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## PREFACE.

The texts published in this volume were copied during my sojourn in Philadelphia in 1907. They have since then been worked out at sundry hours, between the more immediately pressing work on other publications, especially my edition of the Arabic text of as-Subkī's kitāb mu'īd an-ni'am wa-mubīd an-niqam, as well as the routine work of teaching and lecturing in connection with my duties as Docent of Semitic Languages at the University of Uppsala. This together with unfortunate and hindering circumstances has caused a delay in publication, which I am the first one most keenly to regret. The volume was accepted by the Editor-in-Chief and the Committee on Publication, December 21, 1909, and went into the printers' hand early in January, after the means for printing it had again been generously provided.

The title of the volume may call for an explanation. As can he gathered from the general survey of the contents of these texts, the documents included are legal and commercial as well as purely administrative. While it was desirable to give the volume as short a title as possible and yet to denote the general characteristics of the documents, the term admznistrative was selected on the suggestion of the Editor-in-Chief, as that term would include the different departments of the temple administration, to which these documents refer.

In regard to the general plan as well as minor details of the volume, I naturally have followed the principles characteristic of the Series, of which it forms a part. In the matter of footnotes, however, I have aimed to place whatever I may have had to say or argue in the text proper, reserving the footnotes merely for references, except, of course, in the Chapters of Translations and Names.

As this is the first volume of texts from the time of the second dynasty of Ur, published in this Series, I have judged it desirable, if not altogether necessary, to include a list of cuneiform signs, characteristic of this volume and the period in question.

At present there is a great variety of systems, or rather lack of systems, employed in regard to the transcription of cuneiform signs, which makes it almost [vii]
impossible to ascertain frome it mere transcription, which particular sign on the cuneiform tablet is actually referred to. Hence I have also added the key to the system of trnnscription I have used, but for the time being only including signs or transcriptions of signs that actually occur in this volume.

The most pleasant task remains to avow my obligations to those, who in one way or another have promoted the creation of this volume. To Professor Hilprecht, the Editor-in-Chief of this Series, I am under great obligations for the confidence he showed me by entrusting the publication of these tablets into my hands, as well as for his still greater confidence in entrusting to me the publication of other texts, the copying, interpretation and translation of which would tax the working ability, scientific skill and experience of any Assyriologist to the very utmost. In every way he has also facilitated my work, and he has been kind enough to assist me in reading the proofs. In this way the volume has greatly been enriched by his knowledge and experience. Likewise I am under great obligations to Provost Harrison, whose wide-hearted scientific interest and generosity in a large measure brought about my coming to Philadelphia, and also made my prolonged sojourn here in 1907 possible. To Mrs. Harrison I am most grateful for her enthusiastic interest in this work. By her generosity my return to this city and my work herc this time was and is made possible. As a small token of my great esteem and devction I have taken the liberty to dedicate this volume to her. I also beg to express my high appreciation and my gratitude to Mr. Eckley Brinton Coxe, Jr., the Macenas of Philadelphia, who, generously as ever, has sustained the heavy cost of printing. To Dr. Radau 1 am indebted for many a valuable suggestion. I also wish to acknowledge my obligations to the authorities and officers of the University of Pennsylvania, of the University Museum and the University Library, who as courteously as effectively have facilitated my work. And last, and first, I beg to thank my many noble friends of this city, who by their kindness and hospitality have rnade their own Philadelphia a home city to me. As this has been a constant source of encouragement and support during weary toil, my friends have a large share in the creation of this volume. One and all, I beg graciously to accept my sincere appreciation and heartfelt gratitude.

David W. Myhrman.

> Philadelphia, February, 1910.
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## I.

## 'I'HE PLACE IN HISTORY OF THE SECOND DYNASTY OF UR.

The chronological material, so far advanced, does not enable us to determine the exact date of the second dynasty of Ur with absolute certainty. A review of the principal arguments on the subject and an attempt approximately to place this dynasty may, however, not be out of place in an introduction to a volume of texts from this period.

On account of the publication of new and startling chronological material, a great deal has been written on the subject of old Babylonian chronology during the last two or three years. The discussion so far has shown a marked tendency to cut down old figures. The late Babylonian king Nabûna'id still holds his ground as the central figure in Babylonian chronology, only that the pendulum has swung in the opposite direction. On the tide of his authority old Babylonian dates once soared to swindling heights; the recent undermining of his trustworthiness tends to make the very foundations swerve. The high-water mark was reached by placing Sargon I at 3800 B.C. Eduard Meyer has reached the low-water mark by placing him 2500 B.C. ${ }^{1}$ The one extreme was to take the round numbers of Nabâna'id's scribes in regard to earlier and later dates as definite numbers; the other extreme is now to round them off, so to speak, altogether. The truth, no doubt, will be found somewhere between.

Leaving the dates of Sargon I and Narâm-Sin, which stand rather isolated, there has been no lack of material in regard to Babylonian chronology from the beginning of the so-called first dynasty of Babylon down. But the difficulties, as well known, have been and are still in regard to the interpretation of the material at hand. At what widely different conclusions scholars have arrived from the study of the same material, can be gathered from the different dates assigned to the prominent figure of Hammurabi, as surveyed by King in his latest important book. ${ }^{2}$

[^0]Thus we note a difference as to the dates of that king between Winckler and Hommel of not less than 600 years, and between Hommel and Lehmann-Haupt of 500 years. Yet the calculations were made in the same year, 1898. To be sure, discrepancies are to be found in the statements of the Babylonian and Assyrian docunients themselves, which tend to show, that the old Babylonian and Assyrian scribes, in their mode of interpretation and handling of the chronological material at their disposal, as well as in reaching different conclusions from it, almost vie with modern scholars.

The chief impulse to the recent activity in chronological research came from the publications by Hilprecht' and King, ${ }^{2}$ which showed, as others long ago had assumed, ${ }^{3}$ that Babylonian dynasties overlapped each other. The consequences of this discovery affect the old Babylonian chronology in general, but especially and in the first place the date of the first dynasty of Babylon. On the more or less definite determination of the date of this dynasty depend almost exclusively the earlier Babylonian dynasties, and among them the second dynasty of Ur, which is the oldest dynasty of Babylonia that at present can be approximately placed, as its relation to the following or Isin dynasty is now exactly known by the new chronological tablet, published by Prof. Hilprecht, ${ }^{4}$ while the relation of this dynasty to the first dynasty of Babylon, on the other hand, can be very approximately determined.

On the ground of the new chronological material recently published by King, this scholar has placed the beginning of the first dynasty of Babylon at about 2100 B.C. ${ }^{5}$ Eduard Meyer has not only accepted the conclusions of King in full, but he seems to place even more reliance on doubtful or disputed details. ${ }^{\text {b }}$

In regard to the second dynasty of Ur, King incidentally places the beginning of it at about 2320 or 2330 B.C. ${ }^{7}$; Meyer places the whole dynasty 2304-2188 B.C. ${ }^{8}$

Taking the conclusions drawn by King as a starting point, we note that his new construction of old Babylonian chronology principally rests on three stepping stones:
(1) The end of the third or Kassite dynasty;
(2) The immediate succession of the third dynasty on the first, with the total elimination of the second dynasty, the dynasty of the Sea-land, and
${ }^{1}$ B. E., XX ${ }^{\text {t }}$, No. 47; also pp. 41 ff . and 46.
${ }^{2}$ Chronicles, I, pp. 70, 93, 97, 147ff.; II, p. 15ff.
${ }^{3}$ See Hilprecht, B. E., XX ${ }^{1}$, p. 43.
${ }^{4} B . E ., \mathrm{XX}^{1}$, No. 47; also p. 46.
${ }^{5}$ Chronicles, I, pp. 126, 136, 137.
${ }^{6}$ See Geschichte des Alt. ${ }^{2}$, $\mathrm{I}^{2}$, p. 341.
${ }^{\mathbf{T}}$ Chronicles, I, p. $168 . \quad{ }^{\mathbf{s}}$ Geschichte des Alt. ${ }^{2}, \mathrm{I}^{2}$, p. 344.
(3) The end of the dynasty of Isin.

Now, as for the end of the third or Kassite dynasty, King has placed this event 1160 R.C., but, as he also remarks, the exact date cannot be definitely established.' Meyer, on the other hand, places it as high as 1185 , ${ }^{2}$ while Thureau-Dangin gives the date $1186,{ }^{3}$ not to speak of other most divergent dates advanced. ${ }^{4}$ Hilprecht ${ }^{5}$ and Hinke, ${ }^{\text {e }}$ however, have shown that, especially on account of the statement on the new boundary stone in regard to Nebuchadrezzar I, the end of the third dynasty is to be placed as low as about 1140 R.C.

The total elimination of the second dynasty, as far as the sequence of the first and third dynasties is concerned, and the assumption that the third dynasty followed immediately on the first, are, of course, questions of more important and far-reaching consequences in regard to the construction of earlier Babylonian chronology. King took the radical step to eliminate the second dynasty altogether. He did that in spite of the fact that Ea-gâmil, the last king of the second dynasty, according to the new chronological material he produced, is found to be a contemporary of $K a s ̌-$ tiliašs, ${ }^{7}$ the Kassite. Rather than taking the most probable course ${ }^{8}$ of identifying this Kaštiliaš with the third king of the Kassite dynasty, he resorts to the extreme means of creating an entirely new set of later kings, to be placed in the gap of the Kings' list. ${ }^{9}$

The chief reason for the elimination of the second dynasty, and an argument on which King lays a great deal of stress, is the absence so far of any positive statement that the kings of the second dynasty actually ruled over Babylon itself. Indeed he considers this, of course, quite negative proof of such importance, that the more positive arguments in favor of the identification of Kaštiliaš, the contemporary of Ea-gâmil, with the third king of the Kassite dynasty have to be set aside, ${ }^{10}$ and in this he is also supported by Meyer. ${ }^{11}$

Now it is true that thus far we do not have any positive statement in the inscrip-

[^1]tions and dated documents that any of the kings of the second dynasty actually ruled over Babylon, but, as a matter of fact, we know very little about these kings in any respect. It is a question, on which further excavations and new material no doubt will supply more definite information. As long as we have no positive proof to the contrary, the mere absence of a definite statement cannot, of course, constitute a proof that none of these kings controlled Babylon. On the other hand, as has been pointed out before, ${ }^{1}$ the very presence of this dynasty in a list, otherwise including only such dynasties as we know actually controlled Babylon, would be difficult to explain, if not at any time some one of these kings ruled in Babylon. But, of course, this does neither prove nor disprove the supposition that Babylon for a time at least was included in the domain of the second dynasty.

But I am inclined to think that too much importance has been placed on the question, whether this dynasty ruled in Babylon or not. In itself it does not solve the problem of the relation between the first and third dynasty. King ${ }^{2}$ and Meyer ${ }^{3}$ assume that the third dynasty followed immediately on the first. But in this respect they seem not only to have underestimated the Hittite invasion and conquest of Babylon, ${ }^{4}$ but have gone so far as practically to eliminate its consequence on the chronology altogether. It is most difficult to see, how an event of such importance really can be so lightly disposed of historically.

The conquest of Babylon, with the position this city had obtained in Babylonia during the first dynasty, as well as the overthrow of this dynasty, would naturally be an event of great consequence. It is therefore difficult to see, how the Hittites, according to the natural order of things, could have been content only to make such a conquest, and then immediately leave another people, the Kassites, to reap the advantages of the whole conquest, unless, (what has not been shown), the Hittites and the Kassites are identical. A people like the Hittites, being able to conquer Babylon and overthrow the ruling dynasty, would also be able to keep the conquered territory in their hands, at least for some time. The Hittites. moreover, were no marauding tribes that would only be content with plunder.: A Hittite conquest and the overthrow of the native dynasty would naturally have as a consequence the establishment of Hittite rule. Hence some time must have elapsed between the end of the first dynasty and the beginning of the rule of the third over Babylon.

On account of the facts, set forth by Prof. Hilprecht, B. E., XX ${ }^{1}$, pp. 44, 45,

[^2]and Hinke, B. E., Series D, pp. 130ff., viz., that (Agum-)Kakrime "probably was the first emperor of Babylonia," among the members of the Kassite dynasty, we possibly may have to bring down the dates, previous to the Kassite dynasty, some decades.

The only positive chronological data, so far known, by which we can be guided in an attempt to calculate the length of the apparent gap between the first and third dynasty, are the facts known in regard to the second dynasty itself. It has never been questioned that the Iluma-ilu, who according to the new chronicle was a contemporary of Samsu-iluna and Abi-esu, is to be identified with the first king of the second dynasty. ${ }^{1}$ Thus the beginning of this dynasty and the very approximate length of time it was contemporaneous with the first dynasty can be determined. But, on the authority of the same material, the end of the second dynasty and the length of time it was contemporaneous with the third dynasty can also he fixed.

The identification of Kaštiliaš, the contemporary of Ea-gâmil, last king of the second dynasty, ${ }^{2}$ with the third king of the third dynasty is certain, as far as the material now at hand shows, unless we, like King, and more recently Hommel, ${ }^{3}$ postulate an entirely new set of kings, that would answer the conditions required. That Kaštiliaš, the third king of the third dynasty, answers the statement of the new chronicle, or that he was the son of Agum, not the father, as the kings' list erroneously has it, is now established without a doubt by the emendation of $\mathrm{V} R$., 33, col. I, according to King's collations published by Hommel. ${ }^{4}$

The passage relating to this special point runs as follows:

```
17 mārr}\mp@subsup{r}{}{5}Ka⿱̆š-ti\mp@subsup{l}{}{6}-ia-šu
18 aplu reš-tu
19 šáa A-qu-um ra-bi-i
20 zērum el-lum zèr šarrüti(-ti)
21 ta-mi-ih sir-ri-ti
2 2 m a ̈ r ~ G a ́ n - d i
```

The order of the three first kings of the third dynasty would thus be:

[^3](1) Gandi or Gandaš,
(2) Agum the great or first,
(3) Kaštiliaš, his firstborn son.

Thus if we can within a few years ${ }^{1}$ determine to what extent the second dynasty overlapped the first and the third, the balance of the sum total of the years attributed to the second dynasty would, of course, denote the time that elapsed between the end of the first and beginning of the third dynasty. For this calculation, however, we depend entirely on the figures given by the kings' list. The chief objection to this procedure has been the fact that these figures are unusually high. Still they are not impossible. Of eleven kings four ruled $60,56,55$ and 50 years respectively, but others only $8, \mathbf{1 5}$ and 20. That mistakes occur in the list is seen from the fact that that to Hammurabi are assigned 55 years, while according to the date lists he only ruled 43. But mistakes of reduction are also found. as Ammi-ditana is given only 25 years in the kings' list, while he actually ruled 37; Abi-ešu' 25 instead of 28, and Samsu-iluna 35 instead of $38 .{ }^{2}$ If subtraction has to be made from the sum total of these years, it would only be a question of a few decades. As long as we have no positive proof to the contrary, the safest course is to be guided by the figures given. As Thureau-Dangin ${ }^{3}$ has calculated, we would have a period of about 177 years to be accounted for between the first and third dynasty.

As €or the fall of Isin and the overthrow of the Isin dynasty, King was inclined to join those two events and to identify them with the conquest of Isin in the 7th year of Hammurabi, rather than with the same event recorded as taking place in the seventeenth year of Sin-muballit. ${ }^{4}$ Whether the eonquest of the city of Isin in any of those years mentioned also marked the end of the Isin dynasty or not has not yet been definitely proven. The dynasty might have been overthrown at some earlier unknown conquest. These are two events that will have to be distinguished and kept separate. But that the conquest of Isin in the seventh year of Hammurabi did not in any case, as was quite obvious for other reasons, refer to the conquest of Isin by Rîm-Sin is absolutely certain from the date formula for that year:

$$
\text { ти Unu }(g)^{k i} \grave{u} I \tilde{I}-s i-i n^{k i} b a-a n-d i b,{ }^{\bar{s}}
$$

which shows that Hammurabi took the city. We know for certain that Isin also was taken before that time by Sin-muballit in his seventeenth year. ${ }^{\circ}$

[^4]In what relation his conquest of the city really stands to the well-known conquest of ISin by Rim-Sin, and which must have occurred about the same time, is another question to consider.' The conquest of Isin and the overthrow- of its venerable dynasty, however, must have been an event of great consequence; and as for Rim-Sin, it was the occasion for instituting a new era. Whether the dynasty of Isin actually went down with the city in the seventeenth year of Sin-muballit we do not know, but it is the very latest date, at which we can place the end of this dynasty.

Thus by starting as low as possible, or placing the end of the third or Kassite dynasty as late as 1140 , adding 577 years, the length of the third dynasty, 177 years to be accounted for between the third and first dynasty, 201 years up to the seventeenth year of Sin-muballit, $225 \frac{1}{2}$ years for the dynasty of Isin, and 117 years for the second dynasty of Ur, ${ }^{2}$ we would have to place the beginning of the last mentioned dynasty about, 2408 B.C.

This calculation would place the beginning of the first dynasty about 2147 B.C., the reign of Hammurabi about 2045-2003. LIammurabi would then very well come within the round number of 700 years which, according to the scribes of Nabûna'id, separated him from Burnaburiaš, whom even Meyer places about 1380-1375. ${ }^{3}$ Gulkišar would come within 696 years before Nebukadrezzar $I,{ }^{4}$ as he would at least have ruled down to 1780 , which also is the date assigned to him by Meyer. ${ }^{5}$

These dates suggested can also be reconciled with the more trustworthy new chronological material brought to light by the German excavations in Assyria. ${ }^{\circ}$ Salmaneser I states that he rebuilt the temple of $A$ šsur, which had once been built by Ušpia. It had fallen into decay, and Erešu rebuilt it,. One hundred and fiftynine years passed after the reign of Erešu and it fell into decay, and $\check{S}^{2} a \check{s} i-A d a d$ rebuilt it. During 580 years it grew old, fire broke out, and after that $\dot{S}$ almaneser $I$ restored it. According to figures given, Erešu would have to be placed within 739 years of S̈almaneser I, who, according to Meyer, ${ }^{2}$ ruled about 1300 B.C. The father of Erešu was Ilu-šuma, who, according to the new chronological material published by King, ${ }^{8}$ was a contemporary of $S u-a b u$, probably identical with Sumu-abu, the first

[^5]king of the first dynasty. Hence the first dynasty of Babylon would have begun about 2040, the reign of Erešu and Ilu-šuma, and also perhaps a part of the reign of Sumu-abu. But in addition to this we will also have to make allowance for the years the temple was fallen into decay. How long Erešu and his father ruled we do not yet know, but the number of years these kings ruled and the years of the decay of the temple, and the uncertainties of other chronological figures used as a basis, may possibly make up for the discrepancy of about 100 years.

The approximate dates, as far as the chronological material at hand allows us to determine, for the kings of the second dynasty of Ur would be as follows:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Ur-Engur. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 2408-2390 R.C. } \\
& \text { Dungi...................................................... 2390-2332 B.C. } \\
& \text { Bur-Sin....................................................... 2332-2323 B.C. } \\
& \text { Gimil-Sin................................................. 2323-2316 B.C. } \\
& \text { Ibi-Sin.......................................................2316-2291 B.C. }
\end{aligned}
$$

11. 

## TIIE TABLETS.

The clay tablets, inscribed with old Babylonian cuneiform characters, and written in the Sumerian language, now published for the first time in this volume, belong to the large and in many respects unrivalled collection of cuneiform tablets in The Free Museum of Science and Art of the University of Pennsylvania in Philadelphia. With two exceptions only, Nos. 132 and 155, they were excavated in the ruins of Nippur, in central Babylonia, during the first three expeditions of the University of Pennsylvania, vix., 1888-89, 1889-90 and 1893-96 respectively.' The documents published in this volume, however, constitute only a part of the tablets from this period, preserved in the Philadelphia Museum. Documents of the same character, from the same period and in part even found in the same mounds, were also excavated during the fourth expedition to Nippur. ${ }^{2}$ These tablets will be included in volumes to follow.

As could be gathered from the careful description of the tablets in The Catalogue of the Babylonian and General Semitic Section of the Museum, prepared by the Curator, Prof. H. V. Hilprecht, the larger part or 136 of the tablets, here published, were dug up during the second expedition to Nippur (1889-90). From the first expedition (1888-89) came only 8 tablets, Nos. $1,5,13,66,84,91,151$ and 170 ; while from the third expedition thus far we have 25 tablets, namely, Nos. $3,4,8,11,12,14,15,16$, $19,29,30,36,40,41,42,46,55,70,86,95,116,125,133$ and 135 . Two tablets were purchased in Nippur: No. 132 by Dr. Haynes during the third expedition and said to come from Yokha or Telloh; No. 155 by Dr. Peters from Mr. Noorian, the interpreter of the first two expeditions, during the second campaign. Worthy of notice is the fact, that most of the more interesting tablets in this volume, or the so-called ' 'contracts," were unearthed during the first and third expeditions."

[^6]As the Nippur tablets, here treated, vary in contents, it would be of great interest to know the exact places of discovery in the many elevations and depressions of certain parts of the ruins of Nippur, and to ascertain, in what environments and under what general conditions they were found. Thus it would be interesting to learn, whether the so-called "contract" tablets were found in the same places as the tablets containing various accounts, and whether these two kinds of tablets were found apart from or intermingled with each other. But unfortunately, no Assyriologist being present during the second and third expeditions, no records of this kind could be kept by Dr. Peters and Dr. Baynes, who, moreover, at times worked at Nippur under very trying circumstances.

From the Catalogue of the Philadelphia Museum, which also states the different expeditions during which the tablets were found, from the descriptions of the excavations by Peters ${ }^{1}$ and Hilprecht, ${ }^{2}$ as well as from the large raised map of the ruins of Nippur ${ }^{3}$ in the University Museum, where by cuts or different colors the work of the four expeditions is designated, and also from personal information kindly furnished by Prof. Hilprecht, some facts at least can be gathered in regard to the mounds, where these tablets were dug up.

During the first campaign most of the tablets unearthed in Nippur, according to Peters," came from the so-called "Tablet Hill," the site of the earlier "Temple Library," the hill at present marked IV on the Museum map and Hilprecht's reproduction of it, ${ }^{\text {b }}$ but V on the same plan given by Peters. ${ }^{\circ}$ This is the most southeast mound of the ruins of Nippur on the east side of the $\dot{S} a t t$ en-Nil.

According to information from Prof. Hilprecht, no dated administrative documents from the second dynasty of Ur came from this section of the ruins during the first campaign, when he was at Nippur personally. The eight tablets then found came exclusively from the long trench cut in the southern slope of the long ridge on the west side of the $\breve{S} a t t$ en-Nil, opposite "Tablet Hill."

While the few tablets of the second dynasty of Ur, discovered in a trial trench by the first expedition, evidently were found out of place in the general layer of that period, the second expedition reached the very rooms, in which they once had been
${ }^{1}$ Nippur.
${ }^{2}$ B. E., Series D, I, pp. 259-568.
${ }^{3}$ Made by Charles Muret, Paris, under the direction of Percy Hastings Field, architect.
${ }^{4}$ Nippur, I, p. 247.
${ }^{5}$ B. E., Series D, I, p. 305.
${ }^{6}$ Nippur, Vol. I, pp. 242, 243.
${ }^{7}$ Cf. Peters, Nippur, Vol. II, the plan facing p. 194, and Hilprecht, B. E. Series D, I, p. 305. In Peters' map the mound is called $X$; on Hilprecht's No. VI.
stored, at a point marked E on the plan given by Peters;; for, according to Hilprecht's deciphering of the tablets, reported by Peters to have come from a certain level of that section of the ruins, they were dated according to kings of the second dynasty of Ur and according to events characteristic of their reigns. ${ }^{2}$

During the third campaign Haynes also excavated thousands of tablets in the same mound, VI (IX), on the west side of $\check{S} a t t ~ e n-N i l,{ }^{3}$ and among them again were numerous tablets of the second dynasty of Ur. ${ }^{4}$ According to Hilprecht, the mound IV (V) or "Tablet Hill" was seemingly not touched at all, or only very slightly ${ }^{8}$ by Haynes during the third campaign. To judge from the colors on the map of the ruins, provided by Mr. C. S. Fisher to indicate the work of the different campaigns, some kind of excavations were indeed made in this mound during the third expedition, but evidently without yielding any of the documents included in this volume.

As to size, shape, make-up and paleographic 4L character, these tablets share the peculiarities of similar documents from this period already published. The comparative absence, however, of large many-columned account tablets, ${ }^{7}$ which occur in the Telloh collections frequently, ${ }^{8}$ and also of round-shaped field accounts, ${ }^{9}$ is to be noted.

As to their state of preservation, many of these tablets show evidence of having been roughly handled by the vicissitudes that befell the ancient city with its temple library and archives. In this respect the Telloh tablets, to judge from the published texts, seem to have fared better. All the Nippur tablets with but one exception are baked, but, like many similar Telloh tablets, there is a certain number made from a kind of clay that now is crumbling.

Most of the smaller tablets, which no doubt originally were enclosed in cases or envelopes, have seal impressions. A certain small group of tablets made of the same kind of clay, similarly shaped and inscribed but not ruled, is covered with seal impressions that mar the writing and make the decipherment a very difficult task. These tablets had apparently never been enclosed in envelopes. As a rule the seal impressions on the tablets of this volume are very faint and indistinct,
${ }^{1}$ Nippur, Vol. II, facing p. 172.
${ }^{2}$ B. E., Scries D, p. 343.
${ }^{3}$ Cf. B. E., Series D, I, pp. 353, 364.
${ }^{4}$ Ibid., p. 408.
${ }^{5}$ Ibid., p. 431.
${ }^{8}$ Cf. Th. S.-C. P. H. C., p. 287.
${ }^{7}$ According to Hilprecht there are a number of large fragments of this class known to him among the uncatalogued material
${ }^{8}$ See especially the $T . T$. and $H . L$. G. editions.
${ }^{9}$ See especially C. T., I.
so that it is almost impossible to trace them satisfactorily. In such cases I have not undertaken to restore the seals, although this, of course, can easily be done from the names on the tablet. A few impressions, however, are clear and distinct, and these are reproduced. The seals represent the picture characteristic of the second dynasty of Ur. The moon god is sitting on his throne. A worshipper is led into his presence by a priest and is followed by another. In accordance with the contents and character of the tablets, most of the seals are dub-sar seals. ${ }^{1}$ One document has the seal of a patesi, ${ }^{2}$ while another ${ }^{3}$ has the seal of a judge.

As the title of the volume indicates, all these tablets were made and inscribed during the reigns of the kings of the second dynasty of Ur, or during the second half of the third millennium R.C. About half of the number are duly dated, and may thus be assigned to this period without the slightest hesitation, while the undated documents have to be classified principally on the basis of their paleographical characteristics, their proper names and contents. The sifting and cataloguing of the immense mass of material in the Museum is exclusively done by Prof. Hilprecht. With his unrivalled experience and skill in deciphering original cuneiform script, older and later, he also classified, catalogued and assigned to the proper historical period the tablets here published. After a careful examination and study of every tablet, I have no occasion to differ from his in this respect almost unerring judgment.
${ }^{1}$ See No. 32. Cf. also the seals reproduced by Pinches in the Amherst volume.
${ }^{2}$ See No. 13.
${ }^{3}$ See No. 14.

## III.

## SIMILAR TABLETS.

In regard to their contents, these tablets will have to be classed together with other collections of tablets from the same period already published by others. But while they contain, of course, material of a character similar to that of the texts published before, they also, as will be found, furnish a good deal of new information of special interest for the time, to which they belong.

The first tablets of a similar character from this period of Babylonian history were published by Prof. Rilprecht. As early as 1893-96he published the first ordinary clay tablets of the second dynasty of Ur, together with other older Babylonian inscriptions, in "B. E.," Vol. I, Parts 1-2. Cf. Nos. 124-127 and such other inscriptions from the Ur period as Part 1 (1893), Nos. 14 (a basalt tablet), 15 (an agate tablet), 16 (a soapstone tablet), 20, 21 (door-sockets), and 22 (a brick), and Nos. 121 (a door-socket) and 122, 123 (soapstone tablets).

Publications of texts and also transcriptions, translations and treatments of sundry documents from this period were made in different journals and published works, as in Recueil de Travaux, etc., by Halévy, Vol. XI (1889), pp. 171ff.; by Scheil, Vol. XVII (1895), pp. 27ff., Vol. XVIII (1896), pp. 64ff., and also scattered through his ' 'Notesd'épigraphie et d'archéologie Assyrienne" in the same journal, Vols. XVIIXXII; in Rerue d'Assyriologie, etc., by Thureau-Dangin, Vol. III (1895), pp. 118ff., and Vol. V. (1902), pp. 67 ff. ; in Revre Semitique, by Virolleaud, Vol. XI (1893-1902), pp. 76 ff . arid 180ff.; in Zeitschrift fur Assyriologie by Scheil, Vol. XII (1897), pp. 260ff., and Delaporte, Vol. XVIII (1904-05), pp. 252ff. ;in Comptes rendus by ThureauDangin (1896); in Orientalistische Litteraturzeitung by the same author, Vol. I, pp. 161ff.; in Keilinschriftliche Bibliothek by Winckler, Vol. III, p. 76 (1902).

The most recent contributions to the literature from the Ur period, and which have come into my hands only while reading the proofs, are by Delaporte, Empreintes de Cachets de la Collection Amherst, pp. 101-104; Genouillac, Tablettes d'Ur, pp. 137-141; and Huber, Die Altbabylonischen Dahrlehnstexte aus der Nippur-Xamm-
lung im K. O. Museum in Konstantinopel, pp. 189-222, all included in the magnificent Hilprecht Anniversary Volume (1909) just issued.

Complete collections of documents of the same special character as the tablets published in this volume began to be published in 1896. Thus we have to note the small collection published by W. R. Arnold in his dissertation for the doctorate at the Columbia University Ancient Babylonian Temple Records in the Columbia University Library, New York, 1896.

In the same year the British Museum commenced the publication of its Cuneiform T'exts from Babylonian Tablets in the British Museum, of which Vols. I, III, V, VII, IX and X, copied by King, contain documents from the Ur period. Unfortunately, on account of the fact that at first the material submitted was not arranged or numbered, these otherwise excellently edited volumes are most difficult to handle. Hence it is most gratifying to note that this quite formal defect has been remedied in later volumes, and especially in the latest, or XXVI, where not only the texts, but also an extensive introduction, accompanied by translations and notes, as well as by beautifully made photographic reproductions, are presented. A study of these texts has recently been made by Deimel, Zeitschrift für Assyriologie, Vol. XXII, pp. 17 ff .

As an appendix to his Early Babylonian History, Radau published The E. A. Hoffman Collection of Babylonian Clay Tablets in the General Theological Seminary, New York City, New York, 1900, which for the greater part belong to the period of the second dynasty of Ur.

Reisner published a large and well-edited collection of tablets of this character and period from the Königliche Museen, Berlin, in his Tempelurkunden aus Telloh (Mitteilungen aus den Orientalischen Xammlunyen, Heft XVI), Berlin, 1901.

Thureau-Dangin published a collection of old Babylonian tablets from the Louvre, Paris, and the Imperial Ottoman Museum, Constantinople, in Recueil de Tablettes Chaldéennes, Paris, 1903. Of these tablets (a large number of which he had published before in Revue d'Assyriologie) a part of the 4th, the 5th and 6th series date from the Ur period.

Virolleaud edited a small volume of Ur texts, principally documents, of which the texts had been published before, but which he now transliterated and translated under the title Comptabilité Chaldéenne, Parts I and II, Poitiers, 1903, and in the same year another small volume of similar texts, likewise published before by Scheil and Thureau-Dangin, entitled Di-tilla, textes juridiques chalddennes, Poitiers, 1903.

In 1905(?)-no date is to be found in the volume itself-Prof. Barton published the first part of his Haverford Library Collection of Cuneiform Tablets, being
tablets from the Ur period, said to have been dug up at Telloh. To judge from the copies the Haverford Library possesses a collection of unusually large, carefully inscribed and well preserved tablets. Most unfortunately, however, this volume has been subjected to very severe criticism on account of the many mistakes in the copies as well as hasty and erroneous interpretations.

A more careful and reliable edition of Bahylonian tablets, bought from dealers and presented to American institutions, is the collection of Ur tablets published by Lau in his Old Babylonian Temple Records, New York, 1906. The tablets published in that volume belong to the Columbia University. The collection was bought in 1896 from Noorian, formerly interpreter with the Babylonian expeditions of the University of Pennsylvania. The tablets are represented as coming from Telloh, but it is quite certain that at least some of them have come from Nippur.

Pinches published a beautifully made-up volume entitled The Amherst Tablets, London, 1908, "being an account of the Babylonian inscriptions in the collection of the Right Hon. Lord Amherst of Hackney, F.S.A., at Didlington Hall, Norfolk." Among the tablets published in this volume more than a hundred are Ur tablets.

Pélagaud published in transliteration and translation, with an introduction, notes, indexes and in part the cuneiform texts, a revised edition of texts previously published and translated by Scheil, Thureau-Dangin and Virolleaud, in his Sá-tilla, trxtes juridiques, etc., Babyloniaca, Tome 111, 2, Paris, 1909.

Lastly, Barton has published a second part of his Haverford Library Collection of Cuneiform Tablets, Part II, Philadelphia (1909). This volume contains ninetyfour tablets, all of which are from the second dynasty of Ur, and said to have come from Telloh. This second volume is done with more care than the first. Barton has also given a list of corrections in regard to his first volume. The list is not complete, however.

It is a cause of regret that I have not been able to get access to the volume of old Babylonian tablets preserved in the Eremitage, St. Petersburg, in order to ascertain whether it contains any tablets from this period.

## IV.

## THE SUBJECT MATTER.

As to the content or subject matter of the tablets, published in this volume, the comparatively large number of so-called "contract" tablets is to be especially noted. Tablets of this character from the second dynasty of Ur have so far been rather rare. Though about 1,500 tablets have already been published or described in catalogues, there are only about a score of "contracts" among them.'

The Hoffman collection, containing about 165 tablets from this period and partly described and partly published by Radau, ${ }^{2}$ has not a single contract. Among the 267 tablets published by the British Museum there is none, in spite of the term "contracts" in the preface to Parts I, III, V, VII. Nor is there a single "contract" among the 211 tablets published by Barton. ${ }^{3}$ Neither is there any one among the 254 tablets described or published by Lau, nor among the 120 Amherst tablets. Among Reisner's 310 numbers there is a single "contract," No. 51, probably a sale of sheep. Broken as it is, the true character of the document escaped even the otherwise so keen and observant eye of Reisner. The collection published by Thureau-Dangin, however, have among its 171 tablets from this period eight ' 'contracts." With these few exceptions all these tahlets are account, and receipts of various kinds. ${ }^{\text {. }}$

The fact that among the tablets, excavated by the Philadelphia expeditions, there is a coniparatively large number of these rare documents from the second dynasty of Ur will again tend to accentuate the interesting and valuable character of the Nippur collections.

[^7]Among the 171 numbers published in this volume about thirty are "contract" tablets. Some of them, however, are fragmentary and their specific character cannot be determined definitely. The balance are accounts of various kinds. The term "contract" I understand to mean a document recording a legal or business transaction, or some agreement between differentparties, in regard to which a document is legally drawn up, signed and attested.

Into the collection here published has also strayed a very fragmentary tablet, No. 154, which is of special interest, as it is a fragment of a literary tablet ${ }^{〔}$ dating from this early period.

## fragment of a Literary Tablet. ${ }^{2}$



As easily seen, the fragmentary condition of the tablet renders any attempt of a translation or interpretation impossible, but that it is of a literary character seems certain. The $i b$ at the end of the broken lines $\mathbf{3}, 4,5,7$ and 9 is, of course, a verbal prefix. The nu-tug, line 6, followed by dumu, "son," and ama, "mother," looks like a negative followed by the verb or "not" and some form of the verb "to he."

As far as paleographical and archæological evidences tend to show, the tablet was written during the period of the second dynasty of Ur, and would thus form another link in the arguments as to the age of Babylonian literature, ${ }^{3}$ definitely showing, that literary documents existed as far back as in the period of the second dynasty of Ur.

[^8]As for a general survey of the subject matter of the tablets of this volume, the following may be noted: ${ }^{1}$

## Court proceedings:

Legal documents in regard to slaves................................... 1 (I), 4 (111).
Legal document in regard to an office............................................ 2 (II).
Contracts :
Agreements between parties...................................................... 10.

## Documents of sale:


Deed of sale of a male slave.................................................. 15 (VIII).
Receipt of purchase money for a pair of slaves. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . No. 16 (IX). Loan documents:

Documents in regard to loans of silver . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .Nos. $19(?), 20,21$.
Promissory notes ..................................................... 11 (V), 13 (VI).
Acknowledgments of loans of silver. ......Nos. 11 (V), 17-20, 22 (X), 29 (XIII).
Acknowledgments of loans of grain. ........................Nos. 23 (XI), 24 (XII).
Acknowledgment of loan of dates......................................................... 31.
A bond....................................................................................... 7 (IV).
Fragmentary 'contracts" :
Only parts of tablets remaining, the names of witnesses indicating the character of the documents. ........................................ 3, 5, 8, 9, 12.
Account of loans (or payments)................................................................... 56.
Receipts: ${ }^{2}$


Receipt €orwheat. ..................................................................................... 36.
Receiptsforgrains...................................................30, 32, 35, 40, 41, 48.
Receipts for vegetables of various kinds..................................... 47, 49, 53.
Receipts for different kinds of beans. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 44,

Receipts for figs. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 54.

Receipts for straw. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 48.

[^9]Accounts of income:
Accounts of the receipts for corn. ..... Nos. 37, etc.
Account of the receipts for bronze ..... Nos. 71-74.
Accounts of supplies received and at hand:
Statement of silver, corn, oil, etc., received and at hand. ..... No. 151.
Statements of shiploads of grain delivered. ..... Nos. BO, 66.
Statement of corn, wheat and vegetables delivered and at hand ..... Nos. 63, 65.
Statement of garments at hand. ..... No. 143.
Statement of chairs on hand ..... No. 62 .
Storehouse accounts :
Account of corn .....  No. 119.
Account of corn and wheat. .Nos. 67, 84, 100-104.
Account of grain ..... Nos. 56, 58.
Account of beans ..... No. 68.
Account of vegetables. .....  No. 169.
Account of figs, dates, etc ..... No. 105.
Account of bronze ..... No. 71.
Account of grain received and paid out .Nos. 57-59.
Unique account of a fruit harvest. ..... No. 76 (XVIII).
Cattle accounts :
A " round up" of cattle ..... No. 79 (XIX).
Various cattle accounts. ..... Nos. 80-82.
Field accounts:
Accounts of the cost of the tilling of fields, as wages, feed of oxen, seed, etc ..... Nos. 83, 89, 90 (XX), 91 (XXI).
Renting of fields to different persons ..... No. 144.
Account of fields, their measurements, condition, etc ..... No. 91.
Inventories :
Enumeration of belongings, as implements, weapons, victuals, silver,cattle, skins, etc.......................................................................... 77 (XVIII).
Memoranda. ..... Nos. 6 (XXIV), 155.
Accounts of expenditures:
Expenditures of corn. ..... No. 135.
Expenditures of different kinds of grain ..... No. 129 (XXI).
Various expenditures of corn and wheat; among these are 1 gur wheatfor porphyry stone for a couch for the god NuskuNo. 117.
Expenditure of wool. ..... No. 134 (XXIII).
Assignments of garments ..... Nos. 137-142.
Expenditures of sesam. ..... Nos. 134, 136.
Expenditure of sesam oil. ..... No. 125.
Expenditure of straw ..... No. 161.
Special temple accounts:
Grain for the temple of En-lil. ..... No. 131.
Grain for temple offerings ..... No. 88.
Flour and grain for temple offerings ..... No. 132 (XXII).
Temple offerings and porphyry stone for couches for the deities. ..... No. 133.
Accounts of expenditures of supplies to special persons named, as wages orfor sustenance :
Expenditures and distributions of grain. . .Nos. 85, 93-95, 97, 147, 149, 165, 166.
Distribution of grain and vegetables. ..... Nos. 53, 63, 65, 146, 148.
Distribution of fish. ..... No. 106.
Distribution of drink .No. 120 (XX).
Pay-lists :
Lists of officials, employés, artisans and laborers, generally the amountof wages being stated..Nos. 88, 96, 107-110, 123, 170.
Various accounts:Accounts, the character of which cannot be definitely determined onaccount of the broken condition of the tablets
Nos. 61, 69, 72, 86, 98, 111, 114, 145, 152, 171.
Fragments .....  Nos. 157-159, 164.

## D ATES

One of the most valuable features of these documents, especially for the reconstruction of Old Babylonian history, are, of course, the dates. Of the 171 tablets, published in this volume, about 115 are more or less completely dated. Some have complete dates, giving year, month and day, others year and month, others year, and five give only month and day. The rest, or about 56 , are either originally undated or the dates are broken away.

As for the dates themselves, most of them were, of course, known before, either as certain or uncertain dates, but there are also to be found entirely new dates, as well as new variations of previously known date formulas.'

The certain and known dates represent the latter part of the reign of Dungi, from the 35 th to the 53 d year of his reign, with documents from every year mentioned except the 38th, 39th, 42d, 43d and 48th-52d years; the entire reign of Bur-Sin except his 4th year; the whole of Gimil-Sin, and the 1st year of Ibi-Sin, thus covering a period of at least 45 years. The dates found in this volume, giving year, month and day, are the following:

## Certain Dates.

Dates from the reign of Dungi.

| 35th:2 mu Si-mu-ru-um ${ }^{k i}$ ba-hiul : |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| itu Ezen- ${ }^{\text {d }}$ Nin-a-zu | No. 17. |
| itu [Ezen-]mah. | No. 57. |
| itu $A B-a$, ud $X+$ | No. 111 |
| itu Engar-dŭ-a, ud X I X | .Nos. 23 (XI), 24 (XII). |
| itu Se-kin-kud, ud VIII | .No. 79 (XIX). |

${ }^{1}$ See New dates and New variations of known dates, p. 27.
${ }^{2}$ For the identification and the chronological order of the dates see next chapter, Reconstruction of the Dates of the Second Dynasty of Ur.
(No day) ..... No. 80.
itu Ezen-dMe-ki-gál, (no day) ..... No. 81.
36th: mu uš-sa Si-mu-ru-um ${ }^{k i}$ ba-ȟúu: ${ }^{1}$ itu Bár-zag, (no day) ..... No. 44.
37th: ти Ha-ar-šiki ba-húl: itu Ezen- ${ }^{d}$ Dun-gi. ..... No. 156.
ти Ha-ar-šum ${ }^{k i} b a-h$ úl:
(No month) ..... Nos. 83, 84, 112.
40th : ти dumu-sal lugal pa-te-si $A n$-šáaki ba-an-tug :2
(Month broken off). ..... No. 140.
(No month). .....  No. 142.
ти dumи-sal lugal:
(No month). ..... No. 141.
41st: ти а-du II-kam Gan-har ${ }^{k i}$ ba-húl: itu ${ }^{d} N e-[\check{s} u]$. ..... No. 115.
itu Ezen-An-na ..... No. 34.
(No month). ..... Nos. 301, $100: 8,49$.
44th: mu An-ša-an ${ }^{k i} b a-h u ́ l$ :
(No month). ..... Nos. $100: 71,83$.
itu $\stackrel{\breve{S}}{ }$-sag ${ }^{3}$-kud. ..... Nos. 100:79.
itu $\check{S} e-k i n-k u d$. ..... Nos. 100 :55, 56.
45th: ти uš-sa $A n$-ša-an ${ }^{k i} b a-h u ́ l:$
(No month). ..... Nos. 100: 17, 72.
46th : mu ${ }^{d}$ Nannar Kar-zi(d)-da: ${ }^{\text {t }}$a-du II-kam-ma-šu: ${ }^{5}$é-an-na $b a-a n-t u ́(r):^{6}$
itu Še-kin-kud. .No. 14 (VII).
47th: mu bád-ma-da7 ba-rú: ${ }^{8}$
(No month) ..... Nos. 64, 101: 19.

[^10]53d: mu en ${ }^{d}$ Innanna unu $(g)^{k i}$ máš-e ni-pa (d) : itu Gáan-găn................................................................................................. 22 (X).
itu $A B-a$, ud III. .No. 56.

## Dates from the reign of Bur-Sin. ${ }^{1}$

1st: mu Bur-d ${ }^{\text {d }}$ Sin lugal-ám:
(No month)........................................................................... 55.
2d: mu ${ }^{d}$ Bur-d ${ }^{d}$ Sin-ge Ur-bí-lum ${ }^{k i}$ mu-bid-a:
itu Azag-ším, ${ }^{2}$ ud IX....................................................... 15 (VIII).
3d: ти uš-sa Ur-bil-l[ $\left[u m^{k i}\right]$ ba-h[ $\left.[u]\right]:$

ти gu-za den-lil-lá ba-dim:
(No month),.......................................................................... 36.
mu ${ }^{\text {gish } g u-z a a^{4}}$ ba-dim:
(Month broken off)................................................................... 124.
5th: ти en am-gal An-na en ${ }^{d}$ Innanna ba-túg-gà. ${ }^{5}$

(No month)............................................................................ 95.
ти еп ипй(g)-gal d$I n n a n n a ~ b a ~ t u ́ g-g a ̀: ~$
itu AB , иd XI. ...................................................................... 11.
ти еп unŭ(g)-gal d Innanna ba-túg:

mu en bar-gal [..................... :
itu Bâr-zag-gar-[ra] . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . No. 18.
6th: ти uşs-sa en am-gal An-na en ${ }^{\text {dInnnanna ba-túg: }}$

7th: ти Hुu-h̆́u-nu-ri ${ }^{k i t} b a-\underline{h} u l-a$ :
itu Bar-zag, ud XXV.
No. 4.
itu $\mathrm{AB}-\mathrm{a}$, ud XIV No. 8.

[^11]8th: mu en Eridu ${ }^{k i}$ ba-thy:

> (Month broken off). . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 36. itu $\tilde{S} u$-š $4-e \check{s} . ~ . ~ . ~ . ~ . ~ . ~ . ~ . ~ . ~ . ~ . ~ . ~ . ~ . ~ . ~ . ~ . ~ . ~$

9th: mu uš-sa en Eridu ${ }^{k i}$ ba-túg:

itu Ezen- ${ }^{d}$ Nin-a-zu. ................................................................ No. 32.
itu Ki-kin-dNin-a-zu.............................................................. No. 45.
itu Ezen-d Dun-gi. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . $104,157$.
(No month)....................................................... . . . . 10 . 59, 103. mu uk-sa en ${ }^{d}$ En-ki Eridu ${ }^{k i}$ ha-thy:'
itu ${ }^{d} N e$-šú .No. 134 (XXV). mu en ${ }^{d}$ Nanna Kar-zi(d)-da ba-túg:
itu $\check{S} u$-kul- $a$ .No. 60.

## Dates from the reign of Gimil-Sin.

As for the chronological arrangement of the dates, see following chapter on reconstruction of the dates of this dynasty.

```
1st: mu \({ }^{d}\) Gimil- \({ }^{d}\) Sin lugal:
itu Šu-kul, ud XXIII . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 62.
itu \(A b\)-ѐ. ............................................................................... 63.
```



4th: mu bád mar-tu mu ${ }^{4}$-rú:
itu $A$-ki-ti. ............................................................. . . . . . 116.

${ }^{1}$ New variation of date.
${ }^{2}$ Written with sign LUM, cf. E. B. TI., p. 276. That the name is to be read Si-ma-num not Si-ma-Zum is evident from R.T. XIX, p. 57, No. 210, where it is written Si-ma-nu-um. Hence the sign LUM must also have the phonetic value of NUM, known already from the door-sockets of Pargon and Narâm-Sin of Nippur (Hilprecht, B. E , Scries A, Vol. I, Part 1, No. $1: 4 ; 2: 3$, and Jensen in Schrader's $K . B$., Vol. 111,Part 1, p. 116, note 5); cf. No. $15: 1$. Note also even hrre the omission of $K i$ after the name. Cf. $E . B . H_{.,}$p. 276, S. A. K. I.,p. 234.
${ }_{3}$ New name of month. See Chapter VII.
${ }^{4}$ To be noted is the use of $m u$ as prefix of the verb. Otherwise $m u$ is usrd when the active agent is given, and $b a$ is prefix when not given. Cf. the form of date of 5th pear,
6th: mu ${ }^{d}$ Gimil-d ${ }^{d}$ Sin lugal Urì-unu $(g)^{1}$-ma-ge na ${ }^{2}$-rú-a-mah ${ }^{d}$ En-lil ${ }^{d}$ Nin-lil-ra mu-ne-du:

itu Dir-S̆̌e-kin-kud................................................................ No. 2 (11).
7th: mu ${ }^{d}$ Gimil-d ${ }^{d}$ Sin lugal Urù-unu $(g)^{k i}-m a$ ma-cla Za-ab-ša-li ${ }^{k i}$ mu-hid:
itu $B[a ́ r]-z a g$ ..... No. 117.
itu Gu(d)-si ..... No. 117.
itu Sig ..... Nos. 13, 49, 88.
itu $\check{S} u$-kul, ud XXX ..... No. 21.
(Noday) ..... Nos. 75 (XVII), 117.
itu Bil-bil-gar-ra .....  No. 126.
itu Dul-axag. ..... Nos. 85, 128.
itu Engar-dŭ-a, ud VII ..... No. 37.
(No day) ..... No. 25.
itu Gán-gán-è. ..... No. 129.
itu AB ..... No. 117.
itu $\breve{\text { Se}}-$-kin-kud. ..... Nos. 117, 153.
(Month broken off). ..... Nos. 90 (XX), 145.
(No month). ..... No. 152.
8th ${ }^{3}$ : mu ${ }^{d}$ Cimil- ${ }^{d}$ Sin lugal Urù-unu $(g)^{k i}$-ma-ge má-gúur-maḩ ${ }^{d}$ En-lil ${ }^{d}$ Nin-lil-ramu-dim:
itu Sig ..... No. 13 (VI).
itu Ezen-Me-ki-gal\}No. 93.
itu $\check{S}$ e-kin-kud
No. 130.
ти má-gúr-mah ba-dim:
itu $G u(d)-s i-z u$.
No. 131.
itu $A$ š-aNo. 9.
Gimil-Sin in seal ..... No. 65.
Dates from the reign of Ibí-Sin. ${ }^{4}$
1st: mu ${ }^{d} I-b i{ }^{d} \operatorname{Sin} l u g a l:$
itu Bár-zag-g[ar-ra]No. 51.
${ }^{1} K i$ omitted.
${ }^{2}$ Must be $n a$, but looks like $k i$. Note form na-rú- $\alpha$ instead of usual na. Cf. next chapter.
${ }^{3}$ See next chapter.${ }^{4}$ Of the twenty-five years of the reign of Ibi-Sin, according to the Hilprecht chronological tablet, B. E., XX,Part 1, No. 47; also p. 46. only two tablets are to be found in this volume, and one of them cannot yet be identifiedwith a certain pear.



## Uncertain Dates.

From the reign of Ibi-Sin.
mи ${ }^{d} I$-bídSin lugal Si-mu-ru-um ${ }^{k i}$ ba-híl:
$\quad$ itu Kin- ${ }^{d}$ Innanna................................................................... 39.

## Unclassified Dates.

1. mu bhd-gal Nibru ${ }^{k i}$ Urì-unu(g) ${ }^{k i}-m a ~ b a-r u ́: ~$
[ituG]u(d)-si-zu.......................................................................... 133.
2. mu uš-sa bhd-gal Nibrui Urù-unu(g) ${ }^{k i}-m a ~ b a-r u ́: ~$
[itu $\check{S}] u-k u l-a$.
.No. 133.
3. ти $m[a(?)]-d a z[u(?) \ldots .] n.[e(?) . . . . . . . . . . . . .]:$.
itu $G u(d)-s i-z u$.
.No. 50.
4. ти Tu-ki-in-PA-mi-ig-ri-ša dumu-sal lu[gal pa-te-si $Z a-a b-s ̌ a-l i^{k i}$ ba-an-tug:
itu Gán-gán-è.
No. 135.

## Fragmentary Dates.

Originally complete dates.

1. [ . . . . . . . . ] ba-húl................................................. 19.

2. mu[ . . . . . . . . . . . . $]. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .$. .......... 27.
[ . . . . . . . . z]u [ . . . . . . . . ].
itu S̈e-kin-kud, $u d$ IX.................................................................... $28 . ~^{2}$.
3. [ . . . . . . . g]al
itu $\tilde{S}^{2}-$-kin-kud, ud I....................................................................... 31.

4. m[u . . . . . . $]$ e[n . . . . . . . $]$.

Dated month and day only.
itu Bil-bil, ud XVI....................................................................... 163.

${ }^{1}$ Note omission of $\boldsymbol{a}$.
${ }^{2}$ Cf. T. T., p. 31. Perhaps Dim-[ku $]$ ?
FROM THE TEMPLE ARCHIVES OF NIPPUR. ..... 27
itu $A b-e ̀$, ud XVIII ..... No. 52.
itu $A[$ š- $a]$. ..... No. 87.
itu Še-kin-kud, ud XV ..... No. 159.New Variations of Dates.1. ти uš-sa en ${ }^{d}$ En-ki Eridu ${ }^{k i}$ ba-tíu: ${ }^{1}$itu $N e-s ̌ u ́ u$.No. 134.
New Dates.

1. ти bád-gal Nibru ${ }^{k i}$ Urù-unu(g) ${ }^{k i}-m a \quad b a-r u^{2}$. ..... No. 133.
2. mu uš-sa bád-gal Nibru ${ }^{k i}$ Urù-unu(g) ${ }^{k i}-m a ~ b a-r u^{3}$ ..... No. 133.
${ }^{1}$ Bur-Sin, 9th year.
${ }^{2}$ Unclassified dates, No. 1.${ }^{3}$ Unclassified dates, No. 2.

## RECONSTRUCTION OF THE DATES OF THE SECOND DYNASTY OF UR.

The dates of the kings of the second dynasty of Ur, especially those of king Dungi and his followers, Bur-Sin and Gimil-Sin, have been more or less completely arranged chronologically by Radau ${ }^{1}$ and Thureau-Dangin. ${ }^{2}$ Both scholars encountered the difficulty, and in fact the impossibility, of a definite classification of these dates, owing partly to the gaps in the date lists, published long ago by Hilprecht, ${ }^{3}$ on which they principally founded the order of arrangement, and partly to the fact that the exact number of years the different kings ruled was yet unknown.

Recent material, and especially the new chronological list published by Hilprecht, ${ }^{4}$ will now enable us to reconstruct the dates of the kings of the second dynasty of Ur with more certainty. That a reconstruction of these dates according to the very latest chronological material at hand, such as I have undertaken, is not only justified but also necessary, can be gathered from the fact that scholars so far practically have overlooked the important bearing on the dates of the second dynasty of Ur, and especially on the dates of Dungi, which this new Hilprecht chronological list really has. Thus Thureau-Dangin makes no correction of the date lists in the German edition of his Les Inscriptions de Sumer et d'Akkad, although it was published in the year after the Hilprecht tablet was published. Pinches, in his Amherst Tablets, published in 1908, even reproduces a part of the new Hilprecht list, ${ }^{5}$ at the same time reproducing, translating and elucidating the date lists previously published by Hilprecht and Radau; but as for the identification of the years he still refers to Radau, who, of course, would he the first to disavow his former conclusions in face of all the new material published since.

[^12]Pélagaud in his Sá-tilla texts' still follows the figures given by Thureau-Dangin, by giving two dates of Dungi as the 30th and 46th year, though they should now be made the 43d and 58th respectively. Even Eduard Mayer ${ }^{2}$ follows Thureau-Dangin, although he remarks that the figures of the dates of Dungi ought to be raised by 12. Barton in his latest volume of Ur tablets (1909) likewise follows Thureau-Dangin.

In regard to King $U r$-Engur, the founder of the second dynasty of Ur, we now know from the new Hilprecht chronological list that he ruled eighteen years. Of the date formulas of this king, however, we know for certain only one: mu Ur${ }^{\text {a }}$ Engur lugal-e sig-ta igi-nim-šúu ğ̆r si-ne-sci-a. The formulas for the first and second years of his reign we may perhaps, with more or less hesitation, restore in accordance with the formulas used by the following kings of the dynasty. The dates $m u U r$ -Ab-ba pa-te-si and ти en ${ }^{d}$ Innanna Unu(g) $)^{k i}$-a dumи Ur- ${ }^{d}$ Engur lugal-a mag-e ba$p a(d)-d a$, given by Thureau-Dangin ${ }^{3}$ as belonging to the reign of Ur-Engur, may be the date formulas of the patesi Ur-Abba of Lagaš, just as well as the date Gì-de-a pa-te-si, etc. ${ }^{4}$ is given by the same author as the date formula of Gudea. The same may be the case with the fourth date given by Thureau-Dangin. ${ }^{5}$ What we know, however, is that $U r-A b-b n$ was patesi of Lagaš, ${ }^{\text {e }}$ and that he was a contemporary of Ur-Engur.'

The dates of Dungi, the second king of the dynasty, are those most affected by the new Hilprecht chronological list. Working on the basis of the material published or at hand at the.time, Radau and Thureau-Dangin succeeded in establishing chronological order in the dates of Dungi, as far as the latter part of his reign is concerned, Thureau-Dangin, of course, having the advantage of more recent material.

As far as the last 45 years of Dungi are concerned, Radau and Thureau-Dangin have presented identical lists, not to mention differences in transcriptions and interpretations of the date formulas. The order of the last 45 (according to ThureauDangin 46) years is thus established with considerable certainty; but in regard to the identification of the date formulas with the respective years, the whole list was hanging in the air. That the chronological numbers given by Thureau-Dangin to these dates neither can nor were meant to represent the exact year is seen from the fact that he, in spite of the gap after the first year, begins anew with No. 1.
${ }^{1}$ Babyloniaca, III (1909), p. 82.
${ }^{2}$ Geschichte des Altertums, $I^{2}$, p. 341.
${ }^{3}$ S. A. K. I., p. 228.
${ }^{4}$ R. T. C., 200, R. II, 8.
${ }^{5}$ Ibid.

- See seal $R$. T. C., 287; S. A. K. I.,pp. 148, 149.
${ }^{7}$ R. T. C., 261, R. 11, 12.

The whole list, thus far constructed, can now be nailed down to its proper place, and every date formula can be exactly identified with the year which it represents. Thus we know from the new Hilprecht chronological list' that Dungi ruled 58 years. We also know that the last date formula of the reign of Dungi was $т и ~ u s ̌-s a$ $H a-a r-\check{s} z^{k i} K i-m a s^{k i} \grave{u}$ Hu-mur-ti $i^{k i} b a-h \underline{u} l$, which would denote the same year as that which in its later months have the date formula of the new king, or $m u$ ${ }^{d}$ Bur- ${ }^{d}$ Sin lugal, both dates occurring during the patesiship of $U r$-Šamaš. ${ }^{2}$

The last full year of Dungi would then have the formula ти $\underset{H}{H} \alpha-a r-s ̌ i^{k i} H u-$ mur-tizii $\dot{u} K i-m a s^{k i} b a-h u l$, or the last date of the established list. Hence that formula would represent the 58th year of Dungi. Now by simply counting backward from this date we can establish the order of the known and certain dates of the last 46 full years of Dungi. ${ }^{3}$

As for King Bur-Sin, the third ruler of this dynasty, we know from the same source that he ruled nine years. If the translation of a date given by Lau from an unpublished tablet is correct, ${ }^{4}$ we have ten date formulas from the reign of BurSin, the last formula, mu uš-sa en ${ }^{d}$ Nanna Kar-zi(d)-da ba-ticg, denoting his last year, which is the same as the accession year of Gimil-Sin, while the preceding date formula, mи en ${ }^{d}$ Nanna Kar-zi(d)-da ba-tiig, would represent the last full year of the reign of Bur-Sin. Thus we have a complete list of the dates of this king. ${ }^{5}$

In regard to Gimil-Sin, the fourth ruler of the dynasty, we now know from the new chronological list that he only ruled seven years. The perfectly clear cuneiform numbers, as can be seen from the photographic reproduction of the tablet, ${ }^{6}$ excludes every shadow of doubt. On account of certain date formulas, however, a larger number of years have been assigned to this ruler. ${ }^{7}$

The chronological list, published by Hilprecht many years ago, ${ }^{8}$ gives the date formula $m u$ ma-da $Z a-a b-s ̌ a-l i^{k i} b a-h \underline{u} l$, or the recognized formula for the 7th year, as the last. The supposition that this is the formula for the 7th year is strengthened by the fact that the preceding date formula, ти na-mah ${ }^{d} E n-l i l-l a ́ d a-r i c$, is in its turn preceded by an $u s ̌-s a-b i$ year of mu bád mar-tu ba-rú, denoting the 4th year. From the breaks of the tablet it would seem as if the date formula originally had

[^13]been ти bád mar-tu ba-rúu uš-sa-bi. ${ }^{1}$ In any case this date formula cannot correspond to the following. Hence the two formulas must represent two different years or the 5th and 6th respectively.

But if the $Z a-a b-s a-l i^{k i}$ formula is the 7th and last on the tablet, as is clearly shown by the uninscribed place below, it is not the last of the reign of Gimil-Sin. It is most likely that the very tablets were made in this year of Gimil-Sin, and thus naturally the following date formulas could not be given. We know two more date formulas from the reign of Gimil-Sin, for which there is no place except after the 7th year. ${ }^{2}$ Thus in fact we have date formulas for 9 years of Gimil-Sin, although this king, according to the new Hilprecht chronological tablet, ruled only 7 years.

There is, however, a very plausible explanation of this apparent discrepancy between the chronological list and the date formulas at hand. The chronicler only counted the full years of the king's rule, while date formulas also for his first and last year, of which only a few months came within his rule, are to be found. His 1 st year date formula would then designate the part of this year in which he ruled, ${ }^{3}$ the 2 d year formula the 1 st full year, the 8 th formula would designate the 7 th full year and the 9 th the first part of the year in which he died, which year would be the same as the 1st year of his successor. Thus the seven years assigned to Gimil-Sin by the chronicler is a round number, only the full years being counted. As far as we know, he ruled at least eight years and three months in all. This tends to show that instead of the Babylonian chroniclers being apt to raise the length of the rules of their kings by giving round numbers, ${ }^{4}$ they were more apt to lower the total sum of the rule of a dynasty by only giving the number of full years.

An interesting case tablet bearing on the subject of the relation between the decession of Bur-Sin and the accession of Gimil-Sin has been published by Pinches. ${ }^{5}$ The tablet itself bears the date:

itu ${ }^{d}$ Dumu-xi<br>mu Gimil- ${ }^{d}$ Sin luyal;

the case or envelope on the other hand :
itu Ezen- ${ }^{\text {d }} \mathrm{Ba}$-u
mu en ${ }^{d}$ Nanna Kar-zi(d) ba-túg.

[^14]Thus the tablet is dated in the 7th month of the accession year of Gimil-Sin ; but the envelope, as the text actually is transcribed by Pinches, is dated in the 9 th month of the 9 th year of Bur-Sin, that is ten months earlier, as we know, if Lau ${ }^{1}$ gives an authentic translation, that the last or tenth year of Bur-Sin had the formula $m u-u s ̌-s a$ en $K a r-z i(d)-d a .^{2}$ Of course, the date on the envelope must have been made after the tablet was enclosed, hence later. In any case there must be some mistake on the envelope. Perhaps the scribe wrote $m u$ for $m u \quad u s^{\prime}-s a$. The explanation offered by Pinches, that the en $\operatorname{Kar}-z i(d)-d a$ formula must designate the 2 d year of Gimil-Sin, and has to be taken away from Bur-Sin, cannot be maintained. It would upset the whole order of dates.

If, however, the date of the envelope really is meant for the last year of BurSin, i.e., the mu uš-sa en $\operatorname{Kar}-z i(d)-d a$, as is the most plausible explanation, this would show that a scribe in principle perhaps would continue to date according to the formula of a dead king even after the new king had been established, or possibly by ignorance of the change, or by mistake pure and simple, just as we in the beginning of a new year are apt to forget and continue to write the old accustomed year.

It will be noted that I have identified the formulas for the last year of BurSin and the mu lugal of the first year of Gimil-Sin, as well as the last year of GimilSin and the first year of Ibi-Sin, as denoting the same year respectively. This, to be sure, in spite of Kugler's very positive statement to the contrary. ${ }^{3}$ The only proof that Kugler advances for his dogmatic statement is the fact that the same years are designated by two date formulas. To my mind, and as long as no stronger proofs are presented, this fact proves the very opposite of what Kugler's "These" asserts.

Thus it is certain that a year, beginning at the New Year, was designated by a $т и u \bar{s}-s a$ formula of the date formula for the preceding year, until some event took place, which would make the occasion for the giving out of a new date formula. As far as the kings of the second dynasty of Ur are concerned, the last year of three of them is designated by a $m u$ uš-sa formula. ${ }^{4}$ Naturally this formula would be used in the beginning of the year, which also, as of course could not be foreseen, proved to be the last year of the king. The accession of the new king would

[^15]certainly be such an important event as to make it the occasion for the issue of a new date formula, which, according to ordinary usage, would serve as date formula €or the rest of the year.

This view of the matter also explains satisfactorily the nine date formulas of Gimil-Sin, while according to the new Hilprecht tablet he ruled only seven (full) years. As long as Kugler does not give more convincing proofs for his "These," it would also in this respect be safer to rely on the statement of the Babylonian chronicler.

In regard to Ibi-Sin, the fifth and last king of the dynasty, the new list has assigned twenty-five years to his rule. Of the date formulas of this king we know only two, the formula for his first year and another that cannot be identified with a certain year.

## DATE FORMULAS OF THE SECOND DYNASTY OF UK.

## 1. Certain Dates.

## Ur-Engur.

| 1st: [muUr-d Engur lugal](?) |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2d: [mu uš-sa Ur-d Engur lugal](?) |  |
| 3d: [ . . . . . . . . . . ] |  |
| 4th: [ . . . . . . . . . . ] |  |
| 5th: [ . . . . . . . . . . ] |  |
| 6th: [ . . . . . . . . . . ] |  |
| 7th: [ | Certain: |
| 8th: [ | mu Ur- ${ }^{\text {a }}$ Engur lugal-e sig-ta igi-nim- |
| 9th: [ | šúu gǔr si-ne-sá-a ${ }^{1}$ |
| 10th: [ | Uncertain : |
| 11th: [ | mu Ur-Ab-ba pa-te-si ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |
| 12th: | mu en ${ }^{\text {d }}$ Innanna Unu $(g)^{k i}-a ~ d u m u ~ l i r-~$ |
| 13th: [ | ${ }^{d}$ Engur luyal-a maš-e ba-pa(d)-da ${ }^{3}$ |
| 14th: | $[m u \text { é }]^{d}$ Nin-sun-[na(?)] ba-rú-at |
| 15th: [ . . . . . . . . . . ] |  |
| 16th: [ . . . . . |  |
| 17th: [ . . . . . . . . . . ] |  |
| 18th: [ . . . . . . . . . . ] |  |
| ${ }^{1}$ R.7'. C., 261, R. 11, 14; 262, R., II, 2; 263. R., 4. |  |
| ${ }^{2}$ R. T. C., 264, R., II, 5. |  |
| 'R.T.C., 264, R. II, 2. |  |
| ${ }_{5}^{4}$ R. 7. C., 265, R., 111,7. |  |
|  |  |

## Dungi.

## 1st: mи Dun-gi lugal ${ }^{1}$

## 2d: [muui-sa Dun-gi lugal](?)²

3d: [ . . . . . . . . . . ]
5th: [ . . . . . . . . . . ]
6th:
7th:
8th: [ . . . . . . . . . . ]
9th:
10th:
11th:
$\qquad$ (a) mu ${ }^{d}$ Dun-gi-ra à-su(m) $m a^{3}$
(b) mu lugal-ra $\grave{a}\left[\right.$. . . ] su(m)-ma ${ }^{4}$
(c) ти en-nam-X ${ }^{d}$ Dun-gi-ra-ge ba-gub $b a-t u g^{5}$
$\left[\begin{array}{lllllllll} & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \end{array}\right]$

12th:
13th: mu uš éd ${ }^{d} N i n-I ́ B \quad k i-b a-a-g a r^{6}$
14th: $m u$ uš é ${ }^{d} N i n-I ́ B u s ̌-s a^{7}$
mu gı̌r Nibru ${ }^{k i}[\text {. . . . . }]^{8}$
15th: mu lugal-e Urù-unú(g) ${ }^{k i}-t a$ Nibru ${ }^{k i}$ su-in-nigin ${ }^{9}$
16th: mu máa ${ }^{a}$ Nin-lil-lá ba-d $\bar{u}^{10}$
17th: ти mád ${ }^{\text {Nin-lil-lá-ge ui-sa" }}$
ти ${ }^{d}$ Nanna Kar-zi(d)-da é-a ba-tú $(r)^{12}$
${ }^{1}$ R. T. C., 273, R., 5
${ }^{2}$ Restored by analogy and in accordance with the date formula for tlie second year of Bur-Sin, C. T., VII, 19775, II, 17; X, 19064, R., 20. Radau, E. B. H., p. 254, has suggested $m u$ é-ŚID.LAM ba-rú as a date formula that perhaps would come into this gap. Another hypothetical date formula could for good reasons be suggested from the new chronicle published by King, Chronicles Concerning Early Babylonian Kings, Vol. II, p. 11, 117, where it is stated (Reverse, lines 5-7) that Dungi plundered the treasures of Esagila and Babylon. This must certainly have been an event of great notoriety and consequence. Hence it is in the highest degree probable that Dungi would date a year after such an event. The formula would, of course, be something like $m u K a$-dingir-ra $a^{k i} b a$-buul.
${ }^{3}$ On a tablet in the possession of Mr. Noorian, Sew York (see Radau, E. B. H.,p. 254). Barton gives a date $m u$ temen $E-n u n^{k i}$ as a date of Dungi, but on what authority he does not state. The reading, however, is very doubtful. See H. L. C., 11,Pl. 81, No. 36.
${ }^{4}$ R. T. C., 268, R., 8.
${ }^{5}$ E. A. H., 109, R., 7; B. E. H., pp. 280, 420
${ }^{6}$ R.T. C., 274, R., 5.
${ }^{7}$ R. T. C., 275, R., 3.
${ }^{8}$ B. E., $\mathrm{I}^{2}, 125, \mathrm{R} ., 2$.
${ }^{8} B . E, \mathrm{I}^{2}, 125, \mathrm{O} ., 3 ; \mathrm{R} . T . \mathrm{C} ., 277$, K., 1.
${ }^{10}$ B. E., $\mathrm{I}^{2}, 125, \mathrm{O} ., 4$.
${ }^{11}$ R. T. C., 282, R., 4; 283, R., 3.
${ }^{12}$ B. E., $\mathrm{I}^{2}, 125, \mathrm{O} ., 5$.

18th: ти E-har-sag luyal ba-d $\bar{u}^{1}$
ти E-bar-sag ba-d $\bar{u}^{2}$
ти $\hat{E}$-har-say ${ }^{3}$
19th: mu ${ }^{d} K A . D I$ bád-gal-AN ${ }^{k i}$ é-a ba-tú $(r)^{4}$
20th: $m u^{d} N u-T U G^{5}-m u s ̌-d a K a-z a l-l u^{k i} 6-a b a-t u ́(r)^{6}$
21st: ти É-hal-bi lugal ba-dū ${ }^{2}$
22d: ти "Nanna Nibru ${ }^{k i} 6-a b a-t u ́(r)^{8}$
23d: mu en-ner-xi An-na en ${ }^{d}$ Nanna máš-e ni-pa(d) ${ }^{9}$
24th: $m u^{\text {gish }} n a(d)^{10}{ }^{d}$ Nin-lil-láa ${ }^{11}$
ти $n a(d){ }^{d} N i n-l i[l]-l[\alpha] b[a]-d[i m]^{12}$
mu ${ }^{\text {gish }} n a(d){ }^{d}$ Nin-lil-lá uš-sa $a^{13}$
25th: mu ${ }^{\text {gish }} n a(d) u s ̌-s a^{14}$
mи en-ner-xi An-na en ${ }^{d}$ Nanna $b a-t u ́ g-g a ̀{ }^{15}$
26th: ти Ni-alim-mi-da-Bu dumu-sal ${ }^{16}$ lugal nam-nim Mar-ha-ši-ki ba-il ${ }^{17}$
27th: ти UBARA ${ }^{k i 18} k i-b i b a-a b-g i^{19}$
28th: ти dumu Urù-unúu(g) ${ }^{k i}-m a \operatorname{galu-giš-gid-šúu~ka-ba-ab-keš~}{ }^{z 0}$
29th: mu ${ }^{d}$ Nin-IB pa-te-si-gal ${ }^{d}$ En-lit-lá-ge ${ }^{21}$
30th: $\left[m u{ }^{d}\right] E n-l i l-l a ́ a d N i n-l i l-l a ́-g e^{22}$
31st: $m u[$. . . . . $] b a-d u(g)-g a[\text {. . . . }]^{23}$
${ }^{1}$ B. E., I' ${ }^{2}, 125$, O., 6.
${ }^{2}$ R. T. C., 284, R., 6.
${ }^{3}$ R. T. C., 285, R., 4.
${ }^{4}$ B. E., I ${ }^{2}, 125$, O., 7.
${ }^{5}$ Left out in Randolph Eerens' tablets, $A m h$., p. xiv.
${ }^{6}$ B. E., $\mathrm{I}^{2}, 125, \mathrm{O} ., 8$.
${ }^{7}$ B. E., I', 125, O., 9.
${ }^{8}$ B. E., $\mathrm{I}^{2}, 125$, O., 10.
${ }^{9}$ B. E., $\mathrm{I}^{2}, 125, \mathrm{O} ., 11$; E. A , H., 40; E. B. H., p. 256.
${ }^{10}$ Radau reads alam, E. B. If., p. 257, still followed by Pinches, Amh., p. 29; but the sign is no doubt na(d).
${ }^{11}$ T. T., 256, 8.
${ }^{12}$ B. E., $\mathrm{I}^{2}, 125, \mathrm{O} ., 12$.
${ }^{13}$ T. T., 257, R., 2.
${ }^{14}$ Amh., 16, 12.
${ }^{15}$ B. E., $\mathrm{I}^{2}, 125$, O., 13.
${ }^{16}$ This sign, on which every scholar has stumbled, is most likely alim, Br. 8582; R. E. C., 225. Cf. Sign List.
${ }^{17}$ B. E., I ${ }^{2}$, 125, O., 14.
${ }^{19}$ Radau reads bad, E. B. H., p. 258, but it is no doubt Br. 4394.
${ }^{19}$ B. E., I ${ }^{2}, 125$, O., 15.
${ }^{20}$ B. E., $\mathrm{I}^{2}, 125, \mathrm{O} ., 16$.
${ }^{21}$ B. E., I ${ }^{2}$, 125, O., 17.
${ }^{22}$ B. E., I ${ }^{2}$, 125, O., 18.
${ }^{23}$ B. E., I², 125, O., 19.

32d: $т и ~ u s ̌ ~[~ . ~ . ~ . ~ . ~ . ~ . ~ I ' ~$
33d: mu lugal [ . . . . . . $]^{2}$
34th: ти Gan-har ${ }^{\text {ris }}$ ba-híl ${ }^{4}$
35th: mu uš -sa Gan-hुar ${ }^{k i}$ ba-húl ${ }^{5}$
mu Si-mu-ru-um ${ }^{k i}$ ba-ȟúl ${ }^{6}$
36th: wu uš-sa Si-mu-ru-um ${ }^{k i} b a-h u u^{7}$
mu $S[i]-m[u]-r[u]-u\left[m^{k}\right]^{i}[a]-d u \quad$ II-kam-ma-aš ba-h́h $u^{8}$
37th: mu $\underset{\text { Ha-ar-šiki9 }}{ }{ }^{2 i 9}$ ba-húu ${ }^{10}$
38th: mu en Eridu ${ }^{k i}$-ga ba-túg-gà ${ }^{11}$
39th: тu uš-sa en Eridu $u^{k i}-g a ̀ ~ b a-t u ́ g-g \grave{a} a^{12}$
40th: ти dumu-sal lugal pa-te-si An-ša ${ }^{k i} b a-a n-t u g^{13}$
ти dumu-sal lugal pa-te-si An-ša-an $n^{k i}-$ ge ba-túg ${ }^{14}$
mu dumu-sal lugal ${ }^{15}$
41st: mu Gan-harai a-du II-kam-aš ba-húl ${ }^{18}$
mu a-du II-kam-aš Gan-harit ba-húu ${ }^{17}$
$42 \mathrm{~d}^{18}: m u$ Si-mu-ru-um ${ }^{k i}$ a-du III-kam ${ }^{19}-a s ̌ ~ b a-b u ́ l^{20}$
43d: ти uš-sa Si-mu-ru-um ${ }^{k i}$ a-clu III-kam-aš ba-híu${ }^{21}$
mи Gan-har ${ }^{k \prime} a-d u$ III-kam-ǎ̌ ba-hál ${ }^{22}$
${ }^{1}$ B. E. $\mathrm{I}^{2}, 12.5$, R., 1.
${ }^{2}$ B. E., I ${ }^{2}$, 125, R., 2.
${ }^{3}$ To read the name as Sumerian. If taken as Semitic, it is, of course, to be read Kar-har ${ }^{k i i}$.
${ }^{4}$ B. E., I ${ }^{2}$, 125, R., 3; T. T.. 27.
${ }^{5}$ Amh., 17, IV, 6.
${ }^{6} B . E ., \mathrm{I}^{2}, 125, \mathrm{R} ., 4 ; A m h ., 18, \mathrm{R} ., 5$; also Dates of Dungi, preceding chapter.
${ }^{7}$ C. T., X, 14348, R., 11; also Dates of Dungi, preceding chapter.
${ }^{8} B . E ., \mathrm{I}^{2}, 125, \mathrm{R} ., 5$.
${ }^{8} A m h ., 22,7$, has $A$ - $a r-\Sigma_{i} i^{k i}$, and a fragment of the envelope has $A r-s ̌ i$. Note also the variation $\check{s} u m$, Dates of
Dungi, preceding chapter.
${ }^{10} B . E ., \mathrm{I}^{2}, 125, \mathrm{R} ., 6$; also reference in preceding note.
${ }^{11}$ B. E., I ${ }^{2}, 125$, R., 7.
${ }^{12}$ B. E., $\mathrm{I}^{2}, 125, \mathrm{R} ., 8 ; T . T ., 121$.
${ }^{13}$ nates of Dungi (Nos. 140, 142).
${ }^{14}$ B. E., I ${ }^{2}, 125$, R., 9 ; Dates of Dungi.
${ }^{15}$ Dates of Dungi (No. 141).
${ }^{10} B . E ., \mathrm{I}^{2}, 125, \mathrm{R} ., 10 ;$ Amh., 23, 7.
${ }^{17}$ E. A. H., No. 96, has this form, not tlie one given by Radau, E. B. H., p. 260. See also Dates of Dungi.
${ }^{18}$ A $m u u_{s}-s a$ lormula lor this year is probably to be found in H. L. C., 11,Pl. 63, No. 31, R., 1. See Unclassified
Dates, No. 12.
${ }^{19}$ R. T. C., 288, R., 10 adds ma.
${ }^{20} B . E_{.}, I^{2}, 125, ~ R ., 11$.
${ }^{21}$ B. E., I ${ }^{2}, 125$, It., 12.
${ }^{22}$ R. T. C., 142, left edge.

## 44th: $т и ~ A n-s ̌ a-a n^{k i} b a-h 2 u^{1}$

45th: mu uš-sa $A n$-ša-an ${ }^{k i} b a-h ̧ u ́ l^{2}$
ти uš-sa $A n$-ša-an $n^{k i 3}$
46th: mu ${ }^{d} N a n n a \operatorname{Kar-zi(d)-da^{ki}}$ a-du II-kam-ma-šu é-an-na ba-an-túu(r) ${ }^{4}$
47th: ти bád ma-da ba-r $u^{5}$
48th: mu uš-sa bád ma-da $a^{k i} b a-r u^{6}$
49th: ти é-k $\grave{u}^{7}$-ša-ǐ̌ ${ }^{d} D a-y a n-g e^{d}$ Dun-gi-ra ba-rú ${ }^{8}$
mu sú-ša-iš ${ }^{d} D a-g a ́ n-g e{ }^{d} D u n-g i ~ b a-r u^{a}$
ти é-kù-sa-iš ${ }^{d} D a-g a ́ n-n a ~ b a-r u^{10}$
50th: mu uš-sa é-kù-ša-iš d Da-gán-na ba-rú ${ }^{11}$
ти uš-sa é-ka-ša-ǐ̌s ${ }^{d} D a$-gicn-na ba-r $\hat{u}^{12}$
mu us̆-sa é-sú-ša a $D a-g a ́ n ~ b a-r u{ }^{13}$
ти uš-sa é-sú-ša-iš Da ba-rú ${ }^{14}$
ти uš-sa $6^{d}$ Dun-gi-ra ba-riu ${ }^{15}$
51st: ти uš-sa é-kì-ša-ǐ̌s d Da-gán-na ba-rúu ти uš-sa-bit ${ }^{16}$
mu uš-sa é-sú-ša-iš d $D a-g a ́ n ~ b a-r u ́ u ~ m u-u s ̌-s a-b i^{17}$
ти uš-sa é ти uš-sa-bi ${ }^{\text {is }}$
52d: mu $\check{S} a-a s ̌-r u^{k i} b a-h u^{19} b^{19}$
${ }^{1} B . E ., \mathrm{I}^{2}, 125$, R., 13; C. T., X, 15322, IV, 16; Amh., 24, 12; Dates of Dungi.
${ }^{2} B . E ., \mathrm{I}^{2}, 125, \mathrm{R} ., 14 ; E$. A. $I ., 98 ;$ E. B. H., p. 260; C. T., I, $94-10-15,5, \mathrm{R} ., \mathrm{III}, 14 ;$ X, 17747, IV, 21; Dates of Dungi.
${ }^{3}$ Amh., 25, 9.
${ }^{4}$ B. E., I ${ }^{2}, 125$, R., $15(b a-t u(r))$; Dates of Dungi (14).
${ }^{5}$ B. E., I ${ }^{2}$, 125, R., 15; T. T., 16444, IV, 9; Amh., 26, 7; 27, R., 8; Dates of Dungi.
${ }^{\text {e }}$ B. $E$, , I ${ }^{2}$, 125, R., 16 (the only formula having ki); R. T. C., 299, R., 4; E. A. H., 99, 100; E. B. H., p. 261; C. T., I, 94-10-15, 3; IV, 18957, V, 145.
${ }^{7}$ The sign oceurs in different forms in these date formulas as $K A+G A R=k \dot{u}, K A+S A=s \hat{u}$, and, if Lau is right, only KA. See $O . B . T . R .$, No. 252, R., IV, 16. The signs are here transcribed as occurring in the different texts. Cf. the numerous proper names containing this element.
${ }^{8}$ E. A. H., 101; E. B. H., p. 261.
${ }^{9}$ Amh., 29, 11.
${ }^{10}$ B. E., I ${ }^{2}$, 125, R., 18; R. T. C., 423, R., 3 (dingir before Da-gan wanting) ; C. T., IS, 18437, R., 21 (nuwanting); X, 19067, R., 16 (na wanting); H.L.C., PI. 33, No. 81, VITI, 13; O. B. T. R., 185, 5.
${ }^{11}$ B. E., I ${ }^{2}$, 125, It., 19; R. T. C., 41.1, R., 5 ; C. T., VII, 13165, R., 16;Amh., 31, IV, 13. Barton makes this a new date that he has not noticed elsewhere, H.L.C. I, p. 9.
${ }^{12}$ O. B. 2'. R., 252, R., 16.
${ }^{13}$ C. T., X, 19067, R., 16; 21429, R., 14; H. L. C., Pl. 33, No. 81, VIII, 13.
${ }^{14}$ Amh., 30, 8.
${ }^{15} R . T . \mathrm{C} ., 424$, R., 4.
${ }^{10}$ B. E., I ${ }^{2}$, 125, R., 20; T. T., 26; C. T., V, 18358, VI, 5 ( $n a$ wanting), etc.; O. B. T. R., 185; Amh., 32, R., 11.
${ }^{17}$ C. T., VII, 12927, IV, 10.
${ }^{18}$ C. T., V, 18358, I, 5.


53d: mu en ${ }^{d}$ Nanna máš-e ib-pa $(d)^{1}$
mu.en ${ }^{d}$ Nanna máš-e ni-pa(d) ${ }^{2}$
ти en ${ }^{d}$ Innanna unu $(g)^{k i}$ máš-e ni-pa $(d)^{3}$
54th: mu Si-mu-йr-ru-um ${ }^{k i}$ Lu-lu-bu-um ${ }^{k i}$ a-clu X-lal-I-kam-ǎ̌ ba-ȟul ${ }^{4}$ mu Si-mu-ŭr-ru-um ${ }^{k i}$ Lu-lu-bu ${ }^{k i 5}$
55th: mu ui-sa Si-mu-ru-um ${ }^{k i}$ Lu-lu-bu-um ${ }^{k i}$ a-du X-lal-I-kam-aš ba-ḩulb
mu dun-gi nita kala(g)-ga lugal Urù-unu(g) ${ }^{k i}$-ma lugal an-ub-ba tab-ba-ye Ur-bil-lum ${ }^{k i}$ Si-mu-ru-um ${ }^{k i}$ Lu-lu-bu $b^{k i}$ ù G̛an-hhar ${ }^{k i}$ at eš-šúu sag + sīy-bi šu-gir-ra im-mi-ra ${ }^{7}$
ти Ur-bil-liki ba-a-húl ${ }^{8}$
ти Ur-bil-lum ${ }^{k i}$ ba-húul ${ }^{9}$
56th: mu ui-sa Ur-bil-lum ${ }^{k i}$ ba-hí $u^{10}$
ти Ki-maš ${ }^{k i}$ Hu-mur-tiki ba-hál ${ }^{11}$
ти Ki-ma $\breve{s}^{k i} b a-h u b^{12}$
57th: mu ${ }^{d}$ Dun-gi nita kala(g)-ga lugal Urù-unu(g) ${ }^{k i}$-ma lugal an-ub-ba tab-ba-ye Ki-

ти $u s ̌-s a K i-m a s^{〔}{ }^{i i}$ ù $H u-m u r-t i^{k i} b a-h u l^{14}$
58th: ти uš-sa Ki-maški ba-húl mu uš-sa-bi ${ }^{15}$
ти uš-sa Ki-maški mu uš-sa-a-bí ${ }^{16}$
ти $\mathrm{Ha} a-a r-\breve{s}_{\varepsilon^{k i}} \mathrm{H} u-m u r-t i^{k i} b a-h h^{17}$
ти $\mathrm{H} a-a r-s{ }^{2} i \quad b a-h u u^{18}$
${ }^{1}$ C. T., VII, 13164, B., 5; Amh., 38, TV, 28.
${ }^{2}$ E. B. H., p. 263; C. T., I, 94-10-15, 5, R., 111, 18; X, 14612, R., VI, 29 (ni wanting).
${ }^{3}$ It is a question whether this formula denotes the same year as the one above or the formula of Dungi 23d or 38th.

4E. A. H., 1, 2, 3; E. B. H., p. 263; R. T. C., 305, R., 18 ( ${ }_{u} r$ wanting); €. T., V, 12231, O., VII, 28 (adds a).
${ }^{5}$ C. T., 111, 18957, III, 60; IV, 107.
${ }^{\circledR} C . T ., \mathrm{I}, 96-4-10,3, \mathrm{R} ., 3 ; \mathrm{V}, 19024, \mathrm{XII}, 26 ; A m h ., 40,9$.
${ }^{7}$ C. T., V, 12231, X, 15.
${ }^{8} A m h ., 42,7$.
${ }^{9}$ E. A. H., 4, 5; E. B. H., p. 264; C. T., VII, 12940, R., 19 (adds um); T. T., 299.
${ }^{10}$ C. T., VII, 13138, R., 15; 18407, R., 18; T. T. ,61.
${ }^{11}$ C. T., III, 21340, VI, 160.
${ }^{12}$ E. A. H., 6-8; E. B. II., p. 265; H. L. C., Pl. 16, No. 24; Amh., 43, 7.
${ }^{13}$ C. T., V, 18346, VIII, 6.
${ }^{14}$ E. A. H., 9-17; E. B. H., p. 263; H. L. C., Pl. 21, Nos. 11,13; Pl. 22, No. 26.
${ }^{15}$ E. A. H., 18-24; E. B. H., p. 265; G. T., V, 17751, IV, 20; H. L. C., Pl. 24, No. 29.
${ }^{16}$ C. T., 17776, R., $15 ; 17785$, R., 7; X, 14344, R., 10 ( $a$ wanting).
${ }^{17}$ C. T., VII, 12932, IV, 11; 12934, VI, 6, etc.
${ }^{18}$ C. T., III, 21338, VII, 162; Amh., 21, 9 (p. 40).

ти uš-sa Ki-mašsi ${ }^{k}$ Hu-mur-ti $i^{k i} b a-\hbar i l^{3}$

## Bur-Sin. ${ }^{4}$

1st: mu ${ }^{d}$ Bur-d ${ }^{\text {d }}$ Sin lugal-ám ${ }^{\text {h }}$
mu ${ }^{d}$ Bur- ${ }^{d}$ Sin lugal ${ }^{6}$
2d: ти uš-sa ${ }^{d}$ Bur-d Sin lugal ${ }^{7}$
ти ${ }^{d}$ Bur-d Sin lugal-e Ur-bil-lum ${ }^{k i}$ ba ${ }^{8}$-híl ${ }^{9}$
$m{ }^{d}$ Bur-d Sin lugal Ur-bil-lum ${ }^{k i}$ mu-húhl ${ }^{10}$
3d: mu uš-sa Ur-bil-lum ${ }^{k i}$ ba-ȟul-a ${ }^{11}$
mu ${ }^{\text {gish } g u-z a-m a h ~}{ }^{\text {a }}$ En-lil-lá ba-dim ${ }^{12}$
mи gu-za ${ }^{\text {d }}$ En-lil-lá ba-dím ${ }^{13}$
4th: mu en gal-mah An-na en ${ }^{d}$ Nanna ba-a-túy ${ }^{14}$
mи en mah-gal An-na en ${ }^{d} N a n n a ~ b a-t u ́ g{ }^{15}$
ти en mah An-na en ${ }^{\text {d }}$ Nanna ba-túg ${ }^{16}$
ти en mah-gal An-na ba-túg ${ }^{17}$
5th ${ }^{18}$ : mu $^{d}$ Bur-d ${ }^{\text {d }}$ Sin nita kala $(g)$-ga lugal an-ub-da tab-ba-ge en unŭ $(g)$-gal ${ }^{d}$ Innanna in-túg ${ }^{19}$
ти еп unй(g)-yal An-na en ${ }^{d}$ Innanna ba-túg ${ }^{20}$

[^16]mu en am-gal An-na en ${ }^{\text {d }}$ Innanna ba-túg'
ти en unй $(g)$-gal "Innanna ba-tíg-g $\dot{a}^{2}$
mu en-nun-gal An-nuki-ág ${ }^{d}$ Bur-d Sin en Eridu ${ }^{k i}$ ba-túg ${ }^{3}$
ти en-nun-gal ${ }^{d}$ Bur- ${ }^{d}$ Sin ki-hg en Eridu ${ }^{k i}$ ab-túg ${ }^{4}$
ти en-nun-e ${ }^{d}$ Bur-d ${ }^{d}$ Sin-ra ki-ág en Eridu ${ }^{k i} b a-t u ́ g^{5}$
mи en-nun-ni ${ }^{d}$ Bur-d ${ }^{d}$ Sin-ra ki-ág ba-túg ${ }^{6}$
mu en-nun-ni ki-ag ${ }^{d}$ Bur-d ${ }^{d}$ Sin Eridu ${ }^{k i}$ ba-túg ${ }^{7}$
mu en unŭ(g)-gal dnnanna ba-túg ${ }^{8}$
ти en un̄̄(g)-gal d Innanna ba-túg ${ }^{9}$
mи en unŭ (g)-gal ba-tı́y ${ }^{10}$
mи en har-gal ${ }^{\text {d }}$ Innanna ba-túg ${ }^{11}$
mu en har-gal [ . . . . . . . $]^{12}$
6th ${ }^{12}$ : mu uš-sa en am-gal An-na en ${ }^{d}$ Innanna ba-a-túg ${ }^{14}$
mu uš-sa en An-na en Innanna ba-túg ${ }^{1 \text { in }}$
mu us'-sa en am-gal An-na ba-túg ${ }^{16}$
$m u^{d} B u r-{ }^{d}$ Sin lugal-e $\tilde{S}^{2} a-a s ̌-r u-u m^{k i} b a-h u^{17}{ }^{17}$
$m u \check{S} a-a \check{s}-r u^{k i} b a-h u ́ l^{18}$
7th: mu uš-sa $\check{S} a-a \check{c s-r u-u m^{k i}} b a-h u ́ b^{19}$
ти Hu-hí-nu-rikizo ba-húl-a ${ }^{21}$
mu Hu-húu-nu-ri $i^{k i 22} b a-h u u^{2^{23}}$
${ }^{1}$ R. T., XIX, p. 60, No. 615; Dates of Bur-Sin ( $41: 8 ; 95: 34$ ).
${ }^{2}$ See Dates of Bur-Sin (11: 17). ${ }^{3}$ C. T. 111,14606, R., 1.
${ }^{4}$ H. L. C., Pl. 78, No. 67, VII, 14.
${ }^{5}$ T'. T., 291; R. T. C., 303, R., 2; Amh., 102, R., 7.
${ }^{1} H$. L. C., PI. 50, No. 283, R., 5.
${ }^{7}$ Amh., 104,6.
${ }^{8}$ R. T. C., 298, R., 5(?) ; Amh., 81, 10; Amh., 83, 13 (ba-a-túg); Dates of Bur-Sin (47:7).
${ }^{8}$ E. A. H., 74-77; E. B. H., p. 268; R. T. C., 298, R., 5.
${ }^{10}$ Amhe, 82, 6.
${ }^{11}$ B. E., $\mathrm{I}^{2}, 127, \mathrm{O} ., 5$.
${ }^{12}$ Dates of Bur-Sin (18:11).
${ }^{13}$ For the dates of the 6 th year of Bur-Sin see Chapter IX.
${ }^{14}$ Amh., 84, L. E.
${ }^{15}$ Dates of Bur-Sin (42:7).
${ }^{16}$ T. T., $50, \mathrm{~K} ., 3 ; 76$, L. E.
${ }^{17}$ E. Н. В., 78-86; E. B. Н., p. 268.
${ }^{18}$ B. E., I' ${ }^{2}$, 127, O., 6; Amh., 85, 7 (Ša-aš-ru-um $\left.{ }^{k i}\right)$.
${ }^{19}$ C. T., X, 19065, L. E. This datc map belong to Dungi, 54. See Thureau-Dangin, S. A. K. I., p. 233.
${ }^{20}$ Written hu.
${ }^{21}$ Dates of Bur-Sin (4:16).
${ }^{22}$ The signs $h u$ and $r i$ have changed places in $B . E ., \mathrm{I}^{2}, 127,0,7$.
${ }^{23} C T ., \mathrm{X}, 12248, \mathrm{R} ., 12 ; A m h ., 86, \mathrm{R} ., 2 ; 87,11$, etc. See preceding reference.

8th: mu uš-sa $H u-\bar{u}-h u ́-n u-r^{k x} b a-h i ́ u l^{1}$
ти us-sa Hu-ȟ́u-nu-ri $i^{k i}$ ba-ȟú $t^{2}$
ти é-gal ${ }^{d}$ Bur- ${ }^{d}$ Sin lei-cig ${ }^{d}$ en Eridu ${ }^{k i}$ ba-túg ${ }^{3}$
mи en Eridu ${ }^{k i}$ ba-a-túg ${ }^{1}$
mu en Eridu ${ }^{k i} b a-t u ́ g-g a^{5}$
mu en Eridu ${ }^{k i}$ ba-túg ${ }^{6}$
9th: mu ušs-sa en ${ }^{d}$ En-ki Eridu ${ }^{k i}$ ba-túg ${ }^{7}$
mu us-sa en Eridu ${ }^{k i}$ ba-túug
mu uš-sa en Eridu ${ }^{k i}$
mu en ${ }^{\text {i }}$ Nanna Kar-zi(d)-da ba-a-túug ${ }^{10}$
mu en ${ }^{\text {d }}$ Nanna Kar-zi(d)-da ba-túg ${ }^{11}$
mu en ${ }^{d}$ Nanna Kar-zi(d)-da $a^{12}$
10th ${ }^{13}$ : mu us-sa en ${ }^{\text {d }}$ Nanna Kar-zi(d)-da ba-túg ${ }^{14}$

## Gimil-Sin.

1st: mu ${ }^{d}$ Gimil- $^{d}$ Sin lugal ${ }^{15}$
2d: ти má-dara-zu-ab ba-ab-ba-d $\bar{u}^{10}$ ти тú-dara-zu-ab ba-d $\bar{u}^{17}$
3d: ти uš-sa mci-dam zu-ab ba-d $\bar{u}^{18}$ mu Si-ma-num ${ }^{k i 19}$ ba-híl ${ }^{20}$
${ }^{1}$ C. $T ., \mathrm{X}, 24959$, R., E .
${ }^{2}$ C. T., I, 94-10-16, 2, R., 111, $1 ; \mathrm{I}, 94-10-16,4$, R., III, 9.
${ }^{2}$ C. T., I, 94-10-16, 5, E.
${ }^{4} A m h ., 97,14 ; 99,14 ; 99,11 ; 100,14$.
${ }^{5}$ E. A. H., 87; E. B. H., p. 269.
${ }^{6}$ B. E., $\mathrm{I}^{2}, 127, \mathrm{O} ., 8 ;$ Amh., 96, R., 2; Dates of Bur-Sin (3:7; 46:15).
${ }^{7}$ Dates of Bur-Sin (134:13).
${ }^{8}$ E. A. H., 88; E. B. H., p. 269; Dates of Bur-Sin (32; 45; 54; 59; 103; 104).
${ }^{8}$ Amh., 106, 8.
${ }^{10}$ Amh., 117, 10.
${ }^{11}$ B. E., I ${ }^{2}$, 127, О., 9; E. А. Н., 89; E. В. ЯН., p. 269; Amh., 107, 7; 109, 19; 110, 9; 112, 10; 114, 10; 116, 13;
118, 7; 121, 6; Dates of Bur-Sin (60:5).
${ }^{12}$ Amh., 119, 10.
${ }^{13}$ Last year of Bur-Sin, the same as the accession year of Gimil-Sin.
${ }^{14}$ O. B. T. R., 169, according to the catalogue given by Lau, p. 68. The tablet is not published. I have given the Sumerian text according to the English translation by Lau.
${ }^{15}$ R. A., 111,p. 144; E. A. H., 91; E. B. H., p. 275; Dates of Gimil-Sin (62:10; $63: 7$ ).
${ }^{18}$ Dates of Gimil-Sin (158:7).
${ }^{17}$ R. A., 111, p. 144.
${ }^{18}$ T. T., 240.
${ }^{18}$ See note to Dates of Gimil-Sin, 3d year.
${ }^{20}$ R. T. C., 415, R., 4 ; Dates of Gimil-Sin (48:8).
6

4th: mu us'-sa Si-ma-num ${ }^{k i}$ ba-húl $l^{1}$
mu ${ }^{d}$ Gimil-d ${ }^{d}$ Sin lugal Urù-unu(g) ${ }^{k i}$-ma-ge bád-mar-tu mu-ri-ik Ti-id-ni-im $m u-d \bar{u}^{2}$
mu bád-mar-tu ${ }^{k i} b a-d \bar{u}^{3}$
ти bcid-mar-tu ba-dū ${ }^{4}$
mu bád-mar-tu $m u^{5}-d \bar{u}^{6}$
[mub]ád-mar-t[u ba-du . . . . . ] uš-sa-bi ${ }^{7}$
5th: mu us'-sa ${ }^{d}$ Gimil-d ${ }^{\text {d }}$ Sin lugal Urù̀-unu (g) ${ }^{k i}$-ma-ge bád-mar-tu mu-ri-ik Tik-id-ni-im mu-d $\bar{u}^{9}$
mu uš-sa ${ }^{d}$ Gimil- ${ }^{d}$ Sin luyal-e bcid-mar-tu mu-ri-ik Ti-id-ni-im mu-[d $\left.\bar{u}\right]^{10}$ ти uš-sa bád-mar-tu ${ }^{k i} n a-d \bar{u}^{11}$
ти us-sa bhd-mar-tu ba-dū ${ }^{\iota 2}$
ти uš-sa bád-mar-tu ${ }^{k i}$ ba-dti mu uš-sa-bi $i^{1_{3}}$
6th: mu ${ }^{d}$ Gimil- ${ }^{d}$ Sin lugal urù-unu $(g)^{k i}$-ma-ge na-rú-a-mah ${ }^{d}$ En-lil ${ }^{d}$ Nin-lil-ra mu-ne-d?
mu na-mah ${ }^{d}$ En-lil-lá ba-d $\bar{u}^{15}$
7th: mu ${ }^{d}$ Gimil- ${ }^{d}$ Sin lugal urù-unu $(g)^{k i}-m a-g e ~ m a-d a ~ Z a-a b-s ̌ a-l l^{k i}$ mu-híl $-a^{16}$
8th ${ }^{17}$ : mu ${ }^{d}$ Gimil- ${ }^{d}$ Sin lugal urù-unu $(g)^{k i}-m a-g e ~ m a ́-g u ́ r-m a h \underline{~}{ }^{d}$ En-lil ${ }^{d} N i n-l i l-r a ~ m u-~$ ne-dim ${ }^{18}$
ти má-gúr-mah ba-dim'9
${ }^{1} T . T ., 76 ; R . A ., 111$, p. 144.
${ }^{2}$ C. T., III, 14608, R., 5.
${ }^{3}$ R. T., XVIII, p. 71.
${ }^{4}$ R. A., 111,p. 144; E. A. Zf., 93; E. B. H., p. 276.
${ }^{5}$ Note the prefix $m u$.
${ }^{6}$ Dates of Gimil-Sin (116:21).
${ }^{7}$ B. E., I ${ }^{2}$, 127, R., 1.
${ }^{8} \boldsymbol{T}$ omitted in R. T. C., 428, R., 7.
${ }^{9}$ R. T., XIX, p. 186; R. T. C., 428, R., 4.
${ }^{10}$ Dates of Gimil-Sin (49:9).
${ }^{11} R . T$., XVIII, p. 71.
${ }^{12}$ Dates of Gimil-Sin (1:23).
${ }^{13} R$. T., XVIII, p. 71.
${ }^{14}$ R. T. C., 295, O., 9; Dates of Gimil-Sin (2:19, ki after urì-unu $(g)$ is wanting).
${ }^{15}$ B. E., $\mathrm{I}^{2}, 127$, R., 2.
${ }^{10}$ B. E., $\mathrm{I}^{2}, 127, \mathrm{R} ., \mathbf{3}$; Dates of Gimil-Sin (a number of tablets).
${ }^{17}$ See above.
${ }^{18}$ R. A., IIII, p. 124.
${ }^{19}$ Dates of Gimil-Sin $(9,130,131)$.

# 9th ${ }^{1}$ : mu ${ }^{d}$ Gimil-d ${ }^{d}$ Sin lugal urù-unu(g) ${ }^{k i}-m a-g e ~ e ́ ~ d a g a b ~+~ s i g g^{2}{ }^{\text {gish }} H \hat{u}^{k i}$ mu-d $\bar{u}^{3}$ ти $\dot{e}^{d} L a g a b+\operatorname{sig} b a-d \bar{u}^{4}$ 

## Ibí-Sin.

1st: $m u^{d} I-b i{ }^{-d} \operatorname{Sin} l u g a l^{5}$
2d: mu ${ }^{d}$ Innan $[n a] b a-t u ́ g^{6}$
3d-25th: mu ${ }^{d} I-b i{ }^{d}$ Sin lugal Si-mu-ru-um ${ }^{k i}$ ba-híl $i^{7}$

## 2. Uncertain Dates. ${ }^{8}$ <br> Dungi.

1. $m u^{d}$ Dun-gi-ra $d$-su( $m$ )-ma ${ }^{9}$

ти lugal-ra à [ . . ] su(m)-ma ${ }^{10}$
2. mu en-nam- $X^{11}{ }^{d}$ Dun-gi-ra-ge ba-gub ba-túg ${ }^{12}$

## Ibi-Sin.

## 1. $[m] u^{d} I-b i-{ }^{d} \operatorname{Sin} l u[g a l]$ urù- $\left[u n u(g)^{k i}-m a-g e\right]$ Si-mu-ru-um ${ }^{k i}$ mu-híu ${ }^{13}$ ти ${ }^{d} I-b i i^{d}$ Sin lugal Si-mu-ru-um ${ }^{k i}$ ba-híul ${ }^{14}$

## 3. Unclassified Dates. ${ }^{15}$

1. mu bád-gal Nibru ${ }^{k i}$ urù-unu(g) $)^{k i}-m a ~ b a-r u^{18}$
2. $m u$ bád urù-unu(g) $)^{k i} b a-r u^{17}$
${ }^{1}$ Last year of Gimil-Sin, tlie same as the accession year of Ibi-Sin. See above.
${ }^{2}$ Barton simply copies the sign as GAL, H. L. C., I, Pl. 50. So. 144, R., 3, and translates, "the great god Gi-shuh," p. 50 ; but this is no doubt a misinterpretation of the usual Lagab $+\operatorname{sig}$ sign.
${ }^{3} R . T$. C., 309, 4;429, R., 3; and reference in preceding note.
${ }^{4}$ R. A., III, p. 144; R. S.,p. 74. Lau, O. B. T. R., No. 206 (text not given) gives this date as "the year in which the temple of dingir GIS.UH(?) was built." He has probably overlooked the sign of the name of the deity.
${ }^{5}$ R. A., III, p. 144; C. T., III, 16366, L. E., 16367, R., 13; 16368, It., 17; Dates of Ibi-Sin (16, 51, 82, 94).
${ }^{6}$ According to Thureau-Dangin, from an unpublished tablet in Constantinople, M. I. O., 831. See S.A.K. I., pp. 229, 235.
${ }^{7}$ Dates of Ibi-Sin (39.7).
${ }^{\text {ع }}$ For uncertain dates of $U r$-Engur see dates of that king.
${ }^{9}$ See $D u n g i, 3 d-12$ th.
${ }^{10} R . T$ C., 268, R., $8 . \quad{ }^{11} \operatorname{Sign} R . E . C .$, No. 316.
${ }^{12}$ E. A. H., 109, R., 7 : E. B. H., pp. 280, 420.
${ }^{13}$ R. A., 111,p. $126 . \quad{ }^{14}$ Dates of Ibi-Sin.
${ }^{15}$ Under this head would naturally fall the date given by Pinches, Amh., pp. 15, 16, as mu a-ba-gi, "Year tlie water returned," but the phrase is certainly no date at all. Under this head would also come tlie date given bv Barton, H. L. C., II, p 29, as "The year the king repaired the house." How Barton derived this meaning from the text is not easily seen, but he has copied the last signs of the line, H. L. C., II, Pl 56 , No. $56, \mathrm{~V}, 7$, something like $i n$-še-za, omitting the horizontal wedge at the bottom of the last sign. As it now stands, it has, of course, no meaning The line no doubt has to be read mu lugal ge $i n-p a(d)$, "By the name of the king he (they) swore." It is no date.
${ }^{18}$ New dates (133:17). This may be a fuller formula for the following.
${ }^{1^{7}}$ R. T. C., 269, R., 3. This may be a shorter formula for the preceding.
3. mu uS-sa bád-gal Nibru ${ }^{k i} u r \grave{̀}$-unu(g) $)^{k i}-m a b a-r u^{1}$
4. ти id $A-{ }^{-1}$ Nin-tu ba-al ${ }^{2}$
5. ти uš $6^{d} N i n-B \dot{A} D+[?]^{3} k i-b a-a-g a r^{4}$
6. mu luyal-e ${ }^{d} N i b r u^{k i}-t a^{5}$
7. ти $\cup S$-sa Lu-lu-bu-um ${ }^{k i} b a-h u^{\prime} l^{6}$
8. ти еп Ga-es ${ }^{\text {ki }}$ ba-túug ${ }^{7}$
9. ти en ${ }^{d}$ Innanna unú $(g)^{k i}-g a^{8}$ máš-e ni $i^{9}-p a(d)^{10}$
mи en ${ }^{d}$ Innanna unú $(g)^{k i}$ máş-e $i[b \text {. . . . . . . . . . }]^{11}$
10. ти $m[\hat{a}(?)]-d a z[u(?)]-a[b(?)$. . . . . . $] n[e(?) \text {. . . . . . }]^{12}$
11. ти Tu-ki-in-PA-mi-ig-ri-Sa dumu-sal lugal pa-te-si $Z a-a b-s ̌ a-l i^{k i}$ ba-an-tug ${ }^{13}$ ти dumи-sal lugal pa-te-si $Z a-a b-5 ̌ a-l l^{k i} b a-t u g^{14}$
mu-dumu-sal lugal pa-te-si $Z a-a b-s ̌ a-l i^{k i} b a-a n-t u g^{\prime 5}$
mu uš-sa ${ }^{k i} a-d u$ II-kam-aš ba-húul ${ }^{16}$
12. mu Sibum ${ }^{k i}$ ba-húul ${ }^{17}$
13. mи Hudnuri ${ }^{k i} b a-h \underline{u} l^{18}$
${ }^{1}$ New dates (133:20).
${ }^{2}$ R. T. C., 270, R., 6.
${ }^{3}$ The sign in R.T. C., 271, is $B A D$ with a broken sign inside. May be R.E. C., No. 366, but not certain. Cf. Thureau-Dangin, S. A. K.I., p. 235.
${ }^{4} R . T . C ., 271$, R., 3.
${ }^{5}$ R. T. C., 272, R., 3.
${ }^{\text {f }}$ E: A. H., 106, 6; E. B. H., pp. 279, 428.
${ }^{7}$ R. T. C., 378, R., 5.
${ }^{8} g a$ is wanting in No. 56:46.
${ }^{9}$ T. T., 296, has ni-e.
${ }^{10}$ R. T. C., 401, R., III, 3; T. T., 296. Unclassified dates (22, tablet: 7; $56: 46$ ).
${ }^{11}$ Unclassified dates (22, case: R., 2).
${ }^{12}$ Unclassified dates (50:9).
${ }^{13}$ R. T. C., 404, R., 21; Unclassified dates (135:42).
${ }^{14}$ T. T., 237, R., 5; 276, R., 6.
${ }^{15}$ T. T., 243, R., 6.
${ }^{16}$ H. L. C., 11,Pl. 63, No. 31, R., 1. Barton translates: "The year the land was devastated a second time," p. 30. But the $K Z$ is no doubt only the remaining postposition after the name of a country; the namc itself being left.out, whether by the old Babylonian scribe or by the American copyist, cannot be seen from the reproduced text. Both are possible, however. If this explanation is correct, the only known datc formula that would answer all conditions, not considering the $u s ̌-s a$, would he the formula for the 41st year of Dungi, mu Gan-har ${ }^{k i}$ a-du II-kam-ě̌ ba-hul. This would be an $u s ̌$-sa formula of the same and would designate the following or 42d year of Dungi, for which year no uš-sa formula has been found as yet. Hence we would hare to read: mu uš-sa Gan-har ${ }^{k i} a-d u I I-k a m-\alpha \check{s} b a-h u ́ l$.
${ }^{17}$ Thus according to Lau in his catalogue, O. B. T. R., No. 147, but no text is given. Cf., however, the name Sabum in connection with Huhunuri, Morgan, Scheil collection, No. 112.
${ }^{18}$ Thus according to Lau, O. B. T. R., No. 71, but again no text is given. May be an error for Hubunuri.

## THE NAMES AND ORDER OF THE MONTHS DURING THE SECOND DYNASTY OF UR. ${ }^{1}$

In regard to the old Babylonian months of the year, there has been and is still a great deal of uncertainty. It is true that Kugler ${ }^{2}$ recently proposed to brush away all difficulties in the matter by pointing out the fact that Gan-maš was the first month of the year. Unfortunately, however, even if this proposition be granted, there are still, as will be seen, other problems to be solved in a more satisfactory way.

First, then, we have to note the fact that not only two, as Kugler puts the case, but at least four. different nomenclatures of the months are used at the same time during the second dynasty of Ur. And still there are names for months to be found that cannot as yet be identified with certainty, e.g., Mes-an-du and Azag-šim, etc. ${ }^{3}$ That other different nomenclatures of the old Babylonian months existed is clearly shown by the list in V R., 43., where six old Babylonian names are given for every name of the months written ideographically during later periods.

As for the time of the second dynasty of Ur, however, we know that at least four nomenclatures were used. Thus we find a list of names occurring at the time of Sargon I, and even before, ${ }^{4}$ still used during this later period. Although Kugler speaks with great authority and considers the order of months, he presents as definitely settled, the list of old Babylonian months in use at the time of Sargon I, which he gives as List A, is absolutely wrong. ${ }^{5}$

[^17]Disavowing the suggestion, made by Thureau-Dangin, that Mes-an-du is to be regarded as an intercalary month, he inserts it between $M u$-šu-dǔ and Ezen-Amar- $a-a-s i$, thus not only bringing the whole list out of harmony with List B, but giving the list $\mathbf{1 3}$ months, without counting the intercalary month. Thus Amar-$a-a-s i$, for example, would be both the 10th and 11th month at the same time.

Now the order as well as the number of the months of this list, from Dumu-xi to Dir-Še-kin-kud, are definitely fixed by R. A., IV, Pl. XXVIII, No. 77. We have here not only the order and number of months given, but these are also checked by the summary at the end. Thus from Dumu-xi to Dir-S̆e-kin-kud are seven months, the full month of those given always being counted. There is no place for Mes-en-du in this list, and hence it has to be placed in some other list of nomenclatures. This list, marked I in the comparative list of nomenclatures, has to be constructed as given in the first column below. Then another list can be constructed, which by Thureau-Dangin is designed as being characteristic for this period,' and which has been marked II in the comparative lists. ${ }^{2}$ This is given in the second column below.

| I. itu Exen-Gun-mag, | I. itu Gan-maš, |
| :---: | :---: |
| II. itu Ezen-Gu(d)-du ${ }^{3}$-ne-sar-sar, | II. itu Gu(d)-ne-sar-sar, |
| III. itu Ezen- ${ }^{d}$ Ne-š̆u, |  |
| IV. itu $\check{S} u$-kul, | IV. itu su-lcul, |
| V. itu Ezen-Dı̆m-kù, | V. itu Dı̌m-kù, |
| VI. itu Ezen- ${ }^{\text {d }}$ Dumu-zi, | VI. itu Dити-хі, |
| VII. itu Ur, | VII. itu Ezen-d Dun-gi, |
| VIII. itu Ezen- ${ }^{d} B a-$ u, | VIII. itu Ezen-Ba-u, |
| IX. itu $M u-s{ }^{\text {c }} u$-dŭ, | IX. itu $M u$-šu-dú, ${ }^{6}$ |
| X. itu Amar-a-a-si, | X. itu Amar-a-a-si, |
| XIa. itu Še-kin-kud-du, ${ }^{4}$ | XIa. itu Še-kin-kud, ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |
| XIb. itu Dir-Še-kin-kud, | XIb. itu Dir-Š-kin-kud, ${ }^{8}$ |
| XII. itu $\breve{S} e-i l l-l a .{ }^{5}$ | XII. itu Še-il-la. |

But we find even in this comparatively early period names, which are practically
${ }^{1}$ R. A., IV, pp. 83, 84.
${ }^{2}$ See R. T. C., 403; T. T., 3.
${ }^{3}$ Also written $r a, R . T . C ., 337$, edge; 326, R. 5; and ta, $\Lambda m h ., 53,7$.
${ }^{4}$ See R.T. C., 55, B. II, 2 ; $\dot{S} e-k i n-a, R . T$. C., 180, O., 3; cf. itu $\check{S} e-i r-h 2 u-u m ~ \check{S} e-k i n-k u d-a$ and the remarkable variant, Ăškin-kud-a, D.P. M., X, Nos. 11, 12.
${ }^{5}$ For names see also R.T.C., 180; Amh., pp. xixff.
${ }^{6}$ No. 136: 18.
${ }^{7}$ Written itu Še-sag-kud, Nos. 100. 117. See also Nos. 1, 14, 28, 31, 79, 80, 93, 100, 158, $159 . \quad{ }^{8}$ No. 2.
identical with the names of the months, written ideographically, used during the time of Hammurabi and even at later periods, marked III in comparative lists:

I. itu Bár-zag-gar, ${ }^{1}$<br>VIII. itu Engar-dǔ-a, ${ }^{8}$<br>11. itu $G u(d)-s i-z u,{ }^{2}$<br>IX. itu Gán-gán-è, ${ }^{9}$<br>III. itu Sig-ga, ${ }^{3}$<br>X. itu $A b-b a-\stackrel{e}{ }{ }^{10}$<br>IV. itu $\check{S} u-k u l-a,{ }^{4}$<br>XI. itu $\dot{A} s{ }_{s}-a,{ }^{11}$<br>V. itu Bil-bil-gar, ${ }^{\text {T}}$<br>XIIa. itu $\breve{S} e-k i n-k u d,{ }^{12}$<br>VI. itu Kin-dnnanna, ${ }^{6}$<br>XIIb. itu Dir-Še-kin-kud. ${ }^{13}$<br>VII. itu Dul-azag, ${ }^{7}$

Lastly we have an altogether new and different list of nomenclatures from this period, given in the interesting but somewhat mysterious tablet of the E.A.H. collection No. 134, published by Radau, ${ }^{14}$ which begins with Še-kin-kud, marked IV in comparative lists:

| I a. itu $\check{S}$ e-kin-kud, | VII. itu $\dot{A}-k i-t i,{ }^{17}$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| Ib. itu Dir-Še-kin-kud, | VIII. itu Ezen- ${ }^{\text {d }}$ Dun-gi, |
| 11. itu Bar-azag-kù, |  |
| III. itu Dun-da-ku, | X. itu Ezen-Mah, ${ }^{19}$ |
| IV. itu $\hat{U}$-ne-ri-mù, | XI. itu Ezen-An-na, ${ }^{20}$ |
| V. itu Ki-sig ${ }^{d}$ Nin- $\alpha-z u$, ${ }^{\text {T }}$ | XII. itu Ezen-Me-ki-gal. ${ }^{21}$ |
| VI. 边 Ezen- ${ }^{\text {d }}$ Nin-a-zu, ${ }^{16}$ |  |

As far as the order of the months goes, these four lists are pretty well established. The difficulty lies in the identification of these different names with the particular months referred to. In some cases the names, although varying more or less, can be identified with each other, and the order is known. This gives starting points for the comparison of others; but in other cases we are still at a loss as to the reconciliation of these different nomenclatures.

The chief problem, however, is to determine which month in the different lists actually was the first month of the year. In the beginning of his study of old Baby-

| ${ }^{1}$ Nos. 4, 44, 51, 85, 117. |  | ${ }^{2}$ Also read $g u(d)-s i-s a . \quad$ See Nos. 16, 50, 117, 130. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ${ }^{3}$ Nos. 13, 49, 88. |  | ${ }^{4}$ Nos. 21, 60, 62, 75, 117. |
| ${ }^{5}$ Nos. 126, 163. |  | ${ }^{8}$ Nos. 39, 86. |
| ${ }^{7}$ Nos. 86, 128. |  | ${ }^{8}$ Nos. 23, 24, 25, 37. |
| ${ }^{8}$ Nos. 129, 135. |  | ${ }^{10}$ Nos. 41, 52, 63, 65. |
| ${ }^{11}$ Nos. 8, 11, 56, 87, 111, 117, 131. |  | ${ }^{12}$ Nos. 1, 14, 28, 31, 79, 80, 93, 100, 158, 159. |
| ${ }^{13}$ Nos. 100, 117. |  | ${ }^{14}$ E. B. H., p. 299. |
| 15 No. 45. |  | ${ }^{16}$ Nos. 17, 32, 94. |
| ${ }^{17} \text { No. } 116 .$ |  | ${ }^{18}$ No. 53. Also written $\check{S} u$-ša-ě, No. $46: 14$. |
| ${ }^{19}$ Kos. 57, 104. | ${ }^{20}$ No. 34. |  |

lonian months, Thureau-Dangin placed Gan-maš as the second, $\check{S} e-l l-l a$ as the first month.' Later he has been a staunch supporter of the view that Gun-ma5 was the first and $\check{S} e-\hat{l} l-l a$ the last. ${ }^{2}$ This against Radau, who maintained the previous position taken. ${ }^{3}$ Radau, however, has found his followers ${ }^{4}$ as well as ThureauDangin. ${ }^{5}$

As for the documents from Telloh, and as far as the lists I and II are concerned, the facts seem to support the view that Gan-maš was the first, $\check{S}$ e-ill-la the last month of the year at this period. But there are difficulties yet to be surmounted, as will be seen later, in regard to the other lists. That accounts in the Telloh tablets run from Gan-maš to $\check{S}$ e-il-la does not prove the numerical order of these months in the slightest degree. Accounts run between any months in the same year, as well as from any month in one year to any other month in another year, as from $\check{S} e-i l-l a$ to Dir-Še-kin-kud, ${ }^{\text {, }}$ from $\check{S} e-i l-l a$ to $G u(d)$-ra-ne-sar-sar, ${ }^{7}$ from $G u(d)-d u$ -ne-sar-sar to Še-kin-Fud, ${ }^{8}$ from $G u(d)-s i-z u$ to Bár-zag-gar-ra, ${ }^{9}$ from Gu(d)-si-zu to $\check{S} u-k u l$ the next year, ${ }^{10}$ from Dı̆m-kù to Gan-mǎ̌, ${ }^{11}$ and from Amar-a-a-si to Amar-a-a-si the following year. ${ }^{12}$ But, as has been asserted before, ${ }^{13}$ the summary of 62 months during 5 years in C. T., V, Pl. 44, No. 18358, V, 10, and also the summary of 15 months during 2 years in O.B.T.R., 251, IV, $18,{ }^{14}$ would show that, as far as the methods used in Telloh are concerned, Gan-maš was counted as the first month and $\check{S} e-i l-l a$ as the last. But how are the lines O. B. T. R., 251, III, 1-10, $\breve{S}_{e}$-kin$k u d|u ̀ \check{S} e-i l-l a| m u-g u-z a$, etc. | . . $\mid$ itu XII-kam | to be explained?

To these proofs may now be added Amh., 31, last col., 9-17, itu Gan-maš | mu uš-sa bád-ma-da-ta|itu Še-ll-la |mu uš-sa é, etc. | itu dir ni-gál $\mid$ itu-bi XXVII | . Thus from Gan-maš, as the first month of the 48th year of Dungi, to $\check{S}$ e- $l l-l a$, the last month of the 50th year, with one intercalary month, will make 27 months. Also, if $\check{S} e$ - $\hat{l}$-la were the first month, we would expect an $u \check{s}$-sa formula when tablets were
${ }^{1}$ See J. A., Ser. IS,Vol. VII (1896), p. 339ff. ; R. A., IV, pp. 88, 89.
${ }^{2}$ See especially Z. A., XV, pp. 409ff.; also O. L. Z., I, p. 164.
${ }^{3}$ E. B. H., p. 2878.
${ }^{4}$ Ginzel, Handbuch, p. 114;Lau, O. B. T. R., p. 41; Pinches, Amh.. p. XXIII.
${ }^{5}$ Huber, P. K. U. N., p. X; Kugler, Z. A., XXII, pp. 68ff.
${ }^{6}$ R. T. C., 402, O., 11;R., 18.
${ }^{7}$ Amh., 53, 1-7.
${ }^{8}$ C. T., V, Pl. 39, No. 17752, IV, 5-10.
${ }^{9}$ No. 117.
${ }^{10}$ No. 133.
${ }^{11}$ T. T., 3.
${ }^{12}$ H. L. C., I, Pl. 1, No. 67.
${ }^{13}$ Thureau-Dangin, Z. A., XV, pp. 409ff.; Kugler, Z. A., XXII, pp. 71ff
${ }^{14}$ Kugler, Z. A., XXII, p. 72.
dated in this month, as only in exceptional cases the event, on account of which a new date formula would be instituted, would occur in the very first month of the year. Thus $A m h ., 81$ and 86, are dated itu $\check{S}$ e-il-la $\mid m u$ en, ete., and C.T., III, 14600, itu $\tilde{S}_{e}-$-ll-la $\mid$ mu Ur-bil-lum ${ }^{k i} \mid$, and not mu usb-sa ${ }^{d}$ Bur-d Sin lugal, which was an earlier date formula for the same year. On the other hand, Gan-maš has an uk-sa formula, mu uš-sa en-mah, $A m h$., 80,8 ; but the later formula of the same year was mu en am-gal, etc., being the 5th year of Bur-Sin.

In C. T., I, Pl. 1, Nos. 94-10-16, 59, R., 12, the phrase itu $X$-kam takes the regular place of the name of a month immediately before the date formula of the year. By itself the phrase might perhaps mean " 10 months" as well as "the 10th month." Still no summary of the mouths given above on the tablet will make 10 months. On the other hand, the last month of the accounts is Amar-a-$a-s t$, which is the 10th month of the year, if Gan-maš is placed first.

The material and hence the findings in regard to Gan-maš and $\check{S}$ e-il-la, however, are entirely confined Io Telloh tablets. Tu regard to the tablets excavated at Nippur, on the other hand, I have not found, as yet, a single tablet where the months Gan-maš or $\check{S} e-i l-l a$ are mentioned. From this fact it might be argued that the lists of which these two months form part, were used particularly at Telloh. Still other names of these lists, as $G u(d)-d u-n e-s a r-s a r, N e-s ̌ u ́ u$ and $D u m u-z i$, are found on Nippur twblets.

In regard to the lists III and IV, which seem to predominate on the Nippur tablets, the burning question is also the numerical order of the months. Which were the first months? Unfortunately, this cannot be absolutely determined with the material at hand.

In the document published and discussed by Radau, ${ }^{1}$ the month $\check{S} e-k i n-k u d$ heads the list, of months, while at the same time the order of the months is conclusively determined. ${ }^{2}$ This would point to this month as the first month of the year during some period of the second dynasty of Ur; but it does not, of course, by itself supply a conclusive argument for such a proposition. Another document from the same period, Amh., 85, seems to support this view, however. The tablet in question is dated in the month of Ezen-Ba- $u$, but the envelope or case, in which it was originally enclosed, is dated in the month $\check{S} e$-kin-kud. The year, according to Pinches ${ }^{3}-$-the text of the envelope not being published in extenso-is the same on both

[^18]the tablet and the envelope, viz., the 52d year of Dungi' or the 6th year of Bur-Sin. As the tablet must have been made and dated before being enclosed in the envelope, and as the latter consequently must have been dated later than the tablet - but, if Pinches is right, in the same year- $\breve{S}$ e-kin-kud must precede Ezen-Bau, and thus be the first month of the year.

On the other hand, it is clear that $\check{S} e-k i n-k u d$ could not very well be the first month. Tablets are dated in this month without an ub-sa formula, which would show that this month came later in the year. ${ }^{2}$ Still the Še-kin-kud of these tablets may belong to list I or II, where it was the 11th month, or to list III, where it perhaps was the 12th month, and would tend to prove that during the reign of the kings of the second dynasty of Ur the calendar was chanqed so as to make $\check{S}$ e-kinkud the 11 th month of List I and II, the 12 th month of List III and the 1 st month of the list IV. This would also relieve us of the difficulty, otherwise arising, that although Hammurabi changed the calendar by inserting an extra month, ${ }^{3}$ the numerical order of the list III of the Ur dynasty would be the same as that of the Hammurabi period and of later Babylonian and Assyrian times. This would also satisfactorily explain, why the 7 th month was called $\grave{A}-k i-t i$, the beginning month of the (half) year. Bár-azag-kù, if it really is to be identified with Bár-zaggar, will come a month later than in the list III, likewise Ezen-Dungi. Exen-Me-ki-gál would be the 12 th month, to which there are no known obstacles. On the contrary, V R., 43, R., 7, places this month opposite $\check{S} e-k i n-k u d$, or the 12th month of List III. In any case, the customary identification of the old month of Dumu-xi with the later arhu $D u$ 'uzu cannot be maintained.

Thus, as over against the certainty of Kugler, I still fully agree with such a careful and experienced investigator as Pinches, that "there is still much to learn concerning the calendar of this early period." ${ }^{\prime \prime}$

On the supposition that there were changes made in the calendar during this period, of which we still have no definite knowledge, or on the supposition that perhaps different nomenclatures were used in different Babylonian centres, and until fresh material will throw new light on the subject, I venture, provisionally, to harmonize the four different nomenclatures used during the second dynasty of Ur in the following comparative lists. In regard to list IV, however, I am not sure, whether it would not prove more harmonious simply to ignore the evidence which the E. A. H. tablet and Amh., 85, seem to furnish, and consequently make Bar-azag$k \dot{u}$ the first, $\check{S}$ e-kin-kud the last month.

[^19]
## Nomenclatures of Old Babylonian Months

used during the Second Dynasty of Ur.

|  | $I$. | 11. | 111. | IV. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & I a \\ & I b \end{aligned}$ | itu Gan-maš | itu Gan-maš | itu Bcir-zag-gar | itu $\check{S} e-k i n-k u d$ ituDir-Še-kin-kud |
| II | $\begin{aligned} & \text { itu } G u(d)-d u-n e-s a r-\mid \\ & \text { sar } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { itu Gu(d)-ne-sar- } \\ & \quad \text { sar } \end{aligned}$ | itu $G u(d)-s i-z u$ | itu Bar-azag-kù |
| III. | itu Ezen-d ${ }^{\text {d }}$ - - šáu $^{\text {a }}$ | itu ${ }^{\text {d }}$ Ne-šúu | itu Sig-ga | itu Dun-da-kì |
| IV. | itu $\check{S}$ u-kul | itu $\check{S} u$-kul | itu $\mathrm{S}^{\text {u }}$-kul-a | itu $\widehat{U}$-ne-ri-mù |
| V . | itu Ezen-Dı̆m-kù | itu Dı̆m-kù | itu Bil-bil-gar | $\underset{X U}{i t u} K i-s i g-{ }^{d} N i n-a-$ |
| VI. | itu Ezen-d ${ }^{\text {d }}$ - ${ }^{\text {amu-xi }}$ | $\text { itu Ezen- }{ }_{\text {xi }} \text { Dumu- }$ | itu Kin- ${ }^{\text {d }}$ Innann |  |
| VII. | $i t u$ Ur | itu Ezen-d ${ }^{\text {d }}$ Dun-gi | itu Dul-axag | itu $\grave{A}-k i-t i$ |
| VIII. | itu Ezen-d ${ }^{\text {d }}$ a-úu | itu Ezen- ${ }^{\text {d }}$ Ba-u | itu Engar-dŭ-a | itu Ezen- ${ }^{\text {d }}$ Dun-gi |
| IX. | itu Mu-šu-dŭ | itu Mu-šsu-dúu |  |  |
| X. | itu Amar-a-a-si | itu Amar-a-a-si |  |  |
| XI $a$ | itu $\mathrm{S}_{\text {S }}-\mathrm{kin}-k u d-d u$ | itu Še-kin-kud | itu A'S-a-an | itu Exen-An-\%a |
| XIb | itu Dir-Š̆e-kin-kud$d u$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { itu Dir-Š̌e-kin- } \\ & \text { kud } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { XII } a \\ & \text { XII } b \end{aligned}$ | itu Še-ıl-la $^{\text {a }}$ | itu $\check{S} \mathrm{~S}-\mathrm{ill}-\mathrm{la}$ | itu ${ }_{\text {Sene-kin-kud }}$ ituDir-Še-kin-kud | ituEzen-Me-ki-gál |

## VIII.

## TRANSCRIPTION AND TRANSLATION OF SPECIMEN TABLETS.

In presenting these translations of specimen tablets, it hardly needs to be emphasized that some of them, especially the translations of the documents of court proceedings, necessarily must be more or less tentative. In some cases the texts will allow more than one rendering and interpretation grammatically and lexicographically possible. A number of terms stand either quite isolated or are used in a connection different from others known before. Hence a definite interpretation is not possible with the rather scant material at hand. As pointed out before, the so-called "contracts" have been rather rare from this period so far, but further publications of new texts will no doubt throw fresh light on many problems, which it has been impossible to solve satisfactorily in this book. The most tangible translation of the documents in question are here given, however, mostly with a view of calling attention to the difficulties and possibilities, and thus paving the way for a more definite and final interpretation of these and similar documents, which no doubt will come to light later.

## I.

(Teat, Pl. 1,No. 1; Halft., Plate I, Nos. 1, 2.)

## Court Proceedings.

A-la-la brings his slave Sir-ka into court, in order to have put on record that whenever Sir-ka runs away, he would be subjected to the treatment accorded to a runaway. His mother and his sister seem to he made responsible for his conduct.

1. $\nabla$ Sir-ka
2. $\bar{u} r \dot{A}$-la-la-kam
3. $\grave{A}$-la $[-l]$ a igi $[-n] i-n i-$
4. $\bar{u} r \hat{A}$-la-la-kam
5. $\grave{A}-l a[-l] a$ igi $[-n] i-n i-$
A certain Sir-ka, who is a slave of A-la-la,
$[i g] i+g a r^{1}$
A-la-la made
to appear.

[^20]5. mu lugal $[u] d-b a^{1} H A+A^{2} g e^{3}-$
6. $n[a]^{4}-m \grave{a}$
7. ner-da he-a ${ }^{5}$
8. $n e-[i] n-d u(g)^{6}$
9. Za-an-me-ni ama-ni
10. ù Ǧn-d $E n-z u$ nin-
11. na-ni
12. šu-tú(r) $n u-H A+A-d a^{2}$
13. $b a-a n-g u b-s \hat{s}^{8}$
14. $\bar{F}$ Lugal-Lagab
15. $\nabla$ Nam-ha-ni
16. $\nabla U r-E-g i-a^{9}$
17. $\nabla$ Šeš-kal-la
18. $\nabla E(G \hat{A})+$ ner-e-ba-ul

19. | Us |
| :---: |
| 1.a-ni |
20. $\nabla$ Pap-ni-mu
21. yalu-enirn-ma-bi-me
22. itu Še-kin-kud II
' $B y$ the name of the king, on the day when an escape indeed
he will make,
a ner-da may he be,"
he said.
Zan-me-ni, his mother, and Gin-Sin, his sister,
for (his) remaining(?), that he shall not run away,
they shall stand.
Lugal-Lagab,
Nam-ha-ni,
Ur-E-gi-a,
Šeš-kalla,
$E(G \dot{A})+n e r-c-b a-u l$,
Uš-ani,
Pap-ni-mu,
witnesses.
Month Še-kin-kud, second,

The inside of the sign preceding $b a$ is broken away, but the outside lines seem lo make the reading UD certairi. It could be $E$, however. In any rase the interpretation would be very much the same.
$U D$ by itself might of course stand for $\hat{c} n u, B r .7781$, besides $i-n u$, also written $i-n a, A . B . R . U ., 121,7,137,6$. The ba could possibly be verbal prefix to $H A+A$, cf. V $R$., $25,16 a$, but on account of the verb following it is better to take $H A+A$ as an infinitive form. Thus I read $u d-b a$, "the day when." Ci. C. T., XV, 24, 16; XXIV, 16, 17; also Radau, Hilprecht Anniv., p. 386.
${ }^{2}$ The sign is $H A$ enclosed by $A$; cf. line $1 \%$ and No. 1 (III): 7. I take the sign as a composition of $H A$ and $A$, which later were written separately, $H A-A$, and expressing the verbal meaning of haliku, Br. 11856. 1 take the form here as infinitive, followed by a finite verb expressed by $M A$. For the construction cl. Chudea, Cyl. A, XI, 14; B, IX, 2. See further Chapter IX.
${ }^{3} N E$ could possibly be taken as postposition, also expressing the idea of "when," of. C. T., XV, 17, 15, $19,21$. It could be overhanging vowel, dé, as it appears to be in No. 4 (111): 7, cf. R. H., No. 38, 1--3; C. T., XVII, 17,8, 9; Gudea, Gyl. A, VIII, 2 ; XIV, 7. Still it seems better to take it as the emphatic gé, equal lo he, Br., p. 542.
${ }^{4}$ The sign is badly broken, but it is most likely na.
$N E R . D A$ may perhaps be taken as a term for a munaway slave, who is at the entire mercy of his master See Chapter IX.
${ }^{6}$ Cf. Sá-tilla, XVI, 7: XVII, 10; XVIII, 2.
${ }^{7} \check{S} U . T^{\prime} \hat{\prime}(R)$ may be a phonetic writing for $S U . D U R$, i.e., $T U(R)$ for $D U K=K U$, ašàbu, Br. 10523. Cf.

${ }^{8} \mathrm{DU}=k a ̂ n u$, Br. 2884, or nazîzu, Br. 4893, or šakânu, Br. 4897.
Or $U r-M \dot{a}-g i \cdot a$.
23. mи uš-sa bád-mar-
24. tu ba-dū
year after westlandwall built.

## 11.

(Text. Pl. 2, So. 2; Halft., Plate I, Nos. 3, 4.)

## Court Proceedings.

Lugal-iskim-zidda brings suit against Ur-Rammän in regard to a head office of the temple.

1. nam-pa-išib-da ${ }^{1}$
2. Lugal-iskim-zz(d)-da2
3. ki $U r-{ }^{d} I M d u(g)$
t tl-gál-la $a^{3}$
4. $U r-{ }^{d} I M \operatorname{la-ba-}$
5. $\quad a-d \bar{u}-\dot{u}-d a^{4}$
6. Lugal-iskim-zi(d)-da
7. $[m]$ u lugal-bi in-na-pa (d)
8. [ . . . . d]u(g)-ga-ni nu-banda
9. [ . . . . ]- ${ }^{\text {d }}$ Dun-pa-è

1I. dити Ur-Ba-й
12. Lul-a dumu Ur-gu
13. $\grave{A}-k a-k a-m u^{5}$

In regard to the head priestly office,
concerning which Lugal-iskim-zidda
has brought suit against
Ur-Rammān, and
to which $U r$-Rammān
has not given attention,
Lugal-iskim-zidda
by the name of the king swore.
[ . . . . d]ug-ga-ni, the overseer,
[ . . . . ]-Dun-pa-è,
son of $U r-B a u$,
Lul-a, son of Ur-gu, A-ka-ka-mu,
${ }^{1}$ The NAM.PA.ME, as can be seen from the autograph and halitone reproductions, is not very certain as far as the PA.ME is concerned. The signs could possibly be read GUR or PA.DIX. GUR = kunukku, Hr. 3362, and NAM.GUR might denote the office of sealing, a"clerkship." GUR also stands for tâu, Br. 3367, and NAM.GUR could thus mean "restitution." ME, read $i s ̌ i b$, on the other hand denotes a priestly office, as pašišu, Br. 10375, remku, Br. 10376, šiptu, Hr. 10379, and tertu, Br. 10380. See also H. W.. p. 147a; K. B., VI¹, p. 463. PA always denotes a head officer, with otliers under his charge, or an overseer. See Radau, E. B. H., p. 413. Temple offices are always tlie object of bartering in tlie contracts and lawsuits. See, for example, Poebel, B. E., VI ${ }^{2}$, Nos. 37, 39 and 66. Tlie nam-pa-isib mould thus be an overseer of priests, a priestly head office.
${ }^{2}$ For the reading of iskim, IGI.DUB, see M. 7142. CE. Tallqvist, N. B. N., pp. xii, 333; alio M. 7149.
${ }^{3} K A-n i-g a ̆ l$ generally stands lor ruggumu, Br. 612, with tlie preposition $a-n a$, see Urkunden, 117, 12, eli or $m u b-h i, S . P . C . N .$, p. $126 ; B . V .$, CXIII, 14 ; hut the construction here would correspond to the it-ti,R.V., CXIII, 16 , used with denu in similar connections.
${ }^{4}$ The $l a$ as a Sumeriannegative is emphatic, $a$ expresses $l u$. Cf. R. H., 80, 20; Hilprecht Anniv., pp. 400, 419.
The difficulty as to the translation of this document, aside from the exact meaning of the first term, is to be able to decide in what definite meaning the verb $K A K$ here is employed. As it apparently is a question in regard to an office, epêsu with the meaning "to prartisc, cxercise," may be suggested. The accused man has not or shall not exercise that office. Also pakàdu would express this idea. Another interpretation would be to take $K A K$ as meaning sanâku, which also expresses the idea "to appear before the judge, to he summoned, also obey." Hence the document would bc a second appeal for tlic dispute to be settled, the defendant having paid no attention to the first, or he having not been summoned.
${ }^{5} M U$ may be a title.
14. $B a-k a-k a$
15. $U r r^{d} E n-x u$
16. Ur-Engar-d Utu
17. yalu-enim-ma-bi-me
18. 並 $\operatorname{Dir}$-Še-kin-kud
19. mu ${ }^{d}$ Gimil- ${ }^{d}$ Sin lugal
20. Urù-unu(g)-ma-ye
21. na-ru-a-mah ${ }^{d}$ En-lil
22. ${ }^{d}$ Nin-lil-ra mu-ne-dū

Ba-ka-ka,
Ur-Sin
Ur-Engar-Šamaš, witnesses. Month Dir-Še-kin-kud, Year Gimil-Sın, king of $U r$ made the great stele for Enlil and Ninlil.
111.
(Text, Pl. 3, No. 4.)

## Court Proceedings. ${ }^{\text {© }}$

Galu-Enlil takes the oath that he will not run sway from the house of UrNusku.

1. Galu-d ${ }^{d}$ En-lil-lá
2. dити Galu-d $\bar{U}(d)-d u(g)-g e$
3. $U r_{-}^{d} P A \cdot K U-r a$
4. mu-lugal ni-na-pa (d)
5. é-za ga-gin ${ }^{2}$
6. ga-a-an-ta-è ${ }^{3}$
7. $[b a]-r a-b a-H A+A-d \hat{e}-\bar{s} \hat{u}^{4}$
8. [ne(?)-in-n]a-du(g)
9. [ $\mathbb{H}$. . . l-A-el-la
10. $\begin{array}{r}\text { Ba-la-an-gi }\end{array}$
11. Y $\check{S} u-\dot{U} r-r a$
12. ukuš-nita pa-al ${ }^{5}$

## Galu-Enlil,

son of Galu- $\bar{U} d u g$,
to Ur-Nusku
by the name of the king he swore:
"From thy house I will go,
I will indeed depart, (but)
not shall I run away,,'
he said.
[ . . . ]-é-el-la,
Ba-lan-gi, Su-Ur-ra
the ukuš-nita of the pa-al,
${ }^{1}$ For the scheme of this document cf. tlie much later document of a similar nature, B. V., No. CXLV.
${ }^{2}$ Schorr makes the statement that the second person, as a pronoun or subject, is never found in old Babylonian contracts, Hilprecht Anniv., p. 28, hut this seems to be a clear case.
${ }^{3}$ The two lines could perhaps also be translated: "Thy house I mill conic to, from thy house I will go out," i.e., lie would go in and out, but not run away.
${ }_{4}$ Cf. No. 1 (I) : 5, 12. See Chapter IS .
${ }^{5}$ For the sign see Code of Hammurabi, IS 90 ; L.I. H., No. 1, 19, 2\%;3,7,11; C.T.,VI,29,5. In regard to the reading of MIR.US, it will he noted that tlic explaining gloss stands between the MIR and the US, and this would point to the reading ukuš, not $u k u$, for $M E R$, thus for tlic group $u k u s ̌-u s ̌$, or better ukuš-nitu. That the ukuš-nita in our text was in the service of a pa-a! mould tend to support the view expressed by Daiches, Z. A., XVIII, p. 222, that these officials, in some instances at least, did not hold positions of great trust. Cf. also Meissner, Z. A., XVIII, p. 393; and Langdon, Babyloniaca, 1, pp. 289, 290.
13. galu-enim-ma-bi-me
14. itu Bar-zag-gar-ra
15. ud XXV-ba-ni ${ }^{1}$

I6. $т и ~ H u-h u ́-n u-r i^{k i_{2}}$
17. ba-húl-a
witnesses.
Month Bar-zay-gar-ra, day 15 th, year when Huhunuri devastated.
IV.
(Text, Pl. 4, No. 7; Halft., Plate II, Nos. 5, G.)

## Bond.

In case Ur-Enlil does not pay the grain on his account, $U r$-Da-mu shall do it.

1. tukundi-bi
2. $\check{s} a(g) d u b U_{r}^{-d}$ En-lil-lá-ka
3. $X$ še-gur
4. $n u-u b-m \breve{u}^{4}$
5. še-bi Ur-d $D a-m u-g e$
6. $i b-z u-z u^{5}$
7. mu lugal-bi
8. ni-pa(d)
9. $\nabla U r^{d} \breve{S} u-m a h$
10. $\nabla$ Ad-da-kal-la
11. $\nabla$ Kalam-ne-mu ${ }^{6}$
12. $\nabla U t u-s ̌ a ́(g)-g a$
13. galu-enim-ma-bi-me
14. mu Si-mu-ru-um
15. ${ }^{k i} b a-h \check{u} l$.

In case
on account of Ur-Enlil, 10 gur corn, are not forthcoming, its corn $U r-D a-m u$
shall bring in.
By the name of his king he has sworn.
Ur-S̆u-mah,
Ad-da-lcal-la,
Kalarn-ne-mи,
Utu-šagga, witnesses.
Year Simurum
devastatcd.
V.
(Text, Pl. 5, No. 11.)

## Promissory Note.

Elag-nu-a and Nûr-ili has given Lugal-šalizm 1 šekel of silver as a loan. On a certain day he promises to pay it hack.

[^21]1. $[E]-l a-a g-n u-\grave{a}^{1}$
2. ù Nu- $\hat{u}-\underline{-}-\bar{l}$
3. dити $D a-{ }^{-d} I-l i$
4. I g in azag-ud-ta mu-si(d)-dam²
5. [Iu]gal-sa-lim-ra
6. $[p] a d-d a^{3}$
mu lugal-
7. bi ni-pa (d)-da
8. igi A-kal-la pa
9. igi Galu-d $R a$
10. igi Galu- ${ }^{\text {a }}$ En-lil-lá
11. igi Ur-Luh
12. igi $\underset{H}{ } u-p i-p i ~ s ̌ e s ̌-g a l-~$
13. $\mathrm{nam}^{4}$
14. igi $M a-d a-i-l i$
15. galu-enim-ma-bi-me
16. itu Ǎš ud XI ni-la'
17. ти en-am-unu(g)-gal-
18. ${ }^{d}$ Innanna ba-túg-gà ${ }^{6}$

Elag-nu-a, and $N \hat{u} r$-ill, son of Da-Ili,
1 šekel of silver have given
to Lugal-ŝâlim
as a partial payment(?).
By the name of
his king he has sworn
before $A-k a l-l a$, the pa, before Galu-Ra,
before Galu-Enlil,
before $U r-L u h$,
before $\mathrm{H} u$-pi-pi, his oldest brother, before Mada-ili, witnesses.
In the month of $\dot{A} \check{s}$, the 11 th day, he shall pay it.
Year when the high priest of the great abode of Innanna appointed.
VI.
(Text, Pl. A, No. 13; Halft., Plate II, Nos. 7, 8; III, Nos. 9-11.)
Promissory Note.
At the making up of the accounts of the business transactions between $U r$-Luh and Galu-Utu there is found a surplus of 1 mana 10 šekel of silver. Galu-Utu receives this amount as a loan, or as an investment and promises to pay it at a stated time.

[^22]8

1. I ma-na $X$ gin azag-ud
2. si-ni-ibnig-šid-ag
3. ki Ur-Luh-ta
4. Galu- ${ }^{-1}$ Utu šu-ba-ti
5. itu $\check{S} u-k u l$ ud VII ni-la-a
6. $s i(m)-m u-d a^{2}$
7. mu lugal in-pa(d)
8. tukuncli-bi
9. nu-na-an-si(m)
10. ib-tap-pi-a ${ }^{3}$

ти lugal
11. $i n-p a(d)$
12. igi Lugal-axag-xu
13. [igi]Lugal-itu-Da
14. [igi]A-lul-a
15. [ig]i Ur-d $\mathrm{Ma-mi}$
16. [il]u Síg ù-ru ba-gar ${ }^{4}$
17. $m u^{d} \check{S} u-^{d} E n-z u$
18. lugal Urù-unu $(g)^{k i}-$ ge
19. má-gúr-mah
20. ${ }^{a}$ En-lil ${ }^{d}$ Niri-lil-ra ba-dim

1 mana 10 šekel of silver,
being a surplus, when the accounts had been made up,
from Ur-Iuh,
Galu-Utu has received.
On the 7th day of $\check{S} u$-kul he shall pay it.
Concerning the payment,
by the name of the king he swore.
In case
he does not pay it,
it shall be increased.
By the name of the king
he has sworn,
before Lugal-axay-xu,
before Lugal-itu-Da,
before A-lul-a,
before $V r-M a-m i$.
(In) the month of Sig, the document was drawn up;
year Gimil-Sin, king of
Ur, built the great
ship of Enlil and
Ninlil.

## VII.

(Text, Pl. 8, No. 14; Halft., Plate IV, Nos 15, 16.)

## Purchase of a Palm Grove.

A commercial agent, Ur-Nusku, purchases a palm grove, 40 sar in area, on behalf of En-lil-al-šág, and he pays as purchase money $\frac{1}{2}$ mana $8 \frac{1}{2}$ šekel of silver.

1. XI, sar ki-gisȟ̆ar-šá $(g)$
2. $\frac{1}{2}$ ma-na VIII $\frac{1}{2}$ yin azag-ud-šúu

40 sar of a grove of palm trees, for half a mana $8 \frac{1}{2}$ sekel of silver,
${ }^{1}$ Cf. No. 11 (V) 16.
${ }^{2}$ The envelope adds ne-ka $s i(m)=n a d i n u, \operatorname{Br} 4418$
${ }^{3} T A B=$ esêpu, Br. 3762, "to add, increase, double," hence the term may simply designate the payment of interest. It may, however, have the meaning "to increase to the double amount." Cf. Code of Hammurabi, § 101, 124. The sign may, of course, also stand for šanâ, Br. 3370. See Chapter IX.
${ }^{4}$ For $u$-ru, cf. $\grave{U}-R A=$ labirtu, Br. 1435.
3. ${ }^{d}$ En-lil-láa-al-šá $(g)^{1}$
4. clumu Lugal-nanga-šú
5. Ur- ${ }^{d} P A . K U ~ d и т и ~ K a-k a-g e ~$
6. $i n-s ̌ i-s a(m)^{2}$
7. igi Ur- ${ }^{d} D u m u-z i(d)-[d] a$
8. di-kud lugal-k[a?]-šu
9. [i]n(?)-[pa(d)?]
10. $i[g i(?)][A] b(?)-g i[$

1
11. mu lugal-bi $[i n-p a(d)]$
12. $\nabla$ Lugal-itu-D) $a^{3}$
13. $\overline{7}$ Lugal-[ . . . . . . . . . . ]
14. $\nabla[$. . . . . . . . . . . . . ]

15-20. [ . . . . . . . . . . . . ]
21. [Y] Ur- ${ }^{d} D a-m[u$. . . . . . . I
22. [ $\nabla] U r-[$. . . . . . . . . . I
23. galu-enim-ma-bi-me
24. itu Še-kin-kud
25. mu ${ }^{d}$ Nanna Kar-zi(d)-[d]a
26. a-du II-kam-ma-šúu
27. $E-a-n a$ ba-an-túu $(r)$
for $E n$-lil-al-šág, son of Lugal-nanga, Ur-Nusku, son of Ka-ka, has bought.
Before Ur-Dumu-xi, judge of the king, they have sworn(?).
Before $A b-g i$ [ . . . ]
by the name of the king they swore. $\nabla$ Lugal-itu Da,
YLugal [ . . . . . . . . . . ],
$\nabla[$. . . . . . . . . . . . . ],
[ . . . . . . . . . . . . ],
[Y] Ur-Da-m[u . . . . . . . ],
[Y] Ur-[ . . . . . . . . . . ], witnesses.
Month ${ }_{S}$ e-kin-kud.
year (when he) brought Nanna of Kar-xidcla
into his temple
for the second time.

## VIII.

(Text, Pl. 9, No. 15.)

## Purchase of a Male Slave.

The commercial agent $U r-N u s k u$ has bought a male slave for $U r-e-l u g a l a n i$, the price being 11 sekel of silver.

1. I sag-ù $r^{4}[m u-n] i ~ L U M^{\bar{j}} \quad 1$ male slave, his name is called(?)
${ }^{1} a l-s \breve{s}(g)$ could possibly be a title, but also a part of the name, "Enlil is the gracious protector." Cf. Ur-s̆ag $g-$ ga-al, P. K. U. N., p. $66 b$.
${ }^{2}$ For the reading $s a(m)$, or $s a-a$, see M. 3235.
${ }_{3}$ Cl. No. 13 (IV) : 13.
${ }^{4}$ I sag, "one head," cf. A. B. P., Nos. 1-5.
${ }^{5}$ The sign is $L U M$, but this sign is interchanged with $L A M, A . V .2611$, and ref., and often in this period with NUM. See especially the date formula for the 3d year of Gimil-Sin, p. 24. Here it may denote a verb or be a part of the name of the slave. $L U M$ as well as $L A M$ is also equal to $u n-n u-b u, u s-s u-b u, A . V .2611$, Br. 11186-11188, which Haupt, Hebraica, I, p. 219, derives from a stem anäbu, "to spring," hence annabu, "a hare," "a jumper, springer,"
[Luga]l-IM ${ }^{1}$
2. XI gin azag-ud-šúu
3. Ur-É-lugal-a-ni-šúu
4. Ur-PA.KU dam-kar
5. $i n-s ̌ i-s a[(m)]^{2}$
6. igi Gú-de-a MU-6-dub"
7. igi $\check{S}[u-d u](g)-g a-z i(d)-d a i \breve{s}-k u^{4}$

8-15.
16. galu-enim-ma-bi-me
17. itu Azag-š́m ud X-lal-I $n i-l a^{5}$
18. mu ${ }^{d}$ Bur- ${ }^{d}$ En-zu-ge
19. Ur-bil-lum ${ }^{k i}$ mu-húul-a

## Lugal-Rammãn,

for 11 sekel of silver, on behalf of Ur-É-lugal-ani, Ur-Nusku, the agent, has bought.
Before Gudea, the $M U$-official of the tablet house
before $\check{S} u-d u(g) g a-z i d d a$, the $i \check{s}-k u$ priest.

## witnesses.

In the month Azag-šim, on the 9th day, he shall pay.
Year when $B u t-X_{i n}$ devastated Urbillum.

## IS .

(Text, Pl. 9, No. 16.)

## Sale of a Pair of Slaves.

Gimil-Tammuz acknowledges the receipt from $\dot{A} z i d d a$ or one mana of E ver, being the payment for a pair of slaves. The document was enclosed in an envelope.

```
1. I ma-na azag-ud
2. azag\mp@subsup{g}{}{6}}nam-galu-tab-ba-š\mp@subsup{u}{}{7
3. \(k i \grave{A}-z i(d)-d a-t a\)
```


## 1 mana of silver,

```
the purchase money for a slave pair,
from \(\grave{A}\)-zidda,
```

 C. T., XII, $30 a$; XIV, $1,3 a$, which may denote "a runner." Moreover it stands lor $\check{s} a k a$, which denotes some kind of servant, "cupbearer," ete, of which ${ }^{\text {amelu }}$ rab šak $\hat{u}$ is the head. See Muss-Arnolt, p. 1099b. The LUM may thus he a verb, referring to $m u-n i$, or a part of the name of tlic slave. Possibly $L U M$ might also have the reading $I M$, $m u-n i-i m$, "his name." See (hapter IS.
${ }^{1}$ Or Galu-IM. If $L U M$ belongs to tlic name, (inu(?)-lugal(galu)-IM.
Cf. No. VII: 6.
${ }^{3}$ See Chapter IX.
4 See Chapter IS.
Cf. Nos. 11 (V); 16; 13 (VI); 5.
"Here $a z a g$ is equivalent to $s a(m)$, "purchase money."
${ }^{7}$ NAM.GALU $=$ amelutu, Br. 2200, i.e., the human race, but it is also used as collective for slaves, servants. See Muss-Arnolt, p. 576. T TAB-ba =esêpu, Br. 3762, "to increase, double," also šan $\hat{u}$, Br. 3770, "to double," hence here nam-galu-tab-ba is literally "a double slave-ship, a slave pair."
4. $\check{S} u-^{-d}$ Dumu-zi
5. šu-ba-ti
6. $\nabla$ A-ab-gal-mu'
7. $\nabla$ Ur-d Dun-pa-è
8. $\nabla$ Galu-d ${ }^{\text {E }}$-lil-lá
9. $\nabla G \check{ } r$ - $[n] i-s ̌ a g$
10. $\nabla$ Šes̆-Da-da
11. Galu-enim-ma-bi-me
12. itu $G u(d)-s i-[z] u$
13. mu ${ }^{d} I-b i-d e n-z u$
lugal

## Gimil-Tamтих

has received.
Ab-yal-mu(?), Ur-Dun-pa-b, Galu-Enlil, Gir-ni-Kay, Seš-Da-da, witnesses.
Month $G u(d)$-si-zu, year Ibí-Sin (became) king.

## X.

(Test, PI. 11, No. 22.)

## Receipt for a Loan.

$G \check{G}$-íli-šáay acknowledges the receipt of half a mana of silver from Ur-Dun-pa-è as a loan, on which he is to pay an interest of one šekel for five šelkel, or at the rate of twenty per cent.

1. $\frac{1}{2}$ ma-na azag-ud
2. máš̌ $V$ gìn I gìn-ta ${ }^{3}$
3. ki Ur- ${ }^{d}$ Dun-pa-è-ta
4. $[G \dot{\imath} \bar{\imath}] r-i-l i-s ̌ a ́ a ́(g)$
5. [šu-ba-ti]
6. itu Gán-gán-è
7. mu en a Innanna Unú(g) ${ }^{k i}$
8. $m a ́[\check{s}-e n i-p a(d)]^{4}$
$\frac{1}{2}$ mana of silver,
interest 1 šekel for 5 šekel,
from Ur-Dun-pa-6,
Gir-ili-8ág
has received.
Month Gán-gán-e,
year the high priest of Innanna of Erech appointed.

## XI.

(Text, Pl. 12, No. 23; Haltt., Plate V, Nos. 17, 18.)

## Receipt for a Loan.

Išme-ilu acknowledges the receipt of three gur of grain from Ur-IDun-pa-è as

[^23]a loan, on which he is to pay an interest of $90 q a$ to a gur ( $300 q a$ ), or at the rate of more than 30 per cent. Ur-Dun-pa-è transacts another loan to another person on the same day.'

1. III Be-yur ha $\alpha\left[r-s \check{s}^{2}\right]^{2}$
2. máš I yur XG-tu
3. ki Ur-d Dun-pa-
4. $\grave{e}-t a$
5. $I \check{s}$-me-ilu $u^{3}$
6. Bu-ba-ti
7. itu Engar-dŭ-a
8. ud XIX-ba-ni
9. ти Si-mu-ru-um ${ }^{k}$
ba-hill

3 gur corn ut interest, interest for 1 gur 90 ( $q a$ ), from Ur-Dun-pa-è

## Išme-zlu

has received.
Month Engar dŭ-a, day 19 th, year Simurum
devastated.
XII.
(Text, Pl. 12, No. 24.)

## Receipt for a Loan.

$\grave{A}$-bilalum acknowledges the receipt of ten gur of corn from Ur-Dun-pa-è as a loan, on which he agrees to pay an interest of $90 q a$ to a gur, or at the rate of more than 30 per cent.

| 1. X še-gur har-šút | 10 gur corn at interest, |
| :--- | :--- |
| 2. más I yur XC-ta | interest (for) 1 yur 90 qa, |
| 3. ki Ur-d Dun-pa-ל̀- | from Ur-Dun-pa-è, |
| tu |  |
| 4. À-bil-la-lum | A-bil-la-lum |
| 5. šu-ba-ti | has received. |
| 6. itu Engar-dŭ-a | Month Engar-dŭ-a, |
| 7. ud XIX-ba-ni | day 19th, |
| 8. mu Si-mu-ru-um | year Simurum |
| ba-húl | devastated. |

[^24]XIII.
(Text, Pl. 13, No. 29; Halft., Plate V, Nos. 17, 18.)
Receipt for Silver.'
$\grave{A}-z i d d a$ acknowledges the receipt of one šekel of silver from Lugal-Namtar.

1. I gin azag-ud
2. ki Lugal-Nam-tar-
ri-ta
3. $\grave{A}-z i(d)-d a$
4. šu-ba-ti
5. itu $\check{S} e-k i n-k u d$
6. mu en-am-gal
7. ${ }^{\text {d }}$ Innanna ba-túg

1 sekel of silver,
from Lagal-Namtar,
A-zudda
has received.
Month Še-kin-kud, year the high priest of the
great abode of Innanna appointed.

XIV
(Text, Pl. 16, so.11.)

## Receipt for Grain.

Lugal-Namtar acknowledges the receipt of twenty yur of grain for cattle feed from Ur-Azag-ším. ${ }^{2}$

1. $X X$ še-gur
2. $s a(g)$-gal amar-ra $a^{3}$
3. ki Ur-d $\begin{gathered}\text { anag-ším-ta }\end{gathered}$
4. Lugal-Nam-tar-ri
5. šu-ba-ti
6. dub Galu- ${ }^{-1} E n-z u$
7. itu $A b-e ̀$
8. mи en-am-gal An-na
9. en ${ }^{\text {d Innanna }}$ ba-túg

20 gur of corn, feed for young cattle,
from Azag-ším
Lugal-Namtar
has received.
Account of Amèl-Sin.
Month Ab-e,
year the high priest of Ana, high priest of Innanna appointed.
XV.
(Text, Pl. 27, So. 75; Halft., Plate VI, Nos. 23, 24.)
Account of a Date Harvest.
This tablet is unique both in regard to make-up and contents. It supplies
${ }^{1}$ Probably also a loan, but without a statement as to the interest to be paid. Still it may also be only a receipt.
${ }^{2}$ Note the transaction recorded in previous document in regard to the same man.
${ }^{3}$ See Reisner, T. T., p. $3 a$.
an excellent illustration of the queer and laborious, but exceedingly exact and painstaking methods of classification employed by the Babylonian account makers. It is an account, or report in regard to the results of the harvest of a palm grove, stating:

1. Number of date palms yielding a certain amount of dates each.
2. Number of date palms from which the dates had already been taken away or plundered.
3. Total number of date palms, from which dates had been gathered.
4. Total of date palms plundered.
5. Total amount, of dates gathered.
I. VII ${ }^{\text {gish }}$ gisimmar ${ }^{1} I$ gu $[r-t a]^{2}$
6. $I I$

CCXL-ta
7 date palms at $1 g u[r$ each].
3. XII gish....................... CLXXX

2 trees.................. . 240 (qa) e[ach].
4. XVI ${ }^{\text {gish } . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . ~ . ~} C L$

12 trees , 180
5. XXIV gish.....................CXX 24 trees................................. 120

7.XXII ${ }^{\text {gish. ................... } L X X X \quad 22 \text { trees......................................... } 80 ~}$




12. gish4.............................. XXV trees.................................... 25

14. XIV gish............................. . 14 trees............................... . 10
15. XL ${ }^{\text {gish }}$ gišimmar ka-lum sir ${ }^{3}$
16. šunigin $C X C$ aishgišimmar tig-a ${ }^{6}$

40 date palms, the dates taken away. Total : 190 date palms
harvested,
${ }^{1}$ The lruit gathered is ka-lum, dates, hence gish givimmar must signify date palms.
${ }^{2}$ Ta restored after tlie remaining part of $t a$ at the end of line 2.
${ }^{3}$ Of course $g i \check{s}$ is only tlie determinative, hut I have translated "trees" as a matter of convenience, to mark the mode of abbreviation employed by scribe.
${ }^{4}$ Numeral is wanting, but according to the amount of fruit gathered the numeral $I$ ought to be inserted, or it may be simply understood.
${ }^{5} B U$ '́ must here designate nasihu, "to tear out, take away, remove," Br. 7528 , and hence it could also be read gid and bur. No doubt this term designates tlie fact that the dates of these 40 palms had already been harvested or plundered. In any case these 40 trees stand in opposition to the 190 trees from which the dates are now gathered.
${ }^{6}$ TlG-a is no doubt a verb lorm with the méaning of pabiru, "to gather together." (li. Br. 3220, 3222. Thus the term would denote harvesting, or the gathering of dates from these palm trees, in contrast to the 40 , which had no fruit.
17. sunigín $X L^{\text {grsh }}$ gišimmar sir
18. Bunigin LIV C[LXXX ka-lu]m [gu]r
19. itu $\breve{S} u-[k u l$. . . . b]a-ni
20. ти ma-d[a $Z a-a b-s] a-l i$
[""ha-húl

Total: 40 date palms plundered.
Total: 44 gur 180 ( $q a$ ) of dates.
Month $\check{S} u$-kul, day [ . . . . ] th.
Year the co[untry of Zabš]ali
[de]vastated.
XVI.
(Test, Pl. 29, No. 77.)

## Inventory.

A list of implements, tools, furniture, skins, cattle, articles of food, etc., being the property of Sarrum-ili of the city of Basime.

1. $X L I V^{\text {gish }} g i d-d a^{1}$
2. $V{ }^{\text {gish } k u-m a-r u ~}{ }^{2}$
3. III ${ }^{\text {gish }} n a-b a-t u m^{3}$
4. VII ${ }^{\text {gish }} g a-a m-l u^{4}$
5. XIII ${ }^{\text {gish }} d u b b i n ~ k e s ̌-d a^{5}$
6. XII ${ }^{g i[s h]} P A-u \check{s}-s a^{6}$
7. $I g u(d)-{ }^{-g i s h} P A^{7}$
8. IV uz [V]II máš-uš
9. $I V[$. . . $]-u s^{8}$
10. III gai ni-giš
11. $V$ gai ni-nun
12. I gag-tur ni-nun

44 wooden $g i d-d a$,
5 wooden $k u$-ma-ru,
3 wooden nabaturn,
7 wooden gamlu, 13 wooden dubbin-keš-da, 12 wooden staffs(?), second size (?), 1 ox goad(?), 4 goats, 7 male lambs, 9 male . . . , 3 gaš of wood oil, 5 gai of butter, 1 small gaš of butter,
${ }^{1}$ GIS.GID.DA means redly long or heavy wood, or rather something made of wood, long or heavy, cf. Br. 7511,7518 , but it is no doubt here some special object or implement made of wood. Cf. the šēhu, Br. 7583. See also

${ }^{2}$ Cf. gish $K U=k a k k u$, Br. 10529.
${ }^{3}$ Seems to be Semitic word. Cf. nibittu, "rope, fetter, bond."
${ }^{4}$ Also Semitic; no doubt some instrument, implement or weapon. See Muss-Arnolt, p. 221.
${ }^{5}$ DUBBIN $=$ saparu, Br. 2714, "be sharp," hence sip-ri tar-ta-hi,"sharp tools, or points of spears," see Mus,sArnolt, p. 886. It might also come from galâbu, Br. 2710, 2711, 2724, 2725, 2727, "make a mark, whip," arid also mas̆âru, Br. 2716, "send, drive," hence perhaps a "whip." It might also stand lor șumbu, Br. 2716, "wagon, freight wagon," see Muss-Amolt, 881. KEŠ-da = rakâsu, Br. 4331, "bind," saráhu, Br. 4333, "excite"; sir-up-pu-ru, Br. 4334, "sharp points;" also tarâdu, "hunt, drive," Br. 4344, which also points to the meaning of whip, "wagon whips." "team whips."
${ }^{6}$ GIS.PA = hattu, "staff, scepter," Br. 5573. US'sa means ncxt, perhaps next in size to the regular ones.
${ }^{7}$ Literally "ox staff."
${ }^{8}$ Perhaps $g u(d)$-uš, "male, i.e., virile oxen, Lulls."
${ }^{8} G A S$ seems tu be a measure or jar. NI.GIS wood oil, sesam.
9
13. I su-gu(d)
14. $\frac{1}{2} A N . D A H . \check{S} \cup \cup M$
15. $L X X X V I$ si-KAB $B^{1}$
16. XXX-lal-I su-há
17. I su dug-gán ${ }^{2}$
18. TI ${ }^{\text {gish }} b a n s ̌ u r-y i s ̌$
19. [ . . .] [d]ir m $\mathrm{a}-d u b^{3}$
20. nig-ga ${ }_{\text {Sur-ru-um-i-li }}$
21. $\check{s} a(g) B a-s i-m e^{k i} n i-g a ́ l$

1 ox hide, $\frac{1}{2} A N . D A H . S \cup U M$, 86 si of $K A B$
29 hides,
1 good(?) hide,
2 wooden tables.
Account of the
property of Sarrum-ill
in the city of Basime.
XVII.
(Text, Pl. 31, No. 79; Halft., Pl. VIII, Nos. 27, 28.)

## Account of Cattle Herds.

A specific account given of four different herds of large and small cattle, entrusted to the keeping of $U r r^{d} D u n-p a-\grave{e}$, the son of $U r$-Rammann.

1. I $\grave{a} b^{4}$ amar $r{ }^{\prime} u-a^{5}$
2. II $\grave{a} b-a m a r-n a(d)-a^{6}$
3. IV àb-al

1 cow calf (new) born,
2 cow calves of the fold,
4 full grown cows,
${ }^{1} S I=k a r n u$, "horn," also malû, "fill," '(amount." KABB, gub, húb ? = šumëlu? "left horns"?
${ }^{2}$ The sign $H I$, read $d u g$, may possibly be $h b$. GAN may stand for gh. Cf. Br. 8261.
${ }^{3}$ Of the sign that probably stood at the beginning of the line only traces of a vertical or slanting wedge can be distinguished. The following sign, $S I$, is not very clear, but on account of the following $A, I$ am inclined to read the two signs dir. Besides mal̂̂ and atâru, which perhaps do not fit so well in this connection, dir also stands for ahazzu, Br. 3721, and asthhu, Br. 3725, which is a synonym of asâru, i.e., "to bind, enclose." The $I M . G \hat{I} . A=e-s i-r i ~ \breve{s} a-d u p p i$, II $R ., 48,40$, must signify the making up of a document; $I M$, read $i m i$, standing for duppu, Br. 8360. Cf. $\bar{S} A M . \check{S} E B I R . A B . M U . S A R=u z-z u-u h-t u, A . V .2622$, Br. 8851.

The $d i r$ mà- $d u b$ may thus be an equivalent of esiri $d u p p i$, and signify the making up of a document. The mì$d u b$, generally written $m b-d u b-b n$, really signifies some kind of receptable of a tablet. It could possibly, among other things, be applied to the envelope or case of a tablet. The phrase sometimes apparently is employed to signify an office equal to the $d u b$-sur. See Chapter IX.
${ }^{4}$ That the Snmerian of the sign, usually given the value of $L I D$, is to be read $\dot{a} b, \mathrm{cf} . \mathrm{Br} .8865$, is clearly shown by the gloss to " $L I D$ ". $G U(D) . H I . A, \dot{a} b-b a-g u(d)-h a-a, R . M . A ., \mathrm{Pl} .25$, No. 103, O. 11.
${ }_{5} K A K-a=b a n d$, Br. 5298 , is most likely to be considered as a synonymous term for $t u(d)-d a$, lines 21,23 and 30 , which must stand for some form of aladu, and would then denote a (new) born calf, as a careful distinction always, was made as to the age of cattle. Here the ruta calves are distinguished from the $n a(d)-a$ calves, see next line. See also $K A K . K A K-a=k a l a m u$, Br. 5286, denoting mar or young offspring, especially of lambs; but the term can, of course, be applied to other animals. See Z. A., IV, p. 266; Muss-Arnolt, p. 389. Of course, the term may also come from lê-u, Br. 5257, "be strong"; palkadu, Br. 5263, "given in keeping"; nadû, Br. 52, "deposited," etc.
${ }^{8} N A(D)=r a b \hat{i} s u, n a ' \hat{c} l u$, etc., with the meaning "to lie down, to rest," hence couch, but here it must stand for rubsu, Br. 8998, a place of rest and shelter, hence the fold. Calves of the fold would he those that still were kept in special care, not being developed enough to go with the herd. Cf. "lamb of the fold," line 19.

FROM THE TEMPLE ARCHIVES OF NIPPUR.
4. XI gu(d)-giš
5. I db-mu-111
6. I hb-ти-II
7. $111 d b-m u-I$
8. II gu(d)-mu-I
9. XXVIII $g u(d)-\grave{a} b-h b a^{1}$
10. $g \check{r} r A-a-d u-n[a(d)]$
11. XXIV ganam
12. CCLXVIII udu-uš
13. $X X$ sal-sill-uzz
14. XXIII máš-gal ${ }^{3}$
15. $m a ́ s ̌-u \check{s}$
16. CCCXL udu-máš-há
17. ki Ur-zag-è
18. CLIV ganarn
19. ša $(g)$-ba $X$ ganam-sil-na $(d)^{4}$
20. in-gub
21. $C X X X V$ sil $t u(d)-d a^{5}$
22. XLVIII $u x$
23. $X L V^{6}$ máš-tu(d)-da ${ }^{7}$
24. CCCLXXXII udu-uz-mášhá
25. ki Da-bi-a
26. XLII ganam
27. VII udu-uš
28. LVIII sal-sil- $-[u] z$
29. XLI sil-uš-uz
30. XXXVIII síl-tu(d)-da
31. 111 L

11 bulls,
5 cows 3 years (old),
1 cow 2 years (old),
3 cows 1 year (old),
2 oxen 1 year (old),
28 cattle,
ğr-officer Aa-du-na(d).
24 sheep,
268 virile sheep,
20 female kid goats, young ones grown up, 15 male offspring, 340 sheep (and) lambs, from (with) Ur-zagè.

## 154 sheep,

among them 10 lambs of the fold, are
135 young ones born.
48 goats,
45 (46?) young ones born,
382 young ones of sheep and goats
from (with) Dabia.
42 sheep,
7 virile sheep,
58 female kid goats,
41 male kid goats,
38 young ones born
3 goats,
${ }^{1}$ That $H I-A$ is to be read $h a ́ d$ is scen from the gloss, C. T., XXV, 20a, 2; R. M. A., Pl. 28, No. 103. O. 11.
${ }^{2}$ For the reading sil see $J . R . A . X ., 1905$, p. 144, cuneiform text, line 8.
${ }^{3}$ MÁS $=$ uriṣu, i.e., offspring, young ones, both of sheep and goats, hence may denote both kids and lambs. See Muss-Arnolt, p. $104 b$.
${ }^{4} \mathrm{Cf}$. line 2.
${ }^{5} T U(D)-d a$ (see also lines 23 and 30) must probably be taken in the meaning of aladu, Br. 1070. CC. the term $r u ̂-a$, line 1 .
${ }^{8}$ May be XLVI.
${ }_{7}$ Cf. lines 21 and 30.
${ }^{8}$ Cf. lines 21 and 23.
32. XIII sal-ÁŠS.KAR ${ }^{1}$
33. CCII udu-uz-máš-há
34. ki À-bil-lum-ma
35. Bunigin XXVIII gu(d)-àb-háa
36. Bunigin . . . . . ${ }^{2}$ udu-há
37. Bunigin CXXXVIII uz-máš-ȟ́á
38. si@?)-laUr-d Dun-pa-è
dити $U r-{ }^{d} I M^{3}$

## 13 sucklings.

202 lambs (and) kids, from (with) $\grave{A}$-billum. Total: 28 large cattle,
Total: . . . . . sheep,
Total: 138 kids,
in the keeping(?) of Ur-pa-e, son of $U r$-Rammān.
XVIII.
(Text, Pl. 37, No. 90.)
Cost of Cultivation of Fields.
Statement of the amount of grain required for wages, or sustenance of slaves, employed in the cultivation of certain fields.

1. $\frac{1}{3} \frac{1}{18} \frac{1}{72}$ gan sag-d $\overline{u^{5}}$
2. al-du $\bar{u}^{s} X X$ sar-ta
3. h-kal I CCXLVI qa-ta
4. h-bi XXX VIXV gin
5. kal ud-I-šúu
6. Be-bi CCXVII $\frac{1}{2} q a^{8}$
7. $\frac{1}{18}$ gan al ${ }^{9}$ VI sar-ta

725 (sar) of land, the labor cost of tilling ;
for 20 sar
wages of slaves 1 (yur) $\mathbf{2 4 6}$ qa,
the wages 30 (gur) 6 (qa) 15 gin
for slaves per day, the grain $217 \frac{1}{2} q a$.
100 (sar) land cultivated; for 6 sar
${ }^{1}$ In later Uabylonian and Assyrian ṢU.KAR = unèku, Br. 10980.
${ }^{2}$ As the numerals now stand in the text, cf. Halftone Reproductions, the sum total according to the values of numerals in corresponding positions given by Hilpreclit, B. E., XX, p. 26, would be $3600+600+3 \times 60+6=$ 4550. But this is altogether too high, as can be seen by adding together the number of animals specified.
${ }^{3}$ SI.LA may stand for SI.LA $=$ pukudu, Br. 3467, written phonetically, cf. ni-la for ni-lá, Nos. 11 (V) : 16; 13 (VI) : 15; 15 (VIII) :17. But it is not quite certain that the sign is SI. It may he $\bar{S} U+N I G I N$, the wedges in front being indistinct,. If surh is the case, the la would, of course, be the overhanging vowel and would prove that the composite sign, generally read šunigin, will have to be read šukil.
${ }^{4}$ That is $600+100+25 s u r$.
${ }^{5} S A G=r e \breve{s} t u$ in the phrase $r$ ấti kişri, meaning the payment of rent, B. E., V1 ${ }^{1}, 33(8): 10 ; 47$ (A. R. W., 11, 18) : 10; 49 (A. R. U., 11, 19) : 11. In analogy with this $S A G . K A K$ would then here express rêšti zikpi or rê̌sti epšit, "payment, cost of cultivation." SAG might also be explained as referring to the slaves employed for the tilling of these fields, hence $S A G . K A K$ might mean something like "slave-labor." Cf. amelu $K A K={ }^{a m e l u} b a n \hat{u}$, M. 3608.
${ }^{6} \mathrm{Cf}$. al-ag, line 30. AL prefixed to the verb has the foree of the permansive. Cf. the phrases $A L . B A D$, "being completed," $A L . D U G$, "being satisfied," A. B. P., 2, 10, 11, ctc. GAN AL.D $\bar{U}=e k l u$ zik.pu or eḳlu epšu, "field under cultivation."
${ }^{7}$ For a different way of calculating cost of cultivation see $O$. B. T. R., 254, 6, 7.
${ }^{8}$ Here we would expect a grand total given, but this comparatively small amount must denote a ratio of the cost.
${ }^{\bullet} K A K=d \bar{u}$ omitted.
8. h-bi X VI $\frac{2}{3}$ kal ud I-šúu
9. be-bi XC
10. Lagab $+s \bar{\imath} g$ duти dити A-a-bi
11. $\frac{2}{18} \frac{1}{72}$ gan al VI sar-tu
12. h-bi XL LX $\frac{1}{2}$ kal ud I-šúu
13. be-bi CCI
14. $\frac{1}{18} \frac{1}{72}$ gan al-d $\bar{u} X[+\operatorname{sar}-t] a$
15. $\grave{a}$-bi $X$ kal ud $[I-s ̌ u ́ u]$
16. Be-bi LX [ . . .?]
17. [ . . . ]-ba-lul-ge [ . . . . 1
18. $\frac{2}{18}$ gan al-[d̄ . . . .]
19. $s a r-t[a]$
20. $\grave{a}-b i X X X I I I \frac{1}{3}$ kal $[$ ud $I-s ̌ u ́ u]$
21. $\check{s}[e-b] i[$. . . . . . . . . $]$

22-29. [
30. [ . . . .] gun al-ag $a-s ̌ a(g)[g a b-.$. ${ }^{d} A[m a ?]{ }^{d} K A^{1}$
31. [mu $\left.{ }^{d} \check{S} u-^{d} E n-z u l\right] u g a l-[e ~ m a-]$ $d a Z a-a] b-s ̌ a-l i^{k i}-$
$m[u-h u ́ l]$
the wages 10 (gur) $6 \frac{2}{3} q a$, for slaves per day,
the grain is 90 ,
Lagab-sig the son-son of $A-a-b i$.
225 (sar) land cultivated for 6 sar
the wages 40 (gur) $60 \frac{2}{3}$ (qa), for slaves per day
the grain is 201.
125 (sar)land cultivated; for $10+$ ? sar the wages 10 (gur) for slaves per day, the grain 60 .
[ . . . . . . . . . ]
200 (sar) land cultivated; for [ . . . ] sar
the wages 30 (gur) $3 \frac{1}{3} q a$ for slaves per day
the grain [ . . . . . . . . . ]
[ [ . . . . ] land cultivation of field

```
    [ . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 1
```

year Gimil-Sin, the king, devastated the country of Zabšali.
XIX.
(Text, Il. 39, No. 92; Halft., Pl. IX, Nos. 29, 30.)

## Field Account.

An account of the amount of grain required for seed and the feed of oxen at the cultivation of different fields.

1. I $\frac{1}{3} \frac{3}{18} \frac{1}{16}$ gan $a b$-nam-bi $\quad 1$ gan 50 sar of land; its cultivation,
${ }^{1}$ Cf. O. B. T. R., 254.
${ }^{2}$ That is 1 gan $+600+300+50$ sar $=1 \frac{1}{2}$ gan 50 sar.
${ }^{3} A B=$ erềsu, cf. Br. 3819, also nasâku, cf. Br. 3820, "to place, appoint," but also "to do, perform," and thus $=$ epếču . NAM=šâmu, Br. 2103, also "to place, settle,fix,"'see Muss-Arnolt, p. 701. AB.NAM is equal to $A B . E N G A R$. line 15. Cf. $a^{m e l u} A B=$ ameluir-ri-šu, Br. 3819; amelu $A B=$ meluna-si-ku, , Br. 3820. Hence the term $A B . N A M$ arid $A B . E N G A R$ must stand for farming.
2. I gar VIII $\frac{1}{2}-a-a n^{2}$
3. Be-kul-bi I XXIX $\frac{1}{2}$ qa $V$ gin lugal
4. III $\frac{1}{3} \frac{3^{3}}{18}$ yan ab-nam-bi
5. I gar X-lal I-ta-a-an ni-gál
6. Be-bi III XXX VIII qa-gur
7. har-gu(d)-bi II LXVIII $\frac{2}{3} q a$
8. VII $\frac{1}{2}$ gin-gur
9. šunigin Se-bi VI CCVI $\frac{1}{3} q a$
10. II $\frac{1}{2}$ yin Se-kul har-gu(d)
11. Za-la-lum engar
12. $I \frac{2}{3} \frac{2}{18}$ yan ab-nam-bi
13. I gar VIII $\frac{1}{2}$ a-an ni-gál
14. Be-bi $\frac{1}{2}$ XXXIII $\frac{1}{3} q a-g u r$
15. II $\frac{2}{3} \frac{2}{18}$ gan ab-engar-b[i]
16. I gar X-lal-I-ta-a-an ni-gál
17. Be-bi II CXX $\frac{1}{2}$ gur
18. har-gu(d)-bi I CCLXXI $\frac{2}{3}$ qa-yur
19. ss[unigín še-b]i V CCLXXV qa-gur
20. $\kappa[e-k u] l$ har-gu'(d)
21. [ . . . . . . . . . en]gar
22. [ . . . . . a]b-nam I gar
23. [ . . . . . . . ] ni-gál
24. [ . . . . . . . q]aXV gin
25. ha $a\left[r\right.$. . . . . q]a VIII $\frac{1}{2} g i[n]-$ gur
26. [ . . . . . . . ] qa $\Pi_{\frac{1}{2}}^{1}$ gìn
27. 
28. [ . . . . . . . . . 1
29. [ . . . . . . . . $]^{k i} b a-h a ́ l ~$
for 1 gar according to $8 \frac{1}{2}$, the seed is 1 (gur) $29 \frac{1}{2}$ qa 5 gin royal,
$3 \frac{1}{2}$ gan of land; its cultivation, for $1 \operatorname{gar} 9(q a)$,
the grain is 3 gur $38 q a$,
feed for oxen, 2 gur $68 \frac{2}{3} q a$, $7 \frac{1}{2}$ gin,
Total: its grain 6 gur $206 \frac{1}{3} q a$, $2 \frac{1}{2}$ gin for seed and feed.
Za-la-lum, farmer.
1 gan 1400 sar of land; its cultivation, for 1 gar $8 \frac{1}{2}$ (ya), the grain is $\frac{1}{2}$ gur $32 \frac{1}{3}$ qa.
2 gan 1400 sar of land; its cultivation, for 1 gar 9 (qa)
the grain is 2 gur $120 \frac{1}{2} q a$,
feed for oxen, 1 gur $271 \frac{2}{3} q a$.
Total: the amount of grain is 5 gur 275 qa,
for seed and feed.

XX.
(Test, Pl. 55, No. 120; Hallt., Pl. XII, Nos. 39, 40.)

## Expenditure for Drink.

An account of expenditure of grain for drink to a number of men.

[^25]1. V ya $\breve{s}[e-g] a \breve{s}$
2. gथ̆r Ur-d En-ki gìn ${ }^{1}$
3. V qa gaš A-dug-ga²
4. III qa Ri-pi-pi dub-sar
5. V qa a-clu II-kam-ma-ǎ
6. gŭr A-dug-ga
7. V qa gaš ğ̆r Lugal-sirim
8. dити Hal-hal-la
9. V qa er-šu
10. A-dug-ga
11. šunigín XXVIII qa Be
12. $b a-z i$
13. $\check{s} a(g) I n-s i^{-k l}-n a$

14, ğr A-dug-ga

5 qa grain (for) drink,
ghr-officer Arad-Ea (for) journey,
5 qa drink (to) A-dug-ga,
3 qa (to) Ri-pi-pi, the scribe, 5 qa a second time
(to) ğ̆r A-dug-ga,
5 qa drink (to) gŭr
Lugal-sirim, son of Hal-hal-la, 5 qa for the city, (to) A-dug-ga.
Total: 28 qa of grain
given out
in $I \sin (?)$.
$G$ urr A-dug-ga.
XXI.
(Test, Pl. 59, No. 129.)

## Expenditure of Grain.

An account of expenditure of grain for different purposes and to different persons.

1. VIII CCLXXV qa Be-gur
2. XLVIII XII qa áş-yur
3. $\check{s} \dot{a}-d u(g) G u-d u M U^{3}$
4. $X X X$ Be $X X X$ áš gar-exen-ma
5. Gán-gán-è
6. IX CC gur Be-ba ara ${ }^{4}$
7. Barn il-me ${ }^{5}$
8. TI XC gur Be-ba amar-tur-me

8 gur 275 qa corn, 48 gur 12 qa wheat, temple offerings to $G u-d u$, the baker, 30 (ya) corn, 30 (qa) wheat, food during the festival of Gán-gán-̀, 9 gur 100 qa

2 gur 90 (qa) feed for young cattle,
${ }^{1}$ CP. T. T., p. 17.
${ }^{2}$ gèr A-dug-ga, see li. 6 .
${ }^{3}$ For name cf. $G u-d u$, tlic farmer, C.T., I, 94-10-15, 3, O., III, 17. $M U$ as a title $=$ nuhatimmu, "baker," Muss-A molt, pp. 666b, 667a; Zimmern, Z.D.M.G., Vol. 53, p. 115. DI.KA, as denoting temple offerings, would thus include bread.
${ }^{4} S \check{S} E . B A=i b-r u, B r .7440$, "corn, Food," and would thus have tlie same meaning as $G A R$, line 4 , hut here food that is prepared in a certain way.

HAR.HAR, read ara $=$ tenû, Br. 8587, "tu grind, cut, chop, or prepare in some way," here prepared from sonic plant, see next line. Cf. A.B.M., Pl. XV, 49; pp. 46, 47, 136; cf. tlic omeluHAR.HAR," miller." andzimnistituIU AR. UAR, M. 6504; also Pinches, Amh., p. 151.
${ }^{5}$ Lit. "plants lifted up," grown up. In any case plants from which tlie sée-ba or food was cut or prepared.
9. $L X$ Ri-ùg-ba
10. $L X$ Da-a-lim
11. $X X X{ }^{a} U t u-h-b a a^{2}$
12. sunigín $X X I C C L X V$ qa še-gur
13. šunigín XLVII CLII qa áš-gur
14. E.NUN ka ${ }^{\text {id }} I b-a l-t a^{3}$
15. ba-zi itu Gán-gán-è
16. mu ${ }^{d} \check{S} u^{d}$ En-zu lugal-
17. e ma-da Za-ab-̌̌a-li $i^{k i}$
18. mu-ฉ̆úl

60 (qa) to Ri-ùg-ba,
60 (qa) to Da-a-lim (Talim?)
30 (qa) to Utu-hb $a-b a$.
Total: 21 gur 265 qa of corn,
Total: 47 gur 152 qa of wheat, E.NUN at the mouth of the river $I b-a l$, has been given out. Month Gán-gán-è, year Gimil-Sin, the king, devastated the country of Zabšali.
XXII.
(Test, Pl. 60, No 132; Halit., Pl. SIT, No. 41.)

## Expenditure of Flour.

An account of expenditure of flour and vegetables given out for temple offerings.

1. $X^{4}$ zid-ku ${ }^{5}$ sá-du(g)-g ud I-kam
2. X zid sá-du(g) ud II-kam
3. VIII [q]a sá-du(g) ud III-kam
4. XV qa sá-du(g) ud IV-kam
5. XV qa sá-du(g) ud V-kam
6. $X$ xid-gar si(g)-ga ${ }^{6}$
7. V qa zid $V$ qa [ . . . . . 1
8. $I I \quad m\left[\begin{array}{l}u \\ .\end{array}\right]$
9. 

V
[ . . . . . . . . . . . . 1

10 (qa) gu-flour, temple offerings for the 1st day,
10 (qa), temple offerings for the 2 d day,
$8[q] a$, temple offerings for the 3 d day, $15 q a$, temple offerings for the 4th day, $15 q a$, temple offerings for the 5th day, 10 (qa) flour food given away(?).
5 qa flour, 5 qa [ . . . . . 1
2
$m[u$. . . $]$
5
[ . . . . . . . . . . . . 1

[^26]XXIII.
(Text, Pl. 61, So. 134.)
Expenditure of Wool.
An account of expenditures of different quantities of wool to a number of persons, given out by (or from) Ur-Nigh-gar.

1. IV ma-na sig-yi
2. $\dot{A}$-na-na
3. IV ${ }^{d}{ }^{d} r$-ra-kal
4. III Igi-ni-da-a
5. III A-ni-a-bi
6. 111 Im-ti-dam
7. IV Ur-d Lugal-edin-
8. na-ka
9. sunnigín X X I ma-na sìg
10. $z i(g)-g a$
11. ki Ur-Nigin-yar-ta
12. itu ${ }^{a} N e-s ̌ u ́ u$
13. $m u ~ u$ š-sa
14. en ${ }^{d}$ En-ki Eridu ${ }^{k i}$ -
ba-túg

4 mana wool
(to) $\grave{A}-n a-n a$,
4 (to) Ùr-ra-kal,
3 (to) Igi-ni-da,
3 (to) A-ni-abi,
3 (to) Im-ti-clam,
7 (to) Ur-Lugal-edin.

Total: 21 mana wool
given out,
by (from) Ur-Nigin-gar.
Month Nešúu,
year after
the high priest of Ea of Eridu appointed.

## XXIV.

(Test, Pl. 3, So. 6.)
Memorandum.'
This small tablet, containing only two lines of writing, is most likely to be regarded as "notes," jotted down on pieces of clay by the scribes when preparing larger tablets of accounts. Two objects are recorded as wanting.

1. lal-ni I gi-mà-ku ${ }^{2} \quad$ Wanting one gi-ma-ku.
2. lal-ni I gishna(d)

Wanting one couch.

[^27]
## IX.

## GLEANINGS.

A complete and thorough discussion of the entire terminology of the texts of this period would be most desirable, but as this volume has to be kept within reasonable bounds, I must be content only to make some gleanings from these texts.

## 1. Cuneiform Signs and Readings.

$\grave{A} B$.
That the Sumerian sign for the Semitic littu is to be read $\grave{a} b$, not lid, as Lau, Barton and even Pinches still continue to read it, is seen from R. M. A., No. 103, O. 11 .

$$
A B+\text { gunu or } Z A G ?
$$

The new sign, Sign List No. 79, comes nearest to $A B+y u n u$ or $Z A G$ (cf. No. 94), but does not exactly correspond to either.

$$
A+H A \text { or } H A+A \text {. }
$$

This sign, occurring thrice in these texts, No. 1:5, 12 and No. $4: 7$, Sign List No. 345, is composed of $A$ with $H A$ inside. This composite sign occurs, according to Thureau-Dangin,' already in Gudea texts, unfortunately not published. It also is found in accounts from the Ur period, see especially C. T., X, Pls. 38, 39, No. 14316, where the signs stand before numerals, like $B A D$, referring to slaves. Whether this composite sign is the same as the later term $B A . A$, also used in regard to slaves, is a question that cannot be definitely settled, although this seems to be the case. In later "contracts" HA.A occurs in connection with BAD, mêtu, in the sense of halâqu, referring to slaves running away. Cf. V $R$., 25, 16a: ba-BAD ba-an-HA.A = im-tu-ud ih-ta-liq. Also A.D. D., I, p. 34, No. 61, 6, BAD BAD-ma HA.A NUN, referring to a slave girl, which no doubt is to be rendered ênu mêtat-ma halqat, "when she dies or runs away," etc." The following NUN, which Johns
${ }^{1}$ R. E. C , So. 471.
${ }^{2}$ Cf. Johns, A. D. D., I, p. 89. For $B A D=\hat{\epsilon} n u$, see $B r .1505$.
does not render, seems to stand for qarâbu, cf. $\operatorname{Br}$. 2626, which with ana means to "go, be against," cf. Sennacherib, III, 1, I R., 31, 12. Knudtzon's rendering, $\check{s} a[$. . . . $\check{c}] a$ qi-ri-ib, etc., " $[d]$ er nahe stand deinem Vater," A. T., 1, 20, 21, is not possible, as $q i-r i-i b$ is not permansive, and the following $a-n a$ in this case remains unexplained. In accordance with Knudtzon's notes on the signs, the reading [it-t]a-qi-ri-ib, "none that is (goes) against your father," may perhaps be better. Brünnow's reading lip is to be changed to rib, or he-in-NUN = Ziq-qa-rib, No. 2626. In any case the meaning of this and similar phrases in the stipulations concerning slaves given as pledges' would be that in case the slave died or ran away, the loss of the pledge should be put against the owner.‘

The term A. $H A$ also occurs as a verbal preposition particle and also as a verb in the Anxanite texts, published by Scheil, ${ }^{3}$ and composite cuneiform signs are among the noticeable characteristics of the Proto-Elamite script published by de Morgan. ${ }^{4}$

In the translations of the documents, where this sign occurs I have given the reading halâqu as the most probable. ${ }^{\overline{5}}$ But HA.A also expresses the meaning
 No. 1 (I) :5, could very well be an equivalent of $K A$. . GÁL-la, cf. No. 2 (11):3, 4, = ruggumu, Br. 612, 676, or dabâbu, or kênu dabâbu, and the documents could refer not exactly to the running away of the slaves but in regard to bringing suit.

Moreover, the composite sign $A+H A$ or $H A+A$, with the reading $\bar{a} h,{ }^{6}$ and the meaning Be-ru-u, is given in C. T., XIX, 21, 18b. This šer $\hat{u}$ occurs in groups with $s a n a b u=\epsilon m e ̂ d u$, "to erect, put up." If this is the term employed in these texts, it might signify to "raise oneself against, to be refractory." Cf. Muss-Arnolt, p. 1109.

## ALIM.

See sign No. 225 and date formula for the 26th year of Dungi.

$$
\vec{E}+\mathbf{N U N} .
$$

This sign, No. 283, may be composed of either $\hat{E}+N U N$ or $M \grave{A}+N U N$. Cf. the $\bar{E}$ or $M \grave{A} . N U N, A m h .$, p. 200, line 3; also B. E., VI', No. 57, 2.

$$
\mathscr{E}+\check{S} E
$$

A new sign, No. 339 , composed of $E+\check{S} E$, or $\check{S} E$ or $L I L+\check{S} E$.

```
' See A.D.D., I, p. 89. }\mp@subsup{}{}{2}\mathrm{ Cf. the phrase NER.DA, below.
* D. P. M., III, Nos. XXIII, 4; LXIII, 14; V, No. LXXXVI, II, 46.
4
\mp@subsup{}{}{5}\mathrm{ See translations and notes to Nos. 1 (I) and 4 (111).}
* From the broken remains of the sign there is very small reason for reading za, cf. M.9075.
```

$$
H \dot{A} .
$$

The composite sign for plural, HI.A, is to be read háa, according to $R . M$. A., No. 103, O., 11; not sun, as Schorr, A. R. U., II, p. 83.

$$
K A \div G A R \text { and } S A
$$

The signs composed of $K A+G A R$ or $S A$ interchange even with $K A$ pure and simple, according to copy by Lau, in the date formulas of the 49-51st years of Dungr.

## $L A$.

$L A$, No. 276, stands for $L A$, No. 315, in the phrase ni-la and ni-la-a, which is equivalent to ni-lá. See No. $11: 16 ; 13: 5$.

$$
L A G A B+G A L \text { or } L A G A B+M E+y u n u .
$$

This new sign, No. $131: 13$, List No. 332, seems to correspond to these values, if the sign is not simply an error for Lagab + sig.
$L U M$.
This sign, No. 132, has the value of $N U M$, see date formulas for the 3d and 4th years of Gimil-Sin, probably also for NIM and perhaps for ÍM. See No. 15:1.

$$
M \grave{A} . D U B . B A .
$$

The term occurs only once in these texts, No. $77: 15$, and is written $M \grave{A} . D U B$, but I have no doubt that it is the same as the $M \grave{A} \cdot D U B \cdot B A$ of other texts.

The term denotes in the first hand a pisan duppi, 'a receptacle for tablets." Hence the ${ }^{g i s h} M \grave{A} . D U B . B A$, Poebel, B. E., $\mathrm{VI}^{2}$, p. 171; the ${ }^{g i} M \grave{A}$ and ${ }^{{ }^{i}}{ }^{i} M A . H A L, B . E, \mathrm{VI}^{1}, 84,17,18,19,103$ (A. R. U., II), 41, "Urkundenbehältniss," Schorr, A. R. U., II, p. 55. The determinatives GI $\breve{S}$ and GI denote the material of which these receptacles, "chests" or "safes," were made. Could possibly the $M \dot{A}$ also be a term for "case" (tablet) or envelope? Cf. Muss-Arnolt, p. 815b; M. 3742.

Most frequently $M \dot{A} . D U B . B A$ is heading tablets of accounts, as in the number of tablets under $T . T$., No. 146; and heading a list of officials, O. B. T. R., No. 162; cf. Lau, p 44. Amh., No. 121 begins with MA.DUB.BA DUB GID.DA, which Pinches translates "the compiler of long accounts," but which may be a pisan duppi of duppi, or may denote an account simply. To be noted is also M $\grave{A} . D U B$. $B A \mid g u(d)$ engar gub ba $\mid \dot{E}^{d}$ Nin-mar-ti| ni-gál, C. T., III, 14608; the dub mà$d u b-b a, T . T ., 163,8$, and $m \grave{a} d u b-b a \mid n i g-s ̌ i d-a g ~ b a-n i-i b, H . L . C ., ~ 11, ~ P l . ~ 96, ~ N o . ~$
$118,1,2$. In these cases $M \grave{A} . D U B . B A$ seems to signify an account, or possibly the making up of accounts.

But it is quite certain that $M \grave{A} . D U B . B A$ also signifies an office, and in one instance it is made the equivalent of dub-sur. Thus the seal of $R$. T. C., 287, reads: $|B a \check{s} a(g)-g a| m d-d u b b a$ nita-xu|; H. L. C., II, Pl. 96, No. 120, R., 1, 2: |dub $\check{S}$ eš-kal-la $\mid m d-d u b b a$; and Amh., 42, $5: \mid d u b$ Gar-u-rum $|m d-d u b-b a|$, and on the seal: $\mid G a r-u$-rum $\mid$ dub-sur $\mid$. Cf. the sign $\check{S} I D+A=d u b-$ sar-ru, Br. 6011.
$M \grave{A}=$ pisan, but $\check{S} I D$ also $=$ pisan, $B r .5978$, stands also for kunukku, $B r$. 5971, hence $M \grave{A}$ might also express the idea of sealing, which of course again refers to the making up of accounts, or maker or sealer of account tablets.

$$
M \dot{A} \check{S}
$$

The misreading of this sign in face of the repeated corrections ought to he a thing of the past. Yet Lau still reads BIR.

$$
M \hat{E}
$$

Note the form of this sign, No. 99 : 11, List No. SOO. Cf. Br. 2803, 2804; R. E. G., No. 531.

## MER.

This sign, Nos. 88 and 314, especially in the connection with $U s$, is made very like the sign $\dot{I} B$ or $G I N$. See note to No. $3: 12$.

NER.DA.
This term occurs only in the legal document, No. 1 (I): 7, and in reference to a slave. The term occurs also in Gudea, Cyl. A, 12, 26: du(g)-du(g)-ga ne-gi ner-da é-ba im-ma-an-gi, which Thureau-Dangin translates: "Er beseitigte die Rechtsstreite, vom Tempel beseitiyte er die . . . . . ${ }^{1}$ In Cyl. B, 18, 3 we have: nig-erim é ba im-ma-an-gi, "alles Ueble vom Tempel beseitiyte er.'"

Here NER.DA seems to be a term fo: something undesirable, and as it is brought into connection with the instituting of lawsuits or legal quarrels, it might express the idea of "claimant" in a bad sense of this term. In regard to the term employed in No. 1 (I) of these texts, it might denote a runaway, refractory or troublesome slave.
$N E R . D A$ also occurs in the well-known name for the deity, $A-a$, i.e., $\check{S} \dot{e}-n e r-d a-$ kallat-Šamaš, and in the feminine proper name, which is to be read Amat-A-a-kallat-Šamaš. ${ }^{3}$
${ }^{1}$ S. A. K. I.,pp. 102, $103 . \quad{ }^{2}$ S. A. K. I.,pp. 138, 139.
${ }^{3}$ See Jensen, Z. A., I, pp. 398, 399; B. E., VI', No. 94, 5, 6.

But in regard to the $N E R . D A$ of our text, it might also be explained in accordance with phrases of late "contracts" in regard to slaves, or more particularly in the stipulations made in case of death or escape of a slave given as a pledge. $N E R$ could, of course, stand for bêlu and DA for the usual inn eli, ana or ina. Cf. the examples given by Johns, A. D. D., I, p. 89; also A.HA above and translation of No. 1 (I).
NITA.

Note the form for this sign, No. 24; No. 67 :4, omitting the last perpendicular wedge.

$$
S A G .
$$

This sign, No. 122, seems also to have the value of $K I N$, as it occurs in place of that sign in the name of the month ${ }_{\text {So e-kin-kud. See No. } 100: 78 .}$

$$
S A G+N I
$$

This is a new composite sign, List No. 123, made up of $S A G$ with $N I$ inside, and occurring in accounts in regard to storage of grain.

It occurs mostly in connection with $D U B$ as $S A G+N I . D U B$, Nos. 100 and 104 passim, but also alone as $S A G+N I$-bi, etc., No. 100 : 91 . Compare the usual term ni-dub in storage accounts.

$$
\mathrm{SAL}+M E
$$

See sign No. 294.

$$
\mathrm{SA}(M) .
$$

This sign, NO. 56, occurs in these texts both with and without the addition $A . A N$. With the meaning "to buy," it is to be read $s a(m)$, not šam. See now M. 3235; Pinches, Amh., p. 104.
SILL.

The reading of the sign No. 280 is sil, see Pinches in J. R. A. S., 1905, p. 144, cuneiform text, line 7. Schorr, however, stills reads the ideogram $B U H Z U D U$, A. R. U., II, p. 82.

$$
\check{S} A(G)-b a .
$$

This for $\check{s} a(g)-b i, \quad " i n$ its midst," No. $79: 19$.
ŠE.PAD.
$\check{S} E . P A D=$ še-um, B. E., VI', 131, 1. Cf. Babyloniaca, 111, p. 196.

$$
\check{S} \grave{U}(G) \cdot G I
$$

This most probably is only a phonetic writing for $\begin{array}{r} \\ u-g i\end{array}$. See No. $3: 2$; cf. B. E., VI', 95, 19 21; 101, 14. It denotes three officials, šobu, Br. 10841, bard, $B r$. 10826, lêmu, Br. 10833. Rut $\check{s u}(g)=n a z a ̂ z u, B r .10847$; hence the term for witness may better be derived from ašâbu, which would correspond to the mukinnu from kânu.

$$
\check{S} U+N I G I N
$$

If the first sign in No. 79:37 really is $\check{S} U+$ NIGIN and not XI, which after all is the most probable, the following $l a$ would be the overhanging vowel of $\mathrm{XU}+$ NIGIN and would show that this composite sign is to be read $\breve{S} U+k i l$.

$$
\check{S} U . T \cup(R) .
$$

This term may be explained as a phonetic writing for šu-dur, see No. 1 (I): 12, but it might also stand for târu, perhaps with the meaning of reversion of judgment, reopening of a case! or reclamation.

$$
T A G
$$

The rather unusual sign for this period, No. 346 , must be $T A G, K I D$ or $\check{S} I D$. Cf. $B r .1402-1409 ; R . E$ C., No. 175.

$$
U D+g u n u ?
$$

This new sign, No. 102, comes nearest to $U D+g u n u$, in analogy with the makeup of the $I G I+$ gunu or sig.

$$
U M+M E .
$$

This, No. 72, is also a new sign and most likely a ligature of $U M$ and $M E$.

## ZA.INANNA.

This phrase occurs in several proper names, as ZA.INANNA or INANNA.ZA, and might be read šìb or ḩalbili (see Br. 11743; C. T., XXV, $27 a, 15,6,10$; XXV, 3,65 ); but it is doubtful to my mind whether these readings are to be applied to the phrase included in these names.

## 2. Terms of Court Proceedings.

igi-ni-ni-igi-gar, "he made his face appear" ="to bring into court.," No. 1 (I) :3.
$d u(g)$-ni-gál-la, "he has made suit" $=$ "to bring suit or reclamation," No. 2 (11):3. Cf. $d u(g)-m \grave{a}-m \grave{a}$, etc. $=$ rugyumu, A. R. U., II, p. 84, etc. $b a-a-n i-d \bar{u}-\bar{u}$, "he has not appeared" $=$ "to appear before court," No. 2 (11):5. Cf. $K A K=$ sanâqu, a-na DI.KUD is-ni-qu-ma, B. E., VI', No. 56, 6. $m и$ lugal, "by the name of the king" = "to make accusation or arraign," Nos. 1 (I) :5; also mu-lugal-bi in(-na or ni)-pa(d), Nos. 2 (11):9; 4 (111):4. Cf. itmâ, itm $\hat{u}$ of later documents, A. R. U., II, p. 87.
$b a-a n-g u b, " t h e y ~ s h a l l ~ b e ~ r e s p o n s i b l e, " ~ N o . ~ 1 ~(1): 13 . ~ C f . ~ n a z a ̂ z u, ~ B . ~ E ., ~, ~$ VI', 2 (A. R. U., II ${ }^{2}$ ), 11; 23 (A.R. U., II, 10), 13.
galu-enim-ma-bi-me, "the men of the proceedings," Nos. 1 (I): 21; 2 (11):17; 4 (111):13, and passim $=$ "the witnesses of the proceedings." Cf. mu-kin-nu of later documents.
diš stands before the name of the witnesses, Nos. 1 (1): 14-20; 4 (111):9-11; or the names are given without any sign before them, No. 2 (II) : 10-16.

## 3. Terms of Loan and purchase Documents.

in-ši-sa $(m)$, "he has bought," No. $14: 6$.
azag, "purchase money," No. $16: 2$.
$m u$-si(m)-dam, "has given (as a loan)," No. $14: 4$.
ḩar-šúu, "loan at interest," Nos. $23: 1 ; 24: 1 ; 25: 1$.
máš, "rate of interest," Nos. $23: 2 ; 24: 2 ; 25: 2 ; 27: 2 ; 28: 2 ; 31: 2$.
$s i(m)-m u$, "payment," No. 13:6.
yi-yi-ne, "shall return, pay back," No. $18: 14$.
ni-la, ni-la-a, "he shall weigh, pay," Nos. 11:16; $13: 5$.
$n u-n a-s i(m)$, "(In case) he does not pay," No. 13:9.
$n u-u b-m \breve{a}(S A R)$, "(In case) he does not bring in," No. $7: 4$; cf. No. $10: 4$.
$i b-z u-z u$, "he shall cause to be brought, pay," No. $7: 6$.
$i u-b n-t i$, "he has received (as a loan)," Nos. $13: 4 ; 17: 5 ; 18: 5 ; 22: 6 ; 25: 5$;
$27: 6 ; 31: 6$; "he has received (as purchase money), "No. 16:5.
$i b-t a b-p i$, "it shall be increased, doubled," No. 13:10.
tukundi-bi (Šú.NIG.TUR.LÁ-bi), Nos. $7: 1 ; 10: 1 ; 13: 9$ =ium-ma, $B r$. 7256, cf. Old Babylonian family laws and Code of Hammurabi, a legal phrase thus being employed as far back as the Ur period at least, a fact' that has to be taken into consideration in the historical study of the Code of Hammurabi. $\breve{S} \hat{U}=a n a$, generally a postposition, but also occurring before the noun. Cf. S. A. K. T., 70,

[^28]43-46. GAR, NIG =epêšu, kânu, šakânu; $L \dot{A}$, among other things also šakânu, Br. 10111. GAR.TUR = mimma $i$-su, Br. 12044. TUR and TUR.TUR.LA $=$ sihhirûtu, Br. 4113, which perhaps is not so easy to explain. The phrase seems to mean "for its happening," "in case of its taking place," and would be in analogy with our phrase "in case."
$\grave{u}-r u \quad b a$-gar, "the document was made," No. 13:16.
dis and igi interchange before the names of the yalu-enim-ma-bi-me or witnesses. See Nos. $14: 12-22$ and $16: 6-10 ; 18: 6-7$, respectively.

In regard to the form of the documents, two kinds of documents of purchases are to be noted. One kind, Nos. 14, 15, is a deed of sale, where the whole transaction is stated; others are simply acknowledgments of the receipt of the purchase money for an object sold. See Nos. 16, 17.

## 4. Terms of Accounts.

## hi General.

$k u-b a-t i$, "he has (it is) received," equivalent to $d u b$, "to receive on account." $b a-g u b$, "he has (it is) brought in, is at hand."
$b a-x i$, "he has (it is) given, paid out."
gub-ba, credit,' 'at hand."
$z i(g)-g a$, debit, ' 'given out, expenditures."
dub, "account, on account of."
$m u$, 'by name, on behalf of."
gı̆r, visé(?).
Zal-ni, 'deficit."
si-ni-ib, 'surplus, remainder."
azag, "silver value."
an-na, "lead value."
$m \grave{a}-d u b-b a$, 'account."
nig-šid-ag, "making up of accounts."
$i b-r a, ~ i b-r u, ~ " s e a l e d, " ~ c f . ~ B r . ~ 4970 ; ~ B . ~ E ., ~ V I ', ~ 82, ~ 11 . ~$
Seals on account tablets are dub-sar seals. See especially the carefully reproduced seals of the Amh. volume.

## In Regard to Fields.

ab-engar, No. $92: 15, a b-n a m$, No. $92: 1$, al-d $\bar{u}$, No. $90: 2$, sag-d $\bar{u}$, No. $90: 1$, terms used to express the cultivation of fields.
gar, a measure of area, No. $92: 2$, etc., cf. B. E., $\mathrm{VI}^{1}, 44,1 ; 60,{ }^{\top} 6$.

## In Regard to Fruit Harvest.

sir, "(fruit) taken away, or no fruit," No. $75: 15,17$.
tig-a, "(trees) actually being harvested," No. $75: 16$.

## In Regard to Cattle.

rú-a, $t u(d)-d a$, "(new) born," No. $79: 1,21,23,29$.

## 5. Officials and Employés.

$d u b-s a r$, equivalent to mic-club-ba, see above.
galu-ku-mà-še-ti-a, 'the man that receives the grain, grain receiver," No. 118:9.
$g \check{\imath r}$, the most prominent official in these accounts. That gir is an official is seen from the fact that he is travelling, cf. No. $120: 2$, but in many cases it seems as if the term simply meant visé. This personage seems to be a representative official or commissioner, that would superintend, control and check off accounts kept arid expenses made, cf. the gı̌r si(g)-ga = manzaz pāni, Rr. 2101; C. T., VII, 19984, R., 16; of temples, C. T., 21399, R., 24; of the pa-te-si, C. T., 12245, R., 5 ; royal commissioner, C. T., III, 13166, L. E. He would receive, distribute or perhaps transmit grains and other supplies brought in and given out. Cf. T. T., 94, X, 13; Amh. 102, K., 5; 120. Sometimes the pa seems to take the place of the ğrr, see Amh., No. 27; H. L. C., II, Pl. 70, VIII, 11. The gı̆r official also plays the same conspicuous part in the Elamite-Anzanite accounts, see D. P. M., IX. See also the gir, not NER, Schorr, A. R. U., II, p. 82, in B. E., $\mathrm{VI}^{1}, 24,4 ; 32,9 ; 102,4 ; 104,14$; 106, 6. Note the sib gur, No. $96: 13$.
$m \grave{a}-d u b-b a$, equivalent to $d u b-s a r$, see above.
$s \grave{u}(g)-g i$, see above.
ukuš-nita pa-al, see No. $3: 12$.
6. Months.
itu Azag-š̌m is a new month name. To judge from the meaning of the words that compose the name, it must be a spring month. See Nos. $15: 17 ; 42: 8 ; 48: 7$. itu $\check{\mathrm{S}} e-s a g-k u d$, for itu $\check{S} e-k i n-k u d$.
itu-Šu-ešs-ku[l], No. 53 :6, cf. itu $\check{S} u-e s ̌-s ̌ a ~ a n d ~ i t u ~ \check{S} u-s ̌ a-e s ̌ . ~ . ~$
itu-ge itu $V I$ is a phrase occurring on these tablets just before the date formula. The only plausible explanation, unless the phrase signifies a name, is "its months (are) six months," and would thus denote a half year account. See Nos. $83: 45$;
$84: 89 ; 112: 19 ; 114: 17 ; 168: 2$ Cf. R. T. C., No. 398; H. L. C., II, Pl. 56, No. 8, V, 6; also itu V, C. T., X, Pl. 39, No. 14316, III, 18.

The two slanting wedges after $i t u$ Še-kin-kud, No. 1 (I) : 22, might denote "the second $\check{S} e-k i n-k u d, "$ i.e., Dir-Še-kin-kud, or the 2d or 20th day.

## 7. Days.

ucl-X-ba-ni is the general term for denoting the days of the months in these texts. The term ba-ni may have to be read $b a-x a l$. In any case it is equivalent to kam, and it is to be regarded as denoting an ordinal number. It has been pointed out that kam, when used after days in similar texts, stands before the month names, see C. T., III, 19740, 192-194; but it is also found following the month, C. T., III, 21510, 55; V, 17767, R., 7; 13160, L. E. That ba-ni denotes an ordinal number is seen from examples like itu Še-kul ud XXV-ba-ni-ta, C. T., I, 94-10-16, 59.

## 8. Date Formulas.

For new date formulas and new variations of formulas known before, see p. 27.
The different date formulas given under the 5th year of Bur-Sin are no doubt only variations of the same date formula.

## X.

## NAMES AND TITLES.

The aim of the following list has been merely to register the names, Sumerian as well as Semitic, in the form they occur in these texts. To translate and comment on the names would have been an interesting and profitable study in itself, but it would have carried me over the limits set for this volume. By printing the Sumerian names in Italics I have not, of course, indicated that they really are to be read as they now stand. As almost every name presents more or less uncertain readings, I have simply shrunk back from disfiguring the pages by introducing capitals where the reading is not known. The scholar will need no suck warning, as far as Sumerian names are concerned.

> Abbreviations.
> b., brother; d., daughter; f., father; fem., feminine; h., husband; m., mother; s., sori; si., sister; w., mile.
> 1. Names of Men and Women.

A-a-bi, f. of Lagab + sīg-tur, $90: 10$.
A-ab-gá-mu, $16: 6$.
A-a-gulu-dug, 119 :7.
[A]-a-ga-tum, ${ }^{1} 135$ :14.
A-a-gin-n $[a(d)],{ }^{2} 79: 10$.
A-a-kal-la, $56: 31$.
[A]-a-na-ib-e, $19: 3$.
A-a-ni, $68: 12$.
[A]-a-tu(r)-ra, $67: 3,10$.
A-и-ur-mи, $81: 10,12$.
A-ba-An-da, $96: 22$.
A-bad ${ }^{d}$ En-lil, $96: 21$.
Ab-ba-mu, 113:4.
$A n-b a-n i,{ }^{3} 27: 5 ;$ seal, $94: 6$.

A-ba-ra-an-na, $96: 35$.
A-bil-[?], $130: 7$.
A-bil-Engar, f. of Má-gúr-ri, 139:6.
À-bil-la-lum, 24 :5;79:33.
A-É-a-ki, 96 :20.
A-ku-za, 56 : 30.
$A b-t a-a b-\dot{e}, 95: 20$.
A-bu-šu-ni, 135 : 31.
$A d-d a$, f. of (I) $S u-A d-d a$, (2) Su-d $N i n-S ̌ a h, ~(3) U r-L u h$,
(4) Ka-d Innanna, (5) Ur-Nigin-gar, 110 : IX, 3-7.

Ad-du-kul-la, $7: 10 ; 55$ : 13.
Ad-d En-lil, 84 : 88.
A-dug-ga, $120: 3,6,10,14$.
A-ga-ti, $135: 28$.
${ }^{1}$ Perhaps only A-ga-turn, cf. A-ga-ti.
${ }^{2}$ Huber, P.K. U. N., p. 41a, following Reisner, T. T., 35, II, 11, reads A-a-gim-nad.
${ }^{3} \mathrm{Cf} .{ }^{d} B a-n i$.

A-ga-IB, ${ }^{1} 135: 14$.
A-ha-ni-Su, $135: 2$.
A-bu-ni-[šu?], $135: 18$.
A-hூu-šû-ni, ${ }^{2} 64: 3$.
A-hुu-um, 117:38.
A-bu-um-ma, $128: 9$.
A-ka-gal-li, 54 :4.
A-kal-la, $58: 7$; s. of $Z a-m a-[?], 171: 3$.
A-ku-za, $56: 30$.
2-la-la, $1: 2,3 ; 18: 3 ; 35: 3$.
A- li-a-bi, 134:5.
$\bar{A}^{d} L u h, 96: 30$.
A-lul-lul, $95: 12$.
Ama-um + me, $20: 10$.
A-mиг-Kal-la, 116 : 11.
А-пи-пи, 134 :2.
$A n-b a-n i^{3}$
An-dirig-g ${ }^{4}{ }^{4} 128: 9$.
Alim-a, ${ }^{5} 135: 18$.
A-NE-ni, $98: 4$.
An-ni, 95 : 30.
An-Utu-bar-ra, 67 :7.
$A-t u, 32$ : seal.
Azag-zi(d)-da, 135:7; s. of I-ba-ni-iz, 29 :1, seal.
Ba-a-na-zal-la, 115 :2.
Bn-la-an-gi, $4: 10$.
Ba-lul-e, $8: 1$.
$B a-s ̌ a(g)-g a, 95: 5$.
Ba-ta, $96: 70$.
Be-li-Ear, 116:5.
Bu-bu, 95 :27.
$B u-b u-a, 133: 14$.
Bu-ga-ga, $135: 35,36$.
Bu-la-ni, 56 :27.
Bur-d Da-mu, $96: 28$.
Bur-za-Innanna
Bu-zi-na, 56 :3.
$\mathbf{D} a-a-[. .], 130: 5.$.
Da-a-lim, $23: 10 ; 129: 10$.
Da-bi-a, 75 :25.
Da-gi, 126:7,22
${ }^{1}$ Perhaps [A]-a-ga-tum, cf. A-ya-ti.
${ }^{2}$ Cf. P. K. U. N., p. $45 a$.
${ }_{3}$ See Dingir-ba-ni, 27 :5; 94 :6.
${ }^{4}$ See ${ }^{d}$ Dirig-gà.
${ }^{5}$ Perhaps $H u s ̌$ - $a$.
${ }^{8}$ Perhaps ${ }^{d}$ Utu-bar-ra.
${ }^{7}$ Or Sir-ga-ga.

Da-ku-turn, 116:16.
Da-da, 56 :9.
Da-gi, 126:7,22.
Dagal-ra, 126 : 10 .
Da- ${ }^{d} \hat{I}-l i$, f. of $N u-u r-i-l l, 11: 3$.
Dam-[ . . . . ], 56: 13.
Dam-[ . . .]-An, $96: 49$.
Dam-šu-da-a, $56: 13$.
Dir-de, ${ }^{8} 153$ :2.
Dingir-ba-ni, ${ }^{9} 27: 5$, and seal.
${ }^{d}$ Dirig-gà $,{ }^{10} 128: 9$.
Dub-bu-zi-na, 56:3.
$D u$-du, s. of $A i, 110: 13$.
Dug-[ . . . ], 96:52.
Dumu-[ . . . . ], (1) f. of Nin-[ . . , . ], $163: 3$; * (2) f. of Lugal-d Utu-[ . . . . ], $57: 13$.

Dun-gi, 57 :8, and dates of Dun-gi.
${ }^{2}$ Dun-gi-ba-ni, $116: 4$.
1:-a-ma-ne, 139:1.
É-gal-la-lu(r)-ra, $64: 6$.
E-la-[ . . . ], $115: 8$.
E-la-ng-nu-h," 11.1.
E-mul-d ${ }^{d}$ Dumu, 111 :5.
En-[ . . . ], 96 : 53.
Engar-dug, $96: 14$.
Enim-ma-ni-galu, 96 :57.
${ }^{d} E n-k[i]-d u(\mathrm{~g}), 96: 59$.
En-lil-da-ner-gal, $86: 14$.
En-lil-lá-[ . . . ], 56 : 10.
En-lil-li, 96:41.
En-lil-lá-a-An-azag-ga, ${ }^{12} 111$ :S.
En-lil-lá-šáa $(g)$, s. of Lugal-nanga, $14: 3$.
${ }^{d}$ En-lil-mu, 164:1.
[U] $r^{13}-E n-k i-i m-d u, 111: 2$.
En-ne-zu, 128 : 3.
[ . . . $]^{d} E n-k i, 57: 2$.
É-pa-é, $96: 31$.
Ca-gi, 33 : ' $/$.
Galu-d ${ }^{d}$. . . ], 96 :38.
Calu-Bi, ${ }^{14} 109: 9$.
Gala-Bi-bi, $96: 27$.
${ }^{8}$ Sec Si-a-de.
${ }^{9}$ See $A n-b a-n i$.
${ }^{10}$ See An-dirig-gà.
${ }^{11}$ See $I$-la-ag-nu-à .
12 " Enlil is the begotten one of the bright heaven."
${ }^{13}$ Or Šu.
${ }^{14}$ Or Gaš.
[Ga]lu-bu-ga-ga, 135:36.
Galu-dam-[ . . . ], 96 :26.
Galu- ${ }^{d} D a-m u, 70$ : io.
Galu-Dingir-ra, 139 :2.
Galu-dug-ga-de-gal, $50: 6$.
Galu- ${ }^{d}$ En-lil-lda, (1) 111:9; (2) s. of galu- ${ }^{d} U t u, 3: 4$.
Galu- ${ }^{d} E n-z u$, (1) $41: 6 ; 56: 22,25$; (2) s. of $M a$
-[ . . .], $160: 4$.
Galu-Gan-[ . . ],1 $12: 11$.
Galu-gir-si-di-cc, 110 :col. X, 9.
Galu-[ . . . ]-di, 95 :25.
Galu-ka-ni, $109: 13$.
Galu-ditr $r(?)-] r i-e ́-r[u$ ?], $46: 9$.
Galu-Kin-gi-a, $46: 8$.
Galu- ${ }^{\text {Dagab }}$ sāg, $72: 1 ; 104: 31$.

Galu-na-rù-a, 12G:6.
Galu- ${ }^{d}$ Nin-[ . . . ], 46 :case, 3.
Galu-d ${ }^{\text {Nin-gul, }} 58$ : 12.
Galu-Nı[gin]-gar-[ra], 96 :G1.
Galu-d ${ }^{d}$ in-šah $, 61: G ; 74: 8 ; 101: 18 ; 166: 7$.
Galu-d $R a, 121$ :7.
Galu- ${ }^{d}$ Sag-[ . . . ], $12: 12$.
[Ga]lu-Ur, $96: 16$.
Galu-Ur-ki-[ . . ], 108: 11.
Galu- ${ }^{d} U t u$, (1) $13: 4$; (2) f. of Gälu-En-lit-láa, $3: 4$.
Galu-, 160:8.
Ga-gi, 33 :4.
$G a n-s ̌ a(g),{ }^{2} 95: 29$.
Gar-kal-la, 47 :3.
Gar-ša (m)-bi, $130: 9$.
${ }^{d}$ Geštin-an, 102 :5.
${ }^{d}$ Geštin-an-ka, $102: 2$.
$G i n^{d} E n-z u$, fern., si. of Sir-ka, $1: 10$.
Gïn-har-har, fem., $116: 15$.
Gïn-Nin-e-[ . . . ], f., 143:3.
$G \check{r}-a$, f. of $U r-{ }^{d} I g i-z i-b a r-r a, 109: 10$.
$G i ̆ r^{d} B i-l i+l i, 56: 46$.
Gir-d En-li[l]-ga(l), 52:3.
Giri-gi-na, 91 :30.

Gǐr i-liušáá(g), $22: 5 ; 95: 11$.
Ǧัr-Nin-[ . . . 1,135: 12; s.ot Dumu-[ . . . ], 1G3 :3.
$G \dddot{\imath r-n i-s ̌ a}(g),{ }^{4} 16: 9$.
$G u(d)$-da-ri-a, $128: 6$.
Gh-de-a, $15: 5 ; 96: 40$.
Gu(d)- ${ }^{d}$ Geštin-an, $102: 3$
Gu-du, 23: 3 .
$G u-d u-d u, 73: 3$.
$G u(?)-g u-a-l a, 108: 1$.
Gu-la-a, $139: 4$.
$[G] u-z a-n i,{ }^{5} 123: 5$.
$\mathbf{H}$ al-hal-la, f. of Lugal-sirim, 120 : 8.
Ha-zi-in, ${ }^{6} 111: 1$.
He-ša(g), $95: 29$.
Hии-ma-gu-ra, $87: 2$.
Ни́-mu-u-ša, $128: 1$.
Uu-pi-pi, $11: 12 ; 119: 5 ; 137.5$.
Низ̆̌- $a, 13: 14$.
1-ba-nl-iz, 1.of $\grave{\mathrm{A}}-z i(d)-d a, 29$ :seal.
$I$-dim-dingir, s. of Sù-ša-ra-ni, $39: 3$, and seal.
${ }^{d}$ Igi-du, 144 : 8.
Igi- ${ }^{d}$ En-lil, 95.21.
Igi-Ku,' 87 :4.
Igi-ni-da-u, 134:4.
Igi-ša $\alpha(g)$-ša $\alpha(g), 68: 3$.
I-la-ag-nu-ì ${ }^{8}$
I-li-be-ll, $56: 24$.
I-li-nu-ri, $56: 22$.
Iin-ti-dam, f., 134 :6.
Innanna-Kalam-ba, $129: 9$.
${ }^{d}$ Innanna-ur, $139: 7$.
In-ta, ${ }^{10} 56: 38$.
I-ri-bu-um, 56 :2.
I-šar-ba-kal, $116: 14$.
$I$-šar-i-ll , ${ }^{11} \mathrm{~s}$. of $\operatorname{Sin}-\stackrel{s}{a} a-u r(?)-n i, 39$ :seal.
I-Xar-ni-si, $46: 11$.
Iš-me-i-lu, $23: 5$.
I-ta, ${ }^{12} 117$ :35.
I-zn-ur $\operatorname{sig}(?), 119: 8$.
$\grave{I}-z i-z i,^{13} 117: 41$.
${ }^{1}$ Cf. Galu-gan-gu-la, P. K. U. N,$~$ p. $89 a$.
${ }^{2}$ See $H e-s ̌ a ̆(g)$. Cf. $H e(g a ́ n)-n a-s ̌ a g, ~ P . K . U . N ., ~ p . ~ 123 a . ~$
${ }^{3}$ Cf. Giri-gi, P. K. U. N., p. 109 a.
${ }^{4}$ Cf. Gïr-ni-šá $(g), C . T ., \mathrm{V}, 17758, \mathrm{I}, 2$.
${ }^{5}$ Cf. P. K. U. N., p. 111a.
${ }^{6}$ Means "axe." Possibly it is a noun, not a proper name. ${ }^{7} \mathrm{Cf} .{ }^{d} \mathrm{Ku} . \mathrm{Br} .10569$.
${ }^{8}$ Sce E-Lu-ay-nu- .
${ }^{9}$ See Ri-Kalam-ba.
${ }^{10}$ Cf. In-ta- $\grave{c}-a$, P. K. U.N., p. $54 b$.
${ }^{11}$ Perhaps better $I-m a ̆-\imath-n$.
${ }^{12}$ Cf. I-tu-i-a and In-ta-i-a, P. K. U. N., p. 54b. ${ }^{13}$ See $N i-z i-z i$.
$\mathbf{K} a-g i-n a, 57: 22$.
Ka-qu-du-ma, 88: 11.
Ka- ${ }^{d}$ Innanna, 110 : col. IS, 6.
$K c t-i t u-A b-\dot{e}, 37: 5$.
$K a-k a$, f. of $U r_{-}^{d} P A . K U, 14: 5$.
Ka-la-a, 139:3.
Kalam-da(?)-ga, $21: 17$.
Kalam-da-r[a], $87: 5$.
Kalam-il-è, $31: 5$.
Kalam-lam-mu, 7 : 11.
Kalam-ne-mu, ${ }^{1} 7$ : 11.
Kal-d Engar, 17 : G.
Kal-la, 56:34.
Ka-šag-a, 87:3.
Ki-da-lum, 110 :col. X, 3.
Kur-bi-[ . . ], 142 :9.
Kur-ni-mu, ${ }^{2} 120$.
Kur-ru-ti. 110 :col. IS, 1
$\mathbf{L a g a b}+\operatorname{svg}$-tur, s of $A-a-b i, 90: 10$.
Li-ša-be-i-lit-du(?), 12G. 18.
$L u-[$. . . ], f. of [ . . $]$ Se- $b a-m[a], 57: 11$.
Lugal-[ . . . ], 96 : 73.
Lugal-[ . . . ]-ab-[ . . . . ], 96: 62.
Lugal-azag-i, $67: 8$.
Inugal-azag-z[u], ${ }^{3} 13: 12 ; 146 \cdot 14$.
Lugal- $\grave{A}-z i(d)-d a, 5 G: 19 ; 81: 8 ; 111: 11$.
Lugal-Bär, Eem., w. of Šu-d Dumu-zi, $125: 7$.
[Luga]ll(?)-Bu-ga-ga, 135:36.
Lugal-Dub-bu(?), 96 :43.
Lugal-dug-ga, $84: 63 ; 103: 9,122: 4$.
Lugal-ezen, (1) 87 : A; (2) s. of Hal-hal-la, $120: 7$.
Lugal-giš, 1:13.
Lugal-giš-bar, 96 :29.
Lugal-ba-m[a], 57 :7.
Lugal-iskim-zi, $31: 3$.
Lugal-iskim-zi(d)-da, $2: 2,7$.
Lugal-itu-Da, 13: 13.
Lugal-ka-gi-na, 32 :sed; $33: 5 ; 45: 5 ; 99: 13$.
Lugal-ki, $96: 19$.
Lugal-mé-a, $99: 13$.
Lugal-Nam-tar-ri, $29: 2 ; 38: 6 ; 42: 3 ; 95: 2$.
Lugal-nanga, (1) 47 :2; (2) f. of En-lil-al-šag, 14 : 13.
Lugal-Nibru ${ }^{k i}, 96: 46$.
$[L u g] a l(?){ }^{d}{ }^{d} \operatorname{Sag}-[$. . . ], $12: 12$.
${ }^{1}$ See Uku-ne-mu.
${ }^{2}$ See Pap-ni-mu.
${ }^{3}$ Cf. P. K. U. N., 129, p. 129a.
${ }^{4}$ Of. Lugal-ba-ma-til, P. K. U. N., p. $132 a$.

Lugal-šáa (g)-ga, (1) 3:2; (2) s. of Bur-za-Innanna, $40: 3$, and seal.
Lugal-šáa (g)-láa, 160 : G.
Lugal-šá $(g)-$ ša-ri
[Lug]al(?)-Ur, $96: 16$.
Lugal-ùr-ra-ni, 18 :4.
Iutgal-ū $(d)$-da, $96: 34$
Lugal-ù-ším, 109:16.
Lugal- ${ }^{d}$ Utu, 13 : seal.
[ Lugg]al(?) ${ }^{d} U t u-[. .],$. s. of $\operatorname{Dum}[u-], 57: 12$.
Lugal-te-bu-e, s. of Mu-ha, $8: 3$.
Lugal-aag(?)-e, 96 :43.
Iuh- ${ }^{d} K a, 101: 70$.
Lul-a, 109:11; 119:4.
Lul-ù⿱-gu, 144: 13.
[ . . . ] ${ }^{d} L u-s{ }^{2} \dot{a}(g), 149: 5$.
Lu-u[d(?)], $12: 4$.
$\mathbf{M}$ a-ad-i-lit, ${ }^{5} 19: 5 ; 30: 3 ; 104: 39$.
Ma-ba-tu(d)-da, $96: 39$.
Ma-da-i-ll, ${ }^{8} 11: 11$.
Mà-du-du, $96: 42$.
$M a-d[u g](?)$, , of Galu- ${ }^{2} E n-z u, 160: 4$.
Ma-gu-um, ${ }^{7}$
Mä-gúr-ri, ${ }^{8}$ s. of A-bil-Engar, $139: 5$.
Maš-urudu-Gu-la, 96 :44.
Mer-ab, 96 :25.
Me-ru-ru, $98: 3$.
[ . . . ] ${ }^{d}$ Mu-ba-azag, 135: 13.
Mu-ha-ba-tug-tug, f. of Lugal-te-hu-e, $8: 4$.
Mu-ma-da, 164:5.
Mu-ni-mah, $35: 4$.
$\mathbf{N} a-b a-h a-s ̌ u, 96: 11$.
Na-ba-pi-su, $96: 11$.
$N a-b a-\check{s} \dot{a}(g), 109: 9$.
Na-rú-a, $81: 7$.
Nam-tar-ri, $96: 18$.
Nam-uru, $96: 13$.
Ne-galu-urru-ki, 108 : 3.
Ne-ra-ni, 116 :2.
Ne-sag, $96: 33,39$.
Ni, (1) f. of Dumu-nita-ga[b], $108: 10$; (2) f. of Su- ${ }^{\text {d }}$ Ninšah, 110 : col. VIII, $1 ; \mathrm{IX}, 2$.
Ni-bn-ab-ul, 111:7.
Ni-du-[ . . ], 102:7.
${ }^{5}$ Semitic, "How long, my god?"
${ }^{\text {B }}$ Cf. $M a-a d-i-l l$.
${ }^{7}$ Cf. Ma-gu, P. K. U. N., p. $135 b$.
${ }^{8}$ Cf. Lugal-má-gúr-ri, P.K. U.N., p. $133 a$.
${ }^{d} N i-e-{ }^{d} \breve{S}_{S}[\bar{x}], 5: 1$.
[N]i-ir-e, 164:6.
Nin-[. . . ], s. of Dumu-[ . . . ], 163 : 3 .
Ni-ne-za
Ni-s $[a(g)]-g a,{ }^{1} 144: 14$.
Ni[n-]giš-tig-a-an-ti, $142: 1$.
[. . $]^{d}$ Nin-tú, $135: 20$.
Ni-zi-zi, $117: 41$.

Nu-ša-na-zi, $64: 8$.
Pap-ni-mu, ${ }^{3} 1: 20$.
Ri-[. . . ], 56:4.
Rit-[. ]-rú, $56: 6$.
Ri-Kalam-ba, ${ }^{4}$ 129:9.
Ri-pi-pi, 120:4.
Ri-üg-ba, ${ }^{5} 23: 9$.
Sag-[ . . . ], $96: 72$.
Sag-da-na, 34: 6.
Sal-mah, fcm., 153:3.
Si-a-de, ${ }^{6} 153$ : 2.
Sig-a-d $A[d], 58: 15$.
Sīg-a-Ad-d[a], $57: 5$.
Sir-ka, s. of Za-an-me-ni; br. of Gथ̆n- ${ }^{d} E n-z u, 1: 1$.
$S u^{7}-K a-K a$, (1) $110: 30$; (2) f. of Dumu-nita-dŭ, $110: 5$, 6, 29.
$S u ́-s ̌ a-{ }^{d} I M^{8}$
Su-ša-ur(?)-ni, f. of $I$-šar-ilu, 39 : seal.
Ša-ab-ša-a-ba, 108:2.
Ša-bil-mu, $53: 4$.
Sa(g)-gal-lu, 116:9.
Ša-ma-ni, 118:3.
Ša-mu-ša-ti, $56: 7$.
Sa $a(m)$-se-kin, $116: 12$.
Šar-ru-um-i-lu, 77:20.
[ . . . ]Še-ha-ma, s. of $L u-[$. . . ]. $57: 10$.
Seš-da-da, 16:10.
Şeš-kal-la, $56: 16 ; 135: 6$.
Sim-du, 116:10.
Šim-du-gur, 169:2.
Sím-šá $(g), 116: 10,17$.
Su-ad-da, ${ }^{9} 110$ : IX, 5.
$\breve{S}_{u-{ }^{d}}{ }^{d} B E-l i^{10-l i,} 44: 3$.
${ }^{1}$ Cf. P. K. U. N., p. 141b.
${ }^{2}$ See $I-z i-z i$.
"Or Kur-ni-mu.
${ }^{4}$ Perhaps to be read Innanna-Kulam-ba or Innanna-ùg-ba.
${ }^{5}$ See Ri-Kalam-ba.
${ }^{6}$ See Dir-de.

Šu- ${ }^{d} B i l-s ̌ e-g a-d i m-s ̌ a, ~ 44: 3$.
$S^{\prime} u-d u(g)-g a-z i(d)-d a, 15: 7$.
Su ${ }^{d}$ Dhtmu-zi, (1) $16: 4$; (2) h. of Lugal-Bar, $125: 7$.
Šu- ${ }^{d} E n-7 i l .86: 13$.
Su-galu-d ${ }^{d} a, 110: V I I I, 2$.
Šu-(g)iš-dar, $56: 22,24,42 ; 81: 11 ; 96: 51$.
Su-ni-d Nam, $95: 24$.
$\check{S}^{\prime} u{ }^{d} N i n-s ̌ a h, s$. of $N i, 110:$ IX, 2.
Su-ša-ra-ni, E. of I-dim-dingir, 39 : seal.
Šu-u-la, $135: 32$.
Su-ur-ra, 4:11.
Ta-mu-bi-ti, $56: 7$.
U-bar, 160: 12.
U-bar-a-a, 103:25.
$U d-s a_{a}(g)-g a, 7: 12$.
U-dun-[ . . . ], 84:36.
Uku-ne-mu, ${ }^{11} 7: 11$.
Usar-id, ${ }^{12} 127: 11$.
U'ma-ni, $117: 39$.
$U-s ̌ a-a g-s ̌ i m, 149: 1$.
${ }^{d} U t u-b a-b[a], 23: 11$.
${ }^{d}$ Utu-ba-z[u], $130: \mathrm{S}$.
Ü-li, f. of [ . . . . ], $86: 6$.
U-na-cob-ku-in, $110: \mathrm{X}, 4$.
Ur-[ . . . ], $96: 48,63$.
$\left.U r_{-} d_{[ } . ..\right], 59: 60 ; 96: 17$.
Ürà ${ }^{d} I M, 20: 6$.
$U r_{-}{ }^{d} A b-b a r-r a, 43: 3$.
Ur-An-nn. 62 : seal.
Ur-An-tu, $96: 24$.
$U_{r-}{ }^{d} A z a g-s ̌ \imath m, 41: 3$.
$U r_{-}^{d} B a-4,51: 3$.
$\bar{U}_{r}-\operatorname{Dam}_{1} 58: 9$.
Ur-d ${ }^{d}$ a-mu, $7: 5 ; 14$ :21.
$U r_{-}^{d} D u$, br. of $U r-k i-G u-l a, 109: 16$.
Ur-Dub, $96: 58 ; 110$ : XIII, 4.
$U_{r-d u l-d u-e, ~} 84: 61 ; 106: 2 ; 144: 15$.
$U_{r_{-}}{ }^{d}$ Dumu-zi[(d)-da], $14: 7$.
$U_{r_{-}}{ }^{d} D u n-p a-\dot{e},(1) 22: 4 ; 23: 3 ; 24: 3 ;(2)$ s. of $U r_{-}^{d} I M$, 79 : 37.
Ur-E-an-na. $58: 11$.
Ur-dul-har-li-ba, 110 :VIII, 3.
${ }^{7}$ May be read $K u$.
${ }^{8}$ Cf. Kù-za-zi, T. T', 150, Г, 14.
${ }^{g}$ Cf. Šu-ad-da-mu, P. K. U. N., p. 154a.
${ }^{10}$ By mistake of scribe written še-ga.
${ }^{11}$ See Kalam-ne-mu.
${ }^{12}$ May be name of field.

Ur-É-gi-a, $1: 16$.
$U_{r-\grave{c}-{ }^{d}} K a, 123: 10$.
Ur- ${ }^{d} E n-k i, 56: 26 ; 120: 2$.
$U_{r-}{ }^{d} E n-l i l, 96: 32 ; 145: 4$.
$U r_{-}^{d}{ }^{\text {E }}$-bar-ra, $43: 3$.
Ur- ${ }^{d}$ Gal-i[ $n$ ? $]-k a, 135: 26$.
$U r_{-}^{d} G i-b i l, 18: 6$.
Ur-Gu(?), $96: 51$.
Ur-Ha-ba-ba, 83 :25.
Ur-Ib-al, 88 :5; 111:6.
Ur- ${ }^{d} I g i-z i-b a r-r a, ~ s . ~ o f ~ L u l-a, ~ 109: 10 . ~$
$U r_{-}^{d} I M$, f. of $U r_{-}^{d} D u n-p a-\grave{e}, 79: 37$.
Ur- ${ }^{\text {d }}$ Innanna, $96: 67$.
Ur-itu-Azag-ga, $95: 1$.
$U r$-itu-Mu, f. of $U r-J a y-g u, 87: 10$.
$U_{r-}{ }^{-} \mathrm{Kal}$, (1) $58: 7 ; 136: 2$; (2) s. of $\mathrm{Ni}, 48: 9$; $136: 4$.
Ur-ki-ág, $56: 12$.
$\bar{U} r$-kam, $135: 12$.
Ur-ki-Gu-la, (1) $123: 2$; (2) br. of $U r_{-}^{d} D u, 109: 16$.
Ur-li, 113:3.
Ur-li-de, $99: 15$.
Ur-d Lugal-[ . . . ], 110:5.
Ur-d Lugal, s. of Da, $83: 43 ; 84: 83,86$.
Ur-d Lugal-banda, $84: 86$.
Ur-d Lugal-edin-na-ka, 134:7.
Ur-Luh, 13:3;56:36.
[U]r-Ma-a-me, $108: 4$.
Ur-mà-gí-a, 1:16; $95: 19 ; 135: 11$.
Ur- ${ }^{d}$ Ma-lum, $13: 15$.
Ur-Ma-ma, $96: 42$.
Ur-Me-me-e, $28: 5$.
Ur-mu, $142: 12$.
Ur-na-[ . . ], 102 :IV, 1.
Ur-ni, $30: 4$.
Ur-Nigin, $92: 12 ; 96: 71$.

Ur-Nigin-gar, ${ }^{2}$ (1) $54: 5 ; 130: 11 ; 134: 11 ; 143: 4$;
$144: 15$; (2) f. of $A d-d a, 110:$ IX, 8.
$U r_{-}^{{ }^{d}}{ }_{\text {Nin-giš-[ }}$. . . ], 152 :seal.
$U_{r}{ }^{d} N_{\text {Nin-I }} 13,82: 5 ; 135: 5,8 ; 145: 4$.
Ur-d ${ }^{d}$ in-ma-da, $96: 38$.
$U_{r-}^{d}$ Nun-gal, 118:2.
$U r_{-}^{d} P A . K U$, (1) [ . . . ], $30: 2 ;(2) \mathrm{s}$. of $K A-k a, 14: 5$.
Ur- ${ }^{d} P A . K U-r a, 4: 3 ; 8: 2$.
Ur-Ra-a, 12 :9.
Ùr-ra-kal, $69: 1 ; 134: 3$.
Ür-ra-ku-ra, 116:8.
Ôr-ra-ni, $96: 68$.
Ur-sib, 96 : 20.
Ur-Si-gar, 118:7.
$U r-s ̌ a(g)-g a,(1)[\cdots], 111: 4 ;(2)$ s. of $U r-i t u-M u, 87: 9$.
Ur- ${ }^{d}$ Se-ga, s. of Ni-me-šú, $58: 13$.
$U_{r-}{ }^{\text {d Šú-An-[na], } 57: 4 ; 110: 4 .}$
Ur- ${ }^{d}$ Su-mah, $7: 9$.
Ur-[ . . . . ]-t[i], $96: 72$.
$U[r-]^{d} T i-u r u, 135: 27$.
Ur-Tum-al, 88 :5.
$U r-u d-m u$, f. of $U r-, 87: 10$.
$U_{r-}^{d} U r-[. .], 104: 25.$.
Ur-Zag(?), 110: VIII, 4.
${ }^{d}$ Utu-bar-ra, 67:7.
${ }^{d}$ Utu-ha-zu, $127: 11$.
Utu-ša(g)-ga, 7:12.
Uš-a-ni, $1: 19$.
Uš-me- ${ }^{d}$ Nin-ša[h], $12: 7$.
Za-an-me-ni, fern., m. of Sir-ka, 1:9.
Zag-ти, 96 :54, 69.
Za-la-Zum, 92 : 11.
Za-ma-[ . . . ], f. of A-ka[l . . . . . ], 171:3.
Za-ni-a, 117:36.
$Z a-z i, 123: 13$.
Zi-ти, 116: 13.
2. Names of Gods.

A- $a$ :
A-a-yalu-bu, 119 :7.
A-a-gin-na $(d), 79: 10$.
A-a-kal-la, 56 :31.
A-a-nu-ib-e, $19: 3$.
A-a-ni, $68: 12$.
A-a-tu(r)-ra, 67:3.
A-a-ur-mu, $81: 10,12$.
${ }^{1} \mathrm{Cf} .{ }^{d}{ }^{H} a-a b-a b, P . K . U . N .$, p. 174 , note 6. 12
$A-a b:$
$\quad A-a b-g h-m u, 16: 6$.
$d_{A} A b:$
$\quad A b-t u-a b-\&, 95: 20$.
$\quad U_{-}^{d} A b-b a r-r a, 43: 3$.
$d_{A} A d:$
$\quad \operatorname{Si} g-a-d^{d} A[d], 58: 15$.
${ }^{2}$ Cf. Ur- ${ }^{d}$ Nigin-gar, P. K. U. N., p. $127 a$.
$4 d-d a$ :
Ad-da-me, 11024.
$S i g-a-A d-d[a], 57: 5$.
A-ga:
A-ga-ib, $135: 14$
Ama:
Amn-ra, $126: 10$.
An:
An-galu-šag, $162: 4$.
A-ba-An-da, $96: 22$.
An-ni:
95:30.
${ }^{d}$ Apin:

$$
K a l_{-}^{d} A p i n, 17: 6
$$

$d_{\text {Azag-ším }}=$
Ur- ${ }^{\text {d }}$ Azag-šim, $41: \mathbf{3}$
${ }^{d} \mathbf{B}$ - $u$ :
Ur-d ${ }_{-}^{d} B a-u, 57: 3$.
${ }^{d} B i$ :
Galu- ${ }^{d}$ Bi, 109 . 9.
${ }^{d}$ Bi-li-li:
$G \ddot{2}{ }^{d}{ }^{d} B i-l i-l i, 56: 46$.
Bil-la-lum:
À-Bil-la-lum, $24: 5$.
A-Bil-la-luin-ma, 79 :33.
${ }^{d}$ Bil-li ${ }^{1}-l i$
Su- ${ }^{d} B i l-l i-l i, 44: 3$.
${ }^{d} \mathbf{D}$ a-gan:
In date formulas.
Dam:
Ur-Dam, $58: 9$.
${ }^{d} D a-m u$ :
$U_{r-}^{d} D a-m u, 7: 5 ; 14: 21$
Galu-d Da-mu, $70: 10$.
${ }^{d}{ }_{D u}$ :
$U r_{-}^{d} D u, 109: 16$.
${ }^{d}$ Dumu:
E-mul- ${ }^{d}$ Dumu, 111:5.
${ }^{d}$ Dumu-zi:
Su- ${ }^{d} D u m u-z i, 16: 4$.
${ }^{d} D_{u n-g i}=$
itu Ezen- ${ }^{\text {d Dun-gi, passim. }}$
${ }^{d}$ Dun-pa-è:
Ur- ${ }^{d}$ Dun-pa-è, $22: 4 ; 23: 3 ; 24: 3 ; 79: 37$
Engar:
A-bil-Engar, $139: G$.
${ }^{d} E_{n-k i}:$
${ }^{d}$ En-ki-im-du, $111: 2$.
$U r-{ }^{d} E n-k i, 56: 26$.
"En-lil:
En-lil-da-ner-gal, 86 . 14.
A-ba- ${ }^{d} E n-l i l, 96: 19$.
Ad- ${ }^{d}$ En-lil, $84: 88$.
Galu-d En-lil-lá, 111.9.
Gin-d En-lil-gal, 52 :3.
Igi- ${ }^{d}$ En-lil, $95: 21 ; 135: 19$.
[ . . . ]-En-lil-mu, 164:4.
${ }^{d}$ En-zu:
Galu- ${ }^{d} E n-z u, 41: 6 ; 56: 15 ; 160 \cdot 4$
Gin-d ${ }^{d} n-z u, 1: 10$.
${ }^{d} \mathbf{G} a l:$
Ur-d Gál-in(?)-ka, 13526.
${ }^{d}$ Geštin:
$G u(d)-{ }^{d} G e s ̌ t i n-a n, 102.3$.
${ }^{d}$ Gi-bil:
$U r-{ }^{d} G i-b i l, 18: 6$.
(G) $i \check{s}$-der:

Šu-(g)iš-dar, $56: 22 ; 81: 11$.
Gu-la:
Hu-ma-Gu-la, $87: 2$.
Ha :
Ur-Ha-ba-ba, $83: 25$.
${ }^{d} \mathbf{I} B:$
$A-g a-I B(?), 135: 4$.
[ . . $]^{d} I[B], 148: 9$.
${ }^{d} I q i$ :
${ }^{d} I g i-d u, 144: 8$.
Ur- ${ }^{d}$ Igi-zi-bar-ra, $109: 9$.

Da- ${ }^{d} \frac{1}{I}-l l, 11: 2$.
${ }^{d_{I M}}$ :
Ur- ${ }^{d} I M, 79 \quad 37$.
Innannn:
Bur-za-Innanna,
Galu-za-Innanna,
Ka- ${ }^{d}$ Innanna, 110 :IS,00.
${ }^{d} \mathbf{K} a$ :
Galu- ${ }^{d}$ Lub ${ }^{d} K a, 104: 7$.
Kal:
Ur- ${ }^{-}$Kal, $48: 9$.
${ }^{d}$ Kal-la:
A-mur- ${ }^{d}$ Kal-la, 11611.
${ }^{1}$ Written $\check{s e}_{e}-g a$, hut scribe probably omitted the last perpendicular wedge, making the last part of the sign $g a$ instead of Sa Probably the same name, i.e., ${ }^{d} B$ éli-li.

Gar-Kal-la, 47 : 3.
$K u$ :
Igi-Ku, ${ }^{1} 87: 4$.
${ }^{d} \mathbf{L} a g a b+s \ddot{g} g:$
Galu- ${ }^{d}$ Lagab+sig, $104: 31 ; 121: 13$.
Li:
Ur-Li, $113: 3$.
${ }^{d}$ Lugal:
Ur-d Lugal, $110: 5$.
${ }^{d}$ Lugal-banda:
Ur- ${ }^{\text {d }}$ Lugal-banda, $84: 86$.
${ }^{\text {a }}$ Lugal-Nam-tar-ri:
Title for Nin-ÍB, $133: 5$.
${ }^{d}$ Luh .
Galu- ${ }^{d} L u h-{ }^{d} K a, 104: 7$.
${ }^{d} L u$-šáa (g) $=$
[ . . . $]^{d} L u-s ̌ a ́(g), 149: 5$.
${ }^{d} \mathbf{M}$ a-lum:
Ur-d Ma-lum, 13:15.
${ }^{d}$ Me-ki-gal:
itu- ${ }^{d} M e-k i-g a ́ l, ~ 81: 13$.
${ }^{a_{M}}$ :
[ . . . -] $]^{d} M u-b a-a z a g, 135: 12$.
${ }^{d} \mathbf{N} a m$ :
Su-ni-d Nam, $95: 24$.
${ }^{d}$ Nanna:
In dates, $14: 25$, et passim.
${ }^{d}$ Ne-šú:
itu- $^{d} N e-s ̌ u ́ u, 54: 7 ; 134: 12$, etc.
Nigin:
Ur-Nigin, $134: 11$.
Ur-\%gin-gar, 54 :5; 110 :IX, 8.
$d_{\text {Nin-a-zu: }}$
itu-dNin-a-zu, $17: 9$, etc.
${ }^{d}$ Nin-gis $=$
Ur- ${ }^{d}$ Nin-gis, 152 : seal.
$d_{\text {Nin-gul: }}$
Galu-d Nin-gul, $58: 12$.
${ }^{d}$ Nin- $\mathrm{I} B$.
Ur- ${ }^{d} N i n-\left\{\begin{array}{l}\text { i } \\ B\end{array}, 82: 5 ; 135: 5, \mathrm{~S}\right.$.
${ }^{d}$ Nin-lil:
In dates, $2: 22$, et passim.
${ }^{d}$ Nin-šah:
šu-d Nin-šah, 110 :TX, 2.
Uš-me- ${ }^{d}$ Nin-šah, $12: 7$.
${ }^{d}$ Nin-tú:
[ . . . $]^{d}$ Nin-tú, $135: 20$.
${ }^{d}$ Nun-gal: Ur-d Nun-gal, $118: 2$.
${ }^{d} \mathbf{P A} . K U:$
$U r_{-}^{d} P A . K U, 3: 1 ; 14: 5 ; 15: 4 ; 30: 2$.
${ }^{d} \mathbf{R} a$ :
Galu- ${ }^{d} R a, 124: 7$.
$U r-R a-a, 12: 9$.
${ }^{d} \mathbf{S}$ ag.
$[G a] l u($ Lugal? $)-{ }^{d}$ Sag, $12: 12$.
${ }^{d}$ Ses:
An-ni- ${ }^{d}$ Seš, $5: 1$.
${ }^{d} S i g:$
Galu- ${ }^{d} S \bar{\imath} g, 151: 29$.
Xi-gar:
Ur-Xi-gar, $118: 7$.
${ }^{d} \check{S} u-a n-n a$ :
$U r_{-}^{d} \mathrm{~S} u-a n-n a, 57: 4 ; 110: 4$.
${ }^{d} \ddagger u-m a h:$
Ur-d ${ }^{d} u-m a h, 7: 9$.
${ }^{d} \mathbf{T}$ išhu:
Nita- ${ }^{\text {dTišh }} \mathrm{h},{ }^{2} 93$ : seal.
$u r$ :
${ }^{d}$ Ùr-ra-Kal, $134: 3$.
$d_{o r}$ :
$U r_{-}^{d} U r, 104: 25$.
${ }^{d}$ Utu:
Galu- ${ }^{\text {d }}$ Utu, 13: 4.
Lugal $^{d}$ Utu, 13 : seal; $52: 12$.
3. Names of Countries and Cities.
$\mathbf{A} n-s ̌ a-a n^{k i}, 100: 17,56,71,79 ; 114: 19 ; 136: 22 ; 140: \quad \mathbf{H} a-a r-s ̌ i(\underset{y}{c} u m)^{k i}, \mathrm{~S} 3: 46 ; 156: 10$, etc.

$$
12 ; 142: 15
$$

$\mathbf{B} a-s i-m e^{k i, 3} 77: 21$.
Gan-Kar ${ }^{k i}, 100: 9,49$, etc.
Hu-bu-nu-ri ${ }^{k i}, 4: 16 ; 8: 8$, ctc.
Hu-mur-ti ${ }^{k i}$, dates.
In-si- ${ }^{k i} n a, 120: 13$.
Gir-zu ${ }^{k i}, 136: 17,30$.
$\mathbf{K} a r-z i(d)-d a^{k i}, 14: 25$, etc.
$G i s ̌-h u^{k i}, 61: 3 ; 136: 19$.
Ki-maški
${ }^{1} \mathrm{Cf} .{ }^{d} K U, \mathrm{Br} .10569$.


$\mathbf{L} u-l u-b i^{k i}$
$\mathbf{N} i b r u\left(E n-l i l^{k i}\right), 96: 46$, etc.
Si-ma-num ${ }^{k i}, 48: 8$.
Si-mu-ru-um ${ }^{k i}, 7: 14$, etc.
U-bi', 104:38.
$U-b i l^{k i}, 59: 13$.
Ur-bil-lum ${ }^{k i}$, $15: 19$, etc.
$U n u(g)^{k i}, 22: 9$, etc.
Urù-unu $(g)^{k i}, 14: 25$, etc.
$\mathbf{Z} a$-ab-ša-li $i^{k i}, 21: 21$, et passim.

## 4. Names of Temples and Houses.

E-a-ku-[û....], 102: 12.
É-a-ni, 151:37.
É-an-na,
Ur-É-an-na, 58: 11.
E-azag,
Ur-É-azag-ga, 109:24.
$\hat{E}^{\mathbf{d}}{ }^{\mathbf{E}}$ En-lil-la, 131:3.
Égal, 71: 12, 16.
E-gal-la, 64: 6.
E-kur-ra, 38:3.
E-mu-ta, 68: 5.
Énigin-gar-ra, 165: 19.
Énun, 68: 5.
É-šeš-kal, 165:21.
É- $\grave{-}-\mathrm{k} u, 60$ : 3.
5. Names of Months.
itu $A b-\grave{e}, 63: 6 ; 65: 5 ; 95: 2$.
itu A-ki-ti, 116: 20.
itu Amar-a-zi, 152: 5.
іти $A B(-a), 8: 7 ; 11: 16 ; 56: 45 ; 87: 13 ; 111: 13 ; 131: 5$.
itu Azag-šim, 15:17; 42: 8; 48: 7.
itu Bar-zag-gar-ra, 4: 14; 18: 11;40: 10; 44: 6; 117:11, 64.
itu Bil-bil-gar-ra, 126:30; 163: 4.
itu Da, Lugal-itu-Da, 14: 12.
itu Dul-azag, 85:9; 128: 13.
itu Dir-Se-kin-kud, 2: 18.
itu Engar-dŭ-a, 23: 9; 24: 7; 25: 9; 37: 11; 135:34.
itu Ezen-An-na, 34: 8.
itu Ezen- ${ }^{d}$ Dun-gi, 136:18; 156:9; 104:33; 157:9.
itu Ezen- ${ }^{d}$ Me-ki-gal, 81:13; 93:9.
itu Ezen-d ${ }^{\text {d }}$ Nin-a-zu, 9: 11; 17:9; 32:7
itu Gan-gán-è; 22: 8; 47:5; 129:14.
itu $G u(d)-s i-z u, 16: 12 ; 117: 63 ; 130: 14 ; 135: 3$.
itu Kin- ${ }^{\text {d Innanna, 117:43. }}$
itu Ki-sìg- ${ }^{d} N i n-a-z u, ~ 45: 7$.
itu Mu,
Ur-itu-Mu, 87: 10.
itu Mu-šu-ul, 136: 20.
itu Ne-šú, 35: 6; 54: 7; 134: 12.
itu Pap+e[...], 143: 7.
itu Sig, 13: 16; 49: 7; 88: 17.
itu Še-kin-kud, 1:22; 14:24; 28:7; 29: 6; 31:7; 79: 38; $80: 6 ; 93: 8 ; 100: 55,78 ; 117: 55 ; 153: 4 ; 158: 6 ;$ 159:3.
itu Se-sag-kud, 100:78.
itu Šu-kul(-a), 21: 20; 60: 4; 62:8; 75:19; 117: 42.
itu $\check{S} u$-ša-eš, 46: 14.
ind Šu-še-ku[l], 53:6.

## 6. Officials and EmployEs.

$\dot{\mathbf{a}} b-k u, 106: 3,5$.
al-s $\hat{a}^{(a g)}$ ? $14: 3$.
clam-par, $56: 45 ; 146: 14$, etc.
di-kud, 14 : 8.
dub-sar, $29:$ seal; $96: 48,60 ; 120: 4$.
de, $96: 68,70,73$.
$\operatorname{dim}$ ?, $111: 11$.
engar, $96: 17$.
galu-kin-gi-a
galu-ku-mà, 94 :2; 117:34.
galu-sig-a, $136: 9 ; 136: 11,12$.
galu-ším, $127: 2$.
gin, $120: 2, \mathbf{r t c}$.
$g \check{\mathrm{~g}} \mathrm{r}, 96: 22 ; 120: 2,6,7,14 ; 126: 7 ; 128: 9$, etc.
$g$ ăr-ra
$g \check{\imath} r-s i(g)-g a, 141: 7$, ctc.
gu-za-lal, 135:7.
$\mathbf{k} a-$ šu-gab, 116: 17.
kud-dim, 96 :40.
luh, $96: 10 ; 111: 6 ; 133: 10$.
lul, $96: 22$.
lul-a, 109.
$\mathbf{m} \grave{a}-d u \dot{b}-b a$
$m a-d u-d u, 96: 42 ; 100: 89$.
ma-ra-ad, 116:8.
maškim, $48: 12$.

ти, $15: 6 ; 23: 3$.
ni-gab, 88: 5.
$n i-k u, 88: 5$, etc.
ni-ku-eš, 81 :11
nu-banda, $86: 15$.
nu-banda-gu(d), 102: 3.
nu-banda-lugal-me-ne, $86: 15$.
nu-dug-aš, $115: 6$.
nu-ki-gar, $96: 4,5$.
nu-gar, $71: 12,16$.
pa, $96: 69$, etc.
pa-al, 3:12.
pa-išib, $2: 1$.
pa-uš-bar-ge, $55: 13$.
$s a l+m e, 20: 10,11$.
sib, $21: 17 ; 96: 16,21$.
sib $g \stackrel{2}{r}$, 96: 13.
Sim + gar, $96: 4$.
Šù (g)-gi, $96: 12$.
$\mathbf{u k u s ̌ - n i t a , ~} \mathbf{3}: 12$.
uš-ku-gu-la, $96: 57$.

## XI.

## DESCRIPTION OF TABLETS


#### Abstract

Abbreviations. C.B.M., Catalogue of the Babylonian Muscum, University of Pennsylvania, prepared by Prof. Hilprecht; col., column; inscr., inscription; L. E., Left Edge; li., lines; L. Lo. C., Left Lover Corner; La. P., Lower Part; L. S., Left Side; L. U. C., Left Upper Corner; O., Obverse; R., Reverse; Ri. E., Right Edge; Ri. Lo. C., Riglit Lower Corner; Ri. S., Right Side; U. E., Upper Edge; U. P., Upper Part.

The Roman numbers refer to the different expeditions of the University of Pennsylvania sent out to Nippur. Measurements are given in centiinctrcs, length (height) $\times$ width $\times$ thickness. Tablets reproduced both in autograph arid halltone are indicated by a bold number in the first column.


## 1. Autograph Reproductions.

| Text. <br> 1 | Plate. <br> 1 | King. <br> Gimil-Sin | $\begin{gathered} \text { Year. } \\ 5 \end{gathered}$ | Month. Day. <br> Še-kin-kud 20(?) | $\begin{array}{r} \text { C.B.M. } \\ 11176 \end{array}$ | Description. <br> Baked. Brown. Well preserved, only a few small picces chipped off on O. 8.7 $\times 5.3 \times 1.9$ Inscr. 12 (O.) +12 (R.) $=24$. Ruled. I. Court proceedings. See Translation I. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | 2 | Gimil-Sin | 6 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Dir-Se- } \\ & \text { kin-kud } \end{aligned}$ | 11574 | Balled. Bright brown, darkened on $R$. Prrtty well preserved. I,. Lo. C. chipped off. $8.3 \times 5.2 \times 2$. Inscr. 10 (O.) $X 1$ $($ Lo. E. $)+8($ R. $)+3(\mathrm{U} . \mathrm{E})=$.22 li. Not ruled. II. Court proceedings. See Translation II. |
| 3 | 3 | Bur-Sin | 8 |  | 12576 | Baked. Light brown, darkened. Lower part broken off. $4.3 \times 4 \times 1.5$. Iiiscr. 6 (O.) +2 (R.) $=8$ li. Rulcd. III. Contract. |
| 4 | 3 | Bur-Sin | 7 | 125 | 10480 | Baked. Grayish brown. Lo. L. C. broken off. $\quad 4.8 \times 3.9 \times 1.8$. Inscr. 7 ( O.$)+$ 10 (R.) = 17 li. Ruled. 111. Court proceedings. |
| 5 | 3 |  |  |  | 11407 | Baked. Reddish brown. Fragment of case. $3.7 \times 3.9 \times 0.4$. Inscr. 3 li . Not ruled. <br> Traces of seal impressions. <br> I. Contract. |
| 6 | 3 |  |  |  | 11224 | Baked. Yellowish brown. Fairly well |
|  |  |  |  | [ 941 |  |  |

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline Text.

7 \& Plate.

4 \& King.
Dungi \& Year.

35 \& Month. \& Day. \& C.B.M.

11572 \& | Description. |
| :--- |
| preserved. $3.2 \times 2.8 \times 2$. Inscr. 2 li. Ruled. II. Memorandum. |
| Baked. Dark brown. Tablet well preserved. 6.7 X 4.6 X 1.8. Inscr. 7 (O.) $+9(\mathrm{R})=.16 \mathrm{li} . \quad$ Not ruled. Covered with seal impressions which mar the writing. II. Bond. | <br>

\hline 8 \& 4 \& Bur-Sin \& 7 \& 11 \& 14 \& 12577 \& Baked. Dark brown. Fragmentary. 3.2 $\times 9.9$ X 1.2. Inscr. 5 (O.) $+\mathbf{1}$ (U. E.) +2 (L. E.) $=8$ li. Ruled. III. Frag. ment of a document of sale (?). <br>
\hline 9 \& 4 \& Gimil-Sin \& 8 \& Azag-šim \& 5 \& 3412 \& Slightly baked. Yellowish white. Fragmentary, badly preserved. $4.7 \times 4.1 \times$ 1.7. Inscr. $G(O)+7(\mathrm{R})=.13 \mathrm{li}$. Not ruled. II. Contract. <br>
\hline 10 \& 4 \& \& \& \& \& 3403 \& Baked. Blackish brown. Two picces joined. Small pieces chipped off. $3.8 \times 3.8 \times 1.1$. Inscr. 4 (O.) +5 (R.) $=9$ li. Not ruled. Faint traces of seal impressions, which partly mar the writing. II. Contract in regard to a plantation. <br>

\hline 11 \& 5 \& Bur-Sin \& 5 \& 11 \& 11 \& 10156 \& | Case tablet, found unopened. Tablet: Baked. Reddish brown. Well preserved, only a few signs being damaged. $6.2 \times 4.5 \times 1.6$. Inscr. 8 (O.) +10 (R.) $=18$ li. Ruled. 111. Promissory note. |
| :--- |
| Case: Baked. Light brown. R. broken. $6.2 \times 4.2 \times 2.2$. Inscr. 5 (O.) +2 (R.) $=7$ li. Traces of seal impressions. | <br>

\hline 12 \& 5 \& \& \& \& \& 10492 \& $$
\begin{gathered}
\text { Baked. } \quad \text { Reddish brown. } \\
6 \times 4.1 \times 1.8 . \text { Inscr. S } \mathrm{S}(\mathrm{O} .)+6 \text { (R.) } \\
=14 \text { li. Ruled. III. "Contract." }
\end{gathered}
$$ <br>

\hline 13 \& 6 \& Gimil-Sin \& $S$ \& 3 \& \& 3593 \& Case tablet, found unopened. Tablet: Dull brown. Pieces of L. E. broken off. $5.8 \times 4.2 \times 1$. Jnscr. 8 (O.) $\times 9$ $($ R. $)+2$ (. . E. $)+2$ (L. E.) $=21 \mathrm{li}$. Ruled. I. Promissory note. See Translation. <br>
\hline 13 \& 7 \& \& \& \& \& \& Case: Baked. Dark brown. Lo. part of L. E. and L. corner broken off. R. E. cracked, pieces fallen away. $7.5 \times \mathbf{5 . 3}$ $\times$ 3.1. Inscr. 9 (O. $)+8$ (R.) +1 (I. E.) $=18 \mathrm{li}$. Covered with seal impressions, 14 in number, which mar the writing. <br>
\hline 14 \& 8 \& Dungi \& 46 \& Še-kin-kud \& \& 5136 \& Baked. Brown. Two pieces joined. $11 \times$ $5.9 \times 2.8$. Inscr. 15 (O.) +8 (K.) $=$ 23 li. Ruled. Beautiful seal impres- <br>
\hline
\end{tabular}



| $\begin{gathered} \text { TEXT. } \\ 23 \end{gathered}$ | Platte $12$ | King. <br> Dungi | Year. 35 | Month. S | $\begin{gathered} \text { DAY } \\ 19 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { С.B.M. } \\ 337 \mathrm{~s} \end{array}$ | Deschiption. <br> Baked. Iight brown. Well preserved. only small picce of U. Ri. (. chipped off. $4 \times 3.5 \times 2.2$. Inser. 6 ( 0.$)+4$ (R.) $=10$ li. Sot ruled. Traces of sen! impressions on sides and edges. 1I. Loan of gratin. Value receiner. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 24 | 12 | Dungi | 35 | 8 | 18 | 11579 | Baked. Light brown. Well preserved. $4.3 \times 3.7 \times 2.1$. Inser. $6(0)+$. $(R)=$.10 li. Not ruled. Faint traces of seal impressions. TI. Loan of grain. Value receiced. |
| 25 | 12 | Gimil-Sin | 7 | 8 |  | 11587 | Baked. Brown, darkened. Cracked, glued, small pieces wanting. $3.8 \times 3.5 \times 1.3$. Inscr. 4 (O.) +5 (R.) 12 (U. E.) +1 (L. E.) $=12$ li. Not ruled. Covered with traces of seal impressions. II. Loan of grain. Value received. |
| 26 | 12 |  |  |  |  | 3398 | Baked. Light brown. R. broken away. $3.9 \times 3.9 \times 1.1 . \quad$ Jnscr. $5($ O. $)+1$ $($ L.E. $)=6 \mathrm{li}$. Not ruled. Faint traces of seal impressions. Originally dated. II. Loan of grain. Value received. |
| 27 | 13 |  |  |  |  | 3394 | Baked. Light brown. Lo. part of R. chipped off. $4.2 \times 3.8 \times 1.4$. Inscr. 5 $(0)+.3($ R. $)=8$ ii. Not ruled. Covered with traces of seal impressions, which mar the writing. Originally dated. II. Loan of grain. Value received. |
| 28 | 13 |  |  | Še-kin-kud | 19 | 3100 | Baked. Blackish brown. U. L. C. and <br> Lo. part of R . broken off. $4.5 \times 3.7$ $\times 1.4$. Inscr. $7(0)+.1($ R. $)=8 \mathrm{li}$. Not ruled. Part of date broken off. Covered with seal impressions. 11. Loan of grain. Value received. |
| 29 | 13 | Bur-Sin | 5 | Se-kin-kud |  | 10240 | Baked. Reddish light brown. Well preserved. $4 \times 3.4 \times 1.2$. Inscr. 4 (O.) $+4(\mathrm{~K})=$.8 li. Not ruled. Covered with seal impressions which partly mar the writing. III. Receipt of silver. |
| 30 | 13 | Dungi | 41 |  |  | 10439 | Baked. Pale brown. U.E.broken off. 3.8 X $3.5 \times 2.5$. Inscr. $6(\mathrm{O})+.2(\mathrm{R})=.7 \mathrm{li}$. Ruled. III. Receipt of grain. |
| 31 | 14 |  |  | Be-kin-kud | 1 | 11212 | Baked. Dark brown. Lo. L. C. of R. broken off. $3.8 \times 3.2 \times 1.8$. Inscr. 6 (O.) +3 (R.) $=9$ li. Ruled. II. Loan of dates. |
| 32 | 14 | Bur-Sin | 9 | 6 |  | 1124 | Case. Blackened brown. Broken and joined. Greater part of O . wanting. |

Text. Plate. King. Year. Month. Day. C.B.M.
33 14 Bur-Sin 9

Description.
$4.7 \times 4 \times 2.3$. Inser. 6 (O.) +3 (R.) -9 li . Covered with seal impressions. II. Receipt of grain.

11256 Baked. Dark brown. Part of R. chipped off. $3.8 \times 3.3 \times 1.7$. Inser. 6 (0.) t- $4(\mathrm{R})=.10 \mathrm{li}$. Ruled. 11. Receipt of corn, ete.
11259 Baked. Pale brown. Cracked and small pieces broken off. $3.6 \times 3.2 \times 1.6$ Inser. 6 (O.) $+3($ R. $)=9$ li. Ruled. II. Receipt of corn.

3389 Baked. Light brown. Pieces of R. chipped off. $2.9 \times 2.8 \times 1.2$. Inscr. 4 (O.) $+\mathrm{ti}(\mathrm{R})=.10 \mathrm{li}$. Ruled. II. Receipt of grain.
10253 Casc tablet. Tablet: Baked. Black. Pretty well preserved. $3.5 \times 3 \times 1.4$. Inscr. 5 (O.) +7 (R.) $=12$ li. Ruled. 111. Receipt of wheat.
Case: Baked. Black. Two fragments. O., $4.5 \times 2.3 \times 1.6$. Tnscr. 4 li. R., $3.3 \times 4 \times 0.8$. Inscr. 5 li. Traces of sral impressions.
11667 Baked. Reddish brown, darkener. L., side of R. chipped off. $3.7 \times 3.5 \times 1.6$. Inscr. 5 (O.) +6 (R.) +1 (IT. E.) +1 (I. E.) $=13$ li. Not ruled. Corered with traces of seal impressions. 11. List of receipts of grain.

11583 Baked. Blackened brown. R. broken off. $4.2 \times 4.1 \times 1.3$. Tnscr. 4 li. Not ruled. Traces of seal impressions with name of Gimil-Sin. II. Receipt of corn.
3399 Baked. Blackened brown. Ri. Lo. C. of O. broken off. $4.4 \times 3.8 \times 1.7$. Inser. $5(0)+.5(\mathrm{R})=$.10 li. Sot ruled. Corered with sral impressions. II. Receipt of corn.
10256 Baked. Reddish brown. Well preserved. $4.7 \times 4 \times 1 . \quad$ Inser. 5 (O.) +7 ( R.$)$ $=12 \mathrm{li}$. Not rulcd. Covered with seal impressions which partly mar the writing. III. Receipt of grain.

10424 Baked. Pale brown, darkened in places. Cracked. $4.5 \times 3.8 \times 1.1$. Inser. 5 $(\mathrm{O})+.4(\mathrm{R})=.9 \mathrm{li} . \quad$ Sot ruled. Faint traces of seal impressions. III. Receipt of grain.


| $\begin{gathered} \text { Text. } \\ 53 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Phates. } \\ 20 \end{gathered}$ | King. | Year. | Month. <br> su u-eš-kul | $\begin{gathered} \text { DAY. } \\ 15 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { C.B.M. } \\ 11581 \end{array}$ | Description. <br> Baked. Light brown. Cracked. Pieces fallen out. $4.1 \times 3.5 \times 0.9$. Inser. 6 (O.) $+1 \quad(\mathrm{R})=$.7 li. Ruled. Tracts of seal impressions on R. IT. Receipt of ku-mah. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 54 | 20 | Bur-Sin | 9 | 3 |  | 11216 | Baked. Dark brown. Well preserved, only small pieces of $O$. chipped off. $3.8 \times$ $3.5 \times 1.8$. Tnscr. $\mathrm{G}(\mathrm{O})+.\mathbf{3}(11)=$. 9 li. Ruled. II. Receipt of figs. |
| 55 | 20 | Bur-Sin | 1 |  |  | 10765 | Raked. Light brown. U. E. of O. broken away, and small pieces chipped off. 5.8 $\times 4.2 \times 2$. Inscr. $9 \quad$ (O.) $+9 \quad$ (It.) $=18$ li. Ruled. III. Receipt of various objects. |
| 56 | 21 | Dung | 53 | 11 | 30 (?) | 11661 | Baked. Reddish brown. Large pieces broken off. $9.8 \times 6.8 \times 2.3$. Tnscr. 17 $(\mathrm{col} . \mathrm{I})+18(\mathrm{col} . \mathrm{II})+13(\mathrm{col} . \mathrm{III})$ $+1($ col. IV $)=49 \mathrm{li}$. Writing partly effaced on R. Ruled. II. Account of grain paid out. |
| 57 | 22 | Dungi | 35 | 10 |  | 11185 | Baked. Blackened reddish brown. Fragmentary, badly preserved and crumbling. $10 \times 4.9 \times 2.6$. Inscr. $16 \quad(0)+$. (R.) $=26$ li. Ruled. II. Account of grain received (?). |
| 58 | 22 | Bur-Sin | 9 |  |  | 11566 | Baked. Dark brown. Two pieces joined. Most of O. broken off. $7 \times 4.3 \times 1.8$. Inscr. $G$ (O.) +9 (R.) +1 ( L. E.) $=16$ li. Ruled. IT. Receipt of grain received and paid out. |
| 59 | 23 | Bur-sin | 9 | 6 |  | 11203 | Baked. Yellowish brown, blackened on O. Upper $P$. of $O$. broken off. Two pieces joined. $5.7 \times 4.3 \times 1.8$. Inscr. 9 $(\mathrm{O})+$.7 (R.) $=16$ li. Ruled. TI. Account of grain received. |
| 60 | 23 | Bur-Sin | 9 | 4 |  | 3307 | Baked. Pale brown. Two pieces joined. Small pieces chipped off on R. $3.5 \times \mathbf{3}$ $\times$ 1.3. Inscr. $4(0)+.3(\mathrm{R})=.7 \mathrm{li}$. Ruled. II. Statement in regard to grain at hand. |
| 61 | 23 | Gimil-Sin | 4 and 5 |  |  | 11255 | Baked. Light brown, blackened. Fragment. $\quad 5 \times 3.9 \times 0.7 . \quad$ Inscr. 7 li. Ruled. IT. "Account." |
| 62 | 23 | Gimil-Sin | 1 | 4 | 23 | 11110 | Baked. Dark brown. Pretty well preserved. $5.4 \times 4.5 \times 1.3$. Inser. 6 (0.) $+5(\mathrm{R})=.11 \mathrm{li}$. Not rulcd. Covered with seal impressions, which mar the |

Description.
writing. II. Account of chairs received and at hand.
11582 Baked. Light brown, darkened in places. Several pieces joined. Small pieces wanting. $3.5 \times 3.5 \times 1.2$. Inscr. $5(\mathrm{O}$. $)+3$ $(\mathrm{R})=.8 \mathrm{li}$. Not rulcd. Covered with traces of seal impressions. II. Statement of ku-mah at hand.
11220 Baked. Yellowish brown. Varnished. Well preserved. $3.7 \times 3.5 \times 1.7$. Inscr. $6(\mathrm{O})+$.5 (R.) $=11$ li. Ruled. II. Account of grain.
11591 Baked. Darkened brown. Cracked. 3.4 $\times 3 \times 1$. Inscr. $\mathbf{4}(\mathrm{O})+.\mathbf{1}(\mathrm{R})=.5 \mathrm{li}$. Not ruled. Covered with seal impressions. IT. Statement of ku-mah at hand.
11177 Baked. Dark brown. Fairly well preserved. Only U. P. of O. inscribed. $7.2 \times 5.1 \times$ 2.1. Inser. 9 1i. Ruled. I. Shipload (?) of grain received.
11213 Baked. Reddish brown. Pieces chipped off. $4.4 \times 4 \times 1.7$. Inscr. 8 (O.) +6 (R.) $=14 \mathrm{li}$. Ruled. II. Account of grain.
11215 Baked. Dark gray. Fairly well prcserred. $3.8 \times 3.2 \times 1.6$. Inser. 6 (O.) +8 (R.) $=14$ li. Ruled. II. Account of beans, ete.
11235 Baked. Brown. Fragment. $2.1 \times 3.1 \times$ 1.6. Insrr. $4 \quad(\mathrm{O})+.4 \quad(\mathrm{R})=.8 \mathrm{li}$. Ruled. II. Account.
10757 Baked. Dark brown. Only Lo. P. of tablet remaining. $4.7 \times 5 \times 1.9$. Inscr. $6(\mathrm{O})+$.6 (K.) $=12 \mathrm{li}$. Kulrd. III. Account of corn, its volue seeming to he expressed in, silver and lead (?).
11247 Raked. Reddisli brown. Two large pieces joined. Broken, cracked anti crumbling. $8 \times 4.2 \times 2.5$. Inser. 16 (O.)+ 11 (R.) $=27 \mathrm{li}$. Ruled. II. Account of bronze.
11223 Baked. Blackened brown. Fragment,. 2.5 $\times 4.5 \times 1.2$. Inscr. 4 li. Ruled. II. Account.
11230 Baked. Blackened brown. Fragment. Crumbling. Varnished. $3.3 \times 3.5 \times 1.6$. Inscr. 4 li. Ruled. II. Account of bronze received.
11206 Baked. Reddish brown. R. broken off. $5.5 \times 4.3 \times 1.1$. Inscr. 9 li. Ruled. II. Account of bronze received.

| Text. 75 | Plate. <br> 27 | King. <br> Gimil-Sin, | Year. 7 | Month. <br> 4 | DAY. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { C.B.M. } \\ & \text { BOCA } \end{aligned}$ | Description. <br> Baked. Reddish brown, blackened in places. Pieces chipped off on R. 11.2 $\times 6.1 \times 2.1$. Inscr. 11 (O.) +9 (R.) $=20 \mathrm{li}$. Unusually large signs, broad lines and heavy rulings. Nail marks. II. Account of fruit hciruest. Phot. Pl. IV. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 76 | 28 |  |  |  |  | 11.571 | Raked. Dark brown. R. blackened. Lo. E. broken off'. $10.3 \times 6.3 \times 2.7$. Inscr. 15 (O.) +15 (R.) +2 (U. E.) +2 (L. E.) $=34 \mathrm{li}$. Ruled. IT. Inventory list. |
| 77 | 29 |  |  |  |  | 11568 | Baked. Dark brown. Two pieces joined. Cracked. $7.9 \times 5 \times 2.1$. Inscr. 12 (O.) $+9(\mathrm{R})=.21 \mathrm{li}$. Ruled. II. Inventory of the belongings of Sarmom-ili of the city of Basime. |
| 78 | 30 |  |  |  |  | 11507 | Baked. Dark brown. $8.5 \times 5.8 \times$ 2.4. Inser. 12 (O.) +1 (Le. E.) +7 (R.) $=20 \mathrm{li}$. Ruled. 3 lines on R. crased. Inventory. |
| 79 | 31 | Dungi | 35 | St-kin-kud | 8 | 3419 | Raked, Light gray. Two pieces joined. $12.4 \times 4.8 \times 2.3$. Inscr. 18 (0.) $\times 22$ $($ R. $)=40$ li. Ruled. TI. Account of cattle. |
| 80 | 32 | Dungi | 35 | Se-kin-kud |  | 11590 | Baked. Black. [i. Ri. (C. broken off. 3.4 $\times 3.1 \times 1.4$. Inscr. 4 (O.) +4 (R.) $=8$ li. Not ruled. Covered with traces of seal impressions. Nail mark. IT. Account of caitle. |
| 81 | 32 | Dungi | 35 | Se-kin-kud |  | 5505 | Case tablet. Baked. Blackish brown. Well preserved. $3.8 \times 3.4 \times 1.5$. Tnscr. 7 (O.) +8 (R.) $=15$ li. Ruled. IT. Accoumt of cattle. |
| 82 | 32 | Ibi-Sth | 1 |  |  | 3386 | Baked. Dull brown. I. U. C. broken off. Pieces chipped off'. $4.7 \times 4.3 \times 1.8$. Inser. $0(\mathrm{O})+.3(\mathrm{R})=$.9 li. Ruled. II. Account of cattle. |
| 83 | 33 | Dungi | 37 |  |  | 11181 | Raked. Light brown, blackened. Cracked. Lo. E. of $O$. broken off. Pieces of $O$. chipped off. Surface crumbling. $11 \times 6$ $\times$ 2.7. Inscr. 17 (col. I) +18 (col. TI) $+7($ col. III $)+7($ col. IV $)=47 \mathrm{li}$. Ruled. TI. Account of expenditures of grain for the sustenance of slazes, engaged in the tullage of certain felds. |
| S4 | 34 | Dungi | 37 |  |  | 11172 | Baked. Blackish gray. Ri. U. C. broken off'. Surface of O. damaged. 18.8 $\leqslant 5.4 \times 2.5$. Inscr. $24($ col. T) +24 $(\mathrm{col} . \mathrm{II})+26(\mathrm{col} . \mathrm{III})+19(\mathrm{col} . \mathrm{IV})$ |



| Text. | Plate. | King. | Year. | Month. Day. | C.B.M. | Description. <br> +7 (R.) = 13 li. Ruled. IT. Account oj expenditures of grain. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 95 | 41 | Bur-Sin | 5 |  | 10430 | Baked. Reddish brown. Lo. Ri. C., L. E. and Lo. E. broken off. Pieces chipped off. $10.2 \times 5.5 \times 2$. Inscr. $14(\mathrm{O})+$. $(\mathrm{R})=.35 \mathrm{li}$. Ruled. III. Account of expenditures of corn. |
| 96 | 42 |  |  |  | 11660 | Baked. Light. brown. Several pieces joined. U. E. broken off. Many cracks. Small pieces chipped off from surface. $10.5 \times 7.8 \times 2.4$. lnscr. 22 (col. I) $+22($ col. II $)+22($ col. III) +10 (col. IV) $=76$ li. Ruled. II. List of officials and employees. |
| 97 | 43 |  |  |  | 11569 | Baked. Brown, darkened in places. Two pieces joinec?. $8.5 \times 4.5 \times 1.9$. Inacr. $16(0)+.8($ R. $)=24 \mathrm{li} . \quad$ Ruled. II. Account of expenditures of corn. |
| 98 | 43 |  |  |  | 11250 | Baked. Reddish brown, blackened. Fragmentary. $\quad 7.8 \times 4.8 \times 2.5$. Inscr. 13 $(\mathrm{O})+.3 \quad(\mathrm{R})=.16 \quad$ li. Ruled. II. Account. |
| 99 | 44 |  |  |  | 12631 | I3aked. Dark brown. U. P. broken off. Pieces chipped off. $5.7 \times 4 \times 2.4$. Inscr. 9 (O.) +8 (R.) $=17 \mathrm{li}$. Ruled. II. Account of silver. |
| 100 | 44, 45 | Dungi | 41, 44,45 | Se-kin-kud | 11240 | Haked. Grayish brown. I,. Lo. C. broken off. $11 \times 6 \times 2.2$. Inscr. 17 (col. I) +20 (col. II) +20 (col. III) +31 $($ col. IV $)+2$ (L. E. col. I) +3 (L. E. (col. II) $=93$ li. Ruled. Writing on R. partly obliterated. II. Account of corn and wheat. |
| [101 | 46 | Dungi | 47 |  | 11242 | Baked. Pale brown, blackened. Ri. IT. C. of a large tablet. Three pieces joined. Originally three columns on each fide, two remaining on $O$., of It. only Ri. E. $9.5 \times 7.4 \times 1.5$. Inscr. 13 (col. I) $+22(\mathrm{col} . \mathrm{II})+24(\mathrm{col}$. III) +23 $($ col. IV) $=74$ li. Ruled. II. Account of corn and 'wheat. |
| 102 | 46 |  |  |  | 11212 | Baked. Pale brown, blackened. Fragment of large tablet,. Enclosed in the same box and has the same catalogue number as No. 101, but does not belong to same tablet,. $2.4 \times 7 \times 1.8$. Inscr. 4 (col. I) $+6(\mathrm{col} . \mathrm{II})+1(\mathrm{col} . \mathrm{III})+3(\mathrm{col} . \mathrm{IV})$ $=14 \mathrm{li}$. Ruled. II. Account. |


| $\begin{gathered} \text { Text. } \\ 103 \end{gathered}$ | Plate. $47$ | King. <br> Dungi | Yeati. <br> 39 | Monit. | Day. | $\begin{gathered} \text { C.B.M. } \\ 11241 \end{gathered}$ | Description. <br> Baked. Reddish brown. Cracked arid pieces broken away. $11.7 \times 7.2 \times 3.2$. Inscr. $18($ col. I) $+19 \quad($ col. II $)+2$ (col. 111) $=38$ li. Ruled. II. Account of $g \mathrm{~min}$. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 104 | 48 | Dungi | 39 | 7, 10 |  | 11243 | Halied. Grayish brown. Three pieces joined. U. and I. E. broken off. 11 $\times 7.5 \times 2.2$. Inscr. $19($ col. I) $+\mathbf{1 9}$ (col. II) $=38$ li. Ruled. II. Account of grain. |
| 105 | 48 |  |  |  |  | 11207 | Baked. Dark brown, blackened on $R$. Small pieces of surface chipped off. 4.3 X $3.3 \times 1.0$. Inscr. $\mathrm{A}(\mathrm{O})+.2(\mathrm{It})=.8 \mathrm{li}$. Ruled. IT. Account of figs, dates, etc. |
| 106 | 48 |  |  |  |  | 11222 | Baked. Light brown. Well preserved. $3.2 \times$ $3.1 \times 1.5$. Inscr. 4 (O.) $+1(\mathrm{R})=.6 \mathrm{li}$. Ruled. IT. Account of fish oil. |
| 107 | 49 |  |  |  |  | 11244 | Baked. Reddish brown, blackened. Fragment of large tablet. Two pieces joined. $7.2 \times 8.5 \times 2.5$. Iiiscr. 9 li. Writing small, but, sharp and distinct. Ruled. II. Account of payments made to slaves. |
| 108 | 49 |  |  |  |  | 11192 | Baked. Reddisli brown, darkened. Fragment of larger tablet. $5 \times 7.3 \times 2.2$. Inscr. $8($ eol. I) $+5 \quad($ col. 11) $=13 \mathrm{li}$. Ruled. II. Pay-list. |
| 109 | 49 |  |  |  |  | 11245 | Baked. Reddish brown, blackened. Fragment of large tablet. $6.2 \times 9.4 \times 3.1$. Inscr. A (col. I) +14 (col. 11) +7 $(\mathrm{col} . \mathrm{III})=27 \mathrm{li} . \quad$ Ruled. II. Pay-list. |
| 110 | 50 |  |  |  |  | 11239 | Baked. Reddish brown, blackened. Fragment of large tablet. Two pieces joined. Originally the tablet had 12 columns of writing. Only U. P. of R. remaining. $8.2 \times 17.6 \times 3.4$. Inscr. 8 (col. VII. $+8($ col. VIII) $)+9$ (eol. IX) +10 $($ col. X) $=35$ li. Ruled. II. Pay-list. |
| 111 | 51 | Dungi | 35 (? | 11 |  | 3414 | Baked. Blackish yellow. U. L. C. and L. Lo. P. of R. brolcen off. $4.8 \times 4 \times$ 1.8. Inser. 9 (O.) +1 (Lo. E.) +3 (It.) $=13$ li. Ruled. II. Distributions to 8 men. |
| 112 | 51 | Dungi | 37 |  |  | 11249 | Halied. Dark gray. Ri. side broken off. Pieces chipped off. Crumbling. $7 \times 3.5$ $\times 2$. Inscr. 13 (O.) $+8(\mathrm{R})=.21 \mathrm{li}$. Writing on R. partly obliterated. Ruled, 11. Account of grain oil. |
| 113 | 51 |  |  |  |  | 3379 | Baked. Dark gray, blackened in places. |

Text. Plate
$11 t$
115
52
Dungi $\quad 41$

Description
Cracked. Pieces chipped off. $1.6 \times 3.8$ $\times 1.6$ Inser. $8(\mathrm{O})+.2(\mathrm{H})=.10 \mathrm{li}$. Ruled. II. Account of corn.
11205 Baked. Pale brown, darkened. Cracked. Piece: chipped off. Crumbling. Varnished. $6.8 \times 4 \times 2.2$. Inscr. 13 (0) $\times$ 6 (R.) $=19$ li. Ruled. II. Account.
11205 Baked. Reddish brown. Ri. Lo. C. and E. broken off. $4.4 \times 4 \times 2.1$. Inser. 8 (O.) $+5 \quad(\mathrm{R})=$.13 li. Ruled. II. Account of expenditures of corn.
12592 Baked. Light brown. Well preserved. $5.5 \times 4.4 \times$ 1.8. Inscr. 10 (0.) $\times 12$ $(\mathrm{R})=$.22 li. Huled. III. Account of expenditures of grain.
11659 Baked. Dark brown. U. and L. E. broken off. $12.5 \times 7.5 \times 2.4$. Inscr. 11 (rol. 1 ) +21 (col. II) +24 (col. III) +12 (col. IV) $=59$ li. Ruled. Writing partly effaced or broken off. II. Accounl of expenditures of corn and wheat. (One gur of wheat for porphyry stone for a couch for Nustu.
11217 Baked. Dark reddisli brown. Well preserved, only a small piece of surface chipped off. $3.5 \times 3.3 \times 2.8$. Iiiscr. 7 (O.) +3 (R.) $=10$ li. Ruled. II. Account of expenditure of corn.
$3 \pm 01$ Baked. Light brown, darkened in places. [T. Ri. (. broken off. $4.5 \times 3.8 \times 1.6$. Inscr. $5(\mathrm{O})+.6(\mathrm{H})=.11 \mathrm{li}$. Ruled. II. Account of corn.

11895 Baked. Brown, darkened in places. small pieces of surface chipped off. $4.7 \times 3.8$ $\times 1.7$. Inscr. $8(\mathrm{O})+.6(\mathrm{R})=.14 \mathrm{li}$. Ruled. II. Account of expenditure of drink.
11246 Baked. Dark brown. Fragmentary. Three pieces joined. $8.4 \times 5.3 \times 2.5$. Inscr. 1.5 (O.) +6 (R.) $=21$ li. liulcd. II. Account of expenditure of corn.
11208 Baked. Brown, blackened. Fragment. 5.3 $\times$ 5.2. Inscr. 8 li. Ruled.. II. Account of expenditures of comn.
11195 Baked. Iight brown, blackened. Fragmentary. $5.5 \times 3.7 \times 1.9$. Inscr. 9 (O.) +7 (R.) $=16$ li. Nail marks, Ruled. 11. Pay-list.

| Text. <br> 124 | Plate. <br> 56 | King. <br> Bur-Sin | Year. $3$ | Month. ? | DAy. | $\begin{array}{r} \text { C.B M. } \\ 11580 \end{array}$ | Description. <br> Baked. Light brown. Ri. U. C. broken off. $3.5 \times 3.5 \times 1.5$. Inscr. 5 (O.) + 5 (R.) $=10$ li. Ruled. II. Account of expenditures. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 125 | 56 |  |  |  |  | 12593 | Baked. Reddish brown. $3.1 \times 3.5 \times 1.2$. Inscr. $4(\mathrm{O})+.5(\mathrm{~K})=$.9 li. Ruled. III. Account of expenditure of sesam. |
| 120 | 57 | Gimil-Sin | 7 | ) |  | 11577 | Baked. Brown, blackened on R. U. and Lo. P. of O. chipped off. $7.8 \times 3.8 \times$ 1.8. Inscr. 13 (O.) +16 (K.) +1 (U. E.) $+1(\mathrm{~L} . \mathrm{E})=31 \mathrm{li}$. Ruled. II. Account of expenditures of A.TER and KU.KAL. |
| 127 | 58 | Gimil-Sin | 7 | 3 |  | 3387 | Baked. Light brown. darkened. U. and Lo. P. broken off. $4.3 \times 4.2 \times 1.7$ Inscr. $8(\mathrm{O})+.5(\mathrm{R})=.13 \mathrm{li}$. Ruled. II. Account of expenditures of grain. |
| 128 | 58 | Gimil-Sin | 7 | 7 |  | 3392 | Baked. Black. 5.1 X $3.9 \times 1.8$. Inscr. 7 $(\mathrm{O})+.8(\mathrm{R})=.15 \mathrm{li} . \quad$ Kulrd. Writing on R. partly illegible. II. Account of expenditure of grain. |
| 129 | 59 | Gimil-Sin | 7 | 9 |  | 3432 | Baked. Light brown with black spots. Well prescrved. $7.8 \times 4.7 \times 1.8$. Inscr. 11 (O.) +7 (R.) $=18$ li. Ruled. II. Account of expenditures of grain. |
| 130 | 59 | Cimil-Sin | 8 | 2 |  | 3376 | Baked. Reddis? brown, darkened in places. $3.7 \times 3.2 \times 1.8$. Inser. 6 (O.) +9 (R.) $=15 \mathrm{li}$. Ruled. II. Account of expendilures of grain. |
| 131 | 59 | Gimil-Sin | 8 | 11 |  | 3.110 | Baked. Pale brown, blackened. Fragmentary, R. only remaining. $3.5 \times 3.3 \times 1.9$. Tnscr. 7 li. Kulrd. II. Account of grain. Payment of corn 10 Temple of Entil. |
| 132 | 60 |  |  |  |  | 11133 | Baked. Brown. Fragmentary, only U. P. of (). remaining. $6.3 \times 5.8 \times 1.6$. Tnscr. 9 (O.) 1 (R.) +2 (L. E.) $=12$ li. III. (Purchased by Dr. Haynes arid said to come from Yokha or Telloh.) Expenditures of four, A.TRR, etc., for temple offerings. |
| 133 | 60, 61 | (New dates.) |  | 2 |  | 10160 | Baked. Tight brown. U. L. C. broken off. Small pieres chipped off. $7.2 \times 4.9$ $\times 1.8$. Inscr. $12(0)+.10(\mathrm{R})=.22 \mathrm{li}$. Ruled. III. Account of expenditures of corn for temple offerings and stone for couches. |
| 134 | 61 | Bur-Sin | 9 | 3 |  | 11204 | Raked. Reddish brown. Well preserved. $4.4 \times 3.8 \times 1.7$. Tnscr. $\mathrm{S}(\mathrm{O})+$. (K.) $=15$ li. Ruled. II. Account of expenditures of wool. |


| Text. 136 | Plate. <br> 62 | King. <br> (Uncertain date.) | Year. | $\begin{gathered} \text { Month. } \\ 9 \end{gathered}$ | Day. | $\begin{array}{r} \text { C B.M. } \\ 10161 \end{array}$ | Description. <br> Baked. Reddish brown. Two pieces joined. <br> Lo. P. broken and crumbling. $11.3 \times 5.8$ <br> $\times 2.1$. $\operatorname{lnscr} .20(\mathrm{O})+20(\mathrm{R})+$. <br> $($ Lo.E. $)+1(\mathrm{~L} . \mathrm{E})=.43 \mathrm{li}$. Ruled. III. <br> Account of expenditures of corn. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 136 | 63 | Dnongi | 40 | 7 |  | 11183 | Baked. Pale brown, blackened. Crumbling. Varnished. $6.3 \times 4.2 \times 2.2$. $\operatorname{lnscr} .13$ $(O)+.9(\mathrm{R})=.22 \mathrm{li}$. Ruled. II. Account of expenditure of wool. |
| 137 | 63 | ? | ? | ? | , | 11182 | Raked. Dark brown. Ri. E. and surface of R. broken off. $6.8 \times 4.1 \times 2$. Inscr. $12(\mathrm{O})+.3(\mathrm{R})=.15 \mathrm{li}$. Ruled. Traces of date. II. Account of assignment of garments. |
| 138 | 63 |  |  |  |  | 11232 | Baked. Brown, blackened. Fragment. Crumbling. Varnished. $3.2 \times 5 \times 2.4$. Tnscr. 5 li. Ruled. II. Probably upper part oi No. 139. Account of assignment of garments. |
| 139 | 63 |  |  |  |  | 11194 | Baked. Brown, blackened. Fragment. ('rumbling. Varnished. $4.3 \times 4.9 \times 2.3$. Inser. 7 li. Ruled. II. Probably lower part of So. 138. Account of assignment of garments. |
| 140 | 64 | Dungi | 40 |  |  | 11199 | Baked. Reddish brown, blackened. Broken and crumbling. Varnished. $4.4 \times 3.8$ $\times$ 1.7. Inscr. $9(0)+.3(\mathrm{R})=.12 \mathrm{li}$. Ruled. TI. Acoount of assignment of garments. |
| 141 | 64 | Dungi | 40 |  |  | 11221 | Baked. Brown, blackencd. Ri. E. broken off. Crumbing. Varnished. $3.6 \times 3.9$ $\times 1.6$. Insrr. $6(0)+.6(\mathrm{R})=12 \mathrm{li}$. Ruled. II. Account of assignment of garments. |
| 142 | 64 | Dungi | 40 |  |  | 11201 | Baked. Brown, blackened. Fragmentary. Crumbling. Varnished. $5.5 \times 4.4 \times 2.4$. lnscr. 7 (O.) +9 (R.) $=16$ li. Ruled. II. Account of assignment of garments. |
| 143 | 64 | ? | ? |  |  | 11225 | Baked. Reddish brown. Ri. F. and most of $R$. broken off. $3.8 \times 3.5 \times 1.5$. Inscr. $6(\mathrm{O})+.3(\mathrm{R})=$.9 li. Ruled. Traces of date. II. Acknowledgment of garments received. |
| 144 | 65 |  |  |  |  | 11186 | Baked. Reddish brown. Fragmentary. Two pieces joined. U. P. wanting. 5.5 X 6.7 X 2.8. Inscr. $8(\mathrm{O})+.8(\mathrm{R})=$. 17 li. Ruled. II. Account of assignment of fields to a number of persons. |


| $\begin{gathered} \text { Tex'r. } \\ 145 \end{gathered}$ | Plate. 65 | King. <br> Gimil-Sin | Year. $7$ | Month. | Day. | $\begin{array}{r} \text { C.B.M. } \\ 1166 \mathrm{~S} \end{array}$ | Description. <br> Baked. Dark gray. U. L. C. broken off. Surface crumbling. $3.7 \times 3.0 \times 1.2$. Inscr. $5(0)+.3($ R. $)=8$ li. Sot ruled. Traces of seal impressions. IT. Field account. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 146 | 65 |  |  |  |  | 3377 | Baked. Yellowish brown with black spots. U. P. broken off. $4.7 \times 3.7 \times 1.8$. Inser. 7 (O.) +8 (R.) $=16$ li. Ruled. II. Account of assignment of vegetables. |
| 147 | 65 |  |  |  |  | 3108 | Baked. Reddish brown. Fragment. 4.3 $\times 4.2 \times 1.8 . \quad$ Inscr. $7(\mathrm{O})+1$ (K.) $=8$ li. Ruled. II. Account of assignment of corn to a number of persons. |
| 148 | 66 |  |  |  |  | 11187 | Baked. Brown, blackened. U. P. broken of ${ }^{\text {. }}$ Cracked. Crumbling. $9.2 \times 4.6$ $\times 2.6$. Insrr. 16 (O.) +16 (R.) $=$ 32 li. Ruled. II. Account of assignment of grain, vegetables, etc.. to a number of persons. |
| 149 | 66 |  |  |  |  | 3405 | Baked. Grayish brown. Fragmentary. <br> I. E. broken away. $4.5 \times 3.3 \times 1.5$. Inscr. 7 (O.) +5 (R.) $=12$ li. Ruled. II. Account of grain expended. |
| 150 | 66 |  |  |  |  | 11198 | Baked. Brown, blackened. Fragmentary. <br> Crumbling. $6.2 \times 3.9 \times 1.8$. Insrr. <br> 7 li. Ruled. II. Account of cream. |
| 151 | 67 |  |  |  |  | 11174 | Baked. Dark brown, blackened. Fragmentary. Middle $P$. of large tablet. $10 \times 6.5 \times 2$. Inscr. $20(\mathrm{col}$. I) +20 (col. TI) $=40$ li. Ruled. Writing injured by small pieces chipped off. I. Account of silver, corn, etc., received and of hand. |
| 152 | 67 | Gimil-sin | 7 |  |  | 3393 | Baked. Reddish brown. Iii. E. broken off. $3.9 \times 3.8 \times 1$. Inscr. 5 (O.) $+3(\mathrm{R})=$.8 li. Not ruled. Covered with seal impressions. IT. Account. |
| 153 | 07 | Gimil-Sin | 7 | Se-kin-lud |  | 3380 | Baked. Jight brown, blackened in places. <br> Pieces clipped off. $4.1 \times 3.0 \times 1.7$. <br> Inscr. 3 (O.) +3 (R.) $=6 \mathrm{li}$. Ruled. <br> II. Account of expenditures of grain. |
| 154 | 67 |  |  |  |  | 11252 | Baked. Reddish brown, blackened. Fragment of larger tablet. Crumbling. 0.8 $\times 5.1 \times 2.8$. Inscr. 10 li . Ruled. II. Fragment of a literary document, written in the Ur period. |
| 155 | 67 |  |  |  |  | 11.136 | Baked. Reddish brown, darkened in places. |




## 2. Halftone Reproductions.

| $\begin{gathered} \text { ILLustir } \\ 1,2 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { PLATE. } \\ \mathrm{I} \end{gathered}$ | Content. <br> O. and It. of a document of court proceedings in regard to a slave. See translation So. I. | $\begin{gathered} \text { B.M. } \\ 11176 \end{gathered}$ | Description. <br> See description of tablet No. 1. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3, 4 | I | $O$. and R. of a document of court proceetliiigs. See translation No. II. | 11574 | See description of tablet So. 2 . |
| 5,6 | II | O. arid K . of a bond in regard to eorn. See translation IV. | 11572 | Sce description of tablet No. 7 |
| 7, $\times$ | TI | O. and R. of it promissory note in regard to silver. See translation No. VI. | 3593 | See description of tablet So. 13 |
|  | III | Case of above. | 3593 | See description of tablet ho. 13. |
| 15,16 | IV | $O$. and R. of a document in regard to the purchase of a palm grove. See translation No. VII. | 5136 | Hoe deseription of tablet No. 14. |
| 17,18 | V | O. and R. of a document in regard to a loan of grain. See translation So. XIII. | 3378 | See description of tablet No. 23, |
| 19, 20 | V | 0 . and R. of a receipt of silver. | 102L0 | See description of tablet No. 29. |
| 21, 22 | V | (). and R. of a case or envelope in which originally was enclosed a receipt of grain. | 11218 | See description of tablet No. 32. |
| 23, 24 | VI | O. and R. of an account of a lruit haryest. See translation No. XV. | 6064 | See description of tablet So. 75. |
| 25, 26 | VII | O. and It. of an inventory list. | 11571 | See description of tablet Yo. 76. |
| 27, 28 | VIII | O. arid R. ol an account of cattle. See trailslatioii No. XVII. | 3419 | See description of tablet No. 79. |
| 29,30 | IX | O. and R. of an account of the cost, lor the tillage of some fields. See translation No. XIX. | 11189 | see description of tablet No. 92. |
| 31,32 | TS | O. and R. of an account. | 10757 | See description of tablet No. 70. |
| 33, 31 | X | O. and R. of it list of officials and employés. | 11660 | See descriptiori of tablet No. 96. |
| 35, 36 | ST | $O$. and R. of an account of coni and wheat. | $11 \% 0$ | see description of tablet So. 100. |
| 37 | SI | Fragment of an account of payments made to a large number of slaves. | 11244 | See description of tablet No. 107. |
| 38 | XII | R. of a pay-list. | 11239 | See description of tablct No. 110. |
| 39, 40 | XII | O. and R. of an account of the expenditure of drink. See translation No. XX. | 11895 | See description of tablet No. 120. |
| 41 | XII | Fragment of an account of temple offerings. See translation No. XXII. | 11133 | See description of tablet No. 132. |

XII.

## NUMBERS OF THE CATALOGUE OF THE BABYLONIAN MUSEUM.

| C.B.M. | Text. | Plate. | c.B.M. | Text. | Plate | C.B.M | Text. | Plitit |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3372 | 162 | 69 | 3432 | 129 | 59 | 11184 | 111 | 52 |
| 3373 | 48 | 18 | 3593 | 13 | 6, 7 | 11185 | 57 | 22 |
| 3374 | 47 | 18 | 5136 | 14 | 8 | 11186 | 144 | 65 |
| 3376 | 130 | 59 | 5505 | 81 | 32 | 11187 | 148 | 66 |
| 3377 | 146 | 65 | 6064 | 75 | 27 | 11188 | 89 | 36 |
| 3378 | 23 | 12 | 1015s | 11 | 5 | 11189 | 92 | 39 |
| 3379 | 113 | 51 | 10160 | 133 | 60 | 11190 | 165 | 70 |
| 3380 | 153 | 67 | 10161 | 135 | 62 | 11192 | 108 | 49 |
| 3383 | 51 | 19 | 10230 | 46 | 18 | 11193 | 45 | 17 |
| 3386 | 82 | 3\% | 10240 | 23 | 13 | 11194 | I39 | 63 |
| 3387 | 127 | 58 | 10242 | 42 | 17 | 11195 | 123 | 56 |
| 3388 | 49 | 19 | 10253 | 36 | 15 | 11197 | 20 | 10 |
| 3389 | 35 | 15 | 10256 | 40 | 16 | 11198 | 150 | 66 |
| 3390 | 163 | 69 | 10421 | 41 | 16 | 11199 | 140 | 64 |
| 3391 | 52 | 20 | 10130 | 95 | 11 | 11201 | 142 | 64 |
| 3392 | 128 | 58 | 10439 | 30 | 13 | 11203 | 59 | 20 |
| 3393 | 152 | 67 | 10180 | 1 | 3 | 11201 | 134 | 61 |
| 3304 | 27 | 13 | 10492 | 12 | 5 | 11205 | 115 | 52 |
| 3395 | 94 | 40 | 10737 | 70 | 23 | 11206 | 74 | 26 |
| 3397 | 60 | 23 | 10780 | 86 | 35 | 11207 | 105 | 48 |
| 3398 | 26 | 12 | 10765 | 55 | 20 | 11208 | 122 | 56 |
| 3399 | 39 | 16 | 10776 | 15 | 9 | 11209 | 166 | 70 |
| 3400 | 28 | 13 | 10932 | 19 | 10 | 11210 | 93 | 40 |
| 3401 | 119 | 55 | 11110 | 62 | 23 | 11212 | 31 | 14 |
| 3403 | 10 | 4 | 11133 | 132 | 60 | 11213 | 67 | 25 |
| 3405 | 149 | ${ }_{66}$ | 11136 | 155 | 67 | 11214 | 43 | 17 |
| 3408 | 147 | 65 | 1114s | 91 | 38 | 11215 | 68 | 25 |
| 3409 | 87 | 35 | 11172 | 84 | 34 | 11216 | 54 | 20 |
| 3410 | 131 | 59 | 11174 | 151 | 67 | 11217 | 118 | 54 |
| 3411 | 18 | 10 | 11176 | 1 | 1 | 11218 | 157 | 68 |
| 3412 | 9 | 4 | 11177 | 66 | 24 | 11219 | 168 | 70 |
| 3414 | 111 | 51 | 11181 | 83 | 33 | 11220 | 64 | 24 |
| 3419 | 79 | 31 | 11182 | 137 | 63 | 11221 | 141 | 64 |
| 3422 | 22 | 11 | 11183 | 136 | 63 | 11222 | 106 | 48 |
|  |  |  |  | [112] |  |  |  |  |

FROM THE TEMPLE ARCHIVES OF NIPPUR.

| C.B.M. | Text | Plate. | C.B.M. | Text | Plate. | C.B.M. | Texi. | Plate. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 11223 | 72 | 26 | 11256 | 33 | 14 | 11585 | 50 | 19 |
| 11224 | fi | 3 | 1125 s | 156 | 68 | 11586 | 44 | 17 |
| 11225 | 143 | 64 | 11259 | 34 | 14 | 11587 | 25 | 12 |
| 11230 | 73 | 26 | 11407 | 5 | 3 | 11589 | 161 | 69 |
| 11231 | 167 | 70 | 11418 | 170 | 70 | 11590 | 80 | 32 |
| 11232 | 138 | 63 | 11566 | 58 | 22 | 11591 | 65 | 24 |
| 11235 | 69 | 25 | 11567 | 78 | 30 | 11659 | $1{ }^{\text {i }}$ | 53, 54 |
| 11236 | 169 | 70 | 11568 | 77 | 29 | 11660 | 96 | 42 |
| 11239 | 110 | 50 | 11569 | 97 | 33 | 11661 | 56 | 21 |
| 11240 | 100 | 45 | 11570 | 90 | 37 | 11664 | 88 | 36 |
| 11241 | 103 | 47 | 11571 | 76 | 82 | 11665 | 17 | 9 |
| 11242 | 101, 102 | 16 | 11.572 | 7 | 4 | 11667 | 37 | 15 |
| 11243 | 104 | 18 | 11574 | 2 | 2 | 11668 | 145 | 65 |
| 11244 | 107 | 49 | 11575 | 21 | 11 | 11861 | 160 | 69 |
| 11245 | 109 | 49 | 11577 | 126 | 57 | 11895 | 120 | 35 |
| 11246 | 121 | 55 | 11578 | 85 | 35 | 11983 | 164 | 69 |
| 11247 | 71 | 26 | 11579 | 24 | 12 | 12575 | 16 | 9 |
| 1124s | 32 | 14 | 11580 | 124 | 56 | 12576 | 3 | 3 |
| 11249 | 112 | 51 | 11581 | 53 | 20 | 12577 | 8 | 4 |
| 11250 | 98 | 43 | 11582 | 63 | 24 | 12592 | 116 | 52 |
| 11252 | 154 | 67 | 11583 | 38 | 16 | 12593 | 125 | 56 |
| 11255 | 61 | 23 | 11584 | 158 | 68 | 12681 | 99 | 44 |

## Tablets Arranged According to Kings.'

Dungi: Nos. $7,14,17,22,23,24,30,34,44,46,56,57,64,79,80,81,83,84,100,101,103,104,111,112,114,115,136$, $140,141,142,156,157,168$.

Bur-Sin: Nos. 3, 4, 8, 11, 15, 18, 29, 32, 33, 35, 36, 40, 41, 42, 45, 47, 54, 55, 58, 59, 60, 95, 124, 134.
Gimil-Sin: Nos. $1,2,9,13,21,25,37,38,48,49,61,62,63,65,75,85,88,90,93,116,117,126,127,128,129,130,131$, 145, 152, 153, 158.

Ibi-Sin: Nos. 16, 39, 51, 82, 94.
${ }^{1}$ Cf. Dates, Chapter V, and Description of 'Tablets, Chapter XI

## XIII.

## LIST OF CUNEIFORM SIGNS.

1. Dyn. of Ur

114
9.
10.
11.

12.

访。
14.
15.

16.
17.
18.
19.
20.



1．4k


1

评

$$
x^{\frac{x}{x}}
$$


bal
šah
nu



116

37．AK
$38 . M$
39．茾开开
40．IF 71

41．

42． 17 | $7 A$ |
| ---: | :--- |

43．M M（
44．卜774
45．变倿
46． 11
47．N
48．尔
F
49．$E$
50． $5+$


| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 51. } 2 人 \\ & \text { 52. } \end{aligned}$ | 109 | mum．$\frac{2}{3}$ <br> 机，枫的 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 53．采金 | 枵緛 | mul |
| 54． | 5 | gab |
| 55． | 上桇 | dah |
|  |  | sa（m） |
|  |  |  |
| 57．是 | － | ba，Seetra．112． |
| 58．凮 | 甠 | 3 M, See No．113． |
| 59． | 品需 | itur，Su N6． 115. |
| 60. | 嘘 | qu（d） |
| 61． | 気 | am |
| 金 |  |  |
| 证造 |  |  |
| 62．氞 | 匌 | kar，gar |
| 63． 7 | 年 | ha－ |
| 64．梿边 | 年昒 | patal |
| 65．炜㦴 | 河咀而 | sit |
| 67． | 4 | dím |
| 68． | 盛 | gur |




22．

95 景
96．
97．金等等
98．
99．每
100．
10．度正 102.





12.4
124.

$125-4$
126．$\$$
127．
128． 4
129． 4
130． 744
131．स4
132.
133.

134.


全侖
135.

136．\＆y
137.
138.


139．4



142．चाणा


143．$\stackrel{\beta}{p}$
144．$\Rightarrow$ 稘辛
145．$\forall<x^{\circ}$
146 好
146．贸
147．$A$
148．
149．

150．$\frac{1}{4}$

12.6

151．章
152．$\frac{\Delta}{\pi}>1$

153．

154.

155．
156．$\overline{y e n}_{4}^{4}$
157.
158.

159．莫际
160．届
162．Sivt
163.



$128$



130


213．

214.


217．佮
218.

219.





|  | 成乐等 | unù（g） |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 244．通 | N | si |
| 245． | 実乐 | gur，楥 |
|  | 达 | gas |
| $247 .$ | － | bi，gars，kaí |
| 248． 5 | 上1介 | Fa |
| 249. 㱏会 | A ${ }^{\text {H }}$ | ga |
| 250. 踇等立 | 蕆 | sa |
|  |  | ú |
| 2.52. 左 | $\bigcirc$ | rü |
| 253． 1 | Ant | uru，ré |
| 254. |  | $u r \tilde{r}$ |
| $1$ | 会 | urudu |
| 256．जो $\mathrm{H} \\| \mathrm{HIT}$ | 年 | kid |

257．
258．点


262．
263．$T 1$


265．$\sqrt{\sqrt{4}}$
266．事

267.





276．
$27 \%$
278．厝
279．
280．
281．埌
282．気柳票
283．左开开
284． 7


286．



79：17
7早 77：18．
287.

288.

291.

297.

298.


ra
sal
\&-
gin
hú
el
sal +me
min. dam.
dumu, 枟
dis, (quis, num. 1,60,



29．$F$
30．
301.
302.
303.

304.

F
305．少
306．有
307．Ff 嘫
308．用有
309.


310．原
311.


312．通風开
313．Jff
314．相

315.


316．F
3介．点需可


| 318． 5 | 个过 | nanga |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 319. | F | lat |
| 390．㾈工 | Sue No． 318 |  |
|  | JTㅐㅡ﹎ | gin |
| 392．$\square$ | 上 | nigín，kil． lagat |
| 5 | 4 | nigin |
| ： |  | zikum，engus |
| $\leq$ 或 | 可 | már |
| $\bigcirc$ 込 | 赵 | fir |
| 四 | 距 | ku，hug |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 3 9, 胃 } \end{aligned}$ |  | kur k＇ |
|  |  | ku，zid |
| 330． | 员 | $\ln$ |
| 331． | 棫採 | sig |
|  | 萿（\％） | lagat gal or |
| 333. | 践迢 | gamame |


XIV.

SYSTEM OF TRANSCRIPTION OF CUNEIFORM SIGNS.

$142$

$143$


144
láa lam 组开

$l i+h$
$l i$
lie
lu
lugal luh lum





QUNEIFORM TEXTS
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8
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R.
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0.

R. 6 点


Tablet.
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12
$R$.

0.


5

0.

5

R. $\quad Y \sqrt{(r)}$

10
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0.
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10
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U. E.

L. E. 20


Case.
$o$.

R. 10

L. $E$.


$\pm$


PI. 9



Pl. 11
21

R.


Case.
R.




U．E 10品近度

24



6 告
R．

o．


R． 5


L．E．
$\sqrt{7-p} \sqrt{18}$

$$
28
$$

$o$.

v．E．रोता



5 隹
$R$ ．


28
0.

5


R．少く再而



R． 5

释


30
0.
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5
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R．

8.
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33



5

$R$ ．


10 于莩行羅
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促
R. 5
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6

$R$.


10.

38


39
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5

$R$.


10
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0.
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Pl． 17
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0 ．

5


R．
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$O$ ．

$R$ ．




Variants of Case.


47
L. $E$.

0.


5

$R$.


赶有 $\sqrt{5}$
$o$.









52
0.


R．


53
$O$.


R．$\frac{4+4 \times 4+4}{54}$
o．子近而気学镂手
気起侖


5


Continued


55
0.

$R$.


Pl. 21
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0.
R. 10


16

60

R. 6


0.

0.

83
65
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R.

R. 5
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$R$.


10


PI. 25
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0.
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10
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$\stackrel{1}{n}$

So
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賑
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Lo. E,
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10
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$R$.

10


Horizontal wedge mistake of scribe.
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के
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$R$.

L. E. 15
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Pl. 41
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Col. II.


## Continued
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Pl. 50


PI． 51
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## 117

Col. I.
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Col. IV. Continued Col.III.
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5, 6. A BOND IN REGARD TO THE PAYMENT OF CORN.
7, 8. A PROMISSORY NOTE IN REGARD TO SILVER.


9-14. CASE OR ENVELOPE OF PRECEDING TABLET (PL. II, 7, 8).

15, 16. Purchase of a palm grove.


17, 18, ACKNȮWLEDḠMENT OFF A LÔAN ÓF CÓRN.
19, 20. RECEIPT FOR SILVER.
21, 22. CASE OR ENVELOPE, IN WHICH ORIGINALLY HAD BEEN ENCLOSED A RECEIPT FOŔ CORN.

23, 24. ACCOUNT OF DATE HARVEST.

25,26. INVENTORY LISt.


27, 28. A "ROUND-UP" OF CATTLE.


29, 30. ESTIMATE OF COST FOR TILLING A CERTAIN NUMBER OF FIELDS.
31, 32. ACCOUNT OF CORN, GIVING VALUE IN SILVER AND LEAD.

33, 34. LIST OF OFFICIALS AND EMPLOYÉS.


35, 36. SUMMARY ACCOUNT OF CORN AND WHEAT.
37. FRAGMENT OF A PAY LIST.

40. Reverse
38. PART OF A PAY LIST.
41. PAYMENTS OR AN ACCOUNT OF TEMPLE OFFERINGS.


# THE BABYLONIAN EXPEDITION <br> OF THE UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA edited by <br> П. V. 万ilprecht. <br> The following volumes have been published or are in press: 

## Series H, Cuncíform Cexts:

Vol. I: Old Babylonian Inscriptions, chiefly from Nippur, by H. V. Hilprecht.
Part 1, 1893, $\$ 5.00$ (out of print).
Part 2, 1896, $\$ 5.00$
Vol. III: Sumerian Administrative Documents from the Time of the Second Dynasty of Ur.
Part 1, from the Nippur Collections in Philadelphia. by David W. Myhrman, 1910, $\boldsymbol{\$}_{6.00}$.
Part 2, from the Nippur Collections in Constantinople, by P. Engelkeri Huber (ready for press)
Vol. VI: Babylonian Legal and Business Documents from the Time of the First Dynasty of Babylon. Part 1, chiefly from Sippar, by H. Ranke, 1906, \$6.00.
Part 2, chiefly from Nippur, by Arno Poebel, 1909, \$6.00.
Vol. VIII: Legal and Commercial Transactions, dated in the Assyrian, Neo-Babylonian and Persian Periods Part 1, chiefly from Nippur, by A. T. Clay, 1908, $\$ 6.00$.
Vol. IX: Business Documents of Murashô Sons of Nippur, dated in the Reign of Artaxerxes I, by H. V. Hilprecht and A. T. Clay, 1898, $\$ 6.00$.
Vol. X: Business Documents of Murasha Sons of Nippur, dated in the Reign of Darius II, by A. T. Clay, 1904, \$6.00.
Vol. XIV: Documents from the Temple Archives of Nippur, dated in the Reigns of Cassite Rulers, with complete dates, by A. T. Clay, 1906, \$6.00.
Vol. XV: Documents from the Temple Archives of Nippur, dated in the Reigns of Cassite Rulers, with incomplete dates, by A. T. Clay, 1906, $\$ 6.00$.
Vol. XVII: Letters to Cassite Kings from the Temple Archives of Nippur.
Part 1, by Hugo Radau, 1908, $\$ 6.00$.
Vol. XIX: Model Texts and Exercises from the Temple School of Nippur. Part 1, by H. V. Hilprecht (in press).
Vol. XX: Mathematical, Metrological and Chronological Texts from the Temple Library of Nippur. Part 1, by H. V. Hilprecht, 1906, $\$ 5.00$.
Vol. XXVIII: Sumerian Hymns and Prayers to Enlil from the Temple Library of Nippur. Part 1, by Hugo Radau (in press).
Vol. XXIX: Sumerian Hymns and Prayers to NINaIB from the Temple Library of Nippur. Part 1, by Hugo Radau (in press).
Vol. XXX: Sumerian Hymns and Prayers to Tamûz from the Temple Library of Nippur. Part 1, by Hugo Radau (in press).

## Series D, Researches and Creatises:

Vol. I: The Excavations in Assyria and Babylonia (with 120 illustrations and 2 maps), by H. V. Hilprecht, 7th edition, 1904, \$2.50.
Note: Entirely revised German and French editions are in the course of preparation. The first part of the German edition (bis zum Auftreten De Sarzecs) appeared in December, 1904 (J. C. Hinrichs, Leipzig: A. J. Holman \& Co., Philadelphia, Pa., sole agents for America). Price 4 Mark in paper covers, 5 Mark in cloth.
Vol. III: Early Babylonian Personal Names from the published Tablets of the so-called Hammurabi Dynasty, by H. Ranke, 1905, \$2.00.

Vol. IV: A New Boundary Stone of Nebuchadrezzar I from Nippur (with 16 halftone illustrations and 36 drawings), by William J. Hinke, 1907, \$3.50.
Vol. V: Fragments of Epical Literature from the Temple Library of Nippur.
Fasciculus 1, The Oldest Version of the Babylonian Deluge Story and the Temple Library of Nippur, by H. V. Hilprecht, \$0.75.

Fasciculus 2, NIN-IB, the Determiner of Fates, according to the great Sumerian Epic, "Lugale ug melambi nergal," by Hugo Radau (in press).
(OTHER VOLUMES WILL be anNounced later.)
All orders for these books to be addressed to
THE MUSEUM OF ARCHAEOLOGY, University of Pennsylvania,
SOLE AGENT FOR EUROPE:

## Rudolf Merkel, Erlangen, Germany.


[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ Geschichte des Alt. ${ }^{2}$, I, Part 2, p. 345,
    ${ }^{2}$ Chronicles, I, pp. 83, 87.

[^1]:    ${ }^{1}$ Chronicles. I, p. 110.
    ${ }^{2}$ Geschichte des Alt. ${ }^{2}, \mathrm{I}^{2}$, p. 338.
    ${ }^{3}$ Z. A., YXI, p. 185.
    ${ }_{4}$ See Chronicles, I, p. 83;Poebel, Z.A., XXI, p. 167.
    ${ }^{5}$ B. E., XX ${ }^{1}$, p. 44.
    ${ }^{6} B . E .$, Scrics D, IV, p. 130 ff.
    ${ }^{7}$ Thus read the name with Thureau-Dangin, O. L. Z., XI, p. 31, and Hommel, O. L.Z., XII, p. 109, instead of King's Betiliash.
    ${ }^{8}$ See Thureau-Dangin, Z. A., XXI, p. 176ff.; also Ungnad, O. L. Z., X, p. 638.
    ${ }^{\text {y }}$ Chronicles, I, p. 113.
    ${ }^{10}$ Chronicles, I,p. 107.
    ${ }^{11}$ Geschichte des Alt. ${ }^{2}, \mathrm{I}^{2}$, p. 340.

[^2]:    ${ }^{1}$ Poebel, Z. A., XXI, p. 165; also Hilprecht, B. E., XX ${ }^{1}$, p. 42.
    ${ }^{2}$ Chronicles, $\mathrm{I}^{2}$, p. 10.
    ${ }_{3}$ Geschichte des Alt. ${ }^{2}, \mathrm{I}^{2}$, p. 341. ${ }^{4}$ See new chronicle, King, Chronicles. II, p. 22.
    5 See Jastrow's Hittites in Babylonia, R. S., XVIII (1910), pp. 87 ff., just issued.

[^3]:    ${ }^{1}$ Chronicles, I, pp. 70,93, 97, 147ff.; II, p. 15ff.
    ${ }^{2}$ Chronicles, I, p. 104ff., 111,113;II, p. 22ff.
    ${ }_{3}$ O. L. Z .XII, p. 110.
    ${ }_{4}$ O. L. Z.XII, pp. 108-110.
    ${ }^{5}$ The sign is TUR $=m \bar{a} r u$, not $i$.
    ${ }^{8}$ BI.BE., according to collation by King. See ibid., p. 109.
    ${ }^{7}$ Also according to collation by King.

[^4]:    ${ }^{1}$ See Thureau-Dangin, Z. A.; Poebel, Z. A., XXI, p. 75; B. E., VI ${ }^{2}$, p. 122.
    ${ }^{2}$ See Chronicles, 1,p. $95 .{ }^{3}$ Z. A., XXI, p. 179.
    ${ }^{4}$ Chronicles, I, p. 166ff. ${ }^{5}$ See Poebel, B. E., VI², p. 57.
    ${ }^{6}$ See Pinches, C. T., VI, Pl. 9, Bu. 91-5-9, 284, O., 44; King, L. I. H., IT, No. 101.

[^5]:    ${ }^{1}$ Cf. Hilprecht, B.E., XX ${ }^{1}$, p. 53ff.; Poebel, B. E., VI ${ }^{2}$, p. 113 ff .; Tliureau-Dangin, J. A., Ser. X, Vol.XIV, pp. 339 ff .
    ${ }^{2}$ See Hilprecht, B. E., XX ${ }^{1}$, No. 47; also p. 46.
    ${ }^{3}$ Geschichte des All. ${ }^{2}, \mathrm{I}^{2}$, p. 335.
    ${ }^{4}$ See King, Chronicles, I, p. 89 ; Hilprecht, B. E., XX ${ }^{1}$, p. 42 ff .
    ${ }^{5}$ Geschichte des Alt. ${ }^{2}, \mathrm{I}^{2}$, p. 585.
    ${ }^{\text {B }}$ See M. D. O. G., No. 21, pp. 30, 34, 38, 40; King, Chronicles, I, p. 119ff.; Meyer, Geschichte des Alt. ${ }^{2}$, $\mathrm{I}^{2}$, p. 342.
    ${ }^{7}$ Geschichte des Alt. ${ }^{2}, \mathrm{I}^{2}$, pp. 338, 342.
    ${ }^{9}$ Chronicles, TI, p. 11.

[^6]:    ${ }^{1}$ Sec Peters, Nippur or Explorations and 4 dventures on the Euphrates, and Hilprecht, The Excavations in Assyria and Babylonia (The Babylonian Expedition of the University of Pennsylvania, Series D, Vol. I), pp. 289-568.
    ${ }^{2}$ Cf. Hilprecht, B. E., Series D, I, p. 488, and Th. S.-C., P. H. C., p. 195.
    ${ }^{3}$ See Hilprecht, R. E., Series D, I, pp. 297-319 arid 345-425.
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[^7]:    ${ }^{1}$ Pdlagaud has recently collected and practically republished all of them, twentv-two in number, in his Sa-tilla texts. See Chapter III.
    ${ }^{2}$ For this and the following collections published see Chapter III.
    ${ }^{3}$ The tablets which Barton represents and translates as "an appointment to a clerkship," II L C., I, p 10, and "the establishment of a Food Office" (corrected to business), arc only accounts. Cf. the similar tablets T. T., 164 b, 8 ; Amh., 121.
    ${ }^{4}$ According to the Catalogue of the Morgan collection in Sew York, made by Johns, Nos. 49, 70, 71, 85, 86, 87, 88 and 108 , all from this period, are "contracts." Some of them have been already published by Scheil, No. 108, in R. T., XVII, p. 38, and Nos. 70, 71 in $R$. T., YIX, p 63.

[^8]:    ${ }^{1}$ For another tablet of this kind in the Nippur collections of the Imperial Ottoman Museum in Constantinople, cf. Huber in Hilprecht Anniversary Volume, pp. 220ff.
    ${ }^{2}$ See Pl. 67, No. 154, and Description of Tablets, Chapter XI.
    ${ }^{3}$ Cf. Hilprecht, $B . E$, Series A, Vol. XX, pp. 1-10,

[^9]:    ${ }^{1}$ For a more detailed description of the contents of every tablet see the Description of the Tablets, Chapter XI.
    ${ }^{2}$ Some of these receipts may be acknowledgments of loans,

[^10]:    ${ }^{1}$ This date formula must denote the same year as the formula mu Si-mu-ru-um ${ }^{k i}$ a-du II-kam-ma-aš ba-hul (see nest chapter) and must have been used until Simurum was captured the second time.
    ${ }^{2}$ Note in these cases the variation ha-an-tug instead of the usual ba-tug.
    ${ }^{3}$ Note the sign SAG instead of the usual KIN.
    ${ }^{4}$ Note omission of Ki .
    ${ }^{5}$ Note variation of ${ }^{4} u$ for $a i$.
    ${ }^{6}$ Note variation for $\hat{e}-a b a-t u ́(r)$.
    ${ }^{7} \mathrm{Ki}$ wanting.
    ${ }^{8}$ Cf. $T . T$., $164^{14}$, IV, 9.

[^11]:    ${ }^{1}$ From the important chronological tablet published by Prof. Hilprecht, B.E., Series A, Vol. XX, No. 47, li. 3; also p. 46, we know definitely that Bur-Sin ruled nine years. Tablets dated in every year of his reign except 4th and 6th occur in this volume.
    ${ }^{2}$ Cf. Nos. $15: 17 ; 42: 8 ; 48: 7$.
    ${ }^{3}$ Or Bil-bil-gar-ra.
    ${ }^{4}$ mah wanting.
    ${ }^{5}$ See next chapter VI and IX.
    ${ }^{6}$ Written $b u$.

[^12]:    ${ }^{1}$ E. B. H., pp. 252-287 (1900).
    ${ }^{2}$ Les Inscriptions de Sumer et d'Akkad (1905), pp. 329ff., and the German edition of the same work, to which I refer in this volume, S. A. K. I. (1907), pp. 228-236.
    ${ }^{3}$ B. E. , $\mathrm{I}^{2}, 125,127$.
    ${ }^{4}$ B. E., XX ${ }^{1}$, 47, also p. 46.
    ${ }^{5}$ Amh., pp. xiiiff.

[^13]:    ${ }^{1}$ B. E., XX ${ }^{1}$, 47; also p. 46.
    ${ }^{2}$ See dates.
    ${ }^{3}$ See dates.
    ${ }^{4}$ O. B. T. R., No. 168, p. 68.
    ${ }^{5}$ See dates.
    ${ }^{6}$ B. E., XX ${ }^{1}$, Phototype illustrations, Pl. XV, No. 17, Rev.
    ${ }^{7}$ Radau, E. B. H., pp. 275-277; Thureau-Dangin, S. A. K. I., p. 234.
    ${ }^{8} B . E ., I^{2}, 127$, R.

[^14]:    ${ }^{1}$ Cf. the date formula of the 14th year of Dungi.
    ${ }^{2}$ See dates of Gimil-Sin.
    ${ }^{3}$ We know that Gimil-Sinhad ascended the throne already in the month Ne-šu or 4th month, C. T., III, 16371,7.
    ${ }^{4}$ Thus we have one tablet dated in the 4 th month of his 1 st year, C. T., 111, 16371, 7, and another dated in the 6th month of his 9th year, R. T.C., 429, R. 2.
    ${ }^{5} \Lambda m h$., p. xviii.

[^15]:    ${ }^{1}$ O.B. T.R., No. 168, p. 68.
    ${ }^{2}$ That the $\boldsymbol{m}$ en $\operatorname{Kar-zi(d)-da}$ does not designate the last year of Gimil-Sin is seen from the dating in this year even up to the month Dir-Še-kin-kud, Amh., 118, 6.
    ${ }^{3}$ Z. A., XXII, p. 65, i.e.: "These I. ти X lugal(-e) bezeichnet durchaus nicht das dntritts-Jahr (accession year) des Konigs, sondern sein erstes volles Jahr."
    ${ }^{4}$ Dungi, Bur-Sin and Gimil-Sin; see dates.

[^16]:    ${ }^{1}$ Last year of Dungi and accession year of Bur-Sin.
    ${ }^{2}$ Given by Scheil, R. T., XVII, p. 33, without reference made to original. The tablets R. T. C., 291, 292, referred to by Thureau-Dangin, S. A. K. I., p. 233, has the formula mu ${ }^{d} B u{ }^{d}{ }^{d} \operatorname{Sin}$ lugal.
    ${ }^{3}$ C. T., X, 14308, I, 7.
    ${ }^{4}$ See Dates of Bur-Sin, prcceding chapter.
    ${ }^{5}$ B. E., I ${ }^{2}$, 127, O., 1.
    ${ }^{8}$ E. A. H., 27-32; E. B. H., p. 266; R. T C., 291, R , 3; 292, R 8;C. T , VII, 12915, IV, 4; 13140, R., 19; etc.; Amh., 57, 12;58, K., 17, rtc.
    ${ }^{7}$ E. A. H., 33, 34; E. B. H., p. 266; C. T., VII., 11766, R , 15; 13391, R., 15, etc.
    ${ }^{8}$ Note prefix $b a$ with the name given.
    
    ${ }^{10}$ Amh., 61, R., 11; 62, K., 8 (lugal-e).
    ${ }^{11}$ C. T.. VII, 18407, R., $18 ; A m h ., 66$, R.. 15.
    
    ${ }^{13}$ Amh., 69, R., IV, 23.
    ${ }^{14}$ Amh., 70, 12;71, 10; 72, 13; H. L. C., Pl. 2, No. 300, It., 3. Barton makes this an altogether new date by translating the verbal infix $a$ as meaning "for the second time," I, p. 25.
    ${ }^{15}$ B. E., $\mathrm{I}^{2}, 127$, O., 4 ; E. A. H., 68-73; E. B. H., p. 267; C. T., VII, 12925, IV, 5; X, 12921, IV, 36; Amh., 73, 9, etc.; 74, 12 (ba-túg wanting); 78, 5 (ba-túg-a).
    ${ }^{16}$ H. L. C., Pl. 51, No. 1, 24.
    ${ }^{17}$ H. L. C., Pl. 44, No. 232, R , 3: 1'.T., 117, X, 7 (ba-túg wanting).
    ${ }^{18}$ For a discussion of the formula for the 5th year of Bur-Sin, see chapter IX.
    ${ }^{18} B . E ., I^{2}, 126$, R., VII, 6.
    ${ }^{20}$ C. T., VII, 18370, R., 14.

[^17]:    ${ }^{1}$ For treatises on the Babylonian calendar, see Ginzel, Handbuch d mathem. u. techn Chronologie, I, pp. 107ff.; Kugler, Z. A , XXII, pp. 68ff ; Mahler, Hilprecht Anniv., pp. 1ff., and references given to previous publications on the same subject; Meissner, W. Z. K. M., V, p. 180; Muss-Arnolt, J. B. L., XI, pp. 72, 160; Pinches, Amh., pp. XIXff.; Radau, E. B. H., pp. 287ff.; Thureau-Dangin, J. A., Ser. IX, Vol. VII (1896), pp. 339ff.; R. A., IV, pp. 88, 89; O. L. Z., I, p. 164; Z. A., XV, pp. 409ff.; Weisbach, Hilprecht Anniv, pp. 281ff., etc.
    ${ }^{2} Z . A .$, XXII, pp. 68ff.
    ${ }^{3}$ See Chapter IX
    ${ }^{4}$ See text-editions by Genouillac arid De la Fuye.
    ${ }^{5}$ Z. A., XXII, pp. 68ff.

[^18]:    ${ }^{1}$ E. B. $H .$, pp. $299 f \mathrm{f}$.
    ${ }^{2}$ See also No. 93: 8-10, itu Š-kin-kud-ta $\mid$ itu Ezen Me-ki-gál-šu $\mid$ itu-bi XII-a-an, which establishes the order of the months.
    ${ }^{3} \mathrm{~A} m h_{\text {. , p. }} 156$.
    7

[^19]:    ${ }^{1}$ In the 9th year of Bur-Sin, Se-kin-kud, according to the year formula, would not be the first month. See Amh. 116,12. ${ }^{2}$ H. L. C., I, Pl. 45, No. 35; Amh., 116, Nos, 1, 14, 28, 31, 79, X0, 93, 158 and 159.
    ${ }^{3}$ L.I. H., so. 14, $6 . \quad{ }^{4}$ Amh., p. XXII.

[^20]:    ${ }^{1} \mathrm{Cf}$. igi-ni-in-gar-ar-ra, Sa-tilla, IX, 5; also p. 126. Here the phrase is causative and corresponds to the later kurrubu, A. B. P. R., p. 125, or better ultarribšu, A. D.D.,No. 1, p. 262.

[^21]:    ${ }^{1}$ Perhaps to he read zal. $\quad{ }^{2}$ Erroneously written $H U . \quad{ }^{3}$ See Chapter IX.
    ${ }^{4}$ Whatever particular verb $S A R$ stands for, as $a s u, B r .4302$; $k a s ̌ a ̂ d u, 4319$; kunukku, 4322; šatâru, 4336, it must denote delivery or payment. Cf. $i b-t a-\dot{e}-a=u-s ̌ e-s i, B . E ., \mathrm{VI}^{1}, \mathbf{4 2}, \mathbf{6}$; Urlunden, V. A. Th., 4922, p. 32.
    ${ }^{5} Z U . Z U=$ causative form of erêbu, cf. $B r .133$; also $a h \hat{a} z u$, III $^{1}, B r .143$, "cause to take, i,e., give, pay." It would perhaps be possible to interpret the document in a different way by considering Ur-Da-mu as the lender, not the bond-giver. The stipulation then would be that if the grain was not delivered, the creditor would increase, i.e., place interest on the loan.
    ${ }^{6}$ Or Uku-nc-mu.

[^22]:    ${ }^{1}$ The seal reads $I$-la-ag-nu-it. Thus the name obviously is written phonetically and is Semitic as the following $N u-\hat{u} r-\imath-l u$.
    ${ }^{2}$ Cf. the document of tlie same character, A. B. P., No. 19.
    ${ }^{3}$ In later contracts $a z a g$ pad-da is equal to šebirtu, Br. 9918, whicli Meissner explains as "die Nebenkosten beim Kaufe"; also partial payment, Muss-Arnolt, p. $1005 b$. Here it is something that lias to he repaid, if ni-la, line 16, is futurum, which seems to be tlie case.
    ${ }_{4}$ Cl. T. T., 104, R., 8, šě-a-na.
    ${ }^{5}$ That ni-la is written phonetically lor ni-láa is seen from C. T., VI, Pi. 34, 11; VIII, Pl. 39, 10, as Ranke has pointed out, B. E., VI', p. 19. Cl. ni-la-a, No. 13 (VI):5, and ni-la, No. 15 (VIII): 17. That it stands for $i s a l k a l$, not iškul, see tlic form ni-la-e on tablet, but $i$-su-ga-al on envelope, $B . E ., \mathrm{VI}^{1}$, No. 61, 13. Cf. also $A$. R. U., II, Nos. 35,$10 ; 36,9 ; 47,10 ; 49,10 ; 51,10,13$. See Nos. 13 (VI): 15; 15 (VIII): 17; cf. Huber, Milprecht Anniv., pp. 206ff.
    ${ }^{6}$ See Chapter IX.

[^23]:    ${ }^{1} M U$ may be a title, $i e$. , "baker." (if. also $M U-i-d u b$, No. 15 (VIII) 9. It may also belong to tlie name.
    ${ }^{2}$ MAS $=$ siptu, Br. 2029, from esípu, "to gather, add, increase," hence increase, interest. Her Muss-Arnoll, p. $67 a$. Cf. HAR, No. XI, 1.
    ${ }^{3}$ Literally "Interest 5 gin 1 gin according."
    ${ }^{4}$ The envelope has mu en ${ }^{d}$ Innanna Unú $(g)^{k i}$ más-e $i b-[p a(d)]$.

[^24]:    ${ }^{1}$ See next document translated.
    ${ }^{2} H A R-s ̌ u$, as emended from No. 21 (SIT):1, may be taken as ana hubulli, cl. Br. 8530, "at interest," thus referring to the nature of tlie loan transaction, ol it may be taken as ana akali, "for food," stating tlie object of tlic loan, as often is the rase.

    3 The name is no doubt Semitic.
    ${ }_{4}$ Cf. No. 23 (XI). 1, as cmended in analogy with this tablet.

[^25]:    ${ }^{1}$ For gar as a measure of area see B. E., VI ${ }^{1}, 44, \mathrm{I} ; 60,6$.
    ${ }^{2} \mathrm{Cf}$. $t u$-a-an, line 5.
    ${ }^{3}$ That is $3 \mathrm{gan}+600+300 \mathrm{sar}=3 \frac{1}{2} \mathrm{gan}$.

[^26]:    ${ }^{1}$ The name may be read Ri-kalam-ba, "The shepherd of his land," as well as reading above, "The shepherd of his people."
    ${ }^{2}$ Possibly zu, cf. Z. A., XII, p. 343.
    ${ }^{3} E . N U N$, "the great house." $K A=p \hat{u}$, "mouth," or possibly "side."
    ${ }^{4}$ The sign is $B A R$ and might mean $\frac{1}{2}$, but in analogy with following lines, where the offerings vary between $S$ and 15 per day, it must here mean 10 , as also in line 2.
    ${ }^{5} K U$ must denote some cereal or plant from which flour could be made. See Reisner, T. T., p. $15 a$.
     as nadu, "deposit," Br. 4418.

[^27]:    ${ }^{1}$ Cf. No. 155; Amh., 46, 51.
    ${ }^{2}$ Cf. mà $+g i-k u, T . T ., 135$, which Reisner explains as "eine Art Kleid oder Stoff," p. 26.

[^28]:    ${ }^{1}$ As I pointed out in my paper rend before the Fifteenth Congress of Orientalists in Copenhagen, 1908.

