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By definition, a palace is the residence of persons of elevated status. Therefore access to the palace needs to be limited and controlled in order to protect the palace’s inhabitants and their belongings as well as the palace’s precious furnishings from the outside world. Following the Oriental tradition, moreover, a Neo-Assyrian palace consisted of different quarters—residential, representative and administrative—which had to be delimited from each other.

Most essential was of course the safety and the privacy of the palace’s most important occupant, the king. Many letters from the royal correspondence illustrate how secluded a life the Assyrian king led when residing in his palace. It was never easy to meet the king. Whoever wished to see him had to apply for an audience and wait until it was granted. Chance meetings were rare, and even the visits of close family relations were usually pre-arranged.

In order to control access to the palace and its various quarters, a number of means were employed. The concern for limited accessibility is reflected in the architecture of the Neo-Assyrian palaces. We may note the following general principles: the palaces were usually separated architecturally from the rest of the city; they could not be overlooked from the outside; and they had few and easily controllable entrances, both from the outside and between the different palace quarters. These entrances were equipped with one or, more commonly, two wooden door leaves which were reinforced by horizontal metal strips. With the help of these strips, the door leaves were attached to vertical door posts which turned on pivot-stones. The detailed set-up of such doors has been reconstructed from the remains of the temple doors from Imgur-Illil, modern Balawat.

Whenever deemed necessary, doors were equipped with bolts and locks. In order to protect a room from intruders, it is sufficient to bar a door from the inside with the help of a bolt. But in order to hinder somebody on the inside from leaving, a simple bolt is not enough; it has to be secured with a lock. Internal locks were installed at the exterior gates of a palace, but they may also have been deemed useful in order to lock up the women’s quarters or rooms housing guests. External locks, on the other hand, are necessary for the doors to all those quarters and rooms in which something or somebody is to be shut in without the possibility of opening the door from the inside. The most obvious example of a room for which this option was desirable is of course the

---

1 As always, I owe my thanks to Simo Parpola for allowing me to use the electronic Corpus of Neo-Assyrian for the preparation of this paper, originally a contribution to the 1999 symposium 'Palace, King and Empire', organised by M.T. Larsen in Copenhagen. I am grateful to M. Gibson, M. Liverani, J.N. Postgate, J.E. Reade and I. Winter for their remarks on that occasion. I also wish to thank Andreas Fuchs and Heather D. Baker for commenting on earlier drafts of this paper and J. Curtis for providing me with information on a metal find from Nimrud (see footnote 7). Both A. Fuchs and J. Curtis kindly allowed me to reproduce their drawings as Fig. 1 and 2 respectively.

2 The best evidence is found in a fragmentarily preserved letter from the reign of Esarhaddon (now re-published as SAA 18 100); see Parpola 1980: 172 and 176 n. 12.

3 Hence scholars advise Esarhaddon in various letters on days that are auspicious for his sons to visit him: e.g., SAA 10 73 (visit of the crown prince), SAA 10 52 (visit of the crown prince and prince Aššur-mukin-pale’a), SAA 10 207 (visit of the princes Aššur-mukin-pale’a and Sîn-per’u-ukin), SAA 10 53, 70 and 74 (visits of prince Aššur-mukin-pale’a), SAA 10 54 (visit of an unknown man).

4 Cf. SAA 1 203, a list of door leaves with their measurements.

5 For an illustration of the reconstructed gates of Balawat see, e.g., Reade 1983: 23 fig. 25. For a thorough discussion of the technical aspects of ancient Near Eastern doors see Damerji 1973: 176–258.
treasury, but also storage rooms in general, armouries, libraries, prison cells and the living quarters of foreign hostages would come to mind.

Figure 1: ND 9222 (length 11.4 cm, maximum height 3.5 cm). Drawing by J. Curtis

Despite the general scarcity of metal remains from the Neo-Assyrian period, locks and parts of locks have been found in the palaces of Nineveh, Dur-Šarrukin and Kalḫu. The locks from Nineveh and Dur-Šarrukin were found in the pioneer days of Near Eastern archaeology and only their descriptions by Layard and Bonomi survive; both authors compare the finds to the ‘Egyptian Lock’ which was still widely in use at that time. More recently, David and Joan Oates identified a metal find from the Review Palace (ekal māṣarīti = ‘Fort Shalmaneser’) at Kalḫu as part of a lock. They describe the piece as ‘a thin rectangular copper object with three longitudinal slots and a protruding knob’ (Fig. 1). I would like to identify this object as the lock’s holding bar, to be used with three bolt-pins (see below). In addition, fittings for locking mechanisms can be seen in the door jambs of various gates of Neo-Assyrian palaces; the best examples are again found at the Review Palace in Kalḫu, where Esarhaddon (680–669 BCE) had an elaborate gateway constructed on the southern façade whose inner and outer door could be locked.

Figure 2: Reconstruction of a Neo-Assyrian sikkatu lock

6 For the evidence from Nineveh see Layard 1853: 596 and from Dur-Šarrukin (Khorsabad) see Bonomi 1856: 170–1. See also the discussion of Potts 1990: 186–7.
7 ND 9222, found by the jamb of the west door of room NE 7, see Oates and Oates 2001: 160 with n. 23 (on p. 279). John Curtis kindly informs me that the piece has a length of 11.4 cm and a maximum height of 3.5 cm; I am grateful to him for permission to reproduce his previously unpublished drawing as Fig. 1.
8 A photograph of the gate is published in Mallowan 1966: II 465 fig. 379, though unfortunately the fittings are hidden behind a man standing in the doorway. The locking mechanisms have hitherto not been published in full; the most extensive description is found in Oates and Oates 2001: 154: ‘Both the inner and outer doors of the stone entrance chamber had been fitted with a single-leaf door, with a multiplicity of locking mechanisms and bolts.’
A = transverse bar (äškutta); B = holding bar (sikkuru); C = bolt-pin (sikkutu); D = key (namzāqu); E = wall. Drawing by A. Fuchs (reproduced from Fuchs 1998: 102)

The archaeological evidence for locking mechanisms fits well with the contemporary description of a lock of the Neo-Assyrian period: in 714, Sargon II (721–705 BCE) had the lock of the Ḥaldi temple at Mušarî removed and taken to Assyria as booty. In his inscriptions the four components of the lock are described individually and in great detail, as they are made out of gold and fashioned as works of art. Andreas Fuchs recently succeeded in identifying these components and reconstructing the lock (Fig. 2): The locking mechanism consists of a heavy transverse bar, the äškutta. In order to lock the gate a smaller holding bar, the sikkuru, is pushed through the appropriate hole in the transverse bar. The holding bar is in turn kept in place with the help of one or several bolt-pins, the sikkutu or, in plural, sikkātē. In order to open the lock, the bolt-pins have to be removed from the holding bar with the help of a key called namzāqu. The mechanism of this lock closely resembles that of the ‘Egyptian lock’, also known as the Greco-Roman balanos lock. In accordance with the naming of this lock type, which takes its name from the bolt-pin, Greek βάλανος ‘acorn’, Fuchs called the Assyrian lock type sikkutu lock, after the same component.

In addition to the protection offered by heavy doors and locks, the Assyrians relied on supernatural help in order to secure their entrances. In palaces and temples, all major entrances were furnished with images of protective deities, and in these buildings as well as in private houses, clay and metal statuettes of protective spirits, sometimes supplied with short inscriptions, were buried underneath the thresholds. Together with the execution of the appropriate rituals, these representations were thought to offer potent protection against both demonic and human intruders.

Various examples of such apotropaic figures are illustrated and discussed in one of Jeremy Black’s most popular books, Gods, Demons and Symbols of Ancient Mesopotamia: an Illustrated Dictionary, co-authored with Anthony Green and illustrated by Tessa Rickards (Black and Green 1992). I offer the present paper to the memory of Jeremy whose far-ranging interests also encompassed the Neo-Assyrian period, as best illustrated by his publication of the Literary Texts from the Temple of Nabû, the fourth volume in the series Cuneiform Texts from Nimrud.

My paper will focus on the people who were entrusted with the control and supervision of the gateways and doors of the palaces. This task was shared by a number of officials: the attu ‘gatekeeper’, possibly assisted at times by the ša maṣṣartu ‘watchman’, the ša pān nērebi ‘entrance overseer’ and the rab sikkātē ‘lock master’. It will come as no surprise that some of these officials, specifically the gatekeepers and the lock masters, are also found in the context of temples. Just like palaces, temples were screened from the outside world and the methods employed—general architecture, doors, divine and human guards—are comparable.

It should be stressed that our evidence for these officials originates almost exclusively from the legal documents of the 7th century BCE from Nineveh, Assur and Kalḫu. This brings us to the

9 Discussed by Fuchs 1998: 97–107 who also reconstructs another version of a lock with a crank (uppu) instead of the smaller holding bar (sikkuru) to keep the transverse bar (äškutta) in place; note that such an uppu is attested also in the 7th century letter SAA 13.62:14 in which the up-ru ša si-[ka-ti] of certain temples seems to be missing. Fuchs was neither aware of the archaeological remains of locks from the Neo-Assyrian period nor of the work of Potts 1990 who, like himself, proposed the Egyptian lock (= balanos lock) as a model for the Mesopotamian lock. Potts’ identification of the various Akkadian terms with the parts of this lock type differs in some regards from Fuchs as he did not concentrate on one period’s evidence but used terminology from different ages; nevertheless, Potts’ and Fuchs’ overall results match very well. Note also the additional Old Babylonian evidence in an administrative text from Sippar, listing various parts of locks (BM 80394, for the edition see van Koppen 2001: 217–22 no. 3).

10 Cf. also Potts 1990: 188–9.

11 The most exhaustive information on the balanos lock, its use and the various possibilities for manipulating it is found in the account of Aeneas Tacticus, Περὶ τοῦ πῶς χρῆ πολιορκούμενοι ἀντέχειν, xviii–xx, written shortly after 360 BCE (edition: Loeb Classical Library no. 156).

12 For the rituals see Wiggermann 1992; for the representations of the protective deities see Rittig 1977 and Kolbe 1981.

13 A note concerning absolute dates after the year 648 BCE: as the sequence of the officials holding the office of year eponym after this date has not been handed down to us, it has to be reconstructed. Recently two
methodological aspects of this paper. The witness lists of the Neo-Assyrian legal documents, especially the long ones found in the sale texts, are to be counted among our best sources for the reconstruction of Neo-Assyrian society. A person’s place in the sequence of a witness list allows us to deduce that person’s status relative to the other witnesses. The general rule is: the earlier the person is mentioned in the list, the more important he is. That the sequence of the witnesses is by no means arbitrary is clear from the fact that the same sequence can be found in different texts which were written at different times. This leads to a second principle: witnesses of a certain profession are often attested together with colleagues or members of closely related professions. This fact is extremely useful when it comes to the interpretation of hitherto unidentified professions.

THE GATEKEEPER: ATU’U

The title of gatekeeper is one of the most frequently attested professional titles in the Neo-Assyrian texts, and is always written with the logogram (lú) Ì .DU8. Its realization in Neo-Assyrian is probably atu’u.6 Nothings speaks against the basic assumption that, as in the preceding periods,15 the task of the gatekeeper is indeed the guarding and surveillance of gateways and doors. To while away the time, the gatekeepers often seem to have taken to gambling.6

Gatekeepers are found both in palaces and temples.17 Two titles for gatekeepers of superior rank are attested. While according to the known sources the office of a ‘great gatekeeper’ (atu’u rabiu) existed exclusively at the Aššur temple, the ‘chief gatekeeper’ (rab atu’e) is for the time being only attested at the royal palace at Nineveh.18 Best known is the chief gatekeeper Ḥa-baštì who held this office during the reigns of Esarhaddon (680–669) and Assurbanipal (668–c. 630 BCE). That the office of chief gatekeeper could be held by more than one person at a time is clear from the fact that Ḥa-baštì is mentioned together with his colleague, the chief gatekeeper Tariba-Issar, in two texts from early in the reign of Assurbanipal.19 In two other texts from the same period he is attested together with another chief gatekeeper, Nabu-Sumu-usur.20 However, Ḥa-baštì is by far the best known holder of this office. He is attested from 679 until 663.21 His promotion seems to coincide with Esarhaddon’s accession to the throne.22

reconstructions differing from each other in detail have been published: S. Parpola apud Radner 1998: xviii–xx (henceforth Parpola 1998) and Reade 1998: 256–7. Both dating proposals are given in the following.

14 For a discussion of the Neo-Assyrian reading of the logogram ì .DU8 (including a rebuttal of J.V. Kinnier Wilson’s suggestion to read it as petiú) see Menzel 1981: 1230 with n. 3059.

15 Good evidence for the activities of gatekeepers is found in literary texts, especially in Ištar’s Descent to the Netherworld and in Nergal and Ereshkigal (for references see CAD A/2 516–7: atu A a) and in the Middle Babylonian text BE 14 129 (see CAD A/2 517: atii A b.4’), but the most detailed information stems not from Mesopotamia, but from Anatolia: a Middle Hittite text from Boğazköy (IBOT 1 36) is a catalogue of regulations concerning security measures at the royal court, and its first section concerns the proper locking and unlocking of the palace gates (for an edition see Güterbök and van den Hout 1991: 4–5).

16 Note the carving of game-boards on the plinths of colossal figures standing in gateways of the royal palace of Dur-Šarrukin now in London (British Museum, ME 118808–9) and Paris (Musée du Louvre, AO 19863), see Reade 2000: 611.

17 For the temple gatekeepers see Menzel 1981: 1230.

18 For this title see Menzel 1981: 1230.

19 SAA 14 65 r. 7’ (dated 668) and SAA 14 66 r. 4’ (date lost).

20 Nabu-Sumu-usur is attested in SAA 6 307 r. 5 (dated 668) and SAA 6 308 r. 8 (date lost).

21 For a complete list of attestations see my contribution in Baker 2000: 435–6 s.v.: Ḥa-baštì 2.

22 According to the list of attestations given by Lipiński 1983: 128–30, Ḥa-baštì (‘Ahoubasti’) would be attested twice as a simple gatekeeper during Sennacherib’s reign. But one attestation, ADD 443 = SAA 6 348 r. 14’ (dated 686), refers to one [a[s] x ū ]–aš-bat141,DU8 and the other—the title is restored—indeed refers to Ḥa-baštì, but is to be dated to the reign of Assurbanipal due to its context in the Remanni-Adad archive; Lipiński’s dating to 696 is due to the erroneous join of 83-1-18, 259+397 with 83-1-28, 372, as copied in ADD 297; today, the fragments are again separated from one another. The latter fragment, which bears the date, was published on its own as ADD 614 (most recent edition: SAA 6 128; note that this corresponds to ARU 93, not ARU 72), the two others were most recently edited as SAA 6 348. Hence, there are no attestations for Ḥa-baštì prior to the reign of Esarhaddon.
Arbailaiu\textsuperscript{23} and Nabu’u,\textsuperscript{24} the two chief gatekeepers known during the reign of Sennacherib (704–681 BCE), are not attested at all during Esarhaddon’s reign. They may have been among those officials who lost their office and probably their life after the murder of Sennacherib and the subsequent war that led to Esarhaddon’s accession. The last chief gatekeeper known to us by name is Ququ; it is not known under which king he served.\textsuperscript{25}

It is likely that the dimensions of the royal palace at Nineveh made it necessary to organize the many gatekeepers hierarchically, with the appointment of several chief gatekeepers who were probably responsible for different parts of the palace. It is rather plausible that this office also existed in the earlier main residences of the Assyrian kings, at least at the enormous palace of Dur-Sarrukin.

**THE WATCHMAN: ŠA MAŠŠARTI**

The title ša maššarti\textsuperscript{26} means ‘watchman’, literally ‘He of the guard’, and is used to designate a person who guards a concrete object, in contrast to the title maššuru, which specifies an official of more far-reaching competence.\textsuperscript{27}

Only once is a watchman, one Inurta-šarru-ušur from Assur, attested as a witness in a legal text, together with a gatekeeper and a lock master.\textsuperscript{28} Another watchman from Assur, a certain Mannu- […], is mentioned in a judicial document in the context of supervising a river ordeal.\textsuperscript{29} The names of eighteen watchmen who are to protect twenty-two magnates and governors are known from an administrative text from Kalhu, dating to the reign of Sargon II.\textsuperscript{30}

Most other attestations of watchmen are found in the royal correspondence from Nineveh, as a rule without any mention of their names. In one such letter, the astrologer Balasi asks Esarhaddon to supply him with a watchman to protect him against the servants of the chief cupbearer who are causing damage to his estates.\textsuperscript{31} His access to the precious items which he is protecting could make the watchman the suspect in the case of damage. Hence an anonymous watchman was accused of theft by some augurs for whose protection he was responsible, according to a letter of Upaq-Šamaš to Sargon II. Although Upaq-Šamaš’s examination of the case showed that the watchman was innocent, he was replaced by a colleague, obviously because further collaboration with the augurs was impossible after these accusations.\textsuperscript{32} But usually watchmen seem to have been considered supremely trustworthy; thus the exorcist Nabu-nadin-umī informs Esarhaddon that he has handed over the ingredients used in a ritual against the ṭubu demon, certainly objects of a rather sensitive nature, to an anonymous watchman.\textsuperscript{33} Tab-ši-Ešarra, the governor of Assur, asks Sargon II to send him either a šá qurbūti, an honorary title designating officials who enjoyed the king’s trust,\textsuperscript{34} or else a watchman to supervise the workmen performing construction work in the palace of Ekallate.\textsuperscript{35} That the watchmen’s rank in the court hierarchy was inferior to that of a šá qurbūti is also clear from the evidence of divinatory queries to the sun god asking whether the members of court and

\textsuperscript{23} SAA 6 130 r. 8 (dated 696).
\textsuperscript{24} SAA 6 163 r. 11 (dated 686).
\textsuperscript{25} SAA 14 126 r. 10 (date lost).
\textsuperscript{26} CAD M/I 341: ‘guard, watchman’; AHw 620: maššartu(m) l.c. (no translation given).
\textsuperscript{27} For the maššar bēt ili see Menzel 1981: 1 245–6.
\textsuperscript{28} A 338 = STAT 1 20 = STAT 2 238 r. 10: ṭEMAS–MAN–AŠ šá–ma–šar-ti (dated to the eponymy of Upaqa-ana-Arbail = 633 [according to Parpola 1998]) or 638 [according to Reade 1998]).
\textsuperscript{29} VAT 20361 = Deller, Fales and Jakob-Rost 1995: no. 111: 9–10: ‘man-nu–[x x x] šá–EN.NUN-te (dated to the eponymy of Sin-Sarru-ušur, governor of Ḫindanu = 636 [according to Parpola 1998]) or 634 [according to Reade 1998]).
\textsuperscript{30} CTN 3 86: 20: šá–EN.NUN.
\textsuperscript{31} SAA 10 58 r. 19-20: šá–EN.NUN [iš-si-]a lip-qí-du ‘May a watchman be appointed [for] me!’
\textsuperscript{32} SAA 5 163: 5, r. 9: šá–EN.NUN.
\textsuperscript{34} For a discussion of this title see Radner 2002: 13–14.
\textsuperscript{35} SAA 1 99 r. 17: šá–EN.NUN.
army would initiate a rebellion against Assurbanipal. The ša qurbātī officials are mentioned much earlier than the watchmen, who are listed after the mace bearers (ša huṭārī) and before the dispatch riders (kallāpu). 36

From the Neo-Assyrian attestations it is clear that a watchman is a member of the palace staff. His task is to protect specific persons or things, but it would appear that he was assigned to them only temporarily and not on a permanent basis. Although our sources offer no evidence for the fact that a watchman would guard an entrance, it may well have happened occasionally in order to reinforce the number of gatekeepers.

**THE ENTRANCE OVERSEEER: ŠA PĀN NĒREBI**

That the official called ša pān nērebi37 is concerned with entrances is already clear from his title, which literally means ‘the one in front of the entrance’. The title is attested six times in five Neo-Assyrian texts. It is mentioned in three legal documents from Kalḫu, in a letter from the royal correspondence and in an administrative text from Nineveh.

Officials bearing this title seem to be active exclusively in palaces and are presently not attested in the context of temples. A connection with the control and surveillance of palace entrances is suggested not only by the title itself, but also because of the mention of a ša pān nērebi together with gatekeepers and a lock master in the witness lists of two legal texts from Kalḫu.38 By analogy with other professional titles of the type ša pān X, such as ša pān ekkāli ‘palace supervisor’ or ša pān dēnāni ‘lawsuit supervisor’, we may assume that the ša pān nērebi did not physically stand guard in front of an entrance but held an administrative function controlling admittance to the palace. As entrance overseers are attested for the palaces at Kalḫu and Nineveh, we may suppose that these officials existed in every palace. It would seem likely that the entrance overseer was responsible for the organization of the guard of the various entrances of the palace and that he was therefore the direct superior of the gatekeepers, coordinating their service. The fact that Salmu-ahḫutu, the entrance overseer of the Review Palace of Kalḫu, precedes the gatekeeper Šepe-Inurta-ašbat in the witness list would support this.

*The known office-holders*

- Mannu-ki-Inurta, entrance overseer in Kalḫu during the later reign of Assurbanipal (668–c. 630 BCE)
  [1] ND 3426 l.e. 3 = Wiseman 1953: pl. xii (copy) = Postgate 1976: no. 9 (dated 9.xii.649): Mannu-ki-Inurta 𒀀ša-ša-ga-nē-re-bi is the last witness in a slave purchase document from the archive of the eunuch Šamaš-šarru-usur. Most witnesses have a title: the gatekeepers Nur-Šamaš (r. 14) and Tutaia (l.e. 2), the lock master of the crown prince, Tur-dala (r. 16), the eunuchs Šīl-Bel-dalli (r. 8) and Dagil-ili (r. 10), the scribes Samidu (r. 9) and Issar-Šumu-ididdina (r. 19), Nabu-le’i, a servant of the queen (r. 15), Dudu, temple administrator (lakeṭṭinu) of the Ninurta temple (r. 12), Urdu, cook of the Nabu temple (r. 13), Inurtanu, baker of the Ninurta temple (r. 18), as well as four fowlers and gooseherds. The appearance of these last witnesses can be explained due to Šamaš-šarr-usur’s business interests in bird breeding.39

- Salmu-ahḫutu, entrance overseer (of the Review Palace) in Kalḫu during the reign of Sin-Šarru-iskun (c. 626–612 BCE)
  [2] CTN 3 30: 14 (dated 4.iii.617 [after Parpola 1998] or 625 [after Reade 1998]; eponymy of Aššur-remanni): Salmu-ahḫutu 𒀀ša–ša-ga-nē-re-bi acts as a witness in a lawsuit between the šakintu (the female equivalent of the palace manager for the queen’s household) of the Review Palace (‘Fort Shalmaneser’) and a man called Kaba Lau; he is mentioned before the gatekeeper Šepe-Inurta-ašbat (l. 15) and after the courtier (toupper 𒈗DUMU-𒈗.GAL) Tartimanni (l. 13), known from CTN 3 39: envelope l. 11 as the palace manager

---

36 SAA 4 142: 8: 𒈗ša–e[N,X]UN,MEŠ; SAA 4 144: 8: 𒈗ša–EN,NU.N,MEŠ. Together with dispatch riders, guards are mentioned also in a fragmentarily preserved letter to the king, SAA 16 6 r. 3: 𒈗ša–EN,NU.N.
37 CAD N/2 177: nērebu in ša pan nērībi: ‘an official in charge of the entrance’. AHw 780: nērebu(m) 1 (no translation given).
38 ša pān nērebi together with gatekeepers in CTN 3 30 and ND 3426; ša pān nērebi together with lock master in ND 3426.
of the Review Palace.\(^{40}\) It can therefore be assumed with some certainty that Şalmu-ahšutu was the entrance overseer of the Review Palace.

- \([\ldots]\)ani, entrance overseer in Kalhu

\(^{47}\) Copenhagen no. 7 r. 6 = Fales 1987: 22 no. 7 (date lost): \([\text{[x]x]}-\text{a-ni} \, \text{i} \, \text{št-a-IGA–NE-RE}[\,	ext{-bi}]\) and another entrance overseer, \([\ldots]\)e (see \([\ldots]\)i), act as witnesses in a badly preserved document from Kalhu; other witnesses bearing professional titles are the scribe Balassu (r. 4') and a commander-of-fifty (r. 2').

- \([\ldots]\)e, entrance overseer in Kalhu

\(^{48}\) Copenhagen no. 7 r. 3 = Fales 1987: 22 no. 7 (date lost): \([\text{[x]x]}\,\text{e} \, \text{i} \, \text{št-a-IGA–NE-RE}[\,	ext{-bi}]\) acts as a witness in the same text as the entrance overseer \([\ldots]\)ani (see \([\ldots]\)i).

- Two anonymous entrance overseers in Nineveh in the 7th century

\(^{49}\) Two anonymous entrance overseers in Nineveh in the 7th century

\(^{50}\) Two anonymous entrance overseers in Nineveh in the 7th century

\(^{51}\) Two anonymous entrance overseers in Nineveh in the 7th century

\(^{52}\) Copenhagen no. 7 r. 6 = Fales 1987: 22 no. 7 (date lost): \([\text{[x]x]}\,\text{e} \, \text{i} \, \text{št-a-IGA–NE-RE}[\,	ext{-bi}]\) acts as a witness in the same text as the entrance overseer \([\ldots]\)ani (see \([\ldots]\)i).

THE LOCK MASTER: \textit{RAB SIKKÂTE}

The title of \textit{rab sikkâte} has never before been interpreted in the context of the guarding and control of entrances. In the following, I hope to make the identification as a lock master plausible.

The dictionaries fail to offer a satisfactory translation for the title \textit{rab sikkâte}, which, to my present knowledge, is attested twelve times in the Neo-Assyrian period. AHw discusses the title under \textit{sikkatu(m)} \(^{44}\) whereas CAD\(^{45}\) files it under its synonym, a lemma primarily attested in Old Assyrian documents,\(^{46}\) but also found in Old Babylonian texts.\(^{47}\) The Old Assyrian plural term \textit{sikkâtum} refers to a religious festival,\(^{48}\) and the official \textit{rabi sikkâtitim/rabi sikkâtim}—who was for a long time thought to be ‘a high military official’\(^{49}\)—is therefore likely to have been responsible for its organization.\(^{50}\)

For the Neo-Assyrian title, however, this translation is unsatisfactory; hence, we will investigate its meaning independently of the older evidence. The spellings with the logogram \(\text{gi GAG.ME}\) alone make it perfectly clear that the Neo-Assyrian title is based on the plural form of the term \textit{sikkatu} (NA \textit{sikkatu}) ‘nail, peg’.\(^{51}\) As the same person’s title is written once in syllabic and once in logographic writing in two texts from the same archive,\(^{52}\) there can be no doubt that the Neo-Assyrian realization of the logogram \(\text{gi GAG.ME}\) is indeed \textit{rab sikkâte}. The title’s verbatim translation is therefore ‘peg master’.\(^{53}\) Rather than assuming that the pegs in question

\(^{40}\) See Dalley and Postgate 1984: 6–7 for this official.

\(^{41}\) AHw 1041–2.

\(^{42}\) AHw 1041–2: \textit{sikkatu(m)} A discusses in one entry those attestations which are filed under \textit{sikkatu} A and B in CAD.

\(^{43}\) For a discussion of the title (with earlier literature) see Kryszat 2004: 19–25.

\(^{44}\) See CAD S 252–51: \textit{sikkatu} A.

\(^{45}\) CTN 3 36: 15 and CTN 3 39: envelope l. 12. The following writings are attested: \(\text{GAL–SI-ka-a-te}\) (ND 2307 l.h.e. 2), \(\text{GAL–SI-ka-te}\) (ND 2308 r. 1), \(\text{GAL–SI-ka-ti}\) (text: KUR) (CTN 3 39: envelope l. 12), \(\text{GAL–GAG.ME}\) (SAA 14 62 r. 11), CTN 3 36: 15, ND 3426 r. 16), \(\text{GAL–GAG.ME}\) (ND 2316 r. 6, ND 3425 r. 17), \(\text{GAL–GAG.ME}\) (SAA 6 95 r. 6, ND 2315 r. 11), \(\text{GAL–GAG}\) (A 338 r. 7).

always had to be wooden, the frequent spelling with the wood determinative giš should be understood as a writing convention.

As already mentioned, Andreas Fuchs has recently stressed the central function of a building part named sikkatu (NA sikkutu) ‘peg’ in the construction of a type of lock which is well attested for the Neo-Assyrian period. Because of the importance of this component and by analogy with the naming of the Greek balanos lock, Fuchs called this type of lock the sikkatu lock. It would seem possible that the title rab sikkâte has to be understood in this context, especially considering that the term sikkatu is used in the names of three professions concerned with entrances which, however, are attested only in lexical texts: mušēlû sikkati ‘the one who lifts the bolt-pin’, nādû sikkati ‘the one who drops the bolt-pin’ and pētû sikkati ‘the one who opens the bolt-pin’.

An examination of the context of the Neo-Assyrian attestations shows that the title rab sikkâte can indeed be interpreted as an official dealing with entrances, as the official is always mentioned in a palace or temple context, usually among high-ranking personnel and very often together with gatekeepers and other officials controlling entrances. In the available sources (for attestations see below), the rab sikkâte is once mentioned with two gatekeepers and an entrance overseer, in another text together with a gatekeeper and a watchman, once with at least two gatekeepers, and another time with one gatekeeper. I therefore propose the translation ‘lock master’, assuming that the crucial component sikkatu denotes—pars pro toto—the lock in its entirety. This is all the more likely as the sikkatu is the central element of the more primitive locking mechanism which is attested all over the Near East from the Uruk period. This older system consisted of a peg, the sikkatu, which was used to block a door and which was then secured against tampering with the help of a sealing. Suzanne Herbordt, when studying the 565 Neo-Assyrian clay sealings from Nineveh, was unable to identify a single example for such a door sealing in the Neo-Assyrian period. This would seem to indicate that the system was no longer in use at that time, and I suggest that this was so because it had been replaced with the sikkatu lock.

At present, there are eleven known lock masters, attested so far at Assur and Kalḫu and only after the year 663 BCE (see below for attestations). For Kalḫu alone, four lock masters are attested during the reign of Assurbanipal, over a time span of approximately 25 years, while four other lock masters from Kalḫu are contemporaries serving during the reign of Šin-šarru-ışken. These groupings result from the fact that there were different lock masters for and active in different (parts of) palaces and temples. Each of these institutions seems to have one lock master at its service, with separate officials for the queen’s and crown prince’s quarters in the palace. The lock masters working in palaces seem to be the direct subordinates of the palace manager or, in the case of the queen’s household, of the šakinte. Sometimes the title of the lock master gives us details of his sphere of activity. From their titles we know that Indi is the lock master of the temple of Nabu in Assur, that Nabu-belu-üşur is the lock master of the queen’s household in Kalḫu and that Țurdala is the lock master of the household of the crown prince in that city. In other cases we can extrapolate the lock master’s sphere of activity from the context. Hence Inurta-ți-iddina is probably the Kalḫu Review Palace’s lock master, due to his connection with Tartimanni, the palace manager of the Review Palace. Aššur-mudammiq seems to be the lock master of the New Palace in Kalḫu, as he acts as a witness for this palace’s šakinte, the female equivalent of a palace manager in the queen’s household. As Aššur-mudammiq is of superior status to Nabu-bel-u-üşur, the latter’s sphere of activity, known from his title as the lock master of the queen’s household, can be further specified as that of the lock master of the queen’s household at the New Palace of Kalḫu. He is therefore the successor of Šilmu-beli who held this same office some twenty years earlier, as can be assumed from the context in which he occurs. Due to their connection with palace managers,
courtiers or palace slaves, the lock masters Kablu’-Issar, Nabu’a, Šulmu-šarri of Kalḫu and [...]-ukin are also certain to have worked in palaces. Šulmu-šarri of Assur, on the other hand, may well have been the lock master of a temple in Assur, if not the Aššur temple itself, as he is attested with numerous high administrative temple officials.

There is no indication that lock masters were in any way connected with city gates. As the title of a *rab abullāte* ‘overseer of the city gates’ is attested in a letter from the royal correspondence, we may assume that the organization of the guard of the city gates was this official’s responsibility.

Unfortunately, the attestations known so far tell us nothing about the exact function of the lock master. Theoretically, several possible activities arise from dealings with locks and their components. One possibility is that the lock master is the craftsman who builds the locks; this seems unlikely for two reasons. Firstly, there is no connection whatsoever with related craftsmen such as smiths. Secondly, the lock master seems to enjoy considerably higher status than would be expected for such a craftsman. For the same reasons it is not plausible that he is the craftsman responsible for the maintenance of the lock, especially since such a simple mechanism as that of the *sikkatu* lock does not necessitate much maintenance work. As it is certain from the known attestations that the lock master holds a high-ranking administrative post, it is most plausible to assume that he was responsible for the safekeeping of the bolt-pins necessary for locking, and for the keys necessary for unlocking the locks, as well as for the actual locking and unlocking.

To conclude, it should be noted that the same interpretation very likely applies for the Old Babylonian usage, and certainly for the Neo-Babylonian attestations of the *rab sikkāte*. This official is clearly a high-ranking member of the temple staff and is so far attested for the Ebabbar in Sippar and the Eanna in Uruk. In the Ebabbar, one man, Šamaš-aḫḫa-iddina, held the post over the long period of 28 years.

**The known office-holders**

- **Aššur-mudammiq**, lock master in Kalḫu during the reign of Sin-šarru-šīkun
  
  [1] ND 2307 l.e. 2 = Parker 1954: pl. vi (copy) = Postgate 1976: no. 14 (dated 8.xii.622 [after Parpola 1998 = Reade 1998]; eponymy of Daddi): ‘aš-šur-mudam-iq *u*GAL-ši-ka-a-te is the fifth witness in the marriage document between Šubetu, daughter of Amat-Astarti, šakinatu of the New Palace of Kalḫu, and Milki-ramu, son of Abdi-Azuzi; other witnesses bearing professional titles are the mayor Arabaiu (r. 27), the priests Nabu-šumu-üşur (r. 28, also mentioned in text [6] with the lock master Nabu’al) and Iddin-Aia (r. 29), the courtier (*lúÉ.KUR*) Indabe (l.e. 1) and Nabu-belu-üşur, the lock master of the household of the queen (l.e. 3, cf. [7]). As Aššur-mudammiq precedes Nabu-belu-üşur in the witness list, we may suppose that he was considered to be of superior rank and it is therefore likely that he was the lock master of the New Palace.

- **Indi**, lock master of the Nabu temple in Assur during the latter years of the reign of Assurbanipal
  
  [2] A 338 r. 7 = StAT 1 20 = StAT 2 238 (dated 6.xii.633 [after Parpola 1998] or 638 [after Reade 1998]; eponymy of Upaqqa-ana-Arbail): *i*ndi-i GAL-GAG *šAG is one of the witnesses in a badly broken text documenting a sale by the scribe Etel-pi-Marduk son of Balassu. Other witnesses bearing professional titles are the gatekeeper Nabu-na’di (r. 4’) and the watchman Inurta-šarru-üşur (r. 10’).

---

55 SAA 13 128 r. 17: *lú.GAL–ká.GAL.MEŠ*. This official is mentioned in a letter by Aššur-reṣuwa, priest of the Ninurta temple of Kalḫu, to the king. From the context of the letter it is clear that the overseer of the city gates held a rank inferior to that of the priest himself and the mayor (ḫazānmu) of Kalḫu.

56 See now also Stol 2004: 666–7.

57 For attestations from the Ebabbar in Sippar see Bongenaar 1997: 134, for attestations from the Eanna in Uruk see Gehlken 1990: 93–4. The interpretation as ‘Pflugscharmeister’ as suggested in AHW 1042 and adopted by Gehlken seems unlikely to me, especially as Bongenaar stressed that ‘no connection with the ploughmen of Ebabbar can be detected’.

58 Nabonidus 15 to Darius 12; for attestations see Bongenaar 1997: 134.
Inurta-aḫu-iddina, lock master (of the Review Palace) in Kāllū during the reign of Sin-šarru-šiḵun
[3] CTN 3 36: 15 (dated 28.xi.622 [after Parpola 1998 = Reade 1998]; eponymy of Daddi): 𒈨𒀭𒊬𒃱𒅃 is the first witness in a text documenting the delivery of the daughter of [...]-Nanaia to the šaḵuntu of the household of the queen. The only other witness with a professional title is the fuller Iqiḫi-Adad (l. 16).

[4] CTN 3 39: envelope l. 12 (dated 19.i.615 [after Parpola 1998] or 617 [after Reade 1998]; eponymy of Sin-aliḵ-pani): 𒈨𒀭𒊬𒃱𒅃𒈨𒆠𒅃 is the second witness mentioned on the envelope of an obligation note documenting a debt owed by Salmu-šarrī-qiṭī to lady Attar-pašti, scribe of the queen. Inurta-aḫu-iddina, who is mentioned without title in the inner tablet (l. 14), is listed with the title on the envelope after the palace manager Taritāmni (l. 11). Although the lock master’s title is not further specified we may safely assume that he is the lock master of the Review Palace, just like Taritāmni is the palace manager of the Review Palace. Because of Inurta-aḫu-iddina’s involvement with the šaḵuntu of the household of the queen and the queen’s scribe, a connection specifically with the queen’s household at the Review Palace may be possible. The position of the lock master of the household of the queen in the New Palace at Kāllū is at that time held by Nabu-belū-ūṣur.

Kablu-ʾIssar, lock master, probably at Assur during the reign of Assurbanipal or his successors
[5] ADD 62 = SAA 6 95 r. 6 (no date mentioned; reign of Assurbanipal or later): 𒈨𒀭𒊬𒃱𒅃 is the first witness in a document concerning a field of the New Palace of Kāllū during the reign of Assurbanipal. Other witnesses bearing professional titles are Sana-il, messenger of the palace manager (r. 7), and the scribe Nabu-mudammīq (r. 8). Although the text is said to originate from Nineveh it probably comes from Assur originally, as the penalty clauses are in favour of Aššur and Mullissu—a typical feature of Assur legal texts. The document itself does not mention a date, which is rather unusual and should probably be explained as a mistake. But while the text was filed among the texts from the reigns of the kings Tiglath-pileser III (744–727 BCE) through to Esarhaddon in the latest edition, it should rather be dated to the reign of Assurbanipal or one of his successors, as indicated by the use of a penalty clause which is only attested from 650 BCE onwards.59

Nabu’a, lock master in Kāllū during the reign of Sin-šarru-šiḵun
[6] ND 2308 r. 1 = Parker 1954: pl. vii (copy) = Postgate 1976 no. 11 (dated 25.viii.616 [after Parpola 1998] or 621 [after Reade 1998]; eponymy of Bel-ḫu-ūṣur): 𒈨𒀭𒊬𒃱𒅃 is the third witness in a text documenting the release of a female palace slave by one Mannu-ki-abi; other witnesses bearing professional titles are the mayor [...]-Nabu (l. 13) and the priest Nabu-mudammīq and Nabu-belū-ūṣur.

Nabu-belū-ūṣur, lock master of the household of the queen in Kāllū during the reign of Sin-šarru-šiḵun
[7] ND 2307 l.h.e. 3 = Parker 1954: pl. vi (copy) = Postgate 1976 no. 14 (dated 8.xii.622 [after Parpola 1998 = Reade 1998]; eponymy of Daddi): 𒈨𒀭𒊬𒃱𒅃 is the sixth witness in the marriage document between Šutu, daughter of Amat-Astarti, šaḵuntu of the New Palace of Kāllū, and Millki-rumu, son of Abdi-Azuzi; other witnesses bearing professional titles are the mayor Arabalū (r. 27), the priests Nabu-šumu-ūṣur (r. 28, also mentioned in [6] with the lock master Nabu’a) and Iddin-Aia (r. 29), the courtier (𒈬𒆠) Indabe (li. Rd. 1) and the lock master Aššur-mudammīq (i.e. 2, see discussion under [1]).

Šulmu-belū, lock master in Kāllū during the reign of Assurbanipal
[8] ND 2316 r. 6 = Parker 1954: pl. vii (copy) (dated 24.i.641 [after Parpola 1998] or 640 [after Reade 1998]; eponymy of Aššur-garu’a-nere): 𒈬𒆠 is the second witness in the marriage document between Millki-haia, a female palace slave of the New Palace of Kāllū dedicated to the goddess Mullissu, and the weaver Mutuqīn-Issar. Šulmu-belū is mentioned after the only other witness with a professional title, the weaver Qibit-Issar (r. 5). He may well be the predecessor of Nabu-belū-ūṣur as the lock master of the queen’s household in the New Palace of Kāllū.

59 See Radner 2002: 19 for the evidence on the clause adē ša šarri ina qāṭēšu uba’ī ū. 
• Šulmu-šarri (A), lock master in Kālḥu during the reign of Assurbanipal

[9] ND 3425 r. 17 = Wiseman 1953: 141 (dated 5.ix.637 [after Parpola 1998] or 635 [after Reade 1998]; eponymy of Šababa-eriba): 1Šulmu-šarri MAN 3GAL-ŠAM.GAL.MESš is the last witness in the text documenting the sale of a slave woman to Ubru-Nabu, the palace manager of the Review Palace ("Fort Shalmaneser")60 by the gatekeepers Šepe-Nabu-aštab and Ubru-Sebetti, the sons of Šamaš-ši’i. The only other witness with a professional title is the scribe Remanni-Issar (r. 8) but some of the witnesses without titles are gatekeepers, just like the sellers: Tutai, for example, is attested with this title together with Šur-dala, the lock master of the crown prince, in ND 3426 l.e. 2. Due to his connection with Ubru-Nabu, Šulmu-šarri is very likely to be the lock master of the Review Palace. Note that a lock master named Šulmu-šarri is also attested in Assur (see [10]); possibly these two men are identical.

• Šulmu-šarri (B), lock master in Assur during the late reign of Assurbanipal (or possibly during the reign of his successors)

[10] ADD 575+579+805 r. 11 = SAA 14 62 (date lost): 1Šulmu-šarri MAN 3GAL-šarru-ūṣur is the seventh witness in a text in which only the lengthy witness list is preserved; all witnesses bear their titles: the eunuch and temple overseer Abda (r. 5’), the palace manager Ašu-eriba (r. 6’), the temple scribe Marduk-šallim-abla (r. 7’), the eunuch and overseer of the royal tombs Nabu-šezibani (r. 8’), the eunuchs and overseers of the mausoleum Nabu-gamîl (r. 9’), Šulmu-šarri (r. 10’), the (temple) brewer Mutakkil-Ašur (r. 12’), Uardu-Nannaia, priest of Šamaš (r. 13’), and the eunuchs Aššur-isše’a (r. 14’) and Kunaia (r. 15’). For prosopographical reasons, the text must have originated in Assur61 and it can be safely attributed to the late reign of Assurbanipal (or later). Note that the lock master Šulmu-šarri who is attested in Kālḥu (see [9]) could possibly be the same man.

• Šur-dala, lock master of the (household of the) crown prince in Kālḥu during the reign of Assurbanipal

[11] ND 3426 r. 16 = Wiseman 1953: pl. xii (copy) = Postgate 1976 no. 9 (dated 9.xii.637): 1Šur-dala MAN 3GAL-šarru-ūṣur. Most witnesses have a title: the gatekeepers Nur-Šamaš (r. 14) and Tutai, l.e. 2, the entrance overseer Mannu-ki-Inurta (l.e. 3), the eunuchs Šil-Bel-dalî (r. 8) and Dagil-ili (r. 10), the scribes Šamidu (r. 9) and Issar-šumu-iddina (r. 19), Nabu-le’i, servant of the queen (r. 15); Dudu, temple administrator (laḫhiμu) of the Ninurta temple (r. 12), Uardu, cook of the Nabu temple (r. 13), Inurtau, baker of the Ninurta temple (r. 18), as well as four fowlers and gooseherds. The appearance of these last witnesses can be explained by Šamaš-šarru-ūṣur’s business interests in bird breeding.

• […]-ukin (or […]-ka’iš), lock master in Kālḥu during the early years of Assurbanipal’s reign

[12] ND 2315 r. 11 = Parker 1954: 40 (dated 4.7’/663): 1[...]-ukin MAN 3GAL-šarru-ūṣur is the ninth witness in a badly broken text documenting the sale of a slave woman by Amurteši to the lady Atta-iš. Other witnesses with professional titles are a gatekeeper (r. 8) and a courtier (r. 12: dumu-šu-gal) whose names are lost. We can certainly suppose that […]-ukin was lock master of one of the palace households of Kālḥu.

THE DATE OF INTRODUCTION OF THE OFFICES OF LOCK MASTER AND ENTRANCE OVERSEEER

The offices of lock master and entrance overseer are not attested at all prior to the reign of Assurbanipal. In addition, it seems that some of the lock master’s sphere of activity was taken over from the palace manager (who is clearly responsible for locks and locking in the Middle Assyrian period)62 and, in the case of the temples, from the laḫhiμu official.63

Although it remains possible that these offices already existed already before Assurbanipal’s reign and that they are unattested through lack of evidence, it is in my opinion more plausible that these offices were indeed an innovation at the beginning of the reign of Assurbanipal. They were

---

60 For Ubru-Nabû see Dalley and Postgate 1984: 6–7.
61 Kwasman 1988: 56.
62 According to the Middle Assyrian Court and Harem Edicts § 1; edition: Weidner 1954/6: 268.
quite possibly created as a consequence of the traumatic experiences of the murder of Sennacherib by the hand of his own sons in 681 BCE, followed by Esarhaddon’s narrow escape from a conspiracy in 671/670 BCE fronted by one Sasi, to whom the oracle of the god Nusku is said to have promised the Assyrian throne. If the Assyrian king had been carefully screened from the outside world before Sennacherib’s murder, his successor Esarhaddon was surely forced to lead a life of extreme seclusion, in constant fear, as is best witnessed by the many divinatory queries addressed to the sun god focussing on whether various members of the court were likely to plot against the king. The murder of Sennacherib was likely to have resulted in considerable changes to the surveillance of the palace; it was mentioned above that all chief doorkeepers active during Sennacherib’s reign seem to have lost their office (and probably their life) and were replaced by new officials. While the loyalty of the gatekeepers and the watchmen is put to trial in Esarhaddon’s queries to the sun god, mention of the lock keeper and the entrance overseer is conspicuously absent in this context. This seems to strengthen the hypothesis that the offices of lock master and of entrance overseer were created only at the beginning of Assurbanipal’s reign, when the recent uncovering of the Sasi conspiracy had shown that events similar to Sennacherib’s murder had only just been avoided and the need for a more sophisticated security system must have seemed overwhelming.

By introducing these new offices to the palace administration the responsibility for controlling access to the palace, which previously was the domain of the gatekeepers, was now shared by several officials. This certainly reduced the power of the gatekeepers and hence diminished the risk of abuse of this power.

That the various officials responsible for the control and regulation of access to the palaces took their work seriously and that many a potential visitor would have been turned away at the palace door is clear from a proposal which the astrologer Nabu-mušeši made to the king in anticipation of his visit to the royal palace in Nineveh: ‘Maybe they won’t let me enter; let them give me an order sealed with the royal seal (unqu)!’ Such a document would certainly have dispelled all doubts and its holder would have been given admittance to the palace without much further ado.

---

64 See most recently Radner 2003.
66 Gatekeeper: SAA 4 142: 7; watchmen: SAA 4 142: 8. I am grateful to Andreas Fuchs for drawing my attention to this.
67 SAA 8 157 r. 7–8, cf. Frahm 1998: 120.
ABBREVIATIONS

Bibliographical abbreviations follow those listed in the *Chicago Assyrian Dictionary* and the *Chicago Hittite Dictionary*, with the following additions and exceptions:

AAICAB see Grégoire 1996–2001
Adab see Yang 1989
AMD Ancient Magic and Divination
CST see Fish 1932
GARES Archivi Reali di Ebla: Studi
ARI see Grayson 1972–6
ASJ *Acta Sumerologica* (Japan)
ATU see Englund and Nissen 1993
AUWE Ausgrabungen aus Uruk-Warka, Endberichte
BaF Baghdader Forschungen
BAM see Köcher 1964; 1980
BBVO Berliner Beiträge zum Vorderen Orient
BSA *Bulletin on Sumerian Agriculture*
CM Cuneiform Monographs
DB see Kent 1953 (edition of DB, pp. 116–A35)
DP see Allotte de la Fuïe 1908–20
ECTJ see Westenholz 1975b
Emar see Arnaud 1985–7
ETCJ see Black et al. 1998–2006
FAOS Freiburger Altorientalische Studien
Fö see Förtsch 1916
GAG see Von Soden 1969
Hdo Handbuch der Orientalistik
HSAO Heidelberger Studien zum Alten Orient
ISET see Çığ et al. 1969 (ISET 1); Çığ, Kizilyay and Kramer 1976 (ISET 2)
KAR see Ebeling 1919–20
LKA see Ebeling 1953
MC Mesopotamian Civilizations
MSVO see Englund and Grégoire 1991
MVS Münchner Vorderasiatische Studien
Nik see Nikol’skij 1908
NYPL New York Public Library
OBC Orientalia Biblica et Christiana
OBO Orbis Bibliicus et Orientalis
OPSNKF Occasional Publications of the Samuel Noah Kramer Fund
OSP 1 see Westenholz 1975a
PDT see Çığ et al. 1956
PIHANS Publications de l’Institut historique-archéologique néerlandais de Stamboul
PNA 2/I see Baker 2000
RCU P. Michalowski, *The Royal Correspondence of Ur* (diss., Yale Univ.)
RJTC RÉpertoire Géographique des Textes Cunéiformes
RIA Reallexikon der Assyriologie und Vorderasiatischen Archäologie
SAAB *State Archives of Assyria Bulletin*
SAACT State Archives of Assyria Cuneiform Texts
SAALT State Archives of Assyria Literary Texts
SANE Sources from the Ancient Near East
SAOC Studies in Ancient Oriental Civilization
SCIAMVS Sources and Commentaries in Exact Sciences, Kyoto, Japan
SEL Studi Epigrafici e Linguistici sul Vicino Oriente antico
SF see Deimel 1923
SpTU 3 see Von Weiker 1988
StAT Studien zu den Assur-Texten; see Radner 1999 (StAT 1), Donbaz and Parpola 2001 (StAT 2)
STH see Hussey 1912
TCTI 2 see Lafont and Yıldız 1996
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