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Abstract

In the latter half of the eighteenth century B.C.E. (in the Middle Chronology), the southernmost regions of Mesopotamia started rebelling against Babylonian royal power, merely one generation after Hammurapi of Babylon had unified the land in annexing the small kingdoms that had emerged at the beginning of the millennium. This rebellion eventually resulted in the formation of a poorly documented kingdom, the Sealand, which would last as an independent state for over two centuries, maintaining itself long after the Amorite dynasty of Babylon fell. Because of the dire lack of sources, this entire period has remained for us largely in the dark, historically and culturally. Late Old Babylonian royal inscriptions are few and the year names become less evocative of political events, early Kassite evidence is even scarcer, and until recently Sealand I sources were near to non-existent. Our incomplete understanding of pottery sequences and the apparent abandonment of several urban centres in southern Babylonia in that period have made and kept this dynasty very elusive. Until now it was known to us almost exclusively through its inclusion into later king lists and chronicles. The publication in 2009 of well over four hundred archival texts bearing date formulae of Sealand I rulers, soon to be followed by a few literary and
divinatory texts, finally made it possible to start filling this hiatus. This dissertation proposes a history of the Sealand I kingdom, based on this new evidence and on a reevaluation of the previously known sources. The aspects examined are: the recording and transmission of knowledge on the Sealand I dynasty in Mesopotamian historiography; the political history, including a discussion of the geography and the relative chronology; the panthea and the palace-sponsored cult, which show how the Sealand I kings positioned their rule in a Larsean tradition, but with supra-regional ambitions; the economy — mainly the palatial administration and transformation of agricultural and animal resources, which also reveal a very specific model of institutional integration between the palace and temples.
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Conventions and Abbreviations

Dates are given in the following format:

\texttt{day.month.year}

month: in Roman numerals;
year: in the form RN n (where RN= abbreviated royal name and n=regnal year); for the year
formulae of the CUSAS 9 archive, for which the exact regnal year is not always clear, the capital
letter attributed by Dalley is often used alone (see Appendix 2 and Dalley 2009: 11f.).

The following abbreviated royal names are used for the Sealand I kings:

Ilī = Ilī-ma-AN
It = Itti-ili-nībī
Di = Damqi-ilišu
Gu = Gulkišar
Pe = Pešgaladameš
Aa = Ayadaragalama
Eg = Ea-gāmil

Most personal names are given in normalized orthography with diacritics. One notable exception
is Hammurapi, whose name has entered usage so much as to justify this adapted orthography,
instead of Šammu-rāpi.

Abbreviations follow those defined in the \textit{Reallexikon der Assyriologie und Vorderasiatischen
Archäologie}.

Other abbreviations:

\textit{ABC: Assyrian and Babylonian Chronicles} (Grayson 1975)
BC: Belgian Collection (texts cited in Dalley 2009: \textit{passim})
BKL A: Babylonian King List A (BM 33332)
BKL A: Babylonian King List B (BM 38122)
\textit{MC: Mesopotamian Chronicles} (Glassner 2004)
DynKL: Dynastic King List (= \textit{ABC} 18 = \textit{MC} 3)
SynKL: Synchronistic King List (A.117)
Chapter 1
Introduction

1 Introduction

Our knowledge of second millennium Babylonia is one of stark contrasts. A wealth of archival documents – epistolary, legal, and administrative, in the first few centuries (the Old Babylonian period) illuminates several aspects of private affairs and state administration in minute detail. Due to a non-negligible number of tablets, we also have for the same period a fairly good grasp of other scribal activity, for instance in mathematics, divination, and literature. We also learn through the royal Mari archives of many an episode in the intricacies of supra-regional politics that marked the complex relations between the small, ever competing Amorite states; for the Middle Babylonian (Kassite) period in the second half of the millennium, such information comes from the Amarna correspondence. But these relatively solid areas of knowledge co-exist with several grey zones. For instance, the absolute chronology of the greater part of the millennium is an extremely contentious issue. Also, the entire transition from the Old to the Middle Babylonian period is fraught with uncertainties and, it seems, more questions than answers because of the general ebbing of written and material sources. The situation is perhaps best captured in the words of Charpin describing the late Old Babylonian period, and of Brinkman discussing the early Kassite period: the former concludes that "il est impossible d'[en] écrire une histoire politique un tant soit peu continue" (Charpin 2004: 366-367), while the latter observes that "no amount of theorizing can compensate for the lack of clear and trustworthy evidence" (Brinkman 1976: 13).

It is indeed not only a political Zwischenzeit between periods of unified rule in Babylonia – Amorite, then Kassite, it is also an altogether dark age for which we are at a loss to describe and understand with anything approaching confidence most aspects of the demographic, economic, environmental, cultural, and political processes and events. This phase of high uncertainty in our understanding of Babylonian history sets in earlier for southern Babylonia. Indeed, if we trust the available material and written evidence – or rather the lack thereof, the region appears to turn
more or less into a wasteland after the rebellion against Samsu-iluna, and to remain so until Kassite (re-)settlement. To fill this hiatus historians had until very recently barely more to go on than a handful of references to the enigmatic dynasty of (E)uruku(g) and to kings of the Sealand, scattered in later king lists and chronicles and early on associated with southern Mesopotamia. In the last years, primary sources from that dynasty have finally surfaced and allowed for a thorough re-examination of the question. This dissertation presents the results of this undertaking.

It is nonetheless worthwhile to take a step back and endeavour to trace the major steps in our understanding of Sealand history, more particularly, of its first dynasty and kingdom, as some questions raised in early discussions are still valid. I will therefore review the main contributions to reflect the evolution of the idea of Sealand in assyriology from the 1880’s to the present.

1.1 Review of previous scholarship

The sole historical study entirely dedicated to the Sealand dates as far back as 1932 (Dougherty 1932). This is not very surprising since until recently little new evidence had become available to encourage any serious attempt to revisit this part of Mesopotamian history. Therefore, the history of southernmost Mesopotamia in the middle of the second millennium usually remains confined to a few paragraphs in chapters about the Old Babylonian or the Kassite dynasty. The dire lack of sources has also resulted in conflicting, sometimes irreconcilable views and speculations on the Sealand. To cite but two, at opposite ends of the spectrum of intellectual history: Hallo suggested, before any relevant literary texts had surfaced, that scholars of Sumerian who fled to the Sealand after the fall of the Amorite dynasty were responsible for "a final flowering of Sumerian literature, or rather of bilingual texts" (1975: 199; 201); a few years later, with the same evidence at hand, Civil et al. considered that the "occupation of Nippur by the Sealand tribes was quite different from previous conquests by the more 'civilized' Larsa and Babylonian kings, and seems to have put an end to all scribal activities" (1979: 8).
1.1.1 First discussions on the "Sealand"

As early as 1886, Tiele discussed the "Dynastie Seelands" mentioned in the Babylonian Royal Chronicle published some years earlier. Without concluding, he proposed that the "Seeland" was a land along the Persian shore or around an inner sea (1886: passim). The association between the Sealand and the Persian Gulf was embraced by other scholars and in 1904 Hommel assumed that the "Meerland" extended along the Persian coast from Bīt Jakīn in southern Babylonia down to where Bahrein lies. He also posited that Karduniaš might be synonym of "Meerland" (1904: passim), a position followed by others, for instance Knudtzon (1915: passim). Along similar lines, Hüsing suggested in 1906 that Karduniaš might be the Elamite word for "Meerland" (1906: 663-665).

Other scholars, however, did not associate Karduniaš and the Sealand, and the idea of a separate political entity co-existing with the first dynasty of Babylon emerged. Johns discussed the conflicts between Abī-ešuḫ and "Ilu-ma-ilu, king of the Sealand" of the "Uru-azagga" dynasty. He considered the Sealand to have been located in "inaccessible swamps" (1913: passim).

A first attempt to write a history of the Sealand was made by King, who in 1915 dedicated a full chapter to “The Close of the First Dynasty of Babylon and the Kings from the Country of the Sea” as part of his reconstruction of Babylonian political history (1915: 197ff.). He drew from the chronicles he had published a few years earlier to write, from a Babylonian point of view, the history of the "Sea-Country". King situated the Sea-Country mainly in the marshy area in the south-east of Babylonia, a region offering a natural barrier against invaders, also a region which had constituted a sanctuary to Sumerian refugees displaced by the Amorite invasion. King considered that the southern rebellion during Samsu-iluna’s reign was led by Rīm-Sīn (I) of Larsa, by then very old, who had bided his time since Hammurabi’s conquest but seized the opportunity to strike Babylon when it was beginning to struggle with Kassite invasions. Following Samsu-iluna’s brief success in crushing the rebellion, the revolt of "all the lands" was in King’s opinion the fact of Sea-Country leader "Iluma-ilum". Basing himself on the fairly recent publication of legal and business documents from Nippur which used date formulae of the latter, King concluded that central Babylonia had passed into Sea-Country hands in Samsu-
iluna’s twenty-ninth year, a view that is still valid. He discussed Abī-ešuḫ’s unsuccessful efforts to regain control of the south, and the construction of shrines at Babylon, reproducing cult places which had passed under Sea-Country control. Before his fall at the hands of the Kassites, King believed that the last Sea-Country king had unsuccessfully attempted to invade Elam. He also discussed the reasons motivating the inclusion of the Sea-Country rulers in the Babylonian King List, positing that, following the Hittite raid, it was probably the sole stable power in the region.

1.1.2 Dougherty’s "The Sealand of Ancient Arabia"

A turning point in scholarship about the Sealand was Dougherty’s publication of *The Sealand of Ancient Arabia* in 1932. In his book, Dougherty created the idea of the Sealand as a long-lived polity, in fact even as a nation. Basing himself on written sources, including works of literature, he placed the formation of the Sealand in the third millennium - around 2500, on the basis of three main elements: his reading of a partly reconstructed passage of *The Legend of the Birth of Sargon* possibly about "sea lands" or "Sealand"; a Neo-Assyrian omen collection possibly referring to a *ma-a-ti A.AB.BA*, which Sargon would have crossed to bring back booty from the Levant; and a firm belief that the second millennium Sealand, being a separate nation with its own cultural identity and some military power¹, had to be the result of a long process of formation (1932: *passim*; in particular 4-10). Dougherty considered that the Sealand stretched along the northern and western (down to Dilmun) shores of the Persian Gulf², but also situated a large portion of it in the Arabian peninsula, which he saw as the logical route for Sargon after his western conquests. He also considered that Sealand kings had to control a very large territory since they represented at times a strong military power and were granted a place in king lists; the Sealand could hence not have been confined only to southernmost Mesopotamia (*ibid*: 24).

After an episode of Kassite domination and the short-lived second Sealand dynasty, Dougherty depicted a ninth century political landscape characterized by an alliance between Assyria and the

¹ For instance, Dougherty purports nascent monotheistic tendencies in mid-second millennium Sealand, on the basis of the use of *ilum* in royal names (1932: 25-27).

² His assumption in fact goes back to very early scholarship, as discussed above. However he extends the territory associated with the Sealand westwards, inside the Arabian peninsula (1932: 8f. incl. n.23).
Babylonian portion of Karduniaš. Both faced strong rebellion from an Arabian district of Karduniaš that comprised Chaldea and the Sealand, here understood as possibly partly overlapping territories (ibid.: passim; in particular 102-105). In the Sealand, a strong dynasty was founded by Yakînu, to which belonged Marduk-apla-iddina (II), who, in the late eighth century, was considered to have extended his rule from the Arabian peninsula into Sumer and Akkad. The Neo-Babylonian dynasty was seen by Dougherty as in continuity, either in direct descent or at least linked ideologically, to the Sealand dynasty founded by Yakînu (ibid.: 145). Dougherty hence viewed the Sealand as a nation enduring over two millennia and whose history was reflected almost exclusively in external sources.

1.1.3 Modern reassessments of sources pertaining to the Sealand

After assyriologists began distancing themselves from a more literalistic interpretation of sources, in particular literary sources, which characterized scholarship in the nineteenth and early twentieth century, the main conclusions of Dougherty’s research were no longer regarded as valid. It is indeed interesting to note that many later considerations on the Sealand do not derive from the discovery of new evidence but from a re-interpretation of sources known for several decades. But the assessment of their trustworthiness and historical meaning remains a delicate and contentious exercise.

In his work on second millennium chronology, Goetze posited that a Sealand king reigned in Babylon, otherwise the first Sealand dynasty would not have been included in Babylonian king lists. He assumed that this occupation of the Babylonian throne by a Sealand ruler took place immediately after the Hittite raid on Babylon, when the Kassites and the Sealanders were both likely contenders. The Sealand kings being however listed before the Kassites, Goetze inferred that a Sealand king occupied the throne first. Basing himself on known synchronisms for previous kings and on the reign lengths provided by the Babylonian King List A, Goetze identified Gulkišar as the most likely candidate (1957: 66). He estimated that, following Gulkišar, the first Sealand dynasty endured another 142 years, here again basing himself on king lists. As for Ulam-Buriaš, known from a chronicle as the victor of Ea-gāmil, Goetze argued that
he was a (Kassite) king of the Sealand who did not necessarily reign at Babylon but may have conquered the Sealand on behalf of his father Burna-Buriaš (1964: 99).

Landsberger proceeded differently and established synchronisms between Sealand kings and Old Babylonian, then Kassite kings; he suggested that the reign lengths attributed to Sealand kings in the Babylonian King List A have been adjusted by scribes to make the first Sealand dynasty match in length its Babylonian counterparts. He also purported that Babylonian scholars had probably fled into the Sealand at the fall of the first Babylonian dynasty, kept alive scribal traditions in the Sealand, then went back to Babylon under or after Agum II (after almost two centuries in his computation). Hence in his view the scribes responsible for the transmission of Sealand’s history in the Babylonian chronographic tradition were in fact Sealand scribes (1954: 70 n.181). Going further, Hallo suggested that the kings of the first Sealand dynasty "aspired to restore Sumerian traditions" in continuity with the first Isin dynasty and that they may have commissioned a first version of King List A to that effect (1983: 12).

In his succinct but informative entry "Meerland" in the Reallexikon, Brinkman presented the first summary of all sources relevant to the Sealand since Dougherty’s book (1993-1997). He reviewed available written sources in a chronological reconstruction of the Sealand evidence, beginning in the second millennium with the first dynasty known from king lists. He considered the Sealand to have been located in the marshy area in the extreme south of Babylonia. This was of importance for Brinkman who considered that the history of the Sealand was strongly determined by its geographical setting, and he identified the two strong moments of its history as coinciding with high-water phases that would have made the marshes inaccessible to conquerers, the first dynasty emerging during the Old Babylonian period, and the intense resistance to the Neo-Assyrian empire under Marduk-apla-iddina II. He also emphasized the strong association between the Bīt-Jakīn and the Sealand in that period, as well as a close relationship with Elam. For this review of the Sealand sources, Brinkman drew from his extensive work on the Kassite period; indeed, in Materials and Studies for Kassite History (1976), he discussed the textual evidence pertaining to the first dynasty of the Sealand. On the basis of discrepancies found in the Babylonian Dynastic Chronicle (or Babylonian Royal Chronicle), he assumed that the
Babylonian King List A was somewhat more reliable, including for reign lengths (1976: Appendix D). Brinkman questioned Goetze’s reconstruction of Babylonian history and chronology following the destruction of Babylon, for instance he considered by no means certain that Gulkißar reigned at Babylon; he also believed Goetze’s proposed chronology to be too high (ibid.: 104f.).

1.1.4 Archaeological evidence and other relevant contributions

Archaeological evidence that we could associate with the Sealand I kingdom is nearly non-existent, there is therefore very little literature on the Sealand I archaeology. Excavated sites that may have been in Sealand I territory, in southern Mesopotamia, present a discontinuous occupation that points toward an abandonment during the time of the Sealand I dynasty (Gasche 1989: 124-131; Stone 1977: 269-271); for the large part, the southern marshes were surveyed only very recently (Gasche 1989: 312; al-Dafar 2008: 229-230; al-Dafar 2015: 7-8). Excavations at Nippur and Qal'at al-Bahrein, which have each yielded very few texts dated to Sealand I kings — to the first and the last of the dynasty, respectively, do not offer enough material to conclude to more than an episode of control over the town (Brinkman 1993-1997: 6; Cavigneaux and André-Salvini forthcoming); the site of Tell Khaiber, near Ur, where at least one text dated to the Sealand I king Ayadaragalama (and probably more that can be attributed to that dynasty) was unearthed alongside architectural and other material evidence, certainly offers potential, but the excavations are still going on and only preliminary reports have been published so far (Moon et al. 2014; 2015).

The chronology of the second millennium has been and is still extensively discussed by scholars. One contribution certainly stands out: Gasche, Armstrong, Cole, and Gurzadyan (1998) reviewed in Dating the Fall of Babylon the available archaeological, textual, and astronomical evidence pertaining to the second millennium in Mesopotamia in an attempt to define the absolute chronology of that period on a more comprehensive evidential basis. Site stratigraphies were reviewed, of which none are well-established south of Nippur; however, shorter, incomplete sequences at Isin, Larsa, Uruk, and al-Hiba are documented. Therefore, the analyzed ceramic
corpus, in particular of the mass-produced goblets whose shape is considered especially time-sensitive, presents a gap in the sequence in the southern alluvial plain, apparently concomitant with a phase of de-urbanization during the late Old Babylonian\(^3\) and the early Kassite period. The authors considered, basing themselves on early Kassite goblets from Nippur and Tell ed-Der, that (late) Kassite pottery in southern Babylonia evolved in fact from northern Babylonian ware, not from a parallel local development (1998: 45)\(^4\); Armstrong and Gasche remain of that opinion in their recent publication (2014: 99-100). Also noteworthy is the fact that the authors considered unfounded Høljund’s hypothesis that some of the pottery found on the island of Failaka in the Persian Gulf would reflect early Kassite ware from southern Babylonia (Høljund 1989: 9-14; Gasche \textit{et al.} 1998: 8). The authors revised the absolute chronology, basing themselves among other sources on texts from Tell Muhammad mentioning an eclipse and possibly dated with reference to the resettlement of Babylon; they also took into consideration synchronisms with Assyria and Egypt. Their revised chronology resulted in a duration of the first Sealand dynasty of well below 200 years, from the beginning of the second half of the seventeenth century to the very beginning of the fifteenth (1998: 91; appendix).

The demography and the economy of the Sealand have not been extensively discussed since there were until recently no sources available, but it has been assumed by several authors that the Babylonian south was mostly de-urbanized and that significant segments of the population had relocalized to the north, including clergies in the context of cult displacement\(^5\). It was suggested that this came as a result of a drastic shortage of water engineered by Samsu-iluna (Stone 1977: 285). Leemans saw the collapse of the Gulf trade as a logical consequence of this process, which he assumed had begun even before the Old Babylonian period (Leemans 1960b: 26-27; 30), while others purported that an active trade between the Sealand and Dilmun or Failaka was probably taking place, or at least that a strong Babylonian influence is discernible in the Gulf

\(^3\) The apparent abandonment of urban sites is already discussed by Gasche (1989).

\(^4\) Interestingly, a similar theory has been proposed for the seal cutting technology by Nijowne (1999: 66).

\(^5\) For evidence on specific sub-groups of refugees, as well as arguments and discussions on the scale of the migration, see for instance: Gasche (1989: 139); Pientka (1998: 179ff.; 253); Yoffee (1998: 334); Charpin (2004: 345). The relocation of southern cults is reminiscent of King's early observations on the construction of shrines for southern deities at Babylon (1915: 197ff.).
islands at the time (Høljund 1989; Potts 2010: 22). Settlement patterns of the mid-second millennium Sealand have not been much discussed. Gasche reviewed in La Babylonie au 17e siècle avant notre ère the dismally scarce archaeological evidence associated with the late Old Babylonian period in middle and southern Babylonia, which mostly point to the (partial) destruction of urban centres at the time of Samsu-iluna, followed by a long period of abandonment (1989: 124ff.). Most recently, al-Dafar suggested in his doctoral dissertation that the region south of Uruk, Larsa, and Girsu saw an increase of its marshy area in that period, leading to partial local resettlement of the population. He identified, using satellite images and results of an extensive survey, nearly 500 (almost exclusively unexcavated) sites that would date to the Sealand I period (2015: 149). Most of these are very small, but he identified one in the Ur-Eridu region that is quite large and highly urbanized (2015: 158ff.). He also assumes occupation on a small scale in formerly large centres (2015: 138ff.). However, his results are based on a definition of diagnostic Sealand I ceramics that has not been published; these ceramics were apparently also found at Tell Sakhariya, near Ur (Zimansky and Stone 2014: 65). He contends that the Sealand occupation of marshy areas in that period is reminiscent of other such episodes in the history of southern Babylonia, in which the marshes expanded, thus transforming a place traditionally used for refuge into a permanent living space, and conferring to this polity the status of a shadow state (2015: 3); this is reminiscent of King's and Brinkman's deterministic views on a strong relationship between the power of the Sealand and its physical environment.

1.2 The new textual evidence

1.2.1 Text recently published (or identified)

In the previous discussion, I adhered by and large to the denominations used in the reviewed literature to designate the first Sealand dynasty and kingdom. Forthwith, the term "Sealand I" will be used to refer to it.
Dalley’s publication a few years ago of Sealand I tablets marked the entry into the field of assyriology of archival sources from this polity (Dalley 2009). These 474 unprovenanced texts and fragments, since the 1980s and 1990s in the Schøyen Collection (Dalley 2009: v), can indeed all be attributed to the Sealand I dynasty: several texts are dated to two kings whose names are known from Babylonian King Lists, Pešdalgaramesoš and Ayadaragalama, and Dalley’s philological analysis led her to conclude that the remaining undated texts came from the same period and find spot. This archive represents the evidential cornerstone of many results presented in this dissertation and will be introduced in more detail presently. In addition to this archive, a group of eleven new divinatory tablets, two of which are dated to the reign of Pešgaldaramesoš have since been published (CUSAS 18, 22-32), and one previously published text could be reassigned as a Sealand I text (AO 7539). George attributed this entire group of divinatory texts to Sealand I scribes on the basis of a detailed analysis of the orthography, the ductus, and the layout of the tablets, which revealed similarities with the Sealand I archival texts (2013: 131ff.). He also identified a group of eight literary compositions, other than divinatory, that can be attributed to the same scriptorial tradition: seven (CDLI P431311-431317), one of which mentions Ayadaragalama, are as yet unpublished (George 2013: 131) and one, an episode of the Gilgameš epic, was published in 2007 by the same author (George 2007). One administrative text dated to the last Sealand I king Ea-gāmil was found at Qal'at al-Bahrein; it is yet to be published (Cavigneaux and André-Salvini forthcoming). Finally, at the 59th RAI, an

---

6 The few legal texts from Nippur dated to Ili-ma-AN are technically Sealand I archival texts but they are the product of mid-Old Babylonian Nippurite scribes, who simply changed the date formula; the texts are BE 6/2: 68; ARN 123=NI 9271; UM 55-21-239=3N-T87=SAOC 44 12; PBS 8/1,89; also the still unpublished HS2227 (with envelope HS2226).

7 She noted that the orthography and ductus are related to Old Babylonian with some local peculiarities (2009: 13-14).

8 An additional group of thirty-two tablets from the same period and of the same type are in a private collection in Brussels. They are still unpublished but are abundantly cited by Dalley who had access to the copies (2009). In the present work, they will be referred to as Belgian Collection (BC) and their tablet number.

9 CUSAS 18, 28 appears to be dated to his accession year: MU [king's name] LUGAL.E (rev. line 15’), but George noted that the formula could be an abbreviation for any year of his reign (2013: 193 n.20). CUSAS 9, 32 bears a fragmentary date of the year count type which could be his twenty-fourth of twenty-fifth (line 4’).

10 The text was published by Nougayrol (1971).
unpublished Königsepos concerning the Sealand I king Gulkišar (HS1885+) was presented by Zomer (*forthcoming*).

To these texts, one may add the unprovenanced cylinder seal of one Ili-remeanni who claims in the inscription that he "reveres the king, his lord, Ea-gāmil" (Moorey and Gurney 1973: 71)\(^\text{11}\).

1.2.2 The palatial archive (of Kār-Šamaš?)

The texts published in CUSAS 9 are mainly delivery receipts, allocation lists, expenditure records – including for offerings to the gods, and ledgers; there are also fifteen letters. The palace (É.GAL) is omnipresent in the Sealand I archive, not only as an economic and legal body, but as a physical location, since its gates and its roof are mentioned: the texts present it as a locus of economic and diplomatic activity. It can therefore be regarded as certain that the archive, notwithstanding its unclear provenance, was the product of a palatial administration.

The combination of administrative and epistolary texts has been observed to be typical of small Old Babylonian palace archives by Eidem, in particular at Tell al-Rimah, Tell Shemshara, and Tell Leilan, where he noticed that such documents were kept closely together, in very few adjacent rooms (2011: 12). However, it remains questionable whether a parallel between the Sealand I texts and the examples cited by Eidem is admissible. Indeed, Eidem remarked that the archival combination of letters and administrative texts in small palaces was typical of the administration of precious resources requiring close monitoring and that the administrative texts dealing with agricultural products were kept in a separate location (2011: 12-13). While the Sealand I texts may have come from different rooms of one building, the letters certainly do not deal with precious goods, and precious goods in general are almost entirely absent from the archive. A combination of administrative texts and letters pertaining to the same administrative activities has also been observed in some specific palatial archives at Mari (Charpin 1995: 39). However, a parallel between the Sealand I archive and the situation at Mari does not appear easy

\(^{11}\) Glyptic will not be discussed in the present work. Several tablets published in CUSAS 9 are sealed: a study of the seal impressions and a discussion of how they correlate stylistically with Old Babylonian and Kassite glyptic is a desideratum.
to draw, since at Mari most administrative texts and letters pertained to matters unrelated and were found in separate locations\(^{12}\), the former having been left largely undisturbed by the Babylonian conquerers, the latter having been subjected to a selection and probably a relocation (Charpin 1995: 36 n.22; 39)\(^{13}\).

It seems therefore that while the Sealand I archive cannot be analyzed by direct analogy with palace archives retrieved in controlled excavations, for instance to determine whether it came from a small or a large palace, the study of such archives can certainly shed some light on general archival practices in a second millennium palace. That there was a relationship between some of the epistolary and of the administrative texts in the Sealand I archive seems certain: the transportation or transaction of various goods, which are the object of administrative texts, are also discussed in letters (beer, grain, oil); also, one letter orders the collection of the šibšu, a grain tax otherwise attested in large ledgers. It seems therefore likely, considering the situation prevailing in other second millennium palaces, that theses letters and some of the administrative documents were indeed kept together. There may have been a few separate locations involved, corresponding to specialized bureaus of the palace administration. Examination of the texts shows that there was probably a bureau of livestock, dealing with small and large cattle, including the reception of carcasses; perhaps a bureau of grain, possibly dealing also with milling at the palace and at a nupāru-workhouse; a bureau of malt and beer, either including or interacting with a giparu; and probably others dealing with oil, reed, and other resources (see Chapter 6). There are therefore chances that the texts, if they were not refuse material but still a living archive, were kept in separate locations in the palace, and one should thus perhaps rather speak of archives. For the sake of simplicity, I will nonetheless in this dissertation use the term in the singular when referring to all texts published in CUSAS 9.

\(^{12}\) Large administrative archives were found in rooms X; Y; 5; 110; 134; 143; 160. Letters were mostly found in rooms 108 and 115. Room 108 contained both types of texts, but serious uncertainties remain concerning the original recording of the find spot of several tablets attributed to it (Charpin 1995: 35 n.20). It has also been suggested that a few letters found in room 110 had been brought there by Babylonian troops rummaging through the archives after the conquest of the city (Bottéro 1958: 163).

\(^{13}\) In fact, the very function of certain rooms as archive storage before the Babylonian conquest has been questioned (Charpin 1995: 36 n.22).
Dalley discussed the question of the provenance of the texts, whether it was the capital or not, and reviewed various hypotheses. The gods, cult places and cultic activities mentioned in the texts led her to infer that the Sealand I kingdom included, at least for a period of time, Ur, Lagaš, Bad-Tibira, Uruk, Nippur, Al-šarraki, Zabalam and possibly Falaika, Dilmun, Kiš, and Sippàr (2009: 5-9; in particular 9); as for the provenance of the archive, she considers it most likely to be in the vicinity of Nippur (2009: 4-5). Examination of the archive shows that a town of the name of Kār-Šamaš is prominent in it: it appears as a seat of judicial authority and as a palace town, probably the very same which produced the archive, or one in close vicinity to it\textsuperscript{14}. While there were other Babylonian towns of the name of Kār-Šamaš in the Old Babylonian period, evidence shows that the only one that could have been in Sealand I territory was part of the ancient kingdom of Larsa, probably between Larsa and Ur; a find spot of the Sealand I archive in this area also tallies with other evidence of Larsean influence found in the texts (Boivin 2015).

Of the 474 archival texts, the large majority, 393, contain a year name. These year names are of two types: some are based on an event, some use a simple year count (in a fashion reminiscent of Early Dynastic practice), almost always without the king's name\textsuperscript{15}: MU (KI) [numeral] (KAM). The latter date type is similar to the date formulae of texts found at Qal'at al-Bahrein among which one bears the name of the last Sealand I king Ea-gāmil (Cavigneaux and André-Salvini \textit{forthcoming}); this shows that this manner of reckoning regnal years endured until the end of the dynasty. Only two texts are dated to Pešgalardameš, both of which used the year count system\textsuperscript{16}: they date to his twenty-seventh and his twenty-ninth year (years A and C\textsuperscript{17}; CUSAS 9, 85; 16), which must have been at the very end of his reign since internal evidence shows that the texts dated to Ayadaragalama followed without a significant interval\textsuperscript{18}. In addition to his accession

\begin{enumerate}
\item It appears in the same context of beer production (with the same maltsters and brewers involved, whether they act "for the palace" or "for the palace of Kār-Šamaš"). In all likelihood, the palaces are the same and the mention "of Kār-Šamaš" was simply often omitted because it was implicitly understood.

\item The name and title of king Ayadaragalama appear in text CUSAS 9, 111: MU Ayadaragalama LUGAL.E KI 7 (lines 11-12). See Appendix 2 for an overview of the year names.

\item This is also the case of the divinatory text CUSAS 18, 32 briefly discussed above.

\item I follow Dalley's proposed system for naming the years, using capital letters (Dalley 2009: 11-12).

\item The matter is discussed in depth in Section 3.2.1.1.
\end{enumerate}
year (year C: MU Ayadaragalama LUGAL.E), a number of Ayadaragalama's year names refer to events (years E, F, G, H, I, J and O can be reconstructed with some level of certainty), whereas two use the year count system (year L= 7 and year N=8).

Dalley analyzed the year names of the archive, none of which were known before, and attempted to reconstruct their sequence (2009: 11-12). Nothing in the prosopography and other contents of the texts seems to warrant modifications to the general sequence that she proposes, as long as we keep in mind that it is neither detailed nor definitive, but rather an arrangement of clusters of years: last years of Pešgaldaramesh (A-C), first year of Ayadaragalama (D), middle years of the archive during Ayadaragalama's reign (E-J), later years of the archive during Ayadaragalama's reign (L and N). The texts cover a relatively short time span of twelve or a few more years

Among the uncertainties surrounding the sequence of years is the position of years K and M. They read respectively MU GIBIL and MU GIBIL EGIR, namely "New year" and "The year after the new year", which strongly suggests that M followed K. Dalley proposed to view these formulae as alternative year names that were used alongside other formulae: she equates K with L because both have an intercalary month xii; and since L and N are of the year count type, respectively "year 7" and "year 8" and therefore must be consecutive, it follows that year K=L(=7) and year M=N(=8) (2009: 10-12). There is nothing in the documents to contradict this reconstruction, but the archive does not offer further indication corroborating it either. If Dalley's surmises are correct, the formulae MU GIBIL (=K) and MU GIBIL EGIR (=M) were certainly not provisional year names since they are both attested for several months, while their purported equivalents

---

19 For three of the year names attested only once, two of which are very fragmentary, it is not possible to determine whether they represent part of a longer version of another year name (years O, P, and Q). Year R is attested only once and uses the year count system; since it is the only one to feature "year 9", and that "year 8" (= year N) is very well attested, it may be a scribal mistake. Also, since years K and M are respectively read MU GIBIL and MU GIBIL EGIR, Dalley suggested that they are alternative names for other years, namely year L and year N.

20 There were in fact intercalary months in two subsequent years, year L (= year 7) and year N (= year 8); both intercalary months were even added within a few months since we have evidence for an intercalary month xii in year L and an intercalary month ii in year N. Such a measure appears quite drastic and, for it to be justified, one would have expected the grain harvest in year L to have taken place rather late in the (by then out-of-phase) lunar calendar, and roughly two lunar months earlier in year N. We have, however, evidence of grain tax collection in month iv for both years (CUSAS 9, 426; 431A; 432). If the relevant year names had not been of the year count type, it would be very tempting to conclude that they were not consecutive and therefore that a two-month correction did not take place between these two grain harvests; for the present this must remain one of the several unanswered questions.

21 Year K is even attested for every month of the year.
(formulae L and N) are both attested as early as in month i. It seems somewhat surprising that the same palatial administration should have used two concurrent formulae for the entire year. A possible explanation could be sought in different administrative habits prevailing in separate bureaus, but the archive presents no convincing evidence for a concurrent usage of year names\(^\text{22}\). It remains therefore uncertain whether years K and M were really coeval with years L and N.

A number of individuals are attested only for a small cluster of years that indeed seem to belong together\(^\text{23}\), other individuals are attested throughout the entire period\(^\text{24}\). But on the whole, the archive does not offer evidence that enables a reconstruction of families or administrative careers, which would help in sequencing the documents\(^\text{25}\).

If we plot the number of texts per year using Dalley's proposed sequence\(^\text{26}\) and considering all texts which bear a legible date, we obtain the following distribution:

---

\(^{22}\) Grain and beer are more prevalent in documents dating to Year K, whereas livestock is very present in documents of Year L, but there are exceptions, so that this distribution may not be of significance. Also, texts of year M do not feature many livestock deliveries, but the sample is so small that it is impossible to regard this as evidence.

\(^{23}\) For instance Arad-Šamaš who delivers sheep in years E and F (CUSAS 9, 18; 21; 22).

\(^{24}\) For instance Huzalu the malster-brewer who is attested in over fifty texts, (see Index in Dalley 2009).

\(^{25}\) One possible exception – though not very convincingly attested, is Taribatu, who is called once a cook in year J (CUSAS 9, 72) and the overseer of the cooks in all other attestations which all date to year N (perhaps once L), for instance in CUSAS 9, 312; 322-323; 325-330; and others (see Index in Dalley 2009). This apparent promotion to the overseer function tallies with the proposed sequence of years.

\(^{26}\) In this graph, the years K and M are considered coeval with L and N, as per Dalley's suggestion (2009: 10-11). Dissociating them would modify the distribution, but not dramatically, since the number of texts dating to year N is overwhelmingly higher than for any other year.
If we admit the possibility of distinct groups of texts raised above, the archives of the purported "Bureau of livestock and carcasses", "Beer bureau", (and "Bureau of grain"?) all show the same distribution pattern with a peak in year N, it is only less marked for the purported "Bureau of grain": this could indicate that the texts were all kept together, or that the archives of separate bureaus underwent archival procedures according to the same criteria of elimination and conservation. The curve suggests a living, active archive subjected to the pruning of older texts and a sudden, catastrophic stop of activity (Civil 1987: 46) very late in year N — there are texts dated to the first half of month xii of that year. However, the older texts do not appear to be any different from the younger ones: cumulative records are not more prevalent among the older ones. Choosing to keep a few records for the delivery of a small quantity of malt or of one sheep from ten years past defies all archival and administrative good sense. The most likely explanation is therefore that it was the accident of discovery, in this case in fact the accident of looting, which resulted in this distribution. The contents of storage rooms of the living archive may, for instance, have been mixed with tablets found in recycling bins or as filling material.
1.3 The scope and structure of the present work

The aim of the present work is to write a history of the Sealand I polity – political, religious, and economic, and is therefore by and large restricted to a few centuries in the middle of the second millennium, and to central and southern Babylonia. The discussion falls into five chapters. Chapter 2 discusses references, real and purported, to the Sealand I dynasty and kingdom in Mesopotamian historiography. Almost all relevant sources, king lists and chronicles, have been known for several decades and the present analysis is therefore mainly a reassessment. The names of the Sealand I kings and the formation and transmission of the two dynastic names, (E)uruku(g) and māt tāmti, are extracted from these sources and discussed. Because of its relevance for the history of transmission of Sealand I historiographic data, the chronicle ABC 20B is given particular attention, including its genesis and *Sitz im Leben*. Chapter 3 defines the geographical and chronological extents of the Sealand I kingdom. Sources are critically commented: direct geographical evidence is reviewed to establish the few cardinal facts of Sealand I geography, and indirect evidence, partly resulting from the present analysis, is used to identify additional areas likely to have been under Sealand I control; synchronisms between the Sealand I dynasty and other Babylonian rulers are discussed and the reign lengths of BKL A are tested on their accuracy. Chapter 4 writes a political history and the Sealand I kingdom from its possible genesis in the southern rebellion early in Samsu-iluna's reign until its conquest by the Kassite rulers of Babylon. Due to the uneven availability of evidence, the emphasis is on the first half of the dynasty and its turbulent relations with the late Old Babylonian kingdom. Chapter 5 examines religious aspects of the Sealand I kingdom; elements of two main panthea, the state pantheon and the local pantheon of the town where the archive was retrieved, are extracted mainly form archival sources pertaining to the state-sponsored cult; religious *topoi* in year names are also discussed. The information thus adduced is used to situate the Sealand I dynastic tradition within a wider Babylonian context. Chapter 6 examines Sealand I palatial economy; the analysis is partly functional and reconstructs the procurement, transformation, consumption, and expenditure of resources by the palace, and partly philological, examining several types of resources and types of transaction. The results contribute to our general understanding of agriculture and institutional organization and administration in second millennium Babylonia.
Chapter 2
The Sealand I in Babylonian historiography

2 The Sealand I in Babylonian historiography

Until recently, historians could rely only on Mesopotamian historiographic texts and other records of events as sources of information on the Sealand I kingdom. But while such sources have the merit of having revealed the very existence of the Sealand I dynasty, they have not yielded much historical detail on it beyond a few synchronisms between Sealand I kings and kings of the Amorite and Kassite dynasties at Babylon. The recent publication of a few hundred documents indigenous to the Sealand I kingdom, that is Sealand I primary sources, has emancipated the historiographic record from its most basic rôle as witness of the very existence of this polity and dynasty: the name of a king in several year names written on archival documents that were produced in his lifetime is much more convincing evidence than its laconic mention in king lists compiled or copied several centuries later. This allows us to question these sources at another level. How were the Sealand I dynasty and the Sealand I kingdom presented by first millennium chroniclers and compilers and how had they been remembered in sources available to them? The aim of this chapter is to examine chronographic sources about the Sealand I dynasty both as objects and as means of historical analysis. Of course, the reasons and manners of historiographic recording are intimately related to their own objects of interest, therefore the inevitable corollary to the questions raised above is the underlying, ever-present search for a better understanding of the events that took place, the people involved, and their time and place of action. For this reason, and also because historiographic documents yield information well suited to introduce the Sealand I dynasty, its name(s), and its rulers, this corpus of texts is discussed at length at the beginning of the present work.

The chronographic records that have kept traces of the Sealand I dynasty and polity are few but diverse in style. Without aiming at revisiting the typology of the Mesopotamian historiographic documentary production, for the sake of the present discussion the sources will be segmented as follows: firstly, documents whose main object of interest is to identify rulers and dynasties will
be discussed, they are called here king lists; secondly, documents recording compilations of
events and deeds of rulers, namely chronicles, will be examined.

2.1 The Sealand I dynasty in king lists

The Sealand I dynasty is represented in four king lists:
- BKL A = Babylonian King List A = BM 33332
- BKL B = Babylonian King List B = BM 38122
- DynKL = Dynastic King List (= ABC 18 = MC 3) = K8532+
- SynKL = Synchronistic King List = A.117

Three of these lists, the BKL A and B and the DynKL, group the kings into dynasties to which
they associate names. The shortest such document is the BKL B; it contains the names of the
Sealand I rulers on the reverse of a small tablet whose obverse features the kings of the Babylon
I dynasty. While reign lengths are associated with the Babylon I rulers, none are given for the
Sealand I kings. The BKL A, a much larger document, puts the Sealand I dynasty between the
Amorite and the Kassite dynasties of Babylon and associates reign lengths with its rulers. The
DynKL (ABC 18) certainly associated reign lengths with the Sealand I rulers, as can be inferred
from its overall structure, but the passage is too fragmentary to retrieve any of the relevant
figures. Only the names of the dynasty and of four of its kings are legible or partly legible. This
document also positions the Sealand I dynasty after the first Babylonian dynasty; a lacuna
follows. Finally, the SynKL is somewhat different from the other king lists in that it does not
group rulers in dynasties. Its purpose is one of synchronicity between the kingships of Assyria
and Babylonia, ruler by ruler, and their names are therefore listed side by side in adjoining
columns. On the Babylonian side, the list begins, following a break, with the fourth Sealand I
ruler; Kassite rulers immediately follow the last Sealand I king.

27 The line numbering of BKL A will be given according to Grayson 1980-1983: 91ff.
28 The line numbering of BKL B will be given according to Grayson 1980-1983: 100.
29 I consider this curious text as a king list rather than a chronicle, contra Grayson (1975) but alongside Brinkman
(1990: 77 n.21) and Waerzeggers (2012: 289). Finkel calls it a chronicle but notes its "dependence (...) on the
Sumerian King List" (1980: 70); of course, the genre of the latter text may also be debated. My decision of calling
ABC 18 a king list is based on the fact that the section of the tablet that is of relevance here only lists rulers grouped
in dynasties. Forthwith, ABC = Assyrian and Babylonian Chronicles (Grayson 1975) and MC = Mesopotamian
Chronicles (Glassner 2004).
2.1.1 The names of the Sealand I dynasty and polity

A first general observation is that none of the king lists makes use of the term Sealand to refer to the Sealand I dynasty\(^{30}\). In the three documents that name it, the dynasty is called (É.)Uruku(ga) and is not associated with KUR A.AB.BA or KUR *tam-tim*. Table 1 summarizes the attestations of the names given to the Sealand I dynasty and polity in the extant written evidence.

Table 1 shows clearly that king lists and other late documents follow different traditions when naming the Sealand I dynasty or polity. King lists transmitted the (É.)Uruku(g) tradition, a term also found in one contemporaneous and indigenous Sealand I document. In contrast, the authors of at least one chronicle (*ABC 20B*) and of an official legal document of the end of the second millennium followed the *māt tāmti* tradition. The earliest inconvertible attestation of this term is Kassite, it could therefore have been a non-indigenous creation of somewhat later date than the (É.)Uruku(g) tradition. However, there are signs that the toponym KUR A.AB.BA has its root in an earlier one, simply A.AB.BA. Noteworthy is also the fact that (É.)Uruku(g) is never associated with another polity or dynasty except Sealand I, while the term *māt tāmti* is applied to later Babylonian rulers and to an area of southern Babylonia, more or less independently of changes in its political status.

\(^{30}\) In this regard, Glassner’s reconstruction of the missing end of line IV 13’ (in *MC 3*) as "[(...) KÚR NAM.LUGAL.BI KUR A.AB.BA.SÉ BA.NIGIN]", that is "[(...) its kingship went to the Sealand ]" is unfortunate and, for all we know, entirely unfounded since the following line (IV 14’) indicates that the rulers reigned at "É.URU.KÙ.GA\(^{40}\)". It falsely suggests that the king list, in parallel to chronicles, associated the name Sealand to this polity. (The relevant passage is made up of two small fragments, K.16801 and K.16930, respectively published in Lambert 1974 and Finkel 1980: 79 no.4).
Table 1: Names given to the Sealand I dynasty and polity by type of source

2.1.1.1 The māt tāmti tradition

In addition to the few instances clearly referring to the Sealand I kingdom and using the morphology KUR + A.AB.BA or tāmti, there are a number of uncertain attestations of the māt tāmti

---

31 Pending the publication of the epic HS 1885+, its likely date of writing remains uncertain. Should it be considered a product of Sealand I scriptoria, it would be the only attestation of the term A.AB.BA indigenous to the Sealand I kingdom. The chronicle fragment ‘Fragment Concerning the Sealand’ in ABC p.192 mentions the KUR tāmti but not enough of the document is preserved to establish whether it referred to the Sealand I dynasty (see Section 2.2.2.2).
Two possible attestations stem from mid(?)-Old Babylonian documents OECT 15, 10 and 78, perhaps from the time of the southern rebellion, therefore before any other indication that the Sealand I polity existed. In them the term A.AB.BA appears alone, without a preposed KUR or any determinative; both passages are fragmentary and their context unclear. Text OECT 15, 78 is a very fragmentary document, possibly from Larsa, and it probably concerns land. In this text, the phrase LUGAL A.AB.BA appears on line 18' but the rest of the passage is broken, both before and after this segment, therefore LUGAL may not be a title but part of a personal name. In the ration list OECT 15, 10, troops of (the) A.AB.BA appear. The text is also possibly from Larsa, and dated to the first year of Rīm-Sîn, whom Dalley assumes to be the second of that name (2005: 3). On the basis of a parallel with other texts, Dalley estimates that these troops were prisoners of war who had fought against Rīm-Sîn II either along Babylon’s troops or independently (Dalley 2005: 5). However, in her study of the Old Babylonian bīt asīrī texts, Seri (2013) did not include OECT 15, 10 in the group of relevant tablets. And indeed, the Sea(land) does not appear in the contemporary Rīm-Anum archive at Uruk, where several cities and regions are mentioned as provenance of prisoners or allies.

Three other possible attestations come from administrative tablets from Dūr-Abī-ešuḫ, all dating to the reign of Abī-ešuḫ, therefore in the early days of the Sealand I kingdom. In one text (van Lerberghe and Voet 2010: text 1), allotments of grain are given to what may be envoys of A.AB.BA, according to a revised reading suggested by Földi (2014: 43). In another one, the term A.AB.BA shows up in the phrase "ĒRIN e-li A.AB.BA" (Földi 2014: 33, text Sem 1278, obv. 20).

---

32 One chronicle fragment uses the term KUR tam-tim in an unclear context (Grayson 1975: 192 no.2). Also, a lacunary passage of a chronicle fragment concerning the early Old Babylonian period has been tentatively reconstructed as tāmti šapli̇t and suggested to refer to "the Sealands" (Leichty & Walker 2004: 212).

33 Dalley considers that the passage refers to III-ma-AN (Dalley 2005; 2009: 1). I do not see sufficient proof in the text; the matter is discussed in detail in Section 4.1.

34 Dalley assumes this king to be Rīm-Sîn II because he has the divine determinative before his name whereas Rīm-Sîn I is considered to have adopted it later in his reign. Troops of Elam figure on the same ration list.

35 These attestations are discussed in more detail in Section 4.3.1.
perhaps troops of A.AB.BA. Also, an individual who took refuge at the fortress is said to have fled from (ištu) A.AB.BA (George 2009: 136; Földi 2014: 37 n.31).

Finally, in the unpublished epic HS 1885+ the term A.AB.BA appears in the epithet narāmti A.AB.BA of the goddess Ištar, who goes to war with Sealand I king Gulkīšar (Zomer forthcoming). Tantalizingly, the term A.AB.BA becomes enshrined in the name of a regional hypostasis of Ištar in the list AN = dAnum, this time also with the determinative KI; line 129 of tablet IV reads dINANNA-A.AB.BA:î: ia-bi-i-ītu (Litke 1998), which almost certainly refers to the Sealand I kingdom, given the combined evidence from the epic and from archival texts showing that Ištar was of great importance to the Sealand I kings (Boivin 2016a; also Section 5.2.1).

On the whole, the evidence suggests that if A.AB.BA was a political entity already at the time of the rebellion against Samsu-iluna, it seems to have then been very small and relatively unimportant. But if it were the case – and this is Dalley’s interpretation, it would mean that the name was already in use at the inception of the polity later called KUR A.AB.BA (at least by the Kassite conquerors). However, there is an alternative explanation for the presence of "A.AB.BA" in the two OECT 15 texts: the term may have been used to identify a region. More precisely, the expression may have referred to a lake or a marshy area simply called so locally36. The evidence from the time of Abī-ešuḫ seems somewhat more solid, although the interpretation of the term A.AB.BA remains debatable; whether we are dealing with the designation of a lake or marshy area

---

36 The semantic field of A.AB.BA and tāmtu is rather large. In a geographical context, it may designate "any large expanse of water" (Green 1975: 164), that is either the sea or large lakes (Horowitz 1998: 303). In addition, Waetzoldt points out that AMBAR.BI is added as a gloss to A.AB.BA in a Babylonian omen text (CT 41, 13: 10), thus equating marshes with A.AB.BA or adding the marshes surrounding a body of water to the semantic field of A.AB.BA (Waetzoldt 1981: 168). Also, basing himself on the duration of a journey between Girsu and A.AB.BA in an Ur III text, Waetzoldt posits that A.AB.BA designated a large lake located in the city state of Lagaš, closer to Girsu than the Persian Gulf (ibid.: 164-5; 171). Extending his reasoning to deliveries of fresh fish - hence delivered within a day or two, in Old Babylonian texts, he concludes that this lake still existed in that period and that there were lakes also in the vicinity of Larsa and a few other cities (ibid.: 169). Heimpel refutes Waetzoldt’s hypothesis of a large lake near Lagaš and considers that references to the sea and to sea-related work such as the loading of ships indicate that Girsu was home to a port accessible from the Persian Gulf via the Tigris from Early Dynastic times into the Ur III period. The deeper branch of the Tigris would have dried out during the Old Babylonian period, blocking the access to the Gulf (Heimpel 1988: 34). Laursen and Steinkeller show that GÚ-(A).AB.BA was an important seaport south of Lagash from pre-Sargonic times until the end of the Ur III period, establishing that A.AB.BA designated the Persian Gulf in that area (2017: Appendix 3). The term tēâmtu appears to have been fairly widely used to designate lakes or marshy areas since we find attestations at Mari (Charpin, Joannès et al. 1988: text 358: line 4 and note b), in northern Assyria (Horowitz 1988: 303; Elayi 1984: 76, n.8) and, from the sixth century, at Borsippa (Cole 1994: 95). Also, since the date and the context are uncertain, and in the absence of a determinative, we cannot exclude that we are dealing with a reference to the city of Borsippa, which was sometimes written BAD.SI.A.AB.BA.
or indeed of a political entity is difficult to decide. We also have to keep in mind that this evidence is not indigenous to the young Sealand I kingdom. But the use of the term A.AB.BA\(^{31}\) in the name of a regional hypostasis of Ištart associated with the Sealand I kingdom, and which has its parallels in other hypostases like Ištart-of-Kiš, Ištart-of-Uruk, and so on\(^{37}\), shows clearly that it began to function truly as a toponym. However, the date of this process is difficult to assess.

The distribution and evolution of the use of the term A.AB.BA suggests that we are witnessing the development of a new toponym, eventually leading to the preposing of KUR. Indeed, following the defeat of the last Sealand I king by the Kassites, we know that the region was called KUR A.AB.BA by the conquerors, as evidenced by Ulam-buriaš styling himself LUGAL KUR A.AB.BA (BE6405). It was incorporated into the Kassite kingdom as a province under the same name, with the addition of the prefix NAM: NAM KUR A.AB.BA\(^{38}\). It is not the only Kassite province to comprise the term KUR in its name but such a denomination was certainly not the norm\(^{39}\). The toponym KUR A.AB.BA and (KUR) tam-ti remained in use to designate contemporaneous geographical and administrative realities until the Neo-Babylonian period.

Considering the distribution of the attestations, and depending how we interpret the earlier evidence for the term A.AB.BA used alone, we have at least the following scenarios for the development of the māt tāmti tradition:

1- It developed internally based on an unspecific toponym used locally in association with the region where the first leader(s) were based, in the vicinity of either a lake or a marshy area (or the Persian Gulf). This name came to be associated with the entire kingdom later constituted by the same leaders, and was then taken over by the Kassite conquerors. In this scenario of a traditional name, lakes, marshes, or the Gulf need not have remained preeminent in the later geography of the kingdom.

---

\(^{37}\) They are grouped together on the fourth tablet of the god list AN = \(\text{d}Anum\).

\(^{38}\) This happens at least as early as under Nazi-Maruttaš since the term NAM KUR A.AB.BA is used in kudurru L 7072 (for a recent edition see Paulus 2014: NM 1).

\(^{39}\) The province names attested in both Kassite and Isin II sources are discussed in Brinkman 1963; for another province name comporting "KUR", namely KUR URU \(ir-ri-e-a\), see ibid.: 235 n.2.
2- The name applied to only one region within the Sealand I polity, presumably the last one to be conquered and most difficult to vanquish, prompting the Kassite victor to declare himself king of that region (LUGAL KUR A.AB.BA). Later, the toponym, still very much alive through its use as a province name, came to be extended and anachronistically applied to the entire Sealand I dynasty and polity in popular usage, influencing how this polity was collectively remembered. This process must have happened before the eleventh century since Gulkišar is dubbed "King of the Sealand" in a kudurru dated to Enlil-nādin-apli I at the turn of the twelfth to the eleventh century (BE I/1 83; Paulus 2014: EN Ap 1: obv. lines 3 and 6).

If one elects to interpret all early attestations of A.AB.BA as not referring to the Sealand I area, there is the lingering possibility that the name was not taken over by the Kassite conquerors but given by them. One can well imagine a mountain people\textsuperscript{40} giving such a name to a coastal or marshy region since larger bodies of water must have been of some fascination to them\textsuperscript{41}.

2.1.1.2 The (É)uruku(g) tradition

As for (É)uruku(g), Table 1 shows that it was in all likelihood a contemporaneous, indigenous name tradition, later kept in king lists. In fact, there a contemporaneous attestation of the term only if one reads ŠEŠ.UNUG as URU$_{14}$ in the letter CUSAS 9, 6: line 15. This is my proposed reading and it is based on the assumption that all attestations listed in the upper half of Table 1 indeed refer to the same term and are simply orthographic variants. It must be noted that the

\textsuperscript{40} Heinz 1995: 167.

\textsuperscript{41} The possibility that the term KUR A.AB.BA/tāmti was only retroactively extended to the entire Sealand I polity and dynasty for reasons of legitimation, to anchor the reign of a contemporaneous Sealand ruler into an ancient tradition, meets with serious problems. The potential candidates do not abound: Šimbar-šipak at the turn of the millennium, also Eriba-Marduk and Marduk-apla-iddina (II) in the eighth century are presented in historiographic documents as kings of the Sealand. Šimbar-šipak and Marduk-apla-iddina both appear as belonging to a BALA KUR tam-ti (commonly called the second and the third) in BKL A; Šimbar-šipak (and his successors) and Eriba-Marduk are called kings of the KUR A.AB.BA in the DynKL (resp. col. V lines 2-8 and col.VI line 6); Šimbar-šipak is presented as a soldier of the Sealand in ABC 24 obv. line 12. Another candidate, Nabopolassar, may have considered the Sealand as his homeland (Beaulieu 2002b: 114-5). But there is a powerful argument against such a scenario: indeed, Gulkišar is called LUGAL KUR A.AB.BA in a kudurru dating to the late twelfth or early eleventh century (see Table 1), well before any of the potential candidates could have engineered the creation of a fake history of the Sealand. Of course, the development of the toponym could have been realized in successive steps, first organically extending in the collective memory, and only later recuperated by a ruler in a more consistent historiographic scheme.
reading (É.)URU₄.KU₃.(GA)³ remains uncertain but appears at present the best solution, which can accommodate all known attestations⁴².

The DynKL is the only chronographic source which features É at the beginning of the name of the dynasty, in accordance with the contemporaneous source. The case seems similar to that of the dynasty of (Bīt-)Bazi, written with a preposed É in DynKL (V 12) but without it in BKL A (III 13)⁴³; the development of the form É + GN probably reflected tribal affiliation (Brinkman 1968: 158). If we have the same phenomenon with (É)uruku(g), the reference could be to the place of origin of the rulers, their hometown, not necessarily their capital.

The letter (CUSAS 9, 6) which contains the passage mentioned above does not make entirely clear what this term represents but it occurs in what appears to be an appeal to the loyalty of the addressee: (15) É.URU₁₄.KÚ₃i (16) i-na šà-bi-ka la i-ba-aš-ši : "Éuruku is not in your heart" or possibly "Is Éuruku not in your heart?"⁴⁴. It would indeed make sense that the term refers to the seat of power or to the origin of the dynasty, and by extension to the royal dynasty. Dalley tentatively interprets the term as "the house (dynasty?) of holy Ur (?)"⁴⁵. It seems rather unlikely that it refers to the city of Ur since this city name’s orthography had been long established; integrating the adjective KÚ before the determinative – within the toponym, would depart from the standard orthography.

Considering its name and the orthographical variance found in the available sources, the most plausible explanation appears to be that the hometown (or the capital) of the Sealand I dynasty

---

⁴² At the publication of BKL A, Pinches read the name of the dynasty "BALA ŠEŠ.HA" but discussed the possibility of a reading KU₄ for HA (Pinches 1884: 194), followed by King (1907: vol.I 70). As for the first sign, ŠEŠ, King suggested that it should be read URÚ and pondered whether Uruk was meant although he concluded that proof is lacking (1907: vol.I 70-71). The reading was still considered uncertain by Dougherty when he published his work in the Sealand (1932: 17). The case for a reading URÚ₄.KU₄, or rather (É.)URU₄.KU₄.(GA) was strongly reinforced by the publication of a new fragment of the DynKL by Lambert in 1974 in which the name is written É.URU.KÚ.GA.⁴¹. He suggested to read it "the house, the holy city" (1974: 209). The passage É.SES.UNUG.KÚ⁳i in CUSAS 9, 6, with the reading proposed above, appears to confirm what Lambert and others before him had suggested.

⁴³ In other documents, the toponym is usually attested without the É but twice with it in kudurrû from the late twelfth century (MDP VI p.42: i 14 and BBst XXIV: line 24).

⁴⁴ Dalley opts for the interrogative form. She also discusses the negation with lā (2009: text 6 notes to lines 12 and 16).

⁴⁵ She discusses the possibility that it referred to the capital of the Sealand I kingdom in 2009: text 6 note to line 15.
was not one of the large, well-known ancient seats of power of Babylonia for which the written tradition had established standard orthographies. The name is Sumerian in morphology and may reflect the actual pronunciation of the town’s name, with an unstably marked genitive (.GA). It may also be an artificial Sumerian orthography given to a purely Akkadian toponym.

However, if the name represents a by-name of a well-known town, the following likely candidates come to mind:

1- Girsu and Lagaš:

A possible location which could be referred to by (É)Uruku(g) is the temple district of that name at Girsu, known since Early Dynastic times and also attested during Gudea’s reign (Selz 2015). The name É.URU.KÛ.GA is attested in EDIII inscriptions as a by-name of the É.TAR.SÍR.SÍR of Ba’u (George 1993: no.1198). URU.KÛki at Girsu is also attested as the location of the Éninnu of Ningirsu and other sanctuaries.

URU.KÛ(G) also appears in association with the town of Lagaš. An inscribed brick concerning the building of the temple of Gatumdu at URU.KÛ was found at al-Hibā (Crawford 1974: 29). Also, in the "Lamentation over the Destruction of Ur", URU.KÛ appears as the location of what was probably a shrine to Ba’u in the É.BA.GARÁ (lines 22-23) and inscriptions unearthed at al-Hibā

---

46 Two additional possible cities were suggested by scholars in the past, on the basis of their reading of the relevant passage in the then recently discovered BKL A. For the sake of completeness they are briefly presented here. In 1881, Lauth suggested to read the Sealand I dynastic name "Šešku" and saw in it a reference to Babylon due to a parallel with the term שׁשׁך in the book of Jeremiah 25:26 (Lauth 1880-1881: 46ff.). But this term is an athbash cypher for Babylon (שׁשׁך), therefore not an Akkadian alternative name for Babylon. The other suggested reading, the one which came to prevail, was "Uruku" and it was understood to represent "most probably, another name of Erech-Warka" (Eastlake 1881-1882: 36); this possibility was again considered by King (1907: vol.I 70-71).

47 Lambert rejects any association between É.URU.KÛ.GA as a temple name and as name of the hometown of the Sealand I dynasty (1974: 209). In so doing, he rejects an association between the Sealand I capital or hometown and Girsu.

48 Various sanctuaries are identified as located in that temple district. See George 1993: nos.1085; 1121; 1138; 1198; 1309; 1314; 1323; 1344. A temple of Belili is also called É.URA.GARÁ (George 1993: no.1202).

49 URU.KÛ also appears on line 56 of the same text (Kramer 1940). See also George (1993: no.96). (É)URU.KÛ.(GA) also appears twice as a dwelling place of Ba’u in the "Lamentation over the Destruction of Sumer and Ur", on lines 117 and 161 (Michalowski 1989). In this case, it is unclear whether this refers to the URU.KÛ of Girsu or of Lagaš. See also George (1993: no.1198).
have shown that the É.BA.GARĀ was located there (Falkenstein 1966: 17; Crawford 1974: 29-30; see also Selz 2015). This has led scholars to identify Uruku(g) with al-Hibā, either designating the whole town or a temple precinct within it; of course, as an important precinct it could be used as a by-name for the city. Based on its association with Uruku(g), Lambert considered al-Hibā a likely candidate for the capital of the Sealand I dynasty (1974: 209-210)50.

The Sealand I documents pertaining to cultic activity show that while Nazi was prominent in the state-sponsored cult, her circle and other Lagašite deities were remarkably absent or unimportant51. This suggests that the ancient city-state did not have a high political weight in the kingdom52. Also, excavations at Tello and at al-Hibā have shown no indication pointing towards a rôle of importance during the late Old-Babylonian and early Kassite periods although this absence of evidence should not be considered a positive proof since the excavations did not cover all areas of the sites and the reports are often lacunary (Gasche 1989: 127-128; al-Dafar 2015: 130-131).

2- Ur:

As discussed above, Dalley reads CUSAS 9, 6: line 15 tentatively as É.ÜRIM.KUKI, the "House of Holy Ur". If correct, this would position Ur either as the capital or as a city that was of great importance to the dynasty53. However, such an interpretation would also mean that the dynastic name preserved in king lists is a corruption of the original reference caused by scribes who did not recognize it in later compilations. This is not impossible but appears unlikely.

50 Recent data indicate that there was a small Isin-Larsa settlement at al-Hibā, but no evidence for a large second millennium occupation (C.Reichel, personal communication).

51 See Chapter 5 for a detailed discussion.

52 It also speaks against an ideological identification of the Sealand I kings with ancient Lagašite rulers, unless one considers Ninurta as a strong indication of Lagašite influence, an interpretation that does not seem warranted. This goes for instance against Hallo, who, building upon and extending Falkenstein’s argument, surmised that references to exploits of Gudea were still understood in Old Babylonian myths concerning Ninurta, despite the fact that Gudea is never mentioned and that Ninurta had indeed replaced Ningirsu (Hallo 1975: 185; also n.26).

53 Dalley discusses Ur as possible royal centre of the Sealand I kingdom in 2009: 5-6.
A curious fragment of the Epic of Gilgamesh published by George (2007) could also indicate that Ur had a special status in the Sealand I kingdom. The physical appearance and ductus of the unprovenanced tablet have been noted by George to closely resemble those of the omen and other texts dated to or mentioning Pešgalaramaš and Ayadaragalama, it may thus be considered a product of the same Sealand I scribal tradition (George 2007: 63; 2013: 130). The extant passage recounts the episode of Eadu becoming acquainted with urban civilization but it contains enigmatic departures from the usual version. Besides featuring $d_{30}$ and $d_{40}$ instead of the expected Gilgameš and Eadu, it replaces five times Uruk by Ur ($šEš\text{UNUG}^{ki}$)\textsuperscript{54}, although $\text{UNUG}^{ki}$ also occurs once\textsuperscript{55}. His thorough comparison of the fragment with other versions of the Epic of Gilgameš has led George to conclude that:

The wording of the fragment is so close to extant versions of the Epic of Gilgameš that it seems incontrovertible that what we have here is a piece from an edition of the epic in which the names have been changed deliberately. The solitary inconsistency, Uruk for Ur in line 65, is important in this regard, for it reveals that a text with the expected proper nouns underlies the text on the tablet. (George 2007: 60)

According to George’s analysis, this fragment would therefore probably not represent the continuation of a minor, heretofore unknown tradition of the Epic of Gilgameš but truly be a Sealand I innovation, a local adaptation\textsuperscript{56}. Such an adaptation seems to lend weight to the hypothesis that Ur was an important royal centre of the Sealand I dynasty, at least ideologically; this would also tally with Dalley’s interpretation of CUSAS 9, 6: 15. George has put forward various interesting hypotheses to try to explain the strange variations in the Sealand I Epic of Gilgameš: one of them is that the substitutions were mere abbreviations (George 2007: 60), in which case no reference to Ur was intended, but other hypotheses would indeed present Gilgameš as king of Ur (ibid.: 61). The case remains obscure; it is further discussed in Section 5.1.1.

Archaeological evidence is of little help. Woolley’s excavations reports appear contradictory as to the occupation of domestic quarters at Ur between the Old and the Middle Babylonian periods.

\textsuperscript{54} Col.I lines 5; 12; 33; col.V lines 3'; 7'. The cases of col.I line 33 an col. V line 7' are somewhat less certain since the passages are very fragmentary, but the other instances are clear.

\textsuperscript{55} Col.I line 65.

\textsuperscript{56} Hallo calls this "ideological modernization" (Hallo 1974).
They offer both examples of continuity and disruption. Following a layer of destruction dated to Samsu-iluna, there appears to have been immediate rebuilding of the houses without changes to the layout for a prolonged period; on the other side, the Kassite houses do not follow the former layout (Woolley 1965: 77; Gasche 1989: 130-131). Recent excavations have not uncovered clear evidence of late Old Babylonian occupation (al-Dafar 2015: 132).

Al-Dafar recently suggested that the Sealand I capital could be the unexcavated Tell Dehaila, on the lower Eridu branch of the Euphrates, some thirty kilometres from Ur. Satellite photographs enabled him to conclude that it was a highly urbanized city, and he surmises, because of similarities in overall size and in the architectural organization of their main temple precincts, that Tell Dehaila was built as a new Ur, where the inhabitants of the latter resettled following a sudden westward shift of the Euphrates (2015: 168-170). Should this be the case, this would certainly lend weight to Dalley's reading and interpretation of the passage discussed above, since Ur would certainly be dearly remembered among the displaced inhabitants and royal entourage. However, as long as Tell Dehaila remains unexcavated, it appears impossible to validate this theory.

2.1.2 The names of the Sealand I rulers

Another information provided by king lists are the Sealand I rulers' names, some of which are known at present only from them. This information has already been summarized by others, including Brinkman (1993-1997: 7) whose treatment is still fairly accurate; however, the recently published evidence warrants some adjustments to the readings.
Table 2: Sealand I kings in King Lists

Only in BKL A and B the names of the entire dynasty are preserved. Table 2 shows that the names listed in BKL A are abbreviated, usually by truncation. The DynKL is very fragmentary but confirms a few names of the first half of the dynasty, two of which are otherwise known in full only from BKL B (Itti-ili-nībī/u and Iškibal). Similarly, the SynKL offers confirmation of king names of the latter half of the dynasty. In order to establish a comparison with what we

In addition to the evidence of king lists, we find the following names in other chronographic sources: both Ili-ma-AN and Ea-gāmil appear in the chronicle ABC 20B (rev. 2′; 7′; 10′; 12′), where their names are spelled as in BKL B; also, in another segment of DynKL, Damqi-ilišu is named as the head of a dynasty from which Šimbar-šipak of the later (second) Sealand dynasty was issued (col.V , line 3′); in this passage his name is spelled SIGS-DINGIR-šū, which is close to the spelling of BKL A. I chose to normalize the first element of the name as Damqi to reflect the most common spelling, thereby disregarding morphological considerations.
know of the contemporaneous orthography of Sealand I royal names, these attestations are summarized in Table 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>King</th>
<th>Contemporaneous attestation</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Ilī-ma-AN</td>
<td>i-li-ma-AN</td>
<td>Year names at Nippur: BE 6/2; ARN 123; UM 55-21-239–3N-T87; PBS 8,1; HS2227 (legal texts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Itti-ili-nībī</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Iškibal</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Šušši</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Gulkīšar</td>
<td>GUL.KIŠÁR</td>
<td>Probably part of a divine name ₄UTU-ana-Gulkīšar-kurub (CUSAS 9, 83: 15’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7? DĪŠ+U-EN?</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Pešgaldaramēš</td>
<td>PEŠ-GAL-DĀRA-MEŠ</td>
<td>Year names in CUSAS 9,16; 85; 407 (archival documents); also in colophon of CUSAS 18, 32 where PEŠ is partly legible before a lacuna (divinatory text)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PEŠ₄₁-GAL-DĀRA-MEŠ</td>
<td>Colophon of CUSAS 18, 28 (divinatory text)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Ayadaragalama</td>
<td>A-A-DĀRA-GALAM-MA</td>
<td>Numerous year names in CUSAS 9 texts (archival documents); also in unpublished CDLI P431311: lines 7; 12 (liturgical text)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Ekuruwana</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Melamkura</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Ea-gāmil</td>
<td>₄ē-a-ga-mil</td>
<td>Inscription of cylinder seal of Ilī-remeanni (Moorey &amp; Gurney 1973: no.23); also in year name of text QA 94.46 (Cavigneaux &amp; André-Salvini: forthcoming)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Sealand I kings in contemporaneous sources

As made clear in Tables 2 and 3, the evidence of archival and other texts contemporaneous to kings Pešgaldaramēš and Ayadaragalama shows that the SynKL presents somewhat more reliable

---

58 I understand as contemporaneous all attestations issued from the time of the Sealand I dynasty, even if not necessarily dating to the lifetime of the king in question.
spellings of the royal names than BKL B, at least for these rulers\textsuperscript{59}. BKL B features in fact orthographies which change how the name was realized and understood\textsuperscript{60}, and while it seems more faithful to contemporaneous spelling than SynKL in the case of Ea-gāmil, the type of discrepancy is not the same: the SynKL spelling of Ea-gāmil results from a simple change in orthography of the theophoric element \((\text{dé-a} \text{ is equivalenced with } \text{dIS})\), which would not change how the name was realized\textsuperscript{61}. I have therefore based my normalization of the royal names firstly on contemporaneous attestations, then on the SynKL, whenever possible\textsuperscript{62}.

I do not count as attestation of Ayadaragalama's name the inscription on the bronze circlet from Tell en-Nasbeh, which Dalley considers to refer to the Sealand I king (2009:1; 2013: 179-180). Indeed, given the attestations listed in Tables 2 and 3, her suggested orthography for his name, "a-ia-da-a-ra", would be entirely at odds with all other second and first millennium sources. Moreover, a reference to this king on such a circlet would be at best surprising historically, since, as far as we know, he did not make his way into the Babylonian first millennium written tradition, unlike Gulkišar for instance\textsuperscript{63}.

\textsuperscript{59} Indeed the DynKL features the final MEŠ which is also found in all contemporaneous documents while the BKL B has MAŠ instead. Concerning the SynKL, note that Brinkman wrote erroneously GAL for GAL in (1993-1997: 7). The sign GAL is plainly visible in Weidner’s copy (1926: 70); see also Grayson 1980-1983: 117. As for Ayadaragalama, the DynKL duly features the double "A-A" at the beginning of the name – as in the numerous contemporaneous attestations, while BKL B reduces it to a single "A".

\textsuperscript{60} It is interesting to note that the obverse of BKL B, where the names of the first dynasty rulers are listed, also contains one departure from the original orthography which almost certainly changed how the name was realized, namely e-bi-šum for a-bi-e-šu-uh. That name seems to have caused problems to later scribes; we find it contracted and emended to a-bi-šu in a tamītu-text (Lambert 2007: text 3c: 27) and written a-bi-ši in chronicle ABC 20B: 8. But BKL B is the only text which has entirely lost the vowel a and therefore the constitutive element abī.

\textsuperscript{61} Moreover, this discrepancy is based only on two contemporaneous attestations of the orthography of Ea-gāmil. In comparison, the orthographies of Pešgaldarameš and Ayadaragalama, taken together, are based on roughly a hundred contemporaneous instances.

\textsuperscript{62} Contra Brinkman who favoured the BKL B versions when normalizing the names (1977: 377; also in 1993-1997: 7).

\textsuperscript{63} The circlet is broken so that probably only the middle of the inscription is preserved. Any reconstruction remains hazardous, but Vanderhooft and Horowitz’s suggestion certainly appears more plausible since it finds near parallels in other inscribed objects (2002: 319ff.).
2.1.2.1 Additional kings?

The very existence of the seventh king DIŠ+U-EN? is uncertain. His name appears in only one source, the SynKL (col.I: 5'). But since this source appears to be fairly reliable for this dynasty, the addition of a king after the sixth one should not be rejected too lightly. Brinkman, followed by others, considers in fact that this addition is "not unexpected" since the reign lengths given in BKL A do not quite add up to the total indicated at the end of the section (1976: 429; 1977: 347 n.8; Pruzsinszky 2009: 100). But several numbers are damaged and are almost certainly, even when considering various possible readings, unreliable (see Section 3.2.1); it is therefore difficult to see confirmation of the existence of an additional king in them. Nonetheless, BKL A may provide another indication that there was an additional king after Gulkīšar: between this entry and the following one, that is between col. I lines 9 and 10, the sign AŠ appears, justified to the right of the column. It has been suggested that it stood for a missing entry, which would therefore match with the additional name in SynKL (Landsberger 1954: 69 n.177 & n.180). However, if we accept this interpretation of the sign AŠ in BKL A, there must also have been another king between Itti-ili-nībī and Damqi-ilīšu since the list features another such sign between these entries (col. I lines 5 and 6); this king, the third of the dynasty, would have been ignored in BKL B and DynKL. Also, both kings purportedly represented by the wedge AŠ in BKL A would have been disregarded in the total of "11 kings" given at the end of the section. If there was an historical reality behind this "AŠ" in BKL A, the unknown third king and DIŠ+U-EN may have been rulers who sat on the throne a very short time, perhaps in the midst of a difficult succession.

The reading of the name of the purported seventh(?) king DIŠ+U-EN?, based on only one attestation, is uncertain. Grayson has summarized the problems deriving from the low quality of early photographs and from the subsequent deterioration of the tablet (1980-1983: 116-117). Brinkman’s collation in 1971 led to the reading mGĪŠ-EN (Brinkman 1977: 337, followed by Grayson 1980-1983: 117); he later corrected it to mDIŠ+U-EN (1993-1997: 7)\textsuperscript{65}.

\textsuperscript{64} Since there was no other trace of that purported ruler, I have ignored him in the numbering of kings in Tables 2 and 3.

\textsuperscript{65} Weidner’s copy from photograph (1926: 70) appears to show much more than DIŠ or DIŠ+U in the damaged section, before the clearly visible EN. This was accordingly read x.KĀD-en by Landsberger (1954: 69). However, later collations have revealed that the copy contained many errors (Grayson 1980-1983: 117).
2.1.2.2 Akkadian names, Sumerian names

The contemporaneous writings of the first three kings of the dynasty indicate that they bore Akkadian names\(^{66}\). The name of the fourth king, Iškibal, is problematic but might be Akkadian\(^{67}\). The following king’s name, Šušši is also atypical, but could be Akkadian as well\(^{68}\).

Starting with Gulkīšar, however, all rulers except the last one assumed Sumerian names\(^{69}\). Whether the kings who bear these Sumerian names represent a dynasty within the dynasty is difficult to ascertain\(^{70}\). Other dynasties of second millennium Babylonia have mixed onomastica without apparent special significance\(^{71}\). It is true that Gulkīšar may be the only king from the middle of the Sealand I dynasty to have been remembered in later sources other than king lists (see Table 2)\(^{72}\); he is also present in an unpublished epic (HS1885+). His presence in such sources suggests that his reign was marked by significant deeds which earned him a position in

---

\(^{66}\) The name of the first king remains more difficult to interpret. Brinkman considers both its reading and interpretation uncertain (1993-1997: 7). Names with the general morphology DN(-ma)-AN are interpreted by Stamm as "DN ist (wirklich) Gott" (1939: 222); the name of the Sealand I king he normalizes Ili-ma-ilu and renders "Mein Gott ist (wirklich) Gott" (ibid.: n.3).

\(^{67}\) It could be interpreted as Išqi-BALA(-DN): The-reign/era-(of DN-) has been exalted. Admittedly, one would rather expect a stative of šaqû. Landsberger interpreted it logographically with the meaning "Verheerung des Feindeslandes" (1954: 69 n.175), apparently equating BAL with gērû, which may not be correct (MZL: III s.v. BAL).

\(^{68}\) It could come from the Š-stem of našû and represent only the beginning of a name.

\(^{69}\) It is important to note that by far not all Sealand I rulers bore Sumerian names as it has been sometimes sweepingly asserted (for instance Pientka 1998: 269; Richardson forthcoming). In addition to Gulkīšar whose name will be discussed presently: Pešgdarames and Ayadaragalama both refer to an ibex DARA or perhaps stag if ME is a variant of MAŠ (DARA,MAŠ). Dalley also equates PEŠ,GAL = A.A = aplu. Landsberger suggests for the former "Prinzlicher Hirsch", Dalley "Son of the ibex"; for the latter, Landsberger proposes "Vater, Steinbock des Landes", Dalley "Son of the clever stag" (Landsberger 1954: 69 n.175; Dalley 2009: 2); their successors' names, Ekuruana and Melamkura are respectively interpreted as "Bergsohn, Himmelszierde" (Landsberger reads the beginning of the name A-KUR) and "Glorie der Welt" (1954: 69 n.175).

\(^{70}\) The BKL B indicates that king Pešgdarames is the son of Gulkīšar and that Ayadaragalama is "ditto", that is either also the son of Gulkīšar or of Pešgdarames. BKL B has proved rather imprecise with the orthography of these names but this note on the direct filiation may be true since we find Gulkīšar apparently as deified ancestor in an offering list from the archive (see Table 3).

\(^{71}\) For instance the first dynasty of Babylon (Amorite and Akkadian names) and the Kudur-mabuk dynasty (Elamite and Akkadian names).

\(^{72}\) To the evidence of Table 2 concerning Gulkīšar, we must add one instance of his name in a non-historiographic text, probably dating to the second millennium: he appears in the colophon of a glass-making treatise (BM 120960; published in Gadd & Campbell Thompson 1936; see also Oppenheim 1970: 59ff.). It is almost certainly a forgery (see Section 4.7).
the collective memory and the written tradition. We could therefore imagine that an ambitious ruler, perhaps emboldened by significant victories, decided to assume a throne name which reflected the magnitude of his deeds both in meaning (Raider of the totality)\(^{73}\) and in form, by using the ancient Sumerian language.

This fashion for Sumerian names among the members of the ruling dynasty stands in contrast with the onomasticon of the known archival documents, where very few Sumerian names appear. Dalley examines the possibility that individuals with Sumerian names were mostly in high-ranking positions but the evidence is thin and contradictory (Dalley 2009: 13)\(^{74}\).

### 2.1.3 The king lists as historiographic documents: sources, purpose, and their treatment of the Sealand I dynasty

The evidence presented above shows that the king lists are not uniform in their recording of the Sealand I dynasty. The name of the dynasty presents more variations than one encounters for the well-established ancient centres of power of Babylonia. As for the rulers’ names, BKL A stands out in systematically (and specifically) abbreviating them, although the beginning of any name seems fairly close to the contemporaneous orthography, BKL B displays faulty orthographies for several names, while SynKL adheres closest to contemporaneous sources. This lack of unity suggests a deficient or scattered documentary basis, hinting perhaps at a Sealand I historiographic tradition not solidly established or transmitted.

This raises the question of the documents pertaining to the Sealand I dynasty that were available to the compilers of king lists. It has been suggested that date lists were used to compile king lists, the former being tools of practical clerical use\(^{75}\), the latter the produce of antiquarian interest (van Seters 1983: 69) or, as Oppenheim puts it, an "expression of the consciousness of

---

\(^{73}\) This interpretation was suggested by Landsberger 1954: 69 n.175, followed by Dalley 2009: 3. Brinkman estimates that the reading requires further study (1993-1997: 7). The name certainly sounds programmatic.

\(^{74}\) Zadok undertook an analysis of the Sealand I onomasticon of this archive. Since his aim was to identify non-indigenous vs indigenous names, he did not discriminate between Akkadian and Sumerian ones (Zadok 2014).

\(^{75}\) Glassner opposes to this view that some date lists encompass so many years (up to nearly 170 years) that their purpose must go beyond practical use; he sees in them "the product of genuine chronological inquiry" (Glassner 2004: 16-17).
Grayson sees date lists as the primary source material only for the early part of BKL A since they are as yet unattested beyond the Old Babylonian period; he considers the rest of BKL A to be a "running list" that was regularly updated (1980-1983: 90). Hallo, with regard to the second millennium, agrees that king lists derived from lists of year name but sees in them the result of an ideological exercise, namely "comprehensive overviews which pressed chronography in the service of ideology" (Hallo 1983: 11-12). Babylonian king lists indeed present chronography in an idealized geographical-temporal distribution of kingship, in a fashion similar to the Sumerian King List (Hallo 1983: 12). In this Babylonian chronography of power, kingship resides in a locality for a time, then moves to another one; the Sealand I dynasty found its place in this idealized framework and was presented with reference to its capital or the town associated with its tribal affiliation (Éurukug). The very fact that it was included into the Babylonian king lists tradition has been in turn understood as a sign that the dynasty controlled Babylon for a time (Goetze 1957: 66; Matthews 1970: 98; Brinkman 1993-1997: 6), that it controlled or strongly influenced part of Babylonia (Dougherty 1932: 23), or that it was the most stable power during that period in Babylonia (King 1915: 212). Considering the evidence available, one or all could still be considered viable hypotheses.

However, because of its treatment of the rulers' names, it seems unlikely that date lists were used by the compilers of BKL A: the names are systematically abbreviated, even if there is enough room on the line to write them in full. Comparison with other dynasties in the same document shows that this was not a general principle of redaction and it may not have applied to the more ancient portions of the list since the names of the Kassite kings, which immediately follow, are not abbreviated. Why systematically abbreviate these names and not the others? And not less importantly, why does BKL A also truncate two of the royal names of the Sealand II dynasty?}

---

76 Grayson’s argument roots in the fact that he includes BKL A in his category "A" of chronographic documents (Grayson 1975: 6). Commenting upon this category, he notes a strong stylistic continuity between date lists and late chronicles of the same category which suggests a continued compilation of lists with yearly entries. Such lists remain as yet unattested, however. This reasoning presents BKL A as a by-product of such historical record-keeping practices.

77 Unfortunately, the section preceding the Sealand I dynasty, the first dynasty of Babylon, is broken off.

78 Col.III lines 6-7: sim-bar-šī for Simbar-šipak and ṣad-mu-kin for Ea-mukīn-zēri. Marduk-apla-iddina of the Sealand III dynasty (Col. IV line 10) is not abbreviated.
The reason for this treatment of the names of Sealand I and II rulers is unclear but one possible explanation – and one of historical significance, is that the same damaged source was used by the compilers of BKL A, that is, a Sealand King List compiling the names of the Sealand I and Sealand II rulers, therefore establishing a direct relationship between the two dynasties\textsuperscript{79}.

The textual relation between the various king lists is unclear, beyond mere typology. Hallo notes that BKL A starts where the Sumerian King List stops (1983: 10). Grayson suggested that BKL A or a similar source was used by the compiler of SynKL (1980-1983: 117)\textsuperscript{80}. As for BKL B, it has been considered an extract of a larger list, perhaps BKL A (Feigin & Landsberger 1955: 140-141), which may have been lacunary, accounting for mistakes in the lengths of reigns attributed to the kings of the first dynasty of Babylon (Poebel 1947: 111)\textsuperscript{81}. Poebel noted that the compiler of BKL A had chronographic material relevant to the Sealand I dynasty at his disposal, allowing him to record reign lengths, while the BKL B scribe did not, he therefore considered BKL A to postdate BKL B (1947: 120)\textsuperscript{82}. While examination of the treatment of information pertaining to the Sealand dynasty does not solve the problem of the date of writing of king lists, it does suggest that BKL A, BKL B, and SynKL used different sources for this segment (and, incidentally, that BKL A was not used as source material for BKL B and SynKL).

\textsuperscript{79} This suggests a continuity of tradition, perhaps in Sealand scriptoria, presenting the rulers of the Sealand II as descendants of the Sealand I dynasty. This would agree with the relationship established between Damqi-ilišu and Šimbar-šipak in DynKL.

\textsuperscript{80} For the Sealand I section the source could not have been solely BKL A since in this document the names are truncated.

\textsuperscript{81} Poebel posits that the faulty figures found on the reverse of BKL B come from estimates derived from mean values used by the scribe to fill in the lacunary passages in the original (Poebel 1947: 110ff.).

\textsuperscript{82} Or at least this section of BKL A would postdate BKL B. His implicit assumption is that both BKL A and B are issued from the same milieu, although apart in time, and that sources becoming available were available to all scribes involved in the compilation of king lists. This appears a somewhat too idealizing and also reductive view of Babylonian scriptoria.
2.2 The Sealand I kingdom in chronicles

The chronicles and chronicle fragments relevant to the present discussion are:

- BM 96152 = *ABC* 20B = *MC* 40
- BM 26472 = *ABC* 20A = *MC* 39
- Fragments K 2973 and 79-7-8, 36 (probably belonging to same text) = *ABC* ‘Fragment Concerning the Period of the First Dynasty of Isin’ (*ABC*: 190-192) = *MC* 41
- Fragments K 10609 and K 14011 (Lambert 1990b) = *MC* 43 and 44
- Fragment BM 29440 (Leichty & Walker 2004: 205-207)
- Fragment BM 29297 (Leichty & Walker 2004: 211-212)

2.2.1 Chronicle *ABC* 20B

The Babylonian chronicle containing most references to the Sealand I kings and related events is a Late Babylonian fragmentary chronicle of ancient kings, probably from Borsippa, edited by Grayson as text *ABC* 20B. Because of its great relevance for understanding the transmission of Sealand I historical information, it is discussed here at length. Although much uncertainty surrounds that chronicle, it will be expounded that the text is almost certainly not the continuation of *ABC* 20A, that is was probably compiled in first millennium Borsippa from written sources pieced together by the chronicler with minimal rewriting. He weaved a loosely but accurate chronography of events, each of which centres on a legitimate king facing an opponent or contender. These events were probably selected in order to keep the scope of the chronicle on deeds that resulted in changes in the political landscape of middle and southern Babylonia.

The Sealand I dynasty is the only one whose rise and fall are recorded in *ABC* 20B, they are also the only aspects of its history that are recorded. If Sealand I royal propaganda was available to

---

83 The Sealand I dynasty is also indirectly referred to in DynKL: Šimbar-šipak, who is listed as belonging to the (second) Sealand dynasty, is called a soldier of the BALA of Damqi-ilisù (Col.V line 3'). The matter is briefly discussed in Section 4.5.2.

84 Waerzeggers 2012: 292-293.

85 Grayson considers it to be the continuation of chronicle 20A, the "Chronicle of Early Kings" in *ABC* (1975); Glassner calls the same text "Chronicle of Ancient Kings" (no.40) in *MC* (2004).
the compiler, which may have been the case, he discarded any events from the middle years of its existence, including the conflicts between Gulkišar and Samsu-ditana.  

2.2.1.1 The structure of chronicle ABC 20B and its relation to ABC 20A  

The text of ABC 20B spans from the Isin I to the early Kassite period and adheres to the chronology of events. It is so structured that horizontal dividers are drawn between sections, each of which is devoted to a specific king. The first line of a section is always indented and begins with the name (with title and/or genealogy) of the king who is the subject of the new event recorded. If we consider that this narrative structure and the formal arrangement of the text are indicative of the historical understanding of the chronicler, he seems to have considered the king introduced at the beginning of each section as the legitimate one at the time of the event(s) related. Numerous rulers are omitted but the chronicler loosely threaded a historical narrative that respects the chronology. Only the first and the last Sealand I kings appear in the chronicle, Ilī-ma-AN and Ea-gāmil. The founder of the dynasty, Ilī-ma-AN, is presented as antagonist of Samsu-iluna and Abī-esuḫ. The last king, Ea-gāmil, appears at the head of his own section, therefore as legitimate king, but in the context of being challenged by the Kassite conquerer of the Sealand I kingdom, Ulam-buriaš.  

The text comprises the following sections:  
1) The first seven lines pertain to a matter of succession in the Isin I dynasty, namely the death of Erra-imittī and the accession of Enlil-bāni (obv. lines 1-7).  
2) Hammurapi figures in the following section as the victor over Rīm-Sīn I, which made him the conqueror of Ur and Larsa (obv. lines 8-12).  

---  

See Chapter 4; also, Zomer forthcoming.  

This narrative contradicts the chronology of the tradition of king lists which precludes synchronicity between dynasties, but it agrees with its presentation of the first dynasty of Babylon, the Šurukug / Sealand dynasty, and the Kassite dynasty as being, all three of them, legitimate in Babylonian history.
3) The section on Samsu-iluna contains a lacuna because the bottom of the tablet is broken off but is nonetheless by far the longest. It begins on obv. line 13 and ends on rev. line 7. The intact portions of the Samsu-iluna section mention his foes Rîm-Sîn II and Illi-ma-AN.

4) Abî-ešuḫ dams the Tigris but does not succeed in seizing Illi-ma-AN (rev. lines 8-10).

4b) Between sections 4 and 5, written in smaller characters on the separating line, is an entry pertaining to Hittite troops marching against Akkad at the time of Samsu-ditāna; this must be a reference to the destruction of Babylon (rev. line 11).

5) Ea-gāmil, king of the Sealand, flees to Elam, after which Ulam-buriaš conquers his land (rev. lines 12-14).

6) Agum (III) campaigns again in the Sealand, conquers Dūr-Enlil, and destroys its temple (rev. lines 15-18).

Before further analyzing the text, the relationship of ABC 20B to ABC 20A needs to be assessed. ABC 20A and 20B are considered by Grayson to be adjoining parts of the same text; this is suggested by the chronology of the events recorded and by a number of matching lines near the end of 20A (II 8-13) and at the beginning of 20B (obv. 1-7). However, several elements speak against these tablets being two parts of one and the same text. ABC 20A has an additional entry about a synchronism between an Assyrian king and Su(mu)-Abu; this breaks the concept of the identical lines being catch lines that link both tablets. Moreover, it is certain that both tablets could not belong to the same copy of the text since the tablet widths do not match and the indentation marking the beginning of sections seems less marked on 20A than on 20B. This

---

88 Grayson 1975: 152. The remaining fragment measures 2.25 by 2.5 inches according to the catalogue of the British Museum but no photography is available, neither is a description of the cross-section provided, therefore the total length of the original tablet cannot be assessed.

89 The line count follows the numbering in ABC 20B.

90 This entry begins with ana tarsi, which constitutes a stylistic break from the balance of the text. Grayson considered it a later insertion (1975: 49). Given its position and phrasing, it seems very probable.

91 Van Seters, starting from Grayson’s theory that first millennium chroniclers were writing an official continuous chronicle of Babylonian history in the form of a series, extended the idea to encompass ABC 20A and B, placing these tablets as part of the same great endeavour (1983: 85).

92 The relevant passage in ABC 20A comprises six lines, while its equivalent in ABC 20B comprises seven lines.

93 It also features an annotation on "various battles" (lines II 14-15) which could be a colophon.
makes it at the same time extremely improbable that both tablets derive from the same text: indeed, one would not expect the transition between successive tablets to occur at the same point when the text is copied on tablets of different sizes. Two further reasons speak forcefully for separate texts and have been convincingly presented by Waerzeggers (2012: 292-293): \textit{ABC} 20A contains references to the theology of Marduk and passes moral judgements in its historiographic treatment while 20B is entirely devoid of any religious or moral interpretation; also, the texts have been shown through their acquisition history to belong to different sub-groups of the Borsippa chronicle corpus. Waerzeggers calls the sub-group in which she puts 20A the "Rē’i-alpi group", whose texts are characterized by a religious judgement of historical facts, and the sub-group in which she puts 20B the "Bēlya’u group", which contains chronicles of a fairly neutral annalistic style (\textit{ibid.}: 294-295). We can therefore examine \textit{ABC} 20B on its own, not as a part of a longer text\footnote{Most recently, Rutz and Michalowski also consider the texts to be distinct (2016: 19).}

\subsection*{2.2.1.2 Possible sources and their use by the chronicler}

In this section, the sources likely used by the chroniclers, in particular of \textit{ABC} 20B, are reviewed and assessed; the results of this exercise will then be used to reconstruct the textual genesis of that chronicle.

Having established above that \textit{ABC} 20A and 20B are two different texts belonging to different sub-corpora issued from the Borsippa scriptoria, but considering also that these texts contain (six or) seven identical lines (\textit{ABC} 20A: II 8-13 and \textit{ABC} 20B: obv. 1-7), it follows that some written sources were used by the chroniclers of both groups, or that the same oral tradition lies behind those lines\footnote{Oppenheim argued for an oral tradition contributing to the passing down of Babylonian historiographic information (1977: 150-151).}. However, the scenario of oral transmission seems unlikely because both passages are nearly identical, including in the spelling, except for one difference: in \textit{ABC} 20A, the scribe apparently tried to cram at the end of the fourth line of the passage (col.II line 11) some of what corresponds to the fifth line of the same passage in \textit{ABC} 20B (col.I line 5). The \textit{ABC} 20A
compiler must have skipped that line in copying from his source; his efforts to correct his error were not entirely successful since this clause in ABC 20A lacks its verb and the resulting text makes no sense. This is clearly not an error of memory.

The passage in question, represented in both texts, is a curious anecdote about the death of king Erra-imittī sipping hot soup. Its origin has been suggested to be a legend, which appears likely (van Seters 1983: 85; see also Grayson 1975: 48; Edzard 1957: 140). It could also have come from an omen since occurrences that we would consider anecdotic, in particular pertaining to the death of kings, are attested in omens: an example is the story of the stairs of a temple falling on Sîn-iddinam (YBT X 1 in Goetze 1947: 265)96. Be it as it may, if we consider the short Erra-imittī narrative as a segment of the texts into which it was embedded, it appears within ABC 20A as somewhat different in tone from the rest of that chronicle, while within 20B it certainly stands in stark contrast to the list of succinctly related war deeds that constitutes the balance of the text. The chronicler of the 20B did not adapt the passage to reduce it to the bare question of succession on the throne, which would have been more congruent with the style of the rest of the chronicle97. It was treated by the compiler of that annalistic chronicle exactly in the same manner as it was treated by the compiler of 20A, a religious and moral-interpretative chronicle: it was simply carefully copied.

It appears therefore that the scribes of the "Rē’i-alpi group" and of the "Bēliya’u group" were essentially compilers who assembled passages from existing sources with minimal adaptation, in a sense performing "scribal archaeology" (Rubio 2009: 156). This interpretation is supported by the fact that a few passages concerning the Old Akkadian period were taken nearly verbatim from omens (Grayson 1975: 46) in 20A. Since it has been shown that the same sources could be used for both ABC 20A and 20B, and that omens were indeed used for 20A, it follows that a

---

96 Cooper cites other examples of curious kings’ deaths in omens (1980: 99). He includes the Erra-imittī episode from ABC 20 as "being intimately related to the tradition of historical omens" (ibid.: 103 n.2).

97 Glassner interprets this passage and the rôle of the chronicler in a very different manner. He sees the chronicler as a writer and historian who, via the anecdote on Erri-imittī’s death, criticizes the institution of substitute king in reaction to events contemporary to him, and at the same time raises the question of the historical significance of the death of a ruler (Glassner 1997: 101-102). This interpretation presents the flaw of considering this passage alone, completely isolated from the remainder of the texts in which it appears.
compendium of omens could certainly have been source material for 20B if such texts were available for the periods of interest.

Another possible source is a putative chronicle, or chronicles, written as early as the first part of the second millennium and recording events contemporaneous with the first dynasty of Babylon. The existence of such chronicles has been fairly recently even considered proved by Leichty & Walker (2004: 207; 211). They based their argument on documents BM 29440 and BM 29297 which both contain, among other things, what indeed appears to be excerpts of chronicles about the Old Babylonian kings Sabium and Apil-Sîn. The authors underline that BM 29440 "is full of negative happenings", which certainly suggests a genre other than official royal communication. But the history of the texts is by no means clear and these passages could have been compiled (from early material) at a much later date. As for the Old Babylonian sections of ABC 20, Lambert excluded a "chronicle actually compiled during the period" as a possible source because so many rulers were missing (Lambert 1990b: 28). This is only remotely convincing since it implies that the chronicler necessarily tried to compile a chronological account including all (or most) rulers, as in king lists and some chronicles pertaining to the first millennium. This raises the question of the intention of the chronicler, which will be touched upon in Section 2.2.1.4.

A source most frequently purported to have been available to the first millennium chroniclers are Old Babylonian year name lists, or at least some year name formulae (recently Waerzeggers 2012: 292; see also Grayson 1975: 195; for an opposite opinion see van Seters 1983: 81 n.97).

---

98 The possibility that the entire chronicle ABC 20B could have been written in the second millennium is discussed in Section 2.2.1.3.

99 These texts are referred to in Waerzeggers as Fs.Grayson 2 and Fs.Grayson 3.

100 For instance, Waerzeggers does not seem to adhere to Leichty and Walker’s interpretation since she cites the case of the wall built by Apil-Sîn, which is related in BM 29297 and also appears in the king’s third year name, as an example of a year name used as a source for a chronicle (Waerzeggers 2012: 292 n.45). She therefore appears to consider the chronicle fragment BM 29297 to have been compiled at a similar date as the other Borsippean chronicles, in the seventh and sixth centuries (ibid.: 294).

101 Lambert regarded ABC 20A and B as one text.

102 The chronicler referred to here is the late chronicler (using a hypothetical earlier chronicle as his source).
This suggestion is based mainly on two passages: one concerning the damming of the Tigris by Abē-ešuḫ, another concerning the building of a wall by Apil-Sīn.

The damming of the Tigris by Abē-ešuḫ (ABC 20B: obv. 8-10) has been considered to come from a year name list (Glassner 2004: 46; Waerzeggers 2012: 292 n.45) but this interpretation was no doubt strongly suggested by the sources available to us. The damming of the Tigris is also referred to in a tamītu-text, a genre that was part of scholarly libraries in the first millennium. But also, there is certainly reason to assume that an undertaking like damming the Tigris could have found its way into other sources unknown to us, perhaps also through oral tradition (Oppenheim 1977: 150-151). This reference to the damming of the Tigris can therefore not be seen as a proof that Old Babylonian year name lists were available to the first millennium chronicler. In addition, the chronicle offers an explanation of the causes of Abē-ešuḫ’s hydraulic efforts: it presents it as a war tactic against Ilī-ma-AN, whereas this information is neither provided by Abē-ešuḫ’s year name o nor by the tamītu-text. It seems therefore likely that other sources were available to the chronicler, unless one posits that he interpreted and edited his material, which appears unlikely based on his treatment of other segments of the text. The fact that the damming of the Tigris is presented in another chronicle fragment as being commanded by Enlil, while Abē-ešuḫ’s year name o identifies Marduk as the god aiding the king in his task, also speaks against the year name as (only) source material, at least for that chronicle.

The other passage about Old Babylonian kings that has been suggested to derive from a year name is found in another Borsippean chronicle: BM 29297 (published in Leichty & Walker 2004: 211-212; for the interpretation of the year name as source material, see Waerzeggers 2012: 292 n.45). The passage pertains to the building of a wall by Apil-Sīn, an event also related in the

---

103 Grayson raises the possibility that a year name was the source, without concluding (1975: 47).

104 Lambert 2007: text 3c, lines 22ff. = CTN IV 62: iv lines 6ff. and text 3d, lines 1-3.

105 The event may be behind a passage of the late Old Babylonian hymnic-epic CT 15, 1-2 (Römer 1967-68: VIII 7'-9'). For this possible interpretation, see for instance Horsnell 1999: vol.II 260-261 n.94 contra Römer who puts the event during Hammurapi’s reign and the damming of the river as a strategy to flood northern arable land against the Subareans (Römer 1967-68: 20). In this passage of the epic, Ištar orders the damming.

106 ABC’s ‘Fragment Concerning the Period of the First Dynasty of Isin’ B = MC 41 B: col.I.
king’s third year name. As is the case with the damming of the Tigris, the year name refers only to the construction effort while the chronicle frames the deed within the context of a war. This would again put the chronicler in a rôle different from that of a compiler, which has been shown to be unlikely. It appears therefore that we have no proof that date lists were a main source of information to the chronicler.

Finally, king lists may have been used as source material for chronicles, including for ABC 20B, whether one considers them a genre separate from chronicles (van Seters 1983: 68; Glassner 2004: 38) or a sub-type of the same genre (Grayson 1975: 4). Indeed, chronicle ABC 20B and king lists BKL A and B (probably) begin with approximately the same historical period (early Old Babylonian) and may very well have been compiled roughly around the same time, in the seventh or sixth century (Waerzeggers 2012: 294; Grayson 1980-1983: 91).

2.2.1.3 Date of writing

It has also been considered that the chronicle ABC 20B was partly or entirely written in the second millennium. Cavigneaux and André-Salvini implicitly suggested a date shortly after the conquest of the Sealand I kingdom by the Kassites since, when referring to the fall of Babylon and the conquest of the Sealand, they consider that "the tumultuous and dramatic events were still fresh and known to all". They assume that from the reign of Samsu-iluna onwards, the chronicle seems "less dependent" on ancient sources (Cavigneaux and André-Salvini forthcoming). They interpret the chronicle as having been compiled and written with the intention of justifying the current state of affairs, the Kassite control over all of Babylonia, in particular the territories previously controlled by the Sealand I kings. The authors even suggest that ABC 20A and B should be dubbed "Tale of the Conquest of the Sealand". In their analysis, one of the means of historical justification used by the chronicler would be to establish a flattering comparison between the Kassite conquerors and Sargon (ibid.). But ABC 20A and B

107 It will be further discussed below since the enemy of Babylon is possibly identified as Sea(land).

108 Or in fact ABC 20A and B. They raise the possibility that the tablets were not part of the same text without taking explicitly position (Cavigneaux and André-Salvini forthcoming: n.39); however, the rest of their analysis of the text presupposes a view of both tablets as belonging to the same text.
have been shown to be – in all likelihood – separate texts, which excludes the parallel between Sargon and the Kassite conquerors. Moreover, Cavigneaux and André-Salvini’s estimated early date of composition of the chronicle is based on passages in ABC 20B only. But with 20A being in fact a separate text, there is no reason to suggest anything extraordinary about its date of writing, which therefore is more likely to lie in the first millennium like the other texts found in the sub-group to which it belongs (Waerzeggers 2012: 293). This in turn implies that the passage on Erra-imitti’s death, present in both texts, would have been treated in exactly the same way in texts whose first redaction lay several centuries apart. This seems far less likely than an integration of that passage in both 20A and 20B roughly in the same period, using the same version of the source text, and applying the same methods and standards of copying with regard to the adaptation of spelling and ductus. For these reasons, a date of redaction of ABC 20B during the Kassite period can be rejected with a fair level of confidence.

2.2.1.4 Contingencies and intention in the writing of ABC 20B

This survey of possible sources available to the first millennium compiler of ABC 20B has raised the possibility that omens, legends, second millennium chronicles, date lists, and king lists were used, but none of these sources could be included or excluded with certainty. Before exploring other possibilities, it is worthwhile to ponder what type of historiographic endeavour the writing of 20B represented. The eclectic juxtaposition of events recorded in ABC 20A and B has brought van Seters to suggest that the chronicler copied all that was available to him about the distant past so that "the scope [of his work] was dictated by the kind of information available (...) rather than by any special bias or plan" (1983: 85). However, while the work of the chronicler was of course contingent on the availability of sources, I do not think that this evident fact necessarily excludes some plan or systematic selection of information, especially since we do not know how rich this information was. But considering that a royal document like the Codex Hammurapi was still copied in the first millennium, I would assume that much more was known about the Old Babylonian kings than was included in chronicle ABC 20B.

---

109 As noted above, this view is implicitly shared by Lambert who considered that there were no Old Babylonian chronicles used for the compilation of ABC 20 because of the absence of several rulers (Lambert 1990b: 28).
Examination of the text shows that its geographical horizon may have been intentionally limited to middle and southern Babylonia and its thematic purview to deeds of war and royal succession. In fact, especially from the point of view of a first millennium Babylonian, the events related could be considered interior political struggles, namely a problematic succession and episodes of civil war. Was this focus on middle and southern Babylonian political history a criterion for choosing among the sources available to the chronicler? This would explain why of all of Hammurapi’s campaigns, the chronicler recorded only the war against Rīm-Sîn; it would explain why the only events recorded for Abī-ešuḫ and a few early Kassite kings pertain to their struggles with the Sealand I kings and kingdom; it would also explain why so much room was given to the Samsu-iluna section since he waged intense warfare against various southern rebels for the control of these regions.110 I therefore posit that the chronicler willingly kept the scope of text ABC 20B within the realm of middle and southern Babylonia. Admittedly, it is surprising that we do not find a section pertaining to a Larsean king between the Erra-imittī and the Hammurapi sections, Rīm-Sîn I appearing only as opponent of Hammurapi.

If my hypothesis on the geographical scope of the chronicle is valid, the fragmentary section on Samsu-iluna would omit his activities in northern and peripheral regions and concentrate on his struggles south of the capital. We find indeed mention of Rīm-Sîn II at the beginning of the section (obv. line 15), which must record events in Samsu-iluna’s years 8 or 9; the middle part of the section is mostly lost;111 there follows a passage of five lines perhaps referring to a battle against Ilī-ma-AN;112 the very end of the section pertains to a defeat of Samsu-iluna at the hands of Ilī-ma-AN (rev. line 7). The war between Ilī-ma-AN and Samsu-iluna may therefore have

110 On the importance of Samsu-iluna in chronicles, see also Section 2.2.2.1.

111 If my hypothesis is true, one would have had in these lines an account of the many battles waged by Samsu-iluna against the various southern rebels including Rīm-Anum in the few following years.

112 The passage is too fragmentary to make a coherent reconstruction possible but it appears likely that it alludes to hostilities against the founder of the Sealand I dynasty. We find on rev. line 2: [x x] DINGIR-ma- x [...]. This orthography of the name Ilī-ma-AN would be coherent with the other occurrences of the name on rev. lines 7, 8 and 10, and elsewhere, where it is written DINGIR-ma-AN. Line 3 does not permit any coherent reconstruction. Lines 4-5 are damaged but clearly mention a battle, corpses, and the sea while Samsu-iluna appears on line 6.
been given several lines of text and remembered through at least two major battles\(^{113}\), this would tally with the proposed geo-political scope given by the chronicler to the text.

2.2.1.5 Provenance of the sources used by the chroniclers

Possible sources available to later chroniclers of the Old Babylonian and early Kassite period, in particular the compilers of *ABC* 20B, have been reviewed above. They include sources that could be partly independent from the palace, like omens, legends, and perhaps early chronicles. They also include official royal communication like year names, to which we could add royal inscriptions. Especially when dealing with propagandistic, official royal communication, the provenance of the source becomes particularly relevant.

If we consider the last Samsu-iluna entry, his defeat by Ilī-ma-AN, it cannot come from Babylon’s palatial communication such as a royal inscription or a year name because those record only positive achievements. The same holds true for the entry on Abī-ešuḫ not succeeding in his attempt against the same opponent. Assuming that the damming of the Tigris was indeed partly or mainly aimed against his southern foe\(^{114}\), it is no surprise that this information did not find its way into Abī-ešuḫ’s year name commemorating the undertaking. But seen from the point of view of the opposite side, a hostile action against their resources that was successfully mitigated (possibly accompanied by a military attack that could be repelled) would certainly have been recorded and celebrated by Ilī-ma-AN’s entourage. Or the same milieu could have (re-)interpreted and presented Abī-ešuḫ’s undertaking as a foiled war tactic in official communication. It seems therefore either that these events came from a Sealand I royal source, or that they were written down in a less partisan form of record fairly independent from the palace on either side of the conflict. Applying the same type of reasoning, the information pertaining to Ea-gāmil and the Kassite conquest of the Sealand I territory was probably found by

\(^{113}\) The last battle recorded may have marked the conquest of Nippur by the Sealand I king, which we know he controlled at least some months from around Si 29.

\(^{114}\) See for instance Charpin 2002: 558 who interprets the hydraulic works as an attempt to dry out the marshes in which the Sealand would be located.
the chronicler either in royal communication from the victor’s side or in a less propagandistic form of recording\textsuperscript{115}.

Now, considering the entire chronicle, if the source material was mainly of propagandistic nature, the chronicler must have had at his disposal sources from all the dynasties involved, which implies that several separate sources from separate locations had over time been retrieved, copied, and perhaps partly compiled. We know that the chronicler probably combined sources even within individual sections: Samsu-Iluna in his section appears both as the victor and at least once as the loser. This implies a painstaking, surgical piecing together of very short extracts from various sources. If on the contrary we assume that mostly more neutral forms of recording were available to the chronicler, he was certainly able to work with fewer separate sources. \textit{Lex parsimoniae} would suggest that a scenario in which fewer sources coming from fewer locations are required is more likely. However, we need to remember that chronicle \textit{ABC} 20B was a member of a large sub-group of chronicles – of a "manuscript population" – as demonstrated by Waerzeggers (2012: 293), and it appears that a rich variety of information had been assembled by the Borsippian chroniclers (\textit{ibid.}: 295). Even if much of this information pertained to the first millennium, it seems certain that a wealth of sources from various milieux was available. We can therefore not reject the more complex scenario of a multiplicity of different sources as too unlikely, which leaves us with largely unanswered questions as to the types of sources available, their variety, quantity, and provenance.

2.2.2 Other chronicle fragments
2.2.2.1 Another chronicle on southern Babylonia in the early and mid-second millennium

The period of history covered by \textit{ABC} 20B was obviously deemed a matter of sustained interest by chroniclers since at least another chronicle, of a different style, was written about it. Two fragments, found in Aššurbanipal’s library and perhaps belonging to the same large tablet,

\footnote{The fact that the name given to the Sealand I kingdom in \textit{ABC} 20B follows the \textit{māt tāmī} tradition, a tradition which may not have been indigenous to the Sealand I, although we cannot be certain of that at present (see preceding section), could speak in favour of an official Kassite source for the Ea-gāmil episode.}
featured kings of the first dynasty of Isin on the obverse while the reverse of one fragment makes mention of Ili-MA-AN and the damming of the Tigris; the reverse of the other fragment is so damaged that no king’s name can be reconstructed (K 2973 and 79-7-8, 36)\textsuperscript{116}. Lambert suggested that two fragments pertaining to Samsu-iluna, also from Nineveh, may have belonged to the same or to a similar text, K 10609 and K 14011 (Lambert 1990b: 29ff.). These fragments are, as Lambert put it, "more flowery than the jejune chronicle style" (\textit{ibid.}: 34)\textsuperscript{117} that characterizes \textit{ABC} 20B. Indeed, the tone and language could not be more different. In \textit{ABC} 20B, especially if we exclude the legend-like first seven lines, we find only inornate, matter-of-fact diction: no adjectives are used, no adverbs emphasize the actions described, appositions are used only to identify protagonists (so-and-so, king of...). The fragments from Aššurbanipal’s library differ strongly in style: adjectives and (at least one) adverbs enrich the diction, we also find the durative used to narrate past actions, which is a literary device not used in the annalistic style of \textit{ABC} 20B. Noteworthy is also that the Aššurbanipal library fragments are more religious in style, sacrifices are a subject matter and actions are undertaken at the command of deities. In comparison, the topos of divine command is entirely absent from \textit{ABC} 20B.

These fragments are too small and damaged to allow for more analysis. Nonetheless, taken together with \textit{ABC} 20B, they make plain that certain events of the first half of the second millennium in middle and southern Babylonia, including events related to the Sealand I dynasty, were of enough interest in first millennium scriptoria to be treated in at least two very different types of chronicling undertakings, one annalistic and one with an underlying religious interpretation. Also, in what has come down to us, Samsu-iluna certainly stands out among the rulers included in such accounts. His presence in a few fragments could, admittedly, be the result of chance, but the fact that his section in \textit{ABC} 20B is by far the longest is also suggestive.

\textbf{2.2.2.2 Fragments with uncertain or undetermined reference to the Sealand}

\textsuperscript{116} K 2973 and 79-7-8, 36 correspond to \textit{ABC}’s ‘Fragment Concerning the Period of the First Dynasty of Isin’ in Grayson 1975: 190-192 and to Glassner’s \textit{MC} 41. This text also seems to recount the episode of Enlil-bānī and Erra-imitti.

\textsuperscript{117} In fact, one may add the precision that they are more flowery than the style of annalistic chronicles such as \textit{ABC} 20B, not of all chronicles.
A fragment dubbed ‘Fragment Concerning the Sealand’ by Grayson (1975: 192) contains a few lacunary lines in which mention is made of the KUR tam-tim and of an unknown king, Apil-Adad. The historical period and context to which the text refers cannot be reconstructed.

Chronicle excerpt BM 29297 may contain a mention of the sea (or the Sealand) in a very early context, the reign of Apil-Sîn. The passage has been read by Leichty and Walker as: (1) \([m]\) ḫonders, pil-\(d\)30 A ṣa-bu-\(ū\) (2) tar-ṣū-šu \(t\)am\(\)šap-lit (3) \(m\)im-\(m\)-la \(i\)-bi\(3\)-el-ši-na-a-tú : "Apil-Sin, the son of Sabu, during his reign, he did not rule any part of the Sealdands" (Leichty and Walker 2004: 212). This is followed by a few lines about the construction of the wall of Babylon by the king. The small tablet, inscribed only on its obverse, appears to be a school text from Borsippa (Waerzeggers 2012: 293).

There are several problems with the proposed reading of this passage. The photograph of the tablet shows a much larger lacuna on line 2 than what is suggested by the proposed transliteration, which therefore appears questionable. The expression tar-ṣū-šu would be very unusual, perhaps unique, since the term taršu is normally used with a preposition in chronicles, and elsewhere. Also, the syntax and the feminine plural complement of the verb on line 3 appear somewhat awkward in the proposed reconstruction.

The date of writing and the historical meaning are also problematic. Leichty and Walker consider the text to be an excerpt of an Old Babylonian chronicle (2004: 211). It has already been discussed that we do not know whether chronicles were written in the second millennium, let alone early in it, more than a millennium before any of the known versions were written. The passage is so short and out of context that we do not even know for certain whether it is an excerpt of a chronicle. The genre and date of (first) writing are therefore undetermined. A late

---

118 This fragment is identified as Fs. Grayson no.3 in Waerzeggers 2012.
119 From the web site of the British Museum.
120 The only undamaged sign is LIT. The preceding ŠAP is legible. The very first sign on the line could indeed be TAR, but it is by no means certain since only the top part is visible. The other signs are all very uncertain and the reconstructed TAM is problematic since it would look quite different than the same sign plainly readable at the end of the following line.
121 When used alone, it appears in the bound form (CAD T, s.v. taršu B b).
date of redaction would open the door to various possible explanations for this "lower sea" region, apparently the opponent of Apil-Sîn\textsuperscript{122}. At any rate, it appears unlikely that, should the proposed reading be correct, an anachronistic reference to the later Sealand was made since one would have expected the chronicler to use the (by then) received term to designate it: (KUR) \textit{tam-tim} or (KUR) A.AB.BA. I believe we can reject this interpretation with confidence.

\textsuperscript{122} There is a remote possibility that it referred to the Borsippean region. Indeed, the control of that branch of the Euphrates, part of the short-lived kingdom of Marad and Kazallu for a time, was hotly disputed until Sin-iddinam and even later (Charpin 2004: 87-88). The marshy region around Borsippa came to be called \textit{tāmtu}, the Sea, in the sixth century, some time before the end of the period of production of the Borsippean chronicles (Cole 1994: 95 n. 76; Waerzeggers 2012: 294).
Chapter 3
Geographical and chronological considerations

3 Geographical and chronological considerations

Because of the scarcity of primary Sealand I sources, this polity's geo-political history has been until now mostly defined and written in the negative: its emergence was surmised when a void had been left by others and its location posited more or less because there was nowhere else it could be. The new material which has become available to us with the publication of Sealand I archival and literary texts in CUSAS 9 and 10 does not yield much definite, positive evidence on the geography of the kingdom or on the chronology of the dynasty but there are nonetheless enough new indications to warrant a reassessment of the sources. A survey conducted by the Iraqi Department of Antiquities in 2003-2009 and the use of satellite images may also bring new evidence for the location and extent of the kingdom by attesting where sites were occupied during that period (al-Dafar 2015: 7ff.).

3.1 Geographical evidence
3.1.1 Positive evidence of the Sealand I presence in Babylonia

Textual evidence of Sealand I territorial control is very scarce but the little we have does confirm that this kingdom occupied at least part of the territory lost by Babylon under Samsu-iluna. Sources show also that some of it was disputed for more than a generation between the new neighbours, as will be discussed in the next chapter. Our knowledge of the Sealand I geography remains fragmentary since almost all relevant sources are either unprovenanced or of later date, but we have direct proof of Sealand I control from at least three archaeological excavations\(^\text{123}\): five texts and one envelope\(^\text{124}\) from Nippur covering a period of slightly over fourteen months.

\(^{123}\) Also, excavations at the site of Tell Abu Thahab, near Ur, is said to have produced a Sealand I archive (al-Dafar 2015: 139 and personal communication from him).

\(^{124}\) Published: BE 6/2:68; ARN 123=\text{Ni} 9271; UM 55-21-239=3N-T87=SAOC 44 12; PBS 8/1,89; unpublished: HS2227 with envelope HS2226. See also Brinkman 1993-1997: 6.
are dated to the first ruler Ilī-ma-AN (from 16.vii.Ilī 1 to 24.ix.Ilī 2)\(^{125}\); at least one text dated to Ayadaragalama (year Aa 1) was found at Tell Khaiber\(^{126}\); and one text from Qal‘at al-Bahrain is dated to the last ruler Ea-gāmil (year Eg 4)\(^{127}\). We know therefore for certain that Sealand I rulers controlled Nippur briefly at the beginning of the dynasty, the southern Euphrates area near Ur around the middle of it\(^{128}\), and Dilmun at the end of the dynasty – also implying that the Sealand I kingdom possessed a maritime access to the Persian Gulf on the mainland. These are the cardinal facts of Sealand I geography as it is known to us from the textual sources available today.

Contemporaneous evidence also indicates that the town of Udannu was at times part of the Sealand I kingdom and was of some importance for it\(^{129}\). Indeed, Ammī-ditāna's thirty-seventh year name informs us that he destroyed the wall of EZENxSIG\(^{7}\)ki, perhaps read Udinim (Horsnell 1999: vol.II 319 n.176; Groneberg 1980: 244), which had been built by (the third Sealand I king) Damqi-ilīšu. The reading of EZENxSIG\(^{7}\)ki and the identification of the town have been much debated\(^{130}\); Beaulieu suggested that Old Babylonian EZENxSIG\(^{7}\)ki, with a double name Kisig(a)/Ud(i)nim, was strongly associated with later Udannu, either being the same town or separate towns, the cults of the former having been transferred to the latter (1992b: 419). Udannu, written syllabically, is attested in one Sealand I archival document dated to the reign of Ayadaragalama as a town which the king is about to visit (CUSAS 9, 101). If the towns are one and the same, the joint evidence from Ammī-ditāna's year name and from document CUSAS 9, 101 shows that it

\(^{125}\) This includes the unpublished HS2227 (and envelope HS2226) dated to 19.ix.Ilī 1 (personal communication from Manfred Krebernik).

\(^{126}\) The text (tablet 3064.67) apparently bears a full year name corresponding to the first year of Ayadaragalama, as per the excavation report; a small number of other texts apparently date to the same period (Moon et al. 2015: 2). They are still unpublished.

\(^{127}\) Text QA 94.46 in Cavigneaux & André-Salvini forthcoming.

\(^{128}\) Since the excavations at Tell Khaiber have also unearthed one text dated to Hammurapi, and the building in which all texts were found is considered by the excavators to have been used without interruption (http://www.urarchaeology.org/babylonian-public-building-at-tell-khaiber), the odds are that the Sealand I rulers controlled this area from early on.

\(^{129}\) Udannu was not the only stretch of land to be disputed between Babylon and the Sealand I kingdom since Nippur, taken from Samsu-iluna by Ilī-ma-AN, was not held long by the Sealand I king(s). A chronology of events is proposed in Section 4.3.1.

\(^{130}\) See Horsnell for a summary of hypotheses and literature (op.cit.).
was of some strategic importance since it was disputed between the neighbouring states. The location of Udannu is unknown but Neo-Babylonian evidence suggests that it was probably on the Euphrates, not far from Uruk, possibly also not very far from Larsa (Beaulieu 1992b: 402; 409; 411).

It has also been shown that the town of Kār-Šamaš, which is very present in the archive as a palace town and, once, as a seat of judicial authority (CUSAS 9, 7), was probably the very same which produced the archive, or one very close to it. This Kār-Šamaš was, in all likelihood, a town also known from Old Babylonian evidence and very probably located between Larsa and Ur (Boivin 2015; see also Section 6.3.4.1.1).

In the absence of royal inscriptions or other archives, this is the full extent of the positive evidence for Sealand I territorial control known at present.

### 3.1.2 Indirect evidence on the Sealand I geography

Other sources requiring more interpretation are also suggestive of the geography of the Sealand I territory but remain less solid indicators than dated texts retrieved in scientific excavations. This indirect evidence, some of which results from the present analysis, includes: 1- the damming of the Tigris by Abī-ešuḫ; 2- the prominence of the goddess Nazi combined with the absence of her entourage in the state pantheon at the time of Ayadaragama; 3- the reference to Gulkišar in a kudurru dating to Enlil-nādin-apli; 4- the capture of travelling Ešnummeans by Sealand I officials at the time of Ayadaragama; 5- administrative practices reminiscent of those of the earlier Larsean kingdom at the time of Ayadaragama; 6- the prominence of Ea in the state pantheon at

---

131 The relative importance of Udannu in the Sealand I kingdom and the probable proximity between it and the find spot of the archive are also strongly suggested by the cult of Lugal-irra and Nin-Eanna in the Sealand I archive as well as the presence of personal names with the theophoric element 4IGLDU (see Chapter 5).

132 A cylinder seal of one Ili-remeanni, "who reveres the king, his lord, Ea-gamil", and must therefore have belonged to a subject, perhaps a servant, of the last Sealand I king, is unprovenanced but the fact that Ili-remeanni was a "servant of Enil and of Nin-Eanna" is in continuity with the evidence on the Sealand I state pantheon that we have from the time of Pešgaldaramel and of Ayadaragama (See Chapter 5); therefore, it does not give us any additional information on the Sealand I geography.
the time of Ayadaragalama; 7- the evidence for occupation in southern Babylonia in what may be the late Old Babylonian and the early Middle Babylonian period\textsuperscript{133}.

Evidence on the geography of the later region called the Sea(land) will not be discussed here since its extent need not correspond with that of the Sealand I kingdom. One may note, however, that the location of the Kassite province NAM (KUR) A.AB.BA, closest in time to the independent kingdom, seems to roughly confirm most indications on the Sealand I geography: according to a number of kudurrū, it lay in the extreme Babylonian south, bordering on the Euphrates and the Tigris, and it included Uruk and at times Larsa and Ur (Paulus 2014: 193).

3.1.2.1 The lower Tigris

If we accept the account given in chronicle ABC 20B, the damming of the Tigris commemorated in Abī-ešuḫ's year name o was directed against Ilī-ma-AN: this suggests that the nascent polity depended heavily on the Tigris for its water supply. We do not have any other information contemporaneous with Ilī-ma-AN to substantiate this, but a later source, a kudurru, refers to the involvement of Gulkišar in granting land located along the Tigris. In addition, a few indications pointing towards the Tigris being in Sealand I territory may be found in documents from the middle of the dynasty: the prominence of Nazi in the state pantheon and the capture of Ešnunneans by Sealand I officials. These sources are discussed presently.

The kudurru BE I/1 83, dating to the fourth year of the Isin II ruler Enlil-nādin-apli at the beginning of the eleventh century, states that a parcel of disputed land located along the Tigris in the province of Bīt-Sin-māgir had originally been donated by "Gulkišar, king of the Sealand, to Nazi, his lady" (obv. 3-4)\textsuperscript{134}. This would mean that the Sealand I kingdom extended to an area along the southern Tigris in the period preceding the reigns of Pešgaldarameš and Ayadaragalama. The source dates of course centuries after the alleged donation; in fact a time

\textsuperscript{133} The fact that a scribe declared himself "scribe of Marduk, man of Babylon" in the glass-making treatise BM 120960 dated to Gulkišar could suggest control of Babylon, but the text is probably of much later date and its colophon a forgery that was aimed at suggesting antiquity of the Babylonian glass-making lore (Oppenheim 1970: 62).

\textsuperscript{134} For a recent edition, see Paulus 2014: 521.
span – an erroneous one – is given in the text. Despite the wrong reckoning of years, the question remains why Gulkišar was named in the context of this plot of land. Even if the claim is entirely fictitious and no ancient deed existed, Enlil-nādin-apli, in order to give more authority to his confirmation of the land donation, must have called on the name of a ruler once considered legitimate and still well remembered in that area. The odds are therefore that the Sealand I king indeed ruled over the southernmost stretch of the Tigris, around the junction of what would later become the provinces of the Sealand and Bīt-Sīn-māgir.

The claim made in the kudurru seems also cogent with a fairly prominent place given to Nazi in the state pantheon during the reigns of Gulkišar's descendants, when the cult of Nazi enjoyed significant sponsorship by the palace. However, in these documents the goddess appears alone, without her retinue, which seems to reflect a control over parts of the ancient city-state of Lagaš by the Sealand I kings, but without that region being of foremost importance in the kingdom, at least at the time of Ayadaragalama135.

In that period Girsu and the environing region received their water from the Tigris. Gasche et al. established that the old Lagaš branch of the Tigris must have remained active at least into Samsuiluna's reign since Girsu and Lagaš could not have received much water from the Euphrates due to their relative elevation (2007: 61). We know that an important canal from the Tigris toward the Girsu area had been dug out by Rîm-Sîn I, probably in reaction to Šin-muballit's damming or diverting water from the Iturungal branch of the Euphrates (Renger 1970: 78)136. Textual evidence could also suggest that the Lagaš area was irrigated from the Tigris under Hammurapi137: in a letter concerning the collection of taxes (AbB 2,30: 7), an area presumably adjacent to Bad-Tibira was named the "Tigris(-bank)". Naming this area, which must lie east of Bad-Tibira, after the river could indicate that it was dependent on it. If we assume that this situation perdured in subsequent years, the damming of the Tigris by Abī-ešuḫ could be

135 See Chapter 5 for a detailed analysis.

136 It may not have been the first time: Enmetena apparently built a feeder canal for the Lagaš region off the Tigris because of the conflict with Umma (Adams 1981: 134).

137 This is assumed by Renger, who noted that Hammurapi concentrated his hydraulic efforts on the south-western area, fed by the Euphrates, after his conquest of Larsa (1970: 78).
consistent with a Sealand I presence in the Nina, Girsu, and/or Lagaš area at the beginning of the dynasty. Depending how how one reconstructs the course of the Tigris, and especially if one adheres to Steinkeller's reconstruction, a larger area of southern Babylonia could have been watered by the Tigris (2001; Gasche, Tanret, Cole, and Verhoeven 2002: 541); for a contrasting opinion, see Stone 2003; Hritz 2010.

Another element that may indirectly refer to the Tigris comes from a letter belonging to the archive published in CUSAS 9, therefore almost certainly dating to the later years of Pešgaldarameš or the early years of Ayadaragalama: CUSAS 9, 3. The missive was sent by the official Nűr-Ba’u to his superior, informing him that Ešnunneans travelling by boat were detained and questioned on their itinerary. The author of the letter concludes by asking for instructions concerning his detainees. Since the two towns, Quppat-^{d}NIN.GAL(ki) and Tugi(ki), named by the questioned Ešnunneans as their journey’s end appear elsewhere in the archive, we know that they were bound for Sealand I destinations, although the location of these towns is unknown. Travellers journeying from Ešnunna by boat must have transited by the Tigris when leaving the Diyala, but whether their journey continued on the Tigris or on a canal branching off it is impossible to say. Dalley suggested that the theophoric element Ba’u in the official’s name connects him with Lagaš (2009: 21 n.3); the archive does not offer further prosopographical

138 Dalley suggests that the letter was sent from a governor to the king (2009: 21 notes). In this archive, some letters use the Old Babylonian, others the Middle Babylonian opening (Dalley 2009: 19). This letter is of the latter type; lines 1-4 are: ana di-na-ni be-li-ia / a-na-a-ku lu-ul-lik / um-ma nu-úr-štba-ú / Ir-ka-ma.


141 Besides this mention in CUSAS 9, 3: 12-13, the towns appear together in CUSAS 9, 4: 11 & 13. Quppat-^{d}NIN.GAL appears also in CUSAS 9, 77: 6, possibly as a place of offerings. They are apparently otherwise unattested.

142 If this official was based in the area of Lagaš, it would imply that the Ešnunneans had already penetrated far into the southern plain and were then travelling south-west. If they had not been stopped before that stage of their journey, it suggests that they had just entered Sealand I territory. But the mere evidence of one personal name is too thin a basis for such an extrapolation.
information on this man\textsuperscript{143}. What appears certain is that the Sealand I rulers did not control the Diyala, at least certainly not the area of Ešnunna\textsuperscript{144}.

3.1.2.2 The lower Euphrates

Other elements of evidence appear to point toward a Larsean influence on Sealand I culture and kingship, suggesting a control of the lower Euphrates. As expounded in Chapter 5, Ayadaragalama's year names echo the early Larsean topos of invoking Ea, more particularly Enlil and Ea, in year names\textsuperscript{145}. In addition to this symbolic gesture, a cult of Ea (often in conjunction with Enlil) is attested in Sealand I records, which is in itself exceptional in the post-Old Babylonian period and certainly points towards the extreme south being of importance to the dynasty, very probably the south-western area\textsuperscript{146}. In fact, the most direct parallel to the close association of Enlil and Ea in the Sealand I cult comes from an Old Babylonian letter from Larsa mentioning a rare "Temple of Enlil and Ea" (Veldhuis 2008: text 10; see also Chapter 5).

The evidence concerning the palace town of Kār-Šamaš, probably between Larsa and Ur and very possibly the find spot of the archive (or near it), has already been introduced. The odds are therefore that the area of the lower Euphrates is the place of origin of the archive and was an important seat of power of the Sealand I kingdom, at least in the period following the fall of Babylon. This could tally with new archaeological evidence.

Al-Dafar's analysis of satellite images of southern Iraq has revealed a large number of unexcavated settlements; the area was also extensively surveyed after 2003 and al-Dafar contends that he was able to identify pottery types that are diagnostic to the Sealand I kingdom

\textsuperscript{143} The name may be attested in a tax ledger, CUSAS 9, 441: 5; the passage is damaged.

\textsuperscript{144} The relations between the Sealand I kingdom and Ešnunna are discussed in Section 4.4.3.

\textsuperscript{145} It is surmised that Enlil and Ea have replaced the former triad Anu, Enlil, and Ea (see Chapter 5 for a detailed discussion).

\textsuperscript{146} Also possibly pointing towards a southern geographical anchor of the kingdom is the fact that Ur and Eridu appear in an unpublished letter in the Belgian Collection. The information is mentioned in passing by Dalley without more detail on the context in which these cities occur in the text (Dalley 2009: 31 notes).
Basing himself on his survey results, he dates numerous settlements to the Sealand I period, including limited areas in formerly large cities that were partly abandoned at the time (ibid.: 149ff.). He contends that hydraulic works upstreams had led to a collapse of the irrigation system in central Babylonia, leaving more water in the streams to be carried south, leading to a quasi-desertification of the central plain and a marked growth of the marshy area in the south (ibid.: 144). People resettled accordingly, including the transfer en masse from the Ur population to a newly founded urban settlement of similar size further west, on the Eridu branch of the Euphrates, Tell Dehaila, which al-Dafar proposes to identify as the Sealand I capital (ibid.: 168ff.). Pending publication of the pottery and, hopefully, the establishment of (a) continuous sequence(s) in southern Babylonia, the precise dating of these sites remains problematic. But the recent (and on going) excavations at Tell Khaiber and Tell Abu Thahab near Ur, which have yielded Sealand I texts and pottery (Moon et al.: 2015; al-Dafar 2015: 139), will certainly contribute towards clarifying diagnostic pottery types and the chronology of occupation. At any rate, the potential offered by the numerous unexcavated sites is certainly momentous.

Finally, one may add to the indirect indicators of the importance of the south-western region in the Sealand I kingdom the use of the word sūtu in the administration of animals; it seems to echo a practice which was apparently restricted to the territory of the early Old Babylonian Larsean kingdom (see Chapter 6 and Boivin 2016c).

3.2 The chronological conundrum

Positioning the Sealand I dynasty in time is also fraught with difficulties but a number of sources make it possible to anchor its chronology with that of other Babylonian dynasties, however never with absolute certainty. The greater number of attested synchronisms, and the most precise ones, are with the first dynasty of Babylon, but a margin of error always remains even if only very few years in one case. The latter part of the Sealand I dynasty was contemporary with the obscure early Kassite rulers, with whom the only known synchronism attests at the same time of the demise of the Sealand I kingdom. In addition, the local dynasts at Tell Muhammad must have been concurrent with Sealand I rulers.
The following synoptic table gives a general overview of the relative chronology of the Sealand I dynasty and other coeval Babylonian dynasties. Sources and detailed synchronisms are discussed hereafter.
### Table 4: Overview of the chronologies of the Sealand I and neighbouring dynasties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tell Muhammad</th>
<th>Babylon I</th>
<th>Sealand I</th>
<th>Kassite</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Samsu-iluna</td>
<td>Ili-ma-AN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Abī-ešuḫ</td>
<td>Itti-ilī-nībī</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ammī-ditāna</td>
<td>Damqi-ilīšu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ammī-ṣaduqa</td>
<td>Iškibal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Samsu-ditāna</td>
<td>Šušši</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ḥurbah(?)</td>
<td>Gulkīšar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Šipta-ulzi</td>
<td>Pešgaladaramēš</td>
<td>DiŠ+U-EN?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ayadaragalamā</td>
<td>:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ekurduana</td>
<td>Agum II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Melamkura</td>
<td>Burna-buriaš</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ea-gāmil</td>
<td>Ulam-buriaš</td>
<td>Kaštiliaš III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Agum III</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2.1 Problems with BKL A and synchronisms with Babylon I

An obvious source for the chronology of the Sealand I kingdom appears to be the BKL A, because it records reign lengths; it is trusted by some authors since it has proved quite reliable for later periods, but whether this can be extrapolated to the Sealand I section has remained a moot point. The surface of the tablet is in a bad state of preservation, which has gradually worsened since the first edition (Grayson 1980-1983: 90); some of the numerals are therefore difficult to read and various collations have been of limited help. Table 5 shows the readings which have been suggested.

---

147 I do not attempt to establish a synchronism with the kingdom of Ḥana since we have no direct evidence at present. In her recent presentation at the 62nd RAI (2016), Podany, basing herself on textual evidence, including year names of the Late Old Babylonian king Kaštiliašu of Terqa, showed that the latter resided at Terqa and was apparently exclusively concerned with local affairs; therefore, she rejected her previous opinion that he was identical with a king of Babylon, Kaštiliašu I (2002: 51).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Grayson</th>
<th>Brinkman</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Ilī-ma-AN</td>
<td>[x] + š1 (?)</td>
<td>šx+1?¹</td>
<td>There appears to be only the sign DIŠ on the tablet. Glassner reads 60(?) according to his reconstruction of the corresponding passage in DynKL (=MC 3: iv 14'). Poebel also reads 60, considering that the scribe added the reign lengths of Samsu-iluna and Abi-ešuḫ (1947:121).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Itti-ili-nībī</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>š40(+10)+5¹</td>
<td>Grayson considers that the number is 45, 46, 55, or 56 (1980-1983: 93 n.1 5); Glassner reads 56(?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Damqi-ilišu</td>
<td>26(?)</td>
<td>š10(+)+6?¹</td>
<td>Glassner reads 36(?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Iškibal</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>š15¹</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Šušši</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>š24¹</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Gulkīšar</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7? DIŠ+U-EN?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Pešgaldarameš</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Ayadaragalama</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Ekurduana</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Melamkura</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Ea-gāmil</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>š9¹</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 5: Reign lengths of Sealand I kings in BKL A**

New evidence can now be adduced from the Sealand I archive to put BKL A to the test; in addition, a detailed examination of the attested synchronisms between the later kings of the first dynasty of Babylon and their early Sealand I counterparts yields milestones that can be used as criteria in determining the reliability of the reign lengths in BKL A.

### 3.2.1.1 The problem with the reign length of Pešgaldarameš

The archive published in CUSAS 9, the first to emerge from the Sealand I dynasty, yields an important argument against the trustworthiness of the reign lengths attributed to Sealand I kings...
by BKL A. The archive contains a few texts dated to the years 27 and 29 of Pešgaldarameš; the texts use the year count system: MU PEŠ.GAL.ĐARA.MEŠ LUGAL.E KI.[27 or 29] (KAM). We know that these years almost immediately preceded the first years of Ayadaragalama because the GiR official for a delivery of sheep Nanna-mansum in text CUSAS 9, 16 dated to Pe 27 had the same function in texts dated to two different years in the reign of Ayadaragalama (CUSAS 9, 18; 21; 22). Also, several individuals listed in ledger CUSAS 9, 407 dated to Pe 29, including individuals with rarer names, occur in documents dated to the following king, in particular in CUSAS 9, 413 in which the concentration of names identical to those of CUSAS 9, 407 is quite high (see also Dalley 2009: 10 on the same topic). Dalley interpreted this immediate continuity between Pe 29 and Aa 1 with the assumption that Pešgaldarameš used an era-type reckoning of years referring to an event that occurred during his reign. The system which she surmises for Pešgaldarameš would be similar to the one attested for Rīm-Sîn I in the second half of his reign, when his year names stated the time elapsed since his conquest of Isin. She assumes therefore that an event, unknown to us but "of maximum importance", took place in the thirty-third year of Pešgaldarameš's reign (2009: 11); this would equate his twenty-ninth year as recorded in the archive with a purported year Pe 50*, in order to match the reign length of fifty years attributed to him in BKL A.

However, it appears that the year count system used by Sealand I kings was probably not referring to an event, but rather to the reign length of a given king (in other words to the event of his accession). Indeed, the documents found at Qal'at al-Bahrein, which we know was under the control of the last Sealand I king because one tablet bearing his date formula was among them, all use formulae either of the type KI + [numeral] or [numeral] + KAM, with the exception of only two year names apparently referring to a new year. It appears therefore that a system of year count without reference to a specific event was well established in the later days of the Sealand I kingdom, and we have no reason to assume that it was not already the case a few generations earlier since several of the texts published in CUSAS 9 use exactly the same formulae without referring to an event: KI + [numeral] and [numeral] + KAM, in addition to KI + [numeral] + KAM. The fact that a year formula probably reading MU RN LUGAL.E KI. 24(25?).KAM is now attested

148 MU NE.(NE) (Cavigneaux and André-Salvini forthcoming: texts QA01.5 and QA 94.421).
confirms this (CUSAS 18, 32; see Appendix 2). The most likely explanation that reconciles the
distribution of year names and the prosopographical evidence in the CUSAS 9 archive is that
Pešgaldarameš reigned twenty-nine years, or if longer certainly not by many years. At any rate,
the reign length of fifty years given in BKL A is grossly inflated\(^{149}\).

3.2.1.2 Synchronisms with Babylon I and more problems with BKL A

Other sources give us precious information on the relative chronology of the Sealand I and the
Babylon I dynasties. The following evidence yields synchronisms:

The Ilī-ma-AN texts at Nippur. At Nippur five legal texts were found that use Ilī-ma-AN's date
formulae: one appears to be of his first year, unless it is an abbreviated formula (\textit{MU i-li-ma-AN
LUGAL.E}); the others seem to mark the following year: (\textit{MU GIBIL MU i-li-ma-AN LUGAL.E}).
These texts cover a period of slightly over fourteen months from 16.vii.Îlî 1 to 24.ix.Îlî 2\(^{150}\) and
were found in fairly unspecific Old Babylonian context. The synchronism with the first dynasty
of Babylon is based on the estimation of the moment when Nippurite scribes went on from
dating documents with Samsu-iluna's year formulae to using Ilī-ma-AN's, reflecting the change
in rulership over the city.

The damming of the Tigris. We know from Abî-ešuḫ's year name o that he dammed the Tigris,
and chronicle \textit{ABC 20B} (rev. 8-10) informs us that this happened at the time of Ilī-ma-AN.

The destruction of the wall of Udannu. Ammī-ditāna's thirty-seventh year name informs us that
he destroyed a city wall which had been built by (Sealand I king) Damqi-ilišu, giving us a
terminus ante quem for the accession of the latter.

The epic on Gulkišar. The soon to be published royal epic HS 1885+ recounts that Sealand I king
Gulkišar went to war against the last king of the first dynasty of Babylon, Samsu-ditāna,
presenting them as contemporaries (Zomer \textit{forthcoming}).

\(^{149}\) Van Koppen reaches the same conclusion (2010: 456-457).

\(^{150}\) This includes the unpublished HS2227 (and envelope HS2226) dated to 19.ix.Îlî 1 (personal communication from
Manfred Krebernik). The other texts are BE 6/2 68; UM 55-21-239; Ni 9271; PBS 8/1 89).
The evidence is discussed at length and compared with the chronology of BKL A in Appendix 1; the main results are summarized here.

Examination of the documentary sequence at Nippur shows that the first year of Ilī-ma-AN probably corresponds to Si 29 but could be a little later; however, should the reckoning of regnal years in BKL A recognize previous years of rulership of Ilī-ma-AN outside Nippur, his accession year in this reckoning could be somewhat earlier. The damming of the Tigris almost certainly occurred in Abī-ešuḫ's middle years, in all likelihood Ae 19 - 23, or perhaps Ae 13 - 18 (less probable but also possible), which in turns means that Ilī-ma-AN reigned at least until Ae 13. In order for Damqi-ilīšu to have built the wall destroyed by Ammī-gitāna, he must have acceded to the throne at the very latest in Ad 36, and almost certainly earlier. If we can trust the literary epic which presents Gulkišar and Samsu-gitāna as protagonists, they must have had at least one coeval year.

When the chronology of BKL A is put against the gauge of the fairly well established chronology of the Babylon I dynasty using these few synchronisms, the reign lengths of the king list appear very unlikely to be correct. They can only be accurate, if the following necessary conditions are met: the compilers of BKL A had access to material documenting that Ilī-ma-AN reigned somewhere else before his thrust into middle Babylonian territory and they accepted this information as relevant for their compilation; this in turns makes it necessary to posit that the scribes at Nippur, shortly after its conquest by the Sealand I king, used shortened or alternative local forms for the year names of Ilī-ma-AN; the damming of the Tigris took place earlier than what was considered most likely by Goetze and Horsnell on the basis of the distribution of year names in two archives, that is before Ae 19 (summarized in Horsnell 1999: vol.I 72-76); Ilī-ma-AN died (almost) immediately after the damming of the Tigris by Abī-ešuḫ; Damqi-ilīšu acceded to the throne late in Ammī-gitāna's reign, undertook immediately to construct or finish construction of the city wall of Udannu, which was as soon destroyed by Ammī-gitāna; Gulkišar became king at the very end of Samsu-gitāna's reign and set out immediately to campaign against him; the reign lengths of Ammī-šaduqa and of Samsu-gitāna cannot be shorter than what is

151 See Appendix 1 for detailed computations.
indicated in BKL B; the correct reading for all damaged Sealand I reign lengths in BKL A must be without exception the lowest possible one, which also implies that the compiler made a mistake in computing the total duration of the dynasty (see Section 3.2.1.3).

In other words, mathematically the reign lengths recorded for the first six kings in BKL A could be correct, but historically the balance of probability is very strongly against it. The numbers are almost certainly too high.

3.2.1.3 Another problem with BKL A and final remarks

The total number of years inscribed at the end of the Sealand I section in BKL A, 368 years, is curious. It appears to be even higher than the sum of the reign lengths listed above it, which have already been shown to be (almost certainly) too high\textsuperscript{152}. Brinkman explained this discrepancy by the fact that the seventh king DIŠ+U-EN, who appears in SynKL, was omitted in BKL A, thus leaving in the latter document a number of years unaccounted for. In order to match the total of 368 years, he attributed 12 or 22 years to him (1976: 429), which means that he assumed at the time a reading based on the highest possible value for Ilī-ma-AN and Itti-ili-nībī, respectively 60 and 56 years\textsuperscript{153}; such values have been shown above to be untenable with the known synchronisms between the Sealand I and Babylon I chronologies\textsuperscript{154}. This comes in addition to the fact that the reign length of 50 years for Pešgaldaramaš, considered correct in Brinkman's reckoning, was also shown to be by far too high.

\textsuperscript{152} The reign lengths and the total in BKL A are both higher than what was considered likely by Gasche et al. in their low chronology (1998: 67; 91; appendix).

\textsuperscript{153} Following collation of the document in 1987, he revised his readings of reign lengths (1993-1997: 7). The values indicated in Table 5 are based on his revised readings.

\textsuperscript{154} Using Poebel's work on BKL B's reign lengths (1947: 110ff.), one could imagine that also the compiler of BKL A used mean values or approximations resulting in "round numbers" (finishing in 5 or 0) for reign lengths which were not available to him. This could have applied to the reign lengths of Itti-ili-nībī (probably 45 or 55), Iškibal (15), Gulkšar (55), Pešgaldaramaš (50), perhaps also to Ilī-ma-AN if we assume that the sign DIŠ stands for 60 and was not preceded by any other sign. However, for this theory to have some substance, one would expect the total number of years associated with the dynasty to match the sum of individual reign lengths listed, since the scribe, if venturing into mathematical speculation, would probably have made sure that his construct was coherent. Using various combinations of readings for the damaged entries does not yield any obvious solution for the numbers to match. It looks rather as if the scribe had used different sources for the individual reign lengths and the total.
Evidence shows thus that there is no or very little value in the reign lengths attributed to the Sealand I kings in BKL A. One may wonder whether the source used by the compiler was perhaps damaged on the right-hand side, which could explain both that the names are curiously abbreviated and the reign lengths apparently rather fancifully estimated. This "damaged original' theory" as it was dubbed by Brinkman is attractive (1976: 427); the fact that Iškibal's name was shortened in the middle and not only at the end, becoming Išba, speaks against it, but of course there is always the possibility that more than one source was used. While it raises interesting questions on the transmission and the treatment of knowledge on the Sealand I dynasty in Babylonian scribal circles, BKL A appears of no use whatsoever for chronological purposes in that period.

3.2.2 Other (possible) synchronisms
3.2.2.1 At the time of the fall of Babylon

The latest synchronism available between the Sealand I and Babylon I dynasties is a literary one: the epic H 1885+ recounts a conflict between Gulkišar and Samsu-ditāna. As far as information on the unpublished epic is already available\(^{155}\), it does not appear to contain any indication that the Sealand I kingdom was directly involved in the ultimate defeat of Samsu-ditāna, we can therefore not establish that Gulkišar was still on the throne when Babylon fell, but if he himself wasn't, his successor was.

This is also the time, when it might be possible to establish a first synchronism with a Kassite ruler, although this exercise proves difficult. The rôle played by the Kassites in the fall of Babylon is unclear. The Gandaš inscription, known from a later copy (BM 77438) which may have been a forgery, could refer to conquering Babylon: the end of line 4, after a mention of the Ekur of Enlil, contains a passage that has been read by some \(i-na \ ka-\ šad \ bà-bà-lam\), and by others \(i-na \ ka-mat \ bà-bà-lam\) (Stein 2000: 149 incl. n.84 for a brief summary of the problem)\(^{156}\). If the inscription is genuine and if a conquest of Babylon is implied, Gandaš could have been...
involved in the attacks against Samsu-ditāna, which would thus secure a synchronism between him and either Gulkīšar or his successor. But the uncertainties surrounding the source and the reading of the passage are important and such a synchronism can certainly not be considered established at present. Another early Kassite candidate for an involvement in the fall of Babylon, and therefore for a synchronism with Gulkīšar or his successor, is Agum-kakrime. The case was made by van Koppen who considered likely that the Kassite king seized the throne of Babylon either directly from Samsu-ditāna and from other contenders shortly thereafter (2010: 460-461). Both the case for the involvement of Gandaš and that of Agum-kakrime in the fall of Babylon need to be treated with prudence. They are both based on later inscriptions, and in both cases the textual indication is not direct and requires a good dose of interpretation. The history of these early Kassite rulers remains at present obscure and their chronological relationship with the Sealand I dynasty highly uncertain; theirs sequence is not well established, we do not even know whether their inclusion in king lists reflects their (continuous) rule at Babylon, let alone when this rule started.

3.2.2.2 After the fall of Babylon

Also for the period following the fall of Babylon the evidential situation is rather dire, notwithstanding the presence of Sealand I archival texts. These documents offer limited help in matters of chronology: we learn from them that Pešgaldaramēš reigned at least twenty-nine years and certainly not many more, as seen above, that Ayadaragalamā reigned at least eight years but there is no reason to assume that he did not reign longer, and finally that Ea-gāmīl reigned at least four years. The documents do not yield any useful synchronisms: the Elamite ruler who

---

157 Even if the source is genuine and the reading is indeed ka-šad, the historical interpretation remains problematic. We could be dealing with an episode of infighting amongst the powers that had ousted Samsu-ditāna.

158 The minimum reign lengths of Pešgaldaramēš and Ayadaragalamā are based on date formulae attested in the archive published in CUSAS 9; see Appendix 2.

159 Dalley briefly discusses an unpublished letter (BC 423) in which one Burra-x-riāš appears alongside two other individuals, one of which may be attested in the CUSAS 9 archive. Concerning Burra-x-riāš, she notes that "an identification with a king of Babylon cannot be excluded" (Dalley 2009: 31 notes). Pending the publication of the text or at least of more detail on its contents, there is no basis to assume that this was a (future) Kassite king, reigning at Babylon or not. Therefore, this information is at present of no help for the relative chronology of the Sealand I dynasty.
despatched an envoy to the Sealand I court is not named and the Kassite ruler Buragindar who also sent one is otherwise unattested (CUSAS 9, 40; BC 435; both cases are discussed in Section 4.4).

King lists do inform us that Ayadaragalama was followed by two other kings before the last ruler of the dynasty Ea-gāmil ascended the throne, but we do not know how long they ruled since, as it was shown above, the reign lengths of BKL A cannot be trusted.

The texts from Tell Muḥammad

The excavations at Tell Muḥammad in the 1970s and 1980s have also yielded material relevant for the transition between the late Old Babylonian and the early Kassite period, but neither the pottery nor the dating formulae used in the administrative texts unearthed in levels III and II are easy to interpret. The texts have not all been published yet, but a number of them were edited in an MA thesis (al-Ubaid 1983). Among these, a handful of texts are from level III; they feature date formulae based on events in which the name of various individuals appear, one of whom is called a king, Ḫurbaḫ(?)160. The texts from level II are more numerous and also more varied in the dating system they use: a few bear year names based on events like the older texts from level III; most texts feature two date formulae, one of the usual type and one of the era type (MU. [numeral].KĀM ša KĀ.DINGIR.RA ki uš-bu); finally, a few bear only a year formula of the era type. In the event-based year names, one individual is identified as king, Šipta-ulzi. As expounded by Gasche et al. the older dating system must reflect the local tradition, while the era year names represent a novel way of naming years; documents featuring both types of year names should be transitional (1998: 84-87). The historical implications of the contents, the formulary, and the sequence of these year names are of importance and the date of this site has been much debated.

160 The reading is problematic. It is almost certain that the same individual appears in the date formulae of level III documents (IM 90602 and IM 90606), as well as of level II documents (IM 92725 and IM 92721); in the later documents, he appears as the father of an unnamed son. In particular the last sign seems to vary in shape, according to al-Ubaid’s hand copies (1983: 121ff.) She read them as two different names (1983: 114; 118-119), followed by Gasche et al. (1998: 86). The names were read as one and the same by others, including Boese who proposed Ḫu-ur-.ba-zum (2008: 204) and van Koppen who read Ḫu-ur-ba-aḫ (2010: 458 n.12). Sassmannshausen read the names as two different ones, namely Ḫu-ur-ba-aḫ and Ḫu-ur-ba-tum (2004a: 302-304).
Both levels III and II, in which texts were found, were considered Old Babylonian (Gasche et al. 1998: 83 n.334), level III has also been dated to the Isin-Larsa period (Metab 1989-1990: 129; 149)\(^{161}\). But the dating is moot since the individuals named in the texts are not known elsewhere (except for the possible presence of two rulers in SynKL)\(^{162}\), and the pottery sequence in the lower Diyala or in north-eastern Babylonia is not well established for that period\(^{163}\). Any attempt at dating the levels using pottery has to be based on comparison with ceramics from the Babylonian plain; this is the best means available at present and several parallels were established\(^{164}\). Unfortunately, the Tell Muhammad pottery has not been published with systematic reference to the level in which it was found, but even if it had been the main problem remains: using pottery sequences from the Babylonian plain is probably inadequate for any precise assessment of the Tell Muḥammad material. Some of the ceramic found does correspond to pottery from the Kassite period in the Babylonian lowland, and perhaps in the Diyala (in particular groups 205A\(^2\) and 215A\(^2\) in Armstrong and Gasche 2014). All in all, the transition from level III to level II, both of uncertain date, and that from level II to level I, the latter of Kassite date, remain nebulous\(^{165}\).

This leaves the interpretation of the enigmatic date formulae of the type MU.[numeral].KĀM ša KĀ.DINGIR.RA\(^{ki}\) uš-bu without a clear temporal or political context. Gasche et al. looked at instances of the combination "toponym + wašābu" found in omen compendia and found that the

---

\(^{161}\) Hamza mentioned that the artefacts from level III display a stylistic affinity to various periods from the late third millennium until the time of Hammurapi (2011: 414); he noted, in agreement with Gasche et al., that some pottery from level II could have lasted from the end of the Old Babylonian into the early Kassite period. He adds that the transition and relationship between level II and level I, the latter being clearly Kassite, are not well understood (ibid.: 415-416).

\(^{162}\) Boese 2008: 205; the matter is discussed at the end of the present section.

\(^{163}\) In the upper Diyala the sequence at Tell Yelkhi is fairly well-established but it is probably of no relevance for Tell Muhammad since most of the pottery from this site is not typically Babylonian (Armstrong and Gasche 2014: 11-12).

\(^{164}\) Recently, Armstrong and Gasche established parallels between some of the Tell Muḥammad pottery published in Metab (1989-1990) as well as in Metab and Hamza (2003-2004) and second millennium Babylonian pottery types (2014: passim). These references are found in the sub-section "Comparanda" of each relevant pottery group. A correlation with the sequence of Tell ed-Deir in the northern alluvial plain remains difficult as long as the Tell Muḥammad pottery is not published with full reference to the stratigraphy.

\(^{165}\) See also Hamza 2011: 415-416.
expression was used to express the resettling of a place following its abandonment or destruction (1998: 85). That the date formula referred to the resettlement of Babylon, following the raid that probably sealed the fate of the Babylon I dynasty, is certainly a plausible interpretation to which, following Gasche et al., a number of scholars have adhered (Sassmannshausen 2004a: 302ff. and 2004b: 64; Boese 2008: 202-203)\textsuperscript{166}. Gasche et al. considered that the use of such date formulae reflects the allegiance to a new king, unnamed in the Tell Muḩammad texts but whom they assume to be Agum-kakrime (= Agum III in their opinion), reigning at Babylon over a re-unified Babylonia (1998: 89). This dating of the Tell Muḩammad texts is considered too late by Sassmannshausen (2004b: 64), and also by Boese; the latter assumes that the kings named in date formulae that are not of the era type, Ḫurbaḫ and Šipta-ulzi, were in fact kings reigning at Babylon, which had been quickly resettled after the raid (2008: 202-203). Van Koppen's interpretation differs completely: he considers that the ambiguous wording of the era-type date formula precludes any historical interpretation from it, arguing that translation is only possible when informed by a presupposed historical context (2010: 460). His analysis led him to conclude that the Tell Muḩammad texts date to the late Old Babylonian period\textsuperscript{167}, both kings named in their date formulae being contemporary with Samsu-ditāna. He added that Šipta-ulzi, an ally of Babylon, was probably defeated by Agum-kakrime (= Agum II in his opinion) while Samsu-ditāna was still in power. The era-type year names are interpreted by him as a reference to an unspecified subject, probably a Kassite prince or garrison taking up residence at Babylon because the privilege of guarding the city had been granted to them (Van Koppen 2010: 461-462). This translation of the date formula with the posited suppressed subject and the corresponding interpretation appear somewhat forced.

The translation proposed by Gasche et al., which is more direct and is based on parallels in the divinatory literature, seems more plausible. Such a reading, which refers to the resettlement of

\textsuperscript{166} Charpin seems to consider this a likely scenario (2004: 383).

\textsuperscript{167} See also Gentili 2002: 211-212 who dates the texts even earlier within the Old Babylonian period and translates the era-type year dates as "when Babylon was established (in the region)". Another translation is offered by Dalley, who considers "inherently unlikely" that the resettlement of a city would be commemorated for many years; she translates "Year that (the king) stayed (in) Babylon" (2009: 8 n.70). She does not specify to what king the formulae refer and to what period they date.
Babylon, makes it therefore very likely that the texts from level II were roughly contemporary with the Sealand I archive published in CUSAS 9, therefore Šipti-ulzi's reign at Tell Muḥammad may have been coeval with that of Pešgaldarameš or Ayadaragalama. This remains uncertain because we know neither whether and how long Gulkišar reigned after the fall of Babylon, whether there was an additional king between him and Pešgaldarameš, nor how long Babylon remained unoccupied (although this would probably have been a short time).

It was also argued recently that the two kings named in the Tell Muḥammad date formulae could correspond to Kassite kings 7 and 8 in SynKL, whose readings are uncertain (Boese 2008: 205). If these two kings are indeed the same, their position within king lists would certainly be compatible with a post-Old Babylonian dating for them, or at least for the later one, since other sources suggest that king 11, perhaps even 10 were contemporary with the last Sealand I ruler Ea-gāmil.

3.2.2.3 At the time of the fall of the Sealand I dynasty

From the texts found at al-Qal'at al-Bahrein we learn that one Agum, presumably Agum III, probably reigned shortly after the last Sealand I king, without more indications on the exact temporal relationship between them, neither from the archaeological context nor from the prosopography. The other two Kassite rulers named in year formulae in this corpus are otherwise unknown: Kadašman-Saḫ and Urra-?-iaš.

The chronicle *ABC* 20B informs us that Ulam-Bur(i)aš and Kaštiliaš (III) were contemporary with Ea-gāmil since the first episode of the conquest of the Sealand I kingdom is said to have been accomplished by "Ulam-Buraš, brother of Kaštiliaš" (rev. 13-14), after Ea-gāmil had fled. If we accept this relation of events, we may assume that there was no significant interval between the departure of Ea-gāmil from his land and the Kassite conquest; it seems in fact probable that

168 Apparently the stratigraphy suggests that the texts covered a short period but does not yield any more precise information (Cavigneaux and André-Salvini *forthcoming*).

169 Abraham and Gabbay (2013: 189) refer to Van Koppen's suggestion that one of these rulers was included in SynKL as the 13th king (on the damaged line ii 22); he puts him after Agum III (Van Koppen *forthcoming*).
the events were linked\textsuperscript{170}. The chronicle adds that "Agum, son of Kaštiliaš", therefore nephew of Ulam-buriaš also marched to the Sealand. This Agum (III) must be the one attested at al-Qal'at al-Bahrein. How much time elapsed between these campaigns is unclear but the family relationship between Ulam-buriaš and Agum III limits the interval, probably to about the length of one generation.

Ulam-buriaš is known from two inscriptions: one on a diorite mace head and one on an agate weight (both were (re-)edited in Stein 2000: 129-130), in which he identifies himself as Ula(m)-burariaš\textsuperscript{171} and his father as "Burna-buriaš, the king". The mace head inscription also adds that the former is "king of the Sealand". The brother of Ulam-buriaš could be identified with the Kaštiliaš of a newly published royal inscription concerning the digging of a canal; indeed, in this inscription the latter declines his identity and ancestry as follows: "I am Klaşšiliasu (...) / son of Burna-buriaš / grand-son of Agum (II)" (Abraham and Gabbay 2013: 184 obv. 1-3).

This gives us the following (approximative) relative chronology:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Kassite rulers} \\
\downarrow \\
\text{Sealand I} \\
\hline
\text{Agum II} \\
\text{Burna-bu(ra)riaš I} \\
\text{Kaštiliaš III} \\
\text{Agum III} \\
\hline
\text{Ea-gāmil} \\
\text{Ula(m)-bu(ra)riaš} \\
\text{Ula(m)-bu(ra)riaš} \\
\text{Agum III} \\
\end{array}
\]

**Figure 2: Kassite-Sealand I synchronism at the end of the Sealand I dynasty**

This diagram is certainly no comprehensive reflection of the political landscape in Babylonia at the time. It merely indicates the synchronism between Ea-gāmil and the Kassite rulers of the family of Agum II (possibly Agum-kakrime) involved in the conquest of the Sealand I kingdom, as well as a chronology of the transition of power in Sealand I territory, from the Sealand I to

\textsuperscript{170} The documents found at al-Qal'at al-Bahrein suggest at least administrative continuity between the time of the document dated to Ea-gāmil and the documents dated to Agum and to other Kassite rulers or governors.

\textsuperscript{171} The varying orthography of the element bu(ra)riaš is discussed in Balkan 1954: 104; the longer form is older. The matter is also briefly discussed in Brinkman 1976: 12 n.17.
Kassite rulers. The other rulers with Kassite names who are attested in the texts from al-Qal'at al-Bahrein would have to be inserted in this chronological scheme but we don't know where exactly.

Whether all the Kassite kings named in this diagram reigned at Babylon is uncertain; this section of SynKL, should it be taken as an indication of it or not, is badly damaged. Abraham and Gabbay have summarized the main reconstructions suggested by scholars in the last few decades (2013: 189); these reconstructions do not affect directly the synchronism expounded above, which is based on chronicle *ABC 20B* and on royal inscriptions.
Chapter 4
A political history of the Sealand I kingdom

4 A political history of the Sealand I kingdom

4.1 The southern Babylonian revolts: genesis of the Sealand I kingdom?

There is little doubt that the general historical backdrop of the emergence of the Sealand I kingdom is the widespread rebellion against Babylon that began in southern and soon spread to middle Babylonia during the reign of Samsu-iluna, as evidenced by the fact that texts gradually ceased to be dated to him a mere generation after the constitutive conquests of Hammurapi. The early Sealand I polity can indeed partly be defined as a complementary counterpart to the waning Amorite kingdom, geographically and politically: it must have developed where Babylon had no authority anymore. But it may have had to vie for power with other contenders, Kassite and indigenous, at least for a time. Indeed, although only Rīm-Sīn (II) of Larsa and Rīm-Anum of Uruk figure prominently in our records, the rebellion of the years Si 8 - 9 apparently resulted in and was also fuelled by the formation of a number of short-lived, more or less independent fiefs and kingdoms. That the secessionist movement was highly fragmented shows in the fact that both Samsu-iluna and Rīm-Anum enumerated several enemies in year names of that period. The Babylonian king alone identified in his date formulae between Si 9 and Si 13 – beside the generic Sumer and Akkad – the Kassites (met in combat at Kikalla), Ida-Maraš, Ešnunna, Emutbalum, Uruk, Ur, Larsa, Isin, Kisurra, and Sabûm as his opponents. While later

172 Larsa is the city in which texts temporarily ceased to be dated with Samsu-iluna’s year formulae at the earliest date: in the last month of Si 7 (TCL II 215). Rīm-Sīn II was considered king of Larsa by Samsu-iluna (Frayne 1990: text E4.3.7.7 lines 93-97). However, he seems to have also claimed the title of king of Ur (in his year name a; see Stol 1976: 54) and been remembered as such in the chronographic tradition (ABC 20B: obv. 9). Towards the end of his short reign, Rīm-Sīn appears to have added another capital to his secessionist realm or transferred it since his third and last year name, year formula b, proclaims that he was raised to kingship by the Kešite mother goddess Ninmaḫ at Keš (Stol 1976: 54). See also Charpin 2004: 338-339 and Richardson 2010: 16 n.60.

173 In his Kiš cylinder inscription, he puts the number of his foes, besides Rīm-Sīn II, at twenty-six (Frayne 1990: text E4.3.7.7: 101-102). It is unclear to what period exactly the inscription refers; Charpin suggested that a very high fragmentation of rebellious leadership may have immediately followed Rīm-Sīn II’s death in Samsu-iluna’s ninth year (2004: 341).
inscriptions of the Babylonian king may have reinterpreted and presented the events within the literary trope of Naram-Sîn's Great Rebellion (Glassner 1986: 58-59), the year names can probably be considered fairly trustworthy at least in the identification of opponents. The list of insurgents makes plain that the Babylonian king was facing troubles in southern and middle Babylonia, as well as in the Diyala; even northern Babylonia was probably the stage of some turmoil early on, although in that case the troublemakers were not the local population but the Kassites. Despite Samsu-iluna's efforts to counter the secessionist movement, whose ephemeral success is evidenced by a brief return to his year formulae in a number of cities, Babylon's hope and endeavours to reestablish its rule in the southernmost region dwindled rapidly.

The third year name of Rîm-Anum, which corresponds to Samsu-iluna's ninth or tenth year, makes plain that Babylon played by then no major political rôle in southern Babylonia any more:

The year in which King Rîm-Anum, the (forces of) the land of Emutbalum, the armies of Eshnunna, Isin and Kazallu, as if all together (with him), having presented themselves at Uruk for war, inflicted a defeat upon their troops. Since time immemorial Uruk had never experienced (such) a dust storm (raised by a foreign army), but after the dust storm settled, he slaughtered (all of them) and by his power ejected (them all) from the homeland. (Michalowski and Beckman 2012: 427)

Kikalla was probably located near Kiš (Pientka 1998: 368). Kassite groups were hostile also to Rîm-Sîn II, as per the second clause of his year name b, his second, probably promulgated in Si 9 (Stol 1976: 48; Seri 2013: 35f.): "the enemy, the evil Kassites from the barbarous country, who could not be driven back to the mountains" (Stol 1976: 54).

Texts dated with Samsu-iluna's date formulae resume at Larsa at the very beginning of Si 10 (YOS 12, 314), followed later in the same year by other cities, for instance Ur (UET 5, 243), Nippur (OECT 8, 11), and Lagaš (TCL 1, 129). See also Charpin 2004: 342.

The events recalled in Rîm-Anum's third year name would have occurred in his second. To the relative chronology between Samsu-iluna and the rebel king: Rositani, followed by Charpin, put the proclamation of Rîm-Anum's first year name as coeval with Si 8 (Rositani 2003: 16; Charpin 2014: 129); in fact, Charpin's reconstruction differs slightly from Rositani's since he suggests that the first two year names of Rîm-Anum were versions of the same one used for a period of about seventeen months, but the resulting chronology is the same. In contrast, Seri considered that there was a delay between the revolt at Uruk and Rîm-Anum's assuming kingship, she puts the latter first year's proclamation in Si 9 (2013: 35). This would make the situation described in Rîm-Anum's third year name either coeval with Samsu-iluna's ninth or tenth regnal year.

Seri suggests that Rîm-Anum may at the time have become for a brief time an ally of Babylon (2013: 36). If that is the case, the Babylonian troops were possibly not significantly involved in the conflict since this alliance found no mention in the year name (2013: 36).
After that Babylon still fought over the south but its actions, as reflected in its year names, appear to have been essentially war campaigns, probably leaving little opportunity for any serious attempt at stabilizing the area: in all likelihood, the three years between Si 11 and 13 saw mere endeavours of reconquest before Babylon's final disengagement from the southernmost region. That Babylon was then ineluctably losing ground might be reflected in its year names; Seri aptly noted that the language of the twelfth and the fourteenth year names was kept vague (2013: 33), in contrast to the formulae of the preceding years: Samsu-iluna did not name his enemies anymore, he referred only to "assembled (foreign) countries", "the army of Sumer and Akkad"\(^{178}\), and "the rebellious enemy kings"\(^{179}\). This suggests that the entire area had slipped from his control to the point where it had entered the realm of the unnamed, generic outside world. In fact, the textual record appears to stop altogether in southern Babylonia in that period: the last extant texts from several cities are dated between his tenth and twelfth years\(^{180}\). Indeed, by Samsu-iluna's twelfth regnal year (the events are recorded in his thirteenth year name), the front line\(^{181}\) apparently moved towards middle Babylonia, around Kisurra and Sabûm. The restoration of the city wall of Isin celebrated in his fifteenth year name confirms that the area had seen fierce battle and suggests that the Babylonians were probably establishing the retaken city as a stronghold of their new southern border area. That border was not maintained long since documents dated with the date formulae of the Babylonian king ceased in the years Si 28 - 30 at Isin, Lagaba, and Nippur\(^{182}\) (Charpin 2004: 360).

What happened in southern Babylonia after the definitive disengagement of the kings of the first dynasty of Babylon and why major urban settlements then appear to have been abandoned is

\(^{178}\) In the twelfth year name: KUR GÚ-SI-A and UGNIM KI-EN-GI KI-URI (Horsnell 1999: vol.II 197).

\(^{179}\) Fourteenth year name: LUGAL IM-GI4 GÚ-BAR-RA (Horsnell 1999: vol.II 199).

\(^{180}\) To my knowledge the latest text dated to Samsu-iluna in southern Babylonia is from Ur and dates to 3.viii.Si 12 (UET 5, 868). Note that Rochberg-Halton and Zimansky had tentatively identified Larsa as the provenance of a text dated to Si 29 (Rochberg-Halton and Zimansky 1979: text 15; the tentative location is indicated on p.129); Charpin noted on archibab.fr that it is impossible.

\(^{181}\) I am using this term in a loose sense since the nature of the rule exerted by the Babylonian state and by the rebellious leaders was probably not one of ubiquitous control in a continuous territory, which would have resulted in well defined front lines between the belligerents. On the patchy nature of Mesopotamian state control, see Richardson 2012: 17-18; 24-25.

\(^{182}\) For the regnal year of the last texts dated to Samsu-iluna at Nippur, see Appendix 1.
unclear. That the Sealand I state eventually thrived among the rubbles left by the violent clashes between secessionist and Babylonian troops is evidenced by later archival texts. Although the modalities of this development remain uncertain, it is certainly a likely place and time to look for the first Sealand I ruler Ilī-ma-AN; indeed, he must have successfully mustered numerous troops by the time he was able to take Nippur in Si 29 (or shortly after), notwithstanding the lack of solid evidence for his involvement alongside the other rebels in Si 8 - 10. Dalley (2009: 1) argued for his presence in a very fragmentary document probably concerning land, perhaps from Larsa (Ash 1922-353 = OECT 15, 78). While "LUGAL A.AB.BA" indeed appears on line 18’, the rest of the passage is broken. The only visible sign preceding LUGAL could be NI; Dalley’s suggestion that the passage referred to Ilī-ma-AN, whose name she reconstructs as Ilum-ma-ili, is thus based on only one fragmentary sign and implies that a spelling was used in this text which is otherwise not attested for the name of this king. This interpretation must thus be regarded as highly uncertain. Therefore, the evidence appears insufficient to confirm Ilī-ma-AN’s presence in this document and too uncertain to even conclude that a king of a political entity called A.AB.BA existed at the time. Another text, also presumably from Larsa and possibly dating to Rîm-Sîn II, mentions troops of A.AB.BA (OECT 15, 10). This may or may not refer to a distinct

183 Jacobsen did not hesitate to establish Ilī 1 = Si 8 based on the fact that he saw in the southern and eastern rebellion the general context, and more specifically in the Kassite invasion the occasion, for the rise of the Sealand I king. The Nippur texts with a Ilī-ma-AN year formula that were known at the time are dated to his second year; Jacobsen considered that this was coherent with the absence of Si 9 texts (1939: 195, in particular n.15). Most recently, Seri counted him among insurgents whom Samsu-iluna would have included in his statement that he faced twenty-six rebel kings in the Kiš cylinder inscription (Frayne 1990: E4.3.7.7, line 101; Seri 2013: 239). This inclusion raises the question of the date and the chronology of the events related in this inscription, which probably commemorates the rebuilding of the city wall mentioned in the king’s twenty-fourth year name. If Seri’s sequence of events is correct and Ilī-ma-AN was one of the twenty-six rebels, he would have been actively part of the rebellion and defeated by Babylon between the death of Rîm-Sîn II and that of Iluni; the moment of the latter event is unknown, estimates ranging from Si 10 (Charpin 1998: 33) and Si 20 or 23 (Charpin 2004: 340; Jacobsen 1940: 200). Identifying Ilī-ma-AN with one of the twenty-six rebel kings would also imply that the Babylonian king did not kill all rebel leaders since we know that Ilī-ma-AN survived him, but such a sweeping hyperbole would not be surprising in a royal inscription. It is at present impossible to decide whether Seri was right in seeing Ilī-ma-AN as one of the rebel kings of Samsu-iluna’s inscriptions; but the only basis for her assumption is the circumstance that Ilī-ma-AN also fought against Babylon on Babylonian soil at some point during Samsu-iluna’s reign. This is certainly no positive evidence that Ilī-ma-AN was part of the early days of the southern rebellion.

184 In the attested year names at Nippur, as well as in king lists, in chronicle ABC 20B and in other chronicle fragments, the spelling either finishes on the sign AN or drops it entirely. See Chapter 2.

185 In fact, one cannot exclude that LUGAL was the last sign in a personal name instead of a title.
political entity. If it did, its significance must have been still very limited since it does not appear at all, either as foe or as friend, in the bit asīrē texts from Uruk\textsuperscript{186}.

Another possibility for a trace of Ili-ma-AN in documents dating to the time of the rebellion could be in the distribution of flour to messengers that Rim-Sîn II sent to Uruk, one of whom is one i-li-ma (Nisaba 4, I.25)\textsuperscript{187}. Since the (later) Sealand I king’s name is also attested elsewhere in abbreviated form without the final AN, there is a remote possibility that this Ili-ma was the future king, who would have started his career in the diplomatic service of Rim-Sîn II. A Larsean origin of the founder of the dynasty would indeed be in agreement with signs of a Larsean influence in Sealand I culture\textsuperscript{188}. Should it be the case, why the dynasty should be remembered as something else than Larsean is not clear: Rim-Sîn II seems to have been associated with more than one seat of power but the available evidence does not permit us to fully grasp how he established his rule (Charpin 2004: 338-339)\textsuperscript{189}. One could therefore imagine that a continuator of Rim-Sîn II's short-lived kingdom was or came to be associated with another town than Larsa\textsuperscript{190}, but this remains highly hypothetical.

The search for the origins and the early days of the Sealand I dynasty yields meagre results. There remains mainly a balance of probability based on later geographical evidence and on the imperatives of war: we know that the first ruler Ili-ma-AN would soon conquer Nippur and that Babylon's counteroffensive by Abī-ešuḫ would target the southern Tigris. But this need not imply that the Sealand I rise to power unfolded or even began before Samsu-iluna's repression of the rebellion. Indeed, there is no solid evidence for the presence of Ili-ma-AN at the time of the great

\textsuperscript{186} Both possible early references to A.AB.BA are discussed in Chapter 2.

\textsuperscript{187} The text is also discussed in Seri 2013: 73; it is dated to the second year of Rim-Anum.

\textsuperscript{188} See Chapter 5 for the presence of Ea in year names and in the state pantheon, which appears to echo an older Larsean tradition. Also, see the Chapter 6 on elements of administrative practices from the ancient Larsean kingdom in Sealand I records – the latter is admittedly less conclusive than the former since it is probably only indicative of a southern origin of the Sealand I texts.

\textsuperscript{189} Sources associate him with Larsa, Ur, and Keš.

\textsuperscript{190} Gasche considers Ili-ma-AN to have taken up the cause of the fight against Babylon begun by Rim-Sîn II twenty years earlier (1989: 135). Other individuals in contemporary texts originating from Uruk bore the name Ili-ma-AN but were very probably simply homonyms since nothing in their rôle points towards one of them becoming a king some years later (they appear respectively as a cook, a scribe, and an owner of slaves in W 20052,60=Sanati-Müller 2000b: no.269; BM88447; BM88515=Seri 2013: no.35).
southern and eastern upheavals, merely a slight possibility that he started in the diplomatic service under Rim-Sin II.

4.2 Ilī-ma-AN's northern ambitions: the struggle for middle Babylonia begins

Although our earliest incontrovertible evidence of Sealand I rule is at Nippur, it does not mean that it was the hometown or the main power base of the first king of the dynasty, Ilī-ma-AN. While it is not impossible that Ilī-ma-AN was a Nippurite who led a local insurrection, some indications suggest otherwise. The lacunary passage of the chronicle ABC 20B: rev. 2'-7' seems to indicate that before Ilī-ma-AN successfully attacked Samsu-iluna, another violent encounter had taken place between both kings, apparently close to a sea or lake. If we posit that the success registered to the credit of Ilī-ma-AN at the end of the passage refers to his conquest of Nippur (line 7'), it would imply that the scene of their first important battle was elsewhere, possibly in the south, where Babylon was not longer exercising power\(^{191}\). There are therefore good chances that Ilī-ma-AN's authority and the military power that he was able to build up had its roots further south. His successful conquest of Nippur certainly suggests that the Sealand I ruler had gathered significant support, resources, and troops beforehand since the city was in all likelihood no easy target: its fortification wall had just been rebuilt by Samsu-iluna, a fact known from a building inscription (Frayne 1990: E4.3.7.2)\(^{192}\), and if the Babylonian king considered it necessary to strengthen the defensive infrastructure of the city, it was probably manned accordingly. When Ilī-ma-AN conquered Nippur, he was either at the head of a large and well-armed group or he was favoured by such popular support that he did not have to take the city by

\(^{191}\) Moreover, if the dynasty had originated from such a prestigious city as Nippur, one would have expected this fact to be remembered in association with it.

\(^{192}\) We do not know when these works were carried out; the period following the reconquest of the town from Rim-Sin II, which took place late in Samsu-iluna's tenth year (Charpin 2004: 342), is a possibility. It may have been part of a larger programme of improvement of city fortifications in middle Babylonia since similar works are attested for Isin and are commemorated in the year name Si 15 (fortification works are also attested in northern Babylonia; see Pientka 1998: 13-14).
force only, an eventuality for which we have no indication\(^{193}\). However, no signs of destruction were found; archaeological evidence suggests rather that large stretches of the city were abandoned during the Old Babylonian period (Gasche 1989: 124-125, and n.341; Gibson 1992: 42-44). It has been suggested that a natural cause, namely insufficient water supply, was in part, perhaps even mainly responsible for the abandonment of the city (Gibson 1992: 43)\(^{194}\). One scenario that comes to mind to reconcile the facts is that part of the population had fled in front of the approaching Sealand I army, leaving a half-empty city for the conquerers to enter and occupy, after which the Babylonian king cut off the water supply from the north; however, the later chronology of events at Nippur does not support this explanation (see Section 4.3.1 for a tentative reconstruction).

If we accept that the Sealand I kingdom had its core area in southern Babylonia, the conquest of Nippur was not necessarily its founding event but it came early in its history. Although no texts dated to the Sealand I king have been found in other middle Babylonian towns, it is not unlikely that Ili-ma-AN's attack on Nippur was part of a larger offensive in that area since evidence of destruction in the Old Babylonian period was found at Isin, where the last texts using Samsu-iluna's year names may date to Si 28\(^{195}\). This destruction layer is covered by sediments, suggesting that at least part of the city was then abandoned for a few centuries (Gasche 1989: 126). The date of the latest texts found in a context of destruction shows that there was another attack on the city some years after the events to which Samsu-iluna referred in his fifteenth year

\(^{193}\) Pientka saw in the southern rebellion a popular uprising (Pientka 1998: 11), but there is no evidence for this. It may also have been the fact of local elites.

\(^{194}\) Such an explanation is difficult to reconcile with the rebuilding of the city wall mentioned above. A water crisis severe enough to cause the (partial) abandonment of an important city would probably have developed gradually and its consequences would therefore have been in part foreseeable, especially since a large territory upstream was in Babylonian hands; it would seem uneconomic to invest in rebuilding the defences of a city about to be evacuated or abandoned, even if the religious importance of the Ekur could have played a rôle in such a decision. Based on changing patterns in land transactions, Stone suggested that Babylon had in fact cut off the water supply to southern Babylonia in Si 10, affecting Nippur, but that the situation began to improve roughly ten years later (1977: 285-286).

\(^{195}\) Charpin 1981: 518 n.3; also Charpin 2000: 201. The most recent text found in a layer containing the rubbles of destroyed Old Babylonian houses (in the Nordabschnitt II ) dates to Si 26 (Gasche 1989: 126 n.347). A provenanced, but not further specified text dating to Si 27 is also mentioned in Von Soden 1976: 108. An unprovenanced text dated Si 29 has been suggested to come from Isin (Gasche 1989: 126).
name. Nothing indicates that the Sealand I troops were responsible for the later attack but their attested presence at Nippur at about the same time makes them likely candidates.

It appears that the turmoil which characterizes that period of Samsu-iluna's reign also affected north-eastern Babylonia, where texts dated to Samsu-iluna ceased in Si 30 at Lagaba (Charpin 2004: 360; Tammuz 1996: 22-23), which was probably located between Babylon and Kutha (Tammuz 1996: 24). If we use these data as positive evidence, it would mean that Samsu-iluna's kingdom had been, by the end of his reign, amputated from southern and middle Babylonia, but also of a portion of north-eastern Babylonia. It is, given the absence of evidence of (Sealand I) occupation of these towns, impossible to determine whether this was all the doing of Ilī-ma-AN: the action of the nascent Sealand I polity is inextricably mingled with the destruction and the abandonment of entire or parts of long-established cities, the shrinking of the Babylonian kingdom, and a generalized ebbing of textual and archaeological evidence. In this complex context, it is difficult to make out cause, co-factor, co-incidence, and consequence.

4.2.1 Establishing a viable kingdom: the need for water

However widespread Ilī-ma-AN's campaign in middle Babylonia was, we know that he took at least Nippur. One possible explanation for this northward thrust by the new ruler is that he wanted to secure a sufficient water supply further downstream. The question of water was probably crucial to the Sealand I kingdom's viability since its territory lay mostly downstream from the area still controlled by Babylon. Renger observed that the Old Babylonian Larsean kings had an obvious interest in extending their kingdom northward because it translated in a control of the water supply (1970: 77), and Charpin justly noted that this was in fact the reality faced by all southern rulers (2002: 559). There are indeed good chances that the Sealand I kings

---

196 In this year name he commemorated the rebuilding of "(...) the wall of Isin, which had been destroyed" (Horsnell 1999: vol.II 201).

197 No texts dated to Ilī-ma-AN have been found except at Nippur. Other Sealand I texts are all unprovenanced. Al-Dafar, basing himself on pottery, contends that there was Sealand I occupation of southern sites – from Uruk, Larsa, and Girsu southwards (2015: 137).

found themselves in the uncomfortable position of depending upon their counterparts in Babylon for water; they may in fact even have faced chronic water shortage in some areas caused by excessive intervention against seasonal flooding of the Euphrates in northern Babylonia early in the reign of Samsu-iluna (Charpin 2002: 555-556)\textsuperscript{199}. Therefore, besides the appeal due to the religious significance of the city, Iši-ma-AN's conquest of Nippur could have been partly motivated by a need to ensure water supply, either through the control of the Hammurapi-nuḫuš-nišī canal or of the Nippur branch of the Euphrates; since we do not know the course of the Hammurapi-nuḫuš-nišī, this remains a moot point. George even suggested that the canal did not really water the cities listed by Hammurapi in his year name celebrating its construction, his thirty-third: "Nippur, Eridu, Ur, Larsa, Uruk, and Isin"\textsuperscript{200}, and that the assertion was pure hyperbole (George 2009: 139). His reconstruction of the course of the canal would make Nippur entirely irrelevant to its control. However, there may be some truth in Hammurapi's claim since the list of cities named shows a certain amount of geographical and hydrological coherence: they may all be western locations on the Euphrates water network, especially if we consider that also Larsa probably received water from it, in addition to the Bad-Tibira channel (e.g. Stone 2003). The fact that they are enumerated starting with the northernmost city, then the southernmost, and finally in naming successively the remaining cities along a northward axis is somewhat puzzling and could be construed as artificial, but the sequence can also simply be a logical way of first establishing the impressive hydrographic range of the canal, before systematically naming the main cities included in it. Because of these uncertainties, it remains difficult to establish with confidence whether the conquest of Nippur was indeed part of a plan to ensure water supply to southern locations but it is an interesting possibility, especially if the first Sealand I king controlled south-western areas\textsuperscript{201}.

\textsuperscript{199} This is in opposition to al-Dafar's theory that hydrological intervention in the north in fact led to an increase in the water volume reaching the extreme south (2015: 144).

\textsuperscript{200} Horsnell 1999: vol.II 146.

\textsuperscript{201} A recently discovered year formula, considered a variant of Ad 22 by Richardson, seems to indicate that Ammi-diṭāna later (perhaps only partly) re-excavated the Hammurapi-nuḫuš-nišī canal (2015b). If his reconstruction of the fragmentary formula is correct, this probably happened in conjunction with Babylon's renewed control over Nippur (see Section 4.3.1).
4.3 Abī-ešuḫ tries to contain the damage

After the conquest of Nippur by Iš-ša-AN, which was the last of a long series of reductions of its territory, Babylon tried at least to contain the expansionist ambitions of its hostile southern neighbour, among other threats. Abī-ešuḫ inherited from his predecessor a severely reduced kingdom, curtailed from its southern plain, from parts of north-eastern Babylonia, and perhaps from stretches of the Diyala valley. The Babylonian king appears to have tried to reduce or contain the damage early in his reign but the enemies were many; from his year names we learn that he fought against Kassite troops (year name d = Ae 3), Elam (year name f = Ae 5 or 6), and Ešnunna (year name dd). Too little is known of the geo-political situation to decide whether there was some cooperation or infighting among Babylon's foes but the period certainly appears to have been one in which no new equilibrium had been found yet.

Official communication does not explicitly mention that Babylon endeavoured to militarily regain southern territory, but one year name informs us that the Babylonian king built a fortress on the Tigris (year name m), and we learn from three sources that he also dammed that

---

202 A receipt from Dilbat attesting of commercial relations between that town and the KAR.UNUG₂ in the year Ae m (VS 7, 43) has been interpreted by Pientka as a sign that a harbour at Uruk was still functioning and in contact with Babylon (1998: 179 n.7). Charpin justly observed that the KAR in question is much more likely to be a group of merchants from Uruk – incorporated in a kārum – in exile in northern Babylonia (1999-2000: 324).

203 This year name recording another military clash between Babylon and Elam was discussed recently by van Koppen (2013). He suggests that an Elamite raid by Kutir-Nahḥunte may be behind this year name and that this would have resulted in the abduction of Nanaya, which is alluded to in the annals of Ashurbanipal (see ibid.: 380). He follows Beaulieu who suggested that this may have taken place at Kish (Beaulieu 2003: 185; van Koppen 2013: 381).

204 For the year names, see Horsnell 1999.

205 This event is recorded in the king’s year name o (Horsnell 1999: vol.II 260), in a tamītu-text (Lambert 2007: text 3c, lines 22ff. = CTN IV 62: iv lines 6ff. and text 3d, lines 1-3), and in the chronicle ABC 20B (lines 8-10). See Chapter 2 for a discussion of the sources and their possible interrelations.
If we accept the version of events given in chronicle ABC 20B, the damming of the river was done in a failed effort to vanquish Sealand I ruler Iššu-AN. While it is not entirely impossible that Abī-ešuḫ had non-military reasons to retain or divert (some of) the Tigris water, such a project seems very radical compared to the usual digging of canals and de-silting of sluices. Whatever hydraulic effects may have been desired upstream, their corollary is a severe reduction in the availability of water downstream; whether the latter was the primary objective of the king of Babylon in damming the river is uncertain but likely. The great attempt failed and Abī-ešuḫ celebrated only the damming of the river in a year name, but the event had enough resonance to be retained also in the divinatory and historiographic tradition.

4.3.1 The fortress, the dam, and the control of Nippur

We know that Babylon had reconquered Nippur by the eighth year of Ammī-šu-duqa since in that year sacrificial animals were sent there, a transaction recorded using the year name of the river. Following George's suggestion to translate the term GIŠ.GI₂.GI₄ in the year formula m as "barrage", and therefore to understand the location of the newly built fortress as being above the dam of the Tigris referred to in year name o (George 2009: 138f.), Van Lerberghe and Voet surmised that the fortress was built to guard the dam. This interpretation is also based on a chronology of Abī-ešuḫ's reign which puts the construction of the fortress two years after the damming of the river (Van Lerberghe and Voet 2009: 5; 2016: 560), which may be wrong (see Section 4.3.1). As for George, he saw in the fortress a means of defending Nippur and the area from a Sealand I invasion (2009: 141). A fragmentary cylinder found at Kiš contains the epithet "king of the Tigris" (Ash 1924-616); if Frayne is correct in his suggestion to attribute it to Abī-ešuḫ, we would have a striking piece of evidence that the Babylonian king put much emphasis on controlling that river (Frayne 1990: E4.3.8.1001 commentary and line i 4').

As seen above, al-Dafar contends on the contrary that more water reached southern Babylonia, following shifts in the river beds (2015: 144). This may of course have been a dramatic side effect of the damming.

Pientka surmised that the damming of the Tigris may in fact have been a success for Abī-ešuḫ, this operation allowing him to oust Iššu-AN from Nippur and force him to retreat further south (1998: 268 n.67). This interpretation of the events presupposes two important and necessary conditions: that Nippur received its water from the Tigris and that Nippur was indeed retaken by Babylon at the time. We have seen above that the course of the Hammurapi-nuḫuš-šiš canal is unknown and whether it took its water from the Tigris and brought water to Nippur are points of contention. It has been suggested that it lay clearly north of Nippur (Van Lerberghe and Voet 2009: 6) or roughly at the same latitude (George 2009: 139-140). In addition, we have no indication whatsoever that the second condition is fulfilled: if Nippur was indeed retaken by Babylon in the wake of Abī-ešuḫ's hydraulic grand design, it seems strange that such a feat was not found worth commemorating in year name Ae o, alongside the damming of the river.
Babylonian king (CUSAS 8, 23). This information comes from an archive retrieved illicitly at Dūr-Abī-ešuḫ, a fortress whose location is unknown. The texts show that a small version of the Ekur had been set up at the fortress (van Lerberghe and Voet 2009: 1-3) and that it was fully functional in the reigns of Ammī-šaduqa and of Šamsu-ditāna, apparently already at an early date in the reign of the former. In unpublished texts from Dūr-Abī-ešuḫ the fortress is apparently also called the "forteresse de Nippur"; this must have been the case right from the time of its construction since the tablets in this group are mostly dated to Abī-ešuḫ (Arnaud 2007: 42). This not only strongly suggests that the fortress was located in the vicinity of Nippur but that it was used more or less as the city's defensive outpost from the moment of its construction, which implies that Babylon controlled Nippur at the time; the odds are therefore that the construction of this fortress was related to the struggle for retaining control over Nippur. The fact that the religious activity taking place at the fortress, at least in later years, is intimately related to the Ekur reinforces this impression.

The location of Dūr-Abī-ešuḫ has been the object of conjectures. We know from Abī-ešuḫ's year name m that it was located on the Tigris and from several texts published in CUSAS 8 that it was also located on the Hammurapi-nuḫuš-nišī canal, either on its bank, possibly at its water intake (van Lerberghe and Voet 2009: 6), or at its end (George 2009: 139; Földi 2014:

---

210 A similar text is probably dated to the ninth year of Ammī-šaduqa (CUSAS 8, 24). Also, a date list of Ammī-šaduqa was found at Nippur (Frayne 1990: E4.3.10). Since the document is a later copy, this evidence had been considered insufficient to conclude to a reconquest of the city (Charpin 2004: 368), but the Dūr-Abī-ešuḫ texts now leave no doubt about it. Other evidence concerning Nippur found in that archive is discussed in van Lerberghe and Voet 2009: 3-4.

211 The oldest attestation of the nešakkum priest Enlil-mansum is found in the texts CUSAS 8, 2 and 55 dated to Aṣ 5, but grain for the gods of Nippur is received by unspecified nešakkum priests in year Aṣ 2 (CUSAS 8, 54).

212 See most recently van Lerberghe and Voet 2016: 563 for a suggestion based on the existence of two fortresses of the same name, one beside the barrage, one close to Nippur. That there were two such fortresses is shown clearly in text CUSAS 29, 25, as yet unpublished, in which troops travel (lines 9-12) iš-tu BĀD a-bī-e-šu-uh43 / ṯa41 me-ēḫ-ri-im ša1 IDIGNA /  aslı-na1 BĀD a-bī-e-šu-uh43 / ṯa41 KUN8 ṯa-am-ma-ru-bi-nu-ḫu-uš-ni-ši. The matter was also recently discussed by Charpin (2015b: 145-150). The following discussion does not fully take this new information into account.

213 Pientka, following Frayne on the attribution of a royal inscription found at Kiš to the king Abī-ešuḫ, suggested that the fortress may be the "KÁ-KI-BALA" mentioned in it (Pientka 1998: 220; Frayne 1990: Abī-ešuḫ E4.3.8.2 line ii 4'). In the same inscription the king, whose name is lost, calls himself "king of the Tigris" (line i 4').
39-40 n.36), depending on how one reconstructs the course of the canal. Arnaud considers that the fortress was located immediately south of Nippur (2007: 42), van Leberghe, and Voet put it at some distance north of it, near the putative location of Lagaba (2009: 6), while George considers that it was "about twelve kilometers east-northeast" of Nippur (2009: 141).

The fortress may also have served to protect the dam which Abī-ešuḫ built on the Tigris (year name o). This interpretation rests on the reading of Giš.GI₄,GI₄ as "barrage" in the year name Am, which states that the fortress was built "above the Giš.GI₄,GI₄" (George 2009: 138-139, followed by van Leberghe, and Voet 2009: 5). Since the chronology of most of Abī-ešuḫ's reign is uncertain, it is difficult to establish whether the fortress and the dam were built in quick succession, but there is new evidence pointing in that direction.

What seems fairly certain since the publication of the text CUSAS 8, 39 is that the fortress was built before the dam. Indeed, in this text grain is delivered for troops stationed at the fortress in the third month of the year o+1, the year following the commemoration of the construction of the dam. This gives us a terminus ante quem for the construction of the fortress. Both the year names m and o were promulgated early in the year: year name m was in use at least from the 6.i intercalary (CT8, 27a) and year name o at least from the 30.i (PRAK II / C73R). We can therefore assume that both formulae were promulgated in the year following the events that they commemorate. It follows that the only possibility for the fortress to have been built after the

---

214 Richardson notes that van Lerberghe has now changed his reading of the sign denoting the location of the fortress from GŪ to KUN, therefore at "the tail end" of the canal instead of on its bank; his reading is now in agreement with George's (Richardson 2015b: n.2). For a summary of the previous debate, see George 2009:139 n.1.

215 It was suggested that year name o commemorating the damming of the Tigris corresponded to Ae 19 (Horsnell 1999: vol.II 260f.) and that the year name m commemorating the construction of the fortress is equivalent to Ae 21 (ibid: 262).

216 Contra Horsnell 1999: vol.I 79 and George 2013: 14. However, this argument may need to be re-evaluated in light of the new evidence showing that there were two fortresses called Dūr-Abi-ešuḫ (see n.212); since CUSAS 8, 39 refers to the fortress located on the canal, its date of construction may be irrelevant to the chronology of Abī-ešuḫ's reign because year name m almost certainly refers to the other fortress of the same name.

217 The year name undoubtedly follows the one commemorating the damming of the Tigris since it has the form: Mu Gibil ša EGIS Mu [year name o]. It was already attested (Horsnell 1999: vol.II 262).

218 The effective damming of the Tigris may very well have taken place at the end of month v since the tamītu referring to it states that it would take place on the thirtieth day of the month of Abu (Lambert 2007: text 3c, iii 29).
dam would be for the construction to take place in year o (which would correspond to o = m-1). This in turn is highly unlikely since we have seen that year name m was already in use in the month i intercalary, while a provisional year name of the type GIBIL was still in use in the month iii of the year o+1 (CUSAS 8, 39). Thus the most likely conclusion is that the fortress had been built before the dam. It is also plausible historically, since the construction of the dam must have been perceived as a threat by the enemy dwelling downstream, and it certainly made sense strategically for Babylon to have a stronghold near and ready to house troops protecting the construction site and where dam workers could retreat in case of attack. The wording of the year name m, which refers to the dam to describe the location of the fortress, is no argument against this sequence of events. Indeed, if both works were planned as one large project, which seems likely, such a formulation is not surprising: by the time year name m was promulgated to celebrate the newly erected fortress, the future dam, probably under construction, was already real enough to be used as a geographical landmark.

One omen text from Dūr-Abī-ešuḫ may corroborate this and even give us a fairly precise chronology of events. In this text, after asking about the well-being of the fortress and the troops, the diviner asks about the well-being of troops at the dam and about the intentions of the enemy (CUSAS 18: no.4 rev. 23' ff.) The text is dated to 2.ii.Ae m, the year celebrating the construction of the fortress. If this dam is indeed the barrage of the Tigris, it means that its construction started immediately after that of the fortress. The dam still under construction must have been a military target for the Sealand I leader who wanted to ensure sufficient supply in water, or so the king of Babylon apparently thought. Diviners at the fortress were making sure, on his behalf, that everything would be well with the troops overseeing the construction. This certainly bespeaks a period of enmity between Babylon and its neighbour(s), including the Sealand I kingdom which had most to lose from the dam.

Combining this date (ii.Ae m) with that of an oracular question on the effective obstruction of the river on 30.v (Lambert 2007: text 3c), we have the following chronology of events, assuming that the construction of the dam did not take longer than a year (otherwise m would simply correspond to o - 2 and there would be another year before the commemoration of the event).
Table 6: Sequence of the years Ae m and o

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regnal year</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Commemoration of event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>m-1</td>
<td>Construction of the fortress</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m (= o-1)</td>
<td>Construction of the dam at least from ii until 30.v</td>
<td>Commemoration of the construction of the fortress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td>Commemoration of the construction of the dam</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The political climate may have changed rapidly following the construction of the fortress and the dam. Indeed, there are possible signs of interactions between the Babylonian fortress and the Sealand I state\(^\text{219}\). Such an interpretation depends on how one understands the term A.AB.BA, which appears at least three times in texts from Dūr-Abī-ešuḫ. One mention occurs in a text dated to the year n of Abī-ešuḫ (van Lerberghe and Voet 2010: text 1 line 10): if we accept the reading suggested by Földi (2014: 43), which seems more sound syntactically than the reading proposed in the editio princeps, grain was put at the disposal of envoys from A.AB.BA. The term also occurs in a text dated to Ae 28 in the puzzling expression "ÉRIN e-li A.AB.BA" (Földi 2014: 33, text Sem 1278, obv. 20); the context is one of rations handed out to troops, including Kassite troops. The author discusses the passage and raises the possibility that it referred to Sealand I troops (ibid.: 37 n.20). These two occurrences, if A.AB.BA is to be understood as a term designating the Sealand I polity, would indicate that there were sporadic official relations between the two neighbours. Because the chronology of Abī-ešuḫ's reign is poorly understood, these putative contacts cannot be put into a clear sequence of events: that the year Ae 28 was

\(^{219}\) One text, CUSAS 8, 39, also raises puzzling questions on the relations between the fortress and southern cities. The damaged line 3 records a recipient of grain transliterated: (quantity) SAL e-mi-ta AB ki \(\overline{fx \times x \times 1}\), the beginning of which van Lerberghe and Voet translated as a female name, Emita (2009: 86-87). Földi proposed to correct this to \(\overline{fERIN1 \ ha-bi-rum \ LARSA1 \ ù \ ì-sî-in3}\) (2014: 42). But the spelling ha-bi-rum would be peculiar for two reasons: 1-the singular is not expected after ERIN (it is attested with that orthography only when qualifying one person, "PN LU ḫâbiru(m)" (CAD H, s.v. ḫâpiru c); 2- if it is immediately followed by a GN, one would expect the bound form. This reconstruction appears therefore rather improbable. Collation from photograph (available at \text{http://cuneiform.library.cornell.edu/content/51-01-022-2}) is difficult. The same text shows that travel was safe between Babylon and Dūr-Abī-ešuḫ since grain was brought from the capital to the fortress in the year o+1, that is, in the year following the one commemorating the damming of the Tigris (van Lerberghe and Voet 2009: 86).
indeed the last one of this king seems almost certain (Horsnell 1999: vol.I 76)\(^{220}\), but his year \(n\) has not been positioned satisfactorily yet\(^{221}\). At any rate, if we admit the presence of official Sealand I delegates at the fortress and if we consider this in conjunction with the damming of the Tigris, it it would seem that a complex game of negotiations and threats took place between the two states.

Of more anecdotal interest is the fact that an individual dubbed a refugee (\textit{munnabtu}) is said to have fled to the fortress "\textit{iš-tu A.AB.BA}", from the Sea(-land?); this happened in the very year following the construction of the fortress (MS 3218/13: lines 4-5)\(^{222}\). The fact that the refugee is said to have indeed fled from \textit{A.AB.BA} (\textit{iš-tu A.AB.BA \textit{in-na-bi-ta-am}}) seems to indicate that we are dealing here not with a local lake or marshy area but with a geo-political entity. One of the unpublished texts from Dūr-Abī-ēšuḫ also mentions a traveller coming to the fortress from Ur (Arnaud 2007: 43 n.119). If the text refers not only to his origin but truly to the place where he set out on his journey, this means that merchants were able at the time to travel from south-western to central-eastern Babylonia\(^{223}\). However, pending the publication of more detail on the text we do not know whether this merchant was acting in a usual trading context.

While Dūr-Abī-ēšuḫ may have witnessed changes in the relations between Babylon and the Sealand I kingdom, it probably stayed continuously in Babylonian hands well into the reign of Samsu-ditāna since the texts found there, published and unpublished, seem roughly to cover the entire period from its construction until Sd 13\(^{224}\).

\(^{220}\) Horsnell's reconstruction of Abī-ēšuḫ's chronology draws heavily on other previous studies, in particular Goetze's work; all are cited abundantly in Hornsell 1999: vol.I 65-81.

\(^{221}\) Both Goetze's and Horsnell's tentative orderings would place year \(n\) before the year of the construction of the fortress (Horsnell 1999: vol.I 73; 79), which is obviously no longer tenable.

\(^{222}\) The year name is well legible on the photograph on cdli. The text is as yet unpublished but is briefly referred to in George (2009: 136) and Földi (2014: 37 n.31).

\(^{223}\) If we assume that the fortress and Nippur were fairly close to one another, which seems likely as seen above, this makes a Sealand I occupation of Nippur less likely or limited to the city and immediate area.

\(^{224}\) The unpublished archival texts discussed by Arnaud (2007) apparently mostly date to Abī-ēšuḫ; a group of unpublished letters and temple lists in the Cornell collection all date to the reign of Ammī-ditāna (van Lerberghe and Voet 2009: 6); the archival texts published in CUSAS 8 date from Ae 20 to Sd 13, with only a few dated to Ammī-ditāna (van Lerberghe and Voet 2009).
The situation was clearly less stable at Nippur: it had fallen into the hands of Ilī-ma-AN in or shortly after the twenty-ninth year of Samsu-iluna; in the eleventh year of Ammī-ditāna, it had either not been reconquered by Babylon yet\(^\text{225}\), or lost again, since one letter from Dūr-Abī-ešuḫ, not yet fully published but quoted by van Lerberghe and Voet, recounts how unspecified "enemies" attacked Nippur and the Ekur with horses and hundreds of troops (2009: 7; letter CUNES 51-02-138), whereas the letter suggests that the troops of the fortress were not involved in its defence. However, this remains uncertain since the text contains two wide lacunae. The attack came in two waves, which both could be repelled and were witnessed by Nippurites who had fled the city and watched the unfolding of events from the banks of the river. The letter was sent by "servants" to "our lord", perhaps the king or a high-ranking official. One question raised by this fascinating document is why the letter was found at Dūr-Abī-ešuḫ. The text mentions a "copy", however this term does not occur at the very end of the letter but after a reference to the witness reports: "(...) We have written down the reports by Etelpû. Copy. Via Ilīšu-ibnišu, the express-messenger. Via (...). (Date formula)." It is therefore unclear whether the term copy refers to the copying of the original witness report into the body of the letter or whether this tablet is a duplicate of the letter. At stake is whether it was sent to or from Dūr-Abī-ešuḫ. If the letter was sent to the fortress it would necessarily mean that the distance between it and Nippur was considerable\(^\text{226}\) since the wording of the report suggests that when the witnesses spoke on the twenty-eighth of the month, it was the first news they gave of events that had begun on the nineteenth and unfolded until the twenty-fourth. If the letter is a copy and was sent from the fortress (perhaps to Babylon), it puts officers at the fortress in the rôle of informing Babylon of what was happening at Nippur, apparently without intervening there. This episode cannot be associated with archaeological evidence since no signs of destruction of the Isin-Larsa Ekur, on

\(^{225}\) However, the fact that Dūr-Abī-ešuḫ was apparently labelled with the epithet "fortress of Nippur" in unpublished texts which probably dated to Abī-ešuḫ suggests that Nippur was again under Babylon's control at the time (Arnaud 2007: 42); the publication of the texts should help lift uncertainties on that point.

\(^{226}\) This would be in contradiction with other evidence; see above.
top of which the Kassite temple was built, were found\textsuperscript{227}. However, a levelling of the ground seems to have taken place before the construction of the latter, apparently accompanied by a thorough clearing of debris resulting in a low elevation of the Kassite temple (McCown \textit{et al.} 1967: 12); this may have obliterated traces of conflict.

The archaeological record also suggests that the city was largely abandoned for a time in the late Old Babylonian period (Gasche 1989: 124-125), although Gibson noted that the abandonment may not have been total, suggesting that a "skeleton staff at Ekur after Samsuiluna’s times" may have remained (1992: 44). George considers that a period of abandonment began during Ammi-šaduqa’s reign, more precisely in the years following the texts CUSAS 8, 23 and 24 from the Dūr-Abī-ešuḫ archive, which record sheep deliveries to Nippur (whereas other such deliveries of the same archive are all directed to Dūr-Abī-ešuḫ) (2009: 137). He even suggests to narrow down the moment of abandonment of the city between Aš 9, the year of the last attested delivery of sheep to Nippur, and Aš 15, the year in which a tablet was sealed at Dūr-Abī-ešuḫ with a cylinder-seal bearing the inscription $\text{NANNA-MEŠA}4 \text{ka-ri-ib } \text{AMAR.UTU } \text{ud-du-uš } \text{É.KUR } \text{ù NIBRI}$ $\text{li-mu-ur}$: "May Nanna-meša, who renders homage to Marduk, (live to) see the renovation of Ekur and Nippur" (seal B on text CUSAS 8, 16; George 2009: 137).

We have therefore the following chronology of events for Nippur (hypothetical events are in italics):

\textsuperscript{227} Also, the archaeological evidence does not speak for a reconstruction of the Ekur in the interval, which could be implied in one fragmentary year name of Ayadaragalama (year P; see Appendix 2). Even if the formula indeed features a temple É.KUR, we cannot be certain that it was the the É.KUR of Nippur; we do not know whether there was even limited occupation of the site at the time.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Source and contingencies on dating</th>
<th>Event at Nippur</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ha 32</td>
<td>In the year name Ha 33</td>
<td>Excavation of the Hammurapi-nuḫuš-nišī canal bringing water to Nippur and other southern cities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Si 9</td>
<td>Corresponds to RSII 2. At least 1.iv - 25.x. (OECT 8, 14 and 8, 19)</td>
<td>Occupation by Rīm-Sīn II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Si 10</td>
<td>Month i? (TIM 4, 6)</td>
<td>Reconquest by Babylon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In or after Si 10?</td>
<td>Building inscription (Frayne 1990: E4.3.7.2).</td>
<td>Reinforcement of the wall (by Babylon)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In or after Si 29</td>
<td>For at least 1.5 year, from 16.vii.</td>
<td>Occupation by Sealand I king Ilī-ma-AN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Si 31 and Ae m?</td>
<td>Before the construction of Dūr-Abī-ešuḫ in his year m (since the fortress was called &quot;fortress of Nippur&quot; in unpublished texts probably dating to Abī-ešuḫ; see Arnaud 2007: 42)</td>
<td>Reconquest by Babylon?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Period of Babylonian control of Nippur during Ammī-ditāna’s reign? (unpublished texts of uncertain date in the Cornell collection)**

| Before Ad 11 | Before the attack in Ad 11 | Loss of Nippur by Babylon ? (to whom ?) |
| Ad 11 | 19th and 24th days of month xi (letter CUNES 51-02-138) | Unsuccessful attack by unidentified enemy (apparently while Nippur was not under Babylonian control) |

**Period of Babylonian control of Nippur during Ammī-ditāna’s reign? (unpublished texts of uncertain date in the Cornell collection)**

| Ad 21 | In a variant of the year name Ad 22(?) | Re-excavation of the Hammurapi-nuḫuš-nišī canal (related to control of Nippur?) |
| Before Aṣ 8 | Earliest delivery of sheep to Nippur recorded in the Dūr-Abī-ešuḫ archive, on the 20.vii (CUSAS 8, 23) | Babylonian control over Nippur |
| After Aṣ 9 | Latest delivery of sheep to Nippur recorded in the Dūr-Abī-ešuḫ archive, on the 4.xii (CUSAS 8, 24); perhaps before Aṣ 15 (inscription of seal B expressing hope for renovation of Ekur; on CUSAS 8, 16) | Abandonment and transfer of remaining cultic activities? |

**Table 7: Chronology of events at Nippur**

Without more evidence, the circumstances surrounding the (brief?) Sealand I occupation remain in the dark. Whether the Sealand I kings were involved in any further episode(s) of turmoil is
unclear. The possibilities were many in this volatile period; Kassite groups or Elam for instance could also have had their hand in the struggle for Nippur. Also shrouded in uncertainty is the question of the abandonment. That the city was abandoned seems certain according to archaeological evidence and it must have lasted some time since erosion even created stable sloping surfaces in the area TA on Tablet Hill, which the Kassites did not level when they reoccupied it (Gibson et al. 1998-2001: 562). The chronology of events presented in Table 7 suggests that the Sealand I kingdom may not have been involved in the abandonment of the city.

4.4 Other allies, foes, and neighbours of the Sealand I kingdom

The emergence and early growth of the Sealand I kingdom appears to have been partly a struggle against Babylon over territory and water, a series of (re-)appropriation of what had been for a while under Babylonian control. While it has proved impossible to ascertain whether an embryonic Sealand I political entity or Ilī-ma-AN were already involved in the rebellion of Si 8 - 9, we know that Samsu-iluna's repression thereof certainly reduced, at least momentarily, the number of potential contenders for the control over southern Babylonia. Ilī-ma-AN apparently seized the moment and was able to establish his credibility as leader and build up a power base sufficient to attack Nippur some years later, and Samsu-iluna's elimination of rebellious leaders must in fact have unintentionally helped him in this. Nonetheless, the Sealand I polity certainly did not grow in a power vacuum.

4.4.1 Elam

One factor which may have played a rôle in the emergence and establishment of the Sealand I kingdom is a possible political or military involvement of Elam. We know that Babylon and Elam clashed fairly early in Abī-ešuḫ's reign. Indeed, new evidence from Sippar has revealed that his year name f contains a reference to the Elamite army (von Koppen 2013). This year name is one of the few of that monarch that are partly preserved on a date list, making it certain that it
was in the early years on his reign. This bellicose episode could be associated with a putative Elamite raid, perhaps on Kiš, which resulted in the removal of the goddess Nanaya. However, the purported abduction of Nanaya by the Elamites is based on a passage of the annals of Aššur-urbanipal recording the return of the cultic statue into the Eanna; with no source nearer in time, the veracity, let alone the date of the event are impossible to assess. But what can certainly be adduced from year name f is that Babylon and Elam were at war again. The involvement of Elam in the Babylonian lowland may have been advantageous for the Sealand I kingdom in diverting its opponent's military attention, although we do not know what stance Elam took towards the rising southern Babylonian power at the time.

At a later date the Sealand I kingdom and Elam certainly appear to have maintained diplomatic relations; this is shown in CUSAS 9, 40 (dated to Ayadaragalam) which records a messenger from Elam as the intended recipient of ewes delivered to the palace. An Elamite envoy was therefore present at the time at a Sealand I palace, perhaps the royal court.

The historiographic tradition may also indicate that the relations between the last Sealand I king and Elam were friendly, but this interpretation depends on the reconstruction of a lacunary passage of the chronicle ABC 20B. The penultimate section begins with the line: m dē-a-ga-

228 Horsnell suggests that year f = Ae 5 (1999: vol.I 74). Van Koppen raises the possibility of one additional line in the preceding lacuna of Date List B and concludes that year f could be equated with Ae 5 or 6 (2013: 378-379).

229 Van Koppen 2013: 381 using previous works by Beaulieu 2003: 185.

230 This episode was first associated with a raid on Uruk during Samsu-iluna's reign (Leemans 1968: 217; Glassner 1993; see also Beaulieu 2003: 185 and Charpin 2004: 342 n.1785.) According to the annals, the statue would have resided a very long time in Elam (the passage is recorded on the Rassam Cylinder, col.VI, lines 107ff.) Concerning the date of the event, Glassner saw a possible connection between the passage in the annals and the fact that the term SUKKAL.MAḪ appears in a chronicle fragment referring to Samsu-iluna (1993). But the passage is very fragmentary; it was discussed by Lambert in his edition of the text (1990b: 31 n.9).

231 LÚ KIN.GI.LA ša ELAM.MAḪi (lines 3-4).

232 It is likely that travel between Sealand I territory and Susiana could take place unhindered since it was not contingent on the possibility of safe passage in the Diyala or via Der. Indeed, it has been shown that Girsu, Lagas, and other southern cities were directly connected to Susa by waterway in the Early Dynastic and Ur III periods via the Karkheh or the Karun river (Lafont 2010: 174; Gasche et al. 2007: 51 n.234; Leemans 1960a: 175; Laursen and Steinkeller 2017: Appendix 3). The chances are that such itineraries were still used.

233 The structure of this chronicle is discussed in Section 2.2.1.1.

234 ABC 20B: rev. 12'.
mil LUGAL KUR tam-ti a-na KUR ELAM MAki [...]-ma. King reconstructed the passage as [il-li-ku]-ma and translated it as "Ea-gamil, king of the Country of the Sea, [set out] against the land of Elam" (King 1907: II 22, line 11). Basing himself on the same reconstruction of the passage, Weidner translated it more neutrally as "[ging] nach Elam" but added that Ea-gāmil was probably brought as a prisoner (1926: 69 n.1); this brings an entirely new light on the passage but still implies that the states were at war with one another. However, both interpretations are based on a reconstruction which was probably erroneous; it appears indeed problematic in terms of space needed, if we can trust King's hand copy (1907: II 127). Grayson, after collation, suggested to reconstruct the verb ith-liq-ma, translating it "[f]led to Elam" (1975: 156, line Rev.12)\textsuperscript{235}. If we accept this reconstruction, Elam and the Sealand I kingdom were still on friendly terms at the time. It appears therefore that at least from the middle of its history, the Sealand I kingdom had established lasting diplomatic ties with the eastern power.

Taking a macroscopic view of the relations between Elam and Mesopotamia in the first half of the second millennium, we know in fact next to nothing for the post-Hammurapi period\textsuperscript{236}. Elam's influence in Mesopotamia had certainly been drastically curtailed for a time by Babylon's expansion. Elam and Rīm-Anum of Uruk appear to have entertained friendly relations for a short time since we find that an overseer of Elamites received a group of young prisoners from the bīt asīrī in Rīm-Anum's first year (Nisaba 4 II.3; Seri 2013: 134; 240). However, these relations must have soured rapidly since in Rīm-Anum's third year Elamites were brought as prisoners to Uruk (VS 13 13; Seri 2013: 128; 240). Seri considered that Elam may have backed a coalition formed by Rīm-Sīn II of Larsa, Dagan-ma-ilum (probably of Mutiabal), and Rīm-Anum, but that the latter turned against his allies to side with Babylon, also against Ešnunna, as reflected in his third year name (Seri 2013: 240-241). Considering therefore that Elam was allied with southern

\textsuperscript{235} Glassner's reconstruction and translation agree with Grayson's (2004: 272-273, line 12').

\textsuperscript{236} We know that Elamites were integrated into Babylonian society in northern, middle, and southern Babylonia during the entire Old Babylonian period (Van Lerberghe 1986: 152; Seri 2013: 134-135) but that is no reliable indicator of the official relations between the states. A few Elamites are also present in the Sealand I archive, some of them identified as such (Zadok 2014: 224-226; 232; Dalley 2009: 3). They appear as payers of agricultural taxes of Kār-Šamaš (CUSAS 9, 428 and perhaps 441) and craftsmen, some of whom received rations (Zadok 2014: 224-225). Nothing in their interaction with the palace distinguishes them from other individuals besides the fact that they were sometimes identified as Elamite. Dalley mistakenly identifies one messenger Ugin-Saḫ in CUSAS 9, 455 as an Elamite (2009: 3; text 29 n.9): he has in fact a Kassite name (Zadok 2014: 225).
rebels against Babylon early in Samsu-iluna's reign, in a sense reviving its alliance with early Old Babylonian Larsa, it seems indeed not too far fetched to imagine Elam looking favourably upon the Sealand I continuators of this opposition against the same foe\textsuperscript{237}, especially since we know that the enmity between Elam and Babylon probably perdured at least into Abī-ešuḫ's reign\textsuperscript{238}.

4.4.2 The Kassites

Although Kassites were certainly present before\textsuperscript{239}, it is during the southern rebellion that they entered the Babylonian political record, as the enemies both of Babylon and of the rebel king Rim-Sin II: Samsu-iluna's ninth year name claims that he defeated them at Kikalla, while Rim-Sin II, probably in the same year, mentions the "evil Kassites from the barbarous country, who could not be driven back to the mountains" (Stol 1976: 54). It is difficult to decide whether there was concerted action on the part of the Kassites, that is, whether they attacked lowland settlements in an organized military fashion, but sources certainly do not suggest that they were unified under one leader. They may simply have migrated massively onto the northern and middle Babylonian plains, in separate groups, presumably entering the lowland from the Diyala valley\textsuperscript{240}. The exertions of Samsu-iluna and Rim-Sin II to repel the Kassites were to no avail, they were ineluctably becoming part of Babylonian society; but the process did not run smoothly, since, according to his year name d, Kassite groups caused problems also to Abī-ešuḫ early in his reign. Despite these conflicts, many among the newcomers integrated very rapidly; indeed

\textsuperscript{237} The conquest of Larsa by Hammurapi may have been felt by Elam as the last of several blows dealt by Babylon against its base of power in the lowland (Durand 2013: 337-338). We do not know whether it still had any velleities of direct presence on the Mesopotamian plain at the time of the rebellion during Samsu-iluna's reign, therefore how interested its support to smaller southern polities was. At any rate, the Elamite ruler probably preferred smaller neighbours to a large, powerful one.

\textsuperscript{238} The relations between Babylon and Elam probably long remained acrimonious. Indeed, an oracular question from the time of Samsu-ditāna, known from a Neo-Assyrian copy, names Elamite troops among the enemies besieging a city, which may or may not have been Babylon but must have been strategically important enough for Kassites, Elamites, Hanigalbateans, and others to join force in their assault (CTN IV 63: i31ff. = Lambert 2007: no.1 lines 31ff.).

\textsuperscript{239} It seems that a Kassite individual is attested in a text from late in the reign of Rim-Sin I; possible earlier attestations are uncertain (Sassmannshausen 2000: 410).

\textsuperscript{240} Rim-Sin II's date formula certainly seems to point to this scenario.
Kassite troops are attested at Dūr-Abī-ešuḫ somewhat later in Abī-ešuḫ's reign (Arnaud 2007: 43).241

The Kassites may have been a factor to reckon with in Ilī-ma-AN's plans, especially when he pushed into middle Babylonia, where they were presumably more numerous than in the south. But we have no evidence that they had much influence, favourable or detrimental, in the emergence of the Sealand I kingdom, besides the fact that they apparently mobilized some of Babylon's troops and resources.242

A number of Kassites certainly migrated into Sealand I territory, since by the middle of the dynasty, we find evidence of their presence in the texts dated to Pešgaldaramaš and Ayadaragalama, but only a limited number of individuals bore Kassite names (Zadok 2014: 227-228). The onomasticon is of course a deficient method of analysis for Kassite demographics since most individuals identified as Kassite in Old Babylonian texts had adopted Akkadian names (Sassmannshausen 2000: 411). However, it is the only means at our disposal for the Sealand I corpus because people are never identified as Kassite in it.243 Individuals with Kassite names appear in various functions: ploughman (CUSAS 9, 386: 5), leatherworker (CUSAS 9, 448: 16), worker (CUSAS 9, 396: 12), leader of a group of workers (CUSAS 9, 387: 12), GīR official (CUSAS 9, 74: 8). Some received grain rations and ewes (CUSAS 9, 25: 5-6; 49: 1-2; 451: 2 and 7), others had probably been allocated a miksu-field since they paid such royalties accordingly (CUSAS 9, 410: 27; 448: 16; probably 413: 21 and 35).244 These individuals had obviously integrated the local economic life quite seamlessly.245

241 Already at the end of Samsu-iluna's reign, Kassites appear in economic texts, for instance receiving agricultural tools (OLA 21, 19: in particular line 13; the text is discussed in van Lerberghe 1995: 382).

242 A number of late Old Babylonian letters bear witness to the sense of insecurity which prevailed both around towns and in the back country due to what Pientka incisively described as "plündernden und mordenden Völkergruppen" (1998: 260). Among these minatory hordes of wanderers, Bimatites and Šamharites are sometimes named, who may have been affiliated with the Kassite ethno-linguistic group (Pientka 1998: 261-262).

243 This differs from Elamites who are sometimes specifically identified as such, for instance in CUSAS 9, 444: line 37.

244 See Boivin 2016b for a detailed discussion on miksu-fields and the related tax; see also Section 6.2.1.1.

245 The only rôle in which Kassites appear which could distinguish them from the mass of individuals bearing Akkadian names is as recipients of textiles and copper; this will be discussed forthwith.
The social integration of Kassites is more difficult to gauge. One letter refers to Kassite houses, or a Kassite house, written ē ka-aš-ši-i (CUSAS 9, 7: 18' and 20'), which seems to indicate that they tended to live in separate settlements, perhaps organized according to tribal affiliation, as was apparently the case around late Old Babylonian Sippar and Dilbat (van Lerberghe 1995: 380). But the context of the passage is unclear; it follows a break and the preserved text uses an ambiguous verb: it deals with the gummuru of the ē ka-aš-ši-i. The term "Ē" appears here to refer to actual dwellings246 but the plurality of meanings of the verb makes it difficult to decide whether their completion or their destruction is alluded to247. A deity called "The-One-who-dwells-in-the-Kassite-Houses" may also have received offerings sponsored by the palace (CUSAS 9, 59: 16; perhaps in 82: 26'), which suggests royal acknowledgement that this group was welcome in Sealand I society.

In addition, one unpublished text shows that Ayadaragalama entertained diplomatic relations with a Kassite lord or ruler248: a lamb was delivered to the Sealand I palace for the messenger (DUMU šipri) of one Buragindar (text BC 435 cited by Dalley 2009: 47)249, a ruler otherwise unknown. This attestation in a Sealand I text dating to Ayadaragalama shows that a Kassite leader was on diplomatic terms with the southern kingdom shortly after the fall of Babylon. Buragindar did not necessarily reign on a large area but he was important enough to have his messenger received at a Sealand I palace. Other texts from the archive suggest that these good relations were either facilitated by gifts or perhaps by trade. Indeed, although this "messenger of Buragindar" is not identified by name, another individual bearing a Kassite name, Ugin-Saḫ, is

246 See on this Sassmannshausen 2004a: 291.

247 Dalley opted for the former interpretation, but also noted the other possible reading (2009: 25 n.21').

248 Year name F of Ayadaragalama might refer to enmity between the Sealand I ruler and Kassites but the interpretation of the formula is uncertain: MU A.A.DÂRA.GALAM.MA LUGAL.E BÂD ZAG.GAR HAR GU.LÂK LÜ.KÜR KAL ŠU Ú MU.UN.NA.DÜ.A (the long version is used in the texts CUSAS 9, 156; 409). Dalley suggested a reading "Year when A. the king built the wall of the shrine (...) Great Ring, (against?) the Kalšu-enemy(?)" (2009: 11). She notes that a reading /kašš/ of the sign KAL is problematic, as would be the hypothesis of a dissimilation šš > šš, and therefore an interpretation of "Kalšu" as Kassite appears unwarranted. However, since the Akkadian form of the gentilic kaššu derives from galzu, perhaps also *kalzu (Balkan 1954: 131), such an orthography is not completely impossible.

249 This took place only a few days before a messenger (LÛ KIN.GÎ.LÂ) of Elam received two ewes (CUSAS 9, 40: 3-4). The lamb for the Kassite messenger was apparently required for the 8.iii of year N, the ewes for the Elamite messenger on the 12.iii of year N. There may have been political reasons for the presence of a Kassite and an Elamite envoy at the same time at a Sealand I court. The Kassite messenger received less than the Elamite one.
also called a messenger in the same archive (CUSAS 9, 455: 4-5). The text records that he received garments and copper in moderate but non-negligible quantities, a transaction which was apparently no exceptional event since we find Ugin-Saḥ receiving the same goods in CUSAS 9, 460: 1-3; in the latter text, he is not identified as messenger but the complete similarity of context suggests that we are dealing with the same person. He may also be the same Ugin-Saḥ who twice received ewes (CUSAS 9, 25: 5; 49: 2) and once grain allotments (CUSAS 9, 451). Whether there was one or more individuals by the same name is impossible to say, but at least one Kassite messenger received luxury items fit for trade or for presentation as gift.

The recipients of copper and garments in the archive may in fact all have names that are neither Akkadian, nor Sumerian, and some of which are probably Kassite. The quantities handed out appear rather modest for trade and none of these individuals are identified as merchants. However, since the context of the few relevant records is unknown, trade cannot be excluded. What these few documents tell us for certain is that moderate quantities of imported goods (copper) and goods that were probably produced locally (textiles) were handed out to individuals with foreign names – including Kassites, sometimes a few times on the same day (CUSAS 9, 460). We know from a few records that Kassites were involved in trade in northern Babylonia during the late Old Babylonian period (van Lerberghe 1995: 383 and 386), one can therefore wonder whether some Kassite groups and settlements acted as trading agents between the southern and northern Babylonian areas, therefore between the Sealand I kingdom and its northern neighbour(s).

250 If he is the same, and if he was sent by a neighbouring Kassite lord or ruler, he was present at least in four different years at the Sealand I palace (years I; J; L; and N).

251 Ugin-Saḥ appears alongside one Šigin-Saḥ in CUSAS 9, 25 and 451.

252 In CUSAS 9, 456: 2 and 4 garments were given to two individuals whose names are broken but perhaps Kassite: one begins with Kutta-, an element attested at Nuzi (Purves 1943: 231; Oppenheim 1937-1939: 34; Ebeling 1939: 56) and one with Burra- (Balkan 1954: 48). The other recipients of copper and garments in CUSAS 9, 460 are probably also not Akkadian but their origin is unclear: Inbassati on line 6, Kunakki on line 8 and perhaps Šupal on line 10. Zadok considers that Kunakki is “unexplained (non-Semitic)” (2014: 229). Šu-pa-al is reminiscent of Kassite names attested at Nuzi (Purves 1943: 195; 259).

253 Van Lerberghe refers in particular to texts BM 97292, 97252, and 97206 dated to Abī-ešuḫ, and to text BM 78378 for which he offers an edition (1995: 387f. no.1).
4.4.3 Ešnunna

We do not know much about the political history of the Diyala, in particular of Ešnunna, in the late Old Babylonian period. Babylon’s hegemony in the region after Hammurapi’s conquest seems to have been short-lived or at least unstable since Samsu-iluna celebrated a victory over Ešnunna in his tenth year name. After this, the situation is unclear but the relations were certainly at times acrimonious (Charpin 2004: 347)\textsuperscript{254}, although one text from Babylon informs us that, by the time it was on the eve of its demise, Babylon maintained at least commercial relations with the eastern city (VS 22 37)\textsuperscript{255}.

In the period following the fall of Babylon, the Sealand I kingdom and Ešnunna seem to have entertained strained relations. Indeed, the letter CUSAS 9, 3 informs us that Ešnunneans travelling by boat to Sealand I destinations were detained by one of its officials (see Section 3.1.2.1). The incident recorded in the letter shows that travelling into Sealand I territory did not appear impossible to Ešnunneans, but they were probably not very numerous to undertake such a journey, because the official who detained the travellers needed to ask his superior for instructions. His hesitation on his course of action could also be indicative of a recent, sudden change in the relations between these polities, perhaps related to instabilities and uncertainties following the fall of Babylon.

---

\textsuperscript{254} Samsu-iluna’s twentieth year name shows that Babylon was still trying to keep or regain control over the city, after which we are in the dark as to Ešnunna’s fate. It appears that Samsu-iluna had not given up controlling the Diyala since he built a fortress at Khafadje, commemorated in his twenty-fourth year name, probably to ensure control over its lower plain (Charpin 2004: 347-348). Also, towards the end of his reign, he may have been for a time in control of the Hamrin Valley in the upper Diyala, although we have only year names attesting to Babylon’s involvement in the area (ibid.: 363; Pientka 1998: 263). Conflict with Ešnunna perurdured during Abī-ešuḫ’s reign, but trade also took place with other locations in the Diyala (Pientka 1998: 263; Charpin 2004: 369).

\textsuperscript{255} This contract from Babylon is dated to the fourteenth year of Samsu-ditāna and records a loan to fund a commercial expedition to Ešnunna (Klengel 1983: 34-35). The text is also discussed in Charpin 2004: 383 n.2003, where it is erroneously identified as VS 22 34. See also Pientka 1998: 296. In the very few other texts of this period in which Ešnunna is mentioned, the context and relationship between Babylon and Ešnunna is even less clear; see Pientka 1998: 296. She apparently assumed that trade took place because, in her discussion of the text VS 22 84, she mentions that certain goods were bought there; however, the letter is probably referring to the private property of someone who moved his household (Kraus and Klengel 1983: 52-53).
4.5 A second wave of expansion under Damqi-ilišu?

Sources available to us are silent on Sealand I activity following the clashes between Babylon and Ilī-ma-AN surrounding the latter's thrust into middle and perhaps part of northern Babylonia and Babylon's response to it. Whether the Sealand I kingdom had a stake in further turbulent episodes at Nippur is unclear and it was shown that there are at present no indication that the southern kingdom was involved in the (partial) abandonment of that city. In fact, we do not know whether open conflicts occurred at all in the period between Abī-eṣuḫ's failed attempt to defeat Ilī-ma-AN and Ammī-ditāna's raid on Udinim, and if we take this absence of sources as positive evidence, it could suggest that the second Sealand I king, Itti-ilī-nībī, positioned himself differently than his predecessor and tried to make peace with Babylon. Surmises drawn from the absence of evidence are always a perilous exercise but this purported scenario would certainly match the indications, admittedly very slight, found in texts from Dūr-Abī-eṣuḫ, that diplomatic relations may have taken place between the Sealand I state and Babylon during Abī-eṣuḫ's reign (see Section 4.3.1).

At any rate, by the reign of the following king Damqi-ilišu, the situation had certainly deteriorated.

4.5.1 Ammī-ditāna's campaign and the control of Udannu

The next open conflict between Babylon and the Sealand I kingdom known to us was recorded in Ammī-ditāna's thirty-seventh year formula (Horsnell 1999: vol.II 319-320). This year name informs us that Babylon destroyed the wall of EZENxSIG₇₃ⁱ, probably corresponding to the town of Udannu (see Section 3.1.2). The chronology of events suggests that Udannu may have been of strategic importance: the third Sealand I king Damqi-ilišu fortified the city, Ammī-ditāna took it, or at least could reach it and cause some destruction, after which the town was certainly rebuilt by a Sealand I ruler because text CUSAS 9, 101 shows that by the reign of Ayadaragalama Udannu was (again) part of his realm and a place that the king could visit.
Considering that Udannu was almost certainly located on the Euphrates, and very probably north of the find spot of the Sealand I archive (see Section 3.1.1), it seems that Ammī-ditāna's attack on the Sealand I kingdom was effectively contained in the border region between both kingdoms. We see also that Babylon had by then shifted its theatre of action against the southern state from the Tigris to the Euphrates area.

4.5.2 Damqi-ilišu makes a name for himself

Ammī-ditāna's attack on a Sealand I fortified city may have been the culminating event in a series of defensive measures by the Babylonian king, as reflected in a number of year names concerning a military conscription and the construction of fortifications between his third and his thirty-sixth year\textsuperscript{256}. There are a few indications that these measures may have been a response to an increased threat from their southern neighbour during the reign of its third king Damqi-ilišu.

In the year name Ad 37, the builders of the city wall of Udannu(?) are called either ĖREN \textit{dam-qī-i-li-šu-KE}_4 : "troops (people) of Damqi-ilišu", or simply \textit{dam-qī-i-li-šu}; the Sealand I king is personally acknowledged in a fashion which is not very common in an Old Babylonian year name\textsuperscript{257}. There is apparently a will to associate this military deed with that particular foe; Babylon did not only destroy the city's wall, it did it against Damqi-ilišu\textsuperscript{258}. This may have arisen from the wish to record at least that success, however small, against this enemy, because no decisive victory against the entire polity appeared possible.

\textsuperscript{256} The most relevant years are his third (military conscription); his eleventh, sixteenth, eighteenth, thirty-second and thirty-fifth (fortification works). Richardson considers in particular the years Ad 11 to Ad 22 to have been a "crisis decade" (forthcoming).

\textsuperscript{257} In the same period, other enemies identified by name in the year formulae of a king of Babylon are Araḫab(u) in Ad 17 (Horsnell 1999: vol.II 292-293) and Aḫušina, king of Ešnunna in year dd of Abī-ešuḫ (Horsnell 1999: vol.II 258-259); in the latter case, the king was taken captive, which certainly explains why he was named in the formula.

\textsuperscript{258} As opposed to a formula like "destroyed the walls of Ur, Larsa, and Uruk and defeated the army of Akkad" in Si 11.
DynKL calls Šimbar-šipak, who is listed as the first king of the (second) Sealand dynasty (col. V line 8'), a soldier of the BALA of Damqi-ilišu (col.V lines 2'-3')\textsuperscript{259}. This not only presents the third Sealand I king as the remote ancestor of Šimbar-šipak, but also as the head of his dynasty, therefore bypassing the first two kings as they are listed in king lists. We do not know what sources were used by the chronicler but they apparently presented Damqi-ilišu in a fairly prominent position. This would be cogent with active leadership and probably war exploits by this Sealand I king.

Finally, it is possible that Damqi-ilišu was remembered in another late text, probably from the seventh century and found at Nineveh, in which his name is dubbed eternal (K.3992: line 10)\textsuperscript{260}. The text is very fragmentary and does not make clear in what context these rulers are referred to, but it seems to give weight to the fact that Damqi-ilišu left his imprint in local historiographic and perhaps literary tradition.

### 4.6 A fragile equilibrium

On the whole, sources suggest that open conflict between Babylon and the Sealand I kingdom took place only sporadically. Late Old Babylonian evidence from northern Babylonia does not identify southern Babylonia – or the Sealand I kingdom, as a source of slaves or prisoners at any time during that period (Richardson 2002: 304-305). Also, since the year names and inscriptions of the later kings of Babylon remain, with only one exception, stubbornly silent on the Sealand I kingdom, some equilibrium of sorts probably developed between the neighbours\textsuperscript{261}. The basis for such a situation may have been a reciprocal dependency: while the southern state probably needed a certain measure of good will from Babylon to ensure sufficient water supply

\textsuperscript{259} Glassner interprets the passage differently; he considers that the ancestor of Šimbar-šipak, Erība-Sīn, was a soldier who died during Damqi-ilišu's reign (2004: 132-133).

\textsuperscript{260} A transliteration and a translation are given in Winckler 1893-1897: 516. See also Brinkman 1976: 96. One Agum, probably one of the early Kassite kings, is also mentioned in it (line 8).

\textsuperscript{261} However, the number of royal inscriptions decreases sharply after Samsu-iluna, leaving us for historical purposes with one fewer type of source to work with.
downstream\textsuperscript{262}, one may surmise that Babylon was interested in keeping access to the gulf trade, even if only indirectly; the latter was probably best attained through peaceful trading relations with the Sealand I kingdom. Indeed, the recent excavations at Tell Khaiber, near Ur, suggest continuity of occupation in that region between the middle of the Old Babylonian period and the time of Ayadaragalama\textsuperscript{263}, it seems therefore likely that a direct access to the Persian Gulf was ensured very early in the Sealand I history, eventually resulting in control over Dilmun (for which we have proof only for the end of the dynasty), and probably Failaka (Potts 2010: 22).

Concerning water supply, we can only observe that hydraulic undertakings became less numerous in year formulae of the kings of Babylon after they lost the southern plain, and after Abī-ēšuḥ's damming of the Tigris (Pientka 1998: 224). The location of the canals dug by the late Old Babylonian kings is unknown (\textit{i}bid.: 225), therefore we do not know whether and how they affected Sealand I territory\textsuperscript{264}.

This suggested interpretation of a pragmatic balance of interest between Babylon and the Sealand I kingdom is speculative since there is little evidence for it\textsuperscript{265}. The sources available at the moment suggest in fact that Babylon and the Sealand I kingdom had no direct economic interactions: Babylon's attention mostly followed the Euphrates upstream (Skaist 1994: 185), including Ḥana (Podany 2002: 55), and we have seen that there were interactions with Ešnunna; the Sealand I rulers were probably maintaining trading relationships mostly south in the gulf area, since evidence shows that they later controlled Dilmun, and perhaps Failaka, and east with

\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{262} Perhaps the Sealand I rulers were also interested in safe passage upstream on the Euphrates for commercial purposes; a few archival records show that aromatics from the West were used in the Sealand I kingdom (see Chapter 6). However, such goods may also have been bought through intermediaries.

\textsuperscript{263} At least one text found in the large building excavated there is dated to Hammurapi and at least one to Ayadaragalama; moreover, the excavators report that the building appears to have been used without interruption (\href{http://www.urarchaeology.org/babylonian-public-building-at-tell-khaiber}{http://www.urarchaeology.org/babylonian-public-building-at-tell-khaiber}; Moon \textit{et al.} 2015: 2).

\textsuperscript{264} Most recently, Richardson suggested to identify a canal dug by Ammī-ditāna as the already existing Hammurapi-ḫuš-nūšī canal, probably delivering water to Nippur and perhaps further downstream. If his interpretation is correct, this deed would be recorded in a variant of his twenty-second year name (Richardson 2015b).

\textsuperscript{265} No records of commercial contacts with Sealand I agents have been found in northern Babylonia. Silver loans for commercial expeditions do not necessarily specify the destination; but when they do they indicate that late Old Babylonian merchants from northern Babylonia traded along the Euphrates (see Skaist 1994: 185 for a list of texts; also Richardson 2002: 340ff.).
\end{footnotesize}
Elam, with which it was shown that they entertained good relations. As discussed in Section 4.4.2, they may also have traded through Kassite groups, if so presumably with northern areas. But the Sealand I archival texts available to us yield very limited information on diplomatic and commercial matters; their purview is for the most part restricted to palatial involvement in the local economy, they are therefore not the best witnesses of the geo-political reality of the kingdom.

Richardson suggests a different analysis of this period of equilibrium: he sees in the late Old Babylonian evidence, mainly year names and edicts, signs of an active, programmatic courting of southern Babylonian political and cultural loyalties by the kings of Babylon who positioned themselves as the true heirs to the ancient Sumerian kingship (forthcoming). His argument is attractive, there are, however, insuperable problems with his proposed chronology of events. The purported Babylonian efforts of "Sumerianizing" its kingship can hardly have been in response to the ostensibly Sumerian names of Sealand I kings as he contends; indeed nearly all the Sealand I rulers who were contemporary with the late Old Babylonian kings at Babylon had Akkadian names. Also, the very identification of a "Sumerianizing" in Babylon's year names after Samsu-iluna is somewhat problematic since many elements considered diagnostic by Richardson are already present in the early date formulae of Samsu-iluna.

4.7 Gulkišar and the final strife against the first dynasty of Babylon

An unpublished royal epic, in which the Sealand I king Gulkišar is the main protagonist, recounts a battle between him and the last ruler of the first dynasty of Babylon Samsu-ditāna, apparently with Gulkišar in the offensive rôle (Zomer forthcoming). The publication of the text must be awaited for further information, including on the probable date of writing, but if we

---

266 There is also evidence that they had access to aromatics; see Chapter 6.

267 For a list of such terms already attested in the years Si 6, 7 and 8, see Section 5.3 n.417.

268 The text is to be published in the series TMH under the title Various Middle Babylonian Literary Texts from the Frau Professor Hilprecht-Collection.
accept that the epic has its origin in actual events, then an episode of war of some historical moment took place. Of course, the purported original occurrences probably underwent first propagandistic inflation before being recycled into epic literature. Nonetheless, the very existence and tone of the epic seem to suggest that Gulkišar came out as victor of a conflict with Samsu-ditāna, and the question which immediately presents itself is whether it was part of Babylon's final downfall. Since reign lengths in BKL A have proved unreliable, we cannot even be certain that Gulkišar was still on the throne at the end of Samsu-ditāna's reign.

An oracular question posed by the hard-pressed Samsu-ditāna suggests a conjunction of enemy forces menacing one of his cities, but the Sealand or Uruku(g) is absent from that list (CTN IV 63: i31ff. = Lambert 2007: no.1 lines 31ff.), an absence qualified of "noteworthy" by Lambert (2007: 144). He considered that this attack failed, which could have prompted the Hittite king Mursili I to march from Anatolia "to do the job properly and finish off the First Dynasty of Babylon" (ibid.); his surmise implies that he assumed Babylon was the endangered city. Charpin, for his part, suggested that the city in question was rather one whose citizens' loyalty was doubtful (2004: 382) because the question also inquires about the possibility of residents conferring with the enemies and letting them in (lines 78ff.). At any rate, the last Babylon I king knew that he was threatened by many enemies — in that particular episode coming at least from the east and the north, and he apparently expected them to attack together in a very organized fashion, with siege engines (lines 54 ff.) and allied foreign troops (line 34 and passim)\(^\text{269}\). The Sealand I kingdom is not mentioned, nor is it in other documents referring to this episode\(^\text{270}\).

\(^{269}\) The list of powers involved in the fall of Babylon has given rise to much discussion and speculation; the oracular question, cast by the party which was attacked, identifies the Elamite army, the Kassite army, the Idamaras army, the Hanigalbat army, the Samharite army, the Edašuštu army and their foreign allies (Lambert 2007: no.1 lines 31-40). See also Richardson 2015a for a recent addition to the interpretation of this passage. Babylon probably could not have stood long against such an onslaught, especially since the loyalty of "important citizens" a-šib URU DUGUD and "foreign speakers" KA! na-kar-tum (lines 78 and 85) within the city seemed ready to shift to embrace the cause of Babylon's opponents. Therefore, the oracle question was probably put late in Samsu-ditāna's reign, whether it pertained to an attack on the city of Babylon itself or not.

\(^{270}\) The kudurrū of Kadašman-Ḫarbe I, therefore written by the descendant of one of the victors, lists the Amorites, the Haneans, and the army of the Kassites (Paulus 2014: document KH I 1, lines i 5-7). The Edict of Telepinu states that when Muršili (I) destroyed Babylon, he also fought Hurrians (Hoffmann 1984: 18-19 § 9 lines 29-30); if we are to trust the historiographic information contained in this document, it remains unclear whether these Hurrians were defending Babylon or also fighting it (they were perhaps the Hanigalbat army of the tamītu text cited above?).
Although it may not have been recorded as a participant in the downfall of the first dynasty of Babylon, the following facts are suggestive of Sealand I involvement: it has been shown that Elam and the Sealand I dynasty entertained good relations, and Elam is named as an enemy threatening Babylon in the oracular question discussed above; also, and perhaps more significantly, the Sealand I dynasty was able to maintain itself for many years after foreign powers intruded deep onto the Mesopotamian lower plains when they dealt the fatal blow to Babylon. This strongly suggests that the Sealand I kingdom was part of this coalition of sorts. The battle between Gulkišar and Samsu-ditāna can therefore probably be viewed as an episode of a broader scheme.

As one of the victors over Babylon, it would seem likely that the Sealand I king gained something by it, part of the spoils or control over some areas. It has been in fact suggested that one ruler of that dynasty reigned at Babylon and that they were included into Babylonian king lists for that very reason. If so, Gulkišar could certainly be a good candidate since his reign may have extended after Samsu-ditāna's, at a time when Babylon could have been easy to occupy, and he accomplished a feat which only few Sealand I kings achieved: he was remembered in later sources, although never as king of Babylon.

Indeed, Gulkišar appears in the colophon of a glass-making treatise known from a tablet (BM 120960) probably dating to the Kassite period (Oppenheim 1970: 60; 62). The treatise explains a recipe for making "red-stone glass" and concludes with the name of the scribe, his filiation, the additional information that he is a "scribe of Marduk, a man of Babylon", ḪAŠ ḪI 110.

271 The suggestion was made early on for instance by Thureau-Dangin (1927: 184).

272 Of course, the inclusion of the Sealand I dynasty in king lists could be based on other criteria: the scribes may have preferred a local, after all Babylonian, dynasty to fill in that period of confusion in which a number of foreign powers had a hand.

273 Oppenheim considers that the ductus is fairly unspecific and can only be associated with the second half of the second millennium or the first two centuries of the first millennium (1970: 60). It is the onomasticon, in particular the orthography of the name of the scribe, which he considers more typical of the period between the fourteenth and the twelfth century, as well as the use of the expression ša qāṭ to introduce the name of the scribe (ibid.: 62). A number of peculiarities in the orthography of this text are also found in the prologue of the kudurru of Kadašman-Ḫarbe I (YBC 2242; edited in Paulus 2014: KH I 1). Paulus notes these parallels in the commentary of lines i 2; i 4(!); i 11 (2014: 300); note that she systematically identifies the glass-making treaty as BM 120690 instead of the correct BM 120960.
dAMAR.UTU LÚ.NUN₃ (rev. 39-41), and a date formula giving the year as MU.ÜS.SA gul-ki-šár LUGAL.E (rev. 43) – thus apparently very early in Gulkišar's reign. The insistence on the Babylonian origin is surprising; it does not belong to the usual formulary of colophons (Hunger 1968: 1). The scribe gave as the name of his father Uššur-ana-Marduk, who is attested as the ancestor of a fourteenth century scribal family that saw members of the second and third generations enter in the service of the royal houses in Aššur and Babylon (Wiggerman 2008: 205). Whether this was his true ancestry is doubtful, but the reference to Uššur-ana-Marduk – be it as his father or as a famed ancestral name in scribal circles, proves that the document was not written during Gulkišar's reign. The dating of the tablet had been dismissed as a forgery early on (Landsberger 1954: 68 n.174; Oppenheim 1970: 62-63), an interpretation now confirmed by Wiggerman's analysis (2008: 225; see also George 2009: 149). If we accept that the tablet is no copy of an ancient original, for which there are no indications, the central question is why of all Babylonian rulers the scribe chose Gulkišar for his falsified date formula. Oppenheim suggested that the scribe used an archaizing syllabary and the name of Gulkišar perhaps to "demonstrate the antiquity of the native glass lore" (1970: 62-63). George pointed out that the scribe, when trying to give an impression of antiquity to the document, unwittingly built in an anachronism in bringing together the names of Uššur-ana-Marduk and Gulkišar, but more importantly that the reference to this king "can now be taken as explicit recognition by later Babylonian scholarship that the Sealand kings (...) presided over a realm in which scholarship was active" (2009: 149). This scholarship is indeed now evidenced by divinatory and literary texts produced in Sealand I scriptoria (George 2013: 129-131). While this certainly seems a cogent explanation, a memory of this specific king as a great patron of scholarship remains to be proven by more solid documentary evidence. At any rate, although it is impossible to reconstruct the intention of the

---

274 George also refers to Hallo who had, with little textual evidence, posited that the Sealand I kingdom had been a refuge for Sumerian scholars after the fall of Babylon, making it the locus of production of what he called post-Sumerian literature (Hallo 1975:199-201).
scribe when forging the date formula of his text\textsuperscript{275}, his reference to Gulkišar certainly suggests that this king was well remembered a few centuries after his reign, which agrees with the fact that he was also made the stuff of epic literature.

That the name of Gulkišar was well-remembered at least until the beginning of the eleventh century is evidenced by his mention in a *Distanzangabe* of the *kudurru* BE I/1 83 (obv. 3 and 6) dated to Enlil-nādin-apli. Again the central question is why Gulkišar was chosen by the Isin II king to establish that a parcel of disputed land had very long ago been donated to the goddess Nazi. The number of years covering the span of time between Gulkišar and Enlil-nādin-apli's father Nabuchadnezzar I is given as 696 years: this is blatantly wrong since it puts Gulkišar's reign in the late nineteenth century. It may simply be that an ancient real estate document from Gulkišar was indeed found and that the later king saw it fit to refer to it; this is the view taken by Brinkman (1968: 117), who also suggested an ingenious explanation for the figure of 696 years, based on reign lengths in king lists and an oversight by the scribe (*ibid.*: 83-84). If the claim in Enlil-nādin-apli is based on an actual original from the time of Gulkišar, this source would be informative for the geography of the Sealand I kingdom, not so for the importance of Gulkišar as king. But it may also be that Enlil-nādin-apli and his administration simply used the well-remembered(?) name of Gulkišar to confer legitimacy to a claim over land, as it was used to confer the same to specialized knowledge in the case of the glass-making treatise.

Finally, there was apparently a cult of Gulkišar during the reign of his descendants: a deity called Šamaš-bless-Gulkišar is attested in an undated list of gods (CUSAS 9, 83: line 15'). Because of its presence in this archive the text must be from the reign of Pešgalderameš or Ayadaragalama; Gulkišar was either the father of both or the father of the first and the grand-father of the

\textsuperscript{275} The juxtaposition of the statement of the scribe's origin as Babylonian and of the name of Gulkišar is puzzling. Even if Gulkišar or perhaps his successor(s) did rule for a time at Babylon, it probably never was at the centre of their kingdom; the archive published in CUSAS 9 and dating to Gulkišar's two successors points towards a modest importance of the god Marduk in the palace-sponsored cult. But after the northwards movements of population which marked the beginning of the late Old Babylonian period, one can certainly imagine groups of refugees still cherishing and passing on to the next generations a sense of belonging to southern and middle Babylonian culture. The reasons for migrating are complex and refugees need not have been staunch opponents of the southern kings, especially not in the following generations. Conversely, some northern scholars may have fled into Sealand I centres for a while after the fall of Babylon (Hallo 1975: 201), at a time which could indeed be that of Gulkišar.
The filiation is based on the entries of BKL A, in which DUMU KI MIN stands after the names of Pešgaldarameš and of Ayadaragalama.

Brinkman suggests a date in the eleventh century (2015).

The kudurru is unprovenanced; the plot of land discussed in the document lay along the Tigris (lines II 1-4). However, the prologue has probably no direct bearing on the legal object of the kudurru, therefore no specific area can be associated with the claims of obliteration of the borders; indeed, the prologue mentions sweepingly the borders of "KUR šu-me-rim / ǜ ak-ka-di-i " (lines I 2-3).

Baker noted that Kassite and Isin II rulers "actively sought to promote themselves (...) as guardians of fairly established boundaries" (2011: 301).
not necessarily ensue. At any rate, the CUSAS 9 archive, which dates roughly to that period – one or two generations after the fall of Babylon, offers no evidence that stretches of northern Babylonia were part of the Sealand I kingdom. Indeed, the texts pertain by and large to local matters and are in general not very helpful for determining whether the geo-political situation of the kingdom had changed in the recent past. The use of imported aromatics\textsuperscript{280} does suggest access to western trade routes; these may have been more easily accessible to the southern kingdom with the Babylon I kings and their grip over the middle Euphrates gone. The great similarity between the documents found at al-Qal'at al-Bahrein, which include one tablet dated to Ea-gāmil, and the Sealand I archive dating two to three generations earlier strongly suggests that Dilmun was a dependency of the southern Babylonian kingdom at the time\textsuperscript{281}. It has been shown in Section 4.4.3 that relations with Ešnunna were probably strained (or perhaps had changed recently). Also, the presence of an Elamite messenger at the Sealand I court shows that the southern Babylonian kingdom entertained friendly relations with its eastern neighbour (Section 4.4.1). As for another ally of the Sealand I kingdom at the time of Ayadaragalama, the Kassite ruler Buragindar (see Section 4.4.2), one may wonder whether he belonged to a Kassite house competing with the one that finally installed itself at Babylon, since his name does not appear in king lists. This could in the end have put the southern kingdom on the wrong side of friendships among the aspiring contenders to the Babylonian throne. Be it as it may, while Tell Muhammad apparently came under renewed overlordship by Babylon, as suggested by the era-type year formula appearing in level II (Section 3.2.2.2), the Sealand I kingdom was able to maintain its independence for a few more generations, probably a sign of vigorous leadership and, at least for a time, wisely chosen friendships.

\textsuperscript{280} See Section 6.2.1.3.2.

\textsuperscript{281} The formulary of a number of documents is the same, for instance: the "MU.DU ana E.GAL" delivery records QA 94.55; 94.56; 94.66; etc. (for the same use in the Sealand I archive, see Section 6.2.1); the use of LSÅ in ledger QA 01.4 (for the same in the Sealand I archive, see Section 6.3.2). Also there are similarities in the ductus: for instance the ligature \( a+na \) (in QA 94.56: 5 and many other instances), the position of the \textit{Winkelhaken} in RI as an additional vertical wedge at the bottom of the last vertical (in QA 94.394: 2 and many other instances); for a description of these features as characteristic of the Sealand I script, see George 2013: 131-132.
This need not mean that all went on peacefully in the southern kingdom: one year name of Ayadaragalama (year 0; see Appendix 2)\textsuperscript{282}, points to a rebellion of his land (\texttt{KALAM.MA.A.NI M U.U N.B A L.E}). We don't know when during his reign this happened but the overall time horizon of the archive puts it within the first eight years or little more following his accession. Two other of his year names suggest that troubles also came from outside: two enemies, on whose identity we have no information whatsoever, are alluded to in year E and one enemy, the identification of which is uncertain, is mentioned in year F\textsuperscript{283}.

In the end, neither Kassite nor Elamite allies could help the last Sealand I king Ea-gāmil defend his kingdom, although Elam may have at least offered him refuge, if we can trust the account given in \textit{ABC} 20B (see Section 4.4.1). But his kingdom was conquered by the Kassite rulers of Babylon and incorporated into Karduniaš, their growing realm. There was probably some resistance to this conquest since chronicle \textit{ABC} 20B records that, after Ulam-buriaš, also Agum (III) had to march against the Sealand, on which occasion he destroyed a temple\textsuperscript{284} at Dūr-Enlil, written \texttt{unuBÅD-d50} (rev. 15'-18'). Tantalizingly, a town of almost the same name, BÅD-d\texttt{EN-LÍL-LE-KE4}, is referred to in year name H of Ayadaragalama, which probably commemorates the (re)building of a temple\textsuperscript{285}. It is tempting to establish a parallel between Dūr-Enlil and Dūr-Enlileē and suggest that they were one and the same town, indeed one can well imagine that local resistance to the new overlords crystallized around a centre which had enjoyed the favour of its past kings. However, they may be two different locations: one Kassite ledger recording tax payments lists separately the towns BÅD-d\texttt{EN-LÍL} and BÅD-d\texttt{EN-LÍL-HI.A} (BE 14, 5: respectively

\textsuperscript{282} It is attested only once, perhaps twice; for that reason, Dalley suggested that this may be a clause within a longer year name (2009: 12).

\textsuperscript{283} For year E, Dalley suggests the Kassites and the Elamites (2009: 11). We have no indication for it. In fact, at least in the case of Elam, we have indication that relations were friendly as seen in Section 4.4.1. As for the Kassites, they were probably a very scattered and divided group – or rather a collection of groups, at the time, therefore the diplomatic ties with one of their leaders was certainly no guarantee of peace with other Kassite groups. The reading of KAL ŠU Ú in year F in discussed in Dalley 2009: 11.

\textsuperscript{284} The \texttt{É.GALGA.URÚ.NA}, which is not attested in other sources. It is listed as no.336 in George 1993.

\textsuperscript{285} The name of this temple is transliterated by Dalley as \texttt{É.UNÚ(h) LIBIR.RA} (Dalley 2009: 12).
lines 5 and 10). Identification (or dissociation) between the two locations that interest us remains thus uncertain. At any rate, Agum III's raid probably sealed the fate of the Sealand I kingdom.

The Kassites presumably immediately occupied the land conquered, including Dilmun; this shows in the seamless continuity that characterizes administrative activities and recording procedures at al-Qal'at al-Bahrein in the period ranging at least from the time of Ea-gāmil until Agum (III) (Cavigneaux and André-Salvini forthcoming). It appears also that the Kassites went actively to work on the southern mainland: Kurigalzu I, and before him to a lesser extent Kara-indaš, rebuilt several temples in southern Babylonia, and after them Kadašman-Enlil and Burna-buriaš II at Larsa (Bartelmus 2010: 163-165). It would seem therefore that one or two generations following the Kassite conquest of the Sealand I kingdom the new rulers embarked on a large sacral building programme in their newly annexed territory. This extensive programme may be in part responsible for the dearth of Sealand I archaeological evidence: no building inscriptions were found and, as yet, no structure built by them. The excavations at Tell Khaiber show that the Sealand I rulers and administrators sometimes simply reoccupied existing structures; heavy Kassite repairs and reconstruction may have obliterated much of the traces left by their predecessors. But the evidence for destruction and abandonment of parts of the large urban centres cannot be entirely explained away; the built environment and the living space of the Sealand I kingdom remain a largely unanswered question. The CUSAS 9 archive seems to

---

286 Nashef also lists two towns: he normalizes as Dūr-Enlilē the toponyms in which the orthography of the theophoric element is 𒈦-LIL.HLA, 𒈦-LIL.(LE).MES, or 𒈦-LIL-LE-E (1982: 90-91); recently published texts of the late Kassite period, presumably from Dūr-Enlilē, also feature orthographies with 𒈦-LIL.HLA and 𒈦-LIL.MES (van Soldt 2015); under the entry Dūr-Enlil in Nashef 1982: 90, the theophoric element is always written 𒈦-LIL, with the exception of the instance that is of interest to us in ABC 20B, written 𒈦50.

287 The interpretation of the writing 𒈦50 used in the chronicle seems straightforward and must correspond to Dūr-Enlil. The also otherwise unattested orthography in the year name, 𒈦-LIL-LE, is somewhat less clear; it is attested only once since other instances of the same year name are either abbreviated or damaged (Dalley 2009: 12). One of them could correspond to the former(?) Dūr-Abi-ešuḫ where the illicit archive was found since Enlil was revered there (van Lerberghe and Voet2009: 3); moreover, the texts from Dūr-Enlile, recently published, show that there were regular interactions between it and Nippur (van Soldt 2015: 29-30), which would agree with an identification with one of the Dūr-Abi-ešuḫ fortresses, in particular that "of the canal".

288 The text dating to Ea-gāmil is QA 94.46; the texts dating to Agum are QA 94.42; 94.47; 94.49; 96.26. There is evidence that a Kassite governor was present at Dilmun in the fourteenth century, suggesting a fairly long occupation of the island by mainlanders (Potts 2006: 115f.); this presence in the Persian Gulf may have included Failaka (Potts 2010: 22).
confirm that the Sealand I state did not thrive (only) in the former urban and institutional setting. The palace-centric provisioning of temples showing in the records of its administration (Section 6.5) suggests that Sealand I rulers had (re-)established this palace, be it their main or a secondary one, and sponsored cults in an environment devoid of well-functioning temples and clergies. Either this town was a new foundation or the Sealand I rulers occupied a town deserted by its clergies, which we know took place in a number of urban centres.

The demographic trend that partly emptied cities has been explained by political factionalism: Yoffee suggested that Sealand I leaders could have driven urban populations into the countryside because it was what they controlled, whereas cities remained pro-Babylonian (1998: 334). But the conquest of Nippur by Ilī-ma-AN, and presumably of Dilmun including its fortress al-Qal'at al-Bahrein at some point in Sealand I history, suggests that the southern rulers were very much able to take over well defended cities; moreover, the fact that the dynasty endured several generations makes it unlikely that Sealand I kings maintained themselves only by controlling stretches of land interspersed by hostile fortified enclaves; the duration of the dynasty suggests some measure of stability. That the political landscape was fractioned has also been suggested for northern Babylonia towards the end of its first dynasty (Richardson 2005: 284 and passim), a symptom of the rulers' waning grasp\(^{289}\), which would have been less sudden than in southern Mesopotamia but running along somewhat similar lines. Environmental causes have also been considered to be behind the socio-economic and demographic changes in both north-Babylonian and Sealand I territory: repeated inundations appear to have plagued northern Babylonia in the late Old Babylonian period (Gasche 1989: 141-143; Cole and Gasche 1998: 53; Charpin 2002: 555), and hydraulic measures certainly had an effect downstream, either reducing the water availability (Gasche 1989: 141; Charpin 2002: 555-556), or perhaps effectually augmenting it because of a general abandonment of the field irrigation infrastructure in middle Babylonia (al-Dafar 2015: 143). The recent proposition that the Sealand I population lived mostly in as yet unexcavated sites in the southern marshland, some of them still occupied (see Section 1.1.4), certainly offers potential for discovering more material and written evidence. However, it is intimately tied to the identification and correct dating of "Sealand I pottery", which has remained

---

\(^{289}\): This could also be visible in the marked diminution in the number of royal inscriptions.
elusive; but the co-occurrence of dated texts and ceramics in Sealand I sites like Tell Khaiber will certainly help refine the identification of Sealand I pottery and, hopefully, validate the dating of a number of sites.
Chapter 5
The Sealand I panthea and religious history

5 The Sealand I panthea and religious history

5.1 Scribal and religious milieux in the Sealand I kingdom
5.1.1 Tradition, innovation, and the influence of the palace thereon

The emergence of the Sealand I kingdom changed the geo-political landscape of Babylonia, ushering a redesign of trading and diplomatic networks, but it also provoked changes that are somewhat more subtle and difficult to trace, changes in the religious and intellectual spheres. Scribes, intellectual, and religious elites attached to centres which came under Sealand I control found themselves cut off to some degree from northern Babylonian influence. Many probably also found their immediate working environment greatly disturbed since at least some clergy members had fled north, into cities still under Babylon's control (Pientka 1998: 179; 188ff.) They may have been followed by other intellectual elites whose last generation had been partly drawn close to the royal entourage; those who remained certainly faced a dramatically changed situation.

They were heirs to an ancient tradition, upon which the very power ousted by the southern rebels looked with profound respect. The memory of this tradition as being something independent from any recent sponsorship by the Babylonian crown was certainly still very much alive in southern scribal circles since Babylon's dominion in the area had been but a brief one. In such a position, the founders of the new dynasty and the local elites found themselves in theory in no immediate need to innovate in areas such as religion, cult, divination, and literature: everything was there, and not only there, but ancient and legitimate. At the same time, the changed political and institutional environment and the reduced personnel, due to the partial exodus, probably led to a certain freedom in scribal milieux, for a time possibly to a real necessity to innovate, or even improvise, before large scriptoria could be (re-)established. The material and social circumstances of scribal and religious life, having been profoundly upset, offered conditions
propitious for renewal. Such innovative atmosphere indeed transpires in the creative use of logograms and in the new orthographies which characterize Sealand I texts (George 2013: 132ff.).\textsuperscript{290} Even in administrative records a rare logogram is attested, UN.GAL for šarratu, a writing known from the lexical list LÚ = ša\textsuperscript{291}; this entry (line 45 of the canonical list) was present in Old Babylonian forerunners (Civil et al. 1969: 28ff.), which could have been used by the Sealand I scribes of the palace administration.

The emergence of a new political power, probably keen to leave its mark, in a religious and intellectual landscape where a number of institutions had been dismantled and partly abandoned was also fertile ground for political influence in these realms. Gabbay is certainly right in warning about the fallacy of reducing the religious to a mere mirror of the political (2014: 153), but religious and cultic practices are partly exogenous and, in particular in a time of weakened religious institutions, political influence may certainly be surmised. The kings of a newly formed kingdom would certainly seek to influence the intellectual and religious landscape in carefully dosing continuation and change in order to reflect the political reality of their rule. Religious practices and panthea are therefore a certain type of reflections of the political and social entities in which they existed.

Perhaps we may ascribe to such state influence the enigmatic variations found in the Sealand I tablet of the Epic of Gilgameš, in particular the substitution of the usual Uruk by Ur, perhaps also that of Gilgameš and Eadu by Šîn and Ea, written respectively 430 and 440 (George 2007: 60ff.).\textsuperscript{292} George has raised the possibility that these writings are cryptic abbreviations (2007: 60); if they are, they certainly attest of a climate of creative experimentation. If, however, they are to be taken at face value, the Sealand I rulers may have wanted to glorify Ur, which was almost certainly close to the capital or an important palace town of the kingdom, either at or near

\textsuperscript{290} George notes on p.132 that “The individual tablets exhibit a variety of orthographic styles, so that one gains the impression that they were written at a time of innovation and experimentation”.

\textsuperscript{291} CUSAS 9, 312; 321; 333; 337; 345; 351. Dalley comments on this (2009: 163 note to text 312).

\textsuperscript{292} The attribution to a Sealand I origin is based on ductus and information to the effect that the tablet belonged to a group of Sealand I texts (George 2007: 62-63). Since publication of other Sealand I texts, more aspects of the writing appear typical of the mid-dynastic Sealand I scribal practice: the ligature a-na; the position of the *Winkelhaken* in the sign RI and ḪU at the bottom of the last vertical. They are discussed in George 2013: 131ff.).
Kār-Šamaš (Boivin 2015). If that is the case, using the name of Sīn in the rôle of the ancient ruler of that city could be understood as being part of the same programmatic undertaking. As for Ea, the southern deity seems to have been quite prominent for the Sealand I dynasty as evidenced in year names and cult. Therefore, one of the possible interpretations of the idiosyncrasies in the Sealand I Gilgameš manuscript, namely that the substitutions were indeed meaningful, would put them in close alignment with the royal ideals and the geographical reality of the kingdom.

The Sealand I material shows that no religious revolution took place, but clearly some adjustments were effected. A balag to Enlil, attributable to a Sealand I scriptorium on the basis of internal criteria (Gabbay 2014: 148), shows an interesting combination of perpetuation of textual tradition (ibid.: 151) and innovation since it seems to introduce into it elements more typical of a Ninurta litany (ibid.: 152; 159 Table 1). This passage, which is unfortunately lacunary, pertains to a list of temples in a number of towns. Such changes may have reflected Sealand I state discourse, although not necessarily at the geographical level directly. Indeed, Gabbay's suggestion that the list of toponyms could reflect syncretism around the figure of Ninurta as warrior god is interesting (ibid.: 152); it could echo the prominent place which Ninurta enjoyed in the Sealand I state-sponsored cult (discussed in detail in this chapter). Therefore, although it is impossible at present to decide whether the toponym sequence in the Sealand I manuscript was the result of merging existing sources – at least two concerning two distinct deities (Enlil and Ninurta), or whether it entailed original composition as a variant of only one ancient source, the result testifies of a combination of innovation and tradition in the Sealand I scribal milieu; and the innovation was coherent with royal ideas and cult.

293 Hallo, commenting on the adaptation of another composition, described such a process as a text being "creatively transformed to meet ideological requirements of a new age" (1975: 188). It is interesting to note that the Old Babylonian literary corpus at Ur was more anchored locally than the Nippur corpus, including references to Nanna and early Old Babylonian Larsean rulers (Delnero 2016: 32ff.); one may wonder whether the Sealand I scribes were issued from and ultimately passed down that tradition.

294 The Sealand I texts show the already well-attested (in the Old Babylonian period) conflation of the Akkadian and Sumerian panthea (Edzard 2004: 580-582). While the name of a number of deities, for instance the sun god, is systematically written with its Sumerian orthography, some are always written in Akkadian (e.g. dNa-zi), and others alternate between both forms (e.g. dEn-Ki/dé-a, the latter being used in personal names).

295 In other words, the towns listed in this passage need not necessarily have been under Sealand I political control for them to be included in the text. This would be all the more true if the list was copied from an existing source, which is not certain. All elements of the list of toponyms as Gabbay reconstructed it are also known from later versions of the text, but it is only partly the case for potential antecedents.
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On the whole, the sources suggest that the Sealand I kings did leave their own imprint on the official cult and theology, probably to reflect the geo-political reality of their kingdom, and perhaps their ambitions for it, but this was made in careful respect of the received pan-Babylonian traditions. At least one king, Ayadaragalama, anchored the legitimacy of his kingship in the old *topos* of Enlil conferring on him the shepherding of the land. The types of offerings to the gods and the marking of lunar phases were all very Babylonian. The major pan-Babylonian gods remained present and important in the Sealand I kingdom, but one discerns also elements of deliberate design in the mosaic of cults sponsored by the palace: the new state at work. The state pantheon appears to be an amalgamation of imports from local panthea: we observe for instance that some importance was given to Nazi but that she was extracted from her local environment and integrated into the Sealand I state pantheon alone, without her circle, which seems to indicate a positive but limited regional influence of the Lagaš area. Singular importance is also given to Ea, probably reaching back to a Larsean tradition from before the Babylonian conquest. This is not the only reference to the Larsean kingdom since the presence of Enlil and Ea in year names is also reminiscent of year name formulae of Rim-Sin I. In addition, the obscure Nin-é,NIM.ma, a deity apparently favoured by the Kudur-mabuk dynasty, is present in some lists. As for the prominence of the Nippurite pantheon, visible through the high rank occupied by Ninurta and a few other indications, it suggests acknowledgement of the importance of this cultic centre rather than geographical proximity of the find spot of the archive; indeed Enlil and Ninurta are barely represented in personal names²⁹⁶.

The geo-political situation of the Sealand I kingdom is probably also reflected in cultural exchange between the southern Babylonian polity and Elam, assuredly a reflection of friendly relations. Based on small corpora of divinatory texts from Susa and the Sealand I kingdom, George identified a high level of similarity in scribal practices (George 2013: 139ff.). He could even establish that a specific Susean tablet (*MDP 57* no.4) was based on works by the Sealand I

²⁹⁶ This agrees with a find spot at or around the town of Kār-Šamaš, probably in the Larsa-Ur area (Section 3.1.1).
scribe of CUSAS 18, 24; 27; and 20; or on "a tablet in linear descent from one such" (ibid.: 140)\textsuperscript{297}.

5.1.2 Extracting the panthea from the documents

Religious life in the Sealand I kingdom presents itself to us mainly through a set of documents issued in the context of palatial economic activity. That most sources on religion reflect institutional cultic practice (as opposed to personal devotion) is very typical of Mesopotamia, what is less so is that the archive comes from a palace, not a temple. This certainly introduces a very strong bias in the documentation but it is also the occasion to witness the state at work in sponsoring the cult. Most texts are strongly anchored in daily material preoccupations and inform us essentially about the economic aspects of the cult, more precisely the sacrificial economy in which the palace was involved. The following relevant documents are available to us: offering lists, records of deliveries (to the palace) and of expenditures (by the palace) for animals and other foodstuffs destined for offerings, which could take place either at the palace or in temples. There may also be one short god list without cultic function (CUSAS 9, 81)\textsuperscript{298}. A few year names give us some additional insight into the deities which enjoyed royal favour.

Babylonian religious beliefs and practices were manifold, complex, and sometimes contradictory in appearance. Yet despite the apparent fluidity in the characterization of deities, at any given time and place principles of organization, partly hierarchical in nature, are recognizable. The relative importance ascribed to deities can be described as a (partly hierarchical) pantheon, or in fact as superimposed panthea, since a number of concurrent traditions and principles were at work. Various typologies of panthea have been suggested by assyriologists (Sallaberger 2004: 294). Komoróczy (1976) puts much emphasis on fundamental differences between the distinct

\textsuperscript{297} It seems that a number of orthographic innovations of the Sealand I scribes survived in Elam and were briefly reintroduced from there in Babylonia in the late second millennium, before being abandoned (George 2013: 141).

\textsuperscript{298} In addition to these tablets issued from the palace administration, the following religious texts are known to come from Sealand I scriptoria: the balag to Enlil mentioned in the previous section (Gabbay 2014) and an unpublished liturgical text mentioning Ayadaragalama (CDLI P431311). A temple list recently published (CUSAS 30, 451) could be a Sealand I text (van Soldt 2015: 529); it lists temples in all of Babylonia. This sample includes neither rosters of cultic personnel, nor records of regular offerings, nor hymns to temples.
panthea that are reflected in different types of sources. He distinguishes between three main expressions of panthea: the local pantheon in texts relating to cult, the theological pantheon of god lists (and secondarily the state pantheon in royal inscriptions), and the pantheon of mythological literature. A problem with this model is that it applies the same typology to sources and to the cultural constructs that are panthea, another is that it compartmentalizes panthea in a rigid, more or less immutable manner. Sallaberger (2004) proceeds differently and stresses the complex interrelations between the panthea, which he identifies as: the local pantheon, the state pantheon (which may in fact be split into state pantheon and Reichspantheon, mirroring the political situation), and the mythological pantheon. His definition of the local pantheon concords with Komoróczy’s, but Sallaberger considers that both god lists and literature, religious as well as mythological, express the mythological pantheon. As for the cult at the temple of the main god, he considers it to be modelled on the state pantheon. Rubio (2011) avoids the notions of local and state panthea and concentrates on the milieux from which panthea are issued. Basing himself on a quantitative analysis to determine the frequency of co-occurrences of god names in Early Dynastic texts and personal names, he concludes that there were three panthea: at one extremity of the spectrum, he sees the expression of popular religiosity in personal names (popular pantheon), at the other extremity he sees in god lists and literature the product of learned scribal circles (the scholarly pantheon); in the middle he places the pantheon of the official cult as expressed in offering lists and cultic texts. Despite their differences, all models agree on the co-existence of different panthea as conceptual constructs determined by social, political, and cultural factors.

In a historical perspective, it is important in the study of the Sealand I material to consider its panthea also under the aspects of change and, when relevant, intentionality. Panthea are partly malleable creations resulting from a complex interplay of ancient and less ancient traditions and,

299 On the local pantheon, Amiet noted that the iconography suggests that it was not a complete pantheon but rather a divine family with a divine couple at its head that was venerated locally (Amiet 1976: 32).

300 Lambert defined this "Mesopotamian pantheon (as) a multitude of city cults, and thinkers who tried to reduce them to an ordered whole" (1975: 194).

301 In addition, he considers that the official pantheon also has an influence on personal names (Rubio 2011: 107).
at least in the case of the state pantheon\textsuperscript{302}, design. A ruler establishing or taking over a palace and the administration of the cult certainly sought to conciliate between local practices (local panthea) and his own ideas. Also, a dynasty has no need of tenets, such as are conveyed by the state pantheon, that it cannot communicate broadly and efficiently. Royal inscriptions were certainly a good means of communication but they probably reached a limited audience\textsuperscript{303}. Year-names certainly penetrated larger segments of society but are, for obvious practical reasons, severely restricted in how much they can express. Therefore, the building of temples and the sponsoring of cultic activities, through conspicuous consumption, must have been another choice means for the ruler to display political-theological principles including the underlying state pantheon.

The panthea, as complex cultural constructs, express themselves in written sources through an indirect set of relations and interactions. Traditional patterns also certainly play a rôle in the choice of personal names and of certain formulae, for instance in year names. Starting from the available Sealand I sources, we can extract the following data: theophoric elements in personal names, religious \textit{topoi} in year name formulae, and state-sponsored cultic activity favouring certain gods over others (offerings in administrative documents; dedication in year names). But these concrete, observable phenomena are compound expressions of panthea and traditional patterns\textsuperscript{304}. In my analysis, I use the following hypotheses to reconcile the former with the latter: I consider 1- that the state-sponsored cult is the compound expression of the (political-ideological) state pantheon and the local pantheon; 2- that religious \textit{topoi} in year names are the compound expression of the state pantheon and traditional patterns; and 3- that theophoric elements in PNs express the local pantheon and traditional patterns. The sources available to us do not make it realistically possible to discriminate between more variants of panthea than two main ones, the local pantheon and the state pantheon. Other nuances which could have been

\textsuperscript{302} Sallaberger notes that the \textit{Staats-} or \textit{Reichspantheon} mirrors the current political situation (2004: 303).

\textsuperscript{303} We have no Sealand I building inscription; the only royal inscription it that of the seal of Ili-remeanni "who reveres (...) Ea-gâmil" (Moorey and Gurney 1973: 71).

\textsuperscript{304} In my analysis, I attempt to dissociate what I call traditional patterns from the continued effect of tradition on the panthea. Implied here is what Shils describes as the perception of "the given" as "the 'natural way' to do things", making it nearly normative (1981: 200).
conceptualized in mythological, ethnic, or other panthea (Sallaberger 2004), either entirely lack any evidential basis to define them for the Sealand I kingdom or can only be glimpsed at through punctual attestation\textsuperscript{305}.

5.2 The state-sponsored cult

Offering lists and other administrative records reflect the actual cult; in the case of the Sealand I documents, since they were issued from a palace administration, they inform us on the palace-sponsored cult. The relevant texts comprise 1) livestock delivery records to the palace in which the divine beneficiary of the animals is indicated; 2) expenditure records of sacrificial animals and foodstuffs for a specific date or occasion; and 3) offering lists in which commodities are attributed to several deities.

The delivery records may register only one or several deliveries in the same document and are always fully dated\textsuperscript{306}. The exact date of sacrifice is not always clear since we do not know the time lapse between the delivery of the animals to the palace, the recording of the delivery, and the sacrifice. Expenditure records drawn up for specific sacrifices inform us on the composition of the full offering and sometimes on its location; they are also fully dated. Another type of expenditure records, offering lists, keep track of one or a few commodities allocated to several deities\textsuperscript{307}; they therefore make it possible to compare directly the relative hierarchical rank of the deities and the quantities attributed to them. These lists are not always (fully) dated, which could point to regular offerings. The occasion of sacrifice, for instance the name of a festival, is rarely

---

\textsuperscript{305} The very thin evidence from hymnic literature is therefore considered here as contributing to the identification of the state pantheon.

\textsuperscript{306} Some delivery records bear only a date formula but others, which comprise several entries, are cast as cumulative records and add "day X" on some lines. The specific date indicated in such cases probably corresponds to the date of delivery of the animal(s) which may or may not be identical with the date of offering. This is the date which I included in the tables below.

\textsuperscript{307} Two documents may or may not be offering lists: CUSAS 9, 82 and 83. The latter bears neither header nor date and usually features only one vertical wedge at the beginning of each line. But since one line features three verticals instead of one, the most immediate explanation is that these are to be read as numbers, perhaps quantities of an unspecified commodity. Document CUSAS 9, 82 is similar but is broken at the top, so that it is unclear whether a commodity was specified; all preserved lines begin with one vertical.
mentioned so that often only the date and the composition of the offerings give us a clue as to the nature of the event.

In terms of frequency and importance of the offerings, Ištar, Ninurta, and Nazi stand out, followed by Šamaš and Sin\textsuperscript{308}. Several other deities also received offerings, many of them appearing only once or a few times in offering lists. The representativity of the information retrieved depends of course heavily on the accident of discovery and on archival operations which the group of texts underwent in antiquity; the over sixty relevant texts form a basis which is small but sufficient to infer some principles of palace-sponsored cultic practice and some information on the cultic calendar. Due to the nature of the retrieved archive, deities with temples whose economy was fairly independent from the palace may falsely appear of lesser importance.

The apparent hierarchical importance of the best represented gods and goddesses as well as the cultic activities surrounding them are discussed in detail below\textsuperscript{309}; minor cults presenting specific features of interest are also outlined. The objective of this discussion is twofold: describing the palace-sponsored cultic life of the Sealand I town for which we have textual evidence and endeavouring to identify in it elements of the Sealand I state pantheon and of the local pantheon.

5.2.1 The cult of Ištar and her hypostases

The goddess Ištar appears to occupy the foremost position in the offering texts, both in terms of frequency and quantities of offerings, especially of animals, all the more so if we take a holistic view and add up the numerous aspects\textsuperscript{310} under which she appears in the documents. No temple of the goddess is ever mentioned so that we do not know whether she possessed one in the town where the archive came from or whether she was mainly venerated in shrines within other

\textsuperscript{308} I choose to use these Akkadian forms of the divinities' names even if, for instance the sun god is always expressed as \textit{dUtu} and the moon god in turn \textit{d30} and \textit{dEn:zu}. In fact, we do not know exactly what motivated the scribe's orthographic choices.

\textsuperscript{309} Special attention is given to the number of animals sacrificed to various deities since this is one hierarchical aspect of the cult that is particularly easy to track in the archive; other evidence is also discussed, when available.

\textsuperscript{310} This multiplication of aspects of Ištar, including astral aspects, is typical of her cult in all of Babylonia during the second millennium (Westenholz 2007: 339; 342).
temples and at the palace. She seems to have been indeed of special importance to the dynasty since she is given the pivotal rôle as the king's war companion in the unpublished royal epic of Gulkišar, a text in which she also bears the epithet *narāmti A.AB.BA*, beloved of the Sealand?); in addition, we have proof in one document that sacrifices were offered to Ištar on the roof of the palace (CUSAS 9, 69). Also of significance is that her hypostasis Nin-Eanna appears as patroness, alongside Enlil, in the seal inscription of a servant of the Sealand I king Ea-gāmil (Moorey and Gurney 1973: seal no.23).

As Ištar, written *diš-tár*, she received on five occasions the largest quantity of animals attested in this archive for a single sacrifice, namely seven; four of these five documented occasions took place in the same year (see Table 8). Under the aspect "She-who-dwells-in-Uruk", she received sacrifice in a context described as the "ancient rites of Uruk" (CUSAS 9, 68). Considering that the official cult of Uruk had been in part transferred to Kiš at the time of the southern rebellion during Samsu-iluna's reign, as attested by the presence of cult personnel of Ištar-of-Uruk and other Urukean deities (Charpin 1986: 403-414; Pientka 1998: 179ff.; 375ff.), it appears that the Sealand I kings had in parallel or after the fall of Babylon endeavoured to (re-)appropriate or revive ancient Urukean practices in their state-sponsored cult.

---

311 This association of Ištar with the Sealand I dynasty is very probably reflected in the entry *dINANNA.A.AB.BA* among other local aspects of Ištar in the list AN = *dAnum* (tablet IV, line 129 in Litke 1998); the corresponding entry in the second column is *ia-bi-i-[tu]*, apparently meaning "the Sealand". The theological tradition has therefore retained a hypostasis of Ištar whose identity specifically derived from her Sealand origin; the evidence suggests that the time of this close association is that of the first dynasty. On this topic, see Boivin 2016a. Also, it has been suggested that the Sealand I kingdom entered the Babylonian theological-mythological tradition: Jacobsen saw in the battle between Tiamat and Marduk a "political-historical" reflection of the Babylonian situation in the first half of the second millennium in which (Kassite) Babylon, represented by Marduk, vanquishes the Sealand kingdom, *māt tāmti*, embodied by Tiamat (1975: 76).

312 For the roof as a place of sacrifice in the Sealand I kingdom, see also the unpublished text BC 365, cited by Dalley (2009: text 69 n.1), in which "sacrifices of the roof(s)" are mentioned: SIZKŪR.RE *ū-re-e*. The roof as a place of sacrifice is attested elsewhere (CAD U, s.v. *ūru* A.e, under 'sacrifices and offerings' p.263). That Ištar receives offerings on the roof appears cogent with her astral aspect as Venus, or perhaps other astral aspects discussed hereafter. However, Kinsbury interpreted *ū-ri-im* as "evening" in HUCA 4:10, a text from Old Babylonian Larsa (1963: 5 n.18).

313 The goddess may have received more animals in CUSAS 9, 26A: 1 but the beginning of the line is slightly damaged and the quantity is uncertain. Dalley suggests "10?". On the photograph, it looks like 10, less so on her hand copy.
If we group the animal offerings by months, we obtain the following pattern:\textsuperscript{314}:

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
Month & Year & Day & Animals & Combined with other offerings & Type of offering/occasion & Name/aspect of deity & Text CUSAS 9,\
\hline
iii & N & 1? & 7 ewe-lambs & - & SÍZKUR & Ištar & 39 \\
ix & J & 10 & 1 cow & 1 ram & flour, cedar, oil, mersu, ghee & SÍZKUR & She-who-dwells-in-Uruk & 68 \\
ix & L & 28 & 10(? ) ewe-lambs & - & - & Ištar & 26A \\
iiii (interc.) & L & 25 & 6 ewe-lambs & - & SÍZKUR & Ištar & 28 \\
? & N & 22 & 7 ewe-lambs & - & - & Ištar & 57 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\caption{Animal offerings to Ištar}
\end{table}

Besides the ancient rites of Uruk mentioned in CUSAS 9, 68, no special occasion is ever identified except \( ana \) (SÍZKUR ša) Ištar\textsuperscript{315}. As can be observed in Table 8, the month ix may have been of special importance for the cult of the goddess in the Sealand I kingdom. This month is known neither as the occasion of a festival of Ištar nor of any major festival at Uruk, as far as its cultic calendar can be reconstructed (for Ur III: Cohen 1993: 215; for the Old Babylonian period: Richter 2004: 331). Curiously, Ištar does not figure in prominent position in Sealand I offering

\textsuperscript{314} Remarkable is the fact that the goddess received mostly the more valuable female animals. Nazi also received female animals.

\textsuperscript{315} One date coincides with the beginning of the month, so that the occasion may have been the new moon, but the evidence is far too thin to conclude.
lists, and then, never under the name $\text{diš-tár}$, which predominates in animal offering records; we find her represented only by other aspects\(^{316}\), always in the bottom part of the lists\(^{317}\).

The aspects of the goddess attested besides $\text{diš-tár}$ in the Sealand I archive can be grouped in two categories: the astral aspects and the local-geographical incarnations. The astral aspects of the goddess include $\text{d(INANA)-LUGAL(-at)-AN(-e)}$ Inana-queen-of-the-sky (CUSAS 9, 66: 4; 70: 7?; 76: 20; 78: 14-15; 80: 5; 82: 21'; 83: 24'; 84: 10) and $\text{d(INANA-MUL}$ Inana-the-star (CUSAS 9, 83: 41'), $\text{d(KA.NI.SUR.RA}$ Kanisura (CUSAS 9, 64: 26)\(^{318}\), $\text{d(INANA-}$ $\text{na-na(-a)}$ Nanaya (CUSAS 9, 64: 28; 76: 21; 83: 32')\(^{319}\). Finally, her incarnation as $\text{d(INANA-}$ $\text{DUMU(MI)-}$ $\text{EN.ZU}$ Inana-Daughter-of-Sîn (CUSAS 9, 59: 21; 76: 24; 78: 7; 84: 9) could be considered predominantly astral as well\(^{320}\); it figures in more prominent position than other aspects of the goddess. Besides these mainly astral aspects the Sealand I archive feature a number of specifically local-geographical incarnations of Ištar: $\text{d(INANA-ša-šá-UD.UNUG}$ Inana-of-Larsa (CUSAS 9, 59: 15; 64: 28; 82: 24'), $\text{d(INANA-ša-UNUG}$ Inana-of-Uruk (CUSAS 9, 64: 25?), $\text{d(NIN-ak-ka-de}$ Lady-of-Akkade (CUSAS 9, 81: 13), $\text{d(INANA-}$ $\text{NIN-SU.GAL}$ Inana-lady-of-Zabalam (CUSAS 9, 66: 6; 83: 36')\(^{321}\), also $\text{d(a-ši-ib-ti-UNUG}$ She-who-dwells-in-Uruk (CUSAS 9, 59: 17; 68: 2; 82: 30'), as

\(^{316}\) In addition to the aspects of Ištar represented in offering lists and detailed forthwith, $\text{Bēlet-Akkade}$ figures in the short god list CUSAS 9, 81. In the same text, we also find $\text{d(Nin-Nibru}$ who has been considered to have become associated with Ištar during the Old Babylonian period (Richter 2004: 124) but there is in the Sealand I material nothing pointing toward a proximity between Ninurta and Ištar.

\(^{317}\) However, as Inana-Daughter-of-Sîn the goddess does receive more grain than the other deities in the first section of CUSAS 9, 84 (line 9: 2 $\text{SILĂ}$ instead of 1). Also, as Lady-of-Zabalam she seems to be allocated more of an unidentified commodity in CUSAS 9, 83, where she is the only deity to be associated with a quantity of 3 (line 36') instead of 1.

\(^{318}\) Steinkeller has proposed that since Kanisura's pre-Old Babylonian name Gansura(k) probably reflects etymologically her nature as a netherworld deity and since she is associated with Uruk, and therefore with Inana and Venus, she probably represents the period of invisibility of Venus as an astral hypostase of Inana (2013b: 468).

\(^{319}\) Steinkeller summarizes the evidence which presents Nanaya since the Ur III period as an astral incarnation of Inana (2013b: 468-469; 2013c).

\(^{320}\) Ištar's filiation from the moon god is well established (Wilcke 1976-1980: 80f.), although other, less prominent traditions coexisted; she is for instance called daughter of Šin in an hymn to the Queen-of-Nippur (Lambert 1982: col.III 71 and col.IV 26), besides claims of her being the daughter of Anu and of Enlil. Beaulieu summarizes attestations of passages calling Ištar the daughter of Šin in the literature, a survey which shows that the astral aspect of the goddess was sometimes put in the foreground in that context (Beaulieu 2003: 111 n.63).

well as \textsuperscript{d}NIN-É.AN.NA Lady-of-the-Eanna\textsuperscript{322} (CUSAS 9, 66: 9; 74: 5-6\textsuperscript{323}; 82: 23')\textsuperscript{324}; and \textsuperscript{d}É.GI₄.A BĀD!.URUDU!.NAGAR\textsuperscript{ki} Bride(-of Dumuzi)-of-Bad-Tibira (CUSAS 9, 83: 39').\textsuperscript{325} Three hypostases of Ištar received offerings, grain, and dates for the feast of the braziers\textsuperscript{326}; \textsuperscript{d}Queen-of-the-sky, \textsuperscript{d}Lady-of-the-Eanna, and \textsuperscript{d}Lady-of-Zabalam (CUSAS 9, 66).

The plurality of aspects, including a number of them referring directly to the city of origin (Larsa, Zabala, Akkade, and of course Uruk), is in continuity with the nature and geographical extent of the Ištar cult in the Old Babylonian period, when the goddess was revered in all important Old Babylonian cities (Renger 1967).\textsuperscript{327} This, combined with the fact that no specific festival of Ištar is named (or easily recognizable) in the archive, makes the Sealand I evidence pertaining to her cult geographically unspecific. Besides the obvious Urukean references, in particular to the ancient rites of Uruk (CUSAS 9, 68), the Sealand I cult cannot be placed within a clear local tradition, rather, it amalgamates several pan-Babylonian and regional aspects of the goddess. It bespeaks the prominence of the goddess in the state pantheon, which agrees with offerings to her taking place at the palace and her entering the theological tradition reflected in AN = \textsuperscript{d}Anum as Ištar-of-the-Sealand.

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{322} Quite early on, perhaps in third millennium forerunners of the Enmerkar epic cycle, Ištar is associated with the Eanna. In "Enmerkar and the Lord of Aratta", the term \textsuperscript{d}NIN-É-AN-NA-KA appears alone, in most manuscripts with the divine determinative (line 233 in the reconstructed text; for a recent edition, see Mittermayer 2009); this means that the epithet had (already?) a certain level of autonomy as a separate divine embodiment of the goddess. Further evidence of an early association of Ištar and the Eanna, including in the Basetki inscription, is presented in detail by Beaulieu (2002a; 2003: 106ff.). He also discussed her cult at Udannu in the first millennium (2003: 289ff.) At Udannu, Nin-Eanna was revered with \textsuperscript{4}GLDU (Beaulieu 1992b: 401-403; 2003: 289), probably read Palil (Zadok 2014: 226, contra Dalley 2009: \textit{passim}). While we have no evidence for a cult of \textsuperscript{4}GLDU in the Sealand I archive, he appears in several personal names. Moreover, one text shows that the king journeyed to Udannu (CUSAS 9, 101). In addition, the presence of Lugal-irra in the texts seems to confirm the importance of the cults of Dūrum and Udannu which were apparently linked (Beaulieu 2003: 290); see Section 5.2.10 for a discussion.

\textsuperscript{323} The line numbers correspond to each inscribed line counted separately. Note that Dalley's method for numbering lines sometimes differ in her indices and her editions and copies (2009).

\textsuperscript{324} See also Section 5.2.2 for a discussion of the possible association of Nin-Nibri with Ištar.

\textsuperscript{325} Dumuzi and Inana were revered together in the \textit{É.MÛŠ} temple in Bad-Tibira (George 1993: no.829).

\textsuperscript{326} For a discussion on the date of the feast of the braziers, see Section 5.2.13.2.

\textsuperscript{327} She received for instance regular offerings at least in the Ninurta and in the Enlil temples at Nippur (Richter 2004: 69; 50); her own temple may have been abandoned for a long period in the Old Babylonian period (Richter 2004: 123). She also received offerings in her own temple at Larsa, but also alongside Šamaš for the festival \textit{EZEN MĀ.AN.NA} (\textit{ibid.}: 364; 405).
5.2.2 The cult of Ninurta

The cult of Ninurta appears to have been quite prominent since he repeatedly received the second largest quantity of sacrificial animals, namely six. The records also bear twice the special mention that the offerings were sent or given by the king (CUSAS 9, 76; BC 365 in Dalley 2009: 72), which probably reflects the special significance of his cult for the rulers. A temple was dedicated to him in the palace town where the archive was found and a SANGA of Ninurta is attested once (in the miksu-tax remission list CUSAS 9, 384: 21). On a number of occasions, offerings for the temple of Ninurta and for other deities are recorded together; the offerings to the latter are often specifically destined to their dais (BARAG) or temple/shrine (ê), and are usually markedly less plentiful\(^{328}\). We find that such offerings were made to: the dais of Šamaš (CUSAS 9, 65; 73), the dais of Enlil, the dais of Ea, and the dais of Nin-Šubur (all three in BC 365)\(^{329}\), the shrine(?) of the Sibitti and the shrine(?) of Lugal-irra (both in CUSAS 9, 65), finally the shrine(?) of Marduk and of one Nin-[ ] (both in CUSAS 9, 76). Some or all of these daises and shrines may have been housed in the temple of Ninurta, especially since they are not attested independently of it. However, the same deities, without reference to a specific place of cult, also received offerings with no apparent relation with the cult of Ninurta. If the daises and shrines mentioned above were not located in the temple of Ninurta, the co-occurrence and the relative importance of the offerings suggest at least that Ninurta was the central deity of these cultic events. The evidence also may suggest a cultic relationship (and perhaps geographic proximity) between the temple of Ninurta and the palace, since in two documents modest offerings apparently for ritual activity at the palace were recorded alongside larger offerings for the temple of Ninurta and sometimes other offerings (CUSAS 9, 65; BC 365)\(^{330}\).

\(^{328}\) Also recorded together with offerings to the temple of Ninurta were offerings to the following deities, without any mention of a dais or shrine: Ninurta-of-Uruk (CUSAS 9, 65), Queen-of-the-sky, Nana(ya), and Daughter-of-Sin (all in CUSAS 9, 76).

\(^{329}\) The text is unpublished; it is cited in Dalley 2009: 72.

\(^{330}\) In addition, if we posit that the shrines of the Sibitti and Lugal-irra were located in the temple of Ninurta, or that their cults were related, we may add to the relevant evidence the text BC 240 which records offerings to both deities and to the palace. Text BC 240 is unpublished; it is cited in Dalley 2009: 68.
Compiled by month, the animal offerings to Ninurta present the following pattern:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Animals</th>
<th>Combined with other offerings</th>
<th>Type of offering/occasion</th>
<th>Name/aspect of deity</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6 rams</td>
<td>flour, beers, birds, fins</td>
<td>(given by the king)</td>
<td>Ninurta</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6 ewes</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Ninurta</td>
<td>35 &amp; 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6 rams</td>
<td>flour, dates, ghee</td>
<td>(sent by the king); on the roof?</td>
<td>Ninurta</td>
<td>(BC 365 in Dalley 2009: 72)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vii</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6 rams</td>
<td>breads, flours, oil, ghee</td>
<td>(isīḥtu)</td>
<td>Ninurta</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>K</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6 rams</td>
<td>beer, flours, ghee</td>
<td>(isīḥtu) SÌZKUR</td>
<td>Ninurta</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ix</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4 ewes</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Ninurta</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L</td>
<td>2?</td>
<td>1 lamb</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Ninurta</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 ram</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Ninurta</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9: Animal offerings to Ninurta

Table 9 shows that Ninurta received offerings on the first day of the year. Offerings on the seventh day of the month are attested twice, they may correspond to the Old Babylonian Š.Š-festival of the seventh day, during which Ninurta received offerings at Nippur (Richter 2004: 64). Noteworthy is also the offering of six ewes on the twenty-fourth day of month ii; it coincides with the main feast of Ninurta at Nippur, the GU4.SÌ.SA, which is well attested in Ur III times, less so in the Old Babylonian period (Richter 2004: 62-63; Sallaberger 1993: 114ff.; Annus 2002: 61ff.) But with only one occurrence, the evidence is too limited to conclude to the observance of the festival.

331 At Old Babylonian Nippur, Ninurta also probably received offerings on the other Š.Š days, namely the new moon, the full moon, and the last quarter, alongside other deities (Sigrist 1976: 299; see also Richter 2004: 164; 150). In the Ur III period, the celebration of the Š.Š appears to have been observed in several towns and have included several deities (Sallaberger 1993: 39ff; 45; 57). The Sealand I evidence is not only for the 7th day but for the 7th day of the 7th month (both texts). The 7th day of the 7th month had special significance and was considered unfavourable in various Ancient Near Eastern traditions (Cohen 1993: 391), but there is no evidence that it was a special occasion of offerings to any gods. The fact that both relevant Sealand I texts are dated to month vii is probably an accident of discovery.
Ninurta’s deified cultic implement dUD.BI.A.NU.IL.LA, which was set up in judicial proceedings, also received offerings (CUSAS 9, 64). In cultic context, this object is attested only at Old Babylonian Nippur (Richter 2004: 74). However, it also appears in one of the later year names of Samsu-iluna (year 38) which means that this one was in all likelihood outside Nippur because the Babylonian king almost certainly did not control that town at the time (ibid.: n.335)332. The presence of dUD.BI.A.NU.IL.LA in the Sealand I material does therefore not necessarily imply control (past or present) of Nippur, since the fashioning and consecrating of such an implement outside the Ešumeša was theologically admissible.

Ninurta figures in prominent position in offering lists. In CUSAS 9, 64333, he appears twice in the top part of the list: once in the triad Anu, Enlil, Ninurta (lines 3-5), a second time in the group: Anu, Enlil, Ninlil, dUD.BI.A.NU.IL.LA, Ninurta (lines 6-10). In the god list CUSAS 9, 81, he comes in third position after Enlil and Ninlil and is followed by his brother Nusku and his spouse Nin-Nibru (lines 1-5). The presence of Ninurta’s deified cultic implement in the former list and of his spouse in the latter suggests that the enumeration of deities is centred on Ninurta rather than Enlil, and that (Anu), Enlil, (Ninlil) represent his genealogy. In other offering lists, Ninurta figures in less prominent position334 and also received various commodities under other aspects335.

There is no evidence of an active cult of Ninurta’s spouse Nin-Nibru. She appears only once in god list CUSAS 9, 81: 5. But since her cult in the Old Babylonian period had been very modest even at Nippur (Richter 2004: 71), this does not necessarily undermine Ninurta’s importance in the Sealand I state-sponsored cult. Whether dNin-Nibru should be considered an aspect of Ištar is unclear. In the latter's incarnation as Šarrat-Nippuri, sometimes written dUN.GAL-NIBRU, Ištar may have become associated with dNin-Nibru and the latter's cult place at Nippur, the Ešumeša

332 See also Dalley 2009: text 64 n.9.
333 This text dates probably to New Year’s Day (year J).
334 In CUSAS 9, 59, dated to New Year’s Day of year D, Ninurta appears probably in the triad Enlil, Ea, Ninurta (on lines 1-3). In other lists, he is given somewhat less importance, for instance in CUSAS 9, 82 where he comes after Enlil, Ea, Šin, and "The-one-who-dwells-in-the-sky", or in CUSAS 9, 78 where he stands at the top of the second section.
335 He appears as "Ninurta-of-the-Courtyard" and "Ninurta-of-the-town-of-the-Lioness?" in CUSAS 9, 59; 64; 84.
(Krebernik 2009c: 77; Richter 2004: 124), but this identification of both deities is considered unresolved (Lambert 1982: 179-180), or at best of very limited scope; Krebernik (2009c: 77) merely admits one "nicht zu verallgemeinernden Beleg": the Gula Hymn of Bullutṣa-rabi, which associates \textsuperscript{4}UN.GAL-NIBRU with the Ešumeša (Lambert 1967: 124, line 129). In the Sealand I material, only one text could possibly point towards a relation between the cult of Ninurta and the cult of aspects of Ištar: CUSAS 9, 76. It records large offerings for the temple of Ninurta and modest ones for Marduk but also for a number of goddesses: Queen-of-the-sky, Nana(ya), Daughter-of-Sîn, and one Nin-\[ \]. As for Gula, the goddess who comes to be considered Ninurta's wife during the second millennium (Biggs 1998-2001: 477), her cult is fairly marginal in the Sealand I archive; she receives barley and grain-based offerings on three occasions, never in conjunction with offerings to Ninurta (CUSAS 9, 62; 63; 74). In offering lists, she does not figure close to Ninurta (CUSAS 9, 59: 12; 64: 14; 78: 10; 82: 20').

The evidence speaks clearly for a prominent rôle of Ninurta in the palace-sponsored cult\textsuperscript{336}. There may be some direct cultic influence from Nippur but the slight indications to that effect are not compelling. In addition, Ninurta is barely represented as theophoric element in the onomasticon, probably appearing in only one name, while he was very popular both in Old and in Middle Babylonian Nippurite names (Stamm 1939: 68-69; Oelsner 1976: 112; Hölscher 1996: 269)\textsuperscript{337}. Therefore, his importance in the palace-sponsored cult is almost certainly not the reflection of a local pantheon centred on Nippur and the Ešumeša, rather it is more likely that it derived from a very prominent position given to him in the Sealand I state pantheon, into which he was introduced with his genealogy and entourage. The fact that the dedication of a cultic installation(?) to Enlil and Ninurta is celebrated in year name E reinforces this impression: Ninurta and his father Enlil were important to the Sealand I kingship and this needed to be communicated to a wide audience.

\textsuperscript{336} The associated Sumerian deity Ningirsu is mentioned only once (CUSAS 9, 83: 35'); see also next section.

\textsuperscript{337} Enlil is also barely present in the personal names of the Sealand I archive, which speaks against the immediate vicinity of Nippur as the find spot of the archive.
5.2.3 The cult of Nazi

While the Lagašite goddess did not receive as many sacrificial animals as Ištar or Ninurta on any occasion (she almost always received four), animal sacrifices to her are well represented in the extant archive and seem to have taken place on several distinct days in the month. She appears to have received mainly ewes, very valuable animals in a flock\(^{338}\). We have no information on the place(s) of cult where she was revered but a SANGA of Nazi is attested (in the undated expenditure record CUSAS 9, 147). Her name is always written syllabically \(^{d}na-zi\).

Table 10 shows that there was a nindabû-offering of the fifteenth day for this goddess, at least in month v. The tenth day of the month may also have been important in her cult since we have up to four texts recording offerings to her on the tenth day of various months. Nazi is not present, at least not under that name, in offering lists\(^{339}\).

---

\(^{338}\) The sign U₈ is of peculiar shape in this archive. Its identification is considered certain by Dalley in her edition (2009). While the shape is somewhat more elongated than the typical U₈, it does seem different from the sign SILA₄ which is also well represented in the archive. SILA₄ usually ends with a vertical and is almost always accompanied by a specification of the type of lamb, either preceded by MI (female lamb), or followed by GA (unweaned) or GUB (half-weaned). The sign read U₈ always stands alone and ends with Winkelhaken.

\(^{339}\) She appears in an unpublished record of expenditure for flour given to her (BC 233 cited in Dalley 2009: 67). Also, barley, beer, and offering bowls were given to the SANGA of Nazi (CUSAS 9, 147).
Table 10: Animal offerings to Nazi

Nazi, written 𒀭NANŠE, was central in the old city-state of Lagaš (Falkenstein 1966: 84ff.; Selz 1990: 118ff.; Heimpel 1998-2001), where in Ur III times her cult included a festival in month v and offerings related to the moon phases (Sallabeger 1993: 95; 285-287). She probably never gained real prominence in other Babylonian local panthea. During the Ur III period her cult is attested on a limited basis at Uruk, Ur (Richter 2004: 282; 414), and Umma (Sallabeger 1993: 232). In the Old Babylonian period, she is mentioned a few times in texts from Nippur, and she was assimilated into the retinue of Ningal at Ur where there is some slight evidence for her cult (Richter 2004: 162; 452; 498; Wasserman 1995). It follows that, at the time of the creation of the
Sealand I kingdom, Nazi cannot be strongly associated with any major Babylonian cities outside the ancient city-state of Lagaš.

The prominence of Nazi in the Sealand I material is contrasted by the remarkable absence of her spouse\textsuperscript{340} and children and by the extremely modest presence of Ningirsu\textsuperscript{341}. The evidence speaks therefore against a Lagašite influence on the local pantheon\textsuperscript{342}. Nazi’s cult appears to be an import, not a cult which grew organically for centuries. I would contend that her relative prominence in the palace-sponsored cult probably reflects a high rank given to her in the state pantheon and is therefore the product of a political-theological decision. This in turn seems to suggest that the Sealand I kingdom of that period included at least part of the ancient city-state of Lagaš but that this region was neither the origin of the dynasty nor the most influential element of the kingdom\textsuperscript{343}.

5.2.4 The cult of Šamaš

Attestations of a Sealand I cult of the sun god are not very numerous in the archive but they present interesting characteristics. The palace sponsored the cult of Šamaš in at least two cultic

---

\textsuperscript{340} Nazi does not seem to be closely associated with Šin in the archive, therefore there is no immediate reason to assume that Nindara was represented by the moon god, although the former is equated with the latter in AN = dAnum (tablet III, line 65). Ningal is also present in the archive, even if merely once (CUSAS 9, 83: 9’). Therefore, Nazi’s presence and rôle in the Sealand I panthea seem to be largely independent from Šin’s.

\textsuperscript{341} Ningirsu is mentioned only once near the end of an offering list (CUSAS 9, 83: 35’).

\textsuperscript{342} Also, there is only one personal name with Nazi as theophoric element (discussed by Zadok 2014: 226), none with Ningirsu, and only two with Ba’u.

\textsuperscript{343} Nazi was perhaps already important during the reign of Gulkıšar, which pre-dates most texts of the CUSAS 9 archive by two generations, since a later kudurru (BE I/1 83) refers to an ancient land grant effected by Gulkıšar for the benefit of Nazi, his lady (lines 3ff.)
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locations: the temple of Šamaš and the dais of Šamaš\footnote{The phrase "dais of Šamaš" is plainly legible in CUSAS 9, 73 in the passage a-na BARAG ša ₄UTU (line 19). A similar text, CUSAS 9, 65, is clearly to be read in parallel since the date of the offering is the same (for different years) and the offerings are almost exactly the same. It is therefore justified to expect the presence of the word BARAG in the corresponding passage (line 20). This slightly damaged line has been reconstructed by Dalley as: a-na UNUG ki ⸣BARAG⸣ d UTU. But the sign which Dalley reads UNUG is partly damaged and should probably be read BARAG; indeed, the sign appears to have a somewhat more regular outer shape than the sign UNUG as it is written elsewhere in this archive. Also, the traces which she reads BARAG could be interpreted as ŠA. Therefore, I suggest the following reading for this line: ana ₄BARAG¹-ki ₄ša¹ ₄UTU. This would not be a very common orthography of parakku, especially for that period (CAD P, s.v. parakku), but the use of a phonetic ending after a logogram is attested, if not common, in this archive: it is attested for BÁN-tum which Dalley discusses in 2009: 14. (If we include the Sealand I divinatory texts, the use of phonetic complements is better attested. See George 2013: 136f.) The reading suggested here appears also sounder grammatically. A Šamaš-of-the-dais may also be attested in CUSAS 9, 82: line 27\textsuperscript{v}.
}

The dais is attested in combination with Ninurta so that it may have been a small shrine in the latter's temple\footnote{See also Section 5.2.2.}. A SANGA of Šamaš is also mentioned in CUSAS 9, 97: 7-8 and perhaps in CUSAS 9, 384: 25.

The offerings which include animal sacrifice are listed below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Animals</th>
<th>Combined with other offerings</th>
<th>Type of offering/ occasion</th>
<th>Name/ aspect of deity</th>
<th>Text CUSAS 9,</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>vii</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1 ram</td>
<td>beer, flours, ghee, dates</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Šamaš</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>K</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1 ram</td>
<td>beer, flours, ghee, dates</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Šamaš</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>viii</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>24?</td>
<td>4 rams</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Šamaš</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 sheep</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Šamaš</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 11: Animal offerings to Šamaš**

The most important animal offering to Šamaš is also the only offering recorded specifically for his temple: it comprised four rams (CUSAS 9, 50). The month of this offering is viii but the day is of uncertain reading so that we cannot associate it with well established practices\footnote{The day is probably 14 or 24. It was copied as 14 and read as 24? by Dalley; the photograph does not make it possible to decide. Important days of the month in the cult of Šamaš were the 1st(?) , the 8th, the 15th, and the 20th according to Krebernik 2011: 606. Arnaud identified the 1st, the 19th, the 20th, and the 30th for the Old Babylonian Ebabbar at Larsa (2001: 28 n.51).}. The offerings on the seventh day of month vii (CUSAS 9, 65; 73), both for the dais of Šamaš, may have taken place in the context of the cult of Ninurta because they were recorded with the latter's...
offerings. The sun god also received various other commodities in offering lists, in which he usually figures in fairly prominent position. In CUSAS 9, 59; 64 and 82, he comes after Enlil, Ninurta, Ea (and Sin), which roughly concords with the hierarchy of AN = Anum. In these lists, Šamaš also often appears in combination with another deity, either his spouse or (probably) a vizier.

Excursus: Viziers(?) of Šamaš

The sun god sometimes appears alongside his spouse Aya (An-a), either on the same line or on successive lines (for instance CUSAS 9, 59 line 8; 82 line 6; 83: lines 12'-13'). But, surprisingly, he seems to be more often associated with (an aspect of?) Nin-Šubur and also indirectly with Lugal-namtarra, since the name of Šubur followed by (Lugal-)namtarra is often repeated on the following line. The relevant occurrences are grouped in Table 12, showing how the deities are associated in the Sealand I material. The table also presents my suggested readings — which are very uncertain; the collation is based on photographs. Because of the uncertain readings, this excursus is merely a tentative explanation of the pattern in which these deities occur.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text Nr.</th>
<th>line</th>
<th>Suggested reading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CUSAS 9, 59</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Utu Šubur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Utu Šubur Lugal.Nam.Tar.Ra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUSAS 9, 78</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Utu Sukal?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Sukal? Lugal.Nam.Tar.Ra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUSAS 9, 79</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Utu Nin-? x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Lugal.Nam?.Darâ? x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUSAS 9, 81</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Utu Sukal?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Sukal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUSAS 9, 82</td>
<td>8’</td>
<td>Utu Sukal?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9’</td>
<td>Sukal? Lugal 1 - &lt;break&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUSAS 9, 83</td>
<td>19’</td>
<td>Šubur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20’</td>
<td>Nam.Tar.Ra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUSAS 9, 84</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Utu Sukal?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Sukal?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12: Occurrences of (Nin-)Šubur and (Lugal-)namtarra

He receives commodities in CUSAS 9, 59; 64; 78; 82; 83; 84. In these lists, he appears also as Šamaš-of-the-dais and Šamaš-bless-Gulkšar. The SANGA of Šamaš also received flour, dates, ghee, and beer in CUSAS 9, 97.
The reading of the name which I consider to be an aspect of Nin-Šubur is difficult\textsuperscript{348}. Table 12 shows that it is in turn written fairly legibly $dŠUBUR$\textsuperscript{349}, possibly once $dNIN-ŠUBUR$\textsuperscript{350}, but also with a sign probably to be read $dSUKAL$\textsuperscript{351}. Considering that $NIN-SUKAL$ is given as a variant writing of $NIN-ŠUBUR$ in an Old Babylonian copy of the *Silbenvokabular A* (line 72; Sollberger 1965: 23) and that $dNIN-ŠUBUR$ can be written $dŠUBUR$ (Wiggermann 1998-2001b: 490), the following equivalence in the Sealand I texts appears acceptable: $dNIN-ŠUBUR = dŠUBUR = dSUKAL$. Indeed, Table 12 shows that these names all appear in similar context. The apparent equivalence of these names in the Sealand I material could reflect the on-going syncretism between vizier deities, *sukkalū*, which resulted in Nin-Šubur being later absorbed by Pap-sukkal during the Kassite period (Wiggermann 1998-2001b: 492; Beaulieu 1992a: 64). His close association with Šamaš in the Sealand I material may indicate that (Nin)-Šubur/Sukkal had become in the local tradition a vizier of the sun god\textsuperscript{352}. This association of (Nin)-Šubur and Šamaš may have been initiated during Rîm-Rîn I's reign, since, after his conquest of Uruk, the king of Larsa, Šamaš's hometown, seems to have begun referring to Nin-Šubur as male and sponsored his cult and hymnic literature dedicated to him (Wiggermann 1998-2001b: 491; Frayne 1990: E4.2.14.12).

The association between (Nin)-Šubur/Sukkal and (Lugal-)namtarra is difficult to explain. They are named together in the blessing formula of an Old Babylonian letter (BIN 7,43 = AbB 9,230: line 4). Lugal-namtarra remains poorly attested but his identification with Namtar(ra) as suggested by Lambert (1987-1990b) now seems confirmed by the Sealand I evidence because they appear in the same context in it. Namtar(ra) is also a vizier in the underworld (Heimpel 1998-2001: 142ff.) Might he fulfil here the function of vizier of Šamaš during his transit in the underworld\textsuperscript{353} while (Nin)-Šubur/Sukkal, originally associated with the sky, acts as vizier of the sun god while he is in the sky\textsuperscript{354}.

\textsuperscript{348} It has been read in various ways by Dalley (2009): $\textit{d-}a$!, $\textit{dEN?.LIL?}$, and $\textit{dŠKUR}$.

\textsuperscript{349} CUSAS 9, 59: lines 6-7; 83: line 19'.

\textsuperscript{350} CUSAS 9, 79: line 2 (fragmentary); Nin-Šubur is also attested in the unpublished BC 365 (discussed forthwith).

\textsuperscript{351} CUSAS 9, 78: lines 4-5; CUSAS 9, 81: line 12; CUSAS 9, 82: lines 8'-9'; CUSAS 9, 84: line 8. The sign could also be considered a very simplified version of ŠUBUR when one considers the somewhat intermediate shape which that sign presents in CUSAS 9, 59: line 7.

\textsuperscript{352} Incidentally, none of the viziers of Šamaš known from AN = $d$Anum are present in the Sealand I archive. Šamaš and Nin-Šubur were sometimes named together in blessing formulae in Old Babylonian letters. However the deities in these formulae are usually considered to have been selected separately from one another (see Albertz 1978: 135-136 for a discussion; in particular p.136 for the combination Šamaš and Nin-Šubur).

\textsuperscript{353} Heimpel has shown that the sojourn of the sun god in the underworld at night was very present in Babylonian mythology (Heimpel 1986).

\textsuperscript{354} However, the association of the female Nin-Šubur with the netherworld deity Meslamtaea in the Old Babylonian god list TCL 15, 10 could speak against my suggested interpretation (Lambert 1987-1990a: 144).
A dais of Nin-Šubur is attested in an unpublished Sealand I document (BC 365 cited in Dalley 2009: 72) confirming an active cult of this deity. It is likely that both the male and female aspects of the deity were revered at Nippur throughout the Ur III and the Old Babylonian periods (Richter 2004: 134-136). We also find traces of an Old Babylonian cult of Nin-Šubur at Isin, where the deity was absorbed by the circle of Nin-Isina (ibid.: 214). Also, Rîm-Sîn I built temples to both aspects of the deity at Ur (George 2011: 125). The cult of Nin-Šubur was therefore present in various centres.

In the Sealand I tradition, Šubur may have partly retained his original association with the Urukean pantheon since in CUSAS 9, 83 (lines 19’-21’) we find him (again alongside Lugal-namtarra) listed before dAMA.SAG.NU.DI, an obscure Urukean deity identified as his female consort in AN = dAnum and, remarkably enough, still so in documents from Seleucid Uruk356, where and when she had apparently gained in cultic prominence (Litke 1998 Tablet I: 46; Beaulieu 1992a: 49ff.). The Sealand I attestations add significantly to the small amount of evidence on this deity and on the long-term transmission of cultic traditions in the Babylonian south.

While the cult of the sun god is not yet clearly attested in every important Old Babylonian city, for instance at Uruk (Richter 2004: 325ff.), it seems to have been fairly widespread, at least as part of the activities of the temple of another deity. When absent from the cultic record of a city, Šamaš is often in some other manner present, for instance in year names (Renger 1967; Richter 2004: 69; 154f.; 246f.; 338ff.; 493ff.). It appears thus that on the whole his cultic pan-Babylonian presence outside his traditional cultic centres of Larsa and Sippar may have been modest, if undeniable.

The Sealand I evidence pertaining to the cult of Šamaš is somewhat contradictory. We find only fairly modest evidence of cultic activity but at the same time Šamaš offers the archive’s most solid, even if still very limited, indication of the existence of a temple household with control of cattle. Indeed, besides two mentions of the SANGA of Šamaš (CUSAS 9, 97; perhaps 384), we learn from two carcass delivery records that Šamaš possessed cattle (CUSAS 9, 349; 363). Therefore, his temple must have had some economic weight in the palace town where the archive was found; it is possible that many of the cultic activities related to Šamaš were recorded in a

355 The dais is briefly discussed in Section 5.2.2..

356 He appears in these documents under the name Papsukkal.
separate archive located in this temple, and that this archive was not found by the looters\textsuperscript{357}. In conclusion, Šamaš seems to have enjoyed a relatively prominent position locally but whether his prominence comes from his place in the local pantheon or the state pantheon is impossible to determine\textsuperscript{358}.

5.2.5 The cult of Sîn

The Sealand I documents show that the moon god was revered in the palace town where the archive was unearthed. Written in turn $^d_{30}$ and $^d_{EN.ZU}$, we find him in a few texts recording offerings without mention of the cultic location. The evidence for offerings comprising animals is compiled in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Animals</th>
<th>Combined with other offerings</th>
<th>Type of offering / occasion</th>
<th>Name / aspect of deity</th>
<th>Text CUSAS 9,</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>iii</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>1?</td>
<td>1 ram</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>SÎZKUR</td>
<td>Sîn</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 lamb</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Sîn</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vii</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1? (sheep?)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Sîn</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 ram</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Sîn</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13: Animal offerings to Sîn

Table 13 shows that the moon god received offerings for the new moon. He also received various commodities, including once alongside his spouse Ningal and once as the "Fruit" : Inbu\textsuperscript{359} in

\textsuperscript{357} The fact that we find no trace of cattle being offered to Šamaš although he possessed some could speak for a separate, undiscovered temple archive.

\textsuperscript{358} Attestations in personal names offer no additional insight since Šamaš was a very popular theophoric element in all of Babylonia in the Old and Middle Babylonian period (Stol 1991: 202; Stamm 1939: 68-69; Hölscher 1996: 270). The Sealand I archive is no exception since Šamaš appears as the second favourite choice.

\textsuperscript{359} It is written $^d_{GU.RU.UN}$ (CUSAS 9, 83: 26').
CUSAS 9, 59\textsuperscript{360}; 82\textsuperscript{361}; 83. In the two former lists, he stands in relatively prominent position, after Enlil and Ea, and before Šamaš, which concords with the hierarchy of AN = d\textsuperscript{4}Anum. He is curiously absent from the god list CUSAS 9, 81 (see Section 5.4.2), probably also from the offering list CUSAS 9, 64.

The cult of the moon god was not limited to Ur; in Babylonia it was omnipresent in the Old Babylonian period (Renger 1967; Krebernik 1993-1997: 368-369; Richter 2004: 148ff; 238ff.; 316f.; 388ff.), therefore, his cult in the Sealand I archive cannot be ascribed to a specific local influence. Sîn is the most frequent theophoric element in personal names in the archive, in continuity with Old and Middle Babylonian onomasticon (Stol 1991: 202; Stamm 1939: 68-69). Sîn, written d\textsuperscript{30}, also replaces Gilgameš in a passage of his epic attributed to Sealand I scribes. The reasons for that remain uncertain (George 2007), but could be part of a royal exaltation of Ur (see Section 5.1.1).

5.2.6 The cult of Enlil and Ea

These two important deities are not widely attested in the Sealand I texts pertaining to cult. But the available evidence presents two features of interest: the very fact that a cult of Ea is attested at all in post-Old Babylonian texts and the fact that Enlil and Ea usually appear together in the

\textsuperscript{360} Dalley suggested to read dEN.ZU a-ši-ib-AN as Sîn-who-dwells-in-the-sky (CUSAS 9, 59: 5). However, we find in CUSAS 9, 82: 3'-4' dEN.ZU on one line and DINGIR-a-ši-ib-AN on the next; it would appear that the entries counted as separate since there is a wedge at the beginning of line 4', as was apparently the case for each line of the list. Whether line 4' should be understood and read as ilu-a-ši-ib-AN or d\textsuperscript{3}a-ši-ib-AN is unclear. That the moon god was strongly associated with the sky in the attributes given to him is well attested, also that these attributes could become separate deities (Krebernik 1993-1997: 363), for instance as dŠin-ša-šamē in the Tell Leilan treaties (Eidem 2011: Part II, no.1: i 2; no.2: i 2; no.3: i 3); evidence from the Neo-Babylonian and also earlier periods is discussed by Beaulieu (2003: 346-347). The evidence of the Sealand I archive is somewhat contradictory; we may be witnessing Götterspaltung in the making. Dalley reconstructs a-ši-ib-[AN] on line 1 of CUSAS 9, 79; if her reconstruction is correct, this would put this attribute or divinity in a list in which Sîn is also represented in another section of the document (the reverse and the obverse of this tablet have very probably be wrongly identified). However, the photograph shows no residual trace of the missing sign(s) on the edge of the tablet, only that the space remaining was indeed limited, but that this is too thin a basis to conclude to the suggested reconstruction. Moreover, the terms a-ši-ib and a-ši-ib-tē appear in association with other deities in this archive. The evidence of CUSAS 9, 79 seems therefore inconclusive.

\textsuperscript{361} Dalley suggested to read the very fragmentary line CUSAS 9, 82: 13’ as dŠEŠ?.KI\textsuperscript{1} but the traces do not appear sufficient to sustain this suggestion.
To the former point, a cult of Ea is, outside Eridu, barely attested in Babylonia after the Old Babylonian period (Galter 1981: 295), which means that the Sealand I material represents fairly late and probably exceptional evidence for his cult in Babylonia. If we add that he is mentioned in two of the few Sealand I year name formulae known to us, it appears that Ea enjoyed a special position in the Sealand I state pantheon. Ea, written $d^40$, also replaces Eadu in a fragment of the Gilgameš epic attributed to Sealand scribes (George 2007); the matter is discussed in section 5.1.1.

As for the association of Enlil and Ea in the Sealand I material, we observe that they were co-beneficiaries of statues in year name J, and that they received twice offerings on the same day, offerings that were recorded together: once they were given one lamb each (on 1.v.N in CUSAS 9, 42), on another occasion they received each one ram at their daises (on 2.vi.K in unpublished BC 365 cited in Dalley 2009: 72). Such an association in the cult does not seem to have been very common in Babylonia; a "Temple of Enlil and Ea" appears in an Old Babylonian letter from Larsa (HMA 9-01849 edited in Veldhuis 2008: text 10) but no such temple is listed in George’s House Most High (1993). Enlil and Ea also appear in succession at the top or near the top of offering lists CUSAS 9, 59; 79; and 82.

A cult of Enlil, without apparent association with Ea, is also attested: he received once one ram (on 8.viii.N in CUSAS 9, 49) and we know that a ritual installation was set up for him in month xi (CUSAS 9, 106). Enlil stands in very prominent position in most lists, either in foremost (CUSAS 9, 59; 81; 82) or second position, immediately after Anu (CUSAS 9, 64; 79). He is also the god bestowing the shepherding of the totality to king Ayadaragalama in year name $G$. A

---

362 In the Sealand I material, Enlil also appears once with Ninurta in year name E, apparently in the context of the royal bestowing(?) of a cultic installation for them (the "great beer-jar"?).

363 The matter is discussed fully in Section 5.3. Ea was also a relatively popular theophoric element in personal names in the Sealand I town where the archive was retrieved, a popularity closer to the Old Babylonian than to the Middle Babylonian onomasticon (Galter 1981: 282; Stamm 1939: 68-69).

364 On that occasion, Sin and Nazi also received offerings.

365 The presence of Enlil in year name formulae is discussed in Section 5.3. Ea is curiously absent from god list CUSAS 9, 81 (this absence is based on my suggested reading of line 12 as $d^4SUKAL which differs from Dalley’s who proposed $d^4-a^2$? See Section 5.2.4 on this). He is also probably absent from offering list CUSAS 9, 64. His circle, represented by Damgalnunna, Asarluḫi, and Usumu, stands in foremost position in offering list CUSAS 9, 83 although he himself is not named in it.
few other sources also speak of the prominence of Enlil in the Sealand I kingdom. One Ili-
remeanni, probably a servant of Sealand I king Ea-gāmil since he refers to him in his cylinder
seal inscription, calls himself in the same inscription a servant of Enlil and Nin-Eanna (Moorey
& Gurney 1973: seal no.23). Finally, a newly published Sealand I balag hymn to Enlil attests of a
continued interest for this deity in Sealand I scribal circles (Gabbay 2014). As in the case of
Ninurta, Enlil is barely present in the onomasticon, which is in stark contrast with the situation
prevailing at Nippur both in the Old Babylonian and in the Middle Babylonian periods (Oelsner
1976: 111; 114; Hölscher 1996: 269). This clearly indicates that Enlil's importance in the archive
results from his prominence in the Sealand I state pantheon, not in the local pantheon.

5.2.7 The cult of Marduk

The patron god of Babylon is modestly represented in the Sealand I texts. He had a cult place in
(or near) the palace town that produced the archive; it may have been a shrine in Ninurta's temple
since the palace offered fish fins and beer to the Š-ämär.utu on New Year's day and recorded
this together with a number of rams, birds, and large quantities of various other foodstuffs for the
temple of Ninurta (CUSAS 9, 76); modest offerings similar to what was attributed to Marduk
were recorded for a number of other deities on the same document. Marduk was also presented
offerings during the feast of the braziers; we have evidence of this for two different years, year I
(CUSAS 9, 66) and year L (CUSAS 9, 26). In offering lists, Marduk appears in middle position
(CUSAS 9, 59: 14; 82: 10′) confirming that he had gained some importance outside northern
Babylonia; however, the date and the manner of this expansion are difficult to pin down (for
opposite opinions see George 1992: 248-249; Richter 2004: 15). But clearly, his position was
not as prestigious in the Sealand I kingdom as it was in the area still controlled by Babylon

---

366 For the attribution of the unprovenanced tablet to Sealand I scribes, see Gabbay 2014: 148.

367 He is included in the list CUSAS 9, 79, probably as the last entry, but there is no corresponding offering. The
reverse and the obverse were apparently inverted in the edition; Dalley noted that it may be a school tablet, given the
erasures and many irregularities (2009: 78 notes).

368 I follow Richter who considers that the evidence, while scarce, nonetheless points toward an early syncretism of
Marduk and Asalluḫi and a later association with Šamaš. (Note that Richter 2004: 15 n.58 refers erroneously to
during the reigns of the last kings of its first dynasty, where his cult is well attested and where Marduk had become extremely popular as theophoric element in personal names (Sommerfeld 1982: 88ff.); this is not the case in the Sealand I onomasticon\(^{369}\). In southern and middle Babylonian personal names Marduk seems to have enjoyed a greater popularity during and after the Middle Babylonian period, as far as can be seen from a limited number of texts (Sommerfeld 1982: 154). Given the Sealand I evidence, this increase in popularity probably took place after the Kassite conquest, in the reunified Babylonia.

5.2.8 The cult of the Holy Mound

We learn from two documents that sheep were offered to the Holy Mound, written \(\text{DU}_6.(\text{KU})\). In one case, the month name is broken off (CUSAS 9, 57) but the other document shows that the Holy Mound received one ewe in month vii (on the 11th day; CUSAS 9, 56). As of yet, there is no evidence of this cult in the Old Babylonian period (Renger 1967; Richter 2004) but we know that in the Ur III period the Holy Mound was revered at Nippur and that it received sheep also in month vii (Sallaberger 1993: 129-130). However, the term \(\text{DU}_6.\text{KU}\) is also attested outside Nippur as the name of various shrines (George 1993: 77), which makes it difficult to associate the Sealand I evidence with a specific tradition.

5.2.9 The cult of the Sibitti

The Sibitti, written \(\text{dIMIN.BI}\), are fairly well represented in the Sealand I administrative texts, adding significantly to the extremely scarce evidence for their cult in second millennium Babylonia. One Sealand I text shows that they had a temple in which they received one ram, beer, flour, ghee, and dates probably at night (on 6.vii in CUSAS 9, 65)\(^{370}\). There were also sacrifices of lambs twice in month iii\(^{371}\). In addition, they received twice minor offerings of flour,

\(^{369}\) Sommerfeld estimates that Marduk came in second or third position in the late Old Babylonian onomasticon of northern Babylonia (1982: 88). In the Sealand I archive, merely two personal names feature him (2009: 307).

\(^{370}\) See line 33 of the text (and corresponding note by Dalley) for the reference to a night ritual.

\(^{371}\) In CUSAS 9, 39 the relevant passage is fragmentary; the quantity of animals is broken off but \(\text{IMIN.BI}\) is fairly legible on line 13. In addition, the unpublished text BC 435 records that they received two lambs (Dalley 2009: 47).
The Sibitti are also represented in offering lists CUSAS 9, 64; 82 and appear at the end of god list CUSAS 9, 81.

The cult of the Sibitti is barely attested in second millennium Babylonia. There is some evidence of a cult at Nippur during the Old Babylonian period and of a Middle Babylonian temple, probably also at Nippur (Wiggermann 2010: 464; Richter 2004: 158). Therefore, on the basis of the present knowledge of their cult, their presence in the Sealand I records may indicate an influence of the Nippurite pantheon.

5.2.10 The cult of Lugal-irra

The Sealand I texts show evidence of a cult of the netherworld deity Lugal-irra, written LUGAL-GIR-RA, who uncharacteristically appears alone, whereas he is usually attested in the company of his twin Meslamtaea or his spouse ČU-k₃₆₄-u₄₆-an₅₄₆-n₃₆₄-si (Lambert 1987-1990a: 144). One Sealand I text may mention a temple dedicated to him; the evidence is based on a fragmentary passage (CUSAS 9, 65: 24) but the reconstruction "to the temple of Lugal-irra" appears probable. In that text beer, flour, and ghee were probably offered there on the seventh day of month vii, which was a day of offerings to Ninurta and other gods. The records show that two rams were offered twice to Lugal-irra, as well as beer (and flours, dates, and ghee) on the sixteenth day of month x. Lugal-irra was also allotted flour on the thirtieth day of month iii (CUSAS 9, 60) and received various other commodities (CUSAS 9, 59; 78; 82; 83; 84). The presence of Lugal-irra alone, without Meslamtaea, is peculiar and so is his relative importance in the cult. As a netherworld deity, he may in fact have been given more importance than Nergal

\[\text{In years G and J, respectively in CUSAS 9, 61 and in the unpublished text BC 240 (Dalley 2009: 68). On the same day, Lugal-irra received offerings.}\]

\[\text{In two cases he stands immediately before (CUSAS 9, 82: 11’-12’) or after (CUSAS 9, 83: 27’-28’) Nergal but this is not always the case (for instance CUSAS 9, 59: 11 and 20).}\]

\[\text{The traces point towards it: a-na É 4LUGAL is well preserved; follow traces which could be cogent with GİR. The remainder is lost.}\]

\[\text{In years G and J, respectively in CUSAS 9, 61 and the unpublished text BC 240 (Dalley 2009: 68). On that day, the Sibitti also received offerings.}\]
Indeed, the latter is not well represented in the Sealand I texts: one record shows that he received one lamb on one occasion (CUSAS 9, 44) compared to two rams offered to Lugal-irra; in CUSAS 9, 59 they both received the same quantity of (unreadable) items.

For all periods, there is only limited evidence for the Babylonian worship of Lugal-irra. In the Old Babylonian period, he and his twin Meslamtaea were probably mainly revered at Dūrum (BĀDki), where they possessed temples (Lambert 1987-1990a: 144; George 1993: 127 no.804; 132 n.869; Hallo 1991: 379). Lugal-irra and Meslamtaea also received offerings at Nippur as part of the cult of Nusku, in whose temple they guarded doors (Richter 2004: 81). One text from the reign of Rīm-Anum shows that the pair was probably revered at Uruk since slaves dedicated to them were sent there (Nisaba 4 II.25; Seri 2013: 233). The evidence is limited but the presence of Lugal-irra in the Sealand I texts, taken together with the mention of the town of Udannu and of its deities dNIN-È.AN.NA and dIGI.DU (see section 5.2.1), could give some weight to Beaulieu’s suggestion that the Old Babylonian Dūrum and the later Udannu are one and the same, or that the cults of Dūrum were transferred to Udannu (Beaulieu 1992b: 419). This seems also to speak for a local importance of these deities; admittedly, the absence of Meslamtaea alongside his twin remains puzzling.

5.2.11 The cult of Manzât

A cult of the rainbow goddess Manzât, written dTIR.AN.NA, possibly of Elamite origin, is attested in three Sealand I documents. She received commodities at least twice for New Year’s

---

376 In the Sealand I archive, the first sign used to write Nergal's name is identical with the sign GÌR attested in other contexts, an orthography probably resulting from the coalescence of KIŠ and GÌR in the Old Babylonian period (Steinkeller 1987: 162ff.; Wiggermann 1998-2001a: 216); for another opinion based on a phonetic use of the sign with the value NÈ see Lambert 1990a: 52.

377 Manzât is attested as early as in the Ur III period at Girsu in an Akkadian personal name (ITT 2 3782; ITT 5 9965; an probably ITT 5 9879). The texts, although listed as Ur III in ITT 2 and 5, were labelled as Old akkadian in CAD M, s.v. Manzât 1c1', and therefore also in AHw II, s.v. Manziat, Manzât. Lambert labelled them as Ur III (1987-1990c: 345), and indeed, the only copy available, that of ITT 2 3782, presents an Ur III script. We can therefore consider the Old Akkadian date indicated in CAD and AHw as erroneous, and thus there is at present no evidence for this deity in Babylonia before the Ur III period. But since the goddess is attested as one of the Elamite state gods in a treaty of Old Akkadian date, one may prudently surmise that she is of Elamite origin (Lambert 1987-1990c: 344; Hinz 1967:91, line i 20).
Day (CUSAS 9, 59; 64; 82378). The god Šimut, probably her husband (Lambert 1987-1990c: 345), is represented in several personal names379, Manzât only in one. The evidence for a cult of Manzât in Babylonia is extremely scarce but we know that she was revered at Nippur (Richter 2004: 161) and at Larsa (Arnaud 2001: 25) in the Old Babylonian period. We also know that there was a shrine of Manzât in Middle Babylonian Nippur (George 1993: 166). Whether we can see in the Sealand I cult of Manzât a Nippurite or Larsean influence is impossible to ascertain, and at any rate the Sealand I attestations are in themselves exceptional.

5.2.12 The palace as a place of cult

Seven records give evidence for offerings taking place at the palace. In one case the sacrifice, which was carried out on the roof, was for the goddess Ištar (CUSAS 9, 69). The other texts do not specify the deity to whom the offerings at the palace were dedicated (CUSAS 9, 65; 86; 109; BC 240; BC 365; BC 370380). The full moon was probably one of the occasions of such sacrifices since four of these records are dated to the fourteenth, fifteenth, or sixteenth day of the month381. It seems that the offerings took place at night because they are twice called akal mūši (ša É.GAL) (CUSAS 9, 86; 109). The roof and the gates were privileged places for ritual offering as evidenced respectively in CUSAS 9, 69 and BC 365 (roof), and BC 240382 (gates). In addition, singers sometimes performed at the palace gates (CUSAS 9, 87; 88; 95; 96383).

---

378 The date of the latter text (CUSAS 9, 82) is lost.

379 The names are discussed in Zadok 2014: 225-226.

380 These texts are unpublished. They are cited in Dalley 2009: BC 240 on p.68; BC 365 on p.72; BC 370 on p.85.

381 Three of these offerings, recorded in documents presenting mostly similarities since they all involved the sacrifice of ram(s) and the presentation of grain-based offerings, are in month viii (CUSAS 9, 86; 109; BC 370). But the sample is too small to determine whether this is only an accident of discovery or whether this full moon had special significance.

382 This text is unpublished; it is cited in Dalley 2009: 68.

383 The text CUSAS 9, 86 does not mention the palace gates but the analogy with the other records, in particular with text 95 makes it almost certain that the singers performed there.
5.2.13 Some events of the cultic calendar

We find in the Sealand I texts direct and indirect evidence of the following festivals\(^\text{384}\): the *kinūnu*-festival and the rituals marking the moon phases.

5.2.13.1 The moon phase days

Several offerings appear to coincide with the main phases of the lunar cycle\(^\text{385}\): the new moon, the first crescent, the full moon, and perhaps the last crescent. Some of these sacrifices took place at the palace.

New moon

Two texts mention a "sacrifice of the new moon" *sīzkur ša ar-ḫi* as the reason for the delivery of sheep to the palace at the beginning of the month\(^\text{386}\), and a few more texts record the delivery of sheep to the palace "for sacrifice" on the first day of the month (CUSAS 9, 25? and 29?\(^\text{387}\); 30\(^\text{388}\); 42). We have no indication as to the location of this offering. Several deities received animal sacrifices at the beginning of the month: Sin (three times), Nazi (possibly four times), Ištar (once), Ninurta (once if we count New Year’s Day but also possibly thrice on the second day of the month), Enlil and Ea (once each), and Nin-Šubur (once on the second day)\(^\text{389}\).

\(^{384}\) One text may refer to a festival of the month of Abu (in Dalley's translation): CUSAS 9, 43: lines 5-6. The passage reads simply *1 UDU.NITÁ / a-na ITI NE NE.GAR* and is therefore fairly unspecific. Should it indeed refer to a festival, it would be the sole reference to it in the archive. Cohen notes that Neo-Assyrian sources show that the month of Abu was the occasion of celebrating the dead (1993: 320).

\(^{385}\) The term *eššeššu* is never used to designate the occasion of offering but we find it in the personal name Arad-eššešši written *IR-U4.ES.ES* (CUSAS 9, 74: 5).

\(^{386}\) The texts are CUSAS 9, 38 and 39. The former is dated to the first day, the latter to the second of month iii of year N. The latter text is a cumulative record indicating "day 1" a few lines below the entry concerning the new moon, therefore all lines above were probably indeed records of the first day.

\(^{387}\) Both texts are cumulative records dated to the fourth of a month but in both cases "day 1" stands on a line below the entry "(x flock) for sacrifice"; this sacrifice was therefore probably on the first day.

\(^{388}\) This text is dated to New Year’s Day.

\(^{389}\) Text BC 365 (Dalley 2009: 72). For the other deities, see Tables 8-10; 13; and Section 5.2.6.
First quarter

The first lunar quarter may have been marked in the cult of some deities. We find that Ninurta and Šamaš\textsuperscript{390} received animal sacrifice on the seventh day, at least of month vii (see Tables 9 and 11). Offerings of flour, ghee, dates, and beer are recorded for the palace and Lugal-irra (see Sections 5.2.10 and 5.2.12).

Full moon

The full moon was certainly of importance in the cultic calendar. In particular, the full moon of the month viii may have been of special significance for the palace since on three occasions offerings of rams and other foodstuffs are recorded for the night meal \textit{akāl mūši} or simply the sacrifices of the palace on that day (on days 14 or 15 of month viii in CUSAS 9, 86; 109; unpublished BC 370 cited in Dalley 2009: 85). In addition, offerings of flour, dates, and ghee took place at the palace on the 16.x (year J in unpublished BC 240 cited in Dalley 2009: 68).

The term \textit{nindabû}-offering may have been associated with the celebration of the full moon since we find this type of offering attested thrice in the middle of the month, for Nazi\textsuperscript{391}, Lugal-irra, and the Sibitti (CUSAS 9, 75; 61). The \textit{ninbadû}, usually understood as cereal offering (CAD N, s.v. \textit{nindabû}), appears to have been compatible with non-cereal offerings in the Sealand I cult because the foods given in CUSAS 9, 75 included not only flour and beer but also four rams and ghee\textsuperscript{392}. The same text, which calls the occasion the "\textit{ŠUKU dINNIN (nindabû) of the fifteenth day}", adds that the foods were given for the \textit{tākultu}. Dalley has therefore interpreted the term as the "\textit{tākultu-festival}", for which there is no additional evidence, however. I would suggest that a special meal was simply offered to the goddess on the fifteenth day of the month.

Last quarter

\textsuperscript{390} The sacrifice to the Sibitti specified to be at night on the sixth day may also be related (CUSAS 9, 65).

\textsuperscript{391} Nazi receives animal offerings in the middle of the month on another occasion (CUSAS 9, 54).

\textsuperscript{392} However, the flour stands before the rams in the list of foods offered, which is unusual.
There is no clear Sealand I evidence for a celebration of the last lunar crescent. Only for Ištar do we find a few occurrences of offerings that coincide with that period of the month (see Table 8).

5.2.13.2 The festival of the braziers

The festival of the braziers (written kinūnu and plural kinūnâtu) is attested in two texts, once for Marduk alone in year L (CUSAS 9, 26) and once for various deities, including Marduk, in year I (CUSAS 9, 66). Both texts show that it was celebrated in the month ix; offerings on that occasion could include animals, flour, and dates. Dalley noted that month ix was the date of the festival at Nuzi in the Old Babylonian period (Dalley 2009: 16 and 66 n.1; see also Cohen 1993: 392), but there is no need to look for northern influence on the Sealand I calendar for two reasons: there is as yet no contradictory evidence from middle or southern Babylonia and later evidence suggests that the festival of the braziers was also celebrated in the month ix in Babylonia. The only Old Babylonian evidence which does not come from northern Babylonia or further north is from Larsa and remains as yet unpublished, the month of the festival is therefore unknown (L.74.126 mentioned in Arnaud 2001: 28 n.51; see also Arnaud 1976: 68-69). But later evidence points toward the month ix for the observance of this festival at Uruk and perhaps at Babylon (Cohen 1993: 393-394; for Uruk, see LKU 51, rev.13'-18' in Beaulieu 2003: 373ff.) In this light, there is at present no reason to assume that the date of the festival of the braziers in the Sealand I kingdom was much different from other Babylonian instances of it.

5.3 Religious topoi in year names

The state pantheon and the special relationship between kingship and the divine sphere in Mesopotamia are often expressed in royal epithets and other formulae well represented in royal inscriptions. For the Sealand I dynasty, unfortunately, no building or other royal inscriptions have

---

393 The ritual of the kinūnu is also attested as part of other ceremonies at Larsa, for instance as part of a seven day ritual (Kingsbury 1963: 21).

394 At Babylon, the festival may have lasted from the middle of month viii until the middle of month x, but most of the evidence is for month ix (Linssen 2004: 87-88).
been retrieved. The only products of official royal communication that are available to us are a few year names.

Year names are, in comparison to long and elaborate building or other official inscriptions, much shorter and sometimes rather laconic, but they represent a form of official communication that was circulated among a fairly large audience throughout the kingdom. This made year names an attractive vehicle for kings to establish cardinal facts of their rule, although their brevity, imposed by obvious pragmatic considerations, compelled the royal administration to make yearly a very restrictive selection of what should be communicated.

Year names of four Sealand I kings have been discovered: Ilī-ma-AN, Pešgaldarameš, Ayadaragalama, and Ea-gāmil; the year formula of Gulkišar used in the glass-making treatise BM 120960 is almost certainly a forgery. The year names concerning pious deeds of the king and the divine favour that he enjoyed all date to Ayadaragalama. Only two religious topoi are represented in these formulae: the expression of divine favour through the granting of ruling authority to the king and the expression of the king’s devotion through the building of temples and the dedication of votive objects to the gods.

The relevant year names are grouped in Table 14.

---


396 The year identifiers given in the first column refer to Dalley’s preliminary ordering of the year name formulae (2009: 11ff.). See Appendix 2 for a complete inventory.

397 Variants are listed in Dalley 2009: 11f. See also Appendix 2.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Year name</th>
<th>Deity</th>
<th>topos</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>MU.A.A.DÀRA.GALAM.MA LUGAL.E NAM SIPA KI.ŠÁR.RA.TA ḏEN.LÍL.LE MU.UN.GAR.RA.A.BA</td>
<td>Enlil</td>
<td>Divine favour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Year when Ayadaragalama (was ?) king, after Enlil established (for him?) the shepherding of the totality.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>MU.A.A.DÀRA.GALAM.MA LUGAL.E Ā.KAL NÍGIN LÚ.KÚR.MIN.A.BI ḏI.ZI.GA.EŠ.A KA?. ḏDÛ? ḏGU.LA ḏEN.LÍL ḏNIN.URTA IN.NE.[…]</td>
<td>Enlil &amp; Ninurta</td>
<td>Pious deed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Year when king Ayadaragalama, when the massed might (of?) the two enemies rose (and) (...) the great beer-jar(?) of Enlil (and) Ninurta.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>MU.A.A.DÀRA.GALAM.MA LUGAL.E ḏE.UNÚ LIBIR.RA BÂD. ḏEN.LÍL.LE.KE4 MU.UN.DÛ?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Pious deed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Year when king Ayadaragalama (rebuilt?) the ancient ḏE.UNÚ in Dūr-Enlile.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>MU.A.A.DÀRA.GALAM.MA LUGAL.E ḏHAR ZA.GÌN.NA KÚ.GI PEŠ.PEŠ SAL.LA GAR.RA ḏSU ḏEN.KI LUGAL.A.NI GAR.RA.A</td>
<td>Ea</td>
<td>Pious deed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Year when king Ayadaragalama placed a circlet of lapis-lazuli and gold set with fine figs(?) (on) the hand of Ea, his king.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>MU.A.A.DÀRA.GALAM.MA LUGAL.E GIŠ.ALM DIDLI KÚ.GI ḏHÚ.S.A GAR.RA ḏEN.LÍL ḏEN.KI IN.NE.EN.KU4.RA.A</td>
<td>Enlil &amp; Ea</td>
<td>Pious deed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Year when king Ayadaragalama installed wooden statues overlaid with red gold for Enlil and Ea.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 14: Year names with religious topoi**

Enlil held a prominent place in these claims of divine patronage and royal piety. We find him in the long version of year name E alongside Ninurta as the co-beneficiary of a cultic place or device, in year name J he is the co-recipient with Ea of gilded wooden statues and, perhaps most significantly, he is the god establishing the shepherding of Ayadaragalama over the totality in
year name G\textsuperscript{398}. Ea appears in two year names of Ayadaragalama: besides year name J just mentioned, he is the recipient of a ring of gold and lapis-lazuli in year name I. This choice of deities in year name formulae, which was undoubtedly influenced by the state pantheon and by tradition, deserves some attention. Enlil, Ea, and Ninurta, the gods represented in year names, all occupy prominent places in offering lists, which seems to agree with their prominence in the state pantheon, especially since these lists come from a palatial archive. Of the three, only for Ninurta do we have evidence that this high position coincided with, or translated into abundant offerings.

An investigation of the broader context is required to assess how tradition played a rôle in shaping the religious claims in Ayadaragalama's year names. The Larsean king Rîm-Sîn I began to include systematically Anu, Enlil, and Ea\textsuperscript{399} in his year names from his twenty-second\textsuperscript{400} until the introduction of the era system in his thirty-first year\textsuperscript{401}, thus placing it at the heart of his military and civil deeds. Rîm-Sîn’s invoking of Anu, Enlil, and Ea probably stemmed from his expansionist politics: his ambitions and conquests encompassed all southern Babylonia; this had to be reflected in official communication, and the Larsean royal administration shaped the year names into powerful vehicles to that effect\textsuperscript{402}. Most significantly, this divine triad appeared after Rîm-Sîn I's conquest of Uruk, celebrated in his twenty-first year name; it figured also in building inscriptions, for instance "when the gods An, Enlil, (and) Ea, the great gods, entrusted Uruk, the

\textsuperscript{398} In addition, Enlil may be the chief deity of the Ė.UNŪ whose reconstruction(?) is celebrated in year name H since it is located in a town called Dūr-Enlilē.

\textsuperscript{399} This triad came to occupy the top of the pantheon as reflected in royal hymnic literature towards the end of the Ur III period (Espak 2015: 78; 80).

\textsuperscript{400} Before that, between his seventeenth and his twenty-second year, we find reference to Enlil’s patronage of military deeds, possibly a reflection of the control over Nippur (only year 19 does not cite a military event). Years 1 to 16, and year 19 make mention, when deities are referred to, to pious deeds (Fitzgerald 2002: Appendix 3)

\textsuperscript{401} For Rîm-Sîn’s year names, see Sigrist 1990: 37ff. or Fitzgerald 2002: Appendix 3.

\textsuperscript{402} Already his distant predecessor Gungunum had claimed in his nineteenth year that his military actions took place "at the command of An, Enlil and Nanna", probably a reflection of the extent of his control over the important cities of Uruk, Nippur (briefly?), and Ur (Fitzgerald 2002: 42; Charpin 2004: 72, in particular n.229 for a summary of the evidence for the control over Nippur). But this claim of an encompassing divine patronage and a divine command in military action did not immediately become a topos in Larsean year names. Indeed, after this instance, Gungunum returned to shorter, simpler formulae, in which deities were named only in the context of pious deeds. This changed only well into the reign of Rîm-Sîn I.
ancient city, into my hands" (Frayne 1990: E4.2.14.12: 14-18). The Larsean king proclaimed a divine patronage representative of his political realm, placing the supra-regional southern Babylonian pantheon in the foreground instead of the gods of Larsa. The presence of Ea in the triad is particularly significant since he later seems to vanish from year name formulae, to resurface only with the Sealand I kings.

The year names of the Urukean dynasty of Sin-kāšid make no claim of divine patronage (Falkenstein 1963: 8ff.; Sanati-Müller 2000a: 87ff.) Pious deeds for Urukean deities were recorded, in particular for An and Inanna, and the temple of Nanna is mentioned; Ea is entirely absent from the year names and Enlil only present in the context of the liberation of Nippurites by IRnene (Falkenstein 1963: 8 no.8; Charpin 2004: 112 and n.463).

Meanwhile, the Babylonian rulers used, until late into Hammurapi’s reign, fairly short and simple year names, without mention of divine patronage, similar to the year names of the earlier Larsa kings. With the exception of one long formula in his fourteenth year, Hammurapi

---

403 The same phrase is also found in another inscription (Frayne 1990: E4.2.14.13: 23-26). The ‘Anu, Enlil, and Ea’ triad is present in several inscriptions from the Larsean conquest of Uruk on (ibid.: 289ff.) A cone inscription from Ur reflects the newly achieved supra-regional extent of Rim-Sin’s kingdom: the king claims to have built a temple "by the word of the god An (...), by the supreme decree of the god Enlil, [follows Enlil’s suite Ninlil, Ninurta, Nuska], by the wisdom that the god Ea gave to me [follow several other gods: Ninhursag, Nanna, Utu, Iskur, Nergal, Inanna, Ninisina, Nin-sen-ea]" (Frayne 1990: E4.2.14.10: 20-25). This inscription makes clear that the king was invoking the main deities of the entire Babylonian pantheon. The several other inscriptions and year names in which he mentions only the triad Anu, Enlil, and Ea could be understood as a short version of this by naming the most prominent deities.

404 These gods are not only representative of the south, the middle, and the extreme south of Babylonia, they are also the top of the pantheon as reflected in Babylonian tradition (sometimes with the addition of the mother-goddess), as a result of the "Systematisierung des sumerischen Pantheons", perhaps symbolizing the elements heaven, earth, and apsû (Galter 1981: 144ff.). It could also be interpreted as a genealogy of Enlil who had gained prominence by the Old Babylonian period, as reflected in god lists, and whose father is identified as Anu early in the Uruk tradition (VAB 1, 154, col.3, L14-16; for the relationship between Anu, Enlil, and Ea in the Old Babylonian period, see also Edzard 2004: 578ff.; 582. The same structure is still visible in AN = ṣAnum (Lambert 1975: 195).

405 It must also be noted that Ea and Eridu appeared to be particularly important for the Larsean king who often used in his inscriptions the epithet "who perfectly executes the me’s (and rites) of Eridu" (for instance Frayne 1990: E4.2.14.6: 18; E4.2.14.7: 4'; E4.2.14.8: 14). He also rebuilt Ea’s temple at Larsa and Ur (Galter 1981: 291).

406 In addition, Sanati-Müller identified one year name of the type MU US-SA + year no.31, the latter formula being as listed in Falkenstein 1963: 14 (Sanati-Müller 1990: texts no.120 and no.148). A few other fragmentary year names are unclear; they were so damaged that no reconstruction could be attempted (for instance in Sanati-Müller 2000a: texts no. 309, no.339, no.342).

407 But we know from a building inscription of Sin-kāšid that he built a shrine(?) for him at Uruk (Frayne 1990: E4.4.1.10).
introduced long, elaborate year names claiming divine favour only from his thirtieth year on. In that year formula he called himself the "beloved of Marduk" and explained his military success by "the supreme power of the great gods" (Horsnell 1999: vol.II 139). In the following year formula he celebrated the conquest of Larsa, introducing the patronage of Anu and Enlil (ibid.: 141). in taking over Rîm-Sîn’s kingdom, Hammurapi also claimed for himself the help of these great gods, yet leaving Ea aside. In fact, the kings of the first dynasty of Babylon never recorded pious deeds towards Ea nor did they claim his patronage in their year names.

Hammurapi, while clearly wishing to give importance to pan-Babylonian gods, also had a northern Babylonian focus, which was represented by the god of Babylon Marduk who becomes quite present in the year formulae of the last third of his reign. It has been observed that Hammurapi borrowed from Rîm-Sîn I his short-lived style of long, elaborate year names (Fitzgerald 2002: 150), but the Babylonian king clearly did not simply copy it. He borrowed the idea of long and detailed formulae and of divine patronage, but he adapted the content to the reality of his own, larger kingdom. It is surely no coincidence that Hammurapi’s successor,

---

408 The same holds probably true for inscriptions. The few known inscriptions of Hammurapi dating from before his conquest of Larsa probably do not refer to ‘Anu and Enlil’ (Frayne 1990: E4.3.6.1 - E4.3.6.3), while these two deities appear in the later inscriptions (ibid.: from E4.3.6.4 on; E4.3.6.4 probably commemorates the Babylonian victory over Larsa). In his early study of deities in year names from the first dynasty of Babylon, Ravn considered Hammurapi to have remained within "the traditional Enlil-system" (Ravn 1929: 85) but his analysis ignored for the most part changes within the king’s reign.

409 Mentions of Ea in royal inscriptions of the kings of the first dynasty of Babylon are rare. He appears for instance in a building inscription from the year 23 or 24 of Samsu-iluna within the enumeration An, Enlil, Marduk, Ea, and Inanna (Frayne 1990: E4.3.7.8: 78ff.); at the time, southern Mesopotamia had already been lost to Babylonian control. Ea reappeared in inscriptions of Ammî-ditâna, as the god giving him wisdom (Frayne 1990: E4.3.9.2: 19'-21' and, partly reconstructed: E4.3.9.1: 6-8). See also Galter 1981: 188-189. Contrasting with the limited importance accorded to Ea in the royal inscriptions and year names is hymn TCL 16 61 in which Ea endows Hammurapi with the dominion of the lands; this has been interpreted by van Dijk as evidence that the king was crowned at Eridu (1966-1967: 63ff.). Ea stands also in prominent place in Hymn C of Hammurapi (Green 1975: 70ff.; see also Galter 1981: 178).

410 Marduk appears in years 30, 32, 37, 38. In year 38 where Anu and Enlil also appear, they are given different rôles: "at the command of Anu and Enlil" and "by the cleverness which Marduk gave him" (Horsnell 1999: vol.II 157).

411 The standard year names are here discussed, not the local year names used at Larsa in the style of "the xth year of the king" (Fitzgerald 2002: 149).

412 As mentioned above, Hammurapi introduced this style for his thirtieth and thirty-first year names, roughly three decades after Rîm-Sîn had replaced his long year names by the era-style dating following the conquest of Isin. The similarity between the year name style of Rîm-Sîn I and of Hammurapi, after Ha 30, has been noted before. See for instance Edzard 1957: 180 who considers that this phraseology derives from hymns, first introduced into royal inscriptions by early Larsean kings, then into year names by Rîm-Sîn I.
Samsu-iluna, reintroduced the pair Anu and Enlil in his eleventh year name to mark his (brief) reconquest of southern Babylonia and the destruction of the "(great) walls of Ur, (Larsa and) Uruk" (Horsnell 1999: vol.II 195). This topos, after being introduced by his father upon his defeating Rîm-Sîn I, had remained unused for fifteen years, and after this only instance Samsu-iluna never again claimed patronage of the pair Anu and Enlil413. It is also probably significant that his thirteenth year name, coined after he had definitely lost the extreme south but was still desperately trying to maintain control over middle Babylonia (from the area of Kisurra northwards), claimed the divine patronage of Enlil only414 (Horsnell 1999: vol.II 198). Following his loss of middle Babylonia between his twenty-eighth and thirtieth year Samsu-iluna dropped the patronage of Enlil in his year names altogether, as well as the style of long, complex formulae, reverting to the short ones of earlier times. The later kings of the dynasty invoked Anu and Enlil in year names only at the very beginning of their reigns415: the patronage of the pair Anu and Enlil had become an ancient, frozen formula, proper for justifying the status of the king and, by emulating an archaic style, inscribing it in a long-lived tradition. The claim of their protection had become by that time devoid of any actual territorial reality416 but carried with it the remembrance of a glorious past still near enough to be remembered in Babylonian royal circles417. Admittedly, the evidence is limited and since Anu and Enlil are foremost prominent

413 From Si 10 to Si 13, military action was recorded in year names invoking twice Marduk (Si 10 and 12), once Anu and Enlil (Si 11), once Enlil alone (Si 13).

414 He claimed the patronage of Enlil for military deeds in year names for the last time in Si 28, commemorating his campaign on the middle Euphrates (Horsnell 1999: vol.II 220-221), at a period when his control over middle Babylonia was probably already menaced, just before it was definitively lost to him between Si 28 and Si 30 (Charpin 2004: 360).

415 For Abî-ešuh: Anu and Enlil figure only in his second and third year names (Horsnell 1999: Vol.II 244-245); for Ammî-šaduqa: they figure in his second year (ibid.: 327); for Samsu-ditâna: in his third year (ibid.: 361).

416 For the changes in deities invoked in year names, I do not think that we should look for an explanation in the transfer of southern Babylonian cults, first into middle, then northern Babylonia (Charpin 2004: 361).

417 Richardson examined the question from a different angle: he did not look at the deities invoked but at a number of terms and deeds recorded in the year names. He established parallels between the formulae of the late Old Babylonian kings of Babylon and the formulae of the early Old Babylonian kings of Isin, Larsa, Uruk, and Ur, suggesting that the later Babylonian formulae were part of an effort of Sumerianization of their kingship in reaction to the loss of southern Babylonia – a message aimed in particular at the southern refugees (Richardson forthcoming). His argument is certainly not without interest but seems to me somewhat weakened by the fact that several of the terms and ideas which he tracked are also attested before the south was lost, namely in the years Si 6 (ALAN.(A,NI); ŠUD; 4LAMMA), Si 7 (i2TUKUL; SU-NIR), and Si 8 (urudu.KI.LUGAL.GUB.(BA)). This need not completely invalidate Richardson’s argument; indeed, the Babylonian king may already have felt the need to court the loyalty of the southerners.
deities of the Babylonian pantheon, invoking them in year names may or may not be indicative of the control of a specific region.

Of the other southern Babylonian kings who briefly ruled in the latter part of the Old Babylonian period, Rîm-Sîn II claimed to have been elevated to kingship by Ninmah (year name b: Stol 1976: 54-55), while Rîm-Anum did not refer to divine favour at all (Seri 2013: 30).418

The Sealand I year formulae other than "MU RN LUGAL.E" or by year count – all of which are Ayadaragalama's, are fairly short and simple although one of them has at least two clauses, as noted by Dalley (year name E; Dalley 2009: 11). This may indicate that there were longer versions of some year names but the size of the sample is too modest to make any definitive statement. The available — and limited — evidence suggests that Ayadaragalama did not reintroduce the *topos* of divine command and patronage in military deeds used by Larsean and Babylonian kings; this would parallel the few year names promulgated by Rîm-Sîn II and Rîm-Anum. However, a pious deed toward Enlil and Ninurta appears in the second clause of year name E, whose first clause celebrates a military victory; this may establish a relationship between the patronage of the two gods and the military success thus recorded. The choice of Ninurta, who has a warrior aspect, certainly conveys this impression; indeed, the trope of the victorious Ninurta coming back to his father Enlil as a reflection of successful military action is well established in mythological literature (Annus 2002: 27; 172).

But Ayadaragalama’s year names clearly echo the short-lived Larsean tradition from the early second millennium in one respect: the reintroduction of Ea. And not only do we find again Ea in two year names but he appears once alongside Enlil (as co-recipient of gilded statues in year name J). The two gods, part of the triad introduced by Rîm-Sîn I into year names, appear here side by side, perhaps representing middle and southern Babylonia, almost certainly representing the top of the Babylonian pantheon if one considers that Anu was often left aside. Moreover, this

418 In the periphery, Ešnunnaean and Mari rulers occasionally recorded pious deeds to various deities in their year names but Ea is never mentioned (Wu Yuhong 1994; cdli.ucla.edu/tools/yearnames/glossar.htm).

419 This year name is also attested in a longer but heavily damaged version in CUSAS 9, 452. There may be a third clause in this version.

420 Ninurta appears twice in the year names of kings of the First Dynasty of Babylon: Si 38 and Ad 31.
year name concerning concrete objects of cult, the absence of Anu is not surprising since his cult is barely attested in that period in Babylonia, including in the Sealand I kingdom\textsuperscript{421}. Therefore, it appears admissible to interpret this association of Enlil and Ea in a Sealand I year name as a reminiscence of the Larsean tradition of naming the triad Anu, Enlil, and Ea in year formulae.

In one year name we have proof that the king also invoked divine patronage from Enlil for his kingship, that is for his "shepherding of the totality" (year name G: Dalley 2009: 11). The *topos* of Enlil conferring rulership was common among the late Old Babylonian kings; the king as a shepherd was a well established, very ancient, royal epithet, which is already attested for Early Dynastic rulers (Seux 1967: 441ff.), and the image of the ruler as a shepherd of Enlil or for Enlil goes back at least to Ur III times with Ur-Namma (*ibid.*: 442). The choice of Enlil as the deity establishing the king’s shepherding need probably not imply control over Nippur, it may have been simply used as a traditional *topos*, almost a frozen formula\textsuperscript{422}, but it does suggest, along with the reference to the totality $\text{KI.ŠÂR(RA)}$, a claim over a fairly extensive kingdom.

The prevalence of Enlil and Ea in mid-dynastic Sealand I year names seems to contrast with their relatively modest importance in the cult, if the limited evidence at our disposal is representative. Their presence in official royal communication may reflect a conventional gesture of legitimization using a strategy similar to that of the former late Old Babylonian rulers, but the tradition was not taken directly from the Babylonian kings. Indeed, the importance of Ea in the Sealand I year names as well as the association of Enlil and Ea in one of them suggest a wish to reconnect with the earlier Larsean tradition\textsuperscript{423}. But the gap in time renders the analysis difficult and conclusions hazardous, since we have, save the laconic Ilī-ma-AN year names from Nippur, no relevant data for the early Sealand I kings.

\textsuperscript{421} We find only one animal offering to Anu in CUSAS 9, 79 (undated). He stands at the top of the list (Dalley probably inverted obverse and reverse sides in her edition). He figures in offering list CUSAS 9, 64; the commodity recorded is broken off.

\textsuperscript{422} The general association of Enlil and the kingship of the land in southern Mesopotamia is very ancient (Wang 2011: 237; 245).

\textsuperscript{423} The use of year numbers in several date formulae is also reminiscent of Rîm-Sîn I’s later year formulae.
5.4 Panthea and hierarchy in offering and god lists
5.4.1 Offering lists

Offering lists in the Sealand I archive usually begin with great gods of the pan-Babylonian pantheon, reflecting a somewhat unstable hierarchy which very roughly agrees with the god list \( \text{AN} = \text{d} \text{Anum} \) \(^{424}\) and its Old Babylonian precursor TCL 15 10. The offering lists that present these features\(^{425}\) are CUSAS 9, 59; 64; 79; 82. The great gods are usually followed by a large number of minor deities or minor aspects of deities in apparent disorder. The lists differ from one another, therefore no single hierarchy or grouping pattern can be extracted from them, but a number of general characteristics emerge: 1- Anu, when present, is at the top of the list, followed by Enlil; 2- Ninurta does not necessarily appear as a member of Enlil’s circle, he stands in prominent but variable position, sometimes without connection with Enlil\(^{428}\); 3- Šīn, Šamaš, and Adad are usually present, roughly in that hierarchical order; 4- both Marduk and the mother goddess are often absent or given a much lower rank than in \( \text{AN} = \text{d} \text{Anum} \), and Marduk is not integrated in Ea's circle; 5- in the preserved portions of the lists, Ištar is always represented by her hypostases (or at least with her name followed by an epithet). Keeping in mind that the

\(^{424}\) Lambert considered that only tablets I to IV were organized according to a systematic hierarchy, following the "order of seniority":
- Anu
- Enlil with Ninurta
- Ninḫursag
- Ea with Marduk
- Šīn
- Šamaš
- Adad
- Ištar


\(^{425}\) The remaining lists are peculiar. CUSAS 9, 78 and 84 are split into two sections. In the former text, each section begins with a prominent deity (Enlil in section 1 and Ninurta in section 2). The latter text seems devoid of any hierarchical consideration: its first section begins with Nin-Enimma (with Enlil only in fifth position) and its second section begins with what is probably an aspect of Enlil (Enlil-of-the-akitu?). Text CUSAS 9, 83 presents an amalgam of god pairs and single deities in no clear order. Several major deities are absent, for instance Anu, Enlil, Ninurta, and also Ea although the list begins with three gods associated with him (Damgalnunna, Asarluḫi, and Usumu).

\(^{426}\) Offering list CUSAS 9, 64 presents a unique peculiarity: it features two successive enumerations beginning with Anu, namely: Anu, Enlil, Ninurta (lines 3-5) and Anu, Enlil, Ninlil, Uš, BI.A,NU.I.I.L.LA, Ninurta (lines 6-10).

\(^{427}\) The obverse was probably mistaken for the reverse by Dalley in her edition (2009). I assume that the obverse corresponds to lines 8-14 (Dalley’s numbering).

\(^{428}\) See also Section 5.2.2 for more detail.
hierarchy is unstable and based on very few documents, we can nonetheless crystallize the arrangement of Sealand I offering lists as follows: in the top part (Anu), Enlil, Ea/Ninurta, (Sin), and Šamaš; after these deities are usually present in varying order Adad, Marduk, Gula, Nergal/Lugal-irra, Nin-enimma, and hypostases of Ištar, sometimes also Nusku, Ninmah, and the Sibitti. The bottom part of the lists usually lacks any recognizable grouping or ordering principle.

5.4.2 The god list CUSAS 9, 81

Among the lists from the Sealand I archive, only one undated and extremely short document could be a god list without any immediate administrative purpose, which I will therefore examine in more detail: CUSAS 9, 81. Fifteen deities are simply listed, one name per line, using both sides of the tablet and the lower edge. The document is different from the offering lists: it is shorter than most and it includes only divine names. It never features two deities on the same line, which happens at least once in all other lists but one. It also presents some similarities with Babylonian canonical lists, with some departures: if we use AN = 4Anum as a gauge, a number of major deities seem to be represented solely by a minor member of their retinue, while two were entirely left out. The list comprises the following deities (from line 1 through 15): Enlil, Ninlil, Ninurta, Nusku, Nin-Nibru, Usumu, Nin-enimma, Marduk, Šarpanitu, Gula, Šamaš, Sukal?, Bēlet-Akkade, Šarrat-Nina, Sibitti.

The god Anu is absent from this list which therefore begins directly with Enlil. Contrarily to the offering lists in the archive, CUSAS 9, 81 integrates Ninurta in Enlil's circle, as is also the case in AN = 4Anum: the circle comprises Enlil's spouse Ninlil, his sons Ninurta and Nusku, and

429 A parallel comes to mind: a short Old Babylonian god list from Mari (ARM XXIV 263) which has been shown to be a copy of another Mari god list dating to the Ur III period (T.142 edited by Dossin 1967: 99ff.) with the difference that T.142 contained quantities of various items of food offerings. Durand has concluded that such lists not only reflected the "ordre canonique" de préséance des divinités à Mari" but that at least the full version of the document was a "mémento de rituel" (Durand 1985: 163). This conclusion could probably extend to the shortest version of the document containing only the gods' names. Similarly, it is not impossible that CUSAS 9, 81 is a list reflecting a hierarchy to be followed within ritual actions, however, the extant offering records do not corroborate this suggestion.

430 CUSAS 9, 83.

431 My reading differs from Dalley's. See Section 5.2.4 for a discussion on the association of Šamaš, Sukal, (Nin)-Šubur, and Lugal-namtarra.
Ninurta’s spouse Nin-Nibru⁴³². Usumû, Ea’s vizier, appears surprisingly on his own following Enlil’s circle, apparently in lieu of Ea. Still using AN = ⁴³³Anum as comparative, one notes the absence of the mother goddess’ circle.

The deity Nin-é.NIM.ma⁴³³ follows; this god(dess) seems to be much more present in Sealand I texts than in Babylonian written evidence in general. Indeed, (s)he appears in all Sealand I offering lists, and in CUSAS 9, 81 (s)he occupies a fairly prominent position (seventh name, following Enlil’s circle and Usumû). It was suggested that Nin-é.NIM.ma is a male deity because of a personal name featuring a predicate with masculine agreement (Cavigneaux and Krebernik 1998-2001: 349), however, other evidence suggests that there may have also been a feminine aspect to the divinity. This could find expression in an inscription found in the Ur giparu, which celebrates the installation of Kubur-mabuk’s daughter and Warad-Sîn’s sister Enanedu as en-priestess of Nanna. The lacunary passage may simply mention a shrine called é.NIM.ma (Frayne 1990: E4.2.13.15 fragm.16: 10’), in which jewellery is offered to a deity whose name is lost. But the passage has been restored differently by George (1993: 133 n.888) who views ⁴³³Nin-é.NIM.ma as the recipient of the ornament. Moreover, since the rest of the inscription makes frequent and only mention of "my lady, Ningal", Nin-é.NIM.ma appears to be either a by-name of Ningal or a member of her entourage⁴³⁴. That the deity was important to the Larsean kings of the Kudur-mabuk dynasty appears certain since the long version of year name 8 of Rîm-Sîn I informs us that the king built a shrine to her(him?) in a temple of Ninmarki; this temple may have been at Ur because the first part of the year name commemorates the building of another

---

⁴³² Nin-Nibru is also a by-name of Ninlil but appears here separately from her, as spouse of Ninurta; given the importance of Ninurta in the Sealand I documents, it is no surprise to find his spouse in the god list. For a review of literature on Nin-Nibru, see Richter 2004: 71 n.320. For a discussion of Ištar’s possible association with Nin-Nibru as Šarrat-Nippuri, see Section 5.2.1.

⁴³³ The name was formerly read ⁴³³⁴NIN-LIL-ELAM-MA (Edzard 1957: n.970; also Renger 1967: 159 who lists her among the deities of Ur), corrected to ⁴³³⁴Nin-é.NIM.ma by Stol (1976: 19 n.8; followed by Cavigneaux and Krebernik 1998-2001: 349). Stol pointed out that in the attestation on which the former reading was based, only the lower edge of the sign É is visible. He suggested the reading É instead of LÍL based on the GN ⁴³³⁴URU é.NIM.ma (Stol 1976: 20).

⁴³⁴ Since Nin-é.NIM.ma appears to have been of some importance for early Old Babylonian kings of Larsa, she may have been a deity from Larsa whom Enanedu continued to venerate in her new position at the giparu at Ur, therefore establishing a new relationship between two previously unconnected deities. Alternatively, the kings of the Kudur-mabuk dynasty could have embraced her cult when establishing their rule over Ur.
temple in that city. Nin-é.NIM.ma also appears along Šamaš in the blessing formula of an Old Babylonian letter from Larsa, reinforcing the association with the Larsean dynasty (AbB XI: 184 = HMA 9-2310). If Nin-é.NIM.ma was really associated with Ningal, therefore belonging to the retinue of Sin in Old Babylonian Ur, s(he) could be the only representative of the moon good in the list CUSAS 9, 81.

After Nin-é.NIM.ma, come Marduk and his spouse Șarpanîtu. Through syncretism with Asalluḫi, Marduk came to be viewed as Ea’s son and this proximity is reflected in Old Babylonian forerunners of AN = dAnum in which Marduk’s circle immediately follows Ea’s. However, CUSAS 9, 81 presents him and his spouse apparently separately from any relationship to Ea.

Gula comes in CUSAS 9, 81 quite unexpectedly just after Marduk’s circle. It seems unlikely that she appears here as spouse of Ninurta since she is clearly separated from his circle by several deities. The healing goddess, strongly associated with Nin-Isina and Ninkarak (Kraus 1951: 64ff.), entered several local Babylonian panthea and was incorporated in various genealogies (Lambert 1967: 109ff.) Mainly a healing goddess, she also acquired through her convergence with Ba’u traits of a mother goddess (Frankena 1957-1971: 695; Richter 2004: 89). Also, probably for the same reason, she became equated with Șuziana in the Weidner god list (KAV 46: 19 and KAV 63 II 1). If we combine this equation with the fact that, in one tradition, Șuziana was probably assimilated with or considered a by-name of Șarpanîtu (Richter 2004: 89), we could interpret Gula’s position in CUSAS 9, 81 as the result of these associative processes, making her a member of Șarpanîtu’s and therefore of Marduk’s circle. But the association is very uncertain and cannot be considered as more than a tentative explanation for the deities' relative position in the Sealand I list.

The year formula in YOS, 201 reads: MU é dEN.KI ŠA ŠEŠ.UNUG^2-MA ù É dNIN-É.NIM.MA ša É dNIN-MAR-KI MU-UN-DÙ.A. Cavigneaux and Krebernik consider the Nin-marki temple to be located at Ur (1998-2001: 349); I could not find other evidence for the construction of this temple there.

His lineage was eventually reinterpreted to make him the son of Šamaš (Sommerfeld 1982: 15ff.; Richter 2004: 15; 139; 141). For a divergent opinion, see Lambert 1975: 193-194, who considers that Marduk was originally seen as the son of the sun god and was later, in a political gesture under Hammurapi, promoted to become the son of Ea.

Römer considers Gula to be at home in Isin, along Ninisina (Römer 2001: 107-108), an opinion not shared by Richter who considers that while she was a southern Babylonian goddess, we have no evidence for her exact place of origin (Richter 2004: 181 n.798). See also Kraus 1951: 64ff. and Richter 2004: 524 n.2234 concerning the etymology of her name, which also reflects on her origin.
The god Šamaš appears in CUSAS 9, 81 roughly in the hierarchical position which he occupies in AN = ḍAnum, allowing for the differences in Sīn’s circle. He is accompanied here by his vizier(?), Sukal(?), whose close association with the sun god has been discussed in Section 5.2.4. He is followed by a regional aspect of Ištar, Bēlet-Akkade. Since Adad is absent from CUSAS 9, 81, the goddess occupies the rank expected for Ištar, if we use AN = ḍAnum as a reference. This apparent substitution of the main aspect of a deity by one of their minor aspects is similar to the treatment of Ea and perhaps Sīn in this list.

The Queen-of-Nina follows, written ḍšar-ra-at-ni-na. Dalley remained undecided concerning the reading of ni-na (2009: 7; text 81 notes) but suggested as one possibility that the name might refer to Ištar-of-Nineveh. However, Kutscher has reviewed the attested spellings of Nineveh and concluded that the spelling ni-na-a appeared only at the very end of the second millennium (Kutscher 1976: 197-198). A reference to Lagašite Šurgul (or part of it: ibid.: 198) seems therefore more likely. Admittedly, Queen-of-Nina would be an unusual name for Nazi, as yet unattested elsewhere, and her relative position in the list would not correspond with her position in AN = ḍAnum. But considering that Nazi, the chief goddess of Šurgul, is well represented in the archive, this interpretation appears the most consistent with the idiosyncrasies of the Sealand I state pantheon.

The list CUSAS 9, 81 ends with the Sibitti, which have been discussed in Section 5.2.9. In AN = ḍAnum, they appear only in the regional groupings on tablet VI.

### 5.5 Panthea in the Sealand I kingdom

Evidence for the reconstruction of the Sealand I panthea was extracted from tablets, mostly archival, and from one cylinder seal belonging to a servant(? of Ea-gāmil. These sources yielded a limited number of year names, as well as information on the onomasticon and on the

---

438 The same section discusses the reading of the sign.

439 In AN = ḍAnum Nazi comes between Sīn and Šamaš on the third tablet (Litke 1998).

440 In addition, the following sources were introduced: an unpublished epic to Gulkišar; a balag to Enlil; an extract of the Epic of Gilgameš; a later kudurr; a later glass making treatise.
palace-sponsored cult. This information makes it possible to reconstruct part of the Sealand I state pantheon, to discern a probable influence of early Babylonian Larsean tradition – with which the Sealand I kings presumably identified, and to suggest very few elements of the local pantheon of the area where the archive came from. The evidence shows that Ištar, Ninurta, Enlil, and Ea were important deities not only in the Sealand I state pantheon but also for the dynasty. Ištar received sacrifice at the palace and she appears at the side of Gulkišar in the epic exalting the king. Her presence in the palace-sponsored cult, in which she received comparatively abundant offerings, is a composite of several, including regional, incarnations, giving her a decidedly supra-regional persona. Ninurta is invoked in one year name, he also received plentiful offerings, which were sometimes specified as being given by the king. His near absence from personal names precludes that his importance stems from the local pantheon. Enlil and Ea both appear in year formulae, once together, and were sometimes associated in the cult; this association as well as the very importance given to Ea, who had fallen into marginality bordering to extinction in cult and official communication under the kings of Babylon, are reminiscent of early Old Babylonian Larsean traditions, apparently embraced by the Sealand I kings. Also, since the sole joint temple of both deities to be attested as yet appears in an Old Babylonian letter from Larsa, the hypothesis of a Larsean reference seems sound, and it may be that the close association of Enlil and Ea was reflected not only in the state but also in the local pantheon, which is cogent with a find spot of the archive in the Ur-Larsa area. Also fairly important in the state pantheon is Nazi who received abundant offerings; since she appears without her spouse and her retinue, her cult probably results from an import, not from the local pantheon.

Less clear are the cases of Šamaš and Sin. They are both present in various lists, more or less in the positions given to them in AN = Anum and its forerunners. They seem to receive fairly modest offerings from the palace, although for Šamaš there is possible evidence that he had a temple of some economic importance in the town where the archive was retrieved. They are also both very well attested in the onomasticon, but this was the case in all of Babylonia in the preceding period, making it no indicator of specific local favour towards these deities. It is therefore difficult to decide on the basis of the evidence whether these gods were particularly important in the local pantheon or only of some significance in the state pantheon. The
association of Šamaš with (Nin-)Šubur, and the very importance of the latter, in the Sealand I texts could also reflect an early Old Babylonian Larsean influence.

Of fairly modest importance is the cult of Marduk, also characterized by a somewhat low rank in lists. As for the mother goddess, she is almost absent. Adad's position is difficult to assess; he is not very well attested in the archive, but he did receive some offerings from the palace. His fairly noteworthy presence in the onomasticon does not signify much since this seems to have been the case supra-regionally in the Old Babylonian period. Whether he was moderately important in the state pantheon and/or in the local pantheon appears impossible to extricate from the limited evidence.

 Gods whose presence in the archival documents is clearly founded on their importance in the local pantheon are difficult to identify. Besides the possibility of a local significance of Šamaš, Sîn, and Adad just discussed, Lugal-irra certainly seems to be part of the local pantheon. The fact that he seems more important than Nergal is peculiar and could indeed speak for the local prominence of Lugal-irra as a netherworld deity. Also, the town of Udannu, presumably in the vicinity of Larsa or Uruk and Marad, was probably near and of some importance, since it was a destination of travel for the Sealand I king and its deities are well attested in the archive, IGL.DU in the onomasticon and Nin-Eanna in the state-sponsored cult; this could confirm the local importance of Lugal-irra since Udannu may have been his place of cult. The presence of Nin-é.NIM.ma in offering lists, whether it reflects her presence in the local or the state pantheon, reinforces the impression of a Larsean influence and could also point toward the proximity of Ur.

It appears therefore that the tradition with which the Sealand I dynasts identified, the Larsean, roughly coincided with the local context in which the archival texts were probably produced, in the southern Euphrates area. That the Sealand I kings saw themselves as heirs to the old Larsean kings seems a plausible explanation; indeed, a sense of identity with a past society or institution "renders the transmissions and receptions of a stable traditum more likely" (Shils 1981: 14). But the Sealand I rulers did not only anchor their rule in the revival of the Larsean past, their aim was broader and they made the state pantheon, with its somewhat eclectic amalgamation of several minor deities — including local ones, its acknowledgement of the head(s) of the Nippurite and
by the same fact the pan-Babylonian pantheon, a vehicle of their territorial dominion and ambitions.
6 The Sealand I palatial economy

6.2.1 A functional inventory of sources

The available evidence does not warrant anything approaching the writing of a Sealand I economic history: we know nothing of the private sector, temple economy and trade are also barely reflected in the extant documentation, only the palatial economy – whose very apparatus produced the archive published in CUSAS 9, discloses itself to us in these tablets. The palace, written Œ.GAL, appears in the archive as an economic and administrative body managing resources for its own household and for a number of temples. The best documented resources in the extant documents are agricultural and animal: the records allow us to reconstruct, at least tentatively, how the palace procured (and perhaps partly produced) these resources, sometimes stored them, transformed them or commissioned their transformation, and consumed or spent them.

The flow of goods between the palace and other economical actors, or between services within the palace, is documented in numerous Sealand I texts representing a large subset of the extant archive. An inventory of the tablets pertaining to the handling of goods reveals that most of them are delivery records, followed by receipts, then various types of expenditures. Examination of the formulary reveals that delivery records were highly standardized and overall subjected to more administrative measures of control than other transactions\textsuperscript{441}. They were almost exclusively recorded from an external point of view (MU.DU PN ana Œ.GAL : delivery or delivered by PN to the palace). Only delivery records were issued in two copies – the copy was identified as me-elh-rum and stored in the palace, where it was presumably found by the looters. Similarly, only delivery records were sealed, with one exception, and probably only delivery records were

\textsuperscript{441} For a detailed examination of the formulary of Sealand I delivery records and a discussion of administrative procedures surrounding the procurement and the expenditure of goods, see Boivin 2016c.
sometimes encased in an envelope. All these administrative operations applied to the same sub-group of tablets and show that great care surrounded the recording of incoming goods. An official was very often recorded as being involved in the transaction, even two officials for certain types of deliveries.

In contrast, outgoing goods were recorded in various manners, sometimes from the point of view of the palace, sometimes from the point of view of the recipient since receiving and issuing formulae were used with no apparent consistency\(^\text{442}\). In general, the recording of outgoing goods seems to have been subjected to less standardized rules and less control. They are often identified only by the type of expenditure (salary, supplies, etc.).

The relevant texts are grouped in the following table\(^\text{443}\), based on their function (incoming, outgoing, etc.) and their main administrative key word (\text{MU.DU}, \text{ŠU.TLA}, \text{ana}, etc.). The grouping according to key words on the right-hand side of the table derives directly from the terms used by the scribes; in only a few uncertain cases was it necessary to rely on a certain amount of interpretation based on the reconstruction of damaged passages and on the comparison with similar tablets\(^\text{444}\). As for the functional grouping on the left-hand side of the table, it is interpretative because it is based on the meaning inferred from the records, not only on the terms used. This is particularly true for records without any key words. My interpretation was the result of a thorough study of the entire archive, combining functional, historical, and philological analyses of the material, several aspects of which are presented in this chapter.

The types of expenditure are so varied, including various kinds of allotments, supplies, and gifts, that they are not discriminated in Table 15 since they all present the same basic functional aspect of recording outgoing goods. They will be discussed in detail in the section 6.4.

\(^{442}\) For instance one Dummuqu, a jeweller, received twice rams and other foodstuffs towards the end of the same year, once in a \text{ŠU.TLA} receipt (CUSAS 9, 103), once in an expenditure record using the key word \text{nadānu} (CUSAS 9, 105: 1-7). The archive offers no indication that there was double recording (one receipt matching one record of expenditure). Also, the overall lack of standardization of records of outgoing goods strongly speaks against double recording.

\(^{443}\) Table 15 gives the quantity of texts for each group and category; the corresponding text numbers are given in Appendix 3.

\(^{444}\) In the table, the numbers in brackets include the uncertain cases.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Aspect of the transaction</th>
<th>Main key word</th>
<th>Number of occurrences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Incoming goods</td>
<td>Delivery (to the palace)</td>
<td>MU.DU</td>
<td>226 (230)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>wabālu</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ana</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Purchase</td>
<td>šāmu</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incoming goods</td>
<td>Delivery (to the palace) &amp; reception</td>
<td>MU.DU &amp; ŠU.TLA</td>
<td>7 (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MU.DU &amp; maḫāru</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Delivery) to the palace &amp; expenditure</td>
<td>ana E.GAL &amp; (a type of expenditure)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material outgoing / transferred for transformation</td>
<td>Reception</td>
<td>ŠU.TLA</td>
<td>50 (51)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>maḫāru</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expenditure &amp; reception</td>
<td>nadāmu &amp; ŠU.TLA</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outgoing goods</td>
<td>Reception</td>
<td>ŠU.TLA</td>
<td>19 (22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>maḫāru</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expenditure &amp; reception</td>
<td>nadāmu &amp; ŠU.TLA</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>nadāmu &amp; maḫāru</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expenditure</td>
<td>ZI.GA</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>nadānu</td>
<td>21 (22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SUM</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ZI.GA &amp; nadānu?</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>naqū</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ana</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>38 (39)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other or unclear</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 15: Functional typology of sources pertaining to the movement of goods\(^{445}\)

\(^{445}\) See Appendix 3 for corresponding text numbers.
We see that the available archive gives us insight into the following economic processes in which the palace was involved:

1- the procurement of several resources by the palace, mostly animal and agricultural; this is documented in records of delivery to the palace, almost always with the key word MU.DU;

2- the transformation of some resources either by the palace or commissioned by the palace; the most direct indication for this comes from texts recording both the reception of raw materials by workers or a separate institution, and the delivery of transformed products to the palace; some expenditures and receipts can also be identified as recording materials handed out for transformation, either through a note to that effect on the record, or because such a context can be reconstructed from other texts of the archive concerning the same goods and individuals;

3- the expenditure of several raw and transformed goods, mostly foodstuffs for extispicy, cultic purposes, various rations and supplies to individuals, some of whom were palace dependents; outgoing goods were recorded either in expenditure records or in receipts, without an apparent system; due to the fairly free formulary of these records, it is not always clear whether expenditures were indeed outgoing or whether they were for palace-internal consumption; therefore, I did not create separate categories for internal and external expenditures, which would have rested on moot criteria; in addition, some goods that I counted as outgoing may have been in reality for product transformation, the context does not always make it easy to determine what was intended.
6.2 The procurement of resources

The means used by the palace to procure resources were:

- levying taxes on the production of grain and various vegetables, as a share of the harvest; this applied apparently to more than one type of land ownership or use;
- requesting the delivery of small cattle (probably palace-owned);
- imposing the delivery of dead cattle, which was probably not palace-owned, either as a quota or for all carcasses;
- buying from merchants (leeks; bitumen; certainly also aromatics; also means of production such as grinding stones).

The mechanisms for the procurement of dates, sesame, and live large cattle are unclear, as is the harvesting of wild-growing products (reed). Texts recording these transactions were probably not found by the looters.

6.2.1 Agricultural and other vegetal resources

This section reviews vegetal resources found in the Sealand I archival documents, mainly from the angle of their procurement by the palace. However, in order to present an overview of the species attested in the archive, some plants found only in expenditure records are also surveyed here. Malt and beer, also delivered to the palace, will be treated in the section on the transformation of raw materials since there is evidence that the palace did not simply procure them as (semi-)finished products but was greatly involved in their production.

---

446 In addition to regular tax levying, other deliveries of agricultural products may have been requested by the palace. Text CUSAS 9, 91 records the delivery to the palace of leeks and coriander by a merchant and by gardener(s), respectively; this delivery is called erištu. Dalley noted that the term probably had a meaning different from the more frequent mērēštu (Dalley 2009: text 91 n.1). The most apparent difference in use in the archive is that erištu is a delivery to the palace while mērēštu always appears in expenditure records. I would therefore suggest that the former was a request by the palace, the latter a request to the palace (see also Section 6.4.2).
6.2.1.1 Cereals

Cereals are omnipresent in the Sealand I documents. The production itself is not directly documented, since field work is never referred to. Eighteen ledgers\textsuperscript{447} record the payment of agricultural imposts to the palace in the form of a splitting of the crop following a fixed rate; these imposts were applied on a few crops, but cereals – barley in particular, make up the bulk of the produces registered. These ledgers show that the šibšu and the miksu were the main types of agricultural imposts, usually amounting to one third of the harvest. The šibšu may have applied to communal ground, while the payment of the miksu seems to have been related to the function or profession of the tax payers, perhaps for fields attributed to them for a royal service or as emolument. The payers of agricultural taxes are generally called muškēnū although the archive does not make it possible to determine what this term represented socially and economically\textsuperscript{448}. One list shows that the miksu could be remitted (CUSAS 9, 384). For a detailed analysis and discussion of the Sealand I agricultural taxes, including smaller imposts, see Boivin (2016b).

The main crop figuring in the Sealand I documents is barley (ŠE), followed by small barley (ŠE TUR.TUR) and emmer-wheat (kunēšu/kunāšu); a variety of large barley (ŠE GAL.GAL) also seems to be at least marginally cultivated as well as kibtu-wheat\textsuperscript{449}. hargalû-grain and terru-grain also figure in the archive but may not be types of crop.

6.2.1.1.1 Barley

We find in the Sealand I texts mainly barley (ŠE), but also small barley (ŠE TUR.TUR) and large barley (ŠE GAL.GAL).

---

\textsuperscript{447} CUSAS 9, 410; 411; 413; 415; 426; 428; 429; 430; 431A; 432; 434; 441; 442; 443; 445; 446; 447; 448.

\textsuperscript{448} The term iššāku also occurs occasionally in the Sealand I ledgers; both terms in the context of field tilling are discussed in Leemans 1973: 283-284.

\textsuperscript{449} GIG or kibtu-wheat appears to be the only type of cereal not represented in the šibšu-ledgers. It appears in the list CUSAS 9, 408 and in the record CUSAS 9, 92.
Neither small nor large barley are well attested in Mesopotamian texts. They do not appear on Tablet XXIV of UR₅.RA = ḫubullu; this does not necessarily mean that they were rare varieties since the ŠE entries of UR₅.RA were "not a classified list of species" (Powell 1984: 50), most entries in fact recording various qualities and products of processed barley. They are attested together in a bilingual prayer to Šamaš (Cooper 1972: line 18) in which types of barley are listed: "'large' grain, 'small' grain, white grain, black grain" (Cooper’s translation)⁴⁵⁰; to the Sumerian⁴⁵¹ "ŠE GAL-GAL-LA ŠE TUR-TUR" corresponds the Akkadian "ŠE-am ra-ba-a ŠE-am ši-il-ra"⁴⁵². This text, I believe, offers enough evidence to reject Dalley’s hypothesis that GAL.GAL and TUR.TUR may have applied to the standard used for measuring the grain (2009: 59 and 103 n.3 to text 124).

Archaeobotany is of limited help to interpret these terms. As noted by Potts (1997: 59), the Akkadian lexicon does not seem to make the distinction between hulled and naked or two- and six-row barley, all varieties that are attested archaeologically. According to archaeobotanical evidence, the barley cultivated in the southern plain in that period may have all been of the six-row variety, or a mix of six-row and two-row varieties although in the latter case the evidence is inconclusive⁴⁵³. But even if we had proof of the presence of both main varieties of barley, we have no way of assessing whether these varieties were reflected in the epithets TUR.TUR and GAL.GAL⁴⁵⁴, let alone understanding what ŠE without epithet would be when listed along other types of barley⁴⁵⁵. When appearing alone, for instance in a ration list, ŠE was probably

⁴⁵⁰ Stol does not interpret this as a simple enumeration; he considers it possible that ŠE-GAL-GAL is a general term for major crops including white and black barley and that ŠE-TUR-TUR stands for minor crops including pulses which are enumerated after the cereals in the same passage (Stol 1985a: 127). This interpretation, which accepts ŠE.TUR.TUR as a variant of ŠE-NÍG.TUR.TUR and extends the idea to ŠE.GAL.GAL, is not compatible with the Sealand I evidence.

⁴⁵¹ The orthography given here is that of the Nippur manuscript (Copper 1972: 72).

⁴⁵² According to the CAD Š, s.v. še’u 1a 3’, we also find ŠE GAL in STT 73: 88 in a ritual context and ŠE-am GAL-a in CT 39 24:30 (tablet LXVI; omens).

⁴⁵³ Charles 1984: 27 and Renfrew 1984: 39, both basing themselves on works by Helbaek; see also Potts 1997: 57ff. contra the interpretation of two-row barley growing in the south.

⁴⁵⁴ Similarly, a type(?) of emmer called ZÍZ-GAL appears in the Sargonic Mesag archive (Bridges 1981: 250).

⁴⁵⁵ I will adopt the following designations in the present discussion: ŠE.GAL.GAL = large barley; ŠE.TUR.TUR = small barley; ŠE = common barley when discussed as a crop listed along other types of barley, otherwise barley. In general discussions, 'barley' includes all varieties.
understood as a generic term for grain including all types of barley and probably also emmer. Also, we never find a reference to large or small barley in Sealand I documents other than ledgers: the distinction, either of quality or variety, was apparently not important in contexts other than tax-paying.

According to ledgers recording the payment of the šibšu-tax, and assuming that TUR.TUR and GAL.GAL do designate varieties of barley, a same individual could cultivate in the same location more than one type of cereal. When this was the case, the quantity of common barley was usually the largest and listed first. Other cereals - small or large barley or emmer-wheat, follow in smaller quantities. This indicates that the choice between the cereal varieties was not only a question of soil condition and climate. While the preference clearly went for common barley, small barley is quite well attested. Table 16 shows which crops appear together in šibšu-payment ledgers.

On the basis of the rēš makkûri-entries in the šibšu-ledgers, which I understand to be harvested quantities, we can endeavour to evaluate the average size of the fields on which crops were produced. The figures vary greatly. Small harvests for barley can certainly be partly explained by the fact that some individuals delivered various crops but we have nonetheless to conclude that these individuals either harvested more barley which we do not see in the extant records (which is extremely likely), or that they partly relied on rations for their subsistence.

Stol has summarized the discussion surrounding the estimation of barley yields in the Old Babylonian period, concluding to a maximum of 30 kurru per bûru (2004: 840ff.). The area of a subsistence field in the Old Babylonian period is estimated at 18 ikû (Stol 2004: 844). I assumed an average yield of 20 kurru per bûru, corresponding to 333,3 qa per ikû and posited that this average yield would apply to common, small, and large barley.

---

456 For instance CUSAS 9, 426: 3-4; 6-7; 10-11; 12-13; CUSAS 9, 413: 11-13; one tax-payer apparently produced neither common barley nor non-cereal crops: CUSAS 9, 431A: 14-18.

457 For instance, within one ledger, CUSAS 9, 415, we find values ranging from 274 qa to over 21 000 qa!

458 One text mentions "a field of 1 ikû, 1 kor of barley" before stating a name, patronym, and date (CUSAS 9, 126). No context is offered but it may be the estimated yield associated with this parcel of land.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Text CUSAS 9, ŠE</th>
<th>ŠE TUR.TUR</th>
<th>kunāšu</th>
<th>ZAG.HU.LI. SARP (sahlû)</th>
<th>ŠE.GAL.</th>
<th>Additional crop/comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>v?</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td>dalû?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v</td>
<td>429</td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>no ledger; single payment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv</td>
<td>431A</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td>kâšu?; Gû?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r₁iv</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td>very fragmentary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>441</td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>tatarrû?; very fragmentary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>442</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv</td>
<td>443</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>very fragmentary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>446</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 16: Crops in šibšu-ledgers

The resulting average field area\(^{460}\) is very low for some ledgers, for instance 1,5 ikû in ledger CUSAS 9, 432 or 4 ikû in CUSAS 9, 442. This could point toward a communal type of organization in which each individual was responsible only for a small area for the cultivation of barley, but it would mean that individuals had other resources. In other ledgers, the average field

\(^{459}\) Text CUSAS 9, 443 is called a miksu-ledger but is much more similar in format and contents to the other šibšu-ledger; miksu-ledgers usually contain only common barley; see Boivin 2016b.

\(^{460}\) For all following average field areas, I have excluded uncertain entries, either when the quantity was incomplete or when the last column of the ledger did not allow me to determine whether the crop was barley. This has resulted in the fact that for some ledgers, no estimate could be computed.
size lies much higher, around the estimated area of Old Babylonian subsistence fields: for instance 15,7 \textit{ikû} in CUSAS 9, 426, 18 \textit{ikû} in CUSAS 9, 443, and 20 \textit{ikû} in CUSAS 9, 431A. In a few exceptional cases, fields were much larger: as much as 41 \textit{ikû} in CUSAS 9, 429 (recording only one delivery) and 34 \textit{ikû} in CUSAS 9, 411\textsuperscript{461}.

Barley appears extremely frequently in the archive. Besides the evidence of its procurement by the palace through the payment of taxes, we find it given for milling and for malting and allocated as wages and allocations. Transformation and expenditure of barley are treated respectively in Sections 6.3.2, 6.3.4, and 6.4.

### 6.2.1.1.2 Emmer-wheat

Emmer-wheat\textsuperscript{462}, written syllabically (ŠE) \textit{ku-ni-(e)-šu} / \textit{ku-na-(a)-šu}, is very present in the šibšu-ledgers (Table 16). This is rather surprising since the cultivation of wheat is considered to have been barely present in southern Mesopotamia after 1700 and probably entirely abandoned in some areas (Neumann and Sigrist 1978: 240-241). Already during the Ur III period, only an estimated 1.7 % of the cultivated area around Girsu was used for emmer (Potts 1997: 62 using data by Maekawa). The archaeobotanical evidence also points towards an abandonment of emmer in the Old Babylonian period in southern Babylonia (Renfrew 1984: 39; Potts 1997: 60), but the data are scarce for that region (van Zeist and Bottema 1999: 29), which weakens conclusions based on the absence of evidence.

Emmer-wheat was not cultivated by all Sealand I producers; when it was, the corresponding šibšu-payment was recorded in second or third position, after barley. Based on the harvest quantities recorded, when a producer grew both common barley and emmer, the volume of the

\textsuperscript{461} The ledger is fragmentary so that this value is based on only a few entries.

\textsuperscript{462} Probably Triticum dicoccum Schübli. The discussion surrounding the identification of \textit{kunāšu} with emmer is well summarised in Powell 1984: 51ff. The Sumerian \textit{ZI.Z,(AN)} is never used in the Sealand I texts. Powell's hypothesis that originally unprocessed emmer was called \textit{žzum} and processed emmer \textit{kunāšu} and that during the Old Babylonian period \textit{kunāšu} came to have both meanings can neither be proved nor disproved with the Sealand I evidence. What it shows is that shortly after the end the Old Babylonian period, \textit{kunāšu} was used both for processed and unprocessed emmer by the Sealand I scribes and they did not use the Sumerian logogram.
latter represented in average 9% of the former\textsuperscript{463}. Emmer-wheat is associated with at least four localities\textsuperscript{464} and, therefore, as far as the archive shows, appears to have been cultivated more or less wherever barley was. The harvest time was apparently around the same time as the barley’s.

6.2.1.1.3 \textit{kibtu}-wheat

\textit{kibtu}-wheat\textsuperscript{465}, written \textit{GIG(-tum)}, also syllabically in the plural \textit{ki-ba(-a)-tum}\textsuperscript{466}, appears occasionally in the Sealand I texts, but never in a context linked to its cultivation. We find it among seized goods (CUSAS 9, 92) or given as supplies or allocations. It may have been processed into groats (see Section 6.3.2.4.5).

This variety of wheat is not attested in the archaeobotanical record for Old Babylonian southern Babylonia (Potts 1997: 61; Renfrew 1984: 39). It seems that already in the Ur III period, it was cultivated in very small quantities with a mere 0.15% of the cultivated area around Girsu alloted to it (Potts 1997: 62 using data by Maekawa). The Sealand I texts, without offering direct evidence for its cultivation, at least show that this cereal was still marginally present shortly after the Old Babylonian period in southern Babylonia.

\textsuperscript{463} It is based on eight instances, only those in which both harvest yields were well preserved. The proportion emmer-barley varies from 2% to 20%. I chose not to compute the proportion of emmer with regard to the entire harvest associated with a given individual because sometimes several crops are listed (up to five) which increases the risk of finding lacunae in one of the quantities and would have further reduced an already limited sample.

\textsuperscript{464} Kiribti-Enlil, Nūr-šarri, Kār-Šamaš, and Kār-šeduanni.

\textsuperscript{465} For the identification of \textit{GIG, kibtu,} and wheat, probably ”some type of free-threshing wheat”, see Powell 1984: 56ff.

\textsuperscript{466} It is unusual but not unheard of to find this term in the plural (see CAD K, s.v. \textit{kibtu}).
6.2.1.1.4 ḫargalû-grain(?)

We find several occurrences of ḫargalû-grain, mostly written (ŠE) ḫar-ga-lu-ú467, but never in the context of grain production. The term is also associated with flour, in phrases such as ZīD.DA lib-bi ḫar-ga-lu-ú (CUSAS 9, 370)468. In the Middle Babylonian period this term of obscure meaning was associated with flour, although Sassmannshausen noted that it probably was a type of grain (2001: 251 n.5; cited in Dalley 2009: 192). The Sealand I evidence does not corroborate that it was a type of grain, but it does confirm that it applied to both grain and flour. If it was not a variety of grain, it may have qualified its quality or condition. Dalley has suggested an etymological connection with large millstones (2009: 192).

Another possibility, suggested by the writing ḫar-gal-lu, is that we could be dealing with a word related to the Sumerian loanword ḫargu/allu, a lock. This grain, perhaps because it was of special quality, would have been kept under lock? This seems a little far-fetched, but not impossible. It is interesting that one list (presumably of distribution) of ḫargalû-grain (CUSAS 9, 369) is sealed. It is probably the only sealed document recording an expenditure and one of only two dealing with grain469. But then one would expect to find this special grain or flour in offerings to the gods rather than distribution to men as is the case in this archive. The meaning remains elusive.

See also the Section 6.3.2.3 on ḫargalû-flour which shows that its production was apparently separate from that of other flours.

467 Also once ḫar-ga-lu or ḫAR.GAL-ú (CUSAS 9, 374), once ḫar-ga-lu (CUSAS 9, 368A) and once ḫa-ar-ga-lu-ú (CUSAS 9, 377). On the basis of the latter orthography, Dalley justly noted (2009: 192) that in this archive, the normalization should be ḫargalû and not ḫirgalû, which seems to be the later form of the word (CAD ḫ, s.v. ḫirgalû). The term ḫAR.GAL-ú to qualify flour is also attested in texts from Tell Khaiber (based on the photograph on the cover page of the excavation report Moon et al. 2014).

468 Dalley’s reconstruction of the word [ḫar-ga-lu]-ú at the beginning of text CUSAS 9, 373 would imply that tappinu-flour and regular flour are to be considered sub-types of ḫargalû-flour, but the beginning of the line is entirely lost so that the reconstruction is based only on one sign. Moreover, it appears from the photograph that this sign may be in fact KAL. The evidence from this text appears therefore too uncertain to be considered for defining ḫargalû.

469 The other is CUSAS 9, 395.
The cultivation of cress\textsuperscript{470} (\textit{saḫlû}), written \textit{ZAG.HI.LI.SAR}\textsuperscript{471}, is attested in four ledgers recording the payment of the šibšu-tax, three times along other crops and once alone (see Table 16). Its presence in Sealand I texts is not surprising since it was "an important ingredient in the daily diet" in Babylonia (Stol 1983-1984: 26). It appears mostly along cereals and was delivered by the same individuals who also paid their imposts on grain, therefore, we may assume that cress was grown on fields\textsuperscript{472}. It indicates also that the harvest took place in or before the months iv and v. The list of cress seeds CUSAS 9, 407, probably a distribution list, is dated to the beginning of month xi. If these seeds were intended for sowing, the date of the text suggests a harvest roughly at the same time as the harvesting of cereals\textsuperscript{473}, which agrees well with the recording of cereals and cress on the same šibšu-ledgers. The Sealand I evidence does not agree with Stol’s suggestion that cress was mainly harvested in the month vii (1983-1984: 26), but there is other evidence that cress was also harvested as a winter crop early in the year (months ii and iii: \textit{ibid.}: n.16; at the time of the barley’s harvest: Jursa 1995: 178)\textsuperscript{474}.

The ledgers show that the šibšu-tax rate was the same for cress and for grain (one third for the palace)\textsuperscript{475} and that the same standard \textit{GUR} measure (of 300 \textit{qa}) was used. The smaller imposts (\textit{kiṣru} and \textit{bāb āli})\textsuperscript{476} seem to behave differently than for grain but the sample is too small to

\textsuperscript{470} The identification of the \textit{saḫlû}-plant as cress remains uncertain. See Stol 1983-1984 for a detailed discussion of the evidence and the etymology. Dalley discusses the problem, reviews more recent hypotheses (2009: 87 n.1 to text 89) and leaves the term untranslated. Among the recent hypotheses, Haas suggested for the Hittite plant written \textit{ZAG.AH.LI.(SAR)} that it may have belonged to the family of parasitic plants \textit{cuscuta} (Haas 2003: 349); Dalley already noted that there may be a climatic incompatibility with southern Mesopotamia; I believe there is another argument against this hypothesis in the fact that a parasitic plant would not be suited for cultivation as a crop (Stol 1983-1984: 25; the Sealand evidence also speaks for a cultivation as a crop). This plant belongs to the mun-gazi plants (Maekawa 1985: 99ff.; Potts 1997: 64).

\textsuperscript{471} Once written \textit{ZAG.HI.LI.A.SAR} in CUSAS 9, 92. See comment by Dalley (2009: n.4 to text 92).

\textsuperscript{472} According to Stol, it was cultivated in gardens and on fields (1983-1984: 25).

\textsuperscript{473} This concords also with a Neo-Babylonian list of cress seeds CT 55, 386 dated to the 29th day of month x (Jursa 1995: 178).

\textsuperscript{474} This also appears to agree with the evidence from Astronomical Diaries (Slotzky 1997: 36).

\textsuperscript{475} With one exception (CUSAS 9, 432).

\textsuperscript{476} See Boivin 2016b.
establish a rule. Quantities harvested (rēš makkūrī) vary between 0,0,4,0 and 2,3,3,0 with an average just over one kor. Quantities of seeds distributed vary between 0,0,0,2 and 0,0,2,0 with an average of 11 qa.

The archive does not contain any information on the processing of cress, nor much insight into its consumption and distribution477.

6.2.1.2.2 Leek

Leeks, written kar-šum478, appear only once in this archive in a short list also featuring coriander (CUSAS 9, 91), both in modest quantities. It was delivered by a merchant, while the coriander was delivered by a gardener479. The presence of a merchant is exceptional in this archive. If the mention of his profession is here meaningful as to his rôle in the transaction, which appears likely since it figures in the header of the document, it ensues that leeks were not readily available to the palace, at least not in sufficient quantity480 and had to be bought.

6.2.1.2.3 Coriander

Coriander481, written ŠE.LÚ.(SAR.SAR), is also only marginally present in the extant Sealand I texts. Like cress, it belongs to the mun-gazi plants (Maekawa 1985: 99ff.), which include pulses, herbs, and spices. It appears along leek in the already discussed list CUSAS 9, 91 but was delivered by a gardener while the leek was delivered by a merchant. The quantities registered are modest.

477 It was probably recorded as an expenditure in CUSAS 9, 89, and among seized goods(?) in CUSAS 9, 92.
478 karšum is probably the common Middle Eastern leek, less frequent in sources than the "bulb-leek" (Stol 1987: 62).
479 Coriander is delivered by a gardener on line 4. On line 5 the profession of another individual also delivering coriander is not legible.
480 There is proof that during the Old Babylonian period leeks were imported by merchants based in northern Babylonia (Veenhof 1991: 291ff.).
481 Meissner (1891: 294) identified the Akkadian kisibirru as coriander. See also Potts 1997: 66.
6.2.1.2.4 Dates

The only fruit attested in the extant Seeland I documents is the date, always written ZÚ.LUM\(^{482}\). We never find the specific UḪIN for green or fresh dates\(^{483}\), and neither their cultivation nor their procurement is represented in the extant documents. We find dates as expenditures, mostly as offerings to the gods\(^{484}\), also as supplies to individuals\(^{485}\).

6.2.1.2.5 Other crops

Cumin(?)\(^{486}\), written ka-mu-nu, is another mun-gazi plant marginally represented in the archive, as part of seized goods (CUSAS 9, 92). There is no quantity\(^{487}\) associated to it, which is unusual. It may also appear, written logographically TIN.TIR.SAR in CUSAS 9, 98. Onions\(^{488}\), written SUM.SIKIL.SAR probably appear only once in a damaged passage of a list of foodstuffs offered to the gods (CUSAS 9, 99). A crop probably beginning with ka-a- figures in the šibšu-ledger CUSAS 9, 431A: 16 but the end of the line is damaged. Dalley suggested for the last sign -ši? (2009: 252); a kāšu-plant is, I believe, otherwise unattested\(^{489}\).

---

\(^{482}\) This is not surprising since other fruits are very rare in Old Babylonian documents (Postgate 1987a: 125; also only briefly mentioned in Stol 2004: 857).

\(^{483}\) Most texts recording dates are dated to the fall and winter (or the very beginning of spring). Indeed, most are dated to the months vii through xii, while one dates to month vi and one to month i. Since the harvest was in the fall (months vii to x in Charles 1987: 15; months vii and viii in Slotsky 1997: 29 and Stol 2004: 855), it is not surprising to find record of dates in that time of the year but fresh dates could certainly not conserve long into the winter. Slotsky suggested that there may have been a second picking in months xii and i or that fresh dates were delivered from elsewhere (1997: 30).

\(^{484}\) For instance in CUSAS 9, 61; 65; 66; 67; 70; 71; 73.

\(^{485}\) For instance in CUSAS 9, 88; 97; 98; 101.

\(^{486}\) The identification with cumin is uncertain (Maekawa 1985: 99).

\(^{487}\) The entry is on the lower edge of the tablet and the space where the quantity should stand is strongly tapered, however the level of preservation is very good and there definitely appears to be no numeral there.

\(^{488}\) Probably the common onion (Stol 1987: 60).

\(^{489}\) There is a kasû spice (cuscûta?) (Stol 2004: 857) which would be a possibility if the last, damaged sign was misread but that would not explain the long /a/. A thorny plant kalû (CAD K, s.v. kalû D), if the last sign is to be read -lim, would also be possible but it does not seem to be attested as a crop.
Another crop probably appearing only once features in a damaged passage in ledger CUSAS 9, 441: 19. Dalley reads it *ta-ta-ar?rī?* and suggests that it could be a type of garlic *tatturru*, a term otherwise attested only in the first millennium (CAD T, s.v. *tatturru*).

Pulses are barely represented in the Sealand I archive. *GŪ*, perhaps an unspecified type of pulse, may appear in *šibšu*-ledger CUSAS 9, 431A: 11. Most pulses being harvested in the spring (Charles 1985: 56-57), it would indeed be possible to find it in a ledger dated to the month iv. With only one possible instance, neither the cultivation nor the use of pulses can be considered to be documented with certainty in the Sealand I kingdom.

6.2.1.3 Oil plant and aromatics
6.2.1.3.1 Sesame(?)

The oil plant written *ŠE.GIŠ.Ì*, probably sesame (Kraus 1968; Stol 1985b; Bedigian 1985: 164ff.), appears in a few Sealand I texts. None of these documents refer to its cultivation.

We learn from them that sesame seeds could be offered by the king as a gift (CUSAS 9, 121; 129; 139). Sesame seeds also figure in a receipt (CUSAS 9, 135) and in a short list (CUSAS 9, 185).

---

490 The date for harvesting garlic (months xii, i, and ii: Stol 1987: 58) could be compatible with a recording of garlic following the somewhat later barley harvest. However, garlic was normally cultivated in gardens, not in fields according to Stol (1987: 65), which makes it slightly less likely to be found along barley and emmer-wheat, the produces otherwise recorded in this ledger.

491 In a few ledgers, *GŪ* stands as a column header (CUSAS 9, 409; 418; 420; 422; 424; 428; 436). In these cases, it was probably rightly interpreted by Dalley as an abbreviated writing for *GŪ.UN*, the *biltu*-tax, since it appears also in a record of bricks (CUSAS 9, 420).

492 Read *GŪ(?)* by Dalley and tentatively interpreted by her as an abbreviation for *GŪ.GAL*, which she translates as chick-peas (2009: text 431A n.11). The identification remains problematic and will not be further discussed here since it is not even certain that this crop is attested in the archive, and if so only once. For a brief summary of the problem, see Stol 2004: 857-858.

493 Once *ŠE.GIŠ.*.

494 Sesame is a summer crop, harvested between the months v and viii, which is not very salt resistant (Charles 1985: 48-49; Potts 1997: 68; Stol 1985b: 119 and 2004: 854; it is rated "sensitive" in a report by the Food and Agriculture Organization of the UN: Tanji and Kielen 2002: Appendix 1). The other candidate for identification with *ŠE.GIŠ.Ì* is flax, which is a winter crop (Renfrew 1985: 63). The fact that the Sealand archive contains several ledgers recording the payment of the *šīšu*-tax on various winter crops but that the oil plant *ŠE.GIŠ.Ì* never figures in them reinforces therefore slightly the case that we are indeed dealing with sesame rather than flax.

495 This text will be further discussed in Section 6.3.5.1.
440), possibly recording a distribution to the individuals named in the document. The quantities vary, from 5 qa to 1 kor.

6.2.1.3.2 Aromatics

Cedar, written gišEREN, figures only as an aromatic in the extant Sealand I documents. It appears in two forms: crushed (CUSAS 9, 68; 101) and as resin (CUSAS 9, 143). Cypress, written gišŠU.ÚR.MÌN, appears once in a damaged passage (CUSAS 9, 99). Both aromatics are well attested in Mesopotamian perfumery (Brunke and Sallaberger 2010: 49). Even if very few, these occurrences of aromatic wood in the Sealand I material are evidence that the southern Mesopotamian kingdom had access to products from the West (Leemans 1960a: 126-127; Middeke-Conlin 2014: 19; Van De Mieroop 1992b: 158ff.), at least for a short period496.

6.2.1.4 Reed

Reed is not directly mentioned in the Sealand I archive but we find the term AD.KID: reed worker497. Also, reed bundles or bales may be recorded in text CUSAS 9, 425. In this text, the commodity is not specified but the header of the document identifies it as the ÉŠ.GÂR AD.KID.MEŠ, adding that it was a delivery to the palace. The ambiguity of the term ÉŠ.GÂR, often loosely translated "assignment", combined with the absence of further information on the commodity recorded, is problematic.

The term ÉŠ.GÂR in the context of reed is attested at Old Babylonian Ur (Van De Mieroop 1992a: 147). There, it appeared in the phrase "ÉŠ.GÂR of day X" on records of quantities of reed associated with workers; in this context, ÉŠ.GÂR probably meant the bundles of reed harvested by the reed cutters (ibid.) or the quotas assigned to them (ibid.: 153 n.2). In our case, quotas can be excluded since the document is a delivery record; we are either dealing with the work requisites

---

496 Two texts are dated to year J (CUSAS 9, 68; 101), one has no year (CUSAS 9, 143). Cypress is attested in a text dated to year I (CUSAS 9, 99). Cedar and cypress were imported at Old Babylonian Ur and Larsa (Van De Mieroop 1992b: 160).

497 The AD.KID is not the reed cutter but the craftsman, maker of reed objects (CAD A, s.v. atkuppu).
or the finished products of the reed workers. The fact that one entry includes a fraction seems more compatible with a record of raw material requisites\textsuperscript{498}, probably bales\textsuperscript{499}, than with finished objects. This interpretation suggests that supplies had been requested and were delivered for the reed workers attached to the palace; however, the evidence is at present far too limited to suggest that an \textit{iškāru}-system of state service, as in the Neo-Assyrian empire, was in place (Postgate 1987b: 268). No information on the harvesters and the place of harvest are given.

6.2.2 Animal resources
6.2.2.1 Ovine and caprine livestock and products

Deliveries of ovine and caprine livestock are recorded on very standardized delivery records (key word: \textit{MU.DU})\textsuperscript{500}, which indicate the animals delivered, their purpose or end recipient, the name of the source/deliverer, the primary destination – nearly always the palace (\textit{ana É.GAL}), and the date. Sheep are overwhelmingly more numerous than goats in the extant record and are sometimes delivered with small quantities of wool\textsuperscript{501}.

The individuals delivering the animals are sometimes identified as shepherds. The prosopography indicates that this occupation was passed down within the family. The shepherds received rations from the palace\textsuperscript{502} and they also figure as \textit{miksu}-tax payers\textsuperscript{503}, which very

\textsuperscript{498} This interpretation of "raw material requisites" would tally with the Middle Babylonian evidence in which only this meaning of \textit{ÉŠ.GÄR} may be attested (Sassmannshausen 2001: 259). However, see Section 6.3.2.1 for evidence of another possible meaning of \textit{ÉŠ.GÄR}.

\textsuperscript{499} A bundle was probably much too small to be fractioned (for quantities, see Streck 2009-2011: 184-185).

\textsuperscript{500} There are forty-two delivery records of ovine (and caprine) livestock: CUSAS 9, 16-26; 26A; 27-50; 52-54; 56-58. The formulary of such records is analyzed in Boivin 2016c.

\textsuperscript{501} For instance ten shekels in CUSAS 9, 30 and 31; half a mina in CUSAS 9, 29; two minas in CUSAS 9, 26. According to Dalley’s reading, there would be another, in that case very large, delivery of wool recorded in CUSAS 9, 461. However, her reading \textit{SIG} on the first line is dubious; moreover, this would be the only instance of this orthography for wool in this archive since it is always written \textit{SIG-tum}. Also, the quantity given is in capacity measures, not in weight. I suggest, based on a collation from the photograph, the reading \textit{ESIR}: bitumen.

\textsuperscript{502} They received \textit{ḥargalû}-rations at least in CUSAS 9, 371: 3, 18, 29, 38 & 48; 374: rev. 14’ & 21’; 376: obv. 18 & rev. 23’.

\textsuperscript{503} CUSAS 9, 384: 30; 413: 29; 448: 34.
probably means that some shepherds received a field for their service\textsuperscript{504}. Also, ownership marks or further precisions on the source of the animals delivered are never mentioned. It seems therefore fair to assume that the animals came from palace-owned flocks that were entrusted to shepherds employed by the palace.

Since the purpose for the animal delivery is usually added, the procurement of the animals appears to occur at the request of the palace, for specific needs. Most animals were destined for offerings and to perform extispicy but the purposes recorded are varied and several, intra- and extra-palatial ones were sometimes recorded on the same tablet: this suggests the existence of a palatial bureau or service responsible for the reception of livestock, acting as a point of entry for the animals into the palatial economic body. The transaction was recorded with an outward-looking perspective because it recorded the delivery (\textit{MU.DU}) and named the individual responsible for providing/delivering the animal. Great care was given to this book-keeping: these tablets were copied, sealed, and (sometimes) encased in envelopes. Indeed most delivery records of livestock were identified as \textit{mehrum} (copy) and were sealed; some are still or had been encased. This points toward an obligation of delivery to the palace by the shepherds which was carefully monitored by the palace. An official (or officials), the \textit{GÌR}, was sometimes involved and his name recorded. His rôle is not clear but his function seems to be on the receiving side and may be related to the use of the animal\textsuperscript{505}. For an in-depth discussion of the palatial management of animal husbandry, including the rôle of the officials involved, see Boivin 2016c.

Only a few texts record the delivery of ovine carcasses\textsuperscript{506}. The prosopography shows that the same shepherd could deliver ovine and caprine carcasses and livestock\textsuperscript{507}. Wool is not well represented in the Sealand I texts but shepherds often delivered small quantities of it, alongside livestock\textsuperscript{508}.

\textsuperscript{504} For the ownership model behind fields on which the \textit{miksu} was paid, see Section 6.2.1.1; for a detailed discussion see Boivin 2016b.

\textsuperscript{505} For instance, diviners acted as \textit{GÌR} officials in the delivery of a lamb for extispicy in CUSAS 9, 22.

\textsuperscript{506} CUSAS 9, 309; 311; 316; 326; 350; 365.

\textsuperscript{507} Iłũni, son of Arad-Enlil, delivers live and dead sheep and goats (CUSAS 9, 26A; 36A; 42; 311).

\textsuperscript{508} For instance in CUSAS 9, 25: 15; 26: 14; 27: 7; 29: 13.
6.2.2.2 Bovine livestock and carcasses

For bovine livestock we have only three delivery records of the MU.DU type presented in the preceding section\(^{509}\). A large, fragmentary ledger may also record live cattle\(^{510}\) deliveries, perhaps summed over a period of time. However, neither a delivery nor the palace are mentioned or preserved on it, therefore its interpretation remains uncertain\(^{511}\), but enough names are preserved on it to show that several of these individuals figure also in delivery records of cattle carcasses as providers (deliverers)\(^{512}\).

In this archive, most documents pertaining to large cattle are by far delivery records of carcasses\(^{513}\). These tablets are cast as MU.DU records to the palace, like the delivery records for livestock; however, instead of indicating a purpose for the animal delivered they usually add information about its provenance and sometimes the (accidental) cause for its death (killed by a lion or a wolf). The records almost always specify that the dead animal bore an ownership mark (šimtu) but the context does not make clear what ownership was meant. However, several records comprise an additional "libbu (ša) X" clause, probably indicating who owned or herded the animals. We find, among others, cattle "of the queen"\(^{514}\), "of Šamaš"\(^{515}\), and "of the ox-
drivers516. This clause shows an interest by the palace administration in the provenance of the animals and probably indicates that some of the cattle was not palace-owned, or at least that its herding was less centralized than sheep's. The fact that the carcasses of animals were delivered to the palace suggests that it was mandatory that some or all of them were delivered to be processed by the palace.

Delivery records of cattle carcasses were usually copied and sealed, and sometimes encased in an envelope like the delivery records of (mostly ovine) livestock. Officials were often involved in the delivery of cattle carcasses, more so than for ovine livestock. The GīR function517, introduced in the preceding section, was in this case almost always assumed by the cooks (MUḪALDIM.MEŠ), which reinforces the assumption that the function was related to the processing of the received goods by the receiving party. A pǐḫatu-official was often involved518, apparently individuals issued from the ranks of the herders according to prosopography. Unlike the shepherds, the cattle herders are never identified as such, which could reinforce the hypothesis that much of the cattle was not palace-owned. The prosopography shows that the profession was inherited within families. Some herders, like shepherds, may have received rations from the palace but, without a professional designation, the evidence is based in this case only on clusters of names in ration lists. For a detailed discussion, see Boivin 2016c.

### 6.2.3 Other resources

Few documents pertain to goods other than those issued from agriculture and animal husbandry. The acquisition of millstones by the palace is recorded in CUSAS 9, 421, which lists transactions

---

516 CUSAS 9, 314; 366.

517 GīR-officials are recorded fifty or fifty-one times. For instance in CUSAS 9, 310; 314-315; 331-340; 353.

518 Thirty or thirty-one times. For instance in CUSAS 9, 312; 317; 320; 324; 331-340. Another official, the NīG.ŠU, appears only twice, along with a GīR-official, in CUSAS 9, 353 and 357.
by two individuals\textsuperscript{519}. The millstones appear to have been paid for in silver and in grain\textsuperscript{520}. They may have been purchased for the \textit{nupāru}-workhouse or for grain milling by servants of the palace (see Section 6.3.2). Six millstones are also mentioned in a letter (CUSAS 9, 4) in which various goods are said to have been sent to a high official\textsuperscript{521}. Metals, copper and silver, are very scarcely represented. A delivery of copper to the palace is recorded in CUSAS 9, 458; the other few attestations are probably expenditures\textsuperscript{522}. Bricks are delivered, presumably to the palace, by several individuals in ledger CUSAS 9, 420\textsuperscript{523}. We also find the delivery of a large quantity of bitumen by merchants (CUSAS 9, 461)\textsuperscript{524}, one of the very few attestations of merchants in this archive.

\textsuperscript{519} For each purchase, the millstones are recorded in two columns. The header of the first column, $\text{na}_4\text{ḪAR}$, may either designate the complete set of millstones or specifically the lower millstone (Stol 1979: 91-92). The header of the second column is problematic: Dalley suggested $\text{na}_4\text{DA}(?)\text{BAR}$ as an alternative spelling of $\text{na}_4\text{AD}\text{BAR}$, that is, basalt. If correct, millstones of basalt were listed separately from those in the first column, then presumably made of a different stone.

\textsuperscript{520} To the recorded quantities of acquired millstones are associated two entries: $\text{KÙ.BABBAR SUM-}nu$ and $\text{ŠE.SÁM}$, therefore "silver given" and "price (in grain)". The sign following the quantities in silver has been read MA as an abbreviation for MA.(NA) by Dalley, which would result in the extremely large quantities of 13 MA.NA for the first purchase and 4 2/3 MA.NA for the second. (The fraction was read 1/3 by Dalley but collation from the photograph shows that it is 2/3). I would suggest that the sign MA may perhaps be read as GÍN. Another observation is that the quantities of barley and silver are in proportion since they offer between line 1 and 2 the same ratio. (It is impossible that we are dealing with an equivalent barley/silver since we would have a course of 60 SILÀ of barley per MA.NA or GÍN of silver, depending on the reading of the quantities in silver.)

\textsuperscript{521} Perhaps the king (Dalley 2009: text 4 notes).

\textsuperscript{522} For some evidence of copper being given for trade or diplomatic gift, see Section 4.4.2.

\textsuperscript{523} The header of the second column reads $\text{ma-ḫi-ir-tum}$, which Dalley translates as "boat coming upstream(?)". I would suggest the translation: "received". The feminine of the adjective would not be surprising since bricks are the commodity recorded ($\text{iḥbittu}$ written $\text{SIGa-tum}$). The ledger appears indeed to balance between an expected quantity in the first column ($\text{SAG.NIG.GA}$), the received quantity in the second ($\text{mahīrtu}$) and the result in the third ($\text{GÚ}$) which features repeatedly the entry $\text{l.SÁ}$. The reading $\text{l.SÁ}$ has been suggested by Cavigneaux and André-Salvini for entries in a text from Bahrein, with the meaning "it is equal, balanced" (forthcoming). If the column header $\text{GÚ}$ stands for $\text{GÚ.(UN)} : \text{biṭu}$, this would presumably mean that all that was expected has been levied or given. A $\text{GÚ}$ column is also found in some tax-ledgers and flour ledgers.

\textsuperscript{524} This is based of my suggested reading $\text{ESÍR}$ for the last sign on line 1 (see Section 6.2.2.1).
6.3 Storage and transformation

6.3.1 Storage of grain

We have evidence that the palace stored grain from the expenditure record CUSAS 9, 100: an offering took place at the occasion of the opening of a granary (GUR)\(^5\). This does not come as a surprise since we know that the palace procured significant quantities of grain through the payment of taxes and gave out grain as well as transformed products from grain for rations and offerings.

6.3.2 Production of flour

There is evidence that the palace produced flour\(^5\), some of which was milled by palace servants and some probably by workers in a workhouse attached to the palace. We have evidence also that flour and flour-based products were given as offerings to various deities by the palace.

6.3.2.1 The nupāru as workhouse for cereal-milling?

We have in receipt CUSAS 9, 85 evidence that barley was delivered "for grinding" : ana samādi to a nupāru-workhouse. This institution is known in the Old Babylonian period mainly at Mari, Chagar Bazar\(^5\), and Sippar, where school letters were found which attest that the term could be used instead of šibittu (Kraus 1967: 26ff. letters p and q). It has been considered, like the šibittu and other institutions such as the bīt asīrī, to be an ergastulum where distrainees, prisoners for

---

\(^5\) The letter CUSAS 9, 14 also refers to granaries, however, these granaries were probably not the property of the palace since the aim of the letter is to request the payment of the šibšu-tax of a town, Dūr-Ninurta. There was therefore storage of grain at the municipal level as well.

\(^5\) There is no evidence that the palace procured or produced flour in other ways since the archive probably records no delivery of flour to the palace outside deliveries from the nupāru. Delivery record CUSAS 9, 413A is considered by Dalley to be a delivery of flour but it has a very fragmentary header and her reading [zi].\(^1\)\(\text{DA}^1\) is by no means certain.

\(^5\) CAD N, s.v. nupāru A b.
debt, prisoners of war and common criminals were put to forced labour, often involving flour production (van der Toorn 1986: 250; see also Seri 2013: 11ff.).

Other documents of the Sealand I archive may be related to the *nupāru*. The ledgers CUSAS 9, 419; 422; 424; 436 (and probably 409; 416; 418) record quantities of flour (of various qualities) that appears to have been ground by workers in an institutional context. Indeed, the main header of these documents states that flour (*ZÌ.DA*), namely the *ÉŠ.GÀR (LÚ.)EN.NU.UN(.MEŠ)*: "ÉŠ.GÀR of the guards", was delivered to the palace. The term *ÉŠ.GÀR* precludes that it was an allocation: we must be dealing, as discussed in Section 6.2.1.4, either with the requisites or the finished product of the listed workers. The latter interpretation, flour as the finished product, is the more likely explanation since the last column of these ledgers (before the names) records "barley received": ŠE ŠU.TI.A, probably grain received for milling.

If we consider 1- that *nupāru* is equated with *bīt maṣṣarti* in the first tablet of *malku = šarru* (Kilmer 1963; line 97 of the composite); 2- that barley grinding took place at the *nupāru*; 3- that quantities of flour are associated in several ledgers with the *EN.NU.UN : maṣṣartu*; and 4- that this flour was delivered to the palace: the most likely explanation is indeed that a guarded workhouse, the *nupāru*, produced flour for the palace from which it received grain to be ground. Bookkeeping took the form of small ledgers in which the flour produced was recorded as the work produce that the guards of the *nupāru*-workers delivered to the palace.

---

528 Seri found no evidence for flour production in the Old Babylonian *bīt asūrī* at Uruk (Seri 2013: 253). Charpin notes that a servile status of some sort and the grinding of flour are often associated in the second millennium (2014: 131 incl. n. 56).

529 The ledger CUSAS 9, 450 presents a very similar structure but bears neither a main header nor column headers.

530 Once with the plural form ḫī.A.

531 CUSAS 9, 416 and 418 make exception: they have no main header.

532 This is the interpretation chosen by Dalley in her edition (2009).

533 The other possible meaning of *ÉŠ.GÀR*, a work quota, probably does not apply here since the document records deliveries. See also Deheselle 2004: 274 for a brief diachronic survey of the meanings of the word.

534 It has been shown that this list is partly based on Old Babylonian forerunners (Kilmer 1963: 423).

535 Probably for the palace since receipt CUSAS 9, 85 was presumably, like the rest of the archive, drafted by the palace administration.
Most *nupāru*-workers were women and the same names tend to recur in all ledgers. The lists begin with two or three men, followed by several women. Some of the quantities recorded appear too high to be the product of one person-day of labour if we trust Ur III production-rates (Powell 1984: 55), but what recording principle was at work is not easily elicited from these ledgers. In general, quantities associated with men are larger and some types of flour, *ZI.KIN.SIG* and *ZI.KUKKUŠ*, are only associated with them. The records are dated to at least three separate years (F, J, and K).

### 6.3.2.2 Types of flour milled at the *nupāru*

According to the ledgers probably recording the *nupāru*’s output, the following types of (barley) flour were produced in this institution.

#### 6.3.2.2.1 *ZI.(DA)*: flour

The most common term used for flour in the Sealand I archive is *ZI.DA*, sometimes written only *ZID*, and often used as generic term for flour. It stands in the main header of the ledgers while specific types of flour are named in the column headers. It sometimes appears in apposition to a specific type of flour in expenditure records, for instance in CUSAS 9, 60 where we have (lines 1-2):

\[
\begin{align*}
0.0.1.0 & \text{ ZI.DA} & \text{One sūtu of flour,} \\
\text{ZI.MA.AD.GĀL} & \text{mashatu-flour}
\end{align*}
\]

---

536 Mainly Ātanaḫ-Šamaš, Dayyān-ilum, Atta-ilamma; once Kalbu and Taṛibātu.

537 Among them, Amat-Šimut, Ùmāyutu, Waqartu, and Alānitu always appear in prominent position.

538 In the most complex ledgers, the first column called *SAG.NIG.GA* (*rēš makkūri*) is followed by various types of flour, after which comes a first *ŠU.NIGIN* column (a sub-total?), followed by (*ŠE*) *ti-rum(?)*, then another *ŠU.NIGIN*, the *GŪ* column – perhaps for *GŪ(LUN)* – and finally, before the last column with the personal names, a *ŠE ŠU.TLA* column. In general, the following principle applies, with some exceptions:

\[
\text{SAG.NIG.GA} = \text{ŠU.NIGIN (1)} = \text{ŠU.NIGIN (2)} = \text{ŠE ŠU.TLA}
\]

The column (*ŠE*) *ti-rum* always has only *NU* as entry, apparently meaning that no such grain or flour was recorded. The column GŪ always features i.SĀ, probably with the meaning "balanced" (see n.523).

539 In CUSAS 9, 419; 422 and 436. Dalley read this header TŪG.IŠ. See below Section 6.3.2.2.4 for my suggested reading and interpretation.
It also appears alone in several records of expenditure\(^{540}\), in which case it either meant that the flour was of common quality or that it was not necessary to specify its type.

6.3.2.2.2 \(\text{ZÌ\textsc{sag}}\) : best quality flour

This quality of flour is attested a few times in the Sealand I archive. We mostly find it in the ledgers associated with the \textit{nupāru}, as a column beside other types of flour\(^{541}\). It was apparently not produced by all workers, only by the men and very few women.

6.3.2.2.3 \(\text{ZÌ\textsc{kin.sig}}\) : flour for the meal

We can probably consider that this phrase indeed designates a quality of flour\(^{542}\) because it figures among other types of flour in ledgers. The evidence suggests that it was produced only by men.

6.3.2.2.4 \(\text{ZÌ\textsc{kukkuš}}\) : kukkušu-flour

We probably find \textit{kukkušu}-flour, a sort of groats (Milano 1993-1997: 26), among the types of flour recorded in a few ledgers (CUSAS 9, 419; 422; 436). Dalley has consistently read this column header \textsc{TÚG.IŠ}. She based her reading on the assumption that, in this archive, \textsc{ZÌ} has four horizontals and \textsc{TÚG} three (Dalley 2009: text 419 n.2) But collation from photographs and comparison with other texts do not, in my opinion, sustain her assertion. \textsc{ZÌ} has often three horizontals. In addition, since these ledgers have \textsc{ZÌ.DA} in the main header, one expects flour or at least cereal-related products in the document. In addition, I would suggest that the column header read \textsc{TÚG.IŠ AŠGAB} by Dalley in ledger CUSAS 9, 436 could be read \textsc{ZÌ.KUKKUŠ AŠ}, "roasted

\(^{540}\) For instance: CUSAS 9, 65-67; 70-73; 103; 138.

\(^{541}\) We also find it in expenditure records, for instance CUSAS 9, 414. It was given to the \textit{Egirmah}, perhaps for the preparation of food offerings (CUSAS 9, 131): see Section 6.3.3.

\(^{542}\) Dalley (2009: text 8 n.6) considers that it may have been used only for ritual meals. Expenditures of this type of flour seem to confirm her hypothesis, for instance: CUSAS 9, 86; 109. It was also given to the \textit{Egirmah} (CUSAS 9, 131): see Section 6.3.3.
kukkušu-flour". There is no definite evidence that the signs SA and AŠGAB were differentiated in this archive, even if the sign SA appears to be usually written with horizontals; we find AŠGAB both with horizontals (CUSAS 9, 410: 11) and with obliques (CUSAS 9, 72: 4). According to the ledgers, kukkušu-flour was produced only by men.

6.3.2.2.5 ız.uš : second-rate flour

This second-rate flour⁵⁴³ is attested only in ledgers. It was apparently produced by all workers and may have been the main type of flour produced in the nupāru.

6.3.2.3 Production of ğargalû-flour at the palace

The uncertain meaning of ğargalû has already been discussed in the ğargalû-grain section. There is evidence that flour was produced from that category(?) of grain at the palace: document CUSAS 9, 372 is a list recording the assignment of ğargalû-grain to several "servant-girls of the palace", 3 pānā each⁵⁴⁴, for grinding (ṭēnu)⁵⁴⁵. The women named in this document do not appear to belong to the group of women well represented in the flour ledgers recording the output of the nupāru⁵⁴⁶. This type of flour was also delivered to the palace according to records CUSAS 9, 368 and 370⁵⁴⁷, from an unspecified source; nothing in these records allow us to establish a relation with the production of ğargalû-flour by the palace servants.

---

⁵⁴³ It is considered minderwertig by Sassmannshausen (2001: 452).

⁵⁴⁴ This quantity would probably be too much for one work day, according to Ur III production rates (Powell 1984: 55).

⁵⁴⁵ The fact that ğargalû grain was ground (also) by palace servants speaks against Dalley’s suggestion that the term ğargalû refers to a communal mill (Dalley 2009: 192).

⁵⁴⁶ Only one name is identical although CUSAS 9, 372 dates to month x of year K, a period in which we have two nupāru-ledgers (month viii and month xii intercalary of the same year in CUSAS 9, 422 and 424).

⁵⁴⁷ In this record, one Pirḫi-Sîn acts as ġir; he may be the same who appears in connection with emmer-flour (CUSAS 9, 148).
6.3.2.4 Other types of flour

There are several other types of flour whose production is not documented in the extant archive, but they were either produced or acquired by the palace because they appear in records of expenditures. Some of these flour appellations refer to the intended use and may in fact be of one of the qualities discussed above. Although these types of flour are attested only as expenditures in the archive, they are listed here in order to complete the inventory of flour types.

6.3.2.4.1 ZI.GU.SAG : best powdered(?) flour

This type of flour is attested twice in the archive. Once it qualifies a type of bread used by diviners, as its main ingredient (CUSAS 9, 111), and once it figures in a letter among other foodstuffs sent probably to a high ranking person (CUSAS 9, 8). Its meaning is elusive, "a very common sort of flour made of barley", perhaps very finely crushed, and for which the epithet SAG is not common (Milano 1993-1997: 26).

6.3.2.4.2 ZI.MA.AD.GAL : masḥatu-flour

This flour appears a few times in this archive. It is written sometimes logographically, sometimes phonetically ma-aš-ḫa-tum (CUSAS 9, 76), also in the plural ma-aš-ḫa-ta-a-tum (CUSAS 9, 111). We find it used in divinatory (CUSAS 9, 111) and in ritual context (for instance CUSAS 9, 60; 62; 65), which confirms previous Old Babylonian evidence (Milano 1993-1997: 25; 28). In CUSAS 9, 84, quantities of terru?-cereal and of masḥatu-flour are recorded for several deities. The additional mention of "26 bread loaves" on the left edge may indicate that these were ingredients used to make bread.

---

548 Dalley has equated it with ZI.KUM (contra Charpin 1986: 314 and Milano 1993-1997: 26) and suggested a normalization as ašqūqu (see Dalley 2009: text 8 n.6).
6.3.2.4.3  zl.ŠE : tappinnu-flour

We find only one mention, written logographically, of this coarse barley flour or barley "grits" (Milano 1993-1997: 25) in CUSAS 9, 373. The beginning of the text is broken off but it seems to record foodstuffs received by a messenger.

6.3.2.4.4 Ground emmer

We have only slight evidence of the processing of emmer-wheat in the Sealand I archive. Text CUSAS 9, 148, cast like a list but containing only one entry, begins with the header ŠE ku-ni-šu ḪAR.RA : ground emmer. A small quantity is associated with an individual; the undated text does not make it clear whether he received or delivered it.

6.3.2.4.5 NĪG.ḪAR.RA : mundu-groats?

This foodstuff, portioned in measures of dry capacity, appears twice in the archive (CUSAS 9, 65; 100). Dalley chose to read it NINDA.ḪAR.RA and translated it as bread of samīdu, a type of coarse flour or groat, usually written syllabically (CAD S, s.v. samīdu B). However, NĪG.ḪAR.RA could be a better reading: it is a well-attested type of groats549, always written logographically in earlier periods; it starts being written syllabically, mundu, from the Middle Babylonian period on.

It seems to have been produced mostly from barley550 (CAD M, s.v. mundu) but it has been shown that it could also be made out of wheat, as in the Assyrian medicinal text AMT 42,2: NĪG.ḪAR.RA GIG.BA, interpreted "Weizenfeinmehl" by Haussperger (2012: 222)551. In CUSAS 9, 65: 26, NĪG.ḪAR.RA is followed by a fragmentary passage ša ki-X-X-X?. Dalley reads the sign

---

549 Or on the contrary "Feinmehl" according to AHw.
550 See also Postgate 1984: 108.
551 It had been previously read NINDA ḪAR.RA GIG.BA by Thompson who translated it "wheaten bread" (1929: 59). The term has also been translated as ground bread (Englund 1990: 87), and in the context of brewing, as hulled groats (Hartman and Oppenheim 1950: 15).
following *ki- as -*na- and considers it certain; she reconstructs: ša *ki-na- 다양*?\(^{552}\). Collation from the photograph is difficult but the -*na- does not appear entirely certain; I suggest as another possible reconstruction ša *ki- 다양*:\(^{1}\): wheat groats.

### 6.3.2.4.6 *zi.SUR.RA* : flour for magic circles

We find three occurrences of flour for magic circles, written *zi.SUR.RA* in the Sealand I archive. It appears twice in record CUSAS 9, 73 listing offerings for Ninurta and Šamaš – once for each god, and once among other offerings for "when the silo is opened" (CUSAS 9, 100). It is usually considered to be (barley) flour used to draw ritual or magic circles (CAD Z, s.v. *zisurrû*). Whether this flour was in fact of one of the types previously discussed is not known\(^{553}\). It has also been interpreted as a flour and water paste used to draw magic lines (Schramm 2001: 9ff.).

### 6.3.2.4.7 *zi si-ir-qí* : flour for scattering

This phrase occurs twice in record CUSAS 9, 73 listing offerings for Ninurta and Šamaš – once for each god. The name refers to the strewing and scattering of foodstuffs and aromatics in cult and ritual. It is in both cases listed alongside flour for magic circles. See also n.553 for the evidence of UR\(5\).RA = *ḫubullu*.

### 6.3.3. Preparation of breads and other flour-based products

We have no evidence pertaining to the making of bread and other cereal-based dishes but we find various types of such products in records of expenditures. They must therefore have been either acquired or prepared by the palace. One text may indirectly suggest where they were

\(^{552}\) She suggests *"of the servants(?)"* (Dalley 2009: text 65; see also n.26).

\(^{553}\) In tablet XXIII of UR\(5\).RA = *ḫubullu*, it is indirectly equated with *zi.DUB.DUB.BU* and a few Akkadian expressions, in particular (*qi-me*) *si-ir-qí*, all in relation with ritual and cultic purposes: col.V, lines 8-11:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{[zi.DUB.DUB]} & \text{BU} & q\text{-me ma-aq\-qi\-tum} \\
\text{[zi.DUB.DUB]} & \text{BU} & \text{MIN si-ir-qí} \\
\text{[zi.SUR]} & \text{RA} & \text{MIN MIN} \\
\text{[zi.SUR]} & \text{RA} & \text{ŠU\-u}
\end{align*}
\]

In CUSAS 9, 73 we find it listed after *zi si-ir-qí*.
produced: the receipt CUSAS 9, 131 records that two types of flour to (or for) the Egirmah (ana ė.GIR₄.MAH) were received by the cooks (MUḪALDIM.MEŠ). Whether these cooks are the same MUḪALDIM.MEŠ who appear often as GIR officials when livestock and carcasses are delivered to the palace is uncertain but if it is the case, it would mean that the Egirmah functioned within the palatial economy, perhaps as the service responsible to prepare the ritual foodstuffs that we find in expenditure records for deities and temples, therefore apparently as kitchen, which is indeed suggested by the term (house of the great oven). The Egirmah also appears twice as the end recipient of rams (CUSAS 9, 34 and 37) and once of lambs (CUSAS 9, 44) delivered to the palace.

6.3.3.1 NINDA : bread

Common(?) bread, written NINDA, is attested four times in cultic context (CUSAS 9, 63; 84; 86; 109). In text CUSAS 9, 84, the quantity appears to be given in discrete units, 26 bread loaves. It is written on the edge of a tablet containing quantities of grain and flour given to several deities, these may be ingredients used to make the loaves. In other texts, the bread quantities are given in measures of dry capacity. In two cases (CUSAS 9, 86; 109), the bread is part of the supplies for a ritual night meal given on the fourteenth day, that is the full moon, of month viii.

6.3.3.2 NINDA î.DÉ.A : mersu-dish

The best attested NINDA-dish in the Sealand I texts is the mersu-dish, written mostly logographically NINDA (i).DÉ.A, once syllabically me-er-si. It always appears in ritual (CUSAS 9, 63; 68; 69; 86; 100; 109), once in divinatory context (CUSAS 9, 111). The mersu-dish was a compound of ground cereals and fat to which various aromatic ingredients were added, such as leeks, onions, and honey (Vincente 1992: 334; 344), but also dates, spices, and others (Bottéro

554 In this case, it is written syllabically gi-ir-ma-a-hi.
555 Called isihtu in CUSAS 9, 109 (see Section 6.4.3).
556 Both records are for the 14.viii, in one case of year D, in the other of year K.
1995: 22ff.; Sigrist 1977: 175). The mixture was apparently not solid\textsuperscript{557} and had to be served in appropriate containers (Maul 1994: 51ff.).

6.3.3.3 NINDA ZÌ.GU.SAG : bread of best powdered(?) flour

We find one occurrence of bread made of the previously discussed ZÌ.GU.SAG-flour (Section 6.3.2.4.1). It appears in divinatory context (CUSAS 9, 111).

6.3.3.4 NINDA ZÌ šu-mi : garlic powder bread?

A type of bread CUSAS 9, 69:6 is of problematic reading: Dalley reads NINDA šu?-šu-mi and leaves it untranslated\textsuperscript{558}. However, collation from photograph suggests that the sign following NINDA is ZÌ. This would give us: NINDA ZÌ šu-mi. The term ZÌ, while mostly used for cereals, is also attested with vegetables, fruits, and pulses (AHw qēmu 8; also CAD Q, s.v. qēmu b); it is then considered a powder. If this reading is correct, we could have a bread aromatized with(?) powdered garlic.

6.3.3.5 Other types of bread

Text CUSAS 9, 100, which lists food offerings for "when the grain silo is opened", contains two other types of bread. On line 8 a first type is recorded whose name is unclear; Dalley transliterates it NINDA ḫi im bu bu a-za-a-tum and leaves it untranslated\textsuperscript{559}. In particular the first signs seem very clearly written; it is portioned in measures of dry capacity. On line 9, we find

\textsuperscript{557} For this reason I prefer the term "dish" over "cake" chosen by Dalley.

\textsuperscript{558} She discusses possibilities in Dalley 2009: text 69 n.6.

\textsuperscript{559} She suggests possibilities in 2009: text 100 n.8. Also, knowing that NINDA GÌD.DA : "lange Brote", given in measures of dry capacity, is attested in namburbi-rituals (see Maul 1994: 235 and 244 line 6), one could suggest to read GÌD.GÌD reading instead of BU BU.
6.3.4 Malting and brewing

Beer brewing has a long and well attested tradition in Mesopotamia and is abundantly represented in the Sealand I texts. Indeed, the transfer of raw material, semi-processed, and finished products of barley malting and beer brewing has produced, with over 150 records, a large portion of the Sealand I documents that have become available to us. These delivery records and receipts are fairly repetitive and standardized but, without being rich in detail, they do offer valuable information about the actors and institutions involved in these activities.

The brewing of beer in Mesopotamia has been shown to involve two separate series of operations to process barley, one aimed at ensuring fermentation, resulting in a so-called "beer-bread" (BAPPIR) to which aromatics were added, and one aimed at sweetening the beer by means of malting, resulting in prepared (cooked?) malt mash/malt-bread (TITAB). Both ingredients were then mixed in order to brew beer (Stol 1971: 169; followed by Van De Mieroop 1994: 314; see also Stol 1987-1990: 325ff.). Of all the ingredients and semi-finished products involved in this brewing method, only barley (including barley for malt) and malt appear in the Sealand I documents. A few types of beer are also recorded.

It appears that the palace where the Sealand I archive was found was actively involved in beer production. We learn from the records that malt was produced from barley for the palace and that

---

560 See also Dalley’s comment in 2009: text 100 n.9. It is not clear whether a quantity is specified; one expects specially shaped bread to be counted in loaves. This is the case in a namburbi-ritual in which "7 til-pa-na-ti" are used (Maul 1994: 369 line 12’).

561 It is usually not considered to have been produced from malted barley, although there may be contrary evidence (Stol 1987-1990: 325-326). See also Powell 1994: 96ff. for a discussion about whether this product was indeed a baked bread.

562 Malzbrot in Stol 1987-1990: 325; it was perhaps mostly associated with dark beer (Powell 1994: 101).

563 Also in the Old Babylonian beer archive at Tell Leilan do we find the sweetening/malting operations better attested than the fermentation; at Tell Leilan, all the semi-finished products are attested although barley for malt and malt are by far the most common (Van De Mieroop 1994: 315).
beer was brewed at an institution called the *Egipar* which may have belonged to the palace (if not, beer was also brewed at the palace). The same palatial administration tracked the circulation of barley for malt, malt, and beer between maltsters, brewers, the palace, and the *Egipar*. Beer was given out by the palace as offering to deities, there is also some evidence that it was given out as supplies or gift of the king to various individuals although no beer rations are attested. Curiously, the types of beer brewed do not seem to correspond to the common Mesopotamian beer types.

### 6.3.4.1 Maltsters, brewers, and the men in charge of(?) the *Egipar*

Examination of the relevant administrative records shows that the activities surrounding the malting of barley and the brewing of beer involved two professional groups: the maltsters written (LÚ).MUNU₅(.MEŠ)⁵⁶⁴, and the brewers written (LÚ).ŠIM(.MEŠ). The maltsters received barley, sometimes with the additional precision that it was for malt⁵⁶⁵, and delivered malt to the palace⁵⁶⁶. Brewers received malt, a few times also barley, and delivered beer to the palace; in delivery records they are usually identified only by name, not by their professional title, but the co-occurrence and recurrence of personal names leaves no doubt on their identity. In addition to maltsters and brewers, we find that "bēlū pīhāti ana *Egipar*" were involved as well⁵⁶⁷, a phrase which alternates with "bēlū pīhāti LŪ *Egipar*" and "bēlū pīhāti ša *Egipar*". These "men in charge of/for (men of) the *Egipar*" also received malt, and exceptionally barley, like the brewers.

Several individuals could cumulate more than one function as shown in table 17 (I have included the individuals delivering beer in the brewers’ column).

---

⁵⁶⁴ The sign MUNU₅ is written PAB - ŠE x PAB in this archive.

⁵⁶⁵ The phrase is usually "ŠE ana MUNU₅".

⁵⁶⁶ And a few times with the additional mention that it was for the palace of Kār-Šamaš; the matter is discussed below.

⁵⁶⁷ There is a slight possibility that "ana *Egipar*" does not refer to the responsibility of the bēlū pīhāti but to the end destination or purpose of the commodities recorded in the relevant receipts, but it seems unlikely since we find also the variant bēlū pīhāti LŪ *Egipar*. We also have once only bēlū pīhāti (CUSAS 9, 156). The individuals named in these various documents are the same.
Table 17: Title distribution of individuals involved in barley malting and beer brewing

Based on the distribution of names and on the fact that the bēlū pīẖāti LÚ/ana/ša Egipar received mostly malt, as did the brewers, it appears that these "men in charge of the Egipar" were indeed brewers. Whether the titles were entirely interchangeable and all brewers were attached to the Egipar is more than the texts allow us to say but the correlation appears quite strong, especially since the same men were recorded in both capacities during the same period. In addition, one receipt, CUSAS 9, 223, clearly identifies three brewers as indeed belonging to the Egipar (brewers "ša Ė.Gī6.PĀR"). This also suggests that the expression "brewers ana

---

See shading in table 17. Only two brewers do not appear explicitly as "men in charge at the Egipar": Rabūt-Adad, who is only marginally present in the documents with only three occurrences, and Šābī-(E)-Ulmaš.

For instance receipts of malt CUSAS 9, 219 and 223, listing the three same individuals, in one case as brewers, in the other as "men in charge of the Egipar" are dated respectively to the 10th and the 22nd of the same month (month iv of year N).

The three individuals listed in this receipt are already known as brewers and as bēlū pīẖāti LÚ/ana/ša Egipar.
"É.Gî₆.PÂR" found in CUSAS 9, 187 is its equivalent: brewer of/for the Egipar and the same indifferent use of *ana* and ša must apply to "brewers *ana É.GAL" found in CUSAS 9, 207; 235; 244, whose meaning, therefore, must be "brewers of (as well as for) the palace".

There was clearly a strong involvement of the palace in the brewing of beer and a strong economical and organizational relationship between the palace and the Egipar: either the brewers split their time between (at least) these two institutions whose activities were related to the same administration of barley and malt, or the titles were interchangeable, which means that the Egipar was organizationally within the palace, functioning as its brewery.

Since delivery records of beer to the palace usually do not identify the brewers by their titles, it is impossible to establish beyond doubt that beer brewed by Egipar-brewers was indeed intended for the palace but there is an indication that it was so: one delivery record of beer mentions the *bēlū pīḫāti LÚ* Egipar (CUSAS 9, 253). Since *MU.DU* records in this archive are as a rule deliveries to the palace, it is a fair assumption that this delivery by the men of the Egipar was also intended for the palace. Another sign of the direct involvement of the palace in beer

---

571 This is known for instance for prebendary brewers at Nippur in the first millennium, an organization which may have had its root in the Old Babylonian period (Beaulieu 1995: 94ff.)

572 Two records also establish a close relationship between the palace and the Egipar: CUSAS 9, 151 and 161 both record a quantity of malt for the Egipar (*Qty MUNUS ana É.Gî₆.PÂR*), delivered to the palace (*MU.DU PN LÚ MUNUS ana É.GAL*) by a maltster, and received by one Qišti-Marduk, presumably in his rôle as brewer, perhaps even as brewer of the Egipar (see Table 17).

573 It has been suggested that beer may have been brewed at the Egipar of Ur, mainly because of the identification of an oven(?) that may have been used to bake "beer-bread" (Breniquet 2009: 189). While there is indeed no question about the presence of ovens and a well in the Egipar at Ur, there is no archaeological evidence that the installations were particularly appropriate for the brewing of large quantities of beer, nor is there any indication in the texts found in situ that the Egipar functioned as a brewery beyond producing for its own needs. There is therefore no conclusive association of the Egipar-institution with a special vocation in beer brewing at Ur, or elsewhere in Babylonia. However, the evidence from Ur seems to show that there was a separation between the temple of Ningal, the É.NUN, and the actual *gīpāru*, that is, the residence of the entu-priestess, probably incorporated in Ur III times, whereas it was originally a separate building (Charpin 1986: 210-219; Weadock 1975: 123-124). Also, there is some evidence that a *gīpāru* can have an economic function as storage for foodstuffs, as suggested for instance in TCL 16, 136: 1. 30, a religious text dedicated to Ištar, in which *gīpāru* is equated with a storehouse (*É.UŠ.GÎD.DA*); it can also designate a part of a private house, separate from the living quarters (CAD G, s.v. *gīpāru* 2). It seems probable that the Sealand I *gīpāru*, functioning as a brewery, was an extension of the latter meaning of the term, a part of a house (here the palace) with an economic function pertaining to foodstuff. If we add that in the Old Babylonian "Sargon Ur Letter", which contains a list of professions, the section pertaining to food preparation puts the entry *LÚ.GIPAR₆.RA* immediately after a fragmentary entry beginning with KAS, obviously a profession related to beer brewing (Westenholz 1997: 160-161), the Sealand I *gīpāru*-brewery seems not isolated case.

574 The sign LÚ was mistakenly read MÌ by Dalley.
production is found in record CUSAS 9, 232, which seems to identify the palace as the obligatory *locus* of transit for malt. We find on the same record a delivery of malt (*MU.DU*) by a maltster to the palace, followed by the reception (*ŠU.TI.A*) of almost the same quantity of malt (merely with an additional 5 *qā*) by the brewers. The most likely explanation is that malt was delivered to the palace and was almost immediately reached further to the brewers, after topping up an incomplete *sūtu*.

Another striking fact which emerges from Table 17 is that a few individuals cumulated the functions of maltsters and brewers, although by far not all. The records show that the maltsters-brewers were active in these rôles in the same period but when barley or malt was received or delivered, they always appeared in the records in the corresponding capacity. We therefore have a situation in which some maltsters-brewers could divide their time between malting for the palace and brewing for the *Egipar* as part of the palace (or perhaps separately brewing for the palace and the *Egipar*). Curiously, maltsters and brewers do not seem to be attested in ration lists or *miksu*-ledgers. Therefore, although they certainly appear to be employed by the palace, we have no information on their remuneration.

6.3.4.1.1 The town of Kār-Šamaš

The toponym Kār-Šamaš appears several times in the beer-related documents. Between the 13.intercalary ii.N and the 12.iv.N, and perhaps also in the months iii and iv of year L, almost all records bear the mention of this town, either after the list of maltsters or brewers, or in the phrase *É.GAL / ša KAR-4UTU* (for instance CUSAS 9, 213; 216; 220). Prosopography shows that the maltsters and brewers involved are the same. Curiously, this holds true only for barley and malt receipts and delivery records; the beer deliveries dated to the same period do not make mention of Kār-Šamaš although we find for instance Dannū-mūšu, the brewer "of Kār-Šamaš"

575 The second quantity (line 6) is erroneous in Dalley’s transliteration, but correct in the autograph copy.

576 That three maltsters would be the homonyms of three brewers seems very unlikely.

577 This is less certain; CUSAS 9, 192 is slightly damaged so that the numeral of the year name may be "7" (year L) or "8" (year N). CUSAS 9, 190 appears to be dated to year L but it could very well be the only exception to the time span otherwise identified; therefore, an error by the scribe who could have forgotten one wedge can not be ruled out.
receiving malt on the 30.iii.N (CUSAS 9, 214) and delivering beer "to the palace" on the same day (CUSAS 9, 268)\textsuperscript{578}.

There are two possible interpretations which account for these facts: Kār-Šamaš was a quarter within the town where the archive was found, and this town had a main palace, where the archive comes from, and another palace in Kār-Šamaš, where the brewing took place, or else it was a separate town in its immediate vicinity; or Kār-Šamaš is the name of the town where the archive comes from and the expressions "the palace" and "the palace of Kār-Šamaš" are interchangeable, the latter perhaps being the result of a change in scribal personnel or recording habits. Kār-Šamaš is known from three other texts in this archive, including one letter in which it is referred to as a place of judgement (CUSAS 9, 7), which is cogent with the interpretation that it was of some importance. See also Section 3.1.1 and Boivin 2015 on this.

\textsuperscript{578} There are similar examples for other brewers, we can therefore exclude a case of homonymy.
6.3.4.2 The palace administration of beer brewing

The reconstructed organization of beer production can be schematized like this:

Scope of palatial beer administration

Figure 3: Palatial administration of beer production (scenario A)
In both scenarios, whether the *Egipar* institution was separate from the palace or not, it was partly comprised in its administrative scope, sharing brewers, archival resources and practices, and possibly raw materials. This raises questions on the rôle of the *Egipar* as an institution in Babylonia. In the Sealand I *Egipar*, the economical component was obviously important.
6.3.4.3 Malt

Several Sealand I receipts and delivery records are concerned with malt (MUNU₅), also with barley for malt (šE ana MUNUs). As discussed above, malt was produced by maltsters, delivered to the palace and received by brewers. We find once in CUSAS 9, 188 a direct reference to the process of malting, that is, to one step of the process: the quelling caused by germination which follows steeping. The verb used to describe this step is rabû D : "aufgehen lassen" (Stol 1987-1990: 324), therefore "to let grow, quell". Since it appears in the context of a delivery of barley to a maltster in the phrase šE (...) ana MUNUs ru-ub-bê-e, the intended meaning is probably simply "barley for malting"⁵⁷⁹.

Malt is also delivered once to the palace as fodder for horses (CUSAS 9, 203). Residues of the malt production, the malt rootlets and the draff (or spent grain) are considered good animal fodder (Stol 1971: 169-170); this may have been what was delivered here.

6.3.4.4 Beer

A few types of beer are attested in the Sealand I records. Beer was almost always delivered to the palace and quantities are always given in numbers of jars (piḫu). The phrase following the number of jars is written (KAS) piḫu (ḪI.A)⁵⁸⁰ and is sometimes followed by a a specific variety of beer. This type of jar is widely attested in the Old Babylonian period⁵⁸¹.

⁵⁷⁹ Dalley translated the passage "for increasing malt" and suggested that it was to stimulate fermentation (2009: text 188 n.1).

⁵⁸⁰ The use of PI is rather typical of southern Babylonian use (Goetze 1945: 146). In this archive PI is the usual orthography for /piḫu/.

⁵⁸¹ Its capacity was sometimes two sūtu but could be different (CAD P, s.v. piḫu a). See also Van De Mieroop 1994: 338 for a discussion on the capacity and the value of the piḫu-jar as standard measure for beer. The statement of quantities and beer types (there are one or two types of beer per record) is always followed by mah-ru-(ū)-tum. As noted by Dalley, the term does not seem to apply to the type of beer (2009: 142 n.2) since it appears only once even if more than one type of beer is listed, always at the end. It may apply to the jars.
6.3.4.4.1 KAŠ : beer

Jars of beer without any other specification of its type were often delivered. Besides being present in several delivery records (for instance CUSAS 9, 247-254), it figures also in letter CUSAS 9, 4 in which goods sent to a high official are listed. It also appears as food offering to the gods (for instance CUSAS 9, 63; 65), as gift of the king, or as payment to individuals, always along other foodstuffs (for instance CUSAS 9, 103; 112; 114; 138).

The term is usually considered generic for all types of beer, when no specification was required (Röllig 1970: 28). While this explanation seems easily tenable, for instance in the specific context of cultic offerings in which the type and quality of beer was implicitly known by all interested parties, it is more surprising to find it often in delivery records. It may have come to designate a particularly common type of beer. It is never found along another specific type of beer.

6.3.4.4.2 marsānu-beer

This term does not belong to the usual Mesopotamian beer names; it is written mar-sa-(a)-nu on the line following the statement of quantity and (KAŠ) pi/piḫu (ḪI.A)582. As noted by Dalley, it is attested once in a Middle Babylonian text (Dalley 2009: text 255 n.2; Sassmannshausen 2001: text 302: III 10). Sassmannshausen suggested that the name referred to a type of container known from Old Akkadian and Middle Assyrian texts (ibid.: notes). Dalley’s explanation that the word derives from marāsu : "to stir into a liquid", seems more plausible. I would suggest that it may refer more specifically to a type of beer 583 in which malt mash (SUN : nartabum) has been stirred into. Indeed, the verbal adjective marsu is equated in tablet XXIII of URš-ra = ḫubullu with SUN.ŠU.AKA.A (AHw marsu; Hartmann and Oppenheim 1950: 24 Col.III 24; 50 n.75). We could

582 There is one instance, probably an error of the scribe, in which we have the syntax "Qty mar-sa-nu / mar-sa- nu" (CUSAS 9, 308: 3-4).

583 The fact that it is attested not only in the phrase "Qty pi/piḫu.(ḪI.A) mar-sa-(a)-nu", the most common orthography in this archive, but also with the specific KAŠ before piḫu (CUSAS 9, 300; 295?) excludes that a type a malt mash was delivered.
also simply be dealing with a "stirred beer", perhaps as opposed to strained(?) beer (našpu-beer). They are indeed often delivered together, for instance in CUSAS 9, 255-257; 264 (see also Section 6.3.4.4.3), but it could also be delivered alone (for instance CUSAS 9, 264; 296).

6.3.4.4.3 našpu-beer

Another type of beer found in the archive is the našpu-beer\(^{584}\); the word is written na-aš-pu on the line following the statement of quantity and (KAŠ) pi/pi-ḫu (ḪI.A). The term is known to apply to various types of beer and beer ingredients (CAD N, s.v. našpu) but the meaning is not immediately apparent. Powell discussed various possibilities (1994: 105-106) and prudently suggested a meaning related to a light colour of the beer, perhaps "golden". The verb našāpu means "to blow away, winnow"\(^{585}\) and it has been suggested that, for beer, the meaning would be "von Rückständen gereinigt" (Röllig 1970: 37), which therefore would probably equate with "strained beer"(?). If this is correct, this could indeed be the opposite of the marsānu-beer (stirred? beer). It is indeed often delivered alongside marsānu-beer, but also features alone in a few delivery records (for instance CUSAS 9, 262; 307).

6.3.4.4.4 Beer for the meal

In only two delivery records (CUSAS 9, 298; 301), dated two days apart, we find a delivery of a quantity of pi-ḫu.(ḪI.A) KIN.SIG\(^{586}\). It is not clear whether the intended purpose for the beer, its type, or both, is implied. In both texts, this delivery was not the only one for that day, there was another delivery, either of (unspecified) beer, or of marsānu- and našpu-beer. The expression is reminiscent of the "flour for the meal" (see Section 6.3.2.2.3).

\(^{584}\) Translated "sweet beer" by Dalley.

\(^{585}\) With that meaning, it could only refer to a treatment of the grain used in the preparation of the beer, as suggested by Powell 1994: 105.

\(^{586}\) In CUSAS 9, 298, it is followed by an obscure phrase (line 3) which I believe to be equivalent to CUSAS 9, 299: 3 but it is read differently by Dalley; she transliterates a-na? ša ki-\(^1\)te?-e\(^1\) and suggests the translation "for the one of the flax(?)." However, collation from the photograph shows that the beginning of the line could be read either ŠA KAŠ ša ki-... or ŠA-ši ša ki-... Since CUSAS 9, 299 has on line 3: ŠA-šu ša ki?..., the latter transliteration must be correct, therefore "from among...". The remainder of the line remains obscure.
6.3.4.5 KAŠ.SIG₅ : fine beer(?)

This type of beer, otherwise so well attested in Mesopotamia, may appear once in this archive, in a small ledger of outgoing (beer?) jars. The header is damaged and only the sign SIG₅ is partially visible. Since it would be the only occurrence in the corpus, the reconstruction should be considered very uncertain.587

6.3.5 Oil production and transformation

6.3.5.1 i.GIŠ : sesame(?) oil

We have no direct information on oil pressing. A few records suggest that oil was not produced by the palace itself but its production may have been commissioned by it. Sesame588 appears along sesame oil (i.GIŠ) in one text (CUSAS 9, 121): this tablet records that sesame seeds were given by the king, apparently to one Narbu who is named on the following line, and that oil was delivered589 to the palace590. The fact that both outgoing sesame and incoming oil were recorded together by the palace administration suggests that sesame oil was pressed on behalf of the palace and that this individual was (or acted for) an oil-presser. The quantities involved are

587 The document is peculiar in other respects: it is the only ZI.GA record in the whole beer archive and one of very few among the Sealand I documents; the quantities recorded are higher than in other beer delivery records; finally, it refers to the "quay of Dūr-Ninurta", a town known from a letter (CUSAS 9, 14) but never otherwise mentioned in the context of beer production. The offering record CUSAS 9, 76 may feature two other types of beer, of uncertain reading (lines 3-4).

588 See Section 6.2.1.3.1 for the discussion on the identification of ŠE.GIŠ.i. In addition, see Stol 2003-2005: 33 for the identification of I.GIŠ with sesame oil in most contexts in Mesopotamia.

589 There is no verb but the phrase ana E.GAL and the presence of GUR officials, very often found in combination with deliveries to the palace in this archive, makes it almost certain that the oil was indeed delivered to the palace.

590 The obscure line following Narbu, probably qualifying him, does not help us understand the transaction. Dalley reads it ša nar un ḫi (2009: text 121: 4). Based on the photograph, I would suggest that NAR could be in fact GAL although Dalley’s comment that the signs are clear (2009: text 121 n.4) certainly speaks against it. But if my suggestion is correct, we could have here a GAL.UN official. If the ḫi is an abbreviated plural(?), we would have "Narbu of the GAL.UN officials"(?). This would be surprisingly late evidence for this office since these officials are not attested after the Ur III period, unless we equate him with the mu’erru, as does Selz (1989: 85 Anm.); for an opposite opinion, see Bauer 1989-1990: 81-82.
modest (5 sūtu of sesame seeds and 1 sūtu of oil) but by no means unheard of\textsuperscript{591}. It remains unclear what exactly the sesame seeds represented in the transaction. If they were the raw material — the seeds that had been pressed, the ratio "sesame seeds : oil" of 5:1 corresponds indeed to those known from the third millennium (Waetzoldt 1985: 81) for sesame oil extraction. But this would be hard to reconcile with the fact that the sesame is qualified as "NIG.BA of the king". The meaning here may not be best conveyed by the term "gift" chosen by Dalley; "honorarium, compensation" would probably be more adequate (CAD Q, s.v. qīštu 3a). It may thus have been that the palace supplied sesame, presumably as raw material and salary to oil pressers. If we accept that the palace paid oil pressers in sesame seeds, it follows that (at least some) oil pressers were independent from the palace and made business with other customers; this would tally with the fact that they are not attested in ration lists.

Common sesame oil appears only a few times in this archive and we know that it was sometimes measured by the bronze sūtu (CUSAS 9, 90; 120)\textsuperscript{592}. We find it at least twice delivered to the palace (CUSAS 9, 120; 121), in which transaction at least one official, a GīR, was involved\textsuperscript{593}. One of the GīR officials present in delivery record CUSAS 9, 121, namely Arad-Amurru, also acts in the same function in two expenditure records involving sesame oil: CUSAS 9, 128 and 143. It appears thus that the GīR function for oil included responsibility in its reception at the palace and its expenditure. It was not given as offering to deities\textsuperscript{594}, who received only scented (or fine) oil, but it was handed out as supplies to individuals (CUSAS 9, 90; 128; possibly 150).

\textsuperscript{591} In a late Old Babylonian contract from Dilbat (YOS 13,444), 5 sūtu of sesame seeds were given for pressing for which ten days were allotted. For comparison, 10 kurrū are given for oil pressing in another late Old Babylonian contract CT8,36c discussed in Pientka 1998: 221 and Stol 2004: 942.

\textsuperscript{592} The term sūtu is implied (only ZABAR is written). The bronze sūtu was also used once for barley in the context of malting, although its occurrence there is exceptional (CUSAS 9, 200).

\textsuperscript{593} One of them was a barber in CUSAS 9, 120: īr-ia-ū šu. The name is probably to be understood as: Ardijū (Zadok 2014: 229).

\textsuperscript{594} It may be used in a ritual related to a journey of the king (CUSAS 9, 101: 6); however, it is followed in the record of expenditure by cedar pieces, possibly to perfume the oil.
6.3.5.2 1.DUG.GA : scented oil

Scented oil\textsuperscript{595}, 1.DUG.GA, used in offerings to the gods, may have been produced for the palace by perfumers. We find it delivered twice (CUSAS 9, 94\textsuperscript{596}, 107) and in one case there is a possible mention of perfumers: MU.DU / ra-qi-i? (CUSAS 9, 107: 3-4). There is also one mention by name of a perfumer, one Ilänutum, whose profession is written logographically 1.RÁ.RÁ in a list of craftsmen (CUSAS 9, 381: 11’), which suggests some form of employment by the palace. In this document he is the only one of his profession and he is listed with the physicians, which agrees with the association of herbalists with physicians in the Mesopotamian tradition (Middeke-Conlin 2014: 16).

In what relationship exactly the perfumers stood to the palace is unclear but one text suggests that the palace supplied them with the ingredients they needed to prepare the scented oil: CUSAS 9, 143. It records a quantity of oil and one of cedar resin for the anointing of doors, probably as an expenditure, and may therefore list the raw materials needed by a perfumer. The text also seems to indicate that common sesame oil 1.GIŠ was used to make scented oil. The evidence it thin\textsuperscript{597} but since sesame oil can be of very fine quality (Stol 1985a: 120) and is adequate as "a vehicle for fragrances" (Middeke-Conlin 2014: 11), there is no reason to assume that the 1.DUG.GA in the Sealand I texts used another oil as base\textsuperscript{598} It would agree with Ur III evidence (Brunke and Sallaberger 2010: 52).

Scented oil features only four times in the archive and the quantity is never given in standard measures of capacity, always in specific containers, namely: pîlu(?) : limestone jar(?)\textsuperscript{599} in

\textsuperscript{595} Middeke-Conlin pleads for 1.DUG.GA as designating processed or worked oil, therefore perfumed, whereas 1.SAG would indicate the quality (2014: 13; see also his review of other opinions on p.12 n.49). Brunke and Sallaberger also consider 1.(GIŠ) DUG.GA to be scented oil (2010: 52-54).

\textsuperscript{596} Here Dalley transliterated erroneously DUG₄.

\textsuperscript{597} As noted above, we also find sesame oil and crushed cedar listed together in CUSAS 9, 101: 6-7 although, because this document includes more goods, the context is less clear.

\textsuperscript{598} Middeke-Conlin in fact entirely excludes linseed oil in perfume production in Mesopotamia (2014: 12).

\textsuperscript{599} CAD P, s.v. pîlu d.
CUSAS 9, 65; dug(?): jar in CUSAS 9, 94; and dugnamardu : namardu-measuring vessel\textsuperscript{600} in CUSAS 9, 107. In CUSAS 9, 68, it is not clear from the syntax whether the scented oil, to be poured with the mersu-dish, is also measured in a dugBUR.ZI.GAL : large pursitu-bowl with the mersu-dish or whether there is no quantity specified for it.

6.3.6 Transformation of other resources

We have limited information on the transformation of other resources by the palace. The large number of delivery records for animal carcasses strongly suggests that they were processed by the palace. The gir function for these deliveries being almost always fulfilled by the cooks\textsuperscript{601}, it appears likely that this professional group was responsible for the processing of the incoming carcasses. The association of the cooks (MH\textsuperscript{ADD}IM.M\textsuperscript{ES}) with the Egirmaḫ – possibly functioning as a service within the palace, and the fact that the Egirmaḫ also received livestock and flour, have already been touched upon in Section 6.3.3. Therefore, it is possible that the animal carcasses were processed by a sub-division of that same service.

We know that leather-workers were employed by the palace, from a record in which two such workers received barley as wages (CUSAS 9, 378: 16-17) and from miksu-ledgers which show that they could be attributed such fields by the palace (CUSAS 9, 410: 11; 443: 16; 448: 16). We also find a leather-worker probably receiving ghee as ration (CUSAS 9, 72: 5). Given the large number of animal carcasses processed by the palace, there is no surprise in its employing leather-workers to take care of the hides.

There is no direct information on textile weaving or garment making in the extant documents. Wool was sometimes delivered to the palace by shepherds (alongside sheep), we also find a few mentions of garments, probably in expenditure records, but we have no textual basis to relate

\textsuperscript{600} CAD N, s.v. namaddu A.

\textsuperscript{601} See Section 6.2.2.2.
directly these elements of information to one another\textsuperscript{602}. However, we know from ḫargalû-lists that clothiers were employed by the palace (CUSAS 9, 371: 5 & 11; 377: 19).

Reed-workers were employed by the palace\textsuperscript{603}. We find one probably receiving raw material to manufacture objects (CUSAS 9, 452). They apparently received ḫargalû-rations (CUSAS 9, 376: rev. 29’) and may have been endowed with fields, on which they had to pay the miksu (CUSAS 9, 410: 23).

Several minas of copper are recorded as having been given to and received by a smith\textsuperscript{604}, certainly for transformation\textsuperscript{605}. That the palace employed smiths is shown by their presence in one ḫargalû-list (CUSAS 9, 371: 42) and in the list of professions (CUSAS 3, 381: 2 ff.).

### 6.4 Expenditures

The goods acquired, stored, and sometimes transformed by the palace were used and expended for external and internal purposes. The palace sponsored several cults and temples; the records pertaining to these expenditures are discussed in detail in Chapter 5. The palace gave emoluments, probably both to external workers and palace-dependents, in providing barley allotments as salary (ŠE.BA, ŠE.ŠUKU) or wages for hired work (idu)\textsuperscript{606}. It also gave out work materials, travel provisions, gifts, and other supplies to various individuals, including messengers, some of whom were apparently on diplomatic missions.

\textsuperscript{602} One LÚ.TÚ.G.KAL.KAL.LA : stitcher figures in the list of professions CUSAS 9, 381: rev.12’.

\textsuperscript{603} See Section 6.2.1.4 for a discussion on the procurement of reed by the palace.

\textsuperscript{604} The smith was apparently attached to an institution whose name is partly damaged and difficult to read (line 3). It seems to end with ŠE.NA₄: "house of stone". Dalley suggests that this was the smith’s workshop.

\textsuperscript{605} In addition, one expenditure of silver by the palace may have been for transformation by a jeweller since it was given to the daughter of a jeweller but the record does not give any specific reason or purpose for the transaction (CUSAS 9, 453). The quantity is very small.

\textsuperscript{606} I adhere to Steinkeller’s proposition to translate ŠE.BA as barley allotment instead of the widely used ration since the latter conveys the notion of purely alimentary sustenance, while it was rather a regular salary (2015: 26-30). Some individuals who were in the employment of the palace were probably assigned a miksu-field of whose produce they could keep two thirds. See Boivin 2016b.
The main types of expenditures that we can identify in the archive are: the mēreštu-requested supplies(?), the isihtu-allotment(?), the aširtu-pious gift(?), the NIG.BA of the king, ritual offerings, and barley allotments (ŠE.BA, ŠE.ŠUKU, and distribution of ḫargalû-grain). In several cases, the document does not state what type of expenditure is recorded, only what goods were handed out. The attestations are grouped in Table 18 according to the type of expenditure, not the book-keeping key word pertaining to the transaction (ŠU.T.I.A, etc.). The table does not include the records of grain given for milling or brewing, already discussed in Sections 6.3.2 and 6.3.4. Also, since the present section deals only with records of expenditures, the table does not include the numerous animals recorded as delivered to the palace and identified as destined for extispicy or offerings: this diminishes drastically the apparent relative importance of the divinatory and ritual portions in the goods going out of the palace.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of expenditure</th>
<th>Texts CUSAS 9,...</th>
<th>Number of occurrences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mēreštu-requested supplies(?)</td>
<td>74; 87; 90; 99; 105; 110; 113; 116; 118; 128; 133; 138; 437</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>īslītu-allotment</td>
<td>65; 73; 75; 99; 101; 109; 110</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ašīrūt-pious gift(?)</td>
<td>88; 95; 96</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NīG.BA of the king</td>
<td>102; 106; 117; 119; 121; 123; 129; 134; 136; 138; 139; 457</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ŠE.BA-allotment</td>
<td>386-388; 431</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ŠE.ŠUKU-allotment</td>
<td>127; 379-380; 383</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ḫargalū (allotment ?)</td>
<td>368A; 369; 371; 373?; 374-377</td>
<td>7 or 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barley given as wages</td>
<td>149; 378</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allotments to workers (?)</td>
<td>389-394; 408; 412; 423</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>šīdītu-travel rations</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other expenditures of foodstuffs and others to individuals</td>
<td>89; 93; 97?; 98; 103-104; 108; 112; 114-115; 122; 125; 130; 135; 137; 138; 140; 144-145; 147?; 455-456; 459-460</td>
<td>22 to 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZL.GA expenditures</td>
<td>77; 269; 414; 417</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other sacrificial and ritual expenditures</td>
<td>59-71; 76; 79; 82-84; 86; 100; 124; 132</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other divinatory expenditures</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undetermined</td>
<td>72; 407; 438-440; 451</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 18: Types of expenditures**

When recipients of palace expenditures were individuals, their profession was sometimes recorded. Several of these professions are also known from a fragmentary list of professionals (CUSAS 9, 381). When one compares these documents, correlations appear that show some principles of remuneration put in place by the palace administration for its workforce. The payment of the *miku* must also be included in this analysis since it was, in all likelihood, related to the provision of a field as an emolument by the palace. The relationship between the profession and the types of supplies and emoluments given by the palace is presented in Tables...
19a and b⁶⁰⁷; the tables include only cases in which the profession was explicitly stated in the records. Most recipients of palace expenditures are identified only by name, but in order to avoid any mistakes due to homonymy, no speculations based on prosopography have been attempted.

⁶⁰⁷ In some cases, it is in fact possible to trace the same individuals in the list of professionals and as recipients of various allocations, but with an incomplete archive and fragmentary texts, establishing correlations at the individual level would be too stringent a method. Proceeding at the profession level allows for general principles to emerge. Admittedly, these results are obtained at the detriment of more specific rules: for instance, if some workers of a certain profession were entirely attached to the palace, while others of the same profession worked for it only in an ad hoc fashion, the present analysis does not discriminate between their probably differing types of remuneration.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Profession</th>
<th>List of professions</th>
<th>ḫargalû allotment</th>
<th>barley as wages</th>
<th>mīksu field</th>
<th>merēštu supplies</th>
<th>Nīg.BA gift? of the king</th>
<th>other food-stuffs</th>
<th>other supplies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NAGAR</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>NÍG.BA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KÜ.DIM</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>NÍG.BA</td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URUDU NAGAR, SIMUG</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AD.KID</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AŠGAB</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIPA</td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LÚ.TÚG(KAL., KAL.LA)</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.ZU</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ša rēši</td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NU,šāKIRI₆</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ī.DU₈, LÚ.KÁ.GAL</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUḪALDIM</td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MĀŠ.ŠU.GÍD .GÍD</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ŠU.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAR</td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SANGA</td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tableau 19a: Palace remuneration, by profession (part a)
Tableau 19b: Palace remuneration, by profession (part b)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Profession</th>
<th>ŠE.BA</th>
<th>ŠE.ŠUKU-at/tum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENGAR,  ikkaru</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUR. GUL</td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEŠTIN? NAmeš</td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ÉRINmeš</td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to the available expenditure records, the types of remuneration which found the widest use in the Sealand I palace administration were the allotment of miksu-fields and the distribution of ḫargalû-grain, often in conjunction. Many of the professional groups receiving these emoluments were included in the list of professionals CUSAS 9, 381. This list may have been used by the palace administration as a register of the current palace personnel.

6.4.1 Grain allotments and other food allocations

A few texts document the handing out of cereals by the palace as "rations" to a large number of individuals. We know from seven or eight texts that ḫargalû-grain : ŠE ḫargalû was handed out; no other term specifies what type of allocation this represented. The lists recording the distribution of ḫargalû-grain are fairly long, one of them containing well over sixty names. The occupation of the recipient is sometimes mentioned and Table 19a shows that members of many different professions were entitled to this allocation. The texts are often undated but, based on the few that are, we find that ḫargalû distributions took place at different periods of the year (at least in the months ii, iii, and vii). The period for which the grain was distributed is never specified. The quantities vary greatly. In two records, they are fixed at 1 sūtu per recipient (CUSAS 9, 368A; 371), in the other cases they vary from 1 qû to 9 qû or 1 sūtu, depending on the

---

608 Some individuals could be traced, for instance: the carpenter Iddin-ilu who receives a ḫargalû-ration in year K (CUSAS 9, 371: 34) is probably the same who was already registered as a carpenter in year I in the list CUSAS 9, 381: rev. 21°.

609 These dates correspond respectively to the texts CUSAS 9, 369; 368A; 371.
The great variation between the quantities allotted is puzzling; apparently it did not follow the type of profession. A very small quantity of one or very few qû could be a day ration, but several qû must be for a longer period, unless the allocation covered the needs of family dependents of the recipient.

A few expenditure texts record the handing out of other, more familiar types of allocation, namely the ŠE.BA and the ŠE.ŠUKU-at/tum. The evidence is fairly thin, with a mere four texts for each of them, but it appears that these grain allotments were distributed to people who did not receive ḫargalû-grain or a miksu-field. The ŠE.BA was handed out to agricultural workers in the months vi and vii, also to groups of workers (ešertu) at an undetermined time of the year. In such lists, the number recipients varies from two to ten. Twice the records specify that the quantities handed out were for the month. On a given record, each recipient receives the same quantity but from record to record, there are great variations from 2 sūtu to over one kurru. Which type of kurru was used is unclear, which makes a study of the quantities allotted impossible. The ŠE.ŠUKU was allotted to a few people, including one seal cutter (BUR.GUL).

---

610 These numbers show that the regular sūtu containing 10 qû was used for ḫargalû-distributions.

611 We find for instance shepherds receiving 1 qû, 2 qû and 5 qû in the same document (CUSAS 9, 377: 2; 3; 14).

612 In texts CUSAS 9, 386; 387; 388; 431. Text CUSAS 9, 389 is very similar and could also be a ŠE.BA record but it has no header specifying what was handed out.

613 In texts CUSAS 9, 127; 379; 380; 383 (this text also contains the term ŠUKU-tum/tî) at the bottom of the šibšu-ledgers CUSAS 9, 426; 432; 434. It could mean that this grain was intended for rations.

614 CUSAS 9, 386 & 431.

615 CUSAS 9, 387 & 388.

616 CUSAS 9, 387 & 381.

617 If the same standards were used for the ŠE.BA and the ŠE.ŠUKU, the sūtu contained at least 8 qû since such a quantity is recorded in CUSAS 9, 383. None of the quantities recorded give us a definite indication of the number of pānu per kurru. The fact that as much as 1.1.4.0 was recorded in CUSAS 9, 387 per individual for one month, seems to suggest that a small kurru was used (Powell 1987-1990: 498) although even with a kurru as small as 120 qû, the ration appears surprisingly large in comparison to the usual quantities for men, which are between 60 and 90, rarely going above 100 qû in the second millennium, and not higher in other periods (Stol 2006-2008: 266-267).

618 Only one individual in texts CUSAS 9, 127 & 379 and six in CUSAS 9, 380 & 383.

619 CUSAS 9, 127
workers or troops (ÉRINₘₑₛ)⁶²⁰ and perhaps innkeepers(?).⁶²¹ The texts are fully dated and cover the months iv, v, and vi. The allocation could be given for a determined period of time (between 25 days and 3 months). The quantities varied greatly and these variations cannot be explained only with the differing periods of time for which the allocation was given.⁶²² Dalley considers that ŠE.ŠUKU was used for specific tasks (Dalley 2009: text 380 notes); this seems to agree with the fact that the seal cutter received it for a very specific period of 25 days in CUSAS 9, 127. The rest of the evidence is unspecific and no clear principles governing the frequency and the volume of the distribution can be adduced from it.⁶²³

6.4.2 The mēreštu: requested supplies(?)

The term mēreštu can mean "wish, request", also "supplies (for consignment)" (CAD M, s.v. mēreštu). The notion of request appears to correspond best to the Sealand I evidence, more specifically the request for foodstuffs addressed to the palace by beneficiaries.⁶²⁴ In these documents, the term applies indeed to various foodstuffs, most often barley. These supplies could be handed out to deities but most recipients were individuals whose profession is specified in the

---

⁶²⁰ CUSAS 9, 380 & 383; in the former text, they are organized as a "group of ten" (ešertu), although only six individuals are listed.

⁶²¹ CUSAS 9, 383: 1. The reading of the sign GEŠIN is considered certain by Dalley (2009). Collation from the photograph is extremely difficult.

⁶²² The quantity of ŠE.ŠUKU and of ŠE.BA allotted to workers organized in an ešertu could be the same, namely 2 sūtu as shown by CUSAS 9, 380 & 388.

⁶²³ Waetzoldt posited that ŠE.BA applied to "allotments issued to all personnel who were permanently attached to, or employed by the state or temple establishments", regardless of their status (1987: 119). For the early Old Babylonian period, in northern Babylonia, ŠE.SUKU has been considered "more collective" than ŠE.BA (Goddeeris 2002: 206).

⁶²⁴ The term may indeed have had the specific meaning of a request put to the palace, as opposed to an acquisition request by the palace (the erištu attested in CUSAS 9, 91).
records (jeweller⁶²⁵, singer⁶²⁶, cook⁶²⁷, gate-keeper⁶²⁸, scribe⁶²⁹). This strongly suggests that it is the profession exercised by these individuals which put them in a position to request and receive these goods from the palace. Table 19a shows that these professionals also received fields on which they had to pay the mikṣu⁶³⁰, some of them received also ẖargalû-grain⁶³¹ and other rations⁶³²; whether the term applied to extra-ordinary allocations is unclear.

Exceptionally the goods were recorded as received by the beneficiary (CUSAS 9, 116; 128), otherwise there is no transaction keyword. A GilR official is sometimes named⁶³³. The term mēreštu was compatible with isîhtu: they co-occur in two records (CUSAS 9, 99; 110)⁶³⁴. It was also probably compatible with aširtu: CUSAS 9, 87 records a mēreštu-expenditure for singers who sang at the palace gate and this record is very similar to the aširtu-expenditure records, even the quantity given to the musicians is the same (see Section 6.4.4); they may have been more or less interchangeable in that context.

6.4.3 The isîhtu-allotment(?)

The term isîhtu, derived from esēhum "to allot, assign", applies to tasks, personnel, fields, also to wages (CAD I/J, s.v. isîhtu 1). As observed by Stol (2001: 462), it usually means field allotment,

⁶²⁵ CUSAS 9, 105; in one case the mēreštu-supplies were probably given to the sons of a jeweller (CUSAS 9, 138: 8-9).

⁶²⁶ CUSAS 9, 87. This expenditure is very similar to the aširtu, discussed in 6.4.4.

⁶²⁷ CUSAS 9, 118; 437: 6.

⁶²⁸ CUSAS 9, 116.

⁶²⁹ CUSAS 9, 133.

⁶³⁰ CUSAS 9, 384: 10; 413: 58 and 62; 443: 9 and 31; 448: 21.

⁶³¹ Gate-keepers: CUSAS 9, 371: 30; 374: rev. 22’; 377: 6; cooks: CUSAS 9, 374: rev. 3’.

⁶³² Cooks: CUSAS 9, 393:16; perhaps also 394: 2 and 112.

⁶³³ Interestingly, this official is present always and only in texts post-dating the middle of year L (CUSAS 9, 74; 118; 128; 133; 138). However, with thirteen texts, the sample is too small to establish that a new procedure had been put in place. Dalley saw a GilR in the record CUSAS 9, 87: 3, but this title at the end of a line would be very unusual. The sign is probably to be read lum: ʾu i-bi-DINGIR-lum.

⁶³⁴ See Section 6.4.3.
task assignment, or the like. He concurs with Durand’s comment based on evidence from Mari, that an agreement between the palace and a worker concerning a task is implied and he considers this explanation still valid when the term is applied to fields and barley since "the beneficiaries have agreed to work the field for the state" (ibid.). This notion of contract or agreement is not apparent in the Sealand I documents. In them, the *isiḫtu* appears to simply mean an allotment of supplies, always foodstuffs. The reasons underlying the handing out of an *isiḫtu* are varied: a journey of the king, *mēreštu*-requested supplies(?) for individuals or deities, and other types of offerings to deities. The term *isiḫtu* is always in the bound form in this archive: *isiḫtu* of the night meal, of the sacrifice, of (a given day), of (a given) town. I would suggest that the meaning here is "allotment (of foodstuffs)"

6.4.4 The *aširtu* : pious gift(?)

This type of expenditure occurs only three times in the archive, always with singers as the beneficiaries and apparently in direct relation to a specific performance. The *aširtu*-expenditure consisted of barley, once with the addition of dates (CUSAS 9, 88). The quantity of barley is always one *kurru* per day of performance. The texts CUSAS 9, 95 and 96 show that such performances and expenditures could take place frequently since, taken together, they record expenditures for performances on the 27.vi, 7.vii, 8.vii, and 9.vii of the same year. A *Gîr* was involved in all cases. It is difficult to determine whether the barley given was intended as compensation for the pious performance or was used by the singers as offering during their performance. We do not know the number of singers involved, which makes it impossible to

635 CUSAS 9, 88; 95; 96.
636 "At the palace gate" : *i-na KÂ É.GAL* in CUSAS 9, 88: 3 and 95: 3.
637 In CUSAS 9, 96 which records an expenditure for three successive days of performance, three *kurrā* are handed out. The barley is always measured by the *BÂN 6 2/3*, which shows that a *sātu* divergent from the standard 10 *qû* was occasionally used. Powell noted that more variations appeared after ~1600 (Powell 1987-1990: 500).
638 In addition, CUSAS 9, 87 records a *mēreštu* of the same quantity of barley to singers who performed at the gate of the palace. It shows that the *aširtu* and the *mēreštu* were compatible. This text also documents one more performance by the singers in the same period of the year, since it is dated to 27.vii.E.
639 The records are all cast from the point of view of the administration with the key word *nadin* although one adds the reception by the beneficiary with the key word *maḫir* (CUSAS 9, 96).
estimate individual quantities. Singers apparently received food allocations from the palace (CUSAS 9, 114; 115), although they do not appear in any text explicitly recording rations.

6.4.5 The NIG.BA of the king

NIG.BA⁶⁴⁰ of the king appears several times in this archive. The goods thus handed out are varied: barley and sesame are the most common ones but we find also other foodstuffs, wool, and perhaps bronze tables. The beneficiaries are almost always individuals, including a jeweller, also sons of a jeweller⁶⁴¹. One record suggests that the NIG.BA and the mēreštu may have been mutually exclusive: in CUSAS 9, 138, flour and beer are given to sons of a jeweller as a NIG.BA of the king while barley is given, presumably to the same individuals, as mēreštu. Sesame was handed out as NIG.BA to an individual who was probably an oil-presser; it could imply that the meaning of NIG.BA at least in this case is rather "compensation" (see Section 6.3.5.1). With only one exception⁶⁴², a GĪR was always involved in such an expenditure. Very often, the NIG.BA records were cast as receipts⁶⁴³. It seems that the term could also apply to a ritual context, since we find the king giving offerings recorded as NIG.BA for a ritual (CUSAS 9, 106: 1-5).

6.5 The palatial economy

The Sealand I palace appears in the CUSAS 9 archive as an active economic body that acquires, stores, and transforms goods on a scale much beyond its internal requirements. Neither can it be described only as an hypertrophied household, nor as a mere administrative centre: it functions as an important central provider for several cults taking place in at least a few temples.

⁶⁴⁰ Steinkeller demonstrated that in the Ur III period, the NIG.BA was an expenditure of the central state institutions that was directly authorized by the government. It could be credited to a province toward its BALA obligation. He translates it as "king's allotment" (2013a: 384; 415-419).

⁶⁴¹ CUSAS 9, 457; 138: 1-5.

⁶⁴² CUSAS 9, 123.

⁶⁴³ There are seven instances: five times with the key word mahir (CUSAS 9, 119; 129; 134; 136; 139) and two with the key word ŠU.TI.A (CUSAS 9, 106; 123).
The documents available to us allow us to reconstruct certain elements of this economic body. It appears that a large sub-group of the tablets came from what we could call a "Beer bureau", another large subgroup came from a "Bureau of Livestock & Carcasses". The Egirmah seems to have functioned as a palace-internal service responsible for transforming foodstuffs (animal and non-animal), as well a processing carcasses; the Egipar may have served as a palatial brewery. Less clearly visible in the record, but probable, a "Bureau of grain and other agricultural products" – perhaps attached to the palace granary, presumably administered the procurement, storage, and expenditure of agricultural produce. Other segments of the palatial administration are not well represented in the records and it is not always clear whether certain economic activities took place within or without the palace economy. Figure 5 summarizes the functional information adduced from the archive and schematizes the flow of goods entering and leaving the palace and between the services belonging to the economic ecosystem of the palace.

644 That these two sub-groups of texts were produced by separate bureaus is not only visible in the fact that different persons and objects of accounting were involved, as well as in some peculiarities of their respective formularies, one notes also differences in the sealing habits: the seal impression on delivery records of livestock and animal carcasses is usually on the obverse and the reverse of the tablet with the seal inscription running parallel to the text, and the emphasis seems to have been put on imprinting the entire inscription, less so the iconographic portion; in contrast, beer records, when sealed, usually bear the seal impression on the top edge, and often only the iconographic part of it; when the inscription was imprinted, it runs perpendicularly to the tablet's text and only the middle part of it is visible; when the seal impression is on the obverse or the reverse of the tablet, its orientation seems quite free (for instance upside-down).
Figure 5: The Sealand I palace as an economic body
This centralized management of resources, to a large extent non-luxury resources\textsuperscript{645}, by the palace clearly occurs partly on behalf of temples; the Sealand I palace seems in fact to act in their stead as an economic unit of production and transformation. This strongly suggests that the temples as economic institutions were largely absent or dysfunctional in that location (at or near Kār-Šamaš) when the Sealand I rulers established this palace administration. It may have been a new foundation, but it may also very well have been the result of southern clergies having fled northwards, a phenomenon which probably affected a number of large southern centres (Pientka 1998: 179-196). Without functioning organizations and economic networks of their own, the temples were integrated by the royal administration into its own economic system; this is also visible in the fact that the palace provided for priests, for instance in giving them \textit{miksu}-fields\textsuperscript{646}. This integration was probably an efficient means of getting the official cult up and running quickly. In this way, the output of various workers and of other palace-controlled institutions, or institutions partly integrated in the palace economy like the \textit{nupāru}, could be used not only to meet the palace's and state needs but also the requirements of temples.

The economic purview of the archive is too limited to venture on further-reaching considerations on the rôle of the palace, for instance on its overall importance in the state economy\textsuperscript{647}.

\textsuperscript{645} In his review of palace archives, Sallaberger concluded that the management of luxury goods was the main characteristic of Babylonian palace economy (2013: 225; 244).

\textsuperscript{646} See Table 19a.

\textsuperscript{647} There is not enough evidence to warrant a parallel with the centralization effected by the palace at Larsa during Rîm-Sîn I's reign, as observed by Van de Mieroop (1993: 62-64).
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Appendix 1
BKL A and Babylon I - Sealand I synchronism

In order to assess the trustworthiness of the figures given in BKL A, we need to determine whether they are compatible with known synchronisms involving the Sealand I rulers. Starting from the first incontrovertible attestation of the rule of Ilī-ма-АН, namely documents from Nippur dated to what appears to be his first year, we can examine the relative chronology of the Sealand I and the Babylon I dynasties.

Ilī 1 = Si 29?

The first synchronism is putative and cannot be established with exactitude; the first uncertainty arises from the exact position of the Ilī-an-АН texts in the documentary sequence at Nippur, the second from that of the year 1 of Ilī-ма-АН at Nippur within the reckoning of BKL A. To the former point, given the overall distribution of textual evidence from that city, the year Ilī 1 can be equated at the earliest with Si 29, the year in which the last document bearing a date formula of Samsu-iluna is attested (BE 6/2 64 dated to 20.ii.Si 29). Indeed, an examination of the Nippur texts dating to Samsu-iluna shows that, before Si 29, there is only one long interruption from vi.Si 8 to xii.Si 9, but since a few texts show that Rīm-Sîn II controlled Nippur at least from month iv until month x during his second year, which corresponds to Si 9, this interval in the textual record is too narrow to fit in the minimal period of control by Ilī-ма-АН. The only possible scenario remaining for Ilī-ма-АН’s rule over the city is therefore after the latest texts dating to Samsu-iluna.

648 There are four texts dated to Rīm-Sîn II, all with the year name b (Stol 1976: 57), respectively in the months iv, vii, viii, and x: OECT 8,14; ARN 124; ARN 125; OECT 8,19.

649 Text ARN131=Ni9285 bears a very fragmentary date formula which Kraus suggested may be Si 9, but the suggestion was rejected by Horsnell who considers it too uncertain (Horsnell 1999: vol.II 192 n.53).

650 Jacobsen, working with fewer texts than we have at our disposal today, had surmised that Ilī-ма-АН controlled Nippur during the year Si 9 (1939: 195 n.15). Thureau-Dangin then prudently suggested that Ilī-ма-АН may have joined Rīm-Sîn II’s rebellion (1951: 242). Shortly after, Landsberger introduced the idea that Ilī-ма-АН’s presence at Nippur probably occurred after the last texts dated to Samsu-iluna; he suggested his presence in the years Si 30 and 31 (1954: 68 n.174).
It was long thought that texts dating to Si 30 had been found at Nippur, following a comment by Oelsner (1974: 261); these five texts in the Hilprecht-Sammlung, soon to be published, date in fact to the non-specific formula $MU\ GIBIL\ 2-KAM-MA^{651}$. Since the year name Si 30 contains the expression $GIBIL\ 2-KAM-MA$, as a variant of $ÚS-SÁ\ (MU)\ ÚS-SÁ$, Leemans considered when discussing texts mainly from Lagaba that the formula $MU\ GIBIL\ 2-KAM-MA$, even without the king’s name, was an abbreviated form of it (1960b: 81 n.21)\textsuperscript{652}. The year name of the contentious Nippur texts qualifies for the same reasoning, which was probably what led Oelsner to his dating of these texts. But the term $GIBIL$ was also used in Ili-\textit{ma-AN}'s second year name at Nippur ($MU\ GIBIL\ MU\ ili-ma-AN\ LUGAL.E$). Therefore, the Nippur texts dated to the unspecific $MU\ GIBIL\ 2-KAM-MA$ could also be in fact from Ili-\textit{ma-AN}'s third year name, of which we have otherwise no attestation. Also, considering that the use of $GIBIL$ increased in year names of the latter part of the first dynasty of Babylon (Horsnell 1999: vol.II 222 n.153), and that Nippur was at some point under Babylon's control again (Section 4.3.1), we cannot exclude that a date formula of one of the later kings was implied. The possibilities are many and the matter remains unresolved. The current state of textual evidence gives us therefore Si 29 as a \textit{terminus post quem} for the reign of Ili-\textit{ma-AN}.

Prosopography shows that the date of the Ili-\textit{ma-AN} documents cannot be much later than Si 29. Indeed, examination of the Nippur texts shows that scribes and \textit{burguls} remained in place when control over the city went from Samsu-iluna to the Sealand I king\textsuperscript{653}. We find an additional indication of this in a family archive, which is also less liable to homonymy since it concerns two documents from the same family found in the same archaeological locus: SAOC 44 11 and 12. The former is dated to the 54th year of Rîm-Sîn I and records a division of temple offices between one Ubar-Ba’u and other individuals, the latter dates to Ili 1 and records an exchange of

\footnotesize

\textsuperscript{651} Personal communication of Ann Goddeeris who is editing the texts and kindly shared this information ahead of publication. The documents in question are HS 2223; HS 2163; HS 2164; HS 2178; HS 2370. She suggests a date in the second half of Rîm-Sîn I’s reign.

\textsuperscript{652} Horsnell follows Leemans (1999: vol.II 222 n.152), although he does not list this variant separately; he also discusses further evidence from Lagaba, referring to works by Tammuz.

\textsuperscript{653} Chiera noted that the \textit{burgul} Awîlîja named in a text dated to Ili-\textit{ma-AN} was also present in texts dated to Ha 33 and Si 18 (1914: 66). Similarly, Landsberger pointed out that Idîšum is attested for the years Si 6, 12, 13, and 29 as well as in a text dated to Ili-\textit{ma-AN} (1954: 68 n.174). Stone simply noted agreement between several personal names in the texts dated to Ili-\textit{ma-AN} and the latest texts dated to Samsu-iluna at Nippur (1977: 281).
house plots between two brothers, the sons of Ubar-Ba’u. Since we have two generations involved, this evidence does not allow for a precise dating but it certainly excludes a long hiatus between Si 29 and Ilī 1\textsuperscript{654}.

Finally, additional uncertainty comes from the fact that we do not know for certain whether the year \textit{MU i-li-ma-AN LUGAL.E} at Nippur indeed reflects the beginning of Ilī-ma-AN's reign in the reckoning of king lists, in particular of BKL A. The moment of accession to kingship over a new political entity can be difficult to define and we cannot exclude that the compilers had access to sources from an earlier phase of leadership further south, which they deemed acceptable for their purpose, while the scribes at Nippur simply considered the new comer to be in his first year from their point of view, and used accordingly a local form of year names.

![Figure 6: Synchronism Si 29 and Ilī 1](image)

Keeping these uncertainties in mind, we may nonetheless posit Si 29 = Ilī 1 as a starting point for further computations, with Ilī 1 being the first date formula known at Nippur and taken as the beginning of the dynasty.

\textit{Gu x = Sd y}

Since we now know that Samsu-ditāna and Sealand I’s sixth king Gulkišar were contemporary, if we consider the literary relation of their battle as admissible, we have a late synchronism between both dynasties; we can therefore use the reign lengths of the Babylon I kings, which are fairly well established, to determine how much time elapsed between Ilī-ma-AN and Gulkišar. In

\textsuperscript{654} Indeed, Ubar-Ba’u must have been at least a young adult in the 54th year of Rīm-Sīn I when he received his temple office and sealed the document with a \textit{burgul-seal} cut out in his name. If we put tentatively the first year of Ilī-ma-AN as concurrent with the 29th of Samsu-iluna, we have a time span of 49 years between the two documents.
order for Samsu-ditâna and Gulkišar to have battled one another, they must have had at least one concurrent year of reign: at the latest, Gulkišar ascended the Sealand I throne in the last year of the king of Babylon, at the earliest Gulkišar's reign ended in the first year of Samsu-ditâna. Of the two, the computation of the *terminus ante quem* of Gulkišar's accession rests on more solid ground since it is based solely on the chronology of the Babylon I kings. The only uncertainty there concerns the reign length of the last two kings Ammī-ṣaduqa and Samsu-ditâna. These are given in BKL B as twenty-one and thirty-one years, respectively; in both cases what would be their few final years are not attested in date lists. For Ammī-ṣaduqa, a number of additional year names are known so that it is considered fairly certain that he did rule for twenty-one years (Horsnell 1999: vol.I 86-91). The case of Samsu-ditâna is more nebulous; date-list N seems to have kept four additional lines after what was probably his twenty-seventh year name, however these lines have remained uninscribed but for an initial *MU* (Horsnell 1999: vol.I 274-275). The main argument for a reign length of thirty-one years is that in his case, as in the case of the other kings whose reign lengths in BKL B is not a "round number" in 0 or 5, the entry in BKL B should be trusted; this argument is based on initial work by Poebel (1947) and well summarized in Horsnell 1999: vol.I 87. I will therefore use reign lengths of twenty-one and thirty-one years for the last two Babylon I kings; the residual uncertainty cannot exceed a few years. Using these numbers, we find that a maximum of 126 years (10 + 28 + 37 + 21 + 30) could have elapsed *before* the beginning of the reign of Gulkišar in order for him to ascend the throne in the last year of Samsu-ditâna (that is if Gu 1 = Sd 31). This scenario represents an extreme upper limit and would imply that king Gulkišar was able to campaign against the Old Babylonian king in the year in which he assumed kingship.

![Figure 7: Maximal time elapsed before Gulkišar's accession](image-url)
Putting BKL A to the test for the time lapse between Ilī-ma-AN and Gulkišar

We can use the maximal time lapse established above to put the BKL A figures to the test since the sum of the reign lengths of the Sealand I kings before Gulkišar need to be equal to or lower than 126 years. The case of Ilī-ma-AN's reign length requires a little more analysis than the others (see Table 5). It almost certainly ends with the digit one; moreover, we know that the reign of the first Sealand I king spread over two reigns of Babylon I kings, from Si 29 (according to the starting point of our analysis) at least until the damming of the Tigris in Ae 13. The chronology of Abī-ešuḫ's reign is not definitively established but it seems fairly certain that this year name would belong, using Horsnell's classification, if not to the later range of the middle years Ae 19 - 23 (more probable), then to the middle range of the middle years Ae 13 - 18 (less probable but possible) (Horsnell 1999: vol.I 74-76). In other words, Ilī-ma-AN must have reigned at the very least twenty-three years (Si 29 - Ae 13). It follows that the reign length given for Ilī-ma-AN in BKL A has to be thirty-one or a higher numeral finishing with one. Now using the most conservative reading for each reign length (Table 5), that is the lowest possible numeral for each of them, we obtain as the lowest possible total of regnal years from the accession of Ilī-ma-AN until the end of the reign of Šušši 31 + 45 + 16 + 15 + 24 = 131 years. This is greater than the maximum of 126 years established using the Babylon I reign lengths and suggests that the reign lengths in BKL A are too high. The only possibility for the reign lengths of BKL A to be tenable would be to posit that its compilers considered that Ilī-ma-AN began his reign before his first year at Nippur.

Figure 8: Minimal time elapsed before Gulkišar according to BKL A
**Di ≤ Ad 36**

Another anchor for the relative chronology is given in the last year name of Ammī-ditāna, the 37th. It refers to an event which probably took place in his 36th regnal year: "The year Ammiditāna, the king, destroyed the wall of Udannu(?) which (the troops of) Damqi-ilišu had built". This informs us that the third Sealand I king preceded or was contemporary with Ammī-ditāna; his reign must have begun at the very latest in Ad 36, giving us the *terminus ante quem* for it: Di 1 ≤ Ad 36. This represents an extreme limit since if Di 1 = Ad 36, Damqi-ilišu would have built or completed the wall in his accession year, and the king of Babylon destroyed it immediately thereafter.

![Figure 9: Terminus ante quem for Damqi-ilišu's accession year](image)

**Putting BKL A to the test for the time elapsed before and after Damqi-ilišu**

If we compute the time which elapsed from the accession of Ilī-ma-AN, using the putative synchronism Ilī l = Si 29, until the accession of Damqi-ilišu, the reign lengths in BKL A cannot be correct since we obtain an earliest possible beginning of the reign of Damqi-ilišu past the end of Ammī-ditāna's reign (31 + 45 = 76 years from Si 29; this would put the accession year of Damqi-ilišu in Aṣ 2). In order for the BKL A figures to be tenable, we would have to assume that the king list reckoned a reign for Ilī-ma-AN which started before his first year at Nippur.

---

655 Horsnell (1999: vol.II 320) reads the city name Udinim; I follow Beaulieu who suggested that the town may correspond to Udannu (1992b: 419).
To circumvent the uncertainties surrounding Ilī-ma-AN’s accession year, we can work instead from the earliest possible time for the end of his reign. For this, we have a *terminus post quem* in the damming of the Tigris undertaken by Abī-ešuḫ and commemorated in his year name o, which, as expounded above, is almost certainly in or after year Ae 13. We can therefore posit that Ilī-ma-AN died at the earliest in the year of the failed damming of the Tigris, in or after Ae 13656. Consequently, if we put Itti-ilī-nībī’s accession in Ae 14, still using the lowest possible reading for his reign length in BKL A, we arrive at the earliest possible accession of Damqi-ilīšu in year Ad 31, six years before Ammī-dītāna’s claim to have destroyed a wall build by him. This scenario is certainly tenable, mathematically. It would also be compatible, even is barely so, with the lowest possible interval reckoned in BKL A for the time from Damqi-ilīšu’s accession until Gulkīšar’s accession, which would then fall at the earliest in year Sd 28 (16 + 15 + 24 = 55 years from Ad 31).

---

656 The lower limit of Ae 13 for year o is made in fact somewhat less likely by the proposed chronology of the construction of the fortress and of the dam (Section 4.3.1); indeed, since the year of the construction of the dam has also been considered by Horsnell to belong to a group of years which can not be earlier than Ae 13, it makes in fact Ae 14 as the earliest possible date for year o. This would render the mathematical compatibility of the BKL A’s reign lengths even slightly less likely, by one year.
## Appendix 2

### Sealand I year names

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>King</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Year formula (partly reconstructed)</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ili-MA-AN</td>
<td>Ili 1</td>
<td>MU ı̇-li-MA-AN LUGAL.E</td>
<td>ARN 123=Ni9271; UM 55-21-239=3N-T87; HS2227 &amp; HS2226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ili 2</td>
<td>MU GIBIL ı̇-li-MA-AN LUGAL.E</td>
<td>BE 6/2 68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MU ÚS-SA ı̇-li-MA-AN LUGAL.E</td>
<td>PBS 8/1 89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pešgaldarameš</td>
<td>Pe 1</td>
<td>MU PEŠ11-GAL-DARA-MEŠ LUGAL.E</td>
<td>CUSAS 18, 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pe 24?</td>
<td>MU PEŠ-GAL-DARA-MEŠ LUGAL.E KI 24(25?) KAM</td>
<td>CUSAS 18, 32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pe 27</td>
<td>MU PEŠ-GAL-DARA-MEŠ LUGAL.E KI 27</td>
<td>CUSAS 9, 85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pe 29</td>
<td>MU PEŠ-GAL-DARA-MEŠ LUGAL.E KI 29 KAM</td>
<td>CUSAS 9, 16; 407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MU PEŠ-GAL-DARA-MEŠ KI 29 LUGAL.E</td>
<td>BC 363 (Dalley 2009: 84)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ayadaraglama</td>
<td>Aa 1</td>
<td>MU A-ADARA-GALAM-MA LUGAL.(E)</td>
<td>CUSAS 9, 59?; 86; 151; 247; 408; BC 252; Tablet 3064.67 from Tell Khaiber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aa E</td>
<td>MU A.A.DARA.GALAM.MA LUGAL.E Ā.KAL NĪGIN LŪ.KUR.MIN.A.BI İ.İ.Z.GA.ES.A KA?.f.DU?1 GU.LA dEN.LĪL dIN.N.URTA IN.NE.[...]</td>
<td>CUSAS 9, 17-20; 60; 87-88; 152-155; 248-249; 368; 368A?; 452; BC 370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aa F</td>
<td>MU A.A.DARA.GALAM.MA LUGAL.E BĀD ZAG. (GAR) ((ĪD) HAR GU.LA(ki))(LŪ.KUR KAL-ŠU-Ú(?) MU.UN.NA.AN,DŪ.A)</td>
<td>CUSAS 9, 21-22; 89; 156-159; 378; 409-410; 411?; 412-413; 413A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aa G</td>
<td>MU A.A.DARA.GALAM.MA LUGAL.E NAM SIPA KI.ŞAR(.RA.TA dEN.LĪL.LE MU.UN.GAR.RA.A.BA)</td>
<td>CUSAS 9, 61; 160-162; BC 310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aa H</td>
<td>MU A.A.DARA.GALAM.MA LUGAL.E Ė.UN(ki) LIBIR.RA (BĀD.dEN.LĪL.LE.KE4 MU.UN.DU?)</td>
<td>CUSAS 9, 23?; 62; 162A; 163; 165A; 165-169; 171; 309-310; 369-370; 414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aa I</td>
<td>MU A.A.DARA.GALAM.MA LUGAL.E ḤAR (Z.A.GIN(.NA)) (K.U.GI) (NA4?) (PEŠ,PEŠ SAL.LA GAR.RA ŠU dEN.KI LUGAL.A.NI GAR.RA(.A))</td>
<td>CUSAS 9, 1; 63-66; 90-93; 94?; 95-97; 172-173; 250-251; 379-381; 415; 453-457; BC 165; 233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Year formula (partly reconstructed)</td>
<td>Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ayadaragalama</td>
<td>Aa J</td>
<td>MU A.A.DÁRA.GALAM.MA LUGAL.E GIŠ.ALAM DIDLI (KÚ.GI ḪUŞ.A (ŠI) GAR.RA 4EN.LÎL 4EN.KI(.RA) IN.NE.EN.KU₄.RA(.A))</td>
<td>CUSAS 9, 67-72; 100-107; 108?; 178-180; 252; 382; 416-417; 459-461; BC 166; 210; 231; 240; 424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aa K</td>
<td>(MU A.A.DÁRA.GALAM.MA LUGAL.E) MU GIBIL</td>
<td>CUSAS 9, 2; 24; 73; 109-110; 164; 181-188; 188A; 253; 371-372; 418-424; BC 365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aa 7</td>
<td>MU (A.A.DÁRA.GALAM.MA) (KI) 7</td>
<td>CUSAS 9, 25-29; 26A; 54; 56?; 111-122; 123-125?; 189-190; 191-193?; 303-304?; 311; 312-315?; 425-426; 434?; 462; BC 215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aa M</td>
<td>MU GIBIL EGIR</td>
<td>CUSAS 9, 29A; 74-75; 126-127; 194-200; 427-431; BC 259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aa 8</td>
<td>MU (KI) 8 (KAM)</td>
<td>CUSAS 9, 30-53; 55; 57-58; 76; 123-125?; 128-141; 191-193?; 201-241; 242?; 254-287; 288?; 289-301; 302?; 303-304?; 312-315?; 316-336; 337?; 338-365; 342A; 350A; 353A; 355A; 365A; 373; 383-385; 431A; 432-433; 434?; 463; BC 211-212; 238; 244; 255; 263; 425; 435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aa O</td>
<td>MU A.A.DÁRA.GALAM.MA LUGAL.E KALAM.MA.A.NI MU.UN.BAL.E</td>
<td>CUSAS 9, 435; another unidentified text (Dalley 2009: 12 n.89)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aa P</td>
<td>MU A.A.DÁRA.GALAM.MA LUGAL.E [...] MU NI É.KUR? BA.DÛ?</td>
<td>CUSAS 9, 243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ea-gāmil</td>
<td>MU ̃é-a-ga-mil lugal.[x] MU KI 4</td>
<td>QA 94.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 20: Sealand I year formulae**

The years designated by a capital letter refer to the Dalley's analysis of the formulae represented in the archive published in CUSAS 9 (2009: 10-12). Dalley (2009: 12) mentions another possible year name (Q) too damaged for reconstruction in CUSAS 9, 137, but that text features clearly the
year N; I could not find another corresponding text. I concur with Dalley that the year name R (ibid) was probably a scribal mistake for N; it is included as such in the table.

The unpublished text BC 218 apparently features an unidentified year formula of Ayadaragalama (Dalley 2009: 282). With the exception of the year formula of text BC 363, the year names of the tablets in the Belgian Collection have not been published yet; their attribution to a specific year in Table 20 is based on the information provided in Dalley 2009: passim; the same applies to the text from Tell Khaiber, whose dating is based on Moon et al. 2015: 2. The year name of the unpublished texts HS2226 and 2227 was verified by M. Krebernik (personal communication and Dalley 2009: 1 n.5).

The year formula featuring Gulkišar in a glass-making treatise (BM 120960) is not included because it is with near certainty a forgery (Oppenheim 1970: 62-63; Wiggerman 2008: 225; George 2009: 149).
## Appendix 3
Text numbers corresponding to Table 15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Aspect of the transaction</th>
<th>Main key word</th>
<th>Texts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Incoming goods</strong></td>
<td>Delivery (to the palace)</td>
<td><strong>MU.DU</strong></td>
<td>16-26; 26A; 27-58; 78; 91; 107; 155; 157; 162A; 168; 172-173; 175-180; 183; 189-192; 195; 197-199; 203-204; 211; 213; 216-217; 220; 222; 225-231; 234; 237-238; 240-241; 243; 246-259; (260); 261-268; 270-295; (296); 297-342; 342A; 343-350; 350A; 352-353; 353A; 354-355; 355A; 356-365; 365A; 366-367; 413; 413A; 415; 420; 425-426; 428; 431A; 432; 434; (442); 443; (445); 446; 458; 461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>wabālu</strong></td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>ana</strong></td>
<td>94; 120; 370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Purchase</strong></td>
<td><strong>šāmu</strong></td>
<td>421</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Incoming goods &amp; material outgoing/ transferred for transformation</strong></td>
<td>Delivery (to the palace) &amp; reception</td>
<td><strong>MU.DU &amp; ŠU.TLA</strong></td>
<td>151; 161; 232; 409; 422; 424; 436; (419)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>MU.DU &amp; maḥāru</strong></td>
<td>368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>ana É.GAL &amp; exp.</strong></td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Material outgoing / transferred for transformation</strong></td>
<td>Reception</td>
<td><strong>ŠU.TLA</strong></td>
<td>85; 131; 152-154; 156; 158-160; 162-165; 165A; 166-167; 169; 171; 174; 181-182; 184-187; 188A; 196; 201-202; 205-210; 212; 214; 218-219; 221; 223-224; 233; 235-236; 239; 242; 244; (245); 416; 418;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>maḥāru</strong></td>
<td>372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expenditure &amp; reception</strong></td>
<td><strong>nadānu &amp; ŠU.TLA</strong></td>
<td>452; 459</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outgoing goods (...)</strong></td>
<td>Reception</td>
<td><strong>ŠU.TLA</strong></td>
<td>29A; 93; 97; 103; 108; 111; 123; 125; 128; 135; 140; 145; 371; 412; 437; 439; 448; 455; 462; (102); (142); (245)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>maḥāru</strong></td>
<td>64; 98; 114-116; 119; 122; 127; 129-130; 134; 136; 137; 139; 188; 200; 373; 379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expenditure &amp; reception</strong></td>
<td><strong>nadānu &amp; ŠU.TLA</strong></td>
<td>106; 132</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>nadānu &amp; maḥāru</strong></td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Function</td>
<td>Aspect of the transaction</td>
<td>Main keyword</td>
<td>Texts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outgoing goods (continued)</td>
<td>Expenditure</td>
<td>ZI.GA</td>
<td>77; 414; 417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>nadānu</td>
<td>63; 65-66; 73; 75; 88; 95; 99-101; 104-105; 109-110; 112; 124; 138; 147; 378; 423; 433; (59)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SUM</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ZI.GA &amp; nadānu?</td>
<td>269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>naqū</td>
<td>68-69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ana</td>
<td>60; 62; 79; 87; 89; 133; 144; 457; 460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>61; 67; (70); 71-72; 74; 84; 86; 90; 117-118; 126; 148; 150; 368A; 369; 374-377; 380; 383; 385-395; 407-408; 431; 440; 451; 456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other or unclear</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>141; 146; 429; 444; 449; 450; 453</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 21: Texts numbers corresponding to Table 15**