The Royal Inscriptions of Mesopotamia

PUBLICATIONS
(**published or in press  *in preparation)

EARLY PERIODS (RIME)
Edmond Sollberger, Editor-in-Charge
Douglas R. Frayne, Assistant Editor

1 Pre-Sargonic Period (to 2334 BC)
*2 Sargonic and Gutian Period (2333-2113 BC) — Douglas R. Frayne
3 Neo-Sumerian Period (2112-2004 BC)
**4 Old Babylonian Period (2003-1595 BC) — Douglas R. Frayne
5 Addenda et Corrigenda
   Complete Indices to all Volumes

ASSYRIAN PERIODS (RIMA)
A. Kirk Grayson, Editor-in-Charge

**1 Assyrian Rulers of the Third and Second Millennia BC (to 1115 BC), 1987 — A. Kirk Grayson
*2 Assyrian Rulers of the Early First Millennium BC I (1114-859 BC) — A. Kirk Grayson
*3 Assyrian Rulers of the Early First Millennium BC II (858-745 BC) — A. Kirk Grayson
*4 Tiglath-pileser III to Shalmaneser V (744-722 BC) — H. Tadmor
*5 Sargon II (721-705 BC) — G. Frame
*6 Sennacherib (704-681 BC) — L. George and L. D. Levine
*7 Esarhaddon (680-669 BC) — E. Leichty
*8 Ashurbanipal and His Successors (668-612 BC) — L. B. Shiff
9 Addenda et Corrigenda
   Complete Indices to all Volumes

BABYLONIAN PERIODS (RIMB)
John A. Brinkman, Editor-in-Charge
Grant Frame, Assistant Editor

*1 Kassite Dynasty (1595-1155 BC) — J. A. Brinkman
*2 Second Dynasty of Isin to Kandalanu (1157-626 BC) — J. A. Brinkman
3 and 4 Neo-Babylonian Dynasty (625-539 BC)
5 Achaemenid to Seleucid Dynasties (538 BC–end)
6 Addenda et Corrigenda
   Complete Indices to all Volumes

STUDIES (RIMS)

**1 V. Donbaz and A.K. Grayson, Royal Inscriptions on Clay Cones from Ashur now in Istanbul, 1984

Printed in Canada
The Kudurru Fragment VA 213
BARBARA CIFOLA

Fragments of the Annals of Tiglath-pileser I
VEYSEL DONBAZ

Two Neo-Assyrian Stelae in the Antakya and Kahramanmaraş Museums
VEYSEL DONBAZ

Naram-Sin in Martu and Magan
BENJAMIN R. FOSTER

Fragments of Assyrian Royal Inscriptions: Possibly of Tiglath-pileser I
ALAN R. MILLARD

Eine Inschrift Samsu-ilunas von Babylon
JOACHIM OELSNER

Cuneiform Texts at the University of British Columbia
CELESTE A. PETERS
DOUGLAS R. FRAYNE

A New Esarhaddon Prism Fragment Concerning the Restoration of Babylon
AKIO TSUKIMOTO

Obituary: Edmond Sollberger
A. KIRK GRAYSON

Published by the RIM Project
The Royal Inscriptions of Mesopotamia

Greater accessibility to primary sources has long been a desideratum in Assyriology. It is the purpose of the Royal Inscriptions of Mesopotamia Project to locate, collate, edit, and publish in standard format all known royal inscriptions from ancient Mesopotamia.

Thousands of tablets preserving many kinds of literature are housed in institutions scattered around the world. The fraction of these that have been published often prove difficult to find. Of particular interest for historical studies are the inscriptions of the Mesopotamian kings. These texts commemorate the accomplishments of the ancient rulers.

The work of the RIM Project is being carried out by an international team of scholars who are pooling their expertise to produce a multi-volume work of lasting value. After two years of propaedeutic work, the Project began in earnest on 1 July 1981 with funding from the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada, with additional support provided by the University of Toronto.

The entire responsibility for articles is that of the individual author.

The RIM Project is funded by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada and the University of Toronto.

ANNUAL REVIEW STAFF

Editor: A. Kirk Grayson
Managing Editor: L. S. Wilding
Editorial Assistant: D. Matthews

The RIM Project
The University of Toronto
4 Bancroft Avenue, 4th Floor
Toronto, Ontario M5S 1A1
CANADA

Suggested abbreviation: ARRIM
© Royal Inscriptions of Mesopotamia Project
ISSN 0822-2525
Contents

The Kudurru Fragment VA 213 / 1
BARBARA CIFOLA

Fragments of the Annals of Tiglath-pileser I / 3
VEYSEL DONBAZ

Two Neo-Assyrian Steleae in the Antakya and Kahramanmaraş Museums / 5
VEYSEL DONBAZ

Naram-Sin in Martu and Magan / 25
BENJAMIN R. FOSTER

Fragments of Assyrian Royal Inscriptions: Possibly of Tiglath-pileser I / 45
ALAN R. MILLARD

Eine Inschrift Samsu-ilunas von Babylon / 47
JOACHIM OELSNER

Cuneiform Texts at the University of British Columbia / 49
CELESTE A. PETERS
DOUGLAS R. FRAYNE

A New Esarhaddon Prism Fragment Concerning the Restoration of Babylon / 63
AKIO TSUKIMOTO

Obituary: Edmond Sollberger / 70
A. KIRK GRAYSON

Published by the RIM Project
The purpose of this brief note is an edition of the kudurru fragment VA 213, hitherto unedited. It was found in Nippur and assigned to the period of the Second Dynasty of Isin. The fragment is the upper part of a black boundary stone having the following dimensions: length 33 cm, width 38 cm, and thickness 20 cm. Thus only a few divine symbols and 11 lines of the inscription still remain. The latter, however, deserves some attention for in the first column the description of the field, the object of the grant, is included. As usual, the different sides are determined with reference to the adjoining properties. Moreover, the exact length of each side is added, which is rarely the case.

The preserved lines of the second column are a part of the curses upon anyone who would damage the kudurru. The actual curse formulae and invocations to deities are missing.

TRANSLITERATION

Col. i

1) 1 US 20 NINDA 5 NINDA pūtu(SAG.KI) elilitu(AN.TA) amurru(IM.MAR.TU)
2) teh(DA) bit(Ē) 5 śin(30)-ašarāḏeš(SAG.KAL) 1 US 40 NINDA pūtu(SAG.KI) šaplitu(KI.TA)
3) šadīu(IM.KUR.RA) teh(DA) bit(Ē) mā śin(30)-ašarāḏeš(SAG.KAL) 5 US 10 NINDA
4) šiddud(uš) elū(AN.TA) iltūni(IM.SI.SA) teh(DA) bit(Ē) mā śin(30)-ašarāḏeš(SAG.KAL)
5) 3 2 or 3 1 US 10 NINDA šiddud(uš) šapli(KI.TA) šittu(IM.U.₁₉.LU) teh(DA) bit(Ē)

Col. ii

1) shall change, the boundary shall alter, the boundary stone
2) shall change, shall cast (it) into the river,
3) shall destroy (it), in the dust shall hide (it),
4) shall allow fire to destroy (it), into a place where it cannot be seen (shall set it),
5) or shall incite someone to ...

COMMENTARY

4) The field in question appears to be surrounded, at least by three sides, by the district of Bit-Sin-ašarēd; for which see K. Nashef, Rép. Géogr. 5, Wiesbaden, 1982, p. 68. The mention of this GN might be decisive for dating the document since it is not attested otherwise in NB texts (cf. R. Zadok, Rép. Géogr. 8, Wiesbaden, 1985). Its localization,
between Uruk and Larsa, is moreover interesting for
only a few kudurrus stem from the very south of
Mesopotamia as already pointed out by D. Arnaud,

i 5) If the figure beginning this line was 5, then the
long sides would be equal and the field nearly a rec­tangle, i.e. the usual form.

i 6) The name of the last district or estate is unfor­
tunately missing.

**ICONOGRAPHY**

The symbols engraved upon the remaining part of
the stone are those representing the heavenly gods,
namely the solar disc of Šamaš, the crescent of Sīn,
and the eight-pointed star of Ištar. These are nor­
mally present on kudurrus, but their peculiar
arrangement should be noted for on this basis U.
Seidl connects the fragment with rather earlier
boundary stones.⁴

⁴ U. Seidl, ‘Die babylonischen Kudurru-Reliefs,’ *Bagh. Mitt.* 4
(1968) p. 77.
Fragments of the Annals of Tiglath-pileser I

VEYSEL DONBAZ
Istanbul/Bahçelievler

The following fragmentary inscriptions on broken clay tablets from Aššur will be edited with the texts of Tiglath-pileser I in RIMA 2.

A 644 (Ass 6138) = A.0.87.4.5

A 644 (Ass 6138) = A.0.87.4.5

A 690 (Ass 19569) = A.0.87.4.19

A 635 (Ass 17861) = A.0.87.7

A 2126 (Ass 8569) = A.0.87.4.10
A 646 (Ass 17874b) + A 661 (Ass 17874a) + A 2512 (Ass 17874c) + Ass 17874d = A.0.87.8
Two Neo-Assyrian Stelae in the Antakya and Kahramanmaraş Museums

VEYSEL DONBAZ
Istanbul/Bahçelevler

The two stelae published here are on display at two different museums in the south-east region of Turkey, namely Antakya and Kahramanmaraş.1 About 1968, when Selahattin Asim was the director of the Antakya Museum, one of the stelae was found by a peasant digging a new well near the Orontes, at an approximate depth of six metres, to the left of the road about half-way between Antakya and Samandağ (3 km). The area is a flat open valley covered with trees and orchards. Very shortly after the discovery of the stela Asim was summoned to the find-spot and acquired it for the museum.2

The Kahramanmaraş1 stela was found at the village of Kizkapanlı in the Pazarcık area (near Kahramanmaraş) close to the Gözlügöl nomad settlement, while the Pazarcık barrage was being built. Soon after its discovery, the stela was acquired for the Maraş museum.

The Antakya stela is damaged on the left side, from top to bottom,3 and on the top and top right corner, so that the heads of the royal figures carved in light relief have been damaged. The damage may be the result of an intentional act of religious provocation. Examination of the two stelae and their inscriptions shows that the Antakya stela has been carefully carved and is the work of an expert, whereas the Pazarcık inscriptions (both obv. and rev.) are of inferior workmanship,4 insofar as the style of cuneiform script is concerned. The contents of the inscriptions tell us more about the reign of Adad-nērārī III.5 According to the Antakya stela, a boundary was set up between Zakur of Hamath and Ataršumki and this included an agreement for equal use of the Orontes River. The Pazarcık stela reveals that Adad-nērārī settled a border dispute with Ušipulumche, the Kummuhēn king,10 and Qalparuda, the Gurgumean king, but it appears that the main alliance is with Ušipulumche since the agreement is presented to him in the form of a stela (Paz. rev. 12–13). However, Adad-nērārī seems to have established his relations with five cities: Hamath, Arpad(da), Nahlası, Kummuň, and Gurgum through Ataršumki and Ušipulumche.

Adad-nērārī also mentions a war against Ataršumki and his eight allies in Paqirahubuna (Paz. obv. 11–13). Extensive booty from the Damascene ruler Hadyiyan (Paz. rev. 4–10) was brought back home as a result of a campaign to Damascus by Šamši-ili. Four linear descendants are referred to respectively: Shalmaneser III (858-824 bc), Šamši-Adad v (823-811 bc), Adad-nērārī III (810-783 bc), and Shalmaneser IV (782-773 bc); the tartānu-official Šamši-ili (Ant. lines 5 and 8; Paz. rev. 4) served under the last two kings.

The word taḫumu is used in these inscriptions both with the meaning 'border, territory' (cf. von Soden, AHw p. 1303) and with the meaning 'boundary such a heavy block, in the form of an inscribed stela, could hardly be moved very far from its original location.

1 Before I obtained official permission to study the Antakya and Kahramanmaraş stelae, David Hawkins had seen them and made a preliminary study, assisted by some remarks from Karlheinz Deller. I thank them both for their valuable suggestions. Even though I have quoted some of their viewpoints, I carefully copied and collated the inscriptions at the two museums myself and take full responsibility for the article.

2 My thanks are due to the General Directorate of Museums and Antiquities for granting me permission to study the stelae; to the Director-General, Mr. Altan Akat, and the Deputy Director, Nimet Berkok, for their permission and generous assistance; and to Veli Yenisoganci, the Director of the Antakya Museum, for allowing me to complete my work during visits in November (1989) and January (1990). Without their help this study could not have been completed.

3 The modern name has been glorified as Kahrman 'hero, brave' because of its heroism in the fight for freedom against the allied troops during the war of independence.

4 I would also like to thank Mr. Hadi Bozkurt, the Director of the museum at Kahramanmaraş, who very generously allowed me to complete my work there.

5 This may have been due to the re-use of the monument; the site where the original stela was erected is unknown, but the site where the stela was found was near a road about half-way between Antakya and Samandağ (3 km)."
The Antakya Stela

(Env. nr. 11832) Slightly damaged. 127 x 52 x 31 cm. Two sculptured standing human figures. The heads are mostly gone. The inscription runs over the right margin.

**TRANSLITERATION**

1) mdISKUR-ERIN.TAH MAN GAL MAN KAL MAN ŠU MAN KUR TAš1
2) A mšam-ši-10 MAN dan-mu MAN ŠU MAN KUR aš «aš»-šur
3) A mšul-ma-maš MAN kib-rat 4
4) [ta]-hu-mu ŠA ina bir-ti mza-ku-rí KUR ḫu-ma-ta-a-a
5) ([u ina) bir]-ti mšar-šum-ki A mšad-ra-mu mš10-ERIN.TAH MAN KUR AŠ mšam-ši-DINGIR ĽU
tar-ta-nu
6) [šš-ku]-nu-ni URU na-ah-la-si a-di AŠ.A MEš-šú
GIŠ.KIRIš.MEš-šú
7) [u] di-ma-ší-šú gab-be šá mša-ar-šum-ki šú-tú
ID ar-am-tú ina bi-ri-šú-ší-nu
8) [ū-šam]-ší-lu-ma i-zu-zu mi-šír NAM A
mš10-ERIN.TAH MAN KUR AŠ mšam-ši-DINGIR ĽU1
tar-ta-nu
9) [ta]-nu ŠÁ-ki-ú-ma a-na mššar-šum-ki A
mšad-ra-mu a-na DUMU MEš-šú
10) DUMU.DUMU.MEš-šú EGIŠ.MEš ki ri-mu-ti i-rí-mu
URU-ŠI ta-ḫu-ma-ti-šú
11) [x x] a-na mi-šír KUR-šú u-kín MU aš-šur dišKUR u
ší-er _enemyš-aš-šú-šú
12) [NIN.LIš]. aš-šú-tú MU aš-šíb URU.KASKAL-ni
DINGIR.MEš GAL.MEš
13) [šš KUR aš-šú-šar man-nu EGIŠ-ú ŠÁ PÍ NA.RÚ.A
ší-ší-a-tú
14) [ušš]-šam-sa-ku-ma mi-šír an-na-a TA qa-at
mšar-šum-ki
15) DUMU.MEš-šú U DUMU.DUMU.MEš-šú ina
dan-na-e ki-šú
16) [x x] 1) u(t)? šu-mu šat-ri i-pa-ší-ta MU šá-nam-ma
i-šat-far
17) [aš-šúr] dišKUR u ší-er aš-šíb URU.KASKAL
DINGIR.MEš GAL.MEš ší KUR AŠ
18) [šš ina] NA.RÚ.A an-neye MU-šú-nu zak-ru
19) [iš]-ší-bíšš úl i-šá-mu-ú

**TRANSLATION**

1) Adad-nērārī, great king, strong king, king of the universe, king of Assyria,
2) son of Šamsī-Adad, strong king, king of the universe, king of Assyria,
3) son of Shalmaneser, king of the four quarters.
4-5) The boundary which Adad-nērārī, king of Assyria, (and) Šamsī-llu, the commander in chief, established between Zakur of the land of Hamath and Ataršumki, son of Adramu:
6-8) the town of Nahlaši with all its fields, gardens, [and] settlements is (the property) of Ataršumki. They divided the Orontes River between them. This is the border.
9-11) Adad-nērārī, king of Assyria, (and) Šamsī-llu, the commander in chief, have given it free and clear to Ataršumki, son of Adramu, to his sons, and his subsequent grandsons. His city and its territories [...] to the border of his land he made firm.
12-13) By the name of Aššur, Adad, and Ber, the Assyrian Illil, the Assyrian Mulliss, and the name of Sin dwelling in Harran, the great gods [of] Assyria:
14-16) whoever afterwards speaks ill of the terms of this stela, and takes by force this frontier from the possession of Ataršumki, his sons, and his grandsons; and destroys the written name (and) writes another name:
17-19) may [Aššur], Adad, and Ber, Sin dwelling in Harran, the great gods of Assyria [whose] names are recorded on this stela, not listen to his prayers.

**REMARKS**

2) Aššur has one extra horizontal; the scribe probably first intended to write Aššu (as in line 1) but repeated Aš-šur, ignoring the first Aš, to fill the remaining space.
7) [u] di-ma-ší-šú: the reading was proposed by Deller. For dimtu referring to fortified villas see, in addition to the dictionaries, Al-Khalessi, Assur 1 (1977) pp. 81-122.
8) [ušš]-šam-ma-i-zu-zu: cf. usamšilûma izûzû, Grayson, Chronicles p. 160 i 22.'
8) NAM A is a problem. Deller tentatively proposed Nam A = ana (an attested value of Nam), giving ana- = annā. Or should one regard this as an erroneous metathesis for a-nam : annām?
11) aššad aššur-ú: cf. šEN.LIš äššu-ru-u, Ebeling, LKA no. 33 obv. 5 (reference from Deller).
The Pazarcik Stele

Inscribed on both obverse and reverse. 140 x 44 x 16.5 cm. No significant damage has occurred.

TRANSLITERATION

Obverse:
1) ta-₄u-mu ša m10-ÉRIN.TĀH MAN KUR aš-šur
2) a šam-ši-10 MAN KUR aš-šur
3) ša-sam-ma-ra-mat MUNUS.É.GAL
4) ša šam-ši-10 MAN KUR aš-šur
5) AMAN m10-ÉRIN.TĀH MAN KAL MAN KUR aš-šur
6) kal-lat mššil-ma-nu-MAŠ
7) MAN kib-(rat) 4-ti ina us-me mšš-pi-li-lu-me
8) MAN URU ku-mu-ha-a-a a-na m10-ÉRIN.TĀH MAN KUR aš-šur
9) ša-sam-ma-ra-mat MUNUS.É.GAL
10) it pu-rat-tzi zi-se-bi-ru-u-ni
11) a-tar-ši-im-ki a ša-ra-a-₄e URA ţ-pa-da-a-a
12) a-di 8 MAN.ŠEŠ-ni ša ki-ši ina URU
13) si-di-ta-ši-₄u ki-ši-₄u am-dah-is
14) e-kim(₄)-ši-nu-ti a-na šu-₄u-₄ub zl.MESŠ-ši-₄u
15) e-li-₄u ina MU.ŠAN.₄A ša-a-te
16) ta-₄u-mu ša-₄u-a-ti ina bir-ti mšš-pi-li-lu-me
17) MAN URU ku-mu-₄a-a-a ina bir-ti
18) a ša-la₄a-t-₄a ina šu-₄e-li-ni
19) MAN-ša ša (₄A) šu-₄at mšš-pi-li-lu-me
20) DUMU.ŠEŠ-ši DUMU.ŠEŠ-ši E-KI-mu
21) aš-šur AMAR.UTU ţšKUR d₃₀ d₄TU
22) a-na di-ni-₄u lu la i-za-za
23) ik-kib aš-šur DINGIR-ia d₃₀ ašib

Reverse:
1) mšš-la₄ma-ma-MAŠ MAN KAL MAN KUR aš-šur
2) a m10-ÉRIN.TĀH MAN KAL MAN šu MAN KUR aš-šur
3) a šam-ši-DINGIR LU tar-ta-nu
4) k-li-a-na KUR.ŠE₄Š-ši I-li-₄u-ni
5) ma-da-ti ša ša-la₄₄-a-ni KUR.ŠE₄Š-ši-a-a
6) KU.BABBAR KU.GI URUŠU GIŠ.NA MAN-₄i-ši
7) GIŠ nE₄MAT-tU MAN-i-ši DUMU.MUNUS·SU
8) k-nu-du-ni-ši ša ma₄-d₄-a
d) 17) pi-ti up-ni-šu la i-₄a-me-u-₄u
18) KUR-₄U ki-I SIG.₄lu-₄a-x₄ URU-u₄u
19) im₄-MA ina UG₄U MAN la i-₄a₄-li₄k
20) ik-kib aš-šur DINGIR-ia d₃₀ ašib URA.KASKAL

TRANSLATION

Obverse:
1) Boundary stone of Adad-nērārī, king of Assyria,
2) son of Šamši-Adad, king of Assyria,
3) (and of) Sammu-rāmat, the palace-woman
4) of Šamši-Adad, king of Assyria,
5) mother of Adad-nērārī, strong king, king of Assyria,
6) daughter-in-law of Shalmaneser,
7) king of the four quarters. When Uṣpišlume, king of the people of Kummūḫ, caused Adad-nērārī, king of Assyria, (and) Sammu-rāmat, the palace-woman, to cross the Euphrates;
8-10) I fought a pitched battle with them - with Ataršumki, son of Adramu, of the city of Arpad(da), together with eight kings who were with him at the city Paqirahubuna. I took away from them their camp. To save their lives they dispersed.
16-18) In this (same) year this boundary stone was set up between Uṣpišlume, king of the people of Kummūḫ, and Qalparuda, son of PalaIm, king of the people of Gurgum.
19-20) Whoever (dares) to take (it) away from the hand of Uṣpišlume, his sons, his grandsons:
21-22) may Assur, Marduk, Adad, Sin, (and) Šamas not stand (for him) at his lawsuit;

Reverse:
1) Shalmaneser, strong king, king of Assyria,
2) son of Adad-nērārī, strong king, king of the universe, king of Assyria,
3) son of Šamši-Adad, king of the four quarters:
4-5) when Šamš-ilu, the commander in chief, marched to Damascus,
6-10) the tribute of Hadiyani, the man of Damascus - silver, gold, copper, his royal bed, his royal couch, his daughter with her extensive dowry, the property of his palace without number - I received from him.
11-13) On my return (from Damascus) I gave this boundary stone to Uṣpišlume, king of the people of Kummūḫ.
13-15) Whoever (dares) to take (it) away from the hand of Uṣpišlume, his sons, his grandsons: may Aššur, Marduk, Adad, Sin, (and) Šamaš not stand (for him) at his lawsuit;
17) may they not listen to his prayers;
18) and may they quickly smash his country like a brick.
19) May he no longer give advice to the king.
20) Abomination of Aššur, my god, (and) Sin, who dwells in Harran.

REMARKS

The stela omits -rat in kibrāti (obv. 7; rev. 3). It is interesting that this happens in both the obv. and rev.

Obv. 8) Deller thinks that a-na is nota accusativi here (an Aramaism, based on the use of the Aramaic preposition l to mark the accusative).

Obv. 14) e-kim(*)-šū-nu-ti: the kim sign lacks the initial Winkelhaken.

Obv. 17) The last sign has the anomalous form shown in the copy.

Rev. 5) illikāni: the subject seems to be Šamši-ilu. If it were plural, the king and Šamši-ilu, one would expect nillikāni ‘we marched’. Use of the first person in rev. 10-20 can refer only to the king, not to the tartānu (especially ikkib aššur ilūa).

Rev. 18) ur-ru-uḫ: presumably for urruḫiš. It is either a mistake or a dialectical form.

In conclusion, all three inscriptions are of great significance because of the military allusions to Assyrian hegemony over its neighbouring countries. Treaties played an important and prominent role in late Assyrian imperial expansion. Forming alliances of ‘friendship and peace’ with other states was one part of Assyrian policy. Imposing oaths of loyalty on defeated nations was of great practical benefit to Assyria, and it can be taken for granted that copies of all important treaty documents were either carefully preserved in the royal archives or written on materials which were specially selected for long life, and if possible, for eternity.

Hawkins and Postgate have shown that many kings of Tabal and the surrounding region in Anatolia paid tribute to Assyria. Even though most of the treaties are recorded on clay objects, boundary stones are also known to have been inscribed in settling border conflicts. In this context, the purpose of the present stelae seems to be to resolve border conflicts between small native Anatolian administrative centers. Alliances between kings are mentioned in both the Antakya and Pazarcik stelae. The fact that on the obverse of the Pazarcik stela Sammu-rāmat, mother of Adad-nērāri, is mentioned is noteworthy. The defeat of Ataršumki, king of Arpadda, and his allies was a benefit to two parties, namely Ušpilulume, the Kummuhēan ruler, and Qalparaude, the Gurgumean ruler. A border line was established between them and it was confirmed by the erection of the stela. On the reverse of the Pazarcik stela Shalmaneser IV, son of Adad-nērāri III, appears and once again reference is made to the grant of a boundary stone to Ušpilulume. The former agreement with Gurgum was probably spoiled and Shalmaneser resettled it once more.

8 See Parpola and Watanabe, SAA 2.
Figure 3: Antakya Stela
Figure 4: Antakya Stela
Figure 5: Antakya Stela
Figure 6: Antakya Stela
Figure 7: Pazarcık Stela, Obverse
Figure 8: Pazarcik Stela, Obverse, Upper Portion
Figure 9: Pazarcik Stela, Reverse
Figure 10: Pazarcik Stela, Reverse
Figure 11: Pazarcık Stela, Reverse, Upper Portion
Figure 12: Pazarcik Stela, Reverse, Lower Portion
Figure 13: Pazarcık Stela, Reverse, Edge
Figure 14: Pazarcik Stela, Reverse, Edge
Donbaz: Two Neo-Assyrian Stelae

Figure 16. Puzur-Ek, Stela. Reverse. Edge
Naram-Sin in Martu and Magan

BENJAMIN R. FOSTER
Yale University

I. The Tablet

The tablet edited herewith is rejoined of four fragments: HS 1954+1955 (join Kramer)+2499 (join Oelsner, 1970)+2506 (join Wilcke, 1969). The relationship of the fragments is shown in Figure 1. The tablet was excavated at Nippur by the University of Pennsylvania between 1890 and 1900 and bequeathed to the University of Jena by Hilprecht in 1925. Its overall dimensions are 10.5×12.1×1.4 cm. The tablet suffered considerably in the course of excavation. The reverse was struck repeatedly with the point of a pick, causing substantial loss of text and presumably the shattering of the tablet into four (or more) pieces.

The script is small, fairly neat, and of the 'archaizing' type known from other OB Nippur copies of Sargonic royal inscriptions. It is not so expertly written as PBS 5, 34: some signs seem to be misformed (see, for example, 129); others, like su and su₄, can be difficult to tell apart. Disjunctions, abbreviations, scribal notes, and insert marks all suggest that this tablet was not a finished product but some sort of draft.

HS 1954 and 1955, treated separately, were first edited by Hirsch, AJO 20 (1963) 19–20, using photos and information provided by Bernhardt. While this publication brought the tablet to the attention of researchers, it gave little idea of its actual contents. The tablet was referred to again by Oelsner in WZJ 18 (1969) 52 and Kienast, FAOS 7 (1990) 244–48. Under the auspices of the RIM Project (Toronto), the present writer was able to study the document in Jena, with the gracious permission of the authorities of the Friedrich-Schiller Universität and with the whole-hearted cooperation of Joachim Oelsner, Curator of the Hilprecht-Sammlung. Oelsner also generously made available to the writer his notes and studies on the text made over many years. A collaborative effort originally planned with him was prevented by unforeseen circumstances; the writer wishes to express his warmest thanks to Oelsner for his assistance in making this enterprise possible. A hand copy of the tablet is to appear in a forthcoming TuMH volume. I have also had the benefit of excellent photographs kindly provided by the Jena University authorities for study purposes. For various reasons, it was impossible to publish photos here, for which omission I ask the understanding of my colleagues. Drawings of some problematic signs and passages are given in Figure 2; these are keyed to the transliteration with asterisks. Further collation of this tablet would be desirable.

My thanks go to A. Kirk Grayson, Director of the RIM Project, for his support, and to Douglas Frayne (Toronto) for discussing many of the problems of this text with me. I am particularly grateful to Thorkild Jacobsen, who read a draft of this study and sent me numerous corrections, suggestions, and improvements, not all of which have been used here, but even when not have been instrumental in clarifying my reading and interpretation of this text.

II. Text and Translation

Col. i:

1) [a]-na
2) [EN].EN
3) [a]-li-a-tim
4) ữ
5) PA.TE.SI PA.TE.SI
6) SUBUR
7) iš-tap-pá/-ar-ma
8) u-še-li-ma
9) (*nī-al?-me
10) [x x]-me
11) [x x] x
12) EN.EN
13) [a]-li-a-tim
14) ữ
15) PA.TE.SI PA.TE.SI
Figure 1: HS 1954 + 1955 + 2499 + 2506 Obv.
16) SUBUR\textsuperscript{ki}
17) ki-ma
18) [\textsuperscript{d}]En-lil
19) [i]-pá-la-\textit{hi}
20) [...] x-ma
21) [...] x
22) [...] x
23) [...] x
24) \textit{amt}-ma\textsuperscript{1}-ù-\textit{ni-su4-ma}
25) mLugal-AB
26) LUGAL
27) R\textsuperscript{E}C 349\textsuperscript{ki}
28) \textit{ur}-ur-\textit{ma}
29) lu-	extit{i}k-/\textit{ma}-me
30) [x]-ma
31) [...]-\textit{ir}
32) \textit{u}-\textit{lu}
33) ã-	extit{mu}-\textit{ut}

Col. ii:
1) \textit{u}-\textit{lu}
2) u-na-\textit{dš}
3) \textit{iš}-\textit{tum}
4) A-si-ma-núm\textsuperscript{ki}
5) a-na
6) Si-si-if\textsuperscript{ki}
7) in Si-si-if\textsuperscript{ki}
8) IDIGNA\textsuperscript{id}
9) i-bi-ir-\textit{ma}
10) \textit{iš}-\textit{tum}
11) Si-si-if\textsuperscript{ki}
12) a-na
13) pu-ti UD.KIB./\textit{NU}N{id}
14) UD.KIB./\textit{NU}N{id}-/\textit{tám}
15) i-bi-ir-\textit{ma}
16) a-na
17) Ba-sa-\textit{ar}
18) sa-dú-i
19) MAR.TU\textsuperscript{ki}

*20) \textit{šu}-\textit{bi} igi(?)/1?\textit{-âm}(?)
21) Na-\langle\textit{ra-am}\rangle-/\textit{D}(\textit{EN.ZU})
22) ma-núm
23) \textit{iš}-ti-su4-ma
24) u-lá-\langle\textit{aš}-\textit{nú-i-e}
25) A-kú-\textit{děk}\textsuperscript{i}
26) ŠU.DU\textsubscript{8}.A-\textit{ma}
27) a-na
28) pá-ni-\textit{r}su4\textsuperscript{1}
29) \textit{ip}-\textit{du}
30) i-gu-uš/-\textit{ma}
31) Ha-\textit{ab}-\textit{ša-\textit{at}\textsuperscript{ki}}

Col. iii:
1) Na-\langle\textit{ra-am}\rangle-/\textit{D}(\textit{EN.ZU})
2) \textit{iš}-\textit{f(um)}
3) UD.KIB./\textit{NU}N{id}
4) a-na
5) Ba-sa-\textit{ar}
6) sa-dú-i
7) MAR.TU\textsuperscript{ki}
8) ik-su4-\textit{ud}
9) su4-ma
10) R\textsuperscript{E}C 169
11) \textit{iš}-im(?)-\textit{ma}
12) \textit{iš}-\textit{kuš}-/\textit{na}-\textit{ma}
13) i-ta-\textit{aš}/-\textit{za}-\textit{ma}
14) in [\textit{DI}][\textit{KUS}]
15) ã\textit{INANNA}
16) ŠU-\textit{bi} /\textit{igi}1 [...]-\textit{âm}(?)

(space)
17) Na-\langle\textit{ra-am}\rangle-/\textit{D}(\textit{EN.ZU})
18) da-\langle\textit{mīm}\rangle
19) in R\textsuperscript{E}C 169
20) in Ba-sa-\textit{ar}
21) sa-dú-i
22) MAR.TU\textsuperscript{ki}
23) R\textsuperscript{E}C 349\textsuperscript{ki}
24) \textit{iši1}-\textit{ar}
25) \textit{u}
26) ã\textit{En-lil-zi}
27) DUB \textit{r}hi\textit{h}(-\textit{pi}(?)

(space)
28) mLugal-//nu-zu(?)//-/\textit{SHA.GAN.DU}
29) \textit{NU.BANDA}
30) \textit{MA-Ba}4\textit{En-lil}
31) \textit{NU.BANDA}
32) UD.\textit{NU}N\textsuperscript{ki}
33) ra-bf-an\textit{i}
34) u
35) (7 \times 600) + (2 \times 60) + 5/GURUS.GURUS
36) in KASKAL
37) \textit{šu}-\textit{nög} 10 LAL 1 GURUS
38) ra-bf-an\textit{i}
39) u
40) Na-\langle\textit{ra-am}\rangle-/\textit{D}(\textit{EN.ZU})

Col. iv:

(approx. 5 lines lost)
6') [...]
Figure 2: Collations, part 1
Figure 2: Collations, part 2

20) *da-*(num)
21) [...] *lÚ x GÁNATENAT(?)
22) *[ú LUGAL]J(?)
*23) RÉC 349ki
24) in KASKAL
25) i-ik-mi
26) *mÉ-e
27) gIL.NITA
28) *mEn-lil GAL.SUKKAL
29) ABBA URI Ki
30) RÉC 349ki
31) *mLugal-te + UNU(?)
32) GAL.SUKKAL
33) *mdUTU-mu-da
34) PAÁL é

Col. v:
1) *mUr]-[...]
2) *mUr]-d[...]
3) *mNIGIN(?)
4) EN.lIl/ki/-ù
data
5) mdEn-lil-le
6) *mMIR.SI
7) *mŠEŠ-ù
*8) *m-x-X
9) *mSIPA-dè
10) *mUr]-IDIGNA
11) *mUr-ki
12) *mUr-ki
13) *mUr-gidri
14) UNUGki-ù
15) IBi-ru-um
16) ŠEŠ.ABki
17) *mKu-I
18) SIR.BUR.LAki
19) *mAd-da-tur
20) *mSAG.SIG
21) *mLugal-du11-ga-ni-zi
22) *mE-zi
23) GOŠ.ÔH/ki-ù
24) *mDA-da
25) *[Ur]-gidri
26) x [...]*ki/-ù
27) ŠIUR/-[...]
28) NU.[BÀNDA]
29) *KAR(?) [...]
30) *mNI [...]
31) NU.[BÀNDA]
32) RÉC 349ki
33) *mUr-[-]/x [...]
34) NU.BÀ[nda]
35) SIR.BUR.LAki
Col. vi:

1-3) [...] 
4) ˇNU1.BANDA 
5) UD.NUN
6) "Lugal-/Ša-uru 
7) NU.BANDA 
8) EN.LIL 
9) NU.BANDA-ū 
10) "Be-li-šī 
*11) "KIN-ur(?)/iš-a 
12) MAR.TU MAR.TU 
13) ra-šu 
14) ū 
15) ra-bi-a-šī 
16) ū 
17) 3600(?)+ (3 × 600) + (3 × 60)/LU × GÁNA[tenā(?)] 
18) in KASKAL 
19) i-ik-šī 
20) ŠU.NIGIN 6 GİR.NITA GİR.NITA 
21) ŠU.NIGIN 20 LAL 3/PA.TE.SI PA.TE.SI 
22) ŠU.NIGIN 60 + 20 LAL 2/ra-bi-a-šī 
23) ŠU.NIGIN x + (3 × 600?) + 60 + 10 N[U.BANDA] 

Col. vii = Rev. i:

1-3) [...] 
4) x [...] 
5) ŠU.NIGIN [...] 
6) [...] 
7) LUGAL 
8) ŠU.NIGIN 13/GİR.NITA GİR.NITA 
9) ŠU.NIGIN 23/PA.TE.SI PA.TE.SI 
10) ŠU.NIGIN (2 × 600) + 10 + 2 ra-bi-a-šī 
*11) ŠU.NIGIN (2 × 60,000?) + 36,000(?) + [+] (× 600?) LAL 60(?)/GURUS.GURUS 
12) 4En-šī 
13) u-kā-lim 
14) Na-(ra-am-)/4EN.ZU 
15) da-nūm 
16) in KASKAL 
17) ma-lā-su-šu-šu 
18) u-sa-am-(qi/qi-it) 
19) ū 
20) i-ik-šī 
21) ū 
22) šu-un-ni-su-šu-šu 
23) Na-(ra-am-)/4EN.ZU 
24) da-nūm 
25) in KÁ 
26) i-li-ma 
27) u-sa-am-šī 
28) 4En-šī[li(?)] 
29) [i-mā] 
(break) 

Col. vii = Rev. ii:

1) lu ki-ni-/iš-šu 
*2) su-su-šu-šu 
3) im-rī 
4) 4INANNA 
5) An-nu-šu-tum 
6) ū 
7) 4En-šī ū(??) 
8) Na-(ra-am-)/4EN.ZU 
9) da-nūm 
10) in šITĀ 
11) 11-a-baš 
12) be-li-su 
13) lu i-ik-mi-/su-šu-nu-ma 
14) ku u-sa-rī-/bu-su-šu-nu 
15) in gš-nūm 
16) Na-(ra-am-)/4EN.ZU 
17) da-nūm 
18) in šš-ip-rī 
19) 4INANNA 
20) il-su š (large wedge) 
21) LUGAL 
22) A-kā-dēšī 
23) ū 
24) LUGAL 
(space) 
25-26) [...] x 
27) [...] šīm 
28) [...] x 
29) PA.[T]E.SI 
30) 4En-šī 
31) gš-nītā 
32) Il-a-baš 
33) MĀŠKIM.GI š 
*34) SU.NIGIN(?) ŠU.NIGIN(?) 
35) i-lī [...] 

Col. ix = Rev. iii:

1) mu-ki-in 
2) SÜHUS.SÜHUS 
3) A-kā-dēšī 
4) mu-tār-rī 
5) di-šu-nūm 
6) a-na 
7) kā-li 
8) in šī 
9) 4En-šī šī 
10-11) [...] 
12) [...]šī 
13) [...] na 
*14) šu-bi igi(?) 2(?)-ām(?)) 
15) i-šu 
16) ki-šib-(ra-tum)
17) ar-(ba-um)
18) is-ti-/-ni-šš
19) šar in šar-ri
20) ma-na-ma
21) la i-mu-ru
22) i-nu
23) Na-(ra-am)-/-a(EN.ZU)
24) da-nim
25) in ší-ip-rí
26) di-ANANNA
27) ku-lus-ma
28) ki-ib-ra-ti/-um(?)
29) šar-ša-[ba/-i(um)](?)
30) iš-[ti]-/-ni-šš
31) i-kir_(ha)-ni-su₄-ma
32) [i]m-šu/-ru-nim
33) [?LUGAL(?)]-am(?)
34) [...]u
35) [... d]AM(?)

Col. x = Rev. iv:
1) [...]iš-ti
2) [...]-tim
3) [in] di.KU₄
4) [iš][En]-lil
5) [...] en
* 6) [x x] x
7) iḥ(?)-ma(?)-zi(?)
8) [iš][En]-lil
9) be-lš-si
10) in [x (x)]
11) MU [1.KAM]
12–13) [...] en
*14) [...] ši x [...] x
15) [...] ŠILLA
16) [...] u
17) [...] x
18) [...] UD(?)
19) u
20) ši-[a-am-ti]m
21) i-in(?)-[x (x)]
22) iš-[x]-[x (x)]
*23) i-[šti]l-[ir-ma]a
24) M[ā-garš]
25) tādāb-li
26) ti-[a-am-tim]
27) SAG GIŠ.RA
28) u
29) [šI]TUkulki-su₄
30) [in] ti-a/-am-tim
31) [ši]-piš-lim-tim
32) l.[lu]₄
33) Na-(ra-ša)-/-a(EN.ZU)
34) di-anim
35) in ši-[ip-rí]
36) di-ANANNA
37) [i-nu]
38) [šEn]-lil
39) di.KU₄-su(1)
40) [i-dš-nu-ma]
41) [ši]

Col. xi = Rev. v:
1) ši-[ši]-a(?)
2) ni-šš
3) qā-ši-iš-su
4) i-dšt-nu
5) ū
6) na-e
7) e-er-tim
8) la i-dš-nu-šum
* 9) dug(?)_kur.KU.DU[NI]
10) [ig(?)] EtEn-lil
11–14) [...] en
15) [A] MU.RU
16) ma-na-ma
17) MU
18) Na-(ra-am)-/-a(EN.ZU)
19) LUGAL
20) A-kā-ši
21) gir.NI.TA/Dù
22) Il-a-ba₄
23) ušaš-ku-ni(1)
24) at dug(?)_kur.KU.DU[NI]
25) Na-(ra-ša)-/-a(EN.ZU)
26) mu-su₄
27) iša-kā/-nu-ma
28) dug(?)_kur.KU.DU/NI-me
29) i-ša-bi-ū
30) ū
31) LŪ.KAS₄
32) LŪ-lam
33) ša-ni-am
34) ušaš-la-mu/-ma

Col. xii = Rev. vi:
1) mu-su₄-me
2) pī-ši/-iš-ma
3) mu-mi-me
4) su-kur-un
5) i-ša-bi-ū
6) di-ANANNA
7) An-nu-ni-tum
8) AN
From Asimānūm to Sisil, at Sisil he crossed the Tigris. From Sisil to the ‘face’ (= hither side?) of the Euphrates River, he crossed the Euphrates River to Basar, mountain of the land of the Amorites. (Its ditto ...).

[Pericope 2 = ii 21–31]

Naram-Sin: Whoever held captive with him those of Akkad (abroad), released (them) before him. He marched against Habšat.

[Pericope 3 = iii 1–15]

Naram-Sin conquered from the ‘face’ (= hither side?) of the Euphrates River to Basar, mountain of the land of the Amorites. He himself declared (?) battle. They drew up for battle and fought. By verdict of Ishtar (Its ditto ...).

[Pericope 4 = iii 17–26]

Naram-Sin the mighty defeated RÉC 349 in the campaign in Basar, mountain of the land of the Amorites, and Enlil-zi (Inscription broken?).

[Pericope 5 = iii 28 – viii 15]

D, city ruler of ... , A, city ruler of ... (gap). L (don’t understand), captain of Umma, Aba-Enlil, captain of Adab,

Total: 9 important men and 4325 (fighting) men he slew in the campaign.

Naram-Sin the mighty captured [x prisoner]s [and the kin]g of RÉC 349 in the campaign.

E e the general, Enil the chief courier, city elder of RÉC 349, L the chief courier, urtumuda the major domo ... ; U, U, N, Nippurians; Enlille, M, Šeš-lu, ... , Sipade, Ur-Idigna, Uruki, Urki, U-r-gidri, Uruki-an; Ibirum, an Ur; K, a Lagashite; Addatur, S, Lugal-duganizi, Ezi, Ummaites; Dada, U-r-gidri, ... ites; S, captain, a Kar-i-[]-ian; N, captain, (a man of) RÉC 349; U, captain, a Lagashite; (gap) ... , captain, an Adabite; Lugal-sa-uru, captain, a Nippurian; (the) captains; Belili, Amorites, sheikh(?) and headmen, and 5580 (?) (fighting) men he captured in the campaign.

Total: 6 generals; Total: 17 city rulers; Total: 78 headmen; Total: x captains; (gap) ... Total: ...

Grand total: 13 generals; Grand total: 23 city rulers; Grand total: 1212 headmen; Grand total: x captains; (gap) ... Total: ...

Grand total: 137,400 (?) (fighting) men, as Enlil commanded, did Naram-Sin the mighty, as many as there were, slay or capture.

And Naram-Sin the mighty gave an accounting of them in the gate of the gods, ‘I swear’ by Enlil, it is true.’ He ... their ... By Ishtar, Annunitum, and

Translation

[Pericope 1 = i 1 – ii 19]

He kept sending messages to the lords of the Upper Lands and to the city rulers of Subartu, he opened hostilities, (saying) ‘we are allied ...’

The lords of the Upper Lands and the city rulers of Subartu, since they feared Enlil, [...] ... [...] which they had sworn him.

I(?) curse Lugal-Ab, king of RÉC 349, I shall go, ... whether I live or die!
Enlil, Naram-Sin the mighty did indeed capture them, did indeed bring them in, with the mace of Ilaba his lord, ...

[Pericope 6 = vii 16–20]
Naram-Sin the mighty, on a mission of Ishtar his goddess

[Pericope 7 = viii 21 – ix 13]
King of Agade and king of [...], city ruler(?) for Enlil, general for Ilaba, executor for all(?) the gods(?), who made firm the foundations of Agade, commander of the stronghold for all in the house of Enlil, [...] (Its ditto ...).

[Pericope 8 = ix 15–18]
When the four world regions together

[Pericope 9 = ix 19–32]
No king among kings experienced the like: when, as (he was) on a mission of Ishtar, all four world regions warred together upon Naram-Sin the mighty, they received [...]

[Pericope 10 = x 1–32]
By the verdict of Enlil ...
He crossed the sea ... and smote Magan in the midst of the sea and washed his weapons in the Lower Sea.

[Pericope 11 = x 33 – xi 15]
Naram-Sin the mighty, on a mission of Ishtar, [when Enlil gave his verdict and] gave the leadrope of the peoples into his hand and gave him no one to defeat him, [...] he dedicated (this) vessel [before?] Enlil ...

[Pericope 12 = xi 16 – end]
Whosoever shall do away with the inscription of Naram-Sin, king of Agade, general ... for Ilaba, and shall set his name on the vessel of Naram-Sin, saying, 'it is my vessel,' or shall show it to an outsider or to another man, saying, 'Erase his name, set (on it) my name,' may Ishtar, Annunitum, Anu, Enlil, Ilaba, Sin, Shamash, Nergal, Um(um), Ninkarak, the great gods in their totality, lay upon him a great curse. May he hold no scepter for Enlil, may he seize no kingship for Ishtar. May Ninhursag and Nintu give him no offspring or descent ... his kingship. May Adad and Nisaba make no sheaf(?) of his straight. May Enki measure out (only) mud for his watercourses.

III. Interpretive Outline: Pericopes 1–12

Pericope 1
(Begins in the middle of an inscription and ends in the middle of a sentence. Closes with šu-bi igi(?)
1(?)-âm.)

(i 1–25) Naram-Sin is denouncing Lugal-AB, king of the city RÇC 349. He charges him with initiating hostilities and with sending messages to the lords of the Upper Lands and to the city rulers of Subartu, apparently referring to an alliance with him. It seems that they fear Enlil, that is, Naram-Sin, so they do not support Lugal-AB. For further discussion of this interpretation, see below, Part IV, to i 7.

(ii 26 – ii 2) Naram-Sin curses his enemy, saying that he will defeat him, live or die.

(ii 3–19) March from Asimānum to Sisil, across the Tigris, to Sippar, across the Euphrates, and to Mount Basar, the mountain of the Amorites. This suggests that Naram-Sin was campaigning there and that Lugal-AB mounted an attack while he was at Asimanum.

Pericope 2
(Ends in middle of a sentence.)

(ii 21–31) Captured Akkadians are released to Naram-Sin; he moves against a place called Īhabšt.

Pericope 3
(Ends in the middle of sentence, concludes with šu-[bi] ṣigī [...]-âm(?), with partial duplication of Pericope 1.)

(iii 1–15) Naram-Sin marches from Sippar to Mount Basar. A battle is fought; Ishtar gives the verdict in favor of —

Pericope 4
(Preceded and followed by empty space in tablet; may end with line broken in the original. Possibly continuation of Pericope 1, but not of 3.)

(iii 17–26) Naram-Sin is victorious in the campaign at Basar and [captures(?)] a certain Enlil-zi.

Pericope 5
(Unity of iii 28 – vii 15 shown by its pattern: list of men killed, captured, and grand totals of killed and captured. After vii 7–12 is parallel to PBS 5, 36 rev.)

(iii 28 – iv 18) List of nine men summarized as rabiānu who were killed and 4325 fighting men slain. The rabiānu are evidently in charge of contingents of troops from different Sumerian cities (Umma and
Adab are the only ones preserved in the text), and hold the military rank of NU.BÂNDA, here translated 'captain.'

(iv 19 - vi 19) Naram-Sin captures the king of RÉC 349, together with his principal officers and allies. The allies include men from Ur, Lagash, Umma, Adab, Nippur, and the Amorites.

(vi 20 - vii 7) Sub-totals of men captured(?), arranged in descending order of importance.

(vii 8-27) Grand totals of men captured and killed, statement that Naram-Sin made a reckoning of them in the gate of the gods.

(vii 28 - viii 15) Assertion of the truth of the narrative and accuracy of the numbers recorded.

Pericope 6
(Separated by line at end.)

(viii 16-20) Beginning of a sentence about Naram-Sin, perhaps a variant of Pericope 11?

Pericope 7
(Separated by line at beginning and by šu-bi igi 2(?)-ām(?) at end.)

(viii 21 - ix 13) Titles and epithets of Naram-Sin.

Pericope 8
(Ends in middle of sentence, variant of Pericope 9.)

(ix 15-18) Beginning of narrative referring to an attack against Naram-Sin, the lines given in abbreviated form.

Pericope 9
(Begins in middle of sentence; parallels PBS 5, 36 rev.)


(ix 33-34 and 35-36 are separated by rulings, but are too fragmentary for interpretation. They may be captions to pictures of defeated enemies.)

Pericope 10
(Continuation of Pericope 9.)

(x 1(?)-32) After a gap in the text, Naram-Sin is crossing the sea to the land of Magan, which he defeats in battle at sea. He washes his weapons in the Lower Sea.

Pericope 11
(Continuation of Pericope 10?)

(x 33 - xi 15) Naram-Sin dedicates the vessel with this inscription.

Pericope 12
(Continuation of Pericope 11.)

(xi 16 - end) Curse formula.

IV. Notes to Words and Phrases

(i 1) [a]-na: Restoration of Naram-Sin's name here (as proposed by Hirsch) is impossible. The abbreviated form of the name, as generally used in this text, always has the NA to the left; here it is to the right.

(ii 2) [EN].EN: The distinction made here and in UET 1, 274 between the rulers of the Upper Lands and the rulers of Subartu is difficult to interpret. The translation proposed is based on the assumption that EN is here used as in Sargonic Mesopotamia (EN = belu) rather than EN = māliktu, as known from Ebla (see, e.g., Grégoire in L. Cagni, ed., La Lingua di Ebla [Napoli: 1981] 383). This is because the OB copy of Naram-Sin's campaign against Armānum and Ebla refers to the king of Ebla as LUGAL (iii 3) and not EN (see JANES 14 [1982] 29). LUGAL is also used in this text for the king of RÉC 349 and for Naram-Sin.

'Upper Lands' presumably refers to lands near the 'Upper Sea' (Mediterranean).

ENSI is here understood as rulers, independent or not, of individual cities. This text seems to rank captured dignitaries in descending order of importance (compare vi 20-23, vii 7-11): LUGAL 'king,' GIR.NITA 'general,' ENSI 'city ruler,' rabû 'great one,' rabiānu 'headman,' NU.BÂNDA 'captain,' GURUS.GURUS '(fighting) men.' For NU.BÂNDA as a military rank in Sargonic sources, compare BIN 8, 144 iv 10, where a NU.BÂNDA is in charge of soldiers and holds a large parcel of 180 īku of land.

SUBIR/Subartu is here considered to lie between Mesopotamia and the 'cedar forest' (as in UET 1, 274: KALAM SUBIRkî Su-bar-tim a-di-ma GIS.GIS.EREN), hence in the Jezirah, though perhaps both east and west of the Khabur (so Rep. Géogr. 1, 147: 'Das Gebiet am oberen Habur'). For further discussion, see Michalowski in H. Weiss, ed., The Origin of Cities in Dry-Farming Syria and Mesopotamia in the Third Millennium B.C. (Guilford, CT: 1986), 136ff.

(i 7) Choice of ταβ yields an unambiguous writing for the Gtn preterite; the tan-stem of špr is well attested in OAkk (MAD 3, 281).

The major interpretive problem with this passage is to decide who is the subject of the verb. By one interpretation (a), Naram-Sin sends the messages and entreats (see below, to i 8) the lords of the Upper
Lands and the city rulers of Subartu to hold to an alliance with him; they do so, out of their fear for Enlil, or at least do not intervene. By a second interpretation (b), Lugal-AB sends the messages, entreats the lords of the Upper Lands and the city rulers of Subartu to hold to their alliance with him, but, because of their (greater?) fear of Enlil, they do not support him against Naram-Sin. By a third interpretation (c), Lugal-AB sends the messages, hoping to initiate hostilities against Naram-Sin (see to i 8) by stirring up the lords of the Upper Lands and the city rulers of Subartu against him, but because of their fear of Enlil (that is, Naram-Sin), they do not support Lugal-AB (despite an alliance with him?). Interpretation (c) is preferred here because a charge that the enemy initiated hostilities is characteristic of the 'great insurrection' group of texts about Naram-Sin (discussed below), because 'plead' does not seem to be a likely verb for Naram-Sin to use of himself, and because Lugal-AB’s strategy seems to have been for the Amorites and the rulers of Subartu and the Upper Lands to join in a coalition against Naram-Sin while he was at Asimānum ('on a mission of Ištar' = on campaign). Thus it seems to me most likely that Lugal-AB sent repeated messages in the hope of persuading the others to join him. They did not, and do not seem to be mentioned subsequently in the text. Enlil here may be an honorific term for Naram-Sin, as in the Apišal epic (see below, Part VI.c.11).

(i 8) AHw distinguishes sētu/sētu and šelû (all D-stems entered here) for a pair of verbs with roughly the same semantic range: 'strife, contest; use of abusive language', the former attested for OĀkk and OB (references s.v. sētu/sētu). The sense chosen here is 'streiten, Streit beginnen,' Naram-Sin's charge being that the enemy king began the hostilities. For a literary parallel, see below, Part VII. Another possible derivation is sullû 'plead' (so Jacobsen). As read here, Lugal-AB is subject to the verb and Naram-Sin is the narrator (see also to i 7, interpretation [c]).

(i 9) Reading ašatu ‘bind by agreement.’ According to the interpretation here (c), Lugal-AB refers to or seeks an alliance with the Upper Lands and Subartu. The difficulty with this is the present-future, rather than a precative; a question, ‘shall we ally?’ seems unlikely. If in fact it is Naram-Sin who is sending the messages and pleading with the Upper Lands and Subartu, then the reference may be to an existing alliance which they honor (i 24).

(i 10) For the last trace, see Figure 2. This excludes the expected reading [i-qa-b] (as in xii 5).

(i 24) it(?) and ma(?) are the most likely readings of the traces; the sign read ma(?) is too long to be Ku. See Figure 2.

(i 26) For the name of the king, see Figure 2. Perhaps the name is to be read as Lugal-ēš, but see to i 27.

(i 27) RÊC 349. The sign is clear and occurs three times in the tablet (also iv 23, v 32). It is distinguished from Uruk in this ms. (v 14). Naram-Sin commemorates his defeat of this city as a major triumph; yet the toponym occurs outside this text only once (see below). Note that the king's name, like those of the city elder, the chief courier, and the general appear to be Sumerian (see iv 28ff, assuming that 31'-34' still refer to RÊC 349). The Sumerian names favor a localization of RÊC 349 in Sumer (see Foster, Or ns 51 [1982] 304). Since the battle was fought far from the city, this could explain why there is no reference to destroying its walls after the defeat (see iii 24), as is customary in Sargonic royal inscriptions. The allies are Sumerian cities. RÊC 349 is then a Sumerian city formidable enough to pose a threat to Naram-Sin, but which is not attested in this writing in any inscription, administrative document, or later historical text so far as is known.

The sign RÊC 349 is drawn from an Ur III 'school tablet,'1 said to come from Umma, published in photo by Hilprecht, BE 1/1, pl. viii no. 19 line 6. There the sign looks like an AB with an inscribed u; the sign here is similar, save that the bottom of the inscribed sign is extended, as if it were AS, so as to intersect the right-hand vertical. The Hilprecht text is obscure, but the relevant lines read Lugaltūন.ע/לעא|LUGAL RÊC 349̄ ki. This raises the possibility that the Umma school text refers to the same person as does this inscription, but under a variant spelling which remains unexplained.

Deimel, LAK 542, proposed that RÊC 349 was the same sign as that written AB×šuš in the Fara (and now Abu Salabikh) za-mi hymns (SF p. 24 text 23 iv 18; OIP 99 p. 49 line 102): AB×šuš LAK 31 GAL/GAL/ غزة dAšnan za-mi. This is evidently a praise, spoken by Enlil, of the city AB×šuš and its deity Ašnan. The next place mentioned is Umma, and then the text moves to Lagash and Girsu. Whereas Biggs, OIP 99, 45 points out that the sequence of toponyms in the za-mi texts need not be strictly geographical (see also Green, JNES 36 [1977] 294), one is still justified in assuming that AB×šuš lay some-

1 The tablet has a brick-like shape and calligraphic style paralleled by JCS 31 (1979) p. 241 no. 15, a tablet of the same type mentioning Shulgi (see p. 233).
where in Sumer and somewhere in the Umma-Lagash region. Another occurrence of the sign, SF p. 50 text 55 vi 4, is obscure. The sign is attested as a toponym in geographical lists from archaic Uruk; see ZATU 10 (written ab×ZATU 659). As Green points out to me (personal communication), use of ab as the enclosing sign might (though need not) imply a pronunciation of the sign with an initial /ab/ or /ap/.

Therefore, it is tempting to identify REC 349 and LAK 31 as writings of the city Apišal, known to have been situated near Umma (though elsewhere in Sargonic and Ur III sources presumably written A-piššal). Indeed, Naram-Sin’s defeat of a place called Apišal is well attested in later omen and chronicle traditions (see Part VI), though no commemorative inscription has so far been identified as referring to this event. This solution to the identification of REC 349, first suggested to me by Frayne, raises many problems of its own. These are discussed further below, Part VI.

(i 28) The sign read here as ấ is imperfectly formed (see Figure 2), but no other reading seems possible (for example, it does not resemble li as written elsewhere in the tablet). The preterite is taken as ‘Koinizdenzeinfall,’ for which see most recently Jacobsen. Mayer, Studia Pohl Series Maior 5 (1976) 183ff. If li(l) is preferred, the subject is presumably Enlil, for on the basis of other curse formulae one expects a god to be subject of this verb rather than a king.

(i 30–31) One possible restoration is [su]-ma [i-ki]-r ‘he it is made war.’

(ii 4) Asimânûm is a variant of Simânûm; Rép. Géogr. 2, 166 localizes it ‘im Gebirge nördl. von Mardin.’ Si-si-li is presumably the same as Ur III Sišil (see Rép. Géogr. 2, 183). Rép. Géogr. locates Sišil just north of Elam, but this is hard to square with an expedition leaving ‘north of Mardin,’ crossing the Tigris ‘north of Elam’ and ending up at Mount Basar. It is clear that present knowledge of northern Mesopotamian geography is still defective and incomplete.

(ii 13) For pütu UD.KIB.NUN:* ‘face of the Euphrates,’ perhaps meaning the point at which the river enters the northern end of the alluvium at Sippar, see Foster, JANES 14 (1982) to ii 10–13.

(ii 20) This enigmatic line (see Figure 2) is written in larger, more cursive script than the inscription, so is not part of the inscription but a note by the scribe. Similar notes are found in iii 16 and ix 4 (see Figure 2). One may compare āš-bala-bi šu-bi-ma-nam, literally, ‘its curse’s ditto is two’ (that is, ‘its curse is a duplicate’?), a scribal notation substituted for copying a curse formula in an OB Nippur copy of a Nippur inscription (see Foster, Umma 48f) and šu-bi-gin-nam (‘it is like its ditto,’ that is ‘duplicate’) in a text containing abbreviated copies of Ur III inscriptions (Civil, Or ns 54 [1985] 42). For further documentation, see Deimel, SL 334.227; Reiner, JNES 33 (1974) 222; and the instances collected by Jastrow, ZA 23 (1909) 376f (mostly referring to repetition of preceding lines of text, as, for example, in parallel omens). The signs after the group read here as šu-bi are unclear. They may be read as %i plus a numeral, for which Jacobsen suggests ‘its ditto of the obverse is …’ (+ numeral), meaning, perhaps, by the interpretation used here, ‘(this) is the nth duplicate of the (passage on) the obverse of the original’? In each instance the notation occurs at what appears to be a disjunction in the text; here omission of the verb is unexpected on the basis of the parallel passage iii 8. This may refer to the passage immediately above it, but whether that passage itself is the duplicate in question, or whether the passage from which it was copied was followed in the source by material that duplicated something that the scribe had already copied is not clear to me. In addition, what appear to be scribal insert marks, in the form of heavy lines entering the text from the left, are found in iii 21 (one) and 28 (two). For interpretations of the subscriptions and marks, see below, Part V. For general discussion of the use of insert marks in cuneiform texts, see Hallo, Studies Finkelstein 101ff.

(ii 22–29) I owe my understanding of these lines to Jacobsen.

(ii 24) The text has u.l.aš nu-i-e. Deriving nu’ve from nu’aum (AHw nē’u, CAD nē’u) may be considered (rather than nā’u/nā’u), a pejorative term ['yoke!' or the like?], but, following a suggestion of Jacobsen, I read ü-lä-asnu-i-ê for ullānē’i those (Akkadians) there (abroad) (3rd masculine plural oblique). Perhaps the Nippur scribe misread the first three signs as ‘10 minus 1’ because of the frequent occurrence of ‘nine campaigns’ and of the figure 9 in inscriptions of Naram-Sin (and compare here iv 13’, likewise written 10 LAL aš).

(ii 30) gāšu (AHw 283b; CAD G 58a) is here preferred over akāšu.

(ii 31) Ha-ab-ša-at seems to be attested here for the first time.

(iii 1) Note that this is the only place in the text Naram-Sin’s name is written out in full, but that the epithets and titles are omitted.
(iii 6) For sa-du- genitive, compare lugal sa-du-i in the OB inscription edited by Edzard, Sumer 15 (1959) 26 (plural genitive); for the spelling with i in the genitive compare asbassu ki ma-i (Owen, NATN 917). See also the material collected by Gelb, MAD 3, 263f.

(iii 11) Derived, with hesitation, from šiāmum, assuming an ‘abnormal’ broken writing (see Gelb, MAD 2, 42); see Figure 2; not, for example, iš-ivist-a ma or iš-isten-ma (unlikely in OAkk).

(iii 16) See above to ii 20. Although 17ff seem to follow grammatically, the scribal note and the space following suggest a disjunction in the text.

(iii 27) Reading doubtful (see Figure 2); one hardly expects an Akkadian scribal notation in this context. There does not seem to be enough room for nine names and titles between this point and the total in iii 14, hence a gap in the Vorlage may be assumed. This may have been indicated by the scribe with the double ruling in 28.

(iv 7) The doubtful nuuzu(?) is inserted between the lines and is taken here, with hesitation, to be a scribal note ‘don’t understand.’ This may refer to the sign group ša.gan.du, which I do not understand either.

(iv 14) This is a further OAkk occurrence of rabiānu (see Stol, Studies in Old Babylonian History [Leiden, 1976] 73ff), to add to Kutscher, BT 1, iii 8’, iv 20’, with note p. 33. The OAkk instances are useful both for the question of orthography (Stol p. 75) and for use of the -anu suffix in OAkk (Stol p. 79). Note also the pair rabu u rabiānu (vi 13ff).

(vi 11) See Figure 2. While gal-us-ū-a would be an attractive reading, kin better fits the sign as written.

(vii 12–13) The Škē bilingual HS 195 (Oelsner, Studies Sjöberg, 405) gives the Sumerian equivalent to Enlil ukallim as Enlil bi-du-ga.

(vii 27) Taken as D of ša-mer III ‘narrate.’ See also to vii 2/3. This may refer to composing an inscription or to giving a formal report to the gods, as in the later Assyrian royal letters to Ashur.

(vii 2/3) I have no explanation for this puzzling expression. One may compare it and vii 27ff to an obscure line in the Erridu-Pizir inscription (= BT 2 + 3 i 17’–ii 10) DUB pa-ni-su … in kā DINGIR Gui-ti-im im-su4 il-pu-ut ma ‘he “touched” (= made a record of?) the tablet (= inscription showing?) his face in the gate of the god of Gutium.’ Jacobsen tentatively suggests ‘one-sixth of them Annunitum and Enlil (took) (as) offerings.’

(viii 4–7) Perhaps ‘O Ishtar, Annunitum, and Enlil!’

(viii 20) A large insert line here seems to indicate a disjunction in connection with this passage, perhaps that it is to be inserted elsewhere. Hence one is not to understand that he was king of Agade on a mission of Ishtar.

(viii 29) For use of the title ēnsi at Sargonic Nippur, see, for example, Westenholz, OSP 2, 28; and Foster, BiOr (in press).

(viii 33) For recent discussion of this title, known at Ebla as an official emissary of a ruler, see Sollberger, SeB 3, 142; Archi, SeB 4, 191 line 142 and ARET 7, 373; RLA 7, 450ff and 456. Compare also Maništusu Obelisk A xiv 6. However, the OB ‘General Insurrection Text,’ Grayson and Sollberger, RA 70 (1976) 111 Ms G, 4 has a difficult passage that may be parallel to viii 29ff of the Jena text:

Jena Text:  
PA. [.T.E] .SI 4-En-lił  
GIR.NITA 4-il-aba  
MAŠKIM GL  
ŠU.NIGIN(?) ŠU.NIGIN(?)  
i-li(?)

General Insurrection:  
GIR.NITA 4-En-lił  
PA.T.E.SI IL-aba  
ra-bi-is  
bu-ra-at  
in Ir-ni-na

The reading ŠU.NIGIN is not certain (see Figure 2); at least, the signs do not closely resemble the other ŠU.NIGIN signs in the same text. Nor is i-li the expected spelling of the genitive plural (compare vii 26). I am unable to offer any other proposal. The burāt of the OB text might represent a reading of a similar (but not this) Vorlage as Pū.Pū. While the
digging of wells is elsewhere attested as heroic activity (Gilgamesh vii 46; Meissner Tablet [= MVaeG 7 (1902), 14 i 3ff]), the passage remains doubtful in both mss. In AFo 26 (1978–1979) 13 note 50, Jacobsen explains the 'General Insurrection' passage as 'deputy for the sources of the Canal of Irnina ...

(ix 4ff) One may compare mu-še-ši du-un-ni giš.zu (for dingir-su?) a-na ka-la šar-ri of the 'General Insurrection' text, Grayson and Sollberger, RA 70 (1976), Ms G, 8f 'who shows forth the might of his god(?) to all kings(?). Is the OB line a corruption of the same epithet?

(ix 15–19) The abbreviated words are written in larger, more irregular script; 20ff are written in smaller, more careful script than the preceding.

(ix 22ff) This grammatical crux has been often discussed, with the usual interpretation being that inu should mean 'at the time of' (first proposed by Poe­bel, PBS 4/1, 212 note 2, followed by Gelb, BiOr 12 [1955] 111; MAD 3, 144; CAD I/1, 153b; AHw 382b s.v. inu i A). Against PBS 4/1, 212 and all later transliterations, Poebel's copy of the parallel, PBS 5, 36 rev. 2 6'ff, shows ki-ib-ra-[t][im] ar-ša-ul[m](! not collated). The Jena ms. is not well enough preserved here. The writer prefers to take inu in its usual sense of 'when,' as 'at the time of RN' makes no sense in this context. The simplest solution is to take Naram-Sin as the subject of an unexpressed verb: 'when Naram-Sin (was) on a mission of Ishtar' (that is, away on campaign). This fits the circumstances of this text well, as it seems that Naram-Sin was on campaign in Asīmānum when the attack against him was made.

(ix 33) The duplicate PBS 5, 36 (CBS 2344) rev. ii is broken in the same places. There is not enough to see what preceded šar in šar-rî there; there is a trace of only one sign at the bottom after im-šu-ru-nim that appears to be lu[gāl], but this is no help in reconstructing line 34 of the Jena text.

(x 25) qabli here refers not to the location of the land of Magan but, as usual in OAk in inscriptions, to where the battle took place; compare, for example, P34L xxi 48 (and parallels): u GN u GN in qabli Parâši iḫṣurûnimma. Thus this line should not be cited as evidence for the specific location of Magan.

(xi 9) For the first sign of the logogram, see Figure 2. It looks like diq with an extra vertical. This names the object on which the inscription was originally engraved. That such a lengthy historical text should have been written on a vessel or pot is surprising, but the 'Frontier of Šara,' written on a baked clay vessel (see Sollberger, Or ns 28 [1959] 336ff), as well as the Lugalzagesi vases (BE 1, 87) offer adequate parallels. The parallel text (a) has dug kur.ku.du (note du for û). Information on this word has been assembled by A. Salonen, Gefässe 173f; note also Gelb, MAD 3, 150 and Å. Sjöberg, AS 16, 70. On the basis of TCL 2, 5530.1 (cited by Salonen), the capacity of such a vessel could be about 110 sila (Salonen: 90), therefore of ample proportions (5 dug kur.ku.du i-nun i-nun-bi 1.2.2.5 ½ sila gur).

(xii 14) For the deified day, see J.J.M. Roberts, The Earliest Semitic Pantheon (Baltimore, 1972) 55.

(xiii 4) The reading ši-ri-ilb-su was proposed by Sollberger, UET 8 (collation p. 33) for the parallel UET 1, 276 ii 25. Jacobsen suggests šu-ri-te-su. Neither of these fits well here (see Figure 2). I was unable to solve this problem satisfactorily.

V. Notes to the Text

1. Parallels and Duplicates

(a) The Nippur tablet PBS 5, 36 = CBS 2344 (+)N 3539 + PBS 5, 37, partly edited by Poebel, PBS 4/1, 209–15 (CBS 2344, PBS 5, 37), and partly by Michalowski, JCS 34 (1980) 233–37 (N 3539 + PBS 5, 37); see Kienast, FAOS 7 (1990) 226–43. The reverse of CBS 2344 duplicates ix 19–33, x 30 – xi 10, and xii 3–24, unfortunately adding only six lines not preserved in the Jena tablet. It is not clear how many inscriptions were copied in this source.

(b) The curse formula is duplicated, with minor variants, by UET 1, 276, which the writer has argued, JANES 14 (1982) 27ff, is the continuation of UET 1, 275, the narrative of Naram-Sin's successful siege of Armānum.

(c) The tablet Kutscher, BC 1. This is a fragment of a large tablet that contained a copy of an inscription commemorating Naram-Sin's defeat of a coalition against him, in the first instance a northern group of cities led by Kish (cols. i–iv), and in the second a group of Sumerian cities led by Uruk (col. v). At that point the text breaks off.

Text (a) above seems to duplicate (c), at least as far as preserved. Since (a) also seems to duplicate the end of the account found in the Jena text of the campaign against Magan, plus the introductory allusion to the four world regions making war upon Naram-Sin, this raises the possibility that the Jena text gives material that was in the missing sections of (c). Assuming that (c) had the full inscription on the
obverse, (a) would duplicate the beginning and end on its obverse and reverse, while the Jena text would then be an abbreviated version of the same inscription. This cannot yet be demonstrated, owing to overlapping breaks in the ms.

2. State of the Text

An obvious problem in interpreting this document is to what extent it presents a text that is complete and in sequence, and how certain one can be that the material in it represents one original text rather than pieces or conflation of more than one. In favor of assuming a unified text is the presence of one curse formula and one titulary (though with a notation that seems to mean that it existed in two copies). The curse formula comes at its expected position at the end of the text (cols. xi 16 - end). On the other hand, the titulary occurs in Pericope 6. On the basis of other inscriptions of Naram-Sin, one would expect the titulary at the beginning or very near it; in any case, in connection with the first mention of Naram-Sin’s name.

Here the titulary is followed by a ‘when’ clause, known elsewhere, with variants, as introducing, rather than concluding, inscriptions of Naram-Sin (see above, to ix 27, situation in parallel text unclear). Therefore, one might admit the possibility that vii 21(?)-ff is an integral inscription separate from what preceded it, but this leaves the preceding text without logical beginning or end. In the face of this, the writer prefers the alternative that this inscription has not necessarily been copied in its original sequence and that some of its passages have been abbreviated. Moreover, the scribe was apparently copying more than one copy of the same inscription, perhaps with a view to reconstructing a composite text elsewhere. This imposes two problems on this reader: to recognize the abbreviations and to guess what pericopes represent which and how many originals.

With respect to the abbreviations, one may assume that the scribe did not copy in full passages that he considered repetitious or predictable. Therefore, some of the marks and notations in the text were to guide him if he wished to reconstruct elsewhere an unabbreviated version of the composition. This hypothesis is supported by the frequent use of abbreviated writings for repetitive or easily predictable words, such as the name of Naram-Sin, written in full only once (iii 1); dannum ‘mighty,’ written in full five times (vii 15, 24; viii 9, 17; ix 24) and abbreviated twice (iii 18, iv 20); usamqit ‘he slew,’ never written in full (e.g., iv 18); REC 169 ‘campaign; battle’² abbreviated as KASKAL (iv 17', 24'; vii 16); a whole clause written first in abbreviated form then immediately in full form (ix 19ff). All in all, the Jena tablet looks like rough notes for compiling a finished tablet like P34L. Another abbreviated text of this type has recently been edited by Civil, Or nx 54 (1985) 40-45, with discussion of abbreviated texts, including royal inscriptions, p. 37.

The problem of the Vorlage is more complex. One possibility is a damaged monument or tablet(s), in which case the scribal notations refer to fragments of the original. If the original was a large vessel (see above to xi 25) shattered into fragments, this could account for disjunctions, but not for doublets, nor is it clear why the scribe would copy the narrative portions first, then the titulary and curse. Furthermore, the šu-bi formulae imply more than one version of the text before the scribe. Assuming therefore duplicating copies before the scribe, Pericopes 1 + 4 and 3 represent the two sources, with variants, so also Pericopes 8 and 9. The totals, titulary, dedication, and curse formula had no variants or existed in only one of the two sources before the scribe, so were copied only once.

If the pericopes with šu-bi igi belong together, then (3, 7) are one source (‘B’). If the šu-bi pericope (1) and its continuation (4) belong together as one source (‘A’), it is separate from B because of overlaps. If pericopes parallel to PBS 5, 36 all belong to one source, then 9–12 could belong to A or B. In favor of B is the insertion of Pericope 8 before 9 and an assumption that the scribe began each parallel section with the same source. In favor of A is an assumption that it had a better text, to judge from Pericopes 1 + 4 versus Pericope 3. Assignment of this material to Source A, as here, places Pericope 8 in Source B. Pericope 5 is assigned to A because it shares with Pericopes 2, 3, (6), and 11 the abbreviated royal name, whereas Pericope 3, with the full form of the royal name, is assigned to B. Pericope 6 is unplaced. Rearranging the material in hypothetical sequence yields a scheme like Figure 3. Other schemes are also possible.

Pericopes 7 (titulary), 8/9 (attack on Naram-Sin), and 12 (curse formula) could be considered standard blocks of text (I, V), with which one or more campaigns could be commemorated. The Brockmon tablet may have listed nine campaigns; the Jena tablet only two. The nine campaigns are to be compared to the ‘nine levies/call-ups’ (9 šu-ub-bi-im) by Naram-Sin in Agade (differently Jacobsen, AFO 26 [1978–1979] 11 with note 44; I follow R. Kutscher, BT 31; Lambert, Studies Sachs 254f.

² For the translation ‘campaign’ or ‘battle’ for REC 169 see Pomponio, ArOr 51 (1983) 376f; for the sign, see also Kutscher,
Figure 3: Sources for the Jena tablet

A town or city written A.KA-šal₄₃₅ is attested in Sargonic administrative texts from Umma and Girsu, plus one text from Susa that should be assigned to the ‘Ummaite’ group.⁴ (see Rép. Géogr. 1, 16). The same place is attested in Ur III administrative documents from Umma, Girsu, and Drehern (for references, see Rép. Géogr. 2, 13-15). There is general agreement that this town lay somewhere near Umma, and was reckoned as belonging to the territory of Umma. There is nothing to indicate that this place was anything more than a village in the Sargonic or Ur III periods.

The reading A-pi₄-šal₄₃₅ was proposed by Gelb, AJSL 55 (1938) 70-72. Although Gelb adduced evidence for the reading of the last sign, he offered none for reading KA as pi₄ and stressed the hypothetical nature of his suggestion. However, this reading has been generally adopted since.

A city A-p/ bi-šal is attested in second and first-millennium historiographical and literary sources.

⁴ This refers to a group of business documents pertaining to the affairs of Ummaite families residing at Susa, apparently in the time of Naram-Sin; see B.R. Foster, ‘International Trade at Sargonic Susa’, Jahrbuch für Wirtschaftsgeschichte (in press).
concerning Naram-Sin. This material has been studied recently by Glassner, RA 77 (1983) 3–10 (see also Cooper, CRRAI 26 [1979] 99–105); however, for the convenience of the reader, the relevant passages are here excerpted:

A. Omens:

Old Babylonian Period

1. \(\text{amūt} \text{Narām-Sīn ša} \text{A-pī-sā-al īlqa′a} \) (Mari liver model, Rutten, RA 35 [1938] no. 3).
2. \(\text{amūt} \text{A-pī-sā-al-[li-im] ša} \text{Narām-Sīn} \text{ina pilšim idūkū[šu]} \) (OB collection of liver omina, Goetze, YOS 10, 11 iii 31ff).
3. \(\text{amūt} \text{[A-pī-sā-li-im] ša} \text{Narām-Sīn} \text{ikmū[šu]} \) (ibid., 22 4).
4. \(\text{amūt} \text{A-pī-sā-li-im ša} \text{Narām-Sīn} \text{ina pilšim ikmāšu} \) (ibid., 24 9).
5. \(\text{amūt} \text{A-pī-sā-li-im ša} \text{Narām-Sīn} \text{ikšudāšu} \) (ibid., 56 ii 6ff).

First Millennium

6. \(\text{[amūt Narām-Sīn] ša} \text{A-pī-sā-kī} \text{ina pilši īl[šudu]} \) (Ebeling, KAR 453, 9ff).
7. \(\text{amūt} \text{A-pī-sāl} \) (Thureau-Dangin, TCL 6, 1 rev. 3 [and duplicates]).
8. \(\text{amūt} \text{Narām-Sīn ša} \text{A-pī-sāl ina pilši (GUR-ši) iplušu} \) (GUR-<ši>ši) (Clay, BRM 4, 13 18).

B. Chronographic Tradition:

9. \(\text{amūt} \text{Narām-Sīn [ša ina š[ri annī anu} \text{urū} \text{A-pī-sāl illikîma [pilišu iplušu Rīš-Adad šarrī urū} \text{A-pī-sāl [u sukka]l}] \text{urū} \text{A-pī-sāl qassu ikšudu} \) (King, CCEBK p. 135 xii and duplicates; see also Starr, Bio 42 [1986] 635).

C. Epics and Legends:


D. References to Apišal outside of Naram-Sin Tradition:

14. List of wedding gifts on the occasion of the marriage of a princess of Alalakh to the ruler of A-pī-sāl (Alalakh VII, Wiseman, AT 409.45). The passage could not be collated as the tablet is now in the Hatay Museum, Antakya (information courtesy of Christopher Walker).
15. Apišalī: a word occurring in omens and medical texts suggesting a specific physical deformity (see Leichty, AS 16 [1965] 327) and perhaps a general term for medicaments (Von Soden, OLZ 67 [1972] 348).

From 12 and 14 above, it appears that in the Old Babylonian period there was a city Apišal somewhere in northern Mesopotamia, perhaps on the Upper Euphrates (so Wiseman), or beyond the Tigris (so Gelb, AJSL 55 [1938] 71; Goetze, JCS 1 [1943] 258). Yet this city does not appear in the Mari (courtesy Durand) or Rimah archives, nor at Kanesh, so far as the writer can determine. In the Sargonic and Ur III periods there was a town or city in Sumer, near Umma to the east on the Tigris Canal, that could have been called Apišal. In second and first millennium BC Mesopotamia, historical recollections of a victory (usually by siege) over a king of Apišal by Naram-Sin were preserved in omen, epic, and chronographic tradition. This victory is sometimes paired in later tradition with a victory over Magan (as in 9, 10), as is the victory over RĒC 349 here.

The text edited herewith is a genuine inscription of Naram-Sin that commemorates his defeat of a Sumerian (?) city in a campaign in the land of Martu, together with its Sumerian and Martu allies. This was followed by a victory over Magan. The Sumerian city defeated by Naram-Sin is otherwise scarcely known, though it may be compared to a place written in Presargonic sources in a similar way that was located near Umma or Lagash but which is
not heard of thereafter (see above, Section IV, to i 27).

A possible explanation for this mass of data is to propose that Naram-Sin's victory was over the Sumerian Apišal, but, as shown in the inscription, was fought to the north in the region of Jebel Bishri. After that, the Sumerian Apišal was a place of little importance that disappeared after the Ur III period. During the Old Babylonian period, when stories and historiographical data were in circulation concerning Naram-Sin's victory over Apišal, the place was confused with another Apišal located in the north both because of the similarity of the names and because the battle was remembered to have been fought in the north, not in Sumer. Thereby the victory over the by then extinct Sumerian Apišal became a victory over the northern one.

Confusion was compounded by other historical events remembered in the Old Babylonian period and later: the 'general insurrection' against Naram-Sin. To judge from later Mesopotamian tradition, non-Mesopotamian lands joined in an attack upon Naram-Sin. Among these enemies of Naram-Sin was the northern (?) Apišal. While it is not clear if the campaigns in the Jena text against REC 349 and Magan are to be considered part of the 'general insurrection,' it is striking that the Apišal and Magan campaigns should be remembered (together!) in the chronographic tradition, but not the general insurrection, which survived only in the form of the 'Cuthaean Legend.'

While the overlaps in the manuscripts noted above, Part V, could be used to argue in favor of seeing all the campaigns commemorated here as part of the 'general insurrection,' for now the writer would separate campaigns commemorated in the Jena text from the 'general insurrection.' This raises the question as to whether any other Sargonic inscriptions exist that might refer to these campaigns, but which have not been recognized as such.

(a) The introductory formula preserved in col. ix 19ff: šar in šarrī manāma lā ūmu/i ūnu Narām-Sīn dānum in špri Ištar kalūma kibrātī/um(?) arbārī/um(?) īṣṭāniš ikkīrāt(?)nīša-ma imḫurūnīm occurs in a shorter form in the Bassetki inscription (see Farber, Or NS 52 [1983] 68f): inu kibrātum arbārūm īṣṭāniš ikkīrāt(?)-nīša. The OB 'general insurrection' has ināma kibrāt arba' īṣṭāniš ippalkitūninni 'when the four world regions rebelled together against me,' which of course is similar. However, 'making war upon' is not the same as the 'rebelling' of the OB text and one may consider the possibility that the phraseology of the Jena and Bassetki texts refers in the first instance to the REC 349 and Magan campaigns. Note that the action begins in the east, continues to the north and west, and ends in the south, appropriately for a war involving the 'four world regions.' Indeed, the remote location of the Bassetki statue may be because it was placed at some point on the line of march. It is only by hindsight that the phraseology seems to us more apt for the general insurrection than it does for the Apišal-Magan campaign. If the insurrection had not yet occurred when this (and the Bassetki text?) were drawn up, the language is understandable in view of the dramatic nature of the events narrated.

(b) If, as was suggested above, there was a group of nine battles, one or more of which could be commemorated in different inscriptions with much the same introductory phraseology, this group of nine battles as a whole could be the origin of the Old Babylonian tradition of a 'general insurrection.' By hindsight or telescoping, events of different years could have been compressed, heroically, into one. This would mean that the Bassetki and Marad texts could deal with separate events that later became part of the 'general insurrection,' or, that in the Bassetki text the introductory formula of the REC 349-Magan campaign was reused for events that occurred in the 'general insurrection.' In any case, it is noteworthy that the Marad and Bassetki texts share with the Jena text the peculiarity that they do not use the divine determinative for the royal name. Whether this has chronological significance is unknown. If it implies a date early in the reign, the Jena, Marad, and Bassetki texts belong earlier in the reign than do the texts which use the divine determinative. Jacobsen cautiously places the general insurrection 'at a given point' in Naram-Sin's reign (see AFO 26 [1978-1979] 13); Westenholz suggests 'late in his reign' (OSP 2, 28). When more evidence becomes available, the bundle of traditions known as the 'general insurrection' may have to be broken into different episodes that were commemorated with similar terminology and so have been telescoped already by the Old Babylonian period.

(c) The later tradition of breaching the wall of Apišal, which cannot fit the Jena text so far as preserved, could have its origin in a play on words, as well as a confusion with the siege of

1 See, e.g., Glassner, RA 77 (1983) 7; Grayson, ABC 154;
Armānum, the king of which has the same name in a genuine Naram-Sin text as the king of (northern!) Apišal in the OB 'general insurrection' (see Grayson, *ABC* 234). The proposal of Cooper, that piššu may be the original word, and Apišal the play, seems less likely (see *CRRAI* 26 [1979] 102), though this could be offered as a reason for the confusion of the Armānum and Apišal campaigns.

(d) The weaknesses and complications of a proposal that *REC* 349 is Apišal must be stressed: a connection between *REC* 349 and Apišal is hypothetical, the reading of the Sumerian Apišal is hypothetical. Furthermore, in Ur III and Sargonic sources Asnān is not among the various deities associated with Apišal, though in the za-mi hymns *REC* 349 is her city. Therefore, I conclude that while an identification of *REC* 349 with Apišal is not excluded, it cannot on the present evidence be put forward as more than a possibility. The connection of the events narrated here with those of parallel texts (a) and (b), as well as with those of the 'general insurrection,' are still not clear. Lugal-AB is clearly the leading opponent here and not, for example, Iphur-Kishi or Lugal-anne; nor does Lugal-AB or his city seem to occur in the later material about the 'general insurrection.'

VII. Literary Parallels

In addition to its importance for the history of Naram-Sin's reign, the Jena text is of interest in that it shows certain motifs and literary devices that occur later in Akkadian literature.

There has been debate over the historical value and reliability of the group of Akkadian texts known variously as 'narrill-literature,' 'fictional royal autobiographies,' or 'historical-literary texts.' The Jena inscription allows comparison with one such text, the 'general insurrection,' in some passages, and with the later Naram-Sin tradition as a whole in terms of its structure, tone, and content. While the later texts contain reinterpretations and misunderstandings of the older material, the more Sargonic evidence that becomes available, the more the Old Babylonian historical-literary texts appear to be based or modelled on Sargonic originals. Later reworkings, such as the 'Cuthaean Legend,' seem to be based on the Old Babylonian or later texts and are as different from them as the Old Babylonian versions are from their Sargonic sources.

Certain specific motifs may be alluded to briefly here. One is what may be called 'heroic direct speech.' The early Sargonic royal inscriptions were generally cast in the third person; use of the first person prior to the reign of Naram-Sin is rare and in brief, formulaic assertions of truth. In the inscriptions of Naram-Sin more extensive first-person speeches occur, such as become commonplace in the epic or historical-literary texts, many of which were cast in the first person. The only previously attested instance in a genuine Naram-Sin inscription, the siege of Armānum iii 19ff: 'Thus says Naram-Sin ...' is obscure because of corruptions in transmission of the text; it seems to be a challenge in the form of an apostrophe to future kings. The new example found here, unfortunately damaged, may be read as denunciation of the perfidious enemy to Enlil, in which, as interpreted here, Naram-Sin stresses that the enemy began the war (recalling *ikkirinnisi* of the commorative inscriptions). This formal aspect of warfare, well known in later periods, is here attested for the first time in Sargonic sources. Tukulti-Ninurta I's extended denunciation of Kastiliša to Šamaš is a parallel, though there is no evidence in the Jena text for the existence of a treaty that had been violated, as was the case in the Assyrian epic. Note, however, that in the OB Apišal epic (no. 11 above) the Apišalian, after fulsome praise of Naram-Sin, offers to swear an oath (of allegiance?) to him (vii 14); did he later treacherously violate it and hence the attack upon him known in the chronographic tradition?

A second feature of the Jena text that is unusual in Sargonic royal inscriptions is focus on the enemy, describing his actions and quoting direct speech as if from the point of view of an omniscient narrator (col.i, as interpreted here; see comments to i 8, 9). While focusing on the enemy is well known in later Assyrian tradition, there the intent is usually to illustrate the enemy's fear and despair. In the enemy king's message to the rulers of the Upper Lands


4 For example, Rimuš C1 (Kienast, *FAOS* 7 [1990] 193 line 17).


6 Grayson, *BHLT* 4-9; Cooper, *Curse of Agade* 15-19.

(i 9ff), the Jena text offers a plausible literary antecedent for such material as the speech of Nurdaggal to the merchants in the King of Battle: [So where is Zababa], the campaigner who makes straight the way and spies out the paths of the earth? [So where is the lord of all daises, who [...] from sunrise to sunset?]

The 'victory or death' of Naram-Sin's speech presages the fiery speeches of the OB Sargon legends and the Apišal epic (perhaps themselves the model for the speech of the Sibitti in the Erra Epic I.46ff); at least, such speeches need not be considered now a post-Sargonic development in historical-literary texts and a sign of their historical spuriousness. Two examples may suffice: (Sargon says) [I am] the king of battle! The city Burushhanda which arose, let us(?) see its troops in cõmpaign! [What is] its direction? Which is its mountain? What is the road? Which one is it that goes there?' (Naram-Sin says) 'Be off! Let the paths of the mountains be open to me ... [I will show] you going to battles, bread baked on coals, [...] drinking from waterskins.'

One may now propose that the OB Sargon epic(s) were modelled on the bombastic literary style that seems to have developed during the reign of Naram-Sin, extending the tradition backwards to the time of Sargon.

Comparing the Jena text and the siege of Armänum to the earlier Sargonic inscriptions, one is justified in seeing in the reign of Naram-Sin a period of experimentation with and expansion of hitherto rather formulaic royal inscriptions into full-blown heroic narratives, with drama, suspense, direct speech, and change of person and viewpoint. Sentences grow longer, extra-narrative and rhetorical effects begin to appear. The results are artistically as different from what preceded as the Susa stele or the Bassetki statue of Naram-Sin are different from the stele of Sargon or the statues of ManiStusu. The Naram-Sin inscriptions were copied, adapted, and imitated in the Old Babylonian period. In their turn, the Old Babylonian compositions became the models for later Akkadian texts in somewhat the same style but with important changes: a challenge to the future becomes a blessing or curse, the narrative takes on a tone of sorrowful wisdom gained through adversity, the king suffers unimaginable losses and supernatural threats. Such 'historical-literary' texts may already have been in circulation in the Sargonic period, though so far none has been discovered. The frequent later cachet of the royal inscription as the pseudonymous source of a later text leads one to suspect that even existing inscriptions may be a sufficient explanation for the later literary-historical texts. Of these genuine inscriptions the Jena text is a prime example.

*ABBREVIATIONS NOT IN HKL

BT = R. Kutscher, The Brockmon Tablets at the University of Haifa, Royal Inscriptions (Haifa: 1989) tablet siglum B(rockmon) C(ollection) 1.
P34L = Poebel, PBS 5, 34+ Legrain, PBS 15, 41 (with thanks to F.R. Kraus).
Marad inscription = Clay, YOS 1, 10; see Kienast, FAOS 7 (1990) 102-103.

11 Text: Schroeder, VAS 12, 193; edition: Weidner, BoghSt 6 (1922) 62ff; see also Rainey, AOAT 8 (1976) 6ff, and the treatment by Albright, JSOR 7 (1923) 7ff.
12 See note 11. 
14 The so-called 'legend' discussed by Jacobsen, AO 26 (1978-1979) 1ff, seems to me to be simply a Sargonic student excerpt copy of a genuine Naram-Sin inscription dealing with the Iphur-Kishi affair. For a comparable student copy, see MAD 1, 194 (Westenholz, AO 25 [1974-1977] 103 no. 14).
Fragments of Assyrian Royal Inscriptions:
Possibly of Tiglath-pileser I

ALAN R. MILLARD
Liverpool

Two fragmentary royal inscriptions, on two pieces of clay tablets (K 4468 and BM 98572 = Th 1905-4-9,78), possible fragments of royal inscriptions of Tiglath-pileser I, will be edited in RIMA 2 (A.0.8.7.1005 and 1006). K 4468 measures 3.2 x 5.5 cm, and BM 98572 measures 5 x 8 cm.
Eine Inschrift Samsu-ilunas von Babylon

JOACHIM OELSNER
Friedrich-Schiller-Universität Jena (DDR)


Col. i:

1) [sa-a]m-su-i-lu-na
2) [LUG]AL da-n[ul][m]
3) [LUG]AL KÁ.DINGIR [RÁ]ki
4) [LUGAL ki-ib-ra-ti-m ar-ba-l-im]
5) [En-lû]
6) ki-ib-ra-at ar-ba-im
7) a-na be-li-[i]m
8) [id-lû]-nu [lam]
9) [SA]U-[mu]-am
10) a-na qa-ti-[S]u
11) u-ma-al-[l]-ma
12) i-nu-[i(?)]-mi-[S]u
13) [sa-a]-m-[S]-u-[u]-n[na]
14) [SI]PA m[-t][i]-ib
15) [šib-b][i] [A]MAR. [U]TU
16) [in] e-mu-qi-in
17) [ši]-ra-tim
18) ša DINGIR GAL [GA]L
19) id-di-nu-sum
20) in-me-qi-im
21) [ša]-l E-a
22) [ša]-at-li-mu-šum
23) [ši]-ni [E]-n[l][l] [ki]
24) [ši] u-[Š]U[-mu]-ba-li(?)-i(t(?))
25) a-bi a-bi-[S]u


Col. ii:

26) [e]-li ša pa-n[a]
27) [ša]-ba-as-[šu]
28) [ša]-[ap]-pi-[š]
29) BÁD-[šu] ki-[ma]
30) [ša]-TU-im ra-bi-[i][m]
31) u-u[d]-lî
32) ap-pa-ra-[a][m]
33) uš-ta-šš-[š]
34) Š[UD. KIB. [NUN]
35) ih-ri-a-[m-[m]-ma]
36) Gû [UD. KIB. [NUN]
37) u-[u]-um-mi-[š]-lî
38) [ša]-[ša]-Tîm
39) [mar]-kas ma-ta-[i]m
40) [a]-n[a] Š[u]-m[-i]-im ib-[i]
41) [ni]-[š]-e[1] KALAM Šu-me-rî-Tîm
42) u Ak-ka-di-im
43) Šu-ba-at ne-er-tîm
44) uš-ši-ib
45) a-bur-ri[1]
46) ušar-bi-š
47) zi-[k][i] š[EN. Z][u]-mu-ba-li-[it]
48) a-bi a-bi-š
49) [in] li-[ib]-ra-tim
50) uš-š-[pi]

ARRIM 8 (Toronto, 1990)
© Royal Inscriptions of Mesopotamia Project
HS 2003 (alt HS 46)

Tonzylinder Samsu-ilunas von der Stadtmauer von Nippur. S. Hilprecht,
*Explorations* 480–82 (mit paraphrasierender Übersetzung).
Masse: Länge 8,8 cm, Durchmesser links 5,5, rechts 4,0 cm.
Cuneiform Texts
at the University of British Columbia

CELESTE A. PETERS
University of Calgary

DOUGLAS R. FRAYNE
University of Toronto

The University of British Columbia possesses two sets of cuneiform documents, hitherto unpublished. One is now on display in the Museum of Anthropology, hereafter designated the MOA Collection. The other is housed in the University Library’s Special Collections Division, denoted here the SCD Collection. In this article the two collections are combined and presented in chronological order. They are divided as follows: SCD Collection — texts 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, and 10; MOA Collection — 1, 2, 8, 9, 11, 12, 13, 14, and 15. Information about the acquisition of the pieces is given under the individual items when known. Since all the pieces were donated or purchased their origin is determined by the internal evidence of the inscriptions.

Thanks are due to Anne Yandel, Head of Special Collections, and to Elizabeth Johnson, Curator of Collections at MOA, for their kind cooperation in providing access to the collections. Thanks are also due to the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada for its support of the Royal Inscriptions of Mesopotamia Project which provided the facilities for this research. The assistance of G. Frame and L. Shiff in preparing the Neo-Babylonian editions is gratefully acknowledged, although any errors are the sole responsibility of the authors.

TEXT EDITIONS

1: MOA 4.19
Clay cone; length: 12 cm, dia.: 8.1 cm at head tapering to 2 cm; origin: Girsu (Telloh); gift of Mr. Charles Flick, 1934.

TRANSLITERATION
1) ṭēnsī³
2) [ur-sa'g]-f kalā³-[ga]
3) ṭēn³-[il-il]
4) ṭugal-a³-[ni]
5) ṭū-gē-dē-a³
6) ṭēnsī³
7) ṭāgā³-[ke₄]
8) [n]i-du:-f pa mu-na/-ē³
9) ṭē-ninnu ¹IM.DUGUD₄mūn³/bābbar-ra-ni
10) mu-na-du³
11) [ki-b]ē ṭ mu³-[na-gi₄]

TRANSLATION
1) For the god Ningirsu,
2) mighty hero
3) of the god Enlil,
4) his lord,
5) Gudea,
6) governor
7) of Lagaš,
8) made the appropriate order appear.
9) The E-ninnu temple, his shining Anzu bird,
10) he built (and)
11) restored for him.

COMMENTARY
The inscription is badly worn away but is well attested from other examples (see J.-M. Aynard, ‘Les clous d’argile du Musée du Louvre,’ RA 54 [1960] p. 13). Gudea ruled c. 2150 BC.

2: MOA 4.24
Clay cone; length: 7.5 cm, dia.: 5.7 cm tapering to 3.0 cm; origin: Girsu (Telloh); gift of Mr. Charles Flick, 1934.

COMMENTARY
See notes to text 1: MOA 4.19. Duplicate of text 1 with the following variants: line 3 adds -ra at the end; line 4 of text 1 is omitted.

3: SCD A
Clay tablet; dimensions: 3.3 × 3.3 × 1.6 cm; origin: Umma (Djokha).
TRANSLITERATION
1) 9 (gur) 3 (bân) še gur-lugal
2) ē-šu-tum-an-dûl-ta
3) 14 (gur) 2 (bân) gur
4) kun-i-da a ašša ilăm/mu-na-ta
5) 4 (gur) 4 (bân) gur asša(gAN)-ur-gu-ta
6) ugula ka-dišinanna(?)
7) ki ir-ta!
8) lugal-gu-en-e/su-ba-ti
9) iti sigiši-šub-ba/ga-gar-ta
10) iti se-sag-kud-se
11) mu-us-sa si-mu-r[u]-umki lu-lu-buki a-ra-
12) mu-anša-anši ba-hul-/še

TRANSLATION
1) Nine royal gur, 180 (sila) barley,
2) (from) the warehouse of Andul.
3) 14 gur, 120 (sila)
4) (at) the mouth of the river and from the Manu
   field.
5) Four gur, 240 (sila) from the field of Urgu.
6) Foreman: ka-Inanna
7) from Ir.
8) Lugal-guene received (them).
9) From the month of Sig-i-šib-ba ga-gar
10) to the month of Še-sag-kud.
11) From the year after the year after the
   city Simurum was destroyed
12) to the year the city of Anšan was destroyed.

COMMENTARY
2) šu-tum is commonly written as é-šu-tûm = Akk. šatummu 'warehouse, depot' (see R. Labat,
Manuel d'Epigraphie akkadienne, Fifth edition,
Paris: Librairie Orientaliste Paul Geuthner, 1976,
p. 163). Andul is attested as a kus7 in a text published
by M. Sigrist (Neo-Sumerian Account Texts in the
Horn Archaeological Museum [= AUAS 4] Berrien
Springs, Michigan: Andrews University Press, 1984,
text 496:4).
4) For asša gîšmanu see S.T. Kang, Sumerian
Economic Texts From the Umma Archive (=
Sumerian and Akkadian Cuneiform Texts in the
Collection of the World Heritage Museum of the
University of Illinois 2) Urbana, Chicago, and Lon-
don: University of Illinois Press, 1973, texts 18:6 and
48:3.
5) The field of Urgu is well attested in Umma (see
Kang, ibid. 2:14 and 52:2, and Sigrist, op. cit. text
475:5).
7) The PN Ir is attested in many texts including
Kang (Umma, op. cit.) 88:7 from year 36 of Šulgi.
9) Second month of the Umma calendar.
10) First month of the Umma calendar. This and
the second month in line nine appear to be inverted
as the transaction takes place within a single year.
11) Šulgi, year 34.
12) Šulgi, year 34(?). We have followed the order-
ing of Šulgi year formulae proposed by K. Sykes,
'The Year Names of the Ur III Period,' A Field
Paper Submitted to the Faculty of the Division of the
Humanities of the University of Chicago for the
Degree of Master of Arts, Department of Near

4: SCD B
Clay tablet; dimensions: 5.0 x 5.4 x 2.0 cm; origin:
Umma (Djokha).

TRANSLITERATION
1) [...]-21(?)-še
2) x [...] ašša lá/--mah
3) ugula ba [...]...
4) kišib lu[gal-é-mah]-e
5) iti še-gur10-ku,
6) mu-ús-sa si-mu-ru-
7) um[k] lu-lu-ba a-ra-
8) 9-kam ba-ḫul
(Seal)
1) lugal-é-mah-e
2) dub-sar
3) dumu lugal-kù-ga-ni

TRANSLATION
1) [...] for 21 [days]
2) x [...] the Lamah field.
3) Foreman: Ba- [...].
4) Seal of: Lu[gal-e-mah]-e.
5) The month Še-gur-ku.
6) The year after Simurum
7) (and) Lullubu,
8) were destroyed for the ninth time.
(Seal)
1) Lugal-e-mah-e
2) scriber,
3) son of Lugal-kugani.

COMMENTARY
2) The Lamah field is well attested in Umma texts.
See Kang (Umma, op. cit.) 38:2, 39:2, 42:2, 75:2,
6) Month 12 at Puzriš-Dagān and Ur.
7) Šulgi, year 45.
Seal: For examples of the same seal inscription see
Kang (Umma, op. cit.) text 41 and G.G. Hackman,
Temple documents of the third dynasty of Ur from
Umma (= BIN 5) New Haven: Yale University
5: SCD Duschene #38
Clay tablet; dimensions: 4.0 × 4.5 × 2.0 cm; origin: Puzriš-Dagān (Drēhem).

TRANSLITERATION
1) 8 engar dumu-ni
2) 7 guruš ša-gu
3) kun-zi-da(i)-is/du-du-ka gub-ba
4) 18 guruš ša-gu/zár-tab-ba šu-úr-ra
5) 32 engar dumu-ni/mar-da-r[i]-a
6) a-ša gu4-mul nin-
7) nu-dù ú šul-pa/-e!
8) ugal ugal-ukkin-né
9) kišib (ugal)-ukkin-né! x
10) mu-úš-sa ki-maš4/ba-hul

(Seal)
1) lugal-ukkin-né
2) dub-[sar]
3) dumu du-du

TRANSLATION
1) Eight young plowmen,
2) seven male workers, ox drivers,
3) at the weir (dam) of the Dudu canal (are) stationed.
4) 18 male workers, ox drivers, (piled) grain heaps and spread (them).
5) 32 young plowmen equipped (with) spades
6) in the Gumul field, (the)
7) Nin-nudu (field), and the Šulpa-e (field).
8) Foreman: Lugal-ukkinne.
9) Seal of: (Lugal)-ukkinne ”
10) The year after Kimaš was destroyed.

(Seal)
1) Lugal-ukkinne,
2) scribe,
3) son of Dudu.

COMMENTARY
1) For the term dumu-ni see H. Limet, Textes sumériens de la IIIe dynastie d ’Ur (= Documents du Proche Orient Ancien, épitrope 1) [Brussels]: Musées Royaux d’Art et d’Histoire, [1976], text 18:2.
2) For guruš ša-gu4 see Kang (Umma, op. cit.) 64:1 and 69:1.
3) For kun-zi-da see commentary to Kang (Umma, op. cit.) 2:2 (p. 365).
4) For zár-tab-ba šu-úr-ra see Kang (Umma, op. cit.) 53:2, 54:2, and 115:2.
5) For mar-da-r[i]-a see Kang (Umma, op. cit.) 53:4.
6) The gu4-mul field is attested in Kang (Umma, op. cit.) 31:8 and 53:5. The nin-nu-dù field is attested in Kang (Umma, op. cit.) 46:5 and 34:1.

6: SCD C
Clay tablet; dimensions: 3.9 × 5.4 × 1.9 cm; origin: Puzriš-Dagān (Drēhem).

TRANSLITERATION
1) 1 udu-niga […]
2) 1 māš-gal-niga [x …]
3) 4 ha-bu-um 1 sila4
4) še-lu-uš 4-da-gan
5) 1 zeh-niga, ur-nigin-gar/santana
6) 1 sila4 puzur4-EN.zu nu-banda
7) 1 sila4(?) énsi gir-su4
8) 1 sila4(?) zabar-dab4
9) 10 gukkal(?) 1 sila4 gukkal
10) 1 […] x […] māš
11) [x x x x x] na-ša6
12) 1 anše ur-zištaran
13) 1 mašda bu-bu
14) 2 mašda é-a-1(!)-i
15) mu-[du] na-ša6 i-dab5
16) iti šu-eš-ša
17) mu ha-ar-ški ki-maš4
18) Šu-mur-ta2i ü ma-da-bi
19) u-1-a ba-[ḥul]
(Side)
20) u-4-13-kam

TRANSLATION
1) One barley-fattened sheep …,
2) one barley-fattened full-grown goat,
3) four wild animals, one lamb,
4) (from) Sellus-Dagān;
5) one fattened kid (from) Ur-nigingar, the orchard keeper;
6) one lamb (from) Puzur-Siin, the captain;
7) one lamb (from) the governor of the city of Girsi;
8) one lamb (from) Zabar-dab;
9) 10 fat-tailed sheep, one fat-tailed lamb,
10) … goat(s),
11) … (from) Naša;
12) one ass (from) Ur-Ištaran;
13) one gazelle (from) Bubu;
14) two gazelles (from) Ea-il;
15) delivered, Naša took hold of it.
16) The month Šu-eš-ša.
17) The year Harši, Kimaš,
18) Humurti, and their lands,
19) were destroyed for the first time.
TRANSLITERATION
1) AMESPACE
2) NAMESPACE
3) NAME
4) NAME
5) NAME
6) NAME
7) NAME
8) NAME
9) NAME
10) NAME
11) NAME
12) NAME
13) NAME

TRANSLATION
1) Amar-Suena, year seven. Note the variant spelling
with u4 in ṭama-ḫaḫ-ḫaḫ-ri is not attested by N.
Schneider, Die Zeitbestimmungen der Wirtschaftsver-
kunden von Ur III (= AnOr 13) Rome: Pontificio
Istituto Biblico, 1936.

COMMENTARY
This building inscription is found at both Ur and
Eridu. According to the donor, Mr. H.V.S. Page,
who collected both this brick and M4.30 in the Mid-
dle East during WW I, it came from Eridu. For
other examples of this brick see W.W. Hallo, 'The
Royal Inscriptions of Ur: A Typology,' HUCA 33
(1962) p. 35. For an edition, see I. Kärki, Die
Königinschriften der dritten Dynastie von Ur (= StOr
58) Helsinki: The Finnish Oriental Society,
1986, Amar-Suena 5, p. 76.

The inscription is stamped on both the face and
right edge of the brick. The stamp on the face is the
better preserved of the two and is the example copied
here.
1) Amar-Suena, year eight.

9: MOA 4.30
Stamped brick; dimensions: brick - 26.4 x 22 (incom-
plete) x 7.3 cm, stamp - 5.6 x 16.6 cm (incomplete);
origin: Eridu (Abū Shahrain); donated by Mr.
H.V.S. Page.

TRANSLITERATION
1) AMESPACE
2) NAMESPACE
3) NAME

TRANSLATION
1) Amar-AMESPACE
2) NAME
3) NAME

COMMENTARY
6) First month at Ur and Puzriš-Dagān.
7) Amar-Suena, year seven. Note the variant spell-
ing with u4 in ṭama-ḫaḫ-ḫaḫ-ri is not attested by N.
Schneider, Die Zeitbestimmungen der Wirtschaftsver-
kunden von Ur III (= AnOr 13) Rome: Pontificio
Istituto Biblico, 1936.

8: MOA 4.29
Stamped brick; dimensions: 26.3 x 26.2 x 6.7 cm;
origin: Eridu (Abū Shahrain); donated by Mr.
H.V.S. Page.
4) mu-[pà]-da
5) sa'g-ús-
6) è-kén-é il/-ka
7) lugal-kala/-ga
8) lugal-uriš/-ki-ma
9) lugal-an-ub/-da-limmu-ba-ke
10) è-en-ki
11) [... à]g
(breaks off)

TRANSLATION
1) Amar-Suena,
2-4) (the one) chosen by the god Enlil in Nippur,
5) the constant (supporter)
6) of the temple of the god Enlil,
7) mighty king,
8) king of Ur,
9) king of the four quarters,
10) (for) the god Enki,
11) [his belov]ed [lord],
12-13) [he built his beloved Apsû (temple) for him].

COMMENTARY
This inscription is another variation of the text stamped on MOA 4.29. There is a considerable amount of pitch on the back of this brick.

10: SCD D
Clay tablet; dimensions: 4.5 x 4.8 x 2.2 cm; origin: Umma (Djokha).

TRANSLITERATION
1) 4 še-gur
2) ki ḫA₄-nin/-ildu(m)-ma
3) ki ṭu-ma-ni/-ta
4) kišiš á-á/-li-mu NIM
5) iti ḫi₃-si₄
6) mu en eridu₄/ba-ḫun

TRANSLATION
1) Four gur of barley
2) from (?) ḫA-Ninildumma
3) from Umani.
4) Seal of: A'allimu, the Elamite.
5) The month Lisi.
6) The year the en priestess of Eridu was installed.

(Seal)
1) á-al/-li-mu
2) dumu x x e/-ni

TRANSLATION
1) Four gur of barley
2) from (?) ḫA-Ninildumma
3) from Umani.
4) Seal of: A'allimu, the Elamite.
5) The month Lisi.
6) The year the en priestess of Eridu was installed.

(Seal)
1) A'allimu,
2) son of ....e-ni.

COMMENTARY
4) For NIM = 'the Elamite', see Limet (op. cit.) p. 90.

The PN A'allimu is known from a number of variant spellings. The name appears as a-al-li (Kang, *Umma*, op. cit. 313:12 and T.B. Jones and J. Snyder, *Sumerian Economic Texts from the Third Ur Dynasty*, Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1974 [repr. of Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1961] 171:3); a-al-la-mu (Keiser, op. cit. 431:3 and 576:4 and Jones and Snyder, ibid. 101:9; 104:26, and 104:29); a-al-li-mu (Jones and Snyder, ibid. 193:7, seal dumu-mu-ni ... nin-gar); and a-al-mu (Jones and Snyder, ibid. 106:16). However, this appears to be the only text that begins the name with á. Note that, even within this text, there is a discrepancy in the orthography between á-al-li-mu in line four and á-al-li-mu in the seal.

5) Second month, Lagas.
6) Amar-Suena, year eight.

11: MOA 4.37
Clay tablet; dimensions: 4.2 x 4.4 x 1.7 cm; origin: Umma (Djokha).

TRANSLITERATION
1) 17 un-il
2) u₄-š[e] zubi/a zi-ga dab₂-ba
3) u₄-š[e] du₄ DAG (or NAo?) ab-didli/-ne si-ga
4) a-šà en-du₄-du
5) [...] x ugula mu-zu
6) [kišiš x(?)] x ša₄-ga

TRANSLATION
1) 17 porters
2) for eight days removed water from water-logged soil
3) (and) for six days the ... workers filled in the mound ...
4) (at) the field Endudu.
5) ... foreman: Muzu.
6) Seal of: ...saga.

(Seal)
7) [m]lu ḫanna kar/-zi-da

TRANSLATION
1) 17 porters
2) for eight days removed water from water-logged soil
3) (and) for six days the ... workers filled in the mound ...
4) (at) the field Endudu.
5) ... foreman: Muzu.
6) Seal of: ...saga.

(Seal)
7) The year (the en priest of) the god Nanna of Karzida (was installed).

COMMENTARY
3) ab-didli is a type of worker listed in N.W. Forde, *Nebraska Cuneiform Texts of the Sumerian Ur III Dynasty*, N.P.: Coronado Press, 1972, p. 61.


5) Although highly unusual, could this be read with the previous line as: a-sa en-du-gub/-ba ugula mu-zu? There is precedent for abbreviating en-udu-du to en-du in Kang (*Umma*, op. cit.) 62:3. A more likely reading for this line is: ugula pa-mu-zu; however, we are unaware of another attestation of this name.

6) kišib is normally in this position in this type of text.

7) Amar-Suena, year nine.

12: MOA 4.33A

Clay tablet; dimensions: 7.0×4.9×2.2 cm; origin: Umma (Djokha).

TRANSLITERATION

1) 5 kuš udu-bar-gál
2) 22 kuš udu-niga
3) 48 kuš udu
4) 50 kuš máš
5) 6 kuš šila4
6) mu en ga-eški ba-ḥun
7) 30 kuš udu-bar-gál
8) 7 kuš šila4-bar-[gál]
9) 17 kuš udu [...] 
10) 40(+) [kuš udu]
11) 99 kuš [máš]
12) 25 kuš šila4
13) mu 6šu-4EN.ZU lugal
14) kuš udu tag-ma ēnsi-ka
15) kišib a-a-kal-la ašgab
16) ki lú-kal-la-ta
17) ēnsi-ke₄ ba-an-dab₃ [or giš-ūḫ-kt? (Umma)]

(SEal)

1) [Šu-4EN.ZU]
2) lugal-kala-ga
3) lugal-uri₆₄-[_-ma
4) lugal-an-ub/-da-limmu-ba
5) a-a-[kal-la]
6) ēnsi
7) giš-ūḫ[₃]
8) ir-zu

TRANSLATION

1) Five hides (of) unplucked sheep,
2) 22 hides (of) grain-fed sheep,
3) 48 hides (of) sheep,
4) 50 hides (of) goats,
5) six hides (of) lambs,
6) the year the *en* priestess of Gaeš was installed.
7) 30 hides (of) unplucked sheep,
8) seven hides (of) unplucked lambs,
9) 17 hides (of) sheep (of some sort),
10) 40(+) (hides of sheep),
11) 99 hides (of) goats,
12) 25 hides (of) lambs,
13) the year Šu-Sín became king.
14) Stamped sheep hides of the governor.
15) Receipted by A'a-kalla, the leather worker,
16) from Lu-kalla.
17) The governor of ... (?) (Seal)

1) Šu-Sín,
2) mighty king,
3) king of Ur,
4) king of the four quarters,
5) A'a-kalla,
6) governor
7) of Umma,
8) (is) your servant.

COMMENTARY

1) Kang (*Drehem*, op. cit.) p. 274 translates ‘unplucked sheep’.
9) udu-[niga] is to be expected from the order established in lines 1-5.
6) Amar-Suena, year nine.
10) [udu] is to be expected from the order established in lines 1-5. There appears to be another Winkelhacken in the lower position on the edge of the break suggesting the number written is at least 40.
11) [máš] is to be expected from the order established in lines 1-5.
13) Šu-Sín, year one.

Seal: See Kang (*Umma*, op. cit.) p. 345, for the same seal.

13: MOA 4.36A

Clay tablet; dimensions: 5.1×3.9×1.6 cm; origin: Babylon; donated by D. Thom, 1950.

TRANSLITERATION

1) 22 GUR ŠE.BAR ū 50 GUR ZU.LUM.MA
2) Šá ₆MU-₆AMAR.UTU A-šú šá ₆BA-šá-a
3) A ₆ZÄLAG₄ ₃₀ ina ugu ₆[l]₄-ši-ru
4) A-šú šá ₆e₄-ti₃-p₃ a ₆EN-ZI₃₃,MEŠ
5) ina ITI.SIG₄ ŠE.BAR ina DUG₄₄-g[u]-la ka-a[G₄₃]
6) i-nam-din ina ITI.GAN ZU.LUM.MA
TRANSLATION

1) Dates the yield on [...]
2) belonging to Ahu-ah, son of [...], descendant of [...], against the account of [...], son of [...], the month of Ululu, yearly...
3) received [...] the month(?)
4) ... received two [...] in Ur(?), Nergal-usub will pay.
5) Witnesses: Bel-ru-8unu, son of [...], son of [...], descendant of [...], son of [...], descendant of [...], son of [...], descendant of [...], the city Suppatu.
6) The city Suppatu.

COMMENTARY

Date: April 17, 505 BC.

15: MOA 4.34A

Clay tablet; dimensions: 5.0 x 4.0 x 1.7 cm; origin: Babylon.

TRANSLITERATION

1) 42 GUR ZÚ.LUM.MA
2) šā mdEN-TIN-it DUMU šā mdEN-TIN
3) A 4mir-a-nu i-na qa-at
4) 4bul-lu-ta(!)-a DUMU šā mdAG-na-din
(space)
(space)
5) 4šu šā 4ba-la-ťu mdAG-it-tan(!)-ni(!)
6) 4aši šī šā 4AG-NUMUN-MU A 4mir-a-nu
7) 4mT4 ŠÚ.LUM.MA DUB.SAR
8) A 4mir-a-nu(!) TIN.TIR.KI
9) ITI.SIG4 U4 12.KÂM
10) MU 25.KÂM 4da-ri-muš
11) LUGAL TIN.TIR.KI LUGAL KUR.KUR

TRANSLATION

1) 42 kur of dates
2) belonging to Bēl-uballit, son of Bēl-uballit,
3) descendant of Iranu, in the hands of
4) Bulluṭa, son of Nabū-nādin.
(space)
(space)
5) son of Balāt, Nabū-ittanni,
6) son of Nabū-zēra-iddin, descendant of Iranu;
7) Bēl-uballit, the scribe,
8) descendant of Iranu. Babylon.
9) The month Simānu, day 12,
10) year 25 of Darius,
11) king of Babylon, king of the lands.

COMMENTARY

This text is unusual in that the real 'meat' of the contract, if indeed it is a contract, is missing. There is no mention of the terms of the agreement, no date stipulated for the pay-back, and the 'witness' clause and name of at least one witness are missing.

Date: June 27, 497 BC.
A New Esarhaddon Prism Fragment Concerning the Restoration of Babylon

AKIO TSUKIMOTO
Tokyo

The fragment of an octagonal prism published below belongs to the Hirayama Collection (Kamakura, Japan). This text is a part of Version E of Esarhaddon's Babylon Inscriptions. Although I have not checked it with the original of BM 78225, it can be joined to BM 78225 (88–5–12,80) published in CT 44.6. Each column of the fragment continues from BM 78225 almost directly. After the model of designations of the texts by R. Borger and J.A. Brinkman, which is presupposed here, siglum E1a should now be assigned to BM 78225 (previously designated E3), and siglum E1b assigned to the text of the Hirayama Collection. For permission to publish the text I am deeply indebted to Professor and Mrs. I. Hirayama.

With this fragment we can now restore Episode 15 of Version E:


I, Esarhaddon, the servant who reveres his great divinity, planned to build Esagila and Babylon anew, [to re]new (statues of) the gods and the goddesses, [to complete chapels,] to es[tablish] the regular offerings, (and) to gather the dispersed people[,] considered (this) in my mind, entrusted (it) to my heart, and commanded that it be put into action.

With the exception of several simple orthographic variants, there are, in addition to the passages cited just above, some readings of the text E1b which differ from those of its duplicates:

Ep. 8, 1: E1b offers DINIR-šu u 415-šū in the singular in contrast to the plural in E2 and E3a.
Ep. 10, 8: E1b reads ša i-ni-nu while E2 has ša i-nu-nu.
Ep. 35, 7–8: E1b probably omits these two lines.
Ep. 41, 40: E1b offers re-e-me instead of re-e-mu of E2 and E1b.

The fragment of an octagonal prism published below belongs to the Hirayama Collection (Kamakura, Japan). This text is a part of Version E of Esarhaddon's Babylon Inscriptions. Although I have not checked it with the original of BM 78225, it can be joined to BM 78225 (88–5–12,80) published in CT 44.6. Each column of the fragment continues from BM 78225 almost directly. After the model of designations of the texts by R. Borger and J.A. Brinkman, which is presupposed here, siglum E1a should now be assigned to BM 78225 (previously designated E3), and siglum E1b assigned to the text of the Hirayama Collection. For permission to publish the text I am deeply indebted to Professor and Mrs. I. Hirayama.

With this fragment we can now restore Episode 15 of Version E:


I, Esarhaddon, the servant who reveres his great divinity, planned to build Esagila and Babylon anew, [to re]new (statues of) the gods and the goddesses, [to complete chapels,] to es[tablish] the regular offerings, (and) to gather the dispersed people[,] considered (this) in my mind, entrusted (it) to my heart, and commanded that it be put into action.

With the exception of several simple orthographic variants, there are, in addition to the passages cited just above, some readings of the text E1b which differ from those of its duplicates:

Ep. 8, 1: E1b offers DINIR-šu u 415-šū in the singular in contrast to the plural in E2 and E3a.
Ep. 10, 8: E1b reads ša i-ni-nu while E2 has ša i-nu-nu.
Ep. 35, 7–8: E1b probably omits these two lines.
Ep. 41, 40: E1b offers re-e-me instead of re-e-mu of E2 and E1b.

this line and the next is plausible. Then we must take into account the possibility of a mistake in changing the infinitive into the participle. A similar mistake occurs in the case of šukul in which, though, the infinitive erroneously replaces the participle (Episodes 38(b), 39: E1b IV 39' // E* III 21, see R. Borger, BiOr 21 p. 147).

6 The restoration is based on Episode 38, 12–14 (E1b IV 43–45' // E* III 25–27: mu-pa-ši-in išsum ša-raš-ta) and E3a. I am grateful to Prof. J.A. Brinkman, Chicago, and Prof. K. Deller, Heidelberg, for reading the manuscript and offering their helpful critiques.

7 For two earlier publications see R. Borger, Asarh. (= Die Inschriften Asarhadmons Königs von Assyrien, AFO Beih. 9, 1956) pp. 10ff); there are five duplicates of the text in six fragments. See J.A. Brinkman, 'Through a Glass Darkly: Esarhaddon's Retrospects on the Downfall of Babylon,' JAOS 103/1 (1983) p. 38. As for Version E, the texts which were published after R. Borger's standard edition are: AO 7736 (J. Nougayrol, AFO 18 [1957–58] pl. 21–22 and pp. 31ff); BM 42668 (= 81–7–1,430) (A.R. Millard, AFO 24, 1973, pl. 13 and p. 118), and BM 34899 (= Sp.2,411) (CT 51 no. 78). The three texts which R. Borger had edited were later published in CT 44 nos. 6–8 in copies made by Pinches. See also R. Borger, 'Zu den Asarhaddon-Texten aus Babylon,' BiOr 21 (1964) pp. 143–48.

8 For two earlier publications see R. Borger, Asarh. p. 10.

9 See the table of texts and sigla in J.A. Brinkman, op. cit. p. 38.

10 kun or kunnu/kunni is expected here. But, according to the fragment of the first sign of the line which should be read /mu/ and in consideration of the often attested expression mukin sattukki (see CAD S p. 201a), the restoration of

ARRIM 8 (Toronto, 1990) © Royal Inscriptions of Mesopotamia Project
In the following I give transliterations of the Episodes of Version E in a score form which the fragment of E1b represents.9 These are Episodes 5, 7, 8, 10, 15, 20, 21, 22, 35, 41, and the date, among which Episodes 20, 21, 22, and the date are entirely, and Episode 41 is partly, shared with other Versions. These Versions are referred to here in the footnotes only as far as they differ from the text of Version E. The line division is based on E1.

**Version E Episodes 5, 7, 8, 10, 15, 20, 21, 22, 35, 41, and the date**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Museum no.</th>
<th>Publication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E1a = BM 78225</td>
<td></td>
<td>CT 44 no. 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E1b = Esarhaddon's Prism in the Hirayama Collection (Japan)</td>
<td></td>
<td>ARRIM 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E2 = BM 78248</td>
<td></td>
<td>CT 44 no. 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E2a = BM 78246</td>
<td></td>
<td>CT 44 no. 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E2b = AO 7736</td>
<td></td>
<td>AFO 18 pls. 21-22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4 = BM 42668</td>
<td></td>
<td>AFO 24 pl. 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E5 = BM 34899</td>
<td>(Sp.2,411)</td>
<td>CT 51 no. 78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Episode 5**

1) E1a I 10: \(ul-la-\text{n}u-\text{u}a\)
2) E1a I 11: EN GAL \(\text{4}AMAR.UTU\)
3) E1a I 11': \(\text{AMAR.UTU EN GAL}\)-\(u\)
4) E1a I 12: \(i-gu-ug\)
5) E1a I 13: \(i-ru-u-ma\)
6) E1a I 14: \(\text{t}i-ti\) \(\text{E.SAG}.G\text{IL}\)
7) E1b I 1': \(\text{t}i-ti\) \(\text{E.SAG}.G\text{IL}\)
8) E1b I 2': \(\text{t}i-ti\) \(\text{E.SAG}.G\text{IL}\)
9) E1b I 3': \(\text{t}i-ti\) \(\text{E.SAG}.G\text{IL}\)

**Episode 7**

1) E1b I 8': \(\text{E.SAG}.\text{IL}\)
2) E1b I 9': \(\text{E.SAG}.G\text{IL}\)
3) E1b I 10': \(n[a]-mu-tu\)
4) E1b I 11': \(i[l]-li-bu-ma\)
5) E1b I 12': \(\ldots\)-\(\text{mu-}\)
6) E1b I 13': \(\ldots\)-\(\text{šub-bé-}\)
7) E1b I 14': \(\ldots\)-\(\text{šub-bé-}\)

**Episode 8**

1) E1b I 14': \(\text{DINGIR-šú} u \text{d}4\text{[15]}\)-\(\text{šú}\)
2) E1b I 17': \(\text{DINGIR}^{\text{meš-šú}} u \text{d}15\text{meš-šú}\)

**Episode 10**

1) E1a II 12: \(\text{lib-bi} \text{4EN GAL-u}\)
2) E1a II 13: \(\text{lib-bi} \text{4EN GAL-i}\)

---


10 Only E2 is written in Assyrian script, while all the other texts are written in Babylonian script.
Episode 15

1) E2 II 8': ia-ati
E3 II 7'a
2) E2 II 9': AN.SĂR-ŠEŠ-ta-l-na
E2 II 7'b
3) E2 II 10': ar-du-pa-lih
E2 II 28'a
4) E2 II 11': DIN.GIR-ti-šu GAL.ti
E3 II 28'bi
5) E2 II 12': a-na e-peš
E2 III 15'
6) E2 II 13': \[S\]-\[N\]-\[I\]-\[A\]
7) E2 II 14': gal\[N\]-\[S\]-\[A\]
8) E2 II 15': [u-\[D\]-\[U\]-\[A\]
9) E2 II 16': [r]\[I\]-\[S\]-\[E\]-\[M\]
10) E2 II 17': [šuk]-\[L\]-\[U\]-\[N\]-\[I\]
11) E2 II 18': [m\[A\]-\[K\]-\[I\]-\[N\]
12) E2 II 19': [s\[A\]-\[T\]-\[U\]-\[K\]
13) E2 II 20': pu\[H\]-\[U\]
14) E2 II 21': [\[M\]-\[E\]-\[S\]-\[I\]-\[B\]
15) E2 II 3: ina ka\[R\]-\[I\]-\[A\]
E2 III 1'-2': in-\[N\]-\[A\]
16) E2 III 2: [\[U\]-\[I\]
E2 III 3': [\[U\]-\[Š\]-\[A\]-\[I\]
17) E2 III 4: [\[U\]-\[I\]
E2 III 5': [\[U\]-\[A\]-\[B\]-\[A\]
18) E2 III 6': [\[K\]-\[A\]-\[B\]-\[A\]-\[T\]
E2 III 7': [\[K\]-\[A\]-\[B\]-\[A\]-\[T\]
E2 III 8': [\[L\]-\[B\]-\[I\]-\[U\]-\[S\]-\[M\]
19) E2 II 5': \[L\]-\[B\]-\[I\]-\[U\]-\[S\]-\[M\]
E2 II 5': [\[L\]-\[B\]-\[I\]-\[U\]-\[S\]-\[M\]
E2 II 6'-7': [\[L\]-\[B\]-\[I\]-\[U\]-\[S\]-\[M\]

Episode 20

1) E2 II 13: [\[I\]-\[G\]-\[I\]-\[S\]-\[U\]-\[D\]-\[N\]-\[A\]
E3 II 5': [\[I\]-\[G\]-\[I\]-\[S\]-\[U\]-\[D\]-\[N\]-\[A\]
2) E2 II 14: [\[N\]-\[U\]-\[N\]-\[N\]
E3 III 6': [\[N\]-\[U\]-\[N\]-\[N\]
3) E2 II 15: [\[N\]-\[U\]-\[N\]-\[N\]
E3 III 7': [\[N\]-\[U\]-\[N\]-\[N\]
4) E2 II 16: [\[N\]-\[U\]-\[N\]-\[N\]
E3 II 8': [\[N\]-\[U\]-\[N\]-\[N\]
5) E2 II 17: [\[K\]-\[U\]-\[R\]-\[E\]-\[K\]
E3 III 8': [\[K\]-\[U\]-\[R\]-\[E\]-\[K\]
6) E2 II 18: [\[S\]-\[U\]-\[H\]-\[U\]
E3 III 9': [\[S\]-\[U\]-\[H\]-\[U\]
7) E2 II 19: [\[S\]-\[U\]-\[H\]-\[U\]
E3 III 10': [\[S\]-\[U\]-\[H\]-\[U\]
8) E2 III 1: [\[S\]-\[U\]-\[H\]-\[U\]

12 Episode 20 reoccurs in Versions A, B, C, and D (see R. Borger, BiOr 21 p. 143). Because A3 (VA 8420 = Assur 8000), which is the main text of Episodes 20 and 21 in Borger's edition (R. Borger, Asarh. p. 20), is published only in his transliteration, it is cited here from his book.
13 A3, B(a), C3: [\[i\]-\[A\]
14 A3, B(a), C3: {\[A\]-\[A\]
15 A3, D: {\[A\]-\[A\]
16 Episode 21 reoccurs in Versions A, C, and D (R. Borger, BiOr 21 p. 143). For A3 see n. 11.
17 C3: [\[t\]-\[U\]
18 C3: [\[i\]-\[I\]
19 C3: [\[I\]
20 C3: [\[I\]
Episode 22

1) E'b III 12':
E' II 14':
E' II 9':
E' III 13':
E' II 15'a:
E' II 10':
E' III 14':
E' II 15'b:
E' III 15':
E' II 16':
E' II 13'a:
E' I 17':
E' II 17'a:
E' II 13'b:
E' III 17':
E' II 17'b:
E' II 14'a:
E' III 19':
E' II 17'c:
E' II 14'b:

Episode 35

1) E'b IV 1':
E'b IV 18'-19':
E' IV 6-7:
E' IV 2':
E'b IV 20'-21':
E' IV 8:

Episode 41

1) E'a VII 1:
E' V 17:
E'b VI 5'a:
E' V 23a:
E'a VII 2:
E' V 18:
E'b VI 5'b:
E' V 23b:
E'a VII 3:
E' V 19:
E'b VI 6'a:
E' V 24a:
E'a VII 4:
E' V 20:
E'b VI 6'b:
E' V 24b:
E'a VII 5:
E' V 21'-22:
E'b VI 7'a:
E' V 25:
E'a VII 6:
E' V 23:

---

21 B(a): ni-bit-tuš.
Tsukimoto: Esarhaddon Fragment

E₂b VI 7b: [...]
E₄ V 26: DUMU₄₄me[-i₄a]
21) E₁b VII 8': [₄²]AMAR.UTU
E₂ VI 2': AMAR.UTU
E₁b VI 3a: AMAR.UTU
E₄ V 35b: [...]  
22) E₁b VII 9': LUGAL.DINGIR₄₄me₄
E₂ VI 3': LUGAL.DINGIR₄₄me₄
E₁b VI 18b: LUGAL[...]
E₄ V 35c: [...]  
23) E₁b VII 10': [îk-ri-bi-šu]
E₂ VI 4': ik-ri-bi-šu  
E₁b VI 19': ik-ri-bi-[-...]
E₄ V 36a: ik-ri-[-...]
24) E₁b VII 11': [...] iš-em₄me₄
E₂ VI 5': iš-em-₄me₄
E₁b VI 20': iš-em-[me]
E₄ V 36b: [...]  
25) E₁b VII 12': [...] nák-kir
E₂ VI 6': mu-nak-kir  
E₁b VI 21': mu-nak-[-...]
E₄ V 37a: m[û]-na[k-...]
26) E₁b VII 13': [...] Mû-ia
E₂ VI 7': ši-tir₄₄ Mû-ia
E₁b VI 22': ši-tir Mû-ia  
E₄ V 37b: [...]  
27) E₁a VIII 1: mu-sah-₄hu-î₄₃₃
E₂a VIII 2: si-ma-ia₄  
E₁a VIII 3: pa-₄-su  
E₂ VI 8': pa-₄-su  
E₁b VI 23a: pa-₄-su  
E₄ V 38a: pa-₄-su  
28) E₁a VIII 4: e-pi₄₃₃-ti
E₂ VI 9': e-pi₄₃₃-ti  
E₁b VI 23b: e-pi₄₃₃-ti[î]
E₄ V 38b: [...]  
29) E₁a VIII 5: dEN GAL-e
E₂ VI 10': dEN GAL-î  
E₁b VI 24a: dEN GAL-î  
E₄ V 39a: dEN GAL-î  
30) E₁a VIII 6: dAMAR.UTU
E₂ VI 11': dAMAR.UTU  
E₁b VI 24b: dAMAR.UTU  
E₄ V 39b: [...]  
31) E₁a VIII 7: i-na nap-₄har
E₂ VI 12a: i-na nap-₄har  
E₁b VI 25a: i-na nap-₄har  
E₄ V 40a: i-na nap-[-...]
32) E₁a VIII 8: ma-li-ki(!) (copy: ku)  
E₂ VI 12b: ma-li-ki  
E₁b VI 25b: ma-li-ki

22) A: šâ.
23 A₄₁, C₄: KUR u.
24 A: šû.
26 A: ši₄-tir, C: ši₄-tir.
27 A: ši₄-tir, C: ši₄-tir.
28 A: ši₄-tir, C: ši₄-tir.
29 A: ši₄-tir, C: ši₄-tir.
30 A: ši₄-tir, C: ši₄-tir.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1)</td>
<td>E¹b VIII 4': MU.SAG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2)</td>
<td>E¹b VIII 5': NAM.LUGAL.LA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3)</td>
<td>E¹b VIII 6': AN.ŠAR-ŠEŠ-ŠI-[a]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4)</td>
<td>E¹b VIII 7': LUGAL ma-[ar]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5)</td>
<td>E¹b VIII 8': AŠ-ŠUR[H]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6)</td>
<td>E¹b VI 35b: AŠ-ŠUR[ki]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


OBITUARY

EDMOND SOLLBERGER

(1920–1989)

The death of Edmond Sollberger on June 21, 1989, was a loss for the community of scholars specializing in ancient Mesopotamia, and a particular loss to The Royal Inscriptions of Mesopotamia Project. Dr. Sollberger was a founding member of the RIM team and became its first Editor-in-Chief as well as Editor-in-Charge of Early Periods. In the formative years of the Project he took an active, often leading, role and because of his acute perception of what the Project should be he left a permanent stamp on its aims and infrastructure. Unfortunately the illness which plagued him in his final years prevented him from continuing in an active role and deprived the Project of the benefit of his wisdom.

Dr. Sollberger’s involvement with the RIM Project, as his involvement with the Ebla Publication Committee, came at the end of a distinguished career. Born in ‘Constantinople’ (to use his term) he received his early education there before proceeding to study at the University of Geneva (1940–1945). Switzerland was a natural choice since he held Swiss citizenship by birth. During these years he travelled regularly on the Orient Express between Geneva and Istanbul, where his family still lived, and recalled with disgust the war-torn scenes which he witnessed.

By this time he had become seriously interested in cuneiform studies, specifically Sumerology, and on his own initiative went to the Pontifical Biblical Institute in Rome where he studied privately with Anton Deimel. Eventually he received the Doctorat ès Lettres at Geneva (1952) and he held various positions at the Musée d’Art et d’Histoire (1949–1961). In Geneva he met and married Ariane Zender and in due course she gave birth to two daughters, Nicole and Josette. In 1962 he accepted a position at the British Museum in London and remained there, eventually becoming Keeper of Western Asiatic Antiquities, until his retirement.

By the time he moved to London, Dr. Sollberger had gained an enviable reputation as a Sumerologist, primarily through the publication of two books based on his research on the Pre-Sargonic royal inscriptions from Lagash. He continued active research thereafter and by the end of his career had published six further monographs and over seventy articles. The most important aspect of his approach to research and publication was his fascination with new, significant, or unusual cuneiform inscriptions and this is reflected in the number of texts which he published for the first time. At the same time he recognized this characteristic in other scholars and in his official capacity at the British Museum opened up the vast collections of cuneiform inscriptions to serious-minded, qualified scholars. This liberality afforded numerous researchers the opportunity to study and publish original documents and thus make serious contributions to our knowledge of ancient Mesopotamian civilization.

Edmond Sollberger was a scholar’s scholar, dedicated to his profession and to the furtherance of scholarly interests. At the same time he enjoyed company and he and his wife Ariane were hospitable in entertaining scholars in their home and in stimulating conversations on subjects ranging from Mesopotamia, the latest play, good food, to current politics. Because of his cosmopolitan background and fluency in numerous languages — French, English, Greek, Italian, Turkish, etc. — he knew much about people with various ethnic origins and had a passion for travel. He contributed much and therein has left his own memorial.

A. Kirk Grayson

ARRIM 8 (Toronto, 1990)
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