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PREFACE

This third volume of cuneiform texts from Nimrud presents an edition of all the tablets found at Fort Shalmaneser by Sir Max Mallowan and Prof. David Oates during the years 1957 to 1963, except for those which are published in *The Nimrud Wine Lists* (CTN I) by J.V. Kinnier Wilson, and a few literary and historical pieces which will be edited in other volumes of the series. It also gives a list of all inscribed material from Fort Shalmaneser, with the findspots and places of publication, and includes indexes of all personal names, place-names and professions, incorporating those in the Wine Lists.

The edition is a joint effort in that virtually everything has been read and agreed by both editors. Whenever they held strong, divergent views, both opinions are noted briefly with the appropriate initials. In more detail, SMD is principally responsible for all the translations, commentaries on the administrative texts, analysis of all the wine lists, the chapter on Sargon’s army, and the indexes, with the crucial associated prosopographical work. JNP copied the tablets, with the exception of those already in *The Nimrud Wine Lists* and Nos. 120, 121, 126, 133, 134, 136, 137 and 138, copied by SMD. He has also made numerous collations as the work proceeded, and is principally responsible for the commentaries to the legal texts. Most of the Introduction, the transliterations and the textual notes are an inextricably joint product, although JNP gladly acknowledges that his has been the lighter share of the burden. He also apologizes for the notes on sealing which accompany the editions: a full study was not possible, but the summary notes made by him while copying the tablets seemed worth including, with all their imperfections, along with information from the original catalogues and from B. Parker’s article in *Iraq* 24.

We owe a great debt to Prof. Karlheinz Deller, who read much of the manuscript, whose unparalleled knowledge of Neo-Assyrian has been indispensable, and whose generosity with time, information and expertise was unflagging; his specific suggestions are usually acknowledged, but the extent of his help goes much deeper than these might suggest. Several scholars had worked on these texts before us, preparing excavation catalogues in the field which were sometimes veritable editions of the text, and in some cases copying the tablets: Mr J.V. Kinnier Wilson, Prof. J. Laessöe, Mr. A.R. Millard and Mr P.A. Hulin. To all of these we are extremely grateful, for their unselfish gift of their own previous work and their cession of the rights of publication. A special debt of gratitude is owed to Lady Mallowan and to Prof. D.J. Wiseman, for encouraging us to undertake the work, and for much moral and practical support.

In the museums housing the tablets we have been received with the utmost courtesy and consideration. Thanks for their hospitality go to successive Director-Generals and President of the State Organisation in Iraq, Dr. Isa Salman and Dr. Muayad Damerji, to Directors of the Iraq Museum, and in particular to the Heads of the Cuneiform Section, Dr. Fawzy Rashid and now Dr. Bahijah Khalil Ismail. To other members of the museum staff, who responded good-humouredly to repeated requests for tablets for collation and re-collation, but are too numerous to mention, our thanks also go; in particular Sitt Rasmiah Jabr Khalil has earned our special gratitude. At the British Museum our thanks are due to the staff of the Western Asiatic Department under Dr. Edmond Sollberger, and especially to Mr. Christopher Walker for his untiring patience with requests for collation.
PREFACE

For help with various academic points we are indebted to Dr. Tuviah Kwasman, Dr. Anthony Green, Mr J.V. Kinnier Wilson and Mr. Alan Millard. We thank them all for their help and interest.

Finally our thanks are recorded with much appreciation for their care and patience to those who have set this volume on the Lasercomp at the Oxford Computing Service, namely Mr. S.V. Cope, Dr. Ruth Glynn and Mrs. Christine Rossiter.

Stephanie M. Dalley (Oxford) and J.N. Postgate (Cambridge)

May 1984
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### BIBLIOGRAPHICAL ABBREVIATIONS

Most abbreviations follow W. von Soden, *Akkadisches Handwörterbuch* Band III (Wiesbaden 1981) p.IX-XVI, but the following have also been used.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>An.Or.52</td>
<td>J. S. Cooper, <em>The return of Ninurtu to Nippur</em>, Rome 1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AOAT 7</td>
<td>1970 M. Dietrich, <em>Die Aramäer Südbabyloniens in der Sargonidenzeit (700—649 B.C.)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARAB</td>
<td>D. D. Luckenbill, <em>Ancient Records of Assyria and Babylonia</em> 1–2, Chicago 1926—7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ass.T.</td>
<td>B. Parker, <em>Economic tablets from the temple of Mami at Balawat</em>, article in <em>Iraq</em> 25 1963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BT</td>
<td><em>Chicago Assyrian Dictionary</em>, vols. A1, A2, B, D, E, G, H, I/J, K, L, M1, M2, N1, N2, Ś, Z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIS</td>
<td>Corpus Inscriptionum Semiticarum, Paris 1881, 1889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NARGD = NARG</td>
<td>S. Parpola, <em>Neo-Assyrian Toponyms</em>, AOAT 6, 1970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAT</td>
<td>H. W. F. Saggs, <em>Nimrud Letters</em> (numbered serially as published in <em>Iraq</em> 17 1955 to <em>Iraq</em> 36 1974; individual references given on pp.000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NR</td>
<td>F. M. Fales (editor) <em>Assyrian Royal Inscriptions: new horizons in literary, ideological and historical analysis</em>, Orientis Antiqui Collectio XVII, Rome 1981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OAC XVII</td>
<td><em>Orientalia</em>, journal of the Pontifical Biblical Institute, Rome 1932—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studies ... Oppenheim</td>
<td>Studies presented to A. Leo Oppenheim, edited by R.D. Biggs and J.A. Brinkman, Chicago 1964</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ABBREVIATIONS

TH J. Friedrich et alii, *Die Inschriften vom Tell Halaf*, AfO Beiheft 6
XXVI RAI B. Alster (editor) *Death in Mesopotamia, XXVI Rencontre assyriologique internationale*, Mesopotamia 8, Copenhagen 1980
ZAW Zeitschrift für alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, Berlin 1924—

Other abbreviations

B.E. bottom edge
BM British Museum
BT siglum for tablets excavated at Balawat
Col. column
coll. collated
E expedition (tablets assigned to the British expedition, now in BM, IA or School of Oriental and African Studies, London University)
IA Institute of Archaeology, University of London
L.E. left edge
mA middle Assyrian
mB middle Babylonian
nA neo-Assyrian
nB neo-Babylonian
ND siglum for tablets excavated at Nimrud (see list, p.000)
NL Nimrud Letter
No. number of text in this edition
OB Old Babylonian
obv. obverse
pl. plate
PN personal name
rev. reverse
sing. singular
TH siglum for tablets excavated at Tell Halaf
w witness
FOREWORD

The excavators at Nimrud (Kalhu) originally sought to have a preliminary report prepared on any epigraphic discoveries made in a given season for the School's journal *Iraq* pending full publication. The mass of finds from the time devoted to the clearing of Fort Shalmaneser was, however, such that a continuing programme of publication both of the ivories (in the series *The Nimrud Ivories*) and of the texts (*Cuneiform Texts from Nimrud*) was embarked upon. The first of the latter series was taken up by a special group of texts, mainly from Fort Shalmaneser, in *The Nimrud Wine Lists* by J.V. Kinnier Wilson and this present volume now completes the texts from there. The British School of Archaeology in Iraq is grateful to Dr Dalley and Mr Postgate for undertaking this arduous task on its behalf.

Professor David Oates, the principal excavator of Fort Shalmaneser, has already furnished plans and archaeological reports on the site (in *Iraq and Nimrud and Its Remains*) to which appropriate reference is made under the provenance of the one hundred and fifty-two texts presented here.

The precise and changing nature of the occupation of the so-called "Arsenal" (*ekal māšarti*) can now be traced over more than a century. The texts, letters and legal, as well as the prosopography, enlarge our understanding of palace and fiscal administration and of the rôle played by senior officials, both civil and military, in this palace complex and on the citadel itself. Attention is drawn to the organisation and location of the Queen's Household.

This volume is, then, issued in no sense merely to fulfil the moral obligation laid on all excavators to publish their findings but seeks to make a substantial and distinctive contribution to neo-Assyrian studies.

D.J. Wiseman
INTRODUCTION

Sir Max Mallowan and Professor David Oates excavated the building at Nimrud known as Fort Shalmaneser between 1957 and 1963.\(^1\) All the cuneiform tablets found there which have not already been published in CTN I are edited here. They span a considerable period: according to the sometimes scant dating evidence available, they were written for the most part either in the late 8th century B.C. or in the post-canonical period, between 648 B.C. and the fall of the city.

The order in which the texts are presented was the subject of long debate: eventually, so as to avoid splitting up certain well-defined groups, we decided as with earlier volumes to arrange them broadly according to provenance, but by type within each major group, although this has inevitably led to some inconsistencies.

The various different groups of records have shed new light on the functions of the building. First of all, they have established that the queen maintained a house within the palace at both periods, and this house can be identified with the Residency of the excavation reports. During the later period that house was organized by a female official known as the *sakintu*, “female official (of the queen’s house of the Review Palace)”, while the predominantly male staff of the rest of the building was organized by the *rab ekalli*, “palace manager”. Two groups of tablets probably come from the archives of these two officials.

During the late 8th century the building served many military purposes as well as being a centre from which officials dealt with taxes. Army officers drew up their lists of men and horses there; chariots and armour were stocked there; but legal decisions have not survived from this time. By contrast, during the post-canonical period legal matters were frequent within the palace boundaries, and except for No. 12 military titles are absent from the witness lists; there is no evidence for regular military activity at that time from Fort Shalmaneser.

In the late 7th century loans and other financial transactions took place there; the temples of Mullissu and of the Seven Gods provided capital.\(^2\) Notable for this period are texts dealing with the feeding of birds, which is also known from texts of the same period found on the main citadel mound.\(^3\)

A heartening aspect of the study of both periods has been the discovery that many named officials recur in texts found elsewhere at Nimrud. In the late 8th century tablets there are particularly close connexions, both by subject matter and by named officials, with texts from the North-West Palace, which gives impetus to the further study of those tablets, published in considerable detail by Barbara Parker in 1961. In the post-canonical

---

1 Preliminary reports were published in *Iraq* within the year; the final report is found in Mallowan, *Nimrud and Its Remains*, Vol. II.

2 Menzel has documented this function of Neo-Assyrian temples (*Ass. T.*, I, pp. 11 ff.). For the Mullissu temple see No. 39; the involvement of the Sibitti temple in similar transactions is deduced from ADD 1245 (= FNLAD No. 35) which, although found at Nineveh, may possibly have been made out at Kalhu since the witnesses include Szalamašê, Giritu, Nabu-balassu-iqbi and Ubru-Nabu, names known from other Nimrud texts.

3 For references see CAD Mjii, p. 255B s.v. *muđākil lusārī*.
period there are good connexions with the archive of Šamaš-šarru-usur and his scribe Samedu, of which Professor D. J. Wiseman published a preliminary report in 1953, tablets found in a private house on the citadel. Those two men in turn can be shown to recur in texts found last century, Šamaš-šarru-usur being a "rein-holder of the crown prince", and Samedu being a scribe closely associated with the personnel of Nimrud temples.4

So many connexions are not due to coincidence. They show that the tablets, whatever their provenances, record the dealings of a relatively small group of important men, and the Assyriologist need not feel bewildered by seemingly countless names from an enormous bureaucracy. In many ways the links can be compared with those of tablets found within the Old Babylonian palace at Mari, so that publication of the remaining groups of Nimrud tablets may eventually yield quite a detailed and coherent picture of many activities carried out by high officials, rather than each standing in isolation. Nor do the tablets from Fort Shalmaneser give information about secular life only: several of the late 8th century texts give information about the cult,5 and an official of the temple of Nabu, identifiable from another text found a century ago, witnessed a post-canonical legal record which was deposited at Fort Shalmaneser.6

While there is no doubt that many records were written in Aramaic on material which has decayed completely, the brief cuneiform letters of palace officials to one another in the post-canonical period, which are of a type elsewhere virtually unknown, and are published here7 despite many remaining difficulties of interpretation, show plainly that the Assyrian dialect of Akkadian was still spoken and written by the administration, and was not yet the exclusive language of scribes and astrologers. Whereas these terse letters contain to some extent coherent prose, the legal records are only summaries of court proceedings or contract agreements. Where comparison is possible between two very similar tablets, it is obvious that texts often omitted apparently vital clauses.8

The tablets have revealed a greater range of activity carried out in Fort Shalmaneser than could be deduced previously, whether from archaeological finds or from Assyrian building inscriptions. The Chicago Assyrian Dictionary's translation "Arsenal" only partly covers its functions during the late 8th century, and is definitely misleading for the later period. The same can be said of Mallowan's "Fort" and Parpola's "Inventory Palace". In view of these difficulties, we have retained Postgate's "Review Palace", which is less specific and so more flexible.

4 Šamaš-šarru-usur is named without a profession in at least 34 tablets from Nimrud (Wiseman, Iraq 15 (1953) 138ff), and is called L.Ú.SAG in ND 3422. In those tablets certain names found among the witnesses are: Zababa-eriba, Nabu-zuzu-iddin, Nabu-šarri-usur and Mannu-ki-pArbil. ADD 477 contains a clause which clearly shows it to come from Kalhu, the first three witnesses are Šamaš-šarru-usur, Zababa-eriba and Nabu-zuzu-iddin, all designated "rein-holders of the king's son", and Nabu-šarri-usur and Mannu-ki-Arbil are also present. Very frequent in the records of Šamaš-šarru-usur is Samedu, named as a scribe in ND 3426. In that text and in ADD 640 and 641 (collated; previously read sa-[s]-lam-GIN) he is found with Šillî-Bel-dalli, Dudu and Uardu.

5 Nos. 93 and 95.

6 No. 52; there is no evidence from the texts to confirm the suggestion of Y. Mahmoud that the tripartite unit T 10/T 20/T 27/T 29 was where the kispuum ritual took place (see Mesopotamia XII (1977) p. 79 and fig. 18).

7 No. 1 (undated); Nos. 2—5 (all post-canonical), 28 and 84 (both probably post-canonical).

8 This suggests a continuity with Nuzi tradition, in which the legal record is intended as a witness list primarily, the clauses forming merely a reminder of the proceedings that were witnessed (see Eichler, Indenture at Nuzi, p. 12, and Commentary on No. 40 below) [SMD].
Sealing

Seal impressions are now increasingly studied together with dated tablets, so we have given as much information as possible with the transliterations, while realizing that this is a poor substitute for drawings by a seal expert. The range of periods for the legal texts illustrates well the changes that took place within a century of sealing practice: during the reign of Sargon II even people of relative wealth and importance often did not use a seal. They made the impression of a fingernail instead, and Mallowan’s careful observation has shown that this may sometimes have been done with a tool, not with the finger: “Associated with the Nimrud tablets there were little cushion-shaped pieces of terracotta with incurring sides ... when stamped on wet clay they reproduce exactly the curved nail-mark of the šupru (cf. Nos. 65-67). During the reign of Sennacherib (No. 57) a stamp seal might be used alongside fingernail marks; the stamp seal was becoming more popular but was not yet universal. See No. 26 for an instance during the reign of Esarhaddon where the royal cylinder seal is used in conjunction with royal stamp seals, both bearing the familiar motif of royal prerogative showing the king fighting a lion.

In the post-canonical period the stamp seal was almost universally used; nail-marks are scarcely ever found (but see No. 48). If a man owned a cylinder seal, he used it (as on No. 26) as if it were a stamp seal, and did not roll it to form a continuous design. This practice may account for an increasingly static type of cylinder seal design in which the arrangement of motifs would be better suited to a stamp seal (see Nos. 19 and 26).

Few seal impressions can definitely be placed with their owners; Nos. 4, 5 and 6 must all be impressed with the seal of the scribe Šepe-šarrī; the Egyptianizing designs of Nos. 12 and 20 cannot be associated with any Egyptian personal names; the seal used for No. 41, a tablet with perhaps four Egyptian names, does not bear a particularly Egyptian design — presumably it belonged to one of the two debtors, who bear Assyrian names although their fathers were Egyptian.

Administrative records which did not require witnesses were not sealed. Witnessed dockets were always sealed, and so were most letters. When a tablet was originally enclosed in an envelope, only the envelope was sealed; if no envelope had ever existed, the tablet itself was sealed. For this reason tablets bearing a witnessed record without seal impressions are described as “inner tablet without envelope”.

9 The majority of the useful impressions have already been fully published by Barbara Parker, *Iraq* 24 (1962) 26—44, but for the sake of internal consistency we have repeated here the notes made by JNP while copying the texts, without further editing.
11 Of course this was not invariably the case. Examples of stamp seals from Sargon’s reign are to be found on three of the Aramaic dockets from Assur (see p.46 for the dating), and on sealings from the North-West Palace (*CTN* II Nos. 256—262).
12 The royal stamp seal is of course the earliest Neo-Assyrian example of a stamp seal, in the reign of Shalmaneser III (Sachs, *Iraq* 15 (1953) 167ff.).
13 Compare No. 26, with stamp seals and a cylinder seal impressed, with similar sealings from the reign of Sargon, in which the stamp seal is impressed, but the cylinder seal still rolled (*CTN* II No. 132; ND 5486 in *Iraq* 24 (1962) Pl. XII).
14 Particularly seals in the ‘modelled style’ of Babylonia and Assyria in the 8th—7th centuries; see e.g. Buchanan, *Catalogue of Ancient Near Eastern Seals in the Ashmolean Museum*, Nos. 663—670.
15 For the types of document which did or did not have envelopes, see FNALD pp. 4—6.
The number of seals whose owners are named on the record does not correlate with the number of impressions on the tablet (e.g. No. 44), whether these are repeated impressions from a single seal or (rarely) impressions from two different seals. Seldom is more than one seal impressed (Nos. 53 and 73). In the case of the former it is possible that an Urartian type of bell-shaped seal was used, with one impression from the design on the cylindrical sides, another from the circular end.\textsuperscript{16}

\textit{The archive of the rab ekalli} (Nos. 1-27)

\textit{Provenance}

This group of tablets was discovered in 1958, scattered in Rooms SE 1, 8, 10, 11 and NE 2. The circumstances of the discovery are described in \textit{Iraq} 21 (1959) 109-10 (summarized in NR II 420-22); cf. also \textit{Iraq} 23 (1961) 12 for NE 2. The tablets were found in fill at various heights above the floors, and were thought to have fallen from the upper storey because texts which obviously belonged together (and sometimes even joined) were found in the different rooms (see \textit{Iraq} 21, 109 and 23, 12). Most of the tablets came from SE 1 and 10, two adjacent rooms forming part of a suite, which is best described in the words of the excavator:

"West of the gate chamber, in the north-west corner of the SE courtyard, lay another official residence. This consisted of a large room with a small ante-chamber and bathroom attached (SE 1-3), a second slightly shorter chamber ..... opening directly on to the courtyard (SE 10), and a small room, also with its own entrance and a stairway leading to the upper storey (SE 11-12). That this was a single suite, despite the lack of internal communication between the rooms, is shown by its palatial character, expressed in the traces of painting on the walls of SE 1-3 and the ornamental reveals on the doorways of SE 10 and 11 ....."

\textit{(Iraq} 21, 108).

The bathroom (SE 1) and SE 10 to its east contained the heaviest deposits of burned debris, presumed to have fallen from the upper storey. Other rooms from which tablets were recovered are NE 2, directly adjoining SE 10 to the north (although only accessible from the NE courtyard), where No. 16 was found, clearly part of the archive, SE 11 (east of SE 10, the washroom incantation No. 27), and SE 8 (Nos. 4, 11 and 12), which is surprisingly distant, although the tablets leave little doubt that they belong with the remainder of the group.

\textit{Composition of the group}

The following list includes all the inscribed material that was registered from this part of the Review Palace:

Letters Nos. 1 – 5
Legal texts concerning persons Nos. 7 – 9
Legal texts concerning goods & commodities Nos. 6, 10 – 18, 19\textsuperscript{2}
Unwitnessed notes and labels Nos. 20 – 24
Administrative record No. 25
Sealing No. 26

\textsuperscript{16} For examples see Tasyurek, \textit{Orients Antiquus} 18 (1979).
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Incantation No. 27
Historical texts ND 7097–7100; 9902; 9903 = No. 152
Inscribed vase ND 8159
Inscribed lion-weight ND 7879

Further information on the last three categories is given on p.263. Note also that the letter No. 84, found in NE 50, was almost certainly written by a post-canonical rab ekalli.

Sealings

As well as tablets, the debris in SE 1 and 10 contained several clay sealings. Three of these were inscribed (Nos. 21–23; see Plate 47). Of the uninscribed ones some are discussed in the commentary to No. 23, and several have already been published by Barbara Parker as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Publication</th>
<th>Plate(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ND 7049</td>
<td>SE 1</td>
<td><em>Iraq</em> 24 (1962)</td>
<td>36, Pl. XIX.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ND 7046</td>
<td>SE 1</td>
<td>ibid.</td>
<td>37, Pl. XIX.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ND 7037</td>
<td>SE 10</td>
<td>ibid.</td>
<td>37, Pl. XIX.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ND 7039</td>
<td>SE 1</td>
<td>ibid.</td>
<td>37, Pl. XIX.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ND 7104</td>
<td>SE 10</td>
<td>ibid.</td>
<td>38-9, Pl. XXII.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ND 7045</td>
<td>SE 8</td>
<td>ibid.</td>
<td>40, Pl. XXII.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Date

All the dated tablets are post-canonical. No. 11, dated to the eponym Kanunaya governor of Dur-Šarrukin(?), can be compared very closely with No. 17 which is dated to Nur(?)-šalam-kaspi, since both texts are loans to Asqudu, son of Qurdi-ilani, and both have the witness Zizi in common. Nur(?)-šalam-kaspi is a new eponym, and must be post-canonical; therefore Kanunaya must also be post-canonical, to be distinguished from the canonical eponym of 671 and 666 B.C. This new post-canonical Kanunaya must be grouped not only with Nur-šalam-kaspi but also with Aššur-matu-taqqin on the evidence of No. 6. The latter is placed around 624 B.C. by Falkner. The other new post-canonical eponym from this group is Bel-šadua (or Bel-ekallua, see index) in No. 10.

Some of the limmus functioned during the reign of Sin-šarru-šarru-šarru; on the other hand Mušallim-Aššur, after whom Nos. 13, 15 and 16 are dated, is placed by Falkner as early as 642 B.C. It is clear that the tablets are fairly widely scattered in date as well as in content; they span more than 20 years, and the eponyms are listed here according to Falkner’s dates:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Eponym</th>
<th>Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(642)</td>
<td>Mušallim-Aššur</td>
<td>Nos. 13; 14(?); 15; 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(639)</td>
<td>Sin-šarru-šarru</td>
<td>No. 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(624)</td>
<td>Aššur-matu-taqqin</td>
<td>Nos. 6; 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(618)</td>
<td>Sa’īlu</td>
<td>No. 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(617)</td>
<td>Nabu-tapppu-tapi</td>
<td>No. 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>–</td>
<td>Kanunaya</td>
<td>Nos. (6); 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>–</td>
<td>Nur(?)-šalam-kaspi</td>
<td>No. 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>–</td>
<td>Bel-šadua</td>
<td>No. 10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17 See note on No. 11:18.
18 AFO 17 (1954–56) 100–120; in view of the admitted uncertainty of her chronological scheme, which will need improvement in the light of some of the texts presented here, her provisional dates are quoted in round brackets, e.g. (641).
The rab ekalli, "palace manager"

He was the official in charge of many aspects of the Review Palace. His full title is given in No. 12: *rab ekalli ša ekal māšarte ša uru Kalha*: "palace manager of the Review Palace of Kalhu". Six different holders of the title are named in these texts, not necessarily the Review Palace managers, however:

a) Isseme-ili (= Ismeli, Samme-ili) named in Nos. 6, 8 and 12; also in No. 29 of the šakintu group.

b) Urad-Istar, named in No. 9.

c) Emuq-Aššur, named in No. 10.

d) Tartimanni, named in No. 39 of the šakintu group with the title rab ekalli; in Nos. 31 and 40—51 without title, and in No. 30 with the title LÚ.DUMU E.GAL.¹⁹

e) Ubru-Nabu, named in No. 84 without title, but probably the rab ekalli of ADD 640—642.

f) Nabu-ahu-usur, named in No. 41 without title, but probably the rab ekalli of ADD 640 and 641.

If we take the tentative dating of post-canonical limmus proposed by Falkner, the chronological grouping of these palace managers is:

(641) Aššur-gimilli-terri (Ubru-Nabu), (Nabu-ahu-usur)

(640) Zababa-eriba (Ubru-Nabu)

(632) Buluṭtu (Ubru-Nabu), (Nabu-ahu-usur)

(624) Aššur-matu-taqqin Isseme-ili

(623) Šalam-šarrī-iqbi Tartimanni

(622) Sin-šarru-usur Isseme-ili

[(621) Aššur-remanni Tartimanni LÚ.DUMU E.GAL]

(619) Bel-ahu-usur (Nabu-ahu-usur)

(617) Nabu-tappatu-aliq Urad-Istar

(615) Sin-aliq-pani Tartimanni

? Sin-šarrussu-ukin Isseme-ili

? Bel-šadua Emuq-Aššur

There is no reason to suppose that the office of palace manager of the Review Palace could be held by two persons concurrently, but unless the full title is given, it is possible that a man with the title rab ekalli was in charge of another palace: six palaces are known at Nimrud from the time of Aššur-naṣir-apli II onwards, although they may not all have been in use as palaces by the reign of Aššur-ban-apli.²⁰

Moreover, it is clear from the witness lists of ND 2314, where three different palace managers are found together, and of ADD 640 and 641 (two together), that the rab ekallis from presumably various palaces or public buildings might congregate for business. One man named as palace manager in all three of these post-canonical texts is Nabu-ahu-usur; he probably occurs as creditor in No. 41, and in the witness list of No. 35, but there is no definite evidence that he was the manager of the Review Palace. The dates on tablets that mention him are (641), (640) and (619).²¹ Named palace managers from other Nimrud

¹⁹ See notes on No. 30 and No. 3.

²⁰ See RIA Kalhu, p. 309 fig. 1 and §§14ff.

²¹ For bracketed dates, cf. note 18.
texts include: Ili-NAR-ru in ND 2332:2 and Nabu-šarru-ušur in ND 2093, etc.22 Ubru-Nabu of ND 2314 (and eight other tablets) is probably the same palace manager as Ubru-Nabu in ADD 640—642, and he was very likely the author of No. 84. The dates on tablets that mention him are 664, 658, (645), (641), (640), (639) and (635).

Of all these palace managers only Isseme-ili and Emeq-Assur were definitely attached to the Review Palace, an office which the former held for at least two years. If we have correctly interpreted Nabu-ahu-ušur and Ubru-Nabu as each being only one person (rather than two with the same name), their activities span 22 years and 29 years respectively, and they are not given different professional titles during those time spans, although it must be admitted that professions are rarely stated. From this we deduce tentatively that the office of palace manager was a long term appointment. The occurrence of Tartimanni in the eponym year of Šalam-šarri-iqbi (623) would therefore mean that either Falkner's dates are to be revised on this point, or that he belonged to one of the other palaces. It does not seem necessary to assume that any palace had more than one manager at one time.

The suite of rooms in which these tablets were mostly found was identified as belonging to the palace manager because of the role played by him in many of the texts. He appears as recipient of four letters, Nos. 2, 3, 4 and 5, and as 'creditor' in Nos. 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 and 12; in No. 13 the 'creditor' is simply "the Review Palace", and one might conclude that the palace manager was also involved here, except that the other texts from the eponymate of Mušallim-Asūr, Nos. 14-16, have the "chief of the granaries" (rab karmāni) as the 'creditor'. There remain texts in which the person who would normally have kept the tablet is named, though without title: No. 1, a letter addressed to Šili-Nabu and Adad-aplu-iddina; the early loan No. 11, in which the 'creditor' is a certain Bunaya; and No. 17, where the 'creditor' is Abu-eriba.

It would be misleading to assume too great a unity of content for this group of tablets, and some of the rab ekalli records may have been dispersed in antiquity: No. 41 with Nabu-ahu-ušur as 'creditor' from S 10, No. 70 found in S 38, and No. 77 probably from SE 14. Nos. 21—23, perhaps with No. 26, all found in SE 1 and SE 10, form a group on their own of uncertain date but possibly from the reign of Esarhaddon or even earlier, and there is no specific reason to associate them with the business of the palace manager.

In sum one may say that the majority of texts do belong to the records of the rab ekalli, but there is a small group from the records of the rab karmāni, and a few tablets which may or may not illustrate the public or private activities of one of these officials.

The letters to the rab ekalli are written by his administrative subordinates who use a variety of terms to express their subordination:

No. 2 to Isseme-ili from Manni "my lord"
No. 3 to rab ekalli from Tartimanni "my lord" "your servant"
No. 4 to rab ekalli from Šepe-šarri "my father" "your servant"
No. 5 to rab ekalli from Šepe-šarri "my father" "your son"

The content of the letters makes it clear that these are administrative and not private relationships, although it is possible that Šepe-šarri was the son of his boss. He was a scribe, and may have been attached permanently to the rab ekalli (cf. Kinnier Wilson, CTN I 95—8). There are no other officials in this group who can confidently be ascribed

22 Until the documents from the North-West Palace have been studied further, it is not possible to give complete details.
to the *rab ekalli*’s administrative department, but a number of persons recur as witnesses with a regularity which suggests that they were permanently available in the Review Palace and on its staff, although there is no specific evidence to show whether they were the *rab ekalli*’s subordinates. Witnesses were drawn from other departments, as the presence of the *rab ekalli* himself in records of the šakintu group shows.

Witnesses found in the *rab ekalli*’s records were only in one text, No. 12, drawn from military circles: the chief eunuch’s commander of teams, Nabu-danninanni, and the charioteers Eriba-Adad and Sukkaya. Scribes in these records are: Šepe-šarri, Nabu-šumu-lešir, and Nabu-xxx-MEŠ. Others whose professions are specified are: Pani-Marduk a Ninevite merchant and Nabu-taqqinanni a doorkeeper. Some of the names which appear most frequently among the witnesses are not given professions, such as Zeru-ukin, Zittaya and Nabu-ušalli, and it is possible that professions were generally specified when the witness was not a regular member of the *rab ekalli*’s department.

The activities of the *rab ekalli*’s department

The letters to the *rab ekalli* from his subordinates concern the construction of a *kurhu* (room or building; No. 2), a variety of commodities associated in some way with a butcher (No. 3), and two letters from Šepe-šarri concerned with goat-hair and textiles (iariiāte), which are possibly goat-hair tents. The same textiles are the subject of the debt-note No. 6, in which Šepe-šarri is under contract to deliver them to Isseme-ili, the *rab ekalli*.

Other outwardly ‘legal’ documents also belong to the administration of the palace: No. 10 ensures a supply of grain for the birds, described as *iskāru* of the Review Palace, which is to be delivered by the deputy(-mayor) of Kalhu (LÚ.2-u). No. 12 documents barley, SE.BAR, given to the chief eunuch’s groom, while No. 13 is a delivery contract in the form of a debt-note for grain for the birds. Nos. 14—16 also concern corn and straw payments, but the official in charge is the *rab karmāni*. No. 17 concerns the propagation of sheep presumably belonging to the Review Palace.23 There are three documents concerned with persons. No. 7 is an order to produce an individual by a given day; No. 8, although still difficult, documents the release from fetters in the Review Palace of a man by the *rab ekalli*, and No. 9 also uses the same verb, šēšu ‘u, of a man released(?) “from the hands of” the *rab ekalli*, although exactly how the man is connected with the sheep mentioned there remains obscure.24 All these texts seem to show the *rab ekalli* using legal procedures for some aspects of his control of the labour force at his disposal.

Finally we have the inscribed and uninscribed sealings which may also have come from the *rab ekalli*’s archive and have been connected with his duties. Although the restoration of No. 23 is uncertain, Nos. 21 and 22 clearly record troops which have been “reviewed” (ašūru); and the Review Palace is known to be the place where military reviews took place. The excavators found against the outer wall of the large courtyard SE 8 a throne-base, serving “as a rostrum from which the king or his turtan could review the troops” (NR II 426). Whether or not one agrees that the sealings were attached to Aramaic or cuneiform records with the complete list of names, the question which concerns us here is why they were stored with the *rab ekalli*’s archive: were they troops directly under his control? This seems unlikely, since in Nos. 21—22 they are explicitly called “king’s troops”, a class

23 When the Review Palace is not explicitly mentioned, there is a small possibility that the record concerns private transactions.

24 This verb is also discussed below, pp. 58 and 204.
known to be genuine fighting soldiers. Possibly the rab ekalli was responsible for organizing the review, doing the time-consuming work of having his scribes record the names and numbers; or possibly the lists were sent to him because he had to supply the men with food, lodging, or equipment while they were stationed in the palace. In either case, it would not be surprising if the resulting lists were stored with the rab ekalli’s records.

As we might expect, then, the rab ekalli emerges as responsible for the internal organization of the palace. He ensured that the state’s employees working in the palace did their work and were supplied with their raw materials, and saw to it that both humans and birds of the palace were fed. Without doubt he had many other duties which are not reflected in the surviving tablets, but at least this group is consistent with what we should have expected, and his suite of rooms is indeed admirably placed to enable him to fulfil these functions. It is difficult to assess from this group of texts how much Fort Shalmaneser was used for regular military purposes in the post-canonical period. Although No. 12 clearly shows that charioteers and a chief eunuch’s commander of teams (rab urîte) used the building, military professions are absent from most of the witness lists, and very little of the subject matter of the texts is overtly military.

The šakintu group: texts from the Queen’s Household (Nos. 28—45)

Provenance
Almost all these tablets were also found in 1958, in room S 10. One was found in the corridor to its south (No. 30) and another, in two halves, in Corridor D to the east (No. 35). From their content it is certain that these belong with the rest of the group, but this is not so for a third tablet, No. 42, which was found in 1962 in S 73, the room which connects S 10 to the main S courtyard. The tablets in S 10 were not found strictly in situ, but mixed in with ivories etc., in burnt debris resulting from the destruction of the building (see Iraq 21 (1959) 120—1 with Pl. XXVIIIb; NR II 434—5). The excavators were undecided whether they had fallen from an upper storey or not, but the discovery of two tablets in the adjoining corridors, one of which had no direct access to S 10, makes this very plausible. S 10 itself was accessible only from the south, and at some stage its doorway had been partially blocked, leading the excavator to describe it as “deliberately adapted for the storage of valuables” (Iraq 21 (1959) 121). It was certainly not a residential room, and stands rather isolated from the rest of the building. If, however, the tablets came from the upper storey, they could have been kept in an ‘office’ forming part of a residential unit round courtyard S 6, although the question of access to these upper rooms remains open, in the absence of an obvious stairwell.

Composition of the group
The inscribed material from this part of the palace can be classified as follows:

Letter  No. 28
Legal records of settlement in disputes  Nos. 29—31
Witnessed prohibition against further litigation  No. 32
Sales of persons  Nos. 33—36
Exchange loans for silver Nos. 37—39
Silver debt-notes Nos. 40—41
Silver and corn debt-note with harvester clause No. 42
Loan of corn and straw No. 43
Delivery contract for corn No. 44
Royal inscription No. 151
Amulet ND 7096

Of the four sale documents Nos. 33—36 record the purchase of persons by the šakintu or her deputy, while in the fourth the queen herself is the purchaser. The group also includes four judicial documents of which two have the šakintu’s deputy as one of the protagonists, but the other two have no obvious connection with the šakintu.

The loans and debt-notes are also rather miscellaneous: of the three silver loans the first has no apparent connection with the queen’s household (No. 37), No. 38 has a female creditor, and the third has the scribe of the queen’s household as the creditor. This same lady, Atar-palṭi, is creditor in No. 40, but the remainder of the group, Nos. 41—45, have various men as ‘creditors’, and there is no apparent connection with the šakintu or the queen’s household. Some of the tablets we should expect to have been in the keeping of their male creditors, whose professions are not known, and we cannot explain why they were found with the šakintu’s records. The remainder should have been kept by the queen, by the šakintu, by her deputy, and by the queen’s scribe, as well as by a woman whose title is lost. This is not enough to enable us to call it the šakintu’s archive, but it does seem reasonable to conclude that the tablets were stored together in a single office under her administration. There is therefore a possibility that even the apparently unconnected texts belonged in the šakintu’s orbit.

Date

The eponyms in these texts are all post-canonical. They are listed here according to Falkner’s provisional dates:

(641) Aššur-gimilli-terri Nos. 32; 34
(636) Marduk-šarru-uṣur No. 43
(635) Aššur-gara-ni-ni No. 37
(629) Adad-na’id25 No. 36
(626) Nabu-šarru-uṣur No. 45
(623) Šalam-šarri-iqi No. 31
(621) Aššur-remanni No. 30
(619) Bel-ahu-uṣur No. 41
(616) Bel-iqi No. 44
(615) Sin-alik-pa-ni Nos. 38–40
? Sin-šarrussu-ukin No. 29
? Kanunaya (see p.) No. 33

The time-span is similar to that of the rab ekalli group.

25 Previously also read Bel-šarru-na’id and Adad-milki-na’id.
The queen's household

The most exalted person in this group is the queen herself, and the other identifiable officials are members of her household. It is clear from the full titles of the šakintu that the queen maintained a household inside the Review Palace, and that the šakintu was her housekeeper there, helped by the queen's scribe. Nor is there much doubt that the complex of rooms grouped around the central courtyard S 6 and excavated by Mallowan and Oates forms the queen's house; the complexes around courts S 43 and S 37 may have been included too. The nature of this section of the Review Palace as a Residency quite unlike the rest of the Review Palace was clearly indicated by the excavators (NR II 426). The identification as the queen's house provides an additional explanation for the remarkable system of locking sections of the palace, in particular the Residency (NR II 431), for the queen's house had to be isolated from the more military functions of the building, and from the proximity of uncastrated males. The existence of the queen's house within the Review Palace explains the presence in No. 87 of the queen's cook, of her male karkadinmu and female karkadinmutu. Unfortunately the text cannot be confidently dated, but if as suggested it belongs to the reign of Sargon, their presence would show that the queen's establishment was not a 7th century innovation, at a time when the Review Palace had lost many of its military functions, nor a late adaptation of rooms which were built for a different purpose.

In these instances the "queen" is written Mī.E.GAL or Mī.KUR, now well known to be the regular Neo-Assyrian term, and probably derived from ša ekalli "(woman) of the palace". In most cases the scribes use the term without any further qualification, showing that it must have referred unambiguously to the king's chief wife, and we know from other texts that she had an establishment (Ē) of her own and staff of her own. When, as in No. 33:5 and ND 2308:4, we meet the Mī.KUR ša MAN "the queen of the king", we must assume that this is to distinguish the king's wife from the chief wife of the crown prince, or even of the previous king. However, in our texts there is no reason to identify the queen with any but the king's chief wife, the mother of the heir to the throne, and we are therefore inclined to assume that the establishment at Fort Shalmaneser was maintained without a royal occupant for most of the year. We have found no reference in our texts to any members of a harem of "secondary queens", which might have suggested that this was a permanent establishment housing women who would be available for the king on the presumably infrequent occasions when he stayed in the Review Palace. Why the chief queen should have kept an establishment in a palace designed and used for military purposes remains uncertain. It may have been because the king himself resided there on occasion, but perhaps the queen maintained her own military unit here, as the title mukil appāte ša Mī.E.GAL (ADD 444 r. 14) could be taken to imply. Hitherto the assumption had been made that the king and queen had only one residence in each major

26 See A. R. Millard, Ugarit Forschungen 4 (1972) 161—2; B. Landsberger, Vetus Testamentum Suppl. 16 (1967) 198—204; S. A. Kaufman, AS 19, 97; Borger, AOAT 33, 133—4; for the very similar logograms which refer to harem women, see also von Soden, AHw 1036a, s.v. sekretu(m).
27 e.g. her "house" in ADD 806:27; 953.i.5; 967.i.3(?); her officials in BT 140:2 (slave girl); ND 2782:2 (slaves); ND 2605:12 (rab āliōn); ADD 806:27 (weaver); ND 5448:2 (tailor); ADD 1036.iii.4 (butler); ABL 393:11 (AGRIG); and no doubt more.
28 also ADD 445 r.8 (title lost); ADD 408 r.9 read as Ė GĀŠAN by Ungnad, ARU 415, is doubtful according to Parpola, Assur 2/5 (1979) 171.
city, and that it was situated in the citadel, but in future we may have to allow for a multiplicity of residences, without restricting our scope to citadel areas.

Some details in the texts throw a little light on the life of the queen and her household: in No. 33 a woman is bought by the queen; No. 36 mentions her household (𒈗𒈗𒈗𒈗.GAL), and No. 34 was probably similar. There was a šakintu who was in charge of the queen’s household (šakintu ša 𒈗𒈗𒈗𒈗.GAL, No. 36:6–7); No. 30 mentions the “šakintu of the Review Palace”, and since this is a small group of tablets with an apparently coherent archaeological context, we suspect that this is the same office, the fullest description of which would be “šakintu of the household of the queen of the Kalhu Review Palace” as in No. 34:5–7. It seems unnecessary to assume that there were two different šakintus resident in the Review Palace, especially since no further qualification is given to the title in No. 29. Usually the šakintu is referred to by her title alone; only in No. 35 do we learn the name of a holder of the office: Šiti-ilat.

The šakintu’s deputy, the šanîtu, was called Kabalaya, according to No. 30, and she is mentioned again, without her name, in No. 29. In Nos. 39 and 40 we meet Atar-palti, the female scribe (𒀀𒀀.SUB), of the queen’s house. Although it is not made explicit, it is likely that she worked under the direction of, or in collaboration with, the šakintu.

Some witnesses recur in the texts of this group, but they cannot definitely be assigned to the queen’s household in view of the fact that the rab ekalli Isseme-ili and Tartimanni act as witnesses in records of the šakintu group. There is no evidence that the rab ekalli was involved in administering the queen’s house, so this shows that witnesses for the queen’s household records were drawn from a wider range of personnel than the queen’s own staff. As women rarely act as witnesses on Neo-Assyrian legal records,29 this is perhaps not surprising. Definite professions among the witnesses on these records are restricted to: doorkeeper (šepe-Ninurta-aṣbat, LÚ.NLGAB), the “man in charge of the entrance” (Salmu-ahhattu, ša pān nēṣibī), the bolt-keeper (Ninurta-ahu-iddin, LÚ.GAL.GIS.KAK.MEŠ) and the surveyor (Sinqi-İstar, mādīdu). Military professions are not found. Two scribes are found among the records: Balasu and Nabu-ra’im-napisti.30 Witness names which are found in both the rab ekalli and the šakintu groups are: Bel-balaṭi, Bel-iddin, Gabari, İstar-šumu-iddin, Nabua, Nabu-šezibanni, Nabu-uşallī(?), Sukku-İstar, Šalmu-šarri-iqbi, Ša-lamašše and Zittaya.

The activities of the šakintu

The only documents which undeniably reflect the administrative activity of the šakintu and her staff are the two judicial texts Nos. 29 and 30, which concern disputes over slave women between the šakintu’s deputy and another party. Although the word dēnu clearly entitles us to consider these documents as judicial, there does not seem to be any third party acting as arbiter, unless in No. 30 Kabalaya, the deputy, had authority to impose a legal ruling, despite her sex, rather as the rab ekalli seemed to do in Nos. 7–9. However, since Isseme-ili himself is her opponent in No. 29, there may have been an impartial third party who does not figure in the texts for some reason unknown to us. In another judicial text, No. 32, we have the same uncertainty: the head gardener is ordered not to renew litigation, but the authority so ordering is neither named nor implied; possibly therefore

29 An exception is CTN II No. 19:24.
30 All the names of scribes that are theophoric in the rab ekalli, šakintu, encrusted and miscellaneous texts, use Nabu.
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the šakintu had an unknown connection with one of the parties, or functioned as an arbiter. Similarly in No. 31, where a dispute between two men over a debt of silver is adjudicated by the mayor (hazannu) of Kalhu, an official well known already in the role of judge (Deller, Studi in onore di Edoardo Volterra, VI, 647), there is no apparent connection with the šakintu's office or with the queen's household.

Similarly with most of the loans and debt-notes, it is impossible to know why they should have been stored here, although reasonable explanations could be found. The identity of the witnesses shows only that the records were witnessed in the Review Palace, and that the same men acted as witness for the queen’s household and for the rab ekalli’s department. Nos. 39—41 form a group of their own: in No. 39 a man borrows a large sum of money (52 shekels of silver) from the queen’s scribe, drawn from the Mullissu temple. The borrower’s name occurs elsewhere in both the rab ekalli’s and the šakintu’s records, so it is possible that he was an official in the Review Palace as well as owning or managing a farm or village. In No. 40 the queen’s scribe again lends silver, with some of the same witnesses; although the text does not specify the source of the capital, it could also have been the temple of Mullissu. In No. 41 the creditor is not known from other texts, but the two debtors come from the same village or farm. We may detect in these three documents a familiar pattern of farmers coming to the city institutions to borrow money, and this deduction is supported by the time of year: Nisan (Nos. 39 and 41) and Ayyar (No. 40), the first and second months, in the lean weeks before harvest.

No. 44 is almost certainly a document from the administration, since three persons of unknown occupation contract with seven others for the supply of a large quantity of corn at a specified town, village or farm on a certain day. Nos. 42, 43 and 45 do not appear to contribute evidence for the administration of the queen’s household.

There remain the sales of persons, Nos. 33—36. Each is the sale of a girl to a resident of the queen’s household, but the similarity stops there. The purchaser in No. 33 is the queen herself, in Nos. 34 and 35 the šakintu, and in No. 36 probably her deputy. The girls are not all in the same category: a slave in No. 33, a daughter in No. 34, a daughter with some real estate in No. 35 and a daughter who is being adopted in No. 36. It is not usually possible to differentiate between private and administrative transactions, but it is obviously likely that the šakintu was buying girls for the domestic work of the queen’s house. The adoption in No. 36 may be private, although the buyer’s full, official title is given, and there are indications in the list of witnesses that a wider circle than just Review Palace staff was involved, for several of them occur also on citadel texts. Further study of the prosopography of all Nimrud texts of the same period may eventually help to place the transaction in its specific milieu. In this context note the texts concerning slave girls from the ZT wing of the North-West Palace, which may also come from a fragmentary šakintu’s archive or queen’s household records.31

To conclude, these texts suggest that in S 10, perhaps with the courtyard unit around S 6, the high female officials who administered the queen’s household lived and worked, and that the queen’s own residence was there too. The transactions described in the texts are largely or perhaps totally related to that administration. It is particularly interesting to note that the queen’s household offered loan facilities to men with silver drawn from the temple of Mullissu, with the queen’s scribe conducting the transaction. Also noteworthy is

31 See Iraq 41 (1979) 100.
the fact that tablets summarizing legal decisions which affected the queen’s household were stored with the household records.

The encrusted group (Nos. 46 — 64)

Provenance
A total of 18 tablets was found in 1958 as reported in Iraq 21, p.110, in two adjacent rooms SE 14 and SE 15, on or just above floor level.

Composition of the group
Letter No. 46
Sales of persons No. 47—51
Release of female (slave?) No. 52
Sales of land Nos. 53—58
Silver loans and debt-notes: with pledges Nos. 59; 62 (nBab)
without pledges Nos. 60; 61
Silver repayment No. 63
Fragmentary legal record No. 64

All five sales of people involve a woman, but the occurrences are so disparate that this fact alone cannot be taken to indicate a connexion with the šakintu’s office. Of the five land-sales, which all have male sellers, the only tablet in which the buyer’s name is preserved has a man’s name, and none of the five silver documents involves a woman. There is therefore no apparent link with the šakintu, nor is a rab ekalli involved, unless his title is omitted and he is not found in the rab ekalli group. There is no specific internal evidence to associate this group of tablets therefore with any specific official, or with any of the other groups found in the Review Palace.32

Date
The eponyms in this group are all post-canonical except for Mar-larem in 668 B.C. One limmu, Aṣṣur-ilaya(?), is not attested elsewhere. The spread of dates is otherwise comparable with those of the rab ekalli and šakintu groups. The eponyms are listed in order according to Falkner’s provisional dates:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Eponym</th>
<th>Tablets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>668</td>
<td>Mar-larem</td>
<td>Nos. 56; 57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(647)</td>
<td>Nabu-danninanni</td>
<td>No. 54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(639)</td>
<td>Šin-šarru-uṣur</td>
<td>No. 55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(629)</td>
<td>[Adad-na’id]33</td>
<td>No. 53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(626)</td>
<td>Nabu-šarru-uṣur</td>
<td>Nos. 49; 51(?); 59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(621)</td>
<td>Aṣṣur-remanni</td>
<td>No. 48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(620)</td>
<td>Šin-šarru-ıškun 7</td>
<td>No. 6234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(617)</td>
<td>Nabu-tappute-ali k</td>
<td>Nos. 60; 64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

32 JNP’s statement in Iraq 41 (1979) 100 n. 18 is incorrect in saying that the SE 14 and 15 texts deal principally with women, and in confusing them with the šakintu group.
33 Previously also read Bel-šarru-na’id and Adad-milki-na‘id.
34 Šin-šarru-ıškun’s 7th year is provisionally placed in 620, following the scheme of Reade, JCS 23 (1970) 1—9; it would be 616 B.C. after J. Oates, Iraq 27 (1965).
The texts do not contribute to the excavator’s identification of SE 14–19 as “barracks and baths designed for the king’s bodyguard”\(^{36}\), but at this late period the rooms may have changed their function. Notable in these texts is the absence of specifically military personnel. The texts seem to concern only the affairs of administrative officials, but it is possible that they include records unrelated to the administration of the Review Palace, since outsiders who needed a contract may have had to come there as the nearest centre for the necessary legal procedure. Eleven witness names are also found in the *rab ekalli* or *šakintu* group as witnesses.\(^{37}\) There is a good possibility of temple involvement in No. 52. No. 62 is entirely Neo-Babylonian in form and terminology, and must have been brought from Kar-Ištar in the south for reasons we cannot hope to reconstruct.

**Miscellaneous texts (Nos. 65–78)**

These tablets are from various (and in the case of Nos. 75 and 77, doubtful) provenances, and it is possible that some of them belonged to one of the preceding groups although not found in the same part of the building.

**Types of record**

- Sale of land: Nos. 65–67; 68–69(?)
- Judicial order to take oath: No. 70
- Silver loan or debt-note: No. 73
- Administrative notes: Nos. 74–77
- Doubtful: Nos. 72; 78

A grouping can be seen in Nos. 65–68, which all come from NE 38, and are of 8th century type. No. 69 is also of 8th century type, but is connected by provenance (SW 37) to No. 70, the latter being undated, unless 1. 12 is to be emended to make Nabu-sagib the name of the post-canonical eponym provisionally placed by Falkner in 628 B.C. In Nos. 70 and 77 a *rab ekalli* occurs, which suggests that those two tablets do belong specifically to the administration of the Review Palace.

**Date**

Excluding No. 70 (see above), only one eponym-date is preserved, in No. 76 dated to Mannu-ki-Adad (683 B.C.). However, Nos. 65–68 are of 8th century type, and No. 68 probably dates to 749 B.C., during the reign of Aššur-nirari V.

\(^{35}\) Since No. 52 is dated to the 12th month, this is a specific case in which Falkner’s scheme must be wrong: the months in which the two “615” eponyms are attested now overlap.

\(^{36}\) NR II, 379.

\(^{37}\) Nabu-ahu-iddin, Nabu-taqqinanni, Qibit-Ištar, Sukku-Ištar, Sukkaya, Tartimanni, Urad-Ištar, Zeru-ukin, Zittaya, Nurti and Ninurta-iqbi.
Babylonian dockets (Nos. 79—81)

Three very similar dockets came to light in three different seasons of excavation. They were found in three different spots: C 1, NE 2 and in the courtyard opposite SE 8, which indicates once again that provenance is not necessarily a connecting factor for Fort Shalmaneser tablets. All three are securely dated in Babylonian style to 712—710 B.C., a time when Babylonia, ruled by Merodach-Baladan, was independent of Assyria. Dockets of the same type were found at Khorsabad. Durand has suggested that they accompanied imports of wool from the south of Babylonia around Dur-Yakin (see our commentaries on the texts). If so, the dockets published here show that this trade continued to the end of the year before that in which Sargon II besieged Dur-Yakin, the fortress of Merodach-Baladan. These small documents would thus be rare evidence of genuine trade carried out between two countries at war, when official records seem to imply that booty and tax alone supplied Assyria.

Administrative records (Nos. 84, 86—97)

This is a very varied group in both date and content, connected only by provenance, NE 50. It includes one letter, No. 84 concerning a cart and supplies of iron, written by Ubrun-Nabu; there was a rab ekalli of this name, but very likely of one of the citadel palaces, not the Review Palace (see above, p.6). No. 92 quite clearly belongs with the post-canonical tablets Nos. 32 and 44 (both from S 10), despite being found in NE 50. It is a docket recording a debt-note for grain for fodder. The list No. 86 names “guards” assigned to various provinces on the obverse, and then on the reverse gives numbers (probably referring to equids), with chief provincial governors and provinces. The contents on the two faces are not certainly connected and if a comparison with No. 105 is not misleading, the numbers may refer to horses.

Nos. 87—89 are tax records concerning ilkakāte-taxes delivered by the AGRIG-official or his deputy for Arbil, consisting mainly of foodstuffs destined either ša KASKAL “for the campaign” or ša KUR “for the land/palace”. This basic division of ša KASKAL and ša KUR is found in several records, in particular some of the horse lists, and is discussed in the note on No. 87:3—14. No. 89 includes sections of ilku and nāmurtu taxes together. Unless the AGRIG himself kept his archives in the Review Palace, these must be the records of an official who was responsible for the collection of taxes from him and his deputy. No. 90 obverse appears to be a statement establishing a payment of nāmurtu-tax, with the deputy AGRIG again involved; the reverse contains a list of items, and may be unrelated in content (cf. also Nos. 86 and 144). No. 91 appears to be a short list or a stock-taking statement, and lacks the sealing or name of an authorizing official. Both Nos. 90 and 91 underline the casual nature of many of these records.

None of the records in this group Nos. 84—97 is dated, but No. 86 may be connected with No. 99 and its group (reign of Sargon II) by the occurrence in common of four high officials: Aššur-remanni, Nabu-eriba, Pulu and Šarru-emuranni. There may be similar connections with texts dating to Sargon’s reign in No. 87 (see note on 1. 15) and No. 90 (see Commentary).

38 A comparable unconformity may perhaps be observed on Nos. 90 and 144.
39 We write AGRIG because the logogram may be read ab(u)akku, barakku or ma.lennu in Neo-Assyrian (see CAD A/f, s.v. abarakku). For his association with taxes see TCAE pp. 104—6.
The excavator suggested that NE 50 was a workshop, partly to explain why the Kurba'il statue was found there waiting for repair, and because a metal saw and some pieces of red stone were found there too. Nos. 93—97 tend to support the suggestion, Nos. 93—94 being lists of quantities of metals for stated purposes, and No. 95 containing detailed descriptions with measurements of objects for embellishing the temple of Nabu. No. 94 mentions the AGRIG-official again, and is very similar indeed to ND 2774 from the North-West Palace; it probably concerned scrap-metal, and since ABL 319 probably mentions the collection of copper scrap in the Review Palace, this gives an insight into another aspect of the building’s function. Nos. 96 and 97 are lists of chariot parts and their equipment, an inventory of dismantled items, but the text does not state whether they were there for storage or for repair. If Adad-hatti in No. 96 is the same as Adad-hatti in No. 99.iii.10, and further the same man as the commander of Assyrian troops in Syria, this tablet probably dates to Tiglath-Pileser III or Sargon II.

Nos. 93 and 95 shed some light on the Nabu Temple at Nimrud, and may be associated with its rebuilding under Sargon II. Although the interpretation is not always clear, it seems that Apladad and Marduk both had shrines within the building, and that the mythical wild dog uridimmu(?), the goat-fish, the fish-man and fish-woman, made probably of gold and ivory, found a place in the interior decoration.

The Horse Lists (Nos. 85, 98—118)

Provenance

Some of these texts deal explicitly with horses and mules; in others there are numbers which may be deduced to refer to equids, and some list only men but join the group by virtue of close prosopographical connexion. They come from several different rooms: the majority (Nos. 85; 98—107) are from NE 50, which, as already shown, contained tablets with considerable variety in both content and date. No. 108 from NE 2 in a different corner of the courtyard is closely connected with the horse lists from NE 50, and the same is true of Nos. 109 and 110 from NE 55 and of Nos. 112—115 from NE 48, Level III. Although it has lost almost all its personal names, No. 111 from NW 3 is closely similar to the main group (Nos. 99—110). Others like No. 116 from NE 48 Level III and Nos. 117 and 118 from NW 20 and 21 may be associated with the rest by general content only, although No. 118 shares three names with No. 99, perhaps no more than a coincidence.

The horse lists are clearly broken and scattered remnants from a much larger group of records. Because they were found in so many different rooms, we cannot identify, except in a general way, those in which the administration reflected in the tablets took place. One feature which unites the provenances NE 2, NE 55, NE 48, NE 50 and NW 3 is that they all have access to the great, cobbled north-east courtyard. Information from the tablets suggests that it was there that all incoming items, whether foodstuffs, metals, chariots or horses, were recorded as they entered the Review Palace, more specifically perhaps in the “official residence” (Iraq 24 (1962) 18—19): the unit which includes the rooms NW 1—2,

40 For Adad-hatti see Sagg, Iraq 17 (1955) 153 (and NL 19; 20; 28; and also ABL 224—5). Parpola, OAC XVII, Chart 3, thinks that Adad-hatti may have been governor of Hamat during Sargon’s reign.

41 There is a remote possibility that it is not the Kalhu Nabu temple that is described.

42 In the post-canonical text ADD 640 a priest of Marduk follows the priest of Ninurta and the priest of Nabu in the witness list.
NE 51 – 55 with its adjacent storage rooms NE 48 – 50, that house being near to the main entrance of the Palace, NE 46. However, it is not possible from the evidence of the tablets to make a clear distinction between those locations and the rooms that have access to the north-west courtyard, where Nos. 116 – 118 were found, especially because we have to allow for the possibility that some of them may have fallen from an upper storey.43

The ivories found in NE 2 cannot be used in conjunction with No. 108 or with the Esarhaddon prism fragments from the same room to indicate any single function at any date; and neither in NE 50 nor in NE 2 can it be proved that other objects deposited in the rooms are linked chronologically to the tablets. The latest use of the rooms being around 612 B.C., and the tablets from about a century earlier and scattered in antiquity, a close link between their content and provenance is not to be expected. In the case of NE 50 the excavator specifically noted that the tablets “were scattered about the room in the debris overlying the floor, and in neither case was there any apparent significance in the exact location of individual items” (Iraq 24 (1962) 20).

As for NW 20 and 21 in the north-western outer courtyard, David Oates commented on their exceptionally wide doorways and suggested that chariots were restored or repaired there, and that a workbench along one wall was used for this purpose.44 The few tablets found here cannot be said to confirm or to contradict this suggestion, but a possible comparison comes from Nuzi, where the house in which the records of the rab hanṣā-charioteer Kel-Teshub and his father were found also had unusually wide doors opening on to the courtyard.45

There is no clear indication from the Horse Lists themselves of the official in whose archives they might have been stored. Other tablets from NE 50 are certainly associated with the activities of the AGRIG (e.g. Nos. 87 – 88), and the key terms ša KASKAL and ša KUR are common to No. 87 and Nos. 107 – 111. On the other hand, there are few indications in other sources of any close association between the AGRIG and the army or the administration of equids. In view of the close link of some of the texts with the BE-qu (“muster”), one official who may have been closely involved with their drawing-up is the rab BE-qi, who is mentioned once with his deputy and scribe (ADD 1036.ii.22 – 27), but it is likely that official records were stored under the eye of one of the permanent staff of the Review Palace, such as for example “Qurdi-Adad, the scribe of the Review Palace of Kalhu” who witnessed the sale of land dated 709 B.C. and found at Khorsabad (ARU 113 = FNALD No. 2).

**Date**

No. 109 is clearly dated to the end of 716 B.C. There is good evidence that Sargon’s Babylonian campaigns of 710 – 708 are the background against which some of the other lists were written: No. 108 twice mentions Dur-Ladini, a town captured by Sargon during his first Babylonian campaign against Merodach-Baladan in 710 B.C., and used by the Assyrian army as a temporary base; Dur-Ladini may be restored also in No. 100.ii.5’. Borsippa is mentioned once in No. 103.ii.8, and the city is prominent in Sargon’s annals for the same year. The other lists can be dated with fair certainty to within a few
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years of 711 B.C. No. 102 is grouped by repetition of one series of names with No. 110 (from 716 B.C. if part of No. 109), and indirectly with Nos. 99—104 and 107—108. In both subject matter and prosopography there are close connexions also with tablets from the North-West Palace (see below), and almost all these tablets seem to date within the reign of Sargon. Finally, if we take all the names of eponyms for the period 717 to 711 B.C., we find them occurring with more than coincidental frequency in our Horse Lists:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>717</td>
<td>Tab-šar-Aššur</td>
<td>99, 103, 108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>716</td>
<td>Tab-šilli-Ešarra</td>
<td>99, 109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>715</td>
<td>Taklak-ana-Bel</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>714</td>
<td>Ištar-duri</td>
<td>99, 118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>713</td>
<td>Aššur-bani</td>
<td>99, 116</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Not all these men will be the same as the eponyms, but some of them seem certain to be, as shown in the Commentaries, and so confirm the general impression that the entire group belongs predominantly to the first 12 years or so of the reign of Sargon. There may be a considerable spread across these years, however, since differences in the composition of identical units in some of the texts, and changes in the rank or office of some of the officers, indicate that several of the texts are not drawn up on the same occasion; while the recurrence of officers of No. 110 in later texts (assuming it to belong with No. 109) serves as a warning not to take close prosopographical connexions as proof of closeness in time.

Connexions outside the archive

a) from Kalhu. As with the post-canonical groups it is possible to establish close connexions both of subject and of personnel between Fort Shalmaneser tablets and those from ZT, the administrative wing of the North-West Palace. ND 2386+ has provided particularly relevant information, and there are general and detailed connexions with other texts concerned with horses. It will certainly also prove possible to apply some of our dated information on the officers in the Horse Lists to the Nimrud Letters, one clear instance being supplied by NL 56, where the three mušarkisâni Aššur-našîr, Am[ba]ti and Bel-apkal-ilani all reappear in our lists, two of them with the same rank.

b) from Nineveh. Since much of Sargon's military correspondence was also found in Kouyunjik, it is not surprising that the administrative texts published in ADD Vol. II also include some with close links to ours. Thus ADD 855 has enough names overlapping with the list of mušarkisâni in No. 99 §J to be confidently identified as coming from the military

46 An exception being ND 2612 (Iraq 23 (1961) 37) dated to 735 B.C. in the reign of Tiglath-Pileser III, by the limmu Aššur-sallimanni.
47 Perhaps a different man with the same name.
48 So for example in No. 99 Bel-iqbi and Mannu-iddina-ahhe are subordinate to Šarru-emuranni, but in No. 101.iii.6—7 under Mannu-ki-Ninua.
49 Parker, Iraq 23 (1961) 23ff., especially: ND 2386; 2442; 2451; 2458; 2482; 2491; 2499; 2619; 2646; 2672; 2699; 2727; 2768; 2788; 2803.
50 Ambati restored after NL 105:13' (\(^1{an-ba-ti}\)\(^1{mu-šar-kis}\)).
administration of about the same time, and there are possible links with ADD 852. It is of course possible that these tablets were found at Nimrud (for Nimrud and Nineveh material was catalogued together in the British Museum in Layard’s time), but they could also have been transferred in antiquity from Kalhu to Nineveh, perhaps via Dur-Šarrukin, or even written in Dur-Šarrukin itself, since other ADD II texts, and letters in ABL, relate to the construction of the new capital. For details on ADD 852 and 855 see pp.43–5.

c) from Aššur. These form two distinct groups. First, the cuneiform tablets labelled “Protokolle über Pferdemustungen” by Schroeder, who copied and first studied them, KAV 31—38, 131—132, can now be dated to Sargon’s reign, on the basis of definite prosopographical connexions with Nos. 99—108 (see below, pp.41–3 in detail). Second, the three alphabetic Aramaic tablets from Aššur, first published by Lidzbarski and most recently treated by Lipiński, can similarly be linked to the Horse Lists prosopographically and dated to Sargon’s reign, confirming the 8th century date assigned to them on palaeographic grounds. These connexions are also discussed below, p.46.

Content and purpose

No two of the lists have exactly the same structure: some mention horses (and mules) explicitly, others probably did when they were unbroken, still others make no mention of equids. Nevertheless, they all refer to personnel from the cavalry and chariotry of the Assyrian army, and are tablets of the military administration which was based at this date in the Review Palace at Kalhu. This is hardly surprising when we read Esarhaddon’s description of the purpose for which he built the corresponding Review Palace (ekal mašarti) at Nineveh: “for organizing the campaign, and checking the horses, mules, chariots, military equipment and enemy plunder”.51

Only one term occurs in the lists themselves to show the specific occasion which gave rise to their preparation: the batqu or bitqu (written BE-qu etc.).52 We have here translated the word as “muster”, which fits well the contexts of this group of texts, but it should be borne in mind that the same translation will not suit contexts such as ABL 154 or 1180, where it implies an exaction of the government from the individual. In No. 109 the entire document is headed “Muster of horses [(and mules?)]”, and this demonstrates that the muster involved recording numbers of animals with the names of the officers responsible for them. The officers are listed in groups under a superior officer, and the lists sometimes include details of the horses using administrative terms whose exact implications remain uncertain (see on No. 107 for ša KASKAL/ša KUR and sallumu/šesu’u). Some of the tablets, like Nos. 99 and 103, are tidily arranged and carefully written, but the same does not apply to others, such as Nos. 100, 101, 102 and 108, which have frequent erasures and inconsistencies and give the impression of having been prepared as the muster took place, rather than subsequently in the calm of a scribal office. Occasionally the scribe makes a note which seems to indicate that the person was absent (NU) at the roll-call or present (qurbu); and in at least one case an additional column of figures was added on the left side of the tablet in order to accommodate further details about the number of horses (No. 107; No. 110.iii.11’—12’). All this is consistent with passages in the letters such as ABL 630:13’—16’: “Now, team-commanders (rab urâte)—whether (of?) a šaknu or (of?) the

51 Borger, Asarhaddon p. 59.
52 For this term see TCAE pp. 41—62, and for the question of its reading see note on No. 1:7 below.
muṣarkisānī—who are going for their muster (ina muḫḫi BE-qi-šā-nu) ...”, which shows us that team-commanders were present with their animals at the muster.

The exact purpose and content of the lists is in part dependent on when and where the musters took place. No. 109 is dated to the 13th month of the year, and the muster referred to in ABL 630 must also have been in a 13th month, to judge from the king’s instructions quoted in II. 7'–8' “make (them) [go? for] the horses on the 20th day of intercalary Addaru”. In all probability, these musters took place in the Review Palace, especially if we take account of the Esarhaddon passage saying “May I—every year without interruption—take stock (there) during (the month of) the New Year’s Festival, the first month, of all steeds, mules, donkeys and camels, of the harness and battle gear of all my troops, and of the booty taken from the enemy”. That such a muster was often the prelude to a military campaign is possible, but Sargon himself tells us that the month for “assembling the troops and completing the expedition” was the fourth month, Tammuz, in June/July (TCL 3, 11. 6–7), and what evidence we have therefore suggests that the musters which our lists recorded were annual stock-taking exercises rather than the immediate preparations for a campaign. During the Babylonian campaigns of 710–708 B.C., however, part of the army certainly remained in the south with the king, and he was in Babylon for the New Year Festival at the end of 710 and beginning of 709 B.C. This certainly accounts for the details from Dur-Ladini recorded in No. 108 and for the “muster of Borsippa” which is added at the end of the main muster in No. 103, although it need not necessarily imply that those texts were compiled around the New Year. Like most accounting operations, the musters will have served both to check the past actions of those responsible, and to determine the current position so that plans could be laid for the future. The editors have two possible hypotheses for the interpretation of some of the technical terms, depending on whether the lists are thought of as essentially prospective or retrospective. SMD prefers to see them mainly as lists drawn up at the close of the campaign. A muster would have been held of all equids, comprising both those which had come on the campaign and survived it, and those which had been captured or taken as tax from the subjected territories. Both categories would have been distributed among the rab urāti-officers for immediate use or future training. Only the units which fought in the campaign of that year are therefore represented. During the muster the horses were sorted into categories (Nos. 107–111), the smallest group being those which were too old or infirm for further service (BE akiltu, all found in the ša KASKAL column), the next being those which required training (see on unzarhu, šullāme etc., Nos. 103 and 107), and the largest category being those which were immediately fit for further duty, and so passed muster (ušēṣṭā etc., see on No. 107). With this reconstruction, the lists are essentially prospective. JNP would assume that the ša KUR horses had remained in Assyria since the last muster, so that only the ša KASKAL animals had been on the previous campaign; and šallunu and šēṣu’u he sees as accountants’ terms referring to the settling of earlier obligations and the incurring of fresh ones.

53 Slight revision of the translation offered in TCAE p. 287.
55 The few mentions of Dur-Ladini suggest that a full “muster” may not have taken place there. Note that the heading to ND 2451 (“Accounts of the eponymate of [PN], intercalary 6th month, [day x]”) suggests that the accounts (as opposed to the muster) may have been reviewed every six months, or perhaps annually at the end of the half year.
Although there are therefore areas admitting of disagreement as to the precise occasion and purpose of the horse lists, there can be no question that they constitute a major step forward in our knowledge of the composition and size of the Assyrian army. We have therefore thought it necessary to summarize some of the main implications of the new texts in the following section (see pp. 27–41).

Wine List Fragments Nos. 119-149.

These texts belong with the wine lists published by Kinnier Wilson in CTN I. Some are so fragmentary that we cannot be certain whether they are ration lists for wine or for some other commodity.

Date.

Kinnier Wilson suggested that the tablets published in NWL formed “a compact and largely contemporaneous group ... they span the last nine years of the reign of Adad-nirari III and the first four of Shalmaneser IV”. His dating was used by S. Parpola to put the tablets into chronological groups using internal connexions, and to suggest that the tablets represented a fairly large proportion of the original archive, being probably the remains of records of an allowance of wine made once a year. Parpola’s scheme has been applied to these remaining fragments and has not proved to be entirely valid. Briefly, No. 119 belongs to group II according to its heading, but to group I according to the writing A.SIG (not DUMU.SIG). No. 120 is group III according to the occurrence of Kusü, but group II according to the occurrence of Ninurta-mukin-ỉše and Şiili-Marduk, with connecting evidence; it does not come from SW 6.

Moreover, collation by C. Walker and S. Dalley has shown beyond any doubt that the eponym of NWL 9 is not Nabu-šarru-ušur of 786 B.C., but Nabu-bel-ušur of 745 or 732 B.C. The later of the two dates is almost certainly to be preferred, for the presence of Egyptian scribes and of Ethiopians or Nubians (Kusaya) makes good sense two years after Tiglath-Pileser III established overseers in Lower Egypt. This extends the period over which the wine lists were written by nearly 50 years, which makes it clear that we have only a tiny proportion of the whole archive extant.

If NWL 9 is dated to 732 B.C., NWL 8 and 21 can be grouped with it, for they have in common the name Nabu-šarru-ilani; NWL 8 and 9 both have the ruled off section of lines 2—3 with ginu and LU GAL.SAG.MES; NWL 8 and 21 have Kuniya in common (which may include NWL 31 in this chronological group). The Samarians in NWL 8 can as well be explained in the reign of Tiglath-Pileser III or Sargon as around the reign of Adad-nirari III.

The eponym date on NWL 8 has been collated and should almost certainly be read [ša]l-lim-a-ni. This would allow three possibilities: 751 (Marduk-šallimanni), 749 (Sin-šallimanni) and 735 (Aḥṣur-šallimanni). Considerations of spacing as well as connexions with NWL 9 make 735 B.C. the most likely date.

57 This means that broken names, including eponyms, will have to be restored with very great caution; and some of the details of Parpola’s grouping should be seen as caused by individual scribal habits and by alterations of format, rather than basic chronological differences. Joins between fragments are also less likely.
If Dur-Sarru-kin has been read correctly in No. 133, and if it refers to Khorsabad rather than to the place of the same name in Babylonia, that wine list dates to the reign of Sargon II. No. 135 is to be dated either in Tiglath-Pileser’s reign after 734 B.C., or after Sargon II marched into southern Palestine in 720 and 712 B.C.\(^\text{58}\) No. 143 mentioning Moab has the same possibilities for dating. NWL 23, with its reference to Babylonia and men of Borsippa may also date to the later 8th century.

**Provenance**

The detailed excavation catalogue provides definite information for grouping all the wine list fragments by findspot. Exact provenances are listed for each tablet on p. 264 below.

**SW 6 (NWL 1, 2, 3 (= No 145), 4, 5, 33; Nos. 145 – 149).**

Since the tablets here were found *in situ* in the wine store with wine jars, the archaeological context should be to some extent significant.\(^\text{59}\) The definite dates are: 779 (NWL 5) and 784 (NWL 3). No. 147 is dated to the eponym Šulmanu-asared, which gives a choice of 781 (Shalmaneser IV) or 723 (Shalmaneser V) or 857 (Shalmaneser III); because other tablets from this room have such a consistent grouping of dates in the 8th century, the earliest possible date of 857 is most unlikely.\(^\text{60}\) The room presumably continued in use down to the late 7th century; ivories and debris from an upper storey were found in the room, but no tablets of late 8th century date can be identified.

**NE 48 II (NWL 7, 14 (= No 124), 16, 24, 30 (= No. 120), 31; Nos. 119 – 132)**

This provenance, together with NE 48 level III and NE 49, is consistently less coherent than SW 6. To quote the final publication: “The texts were found in packed debris which had been used to raise the level of the floor when the chambers were reoccupied and enlarged by exposing the old, inner face of the ninth century north wall, after 612 B.C.”\(^\text{61}\) Levels II and III represented only stages in one operation of debris-packing, and do not necessarily have chronological implications for the tablets. There are no definite dates for tablets from this level, but No. 124 = NWL 14 can be dated with near certainty around 784 B.C.

**NE 48 III (NWL 8 – 12, 15 – 23, 25 – 6, 28 – 9, 32; Nos. 133 – 140)**

Definite dating evidence for tablets from this level is: 732 (NWL 9, to which are closely connected NWL 8 and 21), reign of Tiglath-Pileser III; Nos. 133, 135 and 136, reign of Tiglath-Pileser III or Sargon II. However, not all the fragments in this group can be allotted to that date, for NWL 18 certainly must be dated early in the 8th century by its clear connections with NWL 2 and 3.\(^\text{62}\)

---

\(^{58}\) See Tadmor, *JCS* 12 (1958) 83.


\(^{60}\) This is the date given with misleading certainty in NR II, 384.


\(^{62}\) *Harranaya/Hulaya is therefore probably wrongly restored in rev. 24a.*
The only definite dating evidence from these tablets comes from No. 143 in which the Moabite ambassador is mentioned, which probably implies a date in Tiglath-Pileser III's or Sargon II's reign. No. 144 may perhaps be dated to the early 8th century.

The increased evidence shows that the three NE provenance groups may contain texts spread over as much as a century, roughly from 800 to 700 B.C., with the possibility of a hiatus from the reign of Aššur-nirari V to that of Tigrath-Pileser III, from 754–744 approximately. There is no reason to suppose that any of the SW 6 texts belong to the later period.

**Content**

The texts published in NWL did not contain explicit evidence for showing to what foreign gentilics referred. Kinnier Wilson suggested that they were captives from campaigns. 63 The new fragments indicate that they also included leaders and ambassadors from the countries concerned who were present in an official capacity. The terms used are: ḫuṣțûnaša kuritu'a 143.ii.9' and LU MAH kuralamāya 145.iv.26.

Drinking vessels shaped like a lion's head, which are represented on reliefs of Sargon II, occur in Nos. 135 and 144; in both texts they may be used for foreign emissaries.

One of four Nimrud texts concerning the substitute king is edited here as No. 141 for the first time; it comes from NE 49. The other substitute king text from Fort Shalmaneser was published as NWL No. 33.64

The Wine Lists and the Horse Lists were found sometimes together in Fort Shalmaneser. The only preserved month on the latter is intercalary Addar, the last month of the year. The Wine Lists have Nisan at least three times, the first month of the year, and Addar twice (once intercalary). It is possible that the same event in the military calendar gave rise to the muster of equids, and the feasting of the army with members of the royal family and foreign emissaries; at least the texts represent a peak of activity between campaigns. They all belong to quite a late phase in the use of the building; none of the tablets describe the activities of the original building phase inaugurated by Shalmaneser III. The building was clearly used for military purposes in the reigns of Tigrath-Pileser III and Sargon II, but there is no evidence from the texts published here to show that Esarhaddon, who is known to be responsible for a major rebuilding, used the Review Palace for the administration of his army.65

Some of the early Wine Lists, like the Horse Lists, can be connected almost certainly with contemporary texts from the citadel at Nimrud in the Governor's Palace Archive (CTN II), by personal names. Although the usual cautions against over-enthusiastic identification apply here, coincidence can be virtually eliminated by grouping. Most convincing is GPA 68, dated 781 B.C. which shares five names in common with NWL 1–4, all dated around 784 B.C. and gives valuable evidence for professions: Ahi-šamšî mišarkisu (NWL 3), Burzinanu the doctor (NWL 2, 3), Šamaš-kumua the scribe (NWL 2,

---

63 NWL pp. 92–4.
64 This text probably consists only of ND 6213, found in E1. ND 6227 should perhaps not be joined to it, as it is of standard wine list type in content, and was found in SW6.
65 See Borger, Asarhaddon p. 34, and NR II especially p. 587.
3, which suggests that the repeated profession of NWL 3.ii.15—19 is L[U A B], Šilli-Ištar the rab ekalli of the new palace (NWL 4) and Šilli-Nergal the rab ekalli of the old palace (NWL 1). Other possible identifications are: Nergal-ahu-iddin of NWL 1—3 who occurs with Šamaš-kumua in GPA 57 (date missing); Bel-ali the rab kallāpi of GPA 9 (text of Bel-issiya 791—756), and possibly Marduk-nadin-ahhe the rab kallāpi of GPA 23 (dated 754). Possibly the name of the goldsmith in NWL 1.iii.24 may be read as ṣi-si-e1 in view of the goldsmith spelt zi-zi-i in GPA 57, a text which has other connexions with NWL 1—3. Pani-Aššur-lamur in NWL 18.rev.11 may be the governor of Ashur who served Adad-nirari III and whose seal, found at Kish, is in the Ashmolean Museum, published by Buchanan as no. 630; he may also be the creditor in GPA 91:6 (dated 797 B.C.).

These links add further small but useful details to the Wine Lists and demonstrate the remarkable way in which new texts throw light on those previously published.
New Light on the Composition of Sargon's army

The Horse Lists, Nos.85, 98–118, have contributed to our knowledge of Sargon's army not only through analysis of the material which they contain, but also because they have enabled us to give an approximate date to ADD 855, ADD 852, the Ashur Protokolle and three Aramaic clay tablets from Ashur, and to identify some of the people named in them. The combination of evidence from all these sources presents new information about the ranks, numbers, origins and organizations of equestrian officers in the home army of Assyria, the kišir šarrūti.1

Although it might have been more circumspect to wait for a hypothetical full edition in the future of all letters belonging to Sargon's reign from Nimrud and Kuyunjik,2 as well as the administrative texts from the North West Palace at Nimrud,3 it is self-evident that cuneiform material is never finite, and that long delays in writing syntheses do not stimulate progress in research. The discussion which follows will certainly need alteration when future editions bring more evidence to the subject, and it should not be treated as unalterable fact.

One basic difficulty cannot be overcome at present, and should be taken into consideration throughout, concerning the terms loosely labelled “professions”. These can be divided into three types: group terms such as LÚ IR E.GAL and LÚ SAG, under which other terms of “professions” may be subsumed; secondly terms which may refer to a person's duties at a particular, temporary task and which may therefore be applied to a man simultaneously with other terms of profession; an example may be šaknu ša ma'assit; and thirdly terms which refer to a full-time occupation or rank, such as rab ekallī, LÚ Gilš.GIGIR etc. These three types are certainly all present in the following discussion, but often they cannot be differentiated with certainty. Some may have partial synonyms that may be regarded as belonging to the second or third type. It is obvious from this that we cannot assume a promotion from one “profession” to another just because a particular officer is named with different titles in two texts, even if we had accurate relative or absolute dates for the two texts.

Another problem is, that there is never any guarantee that the same name means the same man, even when a title is given. When a fixed grouping occurs, there is near-certainty; but even with the Horse Lists themselves, there are two men named Babilaya, and two Kakku-ereš, who are both mušarkisāni; there are at least two named Nergal-šarru-usur who belong to different categories.

Yet another limitation is that only equestrian officers in the home army are discussed here. We have not identified any provincial contingents with certainty; and there are no non-equestrian soldiers such as archers or slingers in the texts. If the better-preserved texts among the Horse Lists all refer to the Babylonian campaign of Sargon, even equestrian units may be omitted from the lists if they did not take part in those campaigns.

1 It was recognized even before Manitius wrote his work, Das stehende Heer der Assyrerkönige und seine Organisation (ZA 24 (1910)), that the standing army of the Assyrian homeland was probably known collectively as the kišir šarrūti.
2 I.e. those that can be dated from ABL and CT 53, possibly also KAV.
3 Principally B. Parker, Iraq 23 (1961), but also some pieces in D. J. Wiseman, Iraq 15 (1953)135ff., and other pieces unpublished.
Several indications will be discussed which show that the army was not composed of exactly the same units during the years which preceded and succeeded Sargon’s reign. It is not possible, therefore, to apply our findings here wholesale to the Late Assyrian period; indeed, one of the useful facets of this study is to highlight a few differences between the composition of parts of the home army in Sargon’s reign, and that under Tiglath-Pileser III before him or Sennacherib after him.

Military Ranks and Titles

LŪ GAL.GAL.MES
The Horse Lists have shown that a large number of officers belonged to this class. They include mušarkisānī4 and šaknūtē ša ma’assī “those in charge of ma’assu-stables”, and perhaps also the rab alāni “quartermaster” or “village inspector”, the šārip duhšē, a specialised leather-worker, karkadinnu “vicualler”, murabbānu “personal tutor” or “horse trainer”, and taššīšu,5 a type of charioteer, the “third man”6 if the tentative identifications made in No.99 §A are valid.

There is a small, uncertain, indication that LŪ GAL.GAL.MES were, all or some of them,7 “eunuchs” LŪ SAG.MES. The following items could be taken as evidence, although none is certain:— Nergal-šarru-šurū the mušarkisu of No.99 §A, may be the eunuch of the Crown Prince in ADD 416, if the two are the same man;8 Pāni-Âššur-lamu the mušarkisu of No.103 rev.i may be the šrsy (LŪ SAG) of Sargon on a Khorsabad sealing;9 and the list of mušarkisānī in ND 2386 has a broken summary ending LŪ SAG.MES-te, which may be taken to imply that the mušarkisānī were eunuchs, although other interpretations are possible. Kinnier Wilson has pointed out that LŪ.SAG.MES “eunuchs” may be equated, at least in part, with Ir.E.GAL “palace servants”,10 and it is possible that this title summarises the types of profession listed above such as karkadinnu and šārip duhšē.

Each of those LŪ GAL.GAL.MES in the Horse Lists who are also mušarkisānī command one rab urāte “commander of teams”. Other LŪ GAL.GAL.MES command more than one rab urāte. In some circumstances there may have been two ranks of LŪ GAL.GAL.MES, to judge from the two-tier arrangement of No.99 §B.

mušarkisu
It has become clear that there was a large number of these men during Sargon’s reign, a minimum of 76 names listed below; that they counted among the LŪ GAL.GAL.MES; and they did not form a unit under a commander. Their role has been discussed in several different aspects. Postgate stressed their connection with the supply of horses for the army;11 Saggs suggested that they were secretaries or adjutants on the staff of high

4 For possible translations of this term, see below, p.29. See also notes on No. 99 §§A and J.
5 As well as Kur-ilaya who is discussed in the note on No. 99.i.23 we may add Bir-amma, probably mušarkisu in ADD 855 obv. 18’, and taššīšu in ADD 476, where he occurs with Šarru-lu-dari, perhaps the mušarkisu of No. 99.i.10.
6 See NWL p. 50–51.
7 If Sin-ahhe in No. 99 §A is Sennacherib, the king’s son, he would not, of course, be a eunuch.
8 See note on No. 99.i.6.
9 See note on No. 103 rev.i.6 and p.38 with note 68.
10 NWL p. 49.
11 TCAE pp. 144–5.
officials; Kinnier Wilson that they were “headquarter staff” who were responsible for distribution, and Parpola that they were responsible for collecting raksûte-soldiers, translating mušarkîsu as “recruiter.”

The Horse Lists confirm the connexion with horses. Each mušarkîsu is assigned a single “commander of teams”. Several categories of mušarkîsu are now attested:

- sa pethal qurubte “of the qurūbu-cavalry”, ND 2386+.ii.16’—17’, (no.99§A)
- sa GIS.GIGIR qurubte “of the qurūbu-chariots” No.103 obv.
- sa GIS.GIGIR ekalli “of the palace chariots” No.103 rev.ii.5—6
- sa¹⁶ šaglâte “of the (unit of) deportees” ND 2386+.iii.14—15
- sa GIS.GIGIR “of the chariot-owners” NWL texts 9, 10, 18 and 31.

In those Horse Lists which number horses in the categories sa KUR and sa KASKAL, it is noticeable that the mušarkîsînî, alone of all the groups of officers, have a sa KUR category only. This suggests that the mušarkîsînî did not take active part in campaigns; further interpretation depends on whether the Horse Lists record a muster before or after a campaign.

The following list gives the basic information on all mušarkîsînî of Sargon’s reign whom we have been able to identify definitely. Note however that the identification of No. 99 §A as a list of mušarkîsînî rests only on Bel-Harran-sadua, and on comparison of the section’s format with §J.

List of mušarkîsînî from the reign of Sargon II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>马高 y</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abi-lešir</td>
<td></td>
<td>sa p.q.(?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adad-abua</td>
<td>ND 2386</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adad-ahu-iddin</td>
<td>No.99 §J</td>
<td>sa m.q.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adad-iqbi</td>
<td>ND 2386</td>
<td>sa p.q.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adad-taklak</td>
<td>ND 2386</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahiya</td>
<td>ND 2386</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahu-ilaya</td>
<td>No.99 §A</td>
<td>sa p.q.(?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahu-larame</td>
<td>No.99 §J</td>
<td>sa m.q.(?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahi-uqur</td>
<td>No.99 §A</td>
<td>sa p.q.(?)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13 NWL p. 56.
15 JNP considers that the “palace chariots” refers specifically to those units in the kišir šarrûti which came directly under the command of the chief eunuch (i.e. principally the “city units”), in contrast to those in the royal entourage (qurūbu). Note other occurrences: rab kiširmeš ša E.GAL (ADD 1036.iii.19—20); GIS.GIGIR.MES ša E.GAL (ABL 306:26); perhaps also ND 2482:13—14. The palace in question is very likely the Review Palace. SMD thinks that there is not yet enough clear evidence for defining the “palace chariots”.
16 It is now necessary to correct the opinion expressed in TCAE pp. 139 and 145, that the mušarkîsu ša šaglâte was in charge of the assembly of deportees. For the equestrian unit of deportees or exiles, see below p.37.
17 See the comment of Kinnier Wilson on these occurrences, raising the question of whether one should understand “of” (the chariot-owners) or “and” (the chariot-owners): NWL p. 56.
18 See above, p.21.
19 Note that the four named in ADD 1179 from Sennacherib’s reign are not duplicated in any of the lists from Sargon’s reign. Alternative titles are discussed in the notes on the appropriate Horse Lists. None of the scribes of Sargon are attested as mušarkîsînî, notably Nabu-šallimšunu and Qurdi-Adad.
Ahua-eriba  ND 2788
Ambati  NL 56; NL 105
Aššur-ahu-iddin  ADD 855
Aššuraya  ND 2386
Aššur-naṣir  No.99 §J; No.101; No.103; No.108; NL 56  ša.m.e.
Aššur-remanni  No.99 §J; No.108; ADD 855  ša.m.e.
Aya-ramu  No.99 §J; No.103  ša.m.e.
Babilaya I  No.99 §J; No.103; ADD 855  ša.m.e.
Babilaya II  No.99 §J; No.100; No.103; ADD 855  ša.m.e.
Bel-ahhe  No.99 §J; No.103  ša.m.e.
Bel-ahu-uṣur  ND 2386  ša.p.q.
Bel-apkal-ilani  No.99 §J; NL 56; ADD 855  ša.m.q.(?)
Bel-duri  No.99 §A  ša.p.q.(?)
Bel-Harran-šadua  No.99 §A; ND 2386  ša.p.q.
Bibiya  No.99 §A  ša.p.q.(?)
Bir-amma  ADD 855
Bisunu  No.99 §J; No.103; ADD 855  ša.m.e.
Dada  No.99 §A  ša.p.q.(?)
Gabbaru  No.99 §J; No.103(?)  ša.m.q.(?)
Haldu  ND 2386  ša.p.q.
Handasaniu  ADD 855; ND 2788
Harmaku  No.99 §A  ša.p.q.(?)
Išme-ili  No.99 §J; No.103; No.108  ša.m.e.
Ištar-šumu-iqiš(a?)  ND 2788
Kabti  ND 2386  ša.m.e.
Kakku-ereš I  No.102; No.103
Kakku-ereš II  No.102
Kalbu  ND 2386
Kalhaya  No.99 §A  ša.p.q.(?)
Kanunaya  No.99 §A  ša.p.q.(?)
Kundaya(?)  ND 2386  ša.p.q.
Mardu-k-eriba  ADD 855; ND 2788
Mušallim-Aššur  No.99 §J  ša.m.q.(?)
Nabu-bel-šumatu  No.99 §J; No.103; No.108  ša.m.e.
Nabu-eriba  No.99 §J; No.108  ša.m.e.
Nabu-il  No.108
Nabu-naṣir  No.103  ša.m.e.
Nabu-šumu-uṣur  No.99 §J; No.100  ša.m.e.
Nanusu  No.102; ND 2386  ša.p.q.
Nergal-iqbi  ND 2386  ša.p.q.
Nergal-šarru-uṣur  No.99 §A  ša.p.q.(?)
Ninurta-abu-uṣur  No.99 §J; No.103; No.108  ša.m.e.
Ninurta-na’id(?)  No.101
Pani-Aššur-lamur  No.103; No.108  ša.m.e.
Paqihi  No.99 §A  ša.p.q.(?)
Qate-ili-gabbu  No.99 §J; No.103  ša.m.q.
These officers are subordinate to the LÚ GAL.GAL.MEŠ. Since none of the names occurs elsewhere with the designation LU.SAG, there is no reason to suppose that they were eunuchs. Kinnier Wilson has pointed out that EN GIS.GIGIR "bearded owners of chariots" can be equated with EN GIS.GIGIR qurubtu, "owners of qurubtu-chariots"20 which reinforces the argument that sa qurbute-officers were not eunuchs.21

The Horse Lists show that the rab urâte “commander of teams” could also serve as rab kišri “captain”. Comparisons with names and professions in the Ashur Protokolle show that LÚ GIS.GIGIR “charioteer” was almost certainly the profession of men who were also rab urâte and rab kišri.22 Moreover, Ame-Atar the rab kišri in KAV 132 is almost certainly the same man as the rab hanšē in KAV 31; in support of this is Nergal-ahu-ušur, rab hanšē in ARU 357 (dated 699 B.C.), found as rab kišri in No. 102.iii.7. However, there is still no evidence to show what distinction exists between rab kišri and rab hanšē, and there is no absolute or relative dating for the Ashur Protokolle.23

20 NWL p. 49.
21 This supposes that one accepts the equation of qurubtu with sa qurbūte, and the partial identity of men called rab urâte and rab kišri with sa qurbūte-officers, discussed below.
22 See below, p.42.
23 For a revision of the view given in TCAE p. 221 see Postgate, An.St. 30 (1980) 72 n.2. Note that the complete text KAV 31 gives ten LÚ.GIŠ.GIGIR for one rab hanšē.
The **rab urāte** in No.99 §A are attached to men who have been identified as *mušarkisu* of *qurubtu*-cavalry. This shows that the term **rab urāte** is not confined to chariotry teams alone, but can equally be applied to cavalry commanders. The same is true of **LŪ GIS.GIGIR**, as has already been shown elsewhere; despite its apparent meaning as "charioteer", it can also refer to cavalrymen. Presumably the ambiguity in these two terms, **rab urāte** and **LŪ GIS.GIGIR**, has its origins in the development of equestrian units from chariory only to an expansion of those units with cavalry.

Three names from the Horse Lists recur in ND 2803 as *ša qurbūte* officers, namely Kubaba-ilaya **rab kīšri**-captain of the Aramean unit; Puli captain of the Aramean unit, and Ištar-duri the "commander of teams" of Paqihi; the date of that text cannot be later than 708 B.C., nor earlier than 713 B.C. To these can be added two further examples: Bel-Harran-sarru-usur the "commander of teams" in No.107.i.24' who is probably the *ša qurbūte* named in ARU 186 (dated 694 B.C.), and Balasi the "commander of teams" of No.99.i.8 may be the *ša qurbūte* of ARU 396 (dated 693 or 688 B.C.). This seems to show that the *ša qurbūte* officers came from the ranks of the **rab urāte**/**rab kīšri**, and from different units of the home army, and that the change of title denotes either promotion or a partial synonym for a group status.

It seems virtually certain that a distinction should be made between **EN GIS.GIGIR** and **LŪ GIS.GIGIR**, as maintained by Weidner; recent support comes from ND 2489.iii.3, in which both terms occur. However, the two cannot be defined more precisely from the Horse Lists. It is also apparent that *ša qurbūte* (when taken as a variant writing for *ša qurbiite*) cannot be equated with **EN GIS.GIGIR** because the two are itemised separately in three texts.

**ša qurbūte**

With this term the problem recurs as to which type of professional term it is. That *ša qurbūte* officers were concerned with both chariotry and cavalry is clear, but we are not certain whether this should be interpreted as two distinct kinds, or whether every *ša qurbūte* charioteer had a retinue of *ša qurbūte* cavalry.

The functions of the *ša qurbūte* have been described by Saggs as "the links between the king and the local administrations in confidential matters"; Klauber thought that there were two different kinds, ordinary soldiers and confidential agents. See NL 89:9—15 in TCAE, especially note on p. 385. JNP now doubts that his earlier interpretation of that text is correct; and it is the sole evidence for **LŪ GIS.GIGIR** as a term including both cavaliers and charioteers.

Dalta, ruler of Ellipi, is mentioned in rev. ii.15. According to the chronological scheme established by Tadmor, JCS 12 (1958) 95—6, he was first subdued in 713 and died in 708 B.C. Although Puli's title is broken in ND 2803 the restoration is very probable.

24 Weidner, TH p. 11 n.40.
25 Dalta, ruler of Ellipi, is mentioned in rev. ii.15. According to the chronological scheme established by Tadmor, JCS 12 (1958) 95—6, he was first subdued in 713 and died in 708 B.C. Although Puli's title is broken in ND 2803 the restoration is very probable.
26 Weidner, TH p. 11 n.40.
28 See ND 2489.1.7—8; ND 2371.7—8; NWL No. 6:7,12.
29 ND 2386+.ii.17*: *mušarkisāni ša pethallī qurubte*; Borger, Ash. 106:16 **LŪ GIS.GIGIR** *qurubte* **LŪ pethal qurubte**, and probably No. 101.i.3—5 (see note on those lines). The assumption is made that **LŪ GIS.GIGIR** *qurubte* is the same as a *ša qurbūte* charioteer, and that **LŪ pethal qurubte** is the same as a *ša qurbūte* cavalryman.
31 Klauber, *Beamtenum* pp. 105—111.
Evidence from the Horse Lists combined with that from other Nimrud and Ashur texts shows that ša qurbūte officers could at some point in their careers serve in units which were not immediately close to the king: the evidence of Kubaba-ilaya and Puli from the Aramean unit has been described above. They were drawn from the commanders of teams and captains, and were not eunuchs. This evidence can be extended if texts from a wider sphere are considered; Abi-ul-idi the ša qurbūte kaldaya of ABL 742 can now be interpreted as an officer attached to the unit of Chaldeans rather than an ethnic Chaldean, although he does not appear in the Horse Lists; and the officer named in ARU 183 (undated) and described as ša qurbūte ša šēpe shows that a ša qurbūte officer could be attached to or drawn from the ša šēpe unit (discussed below). But it is clear that qurubtu and ekallu are distinct, since the mušarkisāni in No.103 are divided between ša GIS.GIGIR qurubte and ša GIS.GIGIR E.GAL.

In conclusion, the ša qurbūte in general could be regarded quite separately from the ša šēpe, but some were attached to that unit and others were attached to or drawn from many different units of the home army. This would imply that they did not form their own unit; nevertheless, there is evidence that ša qurbūte did form specific units on the left and right of the king according to No.108.i.7—8, and this can be connected directly with two passages from the royal inscriptions of Sargon to show that 1,000 qurubtu cavalry marched constantly at the side of the king. The new evidence which comes from the study of the Horse Lists and associated texts has helped us to understand certain details in references to the ša qurbūte, but it has not allowed the analysis of their overall organization to progress much beyond what Klauber deduced in 1910.

šaknūte ša ma'assu

These seem always to be four in number, and various LÚ.GAL.GAL.MES are found with this title. Like the mušarkisāni they do not seem to have been attached to particular units. Probably they were in charge of stabling arrangements. There is a good possibility that they were eunuchs if Nergal-šarru-uṣur is the same man in No.103 rev.ii.8 and in ADD 416. It is suggested below, p.36 that they may possibly have been attached to the main four city units of the home, standing army.

32 Rab kişri-captains, at least those witnessing contracts from Kuyunjik, were often ša qurbūte, see e.g. ARU 231.
33 SMD does not share the view expressed in TCAE p. 194 that the ša qurbūte “does not hold any definite position in the military hierarchy”; JNP would now characterize the title as a status, which is not incompatible with various specific military ranks.
34 This letter was written by Assur-dur-paniya; according to Parpola, OAC XVII chart 3, he was Sargon’s governor in Sabirešu.
35 Signs collated by Mr. C. B. F. Walker.
36 e.g. Klauber, PRT No. 44:6; ARU 558.
37 TCL 3, 11. 130ff., and Lie, Sargon, p. 40 l.257.
38 See Kinnier Wilson, NWL p. 49.
39 The rank of šaknu is discussed by JNP, An.St. 30 (1980) 70; a possible interpretation of ma'assu is offered in TCAE p. 210 n.3.
40 See note on No. 99.i.6.
List of šak núte ša ma' as si from the reign of Sargon II.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aššur-šarru-uṣur</td>
<td>99 103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Babilaya</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bel-dūrī</td>
<td>100 ND 2386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daʾīṣu</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mannu-ki-Ninua?</td>
<td>101?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marduk-belu-uṣur</td>
<td>ND 2386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nergal-šarru-uṣur</td>
<td>100? 103 ND 2386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ninurta-šarru-ibni?</td>
<td>101?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sin-Ša'id</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Šamaš-taklak</td>
<td>99 103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Šarru-emuranni</td>
<td>99 101?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Šepe-ʾAššur</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DN-x-uṣur</td>
<td>ND 2386</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**kallāpu**

They are only represented in a few of the Horse Lists, Nos.112—114 and perhaps 118. Possibly there were two types: those who belonged to the express messenger service, and those whose military duties included sapper work. SMD thinks that all kallāpu were mounted as light, mobile and versatile troops who are mentioned in the casualty lists along with the chariotry and regular cavalry, further differences between pethalu and kallāpu presumably consist of weaponry, armour and organisation of units.

They were commanded by a rab kallāpānī. ND 2706 shows that a rab kallāpānī could be appointed as a musarkisu, which underlines the problem of distinguishing fighting men from purely administrative men.

Their equids were counted in “teams” urū, but as seen with the rab urāte, it is very likely that urū and urāte include cavalry horses as well as chariotry teams.

**Types of chariot**

There were probably three types, which are grouped together in various Nimrud Wine Lists, and are also found in the Horse Lists. They are: the light, 2-horse chariot, (GIS.GIGIR) G1R.2, which had been used for the royal bodyguard, ša šēpē, in Nuzi times; the (GIS.GIGIR) GAB, probably a heavier chariot; and the most heavily armoured chariot, (GIS.GIGIR) tahlipi. It is not known whether all three types were used in all chariotry.

---

41 The kallāp šipīritu (see CAD s.v. kallāpu; Malbran-Labat, L’armée de l’Assyrie, pp. 82–3.
42 There are several passages, quoted in CAD K, pp. 77–8, in which equids are supplied to kallāpu, as well as in our Horse Lists; see also commentary on No. 112. JNP is however still prepared to give a translation such as “light infantry” serious consideration.
44 Kendall, Warfare, pp. 57–62. JNP doubts whether G1R.2 refers directly to a type of chariot, rather than to the position of a body of chariotry within the army.
45 For the difficult (GIS.)GAB.MES see notes on No. 87,31 and No. 111,1.2’.
46 See Borger, AOAT 33, p. 103, for this reading of TAH.KAL in preference to AHw tahl-tan (s.v. taktu), and note the boast of Tukulti-Ninurta I in his epic that he battled bravely balum tahlīpi (AHw tahlīpu “Panzerung”).
units. The *taššušu* “third man” charioteer who has the title *dannu* or *šanišu*⁴⁷ may have been a kind of squadron leader, but there is no information about the type of chariot in which he rode. Three other types of military vehicle occur in No.103, and are discussed in the commentary on that text.

**Units of the Army**

As far as the Horse Lists give clear evidence, the various equestrian units of the home army are listed in a fairly standard order. No provincial units have been recognised with any certainty, although some suggestions are given below, and some of the texts omit one particular unit. But certain elements of a general and consistent order can be observed, particularly in Nos. 99, 101, 102 and 108.

The order of administrative groups and fighting units associated with them in No.99 is as follows. First, the *mušarkisânu* of *qurubtu*-cavalry, discussed above, who are associated with equids from Dur Ladinni in Babylonia in No.108.

Then comes the unit of Šarru-emuranni, the only officer to command both *rab urâte* and *Lû GAL.GAL.MES*, which underlines his importance. It is very likely that he is the same Šarru-emuranni as became governor in northern Babylonia after 709 B.C.; he may have been the governor of Mazama until that time.⁴⁸

There follows an unidentified unit consisting mainly of men with West Semitic names under Kakku-šarru-ušur. There is evidence from the annals of Sargon that certain provincial troops from Babylonia joined the home army in the campaign into Babylonia. A governor of Gambulu, whose name is not known and whose capital was Dur-Athara (renamed Dur-Nabu) almost certainly supplied troops,⁴⁹ and it is possible that Kakku-šarru-ušur should be identified with that governor.

Then comes a unit of Chaldeans which was almost certainly formed before Sargon conquered Babylon; the presence of a piece of real estate at Kalhu described as *ummu ša 10kaldaya* in ARU 395 is probably connected, and may show that this unit had been formed by 715 B.C. with a base at Kalhu. This unit has no named commander.⁵⁰ If the hypotheses for the previous two units are correct, and if the connection of the first unit with Dur Ladinni is significant, all four of these units have connections with Babylonia.

Next comes a unit of Samarians. They were commanded by Nabu-belu-uki who may be the *sukkalitu* of that name.⁵¹ This unit was presumably formed after the capture of Samaria at the beginning of Sargon’s reign. It was clearly allowed to retain its national identity, and was not amalgamated with the unit of *saglûte*-deportees.

It may be right to view these units as provincial contingents, but there are possible arguments against this. One is, that the units of Kakku-šarru-ušur, of the Chaldeans and of the Samarians all include names which recur in the Ashur Protokolle; if those Ashur texts represent the administration of the chief eunuch as commander of the home army (which is not certain) he may have commanded those three units,⁵² and that might explain why names from more than one unit are found mixed on a single tablet. The other is, that

---

⁴⁷ See index of professions for references.
⁴⁸ See notes on No. 99 §B.
⁴⁹ Lie, Sargon, p. 44 1. 283 and p. 45 note 9.
⁵⁰ See commentary on No. 99 §D.
⁵¹ See note on No. 99 ii. 23.
⁵² See below, p.43, on KAV 31 – 38. 131 – 132.
they are not commanded by known provincial governors; one might expect Šarru-emuranni to command the Chaldeans if he was (or was to become) the governor of Babylonia. Such arguments are not conclusive.

There follow three units, under Taklak-ana-Bel, Adallal and Nergal-šarrani respectively. They may be provincial or home-based.53

Then comes a section of mušarkisānī, probably consisting of two kinds: 'suppliers' of qurubtu-charioty and 'suppliers' of palace chariotry.

They are followed by four sections for stable officers, šaknūtē ša ma'assī, who are discussed above, pp.33—4.

The “City Units”

Nos. 101 and 108 list a combination of those units just described with others which we have labelled “city units” and which definitely do not have a provincial origin. They can be seen as the core of the standing, home army, and according to evidence from No.102 they were commanded by the chief eunuch.

The Assyrian Unit. This always comes first among the “city units”, and is the largest of them. The determinative before aššuraya is preserved as KUR in No.111:21', showing that the unit came from the core of the Assyrian homeland rather than from the city of Ashur.54 It should be noted that Sargon II renewed the status of kidinnātu to the city of Ashur during his reign (the exact year is unknown), and specified in the Charter of Ashur that civilians who were “sons of Ashur city” were freed from corvée work and from military call-up.55 Presumably this privilege would not exclude the maintenance of a full-time, professional equestrian unit by the city.56

The Arrapha Unit always follows the Assyrian unit. The names of its captains do not exhibit any clear regional characteristic.

The Aramean Unit. There is no evidence from the Horse Lists about the date or origin of its formation. However, a very tentative suggestion may be made, that the unit was formed when Tiglath-Pileser III annexed Lahiru and counted it within the borders of Arrapha province;57 the unit always follows Arrapha in the Horse List sequence. A slight possibility of support for this comes from two sources. In ND 2386+.ii.9’—13’ the sequence Arzuhina / Lahiru / Arrapha could be interpreted as parallel to the sequence Arrapha / Arameans / Arzuhina in the Horse Lists; and in No.103.ii.9 Daiššu is found third in a group of four šaknūtē ša ma‘assī. If Arzuhina were omitted, as it is in Nos.101 and 108; if Daiššu is Daiššanu the ruler of Lahiru in Sargon’s annals; if Lahiru is the city on which the Aramean unit was based, then the four stable officers, šaknūtē ša ma‘assī, may be responsible for the four city units Ashur, Arrapha, Arameans and Arbil. More evidence is needed before this can be considered to be better than a very faint possibility. Another possible piece of evidence comes from a record of real estate at Kalhu, ARU 394,

53 Following the lead offered by Šarru-emuranni and Taklak-ana-Bel, both attested elsewhere as provincial governors (see on No. 99 §F), it is very likely that, with perhaps the exception of the Samaritans and Chaldeans, most if not all of the contingents listed in No. 99 §§B-H are supplied by provincial governors. There is no evidence to show whether these contingents counted in the kisir šarrāti.

54 NL 89:21 may be a reference to this Assyrian Unit (KUR aššuraya; see TCAE p. 384 with pp. 220 and 225).

55 The text is now fully edited by Saggs in Iraq 37 (1975); see especially p. 14 line 33 and p. 16 lines 38—40. The year in which the privileges were granted is not known.

56 Horses of URU.SA.URU are mentioned in KAV 133 r.6—7.

57 Luckenbill, ARAB I §789, §§805—6.
dated 717 B.C., in which the *ummu ša*¹⁰aramaya is mentioned. If it is connected with this unit, and is comparable to the *ummu ša*¹⁰kaldaya mentioned in ARU 395 discussed above, it may show that at least part of this unit had a base at Kalhu in 717 B.C.⁵⁸

*The Arzuhina Unit.* This seems to be omitted in Nos. 101, 108, 110 and 111, which could be explained in at least two ways. Either this unit did not take part in the muster represented by those texts; or it had not been formed when those texts were written.⁵⁹

*The Arbil Unit.* The names in this unit are characterised by a high proportion compounded with the name of Istar, the city’s patron deity.

These city units were commanded by the chief eunuch, *rab ša rēšē*, according to the evidence of No. 102. There were some *ša qurbûte* officers among their captains.⁶⁰ Individual unit commanders do not appear to be named. There is no information that definitely shows whether they consisted of chariotry or cavalry or both. Presumably they formed the backbone of the *kišir šarrûti* home army, together with the king’s entourage, the *ša qurbûte* of left and right, and the *ša šēpê* unit.

*The Deportee Unit.* It served under its own commander, the *rab šaglûte* “commander of deportees”⁶¹ who was in turn probably subordinate to the chief eunuch. It was supplied by at least five *mušarkisâni ša*¹²šaglûte.⁶² It consisted of deportees or exiles who were professional soldiers. Unlike the officers of the Samarian unit, they lost their national identities in the standing army of Assyria; presumably they included crack chariotry and cavalry from Carchemish and Hamath, for example.⁶³ There is not enough evidence to suggest when this unit was first formed; and it is possible that there was more than one such unit. In the light of the identification of this unit, probably *šaglûte* “deportees” in ABL 325 and ABL 1372 should be interpreted as referring to this military unit.⁶⁴

*The Chief Eunuch.* Klauber pointed out the occasions on which the chief eunuch conducted campaigns under Shalmaneser V and Tiglath-Pileser III, with further references for the reigns of Sennacherib and Esarhaddon.⁶⁵ The Horse Lists show the military importance of the chief eunuch in Sargon’s reign also; according to the information which they provide, he commanded at least the city units and the deportee unit; and the *rab bēti* who was in charge of the camp was subordinate to him.⁶⁶ He may have taken overall command of all units in the home army in the absence or indisposition of the king, but the texts do not give clear evidence for the difference between the king’s and the chief eunuch’s command.

---

⁵⁸ Perhaps cf. also ADD 1168:8', in which an URU *aramaya* is mentioned; and NL 25:5—6: LÚ.ÉRÍN.MEŠ KUR ša-*ma-a-a*.
⁵⁹ The latter would imply that No. 102 is later than No. 108 and the Babylonian campaigns; NL 63 (*Iraq* 21 (1959) 174) may include a reference to this unit, but cannot be dated closely.
⁶⁰ See above, p.33.
⁶¹ No. 102.iii.23'.
⁶² ND 2386+.iii.14—15.
⁶³ Luckenbill, ARAB II, §8.
⁶⁴ The occurrences in CT 53, 211 and 869 are too broken for a sure interpretation. We are grateful to K. Watanabe in Heidelberg for sending us a comprehensive list of references to *šaglûte*.
⁶⁵ Beamtentum, p. 74.
⁶⁶ His role is discussed in the note on No. 102.iii.22'.
There was probably only one chief eunuch at this period. After the reorganisation of the home army by Sennacherib (see below p.41) there was more than one: note that in the post-canonical period the Crown Prince is attested as having a chief eunuch.\(^{67}\) If it is correct that there was only one chief eunuch around 710 B.C., it may be possible to identify him by name in the Horse Lists. A suggested reading on an inscribed sealing of one Pani-Aššur as chief eunuch of Sargon should probably be corrected\(^{68}\) and read “Pani-Aššur-lamur eunuch of Sargon”; there is evidence in the Horse Lists that this man was a \textit{mušarkisu} and not the chief eunuch. More likely is Aššur-šallim-ahhe, who may be named as chief eunuch in the damaged lines No. 101.iv.11’, and who is the ‘creditor’ in the Aramaic loan tablets from Ashur discussed below, p.46. It is notable that no letters from Aššur-šallim-ahhe to the king are known among all the royal correspondence found in Nimrud and Nineveh.

It is possible that the chief eunuch’s administrative base was in Ashur, for the Protokolle which include names of officers from his units were found there with a letter, KAV 133, addressed to him concerning horses; but a brief sojourn there by his units would equally provide an explanation.

\textit{The Muster of Borsippa} This muster is included in No. 103, appended to a muster list of \textit{mušarkisăni} and stable officers. There are two ways in which one may interpret it. Possibly Borsippa contributed an equestrian contingent; and since an inscription of Sargon\(^{69}\) implies that Borsippa enjoyed \textit{kidinnûtu} status during his reign, Borsippa might, like Ashur, have maintained a fully professional unit which was not affected by the granting or withdrawing of \textit{kidinnûtu} status. Alternatively, the “muster of Borsippa” simply indicates the place where a part of the Assyrian army was quartered at the time of the muster, possibly in 709–8 when Sargon remained in Babylon over the New Year to celebrate the New Year festival.

\textit{The Muster of Dur-Ladinni}. Some equids of Dur-Ladinni are included in No. 108 in a section which is summarised as \textit{qurubtu-cavalry}. It is a town in Bit Dakkuri in S. Babylonia which Sargon used as a base for his attack on the fortress of Merodach-Baladan, namely Dur-Yakin. This gives a very precise date to the text, and shows that it cannot be a muster planning that Babylonian campaign; for the annals account seems to make it clear that the main success was secured at Dur-Athara first, and only later at Dur-Ladinni and Borsippa, after the army had campaigned on the eastern part of Babylonia against Elamite allies of Merodach-Baladan. As this could not be known before the expedition set out, then No. 108 (and those texts that are grouped with it) cannot record the plans for that campaign, but may record either equids and officers who returned from it, or the plans for the second campaign into Babylonia.

Although horses are not included by Sargon in the annual tribute imposed on captured cities or tribes, on three occasions at least numbers are given for captured horses in the historical texts: 4,609 horses and mules during the 9th campaign against the Medes; 2,500 horses and 710 mules during the 13th to Dur-Yakin; and on the 8th campaign a mere 12

---

\(^{67}\) VS I Nos. 91–2, 96, 97–8.

\(^{68}\) See note on No. 103 rev.i.6; for the reading of the Aramaic inscription see Kaufman apud Tadmor, in H. J. Nissen & J. Renger (eds.), \textit{Mesopotamien und seineNachbarn}, p.462 (our thanks to A. R. Millard for this reference).

mules from Mušašir, but plenty earlier in the campaign. Clearly these animals must have entered the Assyrian army; but in the present state of preservation and of our understanding of the texts we cannot be sure that the numbers for the Babylonian campaigns are relevant for the muster lists.

The ša šēpē unit

Soldiers called (ša) šēpē šarrī are attested at Nuzi, and Kendall has shown that they were charioteers with two horses each, possibly a royal bodyguard corps.\(^{71}\) Since at least the time of Manitiūs, a ša šēpē corps of the neo-Assyrian army, often translated as “footsoldiers”, has been recognized as the troops in the immediate entourage of the king.\(^{72}\) Certain passages from the historical inscriptions of Sargon show that the king was immediately surrounded by cavalry, 1,000 ANŠE (KUR.RA) pethal GIR.2-ia, “one thousand cavalry horses of my ša šēpē unit”.\(^{73}\) The profession LŪ Giš.GIGIR (ša) GIR.2\(^{74}\) may show that there were charioteers as well as cavalry in the ša šēpē unit, and it is likely that they used the GIR.2-chariot discussed above. However, it is not certain whether the term ša šēpē could be applied to individual charioteers who fought from GIR.2 chariots in units other than the royal bodyguard unit or not.

Some of the men in this unit seem to have been ša qurbūte officers,\(^{75}\) yet there is clear evidence that the ša qurbūte and the ša šēpē could be regarded as distinct.\(^{76}\) It is not entirely clear whether the unit was commanded by the king personally or by the chief eunuch.\(^{77}\)

The Horse Lists have not afforded clear new evidence for this unit, except to show that they are not infantry, so the old translation “footsoldiers” can finally be laid to rest.

The Standing Army and its Order

The Horse Lists have shown that city units formed the basis of the home army, together with a unit of deportees, and with the units of ša šēpē and ša qurbūte which belonged to the king’s close entourage. To these home units some provincial units were added presumably according to the area in which the campaign took place. Comparisons between the better preserved tablets show a distinct order of units which very probably reflects a fixed marching order.

---

\(^{70}\) The expression is found in Nos. 102.i.11' (context broken), 107.i.14' (a summation), and 108A.i.6' (a summation); in these texts it seems to refer to a unit. In No. 101.i.7–8 and No. 111.i.3' it may be the profession of an individual.

\(^{71}\) Kendall, Warfare, pp. 154–7.

\(^{72}\) ZA 24 (1910) pp. 136ff.

\(^{73}\) Lie, Sargon, p. 26 line 150; cf. also p. 40 line 257 and the 8th campaign letter, TCL 3, 11. 320 and 332. Cf. Herodotus VII.40: “1,000 horsemen, selected from all the Persians” for a possible continuation of this tradition.

\(^{74}\) See CAD M/ji, pp. 170–1 s.v. mugirru in ša mugirri 2.

\(^{75}\) See above, p.33.

\(^{76}\) e.g. Klauber, PRT 44:6 lī LŪ qurbūtī lū LŪ ša GIR.2; for other passages see AHw. p. 1215a.

\(^{77}\) If E MAN is correctly read in the damaged line No. 102.i.9', it would be possible to interpret all the following units, including the ša šēpē, as under the chief eunuch’s command.
Menzel\textsuperscript{78} has pointed out that the letter describing Sargon’s eighth campaign gives evidence that particular units of the army marched under the aegis of particular deities. She connected line 14: “Nergal and Adad, the standards which march in front of me” with the charioteers (\textit{LU} iš) of Adad and Nergal who occur together in the Old Babylonian letter AbB IV 110:6—8. The timespan shows strong continuity.

Two other passages in Sargon’s letter may be relevant: line 10: “I made the soldiers of Shamash\textsuperscript{79} and Marduk jump the river Zab as if it were a ditch”, and line 160: “I made sacrifices to Nergal, Adad and Ishtar the lords of battle”. A further piece of evidence may be added from the reign of Ashurbanipal. Remanni-Adad was the charioteer (\textit{mukil appāte}) of the king, the chief charioteer of the king, and was also known as \textit{mukil appāte ša dunānē}\textsuperscript{80}. Ishtar is attested as \textit{bēlet dunānē} in KAR 215.r.ii.13. This would imply that Ishtar was patron of the king’s immediate entourage, and throws a more definite light on her epithet as Goddess of Conflict and Battle. Esarhaddon describes her as “goddess of Conflict and Battle who marches at the side of the king”.\textsuperscript{81} In an oracle it is stated that in battle “Sin is at thy right, Shamash at thy left.”\textsuperscript{82}

Although we cannot yet assign a particular deity to each of the units, it should eventually prove possible to do so, and some of the entries in the Wine Lists may be clarified slightly with this in mind.\textsuperscript{83} A tentative reconstruction of marching order in Sargon’s army is: units of Nergal (on the right) and Adad (on the left) ahead of the king; Ishtar with the king’s bodyguard, and the units of Sin and Shamash to right and left of him.

There are three reliefs of Ashurnasirpal II which show two chariots with standards attached, leading the chariotsry of the army directly in front of the king.\textsuperscript{84} The one on the left shows a god drawing a bow standing on a bull; his identification as Adad presents no difficulties. The standard on the right shows addorsed horned quadrupeds, probably bulls, with a dagger or sword blade pointing up between them. Addorsed bulls are probably associated with Nergal on a standard from Luristan.\textsuperscript{85} A more detailed version of Nergal’s chariot standard is shown on a relief of Sargon II from Khorsabad,\textsuperscript{86} in which the upper part of the god is shown with streams of liquid radiating from him;\textsuperscript{87} the figure rests upon addorsed animals which can be identified beyond doubt as bulls. The names of Nergal as

\textsuperscript{78} Ass.T., II, T 85, expanding on the observations of Kinnier Wilson in NWL p. 54—55.
\textsuperscript{79} Possibly to be equated with the \textit{kišir 4\textit{dUTU} of NWL No. 3.12; No. 6:14.}
\textsuperscript{80} See Tallqvist, APN p. 187 for references. However, T. Kwasman informs us that his studies of the legal records seem to show that there were two men of the same period named Remanni-Adad, contrary to Tallqvist’s assumption.
\textsuperscript{81} Luckenbill, ARAB II §§574 and 736.
\textsuperscript{82} Luckenbill, ARAB II §625.
\textsuperscript{83} In particular the sequence \textit{kišir ša 4\textit{dUTU, ša mušēzibāti, ša 6\textit{ša dunānē} and DUMU.MEŠ SIG ša DINGIR.MEŠ in NWL 6:14—17; cf. NWL 8:18—19.}
\textsuperscript{84} Budge, Assyrian Sculptures in the British Museum, Ashurnasirpal II, pl. 14, 17 and 22. We are grateful to Barbara Mallowan for pointing out the relevance of these standards.
\textsuperscript{85} See Moorey, Iran 15 1977 pl. 1b and p. 144. We are grateful to Dr. Moorey for discussion of this standard and the iconography of Nergal.
\textsuperscript{86} Botta and Flandin, Monument de Ninive II pl. 57 and III pl. 158.
\textsuperscript{87} Nergal is associated with streams on a Susa seal, published by P. Amiet, Glyptique Susienne as no. 1769.
urigallu “standard” and perhaps as IGL.DU “leader” may refer to the god’s capacity as patron of the leading chariot of the Assyrian army in battle.88

Development of the Army

Sargon augmented his army during his reign. Following the capture of Samaria he took the best officers and formed a new unit from them.89 Distinct from this, a unit of deportees had probably existed at least since the reign of Ashurnasirpal II, consisting largely of equestrian talent from North Syrian states;90 Sargon added to it from the captured military élite of Carchemish, and possibly also of Hamath. When he reconquered Lahiru and its surrounding district, he probably strengthened his hold over a unit that may have been formed previously, when Tiglath-Pileser III first annexed Lahiru. The same may be true of the Chaldean unit. Closer study of the royal inscriptions and letters will certainly fill in some of the details of this development.

References to a crown prince’s establishment and to a queen’s or queen mother’s military establishment are lacking in these lists as well as in the NW Palace texts of this period. References to them begin with Sennacherib’s reign,91 and continue down into the post-canonical period. This pattern of evidence may now be sufficient to support the suggestion that Sennacherib’s military reforms, which are referred to in two administrative records92 and reflected in some terms for professions among legal witnesses on dated tablets, involved dividing the ‘royal’ units of the kišir sarrūti into two or three parts among leading members of the royal family.

To conclude this chapter, some notes are appended on the several texts already published which it has been possible to identify and date to Sargon’s reign. Each one has provided some specific information concerning Sargon’s army which complements that of the Horse Lists; in some cases it has been possible to improve upon the interpretation of them.

KAV 31—38, 131—132

Groups of names with professions in the Horse Lists from Fort Shalmaneser have made it possible to date and connect the tablets from Ashur which Schroeder described as Protokolle über Pferdemusterungen. Definite connexions are :-

88 For the names and epithets of Nergal, see von Weiher, Das Gott Nergal; the interchange between Ishtar and Nergal, noted on p. 103, may perhaps be explained in terms of both deities as leaders of the army. The name of Nergal should probably not be emended to Ninurta in An.St. II 1961 p. 150 line 29, in view of the context.
89 See note on No. 99 §E.
90 See, e.g., Grayson, ARI II, §§579, 584.
91 In particular ADD 854, listing 48 LÚ.GAL.GAL.MEŠ DUMU.MAN; ADD 857, listing LÚ.GAL kišir AMA.MAN, LÚ.GAL kišir DUMU.MAN, ša qurbāte AMA.MAN, ša qurbāte DUMU.MAN, mukil appādi AMA.MAN, tātibītu AMA.MAN and DUMU.MAN; and dated legal records with specific military professions followed by DUMU.MAN or AMA.MAN, none until the reign of Sennacherib (though note ša qurbāte ša DUMU.MAN in ND 2803 rev.i.1). Note the absence of such professions in the 9th and 8th century texts of CTN II.
92 ADD 853.i.6; ADD 854:10. It may be deduced from ADD 594 rev.6 (date not preserved) and ADD 612 rev.5 (686 B.C.) that the queen also had a military unit.
Ili-kabar KAV 31:17, *rk arrap* in Nos. 102 and 108.
Atar-bīdī94 KAV 32.r.6, *ru* of Kakku-šarru-ḫusur in No. 99 and 108.
Abda’ KAV 36:3, *(ru?)* in Nos. 107 and 108.
Akkaddaya KAV 131.obv.10, *rk aram* in No. 102.
Kubaba-ilaya KAV 131.r.4, *rk aram* in No. 108.

Probable connexions are:

Ukumu KAV 36.obv.6, Ṣukumu *(rk arbil)* in No. 102.
Saman KAV 131.r.7, Sama *(ru)* of Samaria in No. 99.
Sl’-qatar(?) KAV 132.r.1, Sl’-qatar *(rk arzu)* in No. 102.

An additional point of contact is found between KAV 131.r.14* and No. 111, where the logogram Ṣ almost certainly has exactly the same administrative connotations.

Several points emerge from these comparisons. First, all the men in the Protokolle are LŪ GIS.GIGIR except for Sl’-qatar who is *rab kišri*95, and they are all *rab urâte* or *rab kišri* in the Horse Lists; none is among the LŪ GAL. GAL.MES. This shows that the ‘profession’ LŪ GIS.GIGIR could almost certainly be held concurrently with the titles *rab urâte* and *rab kišri*.96

Correspondence of names is sufficient to date these texts to Sargon’s reign, yet grouping is not so coherent as in the main group of Horse Lists. Since we can identify the units to which some of the charioteers belong, we might expect one tablet per unit, and this does not necessarily happen. KAV 131 can nicely be explained as a muster of Aramean charioteers from two occurrences of known names; but KAV 31 contains the names of Chaldeans and Arraphans as well as of Kakku-šarru-ḫusur’s unit. This suggests that the officers had a role both in the central administration and in the regional units; this might fit the role of the *ša qurbūte*, but there is no evidence to identify any of these men as *ša qurbūte*; further information is needed before the interpretation of the Protokolle can be established firmly.

We know from the Horse Lists that some of these men were attached to city units other than that of Ashur, and so we need not necessarily suppose that the villages mentioned in the Protokolle were in the vicinity of Ashur. The village of Sare where Meni-ili the *rab kišri* of Chaldeans was based may be wherever the Chaldean unit had its permanent base; the village Til-Ulina where the captain of Arraphans Ili-kabar was stationed would be in the vicinity of Arrapha, and so on.

There is no new evidence for determining whether there was a difference between *rab kišri* and *rab hanše*. Since the former is now known to be of the same rank as *rab urâte* and LŪ GIS.GIGIR, it is possible that any charioteer could take administrative and perhaps also

93 The abbreviations *ru* for *rab urâte* and *rk* for *rab kišri* are as used beside the transliterations of the Horse Lists below.
94 Reading *a-tar* (NU), with *bī’dī* as variant for *ba’dī*.
95 The same profession can certainly be restored in KAV 32 rev. 3 and 6, as the pattern of the sections shows.
96 Weidner suggested in AFO Beiheft 6, pp. 11 and 15, that the Protokolle might be lists of *kālīpu-couriers*, with the places in which they were stationed, so that the place names were *marditu* — “relay posts” on the royal roads. Connexions with the Horse Lists do not seem to confirm this. See also TCAE pp. 209–210.
military control of a group, with the *ad hoc* title of *rab kisri* or *rab hanše*. Either promotions or some kind of rota system may give the best explanation to account for the variation in titles held by individual charioteers.

It has become apparent that equestrian units were organized from three different administrative centres in the middle of Sargon’s reign: the North-West Palace at Kalhu; the Review Palace at Kalhu, and the city of Ashur. If it is right to connect the letter KAV 133, written by Kabar to the chief eunuch on the subject of horses, there is a possibility that the Protokolle may represent the records of the chief eunuch who commanded the standing army.

**ADD 855**

A new copy is provided on p.44 below, and the numbering of the lines in the following transliteration differs from that given by Johns. The tablet measures 6.1 × (8.5) × 2.5cm.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Obv.</th>
<th>(upper part broken)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1’</td>
<td>PAP [</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2’</td>
<td>1.š30-su [</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3’</td>
<td>4 ME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4’</td>
<td>2 ME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5’</td>
<td>3 ME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6’</td>
<td>1.ša-a-id-ri la je4-hu? [</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7’</td>
<td>4 ME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8’</td>
<td>4 ME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9’</td>
<td>PAP 16 kal-la-pu qur-b[u-te]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10’</td>
<td>5 ME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11’</td>
<td>2 lim 2 ME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12’</td>
<td>8 ME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13’</td>
<td>2 ME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14’</td>
<td>9 ME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15’</td>
<td>6 ME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16’</td>
<td>5 [ME]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17’</td>
<td>[</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18’</td>
<td>[</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev.</td>
<td>(PAP 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19’</td>
<td>1 lim 1 ME 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20’</td>
<td>1.ša-sur-PAP-AS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21’</td>
<td>7 ME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22’</td>
<td>7 ME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23’</td>
<td>6 ME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24’</td>
<td>7 ME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25’</td>
<td>7 ME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26’</td>
<td>8 ME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27’</td>
<td>7 ME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28’</td>
<td>1 lim 4[ME]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29’</td>
<td>8 ME</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ADD 855

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Obv.</th>
<th>(upper part broken)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1’</td>
<td>PAP [</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2’</td>
<td>1.š30-su [</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3’</td>
<td>4 ME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4’</td>
<td>2 ME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5’</td>
<td>3 ME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6’</td>
<td>1.ša-a-id-ri la je4-hu? [</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7’</td>
<td>4 ME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8’</td>
<td>4 ME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9’</td>
<td>PAP 16 kal-la-pu qur-b[u-te]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10’</td>
<td>5 ME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11’</td>
<td>2 lim 2 ME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12’</td>
<td>8 ME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13’</td>
<td>2 ME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14’</td>
<td>9 ME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15’</td>
<td>6 ME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16’</td>
<td>5 [ME]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17’</td>
<td>[</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18’</td>
<td>[</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev.</td>
<td>(PAP 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19’</td>
<td>1 lim 1 ME 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20’</td>
<td>1.ša-sur-PAP-AS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21’</td>
<td>7 ME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22’</td>
<td>7 ME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23’</td>
<td>6 ME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24’</td>
<td>7 ME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25’</td>
<td>7 ME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26’</td>
<td>8 ME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27’</td>
<td>7 ME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28’</td>
<td>1 lim 4[ME]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29’</td>
<td>8 ME</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Commentary

Line 9' makes it clear that the men in this text are divided into sections according to their ranks or professions. The identifiable sections seem to be:
- *kallāpu-messengers(?)* of the *ša qurbûte(?)*
- *rādī kibsi* "trackers"
- *mušarkisāni* (deduced by comparison with No. 99)

Although one might deduce that the numbers in two columns refer to men or animals, especially with the parallel of the *ša Kur / ša KASKAL* columns in the Horse Lists, the numbers are very large and rounded; the correct interpretation may be taken from line 17' where the verb *tsahhat* is nA for a process in building connected with bricks (see AHw 1130a). So the numbers may refer to bricks, although this allows no easy explanation for the two columns in lines 11'–30'. The correspondence of names of *mušarkisāni* in lines 11'–22' with those in the Horse Lists makes it possible to date this text around 710–708 B.C., which suggests that the numbers may refer to bricks for the construction of Dur-Sarru-kin.

The names of the *mušarkisāni* are included in the list of all those officials from Sargon’s reign on pp.29–31 above.

---

**ADD 852.**

This text can now be recognised as a list of equestrian officers in the army of Sargon. The purpose of the list is unknown. Most of the names which occur in the Horse Lists are of the *rab urāte / rab kišri* level; but Babilaya in ii.8 may be a *mušarkisu*; so may Šepē-Ištar-āšbat (coll.) in ii.15. Two useful additions to Horse List information are found: Ubru-Ištar LÚ GIS.GIGIR in i.6 is a *rab urāte* in No. 99.iv, and Lu-balat 16*susānu urē* in iii.1 is *rab urāte* in No. 99.iv. We are still not certain of the precise meaning of *susānu*, finding no proof to support or reject Parpola’s suggestion made in JSS 21 p. 172 that *susānu* is “groom” and the Assyrian reading of LÚ GIS.GIGIR.

Collation has given the following readings:

- i.2: 4 16*susāni/4 LŪ zu-un; probably the latter is an abbreviation for *zunzurahu.*
- i.11: read ‘*ditto*’ at the end of the line (i.e. SU).
- ii.15: 1GIS.2-15-DOG-bat.

SU in i.8, 10 and 11 may be an abbreviation for *susānu.*
Three Aramaic tablets from Ashur

These tablets were first published in 1921. They were grouped together on obvious internal evidence, and they were dated to the 8th century on palaeographic grounds. They are loans of barley.

A certain amount of correspondence with personal names in the Horse Lists suggests the possibility that the men whose names are written in Aramaic can be connected with the charioteers and their officers of Sargon's reign whose names are written in cuneiform. The readings of the names used here follow Lipinski’s transcriptions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Names</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Tablet No.</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aššur-šallim-ahhe</td>
<td>A1,2,3 lender</td>
<td>No.101.iv.11' (?) GAL.SAG[ ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taquni</td>
<td>A1,2 borrower</td>
<td>No.99.ii.5  ru</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nanna'</td>
<td>A1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akkaday</td>
<td>A2 borrower</td>
<td>No.99.iv.1 ru</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Šepe-Ăššur</td>
<td>A3 borrower</td>
<td>No.99.iv.22 ru</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mannu-ki-Ăšshur</td>
<td>A1,2 witness</td>
<td>No.99.iv.10 ru</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bel-iddin</td>
<td>A1,2 witness</td>
<td>(86 obv.8)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adad-ibni</td>
<td>A1,2 witness</td>
<td>No.108A.i.9' ru?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bel-šar-ųṣur</td>
<td>A2,3 witness</td>
<td>No.107.i.17' ru?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iqbi-Įštar</td>
<td>A3 witness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laqepu</td>
<td>A3 witness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note the high rank of the creditor Aššur-šallim-ahhe in No. 101.iv.11', possibly the rab ša rēše; the fact that one of the borrowers is of the rank of LŬ GAL.GAL.MEŠ; and that all the witnesses whose professions can be identified by cross-reference with the Horse Lists are rab urâte. This order of rank does support the suggestion that the connexions are not coincidental. If we conjecture from the uncertain reading and identification of Aššur-šallim-ahhe in No. 101.iv.11', we could interpret those dockets as loans made in Ashur by a top officer, perhaps the ‘chief eunuch’, to his officers, witnessed by their charioteers, as part of the supplying of the units, during the reign of Sargon II. This would agree well with the evidence of the Protokolle für Pferdemusterungen, and with the deduction that Ashur city was an administrative centre for at least some of the rab ša rēše’s equestrian units. However, the tentative nature of the evidence must be emphasized.

In view of the more precise dating to Sargon’s reign which the connections with the Horse Lists make possible, it is worth noting again that the three tablets bear a variety of seal impressions: a square stamp seal engraved with a cock; a finger-nail impression(?); and an oval stamp seal designed with a goat and a fish. Presumably these were the sealings of the three borrowers, as is normal on loan tablets.

98 Presumably a hypocoristic; could correspond to Aššur-sumu-taqqin(i), also ru, in the same unit (No. 99 §B) as Nani; or Aššur-matu-taqqin of No. 110.iv.6' (probably ru).
99 Establishes the reading of the name written 1URL-a-a beyond doubt (cf. APN p. 19b); this is the only name in common between the Protokolle and here.
The Neo-Assyrian ‘Census’ Lists

First published by Johns as *An Assyrian Doomsday Book*,\(^\text{100}\) and re-edited by Fales,\(^\text{101}\) these texts have been commented on most recently by S. Parpola,\(^\text{102}\) who suggests an earlier date than was considered by either editor, namely the reign of Sargon II around 710 B.C. This dating would make the census lists contemporary with many of the Horse Lists. Although the Census Lists and the Horse Lists are clearly different in scope, and although the suggested date for the former rests on very slight evidence, it is obviously important to consider possible points of contact.

The main likelihood of contact is Nabu-ahhe-šallim in ADB 6 (= Fales No. 5) “who brought prisoners”, in a passage following a section of prisoners-of-war from Gambulu in Babylonia. A man of the same name is a Chaldean *rab urâte* in Nos. 99 and 108. Another faintly possible contact is Nabu-šarru-uṣur in Fales No. 23; a *rab urâte(?)* of that name occurs in No. 118.

---

\(^{100}\) C. H. W. Johns, ADB (Leipzig 1901).


\(^{102}\) Review article of Fales, in ZA 64 (1975).
Obv. 1  IM 1 dpA-bal-lit-a-ni
2  a-na 1 šil-dpA
3  a-na 1 dpIM-A-AS
4  šul-mu a-na ŠEŠ-ia
5  a-na ia-aš šu-ú ta šá man ni
6  1aš-šur-KUR-LAL 1iz-bu LÚ.SIMUG AN.BAR
7  ra-me-šú a-na IGI BE-qi ša E.GAL
8  ma-šar-te šu-ú dul-lu-šú
B.E. 9  li-pu-us (x) x -bi-šú
10  ha-bu-ul-il lu-šá-lim-ka

Rev.  (2 impressions of a stamp seal)

Sealing: see Iraq 24 p.37, fig.2 and pl.XX/I
Stamp seal, nearly rectangular, but two sides narrowing towards base. H. (1.9) cm.; W. at top 2.2 cm., at base 1.8 cm.; impressed twice, condition fair.
Design: near base of preserved impression, single horizontal line, probably ground level. On it, or above it, from left to right, all facing left, man with fish cloak, bull man(?) with beard, merman (half man, head and hands held out before him at different heights, remainder fish). Below ground line near left edge, top part of an unidentified symbol (like letter I with serifs).

Translation
Tablet of Nabu-ballitanni to ~illi-Nabu (and) to Adad-aplu-iddin. It is well with my brother and me .... Ashur-matu-taqquin—IZbu the blacksmith—release him. He is assigned to the levy of the Review palace. Let him do his work (and) let me pay you back the debt from him.

Notes
2: dpA is written over an erased 4NIN.LIL.
5—6: If Izbu the smith is the single person referred to in 1.7, Ashur-matu-taqquin has to be connected with 1.5 but we are unable to make sense of the end of this line. The signs 1 iz-bu are written over an erasure, but quite clear.
7: BE-qi: SMD prefers to read bat-qi, JNP bit-qi (as in TCAE, based on the broken context of NARGD Nos. 9—12, 37, ND 10,001 having a clear BE not bit).
9: the translation assumes a reading TA* lib1-bštú, but this is hardly reconcilable with the signs, which have been collated more than once. Other possibilities considered are µ1, šab3, or ina lib. If ina libbi-šu were correct, JNP would translate “thereby”, “in that way”. For issu libbi a parallel could be sought in FNALD No. 22 A 11—12: TA* libbi A.$A habulli-šu ussattalam (with the Dtt passive form of *SLM).
Commentary
This type of local, administrative letter is rare in neo-Assyrian. The translation given here is very tentative because the tablet was carelessly written, because it is colloquial and brief, and because we do not know the background to the message. Erasures, defective signs, crasis and the omission of signs can be expected in such tablets.

No. 2  
Plate 1; Photo Plate 46  
ND 7068

6.5 × 3.4  
IM 75775

SE 10, 10 cm above original floor.

Obv.  1  [I]M 1man-ni-i  
2  a-na 1i-se-me-e-li  
3  ḫu-ur-hu šur-ū e-ta-pa-āš  
4  10 ma-qar-rat ša GI.MEŠ  
5  be-li lu-šē-bi-la  
6  la ta-ka-la-a

Rev.  7  ša-hi-it-ti ši-i  
(3 impressions of a seal)  
8  ma-a'-da a-na-ku ša-hi-tu  
9  ša be-li-ia a-šam-me

Sealing: Stamp seal or cylinder seal impressed as a stamp seal; shape rectangular or cylindrical; impressed 3 times, rather faint; W. present 1.2 cm.; H. present 2.1 cm.  
Design: inscription in archaic signs, inscribed on seal in reverse; to left, apparently a blank space; remains of two lines, 1: ḫKASK[AL? ] 2: li-{ }

Translation
Tablet of Manni to Isseme-ili. I have made the kurhu-building. May my lord send me ten bundles of reeds. Do not delay. It is my need. I shall be very obedient to the needs of my lord.

Notes
3: ḫurhu also occurs in the unpublished Assur text Ass. Fd.nr. 13955 = Ass. Photo 4127 (tablet in Istanbul), a nA house sale which lists various buildings or rooms (written ḫ ku-hu [correct Or NS 35 (1966) 315 accordingly]; we are grateful to K. Deller for this reference.
6: alternatively translate “they must not be delayed”, taking ta-ka-la-a as N-stem f.pl., subject magarrāte, rather than G-stem m.sg. with ventive, which implies a change from the polite 3 p.sg. to the informal 2 p.sg.
8 – 9: these lines may have been added as an afterthought, since the seal impression in No. 1 comes at the end of the letter.

Commentary
Isseme-ili is known from No. 12 as the palace manager of the Review Palace. Manni, clearly one of his subordinates, is unknown to us, although his name could be a hypocoristic form from any of several full names.
To the palace manager my lord: your servant Tartimanni. May it be well with my lord. I have prayed for you in front of Ninurta. (As to what) you wrote to me—the nīkisu’s boy brought 18½ qa of šu’u-corn, 15 qa of ...-grain, 13 (qa?) of roasted corn, a hašbu-vessel with (a bunch of) grapes, 20 qa of wheat, 20 qa of barley, 3 takkasu-loaves(?) of sea-blite(?), (and) a pot (containing) 1 homer of barley. The vessels belong to the house of the scribe. ..... the qatimmu spoke to us ...... saying “Tartimanni came (and) opened(?) the house and took the vessels”. The scribe has written saying “Bring back the vessels! Put (them) back
in [my?] house!

... they look. Now, talk with the nakisu, and let him speak to the scribe ......

Notes

2: the writing -ia-a is unusual; the context offers no explanation such as emphasis or interrogation.

6: Deller points out that insa 101 4MAS goes with aktarab(ak)ka by comparison with CT 53, 974:3-4 and KAV 215:4.

7–12: the scribe here fails to use the sītu measure, perhaps because of the informality of the context.

12: reading and interpretation of the second item are very doubtful. Read possibly 3 NA x x x ME.

SE kudimmu is paralleled in ABL 207 rev. 2; for kudimmu as an edible plant associated with salt see A.K. Grayson, ARI I, p.60 n.119 and ARI II p.176, also H. Helbaek, Iraq 34 (1972) 191. It also occurs in the list of ikku-contributions, ND 3467, CT 53 27 r.4.

14: TUR-ru presumably for šahu or šhru; the syllabic complement will have been added to distinguish it from DEMU = "son". Nakisu is perhaps equivalent to šabihu "butcher" according to NWL p.29.

17: a possible reading for this line would be ur-ki be-li... "afterwards, my lord the qatinnu...". However, the third sign appears to be nu, not be, and one might expect a LU before the professional term.

20: the verb usanzu is presumably derived from a root nu' or mu' (or mu?); without understanding l.19 it seems fruitless to speculate further.

21: DU is written over an erasure.

22: our translation adopts K. Deller's suggested emendation of UR to ip giving E ip-š-te for iptete; E ur-ti-e as a dovecote seems quite out of place.

23: in-ta-ha for intatha.

28–29: K. Deller suggests a-na ša mi-ti-ni ipallisu "they regard me as if I were a dead man".

Commentary

Since Tartimanni wrote this letter to a rab ekalli whom he calls "my lord" he was presumably not a rab ekalli himself at this time, but still subordinate to another holder of that office.

No. 4 Plate I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Obv.</th>
<th>Rev.</th>
<th>Plate I</th>
<th>ND 7013</th>
<th>IM 74489</th>
<th>NR 421</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>a-na LÜ.GAL/ [GAL]</td>
<td>4.6 x 2.7</td>
<td>SE 8; on floor</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>AD-iaÁ</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>PAP 2 GÜ.UN SIG.ÜZ.MEŠ</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>[Ir]'-ka 1G[IR.]2-MAN</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>at-ti-din 17 tugia-ri-a-te</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>[Ir]-u šul-mu a-na AD-iaÁ</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>TA* ljb-bi TUG pa-ni-a-te</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>[Ir]PA 6AMAR.UTU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>a-na AD-iaÁ lik-ru-bu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>an-nu-rig 30 MA.NA ina u4-me pa-ni</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.E.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20 MA.NA u4-ma-a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>tugia-ri-a-te</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4

12. TA* lib-bi TÜG EGIR-a-te at-ti-šin
13. lib-ba-a-te-ia EN lu la-mal-la
14. Š E D U-u-ri[] UN.MEŠ hal-qu
15. NINDA.MEŠ la-[d]š-šu ú ma luₐ x (x)
16. ú-sāq-dan a-na EN-iₐ SU[Mₐ]

T.E. 17. na-mur-tu ša½ EN₂-iₐ²
L.S. 10 SIG₅

Sealing: see Iraq 24 p.38 and fig 10 and plate XII/2.

Stamp seal; oval or circular. Di. ca. 1.3 cm. Badly preserved. Design: almost certainly identical with that on nos. 5 and 6.

Translation

To the palace manager my father, your servant(?) Šepe-šarr. May it be well with my father! May Nabu and Marduk bless my father! Now, I delivered 30 minas at a previous time, and now 20 minas (more), (and) 10 good ones, a total of 2 talents of goat-hair. I delivered 17 yariate-textiles, of which (some are) previous(ly produced) textiles and some are later (produced) textiles. So may my lord not be filled with anger at me!

Where(ever) I go, the people have disappeared. There is no bread...... I shall cause to give. They shall give(?) (it) to my lord (as) the nāmurtu-present of my lord(?).

Notes

3: although the traces as copied seem to favour IR, we should perhaps prefer DUJMU₁ “your son” by comparison with No. 5:2.
8: the number 20 has been collated; the additional note on the left side (l.18): 10 SIG₅ clearly belongs here and so completes the total. The letter therefore ends with l.17.

10: Tuviah Kwasman has pointed out convincingly that TÜG ia-ri-a-te is probably connected with Hebrew y'ri tah “(tent-)curtain made of goat's hair”, Kohler-Baumgartner, Lexikon in VT libros 405a, corresponding to Targumic y'rifatá (whence a loanword in Syriac).
13: either a crasis of lā lā imalla, or the sign i was omitted accidentally by the scribe.
15: possibly ú-ma “now” followed by a commodity which constituted the nāmurtu of l.17.
16: for grammatical reasons ú-se-rib is impossible; K. Deller suggests ú-se-rubu, but rub is a very uncommon value, and ú-sāq-dan seems to us easiest to justify.
17: if the final two signs are correctly read, this phrase could indicate that a high official could receive nāmurtu like the king; but he might also merely be the person owing it.

Commentary

See on No. 6.
No. 5
Plate 2; Photo Plate 46
ND 7000
IM 74476
NR 421, 643

4.5 × 2.9
SE 1; upper fill

Obv. 1 a-na LÚ.GAL É.GAL AD-îå
2 DUMU-ka[1]GIR.2-MAN
3 lu-u śül-mu a-na AD-îå
4 dPA dAMAR.UTU a-na AD-îå lik-ru-bu
5 ina UGU ša taš-pur-an-ni
6 ma-a tägiša-ri-a-te
7 ma-a'-da-a-te
8 ša MU.AN.NA.MEŠ
9 am-ma-a-te ina IGI-ka
B.E. 10 tägiša-ri-a-te a-ma-te
Rev. 11 a-na l2$ŠU$-NUMUN-DU
12 SUM-an at-ta šü-iš
13 is-sa-he-îš NIG.KA[9] šu ku na
14 su-na-ka a-na-hu-la
15 1 TŪG SUM-an
16 an-nu-rig 12 tägiša-ri-a-te
17 a-na l1sa-si-i at-ti-din

Sealing On the left side of the tablet, lines 5-8. See Iraq 24 p.38 and fig.10 and plate XXII/2. No.6 is impressed with the same seal.
Stamp seal; elliptical. Max. di. 1.6, min. di. ca. 1.3 cm.
Condition: both impressions only fair; edges of upper half insufficiently impressed.
Description: Deity standing, facing right; ankle-length gown with left(?) foot advanced, leg uncovered. Position of arms indistinct. Long hair to shoulder, conical hat. 'Behind' figure a ring with attached mace-heads or stars. In field outside, stars, one to left, one above hat (presumably one to right). Possibly weapons protruding from shoulders.

Translation
To the palace manager, my father: your son Sepe-šarri. May it be well with my father! May Nabu and Marduk bless my father! Concerning what you wrote to me, saying: "Numerous yariâte-textiles of those years are still due from you"—I will deliver those yariâte-textiles to Marduk-zeru-ibni. You and he together, certify his account. I will put aside(? ) one garment from here. Now, I have delivered 12 yariâte-textiles to Sasi.

Notes
6, 10, 16: see note on No. 4:10.
8–10: the distinction between "those years" and the others may be clarified by l.2 of No. 6.
13: the translation assumes an emendation to NIG.KA[9] šu-ki-na, nikkassu kunnu being attested in Šurpu VIII 56:10. However since the copy clearly has ku another possibility one might consider is to read NIG.KA[9] šû-ku-na, even though šakînu does not seem to be attested in such a usage. The meaning would be unaffected.
14: su-na-ka for issu (an)naka (cf. CAD A Pt. 2 127a). a-na-hu-la for ana ahula: see AHw ahula rather than CAD ahulli. JNP suggests a metaphorical meaning "besides, in addition", which would give a translation "I will deliver one textile from here in addition".

Commentary
See on No. 6.

No. 6

| Obv. | 1 | tugia-ri-a-te |
|      | 2 | șib-tu ša lim-mu 1,iti AB-a-a |
|      | 3 | ša 1,is-me-DINGIR LÚ.GAL É.GAL |
|      | 4 | ina IGI 1,GIR.2-MAN LÚ.A.BA |
|      | 5 | (seal impression) |
|      | 6 | ina UD.5,KÁM ša ITLI SIG4 |
|      | 7 | B.E. SUM-an ITLI GU4 |
|      | 8 | UD.16,KÁM lim-mu |
| Rev. | 8 | 1,aš-šur-KUR-LAL-in |
|      | 9 | IGI 1,SUM-aš-šur |
|      | 10 | IGI 1,AD-ša-a-a |
|      | 11 | IGI 1,dPA-MU-GIŠ LÚ.A.BA |

Sealing: See Iraq 24 p.38 and fig.10 with Pl. XXII/2. The same seal was used on No. 5.

Translation
14 yarîte-textiles, stock of the eponym period of Kanunaya, due to Isseme-ili the palace manager, at the disposal of Šepe-šarri the scribe. On the 5th day of the month of Simanu he shall deliver. Month Ayyaru, 16th day, limmu Aššur-matu-taqquin. Witnesses: Iddin-Aššur, Abi-saya, Nabu-sumu-lešir the scribe.

Notes
2: for šibtu see TCAE 168 and 172. From the association of this tablet with Nos. 4 and 5, the date of this tablet, and the occurrence of Isseme-ili, it is clear that the eponym Kanunaya mentioned here must be post-canonical, most probably belonging in the year immediately before Aššur-matu-taqquin, whose date is estimated at 624 BC by Falkner.

Commentary
This "legal" text is intimately connected with Nos. 4 and 5, letters sent by the "debtor" in this contract, Šepe-šarri, to his "creditor", the palace manager, presumably Isseme-ili in Nos. 4 and 5 too although his name is not given there. The texts are all concerned with goat-hair and the textiles made from it, which Šepe-šarri appears to have a long-standing
obligation to provide for his superior. As we should expect, the two letters and the contract are sealed with the same seal, surely that of Šepe-Šarrû himself. Unfortunately, the exact nature of the obligation remains obscure to us.

No. 7

Plate 2; Photo Plate 46

5.8 x 3.9

SE 1

IM 74478

15.x? Sa’îlu

NR 643

Sealing: Stamp seal; irregularly elliptical. Max. di. 1.3; Min. di. 1.1 cm. 3 impressions, all good.

Description: Cross-shaped pattern, irregular; one bar has left end pointed and right end forked, as if representation of fish; other (upright) bar runs straight from one edge to the other. Slight line or blemish at bottom right.

Translation

If Nabû-nadin-ahhe has released[?] Susu but has not brought (him) by the first day of the month of [ ...], and has not delivered him to [PN] the palace manager, he shall give [ ...]. Month Kanunu(?), 15th day, limmu Sa’îlu the head-cook. Witnesses: Dataya, Musûraya, Pani?-Marduk the merchant, son of Nineveh, Sukku-Istar, Zeru-ukin, Zittaya.

Notes

2: It is possible either to restore ip-[ta-sar] (cf. No. 8:4), and interpret ana as nota accusativi, or to take ip as part of a noun and ana as dative preposition.

6: A possible restoration is [e]-lip MEŠ iddan "he shall give double", cf. e.g. ND 2091 (the two texts have in common Dataya as the first witness); for a spurious MEŠ cf. perhaps No. 17:1. There are however other possibilities which cannot be excluded.
Commentary
Both in its outward form (a sealed tablet, without envelope), and in its phraseology this text is an “order in court” (cf. FNALD 59–60). We do not have any means of knowing whether this was genuinely a judicial decision, or merely an administrative order.

Nabu-nadin-ahhe may well be the man who in ND 2323 buys a slave, and in ND 2325 witnesses a slave sale; both texts are also post-canonical. It is very likely that this text should be interpreted with Susu as the slave of Nabu-nadin-ahhe.

No. 8  Plate 2  ND 7005
(5.3) × 3.9  IM 74481
SE 1  [x].x.Sin-šarru-uṣur

Obv.  1  1ma[n-nu-lu]-zi-[t]2 [ŠU.2.MEŠ]
2  ša 1.U.APIN-eš TAŠ ŠU.2 'x x1 ['
3  LÚ.GAL.E.GAL it-ta-ha-d[s]
4  TAŠ líb-bi si-par-ri ip-ta-[jar]
   (stamp seal impressions)
5  [T]AŠ qab-si É.GAL ú-se-š[t]
6  u₄₂-mu ša SAG-su i-na-āš-š[u-ni]

B.E.  7  1man-nu-lu-zi-iti-1 U.U-API[N-eš]

Rev.  8  a-na 1sa-am-me-DINGIR LÚ.GAL[É.GAL]
9  SUM-an ITI.LAB UD.[X.KAM]
10  lim-me 130-MAN-PAP [( )]
11  IGI 1ši-lim-mu [ ]
12  IGI 1IR-EN-kī[1]
13  IGI 1ša-la-maš[- ]
14  IGI 1tu-te-x[ ]
15  IGI 1zi-[ ]

T.E.  16  IGI 1x[ ]

L.S.  17  IGI 1.d.PA-LAL-a-ni LÚ.NI.GAB
18  IG[1 ]d¹5-MU-ÅŞ

Sealing: Iraq 24 p.37 and fig.4 and pl. XX/3
Cylinder seal. Surviving width of impression 1.6 cm.; surviving ht. 2.1 cm. Impressed twice; impressions fair but incomplete; either a large stamp seal or partial impression from a cylinder seal.
Description: Deity standing facing right; hair in bun at nape of neck; long gown leaving left(?), leg advanced, uncovered. God surrounded by 'melammu'; position of arms indeterminate. ?Round hat on head with 2 'horns'??

Translation
Mannu-lu-zitti has struck the pledge of Adad-ereš from the hands of [Isseme-ili], the palace manager. He has released (him) from fetters, he has brought him out from the palace limits. On the day when he requires him, Mannu-lu-zitti shall deliver Adad-ereš to
Isamme-ilii, the palace manager. Month Kanunu, [x]th day, limmu Sin-šarru-usur. Witnesses: Šilimmu, Urad-Bel-kili, Ša-lamašše, Lute[...], Zi[...], X, Nabu-taqqinnanni the door-keeper, Ištar-šumu-iddin.

Notes
1: there are two possibilities; either to restore [EN ŠU.2.MEŠ] at the end of l.1 as in ND 3443 (FNALD No. 49), and take the line as a nominal sentence: “M is the guarantor”, with the problem that the following ša then floats because itahšu is not subjunctive (cf. ithaššini in ND 3443:4); or, as preferred in the translation, to restore only [ŠU.2.MEŠ] in l.1, and take it as object of mahāšu as it is in No. 9. In the comparable text VAT 15461 (unpublished; quoted courtesy K. Deller), the opening lines are ŠU.2.MEŠ ša PN₃₋₃ (pledges) PN₄ (guarantor) ithaššini UN.MEŠ usṣahir, in which the exact construction is obscure, but the qāṭṭī (ŠU.2.MEŠ) seem to be the direct object of mahāšu. In ND 3443 the text is very abbreviated: “PN₁ (is) the guarantor who struck PN₂ (creditor)”, perhaps to be understood as: “PN₁ is the guarantor who struck (the qāṭṭī of the debtor from the hands of) PN₂”. The full phrase may be reconstructed as: “Guarantor struck the qāṭṭī of the pledged person(s) from the hands (qāṭṭu) of the creditor”, a transaction marked by a symbolic gesture. While the connection of qāṭṭī with guarantees goes back to Old Assyrian times, it may not be irrelevant to compare S.M. Sherwin-White, “Hand-tokens and Achaemenid practice” (Iran 16 (1978) 183, with literature).

5: šēšš: this is the normal term for redeeming or releasing a pledge, although the following clauses make it clear that the debt is not yet fully discharged.

6: cf. ND 2080:6–7 Šumu ša ėrēšini (see FNALD p. 38), which shows that the phrase rēša našu means “to request” or “require” here (see also commentary on No. 9 for a Babylonian parallel usage). These two occurrences of šumu ša as a subordinating conjunction show that it is not only spS as listed in AHw. It also occurs in ND 2320 and ADD 1245.

Commentary
Both here and in No. 9 a guarantor is withdrawing a pledge before the obligation is completed. The original debtor is not named, either because the pledged person is the debtor himself, or because he is legally the responsibility of the guarantor alone. In VAT 15461 the guarantor withdrew the three pledges, returned them (to the debtor?) and paid the creditor with wages in lieu of labour. In ND 3443 the guarantor is perhaps replacing a pledge in fulfilment of a clause making him responsible for death or flight (ŪŠ.MEŠ ZĀH-AT).

However, this text is the only one in which fetters are mentioned, from which it appears likely that Adad-erēš was actually in prison. Since imprisonment for debt seems improbable in circumstances where personal pledge was still normal, this text and No. 9 by analogy may reflect a disciplinary function of the palace manager rather than his commercial activities. There is evidence of continuity, both in the general situation and in the specific phrase šumu ša ŠAG-su īnāššu(n), with a group of late Babylonian records, in particular with CNB 151, dated 527 B.C. (edited by E.W. Moore, Neo-Babylonian business and administrative documents, pp. 150–2). M. Stolper, Management and Politics in Later Achaemenid Babylonia (1974), p. 329, thinks that such texts arise from default of debts on goods, crops or work contracts: “similar detention must underlie contracts of release of persons which do not explicitly name the workhouse”. The late Babylonian texts of this type express the guarantee with a different phrase, PN₁ ītu PN₂ našu. It is possible that the role of the rab ekallī was comparable to that of the šatam Eanna in CNB 151.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. 9</th>
<th>Plate 3; Photo Plate 46</th>
<th>ND 7004</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.5 × 3.2</td>
<td>IM 74480</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE 1</td>
<td>20.ii. Nabu-tappatu-alik</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Obv.</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>SU.2.MES ša hu-la-a-a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2 | DUMU la-te-gi-a-na-
| 15 | |
| 3 | 1.dMAŠ-APIN-eš DUMU man-nu-ki-
| dMAŠ | (stamp seal impressions) |
| 4 | TA* SU.2 11R.d15 LÜ.GAL KUR |
| 5 | i-ta-ha-ša î-se-ši |
| B.E. | 6 | šum-ma ina še-er-ti ina li-diš |
| 7 | hu-la-a-a e-te-gi |
| Rev. | 8 | en-ti-ki pu-tuh UDU.MES-ia |
| 9 | i-na-ši 1/4 MA.NA KÜ.BABBAR (erasures) |
| 10 | 1.dMAŠ-APIN-eš a-na 11R.d15 (erasures) |
| 11 | ma-ku-tú ša MU.AN.NA SUM-an |
| 12 | ITI.GU4 UD.20.KÄM lim-me 1.dPA-tap-ut-DU |
| 13 | IGI 1HA.LA-a-a IGI 1SU-a-nu |
| 14 | IGI 1dEN-bal-lat IGI 1.dMAŠ-1 |
| T.E. | 15 | IGI 1.dNU-MAN-lg-bi |
| L.S. | 16 | IGI 1BÁD-ma-ki-
| dMAŠ | |
| 17 | pu-tuh UDU.MES |
| 18 | i-na-ši |
| R.S. | 19 | IGI 1NUMUN-GIN |

Sealing: Stamp seal; irregularly circular. Di. 1.5 cm. Impressed twice, poorly.
Description: Centre: above winged disc with short tail and streamers, supported below by bull man standing feet apart facing left, with arms upraised. To left: symbol of deity, possibly supported by animal. To right: below, star (?)-pointed; above, crescent moon (?).

Translation
Ninurta-eres son of Mannu-ki-Ninurta struck the pledge of Hulaya son of La-tegi-anastar from the hands of Urad-Istar the palace manager; he has brought (him) out. If one day (it is discovered that) Hulaya was negligent or absent, he is (still) responsible for my sheep, (and) Ninurta-eres shall pay to Urad-Istar 1/4 mina of silver as compensation for absence during the year. Month Ayyaru, 20th day, limmu Nabu-tappatu-alik. Witnesses: Zittaya, Ribanu, Bel-balaṭ, Ninurta-na'id, Šalmu-sarri-iqbi, Dur-maki-Ninurta. He bears the responsibility for the sheep. Witness Zeru-ukin.

Notes
8: en-ti-ki G perfect of makū IV. The verbs which occur in šumma ina šerti ina lidš clauses normally occur in the present tense (cf. 29:11); the perfect here indicates future discovery of a past action, and shows that it was not possible to check the sheep at the time when Hulaya was released.
makū and makūtu: according to this occurrence makūtu is to be associated with mekū III (makū IV) rather than with makū I; but it is not certain whether the two occurrences of makūtu listed in AHw are connected. The nA equation naperkū—makū (STT 394:133) and the specific sense 'to stop work' of naperkū in Hh I 367 suggest a
slightly different meaning from that of the association with egā here, where the two verbs could alternatively be taken as a hendiadys. The meaning of makutu as ‘work not done’ (or ‘negligence’) has developed into ‘compensation for work not done’ comparable to hibiltu ‘loss; compensation for loss’.

-ia: refers to Urad-Istar, and suggests that this record was dictated by him.

putuhu: to the discussion in FNALD pp. 43—4 add now Parpola, OLZ 74 p.31.

9: the subject of inasaš is the guarantor Ninurta-erēš.

17–18: these lines are perhaps not merely a repetition of ll.8—9 without the scribal lapse of -ia: according to the interpretation given in the commentary, Hulaya is redeemed prematurely, and these lines may refer to his future obligation as a shepherd to Urad-Istar (SMD).

Commentary

As in No. 8, a pledged person is here released from his unfree condition by a third party who undertakes to be responsible for any future delict of the pledge, Hulaya. There are further similarities: in each case the “creditor” is the palace manager, and he retains some claim over the released person even after the current transaction. As in No. 8, here too we cannot be sure whether the man providing the guarantee was the original guarantor of the debt which landed the debtor in his pledge condition, or is newly arrived on the scene, enabling him to be released temporarily by providing security. It is possible that the detention of the debtor was not on purely commercial grounds, as in No. 8.

A Ninurta-erēš and a Dur-maki-Ninurta both occur as witnesses in ND 2082, a post-canonical female slave sale.

---

No. 10

Tablet: 3.5 × 2.1
Envelope: 4.5 × 2.9
SE 10

Tablet

Obv. 1 2 MA.NA KUB.BABBAR
       2 šā SE ki-se-te šā MUŠEN.MEŠ
       3 šā 1 Á.KAL-aš-šur
       4 ina IGI 1 qur-dī-4-asal-lū-hi
       5 ina UD.1.KÂM šā ITI.GAN
       6 SUM-an šūm-ma la i-dīn

B.E.  7 60 ANŠE ŠE.PAD.MEŠ
       8 ina qab-si Ė.GAL
       9 SUM-an

Rev. 10 IGI 1DPA-ša-li
       11 IGI 1 me-š-su
       12 IGI 1 ša-ši-š
Envelope

Obv. 1 NA₂,KIŠIIB₄ qur-di₄-asal-lú-hi
2 LÚ.2-u urykúl-ha
3 2 MA.NA KÚ.BABBAR ŠE ki-su-tú
4 šá MUŠEN.MES ĖŠ.GAR šá Ė.GAL ma-šar-t[i]
5 šá₁ A.KAL-aš-šur LÚ.GAL Ė.GAL šá Ė.GAL ma-šar-t[i]
   (stamp seal impressions)
6 ina IGI₁ qur-di₄-asal-lú-hi
7 LÚ.2-u šá urykúl-ha

B.E. 8 ina UD.1.KÁM šá ITLGAN
9 SUM-an šumᵐ⁻ma la i-di[jin]
10 60 ANŠE EŠ PAD.MES

Rev. 11 ina qab-si Ė.GAL ma-šar-t[i]
12 a-na₁ Ė.KAL-aš-šur SUM-an
13 ITLAPIN UD.15.KÁM
14 lim-me₁ ĖN-KUR-u-a
15 IGI₁ aš lu a qu³
16 IGI₁ ĖN-(erasure)AŠ
17 IGI₁ šá-la-ma-še-e
18 IGI₁ x x (erasure) x x
19 IGI₁ gab-ri-i

L.S. 20 IGI₁ da-ta-a-a
21 IGI₁.d[A-MA]N²-PAP
22 IGI₁ x [(x)]²-MAŠ.MAŠ

Sealing: Stamp seal; circular. Di. 1.2 cm. Impressed 3 times; impressions fair though salt-encrusted.

Description: Pomegranate surrounded by a band which bends sharply down to left and right of pomegranate’s leaves to join it at their base; band also broken at bottom to accommodate the stalk at base of fruit.

Translation

Tablet: 2 minas of silver for feed for the birds, owed to Emuq-Assur at the disposal of Qurdi-Asalluhi. He shall deliver on the first day of the month of Kislimu. If he does not deliver, he shall deliver sixty homers of barley inside the palace limits. Witnesses: Nabu-usalli, Me’isu, Šaši.

Envelope: Seal of Qurdi-Asalluhi the deputy of Kalhu. 2 minas of silver (for) feed for the birds, iskaru-material of the Review Palace, owed to Emuq-Assur, the palace manager of the Review Palace, at the disposal of Qurdi-Asalluhi, the deputy of Kalhu. He shall deliver on the first day of the month of Kislimu. If he does not deliver, he shall deliver to Emuq-Assur 60 homers of barley inside the palace limits. Month of Arahsamna, 15th day, limmu Bel-šadua. Witnesses: Aš-lu-a-qu(?), Bel-iddin, Ša-lamašše, X, Gabari, Dataya, Nabu-šarru²-ushur, X-Nergal.

Notes

The envelope has a fuller text than the tablet, a different set of witnesses, and is dated. The line numbers which follow refer to the text of the envelope.
3: *kissutu*, long known to mean "fodder" for stall-feeding animals in the 2nd and 1st millennium (cf. CAD K s.v. *kissatu*), is here first attested meaning grain feed for poultry.


**Commentary**

This is a contract between two government officials for the supply of feed for birds, which were presumably kept in, or at least by, the Review Palace. The supplier, in return for 2 minas of silver, undertakes to provide within two weeks the fodder, otherwise he will be liable for 60 homers of corn. The actual quantity of fodder is not specified: either it was tacitly understood, or perhaps the mention of *iskaru* implied a prescribed amount. The term *iskaru* also suggests, although it does not prove, that this is an administrative transaction couched as a commercial one, rather than a purely private contract between two individuals. The profession of *musuikili isurāte* in Neo-Assyrian seems to be unattested before the post-canonical period. It may have superseded *rā'i isurāte*, which occurs only in earlier texts.

**No. 11**

Plate 3; Photo Plate 46

3.6 x 6.0
SE 8
Triangular docket

**Obv.**
1 2 ANŠE ŠE.PAD.MEŠ
2 ša ma-[u-u]l-tū
3 ina GIŠ.BÁN ša 10 ina 1 qa aš-šur-<a>
   (2 stamp seal impressions)
4 ša 1DÚ-a-a
5 DUMU 1rēm-ni-U
6 ina IGI 1as-šu-du
7 DUMU 1qur-di-DINGIR.MEŠ-ni
8 ša URU.ŠIMXA.MEŠ

**Rev.**
9 ina pu-u-hi
10 i-ti-ši
11 ina ANŠE 2-BÁN-šá
12 2 e-ši-de
13 ina ad-ri SUM-an
14 šum-ma la SUM-ni
15 ina ANŠE 5-BÁN-šá tar-bi
16 ITI.BARAG UD.9.KÁM
17 lim-mu 1ITI.AB-a-a
18 LŪ.EN.NAM ša uruBÁD. <MAN> .GI.NA
19 IGI 1ha-na-di-i

**L.S.**
20 IGI 1zi-zi-i IGI 1si-mil-DINGIR
21 IGI 1dPA- x x x .MEŠ A.BA
22 ŠE.BAR ina ha šī 1x 1mā 1-ha i-ka-ra-ra

**ND 7058**

IM 75765
9.i.Kanunayu
Sealing: Stamp seal, oval; Max. di. 1.5 cm.; min. di. 0.7 cm.; impressed twice, faintly. Design: geometrical, rather resembling an archaic cuneiform sign.

Translation
2 homers of barley of the ma‘uttu-land according to the seah-measure of 10 qa, by the Assyrian qa, owed to Bunaya son of Remeni-Adad, at the disposal of Asqudu son of Qurdi-ilani of the Brewers' Village. He has taken it as an exchange loan. He shall deliver on the threshing floor 2 seah interest per homer, and (he shall provide) 2 harvesters (for the creditor's harvest). If he does not deliver, it shall increase by 5 seah per homer. Month Nisan, 9th day, limmu Kanunaya the governor of Dur-Šarru-kin. Witnesses: Hanadi, Zizi, Simil-ili, Nabu-x-x the scribe. He may put the barley ..... 

Notes
2: for the most recent discussion of ma'uttu see S. Parpola, ZA 65 (1976) 295; also CAD M Pt. 2, s.v. mu'unatu.
3: the vertical wedge (J) missing in the copy between ina and qa is in fact present (collated).
8: K. Deller suggests a possible equation with KUR/URU si-ri-iš-a-o-a), for which see NAT 313.
22: possibly to be taken as: ina ha-si-x i-na-ha (for: inuattaha) ikarrara "he shall collect it and deposit it at the granary" assuming a connection with hašimbu (read ha-si-ša-mu or even ha-si-bi 

Commentary
Asqudu, son of Qurdi-ilani, is also the debtor in No. 17 where he owes a ram. Although there is no obvious reason why the two texts need have been kept together, they are also linked by the occurrence of Zizi in each as a witness. The previously unknown limmu of No. 17, Nur-šal-am-kaspi, is presumably post-canonical, and this provides confirmation that Kanunaya, governor of Dur-Šarru-kin, is also post-canonical (as we had already deduced from No. 6).

With Stolper, BASOR 239 (1980) 79, it may be that nibzu is the word used in Neo-Assyrian for a triangular docket of this kind. The same suggestion is made by H. Tadmor, XXV RAI (Berlin 1978 ed. H. Nissen and J. Renger) pp. 453-4 and note 64.

No. 12 Plate 4 ND 7010

5.1 × 2.9 IM 74486
SE 8; floor 26.viii.Ășur-matu-taqquin

Obv. 1 2 ANŠE ŠE.BAR ina GIŠ.BÂN 9
2 1lis-se-me-DINGIR GAL KUR šá KUR ma-šar-ti
3 šá urukal-ha
(2 stamp seal impressions)
4 a-na 1.pA-KAL-in-a-ni
5 LŬ.GAL u-ra1 šā GAL.SAG
B.E. 6 it-ti-din TA* ŠĂ
7 ki-si-ti šá 1.re-mu-ti
THE TABLETS FROM FORT SHALMANESER

Rev. 8 i-ka-sap ITI.APIN
9 UD.26 lim-mu 1as-šur-KUR-LAL
10 IGI l.ĐPA-šal-li
11 IGI 1TE-a-a LÚ.GIGIR
12 IGI 1SU-U LÚ.GIGIR
13 IGI 1HR-ŠIN.LIL

Sealing: see Iraq 24 p.39 fig.11 and plate XXII/4.

Stamp seal; octagonal lozenge shaped. L. 1.5 cm.; width 0.8 cm+. Impressed twice; faint.
Description: up vertical axis of seal, at bottom, lotus flower; above this squats small Egyptian figure, knees drawn up to stomach, hands held up before face.

Translation
2 homers of barley according to the seah-measure of 9 (qa), Isseme-ili the palace manager of the Review Palace of Kalhu has delivered to Nabu-danninanni the commander of teams of the chief eunuch. He shall deduct (it) from the feed-stuff of Remutu. Month Arahsamna, 26th day, limmu Aššur-matu-taqquin. Witnesses: Nabu-ǔsalli, Sukkaya the charioteer, Eriba-Adad the charioteer, Urad-Mullissu.

Notes
5: for LÚ.SAG (=ša rēšī) and GAL.SAG (=rab ša rēšī) see most recently AOAT 33 p.91 and S. Parpola, OLZ 74 (1979) 33, maintaining the meaning "eunuch" and "chief eunuch"; see also on No. 101.i.13.
8: this is taken as a metaphorical meaning of kasāpu, comparable to that of ḫarašu.
11: LÚ.GIGIR: Kinnier Wilson would read ša mugerrāte "drivers" in NWL p.50; Parpola (JSS 21 (1976) 172 and OLZ 74 (1979) 35) would read susānu "groom, trainer", CAD s.v. mugirru takes ša mugirri as the definite reading of LÚ.(GIŠ)GIGIR. These two military witnesses were presumably also in the service of the chief eunuch.

Commentary
Like No. 10 this is probably a document from within the administration, framed in legal phrases. It seems to perform two functions: it acts as a receipt, showing that Nabu-danninanni did indeed receive the corn that is mentioned, and as an authorization to the palace manager, presumably, to recover the corn from Remutu’s fodder. Since the document is sealed, it is not a mere archival note, and the easiest reconstruction of the background to the transaction has to be that the team-commander, Nabu-danninanni, both acknowledged receipt and authorizes the payment. This implies that Remutu is probably another official employed by the chief eunuch, who will recognize the seal and honour it by refunding the corn.

This is the only post-canonical text which attests the continued military use of the Review Palace, and the nature of this document could indeed be taken as evidence that it was not often used by the army at this late date. For the chief eunuch's role, see commentary on No. 100.
TABLET 13

No. 13  Plate 4; Photo Plate 46  ND 7054

3.4 x 5.4
SE 1  IM 75760
Triangular docket  — —v.Muṣallim-āššur

Obv. 1 [ A
2 [ x ANŠE $]E.GIG.MEŠ
3 [ ina GIŠ.BAN] ša 8 ina 1' qa URUDU
4 ŠE ki-su-tū ša MUŠEN.MEŠ
5 ša KUR ma-šar-te
(seal impression)
6 ina IGI 1.d.PA-KAL-in-PAP.MEŠ
7 ina ITI.KIN ŠE.BAR SUM-an

Rev. 8 šām-ma la-din-ni
9 pu-tū-hu MUŠEN.MEŠ
10 i-na-ši ITI.NE
11 lim-mu 1mu-DI-aš-šur
12 IGI 1.GIR.2-15
13 [ IGI 1](x) x -PAP2).MEŠ-SU
14 [ IGI 1](x) x -P]AP-AŠ IGI [ššum7 ma3
15 [ A
16 [ -]i
(remainder of Rev. broken)

L.S. 1' [ x ina muh-hi
2' [( ) SUM]-an

Sealing: Stamp seal(?). Shape of the object with which the impression was made is very uncertain; conceivably a cylinder seal with an umbrella-shaped cap, impressed like a stamp seal. W. of cylindrical part 0.7 cm. as impressed; L. 1.9 cm. H. of umbrella part 0.7 cm.; W. of umbrella part at widest 0.9 cm.

Design: a rather elongated Omega-symbol with a vertical stand(?) below it. Dog-toothings round the lower rim of the 'umbrella'.

Translation
[ ], [x] homers of wheat, according to the copper seah-measure of 8 qa, as feed for the birds, owed to the Review Palace, at the disposal of Nabu-dannin-ahhe. He shall deliver barley in the month of Ululu. If he does not deliver, he shall bear the responsibility for the birds. Month of Abu, limmu Muṣallim-Āṣšur. Witnesses: Šepe-Istar, X-ahhe-s-eriba, X-ahu-iddin, Šumma(?), X, X. [ ] in addition [ ] he shall deliver.

Notes
1: either restore [NA4.KIŠIB PN], or restore a commodity.
2, 7: note that ŠE.GIG.MEŠ, normally translated "wheat" is specified in 1.2, while in 1.7 he is required to make payment of ŠE.BAR, normally translated "barley". A similar apparent change in the kind of cereal is found in ADD 128 (=ARU 322), where ŠE.PAD.MEŠ are borrowed and ŠE.BAR is to be repaid. This does not mean that those two terms can be identified (with R. Borger, RIA III, 310b Getreide), since in ADD 148 (=ARU 325)
The Tablets from Fort Shalmanesar

§E.GIG.MEŠ are borrowed and §E.BAR is to be repaid (ref. K. Deller), as is the case here. Perhaps then §E.BAR is a general term for cereals, wheat or barley.

8: *la-din-ni* contracted for *la i-din-ni* (cf. No. 4:13).

Commentary
In the absence of the *ina pāhi* clause this text is to be seen as a contract for the supply of bird feed. Although the days of the months are not specified, the payment is to be made in the following month, as in No. 10. Presumably, as there, it was the palace manager who acted as “creditor” in the transaction, although here he is not named or even referred to by his title—the creditor is simply “the Review Palace”.

SMD thinks the omission of *ina pāhi* is not significant, and that this is a transaction in which Nabu-dannin-ahhe is recorded as taking the wheat.

No. 14 Plate 4; Photo Plate 46

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Obv.</th>
<th>Rev.</th>
<th>Sealing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.0 × 2.4</td>
<td>9 AN§E §E.PAD.[MEŠ]</td>
<td>9 §um₄-ma NU SUM-an pu₄-tu-h[u ( )]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE 1; on floor</td>
<td><em>ina</em> GIŠ.BĀN šā 10 qa [[ ]]</td>
<td><em>a-šu-u-di</em> šā MAN [[ ]]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Triangular docket</td>
<td>(stamp seal impression) <em>nu</em>sa-he</td>
<td>(stamp seal impression) <em>Ša ma-u-te</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(stamp seal impression) <em>Ša</em> MAN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>ša ŠU.2 LŪ.GAL</em> kar-man-[n]₂</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>ina</em> IGI [d]UTU-PAP-AS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>ina</em> ad-ri SUM-an</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*šum₄-ma NU SUM-an pu₄-tu-h[u ( )]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>a-šu-u-di</em> šā MAN [[ ]]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(stamp seal impression) <em>nu</em>sa-he</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(stamp seal impression) <em>Ša ma-u-te</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(stamp seal impression) <em>Ša</em> MAN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.E.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>TCAE p.403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>ina</em> ad-ri SUM-an</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*šum₄-ma NU SUM-an pu₄-tu-h[u ( )]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>a-šu-u-di</em> šā MAN [[ ]]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(stamp seal impression) <em>nu</em>sa-he</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(stamp seal impression) <em>Ša ma-u-te</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(stamp seal impression) <em>Ša</em> MAN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>ša ŠU.2 LŪ.GAL</em> kar-man-[n]₂</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>ina</em> IGI [d]UTU-PAP-AS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sealing: Stamp seal, circular; Di. ca. 1.2 cm.; one impression, condition poor.

Design: probably deity in circle of ‘glory’; similar, but not identical, to that on Nos. 5 and 6.

Translation
9 homers of barley according to the seah-measure of 10 qa, corn-tax from the ma’utu-land of the king, in the charge of the granary officer, at the disposal of Šamaš-ahu-iddin. He shall deliver on the threshing-floor. If he does not deliver, he shall be responsible for *ašidu*-food for the king(?). Month of Ayyaru, xth day, *limmu* Mu[....]. Witnesses: Ši[ši²], Nabu-x.
Notes
9: for the present tense (iddan) in this context see No. 43:11; the preterite (iddin(i)) is more usual.
10: translation as in TCAE p.403 and FNALD p.44. Alternatively read MAN as part of another word, or as the number 20, and cf. NWL No. 35 iii.18 (SMD). For ašūdu see now, in addition to the passages quoted in CAD s.v., Menzel, Ass.T., II, T 79 and 80, and ND 5461:2 (Iraq 19 (1957) 133); ND 2489 Rev.i.18' (Iraq 23 (1961) 33); CT 53 294.
13: by comparison with Nos. 15 and 16 the eponym may be restored to read Mušallim-Aššur.

Commentary
On this text, and the closely related Nos. 15 and 16, see the discussion in TCAE pp.180—181 which need not be repeated here. Note merely that their character as taxation debt-notes is confirmed by the occurrence of the phrase ša qūt “in the charge of” in each text, implying administrative control of, and not ownership of the items owing.

SMD thinks that these texts may not be tax assessments, but that the provision of e.g. fodder and bedding for animals, raw food for the kitchens, supplied by the Review Palace’s central authority to a particular official, was expressed in the form of a debt note; and that the words nuṣṭahu and šibṣu denote the origin of the grain or straw (i.e. from the king’s supply land), not that the commodity itself is due as tax. The grain and straw are supplied by the granary officer to the ‘borrower’ because they are already in his store; and the specific measure used, “the seah measure of 10 qa” (Nos. 15 and 16 ina libbi aššurite) would surely not be expressed in an assessment.

This leaves the problem of the delivery date “on the threshing floor” (omitted in No.15). If the ‘debtor’ in No.14 is supplied with barley for the purpose of making the king’s ašūdu, he would discharge the debt when he produced the porridge. A similar situation probably occurs in No.13, in which a man is loaned grain expressly as feed for birds; if he does not “repay” grain on a certain date, he is responsible for the birds. Surely what actually happens is that he produces fattened birds. The repayment clause may have become fossilized, and perhaps should not be interpreted literally; it may express a theoretical obligation to repay by a specific date, and has been adopted without detailed consideration from true loans. If this is so, it is not a matter for concern that the debtor repays as šE.BAR what he “borrowed” as šE.PAD.MEŠ or as šE.GIG.MEŠ (see note on No.13:2,7) nor is it puzzling that no interest accrues on overdue repayment. The ‘debtor’ is a palace official who is simply responsible for the final item: fattened birds, cooked ašūdu-porridge etc. [SMD].

This interpretation would link Nos.12—16 as administrative transactions recorded in a legal format, making each official personally liable for the materials issued to him for his work.

No. 15
Plate 4; Photo Plate 47

ND 7015
IM 74491
25.ii.Mušallim-Aššur
TCAE p.402

5.5 × 2.8
SE 10
Triangular docket
Sealing: Stamp seal(?); one straight edge; impression once only, incomplete; condition fair. L. min. ca. 2.4.; width min. ca. 0.9 cm.
Design: 3 unidentified motifs in free field.

Translation
5 bales of straw according to the Assyrian (bale), straw-tax of the ma'uttu-land, in the charge of the granary officer, at the disposal of Šepe-Ištar. Month of Ayyaru, 25th day, limmu Mušallim-Aššur. In the town of Quri'. Witnesses: Šisi, Nabu-usalli.

Notes
1: alternatively, one could read ét in place of tug (CAD M/1, 240a).
9: Quri': no other occurrences of this toponym are listed in NAT.

Commentary
This docket has the same creditor, date and commodity as No. 16, and two witnesses are common to both (and perhaps No. 14 also). The note in 1.9 is absent in No. 16, but after ša ma'uttu No. 16 adds ša MAN, which suggests that in this text too the ma'uttu was royal land. For the nature of the transaction see on No. 14.
TABLETS 16 & 17

Sealing: Stamp seal, circular; di. 1.4 cm.; impressed once, condition fair.
   Design: at outside, raised band. Inside this a circular design resembling spokes and hub of a wheel, but possibly a deity in glory; detail indistinct. Di. of inner circle, 4.5 mm.

Translation
15 bales of straw according to the Assyrian (bale), straw-tax of the ma'uttu-land of the king, in the charge of the granary officer, at the disposal of Šamaš-ahu-iddin. He shall deliver on the threshing floor. Month of Ayyaru, 25th day, limmu Mušallim-Aššur. Witnesses: Šisi, Nabua, Nabu-usallii.

Notes
4: this line was incorrectly transliterated as ŠE šib-ši .... in TCAE pp. 405 and 180.
10: šš is written over an erasure, but is certain by comparison with No. 15:10.

Commentary
See on Nos. 14 and 15; this docket does however have a very different archaeological provenance.

No. 17
Plate 5; Photo Plate 47
ND 7009

3.1 x 4.4
SE 1
15.xii.Nur-šalam-kaspi

Triangular docket

T.E. 1 (line erased)
Obv. 2 1 UDU.NÎTA.MEŠ
  3 a-li-du
  4 ša 1 AD-SU
  5 ina IGI 1 as-qu-du
     (2 stamp seal impressions)
  6 DUMU 1 qr-di-DINGIR.MEŠ-ni
  7 ina SAG.DU DINGIR GIBIL
Rev. 8 1 UDU.NÎTA.MEŠ
  9 a-du li-di-šu
 10 i-da-na
 11 IGI 1,4PA-še-zib-a-ni
 12 IGI 1 zi-zî-i
 13 IGI 1,4UTU-še-zib
ITIŠE UD.15.KÂM

lim-mu¹ ZÂLA[G-š]-a-lam-KÚ.BABBAR

Sealing: Stamp seal; elliptical. Max. di. 1.6 cm.; min. di. ca. 1.2 cm. Narrow raised border. One impression, poor.
Description: upper part of field: a triangular-shaped object, probably on a stem rising up from anvil-shaped base in lower part of field.

Translation
1 breeding ram, owed to Abu-eriba, at the disposal of Asqudu son of Qurdi-ilani. At the beginning of the new month he shall deliver the ram together with its offspring. Witnesses: Nabu-šezibanni, Zizi, Šamaš-šezib. Month of Addaru, 15th day, limmu Nur-šalam-kaspi.

Notes
2: despite the Mes here there is only one ram involved; cf. perhaps No. 7:6 and note that according to the Practical Vocabulary of Assur UDU.NI.ta.MES = ia-bi-li (AFO 18 (1957-58) 331:306).
7: the name of the month, which is usually given when this phrase occurs, is here omitted. If this is not an error the most obvious assumption would be that payment is to be made by the end of the month in which the transaction is dated.
15: the name of this limmu is not previously attested, but has been collated more than once; a rendering Limmir-šalam-kaspi cannot be excluded.

Commentary
The “debtor” in this contract is also encountered in No. 11, q.v., and may therefore have been regularly associated with the Review Palace. Although other texts relating to sheep are known (ADD 115; BT 131 and BT 138; see FNALD pp. 139-140) there are problems in understanding the nature of the transactions, and this text is equally problematical. If indeed it refers to a ram one would assume that it was made available to Asqudu in order to fecundate ewes of his. However, ll.7–10 rather imply that it remained with them during the whole period of gestation, birth, and lactation, which is improbable; moreover, it is hard to see how Asqudu would benefit from the transaction if he has to return all the resultant offspring, quite apart from the unsolved problem of the date (cf. note on l.7, and note that the animals are to be returned in the 12th month in ADD 115). On the other hand, this is not a loan, but a note of obligation, and it is not therefore necessary that Asqudu should be profiting from it; an administrative context could perhaps be invoked to account for some of the other oddities as well.

No. 18 Plate 5; Photo Plate 47

3.7 x (4.2)
SE 1; burnt block
Triangular docket

Obv. (upper part broken)
1’ [x] 'za bâ’ a²
2’ ina IGI¹ šûl-mu-PAP.M[ES² ( )]

ND 7055
IM 75761 [ ]
TABLETS 18 & 19

3' ina IGI 1TR.4ba-ni-[i][2]
   (2 stamp seal impressions)
4' ina pu-u-[i]ji it-ta-šu
5' ina SAG.DU DINGIR GIBIL

Rev. 6' šá ITLSIQ₄₅
7' ú x x ina SAG.DU-šú-nu
8' i-du-nu šum₄-ma la i-di-nu
9' ina 1 ANŠE S-BAN-šú-nu
10' i-ra-bi-'u
   (blank space above break)

Sealing: Stamp seal, circular; Di. 1.2 cm.; impressed twice, one fair, one poor impression.
Design: horned quadruped, back legs en marche, one foreleg raised to touch frame of seal at level of chest, head and neck turned round over back; identity of animal unclear. Narrow rim border.

Translation
[ ] Zabaya⁷, at the disposal of Šulmu-ahhe⁷ (and) at the disposal of Urad-Banitu. They have taken (them) as an exchange loan. At the beginning of the new month of Simanu they shall deliver the .......s at their capital value. If they do not deliver, they shall bear interest at 5 seah per homer. [ ]

Note
7': a plural masc. noun referring to the item(s) owed should be restored here. K. Deller suggests špu'-e, and refers to R. Heyer, Bagh. Mitt. 12 (1981) 83–86 for a discussion of its precise composition as horse fodder. Another possibility reconcilable with the copy would be U.KI.KAL (=lardu; sasswu?). That we do have to do with a vegetable product of some kind, suggested by the initial 0, is probably supported by the fact that this is a triangular docket of the type regularly used for corn loans.

No. 19 Plate 5 ND 7070

(6.3) × 5.2
SE 1
Triangular docket

Obv. (2 or 3 lines broken)
1' 10[ … ]
2' PAP [ … ]
   (seal impression)
3' a-ki 1 [ … ]
4' ú-[ … ]
5' ITILBA[RAG
B.E. 6' lî[ım-
Rev. 7' 1[GI] 1ra-[i][a²-
8' IGI 1gab-ri-[i ( … )]
The Tablets from Fort Shalmaneser

9' IGI 1 PAP-ŠSU(? ( ) ]
10' IGI 1 EN-ki-li-ši-ŠU(? ( ) ]
(seal impression)

Sealing: see Iraq 24 p.37 and fig.5 and plate XX/4.
Cylinder seal, impressed as stamp seal; H. 2.8 cm.; W. of impression 1.2 cm.; impressed once, condition good.
Design: 4-winged, bearded figure, standing with leg advanced, facing right, cloak revealing advanced leg to ankles. One or both hands held out before body. In front of advanced leg, edge of an unidentified angular object. Projecting from back below upper back wing, a limb or similar object.

Commentary
Since this is a docket the text presumably consisted of some kind of debt-note concerned with cereals or similar. L.3' suggests a possible Getreidekursangabe (cf. FNALD p.22; K. Deller, OrNS 33 (1964) 257–9), but since this is only attested in conveyances, some other provision must have been contained here, doubtless prescribing some detail as to the place, time or manner of repayment (cf. FNALD pp. 38–39).

No. 20

Plate 5

ND 7065

(5.9) × 4.5
SE 10
Triangular docket

Obv. 1 2 ME GIŠ ZI KI TU?
2 1 PAP-a-a-šu
(stamp seal impression)
3 1 d MAŠ-iq-bi i-ta-[ ]
4 ina IGI AD x NUM1-nu

Rev. (2 stamp seal impressions)

Sealing: see Iraq 24 p.38 and pl.XX/5.
Stamp seal, ovoid; max. di. 1.6 cm., min. di. 1.1 cm.; impressed once, condition good.
Design: stylized Egyptian sign or symbol, below in field to right, dot or circle. Narrow rim border.

Translation
Ahu-ayalu (and) Ninurta-iqbi have taken 200 torches(?). They will deliver them before(?) the campaign(?).

Notes
1: it is difficult to explain this as a form of ziqtu ‘torch’; a reading ziq-ši pl. ‘stakes’ may be preferable.
4: a reading ina IGI-ši KASKAL.2 is possible (collated), and the translation follows this reading.
TABLETS 20—22

No. 21  
Plate 5  
ND 7032  
ca. 4.5 × 5.0  
IM 64193  
SE 1  
Sealing  
TCAE p.22

1 ÉRIN.MEŠ MAN às-ru-te  
(royal stamp seal impressions)  
2 SU.2 115-BAD LÚ.GAR-[Ṭ]nī

Sealing: Oval clay sealing; reverse flat, with wood impressions. String-holes each end (5.5 x 4.7 x 1.9 cm.). Stamp seal; impressed three times, condition poor to good; di. 1.6 cm. Design: royal seal, king facing right, stabbing lion; wears conical hat with streamers, long sword on left side, tunic down to knee. Lion as usual. Border of dots; uninscribed.

Translation  
Soldiers of the king, reviewed; in the charge of Ištar-duri the šaknu-officer.

Note  
It is possible that Ištar-duri here is the same man as the eponym official for 714 B.C. (or the man who was eponym in 774 B.C.). Cf. also Sargon’s officer(s) Ištar-duri in No. 99.i.2 (rub urdat), No. 118:17, ND 2084:17 and ND 2083.iii.4 (ša qurbāte).

Commentary  
See after No. 23.

No. 22  
Plate 6  
ND 7033  
5.0 × 5.0  
Inst. Arch. London  
SE 10  
Sealing  
TCAE p.23

1 ÉRIN.MEŠ MAN às-ru-[te?]  
(royal stamp seal impression)  
2 SU.2 1.dPA-še-zib-ni

Sealing: Hemispherical clay sealing; reverse essentially flat, but grooved by at least seven roughly parallel string (?) marks; in the body of the sealing, at right-angles to these, carbonized remains of more string passing through it. On obverse, single centrally placed stamp seal impression; condition fair. Probably same seal as on No. 21 (di. 1.5—1.6 cm.).

Translation  
Soldiers of the king, reviewed; in the charge of Nabu-šezibanni.
Note
Nabu-šezibanni may be the same as the man in the text dating to the reign of Sargon, No. 101.iv.13’ (probably a LUGALGAL by comparison with other names in the same section with No. 99.i.21—ii.1) and in the wine list No. 121:14 (probably also reign of Sargon).

Commentary
See after No. 23.

No. 23
Plate 6; Photo Plate 47
IM 64194
TCAE p.23
4.0 × (3.0)
SE 10
Sealing
\[\text{MERSI\$1.MES la\$ bi [ ]} \]
(royal stamp seal impression)

Sealing: Hemispherical clay sealing, broken; reverse has many string impressions. On obverse, stamp seal impression, only one preserved; condition fair. Almost certainly same seal as on No. 21 (di. 1.6 cm.).

Note
The text cannot be confidently restored. la\$-bi-[ru-te] (so TCAE) “old troops” cannot be excluded, but the la could also stand by itself meaning “not …”.

Commentary on Nos. 21—23
Two of these sealings come from SE 10, one from SE 1 leading off it, and all have similar impressions on their reverse and the royal stamp seal on the obverse, and mention troops. Other sealings which bear the royal stamp seal were found in the same area: ND 7075 (=IM 64203) and ND 7078 (=IM 64204) in SE 10; ND 7053 from SE 1 and ND 7076 from SE 11 had a much larger circular royal stamp seal, di. 3.0—3.4 cm. Both small and large stamp seals were also impressed on ND 7080 (=No. 26) and probably on ND 7050 (see on No. 26), which came from SE 10 and SE 1 respectively.

Except for ND 7080 and 7050, which were much larger than the others, the function of all these sealings could have been similar to Nos. 21—23, despite the absence of an inscription, but it is impossible to prove this. As for Nos. 21—23 themselves, they presumably served the same purpose: they were all apparently applied to a wooden object with a flat surface, which had been secured with string. One obvious candidate is a box, but it is perhaps likelier, as suggested in TCAE p. 26, that they were the sealings of wooden tablets inscribed with lists of soldiers. This can hardly be proved, but it does at least provide a single adequate explanation of the string and wood impressions on the reverse, the inscriptions on the obverse, and of the royal seal. Why the lists should have required tying up and a formal sealing, we do not know, but it presumably reflects the existence of some kind of administrative obligation between the officers named and the palace. For the existence of several different palace seals simultaneously in use clearly
shows that not all were the king's personal signet, but probably official ‘palace’ seals wielded by an authorized official (see B. Parker, *Iraq* 24 (1962) 38; A.R. Millard, *Iraq* 27 (1965) 15; 40 (1978) 70). Although the inscribed sealings have the smaller, and the others the larger of the two seals, both occur on ND 7080 and this does not necessarily reflect any difference in date. There are not any reliable internal criteria for dating Nos. 21—23, and the discovery of No. 26 in the same room therefore makes a date in the reign of Esarhaddon the most plausible, but still far from certain.

No. 24

2.6 × 1.9
SE 10
Oval label with string-hole

Obv.  
1 x x x ru-šu
2 DAGAL (erasure)
3 [š]a a-pa-te
4 ša ša pu-li

Rev.  
5 ša ina UGU
6 KI.TA
7 tam-li-i

Translation
A .... one span in width, for 2 ... for the limestone house/room which is at the bottom of the terrace.

Notes
1: JNP suspects that the mu-tu before rāju stands for some form of *ummatu* “a cubit” with a Neo-Assyrian loss of the first syllable (cf. ina-me-te, ADD 1252 = FNALD No. 19:7); but no obvious explanation for the preceding i (which is written over an erasure) presents itself. The rāju is half a cubit, and its absolute value must depend on the length assigned to the cubit (cf. FNALD p. 71 for the possibilities).

3: a-pa-te: either apāte “reins, thongs”, or apāte “door-leaves” or apāte “openings, windows”.

4: ša pu-li: “limestone house” or ša hāl “cattle house”.

Commentary
Presumably this label was attached to the item mentioned, or at least given dimensions, in the text, but we cannot tell what it was since it was clearly superfluous to state it.

No. 25

5.7 × 3.8
SE 10; lower floor

Plate 6

ND 7069

IM 75776

47.iv. —

NR 378
THE TABLETS FROM FORT SHALMANESER

Obv. 1 [x+]4 l.dPA-u-a
2 [ ] l.d[x]x x
3 [ ] l ub-ru
4 5 l.U.GUR-še-zib-a-ni
5 7 l.PAP-u-a-SU

Rev. 6 PAP 31 a-na 1 lim
7 Ė.SIG4
8 14 l.R-EN-ki-li
9 20 l.a-hu-nu
10 [PAP] 34 šādī l x x (x)
T.E. 11 UD.4? ITL.$[U]

Not translated.

Notes
6–7: a translation ‘total 31 for 1,000 brick walls’ is nonsense, so Ė.SIG4 cannot be read īgaru here. The only reading known that seems to give a plausible result is mēlī with the meaning ‘steps of a stairway’.
10: another possibility is sa-bit x x (x).

Sealing: For this unusually large clay sealing see B. Parker, Iraq 24 (1962) 38 and Pl. XXI/I. Although the seal impressions are thoroughly published there, we have thought it worthwhile to include a new photograph here, in particular to illustrate the very clear string impressions on the reverse. The obverse of the sealing has the following seal impressions:
1. Cylinder seal, impressed twice, as stamp seal. H. 8.3 cm. Condition of both impressions fair. Design: king on right stabbing lion (Iraq 24 p. 38); behind king, on right, inscription in four lines within frame; ridged metal caps above and below. The transcription of the text of the seal given above is all that JNP could read with certainty under poor lighting, and the fuller text given in Iraq 24 is no doubt preferable.
2. Stamp seal, impressed at least 10 times. Di. 3.6 cm. Condition worn. Design: royal stamp seal; king facing right, stabbing lion; guilloche border with raised rim, probably uninscribed.
3. Stamp seal, impressed at least 7 times. Di. 1.4 cm. Condition very worn. Design: royal stamp seal; king facing right stabbing lion; probably no border or a border of fine dots.
Commentary
There must have been good reasons for the application of three different "royal" seals to this sealing, but we cannot hope to reconstruct them now. ND 7050, found in SE 1 next door, was very similar: it measured about 8 x 5.6 cm., and bore a single impression from a large cylinder seal with ridged caps, used as a stamp seal, the trace of an impression from a large stamp seal, and three impressions from another, smaller, stamp seal (di. 1.5—1.6 cm.). For the different palace seals, see commentary on Nos. 21—23.

No. 27
Plate 6
ND 7007
ND 7007

Obv. 1 ĖN AN Șūba-ub  KI ȘUB
2 AN BA.SUB  KI BA.ȘUB
3 AN BA.ZA.AH  KI BA.ZA.AH
4 AN BA.ZA.AH.HA  KI BA.ZA.AH.HA
5 LÚ GAB?  E.ZA.AH.HA
6 INIM DINGIR.[R]E  E.NE.KE₄
7 AG ȘUB  TUS ÊN

Rev. 8 an-na-a 3-šǔ šu-sī-šǔ ana mu[h-hi
9 i-haș-ša-aš-ma i-r x 1-bu/pu
10 ina Ė mu-sa-a-[r]
11 A.MEŠ ina muh-hi i-r x-x

Translation

Make him recite this 3 times. He shall build a reed hut (?) facing ...., and he shall .... In the washroom he shall .... water over.

Notes
3—5: ZA.AH (HA) is taken as a phonetic writing of ZAH.
5: LÚ GAB is taken as short for GABA-ri.
8: Șu-sī-šū taken as Bab. Š imperative from Șasū.
9: haššu elsewhere takes haššu as direct object, but it is doubtful whether there is room to restore it at the end of line 8.
11: the verb may be read either i-ra-muk "he shall wash" or i-šap-pak "he shall pour".

Commentary
This is a Sumerian incantation with ritual instructions in Akkadian concerning the washroom, possibly connected with the building of a reed privy. It is Babylonian both in the shape of the tablet and (probably) in the dialect used for the ritual instructions. The translation is offered very tentatively; close parallels are needed.
No. 28  Plate 6  ND 7073

4.2 × 2.4  IM 75780
S 10; east end ca. 0.70 m. above floor

Obv.  1 IM 1.dPA-MU-GIS
      (seal impression)
      2 a-na ha-am-pu-hi
Rev.  3 A.SA ina IGI di-di-i
      4 a-ra-am-me

Seal impression: From a rectangular stamp seal, design not recoverable.

Translation
Tablet of Nabu-sumu-lešir to Ham-puhi. The field (is) at the disposal of Didi......

Notes
1: Nabu-šumu-lešir a scribe occurs in 6:11. He (or a man of the same name) is concerned with cereals in 77.
4: a-ra-am-me: one expects the D stem, to give i-ra-am-me, which would mean ‘I am leaving the field at the
disposal of D’. However, rammū is not elsewhere used with ina IGI in this way. Deller suggests reading A. <SA>
ra-am-me ‘Leave the field!’, with ADD 168:5 for comparison.

Commentary
Note that this administrative letter is authenticated with the writer’s seal. Does this hold
the record for the shortest known Neo-Assyrian letter?

No. 29  Plate 7; Photo Plate 47  ND 7071

5.7 × 3.7  IM 75778
Corridor E 2; ca. 10 cm. above pavement  12.viii.Sin-šarrussu-ukin
   12. viii. Sin-šarrussu-ukin
   NR 434 -- 5

Obv.  1 de-e-nu ša Ml.2-e-tū
      2 ša mšša-kin-tū
      3 TA* is-me-DINGIR
      4 ta-di-bu-u-ni
      (2 stamp seal impressions)
      5 ina UGU ml-mu-sa-i-tū GÊME-i-ša
      6 ša hal-qa-tū-u-ni
B.E.  7 ša ur-ki-ša šu-tū-u-ni
      8 ½ MA.NA KÜ.BABBAR is-me-DINGIR
Rev.  9 a-na Ml.2-e-tū : it-ti-din
      10 ina še-er-te ina li-di-iš
      11 ina E ml-mu-sa-i-tū : ta-na-mar-u-ni
      12 ½ MA.NA KÜ.BABBAR Ml.2-e-tū
13  a-na 1 is-me-DINGIR : ta-da-an
14  ú šš-i’ 1 MA.NA KÚ.BABBAR ša dan-ni-ti-ša
15  ú hi-bi-la-te-ša TA* IGI ē.
16  m̄mu-sa-i-tā ta-na-mar-u-ni : ta-na-ši
17  ITILAPIN UD.12 lim-mu 1,4(l)0-LUGAL-su-GIN
18  IGI 1 rém-mu-ute IGI 1,4 PA-TAĜ,4 PAP
L.S. 19  IGI 1,4 PA-še-zib-a-ni
20  IGI 1 zi-ta-a-a
21  IGI 1 MAN-I
22  IGI 1,4 MAŠ-PAP-AȘ

Sealing: Stamp seal, oval; max. di. 1.6 cm., min. di. 1.2 cm.; impressed twice, condition very faint.

Design: to right, bird (eagle with wings splayed out behind, standing facing left; to left, vertical object, possibly tree or sacred symbol.

Translation
(Result of) a court case which the (female) deputy of the šakintu brought against Isseme-ili concerning her slavegirl Musaitu who escaped (and) whose surety he (Isseme-ili) was. Isseme-ili has paid ½ mina of silver to the deputy. If one day Musaitu is found, the deputy shall pay (back) ½ mina of silver to Isseme-ili. She shall take either the (original) sale price (?) of 1 mina of silver as on her record of sale, or compensation for (loss of) her (services), for the time before which(?) Musaitu was found. Month Arahsamnu, 12th day, limmu Sin­sarrussu-ukin. Witnesses: Remutu, Nabu-rehtU-U$Ur, Nabu-sezibanni, Zittaya, Šarru­na’id, Ninurta-ahu-iddin.

Notes
4: ta-di-bu-u-ni: one expects the nA form to be tad(d)ubbiini, see GAG §101f. K. Deller suggests emending to ta-di-<bu->bu-u-ni.
7: after collation, the first sign may be either ša or TA*.
14: collation has rejected a reading bet .... bet. The context seems to allow “either .... or” or “both .... and”, the latter being particularly emphatic since it is not normally expressed at all in written nA. Cf. “or” in the closely comparable text ADD 105 = FNALD No. 42:15.
šī’l: SMD takes this as nA for šīmu with intervocalic m changing to aleph. The noun šīmu is attested in oAss and nA but not yet syllabically written in nA; cf. GPA p.128 and Deller, RA 61 (1967) 189. JNP prefers to take this as the 3 fem. sg. personal pronoun (for šī or for šīl with loss of intervocalic v: cf. a-bu-tš šī-šīš, ČT 53 974:9, ref. K. Deller). He would then translate: “and she (for her part) shall take the 1 mina of silver as on her record of sale, and her compensation-for-loss-of-services (calculated) in accordance with (issu pān) when M. is found”.
15: TA* IGI ē: this seems the best way to understand the signs. A translation “from the house in which M. is found” seems less satisfactory from both legal and grammatical points of view. Cf. û šīma ē PN inmanmirānū in FNALD No. 42:15; in that text and in ll.11 and 15 here the bet with a preceding word seems to have an indefinite nuance, “if ever”, “whenever”, as does bet alone, with a locative meaning (FNALD Nos. 23:6; 27:9).

Commentary
This is a unique and especially difficult document, despite its excellent state of preservation. The opening lines are clear: Musaitu was a slave-girl purchased by the deputy šakintu for 1 mina of silver, and Isseme-ili was named as her surety (ur-ki-ša; it makes no difference to the sense whether we take this as “her surety” (from urkil’u) or simply “behind her”). Now that she has fled from her mistress, he makes due amends by
paying her half a mina of silver. This would apparently discharge his obligation, but the document goes on to consider what should be done if the girl reappears: the half mina of silver goes back to Isseme-ili, while the deputy šakintu will take back the original 1 mina purchase price and some form of compensation for the period during which she was deprived of both the girl’s services and her money. Nowhere in the document do we learn who was the previous owner of the girl, but presumably he gets the girl back again since the deputy šakintu is understandably no longer interested in her. Nothing in the other examples of the urki’u procedure would allow us to suppose that Isseme-ili could have been the previous owner himself, but it is interesting that he is not even named here.

No. 30  Plate 7; Photo Plate 47 ND 7072

6.8 x 4.2 S 10; in fill ca. 1 m. above floor

Obv. 1 de-e-nu ša maša-ba-la-a-a
2 LŬ.2-i-ta ša maša-kin-te ša E.GAL maša-ti
3 TA* an-da-si ta-GA-ru-u-ni
4 MĪ 10 GIN KŬ.BABBAR ina UGU SAG.DU-sa
5 1 an-da-su a-na maša-ba-la-a-a
6 it-ti-din de-e-nu ú-zak-ki
(2 stamp seal impressions)
7 ša-l-mu a-na bīr-te-sa-nu
B.E. 8 ú-ta-ru TA* IGI a-he-iš mám-ma TA* mám-m[a]
9 la KA.KA man-nu ša UGU man-nu ib-bal-kat-u-ni
Rev. 10 10 MA.NA KŬ.BABBAR SUM-an a-de-e ša MAN
11 ina šU.2-ša lu-u-ba-ʼu
12 ITLSIG4 UD.4 lim-mu 1 aš-šir-ré-m-a-ni
13 IGI 1 tar-te-man-ni LŬ.DUMU E.GAL
14 IGI 1 ša-l-mu-lu-ti ša-ša IGI né-re-ri
15 IGI 1 man-nu-ki-dUTU IGI 1 GİR.2.d MAŠ-aš-bat LŬ.NI.GAB
16 IGI 1 SU-šir IGI 1 na-din-nu
17 IGI 1 GĬŠGAL.15 IGI 115.SUM-PAP.MEŞ
18 IGI 1 DINGIR-la-a IGI 1 PAP-BÁD

Translation
(Result of) a court case which Kabalaya the deputy of the šakintu of the Review Palace brought against Andasu. Andasu has given to Kabalaya the woman (and) ten shekels of silver in addition to her capital (value), (and so) has cleared the dispute. There is accord between them; each has paid the other; neither shall claim against the other. Whoever breaks the agreement with the other shall pay ten minas of silver (and) the oaths of the king shall exact retribution from him. Month of Simanu, 4th day, limmu Aššur-remmanni. Witnesses: Tartimanni the mār(?)=ekalli, Šalmu-ahhutu the man in charge of the entrance,
Mannu-ki-Šamaš, Šepe-Ninurta-ašbat the doorkeeper, Eriba-Aššur, Nadinnu, Sukku²-Ištar, Ištar-nadin-ahhe, Ilaya(?), Ahi-duri.

Notes
6: dēnu uzakki: elsewhere zakkū is not attested with dēnu as an object.
10–11: see FNALD p.20; note that CAD s.v. adī B differs.
13: LŪ.DUMU.É.GAL (or LŪ.TUR.É.GAL): it is not certain whether this is an alternative expression for LŪ.GAL É.GAL. Tartmanni certainly served as LŪ.GAL É.GAL in [623] and [615] B.C., but he is known as a subordinate of a LŪ.GAL É.GAL in No. 3. The title mār ekalli (sic?) is borne by the creditor in the post-canonical archive from Nineveh to be published by Ismail and Postgate, text No. 7: Ninurta-šarru-usur LŪ.DUMU É.GAL ša É.GAL GIŠGAL, who is loaning money to Mannu-ki-Nabu DUMU É.GAL ša É.UGU.É.GAL, who is loaning money to Mannu-ki-Nabu DUMU É.GAL ša É.UŠ-šu. CAD gives no nA references for mār ekalli.
17: GIŠGAL-15 or sūk-15, it is not certain whether the sign is to be considered logographic or syllabic; cf. AHw s.v. sukku l.

Commentary
This text differs from No. 29 but agrees with No. 31 in that it is a “Record of judicial settlement” which concludes the dispute and makes no further dispositions. Presumably the disagreement centred round a female slave, but we have no details because we are simply told that the requisite restitution and payment have been made, and that closes the case. As in No. 29 we are not told what authority presided (cf. No. 31, where it is the mayor of Kalhu).

No. 31
Plate 7; Photo Plate 47

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Obv.</th>
<th>Rev.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.9 × 3.7
S 10; east end of room, ca. 1m above lower floor

5.9 × 3.7
S 10; east end of room, ca. 1m above lower floor

IM 75784
20.i.Šalmu-šarru-iqbi
NR 643
ND 7085
Sealing: Stamp seal, ovoid; max. di. 2.1 cm., min di. (est.) 1.7 cm.; impressed twice, condition fair; lower part missing.

Design: at left, worshipper with shortish hair and beard, kneeling with head back and hands upraised, facing right. Above hands, small winged disc with wedge-shaped tail and streamers; at centre, monster, possibly mushušú, facing left, bearing on his back altar base on which is a stylus, to left, and a space to right. At right, behind mushušú, unidentified object, possibly head of second figure.

Translation
(RESULT OF) a court case which Nabu-šarru-šur the mayor of Kalhu imposed. Court case which Ahu-eriba brought against Sar-Istar concerning his accounts. Instead of 15 shekels of silver he has taken 6 shekels of silver. There is accord between them; each has paid the other; neither shall claim against the other. As for anyone who breaks the agreement, [Assur], Bel, Šamaš, Ninurta (and) the oaths of the king shall exact retribution from him, and he shall pay 3½ minas of silver. Month of Nisan, 20th day, limmu šalmanu-šarru-šur, the turtan. Witnesses: Nabu-ahu-iddin, Tuttaya, Šunu-ahhe, Tartimanni, Zabaya, Banitu-eres, [X], Šamaš-namir.

Notes
1: K. Deller suggests that Nabu-šarru-šur, here mayor of Kalhu, could be the same man as the post-canonical eponym of ND 2091.
11: after collation 2 MA.NA also appears possible.
16: Zabaya seems probable in the light of No. 18:1', but the second sign of this name could also be a z[u].
17: Cf. 1 UTU-sa-na-mer in ND 2335;18, which may indicate that the reading šamšu-namer is preferable.

Commentary
This seems a relatively trivial affair in which to involve the mayor of the city: Sar-Istar has been sued by Ahu-eriba for the sum of 15 shekels of silver, which he either admitted owing but could not pay, or more likely did not acknowledge owing. With the award of 6 shekels to the creditor it looks as though a compromise solution was imposed.

No. 32
Plate 7; Photo Plate 47
ND 7093

IM 75793
S 10; near south wall in SE part of room, ca. 1.20 m above floor
14.vii.Aššur-gimilli-tirri

Obv. 1 NA₄.KIŠIB ¹MAN-lu-dā-ri
2 LŪ.GAL.NU.GIŠ.SAR.MEŠ ša uri kalha
(2 stamp seal impressions)
3 šum-ma ina šer-še il-li-[diš]
4 ¹MAN-lu-dā-ri T[A* ¹]mu₇[-x x (X)]
Sealing: Stamp seal, ovoid; ca. 1.4 x 1.2 cm.; impressed twice, condition bad. Design: two motifs; on left possibly altar-base and symbol(s); on right, possibly a worshipping figure.

Translation
Seal of Šarru-lu-dari, overseer of the gardeners of Kalhu. If one day Šarru-lu-dari sues [PN] or his [son(s), he shall pay 10 minas of silver. Assur and Šamaš shall be his prosecutors. Month of Tašritu, 14th day, limmu Assur-gimilli-terri. Witnesses: Ahu-le'i, Mannu-ki-Arbail, Bel-iddin, Nabu-belu-uṣur, Nabu-danninanni, Istar-na'id, Qarrad-ili.

Commentary
This is another document from a judicial context, although the word dēnu does not appear in the text. This follows from the terminology used (e.g. ina šerte illidin) and from the outward appearance of the sealed tablet, both characteristic of judicial settlements. Šarrulu-dari renounces any future litigation against the person whose name, in 1.4, is damaged, in terms which are immediately reminiscent of the clauses excluding future litigation in the regular Neo-Assyrian sale conveyances. The interest of this text is perhaps that it confirms that the penalties envisaged in those texts were seen as practical realities, even though we do not know what the matter under dispute was in this particular case.
Translation

Seal of Unzahu the owner selling the slave-girl. The queen (lit.: the palace woman of the king) has contracted and taken Urkistu-le’at Unzahu’s slave-girl for 35 shekels of silver. The price is paid completely. That slave-girl is sold and taken. Whoever breaks the agreement shall pay 5 minas of silver. (Guarantee against) an epilepsy attack for 100 days. (Guarantee against) fraud forever. Witnesses: Nabu-ahu-iddin, Belti-iddin, Adad­remanni, Gabari, Bibi, Nabu-sumu-iskun the scribe, Qibit-Istar. Month of Arahsamnu, limmu Kanunaya.

Notes

3: urkištā: urkittu (“lady of Uruk”) is expected; K. Deller suggests ur-UNUG{1-tū.
5: MÌ KUR: the possibilities for Akkadian readings are given by Borger in AOAT 33 pp.133–4.
ša MAN: was perhaps added to avoid confusion with plain GÊME, or to distinguish her from other women of the royal family, especially the MÌ KUR of the crown prince. It is necessary to take the signs MÌ + KUR ša MAN as representing the queen, since if the reading were GÊME ša MAN “servant-girl of the king” she would have been identified by name as the legal purchaser.
9: šudur: for the habitual lack of agreement in gender and number in this type of text see AHw p.1256a, s.v. šudur, šuduru 9.
16: Nabu-ahu-iddin may be the same man as in ND 5463 and 5550, a member of the staff of the Nabu temple.
22: a witness Qibit-Istar also occurs in Nos. 10 and 48, both texts also post-canonical.
23: for the post-canonical eponym Kanunaya see Nos. 6 and 11.

Commentary

In all respects this is a normal sale, the only point of special interest being the identity of the purchaser, in whose possession the text would normally have remained.
No. 34  Plate 9; Photo Plate 49  ND 7089

3.6 x 6.1
S 10; 0.30 m above floor

Obv. 1  NA₄.KIŠIB₄.man-nu-ki₄.урунина
       2  ᵃnu₄-ṣur₄-a-a
       3  EN DUMU.MI₄-ti-šu ta-da-ni

(stamp seal impression)

4  [m₄ x (x x)]x-ši-in : DUMU.MI₄-su
5  [tuppi₄-ša₄]šā-kin-tū
6  [ša ḫ₄ M₄]KUR
7  [ša Ḫ₄.GAL ma₄]-šar-ti ša  uru₄-kāl-hi
8  [TA* IGI₄.man-nu-k₄.урунина]
9  [ina libbi x G₄]N KU₄.BABBAR
10  [talqe kasp]u₄-g₄'am-mur ta-din

B.E.  11  [M]₄( _ ) za-a₄)-pa-a₄
12  [la-₄]e-at
13  [i₄]u₄-ra₄-ru de-e₄-nu

Rev.  14  KA.KA la₄-dā₄-šū₄
15  man₄-nu ša ina ur-ki₄₅
16  ina ma-ti₄-ma i₄-za₄-qu₄-pa₄-a₄-ni
17  i₄-GIB₄-u₄-ni
18  2 MA.NA KU₄.BABBAR SUM.an
19  a-de₄-e ša LUGAL
20  lu₄-EN de₄-ni₄-šū₄
21  ITLZI₄ ZUD.1.KAM
22  lim₄-mu₄ a₄-šu₄-ṣU-GUR

Sealing: Stamp seal, square or rectangular; width 1.8 cm., max. ht. ext. 1.5 cm.; impressed once, condition fair.
Design: humped bull, standing facing right; in field towards left, unidentified object—?star or end of curving-back tail. Below head, to right, small pedestal—?altar?. Below stomach between legs, eye-shaped motif—eye or vulva?

Translation
Seal of Mannu-ki-Ninua the Egyptian, the owner selling his daughter. The šakintu of the queen's household(?) of the Review [Palace] of Kalhu [has contracted and taken] FPN...
his daughter [from Mannu-ki-]Ninua [for x] shekels of silver. [The price] is paid completely. [The woman] is sold and taken. There shall be no going back, litigation or claim. Whoever afterwards at any time lodges a protest and breaks the agreement shall pay 2 minas of silver. The oaths of the king shall be his prosecutors. Month of Šabaṭu, 1st day, limmu Aššur-gimilli-terri. Witnesses: Bel-iddin, Ša-lamašše, Ninurta-ahu-uşur, Ištar-na’id, Šunu-ahhe, Kaskaya, Saši.

Notes
6: [ša ni M]. KUR is restored by comparison with No. 36:7.
18: 2 minas is a surprisingly low fine in relation to normal slave prices.

Commentary
Sale of a daughter to the šakinu, from whose archives this tablet would hence be expected to derive. The text is shorn of any unusual legal clauses, although the low fine envisaged suggests that it was possibly a “restricted conveyance” in that the girl could eventually be redeemed. However the clause in ll.19 – 20 speaks against this assumption.

No. 35 Plate 8 ND 7026 + 7061
IM 75755 + 75768 [ ].xii.[ ]

5.8 × (6.5) IM 75755 + 75768
D 3; southern end, 10 cm above floor (7026) [ ].xii.[ ]
D 3; on floor (7061)

Obv. 1 NA₄KIŠIB [¹dUTU-še-zib]
2 EN DUMU [ ]
3 I EN MAL [ ]
4 AŠA E x [ ]

(stamp seal impressions)
5 tu-piš-m[a miš-ti-DINGIR-at]
6 mišu-kin-[]-tu
7 TA*I G I ¹dUTU-[še-zib ina] ŠA X MA.NA KÙ.BABBAR(?)
8 ta-se-ge kas-[pu ga(m)]-mur [a]-di[n]
9 UN MEŠ šu-a-tu za-d[r]-pu
10 [aq-q]e-[u] tū-a-ru de-e-nu
11 KA.KA la-dāš-šu
12 man-nu ša ina ur-kiš ina ma-ti-ma
13 i-za-qu-pa-a-ni lu-u ¹dUTU-še-zib
14 lu-u DUMU MEŠ šu lu-u DUMU.DUMU MEŠ šu
15 lu-u PAP MEŠ šu lu-u DUMU.PAP MEŠ šu lu-u LÚ kan šu
16 lu-u EN il-ki lu-u mãm-ma mãm-ma
Translation

Seal of Šamaš-šezib the owner [selling his?] son? . . . . . a field, a house, [ . . . . . Šiti-ilat] the šakintu [of the Review Palace(?)] has contracted and taken (them) from Šamaš-šezib for x minas of silver(?). The price is paid completely. Those people are sold and taken. There shall be no going back, litigation or claim. Anyone who afterwards at any time lodges a protest, whether Šamaš-šezib or his sons or his sons’ sons or his brothers or his brothers’ sons or his šaknu-officer or anyone to whom ilku-obligations are due(?), or anyone else at all, who undertakes a lawsuit against Šiti-ilat or her brothers, shall place 10 minas of refined silver and 1 mina of purified gold in the lap of Ninurta who dwells in Kalhu. He shall return the price tenfold to its owners. (If) he claims in an invalid(?) lawsuit, he shall not succeed. Dada the chief [ ] was responsible for bringing(?)[the money]. Witnesses: Ahu-lamur the chief [ ], Susanu the mayor of [ ], Nurti the man of !Sid(?), Tartiba-Istar the [ ], Nabu-ra’im-napisti the scribe(?), Nabu-sumu-iskun the [ ], Puruta the [ ], Nabu-dalli? [ ], Nabu-ahu-usur(?). Month of Addaru, xth day, [limmu ].

Notes
2: in view of 1.9 read possibly EN LÚ[.MEŠ ].
3: it is uncertain whether this should be taken as the beginning of a PN, or as another item for sale: 1-en MAL[ ].
9: since there is no reference here to the field and house mentioned in 1.4, perhaps they were not being sold but had some other function in the transaction.
15: read either LÚ <ša> -kan-šu (cf. e.g. ARU 625; GPA Nos. 17; 32), or ša₁₁ -kan-šu.
16: for bel ilki see TCAE p.68.
25: the second horizontal wedge at the beginning of the line may be accidental, but is clear, as is the vertical wedge which we have copied. Nevertheless, read probably ind1nu1.

27: either LÚ.GAL 10, or LÚ.GAL ËKUR1.

27—28: for a comparable clause see GPA No. 102 rev. 7, and cf. GPA No. 100:9; it is unclear whether Dada had an integral legal part or only an executive role to play in the transaction.

30: No place-name Išid is found in NAT. Nurti: the reading of this name is established from variant writings in other post-canonical texts from Nimrud (cf. Index note 62), but there is no clear evidence to connect this holder of the name with the Nurti of ND 5447—5468.

32: one would restore BiA at the end of the line with greater conviction if the witness was the last in the list, the position usually taken by the scribe.

36: Nabu-ahu-ursur: possibly the rab ekalli of ND 2314:4, ADD 640 rev. 5, and ADD 641 rev. 14. He also occurs (without a profession) in the archive of Šamaš-šarru-ūṣur, in which group of records Tartiba-Ištar acts as a witness.

Commentary
To judge from 1.9 this is a purchase of more than one person by the šakinštu from a certain Šamaš-šezib; at least one of these persons must be mentioned in 1.2, and perhaps more were in the broken end of that line. The problem is posed by lines 3—4, which mention at least a field and a house(?); these further items were probably also sold, because they must be part of the object of the verbs tuppis and tasseqe, and would in a normal document have been placed after the seal impression. With the uncertainty about the correct interpretation of 1.3, we cannot offer a firm solution of this problem.

No. 36 Plate 9 ND 7091

4.4 × 7.4 IM 75791
S 10; east end, 30 cm above floor 28.xi. Adad-na'id

Obv. 1 [NA4.KIŠIB 1x (x)-õ]n[a-na-a
2 [EN DUMU.Mšu ina tar-b]u-ú-ti
3 [(a-da-æ)]ni

(stamp seal impression(s))

4 [mi x x x DUMU.M][l-su
5 [tuppiš-ma mi x x x x x]
6 [ ] ša mišša-kin-ti
7 [(s)A f. Mš.GAL](ina l)ib bi 10 GIN KÙ.BABBAR
8 a-na tar-bu-ú-ii ta-al-qe
9 [k]as-pu gam-nu r ta-dín tu-a-ru
10 de-e-nu KA.KA la-äš-ššu
11 man-nu ša GIB-u-ni aš-šur ËUTU
12 a-de-e ša LUGAL lu EN de-ni-ššu
13 1 MA.NA KÙ.BABBAR SUM-an

Rev. 14 IGI 1,1,1,1 MAŠ-PAP-AS LÚ.GAL G1Š.KAK.MES
15 IGI 1DÚ.GA-IM,urša-il
Translation
[Seal of Urad?-Nana] [the owner selling [his daughter for upbringing. [FPN the . . . .] of the šakinatu of the queen’s household [has contracted] and taken [FPN] his [daughter] for upbringing, for 10 shekels of silver. The price is paid completely. There shall be no going back, litigation or claim. Whoever breaks the agreement, Aššur, Šamaš (and) the oaths of the king shall be his prosecutors. He shall pay 1 mina of silver. Witnesses: Ninurta-ahu­iddin the rab sikkāti, Tab-sar-Arbail, Iqbi-Adad the fuller, Sinqi-Istar the surveyor, Summa-Nabu, Ninurta-iqbi, Šulmu-šarri, [X]-ahu-ushur, Istar-šumu-iddin. Month of Šaƀatu, 28th day, limmu Adad-na’id the chief steward.

Notes
1: there are prosopographical connexions with other post-canonical texts from the citadel of Nimrud, and their association suggests that the name Urad-Nana may be restored.
21—2: K. Deller points out that Istar-šumu-iddin is probably the scribe who occurs in ND 3426:38 and 2321:4.
24: this rendering of the name is adopted following Kaufman, JNES 37 (1978) 101ff., in taking U.U as a writing for Adad (or rather, for Hadad), so that this eponym’s name is read Adad-na’id instead of Adad-milki­na’id, while mudŠaru also continues to be read Adad. K. Deller and T. Kwasman’s recent identification of dA U.U (not MAN) as dApil-Adad rather than dA šarru may strengthen the case for U.U as plain Adad; see note on No. 93:8.

Commentary
This appears to be the first example of a Neo-Assyrian “upbringing” sale (tarbūtu = Ziehkindstellung, AHw s.v.). The purchaser was a female employee of the šakinatu, perhaps a scribe or her deputy. Although the price is relatively low, it is impossible to guess whether this is a consequence of the particular type of transaction, or of the youth of the girl being sold. There is no indication in the text of any special obligations incumbent on the purchaser.
Tablet

Obv. 1 11 GIN.MEŠ K.UB.BABBAR LUH-u
2 ša i z̄ALAG-dša-maš
3 ina IGI [a-][d]īl̄.DINGIR-iq-bu-u-ni
4 ina IGI tab-URU-a-a
5 ina IGI 1.dpa-u-a
6 a-na pu-hi i-[a-su]
7 K.UB.BABBAR a-na 3-s[u-šu]

B.E. 8 i-GAL-[bi]
9 šum-ma K.UB.BABBAR [a SUM-nu]

Rev. 10 [(x)] X.MEŠ-šu-[nu]
11 [a]-r[na ša]-l-par-[i GAR-nu/na]
12 UŠ HA.A ina UGU EN-sú-nu
13 ITL.ZÍZ UD.1 5^\text{c}.KAM
14 lim-mu 1aš-šur-gar-ru-u-a-ZÁLAG
15 IGI 1IM-aš-šur
16 IGI 1ITL.KIN-a-a

L.S. 17 [IGI] 1[-]-tú
18 IGI 1x x x x
19 IGI 1x (x) GAB^2-u-a

Envelope

Obv. 1' (upper part broken)
1' 11 GIN.M[EŠ K.UB.BABBAR LUH-u]
(2 stamp seal impressions)
2' ša i z̄ALAG-dša-maš [( )]
3' ina IGI-šu-nu ina pu-u-hi it-[a-su]
4' K.UB.BABBAR a-na 3-su-sú
5' i-rabb^2-bi
6' šum-ma [( ]
(remainder broken)

Fragment

[ ] UD a a x [ ]
[(x)] x šu a [ ]

L.E. IGI 1x [ ]
LÜ [ ]

Translation (Tablet only)

11 shekels of refined silver owed to Nur-Samaš, at the disposal of Adi-ilil^2-iqbuni, at the disposal of Tabalaya, (and) at the disposal of Nabua. They have taken it as an exchange loan. The silver shall bear interest at one-third. If they do not [deliver] the silver, their [ ] shall be [put] into pledge. (If the pledges) die (or) flee, (the responsibility for compensation rests) on their owners. Month of Šabaṭu, 15th? day, limmu Aššur-garua-neri. Witnesses: Šar-Aššur, Ululaya, X, X, X.
Notes
Tablet 3: the PN is restored by comparison with other instances (see PN Index), but other restorations could be considered, such as ¹[ša]¬DINGIR¬iq-bu-u-ni.
10: perhaps read [M].MEŠ.
11: after collating the tablet, JNP prefers to read this line ša ¹ZÁLAG¬d[U]TU], giving the unusual formulation “their wives(?) (will) belong to Nur-Šamaš”.
14: ZÁLAG used for neri (imperative of nāru) by homophonic association with nāru “light” as a variant of nāru (see CAD N, s.v. nāru D). For a similar pun, see Menzel, Ass.T., II, T22, confusion of mēlātu with māduṭu.
Envelope fragment: the placing of this small piece is uncertain, as it cannot confidently be equated with any part of the text on the tablet. Probably the envelope gave greater detail than the tablet, as often happens.

Commentary
Whichever version of 11.10—11 is correct, this is an unremarkable document, recording the borrowing of a small quantity of silver from Nur-Šamaš by three men, backed up by a pledge if they fail to meet the repayment date.

No. 38

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plate 10</th>
<th>ND 7066</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.8 × 3.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S 10; ca. 1 m above lower floor</td>
<td>14.i.Sin-uli-pani</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unbroken envelope</td>
<td>NR 387, 641, 643</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Obv. 1 NA₄.KIŠIB ¹AD-ul-ZU
2 ½ GIN.LAL.a-na ½ MA.NA KÛ.†BABBAR³
3 ša ml.d[NIN.LIL.-še-zib-ni Ml.x[(x)]]
4 ina IGI-šu ina pu-u-hi
   (2 stamp seal impressions)

B.E. 5 it-ti-ši
6 a-na 4-ut-ti-šu
7 i-GAL-bi

Rev. 8 ITT.BARAG UD.14.KÂM
9 lim-mu ¹.d30-DU-IGI
10 IGI ¹NU-MAN-E
11 IGI ¹NU-PAP.MES-u-ti
12 IGI ¹A-šl.DINGIR-a-a
13 IGI ¹.dPA-PAP-ASl
14 IGI ¹SUM-ma-₄p[4]

Sealing: see Iraq 24 p.38 and fig.6 and plate XX/6
Stamp seal, almost circular; di. 1.3 cm.; impressed 3 times, condition fair.
Design: at right, worshipper, standing facing left, in long robe, hands before face. To left: altar base bearing (at right) a spade (at left) 2 thin vertical rods (as in ND 7082), joined by crossbar at top, and in an unidentified way at centre. In field behind figure, vertical object. Style very linear and sketchy.
Translation
Seal of Abu-ul-idi. Half a shekel less than half a mina of silver, owed to Mulissu-šezibinni the [ ], is at his disposal. He has taken (it) as an exchange loan. It will bear interest at a quarter. Month of Nisanu, 14th day, limmu Sin-alik-pani. Witnesses: Šalmu-šarri-iqbi, Šalmu-ahhuti, Apladad-ilaya, Nabu-ahu-iddin, Šumma-Nabu.

Notes
3: the profession of this female money-lender cannot be read with any certainty. JNP suggests Mf.2-[ii] or similar; K. Deller suggests I[JUR] or N[1]GAB.
12: (²)A.U.U, to be read Apladad, is suggested here (not mār šarri or apil šarri) on the arguments of K. Deller and T. Kwasman; JNP prefers to accept the MAN at face value, although this would certainly seem to imply that the crown-prince was deified, or, to be more precise, could be used in the onomasticon in place of a theophoric element.
13: the last sign appears to be AŠ written over an erased SUM.

Commentary
A straightforward silver loan, for 29½ shekels, notable only for the fact that, as in other tablets from this provenance, a female official is the creditor.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. 39</th>
<th>Plate 10</th>
<th>ND 7088</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tablet: 4.0 × 2.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>IM 75788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Envelope: 5.0 × 3.0 × 2.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>19.i.Sin-alik-pani</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S 10; ca. 1 m above lower floor</td>
<td></td>
<td>NR 387, 641, 643</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tablet
T.E. 1 52 GÎN.MEŠ KÛ.BABBAR
Obv. 2 SAG.MEŠ ša dNIN.LIL
3 ša miša-tar-pal-ši
4 LÛ.A.BA-tu ša E.MÌ.KUR
5 ina IGI ¹NU-MAN-šarri
6 DUMU ¹GIR.2.²MAŠ
B.E. 7 ina pu-hi IL
8 ina 4-ut-ti-šū GAL
Rev. 9 ITL.BARAG <UD >.19.KÂM
10 lim-me ¹d30-DU.IGI.MEŠ.
11 IGI ¹šar-ti-man-ni
12 IGI šùm-ma-²PA
13 IGI ¹EN-bal-lat
T.E. 14 IGI ¹MAŠ-PAP.AŠ
L.S. 15 IGI ša-lam-hu-tu
16 IGI ¹(eraser)
Table 39

Envelope 1

Obv. 1 [(NA₄)KI][SIB 1,dNU-MAN-tiq-bi]
2 [A] 1,dGR.2,dMAŠ URU.ŠE GIŠ x [(x)]x-a-a
3 [S]2 GIN KU.BABBAR
4 ša 1 at-tar-pal-ši
   (very faint impressions)
5 L.U.A.BA-tū ša E M[I].E.GAL
6 ina IGI 1,dNU-dMAN-Iq-bi

B.E. 7 ina pu-hi IL
8 a-na 4-ut-ti-ši GAL

Rev. 9 ITILBARAG UD.19.KAM
10 lim-ma 1,d30-DU-IGI.MEŠ
11 IGI 1,iar-ti-man-ni LÚ.GAL KUR
12 IGI 1,dMAŠ-PAP-AS LÚ.GAL si-kur
13 IGI 1,sūm-ma-IPA
14 [IGI] 1,ša-lam-h[u-tū]
   (Possible few lines broken)

L.S. IGI 1,za-bi-n[u²]

Translation

(Words which occur in one version only are enclosed in round brackets. Differences in the order of witnesses are not marked.)

(Seal of Šalmu-sarri-iqbi [son of] Šepe-Ninurta of the village of X). 52 shekels of silver, (rēšāti-money of the goddess Mulissu,) owed to Attar-palti the female scribe of the queen’s house, at the disposal of Šalmu-šarri-iqbi (son of Šepe-Ninurta). He has taken it as an exchange loan. It shall bear interest at one quarter. Month of Nisanu, 19th day, limmu Sin-alik-pani. Witnesses: Tartimanni (the palace manager), Ninurta-ahu-iddin (the official in charge of the bolts), Šumma-Nabu, (Bel-uballat), Nabu-ahu-iddin, Šalmu-ahhutu, (Zabinu³).

Notes

Table 2: SAG.MEŠ: most recent listing and discussion in Menzel, Ass.T., II, note 155, avoiding any firm conclusion; also E. Lipiński, Les temples néo-assyriens, OLA 6 (1979) 572-4, opting for “top quality, first-rate”. JNP prefers to retain his interpretation of the original meaning as “first-fruits”, and hopes to return to the problem in his review of Menzel in JSS 28 (1983) 155-9; note that the correct nA transcription of the logogram is probably to be recognized in ND 10026:5 (NWL Pl. 45; here No. 141).

4: the female scribe in nA is attested only once (see Landsberger, Hebräische Wortforschung, in Festschrift W. Baumgartner (1967), 203). AHw s.v. ṣuparratu omits all OB references from Mari texts; add now MSL 12, 58.

12: collation established that “KUR at end of the line is beyond all doubt” (JNP). Since in No. 36:14 the same man is called rab sikkāte, this title must have been intended here too. Read perhaps si-kal². This title probably does not affect the (mainly nB) problem of reading UJ.GAL.DU (cf. Borger, AOAT 33, p.143).

Envelope 3: there is an erasure after 50.

4: note that Attar-palṭi lacks the female determinative in this version!

6: the writing NU-dMAN for Šalmu-šarri is unparalleled.
Commentary
As in No. 40, Attar-paṭi lends a not inconsiderable amount of silver. Whether she did this in a private capacity, or in her official role as scribe of the queen’s household we cannot tell for certain, but more light might be thrown on this question if we understood the mechanism of loans made from temple offerings (see Menzel, Ass.T., I, 11—21). Note that although some at least of the witnesses belong to the permanent staff of the Review Palace, the borrower comes from a village, outside the city. The borrower is synonymous with a post-canonical turtānu who held the limmu office. The money comes from the temple of Mulissu.

No. 40

3.4 × 2.3
S 10; ca. 0.30 m above floor
Inner tablet without envelope

T.E. 1 ½ MA.NA KÜ.BABBAR
2 ša m[a-tar-pa-al-ṭi
Obv. 3 A.BA-tu ša È MI.É.GAL
4 ina IGI 1-na-si-i
5 A1.man-nu-ki-15
6 a-na 4-ut-ṭi-šū GAL-bi
7 ITI.GU4 UD.1.KAM
B.E. 8 lim-me 1.d30-DU-IGI
9 ša UGU È-an-ni
10 IGI 1.tar-ṭi-man-nu
11 IGI 1.dMAS-PAP-AS
Rev. 12 IGI 1.NU-mu-hu-ṭi
13 IGI 1.dPA-MU2-AS
14 IGI 1.R3.PA
15 IGI 1.šum4-dPA
16 IGI 1.ÉN-TI
17 IGI 1.dPA.TAG4.PAP

Translation
Half a mina of silver owed to Atar-paṭi the female scribe of the queen’s house, at the disposal of Nasi the son of Mannu-ki-Ištar. It shall bear interest at one quarter. Month of Ayyaru, 1st day, limmu Sin-alik-pani the overseer of the inner quarters. Witnesses: Tartimannu, Ninurta-ahu-iddin, Šalmu-(a)hhuti, Nabu-šumu2-iddin, Urad-Nabu, Šumma-Nabu, Bel-ubahlat, Nabu-rehtu-ṭusur.

Notes
13: a reading 4PA·NUMUN-AS (Nabu-zeru-iddin) cannot be excluded; if the name is Nabu-šumu-iddin, he could be the scribe of ND 2324:43, although the two texts may be 20 or more years apart.
Commentary
The many points of similarity between this text and No. 39 suggest that the silver here too might come from the temple of Mullissu (note that this information is only on the tablet in No. 39, whereas in a text from Assur a similar note is found only on the envelope—cf. FNALD No. 26). These texts raise the point that any loan which appears to be between two individuals could rather involve temple capital.

No. 41 Plate 11; Photo Plate 49

(4.1) × 2.5
S 10; ca. 0.75 m above floor
Unopened envelope

T.E. 1 NA₄.KIŠIB¹ KAL-ba-a-a
Obv. 2 A¹ pi-sa-ni-še
           ᅡ¹R⁻⁴NIN.LIL
(2 seal impressions)
4 [A]¹ har-ti-bu-u
B.E. 5 [T]A* uruna-pi-si-$n[a²]
6 ½¹ MA.NA 2 GĪN KŪ.BABBAR
7 ša ¹dPA-PAP-PAP
Rev. 8 ina IGI-e-ši-nu ina UD.13.KĀM
9 ša ITI.GU₄ KŪ.BABBAR SUM-nu
10 šum₄-ma ina 4-ti-ši
11 GAL-bi man-nu ša kar-mu-u-ni
12 KĪ.BABBAR SUM-an ITI.BARAG UD.16.KĀM
13 lim-mu¹ EN-PAP-PAP ša IGI KUR
T.E. 14 IGI¹.dPA-u-a
15 IGI¹ di-in-hu-ru
16 IGI¹ me²-iša-me-ni
L.S. (broken)

Sealing: Stamp seal, almost circular; ca. 1.3 – 1.4 diam.; impressed twice, condition poor.
Design: above, winged disc, hollow circle with inner dot; wedge-shaped tail, long wings, reaching to edge of seal. Above disc: ?inverted crescent; below, a curved motif, above it to left, ?star; to right, crescent.

Translation
Seal of Ribaya(?) son of Pisanša, ditto of Urad-Mullissu [son of] Hartibu of the town Napisina(?). Half a mina and 2 shekels of silver owed to Nabu-ahu-ušur is at their disposal. They shall deliver the silver on the 13th day of Ayyaru. If they do not deliver, it shall bear interest at one quarter. Whoever is last shall pay the silver. Month of Nisanu, 16th day, limmu Bel-ahu-ušur the palace overseer. Witnesses: Nabua, Din-Huru, Meya²- Amenī, [(?)].
Notes
2: this Egyptian name is already attested in two nA texts (see Tallqvist, APN), but there is no specific reason to suppose that he is the same man here.
3: another Egyptian name. The word hr-tb, from which CAD gives the etymology for harjibi (translation "dream interpreter") means more generally "magician", "reader of rituals". Oppenheim, Dreams, p.238b, quotes Gardiner and Stricker misleadingly. See now J.D. Ray, The Archive of Hor (London 1976) 135 for the part that these general magicians might play in dream interpretation. (We thank Prof. J. Baines for his help.)
4: another Egyptian name. The word J:tr-tb, from which CAD gives the etymology for harjibi (translation "dream interpreter") means more generally "magician", "reader of rituals". Oppenheim, Dreams, p.238b, quotes Gardiner and Stricker misleadingly. See now J.D. Ray, The Archive of Hor (London 1976) 135 for the part that these general magicians might play in dream interpretation. (We thank Prof. J. Baines for his help.)
5: Nabu-ahu-usur may be the rab ekalli of the Nimrud texts ADD 640 and 641.
6: according to K. Deller (privately) the spelling kar-ma-u-nil should represent a plural form, to be distinguished from spellings of karimani which are singular. While mannu ša is normally singular, Deller points to BM 93088 (Walker, Iraq 42 (1980) 84—6) for a clear case of its use in the plural. In the present text, however, the apodosis is clearly singular, and a singular meaning is needed for legal reasons as well (see commentary).
7: SUM-an: note that in the two similar texts edited as FNALD 22 and 33 the verb used at this point is šallum; no doubt SUM-an should be understood as "pay (back in full)" here.
8: Nabu may be the scribe who is found in at least four other Nimrud tablets of this period, as well as in ADD 208 and 391.
9: another Egyptian name; the meaning of the element din is uncertain.
10: both the reading and the language of this name is uncertain, but it could be Egyptian, compounded with the god name Amun.

Commentary
Two men with Assyrian names but Egyptian fathers jointly owe a sum of 32 shekels of silver to Nabu-ahu-usur, who may indeed have been the palace manager, which would explain why this tablet was found in the Review Palace (cf. note on 1.7). As with some other loans or debt-notes with more than one debtor, there is a clause placing the responsibility for repayment with "whoever is last" (cf. FNALD p. 46). In similar contracts from Nuzi and Alalakh, instead of mannu ša karmăni, the different phrasings ina bērī-šunu baštū and mannume ina lībbī-šunu askū are found. As discussed by Koschaker, and by Eichler, Indenture at Nuzi, p. 71, the clause expresses "a joint responsibility rather than a date of maturity ... the creditor has a right to bring suit against any one of the co-debtors for the entire sum; and the payment of the entire sum by one of the co-debtors frees the other from prosecution by the creditor". For a comparable Middle Assyrian clause, also discussed by Koschaker, see most recently C. Saporetti, Assur 14446: La famiglia A (Data Sets: Cuneiform Texts, Vol. 1, Malibu 1979), 12—13 (ina muhhi šalmēšu u kēnēšu annuku rakīs, or ina bērī-šunu tarṣu-na .... kaspa (?) əşallum); cf. also FNALD p. 126. The comparable phrase in nB is: išēn pāt šānī ana ejēr našū ša qereb iṭṭir.

No. 42
Plate 11

Expedition ND 11300

2.6 x 1.7 x 1.3
S 73; in fill ca. 1.50 m above floor
Inner tablet without envelope

Obv. 1 4½ GIN.MEŠ KU.BABBAR
2 1 ANŠE 5-BĀN ŠE.PAD.MEŠ
3 ša 1ir-ka-li
4 ina IGI 1PAP-SU
B.E. 5 KŪ῾:BABBAR a-na 4-tū-šû
6 GAL-bi Š.E.PAD.MEŠ
7 a-na 1 ANŠE 5-BĀN-šâ
Rev. 8 ina ad-ri 2 e-ṣi-di
9 ina muk-hi SUM-an
10 IGÎ 1ru²-x-u
11 [IGÎ] 1IR-15
12 IGÎ 1.d[UT]U-TI.LA
13 IGÎ 1SUHUŠ.d4PA

Translation
4½ shekels of silver (and) 1 homer 5 seah of barley, owed to Irkali, at the disposal of Ahu­criba. The silver shall bear interest at one quarter. He shall deliver the barley at 5 seah per homer on the threshing floor (and) 2 harvesters in addition. Witnesses: Ru..u, Urad-Ištar, Šamaš-uballit, Ubru-Nabu, [ ].

Notes
13: note that one Ubru-Nabu is a rab ekalli "palace manager" in the post-canonical Nimrud texts ADD 641 and 642; he may be the writer of letter No. 84 below.

Commentary
A straightforward debt-note for silver and corn. As this was an isolated find, it is not surprising that we know nothing definite about either of the principals. In the absence of the ina pəhi clause, it may well be that one or both of the silver and corn borrowed was an earlier debt here renewed. The date, which is lacking, may have been supplied in the envelope which we do not have; cf. No. 10 where the envelope has the date and the tablet omits it.

No. 43

Plate 11

ND 7092

3.5 × 2.6
S 10; in fill ca. 0.40 m above floor
Triangular docket

Obv. 1 1 ANŠE Š.E.PAD.MEŠ
2 ina GIŠ.BĀN 8 qa
3 1 ma-gar-ru-tû
4 ša 1ju-si-i
   (3 stamp seal impressions)
5 ina IGÎ 1šu-nu-ŠES
6 ina pu-u-hi it-ti-ši
7 ina ANŠE 5-BĀN
8 ina ad-ri

Plate II
IM 75792
27.viii.Marduk-šarru-ušur
Rev. 9 SUM-an
10 Šum-ma [a]
11 SUM-an
12 ana ens 5-BAN-i-ša
13 ta-rab-bi
14 ITI.APIN UD.27.KAM lim-me 1.dšU-MAN-PAP
15 IGI 1ár-za-a-a
16 IGI 1EN-DINGIR-QI-bu-[(u-)ni]
17 IGI 1.dMAS-x[ ( )]
18 IGI 15-I[ ( )]

Sealing: see Iraq 24 p.39 and plate XXII/3.
Stamp seal, ovoid; max. di. 0.9 or more; min. di. 0.8 or more; impressed twice; condition fair but edges incomplete.
Design: at right, worshipper, long robe, hands raised, standing facing left. At left, symbol of star supported on short stem, from base of stem, 2 shoots reaching to left and right of star.

Translation
One homer of barley according to the seah measure of 8 qa, and one bale (of straw?) owed to Tusi, at the disposal of Sunu-ahhe. He has taken them as an exchange loan. He shall deliver at the threshing floor (at) 5 seah per homer. If he does not deliver, it shall bear interest at 5 seah per homer. Month Arahšamnu, 27th day, limmu Marduk-šarru-usur. Witnesses: Arzaya, Adi-ili-ıqbuni, Ninurta-[..], Istar-na‘id(?).

Notes
3: perhaps šE.IN.NU 'straw' was omitted accidentally after maqarratu.
7, 12: unless the repetition of the interest is a mistake, it is probable that the first payment accrued simple interest, the second compound interest (SMD).
11: SUM-an: in place of the more usual preterite SUM-infinifin. Also occurs in 14:9.
12: ana is written over an erasure, probably the initial two horizontals of ANŠA.
14: the month and day were omitted by the scribe at first, and so added later on the edge.
16: QI probably a reversed writing for iq; see Deller, Or.31 (1962) p.186ff and cf. li-QI-bi for liqbi in 3:32. Alternatively it may be a sandhi writing with a Sprossvokale: adi-ili-(i)-qi(i)buni. The same name occurs in ND 5475/7:4, spelt 'a-di-DINGIR-liqi-bu-a-ni.

Commentary
The only unusual feature about this loan of corn and straw is the repeated mention of payment of interest on the corn; interest on the straw is not specifically mentioned, and it is impossible to guess whether or not it was also to accrue interest at the same rate.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T.E.</th>
<th>Obv.</th>
<th>B.E.</th>
<th>Rev.</th>
<th>L.S.</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>NA₄.KIŞĪB ¹a-ta-n-ha-DINGIR</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>NA₄.KIŞĪB ¹GİR.2-MAN</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15 ANŠE ŠEPAD.MEŠ ina GIŠ.BÂN ša 8 ina 1 qa aš-šur-a-a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>&quot; ki-qi-la-nu</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>&quot; us-ta-hu-ru</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>ša ¹BĀD-ma-ki.ºMAŠ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2 stamp seal impressions)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>&quot; PAP-SU</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>ša ¹da-us-ku-nu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>PAP-la-mur</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>ša ¹IR-ºPA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>¹SA-PAD.MEŠ ina</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>ina IG1-ešu-nu ina UD-me ša LUGAL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>ina NINA ki-e-rab-bi ŠEPAD.MEŠ</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>ina SAG.DU-šu ina wuḫu-ru-e-eer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>i-dan-nu šum-ma la iš-din-nu</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1-ST-MA-a-a EN šu.ºMEŠ ša ŠE.BAR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>a-na 1 ANŠE 5-BÂN-ša ta-rab-bi</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>IT.LIN UD.1 KÂM lim-mu ¹EN.E GAR tuš-ha-an</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>¹HI-ma-a-a ¹EN.ºBAR</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>¹IGI ¹dPA-tar-ti-ša-PAP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>¹IGI ¹dPA-SIG.ºDINGIR.MEŠ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>¹IGI ¹kur-DINGIR-a-a</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>¹IGI ¹dPA-SUR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>¹IGI ¹ba-la-su</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>A.BA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sealing: see Iraq 24 p.37, fig. 3 and plate XX/2.

Stamp seal, ovoid, with slight break at right-hand end; max. di. 1.7 cm., min. di. 1.1 cm.; impressed twice, condition fair.

Design: stork or heron, feet apart, bending neck down. Behind rear leg, unidentified object in field.

Bird either has very large feet or is standing on ground. Narrow rim border.

Translation

Seal of Atanha-ili, seal of Šepes-šarru, seal of Mannu-ki-Arbail, ditto Kiqillanu, ditto Usta-Huru, ditto Ahu-eriba, ditto Ahu-lamur. 15 homers of barley according to the seah measure of 8 Assyrian qa, owed to Dur-maki-Ninurta, to Dauskunu (and) to Urad-Nabu, at their disposal. On the day when the king enters Nineveh, they shall deliver the barley at its capital sum in the town of Buru-Wer. If they do not deliver, it shall bear interest at 5 seah per homer. Himaya(?) is the guarantor of the barley. Month Ululu, 1st day, limmu Bel-iqbi governor of Tushan. Witnesses: Nabu-tartiba-ahu, Nabu-damiq(?)-ilani, Kur-ilaya, Nabu-eṭir, Balasu the scribe.

Notes

5: Usta-Huru is an Egyptian name.
8: although the scribe appears to have written 8½ qa, parallels indicate that the MAŠ sign has to be separated into ina 1.
8, 17: for the shift from ŠEPAD.MEŠ to ŠE.BAR see note on No. 13:2.
THE TABLETS FROM FORT SHALMANESER

12—13: ina ūmu ša šarru ... erabbī: an unusual infinitive construction; see Deller, Or. NS 31 (1962) 229—30, also 226 for erabbī = erābī. Here the construction may well have a gerundive force “on the day the king is due to enter” (cf. GAG §150b).

21: M. Stolper (AfO 27 (1980) 85) favours reading this name, previously taken as Mat-ilaya, as Kurilaya. If this is correct, we may have here the god name Kurra or Kur'e. This god is possibly first attested at Ebla as Kura (Petinato, Culto ufficiale ad Ebla, Oriens Antiquus 18 (1979) 210 s.v. dku-ra), then perhaps at Mari in the name 1abi-Kur-i, then at Nuzi, dku-yur-we-e (AASOR 16, 47:1) and Kür-we-e (AASOR 16, 48:1); in nA dku-ru-a (ADD 1252 = FNALD No. 19), and in the name 1abi-di-kur-ra (Ismail and Postgate, forthcoming, No. 6). JNP suggests emending the deity K'D in the Sefire treaty to KR'.

Commentary
This is by no means a normal corn-loan, which is of course why the ina pūhi clause is absent. Instead, we see that the three men in ll.9—11 have a claim over the seven “debtors” for a quantity of corn. Probably the claim arises from an administrative, rather than a legal situation, but this is not made explicit. What does appear to be of the essence of the contract is that the corn should be delivered at the place called Buruwer “on the day of the king’s entry into Nineveh”. It is this clause in particular which suggests that the transaction is essentially administrative, a means of ensuring that the necessary quantity of corn is in the right place at the right time, a time which is directly related to the movements of the king, movements which no doubt would create the need for the corn.

Strictly, perhaps, we should characterise this as an “administrative supply” contract. In the absence of the ina pūhi clause, in the use of a tablet and envelope instead of the more usual triangular docket for a corn contract, and in the specification of a particular place for the delivery, this is comparable with FNALD Nos. 29 and 30 (although there the actual capital is given in silver suggesting that the transaction was more of a commercial contract than an administrative arrangement). A closer parallel may be drawn with two corn debt-notes from Balawat, BT 116 and 117. BT 116 in particular has the clause ūmu ša PN (the creditor) ina urbArba' šarru erabbīni “on the day when PN enters Arba’”, the time of repayment thus being defined by an event rather than a date. The reason for this is clear from BT 117 where a similar amount of corn is specified as for “the festival of Arba’”, for which one of the principal persons in the Balawat archive is presumably expected to supply it—it is “belonging to” (ša) Mamu-iqbi (or Ziqiq-iqbi?) not because he has ever possessed this corn, but because he has some legal or administrative entitlement to have it supplied on his behalf.

There is one further point worth noting. Here (l.17), in FNALD No. 30, and in BT 117 the contract is backed up by a guarantee clause which is unusual in an ordinary corn loan. In FNALD No. 29 also, there is an additional clause in case of non-payment. This is certainly not fortuitous, but results from the underlying similarity of the transactions, in that it is the punctual delivery of the corn for an over-riding administrative or religious purpose that makes the non-fulfilment especially serious.
No. 45 Plate 11 ND 7095

3.0 \times 2.0
S 10; near No. 37
Inner tablet, without envelope

T.E. 1 2 GÍN KÚ.BABBAR
Obv. 2 gi-mir A.SÀ
3 šá 7 BÁN ŠE.NUMUN
4 šum₄-ma e-ta-ra-ša
5 e-ta-ša-da
B.E. 6 e-gir-tú i-ma-raqi
7 šum₄-ma la e-ši-da
Rev. 8 ú-sa-ha-[x]
9 ir a
10 ITL.KIN UD.13
11 [(]im-me \textsuperscript{1.d}PA-MAN-PAP
12 [I\textsuperscript{G}][\textsuperscript{1,0}d\textsuperscript{P}AP-\textsuperscript{A}Š
13 x x x KÚ.BABBAR\textsuperscript{?} ku-um
L.S. 14 [ ] x x[ x (x)]
15 [I\textsuperscript{G}][\textsuperscript{1}ka-x[ (x)]
16 [I\textsuperscript{G}][\textsuperscript{1}hi-bi[r-x]

Translation
2 shekels of silver, expenses(?) for a field of 7 seah of seed-corn. If he has cultivated and harvested, he shall rub out the contract. If he has not harvested, he shall ..... Month Ululu, 23rd day, limmu Nabu-šarru-usur. Witnesses: Nabu-ahu-iddin ..... (LS:) Ka..., Hibir...

Notes
1: this was certainly the line the scribe wrote first, but see note on 1.13. 2: gimru is translated as neutrally as possible, but in accordance with usage in nB texts where it seems to mean “money spent”, “expenditure”. Its precise connotation here must be deduced after comparison with other occurrences in nA texts, ND 3457 and IM 76890, which are discussed in the Commentary.
3: although we had initially ša PN, the correct reading, suggested by K. Deller, follows from comparison with IM 76890:3-4: 2 GÍN KÚ.BABBAR gi-mir A.SÀ ša 1 ANŠE ŠE.NUMUN.
8—9: one obvious restoration would be ú-sa-ha-[ra], although there are other possibilities: without understanding 1.9 a decision seems unwise. For 1.9 K. Deller suggests ú-ṣ-šu but the signs have been collated more than once, and the only doubtful point would seem to be whether the first sign is sa or ir. By comparison with similar texts, one might expect elli “he will go away”, but this is evidently not what it says.
13: this line was written on the top edge of the tablet, and since it ends in kūm it seems very probable that it is not meant to interrupt the listing of the witnesses, but was an afterthought of the scribe intended to be read before 1.1. The translation would then be “..... of silver, instead of 2 shekels of silver”; possibly the actual item which changed hands was therefore a small silver object of equivalent value.

Commentary
As it stands, this text lacks essential details: the name of each party to the contract, and the nature of the transaction which has taken place. In the absence of the envelope, which presumably did give some of these details, we cannot hope to reconstruct the identities of
the principal parties, but some light on the nature of the transaction can be shed by comparison with two similar documents, linked by the use of the term *gimru*.

ND 3457 (*Iraq* 15 (1953) 145, Pl. XIII, with correction in *Iraq* 16 (1954) 465), comes from the archives of Šamaš-šarru-uṣur found in the Town Wall house. This wealthy gentleman is bound by the contract to cultivate 3 homers of fallow land belonging to Šulmu-Bel, and one or the other of the principals receives 3 shekels of silver *gi-mir A.šA-šū* “payment for his field” or “his field-expenses”.

IM 76890 (to be published as No. 4 in Ismail and Postgate, forthcoming), is comparable in several respects: the cultivator of the land is also a wealthy person (Ninurta-šarru-uṣur), from whose archives the text was found. The owner (or agent—he is the *rab ālāmī* of the chief steward) of the land seals the document, implying that it is he who is ceding a right (to use the land?) or acknowledging an obligation (to pay the silver?); that ND 3457 was found with Šamaš-šarru-uṣur’s archives suggests that the same situation prevailed there too. Here, as in ND 3457, the land to be cultivated and handed back is fallow (*karaphī*).

In none of these three texts can we be certain which party received the silver. Both reconstructions seem possible: either the owner of the land was being paid silver, effectively a rental, to permit the cultivator to till the land and reap the profits; or the cultivator was being paid, effectively hired, by the owner to do a year’s work on the land and bring it into cultivation. Since in two cases the cultivator was a man of some standing, the former of these two possibilities seems likelier. However, the text published here makes it clear that the cultivator also undertook an obligation, since he may only discharge his obligation (by breaking the tablet) if he has cultivated and harvested the field; in this case, if isolated, one would be tempted to see the silver payment as the hire of a workman in a work-contract. For the present, therefore, it seems impossible to decide between these two choices, if they are indeed incompatible.

---

**No. 46**

**Plate 12**

| ND 7029 |
| IM 75757 |

5.6 × 3.0

SE 14; from floor 1.10 m from doorway leading to SE 15, 1.20 m below surface, near No. 51

**Obv.**

1 IM 1.\(\text{da-num-KAR-ir}\)
2 1.\(\text{ba-qi-am-ri}\)
3 1.\(\text{se-e-se-e}\) 1.\(\text{MAS-PAP-AS}\) (faint seal impression)
4 *ina *\(\text{GI-e-ka il-la-ku-u-ni}\)
5 *ina pu-il UD\(1.\text{MES ša at-ta}\)

**B.E.**

6 *qi-ru ta-šu-u-ni*

**Rev.**

7 1.\(\text{se-e-se-e}\) 1.\(\text{MAS-PAP-AS}\)
8 *li-šu-lu* (2 stamp seal impressions)
Sealing: Stamp seal, round; di. 1.9 cm.; impressed twice, condition fair.
Design: 'winged disc', but disc consists at centre of a hollow circle, wings extending both sides to edge of seal, and to form wedge-shaped tail at base. At base of tail, curving band, identity uncertain. Above disc, crescent. Between each wing and tail, a streamer, above each wing, a spear.

Translation
Tablet of Anum-etir to Baqiamri. Sese and Ninurta-ahu-iddin are coming to be at your disposal. In return for the (work-)days on which you ....ed bitumen, let Sese and Ninurta-ahu-iddin .... (it).

Notes
3: it is possible that Sēsē is another form of Sasī/Sasī/Sisī. Sasī and Ninurta-ahu-iddin occur together as witnesses in No. 34.
5: the sign UD is written over an erasure; it has been collated.
6: for a bitumen well near Fort Shalmaneser see NR II, map pl. 301. ta-pu-u-ni: according to Parpola, Assur 1/1 (1974) 7, this is not an attested or likely form of naṣu-pu preterite. K. Deller suggested emending to ta-pu-u >u-ni, so that lines 6 and 8 both contain the same verb, *ṣu-u-ni. Alternatively, it may be preferable to interpret it as naṣu-ni or naṣu-ni (a/i) "to pour out, to drain".

Tablet 47 Plate 12 ND 7011

4.8 X (7.6) IM 74487
SE 14; top fill [—]

Obv. 1 [NA₄,KIŠIB ]
2 [NA₄,KIŠIB ]x
3 [EN MÌ SUM-n]i

(2 stamp seal impressions)
4 mIN-AD-ša NIN-su-nu
5 4 ru-u-ša a-na 1na-bu-u-a
6 DUMU-ša ša 1SUHUŠ-d al-la-a-a
7 [a-n]a MÌ-su-ti-ša
8 [ina lib]-bi 10 GIN.MES KÚ.BABBAR
9 [(x) x LUG]AL? it-ta-ṣa
10 [a-n]a DUMU-šu it-ti-din

B.E. 11 [kas-p]u ga-mir
12 [ta-ad]-diu man-nu

Rev. 13 [(ša) ina ur]-kiš ina ma-ti-[ma]
14 [x x (x)-n]l lu LÜ.MES
15 [an-nu-t]e lu-u DUMU.MES-šu-nu
16 [lu-u SE]Š.MES-šu-nu lu-u
17 1LÜ.GAR?1-šu-nu lu-u mam-ma-ma-nu-šu-n[u]
18 ša e-la-an-ni
19 TA* 1SUHUŠ-d al-la-a-a
THE TABLETS FROM FORT SHALMANESER

20 de-e-nu KA.KA i-gar-ru'-u-ni
21 2 MA.NA KÜ.BABBAR i-dan-na
22 a-de-e ša LUGAL ina šu.2-šu
23 [lu-ba]-iu-ú aš-šur dša-maš
24 [IGI 1x x (x)] IGI 1NUMUN-\d15
25 [IGI 1x x (x)] IGI 1ha-nu²-x (x)

L.S. 1' [IGI 1.15-BÂ[D ( )]]
2' [IGI 1.15-x-\[ ]

Translation
[Seal of PN₁, seal of PN₂, the owners selling the woman]. He (Ubru-Allaya) has taken Ahat-abisa their sister (who is) 4 rūtu tall, on behalf of Nabua son of Ubru-Allaya to be his wife, for 10 shekels of silver [according to the] royal (mina). He has given (her) to his son. The price is paid completely. Whoever afterwards at any time [lodges a protest], whether [these] men or their sons or their brothers or their representative(?) or anyone else connected with them, and instigates litigation or claim against Ubru-Allaya, shall pay two minas of silver. The oaths of the king shall exact retribution from him, and Assur, Šamas, [DN] and Salmanu shall be his prosecutors. [Witnesses: X], Zer-Istar, [X], Hanu-[...], [X], Istar-duri, Istar-[...].

Notes
7: if this is the correct reading, it suggests that a girl might be contracted for marriage before puberty, since here she is only 4 rūtu tall. However, there is doubt about the equivalence of the nA cubit; see FNALD p.71. The rūtu is provisionally reckoned in this volume at 24cm.

For issu as the likely nA equivalent of Bab. aššatu, see Postgate, Iraq 41 (1979) p.95 n.9, and Parpola, OLZ 74 p.34.
9: probably restore [ina ša LU]GAL, like ND 2080:1 - 2, as a shortened form of ina MA.NA-e ša LUGAL.
11: garnir is presumably G stative. One expects gammur, D stative.
14: restore e.g. izzaqqupanni or ipparrīkīni.
17: mām-ma-ma-ru-šu-nu cf. ADD 211 r.2 mām-ma-ma-ru-šu-nu and GPA 25:13 mām-ma-ma-ru-šu. These three examples suggest either that the common writing mām-ma-ma-ru-šu-nu may be read mām(m)-ma-ma- (cf. Deller, Or.31 (1962) p.78f), and the word normalized as mammāmānu rather than with the separate nB mammānu, or that a form of mammāmānu with internal reduplication co-exists with it; cf. harāma with harāmāma(n) (SMD). JNP prefers to take -ma following mām as a reading indicator.
24: this reading was suggested by K. Deller; JNP prefers to read ilu mammānu. Deller suggests that Salmānu is a better reading than Salmānu because of the Biblical spelling of Shalmaneser’s name (cf. Millard, JSS 21 (1976) 7 - 8), and it accords with the nA name ša-am-mu-šab-ši (Saporetti, OMA I 387).

Commentary
Ubru-Allaya is probably the same man as occurs in No. 48. It is noticeable that Ubru-Allaya in this text buys a wife(?) for his son for roughly one-tenth the price which he pays for a slave-girl for himself in No. 48. Similar low prices for the purchase of young girls for marriage are known elsewhere (e.g. FNALD No. 13), but if we compare No. 51, in which again the price of 10 shekels is paid for a woman to become the wife of the buyer’s son, there appears to be an additional redemption clause in l.18 which could have been omitted.
accidentally in this text. Possibly in both texts the seller was in debt to the buyer, and the minimal sum of 10 shekels was a balance payment so that the girl who was already pledged might be retained forever. If so, she was already working in the house of the creditor when he decided to buy her as a wife for his son.

**No. 48**

Plate 12; Photo Plate 49

4.7 × 8.1

SE 14; floor, with No. 53

Obv. 1 NA₄[KIŠIB] ¹:\d\{3\}₀-I
  2 [DU]\MU₁₁\x\₁-di-a Ṽ\Ur\{x\} x
  3 EN GEM]E-Šū SUM-N[i]

(2 stamp seal impressions)

4 Ṽ\{ma-\}₁-\x-x-x Ṽ\GEME-Šū
5 Ṽ\ša\₁:\d\{3\}₀-I
6 Ṽ\piš-ma\₁ SUHUŠ-al-la-a-a
7 ina \{ib-b\}i \₁ MA.NA \₁ \₁ MA.NA \₁ \₁ GIN KÜ.BABBAR
8 \{i\}₁-\q\e kas-pu
9 \{ga\}m-ru SUM-ni
10 \{u\}a-ru de-e-nu
11 \{da-ba\} bu la-āš-šū
12 man-nu ina ur-kiš-š[i]

B.E. 13 ina \{ni\} ma-ti-e-ma

Rev. 14 e-za-qu-pa-ni
15 e- \{<\pa>\}-ri-ku-u-[ni]
16 \{lu-u\} \₁:\d\{3\}₀-I lu-u DUMU-Š[i]
17 \{lu-u\} DUMU.DUMU-Šū lu-u PAP.MEŠ-šū
18 \{lu-u\} x (x) za₂² x -qi-šū
19 \{ša\} TÀ\₁\SUHUŠ-al-la-a-a
20 \{lu-u\} DUMU-šū lu-u DUMU.DUMU-šū
21 \{de-e-nu\} a-ba-bu
22 \{ub-ta-\'u\}-ni
23 10 MA.NA KÜ.BABBAR I MA.NA KÜ.GI
24 \{r\}x-x (x)² \{ ina bur-k\}_\₁ MAŠ
25 a-ši-bi [\{\ur\ Destructor\}] ha i-šak-kan
26 ITLDUG_{U} [\{D.x.KÂM \l\m\-me\}] \₁ aš-šur-rém-a-ni
27 \{IG\} \₁qi-bit-15 [\{x x\}] ku\₁\-DÜ
28 \{IG\} \₁\x (x) x-iq-[\{bu-ni\}²]-ni
29 [ ] x [ ] MA\₁
30 IG\{I\}
31 IG\{I\} \₁\x x-\{MEŠ \{\}\}
Sealing: Stamp seal, probably circular; Di. 1.3 cm.; impressed twice, condition fair, but parts of impressions apparently obliterated by finger-nail impression and overlapping with the cuneiform signs. Space probably ruled for fingernails.

Design: at right, deity standing, facing left, on back of beast, possibly mutḫušu. Right(?) hand raised before face, left arm extended horizontally from elbow, holding unidentified object. Behind, to right, long staff, or sceptre, and a second, more ornate, similar object. To left, figure standing facing right, hair bunched at nape of neck, long robe, other details not clear.

Translation
Seal of Sin-naʿid son of x-dia(?) (from?) the town of [ ], the owner selling his slavegirl. Ubru-Allaya has contracted and taken Ma-x the slavegirl of Sin-naʿid for 1 mina ½ mina (and) 4(? ) shekels of silver. The price is paid completely. There shall be no going back, litigation or claim. Whoever afterwards at any time lodges a protest and breaks the agreement whether Sin-naʿid or his son or his [grandson] or his brothers or his ...., who initiates litigation or claims against Ubru-Allaya [or his son] or his grandson shall place 10 minas [of silver (and) one(?) mina of ... gold [in the lap of] Ninurta who dwells in Kalhu. Month Tašritu, [xth day, limmu] Assur-remanni. Witnesses: Qibit-Ištar, ..., [Adi­ili]-iqbuni (?),(at least 3 more fragmentary names).

Notes
7: MA.NA may have been written accidentally the first time.
24: one expects sagur; but the traces do not appear to support any writing of the word.

Commentary
For Ubru-Allaya’s purchase of a young girl for his son, see already No. 47. There are a number of scribal aberrations in this text, whether intentional or not, which could perhaps justify some scepticism about the correctness of the unusually high price paid for this slave woman.
Rev. 1’ [ ]x
2’ [ ]x-si-i
3’ IGI $^{11}$x$^{3}$-bu-tu$^{2}$
4’ IGI 1.dš-U-iq-bi
5’ IGI 1[I]R-15
6’ IGI 1PAP-la-maš-ši
7’ ITILAB UD.22.KAM
8’ lim-mu 1.dPA-[MA]$^{2}$-P[AP]
T.E. 9’ IGI 1mil-ki-[x (x)]
10’ IGI 1ZU$^{2}$-x[(x)]

Sealing: Stamp seal, oval; max. di. 1.4, min. di. 0.9 cm.; impressed twice; condition poor.
Design: up long axis: at base, lotus flower; above this, curved object, possibly boat; resting on boat, unidentified object, possibly (by comparison with No. 12) a dwarf or mannikin, but details if so no longer visible.

Note
Rev. 3’: the sign before -bu- looks like an [a]r or a [b]i.

Commentary
Fragmentary sale of a slave woman by Bel-[…] son of Ubru-Istar$^{2}$ to a purchaser whose name is lost, as is the price. Dated 22nd Kanunu, limmu of Nabu-šarru$^{2}$-uṣur (682 or post-canonical).

No. 50 Plate 13; Photo Plate 49 ND 7025
5.0 × (8.5) IM 75754
SE 15; on floor [—]

Obv. 1 [NA₄.KIŠIB 1-a-ka-bur(?)]
2 EN [LU SUM-ni]

(3 stamp seal impressions)
3 1ka$^{2}$-ab-lu-si x [x] x
4 [I]šu-šu ša 1-a-ka-bu-ru
5 tu-piš-ma miḫi-e₂-ti-x₁-li
6 TA* IGI 1-a-ka-bur
7 ina lib-01 MA.NA 5 G[I]N KU.BABBAR
8 ta-al-ge kas-pu gam-mur ta-di-ni
9 LU šu-a-te za-ar-rip la-qi
10 [lu-a-ru de-e-nu KA.KA
11 [la-a]-šu ma-nu ša ina ur-kiš ina ma-te-ma
12 [i-za-qa]lu-pa-an-ni
13 [lu-u] 1[a-ka-bur lu-u DUMU[(.MEŠ)-šu]}
Rev. 14  [3]a TA•\[m]ib-i•l[t\}[i\{'-x-li\]
15  u DUMU.MEŠ•ša de-e-[nu]
16  [K]A.K[A] ub•t\[a\{-u•nî\]
18  ina bur-k[i] d\[M]AŠ a•ši•ib urukal-\[h\]
19  i•šak-kan kas-pu a-na 10.MEŠ
20  a-na EN.MEŠ•šu u-GUR ina l[a] de-ni•šu
21  [i•d\]a•bu•ub-ma la i•la•qe

22  IGI 1\[m]an-nu-ki-PAP.MEŠ
23  IGI 1\[n]u•še•zib•d\[M]AŠ
24  IGI[I] 1\[k]ab-bit-15
25  IGI[I] U.GUR•še•zib•an•[n]i
26  IGI[I] 1\[g]ir•a-n[i\]
27  IGI[I] 1\[a\]•d[\]
28  IGI[I] 1\[l\] 1
29  IGI[I]

(remainder of Rev., ca. 2-4 lines, broken)

L.S. 1’ IGI \[b\]i•e\[l\-x-\]a•zu•ri

Sealing: Stamp seal, oval with long sides straight or nearly so; Max. di. 1.7 cm.; min. di (=Ht.) 1.1 cm.; impressed 3 times, twice in fair condition.

Design: animal, probably cow, standing en marche facing left; round design is a single ridge as border.

Translation
[Seal of Akaburu] the owner [selling the man]. Belti-x-li has contracted and taken from Akaburu Kablu-x(?)[ the slave of Akaburu, for one mina and five shekels of silver. The price is paid completely. That man is sold and taken. There shall be no going back, litigation or claim. Whoever afterwards at any time lodges a protest, [whether] Akaburu or his son(s) who initiates litigation or claim against Belti-x-li or her sons, shall place 5(?)[ minas of silver and one mina of gold in the lap of Ninurta who dwells in Kalhu. He shall return the price tenfold to its owners. If he claims in an invalid lawsuit, he shall not take possession. Witnesses: Mannu-ki-ahhe, Mušezib-Ninurta, Kabit-Istar, Nergal-šezibanni, Girani(?), Adu-x, X, X, [ ]. Bel-azuri(?).

Notes
2: it is possible that there was an extra line (e.g. [DUMU PN]) between lines 1 and 2.
5: obviously the name of the purchaser here should be the same as the name in 1.14, but collation will not permit the restoration of the same signs in each place. The reading which agrees best with the traces here seems to be \[m]ib-i•e\{l\-i•a\-\]l;15; alternatively K. Deller suggests \[b•e\-el\-i•a\-\]l.
15: for the use of \[u\] cf. No. 29:14 and 15.

Commentary
Virtually the only feature of particular interest about this slave sale is that the purchaser is a woman, who must presumably have been resident in the palace for the deed of sale to have been found here.
No. 51  Plate 13  ND 7028
3.4 × 6.2  SE 14; near No. 46 q.v.

Obv.  1  NA₄.KIŠIB I ZÁLAG-U[r² x (x)]
      2  EN MI ma sa šú ta-a-qi-a-ni

(2 faint stamp seal impressions)

---

3  ṣ³pu-uš-q6 [DU]MU³MI-su
4  ú-piš-ma ṻ-mu-[ha-[(x)]]-a
5  ina lib-bi 10⁷ G[I][N³].M[E] KÜ.BABBAR
6  [ana 1³]q³-bi³-EN [DUMU]-šú
7  in[a² MI]-u-ti il-q[é]r
8  kas-pu gam-mur
9  ta-šin [MI šú-a-tú
10  [za]-ar-p[a-a]l laq-qi-at

Rev.  11  tu-[a]-ru de-e-nu
  12  KA.KA la-aššu
  13  man-nu [S³a² GIB-ni
  14  5 MA.NA KÜ.BABBAR SUM-an
  15  5 MA.[NA KÜ.BABBAR LUH-u
  16  ina bur-[k]i [MAš³] aši-ib [uru] kal-ši
  17  SUM³-an x x x
  18  ú-še-ša

---

19  IGI³ tar-te³-man-ni
20  IGI³ sa-si³-l-i
21  IGI³ dš³-EN-DINGIR.MES
22  IGI³ BÁD-15
23  IGI³ x x (x) -d³M
24  ITLBARAG³ U[D.

T.E.  25  x x [ lim-me I.DPA-M[AN³-PAP
L.S.  27  IGI³ x x x x
28  IGI³ [x (x)]x x

Translation
Seal of Nur-x, the owner selling his .... Nuha has contracted and taken Pušqi² his daughter for 10⁷ shekels of silver as a wife [for] his son Iqbi-Bel(?). The price is paid completely. That woman is sold and taken. There shall be no going back, litigation or claim. Whoever breaks the agreement shall pay 5 minas of silver. He shall give(? 5 minas of re[fining silver] in the lap of [Ninurta~] who dwells in Kalhu, and (thus) release the .... Witnesses: Tartimanni, Sasi, Marduk²-bel-ilani, Duri-Istar, X-Adad. Month Nisanu, xth day, ......, limmu Nabu-šar[ru²-ušur²].
Notes

2: the only suggestion we have for this line is *miš-sa-šu* (see on No. 47:7, although one might rather expect *issu-šu* (JNP).


15—16: although badly damaged, these lines may be fairly confidently restored by comparison with ADD 453 = ARU 187, where payment of a fine to a deity (with or without a payment to the purchaser) will enable the release of the persons sold.

17: *tadīnu* is used in ARU 187:15, but with the "lap of Ninurta" one expects *išakkan*, and this could also be restored, either as *t-GAR1-an* or as *t-šu-kar1*. For the following signs JNP proposes reading *ne-pu-[u]"pledge(d person)"; this word is admittedly unattested in nAss hitherto, but it gives good sense and agrees with the signs. For another, but very dubious, possible instance of this root see also *Assur* 2/4 (1979) p. 104.

21: the *dštū* is particularly uncertain.

25: it is not clear what might have stood here; for an additional remark similarly placed as an afterthought cf. Nos. 9:17—18; 11:22; 13 L.S.1—2; 45:13; 52 Rev.11—12*.

Commentary

See above on No. 47, where a girl is sold in marriage by her family for the paltry sum of 10 shekels too. The background to the present sale is clearly indicated by the verb "he shall release" in l.18, which shows that this (although a sale into marriage) is a "restricted conveyance" (see FNALD p. 28) undertaken in economic distress and thus liable to be reversed, so that the formula *tū āru ... laššu* is used without real meaning.

No. 52

Plate 13; Photo Plate 49

**ND 7021**

4.2 × (4.2)

SE 14; east end, on floor with No. 63

Obv. 1 NA₄.KIŠIB₁ AD-ū-ri
   2 A₁sa-ah-ru-[u]
   3 EN Ml-šu še-šu-i

(3 stamp seal impressions)

4 mika-ku-ša-a² x x
5 us-s[e]-ši
6 lu-[ ]

(remainder of Obv. broken)

Rev. 1* [IGI]¹ U.GUR²:-
2* IGI² GIŠGAL-15
3* IGI¹ di²-di²-di² L[0³ x X] X MAS⁹
4* IGI¹ di²MAS-ti-i
5* [IGI]¹mar-di-i
6* IGI¹ TE-a-a
7* IGI¹ EN-lu-TI.LA
8* ITLI.SE UD.1¹ KAM
9* lim-me¹ E-DINGIR.MEŠ-ni
Sealing: Stamp seal, circular; Di. 1.3 cm.; impressed 3 times, only partially; condition poor.
Design: at centre, deity, seated facing right on high-backed straight throne, wearing long robe to ankles; right(?) hand holds rod and ring out before the figure, other hand raised before face(?). Throne legs and deity’s feet rest on back of monster, two-horned, ?mushussu. Before monster in field below unidentified object. Detail behind throne indistinguishable.

Translation
Seal of Abi-uri son of Sahruru the owner redeeming his woman. He has relea[sed] Kakkua(- ... )...
Witnesses: Nergal(-...], Sukku-Istar, Dudu(?),..., Nurti, Mardi, Sukkaya, Bel-lu-ballat. Month Addaru, 11th day, limmu Iqbu-ilani. He shall place 10 minas of refined silver and one mina of purified gold in the lap of Ninurta. He shall not succeed in his invalid lawsuit. Witnesses: [-...]-ereš, Nabu-ahu-iddin.

Notes
Rev.3: it is very uncertain whether this unclear name can be read Dudu and then equated with Dudu the lannahu of Ninurta known from ADD 642 and ND 3426. There is not enough space to restore l[U][lah-][h3]-nu 6MAS, nor is 6MA$ a likely reading for the end of the line. Other indications that temple staff are involved, however, are discussed below.
4: Nurti occurs very frequently in the Ninurta archive of Samas-sarru-ur, whose close association with the temple of Ninurta is known from coincidence of witnesses in his tablets with those of ADD 640-642.
14: Nabu-ahu-iddin is possibly the LSDsa$gisendisu of ND 5463:32.

Commentary
In legal terms the closest parallel we have for this text is ND 2308 (see FNALD No. 11), in which a slave girl is redeemed (pašaru) from a certain Mannu-ki-abi. It seems to have resulted from a court case decided by the mayor of Kalhu, and was witnessed by a priest (šangū) and a rab sikkāte among others. Like other texts relating to a queen and her subordinates, the tablet was found in ZT 16; K. Deller observes that other witnesses to it include Nani (known to be a lannahu of the Nabu Temple from ND 5550) and Urad-Istar (a šangū of Istar according to ADD 640 = ARU 45:27), and suggests that both here and in ND 2308 the women being released are šēlātu votaries. That in each case a man is named as “owner” of the woman does not necessarily contradict this theory, because we know from ND 2316 that a woman could both be a šēlātu and be married to a man, in this case a weaver. However, it is not clear which temple might be involved (Nabu, Istar, Mullissu are all candidates, quite apart from the proximity of the Ninurta Temple), and the presence of priestly witnesses need only reflect the fact that we are moving in the highest social circles of Kalhu.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Obv.</th>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>NA₄.KIŠIB₁.d₁5-[x (x)]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>NA₄.KIŠIB₁.d_UTU-PAP[(x)]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>DUMU₁.EN-[K]AL-a-ni EN qaq-q[i]-r[l]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>p[u-še]-še₂-su₂-sum-ni</td>
<td>(3 stamp seal impressions)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rev.</th>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1'</td>
<td>x[x]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2'</td>
<td>x x x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3'</td>
<td>pu-še-e ina $[À] 10 MAN[À³]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4'</td>
<td>K[Ø].₁.BABBAR $l₁-[š]-ši-u kas-p[u gammur]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5'</td>
<td>ŭ₄₅₆₇₈₉[x (x)] ab² r[a²]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6'</td>
<td>[ina dje-ni-šu x[ ]] x x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sealing: (1) Stamp seal, circular; Di. ca. 1.5 cm.; impressed twice (originally probably 3 times). Condition: faint, and broken. Design: unidentified, consisting of a pattern of thin lines, possibly a stylized animal. (2) Stamp seal, oval(?); max. di. ca. 2.0 cm.; min. di. ca. 1.6 cm.; impressed once, on left edge of tablet at level of seal-impression space. Condition: fair, but broken. Design: quadruped, probably short-horned goat, standing facing left, and feeding off stylized tree, at right. Above animal's back, crescent moon and small circle, probably star. (3) Finger-nail marks on Rev. at left of Rev. 2'-3' (see copy).
Translation

Seal of Ištar-šašiq (or: Šamaš-ahu-xi) son of Bel-danninanni, the owners redeeming and selling the unbuilt ground. 73½ cubits long and 50 [cubits wide, (a plot of)] unbuilt ground … by the royal road which [goes] to [….. (long break) ] … they have redeemed the unbuilt [ground] in exchange for 10 minas of silver. The price is paid [completely] … in his lawsuit … Witnesses: X, Na..., Sinii, Ninurta-alik-pani, X, X, X, Ubru-Ištar, X, Aššur-šallim, X, Qardu, X, Kandillanu the scribe who wrote (or: safeguards) [the tablet]. Month Nisanu, 13th day, limmu [Adad-na'id] the chief steward.

Notes

4: the emendation to še-su-u does no great violence to the copy, and follows from the reading of Rev. 4' which was elicited too late to collate this line for confirmation.
Rev.15': for the problem of šabātu see CAD s.v., FNALD p. 10, and Fales, BSOAS 40 (1977) 597–8.

Commentary

It is unfortunate that the body of the text is so damaged, for this is so far unique, the only comparable text (ADD 334 = ARU 631) being a house redemption, using the verb pašātu. The price paid to redeem the property is suggestive, since 10 minas of silver seems unnaturally high, and is a sum often mentioned in conveyances as a penalty for litigation; compare in this volume No. 51, where the “penalty” is so phrased that it forms an agreed redemption payment.
Sealing: Stamp seal, circular; Di. ca. 1.0 cm.; 2 impressions, in bad condition.

Design: above, winged disc, with wedge-shaped tail; below details invisible.

Translation
Seal of Šepe-Ninurta, seal of Mannu-ki-Adad, seal of Nurti, the owner(s) selling the orchard and well(?).

...... Whoever breaks the agreement shall pay [x min]as of silver. Aššur, Šamaš, Bel and Nergal shall be his prosecutors. Witnesses: Mannu(?)-ki-x, x-Ištar, X, Ahuni, Abdi(?), Du-xši, Šamaš-x-I, Sasi, I-x-ša(?), Liqepu, Ubru-Ninua, X, x-taya, Mušezib-Nabu the scribe. Month Ayyaru, [xth] day, [limmu Nabu-danni-janni the governor of Qu'e.

No. 55
Plate 14
ND 7031

4.8 x (7.4)
SE 14, just above floor

Obv. 1 [N]A₄.KIŠIB ¹kar₂-nil²-e’? [(x)]
2 DUMU¹a-qi-a-a [(x)]
3 EN A.ŠA ta-da-a-n[í] (stamp seal impressions)

4 E₁ ANŠ[E ]
5 GAB.DI [n]a-hal[(-)x x x (x x)]
6 GAB.DI¹(x-)PAP-[(x-)]x
7 GAB.DI na-hal[(-)x] x
8 GAB.DI¹k[u²-x x ]x
9 GAB.DI A.ŠA šqa[ ]
10 ú-piš-ma ¹.d[x[ ]
11 [T]A* IGI¹[k]q²-nil²-e’? (remainder of Obv. broken)
Table of Contents

Translation

Seal of Karne, son of Aqiaya the owner selling the field. A lot comprising one homer [ ] beside the wadi [of x], beside the wadi [of X], beside (the property of) [PN 1], beside the wadi (of X), beside (the property of) [PN 2], beside the field of [ ]. [PN 3] has contracted [and taken it] from Karne, ..... minas of gold he shall place in the lap of Ninurta who lives in Kalhu. He shall return the price tenfold to its owners. If he claims in his invalid lawsuit, he shall not succeed.


Month Tašritu, 15th day, limmu Sin-šarru-šur the palace scribe.

No. 56

4.7 × (5.9)
SE 14; upper fill

Obv. 1 NA₄.K[IS]IB₁ ma₂ u₁ d₄(x x)]
2 NA₄.KIŠIB₁ e-ri-si [(x x)]

(2 stamp seal impressions)

4 qaq-q[i-ri]² pu-še-e ina uru[
5 pu²-d₄-ri ša¹ 1.dPA-šal-lim-šu-nu
6 [ ] x te² x x x] x[

(remainder of Obv. broken)

Rev. 1' [x] x x² ū² [ u²
2' ([ ] GII)B-u-ni lu-u [ u
3' [lu-u DUMU.M[EŠ-šu-nu] lu-u [ u
4' [x x x (x)]-šu-nu lu-[u
5' [ ] x ši x x [ u
6' de-e³-[nu KA.KA] u[b³-ta]-u-ni
7' 1 MAN[A K]U.GI x[

Translation

Seal of Karne, son of Aqiaya the owner selling the field. A lot comprising one homer [ ] beside the wadi [of x], beside (the property of) [PN 1], beside the wadi (of X), beside (the property of) [PN 2], beside the field of [ ]. [PN 3] has contracted [and taken it] from Karne, ..... minas of gold he shall place in the lap of Ninurta who lives in Kalhu. He shall return the price tenfold to its owners. If he claims in his invalid lawsuit, he shall not succeed.


Month Tašritu, 15th day, limmu Sin-šarru-šur the palace scribe.
THE TABLETS FROM FORT SHALMANESER

8' IGI 1 ku-x x IGI 1 x
9' IGI 1.d x(x) x-bar 1 IGI 1 qur-di-x
10' IGI 1 ma 2-ku 2-ni 2
11' IGI 1 ba-[x x x] ni 2-si-aš-sur
12' IGI 1 sa 2-[x x] A
13' IGI 1 x [x x x (x)] -m-uš-e-z[ib]
14' IGI 1 [x x x (x)] ām
T.E. 15' lim-mu 1 m[a]-ar-la-[rem]

Notes
5: the restoration of the beginning of the line is very doubtful; see on Rev. 5'.
Rev. 5': an obvious restoration of this line is: [TA* 1 dPA-ša]-lim-[ša-nu] DU[MIK.MES]-ša. The difficulty about this is that Nabû-šallûmûnu is mentioned in 1.5, but apparently not as the purchaser. Although the suggested reading of 1.5 is far from certain, it seems even less possible to restore a form such as uppiš-ma which would be expected if he were the purchaser.

Commentary
A sale of an area of unbuilt ground, too broken to warrant a translation.

No. 57 Plate 15; Photo Plate 50 ND 7064

4.5 x 9.3 IM 75771
SE 14; on floor 25.x.668

Obv. 1 NA₄.KIŠIB 1 mil-ki-ia-[tu-n]u
2 A 1 ab-di-li-su-pu
3 EN AŠA ta-da-an-ni

(3 stamp seal impressions and 2 fingernail impressions)

4 [()] ANŠE AŠA E ši-q[i']
5 i[n]a [u]ma-za-n[ ]
6 [x] [ ]-šū
7 [x-šū]
8 [ ]-šū an ši x (x) ra
9 [( ) ū-piš-m[a 1 gi-ra-a-a
10 [( ) x x T]A 1 mil-ki-la-tu-nu
11 [( ) ina li-bi x MA.N]A KU.BABBAR
12 [(q) as-pur gam-mur
13 [ta-din-]ni
Rev. 15 [AŠA ŠU-a-]tu za-ar-[ri%p']
16 [laq-qe t]u-a-ru de[-e-nu
17 [KA.KA ]a-šš-šū
18 [m-an-nu i-n]a ur-kiš ina ma-te-ma
Sealing: Stamp seal, oval; max. di. 1.9 cm.; min. di. 1.4 cm.; impressed 3 times, condition poor.

Design: 4-winged beast, standing legs apart facing left; wings spread, head details indistinct. Legs probably eagle legs. No other details clear.

Translation
Seal of Milki-yatunu son of Abdi-lisupu the owner selling the field. [x] homers of field, an irrigated plot of land in the town Mazani[...], Girraya has contracted and [taken] from Milki-yatunu [for x minas of silver. The price is paid completely. [That field] is sold and [taken]. There shall be no going back, litigation or claim. Whoever afterwards at any time lodges a protest shall place [x minas of] refined silver and 1 mina of [purified] gold in the lap of Ninurta who dwells in Kalhu. He shall return the price tenfold to its owners. (If) he claims in his [(invalid) lawsuit, he shall not succeed. Witnesses: Mannu-ki-ahhe, Ubru-Assur, Qibit-Istar, Halusu, Ahua-alki-pani, Siddi-lusuki. Month Kanunu, 25th day, limmu Mar-larem.

Notes
3: note that after this line there are both finger-nail and stamp seal impressions, despite the mention of only one seller.

No. 58
Plate 15
ND 7012

5.3 × (7.3)
SE 14; east end, just above floor

Obv. 1 [N]A₄.KIŠI.B ₁šúl-mu-PAP.MEŠ
2 [EN] É ta-din-ni
Translation

Seal of Sulmu-ahhe, the owner selling the house. The ground of Girraya, the buildings of Sulmu-ahhe—Girraya—has contracted [and taken] from Sulmu-[ahhe], buildings for [ground] as an exchange [ ]. (long break) Witnesses: Minu-ahti, Hanhani, Ahu-lamašši, Adrumuš the chief [ ], Ilinašir, [x]-Šamaššu, Sulmu-ahhe, Kanunaya, Binitu-ahi, Abdiš-Mutu, Iliaš-Tir.

Notes

3—4: strictly these two parallel lines should perhaps be considered the object of the verbs uppiš and [ilqe(?)], but they also have the function of stating the two items up for exchange.

8: sapiisu: see FNALD p. 101 for a discussion of exchange conveyances and their formulation.

Rev. 6': this witness Sulmu-ahhe is possibly not the same man as the seller Sulmu-ahhe.

Commentary

Although the surviving text could suggest that Girraya is acquiring (or indeed selling, since the critical verb is lost) his own ground and Sulmu-ahhe's buildings, in reality the likeliest reconstruction is that ground belonging to Girraya is simply being exchanged for buildings belonging to Sulmu-ahhe. It could therefore be predicted that Girraya himself would have impressed his seal on a tablet granting ownership of the ground to Sulmu-ahhe. Note that if the tablet was dated, the date must presumably have been untypically before the list of witnesses.
TABLET 59

Plate 16

3.3 x 2.0

SE 14; just above floor, with Nos. 60 and 61
Inner tablet, without envelope

No. 59

Tablet 59

No. 59

Plate 16

3.3 x 2.0

SE 14; just above floor, with Nos. 60 and 61
Inner tablet, without envelope

Obv. 1 50 GIN.MES KU.BABBAR
2 ša PAP-SUM-na
3 ina IGI lu-qi
4 [ina IGI] 'nar-3-gi-i
5 [ina x-ti]-šu GAL-bi
B.E. 6 KU.BABBAR ša ŠU.2(2(x) ]x-nu
7 [GE]ME-ša miEN?-lu²-x-x
Rev. 8 DUMU.MI-su PAP 2 ZL.MEŠ
9 ina ša-pár-te GAR-nu UN.MEŠ
10 ina IGI EN-šu-nu KU.BABBAR GAL-bi
11 EGIR du-ra-ri KU.BABBAR x (x)
12 [IT]Lsu UD.23.KÂM
T.E. 13 lim-mu 1.d.PA-MAN-PAP A.BA KUR
14 IGI 1sa-a-sa-a IGI 1BÂD-15

Translation

50 shekels of silver due to Ahu-iddina, at the disposal of Luqi [(and) at the disposal of (?)] Nargi. It shall bear interest [at one xth]. The silver (is) of ...... (PN?), his [slave]-woman, FPN his daughter, a total of 2 persons, are committed as pledges. The people are at the disposal of their master (i.e. the creditor), and the silver shall bear interest. After the remission the silver .... Month Du‘uzi, 23rd day, limmu Nabu-šarru-usur the palace scribe. Witnesses: Sasaya, Duri-Istar.

Notes

4: on collation the spacing seemed to favour restoring [ina IGI] rather than [DUMU], but both remain possible, and the singular suffixes in ll.7–8 might be thought to favour the latter.
6: JNP proposes: KU.BABBAR šu ŠU.2 MÈŠ-šù-nu “The silver (is) of their guarantee” (cf. note on No. 8:1). The translation admits of another possibility, which is that the broken end of l.6 contained a personal name.
11: the closest parallel to this line is in IM 76899 (quoted in FNALD p. 22) EGIR durāri dumatu [šopar] “the sale-document was written after the remission”. The implication is that the transaction is not annulled by the remission, and in the present instance (which is of course a debt-note, not a sale text) one would expect a meaning like: “the silver was borrowed/lent after the remission”. Unfortunately the signs at the end of the line are very difficult to read; K. Deller suggests KU.BABBAR-šu IGI1 by comparison with ADD 629 rev. 13: KU.BABBAR-su i-da-gal, but that is preceded by a šumu clause, and a simpler solution may be KU.BABBAR SUM-šù-nu “the silver was given to them” (JNP) or GUR-šù-nu. Note that if -sunu were correctly restored here and in l.6, there must be two debtors.

Commentary

A debt-note for silver owed by two, or perhaps only one, debtor, backed up by the pledging of two persons. The point of ll.9–10 seems to be to point out that these pledges are handed over to the creditor (for “their master” meaning the creditor cf. FNALD pp.
THE TABLETS FROM FORT SHALMANESER

48—9), and interest will be paid on the silver as well; for the pledge was no doubt often taken in an antichretic arrangement instead of interest.

As T. Kwasman has pointed out, the same men Luqi and Nargi are also found together in ARU 53 and 285.

No. 60 Plate 16 ND 7023

3.0 × 1.6 IM 75752
SE 14; just above floor, with Nos. 59 and 61 28.ii. Nabu-tappute-alk
Inner tablet, without envelope

Obv. 1 10 GIŠ NÚ.BABBAR SIG?
1a x x x x x
2 ša 1.dPA-PAP 1.MES-šú-SU
3 ina IG 1.BÁD-MA-KI.1.dMAŠ
4 DUMU 1.man-nu-ki.1.15
B.E. 5 [ina] UD.5.KÁM šá 1.ITALSIG4
6 [SUM-an šú] m4-ma NU SUM-ni
Rev. 7 [KÚ.BABBAR ana] 4-tú GAL-bi
8 [1.x x x (x)] A 1.GIR.2.dMAŠ
9 [EN-SU] 2.MES šá KÚ.BABBAR
10 [TT].GUq UD.28.KÁM
T.E. 11 [lim-m] 1.dPA-IPPU-TE-D[U]
12 [IGI] 1.am²-x-TAR
13 IG 1.dMAŠ-ti-i
L.S. 14 [ ]
15 x x x x

Translation
10 shekels of good(?) silver, ...., due to Nabu-ahhešu-eriba, at the disposal of Dur-makí-Ninurta son of Mannu-ki-Ištar. [He shall pay] on the 5th day of the month Simanu. If he does not pay, [the silver] shall bear interest at one quarter. [PN] son of Šepé-Ninurta is the guarantor of the silver. Month Ayyaru, 28th day, limmu Nabu-tapputu-alk. Witnesses: Am[...], Nurti, X, X.....

Notes
1a: this line is written as an afterthought between ll.1 and 2 in very small script, and I could not read it (JNP).
12: the sign after am is clear, and perhaps most resembles a STD with the lowest horizontal displaced. Since we can find no parallels for the name we are unable to suggest a convincing reading; am is certainly preferable to bi.

Commentary
A normal silver loan, to run for 7 days before it begins to accrue interest.
No. 61
Plate 16

3.5 × 1.8
SE 14; just above floor, with Nos. 59 and 60
Inner tablet, without its envelope

T.E. 1 5 G İn Kû.Babbar
Obv. 2 ša 1.miştir-E[()]]
3 [ina] GI 1.ub-ri[ ][.坚定不移]-ba-nit
4 DUMU 1.İR-15 [(x x)]
5 ina pu-u-hi [it-it-sî]
6 ina 4-tû-šû GA[L-bî]
B.E. 7 [?]l.Î.KIN UD.97.KAM
8 lim-mu 1.30-DU-IGI[()]]
Rev. 9 IGI 1.rêm-ut-DINGIR.MEŠ
10 IGI 1.GIŠGAL-15
11 IGI 1.économ-PÂ-LAL-a-ni
12 IGI 1.zî-ta-a-a A.BA

Translation
5 shekels of silver due to Ninurta-iqbi(?), at the disposal of Ubri-Banitu(?) son of Uradištar. [He has taken it] as an exchange loan. It shall bear interest at one quarter. Month Ululu, 9th day, limmu Sin-alik-pani. Witnesses: Remut-ilani, Sukku-Ištar, Nabutaqqin anni, Zittaya the scribe.

Notes
3: JNP prefers to take the name of the borrower simply as 'ub-ri, and see the signs on the right edge as a subsequent addition; however, he can suggest no plausible reading for them.

Commentary
A normal silver loan bearing interest immediately.

No. 62
Plate 16

4.5 × 3.4
SE 14; just above floor

Obv. 1 1⁄2 MA.NA Kû.Babbar ša 1.ta-qiš.dgu-la
2 A 1.šî-rik?[ ina muh-hi 1.ptrdiff-IDIM
3 A 1.X × X.APIN-es ul-tu UD.13.KAM
4 šâ IT.I.BARAG ina 1 Gîn hum-mu-šû Kû.Babbar
5 ina muh-hi-šû i-rab-bî mîMA.AQ-ra-t
6 maš-ka-nu šá KÜ.BABBAR-šú ra-šu-ú
7 šá-nam-ma a-na muh-hi-šú
B.E. 8 uš i-šal-laj a-ra-erdi1 ta-qis-dME.ME
9 KÜ.BABBAR-šú i-šal-lim1

Rev. 10 6mu-kin-ni
11 1.dba-Ú-MU A 1.dU.GUR-GI
12 1.dMAŠ-NIGIN-ir A 1 dak-AK-MU-DÜ
13 1.shu-zu-bu A 1.dAK-ŠEŠ-MU
14 ša-tir ši-il-tt1 tab-ni-e-a
15 A 1ku-ri-gal-zu
16 ur4KAR-AN.SHAR ITIL.BARAG
17 UD.13.KÁM MU.7.KÁM
T.E. 18 1.dULUGAL-GAR LUGAL KUR.KUR

Translation
Half a mina of silver due to Taqis-Gula son of Širik(?), at the disposal of Ninurta-kabti
son of ...-erēš. From the 13th day of the month Nisannu the silver shall bear interest on it
at one-fifth per shekel. Ummu-aqrat is the pledge for his silver; no other creditor may lay
claim to her, until Taqis-Gula gets his silver back in full. Witnesses: Bau-iddin son of
Nergal-sullim, Ninurta-upahhir son of Nabu-suma-ibni, Suzubu son of Nabu-aha-iddin,
Tabnea son of Kurigalzu, who wrote the record. Month Nisannu, 13th day. Year 7, Sin-
šar-isšun king of the lands.

Notes
2: 1ši-rık2: even after collation the sign after ši seems to be a clear GīR, but since this gives no sense, we
propose to take it as a scribal spoonerism for rık/, yielding a well known nB name.
3: the signs in the name of Ninurta-kabti's father seem to be 1NE-KUR1-DINGIR-APIN-es, but we are unable to
propose a satisfactory reading.
8—9: see Petschow, Pfandrechte p.88; the subjunctive šallimu would be expected.
16: Kar-Aššur in ADD 950 rev. 7 is listed between Arrapha and Lahiru, and mentioned with Gananati and
Zabban in ND 2664, so that it almost certainly belongs in the Kerkuk-Diyala region which lies between Assyria
and Babylonia (cf. J.A. Brinkman, PKB 276). G. McEwan refers us to Sachs, LBAT 471, 12 and 516, 27' (on the
Tigris).

Commentary
There is no evidence from the prosopography of this text to explain why this entirely Neo-
Babylonian silver loan was found at Nimrud, in post-canonical Assyria. The date of the
text would be 622 according to Borger (Or.NS 38 (1969) 237ff.) or 616 according to J.
Oates (Iraq 27 (1965) 158); Reade would place it in 620 B.C. (see JCS 23 (1970) 3, where
he refers to this tablet).
No. 63

5.3 x 3.3

SE 14; east end, on floor with No. 52

Cushion-shaped tablet, sealed

Obv. 1 NA₄.KIŠIB ¹.d.MAS-ti² [(x)]
2 KU.[BABBB]AR ša ¹.d.MAS²-ti x [()]
   (stamp seal impressions)
3 ša ina IGI ¹.lu-qI
4 ū-ša-šIM

B.E. 5 it-ti-din

Rev. 6 ū-[]u-[ru]
7 šIL-MU ina bir-ti-šIL-nU
8 man-nu ša GIB-u-nI
9 aŠ-Šur ⁶PA a-de-e ša MAN
10 lu EN de-nI-šI
11 IGI ¹li-qi-p[u]
12 IGI ¹ka¹-[x]-su

T.E. 13 [IT][x U]D.2.KÀ[M]
14 lim-mu ¹aŠ-Šur-DINGIR².a²-[a²]

L.S. 15 IGI ¹-DINGIR

Sealing: Stamp seal; roughly circular; Di. 1.0 cm.; impressed three times, twice indecipherable.
   Design: star-shaped design formed by 4 regularly intersecting lines.

Translation

Seal of Nurti³. Silver due to Nurti³ which (was) at the disposal of Luqi—he has repaid in full, he has given (it back). They are paid off, there is mutual satisfaction. Whoever breaks the agreement, Aššur, Nabu and the oaths of the king shall be his prosecutors. Witnesses: Liqepu, Ka-x-su. Month [x], 2nd day, limmu Aššur-ilaya(?). Witness: Na’id-ili.

Notes

1—2: for legal reasons it is probable that these lines contained the same name, but it was not possible to confirm or deny the suggested reading on collation.
3: ¹lu-qI, one of the debtors in No. 59, may be the same person, but note that we should expect him to have retained this tablet, whereas the tablet in No. 59 would normally have been in the possession of the creditor.

Commentary

Although found with No. 52, this appears to be one of the few legal texts from Fort Shalmaneser dated by canonical limmus. The text seems to be a fairly straightforward receipt, but the clauses in II.6—10 suggest that it may have been drawn up at the conclusion of a dispute. This might also be held to follow because the amount of silver is not mentioned, implying that the parties to the transaction knew well enough what the amount was.
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No. 64 Plate 17 ND 7019

(3.1) x 4.0
SE 15; floor
Cushion-shaped tablet, sealed

Obv. 1 [ ] it-ta-bal-kât
2 [ ]-TI-i
3 [ ]x-a-a-te la ta-di-na
4 [ ]-r]u²-TI-i
5 [ ]x-i-ù ta-se-ge
6 [ ]b]ir-ti-r šu²-nu
7 [ ]-ma la KA.KA

Rev. 8 [mannu ša G]IB-u-ni a-de-e
9 [ša x (x x) ina] SU.2-šu lu-ba-ù
10 [ITI.x UD.(x +)]5.KÂM lim-mu 1.dPA-tap-pute-a-liq
11 [ ]a² IGII hu-da-sa-a
12 [ ]-a-a-li
13 [ ]x-na-šuh²
14 [ ]-[a²]-a-bi
15 [ ]IG]I³ PAP-hi-di
16 [ ]-[T]I-i

Commentary
To judge from 11.6—9 this must have been a record of a judicial settlement, but the phrasing is unusual and cannot be confidently restored. It seems to include oratio recta (lā taddina “you did not pay”), but tasseqe in 1.6 is more likely to be a 3 fern. sing. in this position. Nabalkutu (I.1) is otherwise known in Neo-Assyrian legal texts only in the sense “to overturn a case”, i.e. to appeal, or to re-open a case. Unfortunately it is impossible to deduce the subject of the disagreement from the surviving traces. For the usual format of judicial settlements, see FNALD Nos. 46—48.

No. 65 Plate 17 ND 9905

5.6 x 8.5 x 3.0
NE 38

Obv. 1 šu-pur 1ab-di-i
2 šu-pur 1aš-šur- x x x
3 šu-pur 1 x x (x) -a-ta-ra
4 PAP³ LÛ.MEŠ EN A.ŠA.G[A]
**Translation**

Nail impression of Abdi, nail impression of Aššur-x, nail impression of X-atarq total three men, owner(s) of the field. Mannu-ki-Bel(?) has contracted and taken a field of [x] homers under cultivation(?), according to the copper seah measure of 10 qa, for 12 minas of [copper]. The price is paid completely. The field ..... There shall be no going back (or) litigation. Whoever, whether [Mannu-ki-]Bel(?) ..... initiates [litigation or claims] shall ..... white horses and shall bring in [x] hurbakannu-horses to the "feet" of Nergal, [(and shall give) x] talents of tin to the governor of his city. He shall return the price ten-fold to its owners. (If) he claims in a lawsuit, he shall not [succeed]. Witnesses: Ninurta?-ahu-iddin, Ahu-x, Balî(?), [ .....]. Limmu ..... 

**Notes**

2: possibly read Aššur-GIN-MAN-ti.

13: one expects Aššu.A.GA zarip laqi, but the traces do not appear to support this.

rev.2: either a scribal omission or an abbreviation must occur here, since there is not room for the expected phrase ina GIR.2 Aššur trakkas (see Menzel, Ass.T., II, T200ff.).

rev.4: it is possible that GIR.2 is an abbreviation for GIS.GIGIR GIR.2 (K. Deller, forthcoming), and that the phrase should be translated: "bring in horses for the GIR.2 chariot of Nergal" (SMD).

rev.5: as before, either a scribal omission or an abbreviation occurs here, since there is not room for the expected ana LÜ.EN.NAM URU-su SUM-an.
rev.10': in view of the similarity to No. 68 (749 B.C.), the likeliest limmus here are Ninurta-šezi-banni (754) or Nergal-naṣir (746).

Commentary
This and the three following texts (Nos. 65—68) are all probably real estate conveyances dating to the mid—8th century, although the purchasers are different. No. 68 is fairly securely dated to 749 B.C., and the other texts from the same room show 8th century features like the use of copper (not silver) for payment, and finger-nail impressions (no stamp seals). There are no definite prosopographical links with names in GPA or in the Sargonid texts in this volume.

No. 66

Plate 17

ND 9906

5.6 x 8.2 x 2.9

NE 38; southwest corner, just above floor

Obv. 1 [su-p]ur 1ka-pa-ta-rni?1
2 [e]N A.ŠA

(fingernail impressions)

3 2 GIŠ.GU.ZA.MEŠ-te
4 1-te E 1[-BĀN] 1-te7 E 3-BĀN
5 PAP 4²-BĀN A.ŠA tihi* 11ha-an-ni-i1
6 tihi* 1sa-ra-an ú-[p]š
7 1sa-ra-a-r1na7 [ina ŠA X M]A.[N]A URUDU
8 [il-qi] kas-pu g[a-m]ur
9 [ra-di]n A.ŠA za-rip
10 [laq-qi] tu-a-ru de-nu
11 [KA.K]A la-a-šu
B.E. 12 [(man-nu) šâ] GIB-u-ni
13 [X MA.N][A K][U.[B]B][AR]

Rev. 14 [X] MA.[NA KÚ.[G]I]
15 [a-na] 6MAŠ [SU.M1-an]
16 [kas-pu] a-na EN,[MEŠ-šu]
17 [a-]n[a 10.MEŠ-t² GUR]
18 [ina dje-n[i-šu K]A.KA[-ma NU TI]

19 [IGI] 1ha-a[n-]ni-f( )
20 [IGI] 1me-'i-su³
21 [IGI] 1U-im-me
22 [IGI] 1as-šur-PA[P
23 [IGI] 1x-na-nu³

(remainder of Rev. and T.E. broken)
Translation
Nail impression of Kapatani, the owner of the field. Two kussāte, one being a plot [of 1 seah], the other being a plot of 3 seah, total 4 seah of land adjoining (the property of) Hanni (and) adjoining (the property of) Saran, Sarana has contracted and taken [for x] minas of copper. The price is paid completely. The land is sold and taken. There shall be no going back, litigation or [claim. Whoever] breaks the agreement [shall pay x minas of silver] and x minas [of gold] to Ninurta, [and he shall return the price] tenfold to its owners. (If) he claims in a lawsuit, he shall not succeed. Witnesses: Hanni, Me’isu, Adad-imme, Aṣṣur-ahu-x, X-nanu, [.....], X, X who wrote (or: safeguarded) the tablet.

Notes
3: 2 GIŠ.GU.ZA.MEŠ-te: in ADD 391, a sale of land dated to 717 B.C., a plot of land 4-BĀN GIŠ.GU.ZA occurs in 1.16. In ADD 1167, a sale of land dated to 699 B.C., a plot of land 3-BĀN A.ŠA GIŠ.GU.ZA 1na usāli is found in 1.9. In ADD 1185 (date missing) two different plots are separately called by this term: the first in a broken line, the second in 1.20. 2 GIŠ.GU.ZA.Ū. The term also occurs in Ismail and Postgate, forthcoming, No. 33:15, without any indication of surface area: GIŠ.GU.ZA *tehi [ ]. (In ADD 1179 read: *tehi GIŠ gu-pu-nu; Johns inserted the ZA in error; collated.)

Note that all occurrences refer to small plots between 1-BĀN and 4-BĀN in size, and that more than one kussū may be grouped together and their boundaries then described as if the plots formed a single unit. The meaning of the term is unknown. Since “crown land” presumably could not be sold, CAD s.v. kussū in bit kussū cannot be correct for our occurrences. The term is also found in Old Babylonian according to the unpublished text from Tell Asmar quoted by CAD K 43b (reference thanks to T. Kwasman). Since the word is feminine in this Nimrud text, the passage listed under kussu B: 9 ku-us-sa-ti 1a GIŠ.SAR (MDP 24, 371:4) may be a phonetic writing for the land term GIŠ.GU.ZA.MEŠ.

4: 1-te presumably refers to kussū.

6–7: 1sa-ra-an and 1sa-ra-a-naar are taken to be forms of the same name: the buyer is extending his property. By comparison with No. 65, it is possible we should read the verbs in the perfect: i-tap-piš in 1.6 and i-š-e-qe in 1.8, both of which could be fairly reconciled with the copy.

20: the reading of the name is uncertain: possibly 1me-eh-li.

Commentary
See on No. 65 for dating.

The plot of land known as GIŠ.GU.ZA “chair land” may be part of a continuous tradition from Old Babylonian into the late Babylonian period, possibly as a military holding, for 2 GIŠ.GU.ZA “chair land” occurs with 2 ANŠE.KUR.RA “horse land” and 2 GIŠ.GIGIR “chariot land” as plots of land or fiefs in the late Bab. text PBS 2/1, 65. It occurs with 2 GIŠ.BANSUR “table land” in VS 5, 128. See F. Joannes, Textes économiques de la Babylone récente, Paris 1982, p.28.

No. 67 Plate 17
4.4 × 8.2² × 2.5 IM for study
NE 38, south-west corner just above floor, with No. 66
ND 9907
[—]
Obv. 1 [su]-pur 1₃[PA²-r]e-šu-[u-a]

(finger nail impressions)

2 ṣep-šū a-dī [G]IŠ.UR.MES-[s][a]
3 [a-]di GIŠ.I[G].MES-šū ú-piš-ma ¹U.[
4 [TA*]I]GI 1₃drPA²₃-r)e-šu-u-a
5 [ina libbi x M]A.NA URUDU.MES
6 [il-ge kas-pu gam]-mur ¹U.a-dīn
7 [Išu-a-tū] z[a-rî]p laq-q[i]
8 [tu-a-rū] de-nū K.A.KA [a-dū]-šu]
9 [(x) x x [(x) x] ina KUR² ma-[i²-ma(?)]
10 [ ]-u-ni a x[

(remainder of Obv. broken)

(Rev. entirely lost)

Translation
Nail impression of [Nabu²]-rešua. Adad-x has contracted and [taken] a building with its roof-beams and with its doors from Nabu²-rešua [for x] minas of copper. [The price is] paid completely. [That house is] sold and taken. There shall be no [going back,] litigation or claim.

Notes
9: at the end of the line a reading ]x mām-ma-an[ is not excluded by the traces, but does not give good sense here.

Commentary
A normal house sale, so far as preserved. For the date, see on No. 65.

No. 68 Plate 18 ND 9908

(7.5) x (8.3) x 3.4

NE 38; SW corner just above floor, with Nos. 66–67

Obv. 1’ [( ) GAR-][n 2 ANŠE.R][KUR.RA¹][(MEŠ) BABBAR.MES]
2’ [ina GIŠ.R₂₉-sûr]²⁻rak¹⁻kas ⁴ANŠE hur-ba-k[an-ni]
3’ [ina GIŠ.R₂₉MAŠ ü-še-rab ¹GŬ.UN AN][NA]
5’ [ana E]-šu G]UR ina de-ni-šu K.A.KA la TI-qê
6’ [GI]₁₃₃₁₆₃₉₄₅ L､GĬŠ.GI[GIR [( )]]
7’ [GI]₁₃₃₁₆₃₉₄₅ L､GĬŠ.GI[GIR [( )]]
8' [IGI {x} x IGI 1is-da'-a-[1
9' [IGI] 1EN-A-PAP IGI 1ba-li-x[
10' [IGI] 1ab-di-lat, a-ta-ra IGI 1 x x [1
11' [IGI] 1rib-a-a IGI 1BE- x x
12' [IGI] 1[x x (x x)] IGI 1,drPA^2, SU
13' [IGI] 1kaš-ša'-a-a IGI 1IR^2-PAP.MEŠ-šú
14' [IGI] 1,drPA-še-zib-[a]-ni š[a-b]i[i]t tup-p[i]
15' [ ] lim-me 1,drUTU-GIN-r du-gul^1
T.E. [ ] x x x

Translation
..... shall place. He shall harness two [white] horses [to the “feet” of Aššur]. He shall bring in four hurbakannu-horses [to the “feet” of Ner]gal. He shall pay one talent of tin to the governor of his city. He shall return the price tenfold to its owner. (If) he claims in his lawsuit he shall not succeed. Witnesses: Muššallim^2-Ištar the charioteer, X-risa the charioteer, X, Isdaya(?), Bel-aplu-šur, Bali-x, Abdi?-Atara, X, Ribaya, X, X, Nabu^2-eriba, Kaššaya^1, Urad-ahhešu, Nabu-šezibanni who wrote (or: safeguarded) the tablet. [Month x, xth day, lim]mu Šamaš-kenu-dugul. ..... 

Notes
2': for GIR.2 see note on No. 65 rev.4'.
14': see note on No. 53 rev.15.
L.S.: either a note or an extra witness added after the date.

Commentary
See on No. 65.

No. 69 Plate 18

(6.8) x 11.3 x 3.0
SW 37 [x].ii.[x]

Obv. (lost)

Rev. 1' [ ] MA.N[AK][U.x][
2' ina bur-[k][i] MAŠ a-šib urru kal- hi [GAR-an]
3' 2 GI[U.UN AN.N][A ana L][U EN.NAM URU-šú]
4' SUM-[ar] 4^2 ANŠE.KUR.R[A.MEŠ BABBAR^2.MEŠ ( )]
5' [ ] x x ša urru x[
6' [ka]s-p[u] ana 10.MEŠ^7 < ana^2 > EN.M[MEŠ-šú GUR-ra]
7' ina de-[ni]-šú KA.K[MA-MAŠ 1 T][

8' IGI 1ha-x-x-x-x [ ]
9' [IGI] 1x-x-ri [()]
10' [IGI] 1la-x-be [()]
THE TABLETS FROM FORT SHALMANESER

11' [IGI] 1ba^2-x-x [( )]
12' [IGI] 1ab-di-[
13' [IGI] 1PAP-si-x [
14' IGI 1a-r[a]
15' IGI 1GI[R.2-U.G]UR^3[( )]
16' IGI 1.cMAš-[x] x [
17' IGI 1.PA-šeq[-x-x [( )]
18' ina ITIL.GU4[
19' tim-me 1x-x [
Not translated.

Note
5': one expects ina GIR.2 aššur irakkas.

Commentary
Only the penalty clauses, witnesses and date of this conveyance are preserved, and there are no obvious criteria for establishing its date since the eponym name cannot be confidently restored.

No. 70
Plate 18
ND 9901

5.9 x 3.4
S 38; on level 2 floor (grey level)
Horizontal tablet; sealed

Obv. 1 ina UD.1.KÁM ša ITIL.ZÍZ
2 1.U.IQ-bi TA* 1ta-ta-a-a
3 i-ku i-nar-ma-ak-te
4 ša zu-qa-ri i-ta-ri-u
5 ma-a šum₄-[m]a 9-BÁN NUMUN-ú ina SÁ A.SÁ
   (2 stamp seal impressions)
6 ša LÚ.GAL É.GAL la a-du-šu-u-ši
B.E. 7 4 MA KÚ.BABBAR TUR-su la a-din-u-ni
Rev. 8 ma-a ša šib-ši ša nu-ša-hi
9 šum₄-ma tu-du-ši TA* SÁ DINGIR
10 3 ANŠE 2-BÁN ŠE.BAR a-na LÚ.GAL É.GAL
11 di-du-ši ITIL.AB UD.24.KÁM
12 lim-<me > 1.PA-sa-šib IGI 1aš-šur-MAN-PAP
13 IGI 1.dSU-MAN-PAP IGI 1aš-šur-KUR-LAL-in
14 IGI (remainder of tablet blank)

Sealing: Stamp seal, roughly circular; di. 1.3 cm.; impressed twice, poorly.
Design: 8-pointed star formed by 4 regularly intersecting lines.
Translation
On the first day of the month Šaḇatu Adad-iqbi shall go with Tataya (and) they shall swear an oath at the .... of ...., saying: "I swear that I did sow 9 seah of seed-corn in the field of the palace manager, (and) that I did give him 4 minas of silver .... for straw-tax and for musahu-tax." If they refuse (to take) the (oath of the) god, they shall pay 3 homers and 2² seah of barley to the palace manager. Month Kanunu, 24th day, limmu? Nabussagib. Witnesses: Aššur-šarru-usur, Marduk-šarru-usur, Aššur-matu-taqqin. (Blank space for a 4th witness.)

Notes
3: i-nar-ma-ak-te: JNP takes this (following a suggestion of E. Reiner) as i(na) narmakte “at the basin”. Deller and SMD prefer to take it as a variant of ARU 232:2-3 ina ŠA na-da-bo-ak-te, even though the copy clearly does not favour reading i-na na warfare. For an oath on the nadabaktu, cf. Šurpu 65-66: mamit šadi u hatu i mamit rēši u na[dabakte].
4: zu-qa-rē: JNP takes this as a form of sigqurratu. K. Deller suggests associating it with su-qa-a-ra = tallaktu (CT 18, 5 f 12); so also Stolper, BASOR 239 (1980) 80. Astour, RA 67 (1973) 74, suggests it is a town Zuqarru/i on the upper Euphrates. SMD suggests zuqari as possibly a form of zaruqqu, literally “at the pouring-out-place of the irrigation apparatus”. New evidence is needed.
7: TUR-su: JNP proposes hesitantly to read this as qalissu, with TUR abnormally used for qallis; MA.NA itself is normally masc., and the fem. adjective would have to be taken as applying to the talent (cf. FNALD p. 65). SMD suggests perhaps turu-su as a form of the Nuzi/mA word turūsu/turēzu “harvest”.
9: perhaps better <i>-tu-re-ri; cf. i-ti'-ra in ARU 232:8.
14: both here and in ARU 232 the last line is blank after IGI, as if a further witness’ name was to be added at a later stage.

Commentary
The text was previously published in transcription in TCAE p.181 and 404—5, and as FNALD No. 41. Two persons, Adad-iqbi and Tataya, are required to go and take an oath in 7 days time in order to prove their assertion that they had sown some seed on the palace manager’s land, and had paid a large sum of silver for taxes. As K. Deller points out to us, 4 minas of silver is disproportionately large by comparison with 9 seah of seed-corn, and the two items are probably quite separate. We have no prosopographical information about the “defendants”, nor is there any clue to the authority—whether judicial or administrative—imposing the trial by oath, although it seems likely that the palace manager (rab ekalli) was involved in the procedure in some capacity.

LII.3—4 are the most enigmatic of the text. JNP prefers to see the narmaktu ša zuqāri as some installation in the temple favoured for the taking of oaths, and the na-da-bo-ak-te in ARU 232:3 as a different installation used for the same purpose. SMD however would make comparison with ND 2338:18—23: šumma PN TA ŠA nadabākī annē urtame, translated in FNALD p.46 as “If PN withdraws from this nadabāku (he shall bear the liability for the 4 minas of silver)”, which she would see as a refusal to take an oath.

In the post-canonical Nimrud text ADD 640 Marduk-šarru-usur is a witness with the title “priest of Nabu”, and in ND 5550 Aššur-mātu-taqqin occurs with title broken, in a Nabu Temple context (both texts newly edited in Menzel, Ass.T. II). This may indicate a connection with the temple.
This tablet could not be found. The following information is quoted from the excavation catalogue. The names have not been indexed.

‘Complete baked tablet, 5—3—5—3 lines, with about one-third of its envelope (ND 11301a) 4.4 × 2.9 × 2.4 cm. Record of loan of 21 homers of grain at the sutu of 9 qa. 7 witnesses including Assur-ba-liṭ and Bel-ab-uṣur. Envelope bears 2 impressions.’

Commentary
This is a note of a large quantity of corn(?) and 10 shekels of silver(?), owed by ú-x[; apparently not a complete legal document, as it is neither dated nor witnessed. The capital was “of Ištar of [...]”, which is unusual since Ištar is very rarely associated with grain loans (see Menzel, Ass.T., II, T199—207).
TABLETS 71—73

5 [ ]
6 x[ ]
7 EN[ ]
8 IGI 1x[ x

B.E. 9 IGI 1x (x)-ana-15 A 1 gab-ri-i
10 IGI 1HA.LA-a-a
11 IGI 1GIŠGAL-15 A 1 EN-DINGIR-E-u-ni

Rev. 12 IGI 1sa-li-li-i
13 IGI 1si-si-i
14 IGI 1ba-la-su
15 IGI 115-Ė.GAL-u-a
16 IGI 1Kab-ti-i
17 IGI 1ba-Ū-AŠ
18 IGI 1MAŠ-šal-lim

T.E. 19 IGI 111]5-SUM-MU

Envelope

Frag. A 1 x MA.N]A 5 GĪN [KŪ.BABBAR

Frag. B 1’ [ ]
2’ [ ]
3’ ša 1 [ ]
4’ GAL[ ]
5’ ina IGI 1x[ ]
6’ ina IGI 1nu-[ ]
7’ ina IGI 1x[ ]
8’ ina IGI 1x[ ]
9’ [ina IGI ] 1x[ ]

Sealing: (1) Stamp seal, circular(?); min. di. 1.1 cm.; one impression, incomplete, condition fair.
Design: at centre, cult symbol of post with ball on top, above ball inverted crescent; from base of post 2(?) further symbols springing to each side (?maces). Each side, standing figure facing centre, one hand raised before face, possibly holding pine cone, other hand holds bucket down. Remaining details absent.
(2) Stamp seal, possibly circular; max. width 0.9 cm. One impression only partly preserved, condition fair.
Design: 3 rows or horizontal lines with triangular ‘teeth’?
(3) Stamp seal, circular(?); est. di. 0.8 cm.; one impression, upper half only, poor condition.
Design: above centre, winged disc, with large wedge-shaped tail; below, left, upper half of ?adoring figure, head and raised hands only preserved.

Notes
7: this line probably held a guarantee clause, e.g. [PN] EN [SU.ŠU.2.MEŠ ša KŪ.BABBAR]. After this line on the tablet there are remnants of the seal impressions from the envelope, adhering to the surface.
9: read probably 1GIŠGAL-15 which explains why the filiation is given only here and in l.11.
Frag. A: this may rather be a small piece from the tablet, in which case it could be placed in l.1.
Commentary
A loan or debt-note for silver; combining B.3'-4' and ll.2-3 of the tablet, it is probable that the creditor was a rab [....] of the palace scribe, and there were at least 5 debtors or borrowers. Some of the witnesses are known elsewhere in post-canonical Fort Shalmaneser texts; the date may be concealed in 1.8.

No. 74 Plate 19 ND 11305

4.8 × 3.9 × 1.7 Expediotion
T25; in fill 70 cm. above cement floor

Obv. 1 kūša-ri-tū ša kam-me-te
2 MUL.MEŠ ša UGU & til-le
3 1 ME GIŠ.GAG.TI SIG₃ ME-te
4 4 ME ša GIŠ.GAR.MEŠ
5 PAP 5 ME GIŠ.GAG.TI.MEŠ
6 2 ME ma-ta-na-a-te
7 5 gūša-ri-a-te
8 ša GIŠ.PA.MEŠ
9 kab-bu-ta-a-te
10 (erased signs)
11 ša (erased signs)
12 ina uruka-ru-nu-ri
13 1.d30-EN-PAP
14 ip-ti-qit-di

Translation
A leather shield with rivets(?); the stars which are on the holder(?) for trappings; 100 good uššu-arrows, 400 of iškārus, total 500 uššu-arrows; 200 bow-strings; 5 shields (made) of heavy sticks; (erasures), which (erasures). Sin-bēl-u-usur authorized in the town Karunuri.

Notes
1: kammete: this cannot easily be explained as a mistake for kamnāte, plural from kammu "a metal rivet", nor as a mistake for kamkammatu "a ring".
2: ša muhhi & til-lle in the ma text VS 19, 63:8 appears to be a profession (without a LÚ determinative, as here); this line could therefore be taken with 1.1: "a shield with rivets (in the form of) stars—(the officer) in charge of the trappings store".
3-4: SIG₃ ME-te and ša GIŠ.GAR.MEŠ appear to be used as contrasting terms; possibly "in good order"/"needing (repair) work" (SMD) or "well made"/"made by government workers" (reflecting the expected quality of goods made under the iškāru system; JNP).
6: matanāte for matnāte, plural of matna. 8: ša GIŠ.PA.MEŠ: cf. TH No. 53:12, which is a closely comparable text. Does "sticks" mean wickerwork?
9: kabbuša: translated according to AHw s.v. kabbatu, in preference to CAD s.v. kabbatu.
12: uruka-ru-nu-ri: in view of the evidence from IM 76884 (Ismail and Postgate, No. 11) that Ninurta's name may have had a form Nūr, there is a good possibility that this is a syllabic spelling for Kar-Ninurta (Kišesim, renamed by Sargon II). See also note 62 to FN index. Cf. also URUkar-nu-û-ri (Luckenbill, Sennacherib 78.8). If
this identification is correct, the text cannot date before the reign of Sargon. If Sin-belu-usur can be identified with the rab kiri of ADD 276 (682 B.C.) and ADD 625 (670 B.C.), this text may date during the reign of Sennacherib or Esarhaddon.

No. 75  
Plate 19  
4.0 × 2.3  

Found on dump of Fort Shalmaneser  
Rough cigar-shaped lump; no sealing, and not formed round string  

1  sa-ri-a-a-nu AN.BAR  
2  ša urudi-maš-qa  

Translation  
An iron coat of mail, of Damascus.  

Note  

No. 76  
Plate 19  
3.3 × 2.2  

From pavement of courtyard, immediately south of SE 22  
Unsealed lump of clay, without perforations for attachment  

Obv. 1  7 ME 84  
2  GIS.BAN.MEŠ  
3  ša uruš-pad-aš[a]  
Rev. 4  lim-me ṯman-nu-ki-U  

Translation  
784 bows of the city Arpad. Limmu Mannu-ki-Adad.
No. 77 Plate 19 ND 7059

Fort Shalmaneser dump; probably from SE 14
Horizontal tablet, sealed

Obv. 1 30 ANŠE ŠE.BAR ša T] xT
2 ša šaš-dag-diš
3 1.dPA-MU-GIS
(stamp seal impression)
4 ŠU.2 LÚ.GAL É.GAL

B.E. 5 e-tar-ba [( ])

Rev. 6 ina UGU x[x (x)]
7 [( ] I-[ ]
(remainder blank)

Translation
30 homers of [.....] of last year, Nabu-šumu-šeṣir. Responsibility of the palace manager. It has entered .......

Notes
1: possibly read: ša t-a-[ma]-a, i.e. “of now (and) of last year”?

Commentary
Although unwitnessed and lacking any strict legal formulation, the use of a seal shows that this tablet had some dispositive force.

No. 78 Plate 20; Photo Plate 50 ND 7082

SE 4; in the upper fill

Roughly rectangular label, pierced like a triangular docket with string-holes at the left-hand corners and the centre of the right side. Two stamp seal impressions on Obv. and on Rev. None of the text can be read with confidence, unless the first line is intended for a number:

1 lim 1 šu, i.e. 1060.

The remainder of the text is not only incomprehensible, but also includes signs which cannot be definitely identified. Is this the work of a foreign or very inadequately trained scribe?

Sealing: Stamp seal, nearly circular; di. 1.4 – 1.5 cm.; impressed twice, condition fair.
Design: at left, worshipper standing facing right, hair bunched at nape, bearded, long robe to feet, hands raised before face. Centre: low offering stand on pedestal, possibly with offerings in position
TABLETS 77—80

on top. Right: altar base with step at left, bearing 2 symbols, to left, probably spade of Marduk, to right pair of tall thin rods, other details unclear. In field above pedestal, crescent. Behind worshipper, unidentified vertical object.

No. 79

1.7 × (2.5)
Courtyard 1, SE corner
Oval label

Obv. 1 [ ]-sa₂-ru²-rat
2 [ša šUL],₃⁷_mar-na-lu
3 [()]₄,LIL
4 [ ] KUR.GAL.GIN²-SHU-Š-šá

Rev. 5 [T][I]₅ x Mu.1]₅,KĀM
6 [dAMAR.UTU-DUMU.U]₆-SUM-na
7 [LUGAL.TIN.T]₇[KI]

Translation
[Belonging to ...-]sarurat(?), in the charge of Marnalu [of Dur²-En]lil (and of?) Amurru(?)-mukin-išidiya. [Month Šabātu¹], 11th year of Merodach-Baladan, king of Babylon.

Notes
1: presumably restore [ša miPN].
3: cf. Durand, Journal Asiatique 267 (1979) pp.245—60, no.16 [ša BĀD-⁴EN.LIL. However, collation did not find the expected traces of BĀD and EN.
4: this extra line finds no parallel in Durand’s corpus.
5: according to all the parallels ITI.ZIZ can be restored confidently.

Commentary
For the suggestion that this type of text is a label for a consignment of wool(?) see Durand, Les ‘slave documents’ de Merodach-Baladan, Journal Asiatique 267 (1979). The chef de service Marnalu occurs in his corpus in nos. 3, 5 and 6. Copies of his ‘slave documents’ have now been published by him in Textes babyloniens d’époque récente, Cahier no.6, Paris 1981, plates 79—80.

No. 80

3.2 × 1.6
NE 2; surface soil
Oval clay label, tapering to the right-hand end, with a perforation through the thicker end. Babylonian script.
THE TABLETS FROM FORT SHALMANESER

Obv. 1 šá mi-li-ti
2 šá ŠU.2
3 1.dba-ú-al-st-ki-TIN-um
Rev. 4 ITI.ZÍZ MU.10.KÁM
5 dAMAR.UTU-DUMU.Š SUM-na
6 LUGAL.TIN.TIR ki

Translation
Belonging to Ilitti, in the charge of Bau-alsi-ki-abluṭ. Month Šabaṭu, 10th year of Merodach-Baladan, king of Babylon.

Notes
See note on no. 79.
3: This chef de service also occurs in Durand’s Corpus nos. 1 and 10.

No. 81 Plate 20 ND 7084

2.2 × 1.6 IM 75783
Courtyard opposite SE 8; from lower fill — .xi.710 B.C.
(before removal of pavement) NR 426
Rounded lump of clay, slightly wider at its left end; there is a perforation which does not however penetrate the full thickness of the label.

Obv. 1 1.dAK-DU-uš
2 šá ŠU.2 1.dAK-GIN-an-ni
Rev. 3 ITI.ZÍZ MU.12.KÁM
4 dAMAR.UTU-DUMU.Š SUM-na
5 LUGAL.KUR.TIN.TIR ki

Translation
Nabu-epuš, in the charge of Nabu-(u)kinanni. Month Šabaṭu, 12th year of Merodach-Baladan king of Babylon.

Commentary
This is similar to the previous texts. It adds new names to those compiled by Durand, op.cit., p.252. It is the only published text of this type that dates to Merodach-Baladan’s 12th year, the year of the Assyrian invasion. The date is clear, and gives support to the reported date on the Orleans tablet (see Durand, p.247 n.2). Since this text was dated to the 11th month of that year, and yet was dated to the reign of the supposedly defeated king, it implies that Merodach-Baladan still controlled the south of Babylonia even after he had lost control of the north. This supports Brinkman’s contention that Merodach-Baladan did not submit to Sargon in 710 B.C. but only in 709 when the latter captured Dur-Yakin. See Brinkman, Studies... Oppenheim p.20 n.102.
There is no apparent reason why most of the labels from Khorsabad date from the 9th and 10th years whereas these from Nimrud date from the 11th and 12th years. Since such labels cover a 4-year period, it may be better to interpret them as the result of peaceful trade between kingdoms nominally at war, rather than as the result of Assyrian looting of a wool depot in Dur-Yakin on a single occasion.

No. 82

Plate 45

ND 6224

6 × 6.5

IM 60590

SW 10

Oval lump of clay

1' \[1.Aššur-P\]AP-AS MAN ŠÚ MAN KUR aš-šur

2' \[\]x[\]

3' \[DUMU\]1.130-PAP.MEŠ-SU MAN ŠÚ MAN1 KUR aš-šur

4' šá ina lib-bi x-u LAL-u ma diš bi

Commentary

Rough note giving the name and titles of Esarhaddon and his father Sennacherib (11.2' – 3'). Possibly the undeciphered last line mentioned the context in which these titles were to be inscribed or had been copied from.

No. 83

Plate 45

ND 6228

L. ca. 9 cm.

IM 60592

NW 15; "with ivories"

Clay label, rejoined from two pieces. 3 stamp seal impressions

KUR2 130-MAN-GAR

Translation

Palace (property) of Sin-šarru-iškun.

Commentary

Presumably this label was used in some way to seal and identify something, but significant impressions were not noted on the reverse.
No. 84

Plate 20

3.0 × 5.0
NE 50; east

Obv. 1 IM¹SUHUS₄PA
2 a-na₁^drUTU¹-ZÁLAG
3 [LU.D]UMU šip-ri
4 ša e-gir-tú
5 ú-bala-ka-ni
6 šī₄mu-gir i-si(-)x-x
7 ša šī₄ut-tar SIG₃
8 di-i-ni
9 [1₅]MA.NA AN.BAR

B.E. 10 [ina p]a-ni-ka

Rev. 11 7½ MA.NA AN.BAR
12 a-na¹^dpa-MAN-PAP
13 di-i-ni
14 7½ MA.NA AN.BAR
15 a-na urukal-hi-a-a
16 di-i-ni
17 šum-ma la i-ma-gúr-ru
18 IGLMES ina x x
19 ša-bi-te

T.E. 20 li tu di ni
L.S. 21 lu-bi-lu-u-ni

Translation
Tablet of Ubru-Nabu to Šamaš-nuri. Give the envoy who bears this document to you a .... wheel(?) for a good cart. [1₅?] minas of iron are at your disposal: give 7½ minas of iron to Nabu-šarru-usur, (and) give 7½ minas of iron to the man¹ of Kalhu. If they do not agree, witnesses .... let them bring to me.

Notes
1: there is a post-canonical rab ekalli in ADD 640-642 and in ND 2314 named Ubru-Nabu; a man of the same name is found as witness on several citadel tablets of this date as well as in No. 42. It is possible they are all the same man. If so, this letter can be dated approximately to the first half of the post-canonical period.
2: although most of the divine name is lost, UTU is definitely preferable to IM on grounds of space alone.
6: K. Deller suggests reading i-se-en₁, "one, a single", which makes good sense, although one might expect 1-en šī₄mugir, and it does not well fit the traces.
7: SIG₃ may go with mugirru rather than uttartu; another possibility worth considering might be ši-pir.
12: Nabu-šarru-usur may be the LŪ ša UGU Ẹ of ND 5448:20 (dated 658 B.C.) and ND 5463:25 (see Menzel, Ass.T.II, T168; late canonical or early post-canonical).
15: or: "men"; alternatively, one might take this as a PN with the determinative DIŠ accidentally omitted. The name is attested in late 7th century texts (see Index) but not in post-canonical Nimrud.
slightly closer to the traces as copied, is to read ina U[GU]U qa-. In either case the meaning would be: “witnesses to the catching-red-handed”. Although it is a compound word, it is unexpected to find it divided across two lines. Theft has not been mentioned in the previous lines, but this is not necessarily significant, since the addressees knew the background to the matter, and a court case may be mentioned in l.20.

20: li-tu “hostage” is not attested in nA, nor is the practice of subpoenas in connection with a court case. Nevertheless, li-tu de-ni is definitely preferred by JNP, with the meaning “hostage(s) of the court-case”. Alternatively, a precative verb may be required here; possibly a sign has been omitted by the scribe, before -ni, which would give a 3rd person plural.

No. 85

Plate 21

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Col. i’</th>
<th>(ends of three lines only)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1’</td>
<td>[]-ba-x[</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2’ | []-na-âš-[
| 3’ | []uru-a-ri-[
| 4’ | [x x -]DINGIR 1gab²-[ |
| 5’ | [x (x)] A ṛuruṣ][x[ |
| 6’ | [x (x)] x-ba-a-a ṛuruA-dā-ri-xAD²⁻¹ |
| 7’ | 1ṣu-PAP-a 1gab-bi-i |
| 8’ | 1.4UTU-GIN-PAP 1DUMU-15 |
| 9’ | 1ra-ṣa-pa-[a-a(?) ] |
| 10’ | ṛuBĀD-x[ |
| 11’ | 1.4UTU-DINGIR-a-a ] |
| 12’ | 1ERIN.MES-SIG 1PAP- [ |
| 13’ | ṛuṣ][x[ |
| 14’ | (remainder of Col. ii’ broken) |

Col. iii’ (only one or two wedges survive)

Note

8’: Mar-Ištar may be identified with the ša qurbûte of ABL 206:7. Note also that one Mar-Ištar was hazannu of Kalhu in 709 B.C. (ARU 113).
Commentary
Although this fragment much resembles most of the horse lists, there are no indications preserved that it dealt with animals. The occurrence of Šamaš-ilaya (known as one of the LU.GAL.GAL.MES and as a mušarkisu) with Šabu-damqu in lines 11'-12' compared with the same two names in 100 ii 12-13 makes it almost certain that it is a fragment from the group 98—111.

No. 86  
NWL, Plates 51—2 (coll.)  
ND 10005

8.8 × 13.8  
NE 50; east

Obv.  
1.1dPA^2-RU-DINGIR.MES    IGÌ lu^a-tar-tan
2.1EN-KASKAL-tak-lak    IGÌ uru-ra-ša-pa
3.1.30-DINGIR-a-a    IGÌ LU.DÌS+U E.GAL
4.1da-a-na-nu    IGÌ LU.GAL.KAŠ.LUL
5.1EN-KASKAL-KI-ia    IGÌ uru-na-šib-na
6.1MAN-IGIL.LÁ-a-ni    IGÌ uru-st-i-’me-e
7.1.1dPA-MAN-PAP    IGÌ uru-ti-l-li-e
8.1EN-ÅŠ    IGÌ uru-gu-za-na
9.1pu-u-lu    IGÌ uru^0-år-zu-hi-na
10.1ZÁLAG-a-a    IGÌ KUR kir-ru-ri
11.1.1dMAŠ^2-DINGIR-a-a    IGÌ uru-år-pad-da uru-kur-ba-il
12.1šìl^1-LUGAL^1    IGÌ uru[k(u-(ur-)][na]-li-a
13.1EN-KASKAL-KI-ia    IGÌ uru-sa-ram-al-la^1 uru-kâl-zì
14.1U.GUR-KAR-ir    IGÌ uru^0-ti-im-î[e ( )]
15.1ib-ni-e-a    IGÌ uru^0-hal-zì-ad-[bar]
16.1.1dPA-ge-pi-DINGIR.MES    IGÌ uru^0-tam-HA( = nunî) [ ( )]
17.1.1dPA-SU    IGÌ uru^0-tal-mu-sa [ ( )]
18.1EN-IGIL.LÁ-a-ni    IGÌ uru^0-i-sa-ñ[a]
19.uru^3-hu-pa uru-arba-il
20. PAP 18 3a EN.NUN IGI 22 GAL.MES-[x (x)]

Rev.  
1 10 tar-tan
2 [x] ra-ša-pa
3 [x] DIŠ+U KUR
4 [x]+ 3 GAL KAŠ.LUL
5 *60^1 na-šib-na
6 28^0 si-me-e
7 40 ti-l-li-e
8 21^2 gu-za-na
9 20(+x^1) år-zu-hi-na
10 [x] kir-ru-ri
11 [x]+ 12 a[r]-pad-da
TABLET 86

Translation

Nabu-\(\text{-RU-ilani}\) serving the turtan
Bel-Harran-taklak serving Raşappa town
Sin-\(\text{-ilaya}\) serving the palace herald
Dayyananu serving the chief cupbearer
Bel-Harran-\(\text{-issiya}\) serving Nasibina town
\(\text{Šarru-emuranni}\) serving Si‘me town
Nabu-\(\text{-šarru-ušur}\) serving Tille town
Bel-\(\text{-iddin}\) serving Guzana town
Pulu serving Arzuhina town
Nuraya serving the land of Kirruri
Ninurta\(\text{-ilaya}\) serving Arpad town (and) Kurbail town
\(\text{Silli-šarrı}\) serving Kunalia town
Bel-Harran-\(\text{-issiya}\) serving Sam‘al town (and) Kilizi town
Nergal-\(\text{-eṭir}\) serving Tuimme town
\(\text{Ibnea}\) serving Halzi-adbar town
Nabu-qepi-\(\text{-ilani}\) serving Tammuni town
Nabu-\(\text{-eriba}\) serving Talmusa town
Bel-emuranni serving Isana town, Šahupa town (and) Arbîl town.

Total: 18 guards serving 22 high officials [ ].

Notes

10: for the reading of Kirruri cf. Levine, RIA V, s.v. (Habaruri?).
11: or dPA.
12: for Kunnalia, capital of Unqi province, see Na‘aman, BASOR 214 (1974) 37 (=Kullania), and for spelling variations see already Hawkins, Iraq 36 (1974) 83, addenda to note 111.
13: for the reading Kilizi replacing the old *Kakzi, see RIA V, s.v. Kilizu.
17: Talmusa now replaces the old reading of Rimusa, as originally proposed by Goetze; see Fales, Censimenti et catasti di epoca neo-assira p. 58, and Kessler, ZA 69 (1980) 217; identified with Jerahiyeh 20 miles N. of Nineveh in Jacobsen and Lloyd, Sennacherib’s Aqueduct at Jerwan (OIP 24) p. 39 and map, p. 32, though this is doubted by Reade, RA 72 (1978) 158 ff. Also attested in OAkk, Ur III, OB, Hittite and M.A. 
19: Šahuppa: probably the capital of Katmuhi province; see Millard, AIF 24 (1973) 72.
Rev.6: or read 38.

Commentary

The Obv. of this tablet was transliterated in NWL p. 39. A few of the personal names are also found in Nimrud letters which are generally dated to Tiglath-Pileser III and Sargon
II: Bel-emuranni in NL 18; Ninurta-ilaya in NL 34 and 97; Šarru-emuranni in NL 74 (LÚ.2-u ša URU Isana); but there is no good evidence to show that they are the same men. A date within the reign of Tiglath-Pileser might be favoured because the province Tuimme is so far only attested in his reign.

The text of the Reverse may perhaps be compared with No. 105 and ND 2451:15—18 (see TCAE pp. 376—7). The latter text definitely refers to equids, and it is therefore conceivable that the numbers on the Reverse here apply to horses. Although the two faces seem to be concerned with different subjects, the order of the provinces named is the same for the first eleven entries, and it seems most likely that there is a connection between them. A guard (LÚ ša EN.NUN) is mentioned in ABL 99 r.17′ as an alternative to a (ša) qurbûte as an officer to be sent by the king to a provincial governor to collect troops from him, substantiating the rather high rank suggested by this text for the ša maṣṣartu (see the references collected by Kinnier Wilson, NWL pp. 57; 82). A superior officer named Aššur-remeni occurs also in No.101.i.18; if he is the same man, this text may date to Sargon’s reign.

No. 87

NWL Plates 46—8 (coll.)

ND 10009

BM custody

7.0 × 13.7

NE 50; east

Obv. 1  il-ka-[ka-t]e ša LÚ[U][ša] ururu-arba-il
2  ina É.GAL[ša] URU

3  4 qa GIS.KU.GEŠTIN[ša]  ša KUR
4  [  ša KUR
5  [  K.H.LA

(4 or 5 lines lost)

10  PAP an-[ni-u]  ša² KASKAL

11  20 MA.NA ŠIM.[  ] SIM.LI
12  1 GÜ ŠIM.[  ] X X[  ]
13  PAP an-ni-ú LÚ.[  ] KASKAL

14  3 qa GIS.KU.GEŠTIN.MEŠ 3 MA.NA ŠIM [ša] LÚ.SIMA ša KASKAL

15  4².BÁN ²ti-ti-pu 6 MA.NA URUDU 1A[D-GI][ša] LÚ.SUM.MINDA
16  ša IGI KU.S.DU 10.GAN.MEŠ

17  2.BÁN 7 qa urkar-[ša]  2.BÁN 7 <qa> GIS.KIN.GEŠTIN 5 MA.NA URUDU.MEŠ 1.a[x]-u-a-a L[U][ša] r7
18  6 qa urkar-[ša] li-na-ki-su
19  4 MA.NA URUDU 1.d30-tab-ni-PAP liša me-di-li-šu
TABLET 87

20 P[AP] an-ni-ú É LÚ.MU

21 2-BÁN 7 qa ǔkar-šú 2-BÁN 7 qa GIŠ.KIN.GEŠTIN 5 MA URUDU[l\^{a}s]-šú-xx(x)
LÚ.SUM².NINDA²

22 1-BÁN GIŠ.KIN.GEŠTIN.MEŠ lúša a-kù-si-šú

23 5 qa ǔkar-šú lúša b[i]l-li-šú

B.E. 24 3⁷ qa ǔkar-šú lúša x x MEŠ-šú

Rev. 26 5 qa bošur-‘i ha-še-ú-te 1 ME GIŠ.NU[\text{Ur.MA (?)]}

27 lúša si-e-qu-[\text{d}-te-šú(?)]

28 [PAP] an-ni-ú É LÚ.SUM.NINDA

29 [x] qa ǔkar-šú 1⁴ qa GIŠ.KIN.GEŠTIN 1⁴ qa ǔti-[ti]-pu

30 lúša GIŠ.PA a-na LÚ.MAH.MEŠ-ni

31 1-ú x⁷ GAB.MEŠ a-na šam-me ina UGU lúša-m[a-(a)-]ni

32 [x M]A URUDU ku-um šam-me LÚ.[ ]x

33 [x] ina urur-za 24 [x] ina urusa-ma-ak-ka

34 [(x) x x ((x) LÚ]še-lap-pa-a-a [L]Ú.SIMUG URUDU LÚ.NAGAR.MEŠ e-ši-du

35 [x+]10 ANŠE ŞE[N]UMUN x x x ] MAN LÚ.SIMUG AN.BAR e-ši-[d]ju

36 [PAP] 80 ANŠE [ ] ma-ŠEŠ-ša É.GAL

37 2 i-si-ta-a-[te ( )] ša BÁD lúša-ma-ši-i-ra-št-pu

38 PAP an-ni-ú [ ] É.GAL


40 [ ] SIM x 1-BÁN 6[t⁶] qa [giš]bur-šú-na-te LÚ.MU ša MÍ KUR

41 [x-BÁN²] ǔkar-šú 1-BÁN 6 qa GIŠ.KIN.GEŠTIN 2-BÁN [giš]bu-[t]u-na-te

42 1-BÁN ǔti-šú-pu 1-BÁN 6 qa [giš]bur-šú-< na >-te x x (-x) LÚ.SUM.NINDA ša MÍ KUR

43 5 qa GIŠ.KIN.GEŠTIN ša a-kù-si-šú 3 qa ǔkar-šú lúša [b]il-li-šú

44 2 qa ǔkar-šú 2 qa ǔti-šú-2 qa [giš]bu-fu-na-[te]

45 4 qa [giš]bur-šú-nte 4 qa GIŠ.KIN.GEŠTIN.MEŠ

46 M.ŠIM.NINDA-tú ša MÍ É.GAL

47 [x] qa ǔti-šú-2 qa GIŠ.KIN.GEŠTIN

48 1⁴ qa ǔkar-šú LÚ.MU LÚ.SUM.NINDA ša É.GAL

L.S. 49 PAP 5-BÁN 4 qa ti-ti-šú [x-BÁN] 1 qa ǔkar-šú 1 ANŠE 1⁷-BÁN 5 <qa>
[giš]KIŠ.GEŠTIN 2-BÁN 7 <qa> bu-fu-na-ta

50 3⁷-BÁN 6 qa bur-šú-na-[te ] x x [ MA.N]A URUDU
Translation

Ilkakāre-payments which the deputy? abarakku-steward for Arbil [delivered] in the palace:

4 qa of grapes? of the land/palace
[ ] of the land/palace
(5 or 6 lines too fragmentary to translate)
All this [ ] of the campaign.

20 minas of (plant) juniper
1 talent of (plant)
All this, the [...]-official, of the campaign.

3 qa of grapes, 3 minas of aromatic plants: the brewer of the campaign.

4 seah of titipu-fruit, 6 minas of copper: Abu-lešir the karkadinnu-official who is in charge of the leather bags.

2 seah 7 qa of leeks, 2 seah 7 (qa) of grapes, 5 minas of copper, PN the “ditto”-official?.
6 qa of leeks, the nākisu,
4 minas of copper, Sin-tabni-uṣur, the official in charge of salted meats:
All this, the department of the nuhatimmu-cook.

2 seah 7 qa of leeks, 2 seah 7 qa of grapes, 5 minas of copper, Assur-x the karkadinnu-official?,
1 seah of grapes, the official in charge of akāsu-soups/sauces,
5 qa of leeks, the official in charge of billu-mixture?,
3 qa of leeks, the official in charge of aromatic plants(?),
x qa of grapes, 5 qa of pistachios,
5 qa of crushed? šu‘e-grain, 100 pomegranates?, the official in charge of zigurrat-cakes:
All this, the department of the karkadinnu-official.

x qa of leeks, 1½ qa of grapes, 1½ qa of titipu-fruit, the mace-bearer for ambassadors.

1 ...: for plants, for the use of(?) the craftsmen?, x minas of copper instead of plants, the official [ ]

[ ] in the town Urza, 24 ( ) in the town Samakka,
[ ] ... the Šeleggana(s), coppersmith(s) (and) carpenters will harvest,
10² homers of seed-corn [ ] ... the blacksmith(s) will harvest: Total, 80 homers [ ] ma‘uttu-land of the palace.

2 towers (....) of the wall, the craftsmen will build.

All this, [ ] the palace.
leeks [ ] pistachios, [ ] ... 1 seah 6 [qa²] of bursinâtes, the nuhatimmu-cook of the queen, [x seah³] of leeks, 1 seah 6 qa of grapes, 2 seah of pistachios, 1 seah of titipu-fruit, 1 seah 6 qa of bursinâtes, [ ] the karkadinmu-official of the queen, 5 qa of grapes, the official in charge of akûsu-soups/sauces, 3 qa of leeks, the official in charge of bîllu-mixture, 2 qa of leeks, 2 qa of titipu-fruit, 2 qa of pistachios, 4 qa of bursinâtes, 4 qa of grapes, the karkadinmutu female official of the queen.

x qa of titipu-fruit, 1½ qa of grapes, 1½ qa of leeks, the nuhatimmu-cook (and) the karkadinmu-official of the palace.

Total, 5 seah 4 qa of titipu-fruit, [x seah] 1 qa of leeks, 1 homer 17 seah 5 (qa) of grapes, 2 seah 7 qa of pistachios, 3 seah 6 qa of bursinâtes, [............., x mijnas of copper.

Notes
1: LÜ.U[5] AGIRIG: this title occurs also in No. 90:9; see also AHw s.v. rēdû 3a.
2–14: the distinction between ša KUR and ša KASKAL occurs in the horse lists (Nos. 107, 110 and 111). In both contexts it is hard to decide whether ša KUR stands for ša mātû “of the land” or ša ekkalû “of the palace”; see the commentary below and commentary on No. 107. The designation ša KASKAL by itself is found in two administrative documents from Kalhu which deal with ilku contributions of a similar kind (ND 453 from the Governor’s Palace and ND 3467 from the Town Wall House; cf. TCAE pp. 83–6).
3, 10, 13: by comparison with L.14 a profession should be restored in these lines; see the note on L.14 also.
4: there could be uncertainty about the precise implication of ša KASKAL here and in L.10 and 13: it could be closely connected with the professional term, e.g. “the campaign-brewer”, and if this is correct K. Deller suggests that the campaign brewer, karkadinmu, butcher and bread-baker are shown at work in the relief illustrated in NWL Pl. 3b. On the other hand comparison with the other ilku texts mentioned above in the note to L.3–14 makes it possible that ša KASKAL here means “for the campaign”, and that the brewer’s contribution in L.14 certainly, and those in lines 10 and 13 possibly, were exclusively intended for the campaign, not for the land or palace (ša KUR). In this case we should restore at least one ruling between lines 6 and 9, after a lost total.
5: Abu-lešir: perhaps the same man as in NL 88 (given food supplies for a month), and the LÜ GAL.GAL of No. 99:4. If so, this text may date to the reign of Sargon II.
6: KUS.DU10.GAN.MEŠ: correct reading as tukkannû/tukkkannû given by von Soden, ZA 64 (1979) 130. The word either qualifies LÜ.SUM.NINDA (as translated), or it could refer to a separate profession; cf. L.43 ša akûsi-sû without LÜ.
19: Deller makes the excellent proposal to see here a writing of ša midûšu, to be connected with maddû and maddû, both known in Na texts, and understood as a kitchen specialist for the salting or pickling of meat, well suited to this context. The same profession probably occurs in No. 90:23. A reading from mēdelu “lock, bolt” is unlikely not only because of the context, but also because mēdelu is otherwise attested only as a Babylonian word. mûmid-û should be read instead of tillû in the Practical Vocabulary of Assur 1.911 (AFO 18 p. 334). See Deller, Assur 3/4 (1983).
24: ša x x MEŠ-šû: the signs have been collated without success; Deller suggests ša <GIŠ> MEŠ-šû, but some connexion with food seems required. ša ri-qi-šû has been considered.
26: the adjective hasû’u is elsewhere unattested (though cf. ḫastû’u!); the verb hasû is otherwise used of the onion family, and rendered “chopped”, which seems inapplicable for a grain.
27: a Ma text, VS 19, 33:7, lists linseed/sesame cakes called ziggurrats, 1 seah each in weight (Postgate, Bi.Or. 37 (1980) 68). A Ma cylinder seal from Tyre shows “a table decked with a cloth and perhaps two cakes in the shape of temple towers” (Porada, Akkadica 13 (1979) 9). Porada points out that such cakes are also shown on the White Obelisk.
30: LÚ.MAH.MES = pêrdîni, used in NA for foreign delegations, never for Assyrian officials (see TCAE pp. 123ff.).

31: the restoration of the third sign is difficult because we do not know the meaning of GAB.MEŠ; it is possible that the second sign is ë rather than ù. According to Dr. C. Walker's collation, the sign x is “certainly not [fj], and the spacing suggests a fairly long sign”. If one takes 1-ù as le-ù (which is a writing attested in mB), GAB.MEŠ for GAB.LÂL (= ëikurru), šammu as a mixture of minerals (AHw šammu 4, p. 1157a), and ummuðu as a scribe, this line might be rendered: “A slab of wax for the mineral mixture (for writing boards) for the use of the scribe(s)” (SMD). K. Deller suggests interpreting ummuðu as a doctor and šammu as a herbal remedy; see AHw s.v. ummuðu 9b. JNP reads 1-ù[k] GAB.MEŠ “1 set of ...”, without being able to propose a convincing translation of the term GAB.MEŠ; if it represents irûde we should connect with (LÚ.GIS.GIGIR) GAB.MEŠ (dissociating this from G1/G1 GIR taš-lip), which may perhaps be “chariot with breast-guard” (for applied meaning of irtu cf. CAD I/1 187-9; for GAB.MEŠ see e.g. ADD 834(+) .i .3; 837 .4; 835 .2; 857 .ii .24-27; iv .2; 971 .i .5; 912 .i .2 (GAB.MEŠ-te); ARU 100a .2; 21; 153 .16; 483 .10; NWL 6 .34; 19 .19). Ina muhhi could also mean “incumbent on, owed by”.


33-36 can probably be understood as: “x homers of sown land in Urza village, 24 (homers) in Samakka village, the x-men, the Seleppaeans(s), the coopersmith(s) and the carpenters shall harvest. x homers of sown land in x village, the blacksmith(s) shall harvest”. For the Seleppaeans as craftsmen see NWL pp. 98ff.

37: isitakê: see AHw s.v. asitu and ND 2715 (TCAE p. 392).

42, 43, 50: ëburjûqû of purjûqû appears to be a new word; cf. perhaps pursandu (an oil-producing substance, AHw 881a) or büsin(â)û (plant used for wicks e.g. ND 453:7). For a connection with burjûnu see Kinnier Wilson, NWL pp. 107-8. T. Kwasman suggests a connection with Aramaic purûna “kernels of grapes”; see Jastrow, A dictionary of the Targumim, p. 1148b.

Commentary
This text and Nos. 88-89 were discussed by J.V. Kinnier Wilson in NWL pp. 105-9, with a tabulation of the officials and commodities involved on p. 108, and detailed comments on points of difficulty. The essential conclusion, that the texts list ilkakâte contributions paid, or to be paid, into the Review Palace, does not need to be further supported. However, since the present editors differ among themselves as to the exact administrative situation reflected by the texts, a few words may be added. JNP interprets this text, No. 88 and possibly No. 89 as a record of liability to the Review Palace, 148 THE TABLETS FROM FORT SHALMANESER
back from a campaign as campaign supplies or as booty; together with more locally produced goods, these were paid into the Review Palace in the form of ilkakāti taxes. If this is correct, the “conversion” of campaign goods into taxes would have been the chief incentive for bringing back goods intact. Possibly the military kîṣrum Arbila would be responsible for the taxes jointly with the civilians of Arbil, and if goods were not produced, labour was exacted in lieu. This interpretation is extremely tentative. If ša KUR and ša KASKAL were not found in totally military contexts referring to horses and mules, it would be simpler to take these as non-military tax payments which were immediately allocated to the forthcoming campaign or for use in the homeland.

There are no firm criteria for dating Nos. 87—89. Documents similarly formulated belong to the late 8th or 7th centuries, but this in itself is hardly enough evidence. Note that Nos. 84 and 92, also found in NE 50, are probably both post-canonical; see also note on l.15.

Translation
Ilkakāti-payments which the abarakku-official delivered in the palace.

83 homers 8 seah of barley in the department [of]
200 ... [ ... [ ]
[ ]
(break)
[ ] qa of pressed oil, 2 qa of ...[
[ ] -------[ ]
[ ] -------[ ]
[ ] copper, the department of the nukatimmu-cook; 5 oxen, the department of the karkadinnu-official

[( )] they shall feed two teams: all this the official [ ]

Total 1,584 [homers of barley, x+] 21 homers of wine? [ ] 55( ) 4 wineskins of wine [ x]
empty wineskins [ ] oil [ ]
[ ] Zamua'wine jars.
(2 broken lines)

Notes
1: as with No. 87:1 the verb in this introductory line will be present/future or preterite according to one's understanding of the text as a whole.
3–4: SMD would prefer to read KU[S.SAL.MEŠ] KU GEŠTIN; however, collation did confirm the DU as copied, and suggested that the preceding sign in each case is HAR.
Rev.8': K. Deller has expressed doubts whether DUG sazanû, plural DUG sazanûûête, should be understood as "skin/jar of Zamuan wine" (NWL pp.107, 113), or "Zamua-Weinfuss" (AHw 1206a). The determinative KUR is never found before zamû, and the placename is Zamua, not Zamû. Also, an unpublished writing in 81–7–27, 150 rev. 3', has [DU]G sa-AZ-mu-u. SMD suggests that this vessel may be a form of assumeniz[ad(2)zamû], although there seem to be no parallels for such a variant form; JNP prefers to keep the old interpretation.

Commentary
In NWL p. 106 Kinnier Wilson points out that "the obverse and reverse of ND 10012 are likely to provide the beginning and end of ND 10013" (= No. 89). Discussion of this fragment is therefore deferred to the commentary on No. 89.

No. 89
NWL Plate 49
ND 10013

(8.5) × (16.0)
NE 50; east

Obv. (upper part broken, perhaps = no.88)
1' [ ] umu-mu-[a]
2' [ ] uru EN-AN
3' [ ] x x 4 UD.MEŠ ina uru[ ]
4' [ ] MEŠ a-na kuÈl-z[i]
5' [ ] x EN UD.30.KÁM x [ ]
6' [ ] ANSÈ 1-BÁN M[UN? ]
7' [ ] x ša SAR 2' ANSÈ 1-BÁN (erasures) nap-f[u ]
8' PAP an-ni-à il-ku ša 3 LÚ[ ]
9' [ ] 12 ANSÈ 4-BÁN SE.PAD.MEŠ a-na 22 ML.ANSEC.KUR.RA.MEŠ L[Ú ]
10' [ ] 1 75 ditto 2 75 ANSÈ NIT.A.MEŠ ša ma-'a-[si ]
11' [ ] 1 ME 70 ANSÈ [( )] a-na [(x +)] 1 LÚ.ÈRIN.MEŠ [ ]
12' [ ] 7 ME 42 A[NSE SE.PA]D.MEŠ LÚ US ANSÈ NIT.A ša ma-'a-sí[( )]
Translation

Nineveh[ ] Adian[ ] 4 days in the town of[ ] to the district of Halzi(Adbar?) until the 30th day[ ] homers 1 seah of salt? 2 homers 1 seah of naphtha[ ]. All this is the i/ku-payment of 3[ ] men.

12? homers 4 seah of barley for 22 mares, the man[ ]

175? homers of the same(?) for 175 donkeys of the ma'assu-stable[ ]

170? homers for (x +) 15 soldiers[ ]

[Total] 742 homers of barley, the donkey-driver(s) of the ma'assu-stable[ ]

[ ] from the 1st day of Abu until the 30th day of Nisanu in the eponym[ ...]

[x h]omers of barley [for?] 8 milkmen[ ]

[ ] homers of best beer for[ ]

Assyrian?, the 30th day of[ ]

[x +]41[ ] 26 ...[

[Total?] 1,531 homers[ ]
[ ] wineskins of wine, nāmurtu-gift [ 
[ ] 20 homers [ ] , 120 šappu-bowls(?) 
x wineskins of wine, nāmurtu-gift, 1 seah of [ 

[x] wineskins, 21? šappu-bowls of wine, 4 seah of wine [( )] 
[ ] in the town[ ] of[ 
[ ] nāmurtu-gift in ...[ 
[ ] ... 5 seah of wine [ 
[ ] wine [ 
[ ] ....[ 
[All this[ in the department of [ 
[ ] nāmurtu-gift, the cupbearer(s) [ 

[ ] department of the [ ]-official [ 
(remainder broken)

Notes
11': possibly sāb [farru] "king's troops".
15': after ana very likely a number, 40[+]x).
19': after ANŠE possibly š[il-ku or GEštīn? 
21': the occurrence of KUŠ.SAL.MEŠ as well as KUŠ zi-qa-iti in the same text does not disprove Kinnier Wilson's suggestion that KUŠ.SAL is the logogram for ziqqu (NWL p. 107). If the proposed restoration at the beginning of 1.25' is correct, and if ll.24'-25' are correctly interpreted as a summary of ll.20'-25', ziqqu seems to be included in the total of [KUŠ.SAL].MEŠ. [NB from this line on the text could not be collated on the original.]

Commentary
For a description of this text, probably composed of Nos. 88 and 89 together, see Kinnier Wilson, NWL pp. 105-7. The similarity to No. 87 is there noted, and clearly our interpretation of the administrative background of this text must depend on how we view No. 87 (see commentary to that text, with the divergent interpretations offered). Either way, it seems likely that the document lists contributions paid, or to be paid, by the chief abarakku: this will explain the much larger amounts in this text than in No. 87 where the contributor is only a deputy abarakku for Arbil. It is particularly unfortunate that the text is so badly preserved, since the surviving parts show that we might have been given a detailed breakdown of a great variety of obligations incurred as commuted īku payments.

No. 90
Plate 21
ND 10017

4.5 × 10.0
NE 50; east.

Obv. 1 1 GÚ URUDU ša GISSAG₃ UL₃ MEŠ SUM-an
2 GU₄ NĪTA ša 1U-PAP-PAP SUM-an

IM 64220
TCAE p.150
TABLET 90

Translation
He shall deliver 1 talent of copper ('s worth?) of sakullu-timbers.
He shall deliver one male ox, of Adad-ahu-ushur.
([ ] at his disposal) (erased line)
They shall give a namurtu-gift of barley (and) straw, just as their fathers and grandfathers gave.
They shall carry out the harvesting of the town of Nirgi.
They shall not perform (ilku-duty) of the village.
If the urasu-builders give service with the bitumen (?) workers in the deputy abarakku-steward's department,
the coppersmith and the blacksmith are exempted from it.
All this, of the carpenters.

20, the steward, town of Adbab (?)
12, city of Samaria.
10, Ilu-dala, of my (?) house
2, Tua (?)
1, Urlaya.
60, now.
Total 97 yellow hides, akiltu,
from the son of Bel-tukulti(?)

---

3 (line erased, concluding:) pa-ni-šú
4 na-mur-tú ša ŠE.PAD.MEŠ
5 ša ŠE.IN.NU ki-i AD.MEŠ-šú-nu AD.AD.MEŠ-šú-nu
6 i-da-nu-ni šu-nu i-du-nu
7 e-ša-du ša uruni-ir-gi
8 e-šl1-du URU.ŠE la i-lu-ku
9 šum-ma dul-lu ina E LÚ.UŠ AGRIG
10 x x si x x qi x x i-du-nu
11 LÚ.SIMUG URUDU LÚ.SIMUG AN.BAR
12 TA* ŠÁ-bi za-ku-u
13 PAP an-ni-u ša LÚ.NAGAR.MEŠ

Rev. 14 20 LÚ.AGRIG uru/ad1-ba-ab?
15 12 uruša-me-ri-na
16 10 1DINGIR-da-la-a ša E-ši3?
17 2 1tú-u-a
18 1 ur-lá-a-a
19 60 ú-ma-a
20 PAP 97 KUŠ duh-ši-e a-kil-tú
21 TA* IGI DUMU 1EN-KU
22 1 ME ša 50 UDU.MÁŠ.GAL.MEŠ
23 50 ša mid1-li
24 36 ša SIPA BUR
25 PAP 1 ME 86
100, for 50 mature rams.
50, for salted meat.
36, for the shepherd (responsible for) the meal(s).
Total 186

Notes
1: for ŠAG₄,U₄ as a variant of ŠAG₄,KAL see AHw 1141a s.v. sakkulu (reference courtesy K. Deller); a type of tree used in chariot-making as well as in furniture. It also occurs by number (of standard timbers?) in ADD 1036.i.22 (see TCAE p. 329).
8: if this stands for kapru la illsu we must take it as a colloquial abbreviation for *illu ša kapru la illsu or similar (comparing the 9th century ilku štu URU la illsu “they shall not perform ilku with/from the village” with its 8th and 7th century counterparts, quoted in TCAE pp. 63–4).
Alternatively K. Deller suggests that here (and elsewhere) URUŠE should be read eri-še as a Hurrian loan-word meaning “domain”, pointing to the equation for Nuzi texts proposed by Koschaker irwissa = ilku (ZA 48 (1944) 209 n.80), and quoting further A. Fadhil, Rechtsurkunden und administrative Texte aus Kurruhanni (unpublished dissertation, Heidelberg 1972) p. 42.
9: this text presumably comes from the department of the abarakku, like Nos. 87–89.
10: the translation follows a possible restoration: ḫ̱a-ra-se TA* L[U]3 qi-ru-te i-du-nu but we are unable to maintain this reading with full confidence. A connection with quru “bitumen” seems plausible, and K. Deller suggests qir-ru- $<$uh$>$ with the Hurrian professional suffix -uhu.
9–11: the structure of these lines could alternatively be: “If (there is) work in the deputy abarakku’s department, the ….. shall “pay” it; the coppersmith and the blacksmith are exempted from it”.
19: for ümâ in a very similar context cf. e.g. ND 3467 (TCAE 399):11.
20: okištu “consumption, expenditure” is a technical term of the Neo-Assyrian accountant (see S. Parpola, JSS 21 (1976) 170, quoting K 1060+ now published as CT 53 No. 20 (Parpola’s reading much to be preferred to that of Fales, AFO 27 (1980) 139); CT 53 No. 970 r. 12). See also No.111 obv.10’ with note.
Because the word is so often found in the context of textiles, hides, and dead animals, SMD suggests a connexion with šikuku “to tan, soak” instead (cf. GAG §89c). Note that the occurrence listed by Deller in Or NS 34 (1965) 269 (Billa No. 78) is read a-ilk $<$il-[k]$>$ after collation in TCAE p. 351; the heading of the ration list ND 2803 may read [ITI x U₄ x] a-[d]-U₄ $<$ I$>$ spacing suggests that the U₄ sign is to be separated from the preceding sign. In general perhaps this line is similar to SM 2120 (RA 36 (1939) 140):
2 KUS.MES ša GU₄ ša ta li-mu
1 KUS ša GU₄ li-i-mu
24: for SIPA BUR (also in CTN II p. 31, note on No. 3.25) K. Deller refers us to CAD N Pt. 1, 321a-b, proving the reading to be raʾṭi naptini.

Commentary
The obverse of this tablet seems to belong with Nos. 87–89 in that it lists contributions to be made by various craftsmen; there may be a connexion with ilku by analogy with those texts, and this is not contradicted by the mention of nāmurtu-gifts, since these recur in No. 89. A connexion with the department of the (deputy-) abarakku has already been suggested ad 1. 9

Unless connected by association with the same department, the matter on the reverse of the tablet, concerned with skins and sheep, appears to be entirely unrelated.

The expectation that this tablet belongs to the reign of Sargon may be supported by the mention of Samaria (Rev. 15) and the possibility that Ilu-dala (Rev. 16) is the same as the rab urâte of this name in the Horse Lists.
No. 91  
Plate 21  
ND 10022 B

3.5 × 2.0  
NE 50; west.

Tablet, with uninscribed envelope

Obv.  1  15 DUG.$AB.ME$  
2  pa-nil-a-te  
3  2 ur-ki-a-te  
4  PAP 17 DUG.$AB.ME[$]

Rev.  5  ina $E.GAL ma$-šar-ti  
6  ur[u]ka$h-i  
7  ITI.NE UD.16.KAM

Translation

15 previous šappu-bowls, 2 later. Total 17 šappu-bowls in the Review Palace of Kalhu. Month Abu, 16th day.

Note

2–3: for this usage of paniu and urkiu cf. No. 4:11–12 and ABL 117: rev.3’. As K. Deller points out, the endings imply that DUG.$AB$ is feminine, at least in the plural, and we may wonder where the demarcation line between šappu and šappatu should be drawn. Possibly this note refers to the contents of the bowls (very likely wine) rather than the containers themselves.

---

No. 92  
Plate 22  
ND 10008

5.7 × 4.6 × 2.4  
BM custody  
[...]

Triangular docket, with string holes at all three corners.

Obv.  1  4 ANŠE $ŠE.PAD.M[EŠ ina GIŠ].BÂN 10 [qa]  
2  ša $ŠE ki-su-tu( )$  
3  (cylinder seal impression)  
4  ina IGI 1$NIGIN-EN LU.GAL kar$-[man$]  
5  ina ITI.GU₄ SUM-an  
6  šum₄-ma la SUM-ni

B.E.  7  ina mit-har tar-[bi]

Rev.  8  IGI 1$mu-qâš-[li:IDIM]$  
9  lim-me 1$[ ]$  
10  IGI 1$[ ]$PA-MU-[ ]
Translation
4 homers of barley [according to the] seah measure of 10 qa, of feed, due to Mannu-ki-Arbil, at the disposal of Naḥšir-Bel the granary officer. He shall deliver in the month Ayyaru. If he does not deliver, it shall bear interest at 100 percent. Witness: Muqallil-kabti. Limmu [ ]. Witness: Nabu-šumu-[x].

Notes
3: a Mannu-ki-Arbil owes grain in No. 44 (dated to Bel-ıqbi), and is the second witness in No. 32 (dated to Aššur-gimilli-terri). This tablet is almost certainly post-canonical despite its findspot. A man of the same name is found in at least 5 other post-canonical Nimrud tablets including ND 3420 and 3433 where he witnesses documents from the archive of Šamaš-šarru-usher. Another (?) Mannu-ki-Arbil occurs in a tablet found at Gezer in Palestine, discovered in the vicinity of another tablet dated by eponym to 651 B.C. (Macalister, The Excavation of Gezer, I, p. 24).
8—9: The space may have been left deliberately for the day and month to be filled in later. The eponym occurs between witnesses also in Nos. 49; 51; 52; and 63, but in all these cases the subsequent witnesses are added to the L.S.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>[ ] 8 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>$^{1}$ha-di-[l][l]-pu-šu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>$^{1}$dUTU-GIN-PAP (x) x SU</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.E. 22</td>
<td>[ ] 61 [</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Translation**

9 talents 21 minas, chapel [of Nabu(?)]
15 talents 19 minas, chapel of Tashmetum?
19 talents 4½ minas, bedroom shrine
6 talents of 6 hašbu-pots (for ritual?) washing(?)
1½ talent 26 minas for 157 [ ] Sin and Ningal
Total 52½ talents 10½ minas, city of Kilizu(?)

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>talents 10 minas for one copper [ ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>talents 10 minas, chapel of Apladad (?)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>talents 18 minas, chapel of Nabu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>talents 2 minas for 53 [ ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>72 talents 2 minas, city of Arbil</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>talents 17 minas, city of [ ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>talents 23 [minas ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>talents 10½ minas of [ ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>69 talents 3½ minas [ ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>talents [ ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>x hundred and 90 (+x) talents 12 minas [ ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 8   | Hadi-lipušu, Šamaš-kīnu-ūṣur (?)   |.....(?)
| 61  | [ ]                               |                                                 |

**Notes**

1: in favour of the restoration of $^{[6]}$PA] at the end of the line K. Deller points out that nA texts mention bit eriši (E.GIŠ.NA) exclusively with Nabu and Tashmetum. Many of these texts were collected and discussed by Postgate, *Sumer* 30 (1974) 31ff.
2: the emendation to KUJRNU could not be collated.
4: the final signs were collated more than once but cannot be read with confidence; at the last collation the signs seemed nearest to ha-as-bi 4EN. The translation suggests reading LUH after a proposal of SMD (cf. DUG.LA (= hašbu) ša mē qāti̇ in the mA coronation ritual text MVaeG 41/3, Pl. 2 ii.20).
6: to judge from the erasures the scribe had problems with the addition; the numbers as given here add up on the assumption that the talent of 30 minas was in use, as it certainly is in ll.13—15. For the restoration of the placename Kilizu cf. Arbil in l.11.
8: see note on No. 38:12.
21: the wedge after PAP may be erased, but if not, M[EŠ] is a likely interpretation. Restoring $^{rak_{1}}$-su hardly yields good sense here; K. Deller suggests $^{1}$PA$^{1}$-SU.
Commentary
The text records the issue or allocation of large amounts of copper (to judge from 1.7; although it could for example have been tin), to various shrines in different Assyrian cities, or alternatively to individual shrines within the Kalhu Nabu Temple from the cities named. There is no definite evidence for dating, but if it refers to the Nabu Temple it might be associated with the rebuilding of Ezida by Sargon II (cf. NR pp. 234—6).

No. 94
NWL Plate 43; coll. ND 10010
4.3 × 7.8
NE 50; east

Obv. 1 19 GÚ hu-[š[e²-e²]]
2 16 GÚ bi[l ren¹ zu PAP 35
3 4 GÚ 10 MA 'x³ AN.NA
4 3 GÚ A.BAR
5 1 ME 55 GÚ URUDU.MES
(space with traces of erased signs)

Rev. 6 [ ] ina pa-ni-šú-nu
7 [ ] 12 ina pa-an LÜ.AGRIG
8 [x] GÚ 52 MA šá KA[l²-t]e²
9—10 (two lines illegible)
11 PAP 48 GÚ 26 MA.NA AŠ

Translation
19 talents of scrap metal, 16 talents of alloy..., total 35.

4 talents 10 (x) minas of tin.

3 talents of lead.

155 talents of copper
(space)
[ ] at their disposal,[ ] at the disposal of the abarakku-official. x talents 52 minas by the large mina(?).

Total 48 talents 26 minas ...
Notes
1: or restore after Kinnier Wilson hu-lá(h-hi) and assume that the word in ND 2774:5 is to be read hu-lá(h-hi) (meaning uncertain).
2: it is clear from the alternative sign BIL in CTN II No. 108:1, and from ND 2774 obv. 1 BIL compared with rev. 1' and edge 3 BIL, that the sign cannot here be read ne, as proposed in AHw 778a for ne-in-zu in Tigl. III.12,53, and ND 2774 rev. 1' shows that the BIL/BIL is separate from en zu which must be syllabic since the Tiglath-Pileser passage has in zu. K. Deller suggests taking bil as an abbreviation for billu "alloy", and enzu for inzuratu, a red dye. Alternatively, BIL and BIL are both used for galū "roasted", a common attribute of silver in Late Babylonian texts (see AHw 895b s.v. galū I); enzu could most plausibly then be assigned to the root ms' "to wash" (JNP).
3: by comparison with CTN II No. 108:2 a fraction might be expected here, and could indeed be reconciled with the copied traces.

Commentary
This text concerned with copper, tin and lead comes, like Nos. 87—89, from NE 50, and Kinnier Wilson is surely right to direct attention to the mention of the (a)barakku here (NWL pp. 105ff.). His involvement with these metals may also account for the presence of No. 93 above in the same findspot, as well as other similar texts. Compare also ND 2774 from the North-West Palace. Note also ABL 319, in which Šarru-emuranni, a top officer of Sargon II, deals with husū-scraps of copper, perhaps concerned with supplies in the (ekal) māšarti at Kalhu and at Dur-Šarrukin.

No. 95
Plate 22
ND 10007
IM 64214

NE 50; east

A

(about 6 lines broken)

1' [ ] MA.NA [x x (x)]
2' [ ] MA.NA [x x (x)]
3' [ ] 25 MA.NA KÜ.GI
4' [ ] x GIS 'ZÜ.tJ.AM.SI.MEŠ
5' [ ] x x qa/na1-1-a-a PAP ša É ôPA

6' [ ] MA.NA KÜ.GI x [ ]
(2 lines missing)
9' [ ] KÜ.GI
10' [ ] qa^2-ša^2-sî^0-î

11' [ ] NA 3 LIMMU.MEŠ KÜ.GI
12' [ ] NA 3 LIMMU.MEŠ K[Ü].GI
(remainder broken)
(about 3 lines broken)

4 [(x) x] x UR.ID [IM] x x x [ ]
5 [x KÜŠ GID 1 KÜŠ DAGAL PAP 4 KÜŠ x x x]
6 [x KÜŠ GID 1 KÜŠ DAGAL PAP 4 KÜŠ GIS KAK².MES]
7 [x KÜŠ ru-šu GID 2 KÜŠ 2 pu-uš-ši ku-bur]
8 [x + ] 2 KÜŠ GIS[ hu-tu-ú PAP an-ni-u È d.MES]

9 [PAP a]n-ni-ma ša È d.PA

10 [x KÜŠ] GID 2 KÜŠ ku-bur PAP 8 KÜŠ GIS[ hu-tu-ú]
11 [x KÜŠ] ru-šu GID 1 KÜŠ ru-šu DAGAL la-a-nu
13 [ru]-šu GID [2 pu-uš]-ši-ki DAGAL ša 1 qar-ni
14 [ru]-šu GID [2 pu-uš]-ši-ki DAGAL ša GIR.2
15 [PAP 6][1 KÜŠ] x SUHUR.MAŠ[ ] GID 13 KÜŠ 2 SUHUR.MAŠ
16 1 KÜŠ ru-šu [GID x ru]-šu DAGAL GABA a-di SAG.DU-šá
17 2 KÜŠ GID 1 KÜŠ ku-b-[ur ()] ša² la-a-ni
18 ru-šu GID ru-šu DAGAL ša² [1] a-hu
19 PAP 7 KÜŠ ša 1 KÜŠ LÚ.U19 L[U ]
20 PAP an-ni i ša È [NU] ] rqa²-ba-si-e

21 4 KÜŠ ru-šu GID 2² KÜŠ 2 pu-uš-ši ku-bur ša GIS hu-te-e
22 [x] KÜŠ GIS PAD.DU GID 1 KÜŠ [GIS.RA]DU.DU DAGAL la-a-nu
23 [x KÜŠ] ru-šu GID 1 KÜŠ ru-šu DAGAL SAG.DU
24 [x] KÜŠ ru-šu ša NU qa-ba-si-e
25 [x (KÜŠ) GIS] PAD.DU GID 1 KÜŠ GIS.RA.DU.DU GABA a-di SAG.DU-šá
26 [ ] GID 1 KÜŠ 2 pu-uš-ši ku-bur la-a-nu
27 [ ] GID ru-šu pu-uš-ši DAGAL ša 1 a-hu
28 [ ] [x ša 1-te ku-lil-te PAP 15 KÜŠ 2 ku-lil-a-te
29 [PAP an-ni-ša È GIS.NA

Translation

A

[ ] x minas [ ]
[ ] x minas [ ]
[ ] 25 minas of gold
[ ] ivories
[ ] total belonging to the temple of Nabu.

[ ] minas of gold [ ]
(two lines missing)
[ ] gold
[ ] central(?)[room?]
TABLET 95

B

[ ] ½ minas of gold
[ ] ½ minas of gold

(remainder broken)

B

[ ] wild dog (?) [ ]

x cm long, 48 cm wide, total 192 cm,...[ ]

x cm long, 48 cm wide, total 192 cm, the pegs(?).

x + 24 cm long, 112 cm thick,

x cm, the hutū; all this, the chapel of Marduk

All this belonging to the temple of Nabu.

x cm long, 96 cm thick, total 384 cm, the hutū.

x + 24 cm long, x + 24 cm wide, the face.

x + 24 cm long, x + 24 cm wide, the head.

24 cm long, 16 cm wide, (measurement) of one horn.

24 cm long, 16 cm wide, (measurement) of one (pair of?) feet.

Total 288(?), x goat-fish, total 624 cm, 2 goat-fish.

72 cm [long], 24 cm wide, chest to its head.

96 cm long, 48 cm thick, (measurement) of the face.

24 cm long, 24 cm wide, (measurement) of one arm.

Total 336 cm, (measurement) of one fish-man [( )]

All this belonging to the room with the central [statue?].

216 cm long, 128(?), (measurement) of the hutū.

x + 32 cm long, 80 cm wide, the face.

72(?), 72 (?) cm wide, the head.

Total x + 24 cm, (measurement) of the central statue.

x + 32 cm long, 80 cm (wide), chest to her head.

[ ] long, 64 cm, thickness of the face.

[ ] long, 32 cm wide, (measurement) of one arm.

[Totat x cm, (measurement)] of 1 fishwoman, total 720 cm, 2 fishwomen

[All this belonging to] the bedroom shrine.

Notes

A.4: the reading of ZU.AM.ST thanks to K. Deller.

5: a possible reading is J’x MA.NA3-a-a “x minas each”.

B.5: possibly the traces at the end of the line are GIS hu-te-e’.

6: alternatively restore GIS.MAR at end, since the god is Marduk.

8: by comparison with Il.10 and 21 we should probably restore a [PAP (“Total ”)] at the beginning of this line.

gīhutū here and in II.10 and 21 seems to be new, and is not understood. The sign GIS could also be read as the first syllable of the word. In view of its size and the other elements of the statues mentioned in the text, it may refer to the main body or core of the figures. A connexion with CAD H 152a hatū B “to attach (gold ornaments)” might be suggested.
It appears from 1.9 that the Equ[ed MES was included within the Equ edPA. This suggests that Marduk had a shrine within the Nabu Temple at Kalhu, and K. Deller points out to us that in ADD 640:19–20 the priests of Nabu and his father Marduk are mentioned together. As with the shrines in No. 93, a crux for the interpretation is whether Equ should be understood as an independent building (e.g. 1.9) or as a room within a building (e.g. ll.8 and 29).

9: -ma was specifically confirmed by collation.

15: by analogy with 1.28 we may perhaps restore PAP 6 [KUŠ ru-tu ša 1 SUHUR.MÂŚ.KU₂₆, giving “Total, 6½ cubits for 1 goat-fish, in all 13 cubits (for) 2 goat-fish”.

18: despite the traces copied, which were also collated, this line presumably has to be restored as we have done, by comparison with 1.27.

20: K. Deller suggests that salmi qabassi (cf. 1.24 from which the restoration here is taken) is the statue of Tašmetum, because it is listed between Equ edPA (1.9) and Equ GIS.NA (1.29), just as Equ [KU]RNUN² is in No. 93. However there is no arrangement of three rooms in the Nabu Temple plan as excavated which might correspond to this interpretation. K. Deller also points out the occurrence of Equ MES and perhaps Equ qa⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻⁻ in cr 53 No. 846 obv. 5' and 10', and JNP would prefer to read Equ qabassê here (without NU), giving “the central room”.

Commentary

It is clear from A.5' and B.9 that these measurements of statues refer to the furnishing of a Nabu Temple, and since the other shrines mentioned could easily be accommodated within the Nabu Temple on the Kalhu citadel, we are probably justified in guessing that it is the building in question. There is no definite evidence for the dating of the text, but we may perhaps associate it with the rebuilding of Ezida by Sargon II; to judge from the quantities of gold mentioned, it must have been a major undertaking under royal patronage. Fishmen were indeed found as stone statues guarding the outer gate of the temple and were attributed by Mallowan to the reign of Sargon (NR 235); they should probably be interpreted as generally apotropaic, rather than specifically associated with Ea as suggested by Mallowan, because we have no evidence for Ea in connexion with the Nabu Temple.

Turning to the detailed interpretation of the text, first we cannot be certain which face is the obverse; there are arguments either way, and the two faces appear at first rather different. While large amounts of gold are listed in A, face B is devoted to detailed dimensions of parts of statues of considerable size; our conversion into cm uses the equivalents given in FNALD p. 70 (though cf. Fales, Censimenti è Catastì di epoca neo-assyria p. 121 who estimates the ruṭu at 27.5–28 cm rather than 24 cm). Because of the many lost figures, it is impossible to prove, but it seems probable that the “totals” given in B.5—6, [8], 10, 15, 19, and 28 are not additions of the linear measurements for width, length and thickness, but area measurements (in square cubits) reached by multiplying the length by the width or thickness. Thus there seems to be no way that [x] + ½ cubits plus 2½ cubits (1.7) can be added to achieve a whole number of cubits as a total in 1.8, whereas if [2]² were restored and multiplied with 2½ we should have 5½ square cubits, which could easily be rounded up to 6.
This remains uncertain, but it does seem clear that there must have been a practical reason for so minute a calculation, and the clue must surely come from face A: the scribe is calculating the area of the statues to be covered in gold leaf, and the quantity of gold accordingly needed.

No. 96

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plate 24</th>
<th>ND 10015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.6 × 10.2 × 2.5</td>
<td>BM custody</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE 50; east</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NR 639</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Obv. 1 [ (x)-x-pat K[A]d³ SAG.DU.MEŠ š[u²-pat] |
2 [ t]al-lul-a-[te (x,x)] |
3 [ -]\text{R}a² 5-a-a nap²-x[ |
4 [(x) x x -t]\text{E}²-si-na URUDU PAP 5 |
5 x[-(x-)]a-te-si-na x x -ši² (erasures) |
6 ša 1 GIŠ.GIGIR ina ŠA SAG.DU šu²-pat |
7 2 GIŠ.GIGIR ša UGU x [(x x)] |
8 ú-šal-lim-ú-n[i²] |
9 2 (x) a-ri-te-si-na URU[DU] |
10 1 GIŠ.GIGIR x ta-te |
11 1 GIŠ.GIGIR ša 1\text{U-ha-ti} |
12 na-ša-an-ni : URUDU-šá |
13 tal-lul-ta-šá la-ás-šá |
14 GIŠ.KI.KAL GIBIL ina ê 2-e |
15 ša TA* É.GAL ma-šar-[t]i |
16 na-ša-ni |
17 3 GIŠ.KI.KAL SUMUN ina né-re-bi É².G[AL]³ |
18 PAP 4 GIŠ.KI.KAL |
19 3 GIŠ.GIGIR.MEŠ ša lú²ša UGU ê |
20 ú-šal-lim-u-ni URUDU-si-na ina tup-ni-n[i²] |
21 [(x)]a-ri-a-te-si-na URUDU |
22 [x] GIŠ.KI.KAL SUMUN |

B.E. 23 [x] giš₃ut-iar-tu SUMUN¹ |

Rev. 24 [[(x)]] É GIŠ.BAN SUMUN dû²r-x-na²[i²] |
25 20 giš₃a-ri-tú ša x [ |
26 1 giš₃tup₃-ni-nu GIŠ² |
27 NA₄.KIŠIB ša LÚ.GA[L]² |
28 ina UGU É GIŠ².x[ |
29 NA₄.KIŠIB ša LÚ.GA[L |
30 ša a-dú x[ |
31 3 GIŠ me[- |
32 4 GIŠ.KI.KAL[ |
Translation

[ ] the tops embroidered(?)
[ ] harnessing
[ ] five each[ ]
[ ] their shields(?) of copper, total 5,
their [ ]s are missing (?)
of one chariot of which the top is embroidered(?)

2 chariots which the officer in charge of the house (?) replaced (or: repaired), (and) their 2 copper shields(?)

1 ... chariot.

1 chariot which Adad-hatti brought; its copper (and) its trappings are missing.

A new driving-platform in the 'second house' which was taken from the Review Palace.

3 old driving-platforms, at the entrance to the palace(?).

Total 4 driving-platforms.

3 chariots which the officer in charge of the house replaced, (and) their copper in a tupninnu-box, (and) their (x) copper shields(?)

[x] old driving-platform(s).
[x] old cart(s).

An (?) old bow-case,[ ]

20 shields(?) of [ ]

1 tupninnu-box of [ ], (under?) seal of the officer of [ ], upon the container(?) for [ ], (under?) seal of the officer of [ ] which is [ ] with [ ].

3 [ ]

4 driving-platforms [ ]

8 [ ], upon [ ].

1 container for [ ]

(remainder too broken for translation)

Notes

1: nu-pat restored at end of line after 1.6 (q.v.) and conceivably also to be restored earlier in the line.

3: a plausible restoration at the end of the line could be MUL (see e.g. No. 74:2), referring to decorative stars.

K. Deller suggests tentatively naps[gi], with the caution that this chariot part is not yet identified, and could prove to be incompatible with 5-a-a.

5: the traces hardly favour laštu (cf. 1.13), but the area is much erased and šašul šú is conceivable.
6: su²-pat: see AHw suppu I and add SMN 442:24—5, now edited by Wilhelm, Das Archiv des Silwa-Teššup (Wiesbaden 1980) No. 51: 1 kuduktii SIG.MES a-na si²-up-pa-a a-na GIS.²·GIGIR.²-ti¹; see also Postgate, Assur 2/4 (1979) 98 s.v. sa²-šapu. K. Deller suggests alternatively zaq²-pat.

7: perhaps ša UGU E¹ by comparison with l.19 although we have here one less ša and no LÚ.

8: this usage of šalumu obviously relates to the similar occurrences in the horse lists below.

9: it is not certain whether arītu A "shield" or arītu C "probably designates a pole pin on the axle of a chariot" (CAD A Pt. 2, p. 271b) is meant here.

10: a reading mu-ta-te seems epigraphically easiest, but muttatu "half" is not so far attested in nA. If the first sign were rather GAB/DUH one might think of the type of chariot ša (GIS.)GAB.MES (cf. note on No. 87:31), although this never has -ta-te. GAB cannot be read kab₂, to give *kabštā, and the ta is too clear to emend to lip (which would give ūh-šīp-te, cf. NWL 6:36; 19:20). JNP hesitantly suggests the equation (GIS.)GAB.MES = muttatu, and a possible connexion with muttatu A 3 ("headband(?)") (CAD M Pt. 2, 312a), which does not seem to have any obvious association with "half" and might be better assigned to muttu "front".

11: Adad-hatti: without a close dating of this tablet we cannot confidently equate this man with Adad-hatti in NL 19 and 20 as well as other nA letters (see Saggs, Iraq 17 (1955) 138—9). The following verb (naṣannī) excludes a reading 1 uhatī (a leather harness item known only from Amarna 22 i 9,15,18, re-edited by Adler, AOAT 201 (1976) p. 148).

12: E 2-e: this text indicates that this E 2-e was not part of the Review Palace. A stone slab uncovered by recent work in the North-West Palace bears an inscription identifying it as coming from the paving (kisirtu) of the E 2-e. A meaning such as "Nebenhaus" (AHw) or "servant quarters" (CAD B 297a) remains compatible with the existing occurrences in both palaces and private houses (add CT 53 No. 481:6').

17: note that plural signs are not always used: we should expect them in ll.7, 17, 18 and 25.

20: tup-ni-ni: cf. 1.26 ḫup-tup-ni-nu. Although the sign tup differs in the two occurrences here (collated), and although only one of them bears the determinative GIS, SMD does not agree with von Soden, ZA 67 (1977) p. 237 that OB ḫup-ni-ni-nu, a box for storing precious stones etc., is distinct from Nuzi and 1st millennium GIS.ni-ni-ni for storing clothes. See also AOAT 33 p. 422.

35: possibly restore 1 E KUṣ qa'amūš[mahit]. Although mahitu elsewhere is only attested with the GIS determinative.

Commentary
An inventory of chariots and parts of chariots in, or within the administrative competence of, the Review Palace, to judge from the provenance of the tablet. It is an informal everyday document, with many erasures (shown on the copy but not indicated in the transcription) and carelessly written.

No. 97 Plate 23 ND 10014

5.5 × 11.5 IM 64218
NE 50; east

Obv. 1 [1 GIS.GIGIR SUMUN⁷ ša LÚ GIG² x x x URUDU¹.MES
2 5 GIS.GIGIR x x (x) URUDU.ME
3 ša² i²na [k]al-zi uruv.arba-il
4 1 GIS. " ša x (x) x ta-ni
5 1¹ GIS. " tap-ši-e¹ URUDU
6 PAP 8 GIS.GIGIR tap-[ši]-²² a-ri-tú URUDU

Nd 64218
Nd 639
7 1 GIS.GIGIR na-gal'-me-[ ( ) ] su
8  s:\ uruk[gal]-ha
9 1 GIS.BU gi za ud [(x) x] MEŠ
10  KUS x [x x (x x) ] x
11 3 GIS.B[U ]
12 1-te GIS mu' x [ ]
13 1 GIS [ ]
14 1 " GIBIL.MEŠ na [x] am me [x] x x (x)
15 1 GIS.GIGIR SUMUN 'na2-gal-x [ ]

Translation
1 [old chariot belonging to the officer in charge of [ ]], copper ones(?)
5 chariots [ ] copper ones, which are in the kalzu-area of Arbil.
1 ditto, which [ ]
1 ditto, (and) a copper cover.
Total 8 chariot(s), covers (and) shield(s) of copper.

Notes
1: the total in 1.6 makes it unlikely that the end of the line should be restored as (x+10 GIS "2 URUDU.MEŠ; other possible readings which have been considered are: "GIS.BU gi za tu2 URUDU.MEŠ or Jx rGÜ x1 URUDU.MEŠ (see II.2 and 9).
2: conceivably restore 1 [c]URUDU.ME "1 talent of copper" (JNP).
3: kāl-zī: if this reading is correct, it establishes the reading of this word (see CAD K s.v. kalzu, to which add NL 18:32 and CT 53, 869A.7).
9: GIS.BU: possibly logographic for makkā or one of its synonyms, e.g. mudulu, mandā, maštī, all meaning a pole or a lever, but scarcely attested outside lexical texts. An alternative is to take this as a typical nA scribal abbreviation for GIS ša GID(DA) or ša šaddāl (a chariot drawn by men); were this correct, the following signs would have to be taken as gizzātu "clippings (of metal)", and [URUDU] MEŠ probably restored at the end of the line (for gizzātu "clipping" see CTN 2 on No. 145:2). Were this suggestion right, it would imply that some at least of the chariots are listed with their contents; there are parallels for the use of chariots to transport goods (e.g. G. van Driel, The Cult of Assur, p. 207; ABL 241; 242).
14: note the spurious MEŠ.
15: should we restore m[es] at the end, to give a word nagalmesu (garbled nA for agalmesu?) as in 1.7? (JNP).
TABLETS 98 & 99

No. 98

Plate 24

5.5 × 9.5
NE 50; west.

Obv. (written with the tablet vertical)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2² [ME (x)]</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1 ME 10[(+x)]</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2 ME [(+x)]</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1 ME 12</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1 ME 12</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1 ME 12</td>
<td>x+4</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2 ME [(x)]</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rev. (written with the tablet horizontal)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>16</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PAP 2 lim 2 ME 5 KUR.MES</td>
<td>1 ME 77 ku-din</td>
<td>PAP-ma 2 lim 3 ME 82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Translation (of ll.16-18)
Total 2,205 horses, 177 mules. Grand total 2,382.

Commentary
The first column on the obverse lists horses by hundreds, the middle column lists mules in smaller numbers. The right-hand column appears not to contain totals for the other two columns, and may have been simply a space used for calculation without a heading, since the three bold figures add up to the total of 2,205 horses given in l.16.

No. 99

Plates 25–26

10.0 × 15.0
NE 50; east.

Rev. (written with the tablet horizontal)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>16</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PAP 2 lim 2 ME 5 KUR.MES</td>
<td>1 ME 77 ku-din</td>
<td>PAP-ma 2 lim 3 ME 82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Translation (of ll.16-18)
Total 2,205 horses, 177 mules. Grand total 2,382.
THE TABLETS FROM FORT SHALMANESER

§A Obv.

1 LÚ.GAL ú-ra\textsuperscript{mes} §a LÚ.GAL.GAL.MEŠ
2 1\textsuperscript{[1]}s-BÁD §U 1\textsuperscript{pa-gi-hi}
3 1\textsuperscript{U-AD-PAP} §U 1\textsuperscript{TTIAB-a-a}
4 1\textsuperscript{iz-bu} §U 1\textsuperscript{AD-GIS} 108.ii.27
5 1\textsuperscript{še-lu-bu} §U 1\textsuperscript{30-PAP.MEŠ} 108.ii.28
6 1\textsuperscript{hal-di-DINGIR-a-a} §U 1\textsuperscript{U.GUR-MAN-PAP} 108.ii.29; 100.iii.4
7 1\textsuperscript{GIR.2-dUTU} §U 1\textsuperscript{ùra\textsuperscript{k}al-hu-a-a}
8 1\textsuperscript{ba-la-su} §U 1\textsuperscript{PAP-DINGIR-a-a}
9 1\textsuperscript{PAP-ši-na} §U 1\textsuperscript{da-da-a}
10 1\textsuperscript{dUTU-rém-a-ni} §U 1\textsuperscript{MAN-lu-dà-rî}
11 1\textsuperscript{dPA-A-AŠ} §U 1\textsuperscript{hi-bi-ia}
12 1\textsuperscript{rē[\textit{m}-u]te} §U 1\textsuperscript{HA\textsuperscript{R}-ma-ku} 100.iii.5
13 1\textsuperscript{dUTU-DINGIR-a-a} §U 1\textsuperscript{sa-si-i}
14 1\textsuperscript{dUTU-DINGIR-a-a} §U 1\textsuperscript{30-1} 100.iii.10
15 1\textsuperscript{dUTU-hi-fi} §U 1\textsuperscript{PAP-u-qur} 108.ii.38
16 1\textsuperscript{dNU-im-me} §U 1\textsuperscript{EN.KASKAL-KUR-u-a} 108.ii.40
17 1\textsuperscript{[s]-s[i]-i} §U 1\textsuperscript{EN-BÁD} 100.iii.11’-13’; 108.ii.43

18 PAP 14

§B 19 1\textsuperscript{aš-šur-LAL-a-ni} §U 1\textsuperscript{ha-rx (-x)}\textsuperscript{1}-i 104.A.ii’1; 108.ii.49
20 1\textsuperscript{KAXŠU\textsuperscript{2}-ma} §U 1\textsuperscript{EN-KAL-an} 104.A.ii’.2
21 1\textsuperscript{ši-iu-u} §U 1\textsuperscript{gu-w-a} 101.iv.14’; 104.A.ii’.3
22 1\textsuperscript{a-tar-šu-ki} §U 1\textsuperscript{AD-di-ki-ri} 104.A.ii’.4
23 1\textsuperscript{ši-EN-i-sa-na} §U 1\textsuperscript{kur-DINGIR-a-a}
ii 1 1\textsuperscript{[k\textsuperscript{[\textit{d}]]EN-KUR-DIB} 1\textsuperscript{aš-šur-MU-LAL-ni} 101.iv.15
2 1\textsuperscript{[\textit{d}]-KA\textsuperscript{3}]-L-an} §U 1\textsuperscript{MAN-NU-GIM-AD} 108.iii.8
3 1\textsuperscript{RX-X\textsuperscript{[\textit{p}]}PAP.MEŠ} §U 1\textsuperscript{dUTU-1} 101.iv.16’; 104.A.ii’.8’; 108.iii.9
4 1\textsuperscript{sa-al-[\textit{i}-\textsuperscript{d}]INGIR} §U 1\textsuperscript{dPA-tak-lak} 108.iii.10
5 1\textsuperscript{dUTU-DÜ-P\textsuperscript{[\textit{p}]}AP.M\textsuperscript{[\textit{e}]S} 1\textsuperscript{na-ni-i} 104.A.ii’.9’; 108.iii.11

6 [P]PAP 10 §U 1\textsuperscript{MAN-IGIL-LÁ-a-ni} 108.iii.13

§C 7 1\textsuperscript{mah-DI-e} §U 1\textsuperscript{ia-ta-ra} 108.iii.18
8 1\textsuperscript{kal-bu} §U 1\textsuperscript{ha-sá-na} 108.iii.22/20
9 1\textsuperscript{U-IM-me} §U 1\textsuperscript{ka-pár-ra} 108.iii.15/21
10 1\textsuperscript{a-tar-ba-a-di} §U 1\textsuperscript{si-id-qa-a-a} 108.iii.23/17
11 1\textsuperscript{DINGIR-da-la-a} PAP 10 §U 1\textsuperscript{dTUKUL-MAN-PAP} 108.iii.16/24

§D 12 1\textsuperscript{sa-la-a} §U 1\textsuperscript{a-me-ni-DINGIR} 108.iii.25/26
13 1\textsuperscript{dPA-PAP-MEŠ-šal\textsuperscript{l}-lim} §U 1\textsuperscript{PAP-di-ki-ri} 108.iii.27/28
14 1\textsuperscript{ZÁLAG-ia-pu-a} §U 1\textsuperscript{kab-ti-DINGIR} 108.iii.29/30
15 1\textsuperscript{dA-a-tu-ri} PAP 7 KUR kal-da-da-a-a 108.iii.31
TABLET 99

§E
16  
1ib-ba-da-la-a  
1da-la-PAP  
108.iii.33
17  
1ia-u-ga-a  
1a-tam-ru  
108.iii.36
18  
1PAP-id-ri  
1ab-di-mil-ku  
108.iii.37/38
19  
1EN-BĀD  
1na-ar-me-na-a  
108.iii.39/40
20  
1gab-bi-e  
1sa-ma-a  
108.iii.41
21  
1PAP-id-ri  
1ba-hi-e
22  
1PAP-i-u  
13 uru sa-mir-ni
23  
SU 1.dPA-U-GIN-in

§F
24  
1[1]ba-ri-ki  
1iz-bu-GIŠ  
108.iv.4/5
25  
1SU-DINGIR  
1zi-zi-i
26  
PAP 4 [( ]) SU 1.tāk-lak-ana-EN

§G Rev.

iii  
1  
1.dPA-šar-hi-DINGIR.[MES]  
1U.GUR-MAN-PAP  
108.iv.12
2  
1šal-mu-EN-la-rāš-me  
130-PAP-ir  
108.iv.13
3  
PAP 4 SU 1a-da-lāš

§H  
4  
1.dIGIL.DU-KAM  
1aš-šur-U-GIN
5  
PAP 2 SU 1.dMĀŠ.MAŠ-MAN-a-ni  
108.iv.20

§J  
6  
na-a-su

§J
7  
1ma-lu-tu  
SU 1šal-mu-PAP.MEŠ  
101.iv.2' (muš)
8  
1bal-nam-he  
SU 1EN-NUN.ME-DINGIR.MEŠ (muš)
9  
1na-hi-ru  
SU 1PAP-la-ra-me (muš)
10  
1U-hat-ti  
SU 1gab-ba-ru (muš)
11  
1a-tar-ra-hi-ni  
SU 1DU-TU-PAP-PAP (muš)
12  
1mil-ka-ta-ta-a  
SU 1sā-alu-DINGIR (muš)
13  
1a-ba-a  
SU 1mu-DI-aš-šur (muš)
14  
<1> PAP-šu  
SU 1U-PAP-AS (muš)
15  
1.dMāš-shal-me  
SU 130-BĀD-PAP (muš)
16  
1.urud-eb-ra-a-a  
SU 1za-za-ku  
103.i.3 (muš)
17  
1mu-DI-DINGIR  
SU 1SU.2-DINGIR-gabbu  
103.i.4 (muš)
18  
1TALLA-IGILÂ  
SU 1bi-su-nu  
103.i.1 (muš)
19  
1.dUTU-DŪ  
SU 1d.a <a>-ra-mu  
103.i.5 (muš)
20  
1aš-šur-ig-bi-PAP.ME  
SU 1d.PA-SU  
108.v.19 (muš)
21  
1aš-šur-še-zib-a-ni  
SU 1KĀ.DINGIR-a-a  
103.i.8 or 14 (muš)
22  
1GIN-e-pu-uz-DINGIR  
SU 130-GIN-PAP  
103.i.10f (muš)
23  
130-PAP-AS  
SU 1DU-TU-DINGIR-a-a  
100.ii.6'; 103.i.11 (muš)
24  
1SU-DINGIR.MEŠ  
SU 1EN-PAP.MEŠ  
103.i.12 (muš)
25  
1U.GUR-DINGIR-a-a  
SU 1.dPA-MU-PAP  
100.i.14'/17' (muš)
26  
1PAP-SIG  
SU 1KĀ.DINGIR-a-a  
103.i.14 or 8 (muš)

iv  
1  
1.U.R1-ri-a-a  
SU 1ššur-rēm-a-ni  
101.ii.17; 108.v.27 (muš)
2  
1[1]ša-si-i  
SU 1.dPA-EN-MU.MEŠ  
103.i.17; 108.v.30 (muš)
3  
1.[1]DU-TU-DINGIR-a-a  
SU 1.dUTU-BA-šā  
103.i.18; 108.v.31 (muš)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Transliteration</th>
<th>Translation</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>§K 9</td>
<td>ku-da-a-a</td>
<td>SU SUHUS-U.GUR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>aš-šur-DU-PAP.MES</td>
<td>man-nu-GIM-aš-šur</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>kur-e-e-APIN-eš</td>
<td>SUHUS-15</td>
<td>100.ii.2?; 102.iii.17’  rk arb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>PAP 6</td>
<td>ŠU 1.dUTU-tāk-lak</td>
<td>103.ii.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§L 13</td>
<td>GIN-i</td>
<td>1.dTUKUL-A-PAP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>U.GUR-at-ka-la</td>
<td>PAP-la-maš-ši</td>
<td>102.ii.5’  rk aš</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>aš-šur-PAP-ir</td>
<td>1.EN-ig-bi</td>
<td>101.iii.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>man-nu-SUM-na-PAP.MES</td>
<td>PAP 7 ŠU 1.MAN-IGI-a-ni</td>
<td>101.iii.7/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§M 17</td>
<td>kal-da-a-a</td>
<td>hi-da-ta-a-nu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>ha-bu-šu</td>
<td>pu-u-lu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>ka-ki-i</td>
<td>aš-šur-1</td>
<td>102.i.5’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>ba-hi-i</td>
<td>PAP-la-mur</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>1.sl.ER.uru-ta-e</td>
<td>1.dUTU-DU</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>PAP 10 ŠU</td>
<td>1.GIR.2-aš-šur</td>
<td>108.A.rev.i’.2’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§N 23</td>
<td>man-nu-GIM-PAP.MES</td>
<td>1.da-ku-HU-PAP.MES-SU</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>AD-SU</td>
<td>1.A-PAP</td>
<td>101.ii.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>PAP 5 ŠU</td>
<td>1.aš-šur-MAN-PAP</td>
<td>103.ii.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>PAP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Translation and notes**

For ease of reference we have assigned letters (e.g. §A) to the sections ruled off by the scribe. Throughout this group of lists definite connexions with other texts in the group are indicated beside the transliteration, usually wherever two or more names recur together in the same order. Also, official titles known or inferred from other texts are indicated in the following abbreviated forms:

- **rr** = LUGAL.GAL.(MES)
- **ru** = rab urâte
- **rk** = rab kîṣir
- **muš** = mušarkisu
- **šm** = šaknu ša ma’assi

§A (i.1 – 18): “Rab urâte officers of the chief officers:

- Istar-duri hand of Paqihi
- Adad-abu-ušur hand of Kanunaya
- Izbû hand of Abi-lešir
- Šelubû hand of Sin-ahhe
- Haldî-ilaya hand of Nergal-šarru-ušur
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>ROLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Şepê-Samaş</td>
<td>hand of Kalhaya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balasu</td>
<td>hand of Ahi-ilaya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahu-šina</td>
<td>hand of Dada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Şamaş-remanni</td>
<td>hand of Šarru-lu-dari</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nabu-aplu-iddin</td>
<td>hand of Bibiya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remute</td>
<td>hand of Harmaku</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aššur-šumu-uşur</td>
<td>hand of Sasi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Şamaş-ilaya</td>
<td>hand of Sin-na'id</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Şamaş-hitî</td>
<td>hand of Ahi-şur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Şalumu-imme</td>
<td>hand of Bel-Harran-šadua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sisi</td>
<td>hand of Bel-duri</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total 14.**

The names in the left-hand column are the rab urâte or "team-commanders" in this and the following sections, and the right-hand column lists the LÜ.GAL.GAL.MES.

i.1: LÜ.GAL.GAL.MES: it is not certain whether this logogram is an alternative form of LÜ.GAL.MES, which in other contexts is usually applied to provincial governors and the other highest officials of state who held eponym office. The reduplicated form is otherwise known to us only from ADD 854 rev.6, where a total of 48 LÜ.GAL.GAL.MES DUMU LUGAL includes the following officials: Dari-šarru ša muhâl, rab til-li; Šali, rab BAT-qi; Gabbu-amur, rab karkadinni; Qurdi-štarr, rab nikkkassê (collated). These are not the highest officials or "emirs" who are usually referred to as LÜ.GAL.MES (see Kinner Wilson, NWL p. 40 for examples), and so there may be a definite distinction; or else LÜ.GAL.GAL.MES is merely another way of writing LÜ.GAL.MES. Cf. AHw 934b for rabbi(m) written GAL.GAL.GAL.MESDUMU LUGAL but also 938a s.v. rabâ(m) 7d. There is some evidence to suggest that the LÜ.GAL.MES of §A do indeed include men of a comparable range of professions to those of ADD 854, although some of them have not previously been regarded as military in function. The following professions may be represented if identifications made simply from identical names (Abi-lesir), of Sargon's reign are correct - this is very uncertain: - rab ilâni (Paqhi), šairip dühê (Sin-na'id), karkadinnu (Abî-lesîr), murabbânû (Nergal-şarru-usur), tašîšîn (Kur-ilaya).

i.2: Paqhi is perhaps to be identified with 1pa-qa-ha LÜ.GAL URU.MES in ADD 234 rev.8 (709 B.C.) and with 1pa-qa-[ha] LÜ.GAL URU.MES in the witness list of ADD 238 (693 or 688 B.C.), where a close association with the royal family seems likely. In ABL 102, a letter written by Sargon's abarakku rabû, there is a LÜ (o)tinû ("builder") called 1pa-qa-ha (see Deller and Parpola, RA 60 (1966) 59-60). To translate the profession rab ilâni JNP favours "village inspector", SMD prefers "quartermaster".

i.4: Abî-lesîr is possibly the karkadinnu of No. 87:15.

i.5: Sin-ahbe occurs again with [Nergal]-šarru-usur in No. 108.ii.28-9, and SMD suggests that the name may be an abbreviation for Sin-ahbe-erîba, the prince who succeeded Sargon on the throne of Assyria. This identification would be supported by the association with Nergal-šarru-usur if he is the "eunuch of the [king's] son" of ADD 416 (see on i.6 but also p.28 above). JNP reserves judgement; there is, for instance, a Sin-PAP-PAP.(MES?) in TCL 3 1.123; we have no reason to suppose that a name formed like Sin-ahbe-erîba was unusual, so that this rather peculiarly formed short name might even be a deliberate device to preclude confusion with the king's son.

i.6: Nergal-šarru-usur occurs in Nos. 100 and 108 in the same man, but he is to be kept separate from the rab urâte of No. 99.iii.1. There is also a šaknu ša ma'assi of this name in No. 103 rev.i.5 and TD 2386+ i.18 who is almost certainly the same man since other rabû (Šarru-emurannî and Bel-duri) are also found as šaknuša ša ma'assi. See also NL 23 and ADD 1185. He may be a murabbânû; cf. ADD 1248 rev.5, which almost certainly dates to Sargon's reign. For murabbânû see note on ii.20. For the connexion with Sennacherib the most important text is ADD 416 (=ARU 438), where the first witness is Nergal-šarru-usur LÜ.SAG ša DUMU [MAM²]; to reinforce his identity further, note that he is accompanied there by two Urartians, Haldi-şurî and Haldi-ilînu, while here in i.6 his rab urâte is another Urartian named Haldi-ilaya.

i.11: it is not very likely that 1bi-bi-e in ARU 173 (dated probably 692 B.C.), whose profession is to be read LÜ.GI.[G]GIGIR GAL according to the collations of Fales, BSOAS 40 (1977) 599, is the same man, because of the difference in time, and because the other men in the same witness list with the same profession do not occur here. See also note on No. 101.vii.7.
i.12: Harmaku: perhaps the father of the king’s scribe in 714 B.C., see TCL 3 line 429.
i.14: Sin-na’id: possibly to be identified with the ša’āri₃ du₃ṣu₃ of ADD 1246 (dated 710 B.C.) in which Izbu and Balasi also occur, in common with §A here.
i.17: Bel-đuri in NL 18 may be the same man, and like Nergal-šarru-ṣuṣur in i.6 he reappears in ND 2386+ as a šakru ša pethal ma’asti, connected with the provinces of the palace herald and of Kirruri. Note that both the rab urāṭe and his superior officer recur in No. 100.iii.11’—13’.
i.18: the total should presumably read 16, but the tablet certainly has 14.

§B (i.19—23): “Aššur-taqquinanni” (hand of Ha[₃j]i[
...ma
Şiyu
Atar-šu(m)ki
Şili-Bel-Isana

There is no double ruling at the base of col.i, and it is almost certain that §B 19—23 is the first part of the contingent of Šarru-emuranni.
i.19: a possible restoration of the name is ₁ḥa-zi-r⁻i, by comparison with ₁ḥa-zi-ri-i who is listed in No. 101.iv.17 with other men from this section; similarly no. 108.ii.49 ₁ḥa-zîr⁻i?
i.20: Bel-dan: possibly the rab kaṣir who occurs as witness in BT 101, dated 710 B.C.
i.23: Kur-ilaya: perhaps the taššētu of AR 635 (dated 711 B.C.), and may occur in ADD 1185 (probably Sargon’s reign) with Nergal-šarru-ṣuṣur.

§B (ii.1—6): “Bel-matu-ṭaṣbat” (hand of?) Aššur-ṣumu-taqquin(i)
[x]-daŋ
[x]-ahhe
Salti-ilî
Šamaš-bani-ahhe
Total 10, hand of Šarru-emuranni”.

The total 10 could be understood either as adding the left hand names of i.19—ii.6 or as adding all the names in ii.1—6. The former is preferred by comparison with No. 108.iii.1—13, and with the listing in No. 104 of Šamaš-na’id and Nani among the rabûti. If this is correct, the ŠU in i.19—21 was deliberately added later, not erased; and the single Winkelhaken on the B. E. may have been a mistaken total of names from i.19—23. Atypically, therefore, we seem to have a three-tier command here: Šarru-emuranni in charge of the superior officers in the right-hand column who in turn command the rab urāṭe in the left-hand column.

ii.6: Šarru-emuranni: in the Horse Lists there appear to be two men of this name who are distinguished by the spellings of their name, but who both count as LU GAL.GAL.MES—
I MAN-IGI-LA-a-ni 99.ii.6 108.iii.13(?)
II MAN-IGI(a)-ni 99.iv.16 101.i.3

It is not certain whether the difference in spelling would reflect a difference in the names’ pronunciation; IGLI₃ has the variant e₃mur- in letters (e.g. ABL 759 and 760), establishing the General Preterite as one possibility; on the other hand an imperative form(? ) -a₃mur₃-a-ni (NA CTN II No. 25.6,11 compared with line 2; -amranni as variant for IGI-ni in ma, see Saporetti, OMA II 103) cannot be entirely discounted. There seem to be no parallels for distinguishing preterite and imperative by variation of the logogram.

Parpola (OAC XVII, chart 3) has suggested that Sargon had two top officers named Šarru-emuranni, but we cannot apply this suggestion directly to our two spellings, since in the letters the name is always spelt with IGLI₃ or e₃mur- (with the exception of CT 53 632). Nor is there evidence to show whether the Šarru-emuranni of the letters is genuinely two different governors, or simply the governor of Mazama and eponym for 712 B.C. who was transferred to Babylonia during the campaign of 710—708 B.C. Further evidence is needed. In any case, there is a possibility that the Horse Lists distinguish by spelling two different men with identical names because both occur written by one scribe in the same list, whereas those different spellings were not needed in the letters, which would have been written by separate scribes. As Šarru-emuranni I is the only officer who commands both rab urāṭe and their superior officers, he is probably to be identified as the
governor or governor-to-be of Babylonia, whereas Šarru-emuranni II is a šaknu ša ma'assi probably in both occurrences. Note also the Šarru-emuranni in NL 74 who is LU 2 ū ša URU Isana, and CTN II No. 242.

§C (ii.7—11): “Mahdie
Kalbu
Adad-imme
Atar-badi
Ili-dala
Yatara
Hašana
Kaparra
Ṣidqaya
Total 10, hand of Kakku-šarru-uṣur”.

Most of these names are West Semitic, and recur in Kakku-šarru-uṣur’s contingent in No. 108.iii'‘.14—24.

ii.7: given the identity of all other names here and in No. 108, it is possible that 1mah-Di-e here is identical with the name in 108.iii’‘.14 which should then be read 1am-ha-ti-e.

ii.11: Ili-dala: probably occurs in ABL 251:10. The total in this line should be 9, not 10.

§D (ii.12—15): “Ṣalaya
Nabu-ahhe-šallim
Nuri-yapa
Aya-ṭuri
Ammeni-ili
Ahi-dikiri
Kabti-ili
Total 7, Chaldaeans”.

ii.14: comparison with No. 108.iii’‘.30 shows that Kabti-ili here is there abbreviated to Kabti.

§E (ii.16—23): “Ibba-dala
Yau-ga
Ahi-idri
Bel-duri
Gabbe
Ahi-idri
Ahu-Yu
Dala-ahu
Atamru
Abdi-milku
Narmena
Sama
Bahe
Total 13, city of Samaria, hand of Nabu-belu-ukin”.

Since in both cases it is directly preceded by the Chaldaean contingent it is clear that the Samarian contingent was also listed in No. 108.iii’‘.33ff., and the first name there can be restored accordingly. Although not indicated beside the transliteration, it is also clear that the names in No. 108.B.ii’‘ can be restored after §F here.

ii.20: Sama could be the same man as occurs in ARU 59; 186; 201; and 554 (probably all dated 694 and 693 B.C.) 1sa-mu-ṣa, whose profession is given as murabbānu ša mà-aššur|Nergal-sarr[ī]. He occurs next to equestrian witnesses in all four texts, which suggests the possibility that murabbānu in NA could mean “horse breeder/trainer” rather than “tutor”. Possibly the borrower of silver in BT 101, dated 710 B.C.

ii.23: Nabu-belu-ukin (or: -ka”in?) may be the sukallū who wrote several Kouyunjik letters and NL 63 and perhaps 42 (S. Parpola, OAC XVII p.[137] Chart 3), although he has no connexion with Samaria in any of those contexts.

§F (ii.24—26): “Bariki
Eriba-ili
Izbu-lešir
Zizi
Total 4, hand of Taklak-ana-Bel”.

Although not indicated in the transliteration, it is clear that the same contingent was listed in No. 108.B.rev.i’‘.4—7.

ii.26: Taklak-ana-Bel: probably the man who was governor of Naṣibina and eponym in 715 B.C., author of several Kouyunjik letters (S. Parpola, OAC XVII p.[138] Chart 3).
§G (iii.1 – 3): “Nabu-šarhi-ilani  
Šulmu-Bel-lašme  
Total 4, hand of Adallal”.

iii.1: Nabu-šarhi-ilani: possibly the same man as in NWL Nos. 8; 9(?) and 21, according to the revised dating of those texts (see above p.22).

iii.2: Šulmu-Bel-lašme: a Sulmu-Bel, perhaps an abbreviated form of the same name, was eponym in 696 B.C.; he may also occur in ARU 249 (686 B.C.) and in ARU 612 as a tallītu (see NWL p. 52), with Šarru-emuranni as ša qurbāti. He is perhaps the deputy of the nāgīr ekalli, author of at least seven Kouyunjik letters (S. Parpola, OAC XVII p. [138]).

§H (iii.4 – 5) “Nergal-ereš  
Assur-belu-ukin  
Total 2, hand of Nergal-šarranī”.

This section probably corresponds to No. 108.iv’8’ – 11’, q.v.

§I (iii.6): na’a-šu: the first sign has been collated and is not a satisfactory šu, na or ma. A reading ma’-a-su (for ma’yullu = ma’asū “stable” is hardly likely, since elsewhere in NAss this word is regularly written with the aleph sign in the middle. The double rulings each side make it unlikely that this word was intended as a summary or heading for §H or §J respectively, and the most plausible solution might be to emend fairly drastically and read la’a-šu “there is none” as an explanatory note for an empty section.

§J (iii.7-iv.8): “Maluṭu  
Bal-namhe  
Nahiru  
Adad-hatti  
Atar-rahini  
Milki-yata  
Abá  
Ahu-šu  
Adad-šalme  
Deraya  
Mušallim-ili  
Balatu-lamur  
Šamaš-bani  
Aṣṣur-iqbi-ahhe  
Aṣṣur-šezi-banni  
Ken-epuš-ili  
Sin-ahu-iddin  
Eriba-ilani  
Nergal-ilaya  
Ahu-damiq  
Akkadaya  
Sasi  
Šamaš-ilaya  
Atamru  
Ṭabnaya  
Sīlim-Adad  
Lu-balaṭ  
Nergal-lamur

Nergal-šarru-uṣur  
Sin-naṣir  
Total 4, hand of Adallal”.

10  
hand of Šalmu-ahhuti  
hand of Bel-apkal-ilani  
hand of Ahi-larame  
hand of Gabbaru  
hand of Šamaš-ahu-uṣur  
hand of Salti-ili  
hand of Mušallim-Asṣur  
hand of Adad-ahu-iddin  
hand of Šin-duri-uṣur  
hand of Zazakku  
hand of Qate-ilī-gabbu  
hand of Bisunu  
hand of Aya-ramu  
hand of Nabu-eriba  
hand of Babilaya  
hand of Sin-kuṇu-uṣur  
hand of Šamaš-ilaya  
hand of Bel-ahhe  
hand of Nabu-šumu-uṣur  
hand of Babilaya  
hand of Aṣṣur-remanni  
hand of Nabu-bel-šumate  
hand of Šamaš-iqtiša  
hand of Ninurta-abu-uṣur  
hand of Ubru-Harran  
hand of Aṣṣur-naṣir  
hand of Ṭab-šar-Aṣṣur  
hand of Išme-ili”. 

15  
20  
25  
5
The first part of the section probably lists mušarkināni ša Giš.GIGIR qurbite; see No. 103 obv. Most of the names of superior officers in the second part of this section recur in No. 103 rev., and so can be identified as mušarkināni ša Giš.GIGIR E.GAL.

iii.8: Bel-apkal-ilani is probably the mušarkīsu of NL 56, where he is with Aššur-naṣīr, named here in iv.6 (rather than iv.19), and with Amībat (restoration from NL 105).

iii.10: for the name Adad-hattī see note on No. 96:11; a man of this name is also found in ND 2672:35 (TCAE p. 389) in connexion with horses.

iii.14: the name Ahulu is attested elsewhere in these texts, but the omission of the Personenkil suggests that the scribe heard this as "his brother" instead of a personal name.

iii.16: Zazaikkur probably occurs in ND 2386+.i.5' as well as in No. 103.

iii.18: Bismuc may be an abbreviation for Aššur-bisun, who accompanied emissaries in the letter to Sargon ABL 252.

iii.20: Nabu-eriba: almost certainly the same man as in ABL 529 rev.12.

iii.21, 26: the two men named Babilaya are distinguished in No. 103.i.8 and 14 as "of TAR-nina" and "of Arrapha". Two Babilayas are also listed in the list of mušarkināni under Sargon, ADD 855; see p.43 above for a new edition.

iii.23: a Šamaš-ilaya occurs as a witness with the profession mukil appāte in ARU 186 (694 B.C.), together with Sama' and Bel-Harran-šarru-ḫuṣur (see No. 107.i.24'). Possibly the author of NL 30, and perhaps occurs in ND 2629.

iv.1: Akkada: the identity of this man with Akkada in ARU 31 (710 B.C.) and ARU 394 (717 B.C.), and ABL 488:7 (reign of Sargon) is possible. Correspondence with Aramaic 'kdy in the Ashur text Lidzbarski no. 2, where identity is almost certain, shows that Urartaya is not here the correct reading of URI-a-a. See p.46 above.

iv.5: Tabaya: possibly emend to DUG.GA-ba-a-a (Tabaya) or DUG.GA-URU-a-a (for Šalālaya).

Ubru-Harran: perhaps not to be identified with the ša qurbīte of ABL 408:7; there is no other evidence to suggest that mušarkināni were also ša qurbīte, but if No. 99 is later than ABL 408, he could be the same man, promoted during the intervening period.

iv.8: Imē-illi: a man of this name occurs in the multiple land sale at Kalhu, ARU 31 (710 B.C.).

Note that there is no single overall commanding officer for this group of mušarkināni, in accordance with what we know of their independent activities.

§K (iv.9-12): “Kudaya
Aššur-bani-ahhe  Ubru-Nergal
Kur’e-ereš     Mannu-ki-Aššur

Total 6, hand of Šamaš-taklak”.

iv.9: Ubru-Nergal: perhaps the ša qurbīte of NL 31:12.

§L (iv.13-16): “Keni
Nergal-akkala  Kakku-aplu-ḫuṣur
Aššur-naṣīr    Aḥu-lamaššī
e Mannu-iddina-ahhe Bel-iqbi

Total 7, hand of Šarru-emuranni”.

iv.16: on Šarru-emuranni see note to §B (ii.6) above.

§M (iv.17-22): “Kaldaya
Habušu  Hidatanu
Kakki    Pulu
Bahī      Aššur-na’id
Șilli-Bel-Tue  Aḥu-lamur
Šamaš-bani  Šamaš-bani

Total 10, hand of Šepe-Aššur”.
Total”.

iv.23: HU in the second name was specifically collated; perhaps emend to da-ku-ri 1 nevertheless, and see PN index note 31.

iv.25: Aššur-šarru-uṣur: possibly the governor of Que known from NL 39 (see Iraq 35 (1973) 21—34) and CT 53, 15.rev. 2—3. However, this would pose a problem if our text is rightly assigned to 710 B.C., since it was thought that he was involved in a campaign in Cilicia against Midas during that year (see Iraq 35, 33). Perhaps rather we have a second man of the same name, to be identified with the šaknu ša ma’assi of No. 103.ii.10, especially as Šamaš-taklaš (in §K) is found there too (No. 103.ii.7).

Note that an Aššur-šarru-uṣur is found in the Sargon text ADD 928 immediately after the two turtans; and in ND 2451 he contributes 10 equids, being named before the Palace Herald, the Chief Cupbearer and several provinces. The name Aššur-šarru-uṣur was found inscribed in Aramaic on a bronze from Khorsabad; see CIS II/1 no. 50, and Millard, Iraq 45 (1983) 103.

Commentary

Date. In §§B and F are named the eponym officials for 715 and 712 B.C. or their namesakes, and several other commanding officers may plausibly be identified with high officials of Sargon’s reign. Several names are found in a very similar context in ND 2386+, which is probably to be dated to 711 B.C. (see TCAE p. 371). If connexions with No. 108 are the result of a date in the same year, 710—708 B.C. is the period during which the tablet was written, and Sargon II’s Babylonian campaigns of those years may be the background against which it should be interpreted.

Purpose. This complete and carefully written text has such close connexions with Nos. 102 and 108, that we suggest it was a formal check list either preceding or following the actual muster lists, which were less carefully written (see p.20 above). It lists team-commanders with their superior officers; while all the superior officers are probably described as LÚ.GAL.GAL.MES, it is certain from comparison with the other lists that they have different specific functions, such as mušarkisu, šaknu ša ma’assi. It is possible that some provincial units under their governors are also included, and two units are expressly described as Chaldean and Samaritan. The identity of each unit must therefore be independently established, before the scope of the list can be determined.

§A. We are still not certain to which unit these men belonged. One possibility is that they were the staff of the king’s palace, to each of whom one rab urâte was assigned. On the other hand, the close parallelism with No. 108, and especially the reappearance of Abilešir, Sin-ahhe and Nergal-šarru-uṣur (i.4—6) in the same order in No. 108.ii, suggests that §A might be equivalent to No. 108.ii.27ff., which is confirmed by No. 108.ii.38ff., where we find our last three entries, Ahi-uqur, Bel-Harran-sadua and Bel-duri, also closing a section. The section in No. 108 is summed up as: 128 pethal qurubtu or “128 qurubtu-cavalry”. A connexion with cavalry is supported by a comparison with ND 2386+, where we find Bel-Harran-sadua as a mušarkisu ša pethal qurubte, and a Bel-duri and a Nergal-šarru-uṣur as šaknûte ša pethal ma’assi.

Given the similarity of §A with §J, with a single rab urâte to each of the LÚ.GAL.GAL.MES, we propose to see the 14 superior officers in this section as mušarkisâni ša pethal qurubte.
§B. The unit of Šarru-emuranni. If we are correct in supposing that this text is connected with a muster which took place either in Babylonia, or in Calah at the end of a Babylonian campaign, there is a strong likelihood that this man is the one who became governor in N. Babylonia. If so, this section may be considered a provincial contingent.

§C. The unit of Kakku-šarru-ušur. This officer is unknown from other texts. At one time we considered the possibility that this was the Arrapha unit, because first, in No. 102.ii.10' [III]-kabar is a *rab kišri arraphaya*, and second, because this unit comes after §B: if §B were the Aššuraya unit, §C might be the Arrapha unit according to the standard order of city units known from Nos. 102 and 111. We now think that this is due to coincidence. No. 108 as reconstructed below lists the *rab kišri-*officers of the Arrapha unit in col. ii, then later the *rab urāte-*officers under Kakku-šarru-ušur are listed in col. iii, and there is no definite connexion between them. This is probably therefore a provincial contingent, the origin of which remains to be discovered. It contains a large number of West Semitic names, some of which recur in the Aššur Protokolle (see above p.42).

§D. The Chaldean unit. Although it appears plausible to associate this unit and its formation with the capture of Dur-Yakin in 709 B.C., Sargon's formal inscriptions do not mention that he added a contingent of chariotsy from the subjugated Chaldeans to his army. We do not know why this unit alone has no named superior officer. It is possible that the unit is the *šāb kidinnī* from Sippar, Nippur, Babylon and Borsippa mentioned in Sargon's annals (Winckler, pl. 30 no. 63:7). The presence of a piece of land belonging to the *ummu ša* 16kaldaya at Kalhu in 715 B.C. (ARU 395) suggests that a Chaldean unit, with which ours might possibly be connected, already existed before Sargon conquered Babylon. A Chaldean *ša qurbūte* named Abi-ul-idi is mentioned in a fragmentary letter of Sargon's reign, ABL 742, and is perhaps to be associated with the unit. Connexions with KAV 31 probably show that it was a chariots unit.

For the ethnic characteristics of the Chaldeans as far as they are known, see now Brinkman, CAH (2nd ed.) vol. iii/1, pp. 290 and 306. Half the names in this group are definitely West Semitic.

§E. The Samarian unit. This can convincingly be related to II.23—4 of the Prunkinschrift (Winckler, *Sargon*, p. 100): "I besieged and captured Samaria, and took captive 27,290 of the population living there; I formed a unit of 50 chariots from among them". In that account he does not state that he added them to the *kišir šarrūti*, but does specify this in his Annals (Lie, *Sargon*, p. 4 line 15). This unit must therefore have been in the army for about a decade. It is led by Nabu-belu-ukin (or: -ka"in), possibly the *sukkallu* of this name, although elsewhere the *sukkallu* has no connexions with Samaria (see Parpola, OAC XVII, Chart 3 for references). Note that almost all the names in this group are West Semitic.

§F. The unit of Taklak-ana-Bel. If Taklak-ana-Bel is the same man as the governor of Našibina of that name, this may be a provincial unit. The identification cannot be regarded as certain.

§G. The unit of Adallal. There seems to be no evidence for identifying this unit.

§H. The unit of Nergal-šarrani. There seems to be no evidence for identifying this unit.

§I. Not understood; see note with translation.

§J. The *mušarkisāni*. As observed above, the identity of the members of this section is established by the comparison with No. 103, from which it is clear that the section can
be divided into at least two groups: the mušarkisāni of the qurubtu-chariotry, and those of the palace-chariotry. The order and the names on No. 103 are not precisely the same as here; the correspondences between Nos. 103 and 108 appear closer. It is possible that there was yet a third grouping in the lines before Bisunu, but more likely that certain types of mušarkisu, specifically the mušarkisāni ša pethal qurubte and ša šaglūte of ND 2386+.ii.16' –17' and iii.14 – 15, are not included in this section; this is self-evident if we are right in our identification of §A as the mušarkisāni of the qurubtu-cavalry. As there, each superior officer in §J was assigned a single rab urāte, and they are clearly not attached to any regional unit. For a list of all identified mušarkisāni of Sargon’s reign, and a discussion of their function, see pp.28 – 32 above.

§§K—N. The 4 units of the šaknūte ša ma’assi. The title of the commanding officers in charge of these units can be deduced from No. 103.ii.12–13, where two of the same men reappear in a section which also immediately follows the chariotry-mušarkisāni; the same order is also found in No. 108, if No. 108A is correctly placed so that Šepe-Aššur and Aššur-šarru-usur belong to the upper part of No. 108.rev.vi. For the office of šaknu ša (pethal) ma’assi, and for other holders of the title, see p.34. Given the known importance of the office, we assume that these holders, like the mušarkisāni, are included in the heading LÚ.GAL.GAL.MEŠ, and the other occurrences of the title suggest that the four units may concern only cavalry.

Composition of the list. According to its heading, this tablet lists “team-commanders” (rab urāte). The majority of team-commanders were probably chariopteers, to judge from connexions with the Aššur Protokolle; this is certainly true of Ammeni-ili (Chaldean unit), and of Adad-imme and Atar-ba’di (both in the unit of Kakku-šarru-usur). On the other hand, the connexions of §A with No. 108.ii.27–47 show that some rab urāte were in fact cavalry officers.

No. 99 does not list all the team-commanders of Sargon’s army: as the heading implies, they are only those under the command of LÚ.GAL.GAL.MEŠ, and quite likely only a selection of them, present on a specific occasion. They are listed in the following broad divisions:

§A Single officers (=chariotry, mušarkisāni?)
§§B—C Provincial units?
§D Chaldeans
§E Samarians
§§F—H Provincial units?
§J Single officers (=chariotry, mušarkisāni)
§§K—N Stable officers (=šaknūte ša ma’assi)

The presence of provincial units, although it cannot be proved, is to be expected in the light of references in the annals to their activities in Babylonia (Lie, Sargon, p. 56:382). Many important men are not found, for instance Nergal-āšared, the rab kisri of ABL 1109 (an important person also in ARU 186 and 397); the eponym officials for 716, 714, 713, 710 and 707 B.C.; Aššur-rešua the governor of Kumme; or Šamaš-belu-usur, the governor of Der. While other explanations could be found, it is likely that their absence means merely that these men did not play a part in the Babylonian campaign and concomitant muster.

A comparison with Nos. 101, 102 and 108 in particular reveals parts of the army not represented here (not to mention the infantry): the miscellaneous officials listed at the start
of each text, who may be closely associated with the king, and perhaps the entire contingent commanded by the chief eunuch. JNP's description of the text as recording "the disposition of cavalry-commanders throughout the separate provinces of Sargon's empire" (M. T. Larsen (ed.), \textit{Power and Propaganda}, 197) is therefore in need of revision in more than one respect!

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline
\textbf{No. 100} & \textbf{Plate 27} & \textbf{ND 10003} \\
\hline
12.5 \times 16.6 \times (3.3) & & IM 64211 \\
NE 50; east & & – \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Obv. \textbf{(one face, probably the Obv., is entirely destroyed)}

\begin{tabular}{|c|}
\hline
1' \[ ] x[ \\
2' \[PAP (x +)] 51 \\
\hline
3' \[1d(MA)S²-K[i?] -a] \\
4' \[x x] \\
5' \[SU]HUS² \[dUTU² \ x] \\
6' \[ ] x x \\
7' \[PAP 6 na² me² (x) -DINGIR \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\textbf{(remainder of column blank/destroyed?)}

\begin{tabular}{|c|}
\hline
\textbf{ii} & (about 11 lines broken) \\
\hline
1' \[ ] x[ \\
2' \[1rkur-²[e-APIN-e] ²] \\
3' \[1U.GUR-[x]-PAP \\
4' \[PAP 4 [x x] x-a-a \\
5' \[ina uuru[(x)] (x) x x \\
\hline
6' \[30-[ ] PAP-AS \\
7' \[LÜGAL ú-rat \\
8' \[r x² 1]/[R] -15 \\
9' \[1d[x-ša]-l-im-PAP.MES \\
10' \[ ] -DU \\
11' \[x x] x na² qur-bu \\
12' \[1E[RIN²-S] IG 5 \\
\hline
13' \[PAP 6 [( ) ²] UTU-D[DINGIR]-a-a \\
14' \[1U.GUR-DINGIR-a-a \\
15' \[LÜ.GAL ³ ú-rat \\
16' \[1EN³-[kab-i]-DINGIR.MES-ni \\
17' \[PAP 2 [²] PA-MU-PAP \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

99.iii.23 \quad ru

\begin{tabular}{|c|}
\hline
ru muš \\
\hline
99.iii.25 \quad ru \\
\hline
99.iii.25 \quad ru muš \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
### THE TABLETS FROM FORT SHALMANESER

(remainder of column blank?)

#### iii

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1'</td>
<td>LÚ.[GA]L ú-rat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2'</td>
<td>[PAP] 1 MAN-PAP(-)x (x)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3'</td>
<td>[x] LÚ.ÉRIN.MEŠ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4'</td>
<td>[J][u-[a] U.GUR-MAN-PAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5'</td>
<td>[ê]-m-tù</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6'</td>
<td>LÚ.G[AL] ú-rat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7'</td>
<td>PAP KĀ.DINGIR-a-a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8'</td>
<td>115-[[(B)]A-sā GAL u-rat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9'</td>
<td>[x]LÚ.ÉRIN.MEŠ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10'</td>
<td>[x] 130-I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11'</td>
<td>[ê]-si-si</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12'</td>
<td>LÚ.GAL ú-rat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13'</td>
<td>PAP EN-BA-D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(about 7 lines broken)

#### iv

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1'   | [(x) x] x ú²[
| 2'   | [SU]DINGIR[( ]] |
| 3'   | [ê]-i-zí-i (( ] ] |
| 4'   | [SUHUŠ-DINGIR[(.x)] |
| 5'   | [(x) x] 1ú.r x x³ |
| 6'   | [aš-s]ur-KUR-LAL |
| 7'   | [x A BA² |
| 8'   | [ ] |
| 9'   | [(x) x]-la-m[ur² |
| 10'  | [ ) ]EN-BA[D] |
| 11'  | [( ) ]U-U-PAP |
| 12'  | [ ] ME(S)-SU |
| 13'  | [ ] x-ir |
| 14'  | [ ] x-TAR |
| 15'  | [ ] d]-da-lal |
| 16'  | [ ] PAP |
| 17'  | [ ] x |
| 18'  | -r][a²-ru |
| 19'  | -KĀD-ru |
| 20'  | -E]N²-DINGIR.MEŠ |
Translation and Notes

i.3'—7': fragmentary names including Ninurta-issiya(?) and Ubru-Šamaš(?); summarized "Total 6, Na-x-ili"

ii.1'—5': fragmentary names including Kur’e-eres(?), and Nergal-x-usur; summarized "Total 4, [PN], in the town of ....". The PN could be restored 1[KĀ.DIN]GIR-a-a ("Babiliya"). The placename could be read either 𒀀𒀀𒀀bet-zi-zi-zi-din-ni1 (see note on No. 103.i.9), or, less reconcilable with the traces, 𒀀еш-[TAR]-1ni-su-a1.

ii.6'—13': "Sin-ahu-iddin the rab urâte-officer, Urad-Istar, [x]-šallim-ahhe, PN, PN present, Šabu-damqu: total 6, Šamaš-ilaya".

For qurbu "present", which may have been added later, cf. No. 101.i.14.

ii.14'—17': "Nergal-ilaya the rab urâte-officer, Bel-kabti-ili: total 2, Nabu-šumu-usur (or: -nadin-ahi)",

iii.1'—2": "[PN] the rab urâte-officer: total 1, Šarru...

iii.3'—4': "(...) soldiers [o]f Nergal-šarru-usur". For Nergal-šarru-usur see note on No. 99.i.6; these two lines are parallel to iii.9'—10', and since Sin-na’id is one of the LUGAL.GAL.MES in No. 99, the Nergal-šarru-usur here is not the rab urâte but the important officer in No. 99.i.6. It is impossible to deduce from internal criteria whether a figure has been lost at the beginning of iii.3' and 9', or whether these two pairs of lines summarize what went before or are an introductory heading.

iii.5'—7': "Remutu the rab urâte-officer: total, Babiliya".

iii.8': "Istar-iqiša the rab urâte-officer".

iii.9'—10': "(...) soldiers [of] Sin-na’id".

See note on iii.3'—4' above; the isolated entry in iii.8' might lead one to see these two lines as a summary rather than a heading, but this cannot be considered certain.

iii.11'—13': "Sisi the rab urâte-officer: total 1, Bel-duri".

iv.1'—5': fragmentary names include Eriba-ili(?), Zizi, Ubru-x; summarized "[Total x], Adad-x (?)". The final PN could rather be 1UGUR-ŠUM-nâq or similar.

iv.6'—15': fragmentary names include Ašur-matu-taqquin, Bel-duri, Adad-belu-usur; summarized: "[Total x], Adallal"

iv.16'—17': contents of these lines cannot be reconstructed.

iv.18'—22': probably 4 fragmentary names: summarized "[Total x], Ninurta-našir".

iv.23'—24': "... šaknu-officials ..... ".

Unfortunately we cannot be certain to how much of the text this broken summary referred, a problem which is taken up in the commentary below.

Commentary

We have assumed that this is the reverse of the tablet because there is a total at the base of the left-hand column and none in the right-hand column; but the large blank space up to the end of the right-hand column suggests the opposite. The many large blank spaces and erasures suggest that this was a rough compilation, but it is not certain whether the blank spaces were left in expectation of additions which would be made before the clay dried (cf. comment on qurbu, ii.6'—13').
In all the sections of cols. ii and iii which are quite fully preserved, the same arrangement can be observed: a *rab urâte* is named, followed by one or more names, presumably of soldiers of lower rank, or simply by a note “x soldiers” (LU.E RIN.MEŠ, iii.3’, 9’); the section concludes with a total and the name of a superior officer.

There are significant connexions with No. 99 §§A and J, with three superior officers from each of those sections reappearing here: Nergal-šarru-ūṣur, Sin-na'id and Bel-duri from §A in col. iii, and Šamaš-ilaya, Nabu-šarru-ūṣur and Babilaya from §J in cols. ii-iii. Those from §J are certainly *mušarkisâni*, those from §A perhaps also (see on No. 99), although two of them (Nergal-šarru-ūṣur and Bel-duri) reappear in ND 2386+ as šaknûte ša ma’aṣsi. In some cases the identity is put quite beyond doubt because the superior officers have the same *rab urâte* as in No. 99. Despite its poor condition, the evidence of No. 101 is important because it establishes that the team-commanders working under the *mušarkisâni* had another rank beneath them.

In col. iv the pattern changes, with a number of men listed under a superior officer apparently without a *rab urâte*. Two names of superior officers are preserved: Adallal and Ninurta-naṣîr, neither of whom is attested elsewhere as a *mušarkisu* or as a *šaknu ša ma’aṣsi*. The damaged summary, iv.23’—24’, may be applicable to the whole tablet (if the face preserved is the reverse), to the preserved face only, or to a part of col. iv.

---

**No. 101**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plate 28</th>
<th>BM custody</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.0 × (12.0) × 2.4</td>
<td>ND 10004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE 50; east</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Obv. i

1. 1*aš-šur-[x]-PAP2 GAR-nu
2. 150 A[N]ŞE? GIŠ.GIGIR BE [(x)]
3. [(x)] 1*ku-al-ha-a-a pêt-hal qur-ub
4. [1*šum-mur-DINGIR
5. [1*x]-da-di
6. [1]*šag-ju-te
7. [1]*šir-ta-a-a GIR.2
8. [1]GAL-DINGIR.MEŠ
9. [1]PAP2
10. [1]DI-EN-
11. [1]HÉ.NUN-a-a [(x x)]
12. [1]EN.KASKAL-BAD
13. PAP 4 SAG.MEŠ
15. [1]*ša-ši-i
16. PAP 2
17. [1]ki-ši-ra-aš-šur GAL ki-ši-
18. ŠU 1*aš-šur-rém-ni GAR-nu

---
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Entry</th>
<th>Column Numbers</th>
<th>Language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>LÚ.GIS.GIGIR tah-ilp</td>
<td>107.i.8' 110.i.7'</td>
<td>ru²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1PAP-BÁD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>1LUGAL-30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>1D-a-a-ši-id-qi</td>
<td>99.ii.3 104.A.ii.8' 108.iii.9²</td>
<td>rr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>1DUTU-I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>1sa-par-šu NU³</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>[H]E.NUN-a-a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>[PAP] 6 'X x ( )¹</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>[1PAP]²-di-kir [( )]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>[1X x]-na-a-a [( )]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>[1X x]-a²-ru [( )]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>[( )] 'X [( )]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(remainder of column broken)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Entry</th>
<th>Column Numbers</th>
<th>Language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ii</td>
<td>(blank)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>na-bi-e²[() ( )]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1PAP-BÁD</td>
<td>107.i.8' 110.i.7'</td>
<td>ru²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1DINGIR-id-ri</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1al-ra-x [(x)]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>PAP 4 1aš-šar-M[AN²-PAP²]</td>
<td>99.iv.25 102.i.6' 103.rev.ii.10</td>
<td>rr šm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1dUTU-DÜ-PAP.MEŠ</td>
<td>99.ii.5</td>
<td>ru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>ŠU 1EN-IGI-ni</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1muše-zib-šO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1lu-ti-²l</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1aš-šur-M[AN¹-x]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>PAP 3 ŠU 1M[AN-x (x)]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Entry</th>
<th>Column Numbers</th>
<th>Language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>LÚ.GAL u-[rat]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1qur-di-DINGIR.[MEŠ(-ni)]²</td>
<td>102.ii.20³</td>
<td>rk aram</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1AD-SU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>1dPA-še-zib</td>
<td>99.iv.24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>1URI-a-a</td>
<td>107.i.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>1S-ÅS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>1DUMU.U[S-]a-a</td>
<td>99.iv.1 102.ii.25⁻</td>
<td>rk aram</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1mu-x [(x)] x-xšu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>1MAN-[ ]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>[1X x ]-a-a</td>
<td>107.i.22⁻ 108.ii.9</td>
<td>rk aram</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>1d[x]-lg-bi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>1SUH[UŠ²]-PAP.MEŠ</td>
<td>108.ii.18</td>
<td>rk arbil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>1qur-[di-d]š]-IGI</td>
<td>108.ii.20 110.iii.10⁻</td>
<td>rk arbil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>[na-(an-) ]-ni-i</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>[(x) x] GAL ki-šir</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>[x] GAL.SAG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>[1]SUH[UŠ]-aš-šur</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>[1]PAP-KAM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>[1]ša²-ah-di-e²</td>
<td>99.ii.7 108.iii.14</td>
<td>ru</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
32 \[ \text{x hi x} \]

(remainder of column broken)

iii 1 [ ]

2 \[1^1\text{kur-i-r}\text{r}\text{r}^3\text{-A[PIN]} \]

3 PAP 5 \text{1MAN-IGI-ni} 99.iv.16 \text{ru šm}

4 \text{1A-KAM}

5 \text{aš-šur-rēm-ni}

6 \text{1EN-iq-bi} 99.iv.15 \text{ru}

7 \text{1man-nu-SUM-PAP.MEŠ} 99.iv.16 \text{ru}

8 \text{1ĒRIN.MEŠ-SIG} 108.v.43

9 PAP 5 \text{1man-nu-GIM-NINA} 107.i.11', 13'

10 \text{1AŠ-PAP}

11 \text{1PAP-DINGIR-a-a} 99.i.8 \text{rr}

12 \text{1UTU-DIB-ni}

13 \text{sa-x-‘i}

14 PAP 4 \text{14MAŠ-MAN-DŪ}

15—17 (3 lines erased)

18 \text{ha-am-ba-si ‘‘}

19 \text{x x x x (x)}

20 [ ]

21 \text{1PAP-BAD GAL u-r[al?]} (3 lines erased)

22 \text{SU 1AŠ-aš-šur}

23 \text{šag-lu-īe}

24 LŪ.GAL.SA[G (x)]

25 \text{ku-r}^\text{um}^3 \text{[x x (x x)]}

(remainder of column broken)

iv (2 or 3 lines broken)

1' \text{PAP 3 x[} 99.iii.7 \text{rr muš}

2' \text{1NU-PAP.MEŠ-f[β( )]}

3' \text{ISUHUS-KASKAL [ ]} 99.iv.5; 103.i.20; 108.v.23' \text{rr muš}

4' \text{1aš-šur-PAP-ir ‘‘ [( )]} 99.iv.6: 103.i.21; 108.v.24' \text{rr muš}

5' \text{1.0MAŠ-I ‘[‘}}

6' \text{PAP 4 [ ]}

7' \text{ku-um [ ]}

8' \text{1PAP-u-a-S[U^β( )]} 108.iii.3^2

9’ \text{1tab}^?_.ni-\{}

10' PAP 3 x[}

11' \text{1aš-šur-DI-P[AP^β(MEŠ)}

12' \text{GAL.SAG [( )]}

13' \text{1.0PA-še-zib-a-ni [( )]}

14' \text{1qu-u-a-a'[} 99.i.21; 108.iii.3' \text{rr}

15' \text{1aš-šur-MU-LAL}

16' \text{1.0UTU-I}

17' \text{1hu-zī-ri-i} 99.ii.1 \text{rr}

18' \text{1.0UTU-I} 99.ii.3; 104.ii'.8' \text{rr}

19' \text{1hu-zī-ri-i} 99.i.19; 108.ii.49' \text{rr}
18'—24' (traces only of these lines)
(remainder of Obv. broken)

Rev. (columns v and vi entirely broken)

vii (upper part broken)

1' \[ \[x\text{ si}^2 \]
2' \[1\text{ (x)-} an-du-su\]
3' \[\text{[}\text{}\text{j}^2\text{-ši}^3\]
4' \[\text{[}\text{si}^2 \text{x}\]
5' \[\text{[}\]
6' \[\text{[}\]
7' \[(\text{[}\text{ }\text{]}\text{ }\text{S}u^1\text{[}\text{b]}^\text{\text{b}}-\text{e}^2\text{[}\text{ }\text{]}
8' \text{man-ni-i }``
9' \[\text{[}\text{KAM-\text{u-a}}

viii (upper part broken; then traces of 3 lines, and below this the column is blank for 7.2 cm. above the base)

Translation and Notes

i.1—2: the translation of these lines depends on doubtful points in i.2, the signs of which have been collated several times. JNP would translate “Aššur-[x]-uṣur? the šakmu official of the left (for) horses (for) chariots (and) cavalry”, on the assumption that the first sign is 150 = šumētu (Borger, AOAT 33, No. 578a), rather than a number written in the normal way as 1 Me 50. For the division of the army into left and right, cf. No. 108.i.7—8, but note that a different logogram is used there for “left”. Unfortunately the ANŠE sign is very uncertain, and is not used elsewhere in these texts for “horses”. At the end of the line JNP would read pet-[hal], but BE-[q₁] or SUMUN/US could equally well be considered (cf. Nos. 110.i.13 and iii.rev.2).

i.3—5a: “Kalhaya₂(of) the cavalry qurubtu-bodyguard; x-ili ditto; x-dadi ditto, taken out; [Total 3(?)]”.

The PN in i.3 is very doubtful, since the tablet appears to have 1U-a-a as copied; for a LÜ.GAL.GAL named Kalhaya see No. 99.i.7. qur-ab is presumably an abbreviation for (pēthal) qurubtu, and should not be confused with qurbu “present” (see i.14) or the official ša qurbūtu. In i.5 the E was added later in very small script; for an interpretation as a form of šēstu see on No. iii.6’. Line i.5a has been inserted by the editors belatedly by comparison with i.13 and 16, and accounts for the apparent blank space after i.5.

i.6: while the word sagliite is clear, the correct restoration of the beginning of the line is very difficult. It is impossible to determine whether it refers back to the preceding lines or forward, perhaps to the men named in i.7—8. The same problem occurs in i.19. For sagliite, conventionally translated “deportees”, see following commentary.

i.7—8a: “Birtaya the gīr.2 (officer); Ibašši-ili ditto; [Total 2]”.

GIR.2 is presumably an abbreviation for ša šēpē (on which see above p.39). For the possible insertion of i.8a cf. on i.5a, and note that i.13 totals only the preceding four names.

i.9—13: “PN [ ]; PN [ ]; Nuhšaya [ ]; Bel-Harran-duri ditto; total 4 eunuchs”.

i.9: at the end of the line we should probably restore some kind of official title (ending in Mēš), which would be resumed by the “ditto” in i.12 and probably by “ditto” in i.10 and 11 too.

i.10: read possibly Šalmu-Bel(-lašme), a name which recurs as a rab urate in No. 99.iii.2.

i.13: we translate LÜ SAG as “eunuch”, although there are recently expressed doubts that this is correct (e.g. G. van Driel, Bi. Or. 38 (1981) 270; M. Stolper, BASOR 239 (1980) 80; W. von Soden, AHw. s.v. rešu
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i.14—16: “Bel-abu-uṣur the mušarkisu, present; Şaši ditto, not (present); total 2 (mušarkisānī)”.

That qurbu here means “present” as also proposed for No. 100.ii.11’, seems indicated by the NU “not” added to the next line, also in smaller script. We assume that mu-KEŠDA or mu-šar is a syllabic or semi­logographic abbreviation for mušarkisu.

i.17—19: “Kišir-Aššur the rab kṣirī-captain, hand of Aššur-remeni the šaknu-official (in charge of?) tahlipu-charioteers”.

A significant problem is whether i.19 belongs with šaknu or is a heading to the lines which follow, for there is no ruling to help. On the other hand, if šaknu in i.1 connects directly with i.2, we might expect šaknu in i.18 to behave in the same way; there are no graphic objections to this solution, which is followed in the translation. On the other hand, it is possible by comparison with ii.13 that LU.GIS.GIGIR tab-li:p is the heading for a new section like rab urāte there. Unfortunately these doubts affect our interpretation of similar entries in No. 108.i.12 and No.110.i.6.

i.18: SMD provisionally follows K. Deller in making a distinction between rēm-ni for remēnī (stative of remēnu), and rē-m-a-ni for rēmānī (imperative with 1st pers. sing. suffix), with the reservations that no spelling *re-me-ni is yet attested, and rēm-ni may be used as an abbreviation for rēmānī, cf. še-zib-ni for šēšibanni, No. 17:11 with No. 22:2. Thus two important officers, Aššur-remēnī and Aššur-rēmānī (who never occur in the same text) could be the same person. If No. 86 rev. numbers horses in Sargon’s reign, Aššur-rēmēnī there may be the same person.

i.20—26: “Ahi-duri; Šarru-Sin; Aya-ṣidqi; Šamaš-na’id; Saparšu, not (present); Nuḫšāya; total, 6 ....”.

i.20: same person may recur in a similar position in No. 110.i.7.

i.26: possibly 6 ki ME(8) x̱ with ki as an abbreviation for kṣirī (cf. FNALD No. 7:28); or G[IR].2 x̱. But neither of these is entirely supported by the traces.

i.27—30: four broken PNs followed by a break.

ii.1—6: “(...) Nabe; Ahi-duri; Ili-idri; Alra-x; total 4, Aššur-ša[ruru-uṣ]ur(?).”

Presumably the scribe could equally well have added ŠU before the name of the superior officer, as he does in ii.8 and 12.

ii.7—12: “Šamaš-bani-ahhe, hand of Bel-emuranni. Mušeziġ-Marduḳ; Luti’; Aššur­MAN-[x]; total 3, hand of ....”.

ii.11: the PN could be Aššur-shirtsanī as in No. 107.i.12’ (in a unit of the royal bodyguard).

ii.13—26: “Rab urāte-officers: Qurdi-ilani; Abu-eriba; Nābu-šeziġ; Akkadaya; Ištar­apl[u-iddina; Aplaya; Mu...šu; MAN-x; ...aya; [x]-iqbi: Ubru'-ahhe; Qurdi-Ištar-lamur; [Nan]ni”.

This section appears to include officers from the Aramean and Arbil units.

ii.19: Aplaya: occurs with Nergal-šarru-uṣur in ADD 1248; probably became taššīša ša mār šarrī (ARU 38, dated 694 B.C.), and bought an URU ištā (“tower”) with land and people in ARU 96 (dated 698 B.C.). Also in Nos. 107.i.22; 108.ii.9; and perhaps the person in NL 39 (see Iraq 35 (1973) p. 24).

ii.27—28: “[Total 13(?)] rab kṣirī-captains [of(?)] the chief eunuch”.

Again there is uncertainty whether this is the summary of what precedes, or a fresh heading; the translation assumes that it is a summary, and that these rab kṣirī-captains are a sub-group of the rab urāte. It is certain from Nos. 99 and 102 that rab urāte could also be rab kṣirī, and from Nos. 108 and 110 that Ubru-ahhe, Qurdi-Ištar-lamur and Nanni were in the service of the chief eunuch.
ii.29—32: “Ubru-Aššur; Ahi-ereš; Mahde; ...”. (remainder broken).

iii.1—9: “(four names lost); Kur’e-ereš(?); total 5, Šarru-emuranni. Aplu-ereš; Aššur-remeni; Bel-iqbi; Mannu-iddina-ahhe; Šabu-damqu; total 5, Mannu-ki-Ninua”.

Bel-iqbi and Mannu-iddina-ahhe recur in No. 99 as rab urâte, although under Šarru-emuranni, and it is therefore likely that this section, and by analogy the rest of the column down to iii.14, belong under the general heading LU.GAL ur-[rat] in ii.13. The superior officers in this section were probably šaknûte ša ma’assi: Šarru-emuranni must have this post in No. 99.iv.16, and although Mannu-ki-Ninua is only attested in a different capacity (see below), not only Bel-iqbi and Mannu-iddina-ahhe but also Šabu-damqu recur elsewhere in units commanded by a šaknu ša ma’assi (Nos. 99 §6; 108.v.49), as does Kur’e-ereš if rightly restored here.

iii.9: it is possible that Mannu-ki-Ninua, identified as the governor of Harhar by Parpola (see OAC XVII, Chart 3), is distinct from the superior officer of this text and perhaps of No. 107; in any case, if not both, must be the writer of ABL 127, a letter to Sargon about horse personnel (cf. TCAE p. 256). It may be misleading to group ABL 127 with the other letters of Mannu-ki-Ninua.

iii.10—14: “Iddin-ahi; Ahí-ilaya; Šamaš-šabtanni; Sasi(?); total 4, Ninurta-šarru-ibni”.

iii.18—23: “Hambasi, ditto; [PN]; [......]; Ahi-duri, the rab urâte-commander of teams, hand of Iddin-Aššur; deportees”.

iii.20: this lost line could either be restored simply as a fourth PN under Iddin-Aššur, or as [PAP 2] STU PN, giving two persons under an unknown officer and one under Ahí-duri.

iii.23: the space after this line, and the double ruling before the next, make it certain that šagâtûte refers back, at least as far as iii.18.

iii.24—25: “Chief eunuch, instead of (?) ...”. The double ruling must indicate that this is the heading of a new section, not a summary; for kâm cf. iv.7, although there too the implications are unknown.

iv.1’: (three names lost) “Total 3, [PN]”.

iv.2’—6’: “Šalmu-ahhuti, [...] Ubru-Harran, [...] Aššur-našîr, ditto; Ninurta-na’id, [ditto]; total 4, [PN(?)]”. Three at least of these men were mušarkisu-officials, but there is probably not room to restore this title at the end of iv.6; perhaps the end of the line was blank (cf. i.16).

iv.5’: Ninurta-na’id: probably the man who sold at least eight plots of land in ADD 1185, his neighbours including Kurilaya (LU.GAL.GAL in No. 99.i.23), Nergal-šarru-ušur (LU.GAL.GAL in No. 99.i.6) and Mannu-ki-Adad (rk arrap).

iv.7’—10’: “(a man) instead of [PN]; Ahua-eriba (...); Tabni?-[x (....)]; total 3 [...]”.

There is a possible connexion here with the Arrapha unit as listed in No. 108.ii, if we accept Ahua-eriba as a variant form or writing of Ahua-eriba.

iv.10’: here there was certainly something written after 3, and not a personal name, but the trace cannot be confidently restored.

iv.11’—12’: “Aššur-šallim-ahhe(?), chief eunuch(?).” It is very doubtful whether these lines imply that the chief eunuch of Sargon was himself Aššur-šallim-ahhe: he would not normally be mentioned by his own name in an administrative context, merely by his title, and it is possible to see GAL SAG as a heading unconnected with Aššur-šallim-ahhe, or to restore some other title (e.g. GAL šag-[la-te]). See also the discussion of two Aramaic tablets from Aššur, in which one Aššur-šallim-ahhe is the creditor (p.46).

iv.13’—17’: “Nabu-šezi-banni; Guaya; Aššur-šumu-taqqin; Šamaš-na’id; Huziri; ......”.

vii-viii: too broken for translation.
K. Deller suggests 1ha-an-du-su; if so, note the mušarkisu called 1ha-an-da-sa-nu in ADD 855 (now dated to Sargon’s reign, see p.43), and 1ho-da-so-ru in ND 2788:27 (TCAE p.398), almost certainly the same man, may be an alternative form of the same name.

vii.7: 1kās-bi-ia²: it is possible that the same man, read 1bi-bi-ia, occurs in No. 99.i.11 as a chief officer, and that this name should there be read 1kās-bi-ia.

**Commentary**

This is a list of men grouped under superior officers. They are presumed to be connected with horses, i.e. to belong to cavalry and chariots, because some of them occur in other horse lists, even though horses are not mentioned or numbered. The text was probably written at the time of a muster, for it is a rough list with terms such as: “taken out”, “present”, “not (present)” added to the names. There is no specific internal evidence for dating, but similarities with No. 108 in particular suggest that this too was a muster list connected with the Babylonian campaigns of 710—708 B.C.

**Composition of the list.** Despite several connexions with Nos. 99, 102, 103, 108 and 110 the order of the units is not always clear, largely because the absence of the usual rulings makes it difficult for us to determine where one section ends and the next begins. Using the internal evidence of the text and comparisons with others, it is possible to suggest the following broad divisions of the list:

- Miscellaneous officials (royal unit?)
  - LU.GI.i.GIGIR tahlip
  - rab urāte
    - including: aramaya
    - arbilaya
  - Miscellaneous unclear entries
    - mušarkisāni
   - Section of Šamaš-emuranni

There are of course serious breaks, even on the obverse of the tablet, and the parallelism with the other lists is not close enough to enable a confident reconstruction. Thus for example several of the rab urāte in col. ii reappear in the “city units” under the chief eunuch’s command in Nos. 108 and 110, where they are clearly identified as rab kisri; but there is not enough space at the bottom of col. ii to accommodate the other “city units” before iii.1, where we appear to have rab urāte under the šaknūte ša ma’assī, who do not seem to be under the command of the chief eunuch on other occasions. These inconsistencies may reasonably be attributed to the circumstances under which which the tablet was written.

This text shows that the word “deportees” can stand for equestrian officers. The unit of deportees is discussed above, p.37.
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No. 102

(15) × (24) × (4)
NE 50; west

i

(upper part of column broken)

1' [ ]-tù
2' [ ] E[N̄]-KAL
3' [ ] ME-MU-GIš.MEŠ↑
4' [ ] a-lik-pa-ni
5' [ ] aš}s]ur-1
6' [ ] aš}s]ur-MAN-PAP

7' [ ] X.MEŠ
8' [ ] KUR?].MEŠ 15 ku-din
9' [ ] .allocate MAN
10' [ ] MEŠ
11' [ ] GIR.2

(about five lines broken)

ii

(5 or 6 lines broken)

1' [x ] X MU-BU
2' [x ] 1.d[x].DI-PAP.MEŠ
3' [x ] 1.lu-na-te-e
4' [x ] 1.d.U.GUR-MU-AS
5' [x ] 1.PAP-la-maš-si
6' [PAP X L]U.GAL ki-šir- MEŠ
7' [ ] 1š]-šur-a-a
8' [x ] 1.U-ka-šir
9' [x ] 1.b]a'-a'-di-DINGIR
10' [x ] 1.DINGIR]-ka-bar
11' [x ] 1.man-ŋu]-ki-U
12' [x ] 1.s]u-un-ba-a-a

99.iv.19 ru
99.iv.25; 101.ii.6; 103.rev.ii.10 šm
99.iv.14 ru
108.ii.1?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13'</td>
<td>[x 1 x (x) ] -SU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14'</td>
<td>4 PAP-A-[x]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15'</td>
<td>2(^\d) ba-a-a-ša[-x (x)]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16'</td>
<td>4 PA-NUMUN-BA-ša</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17'</td>
<td>8 HAR-ma-ku</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18'</td>
<td>PAP 53 LÜ.GAL ki-šir(_m)es</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19'</td>
<td>urarrap-ha-a-a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20'</td>
<td>3 qur-di-DINGIR.MEŠ-ni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21'</td>
<td>aš-šur-A-AS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22'</td>
<td>3 ma-TAR-x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23'</td>
<td>4 kab-ti-i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24'</td>
<td>4 dUTU-PAP-ir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25'</td>
<td>[x 1]RI-a-a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26'</td>
<td>[x ] bur-a-tar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27'</td>
<td>[PAP x] LÜ.GAL ki-šir(_m)es</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28'</td>
<td>[ ar-ma-a-a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### iii (probably 1 line broken)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1'</td>
<td>[x 1] x ma [</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2'</td>
<td>4 si-i'-ramu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3'</td>
<td>4 ku-baba(KA)-su-ri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4'</td>
<td>5 ú-ar-[k]a-za</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5'</td>
<td>3 ha-bi-i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6'</td>
<td>5 ha-ma-qa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7'</td>
<td>5 U.GUR-PAP-PA[P]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8'</td>
<td>[x] 1U-al-tu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9'</td>
<td>[1? 1] si-i'[q(_a)]-tar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10'</td>
<td>6 [PA-SUM-Š[E]Š].MEŠ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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11' PAP 45 LÚ.GAL k[iš]i[ru]meš
12' uru-ar-[z]u-[i]-na-a-a

13' 5 \(1\)aš-šur-EN-LAL-in
14' 3 \(1d\)[x]-U-PAP
15' 4 \(1\)[x]-MU
16' 1 \(1\)[u]-d\(u\)
17' 8 \(1\)[SUHUŠ]-15
18' 2 \(1\)[gur]-di-15-IGI
19' 3' \(1\)[su]-ku-mu
20' PAP 26 LÚ.GAL ki-ši[ru]meš
21' uru-arba-il-a-a

22' 10 LÚ.GAL É
23' [x] LÚ.GAL ša-gu-te
24' PAP 2 ME 38 LÚ.GAL SAG

25' 4 \(1d\)[TUKUL-KAM-eš]\(1\)
26' uru-arba-il-a-a
26a' šal-lum-tú SUM-an
27' 7 \(1\)[GIR.2-MAN]
27a' šal-lum-tú SUM\(2\)-an\(2\)
28' – \(1d\)[TUKUL-KAM-eš]\(1\)
29' DUMU \(1\)[BA]-šá,\(d\)[IM]
29a' ǔ-sa-lim
30' 4 \(1\)[na]-mu-su
30a' šal-lum-tú SUM-an
31' – \(1\)[SUHUŠ]-urušA.UR[U]
31a' ǔ-sa-[\(\imath\)-im]

iv (about 3 lines broken)

1' 2 [ ]
2' 9 [ ]
3' 17 [ ]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4'</td>
<td>8² 1 [ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5'</td>
<td>15 1U-[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6'</td>
<td>40 1.d[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6a'</td>
<td>1IR-[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7'</td>
<td>11 1.d[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8'</td>
<td>33 1EN-M[U]²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9'</td>
<td>PAP 1 ME 48 E LÜ x[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10'</td>
<td>18 1EN-la-[mar?]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11'</td>
<td>9 1EN-ZI⁻²⁻¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12'</td>
<td>23³ 1gu-x[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13'</td>
<td>8 1.d)[TU]²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14'</td>
<td>23 1[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15'</td>
<td>16[(+x)]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16'–17'</td>
<td>(broken)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18'</td>
<td>10[(+x)]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19'</td>
<td>16[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20'</td>
<td>[PAP] 1 ME 56 1.d)x[</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21'</td>
<td>[(x+)]4 1.d)MA[8]²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22'</td>
<td>30 1ku-[</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23'</td>
<td>18 1b'[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24'</td>
<td>30 [</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25'</td>
<td>20 [</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(remaining 2² lines broken)*
*(other face entirely broken)*

**Translation and Notes**

i.3'–9': "... [x], PN; [x], -alik-pani; [x], Aššur-na'id; [x], Aššur-šarru-usur; ..... horses, 15 mules, ..... king's house(?)".

i.3': K. Deller suggests reading this name Gula-šumu-lešir, ignoring the MEŠ as perhaps insufficiently erased.

i.4': possibly restore [Nergal]-alik-pani, eponym for 711 B.C., or [Aššur]-alik-pani, author of ABL 783-8.

i.5': alternatively ¹[IM]-741 (Amurrú-na'id); neither name has been identified from other records of this period.
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i.6': see note on No. 99.iv.25.

1.7: conceivably restore: ... EN GIŠ.GIGIR.MEŠ (see below).

i.8’–9’: these two lines may summarise what went before; possibly we should restore LÜ.GAL] E MAN “the
king’s rab bēti” (see note on iii.22’ for the rab bēti under the chief eunuch). Alternatively, although the phrase
bēti šarru is not known to us from elsewhere, it is apparent that E in Neo-Assyrian may refer to a military
establishment without implying a fixed building at all, when E is followed by the name of a high official or a
member of the royal family. Cf. LÜ turtum E šumēli (Lie, Sargron, p. 72:10) and LÜ turtūn(E?) in ND
2386+i.4’ as well as iv.9’ below, all purely military contexts. It is possible that E DUMU.MAN and E MI E.GAL
may sometimes have this specific meaning (see p.41), which is not pinpointed in CAD or AHw.

i.10’–11’: no certain restoration of these lines is possible but for GİR.2 (ša ūpu) see Nos. 107.i.14’;
108A.i.6’; and 111.3’, which suggests the possibility of restoring GAB).MES in i.10’ here, and so enhancing the
parallelism with the sections which precede the “city units” in these other texts.

ii.1’–7’: “x, PN; x PN, [x], ...-šallim-ahhe; [x], Lunate(?) [x], Nergal-šumu-iddin; [x],
Ahi-lammāšš. [Total x], rab kisri-officers, Assyrian”.

Here and below it is not certain whether the gentilics apply to the rab kisri-officers themselves, or to the
men whom they command.

ii.8’–19’: “[x], Adad-kašir; [x], Ba’di-īli(?) [x], Illi-kabar; [x], Mannu-ki-Adad(?); [x],
Sunbayā; [x], ...-eriba; 4, Ahī... 2, Bayasa-...; 4, Nabu-zeri-iqīša; 8, Harmaku; total 53,
rab kisri-officers, of Arrapha”.

ii.20’–28’: “3, Qurdi-ilani; 0, Aššur-aplu-iddin; 3, Ma-... 4, Kabti; 4, Šamaš-našir; [x],
Akkadaya; [x], Bur-Atar; total x, rab kisri-officers, Aramaean”.

ii.23’: Kabti is an Aramaean rab kisri here, but a Chaldean rab kisri in No. 108.iii.30; but the two terms
Aramaya and Kaldaya occur together in No. 108, which shows that there are two men named Kabti in these
texts, and confirms the distinction maintained by Brinkman, PKB 260–85 and Or NS 64 (1977) 306 and 309
against Dietrich, AOAT 7 (1970) passim, that Aramaeans and Chaldeans were terms for two different ethnic
groups at this period.

iii.2’–12’: “4, Si’-ramu; 4, Kubaba-suri; 5, Uarkanaza; 3, Babī; 5, Hamaqa; 5, Nergal-
ahu-uur; [x], Adad-altu; 1’, Si’-qatar’; 6, Nabu-nadin-ahhe; total 45, rab kisri-officers, of
Arzuhina”.

iii.7’: Nergal-ahu-uur: may be the GAL 50 ša [ ] of ARU 357, dated 699 B.C.

iii.13’–21’: “5, Aššur-belu-taqquin; 3, ...-belu-ušur; 4, ...-MU; 1, Urdu; 8, Ubru-Istar; 2,
Qurdi-Istar-lamur; 3, Šukumu; total 26, rab kisri-officers, of Arbīl”.

iii.22’–24’: “10, rab bēti-official; [x], chief of deportees; total 238, the chief eunuch”.

iii.22: this is the only occurrence of this official in the Horse Lists as preserved (though cf. i.9’). It may be
right to connect E in his title with the meaning suggested above in the note to i.8’–9’. For the role of the
rab bēti as a second in command of the military establishment of a provincial governor or other high official, see
e.g. ND 2631:28–9 (cf. TCAE p. 384); Iraq 35 (1974) 3115; GPA No. 17:36 (rab bēti of the chief eunuch,
dated 783 B.C.); and the Sargon letter ABL 242 in which the rab bēti is responsible for striking camp.

iii.23’: for the šaglāte see p.37.

iii.25’–31a’: “4, Kakku-eres of Arbīl—will give complete repayment; 7, Šepe-šarri—
will give complete repayment; 0, Kakku-eres son of Iqīša-Adad—has completed; 4,
Nanusu—will give complete repayment; 0, Ubru-Libbi-ali—has completed”.

This was presumably a section devoted to musarkišāti: one or the other of the two Kakku-eres must be the
man who is listed in No. 103.i.16 as a musarkiša ša GIŠ.GIGIR.E.GAL, and although none of the others
certainly reappears in our texts, Nanusu and Ubru-Aššur are known from ND 2386+ as musarkišāti ša
pethal qurubte attached to Arzuhina. It seems fair to assume that the others mentioned in this section also have the rank of mušarkisnu.

iii.26a'-31a': these small subsidiary lines are subsequent additions. The zero figure before both usallim entries shows that where numbers do occur in this section, they may refer to equids not yet supplied. See note on No. 103.iii.3 for possible ways to interpret šallumu and its derivatives in these lines.

iv.1'-9': broken section totalled as "Total 148, 'house' of the ...-official'.

See above on i.9' for the use of š.

iv.10'-20': a similar section with a total of 156 animals.

iv.21'-25': beginning of another section including at least another 145 animals.

Commentary

Date. Two of the mušarkisnu in this text are named together in ND 2386+, assigned to 711 B.C. (see note on iii.25'-31a'). This gives an approximate date around 711 B.C. for our tablet, and a clear connexion between tablets found in the administrative wing of the NW Palace, which mostly date between 719 and 707 B.C. (see Parker, Iraq 23 (1961) 15 n.4, but note ND 2612 from 735 B.C.), and the Horse Lists from Fort Shalmaneser.

Composition of the list. The first surviving portion of the text, i.1'-9', contains personal names of officials who cannot be firmly identified but may have belonged to the king's household (see note on 8'-9'). Line 8' makes it clear that the names were preceded by numbers, referring to horses and mules. The space before i.8' suggests that this was the sub-total at the end of a section.

This is followed almost immediately by a mention of a bodyguard (ša šēpē). Whether this belongs more closely with what precedes it or with the chief eunuch's command which follows is a problem which is met in No. 108 as well. In this case the arithmetic of the chief eunuch's section, as set out below, favours including the ša šēpē and the entry in i.10' in it, but not conclusively. After the break of about 10 or 11 lines at the base of col. i and the top of col. ii, ii.1' to iii.21' lists numbers of horses with named rab kipri-captains, grouped as units from cities or specific groups within the Assyrian homeland: Aššur, Arrapha, Aramaeans, Arzuhina and Arbil. In iii.22'-24' we have two further entries under single officials, and a grand total of horses (no mules) under the command of the chief eunuch.

The figures may be summarized as follows:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aššur unit</td>
<td>[x]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrapha unit</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aramaean unit</td>
<td>[x]+14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arzuhina unit</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arbil unit</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rab bēti</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rab šaglûte</td>
<td>[x]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[Total: 148 + c.65 = c.213\]

[Note: the Assyrian contingent is elsewhere the largest, so that 50 may be an underestimate; in the Aramaean unit figures for 2 captains are missing, the rest of the unit has an average of just under 3 each; the figure for the rab šaglûte is a pure guess.]

Despite all the uncertainties, this summary makes it clear that although the further 25 animals needed to reach a total of 238 could, and probably in part should, come from an
increase in the numbers assigned to the Aššur unit, it is also perfectly possible that the entries in i.10'—11' were included in the rab ša reše's total. Equally, it emerges as very unlikely that the animals listed before i.10' are included.

After the chief eunuch's contingent the text lists some mušarkisāni, although we do not know their specific responsibility (see note on iii.25'—31a'). Their position within the text is roughly comparable with Nos. 99 and especially 101. If the section ends with the column, and does not spread over on to col. iv, only five mušarkisāni are listed. The names indicate that not all the mušarkisāni of c. 711—709 B.C. are listed in No. 99, and their placing within the text confirms that they were not dependent on the chief eunuch.

According to the order followed in other lists, it is likely that the remainder of the text listed some "provincial units", but the text is too fragmentary for certainty.

Purpose and relationship to other lists. Unlike Nos. 99—101, this is a list of animals, especially horses but also mules. Being a 4-column tablet it is comparable in format to No. 108 and perhaps Nos. 109—110, and like them it records at least four major divisions of the army: a small body of special troops probably attached to the royal household, the command of the chief eunuch, some mušarkisāni, who as usual appear to function independently, and a body of other troops arranged under various high officials. The broad arrangement of the entries is similar to that in other tablets, but there are also differences, such as in the number and position of the mušarkisāni, and the inclusion of a E L.U.x[. These differences suggest that No. 102 need not be very close in time to any of the other lists, and this is perhaps supported by the relative infrequency of prosopographic connexions with them.

No. 103

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. 103</th>
<th>NWL, Plate 53 (coll.)</th>
<th>ND 10001</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.5 × 15.5</td>
<td>NE 50; east</td>
<td>BM custody</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Obv. (traces only of Col. iii; only the final line of the obverse can be deciphered, partly written round on to the right edge: LÚ mu-š[a]r-kišmēg Gitt.GIT.GIR gw-r-ub-te).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rev.i</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>bi-su-ni</td>
<td>99.iii.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>ga-ba-si</td>
<td>99.iii.10???</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>za-[za²-k]μ?</td>
<td>99.iii.16??</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>ȘU.2.DINGIR-šabn-[b]μ</td>
<td>99.iii.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.d.a-a-š-ra-μ</td>
<td>99.iii.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.GI-aš-sur-la-mur</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.d.PA-PAP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I96</td>
<td>THE TABLETS FROM FORT SHALMANESER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1KĀ.DINGIR-a-a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>uruTAR.NINA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>99.iii.21 or 26 rr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1si-LAM-TAR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>99.iii.22? rr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1dUTU-DINGIR-a-a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>99.iii.23 rr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1EN-PAP.MEŠ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>99.iii.24 rr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1[sa³]-ral'ti-R.DINGIR²²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>99.iii.12? rr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1KĀ.DINGIR³-[a]-a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>uruarrap-ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>99.iii.26 rr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1dTUKUL-APIN-eš</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>99.iv.2; 108.v.20” rr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1dPA-EN-MU.MEŠ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>99.iv.3; 108.v.21” rr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1dUTU-BA-šá</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>99.iv.4; 108.v.22” rr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1dMAŠ-AD-PAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>99.iv.5; 101.iv.3”; 108.v.23” rr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1SUHUŠ-KASKAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>99.iv.6; 101.iv.4”; 108.v.24” rr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1aš-šur-PAP-ir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>99.iv.7; 108.v.25” rr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1DUG.GA-IM-aš-šur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>99.iv.8; 108.v.26” rr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>12²</td>
<td>1[š³-me³]-DINGIR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>99.iv.12 rr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>112? 1 x x x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>PAP 3 ME 73 KUR.MEŠ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>10mu-šar-kišmeš</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>ša GIS.GIGIR E.GAL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1dUTU-[ak]-lak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>99.iv.12 rr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>NU</td>
<td>1U.GUR-MAN-PAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>1da-i-šu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1 ME 54 1aš-šur-MAN-PAP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>99.iv.25 rr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>PAP 2 ME 37 KUR.MEŠ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1šak-nu-te</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>[(ša)] ma-‘a-si</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>PAP 2 lim 7 ME 46 KUR.MEŠ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>2 ku-din ša GIS.NÁ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>1 &quot; ša GIS.NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ša GIS.ki-ba-ni</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Translation and Notes

Obv.: "[Total ...], the mušarkisišāni of the qurubtu-chariotry".
This line must have totalled a number of horses in the charge of individual mušarkisu-officials in the same way as in Rev.i-ii. Cf. ND 2386+.i.16-i.17 LÚ mušarkis MES ta pethal qurubtuššaš.[1]


Rev.i.2: collated for ḫa-ba-ri without success; nevertheless perhaps to be identified with ḫa-ba-ru in No. 99.iii.10.

.i.3: collation confirmed the possibility of this reading.

Rev.i.6: Pani-Aššur-lamur may be the šaršu (= LÚ SAG) of Sargon whose seal was found at Khorsabad, published by Sprengling (AJSL 49 (1932) pp. 53-56), if this corrected reading of the name is right (see Millard, Iraq 45 (1983) 103). See also p.38 note 68.

Rev.i.8-9: there are two mušarkisišni named Babilaya in No. 99 and in ADD 855; here they are distinguished by their origin. See the list of mušarkisu-officials, pp.29f. For a place muš-šar-ru-ru see ND 2791:1.

Rev.ii.4-6: "Total 373 horses, mušarkisu-officials of the palace chariotry".

Rev.ii.7-10: "36 Šamaš-takla; 0 Nergal-šarru-usur; 47 Dašu; 134 Aššur-šarru-usur".

Rev.ii.8: for Nergal-šarru-usur see note on No. 99.i.6.

Rev.ii.9: ḫa-ba-ri: possibly to be identified with ḫa-ba-ša-nu the nasīkku-ruler of Lahiru (LIE, Sargon p.52 line 1), whose allegiance Sargon won in 710 B.C., along with many horses and mules; for a possible connexion of Lahiru with the Aramaean "city unit" see p.36. For similar versions of names, cf. zabdiš-zabdišu and handasiš/handaši/handašamu.
ii.10: for Assur-sarru-usur see note on No. 99.iv.25.

Two of these four names correspond to two of the LÚ.GAL.ME₃ of No. 99 §§K-N.

ii.11—13: “Total 237 horses, šaknu-officials of the ma’assu-stables”.

Note that in ND 2386+ the same number of men, four, is found as šaknûte ša pethal ma’assî, including a Nergal-sarru-usur. Therefore šaknûte (ša) ma’assî here is presumably an abbreviation of šaknûte ša pethal ma’assî.

ii.14: “Total 2,746 horses”.

Since the totals in ii.4 and 11 amount to only 610, it follows that the Obv. of the tablet listed 2,136 equids, some of them under the mušarsûšûni of the qurfûtu-chariotry.

ii.15—18: “2 mules of the ‘bed’, 1 ditto of the kibûni, 18 ditto of the carts, total 88 mules”.

ii.15: cf. LÚ.UŠ.AN̄SU ša NÂ in ND 2489.ii.15.

ii.16: the closest parallel is 3 GU.ME₃ ša ᵃḇši₃-ba-a-nî, Billa No. 72:42, 44 (cf. TCAE p.346); see CAD K 329—330 s.v. kibûnu A, for possible other occurrences of this word in nA, and perhaps No. 108.iv.2’. K. Deller suggests that it may have been a sledge.

ii.17: ARU 186, dated 694 B.C., seems to show that the ʿuttâratû-carts were in the charge of a rab kîṣrî (ll.27-8 read LÚ.GAL ki-ṣrû ša ut-tar ME₃).

The total of 88 presumably includes mules which were itemized on the Obv.

iii.1—2: “Total, 2,834 horses (and) mules, muster”.

This passage, with iii.8, is a critical context for the term BE-qufqi, discussed in TCAE p. 61 and in the note on No. 1:7. The translation “muster” in the sense of a roll-call or stock-taking is preferred here to “levy”, which does not fit so well into the context of the horse lists.

iii.3—9: “297 unzarhu-horses, 342 horses (and) 4 mules, completion. Total 643 horses (and) mules, of the muster of Borsippa. (Grand) total, 3,477 (horses and mules).”

iii.3: the terms unzarhu and šallantu are of uncertain meaning here. When applied to persons, unzarhu is known to mean a free or freed man (AHw 1420b). SMD suggests that referring to horses it may mean “untrained, unbridled”, and that šallantu is to be understood in opposition to it; cf. ND 2482, where unzarhi in ll.2 and 9(?) is contrasted with šallûme, a term which is applied to mares in ND 2768:32 and to mules in K 1053+1533 (Fales, Assur 1/3 (1974) 16—17). If “untrained” is right for unzarhu, šallantu and šallûme in these contexts could be interpreted as “trained”. In turn, this would imply that ša KUR horses were those captured or taken as tribute, some of which would be untrained (see discussion of ša KUR in commentary to No.107).

Note that here the terms are applied only to the equids from the separate muster of Borsippa. JNP does not think it is possible to separate šallantu from the usage of šallûmu “to repay in full” known in legal texts, and takes it as a scribal accounting term referring to animals on which the relevant military department had a claim, so that their delivery was in fulfilment of that claim. unzarhu would then have to mean animals which were “free” of that claim, perhaps supplied on a voluntary basis by the wealthier members of Assyrian society or by voluntary allies (e.g. in the case of Borsippa). The editors prefer to give a neutral translation while the terms remain unclear.

iii.7—8: the muster of Borsippa, presumably recorded elsewhere, is appended to the main muster. Borsippa had long enjoyed a special status as a religious centre (see Brinkman, CAH III/I pp. 293 and 307); it is likely therefore that its citizens would not have been subjected to obligatory Assyrian military service. So either this was the muster of an Assyrian contingent, possibly a garrison in the city, or, if the suggestion made on p.000 concerning the Ašûr unit is correct, by parallel it would be possible that Borsippa had to maintain a professional unit in exchange for freedom from call-up and corvée for all its citizens. Alternatively it is equally possible that Borsippa is mentioned only because it was there that a subsidiary muster happened to take place, and JNP inclines towards this view.
Commentary

Date. Connexions with Nos. 99, 101 and 108 indicate a date around 711–708 B.C. The muster of Borsippa in iii.8 suggests a closer dating of 709–8 B.C.

Composition of the list. The surviving part of this text corresponds very closely in its composition to No. 99, although it lists numbers of horses and mules, under their superior officers, without mentioning their rab urâte. These correspondences may be summarized as follows:

Obv., destroyed portion = §§A-H(?)
Obv., end of col. iii: mušarkisâni Giiš.GIGIR qurubte = §J (1st half)
Rev. i-ii.6: mušarkisâni ša Giiš.GIGIR E.GAL = §J (2nd half)
Rev. ii.7-13: šaknûte ša ma’assî = §§K-N
Rev. ii.14-iii: Totals.

If we go by the 21 lines in Rev.i, the Obv. must have had about 63 lines, and if it did indeed list the same sections as No. 99 §§A-H, we should expect a total of about 44 names (including each of the 10 superior officers in §B and allowing for 11 mušarkisâni in the first part of §J). Even assigning some space to totals and a heading, it seems that there could well have been additional entries before §A, perhaps corresponding to the king’s and the chief eunuch’s contingents as in e.g. Nos. 102 and 108. Obviously this must be regarded as very speculative.

The information given us by the surviving Rev. of the tablet allows the identification of the mušarkisâni and the šaknûte ša ma’assî in No. 99. It also gives us the valuable information that §J there includes two groups of mušarkisâni, the second beginning presumably with Bisunu. Many of the names are duplicated in the two texts, but the order is not the same, and it is obvious also from the differences between the officers serving as šaknu ša ma’assî that the two lists were not prepared on the same occasion.

The totals at the end of the text tell us that it derives from a be-qu muster, and that as many as 2,136 horses and 67 mules must have been detailed on the Obv. In ii.15-18 the section totalling mules lists a few apparently without officers, serving miscellaneous purposes: a pair for the Giiš.NA (possibly a litter for wounded officers?); a single mule for the kibâni (sledge(s) for bringing bodies away from the battlefield for burial?), and 18 mules for waggons. These very tentative explanations are offered to account for the close connexion between the equestrian units and this section.

It may be relevant to note here that A.R. Green suggested at the Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale (London, 1982) that the room S.E. 5 in Fort Shalmaneser may have been a sick-bay, on the basis of his study of apotropaic figurines. No specific name for a hospital room has been identified in the texts; the treatment of battle wounds is referred to in the Vassal Treaties of Esarhaddon, viii.643–5.

Purpose and relationship to other lists. While we are probably justified in seeing this tablet as the record of a be-qu muster, it is different from Nos. 109(+110 and 102 and 108, which can probably also be given the same description. It is smaller, with only six columns of fewer lines, and more regularly written in a larger script; there are no rough additions or lines in Glossenschrift, and the numbers of animals are recorded (as far as we can tell) only under their superior officer (cf. No. 108 where the subordinate officers beneath the šaknûte ša ma’assî are listed separately). All these features suggest that this is a fair copy of the muster, considerably abbreviated, and the same conclusion can be drawn by the
addition of figures from another, entirely separate, muster at Borsippa, which must have been recorded on a tablet of its own. It seems likely therefore that this tablet constituted a record of all the horses and mules in the chariotry and some, if not all, of those in the cavalry, of the army gathered by Sargon for one of the years of his Babylonian campaign.

No. 104  Plate 30  ND 10021

(5.0) × (6.5)  IM 64223
NE 50; west

Face
A.i'  (only the ends of 2 lines survive)
ii'  1'  [ ]
     2'  [x(x)]  1\text{EN\text{l-KAL-an}}
     3'  43\text{1}  1\text{gu-\text{u-a-a}}
     4'  50  1\text{AD-di kir}
     5'  40  1\text{dU.GUR-U-PAP}
     6'  35  1\text{GIN-AD-u-a}
     7'  [x]  1\text{IDIM-DINGIR.ME}
     8'  [x]  1\text{dUTU-I}
     9'  [x  1\text{na-n]}\text{2-i}
         (remainder of col. ii' broken)

Face
B.i'  (upper part broken)
1'  [ ]
2'  [ ]  1\text{dIM}
3'  [\text{PAP}}  1\text{KUR.MEŠ}
4'  [ ]  1\text{ku-din}
5'  [ ]  1\text{ba x (x)}
     (remainder broken)

Notes
A.ii'1': possibly read 1\text{ha-zir-t}, using the preserved signs in 99.i.19 with the traces here.
B.i.5': restoring 1\text{GIS} 1\text{ki-[ba-afen-ni]} by analogy with No. 103.ii.16 does not agree well with the traces; JNP suggests hesitantly 1\text{BA.ÛŠ.M[E]} (cf. note on No. 113:1).
Commentary
This fragment is very similar in physical aspect to Nos. 105 and 106, and they may all be fragments from the same tablet. This piece corresponds to what one would expect of the missing obverse of No. 103, i.e. the names of officers listed in the early part of No. 99 (§§A, B and C), with large numbers of horses each. The other fragments are too small to be placed with confidence within the tablet.

No. 105
NWL, Plate 52
ND 10018/1

(5) × (3)
NE 50; east

\[
\begin{align*}
2' & \quad [(x+)]50 \text{KUR ra-}\$[a-pa ( )] \\
3' & \quad [x M]E \text{LÜ.DI}$\S+ U [\text{KUR}?] \\
4' & \quad [x M]E \text{LÜ.GAL KAS.[LUL]}
\end{align*}
\]

(remainder broken)

Notes
This small fragment may have belonged to the same tablet as No. 104, q.v., and No. 106. The order of the provinces or officials here is found also in No. 86 (twice), and by comparison it seems probable that the turtānu should be restored in l.1'. Compare also ND 2451:15—18 (TCAE pp. 376—7).

No. 106
NWL, Plate 52
ND 10018/2

(3) × (3)
NE 50; east

\[
\begin{align*}
i' & \quad 1' \quad [x
\\
2' & \quad \text{uru}_2\text{z}u^{-2}-hi-na
\end{align*}
\]

(remainder of column broken)

\[
\begin{align*}
ii' & \quad 1' \quad 30[ \\
2' & \quad 30[ \\
3' & \quad 50[ \\
\end{align*}
\]

(remainder broken)

Notes
Small fragment perhaps belonging to same tablet as No. 104, q.v., and No. 105. By comparison with No. 86 obv.8 and rev.8 restore perhaps \text{uru}_2\text{zu-}n\$ in i.1'.
No. 107

Plate 30

ND 10016

IM 64219

8.5 x (11.0) NE 50; east

Col. i (upper part broken)

1'  [x x x]  PAP x  1[x (x)] x [ ]
2'  [x x x]  PAP 13  1i[DU]n-i-ki-a-a(-a?)
3'  [x x]  1  PAP 2  1ha-an-ba?-ru  108A.i.12'
4'  [x -]  1  PAP 1  1.dPA-šē-zilb  108A.i.13' ru
5'  1  5  1  PAP 6  1ab-da-a  108A.i.14'
6'  1  4  2  PAP 6  1da-di-su-ri
7'  2  6  4  PAP 10  1DINGIR-AŠ-PAP
8'  1  6  3  PAP 9  1PAP-BĀD
9'  1  5  5  PAP 6  1za-b[a?]i-a-a
10'  1  2  4  PAP 6  1KĀ.DINGIR-a-a
11'  [PAP] 25  [ina] pa-an 1man-nu-ki-uruni-nu-a  101.iii.9
12'  5'  ina pa-an 1aš-šur-MAN-a-ni PAP 30 ša KASKAL
13'  38 ša KUR PAP 68 1man-nu-ki-uruni-nu-a
14'  PAP 50 ša KASKAL 54 ša KUR PAP 1 ME 4 GIR.2
15'  11  ū-šal-lam 93 ū-šē-ša

16'  1  —  PAP 1  1R.HE.NUN?1-a-[a]  101.i.11
17'  [ ] —  PAP 1  1EN-MAN-PAP
19'  2  —  PAP 2  1.dPA-MU-OIŠ
20'  2  —  PAP 2  1.dUTU-de-ni-a-mur
21'  2  —  [PAP 2]  1.dPA-SUHUŠ-ia-GIN
22'  1  —  [PAP] 1?  1A-(erasure?)-ia  101.i.19 ru
23'  [ ]  PAP 2  1aš-šur-SAG.KAL
24'  [ ]  PAP [x]  1EN.KASKAL-MAN-PAP
25'  [ ]  1ki-šir-15
26'  [ ]  1DUG.GA-[x]-E.ZI.DA

(remainder of column broken)

Col. ii (upper part broken)

1'  2[ ] x  PAP x
2'  5 x [x]  PAP x
3'  4 [x]  PAP x
4'  3 [x]  PAP x
5'  2 4[ ]  PAP 6
6'  2 8[ ]  PAP 10
7'  3 [x]  PAP x
8'  1 [x]  PAP [x]
9'  3 [x]  PAP ?6y? [ ]
10'  4 [x]  PAP 7 [ ]
### Translation and Notes

i.1’ — 10’: 10 officers’ names with the numbers of horses associated with each one. The first column of numbers was probably added later, being out of alignment, and is totalled as 11 usallānī in i.15’ (being the only column with figures low enough). The second column of numbers must be totalled as ša KASKAL (i.14’), the third as ša KUR (ibid.), and the fourth as the total of 104.

i.2’: possibly 1ma’-ki-a-a.

i.11’—15’: “Total 25 at the disposal of Mannu-ki-Ninua; 5 at the disposal of Aššur-sarrani; total 30 of campaign; 38 of land/palace; total 68, Mannu-ki-Ninua. Total 50 of campaign, 54 of land/palace; total 104, ša šēpē. He shall complete 11 (and) take out 93”.

The grand total of 104 in this section is divided into ‘campaign’ and ‘land/palace’ horses, and since i.11’—13’ apply only to those under Mannu-ki-Ninua, another 36 may have been listed under another officer in the broken beginning of the column.

i.11’: Mannu-ki-Ninua: see note on No. 101.iii.9.

i.12’: ša KUR ... ša KASKAL: see discussion in following commentary.

i.14’: for Gbg.2 see commentary on No. 101. This occurrence suggests that Aššur-sarrani and Mannu-ki-Ninua were commanders of the ša šēpē unit.

i.15’: for šallatum see following commentary. As noted on i.1’—10’ the scribe seems to have entered the numbers to be ‘completed’ in the extreme left-hand column, and having added these to have reached the total of 93 to be ‘taken out’ by subtracting 11 from 104.

i.16’—26’: 11 officers’ names, presumably associated with ‘campaign’ and ‘land/palace’ horses. None of the names recurs in a group of two or more in other texts of this group, and most of them occur only here.

i.22’: for Aplaya see note on No. 101.ii.19

i.24’: Bel-Harran-sarru-ĝuru: may be the same man as in NL 104 and in ARU 186 (dated 694 B.C.) as a ša qurbāti.

### Commentary

**Date.** There is no definite evidence for dating this text, except that an officer Mannu-ki-Ninua is also found in No. 101, which can be connected directly with the Babylonian campaigns, and three officers in i.3’—5’ reappear in No. 108.
Composition of the list. Like Nos. 102ff. this was a record of horses listed according to their officers, who are themselves divided into sections. Owing to the tablet's fragmentary condition only the summary in i.11'–15' is preserved, showing that, as in other lists, a ša šēpē unit was listed in the first column. For members of this unit see No. 108A.i.12'–14' with note; of the two superior officers mentioned Mannu-ki-Ninua recurs perhaps in No. 101, and for a possible mention of Aššur-šarrani see on No. 101.ii.11'. The remaining sections cannot be identified, but if the text follows the order known in other lists (e.g. Nos. 102 and 108), the "city units" may have followed in col. ii, but since the tablet had only four columns, it may not have included as many groups as the others.

ša KUR and ša KASKAL. Throughout the text as preserved the horses are listed as either ša KUR or ša KASKAL. These categories are also used in the horse lists Nos. 108, 109–110, and 111, and have been discussed above in the context of No. 87:3–14, where they refer to ilku-contributions. Unfortunately the correct interpretation is far from certain: there are no criteria for deciding whether KUR is a logogram for mātu "land" or ekallu "palace", although we favour the former; a third possibility, to read it as kišittu "booty" is less likely because it is not usual in administrative texts and would normally have a syllabic complement. Although we can be sure KASKAL means "campaign", we are also uncertain whether ša refers to the animals' origin or their destination—"from the campaign" or "for the campaign". Since the terms ušallam and ušēṣṣa (see below) clearly refer to the future disposition of the animals, we believe that "campaign" and "land/palace" refer to their origin, and the only point on which the editors differ is that JNP supposes that the ša KUR horses had remained in Assyria since the last muster, or at least had not been on campaign, whereas SMD understands the distinction to be between "new" horses captured or levied abroad, and the army's horses which had survived the campaign. To some degree, the correct interpretation will depend on whether we see these lists as muster-lists before the campaign (so JNP) or afterwards (SMD).

ušallam and ušēṣṣa. In i.1'–15' a second pair of categories is in use, summarized in i.15' as ú-šal-lam and ú-še-ṣṣa (cf. note on this line). With its derivative šalluntu, šallumu has already been discussed in the note on No. 103.iii.3. SMD suggests that in view of the opposition to unzarhu in No.103, it should be connected with šallāme and was a technical term applied to horses, to be translated here "he shall train". This would fit the interpretation of ša KUR as horses captured or levied abroad at the end of a campaign. Note the occurrence of trainees, LŪ tarbišati, in the letter of Mannu-ki-Ninua to Sargon about equids, ABL 127, and see note on No. 99.ii.20 for the possibility that the profession murabbāunu could be connected with horses. JNP prefers to translate ušallam as "he will repay in full", comparing the usage of šallumu in nA legal texts to denote the fulfilment of a pre-existing obligation by making a full or final payment (see FNALD pp. 56–61). As used here by military accountants, the implication of the verb must be that the animals are being handed back to the army authorities in fulfilment of the administrative obligations incurred by the officers when the horses were assigned to them earlier.

Further light on šallumu ought to come from the contrast with šēṣṣu, but good parallels for its usage in this context are lacking in nA texts, and its possible meanings are too wide to offer a precise solution. We can only offer interpretations based on our understandings of the background to the text: SMD suggests "to pass muster" (i.e. to count as immediately fit for military use), JNP "to withdraw" (i.e. to remove from the accounting
responsibility of the authority making the list, perhaps even "to (be allowed to) write off"). In view of the uncertainty, a neutral translation is adopted here, pending fresh evidence.

**No. 108**

This tablet is represented by three pieces that were found together and are very similar. The relative position of ND 9910 and 9915 is certain, although the junction is eroded. ND 9911 can only have belonged if the tablet originally had four columns on each face. Since this is not certain, it is transliterated separately as No. 108A.

ND 9910 = IM 75895 (11.0) × (18.5) × 4.0 NE 2; 2.40 m below surface

ND 9915 = IM 75900 (7.6) × (7.1) × 3.3 NE 2; 2.40 m below surface

Obverse

(9910)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Transliteration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>]x zi a u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>]-a-a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>]L]U qur-bu-te ZAG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot; ša GŪB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>]L]U ša GİŞ ni te</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>]L[U.3.U₅ dan-nu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>]L]U. &quot; 2-u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>GİŞ tah-lip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td>1]ki-din-nu-diša-maš</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td>1]e²-zi-i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td>1(x-)[x-pa-a-nu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td>1e²-zi][i 2-u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td>]x-šū</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td>ji</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(long break)

ii

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Transliteration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1man-nu-ki-dIM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1uš-šur-DIB-a-ni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1PAP-S[U]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1EN-D[U]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1tab²[-     ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1za-[x (x)]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1²PA-N[UMUN² ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

102.ii.11², 102.ii.13², 102.ii.16²
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8  PAP 19 L.U.  " ururuarrad[p^2]-h[a^2]-a-a  
9  2  1A-la  101.ii.19; 107.i.22  
10  k[i] kur 1pu-ili-i  
11  2  1mu-ta-kit,0[u]TU  
12  1  gi-ia-a  
13  1.d30-KAM-eš  
14  1  aš-šur-ig-bi  
15  1.d[k]u-ba-ba-DINGIR-a-a  
16  PAP 10 L.U.  " ar-ma-a-a  
17  2^2  1.dPA-PAP-ir  
18  2^2  1SUHUŠ-PAP.MEŠ  101.ii.24  
19  1[(+x)]  1ur-du  102.iii.16; 110.iii.9  
20  1[(+x)]  1[gi]ur-di-15-IGI  101.ii.25; 102.iii.18; 110.iii.10  
21  1[(+x)]  1da-du-su  110.iii.11  
22  1[(+x)]  1[IGI-d]15-SLSÅ  110.iii.12  
23  1[(+x)]  1[IGI-d]15-tuk-lat-u-a  
24  [PAP]x L.U.  " ururuarba-il-a-a  

25  [() ] LÜ.EN.GIŠ.GIGIR.MEŠ  
26  [(x)]x x "LÜ.GAL.SAG  
27  [() ] 1AD-SLSÅ  99.i.4  
28  [() ] 130-PAP.MEŠ  99.i.5  
29  [() ] 1U.GUR-MAN-PAP  99.i.6  
30  [() ] 1-a-a  
31  [() ] 1-a-a  
32  [() ] n)a^2-di-nu  
33  [() ] a  

(break of two lines)

(9915)

36  [() ] 1  1ši[i]^f-  
37  [() ] 4  uruvAD-la-di^2-[m^2]  
38  [() ] 5  1PAP-u"qu^1  99.i.15  
39  [(PAP)]  1 ša KASKAL 11 ša KUR  
40  [PA]P 12 1EN.KASKAL.KUR-u-a  99.i.16  
41  [X ] IG1 1DINGIR-rém-a-ni  
42  [(x+)] 4  IG1 1EN-BAD  
43  [() ] PAP 6 1EN-BAD  99.i.17; 100.iii.11' − 13'  

ru

ru

ru

ru

rr

rr

rr

rr
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>[(x) x ururBAD-la^-din</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>[(x+)2 ] urur^-a^-2-na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>PAP 16 ša KASKAL 1 ME 12 ša KUR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>PAP 1 ME 28 pët-hal qur-[u]b-tù</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>2 ša KASKAL 4 ša KUR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>PAP 6 1ha-x[</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>3 &quot; 3 &quot; PAP 6[</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>(broken)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>&quot; 1[ PAP 5^2]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>&quot; 4 PAP 6 1man-nu-k[i-AD]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>&quot; 4 PAP 6 1,UTU-r^7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>&quot; 4 PAP 8 1,dPA-[tak-lak]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>&quot; 3 PAP 7 1na-n[^2]-i]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>PAP 30 ša KASKAL 35 [ša KUR]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>PAP 65 1MAN-IGI[LA-a-n]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>23 1am-ha-r^7ti-e^7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>13 1U-im-me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>14 DINGIR-da-la-a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>8 1si-id-q^12-ia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>3 1a-ta-ru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>12 DINGIR-ka-bar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>6 1ha-šá-na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>10 ka-pa-ra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>7 kal-bi-i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>6 a-tar-ba-a^-di</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>PAP 1 ME 2 ša KASKAL 1.dTUKUL-MAN-PAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>4 ša-li-ia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>6 am-me-ni-DINGIR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(9910)  

iii 1-6  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>&quot; 4 PAP 5^2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>&quot; 4 PAP 6 1man-nu-k[i-AD]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>&quot; 4 PAP 6 1,UTU-r^7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>&quot; 4 PAP 8 1,dPA-[tak-lak]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>&quot; 3 PAP 7 1na-n[^2]-i]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>PAP 30 ša KASKAL 35 [ša KUR]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>PAP 65 1MAN-IGI[LA-a-n]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>23 1am-ha-r^7ti-e^7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>13 1U-im-me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>14 DINGIR-da-la-a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>8 1si-id-q^12-ia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>3 1a-ta-ru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>12 DINGIR-ka-bar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>6 1ha-šá-na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>10 ka-pa-ra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>7 kal-bi-i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>6 a-tar-ba-a^-di</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>PAP 1 ME 2 ša KASKAL 1,dTUKUL-MAN-PAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>4 ša-li-ia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>6 am-me-ni-DINGIR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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27 3 ¹dPA-PAP.MEŠ-DI 99.ii.13 ru
28 7 ¹PAP-di-ik-ir 99.ii.13 ru
29 3 ¹nu-ri-ia-ba-a² 99.ii.14 ru
30 [(x+)]³ ¹kab-ti-i 99.ii.14²; 102.ii.23' (rk aram)
31 [x ¹d-a-a-tu-ri] 99.ii.15 ru
32 [PAP x ]ša LÙ kal-da-a-a

(9915+9910)
33 ¹r² [¹ib-h]a-da-la-[a ( )] 99.ii.16 ru

(9915)
34 4² [ ]
35 3 ¹x [ ]
36 7 ¹a-[tam-ru] 99.ii.17
37 3 ¹PAP-i[²i²-ri] 99.ii.18
38 2 ¹ab-di-[m]i[ku] 99.ii.18
39 7 ¹EN-[BAD'] 99.ii.19
40 3 ¹ar-me-[na-a²] 99.ii.19
41 [x] ¹rga³[l-[bi-e²] 99.ii.20

(Reverse)
iv 1 [ ]
2 ¹0³[ ]
3 [ ]
4 9 ¹ba-r[i-ki] 99.ii.24 ru
5 8 ¹iz-[bu-G1§] 99.ii.24 ru
6 9 ¹[ ]
7 ¹5²[ ]

(2 lines missing)

(9910)
10 x[ ]
11 10 1.d[ ]

12 10 1.U.GU[R-MAN-PAP(?)]

13 10 1.D[I-mu-EN-lašme(?)]

14 6 1[

15 PAP [

16 PAP 59 1[

17 4 1.x[

18 6 1[

19 PAP[1[

20 PAP 14 1.d.MAŠ.MAŠ.[MAN-a-ni(?)]


22 ([x) x x 44 x (x) 30(+) x] PAP[1] A[ša ( )]]

23 [ ]MAN-R.d²-Mi²[š[a] $a x x 1 te²]

24 [ ]x [x (x)] $a³[-] um² zi²

25 [x x] 1.DINGIR-K[i]-la

26 1 " ina² pa²[-]

27 1 1.$iš-mu-[x x]

28 1 ku-din² LÜ.GAL A.[

29 PAP 5? " $f x x x x 1 x [

30 $f x x x 1 [ (break of about 10 lines to end of column)

v 1 [ ] 4 ku-din

2 [ ]x x (x x)

3 [ ]k]u-din

4 [ ]-u-a

5 [ ]x

6 [ ]x

7 [ ]x x

8 [ ] zi²

9 [ ] x x (x)
| 10 | [x x [ ]da'qur-ub-tú |
| 11 | [ ] |
| 12 | [ ]-
| 13 | [ ]hu2 |
| 14 | [ ]-mu-D[?] |
| 15 | [ ]-KA\[r\]ir |
| 16 | [ ]x-MU |
| 17 | [ ]1IGI-aš-šur-la-mur |
| 18 | [ ]1d.PA-il |
| 19 | [ ]1d.PA-SU |
| 20 | [ ]a x x x |
| 21 | [ ]x-PAP |
| 22 | [ ]a |
| 23 | [ ]x |
| 24 | [ ]-PAP |
| 25 | [ ]x (x) |
| 26 | [ ]x x x |
| 27 | [ ]1aš-šur-rém-a-[n] |
| 28 | [ ]1aš-šur-\[r\]x.\[A] ([ ] |
| 29 | 16 20 [x] x x x x |
| 30 | 17 1d.PA-EN-M[U.M]E |
| 31 | 14 \[d\]U[UTU-BA-sá |
| 32 | 12 1d.MAŠ]-\[R\]AD7-[P]AP |
| 33 | 15 \[S\]UHU-\[R\]KASKAL7 |
| 34 | 34 1aš-šur-PAP-ir |
| 35 | 26 1DUG.GA-IM-aš-šur |
| 36 | 14 \[iš-[me-DINGIR |
| 37 | PAP 2 ME L[\[U].x[ |
| 38 | 10 1[ |
Translation and Notes

i.1 – 6: unless there was a fourth column (if so, this is col.ii), the text began like 101 with the names of the senior officers.

i.7 – 12: “[x], the ša qurbûte-officer of the right; [x], ditto of the left; [x], man of the ....; [x], the chief third rider; [x], the deputy third rider; [x (....)] the tahîtu-chariots (or: charioteers)”.

i.7 – 8: perhaps compare the left in No. 101.i.2 (JNP).

i.9: one obvious emendation would be šâ pa’-ni-te, but such a post is otherwise unknown.

i.12: this may be taken as a heading for the following section; JNP prefers this here and in 101.i.19, and 110.i.6.

i.13 – 18: “[x], Kidinnu-Šama; [x], Ezî; [x, x]-panu; [x, E]ziî the second; .....”.

i.14, 16: we restore 1je-zi-i rather than 2e-zi-i on the assumption that the PNs in this section are aligned as usual with that in the first line (i.13); and because of 2-u.

The break here probably included the Assur unit, following the order of No. 102.

ii.1 – 8: “1, Mannu-ki-Adad; 3, Aššur-šabtanni; 1, Ahu-eriba; 4, Bel-ibni; 1, Tab[ ... ]; 3, Za[ ... ]; 2, Nabu-[ ... ]; Total, 19, ditto (i.e. rab kišri-officers) of Arrapha”.

ii.8: the total shows that between 1 and 4 lines of this section are lost at the base of col.i. That the ditto sign refers to rab kišri is deduced by comparison with No. 102.

ii.9 – 16: “2, Aplaya; zero(?), Puli; 2, Mutakkîl-Šamas; 1, Giya; 3, Sin-ereš; 1, Aššur-iqbi; 1, Kubaba-ilaya; Total, 10, ditto (i.e. rab kišri-officers), Aramaean”.

None of the names in this unit recurs in No. 102.

ii.9: for Aplaya see note on No. 101.i.19.

ii.10: a Puli is found in ND 2803, where by analogy with Kubaba-ilaya (see next note) he may be a ša qurbûte.

ii.15: Kubaba-ilaya occurs in KAV 131 rev.4 as a LÚ GI.S.GIGIR, and the association with Puli makes it virtually certain that he is identical with the Kubaba-ilaya of ND 2803.i.28, a ša qurbûte. He may be the same man as is described in the letter to Sargon ABL 342:16 as bel lišāni šî. For the reading ki-babâ, see note 45 to PN Index.

ii.17 – 24: “2î, Nabu-našîr; 2î, Ubru-ahhe; 1î, Urdu; 1î, Qurdi-Ištar-lamur; 1î, Dadusu; 1î, Pan-Ištar-lešîr; 1î, Ištar-tuklatua; [Total], x, ditto (i.e. rab kišri-officers), of Arbil”.

Note that three out of seven names are composed with the divine name Ištar, perhaps as a result of the connexion with Arbil.

ii.25 – 26: “[Total, x(?)] owners of chariots; [....]..., chief eunuch”. 

ii.25: what, if anything, is to be restored at the beginning of this line is uncertain; there does not appear to be space for PAP and a number, so that it may have been no more than a heading or concluding remark, in which case it would presumably apply to the preceding “city units”. Since some of those named there are also attested in the Aššur Protokolle as LÚ GI.S.GIGIR (cf. e.g. Kubaba-ilaya, ii.15), this could be taken as grounds
for identifying the two terms LŪ GIS·GIGIR and EN GIS·GIGIR. On the other hand No. 111.5', if correctly restored, gives the "owners of chariots" as a single entry, separate from the "city units", and it is therefore possible that the scribe did the same here, merely giving a single number for their horses at the beginning of the line.

ii.26: a possible restoration is [PAP] 60 + 10 + 1 1 1 LŪ GAL·SAG, which would agree well with No. 102.iii.24 where the same units are totalled and assigned to the rab ša rēšē.

ii.27 – 33: "[x], Abu-lešir; [x], Sin-ahhe; [x, Nergal-šarru-usur; [x, Kalha]ya'; [x, Ahilaya?; ....]."

The translation of ii.30 – 31 restores the names according to comparison with No. 99.i.4 – 8.

ii.36 – 47: "(…) 1, Šili-[x]; (…) 4, city of Dur-Ladini; (…) 5, Ahir-usur; [(Total)] 1 of campaign, 11 of land/palace; total 12, Bel-Harran-šadu-a; [x], at the disposal of Ilimanni; [(..)] 4, at the disposal of Bel-duri; total 6, Bel-duri; [x], city of Dur-Ladini; [(..)] 2 ditto, city of [.].arna?; total 16, of campaign, 112 of land/palace. Total, 128 qurubtu-cavalry?".

ii.37: Dur-Ladini is a town in southern Babylonia in Bit-Dakkuri captured by Sargon in 710 B.C. and used by him as a base for a short while (see Lie, Sargon, p. 54:7 – 8 and p. 56:373).

ii.47: pethal qurubtu: see p.32 for the qurubtu-cavalry. Note that Ahir-usur, Bel-Harran-šadu-a and Bel-duri occur together at the end of No. 99 §A.

ii.48 – 50: "2 of campaign, 4 of land/palace, total 6, Ha[..]; 3, ditto (i.e. of campaign), 3 ditto (i.e. of land/palace), total 6, [..]".

If the name Ha[..] is correctly identified with the broken name Ha[zi]r in No. 99.i.19, this section begins the unit under Šarru-emuranni (§B).

iii.7 – 13: "[..]; 4, ditto (i.e. of campaign), 1 (of land/palace), [total 5?, PN]; 2, ditto, 4, total 6, Mannu-ki-[abi]; 2, ditto, 4, total 6, Šamaš-na-ād; 4, ditto, 4, total 8, Nabu-[talklak]; 4, ditto, 3, total 7, Nan[i]; Total 30 of campaign, 35 of land/palace; Total 65, Šarru-emur[annij]".

This section corresponds closely with No. 99 §B, and begins in col. ii. There may have been only 5 lines lost at the beginning of col. iii, and they must account for only 21 horses to make up a total of 65, which probably came under 3 officers, to judge from the numbers commanded by the rest of the unit, making a total of 10 senior officers (they are LŪ GAL·GAL·MES, not rab urate), exactly as in No. 99 §B.

iii.14 – 24: "23, Amhati?; 13, Adad-imme; 14, Ili-dala; 8, Šidqaya; 3, Yataru; 12, Ilikabar; 6, Hašana; 10, Kapara; 7, Kalbi; 6, Atar-ba'ādi; Total, 102 of campaign, Kakkušarru-usur".

This section corresponds closely with No. 99 §C. For an unknown reason all the horses are "of campaign" in this section. 4 names recur in the Assur Protokolle.

iii.14: the first name in No. 99 §C is 1 māh-Dī-e; here 1 1 am-ha-ii-re is read as a form of the same name.

iii.17: it is uncertain whether we should take the third sign as qaš over an erasure, or find some other way of identifying this name with Šidqaya in No. 99.ii.10.

iii.25 – 32: "4, Šaliya; 6, Ammeni-ili; 3, Nabu-ahhe-šallim; 7, Ahī-dikir; 3, Nuri-yaba'; 4?, Kabti; [x], Aya-ūrī; [Total, x] of the Chaldeans".

This section corresponds closely to No. 99 §D, the summary of which reads "Total 7 Chaldeans". All the names of the officers are the same except for Kabti, who is given his full form, Kabti-ili, in No. 99.ii.14. For the origin of this unit, see the commentary to No. 99 on §D.

iii.33 – 41: despite the breaks, this section probably corresponds closely to No. 99 §E, and lists a Samarian contingent under Nabu-belu-ukin.

iv.1 – 7: this section almost certainly corresponds closely with No. 99 §F, a unit of four rab urate under Taktak-ana-Bel.

iv.11 – 16: "10, [Nabu-šarhu-ulan]; 10, Nergal-šarru-usur; 10, Šuš[mu-Bel-lašme]; 6, [Sin-našir]; Total, [x of campaign, x of land/palace]; Total, 59, [Adallal?]".
Almost certainly this section corresponds closely to No. 99 §G, and the restorations in the translation are made on that basis.

iv.17—20: “4?, Ner[gal-ereš]; 6?, [Aššur-bel-ukin]; Total, [x of campaign, x of land/palace]; Total 14, Nergal-[šarrani].”

This section almost certainly corresponds to No. 99 §H, and the restorations in the translation are given on that basis. At this point the close parallelism with No. 99 is apparently interrupted.

iv.21—23: “Total, 1312 of [campaign?], 1022 of land/palace”, then further numbers followed by a PN, then a term perhaps of profession.

This badly damaged section has been collated more than once without significant improvements, but it must have formed a total for several of the preceding sections, perhaps as far back as ii.48.

iv.23: one possibility considered was to read GIGIR qa[ru]-ub?-ti' at the end of the line; another very tentative suggestion is to read ša LO' pa'-tē(he-te)' (JNP).

iv.24—30: a section including mules, with a preliminary total of 5. It is not certain whether the “of campaign” and “of land/palace” categories continue.

iv.31—36: a section with two columns of numbers, but all further information is missing. Presumably the text reverts to the previous pattern of a column for campaign horses and a column of land/palace horses, with the name of an officer; but note that if the musarkisiši begin in this section, as other indications might suggest, it is almost the only case where they have these two categories of horses associated with them (another exception being perhaps in v.29).

v.1—5: two sections, each including a total of mules at the end of the line.

v.6—11: too badly preserved for identification; but if v.11 is a summary, it lists ša qurbūte-officers, as the transliteration stands. However, this title is not elsewhere attested with -ub- rather than -bu-, and *qurubtu is the fem. of qurbu and is used in direct apposition to cavalry (pethallu) and chariotry (GIS.GIGIR). So either U8 is a mistake for BU, or we should emend here, after No. 103 Obv., to give ...musarkisiši (ša) GIS.GIGIR' qur-ub-te'.

v.12—28: very fragmentary, but may list musarkisiši, some singly within rulings, others grouped. “Aššur-remanni” is clearly legible near the end.

v.20: hardly ḫar-tar-NINA (cf. on No. 103.i.9).

v.29—37: “16, 20, [PN]; 17, Nabu-bel-šumate; 14, Šamaš-iqiša; 12, [Ninurta]-abu-uṣur; 15, Ubru-Harran; 34, Aššur-našir; 26, Ṭab-šar-Aššur; 14, Iš[me-ili]; Total, 200, [...]-men”.

This section corresponds with the final part of No. 99 §J, and with No. 103 where the same officers are listed as musarkisiši of the palace chariotry. So a form of mularkis should almost certainly be restored in v.37. The early musarkisiši up to Aššur-remanni (v.29) are sometimes listed in groups, but otherwise (as in Nos. 99 and 103) these officials are listed singly, enclosed between ruled lines. Some, but not all, of the names correspond with the other two texts. The summary presumably includes numbers from v.12 onwards, but probably not further back.

v.28—43: numbers with names continue for at least 6 entries, probably totalling 33 horses. Only the name Šabu-damuq survives.

Possibly this section corresponds to No. 99 §K, and it may be followed by No. 108A rev.1’, which includes the sections equivalent to No. 99 §§L, M and N.

VI: if this was a 3-column tablet, vi.1’—2’ would have been the end of the whole text, and the small blank space further up would suggest that these lines may have been a concluding remark. A possible restoration would compare No. 103.i.16—17 and so read vi.1’ as [GIS] ut-tatATES and vi.2’ as [GIS] ki-pa-ni; by analogy with No. 103 these lines would therefore be listing mules.

If this was a 4-column tablet, No. 108A rev.ii’ would have followed, as a subsequent, grand total of horses and mules.
No. 108A

ND 9911 = IM 75896  (7.8) × (9.5) × 3.9 NE 2; 2.40 m below surface

Obv. i  (break)
1' [x x B]e3-qu 5 x[ ]
2' [x x ša]l-lum-tú ū-še-ru-[bu?]
3' [x x (x)] ina ŠA ANŠE ū-rat
4' [ ] x x x x x
5' x[ (x)] x ku? nu te?
6' 1.8 [AP] 24 ša GīR.2

7' 1 1.6 UTU-DINGIR-a-a KASKAL 99.i.14\?/iv.3\?  ru/rr
8' 1 1.Aš-PAP " 101.iii.10
9' 1 1.U-Dū "
10' 1 ša KASKAL 1 ša KUR PAP 2 1.15-[x]
11' 1 š[a] KASKAL 1 ” PAP 2 1.hab-ha-a-a
12' 2 ša [K]UR 1 ha-am-ba'-ru 107.i.3'
13' 1 ša KASKAL 1 ša KUR PAP 2 1.d.PA-še-zib 107.i.4'  ru
14' [x ša KASK]AL 1.1 ab-da-a'
15' [x] ša KUR 1 \([x x (x)]-a\) (remainder broken)

Obv. ii  (break; may carry on from No. 108.obv.i')
1' 8[
2' 6[
3' 5[
4' PAP 70[(+x)]

5' 5 [ ]
6' 4 [ ]

(remainder broken)

Rev. i'  (break)
1' [ ] 1[ ]

2' 23 1.GīR.2-aš-šur 99.iv.22  rr

3' [x x\1 [x (x)] a\2-kī-Dū
4' [ ] MEŠ

5'–6' [ ]
7' [r5\1 1.aš-šur-PAP-[ir2]
8' 2 1.AD-S[U]
9' 18 1.r\1-šx
10' 3 1.SUHUŠ-[P]A[P.MEŠ2]
11' PAP 38 x[ ]
Translation and Notes

Obv.i.1'—6': "... muster; [5....] they shall bring in (as) complete repayment [.....] among the teams .....; To[tabl'], 24, ša šēpē-bodyguard".

The ša šēpē-officers are listed early in Nos. 101 and 102 as well as No. 107, and it is therefore probable that this fragment comes from the obverse of the tablet, with the two broken columns on the other face forming the 7th and 8th columns of a 4-column tablet. While there are dissimilarities between the obverse of 108A and the rest of No. 108, there are similar irregular passages at the beginning of other tablets, and as noted in the Commentary below, the contents of the reverse mesh very neatly into the reverse of No. 108. Given their common provenance and identical external appearance, we consider it almost certain that all three pieces belong together. As to the exact position of this piece, it has been placed in the diagram (p. 216) where it would fall if ii.5' began an "Assyrian" unit of the same size as that in No. 111; evidently this is only a rough guess.

Rev.i.1'—2': may end a section commanded by Sepe-Asšur, which would then have roughly corresponded to No. 99 §M.

Rev.i.3'—12': "[x, P][N]; ....; 5', Aššur-našiš; 2, Abu-er[i][ba?]; 18, P[N]; 3, Ubru-ahhe; total, 38 [of campaign, 47 of land/palace, total 85, Aššur-šarru-[ušur?]".

This section probably corresponds to No. 99 §N, although some of the names are different. It lists rab urdā-officers under their superior Aššur-šarru-ušur, known also from No. 103.ii.10 as a šaknu ša ma'assi, and applies the ša KUR categories to their equids.

Rev.i.3': the PN could be restored after 1d-p-a-ki-lu-ni in IM 76885 (= Ismail and Postgate, No. 6) 14.

Rev.i.13'—15': "Total, 94, city of Dur-[....] .....".

12' PAP 85 1āš-šēr-MAN-[PAP(?)]

99.iv.25

rr

13' PAP 94 uruBĀ[D-

14' x[ ]GAL[

15' PAP [ (remainder broken; No. 108.rev.vi' may follow here)

Rev.ii' (break; may carry on from No. 108.rev.vii' (lost))

1' PAP[

2' PAP 1' lim 5 ME 23'

3' KUR.MEŠ ku-din

(blank space, then break)
ii.1'—3': "Total [.....]. Total 1,523\textsuperscript{3} horses and mules".

By comparison with No. 103.iii.1—2 these lines must come near the end of the complete text.

**Commentary**

*Date.* The reference to Dur-Ladini in ii.37 and 44 puts the date of this text between 710 and 708 B.C., and gives a firm connexion with Sargon's Babylonian campaign.

*Composition of the list.* The accompanying diagram illustrates the major divisions of the text, with cross-references to the corresponding sections of No. 99. While the exact position of No. 108A remains uncertain, our reasons for thinking that it must come from the left edge of the same four-column tablet are summarized above (note to 108A obv.i.1'—6'), and for the purposes of the following discussion this will be accepted. Nevertheless, it is wise to underline the doubt on this score, and we shall begin by considering the matter on No. 108 itself.

The entries in ii.27 through to iv.20 correspond very exactly with the list of *rab urāte* commanded by LŪ.GAL.GAL.MES, No. 99 §§A-H. Wherever it can be checked, we have the same team-commanders and the same superior officers, and the sections are in the same order. There are sub-totals at the end of §A, and after §H. Although from this point the parallelism is not so close, the repetition of names and its position within the list show that v.1—37, and probably also the end of iv, were *mušarkisāni*; as in No. 103, they were probably divided into *qurubtu*[chariotry] (v.11) and [palace chariotry] (v.37?). By analogy with No. 99 and other lists we would expect the sections after this to be devoted to the *saknute sa* ma'assi, and if No. 108A is correctly inserted, we do indeed have the two superior officers from No. 99 §§M and N in approximately the right position; however, it must be stressed that it is not possible to restore the names of the subordinate officers from No. 99 as regularly as in the part of the list corresponding to §§A-H. The end of col. vi and the last column (108A rev.ii') are given over to totals, an arrangement which may be expected by comparison with No. 103.

Returning now to the beginning of the text, comparison with Nos. 102, 110 and 111 make it certain that before ii.27 we have the end of the large contingent commanded by the chief eunuch. As with other instances of this contingent (see No. 102, commentary), it consists largely of "city units", and an "Assyrian" unit is obviously to be restored at the base of col.i. The beginning of the chief eunuch's contingent is less easy to pinpoint: the city units are preceded, in i.12', by a *tahūpu* unit (whether it be a separate entry or a heading for the following names), which thus occupies the same position as in Nos. 101 and 110, and it is preceded, as in No. 110, by two *tāšīšu* and other miscellaneous officers. Before this, in the original first column, are listed 24 *sa sēpē* troops (i.6'), followed by a group which has at least three men who reappear in the first preserved section of No. 107, also designated GīR.2.

*Purpose and relationship to other lists.* The tablet lists horses and mules under their officers' names in groups under their senior officers, like Nos. 102 and 103. The connexions with No. 99 show that the officers were mostly *rab urāte*, and there are coincidences of names with the LŪ.GIS.GIGIR in the Ašur Protokolle, notably Ammeni-ili, Adad-imme and Atar-ba'di. For the problems of distinguishing charioteers from cavalrmen see above, p.32; it seems that the terms *rab urāte* and LŪ.GIS.GIGIR could each be applied to both chariotry
and cavalry. Some cavalrymen are certainly listed, according to the unambiguous statement of ii.47. Like Nos. 107 and 110—111, the scribe distinguishes the categories ša KASKAL and ša KUR (see commentary on No. 107), giving two columns of figures which are totalled at the end of the relevant sections (i.e. in 108A, Obverse; ii.27—47; ii.48-iii.13; iii.21—3; iv.31—2; cf. v.29). In the remaining sections—notably the "city units", the unit of Kakku-šarru-uṣur and perhaps the mušarkisāni—there is only a single column; however, iii.24 shows that Kakku-šarru-uṣur's entire unit was ša KASKAL, and it may therefore be that the same was true of the other units but did not need to be stated.

In the presence of this information about "campaign" or "land/palace" categories, and in the mention of "bringing in a complete repayment" at the beginning of the reconstructed text (No. 108A.i.2'), this list shares features with Nos. 107 and 109-11; but in the composition of the list it is very close to Nos. 102 and 103 which lack these features. While they could therefore result from different stages in the administrative process, the actual numbers of animals mentioned in the various texts make it clear that despite all similarities in the personnel, they refer to different occasions, possibly therefore to annual BE-qu musters, and are not successive recensions of the same list.

**No. 109**

(9.0) × (5.0)  
NE 55

**Plate 33**

IM, for study  
[x].xii+i.716 B.C.

Obs. (presumably the first column of three or four)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>BE-qu AN[SE ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>ITI.DIRIG.ŠE UI[D.X.KĀM]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>&quot;çu-u šaKASKAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>saKASKAL   saKUR [()]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>21 [ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>5 ku-din 1[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>PAP 74 x[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>8 KUR 1[(+x) ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>20[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(remainder of Obv. broken)

Rev. (penultimate column, the end of the last column being blank)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1'</td>
<td>[x ] [x šašu]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2'</td>
<td>[(x)] 4 [M]E 60° 1š-ešu-u 10'[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3'</td>
<td>[(x)] x E.GAL x [ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Translation and Notes

Obv. 1-3: "Muster of hor[ses ...... ]. Intercalary month of Addaru, [xth] day, limmu Ṭab-ṣil-Ešarra".

This is our only text which is headed by the designation BE-qu; by analogy with No. 103 rev. iii probably restore the first line as BE-qu AN[SE.KUR(RA.MEŠ) ku-dīn] "Muster of horses and mules". For BE-qu see note on No. 1:7.

4: Heading to the following list, first column "of campaign", second column "of the land" or "palace" (KUR being either ṻātu or ekallu). There is perhaps the trace of P[AP] "Total" to be discerned at the end of the line (cf. the heading of No. 111).

5-9: broken beginning of the listing of equids (as shown by ku-dīn "mule(s)" in 1.6).

Rev. 1'-3': "..... ]replace[ ..... ] 460? they shall withdraw ..... the palace ..... ".

1': in view of ṣēṣu·u in the next line, a derivative of šallumu is needed here, but it is impossible to be sure whether to restore usšallum, usšallumu or šallumu; perhaps best is the last of these, since the trace before šal is not part of an -u-

3': very likely we should restore [(GIS.GI)GIR E.GAL "palace chariotry"].

Commentary

Date. The clear date for 716 B.C. shows that the Horse Lists cannot all be grouped around the Babylonian campaigns of 710—708 B.C. The month would be early in the year, before the army was normally on campaign, which suggests that this was part of an annual muster held in Kalhu, unless the previous campaign had ended very late. Sargon's army would have returned from the intensive campaign against Mannai which is recounted in particular detail in the stela inscription published by L. Levine, Two Neo-Assyrian Stelae from Iran (Toronto, 1972) pp. 25ff.

Contents. The headings show that a muster was carried out in the intercalary month of Addar in 716 B.C., and that the equids were divided into the ša KASKAL and ša KUR categories. There is no further detail unless No. 110 is part of the same text, as it was according to the excavator (Iraq 24 (1962) 21—2). The two pieces were found in the same room, and that they belonged to the same tablet was presumably deduced from their external appearance, which is difficult for us to assess since they are now in different lands; but internal criteria seem to support the suggestion.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page 3</th>
<th>[ú-šal-]ám 23 ú-še-su-u</th>
<th>108.i.10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Page 4</td>
<td>LÚ.3.U₂ dan-nu</td>
<td>108.i.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page 5</td>
<td>LÚ.3.sumerian 2-ú</td>
<td>108.i.12; 101.i.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page 6</td>
<td>GIS tah-lip</td>
<td>101.i.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page 7</td>
<td>[1PA]P².BÁD</td>
<td>101.i.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page 8</td>
<td>[ ] i x [ (x) ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page 9</td>
<td>[ ] x x [ ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10’—15’ (traces only)
(remainder of col. i broken)

Col. ii

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page 1’</th>
<th>2[</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Page 2’</td>
<td>7 7 PAP 14[</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page 3’</td>
<td>1 7 PAP 8[</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page 4’</td>
<td>1 11 PAP [12]</td>
<td>KUR²-ra-ta-[a((-x))]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page 5’</td>
<td>4 6 PAP 19</td>
<td>i-sa-a-a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page 6’</td>
<td>3 BE 4 x(x)</td>
<td>ki-ir-pi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page 7’</td>
<td>5 8 PAP 1[3]</td>
<td>aš-sur-LAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page 8’</td>
<td>1 9 PAP 10</td>
<td>[a[²]]=du-si</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page 9’</td>
<td>[2] 10 PAP 12</td>
<td>kù-[x]-AŠ³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page 10’</td>
<td>[PAP (x +)][27 ša KASKAL 60⁷(+x) [ša³ K]UR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page 11’</td>
<td>[ ] ši[a-ma-ta-a-a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page 12’</td>
<td>[PAP x] ša KASKAL 1 ME 14⁷ ša KUR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page 13’</td>
<td>PAP 1 ME 65 x (x) 4 EN BE x (x)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page 14’</td>
<td>5 [š]al-lum-tá</td>
<td>mu-LAL-aš-šur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(3 lines erased)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page 15’</td>
<td>4 14 PAP 18</td>
<td>ba-la-[x]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page 16’</td>
<td>[x] x [PAP x]</td>
<td>U.GUR.PAP-SU[M²]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page 17’</td>
<td>[x] x</td>
<td>[³]dPA-u-a-a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page 18’</td>
<td>[x] 6</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page 19’</td>
<td>[x] 12</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(remainder of Col. ii broken)

Col. iii

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page 1’</th>
<th>[4] 3 PAP 7</th>
<th>aš-sur-x</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Page 2’</td>
<td>[2²] 12² PAP 14</td>
<td>MAN²-x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page 3’</td>
<td>[13²] 3 P[AP] 16</td>
<td>x(x)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page 4’</td>
<td>[x] x [PAP] 12</td>
<td>[x] x</td>
<td>b[i]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Translation and Notes

i.1′–6′: "... eunuch; [ ], total 1, Aššur-remeni; [x] he shall complete, 23 they shall take out, [x], the chief third rider; [x], the deputy third rider, [x], tah/lip-charioteer".

This section (which may begin with No. 109 obv.5–9) relates to the royal bodyguard and is closely similar to No. 108.i, and to No. 101.i.

i.1′: LÚ SAG is also found in No. 101.i.13.

i.2′: 1-en, if correctly understood, must have been written by the scribe to distinguish it from 60; if so, it cannot be the total for the entire section (which we would have to restore at the beginning of i.3′). For Aššur-remeni see No. 101.i.18, very likely the same man. Note that EN occurs after a numeral in ii.13′, where it probably stands for aš.[i]. Possibly the scribe omitted BE here, and one should read: P[AP 60 EN <BE> Aššur-remeni.

i.3′: for šalḫunu and šeṣu′u see commentary on No. 107. It is not understood why one verb is singular, the other plural.

i.6′: tah/lip also in No. 101.i.19 and 108.i.12. Probably restore [LÚ.GIŠ.GIGIR (MEŠ)] tah-lip after No. 101.i.19. JNP would prefer to take this line as a heading for the subsequent section in all three occurrences; SMD thinks that rulings all indicate ends of sections. See also note on No. 101.i.17′–19.

i.7′ onwards consisted of a group of names preceded by numbers (of equids). Only the name Ahuš-duri is preserved (cf. 101.i.20).

ii.1′–14′: "... 2, [x, total x, PN]; 7, 7, total 14, [PN]; 1, 7, total 8, [PN]; 1, 11, total [12], Kurrataya; 4, 6, Isaya, total 19, 3 BE, 4 ..., Kirpi; 5, 8, total 13, Aššur-taqqin; 1, 9, total 10, Sudusi; [2], 10, total 12, PN. [Total, (x+)27 of campaign, ... [of land/palace], ... 5, men of Hamath; [total 51] of campaign, 114 of land/palace. Total 165, ... 4 including BE, ... 5, completion, Mutalqin-Aššur".

This section lists animals by their officers' names, giving the number ša KASKAL, the number ša KUR, the total, and then the officer's name. This can be deduced from the totals in ii.10′–12′, and agrees with the headings in Nos. 109.4 and 111.i.1′.

ii.5′–6′: the total of 19, which is written between lines 5′ and 6′, is intended to apply to both lines for an unknown reason; possibly emend 6 in ii.5′ to 8 (to reach a total of 19), but uncertainties about ii.6′ make this doubtful.
ii.6': BE and x (x): the possibilities for reading BE in the horse texts include the following:

1. US "dead", as translated in TCAE pp. 256 and 376-7 for ABL 127 and ND 2451. SMD is against this on the grounds that dead horses would not remain in ma'assu-stalls, but JNP still thinks it the likeliest.

2. pēti, short for pethallu "cavalry": unlikely, since it does not fit the context of ABL 127, and pethallu is elsewhere written pēti-hal wherever cavalry officers occur.

3. BE, short for BE-qu (i.e. batqu or biqqu): the arguments against this are clearly stated in TCAE p. 53.

4. SUMUN = labiru "old, knackered"; this seems to suit all contexts, including the juxtaposition with akiltu in No. 111 rev. (whether akiltu means "written off" or "consumption"), and it is a well-attested use of the sign elsewhere in nA administrative tablets.

Whether BE means "old" or "dead", two passages in other texts make it clear that horses so designated are being booked in the accounts as deficits: this is certain from ND 2451, where the text is divided into credit and debit sections, and in ABL 1180 men who are BE.MES are counted among the "deficit" (mutā'a, wr. LĀ-e; cf. TCAE p. 295).

The second entry in this line also belongs under the heading ša KASKAL, to judge from its placing. For the sign(s) rendered x (x), which should presumably stand in opposition to BE, K. Deller has suggested re-<mutil>, by comparison with ND 2451:23 (TCAE p. 377); JNP proposes Z[I].ME[S] "alive", though without any exact parallels.

ii.11': "men of Hamath" are mentioned in ND 2646 along with other non-Assyrian groups known to have been incorporated in Sargon's army (cf. B. Parker, Iraq 23 (1961) 15, and TCAE p. 224 on the Ruqahaya and Hallataya in ABL 94).

ii.13' - 14': we are unable to restore ii.13' confidently; in the light of ii.6' the BE is probably a designation of some of the animals, but this does not assist the restoration of the sign which follows; reading BE-qi does not agree with the traces, or with other occurrences of BE-qu (especially No. Ill Obv.32'), and after EN = adi we should require BE-qi. 'n spite of the ruling after ii.13', comparison with No. 111 Rev.8 -9 and 17-18 strongly suggests that ii.14' is in fact the last line of this section, so that Mutaqqin-Assur would have been its commanding officer.

ii.15' - 19': "4, 14, total 18, Bala[...]; [x], x, [total x], Nergal-ahu-iddin?; [x], x, Nabuaya; [x], 6, [PN]; [x], 12, [PN]; ....".

The rulings between these entries suggest that these may be individual officials operating independently, like the musarkisū-officers, for instance, in other texts, rather than members of a section like the one before.

iii.1' - 6': "...; [4], 3, total 7, Aššur-[x]; [2], 12, total 14, Šarru2-[x]; [13], 3, total 16, [PN]; [x], x, total 12, [PN]; [Total, (x +)32 of campaign, 20(+(+x)) of land/palace, total 72? ... [x he shall complete]e, 24 they shall take out .....".

iii.5': possibly restore at the end of the line BE-qi after No. Ill Obv.32'; cf. also ii.13' above.

iii.6': the translation presumes restoring u-sa/-lam at the beginning of the line, but a number (j60 +24) is also possible. Restoration of the end of the line is impossible. The unit may be of Arzuhina or the Arameans, since the Arbil unit almost certainly follows.

iii.7' - 15': "[x, x, total x, Aššur-tuklassu; 3?, [x, total 3] of [...], total 6, [PN]; 1, [x, total x], Urdu; 3, 3, [total 6], Qurdi-Istar-lamur; [...], Dadusu—2; 5, 1[, [total 6?], Pan-Istar-lešir— 1; 3, x, [total x], Nanni; 34, 11[(+(+x), ....]; Total 54? .....].

Comparison with No. 108.obv.ii.17 -24 indicates that this was probably a contingent of Arbil officers.

iii.7': taking the PN as Aššur-tuklassu-1-1a-su.

iii.11' -12': the figures added later at the ends of these lines are very likely the numbers that they will 'complete' (cf. No. 107.3).

iii.14': although there is no PAP, the numbers in this line are so much higher than the others that they may be a total.

iii.15': if EN[...] is right, perhaps understand it as adi and compare ii.13' -14'.

iii.16' - 18': the numbers in this total are not large enough to be a summation of all the city units, even if Arzuhina is omitted. Since Arbil elsewhere comes last in the order of city units, these lines may contain a separate item like No. 102.iii.22' -24'.
Commentary

*Date.* If No. 109 is part of this tablet, the date is 716 B.C. In any case Lû hamataya in ii.11' may be an allusion to Sargon's conquest of Hamath, indicating a date certainly later than 720 B.C.

*Composition of the list.* Col.i is closely similar to No. 108 col.i, and if No. 108 is from a 4-column tablet one would have to assume that No. 110 (with 109) was also. In that case this would be the second column of the obverse, No. 109.i of course from the first column, and for the rest of col.i one would have to compare No. 108A.i. Here, as with the section before the chief eunuch's in No. 101.i, Aššur-remeni plays an important role.

Col.ii.1'—14' lists equids in (ša KASKAL) and (ša KUR) columns with their (rab urâte?) officers, and then gives a summary. This pattern is followed in iii.1'—6' and 7'—15', and since in this last section the officers are known from Nos. 101, 102 and 108 as rab urâte of the Arbil unit, it is reasonable to assume that the preceding sections were also "city units". The passage ii.14'—19' seems to be arranged differently and may therefore not be a "city unit".

If No. 109 belongs with this piece, it is likely that one of the last sections of the list was concerned with the "palace chariots" (see note on No. 109.rev.1'—3').

**No. 111**

(7.2) × (12.8) × (2.9)  
NW 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Obv.</th>
<th>(upper part, probably only ca. 3 lines, broken)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1'</td>
<td>[ ] ša KUR PAP 'LÜ.LŠGAL.SAG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3'</td>
<td>[ 8? ] 18 PAP 26 GIR.2 [( )]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4'</td>
<td>22 32 PAP 54 šal-[u-u]a-šal-lam 4 ŠE2?I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5'</td>
<td>10 14 PAP 24 LI[EN?] GIŠ.GIGIR.MEŠ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6'</td>
<td>2 4 PAP 6 BE3[(-x)] 2 ša ša ša šal-lam 4 ŠE2?I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7'</td>
<td>3? 3 PAP [6( )] 2' &quot; 4 [</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8'</td>
<td>[ x ] 4 [PAP x] x' &quot; 8 [x]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9'</td>
<td>[ x ] 5 [PAP x] x' &quot; 12 [x]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10'</td>
<td>[ 8?] BE a-k}[š-ta] 18 PAP [26] 2' &quot; 24 [</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12'</td>
<td>4 4 PAP 8 1' &quot; 7 [</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13'</td>
<td>5 8 PAP 14 [2] &quot; 12 [</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14'</td>
<td>1 7 PAP 8 [4] &quot; 4 [</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLET 111

15' 11 5 PAP 16 [2] 14 1 x
16' 10 12 PAP 2 [2] 20 1 x
17' 3 3 PAP [6] 2 4 1 x
18' [ ] ku-mu 1 dšU-
19' 8 2 2 PAP 1 [0] 2 8 1 x
20' PAP 68 BE a-kil-tu [60+] 34 ša KUR PAP 1 ME 62 [1]
21' 26 šal-la-mu 1 ME 37 E KUR aššu]-r-a-a

22' 6 2 PAP 8 1 7 ša-pi-ru
23' 2 2 [PAP] 4 1 3 na-ba-[a]-a
24' 3 1 [PAP] 4 1 3 1 i-5-A-
26' 2 6 PAP 8 1 7 PAP-SU [ ]
27' 2 3 PAP 5 1 4 da-ll-
28' 6 5 PAP 11 1 10 1 d[P]-A-
29' 5 5 PAP 11 1 10 1 š[a]-
30' — 4 PAP 4 1 3 1 [ ]
31' — 2 [PAP] 2 1 1 1 [ ]
32' PAP 29 33 PAP [62 x (x)], MES BE-qu [ ]

B.E. 33' 10 ú-šal-la-mu [ ]
34' uru-arrap-[ha-a-a(?)]

Rev. 1 5 9 PAP[14]
2 3 BE a-kil-tu 8 PAP[11]
3 1 4 [PAP 5]
4 1 6 [PAP 7]
5 2 11 [PAP 13]
6 3 2 [PAP 5]
7 5 [ x ] PAP 5 + x
8 PAP 20 BE [a-kil]-tu [40 + x ša KUR
9 5 šal-lum-tū [ ]

10 1 1 [PAP 2]
11 3 BE a-kil-tu 3 PAP 6
12 1 2 i PAP 3
13 3 x PAP 3 + x
14 9 x PAP 9 + x
15 5 9 PAP 14
16 3 2 PAP 5
17 PAP 25 BE a-kil-tu 10[ + x ša KUR
18 [x] šal-lum-tū [ ]

19 [x] 15 [ ]
(remainder broken)
Translation and Notes

Obv. 1: “[...]; of the land/palace; total; the chief eunuch”.

This line gives the column-headings for the rest of the obverse and reverse of the tablet, and by comparison with No. 109.1-4 it may have been preceded by an introduction giving the occasion and date of the list. The probable restoration of the first entry is [ša KASKAL] “of campaign” (see note on Obv. 20’ below). The top right-hand corner of the tablet, now missing, was present earlier, and we are most grateful to A.R. Millard for making his copy available to us, from which we have added the signs at the end of ll.1’-2’ on Plate 34.

Obv.2’-5’: “[11], 17, total 28, GAB.MES; [8], 18, total 26, ša šēpē; 22, 32, total 54, completion of the chief [...]; 10, 14, total 24, chariot-[owners]?”

2’-3’: these two entries must certainly be connected with the profession LÚ GIS.GIGIR (ša) GIR.2 and LÚ GIS.GIGIR GAB.MES(S-te) (see CAD M/ii 170-171 for references). For GAB(MES) see note on No. 87:31; here perhaps an abbreviation for gabagallu, pars pro toto, indicating a chariot with a higher front than the GIR.2 (but see also note on No. 96:10). For the types of chariot in general use see p.34.

4’: for salluntu (also Rev.9, 18) see Nos. 102.iii.26a’ ff.; 103.iii.3; 110.ii.14’. At the end of the line various restorations, including LÚ.GAL.MES, LÚ.GAL.SAG and LÚ.GAL[E], could be proposed.

5’: this line is restored in the light of No. 108.ii.25; for the EN GIS.GIGIR see above, pp.31-2.

Obv.6’-21’: “2, 4, total 6: [...]; 2) of which he shall complete, 4 he shall take out—[PN]; 3’, 3, total [6;2] ditto (=he shall complete), 4 (he shall take out)—[PN]; [x], 4, [total x +4; x] ditto, 8 (he shall take out)—[PN]; [x], 5, total [x +5; x] ditto, 12 (he shall take out)—[PN]; [8], BE consumption, 18, total [26]; 2 ditto, 24 (he shall take out)—[PN]; 2, 13, total [15]; 2 ditto, 13—[PN]; 4, 4, total 8; 1 ditto, 7 (he shall take out)—[PN]; 5, 8, total 13(!); [2] ditto, 12 (he shall take out)—[PN]; 1, 7, total 8; [4] ditto, 4 (he shall take out)—[PN]; 11’, 5, total 16; [2] ditto, 14 (he shall take out)—[PN]; 10, 12, total 22; [2] ditto, 20² (he shall take out)—[PN]; 3, 3, total [6;2] ditto, 4 (he shall take out)—[PN], instead of Marduk-[...]; 8, 2’, [total 1]0²; 2 ditto, 8 (he shall take out)—[PN]. Total: 68 (of campaign including²) BE consumption¹; [9]4 of the land/palace; Total 162 [...]. 26 completion(?), 137 they shall take out—the Assyrians”.

This section listed 13 individual officers comprising the Assyrian contingent each with their numbers of [campaign’s], land/palace, and šallumu and šēpu’s horses.

6’: restore probably BE-qu, since the total of the first two columns is described as BE-qu below (Obv.32’). After this 2 can be restored with confidence since throughout this section the 2 final columns of numbers give the same total as the two left-hand columns; is presumably to be read ušēṣṣu as in No. 107.i.15’ (unless it is ušēṣṣu but this seems less likely where only one officer is concerned).

10’: BE akiltu is restored after Rev.2 and 11; previously we had read the traces as UD.DU but it seems equally possible and consequently preferable to take the traces as -kil-tu¹. For the logogram BE see on No. 110.ii.6; for akiltu see on No. 90:20.

18’: for other occurrences of PN, kānum PN, in the horse lists see No. 101.iii.25 and iv.7’.

20’: this line gives the totals of the first three columns, although we cannot persuade the figures to match exactly: the only intact column of figures is the second (ša KUR) and this adds up to 88 instead of 94 as stated here; on the other hand 68 plus 94 does give 162 (which is only 1 off the total of 28 plus 137 (see L21’). At the end of the line we should perhaps restore [BE-qu] as in Obv.32’, perhaps with KUR.MES before it. The only remaining problem concerns BE akiltu: at first sight this phrase seems to refer to the entire first column of figures, suggesting that it should perhaps be restored as the heading to this column in Obv.1’. However, it would then be difficult to explain the phrase’s occurrence in Obv.10’ and Rev.2 and 11, where it applies to single entries only, implicitly excluding the others from this category. We can only suggest that the total here has to be understood as “Total, 68 (of campaign), (including) BE akiltu (=old/dead, consumption)”.

21’: šal-la-mu: the easiest explanation for this form is that it equals the word šallumu (AHw 1267α), but the meaning and connexion with the verb šallumu is here obvious; since in Obv.33’ it is replaced by ušallumu, here probably is to be read ušēṣṣu. For the “Assyrians” see No. 102.ii.7’.
Obv.22'-34': "6, 2, total 8; 1 ditto (=he shall complete), 7 (he shall take out)—Sapiru; 2, 2, [total] 4; 1 ditto, 3 (he shall take out)—Nabaya; 3, 1, [total] 4; 1 ditto, 3 (he shall take out)—Istar-aplu-[x]; 2, 3, [total] 5; 1 ditto, 4 (he shall take out)—Nergal-ahu-ididdina; 2, 6, total 8; ditto, 7 (he shall take out)—Ahu-eriba; 2, 3, total 5; 1 ditto, 4 (he shall take out)—Dal[i]; 6, 5, total 11; 1 ditto, 10 (he shall take out)—Nabu-[x]; 5, 5, total 11(!); 1 ditto, 10 (he shall take out)—Z[a ... ]; 0, 4, total 4; 1 ditto, 3 (he shall take out)—[PN]; 0, 2, [total] 2; 1 ditto, 1 (he shall take out)—[PN]; Total: 29, 33; Total [62 horses(?)], BE-qu[...].

10 they shall complete, [52 they shall take out]—the men of Arrapha?".

This section lists 10 individual officers of the Arrapha or Arbil contingent (see on Obv.34'), with numbers of horses listed as in the Assyrian section; comments made there will apply here and to the two following sections as well.

26': An Ahu-eriba is listed in the Arrapha section in No. 108.ii.3 and perhaps in No. 102.ii.13'.

29': since 11 is obviously the correct total, the 5 in the first column should read 6. For the restoration of the PN cf. perhaps No. 108.ii.6 1za-[x (x)].

32': if the 5 in 1.29' is emended to 6, the totals here are correct. There are no close parallels for the restoration of the sign lost before ]MEŠ, but perhaps simply read KUR.MEŠ "horses". Note that since no BE akiltu note is added to the figures in the first column here, there is no such note in the totals either.

34': for the restoration of Arrapha rather than Arbil here, cf. note on 1.26'; and in No. 102 and 108 Arrapha is listed before Arbil also.

Rev.1-9: "5, 9, total [14; ...]; 3 (of campaign, including?) BE consumption, 8, total [11; ....]; 1, 4, [total 5; ...]; 1, 6, [total 7; ...]; 2, 11, [total 13; ...]; 3, 2, [total 5; ...]; 5, [x, total 5+x; ...]; Total 20 (of campaign, including?) BE consumption, 40+x of the land/palace; Total .......]. 5, completion, [x they shall take out—the men of .......]."

This section listed 7 individual officers; probably they were Arameans, since the Aramean contingent follows that of Arrapha in Nos. 102 and 108; like the Arbil contingent it has only 7 officers in each case.

Rev.10-18: "1, 1, [total 2; ...]; 3 BE consumption, 3, [total 6; ...]; 1, 2, [total 3; ...]; 3, [total 3+x; ...]; 9, x, [total 9+x; ...]; 5, 9, [total 14; ...]; 3, 2, total [5; ...]; Total 25 (of campaign, including?) BE consumption, 10+[x of the land/palace: Total .......]. [x] completion, [x they shall take out—the men of .......]."

This section listed 7 individual officers, probably from Arbil (see above on Rev.1-9), since the contingent from Arzuhina (cf. No. 102) has 10 or 11 officers.

Rev.19: It looks as though the listing continued in much the same way, perhaps with the Arzuhina contingent (cf. No. 102); there would be room at least for one more contingent and a summation.

Commentary
There is no firm evidence for dating this text.

This text lists numbers for equids in the categories ša KASKAL (restored) and ša KUR, with the names of officers in the city units. The column headings suggest that those units were all under the command of the rab ša rēšē—chief eunuch, as were also the types of chariotry GAB.MEŠ and GIR.2, which are listed in lines 2'-5'.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. 112</th>
<th>NWL, Plate 54 (coll.)</th>
<th>ND 10076</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.0 × 9.0</td>
<td>BM custody</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### The Tablets from Fort Shalmaneser

#### Obv.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>[x te x]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>IM-ka-šir</td>
<td>102.ii.8’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>[x (x)] [1]<em>EN-I</em></td>
<td>114.2’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>U-EN-PAP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>man-nu-ki-[IM²]</td>
<td>102.ii.11’; 113.r.5; 114.1’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>AMAR.UTU-HAL⁻ni</td>
<td>113.r.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>ba-an-ni</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>x-[i]³-me²-e²</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>MAŠ.MAŠ-rém-ni</td>
<td>113.r.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>x-EN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>x-DINGIR x</td>
<td>(short break, possibly no lines missing)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Rev.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>[x (+)] LÚ.x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>ša LÚ.PA.MEŠ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>x ba² ad³</td>
<td>[1]<em>MAR.UTU-SU</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>šu³-Mu-MAN</td>
<td>[1]<em>DINGIR-ka-a-PAP</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>UTU-še-sib</td>
<td>[1]<em>MAŠ¹-pi-la-a</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>PAP-la-mur</td>
<td>li-pu-šú</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>GL²-INNIN</td>
<td>za-a-a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>ki-qa-la-nu</td>
<td>[1]<em>DINGIR-A-PAP</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>G-I-MAN</td>
<td>[1]<em>kab-bu-tú</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>PAP-GIS</td>
<td>PAP 32 ₂-ru-ú</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>LÚ.GAL kal-la-pa-[n]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>AP 2 ME 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>x 68</td>
<td>(perhaps 1 or 2 lines broken)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Translation and Notes

**Obv. 1-11:** “[x (x)], PN²; [x (x)], Adad-kašir; [x (x)], Bel-na’id; [x (x)], Adad-belu-uṣur; [x (x)], Mannu-ki-[Adad²]; [x (x)], Marduk-išmeanni; [x (x)], Banni; [x (x)], [...]; itme³; [x (x)], Nergal-remeni; [x (x)], [...]-Bel; [x (x)]; PN”. (*Break?*)

**Obv. 3:** Bel-na’id, possibly the same man as the abarakku ša mār šarrī of ADD 625 (690 B.C.).

**Obv. 6:** was collated for EN⁻HAL-ni unsuccessfully.

**Obv. 11:** was collated for [¹]*UTU-sal]-lim-ME[S] unsuccessfully.

The correspondence of two names with No. 102.ii suggests that these men are all rab kišri-captains of the Arrapha city unit.

**Rev. 1-2:** “[Total² x +]5, [...]-officers. [...] of the mace-bearers”. **
TABLET 112

Rev. 1: may perhaps be restored LÚ G[AL ki-šir uruarraphaya], if the two connexions with No. 102.ii are significant.

It is uncertain whether line 2 is an entirely separate entry, or has some connection with the previous line.


Rev. 3: Marduk-eriba: possibly the same man as occurs (promoted?) in ND 2788:18 and in ADD 855 r.4 as a mušarkisu.

Rev. 11: it is uncertain whether rab kalliipiini refers to one officer in charge of the preceding men (as translated), or whether all the preceding men are rab kalliapi rather than kalliapi.

Rev. 12: the total here seems to imply that the restored numbers on the obverse referred to urú too.

Commentary

Date. This text is grouped closely with Nos. 113 and 114 by personal names. The two connexions with No. 102 suggest a date in Sargon’s reign, very roughly around 711 B.C.

Content. The text appears to be another equestrian muster list in which the numbers refer to equids, possibly all as teams, urú, totalling 210 in all. The obverse probably lists some rab kisri-capitains of the Arrapha city unit. The reverse lists 15 named men who are probably dispatch-riders, kalliapi or kalliapi šipiri, and who have 32 teams (two each plus a spare?) under their officer in charge.

The kalliapi: These men are usually found as dispatch-riders, see Malbran-Labat, L’armée et l’organisation militaire de l’Assyrie pp.53, 82-3. If the single connexion with No. 118 through the name Ahi-lamur is not due to coincidence, these men are kalliapi šipiri. Stolper, BASOR 239 1980 p.79 has identified the (KUS) šipirtu as a scroll with sealing attached, but cf. Parpola, OAC XVII p.123 n.9.

Two texts show that there was a close connexion between the kalliapi and the mušarkisu. In ND 2706 a rab kalliapi named Aššur-šallimanni was appointed to be a mušarkisu; the text is almost certainly of Sargon’s reign, but the man is not found in these texts. ADD 855 lists kalliapi, followed by a section with named mušarkisani, identified from No. 99 §I as belonging to Sargon’s reign. A title *mušarkis kalliapi is not attested.

The close involvement of the kalliapi with other charioteers and cavalry is clear from the casualty list of Sargon’s 8th campaign, 1.426 (KAH II 141): 1 bēl mugerri 2 ša pethalli 3 kalliapi dikū “1 chariot-owner, 2 cavalrymen, 3 dispatch riders dead”. This list probably included only equestrian fatalities, and should not be taken as a full total. Kalliapi and rādi kibsi are connected in ADD 855 and ABL 526.

The teams in this text may imply that the kalliapi operated in chariots, but we are not confident that urú invariably means a chariot team; see p.32 above.

Note that the kalliapi is not attested in Nuzi texts; he may have superseded the lāsimu-runner. See Kendall, Warfare p.117.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Plate</th>
<th>ND 10073</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>35—36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NE 48; level III**

**Obv.**

1. 57 ANŠE.KUR.RA BE.BA 1 šu-ši \(^{1}\) ku-din\(^{1}\)
2. 53 KUR.RA ši-hi-li 22[+x] ku-din
3. PAP 1 [ME] 10 KUR.RA PAP 84\(^{2}\) <ku-din>
4. 53 KUR.RA \(^{57}\) ku-[din]-ni
5. 1 ME 10 1 MAN-[ ]
6. 13 ú-r[u]-ú 6 ú-r[u-ú]\(^{3}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1 U-MU-Šî[D](^{2}) 2 EN-S[I](^{2})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2 (\text{L}d)MAŠ-PAP-A[S](^{3}) 3 (\text{L}d)x[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>[x] 1 EN-BÀ[šá]-ni 1 ša x[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2 šu-šur-MU-[x] 20(^{2}) ma an x[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2 EN-GIŠ [(x x)] (\text{ša})(^{3}) GAL [ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1 (\text{L}x) LÜ.A.KIN(^{3}) [ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>2 PAP-ia-a-[x] 10(^{3}) lU-x[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>(\text{L}d)UG.GA-sa-x[ (x)] (\text{še})(^{3}) x[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>3 (\text{iš})-p[(\text{i})]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>(\text{L}d) x x [ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>PAP 20[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Rev.**

1. 6 4 \(\text{ša}\)\(^{7}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5 3 1 U-[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5 2 (\text{L}d)x[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3 1 (\text{L}d)AMAR.UTU-HAL-(n)[x](^{2})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3 1 man-nu-k(\text{d})fIM(^{2})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2(^{3}) [x] EN-HAL-ni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>[ ] x x x x x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>5 [(x)] (\text{L}d)MAŠ.]MAŠ-rém-ni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>3 1 EN-I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2 3 (\text{l})mi-is.d(\text{e})EN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>3 1 (\text{L}d)UTU-šal-lim-MES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**BM custody**

ru

99.iV.24

99.ii.22\(^{2}\); 118:10\(^{2}\)

112:6

102.ii.11'; 108.ii.1; 112.5\(^{2}\); 114.1' rk arrap

112:9

114.2'
Translation and Notes

Obv.1—6: “57 horses, BE.BA, 60 mules
53 horses, šihili, 24? mules
Total 110 horses. Total 84? mules

53 horses, 57 mules
110, [PN]

13 teams 6 teams (?) ”

Obv.1: BE.BA: the signs have been collated, and are quite clear. Perhaps an abbreviation; one expects a contrast with šihili in meaning. It is unlikely that BE.BA and šihili correspond to ša KUR and ša KASKAL in other Horse Lists, although the latter two categories may be applicable to the two columns of numbers on the reverse.

JNP, though fully aware of possible objections, would take BE.BA as an inversion of BA.ØS “dead” (attested at Tell Billa, JCS 7 (1953) 137ff. Nos. 72:45 and 86:8’; see TCAE pp. 344ff.).

Obv.2: ši-hi-li: taken as a form of šihlu II (AHw 1232a), to which add probably ši-hi-šu from CT 53 77.r.19 and [ANŠE.KUR.R]A' .MEŠ ši-ih-šu (CT 53 674:5’). The rendering “replacement, substitute” in TCAE pp. 256 and 258—9 is based on the context in ABL 154:27—30; confirmation for it comes now from the realization that in mA šihlu, doubtless a Hurrian loan, means “second(-class)”, which can be deduced from its opposition to SIG2 in KAJ 310:41—3.

Obv.6: urū: since rab urāte can mean both a cavalry officer and a chariotry officer, urū may not be restricted in meaning to chariotry teams.

Obv.7—12: “1, Adad-šumu²[...]; 2, Bel[...]; 2, Ninurta-ahu-iddin; 3, PN; [x], Bel-iqišanni; 1, of [...]; 2, Aššur-šumu²[...]; 20²[...]; 2, Bel-lešir ([...]) of the chief²[...]; 1, [...]

the envoy [...].”

Obv.12: LÚ A.KIN: this profession occurs individually in contrast to the other men who may all be rab urațe. The mār šipri (LÚ A.KIN) was an envoy or plenipotentiary usually acting on behalf of the king or the highest officials. Note that an interchange between the titles sukkalu and mār šipri has been found at Nuzi (Kendall, Warfare, pp.144—7). It would also be possible to understand this line as: “[PN] the envoy”, with the first sign as determinative DIS, not as a numeral.

Obv.13—17: “2, Ahu-ya...; 10, Adad-[...]; Ṭab-[...], [...]; 3, Išpi-[...]; ([PN]); Ninurta²-sharru²[...]. Total 20 [ ]”.

Obv.14: -sa- is quite certain. No connexion with Īb-sagal (see APN p.236) seems possible.

Obv.16: since Aššur is normally written without the divine determinative in these texts, the traces presumably represent _IMP.

Rev.1’—11’: “6, 4, of [ ... ]; 5, 3, Adad-[...]; 5, 2, [PN]; 3, 1, Marduk-isšmeanni; 3, 1, Mannu-ki-Adad³; 2’[x], Bel-isšmeanni; [ ]; 5, [x], Nergal-remeni; 3, 1, Bel-na’id; 2, 3, Mis-Bel; 3, 1, Šamaš-šallimanni?”

Rev.11’: for the possible reading of šal-lim-MEŠ see note 73 to PN index.

Commentary

This is a list of equids, some as teams, under named officers. Connexions with other horse lists indicate a date in Sargon’s reign. The first two groups of names may all be rab urațe. The third group, listed on the reverse, may perhaps all be rab kišri arraphaya, comparable to No. 112.obv.
No. 114  Plate 35  ND 10077
(6.3) \times (7.5) \times 2.4  BM custody
NE 48; level III  --

Obv.  (upper part broken)
1'  [ 1\text{man-nu-k}]-d[1\text{IM}^3]  108.ii.1;112:5;113.r.5  \text{rk arrap}
2'  [ 1\text{EJ}N^3-I  112:3;113.r.9
3'  [ 1\text{mi-is-EN  112:10};113.r.10
4'  [ x+7 1\text{dUTU-šal-lim-MEŠ  113.r.11

5'  [ ] 1\text{dAMAR.UTU-SU  112.r.3
6'  [ ] 1\text{PA}D^2-GIS  112.r.10
7'  [ ] 1\text{dMA}\text{S}^{3}\text{-pi-la-a  112.r.5

Rev.  8'  [ ] 1\text{DINGIR-ka-a-PAP  112.r.4
9'  [ ] 1\text{i-pu-šu  112.r.6
10'  [ ] 1\text{-PAP  
(3 or 4 lines broken)
15'  [  \text{k}al-la-pa-ni  (remainder broken)

Translation and Notes
Obv.1'–4': "[x, x, Mannu-k]i-[Adad]\text{3}; [x, x, B]el-na'\text{id}; [x, x], Mis-Bel; [x, x+7, Šamaš-šallimanni]."
As in the similar section of Nos. 112 and 113, there were probably two columns of numbers, and the men named may all be \text{rab k\text{išt}-captains of the Arrapha unit.}
5'–10': "[\text{PN}], Marduk-\text{eriba}, [\text{PN}], Ahu-\text{lešir}, [\text{PN}], Ninurta-pila, [\text{PN}], Ili-ka-ušur, [\text{PN}], Lipušu, [\text{PN}, ...]-u\text{šur/ahu]."
Compare No. 112.r.3–6. The same comparison may allow an approximate restoration of the broken lines ending:
15'–16'? : "[Total, x teams, officer in charge of] dispatch-riders, [total x]."

Commentary
Like Nos. 112 and 113, this text originally listed numbers of equids with named men. A sequence can be reconstructed from the three texts as follows:
- Heading plus total of horses and mules
- Heading for \text{urû}-teams
- At least two sections with a single column of numbers and the names of \text{rab urâte} from unidentified units
- One section with two columns of numbers plus the names of Arraphan captains, each underlined
- A group of officers, without a column of numbers, arranged with two names per line, and a total of teams under a \text{rab kallâpâni}.\]
No. 115

Plate 35

5.5 × 4.0

NE 48; level III

Obv. 1 1 ME 8 ú-ru-ú
2 Ša ANŠE.KUR.RA.MEŠ
3 1 ME 2 Ša ku-din-ni
4 PAP 2 ME [1]2

Translation
108 teams
of horses
102 of mules
Total 212

Note
Cf. TH no. 38, and the similar phrasing of ND 2631:7—8.

No. 116

Plate 36

(9.0) × (8.7) × (3.3)

NW 7

Translation

1' [ ] KI.MIN SA₅{[ ]}
2' [ ] G₁₆ PAP 15 ur ráp-ha₄[ ]
3' [ ] ANŠE.KUR.RA ir 1 KIMIN ir 1₆PA-Âš[(-x)]
4' [ ] G₁[N²] AD-₃ u - a 2 KUR SA₅ 2 KUR ir 1₆ša-15-du-[bu]
5' [ ] 1[ ] LUGAL-IGILÂ-₃ ni ur ráp-zu-hi-[n(a ( ) ]
6' [ ] M[ ]E₄ 3 KUR ha 1 KUR ir GUN [ ]
7' [ ] ME₄ PAP 4 AN.GAL-U-PAP [( ) ]
8' [ ] ME₄ 1 KUR G₁₆ 1₃šum₄-MA-DINGIR-a-a [( ] ]
9' [ ] 1par-ši-a[u]

10' [ ] x₁ + 1 KIMIN G₁₆.ME₄ 2 KIMIN SA₅.ME₄ 1 KUR[ ]
11' [ ] GUN₁ aš-sîr-re-su-[u]-a

12' [ ] 1 KUR [(remainder broken)]
Translation

[ ] ditto red
[ ] black. Total 15, city of Arrapha(?)

[ ] horses, irgu-colour, 1 ditto, irgu-colour, Nabu-iddin(?).
[ ] Ken-abua, 2 red horses, 2 irgu-colour horses, Ša-Ištar-dubbu.
[ ] Šarru-emuranni, town of Arzuhina.

[ ] 3 ha-colour(?) horses, 1 irgu-colour dappled(?) horse [ ]
[ ] total 4, Angal-belu-uṣur [ ( ) ]

[ ] 1 black horse, Šumma-ilaya [ ( ) ]
[ ] Parsidu

[ ] + 1 ditto, black ones, 2 ditto, red ones, 1 horse [ ]
[ ] dappled(?), Assur-rešu

[ ] 1 horse [ ]

(remainder broken)

Notes

2': Arrapha precedes Arzuhina also in No. 102.ii.19'.
3', 4': ir is taken as an abbreviation for irgu, which Fales, Assur 1/3 (1974) translated as "dun-coloured".
4': ša-Ištar-dubbu: the name has been collated and cannot be read ša-Assur-dubbu (limmu of 707 B.C.).
5': Šarru-emuranni: see note on No. 99.ii.6b and iv.16b.
6': ha: presumably an abbreviation for a term indicating colour or breed. One might expect har short for harbakannu or haršaya; a relevant word beginning with an open syllable ha is not known to us.
9': Parsidu is one of the recipients of a land grant from Sargon dated 713 B.C. (NARGD no.32).
11': Assur-rešu: possibly writer of ABL 144-8, 380-382, [444], 491-2, [544], [646], [1176], TCL 9 67, CT 53,42. He is mentioned in ABL 101:4, 123:12, 197:21 rev.4, 198 + CT 53,120 + CT 53 438:23 and rev.11; ABL 488:4, 490 rev.2, 1079 obv.2'; CT 53,35:6, 82:5, 98 obv.7', 138 A 17', 389:7'. Probably not the LU SAG scribe of the queen in TCL 9 58 (FNALD no.2).

No. 117  Plate 36  ND 10082

4.2 × (2.0)  IM for study
NW 21; fill.  [ — ]

Obv.  1  36 lim 2 ME 42
      2 'GIŠ3.BAN IGI.LÁ.MEŚ
      3 [ ] LAL

(1 or more lines broken)

Translation

36, 242 bows, inspected, [ ].
No. 118

3.5 × 7.0
NW 20; fill.

Obv. 1 PAP-la-mur 99.iv.20 ru; 112.r.6
2 ar-ra-bu
3 AD-DUG.GA
4 1.dPA-MAN-PAP
5 qi-sa-a-a
6 a-a-ra-bi
7 PAP 6 ina uruni-nu-a

8 a-tar-šum-ki 99.i.22 ru
9 ia-ga-DINGIR
10 PAP-ia-ú 99.ii.22 ru Samar; 113:13
11 gir-bi-íl
12 1.dPA-KI-a
13 bul-ta-a-a

Rev. 14 [PAP] 6 ša uruk kal-hi

15 1.dPA-ka-ša-at-kal
16 1R X1-PAP
17 115-BAD 99.i.2 ru
18 PAP 3 ina ši-pir-ti

Translation and Notes
1—7: “Ahi-lamur, Arrabu, Abi-šab, Nabu-šarru-usur, Qisaya, Aya-rabi, total 6, in Nineveh”.
8—14: “Atar-šumki, Yaqa-ili, Ahi-Yau, Girbil, Nabu-issiya, Bulțiya, total 6, of Kalhu”. Possibly Bultaya is a hypocoristic form of a name such as GN-ballittanni.
15—18: “Nabu-kaša-attkal, [...]-nasir, Ištar-duri, total 3, in the messenger service(?).”

Commentary
This text probably dates to Sargon’s reign according to its probable connexions with No. 99. It is the only tablet found in NW 20. It is a list of named rab urâte “commanders of teams”, divided into three parts with rulings. The precise meaning of the three summaries: “in Nineveh”, “of Kalhu”, and “in the šipîrî-service”, is not certain. There is no evidence to show that these chariooteers were themselves kallâpini “dispatch-riders”, except in the case of Ahi-lamur, who may recur in No. 112 as a kallâpu. This gives some credence to the reading šipîrî rather than šiṭû in line 18, as it is known from the phrase kallâp šipîrî.
THE TABLETS FROM FORT SHAULMANESER

No. 119 Plate 37 ND 10036

4.5 x 11.0 x 2.7

NE 48, level II.

BM custody

Obv. 1 [GEŠ]TIN.MEŠ KU I[TI.BAR]+AG UD.11.[KĀM]

2 [ ] L[U]I[ ] qur-bu-te
3 [ ] x (x)
4 1-BAN 6 E 2-e
5 [ ] x kil x
6 [ ] x .MEŠ
7 2[+1/2] qa I(m)u-kil PA
8 [ ] x x x
9 2((+x)) ša 6 ku-din
10 (x) x A.AIG śa qur*-ub
11 x (x) [š]I x x
12 x (x) [ka]I*-la-pu
13 (x) x [(x) x] x -ši-i
14 [ ] x [(x) x] x-KAD
15 [ ] 1(x x (x))-ki-[k (x)]
16 [ ] MEŠ-x-AS
17 [ ] -hu-ru
18 [ ] m[u]
19 [ ] śa\d DI[NGIR
20 [ ] 1PAP-KI-[x]-x
21 [ ] x 1MAN-[x (x)]-x-bu
22 [ ] x tab ši 1ši x
23 [ ] la\d be\d PAP
B.E. 24 [ ] 1u[r]
25 [ ] jup x [ ]
26 [ ] x x x [

Rev. (the reverse is written in two parts facing different directions, neither therefore apparently a continuation of the Obv.)

A. 1 [x (x)] GIŠGIGIR x (x) GAIU-ra[tI [x] x a-ni
2 [ ] x 1.MAS-rém-an\d
3 [ ] x 1.LU qur-bu-te
4 [ ] i x 1PAP-lu-x
5—6 [ ]
7 KUR x (x) -ti\d-a-a
8 KUR d\d-MAS-qil\d-a-a
9 KUR [h]ar-ha-[r]a-a-a
10 KUR [zu]r\d-zu-ka-za-a-a
11 [KUR (x)] sa-x-a-a
12 [(x) x-x-[k]u\d-[u]\d
B. 1 5[+x] ANšE 6-B[AN]ʃe [  
2 12 ANšE [  
3 9 5-BÁN 6½ qa [  
4 8 6-BÁNʃe 5½ qa GAL] [  
5 9½ 7-BÁN 2 qa  
6 [x] 9-BÁN 3 [qa  
7 [ ] ša [  

Notes
This wine list contains a very limited range of personnel; possibly all are military. The heading is very similar to that of NWL 2, and like NWL 2, 5 and 6 (?) it is dated to the 11th day of Nisan. It can probably be dated very roughly around 784 B.C.
Obv. 1: KU: Parpola, JSS 21 p. 70 suggested that akītu is the reading of this logogram. See note on No. 90:20.
Rev. A.8: not di₃-maš-qa-a-a (specifically collated)
11: perhaps sa-qa-a-a (collated)
Rev. A.7—11: these foreign gentilics, as in all the other wine lists, should perhaps be regarded as abbreviations for LU.MAH KUR ....uya, by comparison with 145.iv.26.

No. 120 Plate 38 ND 10038

8.8 x (10)
NE 48, level II.

Obv. (about 2 lines broken)  
1' 2 qa [ ]ši  
2' 2 qa [ ]ši-i  
3' 1 qa [ ]  
4' 1 qa x [  
5' 1 qa [  
6' 1 qa [  
7' 1 [qa [  
8' 1 [qa [(x) x] ra' a' nu²  
9' 4 [qa [ ] AL²  
10' 2 [qa x x x SIMUG KU.G[ ]  
11' 2 [qa 1[(x (x)]-15 ur[u]š[a] UR[U]-a-a  
12' 1 [qa 1[(x)]-MU-AŠ  
14' [x x] 1[m[a]-ši-DINGIR ša] UR.KU  
15' 2 qa KUR qū-ti-a-[a]  
16' 5 qa L[U.HAL².MEŠ KUR kaš-GŠÔ-a¹-a  
17' 1 qa 1[GIS].ML₃ AMAR.UTU  
18' 1 qa 1[(x)] x x x  
19' 5 qa 1[di]AMAR.UTU-x-[(x)]-ni
20'  $^7 q\alpha \left[x (x)\right]-E\hat{n}-x x$
21'  [ ] $K\hat{a}-[x (x)] x$

(remainder of Obv. broken; illegible traces on Rev.)

Notes

An extract from this text was published as NWL 30.

The name Silli-Marduk connects this text with NWL 3 (dated 784 B.C.)

If the name Ninurta-mukin-nii is correctly read, it connects this text with NWL 4, a tablet which contains the names of eponym officials of 787–765 B.C., and with NWL 30. A man of this name was limmu in 765 B.C.

2': possibly read $^{1}[k]\hat{a}-[s]-i$ and cf. NWL 6 and 19.

8'–12': it is not entirely certain whether the ends of the lines go as indicated or with different beginnings.

No. 121

Plate 38

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>$\times 10.0$</td>
<td>BM custody</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE 48, level II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Obv. 1  $^{1}24\hat{a} q\alpha u\hat{s} kib-si ME\hat{s} [\ ]$
2  $^{5} q\alpha k\hat{a}l-la-pu \hat{s}i-pi\hat{r}-te [()]$
3  $([(x)] 1.MA\hat{s}-LAL-\hat{s}u)^2$
4  $[x-B\hat{a}]N^2 1\hat{s}e 1 NUMUN-ti$
5  $^{3}q\alpha EN.GI\hat{s}.GI[GIR (L\hat{u})] IR KUR 1 h\hat{a}-[ ]$
6  $^{2}B\hat{A}N^3 [rak-su-te] ^{1}U-bu-ni-i$
7  $3 S\hat{u} . ^{1}ME\hat{s} 1 KUR sa-mi-r-na-a-a$
8  $^{1}x (x) 1-hi-mu$
9  $3 q\alpha [x x (x x)]-a-a 1 KAL^2-ma-n[a ( ) ]$
10 $3\hat{a} q\alpha 3 S\hat{u} . M\hat{e}\hat{s} KUR h\hat{a}-i[a]-a-a$
11 $^{1}AD-q\alpha-mu$
12 $([(x)] 1.GA[L] [k]-s\hat{u}-te [()]$
13 $[x x] 1-B\hat{A}N L\hat{U}.GAL [\ ]$
14 $[(x)x] 1.PA-\hat{s}\hat{e}-zib-ni [\ ]$
15 $[(x)x] 1.bu^2-[\ ]$
16 $[(x) x] 1.E\hat{n}-D\hat{U} x [x] x\{\ }$
17 $[x] q\alpha 1 D\hat{U}M.\hat{r}U\hat{s}\hat{u}-\hat{i}$
18 $[x q\alpha] BE \hat{i}\{\ }$
19 $[(x)] x q\alpha GAL x \{\ }$
20 $\frac{1}{4} q\alpha TA\hat{H} \{\ }$
21 $\frac{1}{4} q\alpha \{\ }$

(Rev. blank)

Notes

The tablet is roughly written and arranged. None of the names provides connexions with other wine lists.

7,10: $S\hat{u} . M\hat{e}\hat{s}$ presumably a smaller measure than the half $q\alpha$, since it follows $3\hat{a} q\alpha$ in line 10. It cannot be a fraction (cf. $3\hat{a} su$ in NWL, discussed on p. 114 there) and should be read logographically. Perhaps $LI\hat{s}^3$ for
"spoon, small dish" is correct; cf. NARGD p. 129 under itqurtu, references to the "spoon" used as a measure, but one expects a determinative.

8: the traces do not favour restoring the name of Menahem.

No. 122

17 × 6
NE 48, level II

Obv. NWL no. 16 and plate 29-30

Rev. 5' [x qa] 1 in? x x
6' [x qa] 1 kab-lu-aš-sur ṾŪ x
7' [x qa] 1 S怀⁰Subs.⁰GId[U?] 
8' [x +] qa 1 ma²-qa-na²-x-AN-
9' [x qa] [ ] b? x [ ]
10' [x qa] LŪ x [ ]
11' [x qa] LŪ x [ ]
12' [x +] qa LŪ A[.ZU?1] KUR h[a²]
13' [x +] qa 1 i-lu-hu²-[ ]
14' [x +] qa 1 i-lu-x [ ]
15' [x +] qa UN⁰.ME[ ]
16' [ ] [ ] x [ ] a²
17' [ ] [ ] x [ ] GAL⁰ NAGAR⁰
18' [ ] [ ]
(possibly another line missing)
20' [ ] [ ] LŪ A₃.SIG⁰.MAN⁰[()]
21' [ ] [ ] 2²
22' [ ] [ ] 10 [ ] x²
23' [ ] [ ] 1 x [()] A x ki
24' [ ] [ ] Ṿ x Ṿ JR.U.KAS[KAL?] x x [ ]
25' [ ] [ ] 1 a²-hu²-u-a² ša LŪ GAL⁰ x ṾMEŠ⁰¹
26' [ ] [ ] 1 x (x) ta¹-hi-bi EN ŠES⁰.MEŠ-šù
27' [ ] [ ] KUR elam-ma-a-a
28' [ ] [ ] KUR a [ ] u²
29' [ ] [ ] KUR elam-ma-a-a ša ki-i-ki
30' [ ] [ ] KUR x sa²-a-a
31' [ ] [ ] KUR [ ] x [ ]
32' [ ] [ ] MI [ ]
33' [ ] [ ] MI [ ]
34' [ ] [ ]
Notes

In this text women’s names follow gentilics of foreign countries, for which there is no parallel among other
wine lists. In NWL 18 there is an intervening section of male names between the two sections. Foreign gentilics
end the text in NWL 1, 4, 6(7), 8, 9(7), 11, 14, 23.
20': Deller suggests alternatively reading rra'-tep-p[a] at the end of the line.
25': perhaps read LŪ GAL GESŢIN.
26': "PN, with his brothers".
29': ša kiki or ša šikku: meaning unknown.

No. 123 Plate 39 ND 10039

3.7 × (8.4) × 2.0
NE 48, level II

Obv. 1' 42 qa2
2' 1 qa [ ]
3' 3 qa [ ]
4' 3 qa KUR E[ ]
5' 2 qa2 e2 [ ]
6' 2 [(x) x] [ ]
7' [ ] x [ ]
8' [ ]1 x (x) x
9' K[UR?] (x) 1ar-bu-šu2 x [ ]
10' [ ] na [ ]
11' 1 [qa] GAL SUM .NI(NDA]
12' [x] qa? ša E. ku-dīn
13' 6 qa A.SIG DINGIR.MEŠ
14' [ [ša2 e][u]mu-še-zib-te x (x)
(Perhaps 1–2 lines broken; Rev. uninscribed)

No. 124 Plate 40 ND 10031

16.3 × 9.5
NE 48, level II

Obv. see NWL plate 27 and No. 14.

Rev. 1 [ qa2 LŪ NAR.M]E(S) kur'kaš-[ša-a-a]
2 [ ] x nu2 am du r1.d2 a2 x [ ] mu še [ ]
3 [ ] r x1 ša rUR.H.KU.MEŠ ša-r nu1
4 [ ] bša2-ni
5 [ LŪ NAR.M]E(S) kurha-ta-a-a
Notes

5: since hattaya occurs elsewhere only with NAR.MEŠ, the restoration of that profession is almost certainly correct.

6: alternatively [Burz~]nani is possible; cf. NWL 3.ii.22(!)

11: it is doubtful whether the gentilic ulubaya should be read here; the preceding sign is clearly not KUR.

12: this name should almost certainly be restored as šilít-AMAR.UTU; cf. NWL 3.ii.26, where likewise Šili-Marduk follows soon after Marduk-uballit.

19-20: note that a ruling separates the middutu section here and on NWL 5, dated 779 B.C. (reign of Shalmaneser IV).

25: Parpola’s suggestion in JSS 21 p.168 to read kur.₃-₄-₅ ni-sa-[a-a] is not supported by collation.

Commentary

Texts which end similarly with middutu + gentilics + total are NWL 1, 5 and 11. As NWL 1 and 5 both date to around 780 B.C., it is likely that this text should be placed at roughly the same date. The name Marduk-uballit occurs in NWL 3, dated 784 B.C., which confirms this grouping and dating. With these factors in mind, we re-collated the limmu of NWL 14 obv.2 again; ₁drMAS₃-₄DU₃-₅SE₃ seemed most convincing, for 789 B.C., but this reading cannot be considered definite.

Comparison with NWL 11:23 and NWL 5.r.12 suggests that the latter should be read: ṭ₁₃ DUG.SAB 1 ANSE me-₄-du₃-tu; a unit of measure occurs in this text too before middutu.

It is possible that Marduk-uballit is the cavalryman, ša pethalli, of GPA 94, dated 788 B.C.
No. 125 Plate 39 ND 10034

7.0 × 4.0
NE 48, level II

Obv. completely illegible.
Rev. 1 [x] qa 1.dPA-MIŠ LÚ ḫZADIM?
2 [x] qa ḫERIN3,MIŠ ša ḫIM
3 [ ] x DINGIR-PAP
4 10 [ ]EN-BAD ( )
5 1 x 1 2 ka'i ša

Notes
2: probably ḫIM rather than URU1 ḫIM; there are no parallels for this line.
5: One expects a total, as for example at the end of NWL 4. This text may date to Sargon II's reign if Nabu-sumu-lesir in No. 133 is the same man.

No. 126 Plate 38 ND 10046/2

(3.4) × (5.5)
NE 48, level II

Obv. (upper part broken)
1' x
2' [(x + )] qal x
3' 2 qa LŪ
4' 4½ qa LŪ
5' 4½ qa LŪ
6' 2 qa LŪ. " [ (remainder of Obv. broken; on Rev. only blank space preserved)

No. 127 Plate 37 ND 10045/1

(4.2) × (4.6) × (1.7)
NE 48, level II

1' [ ] x [qa] ᵃš[a] ᵃš[a]
2' [( )] 2 qa ša DINGIR-
3' 2 qa ša إشšu-na-ni
4' [x qa ša [ (remainder broken)
Note

*dunāni* is discussed by Menzel, Ass. T. II, T86. See also p. 40 above.

No. 128  
Plate 37  
ND 10044/1

$\text{(3.4) } \times (6.2) \times (2.9) \quad \text{BM custody}$

NE 48, level II

**Obv.** (upper part broken)

1' [ ] ša[
2' [ ] x qa L[U.
3' [ ] x q[a] L.[U.
4' 4 qa L[U.x[
5' 2 qa A[
6' 5 qa x[
7' 3 qa ][

(remainder of Obv.) broken)

**L.S.**  
1' [ ] x x[
2' [ ] $\text{fu(?)bu-x[}$
3' [ ] šu\text{a} te x (x)[

No. 129  
Plate 41; NWL Pl. 39  
ND 10045/2 + 3

$\text{(2.6) } \times (2.6) \ [10045/2] \quad \text{IM for study}$

$\text{(2.0) } \times (1.8) \ [10045/3] \quad -$

NE 48, level II

Two small fragments, probably joining as indicated.

1' [ ] L[U.]š $kib-si...$
2' [ ] L[U. kar-[ka-
3' [ ] L[U. bar-[a-qu
4' [ ] ša U[R.KU].[MEŠ
5' [ ] L[U.GAL [  
6' [ ] L[U.MU [  
7' [ ] $\text{šES}^{\text{th}} [$

NB. ND 10045/2 is copied in NWL Plate 39 ('No number assigned'). For restorations, see e.g. ND 10051 Rev (Plate 34).
No. 130  
NWL, Plate 44 (coll.)  
NE 48, level II.

Obv. 

(1 or 2 lines broken)

1' 

[(x) x] ANŠE ša 1.d.

2' 

[(x) x] 2 AN[SE 8]-BĀN ša 1.d.MAŠ. X.[]

3' 

[(x) x] 1 ME [(x +)]3 ANŠE 3.BĀN

4' 

19 ŠE 3.BĀN É.GAL ŠU 1.d.MAŠ.[

5' 

20 KIMIN ŠU 1aš-su[r]-ni[-]

6' 

2'2 KIMIN 1.d.MAŠ.TI-[ ]

7' 

PAP 62 LŪ.ŠU É.GAL[( )]

(Reverse uninscribed)

Note
The commodity with which this text deals is unknown.

No. 131  
Plate 41  
ND 10044/2

Obv. and Rev. have the beginnings of 9 lines each, containing only quantities in qa and the sign MI introducing female recipients.

No. 132  
NWL Plate 37  
ND 10046/3

NE 48, level II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1'</td>
<td>[ ] ina GIS [ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2'</td>
<td>[ ] qa x x [ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3'</td>
<td>[ ] ANŠE (NIGIDA) 2 BĀN ina É [ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4'</td>
<td>[ ] DUGŠAB a-na [ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5'</td>
<td>[ ] KIMIN ina É.GAL [ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6'</td>
<td>[ ] x x [ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLES 130—134

**No. 133**

Plate 42; NWL Pl.43

ND 10058

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(10.5) × 11.0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NE 48, level III</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Obv. i**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>[(x)] x x (x)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>qa ta-ri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>qa x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>ni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>a2-ku-u-a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>qa PA-MU-GIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.dPA-MU-GIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>DUG.SAB x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>TA* x BAD.1MAN-G[t]N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>i-ti-x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>4 DUG.SAB mušar-kis-MES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>LÜ.NAR.MES ina bit-a-ni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1q GAL KAŠ.LUL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(remainder of Col. i broken)

**Notes**

i 1: despite many attempts, the reading of this line remains puzzling. JNP suggests rak-si! U₃.KAM, but there does not seem to be enough space for U₃.KAM. SMD thinks the signs may be MI US KUR, but this does not appear to make sense. JNP interprets sa u-ta-ri as "of the intercalary month".

i 10: either Khorsabad or the Babylonian place called Dur-Sarrukin is meant.

i 11: as noted in NWL p.153, the signs are in *Glossenschrift.*

---

**No. 134**

Plate 42

ND 10060

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(6.0) × (9.0)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NE 48, level III</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**BM custody**
Notes
This tablet is in poor condition, but was well written.
12': might equally be read LÜ US[.BAR,5ip]-ra by comparison with 145.iv.14.
The surface of the reverse is destroyed.

No. 135  Plate 41

4.8 x 7.7  ND 10078
NE 48, level III  IM 64238

Obv. 1  2\(g\)a SUR IGI\(dr\)IM\(\aat\) \(x\)
2  2\(g\)a LÜ X X X li
3  1 qa LÜ A.KIN ša mi\(MAN\)\(\aat\)-\(ia\)
4  SAG.DU\(\num{12}\)UR.MAH\(\aat\) [(x)] X ü X ia du\(\aat\)
5  1\(K\)ASKAL\(\aat\)-U-PAP
6  2 [kur\(a\)]\(\aat\)-du-da-a-a
7  1 [kur\(a\)]\(\aat\)-du-ma-a-a
8  1 [kur\(a\)]ha-za-\(a\)-a-a
9  2 kur\(a\)-\(\aat\)-\(\aat\)-\(\aat\)-\(\aat\)-\(\aat\)-a-a ur-ki-i-u-tu\(\aat\)
10 2 kurses-du-u[p\(\aat\)]
11 2 kur\(a\)-\(\aat\)-da\(\aat\)-\(\aat\)-\(\aat\)-\(\aat\)-a-a ur-ki-i-u-tu
12 2 [kur\(a\)]\(\aat\)-\(\aat\)-\(\aat\)-\(\aat\)-\(\aat\)-a-a ur-ki-i-u-tu
13 [  ] \(x\)-\(qa\)-\(\aat\)-\(\aat\)-\(\aat\)-a-a
14 [  ] \(b\)\(\aat\) X X X-a-a
15 [x]+ \(20\aat\) DUG\(\aat\).S[AB\(\aat\)]

Rev.  (traces of signs about half-way down, but remainder blank)
Notes
1: *purāri* (SUR)-offerings are made for Adad in NWL 3:6, for Marduk in NWL 4 obv.3 (Parpola’s emendation), to MUL in NWL 6:3, and to deities whose names are missing in NWL 5, 11 and 14. At the end of the line, SUMUN and *tMU* are both possible.

3: *mi*MAN*-te*-ia: probably not MI*KUR*. Since this text lists mainly foreign envoys, and since she has her own envoy (LU A.KIN) she was probably a foreign queen, but it seems unlikely that MI MAN-te should be read *tarrete* followed inexplicably by -*ia*.

4: SAG.DU UR.MAH: K. Deller identified this complex as a drinking vessel in the shape of a lionhead, both here and in No.144:3, 6, for which we are most grateful. The logogram is never preceded by a determinative for a vessel; it also occurs in the ritual text K.3455+ (Menzel, *Ass. T II* T93–95) and in ABL 366, also with reference to a ritual (see Postgate, *Sumer* 30 (1974) pp.58–9 and note on p.71). It also occurs in CT 53 1:18. The occurrence here and in No.144 shows that its use was not restricted to ritual. Such vessels are shown in use in some numbers on a Khorsabad relief of Sargon II; see NWL pl.2.

9: *ia-s*[(x)]u-a: possibly compare *ia-su-[h]a-a-a* in ADD 1110+.iii.3 (TCAE p.341); Zadok, *WdO* 9 (1977), suggests dating that text to 698–694 or 688–678 B.C. It is very unlikely, however, that this text or any of the Wine Lists can be dated after Sargon’s reign.

10: Deller points out the possibility of reading *kur-sa-da-[l]a-a-a* by comparison with ABL 198+CT 53 438+CT 53 120, line 57.

12: was collated unsuccessfully for some spelling of Jerusalem.

13: Deller suggests perhaps *kan*-qa-*ru’*<-na>-*a-a*, Ekron.

Commentary
This text is unusually short for a wine list; it may be an extract from a longer list. The occurrence of Ashdod, Edom, Gaza and Judah makes possible at least two different datings: either following Tiglath-Pileser III’s annexation of Lower Egypt in 734 B.C., or in connexion with Sargon’s conquests in 720 and 713–2 B.C. (Tadmor, *JCS* 12 (1958) pp.79 and 83, notes that Sargon intervened in that area before his conquest in 712 B.C., probably in 713). For a detailed review of the conquests of Assyrian kings in Palestine, see Y. Aharoni, *The Land of the Bible* (2nd ed. revised, 1979). Deller suggests that this text reflects the same event as NL 16, although this cannot be taken as more than a likelihood; we cannot be at all certain that all these gentilics belong to the same area, as the gentilics are very mixed geographically in other wine lists, e.g. NWL 4, 6, 8, 18, and No.143, as far as can be judged in view of the bad state of preservation of all passages. Nor do we know whether the visit of such envoys was always restricted to a year of conquest, or whether it was repeated in subsequent years; the mixture in other wine lists suggests the latter.

According to a new reading by Borger and Tadmor, *ZAW* 94 (1982) p.244ff, Hosea brought tribute to Tiglath-Pileser III after the succession of the former in 732–1 B.C. But there is no evidence that emissaries from other Palestinian countries accompanied him; and the tribute was paid in Babylonia, which may imply that the wine list for that occasion would not be found at Kalhu.

No. 136

(5.5) × (3.7)
NE 48, level III

Plate 42

247

BM custody

ND 10068
Obv. 1 [ ] LÚ.SAG KUR ú-ra-á[r-ta-a-a]
2 [ ] u[1rusar2-gi-t[3]
3 [ ] x [ud] šá 1GH I[Jú
(remainder of Obv. broken)

Rev. (upper part broken)
1' [ ] x k[1d na bu [d]
2' [ ] KUR an-di-a-a
3' [ ] aI.GIS.GIGIR ša GIR3.22[()]
4' [ ] IR KUR [()]

Note
Obv 2: cf. Sarragitu, an Aramean stronghold known only in the inscriptions of Tiglath-Pileser III and ABL 617. This makes a date in his reign possible for this fragment.

No. 137

(4.0) × (3.5)
NE 48, level III

1' [ ] š[2 GIR.
2' [ ] GIS.PA3
3' [ ] MEṣ KUR ha-ta-a-a
4' [ ] ša DINGIR.MEṣ-ni
5' [ ] KUR [d]r-ma-a-a
6' [ ] MU.MEṣ-te
(remainder broken)

No. 138

Plate 42

(3.3) × (6.5)
NE 48, level III

Face A 1' [ ] GAL3[...
2' [(x) x q]a2 LÚ[...
3' [ ] aI.GIS.GIGIR.MEṣ[...
4' [ ] ]šu-[u2-
5' [ ] 1PAP[...
6' [ ] 1UR.MAN x[...
7' [ ] ša x[...
8' [ ] x su[...
(remainder of Face A broken)
Face B

1' [ ] L[Ù]
2' [ ] ša x[
3' [ ] ša x[
4' [ ] x x x[
5' [ ] x Š.G/A/L²

(remainder of Face B broken)

No. 139

Plate 41

ND 10072

(2.5) x (6.5) x (1.8)

NE 48, level III

1' [ ] L[Ù].
2' [ ] ga² LÙ.[
3' [ ] LÙ.x[
4' [ ] LÙ.A.ZU
5' [ ] LÙ.x[
6' [ ] L]Ù.]
7' [ ] LÙ.x[
8' [ ] LÙ.GAL[
9' [ ] šašur-us²[
10' [ ] x-sa-x[
11' [ ] BĀ[D

(remainder broken)

No. 140

Plate 41

ND 10075

3.8 x 2.8 x 1.8

NE 48, level III

1 ¹tab-ši-GIS
2 ku-um ¹GURUN-i-še-ha
3 URU du-na-a-te

Translation
Tabši-lešir instead of Inbu-išera, town Dunnate.

Note
3: du-na-a-te could also be read gup-na-a-te; but a fem. plural of gapnu/gupnu is not elsewhere attested.
No. 141

THE TABLETS FROM FORT SHALMANESER

NWL Plate 45 (coll.)

BM custody

No. 141

14.2 x 9.0

NE 49

Obv. 1 GEŠTIN.MEŠ KU ša [ ]-MAN-PAP

2 3-BAN a-na [ ]
3 3-BAN a-na ug[U (x)] pu[ ]
4 2 ANšE[
5 PAP 2 ANšE 2-BAN re-sa-a-ti

6 10 ANšE ina [urš]kur-TAR-ru

7 17 ANšE 6-BANše 6 ? q[a] ina uruši-šil

8 16š ANšE 8-BAN [x qa] ina uruš-[b]a-se-e

9 1š ANšE 2-BAN 1(( + x) qa x x x (x x)-])š

B.E. 10 ina E.GAL ma-[šar-ti (x x x)]šš-tiši

11 PAP 54 ANšE 5-BAN 4 qa ša [x x (x x)]-šša

Rev. 12 1 ANšE 8-BAN pa-an AD M[AN p]u-hi ina MÛRU URU ša 2 K[ASKALš.MEŠ]

13 5 ANšE 1-BAN 5 qa [in]a uruši-ša-se-e

14 pa-an AD MAN pu-hi ša 2 KASKAL MEŠ

15 14 ANšE 5-BAN ina E.GAL ma-šar-ti

16 PAP 21 ANšE 4-BAN [5] qa ša MAN pu-hi

17 PAP-ma 76 ANšE 6-BANše 8 qa GEŠTIN.MEŠ KU

Translation

Wine, ... of [ ]-šarru-ušur

3 seah, to [ ]
3 seah, to [ ]
2 homers [ ]
Total 2 homers 2 seah, first-rate/first fruits.

10 homers in the town Kartarru(?)

17 homers 7 seah 6 qa in the town Šišil

16 homers 8 seah [x qa] in the town Ubase

1(?) homer 2 seah 1(?) qa [ ]
in the Review Palace [( )] he took
Total 54 homers 5 seah 4 qa ...

1 homer 8 seah, before the father of the substitute king on the citadel, of 2 journeys.

5 homers 1 seah 5 qa in the town Ubase, before the father of the substitute king, of 2 journeys.

14 homers 5 seah in the Review Palace

Total 21 homers 4 seah 5 qa, of the substitute king.
Total 76 homers 6 seah 8 qa, wine, ....

Notes

Other texts from Nimrud that mention the šar pūši (substitute king) are ND 3483 (Wiseman, Iraq 15 pl.15) and NWL 33.

By comparison with NWL 33 Deller would restore ša [pa-ni] MAN puš <-hi>. But it may be better to accept the clear PAP and read ša [lim-me '(x) x]-MAN-PAP, i.e. the eponym for 786 or 784 (the only possibilities between 800 and 700 B.C.). ND 3483 is post-canonical (Nabu-naṣir, now attested also on a Syrian tablet, see RA 65 (1971) 85).

5: rēšāti: see note on No.39:2. The supposed total does not seem to summarise the previous lines.

6: URU kar-TAR-ru: not elsewhere attested; possibly read kar-mu-ra, and see note on No.74:12.


8: Ubase: a possible location at Tell Huwaish, on the W. bank of the Tigris 15 km. N of Ashur is suggested in NWL p.111. JNP suggests alternatively Qayyara, which is similarly situated about 40km. N of Ashur.

12: MURU URU: presumably the citadel at Kalhu; cf. NWL 3.i.10—11.

12, 14: ša 2 KASKAL MEŠ: the precise meaning is not certain.

Commentary

As pointed out by Parpola, JSS 21 (1976) 173, this text can almost certainly be associated in content with two tablets found in ZTE 30 on the citadel at Nimrud: ND 3483 (post-canonical) and perhaps ND 3484 (readings uncertain), and with NWL no.33 (probably reign of Adad-nirari III, since Bel-ali also occurs in NWL 3 dated 784 B.C.). It may be possible to improve the interpretation of these texts when the citadel tablets are collated and studied again. However, it is already apparent that a substitute king was supplied from Kalhu at two different periods, and that he travelled to various towns. Possibly URU ša-ša-se-e here is a different spelling for URU ub-si-a-a in ND 3483 (and the closely associated ND 3414), which might imply a special connexion of Ubase with the ritual. Timing definitely attested is 22nd—24th Dumuzi (ND 3483, x2, each on edge of tablet, not collated), and 22nd Abu (NWL 33).

This suggests the possibility of connexion with a ritual event of more regular occurrence than an eclipse. Note that the 22nd of the month (? Śabatu, or every month?) is the day when the god Ashur goes to the bit dugani, according to LKA 73:8 (see Menzel, Ass.T II T29—32, but also Addenda T218; there are actually no clear month names extant for this event), almost certainly as part of the kISpu ritual. A text for the ritual surrounding the substitute king (Lambert, AIFO 18 (1957—8) 111) includes a very damaged second column
in which the king's family and ghosts are mentioned. This seems to support the possibility that a substitute king was at least sometimes appointed when Ashur went down into the temple to Dagan for *kispu* rituals.

In ND 3483:14 the substitute king is supplied *ina nubatte*; it may be relevant that *Malku III 143* gives *ūm kispī* as a synonym of *ūm nubatti*, although a less specific meaning for *nubattu* as "evening ceremonies" may be preferable. Line 14 here shows that the substitute king's father was involved and supplied, and a large retinue perhaps accounts for the large quantities of wine issued.

According to information kindly supplied by Dr. F.R. Stephenson of the Department of Physics, Durham University, there was a total lunar eclipse in 786 B.C. in the middle of March (Abu in NWL 33 corresponds roughly to July—August) which would have been visible from Ashur; and a partial eclipse of the sun in February 784 B.C. The substitute king could remain on the throne for 100 days in the case of an eclipse. The substitute king ritual and all associated texts are discussed at length by S. Parpola, LAS part II (AOAT 5/2 1983) pp. XXII ff.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. 142</th>
<th>NWL Plate 40 (coll.)</th>
<th>ND 10025</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(4.0) × 3.2</td>
<td>BM custody</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE 49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obv. 1</td>
<td>[-]na²-a-a x[</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>]elam-a-[a]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>]gara]-g]a²-x[</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>q]a² KUR sa-ma-[al-a-a]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>K]UR sa-me-ri-na-a-[a]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev. 6</td>
<td>AN]ŠE GEŠTIN 2 §AB.MES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>[( )] KUR b[]-ni-sa-a-a-u</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(remainder blank)*

*Note*

7: cf. NAT Bunisa.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. 143</th>
<th>Plate 43</th>
<th>ND 10030</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8 × 8</td>
<td>IM 64227</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE 49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

col.i: It is not certain whether the traces, which include numerals, really belong with col ii and were wrongly separated by a double ruled line by the scribe.
Notes
ii.9’—10’: the sheikhs of Itu’a occur in the letter of Sargon’s reign ABL 424.
ii.9’—11’: the terms nasiktini and sakniite may perhaps be on the same diplomatic level as LÙ MAH.MEŠ in No.145.iv.26, and comparable with all other foreign gentilics of this type. Cf. note on No.119.r.A.7—11.
ii.13’: Deller suggests rKURl nu-q[u 1-d]i-na-a-a (cf. NAT p.270)

For a third column which is used for rough calculation, cf. no.98.

Commentary
The mention of an envoy or ambassador from Moab makes a date in the reign of Tiglath-Pileser III or Sargon II very probable. See commentary on No.135. Note that the reading of Moab in ND 400, in the reign of Tiglath-Pileser III, is now read mu’unaya by Borger and Tadmor, ZAW 94 (1982) and connected with the Me’unim of II Chron.26:7, probably to be located around Ma’an in S.W. Jordan, and so likely to occur in similar contexts to Moab.

No. 144
Plate 43

ND 10029

7.0 × 4.3
NE 49

Obv. (? with longest dimension vertical)
1 3 qa mif‘È.SAG₂.GIL-ÈÈ

IM 64226
THE TABLETS FROM FORT SHALMANESER

2 1 qa\(^1\) mi\(\_ki\)-si-tú-NA\(^4\)

3 [qa\(^1\)] mi\(\_ri\)-mu\(\_r\)-x (x)\(^1\)-e-a-a

4 2 qa mi\(\_a\)-hu\(\_r\)-te\(\_l\)\(^3\)

5 2 qa mi\(\_a\)-bi-ra-mi\(^3\)

6 1 qa mi\(\_ha\)-su-nu

7 x qa mi\(\_e\)-su\(^3\)-tú

8 2\(^7\) qa x x x

9 1\(^1\)U\(^1\)-AŠ

10 1\(^1\) na-a-hu

11 ([() \(\_\)]\(^1\)tur-ta-ni

12 [(x)]\(^1\) mu-še-zib-d\(\_\)MAS

Rev. (? with longest dimension horizontal)

13 [x (DUG)] S\(\_\)AB \(\_\)ša\(^3\) Tiššu

14 [(() \(\_\))] \(\_\)PA-x (x)

15 [(() \(\_\))] S\(\_\)AG\(^1\).DU U.R MAH LÚ SUKKAL

16 [(() \(\_\))] \(\_\)mu-še-zib-d\(\_\)MAS

17 [x (DUG)] S\(\_\)AB kurhu-bu-us-ka-a-a

18 [(() \(\_\))] S\(\_\)AG\(^1\).DU U.R MAH DUMU\(^2\) MAN kal x x x hu\(^2\)

19 1 (LAL\(^1\)) LÚ NAR [(()]

20 1\(^1\)EN-TILLA

Notes

It is not certain which is obv. and which is rev.; in No.122 the women's names follow the gentilics. However, the overlapping signs on the first surface suggest that the opposite is true here.

4: or read a-hu-u-tú (Deller)

5: or read a-bi-ra-hi\(^3\) (Deller)

7: or read e-le\(^3\)-tú (Deller)

8: possibly read and \(\_\)TUK-DINGIR\(^1\).ME (read Raši-ilāni).

Rev. 15, 18: the lion head drinking vessel which may have also been a standard capacity measure, see note on No.135:4.

18: Deller suggests \(\_\)A-hi\(^3\)-hu, but parallels are needed. To take the signs as \(\_\)ka\(^x\)-A-A-A\(^3\) x makes poor sense and leaves the last sign stranded.

Commentary

There is no definite evidence for dating this text. However, Mušešib-Ninurta occurs twice (lines 12 and 16), possibly translatable as: "turtan of M" and "sukkalla-vizier of M". This suggests that he was a foreign ruler, visiting as a pro-Assyrian vassal, and he may perhaps be the ruler whose name was inscribed on the stone bulls at Tel Arban, found by Layard (Nineveh and Babylon p.276) and whose seal (E. Unger, BASOR 130 (1953) p.15 ff) shows that he was the grandson of Samanuha-šar-ilani ruler of Šadikanni (see CTN II pp.8-9 for this man and a governor of Kalhu with the same name, and note that G. van Driel, Bi. Or. 38 (1981) 266 is to be corrected accordingly). The grandfather sent tribute to Ashurnasirpal II in 883 B.C. (see Grayson, ARI II p.124). Unless Samanuha-šar-ilani was a more distant ancestor than a grandfather, the identification of Mušešib-Ninurta would imply that the tablet is to be dated among the early Wine Lists (see Introduction p.24 above), for which the earliest definite date is 784. This would imply in turn long reigns for
the rulers of Sadikanni. In any case, this text cannot be dated securely on one possible identification without supporting evidence.

No. 145  
Plate 44  
ND 6218  
16.0 x 20.0  
S.W.6  
IM 60589  
784 B.C.

col.iii  
1  2-BÁN²  L[U rāj-su-[le GA]² LÚ SAG  
2  5² qa  ša 8[5m[hu]-zi-b-ā-te  
3  3 qa  ša ū'-ra-ā-te  
4  1½ qa  ša 8[5du-na-ni  
5  ½ qa  LÚ GIGIR ša 8[5tah-lip  
6  2 qa  LÚ UŠ kib-sī  
7  2 qa  LÚ GAL 50.MEŠ-ni  
8  2 qa  LÚ AŠGAB.MEŠ URU.ŠA.URU-a-a  
9  (line erased)  
10  4 qa  ṯ x x x LÚ SUKKAL² MEŠ  
11  (line erased)  
12  2 qa  LÚ ZADIM.MEŠ GİŠ.BAN.MEŠ  
13  [()] URU³,ŠA(st).URU-a-a  
14  1 qa  [1]d²-B[IA].KUR LÚ SIMUG.KŬ².GI  
15  1 qa  1u²-da²-a-ki  
16  1 qa  [1]man-nu-ki-PAP.MEŠ LÚ UŠ.BAR  
17  1 qa  [1]d²[ ] x ū  
18  DUG¹ ṯSAB²[MF] NAR.MEŠ  
19  2 ṯANŠE²[ ] LŬ² NAR.MEŠ  
20  KUR aš-šur-a-a  
21  2 qa  KIMIN KUR kaš-ša-a-a  
22  1 qa  KIMIN KUR ta-ba-la-a-a  
23  1 BÁN 5³ qa  KIMIN KUR ku-mu-ha-a-a  
24  4 qa  KIMIN KUR kal-dâ-a-a  
25  1 qa  1ki-in-zu-ra [DUMU-šă³  
26  1 qa  1ra⁵-du²-lU AŠGAB  
27  1 qa  1ra⁵-rd²-mu² LŬ SIMUG² AN².BAR  
28  1[ ]  
29  1-BÁN ½ qa  LŬ.NINDA.MEŠ KUR aš-šur-[a]-a  

col.iv  
1  [ ] x x ši  
2  [ ] x ni  
3  [ ] x x-a-a  
4  [ ] x dan x-a-a  
5  [ ] 16da-šil]MŰSEN.MEŠ [(KUR) ku]-mu-ha-a-a  
6  [ ] x a ni (x) ki [ ]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column</th>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Translation</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>x x</td>
<td>x -a-a sî2 x ha</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>x x</td>
<td>urû kal-ha-a-a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>URU.ŠA.URU-a-a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>1ûkar-ka-di-na-a-îte3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>x qa</td>
<td>dî3-nu16mu-îx3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>[x] qa</td>
<td>î[ ] x si hu3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>LÛ.ZADIM GIŠ.BAN.MEŠ KUR elam1-a-a-a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>UŠ.BAR TÖG şî-pîlr-a-ti</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>x -a-a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>Aš8 GAN2-a-a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>[x] qa1</td>
<td>1rŠES1-la-mur</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>[x qa]</td>
<td>1AŠ DI A SÚ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>1mar-duk-A-TI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>1AŠ DI e lî3-Sû</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>qu x x x [ ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>x x x x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>x x a2 nu LÛ NAGAR mu-gir3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>x x 22 2-BÁN mi-du-îtû3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>1 ME x (x x x erased)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>DUG.SAB LÛ MAH KUR elam-ma-a-a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>PAP 6 ANŠE x-BÁN l qa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>U4.19.KAM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L.E.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>KUR qa2 AN MEŠ HU ME</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes

Cols i and ii were published as NWL 3, plates 9 and 10.
iii 1: cf. e.g. NWL 4 obv.14.
7: the expected forms are hanû or hanat. The complement -ni implies a form hanatâni.
8: Fales, Or.Ant.16 p.66 suggested that URU.ŠA.URU be read ekallâtâ rather than Ašûr or libbi âli. But see note 78 to PN index below.
10: possibly read LÛ.SIMUG AN3.BAR.
25: cf. Abdaya AŠGAB in NWL 1 iii 14. Abdu and Abdaya may be forms of the same name.
iv 28: the heading implies that the whole list is for the 22nd(?) day; we have found no explanation for this line naming the 19th day. The number in the heading cannot be read 19.

Commentary

The additional information afforded by these two columns shows a greater range of ethnic singers than any other wine list. It also shows that the Assyrian army was using and manufacturing the Elamite bow (iv.13) in 784 B.C., i.e. during the reign of Adad-nirari III; and that an Elamite ambassador was entertained in Kalhu in that year (iv.26).
TABLETS 146 & 147

No. 146

No copy

ND 6225

8.5 × 14.5

IM 60591

SW 6; 2m. below surface.

[Unfortunately this tablet is mislaid and has been for some years (cf. CTN I p.124 where ND 6228 is a misprint for 6225, and 1967 for 1957). Since after a further search there is no prospect of rediscovering it, we quote here the information given in the excavation catalogue for 1957: Right edge and lower edge broken; 19 and 27 lines. Issues of provisions, possibly wine, issued in qa and šappu-pots to individuals or officials and tradesmen or groups of nationals. Entries include 1 qa to the exorcist (Lû dšîpu), 1½ qa to the râdi kibsi officer of the footstool (?) (i.e. ša GIR.2, JNP?), 2 qa to a blacksmith, 1 sîtu 5 qa ina libbi 5 DUG.SAB. A fragment of the right corner, 3.5 x 3.5 cm., with 7 and 5 lines belongs but does not fit.]

The professions could not be checked, and so have not been included in the index.

No. 147

NWL Plate 44

ND 6210

3.5 × 2.5

IM 60586

SW 6; 2.40 m. below surface, 0.90 m. W of E wall.

16.xii.781

NR 384; NWL 111

Obv. 1 20 ANŠE GEŠTIN.MEŠ
2 ša ursia-lu-na
3 TA* IGI
4 1mu-šē-zib- DINGIR

Rev. 5 mah-ri
6 ITIŠE UD.16.KĀM
7 lim-me
8 1.dšūl-ma-nu-MAŠ

Translation

20 homers of wine, of the town Yaluna, received from Mušezip-ili.

Month of Addar, 16th day, limmu Shalmaneser.

Notes

The date is given as 857 in NR 384. Also possible are: 781 B.C. (Shalmaneser IV), and 723 (Shalmaneser V).

5: mah-ri probably for mahš.
No. 148

NWL Plate 44

ND 6211

4 × 7

BM custody

SW 6; 2 m. below surface.

Triangular docket, sealed on both faces.

Obv. 1 17 ANŠE 4\(\tilde{b}\)[N GEŠTIN,MEŠ] (seal impression)

2 [ša urūia-lu-[n]a

3 ša 1.dU\(\ddot{u}\)TU-rēm-ni

Rev. 4 ITLIŠE UD.8.[KĂ]M

(seal impression; then a break in which the name of the eponym was presumably written).

Translation

17 homers 4 seah [of wine]
of the town of Yaluna
of Šamaš-remeni.
Month of Addar, 8th day.

No. 149

NWL Plate 44

ND 6223

5 × 2

BM

SW 6; found in jar at S end of room

Obv. 1 1 ANŠE 5-BAN KAŠ.M[EŚ ( )]

2 UD.27.KÂM ša\(^{2}\)[

B.E. 3 ina Ė LŪ.GA[.]SA[G]

Translation

1 homer 5 seah of beer, 27th day of [ ] in the house of the chief eunuch.

No. 150

Plate 45

ND 11303

(2.5) \(\times\) (4.0) \(\times\) 3.3

Inst. Arch. London

FS Dump

Fragment of baked clay, probably not from a tablet. Ends of three lines, in large script, perhaps more Babylonian than Assyrian.
No. 151  
(3.0) × 3.6 × 0.55  
Plate 45; Photo Plate 50  
Corridor E, west end  
reign of Shalmaneser III  

Small fragment of polished red stone, perhaps from the bowl of a spoon.

1 [ ]dǘl-ma-nu-MAS [()]  
2 [ ]AŠ-PAP-A MAN KUR AŠ [()]  
3 [ ]KUR AŠ-ma [()]  
4 [ ]KŪ LÁ-e-ti LIŠ x[  

Translation  
[ ] Shalmaneser (III), [king of Assyria, son of] Aṣṣur-naṣir-apli (II), king of Assyria, [son of Tukulti-Ninurta (II)], also king of Assyria. [ ] eat, .... spoon(?) ..[ ]  

Note  
4: the sign LIŠ is quite clear, and since this piece of stone is of a gently concave shape in two directions, it is very tempting to understand the sign as DILIM = itqāru "spoon". The inscription is on the convex side (the "back"). An inscription for a spoon, dedicated to Tašmetum by Sin-šarru-iskun, is known from Ashur (M. Falkner, AFO 16 (1952–53) 306–7), written as a draft on a clay tablet together with a dedication for a kalli šulpi “bowl and drinking tube” to Nabu. It is possible that the name of a deity should be restored at the beginning of the first line, although a secular inscription is also possible; especially since the object was not found in a temple, and the inscription here is very much briefer than the dedication on the Ashur tablet.  
For the spoon used as a measure see note on No.121.  

No. 152  
(5.4) × (7.7) × 1.2  
Plate 45  
NE 2, fill above floor  

Fragment of hollow barrel cylinder of Esarhaddon; duplicates ll.55—62 and 1—12 of ND 1126 (Borger, Ash. pp.33—5); dated to eponymate of Banba, deputy sukkalu, 676 B.C.
## CATALOGUE OF TEXTS (BY EXCAVATION NUMBER)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ND</th>
<th>No. or ref.</th>
<th>Museum</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Provenance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1126</td>
<td>Iraq 14, 54—60</td>
<td>Esarhaddon cylinder</td>
<td>Surface find</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6210</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>IM 60586</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6211</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>E (BM)</td>
<td>SW 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6212</td>
<td>NWL No. 4</td>
<td>E (BM)</td>
<td>SW 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6213</td>
<td>NWL No. 33</td>
<td>IM 60587</td>
<td>E 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6214</td>
<td>NWL No. 5</td>
<td>IM 60588</td>
<td>SW 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6218</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>IM 60589</td>
<td>SW 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6219</td>
<td>NWL No. 6</td>
<td>E (BM)</td>
<td>SW 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6220</td>
<td>79</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ctyd. 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6223</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>E (BM)</td>
<td>SW6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6224</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>IM 60590</td>
<td>SW 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6225</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>IM 60591</td>
<td>SW 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6227</td>
<td>NWL No. 33</td>
<td>E (BM)</td>
<td>SW 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6228</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>IM 60592</td>
<td>NW 15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6229</td>
<td>NWL No. 1</td>
<td>E (BM)</td>
<td>SW 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6230</td>
<td>NWL No. 2</td>
<td>IM 60593</td>
<td>SW 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6231</td>
<td>Iraq 19, 139—145</td>
<td>IM 73200</td>
<td>Aramaic ostracon</td>
<td>SW 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6232</td>
<td>NR 394; ARI II p.168</td>
<td>IM 60498</td>
<td>Aššur-naṣir-apli inscription</td>
<td>NE 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6233</td>
<td>NR 394; ARI II p.168</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>as 6232</td>
<td>NE 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6234</td>
<td>NR 394; ARI II p.168</td>
<td>IM 60635</td>
<td>as 6232</td>
<td>NE 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6235</td>
<td>NR 394; ARI II p.168</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>as 6232</td>
<td>NE 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6236</td>
<td>NR 394; ARI II p.168</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>as 6232</td>
<td>NE 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6237</td>
<td>NR 394; ARI II p.168</td>
<td>IM 60636</td>
<td>as 6232</td>
<td>NE 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6238</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>IM 60594</td>
<td>uninscribed?</td>
<td>NW 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7000</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>IM 74476</td>
<td>SE 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7001</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>IM 74477</td>
<td>SE 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7002</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>IM 74478</td>
<td>SE 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7003</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>IM 74479</td>
<td>SE 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7004</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>IM 74480</td>
<td>SE 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7005</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>IM 74481</td>
<td>SE 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7006</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>IM 74482</td>
<td>SE 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7007</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>IM 74483</td>
<td>SE 11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7008</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>IM 74484</td>
<td>Ctyd S of SE 22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7009</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>IM 74485</td>
<td>SE 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7010</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>IM 74486</td>
<td>SE 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7011</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>IM 74487</td>
<td>SE 14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7012</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>IM 74488</td>
<td>SE 14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7013</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>IM 74489</td>
<td>SE 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7014</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>IM 74490</td>
<td>SE 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7015</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>IM 74491</td>
<td>SE 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This list is intended to cover all cuneiform inscriptions known to the editors from Fort Shalmaneser; although one Aramaic ostracon is included, it does not cover Aramaic, Hieroglyphic Luvian or Egyptian inscriptions on ivories and other objects. It is impossible to give entirely precise details for some of the stone and brick inscriptions left in situ; nor have we attempted to include inscribed cylinder seals or impressions from them.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Qty</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>IM</th>
<th>Section</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7016</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td>IM 74492</td>
<td>SE 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7017</td>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
<td>IM 74493</td>
<td>SE 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7018</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>IM for study</td>
<td>IM 74494</td>
<td>SE 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7019</td>
<td>64</td>
<td></td>
<td>IM 74495</td>
<td>SE 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7020</td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
<td>IM 74496</td>
<td>SE 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7021</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
<td>IM 75751</td>
<td>SE 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7022</td>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
<td>IM 75752</td>
<td>SE 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7023</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td>IM 75753</td>
<td>SE 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7024</td>
<td>61</td>
<td></td>
<td>IM 75754</td>
<td>SE 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7025</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td>IM 75755</td>
<td>(+7061) D 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7026</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td>IM 75756</td>
<td>SE 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7027</td>
<td>73</td>
<td></td>
<td>IM 75757</td>
<td>SE 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7028</td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
<td>IM 75758</td>
<td>SE 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7029</td>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
<td>IM 75759</td>
<td>SE 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7030</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
<td>IM 64193</td>
<td>inscribed sealing SE 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7031</td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
<td>IM 64194</td>
<td>inscribed sealing SE 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7032</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td>IM 64200</td>
<td>sealing SE 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7033</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>E (1A)</td>
<td>IM 75760</td>
<td>SE 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7034</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td>IM 75761</td>
<td>SE 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7035</td>
<td>151</td>
<td></td>
<td>IM 75762</td>
<td>SE 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7036</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td>IM 75763</td>
<td>stone spoon(?) Corridor E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7037</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td>IM 75764</td>
<td>SE 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7038</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>IM 75765</td>
<td>Dump (SE 147)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7039</td>
<td>77</td>
<td></td>
<td>IM 75766</td>
<td>Dump</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7040</td>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
<td>IM 75767</td>
<td>(+7026) D 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7041</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td>IM 75768</td>
<td>SE 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7042</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
<td>IM 75769</td>
<td>SE 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7043</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
<td>IM 75770</td>
<td>SE 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7044</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>IM 75771</td>
<td>SE 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7045</td>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
<td>IM 75772</td>
<td>SE 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7046</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>IM 75773</td>
<td>SE 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7047</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>IM 75774</td>
<td>SE 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7048</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td>IM 75775</td>
<td>SE 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7049</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td>IM 75776</td>
<td>SE 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7050</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td>IM 75777</td>
<td>SE 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7051</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td>IM 75778</td>
<td>E 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7052</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td>IM 75779</td>
<td>S 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7053</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td>IM 75780</td>
<td>S 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7054</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td>IM 75781</td>
<td>S 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7055</td>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
<td>IM 75782</td>
<td>S 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7056</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td>IM 75783</td>
<td>S 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7057</td>
<td>81</td>
<td></td>
<td>IM 75784</td>
<td>S 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7058</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td>IM 75785</td>
<td>S 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7059</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td>IM 75786</td>
<td>S 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7060</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
<td>IM 75787</td>
<td>S 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7061</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
<td>IM 75788</td>
<td>S 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7062</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td>IM 75789</td>
<td>S 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7063</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td>IM 75790</td>
<td>S 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7064</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td>IM 75791</td>
<td>S 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7065</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
<td>IM 75792</td>
<td>S 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7066</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td>IM 75793</td>
<td>S 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7067</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td>IM 75794</td>
<td>S 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7068</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
<td>IM 75795</td>
<td>S 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>IM/Location</td>
<td>Inscribed amulet</td>
<td>Dump or Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7097</td>
<td>Iraq 23, 176-8</td>
<td>E (BM)</td>
<td>Esarhaddon cylinder</td>
<td>SE 1, 2 &amp; 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7098</td>
<td>Iraq 23, 176-8</td>
<td>E (BM)</td>
<td>Esarhaddon cylinder</td>
<td>SE 1 &amp; 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7099</td>
<td>Iraq 23, 176-8</td>
<td>IM 64206</td>
<td>Esarhaddon cylinder</td>
<td>SE 1 &amp; 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7100</td>
<td>Iraq 23, 176-8</td>
<td>IM 64209</td>
<td>Esarhaddon cylinder</td>
<td>S 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7104</td>
<td>Iraq 24, 38 - 9 pl. 22/1</td>
<td>IM 61867</td>
<td>Sealing</td>
<td>SE 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7879</td>
<td>NR, 384, 420</td>
<td>IM 75887</td>
<td>Lion weight</td>
<td>NE 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8159</td>
<td>NR, 420</td>
<td>IM 75888</td>
<td>Stone vase</td>
<td>S 38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9900</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>IM 75895</td>
<td>Esarhaddon cylinder</td>
<td>NE 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9901</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>IM 75896</td>
<td>Esarhaddon cylinder</td>
<td>NE 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9902</td>
<td>Iraq 24, 116f.</td>
<td>IM 75897</td>
<td>IM for study</td>
<td>NE 38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9903</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>IM 75898</td>
<td>IM for study</td>
<td>NE 38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9904</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>IM 75890</td>
<td>IM for study</td>
<td>NE 38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9905</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>IM 75891</td>
<td>IM for study</td>
<td>NE 38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9906</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>IM 75892</td>
<td>IM for study</td>
<td>NE 38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9907</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>IM 75893</td>
<td>IM for study</td>
<td>NE 38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9908</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>IM 75894</td>
<td>IM for study</td>
<td>NE 38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9909</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>IM 75895</td>
<td>IM for study</td>
<td>SW 37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9910</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>IM 75896</td>
<td>IM for study</td>
<td>NE 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9911</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>IM 75900</td>
<td>IM for study</td>
<td>NE 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9915</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>IM 75901</td>
<td>Shalmanezer III statue</td>
<td>NE 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10000</td>
<td>Iraq 24, 90ff.</td>
<td>E (BM)</td>
<td>NE 50, East</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10001</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>IM 64210</td>
<td>NE 50, East</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10002</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>IM 64211</td>
<td>NE 50, East</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10003</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>IM 64212</td>
<td>NE 50, East</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10004</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>IM 64213</td>
<td>NE 50, East</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10005</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>IM 64214</td>
<td>NE 50, East</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10006</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>IM 64215</td>
<td>NE 50, East</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10007</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>IM 64216</td>
<td>NE 50, East</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10008</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>IM 64217</td>
<td>NE 50, East</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10009</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>IM 64218</td>
<td>NE 50, East</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10010</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>IM 64219</td>
<td>NE 50, East</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10011</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>IM 64220</td>
<td>NE 50, East</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10012</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>IM 64221</td>
<td>NE 50, East</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10013</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>IM 64222</td>
<td>NE 50, East</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10014</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>IM 64223</td>
<td>NE 50, East</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10015</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>IM 64224</td>
<td>NE 50, East</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10016</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>IM 64225</td>
<td>NE 50, East</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10017</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>IM 64226</td>
<td>NE 50, East</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10018/1</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>IM 64227</td>
<td>NE 50, East</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10018/2</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>IM 64228</td>
<td>NE 50, East</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10019</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>IM 64229</td>
<td>NE 50, East</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10020</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>IM 64230</td>
<td>NE 50, East</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10021</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>IM 64231</td>
<td>NE 50, East</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10022(A)</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>IM 64232</td>
<td>NE 50, East</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10022(B)</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>IM 64233</td>
<td>NE 50, East</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10023</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>IM 64234</td>
<td>NE 50, East</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10024</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>IM 64235</td>
<td>NE 50, East</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10025</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>IM 64236</td>
<td>NE 50, East</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10026</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>IM 64237</td>
<td>NE 50, East</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10027</td>
<td>NWL No. 13</td>
<td>IM 64238</td>
<td>NE 50, East</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10028</td>
<td>NWL No. 13</td>
<td>IM 64239</td>
<td>NE 50, East</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10029</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>IM 64240</td>
<td>NE 50, East</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10030</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>IM 64241</td>
<td>NE 50, East</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*IM = Inscribed Marking*  
*NWL = Northwest Library*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Catalogue No.</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10031</td>
<td>IM 64228</td>
<td></td>
<td>NE 48/II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10032</td>
<td>E (BM)</td>
<td></td>
<td>NE 48/II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10033</td>
<td>IM 64229</td>
<td></td>
<td>NE 48/II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10034</td>
<td>IM 64230</td>
<td></td>
<td>NE 48/II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10035</td>
<td>E (BM)</td>
<td></td>
<td>NE 48/II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10036</td>
<td>E (BM)</td>
<td></td>
<td>NE 48/II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10037</td>
<td>IM for study tablet fragment</td>
<td></td>
<td>NE 48/II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10038</td>
<td>E (BM)</td>
<td></td>
<td>NE 48/II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10039</td>
<td>E (BM)</td>
<td></td>
<td>NE 48/II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10040</td>
<td>IM for study tablet fragment</td>
<td></td>
<td>NE 48/II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10041</td>
<td>IM for study tablet fragment</td>
<td></td>
<td>NE 48/II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10042</td>
<td>IM for study tablet fragment</td>
<td></td>
<td>NE 48/II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10043</td>
<td>IM for study tablet fragment</td>
<td></td>
<td>NE 48/II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10044</td>
<td>IM for study tablet fragment</td>
<td></td>
<td>NE 48/II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10045</td>
<td>IM for study tablet fragment</td>
<td></td>
<td>NE 48/II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10046</td>
<td>IM for study tablet fragment</td>
<td></td>
<td>NE 48/II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10047</td>
<td>IM for study tablet fragment</td>
<td></td>
<td>NE 48/II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10048</td>
<td>IM for study tablet fragment</td>
<td></td>
<td>NE 48/II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10049</td>
<td>IM for study tablet fragment</td>
<td></td>
<td>NE 48/II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10050</td>
<td>IM for study tablet fragment</td>
<td></td>
<td>NE 48/II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10051</td>
<td>IM for study tablet fragment</td>
<td></td>
<td>NE 48/II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10052</td>
<td>IM for study tablet fragment</td>
<td></td>
<td>NE 48/II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10053</td>
<td>IM for study tablet fragment</td>
<td></td>
<td>NE 48/II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10054</td>
<td>IM for study tablet fragment</td>
<td></td>
<td>NE 48/II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10055</td>
<td>IM for study tablet fragment</td>
<td></td>
<td>NE 48/II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10056</td>
<td>IM for study tablet fragment</td>
<td></td>
<td>NE 48/II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10057</td>
<td>IM for study tablet fragment</td>
<td></td>
<td>NE 48/II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10058</td>
<td>IM for study tablet fragment</td>
<td></td>
<td>NE 48/II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10059</td>
<td>IM for study tablet fragment</td>
<td></td>
<td>NE 48/II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10060</td>
<td>IM for study tablet fragment</td>
<td></td>
<td>NE 48/II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10061</td>
<td>IM for study tablet fragment</td>
<td></td>
<td>NE 48/II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10062</td>
<td>IM for study tablet fragment</td>
<td></td>
<td>NE 48/II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10063</td>
<td>IM for study tablet fragment</td>
<td></td>
<td>NE 48/II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10064</td>
<td>IM for study tablet fragment</td>
<td></td>
<td>NE 48/II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10065</td>
<td>IM for study tablet fragment</td>
<td></td>
<td>NE 48/II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10066</td>
<td>IM for study tablet fragment</td>
<td></td>
<td>NE 48/II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10067</td>
<td>IM for study tablet fragment</td>
<td></td>
<td>NE 48/II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10068</td>
<td>IM for study tablet fragment</td>
<td></td>
<td>NE 48/II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10069</td>
<td>IM for study tablet fragment</td>
<td></td>
<td>NE 48/II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10070</td>
<td>IM for study tablet fragment</td>
<td></td>
<td>NE 48/II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10071</td>
<td>IM for study tablet fragment</td>
<td></td>
<td>NE 48/II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10072</td>
<td>IM for study tablet fragment</td>
<td></td>
<td>NE 48/II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10073</td>
<td>IM for study tablet fragment</td>
<td></td>
<td>NE 48/II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10074</td>
<td>IM for study tablet fragment</td>
<td></td>
<td>NE 48/II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10075</td>
<td>IM for study tablet fragment</td>
<td></td>
<td>NE 48/II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10076</td>
<td>IM for study tablet fragment</td>
<td></td>
<td>NE 48/II</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The Tablets from Fort Shalmaneser*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Catalogue Number</th>
<th>Excavation Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10077</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>E (BM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10078</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>IM 64328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10079</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>E (BM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10080</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>E (BM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10081</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>IM 64239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10082</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>IM for study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10152</td>
<td>NR, 596</td>
<td>Ivory with inscr. of šamši-adad V SW 37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11000</td>
<td>Iraq 25, 48—69</td>
<td>IM Throne base T 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11300</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>E (IA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11301</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11302</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>E (IA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11303</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>E (IA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11305</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>E (IA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11307</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11308</td>
<td>Iraq 24, 116—8</td>
<td>IM 65573 Esarhaddon cylinder By S. wall</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Inscribed material without ND numbers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Letter</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Iraq 25, 44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Iraq 21, 38—40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Iraq 21, 40—41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Iraq 25, 27—8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>NR, 389; 468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>NR, 384; 402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>NR, 389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>NR, 376; 466</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Inscribed apotropaic figurines:** These are not included in the above list, since they have recently been studied by A. R. Green and it is hoped that his account of the Nimrud figurines will be published with a complete listing. Nevertheless, to complete our list of the inscribed cuneiform material from Fort Shalmaneser the inscribed examples are listed here according to his types. Thanks are due to Dr. Green for supplying the details.

Type II.2, inscribed: erba rabiš šāmi, ši rabiš lemuki : ND 8178; 8179; 8180; 8182; 8185A(?),B; 8186A; 8187; 8188; 8189; 8191A; 9445; 9446; 12554

Type II.4, ascribed as Type II.2: ND 7846; 7847; 9343; 9344; 9345; 9527 bis; 10229

Type II.5, ascribed as Type II.2: ND 11304; 11306; 11309; 12555

Type III.b, inscribed ši mātu, erba balātu: ND 7897; 7898; 7899(?); 8191B

Type III.c, inscribed ši [ ]: ND 9523

Type IV, inscribed: it biti lā kavyān, lamassu [la] dārī: ND 7901

Type VI, inscribed: mutū iti lēnni ā ayyābī: ND 8181; 8190
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Note. It includes names from the texts published in NWL, making use of subsequent new readings and collations. The following abbreviations are used:

- w for witness  
- f for father  
- s for son  
- rr for LÚ GAL.GAL  
- ru for LÚ GAL u-rat  
- rk for LÚ GAL ki-šīr  
- šm for šaknu ša ma’assi  
- muš for mušarkisu

Logographic name elements are read in the Babylonian dialect unless there is good evidence from phonetic variants, e.g. NUMUN is read zēru (not zāru), SUM and AŠ are read iiddin (not iiiddin). But the Assyrian acc. masc. sing. is used, e.g. šumu not šuma. This inevitably has led to some inconsistencies.

Logographic elements compounded with a phonetically spelt, non-Akkadian element are treated as Akkadian, e.g. AD-dikiri is read abi-dikiri.

Basic renderings are given for names of deities, disregarding evidence from Aramaic that Ninurta was pronounced Enurta, Šamaš as Šaššu, and the possibility that IGLDU was pronounced Palīl, U.GUR as Uqur rather than Nergal.

*îM, U and U.U are read Adad
*dâ.MÂŠ,MÂŠ, dû.UL.GAL, U.GUR and dâm.UL.GUR are read Nergal
*dâ.MÂR,UTU, dâ.MES and dâ.ŠU are read Marduk
*dû.UTU, U.TU and ša-maš are read Šamaš
*dû.PA and dâ.AG are read Nabû

dâ? x (x)-mu-še-[zib?'] 124:2
a-bu-a 99.i11.13 ru
abdâ, abba’ NWL 1.i1.2 aram iii.14 LÚ AŠGAB
 107.i.5’ 108A.1.14’
abdâ(?’) 54:9’ w
abdî-[ ] 69:12 w
abdî 65:1 seller
abdî-atara 68:10’ w
abdî-lisupu 57:2 f of Milki-yatunu
abdî-milku 99.i11.18 ru Samaritan 108.i.38
abdî-mütu(?’) 58:9’ w
abdû(?’1) 145.i11.25 LÚ AŠGAB
abûdik(i) 99.i22 rr 104A.i.4’
abi-ṣamû 17:4 99.iv.24 ru 101.i.15 ru
108A.rev.i.8’
abi-il see qurib-ili
abi-lēšir 87:15 LÚ SUM.NINDA ša kuštekkanē
 99.14 rr 108.i.27
abi-qamu 121:11
mlabi-rami(?’ 144:5
abi-la-ma 6:10 w2
abi-šab 118:3
abi-ul-idd 38:1 debtor
abi-ûrû 52:1 s of Sahuru
Adad[ ] 67:3 buyer 102.iv.5’ 113.obv.13,
rev.2
Adad-[ ] mES 101.i.9 SAG
Adad-abu-usur 99.i.3 ru
Adad-ahu-iddin 99.i11.14 maš rr
Adad-ahu-usur 90:2
Adad-altu 102.i.8’
Adad-aplu-iddin 1:3 addressee

1 Perhaps a variant of Abdâ.
Adad-bêlu-usur 100.iv.11' 112.obv.4 See also Adad-nasîr
Adad-bûnî 121:6
Adad-êrêš 8:2,7 slave
Adad-hattî 96:11 99.iii.10 ru
Adad-ibnî 108.A.9' See also Adad-bêlu-usur
Adad-iddîn 144:9
Adad-imme 66:21 w 99.ii.9 ru 108.iii.15
Adad-îqi 70:2
Adad-isîiya NWL 1.i.18 LÛ SAG 55:8' w
Adad-kalîr 102.i.8' rk arrap 112.obv.2
Adad-na'id 123:6 36:24 limmu AGRIG.GAL [53:16']
lîmmu 6
Adad-na'id(?) 100.iv.11' See also Adad-bêlu-usur
Adad-nashîr NWL 18 rev.9
Adad-remann x 33:18 w
Adad-salme 99.iii.15 ru
Adad-sumu-Sm 75 113.obv.7
Adad-uballît NWL 4.rev.2 NWL 14.obv.2(?)
Adad-nashîr NWL 18 rev.9
Adad-remann x 33:18 w
Adad-salme 99.iii.15 ru
Adad-sumu-Sm 75 113.obv.7
Adad-uballît NWL 4.rev.2 NWL 14.obv.2(?)
Adad-nashîr NWL 18 rev.9
Adad-remann x 33:18 w
Adad-salme 99.iii.15 ru
Adad-sumu-Sm 75 113.obv.7
Adad-uballît NWL 4.rev.2 NWL 14.obv.2(?)

3 Or -bani or -êpuš.
4 Note that Falkner, AFQ 17 p.102, supposed that the lîmmu in ND 3427 written EN.MAN.I without profession was the same as U.U.I.
5 This is perhaps a mistake for Adad-taklîk, in which MU as sum is confused with šum/tak.
6 Reading suggested by Parpola, JSS 21 p.168.
7 SIG is used as a phonetic logogram for SIG 5; see GPA p.32.
8 Or aхи-Áya; or read usur-GN for all these names.
9 Analysed as li amašš, from mašš “to forget”?
10 Taken as a form of akbaru.
11 Cannot be connected with the name in NL 105 am-ha-ti-i (also in NL 56).
12 It is not certain that KUR.GAL should be read Amurru in nA names; the equation is correct for nB names according to Zadok, W. Semites, p.76.
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13 An-gal according to Borger, AOAT 33 p.61. Other possibilities are Istarān (Lambert, ZA NF 25 p.100) and Humban (Zadok, W. Semites p.20).
14 For Apalad in preference to apil-šarrī or mār šarrī see note on No.38:12.
15 Or aplu-našir.
16 Probably an abbreviation of the following name, and possibly the same man.
17 Could also be read IM.4-1.
18 It is possible to read all the occurrences of Aššur-rēmēni as Aššur-rēmānni. See note on No.101.i.18.
19 This reading is preferred to -manānī following Parpola, ZA 65 p.294.
20 Could also be read -turānī. A pronunciation taqqūtānī is implied by the spelling given in ADD 852.iv.1.
21 The variant writings discussed by Zadok in WO 9 (1977) p.47—9 show that Aya, not ilāya, is correct here.
SMD considers Aya to be the normal nA writing of the name of the god Ea, not the sun-god's spouse Aya.
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bahi 99.ii.21 ru Samarian
bahî 99.iv.20 ru
ba-la-[ ] 110.ii.15'
ballu 44:23 w.ABA 73:14 w 99.11.8 ru
ballu-lûmu22 99.iii.18 ru
ba³-li-i-[ ] 65:9' w 68:9' w
bal-namhe 99.iii.8 ru
Banîtu-ëreb23 31:16 w
banni 112.obb.7
baqiamri 46:2 addressesee
barlik 99.ii.24 ru
barruq NWL 2.ii.7 NWL 10.rev.5 NWL 11.rev.13(?)
Bau-alsî-kâbulu 80:3
Bau-iddin 62:11 s of Nergal-šulîm, w 73:17 w
buyasa-[i] 102.ii.15' rk arrap
BE-x x 68:1 w
BEL-[ ] 49:1 seller, s of Ubrû-Istar(?)
BEL-âbu-usur 101.ii.14 muš
BEL-ahhî 99.iii.24 ru muš 103.rev.ii.12 muš
BEL-ahu-usur 41:13 limmu su IG1 KUR
BEL-aliî 24 NWL 2.ii.8 NWL 3.ii.18 NWL 18:12a NWL 33:10
BEL-aliîsîr NWL 3.ii.23 NWL 18:2
BEL-âpkal-îlînî 99.iii.8 ru muš
BEL-âpulu-usur 68:9' w
BEL-azurî(?) 50:1' w
BEL-ballu 9:14 w 39:13 w 40:16 w
BEL-dân 99.ii.20 ru 104.A.ii.2'
BEL-danninanni 53:3' of Šamas-PAP-[ ]
BEL-dûrü 99.ii.17 ru 99.ii.19 ru Samarian
100.iii.13' iv.10' 108.ii.42,43 108.iii.39 125:4
BEL-emûranni25 NWL 3.ii.21 NWL 18:13a
86.obv.18 ša EN.NUN of Isana, Šahupa and Arbil 101.ii.8
BEL-ëtîr 133.ii.3
BEL-Harran-dûrî 101.ii.12 SAG
BEL-Harran-issiya 86.obv.5 ša EN.NUN of Nisibin
86.obv.13 ša EN.NUN of Sam'il and Kilizi
BEL-Harran-šadûra25 99.i.16 (GAL.GAL) 108.ii.40
BEL-Harran-šaru-usur 107.i.24'
BEL-Harran-taklîk 86.obv.2 ša EN.NUN of Raṣappa
BEL-ibnî 108.ii.4 ru arrap 121:16
BEL-iddin 10:16 env. w 32:11 w 34:23 w 86
obv.8 ša EN.NUN of Guzana
BEL-ilîya (?) NWL 3.ii.22 T.D.SAG(?)
(BEL-iqâlîanni) NWL 3.ii.9 see x x x x-ni
BEL-iqâ 44:18 limmu GAR Tushan 55:6' w 99.iv.15 ru 101.iii.6
BEL-iqâlîanni NWL 8.obv.12 limmu 99.iv.24 ru 113.obb.9
BEL-ilîmâanni 113.rev.6
BEL-kabîlî-lînî 100.ii.16
BEL-kili-ahhûsu(?) 19:10' w
BEL-lâmûr 102.iv.10(?)
BEL-lîsîr NWL 5.obv.1 limmu 113.obv.ii.11(?)
BEL-lu2-[ ] 59:7 pledge
BEL-li-balât 52:7' w
BEL-mûtî-šabat(?) 99.ii.1 ru
BEL-MU-[ ] 102.rev.8'
BEL-na'id 112.obv.3 113.rev.9 114.obv.2' NWL 2.iv.4(?)
BEL-sî[ ] 113.obv.7
BEL-sadûra25 10:14 env. limmu
BEL-sharu-usur NWL 1.ii.20 NWL 2.ii.2(?) 107.i.17
BEL(;)?-x-sîli 50:5, 14 buyer
BEL-tû-iddin 33:17 w
BEL-tukulti(?) 90:21
BEL-ûbalîš 144:20
BEL-zî[ ] 102.rev.11'
bê 33:20 w
bibîya 99.iii.11 ru See also Kasbê
Biniitu-ahî28 58:8' w
birûnu(?)29 145.iii.26 LU SIMUG3 AN3 BAR3
birtâya NWL 18.obv.11(?) 101.i.7
bisûnu, bisûnî 99.iii.18 ru muš 103.rev.i.11 muš
bû[ ] 121:15
bulîšaya 118:13
bûnîya 114:5 s of reînnî-Adad
Bûnitu-ahî 102.ii.26' ru aram
bur-Atar 102.ii.26' ru aram
22 Could also be read –êmar.
23 The etymology of this goddess' name is not certain, see APN p.253, and cf. Biniitu-ahî. She had a place in the temple of Ašûr at Nineveh; see Menzel, Ass.T II, T131, iii.6-8. Aramaic inscriptions from her temple at Syene in Egypt are edited by Gibson, Syrian Semitic Inscriptions p.132—5. Cf. Kar-Baniti in Egypt, NAT 196.
24 Collated for BEL-le'î without success; the sign URU is unmistakatable. The name may occur in ma; see Saporetti, OMA I p.162.
25 This is the traditional reading of -KUR-u-a, but it is challenged by 15-Š.GAL -u-a, which may be taken as a variant writing of the same element rather than a mistake or an unparalleled name.
26 Could also be read -ammarînî.
27 Deller suggests Bîl-KASKAL-PAP-Sâ; but cf. Nabâ-bîl-nap-har-ahhêšu in ABL 1366. See also note 81 below.
28 Biniitu taken as a form of Banîtu; cf. liqîpu for laqîpu.
29 Or read gaštînu.
30 bur probably short for ubur; see AHw wabrum.
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bur-zini NWL 2.iv.12 NWL 3.i.22 NWL 18.rev.17

dabihu NWL 1.i.2 NWL 18:14

dadā 99.i.9 rā

dadāyā 35:27 LŪ GAL x [ ], w.f.of Nūrī

dādi-surī 107.i.5

dadusu 108.ii.21 rā arbi 110.iii.11

dāiu 103.rev.ii.9 ūn

Dakhušu-ahhē-eriba[31] 99.iv.23 ru

dāl-ahī 99.i.16 ru Samarian

da-ī[ ] 111:27

dātāya 7:10 w 10:20 env. w

dauskunu 44:10 creditor

dayyānānu 86.obv.4 ša ENNUN of GAL KAS.LUL

DE-EN[ ] 101.i.10 SAG See Šulmu-Bel -(x)

udārāya 99.iii.16 ru
didī 28:3 w
dīn-Huru 41:15 w

dudū[32] 52:3 w LŪ [ ] dMĀS/AN.BAR

dūrī-ība 51:22 w 59:14 w

dūr-makī-Ninurta 9:16 w 44:9 creditor 60:3

debtor, s of Mannu-ki-ība 54:10 w

 ebūrāya/yābūrāya NWL 1.iii.1 NWL 2.iv.7

NWL 3.1:20 NWL 18.obv.13 (?)
edū-su-ūrī see iddin-ahu

emuq-āšūr 10:3, env.5,12 LŪ GAL E.GAL ša E.GAL māšāri

erība-ahuwa[?] 85.i.7

erība-Adad[33] 12:12 w LŪ GIGIR

erība-Āšūr 30:16 w

erība-īla nī 99.iii.25 ru

erība-ilī 99.i.25 ru 100.iv.2 (?)
e-ri-i[34] 56:2 seller

ĒSAGilīya 144.obv.1

mēsatu 144:7

etarraya see ebūrīaya

eṭir-Gula NWL 18.rev.8 (?)

ēzi[?] 108.i.14, 16 (2-u)

gab[ ] 85.i.4

gabarī 10:19 env. w 19:8 w 33:19 w 73:9 f of x-ana-ība 54:13 w

gabbarī 99.iii.10 rā muš

gabasi 103.rev.i.2 muš (probably read gabarul)
gabbē 99.i.20 ru Samarian 108.iii.41(?)
gabbī 85.i.7

gabbū[ ] NWL 11:20

giyā 108.ii.12 rū aram

gišayā 57:10 buyer 58:3,5 buyer

igm-a-nī[35] 50:26 w
gišīlu 118:11

GIS[ ] 108.v.42

GISGAL see sukku-

gu[ ] 102.iv.12' ēlūyā see qēlāya

ha-[ ] 69:8 w 121:5

ha-x-(x)-i 99.i.19 rū 104.A.ii.1’(?) 108.ii.49(?)

habīlāya 108A.i.11’

habūsu 99.i.18 ru

hādē-dišūšu 93:20

Haldī-išāya 99.i.6 ru

halusu 57:29 w

hamaqa 102.iii.6 rū arzuhi

ha-am/-an-ba’-ru[36] 107.i.3’ 108A.obv.12

ham-baṣī[34] 101.iii.18 šagīlu

ham-puḫi[34] 28:2 addressee

hanādī 11:19 w

hanbānī 58:2 w

mīhanī NWL 18.rev.24

hannī 66:5, 19 w

ha-nū’-x-(x) 47:26 w

harrāku[35] 99.i.12 rū 102.ii.17 rū arrap

harranāya see hūlāya

Harrān-bēlu-ūṣur NWL 10.rev.2 135:5

hartību 41:4 f. of urad-Mullissu

mēhasunu 144:6

hašana 99.i.8 ru 108.iii.20

hi-bīr-x[37] 45:16 w

hidatānū 99.iv.17 ru

himāya 44:17 guarantor

hudašā 64:11 w

hūlāya[38] 9:1, 7 s of La-tegi-ana-ība

mēhūlāya NWL 8.rev.5 NWL 13.rev.11’ (NWL 18.rev.24a’)? NWL 21.rev.4

huzirī 101.iv.17

i-x-šā[39] 54:13 w

ibāššī-īla nī 101.1.gīr.2

31 Or read dukarū and cf. āhi-dikirī and APN p.279b.
32 Possibly read DUDU-u as muddūri.
33 Probably not Sī; APN su-u-u is probably to be read rūbahā.
34 For ham- as an initial element see APN, and Fales, Censimenti e catasti p.50, and Durand, Revue Asiatique 267 p.248ff.
35 This word as a profession is discussed by Menzel, Ass.T II, T4 note on 16’. There seems to be no certain evidence for the reading of the first sign.
36 This reading is preferred to Harrānāya; see CAD s.v. hūlu, but cf. also har-ra-nu-u in APN.
ibba-dalā 99.ii.16 ru Samarian 108.iii.33
ibnēa 86.obv.15 ša EN.NUN of Halizi-adbar
iddin-ahu 37 101.iii.10 108.A.i.8
iddin-Aššur 6:9 w 101.iii.22
ilāya(?) 30:18 w
ilı-hū see iilı-nāṣir
ilı-aplu-usur 112.rev.8
ilı-Aya see Bēl-lāya
ilı-dalā 90:16 99.ii.11 ru 108.iii.16
ilı-ēdu-usur see iilı-nādin-ahu
ilı-ēriša NWL 21.rev.13 LŪ SIPA
ilı-ēriš 58:10 w
ilı-īdr(?) 101.ii.4
ilı-issiya (?) 108.rev.iv.25
ilı-ixqup-keni see Šamaš-bēlu-ukin
ilı-kā-usur 38 112.rev.4 114.rev.8
ilı-kabar 102.ii.10 (?) rk arrap 108.iii.19
ilı-nādin-ahu 101.ii.7
ilı-nāṣir 58:5 w
ilı-rēmanni 108.ii.41
mikitti 80:1
ilı-tuklatsu see Šamaš-kumūa (?)
ilu-mūnkinu-māršu see burzinānu
in[ ] 122:5
inbu-ēšēa 140:2
iqbi-Adad 36:16 LŪ AZLAG w
iqbi-Bēl NWL i.ii.10 LŪ SAG 51:6 s of Nuhā(?)
iqbi-ilānī 52:9 ṭimmu
iqša-Adad 102.iii.29 f of Kakkū-ēreš
iqq-[?] 108.A.i.15'
ir-[ ] NWL 9.rev.8
ir-ka-li 39 42:3 creditor
isāya 110.ii.5
is-da-a-[ ] 68:8 w
is-sa-me-e[ ] NWL 2.ii.14 NWL 18.obv.27
issem-e[ ] 2:2 addressees 6:3 LŪ GAL E.GAL
8:8 12:2 GAL KUR ša KUR māštarti ša URU
Kalha 29:3,8,13. See also isāme-illi
iš-bu-[ ] NWL 9.rev.9
iš-di see ubru
išme-illi 99.ii.8 ru muš 103.rev.ii.2 muš 108.v.36.
See also issame-illi
iš-p[ ] 113.obv.15

[37] Could be read edu-usur.
[38] Variant spellings of the middle element -ka- and -ka-a- indicate that it is phonetic, but the meaning of the word is unknown. Cf. also Šamaš-kā-usur.
[39] Possibly (N)ergali.
[40] See note 25.
[42] Taken as a hypocoristic of the god name Kakkū.
[43] Deller kindly informs us that 4KU should be read Kakkū, not Marduk as Tallqvist suggested in APN. The evidence comes from a collation of A 485+3109, 4kak-kud as a variant of 3R 66.vi.14 4giš.TUKUL. This means that the post-canonical limmu 4KU-rēmanni in ARU 265 (Falkner No.77) should be separated from Marduk-rēmanni. A phonetic spelling of the god name also occurs in KAV 36:1, 1kak-kud.SU.
Since kan-unu-a-a is never found as a definite variant of ITI.AB-a-a or ka-nun-a-a, we have taken it as HE .NUN-a-a, although the possibility remains that Kaniinaya is the correct reading for all three writings .

The variant KV-ba-ba for KU-KA in these two names supports Deller’s original suggestion, Or.NS 31 p.14 (Cf. Borger, AOAT 33 supplement p.432). Mr. C. Walker has kindly collated all the names indexed as ellu-babu-in ARU, and says: “In every single case where Johns copies XV the text clearly has KÔ. In the doubtful cases, ADD 46 and 150, I see no real objection to [dk1u].” The scribe of Carchemish Kubaba-sallimanni (colli. I. Finkel) occurs in ADD 675 rev.1 I. See also Zadok, W. Semites p.434, addenda to p.273-4 .

For the god kur or kur’e, see note on No.44:12.

Taken as a variant of Lâgépa to be analysed as an Assyrian precative from qiâpu, not as in Lippiński, Onomastics p.93.
Marduk-itiqi 49:4 w 55:7 w  
Marduk-ismanni 112.obv.6 113 rev.4(?)  
Marduk-nadin-ahhe NWL 1.ii.16 NWL 3.ii.10  
Marduk-naṣir NWL 3.ii.23  
Marduk-šarru-ṣusur NWL 3.i.2 limmu 43:14  

limmu 70:13 w  
Marduks, Marduks NWL 2.iv.11 NWL 18:8  
NWL 18.rev.16  
Marduk-uballit NWL 3.ii.24 124:8  
Marduk-zēru-ibni 5:11  
mār-ῆtar 85.ii.8  
mār-lērēm 56:15 limmu 57:33 limmu  
mar-na-lu 79:2  
mār-sarrī-liāya see Apladad-liāya  
maṣī-ilī 120:14 'a Ur.KU  
ma-TAR[--] 102.i.22 'rk aram  
ma-ā'ī-dīl[ā](?) 56:1 seller  
me-ʾa-me-me-ṇa 46:41:16 w  
me-su 10:11 w 66:20 w  
mikī-[?] 49.9 w  
mikī-yatī 99.iii.12 ru  
mikī-yatumī 57:1,11 s of Abdi-lisuṣupu, seller  
mīnu-aḥti (?) 58:1 w  
mīs-Bēl 110.rev.10 114.obv.3  
MU-[ ] NWL 2.i.1 NWL 18:9a 14:13  

limmu 32:4  
mīlu-ru-šu-x-e-a-a 144:3  
MU-x-SU 101.ii.20 ru  
mu-ʾiq-[ ] see šumu-lišī  
mīllušu-sēzēbaanni 38:3 creditor  
muqallī-[kabtī?] 92:8 w  
mīlu-su-i-tū 52:29:5,11,16  
mūṣūrayyā 7:11 w  
mušallim-Aššur 13:11 limmu 15:8 limmu 16:9  
limmu 99.iii.13 16:8  
mušallim-ilī 99.iii.17 ru  

[mušallim-Bītar 68:5 w LŪ GĪSIGIR  
mušallim-Marduk NWL 1.ii.6 LŪ UŠ.BAR NWL 1.iii.27 LŪ UŠ.BAR  
mūšēzēbi 147:4  
mūšēzēbi-Marduk 101.ii.9  
mūšēzēbi-Nabū 54:18 w ABA  
mūšēzēbi-Ninurta 50:23 w 144:12, 16  
mūtakkil-Samaš 108.ii.11 'rk aram  

Mutaqim-Aššur 110.ii.14  

48 The name may be normalized as Meya-Amun. Cf. mi-ia-re-e in the Amarna tablets.  
49 The signs IŠ-ki have been read throughout as milki, although there is a strong possibility that iški = mārī 'my son' is correct in Akkadian names; see AHw. sub išku.  
50 There is no evidence that GIŠ3 for sillī can be reversed, so this element is taken as phonetic, perhaps comparable to mi-is-tū... and mi-is-pa-rū' in APN.  
51 This reading is preferable to maqallī-mūsu; see Stammt, Nameengebung p.370 and AHW gallū D.  
52 The etymology of this name is uncertain; ʾešī Gtin plc. seems likely; cf. OB 1-mu-šu-te-šu-balit'; or *mušannitu is possible.  
53 Could also be read with tarraṣu instead of taqqunu.  
54 The meaning seems to exclude a reading ubru for SUH.UŠ here.  
55 Cf. ADD 852:3 [ ]-ka-šā-at-kaš, and the nB name Nabū-ana-kāša-atkal.
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Nabu-qepi-iliini 86.obv.l6 sa EN.NUN ofTamnuni
narmenii 99.ii.l9 ru Samarian. See also armenii
nashir-Bel 92:4 GAL karmanni(?)
Nabu-rii'im-napisti 35:32 A.BA(?)
Nabu-rehtu-usur 29:18 w 40:17 w
nasi 40:4 debtor, s ofmannu-k!-IStar
Nabt1?-re~iia . 67:1,4 seller
nasihu NWL 13.rev.l3'
Nabil-ru-iliini 56 86.obv.l sa EN.NUN of turtiinu
Nergal-[ ] 52:!' w 108.iv.ll' 108.iv.3'
Nergal-[ ]-PAP IOO.ii.3'
Nabu-sagib5 7 70:12/immu(?)
Nabu-sallimsunu 56:5
Nergal-ahu-iddin NWL l.i.6 NWL 2.i.4 NWL
Nabu-sarhi-iliini
NWL
8.obv.l3
NWL
3.i.9 NWL 18.rev.20 IIO.ii.l6' 111:25'(?)
NWL
21.rev.9
99.iii. l
ru Nergal-ahu-u~ur 102.iii.7' rk arzuhin
9.rev.6(?)
108.iv.ll(?)
Nergal-atkala 99.iv.l4 ru
Nabt1-sarru-u~ur
10:21env.(?) w 31 :1 hazannu sa Nergal-belu-u~ur 104.A.ii'.5'
Kalha
45:11 limmu 49:8'(?) limmu
51:26(?) Nergal-eres 99.iii.4 ru 108.iv.17(?)
/immu
59:13 limmu A.BA KUR
84:12 Nergal-etir 86.obv.l4sa EN.NUN ofTuimme
118:4 (NWL 9 Nergal-iliiya 99.iii.25 ru IOO.ii.l4' ru
86.obv.7 sa EN.NUN of Tille
obv.l)
Nergal-liimur 99.iv.8 ru
Nabt1-se?-x-[] 69:17 w
Nergal-remeni 112.obv.9 113.rev.8(?)
Nabu-sezib 10l.ii.l6 ru 107.i.4' 108A.i.13'
Nergal-sarriini 19 99.iii.5 rr 108.iv.20(?),23(?)
Nabu-sezibanni 17:11 w 22:2 29:19 w 68:14' Nergal-sarru-u~ur
99.i.6
rr
99.iii.l
ru
w IOI.iv.l3' 121:14
IOO.iii.4' 103.rev.ii.8 sm 108.ii.29, iv.l2(?)
Nergal-sezibanni 25:4 50:25 w
Nabu-sumu-ibni 62:12 f of Ninurta-upahhir
Nergal-sullim 62: II f of Bau-iddin
Nabu-sumu-iddina NWL 3.ii.25 40:13 (?) w
Nabu-sumu-iskun 33:21 A.BA, w 35:33 LOx [ ],w Nergal-sumu-iddin
NWL l.ii.23
NWL 3.ii.ll
Nabu-sumu-lesir 6:11 A.BA, w
28:1 author
NWL 30:1(?) 102.ii.4' rk assur
77:3 107.i.l9' 125:1 ZADIM? 133.i.7
Ne'su-Sin(?) 62:3 fofNinurta-kabti
Nabt1-sumu-u~ur 99.iii.25 rr mus IOO.ii.l T
Ninurta?-[
] 43:17 w 65:10' limmu 69:16
Nabu-takliik 99.ii.4rr 108.iii.IO(?)
w 102.iv.2!' (?) 130:2' 130:4'
9:12 limmu
60: II limmu Ninurta-abu-u~ur
99.iv.4 rr mus
103.rev.i.l9
Nabu-tapputu-alik 58
64:10 limmu
mus 108.v.32
Nabu-taqqinanni 53 8:17 NI.GAB, w 61: II w
Ninurta-ahu-iddin 29:22 w 34:25 w 36:14 w, LO
Nabu-tartlba-ahu 44:19w
GAL GIS.KAK.MES 39:14 w
39:12 env. LO
Nabii-uk!nanni 81:2
GAL si-kat! w
40:11 w
46:3,7
65:8' w
Nabu-u~alli 5 9
10:10
12:10 w
15:11 w
16:12
113.obv.8
w 35:35(?) w
Ninurta-aplu-iddin NWL 5.rev.9
Nabu-u-SAT-[( )] NWL 20.obv.l4
Ninurta-Aya see Ninurta-iliiya
Ninurta-baliit! see Nurt!
Nabu-zeru-ibni NWL 34.iii.8
Nabu-zeru-iddin see Nabu-sumu-iddin
Ninurta-bel?-~i?-[ ] 133.i.8
Nabu-zeru-iq!sa
102.ii.l6' rk arrap
108.ii.7(?) rk Ninurta-diir-[()] NWL 22:9
arrap
Ninurta-eres 9:3,10 s ofmannu-k!-Ninurta
nadin- see iddinNinurta-iliiya
NWL l.ii.21
NWL 18.obv.l2
nadinnu 30:16 w
86.obv.l1 sa EN.NUN of Arpad and Kurbail
niihiru 99.iii.9 ru
Ninurta- <? > ia-a NWL l.iii.4
niihu 144:10
Ninurta-iqbi 20:3 36:19 w 61:2 creditor
na'id-ili 63:15 w
Ninurta-issiya IOO.rev.i.3'(?) 130:6'(?)
na?-me?-(x)-AN IOO.rev.i.T
Ninurta-kabti 62:2 debtor, s ofNe'su-Sin
(niini) see etir-Gula(?)
Ninurta-muk!n-n!Sl NWL 4.rev.ll' NWL 30:2 =
nam
99.ii.5 rr
IOI.ii.26(?) ru?
104.A.ii.9'(?)
120:13'
108.iii.11(?) 110.iii.l3'
Ninurta?-na?-din? 73:6
nanusu 102.iii.30'
Ninurta-na'id 9:14 w IOI.iv.5'
Ninurta-na~ir
100.iv.22'
narg! 59:4
56 The middle element -ru- may perhaps be taken as imperative of warum "lead", or as construct of rii'u
"companion". RU for seriktu does not make good sense.
57 Reading preferred to sakip.
58 Variant spellings for the middle element of this name, as well as in the name remiitu suggest a value utu for
UD.
59 Some spellings show sandhi writing.


Ninurta-pâni-alik(?) 53:10' w
Ninurta-pâli 80 112.rev.5 114.obv.7'
Ninurta-rêmanni 119.rev.A.2
Ninurta-kallûm 73:18 w
Ninurta-saRa(?) 113.obv.16
Ninurta-šarru-ibni 101.iii.14
Ninurta-taqginhu(?) 121:3
Ninurta-upâhhir 62:12 w, s of Nabû-šumu-ibni
nu-[ ] 73:6' env. w
nu-ha-(x)-a 51:4 buyer, f of Iqbi-Bêl(?)
nubiñâya 101.i.11 SAG 101.i.25 107.i.16' see also
Kânûnûya
mi-nun-'a'-ni NWL 18.rev.26a
nûr'-(x)[R ] 51:1 seller, b of mi-pušqi(?)
nûriya, nûriyâ NWL 13.rev.17' 86.obv.10 ša
EN.NUN of Kirrûni 134:2'
nûrî-yaba', nûrî-yapa' 99.ii.14 ru 108.iii.29 ru
Kaldûya
nûr-salam-kaspî 17:15 limmu
nûr-Šamas 37:2,11(2) creditor 37:2' env.
Nårîtu 52:30 w, Lû ṭîšdaya(?) 52': w 54:3
seller 60:13 w 63:1,2(2) creditor
Nûskû-šadûta 25 NWL 3.ii.20
pâni-Ăsûr-lûmûr NWL 18.rev.11 103.rev.i.6
muš 108.v.17
pâni-lûtar 112.rev.7
pâni-lûtar-lêshîr 108.ii.22 rk arbil 110.iii.12'
pâni-Marduk 7:12 w, DAM.GAR, DUMU Ninâ
(pâni-Nerîqi)-duguî 124:9
pâni-šarru 112.rev.9
(pâpadudu) see Nabû-šidi-ukînr
paqîi 99.i.2 ru
parsûdi 116:9'
parû(?) NWL i.ii.3
pisaniše 41:2 f of Kalbûya
pûlî 108.ii.10 rk aram
pûlî 86.obv.9 ša EN.NUN of Arzûhina 99.iv.18 ru
purûtâ 35:34 w
ma-pušqi(?) 51:3 sister of nûr-ûfr ]
mi-qanumîl NWL 4.obv.19
qardu 53:14' w
qarrad-ili 32:15 w
qatî-li-gabîîu 99.iii.17 ru maš 103.rev.i.4 maš
qibîl-lûtar 33:22 w 48:27 w 57:28 w
qiqî NWL 3.i.15 NWL 6.obv.10 NWL
8.obv.17 NWL 9.obv.11 NWL 13.obv.5
NWL 15:5 NWL 16:10(?) [NWL 19.obv.4]
NWL 20.obv.4 NWL 33:8
qišûya 118:5
qiûya 99.i.21 ru 101.iv.14' 104.A.ii.3'
qurî-ili NWL 5.rev.6
qurî-[-ñ NWL 6:9' w
qurî-Assûlûhi 10:4, env.1.6 Lû 2-u šà Khâla
qurî-îlûnî 11:7 f of Asqûdû 17:6 f of Asqûdû
qurî-îlî NWL 1.iii.5
qurî-Assûr-lûmûr 101.ii.25 ru 102.ii.18' rk arbil
108.ii.20 rk arbil 110.iii.10'
ra-sapûpûya 85.ii.9' ra-ta[ ] 19:7' w
rêmû-i-Î(?) [ ] NWL 20.obv.12
rêmû-î-Adad 11:5 f of Bûnûya
rêmû-îînu 61:9' w
rêmûtu, rêmûtu 61 12:7 39: w 99.i.12 ru
100.iii.5' ru
ribânu 9:13 w
ribbûyâ 61 41:1 debor, s of pisaniše 68:11' w
ru-tû(?) 42:10 w
sa-[ ] NWL 11.obv.11' 56:12' w
sa-x[ ] 101.iii.13
sa-ah-ru-û 52:2 f of abî-ûrû
sâlî 73:12' w
sâlu 7:8 limmu Lû GAL.MU
slî-îî 99.ii.4 ru 99.iii.12 ru maš 103.iii.13(?) maš
samâ 99.ii.20 ru Samarian
samme-îî 8:8 Lû GAL É.GAL see also issame-îî
sa-pa-û(û) 101.i.24
sapirû 111:22'
sarrâ, sarân 66:6,7 buyer
sâsîya 59:14 w
sasî 64 5:17 51:20 w 54:12' w 99.i.13 ru
99.iv.2 ru
sasî 64 34:29 w
sîs 65 46:3, 7
si-[î] see sime-îî
Sibîtî-îîmû 145.iii.13 SIMUG Kû.GI
si-lâm-ûr 103.i.10 maš
silîm-Adad 99.iv.6 ru(?) 60

60 pilû: not understood.
61 Could also be read limmîr-. or namîr-.
62 DMASH-îî and ZALAG-îî are taken as forms of the same name; see Iraq 32 (1970) p.143 n.9. But it is also possible to read the two names differently, as Ninurta-bal'dûl, and Nûr-bal'dûl. Note that both gods NR and NRT occur in the Sefîre inscriptions, so that Akkadian Nûr may not be a writing of Ninurta’s name.
63 kalbûya and labbûya are also possible.
64 sasî and sa’sî may be forms of the same name.
65 sësî and sîsî may be forms of the same name.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tablet Name</th>
<th>Line(s)</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Šamaš-sabtanni</td>
<td>101.iii.12</td>
<td>Šamaš-sabtanni</td>
<td>101.iii.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Šamaš-kalim-MEŠ⁷⁰</td>
<td>113.rev.11</td>
<td>114.rev.4v</td>
<td>Šamaš-kalim-MEŠ⁷⁰</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Šamaš-ležib</td>
<td>17:13 w</td>
<td>35[1], 7, 13</td>
<td>112.rev.5 GAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kalilpani</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Šamaš-takläk</td>
<td>99.iv.12 rr</td>
<td>103.rev.ii.7 šm</td>
<td>Šamaš-takläk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Šamaš-upahhir</td>
<td>NWL 1.ii.14, LÜ SAG, 22 NWL</td>
<td>3.ii.19(?) LÜ SAG NWL 14.obv.2(?) limmu⁷¹</td>
<td>Šamaš-upahhir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ša-Nabû-izzazza see Ninurta-mukîn-nîšê(?)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>šar-Aššur</td>
<td>37:15 w</td>
<td></td>
<td>šar-Aššur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>šär-Istar</td>
<td>31:4</td>
<td></td>
<td>šär-Istar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>šarratu-iddin see parallels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>šarratu-iddin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>šarru-šurani²⁶ NWL 2.ii.6 86.obv.6 ša</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>šarru-šurani²⁶</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EN.NUN of Si'me 99.ii.6 rr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EN.NUN of Si'me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>šarru-kini</td>
<td>26:4 king</td>
<td></td>
<td>šarru-kini</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>šarru-lu-šarru</td>
<td>32:1, 4 GAL NU.KIRl-ŠE-ŠE-ŠI-ša Kalha</td>
<td></td>
<td>šarru-lu-šarru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>šarru-na-šid</td>
<td>29:21 w</td>
<td></td>
<td>šarru-na-šid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>šarru-Sin</td>
<td>101.i.21</td>
<td></td>
<td>šarru-Sin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>šašit⁵⁴</td>
<td>10:12 w</td>
<td></td>
<td>šašit⁵⁴</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>šepē-šarru</td>
<td>99.iv.22 rr</td>
<td>108A.rev.i.²'</td>
<td>šepē-šarru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>šepē-lâni NWL 3.i.17 NWL 18:11a(?)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>šepē-lâni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>šepē-Istar</td>
<td>13:12 w 15:6</td>
<td></td>
<td>šepē-Istar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>šepē-Nergal(?)</td>
<td>69:15 w</td>
<td></td>
<td>šepē-Nergal(?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>šepē-Ninurta</td>
<td>39:6, env.2 f of šalmu-šarrî-iqbi 54:1</td>
<td></td>
<td>šepē-Ninurta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>seller 60:8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>seller 60:8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>šepē-Ninurta-ašbat</td>
<td>30:15 NIL.GAB, w</td>
<td></td>
<td>šepē-Ninurta-ašbat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>šepē-šar-sammu</td>
<td>99.17 ru</td>
<td></td>
<td>šepē-šar-sammu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>šepē-šar-sammu</td>
<td>4:3 author 5:2 author 6:4 debtor,</td>
<td></td>
<td>šepē-šar-sammu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.BA 44.2 debtor 102.iii.27'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A.BA 44.2 debtor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ši-šu-Istar</td>
<td>14:14 w 119.obv.22</td>
<td></td>
<td>ši-šu-Istar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>šiddi-šu-sukī(?)</td>
<td>57:31 w</td>
<td></td>
<td>šiddi-šu-sukī(?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>širik(?)</td>
<td>62:2 f of taqîl-Gula</td>
<td></td>
<td>širik(?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>šissi</td>
<td>15:10 w 16:10 w</td>
<td></td>
<td>šissi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mššitšul</td>
<td>35[5], 17 šakintu</td>
<td></td>
<td>mššitšul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dšÚ see Marduk-72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>dšÚ see Marduk-72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>šu-ug-x-ša-šu NWL 3.19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>šu-ug-x-ša-šu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulmanu-šarrêši⁷³</td>
<td>147:8 limmu</td>
<td>150:1</td>
<td>Sulmanu-šarrêši⁷³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulmânu-lâmu see Sulmânu-lâmu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sulmânu-lâmu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>šulmu-[ ]⁷⁴ 108.iv.27 138:4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>šulmu-[ ]⁷⁴</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>šulmu-ahhe</td>
<td>18:2' 58:1,4,6 seller 58:6'</td>
<td></td>
<td>šulmu-ahhe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>šulmu-Bēl-lâmâša 99.iii.2 ru 101.i.10(? LÜ SAG</td>
<td>108(iv.13(?</td>
<td>šulmu-Bēl-lâmâša</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>šulmu-lâmu NWL 1.ii.4(</td>
<td>?)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>šulmu-mêt-Aššur(?)</td>
<td>55:8' w</td>
<td></td>
<td>šulmu-mêt-Aššur(?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>šulmu-šar-ri NWL 1.iv.1 NWL 2.iv.9 NWL</td>
<td>18:14a 36:20 w 55:7' w 112.rev.4(?)</td>
<td></td>
<td>šulmu-šar-ri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>šumu-[ ]</td>
<td>13:14 w</td>
<td></td>
<td>šumu-[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>šumma-šaɪ̇ya⁷⁵</td>
<td>116:8' w</td>
<td></td>
<td>šumma-šaɪ̇ya⁷⁵</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>šumma-Nabû</td>
<td>36:18 w 39:12 w</td>
<td>39:env.13 w 40:15 w</td>
<td>šumma-Nabû</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>šumu-lišši NWL 3.ii.17 LÜ SAG NWL 18.obv.9a(?),rev.23 NWL 22.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>šumu-lišši</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>šunu-ahhe</td>
<td>31:15 w 34:27 w 43:5 debtor</td>
<td></td>
<td>šunu-ahhe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>šüzubu</td>
<td>62:13 w, s of Nabû-ahu-iddin</td>
<td></td>
<td>šüzubu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tab⁵[ ] 108.ii.5 rk arrap</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>tab⁵[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tabalâya</td>
<td>37:4 debtor</td>
<td></td>
<td>tabalâya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tabnêa</td>
<td>62:14 s of Kurigalzu, šātir u’lîti w</td>
<td></td>
<td>tabnêa⁷⁶[ ] 101.iii.9'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>taqîl-ana-Bēl 99.ii.26 rr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>taqîl-ana-Bēl 99.ii.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>taqîl-Gula 62:1, 8 creditor, s of širîk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>taqîl-Gula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tartîb-Istar</td>
<td>35:31 w, 1,0 x [ ]</td>
<td></td>
<td>tartîb-Istar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tartîmanî</td>
<td>3.3, 21 author 30:13 w, DUMU</td>
<td></td>
<td>tartîmanî</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.GAL 31:15 w 39:11 w 39.env.11 w,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>E.GAL 31:15 w</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAL.KUR 40:10 w 51:19 w</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GAL.KUR 40:10 w</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>taṭâyâ</td>
<td>70:2</td>
<td></td>
<td>taṭâyâ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>te'-x-ša-su NWL 18:9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>te'-x-ša-su</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tûâ</td>
<td>90:17</td>
<td></td>
<td>tûâ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tuttâya</td>
<td>31:14 w</td>
<td></td>
<td>tuttâya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Žabnâya</td>
<td>99.ii.5 ru</td>
<td></td>
<td>Žabnâya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Žab-sa-[ ] 113.obv.14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Žab-sa-[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Žâb-nil-[šârara] 109:3 limmu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Žâb-nil-[šârara]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Žâb-x-žûda 107.i.26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Žâb-x-žûda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Žâb-lâr-Abâb 36:15 w</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Žâb-lâr-Abâb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Žâb-lâr-Aššur</td>
<td>99.iv.7 rr muṣ 103.rev.ii.1 muṣ</td>
<td>108.v.35</td>
<td>Žâb-lâr-Aššur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Žâb-lûnû see Harrân-lêl-uṣur</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Žâb-lûnû</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Žu'â-da'a-ki 145.iii.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Žu'â-da'a-ki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Žuši</td>
<td>43:4 creditor</td>
<td></td>
<td>Žuši</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100(iv.5'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100(iv.5'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Žur-zûr-ka-za 102.iii.4' rk arzuheh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Žur-zûr-ka-za</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ubri-Banišṭ(?) 61:3 debtor, s of urad-Istar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ubri-Banišṭ(?)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

70 In both texts the name ends with MEŠ. If the suggestion that MEŠ has the value -ani irrespective of plural function, made by Kinnier Wilson, NWL p.123, is correct, the name could be read Šamaš-šallimanni.

71 Or Šamaš-uballit. The reading is very uncertain. See Parpola JSS 21 p.168.

72 Despite careful copying and collation, there is still a possibility of confusion between dMAS and dŠO.

73 For the likely pronunciation of Sulmanu as Salmanu, see note on No.47:24.

74 Borger, AOAT 33 p.175, suggests reading salimmu rather than šul-mu; but cf. APN 224 šul-lušarri // DINU.MAN. However, a Babylonian writing may often conceal an Assyrian reading, and have a quasi-logographic use; cf. dŠOhal-sušimme for birâtê, Deller, Or. NS 35 p.313.

75 Or šumma-Aya, and cf. akin-lâyâ or akin-Aya.

76 Perhaps Tâ'âyî, “man of Tue”. 
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ubru-dū[ ] 77 100.iv.4'
yābūrāya NWL 3.i.20 see also ebūrāya
yaqa-i[ ] 118:9
ubru-ahhā NWL 2.iv.6 NWL 18:10 101.ii.24(?) ru 108.ii.18 rk arbil 108.A.rev.1.10(?) yataru, yataru 99.ii.7 ru 108.iii.18 Yāu-gī (or Yāu-ugā) 99.ii.17 ru Sāmariān
ubru-ahhē NWL 2.ii.9 zā[i] 108.ii.6 ru 112.rev.7
ubru-Allaya 47:6, 19 f of Nabū 48:6, 19 zabāya 18.1(?) 31:16(?) w 107.i.9(?) zabīnū(?): 39:env.L.S.
ubru-ahu[m] 25:3 ru 108.ii.6 NWL 18:10 101.ii.24(?) yataru, yataru 99.ii.7 ru 108.iii.18 Yāu-gī (or Yāu-ugā) 99.ii.17 ru Sāmariān
ubru-ahhē NWL 2.ii.9 zā[i] 108.ii.6 ru 112.rev.7
ubru-Allaya 47:6, 19 f of Nabū 48:6, 19 zabāya 18.1(?) 31:16(?) w 107.i.9(?) zabīnū(?): 39:env.L.S.
ubru-ahhē NWL 2.ii.9 zā[i] 108.ii.6 ru 112.rev.7
ubru-Allaya 47:6, 19 f of Nabū 48:6, 19 zabāya 18.1(?) 31:16(?) w 107.i.9(?) zabīnū(?): 39:env.L.S.
ubru-ahhē NWL 2.ii.9 zā[i] 108.ii.6 ru 112.rev.7
ubru-Allaya 47:6, 19 f of Nabū 48:6, 19 zabāya 18.1(?) 31:16(?) w 107.i.9(?) zabīnū(?): 39:env.L.S.
ubru-ahhē NWL 2.ii.9 zā[i] 108.ii.6 ru 112.rev.7
ubru-Allaya 47:6, 19 f of Nabū 48:6, 19 zabāya 18.1(?) 31:16(?) w 107.i.9(?) zabīnū(?): 39:env.L.S.
ubru-ahhē NWL 2.ii.9 zā[i] 108.ii.6 ru 112.rev.7
ubru-Allaya 47:6, 19 f of Nabū 48:6, 19 zabāya 18.1(?) 31:16(?) w 107.i.9(?) zabīnū(?): 39:env.L.S.
ubru-ahhē NWL 2.ii.9 zā[i] 108.ii.6 ru 112.rev.7
ubru-Allaya 47:6, 19 f of Nabū 48:6, 19 zabāya 18.1(?) 31:16(?) w 107.i.9(?) zabīnū(?): 39:env.L.S.
ubru-ahhē NWL 2.ii.9 zā[i] 108.ii.6 ru 112.rev.7
ubru-Allaya 47:6, 19 f of Nabū 48:6, 19 zabāya 18.1(?) 31:16(?) w 107.i.9(?) zabīnū(?): 39:env.L.S.
ubru-ahhē NWL 2.ii.9 zā[i] 108.ii.6 ru 112.rev.7
ubru-Allaya 47:6, 19 f of Nabū 48:6, 19 zabāya 18.1(?) 31:16(?) w 107.i.9(?) zabīnū(?): 39:env.L.S.
ubru-ahhē NWL 2.ii.9 zā[i] 108.ii.6 ru 112.rev.7
ubru-Allaya 47:6, 19 f of Nabū 48:6, 19 zabāya 18.1(?) 31:16(?) w 107.i.9(?) zabīnū(?): 39:env.L.S.
ubru-ahhē NWL 2.ii.9 zā[i] 108.ii.6 ru 112.rev.7
ubru-Allaya 47:6, 19 f of Nabū 48:6, 19 zabāya 18.1(?) 31:16(?) w 107.i.9(?) zabīnū(?): 39:env.L.S.
ubru-ahhē NWL 2.ii.9 zā[i] 108.ii.6 ru 112.rev.7
ubru-Allaya 47:6, 19 f of Nabū 48:6, 19 zabāya 18.1(?) 31:16(?) w 107.i.9(?) zabīnū(?): 39:env.L.S.
ubru-ahhē NWL 2.ii.9 zā[i] 108.ii.6 ru 112.rev.7
ubru-Allaya 47:6, 19 f of Nabū 48:6, 19 zabāya 18.1(?) 31:16(?) w 107.i.9(?) zabīnū(?): 39:env.L.S.
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N.B. Place names which occur in personal names are not included.

kura [ ] 122.28'  
urudabab (?) 90:14  
urudian 89:2'  
kurumašqaya (?) 119.rev.A.8  
kurandiaya NWL 1.iv.6' (?) 136.rev.2'  
ururabil 86:19 87:1 93:11 97:3  
urubarabaya 102.iii.21' iii.26' 108.ii.24  
(kur)arappha 103.ii.15 116.2('?)  
(kur)arpaya NWL 1.iii.2 NWL 18.obv.25 102.ii.19' 108.ii.8 111.obv.34'  
(kur)arzuinaya 102.iii.12'  
(kur)asadaya (?) 135:6  
(kur)aššur 82.2',3' 150.2,3  
(kur)aššuraya NWL 1.iii.19 NWL 6.rev.41 NWL 9.rev.18 NWL 11.rev.8 NWL 15:11 NWL 16:30 44:8 102.ii.7' 111.i.21' 145.iii.19,29  
(kur)aššuraya (spelt ŠA.URU-a-a) see Libbi-šilaya  
asšuritu 16:3  
babili 79:7 80:6 81:5  
babilaya NWL 23:11  
baršipo 103.ii.20  
baršipsaya NWL 23:12  
bi-x-x-a-a 135:14  
bininayu 142.7  
bīrururu 44:14  
bišanniya NWL 18.obv.23  
(kur)di-pa-ni-sa bit-a-nim NWL 4.rev.16'?  
(kur)di-ri-AD? ' 85.ii.6'  
dimassa 75:2  
dun(n)ātē 140:3  
dūr-lu- 85.ii.10 108.v.26 116:2'  
dūr-ladini 108.ii.37(?) 44  
dūr-sharru-kīn 11:18 133.i.10(?)  
(ku)elamaya NWL 8.rev.8 NWL 21.rev.2' NWL 35.iii.10 122.27' 134:11(?) 142:2(?) 145.iv.13,26  
elamaya ša kīki 122.29'  
gar-ga-? 142:3(?)  
(gargamisayu NWL 8.rev.17  
(gur)guzana 86:8, rev.8  
hal-z[i?] 89:4'  
halzil-adbar 86:15  
hamataya 110.ii.11'  
(kur)harharaya 119.rev.A.9  
(kur)hattaya NWL 1.iii.6 NWL 6.rev.42 NWL 8.rev.6'? NWL 10.obv.11 NWL 11.rev.9 NWL 15.7(?) NWL 16, ND 10,033:27 NWL 21:5 NWL 26:3 NWL 33.ii.5 121:10 124.rev.5 137:3'  
(kur)pazataya 135:8  
(kur)pazazzaya NWL 4.rev.18'  
(kur)pubuškaya 144:17  
(kur)sana 86:18  
lišidayā (?) 35:31  
(kur)tu'a 143.ii.10'  
(kur)kaldaya NWL 1.iii.11,12 99.ii.15 108.iii.32 145.iii.23  
(kur)kalhaya 84:15 101.1,3 145.iii.11.iv.8  
(kur)kalizi see kilizi  
(kur)kar-šašur 62:16  
(kur)kar-tar'-ru 141:6  
(kur)karunuri 74:12  
(kur)kašaya NWL 1.iii.8,9 NWL 6.rev.40 NWL 10.obv.10 NWL 11.rev.7 NWL 12.4' NWL 13.obv.20' NWL 15:10 NWL 16:31 120:16' 145.iii.20  
(kur)kalkizi 86.obv.13 93:6(?)  
(kur)kirkirri 86:10.rev.10  
(kur)kummuhaya NWL 1.iii.7 NWL 3.15 145.iii.22.iv.5  
(kur)kunnalia 86:12  
kurkurba'il 86:11  
(kur)kusaye NWL 9.rev.21  
(kur)lbbi-šilaya 120:11' 145.iii.8,13.iv.9  
kurma'abaya 143.ii.13  
(kur)mada ya NWL 13.rev.7  
(kur)madiraya NWL 1.iii.9 NWL 18.obv.22  
(kur)mannaya NWL 6.rev.51 NWL 8.rev.16 NWL 23:9 143.ii.12'  
(kur)manisaya (?) NWL 14.rev.5'  
(kur)mēlidayā NWL 6.rev.52 NWL 13.obv.11'? NWL 23:10(?).
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kurmuṣiraya* NWL 4.rev.14
(ṭ)muṣuraya NWL 9.rev.19 34:2
urunapisina (?) 41:5
(nu)naṣibina 86:5,rev.5
(nu)ninua 7:12 44:13 89:1’ 118:7
(uru)ninuaya(?) 145.i.11
(uru)uirgi 90:7
kurḫu-ix-x-a-a 143.i.14
puruer see buruer
uruque 54:20`
uruṣir 15:9
kurqtiaya NWL 18.obv.24 NWL 30:4 120:15’
uru kurraṣappa 86:2,rev.2 105:1’
[kur(x)]ja-x-a-a 119.rev.A.11
kurṣa-du-up[ ] 135:10
urušamakka 87:33
urušam‘ala 86:13
kuršam‘alaya NWL 8.rev.18 142:4(?)
urušamerīna 90:15 99.i.22
kuršamerīnaya NWL 1.iv.7(?) NWL 4.rev.15’
NWL 8.rev.15 121:7 142:5
urušam‘alat[e?] (x) 136:2
(uru)uš‘im 86:6,rev.6
kuršingibutu(?) NWL 13.rev.7’
urušahuppa NWL 1.iii.20 NWL 14.rev.4 = 124:24
urušahuppa 86:19
lāšelappaya NWL 4.rev.9’ 87:34
urušja-x-ma-[e-] MEŠ 11:8
urušgil 141:7

dkutšubriaya NWL 4.rev.17(?) NWL 23:7
uruṭalmusa 86:17
kuršbalaya NWL 11.rev.24 NWL 23:8
145.iii.21
uruṭamnuni 86:2
urušAR-NINA 103.i.9
(aruššu)le 86:7,rev.7
uruṭuimmun 86:14
tušhan 44:18
kurš-t-x-ma-a-a 135:12
urušbase 141.8,13
kuršudumaya 135:7
kurš-š-u-ma-a-a 135:12
kuršuraraya NWL 5.13 136:1
uruṣurza 87:33
uruṣyaluna 147:2 148:2
kuršia-st‘-x-a-a 135:9
kuršyadaya 135:11
kuršurzurzu-ku-x-a-a-a 119.rev.A.10
kuršDAN-x-a-a 145.iv.4
[kusa-x-a-a 142:1
kurš-x-qa-x-a-a 135:13
kurš-x-sa-x-a-a 122:30
kurš-x-sä-x-a-a 124:25
kurš-(x)-šu-x-a-a-a 119.rev.A.7
urušx-ar‘na 108.ii.45
URUŠE GIS x (x)-a-a 39.env.2

*Kinnier Wilson suggested emending to μu-sa-ru-a-a; Parpola, JSS 21 p.167 suggested emending to μu-<ša>-ṣir-a-a.
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NWL 34 and 35 are not included because they do not come from Fort Shalmaneser. As far as possible, the results of collations and of reviewers’ suggestions to NWL texts, especially from Parpola in JSS 21 1976, have been incorporated, except where further study has eliminated a suggestion. To avoid excessive annotation, simple question marks in brackets denote both disputed and improved readings. No.146 is not indexed because the tablet could not be found. The king is not included, but the logogram translated as ‘queen’ is included. All professions are listed in the form in which they occur; logograms are not transcribed into Akkadian, with the exception of nāgiru (DIŠ+U), šani‘u (2-u), and taššuš (3(-šu) U-g).
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A. BA.KUR/E.GAL NWL 12:3' NWL 16:21(?% NWL 19.obv.21 55:10' 59:13 73:3

A. BA-tu ša E MI.E.GAL/KUR 39:5(env .), 4(tablet) 40:3

AGRIG 88:1 90:14 94:7 See also UŠ AGRIG

AGRIG.GAL 36:24 53:17'

A.KIN 113:12 135:3

A.KIN ša LŪ GAL.KAS.LUL NWL 13:rev.16'

A.Sig (MEŠ) ša [ ] NWL 13:rev.15' NWL 16, ND 10,033:11, ND 10,050/1:5' 134:1'3'

A.Sig (ša) DINGIR.MEŠ (-ni) NWL 8:15 NWL 13:rev.8' NWL 14:rev.14 NWL 16, ND 10,033:13
ND 10,050/1:7' 123:12' 137:4(?)

A.Sig ša qurab 119:10

A.Sig MAN(??) 122:20'

A.Sig ša mudēštēte NWL 8:obs.21(?) NWL 16:12 NWL 17:5'

AŠGAB (MEŠ-ni) NWL 1.i.2, ii.13-4.22 NWL 2.i.15 NWL 6:obs.39 NWL 11:rev.11 NWL 22:5
124:13 133.ii.5 145.iii.8, 25

AZLAG (MEŠ-ni) NWL 11:rev.12(?) 36:16

A.ZU(MEŠ) NWL 8:obs.28a NWL 15:14 122:12' 133.ii.4 139:4'

NWL 17:5 NWL 19:rev.5 NWL 27:2 129:3 (?)

dāgīl MUŠEN.MEŠ NWL 3.i.4 NWL 8:obs.3(? NWL 9:obs.3(?) NWL 14:obs.4(?) NWL 16:2(?)
NWL 29.2 145.iv.5(?) kummuhaya

DAM.GAR 7:12

DUMU[ ] 88:rev.5'

DUMU.E.GAL 30:13

DUMU.KIN NWL 21:rev.12' NWL 23:11

DUMU.MEŠšu.DILIM.DUG NWL 1.i.16

DUMU.KAŠ.LUL NWL 8:obs.27 NWL 13:rev.10' NWL 16:23

DUMUSIGSIG (MEŠ) NWL 2.i.6(?) 12 NWL 3.i.16 NWL 4:obs.11 NWL 6:obs.8 NWL 7:7
NWL 19:obs.8 NWL 22:13

DUMUSIGSIG ša DINGIR.MEŠ-ni NWL 3.i.28 NWL 6:obs.17 NWL 12:7' NWL 18:5 NWL 33.i.9

DUMU šip-ri 84:3

EN GIS.GIGIR.MEŠ NWL 8:rev.1, 2 NWL 9:rev.3, 4 NWL 20:rev.4' NWL 31:3 108.ii.25
111.i.5(?) 134:9' 138.A.3'(?)

EN GIS.GIGIR ša DINGIR.MEŠ-ni NWL 3.i.28 NWL 6:obs.17 NWL 12:7' NWL 18:5 NWL 33.i.9

EN GIS.GIGIR.MEŠ ša DINGIR.MEŠ-ni NWL 3.i.28 NWL 6:obs.17 NWL 12:7' NWL 18:5 NWL 33.i.9

EN GIS.GIGIR.MES ša qurbute NWL 6:obs.12 NWL 19:obs.15 134:10'

EN GIS.GIGIR ša GIR.2 IR KUR 136:3'4'

EN GIS.GIGIR ša ziqnit/SU ši NWL 3.i.27 NWL 10:rev.10 NWL 13:obs.18' NWL 14:obs.26
EN ilki 35:16

EN.NAM 11:18 68:4'

EN.NUN.MEŠ NWL 21:rev.14'

EN piri(?) NWL 9:obs.15(?) NWL 10:obs.13(?) edge 1. See also UŠ piri

EN šu.2 MEŠ 44:17 60:9

ĒRIN.MEŠ 89:11' 100.iii.3',5' 125:2 ša E diM

ĒRIN.MEŠ MAN 21:i 22:1

Ēṣidū 11:12 42:8

Ē.2-e NWL 2.i.8 NWL 3.i.13 NWL 4:obs.10 NWL 6:obs.9 96:14 119:4(?)

GAB 27:5

GAB.MEŠ 111.ii.2

GAL[ ] NWL 4:obs.3' NWL 19:rev.13 35:27 and 28 58:4' 73:env.4' 96:27 and 29 111.i.4'
121:13 and 19 122:25' 129:5' 134:5' 139:8'

GAL.MEŠ NWL 5:obs.5 NWL 19:obs.6(?) NWL 21:rev.16' 86:20

GAL.AZU NWL 6:obs.20 NWL 19:rev.11

GAL.GAL.MEŠ 99.1

1 All references are included, even when they probably refer to the place rather than its staff.
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(LÜ)PA (MES) 112.rev.2 137:2(?). See (sa) (GIS) PA
pōhīzāni NWL 13.rev.12' NWL 25 side.3 134:4'
phaltal qurub(e) 101.i.3,4,5 108.ii.47
qattumu 3:17 (?)
qurbiitu NWL 1.ii.8 (?) NWL 2.i.5 NWL 3.i.14 NWL 4.rev.8 NWL 5.5obv.8 NWL 6.5obv.7 NWL 8.5obv.8 NWL 9.4obv.7 NWL 13.5obv.3' NWL 14.5obv.11(?) NWL 16:6 NWL 19.5obv.7 NWL 20.5obv.2' NWL 22:11 NWL 28:1 NWL 33.i.4 103.5obv.end 108.ii.47,v.11 119.5obv.2,rev.A.3 134:10'
qurbiite ša GŪB 108.i.8
qurbiite ZAG 108.i.7
raksūte NWL 2.i.6 NWL 5.5obv.6 NWL 6.5rev.33 NWL 7:6 NWL 9.5obv.8 NWL 13.5obv.4' NWL 14.5obv.12(?) NWL 16:7 NWL 19.5obv.17 NWL 28:2 121:6
raksūte (sa) (LÜ) (GAL) SAG NWL 1.i.7 NWL 8.5obv.9 145.i.3
SAG (MES) NWL 1.i.3, 14, 17, 18 NWL 3.i.12, ii.14 NWL 4.5obv.15 NWL 5.5obv.4 NWL 8.5obv.5 NWL 20.5rev.2' NWL 33.i.2 101.i.13 110.i.1(?) 136:1 143.i.5' 145.i.1
SIMUG AN BAR (MES) NWL 1.i.ii.18 NWL 4.5rev.12' 1:6 87:35 90:11 145.i.12
SIMUG KU.GI (MES-nu) NWL 1.i.ii.15,24 120:10' 145.i.14
SIMUG URUDU 87:34 90:11
SIPA NWL 21.5rev.13'
SIPA BUR 90:24
SUKKAL (MES) 144:15 145.i.ii.10(?)
SUM.NINDA (MES) NWL 8.5obv.29 NWL 9.5obv.29 NWL 17:4 87:15,17(?) 21(?) 28 88.rev.4' 143:8'
SUM.NINDA ša ŠGAL 87:48
MÌ SUM.NINDA-ta ša MÌ ŠGAL 87:46
SUM.NINDA ša MÌ.KUR 87:42
SUM.NINDA ša IG KUŠ tukkanīi 87:15-16
sūshīn ša [ ] NWL 12:8'
sa x x MES-ta 87:24
ša akkūša 87:22,43
ša billūtis (?) 87:23,43
ša (GIS),GAB.GAB.MES/ME NWL 6.5rev.34 NWL 7:3 NWL 11.rev.4(?) NWL 14.5obv.22(?) NWL 16:17 NWL 18:6 NWL 19.5obv.19 NWL 33.i.8
ša Ë.dūnāni NWL 5.5rev.7 NWL 6.5obv.16 NWL 7:4 NWL 8.5obv.18 NWL 9.5obv.16 NWL 15:6 NWL 16, ND 10,033:16, ND 10,050:1:11' NWL 18:6a NWL 19.5obv.13 NWL 20.5obv.8' NWL 21.rev.7' 124.rev.6(?) 127:3(?) 134:8' 145.i.3
ša Ë[ ] NWL 16:4'
ša Ë. kudīni NWL 3.i.14 NWL 4.5obv.20 NWL 6.5obv.11 NWL 8.5obv.16 NWL 9.5obv.10 NWL 13.5obv.6' NWL 16,ND 10,033:9 ND 10,050:3' NWL 18:3 NWL 19.5obv.11 NWL 20.5obv.6' NWL 28:5 119:9 123:11'
ša Ë kustall NWL 16:10
ša EN.NUN NWL 16:24(?) 86:20
ša Ë (1)Qīqš NWL 3.i.15 NWL 6.5obv.10 NWL 8.5obv.17 NWL 9.5obv.11 NWL 13.5obv.5' NWL 15:5 NWL 19.5obv.10 NWL 20.5obv.4' NWL 33.i.8
ša Ë 2-e NWL 8.5obv.12(?) NWL 9.5obv.9 NWL 14.5obv.13 NWL 16, ND 10,033:8 ND 10,050:1:2' NWL 19.5obv.9 NWL 20.5obv.5 NWL 28:3 NWL 33.i.5. See also Š 2-e
ša GlR.2 NWL 6.5rev.35 NWL 8.5rev.11(?) NWL 10.edge 2 NWL 11.rev.5(?) NWL 15:1 NWL 16:18 NWL 19.5obv.18 108A.i.6' 136:3(?) 137:1. See also GlR.2
ša GIS.NI.TE (reading and meaning unknown) 108.i.9
šagūte 101.i.6, iii.23 102.iii.23'
ša IG KUŠ DU 10.GAN.MES 87:16

4 All occurrences are listed, although some may refer only to horses.
5 All types of occurrence and writing are listed together.
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a(p)pāte 24:3
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aṣūdu 14:10
BE 110.ii.6'
BE. BA 113:1
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bēt 29:15
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DUG.ŠAB.MEŠ 91:4
dunnātē(?) 140:3
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hašā (?) 94:1
hūtū 95:8
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inarmakate 70:3
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isātē 87:37
issu = aššatu 47:7 51:2,7
kabbūtāte 74:9
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karminī 41:11
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kulītu 95:B 28
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KUS.SAL 89:21'
lībbu 1:9
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LÜ.MAH.MEŠ 87:30
LÜ.SAG 101.ii.13
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matanāte 74:6
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middutu 124 commentary
midu 87:19 90:23
murabbānu 99.ii.20
mutātē 96:10
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nagalmesu 97:15
narmakate / nadbakte 70:3
na-a-su 99.iii.6
nasikānī 133.ii.9'
nenzu 94:2
Gi₃PA.MEŠ 74:8
panišu 91:2
putuhu 9:8
qāštātī 8:1
qurbu 101.ii.14
rab bētī 102.iii.22'
rab sikkātē 39:12
rēšu našū 8:6
rūtu 24:1
SAG.DU UR.MAH 135:4 144:15
SAG.MEŠ 39:2
kū₃SAL 89:21'
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šalmi qabassī 95:B 20
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ND</th>
<th>Text Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>453</td>
<td>GPA no.141, TCAE p.369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2080</td>
<td>Iraq 16 pl.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2082</td>
<td>Iraq 16 pl.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2084</td>
<td>Iraq 16 pl.35, pl.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2091</td>
<td>Iraq 16 pl.35, pl.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2093</td>
<td>Iraq 16 pl.35, pl.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2308</td>
<td>Iraq 16 pl.7, FNALD no.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2314</td>
<td>Iraq 16 pl.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2316</td>
<td>Iraq 16 pl.40, pl.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2320</td>
<td>Iraq 16 pl.41, pl.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2321</td>
<td>Iraq 16 pl.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2323</td>
<td>Iraq 16 pl.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2324</td>
<td>Iraq 16 pl.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2325</td>
<td>Iraq 16 pl.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2332</td>
<td>Iraq 16 pl.43, pl.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2335</td>
<td>Iraq 16 pl.44, pl.9, FNALD no.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2386</td>
<td>Iraq 16 pl.11, TCAE p.371 – 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2410</td>
<td>Iraq 36 pl.21, pl.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2451</td>
<td>Iraq 23 pl.14, TCAE p.376 – 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2462</td>
<td>Iraq 21 pl.45, TCAE p.380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2482</td>
<td>Iraq 23 pl.31, pl.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2489</td>
<td>Iraq 23 pl.32 – 3, pl.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2605</td>
<td>Iraq 23 pl.36, pl.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2612</td>
<td>Iraq 23 pl.37, pl.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2618</td>
<td>Iraq 23 pl.37 – 8, pl.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2629</td>
<td>Iraq 23 pl.39 pl.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2631</td>
<td>Iraq 28 pl.56, TCAE p.383 – 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2643</td>
<td>Iraq 18 pl.41 pl.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2655</td>
<td>Iraq 20 pl.191, pl.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2664</td>
<td>Iraq 23 pl.42, pl.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2672</td>
<td>Iraq 23 pl.22, TCAE p.387 – 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2706</td>
<td>Iraq 23 pl.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2715</td>
<td>Iraq 17 pl.30, TCAE p.390 – 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2759</td>
<td>Iraq 35 pl.21 – 34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2765</td>
<td>Iraq 17 pl.134, pl.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2768</td>
<td>Iraq 23 pl.48 – 9, pl.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2774</td>
<td>Iraq 23 pl.50, pl.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2777</td>
<td>Iraq 21 pl.174 pl.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2788</td>
<td>Iraq 23 pl.27, TCAE p.397 – 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2792</td>
<td>Iraq 18 pl.47 pl.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2803</td>
<td>Iraq 23 pl.55 – 7, pl.29 – 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3414</td>
<td>Iraq 15 pl.139, pl.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3420</td>
<td>Iraq 15 pl.140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3422</td>
<td>Iraq 15 pl.140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3426</td>
<td>Iraq 15 pl.12, FNALD no.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3432</td>
<td>Iraq 15 pl.142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3443</td>
<td>Iraq 15 pl.12, FNALD no.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3451</td>
<td>Iraq 15 pl.145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3467</td>
<td>Iraq 15 pl.13, TCAE p.399 – 400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3483</td>
<td>Iraq 15 pl.148 pl.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3484</td>
<td>Iraq 15 pl.148 pl.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3488</td>
<td>Iraq 19 pl.28, FNALD no.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3561</td>
<td>Iraq 19 pl.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3563</td>
<td>Iraq 19 pl.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3575</td>
<td>Iraq 19 pl.135, pl.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5550</td>
<td>Iraq 19 pl.33, FNALD no.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>