibu shum Gabara, 127 : 14, U. E.

33. 118 : 14.

[F]or the second element cf. Kusa-la'a (IX). Like Kusa, Dun seems to represent a deity which may be identical with *Dun(ua)* (cf. *Dun-na-di-ke-dim*). As to the use of Dun(ua) alongside of Dun, cf. *dE-han* and *dE-un*, and perhaps *Gan-ta-ha* and *Gan-un-ta-ha*, below. The god Dun(ua) is perhaps also to be recognized in Bi 227:8, thevisha unless 17 stands for [*]. — Ed.

[In addition to the Bi. names quoted in connection with this name in Vol. IX, cf. Ga-lul, Ga-lu-la, Ga-lu, (Johns, Assy. Deeds, p. 291).—Ed.]

[In all probability we have here to distinguish between names of different origin, the one being Persian, the other derived from the Semitic root *d-li*, often found in proper names. Cf. Ga-ba-ri (Vol. IX) or Ga-ba-ra, Ga-ba-ri, Ga-ba-ri (Johns, Assy. Deeds, Vol. III, p. 412), Ga-ba-ru (Strassmaier, Camb. 96 : 3) and Ilu-ga-bar (Ga-e), Ga-ga-ri, below. — Ed.]

[If the feminine name Gil-bal-la, Strass., *Nbm. 310* : 4. Cf. also *Gubbah, Yagqul 3 : 13, 17. The name of the father of certain Manduk-sar-apar (Johns, Assy. Deeds, Vol. III, p. 227) is written Ga-bi-lu, Ga-bi-le, Gaba-li and Gab-e. I regard all these names as hypokoristika of names like *Gabbu-tani(-m), Johns, 1. c., Nos. 92 : R. 3 : 137 : O, 5 : 130 : O, 7* (again shortened from a name like Gil-bal-la-tani(-m), (e.g.) or Gil-bal-la-tani(-m), etc.—Ed.]

[Unless the name is Ar. and to be compared with Can (Kar) = sab-ka* (Vol. IX).—Ed.]

[For evidently identical with the name Kas-sa-a (Johns, Assy. Doomsday Book, No. 1, Col. II, 41. The change of g and k points to original Qus-aa.-Ed.]

*Ha-bi-i*† (Ar. docket *Sârâf*), f. of *Ha-bi-i*, 99 : 4, U. E.

*Ha-da-an-na* IX (s. in), f. of *Shishki-Bûl* and *Thuddannibu-lûnu*, 41 : 3.


*Ha-na-nu* (s. of *Shabātai*), 83 : 16, L. E.

*Ha-nu-gi*† (cf. Pa. *Addiši* and *Sufait* *Sâlā*), 119 : 8.


*Ha-ni-a-ni* (s. of *Zabīl-Nâ*), 160 : 10, R.


*Ha-nu-ta-a* (cf. *Addiši*, s. of *Artapaîre*), 89 : 16, R.

*Ha-nu-ta-a* (cf. *Addiši*), 124 : 12, R. E.

*Ha-na-a-sha-anu, Ha-an-a-sha-anu* (s. of *Nîmr*), 124 : 12, R. E.

*Ha-an-a-sha-anu* (Ar. docket *Sâlā*, 132 : R.)

1. s. of *Bel*...; 24 : 17.

†[Cf. also *Ha-ba-nu* (Johns, *Assyr. Deeds*, No. 60, E. 2) and *Ha-ba-nu* (l. c., No. 434, O, 8), while the female name *Hamna* (according to the Ar. docket on Johns, l. c., No. 233, *Sâlā*) must be compared with the Ph. *Sâlā*. Cf. Johns, l. c., Vol. III, p. 99.—Ed.]


§[In Vol. IX I compared this name with Bi. *Nîmr*, *Asmar*; but in view of such writings as *Hîn-îd-bar* (Vol. X, 10 : 8, L. E.) *Înîd-bar = îhîn-îd-bar = îhîn-îd-bar* (and 1 and 0), or *Hîn-a-dî-ru* (Siûntaie, Nersipâsir...: *Hîn-a-dî-ru* = *Hîn-a-dî-ru* (cf. Editorial Preface), it may also be possible to interpret *Hîn-a-dî-ru* = *Hîn-a-dî-ru* = *Hîn-a-dî-ru*. “God Had (= *Had*) is powerful,” and to compare Pa. *Nîmr*, *Nîmru*—Ed.]


[†Cf. the man from *Hamnachar* (*Nîmr*) or *Hamnachar* (*Nîmr*).—Ed.]


*S*|†[The element *Har* or *Har* noticed in this and the following names, is also found in a number of names published by Johns, *Assyr. Deeds*, pp. 98 and 537. It is possible that some of them may contain the Egyptian god Horus, rendered as *Nîm* in *Hamnacharu* (Vol. IX) and *Hamnacharu* below, and the name *Hamnacharu* (cf. Johns, *Assyr. Deeds*, No. 446, R. 21.—Ed.]

††[Cf. the previous footnote.—Ed.]

SS[The element *Har* or *Har* noticed in this and the following names, is also found in a number of names published by Johns, *Assyr. Deeds*, pp. 98 and 537. It is possible that some of them may contain the Egyptian god Horus, rendered as *Nîm* in *Hamnacharu* (Lidzbarski, l. c., p. 280) and *Har* in V R 1, 98 (*Hamnacharu*). Cf. Steindorff, B. A., Vol. I, p. 890.—Ed.]
DATED IN THE REIGN OF DARIUS II.

1. f. of Apelc, 1: 2, 9.
2. handwritten shā Harrimanni tatu, ḫabarak, 123: 4.
L. E. 3. 66: 5.

*Har-rī-ma-a-haša,* Bar-ma-da.†

1. f. of Apelc, 1: 2, 9.
2. handwritten shā Harrimmantuu, ḫabarak, 123: 4.
L. E.

3. 66: 5.


*Har-rī-ma-a-tu, m. of Harramah*, 123: 4.


1. b. of Tagbi-lishā, 60: 18.
2. 63: 2.


*Hu-ti-la* (*in ḫuḫišla* (cf. ḫuḫišla)), 71: 5.


*Hu-bu-ni-š-ēlu* (cf. Pu. ḫurūma), s. of Dalatanni, 43: 1, 19.


*Hu-ba-da-ni* (cf. Bi. ḫurūma), 8, of Kedin, 39: 15.


*Hu-ush-la-a* (f. of ḫushbatai), 99: 16.


*Hu-ush-la-a* (f. of ḫushbatai), 99: 16.

1. s. of ḫusīr, 64: 3.
2. f. of Tagbi-lishā, 99: 16.

*Hu-di-ri* (cf. Ar. ḫurīrdā), 99: 16.


2. f. of ḫuṣāštum, 3: 13.

*Hu-ush-la-a* (Pe.). f. of Porriḥātu, 114: 5, 6.

*Hu-di-ri* (cf. ḫurīrdā).


1. s. of Belāših, 40: 15.

†[Id. with Hu-ma-ar-ḫaša* (Vol. IX), for Abīhu, the latter’s slave, is also called “slave of Harramah,” Const. Ni., 612, Ed.]


§[The fact that ḫuṣāštum = is also written ḫuṣāštum, points to a word with ḫ as first radical. I therefore prefer to transliterate ḫuṣāštum and ḫuṣāštum, and to compare the name with Bi. *Hu-ush-la-a* (final ẖ frequently being dissoluted into ẖ), cf. Vol. IX, p. 27, note 3. Also cf. Pu. *Hu-ush-la-a* (cf. Pu. Abīhu-šēlu, 487, Ed.).]
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2. f. of Ahatiddina, 48 : 4.
3. f. of Bêl-apûqa, 123 : 10.
5. f. of Ninû-ab-iddûna, 49 : 3 [prob. id. with No. 2—Ed.].
7. f. of Rdu-nušakan, 14 : 20.

Iddina-aplu IX, see Iddina, Iddina-Bêl (Bêl10):
1. 8. of Ahatiddina, 10 : 4 | 7.
4. 8. of Bêlûkûnu, b. of Erkal-Bêl, 11 : 2.
5. 8. of Bulûqûnu, 5 : 3.
6. 8. of Ninû-muhallû, 121 : 12, sc.
7. 8. of......, 42 : 16.
8. 8. of Ahatiddina, 9 : 34.
10. 7. of Bêbî, 47 : 4.
11. 7. of Iddînû, 54 : 17.
12. 7. of Idu-lûdar, 10 : 1.
14. 6. of Nûbî-mûbellû, 47 : 4.
15. 6. of Shâma-êlûdar, 18 : 4.
16. 6. of Tabûnu, 4 : 5.
17. 6. of Zâgêšû, 41 : 17. Probably id. with No. 18.

Iddina-Marduû (4AMAR-UD):
1. 8. of Nabû-êr-ênumû, 7 : 13 | 32 : 18 | 71 : 15, R.

Iddina-Nabû
1. 8. of Bêlûqûnu, 33 : 18 | 34 : 20 | 71 : 5.

† Cf. note to Hadannû,—Ed.]
‡ Cf. footnote, p. 45.
*Ish-lu-šu-pir-na’-, cf. Brādāpīrā‘.
Iškābu(BA-SHA)-a, Iškābu(BA-SHA), 39 : 13, not Iškābu-aplu, Vol. IX (cf. Intro., p. 15)
2. s. of Ninī-bīšir, 38 : 3. L. E.
4. f. of Bēl-ēpuš, 26 : 3.
5. f. of Aššāb, 14 : 13.
8. f. of Shum-iddina, 63 : 12.
10. b. of Mānkiša, 118 : 35.
11. 70 : 3.
†Iš-su-ba-šu. of Ardi-Ninib, 68 : 7.
*Iš-qu-pa’-(cf. Pa. .wp, aomow), f. of Shamsas-nari’,
46 : 3.
*Iš-su-ri-ba-ša-na’-(cf. He. ʾšš, s. of Pillu-ta-ma, hshaknu sha kishšaniniš sha nakkanda, 65 : 9, 14, R.
Iššu-baššatu(?)IX, read Iššu-ba-za-na’-, q. v.
†Iš-su-ri-ba-ša-na’- (cf. also Tādāti), f. of Bēlšt, 23 : 18.
Iššu-Bēl-bulatu, s. of Ninīš-nāpir, 52 : 24. sc.
Iššu-Samaš-baššatu, s. of Lakīp, 10 : 13.
†Iš-su-abu. see Iššu-abu.
Ka-ba-nIX, Ka-ba-na, 115 : 30.
Kar-ba-Bau (Bēl-bau IX). Kar-ba-Bau (Bēl-bau, without det,). f. of Bēl-dānu, 124 : 3.
Kar-ri-i, f. of Bēl-banna, 4 : 3.
*Kar-gu-ud, hshaknu ša kaš-te-ba-ri-an-na. in. of Pārīnunūnāš, 76 : 5. 11. R.
Kni-šir
2. f. of Mššu-aplu (abbreviation for Bēl-muballit-aplu, No. 1), 82 : 13. Lo. E.
Kau-ia(?)-I. 118 : 25.
Ki-šin
1. n. of Bēl(?)-aššu-iddina, 63 : 15.
2. s. of Bēl-bullīšu, 67 : 17.
3. s. of Ninīš-nu-ballit, 78 : 10.
5. f. of Iššu-ba, 39 : 16.
8. f. of Šamaš-šum-unšir, 14 : 2 40 : 17.

†[Cf. Xa-rī-e-a. Strassm., Nabuk. 350 : 20. As Tab-ni-i and Tab-ni-e-a are abbreviations from names like Bēl(Nabu, etc.)-tab-šu-ṣur(šu-ši) et c., Kari and Karī are doublet shortened from a name like Nabu-na-ka-ra-ši₂(u-mar), etc.—Ed.]

†[The reading Gar-gu-ud may be preferable in view of Pu, Šubī, and the Babylonian tribal name Šubī.—Ed.]
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Ki'il(i)-i-ša-ša-du, ki-šatu ki-ša šuḫum-dēdina and Žubina, 32:3.


Ki-nu-Šu, f. of Ina-Esagila-rashîl, 107:10, L. E. (cf. also Mulûm-apûlu).

Kî-rî-ši-Bēl
1. f. of Ardi-a, 2:11 9:33, L. E.
2. f. of Ša-na-Nabû-Šulatu, 32:3.

Kî-rî-ši-Bēl 3) ka-pîširi ša ki-imtût-Ninhû, 127:9, ša Murâshû, s. of Bîl-mîdîn-šum, 129:10.

"Kî-tî-r(i)-ši-Bēl" f. of Shammû, 5:20.


La-ba-aššu, La-ba-aššu, La-ba-aššu (Ar. docket 327, 59:R.
1. s. of Apûl, 128:19.
3. s. of Bûbû, 101:27, R. E. 112:18, U. E.
4. s. of Bêl-asâku, b. of Bêl-idâlu, 15:6, šakkanu ša Bîl-Shum-ma-šu-pi-ri-ru, 5.
5. s. of Iqîhâdû, 14:3, L. E.
6. s. of Nûbû-šu-bâtâ, šûba šuḫuš šuḫuš ša bi-ti šarrí, ša bi-šim šarrû, šûkaknu ša Nûbû-dêdina, 59:

8. s. of Shagû, šuḫuš (yaqqaqûa) šuḫa ša "Dûndâna", 28:5, 9, 11, Lo. E. | 28:6, 9, U. E.
9. s. of Umâqâhuš, šakkanu ša ša-na-gûl-la-au, 81:5, 8, 11, 18, U. E. | 84:12, L. E.
15. f. of Bîl-dēlû, 47:2.
16. f. of Bîl-mušû, 130:29 | 131:29 | 133:23, L. E.
19. f. of Ni'il-lû-Ninhû, 130:29 | 131:29. Same as No. 16.
22. m. of Lamûnanu and Minâhûmû, 127:4. 5. 11, R. U. E.
23. s. of Bîl-mušû, ša ša-šu-harshamai, 113:3.

La-ašî, La-ki-pî IX
1. s. of Bêl-ashû, ša-šu-harshamai, 113:3.
2. s. of Ni'il-lû-mušû, 61:10.
3. f. of Bêl-idâlu, 60:6.
4. s. of Iš-Šum-âši-bâlu, 10:13.
5. pl. šuḫuš ša-šu-harshamai, 95:11.
6. Lamûnanu (M KAL-KAL)-dêdina
1. f. of Ša-a-mu-ru, 44:3.


Lib-šû-tu
1. s. of Dišîtu, 68:9.
3. s. of Ni'il-lû-mušû, 48:3 | 49:18.
4. f. of Shirkušû, b. of Shabatu, 39:2 L. E.
5. s. of Ina-ašû-lû-sha-šu-mu-šu-(or), 87:14 116:12.

Li-na-šu-na-a-na-an(a)-Bîl ("May he be rejuvenated for Bîl"), šuḫuš ša Šippûra, 75:8 12, L. E.

† [Probably to be read Hub-il-Gâšû-du. The second element represents the West-Semitic "fortune" and a god of fortune (Fortuna), contained also in several El. names. Cf. Baethgen, Beiträge zur Semit. Religionsgeschichte, pp. 76, ff.; Lidzbarski, Handbuch, p. 249; Zimmern, K. A. T., pp. 479, f.-Ed.]
‡ [Possibly to be read Kî-rî-ši-Bêl (E HEN-LIL),—Ed.]
§ KUR-GAL instead of Shabû-šu-bašû (Vol. IX) is preferred until the exact rendering of "KUR" is determined. Cf. Intro., p. 8.
|| Cf. Ku-sur-ru-a, Dar. 154:1; also Introduction, p. 16.
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Marduk-êri, f. of Shulum-Biblu, 39 :18 | 40 :12.
Marduk-êrig
1. s. of Bélik-tamma, 54 :17, U. E.
2. f. of Shamsha-nadîn, 36 :19.
Marduk-êrîsh, in duHaggê-sîa Marshû-êrîsh, 114 :3.
Marduk-igshâ-nâni, s. of Puda-êrî, 39 :14.
Marduk-nabûdu, f. of KUR-AL-nabûdu, 99 :16.
Marduk-šal-êlîm, f. of Bêl-nadîn, 57 :2.
*Ma-âta-ni-la-a-ma (cf. He. מִשְׂרָה), 83 :14, R. E.
Mûli-êba-šum, s. of Akkadân, 75 :5.
*Mi-na-êba-im, Mi-na-êba-im, Mi-na-êba-im-mu IX,
Mi-na-êba-im, Mi-na-êba-im
1. f. of Hammânu, 128 :15.
2. b. of Hammânu, 127 :5, 8, 10, U. E.
3. 118 :4, 36.
*Mi-nîs-ka-â-me-ên, Hîn-îa-îm-û-ên IX, Hîn-îa-îm-û-ên IX
(cf. He. מִשָּׁרָה) [also Fraenkel, Z. A., XIII, p. 128—Ed.]
1. s. of Bibina, 76 :14, U. E.
2. s. of Bêl-bu-šum, b. of Shabatat, 65 :18, U. E.,
84 :18, Lo. E. 185 :12, Lo. E.
Mi-nî-ê-ana-Bêl-da-êna, f. of Bêl-tanna, 6 :15.
Mi-nî-ê-ana-Bêl-da-êna (da-an) and abbrev. Mi-nî-ê-a, s., of
Daghû, hra-bu-u-ma, 101 :23, Lo. E.
*Mi-nî-ê-â-î-ni (Pe.= Muskû (cf. Maaboc)-êkina—
Ed.), f. of Bêl-ûrû, 69 :14, Lo. E.
*Mi-nî-ê-â-î-nu, Mi-nî-ê-â-î-nu (Pe. Mîrât), m. of Nahish-
ûnu, 114 :16, U. E.
Huqurshu IX, to be read Mûhrurshu, q. v.
Mi-kûn-aplu (DU-A) [according to Vol. IX, pp. 10 and
92, to be read Kink, cf. also Kin-i, Johns, 
1. s. of Kôšir (from Bêl-mûkin-aplu, by
comparison of the seals), haiauni sha Nbr-Sin,
82 :13, Lo. E.
2. f. of Nabû-êba-aballû, 15 :17.
3. f. of Ninî-âna-îshu, 10 :14.
4. f. of Ninî-nâmûdu, 28 :15.
5. in duBi-num-kûn-aplu, 51 :6, 10.

Marduk-êri, f. of Shulum-Biblu, 39 :18 | 40 :12.
Marduk-êrig
1. s. of Bélik-tanna, 54 :17, U. E.
2. f. of Shamsha-nadîn, 36 :19.
Marduk-êrîsh, in duHaggê-sîa Marshû-êrîsh, 114 :3.
Marduk-igshâ-nâni, s. of Puda-êrî, 39 :14.
Marduk-nabûdu, f. of KUR-AL-nabûdu, 99 :16.
Marduk-šal-êlîm, f. of Bêl-nadîn, 57 :2.
*Ma-âta-ni-la-a-ma (cf. He. מִשְׂרָה), 83 :14, R. E.
Mûli-êba-šum, s. of Akkadân, 75 :5.
*Mi-na-êba-im, Mi-na-êba-im, Mi-na-êba-im-mu IX,
Mi-na-êba-im, Mi-na-êba-im
1. f. of Hammânu, 128 :15.
2. b. of Hammânu, 127 :5, 8, 10, U. E.
3. 118 :4, 36.
*Mi-nîs-ka-â-me-ên, Hîn-îa-îm-û-ên IX, Hîn-îa-îm-û-ên IX
(cf. He. מִשָּׁרָה) [also Fraenkel, Z. A., XIII, p. 128—Ed.]
1. s. of Bibina, 76 :14, U. E.
2. s. of Bêl-bu-šum, b. of Shabatat, 65 :18, U. E.,
84 :18, Lo. E. 185 :12, Lo. E.
Mi-nî-ê-ana-Bêl-da-êna, f. of Bêl-tanna, 6 :15.
Mi-nî-ê-ana-Bêl-da-êna (da-an) and abbrev. Mi-nî-ê-a, s., of
Daghû, hra-bu-u-ma, 101 :23, Lo. E.
*Mi-nî-ê-â-î-ni (Pe.= Muskû (cf. Maaboc)-êkina—
Ed.), f. of Bêl-ûrû, 69 :14, Lo. E.
*Mi-nî-ê-â-î-nu, Mi-nî-ê-â-î-nu (Pe. Mîrât), m. of Nahish-
ûnu, 114 :16, U. E.
Huqurshu IX, to be read Mûhrurshu, q. v.
Mi-kûn-aplu (DU-A) [according to Vol. IX, pp. 10 and
92, to be read Kink, cf. also Kin-i, Johns, 
1. s. of Kôšir (from Bêl-mûkin-aplu, by
comparison of the seals), haiauni sha Nbr-Sin,
82 :13, Lo. E.
2. f. of Nabû-êba-aballû, 15 :17.
3. f. of Ninî-âna-îshu, 10 :14.
4. f. of Ninî-nâmûdu, 28 :15.
5. in duBi-num-kûn-aplu, 51 :6, 10.
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1. s. of Labani, 28: L. E. | 44 : 11.
2. f. of Bêl-dâhabbi, 99 : 15, R. E.
3. f. of Bêl-ittanu, 18 : 2.
5. f. of Zad . . . . , 52 : 20.

Nûbû-Ninîlî

1. s. of Ardi-Ninîlî, 15 : 20 | 116 : 12.
2. s. of Labûšû, b. of Bêl-muballitî, 130 : 28, R. E. | 131 : 28, L. E.

Nabû-âbû-emûrîsh, 115 : 5.

Nabû-âbû-ittanu, s. of Nannû-nûdun shu ana mulîh in AR ša nûr-Harrûpûdûlû, 85 : 13, L. E.

Nabû-abû-iddûna


*Nabû-aqa-âbû, Nabû-âqa-âbû (IX), f. of Bîlûshû, 123 : 12.

Nabû-aqa-a-arûsh IX. read Nabû-aqa-a-arûsh.

Nabû-balâsâ-ûqûlî

1. s. of Ahûnu, 1 : 16.
2. s. of Bêl-âtûrû, 1 : 20.

Nabû-bêl-mûbâlîtî (of)

1. s. of Bátû, luṣkanu šu bûpîrû, 7 : 4, 7, L. E.
2. s. of Mûbîn-apûlu, luṣkanu šu Nûr-Sûn, 15 : 16, R. E.

3. f. of Labûshû, 58 : 8 | 19 : 95 : 3 | 101 : 14, 16.
4. luṣkanu šu Bêl-ittanûlu, 97 : 14, L. E.

Nabû-bêlûsâ-sû, Nabû-bêlûlî-sû (IX)

1. s. of Shanûn, 45 : 9.
2. f. of Tuqûsh, 37 : 11 | 41 : 2.

Nabû-dâ-eûlu, f. of Shaûsû, 44 : 11.

Nabû-êrûš, s. of Bîlûshû, 4 : 2. 13.

Nabû-êrûš

1. f. of Gûâlû-Sumûsh, 51 : 2.
2. f. of Tû-bânûû, 98 : 2.

Nabû-êrûš (of)

1. s. of Bûlûhûm-înû, 75 : 6.
2. f. of Bêl-ittanûlu, 104 : 8.


Nabá-iddina, f. of Nabá-iddina, 54 : 18 | 70 : 15.
R.
Nabá ... f. of Shampa', 8 : 10.

Nu-din

1. s. of Bél-rashāl, 69 : 16.
4. s. of Mannu-Bél-Dintiš, 71 : 14.
5. s. of Sab-ga', b. of Ardi-Bēl, ša ḫṣṣṣṭī ša ḫḫsuḫanā mērē ḫšunatu, 61 : 3.
6. s. of ... , 47 : 16.
7. f. of Ardi-Et.GAL-Ma'ā, 98 : 17 | 112 : 19 | 125 : 17, Lo. E.
8. f. of Bél-Nippur-ashša-lat-ter, 117 : 15.
15. f. of Után, 15 : 21 | 79 : 15.

*Na-il-ti, Na-il-bēl IX

1. g. of Baršēd-Samuk, 99 : 15, R. E. | 123 : 11.
2. f. of Zabdiia, 115 : 19.
*Na-ša-il-nu (cf. Bi. 72, Tha. 7223), s. of Mušḫuššu-Bēl, 107 : 12.

[Na-ša-il-tū, Na-ša-il-šašu, Na-ša-il-tū, Na-ša-il-šašu, Nruqatu ša mārātu, 114 : 16, U. E.

**Ni-din-turn-∂A-num, s. of Shulīq, 107 :11 126 :13, Lo. E.**

**Ni-din-turn-∂U-Bēl**

4. *s. of Sin-iddin, 4 :5.
5. s. of Shamash-pārāt, 52 :21.
7. s. of _checksum_, 83 :2.
10. f. of Bēl-ar-t-ittānum, 9 :32. Id. with No. 1.
14. f. of Bēl-tāt, 27 :3.
15. f. of Shamash-barrīqī, 107 :Lo. E.
17. f. of _checksum_, 25 :2. Id. with Nos. 9, 12, 16.
18. [157 :18]

**Ni-din-turn-Samash, s. of Kar-ak-ku, hardu ša Artab-shari, 58 :13, U. E.**

**Ni-∂i-tam, s. of Lu-... ḫā̄nā ṣa Nergal-awur, 5 :19, 12.**

*Na-∂i-ri (cf. Pe. Nīxor or Bi. ḫēm ūt).* f. of Bēl-∂i-ṣīr, 36 :2.

**Ni-din-awur**

2. *s. of Ninī-nū, 27 :3.

---

1. [Ed.] [I am inclined to regard the sign E here as a variant of UN, one or two perpendicular wedges being frequently left out in the cuneiform characters of this period (cf. Vol. IX, pp. 16 ff.). Read therefore Nu-tu-nu (Vol. IX).—Ed.]

Dated in the Reign of Darius II.

**Ninib-ah(a)-iddina**
   129:15.
5. s. of Idâhâ, b. of . . . . . , 49:3.
6. a. of . . . . . . . . , 52:17.
7. s. of Abuhamun, 90:12, U. E.
9. f. of Bûbât, 111:16.

**Ninib-ah(a)-nasibâšši**
1. s. of Abuhamun, 26:2.
3. a. of Mumak-aplu, 10:14.

**Ninib-ah(a)-isu**
1. s. of Bittušu, 23:16.
2. a. of Ibiša, hardu aha Bel-ittamu, 56:15, 8, L. E.

**Ninib-un-me(a)š-ha**
1. s. of Iddi-nâšî, 10:14.
3. a. of Mumak-aplu, 10:14.


**Ninib-eshe, Ninib-er(a)n**
1. s. of Abu-abîr, 9:3.
2. s. of Ardiush, 68:10.
3. s. of Mudhûrus-Bêl, 16:19 | 17:3 | 110:14.
4. f. of Lûtâ, 48:3 | 49 | 18.
6. f. of . . . . . . . . , 30:19.


**Ninib-âtar**
1. s. of Apâêl, b. of Bêl-bani, 104:9.
2. s. of Shum-iddina, 9:34.
3. s. of Zambbû, 55:16.
4. f. of Bêl-ah(a)-iddina, 121:9.
5. f. of Bêl-ittamu, 45:12.
6. f. of Bêl . . . . . . , 110:11.
8. f. of Gubbû, 61:3.
9. f. of Dûmûq, 61:3.
10. f. of Iibiša, 38:3.
11. f. of Ninib-iddina, 29:5.

**Ninib-âmil**
2. a. of Dinâmî, 24:19 | 38:15.
3. s. of Tûdûshû, 56:13.
4. f. of Bâlûšî, 56:15.

**Ninib-bumâsâh(a)**
1. s. of Abû-îti, 20:4.
2. s. of Ardi-Gula, 130:1, L. E. 131:26, U. E.

1. s. of Bêl-âmil, hardu aha Ñuruhi, 130:27, 131:27.
2. s. of Lidâhâ-Bêl, b. of Bûbât, 47:3.
4. f. of Iddina-Bûl, 121:12.
5. f. of Kudin, 73:10.
6. f. of Lakûp, 61:19.
7. f. of Ninib-Bêl, 121:11.
8. f. of Ninib-nâšî-sham, 18:3.
9. f. of Ùbarû, 18:3.

1. s. of Abû-iddina, b. of Ninib-ûmil, 48:18 | 94:2.
2. s. of Bêl-nâšî, 11:6.
4. a. of Mušûlû-aplu, 28:15.
5. s. of Mûdûra, 28:15.
6. s. of Ninib, b. of Donnû, 79:1, 11, 12, L. E. 88:14 | 115:17, L. E.
7. s. of Ninib, b. of Bûshu, 4:23.
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14. f. of. ......... 86 : 12.
15. 70 : 5 F 95 : 17.

Ninib-nādin-šumu, s. of Ninib-muballit, b. of Ūbar, 18 : 13.

Ninib-nādin, Ninib-nā-dī (IX)
2. s. of Aha-maṭišu, 45 : 2.
5. s. of Bīššu, 52 : 23.
7. s. of Bīššua, 83 : 12.
8. s. of Ḍuallet, 124 : 12, R. E.
14. f. of Shum-iddina, 29 : 15.
15. 113, Lo. E.

Ninib-muballit (DuN-IJ), Ar. docket. ḶAÁru-AHUMU, hardu ša Ninib-Ratā, 87 : 3, Lo. E.
Ninib-muballit, s. of Bēl-māṭel, 130 : 26. Lo. E. 131 : 25, L. E.

Ninib-... ,... , f. of Bēl-māṭuš-aplu, 113 : 16.
Ninib-... , f. of Bēl-baḥtu, 125 : 15, L. E.


† Cf. also Upaššu-Bēl, below.
‡ Suggested by Dr. Littmann. Cf. Ḥa-na-ta-Ešši, 566.
§ Perhaps identical with the name Pir-ri-nu-ah below.

[For Puššara as a hypokoristikon formation, cf. Ranke, Personal Names.]
*Qa'-ma-nu (determinative omitted) [cf. the Bi. name of a place] 13.
2. s. of Rib'-shaknu, 99 : 3.
3. of Murashu, 122 : 17.
4. f. of Marduka, 73 : 3.
5. of Murashu, 122 : 17.
6. f. of Nidintum-Bili, 102 : 15, U. E.
7. of Rib'-shaknu, 99 : 3.

Qu-nu-nu-a, s. of Bili-share (abbr. Qu-nu-nu), 99 : 4, 9, 14.

**Ru-b-cid, Ba-ab-li-il-di XXX, s. of Nabu-zerr-iddina, 54 : 18**
70 : 15, Lo. E.

**Ru-ab-im, Ba-bi-su**
1. s. of Bili-abu-qurur, 112 : 1, Lo. E.

**Ru-ab-im-ili, Ba-bi-su-li/Il (Ar. docket) 68 : 0**
2. f. of Ribat, 96 : 13, L. E. 102 : 15, U. E.
3. f. of Sha-ah, 68 : 2, L. E.

**Ru-anu-a, s. of Bili-abu Shamsu IX**
1. f. of Bili-abu, ishaknu sha hamatru sha hnasahamu, 83 : 5, 9, L. E.
2. f. of Ab-iddina, 26 : 11.

**Biumu-ab-unu(SHA)†, in Vol. IX read *Ga-shur and Shamsu* (SH)***
1. s. of Bili-abu-unun, 18 : 3, 10.
2. s. of Bili-abu, 73 : 11.
3. s. of Isedin, 14 : 20.
4. s. of Shamsu-ab-iddina, 10 : 15.
5. 122 : 1.

**Ri-bu-di, Ba-la-bi-di IX (Ar. docket) 99 : R**
1. s. of Ardi-Ninib, 47 : 3.
2. f. of Bili-abu, harda sha Rimat-Ninib, s. of Murashu, also of Bili-nam-shumu, 54, m. of habdu, 54 : 1, 13, 14 | 68 : 2, 3 | 78 : 3 | 87 : 1 | 99 : 6, 8, 10 | 104 : 1, 6 | 107 : 6 | 106 : 8 | 111 : 6, 13 | 115 : 20, 3, 128 : 5.
3. s. of Bili-makiri-aplu, 47 : 2.
5. s. of Bili-iddina-Nabu, 47 : 4.
6. s. of Ninnu-ab-sha-iddina, 111 : 15, 16.
7. s. of Nippud, 125 : 15, L. E.
8. s. of Nabu, 27 : 2, L. E.
9. s. of Isidu, 23 : 18.

**Ru-ab-im-da-a-tu(t) (XI)***
1. f. of Barikkesu, 7 : 14.
2. f. of Bili-iddina, 7 : 14.


**Sh-ilim-Bili (Bili)**
1. f. of Abili, 35 : 16.
2. f. of Umalshu, 112 : 14.

**Sh-ilim-Lamti**
1. s. of Duma, ham-ma-ri a-kali, 80 : 15, U. E. 82 : 14, R. E. 97 : 15, L. E.
2. s. of Lashash, B. of Azi-iddina and Ubir, 35 : 16.


Shamash-ša-šir, Shamash-ša-šir(ISH) IX, in the Bit-sin-ša-šir, 91.


Sin-ša-šu-sham-ma, s. of Ardi-Gula, 117:3, 4, 8, 11, R. 2. 129:16.

Sak-ki-i-tum, see Zaka-k-i-tum.


4. s. of Shekka, b. of Libbi, 39:2.
5. f. of Godai-Gula, 7:17.

4. s. of Shekka, b. of Libbi, 39:2.
5. f. of Godai-Gula, 7:17.

4. s. of Shekka, b. of Libbi, 39:2.
5. f. of Godai-Gula, 7:17.
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2. s. of Il-bana', 51:3.
4. s. of Shabtik, 18:16.
5. 91:4.

*Shamash-(mesh)-nu-ur-ri, Shamas-(mesh)-nu-asir* (cf. Pu.)
1. s. of Ardi-Ninib, 130:18, 20 R.
2. s. of Iqipna, 46:3.

*Shamash-(mesh)-ra-ki-ki, Nabu-ra-ki-ki, Shamash-(mesh)-ra-mas-pi-it-ru, Shamash-(mesh)-ra-mas-pi-it-ru-C*.

1. s. of Kish-ki, 107:11 | 126:13, Lo. E.
5. f. of Nidintum-Anum, 207:9 | 212:13, Lo. E.
6. 40:1, L. E.
7. in daf-Bal-Sulat, 39:5 | 87:11.

Shalum, Shal-tu-mu
1. s. of Zabba, 38:15.
2. s. of Nusir, 87:5.
3. f. of Nidintum-Del, 60:6.

Shalum-ma, Shal-un-ma-IX, Shal-un-ma IX, s. of Bel-lupush, 19:2.

Shalum-Babilu(Eh), Shalum(D)-Babilu(Eh)
1. s. of Belshana, 13:2.
2. s. of Gusa, 44:12.
3. s. of Kadina-Nabu, habbanu sha bit quarqabbatu, 91:8.
4. s. of Nabu-7adn, 15:4.
5. s. of Nabu-adn, 15:18.

Shu-ma-a, Shunu-sha
1. s. of Brila, 51:3.
2. f. of Nabu-bullit, 45:10.

Shum-iddina(MU-MU), (MU-ASH)
1. g. of Anum-muballit, 34:2.
2. g. of Bel-erb, b. of Zabina', m. of Bel-erb-gaddatu, 32:2, 3.
3. g. of Belshana, 61:20, U. E. | 62:16.
4. g. of Ila-sha-Ninib, 30:12.
5. s. of Iqish, 63:12.
6. g. of Labbaha, b. of Bel-sul-merce, 55:14.
7. g. of Nabu-adn, 4:4.
8. s. of Nabu-7adn, 29:15.
9. s. of Pulhharu, 44:1, L. E.
10. s. of Sha-pu-kalbi, 126:10, U. E.
11. s. of Bilit, 52:21.

Shu-ru-sha
1. s. of Belshana, sc. 59:22 | 119:18 | 120:14.
2. s. of Ninib-nadn, sc. 9:36 | 23:19.
3. s. of Tubhulu, 30:13.
4. g. of Ardi-Ninib, 32:18.
5. f. of Nidintum-Anum, 107:11 | 126:13, L. E.
6. 40:1, L. E.
7. in do-BAS-Sha-lut, 39:5 | 87:11.

Shu-ma-a, Shumu-sha
1. s. of Belshana, 13:2.
2. s. of Gusa, 44:12.
3. s. of Kadina-Nabu, habbanu sha bit quarqabbatu, 91:8.
4. s. of Nabu-adn, 15:4.
5. s. of Nabu-adn, 15:18.

Shu-ma-a, Shumu-sa
1. g. of Brila, 51:3.
2. f. of Nabu-bullit, 45:10.

Shum-iddina(MU-MU), (MU-ASH)
1. g. of Anum-muballit, 34:2.
2. g. of Bel-erb, b. of Zabina', m. of Bel-yel-gaddatu, 32:2, 3.
3. g. of Belshana, 61:20, U. E. | 62:16.
4. g. of Ila-sha-Ninib, 30:12.
5. s. of Iqish, 63:12.
6. g. of Labbaha, b. of Bel-sul-merce, 55:14.
7. g. of Nabu-adn, 4:4.
8. s. of Nabu-7adn, 29:15.
9. s. of Pulhharu, 44:1, L. E.
10. s. of Sha-pu-kalbi, 126:10, U. E.
11. s. of Bilit, 52:21.

Shu-ru-sha
1. s. of Belshana, sc. 59:22 | 119:18 | 120:14.
2. s. of Ninib-nadn, sc. 9:36 | 23:19.
3. s. of Tubhulu, 30:13.
4. g. of Ardi-Ninib, 32:18.
5. f. of Nidintum-Anum, 107:11 | 126:13, L. E.
6. 40:1, L. E.
7. in do-BAS-Sha-lut, 39:5 | 87:11.

Shu-ma-a, Shumu-sa
1. s. of Belshana, 13:2.
2. s. of Gusa, 44:12.
3. s. of Kadina-Nabu, habbanu sha bit quarqabbatu, 91:8.
4. s. of Nabu-adn, 15:4.
5. s. of Nabu-adn, 15:18.

Shu-ma-a, Shumu-sa
1. g. of Brila, 51:3.
2. f. of Nabu-bullit, 45:10.

Shum-iddina(MU-MU), (MU-ASH)
1. g. of Anum-muballit, 34:2.
2. g. of Bel-erb, b. of Zabina', m. of Bel-yel-gaddatu, 32:2, 3.
3. g. of Belshana, 61:20, U. E. | 62:16.
4. g. of Ila-sha-Ninib, 30:12.
5. s. of Iqish, 63:12.
6. g. of Labbaha, b. of Bel-sul-merce, 55:14.
7. g. of Nabu-adn, 4:4.
8. s. of Nabu-7adn, 29:15.
9. s. of Pulhharu, 44:1, L. E.
10. s. of Sha-pu-kalbi, 126:10, U. E.
11. s. of Bilit, 52:21.

Shu-ru-sha
1. s. of Belshana, sc. 59:22 | 119:18 | 120:14.
2. s. of Ninib-nadn, sc. 9:36 | 23:19.
3. s. of Tubhulu, 30:13.
4. g. of Ardi-Ninib, 32:18.
5. f. of Nidintum-Anum, 107:11 | 126:13, L. E.
6. 40:1, L. E.
7. in do-BAS-Sha-lut, 39:5 | 87:11.

Shu-ma-a, Shumu-sa
1. s. of Belshana, 13:2.
2. s. of Gusa, 44:12.
3. s. of Kadina-Nabu, habbanu sha bit quarqabbatu, 91:8.
4. s. of Nabu-adn, 15:4.
5. s. of Nabu-adn, 15:18.

Shu-ma-a, Shumu-sa
1. g. of Brila, 51:3.
2. f. of Nabu-bullit, 45:10.
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14. f. of , 32: 16.
15. f. of Ah-iddina, 29: 16.
16. f. of Bēl-ēri, 52: 18.
18. f. of Bēl=. =, 125: 19.
22. f. of Ḫubān, 26: 4.
25. f. of Ninā-bāl, 9: 34.

Shum-iddin
1. s. of Bēl-muhalā, b. of Bēlshunu, 122: 15.
2. 31: 7.

Shu-ēna
2. f. of Ḫubān-ēri, and Naḥānī, 92: 5.

*Šēša* (cf. Bi. soup, and i-i-ka-Johns, Deeds and Documents, p. 515.)
1. s. of Addānī, 66: 13, U. E.
2. f. of Bāłyā, 99: 3.

Silla-ēn, šil-lu-ēn (abbrev., cf. Ina-silla-Nimī)
2. g. of Shum-iddina, 52: 22.

Silla-Nimī, abbrev. from Ina-silla-Nimī, 60: 18.

Tab-ni-e-a, s. of Iddina-ēl, 4: 5.

Ted-dan-ū, Ted-ad-dan-ū (identical with the name read Addānī, IX, cf. Intro., p. 11). Perhaps to be read also Tattannu.²
1. s. of Ahē-Balā, 114: 15, L. E. 2. s. of Ahēshumī, b. of Bēl-ēsīṣu-ugar, 37: 19.
6. s. of Bēl-mā-anī, 63: 15.
7. s. of Ipqahā, 63: 14.
8. s. of Nīnā-tā-Bēl, 52: 19.
9. s. of Tērū-tāma, ṣhānakū ša qımānū, 97: 12.
12. f. of Bēl-barna, 16: 16.
15. f. of Shum-iddina, 12. L. E. 13: 14, L. E. 78: 8 (Id. with No. 13, cf. IX, p. 47, read Nūqāt-shumānu?)
17. 89: 12.
Ted-dan-ē-nu-baši, s. of Iddanna, b. of Shishki-Bēl, 41: 2.

*Ta-tu-nu* (cf. Ta-tu-nu), f. of Raḥūm-ēl, 68: 3.

†On the probable meaning of this name cf. Ed. Preface. —Ed.
‡Delitzsch (A. B., p. 452) translates “gišī” and makes it equivalent to tadbīnu. This would appear more reasonable were it not for names like Nabī-ta-ad-dan-ē-nu-ugar. “Nebo, protect what thou huṣī presented,” which show that it is to be regarded as a verbal form.
§After a portion of the Introduction was printed I found an Aramaic docket containing the name ṢMU for Ted-dan-ū (C. B. 5, 173). While this gives additional assurance that the results obtained concerning the first character of the name, cf. Intro., p. 11, are correct, it shows also that alongside of Ted-dan-ū, at least, some of these names were pronounced Tattannu. Cf. ṢMU for ṢMU, Intro., IX, p. 24.
[In view of the hypothesis Das-ēl, Da-da-ēl, Da-da-ēi, Da-ēli, Da-ēli, Da-da-ēu, Da-da-ēu-a (Johns, Assy. Deeds, Vol. III, pp. 95, 269, 443, 528), and Di-di-ē and Da-di-ē (Byb. Zep., IX), on all of which cf. Zimmerm. K. A. T., pp. 935, 483, I prefer to read the above name Das-ēl = Dasī. In several instances the name may not be Semitic but Persian (cf. Dasī, Dasēr, Dasēr, Dasēr, Dasēr, l. e.). Cf. my note to (Da-ba-ēl, above.—Ed.]
It is a remarkable coincidence that a god

"Ta-ri-ru-kam-ma,

Ta-ri-ru-kam-ma,

Ta-ri-ru-kam-ma,

Ta-ri-ru-kam-ma,

Ta-ri-ru-kam-ma,

Ta-ri-ru-kam-ma,"
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*U-na-âl, U-na-âl-IX (perhaps Egyptian, containing the goddess Pâ, Neit, Nut—Litmann), f. of Bâgrap, 15:20.


*Ur-a-tu, cf. Umardâtû


*Ush-ba-ba-bu-na, cf. Ishlabbânû

Za-ab-ba-bu-a (cf. Pa. Zu), f. of Xuîlumum, 58:15.


*Za-bîr-Na-nâh (Aor. docket Zu-bi, s. of Hammâr-nu, 106:10, R.

*Za-bal-ânâ, Za-ab-bâ-ta-IX

1. s. of Bêl-cû-shê, 33:18 34:21.

2. s. of Bêl-cû-shê, 62:18.

3. s. of Bêl-cû-shê, 54:18, Lo. E. 70:15, Lo. E.

4. s. of Zu-umû, 115:19.

5. s. of Nîkumûm-Bâl, b. of Aîziddînû, Nabû-rébâ-shûnu, . . . za-a, 25:2.

6. f. of Zu-ab, 93:4.

7. 24:12.


1. s. of Bêl-cû-bê, b. of Sham-iddînû, m. of Kîl(y)î-ga-

2. 32:2.

2. s. of Zu-ba-râmâ, b. of Bânâ-ba-râm, Himmânî, Zu-ba-


1. b. of Bûlâshû, hâbûmu hâpâri-qal ash hu-qu, 102:6, 10, 12. R. 118:U. E.

2. s. of Bîbê, 1:19.


*Za-bi-dî-dâ, Za-bi-dî-dâ.

1. s. of Bêl-ab-iddînû, 25:3.

2. 8:2 46:10.

Za-bu-dâu

1. f. of Qaddâ, 30:2.


2. in âBu-i-MasÎmû, 71:3. Id. with No. 1. cf. Vol. IX, p. 73.

1. s. of Bata-wâ, b. of Bêl-ré-bahumû, 1:15.

2. M. of Bêl-bellûtu, 19:3.

3. 96:2.

*Za-ta-me (cf. Bi. Zu—Ed.)

1. f. of Bîl-ittanû, 75:11.

2. 1:2.

*Zi-ma-bu-IX, Zi-ma-ab-kê, f. of Âlzu’a, 37:18.

Zi-im-na-a

1. s. of Bêl-êzê, 65:17, Lo. E.

2. f. of Bêl-nabîd-shumû, 102:10.

Zittûl (HA-Lâ)-Nabû

1. s. of Muhbêl-Bêl, 101:26, U. E.

2. s. of Bîl-êzê, 118:U. E.

Z(S)uk-ki-i-tum, Z(S)uk-ki-i-tum, in âBu-i-MasÎmû, 65:5 16:5.

Za-um-bu


2. f. of . . . 3:15 (prob. id. with No. 1).

†[cf. Ab-ma-na-’, above. For the second element cf. At(n)ru-manu’ and Turu-manu’, Vol. IX, p. 51.—Ed.]

§[In favor of this interpretation we may quote 0’nu-mu-nu, if = ūn-Anna, V R. 1, 97 (cf. Pa-mu-nu, above), probably containing the name of the god Amman.—Ed.]

[In view of the fact that the two principal values of NîkûN are pâhûra and sahûra, both of which occur in proper names (cf. Bêl-pâhûra-IX, p. 56, on the one hand, and Nîkû-nah-sahûra-Bêl, IX, p. 68, or Nîkû-nah-sahûra (Concordance of the present volume on the other), it must remain doubtful whether the name NîkûN-Bêl, above, is to be read Upâjkhi-Bîl or Nûkû-nah-sahûra-Bîl.—Ed.]

[The reading of the first radical is doubtful. The name looks like a female name. In any probability it is to be connected with the names quoted by Johns (Assyr. Deeds, p. 136), Sûk-kal-â, Sûk-â, Sûk-ka-â, Sûk-kal-â, from the writings Sû-kal-â and Sû-ka-â found alongside the others it would follow that the first radical was 6 and the second k. Cf. the hypokokalltû, Bi. Zu- and Pa. Zu-ba, (transcr. spâmu), and Zu-ak-ki-a, the name of a place, below. The common Neo-Babyl. name Zu-pa-âi, from which we read the fem. Zu-pa-âi-tî, Strassmaier. Nabûn, 348:13, is a different name and probably be connected with Sêlu, “street, bazaar.”—Ed.]
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*Zu-n-a (cf. Bl. Wf)*

1. f. of Aḫḫ-iddīna, 100 : 11. Lo. E.
2. m. of Aunu-Bēl-apāpa, 51 : 17 | 65 : 15. Lo. E.

... it-tan-nu, s. of Bkulshunu, 30 : 11.
... abu-ugur, f. of ... , 118 : 34.
... muterl, f. of Siblim-dānī, 52 : 20.
... zi-shu..., f. of Bagienna', 70 : 17.

2. NAMES OF WOMEN.

**I-a-dir-tum,** s. of Bnunia, 2 : 2. U. E.
**Ibu-li-tu-nu**, 74 : 5. 16.

**IB(B)**-ya-ru-ush-ā-tu, m. of Ninib-muballit, 131 : 27.
**Nī-ni-dir-tum**, d. of Ibu.

3. NAMES OF SCRIBES.

Ardi-Ninib, s. of Ninakur-Biš, 35 : 20.
Ba-la-tu, Bālu-tu, s. of Bēl-eqīha, 41 : 18 | 57 : 17
Bēl-apal-ugur
1. s. of Bēl-bēnī, 123 : 13.
2. s. of Nīdatu-Bīl, 1 : 20.
Bēl-ba-tin, s. of Ninib-tēr, 109 : 10.
Bēl-nādīn-baṣ̄ir, s. of Ardi-Ninib, 77 : 16.
Bēl-muballit(-tēr), s. of Itī-Ninib-rē, 39 : 17 | 40 : 17 | 108 : 15.
Iddīna-Bīl, s. of Ninib-muballit, 121 : 11.
Iriti Bēl-baṣ̄ir, s. of Ninib-muballit, 52 : 24.
La-ba-shī
2. s. of Nīdatu, 63 : 16 | 73 : 13 | 116 : 15.
3. s. of... 84 : 18.
Na-dir
2. s. of Labāšī, 63 : 16 | 73 : 13.
Ninib-šur, s. of Ardi, 68 : 10.
Ninib-tēr, s. of Zumba, 55 : 18.
Ninib-šur-ālib, s. of Dūmmu-qub, 24 : 19 | 38 : 15.
Ninib-nādīn, s. of Mutēr-lu, 4 : 28.
Rēmu-shakum, s. of Shamash-aḫḫ-iddīna, 10 : 15.
Rēmu-Ninib, s. of BBkulshunu, 78 : 11.
Sin-na-dir-akšu, s. of Ardi-Bau, 51 : 22.
Skul-šu-a
2. s. of Ninib-nāṣir, 9 : 36 | 23 : 19.
U-bar, s. of Nīdatu, 15 : 21 | 79 : 15.


II. Names of Places.

Ama-az-ta-nu, 64 : 5.
A-ha-sha-nu, 54 : 3.
A-na-šu-šu-šu, 43 : 5.

Aragna [ = Ar. ܒܬܐܢܓܢܐ, “earth, ground” —Ed.,] 58 : 5.
Babitiši (written BM and DIN-TIRu), 1 : 21 | 15 : 21, in
nūr Babitiši, 95 : 15 | 95 : 17, in mšahum-
Babitiši, 13 : 2 | 15 : 18 | 23 : 3 | 39 : 13 | 40 : 12,

Bit nūr Dir-rā, 43 : 7 | 103 : 5.
Bit nūr Shubtiši-(K)-(U)-Ea, 80 : 4.
Ba-al-sha-an, 179 : 18 | 120 : 14.
Bēn-ništum, 93 : 5.

Bit-ša-Ma-la-nu, 17 : 6.
Bit-ša-ad-di-tu, 76 : 3.

Bit-ša-niš-tu-
Bit-ša-ša-ša, 55 : 4 [prob. Ḥa-di-ša, id. with Ḥa-ad-di-ša —Ed.]

Bit mšal-te-ši-ri-neri, 34 | 6, 9.
Bit-mša-šu-a, see Bit-mša-šu-apu.
Bit-Ma-ra-šu, 6 : 5, Bit-Ma-šu-du IX, without det. d.
Bit-Mašu-šu, 51 : 6, 10.

Bit-Mu-ra-ša-šu, 127 : 3.
Bit-Na-di-ši, 129 : 4.
Bit-Na-ši-šu, 124 : 2.
Bit-si-ša-aššur, 43 : 7.
Bit-si-ša-aštatuši, 84 : 2.
Bit-si-ša-aštatuši, 94 : 4.

Bit-taššu (SAG), 18 : 7, 9.
Bit-ti-šu-la-šu, 40 : 4, 5.
Bit-ti-šu-la-šu, Bit-ti-šu-la-šu (GISH IX, 91 : 5.
Bit-tu-ša-na, 39 : 5.


Bit-tu-šu-šu-šu, 71 : 3.
Bit-tu-šu-šu-šu, 65 | 56 | 588 | 6, 10 | 86 : 4 | 106 : 4.

Bit-tu-šu-šu-šu, 126 : 5.

Bit-ta-šu-šu-šu, 73 : 3.
Bit-tu-šu-šu-šu, 65 | 56 | 588 | 6, 10 | 86 : 4 | 106 : 4.

Bit-tu-šu-šu-šu, 126 : 5.

Bit-ša-šu-ta-šu, Bit-ša-šu-ta-šu IX, 8 : 4, 5 | 24 : 5, 7 [Const. No. 498, I found a place du-ša-[lo-šu, —Ed.]


DATED IN THE REIGN OF DARIUS II.

...Abulh-LUGAL-SI-DI, 105:16
Abulh-LUGAL-SI-GUD-SI-DI.

Ba-la-& Ba-tia
Eu-us-si-e-ti & +i-e-ti
KU-gabar-ri, Nippurki, Larakki, Na-ki-di-ni Mi-li-du, Ku-za-ba-tu(tum), Ku-ur-du,
Kab-ri(ta1)-li-ri-im-mu-shi, Kdr-Ninib, ident. with
...1, 5.
...22. 

III. NAMES OF GATES IN NIPPU.

Aballu E-MAH, Aballu MAH not Aballu r@bh, Vol. IX; [though referring to the largest gate of Nippur, the name (E)MAH is ident. with E-GAL-MAE, q. v.—Ed.], 18:20 19:19, U. E. 20:22 37: 141 45:17 46:22.

Aballu-Gula (Gala) written without det. d, 18:21 19:20.


Aballu-Shi-bi-Urukki, 37:15 45:19.

B@bhu shu m@G@U-bar-r@tu, 128:14, U. E. (a sluice?).

IV. NAMES OF CANALS?

m@Da-bi-ba-nah-ta , 82:8.
Diglal-bi-bi-(an old bed of the Tigris), 36:8 41:9 98:9.

Di-rat, Di-ra-a-tu, 43:7 79:3 8:103:3 112:4, 10.
V. Names of Deities Contained in the Proper Names.

Ad-âtu, Addu (âHM), cf. the male proper names under Addu. [Shortened also to Ad, cf. Aârahk, Aâman.]  
A-ânum, cf. the male names under Anum  
A-ânum-an (âlûnum "his divinity"), cf. Atûmar-ad-ânum-an.  
A-âhur (written adû), cf. Aâhur-UR(i)-ûnû.  
Bây (written Bûû, with and without det. d.), cf. names under Bâyû, Arû and Kûbi.  
Bûl (written BEN, ëN-LIL, L.), cf. the proper names under Bûl, Arû, etc.  
Dû-âmân (written DZ-KUD), cf. male proper names under Dû-âmân. Cf. also ôKUD. 

[Danû (without det. d.), perhaps in hîpôk. 'ûmû. — Ed.  
[Perhaps also written Du-ûn (without det. d.) in Dû-ûnâ].—Ed.]  
E-ê (written ëE), cf. the male proper names under E-ê, also nû Shûbû-ôEa.  
E-GAL-MÂHû, also written E-MÂHû and only MÂHû, cf. Arû-ê-GAL-MÂHû, Abûlû(Z)MÂHû.  
[The Egyptian Isis —ânâ, ânâ, cf. the male names under Pûdûni, Pûaûndû, also Pûû.  
Gû-êd-ûtu (written without det. d.), cf. Kûû-Gûûtu, the West-Semitic god of Fortuna (Fortuna).  
Gû-ûtu (without det. d.) in abûlû Gu-ôla, M E-M E-E, cf. the male proper names under Gûlû, Arû and Tûqûlû.  
[Ha-ûn (without det. d.), perhaps also 'ûn-û,] cf. guma-ûnû and Ha-ûn-ê-sha-ûnû, Eu-ân-êta-à. — Ed.]  
[Ha-û-û-lî, IX, âlû-ôû, 4âlû Ôîlî IX, =âûû (not âûû), Vol. IX, p. 17.,] the contracted form of Jahwe at the beginning of Hebrew names. Also written ëHûû-û, cf. Intro., pp. 19, f.  

Sha-û-ô-sû-ê, 117 : 3.  
Shaôû-û-ôûlû, 43 : 5.  
Shûbû-Ôûlû. 80 : 4.
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NAMES OF UNPUBLISHED ENDORSEMENTS QUOTED.


ARAMAIC CHARACTERS FROM THE ENDORSEMENTS.

With the exception of a few characters, more or less uncertain, as for instance in No. 78, the list represents most of the variants which appear in these documents. Several from Vol. IX and unpublished Murasšu tablets have been added.

---

* After the Introduction had gone through the press I discovered an additional "docket," written with black fluid, containing the god Ninib. The one character in doubt seems to be ע. Besides the ר the other characters are very clear, cf. Preface.
TABLE OF CONTENTS

AND DESCRIPTION OF OBJECTS.

ABBREVIATIONS.

C. B. M., Catalogue of the Babylonian Museum, University of Pennsylvania (prepared by the Editor-in-chief); Cn., Cast; cf., confer; cyl., cylinder(s); Ed., Edge; foll(ow),, following; fr., fragment, fragmentary; No., Number; O., Obverse; pend., perpendicular; Pl., Plate(s); R., Right; Rev., Reverse; U., Upper.

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

I. AUTOGRAPH REPRODUCTIONS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Plate</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Day</th>
<th>C. B. M.</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Accession</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Possession of H. V. Hilprecht.</td>
<td>U. L. corner cracked; small portions broken out; otherwise well preserved. 6.3 $\times$ 7.65 $\times$ 2.68. Inscr. 14 (O.)$+\theta$ (R.) = 22 li. Thumbmark on L. E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Accession</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5277</td>
<td>Lo. L. corner of O. chipped off; otherwise well preserved. 6.15 $\times$ 7.3 $\times$ 2.4. Inscr. 10 (O.)$+\theta$ (R.) = 19 li. Thumbmark on U. E. Seal impr. on L. E. Faint Aramaic inscr. incised on L. E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Accession</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5272</td>
<td>Fragmentary; U. and Lo. part wanting; also cracked, with small portions broken away. 5.7 $\times$ 7.45 $\times$ 2.4. Inscr. remaining, 11 (O.)$+\theta$ (R.) = 19 li. Seal impr. on L. E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Accession</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>possession of H. V. Hilprecht.</td>
<td>Slight crack, otherwise in a fine state of preservation. 7.85 $\times$ 10.3 $\times$ 7.85. Inscr. 17 (O.)$+\theta$ (Lo. E.)$+\theta$ (R.) = 30 li. Five thumbmarks on L. E. Three seal impr. on U. E., one on L. E. and Lo. E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Accession</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5235</td>
<td>A large portion of Lo. R. corner wanting. Several cracks. 6.2 $\times$ 7.9 $\times$ 2.9. Inscr. 12 (O.)$+\theta$ (R.) = 23 li. Seal impr. on L. E., U. E. and Lo. E. Inscr. of the latter is broken away.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Accession</td>
<td>(?)</td>
<td>(?)</td>
<td>5233</td>
<td>U. and a large portion of Lo. L. corners wanting. Several cracks. 8.85 $\times$ 7.75 $\times$ 3. Inscr. 11 (O.)$+\theta$ (R.) = 18 li. Seal impr. on L. E. and Lo. E. Inscr. of the latter, belonging to Bēl-mukīn-aplu š₃ of Kēṣīr, is broken away.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text</td>
<td>Plate</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Month</td>
<td>Day</td>
<td>C. R. M.</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5257</td>
<td>Possession of H. V. Hilprecht.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>In an excellent state of preservation. 6.7 × 8.95 X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Inscr. 8 (O.) + 12 (R.) = 20 li. Two seal impr. on Lo. E. and one on L. E. Seal ring impr. on U. E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5257</td>
<td>Cracked, with small portions broken out on R.; other- wise well preserved. 5.95 × 7.5 × 2.75. Inscr. 7 (O.) + 7 (R.) = 14 li. Two impr. of seal rings on Lo. E. and one on R. E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5267</td>
<td>Lo. L. corner chipped off; otherwise in an excellent state of preservation. 7.5 × 9 × 3.25. Inscr. 17 (O.) + 5 (Lo. E.) + 14 (R.) = 36 li. Two seal impr. on U., E., one on L., E., R. E. and R. Two thumbmarks on U. E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5448</td>
<td>Cracked; Lo. L. corner wanting. 4.8 × 5 × 1.7. Inscr. 10 (O.) + 7 (R.) = 17 li. Thumbmark on L. E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5237</td>
<td>Large portion of U. E. wanting. Trapezoidal shaped. 4.4 × 6.2 × 2.0. Inscr. 5 (O.) + 8 (R.) = 13 li. Two thumbmarks on L. E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3(?)</td>
<td>5164</td>
<td>Considerably cracked. Portions of O. broken out. 5.6 × 7.1 × 2.85. Inscr. 9 (O.) + 6 (R.) = 15 li. Thumbmark on U. E. Impr. of seals on Lo. E. and L. E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1(?)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5851</td>
<td>U. L. corner wanting; also cracked. 6.4 × 7.7 × 2.5. Inscr. 10 (O.) + 6 (R.) = 16 li. Seal ring impr. on U. E., and portion of one on L. E. The inscription of the latter is broken away.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5356</td>
<td>In an excellent state of preservation. 6 × 8.36 × 2.6. Inscr. 12 (O.) + 11 (R.) = 23 li. Three thumbmarks on Lo. E. Impr. of seals on U. E. and L. E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5147</td>
<td>Lo. L. corner injured; otherwise well preserved. 5.48 × 6.7 × 2.85. Inscr. 11 (O.) + 11 (R.) = 22 li. Seal impr. on L. E., Lo. E. and R. E. Seal ring impr. on U. E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5360</td>
<td>Well preserved. 5.85 × 7.38 × 2.7. Inscr. 12 (O.) + 9 (R.) = 21 li. Two thumbmarks impr. on U. E. Seal impr. on L., E., Lo. E. and R.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5318</td>
<td>Cracked, with small portions broken out of O. 6 × 7.9 × 2.7. Inscr. 12 (O.) + 1 (Lo. E.) + 8 (R.) = 21 li. Four thumbmarks on U. E., seal impr. on L. E., Lo. E. and R. R. also shows impr. of texture of cloth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text.</td>
<td>Plate.</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Month</td>
<td>Day</td>
<td>C. B. M.</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5326</td>
<td>Slightly effaced on O. and R., otherwise well preserved.  5.7 × 7.7 × 2.6. Inscr. 13 (O.) + 10 (R.) = 23 li. Three thumbmarks on R. Two seal impr. on U., one on L. E. and Lo. E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5225</td>
<td>Several cracks; small portions broken away.  6.58 × 7.75 × 2.9. Inscr. 11 (O.) + 9 (R.) = 20 li. Three thumbmarks on L. E. Two seal ring impr. on Lo. E. and one on R. E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5177</td>
<td>Slightly injured on Lo. R. and L., corners; otherwise well preserved.  5.5 × 6.8 × 2.6. Inscr. 10 (O.) + 7 (R.) = 17 li. Thumbmark on L. E. Seal impr. on U. E. and on R. E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5222</td>
<td>Cracked; small portion of O. broken out.  5.85 × 7.65 × 2.9. Inscr. 8 (O.) + 5 (R.) = 15 li. ḫupasūrānu written on Lo. E., but no thumbmarks are visible. Two seal ring impr. on U. E., and one on L. E. Very faint traces of an Aramaic inscr. in black color on O.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5282</td>
<td>Excellently preserved with the exception of a small portion chipped off L. E.  5.85 × 6.45 × 2.3. Inscr. 12 (O.) + 8 (R.) = 20 li. Three thumbmarks on L. E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5324</td>
<td>Numerous cracks. Large portion of U. E. wanting.  6.3 × 7.8 × 2.9. Inscr. 10 (O.) + 10 (R.) = 20 li. Three thumbmarks on L. E. Two seal ring impr. on L. E. and one on U. E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(?)</td>
<td>5198</td>
<td>Numerous cracks. Portions broken out of O. and R.  6.9 × 8.3 × 2.6. Inscr. 10 (O.) + 8 (R.) = 18 li. Five thumbmarks on U. E. Two seal ring impr. on L. E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5227</td>
<td>U. L. corner injured; otherwise well preserved.  5.9 × 7.6 × 3. Inscr. 12 (O.) + 2 (R.) + 10 (R.) = 24 li. Two seal ring impr. on U. E. and one on R. E. Three thumbmarks on L. E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5259</td>
<td>Slightly cracked; otherwise well preserved.  5.35 × 6.7 × 2.5. Inscr. 9 (O.) + 1 (L.) + 8 (R.) = 18 li. Seal impr. on U. E. and Lo. E. The former, belonging to  Bit-nəḏin-šumu, s. of Taddanu, is uninscribed. Thumbmark on L. E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5179</td>
<td>Cracked. Portions broken out of O. and R.  4.81 × 5.78 × 2.2. Inscr. 10 (O.) + 8 (R.) = 18 li. Same seal impr. on U. and Lo. E. The former, belonging to  Bit-nəḏin-šumu, s. of Taddanu, is uninscribed. Thumbmark on L. E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5283</td>
<td>Very well preserved.  5.2 × 6.25 × 2.3. Inscr. 9 (O.) + 1 (L.) + 10 (R.) = 20 li. Seal impr. on R. Three thumbmarks without an inscr. on R. E. Aramaic docket incised on U. E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5157</td>
<td>Lo. L. corner wanting.  5.25 × 6.4 × 2.5. Inscr. 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEXT.</td>
<td>PLATE.</td>
<td>YEAR.</td>
<td>MONTH.</td>
<td>DAY.</td>
<td>C. B. M.</td>
<td>DESCRIPTION.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>26(?)</td>
<td>5190</td>
<td>R. end wanting. Cracked. 6.45 X 7.55 (fr.) X 3. Inscr. 13 (O.) + 8 (R.) = 21 li. Five seal ring impr. on U. E. and one on L. E. Four thumbmarks on R.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>27(?)</td>
<td>5223</td>
<td>U. L. corner wanting; otherwise well preserved. 6.15 X 8.05 X 3.1. Inscr. 13 (O.) + 1 (Lo. E.) + 10 (R.) = 24 li. Five seal ring impr. on L. E. and one on U. E. Two thumbmarks on Lo. E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5274</td>
<td>Slightly effaced on O.; otherwise well preserved. 6.35 X 8.1 X 3.1. Inscr. 12 (O.) + 9 (R.) = 21 li. Two seal ring impr. on R. E. Two thumbmarks on U. E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5254</td>
<td>Considerably cracked, with small portions broken out. 6.2 X 7.5 X 2.85. Inscr. 12 (O.) + 10 (R.) = 22 li. Two seal ring impr. on L. E. and one on U. E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5375</td>
<td>Several cracks. Small portions broken out of R. 5.8 X 7.1 X 2.35. Inscr. 10 (O.) + 11 (R.) = 21 li. Two seal ring impr. on U. E., and seal impr. on L. E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5264</td>
<td>Slightly cracked on O., otherwise well preserved. 5.05 X 6.05 X 2.4. Inscr. 10 (O.) + 1 (Lo. E.) + 6 = 17 li. Impr. of seal on U. E. and on R. Thumbmarks on L. E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5361</td>
<td>In an excellent state of preservation. 6.75 X 8.45 X 3.0. Inscr. 10 (O.) + 9 (R.) = 19 li. Three thumbmarks on L. E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5329</td>
<td>Lo. R. corner, which was uninscribed, is wanting; otherwise well preserved. 6.9 X 8.65 X 2.85. Inscr. 9 (O.) + 10 (R.) = 19 li. Two thumbmarks on L. E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5245</td>
<td>Cracked; otherwise well preserved. 6.3 X 7.1 X 2.5. Inscr. 11 (O.) + 8 (R.) = 19 li. Two seal ring impr. on U. E. and one on L. E. Two thumbmarks on L. E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4985</td>
<td>Considerably cracked and badly effaced. 5.75 X 6.8 X 4.45. Inscr. 10 (O.) + 9 (R.) = 19 li. Seal impr. on U. E. and one on O. Seal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text</td>
<td>Plate</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Month</td>
<td>Day</td>
<td>C. B. M.</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5349</td>
<td>Slightly cracked and effaced; otherwise well preserved. 6.35 X 7.7 X 2.7. Inscr. 14 (O.) + 10 (R.) - 24 li.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>9555</td>
<td>Well preserved. 5 X 6.48 X 2.28. Inscr. 8 (O.) + 7 (R.) - 15 li. Two seal impr. on Lo. E. and one on L. E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5354</td>
<td>Very well preserved. 6.05 X 7.95 X 3.1. Inscr. 11 (O.) + 1 (Lo. E.) + 10 (R.) = 22 li. Two seal ring impr. on Lo. E. and one on R. E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5320</td>
<td>Slightly cracked; otherwise well preserved. 5.95 X 7.6 X 3.05. Inscr. 12 (O.) + 4 (Lo. E.) + 9 (R.) = 25 li. Two seal ring impr. on U. E. and one on R. E. Six thumbmarks on L. E. Aramaic docket in black color on R.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5350</td>
<td>In an excellent state of preservation. 6.15 X 8.15 X 3.15. Inscr. 12 (O.) + 8 (R.) = 20 li. Seal impr. on L. E., Lo. E. and R. O. Three thumbmarks on U. E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5193</td>
<td>Lo. L. end wanting. Cracked, with portions broken out of R. 6.3 X 8.5 X 3.25. Inscr. 11 (O.) + 9 (R.) = 20 li. Two seal impr. on U. E., one on Lo. E. and L. E. The inscr. of the latter, belonging to Bēl-šadin-šumu, s. of Taddanu, is broken away.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5273</td>
<td>Lo. L. corner slightly injured; otherwise well preserved. 6.4 X 8.1 X 3. Inscr. 12 (O.) + 9 (R.) = 21 li. Two seal impr. on U. E. and Lo. E., one on L. E. Seal ring impr. on R. E. Two thumbmarks on R.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5278</td>
<td>Slightly effaced on R.; otherwise well preserved. 6.2 X 7.8 X 3.25. Inscr. 11 (O.) + 2 (Lo. E.) + 10 (R.) = 23 li. Seal impr. on U. E. and L. E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5268</td>
<td>Cracked. Large portions broken out of O. and R. 8.6 X 6.9 X 3.1. Inscr. 16 (O.) + 11 (R.) = 27 li. Two seal ring impr. on Lo. E., two seal impr. on L. E. and one on U. E. Two thumbmarks on U. E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5501</td>
<td>Cracked; otherwise fairly well preserved. 6.08 X 8.7 X 2.9. Inscr. 14 (O.) + 6 (R.) = 20 li. Two seal impr. on U. E. and one on Lo. E., L. E. and R.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEXT.</td>
<td>PLATE.</td>
<td>YEAR.</td>
<td>MONTH.</td>
<td>DAY.</td>
<td>C. B. M.</td>
<td>DESCRIPTION.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>5284</td>
<td>In an excellent state of preservation. 4.3 ( \times ) 5.35 ( \times ) 1.75. Inscr. 9 (O.) ( + ) 2 (Lo. E.) ( + ) 6 (R.) ( - ) 17 li. Seal impr., also faint incised Aramaic docket on R. Faint traces of a second Aramaic inscr. on L. E., upon which a seal impr. was made.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>5160</td>
<td>U. end including several lines wanting. 4.7 (fr.) ( \times ) 5.75 ( \times ) 2.22. Inscr. 9 remaining (O.) ( + ) 2 (Lo. E.) ( + ) 6 (R.) ( = ) 17 li. Thumbmark on L. E. broken away. Aramaic docket incised on R.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5357</td>
<td>In an excellent state of preservation. 6.45 ( \times ) 7.95 ( \times ) 2.9. Inscr. 10 (O.) ( + ) 8 (R.) ( - ) 18 li. Two seal ring impr. on U. E. Seal impr. on L. E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>5279</td>
<td>Cracked; otherwise well preserved. 6.2 ( \times ) 7.7 ( \times ) 2.75. Inscr. 10 (O.) ( + ) 7 (R.) ( - ) 17 li. Two seal impr. on U. E., one on Lo. E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5353</td>
<td>Cracked; otherwise well preserved. 6.2 ( \times ) 7.9 ( \times ) 3.1. Inscr. 13 (O.) ( + ) 2 (Lo. E.) ( + ) 8 (R.) ( = ) 23 li. Two seal impr. on L. E., one on U. E. and one on Lo. E. Seal ring impr. on Lo. E. and R. Aramaic docket in black color on R.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>535s</td>
<td>In an excellent state of preservation. 6.05 ( \times ) 7.24 ( \times ) 2.7. Inscr. 13 (O.) ( + ) 11 (R.) ( = ) 24 li. Two seal impr. on R. and one on U. E., Lo. E. and L. E. Aramaic dockets in black color on R. E. and L. E. The latter is very indistinct.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5149</td>
<td>Cracked. Small portions broken out. 5.7 ( \times ) 6.95 ( \times ) 2.55. Inscr. 11 (O.) ( + ) 2 (Lo. E.) ( + ) 10 (R.) ( = ) 23 li. Two seal impr. on U. E. and one on L. E. Seal impr. on R. Two thumbmarks on R. Very faint Aramaic inscr. in black color on R.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5327</td>
<td>In an excellent state of preservation. 6 ( \times ) 7.2 ( \times ) 2.75. Inscr. 11 (O.) ( + ) 2 (Lo. E.) ( + ) 8 (R.) ( = ) 21 li. Two seal impr. on L. E. and one on U. E. Thumbmark on L. E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5319</td>
<td>Considerably cracked. Portions broken out. 6.55 ( \times ) 7.6 ( \times ) 3. Inscr. 9 (O.) ( + ) 9 (R.) ( = ) 18 li. Seal impr. on L. E. Thumbmark on Lo. E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5255</td>
<td>Considerably cracked on R. 6.3 ( \times ) 7.95 ( \times ) 2.7. Inscr. 9 (O.) ( + ) 7 (R.) ( = ) 16 li. Seal impr. on Lo. E. and U. E. Seal impr. on R. E. and Lo. E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5363</td>
<td>Cracked. Portions broken out of O. and R. 7.35 ( \times ) 8.8 ( \times ) 3.15. Inscr. 14 (O.) ( + ) 9 (R.) ( = ) 23 li. Two seal impr. on U. E., one on L. E., Lo. E. and R. Seal ring impr. on Lo. E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5270</td>
<td>Cracked. Small portions broken out. 6.25 ( \times ) 7.75 ( \times ) 3.1. Inscr. 10 (O.) ( + ) 7 (R.) ( = ) 17 li. Seal impr. on U. E., L. E. and Lo. E. Seal ring impr. on U. E. Thumbmark on Lo. E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEXT.</td>
<td>PLATE.</td>
<td>YEAR.</td>
<td>MONTH.</td>
<td>DAY.</td>
<td>C. B. M.</td>
<td>DESCRIPTION.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5158</td>
<td>L. corner slightly injured; otherwise well preserved. 6.15 x 7.5 x 2.75. Inscr. 10 (O.) + 10 (R.) = 20 li. Two seal impr. on Lo. E., one on U. E., L. E. and R.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5502</td>
<td>U. L. corner injured; otherwise well preserved. 5.25 x 6.15 x 2.25. Inscr. 6 (O.) + 5 (R.) = 11 li. Two thumbmarks on L. E. Incised Aramaic docket on R.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5219</td>
<td>Cracked; portion of L. E. broken out. 5.95 x 6.94 x 2.87. Inscr. 12 (O.) x 8 (R.) = 20 li. Two seal impr. on Lo. E., one on U. E. and L. E. Seal ring impr. on L. E. and R.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5339</td>
<td>Lo. L. corner wanting; otherwise well preserved. 7.1 x 8.9 x 3.45. Inscr. 12 (O.) + 7 (R.) = 19 li. Two seal impr. on U. E., Lo. E. and R.; one on L. E. and R. E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5180</td>
<td>L., end partly wanting. Considerably cracked. 6.15 x 7.45 x 2.65. Inscr. 11 (O.) + 7 (R.) = 18 li. Thumbmark and seal ring impr. on U. E. Two seal impr. on Lo. E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5263</td>
<td>Very well preserved. 4.35 x 5.25 x 2.1. Inscr. 6 (O.) + 9 (R.) = 15 li. Thumbmark on L. E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>(?)</td>
<td>5175</td>
<td>Fragmentary. Large portion wanting. 6.4 x 6.6 x 2.75. Inscr. 10 (O.) + 1 (Lo. E.) + 13 (R.) = 24 li. Seal impr. on L. E. and R. E. Portion of an incised Aramaic docket on U. E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5256</td>
<td>Cracked. 5.9 x 7.7 x 2.85. Inscr. 13 (O.) + 7 (R.) = 20 li. Two seal impr. on U. E., one on L. E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5207</td>
<td>Numerous cracks. Portions broken out of O. and R. 5.85 x 7.6 x 2.95. Inscr. 12 (O.) + 8 (R.) = 20 li. Seal impr. on U. E., L. E. and Lo. E. Seal ring impr. on U. E. and R.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4995</td>
<td>Considerably cracked. Portion of R. end wanting. 4.5 x 5.8 x 1.85. Inscr. 9 (O.) x 9 (R.) = 18 li. Thumbmark on L. E. Faint traces of an Aramaic inscr. on O.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5449</td>
<td>Lo. L. corner injured; otherwise well preserved. 5.2 x 6.4 x 2.4. Inscr. 7 (O.) + 6 (R.) = 13 li. Seal impr. on U. E. and one on Lo. E. Incised Aramaic docket on R.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5368</td>
<td>In an excellent state of preservation. 5.35 x 6.65 x 2.7. Inscr. 11 (O.) + 1 (Lo. E.) + 4 (R.) = 16 li. Seal impr. on U. E. and on L. E. Seal ring impr. on L. E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEXT.</td>
<td>PLATE.</td>
<td>YEAR.</td>
<td>MONTH.</td>
<td>DAY.</td>
<td>C. B. M.</td>
<td>DESCRIPTION.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5269</td>
<td></td>
<td>U. R. corner wanting. Portion broken out. 6.4 × 8.15 × 2.95. Inscr. 12 (O.)+ 9 (R.) = 21 li. Two seal impr. on U. E. and two on L. E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5138</td>
<td>U. R. corner of O. wanting. Numerous cracks. 6.7 × 8.25 × 2.8. Inscr. 12 (O.) × 8 (R.) = 20 li. Two seal impr. on Lo. E., two on U. E., one on L. E. and one on R. with inscription broken away. Seal ring impr. on R. E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5359</td>
<td>In an excellent state of preservation. 6.7 × 8.15 × 2.3. Inscr. 11 (O.)+ 7 (R.) = 18 li. Two seal impr. on U. E. and L. E., one on R. E., O. and Lo. E. Seal ring impr. on Lo. E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13(?)</td>
<td>5266</td>
<td></td>
<td>L. U. and R. E. broken away. Cracked. 7 × 8.65 × 2.95. Inscr. 10 (O.)+ 9 (R.) = 19 li. Seal impr. on Lo. E. and R. Seal ring impr. on Lo. E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5367</td>
<td>Lo. R. corner wanting. Cracked. 6.3 × 8.05 × 2.6. Inscr. 11 (O.)+ 8 (R.) = 19 li. Two seal impr. on Lo. E., one on U. E. Seal ring impr. on U. E. and L. E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5333</td>
<td>Cracked. U. R. corner broken away. 5.45 × 6.4 × 2.4. Inscr. 9 (O.)+ 8 (R.) = 17 li. Seal ring impr. on U. E., L. E. and Lo. E. Faint traces of an Aramaic docket in black color on R.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5236</td>
<td></td>
<td>U. R. corner wanting. Cracked. 4.45 × 5.03 × 1.98. Inscr. 8 (O.)+ 7 (R.) = 2 U. E. = 17 li. Seal ring impr. on L. E. Aramaic docket incised on Lo. E. consisting of three li.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5280</td>
<td>Lo. R. corner injured. Inscr. well preserved. 6.35 × 8.4 × 2.98. Inscr. 12 (O.)+ 9 (R.) = 21 li. Two seal impr. on U. E., one on Lo. E. and R. Seal ring impr. on L. E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>5352</td>
<td>Lo. L. corner injured. Inscr. well preserved. 5.95 × 8.05 × 2.8. Inscr. 8 (O.)+ 7 (R.) = 15 li. Two seal impr. on U. E., one on L. E. and E. Thumbmark on R. Faint traces of an Aramaic inscription in black color on R.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5252</td>
<td>Several cracks with small portions broken out. 5.95 × 7.9 × 2.5. Inscr. 12 (O.)+ 3 (Lo. E.) + 8 (R.) = 23 li. Two seal impr. on L. E. and one on R. Two seal ring impr. on U. E. and one on R.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TEXT. | PLATE. | YEAR. | MONTH | DAY. | C. B. M. | DESCRIPTION.
---|---|---|---|---|---|---
92 | 51 | 4 | 9 | 23(?) | 5143 | Cracked. Small portions broken out. 6.75 × 8.2 × 2.75. Inscr. 13 (O.) + 7 (R.) = 20 li. Two seal impr. on U. E., two on L. E. and one on Lo. E. Seal ring impr. on Lo. E.
93 | 51 | 4 | 9 | 27 | 5373 | In a fine state of preservation. 5.25 × 7.05 × 2.45. Inscr. 10 (O.) + 7 (R.) = 17 li. Two seal impr. on U. E. and one on Lo. E. Three short parallel lines in black color on R.
94 | 52 | 4 | 11 | 8 | 5281 | In a fine state of preservation. 5.4 × 6.8 × 2.48. Inscr. 10 (O.) + 3 (Lo. E.) + 10 (R.) = 23 li. Two seal impr. on L. E., one on U. E. and one besides thumbmark on R.
95 | 52 | 4 | 12 | 3 | 5221 | Cracked. Portions broken out of O. 6.3 × 6.2 × 2.85. Inscr. 11 (O.) + 2 (Lo. E.) + 7 (R.) = 20 li. Two seal impr. on U. E., two on L. E., one on R, E., Lo. E. and R. Seal ring impr. on U. E., Lo. E. and R.
96 | 53 | 4 | 12 | 17 | 5362 | Well preserved. 7.3 × 5.8 × 2.55. Inscr. 10 (O.) + 8 (R.) = 18 li. Seal impr. on U. E., L. E. and Lo. E. Seal ring impr. on L. E. Four thumbmarks. Also faint traces of an Aramaic inscription in black color on R.
98 | 54 | 4 | (?) | | 5140 | U. R. corner wanting. Cracked; otherwise well preserved. 6.1 × 6.85 × 2.8. Inscr. 13 (O.) + 6 (R.) = 19 li. Two seal impr. on Lo. E., one on U. E., of which the inscr. is broken away. Seal impr. on U. E. Two thumbmarks on L. E.
100 | 55 | 5 | 5 | 16 | 5188 | Numerous cracks. Small portions broken out. 7.7 × 6.6 × 2.8. Inscr. 9 (O.) + 6 (R.) = 15 li. Two seal impr. on Lo. E., one on U. E., and one on L. E. Seal ring impr. on U. E.
102 | 56 | 5 | 8 | 21 | 5321 | Slightly cracked; otherwise well preserved. 6.1 × 7.6 × 2.7. Inscr. 12 (O.) + 1 (Lo. E.) + 10 (R.) = 23 li. Seal impr. on U. E, Lo. E., R. and two on L. E. Seal ring impr. on Lo. E., U. E. and R.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEXT.</th>
<th>PLATE.</th>
<th>YEAR.</th>
<th>MONTH.</th>
<th>DAY.</th>
<th>C.R.M.</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5285</td>
<td>In an excellent state of preservation. 4.75 × 5.95 × 2. Inscr. 9 (O.)+ 8 (R.) = 17 li. Seal ring impr. on L. E. U-shaped mark in black color on R.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5372</td>
<td>In an excellent state of preservation. 5.36 × 6.58 × 2.7. Inscr. 7 (O.)+ 5 (R.) = 12 li. Thumbmark on Lo. E. Incised Aramaic docket on O.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5287</td>
<td>U. R. corner wanting. 4.09 × 6 × 2.25. Inscr. 9 (O.)+ 2 (Lo. E.) + 3 (R.) = 14 li. Thumbmark and incised Aramaic docket on R.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Const. Ni. 607</td>
<td>Well preserved. 4.9 × 6.2 × 2.32. Inscr. 9 (O.)+ 2 (Lo. E.) + 2 (R.) = 13 li. Three thumbmarks on R. Incised Aramaic inscr. on R.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>(?)</td>
<td>5230</td>
<td>U. E. of R. considerably broken away. Numerous cracks. 7.84 × 10.85 × 3.3. Inscr. 8 (O.)+ 6 (R.) = 14 li. Two seal impr. on L. E., one on Lo. E. Seal ring impr. on Lo. E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5217</td>
<td>Numerous cracks; small portion broken out. 6.75 × 8.25 × 2.65. Inscr. 10 (O.)+ 7 (R.) = 17 li. Thumbmark on L. E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5450</td>
<td>Cracked. 4.65 × 5.2 × 2. Inscr. 7 (O.)+ 6 (R.) = 13 li.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5286</td>
<td>Numerous cracks; portions broken out. 5.1 × 6.64 × 2.55. Inscr. 9 (O.)+ 7 (R.) = 16 li.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5447</td>
<td>Cracked. Small portions broken out. 6.1 × 5.1 × 2.4. Inscr. 8 (O.)+ 2 (Lo. E.) + 9 (R.) = 19 li. Seal impr. on U. E. and R. E. Seal ring impr. on L. E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5220</td>
<td>Cracked. Portions broken out. 7.6 × 9.65 × 3.15. Inscr. 15 (O.)+ 6 (R.) = 21 li. Three seal impr. on U. E., the inscription of one of which, belonging to Erba-Bêl, s. of Bêl-ba-na, is broken away; two on L. E. and one on Lo. E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>(?)</td>
<td>5369</td>
<td>Lo. R. corner wanting. Numerous cracks. 6 × 7.83 × 2.8. Inscr. 11 (O.)+ 7 (R.) = 18 li. Two seal impr. on U. E., one on Lo. E., L. E. and R. Thumbmark on R.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5244</td>
<td>Cracked. Small portion of L. E. wanting. 4.95 × 6.3 × 2.4. Inscr. 10 (O.)+ 9 (R.) = 19 li. Two seal impr. on Lo. E. and one on U. E. Seal ring impr. on U. E. and L. E. The Rev. begins at the wrong end.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(?)</td>
<td>(?)</td>
<td>5504</td>
<td>Lo. half wanting. 4.8 × 5.3 (frag.) × 2.35. Inscr. 9 (O.)+ 7 (R.) = 16 li. Thumbmark on L. E. Incised Aramaic docket on Lo. E.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEXT</th>
<th>PLATE</th>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>MONTH</th>
<th>DAY</th>
<th>C. B. M.</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5185</td>
<td>Several cracks. Large portions broken out of O. and R. 6.25 × 8.4 × 2.9. Inscr. 11 (O.) + 1 (Lo. E.) + 10 (R.) = 22 li. Three seal impr. on U. E., two on Lo. E. and R. E. Seal ring impr. on Lo. E. and R.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5325</td>
<td>Fragment. Right half wanting. Several cracks. 11.3 × 10.5 (fr.) × 3.55. Inscr. 20 (O.) + 19 (R.) = 39 li. Two seal impr. on R. E., U. E. and one on R. Two seal ring impr. on R. E. and U. E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5291</td>
<td>Slightly chipped on R.; otherwise well preserved. 4.8 × 5.55 × 2.2. Inscr. 10 (O.) + 1 (Lo. E.) + 9 (R.) = 20 li. Thumbmark on L. E. Faint traces of an Aramaic docket in black color on U. E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5246</td>
<td>Cracked. 4.8 × 5.5 × 2.15. Inscr. 7 (O.) + 9 (R.) = 16 li. Thumbmark on L. E. Faint traces of an Aramaic docket in black color on O.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5290</td>
<td>In an excellent state of preservation. 3.95 × 4.9 × 1.9. Inscr. 6 (O.) + 8 (R.) = 14 li. Thumbmark on Lo. E. Incised Aramaic docket on O.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5365</td>
<td>Well preserved. 6.25 × 7.4 × 2.7. Inscr. 12 (O.) + 9 (R.) = 21 li. Two seal impr. on L. E., one on U. E. and Lo. E. Thumbmark on U. E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>5218</td>
<td>Lo. R. corner wanting. Cracked. 8.4 × 10.57 × 3.75. Inscr. 6 (O.) + 8 (R.) = 14 li. Seal impr. on L. E., U. E., O. and two on Lo. E. Seal ring impr. on L. E., U. E., Lo. E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5370</td>
<td>In an excellent state of preservation. 5.3 × 6.45 × 2.5. Inscr. 8 (O.) + 8 (R.) = 16 li. Seal impr. on R. E. and U. E. Seal ring impr. on L. E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5231</td>
<td>Cracked. Large portions broken out of O. 6.35 × 8 × 2.7. Inscr. 14 (O.) + 9 (R.) = 23 li. Two seal impr. on U. E., one on L. E. and Lo. E. Seal ring impr. on Lo. E. Three thumbmarks on R. Faint Aramaic docket in black color on R.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>5275</td>
<td>Well preserved. 6.65 × 8.15 × 2.88. Inscr. 10 (O.) + 6 (R.) = 16 li. Two seal impr. on U. E. and one on Lo. E. Seal ring impr. on L. E. and Lo. E. Incised Aramaic docket on R., in a portion of which black color is seen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>(?)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5276</td>
<td>Slightly effaced on R.; otherwise well preserved. 6.3 × 7.98 × 2.8. Inscr. 12 (O.) + 1 (Lo. E.) + 10 (R.) = 23 li. Seal impr. on L. E. and Lo. E. Three seal ring impr. on U. E. Thumbmark and faint traces of an Aramaic impr. on R.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
11. PHOTOGRAPH (HALF-TONE) REPRODUCTIONS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text.</th>
<th>Plate.</th>
<th>Year.</th>
<th>Month.</th>
<th>Day.</th>
<th>C. B. M.</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5449</td>
<td>O. of a tablet, with incised Aramaic endorsement. Cf. Pl. 44, No. 78.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text</td>
<td>Plate</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Month</td>
<td>Day</td>
<td>C. B. M.</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>5505</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lo. E. of a clay tablet, with fragmentary incised Aramaic endorsement, which contains the name of the god 4KUR-GAL.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>5417</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R. E. of a clay tablet, with a portion of an Aramaic endorsement, containing the name of the god 4KUR-GAL. Cf. Vol. IX: 68.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>VI</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Const. Ni. 607</td>
<td>R. of a clay tablet, with thumb-nail marks, and Aramaic endorsement, containing the name of the god 4KUR-GAL. Contents: A lease of sheep and goats. Cf. P1, 58, No. 106.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>VI</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5512</td>
<td>R. of a clay tablet, containing seal ring impr., and Aramaic endorsement. Contents: A lease of sheep and goats with an Aramaic endorsement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>VII</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5353</td>
<td>R. of a clay tablet, containing faint Aramaic inscription. Cf. P1, 34, No. 59. For the contents, etc., cf. Intro., p. 34.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(? )</td>
<td>(? )</td>
<td>5160</td>
<td>R. of a tablet, containing incised Aramaic &quot;docket.&quot; Cf. P1, 32, No. 56, also Intro., p. 7, note 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5502</td>
<td>O. of tablet with incised Aramaic &quot;docket.&quot; Cf. P1, 39, No. 68.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>IX</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>(?)</td>
<td>5236</td>
<td>L. E. of tablet (double natural size) with Aramaic endorsement, containing the name of the god Ninib. Cf. Intro., p. 8, also P1, 48, No. 87.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>IX</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5283</td>
<td>U. E. of tablet (double natural size) with incised Aramaic endorsement, containing the name of the god Ninib. Cf. Intro., p. 8, also P1, 17, No. 29.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>5284</td>
<td>R. of clay tablet with very faint Aramaic &quot;docket.&quot; Cf. P1, 32, No. 55, also Intro., p. 28f., for translation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5246</td>
<td>O. of tablet containing faint Aramaic inscr. in black fluid. Cf. P1, 65, No. 120.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5358</td>
<td>L. E. of a tablet containing a very faint Aramaic inscr., a copy of which is not given in the texts. Cf. P1, 34, No. 60.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BUSINESS DOCUMENTS, DARIUS II.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5358</td>
<td>R. E. of tablet with &quot;docket&quot; partially incised, and written with fluid. Cf. P1, 34, No. 60.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28, 29</td>
<td>XII</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5245</td>
<td>U. E. and L. E. of a tablet containing seal impr., the latter also contains thumb-nail marks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>XII</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5358</td>
<td>U. E. of tablet with seal impr. Cf. P1, X, No. 26, also P1, 34, No. 60.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>XII</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5359</td>
<td>L. E. of tablet containing seal impr. Cf. P1, 5, No. 7.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>XIII</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5501</td>
<td>U. E. of a tablet with seal impr. Cf. P1, 31, No. 54.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>XIII</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5361</td>
<td>L. E. of a tablet containing three thumb-nail marks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37, 39</td>
<td>XII</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5267</td>
<td>Possession of H. V. Hilprecht. U. E. and Lo. E. of clay tablet with seal impr. Cf. P1, 5, No. 7.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>XIII</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5790</td>
<td>U. E. of tablet with two seal impr. and a thumb-nail mark. Cf. P1, 6, No. 9.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>XIV</td>
<td>c. 600-300 B.C.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5790</td>
<td>Pottery jar, probably used for wine. The inside is covered with bitumen. There is a hole slightly above the centre, into which, doubtless, a plug or faucet was inserted. Bitumen is smeared about the hole for the purpose of making the jar watertight, after the faucet was inserted. There is a second hole at the same distance from the bottom to the left of the other. Length 32.5, circumference 43.6.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>XIV</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10183</td>
<td>Pottery jar, probably used for wine. Top is frag. Covered with bitumen on the inside. Length 34.5, circumference 34.25.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>XIV</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5761</td>
<td>Pottery wine jar. Inside is covered with bitumen. Length 33.25, circumference 40.5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>XV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Modern Babylonian water wheel, or nad'ura, at 'Anah. Photograph by Wolf Expedition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>XVI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A different view of a similar machine, taken by Haynes, one mile below Ḥillah on the Euphrates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEXT.</td>
<td>PLATE.</td>
<td>YEAR.</td>
<td>MONTH.</td>
<td>DAY.</td>
<td>C. B.M.</td>
<td>DESCRIPTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>XVII</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Bos indicus</em> (humped bull), (‘Zebu.” Cf. Hilprecht, <em>Assyriaca,</em> Tafel 1., also <em>alp.</em> Intro., p. 29. Used at the present time in machines for irrigation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LIST OF SIGNS

And their values.

Only the characters and variants, with their ideographic and phonetic values, found in the published tablets of the Marashkā archives, are given, cf. Introduction, p. 10. Subdivisions of the GUR and fractions have been omitted. All the ideograms for the gods are given under No. 6, and the cereals, having the determinative SIIK, under No. 179.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Sign</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>ash, rum, ant.</td>
<td>gal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>bal, pal.</td>
<td>an.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57.</td>
<td>rit, dup.</td>
<td>duppu, kanukku, tupāharru.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59.</td>
<td>tak, taq, šum.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63.</td>
<td>du, kin.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65.</td>
<td>ram.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66.</td>
<td>tum, ep.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67.</td>
<td>shim, rik.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68.</td>
<td>ziq.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69.</td>
<td>ši.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70.</td>
<td>ka.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74.</td>
<td>nāk.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76.</td>
<td>ush, šīṯ, nṣīṯ, mḏ.</td>
<td>zikaru, emidu.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77.</td>
<td>bi, kash.</td>
<td>šibkaru, šarranāhu.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cf. Id. 39.
Cf. Id. 122.
Cf. Id. 76.
Cf. Id. 194.
Cf. Id. 6.
Cf. Id. 191.
Cf. Id. 201.
Cf. Id. 201.
Cf. Id. 77.
Cf. Id. 253.
Cf. Id. 98.
Cf. Id. 89.
Cf. Id. 6.
Cf. Id. 201.
Cf. Id. 201.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Translation</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>man, nish.</td>
<td>Cf. Id. 6.</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>sharru.</td>
<td>Cf. Id. 6.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>ēšh, sin.</td>
<td>Cf. Id. 71.</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>kar.</td>
<td>Cf. Id. 71.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>lum.</td>
<td>Cf. Id. 71.</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>šēpu.</td>
<td>Cf. Id. 71.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>lam.</td>
<td>Cf. Id. 71.</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>kan, kam.</td>
<td>Cf. Id. 71.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td></td>
<td>Simūnu.</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>Su.</td>
<td>Simūnu.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td></td>
<td>Shēpu.</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>Sipparu.</td>
<td>Shēpu.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>uk.</td>
<td>Su.</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>Lēbu.</td>
<td>Su.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>ac.</td>
<td>Su.</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>šāk.</td>
<td>Su.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>kish, bis, qish.</td>
<td>Su.</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>šarru.</td>
<td>Su.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>mat, lat, lat.</td>
<td>Su.</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>šarru.</td>
<td>Su.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>shē.</td>
<td>Su.</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>šarru.</td>
<td>Su.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>bu, pu.</td>
<td>Su.</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>šarru.</td>
<td>Su.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>mush, par.</td>
<td>Su.</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>šarru.</td>
<td>Su.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>us, uq, uz.</td>
<td>Su.</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>šarru.</td>
<td>Su.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>li.</td>
<td>Cf. Id. 97.137.</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>šarru.</td>
<td>Cf. Id. 97.137.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>tu.</td>
<td>Cf. Id. 201.</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>šarru.</td>
<td>Cf. Id. 201.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cf. Id. 6.</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>šarru.</td>
<td>Cf. Id. 6.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cf. Id. 179.</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>šarru.</td>
<td>Cf. Id. 179.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
- "Cf. Id." stands for "Compare to Id."
- "Su." is a placeholder for a word that is not fully visible.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Page Reference</th>
<th>Page Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>201</td>
<td>šatu</td>
<td>šatu</td>
<td>Cf. Id. 6</td>
<td>Cf. Id. 137:201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202</td>
<td>šatu</td>
<td>šatu</td>
<td>Cf. Id. 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203</td>
<td>šatu</td>
<td>šatu</td>
<td>Cf. Id. 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>204</td>
<td>šatu</td>
<td>šatu</td>
<td>Cf. Id. 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205</td>
<td>šatu</td>
<td>šatu</td>
<td>Cf. Id. 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>206</td>
<td>šatu</td>
<td>šatu</td>
<td>Cf. Id. 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207</td>
<td>šatu</td>
<td>šatu</td>
<td>Cf. Id. 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>208</td>
<td>šatu</td>
<td>šatu</td>
<td>Cf. Id. 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>209</td>
<td>šatu</td>
<td>šatu</td>
<td>Cf. Id. 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210</td>
<td>šatu</td>
<td>šatu</td>
<td>Cf. Id. 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>211</td>
<td>šatu</td>
<td>šatu</td>
<td>Cf. Id. 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>212</td>
<td>šatu</td>
<td>šatu</td>
<td>Cf. Id. 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>213</td>
<td>šatu</td>
<td>šatu</td>
<td>Cf. Id. 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>214</td>
<td>šatu</td>
<td>šatu</td>
<td>Cf. Id. 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>215</td>
<td>šatu</td>
<td>šatu</td>
<td>Cf. Id. 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>216</td>
<td>šatu</td>
<td>šatu</td>
<td>Cf. Id. 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>217</td>
<td>šatu</td>
<td>šatu</td>
<td>Cf. Id. 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>218</td>
<td>šatu</td>
<td>šatu</td>
<td>Cf. Id. 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>219</td>
<td>šatu</td>
<td>šatu</td>
<td>Cf. Id. 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>244.</td>
<td>tar, tar, qudi, qudi</td>
<td>Cf. Id.6.</td>
<td>shipatu, rushad.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>245.</td>
<td>tuk.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>246.</td>
<td>pub, qep, qup.</td>
<td></td>
<td>rikimmaru.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>247.</td>
<td>ur, lkh, lqi, bas, las, dash, das.</td>
<td></td>
<td>balbu. nedhu.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>248.</td>
<td>tu.</td>
<td></td>
<td>shiqlu.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>249.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>shumelbu. aplu. nu.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>251.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>252.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>253.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>sha, por.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>254.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>za, qa.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>255.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cf. Id. 238.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>256.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>257.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>id.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cf. Id. 6.
CUNEIFORM TEXTS.
0.

6

R.

10

16

20

rest erasure. Scribe began to write.

8

0.

6

R.

10

rest erasure. Scribe began to write.

inserted after was written.

omitted by scribe.
Continued

Pl. 7

R.

10

L. E.

Rest erasure.

O.

11

Year of accession did not have Xisan.

72

O.

5
Continued

18

14
Continued

* omission, mistake of scribe.

Lower horizontal wedges, erasure.

Oblique wedge erasure.

Erasure.
Continued

Pl. 15

25

O.

6

10

R.

16

26

O.

5

10

Lo. E.

R. 16

rest erasure

omitted by scribe.

Lower horizontal wedge, mistake of scribe.
Continued

27

Lo. E. 10
R.

16

28

0.
Continued

"Repeated on following line.

* Erasure.

* Erasure of thumbnail marks.

* Scribe failed to write name.

* Horizontal wedge, erasure.

* Erasure.

* Post erasure.

* Post erasure.
Continued
Continued

Pl. 21

0.

[Handwritten text and illustrations]
n.

Omit, mistake of scribe.

Ital. wedge, omitted.
Omit, mistake of scribe.
PL. 35

61

O. 

6

R.

10

Lo. E.

15

R. E.

20

\`rest erasure.

62

O. 

6

Lo. E.

10

R.

16

\*omitted by scribe.

\*Omit, mistake of scribe.
Continued
Omitted by scribe.

Erasure.

Written upon erasure.

Rest erasure.
Omit, mistake of scribe.
Continued

Pl. 44

78

79

Evasture.

rest mistake of scribe.
Lo. E.

R. E.

L. E.

U. E.

The writing by mistake reversed these names. Cf. seals in Lo. E., and 68: Lo. E.
omitted by scribe.

Erasure.

L. E.

U. E.

L. E.
88

0.

L. E.

6.

Lo. E.

10.

U. E.

R.

16.

Lo. E.

20.

89

O.

U. E.

5.

"The scribe erased a mistake, but failed to write..."

10.

"rest erasure."

R.

15.

Lo. E.
Characters above & intended for insertion here.
Pl. 56

O.

6

10

Lo. E.

R.

16

26

R.

L. E.

Erasur.

omitted by scribe.

L. E.

R.

...* Erasure.

L. E.

R.


103

O.

6

R. 10

16
Pl. 57

104

O.

Lo. E.

6

рест erasure

10

16

рест erasure.

R.
Characters above li. intended for insertion here

real, mistake of scribe.
PL. 1.

Reverse.

1

Lease of Sheep and Goats.
RELEASE ON ACCOUNT OF A CLAIR FOR DAMAGES ARISING FROM TRESPASS.
ONE YEAR'S LEASE OF FISH PONDS.
TABLETS WITH ARARAIC ENDORSEMENTS.

4. RECEIPT FOR THE KENT OF PIEF LANDS.
5. THREE YEARS' LEASE OF CERTAIN LANDS.
PL. V

TABLETS WITH INCISED ARARAIC ENDORSEMENTS.
SHEEP AND GOAT LEASES WITH INCISED ARAMAIC ENDORSEMENTS.
TABLETS WITH ENDOKSEMENTS IN ARARAIC.

No. 14 is written with black fluid.
Nos. 15 and 16 are incised.
TABLETS WITH INCISED ARAMAIC ENDORSEMENTS.

17. RECEIPT FOR THE RENT OF A HOUSE.

18. RECORD OF A DEBT.

19. PROMISSORY NOTE.
TABLETS WITH INCISED ARAMAIC ENDORSEMENTS, CONTAINING THE NAME OF THE GOD NINIB.
(ENLARGED.)
TABLETS WITH ENDORSEMENTS IN ARARAIC.
ONE YEAR'S LEASE OF SHEEP.
REVERSE CONTAINS ARAMAIC ENDORSEMENT
TABLETS WITH SEAL IMPRESSIONS AND THUMB-NAIL MARKS.
TABLETS WITH SEAL IMPRESSIONS AND THUMB-NAIL MARKS.
BABYLONIAN WINE JARS.
MODERN BABYLONIAN WATER WHEELS.
MODERN BABYLONIAN WATER WHEELS.
THE WATER BUFFALO AND ZEBU USED IN MODERN WORKS OF IRRIGATION.
CORRECTIONS AND ADDITIONS.

The following are offered in connection with the text of Vol. IX. The originals were examined only when the transliteration or translation seemed to suggest that the text was different from the tablet.

VOL. IX.

1:1. Instead of $h\text{SH}A\text{B}$ the tablet has $kré\text{â}$.
1:14. Instead of $\text{ZU}miqitu$ the tablet has $\text{imme}ru\text{miqitu}$.
7:17. Instead of $a\text{-DI-i}$ the tablet has $ak\.i\text{-i}$.
10:21. Instead of $i\text{-NA-epshu}$ the tablet has $i\text{-le-epshu}$.
12:8. Scribe omitted amebu before $kibri\text{-lú-e-ši}$.
16:6. Instead of $ni\text{-DU-qa}$ the tablet has $ni\text{-ish-qa}$.
18:13. Instead of reading $\text{Ish-DU-bu-}\text{HA-tu}$ read $\text{Ish-ta-bu-xa-na}$.  
20:9 end. Instead of reading $\text{EN-SHAM-}\text{DU}$ the tablet has $\text{EN-NUN-tum}$.
24:7. Read $\text{e-Zat}$; rest is mistake of scribe.

The fourth character is $shu$. Cf. l. 9 end and 29:19:30:8.
12. Instead of “Erasure,” note should read “Tablet injured.”
17 end. The tablet has the determin. $m$ before $ka\text{-q}ir$.
24. MESH omitted by scribe after $\text{MU-AN-NA}$.
17. $\text{MAN}$ omitted by scribe. It should read $\text{um-ma-na-nu}$.
17. Instead of $\text{um}\text{ER}$, tablet reads $\text{um-mar}\text{ba}$.
22. Omit $\text{GU}t$ between 200 and 50. Cf. l. 14. It is a mistake of the scribe.
3. Transpose $\text{sha}$ and the determin. $m$. It should read $\text{um}\text{š\text{-}ša}\text{-}\text{Nabu}\text{-}\text{ši}$.
24. Text is correct. Name is to be read Bêl\text{-}šum\text{-}lil\text{-}bûr.
48:U.E. Determin. $m$ omitted before $\text{Marâshu}$.
5: end. Tablet contains $\text{diu}\text{Ninib}a\text{-}\text{shu}\text{-}\text{šu}\text{-}\text{ig}\text{-}\text{bi}$.
18. The sign $\text{KIRRUD}$ has on the tablet an additional perpendicular wedge on the left side. Cf. Sign List.
20 beginning. $\text{tu}$ is omitted by the scribe. Read $\text{ul-tu}$.
1 end. $\text{tu}$ is correct. Cf. 65:11.
11. Fourth character is to be read $\text{li}$. Cf. li. 1, and 65:11.
8 end. The sign on the tablet is $\text{ba}\text{-}\text{šu}\text{-}\text{šu}\text{-}\text{šu}$, and not BAR-NUN. Cf.
7:6. $\text{bi}$ is omitted by scribe. Read $\text{in\text{-}du}\text{\text{-}lih}\text{-}\text{bi}\text{-}\text{šu}$.
1 end. $\text{be}$ is omitted by scribe.
8. $\text{h}$ omitted by copyist before $\text{₃\text{A}s}$, which is read $\text{₁₃\text{R}s}$, Vol. IX, p. 75.
6: Tablet contains $\text{sha}\text{-}\text{ša\text{-}šu}\text{-}\text{šu}$.
7. Instead of $\text{DI}2$ tablet has $\text{KAR}$. Read $\text{Bēl\text{-}entrée}$.
11 end. Tablet reads $\text{u\text{-}ša\text{-}ša\text{-}šu\text{-}šu}$.
16. Instead of $\text{GISH}$ read $\text{bar}\text{-}\text{hush-ta-ar-bar}$.  
106. Instead of $\text{AD}$ tablet has BIL. Cf. Sign List, 88, variant.
8: Tablet reads 1600 instead of 1500.
2: Instead of $a\text{-DI}2$ read $a\text{-kê-i}$. It is a mistake of the scribe.

VOL. X.

For a goodly number of the following corrections and additions I am indebted to Rev. W. J. Hinke, a member of the Babylonian Seminar.

P. 8, li. 19, read $\text{D}$ instead of $\text{?}$.
P. 14, li. 20, read $\text{KIRRUD}$ instead of $\text{KIRRUD}$.
CORRECTIONS AND ADDITIONS—CONTINUED

P. 19, li. 11, read ărāb instead of ărāba.
P. 24, note, li. 5, read 퍿
P. 24, note, li. 16, As suggested by the Editor, cf. Heb. ܒܪ and Aram. ܕܐ instead of ܒܐ.
P. 28, li. 21, read ܝ instead of ܓ.
Pp. 29 and 37, instead of [?] in ܐܝܡܝܝܠ read ܗ. I left it open as the Editor at first desired to read ܐܒ for ܐܝ, cf. p. 71.
P. 40, notes, li. 7, read ܓܠܢ instead of ܓܠܢ.
P. 58, read ܢ-ܐ-ܐ-ܐ.
Sign List, No. 252, read ܓܠܘ instead of ܓܠܘ.
P. 21, li. 9, scribe omitted ܐܠ before ܐ-ܫܠ-ܠ-ܠ.
P. 63, li. 1, omit ܓܠܘ (dittography by scribe).
P. 122, li. 9, omit ܐ (dittography by scribe).