



UNIVERSITÀ CA' FOSCARI VENEZIA

KASKAL

Rivista di storia, ambienti e culture del Vicino Oriente Antico

Volume 10

2013



LoGisma editore

Firenze 2013



UNIVERSITÀ CA' FOSCARI VENEZIA

KASKAL

Rivista di storia, ambienti e culture del Vicino Oriente Antico

Volume 10 – 2013

Direzione – Editorial Board

Stefano de Martino, Frederick Mario Fales, Giovanni Battista Lanfranchi, Lucio Milano,
Simonetta Ponchia

Consiglio scientifico – Scientific Board

Yoram Cohen, Stefano de Martino, Frederick Mario Fales, Francis Joannès, Michael Jursa,
Giovanni Battista Lanfranchi, Cécile Michel, Lucio Milano, Simonetta Ponchia, Michael Roaf,
Jack M. Sasson

Segreteria Scientifica – Scientific Secretary

Paola Corò

Composizione – Typesetting

Stefania Ermidoro

Editore – Publisher

LoGisma editore – Via Zufolana, 4 – I-50039 Vicchio (Firenze) www.logisma.it

Stampa – Print

Press Service Srl – Via Curzio Malaparte, 23 – I-50145 Firenze

Distribuzione – Distribution

Orders can be either addressed to the publisher, or to:

Casalini Libri s.p.a. – Via B. da Maiano 3 – I-50014 Fiesole (Firenze) <http://www.casalini.it>

All articles published in this journal were submitted to peer reviewed evaluation.

ISBN 978-88-97530-30-5
ISSN 1971-8608
Stampato nel febbraio 2014

NAZI-MARUTTAŠ IN LATER MESOPOTAMIAN TRADITION¹

Mary Frazer

Nazi-Maruttaš, the twenty-third king of the Kassite dynasty (r. *ca.* 1301-1277 BC),² appears in a total of ten literary texts that were copied after his reign. Two of these were probably composed in his lifetime, but the remaining eight seem to have been composed at later dates, from the end of the thirteenth century to the Persian period. This literary footprint, admittedly smaller than that of several other Mesopotamian kings,³ is striking when compared with those of other Kassite rulers, who, for the most part, fell into oblivion with the end of their dynasty (*ca.* 1500-1155).⁴ However,

1. This paper was presented at the Advanced Seminar in the Humanities 2012, organized by Prof. L. Milano and Prof. E. Cingano. I would like to express my thanks to Prof. B.R. Foster and Prof. E. Frahm for much critical feedback, and Prof. E. Jiménez for discussing many aspects of this paper with me and sharing his knowledge of several unpublished fragments in the Kuyunjik Collection. I would also like to thank the Trustees of the British Museum and Dr. J. Taylor, Assistant Keeper of Cuneiform Collections, for permission to study K 11536 and the unpublished fragments BM 38287 and BM 141832, as well as the University of Pennsylvania Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology and Dr. P. Jones, Keeper of Collections of the Babylonian Section, for permission to study CBS 11014 and publish photos of it.
2. All subsequent dates are BC. The absolute dates of the reigns of the middle and late Kassite kings (nos. 18-36) are yet to be established with certainty. Brinkman 1976, 31, as part of his chronology for the Kassite dynasty, dated Nazi-Maruttaš's reign to 1307-1282. Boese 1982 lowered these dates to 1302-1277. Janssen 2012 has proposed a minor modification of Boese's chronology, resulting in the dates for Nazi-Maruttaš being lowered again, but this time by just one year, and his reign being shortened by one year. These newest dates are followed here.
3. Among the kings who feature most prominently in later Mesopotamian literary tradition are: Gilgamesh (see *e.g.* Michalowski 1988, George 2003, 91-137, and Van De Mieroop 2012, 43-48); Sargon and Narām-Sin of Akkad (Güterbock 1934, 11-91, Goodnick Westenholz 1997, Van De Mieroop 1999, Galter 2006 and Van De Mieroop 2012, 48-52); Šulgi (Cavigneaux 2005 and Frahm 2006); Amar-Sin (Michalowski 1977); Hammurabi (Frahm in Frahm – Braun-Holzinger 1999, 144-147, 155, Charpin 2003, 271-5, Hurowitz 2005 and Maul 2012); Nebuchadnezzar I (Frahm in Frahm – Braun-Holzinger 1999, 147-148, 155).
4. Besides Nazi-Maruttaš the other exceptions to this tendency are Kurigalzu (I/II), Burna-Buriaš II and Adad-šuma-ušur. Brinkman (1976, 242; 116-118; 93, respectively) lists the not inconsiderable number of

despite Nazi-Maruttaš's place among the relatively small number of Babylonian kings who were remembered after their reigns, he has not yet been studied from the perspective of later tradition. The present study aims to rectify this deficiency.

Although the appearances of Nazi-Maruttaš in later tradition are noteworthy, the reasons behind them are not immediately clear. Accordingly this paper will also address the question of why certain Mesopotamian kings, and not others, were remembered after their deaths. Previous scholarship has suggested several possible explanations for this. In some cases the pioneering character of a king's reign may have led to them becoming, in the words of Liverani, "prototypes" of a behavior to be imitated (or else to be avoided) by later kings".⁵ Prime candidates for this means of explanation are the third millennium rulers Sargon of Akkad, founder of the first territorial state in Mesopotamia, and his grandson **Narām-Sîn**, the first Mesopotamian king to be deified in his lifetime.

The kings of the Sargonic period may have set precedents in Mesopotamian political leadership but kings of the first millennium nevertheless occasionally looked to other rulers as models. For example the Chaldean dynasty king who commissioned the literary work *King of Justice* seems to have encouraged comparison between himself and Hammurapi (r. ca. 1792-1750) by allusions to the *Law Code of Hammurapi*.⁶ The prologue and especially the epilogue of the same text were also a source of inspiration for the two Brisa inscriptions of Nebuchadnezzar II.⁷

As suggested by the later interest in the *Law Code of Hammurapi*, in some cases the main impetus for a successful literary afterlife seems to have come from the king himself.⁸ Šulgi, Hammurapi and Nebuchadnezzar I all appear to have commissioned, or at least encouraged, the composition of the works celebrating their achievements copied after their deaths. In the cases of Šulgi and Hammurapi, their works seem to have been incorporated into scribal education already during their reigns, suggesting that the kings themselves actively promoted the recopying of these texts.⁹

Not only literary but also physical monuments may have contributed to a king's prominence in later tradition.¹⁰ Mesopotamia's urban landscape must have been full of the detritus of previous

later sources attested for them. To the later sources for Kurigalzu (I/II) can be added a letter of Kurigalzu (Wiseman 1967, Al-Rawi – George 1994, 135 n. 2), a text narrating a dream of Kurigalzu (Finkel 1983) and two copies of a commemorative inscription of Kurigalzu II (George 2011, no. 61; 2012). To the later sources for Adad-šuma-ušur can be added a letter in his name attested in Neo-Assyrian and Neo-/Late Babylonian manuscripts (K 3045+, see n. 50) and a letter in Neo-Babylonian script from a Middle Elamite king (VS 24 91, see n. 71).

5. Liverani 1993, 48. See also Michalowski 1993, 87, Van De Microop 1999; 2011, 327-328 and Frahm in Frahm – Braun-Holzinger 1999, 144.
6. Hurowitz 2005, 507-516. For an overview of the respective arguments for assigning the text to either the reign of Nebuchadnezzar II (605-562) or that of Nabonidus (556-539), see Schaudig 2001, 579-580, who prefers the latter date.
7. See Da Riva 2012, 25 with further literature.
8. See Frahm in Frahm – Braun-Holzinger 1999, 155.
9. Copies of Hammurapi's law code are attested already in the Old Babylonian period: see Frahm in Frahm – Braun-Holzinger 1999, 144 and Maul 2012, 81 n. 32. The Šulgi hymns seem likely to be a product of the scribal schools referred to in Šulgi *Hymn B* 308-315 (George 2005, 132-133).
10. A factor that could well have contributed to a king's building achievements is his longevity. It is therefore interesting to note that many kings who featured in later tradition enjoyed lengthy reigns. Narām-Sîn of Akkad ruled for perhaps thirty-seven years (Westenholz 2000, 555-556), Šulgi ruled for forty-eight years, Hammurapi, for forty-two years, and Tukulti-Ninurta I ruled Assyria for approximately

reigns, parts of which would have been inscribed with the king's name. Such remnants seem to have enjoyed an especially avid audience during the Chaldean dynasty, when they could easily have served as sources of inspiration to later scribes.¹¹

While these various reasons suffice to explain the later fame of most kings, they seem, at least at first glance, inadequate in the case of Nazi-Maruttaš. He is known neither as a pioneering ruler, nor as a commissioner of imposing royal inscriptions, nor as a sponsor of major building projects. It would seem, therefore, that either we have missed something crucial about his reign, or that as yet unconsidered factors may have contributed to a king's posthumous appeal.

1. The Reign of Nazi-Maruttaš according to Primary Sources

Since a king's achievements often seem to have played a decisive role in his entrance into later Mesopotamian tradition, the first step in this study will be to consider Nazi-Maruttaš's reign. Modern assessments of individual reigns frequently take into account texts composed after a king's death as well as texts written during his lifetime, especially when the latter are less than eloquent. Regardless of its advantages and disadvantages, such an approach is not possible in the present study because of its need to maintain a clear distinction between Nazi-Maruttaš's reign and how it was remembered. Accordingly, the following assessment focuses largely on primary sources.

The first event of Nazi-Maruttaš's reign, his accession to the throne, seems to have been straightforward. Genealogies in several texts, both royal inscriptions and administrative documents, describe him as the son of the preceding king of Babylonia, Kurigalzu II (r. ca. 1325-1302).¹²

At this point in time, Babylonia seems to have held the upper hand in a border dispute with its northern neighbor, Assyria.¹³ Sometime later, after the accession to the Assyrian throne of Adad-nārārī I (r. ca. 1296-1265), Babylonian and Assyrian forces clashed,¹⁴ possibly at Babylonia's

thirty-six years. The other Kassite kings whose afterlives were comparable to that of Nazi-Maruttaš also enjoyed reigns of significant length. Kurigalzu II reigned for twenty-five years (the length of Kurigalzu I's reign is uncertain), and Burna-Buriaš II and Adad-šuma-ušur reigned for twenty-seven and thirty years respectively. In keeping with this tendency, Nazi-Maruttaš enjoyed a twenty-five or twenty-six year reign.

11. As has often been observed (see e.g. Goosens 1948 and Winter 2000), the kings of the Chaldean dynasty seem to have been particularly interested in past kings' inscriptions. On the interest of Nabonidus in particular, see Beaulieu 1989, 138-142, Frame 1993 and Schaudig 2003.
12. The sources are listed by Brinkman 1976, Q.3.5-Q.3.7. His succession, of lesser import for the topic at hand, seems to have been a less smooth affair. Boese 2009 has argued that a brother of Nazi-Maruttaš ruled for several months, as "Kadašman-Enlil IIa", before Kadašman-Turgu (r. ca. 1276-1260) ascended the throne. Kadašman-Turgu is generally considered to have been a son of Nazi-Maruttaš.
13. This dispute may have begun in the reigns of Assur-uballit I (r. ca. 1354-1319) on the Assyrian side and Kurigalzu II (r. ca. 1325-1302) on the Babylonian. Nazi-Maruttaš's initial success in his confrontations with Assyria may be the topic of a line of the *Epic of Adad-nārārī: ḫiblat ummāni šar māt kaššī abī ul ultēšir*, "My father (i.e. Arik-dēn-ilī) did not put right the crimes of the army of the king of the land of the Kassites" (following the edition of this line of VAT 9820 by Weidner 1963, 114 and pl. 5 obv. i 12). However the Kassite king in question could also be Nazi-Maruttaš's father, Kurigalzu II.
14. The confrontation could have taken place at any point from ca. 1296 to ca. 1277, that is, from Adad-nārārī's accession to Nazi-Maruttaš's death.

provocation.¹⁵ Victory went to the Assyrians and, if a later Assyrian source can be trusted,¹⁶ it was so decisive that the Babylonian king's standards were captured and the Assyro-Babylonian border redrawn in Assyria's favor.¹⁷

The battle probably cast a shadow over what remained of Nazi-Maruttaš's reign. Furthermore, since the next meeting of the Babylonian and Assyrian armies, in the reigns of Kaštiliaš IV (r. ca. 1229-1222) and Tukultī-Ninurta I (r. ca. 1234-1199), resulted in a disastrous defeat for the Babylonians,¹⁸ the earlier Assyrian victory over Nazi-Maruttaš could also be seen as the beginning of a decline in Babylonia's power.¹⁹ Nevertheless, it was probably not the most important factor in Kaštiliaš's defeat by Tukultī-Ninurta, since this happened at least fifty-seven, possibly almost another seventy-five years, later.²⁰

Nazi-Maruttaš's troops probably engaged in other military actions with more successful results. Various conquered peoples from the regions to the north and east of the Assyrian heartland appear in the inscriptions of Adad-nārārī I and it is conceivable that the Babylonian king also campaigned in these areas.²¹ The silence of Nazi-Maruttaš's inscriptions on military matters reflects the tendency of Babylonian rulers to avoid mentioning their military exploits rather than indicating a real absence of campaigns. To provide a more balanced view of their military activity one would like to turn to pertinent later sources but, in the case of Nazi-Maruttaš, these are not easy to interpret. One, a text studied at the end of the next section, refers to Namri, a region in the northern Zagros, but in a damaged context.²² Two other texts, unpublished rosters from the later Middle Babylonian period, list Elamites in association with Nazi-Maruttaš, but the precise connection is unclear.²³

Babylonian kings typically concentrated on producing votive and building inscriptions and Nazi-Maruttaš is no exception in this respect. Inscribed bricks from Larsa²⁴ and one, possibly more, stamped brick found not far from Dūr-Kurigalzu testify to building projects undertaken during his reign. A later source, an inscription of Esarhaddon,²⁵ indicates that he also rebuilt the Eḫiliana, the

15. See Llop 2011, 209 with further literature.

16. The Assyrian chronographic text known as the *Synchronistic History*. Its description of this battle is discussed further in Section 2.

17. The victory is the main subject of the *Epic of Adad-nārārī*. Although it was probably composed soon after the battle took place, it is preserved in later manuscripts, and so will be discussed in greater detail in Section 2. In all likelihood the victory is also the subject of an Assyrian inscription of Adad-nārārī I (Grayson 1987, A.0.76.21). Babylonian responses to the confrontation have not survived (see nn. 58 and 59).

18. The Babylonian king was captured, the statue of Marduk, Babylon's patron god, was removed to Assyria, and Babylonia lost its independence for several years.

19. Fuchs 2011, 249 implies this with the statement "decades of stagnation or even crisis had preceded the reign of Kaštiliaš IV".

20. Depending upon the date of the battle (see n. 14 above).

21. In the standard introduction to most of Adad-nārārī's building inscriptions from Aššur the Assyrian king is described as "The slayer of the heroic armies of the Kassites, Qutians, Lullumeans and the Subareans" (*nēr dapnūti ummān kaššī qūtī lulumī u subarī*), Grayson 1987, A.0.76.1 ll. 3-4.

22. See the edition and commentary in the appendix to this paper, *ad* l. 16.

23. These rosters are briefly mentioned by Brinkman 1998-2001, 191, who thinks that the Elamites may have been prisoners of war captured during Nazi-Maruttaš's reign.

24. Arnaud 1998, 199.

25. YBC 2146 ("Uruk D"): copied by Clay in *YOS* 1 40 and most recently edited by Leichty 2011, 277-278 no. 136. Porter 1993, 175 dates the inscription to "between 676 and not long after 671".

shrine of Nanāya in the Eanna temple in Uruk. There are three known votive inscriptions dedicated by high-ranking officials in Uruk and Dūr-Kurigalzu on Nazi-Maruttaš's behalf. They take the form of two stelas and a terracotta dog respectively.²⁶ The remaining ten votive inscriptions are written on axe-heads of blue glass,²⁷ six lapis-lazuli disks, two magnesium knobs and one piece of chalcedony.²⁸

Individually the building and votive inscriptions are not very revealing but, together with those attested for his father, Kurigalzu II, they are markedly fewer in number than those attested for earlier Kassite kings. Since several of the earlier Kassite kings, in particular Kurigalzu I but also Kara-indaš, Kadašman-Enlil I and Burna-Buriaš II, were prolific builders their successors' building achievements could only pale by comparison. By the time of the reign of Nazi-Maruttaš, three quarters of a century after the reign of Kurigalzu I, one might nevertheless have expected some repair work on the temples to have been necessary. Another way of interpreting these figures has been proposed by A. Bartelmus. Noting the large number of votive inscriptions for Kurigalzu II, she suggests that the extensive nature of the building projects of the earlier Kassite kings may have encouraged Kurigalzu II "to concentrate on another means to compete with his namesake in showing devotion to the gods".²⁹ This idea may also hold true for Nazi-Maruttaš.

The survival from Nazi-Maruttaš's reign of three "entitlement *narûs*", stelae recording privileges granted by the king to an individual or a temple,³⁰ and of almost four hundred administrative documents, the largest number attested for a Kassite king, suggests that Babylonia's economic situation was, broadly speaking, stable. The first entitlement *narû*, found in a room in the temple complex of Dūr-Kurigalzu, awaits full publication.³¹ The second, L 7072, records a grant of four fields and income with tax exemption to a chief musician.³² The third, *MDP* II 86, records Nazi-Maruttaš's grant of a large parcel of land (a little over 4000 hectares) to the god Marduk, *i.e.* to the temple of Marduk probably in Babylon.³³ A significant portion of the administrative documents are still unpublished and so it is not yet possible to compare Nippur's economic situation under Nazi-Maruttaš with its situation under his predecessors and successors.³⁴

26. U.2.20.1, U.2.20.2 and U.2.21 in Brinkman 1976, 265-266, who provides further bibliography.

27. An edition of the inscriptions by G. Frame can be found in a recent study on the axes by Clayden 2011. Also included is a material analysis by S. Kirk.

28. Described as a "block", by Brinkman 1976, 262, but a "gem" by Lambert 2007, ix. The inscription is published by Lambert 2007, 3.

29. Bartelmus 2010, 167 and n. 166.

30. Entitlement *narû* is the designation proposed for these objects by Slanski 2003. Elsewhere they are frequently referred to as *kudurrus*.

31. For photographs, see *Iraq Supp.* 1944, fig. 21 and Seidl 1989, pl. 1a. For further bibliography and a description see Brinkman 2006, 13 n. 41, 40 nn. 170-171.

32. First published by Arnaud 1972 and re-edited by Slanski 2003, 70-74. It was excavated in Larsa, in a room off a chapel of the city's main temple, Ebabbar.

33. Originally from Babylon, this is a copy of a *narû* of clay from the reign of Nazi-Maruttaš that was made when the original was accidentally destroyed during the reign of one of his successors, Marduk-apla-iddina I (r. ca. 1171-1159). Soon afterwards, as part of the booty taken by the Elamites, it was removed to Susa, where it was excavated.

34. A catalog of the known documents is provided by Brinkman 1976, 266-181. Over a quarter of them have been published by Sassmannshausen 2001, many of which belong to the "Archive of the Storehouse". The majority record deliveries, often of large amounts, of barley (see Sassmannshausen 2001, 187-188).

This brief attempt to describe the “real” Nazi-Maruttaš indicates that an appraisal of his reign cannot yet be made with confidence. That he suffered a military defeat at the hands of the Assyrians is clear, but its consequences are not well understood. He built less extensively than several of his predecessors yet he was able to grant substantial areas of land to the temple of Marduk in Babylon as well as privileges to his subordinates, who in turn were able to dedicate inscriptions carved on precious objects on his behalf. From an economic perspective his reign does not seem to have been noteworthy but any conclusions in this respect await the publication of the majority of Kassite period documents.

2. Nazi-Maruttaš in Later Literary Tradition³⁵

We turn away now from Nazi-Maruttaš’s possible achievements or failures and focus instead on the various ways in which he was depicted in texts copied after his death. This section provides a review of the relevant literary texts, which are discussed in the following order:³⁶

1. Poem of the Righteous Sufferer
2. Epic of Adad-nārārī
3. Epic of Tukultī-Ninurta
4. Hemerology Colophon
5. Synchronistic History
6. Name Book
7. Letter to Nazi-Maruttaš
8. Historical-literary Fragment
9. In Praise of the Just
10. Historical-literary Text

2.1 *Poem of the Righteous Sufferer*

Known in antiquity as *Ludlul bēl nēmeqi*, “I will praise the lord of wisdom,” this first-person account of the sufferings and eventual recuperation of the protagonist, Šubši-mešrê-Šakkan, projects a pious picture of Marduk as an all-powerful deity. The work is probably the product of late second millennium Babylonia, both because of the frequency with which rare words are used, a trait of works composed in the Middle Babylonian period, and because of the Kassite background of the three personal names that appear in the course of the poem. Any greater precision in dating the text’s composition lies in the realm of uncertainty, but the fact that the figure of Šubši-mešrê-

35. Nazi-Maruttaš is mentioned in genealogies in some of his descendants’ inscriptions (Brinkman 1976, 283 U.3.1-5 and 286 U.4.3.1-2). These are not considered relevant to this study. For Nazi-Maruttaš’s appearances in non-literary works that were copied or written after his reign see Section 3.

36. The texts are presented in descending chronological order according to their approximate composition dates. The composition dates and manuscript dates of texts 4-10 are difficult to establish with certainty: only one manuscript, the main witness to *In Praise of the Just*, contains a date (30 December 533).

Šakkan is probably based upon a homonymous individual who lived during the reign of Nazi-Maruttaš makes a composition date of that king's reign, or very soon afterwards, seem likely.³⁷

A small fragment from Assur, KAR 116, identified as a duplicate by W.G. Lambert,³⁸ makes it clear that Nazi-Maruttaš featured in the work.³⁹ Although there is no doubt about its ascription to this poem, the exact point where it falls is unclear:⁴⁰

8. [...] É.SAG.Í[L ...]
9. [...] x *li-šar-r[i-...]*
10. [... ^m*na-zi*]-*múru-taš* [...]
11. [...-*tu*]*m nap-ša-tum* [...]
12. [... *li-nap*-[...]

8. [...] Esangil [...]
9. [...] may [...]
10. [... Nazi]-Maruttaš [...]
11. [...] life [...]
12. [...] may [...]

The passage, which comes from one of the last tablets of the poem, is too damaged for detailed deductions about the manner of Nazi-Maruttaš's portrayal. However, as suggested by Lambert,⁴¹ he should in all likelihood be identified with the unnamed king who becomes angry with Šubši-mešrê-Šakkan in Tablet 1 (ll. 55-6).⁴² The king's displeasure, albeit essential for the plot, was probably not intended to elicit a favorable or unfavorable reaction from the audience.

Ludlul bēl nēmeqi is by far the most popular of the texts in which Nazi-Maruttaš appears. The majority of its currently known manuscripts, thirty from Assyria and twenty-three from Babylonia,

37. The documentary attestations of the rare name Šubši-mešrê-Šakkan point to a man of socio-economic means. He is attested as a governor (¹⁶GAR KUR) in a legal document from Ur dated to Nazi-Maruttaš's sixteenth regnal year, as pointed out by Gurney 1986, and as a man whose messenger received grain-rations in a document from Nippur dated to Nazi-Maruttaš's fourth regnal year, as pointed out by Lambert 1995, 33. The poem's references to the social status of the protagonist before his fall also suggest a man of considerable standing (see already Lambert 1960, 21-22).

38. Lambert 1995, 33.

39. The obverse of KAR 116 duplicates BM 32208+, one of the exemplars of the *Poem of the Righteous Sufferer* (MS jk in the new edition by Annus – Lenzi 2011). However the reverse, which contains the name Nazi-Maruttaš, is difficult to place within the known text of the poem.

40. The reconstruction by Annus – Lenzi 2011, 196, 198 is uncertain. Consequently, only the text from the reverse of KAR 116 is transliterated here.

41. See n. 38.

42. Šubši-mešrê-Šakkan is often thought to have been the author of the poem, even though, as argued by Annus – Lenzi 2010, xviii-xix, expanding on a point made by von Soden 1990, 112, there is no concrete evidence for such a belief.

were written in the Neo-Assyrian, Neo-Babylonian and early Persian periods,⁴³ and six school manuscripts in Babylonian script may have even later dates.⁴⁴

2.2 *Epic of Adad-nārārī*

As in the case of the *Poem of the Righteous Sufferer*, the *Epic of Adad-nārārī* was probably composed during Nazi-Maruttaš's reign, but in Assyria rather than Babylonia. Although much of the text is still missing, it appears to describe the build-up to the eventual defeat of the forces of Nazi-Maruttaš by Adad-nārārī I (r. ca. 1296-1265), king of Assyria for the greater part of Nazi-Maruttaš's reign.

The main manuscripts of the work are difficult to read but phrases such as, “Nazi-Maruttaš [sent] a message of boast[fulness],” “Adad-nārārī dispatched a scholar,” and “Nazi-Maruttaš said ...” indicate that a significant portion of the text was devoted to narrating messages exchanged by the kings.⁴⁵ Four references to the sun god Šamaš as well as several to an oath suggest that a treaty has been broken, presumably by the Babylonian king. As first suggested by E. Weidner, these messages probably served as the prelude to a battle narrative, as in the *Epic of Tukulī-Ninurta*,⁴⁶ but this is not preserved.

Four manuscripts of the epic have been identified, three from Assur⁴⁷ and one from Nineveh.⁴⁸ The Neo-Assyrian manuscript exhibits the library “stamp” of Assurbanipal (r. 669-ca. 630) on its reverse, thereby indicating that the text was still extant in the last few decades of the Assyrian empire. Since the reigns of the Sargonid kings are marked by Babylonia's reluctance to submit to Assyrian rule and corresponding Assyrian strategies of control, the epic's portrayal of an Assyrian victory over Babylonia may have seemed particularly relevant in Assyria at this time.⁴⁹ Late Neo-Assyrian concern for past conflicts between Assyria and Babylonia may also be represented by the

43. The currently known manuscripts are listed by Annus – Lenzi 2010, xli-xliv, and are helpfully categorized by geographical origin on xlix. The texts from the Sippar library discovered in the mid-1980s now have ca. 490 as a *terminus ante quem* (see Schaudig 2009).

44. The museum numbers of these school tablets are listed by Gesche 2001, 814.

45. According to Weidner 1963, 114, Adad-nārārī I sends three messages while Nazi-Maruttaš sends four.

46. See the following sub-section.

47. VAT 10084, VAT 9820, VAT 10889. Their excavation contexts are unknown. Weidner 1963 published a study of all three, with partial transliterations and a copy of the obverse of VAT 9820, the largest manuscript, by F. Köcher. Two copies have been published of VAT 10084: KAH II 143 by O. Schroeder and KAR 260 by E. Ebeling. The reverse of VAT 9820 and its partial duplicate, VAT 10889, are yet to be copied. S. Jakob has kindly informed me that approximately fifty new fragments of possible Middle Assyrian historical epics have so far been identified in the course of the Assur Project at the University of Heidelberg led by S.M. Maul, and so the number of manuscripts from Assur may increase in the near future. An edition of these fragments is being prepared by Jakob for the forthcoming volume in the KAL series, *Historische und historisch-literarische Texte II. Historisch-epische Texte*.

48. Rm 293, identified by Borger 1954/1956.

49. Frahm 2009, 8 suggests that the presence of several texts in the Neo-Assyrian *āšipu* library from Assur may also reflect an interest in past Assyro-Babylonian relations motivated by contemporary political tensions. In addition to these literary texts, the presence in Kuyunjik of the correspondence relating to the defeat of Babylonia in 710-709, which must have been moved there from Dūr-Šarrukēn after Sargon II's death, has also been attributed to an interest in preserving sources on Assyro-Babylonian conflict (Dietrich 2003, xviii).

Neo-Assyrian manuscript of the *Epic of Tukulti-Ninurta*, discussed below, as well as by diplomatic letters between Middle Assyrian and Middle Babylonian kings found at Nineveh.⁵⁰

2.3 *Epic of Tukulti-Ninurta*

This better known Middle Assyrian epic celebrates the military victory *ca.* 1222 of Tukulti-Ninurta I over the Babylonian king Kaštiliaš IV, and was in all likelihood composed soon afterwards. As in the *Epic of Adad-nārārī* the two leaders exchange several messages prior to the battle and it is in the course of one of the Assyrian king's messages that Nazi-Maruttaš makes an appearance. The passage runs as follows:⁵¹

31'. [o m.d10/IŠKUR.É]RIN.TAḤ ba-^rnu¹ a-bi-ia ^r(x) x x¹ i ^rsu² zu² x na¹ [o o]-šū

32'. [o o o o] mna-zī-^rma¹-ru-ta-áš ^rx x x (x)¹ ina ^{giš}LÁ A [o o (o)] š-šū

31'. [... Adad-*n*]ārārī, who begot my father

32'. [...] Nazi-Maruttaš ... in battle ...

The reference to Adad-nārārī in the preceding line suggests that Tukulti-Ninurta is here alluding to the Babylonian defeat commemorated in the *Epic of Adad-nārārī*. Since oath-breaking seems to play an important role in both texts, Nazi-Maruttaš appears to be being cited as an example of a Babylonian king who committed perjury and experienced military defeat as the attendant consequence.⁵² Therefore, this passage, though badly broken, strongly suggests that a negative image of Nazi-Maruttaš was current in late twelfth century Assyria.

The majority of the epic's manuscripts date to the Middle Assyrian period, when the text seems to have circulated beyond the Assyrian heartland,⁵³ but several of them were found on Kuyunjik and so were presumably still in use in the Neo-Assyrian period. The text was also copied anew in the Neo-Assyrian period.⁵⁴ These fragmentary lines of the *Epic of Tukulti-Ninurta* thus provide

50. The longest of these was re-edited in light of the identification of new Assyrian and Babylonian manuscripts (Llop – George 2001/2002). The text of a second letter, K 3045 = ABL 924, has been substantially increased by a join with K 1109, made by F.A.M. Wiggermann (a duplicating fragment in Neo-Babylonian script was also identified by Lambert 1992 and a second has recently been identified by E. Jiménez). A third letter, K 2641 = ABL 1282, is poorly preserved. All three letters will be re-edited in the author's dissertation, "Akkadian Royal Letters in Later Mesopotamian Tradition".

51. BM 121033 col ii ll. 31'-32'. This transliteration and translation follow Machinist 1978, 78-79.

52. Three lines earlier Tukulti-Ninurta says: "[Now] you face Šamaš with false testimony about us" (BM 121033 col ii ll. 28', transliteration following Machinist 1978, 78, translation following Foster 2005, 304). In the *Epic of Adad-nārārī* an oath, *māmītu*, is mentioned in VAT 9820 rev. i 20 and 24 and the several appearances of the god Šamaš (*e.g.* VAT 9820 obv. i 3, 11, 14, 17), who was responsible, among other things, for over-seeing oaths, suggest that an oath had been broken by Nazi-Maruttaš.

53. A recently published manuscript from Ugarit (Arnaud 2007, 120-124) comes from a clear Middle Assyrian context.

54. One Neo-Assyrian manuscript, Rm 142 (Lambert 1957/1958, 38; 49-51), is attested. As suggested by Lambert in a personal communication (*apud* Foster 2005, 317), the beginning of the epic may be preserved in an additional Neo-Assyrian manuscript, K 6007 (Borger 1964, 73-74), which contains the beginnings of a hymn to Assur and Tukulti-Ninurta I.

further evidence for a negative image of Nazi-Maruttaš still being in circulation in Assyria in the late seventh century.

2.4 *Synchronistic History*

The military defeat of Nazi-Maruttaš by Adad-nārārī I also appears in the Assyrian chronographic text known as the *Synchronistic History*. The passage in question, from the first column of the tablet, runs as follows:⁵⁵

- 24'. m.dIŠKUR.ÉRIN.TAḤ XX^{kur} aš-šur^m na-zi-múru-taš XX^{kur} kar-du-ni-áš
 25'. it-ti a-ḫa-meš ina^{uru} kar-d^{XV} ana A.GÀR-sa-al-lu i-duk
 26'. m.dIŠKUR.ÉRIN.TAḤ a-bi-ik-tú šá^m na-zi-múru-taš iš-kuun
 27'. BAD₅.BAD₅-šú im-ḫa-aš KI.ALAD-su dÛRI.GAL^{meš}-šú i-ḫu-ga-šú

- 24'. Adad-nārārī, king of Assyria, (and) Nazi-Maruttaš, king of Karduniaš
 25'. fought with one another at the city Kār-Ištar of Ugarsallu.
 26'. Adad-nārārī inflicted a decisive defeat upon Nazi-Maruttaš.
 27'. He conquered him. He took away from him his camp (and) his standards.

The text continues by describing a re-alignment of the Assyro-Babylonian border in the Assyrians' favor.⁵⁶

In providing details on the battle's political consequences (ll. 28'-31'), as well as its location⁵⁷ and a sense of the scale of the Babylonian defeat (l. 27'), the *Synchronistic History* is the most informative of the available sources for the battle between Nazi-Maruttaš and Adad-nārārī. In its present form, the text must have been written at least three centuries after the battle, since its final entry concerns the Assyrian king Adad-nārārī III (r. 811-783). The most complete of the three known manuscripts, all of which come from Nineveh, preserves part of an Assurbanipal library "stamp" and so it is clear that this account of the battle, together with the version offered by the *Epic of Adad-nārārī* and the allusion in the *Epic of Tukulti-Ninurta*, was still known – if only to a limited circle of men – in Assyria in the mid-late seventh century.

Nazi-Maruttaš does not feature only in the Assyrian chronographic tradition. He appears also in the Babylonian composition, *Chronicle P*, and, in all probability, in *Babylonian King List A*. The former seems to deal with his relations with Assyria, but a break in the text prevents further analysis.⁵⁸ *King*

55. The transliteration and translation are for the most part based upon the edition by Grayson 1975a, 160-161, who suggests that the singular verbal form *idūke* (l. 25') with a plural subject may be due to corruption of the text in the course of its transmission. The reading of the sign *diš* as *ana* in l. 25' follows Glassner 2004, 178-179.

56. For a discussion of this realignment see Fuchs 2011, 246-247.

57. For the possible location of Kār-Ištar see Fuchs 2011, 246 with n. 64, with further bibliography.

58. *Chronicle P* col. iii ll. 23-4 (Grayson, 1975a, 175).

List A, in keeping with most of its other entries, provides no information about his reign apart from its duration.⁵⁹

2.5 Hemerology Colophon

A colophon to a hemerological text attested in two manuscripts from Assur implies that Nazi-Maruttaš patronized, or at least encouraged, the making of this edition of the text. The entire colophon runs as follows:⁶⁰

Obverse

- iv 25. U₄^{meš} DÙG.GA^{meš} KA 7 *tup-pa-a-[te/ni]*
 iv 26. GABA.RI ZIMBIR^{ki} NIBRU^{ki}
 iv 27. KÁ.DINGIR.RA^{ki} UD.UNUG^{ki}
 iv 28. ÚRI^{ki} UNUG^{ki} *u eri₄-du₁₀^{ki}*
 iv 29. *um-ma-a-ni ú-na-as-si-ḫu-ma*
 iv 30. *ú-na-as-si-qu-ma*
 iv 31. *ana^m na-zī-múru-u[t-ta]š*
 iv 32. LUGAL ŠÚ SUM-*nu*
 iv 33. *ana šu-bu bu-ut-qe-e*

Reverse

- iv 1. *za-re-e šer-re-e*
 iv 2. *ša-ba-áš ka-re-e*
 iv 3. *ù mim-ma ši-bu-te DÙG.GA*

Obverse

- iv 25. (The text) ‘Favorable Days’ according to seven tablet[s],
 iv 26. copies from Sippar, Nippur,
 iv 27. Babylon, Larsa,
 iv 28. Ur, Uruk and Eridu.
 iv 29. Scholars selectively
 iv 30. copied (them) out and
 iv 31. they gave (the resulting text)
 iv 32. to Nazi-Maruttaš, king of the world.
 iv 33. For checking losses,

59. Nazi-Maruttaš’s name is not preserved but see Brinkman 1976, 16-17 for strong arguments in favor of restoring him as the twenty-third Kassite king.

60. *KAR* 177 obv. iv ll. 25-33, rev. iv ll. 1-3. The transliteration and translation offered here are informed by Lambert 1957, 8, Hunger 1968, no. 292, *CAD* S 184b (for rev. iv 1), Black 1985, 93 and Heeßel 2011 (for the reading “seven tablet[s]” in obv. iv 26).

Reverse

- iv 1. winnowing heaps of barley,
- iv 2. collecting tax from the storage piles
- iv 3. and for doing any kind of business they (*i.e.* the days) are favorable.

The main manuscript of this text was found in the “House of the Chief Singers”, which contained texts with references to Assyrian kings from Assurnasirpal II (r. 883-859) to Assurbanipal (r. 669-*ca.* 630) and dates ranging from 744/734 to 631.⁶¹ Since the colophon is difficult to explain as an Assyrian note, the entire text, colophon included, is probably of Babylonian origin. It may have come to Assyria either as one of the tablets looted from Babylon in the time of Tukulti-Ninurta I or via some less well documented channel.

The description of the text as a compilation of seven manuscripts from seven different cities is unparalleled and consequently doubts have arisen about the accuracy of the colophon’s claims.⁶² For the purposes of this study it seems sufficient to note, following N.P. Heeßel,⁶³ that the Assyrians who copied this text in the eighth or seventh century were aware of its association with Nazi-Maruttaš.

2.6 *Name Book*

The sixth text to mention Nazi-Maruttaš, though attested only in Assyria, also seems to reflect a Babylonian tradition. Often called the *Name Book*, it consists of various lists of non-Akkadian names and their Akkadian “translations”.⁶⁴ Some of the lists contain the names of scholars but the name Nazi-Maruttaš, which is translated into Akkadian as Šillī-Ninurta, “Ninurta is my protection”, appears in the first column of the tablet, in the course of a list of nine Kassite and West Semitic names of rulers. It runs as follows (the numeration and dates of reigns are added):

- 15'. Hammurapi (r. *ca.* 1792-1750),
- 16'. Ammi-šaduqa (r. *ca.* 1646-1626),
- 17'. Kurigalzu (I r. *ca.* x-1375, II r. *ca.* 1332-1308),
- 18'. Simbar-ŠiĪU (r. *ca.* 1025-1008),
- 19'. Ulam-Buriaš (r. *ca.* 1480),
- 20'. Nazi-Maruttaš (r. *ca.* 1301-1277),
- 21'. Meli-ŠiĪU (r. *ca.* 1186-1172),
- 22'. Burna-Buriaš (I r. *ca.* 1500, II r. *ca.* 1359-1333),
- 23'. Kadašman-Enlil (I r. *ca.* 1374, II r. *ca.* 1263-1255).

61. See Pedersén 1986, 35, who also mentions the possibility that the library may have contained texts with slightly earlier dates.

62. See the discussions by Lambert 1957, 8-9, Hunger 1968, 6 and Frahm 2011, 323 with n. 1544. For literature on the possible symbolic significance of the number seven, see Heeßel 2011, 173 n. 8.

63. Heeßel 2011, 173.

64. A complete edition of the only known manuscript of the text, 5R 44, is yet to be made. See Lambert 1957, esp. 5, 12-13 for a description of it and an edition of cols. ii and iii.

The first two names are West Semitic and correspond to kings of the First Dynasty of Babylon. The fourth and fifth names are Kassite: Simbar-ŠiĤU founded the Second Dynasty of the Sealand and Ulam-Buriaš was a king of the First Dynasty of the Sealand. The remaining five names are Kassite and belonged to kings of the Kassite dynasty. Although the Akkadian equivalents suggest that the primary purpose of the text is linguistic, an additional reason must lie behind the selection, for many more Mesopotamian kings than those listed bore West Semitic or Kassite names. Since the list includes Hammurapi, who was still well known in the first millennium,⁶⁵ it is possible that these were names that were easily recognized,⁶⁶ but any narrower principle of selection remains elusive.

2.7 Letter to Nazi-Maruttaš

The seventh text from later literary tradition known to feature Nazi-Maruttaš is a letter addressed to him of which only a small unpublished fragment in Neo-Babylonian script is preserved.⁶⁷ In spite of the fragment's diminutive size, it proves that Nazi-Maruttaš belonged to the relatively select group of kings whose correspondence, authentic or not, was studied after their reigns.⁶⁸

The fragment contains a few words from the top of the obverse of the tablet as well as a couple from the last line on its reverse. The identity of the addressor is uncertain because his name and titles are missing, but he may be an Elamite king.⁶⁹ His royal status is suggested by the reference to "my throne" (l. 4) but the case for him being an Elamite king in particular depends on the surrounding words. It is possible to restore "[...] you s[at] on my throne [...]" ([...] 't-na 88GU.ZA-'ia tu-št'-[ib ...]) which, if correct, suggests that the sender regards the Babylonian throne as rightfully his.⁷⁰ Of the non-Babylonian kings of the late second millennium, only an Elamite king (or kings) is otherwise known to have laid claim to the Babylonian throne.⁷¹

As with so many letters with royal correspondents that have survived only in later copies, it is difficult to establish whether this one is derived from an authentic letter or whether it is a fictional

65. See n. 3.

66. Two later copies of a commemorative inscription of Simbar-ŠiĤU indicate that primary sources for his reign were still available in first millennium Babylonia (see Frame 1995, B.3.1.1).

67. BM 141832. It was "found unregistered in the collection" in 2005 according to the website of the British Museum (<http://www.britishmuseum.org/research/collection-online/search.aspx> - accessed November 14, 2013).

68. See, for example, the texts mentioned in nn. 50 and 71.

69. I thank E. Frahm for this idea.

70. An alternative interpretation is that Nazi-Maruttaš occupied a second throne in addition to the Babylonian one, but no other evidence for this exists.

71. In two letters of uncertain authenticity: VS 24 91 (edited by Van Dijk 1986, see most recently Paulus 2013, 429-438 with further literature) and BM 35404 (see the translation by Foster 2005, 370-371 with further literature), both of which will be re-edited in the author's dissertation, "Akkadian Royal Letters in Later Mesopotamian Tradition". If the addressor of the letter to Nazi-Maruttaš is an Elamite king and if he is advancing his claims to the Babylonian throne in the course of this letter, the fragment might be relevant to the much debated question of the identity of the sender of VS 24 91.

composition.⁷² The provenance of the fragment is unknown⁷³ and traces of what appear to be a colophon on the reverse are unenlightening.⁷⁴

2.8 Historical-literary Fragment

A further small fragment in Neo-Babylonian script, from Nineveh, preserves the name Nazi-Maruttaš among several words from the opening lines of an otherwise unknown text, and a few words from the top edge of the tablet. It runs as follows:⁷⁵

Obverse

1. [...] x KUR NUN ^r*mi-gir* ^d*en-lil* LUGAL x' [...]
2. [... šá] ^dAMAR.UTU KUR.KURr *a-na* GÌR^{min}-šú *ú-ke*[*an-niš/ni-šú* (?)]⁷⁶
3. [...].^rmeš(?)^r *na-zi-múru-taš* x [...]
4. [...] x (x) ^rTI UGU [...]
5. [...] x [...]

Top edge

- [...] ^rd²MAŠ^š^r *u d^rgu^r*-[*la* ...]
 [...] GABA.RI ^rx' [...]

Obverse

1. [...] ... prince, favorite of Enlil, king ... [...]
2. to [whose] feet Marduk made the lands b[ow]
3. [...] Nazi-Maruttaš [...]
- 4-5. *Traces only.*

Top edge (Colophon?)

- [...] Ninurta (?) and G[ula ...]

72. L. 3 reads “not his seed, not his reign, not...”, which may refer to the extermination of an earlier king’s descendants.

73. According to the website of the British Museum “it is likely that it belongs to one of the museum’s nineteenth century collections” (see n. 67).

74. The traces seem to read: [...] ^m1.d⁺EN-ú-^r*bal-liš* x x' [...]. The name Bēl-uballit is attested in colophons of tablets from Babylon (Hunger 1968, 148) and the fact that the name contains the element “Bēl” (*i.e.* the god Marduk) also supports the idea that the tablet was written in Babylon, but this is not beyond doubt.

75. K 11536. It was published by Brinkman 1976, 385 pl. 5, whose edition is reproduced here with some minor adjustments made upon collation of the fragment in the British Museum.

76. A restoration of *kanāšu* D is most compatible with the traces. The closest parallel, according to *CAD* K 146, is the Cyrus Cylinder l. 13: *māt qutī gimir ummān-manda ú-ka-an-ni-ša ana šēpīšu*, “He (Cyrus) bent the land of the Quteans and all the Umman-manda to his feet”. A restoration of *kanāšu* Š has closer parallels, *e.g.*, from the inscriptions of Sargon II: *kaššitti qātēya ša aššur nabû u marduk ana šēpēya ú-šak-ni-šû-ma*, “My captives whom Aššur, Nabû and Marduk have made bow down at my feet and...” (*CAD* Š/1 147a), but it seems less satisfactory from an epigraphic perspective.

[(...)] copy [...]

It is tempting to assume that Nazi-Maruttaš is the referent of the first two lines. If this is correct, the text would seem to reflect a positive view of Nazi-Maruttaš in a historical-literary context as well as being one of the few references to Nazi-Maruttaš as a military conqueror. It is conceivable that it represents the beginning of a historical epic, such as are attested for the Kassite kings Kurigalzu II and Adad-šuma-ušur.⁷⁷ Even if the text does not date from his reign, it seems to have enjoyed some circulation before this copy was made: the traces on the fragment's top edge could belong to a colophon, which would seem to have stated that this manuscript was a copy of an older tablet.

2.9 *In Praise of the Just*

The interpretation of the ninth literary text to feature Nazi-Maruttaš is still largely uncertain. The obverse appears to list a number of proverbial sayings but the contents of the reverse are unclear. As noted by W.G. Lambert, internal inconsistencies within the text suggest that it is “a compilation from pre-existing sources”.⁷⁸ The middle column on the obverse contains names of individuals: first of all, Burna-Buriaš (presumably one of the homonymous Kassite rulers), second, Nazi-Maruttaš, third, a name yet to be deciphered, fourth, “Taqiša of Nippur”, fifth, “Old Sidu”, sixth, “Kudurru the seer”, seventh, one “Muballitu” and eighth, the partly damaged name “...-rēmēni”. The fourth and fifth names refer to scholarly figures.⁷⁹ Nothing further is known of the last three.

Horizontal lines serve to associate each of these names with a particular pair of statements that seem to be proverbial in nature.⁸⁰ The lines associated with Nazi-Maruttaš run as follows:⁸¹

3.	[...] x <i>kei-nim lu-ú ša</i> Ì.UDU	<i>na-zi-míru-taš</i>	^d GÌRA ul ub _x (ÍB)-bal ⁸²
4.	[...] ^r lu-ú ^r ša ^{na4} KALA.GA		<i>i-na ra-a-dì ú-tab-bat</i>

3. [... of] a true [...], be it of tallow, fire will not purify (it).
4. [... of an untrue ...], be it of diorite, it will be destroyed in a downpour. Nazi-Maruttaš.

W.G. Lambert suggested that the individuals in the middle column were all authors (or regarded as such) and posited the idea that they were listed together with lines excerpted from their works.⁸³

77. See Grayson 1975b, 47-77. I thank E. Frahm for this suggestion.

78. Lambert 1974, 156. For a full transliteration and copy see the edition by Lambert 1974, 149-151, 154. For a re-edition of the first and third columns of the obverse and their translation see Reiner 2008.

79. For a Taqiša(-Gula), variously described as a lamentation-priest and a scholar, see Lambert 1962, 75-76. For Sidu see Frahm 2010, 168-176 and Stol, 2011, 131.

80. As pointed out by Reiner 2008, these statements run from the first to the third column, skipping the narrower middle one.

81. The text and translation follow to a large extent Reiner 2008, 208-209.

82. The reading of these two signs was suggested to me by E. Frahm. *Ebēbu* D is attested elsewhere with fire as its subject (see *CAD* E 5a for references). As pointed out by Frahm, there may be a word play between *ubbab* and the similar sounding verb *utabbat* at the end of l. 4.

83. Lambert 1974, 156.

E. Frahm, focusing on the inclusion of Burna-Buriaš and Nazi-Maruttaš and referring to the latter's association with a hemerology text (discussed above), suggests that they may have been regarded as "particularly wise".⁸⁴ It is interesting that Burna-Buriaš and Nazi-Maruttaš are two of the Kassite kings associated with each other in the section of the *Name Book* discussed earlier, and that the *Name Book* also contains lists of scribes.⁸⁵

The text is currently attested in two manuscripts. The provenance of the first is unknown but, if Lambert's restoration of the colophon is correct, it appears to have been a copy of a text from the main temple of Borsippa (itself a copy of another baked tablet) made in the third year of Nabonidus (564).⁸⁶ The second manuscript is represented by an unpublished fragment from the Kuyunjik collection.⁸⁷

2.10 *Historical-literary Text Containing an Endowment*⁸⁸

The final literary text to mention Nazi-Maruttaš has received relatively little attention since its publication by Legrain in 1922 as PBS 13 69 and so it is re-edited as an appendix to this paper.⁸⁹ Legrain thought it was a Middle Babylonian letter but, as observed by Brinkman,⁹⁰ this seems unlikely. The usual indicators of a letter, an epistolary address formula and first or second person forms, seem to be absent⁹¹ and the manuscript, if not the composition itself, is of a mid-late first millennium date.⁹²

Although the text lacks epistolary characteristics it is difficult to place it within another well-defined genre. Borger listed it as "*kudurrū*" with a question mark, whereas Brinkman has tentatively described it as "an endowment with a literary introduction".⁹³ Nazi-Maruttaš is mentioned by name in each of the first two lines, where he is accorded the epithet "king of the world", and in l. 15, where it is said that he "heeded the word of Enlil". This line may mark a turning point in the text's

84. Frahm 2010, 173.

85. Possible evidence for Burna-Buriaš having been regarded as a source of proverbial wisdom is a passage in a letter to Esarhaddon. His agent in Babylonia, Mār-Issār, attributes the proverb "[The (time of) accounting is] the ordeal of the sheph[erds]" to "[Burna-Bur]iaš, king of B[abyl]on" (SAA 10 353 r. 13-15, cited by Fabritius 1999).

86. BM 34110 + 35163 (Lambert 1974).

87. Recently identified by E. Jiménez.

88. CBS 11014.

89. It is discussed briefly by Brinkman 1974, 401 n. 42; 1976, 282; 1998-2001, 191. Following collations by E. Leichty, translations of several passages appear in entries of the *CAD* (e.g. K 153b, M/1 254a, P 44b and Š/1 256b) and a collation of l. 11 by Sommerfeld is recorded in Deller, Postgate – Sommerfeld 1985, 78b and 80a. More recently, a suggestion for the interpretation of l. 16 has been made by Fuchs 2011, 304 with n. 237 and a précis of the whole text is offered by Lambert 2013, 269.

90. Brinkman 1976, 282 nn. 7-8.

91. Neither *a-na*, "To," nor *a-mat*, "Word (of)," fit the traces near the beginning of the first line, nor do they fill the available space. Some first and second person forms may be present but they are not unquestionable. See the commentary provided in the appendix to this paper.

92. The colophon includes personal names attested only in the Neo-Babylonian and Achaemenid periods. For other aspects of it that point to a first millennium date, see the commentary below.

93. Borger 1967, 301 (more specifically the tablet would be a copy of the text on a *kudurrū*), Brinkman 1976, 282 n. 8.

narrative: until then the text seems to describe the occurrence of an event with negative consequences for Nazi-Maruttaš's reign and a consultation of the god Marduk, presumably to find out how to resolve the situation. Several of the lines following l. 15 are badly broken but the focus of the narrative seems to have changed: cities in Namri are mentioned; then, following a break of two and a half lines, an endowment of twelve cities (perhaps those in Namri mentioned in the preceding lines) is recorded.

The endowment establishes twelve cities of a province, the name of which is broken away, "for the pot-stand of Enlil in perpetuity" (l. 21), as well as "wine, honey, ghee, fruit and barley, as much as there is" for one Enlil-šuma-imbi (l. 22). If this understanding of the text is correct, the endowment appears to benefit not only a temple but also an individual.

The manuscript was found at Nippur and the names mentioned in its colophon and in the main body of the text suggest that the text was probably copied and composed there too.⁹⁴ The name Enlil-šuma-imbi (l. 22) is otherwise known to have been held by three men: a high-ranking official in the Kassite period, the father of a lamentation priest of Enlil who may have lived in the late Chaldean period, and an individual who appears in two, possibly more, early Seleucid period documents.⁹⁵ This last Enlil-šuma-imbi had a son called Nazi-Maruttaš and so, as will be discussed in the following section, it is tempting to connect him with the Enlil-šuma-imbi in the Nazi-Maruttaš-related text under discussion here. The reference to the god Marduk (l. 9), who may have risen to prominence only in the reign of Nebuchadnezzar I,⁹⁶ might also suggest that the text is a first millennium composition.⁹⁷

3. Nazi-Maruttaš in Later Non-literary Documents

Nazi-Maruttaš appears in later texts of a more mundane character than the ten literary texts discussed above. One, a copy of an account of oil in a temple's stores in his eighteenth regnal year, indicates that administrative documents from his reign were still accessible almost seven hundred years after his death.⁹⁸ The copy, which is dated to 20 Abu Year 17 of Nebuchadnezzar II (r. 605-

94. Two individuals, one mentioned in the text, the other in the colophon, bear names containing "Enlil", the patron deity of Nippur. As has been observed by, for example, Frahm 2002, 92 and Jursa 2005, 7, names containing this element are rarely attested outside Nippur. For further Nippurean features of the text see the commentary *ad* ll. 11, 22 and colophon.

95. For further details see the commentary *ad* l. 22.

96. Lambert 1964. For the importance of Marduk even before the reign of Hammurapi, see Richter 2011, 240-241.

97. Two other endowments allegedly from the reigns of Kassite kings (Agum-Kakrime and Kurigalzu I) are also attested only in later copies and their authenticity has been contested. See Oshima 2012 with earlier bibliography.

98. BM 38287 (unpublished). The original document has not survived although transactions of oil involving individuals and the Ekur temple in Nippur are recorded in three published documents dated to Years 14, 15 and 22 of his reign (Sassmanshausen 2001, nos. 275-277). Administrative texts are sometimes attested as accessible several decades after they were written. San Nicolò 1941, 65 (cited by Frame 1991, 63), for instance, points out that writing boards from the reign of Nebuchadnezzar II were still accessible probably in the reign of Cambyses. Nevertheless, the availability of so early an administrative document as BM 38287 during the time of the Chaldean dynasty seems unparalleled.

562), is made on fine clay and written in large Neo-Babylonian script with some archaizing writings in the colophon.⁹⁹ Another finely factored copy of an administrative document, this time from the reign of Adad-apla-iddina, is also dated to the reign of Nebuchadnezzar II.¹⁰⁰

A memory of the Kassite king may also be reflected in the occasional and sporadic use of his name by private individuals from later periods. The father of an eponym during the reign of Aššur-dān II (r. 934-912) is called Nazi-Maruttaš,¹⁰¹ as is a witness to a slave-sale a little over two centuries later, in the reign of Sennacherib (r. 704-681),¹⁰² and, as mentioned in the preceding section, a Nazi-Maruttaš is attested in several documents from Seleucid period Uruk.¹⁰³ This name seems to point to the Kassite ruler because it is not attested prior to his reign and, as is clear from the discussion above, the ruler was clearly still remembered in learned circles in the Neo-Assyrian, Neo-Babylonian and Achaemenid periods. Be that as it may, this reappearance of the name in later periods may reflect only the continuing existence of a Kassite ethnic group in Mesopotamia – in the same way that today people may be called Arthur without directly implicating the legendary king of Camelot.¹⁰⁴

An exception to the rule may be the Nazi-Maruttaš attested at Uruk.¹⁰⁵ His father was called Enlil-šuma-imbi and, as discussed at the end of the previous section, according to a text featuring Nazi-Maruttaš a man bearing this name was the beneficiary of an endowment. Since neither Nazi-Maruttaš nor Enlil-šuma-imbi are particularly well-attested names, this is a striking coincidence. Furthermore, as discussed above, the endowment text was copied in Nippur, and, because of his name, it seems likely that Nazi-Maruttaš's father and perhaps Nazi-Maruttaš himself came from Nippur.¹⁰⁶

99. Namely in the writing of the name Nabû-aḥḫē-bullit (possibly the scribe) as ^mna-bi-um-ab-be-em-bu-li-it.

100. BM 33340 (unpublished). As pointed out by Frahm 2011, 324, correspondence of another king of the Isin II dynasty, Marduk-nādin-aḥḫē (r. 1099-1082), seems to have been available to scholars in the reign of Assurbanipal (r. 669-ca. 630). Hallo 2006, 187-188 discusses several archival texts that are only attested in duplicate later copies.

101. RIMA 2 A.0.98.3: 21, cited by Brinkman 2001.

102. SAA 6 118 rev. 7', cited by Baker 2001. Of the witness's name only ^mna'-zi-[...] is preserved.

103. He appears as a witness in a document dated to 283 (NCBT 1950, Doty 2012, no. 15), as the scribe of a contract dated to 279 (BM 104805, mentioned by Brinkman 1998-2001, 191), as the scribe of three more documents, two of which date to 273 (NCBT 1952, 1976 and 1959 (no date) = Doty 2012, nos. 17, 18, 19), and as the scribe and a witness of a document dated to 270 (NCBT 1942, Doty 2012, no. 20). A possible additional reference from this period to an individual named Nazi-Maruttaš is to be found on a small fragment of an administrative document found in the Rēš temple that mentions a ^mna-zi-[mūru-taš] (*BagM Beib* 2, no. 131, reference courtesy of E. Jiménez).

104. However, it is interesting that, out of all the Kassite names that were held by kings of the Kassite dynasty, only Nazi-Maruttaš and Kurigalzu are attested as names in use in the Neo-Assyrian period (see Baker 2000 and Brinkman 2001). For attestations of Kassites in Mesopotamia after the fall of the Kassite dynasty, see Brinkman 1976/1980, 470-472 and Sassmannshausen 1999, 417-420.

105. This attestation may be part of a wider phenomenon since Sassmannshausen 1999, 419 and n. 56 cites P.-A. Beaulieu for the information that additional royal names appear in other Late Babylonian texts. Doty 1977, 195 suggests that Nippur, as an important city under the Kassite dynasty, would have been a likely location for people with Kassite names in later periods, but Kassite names are notably absent from the early Neo-Babylonian archive from Nippur that was published by Cole 1996.

106. See n. 94. For evidence of Urukian scholars travelling to Nippur in the late Achaemenid period, see Frahm 2002, 91-94, with references to previous literature.

The composition date of the endowment text cannot be established with certainty but, even if it dates to the late Achaemenid period (*ca.* 400-331), it is probably too early for it to have been composed by the Enlil-šuma-imbi attested in Seleucid documents from Uruk. The possibility nevertheless remains that this Enlil-šuma-imbi named his son Nazi-Maruttaš with the aim of evoking the memory of the Kassite king. It is conceivable, therefore, that king Nazi-Maruttaš continued to enjoy some cachet as a historical figure until the mid-third century.¹⁰⁷

4. Possible Explanations for the appearances of Nazi-Maruttaš in Later Tradition

In light of the preceding discussion it is possible to posit two general but conflicting hypotheses for Nazi-Maruttaš's appearances in later tradition. The most intuitive means of explaining a king's literary afterlife is to suppose that as a ruler he had an extraordinary impact on his contemporaries. The problem with explaining Nazi-Maruttaš's appearances in the ten texts examined above in this way, is that the supposed magnitude of his impact stands in stark contrast to the survival of only a few, individually unremarkable royal inscriptions from his reign. The second hypothesis instead accepts the paucity of inscriptions in his name as representative of the original corpus and so as indicative of a reign of comparatively minor political achievement. If one prefers this interpretation, one must look for other legacies of his reign as a means for explaining his relative popularity in later tradition.

The most obvious of these is the *Poem of the Righteous Sufferer*. Its widespread popularity, indicated by the fact that it has been found at several sites in Babylonia and Assyria in manuscripts dating from the Neo-Assyrian to the Late Babylonian periods, suggests that, rather than being a manifestation of Nazi-Maruttaš's popularity, it may in fact have been its catalyst. Although, as discussed above, full understanding of Nazi-Maruttaš's role in the poem awaits discoveries of missing parts of the text, the details may be irrelevant. The obvious erudition of the author of the *Poem of the Righteous Sufferer* may have led to the association of Nazi-Maruttaš with scholarship, as is clear from the colophon to the hemerology text KAR 177, and wisdom, as evinced in *In Praise of the Just*.

Of course not all of the later texts featuring Nazi-Maruttaš may have been directly inspired by the *Poem of the Righteous Sufferer*. The author of *In Praise of the Just*, to take one example, may have looked to the *Name Book* or drawn upon another no longer extant tradition that also associated Nazi-Maruttaš and Burna-Buriaš with proverbial wisdom. Similarly, there may even be some as yet undefinable connection between the Assyrian historical epics and the later texts that appear to mention Nazi-Maruttaš in military contexts. The portrayal of Nazi-Maruttaš's military defeat in both the *Epic of Adad-nārārī* and the *Epic of Tukultī-Ninurta*, whether accurate or not, may even have sparked Babylonian interest in him, perhaps in the form of an epic extolling Nazi-Maruttaš's military achievements.

107. This does not seem too far-fetched a proposal when one considers that *In Praise of the Just* was still being copied in the reign of Nabonidus and the *Poem of the Righteous Sufferer* was copied at least until the early Achaemenid period (see n. 43).

Nazi-Maruttaš seems, in conclusion, to be exceptional when compared to other Mesopotamian kings that frequent later tradition. Rather than reflecting the impact he made upon his contemporaries, the posthumous appearances of Nazi-Maruttaš in literary works are more likely to be a reflection of the popularity of the *Poem of the Righteous Sufferer* and, perhaps, the *Epic of Adad-nārārī*, works which were recopied for reasons entirely independent of the fact that they featured Nazi-Maruttaš. The case of Nazi-Maruttaš therefore opens up the possibility that appearances of some kings in later compositions could have been a self-perpetuating phenomenon rather than a reliable gauge of a king's achievements.

Appendix: Re-edition with commentary of PBS 13, 69 (CBS 11014)

This portrait-oriented tablet (5 x 7.5 cm) is the only known manuscript in Babylonian script of a text about Nazi-Maruttaš. The text's first editor thought that it might be a letter but, for reasons discussed above, this seems unlikely.

The top left corner of the tablet's obverse side is broken away, as are most of the last three lines of the obverse and the top right corner of the reverse. Further loss of text has been caused by a scrape on the right edge of the obverse and a small hole on the reverse (Fig. 1 and 2, and see also the photograph of the tablet on the CDLI website, P266192).

The text was described by W.G. Lambert as "badly written and very obscure".¹⁰⁸ The signs vary in size, lie above the line, and some of them, though undamaged, are not easy to recognize. This may be due to want of experience or care on the part of the scribe. Two erasures on the reverse compound such an impression.

On the tablet's obverse the lines often run onto the right edge but seldom seem to correspond to semantic units. The last word of l. 7, for example, is the preposition *eli*(UGU). The signs on the reverse are larger than on the obverse and more generously spaced. A single ruling before and after the colophon demarcates it from the body of the text.

The text was read in a seminar at Yale University and I would like to thank the participants, particularly C. Ambos, B.R. Foster, E. Frahm and E. Jiménez, for their many suggestions that have been adopted here. B.R. Foster also kindly shared his thoughts on the overall interpretation of the text, which influenced my translation of several passages significantly. Nevertheless the interpretation presented below remains my own responsibility.

Transliteration

Obverse

1. [o o (o)] 'x' ^mna-^zi-^múru-taš LUGAL 'KÍŠ'
2. [o (o)] 'x' ^mna-^zi-^múru-taš LUGAL [KI]Š
3. 'TA' šá' -te-e a-^hd'(A)-meš ší-^kar 'x x (x)-šú'-nu
4. a-na pi-i-šú la ta-bu ú-UR-'x-x' x
5. a[š]-'UD' a-na pa-ni-šú

108. Lambert 2013, 269.

6. *it-tá-na-áš-ka-nu-ma šib-gaté² 'ù x (x)¹-na*
7. *la i-kaš-ši-du li-tum u ki-ši[t-tú] ŠU^{min} UGU*
8. *na-ki-ri-šú la i-šak-ka-nu bi-ri*
9. *m.dAMAR.UTU.MU.SI.SÁ A m.dUTU-ba-ri*
10. *ina ma-ḫar^dAMAR.UTU EN-šu ina é ú-šab-ri-^rma¹*
11. *ŠU^{min} d⁺en-líl EN-šu ina É šá qé-reb dur-^ranⁿ-ki x 'x' [ina]*
12. *ma-aq-qa-^ršú¹ GEŠTIN ba-aṭ-lu la šal-mu iš-šá-kin*
13. *ina ter-tum GEŠTIN el-lu IM É.KUR-šú níg-na-ke-šú*
14. *i-šat-tu-ši-ma la tuḫ-ḫa-a a-na d⁺en-líl ú-^rqarⁿ-r²<-bu>*
15. *mⁿna-zi-múru-taš a-mat d⁺en-líl EN it-ta-^rn-id-ma*
16. *URU^{meš} šá^{kur}nam-ri ma-la ^r<ba->šú-ú x (o)¹*
17. *ina ki-sur-re-e A[B^r]-^rx¹-[...]* ...]
18. *'x PA x¹ [(o)] 'x x¹ ...* ...]
19. *[o] 'x¹ i[r²] ...* ...]

Reverse

20. *'ú¹ 12 URU^{meš} pi-^rḫat x¹ [o o o] / erasure x-^rx¹ [o (o)]*
21. *'a¹-na gan-ga-nu d⁺en-líl EN-šú ú-kin 'a¹-[na] / du-ur da-^rriš^a*
22. *a-na ŠU^{min} <m.>^{d+}en-líl-MU-im-bi BI A KU / RI BA URU GÀR RI*
23. *SUM-na it-ti KURUN GEŠTIN LÀL Ì.NUN.NA / in-bi*
24. *ŠE-i ma-la ba-šú-u*

Colophon

1. *pi DUB m.den-líl-I A-šú šá (erasure)*
2. *mⁿba-zi-zi pal-lib^den-líl*
3. *u dⁿnin-líl dMASŠ u dNUSKA*
4. *[A]a i-ta-bal-šú ina ITI-šú*
5. *[a-n]^a EN-šú lí⁶(I)-ú-tir-šú*

Translation

(1) [...] Nazi-Maruttaš, king of the world, (2) [...] Nazi-Maruttaš, king of the world, (3) *After drinking together, beer of their ...* (4) is sour to his taste, ... (5) ... are repeatedly set (6) before him and plans and ... (?) (7) (his troops?) will not reach/ conquer. They will not inflict decisive defeat on (8) his (the king's?) enemy. He (Enlil-šuma-imbi?) sought (9) an oracle (as to why?) of Marduk-šumališir, son/ descendant of Šamaš-bāri, (10) in the temple, in the presence of Marduk, his lord, and (11) the power of Enlil, his lord, in the temple which is in Duranki, [In/ from] (12) his (Enlil's?) libation (vessel) wine has ceased, impure (wine) has been placed. (13) At the oracular decision pure wine, clay of his temple, his incense-burner (14) ... *They brought* (?) what had not yet been offered to Enlil. (15) Nazi-Maruttaš heeded the word of lord Enlil and (16) the cities of the land of Namri, all that there are ..., (17) in the territory of ... (18) ... (19) ... (20) Moreover, twelve cities, (in) the district of ... (21) for the pot-stand of Enlil, his lord, he

established forever. (22) Into the hands of Enlil-šuma-imbi... the city ... (23) did he (?) give, together with beer, wine, honey, ghee, fruit (24) and barley, as much as there is.

Colophon

(1) According to the tablet of Enlil-nā'id, son of (2) Bazuzu. He who reveres Enlil (3) and Ninlil, Ninurta and Nuska (4) shall not take it (this tablet) away. Within a month (5) he will return it to its owner!

Commentary

Obv 1. It is uncertain how the beginning of the text should be restored. The vertical wedge preceding the name Nazi-Maruttaš here and in l. 2 seems to be a *Personenkeil* rather than the end of a longer sign. The traces preceding the *Personenkeil* may be of the sign [k]am, in which case one might consider restoring a date: [MU.N.K]AM, “[Year n] of Nazi-Maruttaš ...”.

šarru(LUGAL) *kiššati*(^rKIŠ), “king of the world”: This epithet is attested in reference to Nazi-Maruttaš in texts from his reign.¹⁰⁹ It is also attested in the hemerology colophon discussed in Section 2.5 above, where it is written LUGAL ŠÚ.

Obv 2. The traces of the sign preceding the *Personenkeil* (on which, see above *ad* l. 1) seem to consist of the tails of three or four horizontal wedges and the head of one vertical. The repetition of Nazi-Maruttaš's name in this line is currently inexplicable.

Obv 3. The reading of this line, which follows *CAD* Š/2 210b, is uncertain.

TA² šā^r-te-e, “After drinking”: The reading *ultu*(TA) seems unsatisfactory epigraphically since the traces of the first sign do not match the sign *ta* in l. 6.¹¹⁰

a-bā'(A)-meš, “together”: These signs could also be interpreted as a 1 cs possessive suffix attached to the preceding infinitive, yielding *šatēya* followed by A^{mes}. The line would then mean: “After I drank water and beer, *their* ...”.

-šū^r-nu, “their”: If this is the correct reading of these signs,¹¹¹ it is unclear to whom this 3 mp possessive suffix refers. Since Enlil-šuma-imbi is the beneficiary of the endowment in ll. 22-24, one would expect him to appear earlier in the text, performing some deed worthy of reward.¹¹² Perhaps, therefore, he is referred to here, together with Nazi-Maruttaš.

Obv 4. Collation confirms that the sign after *la* should be read as *ta*- (instead of *iš*-, as it is read in *CAD* Š/2 210b).

Obv 5. a[*f*]-UD^r ana pānīšu, “... before him”: The initial signs of this line, which have evaded attempts at decipherment, may designate the subject of the verb at the beginning of the following

109. Seux 1967, 311.

110. For other attestations of the uncommon construction *ištu/ultu* + infinitive, see Aro 1961, 258-259. TA could also be read syllabically with the following signs as a finite verbal form *tašattē*, “you (fs) drink,” but this seems unlikely.

111. They are omitted in *CAD* Š/2 210b. They lie on the tablet's right edge.

112. Compare, for example, the texts of the Šitti-Marduk *kudurru* (*BBS* 6: see Foster 2005, 383-384 for further literature) and the Hinke *kudurru* (re-edited by Hurowitz 1997), both composed in the reign of Nebuchadnezzar I.

line, *ittanaškanūma*. It may refer to Nazi-Maruttaš or to Enlil-šuma-imbi if he is present in the preceding lines (see above *ad l.* 3), but this is unclear.

Obv 6. *ittanaškanūma*, “(they) are repeatedly set”: The subject of this verb, as with the subject of the verbs *ikaššidū* and *išakkanū* in ll. 7-8, is unclear. It may be specified in the un-deciphered signs at the beginning of the preceding line. The Ntn stem of *šakānu* is rarely attested.¹¹³

šibqāt u, “plans and (?)”: Of the two readings *šib-qat*₆, “plans”, or *šip-kát*, “heaps”, the former seems preferable on the basis of its attestation in a *kudurru* (BBS_t no. 5 ii 7, from the reign of Marduk-apla-iddina I, r. ca. 1159-1147), a category of text to which PBS 13, 69 may be related.¹¹⁴ However, if the reading of the sign before the scrape as *ù* is correct, neither interpretation seems likely. One might expect this part of l. 6 to contain the subject of the verb at the beginning of the following line, (*lā*) *ikaššidū*. If, on the other hand, ll. 7-8 are the reported speech of an oracle, one would expect this part of l. 6 to introduce the oracle pronouncement.

Obv 7. Although, as in the preceding lines, the identities of the actors in this sentence are unclear, the context suggests that they may be the troops of king Nazi-Maruttaš. As with l. 12 (on which see below) this line could be interpreted as direct speech, as the quotation of the answer to a divination query.

la i-kaš-ši-du, “they will not reach/conquer”: The theme vowel *i* is unexpected in a G stem of *kašādu* and so one might consider translating this as an N stem preterite, “they were not conquered (etc.)”.

litum u kišiti[ti] qātī, “decisive defeat”: Parallels strongly suggest that this phrase marks the beginning of a new clause.¹¹⁵ While the phrase *kišitti qāti* is attested in Assyrian royal inscriptions from the reign of Tiglath-Pileser I (r. ca. 1114-1076) on, it appears to have been particularly popular in the inscriptions of the Sargonid kings.¹¹⁶ Apart from this instance, the pairing *litum kišitti qāti* seems to be attested only in inscriptions of Sennacherib (r. 705-681), for instance:¹¹⁷

litum kišitti qāti ša elišun aštakkanu šēruššu ušaštirma

I had all the victorious conquests that I achieved over them written on it (a stela).

Obv 9. A Marduk-šuma-līšir is attested twice in the Neo-Babylonian period, both times at Uruk.¹¹⁸ Descendants of a Šamaš-bāri are attested in Neo-Babylonian Larsa as a “fairly unexceptional prebendary family”.¹¹⁹

Obv 10. The appearance of Marduk in this line seems surprising because of the Nippurean context of the text.¹²⁰ The subject of the verb *ušabri* is unclear but it may be Enlil-šuma-imbi, if he is

113. CAD Š/1 156b.

114. See n. 112 and Section 2.10 above.

115. See CAD L 221b.

116. See the range of attestations cited in CAD K 452a.

117. Grayson – Novotny 2012, 52 no. 3: 26. See also *ibid.* e.g. no. 16 ii 35-37.

118. Joannès 1982, 394.

119. Jursa 2005, 109.

120. See the references to Enlil and Duranki in the following line, and the commentary *ad l.* 22 and the colophon. A sanctuary to Marduk is, however, attested in Nippur in the Middle Babylonian period (George 1993, no. 1358 with further literature).

the “hero” of the text (see above *ad l.* 3). This appears to be the only attestation of the phrase *bīra barū*, “to perform divination”, with the verb in the Š stem. The closest parallel seems to be *ušabri bārâ tērti d[alḫa]*,¹²¹ “I asked the diviner to make an extispicy, (but) my oracles were co[nfused]”,¹²² whence the translation offered here.

Obv 11. *dur-^ran^l-ki*, “Duranki”:¹²³ For Duranki as a designation for the city of Nippur, see Nashef 1982, 88-89 and George 1992, 261-262.

Obv 12. The reading of this line follows a collation by E. Leichty (reported in *CAD* Š/1 256b and M/1 254a). As in the case of ll. 7-8, it is possible that this line is in direct speech quoting the result of a divinatory act: “[In/from] / his libation (vessel) wine has ceased, impure (wine) has been placed”.

Obv 13. *karānu ellu*, “pure wine”: The description of wine as *ellu* is also attested in Neo-Assyrian and Neo-Babylonian inscriptions, and in *The Poem of the Righteous Sufferer*.¹²⁴

im é.kur-šú, “clay of his temple”, and *nignakkešū*, “his incense burner”: The significance of both items is obscure.

Obv 14. *i-šat-tu-ši-ma*, “they will drink it and”: Although the referent of the pronominal suffix is unclear,¹²⁵ the reference to wine in ll. 12-13 and the possible reference to drinking in l. 3 make the derivation of the verb from *šatū*, “to drink”, seem probable.

la ṭub-ḫa-a, “what had not yet been offered”: This meaning of *ṭubḫu*, from *ṭebū* D, “to bring near, present”, seems to have a parallel in the *Esangil Chronicle*.¹²⁶

qutū nūna bašla lā ṭub-ḫa-a ina qātīšu ēkimūšu

The Gutu took from him (Utu-hegal) the fish that had been cooked but not yet offered (to Marduk).

ú-^rqar^r-rē<-bu>, “they brought (?)”: This reading is unsatisfactory epigraphically, since neither the GÀR sign nor the RI sign resemble GÀR and RI signs encountered elsewhere in the text. If the general interpretation of the previous lines is correct, we would expect this line to narrate the successful resolution of the situation that led to the negative statements in ll. 7-8.

Obv 16. URU^{meš} *ša namri*, “cities of the land of Namri”: Legrain and Brinkman suggest that these cities could have been the object of a military campaign by Nazi-Maruttaš.¹²⁷ A successful military exploit at this point in the narrative would be in accord with the proposed interpretation of the previous lines: the problematic situation now resolved, Nazi-Maruttaš is once more ensured victory on the battlefield. More recently Fuchs has interpreted this passage as meaning that Nazi-Maruttaš was able to assign deliveries of beverages from Namri to Nippur.¹²⁸

121. In a wisdom text published by Lambert 1960, 288 l. 8.

122. Following the translation of *CAD* B 118b.

123. This reading was suggested by Sommerfeld (Deller, Postgate – Sommerfeld 1985, 78b; 80a).

124. See *CAD* K 205a.

125. The “pure wine” in l. 13 is the obvious choice but, as well as the fact that wine is grammatically masculine, it is difficult to relate words that follow “pure wine” in l. 13 to drinking.

126. Al-Rawi 1990, 7 A 60, cited by *CAD* T 124a, whose translation is followed here.

127. Legrain 1922, 97, Brinkman 1976, 282 n. 8.

128. Fuchs 2011, 304 with n. 237.

The name Namri seems to designate a region located east of the Diyala River in the Zagros Mountains. It appears to have been inhabited by Kassites from the Middle Babylonian period until the reign of Alexander the Great.¹²⁹ Although the name could be written kur *na-mar* or kur *nam-ri* the latter writing is attested, apart from here, only in Neo-Assyrian inscriptions.¹³⁰ It may therefore point to a first millennium date of composition for this text.

Obv 17. The reading of this line follows a collation made by Brinkman.¹³¹

Rev 21. *gan-ga-nu*, “pot-stand”: This reading is preferred to the suggestion of *CAD* K 153b to read *zag^l.ga-nu*.¹³² As discussed by Porter 2006, pieces of furniture are attested receiving meat offerings in the Neo-Assyrian period.

ana dūr dāriš, “forever”: The only other attestation of this phrase seems to be in the Tell Abta stele,¹³³ which was inscribed in the reign of Shalmaneser IV (r. 783-773).¹³⁴

Rev 22. ^{<m.>^d}*en-lil-MU-im-bi*: The absence of a *Personenkeil* makes the interpretation of these signs as a personal name uncertain. However, three individuals called Enlil-šuma-imbi are known. The first one was a *šandabakku* of Nippur in the reigns of Adad-šuma-ušur (r. ca. 1205-1176) and Meli-ŠiḪU (r. ca. 1175-1160).¹³⁵ The second was the father of one Enlil-kāšir, a *kalū* of Enlil who claims descent from ^mLÚ.DUMU.NUN.NA, “the Sumerian”, and is the owner of the three scholarly tablets.¹³⁶ The third attested Enlil-šuma-imbi is the father of an individual who appears in two, possibly more, Seleucid period documents from Uruk.¹³⁷ As has been suggested above, it seems possible that the Enlil-šuma-imbi mentioned in this line was a not too distant forefather of the early Seleucid period Enlil-šuma-imbi.

Colophon 1. *pi tuppi*(DUB), “according to the tablet”: One might expect the more common *ki pi-i tuppi*(DUB), but *pi tuppi* is attested elsewhere.¹³⁸ Alternatively, the signs could be read as *tup:pi*, a retro-graphic writing of *tuppi*, “Tablet of ...”. This interpretation would account for the otherwise strange omission of the name of the tablet’s owner.

Enlil-nā’id: As already observed by Brinkman 1976, 282 n. 7, this name is otherwise attested only at Nippur in the Achaemenid period, where it was born by an Enlil-nā’id son of [...]zēr and father of Mukīn-apla, attested in a document dated to the sixth year of Cyrus. It was also the name of the father of one Kīnā, attested in a document dated to the thirty first year of an Artaxerxes.¹³⁹

129. Kessler 1998-2001, 92.

130. Kessler 1998-2001, 91.

131. Brinkman 1976, 282 n. 8.

132. Although not specified by the *CAD*, the emendation probably refers to *imnu*, “right (side)”.

133. According to *CAD* D 114a.

134. Grayson 1996, A.0.105.2: 13.

135. *BBS* 3 i 45-47.

136. One, TCL 6 47, was probably found at Uruk. The other two, which are commentary-texts, were excavated at Nippur. See Civil 1974 and Frahm 2011, 231; 299; 302.

137. NBCT 1942, edited by Doty 1977, 193-197.

138. Albeit only once, in the hemerology colophon that mentions Nazi-Maruttaš discussed above in 2.5. There the phrase is written wholly logographically, as KA DUB.

139. In the administrative documents *TuM* II-III 22: 6 and 12 and *TuM* II-III 179: 13 respectively. Kīnā is a nickname for Mukīn-apla (see Kümmel 1979, 46 n. 12), and so both documents refer to a Mukīn-apla son of Enlil-nā’id. However the time gap between the two texts suggests that they are two different men.

The reading of the end of the line follows the collation by Brinkman 1976, 282 n. 7. After the *šá*, the scribe may have begun to write “Bazuzu” before deciding that there was insufficient space, since the traces of a *Personenkeil* and a *ba* are visible.

Colophon 2. Bazūzu: According to Brinkman 1976, 282 n. 7 this name is relatively common in the late Chaldean and Achaemenid periods. It is born by a smith and a shepherd at Uruk in the fifteenth and seventeenth years of Nabonidus respectively.¹⁴⁰ Two men of the same name, who may or may not be identical with the aforementioned, are also attested in Neo-Babylonian period Uruk, one in the reign of Nabopolassar, the other in the reign of Cambyses.¹⁴¹ Several Bazūzus are also attested in Neo-Babylonian Sippar.¹⁴²

The writing of *pālib* as *pal-lib* is unusual.

Colophon 2-5. The formula forbidding the theft of the tablet is usually expressed in colophons in one of two ways. Either: “whoever takes away (this tablet) may ... [some negative event befall him]” or, as here: “He who reveres DN will not take it (*i.e.* this tablet) away”. Both are found on scholarly tablets from Seleucid period Uruk, but the latter is also found in colophons on three tablets from Nippur. One of these invokes Enlil and Nuska, as on the tablet here.¹⁴³

Colophon 5. Although the sign preceding *ú-* looks more like the *i-* in the preceding line than the *ĤÉ* (*gan-*) in l. 21, it may be a *ĤÉ* to be read with the value *lu_x*. A precative form of *turru*, “to return x”, is clearly intended. The reading *li₆(ĤÉ)* follows *CAD T 268a*.¹⁴⁴ The unusual, pseudo-Sumerian orthography of *litiršū* is consistent with a Nippurean origin for the tablet.¹⁴⁵

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Al-Rawi F.N.H. 1990, “Tablets from the Sippar Library I. The ‘Weidner Chronicle’: a Supposititious Royal Letter Concerning a Vision”, *Iraq* 52, 1-13.
- Al-Rawi F.N.H. – George A.R. 1994, “Tablets from the Sippar Library III. Two Royal Counterfeits”, *Iraq* 56, 135-148.
- Ambos C. 2011, “Šamaš-bānī”, in H.D. Baker (ed.), *The Prosopography of the Neo-Assyrian Empire*, Helsinki, 1192.
- Annus A. – Lenzi A. 2010, *Ludlul bēl nēmeqi* (*State Archives of Assyria Cuneiform Texts* 7), Helsinki.
- 2011, “A Six-column Babylonian Tablet of *Ludlul bēl nēmeqi* and the Reconstruction of Tablet IV”, *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 70, 181-205.

140. Joannès 1982, no. 45: 17, Kümmel 1979, 172.

141. Kümmel 1979, 172.

142. Bongenaar 1997, 315.

143. Hunger 1968, no. 121: 8-10, in a text from the seventeenth year of one of the three Persian kings named Darius. The other two colophons from Nippur to contain this formula are Hunger 1968, nos. 119: 3 and 129: 4.

144. Borger 2010, 203 no. 253 assigns the value *li₆* to the sign *ĥé*.

145. Evidence for first millennium Nippur’s pride in its Sumerian traditions is summarized by Frahm 2002, 94 n. 105. See also Frahm 2010 for additional evidence for interest in Sumerian in late period Nippur.

- Arnaud D. 1972, “Deux Kudurru de Larsa II. Étude épigraphique”, *Revue d'assyriologie et d'archéologie orientale* 66, 163-176.
- 1998, “Cinq dédicaces d'époque cassite provenant de Babylonie et de Syrie”, *Studi Micenei ed Egeo-Anatolici* 40, 197-204.
- 2007, *Corpus des textes de bibliothèque de Ras Shamra-Ougarit (1936-2000) en sumérien, babylonien et assyrien (Aula Orientalis Supplements 23)*, Sabadell.
- Aro J. 1961, *Die akkadischen Infinitivkonstruktionen (Studia Orientalia 26)*, Helsinki.
- Baker H.D. 2000, “Kurigalzu”, in H.D. Baker (ed.), *The Prosopography of the Neo-Assyrian Empire*, Helsinki, 640-641.
- 2001, “Nazi[...]”, in H.D. Baker (ed.), *The Prosopography of the Neo-Assyrian Empire*, Helsinki, 940.
- Bartelmus A. 2010, “Restoring the Past. A Historical Analysis of the Royal Temple Building Inscriptions from the Kassite Period”, *KASKAL* 7, 143-172.
- Beaulieu P.-A. 1989, *The Reign of Nabonidus, King of Babylon (556-539 BC) (Yale Near Eastern Researches 10)*, New Haven - London.
- Black J. A. 1985, “*Nasābu* ‘to copy’”, *Revue d'assyriologie et d'archéologie orientale* 79, 92-93.
- Boese J. 1982, “Burnaburiaš II., Melišipak und die mittelbabylonische Chronologie”, *Ugarit-Forschungen* 14, 15-26.
- 2009, “Kadašman-Enlil, Kadaman-Turgu und die kassitische Chronologie des 14. und 13. Jahrhunderts v. Chr”, *Altorientalische Forschungen* 36, 85–96.
- Bongenaar A.C.V.M. 1997, *The Neo-Babylonian Ebabbar Temple at Sippar: its Administration and its Prosopography (Publications de l'Institut historique-archéologique néerlandais de Stamboul 80)*, Istanbul - Leiden.
- Borger R. 1954/1956, “Ein Duplikat zu KAH II, Nr. 143”, *Archiv für Orientforschung* 17, 369.
- 1964, *Einleitung in die assyrischen Königsinschriften. Erster Teil. Das zweite Jahrtausend vor Chr.*, Leiden - Köln.
- 1967, *Handbuch der Keilschriftliteratur*, Berlin.
- 2010, *Mesopotamisches Zeichenlexikon. Zweite, revidierte und aktualisierte Auflage (Alter Orient und Altes Testament 305)*, Münster.
- Brinkman J.A. 1974, “The Monarchy in the Time of the Kassite Dynasty”, in P. Garelli (ed.), *Le palais et la royauté (archéologie et civilisation)*, Paris, 395-408.
- 1976, *Materials and Studies for Kassite History 1. A Catalogue of Cuneiform Sources Pertaining to Specific Monarchs of the Kassite Dynasty*, Chicago.
- 1998-2001, “Nazi-Maruttaš”, *Reallexikon der Assyriologie und vorderasiatischen Archäologie* 9, 190-191.
- 2001, “Nazi-Maruttaš”, H.D. Baker (ed.), *The Prosopography of the Neo-Assyrian Empire*, Helsinki, 939-940.
- 2006, “Babylonian Royal Land Grants, Memorial of Financial Interest, and Invocation of the Divine”, *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient* 49, 1-47.
- Cavigneaux A. 2005, “Shulgi, Nabonide, et les Grecs”, in Y. Sefati – P. Artzi – C. Cohen – B.L. Eichler – V.A. Hurowitz (eds.), *An Experienced Scribe Who Neglects Nothing: Ancient Near Eastern Studies in Honor of Jacob Klein*, Bethesda, 63-72.

- Charpin D. 2003, *Hammu-rabi de Babylone*, Paris.
- Civil M. 1974, "Medical Commentaries from Nippur", *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 33, 329-338.
- Clayden T. 1996, "Kurigalzu I and the Restoration of Babylonia", *Iraq* 58, 109-121.
- 2011, "Glass Axes of the Kassite Period from Nippur", *Zeitschrift für Orient-Archäologie* 4, 92-135.
- Cole S. W. 1996, *Nippur IV. The Early Neo-Babylonian Governor's Archive from Nippur* (Oriental Institute Publications 114), Chicago.
- Da Riva R. 2012, *The Twin Inscriptions of Nebuchadnezzar at Brisa (Wadi Esb-Sbarbin, Lebanon). A Historical and Philological Study* (Archiv für Orientforschung Beiheft 32), Wien.
- Deller K. – Postgate J.N. – Sommerfeld W. 1985, "Nachträge und Verbesserungen zu RGTC 5", *Archiv für Orientforschung* 32, 68-81.
- Dietrich M. 2003, *The Babylonian Correspondence of Sargon and Sennacherib* (State Archives of Assyria 17), Helsinki.
- Doty L. T. 1977, *Cuneiform Archives from Hellenistic Uruk*, unpubl. PhD dissertation (Yale University).
- 2012, *Cuneiform Documents from Hellenistic Uruk* (Yale Oriental Series, Babylonian Texts 20), New Haven - London.
- Fabritius K. 1999, "Burna-Buriaš", in K. Radner (ed.), *The Prosopography of the Neo-Assyrian Empire*, Helsinki, 354.
- Finkel I.L. 1983, "The Dream of Kurigalzu and the Tablet of Sins", *Anatolian Studies* 33, 75-80.
- Foster B.R. 2005, *Before the Muses: an Anthology of Akkadian Literature*, Bethesda.
- Frahm E. 2002, "Zwischen Tradition und Neuerung: Babylonische Priestergelehrte im achämenidenzeitlichen Uruk", in R.G. Kratz (ed.), *Religion und Religionskontakte im Zeitalter der Achämeniden*, Gütersloh, 74-108.
- 2006, "Šulgi Sieger über Assur und die Skythen", *Nouvelles assyriologiques brèves et utilitaires* 2006/25.
- 2009, *Historische und Historisch-literarische Texte* (Keilschrifttexte aus Assur literarischen Inhalts 3), Wiesbaden.
- 2010, "The Latest Sumerian Proverbs", in S.C. Melville – A.L. Slotsky (eds.), *Opening the Tablet Box. Near Eastern Studies in Honor of Benjamin R. Foster*, Leiden - Boston, 155-184.
- 2011, *Babylonian and Assyrian Text Commentaries: Origins of Interpretation* (Guides to the Mesopotamian Textual Record 5), Münster.
- Frahm E. – Braun-Holzinger E. 1999, "Liebling des Marduk – König der Blasphemie. Große babylonische Herrscher in der Sicht der Babylonier und in der Sicht anderer Völker", in J. Renger (ed.), *Babylon: Focus mesopotamischer Geschichte, Wiege früherer Gelehrsamkeit, Mythos in der Moderne* (Colloquien der deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft 2), Saarbrücken, 131-156.
- Frame G. 1991, "Nabonidus, Nabû-šarra-ušur, and the Eanna Temple", *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie* 81, 37-86.
- 1993, "Nabonidus and the History of the Eulmaš Temple at Akkad", *Mesopotamia* 28, 21-50.
- 1995, *Rulers of Babylonia from the Second Dynasty of Isin to the End of Assyrian Domination (1157-612)* (The Royal Inscriptions of Mesopotamia Babylonian Periods 2), Toronto - Buffalo - London.

- Fuchs A. 2011, "Das Osttigrisgebiet von Agum II. bis zu Darius I (ca. 1500 bis 500 v. Chr.)", in P.A. Miglus – S. Mühl (eds.) *Between the Cultures. The Central Tigris Region from the 3rd to the 1st Millennium BC. Conference at Heidelberg January 22nd-24th, 2009* (Heidelberger Studien zum Alten Orient 14), Heidelberg, 229-320.
- Galter H. D. 2006, "Sargon der Zweite: Über die Wiederinszenierung von Geschichte", in R. Rollinger, and B. Truschnegg (eds.), *Altertum und Mittelmeerraum: die antike Welt diesseits und jenseits der Levante. Festschrift für Peter W. Haider zum 60. Geburtstag* (Oriens et Occidens 12), 279-302.
- George A. R. 1992, *Babylonian Topographical Texts* (Orientalia Lovaniensia analecta 40), Leuven.
- 1993, *House Most High. The Temples of Ancient Mesopotamia* (Mesopotamian Civilizations 5), Winona Lake.
- 2003, *The Babylonian Gilgamesh Epic. Introduction, Critical Edition and Cuneiform Texts*, Oxford.
- 2005, "In Search of the é.dub.ba.a: the Ancient Mesopotamian School in Literature and Reality", in Y. Sefati – P. Artzi – C. Cohen – B.L. Eichler – V.A. Hurowitz (eds.), *An Experienced Scribe who Neglects Nothing. Ancient Near Eastern Studies in Honor of Jacob Klein*, Bethesda, 127-137.
- 2011, *Cuneiform Royal Inscriptions and Related Texts in the Schøyen Collection* (Cornell University Studies in Assyriology and Sumerology 17), Bethesda.
- 2012, "CUSAS 17 no. 61", *Nouvelles assyriologiques brèves et utilitaires* 2012/72.
- Gesche P.D. 2001, *Schulunterricht im Babylonien im ersten Jahrtausend v. Chr* (Alter Orient und Altes Testament 275), Münster.
- Glassner J.-J. 2004, *Mesopotamian Chronicles* (Writings from the Ancient World 19), Atlanta.
- Goodnick Westenholz J. 1997, *Legends of the Kings of Agade* (Mesopotamian Civilizations 7), Winona Lake.
- Goossens G. 1948, "Les recherches historiques à l'époque néo-babylonienne", *Revue d'assyriologie et d'archéologie orientale* 42, 149-159.
- Grayson A.K. 1975a, *Assyrian and Babylonian Chronicles* (Texts from Cuneiform Sources 5), Locust Valley.
- 1975b, *Babylonian Historical-Literary Texts*, Toronto - Buffalo.
- 1987, *Assyrian Rulers of the Third and Second Millennia BC (to 1115 BC)* (The Royal Inscriptions of Mesopotamia, Assyrian Periods 1), Toronto - Buffalo - London.
- 1996, *Assyrian Rulers of the Early First Millennium BC II (858-745 BC)* (The Royal Inscriptions of Mesopotamia, Assyrian Periods 3), Toronto - Buffalo - London.
- Grayson A.K. – Novotny J. 2012, *The Royal Inscriptions of Sennacherib, King of Assyria (704-681 BC), Part 1* (The Royal Inscriptions of the Neo-Assyrian Period 3/1), Winona Lake.
- Gurney O.R. 1986, "Šubši-mešrê-Šakkan", *Revue d'assyriologie et d'archéologie orientale* 80, 190.
- Güterbock H.G. 1934, "Die historische Tradition und ihre literarische Gestaltung bei Babyloniern und Hethitern bis 1200", *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie und vorderasiatische Archäologie* 42, 1-91.
- Hallo W.W. 2006, "Another Ancient Antiquary", in A. Guinan et al. (eds.), *If A Man Builds A Joyful House. Assyriological Studies in Honor of Erle Verdun Leichty* (Cuneiform Monographs 31), Leiden - Boston, 187-196.
- Heeßel N.P. 2011, "'Sieben Tafeln aus sieben Städten' - Überlegungen zum Prozess der Serialisierung von Texten in Babylonien in der zweiten Hälfte des zweiten Jahrtausends v.

- Chr”, in E. Cancik-Kirschbaum – M. van Ess – J. Marzahn (eds.), *Babylon: Wissenskultur in Orient und Okzident*, Berlin - Boston, 171-196.
- Hunger H. 1968, *Babylonische und Assyrische Kolophone* (*Alter Orient und Altes Testament* 2), Kevelaer - Neukirchen-Vluyn.
- Hurowitz V.A. 1997, *Divine Service and Its Rewards. Ideology and Poetics in the Hinkel-Kudurru*, Beer-Sheva.
- 2005, “Hammurabi in Mesopotamian Tradition”, in Y. Sefati – P. Artzi – C. Cohen – B.L. Eichler – V.A. Hurowitz (eds.), *An Experienced Scribe Who Neglects Nothing: Ancient Near Eastern Studies in Honor of Jacob Klein*, Bethesda, 497-533.
- Janssen T. 2012, “Die mittel- und spätkassitische Chronologie im internationalen Kontext: eine Revision”, *Akkadica* 133, 123-145.
- Joannès F. 1982, *Textes économiques de la Babylonie récente*, Paris.
- Jursa M. 2005, *Neo-Babylonian Legal and Administrative Documents: Typology, Contents and Archives* (*Guides to the Mesopotamian Textual Record* 1), Münster.
- Kümmel H.M. 1979, *Familie, Beruf und Amt im spätbabylonischen Uruk. Prosopographische Untersuchung zu Berufsgruppen d. 6. Jb. v. Chr. in Uruk*, Berlin.
- Lambert W.G. 1957, “Ancestors, Authors and Canonicity”, *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 11, 1-14, 112.
- 1957/1958, “Three Unpublished Fragments of the Tukulti-Ninurta Epic”, *Archiv für Orientforschung* 18, 38-51.
- 1960, *Babylonian Wisdom Literature*, Oxford.
- 1962, “A Catalogue of Texts and Authors”, *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 16, 59-77.
- 1964, “The Reign of Nebuchadnezzar I: A Turning Point in the History of Ancient Mesopotamian Religion”, in W.S. McCollough (ed.), *The Seed of Wisdom, Essays in Honour of T.J. Meek*, Toronto, 3-13.
- 1974, “A Piece of Esoteric Babylonian Learning”, *Revue d'assyriologie et d'archéologie orientale* 68, 149-156.
- 1995, “Some New Babylonian Wisdom Literature”, in J. Day – R.P. Gordon – H.G.M. Williamson (eds.), *Wisdom in Ancient Israel. Essays in Honor of J.A. Emerton*, Cambridge, 30-42.
- 2007, *Babylonian Oracle Questions* (*Mesopotamian Civilizations* 13), Winona Lake.
- 2013, *Babylonian Creation Myths* (*Mesopotamian Civilizations* 16), Winona Lake.
- Legrain L. 1922, *Historical Fragments* (*University of Pennsylvania, Publications of the Babylonian Section* 13), Philadelphia.
- Leichty E. 2011, *The Royal Inscriptions of Esaraddon, King of Assyria (680-669 BC)* (*The Royal Inscriptions of the Neo-Assyrian Period* 4), Winona Lake.
- Liverani M. 1993, “Model and Actualization. The Kings of Akkad in the Historical Tradition”, in M. Liverani (ed.), *Akkad. The First World Empire. Structure, Ideology, Traditions* (*History of the Ancient Near East. Studies* 5), Padova, 41-67.
- Llop J. 2011, “The Boundary between Assyrian and Babylonia in the East Tigris Region during the Reign of Tukulti-Ninurta I (1233-1197 BC)”, in P.A. Miglus – S. Mühl (eds.) *Between the Cultures: The Central Tigris Region from the 3rd to the 1st Millennium BC* (*Heidelberger Studien zum Alten Orient* 14), Heidelberg, 209-215.

- Llop J. – George A.R. 2001/2002, “Die babylonisch-assyrischen Beziehungen und die innere Lage Assyriens in der Zeit der Auseinandersetzung zwischen Ninurta-tukulti-Assur und Mutakkil-Nusku nach neuen keilschriftlichen Quellen”, *Archiv für Orientforschung* 48-49, 1-23.
- Machinist P. 1978, *The Epic of Tukulti-Ninurta I: A Study in Middle Assyrian Literature*, unpubl. PhD dissertation (Yale University).
- Maul S.M. 2012, “Tontafelabschriften des ‘Kodex Hammurapi’ in altbabylonischer Monumentalschrift”, *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie und vorderasiatische Archäologie* 102, 76-99.
- Michalowski P. 1977, “Amar-Su’ena and the Historical Tradition”, in M. De Jong Ellis (ed.), *Essays on the Ancient Near East in Memory of Jacob Joel Finkelstein (Memoirs of the Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences 19)*, Connecticut, 155-157.
- 1988, “Divine Heroes and Historical Self-Representation: from Gilgamesh to Shulgi”, *Bulletin of the Canadian Society for Mesopotamian Studies* 16, 19-23.
- 1993, “Memory and Deed. The Historiography of the Political Expansion of the Akkad State”, in M. Liverani (ed.), *Akkad. The First World Empire. Structure, Ideology, Traditions (History of the Ancient Near East. Studies 5)*, Padova, 69-90.
- Nashef K. 1982, *Die Orts- und Gewässernamen der mittelbabylonischen und mittelasyrischen Zeit (Répertoire Géographique des Textes Cunéiformes 5)*, Wiesbaden.
- Oshima T. 2012, “Another Attempt at Two Kassite Royal Inscriptions: The Agum-Kakrime Inscription and the Inscription of Kurigalzu the son of Kadashmanharbe”, *Babel und Bibel* 6, 225-268.
- Paulus S. 2013, “Beziehungen zweier Großmächte - Elam und Babylonien in der 2. Hälfte des 2. Jt. v. Chr. Ein Beitrag zur internen Chronologie”, in K. de Graef – J. Tavernier (eds.), *Susa and Elam. Archaeological, Philological, Historical and Geographical Perspectives (Mémoires de la Délégation en Perse 58)*, Leiden - Boston, 429-449.
- Pedersén O. 1986, *Archives and Libraries in the City of Assur. A Survey of the Material from the German Excavations*, Uppsala.
- Porter B.N. 1993, *Images, Power, and Politics. Figurative Aspects of Esarhaddon’s Babylonian Policy*, Philadelphia.
- 2006, “Feeding Dinner to a Bed. Reflections on the Nature of Gods in Ancient Mesopotamia”, *State Archives of Assyria Bulletin* 15, 307-331.
- Reiner E. 2008, “In Praise of the Just”, in M. Ross (ed.), *From the Banks of the Euphrates: Studies in Honor of Alice Louise Slotsky*, Winona Lake, 207-210.
- Richter T. 2011, “Review of *The God Ninurta in the Mythology and Royal Ideology of Ancient Mesopotamia* (2002), by A. Annus”, *Archiv für Orientforschung* 52, 240-243.
- San Nicolò M. 1941, *Beiträge zu einer Prosopographie neubabylonischer Beamten der Zivil- und Tempelverwaltung (Sitzungsberichte der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften. Philosophisch-historische Abt. 2/2)*, München.
- Sassmannshausen L. 1999, “The Adaptation of the Kassites to the Babylonian Civilization”, in K. Van Lerberghe – G. Voet (eds.), *Languages and Cultures in Contact. At the Crossroads of Civilizations in the Syro-Mesopotamian Realm. Proceedings of the 42th RAI (Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta 96)*, Leuven, 409-424.

- 2001, *Beiträge zur Verwaltung und Gessellschaft Babyloniens in der Kassitenzeit* (Baghdader Forschungen 21), Mainz.
- Schaudig H. 2001, *Die Inschriften Nabonids von Babylon und Kyros' der Großen samt den in ihrem Umfeld entstandenen Tendenzschriften* (*Alter Orient und Altes Testament* 256), Münster.
- 2003, "Nabonid, der 'Archäologe auf dem Königsthron'. Erwägungen zum Geschichtsbild des ausgehenden Neubabylonischen Reiches", in G. Selz (ed.), *Festschrift für Burkhardt Kienast zu seinem 70. Geburtstag dargebracht von Freunden, Schülern und Kollegen* (*Alter Orient und Altes Testament* 274), Münster, 449-497.
- 2009, "The Colophon of the Sippar Text of the 'Weidner Chronicle'", *Nouvelles assyriologiques brèves et utilitaires* 2009/15.
- Seidl U. 1989, *Die babylonischen Kudurru-reliefs. Symbole mesopotamischer Gottheiten* (*Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis* 87), Freiburg - Schweiz - Göttingen.
- Seux M.J. 1967, *Épithètes royales akkadiennes et sumériennes*, Paris.
- Slanski K.E. 2003, *The Babylonian Entitlement narûs (kudurrus): A Study in Form and Function* (*American Schools of Oriental Research Books* 9), Boston.
- Stamm J.J. 1939, *Die Akkadische Namengebung* (*Mitteilungen der Vorderasiatisch-Agyptischen Gesellschaft* 44), Leipzig.
- Stol M. 2011, "Review of *Opening the Tablet Box. Near Eastern Studies in Honor of Benjamin R. Foster* (2010), S.C. Melville, A.L. Slotsky eds.", *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 68, 130-132.
- Van De Mieroop M. 1999, "Literature and Political Discourse in Ancient Mesopotamia: Sargon II of Assyria and Sargon of Akkad", in B. Böck – E. Cancik-Kirschbaum – T. Richter (eds.) *Munuscula Mesopotamica. Festschrift für Johannes Renger* (*Alter Orient und Altes Testament* 267), Münster, 327-339.
- 2011, "Hammurabi's Self-presentation", *Orientalia Nova Series* 80, 305-338.
- 2012, "The Mesopotamians and their Past", in J. Wieschöfer – T. Krüger (eds.), *Periodisierung und Epochenbewusstsein im Alten Testament und in seinem Umfeld* (*Oriens et Occidens* 20), Stuttgart, 37-56.
- Van Dijk J. 1986, "Die dynastischen Heiraten zwischen Kassiten und Elamern: eine verhängnisvolle Politik", *Orientalia Nova Series* 55, 159-170.
- Von Soden W. 1990, "'Weisheitstexte' in akkadischer Sprache", in W.H.P. Römer – W. Von Soden (eds.), *Weisheitstexte I (Texte aus der Umwelt des Alten Testaments III/I)*, Gütersloh, 110-188.
- Weidner E. 1963, "Assyrische Epen über die Kassitekämpfe", *Archiv für Orientforschung* 20, 113-124, pl. V-VIII.
- Westenholz A. 2000, "Assyriologists, Ancient and Modern, on Naramsin and Sharkalisharri", in J. Marzahn – H. Neumann (eds.), *Assyriologica et Semitica. Festschrift für Joachim Oelsner* (*Alter Orient und Altes Testament* 252), Münster, 545-556.
- Winter I.J. 2000, "Babylonian Archaeologists of the(ir) Mesopotamian Past", in P. Matthiae – A. Enea – L. Peyronel – F. Pinnock (eds.), *Proceedings of the First International Congress on the Archaeology of the Ancient Near East*, Roma, 1785-1800.
- Wiseman D.J. 1967, "A Late Babylonian Tribute List?", *Bulletin of the School of Oriental (and African) Studies* 30, 495-504.



Fig. 1: CBS 11014, obverse (photograph: author's own)



Fig. 2: CBS 11014, reverse (photograph: author's own)