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Abbreviations and conventions

Filiation

The typical tripartite filiation of the Neo-Babylonian period is rendered as name/father’s name/family name or, when father’s name is omitted, as name//family name.

Dating

The dating of the tablets follows the format: day-month-year king’s name. The month is expressed in large Roman numerals. The accession year is expressed as “acc”. The king’s name is abbreviated.

The Babylonian months are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roman</th>
<th>Babylonian</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>nisammu</td>
<td>(March/April)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>ayyaru</td>
<td>(April/May)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>simanu</td>
<td>(May/June)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>du’uzu</td>
<td>(June/July)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>abu</td>
<td>(July/August)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>ululu</td>
<td>(August/September)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIa</td>
<td>intercalary ululu</td>
<td>(February/March)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII</td>
<td>tašritu</td>
<td>(September/October)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>araḥsamnu</td>
<td>(October/November)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX</td>
<td>kislimu</td>
<td>(November/December)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>ṭebētu</td>
<td>(December/January)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI</td>
<td>šabātu</td>
<td>(January/February)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XII</td>
<td>addaru</td>
<td>(February/March)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIIa</td>
<td>intercalary addaru</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following list contains the king’s names (starting with Assurbanipal) with their abbreviated forms and their regnal periods converted to Julian calendar (all of them are BC). The conversions follow Parker and Dubberstein 1956:

- Mai Marduš-apla-iddina II 721-710
- Asb Assurbanipal 681-669
- Ššu Šamaš-šum-ukin 668-648
- Kan Kandalānu 648-627
- Sši Sîn-šarru-škun 628-612
- Npl Nabopolassar 626-605
- Nbk Nebuchadnezzar II 604-562
- Ami Amil-Marduk 561-560
- Ner Neriglissar 559-556
- Lab Lābāši-Marduk 556
- Nbn Nabonidus 555-539
- Cyr Cyrus 538-530
- Camb Cambyses 529-522
- Bar Bardia 522
- Nbk III Nebuchadnezzar III 522
- Nbk IV Nebuchadnezzar IV 521
- Dar Darius I 521-486
- Xer Xerxes I 485-465

Weight and measures

Weight:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Equal to</th>
<th>Approximate Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>biltu</td>
<td>talent</td>
<td>60 m</td>
<td>≈ 30 kg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>manū (m)</td>
<td>mina</td>
<td>60 ₤</td>
<td>≈ 500 g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>šiqlu (₪)</td>
<td>shekel</td>
<td></td>
<td>≈ 8.33 g</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Capacity:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Equivalent</th>
<th>Volume</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 gur</td>
<td>kurru</td>
<td>5 PI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 PI</td>
<td>pánu</td>
<td>6 bán</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 bán</td>
<td>sútu</td>
<td>6 sìla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 sìla</td>
<td>qû</td>
<td>10 GAR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 GAR</td>
<td>akalu</td>
<td>1/10 litre</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Approximately 180 litres = 5 PI
36 litres = 6 bán
6 litres = 6 sìla
1 litre = 10 GAR
1/10 litre = 1 GAR

Capacity measures are expressed using positional notation, e.g. 1;2.3.4 = 1 kurru 2 pánu 3 sútu 4 qû.

**mašḫu**

The **mašḫu** was a type of measuring container. In Sippar the regular **mašḫu** had the capacity of 1 pánu, i.e. approximately 36 litres (Jursa 1995a: 151). However, in the context of the **imittu**-deliveries the **mašḫu** was assigned a fictitious lower value of 30 litres. This was usually expressed in terms of the number of **mašḫu**-measures which ‘fit’ into one kurru (180 litres), for instance: ki (pi) 6 mašḫu ana 1 gur. Sometimes this measure was explicitly designated as **mašḫu ša imitī** (Jursa 1995a: 151). As is made clear by Jursa, this meant that a gardener had to fill the **mašḫu**-measure six times in order to pay one kurru of dates. The value of 30 litres for the **imittu**-**mašḫu** was only nominal, while in fact retained its standard size of 36 litres. This implied that for each kurru of dates charged against him the gardener delivered 216 litres instead of 180, i.e. 20% more.

In Uruk a **mašḫu** of 1 pánu (= 36 litres) is frequently attested and seems to be the standard value. However, a range of other values, all but one larger than the standard-**mašḫu** are attested (see below). A **mašḫu** of 35 litres is attested once in 18 Npl (NBC 4838 l. 3: dug mašḫu ša 1 pi 1 sìla-ām-lā; Beaulieu 2002: 105); the **mašḫu** used by the temple in 43 Nbk (NCBT 620), for instance, had a capacity of 45 litres (Beaulieu 1989b); and according to YOS 17 122, a **mašḫu** ša Eanna carried 48 litres.

It is not certain whether this measure should be equated with the **mašḫu** ša Bêlti ša Uruk, which is used frequently in the texts related to the agricultural production of Eanna, especially in the **imittu**-context. The size of the **mašḫu** of the Lady of Uruk and in turn the scope of metrological manipulations, if indeed any were applied, cannot be ascertained for the time being. The only available text which may have provided this information is damaged at the crucial passage. According to YOS 17 36, an **imittu** debt note for dates, the dates were to be delivered ina mašḫu ša 4 gaššu ša unnug / 1 x3 mašḫu aki-i 1 gur (l. 4-5). The damaged part of the text contained a numeral of which at least three wedges are visible; however, even two attempts at collation undertaken by myself and E. E. Payne on separate occasions could not provide any clarity. Unfortunately, without certainty on this numeral any further deliberation is pointless.

35 qû       NBC 4838² (18 Npl) l. 3: dug mašḫu ša 1 pi 1 sìla-ām-lā zú-lum-ma
36 qû (ša 1 pi)  NBC 4527
              NBC 4684 (32 Nbk)
              NBC 4523 (18 Npl)
              NCBT 183 (15 Npl)
              NCBT 197 (15 Nbk)
              PTS 2756 (15 Npl)
              PTS 3279 (4 Nbk)³
              YBC 4028 (13 Npl)⁴

---

¹ A **mašḫu** ša Ištar is attested once in the **imittu** debt-note for dates YBC 6868 from Neriglissar’s reign (year broken off). It is possibly identical with the more common measure of the Lady of Uruk.

² Text quoted by Beaulieu 2002: 105.

³ Edited by Beaulieu 2002: 107f.

⁴ Edited by Beaulieu 2002: 103ff.
YOS 17 159 (18 Nbk)
YOS 19 170 (5 Nbn)

43 qû YBC 9652 (20 Nbk)

43.5 qû YBC 9652 (20 Nbk)

45 qû NCBT 620 (43 Nbk) (= m. ša Eanna)
YOS 17 150 (19 Nbk) ll. 4-5: 274 ma-ši-ḫi ki-i / 68:2.3 (še-bar)

48 qû NBC 4927 (16 [Nbk]) m. ša 0;1.2-ām še-giš-i
YOS 17 122 (3 Nbk) ll. 1-3: 232 šik ma-šiḫ šá še-bar / ina šik ma-šiḫ šá é-an-na šá
0;1.2-ām / pab 61;4.3 še-bar

51 qû? YOS 17 140 (18 Nbk) ll. 1-2: 17 21-ta šušš-ma-ši-ḫu šá še-bar / ku-um 5 gur
še-bar

Length:

14 ammatu (kūš, “cubit”) = 1 NINDA ≈ 7 m
7 ammatu = 1 qanū (gi, “reed”) ≈ 3.5 m
3.5 ammatu = 1 nikkas ≈ 1.75 m
1 ammatu = 24 ubānu (šu-si, “finger”) ≈ 0.5 m
1/24 ammatu = 1 ubānu ≈ 0.02 m

Surface:

Seed measure, Uruk system (Babylon system is in brackets)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>seed measure</th>
<th>square cubits</th>
<th>square meters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 kurrú</td>
<td>50,000 (54,000)</td>
<td>12,500 (13,500)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 pānu</td>
<td>10,000 (10,800)</td>
<td>2,500 (2,700)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 sūtu</td>
<td>1,666.666 (1,800)</td>
<td>416.666 (450)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 qû</td>
<td>277.777 (300)</td>
<td>69.444 (75)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 akalu</td>
<td>27.777 (30)</td>
<td>6.944 (7.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/10 akalu (= 108 še)</td>
<td>2.777 (3)</td>
<td>0.694 (0.75)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Symbols and abbreviations

[ ] marks broken and/or restored signs and passages
' ' marks partially preserved signs
<> marks omitted signs in the cuneiform text
<<>>> marks redundant signs in the cuneiform text
{} marks information not explicitly stated, but implied by the text
! marks emended sign
? marks uncertain reading of a sign
* marks reading improved by collation
BšU Bēltu ša Uruk (= Lady of Uruk)
GN geographic name
IU Ištar Uruk (= Ištar of Uruk)
le.e. left edge of a tablet
lo.e. lower edge of a tablet

5 This figure should be corrected to 61;4.2.
Text sigla used here follow the standard Assyriological conventions and can be found, for instance, in the list of abbreviations of the Chicago Assyrian Dictionary (CAD). In addition to these, the following sigla are used for texts published and/or edited in the specified publications:

AfK 2  Text in Schwenzner 1924-25
AOAT 358  Text in Kleber 2008
AoF 31  Text in Kessler 2004
AUWE 5  Text in Gehlken 1990
AUWE 11  Text in Gehlken 1996
BaM 30  Text in Kessler 1999
CAHU  Text in Doty 1977
CD  Text in Sack 1994
Dillard  Text in Dillard 1975
EHE  Text in Durand 1982
Fs. Greenfield  Text in Geller 1995
Iraq 13, 95ff.  Text in Figulla 1951
Iraq 59  Text in Jursa 1997
JCS 28  Text in Stigers 1976
JCS 36  Text in Ellis 1984
JEOL 33  Text in Bongenaar 1993-94
Knopf, SC  Text in Knopf 1939
Montserrat  Text in Wunsch 1997
NBDM  Text in Moore 1939
NU  Text in Hunger 1970
OIP 122  Text in Weisberg 2003
Or 67  Text in Beaulieu 1998
RA 19, 86f.  Text in Thureau-Dangin 1922
RA 23, 13ff.  Text in Boissier 1926
RA 24, 38  Text in Scheil 1927
RA 54, 86f.  Text in Labat 1960
RA 76, 158  Text in Frame 1982
SAKF  Text in Oberhuber 1960
Spar, Studies  Text in Spar 1972
Truro  Text in Walker 1973
WZKM 94  Text in Jursa 2004a
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1. Introduction

Agriculture, together with animal husbandry, was the mainstay of Mesopotamian economy. In Babylonia agriculture was at all times dependent on an extensive network of irrigation canals. It rested on two pillars: on the one hand on cereal cultivation, which primarily produced barley, but also wheat, spelt and sesame, and on horticulture, which focussed on date production, on the other. Cereal farming was an extensive agricultural regime – the input of resources such as human and animal labour, seed, and water was comparably low relative to the cultivated area. By contrast, horticulture was an intensive form of agriculture with a higher input of capital and labour per unit of land, but at the same time with higher returns. In the first millennium BC agriculture was intensified. In arable farming the average yields per unit of land rose by some twenty-four percent in comparison to the Ur III and Old-Babylonian periods: more seed was expended per unit of land, which indicates that the spacing between the furrows was reduced compared to earlier periods. Another possibility to raise agricultural productivity was to focus on a more intensive form of agriculture, namely horticulture. This strategy was particularly popular with private urban landowners, but could also be applied by large institutional landowners.

An interplay of different factors enabled and drove the change observed for the agricultural practices of the sixth century BC. The (minor) climate change around 900 BC which influenced the amount of precipitation in Anatolia and west Iran had an effect on the amount of water carried by the Euphrates and the Tigris. As a result, there was a richer supply of water and the conditions for irrigation agriculture were more favourable than in the previous centuries. Technological development following the onset of the Iron Age (from ca. 1300 BC) also played a role here. Iron was easier to obtain and easier to work than tin or bronze. Even though the technological innovations of this period were not radical, they nevertheless enabled a more widespread use of agricultural iron tools and iron ploughshares. The intensification of agriculture can also be seen as a response to population growth which is also attested for Babylonia in the first millennium BC. Adams conducted an archaeological survey in Iraq recording the numbers and sizes of ancient settlements for different historical periods. The results of this study indicated more than a five-fold increase in population during a period of five to seven hundred years in the first millennium BC (1981: 178). During the ‘Middle-Babylonian’ period (according to Adams this was the time span from 1150 to 700 BC) the total occupied site area was 616 hectares. During the Neo-Babylonian and Achaemenid period this figure rose to 1,769 hectares culminating in the Seleucid-Parthian period with a total occupied area of just under 3,000 hectares. However, Adams’ analysis was fraught by several limitations: the dating of the pottery on which the whole study was based is by no means certain (this was acknowledged by Adams himself, 1981: 47ff.). Furthermore, the surveyed region did not include some of the major Babylonian urban centres, such as Babylon, Sippar, Borsippa, Kutha, Dilbat and Kiš, as well as the areas in the west and south-west Babylonia inhabited by Chaldean tribes (Brinkman 1984b: 176). For these reasons Adams’ results are not necessarily representative. While there is sound evidence for a long-term decline in population and occupation during the ‘Middle-Babylonian’ period, a decline which culminated and was subsequently reversed in the eighth century, the suggested subsequent increase in population of more than five times is too high. Although the rate of the population growth in the Neo-Babylonian period remains unquantifiable, it is nevertheless taken as a fact of the Babylonian history.

These, and other, factors affected not only the agriculture but the Babylonian society and economy as a whole. The far-reaching developments evident in the first millennium, and especially

---

6 Fruit trees, vegetables and cereals were also present in the date plantations.
7 Jursa 2010b: 49f.
8 Jursa 2010b: 34f.
10 Adams calculates the occupation area in this period as 3,201 hectares, but this figure should be modified to 2,955 hectares as Jursa points out (2010b: 39 note 164).
11 Brinkman ibid.: 178; see also Jursa 2010b: 39ff. who supports Brinkman’s conclusions.
the sixth century BC, were investigated by Jursa in his 2010 all-encompassing socio-economic depiction of first millennium Babylonia (2010b). The following study examines the temple agriculture of the first millennium BC as one facet of this particular socio-economic context. The focus is on the southern Babylonian city of Uruk and the agriculture of the main Urukean sanctuary, the temple Eanna, which was dedicated to the goddess Ištar. The primary sources utilised in this study are the tablets which were produced by the temple’s administrative apparatus, which constituted the so-called Eanna archive. This was a ‘dead archive’, discarded already in the antiquity. It encompasses over 8,000 tablets and fragments which stem mainly from the antiquities market and are housed in the collections of the Yale University, the Princeton Theological Seminary, the Louvre, the British Museum and Vorderasiatisches Museum in Berlin. Additionally, about 4,000 tablets and fragments were recovered by the German excavations in Uruk during the fifties of the previous century. They are stored in the collections of the University of Heidelberg, in the Baghdad Museum and the Istanbul Archaeological Museum. For the present study some 6,000 tablets were surveyed of which over 1,080 were directly relevant for the study of agriculture. The period under investigation is indicated by the scope of the archive: it encompasses the reigns of the kings of the Chaldean dynasty and of the first few Achaemenid rulers, i.e. roughly the time from Nabopolassar (626-605 BC) to Darius I. (521-486 BC). The archive contains a small number of earlier documents from the late Neo-Assyrian period, but the dated texts only start to be abundant from the middle of the reign of Nabopolassar (ca. from 615 BC). Where relevant these earlier documents were also taken into consideration in the following study. There is a clear break in the documentation in the second regnal year of Darius I. with only a trickle of later texts which peters out in Darius’s 29th regnal year. This break was not a result of a destruction of the Eanna temple or of a discontinuation of the archival practices. Rather it was probably connected to the settling of accounts with Gimillu, one of the temple’s agricultural contractors, as was suggested by van Driel (1998: 68ff.). A survey of a sample of 5,738 Eanna tablets supports the suggestion of an administrative clean up in the second regnal year of Darius. Most of the tablets in the sample – 1,967 – were not datable: either they were not dated, or the date was lost in a break and they could not be assigned to any ruler with certainty. Some thirty tablets were dated to Assyrian rulers (of which twenty were from the reign of Kandalānu). For the Chaldean and Achaemenid era most tablets stem from Nebuchadnezzar’s reign – 1,611. This is not surprising considering the length of this king’s rule. For a period of forty-three regnal years this would imply an average of approximately thirty-seven tablets per year. What is striking though, is that there are fifty-six tablets from Nebuchadnezzar IV’s rule, which lasted only some six months. At this rate, this would imply a theoretical average incidence of some ninety-three tablets per year – this is a 2.5 times higher ‘density’ than for Nebuchadnezzar’s rule. The average annual number of tablets was calculated or extrapolated for other rulers as well. The results are presented in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ruler</th>
<th>no. of tablets</th>
<th>incidence of tablets per year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Npl</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nbkh</td>
<td>1,611</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ami</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12 The Akkadian form of the temple name is ayakku according to Beaulieu 2002b. For the sake of convention, the Sumerian form Eanna is used throughout this study.
13 On the find circumstances and the difficulties in reconstructing the archive owed to the unsatisfactory documentation of the finds and to the fact that most of the tablets stem from illicit digs see Gehlken 1990: 6f. and van Driel 1998.
14 Smaller numbers of Eanna tablets can also be found in collections in Florence, St. Petersburg, New York, Birmingham and Montserrat. Kessler 1991: 8f. gives an overview of the publications of texts from the Eanna archive.
15 Gehlken published 240 of these tablets and fragments in 1990 and 1996.
16 These stem mostly from Kandalānu’s reign, 648-627 BC, with just a few tablets from Šamaš-šam-ukin’s reign, 668-648 BC.
17 The temple was destroyed later, probably under Xerxes (see Waerzeggers 2003-04).
18 The figures in this column are rounded off. For kings who ruled for less than a year (Lābāši-Marduk, Bardia, Nebuchadnezzar IV) the rate of tablets per year was extrapolated and is thus hypothetical. The reign of Darius is taken to last 29 years for the purpose of calculation, as the archive ends after his 29th regnal year.
Another interesting point is that of the fifty-six texts from the time of Nebuchadnezzar IV only three do not relate to Gimillu or Eanna’s agriculture. At least forty-nine texts directly concern Gimillu and the date cultivation under his responsibility. To these we can add another eight texts from the first two regnal years of Darius.\(^\text{19}\) This was the last large ‘file’ disposed of by the temple administration and it indicates a partial\(^\text{20}\) clean up of the documentation connected to this agricultural contractor whose career ended in 2 Dar.\(^\text{21}\) A thorough examination of the composition of the Eanna archive, of the distribution of texts and files, will not be attempted here as it goes beyond the scope of this study. This preliminary analysis only serves to shed light on some of the administrative practices responsible for the formation of the Eanna archive and to remind us that our perception is ultimately skewed. The fact that there is a substantial number of documents concerning date gardening, but almost none concerning arable cultivation during Nebuchadnezzar IV’s reign, for instance,\(^\text{22}\) can easily lead to erroneous conclusions unless the archival practices and the composition of the archive are kept in mind.

The following study builds up on previous scholarly work\(^\text{23}\) and uses both published and unpublished cuneiform tablets as sources. The first part deals with the organisation of agricultural work in the Eanna temple. Different types of agricultural workers, ploughmen, gardeners, sharecroppers, are treated in individual chapters. The focus is on the people involved, their social status, their duties, and generally their relationship to the institution employing them. After treating the workers who represent the lowest level of the agricultural organisation, the people in higher

\(^{19}\) See attestations of Gimillu on p. 244.

\(^{20}\) A ‘file’ concerning Gimillu’s activities on arable land has not come down to us at all.

\(^{21}\) A relatively high incidence of tablets can be observed also for Nabonidus’s reign. Of the 985 extant texts only about 227 are connected to agricultural matters. However, the composition of this clearly heterogeneous group of texts and the identification of different ‘files’ is a work which still remains to be done.

\(^{22}\) By contrast, for Cyrus’s reign we have some information on arable cultivation but practically none on horticulture.

\(^{23}\) Only a few of the relevant studies can be cited here. The afore mentioned Jursa 2010b is a comprehensive study on the economy and society of Babylonia in the first millennium BC. Van Driel 2002 is another examination of the socio-economic questions of the first millennium Babylonia, with special focus on taxation practices. Van Driel also dedicated a number of articles to the subject of agriculture in the Neo-Babylonian period in general (1987-88, 1988, 1990, 1999). As for the agriculture of the Uruk region, Coquerillat conducted an extensive study of the date cultivation and the rent farm system employed by the Eanna temple. This was published in a monograph in 1968 and accompanied by a series of complementary articles in the following years (1981, 1983, 1984a, 1984b, 19859). She also investigated the prebendar gardeners of the Eanna temple (1973-74). F. Joannès addressed matters of topography, the temple agriculture and the rent farm system in Uruk (1982) and surveyed the irrigation system (2002). Kümmel undertook an extensive prosopographic study of the organisation of labour and the administration of the Eanna temple (1979). Kleber investigated the relationship between the Eanna temple and the royal administration (2008). The only other comparable archive from the first millennium Babylonia stems from the Ebabbar temple in the north-Babylonian city Sippar. The archive of the temple dedicated to the god Šamaš counts approximately 35,000 tablets (these constitute in fact two distinct archives – an early (from the last decades of Assyrian rule to the early Chaldean period) and a later one (from the middle of Nebuchadnezzar’s reign to the second year of Xerxes) (Jursa 2005: 116ff.)) and is subject of several important studies (e.g. Bongenaar 1997, MacGinnis 1995, 2012). Different aspects of Ebabbar’s agriculture were treated exhaustively in Jursa 1995a. Da Riva (2002) also examined aspects of the temple agriculture based on the material from the ‘early’ Ebabbar archive.
hierarchic positions, different types of agricultural managers, are examined. The individual chapters are accompanied by prosopographies of the people in these positions. Special interest is given to rent farming, a type of organisation of the agricultural production characteristic for the first millennium BC. All of the known rent farmers are treated in individual chapters in which their social backgrounds and careers are described and in which lists of attestations are supplied. The second part of the study examines the land lease contracts found in the archive. Of the forty known land lease contracts twenty editions of hitherto unpublished texts are presented. Formal aspects of these contracts are discussed, as well as the terminology used in them and the duties and obligations of the involved parties. The third part of this study deals with the topography and land use patterns. The general settings of the Urukean hinterlands are described, as well as the temple estates situated there. This includes estimates on the total size of the temple’s land holdings and its income in agricultural products. Furthermore, several cadastral texts are introduced and their significance is discussed. Estimates are also made on the size of the plots and their productivity, also in comparison to other regions in Babylonia. All of this allows for conclusions on the type of agricultural regime employed by the Eanna temple which can be contrasted to other regimes identified for other regions in Babylonia. The concluding chapter is followed by a set of appendices. Appendix 1 offers editions of seventeen texts which were not incorporated in the body of the text, but which are discussed there. In total seventy-nine texts are edited in this study, of which forty-five texts were previously unpublished. Further appendices include a tabular analysis of two important accounts recording the temple income in agricultural commodities (OIP 122 82 and TCL 13 227; Appendix 2), a tabular reconstruction of the agricultural calendar (Appendix 3), a list of documents belonging to the private archive of the rent farmer Šum-ukin (Appendix 4), and a tabular lists of the imittu debt notes for dates (Appendix 5).
2. Organisation of labour

2.1. Ploughmen (ikkaru)

On the lowest level of the organisation of the temple agriculture, among the people who did the actual work on the land, one finds a group of workers called the *ikkarus*. This term, which has been discussed on many occasions before, is usually written with the logogram *engan* which can be also read as *apin = epinnu*, "plough". This can give rise to ambiguity, and certainly has done so in the past, if a determinative (lü for *ikkaru* or giš for *epinnu*) is not provided. Though *ikkaru* is generally understood to designate a "ploughman". Though an *ikkaru* engaged in other agricultural activities involved in the cultivation of grain, ploughing was the most time-consuming, work-intensive, and hence the most typical activity. This is reflected by the logogram *engan/apin*. In the context of the temple agriculture the term *ikkaru* is translated in this study as "ploughman" rather than "temple ploughman", since no such affiliation to the temple is implicit in the word *per se*. The connection to the temple could be expressed with an additional ša Bêlti ša Uruk (e.g. BIN 1 157), ša Ištar Uruk (BIN 1 156) or ša Eanna (BaM 30, no. 3 = BM 113434). However, these additional designations were most of the time omitted. In the majority of the situations reflected by our documentation this type of information was redundant from the point of view of the temple.

2.1.1. Status

A large portion of the *ikkarus* working for the temple was recruited from the stratum of temple dependants, from among the temple oblates (*širkus*), to be precise. Occasionally the ploughmen were explicitly designated as *širkus* in the texts. The appearance of such *širku-ikkaru* vs. "simple" *ikkaru* has led Dandamayev (1984: 590ff.) to the assumption that one should distinguish between these two classes of agricultural workers, despite the fact that he himself found prosopographic evidence for individuals referred to as only *ikkaru* on some and *širku-ikkaru* on other occasions (*ibid: 614*). The designation *širku* expressed an individual’s dependency on the...
temple, in other words, his legal status. This type of information was irrelevant for most of the transactions recorded in the administrative texts and so it comes as no surprise that the ploughmen usually lacked this designation. They were characterised as širkus in cases in which their legal status was relevant, i.e. in legal documents. As Jursa (1995a: 7f.) noted, against Dandamayev, there is no such thing as an “ikkaru-status”. ikkaru is primarily a professional title without any legal connotations a priori. The ikkarus’ dependency on the temple stems from their širkūtu-status. However, while it is wrong to suppose that an ikkaru not otherwise designated as a širku had automatically a different status from all the other temple oblates, at the same time the assumption that all the ploughmen working for the temple were širkus is incorrect. Some evidence for the temple’s practice of hiring labour from outside its organisation to do the ploughing is offered by GC 2 246 (not dated):

GC 2 246
obv. 1. 1la-ba-ši
    ḫa-na-a-ā-išal- ī
    1mu-ag-pab ū dumušk šā
    1din-su ü engar šā

    5. 1en-su a-šu šā 1 sum-na-a
       131 dumumšk šā ū en-[x]

lo.e. 131 dumumšk šā ū en-su

rev. 11a. [ina] muḫ-ḫi ĝa apin
      a-ga-nu-tu kū-babbar

    10. 1en-su i-maḫ-ḫar
        ḫu₂₄₅₃15 3 dumumškšū
        šā umša-pi-ia
        it<-ti>-šu-nu kū-babbar i-maḫ-ḫar

“Lābiši, Nanāya-ūṣallī, Iddin-Nabû, in total three sons of Balāssu, the ploughman of Bēl-eriba, son of Iddināya; three sons of Bēl-[x]; three sons of Bēl-eriba: these are (the men) in charge of plough(s). Bēl-eriba will receive the money. Ibnī-Ištar (and) his three sons from Șapīa are (also) with them. He will receive the money.”

Though the text is highly cursory, the only feasible interpretation is that the men listed, fathers with their sons, constituted four teams and were hired by the temple to work the ploughs. Bēl-eriba, son of Iddināya, who acted apparently as their representative, was to receive their remuneration in silver. He not only ‘had’ a plough team of his own, comprised of Balāssu and his three sons, perhaps his slaves, but himself operated a plough with his sons. Ibnī-Ištar and his sons, people from a presumably different locality, which was specifically noted, were to work together with Bēl-eriba’s teams and to be remunerated together with them. This exceptional case of ploughmen paid in silver indicates that these were external labourers hired by the temple for agricultural work. Unfortunately, the amount of silver is not stated, but this nevertheless suggests that hired

new (and unwanted) addition” in the temple agriculture (p. 149) which was the result of royal innovation p. 153). This view, based mainly on the letter YOS 3 200, is not convincing. The letter merely describes the conflict which arose between (independent) cultivators working for the temple (small-scale contractors perhaps) and the širkus who were allotted land in the same region. From the standpoint of the cultivators who had been planting orchards there for 13 years, the newly arrived širkus were unwelcome intruders. However, for all we know, this was an odd incident and was not representative of the general role of the širkus in Eanna’s agriculture.

30 For instance in documents dealing with the flight of ploughmen (e.g. YOS 7 102 (acc Camb), Dandamayev 1984: 494f.; see also YOS 7 152 (3 Camb) and YOS 7 137 (3 Camb), Dandamayev ibid.: 491ff.). The restricted use of the designation of the ploughmen’s legal status accounts for the fact that in the Ebabbar archive, which contains a comparatively small number of legal texts, ikkarus are extremely rarely labelled širku (Jursa 1995a: 7). (An example for an ikkaru designated as širku in the Ebabbar archive is the list of date disbursements BM 114818 from the time of Nabonidus. This text records dates given out to širkus, listing the recipients by name and occasionally professional titles. One of these, Éter, appears with the title ikkaru.)
ploughmen worked for a standardised fee. In this context one should also note the labour contract YOS 19 71:

YOS 19 71  10-IV-12 Nbn

1. rįl* na-na-a-kam u¹ dingir-i-la-da-* [dumu*šk]
   sà¹ i-zara-pir-ti a-na <-\textless ina\textgreater >  igi¹ līn[a-a]
   a-sū sà¹ ba-la-tu ša muḫ-hi su-ut-ti
   sà¹ gašan+unug² aπie-ki-ku-ma³ ki-a-am iq-bi-ma²

5. um-ma² ḍu³ lu ina igi-ka ni-ip³ šū
   ḍu³ a-i-šē²-isê³-šē³-nu-tu 4 [g Ur] 1+en li-sâ-nu
   1+en ap-ṭu²-ṭi 2 ma-a[r]-a-ṭi
   i-na-da-aš-šû-nu-tu <alawi> lu ina š[s] ip-pu-ru
   20 gur šē-numun līb-bi-ū ik-ka-[r]³šî

10. sà¹ gašan+unug² i-na-da-aš-šû-nu-tu
    u i-ma-āš-ḥi²-ışe³ i-ma-ḥar-šû-nu-tu

rev.

pu-ut [...]

sà gu⁴ [...]

ši-tu[...]

15. ūa-din² [...]

a-sū sà¹ išin-in²-x¹[...]

u³ umbisag³ išen-nu²[...]

uru hu-ri-za-ti šà¹ ta-qilš³-gû³-la³

ši-i-ḫu šà¹ gašan+unug² iti šû ud 10-k[am]

20. mu 12-<kam³>³ ag-i³ lugal tin-tir³

“Nanâya-ereš and Il-ilâda² [son³] of Iza-napirti went² to Ibnâya, son of Balâtu, the rent farmer of the Lady of Uruk (³3³), and said as follows: ‘We want to perform⁴⁴ (agricultural) work for you.’ Ibnâya listened⁵⁵ to them (and accepted their offer). He will give them four oxen, one ploughshare,

3¹ Note that according to the legal record YOS 7 102 (acc Camb), the infamous rent farmer Gimillu, son of Ininn-šumi-ibni (for whose career see pp. 235ff.), got hold of a fugitive ploughman of the Lady of Uruk and leased him out to a private person for an annual fee of 5 shekels of silver. The money was to be given to Gimillu. This amount can be compared to 5 kurru of barley which was the annual ration of a ploughman according to the ‘Edict of Belšazzar’ (see below).
3² The verb is written with an initial al- instead of the expected il- (l. 4). This, unless we are dealing with a plain scribal error, could be an example of ‘vowel indiffERENCE’ frequently observed in CVC (consonant-vowel-consonant) and to a lesser extent CV signs in the Neo-Babylonian period (Streck 2001: 81f.). This phenomenon, which is understood to be the result of the increasing bi-literacy of the scribes of this period (i.e. their proficiency in Akkadian cuneiform and Aramaic alphabet script), is here then exceptionally attested for a VC sign. The text is on the whole replete with misshapen signs (for instance ma in ll. 4 and 5, dul in l. 5) and odd or broken writings which will be discussed individually. Further peculiarities include redundant (ina in l. 2) and forgotten signs (dul in l. 8 and kam in l. 20) and unusual syllabic writings (e.g. l. 3: su-ut-ti for sûti, l. 9: ik-ka-[r]³šî).
3³ The divine name written in ll. 4, 10 and 19 is problematic. The sign following DINIGIR is MURUB₄, however, this combination does not result in a divine name. The god Mummu, written ūummu (= DÈ), would graphically come close to what is in the text, but is otherwise unattested in the pantheon of Uruk at this time. Beaulieu opts for the reading ‘edin, Šerua, which is a goddess originally worshipped in Assyria (2003: 323f.). The problem with this reading is that the sign EDIN does not resemble what is actually written on the tablet. Even if one took into consideration the scribe’s peculiar style exhibited in his graphic renderings of the signs ma or dul, for example, this would still be the sign EDIN does not resemble what is actually written on the tablet.
3⁴ Even to the context, one would expect here the Lady of Uruk. Ibnâya (= Ibnâ-Ḫâtar), son of Balâtu, was a širku of the Lady of Uruk, who in 11 Nbn rented some temple land for cereal cultivation (YOS 6 150). In another text, SAKF 155 (13 Nbn), he appears with the title ša muḫḫi sūt ša Bēlti ša Uruk (for this rent contract see pp. 203ff.). Has the scribe perhaps created a ligature “gašan+unug here?
3⁵ Note the writing ni-ip-ša (l. 5) for ni-puš. A comparable example for the ‘non-notation of vowels’ can be found in Streck 2001: 84 sub 5.2.2.2.
3⁶ Note the defective writing of the verb šemû in l. 6 (for išmêšumûta).
one *appatu*-tool and two spades.\textsuperscript{36} They will do\textsuperscript{37} the work there. He will give them 20 *kurru* of land,\textsuperscript{38} like the ploughmen of the Lady of Uruk (get), and he will measure\textsuperscript{39} (and) receive (barley) from them. [They] guarantee for [...] of the oxen [...]. [Witnesses: ...] Nādin [...],

\textsuperscript{36} The writings of the tools in l. 7 are peculiar. *ma-a[r]-a-ti* for *marrā(i)* is an example of a morphophonological ‘broken’ writing (cf. Streck 2001: 85 sub 6.2.4). The writing *ap-ta-ti* (or *ap-ta’*) for *appatt(i)* can be explained as a combination of three graphic phenomena, as recorded and discussed by Streck (2001). He notes that vowels are sometimes not noted following CVC and VC signs (2001: 83f.) and the initial *ap* in our text should probably be understood in this way, i.e. as standing for *ippa* (note the comparable example quoted by Streck *ibid.*: *ma-an-da-at-sū* for *mandattāsu*). The next sign, *ta*, is used vowel-indifferently, i.e. only the consonant value is decisive, /t/. The last sign can be interpreted as a complement to the preceding sign (Note, however, that these are generally found CVC or ‘vowel-indifferent’ VC signs (Streck 2001: 82 sub 2. and 83f. sub 4.).

\textsuperscript{37} Note the writing *ip-pu-re* for *ippūšu* in l. 8. Von Soden listed some Neo-Babylonian examples for rendering /s/ as *r* preceding palatal and dental stops (1995a: 39), however, a case of an intervocalic /s/ written as *r* has so far not been attested. This can be explained by assuming that *r* and /s/ (or sibilants in general) had a similar point of articulation (alveolar) as well as a similar type of closure (fricative). The Akkadian *r* would have sounded in the later period much like the Czech /f/ (Jursa 2003: 236). The opposite case of *r* being rendered as /s/ in writing, both preceding palatal and dental stops and intervocalically, is even better attested (von Soden 1995a: 44; Jursa 2003: 235f.; see also Hackl 2008: 86f.).\textsuperscript{12} Note also the one case of /ṣṣ/ being written as *rṣ* in the word *mukaṣṣītu* (*mu-kar-ṣi-ti* (quoted by Jursa 2003: 235).

\textsuperscript{38} Alternatively “seed” could be meant here.

\textsuperscript{39} The writing of the verb, the present tense of *maṣṣu* (with an accusative suffix, perhaps referring to barley), *imaššaš-š(i)*, as *i-ma-āš-ḥi-š*i can also be explained by the phenomena of ‘non-notation of vowels’ (*dā* stands for /ašša/) and the ‘vowel indifference’ of the signs *ḥi* and *iš* (see Streck 2001: 81ff.).

\textsuperscript{40} By comparison one can turn to the (semi-)private sector in the 5\textsuperscript{th} century Nippur as represented by the Muraššī archive. The leases of agricultural land attested in this archive demonstrate that land itself was cheap. The ploughs, draught animals, ploughmen, and water were the expensive factors that directly influenced the rate of the rents. If the means of production were supplied by the lessors the rents were consistently higher in proportion to the equipment/work force provided (Stolper 1985: 125ff.; 2005).

\textsuperscript{41} Actually the term simply means “cultivator”. The translation “sharecropper” is derived from their factual status of a lessee of temple land who delivered only a portion of the yield to the temple as rent and kept the rest for himself.

\textsuperscript{42} For the distinction between *ikkaru* and *errēšus* see the already quoted literature in note 24, especially Danدامayev 1985: 585ff., Kümmel 1979: 97ff. and Jursa 1995a: 7ff.
Occasionally one finds *ikkarus* in the temple records who are designated as “ploughman of PN/professional title” indicating that they could be employed for personal agricultural activities of the people/officials in question. In YBC 3493 (not dated) two persons and in BIN 1 142 (date lost) one person is designated as *ikkaru ša šakin ūmēni*; in YOS 19 75 (1 Nbn) one person, a ploughman of the resident (*ikkaru ša āppi*), appears. In several other texts the *ikkarus* are said “to be of” a certain named individual: GC 2 246 (PN *ikkaru ša Bēl-eriba/Iddināya*, the text is edited above), YOS 3 110 (PN *rešišu u ikkaršu* (of *Ša-Nabû-mannu*)), AUWE 5 86 (40 Nbk, PN *ikkaru ša Nabû-ahḫē-šullim*), BIN 1 166 (2 Ner, *ikkaru ša Šum-ukīn*), YOS 19 75 (1 Nbn, PN *ikkaru ša Šum-ukīn*). We also find *ikkarus* under the responsibility (*ša gāti*) of certain individuals: of Nādin in YOS 7 152 (3 Camb), of Etellu in TCL 13 180 (1 Dar) and perhaps of Šulāya in NBDM 89 (not dated (Cyr/Camb43)). These three men can be identified with the overseers of the plough teams, *rab epinnis*44 bearing the same names. Some of the other named individuals could conceivably also be assigned to different levels of the agricultural management, though all of these identifications are uncertain, as we are usually missing the patronymics. Nabû-ahḫē-šullim from AUWE 5 86 could thus be identified with the *rab ēserit* and the *rab ikkarāti* of the same name (see p. 116) and Šum-ukīn from BIN 1 166 and YOS 19 75 could be the large-scale rent farmer from the Basia family (see pp. 158ff.). However, for Bēl-eriba, son of Iddināya (GC 2 246), *Ša-Nabû-mannu*45 (YOS 3 110) and Nergal-uballit46 (BIN 1 44) not even such tentative identifications are possible. The status of the *ikkarus* in question is highly uncertain. In some cases those who have been ‘regular’ temple ploughmen working under the responsibility of certain agricultural officials, though it is still not clear why this relationship was stressed in these particular instances. In others they could have been anything from personal slaves or hired labourers of the individuals/officials in question, who were entrusted with the ploughing of their masters’ fields, to perhaps even small-scale tenants or settlers on the land belonging to private parties. The possibility that these were temple ploughmen who were put at the service of the temple officials cannot be entirely excluded either. Be that as it may, a further twist in the line of dependencies and responsibilities is introduced by their interaction with the temple. In some47 of the attestations these ‘private’ *ikkarus* seem to have had obligations toward the temple as their deliveries of agricultural produce to Eanna indicate. It seems that they were discharging these obligations on behalf of their ‘masters’, who had probably leased land from the temple.48

To sum up, the term *ikkaru* had no legal implications. What the people designated by this term had in common, was the work with a plough. Other than that, *ikkarus* that appear in the Eanna texts do not represent a homogeneous group: Temple oblates as well as free persons hired by the temple are described as *ikkarus*, as well as slaves or hirelings of contractors working for the temple. As a rule, the temple had to provide the tools and the draught animals to the *ikkaru*.

---

43 The text should be dated either to the end of Cyrus’s or the beginning of Cambyses’s reign, as the governor of Babylonia, Gūbaru, appears in it. Šulāya is not given a patronymic (l. 24), so this attestation is not certain.
44 The *rab epinni* Nādin, son of Innin-zēr-ibni, was attested from 14 Nbn until 1 Nbk IV. The *rab epinni* Etellu, son of Zēria, was attested from 8 Nbn until 6 Camb (or 1 Dar with this attestation). Their colleague Šulāya, son of Šin-nādin-šumi, was attested from 2 Ner until 1 Nbk IV (see the chapter on *rab epinnis*, p. 96).
45 A certain *Ša-Nabû-mannu*, perhaps the same person judging by the rare name, appears also in the letter YOS 3 163, however, in a broken context.
46 At least it can be assumed that Nergal-uballit did not belong to the temple organisation, since the authors of this letter complain about him taking the water from the canal belonging to the Lady of Uruk, to which he obviously had no right.
47 E.g. in YBC 3493, AUWE 5 86, BIN 1 166, YOS 19 75.
48 A similar three-level arrangement can be observed in the archive of Itti-Šamaš-balātu, son of Lābāši, an entrepreneur from Larsa (Beaulieu 2000: 43ff.): according to the work contract NCBT 1021 (edited *ibid.* : 47) Itti-Šamaš-balātu employed (l. 5: *uš-še-ziz*) his *ikkaru* and his (and another person’s) gardener for work on land, which belonged to the state administration. That this was crown land is evident from the stipulation on the shares of the harvest: the labourers (the *ikkaru* and the *nukuribbu*) were entitled to a half share of what remained after the king had taken his share (we are not told how much this was). As Beaulieu observed, this transaction was “tantamount to sublease” of crown land (*ibid.* : 47). (Ploughmen of Itti-Šamaš-balātu and other individuals appear also in YOS 19 69; however, the details of this work contract are not entirely clear owing to the state of preservation of the tablet.)
2.1.2. Organisation

2.1.2.1. The plough team

The plough was the basic tool of the ploughmen; hence the basic work units were organised around it. We call these work units plough teams or teams for short. The term conveniently used for them in Akkadian was *epinnu*, plough.\(^{49}\) Each plough team consisted therefore of a plough, of draught animals\(^{50}\) and men, *ikkarus*, who operated it and drove the animals. The number of men and animals working in a team varied, but as transpires from the ‘Edict of Belšazzar’ (see below) and some rent contracts, there existed a norm for the composition of a plough team. Ideally four men, four oxen and two cows were part of a team.\(^{51}\) The oxen were used for pulling the plough, though it is not clear whether all four were used simultaneously. Van Driel suggested that only two oxen at a time were harnessed and did the work. Thus two teams of oxen could be used alternately which resulted in increased performance (1990: 227; see also below).\(^{52}\) Oxen trained for pulling a plough appear occasionally with the designation *ummānu*.\(^{53}\)

The purpose of the cows was to keep the number of the draught animals up to strength with their offspring. It was explicitly stated in some of the rent contracts that the oxen provided by the temple were “made of iron”, in other words, that they were supposed to be imperishable, at least for accounting purposes. It was consequently the tenant’s responsibility to replace the dead animals.\(^{54}\) However, in the absence of adequate numbers of oxen, cows could be used for pulling the ploughs. Cows trained for this task were designated as *šaddītu*.\(^{55}\)

Frequently, however, the standard for a plough team was not attained. Particularly the ‘practical’ texts from the Ebabbar of Sippar give evidence for this. Texts recording inspections of the plough teams, usually conducted shortly before the ploughing season, demonstrate that the ideal of four men, four oxen and two cows was rarely reached in practice (Jursa 1995a: 17). The administration of Ebabbar even introduced terms such as “half-plough” (*mišīl epinni*) or “two-thirds-plough” to designate under-strength teams with respect to both animals and men, indicating teams of lower productivity. The fractions may even have been related to the quota expected from these teams.\(^{56}\) Somewhat surprisingly teams consisting of more than four men are also known from both Sippar and Uruk. For instance in OIP 122 172 from Eanna, a list of 53 *ikkarus* distributed in ten plough teams, one encounters teams consisting of either three or six people. It is conceivable that not all of the people listed were fully productive as some of them may have been children (their age is not noted, though).

The individual duties of the members of a plough team are not spelled out explicitly in our texts. During the planting season the work of at least three men was required: one would drive the

\(^{49}\) That *epinnu* referred both to the plough itself and the work unit, the plough team, was already noted by Kümmel 1979: 99f. The plough implied by this term was a seeder plough (see for instance Hruška 2003-05: 510ff. and Potts 1997: 78f.). It was made mainly of wood, but the ploughshare was usually made of iron in this period (for archaeological finds of iron ploughshares see Seidl 2003-05: 514).

\(^{50}\) In the course of Mesopotamian history donkeys, mules, horses (Weszeli 2003-05: 475) and bovines were used for the traction of ploughs. In the temple records of the Neo-Babylonian period, however, only oxen and cows are attested as draught animals.

\(^{51}\) YOS 6 103 (7 Nbn), YOS 6 150 (11 Nbn), TCL 13 182 (2 Dar). However, note that according to Šum-ukin’s and Kalḥāya’s rent contract (YOS 6 11 (1 Nbn) + duplicates) a team consisted of four men, four oxen and only one cow.

\(^{52}\) It is generally known that each additional animal harnessed reduces the speed of a plough team (Renger 1990: 271). However, evidence from sub-Saharan Africa shows that using two pairs of oxen instead of just one could extend the daily working hours by approximately 20% (Renger 1990: 271f.).


\(^{54}\) E.g. the lines 20f. of the ‘Edict’ (YOS 6 103) read: *gu₄₅₆₄ ul i-mut-ti / ša an-bar ša-du-nu* (“The oxen will not die; they are (made) of iron”). In YOS 6 11, the cows are stated to be intended for the upkeep (literally “repair”) of the oxen, line 10: 1 me áb-gal₄₅₆₄ a-na bat qa ša₄ me *gu₄₅₆₄*.

\(^{55}\) Van Driel 1995: 224-226, Jursa 1995a: 17.\(^{60}\) For more terms for oxen and cows used as draught animals see Weszeli 2007: 393f.

\(^{56}\) Jursa 1995a: 18. 139\(^{283}\).
oxen (this could be a boy), one would steady the plough (this had to be an adult in full strength) and one would apply the seed (van Driel 1990: 227). Very frequently, but not exclusively, family members, fathers and sons, uncles, etc., constituted a plough team. Most of the evidence for this comes again from the inspection lists (amīrītu) from Sippar. For these lists consist of three to four people of which one to two were adults. Old people (šibu), fully productive workers (iṭābu) and children, differentiated by age, appear in one of these lists (CT 56 481+). This particular text informs us that children of five years or older already counted as iṭābu, i.e. had to work.

Very rarely are such details available from the documentation from Eanna. BIN 1 157 (not dated, but on prosopographic grounds probably from Nebuchadnezzar’s reign) is a list of 46 ploughmen of the Lady of Uruk; however, no further information, other than patronyms, is given. These ikkaru were probably the representatives of individual plough teams. Another list of the ploughmen, the already mentioned OIP 122 172 (not dated, but prosopographically to be placed in Nebuchadnezzar’s reign), gives a more detailed picture. The leader of each team was accompanied by his son(s) and brother(s). Frequently members of different families appear together in the teams listed here. The list AUWE 11 205 (40 Nbk) was originally the most detailed as it provided both the information on the family ties as well as the age-class of the person in question. Unfortunately the fragmentary state of the text renders it almost useless for prosopographic purposes. Nevertheless, we are informed that, similarly to the plough teams in Sippar, in Uruk they consisted of old people, fully productive grown-ups (Iú = amīlu), young men (rabū, written ilgal or syllubically), and children distinguished by age. Among them two, six and ten year-olds are attested.63

Inspections of ploughmen and plough teams must have occurred on a regular basis in Uruk also, even though this type of texts is underrepresented in the predominantly legally oriented part of the Eanna archive available to us. It should be noted, however, that the high temple administration ordered an overseer of the ploughmen to bring all the ikkaru of the Lady of Uruk from a certain locality, together with their sons and brothers, their ‘substitutes’ (kutallātu), and the additional men (jiipānu), who are with them, and show them to the chief administrator of Eanna (YOS 17 33, 19 Nbk). The purpose of this summons may have been an inspection of the agricultural workers. At any rate it is evident that beside family members ‘outsiders’, whichever their affiliation may have been, were summoned to the palace for such an inspection.

---

65 Jursa 1995a: 8f. For Uruk see below.
66 See van Driel 2002: 209 with earlier literature.
67 Jursa 1995a: 8f.
68 This seems very likely in the light of the fact that most of the men listed were not related. Only four of the 37 extant patronyms are repeated (one three times and three two times each), and this is not necessarily a proof of these people belonging to the same family as the names in question are rather common. In texts listing members of individual plough teams the incidence of familial relations is much higher.
69 Marked in this text with a prefixed large Personenkelt.
70 Following Gehlen’s translation of the term (1996: 45).
71 This can hardly be taken for an indication that the children from Uruk had a ‘nicer’ childhood than their peers from Sippar, who apparently counted with the fully productive workers from their fifth year on.
72 According to CAD K: 607 kutallātu expressed an “obligation to serve as a reservist in the royal army”, an obligation which probably arose from fief holdings such as bow-land or the like. This taxation-related term was probably not intended in our text (see Abraham 2004: 425; van Driel 2002: 247-249; for non-taxation related occurrences of kutallātu see ibid.: 248). This is indicated in the copy. The Chicago Assyrian Dictionary records for the word tīpu, “attachment, addition”, only the attestations in a mathematical context and in relation to buildings as annexes (CAD T: 112f.). In our text it refers to people, designating extra personnel. The term appears in the taxation context in some Egiḫi documents edited by Abraham 2004: no. 6 (l. 2) on pp. 212ff. and no. 15 (l. 5) on pp. 230ff. It designates the people obliged to perform the ilku and the bow-service: in this context the documents usually refer to a specific person (PN) accompanied by his tīpānī, an anonymous group of people. (Abraham briefly discusses the term on p. 213; however, she opts for the emendation to qipānu and translates it as “administrators”; however, see van Driel 2002: 240f. with note 59. See also Jursa 1999: 106.)
73 The text is edited on p. 88.
74 However, other reasons, which unfortunately elude us, are perhaps more probable. For one it is questionable whether the chief temple administrator (ṣatammu) would have personally conducted an amīrītu,
particular functions may have been, could be associated with the ploughmen. A similar situation is found in TCL 13 152 (2 Camb). Here the ikkarus, who were at the same time the overseers of the plough teams, were summoned for some reason to Babylon, but were obliged to make sure that their brothers, sons and workers (šābū) guarded the barley while they were away.

2.1.2.2. Overseers

The exact number of the ploughmen and the plough teams of Eanna is not known and it may have varied over time. The list BIN 1 157 (see above) seems to indicate that at some point in Nebuchadnezzar’s reign there were only 46 plough teams. At the beginning of Nabonidus’s reign a rent contract speaks of hundred plough teams, or in other words 400 ikkarus. This was the contingent the temple promised to provide to the rent farmers Šum-ukin and Kalbāya (YOS 6 11 + duplicates, 1 Nbn). These conspicuously round figures were probably to an extent fictitious. They were calculated on the basis of the surface area leased to these two rent farmers and did not represent the actual situation. There is no way of knowing what the actual figures were. It is possible that there were in fact more ploughmen, since in 3 Nbn two more rent farms in addition to Šum-ukin’s and Kalbāya’s were established (YOS 6 40 and 41). Admittedly these contracts give no stipulations on plough teams, possibly indicating that it was the responsibility of the rent farmers to organise the work-force and the means of production. It should be noted, however, that at the beginning of Darius’s reign when the temple administration dismissed the rent farmer Gimillu who had fifty plough teams at his disposal, it promised his successor Bēl-gimlanni to raise the contingent to hundred teams in the following year (TCL 13 182, 2 Dar), even though the area under cultivation was much smaller than Šum-ukin’s and Kalbāya’s. At this time some ploughmen may have also be employed under the direct supervision of the temple officials rab epinni (see pp.96ff.). In other words, the temple probably had more than fifty plough teams at its disposal and there must have been at least a theoretical chance for it to recruit hundred plough teams. For the time being all speculations on the exact numbers of ploughmen cannot go beyond these rough estimates.

Their number was at any rate high enough in order to exact several levels of supervision. At the head of each plough team there was one individual who represented it for administrative purposes. This is usually the person who appears in our texts, e.g. as the person making a delivery of agricultural produce in imittu lists or as the debtor in imittu debt notes. If at all, these people are normally designated as ikkarus only. However, in some instances in the texts from Sippar they are attested with the title rab epinni. In Uruk the ‘heads of plough teams’ appear only as ikkarus. Only once do we hear of a bēl epinni, who could well have been the equivalent of a Sipparean rab epinni. In YOS 7 102 (acc Camb) a certain Rēḫētu, a ploughman and a širku of Ištar of Urūk, testified before the šatammu and the bēl piqitti of Eanna to have fled from the plough of Šamaš-mukin-apli, the son of Sīn-nādin-šumi, ploughman of the Lady of Urūk, his bēl epinni. Besides each having a representative within the plough team (bēl epinni?), the teams were subordinated to local overseers. These were recruited from among their own ranks. In Sippar they

if one is to take the wording of the text literally. Furthermore, the text was written in the ninth month, i.e. in the middle of the ploughing and sowing season. This was not a favourable moment for conducting an inspection as it would interrupt the ongoing work on the fields. A regular inspection should have ideally happened before the ploughing season for the purpose of taking stock of the available resources.

See the chapter on rab epinni (p. 96) and below.

For a partial edition of the text see Kümmel 1979: 100f. The text was written in the first month, which implies that the barley had not been harvested yet and needed to be guarded (l. 15: ma-aš-šar-tuš ša še-bar) either against pest, flooding or simply theft.

Šum-ukin’s and Kalbāya’s rented 6,000 kurru of land while Gimillu and after him Bēl-gimlanni had 1,000 kurru of land at their disposal.

Jursa 1995a: 9. They should not be confused with the Urukean officials rab epinnis (see chapter 96 and below), who were attested during the Achaemenid period and were in charge of several plough teams.

For a translation of the text see Dandamayev 1984: 494f.

Šum-ukin’s and Kalbāya’s went on a tour of inspection as it would interrupt the ongoing work on the fields. A regular inspection should have ideally happened before the ploughing season for the purpose of taking stock of the available resources.

YS 7 102 l. 4-6: ul-tu ugu 5i apin / ša ša 4e širku 3uš 14-30-na-din-mu 15 engar ša ḫaššiš ša unug 20 en 8i apin-īā / aḫ-li-iq-ša ...
did not have a specific title,\textsuperscript{74} but in Uruk they appear as “overseers of ten” (\textit{rab ešerti}s) during Nebuchadnezzar’s reign or as “overseers of plough (teams)” (\textit{rab epinnis}) during the Achaemenid rule. Following OIP 122 172 one can conclude that at least the \textit{rab ešerti}s were in charge of ten teams\textsuperscript{75} (no such lists are attested for the \textit{rab epinnis}). Despite the meagre evidence this title probably also reflected their responsibilities over ploughmen when employed for non-agricultural work (and organised in groups of ten, decuries, as was common practice at the time).\textsuperscript{76} Their duties were at any rate very similar to those of the \textit{rab epinnis} (for details see the pertinent chapters on these “officials’), the main being assuming the responsibility for the deliveries of agricultural produce from their respective localities.

The so-called “canal inspectors”, the \textit{gugallus}, were another type of officials under whose authority the ploughmen stood. They, too, were usually hired from among the ploughmen or gardeners. Apart from the obvious, namely their responsibility for various tasks concerning the irrigation system, the upkeep of the old and the creation of new irrigation canals, dikes, etc.,\textsuperscript{77} it is not clear to what extent their activities and duties with respect to ploughmen differed from those of the \textit{rab ešerti}/\textit{epinnis}.\textsuperscript{78}

At the top of the hierarchy of the agricultural officials was one “overseer of the ploughmen” (\textit{rab ikkarāti}), who was a ploughman himself. This official is known from both Sippar and Uruk.\textsuperscript{79} Apparently he had a longer tradition in the temple organisation: his first so far known attestation stems from the 20\textsuperscript{th} year of Kandalānu.\textsuperscript{80} However, with the introduction of the large-scale rent farms, this official was rendered obsolete, his responsibilities being taken over by the rent farmer. The Urukean rent farmer Šum-uki was known to have been in charge of ten plough teams (\textit{súti}, lit. “ten ploughmen”),\textsuperscript{81} which was a ploughman himself. This official is known from both Sippar and Uruk.\textsuperscript{82} It is not clear whether the intermediate structure of overseers was kept up. Though some of these people still occasionally appear in our sources during the period of large-scale rent farms, they do not do so in any official function. As they probably dealt directly with the rent farmer, rather than the temple administration, it is only natural that they are not visible in the documentation of this time.

2.1.2.3. The ‘Edict’, the workload of \textit{ikkarus}, and some quantitative considerations

A good starting point for a discussion of the obligations of the ploughmen is the so-called ‘Edict of Belšazzar’ (YOS 6 103, 7 Nbn),\textsuperscript{83} a document dealing with the estates of the god Bēl of Babylon which had been distributed to rent farmers (\textit{rab sūtis} in this text) by the crown prince

\textsuperscript{74} Jursa 1995a: 10.
\textsuperscript{75} Line 54 reads: pab 10 64 apinmek Ína igi ld u-gur-súš-sur a-sī ša 1'za-bi-da-a. This Nergal-ina-tešši-čet is known from BIN 1 112 (19 Nbk) as a \textit{rab ešerti}. Cf. also AUWE 11 205, of which the last line (rev. III l. 8’) reads: [ša or lä] 10-ti ša dû-15. Ibni-štar, son of Nabû-šum-ibni, is attested as a \textit{rab ešerti} in YBC 4000 (34 Nbn, Janković 2005: 167ff.).
\textsuperscript{76} Cf., for instance, the letter YOS 21 115 discussed in the note 151. Note that \textit{rab ešerti} appeared not only in the agricultural but also in other spheres of the temple organisation (Bongenaar 1997: 130). They appear in Sippar only once in connection with the ploughmen, however, the context is not clearly agricultural (Nbk. 458; cf. van Driel 1990: 234 and Jursa 1995a: 22).
\textsuperscript{77} See Janković 2007.
\textsuperscript{78} The \textit{gugallus} are treated in detail in a separate chapter, p. 118.
\textsuperscript{79} For Sippar see Jursa 1995a: 11. 24f. and for Uruk see below p. 114.
\textsuperscript{80} AJo 16: 42 no. 8, quoted in Jursa 1995a: 11.
\textsuperscript{81} An edition of the text can be found in Coquerellet 1968: 37. 108 and van Driel 1987-88: 61ff.; see also the discussion in Joannès 1982: 142ff.; see Jursa 1995a: 137f. for a summary and the applicability of the model in Sippar and generally in practice. Some of Coquerellet’s reconstructions of the broken portions of the text, especially of the numerical values, are dubious, particularly the area of 125 \textit{kurr} per plough team. The interpretation and reconstructions proposed by van Driel (1987-88: 62ff.; 1990: 224f.) certainly make a more coherent picture, though the text is still problematic owing to breaks and its irregular phrasing (for a ‘catalogue of errors’ see van Driel 1987-88: 62). Most recently van Driel (2002: 166ff., especially p. 170) returned to this text and re-interpreted some parts of it, in particular the arable section (ll. 15-30). However, he did not comment on these changes in the light of his earlier interpretations and on certain aspects of this part of the text (e.g. the total costs and their implications for the \textit{ikkarus}).
Belšazzar. At this time he was heading the government in Babylon while his father, the king Nabonidus, was in Teima. The text is divided in two sections and lists in general terms (no particular localities or people are named) the quotas of the gardeners, on the one, and the ikkarus, on the other hand: the size of the plots, the means of production (tools, draught animals, ploughmen, seed) assigned to them, the expected revenues, and the administrative fees. This particular localities or people are named) the quotas of the gardeners, on the one, and the Nabonidus, was in Teima.

The text has been edited and discussed on numerous occasions in the past, but nevertheless, it is still not perfectly understandable. The arithmetic of the section concerning the arable cultivation in particular poses some problems. First we will turn to this section, which is presented here in translation:

YOS 6 103 ll. 15-30:
“[Per plough] they\(^{82}\) gave 25 kurru of arable land. Per each kurru (of land the ploughman) will give 12 kurru of barley as net rent. Additionally 5 kurru of land are gra[ned] for costs and for rations of the governor, scribes, measurers and gate keepers. For one plough 4 oxen, 2 cows (and) 4 [ploughmen] are provided. The oxen will not die; they are (made) of iron. Per kurru they will add to the rent 11½ litres of barley or dates for rations and give them to Esagil; they must give the barley and dates net in Esagil. Per kurru they will give 3½ litres as rations to the governor, the scribes, the measurers and the gate keepers over and above their rent. In the first year they will give [per plough] 25 kurru of barley for seed, and [20 kurru for] rations of the ploughmen. [In total] they will give 45 kurru of barley.”

According to this section a plough team consisting of one plough, four oxen, two cows and four ploughmen was assigned an area of 25 kurru of land for cultivation. In the first year of the lease they were provided with 25 kurru of barley seed (including fodder for the cattle\(^{84}\)) and 20 kurru of barley for the rations of the ikkarus.\(^{85}\) The yield per 1 kurru of land was estimated at 12 kurru of barley, in other words, for the entire plot of 25 kurru of land one could expect the returns of 300 kurru of barley.

In order to cover the running costs (seed, rations, administrative taxes) another 5 kurru of land were provided.\(^{86}\) This is where my interpretation (and van Driel’s most recent one (2002: 170), though this is not stressed or commented further by him) diverges from the generally accepted previous interpretations proposed by van Driel (1987-88: 64; 1990: 224f.). According to these, 5 kurru of land were set aside from among the already granted 25 kurru, meaning that the temple received the revenue from 20 kurru of land, i.e. 240 kurru of barley.\(^{87}\) However, this is not what the text says. It states clearly that 25 kurru of land were given, for which a 12-fold revenue was expected, and (l. 17) that 5 kurru were provided for the costs and rations of various officials. In total then 30 kurru of land were granted to each plough team. The revenue of these extra 5 kurru of

\(^{82}\) Note that the text lacks the typical legal form, i.e. a witness list or a date formula, unlike the ‘Edict of Ammišaduqa’, for instance. For ‘Edict’ being a misnomer in this particular case see van Driel 1987-88: 61.

\(^{83}\) “They” refers to the rent farmers (rab sūtis).

\(^{84}\) This is nowhere stated explicitly, but Powell (1984: 64) suggested this interpretation in general for the Neo-Babylonian period since otherwise one would end up with an inexplicably high ratio of seed to land. He further assumes that half of the provided barley was used for sowing and the other half was used as fodder for draught animals. For seed to fodder ratios see below.

\(^{85}\) This figure is reconstructed. As the text stipulates 25 kurru for seed for the first year of the lease, and at the end of the text records 45 kurru, it was van Driel’s idea to see this last figure as the total and reconstruct 20 kurru for rations of the ploughmen in the previous line (ll. 27-30: ... mu-an-na mah-ri-iti / [ana ùšapin] 25 gur še-bar ana še-1-numun¹ / [20 gur a-na] šukšiš-a ša ša-še engaše i-1-nam-di-nu¹ / [Ø pap] 45 gur še-bar i-nam-[di-nu]).

\(^{86}\) Note that the seed is not provided for this extra plot in the first year.

land, i.e. 60 kurru of barley, calculated using the yield factor 12, was available to the plough team for the annual expenses. These were comprised of seed, rations of the ploughmen and administrative costs including rations of the officials. The seed (and fodder) amounted to 25 kurru for the main plot and 5 kurru for the extra land. The rations of the ploughmen would have amounted to 20 kurru, to follow van Driel’s reconstruction. The administrative costs, rations for the bél píhāti, the measurers (mādīdūs) and the gatekeepers (atūs), amounted to 0;0.2.3 (0;0.1.5½ + 0;0.0.3½) kurru per 1 kurru of barley, i.e. 1/12 or 8.3% of the barley revenue. Presumably this percentage referred to the amount of barley delivered to the temple as rent and the administrative costs add up to 0;0.2.3 × 300 = 25 kurru of barley.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>costs in kurru</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>seed + fodder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rations of ploughmen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>administrative costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The total costs were consequently 75 kurru of barley. The barley provided by the extra plot of 5 kurru amounted to 60 kurru on average, following the model given by the ‘Edict’ (yield factor 12). This means that according to this model the ikkarus had a deficit of around 15 kurru of barley which they somehow had to make up for. This deficit was, however, only virtual. Whether there was a deficit at all depended on the productivity of land. With a yield factor 12 or less there certainly would have been one. However, this is just an average value. In fact, higher factors, of 15 and higher (up to 30), are also well attested in the ‘practical’ texts from Sippar (see below). The plot of 5 kurru with the yield factor 15 would cover the costs exactly (5 × 15 = 75). In essence, the model used by the temple administration was deliberately constructed so as not to work out neatly and make it all too easy for the rent farmers and the ploughmen, but rather provide an incentive for them to strive to achieve the highest possible productivity of land. The productivity had to be above the average if they were to generate enough surpluses to cover the running costs and make profit too.

---

88 I.e., 5 kurru of barley per man per year, or 75 litres per man per month, which was less than the more frequent monthly ration of 180 litres for the adult temple workers (Jursa 2008a: 292 and passim; Bongenaar 1997: 2972⁵²), but more than the occasionally attested 30 litre ration for workers in Uruk (Gehlken 1990: 81ff.). This amount was at any rate more than enough to sustain a male adult, as the monthly costs of living amounted to about 50 litres of barley (Janković 2008: 441). The barley ideally intended for the ploughmen by the ‘Edict’ was in fact hardly more than a subsistence allowance, as opposed to the larger rations (e.g. the typical monthly 1 kurru ration) which can be considered as wages.

89 The two separate amounts had to do with the internal accounting of the Esagil temple. This is evident from the section on date orchards in which one finds the same fractions as administrative costs: 1 sîtu 5½ qā and 3½ qā per one kurru of dates (in total 15 litres per kurru or 1/12 of the rent). Lines 10-11 state that 0;0.1.5½ dates, the rations of the governor, scribes, measurers and gatekeepers, will be retained in the silo (kalakkū), while 0;0.0.3½ dates, the rations of these same officials will be given to them and they will consume them (immediately) (ll. 12-14). Whatever the significance of these different treatments of the administrative costs, the same procedure seems to have been applied to the fees due from arable land.

90 These issues are not dealt with by van Driel in his latest analysis of the text (2002: 170). However, according to his earlier interpretations (van Driel 1987-88: 64; 1990: 224ff.) this amount exceeds the total costs calculated by him by 10 kurru. He assumed that seed and fodder would amount to 25 kurru, rations of the ploughmen to 20 kurru and administrative costs to 20 kurru (0;0.2.3 × 240 = 20), i.e. in total 65 kurru. According to this model, the ikkarus only had a deficit of 5 kurru (this was equivalent, for instance, to the seed for the plot reserved for the costs), which, if correct, is certainly a more attractive scheme for the ploughmen.

91 And not only that. If the same factor were applied to the main plot, it would produce 25 × 15 = 375 kurru of barley. Of these, 300 kurru would be delivered to the temple, which left the rent farmer with a profit of 75 kurru or 20%. (Calculated over the entire plot of 30 kurru with the deduction of running costs, the profit of the rent farmer would have amounted to 16.67% of the yield.)

92 This is not only visible in the example of running costs, but also in the fact that in the first year the temple did not provide the seed for the additional 5 kurru of land.
2.1.2.4. Sowing rates and yields

In the institutional context in the Neo-Babylonian period the ‘seed’ expended was equivalent to the amount of land on which it was to be sown. Already in the Kassite period “the seed rate becomes a definition of surface” (Powell 1984: 58). In other words for 1 kurru of land (in the temples of Uruk and Sippur 50,000 square cubits or ca. 1.25 ha) 1 kurru of seed (180 litres) was given out. This is equivalent to 144 litres per hectare and is a fairly high ratio. Though the Neo-Babylonian texts never state this explicitly, unlike, for instance, the so-called seed and fodder texts (see for instance Maekawa 1984: 75f.), these 180 litres must have included barley which was not sown but used for other purposes, most probably for fodder of the draught animals. Powell assumed a 1:1 seed to fodder ratio (1984: 64), meaning that per each kurru of land 90 litres of barley were sown out (= 72 l/ha) and 90 litres were used as fodder of the oxen.

Other seed to fodder ratios are also attested in the Ur III period, e.g. 2:1 or 6:5 (Jursa 2008b: 622). Powell speaks of half-feed in this context (1984: 48), implying that in the 2:1 seed to fodder ratio in fact only half of the fodder was included, the other half presumably being the responsibility of the ploughmen (thus also Civil 1994: 82).

As for the actual amount of barley sown out, there was no one generally applicable sowing rate per unit of area. This is demonstrated by the various sowing rates attested in the Ur III period, which usually ranged from 240 sìla/bùr to 360 sìla/bùr (37 to 55.6 l/ha). Various factors such as quality of soil or availability of irrigation water played a role. Furthermore, the different furrow intervals also influenced the sowing rates. Despite these variations a rate of 300 sìla per bùr of land (with 10 furrows per nindan, i.e. furrow spacing of 60 cm) which is equivalent to 46 l/ha could be taken as an institutional norm in the Ur III period. This sowing rate is very low compared to the modern data from Iraq and can be explained by the efficient use of seed when working with a seeder plough as opposed to broadcast sowing. In terms of length of furrow, the standard of 300 sìla/bùr can be translated into 1 gín (= 1/60 sìla) of seed per 1 nindan (= ca. 6 m) length of furrow (Maekawa 1984: 76). Interestingly, this same rate is mentioned also in the ‘Farmer’s Instructions’ (l. 51 following Civil’s 1994 edition).

The Neo-Babylonian equivalent of 1 kurru of ‘seed’ to 1 kurru of land implied, if we assume a seed to fodder ratio of 1:1, a sowing rate of approximately 72 litres per hectare. This is an increase of roughly 56 % over the common Ur III rate of 46 litres per hectare, which has been interpreted as a sign of intensification of agriculture and even deterioration of the soil quality due to increasing soil salinity. Powell explained this phenomenon by assuming that the furrow intervals were reduced in the Neo-Babylonian period to 41.6 cm, which resulted in approximately 14.4 furrows per nindan. This represented an increase of 44 % in furrow length in comparison to the standard 10 furrows per nindan of the Ur III period. Not only were there more furrows per unit

93 Note that in a text from pre-Sargonic Lagaš (VS 14 184) a very different ratio is attested, namely 1:2 seed to fodder. The text distinguishes between the more difficult work of land reclamation, which probably included several rounds of ploughing and harrowing, and the final ploughing and sowing. According to it, the more difficult work required double the amount of fodder, while in the final, less strenuous work-step, namely the sowing, the expenditure of seed and fodder was 1:1 (Hruška 1984).
94 Jursa 2008b: 622; see also Powell 1984: 48 table 1.
95 The higher the quality of soil and the more water was available the more densely could be sown. Where the conditions were not ideal less seed was put into ground and the deficits of the soil and other external conditions were made up for by providing more space for the individual plants. In this way their roots could expand to a greater extent than those of the more thickly sown barley and more tillering could occur, which brought the yields to approximately the same level as the yields on better quality soils, with denser sowing (See Powell 1984: 49 and Halstead 1990: 188).
96 See for instance table 5 in Pettinato and Waetzoldt (1975: 278f.) which compares the sowing rates from Lagaš, Umma and Nippur. Note, however, that for conversion purposes they use the equivalent 1 sìla = 0.84 litre. Powell argues against this insisting on a 1 sìla = 1 litre conversion rate (1984: 33), which is also used here. It should be further noted that the relatively high sowing rates from Lagaš represented in table 5 included animal fodder and the rates are in fact comparable to those from Umma and Nippur.
98 Modern broadcast sowing uses from 50 to 128 kg/ha as opposed to the 28.5 to 32 kg/ha (depending on the conversion rate for one litre of barley to one kilogram) in the Ur III period (Halstead 1990: 187).
99 However, see Powell 1985 who convincingly argues against this interpretation.
of area, but it seems that the sowing per length of furrow was more intensive than the Ur III standard of 1 gin of barley per 1 nindan length of furrow. When this standard is applied to a plot with a surface area of 1 kurru and with 14.4 furrows per nindan, the seed expended at this rate would amount to 83.47 litres per kurru or 66.78 litres per hectare (= ca. 41.4 kg/ha), which was slightly less than the alleged 72 litres per hectare sown out in this period.

However, these are speculations. As was already mentioned, the texts are reticent about the inclusion of fodder in the expenditure which is simply termed ‘seed’ (zēru, še-numun), let alone the actual ratio of seed to fodder. Circumstances such as soil quality, availability of irrigation water and grazing ground for the animals, differing furrow intervals, etc., commanded a certain margin of flexibility and the actual distribution of seed and fodder was left to the ploughmen’s discretion. In other words, we cannot determine the actual amount of seed sown out per unit of land in the Neo-Babylonian institutional context, but have to rely on these speculative ratios.

It is nevertheless certain that the Neo-Babylonian institutions applied a more intense regime of sowing than their Ur III predecessors, although to what degree can hardly be verified. Whether the motivation for the intensified sowing was a conscious effort on the part of the temple administration to raise productivity, whether it was influenced by an (ongoing) deterioration of soil quality, or whether it was a natural consequence of the higher efficiency of iron ploughshares, as opposed to wooden ones used in earlier periods, must remain speculative. What is evident, however, is that the intensified sowing practices were accompanied by an increase in the average yield per unit of area on the land of the Neo-Babylonian institutions. This can be demonstrated for the land of the Ebabbar of Sippar in particular (Jursa 1995a: 165, 2010b: 49).

Although the figures proposed by the ‘Edict’ must have been understood as guidelines – something like a generally applicable yield factor (here: 12) cannot have existed since yields were largely influenced by such variables as the quality of soil and seed, availability of water and climatic conditions – they must have been based on practical experience. From Uruk there is only a small number of comparable data and it all comes from rent contracts, i.e. more or less theoretical models (see the table below and also the more detailed table on p. 263). The lowest attested factor is 4.3 (YOS 6 40, 3 Nbn). The text is not listed in the table below, as no stipulations for workforce and equipment are given in it. This, as well as the fact that the land in question was probably of inferior quality, accounts for the low returns expected from it. The yield factor 8 is anticipated by YOS 6 150 (11 Nbn), 8.3 (or 107100) by YOS 6 11 (1 Nbn), 10 by TCL 13 182 (2 Dar) and 12101 by PTS 2344 (1 Ner). From Sippar, on the other hand, a greater variety of yield factors is known, mainly from practical administrative texts. These yield factors were considered a proper administrative category, designated in the texts as bán-šē or 1-en x (x being the factor number, the expression meaning then “x-fold” with respect to area/seed). The factors range from 2 to 30, with most attestations falling in the range 8 to 15. The average yield factor derived from these ‘practical’ figures is, perhaps not coincidentally, 12 (Jursa 1995a: 138. 160ff.).

Jursa showed that the average yield per hectare was 1,728 litres of barley (= ca. 1,071 kg/ha).102 This represents a 1:24 seed to yield ratio. By comparison, the Ur III and Old-Babylonian standard of seed to yield ratio of 1:30 gives an average of 1,389 litres of barley per hectare (= ca. 861 kg/ha). The Sippar yields exhibit a 24 % increase per unit of area in comparison to Old-

---

100 YOS 6 11, Šum-ukin’s and Kalbaya’s rent contract stipulated a rent of 25,000 kurru of barley for 3,000 kurru of land split up between 100 plough teams. In other words, there were 100 plots of 30 kurru with a rent of 250 kurru of barley each. These 30 kurru of land are reminiscent of the 25 + 5 kurru from the ‘Edict’. It is not known whether an ‘auxiliary’ plot of 5 kurru was included in the 30 kurru plots of Šum-ukin’s and Kalbaya’s rent farm. If this were the case and they were to be used for covering the running costs (of which, however, there is no mention in the contract) rather than the rent, then the yield factor assumed by this contract was 10. Alternatively, if the entire plot of 30 kurru was used for covering the rent payment, then the yield factor was somewhat lower, namely 8.3.

101 A factor 15 is also possible in this text if calculated as the ratio of rent to seed, which in this case was not equivalent to the area rented (rent: 600 kurru, area: 50 kurru, seed: 40 kurru; the text is edited below; see also note 131).

Babylonian and Ur III standards which is quite significant. Compared to modern (20th century) yields from Iraq, which average around 1,355 litres per hectare (= ca. 840 kg/ha), the Sippar yields are even higher.

For Uruk we do not have any practical data which would allow us to derive average yields, as is possible to do for Sippar, but we do have general accounting models presented in the rent contracts. Thus Šum-ukin’s rent contract (YOS 6 11 and duplicates) offers us a set of figures which can be compared to the Sippar data and the Ur III and the Old-Babylonian models. The contract makes provisions for 3,000 kurrū of land (= 3,750 ha) to be cultivated from which the temple would receive annually 25,000 kurrū of barley. This was clearly not the entire yield. Additional 3,000 kurrū of barley had to be provided for the running costs for seed and fodder and if we assumed that the rent farmer also made a profit, the yield must have been over 28,000 kurrū (= 5,040,000 litres). However, since we do not know what the profit margin was, we have to work with this figure. This translates into an average ‘yield’ of 1,344 litres per hectare (or ca. 833.3 kg/ha), which is fairly close to the Ur III and Old-Babylonian models. The seed to ‘yield’ ratio is approximately 1:19. Of course this does not represent the actual yields, but only the fixed running costs (rent + seed + fodder) and the yields could have been much higher as the data from Sippar demonstrates. In fact the ‘Edict of Belšazzar’ exhibits the same rate of productivity as attested in the ‘practical’ texts from Sippar. It assumes 12-fold returns from a plot of 25 kurrū which translates into 1,728 litres of barley per hectare. This is significant, as it demonstrates that the temple administrations in the Neo-Babylonian period were well aware of the potential productivity of the land, at least in northern Babylonia. The Uruk administration, at least in the case of Šum-ukin, used a more conservative model. The fact that he theoretically had a chance at a larger profit margin on account of soil productivity may explain why he accepted to take on such a large amount of land (6,000 kurrū to be worked in a two year fallow cycle) when only a very inadequate number of plough teams had been provided by the temple. What is more, the use of a conservative model in Uruk may also be taken as an indicator for a generally less intensive regime of agriculture than the one exercised in the north.

2.1.2.5. The ploughing workload

Thus also the 25 kurrū of land (ca. 31.25 ha) per plough team must have been founded on what was tested in practice and was considered an acceptable, even if a very heavy, workload. The same quotas appear in the rent contracts PTS 2344 (1 Ner) and YOS 6 150 (11 Nbn) from Uruk (see table below). Van Driel argued that these quotas verged on the impossible (1990: 226f., see also below), but despite his reservations we are informed by our documentation, that even more could be demanded of the ploughmen. Effectively, the plough teams of the ‘Edict’ had to work 30 kurrū of land (ca. 37.5 ha) and this is a workload we also find in Šum-ukin’s and Kalbiya’s rent contract (YOS 6 11 + duplicates, 1 Nbn). It stipulates that 3,000 kurrū of land (half of the entire granted area, which was to be worked in a two-year fallow cycle) were to be cultivated by 100 plough teams. In other words, each plough team was allotted an area of 30 kurrū. There is

103 That the seed to yield ratio is lower in Sippar is not surprising, since an increase in seed does not produce a directly proportional increase in yields. Modern experiments quoted by Powell (1985: 36) show for instance that doubling the seed from 25 kg/ha to 50 kg/ha will only result in an increase of 11-14% in yield.

104 All of this data is presented comprehensively in table 2 in Jursa 2010b: 49.

105 Note that in the Ur III period plough teams consisting of three men could be assigned plots of 6 to 8 bûr, or approximately 39 to 52 hectares (Maekawa 1984: 82). The existence of such large plots and the implicit workload can only be explained with the relatively wide furrow spacing in mind (generally between 50 and 75 cm; see Powell 1984: 47 and Civil 1994: 81f.). Weszeli collected data for seasonal ploughing quotas from different regions and periods and some of these are in an equally high range as the Ur III and the Neo-Babylonian highest values: in the Old-Babylonian evidence plots of 108 iku (38.88 ha) are common, but also 135 iku (48.6 ha) is attested. The teams consisted of 6 oxen (and sometimes cows) and four men. The norm for freshly reclaimed land seems to be between 45 and 50 iku (16.2-18 ha). Mari plough teams, consisting of 7-8 oxen and 14-16 persons, were allocated plots of 70-150 iku (25.2-54 ha). Middle Assyrian plough teams with only two oxen ploughed plots of 40 iku (14.4 ha), and so on (Weszeli 2007: 394f.). Not surprisingly these figures show that the larger the teams were in terms of animal and man power the larger the plots
perhaps even some evidence from a practical text corroborating this rate. OIP 122 77 is
unfortunately not dated, by there is some indication on prosopographic grounds that it could be
placed in the reign of Nabonidus. It lists issues of barley seed to ploughmen. Apparently each of
them received seed allotments for several plough teams to judge by the amounts issued. These
amounts were invariably multiples of 30 and, following the typical 1:1 seed to area ratio, were
intended for plots of 30 kuru surface area. It is very tempting to see in these ploughmen the men
employed on Šum-ukin’s and Kalbaya’s rent farm, although this is not stated explicitly. As for the
contracts PTS 2344 and YOS 6 150, which both concern plots of 25 kuru of land, they may have
implicitly allowed for additional plots for covering the running costs – land was abundant after all.

However, smaller workloads are also attested in the Uruk material. The plough teams
working on Gimillu’s rent farm were assigned 20 kuru (ca. 25 ha) of land. The same rate is also
attested in the work contract YOS 19 71 (12 Nbn), edited above. This was still a difficult task.
For this reason and probably also as a consequence of his failure to deliver the required rent
Gimillu complained to the temple authorities asking for an increase in work force which would
have resulted in the reduction of the workload to 10 kuru (ca. 12.5 ha) per team. The temple
discharged Gimillu from the position of a rent farmer, but promised to grant the requested
additional workers, oxen and ploughs to his successor Bêl-gimlanni. Since our documentation
depicts out at this point in time, we do not know whether the temple kept its promise. This
uncertainty notwithstanding, it is clear that even such a comparably low rate of 10 kuru of land per
plough team was potentially acceptable for the Eanna administration. By comparison, a workload
of 20 kuru of land per plough team is known from rent contracts from Sippar (Jursa 1995a: 137).
However, practical administrative texts give evidence for considerably lower rates, between 10 and
15 kuru (i.e. between 12.5 and 18.75 ha) per team (ibid.: 19. 138).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>text</th>
<th>date</th>
<th>area (kuru)</th>
<th>plough teams</th>
<th>area per plough (kuru)</th>
<th>yield factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PTS 2344</td>
<td>8-II-1 Ner</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12\textsuperscript{107}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 6 11</td>
<td>28-I-1 Nbn</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>8.3 (or 10\textsuperscript{108})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 6 103</td>
<td>1-7 Nbn</td>
<td>25+5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25+5</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 6 150</td>
<td>28-[x]-11 Nbn</td>
<td>625</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 19 71</td>
<td>10-IV-12 Nbn</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCL 13 182</td>
<td>13-IV-2 Dar</td>
<td>1,000\textsuperscript{109}</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Workload of plough teams according to rent contracts

Van Driel tried to calculate how time-consuming the quotas attested in the rent contracts
were (1990: 227). He assumed that a pair of oxen could plough 0.25 hectares in a day,\textsuperscript{111} and that at

assigned to them were and that freshly reclaimed land was more work-intensive so consequently less of it
could be cultivated in a season. The Old-Babylonian model with a plough team of six animals and four men
and the corresponding ploughing quota is fairly consistent with the one we find in the Neo-Babylonian
institutional administrative context, which indicates a certain degree of continuity in agricultural practices.
\textsuperscript{107} Here two men seeking to work for the rent farmer Ibni-Istar (Ibnay) received 20 kuru of seed/land “like
the ikkarus of the Lady of Uruk” in addition to the tools and draught animals.
\textsuperscript{108} This factor represents, as all the others in this column, the ratio between the rent and the area cultivated. In
this case the rent was 600 and the area 50 kuru. However, in this text the seed supplied exceptionally does
not equal the cultivated area but amounts to 40 kuru. If the yield factor is taken to be the result of the rent to
seed ratio, which would not make a difference in the other examples in the table, here it would be 15.
\textsuperscript{109} See note 100.
\textsuperscript{110} The first row indicates the conditions under which the rent farmer Gimillu had to work, while the second
row is a prognosis of the conditions under which his successor Bêl-gimlanni would have continued operating
the farm, in case the temple administration kept its promise to increase the contingent of plough teams.
\textsuperscript{111} The worked area is derived from the amount of seed supplied which presumably occurred at a 1:1 rate.
\textsuperscript{112} This rate may well have been based on some traditional standard representing a day’s ploughing with a
pair of oxen. For instance, the classical Roman standard of ingerum, “yoke”, was a surface measure roughly
least three rounds of ploughing were necessary. Based on these assumptions van Driel arrived at 360 days of work for a plot of 30 kurru, 300 days for 25 kurru and 120 days for 10 kurru. These results are not necessarily correct. The ploughing-rate postulated is probably too low (see previous footnote). The surface area alone is not precise enough an indicator for the time required for ploughing. Beside other factors which influenced the work-load, such as the topography, the quality of soil, etc., the spacing of the furrows could make a big difference in terms of the distance that a plough team needed to cover. In the Ur III period several different furrow intervals were in use. As Powell (1984: 46f.) notes, eight to twelve furrows per nindan (approximately 6 m) are attested, in other words furrow intervals between 75 cm and 50 cm. 112 The difference between the two extreme values of furrow spacing represents an increase of as much as 50% in terms of distance travelled or seed expended.

As could be expected, the Neo-Babylonian written documentation does not provide us with details on furrow intervals explicitly. However, following the considerations on the grain seed expended per surface area Powell could derive for the Neo-Babylonian period a furrow interval of 20 fingers or 41.6 cm. 113 The furrow interval is generally valuable information as it allows us to determine the distance which a team had to plough. For the purpose of calculation it can be assumed that a plot of 1 kurru (ca. 1.25 ha) was a rectangle with a frontage of 50 m and a flank of 250 m. Taking the interval calculated by Powell, this plot would contain slightly over 120 furrows, the total length of which would be around 30 km. A plot of 30 kurru would therefore have 3,600 furrows with a total length of 900 km. 114 Following further Powell (1984: 53), who makes an estimate that 1 bēru (ca. 10.8 km) was the distance which could be ploughed in a day, it turns out that it would take just over 83 days to plough a plot of 30 kurru surface area. Three rounds of ploughing (two preparatory ones and a final one for sowing) would take 250 days. This is much less than the 360 days calculated by van Driel (1990: 227), but eight months of ploughing is still too high a work load and certainly an impracticable one. By comparison, plots of 10 kurru (ca. 12.5 ha) which Gimillu would have preferred for his plough teams and which are attested in practical texts from Sippar (see above), would take under three months to plough and sow at this rate. Following work loads are obtained for plots of size from 30 to 10 kurru:

---

112 The so-called ‘Farmer’s Instructions’, a Sumerian text from the Old-Babylonian period which records a farmer’s advice to his son concerning cereal cultivation, prescribe eight furrows per nindan (line 46; see for instance Civil’s (1994) edition and treatment of this text). However, according to Civil (1994: 81f.) this furrow interval was in fact rarely in use in the Ur III period. The ‘practical’ texts show that on average the ten furrows per nindan interval (ca. 60 cm) was the one most commonly used. The relatively wide spacing between the furrows (note that intervals of 23-25 cm are also possible according to Powell 1984: 53) was probably typical for southern Mesopotamia as it was convenient for the furrow irrigation generally practiced in the region (ibid. p. 47; see also Postgate 1994: 167f. with figure 8:5 for the continuation of this practice in modern times).

113 Powell 1984: 64. The narrowing of the furrow intervals would imply an increase of 20% in the sowing rate in the Neo-Babylonian period relative to the highest Ur III rate (ibid.) and is a sign of (a gradual) intensification of agriculture. However, it should be kept in mind that the furrow interval of 41.6 cm is based on the assumption that the seed to fodder ratio was 1:1. For a possibility of other ratios see below.

114 In fact these figures are slightly higher, namely approximately 3,606 furrows with a total length of ca. 901,425 m, but are rounded here for the sake of simplicity.
size of plot in kurru | 30 (37.5 ha) | 25 (31.25 ha) | 20 (25 ha) | 15 (18.75 ha) | 10 (12.5 ha) 
--- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- 
number of furrows | 3,600 | 3,000 | 2,400 | 1,800 | 1,200 
total length of furrows | 900 km | 750 km | 600 km | 450 km | 300 km 
days (months) needed for ploughing and sowing115 | 250 (8.33) | 208.33 (6.94) | 166.67 (5.56) | 125 (4.17) | 83.33 (2.78) 

**Table 3:** Ploughing time (furrow interval 41.6 cm, ploughing speed 1.8 km/h)

However, three rounds of ploughing were not all the work that had to be performed on a field. Although this is nowhere explicitly stated in the Neo-Babylonian sources, several rounds of harrowing had to be conducted before the final ploughing and sowing. In the Ur III period between one and five rounds of harrowing were common practice and ‘The Farmer’s Instructions’ prescribe three rounds of harrowing (see Civil 1994: 77). According to Civil (ibid.) between 4.5 and 6 iku (i.e. 1.62 and 2.16 ha) could be harrowed in a day. If we use for our purposes an average of these values (i.e. 1.89 ha/day) and assume three rounds of harrowing, this would add another 60 days of work for the team cultivating a 30 kurru plot. The harrowing input in days (and months) for other smaller plots is indicated in the following table:

size of plot in kurru | 30 (37.5 ha) | 25 (31.25 ha) | 20 (25 ha) | 15 (18.75 ha) | 10 (12.5 ha) 
--- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- 
days (months) needed for ploughing and sowing116 | 250 (8.33) | 208.33 (6.94) | 166.67 (5.56) | 125 (4.17) | 83.33 (2.78) 
days (months) needed for harrowing | 60 (2) | 50 (1.65) | 40 (1.32) | 30 (1) | 20 (0.67) 
total time need in days (months) | 310 (10.33) | 258.33 (8.59) | 206.67 (6.88) | 155 (5.17) | 103.33 (3.45) 

**Table 4:** Ploughing and harrowing time (furrow interval 41.6 cm, ploughing speed 1.8 km/h)

Another variable is the ploughing speed. The model used by Powell, namely 10.8 km ploughed in a day would imply a ploughing speed of 1.8 km/h in a 6 hour workday. Potts notes a 2.2 km/h average ploughing speed for a pair of oxen, which is derived from studies in sub-Saharan Africa (1997: 83. 85). If we assumed that the Babylonian ploughs also worked with this speed and that one workday comprised of at least 6 hours of effective ploughing then 900 km which had to be ploughed in a 30 kurru plot would take approximately 68 days. Three rounds of ploughing would result in 204 days, plus 60 days of harrowing, totalling in 264 days. The following results are obtained:

size of plot in kurru | 30 (37.5 ha) | 25 (31.25 ha) | 20 (25 ha) | 15 (18.75 ha) | 10 (12.5 ha) 
--- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- 
time for ploughing at the rate of 2.2 km/h for 6 h/day in days (months) | 204 (6.8) | 170.45 (5.68) | 136.36 (4.56) | 102.27 (3.41) | 68.18 (2.27) 
days (months) needed for harrowing | 60 (2) | 50 (1.65) | 40 (1.32) | 30 (1) | 20 (0.67) 
total time need in days (months) | 264 (8.8) | 220.45 (7.33) | 176.36 (5.88) | 132.27 (4.41) | 88.18 (2.94) 

**Table 5:** Ploughing and harrowing time (furrow interval 41.6 cm, ploughing speed 2.2 km/h)

Civil on the other hand notes average ploughing speeds from 3.6 to 4.3 km/h obtained experimentally with a replica of the prehistoric ard (1994: 77). Even the lower value of 3.6 km/h, i.e. the double of the ploughing speed used in the first model, would produce a dramatic difference in terms of time consumed, and make plots of 20 kurru a perfectly acceptable work-load:

115 This included three rounds of ploughing and is calculated on the assumption that a plough team worked 10.8 km in a day.
116 This included three rounds of ploughing and is calculated on the assumption that a plough team worked 10.8 km in a day.
size of plot in *kurru*  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>30 (37.5 ha)</th>
<th>25 (31.25 ha)</th>
<th>20 (25 ha)</th>
<th>15 (18.75 ha)</th>
<th>10 (12.5 ha)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>time for ploughing at the rate of 3.6 km/h for 6 h/day in days (months)</td>
<td>125 (4.17)</td>
<td>104.17 (3.47)</td>
<td>83.33 (2.78)</td>
<td>62.5 (2.08)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>days (months) needed for harrowing</td>
<td>60 (2)</td>
<td>50 (1.65)</td>
<td>40 (1.32)</td>
<td>30 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total time need in days (months)</td>
<td>185 (6.17)</td>
<td>154.17 (5.12)</td>
<td>123.33 (4.1)</td>
<td>92.5 (3.08)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 6:** Ploughing and harrowing time (furrow interval 41.6 cm, ploughing speed 3.6 km/h)

However, it is questionable whether these ploughing speeds are applicable to Mesopotamian conditions, especially considering the speeds for African plough teams quoted by Potts (1997: 83). As was mentioned, a yoke of two oxen would plough at a speed of 2.2 km/h, but this would be reduced to 1.8 km/h if another pair of oxen was added, which correlates nicely with the model presented in tables 3 and 4. Hruška (1995: 35) notes average ploughing speeds of 2.0 to 2.3 km/h for a pair of oxen yoked to a wooden ard. The speed range from 1.8 to 2.2 km/h is probably realistic for the ancient Babylonian setting. Whether the Neo-Babylonian plough teams used all four oxen simultaneously, or as suggested by van Driel as two alternating teams (1990: 227), is not known to us. Be that as it may, van Driel’s suggestion that using two pairs of oxen alternately could even double the area ploughed (*ibid.*) does not seem plausible, though it is beyond doubt that productivity would be increased in this way. This increase, however, can hardly be quantified.

With the given parameters (furrow spacing: 41.6 cm and ploughing speed: 1.8 km/h), as represented in tables 3 and 4, it is clear that only the plots of 10 *kurru* surface area represented a reasonable workload if one is to assume that ploughing took no longer than four months. The length of the ploughing season is not explicitly mentioned in the administrative texts. It could extend over several months. The Ur III seed and fodder texts, for instance, record issues of grain for two to three months (Hruška 2007: 61). A reference to four months of ploughing is given in a Sumerian literary composition, “The dispute between the hoe and the plough” in lines 107-108. Here the hoe prides itself of being used all year round, while the plough is active only during four months and lies idle for the remaining eight. The last round of ploughing and sowing was probably conducted with the first autumn rains in October and November (eighth month). By the end of November the ploughing season was over (Hruška 1990: 468). This implies that it could have started at the end of July or beginning of August (fifth month). This would, however, result in an overlap with other agricultural tasks such as harvesting, transportation, threshing and storage of grain which started at the end of the first month (April) and took about five months to complete according to Hruška (1990: 467). The texts from the Eanna archive which record issues of oxen for ploughing or barley seed for sowing (see below) span a period between the fourth and the tenth month, indicating that the ploughing and sowing season extended for several months within this time frame.

A change in any of the assumed parameters would naturally result in the change of the efficiency of the plough teams. Raising the ploughing speed from 1.8 to 2.2 km/h (table 5) would make plots of 15 *kurru* almost manageable and doubling the speed to 3.6 km/h would make even the plot of 20 *kurru* seem reasonable. But whether such a drastic increase in speed, as in the second example, was in fact possible, remains doubtful.

The furrow intervals, on the other hand, could be more easily manipulated. The relatively narrow interval of 41.6 cm postulated by Powell based on metrological considerations is not attested in practice and could have been a metrological fiction for all we know. The wider spacing between the furrows which is attested either explicitly or can be deduced from the Ur III

---

117 This is also true for the Ur III Period (Hruška 1990: 468).
119 According to Hruška the common practice among the peasants of the modern day south-Iraq is to sow as late as mid November (1990: 473).
120 See Appendix 3 for a reconstruction of the agricultural calendar.
documentation, for instance 75 cm (8 furrows per nindan) or 60 cm (10 furrows per nindan), would imply a shorter distance to be ploughed per unit of surface area and thus a reduced workload. The following tables demonstrate the time needed for preparing the soil and sowing with these modified parameters:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>size of plot in kurru</th>
<th>30 (37.5 ha)</th>
<th>25 (31.25 ha)</th>
<th>20 (25 ha)</th>
<th>15 (18.75 ha)</th>
<th>10 (12.5 ha)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>number of furrows</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>1,667</td>
<td>1,333</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total length of furrows</td>
<td>500 km</td>
<td>417 km</td>
<td>333.25 km</td>
<td>250 km</td>
<td>166.75 km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>days (months) needed for ploughing and sowing</td>
<td>139 (4.63)</td>
<td>116 (3.86)</td>
<td>93 (3.09)</td>
<td>69.44 (2.31)</td>
<td>46.32 (1.54)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>days (months) needed for harrowing</td>
<td>60 (2)</td>
<td>50 (1.65)</td>
<td>40 (1.32)</td>
<td>30 (1)</td>
<td>20 (0.67)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total time need in days (months)</td>
<td>199 (6.63)</td>
<td>166 (5.51)</td>
<td>133 (4.41)</td>
<td>99.44 (3.31)</td>
<td>66.32 (2.21)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7: 8 furrows per nindan (interval 75 cm) at a speed of 1.8 km/h

With the interval of 75 cm and at a ploughing speed of 1.8 km/h the plot of 20 kurru would seem barely manageable. This changes when the speed is raised to 2.2 km/h, and a plot of 20 kurru or more is pushed into the realm of the possible:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>size of plot in kurru</th>
<th>30 (37.5 ha)</th>
<th>25 (31.25 ha)</th>
<th>20 (25 ha)</th>
<th>15 (18.75 ha)</th>
<th>10 (12.5 ha)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>number of furrows</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>1,667</td>
<td>1,333</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total length of furrows</td>
<td>500 km</td>
<td>417 km</td>
<td>333.25 km</td>
<td>250 km</td>
<td>166.75 km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>days (months) needed for ploughing and sowing</td>
<td>113.64 (3.79)</td>
<td>94.77 (3.16)</td>
<td>75.74 (2.52)</td>
<td>56.82 (1.89)</td>
<td>37.9 (1.26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>days (months) needed for harrowing</td>
<td>60 (2)</td>
<td>50 (1.65)</td>
<td>40 (1.32)</td>
<td>30 (1)</td>
<td>20 (0.67)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total time need in days (months)</td>
<td>173.64 (5.79)</td>
<td>144.77 (4.81)</td>
<td>115.74 (3.84)</td>
<td>86.82 (2.89)</td>
<td>57.9 (1.93)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8: 8 furrows per nindan (interval 75 cm) at a speed of 2.2 km/h

Using a model with 10 furrows per nindan (i.e. interval of 60 cm), which appears to have been the most commonly used standard in the Ur III period (Civil 1994: 82), produces different results. In this case only about 15 kurru or slightly more seem realistic:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>size of plot in kurru</th>
<th>30 (37.5 ha)</th>
<th>25 (31.25 ha)</th>
<th>20 (25 ha)</th>
<th>15 (18.75 ha)</th>
<th>10 (12.5 ha)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>number of furrows</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>2,083</td>
<td>1,667</td>
<td>1,250</td>
<td>833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total length of furrows</td>
<td>625 km</td>
<td>521 km</td>
<td>417 km</td>
<td>312.5 km</td>
<td>208.33 km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>days (months) needed for ploughing and sowing</td>
<td>173.61 (5.79)</td>
<td>144.68 (4.82)</td>
<td>116 (3.86)</td>
<td>86.81 (2.89)</td>
<td>57.87 (1.93)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>days (months) needed for harrowing</td>
<td>60 (2)</td>
<td>50 (1.65)</td>
<td>40 (1.32)</td>
<td>30 (1)</td>
<td>20 (0.67)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total time need in days (months)</td>
<td>233.61 (7.79)</td>
<td>194.68 (6.47)</td>
<td>156 (5.18)</td>
<td>116.81 (3.89)</td>
<td>77.87 (2.6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9: 10 furrows per nindan (interval 60 cm) at a speed of 1.8 km/h

Raising the ploughing speed to 2.2 km/h would make 20 kurru seem more realistic, though only manageable in four and a half months. The maximum that could be cultivated at this rate within four months would be around 18 kurru of land:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>size of plot in kurru</th>
<th>30 (37.5 ha)</th>
<th>25 (31.25 ha)</th>
<th>20 (25 ha)</th>
<th>15 (18.75 ha)</th>
<th>10 (12.5 ha)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>number of furrows</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>2,083</td>
<td>1,667</td>
<td>1,250</td>
<td>833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total length of furrows</td>
<td>625 km</td>
<td>521 km</td>
<td>417 km</td>
<td>312.5 km</td>
<td>208.33 km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>days (months) needed for ploughing and sowing</td>
<td>142.05 (4.73)</td>
<td>118.41 (3.95)</td>
<td>94.77 (3.16)</td>
<td>71.02 (2.37)</td>
<td>47.35 (1.58)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
These various models show that under most conditions a plot of 20 kurru was just outside the limit of what could have been managed in one season. A plot of this size would imply an enormous effort on the part of the ploughing team and most likely a less intensive mode of cultivation (wider furrow intervals). Plots of 15 kurru seem under most conditions acceptable and it is therefore not surprising that in Sippar this was in fact the average plot size (see above).

With respect to the large-scale rent contracts which seem to imply much larger plots per plough team, it has to be kept in mind that these ratios (30 kurru or 25 kurru per plough team) only went as far as the temple’s own workforce was concerned. In reality the temple estates could not have been cultivated to the extent the temple administration had in mind unless additional workforce was provided through sub-leasing or hiring ploughmen. This was the task of the rent farmers. Thus Šum-ukin probably had to double the number of the plough teams provided by the temple by sub-leasing land or hiring additional labour. Another consideration to be made is that the yield factors used in these contracts were comparably low: for instance, 8.3 in YOS 6 11 or 8 in YOS 6 150, which is about 30% less than the average yield factor 12 known from Sippar. In other words, the rent farmers had more leeway and were not forced to cultivate the soil as intensively as this seems to have been the case in northern Babylonia at that time. This must have been taken into consideration both by the rent farmer and the temple administration responsible for these seemingly unrealistic contracts.

Nevertheless, it is beyond doubt that the ploughmen had extremely demanding workloads. It does not come as a surprise then that some of them, just like the temple oblates who lived under similarly harsh conditions, occasionally tried to flee. The reports of unsuccessful escape attempts and shackling of širkus and ikkarus have come down to us in letters and legal documents. The ploughmen in Sippar had another alternative for dealing with their excessive workloads. They could sub-lease parts of their plots to sharecroppers. This transpires from administrative texts from Ebabbar which record the deliveries of agricultural produce or the inspections of cultivated fields. It is evident from them that some ikkarus “had” their errêšus, i.e. that they let them cultivate parts of the plots assigned to them (Jursa 1995a: 15f.). The administration of Eanna was apparently not as tolerant toward this kind of practice. In YBC 4000 (34 Nbk) the ploughmen and their supervisors are explicitly warned against such actions. Under the threat of capital punishment they were forbidden to sub-lease parts of their plots to the errêšus or share their means of production (ploughs and draught animals) with them. However, despite the ploughmen’s unenviable position, there were still people who were apparently worse off and who of their own free will – if one can speak of a free will in face of poverty – applied for work under the same conditions as the ikkarus (cf. YOS 19 71, edited above).

2.1.2.6. A contractual relationship?

As was demonstrated by the ‘Edict’ and various rent contracts, the quota of a plough team was more or less standardised, at least in theory. The agricultural management of the temple and later the rent farmers were bound by certain parameters, such as the amount of the land leased, plough teams provided and rent expected, when allotting plots to the ploughmen at their

---

121 E.g. YOS 21 72, YOS 3 146, YOS 7 102 (acc Camb), YOS 7 137 (3 Camb), YOS 7 152 (3 Camb). See also the chapter on attempted escapes of the širkus in Dandamayev 1984: 490ff.
122 The text is edited and discussed by Janković 2005: 167ff.
disposal.\textsuperscript{123} Over and above this, the constant control through the institution in form of yield estimation procedures conducted by the temple (\textit{imittu}) and lastly the regulative measures such as the ‘Dict’ probably had the additional purpose to protect the ikkarus from the high-handedness of the rent farmers, who may have been tempted to drive them even harder for their own profit. Be that as it may, while the rent contracts defined the rights and obligations of the rent farmers more or less clearly, the question arises what mechanisms were used to determine the rights and duties of the ikkarus. Customary practice based on experience is a viable option and would explain the missing documentation for land allotment schemes and obligations on the lowest level. However, a few rent contracts involving ikkarus as lessees are available to us. Three documents come from Sippar. In CT 55 88\textsuperscript{124} (date lost) the ploughman Šamaš-iddin, who had either at the same time or at a later point the function of an “overseer of the ploughmen” (rab ikkarati), rented 50 kurru of land for a fixed rent. Owing to the fragmentary state of the tablet nothing can be said about the size of his rent or the number of plough teams supplied to him. The text BM 60389 (6 Nbn; Jursa 1995a: 143 no. 51) is a rent contract (\textit{ana errešûtî}, “for cultivation”) for an unspecified amount of land in a certain locality for a period of five years. The ikkaru of Šamaš who leased the land was to pay an annual rent of net 25 kurru of barley. Though the size of the plot is not specified, this cannot have been a very large plot or very productive land. The third contract BM 74439 (16 Nbn; Jursa 1995a: 13ff. no. 43) is a lease of a vineyard of the size 0;2.2 kurru and of an unspecified amount of arable land.\textsuperscript{125} The lessee, an ikkaru of Šamaš, had to deliver annually 13 kurru of grapes (10 kurru in the first year) and the tenfold returns of one half of the arable land at his disposal. He was not provided with tools and was granted the yield of 1 kurru of land as compensation. No stipulations are made for the provision of draught animals and workforce, but it appears that some workforce came with the property. The text mentions settlers (\textit{aššābus}\textsuperscript{126}) and ‘planters’ (\textit{zāqipāmus}) half of which, corresponding to half of the arable land for which rent was payable, should perform the work in connection to their ilku and urāšu duties.\textsuperscript{127} It was the lessee’s responsibility to ensure that these obligations toward the state were fulfilled.

Now a rent contract from Eanna involving a temple ploughman, Naniya-ah-iddin, son of Nergal-ina-tēši-ēter,\textsuperscript{128} as lessee, and Šum-ukin, the later fermier général, who is designated here as the messenger of the king, as lessor of temple land, is available to us:

\begin{verbatim}
PTS 2344   8-II-1 Ner
obv.  1. 1d\textsuperscript{a} na-na-a šeš-mu a-
\textsuperscript{b}šá šá l\textsuperscript{c}u-gur-ina-súh-súr
\textsuperscript{d}lu \textsuperscript{e}engar šá d \textsuperscript{f}gašan šá unug \textsuperscript{g}ki ina ū-ud liš-bi-šú
\textsuperscript{h}a-na mu-gin a-
\textsuperscript{i}šá lu en-nunum a \textsuperscript{j}ba-si-šá
\textsuperscript{k}lu \textsuperscript{l}a-kin šá lu \textsuperscript{m}u-gur-lugal-ur dú lugal tin-ti\textsuperscript{n}e
\textsuperscript{o}en-šú
5.  ki-a-am iq-bi um-ma \textsuperscript{p}lu en-gar-me\textsuperscript{q} a-ki-l
\textsuperscript{r}a-mir-t\textsuperscript{s}a ina ugu \textsuperscript{t}da šá d \textsuperscript{u}gašan šá unug\textsuperscript{v}ki
šá 2 \textsuperscript{w}apin me\textsuperscript{x} u 8 \textsuperscript{y}gu me\textsuperscript{z} 50 gur
še-numun qaq-qar 40 gur še-bar a-na še-numun
bi-nam-ma ina mu-an-na 6 me gur gam-mir-tu₄
10. 1\textsuperscript{a} ina \textsuperscript{b}e\textsuperscript{c}i-\textsuperscript{d}an-na a-
\textsuperscript{e}na ù \textsuperscript{f}gašan šá unug\textsuperscript{g} lu-din
\textsuperscript{h}1\textsuperscript{i}mu-gin \textsuperscript{j}tēš-me-šu-ma šá 2 \textsuperscript{k}apin me
\textsuperscript{l}gu me\textsuperscript{m} [u] \textsuperscript{n}lu\textsuperscript{o} en\textsuperscript{p}gar 50 gur še-numun qaq-qar
lo.e.  40 gur še-bar a-na \textsuperscript{s}še-numun \textsuperscript{t}lid-dî\textsuperscript{u}nu-sú
\textsuperscript{u}ina mu-a[n-na] \textsuperscript{v}6 me še-bar gam-mir-ti
\end{verbatim}

\textsuperscript{123} No documents to this effect have come down to us, though. These considerations apply equally for the periods when there were no rent farmers.
\textsuperscript{124} See Jursa 1995a: 24.
\textsuperscript{125} Note that this contract concerns land in the Ìbôr region, i.e. a long way away from Sippar and the direct supervision of the Ebabbar, and may for this reason have been atypical. For the localisation of Ebabbar’s land holdings on the Ìbôr in Syria, rather than in Babylonia, see now Jursa 2010b: 348.
\textsuperscript{126} See Jursa 1995a: 8 and van Driel 2002: 207ff.
\textsuperscript{127} For these taxation terms see van Driel 2002: 254ff, 264ff. and below. See also MacGinnis 2012: 27ff.
\textsuperscript{128} The father of the lessee was perhaps the same person as Nergal-ina-tēši-ēter, son of Zabidāya, an overseer and a ploughman himself, who temporarily had the functions of a rab ešerti (BIN 1 112, 19 Nbk) and a gugallu (YBC 4000, 34 Nbk) (see p. 95).
rev. 15. *ina é-[an-na] ina *šaŠ-ma-ši-bi šá *šašan šá unug³i
i-na[m]-din pu-ut me-e ¹mu-gin na-ši
2. ¹lu-ra-šu ba-ti-il
¹na-na-a-šiše4 mu a-na ¹mu-gin ¹[-na]m-din
(one blank line)
¹mu-kin-nu ¹ag-din-su-e a-šiša šá ¹ag-sur
20. a ¹30-ti-ér ¹ir-È nin-nin
a-šuša ¹en-mu a ¹kur-¹a ¹ag-gin-a
a-šuša ¹ag-numun-ba-ša šÁša-munšiša-ša
u ¹um-sag ¹za-láq-e-a a-šuša ba-ša unug³i
iti gu4 ud 8-kam mu 1-kam ¹d-u-gur-lugal-urú
25. lugal tin-tir³ki

“Nan¤ya-aḫ-iddin, son of Nergal-ina-tēšši-ēṭer, a ploughman of the Lady of Uruk, of his own free will said to Šum-uκín, son of Bēl-zērī, descendant of Basia, the messenger of Neriglīsar, the king of Babylon, his lord, as follows: ‘Give me ploughmen for two ploughs in accordance to the inspection (recorded) in the register of the Lady of Uruk, eight oxen, 50 kurru of land and 40 kurru of barley for seed and yearly I will deliver net ¹600 kurru of barley to Eanna to the Lady of Uruk.’ Šum-uκín listened to him and gave him the oxen [and] the ploughmen for two ploughs, 50 kurru of land and 40 kurru of barley [for] seed. Yearly he will deliver net ¹600 kurru of barley to E[anna] using the measure of the Lady of Uruk. Šum-uκín guarantees for the water (supply). Nan¤ya-iddin will provide two ... ¹30 urašu-workers to Šum-uκín.

Witnesses: Nabû-balāssu-iqbi, son of Nabû-ēṭer, descendant of Sîn-leqē-unninni
Arad-Innī, son of Bēl-iddin, descendant of Kûrî
Nabû-mukin-apli, son of Nabû-zēr-iqiša, descendant of ša-țaṭbišu
Scribe: Nūrea, son of Iqša
Uruk; 8-II-1 Ner, king of Babylon.”

Though the extant documentation is not explicit, it appears that Šum-uκín had already at this point been a lessee of temple land and had sub-leased some of it to the ikkaru Nan¤ya-aḫ-iddin. These 50 kurru of land were to be cultivated by two plough teams, which amounted to a workload of 25 kurru of land and 300 kurru of barley as rent per team. This quota is consistent with what is known from the ‘Edict’ and some other rent contracts. The same can be said about the yield factor which was 12, based on the ratio of rent to cultivated area. The only discrepancy to the standard model was seemingly the provision of 40 kurru of seed only, instead of the expected 50 kurru in keeping with the typical seed to land ratio (1:1). It is not clear whether this indicated that only 20 kurru of land were to be cultivated by each team, with the remaining five kurru perhaps set aside for the personal use and the running costs of the plough team (including administrative fees?). ¹31 Eight oxen and an unknown number of ikkarus were to be provided to Naniya-ah-iddin to operate two ploughs. It is interesting to note that the ikkarus were to be assigned to the ploughs with reference to the temple’s inspection register.

This interesting document raises the question of how land was distributed to the ploughmen. Jursa notes that generally individual plough teams were bound to certain localities, but not necessarily to the plots they were cultivating. The scope of their activities and obligations could be determined annually as is indicated by Nbk. 452+ (Jursa 1995a: 13). In PTS 2344 we see (presumably) a rent farmer engaged with the task of assigning the land to two plough teams under

¹29 For gamruru with the meaning “net, without (further) deductions” see Jursa 1995a: 151.
¹30 The form ba-ti-il (l. 17) is not easily explicable. One possibility would be to connect it to the word batulû which designated a “young man (adolescent)” according to CAD B: 174. The problem is the vowel ū rendered as i in the text (unless we are dealing with ‘vowel indifferent’ signs in the sense of Streck 2001: 81f.). The other, probably less likely, possibility would be to interpret the word as the stative of batulû, “inactive”. We expect here the plural form batûlu. The rendering in the text could be explained with the use of ‘vowel indifference’ and ‘non-notation of vowels’. However, the problem with this interpretation would be the syntax of the sentence and the writing of the emphatic i with the sign ti.
¹31 Note that at this rate the yield factor would amount to 15, which is a well attested value in ‘practical’ texts from Sippar.
the direction of one *ikkaru*. Should this contract be considered an exceptional arrangement or did all the plough teams working for a rent farmer have to make a written agreement of this kind? In the event that PTS 2344 was a special case, which is likely, clearly not many documents of this kind can be expected to crop up. NaNiya-ah-iddin, the temple ploughman, was not only responsible for his own plough, but was to manage two teams. By this he stood out from the masses of *ikkarusi* be they temple oblates or hired labour, who just worked the land “like the ploughmen of the Lady of Uruk” (cf. YOS 19 71, p. 31).

Van Driel, without knowing this text from Uruk and basing his conclusions on the Sippar material, in particular the rent contracts of the *ikkarus* presented by Jursa (1995a), states that “the institutional *ikkaru* was a proper tenant [...] not only in Sippar, but occasionally also in exemplary Babylon. The rent farmer of the institutional land in this manner had a modest, and probably older, “little brother”, who belonged to an early phase of the system he operated.”132 Jursa, on the other hand, maintains that these rent contracts represent special cases which may not be applicable to the temple’s entire agricultural workforce. These were assigned land according to customary practice. He is also reluctant to see in the *ikkarus* minor entrepreneurs – even in the cases of the contracts – as it is questionable to what extent they had the freedom to choose and make decisions to get contractually involved, phrases such as *ina hūd libbišu* notwithstanding. This is in fact a recurring question especially concerning the organisation of the agricultural production before the appearance of large-scale rent farmers who came from outside the institutional structure. We are confronted with this problem particularly in the case of the overseers of the ploughmen (rab eserti/epinni, rab *ikkaratü*) and the ‘officials’ such as gugallu, who were recruited from among the *ikkarusi* (and nukuribbu) and who not only supervised the agricultural labour put under their control but also assumed personal liability for their dues in the manner of the later *fermiers généraux*, only on a much smaller scale.

The ploughmen working for the temple were generally bound by customary practice – there was no need to set in writing duties and rights that have been in use for generations (and that concerned a predominantly illiterate segment of the population). The evidence shows, however, that there were also ploughmen who took on additional responsibilities, responsibilities which bore entrepreneurial traits despite the fact that the (temple) *ikkarus* were not independent economic agents. These additional responsibilities could be, and were, contractually fixed. In a sense, van Driel is right to call the *ikkaru* the “little brother” of the later rent farmers, although this should be restricted to (a few?) special cases like the one attested in the contract PTS 2344 and the similar Sippar evidence.

2.1.3. Agricultural tasks

2.1.3.1. Obligations

The main task of the *ikkarus* was, needless to say, the growing of cereals for the temple. Their obligation toward the temple, the crops they had to deliver, was a more or less fixed amount called *sūtu*, which is generally understood and translated as “rent”. The term also appears in the context of the *fermiers généraux* designating the fixed amount of agricultural produce due to the temple and determined by their rent contracts. The term itself is included in the title “rent farmer”: ša *mūḫḫi sūti*. The translation of *sūtu* as “rent” in this context is suitable, but it is perhaps not entirely fitting when referring to the *ikkarus*, who were not (always) tenants of temple land by their own choice. A broader understanding of the term such as “obligation” is probably more appropriate in connection to the *ikkarus*. However, such a translation obscures the connotations pertaining to the scope of this due. For this reason the term is usually not translated in the following. It was an amount determined on the basis of the surface area cultivated and the yield factor, which could depend on the quality of soil, availability of water, etc., with possible annual variations. In the case of the rent farmers the *sūtu* was fixed contractually and was valid for several years. The situation is somewhat obscure in the case of the ploughmen – we can conjecture that probably an annual
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132 Van Driel 2002: 225. Cf. also *ibid.*: 315.
agreement was made between the ikkaru and the temple or a rent farmer they were subordinated to, based on customary practice. The most important parameter will have been the surface area of the land under cultivation and the quality of the soil.

Although they had a fixed obligation, the ikkarus were subjected to an annual imittu procedure or “yield estimation”. This estimation conducted by a board of temple officials, scribes and estimators (emidus), took place shortly before the harvest, usually in the second month. These estimates resulted in imittu lists anticipating the crop revenues of the temple and sometimes even individual debt notes charged against individual ikkarus, presumably as representatives of their plough teams. Such debt notes are particularly well attested for the date orchards of Eanna, but there is also a small number of those concerning the arable production under the large-scale rent farmer Šum-ukin. These include YOS 6 45, 47, 55, TE BR 38 and PTS 2863 all from the second month of the third year of Nabonidus. As an example YOS 6 55 is edited here:

YOS 6 55 13-II-3 Nbn

1. 2 me 75 gur še-bar sag-du zag šá 16 en-šes 14 mu 16 engar šá ina šar-im-tu-nu níg-ga 16 gaš-an šá unug 16 u ‘na-na-a šá 16 báñ šá 16 mu-gin a-šú šá 16 im-unum

5. a 1 ba-si-ia 16 šá ugu šá 16 báñ šá 16 gaš-an šá unug 16 ina ugu 16 en-šes 14 mu a-šú šá 16 ag-kam ina iti gu4 ina 16 ma-šii šá 16 gaš-an šá unug 16 i-nam-din e-lat ú-il-ti mah-ri-tu4

10. šá ina muh-hi-šú

16 mu-gin šá 16 na-a-mu a-šú šá 16 ki-4 amar-utu-di ūr ‘in-niš a-šú šá 16 ag-mu-dù ’gi-mil-lu a-šú šá 16 -hu-lap ‘innin šá 16 utu-numun-giš a-šú

15. šá 16 utu-mu-giš šá 16 umbisag ba-la-tu a-šú šá 16 mu-še-zib 16 en ri₃₃ nin bi₃₃ tu₃₃ šá ba-zA-a-a ši-i-hu [šá] 16 gaš-an šá unug 16 iti gu₄ ud 13-kam [m]₃₃ 3-kam 16 ag-ni-tuk

20. lugul tin-ti₃₃

“275 kurru of barley, the principal of the impost, the sütu-obligation of Bél-al˘h˘č˘-iddin, the ploughman from Im˘tnu, property of the Lady of Uruk and Nan˘ya, pertaining to the sütu of Šum-ukin, son of Bél-zêr˘, descendant of Basia, the rent farmer of the Lady of Uruk, are the debt of Bél-al˘h˘č˘-iddin, son of Nabû-er˘ ğ˘. He will deliver (the barley) in the second month using the measure of the Lady of Uruk. (This is) apart from the previous debt notes charged against him.


At first sight it may seem contradictory for the ikkarus to have had a fixed (sütu) and at the same time a variable annually estimated obligation (imittu), but there is an explanation for this. In contrast to the shares (zittu, šibšu) delivered by the sharecroppers to the temple, which were a fraction of the yield, the sütu of the ploughmen represented more or less the entire yield of the plot assigned to them (after the deduction of administrative costs, rations, etc.). But unlike the rent

Following debt notes for barley pertaining to the rent of Šum-ukin have a similar form, but do not explicitly mention ikkarus as debtors: YOS 6 24 (I-1 Nbn), YOS 6 43 (IV-2 Nbn), YOS 6 84 (II-3 Nbn). TCL 12 108 is a similar imittu debt note for barley from the rent farm of Ib˘n˘ya.
(sůtu) of the fermiers généraux, which was predetermined in absolute figures by the rent contracts, the sůtu of the ikkarus was a fixed obligation only insofar as it was a multiple of the area cultivated (or the seed provided). As Jursa (1995a: 14) noted, the yield factor by which the area cultivated was multiplied in order to calculate the obligation of a ploughman had to be determined individually on an annual basis during an imittu procedure, general models like the ‘Edict’ notwithstanding. Furthermore, the yield factor could vary from year to year as observed for the ikkaru Appanu from Sippar (Jursa 1995a: 14).

2.1.3.2. Crops

In addition to barley (u††atu, še-bar), which was the most important cereal they produced, the ploughmen also delivered spelt (še-zíz-ām), wheat (še-gig-āba) and cress (sašlištu) to the temple. These were winter crops and frequently appear together in the imittu lists recording completed or anticipated deliveries of the ikkarus (and the err®¡u). As Jursa (1995a: 14) noted, the yield factor by which the area cultivated was multiplied in order to calculate the obligation of a ploughman had to be determined individually on an annual basis during an imittu procedure, general models like the ‘Edict’ notwithstanding. Furthermore, the yield factor could vary from year to year as observed for the ikkaru Appanu from Sippar (Jursa 1995a: 14).

Sesame (še-giš), which was a summer crop, also appears among the staples grown by the ikkaru. The evidence from Sippar shows that the main producers of this summer crop for Ebabbar were the err®¡u and the gardeners (it was grown by them below the date palms). In Uruk, however, most attestations indicate that the barley and sesame production had to be managed by the same group of agricultural labourers. Issues of sesame for seed took place in the fourth month, i.e. after the barley harvest, according to the texts from Eanna (PTS 2550 (IV-5 Nbk), GC 2 281 (IV-11 (Nbk)), CD 51 (IV-19 (Nbk)). At around this time the planting would have occurred. Harvesting of the sesame could be done 70 to 100 days after the planting, i.e. between the sixth and the seventh month. There is no evidence for harvesting in our material, but we do have yield estimations which would have been conducted shortly before the harvest. In Uruk these were carried out in the sixth (PTS 3021 (10 Npl)) and the seventh month (PTS 2312 (1 Ner)). According to the imittu debt note PTS 2312, sesame was the sůtu-obligation of the ploughmen:

PTS 2312 10-VII-1 Ner

obv. 1. 28 gur 2 p 3 b še-šiš-ši ąd-bān šā
     18 gur šā 1 ū na-na-a šeš-mu
     14 gur šā 1 ši-lim-e 

5.  4 gur šā 1 šā-ra-1-šingir-met 2-ta 1 kāįmēt
    pab 1 +šu 5 gur 2 p 3 b še-šiš-ši sag-du
    i-mit-tuq ąg-bān šā 1 ū engal-met
    ‘nia 1-šu gašan šā unug kį u ą na-na-a
    [ina 1-ši] bān šā mu-gin a-šū šā 1 ši-lim-e 

10. [a b]a-si-ia 3 ū en pi-gi-ti šā tųšal 11
    lo.e. [ina ugu 1 s]i-lim 1 ū en a-šū šā 1Ša 1 a-
    rev. [ina iti a]pin ina ą ą ma-ši-hu šā d gašan šā tųunug kį
    [ina ę-an]-na i-nam-din e-lat

134 E.g. TCL 13 180 (spelt and wheat); UCP 9/2 25, NCBT 650, NCBT 652 (spelt, wheat and cress).
136 Note that even in several rent contracts concerning arable land sesame deliveries were expected in addition to the barley rent: VS 20 88 (35 Nbk, edited on p. 152), PTS 2821 (5 7 Nbn), TCL 12 90 (8 Nbn). kasia which is also generally associated with the date cultivation was perhaps also grown/harvested by the ikkarus. There are no explicit attestations of this plant in the context of the obligations of the ploughmen, but some rent farmers who were mainly concerned with cereal cultivation also had to deliver kasia to the temple (e.g. Nergal-nāsir, according to VS 20 88 and GC 1 418, or Ile’t-Marduk according to BIN 2 130).
137 One text from Ebabbar records the issue of sesame for seed in the third month (Nbn. 226; Jursa 1995a: 176).
138 This is an imittu list for sesame, with the caption šamaššamMU imittu ša ikkarāti (line 1).
139 The evidence from Sippar correlates well with the Eanna texts. Here yield estimations for sesame are attested between the sixth and the eighth month, with the majority taking place in the seventh month (Jursa 1995a: 176).
“28;2.3 sesame, sūtu of Nabû-aḫḫê-ṣuilli, 18 kurru of Nanāya-aḫ-iddin, 14 kurru of Silîm-Bêl, 4 kurru of Šarā-il, two entries; in total: 65;2.3 sesame, the principal of the impost, the sūtu-obligation of the ploughmen, property of the Lady of Uruk and Nanāya, pertaining to the sūtu of Šum-ukîn, son of Bêl-zêri, descendant of Basîa, the commissioner of the king, are the debt of Silîm-Bêl, son of Aplîya. He will deliver (the sesame) to Eanna in the eighth month using the measure of the Lady of Uruk. (This is) apart from the debt notes of the sharecroppers which are charged against him.

Witnesses: Gimillu, son of Balâṭu
[PN], son of Bêl-aḫḫê-iddin
Mušêzîb-Bêl, son of Žëria
Scribe: Balâṭu, son of Mušêzîb-Bêl
Nār-Innin, estate of the Lady of Uruk; 10-VII-1 Ner, king of Babylon.”

Deliveries of sesame by ikkarus are attested in YOS 314 (IX-4 Nbk) and YOS 17 326 (X-11 Nbk). Texts from Sippar record sesame deliveries between the seventh and tenth month, of which the majority occurred in the eighth month (Jursa 1995a: 176).

2.1.3.3. Ploughing, sowing and harvesting

At any rate, the sesame harvest had to be completed before the autumn ploughing and barley sowing season. There is no direct evidence for these activities, but issues of barley seed and draught animals give some clues for the time-frame of these tasks. Before the ploughing started, the ikkarus received the draught animals from the temple, as receipts documenting the issues of oxen indicate. In Sippar these receipts are usually dated to the fourth or fifth month (Jursa 1995a: 19-62). There are so far only two relevant texts from Uruk which are dated to the sixth and seventh month. BIN 1 112 (VI-19 Nbk; p. 86) is a receipt for 62 oxen taken by four rabeṣerit. Though the text does not explicitly state this, these oxen were probably intended for the plough teams of ikkarus. NBC 4840 (VII-19 (Npl)) records issues of oxen to ikkarus:

NBC 4840  17-VII-19 (Npl)

obv.  1. gu₄ me ša a-na ḫa engar₄ mek sum-nu
      šid iti du₉ ud 17-kam mu 19-kam
      21 gu₄ meša ša 1-mu-gin a ša-bi-da-a
      a-na ḫa engar₄ me id-di-nu
      5. 1 gu₄ ša nad-na-a ša e-reš
          1 ša mu-mu a liddi-iā
          1 ša sum-na-šeš a e-reš
          1 ša ag-numum-du a ša-ag-šu-ū
          1 ša ḫe-din-iṭ a ḫu-qī-pi
      10. 1 ša-d ḫu-amur-utu ša e-a-a
          1 ša-ag-du-uš a liddi-ën
          1 ša-ag-šu-ū ša tin-tir₄[-a-a]

140 The actual sum of the listed amounts is 64;2.3.
+17-VII-19:

21 oxen which Šum-ukin, son of Zabidāya, gave to the ploughmen; 1 ox − Nadānya, son of Ėreš; 1 (ox) − Šum-iddin, son of Iddia; 1 − Nādin-ahī, son of Ėreš; 1 − Nabū-zēr-ibni, son of Ša-Nabû-šū; 1 − Bēl-uballit, son of Lāqīp; 1 − Muṣallim-Marduk of the house of Aplāya; 1 − Nabū-ipuš, son of Nāʿid-Bēl; 1 − Ša-Nabû-šū of Bābilāya; [1] − Šillāya, son of Rēmūt, [1]and [1]; 3 − Bēl-x, son of Nāḥid-Bēl; 2 − Ea-ipuš, son of Aḫunāya; 1 − Kudurrū.

During the ploughing season some of the animals died and their carcasses were delivered to the temple. This was also recorded in short receipts or lists, which usually date between the ninth and the eleventh month. In the following example some of the men delivering the carcasses are the ones who reappear several years later as recipients of oxen in NBC 4840 (see above):

NCBT 1079

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>obv.</th>
<th>20-X-14 (Npl)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>rev.</td>
<td>1 gu pag-ri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>l'din-iy a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>l'ag-numun-gin a l'man-na-i-lu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>l'mu-gin a l'za-bi-da</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>l'ag-numun/mu-dū a šeša-e-a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lo.e.</td>
<td>1 šā dumu-šū šā id-di-iša</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>šā ud 19-kam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rev.</td>
<td>5 gu pag-gar-nu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>l'engarša mah-ru-u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>l'en-pabšu a l'ag-sur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iti ab ud 20-kam mu 14-kam</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“1 carcass of an ox − (received from) Bēl-uballit, son of ...; 1 − Nabū-zēr-ukin, son of Mannu-il; 1 − Šum-ukin, son of Zabidāya; 1 − Nabū-zēr-ibni, son of Aḫḫē; 1 − of the son of Iddia, which was (brought) on the 19th day; in total 5: carcasses of oxen were received from the ikkaru. 1 − Bēl-ahḫē-eriba, son of Nabū-čēr; in total: 6 carcasses of oxen. 20-X-14.”

After the ploughing season, the animals were taken by the temple from the ikkaru. The text NBC 4940 (27-X-20 Nbk) lists oxen which were received from ikkaru. This would indicate that the ploughing had been completed by the end of the tenth month. NBC 4649, unfortunately without a date, could also be an example for this practice:

---

141 This Šum-ukin was to all likelihood also a ploughman, if we accept his identification with the ikkaru with the same name and patronymic who appears in NCBT 1079 (edited below). It is apparent from NBC 4840, however, that he had a somewhat higher position, at least since 19 Npl, as he was responsible for the distribution of the draught animals to the ploughmen.

142 NCBT 807 (IX-1), NCBT 1079 (X-14 (Npl)), PTS 2772 (XI-12 Nbk). The animal in a text published by Dillard, FLP 1529 (VI-14 Nbk) will have died just before the ploughing started. Two receipts for dead draught animals are attested in the Ebabbar archive and are dated to the ninth and the tenth month (Jursa 1995a: 19).

143 The scribe left this spot blank. The patronymic could have been Lāqīp. This would then be the same person as in NBC 4840 (l. 9), edited above.

144 The scribe could obviously not remember the name of the person who brought a carcass of an ox one day before the writing up of this receipt, but he still knew that this was a son of a certain Iddia.

145 This entry was added subsequently.

146 Jursa (1995a: 19) assumed that once the ploughing had been finished the oxen were distributed to the herdsmen and kept with the rest of the temple’s cattle.
Issues of seed to ploughmen (and people not explicitly designated as such) for sowing were carried out in Sippar between the seventh and the tenth month (Jursa 1995a: 19f.; see also van Driel 1990: 239f. for other, some even later, attestations). From Uruk there are not that many attestations of barley being issued for sowing. The already mentioned text OIP 122 77 which records issues of barley seed to a large number of individuals is not dated. Another three dated texts from Eanna, however, fall into the same temporal frame as the Ebabbar documents. In AnOr 8 42, dated to the seventh month of 4 Cyr, 40 kurru of barley were issued by the rent farmer Nabû-udammiq, to a certain Šárîz-rîbni, probably an ikkaru, for the seed of his ploughs. YOS 7 139, dated from the tenth month of 3 Camb, records the issue of spelt for seed to the ikkaru s. The recipients are known from other sources as rab epiannis. They will have probably redistributed the seed among the plough teams under their responsibility. BIN 1 154 (29-VIII-[x] Nbk) records the issue of dates for seed to people, who are known from other sources as overseers of the ploughmen (rab êerti s), and the ikkaru s. It is quite unlikely that the dates were used for planting date orchards. Rather, the temple may have suffered a shortage of barley at this time, but had plenty of dates as the date harvest would just have been completed (the text was written in the eighth month). Hence the temple authorities issued dates with the intention that they be exchanged for barley by the recipients themselves.

There is no direct evidence for the harvesting of barley from the Eanna and the Ebabbar archives. However, documents related to the yield estimation procedure (imittu lists and debt notes) dated to the first and the second month, indicate that the barley harvest must have taken place between the end of the first and the third month.

2.1.4. Non-agricultural tasks

2.1.4.1. Work projects

Occasionally we hear of the ikkaru employed at various non-agricultural projects. These included work on the irrigation system (e.g. on the Nâr-šarrî and on a local canal in the district Angillu as is evident from the letter YOS 21 71, or an unspecified canal in YOS 6 246 (VII-11 Nbn)), (construction) work in Babylon (YBC 4173 (VI-1 (Nbk IV))), work in Raqqat-Šamaš (GC 1 103 (IX-38 Nbk)), work on the palace in Matanan (YOS 7 187 (IV-6 Camb)), production of

---

147 The text is edited by Coquerillat 1968: 51. 113f.
148 The text is edited by Coquerillat 1968: 51. 114.
149 Cf. the agricultural calendar reconstructed in the Appendix 3 and the one worked out by Landsberger 1949: 284ff. See also Salonen 1968: 190ff. and especially p. 196.
150 For an edition of the text see Henkelman and Kleber 2007: 164f.
bricks (PTS 2008 (undated letter)), etc. When employed at these projects the *ikkarus* were organised in *ešertus*, units of ten people, as was common practice. Though there is usually no explicit evidence for this, a number of these work assignments will have been connected to the service for the state which the temple had to provide (see also below). Apparently the agricultural calendar was not taken into consideration in these projects. The dated texts show that the *ikkarus* were frequently deployed during the labour-intensive ploughing season – an interesting observation, considering the lack of manpower which the temples suffered during the Neo-Babylonian period. The temple may not have had much choice in these cases but to conform to the schedule of the state administration.

In connection with these non-agricultural assignments there are several attestations of *ikkarus* receiving rations. These included beer (GC 1 103 (IX-38 Nbk) and perhaps also YOS 7 174 (IX-4 Camb), edited on p. 386), flour (NCBT 708 (I-40 Nbk)), bread (NCBT 2336 (V-40 Nbk)) and date rations (YBC 4173 (VI-1 (RN)), PTS 2 107 (IX-18 Nbk), NBC 4612 (XII-1 Camb)). The situation is similar in Sippar. The ploughmen could be deployed for various projects and received rations in return (Jursa 1995a: 11. 22f.).

2.1.4.2. Taxation-related obligations

Occasionally we hear about obligations which were imposed on the temple and were to be discharged by the *ikkarus*. These include the rations of the governor (*bēl piḫāti*) of Esagil, the bow-service (*qaštu*) and the more general types of service such as *ilku*, *urḫu* and *dullu*.

The obligations toward the state which were to be paid in kind, the rations of the governor (*bēl piḫāti*), are referred to in the ‘Edict of Belšazzar’. The amount of these rations was a fraction of the yield from both the arable land and the orchards. This fraction, according to the ‘Edict’, was 1/12 (or 8 1/3 %) of the yield or 2 *sūtu* 3 *qū* per each *kurru* delivered. However, this amount included also the rations of other officials, *ṭupšarru*, *mādīdu* and *atū*. The rations of the scribes, measurers and gatekeepers probably had to do with the administrative tasks surrounding the agricultural production of the temple, such as compiling *imittu* lists and debt notes, estimation of yields, weighing and storing of harvested commodities, and were intended for the temple’s own employees entrusted with these tasks. The rations of the governor, on the other hand, were meant for an official of the state administration and can be seen in the context of taxation. Two later documents from the sphere of the large-scale rent farms mention the rations of the *bēl piḫāti* of Esagil and shed more light on the whole matter.

TCL 13 182 (2 Dar), a contract recording the transfer of Gimilu’s rent farm to Bēlgimlanni, makes stipulations on the obligations of the new rent farmer. At this occasion it mentions in general terms the provision of the rations of the *bēl piḫāti* of Esagil, scribes, measurers and gatekeepers. Since the context of these obligations is the same as in the ‘Edict’ it seems more than likely that the governor referred to by the ‘Edict’ was in fact the *bēl piḫāti* of Esagil.

---

151 This is indicated by the letter YOS 21 115, in which the author of the letter complains that there is no work for 5 ploughmen of an *ešertu*-unit under his responsibility (ll. 7-10: ina *lib-bi* 1+et 10-ti / 5 *ūn* *ēngar-ma* / šā *šu-ia qaqq-qa-ra / ina igi-šu-nu ia-a-mu*). In this context *qaqqaru* probably meant that some digging rather than agricultural cultivation was involved.

152 According to this text they were sent on an expedition (*madāktu*).

153 These bread rations were for the *ikkarus* who carried grain. This operation probably was not a part of their regular agricultural activities.

154 This text is edited on p. 106. The *rab epinnis* who had received the date rations for the *ikkarus* are obliged to return these dates (converted to barley) to the temple since the *ikkarus* were idle (*samū*).

155 MacGinnis recently studied the bow-service on the basis of the evidence from the Ebabbar archive from Sippar (2012). On the role of the *ikkarus* in connection to this service see especially p. 5f.

156 For this official, who was one of the main suppliers of barley and dates for the palace in Babylon, see Jursa 2010a: 74ff. and van Driel 2002: 167. 176. For *bēl piḫāti* in connection with the dues from agricultural land from Sippar see also Jursa 1995a: 138f. and 2010b: 68f.

157 See p. 239.
The debt note AnOr 8 63 (9 Cyr) records the debt of the rent farmer Ardia, son of Nabû-bân-âhi, descendant of Rēmût-Ea, consisting of 179;1.4 kurru of dates, the remainder of his rent, and 400 kurru of dates, the rations of Ardia, son of Marduk-zêr-ibni, the bèl piḫâtî of Esagil. These rations are said to amount to 1 sîtu per each kurru (of the rent), i.e. 1/30 or 3 1/3 % of the rent. In Ardia’s case, the rent was 12,000 kurru of dates which fits well with the additional 400 kurru charged against him and which the temple had apparently already paid to the governor of Esagil on his behalf. Though we are dealing here with date cultivation rather than arable land, the obligations of the gardeners with respect to the extra costs and rations are the same as those of the ikkarûs as far as the ‘Edict’ goes. The gardeners are also obliged to pay 1/12 of the yield (or 0;0.2.3 per kurru) for the services and rations of the bèl piḫâtî, scribes, measurers and gatekeepers. Relying on AnOr 8 63 we can deduce that the governor of Esagil was to receive 1 sîtu (6 litres) per each kurru of dates or barley delivered to the temple, 159 this tax being based on the temple’s revenue in agricultural produce, which in turn was established by the amount of land under cultivation. In this respect the basic orchards (1 kurru of land) and arable plots (25 kurru of land) were used as a model for calculating not only the revenues of the temple, but also of the state. In fact, this was probably the main motive for the compiling of a document such as the ‘Edict’. In the case of Eanna during Nabonidus’ reign, while Šum-ukîn’s and Kalbîya’s rent farm was in place, the state administration could expect around 1,166;3.2 kurru of barley and dates per year based on the annual revenue of 35,000 kurru of barley and dates due from Šum-ukîn and Kalbîya 160 and assuming that the rate of 1 sîtu per kurru attested in the ninth year of Cyrus is applicable here. These figures should be taken as approximations only, since the actual returns of the temple cannot be determined with certainty due to additional sources of income (there were other minor rent farmers and sharecroppers engaged at the same time) and were in fact wildly variable from year to year as is demonstrated by TCL 13 227 (see Appendix 2).

The administrative text YBC 4164 (6 (Cyr or Camb)) listing incoming and outgoing commodities and silver, notes that 3 1/3 minas of silver, the price of 240 kurru of barley, following the exchange rate of 1;1 kurru of barley per one shekel of silver, were sent to the bèl piḫâtî of Esagil as rations due from 7,200 kurru of barley, the sîtu of the ikkarûs for the sixth year. 161 Here the rate of the rations of the bèl piḫâtî is also one sîtu per each kurru, i.e. 1/30 of the rent. The same rate is found in a similar text, PTS 2126 (5 (Camb)), according to which 0;1.1 of sesame were given to the bèl piḫâtî of Esagil for a rent of 7 kurru of sesame for the fifth year.

The governor of Esagil was entitled to a portion of the agricultural produce of the temple, which could be delivered in kind or converted to silver. Not only the agricultural production was taxed, but also, it appears, the cattle employed in this production. According to the letter YOS 3 9 (later Nebuchadnezzar’s or Neriglissar’s reign) 162 Ibni-Ištar, perhaps a rab eserti, was instructed to collect one shekel of silver from the ikkarûs per each ‘reserve’ ox which he had given to them. The silver was to be given to the bèl piḫâtî of Esagil by the sender of the letter Nabû-ahḫē-ḫullim, 158

158 Edited by Cocquerillat 1968: 73. 127. See also here p. 222.
159 The remaining 1 sîtu 3 qî per kurru were reserved for the scribes, measurers and gatekeepers. Assuming that equal numbers of these professionals were employed each group would receive 3 litres per kurru, or 1/60 of the rent.
160 Although no obligations for costs and rations are stipulated in Šum-ukîn’s and Kalbîya’s rent contract (YOS 6 11 + duplicates) we can assume that these were nevertheless expected of them, as they were no invention of the ‘Edict’. Texts from Sippar give evidence that these dues were known even before Nabonidus’s reign (Jursa 1995a: 138

161 Jursa (2010b: 69 324) suggests dating the letter to the early reign of Nabonidus; however, if the author of the letter and the addressee – Nabû-ahḫē-ḫullim and Ibni-Ištar – are identified with the agricultural officials rab ikkarûtî and rab eserti respectively then a slightly earlier dating (to Neriglissar’s or to the end of Nebuchadnezzar’s reign) is more adequate.
162 The text speaks of alpû uškûtu (ll. 23f.), literally “late(r) oxen”. These were perhaps oxen delivered to the ploughmen at a later stage (after the beginning of the ploughing season?) as a reserve or as a replacement for animals which had died during the ploughing.
probably the rab ikkarūti.¹⁶⁴ The implications of this text are not clear. It would appear that the basis for taxation could be the draught animals (a special kind of oxen?), but as there are no other attestations of this practice and the exact connotations of the term iškū in this context are unclear it remains questionable whether this indeed was a regular form of taxation or just an ad hoc payment.

Besides the dues in kind, the temple ploughmen were burdened with services for the crown as well. Together with the gardeners and shepherds of the temple they were obliged to serve as archers in the royal army. It was the responsibility of the rent farmers to organise and supply men for this service from among the ikkarūs put at their disposal. This is evident from some rent contracts from Sippar. The text BRM 1 101 (6 Dar; Jursa 1995a: 103ff.), which concerns the splitting of a rent farm in two equal parts between two men, sets forth the obligations for the new rent farmer: besides being responsible for half of the land and rent, he also got the responsibility for half of the urāšu-service.¹⁶⁵ The previously mentioned contract BM 74439 (16 Nbn; Jursa 1995a: 133) stipulates the obligation of the lessee, an ikkaru, to organise half of the settlers and agricultural workers assigned to him with the land he rented for work (dullu) entitled in the īku- and urāšu-service.¹⁶⁶

From Uruk there is some more evidence for the urāšu-service of the ikkarūs.¹⁶⁷ In the letter YOS 21 33¹⁶⁸ Ibnī-lštar wrote to Nabū-ahḫē-šullim as follows:

“Amurru-mukin-apli is holding me back because of the urāšū. May the lord rally all the urāšūs. The responsibility of the rent farmers to organise half of the settlers and agricultural workers assigned to him with the land he rented for work (dullu) entitled in the īku- and urāšu-service should be at their disposal. This is evident from some rent contracts from Sippar. The text BRM 1 101 (6 Dar; Jursa 1995a: 103ff.), which concerns the splitting of a rent farm in two equal parts between two men, sets forth the obligations for the new rent farmer: besides being responsible for half of the land and rent, he also got the responsibility for half of the urāšu-service.¹⁶⁵ The previously mentioned contract BM 74439 (16 Nbn; Jursa 1995a: 133) stipulates the obligation of the lessee, an ikkaru, to organise half of the settlers and agricultural workers assigned to him with the land he rented for work (dullu) entitled in the īku- and urāšu-service.¹⁶⁶

The previously mentioned contract BM 74439 (16 Nbn; Jursa 1995a: 133) stipulates the obligation of the lessee, an ikkaru, to organise half of the settlers and agricultural workers assigned to him with the land he rented for work (dullu) entitled in the īku- and urāšu-service.¹⁶⁶

From Uruk there is some more evidence for the urāšu-service of the ikkarūs.¹⁶⁷ In the letter YOS 21 33¹⁶⁸ Ibnī-lštar wrote to Nabū-ahḫē-šullim as follows:

“Amurru-mukin-apli is holding me back because of the urāšū. May the lord rally all the urāšūs. The responsibility of the rent farmers to organise half of the settlers and agricultural workers assigned to him with the land he rented for work (dullu) entitled in the īku- and urāšu-service should be at their disposal. This is evident from some rent contracts from Sippar. The text BRM 1 101 (6 Dar; Jursa 1995a: 103ff.), which concerns the splitting of a rent farm in two equal parts between two men, sets forth the obligations for the new rent farmer: besides being responsible for half of the land and rent, he also got the responsibility for half of the urāšu-service.¹⁶⁵ The previously mentioned contract BM 74439 (16 Nbn; Jursa 1995a: 133) stipulates the obligation of the lessee, an ikkaru, to organise half of the settlers and agricultural workers assigned to him with the land he rented for work (dullu) entitled in the īku- and urāšu-service.¹⁶⁶

The previously mentioned contract BM 74439 (16 Nbn; Jursa 1995a: 133) stipulates the obligation of the lessee, an ikkaru, to organise half of the settlers and agricultural workers assigned to him with the land he rented for work (dullu) entitled in the īku- and urāšu-service.¹⁶⁶

The implications of this text are not clear. It would appear that the basis for taxation could be the draught animals (a special kind of oxen?), but as there are no other attestations of this practice and the exact connotations of the term iškū in this context are unclear it remains questionable whether this indeed was a regular form of taxation or just an ad hoc payment.

¹⁶⁴ YOS 3 9 ll. 23-31: šar apu / uš-ku-tu / ša a-na li engar / ta-ad-din ina ugu / al-pi / 1 gin kú-babbar ša ina / bit-qa / a-na engar / mu-ḫur-ri / kú-babbar / iš[am]-ma / a-na / 1 en nam ša e-sag-gil / lud-din.
¹⁶⁶ „Die Hälfte der dort ansässigen Leute und der Gartenarbeiter steht ihm (d. h. dem Pächter) zur Verfügung. Den Arbeitsdienst für die Hälfte der īku- und urāšu-Verpflichtung wird er (sie) leisten (lassen).” (Jursa 1995a: 121).
system, to judge by his role as gugallu. These workers were apparently missing. For this reason Ibni-Ištar wrote to Nabû-alḫē-šullim asking for the urāšus of a certain Ibni-Ištar, son of Silim-Bēl, who is not otherwise known, and of the ikkarus to be sent with a dēkû (“summoner”) heading them.

That the ikkarus were obliged to provide urāšus is also evident from the contract PTS 2344 (edited above) from the first year of Neriglissar’s reign. The lessee, an ikkaru, who leased 50 kurru of land which were to be cultivated by two plough teams, had to provide two urāšus. Apparently one urāšu per plough team was the norm.

In TCL 13 150 (edited on p. 105) from the second year of Cambyses Aqria, son of Nabû-dalâ, who is known from other sources as a širku and an ikkaru (BM 113252), a gugallu (YOS 7 186) or a rab epinni (TCL 13 152), is obliged by the temple administration to provide 10 urāšus from among the ikkarus under his responsibility for work on a canal whenever Nabû-balāt-šarrī-qiḫbī, a rent farmer on Nār-Piṣiḏu (ša muḫḫi sītša muḫḫi Nār-Piṣiḏu), probably a state official, calls for them. Though there is no direct evidence for the number of plough teams under the control of the rab epinnis, one could conjecture that, by analogy to the rab eṣertis, who during Nebuchadnezzar’s reign had the same responsibilities and duties as later the rab epinnis, they also were in charge of ten ploughs each. Provided that this is correct, TCL 13 150 would again present us with a ratio of one urāšu to one plough team.

2.1.5. Summary

The term ikkaru, “ploughman”, had no legal connotation per se. The temple employed its dependants, the širku, as ikkarus. However, it could also hire free persons to work for it as ploughmen. Furthermore, the term ikkaru also applied to the slaves or hirelings of the agricultural contractors working for the temple. In other words, ikkaru was a general term applied to people working with a plough irrespective of their legal status or institutional affiliation.

In the context of temple agriculture the ikkarus were provided with land and means of production by the temple. In turn, they had to deliver almost the entire yield of their plots to the temple.

The ikkarus were organised in plough teams. As a norm these teams consisted of four ploughmen, four oxen and two cows. The oxen served as draught animals and the purpose of the cows was to keep the number of the animals up to strength with their offspring. In practice the norm of four ploughmen, four oxen and two cows was not always reached – numerous understrength plough teams are attested. Frequently family members constituted a plough team, which could also include old men and children. The head of a plough team interacted with the temple administration as the representative of his team and is therefore the best attested in the written documentation. He is usually designated simply as ikkaru, although there is one attestation of the term bēl epinni for the head of a plough team.

The exact number of ploughmen and plough teams available to the temple is not known. During Nebuchadnezzar’s time the temple had at least 46 plough teams and during Darius’s reign it probably employed more than fifty teams. Although the rent contracts from Nabonidus’s and Darius’s reigns speak of hundred plough teams, i.e. 400 ploughmen, which the temple was to provide to the rent farmers, it is questionable whether this was possible in practice.

The plough teams were subordinated to a number of local overseers (rab eṣertis, rab epinnis and gugallus) who were recruited from the ranks of agricultural workers and one overseer of the ploughmen (rab ikkarātē). During the time of the large-scale rent farms the office of the rab ikkarātē was supplanted by the rent farmers and the ikkarus stood under the authority of these contractors.

173 Perhaps this affair is even directly connected to YBC 9448 (Janković 2007: 221ff.), which mentions the construction of a dam (mušannītu) under the direction of the gugallu Ibni-Ištar.
174 The tax basis in some cases may have been real estate as is maintained by van Driel on account of evidence from Borsippa (2002: 264). These different types of taxation should probably be attributed to the different social spheres, private vs. institutional, to which they were applied.
175 See p. 250.
176 In Sippar the head of a plough team is usually designated as rab epinni.
The plough teams had very high work loads: plots with a surface area ranging from 20 kurru (25 ha) to 30 kurru (37.5 ha) were assigned to them according to the rent contracts from the Eanna archive. It was virtually impossible to conduct the necessary work on plots of this size in a reasonable time frame. In fact, practical texts from Sippar show that the plough teams on average tilled plots between 10 kurru (12.5 ha) and 15 kurru (18.75 ha). There is even some evidence that the temple authorities of Eanna considered a work load of 10 kurru of land per plough team acceptable.\textsuperscript{177} The work loads which appear in the rent contracts were clearly not adequate to the work force provided by the temple – the necessity for the rent farmer to organise and employ additional work force is implicit in these texts.

The obligations of the ikkarus were generally based on customary practice and were not recorded in written contracts. There were, however, some ploughmen who took on additional responsibilities which were contractually regulated. The ploughmen in these exceptional cases can be seen as small scale entrepreneurs.

Their main responsibility was the production of winter crops (barley, spelt, wheat and cress), but also of the summer crop sesame.

Apart from agricultural tasks, the ikkarus, as long as they were also temple dependants, were employed at various projects, such as construction work, brick production, and work on the irrigation system. They were organised in units of ten under the supervision of the rab eşertis. The ploughmen also had several taxation related obligations: they are attested in connection with the bow- and the ilku-service. They were obliged to supply urāšu-workers at a rate of one urāšu per plough team and they had to pay administrative fees: rations of bel pihatit at a rate of 1 sītu per 1 kurru of rent. They also had to pay for administrative services, i.e. the rations of the scribes, measurers, and gate-keepers which amounted to 1 sītu 3 qū per 1 kurru of rent.

\textsuperscript{177} TCL 13 182.
2.2. Sharecroppers (errēšū)

Another category of agricultural workers frequently contrasted with the ploughmen (ikkarus) were the errēšū. The term errēšu, always written syllabically, literally means “cultivator” and was in the past occasionally confused with the term ikkaru, which also designated a worker engaged in arable cultivation. Already Ehrenkranz (1936: 19) recognised that the difference between ikkarus and errēšus did not lie in the type of their activities but in their relationship to the landowner. In the context of the temple agriculture ikkarus were ploughmen, most frequently temple dependants, who did not possess any means of production, tools or draught animals, but were provided with these by the temple. They were obliged to deliver to the temple more or less the entire yield of the plots assigned to them. Usually a small portion of the plot was reserved for covering the running costs, seed, animal feed and ‘rations’ of the ploughmen. Since ikkarus were temple dependants the temple could dispose of this work force as it wished. They could also be employed at non-agricultural work projects by the temple, and on these occasions the ikkarus were entitled to rations like all the other temple dependants. errēšus on the other hand, had their own means of production and worked as tenants on temple land. The temple was entitled to a specified share of the harvest, while the errēšus kept the remainder. For this reason the term is best understood as “sharecropper”. Since they were not temple dependants they could not be engaged by the temple in any non-agricultural projects the way ikkarus could. The shares in the context of land tenure are designated as zittu ("share") or šibšu ("harvest share"). The two terms are partially synonymous. The former is more general and can refer to different types of divisions (e.g. in the prebendary or inheritance context), while the latter term is exclusively used in the agricultural context for winter crops, sesame and kasia.

On the whole errēšus are not well attested in the Eanna archive. They did not belong to the temple personnel and were for the most part of no concern to the administrative apparatus. What indeed was of concern to the temple administration were their deliveries of agricultural products. Thus specific individuals designated as errēšus generally only appear in lists of deliveries, usually side by side with ikkarus. From these lists it transpires that the errēšus were involved in the cultivation of arable land and made deliveries of barley, spelt, wheat, sesame, cress and kasia – in other words, all the major crops cultivated on the estates of Eanna except the dates. Even though date orchards were on rare occasions rented out on sharecropping terms, the tenants of these orchards were never designated as errēšus. This term is restricted to the context of cereal cultivation. The sharecropping gardeners, unless they were rab banē in charge of the prebendary orchards, did not have a specific designation distinguishing them from the ‘regular’ nukuribbus. Most gardeners, however, were in part also sharecroppers. The land below the date palms which could be planted with barley, sesame or other cereals and vegetables was usually subjected to sharecropping terms. For instance, in the orchard lease ana nukuribbut, BIN 1 117, the tenant is obliged, besides tending to the orchard and the date palms, to work the land below the palm trees. For the plants grown here he is to pay a tenth share to the lessor. This dual character of the obligations of the nukuribbus is also reflected in some imittu debt notes for dates. While the main
object of the debt note were the dates, whose amount, determined by a yield estimation procedure, probably represented a larger portion of the entire yield, plants grown below the date palms, for which only a share had to be paid to the temple, were also accounted for in an additional clause.\(^{185}\)

**BM 114643**

26-VI-7 Camb

**Obv.**

1. 260 gur zú-lum-ma zag a-ša ša\(^{\text{u}}\)\(^{\text{nu}}\)la-\(\text{a}^{\text{g}}\)šän
   े rit-tu₄ ša \(\text{ār}^{\text{r}}\)-rab \([\text{a-ša} \text{ ša PN nī-g-ga} \text{gša}^{\text{a}} \text{ša} \text{ ūnu}^{\text{k}}\]
   u \(\text{na}-\text{na}-\text{a} \text{ ša} \text{[} \text{a}^{\text{g}} \text{ša} \text{ ša} \text{ ūn}^{\text{a}} \text{a} \text{ ūnu}^{\text{k}}\]
   a \(\text{re-mu}^{\text{a}}\)\([\text{bad} \text{ ina} \text{ u}^{\text{a}}\text{šu}^{\text{h}}-\text{hi PN}]\)-mu a-šän

5. ša \(\text{a}^{\text{g}}\|\text{ag-} [\text{x-x} \text{ a PN ina iti} \text{ du₄}^{\text{a}}\text{ or} \text{ apu-}]
   \text{ ina} \text{ ha}^{\text{a}}\text{-ṣa-ri}
   \text{ ina} \text{ gša}^{\text{a}}\text{-ṣi- [hi ša} \text{ gša}^{\text{a}} \text{ ūn}^{\text{i}} \text{ ina} \text{ μu}^{\text{h}}-\text{hi} 1\text{-ta}
   \text{ rit-tu₄}  \text{ it-ṭi 1 gur} 0;0.1.3½ \text{ šila ki-ṣir}
   \text{ e-ṣit-tu₄} \text{ di} \text{ en} \text{ bi} \text{t-tu₄} ša ḫu-ṣaṭu ṭu-ḥal-la
   \text{ lib-lib} \text{ bi u man-} \text{ ga-ga i-nam-din}

**Rev.**

10. \(\text{mu}^{\text{u}}\text{-kē-e-a a-šu} \text{ ša} \text{ inin-na-} \text{numun-ti}
   \text{ u} \text{ dan-nu}  \text{ṣe₃-} \text{sū-} \text{dū a-šu} \text{ ša} \text{ ag-su}

15. \text{mu-} \text{kin₉} \text{ ag-a-mu a-šu} \text{ ša} \text{ en-din-ta} \text{ a} \text{ ša-mun} \text{ bi-a} \text{-şu}
   \text{ bi-a} \text{-mū-mu a-šu} \text{ ša} \text{ ha} \text{-ni-din a} \text{ šu} \text{-ti-i}
   \text{ šu} \text{ a-šu} \text{ ša} \text{ ag-kar-zi₉} \text{ a} \text{ gša-} \text{bi}
   \text{ gša-en} \text{-ṣu-nu a-} \text{šu} \text{ ša} \text{ inin-mu-kam a} \text{ ša-bad-dingir-ū-tu} \text{-dū}
   \text{ umber} \text{a} \text{ šu-gin} \text{-ibila a-šu} \text{ ša} \text{ e-} \text{an-na-na-din-mu}

20. \text{a} \text{ ba-bu-ū-tu} \text{ ūn₉} \text{ gur-mu} \text{ ši-i-ḥi}

**U.e.**

ša \(\text{a}^{\text{g}}\)\(\text{ša}^{\text{a}}\) \(\text{gša}^{\text{a}}\) 185 iti kin ud 26-kam

**L.e.**

\text{ugal e₉₁} \text{lugal kur-kur}

"260 kurru of dates, impost of the plot in Las¹tu, bit ritti of Arrab, [son of PN], [property of the Lady of] Uruk and Nanaya, from [the rent farm of Ardia, son of] Nabû-bân-ahī, descendant of Rēmūt-[Ea, are the debt of PN], son of Nabū[-x, descendant of PN]. He will give the dates in the month [VII or VIII], all at once using the measure [of the Lady of Uruk.] With each kurru (of dates) he will give 0;0.1.3½ (dates) as kisir esitti balatu ana Bēl fee, a load of wood, (a?) basket, leaflets and fibre. Mukkēa, son of Innin-žēr-ũšabī and Dannu-ahḫēṣu-ibi, son of Nabû-eriba, guarantee for the payment of the dates. (This is) apart from 1 kurru of sesame, two measures of kasia (and) 2 sittu of fenugreek, the share (from the land) below the date palms which is at his disposal.

**Witneses:** Nabû-apla-iddin, son of Bēl-uballit, descendant of Ša-tābtišu, Marduk-šûm-iddin, son of Nādin, descendant of Sutī, Gimil-Šamaš, son of Nabû-ētēr-napšātī, descendant of Egībi, Nabû-bēlšunu, son of Innin-šûm-ērēš, descendant of Ea-ilūla-bānī, Scribe: Šamaš-mukin-apli, son of Eanna-nādin-šumi, descendant of Babûtu; Bit-Šakin-šumi; 26-VI-7 Camb, king of Babylon, king of lands."

Beside the two imittu debt notes for dates which also mention the shares of the cereals grown in the orchards, several debt notes dealing exclusively with share-obligations, designated either as zittu or šibšu, have come down to us.\(^{186}\) These debt notes deal without exception with barley or other cereals, but not dates, and are formulated like the more common imittu debt notes, with the exception that the commodities owed are not designated as imittu of a plot, but rather zittu or šibšu. The debtors in these texts do not appear with any particular title and are not explicitly called errēšus, but it is more than probable that they were sharecroppers. In the sharecropping land

\(^{185}\) This type of clause is quite exceptional. Beside the example presented below it is so far only attested once more in BM 114641 (edited on p. 77): “(This is) apart from 5 kurru of kasia, the share from (the land) below the date palms” (ll. 13f.: e-lat / 5 gut ka-as-si-ṭa šib-shū ša šu-pal 186 ⁹ gišimmâr).\(^{186}\) E.g. BIN 1 97, NCBT 1012, PTS 2937, UCP 10/8, 244f., YBC 9144, 9161, 9213, etc.
leases the tenants also do not appear with the title errēšu. The relative scarcity of attestations of individual errēšus is not surprising considering that errēšu is not a professional title but rather a status resulting from a land tenure arrangement.

In terms of work they were conducting for the temple, the errēšus did not differ much from the ikkarus. They were embedded in the same organisational structure as the temple’s own agricultural personnel. Occasionally they tilled previously uncultivated land and were instructed by the temple administration to use specific tools. As far as it is evident from the rent contracts, the temple never provided them with tools or draught animals. The harvest shares they were obliged to deliver to the temple differed according to the type of work they had to conduct. The more strenuous the work was, the smaller the share of the temple was. Just like the ploughmen, the sharecroppers also stood under the supervision of the various overseers in the agricultural sector, such as the rab epinnis or large-scale rent farmers, ša muḫḫi sūtiš. These ‘supervisors’ were generally concerned with the sharecroppers’ deliveries of agricultural commodities, since it was their responsibility to make sure they reached the temple. The pending deliveries were recorded in debt notes (see above) following a yield estimation (ummitu) carried out by the temple’s estimators (émidus) and subsequently collected by the supervisors and delivered to the temple.

Sharecroppers, particularly the errēšus, were employed on the land which could not be tilled by the temple’s own workforce. In one letter (YOS 3 84 ll. 28-33) the qipu instructs the overseer of the ploughmen (rab ikkarātitan) to install overseers of plough teams in the irrigation districts so that they may cultivate these. Whatever exceeded their resources the qipu intended to assign to errēšus for cultivation (I. 31-33: ú ša al-la / dul-liššu at-tar / a-na erek-reš-e eš-su-aš-bīt). Similarly, in the rent contract YOS 6 150 provisions are made for the land which cannot be cultivated using the resources provided to the rent farmer š oppressive. This land was to be tilled by the errēšus. Another document (BM 113252, see p. 101 for an edition of the text), which comes from a period when no large-scale rent farmers for cereal cultivation were working for Eanna, deals with the organisation of labour, in particular the plough teams, in specific localities under the supervision of the overseers of the plough teams, rab epinnis. It was one of their duties according to this text to install errēšus where needed in a common effort: er-erek-reš-e i-ti a-ḫa-meš ú-sa'-za-zu (I. 25). Not very many leases ana errēšitu are known to us, but the extant rent contracts inform us that beside the qipu (PTS 2134) also the šatammu (YBC 3543) or the large-scale rent farmers, ša muḫḫi sūtiš (e.g. YBC 3750, YOS 21 207), could lease out temple land for sharecropping.

The sharecroppers were used as a supplement to the temple’s own agricultural workforce which could obviously not deal with all of the temple’s estates. Even though the income from the land tilled by the sharecroppers was lower than the income from the land worked directly by the temple’s own agricultural personnel, the discrepancy between the land and the workforce available must have been high enough to make the temple resort to this scheme of land management. This system can also be observed in the Eabbar of Sippar. Jursa (1995a: 84) estimated that two thirds of the temple land in Al-Šamaš, a locality with extensive arable holdings of the Eabbar temple, which cannot be interpreted with any degree of certainty. However, nine of the ten overseers appearing in this text are well known from other sources and their function as overseers of temple plough teams is certain.

---

187 According to the rent contracts BM 114559 (p. 301) and YOS 21 207 (p. 302).
188 For instance, the mayyāru-plough (“Umbruchpflug”) in YOS 21 207 and 208 (see p. 272).
189 E.g. according to YOS 21 207 the sharecropper was to pay a half-share for regular land (būt dullû) and a third-share for previously uncultivated land (bīt tapē) (see also p. 301).
190 See for instance TCL 13 209 edited on p. 97.
192 See Coquerillat 1968: 42. 109f. and here p. 203.
193 “The land which exceeds his rent farm (sūtiš) will be worked by errēšus; [estimators] of Eanna will make the yield estimates and they will pay a share to Eanna” (YOS 6 150 ll. 14-16: ... pi-šu lu-pu / ša eli) bān-sū at-ra er-erek-reš-e ina li-bi ir-ri-sū / erek-reš-e ša é-an-na im-mi-du ū ša-la a-na ša-an-na i-nam-di-ru.
194 Here these individuals appear with a title bēl gimil, or so (ēn gi-mil), which is unattested elsewhere and which cannot be interpreted with any degree of certainty. However, nine of the ten overseers appearing in this text are well known from other sources and their function as overseers of temple plough teams is certain.
195 Cf. for instance Cyr. 26 in Jursa 1995a: 137.
were cultivated by ḫerrēšus. In other words, even though they are not well attested in the documentation, their number and importance for the temple agriculture was by no means negligible. What is more, the ubiquity of the sharecroppers of Ebabbar went so far that they were even working on plots assigned to the ikkarus. This is evident from a text recording deliveries of ḫerrēšus from the land of the ikkarus or from a survey of plots assigned to ploughmen and tilled (in part) by sharecroppers. While this seems to have been common practice in Sippar, it is not entirely clear how the work division between ikkarus and ḫerrēšus was regulated in Uruk. There seem to have been some problems in this area as some legal documents demonstrate. In YBC 4006 (34 NbK) the gugal, four rab ġšertiš and temple farmers are warned under the threat of death penalty against giving out land from their allotments or draught animals to sharecroppers. The background of this affair is not known, but we can assume that the distribution of the temple land and work resources got out of hand undermining the temple’s policies and resulting in the necessity for the temple administration to take firmer control in this matter. Years later, during Cambyses’ reign, there were again problems concerning the management of the temple’s own workforce and the sharecroppers. BIN 2 108 records an oath of three rab epinniš who pledge not to conceal the land of the Lady of Uruk or impose obligations of the temple farmers on the sharecroppers and vice versa.

Despite all the problems which may have accompanied the management of the internal and external agricultural workforce, it is beyond doubt that sharecroppers made important contributions to the temple’s income in agricultural commodities. The account OIP 122 82 which lists Eanna’s total agricultural income for the second year of Nabonidus’s reign records substantial amounts of cereals delivered by the sharecroppers: 3,355 kurru of barley, 60 kurru of sesame, 840 kurru of kasia and 0;1.4 of cress. Unfortunately the text does not provide a total sum, the space for this was left blank by the scribe, and it cannot be derived from the individual entries because some of them, in particular the ġšuru-income, give the amounts of barley and dates together. However, the ḫerrēšus’ deliveries can be compared to the sitten-income of the second year of Nabonidus supplied by the rent farmer Šum-ukin (l. 2), namely 25,000 kurru of barley. These 3,355 kurru of barley from the sharecroppers represent 13.4 % of what was expected (and delivered in the second year) from Šum-ukin’s rent farm. In another similar account dealing with the temple’s income over several years, TCL 13 227, the data from the fifth year can be used for comparing the income from the ḫerrēšus to the total income. Line 26 records that the sharecroppers delivered 1,171;0.5 of barley, 130 kurru of spelt and 18 kurru of sesame in the fifth year, while the total income in this year was 11,890;3.2 of barley, 943 kurru of spelt and 93 kurru of sesame (ll. 40f.). This means that ḫerrēšus in the fifth year of Nabonidus supplied 9.8 % of barley, 13.8 % of spelt and 19.4 % of sesame relative to the total income in these commodities. The figures from these accounts can be taken to indicate that the sharecroppers focused on the more work-intensive summer crops.

It is also interesting to note that the deliveries of the sharecroppers were not included in the sitten-deliveries of the large-scale rent farmer Šum-ukin. While he was certainly forced to sub-lease parts of the land at his disposal because he was not provided an adequate workforce by the temple, it seems that there was a certain number of sharecroppers directly supervised by the temple and not included in Šum-ukin’s rent farm.

No estimates concerning the total number of sharecroppers working for Eanna can be made at present. From Sippar we know, however, that their numbers could be quite substantial. The largest group of ḫerrēšus in one locality counted 24 individuals, while in total at least 60 ḫerrēšus are attested in one imittu list (Cyr. 34; see Jursa 1995a: 84). Jursa deduced further from this text that

---

196 BM 60160 ll. 5'f.: še-bar ʾšell-š[i(bššu)] ʾeš-ru-ú šáḫ ʾer-re-še-x-e šáš [ina ʾeq₂b₂m₅] / šá’ ʾeq₂b₂m₅ (Jursa 1995a: 15).
197 CT 56 505+, see Jursa 1995a: 16 for an edition of the text.
199 See Kümmel 1979: 98. 107, Cocquerillat 1968: 60. 121ff., Sandowicz 2012: 275ff. See also here p. 139.
201 Deliveries of the sharecroppers are recorded also for the year four: 3,753 kurru of barley, 247 kurru of spelt, 35;1.4 of sesame and even 71;2.3 of dates (ll. 10f.). The presence of dates here is exceptional. Unfortunately the total income for the year four (ll. 21f.) includes also the deficit from the year three and cannot be used for our purposes.
the *errēšus* must have tilled two thirds of the land represented in this list, while the *ikkarus* dealt with only one third (*ibid.*). Therefore, despite the scarce attestations of the *errēšus* their significance for the temple agriculture should not be underestimated. Nevertheless, the impression we get from the written documentation is that in Uruk the *errēšus* played a more marginal role than in Sippar.

To sum up, *errēšus* were cultivators on arable land holdings of the temple. Their agricultural activities were similar to those of the *ikkarus*. A major difference, however, was that the *errēšus* had their own means of production and that they worked under sharecropping terms. The size of the share they had to deliver to the temple varied depending on the type of work conducted in the fields.

Their efforts concentrated on the production of summer and winter cereals. There is some indication that in Uruk they focused on the more intensive forms of agriculture such as sesame and *kasia* cultivation.

In Sippar a considerable portion of the Ebabbar’s land holdings was worked by *errēšus*. For Uruk we lack adequate evidence; however, it appears that the number of *errēšus* employed by the Eanna temple was comparably less significant.
2.3. Gardeners (nukuribbu)\textsuperscript{202}

2.3.1. Documentation and status

People in charge of the individual date orchards were called nukuribbu (usually written logographically: \textit{nu-ki₃₃}). The term nukuribbu does not appear frequently in the Eanna texts and one often has to turn to the Ebabbar archive from Sippar for further insights concerning their status and organisation. In Uruk one finds the term nukuribbu sporadically in administrative receipts and court proceedings involving individuals specifically designated as gardeners and in letters usually referring to them as groups of unnamed people. The term also occasionally appears in the captions (or summaries) of lists of date imposts (\textit{imittu} lists) and deliveries. However, there is a much larger number of texts in which the designation nukuribbu is not mentioned, but which must have concerned gardeners. The majority of \textit{imittu} and date delivery lists should be counted here in analogy to those lists which mention nukuribbu explicitly. The large group of \textit{imittu} debt notes for dates in which the debtors lack any further designation should also be added here, since some of the debtors from the \textit{imittu} \textit{ultius} appeared also in the lists of imposts and deliveries. Consequently they must have been gardeners. A further fact in support of the assumption that the debtors in the \textit{imittu} debt notes were nukuribbu is that they were frequently designated as recipients of sissinu, “gardener’s salary”, in these texts. Orchard leases (\textit{ana nukuribbīti}) and leases of land for orchard planting (\textit{ana zāqipīti}) should also be counted among the documents relevant for our understanding of the gardeners, although the tenants are not designated as nukuribbu in these documents and their social status (free person, temple dependant, etc.) is also not explicitly mentioned. It seems that both the ‘temple gardeners’ and those employed from the outside worked under generally the same conditions and that the temple administration made no distinction between them.

The expression nukuribbu ša Šamaš is attested in the texts from the Ebabbar of Sippar. According to Jursa “the gardener of Šamaš” will have been equivalent to the ikkaru ša Šamaš (temple ploughman) in terms of status. In other words, these gardeners were temple dependants (perhaps even širkus in analogy to the temple ploughmen).\textsuperscript{203} The gardeners of Šamaš were occasionally employed by the temple for non-agricultural work, which also speaks in favour of seeing them as temple dependants. There is no reason to assume that the situation was substantially different in Eanna, especially in the light of one explicit attestation of “the gardeners of the Lady of Uruk” in an \textit{imittu} debt note (TCL 12 66 II. 9f: nukuribbu ša Bēlti ša Uruk) and some hints of employment of the nukuribbus for non-agricultural work (see below).

Despite these few explicit cases, the documents recording the management of the temple estates from both temple archives do not differentiate between the temple gardeners and the tenants of the orchards “for orchard-tending” (\textit{ana nukuribbīti}). As far as we can tell, the tenants and the temple gardeners appeared in the administrative documentation (\textit{imittu} and delivery lists) and the debt notes without distinction. This was probably the case because they worked under the same conditions.

Even among the tenants there were differences in status which mostly elude us, though. They were not all temple outsiders. While in most of the cases their legal status is not specified, in one instance the tenant of temple land \textit{ana nukuribbīti} is designated as a širku of the Lady of Uruk (YOS 7 47\textsuperscript{204}). According to this contract the širku leased 5 \textit{kurru} of land. This area was too large for a single orchard. The širku cannot have worked this plot on his own, if he did the work himself.

---

\textsuperscript{202} For the gardeners of the Ebabbar of Sippar see Jursa 1995a: 35ff. The Urukean gardeners have not been given a specific treatment as a professional group either by Kümmel 1979 in the chapter on the agriculture of Uruk or by Cocquerillat 1968 in her study of the date orchards and date cultivation of Eanna. The reason for this is probably the relative scarcity and the ambiguity of the relevant documentation.

\textsuperscript{203} Jursa 1995a: 35. He understands the expression as ‘Tempelgärtner’ as opposed to orchard tenants.

\textsuperscript{204} Edited by Cocquerillat 1968: 46f. 111f.
at all. Possibly he subleased the land (or parts of it) to several gardeners. In other words, this is further evidence for entrepreneurial activities of a temple dependant.

Furthermore, we can note that people of different professions could also work as gardeners or at least have temple orchards entrusted to them. They usually appear in the *imittu* lists. Among these, the bow-makers (*sasınnu*, e.g. in YOS 6 32, YOS 7 95, 124) and the smiths (*nappāhu*, e.g. in YOS 7 95, NCBT 399, PTS 3035) are the most numerous. A ploughman (*ikkaru*, TCL 12 59), a bird-herder (re‘i *ışṣūri*, TEBR 40), and a carpenter (*nagāru*, YOS 7 95), among others, are also attested in the lists. But also members of more prominent professions such as a baker (*nuhatimmu*, YOS 17 300) and an architect (*arad ekalli*, YOS 7 95) are attested. Even royal officials appear in the lists (ša ́rēši, in TCL 13 146 and NBC 4837, note also the mention of a delivery from a plot of the šanü-official in NCBT 4795). However, since these texts are cursory, we can only guess at the circumstances under which these people were assigned temple orchards. In some instances, e.g. in the case of the royal official or the architect, these will have been tenants who did not personally cultivate the land. In others, they may have received the land from the temple as part of a subsistence scheme.

In sum, our documentation usually does not allow us to make a distinction between orchard-holders and the actual orchard-workers. The group of gardeners/orchard-holders thus appears heterogeneous: temple dependants, (unqualified?) širkus or craftsmen, could be assigned temple orchards, as well as free citizens and people of higher social standing. Their legal or social status is of no consequence for their duties toward the temple. There is nothing like the dichotomy *ikkiaru* – *errešu* among the date gardeners, as both the internal and the external *nukuribbus* worked under the same conditions.

### 2.3.2. Organisation

Here again we must turn to the Ebabbar of Sippar for the information on the organisation of the gardeners. Fragments of inspection lists of the gardeners of Šamaš have come down to us from this archive. Thanks to them we know that several people worked in an orchard under the direction of a ‘main’ gardener, the person who was the main responsible and who probably appeared in the *imittu* lists, debt notes, and so on. The size of these groups of workers was variable. Groups of seven, eight, ten and even 15 workers are attested in one text. They sometimes consisted of members of the same family, sons and brothers of the main gardener. Children of three to five years of age, fully productive workers (*itbārus*) and women, as well as fugitive workers (*halqu*) appear in these lists. This shows that, as in the case of plough teams, families worked together in the orchards. Furthermore, based on prosopographic evidence, Jursa could demonstrate that the profession of a gardener was hereditary (1995a: 36).

On a higher level of organisation, the gardeners (and their orchards) were bound to certain localities and to the *gugallus* administering these. They are usually referred to as a collective in these cases (e.g. *nukuribbu ša Huṣṣētu-ša-Nabû-šum-ilišir* in YOS 17 42). In the *imittu* or date delivery lists the individual gardeners are also grouped in separate sections assigned to certain localities. In consequence they were under the responsibility of the *gugallus* who were in charge of these regions. The *gugallus* were responsible for the imposition of the gardeners. They were to make sure that it reached the temple. Furthermore they were to extract from the gardeners a tax called ḫabi ṭūḥini, at least from the Achaemenid period on (explicitly so in YOS 7 38, see p. 131). In return for their services they received a payment in kind from the gardeners – 1 *kurru* of dates from

---

205 Note that there is a lease of temple land to a ša ́rēš šarrī for orchard-planting (PTS 2089, see p. 269).

206 This is evident for instance from the entry in YOS 7 95, which concerns the *imittu* of the architect, but which had been delivered by another person, probably the actual gardener: (amount) ša Nanāya-iddin, arad ekalli, ina qāt ˇuṣiyā/Gimillu.

207 Notably, the bow-makers, who are elsewhere attested as holders of bū *rittis* (see p. 287).

208 In one of these lists (BM 63348 I 14’) Jursa proposes to read *uṣigal* ˇqirri,1 (?)’ after a personal name, juxtaposing the title rab *kurri* (“Gartenauferher”) to the rab *epinni* of the ploughmen (1995a: 35f.).

209 Jursa 1995a: 36. The situation was similar in Uruk: the tenants in NBC 4889 are two brothers and in Spar, Studies, no. 8 father and son. The tenant in the private orchard lease from Uruk, YBC 4143, was obliged to bring his two brothers to do the work in the orchard together with him.
each orchard (p. 128). From the Ebabbar of Sippar we know that the *gugallu* also played a role in
organising the gardeners for non-agricultural work (Jursa 1995a: 36).

In one instance, we find gardeners under the responsibility of the *rab ešerti* (“overseers of
ten”, see p. 83), who were generally in charge of the management of the temple plough teams. In
the balanced account TCL 12 59 (see below) recording *imittu* deliveries and date disbursements,
the impost of the gardeners of certain localities are said to be at the disposal (*ina pān*) of
individuals who are attested as agricultural officials in other texts (rab *ešerti*, *rab ikkarāti*,
gugallu). However, since other individuals, who did not have an obvious connection to the official
management of the temple agriculture, also appear in this role, it is conceivable that their
responsibility for the gardeners and their impost stemmed from a contractual relationship with the
temple from which they presumably leased orchards *en gros*.

During the time when a large-scale rent farmer for dates (Ardia/Nabû-bûn-aḫḫi/Rēmût-Ea)
was active for the temple, the gardeners were, as could be expected, put under his responsibility.
On several occasions they were explicitly referred to as *nukuribbā ša qaṭ Ardīa* (YOS 7 84, 124,
142). There is no such information for other rent farmers, but it is beyond doubt that the gardeners
stood under their direction whenever these were present and active in the temple agriculture.

2.3.3. Tasks

2.3.3.1. Cultivation and work in the orchards

The stages a date orchard ran through, from planting to harvesting, have been described by
Cocquerillat based on the modern practices, since the ancient sources are mostly reticent in this
respect (1968: 32ff.). Her description will not be repeated here.

Most of the information we do get about the work done in the orchards comes from the
orchard leases. Frequently it was designated by the general term *dullu*, “work”. But from time to
time we do get more specific information. If the orchard contained young date palms these were to
be ‘raised’ (*rubbû*) and taken care of (*suddudu*). Occasionally additional palms had to be planted
(*zaqāpu*) in the orchard. Sometimes they were specified as Dilmun date palms (*asnû*). The
gardeners were obliged to submit the orchard to a yield estimation (*imittu*) while the dates were still
on the palms and then to harvest them (*uḫḫu ina muḫḫi gišimmari emēdu u nakṣu*). The harvesting
(*nakṣu*) took place from September to the beginning of October (i.e. months VI-VII). At this
point, a selection of high quality dates (*makkasā*), which were reserved for cultic purposes, was
made. These dates which were of better quality due to a better exposure to the sunlight and which
were probably hand-picked individually (Cocquerillat 1968: 34) composed about 10 % of the
impost due from the orchard (see below).

The land beneath the date palms or adjacent to them also had to be cultivated. This was
expressed as doing work or digging beneath the date palms (*dulla ina šupāl gišimmari epēšu or
ḫerūṭa ina šupāl gišimmari ḫerū*). Here cereals such as barley, sesame or *kasīa* could be planted,
but also vegetables and even fruit trees (*šikitta u gapnī šakānu*). The lease contracts occasionally
stipulate the planting of willows (*hilēpī šakānu*) along the canal banks adjacent to the orchards.
The preparatory work involved removing shrubbery (*abatta nasāku*) or clods of earth (*paškāni nasīt*), as
is specified in the ‘Edict of Bešazzar’, and ‘opening’ the previously uncultivated land (*tapē puttū*).
The cultivation itself was done using spades (*marru*) or ploughs (*epinnu*). This is known from the
stipulations concerning the remuneration of the gardener: he was allowed to keep a portion of the
yield of the date palms in proportion to the surface area cultivated. For the land worked up with a
spade the gardener would receive a larger portion of dates, since this was more strenuous than the
work with a plough. The provision of tools was probably the duty of the temple, at least in the case

---

210 The expression implies an outstanding obligation.
211 I.e., the slave of the *qīpu* Nabû-ah-iddin and a certain Bēl-uballit, who may have been a prebendary baker
(see below).
212 For details and references see the section *ana nukuribbāti* in the chapter on land leases (pp. 306ff.) and
also the overview of the obligations of the tenants in the table on p. 314.
of temple gardeners. Several administrative texts from the Eanna archive record receipts or deliveries of (iron) spades from/to the nukuribus (CD 46, GC 2 225, JCS 28 no. 42), though it cannot be excluded that these tools were used for non-agricultural construction work. The private orchard lease YBC 4143 (edited on p. 310), however, is more explicit. Here the tenants were provided with tools by the lessor – iron spades, one iron hoe and one iron sickle, and it is beyond doubt that these were to be used for orchard work.

The tenant/gardener was responsible for building and maintaining the irrigation facilities for the orchard. He was required to dig the irrigation canals and supply them with water (nārāti ḫerī u mē šuṣbutu). By this, probably only the secondary outlets and ditches were implied, not the main canals. These were dug under the direction of the temple officials (gugallus) or, exceptionally, the large-scale rent farmers (TCL 13 182, TCL 12 90) using the temple’s resources.

The regular type of irrigation, about which the texts are not explicit, was probably accomplished by flooding. Rarely the gardeners were supposed to irrigate their plots by buckets (zēra dalū). Furthermore they were to build an orchard wall (igār kīrî epēšu) which, besides having a protective function, may have been significant for irrigation purposes, for containing the water within the plot when it was being flooded.

The gardeners were obliged to keep watch of the orchards and the plants growing there (pūt maṣṣartī (ša uḥīni) naṣā). The fronds and the shoots of the palms were to be protected (lībbi u ḫarattī naṣāra) and the illicit felling of date palms (dāku ša gisimmari) was to be avoided. In case this happened a fine of 1 mina of silver per palm tree had to be paid. For any other plant torn out from the orchard 10 shekels of silver were the fine according to one orchard lease (BM 114450). In fact, a case of illicit date palm felling occurred during Cyrus’s reign. This was recorded in YOS 7 68. Nabū-udammêq, who was the rent farmer responsible for the orchard in question, was to bring the gardeners who had allegedly cut the date palms and present them to the temple authorities or alternatively pay three minas of silver for the three felled palm trees.

2.3.3.2. Payment obligations

The ‘Edict of Belšazzar’ (YOS 6 103, 7 Nbn), which has been discussed in the context of arable cultivation (p. 38), also makes stipulations for the tenants of the orchards of the god Bēl. It represented a general accounting model introduced to the temple by the royal administration (whether this model was in fact implemented by the temples and if so, to which extent, is another matter). Though the ‘Edict’ was in essence a theoretical model, which concerned a higher level of agricultural management – the large-scale rent farmers, it is still possible to gain some insights on the obligations of the gardeners through it. After all, the rent farmers met their obligations by delegating these to the individual gardeners. Following mostly van Driel’s edition of the text,214 the relevant passage is given here in translation:

YOS 6 103 ll. 4-14:
“For each (surface) kurru of date plantations215 40 kurru of dates (are to be delivered); this includes 5 kurru of dates for the remuneration of the gardeners, who dig the ditches and perform the digging, who build the garden walls and remove the clods of earth, which the crown prince left up to them.216 [For] the costs and the rations of the governor, [the scribes], the measurers and the gate keepers: [per each] kurru (of dates) 1½ litres (of dates) is (the payment for) their services, [which]217 is kept in the silo; [per each] kurru (of dates) 3½ litres (of dates) are the rations, [which]218

---

213 The text was edited by San Nicolò 1932: 345f. This was not a unique incident. See p. 213 with note 751 for further attestations.
214 Van Driel 1987-88: 61ff. See also van Driel 2002: 166ff.
216 This remark refers to the sissinnu of the gardeners.
217 It is suggested here to reconstruct only [šā] at the beginning of line 11. Since this is the lower edge of the tablet it is possible that nothing else was missing in this line. The suggested reconstruction of van Driel, [sug-
According to this text the rent farmer was obliged to deliver 40 kurru of dates per each kurru of land planted with date palms. The remuneration of the gardener (sissinmu), namely 5 kurru of dates, was included in this amount. In other words, the temple was to receive on average 35 kurru of dates from a plot of 1 kurru. In addition to this, however, taxes for the central administration in Babylon and service payments for the officials involved in the administration of the temple’s date production were to be provided by the rent farmer. A part of these, 11½ litres per kurru of dates intended for the service fees was to be deposited in the temple’s storage facilities, while the other part, 3½ litres per kurru, the rations of the governor, the scribes, the measurers and the gate keepers, was to be given to these officials immediately. In total these fees amounted to 15 litres of dates per each kurru of dates delivered, i.e. 1/12 or 8.33 %. The basis for calculating the fees is not spelled out in the text. It could have been the amount mentioned at the beginning of the section, the 40 kurru of dates (the impost and the sissinmu). By contrast, it should be noted that the amount from the Eanna debt notes, the imittu, did not include the sissinmu and the administrative fees depended on the imittu alone. Thus, this amount could also have been 35 kurru of dates.

The implication of these additional fees is that the 40 kurru did not represent the entire yield of the exemplary plot of 1 kurru. A certain margin had to exist over and above this amount in order to allow for the service and ration payments and also to enable the rent farmer to make a profit. In other words, the yield consisted of the net delivery of 35 kurru of dates, 5 kurru of dates as sissinmu, 8.33 % for rations and service (3.332 kurru if this percentage is calculated over 40 kurru or 2.9155 if it is calculated over 35 kurru, the impost without the sissinmu), and an unknown amount as profit of the rent farmer.

It would be interesting to know in which relation the actual yield stood to the net delivery of 35 kurru, which is equivalent to the impost, imittu, charged against the gardeners. The ‘Edict’, however, does not provide information on the total yield, perhaps in view of the fact that date yields were highly variable. They did not depend solely on the surface area of the orchard, but more importantly on the density of palm trees in an orchard and their stage of productivity. The flexible margin between the fixed delivery and the total yield was hence the concern of the rent farmer. Any sort of prediction on the total yield and profits must therefore be regarded as a highly constructed model dependent on approximations which were certainly not entirely random but which could still diverge greatly from reality. All these reservations notwithstanding, we can attempt to make an estimate on the profit which could be made in an ideal orchard. First of all, this depended on the actual total yield. The question is therefore which portion of the yield was represented by the impost of 35 kurru. Several common ratios which appear in various sharecropping agreements have been taken and tested. On the assumption that the impost of 35 kurru was a certain percentage of the harvest, the entire yield was calculated. Then the sissinmu of 5 kurru was put into relation to the yield. The same was done for the fees (8.33 %). As the ‘Edict’ is not clear whether these were calculated on the basis of the delivery of 40 kurru (impost + sissinmu) or just the impost of 35 kurru both possibilities are taken into consideration. Finally, knowing which percentage of the yield was taken up by the sissinmu and the fees, it was possible to calculate the remainder to which the rent farmer would have been entitled.

\[ ša-nu \] does not seem likely, because the text deals with the rations of the officials in the next section (ll. 12-14).

218 If one is to follow van Driel’s reconstruction of the text, the preterit in the main clause could be understood here as a form of precative (though this usage of the preterit is most frequent in Neo-Babylonian letters, rarely it also appears in contracts (Streck 1995: 127)). It is proposed here alternatively to reconstruct the beginning of line 13 and read the whole passage as “[ša ana* en]-nam ... (other officials) id-din-mu-ma ik-ka-lu-ú” (instead of van Driel’s [ša 4en]-nam...), thus ‘creating’ a subordinate clause. Furthermore the subject of the preterit iddinuma is understood to be the crown prince, and not the rent farmers (or gardeners?) as assumed by van Driel.

219 This is probably what was implied by the verb ikkalû (“they will consume”). It meant that these rations, unlike the service payments, were given immediately to the recipients and were not stored by the temple.
predictions for the large-scale rent farms. The main objective of these was to provide a fixed net possible according to modern data. Jursa notes harvest rates of 56-74 kurru based on the quarter-share for the gardeners underlay the ‘Edict’.

palm tree amounts to about 26.6 litres in small-scale productions. This translates to 23-32 kurru per tree this would imply a total yield of 44.33 kurru as % of the yield. A percentage would imply no profit and even a deficit for the rent farmer. The question is whether the ‘Edict’ was tied to a certain percentage at all. One could object that it would have been easier to express the obligations of the gardeners/rent farmers in terms of shares if this were the case. However, one should not forget that the ‘Edict’ was a model constructed for the purpose of making predictions for the large-scale rent farms. The main objective of these was to provide a fixed net income of agricultural produce for the temple. For this reason, the ‘Edict’ had to be based on fixed amounts and for this reason also there is no mention of the yield estimation procedure in this text, even though we know that in reality it was regularly conducted for individual plots within the large-scale rent farms. It is more than likely that the accounting model from the ‘Edict’ relied on a system which had been tried out in the past and which proved viable. One such system known from the pre-rent-farm era from Eanna is the cultivation of the orchards against a quarter-share. The temple received 75 % of the date harvest, while 25 % were left to the gardeners. This system was employed by the nukuribbus on Nār-šarrī, Takkīrū, Ḥarru-ša-Nadnaya and in Til-ururrēti in the first regnal year of Amil-Marduk according to the account TCL 12 59 (for a partial edition and discussion see below). It is possible, though of course this can hardly be verified, that a system based on the quarter-share for the gardeners underlay the ‘Edict’.

As for the other models, the yields represented by them all fall within the range of the possible according to modern data. Jursa notes harvest rates of 56-74 kurru of dates per kurru of surface area for large-scale production in modern Algeria, for instance. Average date yield per palm tree amounts to about 26.6 litres in small scale productions. This translates to 23-32 kurru of dates per kurru of land. In our cases this rate would imply approximately 284 (83.33 %), 296 (80 %), 316 (75 %), 355 (66.67 %) and 474 (50 %) palm trees per kurru of land. The most favourable density of palms in a date orchard is 187.5 per kurru, but higher numbers of trees from 250 to 500 are also quite common (Jursa 1995a: 150). According to one text from Uruk (AnOr 9 19) the average density in several temple orchards was about 300 palms per kurru. At a rate of 26.6 litres per tree this would imply a total yield of 44.33 kurru of dates. This means that the models following a two-thirds- (66.67 %) and a half-share (50 %) are less realistic than the remaining three. The problem with the five-sixths-share model (83.33 %) is the apparent deficit, though, as was mentioned before, a ‘virtual’ deficit could also be noted in the ‘Edict’s’ model for cereal cultivation. The more appealing models are those according to which the impost was between 80 and 75 % of the total harvest. The latter percentage would have been more favourable for the rent farmers (and the gardeners), since it would provide a wider margin for profit. Average orchard

| Table 11: Impost and profit for an orchard of a size of 1 kurru according to the ‘Edict’ |
|---------------------------------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| impost220 as % of the yield (or as a share) | 83.33 % (5/6) | 80 % (4/5)    | 75 % (3/4)    | 66.67 % (2/3) | 50 % (1/2)    |
| total yield                                | 42 kurru      | 43.75 kurru   | 46.67 kurru   | 52.5 kurru    | 70 kurru      |
| sissimmu221 as % of the yield               | 11.9 %        | 11.43 %       | 10.71 %       | 9.52 %        | 7.14 %        |
| fees222 as % of the yield                   | 6.94 % (7.93 %)| 6.64 % (7.62 %)| 6.23 % (7.14 %)| 5.55 % (6.35 %)| 4.17 % (4.76 %)|
| profit223 of the rent farmer                | -2.17 % (-1.16 %)| 1.9 % (0.95 %)| 8.04 % (7.15 %)| 18.26 % (17.46 %)| 41.7 % (38.1 %)|

In the case of the ‘Edict’ the impost was a fixed amount of 35 kurru of dates. The percentages chosen represent several common ratios. The portion of the yield to be delivered to the temple is represented by these percentages and the fractions in brackets.

220 The sissimmu was also a fixed amount, namely 5 kurru, according to the ‘Edict’.

221 The fees are calculated on the basis of the impost: 8.33% of 35 kurru amounted to 2.9155 kurru. The alternative possibility of the fees based on the delivery of 40 kurru (this amounted to 3.332 kurru) are given in the brackets.

222 The possible profits are based on the administrative fees of 2.9155 kurru. The alternative results based on the fees of 3.332 kurru are shown in the brackets. See previous note.

223 We are not informed whether the gardeners were obliged to pay any fees during this period, though this certainly seems probable.
productivity of 46.67 kurru per surface kurru is nevertheless quite high, even if not impossible. This is comparable to the productivity of the orchards of the Borsippean urban elite: The average imittu per surface kurru was about 48 kurru of dates (Jursa 2010b: 373ff.). The institutional orchards were less productive. For the orchards of the Ebabbar of Sippar Jursa calculated an average imittu of 26.78 kurru of dates per surface kurru (ibid.: 352). The Urukean orchards produced an average imittu of 26.69 kurru of dates per kurru of land (p. 363). These figures, however, represent the imittu, not the entire yield. The entire productivity of the institutional orchards, following the most realistic 75 to 80 % models, was then probably between 34 and 36 kurru of dates per kurru of land (or from 4.896 to 5.184 litres per hectare).

The terminology from the ‘practical’ texts from Eanna, which are relevant to the question of the obligations of the gardeners, is not always the same as the one used in the ‘Edict of Belšazzar’. This is not so surprising considering that, in addition to potential regional and diachronic differences, we are dealing with two different levels of organisation when comparing the evidence from Eanna and the ‘Edict’. Nevertheless, it is doubtless that the Eanna temple employed comparable administrative schemes as the ones proposed by the central administration in Babylon. The main obligation of the gardener, the delivery of dates produced in his orchard, is termed as imittu or imitti eglî, “impost”, which can be equated to the amount of 35 kurru from the ‘Edict’ and which represented a larger portion of the total harvest. As is described in the chapter on the yield estimators (ëmidus, p. 137), a commission usually composed of scribes visited all the orchards shortly before the harvest, made estimates for each of these regarding the amount of dates due to the temple, the remuneration of the gardener, and administrative fees, and composed the relevant documentation (imittu debt notes, lists). The impost represented the net delivery of dates, not including the sissinnu and the other fees. The texts (from Nabonidus’s reign onwards) frequently record whether the sissinnu had been paid (efer) or received (maḫîr), and often they give the exact amount of this payment, clearly separating it from the amount of dates owed, stated at the beginning of the debt note. makkasû, selected high quality dates, on the other hand, were included in the imittu. Stipulations for makkasû start appearing in debt notes from 3 Nbn. In YOS 6 36 (3 Nbn) it is stated that pro 100 kurru of dates 10 kurru were to be makkasû dates (ll. 13-14: ina muḫ-ḫi 1 me gur 10 gur zû-lum-ma / a-na ma-ak-ka-su ú-ša-b-bat). This expression appears once more in an unpublished text (YBC 7377, [x Nbn]). More frequently the exact amount of makkasû is given in the texts (e.g. ina libbi x gur zû-lum-ma ana makkasû ot ina libbi x gur makkasû), which was on average 10 % of the imittu.

The modes of delivery of the impost were usually regulated in the debt notes. The dates were to be delivered either in the seventh or eighth month, immediately after the harvest, using the measure (muṣḫu) of the Lady of Uruk. It was usually stipulated that this was to be carried out at once (ina muḫḫi išṭē titti, “at one hand”), i.e. not in instalments, though this inevitably happened from time to time. The place of delivery, if noted in the debt notes, was most frequently designated as ḫaṣāru, “enclosure”. This was probably some sort of makeshift enclosure set up annually, perhaps near a watercourse for transportation purposes. There were probably several ḫaṣārus set up in different localities as collection spots for a number of nearby orchards, from which the dates would subsequently be transported to the temple or other storage facilities. Alternatively the debt notes could state that the deliveries were to be made at a specified location.

---

225 The necessity for an annual estimation procedure speaks against the applicability of a general model such as the ‘Edict’ on the level of individual orchards/gardeners (on the level of the rent farmers it may have been a valid model after all).
226 Whether metrological manipulations played a role here as in Sippar is not entirely clear. See p. 294 for further details.
227 This is suggested by the receipts or debt notes for “the remainder of the impost” (rēḥet imittu), e.g. YOS 6 204, YOS 19 87, TEBR 43, etc.
228 ḫaṣāru is already attested in 21 Nbk (YOS 17 36) and appears throughout the entire duration of the archive.
229 The letter JEOL 33, no. 18 mentions the setting up of a ḫaṣāru by a messenger of a person who could have been a scribe or a yield estimator (I. 11: ḫa-ṣa-ri i-te-pu-uš).
This was usually the locality in which the orchard was situated, but sometimes also the temple appears as place of delivery.

In addition to the imittu, including the makkasu dates, the debt notes stipulate other obligations and fees payable by the gardeners. For once, there was a range of by-products which had to be delivered. They are attested at least since 2 Nbn (YOS 6 44) and appear regularly in the files from Cambyses’s and Nebuchadnezzar IV’s reigns. These were tuhallu, a kind of basket made from palm leaves (Landsberger 1967: 48), liblibbu, “leaflets” (ibid: 46f.) and mangâgu, “fibre” (“Bast”, ibid: 45f.). The exact amount of these by-products never appears in the texts. They simply state that per 1 kurru of dates tuhallu, liblibbu and mangâgu were to be delivered (itti (or ina muḫḫi) 1 gur tuhallu liblibbu u mangâga inamdin). From the reign of Cambyses onwards, these three by-products are supplemented by a “load of wood”, biltu ša ḫusābi.230 Again we do not know the exact size of this load. Since it does not seem likely that one piece each of tuhallu, liblibbu and mangâgu were to be delivered together with each kurru of dates, at least in the case of leaflets and fibres this seems absurd, we have to assume that there was a conventional agreement on how much of these by-products went with 1 kurru of dates.231

Another payment which had to be made by the gardeners was called kaspû ša ḫabû ḫûhûni (literally “silver of the pots of date preserve”). It appears in the imittu debt notes from the time of Cambyses and is also attested during Nebuchadnezzar IV, but is already known from the year 4 Cyr, from the guggallitu-contract YOS 7 38 (see p. 131). The nature and size of this payment is not known. The texts usually only refer to it as still being outstanding (elât kaspî ša ḫabû ḫûhûni (e.g. GC 2 114, 117, YOS 7 104, etc.), or once kaspû ša ḫabû ḫûhûni ina pânišu referring to the gardener (GC 2 112)). From the guggallitu-contract YOS 7 38 we know, however, that this payment was to be collected from the gardeners by the guggallu official and was (only in this particular case?) to be used for (the purchase of) cattle. It is not clear whether all the gardeners were obliged to make this payment, since it does not appear in the majority of the debt notes which have come down to us.

Frequently the texts speak of the dates or the rations of the guggallu. This was a regular payment with a fixed amount, usually 1 kurru of dates per orchard/gardener (p. 128).

From Cambyses’s reign onwards, the texts start mentioning additional fees which are comparable to the service and ration payments which appear in the ‘Edict’.232 The kîṣrû and kurummattû payments are regarded as obligations of the large-scale rent farmers (rab šittû) by the ‘Edict’. The rent farmers charged these against the individual gardeners (or small scale tenants). During the accession and the first year of Cambyses, rations (kurummattû) appear together with the by-products which the gardeners had to deliver. Their composition and quantity are not further specified. It is simply stated that they are to be given, or that they are apart from (elât) other dues (the imittu and by-products). In the second year of Cambyses the terminology changed. The fee was now called kîṣir esittû (u) balâṭu (ana) Bîl.233 The mention of the god Bîl, who may be seen as the beneficiary of at least a part of this fee, implies the involvement of the central administration in Babylon.234 The size of this fee was calculated on the basis of the impost. Per each kurru of dates 0;0.1.4½ dates (= 10.5 l), i.e. additional 5.83 % of the impost, were to be delivered.

Under Nebuchadnezzar IV yet another change occurred. The expression kîṣir esittû (u) balâṭu (ana) Bîl disappeared and was substituted by kurummattû, known from the beginning of Cambyses’s reign. The size of the fee also changed. Now 0;0.2.3 kurru of dates (= 15 l) were to be

---

230 For the interpretation of ḫusābi as dry wooden parts of the palm trees that could be used as fire wood see Landsberger 1967: 48f.
231 Perhaps one tuhallu-basket filled with leaflets and fibre was to be delivered per each kurru of dates.
232 As van Driel notes, the fact that the imittu uitus do not contain any stipulations on these taxes prior to Cambyses’s reign does not necessarily mean that these taxes were not being levied previously (2002: 173).
233 kîṣrû can designate a rent (payment) for a house or in the context of hire of persons, or alternatively a service or tax payment usually dedicated to an institution, most commonly a deity/temple (CAD K: 438f.). esittû is a “pestle” (CAD E: 337). It is not clear what it exactly signifies in connection with kîṣrû. The CAD does not translate esittû in this expression.
234 The same fee was apparently also levied in Sippar; note the mention of kîṣrû u balâṭu ana Bîl in CT 56 225 (van Driel 2002: 175f.).
paid per each *kurru*. This is equivalent to the 8.33 % fees of the ‘Edict’. Van Driel suggests that this rise in Uruk was only “a partial adaptation to what was habitual elsewhere, notably in the Babylon area” and that “this form of taxation was virtually stable from Nabonidus to the coming of Darius, that is, if we assume that the purpose of the various payments was identical” (2002: 174).

The following table gives an overview of the payment obligations as proposed by the ‘Edict of Belšazzar’ on the one, and stated in the *imittu* debt notes from the Eanna archive on the other hand:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>‘Edict’</th>
<th>debt notes from Eanna</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>main obligation</td>
<td>35 <em>kurru</em> + 5 <em>kurru</em> <em>sissinnu</em></td>
<td><em>imittu</em> (not including <em>sissinnu</em>)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| service & ration fees | 8.33 % (*kišru u kurummātu*) | Camb: 5.83 % (*kišir esitti...*)
|                  |         | Nbk IV: 8.33 % (*kurummātu*) |
| *gugallitu*-fee  | -       | 1 *kurru* |
| *habi uñini* (?)235 | -       | (x silver) |
| by-products       | -       | per 1 *kurru* of dates: *tuballu, liblibbu, mangāgu, bitu ša ḫusābi* |

**Table 12: Fees of the gardeners**

If we tried to translate the obligations of the gardeners into the model proposed by the ‘Edict’, and with regard to the relative size of the *imittu*, the following picture would emerge for Cambyses’s reign:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>impost236 as % of the yield</th>
<th>83.33 %</th>
<th>80 %</th>
<th>75 %</th>
<th>66.67 %</th>
<th>50 %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>total yield</td>
<td>42 <em>kurru</em></td>
<td>43.75 <em>kurru</em></td>
<td>46.67 <em>kurru</em></td>
<td>52.5 <em>kurru</em></td>
<td>70 <em>kurru</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>sissinnu</em>237 as % of the yield</td>
<td>11.9 %</td>
<td>11.43 %</td>
<td>10.71 %</td>
<td>9.52 %</td>
<td>7.14 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>gugallitu</em>238 as % of the yield</td>
<td>2.38 %</td>
<td>2.29 %</td>
<td>2.14 %</td>
<td>1.9 %</td>
<td>1.43 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fees239 as % of the yield</td>
<td>4.86 %</td>
<td>4.66 %</td>
<td>4.37 %</td>
<td>3.89 %</td>
<td>2.92 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>profit of the rent farmer</td>
<td>-2.47 %</td>
<td>1.62 %</td>
<td>7.78 %</td>
<td>18.02 %</td>
<td>38.51 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 13: Impost and fees during Cambyses**

The by-products could not be taken into account, nor the *habi uñini* payment, of which we know very little. Though the service and ration fees are lower than the ones proposed by the ‘Edict’ the presence of an additional *gugallitu*-fee in Uruk, evens out the results for the profit of the rent farmer, which are on average still slightly higher than the results in the ‘Edict’-model. A rise in the fees during Nebuchadnezzar IV’s reign to the level of the ‘Edict’ (from 5.83 % to 8.33 %) shows a drop in the profit-share of the rent farmer, so much so that now the 80 %-model also resulted in a deficit:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>impost as % of the yield</th>
<th>83.33 %</th>
<th>80 %</th>
<th>75 %</th>
<th>66.67 %</th>
<th>50 %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>total yield</td>
<td>42 <em>kurru</em></td>
<td>43.75 <em>kurru</em></td>
<td>46.67 <em>kurru</em></td>
<td>52.5 <em>kurru</em></td>
<td>70 <em>kurru</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>sissinnu</em> as % of the yield</td>
<td>11.9 %</td>
<td>11.43 %</td>
<td>10.71 %</td>
<td>9.52 %</td>
<td>7.14 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>gugallitu</em> as % of the yield</td>
<td>2.38 %</td>
<td>2.29 %</td>
<td>2.14 %</td>
<td>1.9 %</td>
<td>1.43 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fees240 as % of the yield</td>
<td>6.94 %</td>
<td>6.66 %</td>
<td>6.25 %</td>
<td>5.55 %</td>
<td>4.17 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

235 It is not clear whether this fee, which had to be paid in silver, was levied regularly and if not, it is unknown under which circumstances it was imposed on the gardeners. Furthermore, we are never told how much *habi uñini* added up to, which probably means that its amount was customary or at any rate known to the involved parties.

236 The calculations are based on the average impost of 35 *kurru* of dates as proposed by the ‘Edict’.

237 Here also we take over the average *sissinnu* of 5 *kurru* which appears in the ‘Edict’.

238 The *gugallitu*-payment was a fixed amount of 1 *kurru* of dates per orchard.

239 During Cambyses’s time the service and ration fees amounted to 5.83% of the impost, i.e. 2.04 *kurru* based on an impost of 35 *kurru*.

240 During Nebuchadnezzar IV’s reign the payable rations amounted to 8.33% of the impost, i.e. 2.92 *kurru* based on an impost of 35 *kurru*. 
2.3.3.4. Non-agricultural work

The evidence for employment of the gardeners in work projects conducted by the temple is scarce in the Eanna archive. From Sippar we know that the gardeners worked on the expansion of the irrigation system and that they were also employed in the brick production (Jursa 1995a: 40). The few hints we get from the texts from Eanna are enough to suggest that the situation was not substantially different here. In the letters YOS 3 19, 33 and 110 nukurribbu appear in the context of digging and generally work in the steppe (digging assignments, mešhātu, are mentioned in YOS 3 33 and 110, and in YOS 3 19 the gardeners are summoned for the work in the steppe). In the ration list TCL 12 93 gardeners appear next to brick makers as recipients of dates, implying that they were possibly employed together at brick making. Generally, the appearances of gardeners as recipients of rations suggest that they occasionally had to perform work in non-agricultural projects. The performance of military service, which is known for the gardeners of the Ebabbar of Sippar (Jursa 1995a: 40f.), is not attested for their Urukean counterparts, but should not be ruled out. The practice of entrusting the sheep from the flocks of Ebabbar to the gardeners (Jursa 1995a: 40) is also not known from Uruk.

2.3.4. Remuneration

The gardeners could be remunerated in several ways. Frequently they were entitled to a kind of salary, sissinnu. In addition, they could keep a part of the produce of the orchard. This usually consisted of the crops cultivated below the date palms. In special cases, which will be discussed below, they had the usufruct of the date palms as well. However, there is also evidence for orchards cultivated under explicit sharecropping terms, according to which the gardeners could keep a share of the date harvest as compensation for their work.

2.3.4.1. sissinnu

The sissinnu was paid out to the gardeners in proportion to the type of land and work conducted below the date palms. Generally bit marri, land worked with a spade, and bit epinni, land worked with a plough, were distinguished. The work with a spade was physically more strenuous and was valued more than the work conducted on bit epinni. For bit marri the gardeners could expect to get 4 or 5 kurru of dates and for bit epinni 3 or 4 kurru per each surface kurru worked. In one case a uniform rate for sissinnu, namely 4 kurru per kurru area, is recorded (BM 114450). One of the orchard leases states that the gardener was to receive the sissinnu like his neighbours without indicating a specific amount (YOS 7 51) and the ‘Edict’ specifies 5 kurru of dates as an average sissinnu for a surface of 1 kurru.

The sissinnu appeared regularly in the orchard leases anu nukurribbi, however, not in the leases of the ḫallatu-orchards, which were sharecropping arrangements, and in the planting contracts (ana zaqipitī). This was the case because the gardeners in these leases either kept a part of the harvest as their share or had the usufruct of the orchard for a certain period of time.

2.3.4.2. Share of a part of the orchard’s produce

In addition to the sissinnu the gardeners could keep a share of their orchards’ produce. The stipulations for these shares are found mainly in the lease contracts. In the majority of cases they

---

241 The three letters are edited by Cocquerillat 1968.
refer to the crops cultivated below the date palms (šupál gišimmari) or in the fields adjoining the orchards. On one occasion it was indicated that the crop for which a share was to be paid was barley (YOS 7 51), but the other texts are not as specific. Some of them mention (the land) below the date palms (šupál gišimmari, e.g. BIN 1 117, 125), others fields for cereal cultivation (piš šulpi, YOS 7 47, 51), or unbroken land (bit taptē, NCBT 630) adjacent to or within the orchards. Some texts also give details on the type of irrigation to be conducted on this land, namely bucket irrigation or regular irrigation (by flooding) (bit dāli and bit mê qāti, NCBT 630, 677, see p. 278). The size of the shares is not always spelled out and general terms such as šibšu or zittu are used. But sometimes we get specific figures. According to BIN 1 125, the tenant was to keep 4/5 of the produce of the land below the palms which was irrigated by buckets. In NCBT 677 he was to keep 1/2 and 2/3 and in NCBT 630 2/3 and 4/5 of the produce from the land irrigated regularly and by buckets, respectively.

As for the crops cultivated in the orchards, apart from the one attestation of barley mentioned above, the contracts occasionally speak of vegetable plantations (šikittu) and fruit trees (gapnû), though not in the context of sharecropping. However, we do get some information on these additional crops from two imittu debt notes from the reign of Cambyses. BM 114641 speaks of a share in kasia cultivated below the date palms:

BM 114641    25-V-7 Camb

obv.  1. 2 me 89 gur zû-lum-ma zag a-šà
sà 5-ta kàmêk sà e lí ag-mu-sî-sà
ni-ga' gašan sà unugkî u 'na-na-a sà gin bán
sà 'ir-ia a-sù sà gi-dû-šèš a 1'ire-mut-ábad
5. ina muh-û idîninn-na-mu-gar-un a-sù šà 'gi-mîl-lu
a 1'kur-i ina iti du6 zû-lum-ma ina ma-si-hî
sà 'gašan šà unugkî ina muh-û 1-ta rît-tu4
it-i 1 gur 0;1.4½ sîla ki-sîr e-sit-tu4
dîn 4'en bil-tu4 šà hu-sab tu-hal-lu

lo.e. 10. lib-lib-bi u man-ga-ga i-nam-din e-lat
ú-il-tî šà 1me 60 gur zû-lum-ma

rev.  zag a-šàmek sà únun 'ga-di-i'-i e-lat
5 gur ka-as-sî-â šib-sû šà šu-pal êdî gišimmarn
lu mu-kîmî, šû-mu-mu a-šà šà 'na-din a 'su-ti-i
15. 'gi-mîl-lu a-šù šà 'a-łu-lap-ûdîninn a 'łu-un-zu-û
'gi-'šû a-šù šà ag-kar-'zi-ti'mekî a 'ši-gu-û-a
lag-en-šû-nu a-šù šà idîninn-mu-kam a 1'bad-dîngir-ta-dû
ûnîmsa agûtu-gin-ibila a-šù šà 'e-an-na-na-din-mu
a 1'ba-bu-û-tu unugkî iti ne ud 25-kam
20. mu 7-kam 'kâm-bu-zi-idêugal eê
lugal kur-kur

“289 kurru of dates, impost of the plot of five sections, of the estate of Nabû-šum-lišir, property of the Lady of Uruk and Nannaya, from the rent farm of Ardia, son of Nabû-bân-âhi, descendant of Rêmût-Ea, are the debt of Innin-šum-škun, son of Gimillu, descendant of Kuri. He will give the dates in the month VII, all at once using the measure of the Lady of Uruk. With each kurru (of dates) he will give 0;1.4½ (dates) as kišir esitti balâtu (ana) Bêl fee, a load of wood, (a?) basket, leaflets and fibre. (This is) apart from the debt note on 160 kurru of dates, impost of the plots in Gadi (and) apart from 5 kurru of kasia, the share from (the land) below the date palms.

Witnesses: Marduk-šum-idînnu, son of Nadin, descendant of Suti,
Gimillu, son of Ašulap-lîstar, descendant of Šumûnu,
Mušallim-Marduk, son of Nabû-êter-napṣatu, descendant of Šegûa,
Nabû-bêšûnu, son of Innin-šum-cresh, descendant of Ea-ilûta-bini,

Uruk; 25-V-7 Camb, king of Babylon, king of lands.”
Beside the *kasia*, which was identified by Stol (1994: 175ff.) as *cucscuta* and which was used in beer production, other summer crops such as *sesame* and *fenugreek* were also grown by the gardeners. The *imittu* debt note BM 114643 (7 Camb) contains a clause similar to the one in the previous text: “apart from 1 *kurru* of *sesame*, two measures of *kasia* (and) 2 *satu* of *fenugreek* (*çambaliitu*), the share (from the land) below the date palms which is at his disposal” (ll. 13-14: *e-lat* 1 *gur še-gisš-i 2-ta meš-ḥat šā ka-as-si-iá / 0;0.2 šam-ba-lil-tu, ḥa-la šā šu-pal šgigšimmarr šā ina igi-siú) (for an edition see p. 63).

Occasionally the gardeners were compensated for their work by the production from the entire orchard or from individual date palms. This usually happened with orchards in their early stage, i.e. orchards which had to be planted and which were not fully productive for a number of years and orchards which contained young palm trees which also had not reached their full productivity but required special care. The orchard in YOS 7 47, for instance, contained mature and young date palms. The fully productive palms were to be subjected to an *imittu* procedure according to which the impost would be delivered. Of the young palms, however, the gardener had the usufruct for five years, until they too became fully productive and subject to *imittu*.

The *zaggipitu*-contracts generally stipulate a period, five (YOS 17 6) or ten years (YOS 6 33, 67, PTS 2089), during which the gardener had the usufruct of the entire orchard.

### 2.3.5. Sharecropping

As Jursa observed in his study of land lease contracts, the leases of orchards under sharecropping terms were rare (2004b: 178). There are, however, several examples from Uruk of orchards cultivated by sharecroppers. Interestingly, the *zaggipitu*-contracts usually laid down sharecropping terms after the expiry of the ‘usufruct period’. YOS 6 33 and 67 both mention a share of 1/3 for the tenant, after the ten years, which the orchard needed to mature, passed. YOS 17 6 mentions a half-share after five years, albeit in a broken context. This share could have referred only to the crops below the date palms rather than the entire date production. PTS 2134, a contract for planting a vineyard, also stipulates a half-share from the beginning (without any arrangements for a previous ‘usufruct period’). A couple of *nukaribbiitu*-leases can be counted here as well, though they can be regarded as special cases. YBC 4143 was a private lease according to which the tenant was to keep 1/6 of the yield. The institutional texts are all leases of prebendary *gallatu*-orchards (BM 114444, YBC 4149, YOS 7 162) in which a share of 1/4 (in the London text) or 1/5 (in the Yale texts) was to be kept by the tenant of the orchard.

However, an account of *imittu* deliveries composed retrospectively probably in acc Ner for the years 42-43 Nbk and 1 Ami, TCL 12 59, gives rise to the notion that sharecropping in temple orchards was in fact more widespread than previously thought (at least during the period before the appearance of Šum-ūkin and the consecutive large-scale rent farmers). The text is divided in four sections, corresponding to different localities, and deals with the date obligations of the men in charge of these localities. The subject of the first section is the date impost from the orchards along Nār-šarri and the canal Takkiru, from 1 Ami. This impost was the responsibility of Nabû-ahhē-šullim, son of Nabû-udammiq, who was originally a ploughman, who became a supervisor of ten plough teams (*rab ešerti*) at some point during Nebuchadnezzar’s reign and was later promoted to become the top agricultural manager of the temple, the overseer of the ploughmen (*rab ikkarāti*).

The second section deals with the impost from the place Tīl-agurrēt, which was under the supervision of Ibin-Ištar, son of Nabû-šum-ibni, who was another *rab ešerti* and a *gugallu* (see p. 93), and Nabû-ahh-iddin, the slave of the *qipu*. Though no date is given for this section, it presumably also concerned the first year of Amil-Marduk. The next two sections relate to the impost of the orchards on Ḥarru-ša-Nadnaya. The first of the sections deals with the impost of the years 42 and 43 of Nebuchadnezzar and the second one with the year 1, probably of Amil-Marduk. The responsibility for the orchards on Ḥarru-ša-Nadnaya is shared by Bēl-uballiṭ, son of Ea-
iddin, and Zeria, son of Nabû-iddin during the years 42 and 43 of Nebuchadnezzar’s reign. In 1 Ami Zeria holds this responsibility alone.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TCL 12 59 (IX-acc Ner)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1 Ami</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1-6</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>701 gur zû-lum-ma sag-du i-mit-ti ša mu 1-kam / lâ-amar-utu lugal tin-tirû ša lûnu-šgeškiriš / šu ugu id-lugal / ū lu-tak-ki-ru e-lat zû-lum-ma ša dwu-ahur-re-e-ti / ū lu-ša-bar-ri-sáši-sum-na-a ina igi lu-šageššak / gi a lu-ag-šal / ina lib-bi 175;1.1.3 4-û ha-la ša lu-šgeškiriš / re-e-bi 525;3.4.3 ina igi lu-šageššak / gi... disbursements/deliveries...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>12-14</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pab 175;2.3 zû-lum-ma ina igi / re-bi 350;1.1.3 zû-lum-ma ina igi lu-šageššak / gi...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>II. 15-18</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202;3.2 ša dwu-ahur-re-e-ti ina igi lu-šageššak / lu-ag-mu-dû lu-šageššak / lu-gal-la ša lu-šageššak / ina lib-bi 50;3.2 4-û ha-la ša lu-šageššak / re-e-bi 152 gur zû-lum-ma... individual deliveries...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>II. 22-25</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pab 30;4.1 zû-lum-ma ša a-na pab̃-a-nect a-na / re-mut lu-šageššak / id-di-nu maḫ-ru / re-bi 121;0.5 zû-lum-ma ina pa-nil / lu-šageššak / lu-šageššak / mu...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>42-43</strong> Nbk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>II. 26-29</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[1 lim 2] me 80 gur zû-lum-ma i-mit-ti ša lu-šageššak / lu-šageššak / lu-šageššak / lu-šageššak / lu-gal-la ša lu-šageššak / ina lib-bi 50;3.2 4-û ha-la ša lu-šageššak / re-e-bi 152 gur zû-lum-ma... various disbursements for rations...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>II. 43-44</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pab 739;1 zû-lum-ma maḫ-ru / re-bi 540;4.1 zû-lum-ma ina igi-šû-nu 1,280 dates, imittu from Ḥarru-ṣa-[Nadnaya] for the years 42 and 43 of the debt note charged against Bēl-uballit/Ea-iddin and Zeria/Nabû-iddin... various disbursements for rations... in total: 739;1 dates were received; the remainder of 540;4.1 dates is at their disposal...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I (Ami)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>II. 45-48</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 482;0.5 zû-lum-ma i-mit-ti ša luša-bar-ri-sáši-sum-na-a / ša mu 1-kam ina igi lu-šageššak / lu-šageššak / lu-gal-la ša lu-šageššak / re-e-bi 361;3 ina igi lu-šageššak / lu-šageššak / lu-šageššak... disbursements... pab 173 gur [...] re-bi 185;3[...]
| **I. 56**              |
| 482;0.5 dates imittu from Ḥarru-ṣa-[Nadnaya] for the year 1 are at the disposal of Zeria/Nabû-iddin... of these 120;2.4 are the quarter-share of the gardeners; the remainder of 361;3 is at the disposal of Zeria; disbursements... in total: 173 [...] the remainder is 185:3[...]

Each section gives the amount of the impost owed, followed by a list of disbursements (for rations and so on) on behalf of the temple or individual deliveries of dates which had already reached the temple. Subsequently the balance is made and the outstanding dates are noted as ina

---

244 He is not otherwise attested in the management of temple agriculture. Perhaps he should be identified with the prebendary baker of the same name, from the family Amil-Ea (attested in prebendary context in AUWE 8 47 (date broken), YOS 19 133 (1 Nbn), YOS 19 136 (3 Nbn) and as a witness in PTS 3069 (28 Nbk) and YBC 7420 (acc Ner)). The appearance in TCL 12 59 could imply that he was also active as tenant of temple land on a larger scale.

245 For other attestations of Zeria see note 269.

246 The list is not dated, but in line 12 one individual delivery was dated to the month IX of acc Ner, giving the terminus post quem for this text.
pān PN (= the person(s) responsible for the locality in question). In three of the sections, namely those concerning the first year of Amil-Marduk, a quarter of the initial sum is subtracted as the quarter-share of the gardeners (rebû zittu ša nukuribbi). Only in the first section, though it must have been implied in the second and the fourth one as well, this initial sum is designated as qaqqad imitti, i.e. the result of the yield estimation procedure on the basis of which the shares were to be calculated (see Jursa 1995a: 148) and which probably represented the entire yield of the orchards. The expression qaqqad imitti appears in the caption of another list from the reign of Nebuchadnezzar, AUWE 11 171. The first two lines read: zú-lum-ma sag-du záša ugu id [...] / ḏag-nig-du-uru lugal tin-ti $. The expression appears also next to an individual entry in NBC 4653, a list dated to 32 Nbk (l. 1-3: 2;2.3 zú-lum-ma sag-du zág ša 'men-qa₂₃-bi-ti / ina id g̱i-din-ıṭ a 3en-su₂₃-su) and in the subscript of a list from 6 Npl YBC 6935 (l. 17: sag-du zág ina su-á-tu šá ē-an-na i-nam-din-nu). It is not clear how much one should read into these several cases. The implication of TCL 12 59 at any rate is that the gardeners on Nār-šarri, Takkippīr, Ḥarruša-Nánnaya and in Til-agurrēti cultivated the orchards under sharecropping terms and that the temple was to receive 3/4 of the date harvest from these localities. The fact that entire localities were worked under the same conditions speaks against the assumption that this was an exceptional case. It is not clear if the omission of the remark on shares of the gardeners for years 42 and 43 Nbk is in any way significant. In any case, the quarter-share of a gardener is attested once more in a short imittu list from 25 Nbk, which is edited below.

NBC 4739 21-VI-25 Nbk

obv. 1. zú-lum-ma i-mi₂₃-ti
    nig-ga₂₃-innin unug₂₃ u 'na-na-a
    iti kin ud 21-ka₂₃m mu 25-kan
    ḏag-nig-du-uru lugal tin-ti $ki

5. 33
    [Šu]-la-a 4-ú ē-ha-šu
    [a 3ša₂₃-ag]-šu-ū
    ina bād-ša[a 4a-a-ti-ru

lo.e. [x]+3
    1 din-su
    a [šu]-la-a

rev. 10. ina $gša₂₃-šu-šu-tu

“Dates, impost, property of Ištar of Uruk and Nanñaya; 21-VI-25 Nbk, king of Babylon.
33 (kurru) Šulāya, son of Ša-Nabû-šu, from Dūru-ša-latuiru. A quarter-share is his.
[x]+3 Balāssu, son of Šulāya, from Lasūtu.”

Though other sharecropping ratios are known, primarily from zāqipûtu-contracts (see above), it is tempting to assume that a quarter-share to which the gardeners were entitled was generally the norm before the introduction of the large-scale rent farms. This is of course highly speculative. Even if this were the case, we are not informed about the extra costs and fees imposed on the gardeners before the era of the rent farmers. Thus, the profit margin of the gardeners remains unknown. At any rate it can be assumed that the gardeners who kept a quarter-share of the date harvest did not receive any additional remuneration such as sissinnu. It remains to be seen whether a system based on the quarter-share for the gardeners also underlay the later accounting model represented by the ‘Edict of Belšazzar’.

2.3.6. Summary

The written documentation makes it very difficult to distinguish between the orchard tenants and the people doing the work in the orchards of the Eanna temple as there are no distinct designations for them. Furthermore, the gardeners (nukuribbus) were a heterogeneous group – they
could be temple dependants, širkus, craftsmen or free citizens. People of higher social standing, as well as širkus, are attested as tenants of temple orchards. The temple administration did not make any distinctions based on the legal or social status of its gardeners/tenants as they all worked under the same conditions.

The evidence from Sippar demonstrates that several people worked together in an orchard under a ‘main’ gardener. Frequently they were members of the same family. The gardeners were bound to specific localities and stood under the supervision of the gugallu in charge of these localities. Other agricultural officials (rab esēritu, rab ikkarätu) are sporadically also attested as the gardeners’ superiors. The large-scale rent farmers also exercised authority over the gardeners during the period of the large-scale rent farms.

Occasionally, the gardeners, like the institutional ploughmen, were employed at non-agricultural work projects such as canal-digging or brick-making. However, their main task was the production of dates and the tending of date orchards. An estimation procedure which determined the impost (imittu) to be delivered from each orchard was conducted by special temple officials, the estimators (ēmidus). Following this the dates were harvested in the sixth or seventh month and delivered in the seventh or eighth month. 10 % of the impost was selected high quality dates (makkasitu). The impost did not represent the entire yield of the orchard as there were other administrative fees which the gardeners had to cover over and above the imittu. We are not informed on this ratio; however, it seems probable that the impost amounted to between three quarters and five sixths of the entire yield. The land below the date palms was also cultivated by the gardeners. Cereals, vegetables and fruit trees could be planted here. Not much is known about the deliveries of these products to the temple, but it appears that the gardeners were entitled to a share in these products.

In addition to the deliveries of dates and other commodities grown below the palm trees the gardeners had to supply the temple with certain by-products: a type of basket made of palm leaves (tuballu), leaflets (liblibbu), fibre (mangāgu), and a load of wood (bītu ša ḫuṣābi). They also had to pay certain administrative fees. According to the ‘Edict of Belkazzar’ the rent farmer had to pay 0;0.2.3 (15 l) of dates as service fees and rations (kiṣru u kurummātu) of the governor, the scribes, the measurers, and the gate-keepers per each kurru of dates delivered. This amounted to about 8.33 % of the delivered dates. The imittu lists and debt notes from the Eanna archive also record such service fees, although the terminology and the quantities differ somewhat. During Cambyses’s reign these fees were called in the imittu debt notes kiṣr esitti (u) balātu (ana) Bēl and amounted to 5.83 % of the impost. Under Nebuchadnezzar VI these fees appeared in the corporate debt notes simply as rations (kurummātu) and amounted to 8.33 % of the impost which was probably equivalent to the fees recorded in the ‘Edict’. Over and above these payments the gardeners of Eanna also had to deliver 1 kurru of dates per orchard as a fee for the gugallu-official. This fee does not appear in the ‘Edict’.

The gardeners could be remunerated for their work in different ways. The most ubiquitous was a payment of a gardener’s salary, sissinnumu. According to the ‘Edict’ the sissinnumu for an orchard with the surface area of 1 kurru was 5 kurru of dates. Texts from Uruk show that sissinnumu could vary depending on the type of work conducted in the orchards. Amounts from 3 to 5 kurru of dates per surface kurru are attested. The more strenuous work was rewarded with a higher sissinnumu. In addition to this remuneration the gardeners were also entitled to a share of the products grown below the palm trees. Shares of 1/2, 2/3 and 4/5 are attested.

Sometimes the gardeners would get the usufruct of an entire or a part of an orchard for a fixed number of years. This was usually the case with newly planted orchards, or plantations containing young palm trees, i.e. orchards which had not reached their full productivity. The usufruct of such orchards could extend for five to ten years.

Contracts from the Eanna archive which record orchard leases under sharecropping terms are extremely rare and can be attributed to exceptional circumstances. However, there are two texts, an account of dates and a short imittu list, which indicate that before the large-scale rent farms were set up in Eanna some gardeners were entitled to a quarter-share from their date

---

247 They, however, probably employed others to do the actual gardening for them.
248 Groups of seven, eight, ten or even 15 persons are attested (Jursa 1995a: 36).
249 TCL 12 59 and NBC 4739, see above.
orchards. It is not clear whether these attestations represent exceptional cases or a more widely applicable practice. At any rate sharecropping as a form of date cultivation on temple estates should not be entirely excluded, at least for the period before the large-scale rent farms. The possibility that the accounting models of the large-scale rent farms were based on this quarter-share system should also be taken into consideration.
2.4. Overseer of ten (rab ēerti)

The rab ēerti, literally “overseer of ten”, is well attested in other sectors of temple economy, notably in the organisation of animal husbandry and public works, but his presence in the agricultural sector has not been recognized so far. One rab ēerti heading a group of ikkarus is mentioned in a text from Sippar listing personal names, but the context is not clearly agricultural (Nbk. 458 [not dated]). The temple ploughmen appearing in this list could have been employed for public works, as was regularly the case, so Jursa was reluctant to place the rab ēerti alongside other agricultural functionaries (1995a: 22). The rab ēertis known from Uruk were registered by Kümmel in the prosopography of people working in the sector of animal husbandry. For some of them, doubtless, this classification is fitting, but a number of these rab ēertis ought most certainly to be placed in the agricultural sector. Some of the confusion may be attributed to the occasional mentions of these functionaries together with cattle. In some cases the cattle can be assumed to have been used as draught animals for ploughing. But some rab ēertis with well-established careers in the agricultural sector are also known to have taken active part in animal husbandry. It is not unusual to find individuals working in both of these sectors of the temple economy at the same time. The land which was not under immediate cultivation, for instance during fallow, was very often used as pasture for temple herds.

Following individuals are known with the title rab ēerti:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bulluṭaya/Nanāya-ibni</td>
<td>25-VI-19 Nbk</td>
<td>BIN 1 112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nergal-inatēši-čxer/Zabdiyā</td>
<td>25-VI-19 Nbk</td>
<td>BIN 1 112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nabū-šum-ibni/Šuzubu</td>
<td>25-VI-19 Nbk, 3-VII-34 Nbk</td>
<td>BIN 1 112, YBC 4000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iḫtī/Nabū-šum-ibni</td>
<td>3-VII-34 Nbk</td>
<td>YBC 4000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silim-Bēl/Aplāya</td>
<td>25-VI-19 Nbk, 3-VII-34 Nbk</td>
<td>BIN 1 112, YBC 4000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nabū-ahḫē-šulim/Nabū-udammiq</td>
<td>3-VII-34 Nbk</td>
<td>YBC 4000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is difficult to draw general conclusions about the nature of the rab ēerti’s duties with attestations of this title in two texts only. However, the six individuals who appear as rab ēertis in these two texts are amply attested in other documents, usually without a title. Occasionally they are identified as ploughmen (ikkaru). Some of them also appear with titles designating other agricultural officials. From these records it can be deduced that the rab ēertis were recruited from

---

251 Silim-Bēl, son of Aplāya, is known to have had arrears in goats and sheep ([x] Nbn, UCP 9/2 36), and Nabū-ahḫē-šulim, son of Nabū-udammiq, who is also attested with the title rab ikkarāti, had a large herd of 2,617 heads of small cattle at his disposal (41 Nbk, GC 1 252). Other occurrences of small cattle in our evidence give indirect proof of these functionaries’ active involvement in animal husbandry. For instance, GC 1 63 (10’ Nbk), sadly damaged, mentions a debt of goats and sheep, which is to be paid to the temple instead of 200 [x...y] of Nergal-inatēši-čxer (a man known as rab ēerti from other sources). The number 200 with the following break most likely refers to an amount of agricultural produce, for which Nergal-inatēši-čxer was responsible. This interpretation puts the text again in the agricultural context. Nevertheless, it also indicates that Nergal-inatēši-čxer had access to small cattle in one way or another.
252 In this context land lease contracts for pasture of temple herds should be mentioned (YOS 6 26 (1 Nbn), PTS 2249(3 Nbn)). The tenants, herdsmen (nāqīda) of the Lady of Uruk, were given land on which to pasture the herds under their responsibility. They were also obliged to ensure that some of this land was cultivated, since they had to deliver fixed amounts of barley as rent. For these texts see p. 312.
the ranks of the ploughmen. This is, for instance, demonstrated by an undated list of 46 ikkarus (BIN 1 157), in which Bullu†¤ya/Nan¤ya0ibni, Nergal-ina-tēši-ētēr/Zabidīya and Silim-Bēl/Aplāya’ appear. The rab ēsērtis’ activities as ploughmen also transpire from texts in which they appear as recipients of seed grain (e.g. Silim-Bēl/Aplāya in PTS 2550, Bullu†¤ya/Nan¤ya-ibni in PTS 2793) and from lists of deliveries of agricultural produce (e.g. Silim-Bēl/Aplāya in UCP 9/2 25). Being ploughmen they most probably also had the status of širkus. This is clearly demonstrated in UCP 9/2 36, which deals with the status of Silim-Bēl/Aplāya; at this occasion his širkūtu-tablet is explicitly mentioned.

Several rab ēsērtis could be employed at the same time. Both YBC 4000 and BIN 1 112 demonstrate that at least four of these officials worked simultaneously. There is no way of telling whether there were other, so far unattested, rab ēsērtis.

The appearance of some of these individuals with titles of other, presumably higher, agricultural officials demonstrates the possibility of promotion for some of them. Thus, Nabū-aḫḫē-šu lament appears as rab ikkarāṭi, “overseer of the ploughmen”, in acc Ner (BIN 1 123). Ibnī-Ištar and Nergal-ina-tēši-ētēr are attested as gugalles in 31 Nbk (YBC 9448253) and 34 Nbk (YBC 4000254) respectively, but here the evidence concerning the seniority of the offices is not unequivocal. For one, the two people move in opposite directions: Nergal-ina-tēši-ētēr up and Ibnī-Ištar down the career ladder.255 It is difficult to grasp the consequences of these changes of title. At least no visible effects can be found in the ensuing documentation. This is especially clear for Nergal-ina-tēši-ētēr, whose attestations after his appearance as guggalle do not show a marked difference in his activities and responsibilities to the preceding period. Even relative to his rab ēsērti colleagues, he does not seem to hold a superior position; he is named on a par with them, most frequently together with Nabū-aḫḫē-šu lament in this period. Similarly, the consequences of Ibnī-Ištar’s demotion cannot be fully understood. VS 20 88 (35 Nbk), to be sure, gives the impression of a fall from grace256. An area in Naḥbutu previously entrusted jointly to Ibnī-Ištar and Nabū-šuам-ibni is leased out to another person. But what looks like dissolution of a land lease could have had any number of reasons and may not have necessarily been connected to Ibnī-Ištar’s performance. In fact, Ibnī-Ištar’s activities continue well into the accession year of Neriglissar. In 35 Nbk he is still in possession of land leased in Til-aggūṭati (PTS 3012 and NCBT 101) and evidence from acc Ner shows that he was responsible, together with another person, for the total deliveries of dates from Til-aggūṭati (TCL 12 59), and that he had leased land in Kār-Nanāya (YBC 3830).

Once again, the different administrative categories do not seem to leave distinct traces in the textual evidence. Relying solely on this data it would appear that there was no actual difference between the gugalle and the rab ēsērtis and that the two titles were interchangeable. While there must have been considerable and frequent overlaps in their responsibilities, the system being flexible enough to allow for these, these offices still must be treated as distinctive ones. However, owing to the limitations imposed by our documentation, particularly the frequent omission of the protagonists’ titles, it is not always possible to make a confident distinction between the responsibilities of these functionaries and assign the duties evident from the texts in question to any one particular agricultural official. Bearing this in mind we can proceed with the information that can be gleaned about the activities of the rab ēsērtis.

### 2.4.1. Obligations

A rab ēsērti, being literally an “overseer of ten”, is usually responsible for a unit of ten people. In arable agriculture, a basic work unit is not an individual ploughman, but rather a plough team and so it is feasible that the rab ēsērtis each supervised ten plough teams. This assumption

---

253 Edited by Janković 2007: 221ff.
255 Nergal-ina-tēši-ētēr is first attested as a rab ēsērti (19 Nbk) and then as a guggalle (34 Nbk), while the opposite is true for Ibnī-Ištar (guggalle in 31 Nbk and rab ēsērti in 34 Nbk). For details see the prosopographical section.
256 For an edition of the text see p. 152.
resonates in an undated text (OIP 122 172), in which 53 people are listed and distributed in ten plough teams, which are said to be at the disposal of Nergal-ina-tēšē-ēter (l. 54: ṣap ina igī N.), who was, according to BIN 1 112 (19 Nbk), a rab ēṣerti. Note that Nergal-ina-tēšē-ēter and his own team are also included in this list.

Another similar text (YBC 3858) lists only five men, each representing a plough team, at the disposal of Nabū-ahēḫē-šullim, son of Nabū-udammiq, another individual known as a rab ēṣerti:

YBC 3858 25-XII-42 Nbk

Obv. 1. la-ag-šēmis-gi a-šū šā la-ag-sig-riq
   la-in-nin-mu-uri a-šū šā lu-gur-kar-er
   l-ap-la-a a-šū šā ki-nu-na-a-a
   la-in-nin-nun-m-gal-ši a-šū šā lu-utu-numun-ba-šā
5. la-ag-muq-gu-e-li p a-šū šā 1-du-tū-šū

(ca. four blank lines)

Rev. pab (space for ca. two signs left blank) ša-ap ina pa-ni
la-ag-šēmis-gi a-šū šā la-ag-kal
i-tū še ud 25-kam mu 42-kam
la-ag-nig-du-u-šur lugal tin-tiši

“Nabū-ahēḫē-šullim, son of Nabū-udammiq, Innin-šum-ūṣur, son of Nergal-ēter, Aplāya, son of Kinišnaya, Innin-zēr-ušāšī, son of Šamaš-zēr-iqisla, Nabū-muqqelpū, son of Bānītušu ... A total of ... ploughs under the responsibility of Nabū-ahēḫē-šullim, son of Nabū-udammiq. 25-XII-42 Nbk, king of Babylon.”

This text was clearly not completed by the scribe, as is evident from a blank space of several lines on the obverse following line 5 and the gap in which the total number of ploughs at the disposal of Nabū-ahēḫē-šullim was supposed to be written (l. 6). There is sufficient space in the gap, including the edge of the tablet, to allow for at least another five personal names, which were for some reason left out. As in OIP 122 172 the person responsible for the plough teams appears listed among these himself. This indicates that his responsibilities were not solely organisational, but that he actively took part in the land tilling.

In Sippar there does not seem to exist a special term for a person in charge of several plough teams, even though there are clear indications that such people existed. These people, who were ploughmen themselves, were usually in charge of the teams of a certain locality (Jursa 1995a: 10). The number of teams under their responsibility does not transpire from the Sippar texts. The only occurrence of a rab ēṣerti together with ploughmen from Sippar, Nbk. 458 mentioned earlier, lists ten people (including the rab ēṣerti). However, there is no way of telling whether this text should be put in an agricultural context and if thereby the people listed represented their plough teams, or if those were simply ten individuals that were going to be employed at some other non-agricultural project.

The texts mentioning the rab ēṣeritis are reticent about their actual tasks and responsibilities. There is in fact only one text from Uruk in which these officials appear in an undisputedly agricultural context. This is YBC 4000 (34 Nbk), which has been edited by Janković 2005: 167ff. It is a record of a public proclamation of orders given by the royal official Nabū-šar-uṣur through his commissioner, a temple scribe Nabū-bān-ālī, son of Ibnāya, descendant of Ekur-zakir, to the gugallu, four rab ēṣeritis and a number of ikkarus of the Lady of Uruk. At this occasion they were warned against the illicit sharing of land and draught animals between the ploughmen and sharecroppers under the threat of capital punishment. Though no details concerning the practical tasks of these officials are revealed by this text, it indicates their seniority in relation to the ploughmen. Furthermore, their appearance in a context involving arable land and draught animals implies that these officials’ responsibilities included some sort of supervision of agricultural work. This is not to exclude the prospect of the rab ēṣeritis’ responsibilities for ploughmen employed at
non-agricultural projects, which was assumed by Jursa (1995a: 22), and which is still possible and probable.

The only other text in which agricultural rab eṣerti appear with this title is BIN 1 112 (19 Nbk). It records the number of oxen at the disposal of four rab eṣerti. These numbers were apparently booked in an account which was given to the temple administrator:

BIN 1 112

obv. 1. 19*1 gu₄₄ me šá id ag-mu-du a šu[l-[zu-bu]]
16 gu₄₄ me šá 'idu-gur-ina-sú-sú-sú a 'za-bi-da'-a
11 gu₄₄ me šá 'si-lim-a en a 'a-a
16 gu₄₄ me šá 'bul-lat-a a 'id na-na-a-du
5. pab 1+št 2 gu₄₄ me šá 'id gal 10-i₄₄
il-ru-u-šag a-na
r₄₄-sa-tam id-di-nu

revised

1. gu₄₄ me e-la-at-ti šá 1+št [2 at]

10. 1+en 30 a-na 'gašan šá unug
i-nam-di-nu
mu-kin-nu 'id ag-pab a 'za-bi-da-a
šé a 'id amaru-[su]t r
šá-im a 'id-šá

15. šá-šá-šá 1+št-[a]
unug iti kin ud 25-[kam]

u.e. [m]u 19-kam dag-nig-du-uru
lugal tin-ti₄₄

“19 oxen of Nabû-šum-ibni, son of Šu[zubu], 16 oxen of Nergal-iná-téš-êter, son of Zabdiáya, 11 oxen of Silim-Bêl, son of Apláýa, 16 oxen of Bullútjáya, son of Nanáya-ibni; in sum: 62 oxen that the rab eṣerti registered (on a tablet/in an account) and gave (these records) to the šatammu. If oxen, exceeding the 6[2] (registered ones), are seen at their disposal, they will pay each one thirty-fold to the Lady of Uruk.

Witnesses: Nabû-nášir, son of Zabdíáya,
Nabû-bân-âhi, son of Marduk-êter,
Ibni-Ištar, son of Bêl-ùšallim,
Scribe: Nabû-bân-âhi, son of Ibn[a]ya;
Uruk; 25-VI-19 Nbk, king of Babylon.”

Although the text in itself has no obvious connection to the agriculture of Eanna, it is possible to firmly place the four individuals appearing in it in the agricultural sector on prosopographic grounds. It is conceivable that the oxen mentioned in this text were used for ploughing.

---

257 The text is also edited by San Nicolò 1949: 300. In the first line he reads 19 (!) gu₄₄ me, rather than 161 gu₄₄ me, which is indicated by the copy. A collation confirmed the reading 19, which results in the correct sum of 62 in line 5.

258 This expression is comparable to the phrase šuzzuzzuma ana ... nadânu, with šatâru and šuzzuzzu being equivalent and meaning “to enter/register (in an account)” and expressing the need to give proof of this registration to a party concerned but not present at the transaction. See Baker 2004: 76+452 for comments and further literature on this phrase.

259 Other occurrences of people, without titles in these particular cases, but elsewhere attested as rab eṣerti, in connection with cattle are: YBC 3856 (28 Nbk), a sale document for two cows, of which one had previously been put at the disposal of Nabû-ahhê-bullim/Nabû-udammimiq by the rab bēli; YOS 17 57 (11 Nbk), a receipt of a cow carcass delivered by Silim-Bêl/Apláýa; GC 1 3 (1 Nbk), a receipt of eight cow and oxen hides delivered by Bullútjáya/Nanáya-ibni; NBC 4940 (20 Nbk), a list of cows and oxen received from the ploughmen among which Silim-Bêl/Aplâya appears.
The *rab ėerti* also had responsibilities toward the temple concerning deliveries of agricultural produce. Some of these obligations stem from their *ikkaru*-status. As was already mentioned, their deliveries of barley or dates are recorded in several *imittu* lists. According to NCBT 1090 (not dated), for instance, Nergal-ina-tēšē-ētēr and two other people (Nabû-balāssu-iqbi and Nanāya-ah-iddin/Nanāya-ušallī) delivered or had to deliver 110 *kurru* of dates from Bit-Gilānu.

But they also took on the responsibility for the deliveries of the other ploughmen and sharecroppers or even entire localities. The tabulated *imittu* list NCBT 650 (15 Nbk) records the responsibility of Bullu†ūlēya (using the expression *¡a qē†i*):

**NCBT 650**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>obv.</th>
<th>1.</th>
<th>[še-bar še-zîz-ámara gig-ba saḥ-le-e zag] šā in nam-su a-iš-šu a-din</th>
<th>110 gur</th>
<th>20 gur</th>
<th>37;2.3 šib-šu</th>
<th>130</th>
<th>37;1.5</th>
<th>40</th>
<th>130</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>1301</th>
<th>141</th>
<th>1351</th>
<th>150x</th>
<th>140</th>
<th>120[+x]</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>1901</th>
<th>1 x</th>
<th>1 x</th>
<th>1 x</th>
<th>1 x</th>
<th>1 x</th>
<th>1 x</th>
<th>1 x</th>
<th>1701</th>
<th>1 x</th>
<th>1 x</th>
<th>1 x</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(in)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(in)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(in)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

260 Šamaš-balāssu-iqbi is not known from other documents. His role in this text is not clear either. It would appear that he was in charge of the entire *imittu* due from the ploughmen, but the exact nature of his position remains obscure.
In sum: 600+x barley, 87;1.5 spelt, 19;1.5 spelt.

Barley and spelt, the arrears of the ploughmen:
48 Bullu†dia, son of Nanôya-ibni.
61;4 Bêl-[x], son of Šumâya.
11:4.1 Šakin-šumi, son of Sîllâya.
12;3.2 Marduk-eriba, son of Eanna-ibni.
22;1.4.3 Bêl-ibni, son of Bêl-iddin.
7 Hašdia, son of Nabû-šum-iškun.
10:3.1 Nabû-ahhê-eriba, son of Nergal-ibni.
40;2.1.3 Šamaš-eriba, son of Nergal-iddin.
82;2.5 Nabû-šum-ibni, son of Šûzubu.

In sum: 297;3.4 barley, the arrears of the ploughmen, who are at the responsibility of Bullu†iya.

11-1-15 Nbk, king of Babylon.”

The heading of BIN 1 154 (Nbk, year broken) records the issue of dates in stead of barley seed to Nergal-ina-têsî-êter, Ibni-Ištar/Nabû-šum-ibni, both known as rab eṣertû from other sources, and to several ploughmen. 261 Despite having no particular titles, the fact that their names are given in the heading, while the others are subsumed under ikkarû, indicates that the two of them held some responsibility over the rest of the ploughmen.

The two of them also appear in YBC 9574 (33 Nbk) as recipients of goat hair for sacks – these were probably used for the transportation of grain.

More evidence for a rab eṣerti’s responsibility over ploughmen is offered by YOS 17 33 (19 Nbk). Here Nergal-ina-têsî-êter, who is not explicitly called a rab eṣerti, but is known as such from BIN 1 112, which was written only about three months before this document, was asked to summon before the šatammu the ikkarû of the Lady of Uruk, their sons, brothers, substitutes etc. within a period of 25 days. In case he hid some of the ploughmen, he would have had to pay a thirty-fold penalty to the temple. The traces at the end of line 5 are significant, as they potentially determine the extent of Nergal-ina-têsî-êter’s responsibility. It is suggested here to read them as a place name (Kâr-Eanna) which seems congruent with the remaining visible wedges. This addition, referring to the ploughmen and their associates, sets the bounds of Nergal-ina-têsî-êter’s responsibility to this particular locality.

YOS 17 33

1. ta ud 20-kam šâ iti gan en ud 15-kam
šâ iti ab idu-gur-ina-sûh-sur a ʾza-bi-da-[a]
pab lê engar mašša gašan šà unug ka-ma-la ʾba-Šû-l-[a],
šà-šû-nu dumu<ke>ša-[nu> šeš-šû-nu ku-tal-la-a-tu-šû-nu
5. ʾu ʾiya-pa-nu šâ it-ti-ši-nu šà ina ʾka-er ʾan-[nä]
ib-ka-ʾka<-am-ma a-na id ag-šeš<mill> mu
a idu-gur gi a ʾzâlag ʾ30 ša-tam
ʾan-nu ʾkal-lam ki-i mam-m[a]
lo.e.
a-na pa-ši-ru il-ta-k[an]a

261 BIN 1 154, 1-4: [zû]-lum ma šà a-na ʾše-numûnu (ʾx)/ [x (x)] a-na id u-gur-ina-sûh-sur/ [ʾdû.4]15 ra1 id ag-
mu-dû ʾu lê engar išša/ [sum-na]-ti iti apin ud 29-[k]am.
10. \(1+en\) 30 a-na ́gašan ša unug\(^{ki}\)
\(^{*}l_{1}\)nam-di-in

rev. \(^{lu}\)mu-kin-nu \(^{1}\)ba-la-tu a \(^{1}\)mu-f-a
\(\overset{\text{a}}{\text{a}}\)mu-\(^{3}\)pap-sukkal \(\overset{\text{a}}{\text{a}}\)tu-\(^{2}\)num-num-ba-ša
\(\overset{\text{a}}{\text{a}}\)en-gi a \(\overset{\text{a}}{\text{a}}\)kur-\(\overset{\text{a}}{\text{a}}\)kar-\(\overset{\text{a}}{\text{a}}\)

15. a \(\overset{\text{a}}{\text{a}}\)a-\(\overset{\text{a}}{\text{a}}\)tár-rab-tù
\(\overset{\text{a}}{\text{a}}\)umbisag \(\overset{\text{a}}{\text{a}}\)ag-dù-\(\overset{\text{a}}{\text{a}}\)šè\(\overset{\text{a}}{\text{a}}\) a \(\overset{\text{a}}{\text{a}}\)dù-f-a
\(\overset{\text{a}}{\text{a}}\)ē-\(\overset{\text{a}}{\text{a}}\)kur-\(\overset{\text{a}}{\text{a}}\)-ka\(\overset{\text{a}}{\text{a}}\)r ē-\(\overset{\text{a}}{\text{a}}\)an\(^{1}\)[-na]

(two blank lines)

u.e. iti gan ud 20-kam mu 19-kam
\(^{3}\)ag-nig-du-úru lugal tin-tir\(^{kr}\)

“From the 20\(^{th}\) day of the 9\(^{th}\) month until the 15\(^{th}\) day of the 10\(^{th}\) month Nergal-ina-tēšši-čṭer, son\(^{262}\) of Zabidāya, will bring all the ploughmen of the Lady of Uruk, as many as there are, their sons, their brothers, their substitutes and the extra men\(^{263}\) who are with them, (all) who are in Kār-Eanna, and will show them to Nabū-āḫḫē-iddin, son of Nergal-uṣallim, descendant of Nūr-Sîn, the chief administrator of Eanna. If he hides anyone, he will pay thirty-fold to the Lady of Uruk.

Witnesses: Balātu, son of Šumāya, descendant of Iddin-Papsukkal, Šamaḫ-zēr-iqīša, son of Bēl-uṣallim, descendant of Kūrī, Mušēzib-Bēl, son of Aplāya, descendant of Arrabtu,


The reason for this summons is not revealed by the text. An inspection of the available agricultural workers springs to mind; however, the ninth and the tenth month do not seem favourable for conducting such an inspection, as the ploughing and sowing work would have to be interrupted.

Some of the rab ēšertiš had sūtu-obligations, i.e. were obliged to pay the rent (sūtu). This is evident from the texts recording deliveries of agricultural produce as part of their sūtu.

NCBT 101   27-XII-35 Nbk

obv. 1. 57 gur 1\(_{p}\) 1\(_{b}\) 3 sīla šē-bar
2 gur 2\(_{p}\) 3\(_{b}\) šē-zīz-ām
\(\overset{\text{a}}{\text{a}}\)pāb\(^{1}\) 59 gur 3\(_{p}\) 4\(_{b}\) 3 sīla
\(\overset{\text{a}}{\text{a}}\)šē\(-\)bar ina iti kin m[u] 34-kam

5. \(^{3}\)ag-[nīg-du]-\(\overset{\text{a}}{\text{a}}\)úru\(^{l}\) lugal tin-tir\(^{k}\)
\(\overset{\text{a}}{\text{a}}\)nā-[\(\overset{\text{a}}{\text{a}}\)i[n] a-šū ša] nā-na-a
\(\overset{\text{a}}{\text{a}}\)kar-\(\overset{\text{a}}{\text{a}}\)en a \(\overset{\text{a}}{\text{a}}\)a-a

lo.e. \(\overset{\text{a}}{\text{a}}\)amar-utu-su a \(\overset{\text{a}}{\text{a}}\)en-mu

rev. ina \(\overset{g}{\text{a}}\)kān ša \(\overset{\text{a}}{\text{a}}\)dū\(^{1}15\)

10. a \(\overset{\text{a}}{\text{a}}\)ag-mu-\(\overset{\text{a}}{\text{a}}\)úru ina \(\overset{\text{a}}{\text{a}}\)gūn-du \(\overset{\text{a}}{\text{a}}\)a-gur-re-e-tū
ina ē \(\overset{\text{a}}{\text{a}}\)dū\(^{1}15\) im-\(\overset{\text{a}}{\text{a}}\)šu-\(\overset{\text{a}}{\text{a}}\)hu
ina lib-bi 51 gur 4\(_{p}\) 3\(_{b}\) 3 sīla šē-bar
2 gur 2\(_{p}\) 3\(_{b}\) šē-zīz-ām a-na nīg-ga
nā-šā-a-ta 1 gur 3\(_{p}\) 4\(_{b}\) 3 sīla

15. \(^{\overset{\text{a}}{\text{a}}}{\text{a}}\)gal ka-a-rī it-ta-šī
2 gur 2\(_{b}\) 3 sīla ina ka-lak-ku

u.e. un-da-tu iti šē ud 27-kam
mu 35-kam \(^{3}\)ag-nīg-du-úru

\(^{262}\) Note that all throughout the text the scribe used the shortened version of the logogram for filiation, namely “a” instead of the usual “a-šū ša”.

\(^{263}\) For a discussion of this word see note 65. A collation of the text confirms the reading it-pa-nu rather than qī-pa-nu indicated by the copy.

\(^{264}\) See also note 67.
le.e. lugal tin-tir

“In the sixth month of 34 Nbk, king of Babylon, Nadin, son of Nadnaya, Mûchézib-Bêl, son of Apîaya, (and) Marduk-eriba, son of Bêl-iddin, measured out 57;1.1.3 barley (and) 2;2.3 spelt, in sum: 59;3.4.3 grain from the sîtu-obligation of Ibni-Istar, son of Nabû-Šum-ibni, in Til-agurrêti, in the house of Ibni-Istar. Of these: 51;4.3.3 barley (and) 2;2.3 spelt were delivered to the temple storehouse, the chief of the harbour took 1;3.4.3 (and) 2;0.2.3 were lost265 in the silo. 27-XII-35 Nbk, king of Babylon.”

The figures do not add up. There is a difference of 1;2.3 (i.e. 270 litres of grain) between the measured out 59;3.4.3 and the delivered 58;1.1.3 grain (including the grain delivered to the storehouse, the grain taken by the chief of the harbour (rab kâri), and the grain lost in the silo). The missing amount is therefore larger than the one recorded by the scribe in line 16 by 270 litres. The rab kâri received about 3.22 % of the grain delivered.266

The instances in which their sîtu-obligations are mentioned may indicate a contractual relationship between these people and the temple. This type of relationship is attested for the Sipparean agricultural official Šamaš-iddin (see Jursa 1995a: 24f.). No contracts or land leases are available for the Urukean officials. Perhaps written contracts were not necessary. Since they were temple dependants it is conceivable that their obligations were set according to customary practices. However, additional arrangements as those attested for Šamaš-iddin from Sippar cannot be entirely excluded either. In general, no distinction was made between their official duties and their ‘private’ obligations. They were managers working for the temple who at the same time worked for their personal profit. Being institutional officials they had the opportunity (or were even expected) to make profit but were also personally liable for any arrears.267

Some of the known rab eštérîs were also responsible for date deliveries. TCL 12 59268 (acc Ner) shows that Nabû-ahlê-šullim was in charge of the imittu obligations for dates of the gardeners from Nár-šarri and Takkûru. The same sort of responsibility is attested in this text for Ibni-Istar for the land in Til-agurrêti. However, other people not previously attested with a similar function appear in this text as well: a certain Zêria, son of Nabû-iddin, is responsible for the imittu dates from Ḥarrû-ša-Nadnâyâ269, and Nabû-ahlâ-iddin, the slave of the qîpu, assumes the responsibility for date deliveries jointly with Ibni-Istar. Here again it is not clear whether these obligations stemmed from their regular activities as agricultural official or from contractual arrangements.

2.4.2. Non-agricultural work

The people attested as rab eštérîs were also engaged in the management of the irrigation system. In the letter BIN 1 44,270 addressed by Silîm-Bêl, Nergal-ina-tešî-êcher and Nabû-Šum-ibni

---

265 un-da-tu is a D-stem perfect of maṭû, “to reduce, diminish”, meaning that the original amount of grain was reduced by 2;0.2.3 (i.e. 450 litres) in the silo in which it was stored before the delivery to the temple. This loss amounted to some 4% of the grain originally measured out. It is not clear whether this amount was within the normal loss range.
266 On this official see p. 133. For transportation costs and the various related fees see Weszeli 2010: 140ff.
267 For the dual role of the institutional officials see the discussion on p. 252.
268 Cf. Moore’s edition of the text, 1935: 64ff. and also here p. 79.
269 His other attestations indicate a status of a sharecropper in the region of Ḥarrû-ša-Nadnâyâ (YBC 9251, 41 Nbk: a zittu debt note for dates, in which he figures as the debtor). According to BIN 1 166 (2 Ner) he delivered kasîa pertaining to the sîtu of Šum-ukin in Aṣširûtu. He appears as a debtor in NBDM 4 (3 Ner), a debt note for dates pertaining to the rent farm of Šum-ukin, and as a witness in BIN 1 97 (1 Nbn), a zittu debt note for barley, also pertaining to the rent farm of Šum-ukin. In YOS 6 94 (3 Nbn) he is attested as a commissioner (bêl piqîti) of Šum-ukin. His other possible attestations are in TEBR 40 (1 Nbn) and YOS 6 43 (2 Nbn). See also Joannès 1982: 1631.
270 The letter is not dated, but placed it in the second or third decade of Nebuchadnezzar’s reign seems plausible. For an edition of the letter see Ebeling 1930-34: 196ff.
to the šatammu, the three men report illicit use of water from a temple canal by a certain Nergal-uballit, who had given this water to his ploughman (ikkaru). Even after negotiating, the messenger of Nergal-uballit gave this water to the sharecroppers. At a loss for further action, they asked the šatammu to refer the case to a certain Nergal-šar-uṣur, perhaps the later king who was active as a royal official in the Uruk region at the end of Nebuchadnezzar’s reign.

They not only supervised the irrigation practices, but also ran the digging works. In ll. 23ff. of BIN 1 44 they say that no water had been taken from Nār-šarrī, a canal which they were digging. In another letter, BIN 1 60 (ll. 16-20), Nabū-ahhē-iddin, probably the šatammu, asks the temple scribe Nabū-bān-āḫi, among other things, to send Bullūṭaya, Nergal-ina-tēši-ētēr and Nabū-ṣum ibni and give them spades and other tools they need for work on the irrigation network (dullu ša nārī).

The letter YOS 21 33 also demonstrates the authority of these officials over agricultural workers and their obligation to organise and conduct non-agricultural work. The sender Ibni-Ištar, who can probably be identified as the gugallu and the rab ēerti of the same name, wrote to Nabū-ahhē-šullim, probably also to be identified with an agricultural official (rab ikkarātī, see below), asking him to assemble urāšu-workers of the ploughmen. Ibni-Ištar was engaged in some sort of work (dullu) according to this letter, perhaps on the irrigation canals. Whether this occurred in his function as a rab ēserti or as a gugallu is not clear.

2.4.3. Other activities

The rab ēsertis were not only engaged in the agricultural sector. Some of them extended their activities to animal husbandry as was mentioned above. Nabū-ahhē-šullim, son of Nabū-udammiq, is known to have made a contract for pasturing donkeys (YBC 3739) according to which he was to share the offspring with the animals’ owner. From GC 1 252 we know that he also had a flock of 2,617 sheep and goats at his disposal. UCP 9/2 36 mentions the arrears of small and large cattle beside barley and dates charged against Silim-Bēl, son of Aplāya. These were to all likelihood their own personal enterprises which were not directly connected to their duties as agricultural functionaries. However, access to land, which could potentially be used for pasture (during fallow, or untilled land), and other resources (e.g. fodder), that resulted from their involvement in agriculture on a higher level, certainly made their ventures in animal husbandry easier.

The personal resources of at least some of these people were considerable. Thus we are informed by TCL 12 38 (22 Nbk) that Silim-Bēl, son of Aplāya, had, in spite of his status of a temple oblate and a temple ploughman, the means to purchase land with a frontage of 600 cubits along the Nār-Bānitu. The price was presumably 4 minas of silver, since the text names 2 minas as price of a plot of 300 cubits (l. 15ff). He was also in the possession of at least one slave, as is evident from AnOr 8 50. It is a matter for conjecture whether Silim-Bēl’s wealth arose from his activities in the office of a rab ēserti. Be that as it may, it was of advantage to the temple that its subjects had personal assets. This way the temple could hope for compensation, in case they failed to fulfil their obligations. OIP 122 169 (1 Nbn), which lists plots of land in Bit-Ijallaka measured out to the širkus by the royal official Nabū-šar-uṣur, also records a plot which was received from Silim-Bēl, son of Aplāya, and allocated to another person. It is conceivable that this land was acquired by the temple in lieu of his outstanding debts. This is explicitly the case in Montserrat 1 rev. 20ff., which describes a field taken from Nabū-ahhē-šullim, son of Nabū-udammiq, instead of

271 It appears that the land of Nergal-uballit was tilled both by (his own) ploughman and by sharecroppers. It is unfortunately not known who this Nergal-uballit was and in what relationship he stood to the temple.
272 BIN 1 44 ll. 26-31: a-mur 5 idmē / ul-tu id-lugal / il-la-ka-nu / me-e šá mam-ma / iš-šī al-la / ša "gašan ša unugts.
273 For a partial translation see p. 59.
274 It is evident from UCP 9/1 2 36 that he was a širkus.
275 The text deals with the status of land purchased by Silim-Bēl. Half of it (300 cubits) turned out to be royal land, and Silim-Bēl was granted 200 cubits of land on Takkūrū and a debt note as a compensation for it by the seller, Gimillu, son of Kudurru.
his arrears (field ... ku-um re-e-ḫi šá ugu-šú a-na/ ṭ-an-na na-šá-a’). A similar situation may be the background of AnOr 8 50 (5 Cyr), a summons of a certain Ardia, son of Šākin-šumi, descendant of Šīn-tabni, to Uruk to settle the matter of the status of a slave. This slave had been received by his father Šākin-šumi from Silim-Bēl, who, as is stressed by the text, was indebted to the Lady of Uruk (l. 5f: ša ṭeḫānu ša Bēlti ša Uruk ina muḫḫišu). It is not stated in this document whether the slave was bought by Šākin-šumi, or by which other means he came into his possession, but it is obvious that the temple had laid claim to this slave, as (former) property of its debtor, at least until his status had been settled by the royal judges. In case Ardia failed to appear in Uruk, the text stipulates that he would have to give the slave to the temple and pay his mandattu for the period he had been in his possession.

2.4.4. Summary

The rab ēšertū were overseers of the plough teams working on temple land. They are attested during the period before the large-scale rent farms were set up in Eanna. These agricultural officials were temple dependants, širkūs, and could be recruited from the ranks of the ikkarū. While rab ēšertū were also active in the sector of animal husbandry, at least five individuals working in the temple’s agricultural sector are attested with this title.

The exact number of the agricultural rab ēšertū working for the temple at one time is not known. At least four of them were employed at the same time according to our sources. Their activities often overlapped with those of other agricultural officials, like the gugallū, but it appears that they were subordinated to the overseer of the ploughmen, the rab ikkarātī.

The rab ēšertū were each in charge of ten plough teams. This group of ten plough teams usually included their own team, as they also took active part in temple agriculture. They received oxen, presumably to be used as draught animals, and issues of seed on behalf of the plough teams. They were responsible for the ploughmen and their cereal deliveries. Sometimes their responsibility extended to entire localities. In one case they were even in charge of the date deliveries of the gardeners. These activities took on entrepreneurial traits, although no contracts regulating their obligations toward the temple have been found.

The rab ēšertū were also in charge of supervising non-agricultural types of work such as digging and maintenance of the irrigation system. Some of these officials were also actively involved in animal husbandry and cattle breeding. Even though they were temple dependants some of them managed to accumulate considerable personal wealth, such as slaves and plots of land, probably through their entrepreneurial activities. The temple occasionally confiscated these in lieu of their debts and arrears.

276 Probably both Šākin-šumi and Silim-Bēl were dead by this time.
2.4.5. Attestations\(^{277}\) of the rab ešerti:

**Bulluṭayā/Nanāya-ibnī\(^{278}\)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Filiation</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BIN 1 60: 12</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n.p.</td>
<td>ikkaru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIN 1 157: 1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n.p.</td>
<td>ikkaru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GC 1 3(^{279}); 6f.</td>
<td>2(^{[x]})-VII-1 Nbk</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>ikkaru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCBT 879: 7</td>
<td>23-I-3 Nbk</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>ikkaru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTS 2793: 4</td>
<td>8-VI-12 Nbk</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>ikkaru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTS 2650: 2f.</td>
<td>27-X-13 Nbk</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>ikkaru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AnOr 8 6: 9</td>
<td>9-VI-14 Nbk</td>
<td>(witness)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCBT 650: 3, 24, 35</td>
<td>11-I-15 Nbk</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>ikkaru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 17 68: 3</td>
<td>[x]-[x]-16 Nbk</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>ikkaru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIN 1 112: 4</td>
<td>25-VI-19 Nbk</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>ikkaru</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Ibni-Ištar/Nabū-šum-ibni**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Filiation</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GC 2 354: 3, 17</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n.p.</td>
<td>gugallu ša Bêlti ša Uruk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 3 9(^{280}); 1(^{[x]}), 47f.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n.p.</td>
<td>rab ešerti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>? YOS 3 76(^{281}); 2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n.p.</td>
<td>rab ešerti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 21 33: 1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n.p.</td>
<td>rab ešerti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YBC 9448(^{282}); 3</td>
<td>22-X-31 Nbk(^{1})</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n.p.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YBC 4000(^{283}); 4</td>
<td>3-VII-34 Nbk</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n.p.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>? AUWE 11 205(^{284}); rev. 8'</td>
<td>11-[x]-40 Nbk</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n.p.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{277}\) The first and the second column list the attestation and the date. Uncertain attestations are preceded by a question mark. The third column notes the cases in which the person in question appears without a patronymic (n.p. stands for “no patronymic”). The fourth column records any attested titles or functions.

\(^{278}\) Kümmel 1979: 58.

\(^{279}\) This is a receipt for oxen hides from B. It is not sure whether this attestation belongs here, or if it is another person. In the letter(order) NBC 4630 (18\(^{[Nbk]}\)) B. appears among shepherds (nāqīdū) at whose disposal oxen were put. YOS 17 68 (16 Nbk) is a receipt for small cattle presumably for offerings, received from a Bulluṭayā/Nanāya-ibnī. These may indicate that a homonymous person worked at the same time in animal husbandry.

\(^{280}\) This letter, as well YOS 3 76, was addressed to I. by Nabū-ahḫē-šullim (probably N./Nabū-udammīq) and concern mostly agricultural matters and irrigation. It is not certain whether the addressee of these letters should be identified with the gugallu and rab ešerti of the same name, since the letter YOS 3 9: 47f. mentions another [Ib]ni-Ištar, son of [Nabū-]šum-ibnī, who could well be this official, but, at the same time, not the same person as the addressee.

\(^{281}\) See previous note.

\(^{282}\) This attestation is not entirely certain due to the missing patronymic, though possible on account of context. It is a list of ploughmen, presumably organised by plough teams, giving their family ties and age (class). In the last extant line one reads, following Gehlken’s reconstruction, [šā or lā] 10-tī šā lūdī 15 (”[people of] the decury of Ibni-Ištar”).

\(^{283}\) Edited by Janković 2007: 221ff.

\(^{284}\) The text is edited by Janković 2005: 167ff.
Nabû-abḫē-šullim/Nabû-udammiq

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Filiation</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YOS 3 12: 2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n.p.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 3 30: 2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n.p.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 3 76: 1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n.p.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 3 84: 2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n.p.</td>
<td>(rab ikkarāti)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 3 142: 2, 6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n.p.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 21 33: 2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n.p.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OIP 122 172: 4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VS 20 134: 7, rev. 7'</td>
<td>18-[x]-26 Nb</td>
<td>n.p.</td>
<td>ikkaru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YBC 4000: 4f.</td>
<td>3-VII-34 Nb</td>
<td>n.p.</td>
<td>rab ešerti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YBC 9138: 5</td>
<td>[x]-XI-34 Nb</td>
<td>n.p.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YBC 3941: 2</td>
<td>- (38-42 Nb)</td>
<td>n.p.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YBC 3739: 4, 8, 12</td>
<td>21-VIII-40 Nb</td>
<td>n.p.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCBT 820: 3f.</td>
<td>22-X-40 Nb</td>
<td>n.p.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GC 1 252: 13</td>
<td>13-III-41 Nb</td>
<td>n.p.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YBC 3819: 6, 7, 9, 13, 15, 17, 19</td>
<td>22-IV-42 Nb</td>
<td>n.p.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YBC 3858: 1, 7</td>
<td>25-XII-42 Nb</td>
<td>n.p.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YBC 9161: 10, 12, 22</td>
<td>16-XIIa-42 Nb</td>
<td>n.p.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCL 12.59: 4, 6, 8, 14</td>
<td>ace Ner</td>
<td>n.p.</td>
<td>rab ikkarāti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIN 1 123: 3f.</td>
<td>22-[x]-acc Ner</td>
<td>n.p.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIN 2 120: 7f.</td>
<td>2-VII-acc Ner</td>
<td>n.p.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YBC 6868: 3f.</td>
<td>4-VIII-[x] Ner</td>
<td>n.p.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>? PTS 2312: 2</td>
<td>10-VII-I Ner</td>
<td>n.p.</td>
<td>ikkaru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montserrat 1: rev. 20'</td>
<td>- (13 Nbn or later)</td>
<td>n.p.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nabû-šum-ibni/Šuzûbû

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Filiation</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BIN 1 44: 3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n.p.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIN 1 60: 13</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n.p.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIN 1 154: 3</td>
<td>29-VIII-[x] Nb</td>
<td>n.p.</td>
<td>ikkaru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>? BIN 1 156: 10, 12 23</td>
<td>13-I-8 (Nb)</td>
<td>n.p.</td>
<td>ikkaru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCBT 650: 32</td>
<td>11-I-15 Nb</td>
<td>n.p.</td>
<td>ikkaru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 17 123: 3</td>
<td>5-II-19 Nb</td>
<td>n.p.</td>
<td>rab ešerti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIN 1 112: 1</td>
<td>25-VI-19 Nb</td>
<td>n.p.</td>
<td>rab ešerti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTS 3069: 17</td>
<td>8-[x]-28 Nb</td>
<td>(witness)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YBC 4000: 5</td>
<td>3-VII-34 Nb</td>
<td>n.p.</td>
<td>rab ešerti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YBC 9251: 6</td>
<td>30-XII-[41'] Nb</td>
<td>n.p.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

285 An *errēšu* of this name, but with no patronymic, is known from YOS 17 325 (8 Nb). It is unlikely that this is the same person.

286 Kümmel 1979: 68.
Nergal-inā-tešī-ether, son of Zabidaya

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Filiation</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BIN 1 44: 2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n.p.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIN 1 60: 12</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n.p.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIN 1 157: 2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>ikkaru</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCBT 1090: 2f.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OIP 122 172: 1, 54</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GC 1 63: 11</td>
<td>16-IV-10[^1] Nbk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIN 1 112: 2</td>
<td>25-VI-19 Nbk</td>
<td>rab ešerti</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 17 33: 2</td>
<td>20-IX-19 Nbk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YBC 3856: 11f.</td>
<td>11-VIII-28 Nbk</td>
<td>(witness)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YBC 9574: 3</td>
<td>20-X-33 Nbk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YBC 4000: 2f.</td>
<td>3-VII-34 Nbk</td>
<td>gugalu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCBT 158: 5f.</td>
<td>27-III-40 Nbk</td>
<td>ikkaru</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Silim-Bel/Aplaya

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Filiation</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BIN 1 44: 1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n.p.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>? BIN 1 157: 32</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>[x] ikkaru</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GC 2 354: 15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTS 2550: 3</td>
<td>30-IV^2-5 Nbk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 17 57: 2</td>
<td>9-XI-11 Nbk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 17 121: 2f.</td>
<td>6-II-12 Nbk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AnOr 8 6: 10</td>
<td>9-VI-14 Nbk</td>
<td>(witness)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIN 1 112: 3</td>
<td>25-VI-19 Nbk</td>
<td>rab ešerti</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NBC 4940: 2</td>
<td>27[^x]-X-20 Nbk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCL 12 38: 3f., 4f., 7, 9, 12, 13, 15, 17, 20</td>
<td>25-III-22 Nbk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCP 9/2 25: 4</td>
<td>3-[x]-28 Nbk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCL 12 46: 4</td>
<td>22-XII-32 Nbk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YBC 4000: 3</td>
<td>3-VII-34 Nbk</td>
<td>rab ešerti</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YBC 3830: 13</td>
<td>1-VII-acc Ner</td>
<td>(witness)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>? PTS 2312: 4</td>
<td>10-VII-1 Ner</td>
<td>ikkaru</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 6 4: 11f.</td>
<td>6-VII-acc Nbn</td>
<td>(witness)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCP 9/2 36: 6, 9, 13, 15, 18</td>
<td>10[^x]-II-[x] Nbn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 6 22: 9</td>
<td>5-II-1 Nbn</td>
<td>(witness)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OIP 122 169: 11</td>
<td>23-II-1 Nbn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AnOr 8 50: 5</td>
<td>18-XI-5 Cyr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[^287] Kümmel 1979: 72. His other possible attestations, both without a patronymic, could be in NBC 4775 (23 Nbk), YBC 9567 (39 Nbk) and PTS 2008 (not dated).

[^288] Kümmel 1979: 74. The appearance of Silim-Bel in AnOr 8 50 from 5 Cyr is to all likelihood posthumous. See above for details.
2.5. Overseer of the plough (rab epinni)

As little information on the organisation of the temple agriculture for the time of Cyrus’s reign as there may be, there is an abundance of texts from the time of Cambyses testifying to the activities of a group of men with functions very similar to those of the rab ešertiš of the earlier periods. These people, who were širkus and ploughmen, usually appear without a title. However, twice they are attested with the title rab epinni, “overseer of the plough”. On several occasions ten of these people appear together in texts, which indicates that the temple administration considered them to represent a distinct group of agricultural managers. For these reasons this group of people will be referred to here as the rab epinnis:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Text Reference</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agria/Nabû-dalâ</td>
<td>YOS 3 17 TCL 9 129 (not dated)</td>
<td>rab epinni</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sukkāya/ Nanāya-ĉreš</td>
<td>BIN 2 108 ((x) Camb) rab epinni</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nā’id-lîštar/ Arad-Innin</td>
<td>NBC 4612 (1 Camb) ikkaru, širku, rab epinni</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mukkēa/ Innin-ţer-ušabši</td>
<td>TCL 13 152 (2 Camb) ikkaru, širku, rab epinni</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nanāya-ĉreš/ Mukkēa</td>
<td>BM 113252 (4 Camb) bēl gimil</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Šadûnu/Libuṭ</td>
<td>YOS 7 102</td>
<td>bēl epinni</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Etellu/Zêria</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Šulûaya/ Sin-nâdîn-šumi</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innin-âḫḫe-iddin/ Innin-šum-ušur</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nâdîn/ Innin-ţer-ibni</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nîkkâya/ Nabû-šar-ušur</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ina-šîlli-Nanâya/ Innin-šum-ušur</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 15: rab epinnis

The title rab epinni is well known from Sippar, from the Ebabbar archive. Its use there differs, though, from the one we encounter in Uruk. In Sippar a rab epinni designates the leader of a plough team. This person, probably the eldest member of the team, usually had to deal with the administrative apparatus as a representative of his team and is thus the individual who most frequently appears in the written documentation (Jursa 1995a: 9f.). These people obviously existed in Uruk also, but here they were not given a specific title. They are only ever referred to as ikkarus.

---

289 The table below shows which individuals appear in a given text (indicated by an x). The titles noted in the first row below the text reference apply to all the individuals attested in that text.

290 There is, however, one attestation of a bēl epinni in YOS 7 102, which could be identified with the leader of a plough team (see p. 36).
2.5.1. Obligations

The rab epinni of Eanna had a larger sphere of influence than his titular namesake from Sippar. He was not only in charge of his own plough team, but was responsible for the ploughmen and sharecroppers of certain localities and their dues to the temple.\(^{291}\) This is exemplified by TCL 13 209 (not dated), an accounting text, which records in four individual entries the amounts of barley, spelt and wheat collected by Nāʾid-Īštar, Šulāya, Nādin and Sukkāya respectively from ikkaru and errēšu. Apart from the amounts which were at the disposal of Nergal-āḫ-iddin, son of Nabû-erēba,\(^ {292}\) and which he was supposed to transport to Eanna, the dues of the ploughmen and the sharecroppers were at the disposal of these four individuals, who are known as rab epinnis from other texts.

**TCL 13 209**

**obv.**

1. \(4\) me 40 gur 4₅₆ še-bar 11 gur še-zíz-ām  
\(3₅₆\) 4₅₆ 3 šila še-gig-ba šā sēbān šā lē-engar\(_{me}\)  
\(u\) ḫa-la šā it-ti lē er-re-šē-e  
šā 1₃₄₅-innin a 1₄₅₅-innin in-si-ru ina igi 1₄₅₅-innin  
5. ina šā 4 me 21 gur 5₃₅ še-bar 24₅₃ 3₃ še-zíz-ām  
\(2₃₅\) 3₃ še-gig-ba a-na ze-bē-lu a-na ē-an-na  
in a 1₄₅₅-ini-ig-di-šēš-mu a lē-ag-su  
re-e-ḥi 6 gur 4 pi 3 šila še-bar ina igi 1₄₅₅-inin  
e-lat še-bar ar-ki-it₁₄₅₅-sā ina šu \(1\)₄₅₅-engar\(_{neK}\)  
10. ū lē-er-re-šē-e i-si-ru  
\(1\) me 50 gur 1 pi 3 šila še-bar 10 gur še-zíz-ām  
pab 1 me 1+šu gur 1 pi 3 šila še-bar ū še-zíz-ām šā sēbān  
šā lē-engar\(_{me}\) ū ḫa-la šā it-ti lē er-re-šē-e  
šā 1₃₄₅-innin i-si-ru e-lat 6 gur še-bar šā šu-la-a  
15. ina šu \(1\) uttu-lugal-ūru lē er-re-šī iš-sā-a  
pab 1 me 1+šu 6 gur 1 pi 3 šila ina igi 1₃₄₅-ini-śu-la-a  
in a 1₃₄₅-ini 1 me 36 gur 3₃ 2₃ še-bar 10₃ še-zíz-ām  
pab 1 me 46 gur 3₃ 2₃ a-na ze-bē-lu  
a-na ē-an-na ina igi 1₃₄₅-ini-di-šēš-mu a lē-ag-su  
20. re-e-ḥi 19 gur 2₃ 4₃ 3 šila še-bar ina igi 1₃₄₅-ini-śu-la-a  
\(1\) me 1+šu gur 3₃ 2₃ še-bar 3 gur še-zíz-ām  
2 gur še-gig-ba šā sēbān šā lē-engar\(_{me}\)  
ū ḫa-la šā it-ti lē er-re-šē-e šā 1₃₄₅-ḫa-di-nu  
\([\)i]-si-ru a-na ze-bē-lu a-na ē-an-na  
25. ina igi 1₃₄₅-ini-di-šēš-mu a lē-ag-su  
\(50\)+3 gur 4 pi ū še-bar šā sēbān šā lē-engar\(_{me}\)  
\(1\) ḫa-la šā it-ti lē er-re-šē-e šā 1₃₄₅-su₃₄₅-ka-a-a₁  
i-si-ru ina igi 1₃₄₅-su₃₄₅-ka-a-a₁  
ina šā 3₃ gur 5₃ še-bar a-na ze-bē-lu  
30. a-na ē-an-na ina igi 1₃₄₅-ini-di-šēš-mu a lē[g-su]  
re-e-ḥi 17 gur 3₃ 1₃ ina igi 1₃₄₅-su₃₄₅-ka-a-a₁

\(^{440\text{;}4.4}\) of barley, 11 kurrū of spelt, 0;3.4.3 of wheat of the sūtu-obligation of the ploughmen and the shares (of the temple due from) the sharecroppers, which Nāʾid-Īštar, son of Arad-Innin,

\(^{291}\) Direct evidence for their responsibility for several plough teams is offered by BM 113252. The text is edited below.

\(^{292}\) The exact function of Nergal-āḫ-iddin is not clear. He is also known from AnOr 8 60 (9 Cyr), in which he delivers barley pertaining to the sūtu of the rent farmer Ile-Še-Marduk, son of Nabû-šum-ukin, descendant of Šēr, together with [PN]/Zēria, and from YOS 21 205 (acc Dar), in which he acts as a mār banē in a legal proceeding concerning the digging of a canal (for this text see below).
collected, are at the disposal of Nā'id-Ištar. From this 421;0.5 of barley, 24;0.3 of spelt and 0;2.3 of wheat are at the disposal of Nergal-aḫ-iddin, son of Nabû-eriba, for transportation to Eanna. The remainder of 6;4.0.3 of barley is at the disposal of Nā'id-Ištar. Apart from the later barley, which he will have collected from the ploughmen and the sharecroppers.

150;1.0.3 of barley, 10 kurrum of spelt, in total 160;1.0.3 of barley and spelt of the sūtu-obligation of the ploughmen and the shares (of the temple due from) the sharecroppers, which Šulāya collected. Apart from 6 kurrum of barley, which Šulāya took from šamaš-šar-ûṣur, the sharecropper. In total 166;1.0.3 (of barley) are at the disposal of Šulāya. From this 136;3.2 of barley (and) 10 kurrum of spelt, in total 146;3.2 are at the disposal of Nergal-aḫ-iddin, son of Nabû-eriba, for transportation to Eanna. The remainder of 19;2.4.3 of barley is at the disposal of Šulāya.

160;3.2 of barley, 3 kurrum of spelt, 2 kurrum of wheat of the sūtu-obligation of the ploughmen and the shares (of the temple due from) the sharecroppers, which Nādin collected, are at the disposal of Nergal-aḫ-iddin, son of Nabû-eriba, for transportation to Eanna.

[5]3;4 of barley of the sūtu-obligation of the ploughmen and the shares (of the temple due from) the sharecroppers, which Sukkāya collected, are at the disposal of Sukkāya. From this 36;0.5 of barley are at the disposal of Nergal-aḫ-iddin, son of Nabû-eriba, for transportation to Eanna. The remainder of 17;3.1 is at the disposal of Sukkāya."

The responsibility over the deliveries of agricultural products of the ploughmen and the sharecroppers transpire also from NCBT 652 (3 Camb), a debt note for arable products. This text is unique as it is a kind of a collective imittu debt note for the dues of the ikkurus and the errēšus. The total amount is charged against Agria, a well attested rab epinni, who is himself actively involved in arable cultivation as is evident from the entry in line 11.

NCBT 652

obv. 1. [...] 9[-x]-3 Camb

rev. 15. bab-ma 6 me 57 gur še-bar 19 gur še-ziz-âm 2₃ ṣe-gig-za₃ba¹

lú 1₃ ṣah-le-e ᵹengar⁷me

1 me 15 gur 1 pi še-bar 17 gur 2₃ ṣe-ziz-âm 1 gur 3₃ ṣe-gig-ba ᵹer-re-še-e bab-ma 7 me 72 gur 1 pi še-bar

36 gur 2₃ ṣe-ziz-âm 2 gur 5₃ ṣe-gig-ba ᵹer-re-še-e ᵹer-re-še-e bab-ma 7 me 72 gur 1 pi še-bar
“[..]; 90 kurru of barley, 1₉ kurru of [..]; 55 kurru of barley, 1₅ kurru of spelt [..]; in sum: 395 kurru of barley, 1₉ kurru of spelt [..]; 70 kurru of barley, 2 sütu of cress of Nanay-[x]; in sum 465 kurru of barley, 1₉ kurru of spelt [..] of the ploughmen. 40 kurru of barley, 5 sütu of cress of Samaṣ-eṣṣ in Til-agurrēti. 22 kurru of barley of Samaṣ-ēd-uṣur. 40 kurru of barley of Agria. 60 kurru of barley of Guzanu. 30 kurru of barley of Ḥarrān-Bēl. In sum: 192 kurru of barley, 5 sütu of cress in the limu of Til-agurrēti.
In total: 657 kurru of barley, 1ₙ kurru of spelt, 0;2.3 of wheat and 0;1.1 of cress, from the ploughmen. 115;1 of barley, 17;2.3 of spelt, 1;3.2 of wheat and 1 sütu of cress, from the sharecroppers.
Grand total: 772;1 of barley, 36;2.3 of spelt, 2;0.5 of wheat and 0;1.2 of cress, property of Ištar of Uruk and Nanaya, are the debt of Agria, son of Nabū-dalā. In the third month he will pay these 772;1 of barley, 36;2.3 of spelt, 2;0.5 of wheat and 0;1.2 of cress using the measure of the Lady of Uruk.
Witnesses: Gimillu, son of Aḫulap-Ištar, descendant of Kūri,
Iñáya, son of Bēl-zērī, descendant of Gimil-Nanayā,
Samaṣ-ibni, son of Gimillu,
Scribe: Nādin, son of Bēl-aḫḫē-ēqīa, descendant of Egiḇi;
Til-atināti, estate of the Lady of Uruk. 9₉-[x]-3 Camb, [king] of Babylon, [king of the lands].”

Occasionally there were problems concerning illegal transactions with the barley due to the temple. In a case of alleged embezzlement Etellu, son of Zēriya, one of the rab epi̇̇ṉis, was to be held personally liable if it was proven that another (otherwise unknown) individual sold temple barley in his presence:

PTS 2231 19-X-8 Nbn
obv. 1. ina u₄-mu ṯu-kin-nu lu-ū
da-ti-qu it-tal-kam-ma
a-na 'e-tel-lu₄ a-sū śa ¹numun-īa
a-tin-nu śa še-bar śa ³gašan śa unug³i
5. ¹š-sur a-sū śa "ag-sur-zi₇mek
ina igi-šu a-na kū-babbar id-di-nu
ma-la a-d₁na¹
lo.e. ḫu₄-babbar sum-na-ti
rev. 1[+e]n 30 'e-tel-lu₄
10. a-na ⁴gašan śa unug³i i-nam-din
⁶mu-kin-nu ṯu-gur-mu-mu
a-sū śa ¹ina-sūį-su r a ḫu-un-zu-ū
⁶nin-in-gi-a a-sū śa ¹numun-īa
⁶haš-da-a a-sū śa ¹id-di-īa
15. ḫu₄ umbisag ṯa in-nin-numun-gāl-ši
¹a-sūd₁ śa "u-na-na-a-siskur-siskur
u.e. [u]nug³i iti ab ud 20-1-lā-kam
mu 8-kam ⁴ag-i lugal tin-ti₄ki₁

“The day a witness or an informer testifies against Etellu, son of Zēria, that Iṣṣūr, son of Nabū-ētēr-napātī, sold barley belonging to the Lady of Uruk in his presence, Etellu will have to repay as much barley as was sold thirty-fold to the Lady of Uruk.
Witnesses: Nergal-şum-iddin, son of Ina-ṭēši-ētēr, descendant of Ḫunzūḫ,
Ištar-mukin-apli, son of Zēria,
Ḫašdāya, son of Iddia,
Scribe: Innin-zēr-u šabši, son of Nanay-ka rābi;
Uruk; 19-X-8 Nbn, king of Babylon.”
The rab epinnis’ responsibility for the deliveries of the ikkarus and the errešus is sometimes also expressed using the term sūtu (“rent”). The imittu list TCL 13 180 (1 Dar) illustrates this in its introductory lines: “Barley, spelt and wheat, [sūtu] of the ploughmen and shares (due from) the sharecroppers, pertaining to the sūtu of Agria, son of Nabû-dalāl.”† with a phraseology typically used to express the responsibility of a rent farmer.

Their role as intermediaries between the temple and the sharecroppers is also evident from a number of debt notes with the ša qāt expression. These texts are structured like the imittu debt notes, with the exception that they invariably concern the dues of the sharecroppers (zittu). The barley due, the property of the Lady of Uruk and Nanaya, is said to be at the responsibility (phraseology typically used to express the responsibility (ša qāt) of PN1, and charged against PN2. The first person, from other sources known as a rab epinni, is usually without a title, but is sometimes designated as ikkaru and a širku of Ištar of Uruk.†

NCBT 1012
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```
NCBT 1012 26-I-4 Camb

obv. 1. 13 gur še-bar ḥa-la níg-ga d’ininn unug['] u ‘na-na-a ša šu¹ ag-ri-ia a-šu ša ʾad-ag-da-la-a’ ina muḫ-hi ᵇba-ša a-šu ša šal-ti-dingir ina iti gu₄ še-bar-a₄ 13 gur

5. ina ʾša-šši-[u]šša ʾa-gšan ša unugki ina muḫ-hi maš-kál-tu₄ i-nam-din e-lat Šuk₄ ašša ᵇu-gal


10. ši₄-su₄-ga₄-šu₄ u₄-biš qa ᶇa₂-en-sur ši₄-t₄-hu₄ le.e. ša ᵇa ᵇa₂-gšan šu unug₄ iti bār ud 2-ša₄-[am] mu₂₄-kam ʾka₄₄k₄-bu₂₄-z₂₄-i₄-br a₄₄-lugal eš₄₄-kur₄₄

“13 kurru barley, share, property of Ištar of Uruk and Nanaya, at the hands of Agria, son of Nabû-dalâl, are the debt of Iqša, son of Šalti-il. In the second month he will repay the 13 kurru of barley with the measure of the Lady of Uruk at the depot. Apart from the guggallûtu-fee.

In the presence of Nabû-mukin-apli, the chief administrator of Eanna, son of Nadin, descendant of Dabibi.


Scribe: Marduk-násir, son of Madân-ëlhê-îddîn, descendant of Šûgûa; Bitqu-ša-Bél-êter, estate of the Lady of Uruk; 26-I-4 Camb, king of Babylon (and) of Lands.”

† TCL 13 180, II.1-4: še-bar še-ziz-ām u ʾša²šu ag-ri-gaššu-ša ʾšu² ag-engár ša ḫa-la ša <<ν>>/ ᵇa re-re-še-e ʾša² ša ᵇa-ag-ri-išša ʾa-šu ša ʾad-ag-da-la-a’. The traces at the end of line 1 cannot be interpreted in a satisfactory way. A collation is needed to ensure a reading. Probably a term designating a type of obligation was intended. The traces at the end of line 2 are either the remains of an erasure, or are a continuation of whatever was written at the end of the line above it.

†† Texts of this type are: NCBT 1012 (4 Camb), YOS 7 169 (4 Camb), YOS 7 180 (5 Camb), TCL 13 166 (5 Camb), UCP 10/8 244 (5 Camb). There are of course other texts with the ša qāt expression. Some of these are debt notes, very often for silver, but sometimes also for agricultural products such as barley or dates. These cases, however, do not belong to an agricultural context, as typical elements, such as zittu or imittu as appositions to the owed commodity, or stipulations for the guggallûtu-payment, are missing.

†‡ Thus in YOS 7 180, TCL 13 166 and UCP 10/8 244, all from the second month of 5 Camb, and concerning Mukkēa, son of Innin-žēr-ûšabî.
The use of the ša qāt expression in connection with agricultural officials is also known from earlier periods, from NCBT 650 (15 NbK), where it is used to express the responsibility of the rab eserti Bulluṭâyaa, son of Nanṭaya-ibni, over the duces of ikkaru and errēsīs. Above all, it is attested in a similar context in texts from Isin and Sippar referring to the guggallu. Indeed, Agria is himself attested as a guggallu once (YOS 7 186 (6 Camb)), but this is of no particular significance here. The use of the same terminology for different officials just reflects the lack of rigidity in this system, where overlaps of duties and functions were not uncommon. What remains, though, is the question of the liability of the person “at the hand” of whom the barley debts were placed. In other words, the question is whether these debt notes expressed their tasks as temple officials or their duties as contractors. As with the agricultural officials of the earlier periods a contractual relationship with the temple cannot be entirely excluded. No contracts are known for any of the rab epinni, with the exception of BM 113252 (4 Camb), which in itself is not comparable to any of the land lease contracts known so far:

BM 113252 18-IV-4 Camb


See p. 87.
291 See Jursa 1995a: 50.
292 For the guggallu of the Achaemenid period in Uruk see p. 128.


This document concerns ten people, nine of which are known from other texts as can be seen in the table above. Only Nikkāya, son of Nabū-šar-үүsү, seems to be a newcomer to this group and is not known from other sources. The text is divided in five fairly parallel sections. Each one of the sections treats two of these people together outlining their obligations toward the temple. They are in turn designated as ploughmen, širkus of Ištar of Uruk, and bēl gimils. The last title is not attested elsewhere, and cannot be interpreted with certainty. Deriving the word gimil from gimillu does not help our understanding of the phrase. “A person who owes somebody a favour”, bēl gimilli, as attested once (CAD G: 75), does not make any sense in an agricultural or an organisational context. Resorting to gimlu, a “resting ox (designation of an ox not to be used for hard work)” (CAD G: 76), offers no productive insights either. It remains conjectural in which way the title relates to the office of rab epinni.

The text is put in fairly general terms. Neither are the areas assigned to these bēl gimils precisely delineated, nor is the number of plough teams under their responsibility, nor are their dues to the temple specified in figures, as is the case in regular land-lease contracts. This was probably so because this text was not the original arrangement – these individuals are known to
have carried this kind of responsibility at least since the beginning of Cambyses’s reign — and the specifics such as the land and the plough teams at their disposal were already known to them and the temple administration. There were obviously no changes concerning these matters, so there was no need to be more specific about them in the text. Even the scope of their obligations is summarily stipulated, which indicates that the document is referring to a customary practice without introducing any novelties. The text simply states that each plough team should do the work according to the sūtu which was assigned to the plough teams by the king. This evokes the well known ‘Edict of Belšazzar’, which attests the royal involvement in the organisation of the temple agriculture. It was an attempt to increase productivity by creating a model outlining the workload imposed on and the output expected of a plough team. According to this model, a plough team was supposed to till 25 kurru of land and obtain a twelve-fold yield (i.e. 300 kurru of barley). Perhaps it is this norm that BM 113252 is alluding to with the phrase sūtu ša šarru iškunu, unless the Achaemenid royal administration implemented a different model. Although there is no evidence for this as yet, it does not seem entirely improbable in the light of other interventions in the temple agriculture conducted by the Achaemenids. At any rate, it is interesting to observe that the temple administration actually implemented the measures proposed (or imposed?) by the crown. However, this does not seem to be the crux of this document. It appears that the motive for this contract was a reorganisation of labour, resulting in a relocation of plough teams and merging of the workforce into teams under the authority of a pair of rab gimil. What prompted the temple administration to this move remains unknown.

We can deduce from BM 113252, however, that the rab gimils, and presumably also the rab epinnis, since we are dealing with more or less the same set of ten individuals, were in charge of several plough teams in several localities. Furthermore, it was their duty to impose a workload on them, i.e. assign them an appropriate plot of land according to a current norm dictated by the crown, and make sure their sūtu reached the temple. Where necessary they were to take on sharecroppers to work the temple land. Apparently they were also responsible for setting the impost (imittu obligation) for the ploughmen and the sharecroppers, in the manner of the yield estimators (ēmidus). That this allocation of obligations and labour could sometimes go wrong is documented by BIN 2 108 ([x] Camb). The text records an oath of three rab epinnis expressing their intention not to conceal the land of the Lady of Uruk or impose obligations of the ploughmen on the sharecroppers and vice versa. The situation is similar to that in YBC 4000 (34 Nbk). Here a gugallu and four rab ēsertis together with the ploughmen of a certain locality are warned against sharing the land of the Lady of Uruk and the draught animals between the ikkaru and the errešus under the threat of a death penalty. The hiding of the land appears as another illicit activity in this text.

2.5.2. Non-agricultural work

The rab epinnis were not only involved in the management of the agricultural production of the temple. Just like the rab ēsertis of the Chaldean period, they were also responsible for non-agricultural activities such as digging of canals and grinding of flour.

Public works are the background of the letters YOS 3 17 and TCL 9 129, two almost duplicates, written by Nabû-ah-iddin, the bēl piqitti of Eanna, to the šatammu and Nadin, a temple scribe, respectively. Etellu, son of Zēria, explicitly asks to be assigned digging work on a canal in a locality called Bit-Dabibī, as a compensation for his debts toward the temple. The other rab

---

299 They were appointed as rab epinnis by Gûbaru at an earlier point according to TCL 13 152 (2 Camb). For details see below.

300 YOS 6 103. For a commentary on the text see for instance van Driel 1990: 224f. and here p. 38 and 70.

301 Note, for instance, the setting up of Ardia’s rent farm for dates (p. 221) and the appointment of the rab epinnis (discussed in this chapter), both initiated by Gûbaru.

302 The text was edited by Cocquerillat 1968: 60. 121f. and Sandowicz 2012: 275f. See also here p. 139.


304 It is not obvious what the act of hiding land actually means. A misrepresentation of the amount of arable land under cultivation, and in turn of the yields pending, may have been implied by this.

305 Cocquerillat juxtaposed the two texts 1968: 101f. 117f.
epinnis appearing in the text, designated as ikkarus here, are mentioned in the context of the settling of accounts with them, of hiring workers and of problems concerning the lack of food, i.e. rations for the workers.

A text from the beginning of the reign of Darius, probably later than these letters, shows the large-scale rent farmer Gimillu, son of Innin-sum-ibni, involved in organising canal-digging through three men, of which at least one is known as a rab epinnis from other sources:

YOS 21 205 [x]-X-acc Dar

obv. 1. ć-an-na-li-pi-ú-šur a-šú šá 1-im-[x x]
    a 1-kidin 4-amar-utu 1-innin-na-numun-ba-šá a šú šá 1 x x]
    1-kidin a-šú šá 1-ā-lim
    1-bad-šešmek-ba-šá a-šú šá 1-bad-šešmek-m[u]

5. 1-ir-1-innin-na a-šú šá 1-numun-ia
    1-igi-du-šeš-mu a-šú šá 1-ag-su
    1-šá-pi-i-kal-bi a-šú šá 1-ag-šeš-m[u]

(one blank line)

10. šá 1-gašan šá unug 3-a-na 1-[15]

lo.e. 1-a-šú šá 1-ir-1-innin-na 1-da[1-ś-šešmek-šú-dů]
    a-šú šá 1-du-a u 1-ā-gi <ri> -ia a-šú šá 1-ag-1-da" -la" -a"

rev. 1-q-bu-u um-ma dül-la-ku-nu ina mu[ḥ-hi]
    id-šá- śa-tam a-na ḫ-e-ru-ta 1-ū la-[h] [1-ri]

    ina 1-en 1-ag u lugal a-na 1-ḡi-mil-lu ite-me-ū-ū
    1-ki 1-še-numun šá ni-ir-ri-šú i-ba-aš-šu dül-la-1-nu
    la ni-ig-mu-ru ul-tu ud 10-kam šá iti ab t-q[1-ḡar" ]
    la ni-ís-su-1-ḫu id-šá- śa-tam sur-rī-ma [x x x]

(one blank line)

20. 1-dumu-dumek šú-nu-ma mu-kin-né-e [O]
    1-ūmbisag 1-innin-na-mu-urū a-šú šá 1-[x x (x)]
    uru 1-ša-am-il iti ab u[d x-kam]
    mu sag-1-nam-lugal 1-da-ri-i[á-muš]
    lugal 1 u kur-kur

“Eanna-lip-úsur, son of Im-[x], descendant of Kidin-Marduk, Innin-zēr-iqiša, son of [PN],
Kidin, son of Tašlim,
Ea-ahḫē-iqiša, son of Ea-ahḫē-iddin,
Arad-Innin, son of Zēria,
Nergal-ah-iddin, son of Nabû-eriba,
Ša-pi-kalbi, son of Nabû-ah-iddin,
(these are) the mār banē, in whose presence Gimillu, son of Innin-šum-ibni, ša muḫḫi sūtū of the Lady of Uruk, paid to Nād-šētar, son of Arad-Innin, Dannu-ahḫēšu-ibni, son of Ibnāya, and Agiria,306 son of [Nabû-dalā], as follows: ‘I will ... your diging work on the Nāru-ša-šatammi.’
Nād-šētar, Dannu-ahḫēšu-ibni and Agiria swore by Bel, Nabû and the king to Gimillu: ‘There is no arable land that we still have to till. We have finished our work. Since the 10-X we have been digging [earth]. We will surely [...] the Nāru-ša-šatammi.’
The mār banē were witnesses. Scribe: Innin-šum-úsur, son of [x];
Bit-Šama-il; [x]-X-acc Dar, king of Babylon and of lands.”

306 It is not certain whether Agiria should be considered a variant of the name Agria. In case this identification is correct, two of the three individuals responsible for the digging are previously attested as rab epinnis. Dannu-ahḫēšu-ibni, son of Ibnāya, is not known from other sources.
Gimillu’s declaration to Nā‘id-Ištar, Agria and Dannu-abḫēšu-ibni is not clear. If one chooses to derive the verb from ḫiāru it would mean something along the lines of: ‘I will choose the (amount of) digging work on the Nāru-ša-šatammi for you’. This does not make much sense considering the three men’s reply, which sounds rather defensive. Another possibility would be to derive the verb from ḫerû and understand the phrase as a sarcastic question, accusing the three men of negligence: ‘Shall I do your digging work on the Nāru-ša-šatammi?’ (with an emphasis on “I”). However, while this sort of rhetoric could easily be found in a letter, its appearance in a legal record would seem somewhat odd. Be that as it may, at least the oath of the three individuals is straightforward. They claim that they had finished cultivating the fields and were engaged in digging works since a certain date. Their intentions for the Nāru-ša-šatammi in particular are obscured by a break in the text.

While the tone of some statements in this document is unclear, it is enough to illustrate that the rab epinni were responsible for the digging of canals and were answerable to the highest agricultural official – the large-scale rent farmer, ša muḫḫē sūṭi. In the absence of the large-scale rent farmers they dealt directly with the highest officials of the temple administration, bēl piqitti, šatammu, or temple scribes, as is demonstrated by the letters YOS 3 17 and TCL 9 129. Conducting public works and supervising their workforce were not the only duties of the rab epinni in the public works sector. They were also obliged to rally the workers whenever asked by the temple. Their work units consisted of the ploughmen, who were already under their responsibility for arable cultivation, and of settlers from the villages of the Uruk hinterland. Their obligation to assemble the workers is best demonstrated by TCL 13 150:

TCL 13 150          14-III-2 Camb

1. 10[b]u-ra-šu ša[b]e- ū lung[a]šur[a]šu
i-de-ek-ke-e-ma a-na[ld]har-ri kip-pi
i-nam-din u-му ša[ld]ag-din- <<-su>> -lugal-e[la]ša ugu[lu]bān  
5. ša ugu i .um-pi-du a-na ugu[ld]u-ra-šu i-šap-par-ru
u[ld]u-ra-ša la i-ša-nu
ḥi-šu ša[ld]gu-šar-ru[ld]nam tin-ti[k]
ù e-bir id i-šad-da-ad  
ša[ld]u-tu-mu-gin dumu[ld]man-di-di
iti sig[1]ut 14-kam mu 2-kam  
15. [ld]kam-bu-zi-a lugal tin-ti[k]

“Agria, son of Nabû-dalā, will rally 10 equipped urāšu-workers from among the ploughmen under his responsibility, and deliver them for (work on) Ḥarri-kibbi. If he does not deliver them when Nabû-balāt-šarri-iqbi, the rent farmer of Nār-Piṣīdu, writes (asking) for the urāšu, he will bear the punishment of Gūbaru, the governor of Babylon and Across-the-river.

Witnesses:    Ibnāya, son of Bēl-zērī, descendant of Gimil-Nānāya,  
Ardia, son of Šamaš-šum-ukīn, descendant of Mandiūd,
urāṣus were workers employed at public works, the urāṣu-service of the king. The temple was also obliged to provide urāṣus for the royal building projects and so one finds temple personnel such as the ploughmen, gardeners and shepherds with this designation (Jursa 1995a: 121. 185). Van Driel noted that the royal administration would occasionally “lend” these workers to the temple for its own projects (1989: 208ff. and especially 211; see also idem 2002: 264fF.). The urāṣus in this text are supposed to work on a canal for a rent farmer in the area of Nár-Piqlûdu. It is not specified for which institution, but it seems likely that this work was called for by the royal administration and that Nabû-balāṭ-šarri-iqbi was a rent farmer on royal land, since he is previously attested as a masənnu, a high-ranking royal official, in TCL 13 227 (probably from 7 Nbûn) and his attestations do not indicate a contractual relationship between him and Eanna. ³¹⁰ This text is therefore an order of the temple administration authorizing the royal administration to call on a rab epinni directly in order to assemble and equip a work unit consisting of ten ploughmen.

The rab epinnis were also in charge of the rations of the workers. The ploughmen, who were supposed to provide for themselves while they were engaged in agricultural work, were entitled to rations when employed at non-agricultural projects. The urāṣus were entitled to these anyway.

NBC 4612 (1 Camb) records a case of idle ploughmen. The date rations for these ikkarus were handed over to the ten rab epinnis, presumably for the purpose of distributing these among their workers. However, since the ikkarus did no work, the temple requested the 200 kurru of dates, or alternatively barley, to be returned. The text mentions another amount of barley or dates from the accession year of Cambyses’ and commodities for the rations of urāṣus, but due to the breaks this section is not fully understood.

NBC 4612 ¹-XII-1 Camb

obv. 1. 2 me gur zû-lum-ma è na-unug³ na-a¹ [³na]-¹ na-a¹
ša a-na šuk⁴-μa-šu lù engar⁴-sa-mu-tu
a-na šu-la-a a-ši ša ṣd-³0-na-din-μu e-tele-tu
a-ši ša lì-ze-ri-i-ia ²-li-² 5 15 a-šu ša lì-³²-in-nin-na
ša lù

5. šu-k⁴-ka-a a-ši ša ṣd-³²-na-na-a-kam lì-ag-ri-ia
a-šu ša ³²-àg-da-la-a ³²-² na-na-a-kam a-šuk-ke-e-a
muk-ke-e-a a-šu ša ṣd-³²-in-nin-numun-gàl-si
³²-in-nin-sē⁴-sa-μu a ṣd-in-nin-μu-ûru

³²[šu-du-nu a ³²-si ša lìb-lût u’ na-din a-šu ša ṣd-³²-in-nin-na-numun-μu-ûru
³²

10. [x x (x)] [³¹-sum-¹ na-zù-lum-ma-a² 2 me gur
ša a-na šuk⁴-μa-šu lù engar⁴-sa-mu-tu
[³¹-sum-na (x)] še-bar-a² 2 me gur
lo.e. [³²-μu] ina iti sig a-na nig-[³²-μu]
[i-nam-d]i-nu e-lat 1 me gur]

rev. 15. [x x x x x x] [³¹-saq³-nam-lugal-la
xxx x x x] me ū l-šu gur
[x x x x x a]-na šuk⁴-μa-šu ša ṣd-³²-ra-šu
[x x x]-nu-tu i-na gub-zu
³²-ag-gin]-a³ lù šu-tam è-an-na a-ši ša ṣd-³²-na-din

20. [a da-³²-μu] lì-ag-sag lugal
³¹-en pi-q]-e-tu-a³ è-an-na ū mu-kin-nu
³²-μu a-ši-gu-û-³²-la-a-ba-ši-³²-amar-tu-[³²-μu]
³²-μu [³²-μu]

25. ša lì-³²-en dumu lì-e-gi-bi na-[³²-μu]

u.e. [³²-μu] [³²-μu] [³²-μu] [³²-μu]

³¹⁰ See p. 250.
“200 kuru of dates, property of Išt[a]r of Uruk and Nanâya, that were (intended) for the rations of the idle ploughmen, were given [...] to Šulâya, son of Šin-nâdin-šumi, Etellu, son of Zêria, Na’idd-Išt[a]r, son of Arad-Ininn, Sukkâya, son of Nannâya-erêš, Agria, son of Nabû-dalâ, Nanâya-erêš, son of Mûkkêa, Mûkkêa, son of Innin-ër-ûsabî, Innin-ahê-iddin, son of Innin-şûm-ûsûr, šâdûnu, son of Lîblût, and Nâdîn, son of Innin-êr-înî. The [ploughmen][311] will give the 200 kuru of dates [that were given] for the rations of the idle ploughmen, [or] 200 kuru of barley, in the third month to the treasury. Apart from 100 kuru [...] accession year [...] and 60 kuru [...] for the rations of the уrâšu[s] [...].

In the presence of [Nabû-mukîn]-apli, chief administrator of Eanna, son of Nâdîn, [descendant of Dûbî]bi, and Nabû-ah-iddin, the royal [commis]sioner of Eanna.


The background of this incident remains inevitably obscure, but perhaps TCL 13 1522[312] (2 Camb) allows us a glimpse into its further consequences. According to this document, which was composed less than a month after NBC 4612, the same ten rab epinnîs are ordered by the šatammu and a royal official[313] to leave their sons, brothers and workers to guard the barley, and go to Babylon by the 25th day of that month. The text does not say what they are to do or whom they should see in Babylon. Though this is pure speculation, it is conceivable that they were being sent to some representative of the royal administration to answer for the work that had not been done and which the ikkarus under their responsibility were supposed to do.

Another point of interest in this text is the mention of Gûbaru’s intervention in the installing of these men in the position of rab epinnîs. After listing the names of the ten individuals, the text goes on to characterize them as “ploughmen, šîrku, rab epinnîs of the Lady of Uruk, which were installed over the ploughs of the Lady of Uruk at the order of Gûbaru, the governor of Babylon and Across-the-river.”[314] Obviously the state administration was not only interested in the large-scale rent farmers.[315] It interfered in the work of the lower levels of agricultural management as well.

YOS 7 174[316] (4 Camb) is possibly another record of the rab epinnîs’ responsibility over the rations of their workers. The text is a debt note for 24 empty old barrels charged against Šulâya, son of Šin-nâdin-šumi.317 The barrels are said to come from the villagers (asâšûs[18]) of Naṣibata and Birata and the ikkarus under his responsibility (šâb qâtišu[19]). Šulâya is supposed to collect the barrels and deliver them to the bêl piqîti. (Though it is not explicitly stated, these barrels were likely the vessels used for supplying beer rations to the workers. It is conceivable that these villagers and ploughmen were employed by the temple at some project at a certain point in the past and received beer rations. The vessels in which the beer was delivered were to be returned to the

---

[311] This reconstruction is uncertain. Alternatively one could read [îš gal apin] in the lacuna. At any rate, a term subsuming the responsible individuals previously named was written here.
[312] For a translation of the pertinent passage see Kümmel 1979: 100.
[315] Gûbaru, for instance, also installed Ardia as the temple’s rent farmer for dates (p. 221).
[316] The text is edited in the Appendix 1.
[317] He is known as a rab epinnî from other texts. Here he is designated only as a ploughman and a šîrku of the Lady of Uruk.
[318] These were villagers living on the estates belonging to the temple which could be drafted by the temple as additional workforce for agricultural work (Jursa 1995a: 8[35] . 133f.) or other activities, such as milling (see below; see also van Driel 2002: 207f.). This group of people was distinct from the ploughmen and gardeners.
[319] For this term see van Driel 2002: 213[92].
temple now by a person who was to all likelihood in charge of the workers and the distribution of the rations in the first place.

Another responsibility of the *rab epinnis* involved flour production and delivery. This was a task they held in common with many other temple dependants. VS 20 49 (6 Camb) is an account recording quantities of flour delivered by the ploughmen and other temple workers and its subsequent distribution for rations and various other purposes. Of the ten *ikkaru* named in this text nine are known from other texts as *rab epinnis*. It seems plausible, that they acted here as the representatives of the ploughmen under their responsibility and delivered their dues as well. This assumption seems even more likely when the amounts of flour they delivered are compared to the deliveries of the other temple dependants listed in the text. The second group of people delivered from 3 to 1 *kurru* of flour per person. Though the quantities of flour delivered by the *rab epinnis* vary strongly, from 3;2.3 to 49 *kurru* per person, in most cases they largely exceed the individual deliveries of the other temple workers.

In this context YOS 7 186 (6 Camb) should also be mentioned. This text records an agreement between the villagers (*aššābus*) of a place called Šingu and the temple authorities to grind flour under the supervision of Agria, son of Nabû-dalâ, at the same rate as the other villagers from the settlements of the Lady of Uruk. Agria is designated as a *gugallu* in this document (See p. 133 for further comments and references to this text).

2.5.3. Other activities

The *rab epinnis* were not only involved in arable cultivation and supervision of public works. They also appeared as debtors or witnesses in *imittu* debt notes for dates from the rent-farms of Ardia and Gimillu (as debtors: JCS 28, no. 27, YOS 7 136; as witnesses: BM 114644) and in the lists recording the deliveries of dates (NCBT 678, YOS 21 217). This indicates that on top of their other activities as ploughmen and agricultural officials they cultivated date orchards as well. In a few cases the *rab epinnis* are attested as guarantors in the *imittu* debt notes in additional clauses giving surety for the payment of dates (YOS 7 105, BM 114643). These in itself unique occurrences of guarantee clauses in *imittu* debt notes may be an indicator for their elevated position among other gardeners, possibly on account of their status as temple officials. At any rate, the appearance of these people in the role of guarantors suggests that they were considered to have the means to cover the debts of their fellow gardeners.

2.5.4. Summary

The *rab epinnis* were a group of agricultural officials who were attested during Cambyses’s reign. They were temple dependants (*širku*) and were recruited from the ranks of the ploughmen. Their function is similar to that of the *rab ešerti* of the Chaldean period. *rab ešerti* are not attested during the Achaemenid era, so it is probable that these two designations were used to refer to the same level of management of the temple agriculture.

---

320 The designation *ikkaru* appears in the introductory lines of the text: “Flour that PN1 and PN2 measured out from the ploughmen”, and in line 15, summing up the previous list of deliveries: “the total of the ploughmen”. The names in the list itself (ll.5-14) are not followed by a professional title.

321 These nine people (listed without a patronymic in the text) are: Etellu, Šulâya, Agra, Nâdin, Sukkâya, Nâ’id-Ištar, Mukkâ, Ina-šili-Nânâya and Nânâya-ēreš. The tenth person, Nânâya-iddin, cannot be identified with certainty due to the lack of a patronymic and his rather common name.

322 The document was written in the first month, while VS 20 49 dates to the fifth month of 6 Camb.

323 Having multiple tasks in different branches of the temple economy was not unusual. By comparison, the *rab ešerti* of the Chaldean period, who had similar duties to the *rab epinnis*, engaged both in arable and date grove cultivation. On top of that some of them even had undertakings in animal husbandry.

324 It is safe to conclude that at least some of the *rab epinnis* were well off. According to YOS 6 207 (17 Nbn) Nâdin, son of Imin-zēr-ibni, handed over his slave to the rent farmer Kalâbâya, son of Iqîša, from the family of Bâsia, in order to settle a debt of 40 *kurru* of barley. Similar cases, testifying to the *rab ešerti*’s personal wealth, were discussed on p. 91.
Ten *rab epinni* were employed at the same time. They were each in charge of their own plough team and in addition to this of ploughmen and sharecroppers of certain localities. Unfortunately the texts are reticent about the number of plough teams under their responsibility.\(^{325}\)

We are informed by one text that the *rab epinni* were installed over the ploughs by the governor of Babylon, G¹baru. They stood under the authority of the large-scale rent farmers. In the absence of these, they were directly answerable to top members of the temple administration, the šatammu, the bêl piqitti, and the temple scribe.

The *rab epinni* were in charge of overseeing the ploughing work in the localities assigned to them and were responsible for the grain deliveries of the ploughmen and the sharecroppers. They could also assign land to the sharecroppers and impose obligations on them in accordance with the customary norms. Their duties also involved non-agricultural tasks. They were responsible for rallying the temple ploughmen, *ur¤¡u* or settlers on temple land for different projects such as canal-digging or grinding of flour. They were also in charge of the distribution of rations to the ploughmen employed at these public works.

Some of the *rab epinni* were also active in the temple’s horticulture within the large-scale rent farm system: they are attested as debtors in *imittu* debt notes for dates and in lists recording deliveries of dates.

### 2.5.5. Attestations\(^{326}\) of the *rab epinni*:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Filiation</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>? PTS 2203: 2</td>
<td>n.p.</td>
<td>n.p.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCL 9 129: [23]</td>
<td>n.p.</td>
<td>n.p.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VS 20 61(^{328}): 6</td>
<td>n.p.</td>
<td>n.p.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YBC 3778: 5</td>
<td>n.p.</td>
<td>n.p.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 3 17: 15</td>
<td>n.p.</td>
<td>n.p.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NBC 4612: 5f.</td>
<td>10⁻XII-1 Camb</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCL 13 152: 7f.</td>
<td>12-I-2 Camb</td>
<td>ikkaru, širku, rab epinni ša BU</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCL 13 150: 2</td>
<td>14-III-2 Camb</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCBT 652: 11, 20</td>
<td>9⁻-[x]-3 Camb</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCBT 1012: 2f.</td>
<td>26-I-4 Camb</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM 113252: 7, 9</td>
<td>18-IV-4 Camb</td>
<td>ikkaru, širku, bêl gimil</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 7 186: 11f., 16</td>
<td>23-I-6 Camb</td>
<td>gugallu ša Bêlti ša Uruk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VS 20 49: 7</td>
<td>V-6 Camb</td>
<td>n.p.</td>
<td>(ikkaru)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 7 191: 14</td>
<td>7 Camb</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 21 205(^{329}): 12, 15</td>
<td>[x]-X-acc Dar</td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td>- (witness)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM 114467: 17</td>
<td>29-VI-1 Nbk IV</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCL 13 180: 3f., 13</td>
<td>1 Dar</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{325}\) Should we assume that, in analogy to the *rab ešerit*, the *rab epinni* were responsible for ten plough teams each? If this were so, this would indicate that the temple indeed had 100 plough teams at its disposal. This, however, is highly speculative.

\(^{326}\) The first and the second column list the attestation and the date. Uncertain attestations are preceded by a question mark. The third column notes the cases in which the person in question appears without a patronymic (n.p. stands for “no patronymic”). The fourth column records any attested titles or functions.

\(^{327}\) Agria’s name in line 23 is reconstructed following the parallel passage in YOS 3 17 (ll.15ff.).

\(^{328}\) It is not certain whether this fragment should be counted to the attestations of Agria. The name is recorded partially in line 6 ([‘a]g0ri-ia), but apart from the agricultural context (date arrears and *imittu* of fields are mentioned) there is not much there to help identify this individual.

\(^{329}\) The name is written as: *a-gi-<ri>-ia a-sû ša* [PN] (l. 12) and *a-gi-ri-ia* (l. 15). His appearance next to Nâ’id-Btar/Arad-Innin, who is also known from this milieu, makes his identification with Agria possible.
It is not certain whether this identification is correct. At any rate, E. is quoted in this letter to have said that his sîtu was ruined.

This attestation is not certain. It is a letter of Kurbanni-Marduk, possibly the chief administrator of Eanna (attested from 13016 Nbn, Kümmel 1979:143) addressed to E. He is given orders by the sender concerning deliveries of barley to certain individuals.

This attestation is not certain. The text, a short record of deliveries of barley or dates from four individuals, notes that 80 kurru of dates were received from E.

This is another uncertain attestation of E. He does not figure actively in this text. Rather, it is his son, the ploughman Šamaš-iddin, who is guaranteed for by two individuals, because of barley arrears charged against his father Etellu.

In this list of barley deliveries Innin-ahḫē-iddin’s 40 kurru are stated to come from (ina) Babylon and he is listed separately from Sukkāya, Nādin, Sulāya and Agria, whose barley deliveries are said to be a part of their sîtu-payment. Therefore it is not sure whether the identification of this individual with the rab epinni of the same name is correct.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Filiation</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TCL 9 129: 3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n.p.</td>
<td>ikkaru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 3 17: 3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n.p.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 3 107: 18, 25</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n.p.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>? TEBR 42: 7, 11</td>
<td>- [Nbn]</td>
<td>n.p.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 3 107: 19</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n.p.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>? AnOr 8 54: 2</td>
<td>3-X-6 Cyr</td>
<td>n.p.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NBC 4612: 7</td>
<td>10'-XII-1 Camb</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>? BIN 1 168: 6</td>
<td>2 Camb</td>
<td>n.p.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCL 13 152: 3f.</td>
<td>12-I-2 Camb</td>
<td>ikkaru, širku, rab epinni ša BU</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 7 122: 13</td>
<td>15-III-2 Camb</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(witness)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 7 139: 10</td>
<td>X-3 Camb</td>
<td>n.p.</td>
<td>(ikkaru)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM 113252: 1, 5</td>
<td>18-IV-4 Camb</td>
<td>ikkaru, širku, bēl gimil</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCL 13 166: 3</td>
<td>7-II-5 Camb</td>
<td>ikkaru, širku</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 7 180: 2f.</td>
<td>7-II-5 Camb</td>
<td>ikkaru, širku</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCP 10/8 p. 244: 3</td>
<td>8-II-5 Camb</td>
<td>ikkaru, širku</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VS 20 49: 12</td>
<td>V-6 Camb</td>
<td>n.p.</td>
<td>(ikkaru)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM 114643: 10</td>
<td>26-VI-7 Camb</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM 114467: 16</td>
<td>29-VI-1 Nbk IV</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Nādīn/Innin-zēr-ibni**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Filiation</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TCL 9 129: 3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n.p.</td>
<td>ikkaru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCL 13 209: 1, 11f.</td>
<td>1-IV-17 Nbn</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YBC 3778: 3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n.p.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 3 17: 3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n.p.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 3 107: 29</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n.p.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>? YOS 3 164: 2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n.p.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NBC 4612: 9</td>
<td>10'-XII-1 Camb</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCL 13 152: 6</td>
<td>12-I-2 Camb</td>
<td>ikkaru, širku, rab epinni ša BU</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>? YOS 3 197: 30</td>
<td>1-IV-4 Camb</td>
<td>n.p.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM 113252: 22</td>
<td>18-IV-4 Camb</td>
<td>ikkaru, širku, bēl gimil</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM 113434: 2</td>
<td>9-VIII-4 Camb</td>
<td>ikkaru, širku</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIN 1 102: 5</td>
<td>4-VI-5 Camb</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VS 20 49: 8</td>
<td>V-6 Camb</td>
<td>n.p.</td>
<td>(ikkaru)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD 45: 2</td>
<td>11-IX-6 Camb</td>
<td>n.p.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 21 217: 12</td>
<td>1 Nbk IV</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Nā'id-Ḥṣar/Arad-Innin**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Filiation</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TCL 9 129: 3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n.p.</td>
<td>ikkaru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCL 13 209: 3, 8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 3 17: 3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n.p.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 3 107: 19</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n.p.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>? YOS 3 197: 1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n.p.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 7 105: 8, 10</td>
<td>21-VI-acc Camb</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JCS 28, no. 27: 5f.</td>
<td>21-Vla-acc Camb</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YBC 11634: 5</td>
<td>8-VI-[x] Camb</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NBC 4612: 4</td>
<td>10'-XII-1 Camb</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCL 13 151: 3</td>
<td>12-I-2 Camb</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCL 13 152: 5</td>
<td>12-I-2 Camb</td>
<td>ikkaru, širku, rab epinni ša BU</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 7 124: 11</td>
<td>5-VI-2 Camb</td>
<td>(nukuribbu)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>? BM 113264: 8</td>
<td>(3-4 Camb)</td>
<td>n.p.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 7 139: 11</td>
<td>X-3 Camb</td>
<td>n.p.</td>
<td>(ikkaru)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Filiation</td>
<td>Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 7 169: 3</td>
<td>[x]-I-4 Camb</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM 113252: 18</td>
<td>18-IV-4 Camb</td>
<td>ikkaru, širku, bêl gimil</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM 113434: 3</td>
<td>9-VIII-4 Camb</td>
<td>ikkaru, širku</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VS 20 49: 10</td>
<td>V-6 Camb</td>
<td>n.p. (ikkaru)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 21 219: 8</td>
<td>1 Nbk IV</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM 114644: 16</td>
<td>3-VI-1 Nbk IV</td>
<td>-(witness)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 21 205: 10f., 15</td>
<td>[x]-X-ace Dar</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nanâya-êreš/Mukkêa

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Filiation</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TCL 9 129: 20</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n.p.</td>
<td>ikkaru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 3 17: [22]</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>ikkaru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>? YOS 21 117: 1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIN 2 108: 2</td>
<td>4-XI-[x] Camb</td>
<td>rab epinni ša BU</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NBC 4612: 6</td>
<td>10°-XII-1 Camb</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCL 13 152: 7</td>
<td>12-I-2 Camb</td>
<td>ikkaru, širku, rab epinni ša BU</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM 113252: 12, 15</td>
<td>18-IV-4 Camb</td>
<td>ikkaru, širku, bêl gimil</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VS 20 49: 14</td>
<td>V-6 Camb</td>
<td>n.p. (ikkaru)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD 45: 2</td>
<td>11-IX-6 Camb</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 17 300: 6</td>
<td>1 Nbk IV</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nikkâya/Nabû-šar-uṣur

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Filiation</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BM 113252: 22</td>
<td>18-IV-4 Camb</td>
<td>ikkaru, širku, bêl gimil</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sukkâya/Nanâya-êreš

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Filiation</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YOS 21 72: 11</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n.p.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCL 9 129: 15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n.p.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCL 13 209: 27, 31</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n.p.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>? VS 20 135: 7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n.p.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YBC 3778: 2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n.p.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 3 17: 18</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n.p. ikkaru</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NBC 4612: 5</td>
<td>10°-XII-1 Camb</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCL 13 152: 9</td>
<td>12-I-2 Camb</td>
<td>ikkaru, širku, rab epinni ša BU</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 7 139: 6</td>
<td>X-3 Camb</td>
<td>n.p. (ikkaru)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>? YBC 4164: 2</td>
<td>6 [Camb]</td>
<td>n.p.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VS 20 49: 9</td>
<td>V-6 Camb</td>
<td>n.p. (ikkaru)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Šadûnu/Libluṭ

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Filiation</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TCL 9 129: 4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n.p.</td>
<td>ikkaru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 3 17: 4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n.p.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIN 2 108: 3</td>
<td>4-XI-[x] Camb</td>
<td>rab epinni ša BU</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NBC 4612^336: 9</td>
<td>10°-XII-1 Camb</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCL 13 152: 8</td>
<td>12-I-2 Camb</td>
<td>ikkaru, širku, rab epinni ša BU</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM 113252: 7, 10</td>
<td>18-IV-4 Camb</td>
<td>ikkaru, širku, bêl gimil</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Šulâya/Sîn-nâdin-šumi

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Filiation</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>? NBDM 89: 24</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n.p.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^335 This reconstruction is based on the parallel letter TCL 9 129.
^336 The name in line 9 is badly damaged, but traces of the sign mu are still visible, and the patronymic is fully legible.
YOS 21 72: 6f. - -
NCBT 1219: 4f. - -
TCL 9 129: 4 - n.p. ikkaru
TCL 13 209: 14, 16, 20 - n.p. -
YBC 3778: 4 - n.p. -
YOS 3 17: 3 - n.p. -
NCBT 678: 3 4-VII -
? YBC 3750\(^{337}\); 28 4-XI-2 Ner - (witness)
JCS 28, no. 27: 4f. 21-VIa-acc Camb -
TCL 13 151: 4 12-I-2 Camb -
TCL 13 152: 4 12-I-2 Camb ikkaru, širku, rab epinni ša BU
YOS 7 136\(^{338}\); 5, 12, 13 9-VI-2 Camb -
YOS 7 124: 13 5-XI-2 Camb (nukuribbu)
NBC 4612: 3 10'-XII-2 Camb -
YOS 7 139: 8 X-3 Camb n.p. (ikkaru)
BM 113252: 18 18-IV-4 Camb ikkaru, širku, béž gimil
YOS 7 174: 6f. 1-IX-4 Camb ikkaru, širku
VS 20 49: 6 V-6 Camb n.p. (ikkaru)
YOS 21 217: 7 1 Nbk IV -

\(^{337}\) YBC 3750 is edited on p. 298. Šulāya, son of Sin-nādin-šum\(\text{\textdollar}\), appears as a witness in this land lease contract from 2 Ner. It is not certain whether he should be identified with our Šulāya, as his next attestation is from acc Camb and this would result in an unusually long gap in the documentation.

\(^{338}\) In this imittu debt note for dates from the rent farm of Ardiā Šulāya is the debtor together with his brothers Ištar-zēr-ibni, Guzānu, and Šamaš-qiṣṣa. Guzānu and Ištar-zēr-ibni appear also in the imittu list YOS 21 217. Of these three brothers Guzānu was possibly also involved in the supervision of the ikkarus on some level (cf. YOS 21 71, YBC 3164), but he is never attested with a title.
2.6. Overseer of the ploughmen (rab ikkarāti)

*rab ikkarāti*, the overseer of the ploughmen, is another member of the agricultural management we find in Uruk and Sippar. A lot of confusion about the reading of this title has arisen from the fact that the sign APIN can be read engar, standing for *ikkaru* (“ploughman”), but also apin, for Akkadian *epinnu* (“plough”). The scribes’ inconsistent use of the determinatives *ēk* and *ēt* and the phonetic complements only added to the confusion. This is especially evident in the earlier works on Neo-Babylonian agriculture. Cocquerillat, for instance, reads this title as *rab epinnēti*,339 not distinguishing between this official and the *rab epinni*. Several scholars found this interpretation duly disconcerting;340 however, it was Jursa (1995a: 1145, 87187) who was able to stress the difference between a *rab epinni*341 and a *rab ikkarāti* and secure the reading of the latter official with a couple of explicit syllabic writings from Sippar.

Only two people are attested with this title in Uruk. One of them is Nabû-ahhê-šullim, son of Nabû-udammiq, who was at the same time a ploughman and was also attested with the title *rab esérti*. He appears, as was demonstrated in the chapter on *rab esérti*, already during the reign of Nebuchadnezzar, but with this particular title he is found in Neriglissar’s accession year. The other person bearing the title of a *rab ikkarāti* was Šum-ukîn, son of Bêl-zêri, descendant of Basia, the well known large-scale rent farmer of Eanna.

Nabû-ahhê-šullim/Nabû-udammiq  
BIN 1 123: 3f.  
22-[x]-acc Ner  
ḫi̱ gal engar-ti

Šum-ukîn/Bêl-zêri/Basia  
TCL 12 73: 17  
8-II-1 Nbn  
ḫi̱ gal engarmek

YOS 6 40: 13  
23-VI-3 Nbn  
ḫi̱ gal engarmek

From the evidence from the Ebabbar archive we know that the *rab ikkarāti* was superior to the ploughmen and the local foremen. Only one person could be identified as a *rab ikkarāti* in Sippar with some certainty. This was Šamaš-iddin, son of Balâtu. Several lists of barley deliveries show that he was responsible for bringing in the *sûtu*-dues of the ploughmen of several localities. He was responsible for the irrigation of the temple fields and also had the authority to lease these out to sharecroppers. On top of that, Šamaš-iddin had a contractual relationship with the temple: according to CT 55 88 he leased 50 *kurru* of temple land (Jursa 1995a: 24f.). Texts recording his *šīšū*- and *ešrū*-obligations indicate that he also had a sharecropping arrangement with the temple. In other words, on top of being a temple official Šamaš-iddin was also a rent farmer and a sharecropper, and he even sub-leased some of this land, which was designated as his *bît sûtî*.342

Nabû-ahhê-šullim, the first attested *rab ikkarāti* of Eanna, appears with this title only in one text: BIN 1 123 (acc Ner) is a debt note for dates pertaining to the *sûtu* of Nabû-ahhê-šullim.343 The form of the text is parallel to the structure of the later *imittu* debt notes associated with the rent farms of the large-scale rent farmers. It is not clear whether Nabû-ahhê-šullim, just like Šamaš-iddin in Sippar, had an additional contractual relationship with the temple and if so whether this debt note resulted from his status as a rent farmer. This question was probably of no relevance for the temple administration, as it did not seem to distinguish between the official and ‘private’ obligations of its employees.

339 Cocquerillat 1984b: 144f. She takes this title to designate a “super-fermier” and to be a forerunner of the large-scale rent farmer. Jursa argued against this view (1995a: 87187). See below and p. 252 for a discussion of the origins of the rent farmers.

340 Joannès 1982: 127ff. does not decide on any one particular reading, but leaves the title in its Sumerian form. See also Kümmel’s discussion 1979: 99ff.

341 In Sippar this title designated a foreman of a plough team, i.e. little more than a simple *ikkaru*. Note, however, that in Uruk the *rab epinnis* were on a higher level of agricultural management (see previous chapter).

342 This text was edited by Cocquerillat 1968; 55f. 116.
YOS 3 84, a letter addressed to Nabû-ahhē-šullim by Sin-iddin, presumably the qipu of Eanna, gives information on some of the duties of a rab ikkarāti.\textsuperscript{344} Here the addressee is only indirectly referred to by this title. “What sort of a rab ikkarāti is it, that does not take care of the work and his districts?” is one of the rebukes Nabû-ahhē-šullim had to take from the qipu. He is compared to a certain Ibāya, son of Ḫanţashā, a person unattested elsewhere, who was apparently also not capable of collecting water and irrigating the fields. Furthermore, Nabû-ahhē-šullim is reproached for not having 20 ox-drivers (kulizzu) with him, for not paying the kisru ana Bēl tax\textsuperscript{345} with his colleagues and for failing to supervise the districts (tamirtus), collect water reserves and irrigate the fields. The qipu instructs him then to install a bēl ikkarāti (en ĕngam\textsuperscript{346}) to each district of the Lady of Uruk in Rudāya and Sumandar so that they may till the land. What exceeds their possibilities, the qipu declared to assign to the sharecroppers. It follows from this letter that the rab ikkarāti was in charge of the irrigation of the temple estates and that he was supposed to organise their cultivation. The mention of his districts (garin\textsuperscript{347}-sū) in line 7 and later (ll. 26f.) of the districts Rudāya and Sumandar, in particular, may indicate that he was assigned to these to supervise them, while other people, Ibāya for instance, were in charge of other districts. This is, however, no firm evidence that several rab ikkarātis were active at the same time. Ibāya may have been one of Nabû-ahhē-šullim’s predecessors in this office, and “his districts” could well have meant all of the temple districts. The mention of two particular tamirtus in lines 26f., may only indicate that these two were in need of a special treatment, while the others were causing no problems. Be that as it may, the matter of the geographical scope of responsibility of a rab ikkarāti cannot be resolved with only two documents as evidence.

The texts mentioning Šum-ukan as a rab ikkarāti are not very informative. Both TCL 12 73 and YOS 6 40 are land lease contracts. The lessees are a certain Innin-šum-usur, son of Nanaya-čes, in the Louvre text, and Sin-ibni, son of Šamaš-udammiq, descendant of Rē-i-alpi, together with Arad-Innin, son of Ibni-īštar, in the Yale text. Šum-ukan appears in both texts in additional stipulations, which make provisions for overlaps in payments and the leased land that may occur between him and the current lessees.

At the time Šum-ukan\textsuperscript{347} appeared with this title (1 and 3 Nbn) he had already started working as a large-scale rent farmer (ša muḫḫi sūti) for Eanna. The implications are that he was entrusted with a task of supervising the temple land and ploughmen, a task which had hitherto been undertaken by the temple administration. While it may seem slightly odd that an outsider to the temple household should be entrusted with such an office, this was by no means inappropriate, considering that his lease contract had already given him the managerial authority over large portions of Eanna’s land holdings and the men working on them. With a ša muḫḫi sūti in place, a rab ikkarāti was clearly redundant, and the interchanging use of both titles only shows that they were applied to one and the same function, until the letter finally fell out of use. The positions of Nabû-ahhē-šullim and Šum-ukan as rab ikkarāti are, however, not identical, even though factually there was no difference in terms of obligations and liabilities. Šum-ukan was an outsider and his personal liability stemmed from his contractual relationship with the temple, not from being an ostensible temple official. Nabû-ahhē-šullim was embedded in the temple agriculture already on a lower level as a ploughman, but also as a holder of temple offices (rab eserti, rab ikkarāti) from which his personal liability to the temple arose.

In general, the written documentation gives an impression that the management categories of the Neo-Babylonian temples are not set in a very rigid structure, at least in the sphere of temple agriculture. Responsibilities of different agricultural officials overlap widely. There is only a vague sense of specialization and hierarchical stratification. A very general distribution sets the ploughmen, gardeners and sharecroppers at the bottom, šatammu, qipu and the temple scribes at the top.

\textsuperscript{344} For an edition of the text see Joannès 1982: 127f. and Cocquerillat 1968: 92. 136. The letter should be dated to the reign of Neriglissar relying on the appearance of the qipu Sin-iddin.

\textsuperscript{345} In the imittu debt notes from the reign of Cambyses one encounters frequently a variant of this term: kišir esitti balātu ana Bēl. For the nature of this tax see now van Driel 2002: 172ff.

\textsuperscript{346} This official appears only here. He was, as it seems, introduced ad hoc to the structure of the agricultural management by the qipu in order to improve it. Since he is not attested elsewhere, it is impossible to tell whether this measure was in fact implemented.

\textsuperscript{347} A detailed description of his career can be found in the chapter on the rent farmers.
top, and *rab ešerti*, *gugallu* and *rab ikkarati* in the middle of the administrative hierarchy. Though the written documentation does not give us a strong sense of a vertical structure in this intermediary management level, there is still some indication that the *rab ikkarati* was superior to the *rab ešerti* and the *gugallu*. YOS 21 33 is a letter that a certain Ibn-Ištar wrote to a certain Nabû-aḫḫē-šullim. The letter contains a plea of the sender to have *urāšu* of the *ikkarus* sent to him by the addressee. The context allows to identify the sender as Ibn-Ištar, son of Nabû-šum-ibni, who is attested as a *gugallu* and a *rab ešerti* of the Lady of Uruk (see p. 93), and the addressee is to all probability the *rab ikkarati*. Ibn-Ištar addresses his former peer as “my lord”, which indicates Nabû-aḫḫē-šullim’s superior position and is evidence for a hierarchy among the agricultural officials.\(^{348}\)

Another feature of this system is the lack of a distinction between official duties and private enterprises. Hence the temple officials could, and were probably encouraged to, make a profit over and above their duties toward the temple and thus accumulate personal material wealth. In this sense their activities bore entrepreneurial traits. Being temple dependants they were no independent economic agents, but already van Driel characterised them as proto-entrepreneurs (1999: 216). This practice was advantageous for both parties and was certainly encouraged by the temple. Not only did the temple benefit from having more motivated employees who, driven by the prospect of personal gain, strove to fulfil their duties toward it. It also had the possibility to seize their personal property in case they failed to meet the requirements of the temple.

The first agricultural “entrepreneurs” engaged by the temple were its own employees. It is to these people that one should look in order to find the forerunners of the large-scale rent farmers and not necessarily to the specific temple officials such as the *rab ikkarati*. This is a shift in emphasis rather than substance: the proto-entrepreneurial aspect of their activities was not something specific to any one particular official; rather it is what most, if not all, institutional officials had in common and can probably be extended to the lowest level of the agricultural hierarchy, namely the ploughmen and the gardeners.\(^{349}\)

To sum up the evidence from Sippar and Uruk, the *rab ikkarati* was the top agricultural official of the temple. He was in charge of the agricultural production on the temple estates. This included the responsibility for the delivery of the agricultural products imposed on the individual cultivators and the responsibility for the irrigation system. Furthermore the *rab ikkarati* had the authority over personnel and land: he could recruit (*urāšu*)-workers, appoint overseers of ploughs, sub-lease land of the temple. The *rab ikkarati* probably at the same time entertained a contractual relationship with the temple. In general this official was recruited from the ranks of the temple ploughmen, but in case of Šum-ukin an independent entrepreneur was assigned to this office. In Uruk this office was supplanted by that of the large-scale rent farmer (*ša muḫḫi šiti*) and is only attested during Neriglissar’s and the first three years of Nabonidus’s reign. In Sippar this official is attested during a much longer span, from Kandalānu’s to Darius’s reign (Jursa 1995a: 11).

2.6.1. Excursus: The career of Nabû-aḫḫē-šullim\(^{350}\)

We have encountered this person already in the chapter on the *rab ešerti*. He had started out as a ploughman. One of his first attestations is in VS 20 134 (26 Nbkn) where he is designated as an *ikkaru*. He appears in a list of deliveries of barley, spelt, wheat and cress (UCP 9/2 25; 28 Nbkn). According to YBC 3856 (30’ Nbkn) he also supplied the temple with dates. In 34 Nbkn (YBC 4000) he is attested with the title *rab ešerti*, in a legal case concerning fraudulent distribution of temple land between the ploughmen and the sharecroppers (Janković 2005: 167ff.). His responsibility as a *rab ešerti*, an official who was presumably in charge of ten plough teams, is reflected in YBC 3858 (p. 85) from 42 Nbkn, an unfinished list of plough teams under his responsibility. This text demonstrates that at this time he was still actively working with a plough, as his own team is included in the list. YBC 9138 and YBC 4100 both from 34 Nbkn are debt notes for barley and dates

---

\(^{348}\) For further remarks on the letter see p. 59.

\(^{349}\) For the understanding of institutional offices as a kind of prebend see p. 252.

\(^{350}\) A list of his attestations can be found in the prosopography of the *rab ešerti*.
in which he acts jointly with Nergal-in-a-tēši-ēter, a rab ēšerti and a guggallu, and Nabū-ibni⁵³¹ as an intermediary between the temple and the debtor. Both deliveries were to be made at the canal Takkiri. In the lease contract VS 20 88 (35 Nb) he is again closely associated with Nergal-in-a-tēši-ēter. From this text it follows that they were in charge of land in the area of Naḥbutu. They had to share their plough teams with Nergal-nāšir, son of Nanāya-ibni, the new tenant. Toward the end of Nebuchadnezzar’s reign Nabū-ahḫē-šullim appears more frequently in the context of animal husbandry. YBC 3739 (40 Nb) and GC 1 252 (41 Nb), a contract Nabū-ahḫē-šullim made for pasturing the donkeys of a certain Bēl-ānān-apli, son of Zēr-Bābili, descendant of Ileṣi-Marduk, and a Standardurkunde listing 2,617 heads of small cattle at his disposal, respectively, have been mentioned in connection with the private businesses of the rab ēšerti (p. 91). All the while he continued his agricultural activities as is seen from the above mentioned YBC 3858 (p. 85; 42 Nb) and YBC 9161 (edited in the Appendix 1; 42 Nb), a debt note for dates, zittu of two sharecroppers, which are to be delivered to Eanna. The document stipulates that in case they failed to deliver the dates, they were to make the payment in barley to Nabū-ahḫē-šullim. In the accession year of Neriglissar he is attested with the title rab īkkarāti for the first time in an imittu debt note for dates (BIN 1 123). YBC 6868 ([x] Ner) is an imittu debt note for dates pertaining to his sittu, a text with the same structure as BIN 1 123 (see above). In this text he is not given a title. According to TCL 12 59 (acc Ner), an imittu list for dates, he is responsible for the deliveries of temple gardeners and sharecroppers from the estates on the Nār-šarrī and the Takkiri. In a letter (YOS 21 33) written to him by Ibni-Ištar, who is to all likelihood to be identified with a rab ēšerti and a guggallu of the same name (see p. 59), he is requested to draft urāšu-workers of the ploughmen and send them to the author of the letter. In PTS 2312 (1 Ner), a collective debt note for sesame, sittu of the ikkarus, he appears together with Nanāya-ah-iddin, Sīlim-Bēl and Šar-ilāni as a debtor. Their obligations are said to pertain to the sittu of Šum-ukin. At the latest in 1 Nb he appears as a rab īkkarāti in a document by the rent farmer Šum-ukin, son of Bēl-zērī, descendant of Basia. He is also mentioned in a letter (AfO 44/45, 156) which Marduk-šum-usur wrote to his uncle Šum-ukin. He is mentioned in a broken context, but it is apparent that the king had sent to the temple administrators written instructions concerning Nabū-ahḫē-šullim. Perhaps this had something to do with the end of his career as a rab īkkarāti. Nabū-ahḫē-šullim’s latest attestation is in a cadastral text (Montserrat 1: rev. 20'ff.). The text can be dated to 13 Nbn or later, since this year appears in one of the entries as the year of the purchase of a certain property. It informs us that he was indebted to the temple, probably as a result of his activities in the agricultural or the animal husbandry sector, but that he also had personal assets in form of a plot of the size of approximately 4.5 hectares. This plot, designated as husbandry sector, but that he also had personal assets in form of a plot of the size of approximately 4.5 hectares. This plot, designated as husbandry sector. Clearly Nabū-ahḫē-šullim, who started out as a ploughman in 26 Nb had a fairly successful career. From an ikkaru he was promoted to a rab ēšerti (34 Nb) and then to a rab īkkarāti (acc Ner). He was replaced in this office by the rent farmer Šum-ukin at the latest in the first year of Nabonidus. Nabū-ahḫē-šullim was active in arable cultivation and date production, but also in animal husbandry, and managed to accumulate considerable personal assets during his active career. However, he also accumulated debts which the temple settled by confiscating his orchard plot.

End of excursus

⁵³¹ Nabū-ibni (no patronymic) appears only in YBC 4100. His identity is unknown.
⁵³² Perhaps he lost this office already in 1 Ner. According to the above mentioned PTS 2312 at this time he was an ikkaru under the responsibility of the rent farmer Šum-ukin.
⁵³³ A new edition of the letter can be found in Hackl, Janković and Jursa 2011: 202.
⁵³⁴ This is a term for land of inferior quality which could be reclaimed for the cultivation of date orchards (van Driel 1990: 222ff.).
2.7. Estate managers (gugallu)

The term gugallu is attested at least since the Old-Akkadian period and is conventionally rendered in English as “canal inspector”.\(^\text{355}\) This translation, however, is too narrow. A broader understanding of the term, e.g. “estate manager”, fits the scope of a gugallu’s activities better. The gugallus are well attested in the texts from Eanna and Ebabbar, but their appearance in the documentation from the 1\(^\text{st}\) millennium B.C. is by no means restricted to the temple archives. They frequently appear in the texts from private archives, usually as people working on royal estates and (indirectly) representing the interests of the crown.\(^\text{356}\) There is even some indication that they could be employed by private individuals on private estates.\(^\text{357}\) In keeping with the general subject matter of this study, the following remarks will be restricted to the gugallus in a temple environment, unless otherwise specified.

The most complete treatment of the institutional (temple) gugallus to date can be found in Jursa 1995a: 49ff. His description of their organisation and duties draws mostly on the evidence from the Ebabbar of Sippar from the period of the Achaemenid rule. To sum up Jursa’s findings, it can be said that the gugallus were recruited from the ranks of the gardeners, some of which even went on to become rent farmers (fermiers généraux) for the temple (ibid.: 50). It is, however, still unclear whether outsiders to the temple household, i.e. private entrepreneurs, could take on the ‘office’ of a gugallu (ibid.: 49). In general, the nature of their activities, which indeed bear some entrepreneurial traits, remains ambiguous: were the gugallus primarily temple functionaries or have their responsibilities during the 1\(^\text{st}\) millennium B.C. evolved to tax farming (ibid.: 51)? At any rate it could be observed that the gugallus acted as intermediaries between the gardeners and the rent farmers or, in the absence of rent farmers, directly the land owner, i.e. the temple. They were responsible for groups of gardeners, usually associated with a certain locality, and their date deliveries in particular (ibid.: 50). This is explicitly evident from a list from the Ebabbar archive which names 16 people (gardeners) under the responsibility (ša qāt) of a gugallu (ibid.: 49). These units of agricultural workers were not only of relevance in the management of date grove cultivation. They were also deployed under the supervision of a gugallu as work gangs for non-agricultural work. Thus the gugallus appear in imittu lists recording deliveries of dates due to the temple, occasionally both in the individual entries with dues from their own plots and as the persons responsible for the total amount expected from the gardeners appearing in the list (ibid.: 50), but also in contracts concerning the performance of public works (ibid.: 182). Not surprisingly, these public works entailed the upkeep and the expansion of the irrigation system, as a small number of pertinent documents demonstrates (ibid.: 53. 182). The gugallus are also occasionally attested as the addressees of letter orders in which they are instructed by the temple authorities to give out dates or barley to certain authorised recipients (ibid.: 51). This demonstrates that the gugallus could be responsible for the storage of large quantities of agricultural products off the temple’s central storage facilities.

The gugallus’ main responsibilities were also briefly described by Coqueurillat 1968: 67, who, basing her interpretation on the Uruk evidence from the Achaemenid period, rendered the term as collecteur-garde-messier (“collector-keeper-measurer”),\(^\text{358}\) alluding to their duties to collect agricultural produce, measure, store and guard it.

The attestations of the gugallus are not evenly distributed over time. From the time of Cyrus on there is a large number of texts mentioning this official, with only a trickle of attestations

\(^{355}\) For other translations see Salonen 1968: 339. For a brief discussion of gugallu’s functions and responsibilities and for earlier literature on the subject see Janković 2007: 219ff. See also Jursa and Waerzeggers 2009: 240ff., especially with regard to the evidence from Borsippa.

\(^{356}\) A gugallu ša šarrī is attested in the Eanna letter YOS 21 17 concerning the setting up of the borders of some irrigation districts. Note also the attestation of one, or perhaps two, royal gugallus (gugallu ša šarrī, BM 120024: 24) in the Late-Achaemenid Tattannu archive (Jursa and Stolper 2007: 258).

\(^{357}\) Van Driel 2002: 180 (cf. Nbk. 244 and perhaps also VS 3 24).

\(^{358}\) See also Coqueurillat’s remarks on the gugallus in 1984b: 167 including additional evidence from new texts. Note that the second text quoted by her, JCS 28, no. 44, does not belong to the Eanna archive, but probably to the archive of Silim-Bēl/Arrabi, a royal rent farmer from Isin.
of *gugallûs* predating the Achaemenid period. Kümmel lists in his prosopography for Uruk only *gugallûs* attested from Cyrus to Cambyses, with the exception of the one attested in 1 Nbk (1979: 103). This man is, however, not a member of the temple household but of the estate of the *simmagir*-official (*bit simmagir*). While most of the evidence for *gugallûs* both from Uruk and Sippar comes from the time of the Achaemenid rulers, chiefly in the context of the *guggalîtu*-payments recorded in the *imittu* debt notes, it has been assumed that these officials, or at least people carrying out their functions, existed in the temples also prior to this period. It is therefore not surprising that several recently discovered texts from the Eanna archive support this assumption. During Nabonidus’s reign no *gugallûs* are attested in the two temple archives. This can perhaps be attributed to the reorganisation of the management of agriculture caused by the establishment of the large-scale rent farms. The rent farmers were themselves responsible for the collection, storing and transportation of agricultural produce. Whichever way they organised these activities, it was of marginal importance to the temple administration, and so it is not surprising that they and the people carrying them out do not, or only rarely, appear in the temple’s documentation. That the tasks of *gugallûs* still had to be carried out need not be stressed, and indeed, people entrusted with such tasks, though without a particular title, could be identified in the Ebabbar at the time of Nabonidus. These same people, in fact, appear later, after the dissolution of the large-scale rent farms as *gugallûs* (Jursa 1995a: 49).

In the following pages the period of agricultural management preceding the introduction of the large-scale rent farms will be referred to as the early phase and the *gugallûs* active in it as the “early” *gugallûs* in contrast to the late phase of the Achaemenid period.

### 2.7.1. The early phase

Everything we have known so far about the temple *gugallûs* came from the Achaemenid period. This is also true for the evidence from Sippar. Now eight new documents from the time of Nebuchadnezzar in which *gugallûs* appear could be identified. Together with Truro 11 (= *AfO* 24: 125) which was known to Kümmel (1979: 103) there are then altogether nine texts from the Eanna archive from the reign of Nebuchadnezzar mentioning *gugallûs*:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NBC 4575</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD 5</td>
<td>6-IX-1 Nbk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truro 11</td>
<td>9-IX-1 Nbk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YBC 9221</td>
<td>16-XII-18 Nbk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YBC 9144</td>
<td>25-I-22 Nbk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTS 2850</td>
<td>19-XI-26 Nbk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YBC 9448</td>
<td>22-X-31 Nbk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YBC 9213</td>
<td>27-VI-34 Nbk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YBC 4000</td>
<td>3-VII-34 Nbk</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

359 These were, as Jursa noted, not necessarily *gugallûs* that were to be assigned to the temple administration. One at least is a *guggaltu* of the royal official *mašenna* (1995a: 49).

360 The *gugallûs* and the *guggalîtu*-payments, however, do appear in this period in the texts from some private archives, most notably Egibi from Babylon and Ea-ilûta-bûni from Borsippa. For the attestations see van Driel 2002: 181f. (*TCL* 12 97 (10 Nbn) can be added to the attestations from Borsippa.)

361 These are five hitherto unpublished ones and three published texts (Sack CD 5, YBC 4000, YBC 9448), which were not included in Kümmel’s prosopography as they were published at a later date.

362 This text, together with the closely related Truro 11, has been recently re-edited and discussed by Janković and Weszeli *in press*.

363 See previous note.

364 Published and edited by Janković 2007: 221ff.

365 Published and edited by Janković 2005: 167ff.
The *gugallus* appearing in these texts are not all members of the Eanna household. Some of them come from the households of royal officials. The institutional affiliation of others yet is not indicated in the texts, nor can it be determined prosopographically.366

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Ownerships</th>
<th>Institutions</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Patronymic Identification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nabû-nāṣir/Âḥ-îšîr</td>
<td>6-IX-1 Nbk</td>
<td>CD 5</td>
<td>Truro 11</td>
<td><em>gugallu ša bit simmagir</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9-IX-1 Nbk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>gugallu ša simmagir</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marduk</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>NBC 4575</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>gugallu ša šakin māti</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marduk/Amuru-ušēzib</td>
<td>16-XII-18 Nbk</td>
<td>YBC 9221</td>
<td></td>
<td>- (šxxxxša gugalitten ša šakin māti ina pān M.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nabû-zēr-ibni</td>
<td>25-I-12 Nbk</td>
<td>YBC 9144</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>gugallu</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amuru-šar-uşur/İašdia</td>
<td>19-XI-26 Nbk</td>
<td>PTS 2850</td>
<td>NCBT 647</td>
<td><em>gugallu</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[x]-[x]-27 Nbk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>gugallu ša šakin māti</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amuru-mukīn-apli/Amuru-šar-uşur</td>
<td>22-X-31 Nbk¹</td>
<td>YBC 9448</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>gugallu ša šakin māti (bēl piqitt śa Ḫannin-il, šāpirī śa qēmēt śa šarri)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>İbni-İ̇̄štar/Nabû-šum-ibni</td>
<td>22-X-31 Nbk¹</td>
<td>YBC 9448</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>gugallu ša Bēli śa Uruk</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nergal-šum-uşur</td>
<td>27-VI-34 Nbk</td>
<td>YBC 9213</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>gugallu</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nergal-lna-teši-čer/Zabidiyya</td>
<td>3-VII-34 Nbk</td>
<td>YBC 4000</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>gugallu</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 16: The “early” *gugallus*

Of the people listed above three can be identified as external *gugallus*, i.e. *gugallus* working for institutions other than the Eanna temple: Nabû-nāṣir worked for *(bi)t simmagir*, and Marduk,367 Amuru-šar-uşur,368 and Amuru-mukīn-apli worked for *šakin māti*. Two people listed in the table can be identified as *gugallus* of Eanna: İbni-Ištar and Nergal-lna-teši-čer.369 The institutional affiliation of the others cannot be determined. The attestations of Nergal-šum-uşur and Nabû-zēr-ibni as *gugallus* do not record their patronymics, so it is impossible to identify them with any degree of certainty. Both names appear in other texts of the period and the people bearing them are sometimes designated as *ikkarū*,370 however, since these are not uncommon names, it is doubtful...

---

366 The new texts, especially those in which the external *gugallus* appear, Though not always relevant for the agriculture of Eanna, are of particular interest for illuminating the connections of the temple to the local royal institutions.

367 Marduk from NBC 4575 is probably identical with the person with the same name and the patronymic Amuru-ušēzib from YBC 9221. The latter text does not explicitly designate him as a *gugallu ša šakin māti*, as is the case in the former document, but even though the text is badly damaged and unintelligible, a connection to this office can be established thanks to the expression in II. 1f.: šxxxxša gugalitten ša šakin māti ina pān M. The *šakin māti* in question, as well as in YBC 9448, is to all probability the governor of the Seal, whose entourage had some connections to the sanctuary of Amuru, Ekurgal. This is suggested by the onomastics in these texts, notably the personal names containing the divine name Amuru. For the sanctuary of Amuru, the location of which is not known, but which one should look for in the southern part of Babylonia generally designated as the Seal, see Beaulieu 2003: 327ff.

368 Amuru-šar-uşur is not attested with a patronymic in PTS 2850 and his identification with Amuru-šar-uşur, son of Ḫašdia, from NCBT 647 is conjectural, though probable. It is not certain, though likely, that there is a familial connection between him and Amuru-mukīn-apli, the *gugallu* of the *šakin māti*, whose father bears the same name.

369 These two men are also known at other times with the title *rab ešerti*.

370 Nergal-šumu-uşur in PTS 2107 (18 Nbk) and Nabû-zēru-ibni in YOS 17 326 (11 Nbk) and NBC 4940 (20 Nbk).
if these attestations should be attributed to the individuals in question. It is therefore possible that these two men belonged to Eanna’s internal organisation, but it is by no means certain.

2.7.1.1. Arable cultivation

Apart from the obvious, that the gugallu were in fact active during the early phase, little is revealed by the texts about their activities. Primarily, their involvement in the cultivation of arable land can be confirmed. The later, Achaemenid, evidence led to the assumption that they were chiefly concerned with the management of the cultivation of date orchards. So far there was only one instance in our evidence that gave some indication for their connection to arable cultivation and barley: Cyr. 225 (6 Cyr) from Sippar, a survey of arable land under the responsibility of a gugallu. While most of the new evidence for the early phase is not unambiguous with respect to their activities and even more importantly, their institutional affiliation, it in fact tilts the scales in favour of their involvement in the arable cultivation. Among the texts in which these officials appear with a title there is not one mentioning dates or the cultivation of date orchards. Probably the most important text in this group is YBC 4000 (published in Janković 2005: 167ff.) which shows that the gugallu were closely involved in the management of the arable cultivation. It records an order prohibiting the arbitrary sharing of agricultural resources between ploughmen and sharecroppers. The order, which was addressed to the ploughmen, was delivered to them in the presence of a group of overseers: four rab eserti and one gugallu. Consequently it is clear that the gugallu had at some level the responsibility for supervising the ikkaru and the errêšu and their land allotments. On the example of Nergal-in-a-têši-êter, who appears in this document, it is also evident that a simple ikkaru could advance (via the post of a rab eserti) to the position of a gugallu.

Furthermore, two of the texts involve barley šibšu-obligations (YBC 9144 and 9213) and PTS 2850 deals with barley of unspecified origin, thus giving more indirect evidence for the gugallu’s involvement in the arable cultivation.

YBC 9144 25-I-22 Nbk

obv. 1. [x+]23 gur še-bar ši-ib-šú šá [x x] ṣunu]gki-a-a [x x] x šá mu 22-kam (line squeezed in)
    [nig-ga aššin nišu dha-n[a-a]
    ra-šu-tu šá ugu]šu nišu gki-a-a]

5. šá ag-numun-du  ŠGAL sum-nu (line squeezed in)
    ina ugu  šam-utu-ga (text: za)-mu a-šú šá [∅]
    ŠE-bar ga-mir-ti ina ŠGAL ma-ši-ḫu
    šá ē-an-na ina ē-an-na

10. i-nam-din

rev. ši  mu-kin-nu  ŠE-bar-mu-gi
    a-šú šá  ag-<<erasure>>-numun-du a šitim
    ši-ša-a a-šú šá  ag-mu-dú a šanga-du

(one blank line)

u šumisag 1-du 15 a-šú šá

15. [ag-numun-gin a azlag
    nišu dha-n[a-a]
    šu-la-a a-šú šá  ag-mu-dú a šanga-du
    šu-la-a a-šú šá  ag-mu-dú a šanga-du

371 These could have been different people altogether. There were certainly at least three individuals going by the name Nabû-zêru-ibni, since at least three different patronymics are attested for it during Nebuchadnezzar’s reign.
372 Cyr. 225, 1-2: [meš]-šat ŠE-numun še-bar zag šá gurim gi-šu-šú nig-ga 4·utu / šá ē 1·dub-nunu ŠGAL-gal (see Jursa 1995a: 50).
373 YBC 9448 possibly also points in this direction by mentioning, unfortunately in a badly damaged section, sharecropping in connection to the royal land, which was possibly to be organised by the temple gugallu (see below for a translation of the text; a full edition can be found in Janković 2007: 221ff.).
374 See the prosopographical entry for Nergal-in-a-têši-êter in the chapter on rab eserti.
“23° kurru of barley, share of [...] the Ur[ukeans, [... of the 22nd year, property of Ištar of Uruk and Nanāya, credit charged against the Urukeans, which Nabû-zêr-ibni, the gugallu, had given, is the debt of Marduk-šakin-šumi, son of Šamaš-šūm-ukin, descendant of Esagilâya. He will pay the entire barley with the measure of Eanna in Eanna.

Witnesses: Šamaš-šūm-ukin, son of Nabû-zêr-ibni, descendant of Itinnu, Šulâya, son of Nabû-šûm-ibni, descendant of Šangû-Šamaš,

Scribe: Ibni-Ištar, son of Nabû-zêr-ukin, descendant of Ašlâku; Uruk; 25-I-22 Nbk, king of Babylon.”

The text is difficult. The protagonists are not known from other sources, and the background of the transaction is obscure. It would appear that the citizens of Uruk were involved in sharecropping (indicated by the use of the term ibû) on land owned by Eanna. At any rate, the object of the debt, 23° kurru of barley, are said to be the property of Ištar and Nanāya and are ultimately to be delivered to the temple. One person, Marduk-šakin-šumi, assumed responsibility for this debt, perhaps as a representative of the group of citizens, or alternatively as their sub-tenant. The gugallu Nabû-zêr-ibni appears in a line which is a later addition (l. 5), as the signs are smaller, somewhat squashed and are not stretching over the entire length of the line. His role in this transaction is not clear. The text only states that he had given the barley owed. However, we are not informed to whom and for what reason this delivery was made. Perhaps the gugallu had given the barley to the temple from his personal reserves on behalf of the Ur[ukeans. Now they were obliged to deliver the barley through their representative (or sub-tenant?) in Eanna. If this interpretation were correct, however, it would be odd that the text failed to note that the barley which was to be paid by Marduk-šakin-šumi would go on the ‘account’ of the gugallu Nabû-zêr-ibni. According to the text the delivery was to be made in Eanna, which makes it more probable that the ultimate recipient of the barley was the temple. In this case, an alternative interpretation could be that the gugallu had given the barley on behalf of the temple to the debtors, the Urukeans. However, further speculations on the background of the transaction cannot be justified. In any case, the text demonstrates a connection between the gugallus and the temple’s arable cultivation. The same can be said of the following debt note:

YBC 9213 27-VI-34 Nbk

obv. 1. l me še-bar niɡ-ga gašan ša unug
     u ˈna-na-a ina šib-šu ša qaq-qar
     ša ĝan[d]u, ki-gi ša la bān
     ša ta kā ša lu gaš kur šu-taḫ-ḫu-su-nu
     5. ina ugu ña-šin-mu-du
        a-šu ša lu-din-su ina iti gu₄
     lo.e. ina ĝik-[ši]-ḫu ša d gašan ša unug
        ugu id-lugal lu u-gur-mu-urû
        lu-gaš lu-nam-din-ma lu-ag-lugal-urû₁
     rev. 10. a-na gi-nê-ša d gašan ša unug
           i-nam-din-su še-bar ša a-di unug₁
           i-nam-din-ú-ma a-na ā-su i-nam-šu-šu
           lu mu-kin-nu lu u-gur-gi
           a-šu ša la-bu-i a za-an-nê-a
           15. ĝag-ba-ša a-šu ša āmar-utu-paḫ
               lu en-nig-ir a-šu ša lu en-a lu x₁
               lu um-bi-sag lu-ag-dû-šêš a-šu ša lu du₄
       u.e. a ˈlê-ku-rza-ki ĝan[n]-a-ḫal lu₄
            iti kin ud 27-kam mu 34-kam
       le.e. e-lat eš-ru-ú ša a-na
            ugu eš-ru-ú i-nam-di⁻¹ nu₁
“100 (kurru) of barley, property of the Lady of Uruk and NaNaya, part of the share from the land in Til-ḫurāši (assigned to) the archers, who had been released from the service of šakin mātī, is the debt of Ininn-šum-ibni, son of Balassu. In the 2nd month Nergal-šum-usur, the gugallu, will pay it with the measure of the Lady of Uruk at Nār-šarri, and Nabû-šar-usur will issue it for the regular offerings of the Lady of Uruk. It is the barley which he (Nergal-šum-usur) will deliver as far as Uruk and carry it to his (Nabû-šar-usur’s) house.


Apart from the tithe(-payment), which they will make (at a later date).”

This document, and perhaps also the previous one, is vaguely related to the later imittu/šibṣu debt notes. In contrast to these, more circumstantial information is offered by this text. Thus we can infer that temple land was leased out for sharecropping to archers, who were previously in the service of the royal official šakin mātī. A part of the share (šibṣu) was charged against a certain Ininn-šum-ibni, son of Balassu, who was either one of these archers or their sub-tenant. Why the gugallu Nergal-šum-usur had to pay this barley is a matter for speculation. Perhaps this section only indicates that the debtor, for some reason, could not transport the barley from Til-ḫurāši to Nār-šarri, and this task had to be carried out by the gugallu. Assuming that he was a temple official, perhaps the text only records an exceptional obligation, since, normally, the debtors in the imittu context were supposed to deliver the agricultural produce to a determined place, usually the bank of some watercourse, where it was collected, stored or transported to other destinations. The text additionally notes the use to which the barley was to be put, namely, the regular offerings. It also stipulates that the barley delivered to the city should be deposited in the house of Nabû-šar-usur, who was going to redistribute the barley for the offerings.

2.7.1.2. Irrigation

That the gugallu had certain responsibilities with respect to the irrigation system was known from the Sippar evidence. Not surprisingly, evidence for such activities in Uruk can be found now in one of the new texts, YBC 9448. In a matter concerning the prevention of flooding of royal land a gugallu representing the royal provincial administration (šakin mātī) approached a temple gugallu as the individual in charge of a dam building project. The text, which has been fully edited in Janković 2007: 221ff., is presented here in translation only:

“Amurru-mukin-apli, son of Amurru-šar-usur, gugallu of the šakin mātī, bēl piqitti of Ḥanni-il, overseer of the female millers of the king, said to Ibnī-Istar, son Nabû-šum-ibni, the gugallu of the Lady of Uruk, as follows: ‘Do not flood the limu of the king, which is between the districts of the Lady of Uruk, in Bit-māḫisī, in which you are raising a mušennitu-dam; do not let it turn into a marsh [...] raise therein and [...] sharecropping [...]’. Yearly he shall give two sheep [...] the gimru of the land, to Amurru-mukin-apli. Whoever breaches (the contract) shall pay 12 minas of silver. Witnesses; Scribe: Balatu, son of Ibnī-Istar; Til-agurrēti, estate of the Lady of Uruk; 22-X-31 Nbk, king of Babylon.”

375 For the interpretation of “being in the gate of an official” as an expression for “doing service” for this official see Jursa and Stolper 2007: 262-62.
376 He could be identical with the royal official (ša rēš šarrī) and the later royal commissioner of Eanna (bēl piqitti Eanna) who was active at that time (Janković 2005: 170. 181).
377 The text has a clear lugal-sign here, but something along the lines of šāpiru must have been intended by the scribe; taking it to stand literally for “king” does not make much sense in this context (cf. Janković 2007: 223f.).
378 The name of the king, Nabû-šum-ūkīn, which is written clearly, must be a scribal error for Nebuchadnezzar.
The particular interest of this text lies in the evidence for the interaction between the royal and the temple administration. The extant part of the text is a formal record of the order given by Amurru-mukin-apli to Ibni-Ištar, the temple gugallu, not to let the royal land turn into a marsh as a result of a dam construction. Amurru-mukin-apli was the gugallu of the governor of the land (şakin māt) and at the same time the commissioner (bel piqitti) of a certain Ịanni-il, who was the overseer of the female millers of the king. This Amurru-mukin-apli appeared in several texts of the Eanna archive showing that he was involved with the temple on more than one occasion. The author of the letter, a certain Ibni-Ištar, who could well be the same Ibni-Ištar attested as a gugallu of the Lady of Uruk in YBC 9448 and elsewhere as a rab eṣerti, complained about being held back by Amurru-mukin-apli (no patronymic nor title are given) on account of the urašu-workers and not being able to do his work because of this. For this reason he asked his superior Nabû-ahhe-Sullim (probably the overseer of the ploughmen, see p. 116) to have urašu-workers summoned and sent to him. Nothing is said in the letter about the type of work or the locality in which it was being conducted, so that it is not possible to correlate it with the dam building project mentioned in YBC 9448.

In the case described by YBC 9448, the matter at stake was royal land, a šimi of the king, which was situated between the estates of Eanna. The royal administration seemed to be concerned about the building activities undertaken (or planned) by the temple, and headed apparently by the temple’s gugallu Ibni-Ištar. The building involved raising a mušannitu-dam – a structure which usually ran parallel to the watercourse and whose purpose was to protect the fields lying beyond it from getting flooded. The royal land was, it appears, situated in such a way that the new construction put it under a threat of becoming water-logged – an undesirable state for land as it would render it unsuitable for cultivation. More than a third of the text is damaged or entirely missing, so it can only be speculated what other issues were discussed by the two gugallu, but the traces and extant portions indicate that arrangements were made on the treatment of, probably, this very plot of land. The mention of sharecropping (l. 9) and a yearly payment of two sheep and a gimru ’tax’ for the land, which were to be given to Amurru-mukin-apli, are perhaps indicating that this land was left for use by the temple or the gugallu personally. The nature of this transaction can only be guessed at. A lease of land for the purpose of subletting it to sharecroppers springs to mind. If this indeed were the case, one would expect to find stipulations on the rent payable to Amurru-mukin-apli, as a representative of the royal administration, in the damaged portions of the text.

---

379 This was probably a shortened version of the title šakin māt tāmti, governor of the Sealand (Janković 2007: 230).
381 For a partial translation see p. 59.
382 šimi designated larger units of land which probably originated from land division schemes instigated by the state authorities and typically benefited large institutions like the temples, or in this case the royal administration. For a discussion of the term see p. 284.
383 Cf. Salonen 1963: 449ff. and van Driel 1988: 138f. Another instance of mušannitu in connection with the verb naša is found in a land lease contract from Nippur ROMCT 2 9, quoted by Jursa 1995a: 184. One of the duties of the lessee in this contract was to raise (naša) a mušannitu-dam along the front side of the field. (According to other texts this dam could also run at a right angle to the watercourse thus creating a boundary between two fields (ibid.).)
384 On the nature of this payment see most recently Abraham 2004: 32f. 84ff. and van Driel 2002: 171f. According to the evidence from private archives gimru used to be levied from tenants on royal land in particular. These attestations record only payments in agricultural produce, not livestock as in our text. (gimru was also used with the more general meaning “costs”, especially in the accounting texts of the temple archives. Its appearance in the ‘Edict of Bel只zarr’ should be understood in this sense.)
2.7.1.3. Activities of the external gugallus

As was seen in the previously discussed text, occasionally the interests of the provincial administration and the temple clashed in the areas in which the crown and temple estates lay side by side. Special arrangements had to be made in such cases by which the gugallu of the provincial administration could protect the interests of the crown and perhaps even use his authority to deal with (problematic?) land by passing it on to the temple. However, different institutions could also have common interests. YOS 7 156 (3 Camb), which has been edited by Cocquerillat 1968: 50. 113, is a nice example for three institutions jointly attempting to solve a problem affecting them all. It is a contract for guarding the cultivated land against wild asses and gazelles, animals which posed a threat to the crops. The six men employed to do the guarding were to watch over the land of the Lady of Uruk, of Šamaš of Larsa and of the king and the archers. The terms of the contract were negotiated with the šatammu of Eanna, the qipu of Ebabbar and the gugallu of the irrigation district Angillu, Ea-abi. Ea-abi, was probably a gugallu of the provincial administration, the land of the king and the archers being most probably his domain. How, if at all, the costs for the remuneration of the six watchmen were to be split between the three institutions is not clarified by the text.

Other attestations of the external gugallus and their connections to the temple are less informative as they tend to be restricted to debt notes or receipts. The background of the two closely parallel receipts for silver from 1 Nbk (Sack CD 5 and Truro 11) seems to be a purchase of barley by the gugallu of bit simmagir on behalf of Eanna. NBC 4575 (not dated, probably first half of Nebuchadnezzar’s reign) in which a gugallu of šakin mātī is mentioned, is a list of entries recording the removal or the issuing of sheep of the Lady of Uruk by/to certain individuals. The gugallu of the šakin mātī appears among these people without further details. An example of the activities of possibly yet another gugallu of the šakin mātī is presented by the following text:

PTS 2850   19-XI-26 Nbk

385 The land of the Lady of Uruk and of Šamaš can easily be associated with the šatammu of Eanna and the qipu of Ebabbar, which leaves the land of the king and the archers for Ea-abi. Note also that he is not given a patronymic, an omission customary for royal officials mentioned in the texts of the Eanna archive.

386 For a new edition of these texts see Janković and Weszeli in press.

387 The same gugallu probably appears in YBC 9221 (18 Nbk), but the text is in too poor a condition to make any sense of the preserved traces.
20. a-ṣu šá 1dú-a a 1é-kur-zá-kír
le.e. unug₃ [iti] zíz ud 20-1-lá-kam
μ̄mu₄ 26-kam δ-ag-níg-du-urú
lugal tí-tí₄₃

“If (from) 400 (kurru) of barley, which are at the disposal of Amurru-šar-uṣur, the gugallu, (and which) in the 25th year he had delivered in full and paid to Zéria, son of Nabú-nāṣir, descendant of Amil-Ea, and Kabtia, son of Rēmūt-Gula, descendant of Šigūa, any barley remains (undelivered) until the 26th year, they will pay 1 pānu per 1 kurru (as interest) to Eanna.

Witnesses: [Na]bû-aḫḫē-bullīt, son of [x], descendant of Aḫ-bānī,
Gimillu, son of Zéri̊a, descendant of Šigūa,
Nādin, son of Uraš-šum-uṣur, descendant of Bēl-ētēr,
Nabū-erība, son of Supē-Bēl, descendant of nanāyā,
Ballāsšu, son of Iddīn-[x], descendant of Nabāyā,
Scribe: Nabû-bān-āḫī, son of Bināyā, descendant of Ekur-zākīr;
Uruk; 19-XI-26 Nbk, king of Babylon.”

The verb in line 3 could also be derived from kamāru, meaning “to pile up”. However, this would not substantially change the understanding of the text. Syntactically the text is problematic. The scribe failed to connect the conditional clause in ll. 1-7 to the following sentence. Instead of an apodosis, an independent clause follows in ll. 8ff. The protagonists are not known from other sources and the background of this text cannot be reconstructed with certainty. The gugallu could be the man of the same name designated as the gugallu of the šakin mātī in NCBT 647 (27 Nbk, see below). This high official could in turn be identified with the governor of the Sealand, as was conjectured above. Zéria and Kabtia, though not attested elsewhere, certainly belonged to the urban elite of Uruk which had strong connections to the temple. They were given the barley delivered by the gugallu and were obliged, under the threat of having to pay interest on the amount, not to let it “stay overnight” until the 26th year. This effectively means that the barley, which probably belonged to the temple and was given to them on its behalf, was not to remain in their care until that time without being put to any use. It is remarkable though that the document was composed at the end of the 11th month of the 26th year. By this time, it should have been clear whether the barley had been passed on by the two individuals or whether it had been left to “sleep”. It seems that the latter case in fact ensued and that this conditional verdict was written up subsequently in order to ensure the temple received some compensation for its dormant capital. Nonetheless, the text does not give any clues as to the background of the gugallu’s delivery of this barley to start with.

Another document (NCBT 647) from the following year, probably involving the same gugallu, may offer an explanation for his deliveries of barley to Eanna.

NCBT 647  [x]-I-27 Nbk

obv. 1. [x x x ma]-na 1kū-babbar nig-ga dącgaššu šá unug₃
[ù₄]na-na-a ina muḫ-ḫi₃ 1ag-1ta₃lim-mu
[a-šu ša₄]lim-mu-mu₄ 1ag-še₃ [x-x-(x)]
a-šu ša₄ 1ag-šu-uz-ziz-an-mi₃ 1b₂₄u šá kur tam₃t₄₃
5. u₄kur-gal-lugal-ur₂ a-šu ša₄ ḫaṣ-di-ia ḫu-gal
fš₃gur kur ša₂ ina unug₄ ina iti šu še-bar
f₃a-k₃-lam šá iti gu₄ u iti sig₄
i-nam-dī-mu še-bar šá ina muḫ-ḫi₃ 1ak-ki-[ru]
ina id sa-par-ra-a-ti₃ še-bar šá ina muḫ-ḫi₃

10. f₃id₄lugal ul-tu id₃f x₁ [x x] f₄x (x)₁
lo.e. [x x x (x)] f₃i₉ [x x x x (x)]

388 Apart from possibly the gugallu (see below) and the scribe, who is a well known temple scribe (cf. Janković 2005: 170. 180 and Joannès 1987: 151).
389 Several members of the Amil-Ea and the Šigūa family are attested as temple scribes and prebendaries (cf. Kümmel 1979: 127.133).
The text is damaged which hampers our understanding. The debt charged against three individuals, one of which is the šanû official of the Sealand, is expressed as an amount of silver belonging to the Eanna temple. It is to be repaid in barley according to the exchange rate for months II and III (i.e. at a price current during or just after the harvest). This probably indicates that the text records Eanna’s purchase of barley from these individuals. Unfortunately, the remainder of the text is unintelligible. Different canals in the vicinity of Uruk are mentioned. These remarks could possibly concern the provenience of the barley. Alternatively, the barley could have come from the Sealand, considering that the debtors, some of them at least, were related to it. Beside the šanû of the Sealand, the gugallu of the šakin māti, Amurru-šar-usur, may also have been connected to this region. It has been argued that the title šakin māti is a shorter version of šakin māt tâmti, “governor of the Sealand” (Janković 2007: 230). Interestingly this gugallu seems to have been stationed at Uruk, probably as the governor’s representative. This is indicated by the remark ša ina Uruk (l. 6). This would imply that the gugallus, especially those of the state administration, were not necessarily only local agricultural officials, but could hold legal and administrative responsibilities on a cross-regional level.

Amurru-mukin-apli, the gugallu of the šakin māti and possibly the son of the gugallu Amurru-šar-usur who appears in the texts just treated, continued in the footsteps of his purported father. Beside the above discussed YBC 9448 and the letter YOS 21 33, he is attested in another four documents. He appears as a debtor in BM 114509 (16ª Nbk), a debt note for 70 kurru of barley, property of Eanna, which is described as barley given for the rations of the female

---

390 These have been described and commented on by Janković 2007: 230ff. 237ff.
millers.\textsuperscript{391} In NCBT 996 ([18 Nbk]) he appears again in the role of a debtor together with three other persons, this time owing Eanna 1 mina 20 shekels of silver. In case they failed to repay the silver by the first month, they were to pay 190 \textit{kurru} of barley instead. Amurru-mukin-apli is also the debtor in AOAT 358, no. 39 (= YBC 3530, 38\textsuperscript{or later} Nbk), a debt note for 1,418 \textit{kurru} of barley and 4 minas and 9 shekels of silver. This considerable sum is comprised of a number of individual entries of debts from a period from 35 to 38 Nbk, among which also the 1 mina 20 shekels of silver from NCBT 996 is recorded.\textsuperscript{392} YBC 9161 (42 Nbk), a \textit{zittu} debt note for dates, also mentions an Amurru-mukin-apli, however, without a patronymic, so the identification is not certain. According to II. 8f. he owed an unspecified amount of barley to the temple which he had delivered as dates.\textsuperscript{393}

Though the nature of these transactions cannot be ascertained, some of these texts, especially the ones involving the \textit{gugallu} Amurru-šar-uṣur and Amurru-mukin-apli, can be viewed in the context of Eanna’s relations to the institutions of the Sealand, its purchases of agricultural staples from this region, in particular.\textsuperscript{394}

2.7.2. The late phase

As was mentioned earlier, during the reign of Nabonidus there are no attestations of the \textit{gugallu} in the Eanna archive. Sporadic mentions of this official start appearing during the reign of Cyrus, but the bulk of our evidence comes from the reigns of Cambyses and Nebuchadnezzar IV, from the numerous \textit{imittu} debt notes pertaining to the rent farms of Ardia and Gimillu respectively. Following \textit{gugallu} are known by name:

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|l|l|l|l|l|}
\hline
Nanāya-ēreš/Gimillu & 3-VIII-4 Cyr & YOS 7 38 & - (\textit{gugallitti} contract) \\
Talim/Nabû-nāṣir & 18-XI-1 Camb & JCS 28, no. 15 & \textit{gugallu ša lami ša Bēlti ša Uruk ša Ḥarru-ša-Nadnāya} \\
Ea-abī & 4-XI-3 Camb & YOS 7 156 & \textit{gugallu ša Angillu} \\
Aqria/Nabû-dalā & 23-I-6 Camb & YOS 7 186 & \textit{gugallu ša Bēlti ša Uruk} \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\caption{The “late” \textit{gugallu}}
\end{table}

All except Ea-abī belonged to the temple administration and were in charge of the temple estates. Ea-abī was most probably a \textit{gugallu} of the provincial administration in charge of the royal land and the land given to the archers in a land-for-service scheme. Before turning to the above listed documents, however, we will discuss the more general evidence from the numerous \textit{imittu} debt notes.

2.7.2.1. \textit{gugallu}-payment

The \textit{gugallu} were entitled to an income in agricultural produce from the individuals cultivating gardens and fields situated along the canals under their responsibility. Van Driel recognised that these payments were meant to compensate the services of the \textit{gugallu} since they were occasionally called \textit{kurummatu} (“rations”).\textsuperscript{395} Though most of their attestations stem from \textit{imittu} debt notes for dates and their “special connection” to the date plantations (owing to the date

\textsuperscript{391} This text is edited in Janković 2007: 237ff.
\textsuperscript{392} According to another entry in this text he owed Eanna 1,192 \textit{kurru} of barley together with the \textit{qipu} of the Sealand.
\textsuperscript{393} The text is edited in the Appendix 1.
\textsuperscript{394} For the evidence for the Sealand found in the Eanna archive see Beaulieu 2002a and Jursa 2010b: 91ff. Eanna’s purchases of barley from the Sealand are listed in Jursa 2010b: 93.
\textsuperscript{395} Nevertheless, and despite the lack of any evidence, van Driel considers the idea that these had something to do with payments for water rights (2002: 179). Attestations of actual payments for water from Sippar are quoted by MacGinnis 2005-06: 316\textsuperscript{\textsuperscript{3}}.
orchards’ higher water requirements and their situation along the banks of the irrigation canals) is often stressed in the secondary literature,\textsuperscript{396} the gugallu were not only to receive income from the orchards, but from the arable land as well. This is attested in a small number of debt notes charged against sharecroppers working on the arable land of the temple.\textsuperscript{397} Whether it is significant that these texts concerned only sharecroppers and not the ploughmen cannot be decided at the moment. The payments for the gugallu started being explicitly mentioned in the middle of Cambyses’s reign (probably not earlier than 4 Camb). In the imittu debt notes for dates a remark was made, usually at the end of the document just before the witness list, that a certain amount of dates for the gugallu had not been included in the amount determined as the impost of a given plot and was consequently to be paid extra. This is usually expressed as: e-lat x gur (zú-lum-ma) šá lîgú-gal. The most common amount attested is 1 kurru of dates, but occasionally 2 kurru and once even 4 (see the table below) are attested. There is no way of telling whether the rations of the gugallu were determined in a similar way and whether the new formulary implied a new system for setting the size of these rations.\textsuperscript{400} Be that as it may, the table below clearly demonstrates that from 4 Camb on the rations of the gugallu were not proportional to the size of a plantation and the revenue expected from it. A fixed amount, namely, 1 kurru of dates, was expected from each individual orchard. Even for the debt notes in which 2 or 4 kurru of dates were to be provided to the gugallu it can be shown that the imposts recorded in them were considered to concern separate administrative units: either it would specifically be stated that the dates come from different gardens or the imittu would be charged against two debtors, again implying that separate administrative units were involved.\textsuperscript{400}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>imittu (kurru)</th>
<th>gugallitu-payment (kurru)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YOS 7 175</td>
<td>2-VI-4 Camb</td>
<td>13:2.3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIN 1 116</td>
<td>26-V-5 Camb</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIN 1 102</td>
<td>4-VI-5 Camb</td>
<td>110\textsuperscript{401}</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truro 17</td>
<td>19-VI-6 Camb</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCBT 829</td>
<td>5-[x]-7 Camb</td>
<td>32\textsuperscript{7}</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JCS 28, no. 35</td>
<td>2-VII-7 Camb</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM 114487</td>
<td>4-VII-7 Camb</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM 113429</td>
<td>6-VII-7 Camb</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 21 210</td>
<td>1 Nbk IV</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 17 299</td>
<td>24-[x]-1 Nbk IV</td>
<td>42\textsuperscript{402}</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{396} E.g. van Driel 2002: 179.
\textsuperscript{397} E.g. YOS 7 169, 180, UCP 10/8 244f.
\textsuperscript{398} Cf. van Driel 2002: 172ff.
\textsuperscript{399} Note that according to the ‘Edict of Belšazzar’ (see p. 70) the rations for various (agricultural) officials to be paid by the gardeners were directly dependent on the impost to be delivered by them (15 qû per each kurru of dates). gugallu, however, do not appear among the officials entitled to these rations.
\textsuperscript{400} Note, however, that the appearance of two debtors in an imittu debt note did not necessarily imply that their impost was considered as composed of two separate entities. In YOS 17 286, YOS 17 288 and BM 114570, for instance, the two debtors are charged only with one kurru of dates for the gugallu. The impost is charged against two persons, indicating perhaps that their garden was possibly regarded as comprising of two separate entities. Probably for this reason the gugallitu-payment amounted to 2 kurru.
It should also be noted that not all the imittu debt notes attested after 4 Camb included a remark concerning the rations of the gugallu.\textsuperscript{407} These occasional omissions probably do not imply that in certain cases the gugallus were not entitled to an income from the date orchards or that this income was included in the amount determined as the impost. They only serve to support the assumption that this was a customary payment familiar to all the parties involved which did not necessarily need to be spelled out in the imittu debt notes.

That the gugallus were people with considerable resources thanks to these payments had already been assumed by Jursa (1995a: 52). The actual extent of their yearly income arising from these payments could only be determined if one knew the number of orchards for which a gugallu was responsible. However, this is precisely the kind of information we do not have.\textsuperscript{408} Another implication of this flat rate system is that it weighed more heavily on the gardeners who tended smaller orchards. Should this system be seen as a conscious attempt to encourage gardeners to take on larger plots of land?

\textsuperscript{402} This amount is composed of 24 kurru and 18 kurru of dates from two different plots. It is charged against one person only.

\textsuperscript{403} The impost is charged against one person, but the dates stem from two gardens situated right and left of the Aṣṣuritu-canal.

\textsuperscript{404} This amount is comprised of 115 kurru from a big plot (a-ša gal-ū) and 15 kurru from the small palm trees (ša ṣimmütu ur-tur₄₄₄₄₄₄₄), including 2 kurru of a certain Kalbiya. Two debtors are listed for these dates.

\textsuperscript{405} Two brothers are listed as debtors in this imittu uiltu.

\textsuperscript{406} Only one debtor is listed, but the impost is said to pertain to an unspecified number of gardens: a-ša₄₄₄₄₄₄₄ₑ rît-tu₄₄₄₄₄₄₄ₑ₄₄₄μ₄₄₄μ. It is conceivable that this impost pertained to four plots.

\textsuperscript{407} E.g. BIN 1 103, 110, 119, 128, 129, YOS 7 181, 195, BM 113384, BM 113430, BM 114641, BM 114643, BM 114645.

\textsuperscript{408} Note also that we are lacking quantitative information on the gugalliu-payment from the arable land altogether.
2.7.2.2. Duties and responsibilities

One of the most important and informative documents concerning the duties and responsibilities of the gugallus is certainly YOS 7 38 (4 Cyr), a contract establishing the duties and delineating the sphere of responsibility of an individual who ventured to perform the gugallitu-service. The text has been edited by Cocquerillat (1968: 67. 123) and Joannès (1982: 13f.) and will be presented here in translation only:

“Nidinti-Bēl, the chief administrator of Eanna, (and) Nabû-ah-iddin, the royal commissioner of Eanna, entrusted the date plantations of the Lady of Uruk, bēt ritti of Ininn-ēr-ibni, son of Rēmut, to Nanāya-ēreṣ, son of Gimillu, for (the carrying out of) the gugallitu-service. Nanāya-ēreṣ shall deliver to Eanna as much dates as are imposed by Eanna, according to the impost which the yield estimators of Eanna will determine. ḥabû uḫinu which Nanāya-ēreṣ will exact from the gardeners he will give for cattle and sheep and he will provide one half of the ‘gift of the king’ which is imposed on Nidintu. He will do the work on the plots. bēt ritti of Marduk-šu-um-usur, Ina-silli-Nanāya and Nanāya-ibni which is left of the Ḥarru-ša-Lābāši is at the disposal of Marduk-šā-pik-zēri, and the limu of Lasūtu, bēt ritti of Arrab and Ininn-ēr-uššabī, are at Nanāya-ēreṣ’s disposal instead.

In the presence of Nidinti-Bēl, the chief administrator of Eanna, son of Nabû-mukīn-zēri, descendant of Dābibī, (and) Nabû-ah-iddin, the royal commissioner of Eanna. Witnesses; Nādin, Kīnāya, Māranu, Bāluṭu, the scribes of Eanna; Uruk; 3–VIII–4 Cyr, king of Babylon, king of lands.”

The ‘leasing’ of the gugallitu-service was tied to a specified portion of the temple estates, as would be the case in the regular rent contracts concerning agricultural land, but contrary to these, no rent, neither as a fixed sum nor as a share in the yield, was stipulated by this document. However, Nanāya-ēreṣ’s duties as a gugallu were outlined. His main task would be the delivery of the date yield to the temple in accordance with the imposts established by the yield estimators. Furthermore, he had to obtain ḥabû uḫinu, a kind of tax, from the gardeners, which was to be used for (purchasing) cattle and sheep, and discharge a part of the obligations imposed on the land by the royal administration (nāmurtu ša šarrī). This obligation he had to share with a certain Nidintu whose identity cannot be ascertained, but who apparently also held some responsibility for the land in question, either as a tenant or another gugallu. Another unidentifiable individual, Marduk-ša-pik-zēri, retained the responsibility over some land in the region assigned to Nanāya-ēreṣ. For this reason Nanāya-ēreṣ was compensated with land from another locality. Indeed, the main purpose of this text may have been, as van Driel suggested, to create “an arrangement which solves a number of problems between him [Nanāya-ēreṣ] and his colleagues. […] This is rather an attempt to solve a number of administrative complications than a contract” (2002:182). However, proper gugallitu-leases are also attested. BM 76034, a text from the Ebabbar of Sippar from the reign of Darius, is a formal gugallitu-contract between a number of individuals and the administration of the Ebabbar. In this text, published and edited by MacGinnis (1998: 213f.

Note that Cocquerillat misread this passage (l. 11) as na-ūš-par-ti (1968: 132). This had been observed by Joannès who proposed the reading te-lit-ti (1982: 13; this reading has been adopted by van Driel 2002: 182). However, the initial sign is clearly a NA followed by a partially damaged sign consisting of oblique wedges and a final single vertical wedge. The last sign, a TI, is undisputed. It is proposed here to read the partially damaged sign as MUR, a reading perfectly supported by the visible traces (unlike LID, which does not contain any vertical wedges). Thus, the word in question would be nāmurtu ša šarrī, “present of the king”, a concept attested with varying forms in several other texts as well (e.g. PTS 2044 (rent contract of Ardia edited on p. 221), W 17718x, YOS 3 9, 26, YBC 3750). Little can be said about this obligation, other than that it usually consisted of livestock, cattle or sheep, and that tenants of land could be subjected to it.

Cf. Landsberger (1967: 55) rejects the interpretation of the dictionaries that these were dates of low quality used for cattle fodder. Since the basic meaning of ḥabû is a type of vessel, Landsberger understands the expression as “pots of dates preserve”, which shifted its meaning to designate a kind of tax. He translates the relevant passage in YOS 7 38 as: “(The tax called) pots of dates preserve, which PN will exact from the gardeners, he will spend for (acquiring) cattle and sheep...”.

409 Note that Cocquerillat misread this passage (l. 11) as na-ūš-par-ti (1968: 132). This had been observed by Joannès who proposed the reading te-lit-ti (1982: 13; this reading has been adopted by van Driel 2002: 182). However, the initial sign is clearly a NA followed by a partially damaged sign consisting of oblique wedges and a final single vertical wedge. The last sign, a TI, is undisputed. It is proposed here to read the partially damaged sign as MUR, a reading perfectly supported by the visible traces (unlike LID, which does not contain any vertical wedges). Thus, the word in question would be nāmurtu ša šarrī, “present of the king”, a concept attested with varying forms in several other texts as well (e.g. PTS 2044 (rent contract of Ardia edited on p. 221), W 17718x, YOS 3 9, 26, YBC 3750). Little can be said about this obligation, other than that it usually consisted of livestock, cattle or sheep, and that tenants of land could be subjected to it.

410 This means that Nanāya-ēreṣ will share this obligation at equal parts with Nidintu.

411 Cf. Landsberger (1967: 55) rejects the interpretation of the dictionaries that these were dates of low quality used for cattle fodder. Since the basic meaning of ḥabû is a type of vessel, Landsberger understands the expression as “pots of dates preserve”, which shifted its meaning to designate a kind of tax. He translates the relevant passage in YOS 7 38 as: “(The tax called) pots of dates preserve, which PN will exact from the gardeners, he will spend for (acquiring) cattle and sheep...”.
no. 7), these individuals, whose names are not extant due to large breaks on the tablet, asked the šangū, qipu, and the scribes of Ebabbar to give them a certain irrigation district (tamirtu) in order to perform the gugallṭu duties there (l. 5': 𒈨šu-ša su-la*-[pu*]-tiš*), following a collation and reconstructions (marked with *) by Jursa (2004b: 182). In return they were to deliver dates to the temple annually.\footnote{Further obligations concerning the deliveries of the date palm by-products and the digging of irrigation ditches are also stipulated. Other known gugallṭu-contracts do not stem from the temple milieu: VS 5 122 (2 Dar) from the Tattannu archive records the lease of gugallṭu ša sulupp²; BM 28933 and BM 29035/96285, two texts from Borsippa dated to Amīl-Marduk’s and Neriglissar’s reign are gugallṭu-contracts in which the lessor was the governor of Borsippa.}

It is interesting to note that Nannaya-erēš, the main protagonist of YOS 7 38, appears after some four years as the messenger of the chief temple administrator and the royal commissioner of Eanna, entrusted with the important task of collecting the dates pertaining to the rent farm of the fermier général Ardia.\footnote{Later he went on to become a rab kārī, “chief of the harbour”, of the Lady of Uruk. He is attested with this title, together with his colleague Šamaš-erība, son of Nabū-ahḫiddin, in the first (JCS 28, no. 15, see below) and in the fourth year of Cambyses (YOS 7 171). JCS 28, no. 15 is an example of the interaction between a local gugallṭu and the two chiefs of the harbour.}

It is interesting to note that Nanāya-ēresh, the main protagonist of YOS 7 38, appears after some four years as the messenger of the chief temple administrator and the royal commissioner of Eanna, entrusted with the important task of collecting the dates pertaining to the rent farm of the fermier général Ardia.\footnote{This portion of the text is damaged and MacGinnis’s reconstruction of the line 11’ including specific amounts of dates and barley to be delivered is highly questionable.}

\footnote{This is according to AnOr 8 62 and YOS 7 84 both from 8 Cyr.}
(these are) the mār banē in whose presence Talûm, son of Nabû-nāšir, the gugallu of the limu of the Lady of Uruk in Ḫarru-ša-Nadnāya, measured and delivered to Nanāya-ēreš, son of Gimillum, and Šamaš-eriba, son of Nabû-ah-iddin, the chiefs of the harbour of the Lady of Uruk, 65:4.1 of dates from the house of Iqšâyä, son of Ah-iddin, the imittu of the plot of Iqšâyä.

Scribe: Kidin-Marduk, son of Marduk-šum-usur, descendant of Basia; Estate of the Lady of Uruk of Ál-Ḫarru-ša-Nadnāya; 18-XI-1 Camb, king of Babylon, king of lands.”

Though we cannot be sure about the background of this transaction, it can be conjectured that Iqšâyä, a gardener or a tenant of a temple or chard, for some reason failed to deliver his date impost on time but kept the dates in his house (or on his estate). The gugallu Talûm who was in charge of an estate on the canal Ḫarru-ša-Nadnāya, in which presumably Iqšâyä’s plot was situated, measured the required amount from Iqšâyä and delivered it to the two rab kāris, Nanāya-šrej and Šamaš-eriba. The rab kāri, as an official of the royal administration, was predominantly engaged in the collection of taxes incurred by the use of watercourses for transport. Though there is no real evidence for the temple’s own rab kāris’ collection of taxes, it is clear that they were engaged in the transport of the agricultural products to the temple and for this service a fee was charged. Hence, in the case described by JCS 28, no. 15, it seems that the gugallu’s task was to measure and collect the agricultural produce and deliver it to the rab kāris who were in charge of making arrangements for its transport to the temple or some other storage facilities.

In addition to the impost and the rent (imittu and sûtû), the gugallu were responsible for the collection of other types of obligations imposed on the land or the rural population. This transpires from YOS 7 186 (6 Camb), a text according to which an arrangement was made between the temple administrators and the settlers (aššābus) of the village Šingu to grind flour of a certain quality (hirigallu) under the supervision of the gugallu Aqria in the same manner as the settlers of the other villages of the Lady of Uruk. The flour is said to be imposed on Eanna (ll. 8f: ša ina muḫ-ḫi / ē-an-na na-as-ku), perhaps meaning that this was an obligation the temple had to fulfil toward the crown. The gugallu of the Lady of Uruk, Aqria, son of Nabû-dalâ, is known from other texts to have been a temple oblate and a temple ploughman, who at some point also exercised the duties of an overseer of the ploughs (rab epinni) and was involved in the management of the arable cultivation.

2.7.3. Summary

In order to sum up the basic facts about the gugallu it is best to combine and look at the evidence from both the Eanna and the Ebabbar, as the data from these two archives tend to complement each other. These “estate managers” could be recruited from the ranks of the temple oblates, the ikkaru and the nukuribbu. They were in charge of groups of agricultural workers and their fields and orchards, which probably had a common topographic feature (i.e. they were

415 On the kāru-tax, the term replaced by the word miksu in the Achaemenid period according to van Driel, see van Driel 2002: 274ff. and Abraham 2004: 32f. (on miksu). According to Bongenaar the attestations of the rab kāri from Sippar all refer to an official of the royal administration “who collected taxes and dues from the trade” (1997: 136). For the rab kāri see Weszeli 2009: 165. For different transportation costs and fees see Weszeli 2010: 140ff.

416 TCL 13 157 (3 Camb) is the most explicit in this respect. The text is a bail protocol in which two individuals guarantee to the šatammu and the bēl piqitti to bring Nanāya-ēreš and Šamaš-eriba to them by a certain date. The two men are designated as “those who bring the dates, property of Ištar of Uruk, to Eanna” (ll. 5f.: ša zū-lum-ma nīg-ga ʾinnin unug / a-na ē-an-na ú-qar-rab-bu-ú-mu).

417 According to NCBT 101 (35 Nbk) the fee of the rab kāri was about 3.22% of grain transported from Til-agurrēti to the temple storehouse. (The text is edited on p. 89.)

418 The text has been edited by San Nicolò 1935: 369f. See also the comments in Janković 2007: 213-38 with further literature on this text. On aššābus see also Jursa 1995a: 8+35.

419 There is no reason to assume that the situation in the two temples would have been fundamentally different.
situated on a specific canal, in a certain village, etc.). They were responsible for the deliveries of agricultural products due to the temple from the localities assigned to them. This entailed measuring, collecting, storing and perhaps also transporting of agricultural staples. There is some evidence that the *gugallu* interacted with the chiefs of the harbour, who managed the transportation of agricultural products. The groups of gardeners (or ploughmen) assigned to the *gugallu* were of relevance also when it came to organising non-agricultural operations. The *gugallu* were obliged to supply and probably oversee these workers employed on various projects. In particular, they were responsible for managing the upkeep and the construction of the irrigation system. Other tasks of the *gugallu* included the supervision of the rural population and collecting taxes from them on behalf of the temple.

For their services the *gugallu* were entitled to a special income in kind directly from the people cultivating the fields and the orchards. How the size of these ‘rations’ was determined prior to the middle of Cambyses’s reign is not known. From 4 Camb onwards a *gugallu* was to receive 1 *kurru* of dates for every orchard from the area under his responsibility. This amount was not included in the impost charged against the gardeners and was to be provided in addition to it. There is no information on the size of the *gugallu*-fee collected from the arable land.

The *gugallu*’s relative position in the hierarchy of agricultural management is one aspect of this function which is not always clear. Roughly speaking, they were the intermediaries between the lowest echelon of the agricultural production, the ploughmen and the gardeners, and the highest temple authorities. However, further refinement of this picture is difficult. One is tempted to interpret the sequence of functionaries listed in YBC 4000 as bearing on this particular issue. In lines 2f. one *gugallu* is named, followed by four *rab eserti* (ll. 3-5) and 15 *ikkaru* (ll. 6-13). This provides a clear hierarchical sequence from top down, as is usually the case in the Neo-Babylonian documents. While this sort of arrangement seems plausible, there is unfortunately no other evidence to further support it. Interestingly, the data provided by other texts in which these five individuals (the *gugallu* and the four *rab eserti* from YBC 4000) appear, gives no sign of a difference in status between them, but rather indicates some overlap in their responsibilities and duties. If this assumption is nevertheless accepted, the question arises whether there only was one *gugallu* working for the temple at a time or several. In the light of the evidence from the Ebabbar, which clearly demonstrates that several *gugallu* were employed at the same time, the latter option seems more likely. Not least because of the extent of Eanna’s estates, entrusting their supervision to more than one person would have been a more sensible and practical solution.

Not infrequently some of the *gugallu* in our documentation are also attested with other titles and functions within the agricultural management. Some of them were overseers of the plough teams (*rab eserti, rab epinni*) before becoming *gugallu*, others went on to become rent farmers or chiefs of the harbour (*rab kāri*) in the course of their career. As was stressed earlier, the nature of our sources makes it very difficult to distinguish between the responsibilities of the *gugallu* and some of these other agricultural officials, and some major overlaps in their duties are visible. Further details on the activities of the *gugallu* who are attested with the title *rab eserti* or *rab epinni* are included in the relevant chapters.

---

420 During the time when the temple employed fermiers généraux the *gugallu* were presumably subordinated to these. However, due to a lack of pertinent evidence it cannot be said whether their activities differed in any way from the periods when no rent farmers were employed by the temple.
422 See above p. 84 and 115.
423 If Nergal-šum-ûšur from YBC 9213 should turn out to be a *gugallu* of Eanna, as is probable, then there were at least two of these officials attested for 34 Nb(k (he and Nergal-ina-tēši-ētēr), unless there was a switch of term during the six days that lay between the issuing dates of the two texts.
2.7.4. Attestations\(^{424}\) of the gugallus:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Filiation</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YOS 21 33: 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM 114509(^{425}): 3f.</td>
<td>14-I(^{16})-15(^{12}) Nbk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YBC 9448(^{426}): 1f., rev. 2(^{\dagger})</td>
<td>22-X-31 Nbk</td>
<td></td>
<td>gugallu ša šakin māti (bēl piqitti of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ḥanni-il, šāpiru(^{\dagger}) ša qēmēti ša šarrī)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCBT 996: 3f., 13, 16</td>
<td>6-[x]-[38] Nbk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AOAT 358, no. 39: 4, 7,</td>
<td>(38(^{15})ra(^{16}) Nbk)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10, 14, 22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YBC 9161: 8</td>
<td>16-XIIa-42 Nbk</td>
<td>n.p.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Filiation</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amurru-šar-usur/Ḫašdia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTS 2850: 2</td>
<td>19-XI-26 Nbk</td>
<td>n.p.</td>
<td>gugallu (ša) šakin māti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCBT 647: 5f.</td>
<td>[x]-[x]-27 Nbk</td>
<td>n.p.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Filiation</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aqria/Nabû-dalâ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cf. attestations of the rab epinnis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Filiation</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YOS 7 156: 4f., 11, 16</td>
<td>4-XI-3 Camb</td>
<td>n.p.</td>
<td>gugallu ša Angillu</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Filiation</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ibni-ʾštar/Nabû-šum-ibni</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cf. attestations of the rab esēritēs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Filiation</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marduk/Amurru-ušēzib</td>
<td></td>
<td>n.p.</td>
<td>gugallu ša šakin māti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCB 4575: 8f.</td>
<td></td>
<td>n.p.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YBC 9221: 2f.</td>
<td>16-XII-18 Nbk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Filiation</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nabû-nāṣir/Ab-lišir</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>gugallu ša bīt simmagir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sack CD 5: 6f.</td>
<td>6-IX-1 Nbk</td>
<td>n.p.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truro 11: 8f.</td>
<td>9-IX-1 Nbk</td>
<td>n.p.</td>
<td>gugallu ša simmagir</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Filiation</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nabû-zēr-ibni(^{427})</td>
<td>25-I-22 Nbk</td>
<td>n.p.</td>
<td>gugallu</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Filiation</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nanāya-èreš/Gimmillu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 7 68: 14f.</td>
<td>[x]-[x]-[x] Cyr</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(witness)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 7 38: 4, 8, 10</td>
<td>3-VIII-4 Cyr</td>
<td></td>
<td>(gugallūtu-contract)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AnOr 8 62: 8f., 12</td>
<td>13-XI-8 Cyr</td>
<td>mār śipri ša šatammu u bēl piqitti Eanna</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 7 84: 18</td>
<td>26-XI-8(^{428}) Cyr</td>
<td>mār śipri ša šatammu u bēl piqitti Eanna</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JCS 28, no. 15: 14</td>
<td>18-XI-1 Camb</td>
<td>rab kārī ša Bēlti ša Uruk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 7 109: 17</td>
<td>15-XII-1 Camb</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(witness)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM 114472: 12f.</td>
<td>19-XII 1 Camb</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(witness)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

\(^{424}\) The first and the second column list the attestation and the date. Uncertain attestations are preceded by a question mark. The third column notes the cases in which the person in question appears without a patronymic (n.p. stands for “no patronymic”). The fourth column records any attested titles or functions.


\(^{426}\) Janković 2007: 221ff.

\(^{427}\) His other possible attestations are in YOS 7 326 (18-X-11 Nbk) and NBC 4940 (27\(^{\dagger}\)-X-20 Nbk).

\(^{428}\) Cf. note 803.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Filiation</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YOS 7 124: 30f.</td>
<td>5-XI-2 Camb</td>
<td>scribe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCL 13 157: 3</td>
<td>3-IV-3 Camb</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 7 171: 6f.</td>
<td>13-VIII-4 Camb</td>
<td>rab kāri</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM 114613: 17</td>
<td>17-II-acc Bar</td>
<td>scribe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YBC 7436: 4</td>
<td>28-XIIa-acc Dar</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCBT 1062: 13f.</td>
<td>[1] Nbk IV</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 17 287: 16</td>
<td>24-V-1 Nbk IV</td>
<td>- (witness)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM 114636: 18</td>
<td>26-V-1 Nbk IV</td>
<td>- (witness)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 17 292: 15</td>
<td>13-VI-1 Nbk IV</td>
<td>- (witness)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM 114467: 15</td>
<td>29-VI-1 Nbk IV</td>
<td>- (witness)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTS 2050: 2f.</td>
<td>2 Dar</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nergal-ina-tēši-ēter/Zabidāja

cf. attestations of the *rab ešertiš*

**Nergal-šum-ušur**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Filiation</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YBC 9213: 8f.</td>
<td>27-VI-34 Nbk</td>
<td>n.p.</td>
<td><em>gugallu</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Talim/Nabû-nāšir**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JCS 28, no. 15: 7f.</td>
<td>18-XI-1 Camb</td>
<td><em>gugallu ša līmi ša Bēlti ša Uruk ša Ḥarru-ša-Nadnāya</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

429 He is perhaps also attested in PTS 2107 (05-IX-18 Nbk).
2.8. Yield estimators (êmidû)

The process of yield estimation, \textit{imittu}, was one of the basic administrative mechanisms employed by the temple for the purpose of planning and controlling its income in agricultural products stemming from its estates. It allowed the temple to make a prognosis on the incoming harvest and at the same time established the obligations of the people tilling its land. Both the ploughmen, gardeners and the sharecroppers were subjected to the \textit{imittu} procedure annually and the practice was continued during the era of large-scale rent farms. It was conducted by a commission consisting of up to six people, scribes and estimators (êmidûs), who inspected the fields and gardens and the crops growing therein shortly before the harvest. In this way they could evaluate the size of the prospective harvest and establish the dues of the individual agricultural workers (and their teams) which would be written down in debt notes or lists of deliveries. In other words, the shares due from the sharecroppers (šibšu, zittu) and the obligations of the ploughmen and the gardeners were determined. At the same time, the written documentation made sure that no swindles to the benefit of the tillers/gardeners, such as embezzlement of (a part of) the harvest could be carried out. Consequently the temple was in no need of any further supervision of its estates and the crops until after the harvest. By the same token, the tillers/gardeners, assuming they were given a fair evaluation of their fields/gardens, could be protected against the high-handedness of their superiors (overseers or rent farmers under whose authority they stood) who might have been tempted to extort unreasonably high amounts of agricultural produce from them.

It has generally been assumed that the êmidûs were people with a background in agriculture who had the experience necessary for conducting these estimations. The other members of the estimation commission, the scribes, had the task to record their colleagues’ predictions in lists or debt notes. In fact little can be said about the background of these people as only a small number of estimators are attested. Kümmel was right in saying that the title êmidû did not designate a profession but an \textit{ad hoc} function, but making a strict division between their and the associated scribes’ functions is probably not justified (1979: 107). This was already observed by Cocquerillat who noted that some of the êmidûs were scribes at the same time and that their tasks were interchangeable (1968: 53). Interestingly, we cannot detect anything of the alleged agricultural background for the êmidûs and the scribes of the estimation commissions in a context other than the \textit{imittu} procedure: the only agriculture-related texts they appear in are the \textit{imittu} debt notes and the oaths they made before the higher temple administration. In their other attestations they usually act as witnesses in various temple court records. An exception is Sin-ibni, son of Šamaš-udammiq, from the Rê-î-alpi family, attested as an êmidû in 13 Nbn (AnOr 8 30). His most frequent attestations are as a witness in a number of documents in the period from 38 Nbk (YBC 4143) to the reign of Cyrus (x Cyr, BM 114447), but his connection to the agricultural sector transpires from a land lease contract from 3 Nbn, in which he participated (YOS 6 40). Two of the yield

---

430 On \textit{imittu} in general see Petschow 1976-80: 65ff. Cocquerillat 1968: 51ff. also deals with different aspects of the \textit{estimation forfaitaire}.

431 The term \textit{imittu} is derived from the verb \textit{emēdu} “to impose”. Note that it can also designate the obligation resulting from the yield estimation, “the impost”. In this function it appears in the numerous debt notes for dates or barley (\textit{imittu} debt notes).

432 For the need to make yield estimations for the \textit{ikkarus} as well who had a more or less fixed obligation see p. 49.

433 An exception is posed by the contract for the guarding of fields and crops against wild asses, YOS 7 156 (3 Camb), which has been edited by Cocquerillat 1968: 50. 113. (for comments see also here p. 125).


435 See already Kümmel’s prosopography (1979: 107f.) to which little new data can be added.

436 His last mention is from 8 Cyr (YOS 7 79); however, this must have been posthumous. For a list of attestations of Sin-ibni and comments on his career see p. 201.

437 The text was edited by Cocquerillat 1968: 40. 109, and is discussed here on p. 200. According to this rent contract Sin-ibni, together with Arad-Innin, son of Ibni-îštar, leased over 865 \textit{kurru} of low quality land from the temple, which was to be worked in a three year fallow cycle and for which 1,240 \textit{kurru} of barley were the rent. The rent also included some cattle and sheep, which indicates that part of the land was to be used for the
estimators in PTS 3000 (7 Nbn) are members of the Rab-banê family. This could perhaps suggest that at least their families, if not they themselves, were at some point involved in prebendary horticulture. In this text they are not given the title étidu, but are designated as már banê, “free citizens”. The following table shows the composition of the estimation commissions as evident from four similar texts recording the oaths of the estimators, which will be discussed below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nabû-bûn-šîtur/Nabû-eriba/Rab-banê</td>
<td>már banê</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Šadûnû/Bél-ù-sallim/Al-ù-mûr</td>
<td>már banê</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Šamaš-iddin/Bél-ipuš/Rab-banê</td>
<td>már banê</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gimillû/Ahulap-lîstar/(Hunzû)</td>
<td>étidu</td>
<td>étidu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Šamaš-zèr-lîšir/Šamaš-šum-lîšir</td>
<td>étidu</td>
<td>étidu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marduq-nâṣir/Rēmût/Adad-še’e</td>
<td>étidu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lûši-ana-nûr/Nabû-ah̄ê-bullût/(Dûbibû)</td>
<td>ṯûpsarru</td>
<td>ṯûpsarru</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balâtu/Mûčzûb-Bél/(Gîmîl-Nanûya)</td>
<td>ṯûpsarru</td>
<td>ṯûpsarru</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nabû-âl-iddin/Ḫarbâsû</td>
<td>ṯûpsarru</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Šîn-ibnû/Šamaš-udammîq/Rè’t-alpî</td>
<td>étidu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mûčzûb-Bél/Balâssû/Amûl+Ea</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marduq-šum-iddin/Nûdin/Šûtû</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gimillû/Ahulap-lîstar/Kûri</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nabû-bîlûnû/Ḫîtar-šum-erêš/Ea-ilûta-bani</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 19: Yield estimators

All in all, the impression is that the members of the estimation commissions could be recruited from the same group of men who participated in the temple court proceedings, i.e. men who frequently appear among the witnesses in the legal documents from the Eanna archive. In addition to these, the rent farmers could apparently engage people from their own entourage to make the yield estimates. While the rent farmer Šum-ûkin was away in 3 Nbn, perhaps on business in Babylon, he had two of his ‘commissioners’ (bêl piqnîti), Zûria, son of Nabû-ûdin, and Nanûy-îddin, son of Itti-Marduk-balâtu, determine the barley impost for the ploughmen (YOS 6 78[441]). Apparently Šum-ûkin did not approve of the way this estimation was conducted as he purposes of animal husbandry. This was probably in connection to Šîn-ibnû’s dairyman’s prebend (re’ûṭ šîžîti).

---

438 Nabû-bûn-šîtur/Nabû-eriba/Rab-banê is, for instance, not attested in a prebendary context but rather as a scribe in a house sale contract from 23 Nbk (YBC 7415, published and edited in Beaulieu 1998a:175ff.; read the name of the scribe in line 41 as: ‘ag-[bu-u]n*-su*-tur* Ša*1 ag-su).

439 The people swearing the oath in this text are not given any particular designation or professional title.

440 Gimillû appears in YOS 6 232 without a family name. Theoretically an identification with Gimillû from the Kurû family could also be possible, but due to the temporal proximity of the two texts it appears much more likely that this was Gimillû/¿ûnu who is attested one year later in AnOr 8 30.

441 Balâtu’s family name is not recorded in YOS 6 232 and AnOr 8 30. However, a person called Balâtu, son of Šûzûbû, descendant of Gîmîl-Nanûya, who appears in AnOr 8 31 (13 Nbn), is said to have been doing the imittu procedure for a certain orchard since 10 Nbn (ll. 5f: ul-tu mu 10-kam / ’ag-ni-tuk lugal tin-tir* im-di-num-ni...). The two Balâtus could have been the same person if it is assumed that Šûzûbû was a hypochoristic variant of Mûčzûb-Bél. For an edition of AnOr 8 31 see below.

442 The name of this person is mostly reconstructed (TCL 13 177, 1: ‘m[u]-šêzû-bêdumu-su ša 1 din-su dum] Šûm-ûkin” seems better. This is the title the two men appear with in a follow up document written some days later, in which they are charged with the part of the arrears of the barley impost (YOS 6 94). The two ‘commissioners’ of Šum-ûkin do not appear with the title étidu, even though they act as estimators on at least one occasion, and
debated with them in court. The two men said in their defence that they had determined the barley impost and the corresponding debt notes without Šum-ukīn’s presence and in agreement with the ploughmen. Perhaps Šum-ukīn would have participated in the process himself had he been in Uruk at the time. This is what his nephew and successor, the rent farmer Kalbiya, seems to have done in 2 Cyr according to TEBR 43 (written in 5 Cyr). But direct involvement of the rent farmer in the estimation process as evident in this case may have been exceptional and induced by special circumstances. Kalbiya was trying to pin down a debtor who had failed to deliver his impost for several years. Perhaps for this reason he had to revert to such an unusual course of action.

Other agricultural officials could apparently also be entrusted with the task of yield estimation. To judge by BIN 2 108⁴⁴⁶ (4-XI-[x] Camb) the overseers of plough teams (rab epinni) determined the impost for the ploughmen and sharecroppers. In this text three rab epinni, not designated in the text as émidus or attested as such elsewhere, swore that they would not hide any of the arable land of the Lady of Uruk or impose the obligations of the ploughmen on the sharecroppers and vice versa.

We also hear of the prebendary gardeners (rab banê) with this function. In sub-leases of their prebendary, ©allatu, orchards some contracts stipulate that the lessor would conduct the yield estimation for the lessee (e.g. in YBC 4149 and YOS 7 162, see p. 291 and Cocquerillat 1968: 46. 111).

Not only the estimators from the entourage of the large-scale rent farmer Šum-ukīn caused problems. Even the employment of temple’s own estimators was no guarantee for problem-free yield estimations. This is evident from AnOr 8 31, a text which was written in 13 Nbn, more than three months after AnOr 8 30, one of the documents recording the oaths of the estimators. AnOr 8 31 probably concerns one of the protagonists from AnOr 8 30, the scribe Bal†u.

AnOr 8 31
20-IV-13 Nbn

obv. 1. a-ša‘mek ha-la ša‘a en-sur a-šuš ša‘a amar-utu-mmu-kam
    è mas‘-ka-nu ša‘a daššan ša‘a unug ki ša‘a ag-ina-sùḫ-sur
    a-šuš ša‘a in-nin-mu-ùru a ki-din-ša‘a amar-utu
    iqa-ù-ù um-ša‘a a-šuš ša‘a-ì-ù

5. a šu-ša‘na-a a-ù-ù mu-ù 10-kam
    ‘ag-ni-tuk ‘lugal ‘tin-tir im-mi-dan-ni-ma
    a-nak-kis-ma βurulš a-nam-da-asš-sū a ag-ina-sùḫ-sur
    ha-la-ù-ù-ka-a-ni-ma a-na
    numun-iša ša‘a-tam ë-an-na a-šu

10. ša‘a iš-ù-a a ‘e-gi-bi ù

lo.e. 14. a ‘e-sa‘mek Ša‘a ë-an-na i-nam-din

rev. 7. a ‘e-ša‘na a-ša‘ma-la
    ‘ag-ina-sùḫ-sur ik-kis-su a-na ë-an-na i-nam-din
    ‘u-ši-nu di-kud-ša‘mek mu a-šu

15. ša‘a gi-mi-lu a ‘i-gi-ù-a

the entries in Kümmel’s prosopography (1979: 108), who apparently followed Cocquerillat’s transliteration, should be corrected accordingly.


⁴⁴⁵ For a discussion of the text see p. 195.

⁴⁴⁶ The text was edited by Cocquerillat 1968: 60. 121f. The correct reading of the lines 8-9, which were misread by her, is to be found in Kümmel 1979: 98 and 107 and below. Note, however, that Kümmel translates the oath in the past tense, which is incorrect since this is in fact a negative promissory oath expressing an intention.

⁴⁴⁷ Ll. 8-10: ki-ši-šu-nuš sa‘a ša‘a daššan ša‘a unug ki a-na ŋi-shi-ru ni-iš-[ku-nu] / ša‘a er-re-ša‘a a-na ‘a ‘engar a-na muḫ-ḫi er-re-šu ni-it-êtu / ša‘a ‘er-re-ša‘a a-na a ‘engar ni-it-[te-êtu].

⁴⁴⁸ For the identification cf. note 441.
“Orchards, share of Bēl-êṭer, son of Marduk-šum-êreš, pledge (given as security) to the Lady of Uruk, about which Nabû-ina-tēši-êṭer, son of Innin-šum-ûsûr, descendant of Kidin-Marduk, said as follows: ‘Balâtu, son of ŝûzû, descendant of Šigû’a, has been conducting the imittu procedure for me since the 10th year of Nabonidus, king of Babylon, and I have been harvesting and giving him the yield.’ Nabû-ina-tēši-êṭer will prove Balâtu’s (guilt) and will hand (him) over to Žêria, the chief administrator of Eanna, son of Ibn-êya, descendant of Egibi, and the scribes of Eanna. If he does not hand (him) over, he will deliver to Eanna (dates from) all the plots that Nabû-ina-tēši-êṭer harvested.

Witnesses: Madân-âlḫê-iddin, son of Gimillu, descendant of Šigû’a, Innin-šum-ûsûr, son of Iddin-Nabû, descendant of Kidin-Marduk, Nabû-êrû’ukûn, son of Nabû-kâšir, descendant of Arrabtu, Arad-Innin, son of Ibnû-lûsun, descendant of Gimil-ûna’ya,

Scribe: Nôdin, son of Bēl-âlḫê-îqiša, descendant of Egibi;
Uruk; 20-IV-13 Nbn, king of Babylon.
Šillîya, son of Erêšu, descendant of Kidin-Marduk, guarantees for Ina-tēši-êṭer.”

The background of this text is not elucidated and so it is not clear what the problem concerning the estimator Balâtu exactly was. The orchard in question belonged to a certain Bēl-êṭer, but the temple had the right to use it since it was pledged to it, probably because of Bēl-êṭer’s indebtedness toward the temple. Balâtu has been conducting the yield estimation for the orchard since the tenth regnal year of Nabonidus, according to Nabû-ina-tēši-êṭer, the person in charge of this orchard. Nabû-ina-tēši-êṭer claims further to have harvested and delivered the dates to Balâtu. It is not stated what exactly Balâtu was accused of. Perhaps he was not passing the dates on to the temple. Nabû-ina-tēši-êṭer’s claim does not appear to constitute enough evidence against Balâtu. Rather, he is obliged to prove his guilt (e.g. with the help of other witnesses) and hand him over to the temple authorities.

It is noteworthy that the officials entrusted with the task of yield estimation, and among them this very same Balâtu, occasionally had to swear oaths assuring the temple authorities that they would conduct this procedure properly and conscientiously. BIN 2 108, mentioned above, is only one in a row of similar texts. It has already been observed by Ebeling (1954) and Oppenheim (1941: 262) that YOS 6 232 (12 Nbn), AnOr 8 30 (13 Nbn) and TCL 13 177 ([4] Camb) belonged together and were treated accordingly. Now the unpublished text PTS 3000 (7 Nbn) can be added to this group. BIN 2 108 does not use the same terminology as these four texts but is nevertheless linked to them thematically. Some of the texts concern the yield estimation of the arable land (YOS 6 232, AnOr 8 30, BIN 2 108), others of the date orchards (TCL 13 177, PTS 3000). But these oaths all have in common that they were made before the harvest and most probably before the estimations were conducted.

---

449 Oppenheim (1941: 262f.) discussed the idiomatic terms used in the oaths and Ebeling dedicated an article to the three texts (1954). Cocquerillat also treated the three texts (1968: 51ff.) and most recently Sadowicz discussed them as well (2012: 83ff.).

450 This had only been noticed by Kûmmel (1979: 107) despite his misunderstanding of the tense of the oath.
First, the new text, PTS 3000, will be presented. The text was not finished, as is indicated by the missing list of witnesses and the name of the scribe. Perhaps it was a scribal exercise.\textsuperscript{451}

PTS 3000

15-V-7 Nbn

obv. 1. \textsuperscript{14}ag-bu-un-šu-tur a-šši ša \textsuperscript{15}ag-su a \textsuperscript{20}gal dū
\textsuperscript{5}ša-du-nu a-šši ša \textsuperscript{10}en-gi a 'uru-\textsuperscript{3}lu-mur
\textsuperscript{23}utu-mu a-šši ša \textsuperscript{15}en-du-uš a \textsuperscript{20}gal-dū
\textsuperscript{5}dumu dū\textsuperscript{2}mek ša ú-hi-mu ša a-šša
5. ša '\textsuperscript{14}bul-\textsuperscript{2}lu-tu a-šši ša \textsuperscript{5}en-su a 'ši-gu-\textsuperscript{2}u-a
ša ina unug\textsuperscript{2}ki ša ina igi \textsuperscript{\textsuperscript{15}}en-šẹ\textsuperscript{2}me\textsuperscript{2}-mu
\textsuperscript{5}ša i-mi-du mu dingir\textsuperscript{2}mek
ina \textsuperscript{15}en 'rag \textsuperscript{2}gašan ša unug\textsuperscript{2}ki
\textsuperscript{2}iš-na-na-a a-na \textsuperscript{5}ag-lugal-\textsuperscript{2}uru

10. \textsuperscript{\textsuperscript{15}}iš-sag lugal \textsuperscript{\textsuperscript{15}}pi-gi\textsuperscript{2}t-tu\textsuperscript{2}4 č-an-na

rev.
\textsuperscript{\textsuperscript{15}}i-še-\textsuperscript{\textsuperscript{\textsuperscript{2}lu-\textsuperscript{2}u} ki i-\textsuperscript{\textsuperscript{15}}ig} ni-ta-ad\textsuperscript{2}<\textsuperscript{\textsuperscript{3}}ru>
ú le-e-tu\textsuperscript{4}4 ni-it-ta-du-ú
a-di-i u-hi-ni ša in-nak-ki-su-ma
i-šal-li-mu-ú ina lib-bi ni-im-mi-du

(ca. three blank lines)

15. iti ne ud 15-kam mu 7-kam
\textsuperscript{\textsuperscript{5}}ag-ni-tuk lugal tin-ti\textsuperscript{\textsuperscript{2}ki}

“Nabû-bûn-šûtur, son of Nabû-erîba, descendant of Rab-banê, Šâdûnu, son of Bêl-ûsallim, descendant of Ál-lîmûr, Šamaš-iddîn, son of Bêl-ipûš, descendant of Rab-banê, the \textit{mar banê} who will make an estimation on the dates from the field of Bullû, son of Bêl-êrûba, descendant of Šigûa, which is in Uruk and which is at the disposal of Bêl-ahhiê-iddîn, the ña râši, swore by the gods Bêl, Nabû, the Lady of Uruk and Nanâyâ to Nabû-[arû]u'ûr, the royal commissioner of Eanna (as follows): ‘We will not \textit{fear} the eyes and be negligent (lit. drop (our) cheeks). We will make an assessment on the dates which are to be harvested in totality.’

15-V-7 Nbn, king of Babylon.”

Two idiomatic expressions, \textit{lêta nadû}, “to drop the cheek”, and \textit{înê adûrû}, “to \textit{fear} the eyes”, were used in the oaths of the estimators in three other texts (YOS 6 232, \textit{AnOr} 8 30 and TCL 13 177) in addition to the one just presented. Here only the oaths of the three texts will be repeated:

\textit{YOS 6 232: 18-25}

... ki-i še-numun \textsuperscript{\textsuperscript{\textsuperscript{5}}}gašan ša unug\textsuperscript{\textsuperscript{\textsuperscript{2}ki}} \textsuperscript{\textsuperscript{\textsuperscript{10}}}gîk\textsuperscript{\textsuperscript{\textsuperscript{2}bân}}\textsuperscript{2}mek / ša \textsuperscript{\textsuperscript{\textsuperscript{15}}}ina pa-ni lâ\textsuperscript{2}engu\textsuperscript{\textsuperscript{\textsuperscript{2}me}}/ ú lâ er-re-še-e ša lâ\textsuperscript{2}ag-lugal-\textsuperscript{\textsuperscript{2}uru}
\textsuperscript{\textsuperscript{\textsuperscript{5}}}\textit{gi}-i-pi \textit{u lâ}ša-tam \textit{it-ti} lâ \textit{umbi}sa\textsuperscript{2}mek ša è-an-na / \textit{iš}p\textsuperscript{2}ru-na-a-ši \textit{mim-ma} a-na na-de-e le-e-tu\textsuperscript{4}4 / ina \textit{lib-bi ni-te-èp-šû} igi\textsuperscript{1} ni-ad\textsuperscript{\textsuperscript{\textsuperscript{2}ta-rû} \textit{u le-e-tu\textsuperscript{4}4} / ni-it-ta-du-ú \textit{a-di mittu-ma} ša ik-kaš-ša-du-ú-ma / \textit{gû}\textsuperscript{\textsuperscript{\textsuperscript{5}}}bân ša-lim-tu\textsuperscript{\textsuperscript{\textsuperscript{2}4}}a-na è-an-na \textit{te-er-ru-bu} \textit{i-m-\textit{\textsuperscript{\textsuperscript{\textsuperscript{2}mi}}}tu / ni-im-mi-du} ...

“Concerning the arable land of the Lady of Uruk (and) the \textit{sûtu}-obligation of the ploughmen and the sharecroppers, about which Nabû-šar-ûsûr, the \textit{gi}pu, and the \textit{šatammu} together with the scribes of Eanna wrote to us, we will do nothing to cause negligence concerning this (matter). We will not \textit{fear} the eyes and be negligent. We will make the yield estimation for everything which can be harvested (lit. ‘reached’) and the complete \textit{sûtu} which can enter Eanna.”

\textit{AnOr} 8 30: 15-22

... ki-i \textit{še-numun} ša \textit{gû}gašan ša unug\textsuperscript{2}ki / \textit{gîk\textsuperscript{2}bân} \textit{mek} ša \textit{ina pa-ni lâ\textsuperscript{2}engu\textsuperscript{2}me} ú lâ er-re-še-e / ša \textit{ni-im-mi-du} \textit{u ni-ma-ša-\textit{hu} mim-ma [ma'-\textit{la}] / a-na na-de-e le-e-tu\textsuperscript{4}4 ina \textit{lib-bi ni-te-èp-šû} / igi\textsuperscript{1} ni-ta-da-rû \textit{u le-}

\textsuperscript{\textsuperscript{451}}There are at any rate two mistakes in the line 11 which may suggest that the text was written by an inexperienced scribe. The verbal form at the beginning of the line (\textit{S}-stem of \textit{elû}), should of course have a prefix \textit{i}- not \textit{u}. The scribe also forgot to write the last sign of the verbal form at the end of the line, so that it had to be emended on the basis of parallel passages (\textit{ni-ta-ad}<\textit{ru}>).
“Concerning the arable land of the Lady of Uruk (and) the sîtu-obligation of the ploughmen and the sharecroppers, for which we are doing the yield estimation and which we are measuring, we will do nothing to cause negligence concerning this matter. We will not fear the eyes and be negligent. We will measure the fields and make the yield estimation for everything which can be harvested (lit. ‘reached’) and the complete barley which can enter Eanna. Furthermore, we will not do damage to the gardeners.”

458

The expression lêta nadû was discussed by Oppenheim 1941: 262f. While it could be used in the sense of inclining the cheek as a “gesture of somebody who looks or listens with the utmost attention”, hence meaning “to be attentive”, it could also have the exact opposite connotation of being negligent.453 Oppenheim misunderstood the grammatical structure of the oath translating it as a positive assertoric oath. Furthermore he opted for the former meaning of the expression (“to be attentive”) and derived the verbal form of the second phrase involving the eyes from the verb watâru, understanding it as “to open eyes widely”, another way of expressing being attentive.454 Ebeling, who edited the three published texts (1954), realised that this was a negative promissory oath and translated it accordingly. However, he failed to notice that it was followed immediately by a positive promissory oath introduced by (ki) adî.455 Instead he interpreted the word adî introducing the second part of the oath as a temporal conjunction, “until”.456 As for the idiomatic expressions appearing in the oath, he rightly interpreted lêta nadû as “to be negligent”. He derived the verb of the second phrase from adûru, “to be dark; to fear”,457 and rendered it as “die Augen schweuen”, meaning “mit Rücksicht auf die Persönlichkeit (wohl besser auf den zu erwartenden Bachschisch) verfahren” (Ebeling 1954: 49).458 The implication is that the émidus would do their work conscientiously without being impressed by potential presents (bribes?). This seems possible in the

452 It is particularly interesting how the scribe of this text skips from a negative to a positive and back to a negative promissory oath. The last negative oath (u nukiribbi nいてく) is not specifically set off from the preceding positive one.

453 Oppenheim 1941: 262.

454 He translates lines 21-25 of YOS 6 232, for instance, as: “we really did everything to be attentive: we opened widely (our) eyes and inclined the cheek until everything which belonged (to it), the complete amount of the rent had entered the temple Eanna; thus we imposed the tax!” (Oppenheim 1941: 262). Not surprisingly, since Oppenheim was the editor-in-chief of the CAD at the time, this is the translation adopted by this dictionary (CAD L: 150).

455 Cf. von Soden 1995: 294. A construction ki + perfect tense expresses a negative promissory oath, whereas ki adî + present tense a positive promissory oath. In our texts the positive promissory oath is only apparently introduced by adî alone. ki introducing the negative oath must have served both clauses.

456 The same mistake was made by Oppenheim.

457 Von Soden lists the verb with two distinct meanings under one entry in the AHw (p. 11). CAD, however, makes two separate entries: adûru A, “to be worried, disturbed; to become obscured” (CAD A I: 103ff.), and adûru B, “to fear, to respect, to be afraid of someone” (CAD A I: 108f.).

458 This interpretation was accepted with some hesitation by von Soden in the Akkadian dictionary (AHw: 11).
light of TCL 13 177, in which the ūmidus, instead of using the phrase inē adāru, claim that they will not accept/take any šugarû for their services. The term šugarû designates in this period a product of processed dates. Originally it may have been a basket of fruits, but the meaning of the term was extended to all kinds of gifts\(^{459}\) (Landsberger 1967: 44f. 47f.). Nevertheless, the semantic leap from “fear” to “being impressed by bribes” does not seem very plausible. Perhaps one should rather think along the lines of being intimidated by onlookers, i.e. the agricultural workers whose fields and gardens were being assessed. They certainly outnumbered the estimation commissions and it is easily conceivable that they could from time to time form angry mobs infuriated by the unfairly(?) high obligations imposed on them, threatening the estimators and getting them to make yield estimates more to their advantage and to the disadvantage of the temple.\(^{460}\) Nevertheless, one wonders about the futility of asking these officials, who probably did not really have the option to strike back or defend themselves in case they were attacked, to swear courage as if they were recruits joining an army. The phrase is difficult. Cocquerillat, who correctly interpreted the structure of the oaths of the three texts,\(^{461}\) understood it as “to obscure the eyes”. Though this option seems attractive, since it could be understood as another expression of negligence and inattentiveness parallel to “the dropping of the cheek”, it has to be discarded because it does not work grammatically. The verb adāru in the sense of “to be dark, obscure” is intransitive\(^{462}\) and the form in our texts clearly is transitive.

Whatever the exact connotations of the phrase, the bottom line is that the temple authorities needed reassurance that the estimation procedure for both the arable land and the gardens cultivated by both the internal (ploughmen and gardeners) and the external personnel (sharecroppers) would be conducted with utmost care and without any irregularities, including accepting bribes (TCL 13 177) and thus undermining the temple’s objectives in terms of the incoming yield. Conversely, the agricultural workers were not to be treated unfairly and harmed in the course of the procedure. In all of the texts it is stressed in the positive promissory oaths that the estimations would be made on the complete prospective harvest. None of the temple fields and gardens were to be ‘forgotten’ or left out of the procedure for whichever reason, thus minimizing the temple’s income. This is probably where BIN 2 108, in which there is mention of “hiding” the land of the Lady of Uruk, ties in. A question which remains unanswered is whether these oaths were performed on a regular basis at the occasion of the annual ‘swearing in’ of the estimation commission or whether they were prompted sporadically by specific circumstances. Sandowicz, at any rate, understands them to be “oaths of office” (2012: 83).

To sum up, the yield estimators (ūmidus) were people in charge of making an estimate (imittu) of a prospective yield in the orchards and the fields of the temple. The term ūmidu did not designate a profession, but rather an ad hoc function. The imittu procedure was conducted annually and these estimates were used to determine the obligations of the ploughmen, the sharecroppers, and the gardeners. Three distinct groups of personnel are attested as yield estimators: 1 temple’s agricultural officials (rab epinnis, rab banê), 2. the rent farmer and his entourage, or 3. an ad hoc commission consisting of temple scribes and mār banê. The rab epinnis are attested with this function at a time when there was no large-scale rent farm and the arable holdings were managed internally by temple officials. The rab banê took on this task in the context of the management of their own ḫallatu orchards. The imittu procedure became the responsibility of the rent farmer (and his associates) once this mode of management of temple land was employed, i.e. with the first large-scale rent farmer, Šum-ukīn. This is at least implied by YOS 6 78 from 4 Nbn, discussed above. However, this text also shows that there were some irregularities concerning this procedure. This was probably not a singular incident. Perhaps for this reason the temple administration decided to employ estimation commissions recruited from its own ranks. This way the temple could have more control over the procedure which directly influenced the size of its income in

\(^{459}\) In the Neo-Babylonian rental contracts it can designate a supplementary payment in kind or in silver.

\(^{460}\) An angry group of gardeners threatening an official is described in YOS 21 27 (see Jursa 2010b: 94;\(^{506}\) for a partial edition of the letter).

\(^{461}\) 1968: 51ff. and esp. 52\(^{21}\).

\(^{462}\) Faces, hearts or sick people become dark, for instance, or heavenly bodies during an eclipse (cf. CAD A I: 103ff., AHw: 11).
agricultural staples. However, even the employment of temple’s own estimators was no guarantee for problem-free yield estimations as is evident from AnOr 8 31. It remains unclear whether the oaths of the members of the estimation commission in which they swear to fulfil their duties conscientiously were regularly conducted “oaths of office” or whether they were provoked by certain incidents as the one reflected in AnOr 8 31.
2.9. Rent farmers (ša muḫḫi sūti)

2.9.1. Introduction

The system of the “rent farm” has been the subject of several studies in the past. A discussion of the leases of temple land on the basis of the material from the Ebabbar of Sippar appeared already in 1890 (Peiser 1890: xvii ff.). In 1924-25 Schwenzner published and discussed one of the most important land lease contracts from the Eanna archive. In 1936 Ehrenkranz dealt with the subject while addressing certain aspects of the land lease documents from Eanna. Cocquerillat dedicated one part of her study of the date cultivation of the Eanna temple of Uruk to this phenomenon (1968: 37 ff.), while Jursa examined the situation in the Ebabbar of Sippar (1995a: 85 ff.). Van Driel dealt with different aspects of this system on several occasions. In particular his remarks on the so-called ‘Edict of Belšazzar’ (YOS 6 103) and the accounting models underlying the rent farm documents (1987-88: 61 ff.; 1990: 224 ff.), on exploitation through “farming out of rights” (1989: 204 ff. and particularly pp. 213-217), as well as on the agricultural entrepreneurs (1999: 213 ff.) should be noted here. Joannès also contributed greatly to our understanding of the rent farm system especially in Uruk (1982: 126 ff.; 2000 b: 37-40).

The concept expressed in Akkadian by the titles ša (ina) muḫḫi sūti, rab sūti or bēl sūti was translated in German as Generalpächter (Ebeling 1957: 38) and in French as fermier général

This term stems from the concept of the ferme générale, an administrative system of the Ancien Régime France designed for collection of taxes of all kinds, which as Cocquerillat notes, bears very little resemblance to the Babylonian rent farm system (1968: 12).

The title ša muḫḫi sūti is translated by Ebeling in the glossary to the Neo-Babylonian letters as Vorsteher der(s) Pachtabgabe(namtes) (1953: 205), while Ehrenkranz in an earlier study used the term Oberpächter (1936: 12).

Although this was nowhere explicitly stated, this was probably the case in Šum-ukin’s and Kalbiya’s rent farm, to judge by the size of the date revenues expected from them.

463 AfK 2, p. 107 ff. = VAT 8418, Šum-ukin’s and Kalbiya’s rent contract, the duplicate of YOS 6 11.
464 See also the remarks on rent farmers on institutional land in Jursa 2010 b: 194 ff.
465 This term stems from the concept of the ferme générale, an administrative system of the Ancien Régime France designed for collection of taxes of all kinds, which as Cocquerillat notes, bares very little resamblance to the Babylonian rent farm system (1968: 12).
466 The title ša muḫḫi sūti is translated by Ebeling in the glossary to the Neo-Babylonian letters as Vorsteher der(s) Pachtabgabe(namtes) (1953: 205), while Ehrenkranz in an earlier study used the term Oberpächter (1936: 12).
467 Jursa 1995a: 85.
469 Although this was nowhere explicitly stated, this was probably the case in Šum-ukin’s and Kalbiya’s, as well as Gimillu’s and Bēl-gimlanni’s rent farm, to judge by the size of the date revenues expected from them.
represented a fixed amount which was to be paid annually and which was determined in the rent contract. It was this sūtu which was used in the context of the rent farm. It was a fixed amount despite the fact that a part of its constituents – the individual sūtu obligations of the ploughmen and the harvest shares (zittu) of the sharecroppers – were variable as a result of the annual imittu procedures. To a certain degree, this margin of variation posed a risk for the rent farmer and enabled him to make profit or caused him to incur arrears.

Rent farmers in the context of the temple archives were entrepreneurs, who either stemmed from the institution from which they leased the land or were outsiders. Van Driel describes the agricultural entrepreneur as “someone who does not belong to the (institutional) hierarchy and who (voluntarily) accepts the position of an agricultural manager without thereby becoming a member of the organisation within which he will act [...] or who (without becoming an official) undertakes tasks within the organisation to which he belongs which are not in the normal run of the duties of his (usual/previous) function” (1999: 213f.). The rent farmers leased land from the temple for a fixed annual rent which was to be paid in agricultural produce, but had no intention of personally cultivating the fields and the orchards at their disposal as is evident from the amounts of land leased. They were to take up an intermediary role between the agricultural workers and the landlord – the temple. Together with the land the temple sometimes provided labour (ikkaru), tools and draught animals needed to cultivate at least a part of the leased land. For the remaining land the rent farmers had to organise the tools and the labour themselves. Among other things which the temple supplied to the rent farmer was the seed for cereal cultivation, usually only for the first year and as a rule only for the area under cultivation, not the entire rented land. Sometimes also food rations for the plough teams were provided. Metal for the repairs of the tools and cows, which were meant to keep up the numbers of the plough oxen with their offspring, were also supplied by the temple.

As mentioned above, the rent farmer had to acquire labour in addition to what was provided by the temple. This could be done by engaging sharecroppers (errēšus) who delivered only a part of their harvest or by sub-leasing plots of land to minor contractors who had to deliver fixed amounts of agricultural commodities. By sub-leasing the rent farmer delegated the responsibility for organising labour to these tenants. But there is also evidence that the rent farmers themselves employed agricultural workers who were to work the land under the same conditions as the temple ploughmen and who had no own means of production. The only such work contract known to us is the one commissioned by the rent farmer Ibnī-Iṣṭar (Ibnāya), son of Balāṭu, YOS 19.

There is evidence for several širkas and even a šatammu of the temple in the function of a rent farmer (see the table below).

And, one should add, water, as the temple estates generally had access to watercourses.

This meant that the fallow cycles were taken into consideration. Šum-ukin, for instance, who was in charge of 6,000 kurru of arable land received only 3,000 kurru of barley seed, as only half of the land was to be cultivated each year. The other half was to be left fallow (YOS 6 11). (Although the ratio of seed to cultivated area was 1:1, not all the seed was in fact sown. This would have been excessive, as was demonstrated by Powell (1984: 64). A part of this barley was probably used for fodder of the draught animals.)

The only examples for this practice known to me are PTS 2344 from 1 Ner and PTS 2821 from 5 (or 15) Nbn (for an edition of these texts see p. 49 and p. 155). According to PTS 2344 Šum-ukin, who at that point did not yet carry the title ša muḫḫi sūtu but nevertheless already had temple land at his disposal, leased out a plot of 50 kurru for an annual rent (ana sūtu) of 600 kurru of barley to a certain Nanāya-alaiddin, a temple ploughman. The size of the plot which by far exceeds the common workload of a plough team (e.g. 25 kurru according to the ‘Edict of Belṣazzar’) indicates that this lease did not just represent the normal obligation of an ikkaru but can be rated as entrepreneurial activity. It does not seem very likely that the plot of 50 kurru was to be tilled in a two year fallow cycle, i.e. only 25 kurru per year, as the output per kurru of land with respect to the expected rent of 600 kurru would have been 24-fold. This figure is too high, unless it is to be assumed that the land was exceptionally fertile and productive. The average crop output is usually half that much, i.e. 12-fold. PTS 2821 is a contract which records the sub-leasing of a part of the rent farm of Nergal-nāṣir, son of Nanāya-ibni, to a certain Bēlšunu. Bēlšunu’s rent was counted as a constituent of Nergal-nāṣir’s rent obligation. This sub-lease unlike the one in PTS 2344 was not authorised by the original tenant but by the temple authorities, probably because Nergal-nāṣir, unlike Šum-ukin, was a temple dependant and for this reason apparently less autonomous in managing his rent farm.
According to this contract, the two individuals who applied for work were to cultivate 20 kurru of land, like the temple ploughmen, and were to be provided with seed, four oxen, a ploughshare and other tools by the rent farmer. The fact that the rent farmer had to provide the means of production is a good example for his own investments in his business. Finally, there is a number of leases of date orchards which were to be worked under the same conditions as the orchards of the (temple) gardeners: the date obligation was to be determined at the annual yield estimation (imittu) and the remuneration (sissinu) was comprised of a customary amount of dates depending on the type and amount of work carried out in the orchard. In sum, the rent farmer could have four types of agricultural workers under his responsibility: the workforce provided by the temple (ploughmen or gardeners), sharecroppers, hired workers (ploughmen or gardeners) and tenants (sub-contractors). In terms of means of production, it appears that the rent farmer had to invest from his own stock only in the case of contracted workers, who did not possess the tools and the draught animals required for the work. The sharecroppers presumably had their own means of production, and the tenants either had them or had to find a way to organise them. The ikkarus provided by the temple usually came together with the tools and the plough oxen. This was the ideal case, at any rate. Follow-up rent contracts such as YOS 6 150 or TCL 13 182 show that occasionally the temple failed to provide the requisite numbers of ikkarus and had to make up for them at a later date. The evidence from Sippar, on the other hand, shows that providing adequate numbers not only of the ikkarus, but also of the oxen could pose a problem for the temple and that the plough teams were frequently under strength (Jursa 1995a: 17f.). In practice then the rent farmer will have had to rely on his private assets in this area also. Especially considering the unrealistically high workloads per plough team as suggested by the accounting models found in the ‘Edict of Belšazzar’ and the rent contracts it seems that investments on the part of the rent farmer were expected even if not explicitly stated in the contracts. The ‘Edict’ (YOS 6 103) and the rent contract YOS 6 150 required a plough team to work an area of 25 kurru (= 31.25 ha), while Šum-ukin’s rent contract (YOS 6 11) stipulates an area of 30 kurru (= 37.5 ha) per team. Gimillu’s plough teams were apparently expected to work 20 kurru (= 25 ha) of land (TCL 13 182). He refused to work under such conditions and demanded an increase in workforce which would have resulted in an area of 10 kurru (= 12.5 ha) per team. In order to put the entire land at his disposal under cultivation and meet the rent target set by the temple administration, the rent farmer had to find a way to enlarge his workforce and increase the means of production. Despite this inherent difficulty, there must have been a possibility for the rent

---

474 See p. 31 for an edition of the text.

475 The text does not mention the remuneration of these workers. It is probable that they were to be remunerated in the same way as the temple ploughmen, who usually had a part of the plot at their disposal for personal use.

476 The necessity to do so in order for the rent farm system to function was assumed by van Driel on more than one occasion (1989: 216, 217; 1990: 226). He also discussed the existence of private assets as a prerequisite for the involvement in agricultural enterprises based on the evidence from the Muršu and the institutional archives of Eabbar and Eanna (1999: 215ff.). Though such investments of the rent farmers in their business are rarely visible in our documentation, van Driel mentions BRM 1 101 from the Eabbar archive (Jursa 1995a: 103ff.) in this context (van Driel 1999: 218ff.). The text records an agreement between a rent farmer and another person in which the newcomer asked for half of the other one’s farm. In return for this he was to pay half the rent and additionally repay the arrears which the original rent farmer had incurred. This contract is a nice example of one rent farmer’s attempt at attracting an external capital investment for his rent farm by obliging his new partner to settle his old debts in connection with the rent farm and shows in general the rent farmer’s requirement to invest from his own stock (Jursa 1995a: 105ff.). The above mentioned work contract YOS 19 71 is further evidence for investments in rent farms, however, on a more basic level by organising the labour and equipment.

477 For examples of these contracts see table 35.


479 This is also the standard workload of a plough team proposed by the work contract YOS 19 71 (12 Nbn) mentioned above. Here, however, it appears that only two individuals (as opposed to four ikkarus of the institutional accounting models) were to operate a plough.

480 According to van Driel an area of 10 kurru was “within the limits of what was barely possible” (1989: 216). The evidence from Sippar shows that in practice the plough teams were assigned plots with a surface area from 10 to 15 kurru (Jursa 1995a: 138).
farmer to make profit, as otherwise there would be no motivation for taking up a lease of this scale. This can at least be assumed for the rent farmers who were not members of the temple household. However, it must be noted that it is hardly possible to find evidence for the profitability of the rent farm in our documentation. The question of the motivation of the rent farmers remains difficult. It can be assumed that there was a possibility for the rent farmers to make profit. At the same time it is legitimate to ask to what extent the impulse to take on a rent farm was voluntary to begin with. While a greater degree of voluntarity can be assumed for the external rent farmers, the influence (and coercion?) of the state administration notwithstanding, it is conceivable that temple’s internal rent farmers were pressured into a contractual relationship by the temple administration or at least had little or no say with respect to the conditions of the rent contract.\footnote{Jursa considers the possibility “that tax and rent farming in Babylonia in general might [...] have been on the way to undergoing a similar development as in Hellenistic Egypt, where it changed from a ‘freely’ undertaken entrepreneurial activity to an onerous duty conceived as ‘liturgy’” (2010b: 291f. note 1751).} 

Unfortunately, the extent of this temple- and possibly also state-induced coercion cannot be gauged with the help of the available evidence.

Finally, we can address the matter of the benefits for the temple brought on by the rent farming system. The main advantage of the rent farm system was the influx of capital from outside the institution. The rent farmer not only invested in the production from his own stock, but was held personally liable for any potential outstanding dues. His assets, which often included real estate, slaves and cattle, could be confiscated by the temple in case of his failure to pay his rent. This, together with the chronic lack of manpower, probably one of the Neo-Babylonian temples’ gravest deficits,\footnote{Cf. Janković 2005: 174f.} was in fact one of the main motives for the temple administration to ‘privatize’ the management of its agricultural sector. The temple had much more land than could be cultivated by the ploughmen and the oxen it had at its disposal. Solely relying on its internal resources in manpower and draught animals would mean that parts of this land would remain uncultivated. This was countered on the one hand by assigning larger plots to the ploughmen in an attempt to get the maximum work output out of them (which was probably not very effective) and, on the other, by leasing out land to sharecroppers who would deliver a fraction of the harvest to the temple. However, by putting the ploughmen under enormous pressure these measures occasionally backfired\footnote{See the incidents described in YBC 4000 (34 Nbk) (Janković 2005: 167ff.).} and left room for improvement in general. In order to cope with these problems and help to intensify its agricultural production the temple employed rent farmers. By doing this it ensured a net income in agricultural produce and rid itself of the need to organise and supervise the agricultural workers, which was now the responsibility of the rent farmer. A good example for such a development is the disappearance of the official in charge of the ploughmen (\textit{rab ikkarattî}) after the rent farmer Šum-ukin, who probably had all the available ploughmen at his disposal, supplanted his official duties.\footnote{See p. 115.} However, it is debatable to which extent the temple benefited from a leaner bureaucratic structure now that certain aspects of management were in the hands of the rent farmer. The temple still retained a keen interest in how the rent farmer managed his farm: sub-leases were still most frequently sanctioned by the temple administration, as the sub-lease contracts authorized by the temple administrator, temple scribes or the royal commissioner of Eanna demonstrate (see Table on pp. 320ff.). Furthermore, the officials in charge of the \textit{imittu} procedure, of collecting, weighing and transporting the barley or dates due from the rent farmers were frequently temple scribes. It seems that the temple was reluctant to relinquish the control over the administrative procedures monitoring the processes on which a large portion of its income depended. The role of the royal administration in the context of the \textit{ferme générale}, namely the involvement in the setting up of the framework for the proper functioning of the rent farms and the endorsement of certain individuals as rent farmers, will be discussed in detail in the concluding chapter of this section of the book.

The following is a list of all the rent farmers (column 1) known from the Eanna archive stating their minimal terms in office (column 2) and titles where attested (column 4; the titles cited
in brackets are the additional titles these people were attested with). The third column indicates which sphere of agricultural production they were responsible for: b(arley) stands for arable agriculture and d(ates) for date cultivation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nergal-nāṣir/Nanāya-ibni</td>
<td>35 Nbk - 13 Nbn</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>ša muḫḫi sūti ša Bēlti ša Uruk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Šum-ukin/Bēl-zēri/Basia</td>
<td>1 - 7 Nbn</td>
<td>b+d</td>
<td>ša muḫḫi sūti ša Bēlti ša Uruk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalbāya/Iqṣa/Basia</td>
<td>1 Nbn - 1 Cyr</td>
<td>b+d</td>
<td>ša muḫḫi sūti ša Bēlti ša Uruk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arad-Innin/Inbi-Īṣṭar</td>
<td>3 Nbn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Šin-ibni/Šamaš-udammiq/Rēʾi-alpi</td>
<td>3 Nbn</td>
<td>b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nabū-muṣētiq-uddē/Nabū-šum-iddin</td>
<td>3 Nbn</td>
<td>b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nergal-ipuš</td>
<td>8 Nbn - 2 Cyr</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>ša muḫḫi sūti ša Angillu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inbi-Īṣṭar/Balātu</td>
<td>11 Nbn - 4 Cyr</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>ša muḫḫi sūti ša Bēlti ša Uruk (šīrku)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bānia/Bulluṭayā</td>
<td>12 Nbn</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>ša muḫḫi sūti ša Bēlti ša Uruk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zērbibī/Nabū-ēter-napšātī</td>
<td>127-13 Nbn</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>ša ina muḫḫi mushānē</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nabū-udammiq/Nabū-ēter/Gimil-Nanāya</td>
<td>4 Cyr</td>
<td>b+d</td>
<td>ša muḫḫi sūti ša Bēlti ša Uruk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ileʾi-Marduk/Nabū-šum-ukin/Eṭēru</td>
<td>6 Cyr - 1 Camb</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>ša muḫḫi sūti (ša uṭṭeti) ša Bēlti ša Uruk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ardia/Nabū-bān-aḫi/Rēmūt-Ea</td>
<td>8 Cyr - 7 Camb</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>ša muḫḫi sūti ša suluppi ša Bēlti ša Uruk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nabū-bān-aḫi/Kalbāya/Basia</td>
<td>acc - 1 Camb</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>ša muḫḫi sūti ša suluppi ša Bēlti ša Uruk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mūrānu/Šamaš-iddin</td>
<td>1 Camb</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>ša muḫḫi sūti ša suluppi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diljummu</td>
<td>2 - 4 Camb</td>
<td>b+d</td>
<td>ša muḫḫi sūti ša Bit-Amukanu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nabū-balāt-šarri- iqbi</td>
<td>2 Camb</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>ša muḫḫi sūti ša muḫḫi Nār-P iqūdu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gimilu/Innin-šum-ibni</td>
<td>acc - 2 Dar</td>
<td>b+d</td>
<td>ša muḫḫi sūti ša Bēlti ša Uruk (šīrku)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bēl-gimlanni/Madān-čreš</td>
<td>2 Dar</td>
<td>b+d</td>
<td>(ša muḫḫi quppī Eanna, šīrku)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Šullum</td>
<td>29 Dar</td>
<td>b+d</td>
<td>(šatam Eanna)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 20: Rent farmers

The career of each individual rent farmer is treated in detail in the following chapters. As is evident from the table, not all the rent farmers are attested with the title ša muḫḫi sūti, even though there can be little doubt about the nature of their activities. This is particularly clear in the case of the first known rent farmer Nergal-nāṣir, who had leased large tracts of temple land, but never appeared with a title designating him as a rent farmer. Some of the rent farmers appear with other titles (ša muḫḫi mushānē, ša muḫḫi quppī, šatammu) which shows that these people could be engaged in multiple functions concerning land and water management or could pair their work as rent farmers with tasks within the temple administration. Not only free citizens could venture into the rent farming business, but also temple oblates (šīrkušū). At least three of the known rent farmers could be identified as šīrkušū of the Lady of Uruk. The social background of others still can not be determined at the present state of our documentation. Some of the temple’s rent farmers are natives of Uruk (e.g., Arad-Innin from the family Gimil-Nanāya, and Šin-ibni, from the Rēʾi-alpi family), while others come from elsewhere in Babylonia (e.g., Šum-ukin and his nephew Kalbāya).

The terms of office listed for the rent farmers are minimal, i.e. only those periods are included for which we have reliable attestations of their activities in the rent farming business. Most of the individuals appearing in the table are in fact attested for longer periods in the Eanna

---

485 Three lease-contracts are known for him: VS 20 88 (35 Nbk), YOS 6 41 (3 Nbn), TCL 12 90 (8 Nbn); for a discussion of these texts see below.
486 Similarly, the first rent farmer of the Ebabbar in Sippar, Ana-amāt-Bēl-atkal (4-16 Nbn), is never attested with the title of a rent farmer (Jursa 1995a: 87).
487 “Official in charge of the canal outlets” or similar; see below, chapter on Zērbibī.
488 See Joannès 2000a: 36ff. and especially p. 40 on the question of the native origin of the rent farmers.
archive. They usually start appearing in the texts of the temple archive before they commenced with their rent farming career, and some of them are even attested after their rent farms were dissolved. The actual periods of attestation of the individual rent farmers are noted in the individual chapters dedicated to them and are also visible in the prosopographic tables included at the end of each of these chapters. As for the dates for their terms of office, these may still have to be modified with the appearance of new relevant textual material. It is evident from the table that several rent farmers could be active at the same time. It appears that in the third regnal year of Nabonidus up to six rent farms existed side by side. Indeed, though these varied in size considerably, it becomes clear that the scope of Eanna’s estates was such that there was no one single businessman around at the time that had the adequate assets and the confidence to venture the management of the temple estates in their entirety.

As was noted, some of the titles mention the type of crop – barley or dates – suggesting what part of the agricultural production the rent farmer specialized in. Others include toponyms giving evidence for a geographic specialisation of the rent farmers in question. The institutional affiliation of these ‘local’ rent farmers is somewhat problematic, though. Not one of them (Nergal-ipuš, Diḫummu and Nabû-balâṭ-šarri-iqbi) is attested with a patronymic and at least one of the ‘local’ rent farmers can be related to the royal administration at some point. Nabû-balâṭ-šarri-iqbi is attested as a mašennu, a high royal official with certain responsibilities concerning the maintenance of the irrigation system and the royal estates in TCL 13 227 (7 Nbn) and as a rent farmer of Nâr-Piḫûdu in TCL 13 150 (2 Camb). It is not clear whether these ‘local’ rent farmers were in fact employed by Eanna or some other institution and whose land they managed. Before this can be clarified, hopefully with the aid of new evidence from the unpublished material, they will be included in the list of the rent farmers of Eanna.

Note also that there were three rent farmers for dates in the first year of Cambyses – Ardia, Nabû-bān-aṭi and Mûrānu.

Compare, for instance, Šum-ukin’s and Kalbāya’s annual rent of 35,000 kurru of barley and dates (YOS 6 11) to Arad-Innin’s and Šîn-iñi’s rent of 1,240 kurru of barley (YOS 6 40) and Nergal-nāṣīr’s 1,000 kurru of barley (YOS 6 41).

According to Jursa he was “oberster Bevollmächtigter für landwirtschaftliche Angelegenheiten” (2010b: 80).

Neither of the texts gives a patronymic, but considering the unusual, albeit programmatic, name it seems compelling to assume that the two attestations refer to the same individual.
2.9.2. Nergal-nāšir

In 1990 Dandamayev presented a brief sketch of the career of an individual by the name of Nergal-nāšir, son of Nanāya-ibni, a person active in Eanna’s animal husbandry and agricultural sector. The two different spheres of activities indicate according to Kümmel (1979: 72, 105) that those were two different individuals. This is possible, but is not necessarily so. The two tasks could well have been combined and executed by a single person. This is in fact suggested by one of the rent contracts of Nergal-nāšir (TCL 12 90), which in addition to usual stipulations with respect to agricultural production also makes specific provisions for the grazing of sheep on the fields leased out to him. Dandamayev considers it more likely that all of these attestations concern one individual (1990: 90) and this is the view adopted in the following.

The first certain attestation of Nergal-nāšir is from 24 Nbk, from a receipt of barley for rations (GC 1 165). One possibly earlier attestation could be in YOS 17 39. The date is damaged and the year could be read as 1191 Nbk, but the [2]9th year could also fit the traces and the spacing of the damaged section. Nergal-nāšir’s first appearance in a clearly agricultural context is from 35 Nbk, in his first land lease contract (VS 20 88). His last attestation is from 14 Nbn (BIN 1 174). A Nergal-nāšir, without a patronymic, appears also in 16 Nbn, in a text concerning tools and work materials for canal digging (YOS 6 218), but it is not entirely certain whether he should be identified with our rent farmer. From 6 Cyr (CD 78) we have so far the latest attestation of his name in our documentation. Here he is not an active protagonist, but rather his daughter fxiλ, in whose patronymic he appears. The text itself deals with the status of a slave woman, which had been previously bought from Nergal-nāšir’s daughter and another man.

Nergal-nāšir never appears with the title ša muḫḫi sūtī, but the scope of his agricultural enterprises (see below) certainly qualify him as such. He was probably a dependant of the temple, though he is never explicitly designated as a širku. In a text from 1 Nbn listing houses provided for the temple oblates and granted by the royal commissioner, Nergal-nāšir’s family appears among the beneficiaries of this allocation scheme (OIP 122 169). Furthermore, his professional background within the sector of animal husbandry also points in this direction.

Apart from his attestations in documents concerning animal husbandry, which will not be discussed here, Nergal-nāšir appears in a range of other texts, which are not directly connected to his activities as a rent farmer. He acted as a witness on a couple of occasions: in 43 Nbk, in a debt note for barley belonging to the royal official Nabû-šarrûssu-ukin (YBC 3737), in 3 Ner, in a bail document (TCL 12 69), and in 7 Nbn, in an imittu debt note for dates pertaining to the rent farm of Šum-ukin and Kalbaya (YOS 6 107). In 40 Nbk he acted as a guarantor in a debt note together with two other men for the payment of barley owed by Arad-Innin, son of Ibni-īštār, who was also a rent farmer (see p. 200), and his brother Balṭu (YBC 3729). It may appear odd to find a širku in the role of a witness; however, these occurrences may indicate a rise in Nergal-nāšir’s standing within the temple hierarchy owing to his activities as a rent farmer. Furthermore it should be noted that all the cases he witnessed, with the exception of TCL 12 69, which is too damaged to be precisely

493 It should be noted that more attestations, especially from unpublished texts, could be identified since 1990. Spar (1972: 89ff.) also discussed Nergal-nāšir’s career. See also Coquerillat’s discussion of Nergal-nāšir’s rent contracts (1968: 39ff.)
494 The text should probably be placed in the context of animal husbandry (see also next footnote).
495 The text lists nine people including Nergal-nāšir. The others were apparently under his responsibility. This is probably connected to his activities in the sector of animal husbandry, where he had a similar function as a rab eserti, though he never explicitly appears with the title (unless GC 1 165 line 8 (u₃₀gal 10-ti₈₃₄) is interpreted as including the previously mentioned Nergal-nāšir): for instance, he received the rations of ten men in GC 1 191 (Kümmel 1979: 72).
496 Note however that in 12 Nbn a group of men broke into Nergal-nāšir’s house and stole some iron tools and work clothes according to AnOr 8 27. It is not surprising that he would be involved in canal digging projects, for instance, since the upkeep of the irrigation system was one of the responsibilities of rent farmers. With this in mind the identification of Nergal-nāšir from YOS 6 218 with our rent farmer seems plausible.
497 This is suggested by his receipt of rations from the temple (GC 1 165).
498 For these see Kümmel 1979: 72. YBC 9226 (41 Nbk) and Dillard, FLP 1581 (8 Nbn) can be added to these attestations.
classified, had an agricultural background and may well have been directly relevant to his rent farming business. For this reason Nergal-nāṣir’s presence at those proceedings is not surprising.

A private text from 1 Ami, recording Nergal-nāṣir’s sale of a slave woman and her daughter for 44 shekels of silver, has also come down to us (GC 2 95). Incidentally, this same slave woman, Ana-makkanišu, appears again in 11 Nbn in YOS 6 176 as a fugitive. The man who had purchased the slave in the first place, Šamaš-šar-usur, son of Ḫumšum-ḫṣ-iddin, also appears in the second text, but the woman is designated as the slave of Nergal-nāṣir there. According to this text Nergal-nāṣir had paid 12 shekels of silver to a certain Nabû-mukku-elip and was obliged to return the slave woman to him. The only way to understand this is that Nergal-nāṣir had regained possession of Ana-makkanišu sometime between 1 Ami and 11 Nbn, had sold her to Nabû-mukku-elip, after which she fled to her previous owner Šamaš-šar-usur.

Nergal-nāṣir acted as a debtor in two private debt notes for barley from 7 and 8 Nbn (BM 114588 and 114598). The creditors in both texts were Nabû-balātu-ēreš, son of Dādia, and Nabû-lū-salim, the slave of the royal commissioner Nabû-šar-usur. The amounts of barley owed were 22 and 40 kurru respectively and were to be delivered at harvest time. Unfortunately, the exact nature of the connection between Nergal-nāṣir and his creditors is concealed by the terse format of these documents. It is not possible to claim with a great degree of certainty from whose private archive these texts stemmed. Both the debtor Nergal-nāṣir and either one of the creditors are possible candidates in this case. However, as other private documents of Nergal-nāṣir are known (GC 2 95, YOS 6 176) he seems to be the more likely archive owner. The presence of his private documents among the texts of the temple archive can be explained by the temple administration’s practice of appropriating the private archives of its debtors in order to lay claims on their assets as means of debt settlement. This would imply that Nergal-nāṣir was indebted to the temple, i.e. that his enterprises, be they in the agricultural or the animal husbandry sector, resulted in arrears. Unfortunately no documents recording the final settling of accounts with Nergal-nāṣir which could verify this assumption have come down to us.

As for his agricultural activities in association with Eanna, Nergal-nāṣir dealt mainly with arable land. This is evident from his three rent contracts that are known to us so far. The first one, VS 20 88, is from 35 Nbk and concerns land that had previously been under the responsibility of Ibni-Ḫtar and Nabû-Šum-ibni, two rab esertiši, temple officials in charge of the temple’s arable production (see p. 152). The text is badly preserved, leaving many gaps in its interpretation. From what can be reconstructed it appears that Nergal-nāṣir had some kind of an arrangement for sharing the workforce and the ploughs with Nergal-ina-tēši-čer and Nabû-abḫē-šullim, another two rab esertiši. His rent consisted of over 4,000 kurru of barley, which was in part to be delivered as sesame, kasia and a third product, cress perhaps. In addition to this he was to provide the temple annually with ten lambs. This obligation was probably related to his activities in the animal husbandry sector. Not only does the early date of his rent contract show that Cocquerillat’s statement that Nergal-nāṣir was one of the many imitators of Šum-ukin (1968: 94) is unjustified, but considering the size of his rent it would be safe to claim that he was the first large-scale rent farmer of Eanna.

VS 20 88 5-VIII-35 Nbk

1. id-gur-na-šiš a-ši ša id-na-na-a-[dù a-na aš]-30-mu
   ḫi-i-pi ša ě-an-na ū ṣen[tek pi-iq-né-e-ti]
   ša ě-an-na ki-a-am iqi-bi um-ma ‘aq-q[ar x x]
   ša id-dù a-šu ša id-ag-mu-dù u id-ag-mu-dù [a-šu ša šu-zu-bu]

499 The text also informs us that he was married to a woman called Tišpāya.
500 A tenant-landlord relationship between Nergal-nāṣir and the agents of Nabû-šar-usur is a possibility, the debt notes expressing his rent obligation. In this case the leased land cannot have been of substantial size to judge by the owed amount. This, however, is purely conjectural. Be that as it may, the two texts indicate that Nabû-šar-usur, the ša rēš šarrī bēl piqitti of Eanna, privately engaged in agricultural production through his agents and entertained business relationship with temple associates.
501 This practice can be observed especially for the rent farmer Šum-ukin (see below p. 182ff.).
502 VS 20 88 (35 Nbk), YOS 6 41 (3 Nbn) and TCL 12 90 (8 Nbn).
503 VS 20 was published in 1978. This rent contract was therefore not known to Cocquerillat. It was also not included in Kümmel 1979: 105 and was overlooked by Dandamayev 1990 in his paper on Nergal-nāṣir.
5. "Nergal-nasir, son of Nanaya-[i]bi, spoke to Sin-iddin, the resident of Eanna, and to the officials of Eanna as follows: ‘Starting from the 8th month of the 35th year, give me the land [...504] of Ibbi-ibtar, son of Nabû-šum-ibni, and Nabû-šum-ibni, [son of Šuzubu,] the ploughs and the farmers that are in Naḫbutu, that [...] Angillu, that I am sharing with Nergal-in-štē-čer and Nabû-ahlē-šullim, [the land] of Ibbi-ibtar and Nabû-šum-ibni (situated) on high ground505 and the land in Silištu [...]. From the 1st month of the year 36, for five years I will deliver yearly 4000 [+x] of barley in total, using the measure of the Lady of Urak [at the big watercourses], and yearly I will give one [...amb] to the Lady of Urak.’ Sin-iddin, the resident, and the temple officials listened to him and gave him (the land). From the 1st month of the 36th year of Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon, he will deliver to Eanna yearly 4000 + [x kurru] of barley using the measure of the Lady of Urak [at the big watercourses] and will give ten lambs. Of this amount he will deliver to Eanna 100 [...], Nabû-kibs[ua]-šarratu-urş[ur], the [x]507
Witnesses: Nabû-ahšê-bulli†, son of [PN, descendant of PN],
Gimillu, son of [PN, descendant of PN], [PN], son of Apêya, descendant of [PN], [PN, son of PN, descendant of Egibi],
[PN, son of PN, descendant of PN], Mardûk-er²ba, son of [PN, descendant of PN],
[x]-ia, son of [PN], [PN, son of PN], descendant of Egibi, [PN, son of PN], descendant of ėx,
[PN, son of PN], descendant of Sin-tabni, Innin-[x, son of PN].
Scribe: Nabû-bân-âhi, son of Ibnâ[ya, descendant of Ekur-zakir].
Uruk; 5-VIII-35 [Nbk], king of Babylon.”

This contract applied for a period of five years starting from the eight month of 35 Nbk, i.e.
it expired in 40 Nbk. We do not know whether it was renewed or whether Nergal-nâṣîr was
assigned land in another part of the Uruk hinterlands at that time, as no land leases have come
down to us from that period. There is evidence, however, that he continued working for the temple
as an agricultural entrepreneur. In 42 Nbk he appears in two imittu lists for barley. NCBT 361
records the deliveries from Lasûtu and Kakkabtu. In this text Nergal-nâṣîr is responsible for an
amount of barley (broken off) and for the deliveries of the sharecroppers from these two localities.
His identification in PTS 2363 is not certain, as he is given no patronymic. Here he is responsible
for a delivery of 18 kurru of barley from the district Raṭu. There is another uncertain attestation
from 2 Ner (BIN 1 131), a list of maššartu and ration disbursements, in which a Nergal-nâṣîr, also
without a patronymic, is named as the supplier of barley.

It is not clear what happened to his farm immediately after the creation of Šum-ukîn’s and
Kalbêya’s rent farm in 1 Nbn. Generally the evidence for the period between 40 Nbk and 3 Nbk is
vague. It cannot be determined whether he remained in charge of some land and if so whether his
rent farm retained its scope from 35 Nbk or whether it had been reduced and/or relocated. Was he
even put under Šum-ukîn’s direct responsibility?

From the tenth month of 1 Nbn come two debt notes for barley belonging to Eanna, in
which he acts as an intermediary between the temple and the debtors (YOS 19 30 and Spar,
Studies, no. 9). Both debt notes are similarly phrased. They state that the barley, which is the
property of the Lady of Uruk, is at the disposal of (ina pâni) Nergal-nâṣîr and is charged against PN.
Though these debt notes are structurally reminiscent of imittu debt notes, in which the intermediary
part is played by the rent farmer, the fact that they were both dated to the tenth month indicates that
they could not have been written during a regular imittu procedure. Regrettably, the connotations of
these two texts regarding Nergal-nâṣîr’s status as an agricultural entrepreneur are ambiguous.

Nergal-nâṣîr’s second extant rent contract (YOS 6 41) comes from the third year of
Nabonidus. The text, which has been edited by Coqquerillat (1968: 39, 108f.), informs us that he
had leased land in the Sumandar region, from the district Aššuritu to the district Ḫidû. The contract
explicitly states that this was land which had not been included in Šum-ukîn’s farm. By analogy
one could assume that in the period from 40 Nbk to 3 Nbn he worked side by side with Šum-ukîn,
not under his responsibility, in case he was active in temple agriculture at that time. His new rent
contract shows a diminished responsibility when compared to his rent farm from 35 Nbk: the new
rent consisted of over 1,000 kurru of barley, 60 kurru of sesame and 20 kurru of cress. This was
perhaps the result of Šum-ukîn’s dominance in the temple’s arable sector.

Nergal-nâṣîr was also engaged in date production on a smaller scale. His date orchards
were located in the areas under Šum-ukîn’s responsibility. In 3 Nbn he appears in an imittu list for
dates pertaining to the rent farm of Šum-ukîn with a delivery of 6;2.3 kurru from Kakkabtu and 62
kurru from Lasûtu (YOS 6 35). Furthermore, in 7 Nbn he acted as a witness in one of the imittu
debt notes for dates from the šiûtu of Šum-ukîn and Kalbdêya (YOS 6 107).

In 5 (or [1])5? Nbn part of his farm was sub-leased to a certain Bêšûnu, son of Mardûk.508
It is interesting to note that the sub-leasing had been authorised by the royal commissioner and

508 For this individual see also note 511.
temple officials, while Nergal-nāṣir was present at the proceedings only as a witness. This is probably owed to his status as a temple dependant. Bēlšunu’s farm was not independent. His annual rent of 300 kurru of barley and 5 kurru of sesame was considered to constitute a part of Nergal-nāṣir’s rent (ll. 15f.).

PTS 2821

obv. 1. 15-ši-nu a-šā ša mar-duk a-na la-šag-lugal-ūrū
ušag lugal ša en pi-qit-ti é-an-na
uša pi-qa-nē-e-ti ša é-an-na iq-bi
un-ma qa-qar gi-iz-ze-e-tū ša id.₄ in-nin
5. ū qa-qar šā garšu raq-Šatu a-ḫu-ul-la-la₄
ina qa-qar-gē ša-Ša-na ša-ba-n a-na la-ušur-pab
a-Šu ša id-na-na-a-dū ta-ad-di-nu
bi-in-na-ni-ma mu-an-na 3 me gur
[še] -bar ū 5 gur še-gīš-i ina ša-ma-ši-ḫu
lo.e. 10. [ša]₄ gašan ša ūnu₃ ina ūgu me-e-gal₄
a-na ša gašan ša ūnu₃ luδ-din la-šag-lugal-ūrū
ušag lugal uša piq-nē-e-tū
rev. iš-me-šu-₄ ma lδ-din-nu-ni₃-šše mu-an-na
3 me gur še-bar ū 5 gur še-gīš-i
15. ina ša-ma-ši-ḫu ša ša-gašan ša ūnu₃ ina ša-ba-n
ša la-ušur-pab i-nam-din
ina gub-zu ša la-šag-lugal-ūrū ušag lugal
la en pi-qit-ti é-an-na
[ku-mi]-nu la δi-kudŠe₃-šu-mu a-šū
20. ša la-ši-gu-₃-u-a
la-šag-ži₃-met a-Šu ša ir₄-en a la δu₁-ia₁
u.e. δu₁-ia a-šū ša la-šag-din-su-e a la δ₃-δi-ṭi-ṭer
la-ušur-pab a-šū ša la na-na-a-dū
le.e. Še-mu-bi₄-sag la₄ ma-a a-šū ša la δu₁-ia₃ [šu-]₂nin a
25. [šu]-tur₂-babbar ūnu₃ ina šu ud 20-[kam]
[šu]₂-kam a-gi-ni-tuk lugal ti₃-ti₄ [šu]₁₁

“The Belšunu, son of Marduk, spoke to Nabû-šar-úṣur, the royal commissioner of Eanna, and the commissioners of Eanna as follows: ‘Give me land in the gizzatu of Nār-Ininn and land in the district Raqqat-Šama across (the river), from the land you had leased to Nergal-nāṣir, son of Nanaya-ibni, and I will deliver yearly to the Lady of Uruk 300 kurru of barley and 5 kurru of sesame, using the measure of the Lady of Uruk, at the big watercourses.’ Nabû-šar-úṣur, the royal official, and the commissioners of Eanna listened to him and gave him (the land). He will give yearly 300 kurru of barley and 5 kurru of sesame using the measure of the Lady of Uruk as part of Nergal-nāṣir’s rent.

In the presence of Nabû-šar-úṣur, the royal commissioner of Eanna.

Witnesses: Madan-ahḫē-iddin, son of Gimillu, descendant of Šīgu₄, 
Nabû-čer-šapšāti, son of Arad-Bēl, descendant of Bānī₃, 
Bānī₃, son of Nabû-balās-su-ṭi₃, descendant of Sin-leqi₄-un, 
Nergal-nāṣir, son of Nanaya-ibni, 
Scribe: Šumīya, son of İbn-Iṣtar, descendant of Puṣṣāya; 
Uruk; 20-IV-5 [še]₁₁ Nbn, king of Babylon.”

509 The meaning of the word gizzatu is difficult to grasp. While it originally referred to land confiscated by the royal authorities (according to kudurru inscriptions), this interpretation is not entirely applicable to its use during the Neo-Babylonian period, as in several instances it designated land belonging to the temple. The term has most recently been discussed by van Driel 2002: 195f. (for earlier literature see ibid.: 195) without reaching a conclusion, though. It can be assumed, however, that the term implied a certain juridical status of the land.
In 8 Nbn Nergal-näšir leased another lot of land (TCL 12 90) from the temple. This time he took over the land which had been leased previously by the rent farmer Kalbāya. Kalbāya’s motivation for giving up this land was probably his need to concentrate on the farm which had been managed by his uncle Šum-ukin up to that point and was now under his sole responsibility (p. 189). The land which is the subject of TCL 12 90 was situated in the Sumandar region, from the district Til-ḫurāši to the Euphrates, in the district Rudāya and in the district Angillu. Kalbāya’s rent for this land amounted to 3,000 kurru of barley. Nergal-näšir promised to top that and deliver annually 3,500 kurru. Some of this rent was to be paid in sesame. Parts of this farm had been sub-leased to other individuals previously. The text clarifies their obligations with respect to Nergal-näšir and the temple. The revenue of the land which had been leased out to Gimillu, son of Ardiya, and Bēlšunu, son of Marduk,511 was to be paid in Eanna and deducted from the rent payable by Nergal-näšir (ll. 12ff.). Some land had been allocated to a certain Šamaš-šum-iddin, son of Amil-Nanāya, who was provided with ploughmen for cultivation, and to the rab šuli Ninā-šu-ur,512 but apparently under different conditions. Their impost was to be determined by the temple and deducted from Nergal-näšir’s rent (ll. 15ff.). It is not clear whether Nergal-näšir leased this land in addition to the land he had from before, or whether his old leases had expired and these 3,500 kurru of barley constituted his only responsibility from this time on.

Be that as it may, another rent arrangement must have been made between Nergal-näšir and the temple authorities some time between 8 and 12 Nbn. A debt note for kasia, the share of a certain Nabû-bêlšunu/Marduk/Kuri. YOS 6 67 is edited by Coquerillat 1968: 46. 110ff.

511 This is the same individual who appears as the lessee in the sub-lease of Nergal-näšir’s farm PTS 2821 (see above) and probably also in YOS 6 67 (4 Nbn), a lease of land for planting an orchard (una zāgipūti). If this identification is correct, the text would provide his full name: Nabû-bēlšunu/Marduk/Kuri. YOS 6 67 is edited by Coquerillat 1968: 46. 110ff.
512 For this individual see Kümmel 1979: 62.
Nabû-êter-napšāti, are charged against Nabû-muššētq-uddē, son of [Nergal]-ibni. In the ninth month he will give (the kasia). (This is) apart from 4 kurru of kasia, share charged [against] Kinēnāya, son of Nergal-ibni. (This is also) apart from the earlier debt note.

Witnesses: [Nabû]-zêr-[ušabb], son of Ina-tēši-êter, descendant of Bēl-aplu-uṣur, Eanna-li-pu-uṣur, son of Ţābia, descendant of Kidin-Marduk,

Scribe: Balātu, son of Muššētq-Bēl;
Estate of Bit-Sîn-ašarid, [estate of the Lady of Uruk; 14-[x]-12* Nbn, king of Babylon."

Apparently Nergal-nāṣir managed a farm in partnership with this Zēribī, of whom little is known (see p. 211 for an outline of his career). Nothing more can be said about this farm. Zēribī is attested once more in 13 Nbn in a legal dispute with the rent farmer Ibnāya, son of Balātu, concerning newly reclaimed land (SAKF 155513). Zēribī appears here with the title ša ina muḫḫī mūšānē (i.e. the official in charge of the canal outlets). Nergal-nāṣir also appears in this text. However, the context is unclear due to the bad state of preservation of the tablet. Here he was designated as Zēribī’s partner, šutāpu (l. 23). It is not clear whether Nergal-nāṣir also shared Zēribī’s responsibilities for the irrigation system. This would not be inconsistent with some of his last attestations: namely, AnOr 8 27 (12 Nbn), which describes the investigation of a theft of (digging) tools and work clothes from Nergal-nāṣir’s house, and YOS 6 218 (16 Nbn), in which, if the identification with our Nergal-nāṣir, who is not given a patronymic here, is correct, he appears in connection with tools. However, these tools could have been used for agricultural work as well, which renders these considerations hypothetical.

Be that as it may, GC 1 418 (12* Nbn) is the last attestation of Nergal-nāṣir in a clearly agricultural context. No documentation for the settling of accounts with him has come down to us. The scant evidence we have makes an assessment of the success and the scope of his business difficult. He made several arrangements with the temple for farming its land, but of these only three contracts are known today. His first rent contract entailed an obligation of more than 4,000 kurru of barley, the second one more than 1,000 kurru and the third one 3,500 kurru. As a rent farmer of the temple he was active from 35 Nbk the latest until at least 12 Nbn, which is longer than Šum-ukīn’s or any other rent farmer’s career. It is not known, however, whether the arrangements in his various rent contracts were cumulative or not. Even if this were not the case, the significant scope of his rent farm from 35 Nbk paved the ground for even more ambitious enterprises which were to culminate in the era of Šum-ukīn. The length of his career suggests at any rate that the temple administration was satisfied with the output of his enterprises.

2.9.2.1. Attestations514 of Nergal-nāṣir:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Contents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UCP 9/2 47: 1f.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>fragmentary, disbursements/deliveries of (wool?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCL 13 231: 33, 36f.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>account of barley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 21 42: 12f.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>? YOS 3 166: 13</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>letter (n.p.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>? YOS 3 181: 1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>letter order (n.p.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GC 1 191: 3</td>
<td>23-VI-[x] Nbk</td>
<td>silver disbursements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 17 39: 1, 10f.</td>
<td>17-IV-19 Nbk</td>
<td>list of PNs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GC 1 165: 7</td>
<td>5-VI-24 Nbk</td>
<td>barley disbursement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VS 20 88: 1</td>
<td>5-VIII-35 Nbk</td>
<td>rent contract</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTS 2855: 3</td>
<td>16-VI-36 Nbk</td>
<td>debt note for barley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GC 1 84: 2f.</td>
<td>[x]-XI-37 Nbk</td>
<td>account of cattle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YBC 3729: 7</td>
<td>17-VIII-40 Nbk</td>
<td>debt note for barley (guarantor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YBC 9226: 20</td>
<td>7-I-41 Nbk</td>
<td>bail protocol (witness)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCBT 361: 13, 17, 19</td>
<td>21-I-42 Nbk</td>
<td>imittu list for barley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?PTS 2363: 11</td>
<td>25-I-42 Nbk</td>
<td>imittu list for barley (n.p., 18 gur, Rāṭu)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

513 For an edition of the text see p. 206.
514 Attestations preceded by a question mark are uncertain. The remark n.p. indicates attestations without a patronymic.
Šum-ukin, son of Bêl-zêri, descendant of Basia, was the first large-scale rent farmer of Eanna. The course of his career has been described before, on the basis of the material then known. In the meantime, a number of unpublished documents have become available to us, giving us a better insight in Šum-ukin’s exploits, in particular concerning his life before the rent farm business with Eanna. Among the unpublished material from the Yale Babylonian Collection, the Princeton Theological Seminary and the British Museum, dispersed among the Eanna tablets, a number of documents surfaced which concern Šum-ukin’s private activities, presenting us with a part of his private archive. Although such private documents were also known from the published material the idea of a private archive is fairly recent owing to its special status as a sub-group within the Eanna archive.

---

515 E.g. by Cocquerillat 1968: 92ff. and Joannès 1982: 130ff. A concise description of Šum-ukin’s activities is offered by Geller 1995: 536ff., however, there are some inaccuracies here which are discussed below in connection with his marital status. Furthermore, the attestation which allegedly places Šum-ukin in the circle of the Babylonian businessman Iddin-Marduk (Geller 1995: 537±8) is in fact a reference to another person (a Šum-ukin, son of Żëria, without a family name). See also Tolini 2002: 30ff. on the last stages of Šum-ukin’s career.

516 The status of the archive is treated in more detail below. A rough sketch of the Basia archive can be found in Jursa 2005a: 141ff. See now also the study of Šum-ukin’s letter dossier published by Hackl, Janković and Jursa 2011. An outline of Šum-ukin’s activities is given on p. 177ff.
Besides giving us an insight into Šum-ukin’s business profile, the part of his private archive available to us now, together with the relevant Eanna texts, provides the following picture of the Basia family tree:

![Family Tree Diagram]

As is evident, Šum-ukin had at least two brothers, Iqiša and Silim-Bel. Furthermore a certain Rēmūt, descendant of Basia, appears in a harrānu-contract (TCL 12.40 (23 Nbk)) from Babylon. According to this text the silver that Šum-ukin invested in a business venture with a certain Zababa-Šum-iddin came from the harrānu of Rēmūt, descendant of Basia. If at all related to this strand of the Basia family, Rēmūt could have been either Šum-ukin’s brother or cousin, or alternatively a member of the older generation, i.e. an uncle. Practically nothing is known about this older generation, the father of Šum-ukin and his siblings. Bēl-zēri appears only in the patronymic of the three brothers, never as a protagonist in any of the texts that have come down to us.

Iqiša, Šum-ukin’s brother, appears as a witness in a document written in Babylon in 19 Nbk (PTS 2893). The matter at hand is not clear, as the pertinent passages are damaged, however, the legible portions of the text indicate that this was an agreement between a certain Šillāya and Šum-ukin (no patronymics). This was perhaps Šillāya, son of Šīn-ibni, with whom Šum-ukin later engaged in a harrānu-venture (YBC 11459 (acc Ami)) and in an agricultural enterprise at the estate of the palace scribe (PTS 2046 and BIN 2.109 (both acc Ami)). Iqiša appears also in OrAn 25, 30 no. 1 (PTS 2864 (23 Nbk)), a sale document for a boat written in a place of unknown localization.

---

517 Kümmel’s reconstruction of the Basia family tree (1979: 106) could be considerably augmented. Brief remarks considering Šum-ukin’s family, especially in the context of his letter dossier, can be found in Hackl, Janković and Jursa 2011: 187f.

518 Silim-Bēl possibly had two more sons, Šamaš-zēr-ušubši and Nergal-Šum-uṣur. For a discussion see below.

519 The relationship between Li’udu-Nanāya and Šum-ukin and his wife is not well understood. It appears that at least since 8 Nbn she dwelt in their household. Possibly she was Šum-ukin’s second wife. This is discussed in more detail below.

520 Nanāya-iddin, Bissāya’s husband, stems from a prominent local family of temple scribes. He was the son of Ibnāya and the grandson of Iddin-Nabū, from the Kidin-Marduk family as is evident from YOS 7.59 (6 Cyr). (Ibnāya, Nanāya-iddin’s father, is also attested as a protagonist in YOS 6.108 (15 Nbn).) At least three scribes are known from the Kidin-Marduk family (Kümmel 1979: 132), however, neither Nanāya-ibni, nor his father, are so far attested with this professional title.

521 Note that Bēl-zēri’s name could be written alternately with and without the divine determinative.
(the place is called Bāb-Nār-šarrānī)\). Here he acts as the seller and Šum-ukin is the scribe of this text. Iqiša is also attested as a witness in 2275 (20\textsuperscript{th} Nbk), a debt note for silver, the rent of a house, charged against Šum-ukin. The text was written in Babylon. His last active attestation known to us is from around 30 Nbk (YBC 9263\textsuperscript{522}), from a text probably written at Babylon. This was a receipt for silver for the īlu-service, which the šākin ūtim of Babylon, Marduk-ēṣer, received from Iqiša and Šum-ukin. All other occurrences of Iqiša are in the patronymics of his two sons, Nūrēa and Kalbāya.

Šum-ukin’s other brother, Silim-Bēl, first appears in acc Nbn (YOS 6 4)\textsuperscript{523} in a text recording that five individuals were put at his disposal for irrigation work (ana dalē). This document, which was written in Kār-Nānāya, indicates that at this time Silim-Bēl was involved in agricultural activities in the Uruk region.\textsuperscript{524} It is not clear whether these activities were in any way connected to the temple agriculture. The name of one of the irrigation workers contains the theophoric element Nanāya, which may place him in the temple milieu and may indicate that he and his companions were supplied to Silim-Bēl by Eanna in order to work for him. It is equally, if not more, probable that the text referred to Silim-Bēl’s private agricultural activities. Apart from the name with the Nanāya element there is nothing to connect the text to Eanna. The absence of information on the filiation or the legal status of the five workers in this text is also unusual for a legal temple record. The name of the scribe of this text constitutes another point of interest. It appears as Šamaš-zēr-ušabši, son of Silim-Bēl, descendant of Silim-Bēl. The last part of the filiation is probably erroneous since Silim-Bēl is not attested as a family name. The mistake can be explained as a dittography. The question remains what the actual family name was, but the textual sources do not offer an answer to it. In the accession year of Nabonidus Šamaš-zēr-ušabši, son of Silim-Bēl, appears as a debtor in an īmittu debt note for barley pertaining to the šētu of Šum-ukin (YOS 19 85) and he is also the scribe of this text. Interestingly, Silim-Bēl, son of Bēl-zēri, descendant of Basia, appears first among the witnesses in this debt note. A scribe Šamaš-zēr-ušabši, son of Silim-Bēl, is attested once more in a temple record from 1 Nbn (YOS 19 90, a legal dispute concerning small cattle), however, again without a family name. One could surmise that Šamaš-zēr-ušabši was also a member of the Basia family and that he had written this document (YOS 6 4) for his father.\textsuperscript{525} However, our evidence is not conclusive, making this assumption highly conjectural.

As was mentioned above Silim-Bēl appears as a witness in an īmittu debt note involving his brother Šum-ukin as rent farmer and perhaps his son Šamaš-zēr-ušabši, if this identification is correct, as debtor. One more attestation as a witness a year earlier, in acc Nbn (YOS 19 6), shows him moving in the circles of Urukean elite. This private document records a sale of slaves by members of the asū family to a descendant of the Kuri family.\textsuperscript{526} Silim-Bēl appears in a letter written by the šatammu Bānia to Šum-ukin (YOS 21 18). He is mentioned here together with his nephew Kalbāya. Another possible attestation of Silim-Bēl is in TCL 12 75 from 1 Nbn. This text records deliveries of agricultural produce to the šatammu of Eanna. Silim-Bēl, son of Bēl-zēri, but without a family name, is recorded to have delivered 20 kurru of barley. The people making the deliveries are subsumed under šēbu (workers), which makes the identification with Šum-ukin’s brother uncertain.

Šum-ukin’s wife Buʾitu, daughter of Ša-pi-Bēl, is known from three texts:\textsuperscript{528} the first is an undated letter of Kalbāya, Šum-ukin’s nephew, addressed to her, in which he assured her that

\textsuperscript{522} The text is not dated, but the year 30 Nbk is mentioned in it.

\textsuperscript{523} The text is edited in the Appendix 1.

\textsuperscript{524} By this time, the strand of the Basia family in question will have moved to the Uruk region. This probably happened at the very beginning of Neriglissar’s reign.

\textsuperscript{525} A similar practice can be observed between Šum-ukin and his nephews or grand-nephews, who are attested as scribes of documents from his private archive (see below).

\textsuperscript{526} Other prominent families appearing in the text include Babṭu, Hunzu, Ša-pi-Bēl, Ekur-zakir and Rēmūt-Ea.

\textsuperscript{527} The letter is edited as no. 19 in Hackl, Jakovic and Jursa 2011, and can be roughly dated to the period from 1 Ner to 1 Nbn (\textit{ibid.}: 183).

\textsuperscript{528} Another possible attestation is in a letter (YOS 21 36) written by a certain Šamaš-zēr-ušabši to Buʾitu concerning garments and kidinnû. Yet another possible attestation is in PTS 2957 (2 Nbn), a text which
everything was going fine since she and Šum-ukin had been away (YOS 3 22529); the second is a legal text from 8 Nbn concerning the status of two slave-girls born of a zakītu of Eanna (YOS 6 129530). According to this text Bu’itu inscribed one of the girls’ hands with her own name and the hand of the other with the name of a certain Li’udu-Nanāya.531 Bu’itu’s third attestation is in another legal document from 5th–6th Cyr, the subject of which is difficult to understand, owing to its bad state of preservation (Fs. Greenfield, p. 532ff. = CPLWC 036422, from the Cleveland Public Library, published and edited by Geller 1995: 532ff.). The main protagonist of the text is Li’udu, daughter of Šamaš-bān-āḫi, son of Nabû-nādin-šumi, descendant of [Kur²]. She is probably the same person as Li’udu-Nanāya from YOS 6 129, to judge by her rare name. Geller offers no reconstruction of the patronymic and reads Li’udu’s family name as [x]0ili (see below).

It is proposed here to reconstruct the first two lines of the Cleveland text as follows (the signs which are at variance with Geller’s reconstruction are marked with an asterisk): [lit-’u]-du-u’dumumîi sa iudut-šec ša a-na-aši mu dumu* kur*-i* ša* garzan* a-na/lit*-a*-nu534 li qa’a ta...,” Li’udu, daughter of Šamaš-bān-āḫi, son of Nabû-nādin-šumi, descendant of Kuri, who performed ritu[als in the sanctuaries...]. The case investigated in this text concerns Li’udu’s entering the sanctuaries and apparently taking part in the cult. It is specifically remarked in ll. 13-15 that she wore a didītu-garment at this occasion and that she entered the bit hilṣu of Eanna, a sanctuary associated with Urka’titu, Usur-amāssu, Nanāya and Nabû.535 The main issue seems to be Li’udu’s eligibility to perform rituals in the temple sanctuaries, a matter investigated by the highest temple administrators (satammu and bēl piqitti), the temple enters (erīb biṣtu) and the kīnīstu of Eanna. It is not clear how the mention of the didītu-garment was significant. Was this an indication of an inappropriate dress for the cult practice?536 At any rate the verdict of the temple council (ll. 16-18), which may have shed some light on this question, remains unknown to us, owing to a break on the tablet in l. 18. Bu’itu and Šum-ukin are mentioned in order to set the stage concern female slaves. The name of a woman, a slave owner, is broken off, but could be read as B[u’tu] (see below).

529 This letter is edited by Cocquerillat 1968: 94. 137. A new edition can be found in Hackl, Janković and Jursa 2011: 217. The words “my mother”, which Kalbāya uses when addressing Bu’itu, should not be understood literally, but as a demonstration of his respect for her.530 This text was edited and commented on by Tolini 2002: 30ff.

531 Bu’itu is designated as Šum-ukin’s wife in this text, but Li’udu-Nanāya lacks any designation whatsoever. Her identity is somewhat problematic, though she must be the same person as Li’udu from the Cleveland text published by Geller 1995: 532ff. (see below).

532 Šamaš-bān-āḫi is to my knowledge not attested elsewhere as a scribe and does not appear in Kümmel’s prosopography. However, the family Kuri was prominent among Eanna’s administrative personnel, having produced, not including Šamaš-bān-āḫi, at least seven temple scribes (Kümmel 1979: 133). Šamaš-bān-āḫi from AnOr 9 8 (3 Nbn), quoted by Geller 1995: 534, is in fact a different person, a builder (ittinu), who together with his colleagues receives date rations.

533 garza (= PA-AN; the element AN is clearly visible on the tablet and is in Geller’s transliteration) is the usual logograph for parsû (a general term for “rite, cult (practice)”), which is written syllabically in ll. 13-14.

534 The phrase parsî anu bītam [...] mentioned in l. 14, prompted this reconstruction. (Conversely, the break in this line should contain some form of the verb leqû, e.g., 3.f.sg. stative.) Geller’s reconstruction at the beginning of l. 2 [ukkan-ša]-nu is not convincing. Besides constituting the only attestation of the expression ana pūhīr leqû (“to take to the assembly”), this reconstruction is not plausible because the possessive pronoun -šumu has nothing to refer to at this point in the text. On the other hand, the phrase parsî leqû, “to perform a ritual”, is well attested (see for instance CAD P: 197) and fits the context.

535 Beaulieu 2003: 29ff. This was also the place where (medicinal) oils and potions were prepared (Joannès 2006: 73ff.).

536 The didūtu was a piece of female clothing. According to CAD D: 136 it was “a strip of fabric wound around the hips and between the legs [...] and fastened with a knot”. Note that there were certain specifications how a didūtu should be worn by women in a sanctuary (ibid.: 135), i.e. it was not entirely tabooed in the sacral context.
for Li’udu, probably in support of her claims in connection with a harû-ritual. However, the nature of their relationship is still not evident from the remaining text owing to the many breaks on the tablet. Geller suggests an interpretation by which Li’udu can be identified as Šum-ukin’s second wife, which he had married because his and Bu’itu’s matrimony remained childless. This indeed fits well with the evidence from YOS 6 129, which indicates that Li’udu lived in Šum-ukin’s household at least since 8 Nbn. The only problem with this interpretation, which is mostly based on reconstructed passages, is that Šum-ukin is described as Bu’itu’s former husband in line 9 ([da]m igi-û), which implies that she remarried later. Had the intention been to express the fact that Šum-ukin remarried, the emphasis would have been placed on the fact that Bu’itu was the former/earlier wife. Be that as it may, the most plausible explanation is to identify Li’udu as Šum-ukin’s second wife. In addition to solving the problem of childlessness, marrying a girl from a prominent Urukian family can be seen as an attempt to penetrate and get integrated in the local elite, a desirable prospect for an outsider with big business ambitions.

The document offers us other interesting information on Šum-ukin. If our understanding of the text (following Geller’s reconstructions and interpretations) is correct, it would imply that Šum-ukin participated in the cult practice in connection with the harû-ritual. It is not clear whether this ritual entailed an income, as is the case with temple prebends. At any rate it appears that Li’udu referred to her status as Šum-ukin’s widow in her claim to partake in the cult practice.

The time of Šum-ukin’s death is also mentioned in this text in lines 9-10: ár-ki mu 10-kam ša 1-mu<gi-na探测. Geller understands this section (“Ten years after Šum-ukin went to his fate...”), p. 534) as a temporal setting for Li’udu’s entering the sanctuaries, i.e. in reference to the time when this incident occurred and the document at hand was written, namely to 5 Cyr (or perhaps 6 Cyr). In other words, according to Geller’s interpretation Šum-ukin died ten years before this incident, i.e. around 12 Nbn. However, following the remark on Šum-ukin’s death the text goes on to describe how Li’udu had not remarried, not that she entered the sanctuaries at

537 Very little is known about the harû-ritual (see, for instance, Linssen 2004: 119). From the Hellenistic period it is known that the king performed this religious ceremony on the eighth day of nisannu during the New Year festival in front of the Holy Gate of Esagil (ibid.: 84). There are several attestations for the harû of the king from the Neo-Babylonian Uruk (e.g., GC 2 269, YOS 3 3, Iraq 59, no. 19), and the texts make it clear that this ritual included offerings (beer, barley, sheep). Apparently other persons could also take part in this ritual or could have it performed on their behalf in absentia as is demonstrated by the letter TCL 9 115 (The addressee of this letter, Nabû-ahê-iddin, is in fact not identical with the bel pigitti of Eanna (Nabû-ahê-iddin), as suggested by Geller 1995: 535; a person by the name of Šum-ukin, who also appears in this letter in connection with harû (l. 11), is not necessarily our Šum-ukin).

538 That this second union also remained childless, as suggested in line 9 of the text, can be seen as an indication for male sterility or sexual impotence (Geller 1995: 537).

539 That Bu’itu was not repudiated is evident from YOS 6 129 (8 Nbn). Designated as Šum-ukin’s wife, she appears here together with Li’udu, apparently in a superior position, as she inscribed the hand of a slave-girl with Li’udu’s name. This is not surprising if Li’udu was indeed the second wife, who would have probably also been (much) younger than Bu’itu. Besides, childlessness was generally not a ground for divorcing – in such circumstances one could revert to adoption or taking on a second wife.

540 There is, however, no evidence that Šum-ukin or the members of his family owned prebends.

541 Women in the temple cult, apart from the priestesses and other members of the cultic personnel, are attested in the Neo-Babylonian period as holders of prebends only exceptionally and in connection with their male relatives. They never bought prebends on their own initiative but acquired them passively “as endowments from their husbands, fathers, brothers or mothers” (Waerzeggers 2010: 92). This happened chiefly when the woman was either the only descendant of her father, a prebendary, or when she was the wife or a widow of a prebendary with no male offspring (ibid.: 93). It seems then that the right to participate in the harû-ritual could be transferred to family members as was the case with prebends. At least this is apparently what Li’udu attempted to base her claim on. It should be noted that her father is also mentioned in this context in the Cleveland text, with what seems like an explicit negation of his participation in the harû ritual: Geller (1995: 534) understands the line as “...Šamaš-bân-âli, who had no share in the harû-ritual rite [...]” following his reconstruction of a stative of zâzu in line 13: ...Šamaš-bân-âli ša ina ha-re-e par-si la zi-za-at...]. Note, however, that a feminine third person singular is not congruent with parsû; we would rather expect a third person masculine plural here.

542 These signs are written around the right edge of the tablet. The emendation of the missing signs of Šum-ukin’s name is suggested by Geller in the transliteration of the text; however, on the copy of the tablet made by him no signs are recorded after ša (1995: 541) – this was probably an oversight of the copyist.
that point in time. Furthermore, there is a gap in 1.10 preceded by “a-di 3 [...]” which Geller does not attempt to interpret. It is suggested here to reconstruct and understand this phrase as follows: ṣár-ki mu 10-kam ša mu-ŠG-ḫa-nu / [a-n]a šim-tu₂₅ ḫa li-šu₄ a-di 3¹ mu₂₆-an²₅-ŠG-ḫa₆₅ ḫa mu₂₆-du₂₅-šu₆₅ ṣā²₅ / [a]-na ṣam-li₂₅-šu₆₅ la tu-si₂₅-li₂₅-ma [...]. “After the 10th year (of Nabonidus), when Šum-uk₂₅ died, for three years Liʿudu, daughter of Šamaš-bān-āḫi, had not (re-)married...”. Whichever consequences Liʿudu’s implicit remarrying may have had for her case, this remark offers an explicit date of Šum-uk₂₅’s death, namely the 10th regnal year of Nabonidus. This fits well with other evidence for Šum-uk₂₅’s agricultural activities, which suggests that his nephew Kalbāya took over his rent farm around 8 Nbn. In other words, Šum-uk₂₅ retired from his entrepreneurial activities, perhaps owing to an illness, some two years before his death in 10 Nbn.

While Šum-uk₂₅ was not blessed with offspring, his brothers were luckier in this respect. Ḥaṣṣa had two sons, Ṣurē and Kalbāya. Ṣurē is attested twice as a scribe of documents from Šum-uk₂₅’s private archive: in YBC 3518 (2 Ami), a work contract from Ḥarrubat, according to which part of the land at Šum-uk₂₅’s disposal is put at the disposal of another person, and in BM 114585 (3 Ner), which is written at Uruk and records Šum-uk₂₅’s purchase of a slave.⁵⁴³ He was also the scribe of PTS 2344 (1 Ner), a lease of temple land in which Šum-uk₂₅ acted as the lessor (the text is edited on p. 49). He is also attested in the legal record PTS 2957 from the second regnal year of, probably, Nabonidus which was written in Borsippa. Here he and a certain Nergal-Šum-ubû, son of Silim-Bēl, descendant of [x],⁵⁴⁶ testified in front of the official ša pān ekalli about a certain slave-woman, saying that she was not with their uncle Šum-uk₂₅. Ḥaṣṣa’s other son, Kalbāya, who was married to a certain Busasa and had at least two children,⁵⁴⁷ is above all known for continuing in his uncle’s footsteps as a fermier général of Eanna. The same applies to Kalbāya’s son Nabû-bān-āḫi, who is dealt with on pp. 227ff. Prior to his appearance in the texts of the Eanna archive as Šum-uk₂₅’s associate, Kalbāya is attested in his uncle’s private archive as a witness on a couple of occasions in texts from Ḥarrubat (BIN 2 109 (acc Ami) and YBC 3518 (2 Ami)).

Silim-Bēl also had at least two sons, Marduk-Šum-ubû and Nabû-Šum-idin, who in turn had a son each – Kidin-Marduk and Taqîš-Gula. Marduk-Šum-ubû, a temple scribe, is first attested as a witness in a text from the Eanna archive from 2 Ner (YBC 3750, edited on p. 298), in which Šum-uk₂₅, in his function as the commissioner of the king (bēl pīqitti šarrī), acts as a lessor of temple land in a land lease contract for sharecropping. He then appears in 3 Ner in a debt note for 10 curru of dates, property of the Lady of Uruk, as a witness (NBC 4517, written in Til-agurrēti, to be published in YOS 16). His next attestation is also as a witness in acc Lab in a text from his uncle’s archive, a promissory note for oxen belonging to Šum-uk₂₅, written in Babylon, but specifying the place of delivery of the animals as Uruk (NBC 4534, to be published in YOS 16). Some time between 1 Ner and 1 Nbn Marduk-Šum-ubû wrote a letter to his uncle Šum-uk₂₅ (AfO 44/45, 165).⁵⁴⁸ The letter is damaged, but it appears that in it he shared insider information with his uncle concerning the overseer of ploughmen (rāb ikkarāti), Nabû-āḫḫē-šullim, about whom the king had written to the temple administrators. This seems highly controversial considering that Šum-uk₂₅ took over the function of rāb ikkarāti from Nabû-āḫḫē-šullim around that time.⁵⁵⁰ In 13 Nbn he is attested as the scribe of an imittu debt note for the rent farmer Ibniyya, son of Balāṭu (TCL 12 108).⁵⁵¹ He appears as a witness in YOS 6 221 (16 Nbn), a legal record concerning the arrears of a temple shepherd. Marduk-Šum-ubû worked not only as a temple scribe, but was also

---

The text is reserved for publication in YOS 16.

In this document a certain Nabû-āḫḫē-idin, son of Nabû-Šum-škun, descendant of Basia, appears among the witnesses. However, since this is his only attestation at present, his place in the Basia family cannot be determined.

The name of the ruler is broken and only the first element, ḏag, is extant on the tablet. Should the family name be reconstructed to Basia? If so, this text would provide us with the so far only attestations of another one of Šum-uk₂₅’s nephews.

A detailed description of his family is given on p. 187.

Note that there is a possibility that he had two more sons, namely Šamaš-zēr-ubûṣšaṭi, attested in YOS 6 4, and Nergal-Šum-ubû, attested in PTS 2957. In both cases the erroneous (?) or lacking patronymics prevent a reliable identification of these men.

A new edition of the letter can be found in Hackl, Janković and Jursa 2011: 202.

Hackl, Janković and Jursa 2011: 186f.

For this rent farmer see p. 203.
involved in agricultural production under the rent farmer Ile’i-Marduk.\textsuperscript{552} This is evident from BIN 2 130 (acc Camb), a document recording the hardship sale of Marduk-šum-uṣur’s houses for 6 minas of silver in order to cover his debt of kasia pertaining to the sūtu of Ile’i-Marduk. His next attestation is from 1 Camb (YOS 7 113) in a legal document concerning a debt of 160 kurru of dates. The debtor, Kiribtu, son of Arad-Innin, states that he had given a part of the dates (10 kurru) to Marduk-šum-uṣur and a part to another scribe, a certain Ardia, son of Eanna-šum-ibni,\textsuperscript{553} and is obliged to bring the receipts so they could be entered in the temple registry. The last attestation of Marduk-šum-uṣur is from 2 Camb in a debt note for 10 kurru of barley, exchange for dates (BM 113431).\textsuperscript{554} The dates are said to be the impost (imittu) of the field of Kiribtu, son of Arad-Innin, pertaining to the sūtu of Bānia, son of Kalbāya, which had been received from Kiribtu. Now the equivalent amount in barley is charged against Marduk-šum-uṣur. Marduk-šum-uṣur had received the dates from Kiribtu at an earlier time, but failed for some reason to transfer them to the temple store-houses. In fact, these are the same 10 kurru of dates, for which Kiribtu testified in YOS 7 113 (see above) that he had given them to Marduk-šum-uṣur.\textsuperscript{555} His association with the scribe Ardia, son of Eanna-šum-ibni, his appearance as a scribe of an imittu debt note and this last attestation indicate that he was one of the scribes involved in the administrative processes related to the agricultural sector of the temple. These scribes were not only in charge of issuing promissory notes for the imposts, but they were also involved with the measuring and probably also the transport of agricultural commodities. That these procedures did not always run in one straight line (farmer delivers commodities to temple scribe, who measures them and transports them directly to the temple granaries) is demonstrated by texts such as BM 113431 and YOS 7 113. The causes for these delays on the way of agricultural commodities from the producer to the temple are not revealed by the texts, but some sort of speculation with these goods on the part of the intermediaries, the scribes, can be assumed.

Marduk-šum-uṣur had a son, Kidin-Marduk, who was also a scribe. His only attestation is in a temple record, a receipt for dates from 1 Camb, which was written by him (JCS 28, no. 15).

Sīlim-Bēl’s other son, Nabû-šum-iddin, is attested only as the sender of a letter to his uncle Šum-ukin (BM 116697\textsuperscript{556}), in which he writes about water withdrawal from a canal and complains about his powerlessness in a certain matter, and as a witness in BM 114439 (1 Camb), a document written in Til-agurrēti concerning the guarding of the temple’s date plantations. His son Taqīš-Gula was a scribe and was apparently stationed in Babylon at the beginning of Nabonidus’ reign. He appears as a scribe of two texts written in the capital. YOS 6 5 (acc Nbn) belongs to Šum-ukin’s private archive. It records his purchase of a slave, a barber, for 58 shekels of silver. The seller of the slave is also obliged to produce a third person, a debtor of Šum-ukin, by a certain date. It seems likely that this was a hardship sale brought on by an outstanding debt of the seller toward Šum-ukin. YOS 6 60 (3 Nbn), also written by Taqīš-Gula in Babylon, concerns the status of a slave of a certain Innin-šum-uṣur, son of Apšāya, which had been given to a certain Latubušāinni by the authority of the sartienna and the judges. It is not clear how this text is connected to the Eanna archive. Taqīš-Gula is also attested as the author of a letter to Šum-ukin sent from Babylon (YOS 3 46\textsuperscript{557}), in which he informs his great-uncle on a runaway slavewoman, writes about a delivery of barley and about Šum-ukin’s and Kalbāya’s impending visit to Babylon and the royal court.

Evidently, this branch of the Basia family, i.e. Sīlim-Bēl’s sons and grandsons, were well integrated into the administrative apparatus of Eanna. With the exception of Nabû-šum-iddin, they are all attested as (temple) scribes, but even his appearance as a witness in a temple record speaks in favour of his close connection to the administration of Eanna. A particularly strong tendency

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item[552] Ile’i-Marduk, son of Nabû-šum-ukin, descendant of Eṭāru, is treated in more detail on p. 213.
\item[553] He is attested with this title in WZKM 94, no. 1 (4 Cyr) and TCL 13 168 (5 Camb). His other attestations without a professional title, other than YOS 7 113, are: YOS 3 29, YOS 7 85 (4 Cyr), YOS 7 95 (8 Cyr), BM 114472 (1 Camb), NCBT 952 (1 Camb), YOS 7 124 (2 Camb), YOS 7 131 (2 Camb) and YOS 7 142 (3 Camb). In YOS 7 85 and BM 114472 he appears as a witness. All other documents concern the transport or measuring of dates delivered by the gardeners, or his own date debts resulting from these activities.
\item[555] The text is edited on p. 232.
\item[556] YOS 7 113 is edited by Cocquerillat 1968: 84f. 133f. See also the discussion of this text and BM 113441 in the chapter on Nabû-bān-āḫī.
\item[557] Edited as no. 11 in Hackl, Janković and Jursa 2011.
\item[558] Edited as no. 15 in Hackl, Janković and Jursa 2011.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
toward the agricultural sector in combination with scribal activity can be observed in the case of Marduk-šum-uṣur.

2.9.3.1. The Basia archive

As was mentioned above, a number of texts (over forty) could be identified among the Eanna tablets which are clearly private in character, i.e. concerning private business and activities of Šum-ukin.558 Most of these texts predate Šum-ukin’s involvement with the Eanna temple, but a few texts are concurrent with his time as Eanna’s fermier général. The earliest dated document from this private archive is YOS 17 23, a debt note for silver written in Babylon, from 17 Nb.559 Šum-ukin’s private texts do not include any family documents such as marriage contracts, dowry or inheritance related matters. Property related documents are rare – there are two house leases and three purchases of slaves – but no house purchase or sale documents are among this material. There is only one administrative text (NBC 4569 (not dated)) and several letters which can be assigned to the Basia archive. The largest portion of the extant private texts bears evidence to Šum-ukin’s business activities. Debt notes for barley are among the most frequently attested texts, followed by documents related to his agricultural activities. A small number of harrānu contracts, including both debt notes and investments initiating the formation of harrānu partnerships, and promissory notes for silver have also come down to us. Prebend-related material is missing from this archive. This prompts the assumption that Šum-ukin was not involved in the cultic life of Eanna or other sanctuaries before his time in Uruk. However, one should not forget the implications of the Cleveland text discussed above, concerning Šum-ukin’s possible involvement in a harā-ritual.

The status of the Basia archive particularly in connection with the Eanna archive is discussed on p. 184.

2.9.3.1.1. Šum-ukin’s property

The information on Šum-ukin’s property is unfortunately quite patchy owing to the scarcity of relevant material. In itself this is not surprising considering that we have access only to a part of his private archive. However, some texts from the Eanna archive also contribute to the picture of Šum-ukin’s property, as it was of great interest to the temple, particularly during the phase of the settling of accounts at the end of his career as a fermier général.

2.9.3.1.1.1. Slaves

Three purchases of slaves are documented at the time when Šum-ukin and his family had settled in the Uruk region. For some reason these texts are clustered around the beginning of Nabonidus’s reign, but it is not clear whether this is in any sense significant or a pure coincidence. Two of these three texts seem to have had a debt recovery background. It is conceivable that at the onset of his career as a large-scale rent farmer for Eanna Šum-ukin attempted to collect his outstanding assets and pool his resources for the great undertaking ahead of him. In the course of this pooling of resources he may have acquired these slaves.

558 For a catalogue of tablets from Šum-ukin’s private archive known so far see Appendix 4. Private letters are not included in this list. They are published as part of Šum-ukin’s letter dossier in Hackl, Janković and Jursa 2011, which also includes his correspondence with the temple administrators. In some cases a clear distinction between his private and ‘official’ letters is not possible and was therefore not attempted by the editors of this dossier, who furthermore point out that such a distinction would in a sense be artificial as all of the documents from the Basia archive were ultimately incorporated into the Eanna archive (ibid.: 180). It is to be expected that the number of Šum-ukin’s private documents will rise, as more pertinent texts are bound to be discovered among the unpublished material.

559 A certain Nabû-ruḫu-ṣuṣur, son of Arad-Gula, appears in the text as creditor and Bēl-uṣallim, son of Aḥḫē-ukin, as debtor. Šum-ukin was the scribe of the tablet.
BM 114585 (3 Ner, written in Uruk) is a receipt of silver, the remainder of the price of a male slave bought by Šum-ukîn. AnOr 8 19\textsuperscript{560} (acc Nbn, written in Bitqu-ša-Bêl-êter) records his purchase of four slaves, a woman, her two sons, and her infant daughter, for 1 5/6 minas of silver, the price of 100 kuru of barley. Šum-ukîn undertook to pay the debt of 100 kuru of barley charged against Aḫḫē-iddin, son of Bêl-êter, the seller of the slaves, to Nabû-zêr-lišûr, the commissioner (bêl piqitti) of the district Angillû,\textsuperscript{561} and received the slaves in return. The background of the third slave sale (YOS 6 5 (acc Nbn), written in Babylon) also seems to imply the seller’s indebtedness to Šum-ukîn. There are no stipulations on the receipt of the price (56 shekels) of the slave, who was a barber; but more importantly, the seller is obliged by an additional clause to hand over a certain Nabû-mukûn-apli, son of Sîn-ana-bitûšû, to Šum-ukîn on account of his debt notes. This stipulation implies that Šum-ukîn and the seller did not perform this transaction as equals, but rather that latter was under some sort of obligation toward the former.

Additionally the two slave girls of disputed status from YOS 6 129\textsuperscript{562} (8 Nbn) should be mentioned. They belonged to Šum-ukîn’s wife Bu’ûtu and Li’udu-Nanāya (his second wife?), but the temple also laid claim to them.

Another text concerning slaves is PTS 2957. This is a legal document written in Borsippa in 2 N[Nbn] which records the testimony of Šum-ukîn’s nephew Nûrêa and a certain Nergal-šûm-ûṣûr, son of Silim-Bêl,\textsuperscript{563} concerning female slaves. The text is not perfectly understandable, but it appears that they testify in the presence of the royal official ša pûn ekalli, who is not named in the text, saying that there are no female slaves at Šum-ukîn’s disposal, except for Tarintu, the slave girl of a woman whose name is lost in a break. This woman was perhaps Bu’ûtu, Šum-ukîn’s wife: the name following the determinative mî begins with the sign še followed by a break; as še is a component of the sign bu, the woman in question may have been Bu’ûtu, and the slave girl a part of her dowry. The rest of the text is too fragmentary. It is interesting to note that Šum-ukîn was also linked to Borsippa. He was not present in Borsippa himself at the time this text was written (2 Nbn), as he was represented by his nephews at the proceedings; however, from one earlier text dated to 22 Nbk there is evidence that in the past he had (business?) connections to Borsippa: PTS 2515 is a debt note for 20 kuru of barley in which Šum-ukîn had the role of the guarantor for the payment.

2.9.3.1.1.2. Livestock

This is an interesting matter regarding the context of Šum-ukîn’s entrepreneurial activity as a fermier général and the implicit contribution of his own stock of draught animals. However, while the texts do show Šum-ukîn was in possession of cattle, nothing can be said about the size of his stock, due to the limitations of the textual evidence.

NBC 4534\textsuperscript{564} (acc Lab) is a debt note for four oxen of Šum-ukîn. The text, which was written in Babylon, stipulates that the debtor should deliver the cattle in Uruk. At this time Šum-ukîn had already settled in Uruk, and the text may indicate that, while on a visit to Babylon, he was trying to move his assets in cattle to his new area of residence, the place where the animals were needed for his agricultural activities. BM 114676 (1 Nbn) is a sale document for a two year old ox, which Šum-ukîn buys for 5 kuru of barley. This text, written in Tamûṭû, a district of the Lady of Uruk, may be another case of settling of debts disguised as a sale.

A text from the temple archive informs us that Šum-ukîn also owned horses. GC 1 269\textsuperscript{565} (8 Nbn) is a receipt for a partial payment for one of the horses, which were taken from Šum-ukîn. It appears that the temple appropriated his horses, probably in the course of a settling of accounts (see p. 182), and sold them. This particular one was sold for 3 5/6 minas of silver.

\textsuperscript{560} For an edition of the text see Appendix 1.
\textsuperscript{561} This was perhaps a royal official, as the barley owed is stated to be for the remainders of the king.
\textsuperscript{562} Edited by Tolini 2002: 30ff. See also above.
\textsuperscript{563} The possibility that this too was a nephew of Šum-ukîn was discussed above.
\textsuperscript{564} The text is to be published in YOS 16.
\textsuperscript{565} The text is edited by Dougherty 1923: 30.
From among Šum-ukin’s private texts only two lease contracts speak of his immovable property. The subject matter of YOS 6 85 (4 Nbn, written in Uruk) is the lease of Šum-ukin’s house of unspecified localisation (only a neighbour’s name is given) for an annual fee of 8 shekels of silver. GC 1 413 (5 Nbn, written in Uruk) is formulated as a debt note for an amount of [x] shekels of silver and one two year old sheep. This rental fee for the houses of Šum-ukin situated in Kurbat is to be paid within a year.

Two texts from the Eanna archive tell us more about his property in the city of Uruk proper. GC 1 292 (8 Nbn) is a receipt for 6 minas 3 shekels of silver, the price of a house of Šum-ukin, delivered by a certain Šadunu, son of Nabû-šum-lišir. Another legal document written some time later, AnOr 8 70 (3 Camb), also mentions a house of Šum-ukin, perhaps this very same one. It is a text which deals with two properties, houses in Uruk belonging to Šum-ukin and another individual, which were sold by the temple to Ištar-šum-êreš and Eanna-šadûnu, sons of Nabû-zêr-lišir, descendants of Šangû-Ninurta, for a total of 11 minas 6 shekels of silver. The purpose of this apparently only nominal sale was the supply of the temple with merchandise. The matter of contention was the fact that the temple neither received any money nor merchandise from the two brothers, while the houses were left unattended, stood derelict and had lost in value. The temple administration was therefore set on formulating a new obligation for Ištar-šum-êreš and Eanna-šadûnu based on these circumstances. The undisputable resemblance of the names of the protagonist of GC 1 292 and of one of the brothers from AnOr 8 70 strongly suggests that those are one and the same person. The variance in the paternal names, regarding the middle element Šadûnu and Eanna-šadûnu, it is not clear whether the two texts speak of the same property. Šum-ukin’s house, which is said to be located in the Egahalanki-district of the city, was valued at 6 minas 6 shekels of silver according to AnOr 8 70, i.e. 3 shekels more than the house in GC 1 292. While this difference in price could be explained as an error of the scribe or the copyist, it is difficult to understand why the temple would issue a receipt for a payment that had actually never been made, as is claimed in the later text. If one is to assume that both texts are dealing with the same house, which seems very likely, the question of the purpose of this legal fiction still remains to be answered.

Šum-ukin not only owned houses, he also rented them. So far we know of at least two. In the twenties of Nebuchadnezzar (the date is damaged) a debt note for 22 shekels of silver charged against Šum-ukin demonstrates that he had rented a house from a certain Nergal-ina-têši-êcher, son of Zêr-Bâbîli, from the Šangû-Bêlet-Ninua family. The text (PTS 2275) does not say where the house was situated, but it may have been in Babylon, as the document was written in this city.

The other house Šum-ukin rented was situated in Uruk or its environs. PTS 2218 ([3] Ner) is a receipt for a part of a rent payment for a house which Šum-ukin had rented from Balatu, son of Nabû-bân-aḫi, from the Dâbibî family, from the third month of 3 Ner. The receipt was a legal fiction which stood for another money transfer which was mentioned in an additional clause. Šum-ukin had in fact given the silver to Nabû-mukîn-zêrî, son of Nadin, also from the Dâbibî-family. This Nabû-mukîn-zêrî at this point not yet attested as a member of the temple administration. However, toward the end of Nabonidus’s reign he appears as one the highest officials of the temple administration, namely as the šatammu. The purpose of the transaction between the future šatammu and Šum-ukin is not elucidated by the text.
2.9.3.1.2. Debt notes

2.9.3.1.2.1. Silver

So far only three promissory notes for silver could be identified among Šum-ukin’s private documents, not counting the ḫarrānu-related material and house rentals which are treated elsewhere in this chapter. In all of these texts, two of which were written in Babylon (TCL 12 48, GC 1 167) and one in Ālu-ša-rab-x (PTS 3041), Šum-ukin acts as the creditor. In TCL 12 48 (33 Nbk) 135¹ shekels of silver were charged against Šamaš-balîssu-iqbi, son of Nabû-zêr-ibni, descendant of Imbi-pânia. GC 1 167 (34 Nbk) records the amount of 7 1/2 shekels of silver owed by Rēḫētu, son of Balût. PTS 3041 (23 Nbk) shows that Šum-ukin acted as creditor to an agricultural producer. The debtor was given 11 1/24 shekels of silver by Šum-ukin. In return he was obliged to deliver 3 sētu of barley per shekel of silver by the third month, i.e. immediately after the harvest.

Indirect evidence for a debt of 2 minas 13 1/3 shekels of silver comes from 8 Nbn from a temple receipt for a partial payment by the debtor Uballissu-Gula, son of Silim-Bêl, descendant of Šangû-parakki (BM 114599, see below for an edition). The money originally belonged to Šum-ukin as the text states, but the debt had been transferred to the temple, presumably to cover Šum-ukin’s arrears, and consequently the temple collected this partial payment from his debtor.

2.9.3.1.2.2. Barley

The evidence for barley obligations is more substantial. There are at least 16 debt notes for barley from the Basia archive. As with the promissory notes for silver, Šum-ukin acts as the creditor in all of these texts, with the exception of only one case in which he is the debtor. The documents span from 20 Nbk to the reign of Nabonidus. The amounts in question are generally small: half of the texts record debts of 5 kurru of barley or less. The largest amounts owed to Šum-ukin are 50¹ (CD 92 (x Nbn)) and 33² kurru of barley (PTS 2220 (1 Ami)). A viable assumption would be that at least some of these texts came from an agricultural context. However, given their sketchy nature, there is no conclusive evidence to help identify the background of these transactions.

2.9.3.1.3. ḫarrānu-ventures

Only four ḫarrānu documents appear among Šum-ukin’s tablets. This makes it difficult to make any generalisations on the scope of his involvement in this kind of commercial activities. The first two documents were written in 21 Nbk, in the ninth and twelfth month respectively (PTS 3231 and PTS 2621), and are both of the debt note type. In both of these texts a certain Nan̄ya-Reš, son of Šulâya, is the creditor for barley (5 kurru and 2 kurru respectively) which belongs to the ḫarrānu of Šum-ukin. It follows that this Nan̄ya-Reš was Šum-ukin’s agent. The debtors were inhabitants of rural areas, Ḫuṣṣētu-ša-Ruṣapâya of unknown localisation (PTS 3231) and Bâb-

---

570 YOS 17 23 (17 Nbk) is a promissory note for silver which apparently also belongs to the Basia archive. However, there is no visible connection between Šum-ukin and the active parties, i.e. the creditor and the debtor. He only had the function of the scribe of this text.

571 For a list of debt notes see Appendix 4. The ḫarrānu-related debt notes for barley are not included here. They are treated in the section on Šum-ukin’s ḫarrānu activities. One debt note for dates has also come down to us. NCBT 352 (36 Nbk) records a debt of 11¹ kurru of dates and additional 2 shekels of silver belonging to Šum-ukin, which were to be delivered in Babylon.

572 PTS 3297 is a text written in Babylon in 21 Nbk. (I am grateful to E. E. Payne for bringing this text to my attention.) The creditor is a certain Nabû-mukin-apli, son of Ninurta-šx², to whom Šum-ukin, who is also the scribe of this text, owes 4 kurru of barley.

573 Similar cases are briefly discussed by Lanz 1976: 113f. in the context of the status of the ḫarrānu-assets (see also ibid. note 793 for other text examples).

574 A West Semitic tribe of the name Rusâpi is listed in Zadok 1985: 263. A place Rusâpu (attested with the determinatives uru and kur) was in the vicinity of Naṣibîni (modern Nusaybin on the Turkish-Syrian border)
Nār-Dērat (PTS 2621) which was in the Nippur region. That barley was the object of these loans may imply that Šum-ukīn and his agent were agricultural speculators.

The next ḫarrānu document is TCL 12 40 from 23 Nbk, which was composed in Babylon. In this formation of a business venture Šum-ukīn, as before, appears as an investor. His agent is a certain Zababa-šum-iddin, son of Bēl-ippuš, descendant of Šangū-Bēlet-Ninua. This Zababa-šum-iddin is attested in another three texts over the next twenty-six years in connection with the Basia family: in 34 Nbk as a scribe of a debt note for barley belonging to Šum-ukīn (NCBT 941); in the same year, again as a scribe, in a debt note for silver belonging to Šum-ukīn written in Babylon (GC 1 167); and in acc Nbn as a witness in a document recording the employment of irrigation workers undertaken by Šum-ukīn’s brother Silim-Bēl in the Uruk region (YOS 6 4, see above). The three minas of silver which Šum-ukīn invests in TCL 12 40 are said to come from the ḫarrānu of Rēmūt, descendant of Basia. This would imply that Šum-ukīn had an earlier agreement with his relative Rēmūt as his agent and was using this money to form his own business venture. The advantage for Šum-ukīn by delegating the actual work to someone else is obvious. Not so obvious is the benefit for the original investor who could expect to get a smaller percentage of the profit through this new arrangement, as some of it would go to the middleman, i.e. Šum-ukīn. However, since the original arrangement between Rēmūt and Šum-ukīn is not known, there is no point in pursuing this matter any further.

The fourth document (YBC 11459) from acc Ami, written in ḫarrubat, records Šum-ukīn’s investment of ten shekels of silver, the price of a donkey, in a ḫarrānu-business with ḡillāya, son of Sin-ibni, for a period of three years. The agent ḡillāya is another person with whom Šum-ukīn had business on more than one occasion. In acc Ami, in particular, two texts witness their involvement in an agricultural enterprise with a palace scribe (PTS 2046 and BIN 2 109). The undated administrative text NBC 4569, in which Šum-ukīn’s and ḡillāya’s barley deliveries, or dues, are recorded, is also part of this ‘palace scribe dossier’. Thus we see Šum-ukīn acting mainly as an investor in ḫarrānu-businesses. There is an indirect reference to him as an agent of one of his relatives (TCL 12 40), but this seems to have been only nominal, as he reinvested the money entrusted to him thus taking on the role of an investor again. His business associates could be either family members (Rēmūt) or people with whom he had contact for longer periods of time and entertained other business relations (Zababa-šum-iddin, ḡillāya). The amounts in question are not very high with the exception of the three

---

575 Zadok 1985: 60. 369.
576 This contract is type A according to the categorization of Lanz 1976. See Appendix 1 for an edition of this text.
577 The place of issue of this text is lost in a break on the tablet.
578 Zababa-šum-iddin appears also in BIN 1 122 (lx) Nbk together with his brother Šulāya, however, due to the bad state of preservation of this tablet, little can be said about the contents of this contract.
579 His position in the Basia family has been briefly discussed above.
580 Lanz 1976: 40f.
581 The issue of the “Tochterunternehmen” (subsidiary) in this context has been discussed by Lanz 1976: 146f., however, without a solution to this problem.
582 This text also corresponds to Lanz’s type A.
583 Did this document record an investment of a donkey rather than silver?
584 For more details see p. 170.
585 A person identified as ḡillāya, without a patronymic, appears also in 19 Nbk in a contract of unclear contents involving Šum-ukīn as a protagonist and one of his brothers as a witness (PTS 2839). His identification with ḡillāya, son of Sin-ibni, is not certain.
minas of silver in TCL 12 40. This could have been a special case, however, since Šum-ukin acted here as a middleman and invested the capital of one of his relatives.

2.9.3.1.4. Agricultural activities

Šum-ukin’s agricultural activities connected to the Eanna temple are very well documented and have been the subject of several studies in the past. As with his other endeavours from before his time as Eanna’s fermier général, little was known of his involvement in the domain of agriculture outside of Eanna. Now several unpublished texts allow us an insight in this sphere of his activities.

Apart from the numerous promissory notes for barley, the earliest dated text showing Šum-ukin in connection with agricultural commodities was written in Babylon in 37 Nbk (PTS 2501). This contract records the fact that the dates belonging to Marduk-šum-úṣur, son of Kináya, descendant of gallóbu, were taken by Kináya, son of Ráši-il, without Šum-ukin’s consent. The text stipulates that when doing the accounting for the year 37 with Šum-ukin, Marduk-šum-úṣur, will not make a deduction (sunqutta) of these. This probably means that these dates were not to be charged against Šum-ukin. In other words, Šum-ukin did not want to be made responsible for the dates that someone else took, perhaps the father of Marduk-šum-úṣur. Be that as it may, Šum-ukin appears to have been accountable to Marduk-šum-úṣur. In other words he may have worked as an agricultural contractor for him.

PTS 2937 from 40° Nbk is more straightforward. It is a debt note for barley, the share (šibú) from a field of Šum-ukin. The debtor, Šum-iddin, son of Šuláya, is to pay the barley in the second month, i.e. at harvest time, using the measure (mašihu) of Zér-Báibli. The text was composed at Nárú-éššu, indicating the localisation of the field. The hydronym Nárú-éššu, however, can be assigned to at least two waterways, one near Babylon and the other in the Urak region. Since Šum-ukin moved to Uruk in the beginning of Neriglissar’s reign, the former localisation seems more probable, unless we are dealing with an altogether different locality. The text shows that Šum-ukin leased out a field to a sharecropper. Contrary to the literal implication of the designation of the field as “of Šum-ukin” (aša šá mu-gin), it was not necessarily his property. This was probably just an abbreviated way of saying “at the disposal of” (ša ina pān) Šum-ukin. The mention of the measure of Zér-Báibli with which the barley was to be paid implies that he was the actual creditor and ultimately the owner of the field. Šum-ukin had an intermediary position, meaning that he sub-leased the land, which he had rented from Zér-Báibli. PTS 2937 is so far the earliest unequivocal instance of Šum-ukin’s entrepreneurial activities in the domain of agriculture. This text alone does not illuminate the scope of these activities, though, (the amount of barley in question is under 5 kurru) and so it is not possible to relate them to his later dealings with the Eanna temple, or, prior to that, the palace scribe.

The small ‘palace scribe dossier’ consists of three texts, of which one was published in BIN 2. Two are dated to the accession year of Ami-Marduk and one of the texts is without a date. PTS 2046 and BIN 2 109 are parallel texts, but not exact duplicates. PTS 2046 was written in Babylon on 35 -acc Ami, whereas BIN 2 109 was composed at Harrubat five days later. The documents were written by two different scribes and each one has a different set of witnesses, but the main body of the text is largely parallel with only minor differences in the phrasing. The subject matter is the receipt of a partial payment for a debt of 700 kurru of barley owed by Šum-ukin and
 Şiillaya, son of Sîn-ibni. The barley is said to come from the land in Ḫarrubat, which belongs to the palace scribe Šamaš-šar-uṣur. Of this amount 580 kurru of barley were delivered by Šum-ukîn to Bêl-êranni, the steward (rab bêti) of the palace scribe. The text goes on to clarify that this amount of barley is the equivalent of 5 minas of silver which had been given to the palace scribe.

What follows from these two texts is the fact that Šum-ukîn and Şiillaya worked together as agricultural entrepreneurs in Ḫarrubat. The implication is that they rented the land of a high royal official, the palace scribe Šamaš-šar-uṣur, who was not there at the time (but probably in Babylon), and had an estate manager to overlook his holdings. The reason for the composition of these receipts was Šum-ukîn’s handing over of 5 minas of silver to the palace scribe. This probably happened in Babylon considering that this is where the first receipt was written, that the palace scribe held his office here and that Šum-ukîn frequently visited the capital on business. The silver was converted into barley and subtracted from Šum-ukîn’s and Şiillaya’s debt, which probably constituted the rent for the fields. The receipt was formulated as though Bêl-êranni, the estates manager of the palace scribe, actually received barley from Šum-ukîn. Another receipt was written five days later in Ḫarrubat (presumably when Šum-ukîn returned there from Babylon), the place where the final accounting for the revenues from the palace scribe’s estates from this area would have been done and for which this sort of documentation was necessary.

NBC 4569, an undated administrative note, also deals with Šum-ukîn’s and Şiillaya’s obligations toward the palace scribe. The royal official appears only with his title in this text. It is possible though that this was Šamaš-šar-uṣur, the same temple scribe as in BIN 2 109 and PTS 2046.

NBC 4569

u.e. 1. šâ1 ma-a-li-ki-a-ma apin šâ1 mu-gin
obv. 1 me 50 ḥa-la šâi umbisag é-gal
šâ1 mu-gin 1 me 30 gur ḥa-la
kâ šâ-ni-u
5. ṣâ 3-šâ šâ1 mu-gin
u ʿsil-la-ā 52 gur
lô.e. ḥa-la šâi umbisag é-gal
rev. ʿ14 gur pa-ni uru
ḥa-la šâ <š> umbisag é-gal
10. pab 3 me 46 gur še-bar
i ʾeš apinšad
[šâ1]1 mu-gin ḥa-la
[šâi] umbisag é-gal

“150 kurru (of barley), the share of the palace scribe, are due from Malik-law, the ploughman (of) Šum-ukîn. Second item: 130 kurru (of barley), the share, are due from Šum-ukîn. Third item: 52 kurru (of barley), the share of the palace scribe, are due from Šum-ukîn and Şiillaya. 14 kurru (of barley), just outside the city, are the share of the palace scribe. In total: 346 kurru of barley, (from) the fields (at the disposal) of Šum-ukîn, are the share of the palace scribe.”

The text is loosely structured. The four factually parallel entries recording the amounts of barley due from PN/locality, the share (zittu) of the palace scribe, are all formulated differently. They are followed by a summation of barley due from the arable land (at the disposal) of Šum-ukîn, the share of the palace scribe. It follows from the text that Šum-ukîn had a sharecropping arrangement with the palace scribe. That Šum-ukîn’s involvement was on an entrepreneurial level is indicated by the high amounts of barley and the explicit naming of a ploughman working for him

---

593 Jursa and Payne (2005: 120ff.) discusses the function of this official and gives a list of people attested with this title. According to them a pûšar ekalli was not one of the many simple scribes which must have been employed in the palace. The term rather designated a high official of the state administration. It was not uncommon for these officials to be in possession, or in charge, of extended land holdings on which they did not dwell themselves. Other people, like the steward Bêl-êranni in our case, were in charge of these estates on a day-to-day basis and the land could be subject to rent farming.

594 The term bit epinni specifically designates land tilled with a plough.
Furthermore, it can be inferred that Šum-ukin and Šillāya were not equal partners in this venture and that the former held greater responsibility. This is implied by Šillāya’s and Šum-ukin’s joint obligation to deliver only 52 kurru, in contrast to Šum-ukin’s sole responsibility for at least 280 kurru. Additionally, only Šum-ukin is named as the person in charge of the arable land in the summation of the amounts.

Another text which provides evidence for Šum-ukin’s activities in Ḫarrubat is the work contract YBC 3518 from 2 Ami. It concerns the land which belongs to a certain Nabû-zēr-ibni (the patronymic is lost in a break) and is at the disposal of Šum-ukin. Part of the land is given to Sukkāya (without a patronymic), who is supposed to employ sharecroppers and guarantee for the work on it. Apparently there were two levels of intermediaries (Šum-ukin, Sukkāya) between the land owner (Nabû-zēr-ibni) and the agricultural workers (sharecroppers). Unfortunately nothing more can be said about the scope of this undertaking.

2.9.3.1.5. Šum-ukin’s movements

As the above mentioned texts demonstrate, Ḫarrubat emerges as a place in which some of Šum-ukin’s activities, particularly the agricultural ones, were concentrated. His first precisely datable attestation in Ḫarrubat is from 27 Nbk in a debt note for barley (PTS 2234). Another debt note for barley, GCBC 575 (20’ Nbk), also from the twenties of Nebuchadnezzar, was written here. Two more promissory notes for barley are known from 40 and 41 Nbk (PTS 2868 and PTS 2109 respectively), to be followed by a herrānu-contract between Šum-ukin as investor and Šillāya, son of Šīn-ibni, as agent in acc Ami (YBC 11459). Šum-ukin’s further attestations at Ḫarrubat include the already discussed texts of ‘the palace scribe dossier’ (PTS 2046 and BIN 2 109) from acc Ami and the work contract concerning arable land from 2 Ami (YBC 3518). The presence of his nephews is also attested at Ḫarrubat. In acc Ami Kalbāya appears as a witness in BIN 2 109. His second appearance as witness is in 2 Ami in YBC 3518, the text, which was written by his brother Nūrē. While the close relationship of Šum-ukin to his nephews can hardly be disputed and is not surprising in the light of his not having any offspring, their appearance in several of his documents need not suggest more than that they accompanied their uncle on his business journeys. There is not enough evidence to pinpoint Šum-ukin’s and his brothers’ families’ place of residence for the period before they moved to the Uruk region. While Ḫarrubat seems like quite an attractive locality for this, Babylon appears equally probable, especially in the thirties of Nebuchadnezzar, as the majority of documents from this period were issued there (see Appendix 4 for an overview of texts and their places of issue). However, all of this material may simply reflect Šum-ukin’s movements prompted by his business ventures. The location of his ‘headquarters’ remains unknown for the time being. Other places frequented by Šum-ukin include Borsippa (PTS 2515 (22 Nbk)), Nāru-eḫšu, probably in the region of Babylon (see above), Bāb-Nār-Dērat (PTS 2621 (21 Nbk)) and Alu-ša-ummānī on Nāru-ša-Nergal-dān (YBC 9130 (28 Nbk)), both in the Nippur region. As for the localisation of Ḫarrubat, Zadok lists two entries for what is in my opinion one single locality: Harrūbati, in the Uruk region, and Ḫarrubatu, in the Nippur region (1985: 154f.). The only Eanna-related text mentioning this place is TCL 12 20 (17 Npl), a text recording the income of barley, spelt and wheat from Ḫarrubat and other localities, some as remote as Ur. BIN 2 109 listed by Zadok within this entry is in fact a private text from the Basia archive. In fact, all other mentions of Ḫarrubat found in the Eanna archive come from among Šum-ukin’s private texts written before the time when he settled in Uruk. The other entry (Ḫarrubatu) is

---

595 Šum-ukin’s higher position is also reflected by their herrānu-arrangement from acc Ami, in which he is the investor and Šillāya the agent (YBC 11459, see above).
596 This tablet is to be published in YOS 16.
597 The year in the date formula is partially broken.
598 The real estate related documents come from their Uruk phase only.
599 That he undertook several business trips to the capital is evident from his Babylon texts which were written at the time when he was already settled in Uruk (see Appendix 4).
attested in a Murašû text (TMH 2/3 147: 7, 14), and here the town is localised on Nāru-ša-Nergal-dân, which is most likely the same watercourse as the above mentioned Nāru-ša-Nergal-dân from one of Šum-ukin’s promissory notes for barley (YBC 9130). Thus it appears that the fields from the Ḫarrubat area were a source of barley for Eanna at least for a period during Nabopolassar’s reign, but this does not clarify its localisation. Ḫarrubat’s connection to the Nippur region seems probable, also considering that Šum-ukin had business in this area on more than one occasion.

2.9.3.2 Arrival at Uruk

Šum-ukin’s arrival at Uruk is best indicated by his appearance in the texts of the Eanna archive proper. When this relocation precisely happened remains obscured by a gap in our material between 2 Ami (month lost in a break) and the second month of 1 Ner, i.e. a period of about a year or less.601 His first completely dated attestation in a text from the Eanna archive is in PTS 2344 (8-II-1 Ner), a land lease contract between the temple ploughman Nanaya-al-iddin, son of Nergal-ina-šer, and Šum-ukin, the messenger of Nergilissar. The farmer addressed Šum-ukin directly and requested the land of the Lady of Uruk, the necessary seed, ploughs and draught animals. It is remarkable that already at this early stage Šum-ukin possessed the degree of authority enabling him to lease out temple land. The right to do this was normally reserved for the higher administration of the temple (qippu, šatammu, bel piqitti), the top royal administration, including the king and the crown prince,602 and later, during Nabonidus’s reign, the fermier général. It should be noted that at this time there already was a royal official (ša reš šarrri), Nabû-šar-usur (attested from 20 Nbk until 13 Nbn), who under Nabonidus became the royal commissioner (bel piqitti) of Eanna (Janković 2005: 170f.), and who would have had the authority to lease out temple land. Therefore Šum-ukin, who was at this time attested with the title of a commissioner of the king (see below), must have played a different role to this official.603 His next appearance is in the sixth month of the same year in TCL 12 64,604 in a similar situation. This is an agreement between two brothers to split between them the land of the Lady of Uruk, three limus, which they took from Šum-ukin, the commissioner (bel piqitti) of Nergilissar, for the purpose of sharecropping. These texts are interesting for several reasons. First, they show that at this point Šum-ukin held responsibility over temple land. Since he was not a member of the Eanna administration, but an outsider, and could lease out this land, this responsibility implies a contractual relationship between him and the temple, meaning that he was a rent farmer already at this stage. Second, his connection to the court is demonstrated by his titles, variants605 of which he was going to carry all through Nergilissar’s reign. We have already seen that he was associated with the royal administration during Amil-Marduk’s reign when he was employed as a rent farmer of the palace scribe. Since that time he had managed to penetrate this structure and become a royal official himself. The nature of his duties toward the king as his commissioner in Uruk is not revealed by the texts, as they, coming from the temple archive,606 deal with temple related matters. Thus, only Šum-ukin’s relationship to Eanna is illuminated by the texts. Despite several new unpublished texts from this period our findings do not go very much beyond the conclusion, foreshadowed by his rent contract from 1 Nbn,607 that Šum-ukin was in a contractual relationship with Eanna since at least 1 Ner.

601 The first known attestation of Šum-ukin from Uruk is from 1 Ner (PTS 2344). His last attestation before that is from a text written in 2 Ami in Ḫarrubat (YBC 3518).
602 During the Achaemenid era Gbaru is also attested in this function.
603 Note that Cocquerillat attempted equating Šum-ukin’s role as a bel piqitti ša šarrri with that of the well attested temple functionary ša reš šarrri bel piqitti Eanna (1968: 94). Already Joannès (1982: 131f.) pointed out that this suggestion is erroneous and that the two functions are not related. The term bel piqitti (“commissioner”), which appears in both titles, being fairly general, is not enough to link the two titles (cf. also San Nicolò 1941 p.29f.).
604 The text is edited in the Appendix 1.
605 Attested titles are: bel piqitti ša Nergal-šar-usur, mār šipri ša Nergal-šar-usur and bel piqitti (ša) šarrri.
606 There is only one private text from Nergilissar’s reign, BM 114585 (3 Ner, written in Uruk), recording Šum-ukin’s purchase of a slave.
607 YOS 6 11 and duplicates TEBR 37 and VAT 8418 (= AFK 2, p. 107ff.).
The texts (see table below) from the period during which Šum-ukin was a royal commissioner include debt notes for agricultural products, mostly dates, or equivalents thereof in barley or silver, and one for sesame. These commodities are said to pertain to Šum-ukin’s rent (sîtu) and are formally parallel to the imittu debt notes from his time as fermier général. The debt note for sesame (PTS 2312 (1 Ner), edited on p. 53) demonstrates how individual rent obligations of temple ploughmen/gardeners or other minor agricultural contractors were superimposed by the rent of Šum-ukin. There is one imittu list among these texts (BIN 1 166 (2 Ner)). It is a list for kasia measured out (and taken?) from the messenger of Šum-ukin, Nabû-šum-usur, by two scribes. All of these texts show that Šum-ukin rented date palm orchards, but the extent of this rent farm can not be reconstructed from the material available to us. The two land leases, PTS 2344 and YBC 3750, and the land division contract, TCL 12 64, suggest that he was also in charge of arable land. According to TCL 12 64, several limus were under his responsibility; in PTS 2344 and YBC 3750 he acts as the lessor of temple land. The leases also give evidence for an additional source of his income. The sharecroppers are obliged to present a bull (TCL 12 64) and a bull and a sheep (YBC 3750) to Šum-ukin. The temple ploughman from PTS 2344, on the other hand, was not obliged to make a present to Šum-ukin. He was only supposed to supply Šum-ukin with two urāšu workers, which is related to the service obligations of the temple dependants. Was the necessity to provide gifts for the lessor customary or could it indicate that there was a competition between the contenders for sharecropping on temple land? Or was this simply a reflection of Šum-ukin’s high-handed abuse of his position as intermediary between the landlord, the temple, and the sharecroppers?

YBC 4079 (2 Ner) is the only text from this group which does not have an obvious agricultural background. It is a conditional verdict stipulating that if a witness comes by and charges Nabû-aḫḫē-šullim, son of Nergal-uššub, with selling sheep belonging to the Lady of Uruk, then Šum-ukin will raise a claim (on the sheep). The implications of the text are not clear.

### Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Contents</th>
<th>Šum-ukin’s title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NBC 6127</td>
<td>23-I-[x] Ner</td>
<td>debt note for date-imittu</td>
<td>bēl piqitti ša šarrī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YBC 7411</td>
<td>22-XI-[x] Ner</td>
<td>land lease</td>
<td>bēl piqitti ša [šarrī]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq 59, no. 12</td>
<td>15-[x]-1 Ner</td>
<td>debt note for date-imittu</td>
<td>bēl piqitti ša šarrī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTS 2344</td>
<td>8-II-1 Ner</td>
<td>land lease</td>
<td>mār šipri ša Ner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCL 12 64</td>
<td>4-VI-1 Ner</td>
<td>division of land</td>
<td>bēl piqitti ša Ner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTS 2312</td>
<td>10-VII-1 Ner</td>
<td>debt note for sesamme-imittu</td>
<td>bēl piqitti ša [šarrī]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

608 There is not enough information to identify these people either as ploughmen, gardeners or sharecroppers. The mention of their sîtu would point to their affiliation with the temple, i.e. as temple ploughmen or gardeners. (In the case of sharecroppers one would expect zītu or šībītu in place of this term). However, it is equally possible that these individuals were sub-lesses of Šum-ukin, i.e. minor agricultural contractors.

609 Here Šum-ukin is without a patronymic and a title, but there is little doubt about his identity, considering the amount of kasia (1,521 kurru) involved.

610 Kasia and sesame, both summer crops, were frequently cultivated as sub-cultures in the date groves, rather than on fields of the ikkaru, which, unlike the orchards, usually did not have sufficient water supplies required by these crops (Jursa 1995a: 178). The attestations of sesame and kasia among this material support the picture of Šum-ukin’s involvement in the cultivation of date palm orchards.

611 YBC 7411, another document from Nergilissar’s reign mentioning land (qaqqarat), is too damaged to determine what sort of a lease this was and what role Šum-ukin played in it.

612 This would stand in opposition to Renger’s remark for the situation in the Old Babylonian period, namely that there was no such competition between the prospective land tenants (1994:189).

613 This table does not include BM 114585 (13-V-3 Ner), recording Šum-ukin’s purchase of a slave, as it is a private document. He has no title in this text.

614 For an edition see Appendix 1.

---
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Toward the end of Neriglissar’s reign the documentation peters out. One private text from acc Lab (NBC 4534, see above) shows that Šum-ukín was in Babylon at this time. This text, formulated as a debt note, indicates that he was having four oxen from his other estates transported to Uruk, probably in an attempt to concentrate his resources in an area where he had found good conditions for expanding his business. On a different note, it is not surprising that he would spend time in the capital being a royal official himself, and particularly during the unstable and potentially both dangerous and beneficial period of power change at the royal court. However the turbulences of Lābhî-Marduk’s short reign and Nabonidus’s takeover affected him, it is clear that Šum-ukín abandoned (involuntarily?) his court career and concentrated on his agricultural business with Eanna. Nevertheless, he was not on bad terms with the new ruler – otherwise his new and expanded rent contract with Eanna would hardly have got the king’s sanction.

It is not clear what exactly happened during Nabonidus’s accession year. There is only one pertinent text from Eanna, a debt note for barley from the rent (s̱tu) of Šum-ukín, ša muḫḫī šītī of the Lady of Uruk (YOS 19 85, 22-[x]-acc Nbn). It is his first attestation with this title. It is not clear whether a change in his relationship with the temple is suggested by this new title. This type of text, attested for Šum-ukín already during Neriglissar’s reign, in itself does not offer any evidence for such a change.

2.9.3.3. The rent contract and the rent farm

The documentation from 1 Nbn starts with two debt notes for barley from the rent of Šum-ukín (BIN 1 97 (12-1-1 Nbn) and YOS 6 24 (13-I-1 Nbn). In these texts he appears again with the title ša muḫḫī šītī. These debt notes are followed by the only rent contract we have for Šum-ukín (YOS 6 11 with duplicates TEBR 37 and AfK 2, p. 107ff. = VAT 8418 (28-I-1 Nbn)). However, this will have not been his only rent contract, as it is evident that he was in a contractual relationship with the temple at least since the first year of Neriglissar’s reign. According to the rent contract from the first regnal year of Nabonidus Šum-ukín and Kalbâyā addressed the king, who was at that time visiting Larsa, with a request for 6,000 kurru of land, in addition to the date palm orchards which were presumably already under their control, 400 ploughmen, 400 oxen and 100 cows. In return they offered to deliver yearly 25,000 kurru of barley and 10,000 kurru of dates to Eanna. They were granted this request with the stipulations forbidding them to encroach on the

---

616 The text is edited in Appendix 1. Šum-ukín is not given a patronymic here, but given the context, this identification seems very probable. The debt of one person is transferred to another, and converted from dates to barley – for what reason, we are not told. At any rate, Šum-ukín is supposed to bring the debt note of the original debtor, which is kept in the temple, and hand it over to the new debtor, after he paid the barley to the temple. This was done so that those two could settle this matter between them (these two men are not known from other sources). The text offers some information concerning the practicalities of managing the obligations of the agricultural workers, showing that the (imittu) debt notes were kept in the temple and not with the rent farmer as could be assumed (l. 15). It also demonstrates that the rent farmer was instructed by the temple authorities on how to act in special cases.

617 The text is translated by Cocquerillat 1968: 55.

618 Note also the continuing royal support for Šum-ukín’s nephew Kalbâyā, expressed in the letter YOS 3 2.

619 There are also two private documents from this year, both concerning the acquisition of slaves as compensation from debtors, one of which was written in the Uruk countryside (AnOr 8 19) and the other in Babylon (YOS 6 5), revealing another visit to the capital.

personal networks within the royal administration. How exactly they were put to use to his plantations (YOS 6 11: 3: 6 lim gur še-numun pi-i šal-[p]i e-lat še-numun é šešišimmar). However, this does not necessarily indicate that his agricultural activities during Neriglissar’s reign and the accession year of Nabonidus were confined to the cultivation of date palm orchards. His involvement with arable land, evident from leases from Neriglissar’s reign (see above) and from the three debt notes for barley (imitti and zittu) from acc and 1 Nbn preceding this contract (YOS 19 85; BIN 1 97; YOS 6 24), should not be forgotten. These texts offer clear evidence that Šum-ukin had also rented arable land prior to this rent contract. Evidently the contract was not formulated accurately in this respect. Perhaps the arable land under his control was negligible with regard to size compared to the orchards at his disposal, and was therefore not mentioned in the text. The presumably small amount of land he rented at an earlier date may have now been included in the newly granted 6,000 kurru. But what was the role of the king at the setting up of this rent farm? Had its expansion to a surface of 6,000 kurru only been made possible by the intervention of the royal administration? This hypothesis is at present not verifiable even though there is undisputable evidence for Šum-ukin’s links to the royal administration. He had business connections in the agricultural sector with the high royal official ūpšarr ekkalī (see above). At a later point in his career he even became a member of the royal administration: as an agent (bēl piqitti/mār šipri) of Neriglissar he could establish himself as an agricultural entrepreneur in the Uruk region and commence his work for the Eanna temple. Not surprisingly we hear of Šum-ukin’s audience621 and correspondence622 with the king. Another link to a member of the royal administration, the courtier (ṣa reš šarr) Bēl-šar-uṣur, is provided by the letter YOS 21 26. In this letter Bēl-šar-uṣur appeals to Šum-ukin to provide arable land for his ploughmen focusing on their close personal relationship and reciprocity by promising to return him any favour. A connection to another courtier, Abi-ulide, transpires from the letter YOS 21 143. All this certainly indicates that Šum-ukin built up personal networks within the royal administration. How exactly they were put to use to his advantage remains obscure. It is interesting to note that Šum-ukin’s career did not seem to suffer from the dynastic changes which took place after Amīl-Marduk’s short reign. This probably means that Šum-ukin’s personal networks survived these political turmoils unscathed.

As Šum-ukin had played the role of a rent farmer in Uruk since at least 1 Ner, it is not surprising that this new contract refers to land in addition to land which had already been at his disposal. He and his nephew ask for 6,000 kurru of arable land in addition to the date palm plantations (YOS 6 11: 3: 6 lim gur še-numun pi-i šal-[p]i e-lat še-numun é šešišimmar). However, this does not necessarily indicate that his agricultural activities during Neriglissar’s reign and the accession year of Nabonidus were confined to the cultivation of date palm orchards. His involvement with arable land, evident from leases from Neriglissar’s reign (see above) and from the three debt notes for barley (imitti and zittu) from acc and 1 Nbn preceding this contract (YOS 19 85; BIN 1 97; YOS 6 24), should not be forgotten. These texts offer clear evidence that Šum-ukin had also rented arable land prior to this rent contract. Evidently the contract was not formulated accurately in this respect. Perhaps the arable land under his control was negligible with regard to size compared to the orchards at his disposal, and was therefore not mentioned in the text. The presumably small amount of land he rented at an earlier date may have now been included in the newly granted 6,000 kurru. But what was the role of the king at the setting up of this rent farm? Had its expansion to a surface of 6,000 kurru only been made possible by the intervention of the royal administration? This hypothesis is at present not verifiable even though there is undisputable evidence for Šum-ukin’s links to the royal administration. He had business connections in the agricultural sector with the high royal official ūpšarr ekkalī (see above). At a later point in his career he even became a member of the royal administration: as an agent (bēl piqitti/mār šipri) of Neriglissar he could establish himself as an agricultural entrepreneur in the Uruk region and commence his work for the Eanna temple. Not surprisingly we hear of Šum-ukin’s audience and correspondence with the king. Another link to a member of the royal administration, the courtier (ṣa reš šarr) Bēl-šar-uṣur, is provided by the letter YOS 21 26. In this letter Bēl-šar-uṣur appeals to Šum-ukin to provide arable land for his ploughmen focusing on their close personal relationship and reciprocity by promising to return him any favour. A connection to another courtier, Abi-ulide, transpires from the letter YOS 21 143. All this certainly indicates that Šum-ukin built up personal networks within the royal administration. How exactly they were put to use to his advantage remains obscure. It is interesting to note that Šum-ukin’s career did not seem to suffer from the dynastic changes which took place after Amīl-Marduk’s short reign. This probably means that also his personal networks survived these political turmoils unscathed.

Be that as it may, the formation of Šum-ukin’s rent farm as signified by his contract with the king did not commence an altogether “new era” or cause a break in the organisation of the agriculture of Eanna, as one often gets the impression reading the secondary literature on the subject.626 The mechanism of the rent farm (with much older forerunners) had been in use in Eanna since at least Nebuchadnezzar’s time, and Šum-ukin had been in Uruk and in the function of a rent farmer since 1 Ner the latest. Obviously then Nabonidus introduced neither Šum-ukin nor the rent

---

621 His and Kalbiya’s audience with the king in Babylon is mentioned in the letter addressed to Šum-ukin by his great-nephew Taqiš-Gula (YOS 3 46, edited as no. 15 in Hackl, Janković and Jursa 2011).
622 A letter (šipiru) of the king addressed to Šum-ukin is mentioned in the letter YOS 3 162 (edited as no. 18 in Hackl, Janković and Jursa 2011).
623 Edited as no. 20 in Hackl, Janković and Jursa 2011; see also the comments there on p. 171 and 173.
624 Edited as no. 14 in Hackl, Janković and Jursa 2011.
625 A similar situation can be observed for the Egibis from Babylon (Wunsch 2000b: 100, 104).
626 Cocquerillat, for instance, calls Šum-ukin the founder of the ferme générale, even though she conceives that there were other rent farms for barley albeit of a secondary importance before Šum-ukin’s rent farm (1968: 91). It appears, however, that by this Cocquerillat implied the work of the rab ikkariti and the agricultural rab eseriti (Nergal-nāṣir’s rent contract was not known to her at that time), who were in fact not rent farmers but temple dependants employed in the temple’s agricultural sector.
farm system to Eanna. The only change for Eanna and probably also Šum-ukin was constituted by the considerable increase in the scale of the project. Previously he had worked in a similar function for the palace scribe, and if the figures from BIN 2 109 and PTS 2046 are representative of his annual dues toward this official (700 kurru of barley), then his new arrangement with Eanna entailed an almost 36 times larger obligation, with regard to barley only. As for Eanna, it previously used members of its internal organisation, rab esérti, gugallu, a rab ikkaratii, to supervise its agricultural production, but even the work of these temple officials, just as well as of the ikkarus and errešus on a more basic level, took on traits of entrepreneurial activities as was argued above (p. 116). Additionally, at least one other rent farmer with substantial obligations was employed by the temple before Šum-ukin (see e.g., VS 20 88). Thus, neither was the concept of rent farming new, nor was Šum-ukin a newcomer to Eanna at the time his rent contract was written. He had been around Uruk for at least four years by that time and entertained connections to the royal administration both under Amîl-Marduk and under Neriglissar. It is also conceivable that he enjoyed a good relationship with the temple administration, based on his previous performance regarding the management of temple lands during Neriglissar’s rule. Presumably both Šum-ukin’s desire to expand his business and the requirements of Eanna’s growing agricultural production made this large-scale rent farm a natural next step in the development of this individual’s career and the institution’s economy. How exactly the royal involvement, for which there must have been manifold reasons, tied in with these private and institutional aspirations remains a difficult question. It is conceivable that it was in part motivated by policies designed to strengthen the regional centres based around temple economies, on the one hand. On the other, the desire to entertain good (business) relationships with the local elites (either indigenous or introduced from elsewhere) in order to secure a political support base must have also played a role. Finally, personal relationships between Šum-ukin and the members of the royal administration, possibly aimed at maximising personal gain, though difficult to verify, should not be left unconsidered in this context. Thus, the situation was complex; simply assuming that the rent farmer Šum-ukin was imposed onto the temple does not do it justice. It has to be borne in mind that at least three different factors were at play in shaping Šum-ukin’s ferme générale: Šum-ukin’s private interests, those of the crown and those of the temple. Though it is probably safe to assume that the interests of the crown carried the most weight, the question whose interests prevailed and to what degree is a matter which can hardly be quantified.

Apart from sporadic private texts (for these see Appendix 4), the documentation concerning Šum-ukin for the first seven years of Nabonidus’s reign is fairly uniform. The majority of the material is composed of imittu (or zittu) debt notes for barley and dates. There are also several imittu lists, receipts for agricultural products, and once, iron, accounting ledgers and land leases among these texts.

As was discussed above, when Šum-ukin first appeared in Uruk he went by the title of a royal commissioner (bēl piqitti (ša) šarrī). Soon afterwards he abandoned his court career and concentrated on his agricultural business in Uruk, which he had started up while in this function. In

---

627 This is also true for Ana-amūt-Bēl-ātkal, the rent farmer of the Ebabbar of Sippar, who was present and active in the temple agriculture several years prior to his rent contract sanctioned by Nabonidus (Jursa 1995a: 89f.).

628 Of course, his good relationship with the temple administration, for instance, the royal official Nabû-šar-ūṣur, who under Nabonidus became the bēl piqitti of Eanna, could have been of a purely personal nature, and may have originated from his connection to the court. But other explanations are also possible. Our evidence allows us no more than speculations on this subject.

629 Jursa, for instance, suggests that the temples “had been forced to enter a business relationship with a royal protégé” and understood this to be an “unwanted arrangement” (2004c: 184 n. 104).

630 To these factors one could also add the private interests of the members of the royal administration. However, these are hardly verifiable, as was noted earlier. Whether this type of interests can also be assumed for the temple administration remains a question which cannot be answered at the present.

631 YOS 19 310 (1 Nbn); The text in fact deals with the oil for oil pressers. Additionally, in smaller script, it mentions Šum-ukin’s delivery of 6 talents 40 minas of iron to the treasury as exchange (ana šupēlīti), but for what, the text does not state. The iron in question could have been part of the supplies for the repair of agricultural tools, which was at his disposal. Šum-ukin is designated here as rab ikkarati.
acc Nbn he is for the first time attested with the title ša muḫḫi  sûti ša Bêlti ša Uruk (YOS 19 85), which he kept all throughout his active career. On three occasions, however, he is attested with another title, rab ṭkkarāti, a title generally associated with the internal organisation of the temple agriculture. Two attestations are from 1 Nbn, a title (ešrû) lease contract (TCL 12 73; for an edition see Appendix 1 and also Jursa 1998: 7f. 21) and an account of remaining oil of the oil pressers with an additional remark about Šum-ukin’s delivery of iron (YOS 19 310). A third land lease contract with the mention of Šum-ukin as rab īkkarāti comes from 3 Nbn (YOS 6 40). The services of Nabû-ahḫē-šullim, son of Nabû-udammiq, the only person known with this title before Šum-ukin, had been rendered obsolete by the first year of Neriglissar’s reign, when Šum-ukin arrived at Uruk and started working in Eanna’s agricultural sector. According to our documentation after this point Nabû-ahḫē-šullim does not have more responsibility than a simple īkkarû. The significance of the use of this title is not evident. It appears that no factual difference in Šum-ukin’s tasks and responsibilities was implied by the two different titles.

2.9.3.4. imittu debt notes and lists

The information from the imittu debt notes pertaining to Šum-ukin’s rent farm is of a limited use for us. The existence of debt notes in the archive of a creditor is generally taken to indicate that these debts were not settled. In case of payment of a debt the document recording this obligation was normally either handed over to the debtor or simply destroyed. This was, however, not always the case. The creditor sometimes kept copies of the debt notes even after the debts had been settled. Therefore, the extant imittu debt notes do not necessarily give evidence for obligations of ploughmen and sharecroppers which were not settled. Judging by these texts alone one would get a seriously skewed picture with respect to the success of a rent farmer. The texts have obviously not come down to us in their entire number. Furthermore, it is to be assumed that a selection of the documents which were no longer of interest to the temple administration took place in the antiquity (as was the case with the debt notes from Šum-ukin’s private archive) and so the sample present to us is in no way representative. This is further supported by the fact that the evidence offered by these debt notes is not congruent with the evidence found in imittu lists and accounts. The distribution of imittu debt notes over the first eight years of Nabonidus’s reign is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>year (Nbn)</th>
<th>acc</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>no. of debt notes for barley</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. of debt notes for dates</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 21: Distribution of imittu debt notes from acc to 7 Nbn

Note that according to the account TCL 13 227, which records temple income in agricultural commodities over a period of five years (3 - 7 Nbn), Šum-ukin’s arrears in barley for 4 Nbn would have amounted to roughly 6,500 kurru, but not one imittu debt note for barley has come down to us from this year. Furthermore, there are imittu debt notes for dates, for instance, from the years in which according to TCL 13 227 no arrears in dates were accumulated (year 3 and 6). Note

632 There is possibly even one posthumous reference to him with this title in 11 Nbn (YOS 6 242).
633 For this functionary see pp. 114ff.
634 Šum-ukin is not among the main protagonists in this contract. He appears here in an additional clause (ll. 17-20). This stipulation concerned overlapping areas of responsibility of the rent farmer Šum-ukin and the new lessor of ešrû-land, Innin-šum-šur: Šum-ukin’s deliveries of barley and dates from the land which is recorded in the debt notes of Innin-šum-šur will count as Innin-šum-šur’s rent payment.
635 Joannès adds YOS 6 35 (3 Nbn), an imittu list, to these attestations (1982: 131), following the reconstruction of Cocquerillat 1968: 74, 127. However, the remaining traces of the damaged title do not support the reading rab ikkarāti.
636 These attestations do not include texts in which the regnal year or the commodity owed are lost in a break and cannot be reconstructed we any degree of certainty.
637 For a discussion of the text with a tabulated representation of the entries see van Driel 1990: 248ff. See also here Appendix 2.
also that the *imittu* list from 5 Nbn (YOS 6.63)\(^{638}\) records the amount of dates from the rent farm of Šum-ukin, which were measured out by scribes, as 10,170;2.0.3 dates. TCL 13 227, however, records for this year an amount of 9,845;2 dates as coming from the rent farm of Šum-ukin and Kalbäya. Obviously 325;0.0.3 of dates went missing in the meantime, but we can only guess at a possible explanation. Perhaps some administrative costs needed to be deducted from these dates before reaching the temple granaries. Alternatively, the missing amount may have been withdrawn by Šum-ukin, one of his subordinates, or the responsible scribes after the measuring, assuming that the dates were not immediately transported to the temple, but remained in the countryside for some time longer. Whichever the case, the point is that these *imittu* texts are of only limited value for quantifying the success of Šum-ukin’s and Kalbäya’s rent farm.

However, one interesting piece of information stems from the formulaic designation of the rent farm which is found in every *imittu* debt note. Although the rent farm was granted to Šum-ukin and Kalbäya together, the nephew appears before 7 Nbn only once in a debt note for dates alongside his uncle as the holder of the rent farm (PTS 2036 (1 Nbn)).\(^{639}\) While it can be explained as a convention of the scribes, for space- and time-saving reasons, to record only the senior lease holder as a representative of both, it is surprising to see Kalbäya mentioned after his uncle in every single debt note\(^{640}\) from 7 Nbn. Perhaps his mentions in the debt notes were after all a reflection of his increased active involvement in the management of the farm. The reason for this increase in Kalbäya’s responsibility was not Šum-ukin’s temporary absence. So far there is no evidence for his absence from Uruk for year 7. We do know, however, that Šum-ukin was away from Uruk before, e.g., in 3 Nbn, and this is generally not reflected in the debt notes. Only one debt note for dates from the *sütu* of Šum-ukin says in an additional stipulation that the dates are to be delivered to Kalbäya (YOS 6.25 (3 Nbn)), all other debt notes from 3 Nbn only mention Šum-ukin. A document from 4 Nbn (YOS 6.78) explicitly states that Šum-ukin was away during 3 Nbn and that the yield estimators Žeria, son of Nabû-iddin, and Naniya-iddin, son of Itti-Marduk-balâtu, took care of his arable business in his absence. (ll. 16ff.: mu 3-kam ₅ag-ni-tuk/ lugal tin-tū₅ ki₉e-bar ₅eng₄ i₅na la qa-ri-bi šá 'mu-gin a-ki/i/ pi-i-sú-nu ni-te-mi-id...).\(^{641}\) We can also make an assumption that Šum-ukin was in fact in Babylon during 3 Nbn (the duration of his stay can not be reconstructed) based on YOS 19 155, written in month VI of 3 Nbn in Babylon, a receipt for 370 *kurru* of barley from the rent farm of Šum-ukin, which was placed in a storehouse (*kalakku*) at the disposal of a certain 'Ardia'. The text is not explicit about Šum-ukin’s presence in Babylon, but it seems likely in the light of his certain absence from Uruk, his previous (private) and subsequent connections to Babylon, as expressed for instance by the *imittu* list for dates from 5 Nbn (YOS 6.63). The entries list amounts of dates measured out by relevant temple officials and among other miscellaneous entries “90 *kurru*, which he had given to Bēl-ēter, descendant of Amîl-Nabû, in Babylon” (ll. 12f.). The subject of this sentence can only be Šum-ukin, who is named in the heading of this list.

As was shown for years 3 and probably also 5 Nbn, while Šum-ukin was away from Uruk on business, there are no such indications for Kalbäya’s increased responsibility as are visible in the debt notes from year 7. That said, Kalbäya’s sudden presence in these texts remains a problem to deal with. It is clear that it is not possible to resolve it with any degree of certainty at the present state of our information, but it can be conjectured that at this stage Šum-ukin was for some reason retreating from his position in favour of his nephew. Perhaps his health was not permitting him to take an active part in the management of the rent farm – by this time he must have been relatively old and frail. 39 years passed between his first attestation as a scribe of a debt note from Babylon in

\(^{638}\) Edited by Cocquerillat 1968: 75. 128.

\(^{639}\) He did appear next to his uncle, though, in 6 Nbn, in a receipt for sesame pertaining to their *sütu* (YOS 6.21).

\(^{640}\) The *imittu* debt note YOS 6.82 (7 Nbn) is the only one for which this is not certain because the tablet is broken after the mention of Šum-ukin’s name. However, it seems quite likely that Kalbäya was mentioned in the break.

\(^{641}\) This is corroborated by YOS 6.94 (3 Nbn), a debt note for arrears in barley, in which these two men appear as the commissioners (*bēl piqitti*) of Šum-ukin with the function of yield estimators and collectors of barley obligations. Both texts are edited by Cocquerillat, however, without her noticing their interrelation (1968: 60. 121. 76. 129).
17 Nbk (YOS 17 23) and 7 Nbn.\textsuperscript{642} Not knowing his exact age at this first attestation one can only guess that he must have been well over 50 by 10 Nbn when he died according to the text from the Cleveland Public Library published by Geller (1995: 532ff.). An alternative, albeit less likely possibility is that his health and age may have not been the issue at all, but that he may have decided to concentrate on another line of business, perhaps in some place other than Uruk.

2.9.3.5. The success of the rent farm

Whichever course the events may have taken, an important text written in, probably not coincidentally, 7 Nbn comes to mind. The already mentioned TCL 13 227 was compiled probably some time after the barley harvest and before the date harvest in 7 Nbn, and it records the income in dates, barley and other agricultural products for a period of five years.\textsuperscript{643} The text includes the income from the rent farm of Šum-ukin and Kalbiya, from the sharecroppers,\textsuperscript{644} from the officials in charge of the tithe, from the rab banē, the income (erbu) of the gate, etc. It is clear that the text does not represent a record of the entire income of Eanna, as other rent farmers which were employed by the temple at the same time as Šum-ukin and Kalbiya are not mentioned. Unfortunately, this makes it impossible to assess the importance of their rent farm for the overall income of agricultural commodities. However, if the figures in this text are representative of the total output of Šum-ukin’s and Kalbiya’s rent farm for the years 3 to 7, then a certain pattern concerning the degree of their success can be discerned.

It is clear, for instance, that the date production posed a smaller problem. Their yearly target of 10,000 kurru, set forth by their rent contract, is usually met or even exceeded. A relatively small deficit of less than 155 kurru is recorded for year 5. The target for year 4 was only met by importing dates from Marad and the Sealand (in total 5,028;0.5 kurru minus 1,316 kurru for transport costs), though. The implication of these external deliveries is that Šum-ukin invested money, or other commodities, to purchase these dates. Some of the people responsible for the weighing of the dates in these localities are also known from other sources, which indicate a practice conducted on a regular basis.\textsuperscript{645}

The yearly obligation of 25,000 kurru of barley seems to have been more problematic. Only about two fifths of the required amount were delivered in the years 5 and 6, and slightly more than three fifths in the years 4 and 7. In the face of these figures van Driel concludes “that the rent farm system was an official chimera, something out of reach in real life” (1990: 249). While serious deficits in barley deliveries, as far as our evidence goes, started to surface in 4 Nbn and continued through 7 Nbn (there are no pertinent texts for 1 and 3 Nbn), the obligation imposed by the temple on Šum-ukin was at least once not so out of reach after all: in 2 Nbn he delivered the exact required amount – 25,000 kurru of barley. This piece of information is gained from OIP 122

---

\textsuperscript{642} By comparison, the active working life for men in the Neo-Babylonian period spanned on average only 23 years. Šum-ukin was obviously well above the average life expectancy – only about a fifth of men reached the age of 45 (Gehlken 2005: 107).

\textsuperscript{643} Some of the years are only partially covered: for the year 3 only the date income from the rent farm of Šum-ukin and Kalbiya is recorded, while the opposite is the case for year 7 – here the date income is not included.

\textsuperscript{644} As van Driel has noted, it is possible that these were sharecroppers situated on the land belonging to Šum-ukin’s rent farm, and not all the errēšās employed on the temple estates (1990: 249).

\textsuperscript{645} Nidintu, son of Ahḫēša, for instance, who measured the dates in Marad together with Nanāya-ah-iddin, son of Nergal-uballī, also appears in YOS 6 167 (<6> Nbn). This text includes testimonies of several individuals concerning the dates which were at their disposal and which were taken by Ša-Nabû-îšlim (the slave of the royal commissioner to Eanna). Nidintu, who is designated as the one who transports barley and dates from the steppe to Eanna, also testifies that Ša-Nabû-îšlim took from him some of the dates of the Lady of Uruk which he was transporting from Marad to Eanna. Nidintu also appears in a ration list (YOS 6 32 (2 Nbn)) with the title musaḫḫiru (according to the dictionaries: “Aufkäufer”; “agent, deputy, representative (of a higher official)”). He appears with the same title in BM 114499 (7 Nbn), according to which he received 5 sūtu of barley and 1x, to all likelihood as travel provisions, and was sent to Babylon. Two attestations from 3 Cyr (AnOr 8 40 and BM 114610) show him renting boats “for barley”, meaning probably for transportation of barley.
82, which records the temple income of agricultural commodities and its disbursements for 2 Nbn. It is perhaps significant that this barley was discharged at the beginning of his career as a large-scale rent farmer. It is conceivable that he had barley reserves (or capital in some form or other) from his earlier agricultural undertakings, which he could use to top up the actually harvested barley so as to meet his rent obligation. However, that year the target for dates was not met. Šum-ukín managed to deliver only 7,130 kurru.

Thus, the overall picture for the years for which we have complete data sets, for the combined sîtu due in barley and dates (i.e. 35,000 kurru) is as follows: in 2 Nbn ca. 92 %, in 4 Nbn ca. 80 %, in 5 Nbn ca. 58 % and in 6 Nbn ca. 59 % of the required sîtu were delivered. Perhaps reaching the target for barley in 2 Nbn was only made possible for Šum-ukín by investing and purchasing barley externally, as was done with the dates in 4 Nbn. Evidence for this has yet to be discovered. Van Driel is probably right in supposing that both the obligations set by Šum-ukín’s rent contract and, more generally, by the ‘Edict of Belšazzar’ were unrealistic from the outset. As Jursa points out small-scale prognostication based on practical experience worked reasonably well. Problems arose, however, when these models were applied to larger areas as was the case with the ferme générale. Here often the goals set by the temple administration were too high. This was in part owed to different factors that influenced the productivity, such as variable soil quality, water availability or climatic fluctuations, which had not been taken into account. In part, however, these unrealistic models may have been a conscious effort of the temples, which “had been forced to enter into a business relationship with a royal protégé, (...) to get as much out of this unwanted arrangement as ever they could” (Jursa 2004c: 184 n. 104). Leaving aside the question to which degree the crown imposed the rent farmers on the temples against their will, it comes as no surprise that the temples embarked upon such a business. By setting unrealistically high targets for the people working for them, they had little to lose. While the temples hoped to squeeze the maximum out of their subjects they could also expect to force them into a state of higher dependency. This process was finalised at the final settling of accounts with the debtor, ending usually with the confiscation of his property, sometimes even including members of his family.

The temple dependants seem to have had little choice but to do what they were told by the temple, even if its demands were unrealistic. The question remains why the external entrepreneurs agreed to work under such unfavourable conditions, when all they seem to have entailed was a slow slide into poverty. Certain unquantifiable factors must have played a role here: the rent farmer’s personal capital which he could potentially invest in the undertaking, the availability of free, non-affiliated work force which could be employed to the advantage of the rent farmer (as in YOS 19 71, for instance), and so on. Furthermore, at least some of the rent farmers (Šum-ukín was certainly among these) could count on the support of the royal administration when it came to their accountability toward the temple. Though cases of confiscations of property of the temples’ debtors are attested, we still do not know how rigorous the temples were in enforcing the payments of debts. This is perhaps something that especially the rent farmers with royal backing speculated with.

646 For 1 Nbn we have no data at all. For 3 Nbn, TCL 13 227 offers us a figure for dates – 10,020 kurru, i.e. slightly more than 100 % of the date sîtu, and for 7 Nbn, the text records a delivery of 17,000 kurru plus 2,000 kurru of barley from the land rented additionally by Kalbäya. If the two amounts are taken together as Šum-ukín’s and Kalbäya’s deliveries they would make up 76 % of the barley sîtu. If the 2,000 kurru were credited to a separate account, for which we do not have any evidence, by the way, only 68 % of the barley sîtu would have been cleared for 7 Nbn (see Appendix 2).

647 For “prognostication” in institutional economy in general, its “use of simplifying models or ‘rules of thumb’” see Jursa 2004c: 183f.

648 An aspect of this unfavourable situation of the ploughmen has been discussed by Janković 2005: 167ff.

649 Note the letter of Nabonidus to the temple administrators, who had complained about the rent farmer Kalbäya’s arrears of 44,063 kurru of barley and dates, in which he orders them to leave Kalbäya alone and simply accept any payments he makes (YOS 3 2; see p. 189).

650 Somewhat surprisingly in the case of Šum-ukín the temple administration seems to have been quite thorough in this respect (see below). This degree of meticulousness is not attested for the other rent farmers; however, this may be attributed to archival considerations.
Be that as it may, the recapitulation of the income from Šum-ukin’s farm (TCL 13 227), perhaps prompted by his deteriorating health, seems to have resulted in another series of events in 8 Nbn, which can be subsumed under the caption:

2.9.3.6. Settling of accounts

Unfortunately, no final account juxtaposing Šum-ukin’s credit and debit toward Eanna has come down to us. It seems very likely that such a document had been made toward the end of 7 Nbn or the beginning of 8 Nbn. This is indicated by a group of texts from 8 Nbn, which all seem to be motivated by the temple’s need to recover Šum-ukin’s outstanding dues.

Most of these texts have already been introduced in the section on Šum-ukin’s property, as it is this property that was the most interesting for the temple at this stage. These assets were invariably appropriated by the temple. Thus BM 114599 from the fifth month of 8 Nbn, a receipt for a partial payment of silver, offers evidence for a transfer of a silver debt, owed to Šum-ukin, to the temple as the new creditor. The reasons for this transfer are not stated, as indeed they are not in any of the following cases. The settling of accounts between Šum-ukin and the temple appears as a plausible explanation for this particular cluster of texts.

BM 114599

obv. 1. 1 ma-na ¹kù-babbar² re-ḫe-et
2 ma-na 13 gin šal-šu 1 gin kù-babbar
ša ’mu-gi-na a-šù ša ’en-numun a ’ba-as-si-iā
ša ina muḫ-ḫi ’a-bal-lit-su³ gu-la
5.  niq-ga³ gašan ša unug⁴ u⁵ na-na-a
ina muḫ-ḫi ’a-bal-lit-su³ gu-la
[a-šù ša³] sin lim⁶ en a ša sanga-bára
[ina iti x i]-nam-din

rev.  10. [i]-na gub’-zu ša û³ ag-lugal-ûru û³ sag lugal
[en pi-qi-ti č-an-na
₆ mu-kin-mu ṣ[di-kud-šeš]⁷-mu
a-šù ša gi-mi-lu a šē-gu-û-a
[ta]-sur-zi ² a-šù ša ’ir ² en a ’e-ge-hi
na-din a-šù ša ṣag-pab⁸ me-aša a ’e-ge-hi
15. šu-ma-a a-šù ša dū² ¹ 15 a ṣag-babbar
umbisag ṣa-na-a-mu a-šù
ša ṣag-du-šeš a ’ê-ku-zak-ki
u.e. unug⁹ iti nê ud 3-kam
mu 8-kam ṣag-ni-tuk lugal tin-tir ki

“1 mina of silver, the remainder of 2 minas 13 1/3 shekels of silver, belonging to Šum-ukin, son of Bēl-zēri, descendant of Basia, that were the debt of Uballissu-Gula, is the property of the Lady of Uruk and Nanaya. It is the debt of Uballissu-Gula, son of Silim-Bēl, descendant of Sangū-parakki. He will pay (the money) [in the tenth month].

In the presence of Nabû-šar-usur, the royal commissioner of Eanna.

Witnesses: Madan-ahḫē-iddin, son of Gimillu, descendant of Šigûa,
Nabû-ēter-napšâti, son of Arad-Bēl, descendant of Egibi,
Nādin, son of Nabû-ahḫē-īqišā, descendant of Egibi,
Šumāya, son of Iblîn-Ištar, descendant of Pušûa,
Uruk; 3-V-8 Nbn, king of Babylon.”
What follows in the sixth month is a sale of Šum-ukin’s horses conducted by the temple. This is shown by GC 1 269, a receipt of an instalment for one of Šum-ukin’s horses, which were brought from him (to the temple). The text does not state how many horses those were, but the price of just one was set at 3 5/6 minas, indicating that at the time of the settling of accounts with the temple Šum-ukin still owned considerable assets. About four months after the horse sale the temple sold one of Šum-ukin’s houses:

GC 1 292

22-X-8 Nbn

obv. 1. 6 ma-na 3 gin kù-babbar
    Ŝām ē 1mu-gi-na
    a šet-en-numun šā da ē
    1dū-ûa a 1nad-na-a

5. ina šu 1šā-du-nu

lo.e. 1ag-mu-giš

na-ša-a

rev. iti ab ud 22-kam

mu 8-kam 1ag-ni-tuk

10. lugal tin-tir²

“6 minas 3 shekel of silver, the price of a house of Šum-ukin, son of Bēl-zērī, that is next to the house of Ibnāya, son of Nadnāya, were taken from Šadûnu, son of Nabû-Šum-lišīr.

22-X-8 Nbn, king of Babylon.”

That this transaction was not as straightforward as the text suggests is indicated by another document, AnOr 8 70 (3 Camb). This text points out that the price in fact had not been paid, nor had the temple received any merchandise from Šadûnu and his brother, who had nominally bought this house in order to finance their trading business (see above). The implications of this sale for Šum-ukin and his family are not revealed by the subsequent documentation. They seem to have remained in Uruk despite the measures taken by the temple and the failure of the rent farm, the work on which was pursued, on a somewhat restricted scale, by Kalbāya, and later his son Nabû-bān-al. There is no evidence whatsoever concerning Šum-ukin from 9 Nbn and the following year, the year of his death according to the text from the Cleveland Public Library (Fs. Greenfield, p. 532ff., Geller 1995). After his death, the temple still tried to recover some of his arrears, by reformulating some of the imittu obligations from Šum-ukin’s rent farm in debt notes charged to other individuals, as in YOS 6 242 (11 Nbn). Šum-ukin’s confiscated property probably was not enough to settle his debt. It is conceivable that Kalbāya inherited this remaining debt, as he was also responsible for the rent payment according to their rent contract. Consequently Kalbāya was, more or less, forced to continue with the rent farming business in order to work his dues off.

---

651 The text is edited by Dougherty 1923: 30. Note that ruḫḫu which Dougherty does not translate simply means “the remaining”, indicating perhaps that the other horses had already been sold. Note also that Bazuzu, son of Šamaš-ubbališ, and Angillāya, son of Balātu, did not receive the silver as the translator suggests, but that this money was in fact received from them (for the use of the stative of maḫaru as a passive doubly transitive form in the Eanna administrative texts see for instance Jursa 2005: 46f.). The use of the singular in the stipulation for the payment of the remaining silver (ll. 10f: 1 5/6 ma-na kù-babbar ina pa-ni-šu-nu/ ina iti gan i-nam-din) is probably an abbreviation of the phrase ša qerbu inamdin.

652 FLP 1612 (published by Dillard 1975: 276), written in the fifth month of 8 Nbn, should also be mentioned in this context. It is a receipt for 1 mina 1 shekel of silver from Šum-ukin which were brought by a certain Bānīa, son of Kudurru, and used by the temple for digging a canal. As the document is very cursory, it is not clear how it fits into the process of the settling of accounts.

653 In this text a certain Lâbûš-Marduk, son of Šūzubu, is charged with an amount of dates, his imittu obligation pertaining to the rent farm of Šum-ukin and the imittu of his brother, Nabû-ţer, for the payment of which he had guaranteed. The text is translated by Joannès 2005: 42f.
2.9.3.7. Status of the Basia archive

Incidentally BM 114599, treated above, offers a clue as to why texts from Šum-ukin’s private archive were found among the tablets of the Eanna archive. This transfer of debt may or may have not been expressed as a separate debt note, but in any case the temple needed the original debt note, with Šum-ukin as creditor, on which to base its claims on Uballissu-Gula. It is therefore not unthinkable that the temple administration confiscated Šum-ukin’s private archive, treating it as his other assets, in order to sift through it and find debt notes and property deeds that it could utilize as its own capital.

Šum-ukin’s “private archive” that is now before us is only one part of the actual archive, as important missing documents such as real estate deeds, dowry texts, etc. indicate. These documents, including also the debt note on which BM 114599 was based, and doubtless other debt notes which the temple attempted to use as assets, were not found among our material. They were either kept in a place separate from the part of the Eanna archive found so far, or were disposed of in the course of transfer of property. What we have before us as Šum-ukin’s private archive is probably the portion of the archive which was deemed practically worthless by the temple administration and was discarded. This seems particularly credible considering the usually small amounts of silver and barley as subject of the debt notes. It probably did not pay off for the temple to track down the debtors and pursue these small amounts in relatively remote regions.

As a consequence it becomes apparent why we are not able to create a complete picture of Šum-ukin’s business profile. The small part of his transactions, which is known to us, is hardly representative of the scope of his activities. For these, we can only offer a rudimentary sketch: Šum-ukin based his activities, which included investment in harrānu-ventures and agricultural production on an entrepreneurial level, in the Babylon and Nippur region. For other possible sources of income, such as money-lending, our documentation does not offer sufficient evidence, while not excluding them. At the present state of our documentation, prebendary activities are not attested and can not be assumed for this strand of Basia family, especially considering their social background.

2.9.3.8. Attestations of Šum-ukin:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Contents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PTS 2851: 3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>unfinished account of silver and barley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YBC 7411: 11, 24</td>
<td>22-XI-[x] Ner</td>
<td>legal, badly preserved, mentions land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTS 2344: 3, 11, 11, 16, 18</td>
<td>8-II-1 Ner</td>
<td>land lease contract</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCL 12 64: 5, 16</td>
<td>4-VI-1 Ner</td>
<td>division of land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCL 12 68: 16</td>
<td>15-III-2 Ner</td>
<td>debt note for barley in exchange for dates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YBC 4079: 5f.</td>
<td>8-X-2 Ner</td>
<td>legal text, concerns sheep of the Lady of Uruk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YBC 3750: 2, 7, 21, 23</td>
<td>4-XI-2 Ner</td>
<td>sub-lease ana errēštûti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NBDM 4: 5f.</td>
<td>21-VI-3 Ner</td>
<td>debt note for silver</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

654 E.g. a debt note with Šum-ukin as creditor may have been destroyed or discarded in case Eanna’s claims on the debtor were formulated in a new document. As Eanna sold some of Šum-ukin’s property (horses, a house) it is conceivable that the new owners, in particular in the case of real estate, would get the relevant title deeds from the archive of the original owner and so they would not be found among the Eanna texts.

655 The existence of a couple of texts in which the amounts involved were not negligible, like the two harrānu contracts, may be justified differently. Perhaps the parties involved were not among the living anymore or too difficult to locate. Alternatively, maybe the texts referred to obligations which were met in the past, but for some reason remained in the archive.

656 Here only Šum-ukin’s attestations from the Eanna archive are listed with the exception of the attestations in letters (these are listed in Hackl, Janković and Jursa 2011) and in imittu debt notes (these can be found in the Appendix 5). Uncertain attestations are preceded by a question mark. A list of documents from Šum-ukin’s private archive and his attestations in it is in the Appendix 4.
? OIP 122 50: 10'f. [x]-[x]-[x] Nbn fragmentary rent contract (witness?)

NBC 4583: 1 Nbn? account listing deliveries (?) of agricultural commodities

? YOS 19 75: 17 1 Nbn *imittu* list for barley

TEBR 37: 1, 10f., 15, 17, 22, 24 28-I-1 Nbn rent contract

*A/K* 2, p. 107ff.: 1, 10f., 15, 17, 22, 24 28-I-1 Nbn rent contract

YOS 6 11: 1, 10f., 15, 17, 22, 28-I-1 Nbn rent contract

YOS 6 22: 2, 8 5-II-1 Nbn purchase of dates

TCL 12 73: 17 8-II-1 Nbn lease of *ešrû*-land

BM 114676: 5f. 11-VIII-1 Nbn receipt of oxen instead of arrears of barley

YOS 19 310: 9 18-XIIa-1 Nbn account of oil and iron

OIP 122 82: 3, 12 2 Nbn account of incoming and outgoing agricultural staples

YOS 6 12: 1 9-IV-3 Nbn *imittu*’ list for barley

YOS 6 94: 2 4-V-3 Nbn debt note for arrears of barley

? YOS 6 16: 3 23-V-3 Nbn sale of [x] through a messenger of Šum-ukîn

? YOS 19 155: 2 [x]-VI-3 Nbn receipt for barley

YOS 6 40: 13 23-VI-3 Nbn land lease contract

YOS 6 35: 1 5-XI-3 Nbn *imittu* list for dates

YOS 6 78: 4, 8, 9, 12, 15, 17 8-IV-4 Nbn legal, concerning the barley deliveries of the ploughmen during Šum-ukîn’s absence

YOS 6 88: 4f. 14-VI-4 Nbn fragmentary legal text

PTS 2818: 4, 9, 15 16-IX-4 Nbn legal, concerning cattle

YOS 6 67: 6 14-XI-4 Nbn land lease contract

YOS 6 63: 1 - (5 Nbn) *imittu* list for dates

PTS 2572: 2, 6, 14 24-III-5 Nbn debt note for silver for an embezzled temple cow

? GC 1 327: 6 28-VI-5 Nbn receipt for silver

? YOS 19 170: 4 13-IX-5 Nbn receipt for sesame

YBC 4166: 2f. 6 Nbn *imittu* list for dates

W 17718 1x 14-[x]-6 Nbn land lease contract

YOS 6 21: 2 9-XI-6 Nbn receipt for sesame

TCL 13 227: 7, 9, 17, 18, 25, - (7 Nbn) account of incoming agricultural staples from 3 to 7 36, 38, 43, 55 Nbn

YOS 6 129: 3 9-IV-8 Nbn legal text concerning the status of two slaves

BM 114599: 3 3-V-8 Nbn debt note for silver

TCL 12 90: 5 10-V-8 Nbn land lease contract

Dillard, FLP 1612: 1f. 21-V-8 Nbn[bn] receipt for silver

GC 1 269: 4f. 4-VI-8 Nbn receipt for silver, price of a horse of Šum-ukîn

GC 1 292: 2f. 22-X-8 Nbn receipt for silver for a house of Šum-ukîn

---

657 It is not certain whether this text should be counted to Šum-ukîn’s attestations. This document is an unfortunately very fragmentary rent contract. It mentions 10,000 *kurru* of dates in l. 3’, as well as 400 ploughmen and 400 [x] in l. 5’ (after a collation by M. Jursa read Weisberg’s ‘lú(?)’ giš x’ in l. 3’ as zû*-lu*[m*-ma*] and šá meš in l. 5’ as 4* me*). Šum-ukîn may have appeared among the witnesses in l.10’-11’: [...] / a-šû šá ‘en-numun a ’ba*-[si-ia]. Alternatively, this may have been his brother Šili-i-Bēl. This text may have recorded the transfer of the rent farm to Kalbaya after his uncle backed out of it around 8 Nbn. This is highly conjectural though.

658 The text was only available to me as an entry in the Uruk database of the START Project, for which reason I do not know in which line of the text Šum-ukîn appears.
The story of the large-scale rent farmers of Eanna continues with another member of the Basia family. After Šum-ukin’s death the office of ša muḫḫi sisti of the Lady of Uruk remained in the hands of his nephew Kalbaya. Together they had managed the rent farm since 1 Nbn. Kalbaya’s father Iqiša, son of Bēl-zēri, descendant of Basia, was, as was shown earlier, Šum-ukin’s brother. His last active attestation known to us is from 30 Nbk (YBC 9263), from a text probably written at Babylon.\(^659\) Perhaps he died soon afterwards. At any rate, he is conspicuously absent from his brother’s archive and the documents concerning his two sons Kalbaya and Nūrēa. These two, however, appear a couple of times in Šum-ukin’s archive in texts from Ḫarrubat and later Uruk, indicating that they moved down south with their uncle’s family.

Nūrēa’s appearances as a scribe of tablets from Šum-ukin’s private archive and from the temple archive from 2 Ami (YBC 3518, written at Ḫarrubat, private), 1 Ner (PTS 2344, Eanna archive) and 3 Ner (BM 114585, written at Uruk, private) and in a private legal record from 2 Nbn (PTS 2957) concerning the whereabouts of a slave woman are his only attestations known so far. After 2 Nbn his trail is lost.

Kalbaya, on the other hand, had at this point an eventful life still ahead of him. A couple of his first attestations also stem from Šum-ukin’s private archive. He appeared as a witness in contracts documenting his uncle’s agricultural activities in acc and 2 Ami (BIN 2 109 and YBC 3518, both written in Ḫarrubat). Later he followed his uncle to Uruk, when the latter moved there at the beginning of Neriglissar’s reign. Kalbaya first appeared in the Eanna archive in 2 Ner (YBC 4079\(^660\)) as a witness in a legal document concerning the sale of sheep of contested status.\(^661\)

Kalbaya’s relationship with his uncle was very close, to say the least. To a lesser extent this is also true for Kalbaya’s brother Nūrēa and his cousins, the sons Silim-Bēl, who also appear in the documents from their uncle’s archive. The families of Bēl-zēri’s sons were close-knit, it appears. However, Kalbaya’s partnership with his uncle as agricultural entrepreneur suggests a particularly strong bond between the two of them. This was perhaps a consequence of Iqiša’s (premature?) demise and the fact that Šum-ukin had no male children, i.e. an heir. One almost gets the impression that Kalbaya acted as a surrogate for the son Šum-ukin never had. He not only followed his uncle around on his business trips appearing as a witness in Šum-ukin’s documents, in the accession year of Nabonidus he became his uncle’s business partner as a rent farmer of the Eanna temple and was left in charge of the rent farm when Šum-ukin was away from Uruk: in a letter (YOS 3 22\(^662\)) to his aunt, Buštu, who was away with Šum-ukin, he reassured her that everything

\(^{659}\) The surface of the tablet is eroded and the text is difficult to read. It appears to have been unfinished – only the obverse is inscribed and a date formula is missing. Nevertheless, the year 30 Nbk appears in the text, which helps place it around this date. The text is a receipt of silver for the ilku-service which the šakin āšmi of Babylon, Marduk-ēter, received from Iqiša and Šum-ukin. Iqiša’s other attestations are: PTS 2893 (19 Nbk), OrAn 25, 30 no. 1 (23 Nbk) and PTS 2275 (20\(^67\) Nbk). Two times he appears as a witness in the documents of his brother Šum-ukin (PTS 2275, 2893), and twice he plays an active role: in YBC 9263 (see above) and in OrAn 25, 30 no. 1, where he acts as the seller of a boat.

\(^{660}\) The text is to be published in YOS 16.

\(^{661}\) Šum-ukin, here without a title, but probably in his function as a royal commissioner (bēl piqitti) of Neriglissar, was to lay claim on these sheep (on behalf of the temple) in case they were proven be the property of the Lady of Uruk.

\(^{662}\) This letter is edited by Cocquerillat 1968: 94. 137 and more recently by Hackl, Janković and Jursa 2011: 217.
was going fine at home and reported on the progress of the work in the fields. It is safe to assume that Kalbaya was Šum-ukin’s closest business associate during his time in Uruk.

As for Kalbaya’s own family, he was married to a certain Busasa, about whose origins nothing is known. She is attested only once, without a patronymic, toward the end of her husband’s career in 7 Cyr (YOS 7 93663). The two of them had at least two children. Their son, Nabû-bân-âji, or short Bânia, followed in his fathers footsteps as a rent farmer of the temple. His career is treated in more detail in the next chapter. Kalbaya and Busasa also had one daughter, Bissiaya, who was married to Nanaya-iddin, son of Ibnaya, descendant of Kidin-Marduk. The professions of Bissiaya’s husband and father in law are not known. However, the Kidin-Marduks were a prominent Urukean family with at least three temple scribes stemming from it. Possibly this was a strategic marriage with the purpose of anchoring this strand of Basia family, which, as will be remembered, immigrated from the north, more firmly with the Urukean upper class. Bissiaya’s only appearance in our documentation (YOS 7 59664, 6 Cyr) pictures the not so enviable position she found herself in on account of her father’s failure in the rent farm business. She was denied her dowry, a slave woman, which was claimed by the temple from her father-in-law, probably as compensation for Kalbaya’s arrears. It is conceivable that this did not make Bissiaya particularly popular with the in-laws.

Kalbaya’s career as a rent farmer of Eanna started at the beginning of Nabonidus’s first regnal year with his and Šum-ukin’s land lease contract (YOS 6 11 and duplicates). The conditions of this contract were described in more detail earlier and will not be repeated here. It will be remembered though that Kalbaya entered this agreement together with his uncle Šum-ukin as his partner. However, being older and more experienced with agricultural enterprises Šum-ukin took over the management of the rent farm virtually eclipsing Kalbaya’s activities during the first six years of Nabonidus’s reign. During this period Kalbaya is attested twice on equal footing with Šum-ukin: in 1 Nbn in an imittu debt note for dates (PTS 2036) and in 6 Nbn in a receipt for sesame pertaining to his and his uncle’s sîtu (YOS 6 21). Other attestations suggest a subordinate position for Kalbaya. He appears in 3 Nbn (YOS 6 25) in an imittu debt note for dates in which only Šum-ukin is named as the manager of the sîtu. Kalbaya’s role in this episode is restricted to receiving the date delivery, as an additional clause stipulates (ll. 7-10). In 4 Nbn (YOS 6 88), a fragmentary protocol of some legal dispute, Kalbaya appears as one of the parties involved representing his uncle, who was probably away from Uruk at that time. He is designated as the commissioner, bel piqitti, of Šum-ukin, the sa muḫḫi sîtu of the Lady of Uruk. Kalbaya, for his part, started appearing with the title sa muḫḫi sîtu only since 7 Nbn, here again in association with his uncle.

Other attestations from this period provide evidence for Kalbaya’s purchase of a house in 2 Nbn (BIN 1 161). This administrative note, which records the temple’s income in silver, lists among different entries the receipt of an instalment of 1 mina 5 shekels of silver from Kalbaya, for the house of a certain Nabû-zêr-uṣabbī, son of Bêl-usallim, priced at 2 minas 2 shekels. Despite this formulation, the house will have belonged to the temple, as the temple was the recipient of the money. Nabû-zêr-uṣabbī was perhaps indebted to the temple, which in turn confiscated his property and then sold it to Kalbaya at a later date.665

663 This document is from the context of the temple’s settling of accounts with Kalbaya, who had by this point accumulated considerable arrears as a rent farmer. See below for an edition of the text.
664 The text is edited below.
665 A shepherd (nāqidu) Nabû-zêr-uṣabbī, son of Bêl-usallim, known from an undated text probably from Nebuchadnezzar’s reign (AnOr 9 17), could be identified with our Nabû-zêr-uṣabbī (Kümmel 1979: 69137). The text lists 27 houses, property of the Lady of Uruk, recording the yearly rent, the names of the previous owners of the houses and the names of the tenants. Nabû-zêr-uṣabbī appears in l. 41 in a very terse entry (“ē leg-numum-gál-su a erti-gi mn-gâd”) so that it is not clear how he is connected to the house in question. The persons in the other entries in the expression “the house of PN” in all likelihood refer to the previous owners, who for some reason, probably indebtedness, had to cede their property to the temple. In one case (l. 5) the house is designated as pledge (maškamu), which also points in this direction. Be that as it may, the introductory lines of the text (l. 1: ëen-gi unug”) suggest that the present owner of the houses was the Eanna temple. Nabû-zêr-uṣabbī was probably also one of the previous owners. His house was perhaps without a tenant which would explain the comparatively short entry in the text. This background information can serve to clarify the transaction described in BIN 1 161. The fact that the house in question no
During the first seven regnal years of Nabonidus Kalbāya at least once took part in the temple’s legal proceedings as a witness, a mār banē more precisely, in AnOr 8 21 (4 Nbn). Later he also appears in the role of a mār banē (YOS 6 183, 10 Nbn) or a witness (PTS 2089, 1 Cyr; BIN 2 130, ace Camb) in the texts of the Eanna archive.\textsuperscript{666}

The documentation for this period does not give much insight into Kalbāya’s agricultural activities, rather it puts him in his uncle’s shadow. However, a couple of texts written at later stages of his career show in retrospect that he was indeed actively involved in the rent farming business, and that independently of Šum-ukīn, too.

TCL 13 227, written probably during 7 Nbn, lists the temple’s income in agricultural produce from Šum-ukīn’s and Kalbāya’s rent farm, from the share croppers, the rab banē and other sources. The sources and amounts of income are listed for individual years from 3 to 7 Nbn. In the seventh year, beside the usual entry of the amount of agricultural products from Šum-ukīn’s and Kalbāya’s rent farm (17,000 kurru of barley and spelt), the text also lists a separate amount of 2,000 kurru of barley stemming “from the sītu of the remaining land which is at the disposal of Kalbāya.”\textsuperscript{667} The implication of this line is that the fields which had not already been assigned to his and his uncle’s rent farm were entrusted to Kalbāya as his own rent farm. The amount he delivered was probably not the entire rent, but only a part of it, as the use of the preposition ina suggests, leaving us in the dark about its size.

Potentially, another text comes to the rescue at this point. TCL 12 90\textsuperscript{668} (8 Nbn) is a land lease contract between Nergal-nāšir, son of Nanāya-ibni,\textsuperscript{669} and the officials of Eanna, in which he asks for the lands, which were excluded from Šum-ukīn’s rent farm and were given to Kalbāya as his farm for an annual rent of 3,000 kurru of barley.\textsuperscript{670} Nergal-nāšir offered to pay a rent higher by 500 kurru than the one imposed on Kalbāya, i.e. 3,500 kurru of barley, and following further stipulations was granted this land.

In case both texts refer to the same rent farm under Kalbāya’s responsibility, which seems more than likely, it can be concluded that the original arrangement entailed a rent of 3,000 kurru of barley for fields of three distinct localities\textsuperscript{671} and that this farm was probably set up during 6 Nbn, or at the beginning of 7 Nbn the latest. The amount Kalbāya delivered in 7 Nbn comprised 2/3 of the rent.\textsuperscript{672} So, while he did not reach the target set by the temple, his farming endeavour was not a complete fiasco either. Nevertheless, his farm was dissolved in 8 Nbn, only a couple of years after its formation, and transferred to Nergal-nāšir. Rather than Kalbāya’s failure, the motivation for this state of affairs was perhaps Nergal-nāšir’s higher bid for the rent. However, the developments concerning Šum-ukīn’s rent farm may also have played a part here. As will be remembered, the temple started settling the accounts with him in 8 Nbn. Possible explanations for this, such as Šum-ukīn’s bad health, were discussed earlier, but remain highly speculative. At this time the management of the rent farm may have been transferred entirely on Kalbāya.\textsuperscript{673} What is certain is longer belonged to Nabū-zēr-ukērbī, but was temple property when it was sold to Kalbāya, was probably omitted from the text as a redundant piece of information.

\textsuperscript{666} He also appears among the witnesses in a private document of the temple scribe Nabū-muṣṣīq-uddē/Balāsu/Balīmuq dealing with a division of inheritance (YOS 6 143, 10 Nbn). This Nabū-muṣṣīq-uddē was a scribe involved in the administration of the temple’s agricultural production (see below) and probably had connections to Kalbāya for this reason. But the text also suggests that Kalbāya was moving in the circles of the Urukean elite: among the witnesses were the members of several prominent local families (Egibi, Kurē, Sīn-leq-e-unimmī, Ekur-zakir, etc.). Interestingly one of the witnesses was Inīn-šūm-usur/Iddin-Nabû/Kidin-Marduk, the brother of Ibnāya/Kidin-Marduk who was the father of the (future) husband of Kalbāya’s daughter.

\textsuperscript{667} For this rent farmer see p. 151.

\textsuperscript{668} TCL 13 227 60: 2 lim gur še-bar ina š̱bān šā re-ḫi-it qa qa-qar š̱a šī na igi 1 kal-ba-a.

\textsuperscript{669} Moore 1935: 92ff.; Coquery-Vidrovitch 1968: 40ff.

\textsuperscript{670} For this rent farmer see p. 151.

\textsuperscript{671} TCL 12 90 4ff.: re-ḫi-it še-numuš šā 4 gaššā ša u nūg kiši šī mu-gin la is-ba-tu šā a-na mu-an-na 3 lim gur še-bar a-na š̱bān a-naši kal-ba-a a-sū šà bašā ta-ad-di-na.

\textsuperscript{672} These fields were situated in the area stretching from the border of the district Til-lārišī to the Euphrates, in the district Rudāya until tamiru qaṣtu and in the district Angillu (TCL 12 90 3f.).

\textsuperscript{673} Incidentally, the amount delivered from his and Šum-ukīn’s rent farm that year also came down to 2/3 of the rent. Is this a coincidence?

\textsuperscript{674} This was perhaps recorded in OIP 122 50 ([x] Nbn). The text is too fragmentary and Kalbāya’s name does not appear in the extant portion of the tablet, but his uncle may have been present as a witness (ll. 10’-11’),
that Šum-ukin and Kalbāya accrued arrears over the seven years they worked as rent farmers for Eanna. For 7 Nbn, in particular, a high number of imittu debt notes⁶⁷⁴ may indicate that they ran into difficulties concerning the collecting of the harvests from the gardeners. Kalbāya’s inclusion in these debt notes side by side with his uncle, and for the first time with the title ša muḫḫī sūtī, speaks of his increased involvement in the management of the farm. In the light of this heightened responsibility it is conceivable that Kalbāya himself bailed out of the personal project he had running on the side prompting the temple to look for another tenant.

YOS 3 2,⁶⁷⁵ a famous letter of Nabonidus to the šatammu and the bēl piqitti of Eanna, sheds some light on the precarious situation Kalbāya found himself in after the death of his uncle in 10 Nbn. The letter is not dated, but can be placed between 14 and 16 Nbn on prosopographic grounds. The two officials had complained to the king about Kalbāya, who had accumulated arrears of 44,063 kurrū of barley and dates. The king replied to the officials to leave Kalbāya in peace and accept anything he delivers to the temple: “Order of the king to Kurbanni-Marduk and Ilī-rēmanni. I am well, may your hearts be content. Concerning Kalbāya, the rent farmer, about whom you wrote to me as follows: ‘He has backlogs of 44,063 kurrū of barley and dates’, no one should hassle him. (Just) accept whatever he brings and gives to you”. The apparently unconditional support of the king makes it clear that Kalbāya must have continued in the tradition of his uncle keeping up the good relationships with the court, which Šum-ukin initiated during Neriglissar’s reign, if not even earlier.⁶⁷⁶

Contrary to the view propounded by Cocquerillat (1968: 96) that Kalbāya was out of Šum-ukin’s league, incapable of living up to his achievements, he managed astonishingly well considering the debts accumulated by his “illustrious predecessor”, which he in turn inherited. Looking back at TCL 13 227, probably from 7 Nbn, we can calculate the outstanding amounts of Šum-ukin’s and Kalbāya’s rent farm for the years 4 to 6 Nbn. These arrears add up to over 35,890 kurrū of barley and dates. If we add to this the 8,000 kurrū of barley which were not delivered in 7 Nbn we end up with over 43,890 kurrū. This amount was only a part of the arrears for the first seven years of Nabonidus’s reign, as we do not have complete data sets for their deliveries for all the years.

Apparently, at least another seven years passed before the matter of now only Kalbāya’s arrears was addressed to the king. In the meantime the settling of accounts had been done with Šum-ukin and some of his private assets were confiscated to cover the debt. Unfortunately, we cannot determine by what amount the arrears were diminished. At any rate, seven years later Kalbāya’s debt added up to 44,063 kurrū, meaning that it had not grown considerably over the years. If anything, Kalbāya was just as good as his uncle in managing the rent farm, perhaps even better, considering the initial burden of Šum-ukin’s arrears.

Kalbāya remained in the office of the ša muḫḫī sūtī of the Lady of Uruk for quite some time after the matter of his arrears was referred to the king and even his son Nabû-bān-âhī was employed by the temple as a rent farmer. This can not solely be attributed to the royal support he doubtlessly enjoyed, as he survived the demise of the Chaldean dynasty and kept his function for some two years after the Achaemenid conquest of Babylonia. He remained the ša muḫḫī sūtī of the Lady of Uruk until 2 Cyr (YOS 7 14) (effectively, his last year in office was probably 1 Cyr), and

and the mention of 10,000 kurrū of dates and 400 ploughmen may be indicative of the same conditions as in Šum-ukin’s and Kalbāya’s rent contract from 1 Nbn. See also note 657.

There are six imittu debt notes dated to 7 Nbn (YOS 6 82, 86, 101, 107; YOS 19 78; PTS 2481) and five with a broken date (YOS 6 185; YOS 19 81, 82; YBC 3 466, 11463). These should probably be assigned to this year on account of Kalbāya’s appearance as ša muḫḫī sūtī alongside Šum-ukin, which is characteristic for the debt notes of 7 Nbn. The imittu debt note YOS 6 82 is the only one from the seventh year of Nabonidus in which Kalbāya is not attested because the tablet is broken after the mention of Šum-ukin’s name. It seems most likely that his name was mentioned in the break.

⁶⁷⁴ For an edition of the text see Cocquerillat 1968: 96. 137 and Beaulieu 1989a: 118.

⁶⁷⁵ In a letter (YOS 3 46, see Hackl, Janković and Jursa 2011: 207f.) we hear of Kalbāya going to Babylon in order to accompany his uncle at an audience with the king: “As for Kalbāya, his trip to Babylon is all set. (He says): ‘I will go to Babylon as soon as Šum-ukin sets out.’ He (also) says: ‘Together with Šum-ukin I will approach the king and (stay) with the king until the [end] of the second year.’” (ll. 6-14). The letter should probably be dated to 2 Nbn (Hackl, Janković and Jursa 2011: 182).
was still around until the accession year of Cambyses. These last documents concern the settling of the still open obligations.

The years following Šum-ukin’s settling of accounts had a similar scenario in store for Kalbaya. The only difference seems to be that he took a more active role in this process than his uncle, who was probably hampered by bad health. In Šum-ukin’s case we saw the “temple” or its officials handling his assets and taking action against his debtors. Kalbaya, on the other hand, appeared since 10 Nbn, the year that Šum-ukin died, in a number of texts showing his efforts to deal with the people who had open obligations toward him, i.e. his debtors and the gardeners and farmers under his responsibility. These texts testify to his attempts to track down his debtors, seize their property in exchange for arrears or confront them in legal trials.

YOS 6 194\(^{677}\) (10 Nbn) is a bail protocol concerning the *imittu* for dates from Báb-Ḫili in which a certain Bībēa, son of Nabū-udammiq, guarantees to bring a certain Nabū-tattannu-usur to Kalbaya.\(^{678}\) This guarantee was carried out in the presence of Nabū-mušetiq-uddē and Mušēzib-Marduk, both without a patronymic. Bībēa appears in other texts as well and was either a gardener or a sub-lessee of orchards from Kalbaya’s rent farm.\(^{679}\) Nabū-tattannu-usur could not be identified as he is not given a patronymic. He too was probably either a gardener or a sub-lessee of Kalbaya. The involvement of Nabū-mušetiq-uddē and Mušēzib-Marduk in this case implies that they also had some responsibilities with regard to the *imittu* payment: apparently they were working as intermediaries between the gardeners and the rent farmer. The two of them already appear in an *imittu* list for dates pertaining to the *sītu* of Šum-ukin from the fifth year of Nabonidus (YOS 6 63). They are said to have measured out 1,542 *kurru* of dates in addition to 200 *kurru* from Bit-Amukanu (ll. 6-9). This implies that Nabū-mušetiq-uddē and Mušēzib-Marduk belonged to the group of temple administrators in charge of measuring (and transporting) the harvested crops. These “measurers” were at the same time temple scribes. Nabū-mušetiq-uddē, son of Balāsū, was the scribe of YOS 6 194, and should probably be equated with Nabū-mušetiq-uddē who appears in the body of the text, albeit without a patronymic.\(^{680}\) Nabū-mušetiq-uddē and Mušēzib-Marduk appear in another debt note for dates (PTS 3039, see note 679) written on the same day as YOS 6 194. Nabū-mušetiq-uddē appears one month later in Dillard, FLP 1585 (10* Nbn\(^{681}\)), a receipt for 115 *kurru* of barley. A certain Libluṭ, son of Mūrumu, received this barley from him. The peculiarly formulated text states that the barley, which had been charged against Nabū-mušetiq-uddē, was delivered “according to a debt note, property of the Lady of Uruk and Nanāya, of Kalbaya, son of

---

\(^{677}\) Cocquerillat 1968: 84. 133.  
\(^{678}\) Note that Kalbaya appears in this text without a patronymic, and may in fact have not been the rent farmer, son of Iqṣa, descendant of Basia, but the scribe Kalbaya, son of Nabū-rēmanni, who is also attested in YOS 6 159 (Cocquerillat 1968: 76. 128f.).  
\(^{679}\) Bibēa is already attested in this function in an *imittu* debt note for dates from an orchard on Bāb-Ḫili pertaining to the *sītu* of Šum-ukin in 3 Nbn (PTS 2343). He also appears as a witness in a document (PTS 3039) written on the same day as YOS 6 194. This text, a debt note for dates charged against a certain Šamaš-ah-erēṣ, son of Arad-Nabū, also concerns Nabū-mušetiq-uddē and Mušēzib-Marduk. They act as intermediaries between the temple, to whom the dates belong, and the debtor: the dates are said to be their responsibility (expressed by the phrase *ša qāt*). Nabū-mušetiq-uddē, son of Balāsū, had written both PTS 3039 and YOS 6 194. As for Bibēa, he appears for the last time in 4 Cyr in a debt note for 53 *kurru* of barley in exchange for dates pertaining to Kalbaya’s rent farm (YBC 11541). See below for more details on this text.  
\(^{680}\) This scribe can be identified as a member of the Damiqu family (Kümmel 1979: 120). A part of his private archive has been preserved among the Eanna tablets (Jursa 2005: 142). Kalbaya figured as a witness in one of the documents from his private archive concerning a division of inheritance (YOS 6 143; see also above n. 666). Jursa (*ibid.*) noted that it is often impossible to make a distinction between the temple texts and his private documents, as Nabū-mušetiq-uddē had business relations with the temple. Nevertheless, the presence of his private documents among the Eanna texts is undisputed. The situation is in my opinion similar to that of Šum-ukin’s private archive. The reason for the presence of his private texts in an institutional archive must have been connected to the final settling of accounts with the temple.  
\(^{681}\) Dillard’s copy shows one horizontal wedge for the year number. As regards the content it is difficult to imagine what could motivate a transaction like this in 1 Nbn, at the very beginning of Kalbaya’s career. Furthermore, one would rather expect a vertical wedge for a year numeral. It is suggested here to emend the sign to 10, as it is not inconceivable that a *Winkelhaken* was mistaken for a horizontal wedge by the copyist. The text should be collated.
Iqîša, a-kī-i ṭū-ṭī, nig-gašša unugki u ʾnaʾ-naʾa/šaʾ ʾur-aru a-šu ša ʾba-ša (ll. 1-3). What is meant by this cumbersome phrase is that Nabû-muṣṣetiq-uddē had an obligation toward Kalbâya set down in a debt note and concerning barley, which was temple property, as it probably represented the yield of the temple land. This nice illustration of a chain of responsibility indicates again that Nabû-muṣṣetiq-uddē must have had the function of an intermediary between the farmers and Kalbâya. The same can be assumed for Muṣṣezûb-Marduk, whose identity is uncertain.

Whether their responsibilities were connected to their official duties as temple scribes and measurers, or whether they were (at times) involved with Kalbâya privately, as sub-contractors for instance, remains in the dark.

BM 114457 (17 Cyr) is another record of Kalbâya’s attempt to track down a debtor. Ittišēpē-šarri, probably a gardener, did not pay his imittu duty and failed to show up before Kalbâya. His creditor, however, managed to get hold of his wife and ordered her to either deliver her husband or pay his debt of 35 kurru of dates to the temple.

In case Kalbâya managed to pin down a debtor he could hope to seize his property in order to cover the outstanding debts. This is what happens in TEBR 41, a document from 10 Nbn, which records that a slave had been given to Kalbâya by a debtor in exchange for some agricultural commodity. A similar case is also attested in 17 Nbn:

YOS 6 207

In the pertinent texts he never appears with a patronymic. Perhaps he can be identified with the temple scribe Muṣṣezûb-Marduk, son of Bēl-uballit, from the Amēl-Ea family (Kümmel 1979: 118).
ašu ša 1ba-ša a 2ba-si-ia ša muḫḫi 3tú bān
ša 4gašan ša unug 5id-din pu-ut
6si-ḫu-ù 7pa-qi-ra-nu
8du mu₃-dù-ù 9i₄r₃ lugal-₃-tu
lo.e.

10. ša ina muḫḫi 1a-na- 2innin-tak-lak
il-la-a 3na-din a šu ša

rev.
11in-in-numun-dù na-ši
12mu-kin-nu 13innin1-na-numun-gál-ši a šu ša
14na-na-a-[x]-tu 15ki₄-utu-din

15. ašu ša 16ag-mu-gin 17kal-ba-a a šu ša
šeš-li-ï₃ ba-ša a šu ša 18amar-utu-sur
a ba-bu-tu 19ši₃ utu-numun-gál-si
ašu ša 20u-gur-ina-sūḫ-sur a dan-nē-e-a
ummaš-ka-nu itt šu ud 1-kam

20. mu 17-kam 21ag-i lugal e₃

“Nadin, son of Innin-zēr-ibni, of his own volition sold Ana-lštar-taklak, his slave, for 40 kurru of barley, part of the arrears owed to the Lady of Uruk, which are charged against him for 17 Nbn, as its total price, to Kalbaya, son of Iqiši, descendant of Basia, the rent farmer of the Lady of Uruk. Nadin, son of Innin-zēr-ibni, bears responsibility for (any) lawsuit or claim or (matter concerning the) status of free citizen or royal slave which arises concerning Ana-lštar-taklak.
Witnesses: Innin-zēr-ušābši, son of Nanaya-[x]-tu,
Itti-Samaš-balatu, son of Nabū-šum-ukin,
Kalbaya, son of Aḫ-ilia,
Iqiši, son of Marduk-êter, descendant of Babutu,
Scribe: Samaš-zēr-ušābši, son of Nergal-tēši-êter, descendant of Dannēa;
Maškanu; 1-IV-17 Nbn, king of Babylon.”

All these cases of bails and confiscations on account of indebtedness were probably extremely unpleasant for the involved parties; however, one wonders whether they were not the reflections of the regular mechanisms of a rent farm rather than signs of crisis. At any rate, the rent farm business had gone on as usual. From 15 Nbn there are attestations of deliveries of barley and spelt (YOS 6 209) and dates (TEBR 45) pertaining to the sūtu of Kalbaya, indicating that he was still in charge of the arable lands and the orchards of the Lady of Uruk. From 17 Nbn there is one imittu debt note for dates from the sūtu of Kalbaya, the ša muḫḫi sūtu of the Lady of Uruk (BM 114477). He is attested with this title at least until the month IX of 2 Cyr (BIN 1 115). During this year he seems to have got into more trouble with the temple administration.

The year started off with a legal record concerning canal digging works (YOS 7 14). The text is difficult to understand due to its bad condition. It states that the temple administrator went with Nergal-ipuš, a rent farmer (ša muḫḫi sūtu), for three days, probably on an inspection tour of the work on the irrigation system. He then gave instructions to Nergal-ipuš concerning the digging of a canal in connection to Kalbaya’s work quota. It seems that Nergal-ipuš took over a part of the work from him. Kalbaya then made a declaration to Nergal-ipuš in the assembly, but its content is unintelligible, since this part of the text is damaged. The implications of the proceedings are not clear. The temple obviously employed other rent farmers who collaborated with Kalbaya in one way or another. This was nothing new, as minor rent farmers had been working for the temple simultaneously with the fermiers généraux since Šum-ukin’s time. Kalbaya’s higher status is indicated by his title ša muḫḫi sūtu ša Bēlti ša Uruk and the addition of “of the Lady of Uruk” to his title signifies that he was of higher status than Nergal-ipuš.

Several months later another puzzling document followed. PTS 2692, an imittu debt note for dates, although written in 2 Cyr, refers to the imittu of the first year (“mu 1-kam”), presumably

683 See the highly hypothetical interpretation of Cocquerillat 1968: 85. 134.
of this same ruler. Unless we are dealing here with a scribal mistake, it appears that for some reason the obligation had been redrafted one year later. Alternatively, one could imagine that, again for unknown reasons, Kalbaya and his team of harvest estimators failed to issue the debt note in 1 Cyr, so this was done in the following year.

PTS 2692

14-Vla-2 Cyr

obv. 1. 40 gur zú-lum-ma níg-ga ḍ gašan šá unug ḳ
     u' na-na-a zag a šá šá u n̄ c̣ ḷ ag-mu-giš šá mu 1-kam
     šá 4̣ bán šá kal-ba-a a šá šá ba-šá
     ina muḫ-ḫu  ḷ na-na-a-mu a šá šá 1 ḏ ụ 15

5. a'1 ku-ri-i ina iti apin zú-lum-ma a 4
     40 gur ina u n̄ c̣ ḷ ag-mu-giš
     1-nam-din

rev. ḷ mu-kin-nu ḷ ag-gin-ibila a šá šá 1 na-din
     a' da-bi-bi ḷ ir ḷ in-nin

10. a šá šá ḷ ḏ ụ 15 a šu ḷ na-na-a
     ḷ gi ḷ amar-utu a šá šá ḷ ir ḷ ag a ḷ ḥ e-maš ḍ ag
     ḷ umbišag ba la-tu a šá šá 1 ḏ u ḏ 30 ḏ u
     a ḷ 9ipa gu4 unug ḳ i
     iti kin ḷ ud 14-kam

u.e. 15. mu 2-kam ḷ ku-ra-āš
     lugal e ḷ 5ugal kur-kur

"40 kurru of dates, property of the Lady of Uruk and Nanāya, imitta of a field from Bit-Nabû-šum-lišir, from the year 1 (of Cyrus), pertaining to the rent of Kalbaya, son of Iqša, are charged against Nanāya-iddin, son of Ibni-Īšt, descendant of Kuri. He will deliver these 40 kurru of dates in month VIII in Bit-Nabû-šum-lišir.


In YOS 7 23685 (2 Cyr) Kalbaya was obliged to testify about the whereabouts of 90 kurru of dates, imitta of a field in Bit-Sin-šarābi-išme from the year 1 (of Cyrus). He claimed to have given the dates to Imbia, son of Nanāya-ēreš, descendant of Kidin-Marduk, but had received nothing in exchange for them. It is interesting to note that Kalbaya not only had to justify the situation to the highest temple officials, but also to the šākin ūmni of Uruk, Šulāya, who was present at the testimony. His presence there was probably connected to the involvement of Imbia, whose exact function at this time is not known, but who was probably associated with the city administration at some level, as it was he who succeeded Šulāya in the office of šākin ūmni two years later.686

To judge by the two previously discussed texts, it seems that Kalbaya ran into more and more difficulties at the beginning of Cyrus’s reign. As a consequence he lost the function of the temple rent farmer probably by the end of 2 Cyr. There is no direct evidence for a dissolution of his farm, but his loss of the title of a rent farmer in the subsequent texts can be taken to signify this.

684 The year in the date of the text (14-Vla-2 Cyr) does not present a problem, as there was an intercalary ulûlu in the second regnal year of Cyrus according to Parker and Dubberstein (1956: 29). It is the mention of the year one in line 2 which is potentially problematic.
685 Cocquerillat 1968: 85. 134. The text also has a somewhat damaged duplicate, BIN 2 115, which was not recognized by Cocquerillat.
686 Kümmel 1979: 140. Note also that Kalbaya was personally involved with the Kidin-Marduk family, as his daughter was married to one of its members.
Even after the loss of the title ša muḫḫi sāti in 2 Cyr Kalbāya is attested in the documents of the Eanna archive until at least the accession year of Cambyses.\textsuperscript{687} For the next six years or so he continued settling the accounts with his debtors on behalf of the temple. The case of the debtor, probably a gardener, Aplāya, son of Šamaš-zēr-iqišā, stands out with no less than three texts dealing with his debts. GC 2 98\textsuperscript{688} (3 Cyr) is a receipt for 35 kurr of dates. Following the instructions of Kalbāya, Bānia (Nabû-bân-ahī), his son, received these dates from Aplāya as part of his arrears. This delivery of dates was aside from 16 1/2 shekels of silver, the price of an ox, charged against Aplāya.

Obviously, this did not suffice to cover all of Aplāya’s arrears, as the following year the temple administration issued a summons to Aplāya to come to Uruk in order to debate with Kalbāya in the temple court on account of debt notes for dates charged against him:

PTS 3026 13-VI-4 Cyr

obv. 1. ú-ši-ta ša zū-lum-ma nīg-ga d gašan ša unug ki u d na-[a-a]
ša bg-băn ša kal-ba-a [a-sū ša] lb-ba-siš ša ina muḫḫi 1 ap-la-[a]
ša ša utu-numu-num ša ša kal-[ba-a ša] re-e-hu <<ša>> ina muḫḫi-šū1 [ana]
ni-din-tu-[e]-en ša-tam [e-[an-na]] ra-sū ša lb-ag-gin-numun

a. da-hi-bi ld-ag-šeš-mu ša-ag [i]lu-gal1 by en pi-qi-tu₄ ti₄-[a-[n-na]]
ša iti du₄ ap-la-a-nu unug ki il-la₄-ki₄ mam-ma
ina gi₄ lu₄ lu₄ [ša ni-din-tu₄]-e₄-₄-₄-₄ [ša]-[a-tim] e-an-na
id-ag-šeš-mu ša-gi₄ lugal lu₄ [pi-qi-tu₄ ti₄-[a-an-na]]

lo.e. i-da₄-b₄-tu₄-ub ki-i la it₄[tal₄]-ku a-k₄-i [u]-il-ta₄
ša zù-lum-ma ša kal-ba-a ša ina [m][uḫḫ]-hi-šu e-ele-tu₄]
šu₄-lum-ma a-na₄ d gašan ša unug ki [i-nam-din]

(one blank line)

5. id-um-bi₄ maš ša e-an-na id-di₄-ni₁ a-na₄ [a]-na₄ [a]-na₄ 13-VI-4 Cyr
ša iti du₄ ap-la-a-nu unug ki il-la₄-ki₄ mam-ma

Witnesses: Nûr-Sûn, son of Nabû-bân-ahī, descendant of [Nûr-Sûn],
Mardúk-nâṣîr, son of Rûmût, descendant of [Adad-šêa],
Šulû́ya, son of Nabû-šûm-ukûn, descendant of Rab-ûnû, Kinûya, son of Nabû-balâissu-iqbi, descendant of Mandûdû,
Scribe: Gimûlû, son of [Imnûn]-zi₄-ri₄-

687 His last known attestation is in BIN 2 130 (acc Camb) where he acts as a witness. In other words he was still around six years after the time proposed by Cocquerillat for his disappearance (1968: 97).
688 The text is edited by Dougherty 1933: 28f. Note that the place of issue of the text (l. 13) should be read as: uru-sa-e-sad-da-an, i.e. Álu-sa-Bît-Šaddon. This was probably the same place as the one listed in Zadok (1985: 104) under Bît-Šaddajnu (TCL 13 183: 7; 444 e-sad-da-a-a-nu).
The following year the temple issued a debt note for 60 kurru of dates to Aplaya (TEBR 43, 5 Cyr). The text stipulates that the dates are from a debt note of Kalbaya, the arrears of [an imittu] from 13 Nbn (the year is unfortunately broken and could be anything between 13 and 17 Nbn), which he imposed on Aplaya in 2 Cyr. This small dossier illustrates some of the difficulties of the rent farmers and ultimately the temple administration in dealing with agricultural producers who for some reason failed to meet their obligations. It could take years to pin them down with debt notes and even so the temple had little guarantee that they would eventually pay up.

There was more settling of accounts with Kalbaya’s debtors in 4 Cyr: YBC 11541 converts the debt of dates of a certain B²b®a 689 (he was already mentioned on p. 190) into barley and makes stipulations for a payment in two instalments in the fourth and the eighth month in Uruk and Báb-Ḫilti respectively. The text is edited in the Appendix 1.

By the end of 6 Cyr the temple administration appears to have lost its patience with Kalbaya. In NCBT 540 he had to swear an oath that within nine days he would bring all the debt notes charged against the (agricultural) workers, presumably so that the temple could finalize the accounting with him, the ploughmen and the gardeners:

NCBT 540 8-XI-6 Cyr

obv. 1. kal-ba-a a-šú šá ba-šá a ba-si-ia
    i-na en u û ag ú a-dé-e šá lugal
    (one line erased)
    1 a-naٌ ag-gin-ibila ša-tam é-an-na
    a-šú šá na-di-nu a ٌ da-ṭi-ṭi ú
    5 ag-šš-mu lag lugal en sigs
    é-an-na it-te-mi
    lo.e. ki-i a-di ud 15-kam šá iti ziz
    rev. ū-ill-țašša šá ra-šu-tu ina muḫ-ḫi
    1عر inššša ú-qš-חיšša a-na-aḫš-sá-am-ma
    10. a-nam-dak-ku-nu-šú ár-ki ú-ill-țašša
        šá ina gu-bu-šu šá ٌ kiš-amar-utu-din di-kud it-ti-šú
        e-le-tušša mu-šinašša ٌ ki-si-lim-dingir lag lugal
        šá ugu qup-pu šá é-an-na na-di-nu a-šú
        šá ٌ enšš-šš-ba-šú a e-gi-bi
    15. ٌ ir-amar-utu a-šú šá ٌ amar-utu-[m]u-mu a ٌ enššša a-urū
        ٌ umbisag pir-uptime a-šú šá ٌ e-šan-našša-mu-du
    u.e. unug iti ziz ud 8-kam mu š-š-š
    ٌ ku-raš lugal tin-tišša lugal kur-kur

“Kalbaya, son of Iqišša, descendant of Basia, swore by Bêl, Nabû and the majesty of the king before Nabû-mušken-apli, the chief administrator of Eanna, son of Nādin, descendant of Dâbibi, and Nabû-ḫad-dû, the royal commissioner of Eanna (as follows): ‘By 15-XI 1 will bring the debt notes, concerning the claims (of the temple) charged against the (agricultural) workers and give them to

---

689 Bibêa is already attested in this function in an imittu debt note for dates from an orchard on Báb-Ḫilti pertaining to the sîtu of Šum-ukin in 3 Nbn (PTS 2343). He also appears as a witness in a document (PTS 3039) written on the same day as YOS 6 194. This text, a debt note for dates charged against a certain Šamaš-ša-gišš, son of Arad-Nabû, also concerns Nabû-mušêtiq-uddû and Mušêkipt-Marduk. They act as intermediaries between the temple, to whom the dates belong, and the debtor: the dates are said to be their responsibility (expressed by the phrase ša qāt). Nabû-mušêtiq-uddû, son of Balâšu, had written both PTS 3039 and YOS 6 194. As for Bibêa, he appears for the last time in 4 Cyr in a debt note for 53 kurru of barley in exchange for dates pertaining to Kalbaya’s rent farm (YBC 11541). See below for more details on this text.
you.’ (This is) instead of the debt notes, that were charged against him in the presence of Itti-Marduk-balatu, the judge.

Witnesses: Silim-ili, the royal official in charge of the cash box of Eanna, 
Nadin, son of Bél-ahḫē-qiša, descendant of Egibi, 
Arad-Marduk, son of Marduk-šum-iddin, descendant of Bél-apla-usur, 
Scribe: Pir’u, son of Eanna-šum-ibni; 
Uruk; 8-XI-6 Cyr, king of Babylon, king of lands.”

Less than a month later the temple finally cracked down on Kalbaya attempting to seize his private property. The temple administration turned to the father-in-law of Bissya, Kalbaya’s daughter, and asked of him to hand over to the temple a slave woman, which she had received from her father as dowry. The fact that the temple turned to Bissya’s father-in-law rather than her husband is not so peculiar. It was common practice for men in Babylonia to marry after their father’s death and found a new household with their part of the inheritance. Exceptions to this were possible. In the case of a marriage of a man whose father was still alive, the bride automatically joined the household of her father-in-law and the dowry she brought with her merged with the father-in-law’s property.692 As a rule, the dowry would be transferred together with the groom’s inheritance to the common property of the married couple only after the groom’s father’s death. Bissya’s father-in-law was obviously still alive and therefore he was the one in charge of the slave woman. For this reason the temple turned to him and asked him either to deliver the slave to the temple, or give another slave as substitution, and pay the mandattu for the period the slave was in his possession:

YOS 7 59 1-XII-6 Cyr

1. ud 10-kam šá iti še ’ib-na-a dumu-šú  
ša ’mu-šag a ’ki-din-šamur-utu  
mí ina-dan-na-tú-al-si-is mí géme  
ša ’kal-ba-a a-šú ša ’ba-sá ša ’re-e-ḫi

5. ša ḫašan šá unug ki ina muḫḫi-šú <šā> kal-ba-a  
it-ti mu bi-is-sa-a dumu mi <šu>-šú  
a-na ’na-na-a-mu dumu ’ib-na-a a-na nu-dun-né-e  
id-di-nu ib-ba-kam-ma a-na šag-gin-ibila  
r̃tiša-tam é-an-na a-šú ša ’na-din a ’da-bi-bi

lo.e. 10. ū šag-šeš-mu šeš-sag lugal  
en pi-qit-tú šé-an-na i-nam-din

rev. ki-i ud 10-kam la i-tab-kam-ma la i-tam-nu  
ul-tu ugu eša ša ’a-me-lut-tú  
inša iḫ-šú li-tú u ma-dan-tišú

15. a-na nú-ga ḫašan šá unug ki i-nam-din  
lu šu-kin-nu ši-lim-šingir ša šag lugal (erasure: šá [u]g[u]  
ša ugu qu-up-pl šá e-an-na  
ša útu-gin-a a-šú ša li-di-kud-šeš-me-mu  
ša ’ši-gu-u-a ’mu-ra-nu a-šú ša

20. šag-sur a šeš-sag-gil-a

u.e. ū umbisag šag-gaš-a-mu a-šú ša še ’en-din-[f]  
[a] ša šu-un-giš-ša še ša šu-unug ki iti še ud 1-kam  
ku-ša-raš šag lugal tí-tí

25. lugal kur kur

---

690 For arku with the meaning “instead of” see Jursa 1995b: 54.
691 This indicates that Kalbaya was already in a court on account of this matter and was convicted. Now he was supposed to let the temple authorities have the debt notes instead of a payment.
692 The couple thus “remained economically (as well as socially and legally) dependent upon the groom’s father” (Roth 1989: 9).
“On the 10th day of month XII Ibnaya, son of Iddin-Nabû, descendant of Kidin-Marduk, will bring Ina-dannati-alsiš, the slave woman of Kalbaya, son of Iqiša, against whom arrears of the Lady of Uruk are charged, and whom Kalbaya gave together with Bissaya, his daughter, to Naniya-iddin, son of Ibnaya, as (her) dowry, and will give her (the slave woman) to Nabû-mukin-apli, the chief administrator of Eanna, son of Nadin, descendant of Dabbibi, and Nabû-aly-iddin, the royal commissioner of Eanna. If on the 10th he does not bring her and give her (to them), he will provide a slave (as replacement) and make a compensatory payment (mandattu) to the treasury of the Lady of Uruk, from the day that the slave (woman) had been at his disposal.

Witnesses: Silim-ili, royal official in charge of the basket of Eanna,
Šamaš-mukin-apli, son of Madan-alḥē-iddin, descendant of Šigūa,
Mārunu, son of Nabû-ṭeṭer, descendant of Esagilāya,
Scribe: Nabû-apla-iddin, son of Bel-uballit, descendant of Ša-ṭābišu;
Uruk; 1-XII-6 Cyr, king of Babylon, king of lands.”

What is interesting is that the temple considered the slave woman to still be Kalbaya’s property, which it could lay its hands on for the purpose of discharging his debts, despite the fact that she had already been delivered to the in-laws’ household. While to us this action on behalf of the temple may seem arbitrary and particularly unfair toward Bissaya, perhaps it is possible to reconcile with the legal practice of the time with regard to §9 of the Neo-Babylonian law:

(Concerning) a man who has orally declared the dowry for his daughter, or has written a tablet (to that effect) for her, and later his total estate has decreased – he may give his daughter a dowry in accordance with the remaining assets of his estate. The father-in-law and the groom may not (otherwise) change the mutually agreed upon terms.693

Whether the temple intended to base its claims on this law and whether in the end it obtained the slave cannot be ascertained. What is certain is that Bissiā was not the only woman to have suffered on account of Kalbaya’s business failure. Her mother Busasa was probably struck even harder by the measures of the temple. Ironically, just as Kalbaya had intimidated the wife of a debtor a few years earlier,694 now his wife could feel the pressure exerted by the temple, which was in pursuit of their common property. The temple administration made a certain Kiribtu, son of Arad-Innin,695 and his wife swear an oath to the effect that they were not in the possession of any property belonging to Kalbaya and his wife Busasa. The temple probably seized what it could from Kalbaya, but this not being enough to cover his debts, it suspected that he might have given some of his belongings to a third party for safekeeping. Therefore the temple inquired of Kiribtu and his wife about this property, who promptly denied being in its possession. The exact relationship of this man, who was a scribe and who was also engaged in date cultivation, with Kalbaya is not clear.
“Kribtu, son of Arad-Innin, and Babïya, his wife, swore by Bêl, Nabû and the majesty of Cyrus, king of Babylon, king of lands, (as follows): We certainly do not have any assets, possessions, goods and deposits belonging to Kalbïya, son of Iq²ïa, against whom arrears of the Lady of Uruk are charged, and Busasa, his wife.

Witnesses: Šamaäúballi†, son of Nêdin, descendant of Amïl¹, Marduk-š Vik p-zêrï, son of Balïtu, descendant of Mišîrïya, Mušzib-Bêl, son of Balîssu, descendant of Amîl-Ea, Ardia, son of Kînîya, descendant of Egibi,

Scribe: PirÝu, son of Eanna-šûm-îbni;

Uruk; 22-VIII 7 Cyr, king of Babylon, king of Lands.”

Kalbïya’s penultimate attestation, from 8 Cyr, is in a badly damaged document recording a legal dispute between him and a certain Arad-Sîn, son of Nabû-šükun-rêmu (NCBT 875). Arad-Sîn mentions slaves which he had given to Kalbïya for the property (ana makk¹r) of Eanna. This must have been in connection with an imittu debt, or some such obligation Arad-Sîn had toward the temple, which he claimed to have discharged by handing slaves over to Kalbïya. Due to the state of preservation of the text, the interpretation of the following lines is difficult. It can be made out, though, that Kalbïya was summoned and prompted to debate with Arad-Sîn. Finally, the mêr banê asked Arad-Sîn to bring his debt notes for their inspection, which he failed to do. Thus the disputes with his debtors and the temple went on for Kalbïya at least until 8 Cyr. After this attestation he only appears once more in the Eanna archive as a witness in BIN 2130 in the accession year of Cambyses. Interestingly this document concerned the hardship sale of a house of his cousin Marduk-šûm-ušur, son of Silîm-Bêl, who worked as a temple scribe in the agricultural sector and who incurred debts in kasia amounting to 6 minas of silver.697 All subsequent attestations of Kalbïya are in the patronymic of Nabû-bân-âji, who succeeded him in the rent farming business, even if to a smaller extent.

2.9.4.1. Attestations698 of Kalbïya:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Contents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YOS 21 160: 6, 13</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 21 18: 7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 21 44: 1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 3 22: 1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>letter</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

696 Wunsch (2000a II: 200f.) explains tarkuttu as a taprust form of šakâmû: “Das „Niedergelegte“ könnte [...] sowohl ein Schriftstück, als auch ein Vermögensobjekt bezeichnen.” Hence the translation “deposit”.

697 For more details on this text see p. 217.

698 Kalbïya’s attestations in imittu debt notes (some 15 texts) are not listed in this table. They can be found in the Appendix 5. There is a number of tablets with an agricultural context in which a Kalbïya, without a patronymic, appears. It is not certain whether he should be identified with the rent farmer in (some of) these attestations, as it would be also possible to identify him with the scribe-measurer Kalbïya, son of Nabû-rêmanni (appearing e.g. in YOS 6 159), who was active at the time. These texts are: PTS 2851, TCL 12 95; YOS 3 21, 169; 6 194; 19 203; 21 89.
YOS 3 46: 6 letter
BIN 2 109: 12 20-VII-acc Ami receipt for barley, Šum-ukin’s private archive (witness)
YBC 3518: 9 4-[x]-2 Ami work contract, Šum-ukin’s private archive (witness)
YBC 4079: 12f. 8-X-2 Ner legal, concerning sheep (witness)
NBC 4583: 1 - (Nbn) account listing deliveries(?) of agricultural commodities
YOS 6 11: 1, 11, 15,28-I-1 Nbn rent contract
17, 23, 24
TEBR 37: 1, 11, 15,28-I-1 Nbn rent contract
17, 23, 24
AfK 2, p. 107ff.: 1, 11, 15, , 17, 23, 24 rent contract
Dillard, FLP 1585: 3 14-VI-1 Nbn receipt of barley
BIN 1 161: 4, 5 15-II-2 Nbn receipt for silver
AnOr 8 21: 2 17-V-4 Nbn legal, concerning a denouncement (witness)
YOS 6 88: 3 14-VI-4 Nbn legal, fragmentary
YOS 6 21: 2 9-XI-6 Nbn receipt for sesame
TCL 13 227: 7, 9, 25, - (7 Nbn) account of incoming agricultural staples from 3 to 7 Nbn
43, 55, 60
YOS 19 209: 3 28-I-7 Nbn receipt of silver for iron
TCL 12 90: 6 10-V-8 Nbn land lease contract
YOS 6 243: 32f. 3-VIII-8 Nbn inventory of cadavers and hides
AOAT 358, no. 10: 6 20-XII-8 Nbn statement concerning the payment of a brick-tax
(witness)
YOS 6 111: 1 17-X-9 Nbn receipt for barley
TEBR 42: 3 [x-x-10 Nbn] transfer of slave in lieu of barley arrears
? YOS 6 194: 4, 11 30-V-10 Nbn bail protocol
TEBR 41: 5 22-Via-10 Nbn transfer of slave in lieu of a [barley/date] debt
YOS 6 143: 18 3-X-10 Nbn inheritance document, Damiqu archive (witness)
YOS 6 183: 5 23-X-10 Nbn legal, concerning the theft of an ox and an assault (witness)
YOS 6 159: 10f. 27-XII-10 Nbn debt note for dates and barley
YOS 6 242: 5 20-I-11 Nbn register of debt notes for dates
YOS 19 24: 1f., 8, 10 13-XII-12 Nbn debt note for silver
YOS 3 2: 7 - (14-16 Nbn) letter
YOS 6 209: 16, 23 9-VIII-15 Nbn account of deliveries and disbursements of various
commodities
TEBR 45: 2f. 14-VIII-15 Nbn account of various disbursements
YOS 6 207: 5f. 1-IV-17 Nbn transfer of slave in lieu of barley arrears
BM 114457: 4, 8 21-XI-1 Cyr summons for a debtor
PTS 2089: 23 8-VII-1 Cyr land lease contract (witness)
YOS 7 14: 7, 10 4 ‐III-2 Cyr legal, concerning digging work
BIN 2 115: 1 26-IX-2 Cyr testimony on the whereabouts of an amount of dates;
classification of YOS 7 23
YOS 7 23: 1 [6]-IX-2 Cyr testimony on the whereabouts of an amount of dates;
classification of BIN 2 115
GC 2 98: 7 20-I-3 Cyr receipt for dates
YBC 11541: 2 23-III-4 Cyr debt note for barley in exchange for dates
PTS 3026: 2, 3, 10, 12 13-VI-4 Cyr summons for a debtor
TEBR 43: 1f., 4 24-III-5 Cyr debt note for dates
NCBT 540: 1 8-XI-6 Cyr oath, concerning the delivery of debt notes to the temple
administrators
Another person who had rented arable land from Eanna was Arad-Innin, son of Ibni-Ishtar. In some texts Arad-Innin is attested with a family name, in others he appears without one. It seems that these were two persons that went by this name that should be distinguished. One of them was attested from 12 Nbn until 4 Cyr and was a member of the Gimil-Nannaya family. In most of his attestations he acted as a witness. He also appeared as a scribe and a guarantor for debtors of the temple, who usually stemmed from other prominent Urukean families. The other Arad-Innin, who was attested from 33 Nbk until 6 Cyr, was involved in agriculture and is the one of interest for us. He never appears with a family name, probably because he did not have one. His first attestation is from 33 Nbk in a private text (YBC 9173), which records his purchase of two slaves. A text from the twelfth month of 35 Nbk (PTS 2209) lists different arrears and barley debts from 34 and 35 Nbk owed by Arad-Innin. These add up to a debt of over 338 kurru of barley. One day later, a debt note for 30 kurru of barley charged against him was written up. This barley is said to have been in addition to the earlier debt notes charged against him and his father Ibni-Ishtar, indicating that his father had possibly also been involved in the temple agriculture at some level. This can be claimed for Arad-Innin’s brother Balatu with a greater amount of certainty. The two of them appear as debtors in 40 Nbk in a debt note for 150 kurru of barley in exchange for spelt (YBC 3729). In YOS 7 57, a receipt for dates, the impost of fields, written in 6 Cyr, the two of them together with Arad-Innin’s son, Šamaš-lip-šušu, delivered 133;4.3 kurru of dates.

In his attestations from 43 Nbk and 1 Nbn Arad-Innin acts as a witness: NCBT 1059 is an imittu debt note for dates and YOS 6 22 is a receipt for silver, the price of dates.

The most interesting text concerning Arad-Innin’s agricultural activities is a land lease contract from 3 Nbn (YOS 6 40). Together with Sin-ibni, son of Šamaš-udammiq, from the Rê‘alpi family, Arad-Innin leased 865;1.4 kurru of temple land on the Nær-sarrî. It was specified that this was the land which had not already been taken by Šum-ukîn. The land that was assigned to Arad-Innin and Sin-ibni was apparently of low quality. Only part of it is designated as arable land (bit dulli). Indeed, the two rent farmers said that they were going to work 288;1.4 kurru of land.

---

699 YOS 6 222, 230; BM 114450; YOS 7 7; PTS 2692; YOS 7 18; BM 113409; YOS 7 33; AnOr 8 41; YOS 7 38.
700 YOS 6 152; JCS 28, no. 8. In YOS 6 202, an oath to deliver dates or barley by a man indebted to the temple is addressed to him (no professional title is given) and probably another scribe, Nabû-aliddin, son of Ḥarbašu (see note 738 for more details on this man).
701 NCBT 3; BM 114445; YOS 7 34; AnOr 8 45.
702 Since Arad-Innin’s father does not appear with a patronymic in this text, finding out about his activities is difficult. He could possibly be identified with Ibni-Ishtar, son of Nabû-sum-ibni, who was a rab ešerti and a gugallu of the Lady of Uruk and who also rented out temple land (see p. 93).
703 This was Arad-Innin’s last attestation.
704 Cocquerillat edited this text (1968: 81. 131). Note that ll. 4-5 should read: ʾir-ʾinnin-na ʾba-la-tu / dumuššu ʾdù-ʾinnin, identifying both men as the sons of Ibni-Ishtar and not just Balatu, as suggested by Cocquerillat’s edition. Other attestations of Balatu are: YBC 9448 (31 Nbk), YOS 19 150 ([x] Nbn), YOS 6 132 (10 Nbn) and YOS 7 95 (8 Cyr). He is the scribe of YBC 9448 and YOS 6 132; YOS 19 150 and YOS 7 95 record his deliveries of dates.
705 The text was edited by Cocquerillat 1968: 40. 109.
706 For this term and the interpretation as “land under cultivation” see van Driel 1990: 221. See also here p. 272.
i.e. a third of the farm, in a three year fallow cycle,\textsuperscript{707} and deliver yearly 1,240 \textit{kurru} of barley. This implied a relatively low yield factor of 4.3, which was probably due to the inferior quality of the land. Beside the \textit{bit dulli}, their farm was said to contain \textit{kaslu}, \textit{kâlû}, \textit{gabibu} (ll. 4f.), \textit{bit mê} and \textit{bit nizzi} (ll. 18f.), i.e. low quality land, waterlogged areas and land not suitable for cultivation of cereals.\textsuperscript{708} This land was to be put at the disposal of a \textit{rab bûli} for the pasturing of temple herds (ll. 19ff.). The two rent farmers were probably going to put this land to the same use for their own purposes, as they promised to deliver to the temple one ox and fifteen sheep in addition to the barley rent they were paying.

Arad-Innin’s performance as a rent farmer in partnership with Sin-ibni cannot be assessed, as no pertinent information for their activities is extant. In an unpublished debt note for barley and spelt (\textit{sibšu} for the third year of Nabonidus’s reign) Arad-Innin appears as a debtor (PTS 2938). Here he is not associated with Sin-ibni, but seems to be subordinated to a certain Têši-êter, son of Nanâya-âh-iddin.\textsuperscript{709}

For more than twelve years Arad-Innin is not attested in our documentation. He appears next in 15 Nbn in a text recording different transactions with various commodities (YOS 19 297).\textsuperscript{710} He is listed with an amount of barley, either as a recipient or a supplier. In 16 Nbn he acts as a witness in a conditional verdict concerning the size of a date impost and the resulting obligation of a gardener (YOS 6 177).

Arad-Innin’s last known attestation is from 6 Cyr, a receipt for dates mentioned above (YOS 7 57), according to which he together with his brother Balâtu and his son Šamaš-lip-uṣur delivered 133;4.3 \textit{kurru} of dates, the \textit{imittu} of a plot located in or near Til-agurrêti.

2.9.5.1. Attestations of Arad-Innin:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Contents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GC 2 354: 6, 12</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>receipt for barley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YBC 9173: 6f.</td>
<td>12-XII-33 Nbk</td>
<td>slave purchase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTS 2209: 12</td>
<td>12-XII-35 Nbk</td>
<td>account of barley debts and arrears for 34 and 35 Nbk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YBC 9225: 3</td>
<td>13-XII-35 Nbk</td>
<td>debt note for barley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YBC 3729: 3</td>
<td>17-VIII-40 Nbk</td>
<td>debt note for barley in exchange for spelt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCBT 1059: 16</td>
<td>27-V-43 Nbk</td>
<td>\textit{imittu} debt note for dates (witness)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTS 2938: 6</td>
<td>23-[x]-[x] Nbn</td>
<td>\textit{sibšu} debt note for barley and spelt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 6 22: 10</td>
<td>5-II-1 Nbn</td>
<td>receipt for silver (witness)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 6 40: 1f.</td>
<td>23-VI-3 Nbn</td>
<td>rent contract</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>? VS 20 133 rev. [x]-[x]-15</td>
<td>10\textsuperscript{7}</td>
<td>account of agricultural products</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 19 297: 16</td>
<td>16-X-15 Nbn</td>
<td>deliveries and disbursements of various commodities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCL 12 112: 26</td>
<td>21-X-15 Nbn</td>
<td>deliveries and disbursements of various commodities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 6 177: 19f.</td>
<td>7-VII-16 Nbn</td>
<td>statement concerning \textit{imittu} debt note for dates (witness)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 7 57: 4f.</td>
<td>20-XII-6 Cyr</td>
<td>receipt for dates</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.9.6. Sin-ibni

Sin-ibni, son of Šamaš-udammiq, descendant of Rê‘î-alpi,\textsuperscript{711} Arad-Innin’s partner, is attested from 38 Nbk until Cyrus’s reign.\textsuperscript{712} In a document from 8 Cyr (YOS 7 79\textsuperscript{713}) he is

\textsuperscript{707} This meant that after a year of cultivation the land would be left fallow for two years.

\textsuperscript{708} Van Driel 1990: 222f. See also here pp. 275ff. for these terms.

\textsuperscript{709} The owed amount of 30 \textit{kurru} of barley and 20 \textit{kurru} of spelt is said to be at the responsibility (\textit{ina qât}) of Têši-êter.

\textsuperscript{710} He should perhaps also be identified with a man appearing in a fragmentary account (VS 20 133) of agricultural commodities and transportation costs datable to 15th regnal year of Nabonidus (or later).

\textsuperscript{711} Cf. Kümmel 1979: 82. 105f.
mentioned as the owner of a dairyman’s prebend (rēʾūt šizbi). The text records that Sîn-ibni’s shares in this prebend had been transferred to three other individuals, also from the Rēʾi-alpi family. This perhaps indicates that by that time (12-III-8 Cyr) Sîn-ibni had passed away. Other evidence for prebendary activities is offered by documents in which he appears as a recipient of maššartu: GC 1 387 (11 Nbn) and AnOr 9 21 (date broken). Most frequently, however, Sîn-ibni appears as a witness in temple documents (see table below).

The only evidence for Sîn-ibni’s entrepreneurial activities in the agricultural sector comes from the already mentioned land lease contract YOS 6 40 from 3 Nbn (see above for a discussion). He also had the function of a yield estimator (ēmidu) in 13 Nbn. He appears with this title together with two other individuals and two scribes in charge of measuring barley in a text recording their oath to fulfil their duties properly (AnOr 8 30).

Sîn-ibni’s last active attestation is from Cyrus’s reign (year broken off) as a witness in a promissory note for 52 raw hides from the temple property (BM 114447).

2.9.6.1. Attestations of Sîn-ibni:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Contents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AnOr 9 21 rev. 12'</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>fragmentary maššartu list</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YBC 4143: 28</td>
<td>5-VII-38 Nb</td>
<td>land lease ana nukuribbûti (witness)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GC 2 195: 6</td>
<td>15'-IV'-40 Nb</td>
<td>legal, statement concerning status of a slave (witness)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AnOr 9 15: 27</td>
<td>18-V-2 [Nbn']</td>
<td>hardship sale of a house (witness)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 6 40: 1</td>
<td>23-VI-3 Nbn</td>
<td>rent contract</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GC 1 387: 14</td>
<td>15-XI-11 Nbn</td>
<td>disbursements of barley for maššartu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AnOr 8 30: 1</td>
<td>9-I-13 Nbn</td>
<td>oath of ēmidus and scribes in charge of measuring concerning their duties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM 114603: 3</td>
<td>10-V-14 Nb</td>
<td>oath concerning a garment (witness)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCL 12 112: 25</td>
<td>21-X-15 Nb</td>
<td>deliveries and disbursements of various commodities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM 114447: 13</td>
<td>[x]-[x]-[x] Cyr</td>
<td>debt note for leather (witness)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 7 79: 1f.</td>
<td>12-III-8 Cyr</td>
<td>legal, regulations concerning a dairyman’s prebend</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.9.7. Nabû-mušētiq-uddé

The status of Nabû-mušētiq-uddé, son of Nabû-šum-iddin, as a rent farmer is evident from the rent contract of Sîn-ibni and Arad-Innin from 3 Nbn (YOS 6 40, see p. 200). The land which is leased to them is explicitly stated not to include the land which had been given in rent to Nabû-mušētiq-uddé: e-lēt še-numun šā a-na ṣābūn a-na lag-ag-mu-šē-ti-iq-ud-da / a-šū šā lag-ag-mu-ša na-ad-na (ll. 14f.). The fact that he had rented arable land from the temple for a fixed rent (sītu) is the only information we have on his agricultural activities.

Furthermore he was involved in animal husbandry as a herder of oxen and sheep. This was probably his original and primary line of work. According to 36° Nbk (AUWE 5 53) he was in charge of a herd of oxen. At a later date, in 10 Nbn, he appears as an “overseer of ten” (rab ešerti).

---

712 The date of his last active attestation (in BM 114447) is broken off – only the king’s name, Cyrus, is still visible.
713 The text records that Sîn-ibni’s shares in this prebend had been transferred to three other individuals, also from the Rēʾi-alpi family. For an edition and a discussion of the document see San Nicoló 1934: 186ff. and Beaulieu 2003: 164f. See also van Driel 2002: 122 for comments on this text.
714 His appearance in a list with a certain amount of barley or dates in TCL 12 112 (15 Nbn) could also be interpreted as a receipt of maššartu.
716 Cf. also Kümmel 1979: 68.
obliged to levy archers of the shepherds of the Lady of Uruk (YOS 6 151\textsuperscript{717}). In 16 Nbn he is designated as a shepherd of the Lady of Uruk (\textit{nāqidu ša Bēlti ša Uruk}). According to this text he had arrears of small and large cattle due to the temple (YOS 6 221).

2.9.7.1. Attestations of Nabū-\textit{mušetiq}-uddē:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Contents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AUWE 5 53: 10f.</td>
<td>20°-X-36° Nbk</td>
<td>sequestering of a part of a cattle herd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 6 40: 14f.</td>
<td>23-VI-3 Nbn</td>
<td>rent contract</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 6 151: 5</td>
<td>13-V-10 Nbn</td>
<td>legal, concerning levying of archers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 6 221: 3</td>
<td>7-XII-16 Nbn</td>
<td>legal, concerning cattle</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.9.8. Ibni-Ištar (Ibnāya)

Ibni-Ištar, son of Balātu, was a temple oblate (\textit{širku} of the Lady of Uruk), who appears in our documentation from 11 Nbn until 4 Cyr. His first attestation so far known, YOS 6 150 (11 Nbn), is a rent contract for 625 \textit{kurru} of land granted to him by the crown prince Belšazzar. The text, which was edited by Cocquerillat (1968: 42. 109f.),\textsuperscript{718} is given here in translation only:

“Ibni-Ištar, son of Balātu, an oblate of the Lady of Uruk, made a request to Bēl-šar-ūṣur, the crown prince, my lord: ‘May the crown prince, my lord, give me 625 \textit{kurru} of cultivated land from the arable land of the Lady of Uruk which is in Sumandar, as well as 100 ploughmen, 100 oxen and 50 cows, and I will deliver to Eanna yearly in total 5,000 \textit{kurru} of barley using the royal measure.’ Bēl-šar-ūṣur, the crown prince, his lord, listened and gave to Ibni-Ištar, son of Balātu 625 \textit{kurru} of cultivated land from the arable land, which is in Sumandar, as well as 100 ploughmen, 100 oxen and 50 cows. Yearly he will deliver to Eanna in total 5,000 (\textit{kurru}) of barley using the royal measure. He will (also) deliver 3,000 bundles of straw to the depot.

Furthermore, (concerning) the 2,081 \textit{kurru} of arable land, the domain\textsuperscript{719} of the Lady of Uruk, which is at his disposal: he will [relinquish] from the land at his disposal as much land as he cultivates in a fallow cycle with the plough teams at his disposal to the domain of the Lady of Uruk. Of these 2,081 \textit{kurru} of arable domain land, whatever exceeds\textsuperscript{720} (the size of) his rent farm sharecroppers will cultivate. [The yield estimators] of Eanna will make yield estimates (for them) and they will deliver their share to Eanna. The oxen and the cows [of the 25] plough (teams)\textsuperscript{721} that are at his disposal shall not die; they are [(made of) iron]\textsuperscript{722}. The young of the cows of the Lady of Uruk, which are born while at his disposal, he will show to Nabū-šar-ūṣur, the royal official, and the

\textsuperscript{717} Cf. Kleber 2008: 210f.
\textsuperscript{718} An earlier edition of this text can be found in Dougherty 1929: 119ff.
\textsuperscript{719} The term used here is \textit{nakkandu}. It designates “land held in reserve” either by the temple or some royal institution, i.e. land which was “available for assignation” for cultivation (van Driel 2002: 197).
\textsuperscript{720} A better reconstruction for the beginning of l. 15 than \textit{muḥ-ḥī} as suggested by Cocquerillat (1968: 110) would be \textit{šā elī}.
\textsuperscript{721} Cocquerillat reads in line 17 “[...]
\textsuperscript{722} The beginning of l. 18 should be reconstructed as \textit{šā an-baṣṭašu 巴斯}. This phrase, which implies that the draught animals are the rent farmer’s responsibility and are imperishable as far as the temple administration is concerned, also appears in YOS 6 103: 20-21.
scribes of Eanna; they will brand them with the mark of the Lady of Uruk and return them to him. He will keep the ploughs in good repair.

In the first year 625 kurru of barley for seed, 5 talents 20 minas of iron and 120 kurru for the rations of 30 ploughmen [...] that were given to IbnI-[Ištar, son of Ba]lātu, for the completion of 25 plough teams, [will be provided] by Eanna.

Per 1 kurru 1.5 qû barley for the rations of the scribes, the [me[asurers and the gatekeepers?]}, apart from x...

Witnesses:223  
Nabû-ahē-bulli[t, [šakīn mātī],  
Nabû-šullum-šarrī, [rab šaqē],  
Sin-eriba, [t [...],  
Nabû-šum-šškan, [t [...],  
Bānia, [t [...],  
Itti-Šamaš-balātu, [šanû ša rab ša rēšî],  
Nabû-šar-usur, ša rēš šarrī bel [piqitti Eanna];

Scribe: Marduk-šum-usur, son of Nabû-ušabši;

[Place of Issue]; Date: 27-[x]-11 Nbn, king [of Babylon].”

According to this contract IbnI-[Ištar was given 625 kurru of land which he was supposed to cultivate and deliver 5,000 kurru of barley yearly. This rent implied a yield factor 8, which was less than what was expected of Šum-ukīn (8.3; e.g., YOS 6 11) and the rent farmers of Bēl according to the ‘Edict of Belšazzar’ (12; YOS 6 103). The ploughs, farmers and cattle provided made up 25 plough teams consisting of four farmers, four oxen and two cows. The area to be worked by a team amounted to 25 kurru of land. This figure conforms to the standard given in the ‘Edict of Belšazzar’. There is also a stipulation for an additional payment of 3,000 bundles of straw, which has no parallels in any other known rent contracts from Eanna.

Further stipulations in the text (ll. 11-14) make it clear that this was not the original arrangement between IbnI-[Ištar and the temple. 2,081 kurru of land were already at his disposal, presumably for agricultural exploitation,225 at the time when this contract was written. For some reason, we are not informed which, IbnI-[Ištar was allocated 625 kurru of land in the Sumandar region and had to return to the temple this same amount of land from the 2,081 kurru already at his disposal. This land was probably located elsewhere, though it is not stated where. Practically nothing had changed for IbnI-[Ištar concerning the amount of land at his disposal. Whether there were any changes concerning the location of the land (this seems probable), the size of his rent and the intensity of cultivation (e.g., fallow vs. non-fallow regime, type of fallow) is another matter, on which one can only speculate.226

223 The witnesses present at the allotment of IbnI-[Ištar’s rent farm are noteworthy. Unfortunately, this portion of the text is damaged, but it is remarkable that the witnesses were only listed with their given name (only the scribe appears with a patronymic). The omission of the patronymics suggests that these were individuals of high standing, probably high ranking state officials. In the broken portion of the tablet their official titles were recorded. The title of Nabû-šar-usur, the royal commissioner of Eanna, is partially extant; all the other titles are lost in a break. M. Jursa proposed identifying some of these witnesses with the state officials šakīn mātī, rab šaqē and šanû ša rab ša rēšî (2011: 1924). His suggestions were adopted here. The crown prince Belšazzar sanctioned the installing of IbnI-[Ištar as a rent farmer, while his entourage and the royal commissioner of Eanna, as a representative of the temple, acted as witnesses. In this respect, this document is similar to the rent contract of Šum-ukīn and Kalbāya.

224 Debt notes for barley and bundles of straw are, however, known from Uruk (Kessler 1992: 468f.) and Sippar (Jursa 1995a: 13f.). See also Kessler 1999: 166 for the obligation of two ploughmen to deliver 2,000 bundles of straw and 2,000 loads of hay to a royal palace in the vicinity of Uruk.

225 Other uses for the land can also be envisaged (depending on its quality the land could be used for pasture, fishing or bird-catching grounds, etc.). There is, however, no evidence for such alternative usage of land in IbnI-[Ištar’s dossier.

226 Cocquerillat assumed that IbnI-[Ištar also had a rent arrangement with the temple predating YOS 6 150, according to which he cultivated 2,706 kurru of land (2,081 kurru plus 625 kurru) without a fallow system. By simple arithmetic she extrapolated a rent of 21,648 kurru of barley per year (1968: 42. 95). Following the same logic she assumed that the temple provided IbnI-[Ištar with 432 farmers, 432 oxen and 216 cows (ibid. 95). According to her, the contract YOS 6 150 expressed Belšazzar’s discontent with IbnI-[Ištar’s performance for which reason his farm was reduced from 2,081 to 625 kurru of land, thus commencing the
The temple provided Ibni-Ištár for the initial year of their contractual relationship with 625 kurru of barley seed (l. 22), which is a clear indication that of all the land at his disposal only the corresponding surface area, i.e. 625 kurru of land, was to be cultivated. This implied that he was supposed to work the land in a three year fallow cycle, which would still leave a remainder of 206 kurru of land (2,081 - 3 × 625 = 206). This surplus land was to be allocated to sharecroppers for cultivation, as was also suggested by the contract in line 15. In addition to barley seed ca. 160 kg of iron for repairs of the agricultural tools and 120 kurru of barley for the rations of 30 ploughmen, which were put at his disposal for the “completion” of 25 plough teams, were supplied to him. Unfortunately, there is a break following the word ikkaru, making the understanding of this passage difficult (ll. 23-24: 120 gur še-bar a-na šukša 30 šu-engar[neš] [...] ša a-na / šul-lu-mu ša 25 ša-apinša a-na [šin-aššu ša][ša]-la-tu na-ad-mu). It appears that up to that point Ibni-Ištár’s plough teams were understaffed. Stemming from his earlier arrangement with the temple he presumably already had 70 men at his disposal. At this occasion the missing 30 ikkarus needed to man 25 plough teams and their rations for the first year were given to him.

This is the only attestation we have of Ibni-Ištár, son of Balatu. Subsequently a certain Ibniyā, son of Balatu, who is on some occasions designated as ša muḫḫi siti (YOS 1971, SAKF 155), starts appearing in our documentation. Cocquerillat sees in him a successor of Ibni-Ištár, or perhaps his brother (1968: 97). It seems, however, much more likely that these two are one and the same person, Ibniyā being the abbreviated form of the name Ibni-Ištár.

In his next attestation Ibni-Ištár, alias Ibniyā, appears in a contract for agricultural work (YOS 1971; 12 Nbn). Two men, brothers, address him with a request to do agricultural work for him. Following this agreement Ibni-Ištár was to provide them with a ploughshare, an appatu-tool, two spades and 20 kurru of land which they were to cultivate under the same conditions as the temple ploughmen (libbū ikkarāti ša Bēlti ša Uruk). The text is a nice illustration for a way in which the rent farmers could deal with the problem of scarce manpower. As was stressed earlier the rent farmers were expected to contribute resources such as tools, draught animals and their fodder and perhaps also seed from their own stock. They were also supposed to organise the workforce needed to cultivate the land at their disposal, which could not be provided by the temple due to a general lack of institutional labour. Some of the land could be sub-leased to smaller entrepreneurs. With this land the responsibility for organising the labour was delegated by the rent farmer to another party. But, as this text shows, the rent farmer could also make direct arrangements with agricultural workers. The two individuals in this text did not belong to the temple workforce. They were outsiders to the temple, probably of West-Semitic origin to judge by their names. They were not tenants on temple land nor were they employed as sharecroppers, probably because they lacked the resources needed for such an enterprise. Instead, they were supplied with the necessary work implements by the rent farmer Ibni-Ištár and were employed under the same conditions as the temple ploughmen. This meant that they worked for a subsistence allowance and could not expect to make much profit from this arrangement.

---

727 Van Driel suggests that the fact that the seed was provided only now indicates that no sowing had been done on the land previously at Ibni-Ištár’s disposal (1990: 236).
728 Cf. already van Driel 1990: 236 for this interpretation. A three year fallow cycle is also attested in YOS 6 40.
729 Also according to the ‘Edict of Belšazzar’ rations were provided for the ploughmen in the first year. Note that these amounted to 4 kurru per man in YOS 6 150. The amount of barley provided for rations according to the ‘Edict’ is not extant but is reconstructed by van Driel (1987-88) as 5 kurru per ploughman (see also above p. 38 and note 85).
730 The text is edited on p. 31.
731 Van Driel suggests that appatu was the iron tip of a tool (1990: 236f.).
732 While one of the two brothers has a proper Babylonian name (Nanayā-ēreš), the other one is called Ililada’i. Their father’s name is Iza-napirti.
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From 12 Nbn there is one more attestation of Ibn¤ya. According to the receipt YOS 6 182
(17-VII-12 Nbn) he delivered 14 kurru of barley in N¤ru-e¡¡u to Bunene-¡emânni, the slave of a
certain Tabn®a, following the orders of the temple administrator and two temple scribes.733
He appears next in 13 Nbn in a legal dispute (SAKF 155) concerning newly reclaimed land
and involving beside him Z®rbibi and his partner, the rent farmer Nergal-n¤‚ir. The text which was
published and transliterated by Oberhuber (1960: 104f.) has been collated by M. Jursa, providing
numerous corrections to Oberhuber’s readings and considerably improving our understanding of
the contents. The improved readings based on Jursa’s collation are marked with an asterisk in the
transliteration:
SAKF 155
12-[x]-13 Nbn
I
me¡
lú
I*
obv. 1. [ gab-bi-dingir -lugal-ùru] ª *¬qí*-i*-pi*¡á* é*-an*-na* a-a-ga-a-¡ú
[lú ¡á ugu q]u*-ªup*-pu*¬ ¡á lugal Idin*-nin*-mu-ùru a-¡ú ¡á Imu*-dag*
[a Iki-din-dam]ªar-utu¬ Id*utu*-mu-mu a-¡ú ¡á Idag-din-su-e a Id30-ti-ér
[Idag]-ªmu¬ a-¡ú ¡á I[dù]-d15 a Ié-kur-za-kir Idag-din-su-e
5. [a-¡ú ¡á Idù]-a a Ié-kur-za-kir Idu-gur-mu-mu a-¡ú ¡á Iina-sù©-sur
[a I©u]-un*-zu*-ú Id15-¡e¡-mu a-¡ú ¡á Iap-la-a a Ilu*-u¡-tam-mar-dim*
[lúdumu] dùme¡ ¡á ina gub-zu-¡ú-nu Inumun-ia lú¡à-tam é-an-na
[a-¡ú ¡á Ii]b-na-a a Ie-gi-bi Iib-na-a a-¡ú ¡á Iba-la-†u
[lúri]g7 ¡á ugu gi¡bán ¡á dga¡an ¡á unugki ù Inumun-bi-bi
10. ªa*-¡ú* ¡á*¬ Idag-kar-zime ¡á ina mu©-©i mu-‚a-né-e ¡á dga¡an ¡á unugki
ina ukkin* ú-¡á*-áz-zi-iz-zu-¡ú-nu-ti-ma iq-ba-á¡-¡ú-nu-tu
um-ma dumu* lugal* ¡i*-pir*-tu4* il*-tap-ra* um-ma Inumun-bi-bi
iq*-ta*-ba*-a*Ý um-ma ¡e-numun* (erasure*) ¡á ina é Isag-ga*-ªaÝ?¬
rev.
ina ¡e-numun ¡á dga¡an ¡á unugki ¡á mu-‚a-né-e ¡á ina* pa*-ni*-ia*
15. gi¡apin-a* a-na lìb-bi ki*-i* a*-<<a*>>-bu*-ku* I*dù*-a* gi¡*apin*-a* ul*-tu* lìb*-bi*
ul-te-e*-li* um*-ma Idù-a ab*-kam*-ªma*¬ a*-¡á-a*-lu* Inumun-ia lú¡à-tam é-an-na
I
numun-bi-bi ù Iib*-na*-a*i*-bu*-kam*-ma* ina* ukkin* u¡*-zi-iz* um*-ma* ªx x x¬
I
numun-bi-bi iq-bi um-ma ma-a-a-ri* ina gi¡*apin*-ia* ki-i ad-ku*-ú
I
dù-a ma-a-a-ri-ia i-te-ek-ma-an-ni Iib-na-a iq-bi um-ma
20. [I]numun-<bi-bi> ma-a-a-ri ul id-ki* ù* ma-a-a-ri-¡ú ul e*-ki*-in-¡ú*
[Ié-an-n]a-mu-dù a-¡ú ¡á I¡e¡me¡-¡á*-ªa*¬ lúumbisag ù Idag-¡e¡-mu a-¡ú ¡á I©ar*-ba*-‚u
[¡á Inumun]-ia lú¡à-tam é-an-na ina iti du6* mu 12-kam dag-ní-tuk ªlugal tin-tir¬ki
[a-na Idu-gur-na]-ª‚ir¬ a* Id*na*-na*-a*-dù* lú*¡u*-ta*-pi* ¡á Inumun-bi-bi i¡-p[u-rama]
[ma-a-a-ri] ¡á* Idu-gur-pab id-ku-ú Idu-gur-pab [a-na]
25. [Ié-an-na-mu-dù u] Idag-¡e¡-mu ú-kal-li-mu-ma Idu-[gur-pab]
[ina ukkin? ú-¡á]-az*-zi-zu Ié-an-na-mu-dù u Idag-¡e¡-mu
[ina dga¡an ¡á] unug*ki* dna-na-a ù a-de-e
[¡á dag-ní-tuk lugal tin-t]irki u Iden-lugal-ùru a-¡ú it-mu-ú
[ki-i x x x lu]-ú* lú*engar*-¡ú lu-ú lúa*-kin*-¡ú* ina* ¡e*-numun*
30. [x x x x x i]ªq?¬-bu-ú um-ma ina é Isag-ga*-[aÝ?]
u.e.
[x x x x ma]-ªa*-a*¬-ri-¡ú ina lìb-bi ni-mu-ru u* mim*-ma*
[x x x x x] ªx¬ lú*umbisag* Ina*-di-nu a-¡ú ¡á Iden-¡e¡me-[ba-¡á]
[a Ie-gi-bi unugki i]ti* [x u]d* 12*-[kam mu] 13-kam
[dag-ní]-tuk [lugal tin-tir]ki
“[Gabbi-il²-¡ar-u‚ur], the resident of Eanna,
Ayyig¤¡u, [the official in charge of the cash] box of the king,
Innin-¡um-u‚ur, son of Iddin-Nabû, [descendant of Kidin-Mar]duk,
733

There is a parallel to this text, BM 114602 (edited on p. 209), written two days earlier (15-VII-12 Nbn). It
records the receipt of 14 kurru of barley by the same recipient as in YOS 6 182, also at the orders of the
¡atammu and the same two scribes. The barley is, however, received from B¤nia, son of Bullu†¤ya, another
rent farmer of the Lady of Uruk, who may have been Ibni-I¡tar’s partner (see below). Had Ibn¤ya paid the 14
kurru on behalf of B¤nia, or were these two independent transactions?


Šamaš-šum-iddin, son of Nabû-balâssu-iqbi, descendant of Sîn-leqe-uninnî, [Nabû]-iddin, son of [Ibn]-Ištar, descendant of Ekur-zakir, Nabû-balâssu-iqbi, [son of Ibnî], descendant of Ekur-zakir, Nergal-šum-iddin, son of Ina-teš-ê-chér, [descendant of Ḥu]nzû, Ištar-ah-iddin, son of Aplâya, descendant of Lušâmmar-Adad, (these are) [the mar] bânê in whose presence Zêria, the chief administrator of Eanna, son of Ibnî, descendant of Egibi, made Ibnî, son of Balâtu, [the oblate], the rent farmer of the Lady of Uruk, and Zêrbibi, son of Nabû-chér-napṣâti, the official in charge of the canal outlets of the Lady of Uruk, stand in the assembly and said to them as follows: ‘The crown prince sent me a letter saying: “Zêrbibi said as follows: ‘(As for) the land, which is in Bit-Saggâya, which is part of the land of Lady of Uruk for whose canal outlets I am responsible: when I brought my plough there Ibnî evicted it from there, saying: “Bring (it) here and I will inquire (about it)!’”’”.

Zêria, the chief administrator of Eanna, brought Zêrbibi and Ibnî and made them stand in the assembly and said (to them): ‘x x x¬.

Zêrbibi said as follows: ‘When I reclaimed land with my plough, Ibnî took my newly reclaimed land from me.’

Ibnî said as follows: ‘Zêrbibi did not reclaim any land and I did not take away any newly reclaimed land from him.’

[(As for) Eanna-šum-ibni, son of Aḫḫâsêa, the scribe, and Nabû-ah-iddin, son of Ḥarbâsus, [which Zêr]jia, the chief administrator of Eanna, sent in the month VII of the 12th year of Nabûâsî, king of Babylan, [to Nergal-nâšîr, son of Nanâya-ibni, the partner of Zêrbibi: Nergal-nâšîr showed [to Eanna-šum-ibni and Nabû-ah-iddin [the land] which he had reclaimed and [they made] Nêrgal-nâšîr st]and [in the assembly']. Eanna-šum-ibni and Nabû-ah-iddin swore [by the Lady of Uruk, Nanâya and the majesty [of Nabûâsî, king of Babylan]: ‘[... (n)either his ploughman (n)or his messenger on the land [... sa]id as follows: “In Bit-Saggâya [...] we have (not) seen his newly reclaimed land’ and whatever [...].’

Scribe: Nâdin, son of Bêl-ahḫê-[iqiša, descendant of Egibi]; [Uruk:] 12-[x]-13 [Nbîn, [king of Babylon]].’

The background of this document was a dispute between two agricultural entrepreneurs, Ibnî and Zêrbibi, concerning Zêrbibi’s right to cultivate land in a locality called Bit-Saggâya. 734 Zêrbibi complained to the crown prince Belṣazzar first, but he referred the case back to the temple court of Eanna. The proceedings, which the šatammu Zêria led, are recorded in this document. The šatammu read out the letter of the crown prince in the assembly, quoting Zêrbibi’s complaint about his plough (teams) being evicted by Ibnî 735 from Bit-Saggâya, in which he had some responsibility over the irrigation system. 736 Following this, the two parties were asked by the šatammu to state their case in the assembly. Zêrbibi declared that once he started reclaiming land with his plough, i.e. working up land which had previously not been agriculturally used, Ibnî took the land 737 away from him. Ibnî simply denied both the assertion that Zêrbibi worked up the land and that he took it from him.

---

734 Its localisation is not known.
735 The words with which Ibnî expelled Zêrbibi’s ploughs, namely abkamma ašâl, are not perfectly understandable in this context. While ašâl, “I will ask”, is probably an elliptic way of saying that he will inquire with the authorities about the situation, abkamma, “bring here”, is problematic. In the given context one would expect Ibnî to request of Zêrbibi to remove his plough teams from the land under dispute, which is the exact opposite of what a ventive form of the verb abâku normally signifies.
736 He had the function of a ša ina muḫḫî múšânu of the Lady of Uruk. See p. 211 for further details on Zêrbibi.
737 mayyâru is understood in this context as newly reclaimed land. In general the term can be used to designate both the land and the type of plough used for reclaiming land (see CAD M/1: 121). It does not seem very likely that the case would have been referred to the crown prince if it only concerned such a minor incident as the removal of an agricultural tool from a certain field (however, cf. van Driel 1990: 221f. who is not convinced by the suggested interpretation of the CAD; his hesitance to accept mayyâru as a term for a category of land was probably induced by his poor understanding of SAKF 155, owing to the rather inaccurate copy of the text).
Two scribes, Eanna-šum-ibni, son of Aḫḫēšiya, and Nabû-aḫ-iddin, son of Ḥarbāšu, were then called upon to clarify the matter. They had previously, in the month VII of year 12 Nbn, i.e. several months prior to the current proceedings, been sent by the šatammu to examine the situation. They were sent to Nergal-nāṣir, son of Naniya-ibni, another rent farmer working for Eanna (see p. 151), who is designated in this text as the partner of Zērbibi. He showed them the land which he had reclaimed, presumably in collaboration with Zērbibi, and was also brought to the assembly, if our reconstruction is correct. However, his testimony is not recorded in this document. What is recorded is an oath made by the two scribes, the contents of which are not perfectly understandable owing to large breaks at the beginning of each line in this portion of the text. The impression one gets from the legible remains is that they interrogated the ploughmen and messengers of one of the involved parties, probably Zērbibi, and stated under oath what these had reported to them with respect to the newly reclaimed land in Bit-Saggāya. As crucial portions of the text are missing, it is not revealed to us whether the ploughmen and the messengers corroborated Zērbibi’s or Ibnīya’s testimony. The text only records the statements of the two parties and the scribes sent to investigate the case and we are not informed about the outcome of the proceedings.

Be that as is it may, even though our documentation for Ibnīya is rather scanty, no disruption in his work as a rent farmer as a consequence of this incident is visible so far. From the same year (13 Nbn) there is one imittu debt note for barley pertaining to his rent, which was written in Kār-Eanna (TCL 12 108).

In 14 Nbn Ibnīya appears in the superscript of a list of disbursements of barley (AnOr 8 32). 170 kurru of barley pertaining to his sūtu for 13 Nbn are said to have been measured out by two individuals, probably scribes.

A legal text (YOS 6 173) written several months later (VI-14 Nbn) offers evidence for problems concerning delayed payments from agricultural workers. Here a certain Šamaš-iddin, son of Aḫunu, a sharecropper, is asked to come by a certain date and settle his accounts for barley imittu dues for the year 13 Nbn with Ibnīya and Bānia, son of Bullūṭiya. In case he failed to come to Eanna for the settling of accounts he would have to pay 55 kurru of barley and [x+]2 pānu 1 sūtu of cress to the Lady of Uruk, not including the share of 50 kurru of barley and 10 kurru of spelt for the year 14. Bānia, son of Bullūṭiya, was another rent farmer of the Lady of Uruk as is indicated by BM 114602 from 10 Nbn (see p. 209). It is not clear whether the two men started working as partners at some point and under what conditions. A partnership would seem to be indicated by this text.

For several years we hear nothing about Ibnīya. His next attestation is from 4 Cyr (BM 114573). This is also his last so far known attestation. The text records the removal of 92 kurru 1 pānu of barley from two depots in Álu-ša-Atamāsu-Uṣur by two individuals at the orders of the temple administrator and the royal commissioner of Eanna. The barley is said to stem from the land which is at the disposal of (ina pāni) Ibnīya and does not include the ‘earlier’ 30 kurru of barley from his sūtu.

738 The two scribes had responsibilities in the administration of the temple’s agricultural production. Eanna-šum-ibni is attested as a scribe of a number of documents between 21 Nbk and 11 Nbn (BIN 1 100, GC 1 231, 237, 248, PTS 2477, 2746, 2849, 2855, 2969, 2976, 2985, YOS 6 135); he appears as a witness in a text from 39 Nbk (YBC 9524) and without a professional title in Knopf, SC 21 and YOS 19 222; he is perhaps also attested (without a patronymic) in BIN 1 166 (2 Ner), an imittu list for kasia, as the official in charge of measuring. Nabû-aḫ-iddin is never explicitly designated as a scribe. In 1 Nbn (YOS 19 160) a person [under his responsibility] is given barley rations; in 12 Nbn (YOS 6 232) he is listed among six estimators and scribes in charge of measuring the land for the ploughmen and estimating the yield of the sharecroppers (the text is edited by Cocquerillat 1968: 52. 114); in 16 Nbn (YOS 6 202) a man indebted to the temple takes an oath before him and another person (the scribe Arad-Innin/Ibni-Ḫšar/Gimil-Nanāya) about a delivery of dates or barley to Eanna; his last attestation is from 2 Cyr (YOS 7 22), in a legal proceedings concerning some missing barley, in which he states to have measured a certain amount of barley from Bānia, son Bullūṭiya (for this rent farmer see p. 209) and given it for bird fodder (for an edition see Cocquerillat 1968: 85. 134).

739 SAKF 155 is dated to 12-[x]-13 Nbn. The month name is broken off; therefore at least six months had passed since the inspection of the two scribes which took place in the seventh month of year 12.
To sum up, Ibni-Ištar, son of Balatu, more frequently attested as Ibniya, was a temple oblate and a rent farmer of the Lady of Uruk in charge of arable cultivation. He is attested since 11 Nbn until 4 Cyr. His original agreement with the temple concerning his rent farm has not come down to us. However, a follow-up contract from 11 Nbn (YOS 6 150) informs us that he had 2,081 kurru of land at his disposal. He cultivated this land in a three-year fallow cycle (i.e. 625 kurru of land per year) and his rent amounted to 5,000 kurru of barley and 3000 bundles of straw. Further attestations, such as contracts for work assignments (YOS 19 71), imittu debt notes (TCL 12 108), deliveries and withdrawals of barley from his rent (YOS 6 182, AnOr 8 32, BM 114573), demonstrate regular rent farming activities. As was frequently the case with other rent farmers, too, not everything ran smoothly for Ibni-Ištar. Around 12 Nbn he clashed with another agricultural entrepreneur, Zerbibi, in connection with the latter’s right to cultivate land in a certain region (SAKF 155). He also had problems with a sharecropper, who failed to deliver his due in barley (YOS 6 173). From YOS 6 173 we learn that Ibni-Ištar possibly worked in a partnership with the rent farmer Bania, son of Bulluṭaya, since a sharecropper is supposed to settle his accounts with the two of them. However, the nature of their relationship remains obscure and it is unclear how it affected Ibni-Ištar’s status or the scope of his rent farm. Furthermore, the relatively scant material available for Ibni-Ištar does not allow for any conclusions on the success of his agricultural enterprise.

2.9.8.1. Attestations of Ibni-Ištar:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Contents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YOS 6 150: 1, 8, 24</td>
<td>28-[x]-11 Nbn</td>
<td>rent contract</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 19 71: 2f.</td>
<td>10-IV-12 Nbn</td>
<td>contract for agricultural work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 6 182: 6</td>
<td>17-VII-12 Nbn</td>
<td>receipt for barley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAKF 155: 8, 15-17, 19</td>
<td>12-[x]-13 Nbn</td>
<td>legal dispute over newly cultivated land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCL 12 108: 4</td>
<td>6-‘I-13 Nbn</td>
<td>imittu debt note for barley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AnOr 8 32: 1f.</td>
<td>I-14 Nbn</td>
<td>disbursements of barley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 6 173: 5</td>
<td>27-VI-14 Nbn</td>
<td>legal, concerning a delayed imittu payment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM 114573: 3</td>
<td>15-VII-4 Cyr</td>
<td>receipt for barley</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.9.9. Bania

A rent farmer of the Lady of Uruk for barley by the name of Bania, son of Bulluṭaya, appears for the first time in 12 Nbn (BM 114602). He may be attested earlier, though, already in 43 Nbk (YBC 3737) and also in 10 Nbn (TEBR 41). The identification in these two texts is based on his name and patronymic. In neither of the cases is there any indication of his activity as a rent farmer. In the Yale text he appears as one of the six debtors of barley, which belonged to a royal official (ša rēš šarrī) and which was given to them for expenses (ana nisḫi) through a certain Nabû-abaḫē-šullim. The text does not provide any details on the use to which this barley was supposed to be put. In the attestation from 10 Nbn (TEBR 41), we encounter a Bania, son of B[ulluṭaya’], who handed over a slave of his to the rent farmer Kalbaya, in order to cover his arrears of over 100 kurru of either dates or barley (the type of commodity is broken off). If the identification is correct this is at least an indication of his involvement in the agriculture of Eanna under another rent farmer.

In 12 Nbn, however, Bania appears with the title ša muḫḫi siʾti ša Bēlti ša Uruk in a receipt for barley, which was received from him at the order of šatammu and two scribes (BM 114602). A parallel text is known for the rent farmer Ibniya, son of Balatu (YOS 6 182), which was written only two days later on the 17th (see above). This receipt involves the same amount of barley (14 kurru), which were handed over to the same person, Bunene-šemanni, as in BM 114602:

BM 114602

15-VII-12 Nbn

obv. 1. 14 gur še-bar ḫu-ne-ne-ši-man-ni
      ḫu-ga-li ša-tab-ne-e-a a-sū ša ḫa-an-tu-šū
Bunêne-šemânnâ, the slave of Tabnêa, son of Ḫanṭušu, received 14 kurru of barley at the orders of Zêria, the chief administrator of Eanna, Nêdin, son of Bêl-ahê-iqîša, (and) Kônâyâ, son of Zêria, the scribes of Eanna, from Bânia, son of Bulluṭâya, the rent farmer of the Lady of Uruk, on the Nêru-eššu.

Witnesses: Ibdâya, son of Ḫanṭušu,
Innin-zêr-iqîša, son of Nabû-ah-iddin,
Ištâr-ah-iddin, son of Nabû-kêšîr,
Scribe: Arad-Innin, son of Zêria;
Ál-Nêru-eššu; 15-VII-12 Nbn, king of Babylon.”

No rent contract for Bânia’s farm has come down to us, but judging from his attestations which invariably concern barley, he was involved in arable cultivation. In 14 Nbn a certain Šamaš-iddin, a sharecropper, was required to show up by a certain date and settle his accounts for a barley impost with Bânia and Ibnêya, son of Balû (YOS 6 173). Ibnêya (Ibnî-Ištâr) was another rent farmer (see above). This text suggests that these two rent farmers worked together at this time. 

From the following year, 15 Nbn, a debt note recording the transfer of a debt of barley arrears, which were charged against Bânia, to another person has come down to us:

 BM 114604

obv. 1. 7 gur še-bar ina re-e-hi ša ina muḫ-ḫi
ša-ba-ni-ia a-ši ša 1bul-ulta-a
nig-ga 1gâšan ša unug a 1na-na-a
ina muḫ-ḫi re-mut a l-šu

5. ina iti śig še-bar ina muḫ-ḫi
id-lugal i-nam-din
e-lat re-he-e-nu ša āḫ-gu4
sâ ina muḫ-ḫi-šu

rev. 10. 1en pi-qi-ti ē-an-na
šu-kin-ru 1di-kud-šêš-met-mu
a-ši ša 1gi-mil-lu a ši-gu-tu-a
na-din a še-šêš-met-ba-ša
ša 1umbisag a-ši nunum-na-ša a-ši ša šu linn-šu-mu-ur-ru

740 YOS 6 149 is another possible attestation of Bânia from this year, which has no visible connection with agricultural production of the temple. This is a list of people following the scheme PN1, bêl piqitti u PN2, bêl isgāti iti PN3. There are four such entries in the text. Bânia appears as PN3 in the first entry (ll. 1-4: "1na-na-a-mu a ur-1na-a-al 1en pi-qi-ti <šu> ša a-num-num-num-[m]u 1en in-šu iti-ti dū-tāš a-ši ša 1bul-ulta-a). Neither his connection to the two previously listed men is obvious, nor are the connotations of this text. The mention of shares may indicate a connection to the prebendary system; however, the prosopography of the people involved does not offer any evidence for such a connection.
“7 kurru of barley, from the arrears charged against Bānia, son of Bullūṭāya, property of the Lady of Uruk and Nanūya, are charged against Rēmūt, son of Nā’id-Mardūk. In month III he will deliver the barley on the Nār-šarrī. (That is) not including the arrears in cattle charged against him. In the presence of Ili-rēmanni, the royal commissioner of Eanna.


After this attestation, which does not reveal anything about the background of this transaction and potential difficulties Bānia may have had with the discharging of his obligations toward Eanna, there is a gap of more than four years in our documentation for this rent farmer. His next, and at the same time last, attestation is from 2 Cyr (YOS 7 22). Bānia was not necessarily actively involved in agricultural production at this time. The text concerns an inquiry into the whereabouts of an amount of barley which had neither been delivered to the temple nor to the cultivators for seed. It records statements of various people to this effect, among others of Nabū-ālḫē-iddin, son of Ḫarbūṣu, who stated that he had received 100 kurru of barley from Bānia in Bīt-barī and passed it on for poultry fodder.

To conclude, Bānia was active as a rent farmer for the temple at least since 12 Nbn. He may have been the partner of the rent farmer (and širku) Ibni-Ṭar. However, the key points concerning his rent farm, its scope and success, as well as the time of its dissolution, remain unknown. Similarly, nothing can be said about his social background.

2.9.9.1. Attestations of Bānia:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Contents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YBC 3737: 4</td>
<td>20-I-43 Nbk</td>
<td>debt note for barley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEBR 41: 1, 6</td>
<td>22-VIa-10 Nbn</td>
<td>transfer of slave in lieu of a [barley/date] debt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM 114602: 6f.</td>
<td>5-VII-12 Nbn</td>
<td>receipt for barley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 6 149: 3f.</td>
<td>20-I-14 Nbn</td>
<td>list of PNs in groups of three</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 6 173: 4</td>
<td>27-VI-14 Nbn</td>
<td>legal, concerning settling of accounts for barley impost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM 114604: 2</td>
<td>3-XI-15 Nbn</td>
<td>debt note for barley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 7 22: 16</td>
<td>29-IX-2 Cyr</td>
<td>legal, concerning the whereabouts of barley</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.9.10. Zērbibi

Another one of the poorly documented rent farmers of Eanna was Zērbibi, son of Nabū-ēṭer-napšāti. The only text which gives evidence for his rent farming activities is a debt note for kasīta, the share (ziṭtu) of a sharecropper, pertaining to Nergal-nāṣir’s and Zērbibi’s sīṭtu (GC 1 418, 12 Nbn). Nergal-nāṣir, son of Nanāya-ibni, was another one of Eanna’s rent farmers (see the chapter on Nergal-nāṣir, p. 151). This would indicate the existence of an arable farm jointly managed by the two men.

---

741 Rēmūt, who was involved in animal husbandry (Kūmmel 1979: 73), appears once as a witness in an imittu debt note for barley pertaining to the rent farm of Šum-ukīn (YOS 6 24). He is otherwise not attested in an agricultural context and his relationship with Bānia is unclear.

742 The text is edited by Coqueirillat 1968: 85. 134.

743 He was a scribe involved in the administration of the agricultural production (see note 738).

744 For the rent farmer Nergal-nāṣir, son of Nanāya-ibni, see p. 151.

745 The text is edited on p. 156.
Zêrbibi’s next attestation is from 13 Nbn (SAKF 155), where he is designated as a ša ina muḫḫi mūšānē of the Lady of Uruk. This title is not attested elsewhere, but implies a responsibility for the irrigation system of Eanna, as mūša was some sort of an outlet on a canal. This text records a dispute between Zêrbibi and Ibnāya, the rent farmer of the Lady of Uruk, concerning land. The text is not perfectly clear, but it appears that Zêrbibi accused Ibnāya of taking away the land he had reclaimed in the locality Bit-Saggâya, in which he was active as the ša ina muḫḫi mūšānē. Following Zêrbibi’s claim which he had submitted to the crown prince, Zêrbibi and Ibnāya were made to confront each other in the assembly by the temple administrator. Ibnāya denied taking away the newly reclaimed land. Afterwards the scribe Eanna-Šum-ibni, son of Ahḫēšâiya, and a certain Nabû-ah-iddin, son of Ḥarbâṣu,747 testified mentioning Zêrbibi’s partner, šutāpû (l. 23), the rent farmer Nergal-nāšir, son of Nanāya-ibni. His role in this affair is not clear, as this section of the text is damaged.

Another attestation of Zêrbibi is in YOS 6 187 ([x] Nbn), an administrative note recording his receipt of 12 iron spades for digging work (ana ḫerrûti). The digging may have been connected to the work on the irrigation system, which he would have conducted as the person in charge of the canal outlets.

2.9.10.1. Attestations of Zêrbibi:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Contents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YOS 6 187: 3f.</td>
<td>14-IX-[x] Nbn</td>
<td>receipt for 12 iron spades</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GC 1 418: 5</td>
<td>14-[x]-12 Nbn</td>
<td>zittu debt note for kasia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAKF 155: 9f., 12, 17f., 20, 23</td>
<td>[x]-[x]-13 Nbn</td>
<td>legal dispute over newly broken land</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.9.11. Nabû-udammiq

Another rent farmer of the Lady of Uruk active during the first half of Cyrus’s reign was Nabû-udammiq, son of Nabû-ētēr, from the prominent Urukean family Gimil-Änâya. His first attestation from the Eanna archive known to us is from 7 Nbn (JCS 28, no. 30) and is not connected to his agricultural activities. The text is a debt note for 17 shekels of silver belonging to the Lady of Uruk and which were charged against a certain Kalbûya, son of Nabû-ētēr, descendant of Gimil-Änâya, i.e. probably Nabû-udammiq’s brother. After the payment clause and before the list of witnesses the following phrase is inserted: šābū šarrī ša Rēmāt-Bēl/Bēl-uballīyy/Gimil-Änâya u Nabû-udammiq/Nabû-ētēr/Gimil-Änâya.749 The taxation term šāb šarrī, which designates a conscript of the king, a person fulfilling an obligation toward the crown, or a person hired by another in order to be employed at a royal project of a public or military nature in his stead, has been discussed by van Driel (2002: 245). In this instance the inserted phrase would seem to indicate that the temple provided the men to fulfil the royal duties of the Gimil-Änâyas and charged them 17 shekels of silver for it. The transaction was carried out in Sippar, the place where this debt note was issued. As it is known that the dependants of Eanna occasionally took part in public works in the Sippar region (cf. for instance YOS 6 171, GC 1 350, NCBT 186, YBC 9151, PTS 2122, 2206, etc.) it is conceivable that the “king’s men” supplied to the Gimil-Änâyas came from this contingent of externally employed temple workers.

---

746 For an edition of this text see p. 206.
747 He was probably also a scribe involved in the management of the temple’s agriculture (see note 738).
748 Note that a Zêrbibi, son of Nabû-ētēr-napšāti, appears as the scribe of the text PTS 2046 (acc Ami), which belongs to the private archive of the rent farmer Šum-ukîn. The text which was written in Ḫarrubat, a locality probably north of Uruk, records a partial payment of Šum-ukîn’s rent for the estate of the temple scribe (on this text and its duplicate see p. 170). It is not certain whether the scribe of this text should be identified with our Zêrbibi.
Nabû-udammiq’s next attestation from 16 Nbn (Dillard, FLP 1603) bears evidence for his involvement in date cultivation. The text is a bail protocol in which a father guarantees to bring his son to Nabû-udammiq because of a date palm which had been felled on a plot of Nabû-udammiq. If he failed to bring his son, who was either a suspect in this case or the person responsible for the orchard in which this incident occurred, i.e. a gardener, he would have to pay Nabû-udammiq one mina of silver for the felling of the palm. It is not clear whether this document refers to temple property, as there is no mention of the Lady of Uruk, Eanna or its officials. Furthermore the plot in question is characterised as Nabû-udammiq’s and he is also designated as the beneficiary of the penalty payment and not Eanna or the Lady of Uruk, as is normally the case in this type of texts.

At any rate, this was not the only instance in which date palms had illicitly been felled on the land at Nabû-udammiq’s disposal. During Cyrus’s reign (the year is broken off) another such incident is recorded (YOS 7 68). However, in this case the felled date palms were the property of the Eanna temple, as they grew on a plot designated as belonging to the Lady of Uruk. Nabû-udammiq himself was made responsible to bring the perpetrator to the royal commissioner of Eanna or otherwise pay three minas of silver for the three felled palm trees.

Nabû-udammiq’s only other attestation in an agricultural context is from 4 Cyr in a receipt for 40 kurru of barley (AnOr 8 42). Nabû-udammiq, who is designated here as a rent farmer of the Lady of Uruk (ša muḫḫi súti ša Bēlti ša Uruk), gave the barley for seed for the ploughs (a-na še-numuš šu₇ apin₇-₇Šu₇) to a certain Ištar-zēr-ibni, son of Ša-Nabû-šu, in the locality Bīrāta.

In addition to this Nabû-udammiq also appeared as a witness in several legal texts from Eanna in the period between 2 and 4 Cyr.

The attestations related to the temple agriculture (YOS 7 68, AnOr 8 42 and perhaps also Dillard, FLP 1603) indicate that Nabû-udammiq was in charge of arable land and date orchards of the Lady of Uruk. However, the size of his rent farm is unknown, as are the conditions under which he worked for the temple, since no rent contracts have come down to us. Equally little can be said about the temporal scope and the success of his agricultural undertakings.

2.9.11.1. Attestations of Nabû-udammiq:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Contents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JCS 28, no. 30: 7f.</td>
<td>7-XI-7 Nbn</td>
<td>debt note for silver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dillard, FLP 1603: 3f., 6, 10</td>
<td>7-XI-16 Nbn</td>
<td>legal, concerning felling of date palms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 7 68: 2</td>
<td>[x]-[x]-[x] Cyr</td>
<td>legal, concerning felling of date palms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AnOr 8 39: 18f.</td>
<td>29-XI-2 Cyr</td>
<td>legal, concerning illicit purchase of temple barley and dates (witness)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 7 35: 24f.</td>
<td>27-XI-3 Cyr</td>
<td>legal, concerning small cattle (witness)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AnOr 8 42: 3f.</td>
<td>18-VII-4 Cyr</td>
<td>receipt of barley for seed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AnOr 8 43: 4</td>
<td>1-VIII-4 Cyr</td>
<td>legal, concerning cattle (witness)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 7 38: 25</td>
<td>3-VIII-4 Cyr</td>
<td>rent of garden anagullûtu (witness)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.9.12. Ile’i-Marduk

Ile’i-Marduk, son of Nabû-šum-ukîn, descendant of Eṭêrû was a rent farmer for barley during the second half of Cyrus’s reign. He is attested in the texts of the Eanna archive at least from 4 Cyr until 7 Camb. He appears in connection with a rent farm for barley between 6 Cyr and 1

---

750 The text is edited by San Nicolò 1932: 345f.
751 The same rate of one mina of silver per date palm felled as in FLP 1603 and YOS 7 68 is recorded in TCL 12 89 (8 Nbn), which was also edited by San Nicolò 1932: 346f. The fine of one mina of silver for each felled date palm is stipulated in the orchard lease BM 114450 II. 10-11 (see p. 309 for an edition). Note that the fine for felling a date palm in the Codex Ḫammurabi is half a mina (§59).
752 The text is edited by Cocquerillat 1968: 51. Note the erroneous reconstruction of Nabû-udammiq’s patronymic in l.5 as iṭa-ag-[gin-a]. It should of course be read as iṭa-ag-[šu₇ apin₇ šu₇].
753 In the years from 2 to 4 Cyr Nabû-udammiq appears also as a witness in several legal texts from Eanna: AnOr 8 39 (2 Cyr), YOS 7 35 (3 Cyr), AnOr 8 43 (4 Cyr), YOS 7 38 (4 Cyr).
Camb, but he experienced difficulties running it already in Cambyses’s accession year, if not earlier.

Very little can be said about Ile‘i-Marduk’s family. His father Nabû-šum-ukin is not otherwise known. However, we know that Ile‘i-Marduk had a brother, Kidin-Marduk, and probably a cousin, Bēl-iddin, who guaranteed before the authorities of Eanna that he would go to Babylon in 5 Camb (YOS 7 177, see below). Kidin-Marduk appears in three more texts from Cyrus’s and Cambyses’s reign. In AnOr 8 54 (6 Cyr) he is a member of a commission which counted bricks produced for the temple by a certain Mukkēa and which consisted of, among others, the overseer of the temple slaves (rab širkē) and two scribes. In RA 23, 13ff. (8 Cyr) he testified together with two other men in the assembly that the cultic singers (kālū) carried out a bronze drum (līlissu), placed it in the gate of the temple and proclaimed a lunar eclipse. In the third year of Cambyses he acted as a witness in a document recording a bail for people who bought cattle from the temple and still owed it money (YOS 7 157). Though Kidin-Marduk was obviously connected to the temple administration in some way, his exact function in it cannot be surmised. Even less is known about Bēl-iddin, son of Iqṣa-Marduk, descendant of Eṯēru, whose only appearance is as a guarantor for, presumably, his cousin, Ile‘i-Marduk (YOS 7 177). According to BM 114556 (not dated, see below for an edition of the text) Ile‘i-Marduk was married to a certain Busasa, daughter of Iqṣa-Marduk. She was perhaps Bēl-iddin’s sister, i.e. Ile‘i-Marduk’s cousin. We know also that Ile‘i-Marduk had at least one son. He appears in one of the receipts for barley pertaining to his father’s sūtu as the person who delivered it (YOS 7 53, 6 Cyr). His name is partially damaged in this text, but could possibly be restored to Nabû-šum-lišir.

Before his first attestation as a rent farmer, Ile‘i-Marduk appeared as a witness in five legal documents from the Eanna archive in 4 and 5 Cyr. They concerned cattle, arrears of wool and the status of slaves. After starting up the rent farming business he did not stop taking part in the proceedings of the temple court as a witness. In the intercalary addāru of 6 Cyr he heads the list of mār banē witnessing a formal statement concerning the sale of a female slave (CD 78). In 8 Cyr

---

754 One of these men, Mūrānu, son of Nabû-ēter, descendant of Esagilia, was the scribe of two unpublished debt notes for silver from the Eanna archive (BM 114670 and YBC 17067). He appears among the witnesses in YOS 7 44 and 59. The other one, Marduk-ēter, son of Bēl-uballit, descendant of Amil-Ea, was the scribe of an unpublished debt note for barley and silver belonging to Eanna (BM 114456). He also acted as a witness in several documents from Eanna (YOS 7 31, 41, 115, BM 113250 and NCBT 685).

755 The testimonies of the cultic singers regarding this incident are recorded in another text three days later (YOS 7 71). An unpublished text written four days later (BM 114470) mentioning the duties of a certain Bānia, son of Kidinnu, concerning the bronze drum, also belongs to this small dossier.

756 Kidin-Marduk, son of Nabû-šum-ukin, however, without a family name, appears as a witness also in GC 1 276 (16 Nbn), a debt note for one pānu of barley belonging to Bēl-nā́id, son of Bānittu-ērēš, and charged against Ina-ğāt-Nabû-ṣakin, the slave of Agagašu. It is not certain whether this is an attestation of Ile‘i-Marduk’s brother.

757 Iqṣa-Marduk himself could have been a brother or a cousin of Nabû-šum-ukin, Ile‘i-Marduk’s father. Another member of the Eṯēru family is known – Rēmūt-Bēl, son of Iqṣa-Marduk, descendant of Eṯēru. He was probably Bēl-iddin’s brother. He appears twice in acc Camb as a witness in imitu debt notes for dates pertaining to the rent farm of Ardia (GC 2 114 and YOS 7 105). There is no direct connection between Rēmūt-Bēl and Ile‘i-Marduk, who later in his career also acted as a witness in the imitu debt notes from Ardia’s farm (see below).

758 Consanguineous endogamy was not uncommon in the urban propertied families in the Neo-Babylonian period as was demonstrated by Waerzeggers 2002: 319ff.

759 TCL 13 132 (4 Cyr) is an inquiry into a sale of a sheep and a goat from the pen of a certain shepherd. AnOr 8 43 (4 Cyr) records the report of rab bālis who had received orders from Gūbaru concerning the arrears of the temple herders. YOS 7 29 (4 Cyr) deals with arrears of cattle from 3 and 4 Cyr charged against a certain Bunano, son of Ahḫēšāya.

760 BM 113250 (5 Cyr) records the transfer of a slave to the temple property by a man who had arrears of wool.

761 UCP 9/2 37 (5 Cyr) investigates a case of a temple slave allegedly kept in a private household.

762 The text is partially damaged and the name of the slave woman cannot be read. As is evident from the photo, the name is followed by the signs gēme-ā (l. 13) rather than gu-a read by Sack. His reading of the first witness’s name (l. 1) should also be emended from 1ir-lu-ṣar-āmu-utu to [1]da-ṣar-āmu-utu. The place of issue should be read as Til-atūnitā (l. 20: [uru-]tu-na-tu). It had so far been attested only with logographic writing du-u-udum-ak and is recorded by Zadok sub Til-atūnitā (1985: 309).
he acted as a witness in a case concerning the arrears of several ox herders (PTS 2084). He continued to appear in the sources in this way during the reign of Cambyses, even after his rent farming career presumably ended. He was a witness in 2 Camb in a document recording a bail connected to a debt of dates owed to the temple by a certain Bänia, son of Innin-[x] (GC 2 408). In the seventh year of Cambyses he witnessed at least five imittu debt notes for dates from the rent farm of Ardia. This implies that at the last visible stage of his career (these debt notes from 7 Camb are his last known attestations) Ile’i-Marduk was a member of the yield estimation commission, which consisted of temple scribes and estimators (see pp. 137ff.). His exact function during the estimation process is not known. His previous involvement as a witness in cases concerning animal husbandry and slaves of contested status, however, indicates that, at least initially, he was not specialised in agricultural administration. It is clear, though, that he must have belonged to the temple administration at some level.

Ile’i-Marduk’s activities as a rent farmer are generally not well documented. It is not clear when exactly his rent farm for barley was founded, nor is its size known, as his rent contract has not come down to us. However, in a text from the sixth month of 6 Cyr (YOS 7 53) we find the first so far known mention of his rent farm (s¹tu). It is a receipt for 273;4.1 kurru of barley from the rent of Ile’i-Marduk, which were received by [PN], son of Eanna-bidia, from Nabû-[šum]-lišir, Ile’i-Marduk’s son, on the orders of the temple administration. 6 Cyr is therefore the latest possible date for the commencement of his rent farming activities. An earlier date is conceivable, though, as we know that Kalbäya stopped being a rent farmer for Eanna by the end of 2 Cyr, thus leaving a gap of about four years with no attested large-scale rent farmer. He apparently concentrated on the cultivation of arable land only. All of his rent farm related attestations concern products from arable land, mostly barley and once kasia. Beside several mentions of his s¹tu, Ile’i-Marduk appears three times with the title of a rent farmer: twice as a ša (ina) muḫḫi sūtu ša Bēlti ša Uruk (AnOr 8 60, 9 Cyr; AnOr 8 66, 1 Camb) and once as ša muḫḫi sūtu ša uttati ša Bēlti ša Uruk (BIN 2 130, acc Camb). The longer title is a better indicator of his sphere of influence.

BM 114597 is another attestation of Ile’i-Marduk’s rent farm which should be dated to 6 Cyr. It is an arrangement for guarding barley from his rent farm, which the royal commissioner of Eanna measured out and deposited in a granary of a certain locality (signs of the place name are illegible). The person who guaranteed to guard this barley, Innin-aḫḫe-šubbi, who is not known from other sources, is not allowed to let anyone open the granary, and presumably remove the barley, without the consent of the šatammu and the bēl piqitti:

BM 114597 12-[x]-6 [Cyr]

obv. 1. pu-ut ma-aš-sar-tu₄ ša '314;1 gi[ur še-bar]
   n[i-ga] gašan ša umug₂ u'[n]a-na-a ša ṣu₂[bān]
   ša₂ da₂-amar-utu a-šša ša₄ ag-mu-gin a₁₄-[e₄]-[f-e₄]-ru₄
   ša₄ ag-[še₄š-mu] b₄sag lugal₁₁ën pi-qit-ti [ē-an-na]
   5. im-su-hu-ma ina ka-a-ram₁₁ x x x [x x]
   id-du₄-[u₄] in-nin-[še₄š]₄₄[-mu]
   a-šša ša₄ in-nin-numun-gāl-si
   na-ši ša la₄ ag-gin-a
   lo.e. ša₄-tam ū[ē-an-na ū]₁₁
   10. id₄-[ag]-še₄š-mu₁₁ën pi-qit-t₄₄ [ē-an-na

---

763 These are: JCS 28, no. 35, NCBT 829, BM 114487, BM 113429 and BM 113430. NCBT 552 should probably also be placed among these attestations. This imittu debt note is dated to Cambyses’s reign but the year is broken off. It should probably be reconstructed to [7] Camb, because in NCBT 552 the same witnesses and the same scribe appear as in the other imittu debt notes dated to 7 Camb.

764 The text is edited by Cocquerillat 1968: 82, 131.

765 Note that in Sippar also no large-scale rent farmer is attested at the beginning of Cyrus’s reign at least until 6 Cyr (Jursa 1995a: 96).

766 The king’s name and the month are lost in a break, but a restoration to Cyrus seems like a viable option. A less likely date, but not entirely impossible, would be 6 Camb. This later date would indicate a much longer duration of Ile’i-Marduk’s farm than is reflected by the, albeit sparse, documentation available for him. (Note that Ile’i-Marduk also figures as a witness in this text.)
“Innin-ahhē-iddin, son of Innin-zēr-uṣabši, guarantees for the guarding of 314 kurru of barley, property of the Lady of Uruk and Nanāya, pertaining to the rent of Ile'-Marduk, son of Nabū-šum-ukin, descendant of Eṭēru, which Nabū-ah-iddin, the royal commissioner of Eanna, measured out and deposited in a granary in ... Anyone who opens (the granary and removes) the barley without the consent of Nabū-mukn-āpli, the administrator of Eanna, and Nabū-ah-iddin, the royal commissioner of Eanna, shall incur the punishment of the king.

Witnesses:  Ile'-Marduk, son of Nabū-šum-ukin, descendant of [Eṭēru], Nabū-zēr-ukin, son of [Nabū]-kāsir, descendant of Arrabtu, [PN], son of Nabū-ēṭērt, [descendant of PN],

Scribe:  Gimillu, [son of Innin-zēr-iddin]; [GN]; 12-[x]-6 [Cyr, king of Babylon], king [of lands].”

Interestingly, a text very similar to this one was written in the fourth month of 9 Cyr, i.e. shortly after the harvest (AnOr 8 64). It is another arrangement for guarding barley pertaining to Ile'-Marduk’s rent farm. This time the royal commissioner of Eanna and a temple scribe measured out 110 kurru of barley and deposited it in a granary in Rūtu. Three men, probably locals of this district, guaranteed for the guarding of the barley. They were prohibited to give this barley to anyone without the consent of the šatammu, the bēl piqitti or the temple scribes. The significance of these two contracts is not readily evident. The amounts of barley to be guarded are not very substantial. The ‘Edict of Belṣazzar’ sets a delivery of 240 kurru of barley as the standard workload of a plough team. The 314 and 110 kurru from these two texts could have therefore been the deliveries of two teams from fields of varying sizes. This consideration, as well as the personal involvement of the highest temple officials, would suggest that these were ad hoc arrangements. It is at any rate difficult to imagine that contracts similar to these were drawn up for the barley deliveries of each individual plough team.

After the first two attestations of Ile'-Marduk’s rent farm from 6 Cyr (YOS 7 53 and BM 114597) we hear nothing of it for almost three years. Its next mention comes from the fourth

---

767 This text was also edited by Cocquerillat 1968: 67. 123.
768 Nidintu, son of Nanāya-ēreš and Nīrēa, son of Bēl-zērī are not known from other sources. Nidintu, son of Nabū-bān-āli, may be attested once more in the above mentioned CD 78 (6 Cyr) written in Til-attānīti, in which Ile'-Marduk appears as a witness. In this text a person who had sold a slave woman to Nidintu described the circumstances by which this slave came into his family’s possession. This was apparently a case of contested status in which the temple probably had some claims on the slave.
769 Note that the copy of the text is misleading in l. 11 in that it stretches out the components of the sign la making it look like the signs as and ša. Cocquerillat, who follows the copy as it is, reads here: še-bar ša ina šu PN ša-tam, instead of še-bar ša la PN ša-tam, and translates it as “barley which is at the hands of PN...” (1968: 67. 123). Her translation and transliteration should be corrected accordingly.
770 Perhaps these two maṣṣartu-contracts could be placed in a similar context as the letter YOS 3 137 written by Ile'-Marduk to the šatammu and the bēl piqitti. Here he complains about locusts and birds destroying the harvest and other problems concerning the measuring and transporting of barley. Though some of his complaints were probably mere rhetoric, they were certainly founded on real logistic problems. However, since the text is not dated it is not possible to associate it to any particular stage of his career.
771 Ile'-Marduk is attested once in the meantime, however, only as a witness in the context of animal husbandry (PTS 2084, 8 Cyr).
month of 9 Cyr, in a receipt for 130 kurru of barley from his rent farm (AnOr 8 60\[^{775}\]), similar to the above mentioned YOS 7 53. Four days later a contract for guarding barley from his farm (AnOr 8 64), which was discussed above, was written. Following this document, just over two months later, first signs of crisis concerning Ile’i-Marduk’s farm showed. BIN 2 130,\[^{773}\] written in the intercalary ululu of Cambyses’s accession year, records a hardship sale of a house of Marduk-šum-usur, son of Silim-Bêl, descendant of Basia. The house was transferred to the temple property in order to meet the debt of 6 minas of silver, the price of kasia, recorded in a debt note of Ile’i-Marduk, the temple’s rent farmer for barley, and which was charged against Marduk-šum-usur. This Marduk-šum-usur was the nephew of the first fermier général Šum-ukin and has been discussed in the context of Šum-ukin’s family (p. 163). As was mentioned earlier, Marduk-šum-usur was a scribe involved in the administrative processes concerning temple agriculture, such as measuring, storing or transporting the agricultural produce.\[^{774}\] While his exact activities can not be traced it is clear that in the course of his duties he must have had substantial quantities of agricultural products at his disposal. It is conceivable that he would speculate with these commodities for his personal gain. Occasionally he got the commodities directly from the producers, as in YOS 7 113.\[^{776}\] In this case, however, it appears that he bought an amount of kasia worth six minas of silver from the rent farmer without actually paying this money to him, to which effect a debt note was written. The text provides evidence for an additional source of income for the rent farmer. Not only could he benefit from any surplus in the production, he could also lend the products due to the temple to third parties, and, depending on the agreement, earn interest or part of the profit from the investment. The transaction between Ile’i-Marduk and Marduk-šum-usur apparently entailed the rent farmer’s profit from the interest on the silver (l.21). It is clear that these speculations were not without a risk for the parties involved, of which they were quite aware, as a pledge of Marduk-šum-usur’s houses in Babylon and Uruk and all of his property in city and steppe suggests (ll.17f.). Ultimately, the last link in the chain of agricultural enterprises was made accountable for the missing kasia. The property, which Marduk-šum-usur had lost to the temple, was reckoned up against the barley which Ile’i-Marduk was obliged to deliver to the temple as his rent.

The latest attestation for Ile’i-Marduk’s rent farm comes from 1 Camb (AnOr 8 66\[^{777}\]). It is a receipt for barley, which was taken out of the house of a tašlišu at his own orders and was given by the chief temple administrator and the royal commissioner of Eanna to another individual. The person who received the barley was a certain Mukinx, son of Sin-ibni, and is not known from other sources. More or less the same can be said of the tašlišu Muṣezib-Bêl, son of Barik-il,\[^{778}\] thus leaving the background of this transaction in the dark. The remark that the 30 kurru of barley stem from the sütu of Ile’i-Marduk, the rent farmer of the Lady of Uruk, is, for our purposes, the only matter of interest in this text.

This last attestation of Ile’i-Marduk’s farm does not suggest the existence of any difficulties for his farming business. However, at some point in his career, he must have found himself in dire straits indeed, as is illustrated by BM 114556. This text is only a draft with no date or witnesses, but it is more than likely that it was either used for the drawing up of an official document or was an unfinished scribal exercise based on a real document.\[^{780}\] The text records the measurements of a

\[^{772}\] The text is edited by Coquerillat 1968: 82. 132.
\[^{773}\] For an edition of the text see Appendix 1.
\[^{774}\] He wrote the inittu debt note TCL 12 108 (13 Nbn).
\[^{775}\] This is indicated by texts such as YOS 7 113 and BM 113431 (see above p. 164).
\[^{776}\] This text is edited by Coquerillat 1968: 84. 133.
\[^{777}\] For an edition of the text see Appendix 1.
\[^{778}\] For this military category see MacGinnis 2012: 16ff.
\[^{779}\] He appears in one more text as the owner of a property adjoining on two sides the house of Marduk-šum-usur, son of Silim-Bêl, descendant of Basia, which was transferred to the temple on account of his debt of kasia (BIN 2 130: 6. 8; see above and Appendix 1 for an edition of the text).
\[^{780}\] In other words, the tablet may have been produced as part of scribal training as a copy of a real document, but was left unfinished for some reason. This may also explain the curious sequence of signs ID DA UŠ A on the lower edge of the tablet which should probably be rated as a nonsensical scribble. Numerous gaps and omissions which appear in the text also suggest this was not work of an expert: In the lines 3, 4 and 9 the
house belonging to Ilê'ı-Marduk and his wife Busasa that was transferred to the property of Eanna in order to cover a part of the barley arrears charged against him. The house was subsequently sold by the temple to a certain Šum-ukin, son of Marduk-êreš, for 12 minas and 20 shekels of silver.
sent there on account of his arrears, as it happened frequently that the temple administration would send people with unfulfilled obligations toward the temple to the royal court in Babylon. However, Ile-i-Marduk’s arrears, if this indeed was the reason for going to the capital, may not have necessarily stemmed from his rent farm for barley. At some point during Cambyses’s reign he also cultivated a date orchard on the Takkîru canal which was a part of Ardia’s rent farm for dates. This is evident from an imittu debt note for 95 kurru of dates charged against Ile-i-Marduk (BIN 1 98). The year numeral in the date formula is damaged. The copy shows traces of two vertical wedges, so the text could be from any year from 2 Camb onwards. Ile-i-Marduk probably did not do the actual work in the orchard himself, but had gardeners working for him. In all likelihood he subleased an orchard from the rent farmer Ardia, thus continuing his agricultural activities after the end of his rent farm for barley, however, on a much smaller scale.

The summons to Babylon in 5 Camb (YOS 7 177) may also have been connected to this new line of activates. There is no way of ascertaining this for now. At any rate, we still see Ile-i-Marduk active as a member of the yield estimation commission in several texts from 7 Camb (see above). Whatever happened in Babylon and with his rent farm in general, he managed to weather these crises and remain integrated in the administrative apparatus of Eanna at least until 7 Camb, although his failure in the rent farming business lead to the loss of his rather valuable property.

2.9.12.1. Attestations of Ile-i-Marduk:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Contents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YOS 3 137: 1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM 114556: 13, 15, 16</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>house sale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCL 13 132: 19</td>
<td>18-V-4 Cyr</td>
<td>legal text concerning cattle (witness)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AnOr 8 43: 2f.</td>
<td>1-VIII-4 Cyr</td>
<td>legal text concerning cattle (witness)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 7 29: 16</td>
<td>3-XI-4 Cyr</td>
<td>legal text concerning cattle (witness)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM 113250: 12</td>
<td>6-V-5 Cyr</td>
<td>legal text concerning arrears of wool (witness)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCP 9/2 37: 12f.</td>
<td>13-V-5 Cyr</td>
<td>legal text concerning the status of a slave (witness)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM 114597: 3, 13f.</td>
<td>12-[x]-6 [Cyr]</td>
<td>contract for guarding barley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 7 53: 2f., 5</td>
<td>3-VI-6 Cyr</td>
<td>receipt for barley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD 78: 1</td>
<td>13-XIIa-6 Cyr</td>
<td>legal text concerning the status of a slave (witness)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTS 2084: 25</td>
<td>27-IV-8 Cyr</td>
<td>legal text concerning cattle (witness)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AnOr 8 60: 2f.</td>
<td>21-IV-9 Cyr</td>
<td>receipt for barley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AnOr 8 64: 3</td>
<td>25-IV-9 Cyr</td>
<td>contract for guarding barley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIN 2 130: 14ff., 19, 21</td>
<td>2-VI-acc Camb</td>
<td>house sale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AnOr 8 66: 4f.</td>
<td>1-III-1 Camb</td>
<td>receipt for barley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GC 2 408: 11f.</td>
<td>20-IX-2 Camb</td>
<td>legal text concerning a bail and a debt of dates (witness)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIN 1 98: 5</td>
<td>23-VI-27 Camb</td>
<td>imittu debt note for dates, sîtu of Ardia (debtor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 7 177: 1</td>
<td>8-IV-5 Camb</td>
<td>legal text concerning a bail for Ile-i-Marduk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCBT 552: 12</td>
<td>1-VII-[7] Camb</td>
<td>imittu debt note for dates, sîtu of Ardia (witness)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JCS 28, no. 35: 11</td>
<td>2-VII-7 Camb</td>
<td>imittu debt note for dates, sîtu of Ardia (witness)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM 114487: 12</td>
<td>4-VII-7 Camb</td>
<td>imittu debt note for dates, sîtu of Ardia (witness)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCBT 829: 11f.</td>
<td>5-[VII]-7 Camb</td>
<td>imittu debt note for dates, sîtu of Ardia (witness)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM 113429: 12f.</td>
<td>6-VII-7 Camb</td>
<td>imittu debt note for dates, sîtu of Ardia (witness)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM 113430: 11f.</td>
<td>6-VII-7 Camb</td>
<td>imittu debt note for dates, sîtu of Ardia (witness)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.9.13. Ardia

After Kalbîya’s rent farm for barley and dates had been dissolved around 2 Cyr, a split between the management of the arable land on the one hand and the date orchards on the other is noticeable. The situation is not perfectly clear due to a rather small amount of pertinent documents from Cyrus’s reign, but the general tendency seems to have been a fragmentation of the rent farm system through the employment of a number of individuals with smaller areas of responsibility. It appears that not only the barley and date cultivation were managed separately, but that the
responsibility over these two branches of agricultural production was split between several temple officials and minor rent farmers.

The management of the arable land and date orchards would not be put under the responsibility of one single person again until the beginning of Darius’s reign. But even before Gimillu, son of Innin-šum-ibni, took control over the major part of Eanna’s agriculturally productive land, one man succeeded in uniting the temple’s orchards into one rent farm. This man was Ardia, son of Nabû-bân-âlî, descendant of Rêmüt-Ea, and his appointment as the rent farmer responsible for all the temple orchards, with the exception of the prebendary hallatu-orchards, can now be dated to the second month of 8 Cyr.783

We are not in the possession of texts from Ardia’s private archive, as was the case with Šum-ukîn, and thus we have no information about his background. We do not know whether he was indigenous to Uruk or not. Even ascertaining his first appearance in the Eanna archive is problematic. A certain Ardia, son of Nabû-bân-âlî (without a family name), appears already in 12 Nbn in two texts (both written in the intercalary addaru). YOS 6 203 is a conditional verdict concerning Nabû-apla-iddin, son of Nabû-mukin-apli, and Ibni-ilu’a, son of Sin-âl-iddin, two people not known from other sources, in a case of suspected embezzlement. If a witness proved that they received gold in addition to the gold and the debt notes which they took from nine individuals and gave to the temple administrator and the royal commissioner, they would have to pay a thirty-fold fine for the amount exceeding these debt notes. Ardia appears as one of the nine people from whom the gold and the debt notes for gold were received. These men’s connection to the Eanna is not clear,784 but it is apparent that they had some sort of obligation toward the temple. The fact that they delivered both the gold and the corresponding debt notes to Nabû-apla-iddin and Ibni-ilu’a is remarkable. It indicates that they were not simply debtors, because in this case the debt notes would not have been in their keeping. Perhaps they were in the intermediary position between the temple, the actual creditor, and the debtors, from which they obtained the gold, which they then gave to the two men standing under investigation in this text.785

The other attestation of Ardia, son of Nabû-bân-âlî, from 12 Nbn is in YOS 6 210.786 This is an account with a number of entries recording the deliveries and the disbursements of silver. Ardia received one quarter of a shekel of silver for the carcasses of one goose and one duck. This attestation notwithstanding, no connection with the poultry industry of Eanna could be established for the rent farmer Ardia. While it is possible that both YOS 6 203 and 210 refer to the same Ardia, it is by no means certain that this was the same person as the later rent farmer of this name.

The first certain attestation of the rent farmer Ardia is in BIN 1 111, an imittu debt note for dates pertaining to his rent farm. The text is dated to the fifth month of 2 Cyr, implying that by this time he had entered into a contractual relationship with the temple as a rent farmer. What is disconcerting, though, is that there are no other attestations of Ardia for the next six years, i.e. until 8 Cyr. Moreover, his first attestation from 8 Cyr is in fact his rent contract, the contract establishing his rent farm for dates. While this contract does not necessarily preclude an earlier agreement, perhaps one concerning a smaller portion of the temple’s orchards,787 it is remarkable that the scribe and the witnesses appearing in the imittu debt note from 2 Cyr are the same as in several

---

783 This is according to his rent contract PTS 2044, which is edited below.

784 Beside Ardia five of them appear in other sources as well: Anu-âl-iddin, son of Mušezib, is attested in YOS 6 223 (12 Nbn) according to which he purchased gold for silver; Nânîya-iddin, son of Gimillu, appears in YOS 6 190, YOS 19 198 and YOS 19 199, all from 7 Nbn, as a recipient of oil; Šadûnu, son of Šulâya, appears in YOS 6 210 (12 Nbn), in an account of silver deliveries and disbursements, as a recipient of 1.5 shekels of silver; Dûr-apli is attested in YOS 19 302 (13 Nbn), a text concerning malt and barley, as a commissioner (bél piqitti) of a certain Nabû-zîr-ibni.

785 Note that during the intercalary addaru of 12 Nbn the temple investigated another case of suspected embezzlement of gold (cf. YOS 6 223, a record of an interrogation (mas’alatu) of Iddin-Tigpak, son of Ibnî-lîtar, and YOS 6 230, a bail protocol concerning this same individual), which may have been connected to our text.

786 Šadûnu, son of Šulâya, one of the nine people in YOS 6 203, also appears in this text (see note 784).

787 The rent farmer Šum-ukîn appeared in a similar situation. He was attested in three imittu debt notes in acc and 1 Nbn with the title ša maḫhi sūtu, before his and Kalbaya’s rent contract had even been written. Furthermore, there is evidence for his involvement in Eanna’s agriculture on an entrepreneurial level already during Neriglissar’s reign.
imittu debt notes from the second year of Cambyses. Other than in BIN 1 111, the scribe Nabû-šum-ukin, son of Nadin-ahi, descendant of Gašul, appears as the scribe of at least seven imittu debt notes all of which were dated to 2 Camb. The two witnesses, Marduk-šum-iddin, son of Nadin, descendant of Sittia, and Nabû-bēššunu, son of Ištar-šum-erēš, descendant of Ea-šētu-bāni, appear as sole witnesses in six other imittu debt notes from Ardia’s rent farm, five of which are dated with certainty to 2 Camb. Nabû-bēššunu was himself a scribe of two imittu debt notes from 2 Camb, in both of which Marduk-šum-iddin appears as a witness. Clearly Nabû-šum-ukin, Marduk-šum-iddin and Nabû-bēššunu were involved in the yield estimation process on Ardia’s rent farm. During 2 Camb these three men were, on at least five occasions, members of one estimation committee. Their attestation in BIN 1 111 from 2 Cyr is exceptional, especially considering that the scribe Nabû-šum-ukin was otherwise attested only in 2 Camb. Taking also into account the gap of some six years between this and Ardia’s next attestation as a rent farmer of Eanna (PTS 2044, 8 Cyr), one wonders whether the king’s name in BIN 1 111 should not be in fact emended to Cambyses. Assuming a scribal error here would greatly help to make a uniform picture of Ardia’s involvement in the agriculture of Eanna, starting with his rent contract at the beginning of 8 Cyr and ending in 7 Camb with a set of imittu debt notes for that year. Alternatively, one would simply have to acknowledge the gap of six years in the documentation for Ardia, and assume that he was involved in the temple agriculture as a rent farmer already in 2 Cyr, however, probably on a smaller scale.

Be this emendation justified or not, Ardia’s responsibility for Eanna’s date orchards was established in 8 Cyr by the rent contract PTS 2044. Only the hallatu-orchards are excluded from his control, as was customary in the institutional rent farm arrangements.

PTS 2044

6-2-8 Cyr

5. a-na ašbān i-na qa-ba-a-[iš ša] gu-ba-ru in[am tin-tir]
   uš-e-bir ıd a-na ır-[a duš]mu-ši ša ši ag-šē-ši[tuš] dumu re-mu[t]-bad
   id-di-nu i-ına muš-an-na ı2 liš[m] gur zū-lum-ma f[x x x x (x)] f[x x (x)]
i-nam-din ıx x x [x x x x (x)] ı[b] [e-r]u-ı-[š]tu ı-[he-er] [x x x x (x)]
   aššu-na aš-ša-bat ı-[š]-tu ı1 gur zū-lum-ma lāb-lā-[b-bi ū īl-man-ga-ga]
10. i-nam-din zū-lum-ma-ak ı[2] lim gur i-na mu-an-n[u ın x x (x)]

---

788 TEBR 39; NCBT 991; YOS 7 136; NCBT 957; YOS 7 134; BIN 1 98; 105; CD 84 (Sack misread the scribe’s name, but a consultation of a photograph of the tablet confirms him to be Nabû-šum-ukin, son of Nadin-ahi, descendant of Gašul). BIN 1 115 was also written by this scribe, but the year is broken off. A reconstruction of the date of this text as 27-VI-[2] Camb seems very probable.
789 TEBR 39; NCBT 991; YOS 7 136; BIN 1 105; CD 84; BIN 1 115 ([2] Camb; see previous note). Note also that all of these texts were written by the rent farm of Nabû-šum-ukin. Marduk-šum-iddin appears also in BIN 1 98 (2 Camb), written by this scribe, however, accompanied by two other witnesses.
790 A certain Arad-Bēl, son of Nabû-mušētuq-uddē, descendant of Egibi, accompanies him as a witness in these two texts (GC 2 407; YOS 7 135). Note that Nabû-bēššunu was active as a scribe of imittu debt notes for Ardia’s rent farm not only during 2 Camb, but from 1 until 4 Camb. These other attestations are: NCBT 952 (1 Camb); TEL 13 155 (3 Camb); NCBT 541 (3 Camb); BIN 1 110 (4 Camb); YOS 7 175 (4 Camb).
791 Marduk-šum-iddin and Nabû-bēššunu and two other individuals stated explicitly in TEL 13 177 ([4] Camb), in an oath, that they would make the yield estimates together with Ardia in 4 Camb (translation in Coqueuilhat 1968: 52f.).
792 The text has been collated and the royal name in the date formula is indeed that of Cyrus. If the date of BIN 1 111 were emended to [2]6-V-2 Camb, then it would have been written on the same day as NCBT 991 and TEBR 39. Besides having the same set of witnesses and the same scribe, all three texts concerned fields on the Nūrū-ššu, which further supports this emendation.
793 Scribal errors in the date formula are not uncommon. See, for instance, YBC 9448 (edited in Janković 2007), which was dated to the 31st year of Nabû-šum-ukin (ag-mu-gin). This was clearly an error for Nabû-kudurri-usur.
794 Note that there is also a gap in the documentation for the rent farmer Nabû-bān-ahi, from the Basia family, between 3 Cyr and acc Camb.
Nabû-iddin, the royal commissioner of Eanna, gave the land planted with date palms, property by stating the amount of dates which Ardia had already delivered as his rent payment for 8 Cyr, post. Either way, the temple’s dependency on the court in important matters such as the instalment yearly, [...]. He will not [...]. arrears therefrom. [...]. oxen and sheep he shall give yearly to the same official. Apart from these attestations a measurers and gatekeepers, a recipient of rations connected to date plantations, is probably a reference to the water. For each rev. of the Lady of Uruk, as much as there is, except the [...].

Nabûmuk²n0apli, the chief administrator of Eanna, son of Nadin, descendant of Dabi², and Lugal kur²kur I[Ø] lugal kur²kur IªªIªªIªªIªªIª. He will not [...]. arrears therefrom. [...]. oxen and sheep he shall give yearly to the same official. Apart from these attestations a measurers and gatekeepers, a recipient of rations connected to date plantations, is probably a reference to the water. For each rev. of the Lady of Uruk, as much as there is, except the [...].

As with other major rent farmers, the court was involved in the establishing of Ardia’s rent farm. In his case G¹baru, the satrap of Babylonia, gave out the order to this effect. As we have no evidence for Ardia’s connection to the court, it remains unclear from which direction the initiative for his employment came. The orders of Gûbaru mentioned in the text could either imply that he actively supported Ardia’s enterprise or that he simply endorsed the temple’s candidate for this post. Either way, the temple’s dependency on the court in important matters such as the instalment of a major rent farmer is once again evident.

The contract stipulates that all the temple orchards, except the hallatu-orchards, were given to Ardia for an annual rent of 12,000 kurru of dates. This figure appears also in AnOr 8 63 from the first month of 9 Cyr, a debt note for 400 kurru of dates charged against Ardia. The text begins by stating the amount of dates which Ardia had already delivered as his rent payment for 8 Cyr, namely 11,820 kurru of dates. The 400 kurru charged against him were the dates which the temple advanced on his behalf for the rations of the bêl pihiṭi of Esagil. The

---

794 See next note.
795 This person could be either one of the three sons of Marduk-ṣum-iddin: Arad-Marduk, Bêl-nûdin-apli or Nabû-nûdin-apli.
796 Edited by Cocquerillat 1968: 73. 127.
797 The rations of the bêl pihiṭi of Esagil are also mentioned, together with the rations of scribes, measurers and gatekeepers, in TCL 13 182, the text recording the transfer of Gimilu’s rent farm to Bêl-gilmanni in 2 Dar. The bêl pihiṭi from the ‘Edict of Belšazzar’ (YOS 6 103) who is, again, together with the scribes, measurers and gatekeepers, a recipient of rations connected to date plantations, is probably a reference to the same official. Apart from these attestations a bêl pihiṭi of Esagil appears in the Eanna archive also in the
text goes on to clarify that this amount of dates was derived from a due of one sútu per each kurru of dates for the rations of this official. This was part of a standard tax imposed on rent farms for dates. It generally included rations for other officials, the scribes, measurers and gatekeepers,799 as well. In this instance the payment of rations for only one official was made. It is conceivable that the others would have been paid on a separate occasion. Following van Driel’s (1987-88) interpretation of the ‘Edict of Belšazzar’, the administrative tax set aside for services and rations of these officials amounted to 1/12 of the yearly rent. In Ardia’s case this would have been 1,000 kurru of dates, meaning that after the subtraction of the rations of the bēl piḫatti 600 kurru were left for the services and rations of the scribes, measurers and gatekeepers.

Other than the rent payment, the obligations listed by the rent contract include the maintenance of the irrigation system, the delivery of secondary products of the date palm and the payment of a royal tax (“royal gift”)800 consisting of cattle. There is no mention of the rations of the bēl piḫatti and other officials involved in the date production (the scribes, the measurers and the gatekeepers) in the extant parts of the text. Since this was a customary obligation of the temple rent farmers it was probably not explicitly recorded in the contract. Perhaps the regulations for this payment were in the break at the end of l. 7. Alternatively, this break could have contained the details related to the mode of payment of the rent (e.g., ina mašili ša Bēlti ša Uruk ina Eanna).

During his first year in business as a large-scale rent farmer, Ardia was relatively successful. The debt note from the beginning of 8 Cyr mentioned above (AnOr 8 63) demonstrates that he delivered to the temple 11,820;3.2 kurru, i.e. approximately 98.5 % of his yearly rent. A number of receipts drafted as imittu lists with individual entries of deliveries of gardeners from 8 Cyr record large amounts of dates delivered by scribes-measurers: YOS 7 95 (IX-8 Cyr),801 AnOr 8 62 (XI-8 Cyr),802 YOS 7 84 (XI-8 Cyr),803 BM 114549 (XII-8 Cyr). There must have been other imittu lists and receipts, because the total of the deliveries derived from these texts is short of the amount Ardia delivered according to AnOr 8 63 by over 4,243 kurru.

While Ardia managed to pay off almost the entire rent for 8 Cyr, he still had the considerable debt of 400 kurru of dates, which were given by the temple on his behalf for the rations of the governor of Esagil (AnOr 8 63). There is no indication whether he managed to clear this obligation. At any rate, the accession year of Cambyses witnessed a peculiar development, expressed in a text written probably toward the end of this year.804 PTS 2075 has been edited and discussed in the chapter on the rent farmer Nabû-bân-ahī. This legal proceedings records the order

799 See previous note. In Sippar these officials were frequently accompanied by the qīpu (Jursa 1995a: 138f.).

800 The tax namurtu (or namusitu) ša sarrı does not appear in the ‘Edict of Belšazzar’, but it is attested in two other texts concerning temple orchards: according to a rent contract for a date orchard from 6 Nbn (W 17718x) the tenant is obliged to deliver five sheep as namurtu ša sarrı; stipulations for the payment of this tax, however, without specifying the commodity and the amount, are made in YOS 7 38 (4 Cyr), a rent contract for date orchards leased ana gugallûtì (edited by Joannès 1982: 13f.; cf. also Coquererillat (1968: 67. 123), who misread namurtu as našpartu. Interestingly, van Driel also misread this term as te-li-ti (2002: 182). He does not treat namurtu in his study on taxation.) This tax was not necessarily connected to the date orchards. and the king in person. Other officials could also be the beneficiaries of the gift. In 2 Ner, in a rent contract concerning arable land for sharecropping (YBC 3750), Šum-ukin, the later rent farmer who acted here as the lessor, was to receive one bull and one sheep from the tenant as his namurtu. In another rent contract (TCL 12 64, 1 Ner) Šum-ukin, again as lessor of temple land, was to receive an bull. In this text, however, the term namurtu is not explicitly used. Both texts stem from the period during which Šum-ukin was a royal official (bēl piqitti ša sarrı). Nabû-mukin-žerī, the sender of the letter YOS 3 26, probably the bēl piqitti of Eanna, writes about sheep needed for his namurtu. This term appears also in connection with another high temple official in 20 Npl (GC 2 40) as namurtu ša qīpi. Sheep for the namurtu of the first month are mentioned in the letter YOS 3 9.

801 Edited by Coquererillat 1968: 68. 124.

802 Edited by Coquererillat 1968: 72. 126.

803 Edited by Coquererillat 1968: 72. 126. Note that the copy has erroneously year 9 in the date formula (1. 29). In the eleventh month of his ninth regnal year Cyrus would have been dead for some six months, so the year numeral in this text should be read as 8, which was confirmed by a collation.

804 The day and month are broken off.
of the administrator and the royal commissioner of Eanna to three scribes to bring the *imittu* debt notes pertaining to the rent farm of Ardia. These *imittu* debt notes are said to have been entrusted to the rent farmer Nabû-bân-aḫi, son of Kalbâya, descendant of Basia, who was probably just a minor entrepreneur at that time, instead of Ardia in the accession year of Cambyses. These tablets had not been physically entrusted to Nabû-bân-aḫi, but were stored in containers in the house of a fourth scribe. The three scribes then took these containers with the debt notes, delivered them to the administrator and the royal commissioner of Eanna, after which they gave (those same?) debt notes and their copies to Nabû-bân-aḫi. Two of the scribes ordered to bring the *imittu* debt notes to the temple officials, namely Muṣṣēṣib-Bēl and Itti-Nabû-balâtu, were engaged in the administrative processes involved in the yield estimation and the management of the deliveries of dates from Ardia’s rent farm. So was the scribe Rēmût, in whose house the debt notes were stored. The third scribe entrusted with the delivery of the debt notes, Lâbâdi-Marduk, was not linked to Ardia. He was a college scribe (*tuṣṣar Eanna*), i.e. a scribe of higher ranking, who was apparently sent to supervise the other two.

Two interesting questions arise from this text. Why were the *imittu* debt notes pertaining to Ardia’s rent farm entrusted to another rent farmer? And what did this apparent transfer of responsibility entail for Ardia and Nabû-bân-aḫi? As regards the first question, the text informs us solely that these *imittu* debt notes had been entrusted to Nabû-bân-aḫi instead of (*kūm*) Ardia. Unfortunately, there is no further evidence to elucidate this situation. Were all the debt notes from Ardia’s rent farm to be transferred to Nabû-bân-aḫi? Did this transfer imply that Nabû-bân-aḫi would have been personally liable for the dues recorded in these debt notes, and could have profited from any surplus, just as if the rent farm were his? Was in fact the transfer of Ardia’s rent farm to Nabû-bân-aḫi implied by this text? A transfer of a rent farm from one person to another usually marks the termination of the former rent farmer’s career and is caused by either his inability to conduct the business any longer, due to death, ill health, etc, or generally his failure. However, Ardia’s performance during the year preceding this affair was not exactly poor and his career, as is known, continued until 7 Camb. There are also cases of a rent farmer giving up a part of his farm to another rent farmer in order to reduce his overwhelming responsibility. This is what Kalbâya did when his uncle Šum-ukîn retired from the rent farming business. When he started managing on his own a farm with the rent of 35,000 *kurru* of barley and dates, he decided to give up a smaller farm with the rent of 3,000 *kurru* of barley, which he was running on the side while his uncle was still taking care of the big farm. A similar case was recorded for the rent farmer Bulṭîya, son of Marduk-eriba, descendant of Isinnâya, from Ebabbar in Sippar. According to BRM 1 101605 (6 Dar) he gave up half of his farm to a certain Šamaš-kāšir, son of Nabû-mukîn-apli, descendant of Isinnâya. The text gives a detailed account of the shared responsibilities of the two rent farmers. In addition to his part of the rent Šamaš-kāšir was to pay 1,000 *kurru* of dates in order to cover the arrears accumulated by Bulṭîya. These arrears are an indicator of Bulṭîya’s unsatisfactory management of the farm, which was probably the reason why it was split at the orders of the satrap Uṣîânû. Perhaps something similar was going on between Ardia and Nabû-bân-aḫi. In our text also the satrap Gûbaru was involved, but he is mentioned in connection with the debt notes which Ardia imposed on the gardeners, not the debt notes which were to be transferred to Nabû-bân-aḫi. Perhaps Ardia decided (voluntarily or at the orders of Gûbaru?) that he had too much on his hands and had to cede some of his responsibility to Nabû-bân-aḫi, who for his part was looking to expand his business. If this were the case, one could expect that a separate contract recording this transfer had been made earlier. It would have contained details on the height of the rent to be paid by the two rent farmers and perhaps the size of the areas under their control. The motivation for the proceedings presented in PTS 2075 was probably a delay in the transfer of the debt notes to Nabû-bân-aḫi. This document is not particularly specific when referring to the *imittu* debt notes in the introductory part of the text. We are informed, however, that the three scribes brought two containers with debt notes to the temple officials. Without knowing the actual size of the containers and the number of debt notes Ardia’s rent farm “produced”, it is not possible to tell what fraction of

---

805 See the case of Gimillu and Bēl-gimlanni (TCL 13 182), p. 239.
806 Jursa 1995a: 103f.
Ardia’s tablets was entrusted to Nabû-bān-āḫī. One of the containers, a reed basket, was closed and sealed by Ardia, indicating perhaps a selection of the orchards he had made in order to give them up to Nabû-bān-āḫī. The other container was not sealed by him, but the tablets it contained were all geographically linked. They all concerned orchards situated on the other (left?) bank of Nār-šarrī, possibly suggesting that Ardia relinquished these localities as well.

This interpretation is of course highly speculative. What we do have as evidence, are some twelve imittu debt notes pertaining to Ardia’s rent farm from acc Camb. Perhaps these were the tablets that the high temple officials demanded from the three scribes, i.e. the ones which were to be transferred to Nabû-bān-āḫī. Or they were simply the obligations of the gardeners belonging to the remainder of Ardia’s rent farm. Be that as it may, the first year of Cambyses is very poorly documented for Ardia. There are possibly only two texts, a list of imittu arrears from 1 Camb (TCL 13 146) and an imittu debt note (NCBT 952, 1 Camb), both incidentally with a damaged year numeral. As for Nabû-bān-āḫī, most of his attestations, mainly imittu debt notes and receipts pertaining to his rent farm, are from the first year of Cambyses. One wonders if this distribution of attestations is in any way indicative of the scope of these rent farmers’ activities as a consequence of the events described in PTS 2075.

For 2 Camb we have again more documents relevant to Ardia. Beside one lease of an orchard anā nukurībbāti (NBC 4889), there are two imittu lists (YOS 7 124 and BIN 1 168) and at least ten imittu debt notes. The last document from this year was an oath by Nanāya-ēres, son of Gimillu, to bring in the dates from Ardia’s rent farm to Eanna (NCBT 550). This Nanāya-ēres was a scribe and a messenger of the administrator of Eanna in charge of the deliveries of dates from Ardia’s gardeners.

The third year of Cambyses is again rather poorly documented. There is only one imittu debt note (TCL 13 155) and a debt note for 200 kurru of dates charged against Ardia, son of Eanna-šum-ibni (YOS 7 142), who was one of the scribes involved in the collection of the dates from the gardeners from Ardia’s rent farm. These 200 kurru of dates are said to be apart from the receipt of the rent farmer Ardia, which he had not delivered to Eanna.

The fourth year of Cambyses’s reign is represented by four imittu debt notes, one debt note for 5,000 loads of wood (ḥušābu) for the royal palace in the vicinity of Eanna charged against Ardia (YOS 7 168) and an oath by four scribes assuring the temple officials that they would go together with Ardia and make the harvest estimates for 4 Camb in a proper manner (TCL 13 177).

The surviving record from Cambyses’s fifth year is dominated by imittu debt notes. Other than these eight texts there is an imittu list (NBC 4912), a lease of an orchard anā

---

807 A very rough estimate could use a model orchard producing 40 kurru of dates (according to the ‘Edict’), by which the rent of 12,000 kurru would be divided, leaving 300 orchards, and consequently 300 debt notes. But not even this crude approximation is of much help, as we do not know how many tablets could fit into those two containers.
808 Coqquerillat 1968: 70f. 125.
809 See table on p. 234.
810 See Appendix 5.
811 He wrote the imittu list YOS 7 124 (2 Camb).
812 AnOr 8 62, YOS 7 84. He acts as a witness in TCL 12 23. He is also known as a gugallu in earlier times (YOS 7 38, JCS 28, no. 5). See also Kümmel 1979: 103. 122f.
813 Coqquerillat 1968: 57. 119.
814 Coqquerillat 1968: 82. 132.
815 YOS 7 95 (8 Cyr); YOS 7 124 (2 Camb). For other attestations see Kümmel 1979: 111. 134. Beside measuring and collecting the dates from Ardia’s farm he also had his own imittu obligation. This is demonstrated by the imittu debt note from 1 Camb (NCBT 952) charged against him and the remark in ll. 10f. of YOS 7 142: e-lat zû-lum-ma zag a-šal ša mu 3-kam ša ina pa-ni-šû. His orchard was situated on Nāru-eššu according to NCBT 952.
816 See Appendix 5.
817 Kessler 1999: 166. See also the edition of Coqquerillat 1968: 73. 127.
818 Coqquerillat 1968: 52f. 115. Ebeling (1954) discussed the idiomatic phrases in this text.
819 See Appendix 5.
nukuribbüti (BIN 1 117\(^\text{820}\)) and a list of disbursements of dates from Ardia’s farm to the prebendaries of Eanna (\textit{AnOr} 9 9).

The sixth year of Cambyses is represented by only one single \textit{imittu} debt note (Truro 17).

In the seventh year of Cambyses we find nine \textit{imittu} debt notes in addition to one \textit{imittu} list (YOS 7 191\(^\text{821}\)). This is the last evidence for Ardia during his active period. He is mentioned for the last time in the intercalary \textit{addaru} of Darius’s accession year in \textit{AnOr} 9 11. This is a debt note for barley charged against a certain Zeria, son of Nabû-tukulti-edu, probably a gardener. The barley was to be paid in exchange for dates, which were the impost of a garden pertaining to the rent farm of Ardia for the fifth year of Cambyses.

Clearly, most of the textual material we have for Ardia is related to the administration of the income from his rent farm. Of some 80 attestations of Ardia, 58 documents are \textit{imittu} debt notes. Most of the remaining texts are also \textit{imittu} related. They include \textit{imittu} lists and receipts, debt notes for the arrears of the gardeners and texts concerning the obligations of the scribes-meaurers. Apart from the rent payments we are informed about some other obligations a rent farmer had toward the royal administration – the provision of rations for the \textit{bēl pēḫāt} of Esagil\(^\text{822}\) and supplying the royal palace in Uruk with wood (\textit{ḫuṣābu})\(^\text{823}\). Beside Ardia’s rent contract from acc Camb (PTS 2044), three sub-leases of orchards have come down to us from the time of his rent farm.\(^\text{824}\)

The existence of such a large number of \textit{imittu} debt notes in the Eanna archive may signify that these dues were not paid to the temple. However, there are no other clear signs of crisis for Ardia’s rent farm. In particular, there is no evidence for the settling of accounts between the temple and this rent farmer.\(^\text{825}\) We do have a couple of debt notes and oaths\(^\text{826}\) related to the obligations of the temple personnel involved in Ardia’s farm – scribes, meaurers and yield estimators. These men were a crucial link between the temple, the rent farmer and the gardeners. They not only determined the dues of individual gardeners, but were in charge of receiving and forwarding their date deliveries. It is not in the least surprising that they too could become a source of problems for the rent farmer, and ultimately the temple, beside the non-paying gardeners.

What one could interpret as a sign of crisis occurred toward the beginning of Ardia’s career as a rent farmer for dates of the Lady of Uruk. At this time his rent farm was reduced and a part of his responsibility was transferred to Nabû-bân-aḫi (PTS 2075, acc Camb). It remains unclear what prompted this step. At any rate, it cannot have been Ardia’s bad performance, since the year preceding this incident (in 8 Cyr) he had delivered at least 98.5 % of his rent. The consequences of this intervention for Ardia’s farm, e.g., any difference in the level of his rent payment and the size of the area under his responsibility, remain equally inscrutable.

An attempt to make an assessment of the success of Ardia’s rent farm with only the kind of documentation presently available verges on the impossible. Even the numerous \textit{imittu} debt notes are not a clear indicator of his failure. In acc Camb, the year for which we have the most debt notes (12), the cumulative debt is slightly over 432 \textit{kurru} of dates, which is less than 4 % of the yearly rent. A much larger number of debt notes would be needed in order to come close to the level of the arrears accumulated by Šum-ukin and Kalbâyâ, for instance.\(^\text{827}\) For the time being there is no way of knowing whether more of these texts recording outstanding dues should be expected among the unpublished material, or not, indicating that Ardia’s business was in fact fairly successful. For the same reason we can not determine why his farm was terminated at the end of Cambyses’s reign. It is not possible to decide whether the temple transferred Ardia’s rent farm to Gimillû because of his unsatisfactory management of the farm, whether he voluntarily retired from the business, or whether his death put an end to his career.

\(^{820}\) Cocquerillat 1968: 47. 112.
\(^{821}\) Cocquerillat 1968: 70. 125.
\(^{822}\) \textit{AnOr} 8 63.
\(^{823}\) YOS 7 168.
\(^{824}\) BIN 1 125 ([x] Camb); NBC 4889 (2 Camb); BIN 1 117 (5 Camb).
\(^{825}\) It will be remembered that this phase was clearly visible for Šum-ukin, Kalbâyâ and Gimillû.
\(^{826}\) TCL 13 177; NCBT 550; YOS 7 142; see also TCL 13 146.
\(^{827}\) Note, however, that the number of extant \textit{imittu} debt notes for Šum-ukin’s and Kalbâyâ’s farm is also proportionally small.
2.9.13.1. Attestations of Ardia:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Contents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>? YOS 3 83: 1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>? YOS 6 203: 6</td>
<td>5-XIIa-12 Nbn</td>
<td>legal, concerning embezzlement of gold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>? YOS 6 210: 26</td>
<td>13-XIIa-12 Nbn</td>
<td>account of various deliveries and disbursements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTS 2044: 6</td>
<td>6-H-8 Cyr</td>
<td>rent contract</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 7 95: 2f.</td>
<td>13-IX-8 Cyr</td>
<td>imittu list</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 7 72: 3f., 7, 11, 16</td>
<td>28-X-8 Cyr</td>
<td>debt note for arrears of dates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AnOr 8 62: 2f., 11, 13</td>
<td>13-XI-8 Cyr</td>
<td>receipt for dates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 7 84: 16f., 23</td>
<td>26-XI-8' Cyr</td>
<td>receipt for dates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM 114549: 2f., 9, 12</td>
<td>7-XII-8 Cyr</td>
<td>receipt for dates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AnOr 8 63: 3, 8, 10, 13</td>
<td>21-I-9 Cyr</td>
<td>receipt for dates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIN 1 125: 3f., 11</td>
<td>[x-x-x Camb]</td>
<td>sub-lease <em>ana nukuribbütu</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTS 2075: 13-15, 19, 21, [x]-[x]-acc Camb</td>
<td>22, 24</td>
<td>legal, concerning a transfer of debt notes from Ardia to Nabû-bān-aḫī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCL 13 146: 2f.</td>
<td>1 Camb</td>
<td>list of arrears of dates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD 64: 11, 13</td>
<td>2 Camb</td>
<td>account of barley and silver disbursements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIN 1 168: 3f.</td>
<td>2 Camb</td>
<td>imittu list</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NBC 4889: 4f., 9</td>
<td>2-VI-2 Camb</td>
<td>sub-lease <em>ana nukuribbüti</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 7 124: 3f., 27</td>
<td>5-XI-2 Camb</td>
<td>receipt for dates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCBT 550: 6</td>
<td>12'-XII-2 Camb</td>
<td>oath concerning delivery of dates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 7 142: 2f., 5f.</td>
<td>13-VII-3 Camb</td>
<td>debt note for dates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCL 13 177: 7f., 10</td>
<td>29-IV-[4] Camb</td>
<td>legal, concerning the duties of scribes and measurers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 7 168: 3</td>
<td>9-VIII-4 Camb</td>
<td>debt note for wood (<em>huṣābu</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NBC 4912: 3f.</td>
<td>5 Camb</td>
<td>imittu list</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIN 1 117: 1f., 9, 19</td>
<td>27-VI-5 Camb</td>
<td>sub-lease <em>ana nukuribbüti</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AnOr 9 9: 2</td>
<td>2-VIII-5 Camb</td>
<td>list of date disbursements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 7 191: 2f.</td>
<td>7 Camb</td>
<td>imittu list</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AnOr 9 11: 4</td>
<td>18-XIIa-acc Dar</td>
<td>debt note for barley in exchange for imittu dates from 5 Camb</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.9.14. Nabû-bān-aḫī (Bānia)

Nabû-bān-aḫī was, as was mentioned, the son of the rent farmer Kalbiya, and a member of the Basia family. He had a rent farm for dates simultaneously with the rent farmer Ardia, at least from acc Camb until 1 Camb. Another name of a rent farmer for dates, Bānia, son of Kalbiya (without a family name), crops up in the texts during the same period. Cocquerillat (1968: 97) considered these to be two different individuals, each with a lease of temple orchards. It is more probable, however, that the two names referred to one person, the short version of the name, Bānia, being a hypocoristic form built from the middle element of the full name.829

Bānia’s first attestation is in YOS 6 177830 (16 Nbn), a conditional verdict concerning a delivery of dates belonging to the Lady of Uruk. Šilliya, son of Šarid, probably a gardener, claims that Bānia, son of Kalbiya, had estimated for him in 15 Nbn a yield of 130 kurru of dates for his field in Kurbat. The text continues with provisions for an additional penalty payment of dates in case a witness proves that an amount greater than 130 kurru had originally been imposed on

---

828 In addition to these texts Ardia is also attested in some 58 *imittu* debt notes for dates. These are not listed here, but can be found in the table of *imittu* debt notes in Appendix 5.

829 For the distribution of the two versions of the name across the attestations for this rent farmer see the table at the end of this chapter.

830 Edited by Cocquerillat 1968: 83. 133.
Šillāyā. It remains unclear whether Bānia was at this time (15 Nbn) already in charge of a rent farm of his own, or whether he simply had a function of a harvest estimator (Cocquerillat 1968: 97). It is conceivable that he worked as an estimator on his father’s rent farm, who at this point was still in the business. It is equally possible that he personally rented some land, either as a sub-lease from Kalbāya, or independently of him, directly from the temple. This seems possible, especially in the light of some later date imittu debt notes pertaining to his rent farm, which concerned fields in the Kurbat area.831 Kurbat was clearly a region under his responsibility as a rent farmer during 1 Camb and perhaps this responsibility dates back to as early as 15 Nbn, since this is where Šillāyā’s field, for which he made a yield estimate, was situated. However, this can hardly be resolved relying on the meagre sources presently at our disposal.

The next attestation is from 3 Cyr (GC 2 98). It sheds some light on Bānia’s and his father’s relationship. By this time Kalbāya had in all probability lost the rent farm and was put under pressure by the temple to deal with the farmers and the gardeners and collect their outstanding debts. GC 2 98832 is a receipt for dates, which Bānia, following the instructions of his father Kalbāya, collected from one of his father’s debtors. The text was written in Ālū-ša-Bīt-šaddān, perhaps to be equated with the place Bīt-šaddayān, a locality on the Euphrates river.833 While the text indicates that Bānia helped out his father with clearing the debts of the agricultural workers, the question is raised again whether his function is related to the localities on the Euphrates834 in 15 Nbn and 3 Cyr reflects in any way his own entrepreneurial activities as a rent farmer.

There are no firm indications as to when exactly Bānia entered the rent farming business, as no lease contract for him is extant and prior to Cambyses’s reign we only have the two ambiguous attestations discussed above. The imittu debt notes pertaining to his šītu all come from the first year of Cambyses, but his first appearance with the title of a rent farmer, albeit partially damaged, is from acc Camb, from a very interesting, if not perfectly comprehensible text:

PTS 2075

1. [x]-[x]-acc Camb


2. [x]-[x]-acc Camb

[831] GC 2 119, YOS 7 117, BM 114466, all from 1 Camb.
[832] The text is edited by Dougherty 1933: 28f. He misunderstood the elāṭi clause in ll. 1-2 as a payment of 16 1/2 shekels of silver in addition to the 35 kurru of dates delivered. This amount of silver was in fact excluded from the delivery of dates and remained the debt of Aplāya. Note also that the place name in l. 13 should be read as uru ša e šad-da-an.
[833] See Zadok 1985: 105. See also the place name in l. 13 should be read as uru ša e šad-da-an.
[834] Kurbat was also situated on this river.
Nabûmuk²n0apli, the chief administrator of Eanna, and Nabûa©0iddin, the royal commissioner.

Nabûn¤din0apli, son of B¤nia, descendant of B¤Ýiru, Nabû, descendant of D¤bib², and Nabûa©0iddin, the royal commissioner of Eanna, wrote to Nabûb¤n0a©i took one container in which the debt notes for the Uruk, G¹baru, the governor of Babylon and Across0the0river, [and in the presence of R®m¹t0Ea, is responsible (and) which Ardia imposed on the gardeners, [in the presence of written orders of the This temple court proceedings describes in fact two different affairs, namely the giving out of the fields from the other bank of N¤r0¡arri, not sealed with Ardia's seal, from the house of R®Ýin du, R®m¹t's wife, and they gave them to Nabû0b¤n0a©i.

The debt notes of [...], and the copies of the debt notes, following the written orders of [...], they gave to Nabû0b¤n0a©i.

Scribe: Šama¡0muk²n0apli, son of N¤din, descendant of [Egibi]; Marduk0¡um0ibni, son of B®l0a©0u¡ab¡i, descendant of Am²l0Ea, Marduk0¡um0u'ur, son of B®l0uballi†, descendant of P¹'u, Marduk0¡¤pik0z®ri, son of Bal¤†u, descendant of Mi'ir¤ya, Anu0z®r0ibni, son of Nabû0®†er, descendant of Nabû0¡ar©i0il², Anu0z®r0u¡ab¡i, son of Eanna0n¤din0¡umi, descendant of D¤Ýiqu, Lâb¤¡i0Marduk, son of Arad0B®l, descendant of Egibi, and Mu¡®zib0B®l, son of Bal¤ssu, or less simultaneously, in the presence of the high temple officials and the actions undertaken by the scribes took place more or less simultaneously, in the presence of the mär banê, only the delivery of the debt notes in fact was performed before the assembly. The description of the written orders, which must have been given out at an earlier date in form of a letter, was included in this protocol as background information. The text introduces the letter order, by naming its senders and addressees (ll. 9-13)
and describing the debt notes to which it referred (ll. 13-18), followed by a direct quotation from the letter (ll. 19-21). It was probably read out in the assembly. The debt notes to be brought concerned the dates, *imittu* of the fields of the Lady of Uruk for Cambyses’s accession year, pertaining to the rent farm of Ardia, son of Nabû-bân-âjî, descendant of Rêmût-Ea, who, as is known from other sources, was a rent farmer for dates since at least 8 Cyr. The quoted letter gives the additional information that these debt notes had been entrusted to Nabû-bân-âjî, son of Kalkây, descendant of Basia, instead of Ardia in acc Camb. Nabû-bân-âjî is designated here as *ša muḫḫi [sūtī ša suluppî]*, i.e. a rent farmer for dates, indicating the latest possible date for the start of his employment as a rent farmer. Unfortunately, we are not given any background information for this unique course of action undertaken by the temple administration. We have no explanation for what seems to have been a transfer of responsibilities from one rent farmer to another. This transfer was only temporary in character. Ardia, who was a rent farmer in charge of a major portion of the temple’s orchards at least since 8 Cyr, remained in this position until 7 Camb. Whatever the reason for the transfer of the debt notes from Ardia to Nabû-bân-âjî, his work as a rent farmer for dates was not terminated, as a number of debt notes in Ardia’s name from subsequent years indicates. It should be noted that the transfer of debt notes as expressed by the letter order was only nominal at that point in time. The following sections of the text inform us that they were in fact in the house of another scribe, Rêmût, from which they were taken and delivered to the *šatammu* and the *bēl pīqiṭṭu*. Only after this, had the debt notes, or rather their copies, been actually handed over to Nabû-bân-âjî by the three scribes (ll. 28-29).

The introductory part of the protocol finishes in line 21 with the end of the citation of the letter. The text goes on to describe Lâbâši-Marduq’s, Muṣṣezib-Bēl’s and Itti-Neâbû-balâtu’s ensuing action. Of the three protagonists, only Muṣṣezib-Bēl is not attested with a title, while the other two appear as scribes. However, the context of this and his other attestations (see below) makes the scribal profession a plausible choice for him, too. Lâbâši-Marduq, son of Arad-Bēl, descendant of Egibi, is the best attested of the three with at least 35 appearances in the Eanna archive. He appears in the period from 12 Nbn to 7 Camb. In most of these texts his role is that of a witness. In CD 64 (2–3 Camb) he is designated as a scribe of Eanna, i.e. a college scribe (*ḫupšar Eanna*). He was not linked to Ardia directly and was probably sent to supervise the other two scribes. Muṣṣezib-Bēl, son of Balâssu, descendant of Amil-Ea, appears also mainly as a witness in the period from 17 Nbn to 2 Dar. Four times he is the witness in the *imittu* debt notes pertaining to the *sūtu* of Ardia, which makes the assumption plausible that he was a member of the commission of the scribes-estimators present at the yield estimation procedure. Note that his name should probably be reconstructed in the first line of TCL 13 177 ([4] Camb), as was suggested by

---

835 The reconstruction of the title relies on his later attestations as *ša muḫḫi sūtī ša suluppî ša Bēlti ša Uruk* (YOS 7 117; BM 114466; NCBT 1084). Once Nabû-bân-âjî appears with the title *ša muḫḫi sūtī ša Bēlti ša Uruk* in GC 2 119, giving an alternative for the reconstruction.
836 The designation from I. 12f.: *dub-sar ša [i]r-ia* probably refers only to Itti-Neâbû-balâtu, as the title is in singular and he is the only one of the three ever attested to have compiled texts (*imittu* debt notes) for Ardia. This relationship to Ardia is what this peculiar designation was supposed to signify, not that Itti-Neâbû-balâtu was his personal scribe. He was in fact a temple scribe (see below for details), who had been ‘assigned’ by the temple to Ardia for some of the administrative tasks entailed in the management of a rent farm.
837 12 Nbn: *Iraq* 59, no. 8. 15 Nbn: BM 113480. 17 Nbn: BM 114486. [x] Cyr: NCBT 1048. Acc Cyr: BM 114446. 1 Cyr: YOS 7 10. 2 Cyr: PTS 2086. 3 Cyr: YOS 7 18; 26; 36; BM 113409; NCBT 685. 4 Cyr: *AnOr* 8 46. 5 Cyr: *AnOr* 8 49; BIN 2 111. 8 Cyr: BIN 1 118. Acc Camb: YOS 7 97; JCS 28, no. 34; BM 114544; BIN 2 130; PTS 2075. 1 Camb: YOS 7 107; 115; GC 2 113. 2 Camb: CD 64; *Iraq* 13, 95ff. 3 Camb: *AnOr* 8 71; YOS 7 137; 149; 155; NCBT 1022; BM 113249. 4 Camb: TCL 13 177. 7 Camb: YOS 7 192; *AnOr* 8 79.
838 The exceptions are PTS 2075, the present text, YOS 7 10, in which his son is accused of theft of temple property, *Iraq* 59, no. 8, in which he is a guarantor for a person indebted to the temple, and the administrative text CD 64, a list of silver and barley disbursements, in which he appears together with other scribes and high temple officials in connection with a delivery of silver.
839 17 Nbn: BM 114465. 7 Cyr: YOS 7 93. 8 Cyr: YOS 7 71. Acc Camb: BIN 2 114; PTS 2075. 1 Camb: YOS 7 107; 111. 2 Camb: GC 2 357; NCBT 648; PTS 2825. 2’ Camb: BIN 1 98. 3 Camb: YOS 7 137. 4 Camb: YOS 7 171; 172; 175; BIN 1 110. 5 Camb: YOS 7 176. 1 Nbk IV: YOS 17 302. 2 Dar: TCL 13 182; YNER 1, 2.
840 GC 2 357 (2 Camb); BIN 1 98 (2’ Camb); BIN 1 110 (4 Camb); YOS 7 175 (4 Camb). Once he even appears as the debtor in one of the *imittu* debt notes from Ardia’s rent farm (PTS 2825, 2 Camb).
Nabû-bâlâtu, son of Tabnea, descendant of Kalbi-Nanna, was a temple scribe who also had a strong connection to Ardia and his rent farm. He appears as a scribe of texts from [x] Cyr to 2 Dar, but most of his attestations are from acc Camb. In this year he had written at least eight imittu debt notes pertaining to Ardia’s sîtu, and it is probably these tablets that the temple administrator and the royal commissioner asked for. In fact, twelve imittu debt notes dated to acc Camb have come down to us from the Eanna archive so far. Eight of these were written by Itti-Nabû-bâlâtu and one by Rēmût-Bêl, son of Nabû-ikṣur, descendant of Dûbibi, a scribe who also appears in our text, with the short version of his name − Rēmût. The tablets were taken by Lâbâši-Marduk, Muṣṣêzib-Bêl and Itti-Nabû-bâlâtu from Rēmût’s house, from his wife, as he was apparently not present. Two containers with debt notes were taken from his house: a reed container sealed with Ardia’s seal and a box containing the remaining debt notes concerning the fields from the other bank (i.e. the east bank?) of När-šarru, which was not sealed by Ardia. The administrative significance of a container sealed with the seal of the rent farmer as opposed to an unsealed one is difficult to understand. Perhaps the lack of a sealing indicates that the second set of documents was not related to Ardia’s rent farm. This assumption is highly hypothetical, though. Be that as it may, the tablets were stored in the house of a scribe, who had been involved in the imittu procedure, were taken from there and delivered to the temple administrator and the royal commissioner, for what purpose, we are not told. In addition to this, the three scribes gave some debt notes and (?) the copies of debt notes to Nabû-bân-aḫi, following certain orders. The words specifying the nature of the debt notes given to Nabû-bân-aḫi and the orders which brought on this transfer are lost in breaks, leaving us with little to help our understanding of his role in this situation and his connection to Ardia’s rent farm. As luck would have it, this is at present the only known attestation of Nabû-bân-aḫi from acc Camb, and the evidence from the following years of Cambyses’s reign fails to illuminate this problem any further.

At the beginning of 1 Camb, a certain Rēmût-Bêl, son of Nusku-iddin, was accused by the gardeners in the temple assembly to have collected the dates of their imittu from them (BIN 1 113). In his defence Rēmût-Bêl claimed to have delivered the dates to Bânia’s house and that they were intended for the beer of premium quality. The dates referred to in this text, which was dated to the first month of 1 Camb, must be the harvest of the previous year (acc Camb). This confirms the assumption based on the partially damaged title in line 20 of PTS 2075 that Nabû-bân-aḫi was a rent farmer for dates at that time.

As was mentioned, several imittu debt notes pertaining to Nabû-bân-aḫi’s sîtu have come down to us from 1 Camb, giving evidence for his activity as a rent farmer during this year. In the seventh month three debt notes of standard structure, related to the imittu obligations from orchards.
situated in Kurbat, were written in this locality: GC 2 119, YOS 7 117 (edited by Cocquerillat 1968: 58. 120) and BM 114466.

Also from the seventh month of 1 Camb is NCBT 994, a receipt for 40 kurru of dates, imittu for the first year of Cambyses, written in Bitqu-ša-Bêl-êter. A certain Balatu, son of Ištar-nâdin-aḫi, received these dates from Nabû-balâssu-ibiqbi, son of Ištar, at the orders of Nabû-bân-âhi. Neither Balatu nor Nabû-balâssu-ibiqbi are known from other sources. The transaction recorded here was probably not part of the standard accounting procedures in the rent farm management since this kind of receipts is generally not very frequent. However, as the exact relationship of the three men is not known, nothing can be said about the background of this transaction.

After the series of imittu debt notes and a receipt from the seventh month of 1 Camb, a debt note written in the eleventh month of the same year follows. NCBT 1084, written at Nâru-cassu, records the debt of 6;3.2 dates, the remainder of an imittu obligation from 1 Camb, pertaining to Nabû-bân-âhi’s rent farm. The debtor was obliged to deliver the dates during the same month (XI) on the watercourse Takkiru. Apparently, the debtor had not been able to deliver his imittu in full at the time of the collection of the harvest, and a new, rather close deadline was given to him for the delivery of the missing amount. This was probably done at the occasion of the yearly final accounting for dates, which was usually conducted during the months XI and XII.

The assessment of another affair by the temple court (YOS 7 113) was to all likelihood also motivated by this final accounting. This legal text, written probably in month XII of 1 Camb, deals with outstanding 160 kurru of dates due from Kiribtu, son of Arad-Innin, and Šamaš-uballit, son of Nabû-âhi-šûllûna. Šamaš-uballit is attested only in one more text. He makes a delivery of dates for the rent farm of Ardia in 8 Cyr (YOS 7 95). Kiribtu, who was a scribe, was evidently also involved in date cultivation. He claimed in this text to have delivered 109 kurru of dates to Ardia, son of Eanna-šum-ibni, and 10 kurru to Marduk-šum-ûsûr, son of Silûm-Bêl. Both of these men were scribes involved with measuring and collecting the dates from the gardeners. For the remaining 41 kurru Kiribtu was asked to bring receipts and documents according to the amount of dates, which he had delivered to Bânia. If he failed to do so, he would have to deliver the 160 kurru of dates to the temple.

This episode had a sequel less than two months later. In BM 113431 (2 Camb) 10 kurru of dates, which Kiribtu talked about in YOS 7 113, were charged against Marduk-šum-ûsûr. These dates, which were the imittu obligation of Kiribtu, pertaining to Bânia’s rent farm, had been taken from him by Marduk-šum-ûsûr. Now this amount was converted into its equivalent in barley, which was imposed on Marduk-šum-ûsûr and was expected to be delivered after the barley harvest in month IV:

BM 113431

| obv. | 1. 10 gur še-bar šu-pel-tu₄ ša 10 gur |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| | zû-lum-ma i-na zû-lum-ma |
| | i-mit-tu₄ a-ša ša ki-rib-tu₄ |
| | dumu-šu ša ’ir₄ in-nîn ša ši-bân |
| | ša ₄ dû-ia dumu-šu ša kal-ba-a |
| | ša mu 1-kam ₄ kam-bu-zi-ia |
| | lugal tin-ti₄₄ lugal kur-kur ša ina šu₁ ki-rib-tu₄ |
| | dumu-šu ša ’ir₄ in-nîn-na iš-šu-û |

847 The month name is lost in a break, but the seventh month seems like a probable reconstruction, as this was the usual time of the year for the imittu procedure.
849 Edited by Cocquerillat 1968: 84f. 133f. The break in l. 3 could be reconstructed as: [zag a-šaš]. See also the discussion of Marduk-šum-ûsûr’s affairs on p. 163.
850 The tablet is damaged here, but the traces correspond to the sign še.
851 For a list of his attestations see note 695.
852 See above (p. 163f.) for more information.
853 Though without a patronymic or a title, this was certainly our rent farmer.
“10 kurru of barley, in exchange for 10 kurru of dates, from the dates of the imittu obligation from the plot of Kiribu, son of Arad-Innin, pertaining to the sūtu of Bānia, son of Kalbāya, from the first year of Cambyses, king of Babylon, king of Lands, which he had taken from Kiribu, son of Arad-Innin, the property of Ištar of Uruk and Nānāya, ar e owed by Marduk-šum-ùṣur, son of Silim-Bēl, descendant of Basia. In month IV he will deliver these 10 kurru of barley in Eanna using the measure of the Lady of Uruk.

In the presence of Nabû-aḫiddin, the chief administrator of Eanna, son of Nadin, descendant of Daḫibī; (and) Nabû-apluiddin, the royal commissioner of Eanna.

Witnesses: Nabû-apluiddin, son of Bēl-uballiti, descendant of Ša-tābtitišu, Nabû-mukin-apli, son of Marduk-šum-iddin, descendant of [Balātu],
Scribe: Šamaš-mukin-apli, son of Nadin, descendant of Egibī; Uruk; 3-II-2 Camb, king of Babylon, king of lands.”

Bānia’s latest attestation comes therefore from 2 Camb and refers to his sūtu for the first year of Cambyses. This means that the only concrete evidence for his rent farm comes from a period less than two years long (acc Camb - 1 Camb). While it seems likely that his rent farm terminated after 1 Camb, we have no information to help us determine when it was founded. This could have happened as early as 15 Nbn. For the time being there is no way of telling the length of Nabû-bān-āḫi’s career as a rent farmer and accounting for the scarcity of his attestations during Cyrus’ reign.

Not much can be said about the regional extent of his rent farm either. The orchards of Kurbat, situated on the Euphrates and Ḥarri-kibbi, which appear most frequently in the imittu debt notes, were certainly under his responsibility. Occasionally other places such as Takkiru, Nāru-ēšu and Bitqu-ša-Bēl-ēṭer also appear in the texts. The relative frequency of the attestations of a place name is, especially with such a small sample of texts as is available for Nabû-bān-āḫi, not necessarily an indicator for the greater importance of this place. At any rate, the patchy evidence does not allow us to form a picture of Nabû-bān-āḫi’s rent farm and grasp its scale. The uncertainty is exacerbated by the lack of information on his annual dues. We do know, however, that in 8 Cyr Ardia, son of Nabû-bān-āḫi, descendant of Rēmūt-Ea, leased temple orchards for the annual rent of 12,000 kurru of dates. By comparison, Šum-ukin’s and Kalbāya’s rent for the orchards was 10,000 kurru annually, meaning that Ardia was the major rent farmer for dates since 8 Cyr, and whoever else had a rent farm at the same time must have conducted his business on a much smaller scale. It follows that Nabû-bān-āḫi was just a minor rent farmer, at least during the period in which Ardia was active. We can say nothing about his entrepreneurial activities for a stretch of some five to six

---

Kurbat was perhaps a place he neglected, while taking better care of other localities, which resulted in more outstanding debts from this region and by consequence more of its attestations in the documentation.
years, from 2 Cyr until 8 Cyr, just after the dissolution of Kalbäya’s rent farm and before Ardia’s involvement in date cultivation on a big scale. Without further evidence it is impossible to say to what extent Nabû-bân-aḫi’s rent farm was a continuation of his father’s legacy, both in terms of scope of the farm and his success in managing it.

2.9.14.1. Attestations of Nabû-bân-aḫi:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Contents</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YOS 6 177: 4f.</td>
<td>7-VII-16 Nbn</td>
<td>legal, concerning date imittu obligation</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GC 2 98: 3</td>
<td>20-I-3 Cyr</td>
<td>receipt for dates on behalf of Kalbäya/Iq²¡a</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTS 2075: 20, 29</td>
<td>[x-x]-acc Camb</td>
<td>legal, concerning delivery and transfer of debt notes</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIN 1 113: 4, 9</td>
<td>30-I-1 Camb</td>
<td>legal, concerning collecting and delivery of dates</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 7 117: 3f.</td>
<td>8-VII-1 Camb</td>
<td>imittu debt note</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCBT 994: 4f.</td>
<td>8-VII-1 Camb</td>
<td>receipt for dates for the imittu of 1 Camb</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GC 2 119: 3f.</td>
<td>15-[VII]-1 Camb</td>
<td>imittu debt note</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM 114466: 3f.</td>
<td>16-VII-1 Camb</td>
<td>imittu debt note</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCBT 1084: 5f.</td>
<td>11-XI-1 Camb</td>
<td>debt note for arrears of imittu</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 7 113: 13</td>
<td>[x]-XIIî-1 Camb</td>
<td>legal, concerning collecting and delivery of dates</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM 113431: 5</td>
<td>3-II-2 Camb</td>
<td>debt note for barley in exchange for dates</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.9.15. Mûrûnu

Mûrûnu, son of Šamaš-iddin, appears as a rent farmer for dates (ša muḫḫi sūti ša suluppû) in 1 Camb in a witnessed receipt for dates (YOS 7 112). The text states that 220 kurru of dates, fodder for cattle, were received by four individuals from (ina qāt) Mûrûnu. This rent farmer is not known from other sources and so nothing can be said about his background and the scope of his enterprise. It should be noted, however, that he appears to have been active at the same time as two other rent farmers for dates, namely Ardia, son of Nabû-bân-aḫi, and Nabû-bân-aḫi (Bânia), son of Kalbäya, from the Basia family (for these rent farmers see above).

2.9.15.1. Attestations of Mûrûnu:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Contents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YOS 7 112: 8</td>
<td>22-X-1 Camb</td>
<td>receipt for dates</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

855 Another possible attestation is in the undated BM 114618, a list of thirteen workers put at the disposal of Bânia, son of Kalbäya. One of the men appearing in the text, Širîk-Kusu, son of Balîtu, can probably be identified with the scribe of the same name attested from 5 Cyr until 5 Camb (NBDM 89; YOS 7 44; BIN 1 169; YOS 7 179; BM 113395), giving a rough time frame for this text. The letter GC 2 387 (undated), quoted by Cocquerillat (1968: 97) as an attestation of Bânia was in fact written by a certain Ibnîyâ (îlû-â) to îlî-[x]-šar-ušur. This was not necessarily the crown prince Bêl-šar-ušur as Cocquerillat suggests. While the sender can not be identified, the recipient’s name could be reconstructed as [Nabû]-šar-ušur, who was the first royal commissioner of Eanna, who took great interest in its agriculture (Janković 2005: 170). Granted, this identification is not certain, but it appears much more likely that a temple official, rather than the crown prince, would have got detailed accounts on gardeners and farmers and the activities in the Uruk hinterlands as presented in this letter.

856 This column gives the writing of Nabû-bân-aḫi’s name in the text. B stands for the short and N for the long version of the name.

857 It is not clear why this transaction was recorded as legal document rather than an administrative receipt.
2.9.16. Gimillu

Ever since the edition of YOS 7 7 (1 Cyr), a text which San Nicolò dubbed “the monster trial” (1933: 61ff.), Assyriologists have been intrigued by its main protagonist Gimillu, son of Innin-šum-ibni, and dedicated several studies to him.858 In this document (YOS 7 7), a text of 148 lines, Gimillu, who worked at that time for the temple as a collector of arrears of the herdsmen (ša muḫḫi rēḫānī), had been accused of twelve counts of appropriating temple property, sheep, goats and cows, and had been fined with a thirty-fold payment. In addition to this there are other texts which record individual cases with similar accusations;859 however, despite these accusations he managed to stay in this position from at least 17 Nbn until 6 Camb. The fact that Gimillu continued to advance his career seemingly uninterrupted by these charges has been puzzling to the scholars, who attributed to him an array of unflattering titles (e.g., a “clever and brazen swindler”,860 a “Gauner extraordinaire”,861 etc.). Now, more recently Kozuh (2006: 116ff.) pointed out that these negative judgements of Gimillu’s character are perhaps not entirely justified. After reassessing the charges raised against him he came to the conclusion that “Gimillu’s supposed larceny was neither grand nor extraordinary” (Kozuh 2006: 119). In his function as a ša muḫḫi rēḫānī there is only one document which records a conviction on the charges of misappropriating temple property (YOS 7 7). According to Kozuh, it was rather Gimillu’s close relationship with the royal administration which made him an unpopular figure with the temple authorities and brought on a number of accusations against him.863 It is conceivable that he was also not particularly popular with the

859 Kozuh (2006: 117) lists other instances of individual charges against Gimillu: TCL 13 125, 134, YOS 7 31 and 35. However, it should be born in mind that not all the texts in which it is stated that Gimillu took cattle or sheep from the herdsmen constitute charges against him. Some of these documents only refer to his regular activities as the collector of arrears. In TCL 13 134 (4 Cyr) the shepherd Kiṣṭa/Nabû-ah-hidinnu testifies that a sheep that was entrusted to him by another individual and was supposed to be delivered to Eanna was taken from him by Gimillu who in turn failed to deliver it to the temple. The other examples of accusations against Gimillu quoted by Kozuh (TCL 13 125, YOS 7 31 and 35) are in fact not examples of misappropriations of temple animals. He is reported in these texts to have taken sheep and cattle from various individuals. These animals were temple property, as they were marked with a star branding, and it was Gimillu’s duty to collect them on behalf of the temple. There is no mention of him taking or keeping these animals illicitly; in these cases Gimillu was simply doing his job of a collector of arrears and was not under accusation. However, in addition to TCL 13 134 (4 Cyr), there are other texts which record accusations against Gimillu: in BM 114572 (acc Camb) he is said to have kept a donkey which was to be delivered to the temple and used it as a pack animal; in YOS 7 102 (acc Camb) he is accused of hiring out a runaway širku (for an edition and a discussion of the text see San Nicolò 1933: 73ff. and Joannès 2000a: 226ff.); according to YOS 7 96 (acc Camb) he unlawfully (ina šigiliti) took two carcasses of oxen and seven hides; BM 113408 (3 Camb) records a misappropriation of two cows. In PTS 2290 (4 Camb) it is stated that Gimillu had used temple oxen for ploughing and that these had died before the plough. It is not clear whether this case also implied that he kept and used the temple cattle unlawfully or whether the purpose of the statement was simply to account for the missing cattle.
862 He is accused of misappropriating three cows and ten sheep and goats (Kozuh 2006: 117), of taking away a širku-širku-garmen of and of accepting two shekels of silver as a bribe from an indebted herdsmen. For these offences he was imposed a thirty-fold fine: 92 cows, 302 heads of small cattle and 1 mina 10 shekels of silver (for the bribe and the garment). The figures presented by the fine (line 147) do not match up exactly with the individual counts of misappropriated cattle (this is discussed by San Nicolò 1933: 71 note 4). Jursa suggests that the office of the ša muḫḫi rēḫānī was an innovation initiated by the royal administration (2004a: 123). Kozuh spins this further: “If Gimillu was given a royal mandate to organize and register the Eanna’s animals kept on the hoof with its herdsmen, to extract animals from the herdsmen in a way that perhaps allowed him to take some animals as profit, and to hunt down and use force against delinquent herdsmen and cattle thieves, it is quite possible that this overarching power brought about the indignation and resentment of the resident temple authorities. It is also possible that he was viewed as a collaborator with the Persian occupiers. In fact, (...) the vilification of Gimillu in texts such as YOS 7 7
temple dependants because of his presumably high-handed treatment of the people with whom he had contact in his function as ša muḫḫi ṛēḫāni. While the documents recording charges against Gimillu are no conclusive evidence for his offences, it is safe assume that at least some of the allegations against him were justified. At the same time, he was supported by a member of the royal administration, at least until he got engaged in the temple agriculture, which made it possible for him to have a fairly long career despite his offences and being unpopular with the temple administration. Already San Nicolò assumed that he must have had a powerful patron (1933: 73). Van Driel came to the same conclusion: “How is it possible that a simple širku, Gimillu, perhaps with his wider family, could defy the dignitaries of an institution like Eanna? That would seem possible only if the man had protectors” (1998: 67). This patron was probably Nabû-šarru-ûṣur, the ša rēš šarrī bēl piqitti of Eanna: from a recently published text (PTS 2269 = AOAT 358, no. 10, see below) we know that Gimillu was the messenger (mār šipri) of this official in 8 Nbn. Nabû-šarru-ûṣur was in this position from 1 to 13 Nbn. This means that Gimillu must have found other patrons who supported him, particularly during the reigns of Cyrus and Cambyses when he worked as the ša muḫḫi ṛēḫāni for the temple. His relatively short-lived career as a rent farmer at the beginning of Darius’s reign suggests that he had lost this support at this time.

In this context Gimillu’s family and social status are also of interest. Jursa’s article published in 2004 in WZKM 94 is of particular relevance for this matter as it contains five previously unpublished texts of which four shed more light on his family and private affairs. Gimillu had a brother, Iddiniaya who appears in a temple court interrogation in 2 Dar (TCL 13 181, see below), and who was also involved in date cultivation (TCL 13 183). Both of them were širku. So far only four instances are known in which Gimillu is designated as a širku. Interestingly, he appears with this designation for the first time in 8 Cyr, i.e. in the second half of his active career which spanned at least some 29 years (from 8 Nbn until 2 Dar). Not much can be said about Gimillu’s father Innin-šum-ibni: Jursa (2004a: 119) suggests identifying him with Innin-šum-ibni/Nabû-alḫē-šullim/naggārû from BM 114628 from 2 Cyr. Here he appears as a date-imittu debtor of Šamaš-mukin-âpli/Madân-alḫē-iddin/Šigûa, a holder of a brewer’s prebend. According to Jursa, he may also be attested in BM 114494 (10 Nbn), albeit without a family name. Here Innin-šum-ibni hired a man for agricultural work on a plot of the Lady of Uruk which was at his disposal. Gimillu’s mother Aḫâṣunu appears in one of the texts published by Jursa (WZKM 94, no. 1, 4 Cyr). She was involved, at least in one instance, in handling of the sheep of the temple. In this text four women, wives of the herdsmen of the regular offerings, testify that Aḫâṣunu entrusted them with two sheep and a lamb. It is not clear whether this case represented an illegal action on her part and how this was connected to her son’s activities. While Gimillu’s mother seems to have been a temple dependant, judging by the lack of filiation in this text (Jursa 2004a: 112), he and his brother resulted from an attempt to rein in a heavy-handed, Babylon-supported bureaucrat. If Gimillu was a royal agent and was thought to be compiling fiscal information about the Eanna for the crown, and/or if his royal connections insulated him from the usual ways by which the Eanna controlled its authorities (demotions, loss of prebends, social pressure, etc.), then it is possible that the resident temple authorities kept him in check by treating him as a common cattle thief when specific allegations of misappropriation arose (2006: 124). Ragen comes to a similar conclusion independently of Kozuh. He speaks of a power struggle between the temple and the state administration, rather than the royal commissioner of the temple. The text is partially translated and discussed by Stolper 2003: 267ff. For a full edition and a discussion see Ragen 2006: 94ff. See also Kozuh 2006: 123f.

864 There is at least some indication that not all the accusations raised against him were warranted: in the case recorded in WZKM 94, no. 5 (Jursa 2004a: 126ff.) a woman accused Gimillu of hiring a hitman to kill the bēl piqitti of Eanna, Sin-šar-ûṣur. This allegation is refuted by another witness whose testimony is also recorded in this text. Furthermore, Jursa noted that the royal commissioner is attested as alive and active four months after this court hearing (2004a: 129).

865 Gimillu’s connection to the state administration in Babylon is reflected in YOS 7 70 from 8 Cyr. In this text he reports to the temple authorities on the instructions he received from the Babylonian governor Gûbaru concerning the duties of the temple širku. In other words, Gimillu played here the role of the middleman between the temple and the state administration, rather than the royal commissioner of the temple. The text is partially translated and discussed by Stolper 2003: 267ff. For a full edition and a discussion see Ragen 2006: 94ff. See also Kozuh 2006: 123f.

866 YOS 7 70 (8 Cyr), YOS 7 149 (3 Camb), TCL 13 182 (2 Dar), YNER 1 2 (2 Dar).
may have in fact stemmed from an upper class family. In one debt note recording Gimillu’s purchase of a slave he is designated as a descendant of the naggāru family (WZKM 94, no. 3, acc Cyr). In case this person is identical with our Gimillu, this would be a singular attestation of a širkū with a family name. Jursa, who considers this identification probable, suggested as a possible explanation that Gimillu and his brother Iddinäya could have been dedicated to the temple by their family for religious or economic reasons, e.g., indebtedness (2004a: 118). Perhaps this dedication occurred later in their lives, if one is to attach some importance to the relatively late attestation of Gimillu’s širkū-status from 8 Cyr.

We know from PTS 3045 that Gimillu rented a house from the temple property sometime during the first five years of Cyrus’s reign. This may be taken as another indication of Gimillu’s privileged status. He was married to a certain Ilata, daughter of Nūrêa, as is evident from WZKM 94, no. 2 from 5 Camb (Jursa 2004a: 113ff.). This private document, possibly from Gimillu’s private archive, was a debt note for one mina of silver, which belonged to Ilata; her husband and two other men were the debtors. Ilata was entitled to the interest on her capital, while the three debtors were going to share equally any prospective profit, indicating that they must have undertaken some sort of business partnership. His wife’s possession of this not so negligible amount of silver is yet another atypical circumstance for the širkū milieu, but is not so unusual considering the possibility that Gimillu stemmed from an Urukean upper class family.

During his active career, which, as was mentioned, lasted for almost three decades, Gimillu had at least three different functions: he first acted as an agent of the royal commissioner of Eanna as a tax collector and was then consecutively employed in two different branches of the temple economy as collector of arrears of the animal husbandry and as rent farmer. Gimillu’s first so far known attestation is from the eighth year of Nabonidus, from the text PTS 2269, which was published by Kleber in AOAT 358 (2008: 99ff.) as no. 10. This text records a statement of the goldsmith Šamañ-ana-bitšu that another party, Zêria/Ibnäya/Egibi, was going to make a silver payment to Gimillu within four or five days from the drafting of the document. The payment in question was a kind of tax for bricks imposed on the temple enterers and the priest council (kinaštu) of Eanna. Gimillu is designated here as the messenger (mâr šîprît) of the royal commissioner of Eanna who collects the payment claims for bricks imposed on the priests. Already this first attestation shows him in a position of considerable responsibility and suggests a close relationship between him and the royal representative in the temple, a relationship which may have proven useful for his further career. Unfortunately not much more can be said about Gimillu’s activities as a tax collector as there is no pertinent documentation. This attestation is followed by gap in the documentation of some nine years: he next appears in the Eanna archive at the end of Nabonidus’s reign (YOS 6 208) in 17 Nbn. Here he already took on his next function in the temple’s animal husbandry sector. His main task was to enforce the delivery of cattle, sheep and wool owed to the temple by shepherds and cattle herders and occasionally to bring the indebted herdsmen to the temple, probably for the purpose of the settling of accounts. In this context he

867 Ragen considers this identification to be unlikely as this would be a singular case of a širkū with lineage. Furthermore, it is not possible to link the protagonists in this text with our Gimillu with any degree of certainty. Instead, he suggests that this was simply a case of homonymy (2006:502). While it remains uncertain whether our Gimillu indeed was a member of the naggāru-family, it is beyond doubt that he enjoyed a special status among the širkūs.

868 The year is broken off, but the text can be roughly dated to 1-5 Cyr, because the house was rented to Gimillu by the bēl piqitti of Eanna, Nabû-alj-iddin, and the šatammu, Nidinti-Bēl, and the letter official was in office during this time span (Kleber 2008: 34).

869 Ragen speaks in this context of elite širkūtu (2006: 469ff.). In other words, the širkū society was stratified including “upper and lower class” širkūs. The upper class širkūs were often employed in mid-managerial positions and usually had close ties with the royal administration (ibid.: 477).

870 Zêria was the šatammu of Eanna with two terms of office. He was the šatammu from 2 Ami to 1 Ner and was reinstated in 11 Nbn until 13 Nbn (Kleber 2008: 33f.). At the time of this document (8 Nbn) he was not in office.

871 AOAT 358 no. 10 ll. 16-20: 1gi-mil-ku a-šu ša 2in-nin-na-mu-šu / 3a-kin ša 4ag-ugal-uru / 5sagugal 6en пи-шт-тэ / е-ан-na ša ü-si-ir-tu, ša kù-babbar ša a-guru kù-babbar / ša ina ugu ḫkur-ešme ū “ki-na-aš-ti / ša ē-an-na is-si-ir.”
appears with the title ša muḫḫi ṛēḫānī, literally “one in charge of the arrears”.

The temple administration would make accounts of the owed animals and wool (ṭuppi ṛēḫānī) according to which Gimillu would collect these debts on behalf of the temple. A document from 4 Cyr records Gimillu’s refusal to accept one such tablet from the temple administration and de facto the obligation expressed by it (WZKM 94, no. 4 = BM 113293, Jursa 2004a: 119ff.). The reason for this was probably an unrealistically high target set for him by the temple. The account of the arrears (ṭuppi ṛēḫānī) is also mentioned in YOS 7 198 (6 Camb). The text records how Gimillu was summoned to the temple assembly and asked to collect and deliver to the temple the arrears recorded in this account. Here too Gimillu tried to evade his duties by fleeing; however, he got caught. It is not clear what implications this episode had for his further career. Incidentally, this is his last attestation in the function of a ša muḫḫi ṛēḫānī, in which he had remained for over 16 years. Gimillu’s activities as the ša muḫḫi ṛēḫānī are of little relevance for the study of Eanna’s agriculture and will not be dealt with here any further.

The exact date of Gimillu’s employment as Eanna’s rent farmer is not known. His rent contract has not come down to us. He appears as ša muḫḫi sūṭī ša Bēltī ša Uruk for the first time in the tenth month of Darius’s accession year, in a document concerning the responsibilities of three men, probably rab epinnis, in a canal digging project (YOS 21 205). Ardia, the previous rent farmer, appears for the last time actively in the imittu debt notes from 7 Camb, indicating that the rent farm for dates was transferred from him to Gimillu either at the very end of Cambyses’s reign or during Darius’s accession year, before the tenth month. Prior to this, his last attestation is from 6 Camb (YOS 7 198), still in the function of ša muḫḫi ṛēḫānī. There is, therefore, no evidence for Gimillu’s activities for a period of about two years. This is unfortunate, as during this period he would have wrapped up his business as ša muḫḫi ṛēḫānī and took another career path. Without any pertinent evidence one can only speculate about his success in the area of animal husbandry and ultimately about the motivation for switching over to the agricultural sector.

At this point Gimillu was not a newcomer to Eanna’s agricultural sphere. He is attested already in 3 Camb in one imittu list of date deliveries (NCBT 399) as a supplier of 20 kurru of dates. At this time Ardia was in charge of the rent farm for dates. This implies that Gimillu was responsible for a date palm orchard of the Lady of Uruk, either as a gardener or as a sub-lessee. Another document from 4 Camb (PTS 2290) gives evidence for his activities on arable land. The main concern of the temple administration expressed in this text was the death of oxen belonging to the Lady of Uruk, about which šīrku testified. The oxen were used by Gimillu for ploughing in Kapru-ša-nāqidātī according to this testimony. While it is known that Eanna owned land in this locality, there is no indication as to the nature of Gimillu’s activities in this area. In other words, it is impossible to say whether he was working on institutional or private land. In the latter case his use of temple cattle may have been illicit and could represent evidence for the abuse of his office of ša muḫḫi ṛēḫānī. At least in the case of the date orchard in NCBT 399, his obligation toward the temple makes it clear that he was responsible for temple land. However, these obligations were incomparably smaller than those which he later had as a fermier général. His responsibility amounted to no more than that of a simple ploughman or gardener.

At the start of Darius’s rule he obtained the control over the entire date plantations of the temple and a large part of its arable land as ša muḫḫi sūṭī. His career as a rent farmer was surprisingly short lived, in contrast to his previous “success” as a ša muḫḫi ṛēḫānī. He was in charge of the revenues of Eanna’s land for probably no more than two years.

The area under Gimillu’s responsibility was second in size only to Šum-ukīn’s and Kalbāya’s rent farm. He was provided with 1,000 kurru of barley for seed, 200 draught animals (and ploughmen?) and iron for the ploughs in return for which he was to deliver 12,000 kurru of dates and 10,000 kurru of barley yearly. These figures stem from a text recording the dissolution of

872 He is attested with this title for the first time in 2 Cyr (BM 114587).
874 The text is edited on p. 104.
875 In the latter, more probable, case other people would have done the actual work in the garden.
876 The text will be published by G. Frame.
877 Gimillu does appear in connection with this locality on one more occasion. YOS 21 209 (1 Nbk IV), a private document recording his purchase of some wooden objects, was also written there.
his rent farm and its transfer to Bēl-gimlanni, son of Madān-ērēš, a širku and the official in charge of the cash box (ša muḫḫi quppi), in 2 Dar (TCL 13 182). As the text is edited elsewhere it will be presented here in translation only:

“The Bēl-gimlanni, the one in charge of the cash box of Eanna, son of Madān-ērēš, said of his free will to Bēl-iddin, the chief administrator of Eanna, son of Šin-ērēš, descendant of Ibnī-il, to Nergal-šar-usur, the gīpu, and to Barik-ilī, the royal commissioner of Eanna, as follows: ‘(As regards) 10,000 kurru of barley and 12,000 kurru of dates, the rent concerning which Gimillu, the širku of Ištar of Uruk, son of Innin-šum-inbi, to whom you gave 1,000 kurru of barley for seed, 200 oxen for the ploughs, which are at his disposal, and iron for the repairs of the ploughs, (and) who did not comply with this rent of 10,000 kurru of barley and 12,000 kurru of dates, said as follows: ‘Give me 400 ploughmen, 600 heads of cattle, and 1,000 kurru of barley for seed, and I will pay you 10,000 kurru of barley and 12,000 kurru of dates. Otherwise I will not pay (you the rent). You can give the rent farm to whom ever you want.’” Then Bēl-gimlanni, the širku of Ištar of Uruk, the one in charge of the cash box of Eanna, son of Madān-ērēš, who of his own free will had requested the rent farm, said as follows: ‘Give to me in the first year 1,000 kurru of barley for seed, 200 heads of oxen for the ploughs and more or less (the same number of) ploughmen, and I will deliver for the property of Eanna 10,000 kurru of barley to the threshing floors and 12,000 kurru of dates to the enclosures; in the first year I will also deliver to the fattening stables ten flawless bulls for the regular offerings of the Lady of Uruk.’

Bēl-iddin, Nergal-šar-usur and Barik-ilī spoke in the assembly of Babylonians and Urukeans, of the temple enterers of Ištar of Uruk, and of the priest council of Eanna, following Bēl-gimlanni’s speech. They imposed on him a yearly payment of 10,000 kurru of barley and 12,000 kurru of dates for the property of Eanna. In the seventh month of 2 Dar he shall deliver ten flawless bulls to the fattening stables, aside from the 22,000 kurru of barley and dates, the rent which is imposed on him. In the second year, in the fourth month, Bēl-iddin, Nergal-šar-usur, and Barik-ilī will give from the property of Ištar of Uruk to Bēl-gimlanni, the rent farmer, 200 oxen, the remainder of 400 oxen, 50 workers, old men, children, for the ploughs, the cattle, and the ploughmen, which are at his disposal. He will do the required work. He will not take away any cattle or ploughmen from the property of Ištar of Uruk, aside from these (aforementioned), however much rental area is at his disposal. By the end of the year he shall pay 10,000 kurru of barley and 12,000 kurru of dates to the property of Eanna. (This is) aside from the hallatu-orchards, which are at the disposal of the prebendary gardeners, and the arable land which will be given as remainder to the property of Eanna. He shall dig the large canals (with funding) from Eanna. He shall deliver the 12,000 kurru of dates at one time. (This is) aside from the rations of the governor of Esagil, the scribes, the gatekeepers, and the measurers, which Bēl-gimlanni must deliver. On the fields and in the waterlogged areas sheep and cattle of the Lady of Uruk will graze. The rent farm is at the disposal of Bēl-gimlanni from the fourth month of the second year (of Darius). Per each kurru of dates he will deliver a load of twigs, buds and palm fronds.

(Witnesses...) 13-IV-2 Dar, king of Babylon, king of lands.”

While Gimillu controlled the entire date production of the temple, except the hallatu orchards, he rented less than a third of the temple’s arable land; the rest was probably placed under direct exploitation through temple ploughmen, who were supervised by the officials recruited from their own ranks, the rab epinnī. TCL 13 182 informs us that Gimillu was unsatisfied with the conditions under which he was to manage his farm. The need to invest from his own stock seems to have been the main point of contention: while the provided amount of seed seems to have been

879 The line 20 enumerates the additional workers which are to be supplied as follows: “50 štqa-bi igit ša-ḫar”. It is not clear what the exact difference between šibu (igi) and labīru (libir) is; both words have the basic meaning “old”. Cocquerillat suggests interpreting labīru as “une personne « débile »” (1968: 43 note 114).
880 This figure is derived from the comparison of the amount of seed provided to Gimillu and Šum-ukin, namely, 1,000 and 3,000 kurru of barley respectively. While Šum-ukin had most of Eanna’s arable land under his control, it is evident from other rent contracts which were drawn up during Nabonidus’s reign (e.g. YOS 6 40 and 41 (both from 3 Nbn), TCL 12 90 (8 Nbn)) that he had not rented all of the temple’s arable holdings.
adequate,881 Gimillu complained about the number of oxen and workers put at his disposal. The new rent farmer Bēl-gimlanni quotes Gimillu as saying that he would only be capable of paying the requisite rent if he were provided with 400 farmers and 600 oxen. Otherwise he would not pay the rent and the temple administrators could give the farm to whomever they pleased. This in fact happened. Bēl-gimlanni proposed to rent the farm under the unfavourable conditions criticized by Gimillu and even offered to provide ten flawless bulls for the regular offerings of the Lady of Uruk in the first year on top of the rent payment. The temple administration accepted his offer and let him the farm for five years; however, it conceded to provide him with another 200 draught animals and 50 workers in the second year. Evidently the problem of the productivity of the arable land brought about by an inadequate contingent of manpower and draught animals was ultimately the cause of the failure of Gimillu’s rent farm and its subsequent transfer to Bēl-gimlanni. For an area of 1,000 kuru (ca. 1,250 ha) and the 200 draught animals, i.e. 50 plough teams, this meant an area of 20 kuru (ca. 25ha) per plough. By comparison, the ‘Edict of Belšazzar’ set an area of 25 kuru per plough team and the plough teams of Šum-ukin had to tackle even 30 kuru of land. Van Driel has shown that 25 kuru stipulated by the ‘Edict’ were a very high work-load, verging on the impossible (1990: 224ff.). With the temple’s concession of another 200 oxen in the second year of Bēl-gimlanni’s contract the ploughing area would have been halved, i.e. 10 kuru (ca. 12.5ha) per team. This would have been a reasonable work-load. The temple was willing to provide another 50 men for the new rent farmer in the second year. However, there is not much we can say about this parameter, as we do not know what the size of the contingent originally put at Gimillu’s disposal was.882 It seems as though Gimillu’s complaints were not unjustified when even the temple administration was ready to make concessions to his successor. However, Gimillu’s misappropriation of temple dates and withholding of documentation necessary for the rent collection (see below) were unacceptable, and the temple was more than willing to comply with his insolent proposal to hand the farm over to someone else.

Considering that the main problem Gimillu faced was an inadequate workforce for the tilling of the arable land, the more peculiar it is to find no texts connected to the administration of the production of barley, such as imittu debt notes for barley or lists of barley deliveries. What is more, the documentation we have for Gimillu’s activities as a rent farmer is dominated by a large number of imittu debt notes for dates from Darius’s first year (dated to 1 Nbk IV). These constitute about 77% of the extant material relevant to his rent farming career. The conclusion is then that our documentation does not adequately represent the problems which Gimillu’s farm was facing. The high concentration of the imittu debt notes for dates and the problems in the area of date cultivation, which may have been implied by their existence, on the other, are not reflected in TCL 13 182, the document in which Gimillu airs his dissatisfaction with the conditions of his rent farm.

Clearly the material that has come down to us is far from complete and therefore it is very difficult to assess the extent of Gimillu’s failure in the rent farming business. The bulk of the debt notes for dates which have come down to us reflects the archival practices, rather than problems with the management of the rent farm. Van Driel (1998: 68) suggested that these texts may have been

881 This amount of seed, 1,000 kuru, may have been adequate only in theory, though. In the letter YOS 3 8 Gimillu complains to an official (the title is damaged; Coquery-Lancrin (1968: 103. 140) suggests reading it “šita₄ tin(?)-tur(?)(û)₅”) about various problems: that there is no barley in Eanna that year (ll. 5-6); that only 1,100 kuru of barley, which the addressee took for regular offerings, have been imposed as yield estimate on his rent farm (ll. 7-10); that no help is coming from Babylon where he sent 5 minas of silver (for barley purchases?) (ll. 12-17). He points out that he asked for barley for seed (from the Eanna officials?) but was refused on the grounds that they were held in Ur (ll. 24-26) and that he was assigned 500 kuru of barley for seed in the presence of the addressee (ll. 34-36). Does this last remark refer to the endorsement of Gimillu’s rent farm through a high Babylonian official, the addressee of the letter? If so, the amount of seed assigned to him would have been doubled in the meantime to 1,000 kuru, as is evident from TCL 13 182. Be that as it may, the exact connotations of the letter are not clear; however, it demonstrates that there were serious problems concerning the barley production of Gimillu’s rent farm.

882 The model plough team from the ‘Edict of Belšazzar’ consisted of four oxen and four men. Following this model one could assume that around 200 men were originally at Gimillu’s disposal operating with 200 oxen in 50 teams. Additional 50 men and 200 oxen promised to Bēl-gimlanni, however, would create a disproportion between the human and the animal workforce. It should be noted, though, that the additional 50 men were not ploughmen: the temple could only offer to provide old men and children, which were presumably to be used as auxiliary workers; the experienced, qualified ploughmen were still in short supply.
discarded together with other tablets in the Gartenhof area of the temple after Gimillu’s affairs had been wound up and the texts had lost their significance for the temple administration.  

Apart from a small group of texts from the end of Gimillu’s career at Eanna which concerned the disclosing of his machinations and the dissolution of his farm (see below), the documentation we have for his activities as a rent farmer are fairly unexciting. Among these texts there are three imittu lists for dates (YOS 21 211, YOS 17 300 (1 Nbk IV), TCL 13 183 (2 Dar)) and six land lease contracts (two leases for sharecropping: YOS 21 207 and 208, both from the fifth month of 1 Nbk IV; two orchard leases for gardening: YOS 21 214 (1 Nbk IV), Spar, Studies, no. 8 (1 Dar); and two leases of orchards with stipulations for cultivation of the arable land beneath the palm trees: NCBT 630 (1 [Nbk IV] and NCBT 677 (year and king’s name lost, probably [1 Nbk IV])). There is also a private document (YOS 21 209, 1 Nbk IV) recording his purchase of a wooden chest (šiddatu) and two other objects for half a mina of silver, and the already mentioned YOS 21 205 from the tenth month of acc Dar, in which Gimillu appears for the first time with the title ša muḫḫi sītu. Though the text is not perfectly clear, it sheds some light on the hierarchy of agricultural officials at that time. In this court protocol Gimillu accused three rab epinnis, who were presumably in charge of the management of the arable land not included in Gimillu’s rent farm, of negligence with regard to canal digging. The upkeep of the irrigation system was one of the duties of a rent farmer usually recorded in the rent contract. The rab epinnis had similar obligations toward the temple. They were not only in charge of supervising the ploughmen’s agricultural activities, but were responsible for rallying them for public works as well. In YOS 21 205 they had to justify their actions to Gimillu. This suggests that they were answerable to him as the highest agricultural official at the time. The text gives evidence for the interaction of the system of direct management of arable land through temple officials, which had been in use during Cambyses’s reign when there were no large-scale rent farmers for barley, and the rent farm system.

Even before Gimillu’s conflict with the temple administration on account of his rent farm started he found himself in a rather unpleasant situation. In a record of a court proceedings (WZKM 94, no. 5 = YBC 6932) from the 18th day of the first month of 1 Dar a širku Zumbu, son of Rēmût, testified before the assembly that he was told by Anu-zēr-štadī, son of Lābāšī, another širku, that: “Gimillu, the rent farmer of Ištar of Uruk, had drawn up a contract for the assassination of Sin-šar-ṣur, the royal commissioner of Eanna” (ll. 16-18). Then Anu-zēr-štadī testified under oath that he had never heard anything about such a contract nor had he talked about it to Zumbu. This information that the text gives us, but it is known from other sources that Sin-šar-ṣur was not assassinated in the first month of Darius’s first year: he appeared four months later in another legal text (YOS 15 10, 5-V-1 Nbk IV). It is, however, not clear whether there had been a failed attempt at assassinating the šēl pāqitū of Eanna. Indeed, such attempts did occasionally happen. At any rate, Gimillu seems to have been cleared of these charges, as there are no visible disruptions in his career at this point: following this incident several sub-leases of land belonging to his rent farm were made (YOS 21 207, YOS 21 208 and YOS 21 214), imittu debt notes (see Appendix 5). The cumulative impost in these texts amounts to 2,669 kurru of dates, which was about 22% of Gimillu’s yearly rent. Were these the tablets which Gimillu had hidden from the temple administration (cf. TCL 13 181, below), which the temple eventually reclaimed and discarded after finishing the accounting for Gimillu’s rent farm? Or were the imposts from these debt notes regularly settled and for that reason of no interest for the temple administration?

This particular list was compiled after the dissolution of Gimillu’s farm during the process of the settling of accounts and belongs in fact to the afore mentioned dossier.

The existence of Gimillu’s private documents in the Eanna archive may be connected to the process of settling of accounts as was seen in Šum-ukin’s case. Beside YOS 21 209 two other private texts are known to us: a debt note for silver belonging to Gimillu’s wife, WZKM 94, no. 2 (5 Camb), and his purchase of a slave, WZKM 94, no. 3 (acc Cyr), both published by Jursa 2004a: 113ff. 116f.

The signs are not clear, but could be read either as gišku-siše-e or gišma-siše-e. Either way, the meaning of the word is not known to me.

See for instance TCL 13 182, the transfer of Gimillu’s rent farm to Bēl-gimlanni, in which it is stipulated that the lessee will dig a large canal with the funds of Eanna (l. 26).

Published and edited by Jursa 2004a: 126ff.
Appendix 5) and *imittu* lists (YOS 21 211 and YOS 17 300) were compiled, which suggests a regular progression of his rent farming business.

The reasons for charging Gimillu with an attempted assassination are a matter of pure speculation. It is not difficult to imagine that he was not particularly popular among the dependants of Eanna ever since his employment as a debt collector for the temple and that some of these people could have been spreading rumours about him. It remains questionable, though, whether Gimillu himself contributed to the rise of such rumours. Perhaps he was already at this point on bad terms with the temple administration, the *bēl piqitti* in particular, because of the unfavourable conditions of his rent contract, as Jursa suggested (2004a: 129). Be that as it may, during the first year of Darius some serious malpractices with regard to the rent farm for dates must have occurred, as a consequence of which the dates did not reach the temple. The temple administration investigated this in the first months of 2 Dar.

The first document we have from Darius’s second year is from the third month: Truro 16 records that in the assembly of *mār banē* Gimillu returned to Nabû-tāris, son of [x], descendant of Eḫēru, one mina of silver and a silver vessel weighing 51 shekels, which had been entrusted to him. The background of this matter is not known to us and its connotations for Gimillu’s career are not clear. However, the next text, written on 12-IV-2 Dar, provides straightforward evidence for an offence (YNER 1 2). In it Gimillu swore not to have sold or given away as present the dates pertaining to the rent of the first year of Darius to anyone, except for the 90 *kurru* of dates to which he had confessed (earlier?): [*]gi-mi-lu (...) / (...) it-te-me ki-i zû-lum-ma / 98*bān šá mu l-kam 'dāri-ia-a-mu-uds (...) / (...) a-na ku-babbar ad-di-in ú a-na re-e-μu-ti] / a-na man-ma a-re-e-me e-lat 90 gur zû-lum-ma / šá gi-mi-lu e-li rama-ni-šu ili-in (YNER 1 2: 1-7). The text is concluded with a conditional verdict, which stipulated the usual penalty, a thirty-fold payment of the owed dates in case a witness appeared who would testify against Gimillu. He admitted, presumably at earlier proceedings, to having misappropriated 90 *kurru* of dates. These probably stemmed from his rent farm and were supposed to be delivered to the temple. Gimillu denied having sold any other dates. Whether he was saying the truth or not, it is clear that the temple had tangible evidence at least for an amount of 90 *kurru* of dates. We are not told how he was penalised for this offence. This information would have been contained in a separate document which has not come down to us and may have entailed a thirty-fold penalty payment, i.e. 2,700 *kurru* of dates. At this point Gimillu’s relationship with the temple administration was badly deteriorated. Only one day after this incident his rent farm was dissolved and transferred to Bēl-gimilanni (TCL 13 182, 13-IV-2 Dar).

For about two months we have no news about Gimillu. His next appearance is in a text written at the beginning of the sixth month of 2 Dar (TCL 13 181), which records the interrogation of his brother Iddinīaya by the temple administrators. The document is presented here in translation because Moore (1935: 185ff.), who edited the text, misunderstood some sections.⁸⁹¹

“Bēl-iddin, the administrator of Eanna, son of Sīn-ēreš, descendant of Epeš-ili, and Barakki-ili, the royal commissioner of Eanna, said to Iddinīaya, son of Innin-šum-ibni, the *širku* of Ištar of Uruk, as follows: ‘Certainly’⁸⁹² there are (either) debt notes for dates and break,⁸⁹³ the impost of

---

⁸⁹⁰ Nabû-tāris could be identical with the individual of the same name with the title butcher of Bēl and Esagil (*jābīlu ša Bēl u Esagil*), who appears in the letter YOS 3 8: 15f. in connection with five minas of silver which Gimillu gave to three other men.

⁸⁹¹ See also the translation of this text by Joannès 2000a: 227 and the edition by Ragen 2006: 488ff..

⁸⁹² For the adverbial use of *iḥašši* with the meaning “it is certain, certainly” see CAD B: 155. Note also Jursa’s translation of this passage: “there must certainly be promissory notes for dates and break (read: barley), the impost on the fields belonging to the Lady of Uruk and Nanaja, under your care; or do you know where they have been put?” (Waerzeggers (with a contribution by Jursa) 2008: 30).

⁸⁹³ A *hepi*-remark (literally “broken”) was used to record any breaks in the original manuscript when copying cuneiform tablets. Its appearance in a text is a clear sign that the text is a copy, usually made in the course of a scribal training. In TCL 13 181 there are four such remarks (ll. 4, 6, 19, 20), which indicates that the tablet is a copy and perhaps the product of an apprentice scribe. Interestingly, all of these remarks appear in the same part of a recurring phrase, namely: “debt notes and break”. In line 5 the “debt notes and break” are further designated as “the impost of plots, property of the Lady of Uruk and Nanīya”, suggesting that the word obscured by the *hepi*-remark probably referred to some other kind of document connected to the yield
plots, property of the Lady of Uruk and Nanâya, at your disposal, or you know where they are being kept. The container894 with the debt notes and break, which are the property (of the Lady of Uruk and Nanâya), which your wife Andia had deposited in the house of Kudurrânu, the slave of Rukanna, to whom do they belong? Iddînâya swore in the assembly of the mûr banê by Bêl, Nabû and Darius, king of Babylon, king of lands: ‘In the container895 with the debt notes, which Andia, my wife, deposited in the house of Kudurrânu, there is no property of the Lady of Uruk. Those are my debt notes.’ Then Bêl-iddin, the administrator of Eanna, and Barakki-ilî said to Iddînâya as follows: ‘Why did you not give us the debt notes, which Gimillu, your brother, entrusted to you? We could not collect the dates.’ Iddînâya said in the assembly of the mûr banê as follows: ‘Gimillu, who had entrusted the debt notes and break to me, had written (to me) as follows: “Do not give the debt notes and break to anyone without my consent!”’

Uruk; 6-VI-2 Dar, king of Babylon, king of lands.”

Gimillu’s brother Iddînâya was questioned about the debt notes which his wife deposited in the house of a privately owned slave and which the temple administration suspected were the property of the Lady of Uruk. He denied this under oath claiming that those debt notes were his property. Then the šatammu and the bêl piqitti reproached him for withholding the debt notes, which Gimillu had entrusted to him, thereby making it impossible for them to collect the dates. To this he only replied that he had written instructions from Gimillu not to hand over the debt notes to anyone without his consent. These may have been the imittu debt notes from the first year of Darius (i.e. 1 Nbk IV) which have come down to us in a considerable number.896 It is conceivable that Gimillu intended to disrupt the temple administration in collecting these dates in order to do so himself and keep/sell them. Gimillu appears not to have been present at the proceedings. It seems that he was away from Uruk some time prior to this interrogation. This would explain the necessity to send written instructions to his brother about the debt notes in his keeping. Van Driel suggested that “Gimillu had absconded and had hidden his administration” (1998: 67), perhaps after realising that he would not be able to fulfil his rent obligations toward the temple.

Another document written in Gimillu’s absence was TCL 13 183. It was written on 6-VI-2 Dar, i.e. on the same day as the previously discussed interrogation of his brother, TCL 13 181. These two documents provide us with Gimillu’s last two attestations. TCL 13 183 is a short list recording the amounts of dates which Gimillu had collected as part of the impost for the first year of Darius. The heading reads: zû-lum-ma nîg-ga d’innin unugkiša šà1 gi-mîl-lu uî-l-tu zág a-sâ’ame/sâ mú u 1-kam1 da-ri-ia-muš lugal tin-tirklugal kur-kur iš-su-ti iti kin ud 6-kam mú 2-kam (ll. 1-4). Only five entries are listed of which one records a payment in silver (1 mina) and two túg0kur0ra of dates. The other four deliveries amount to 130 kurru of dates (of which 15 kurru stemmed from Gimillu’s brother Iddînâya). The significance of this text is hard to grasp; it is not possible to say whether these dates were (the only ones?) delivered to the temple as part of

estimation procedure. Terms like lê’u (wooden ledger) or gîttu (receipt) spring to mind as possible reconstructions. Perhaps it is just a coincidence that all four hepi-remarks in this text appear in one particular recurring phrase and apparently refer to the same word. However, it also seems possible that the apprentice scribe could not read or understand the signs in the original (owing to his incapacity rather than the state of preservation of the tablet), and spared himself the embarrassment of having to ask his teacher for help by inserting this remark.

894 The signs are damaged in this part of the text, but a collation of the tablet at the Louvre resulted in the following reading: gi nu uši su šà u-îl-ti. The word we are looking for therefore must be mûshû, a “(reed) container” (see CAD N II: 319 and AHw: 805 sub mushû with a late Babylonian variant nûsû). Other types of containers, boxes and baskets, for storing clay tablets are also attested. In PTS 2075, for instance, we have encountered wooden (qappû) and reed (šaddû) containers used for keeping imittu debt notes (see p. 228). A similar phrasing is used again in TCL 13 181 in line 11 (see below). The visible traces suggest that one should probably reconstruct the same word as the one at the beginning of line 11 (ki-î gi nu su e šà u-îl-ti...). Unfortunately, the signs in this line, which are legible and faithfully reproduced in Contenuau’s copy, do not make much sense.

895 The signs at the beginning of line 11 read: ki-î gi nu su e šà u-îl-ti. The sequence of four signs starting with gi does not seem to make much sense as written. In response to the interrogation by the temple administrators Iddînâya picks up their phrasing. Therefore it is more than likely that here a garbled writing of the word nûsu/mûshû (with the determinative gi) which appears in line 6 is present (see also previous note).

896 Some 46 of those debt notes are known so far. See Appendix 5.
Gimillu’s rent payment for 1 Dar, or whether they were the dates which he had collected, but failed to deliver to Eanna. Be that as it may, the text must have been connected to the final accounting done for Gimillu’s rent farm for dates.

Unfortunately, this is the last attestation we have for Gimillu, as this period in general marks a break in the documentation of Eanna. Van Driel has suggested that the settling of accounts with Gimillu was connected to this break and that “we are dealing with a clean up of the office after certain problems had been resolved and a kind of tabula rasa had been created. In turn that would require a general making up of accounts, which would have been retained and which are, indeed, not present” (1998: 68). This process may have in fact provided us with what we call now the Eanna archive (ibid.: 68ff.). As van Driel rightly noted, this clean up did not signify the end of the administrative routine (ibid.: 67). Furthermore, the causa Gimillu was probably not closed by the middle of Darius’s second year when this clean up took place, even if he was no longer around at that time.897 The presence of a large file of imittu debt notes for dates from Gimillu’s rent farm may indicate “the winding up of his affairs”, as van Driel suggests (ibid.: 68); however, this was probably restricted to the accounting for the date production. The absence of documents concerning the barley production is quite striking, considering that Gimillu himself complained about massive problems in this sphere of agricultural production. This indicates that the final accounting in this area was still ongoing when the date files were discarded. Thus the final stages of Gimillu’s career in Eanna which concerned the settling of his accounts with respect to barley cultivation, which must have gone on even in his absence, remain undisclosed to us.

2.9.16.1. Attestations898 of Gimillu:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Contents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NCBT 642: 1, 10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>incomplete legal text recording Gimillu’s oath, concerning a watch duty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCL 9 104: 2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YBC 4019: 3f.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>list of various deliveries and disbursements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 3 8: 1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 3 19: 24f.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VS 20 78: 3, rev. 7‘</td>
<td>9-III-2 [x]</td>
<td>fragmentary, concerning the delivery of a donkey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AOAT 358, no. 10: 6</td>
<td>20-XII-8 Nbn</td>
<td>statement concerning the payment of a brick-tax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 6 208: 6f.</td>
<td>9-III-17 Nbn</td>
<td>legal, concerning cattle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTS 3045: 8</td>
<td>[x]-III-1-[x] Cyr</td>
<td>house rental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>? WZKM 94, no. 3: 5</td>
<td>20-XII-acc Cyr</td>
<td>debt note for silver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 7 7: 2, passim</td>
<td>3-VI-1 Cyr</td>
<td>legal, concerning animal husbandry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCL 13 125: 7</td>
<td>8-VIII-1 Cyr</td>
<td>legal, concerning animal husbandry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM 114587: 8f.</td>
<td>7-XII-2 Cyr</td>
<td>debt note for cattle (witness)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JCS 28, no. 2: 8</td>
<td>16-IX-3 Cyr</td>
<td>list of four persons in fetters who had been handed over to Gimillu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 7 35: 2, passim</td>
<td>27-XI-3 Cyr</td>
<td>legal, concerning animal husbandry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WZKM 94, no. 4: 14, 16, 20, 22</td>
<td>19-V-4 Cyr</td>
<td>legal, concerning animal husbandry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 7 31: 5</td>
<td>11-VIII-4 Cyr</td>
<td>legal, concerning animal husbandry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCL 13 134: 7</td>
<td>25-VIII-4 Cyr</td>
<td>legal, concerning animal husbandry</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

897 It should be noted that the settlement of accounts accompanying a dissolution of a rent farm could take years. The rent farmer Kálbäya, for instance, who had lost his rent farm around 2 Cyr, appeared in the texts of the Eanna archive for the next six years collecting the arrears pertaining to his rent farm and having legal disputes with the farmers/gardeners.898 The majority of these attestations stems from the temple archive proper. However, there are three texts (also included here) which record Gimillu’s private activities and which originally must have belonged to his private archive: WZKM 94, no. 2 and no. 3, YOS 21 209. Gimillu’s attestations in imittu debt notes are not included in this table. These texts are listed in Appendix 5.
WZKM 94, no. 1: 13 8-IX-4 Cyr legal testimony, concerning sheep
YOS 7 46: 4 17-IX-5 Cyr account of cattle and sheep
BM 114542: 4, 15, 20 [x-x-6 Cyr] legal, concerning animal husbandry
YOS 7 58: 1 12-XII-6 Cyr bail protocol
YOS 7 73: 14f. [x]-VIII-8 Cyr bail protocol
YOS 7 70: 3, 10 13-VIII-8 Cyr legal, concerning Gúbaru orders to the temple administration with regard to the širku
BM 114572: 6 27-IX-acc Camb statement, concerning animal husbandry
YOS 7 102: 27-IX-acc Camb legal, concerning a runaway širku
YOS 7 96: 22 28-IX-acc Camb legal, concerning cattle
YOS 7 111: 1 13-V-1 Camb bail protocol
NCBT 399: 27 3 Camb imittu list for dates
YOS 7 149: 1 19-VI-3 Camb legal, concerning animal husbandry
BM 113408: 16 3-VIII-3 Camb legal, concerning animal husbandry
NCBT 1022: 11, 13 25-X-3 Camb legal, concerning animal husbandry
PTS 2290: 6f. 25-V-4 Camb legal, testimony concerning plough oxen
WZKM 94, no. 2: 2, 3, 7, 9, 12 20-VI-5 Camb debt note for silver
YOS 7 198: 10, 16 18-X-6 Camb legal, concerning animal husbandry
YOS 21 205: 9f., 17 [x]-X-acc Dar legal, concerning work on a canal
Spar, Studies, no. 8: 6 4-I-1 Dar lease of an orchard
WZKM 94, no. 5: 16, 23 18-I-1 Dar legal testimony, concerning an alleged contract killing
YOS 17 300: 3 1 Nbk IV imittu list for dates
YOS 21 211: 3 1 Nbk IV imittu list for dates
YOS 21 214: 6, 7, 15 [x]-[x]-1 Nbk IV lease of an orchard
NCBT 677: 2', 17', 18' 23-V-[1 Nbk IV] lease of an orchard
YOS 21 207: 3 26-V-1 Nbk IV land lease contract
YOS 21 208: 5', 6' 30-V-1 Nbk IV land lease contract
NCBT 630: 4, 5, 11 4-VI-1 [Nbk IV] land lease contract
YOS 21 209: 6, 9f. 5-VI-1 Nbk IV sale contract for wooden objects
Truro 16: 6, 12 22-III-2 Dar legal, recording Gimillu’s pay back of an amount of silver and the returning of a silver vessel
YNER 12: 1, 7 12-IV-2 Dar legal, Gimillu’s oath concerning the selling or giving away of dates of the temple
TCL 13 182: 4 13-IV-2 Dar rent contract
TCL 13 181: 16, 18 6-VI-2 Dar legal, interrogation concerning the whereabouts of imittu debt notes
TCL 13 183: 2 6-VI-2 Dar account of imittu dates taken by Gimillu

2.9.17. Bēl-gimlanni

Bēl-gimlanni, son of Madān-čreš, replaced the rent farmer Gimillu in this office in 2 Dar. This is evident from the contract TCL 13 182 which has been translated and discussed in the previous chapter. However, Bēl-gimlanni appears in the texts of the Eanna archive already in the second year of Cambyses (YOS 7 129). He was a širku of the Lady of Uruk and the son of the brewer Madān-čreš, who was probably also a širku (Kleber 2005: 313). Bēl-gimlanni’s father was
engaged in brewing beer for profane purposes (as opposed to prebendary brewers) and is attested in this function from 2 to 11 Nbn (Kleber ibid.). At the beginning of his career Bél-gimlanni apparently followed in his father’s steps. In 2 Camb (YOS 7 129) he is attested in a document stating his obligation to deliver by a certain date 200 vats of quality beer for the royal palace in Abanu. He was to brew this beer from the dates which the temple gave him for the provisioning of the king.

In his next attestation from 4 Camb (AnOr 8 74) Bél-gimlanni appears without a patronymic and a title. Therefore this identification with our Bél-gimlanni is quite uncertain. The text deals with a girl, Nuptäya, who had been sold by her father, a copper-smith and a širku of the Lady of Uruk. This sale was unlawful, probably because the girl too was a temple oblate. After being returned to the temple Nuptäya was entrusted to Bél-gimlanni (l. 11: ina pán Bél-gimlanni paqdat). If this identification is correct, then it appears that Bél-gimlanni advanced from his brewer’s career and held greater responsibilities within the temple administration.

In his next attestation (YBC 4173) he appears with the title ša muḫḫi quppi, “official in charge of the cash-box”. This official was in a broader sense in charge of temple resources and temple income in precious metals. The term quppu, “basket, box, case”, (originally) designated a container set up at the entrance to the temple for donations of the visitors to the sanctuary, and the ša muḫḫi quppi was the person responsible for this container and the income that came with it (Kleber 2008: 28f.). In YBC 4173, a list of various silver and wool expenditures, Bél-gimlanni acts in one entry as the source of silver for which date rations for the cattle fatteners were bought: ll. 1-3: 10 gin kù-babbar a-na 12 gur zü-lum-ma / ina padme šešu-an-tur / iš-šu-an-na ša muḫḫi qu-up-pu (“10 shekel silver for 12 kurru of dates, as part of the rations of the fatteners of the flawless bulls, (received from) Bél-gimlanni, the one in charge of the cash-box”).

Bél-gimlanni appears with the title ša muḫḫi quppi also in the rent contract TCL 13 182; however, this text does not elucidate the functions of this official in any way. The letter YOS 3 156, on the other hand, may offer some clues in this respect. It is a letter sent by Nabû-mukin-apli to Arad-Marduk and Iddinäya. The sender of the letter could be identical with the šattamu Nabû-mukin-apli, who is attested from 6 Cyr to 6 Camb and Arad-Marduk could be the temple scribe (rupšar Eanna) attested from 4 Cyr to 6 Camb. Iddinäya could not be identified. Among other things Nabû-mukin-apli requests that a certain Ninurta-nāṣir be sent to him as soon as possible and that he be supplied with one shekel of silver for his travel provisions. The silver is to be taken from Bél-gimlanni: I gin kù-babbar / ina šešumme šešu-an-tur / iš-šu-nim-ma a-na / ši-divi-ti-ša in-na-šu (ll. 16-19). Thus, if the identification with our Bél-gimlanni here is correct, this could be another illustration of his activities as a ša muḫḫi quppi similar to those exemplified in YBC 4173. In other words, the ša muḫḫi quppi served as a treasurer, perhaps in situations when ad hoc expenditures arose. This is at least the impression one gets from YBC 4173 and YOS 3 156; however, it is not sure whether his function should be thus narrowed down on the basis of only two texts.

Be that as it may, Bél-gimlanni’s career did not stop at this fairly responsible post. Still in his function of a ša muḫḫi quppi in 2 Dar he became the ša muḫḫi šittu taking over the rent farm from the širku Gimillu, whose relationship with the temple authorities had by then been damaged beyond repair. This incident recorded in TCL 13 182 has been discussed in detail above (see p. 239). From the fourth month of the second regnal year of Darius Bél-gimlanni was in control of arable land and orchards of the Lady of Uruk for which he annually had to deliver 10,000 kurru of barley and 12,000 kurru of dates. He not only accepted to work under the conditions which Gimillu rejected (in other words to till an area of 1,000 kurru with only 200 heads of cattle, which would make 20 kurru of land per plough team), he also offered a donation of ten flawless bulls for

---

899 It was one of the Eanna temple’s obligations to supply the royal palace in Abanu with food and other commodities for the consumption of the king and his entourage when they resided there. This palace served as a stopover for the king when travelling between his residences. This has been discussed by San Nicolòl 1949: 323ff. and now more recently by Kleber 2008: 85ff. The text YOS 7 129 which deals with the beer provisions for this palace has been translated by Kleber 2005: 314.

900 Edited by Ebeling 1930-34: 126f.

901 For these officials see Kleber 2008: 34 and 36 respectively.

902 This was in addition to the rations of the governor of Esagil, the scribes, the gatekeepers, and the measurers.
the regular offerings of the Lady of Uruk. This act of ingratiation indicates that Bēl-gimlanni was a wealthy man when he undertook the responsibility of managing the rent farm, which was probably a prerequisite for such an enterprise in the first place. On the whole, it appears that Bēl-gimlanni entertained very good relationships with the temple authorities. The concessions that were refused to Gimillu were gladly granted to the new rent farmer: the temple authorities promised to provide him with another 200 heads of cattle and 50 additional workers in the second year of his lease, which would practically half the work load of the plough teams. Whether they followed through with this offer is not known. The further development of Bēl-gimlanni’s rent farm also remains in the dark for archival reasons. However, in the letter YOS 3 40 there is some indication that at least for one year Bēl-gimlanni managed to meet his annual rent for barley. The sender of the letter, Bēl-nādin-apli, could not be identified. He writes to Bēl-gimlanni and quotes the šatammu at the beginning of the letter, who had told him that Bēl-gimlanni had delivered 10,000 kurru of barley in the previous year: šá-tam a-kan-na / iq-ta-ba-a um-ma 10 lim gur še-bar / šad-da-qad en-gi-mil-an-nu / a-na ṣ-an-na it-ta-din (ll. 4-7). Bēl-nādin-apli goes on to ask Bēl-gimlanni to deliver the remaining barley for rations, which he had sent for earlier and of which only a portion had been paid out. The magnitude of Bēl-gimlanni’s delivery of barley, namely 10,000 kurru, makes it practically certain that this letter referred to his rent payment and that the letter should be dated to after Darius’s second regnal year. Interestingly, even though Bēl-gimlanni is said to have delivered the 10,000 kurru to Eanna he still could dispose of and withhold some of this barley which had been intended for rations. Does this mean that the delivery to the temple was an administrative fiction and that the barley was in fact kept elsewhere, e.g., in local granaries? Or does the issuing of barley for rations have something to do with Bēl-gimlanni’s other function, that of the ša muḫḫi qrippi? Unfortunately, at the present state of our documentation these questions cannot be answered.

2.9.17.1. Attestations of Bēl-gimlanni:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Contents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YOS 3 116: 10, 14</td>
<td>- (Camb)</td>
<td>letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 3 156: 17</td>
<td>- (Camb)</td>
<td>letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 7 129: 2f.</td>
<td>11-III-2 Camb</td>
<td>legal, concerning obligation to deliver beer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>? AnOr 8 74: 11</td>
<td>7-IV-4 Camb</td>
<td>legal, concerning an unlawful sale of a širkatu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YBC 4173: 3</td>
<td>24-VI-1 (Nbk IV)</td>
<td>list of silver and wool disbursements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCL 13 182: 1, 9, 13-IV-2 Dar</td>
<td>15, 22, 28, 29</td>
<td>rent contract</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 3 40: 2, 6</td>
<td>- (&gt; 2Dar)</td>
<td>letter</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.9.18. Šullum

After a gap of some 27 years the rent farm is again mentioned in the texts of the Eanna archive: the šatti appears in our documentation again in 29 Dar in connection with an individual called Šullum, who is also designated as the šatammu of Eanna. He is attested in two texts, both of which are dated to the 29th regnal year of Darius. No filiation is attested for Šullum.

YBC 4021 records a delivery of dates to the bakers in the year 29 (of Darius). The dates are said to stem from the rent farm (šatti) of Šullum, the šatammu of Eanna. Beaulieu (2003: 260 note 903) mentions these good relationships are perhaps also reflected in the letter YOS 3 116, if the identification with our Bēl-gimlanni is correct. The letter was written by the overseer of the temple oblates (rab širkē), Innin-ahlē-iddin, to Nādin, who should probably be identified with the high ranking scribe of Eanna who was active from 12 Nbn to 4 Camb (Kleber 2008: 35). Innin-ahlē-iddin complained about the lack of esteem shown to him despite his faithful service: “For twenty years I have kept watch for all of you. (But) I am not worth as much in your eyes as Bēl-gimlanni. It is on the orders of Bēl-gimlanni that my house is being ruined, (and) the people of my household are in detention” (ll. 6-18) (translation by Stolper 2003: 286).

903 These good relationships are perhaps also reflected in the letter YOS 3 116, if the identification with our Bēl-gimlanni is correct. The letter was written by the overseer of the temple oblates (rab širkē), Innin-ahlē-iddin, to Nādin, who should probably be identified with the high ranking scribe of Eanna who was active from 12 Nbn to 4 Camb (Kleber 2008: 35). Innin-ahlē-iddin complained about the lack of esteem shown to him despite his faithful service: “For twenty years I have kept watch for all of you. (But) I am not worth as much in your eyes as Bēl-gimlanni. It is on the orders of Bēl-gimlanni that my house is being ruined, (and) the people of my household are in detention” (ll. 6-18) (translation by Stolper 2003: 286).

904 The letter is edited by Ebeling 1930-34: 34ff. and Cocquerillat 1968: 104. 140.
quotes the heading of this text as: zů-lum-ma ša a-na ma-ak-ka-su / šá iti šiž1 mu 29-tam gššbán šá šul-lu-mu / ša-tam é-an-na šá šiž60-šešmex-su / a-na šišmuḫdimex i-din-nu (“Dates which Anu-ḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫḫ化进程）

A list of maššartu disbursements, AoF 31, p. 253 (= PTS 2180905), also records provisions of barley to the bakers from the rent of Šullum. In this text, however, he appears without a title. The heading of this text reads: še-bar ša a-na maš-sar-tuš šá šiš iti šu iti ne / šiš kurššmuḫšš sum-na (“Barley which Šamaš-mukin-apli, son of Dummuq, gave as maššartu for the fourth, fifth and sixth month of the 29th year of Darius, king of Babylion, king of lands, to the bakers from the sūtu of Šullum”). The total amount of barley disbursed was over 573 kuru.

Though Šullum is not attested with the title ša muḫḫi sūti, it is evident that he was directly involved with agricultural production on a managerial level.906 He probably rented both arable land and date orchards as he supplied the temple with both barley and dates. Unfortunately not much more can be said about Šullum’s rent farm, it’s scope and the conditions under which he worked. However, these attestations demonstrate a degree of continuity for the system of the ferme générale in Eanna after the clean up of the temple archive.

2.9.18.1. Attestations of Šullum:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Contents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YBC 4021: 2</td>
<td>XI-29 (Dar)</td>
<td>list of dates given out as makkasu to the bakers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AoF 31, p. 253: 4</td>
<td>29 Dar</td>
<td>list of barley given out as maššartu to the bakers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.9.19. Local rent farmers

2.9.19.1. Nergal-ipuš

Another local rent farmer, Nergal-ipuš, was in charge of the district Angillu (ša muḫḫi sūti ša Angillu) according to BM 114454 from 8 Nab. The text records a debt of 30 kuru of barley and 30 kuru of spelt (in exchange for 60 kuru of spelt), the property of Ištar of Uruk and Naniya, which were given to Nergal-ipuš’s messenger Sαniq at his orders and which were charged against this messenger.

The next attestation of Nergal-ipuš, if this is indeed the same person, comes from 2 Cyr from a not entirely clear legal text concerning digging obligations of the rent farmers (YOS 7 14907). Nergal-ipuš, again without a patronymic, is designated only as ša muḫḫi sūti here. It appears that he shared obligations for canal digging with the rent farmer Kalbaya, from the Basia family.

Again, as is the case with all of these meagrely attested rent farmers, little can be said about Nergal-ipuš’s social background and the scope of his enterprise. It is not even clear whether he was farming temple land. On the one hand, this seems possible since Eanna owned land in the district Angillu. On the other, it is equally possible that he was a local rent farmer responsible for land which did not belong to the temple, who was perhaps connected to the royal administration in this area.

2.9.19.1.1. Attestations of Nergal-ipuš:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Contents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

905 The text is edited by Kessler 2004: 253ff. in Altorientalische Forschungen 31.
906 It is not very likely that he should have been imposed a rent payment at the level of a simple cultivator being the administrator of the temple and considering the amounts of commodities he provided.
907 The text is edited by Cocquerillat (1968: 85. 134); see also above p. 189 for comments on this text.
2.9.19.2. Dišummu

Only two attestations of Dišummu, both without a patronymic, from 2 Camb (NCBT 666) and 4 Camb (YOS 7 165) are known so far. In NCBT 666 he is designated as a rent farmer of Bit-Amukanu (ša muḫḫi šašu ša Bit-Amukanu), which was a Chaldean area in southern Babylonia. The text itself is a debt note for 150 kurru of dates and barley each, property of Ištar of Uruk and Nanaya, which are charged against a certain Bänia, son of Innin-šum-[x], descendant of Gimil-Nanaya. These 300 kurru were the tithe (ešrū) of the mār banē of Bit-Amukanu, which is described as the area between Babylon and Uruk delimited by Takkiur and Nār-šarri up to the “ešrū” of Dišummu”. This probably refers to the land from which the ešrū-tax was to be levied and it implies that Dišummu was responsible for collecting the tithe in this region:

NCBT 666 14-IX-2 Camb

obv. 1. 1 me 50 gur še-bar 1 me 50 gur zû-lum-ma pab 3 me gur še-bar udder zû-lum-ma eš-ru-šaḫ dumu-dû-[išak]
ša kur eš-a-muk-a-nu ul-.ttünag ki a-di tin-tirī
id-tak-ki-ru ū id-lugal la e-bi-ri a-di

5. eš-ru-šaḫ di-ḫum-mu šaša gursak
ša eš-a-muk-a-nu nig-ga innin unagkī u 4na-na-a
ina gur 5ba-ni-ia dumu-šu ša 8l-din-nin-mu-šu-[x]
dumu šu-ḫa-na-na-a ina 4iti guštu it[j] ṣu]
[zû-lu]m-ma pab 3 me gur še-bar udder zû-lum-ma

10. [a-na nig]-ga ĕ-an-na i-nam-din
[x x x x x] 1xšaša itu ṣu m[u 2-kam]
lo.e. [kam-bu-zi-iša] lugal tin-tirīkī lugal kur-[k]ur
[x x x x x x x] 1xšu zû-lum-ma
[x x x x x x x] šu-esh-a-muk-a-nu

15. [me-ki-na-nu]-3ašu-ašša ša [x x x x]
[a x x x x x] en-na-din-ibila ašša ša 8n-er-šaḫ a 6ki-din-1 [k-amar-utu]
[x x x] ašša ša 8d-amar-utu-mu-a [x x] d[u] [x x]
[x x x x x] 1xšu x x x a 1xšu x x x
did 15-numum-[x ...

20. ṣu-num-mu[u x u x x] 1xšu x x[x ...
na-di-nu dub-sar ša 6e-an-na ašša ša 8d-šu-šum-[ba-šaša]
a 6e-gi-šaḫ [r-šaḫ]-am-šaḫ-dub-sar ša 6e-an-na ašša ša 8d-šum-šum-mu-mu-šu
a 6en-a-ūru unagkī ina gd 14-kam
mu 2-kam kam-bu-zi-ia lugal tin-tirīkī

u.e. 25. lugal kur-kur

“150 kurru of barley, 150 kurru of dates, in total 300 kurru of barley and dates, the tithe of the mār banē from the area of Bit-Amukanu, (stretching) from Uruk to Babylon, (from) Takkiur and the near bank[908] of Nār-šarri up to the ešrū-(land) of Dišummu, the rent farmer of Bit-Amukanu, the property of the Lady of Uruk and Nanaya, are charged against Bänia, son of Innin-šum-[x], descendant of Gimil-Nanaya. In the second month he will deliver the barley and in the seventh month the dates, in total 300 kurru of barley and dates, to Eanna. […] of the seventh month of the second regnal year of [Cambys]es, king of Babylon, king of Lands. […] the dates […] the area of Bit-Amukanu […].

[Witnesses:] Bänia, [son of x, descendant of x],

[908] The text reads here “Nār-šarri lā ebu/ebir”, implying that the ešrū-area did not extend beyond the Nār-šarri, i.e. with respect to the Takkiur which was south-west of the royal canal, not beyond its left bank.
Bēl-nādin-apli, son of Arad-Bēl, descendant of Kidin-[Marduk], [x], son of Marduk-šum-iddin, descendant of [x]-bān-[x], [x, son of x], descendant of [x], ıštart-zēr-[x, son of x, descendant of x], Šamaš-zēr-id[⁺din, son of x, descendant of x],


Uruk; 14-IX-2 Camb, king of Babylon, king of lands.”

In YOS 7 165⁹⁰⁹ (4 Camb) Dīlūmmu appears only as a ša muḫḫi sūṭi; however, a break after the title could have contained the addition [ša Bīt-Amušanu]. The text records an oath of a certain Nabū-ahlē-bullīt who claims to have given the barley intended for the flour of the meal of the king to a certain Nabū-ahl-iddin.⁹¹⁰ The barley had been measured out by Dīlūmmu on the order of the sēpiru Itti-Nabū-balātu. Unfortunately the identity of most of the protagonists is uncertain and the background of this matter is not clear. The flour delivery was intended for the king and it is conceivable that this text refers to the obligation of the temple to supply the royal palace in Abanu, which was probably one of the stops along the king’s journey from Susa to Babylon.⁹¹¹

Not much is revealed by these texts about the terms under which Dīlūmmu was conducting his business. In NCBT 666, in particular, one gets the impression that he collected the tithe in Bīt-Amušanu for the Eanna temple, though the land may not have necessarily been temple property.⁹¹² In YOS 7 165 he measured out barley for the flour of the king, which is delivered via another person (Nabū-ahlē-bullīt) to the temple. At the same time, to judge by his title, he was a local rent farmer who worked in the area of Bīt-Amušanu. It is not clear whether Dīlūmmu was directly connected to the temple in this function or whether he was perhaps employed by some royal institution. Since the evidence is so scarce this remains highly speculative. At any rate it is interesting to note the interaction between the temple and the surrounding tribal areas, which were not necessarily under its administration.

2.9.19.2.1. Attestations of Dīlūmmu:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Contents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NCBT 666: 5</td>
<td>14-IX-2 Camb</td>
<td>debt note for dates and barley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 7 165: 5</td>
<td>24-V-4 Camb</td>
<td>oath concerning the whereabouts of barley</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.9.19.3. Nabū-balāt-šarri-iqbī

Another local rent farmer was Nabū-balāt-šarri-iqbī, who is not attested with a patronymic. He appears as the rent farmer on Nār-Pišīdu (ša muḫḫi sūṭi ša muḫḫi Nār-Pišīdu) in the second

---

⁹⁰⁹ The text is edited by Cocquerillat 1968: 84. 133.
⁹¹⁰ Line 6-7: “... a-na ziḏ-da a-na [nap-ta-nu] / šā lugal”. This reconstruction is suggested by Cocquerillat. An alternative reconstruction could be šušbutta.
⁹¹¹ This may have been the bēl piqitti of Eanna. His name is followed by the sign lú and a break in the text. Before the break only two horizontal wedges are visible which could be the beginning of the sign sag. Cocquerillat suggests reconstructing the title as [sag lugal]; however, there seems to be no space for the full title and the verbal form (reconstructed as [at-ta-din] by Cocquerillat), unless the scribe wrote around the edge of the tablet.
⁹¹² Several texts from the second regnal year of Cambyses attest the temple’s obligation to supply the palace in Abanu with beer, flour, sheep and goats and so on (see Kleber 2008: 88ff.).
⁹¹³ See Jursa 1998: 8f.
The text has been edited by Moore (1935: 150f.), translated by Cocquerillat (1968: 100) and re-edited here on p. 105.

For the mašennu see now Jursa 2010b: 80f. with references to earlier studies on this official. According to Jursa he was “oberster Bevollmächtigter für landwirtschaftliche Angelegenheiten” (p.: 80).

TCL 13 227, ll. 3-5: 6,645 gur še-bar zú-lum-ma u še-zíz-ām u 2,000 gur gazi₃₄ r[e-ḫe-e₂] / še-bar še-zíz-ām u zú-lum-ma šá ina e-pe₃₄ nīg-ka₃ šá ina iti ab mu 3-kam “ag-[i] / lugal ti₃₄-ti₃₄ ina igi š₄ag-din-lugal-iq-bi lu₄agrig ina ti₃₄-ti₃₄ [re-ḥi].

BIN 1 8 is edited in Ebeling 1930-34: 164f. and Cocquerillat 1968: 100f. 139.
2.9.20. Rent farmers – Summary and Conclusions

Cocquerillat dedicated the third part of her study on the date cultivation in Uruk to the evolution of the rent farm system in Eanna, describing the origins and the forerunners of the rent farm, its creation and break up and finally its re-creation (1968: 91ff.). A closer look at the evidence, which is, granted, now more complete, shows that neither her division of the stages of the system’s development is justified, nor are her interpretations of the royal interference in the organisation of the temple agriculture tenable. According to Cocquerillat’s overall assessment of the rent farm in Eanna, this was a successful system (ibid.: 104). It is not clear on which criteria this assessment was based. As regards the present state of information, a quantification of the success of the rent farm in Eanna is not possible: except for TCL 13 227, no accounts are available from the temple archive. The goals set by the temple administration, especially for barley cultivation, were over-enthusiastic considering the amount of work force and the means of production supplied by the temple. Apparently, the rent farmer was expected to provide up to 50 % of the human and animal labour. The rent contracts are not explicit about this figure, but a comparison of the prescribed workloads (20 - 30 kurrus of land per plough team) and the actual manageable workloads found in the texts from Sippar (10 - 15 kurrus) allows for this conclusion. In other words, the successful meeting of the goals for arable farming depended on the ability of the rent farmer to provide additional work force, draught animals and tools. This line of the rent farmer’s work, however, remains beyond the scope of our documentation. The figures which appear in the rent contracts, the sūtu-obligations, are not indicative of the actual income of the temple. However, the account TCL 13 227 suggests that the prognostication for date farming was more realistic than the one for barley cultivation. Or rather, that the rent farmers put in more effort to reach the quota for date deliveries, probably at the expense of arable cultivation (see below). In addition to these rather general remarks on the success of the rent farm, it can be pointed out that the system was generally stable and exhibited a large degree of continuity. In this somewhat restricted sense one can agree with Cocquerillat and speak of a successful system. The creation of the rent farm system, however, is more difficult to pinpoint than is suggested by her (ibid.: 91).  

2.9.20.1. Origins of the rent farm system

It has been speculated on the origins of the rent farm and its forerunners on several occasions. Cocquerillat (1968: 92) sought to find them in the structures of the internal organisation to which certain temple officials, “chefs du culture”, belonged. Joannès (1982: 127ff.) followed in a similar vein looking for the proto-rent farmer in the official lúgal apinme(i.e. rab ikkarāti). This idea was again picked up by Cocquerillat at a later stage, when she suggested that the “super-fermier” (i.e. rab ikkarāti) was the forerunner of the ša muḥḫi šuṭi (1984a: 145). Jursa challenged this interpretation by pointing out that there is no conceptual connection between the two functionaries as the former was a member of the temple staff with whom the temple farmed its own land, while the latter was an entrepreneur managing indirectly the institution’s agricultural production (1995a: 87, cf. also p. 25). In theory this observation rings true; however, it exaggerates a distinction between an entrepreneur and a temple official which in practice was not as sharply drawn. While the temple officials were no independent economic agents, and thus can be hardly qualified as entrepreneurs, their activities nevertheless bore entrepreneurial traits. These officials were frequently risk takers (whether voluntary or not is a different matter) with a dual role – they were managers employed by the temple that at the same time worked for personal profit and also carried personal liability. This is in accord with a model for institutional officials of the Ur III period developed by Wilcke (2006: 113) and summarized by Jursa (2010b: 292): “Officials are

918 That Šum-ukin was not the “founder” of the rent farm system has already been discussed (p. 176). See also below.
919 The translation of the title is imprecise as Cocquerillat uses it to refer to two different types of officials, namely the rab ikkarāti and the bel epinni (the former official is occasionally rendered by her as “super-fermier”, for instance, on p. 99).
entitled to profit in person from the sector of institutional business for which they are responsible provided they fulfil their obligation vis-à-vis the institution. Offices, according to Wilcke, should be conceptualised as ‘prebends’ (beneficia) from which it was acceptable, even expected, to draw personal gain.” The temple officials in the agricultural sector were designated already by van Driel as proto-entrepreneurs. He also noted that the temple administration “prepared the ground for more extensive entrepreneurial activities by granting bigger and bigger leases” to these officials, the proto-entrepreneurs (1999: 216). In this light, it is understandable why Joannès and Cocquergillat thought to have found the proto-rent farmers among the temple officials, the *rab ikkarātī* in particular.

The internal organisation of the temple agriculture and its various officials such as the *rab eserti*, the *guggallu* and the *rab ikkarātī* have been discussed in individual chapters. It has been shown that these officials had *sītu* obligations toward the temple. The *rab eserti* and the *rab ikkarātī*,920 in particular, had to manage land and plough teams which were assigned to them and had to deliver a presumably fixed rent.921 Perhaps there were even instances of voluntary (additional) leasing of land on the part of these officials.922 At any rate, these temple officials managed the cultivation of the temple land in a similar manner as the later *ša muḫḫī sāti*, but certainly on a much smaller scale. The main difference lay in the amount of personal assets they could invest in the cultivation of the land entrusted to them.923 One could argue then that these agricultural managers were in fact the first rent farmers, if one defines a rent farmer as a person who leases land for a fixed rent, which he cannot cultivate on his own due to its size, i.e. he has to manage two or more plough teams.924 It is among these agricultural managers, the small-scale rent

920 A number of them appears in Nergal-nāṣir’s rent contract from 35 Nbk (VS 20 88, see p. 152 for an edition). Nergal-nāṣir took over the land which had previously been managed by Ibni-İhtar, son of Nabû-šum-ibni, and Nabû-šum-ibni, son of Šüzūba. Nergal-ina-tiši-êter and Nabû-ahḫê-šullim are also mentioned in connection to plough teams which are shared between them and the new rent farmer. All of these people are known from other sources as *rab eserti*. Nabû-ahḫê-šullim is later also attested with the title *rab ikkarātī*, and Nergal-ina-tiši-êter and Ibni-İhtar also appear as *guggallu*.

921 This is suggested by the use of the term *sītu* in connection to their deliveries of agricultural products. The size of the rent, and their obligations in general, were apparently not contractually fixed. This was not necessary as these people were temple dependents, they belonged to the internal administration, and their obligations were based on customary practice.

922 No such contracts are known for any of the agricultural officials of Eanna, but there is one from the Ebabbar of Sippar. According to CT 55 88 (date broken) Šamaš-iddin, son of Balatu, a ploughman of Šamaš, who is known from other texts also as a *rab ikkarātī* (Jursa 1995a: 24f.), leased from the temple 50 *kurru* of land for cultivation against a fixed rent (the amount is lost in a break). This was probably not the only rent contract of Šamaš-iddin. It appears that he also had a sharecropping agreement with the temple, at least at the beginning of his career. This is indicated by an *imittu* list (Nbk. 131) in which he appears with a *šibša*- and an *esrā*-obligation, which is at the same time his first attestation from the Ebabbar-archive (Jursa 1995a: 24). He was therefore not only responsible for the collection and delivery of the *sītu* obligations of his fellow *ikkarus* in his function of a *rab ikkarātī*, but he also entertained a contractual relationship with the temple.

923 These temple officials were not entirely without means. We know of at least two agricultural *rab eserti*, who were originally simple temple ploughmen and *širkus*, who had considerable property, real estate and slaves. This property ended up in the temple’s possession on account of their debts toward the temple. Silim-Bēl, son of Aplāya, had a plot of land (600 cubits are given as one measurement) worth 4 minas of silver according to TCL 12 38 and at least one slave according to AnOr 8 50. Nabû-ahḫê-šullim, son of Nabû-udammiq, who was also a *rab ikkarātī* for a while, owned a date orchard according to the text Montserrat 1. However, their personal assets were limited compared to those of an independent entrepreneur such as Šum-ukin, for instance.

924 There were, of course, big differences in the scale of the rent farm. While Šum-ukin had 6,000 *kurru* of land and 100 plough teams at his disposal, Šamaš-iddin, the *rab ikkarātī* from Ebabbar, would have needed only two to three plough teams for his plot of 50 *kurru* by the standard accounting models. It is not clear where (or whether) one should draw the line between small- and large-scale rent farmers. As a hypothesis, if one took the title *ša muḫḫi sāti* to indicate the large-scale rent farmer, then this line could lie somewhere around an annual rent of 5,000 *kurru* of barley. The *ša muḫḫi sāti* Ibni-İhtar, son of Balatu, for instance, had to pay a rent of that size and had 25 ploughs under him according to his contract from 11 Nbn (YOS 6 150). Nergal-nāṣir, son of Nanaya-ibni, however, had an annual rent of over 4,000 *kurru* of barley in 35 Nbk (VS 20 88), and in subsequent years he managed other, smaller farms, but he never appeared with the title *ša muḫḫi sāti*. 
farmers, that one should look for the precursors of the ša muḫḫi śuṭi. Rather, one should characterise Šamaš-iddin, the rab ikkarāti from Ebabbar, his counterpart from Eanna, Nabû-ahḫē-šullim, and his colleagues as these proto-entrepreneurs who paved the way for the larger leases granted first to people who were connected to the temple administration, like Nergal-nāšir, and subsequently to outsiders, like the Basias.

So, the precursors for the organisational changes which were exhibited in the large-scale rent farm of Šum-ukin (and Ana-amāt-Bēl-atkal in Ebabbar) are not to be found in the activities of the officials of the temple’s direct exploitation of its land, but in the responsibilities taken on by the small-scale rent farmers of that time. Nergal-nāšir, son of NaNāya-ibni, was a rent farmer, whose rent contract VS 20 88 (35 Nbk) is the earliest such contract we have from Eanna. His rent farm marked a transition from the exploitation of temple land through temple officials/small-scale rent farmers (or van Driel’s proto-entrepreneurs) to its management by entrepreneurs from outside the system. Though Nergal-nāšir’s institutional affiliation is not certain – there is a possibility that he was a temple oblate and he may have been involved in Eanna’s animal husbandry – there is no evidence that he was a member of the temple’s direct agricultural management. It appears that he joined this sector of the temple’s economy as a ‘semi-outsider’ taking over an area previously managed by two individuals, who were also temple officials (rab ešertis). From this rent contract we also learn that at the same time as Nergal-nāšir’s rent farm was set up other rab ešertis remained active (Nabû-ahḫē-šullim and Nergal-ina-tēši-ēṯer), probably as proto-entrepreneurs.

2.9.2. Creation and development of the large-scale rent farms

With the appearance of Šum-ukin of the Basia family and his nephew Kalbāya in Eanna the management of the temple agriculture was revolutionised, not so much conceptually, as in terms of scale. Another novelty was the fact that the two contractors did not belong to any of the temple’s internal structures (or the Urukean city elite), but were in fact natives of Babylon. 925 Šum-ukin and Kalbāya, who was nominally his uncle’s partner since 1 Nbn and inherited the business around 8 Nbn, were the first individuals to carry the title ša muḫḫi śuṭi. They were in charge of a large portion of the temple’s arable holdings (6,000 kurru of land) and probably all the date orchards belonging to Eanna, except the prebendary ḫallatu-orchards. The annual rent consisted of 25,000 kurru of barley and 10,000 kurru of dates and they had a contingent of 100 plough teams at their disposal (see below, table on p. 263). The size of their farm was not matched by any of the previous or subsequent rent farmers.

However, Šum-ukin’s rise to this position was gradual and is illuminated to a degree by a part of his private archive which was found among the Eanna tablets. Šum-ukin, who was originally from Babylon and was also active in the Nippur region, started off his career in Uruk as a royal official (bēl piqitti ša šarrī) under the rule of Neriglissar. Already during this time it appears that he was in a contractual relationship with Eanna, though no contract has come down to us. This makes it impossible to determine the scope of his farm at this point. But even prior to his arrival at Uruk Šum-ukin engaged in agricultural activities on an entrepreneurial level, as his private documents indicate. In particular, he worked on the arable holdings of the palace scribe in the Nippur area, to all probability as a rent farmer. It is evident that both his involvement in agricultural entrepreneurship and his connections to the royal administration predated his activities in Eanna and facilitated the establishment and subsequent expansion of his rent farm in Uruk.

Although our information on Šum-ukin’s personal assets is incomplete, we can see that beside real estate and slaves he also owned cattle (p. 166), which may have been used as draught animals. Van Driel (1999: 220) addressed the question of the entrepreneurs’ personal assets and the possibility of a systematic creation of the means of production needed for their enterprises. In the case of Šum-ukin our data is too scarce to allow for any conclusions to this effect, but the possibility of such a business strategy cannot be excluded either. Šum-ukin’s personal assets are also interesting for another reason. Most of the mentions of his property are in the context of his

925 Already van Driel noted that “the Neo-Babylonian-Achaemenid period represents a further step by engaging outsiders” as opposed to the earlier periods when “people within the system act[ed] as entrepreneurs” (1999: 222).
settling of accounts with the temple during 8 Nbn at which occasion some of his assets were appropriated by the temple. This is a clear indicator of the fact that entrepreneurs were indeed personally liable for their business and that they personally bore the risks they undertook.  

Kalbâya, Šum-ukin’s nephew and partner, is not very prominent in our sources until 7 Nbn when he starts appearing in the imittu debt notes together with his uncle. At this point Šum-ukin was probably retiring from the business due to bad health or some other reason. Before he took over his uncle’s farm, Kalbâya established a rent farm of his own around 6 Nbn with an annual rent of 3,000 kurru of barley. However, in 8 Nbn this farm was transferred to Nergal-näšir, son of Nanâya-ibni. The reason for this transfer was probably not so much Kalbâya’s bad performance, for which we do not have any concrete evidence, as the ‘inheritance’ of Šum-ukin’s farm presumably together with the arrears that accrued over the years. According to the account TCL 13 227 in the period between 3 and 7 Nbn a backlog of over 43,890 kurru of barley and dates was accumulated by Šum-ukin and Kalbâya. Some seven years later, between 14 and 16 Nbn, Kalbâya’s arrears of 44,063 kurru are mentioned in a royal letter (YOS 3 2). Though part of the initial debt was covered by Šum-ukin’s property which was confiscated in the course of the settling of accounts, Kalbâya’s arrears have not grown considerably over time, indicating that he was probably just as good as, if not better than, his uncle in managing the farm. Nevertheless, Kalbâya also went through the process of the settling of accounts during Cyrus’s reign, as a result of which the temple laid claims on some of his property. His service as a ša mushši sūṭi ended sometime between 1 and 2 Cyr.

General remarks about the success of Šum-ukin’s and Kalbâya’s rent farm are difficult to make as we lack adequate data in form of final accounts. What we can say with a degree of certainty is that the date production in general seemed to pose fewer problems for the rent farmers than the arable cultivation. According to TCL 13 227 they usually managed to reach or even exceed their annual quota for dates, but they had serious deficits (from 32 % to 62 % of the rent) in their barley dues. The temple’s expectations with regard to the arable cultivation were clearly unrealistic, especially considering the workforce it provided. In other words, the temple expected high investments from the rent farmers in order to overcome the deficits in labour. Perhaps the two rent farmers opted to concentrate on the more intensive and more profitable branch of agriculture knowing that they would never be capable of fully reaching the quotas imposed on them. Despite these difficulties Šum-ukin’s and Kalbâya’s farm operated for over 17 years and even Kalbâya’s son, Nabû-bân-âli, was involved in the date production as a rent farmer at the beginning of Cambyses’s reign. However, in light of the debts he inherited from his uncle, the question arises to what extent was Kalbâya’s contractual relationship to the temple voluntary. The same can be asked for his son, Nabû-bân-âli.  

Though Šum-ukin’s and Kalbâya’s rent farm was quite extensive Eanna possessed more arable land which it could pass on to other tenants. Nergal-näšir, who had worked for Eanna as a rent farmer at least since 35 Nbk (VS 20 88), was still active in this function, however with comparably small holdings until 13 Nbn. Over time he made two more rent contracts with the temple: in 3 Nbn (YOS 6 40) he was granted land for a rent of over 1,000 kurru of barley and in 8 Nbn (TCL 12 90) he took over the land which was previously at Kalbâya’s disposal for an annual rent of 3,500 kurru of barley. In 12 Nbn (GC 1 418) he worked the land in a partnership with a certain Zērbibi, son of Nabû-êter-napšati, who was also attested as the official in charge of the canal outlets (ša ina muḫḫi mušāše, SAKF 155). In 3 Nbn we hear of three other rent farmers in the rent contract YOS 6 40. Arad-Innin, son of Ibi-Ištar, and Sîn-ibni, son of Šamaš-udammîq, from the Re‘î-alpi family, leased over 865 kurru of low quality land for an annual rent of 1,240 kurru of barley, one ox and 15 sheep. The document mentions an already existing rent farm of a certain Nabû-mušētiq-uddē, son of Nabû-šum-iddin, of whom nothing else is known. Nergal-ipuš, a local rent farmer from the district Angillu, is also attested contemporaneously with Kalbâya’s rent farm among the temple during 8 Nbn at which occasion some of his assets were appropriated by the temple. This is a clear indicator of the fact that entrepreneurs were indeed personally liable for their business and that they personally bore the risks they undertook.  

Against Renger’s suggestion that the risks of entrepreneurs “were in reality born by the government or by the institution granting the lease concerned.” This oral remark from a discussion at the Berlin Rencontre is quoted by van Driel (1999: 213), who is not convinced by it either.  

The rent contract recording this lease has not come down to us. This information is deduced from TCL 12 90 and TCL 13 227.  

See the tabular representation of the pertinent data in Appendix 2.  

Nergal-näšir promised to pay 500 kurru on top of Kalbâya’s original rent.
from 8 Nbn until 2 Cyr. In 11 Nbn Ibn-ištâr (Ibnâya), son of Balâtu, a širku of the Lady of Uruk, set up his rent farm of 2,081 kurrâ of arable land for a rent of 5,000 kurrâ of barley and 3,000 bundles of straw (YOS 6 150). His activities as a rent farmer of the Lady of Uruk are attested until 4 Cyr. At more or less the same time a certain Bâniya, son of Bullûtaya, was active as a rent farmer of the Lady of Uruk in the arable agriculture (12 Nbn).

To sum up, in 3 Nbn four more rent farmers were active beside Šum-ukin and Kalbâya: Nergal-nâṣîr, Arad-Innin, Sin-ibni and Nabû-mušetiq-uddê. In the period around 11 Nbn Kalbâya was active simultaneously with Ibn-ištâr, Nergal-nâṣîr, the local rent farmer Nergal-îpusû, and possibly also Bâniya and Zârribi. At all times, parallel to the large rent farm of Šum-ukin and later Kalbâya,930 there existed secondary minor rent farms,931 which were frequently set up on land of inferior quality. This can be seen as a sign for an attempt of the temple to expand its arable production. As for the date orchards, it seems that all of them, except the prebendary hallâtu orchards, were in the hands of Šum-ukin and Kalbâya. However, to a smaller extent, the temple continued expanding its date plantations as well by having new orchards planted. This is indicated by a lease of 2,2,2 kurrâ of land ana zâqipûtûti in 4 Nbn (YOS 6 67) granted to a certain Nabû-bêšûnu, son of Marduk, from the Kuri family.

After the dissolution of Kalbâya’s farm sometime at the end of 1 Cyr or the beginning of 2 Cyr, Ibn-ištâr’s arable farm still ran until 4 Cyr. There is no evidence for any other farms between 1 and 4 Cyr. Especially the management of the temple’s date orchards remains in the dark during this period. Nabû-udammîq, son of Nabû-êťer, from the Gimil-Nânaîya family, is attested as a rent farmer of the Lady of Uruk in 4 Cyr. He may have continued Šum-ukin’s and Kalbâya’s legacy, as he managed the production of both arable land and date orchards. However, the extent of his farm and the exact date of its foundation are not known, because no rent contracts of Nabû-udammîq have come down to us and his activities are generally poorly attested. It is possible that he became a ša muḫḫi sūti even before 4 Cyr, i.e. immediately after the dissolution of Kalbâya’s farm, as he appears in the documents of the Eanna archive already during Nabonidus’s reign. The gap of some three years between his and Kalbâya’s farm, during which the management of the temple land, and particularly the orchards, is unaccounted for, could be just a result of a coincidental break in our sources.932

We do not know for how long Nabû-udammîq was a rent farmer and how successful he was in this function. In the sixth regnal year of Cyrus, however, Ileî’-Marduk, son of Nabû-šum-ukin, descendant of Eţêru, appeared. He was to be a rent farmer for barley until at least 1 Camb. Again, owing to the lack of pertinent information, practically nothing can be said about the date of foundation, the scope and the success933 of Ileî’-Marduk’s farm.

930 It is assumed that Kalbâya’s rent farm retained the same extent as his uncle’s since there is no evidence to the contrary. This is against Cocquerillat (1968: 96) who suggests that Kalbâya’s date farm was reduced because of the establishment of Ardia’s farm for dates at the beginning of Cyrus’s reign. It has been argued above that Ardia became active as a rent farmer in 8 Cyr only and that the earlier date of one imittu debt note (BIN 1 111, 2 Cyr) must be a scribal error for 2 Camb.

931 Indeed, five of these secondary rent farmers are not attested with the title ša muḫḫi sūti (Nergal-nâṣîr, Arad-Innin, Sin-ibni, Nabû-mušetiq-uddê and Zêrribi), which is perhaps indicative of the size of their farms.

932 Note, however, that in the Ebabbar of Sippar, after the disappearance of the rent farmer Ana-amût-Bêl-atkal, during the first half of Cyrus’s reign the temple reverted to direct management of its date orchards (under the supervision of the gugullu), as was the practice before the large-scale rent farm era. The arable land was divided up between various Großpächter. The next rent farmer for orchards and arable land, Šâipi-kêrû, who became a ša muḫḫi sūti in 7 Cyr, was active in the temple prior to this as a gugullu and a Großpächter (Jursa 1995a: 96, cf. also p. 114f.). The situation in Uruk is less clear, as there is generally a very small number of pertinent documents from the first half of Cyrus’s rule. As for the date cultivation, only a couple of leases of individual orchards have come down to us, without the mention of any higher authority such as a rent farmer (from [x] Cyr: BM 114450; Cyr 1: PTS 2089; Cyr 4: AUWE 11 214, YOS 7 38; Cyr 5: YOS 7 51; Cyr 5’: YOS 7 47). Particularly interesting is YOS 7 38 from 4 Cyr (for an edition see Cocquerillat 1968: 67, 123, and Joannès 1982: 13f.), a lease of orchards for the performance of the gugullu-service (ana gugallûtu). Should these leases be interpreted as the restoration of the direct mode of exploitation of the temple orchards?

933 He did accrue some arrears, it appears, as a house belonging to him had been appropriated by the temple at some point (BM 114556, not dated, see p. 218).
In 8 Cyr Ardia, son of Nabû-bân-âlî, descendant of Rêmût-Ea, established his rent farm for dates. According to his rent contract (PTS 2044, see p. 221) he was granted all the date plantations of Eanna, except the ballatu-orchards, on the orders of Gûbaru for a yearly rent of 12,000 kurru of dates. Despite the explicit statement putting all the temple orchards under his responsibility, there were for a short time at the beginning of Cambyses’s rule two other rent farmers for dates in Eanna. Nabû-bân-âlî (Bânîa), son of the rent farmer Kalbiya, from the Basia family, is attested in this function from acc to 1 Camb and Mûrûnû, son of Šamaš-iddin, only in 1 Camb. While nothing can be said about Mûrûnû, other than that he was a ša muḫḫi šûti ša suluppû, Nabû-bân-âlî’s attestations indicate that in 1 Camb he may have briefly taken over (a part of?) Ardia’s farm. This is implied by a legal record from acc Camb (PTS 2075, see p. 228) concerning the transfer of the imittu debt notes pertaining to Ardia’s farm to Nabû-bân-âlî and subsequent mentions of Nabû-bân-âlî’s šûtu in the imittu debt notes for dates from 1 Camb. Though the exact implications of these texts are not entirely clear, Ardia continues to manage his farm, it would seem, in a fairly stable manner until 7 Camb, while Nabû-bân-âlî stops appearing in our sources after 1 Camb.

This period is of particular importance for the organisation of the arable agriculture, as a significant change occurred at the time in this area. As was said, Ile'-Mardûk’s activities as a rent farmer probably ended in 1 Camb (though he is still attested until 7 Camb). From this year on, either all or a part of the temple’s arable land was exploited directly with a system of supervisors recruited from the ranks of the temple ploughmen. It was a system not unlike the one in use during Nebuchadnezzar’s reign before the era of the large-scale rent farms. At the time of Cambyses the officials overlooking the arable production were called the rab epinni,934 the overseers of the ploughs, and it seems that there were usually ten935 of them working simultaneously. During Cambyses’s reign two local rent farmers, Diḫummu (2 - 4 Camb) of the district Bit-Amukanu and Nabû-balât-šašri-iqbi (2 Camb) of Nûr-Pîqûdu, are attested. However, their status and relationship to the temple is not clear. It is possible that they were not connected to Eanna at all, but that they managed royal estates, for instance.

There is no further evidence for any other rent farmers working parallel with the rab epinnis until 1 Dar, i.e. 1 Nbk IV, when the širkû Gimillû, the son of Innin-šum-ibni, appeared as a rent farmer of the Lady of Uruk. He re-united the date and the arable farms under his responsibility and was in charge of most of the date plantations (his date rent was 12,000 kurru) and probably less than a half of the available arable land (barley rent: 10,000 kurru). This may indicate that a part of the temple’s arable holdings was still exploited directly. His rent contract has not come down to us, but it was presumably made at some point during Darius’s accession year. Gimillû’s career as a rent farmer was not very long. He had problems managing the arable lands with the contingent of workers and draught animals at his disposal: in 2 Dar he complained about it to the temple authorities asking for more ploughmen and cattle. But prior to this, in 1 Dar, and probably as a result of these difficulties, he obstructed the collection of the date harvest, by hiding the imittu debt notes (TCL 13 181). It is not surprising then, and especially taking into account his bad relationship with the temple authorities, that they ignored Gimillû’s plea and decided to transfer his farm to someone else.

He was succeeded in 2 Dar by another širkû, who was at the same time the official in charge of the cash box of Eanna (ša muḫḫi quppy), Bîl-gimlûnû, son of Madân-êrê. According to TCL 13 182 he took over Gimillû’s rent farm under the same conditions, promising to deliver ten bulls in addition to the rent of 12,000 kurru of dates and 10,000 kurru of barley in the first year. In return he was supposed to receive from the temple the contingent of 400 oxen and additional 50 workers in the second year, which shows the temple’s willingness to decrease the workload per plough team to a manageable 10 kurru of land per team (see below).

Nothing can be said about the further development of the rent farm system in Eanna and Bîl-gimlûnû’s performance, as the trickle of texts which come from the archive after Darius’s second year have no bearing on this subject. After some 27 years, in 29 Dar, there are again two more mentions of a rent farm, of the šûtu of Šullûm, the šatammu of Eanna, to be precise. The chief administrator of the temple became directly involved with agricultural production, apparently as a

934 Under Nebuchadnezzar the equivalent officials were called the rab ešertis.
935 Not twenty, as stated by Cocquerillat (1968: 99).
rent farmer. Ultimately, not much can be said about the nature of Šullum’s activities. The scope of the rent farm presumably under his responsibility is not known and it can only be speculated on the motives which led the satammu to take on a rent farm. Should Šullum’s engagement as a rent farmer be seen as an attempt of the temple administration to gain direct control over its agricultural production? Or was this a reaction to some crisis which resulted in the lack of eligible candidates for the position of a ša muḫḫi sūti leaving only the temple administrator as a last resort? Alternatively, Šullum may have been an enterprising spirit who took on this responsibility for personal reasons, even though this may have been at odds with his social position. By comparison, in the Ebabbar of Sippar the rent farm system remained fairly stable with minor interruptions for as long as the evidence from the temple archive reached, i.e. until 2 Xer (cf. Jursa 1995a: 114f.). Can the same degree of stability be assumed for Eanna? To all likelihood this question should be answered in the affirmative.

2.9.20.3. General trends

The rent farm system in Eanna is attested in the documentation during a period of some fifty years. In the beginning it underwent a fairly gradual development. Starting off by engaging agricultural officials (rab ešertiš, rab iškarrāšt), who in their role as proto-entrepreneurs can be seen as the precursors of the rent farmers, and later members of the temple household from other economic sectors (Nergal-nāšir), the temple went on to entrust a large portion of its agricultural estates to total outsiders (Šum-ukin and Kalbaya). The progress from internal to external rent farmers went hand in hand with an increase in responsibilities and the size of the leased land. This development, however, did not proceed in a linear fashion during the fifty years for which we have written documentation. Large rent farms were not exclusively the prerogative of the outsiders. Gimillu, who was a temple oblate, was in charge of a rent farm second in size only to the farm of Šum-ukin and Kalbaya. Outsiders were employed exceptionally rarely and at varying intervals. In the meantime the temple entrusted its land to individuals affiliated to it or reverted to a direct mode of exploitation. Furthermore, internal and external rent farmers were frequently engaged at the same time by the temple.

The establishment of outsiders in Eanna’s agriculture, especially Šum-ukin, was most certainly aided by their connections to the royal institutions. However, one should not underestimate the entrepreneur’s personal initiative and finally the temple’s need for a ‘capital injection’ from the outside, provided by an individual with the necessary means and willing to take on such a big responsibility. Far from simply being ‘introduced’ to Eanna’s rent farming business by the king, both the progress of Šum-ukin’s entrepreneurial career for a period of at least 28 years before his arrival at Uruk and the developments inside the organisation of the temple agriculture converged to create perfect conditions for the setting up of a large-scale rent farm under Šum-ukin’s responsibility.

By the same token, it would be wrong to see the employment of the temple’s own personnel as rent farmers as an expression of some official strategy of the temple administration designed to diminish the influence of the king. Cocquerillat interprets the employment of the širku Ibni-Ištar as a measure intended to counter the royal influence, exercised through the external rent farmers (1968: 95). This is hardly convincing. The temple was not in a position to oppose any personnel policies of the king as it was heavily dependent on him. In fact, the royal

936 Šullum is not attested with the title ša muḫḫi sūti; however, disbursements of dates to the prebendaries from his sūtu are mentioned in the texts. This indicates that he rented land from the temple.
937 It should be noted, however, that among the rent farmers of Eanna there was at least one prebendary, namely Sin-ibni, from the Rēʾ-alpi family. For a discussion of the social status of the rent farmers see below.
938 The opposite view held by Ragen is likewise not convincing. He suggests that the appointment of širku as rent farmers had a political background and was initiated by the royal administration for the purpose of weakening “the hold of the temple hierarchy and prominent Uruk families over temple lands” (2006: 154). This again exaggerates the power struggle between the temple and the crown. Indeed, the širku Gimillu enjoyed the support of the royal administration. However, this special relationship should not be seen as paradigmatic for all the širku in managerial positions. Bēl-gimilanni, for instance, enjoyed a good relationship with the temple administration.
administration did not insist on employing outsiders as rent farmers. The appointment of this same širkū Ibni-ʾIštar, for instance, was sanctioned by the crown prince. Moreover, most of the rent farmers of Eanna, where the documentation allows for any conclusions about their origins, were connected to the temple at some level – either as dependants, širkūs, or in the case of free citizens as members of the temple organization, of the administration (yield estimators or even a šatammu), or, in one case, of the priestly caste (a prebendary). The temple dependants were frequently active in other sectors of the temple economy (animal husbandry) or held other offices (ša muḫḫi rēḥānī, ša muḫḫi quppi). Genuine outsiders in the employ of the temple were rare and rather an exception. The most prominent ones were Šum-ukin and Kalbāyā. However, already Kalbāyā’s son, Nabū-bān-āḫi, cannot be considered as a complete stranger to the temple anymore. He was probably a native Urukean, and by the time of his employment as a rent farmer, a part of his family, his uncles and cousins, had been well integrated in the administration of Eanna, mostly as scribes. The origins of Ardia, from the Rēmūt-Ea family, the rent farmer for dates, are unclear: he may have belonged to the local urban elite, but he may as well have been a total outsider – there is no obvious connection to the temple here. Of the ‘internal’ rent farmers several širkūs are known: Ibni-ʾIštar, Gimillu, and Bēl-gimlannī, and perhaps also Nergal-nāṣir. Gimillu and Bēl-gimlannī had other functions within the temple administration as well, as the officials in charge of the arrears (ša muḫḫi rēḥānī) and in charge of the cash box (ša muḫḫi quppi), respectively. Nergal-nāṣir was furthermore involved in the temple’s animal husbandry before he got engaged in agricultural management. The social status of Nabū-mušētiq-uddē is not known, but it is known that he also worked in the sector of the temple’s animal husbandry. Free citizens, members of the local elite, were also employed as rent farmers. Beside Nabū-bān-āḫi, and perhaps also Ardia, these were: Sīn-išni, from the Rēʾiʾ-ālpi family, Nabū-udammīq, from the Gimil-Nānāya family, and Ileʾ-ʾarduk, from the Eṭtu family. Sīn-išni was at the same time a priest (he held the dairyman’s prebend), and is even attested as a yield estimator (ēmidū), and Ileʾ-ʾarduk seems to have been involved in the temple administration on a lower or an intermediary level: before becoming a rent farmer he was present at numerous temple court proceedings as a witness and toward the end of his career he was a member of the yield estimation commission. For Nabū-udammīq there is no evidence to suggest that he was in any way connected to the temple. However, he does stem from a family from which numerous temple scribes originated, and his father may also have been a temple scribe. Other rent farmers with uncertain institutional affiliation and social status were: Aradia-ʾinīn, Bāniya, Zērbīti and Mūrānū. This information is summarized in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Responsible for fragmentation of rent farms?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Šum-ukin (Bēl-zērī/Basia)</td>
<td>temple dependant; animal husbandry</td>
<td>35 Nbk - 13 Nbn</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalbāyā/Iqša/Basia</td>
<td>outsider</td>
<td>1 Nbn - 1 Cyr</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arad-ʾInnīn/Ibnī-ʾIštar</td>
<td>outsider</td>
<td>3 Nbn</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Šīn-išni/Šaumuš-udammīq/Rēʾiʾ-ālpi</td>
<td>local elite; prebendary, ēmidū</td>
<td>3 Nbn</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nabū-mušētiq-uddē/Nabū-šum-iddin</td>
<td>animal husbandry</td>
<td>3 Nbn</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibni-ʾIštar/Ballātu</td>
<td>širkū</td>
<td>11 Nbn - 4 Cyr</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bāniya/Bullāṭayā</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12 Nbn</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zērbīti/Nabū-ʾēṭer-napšāti</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12 - 13 Nbn</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nabū-udammīq/Nabū-ʾēṭer/Gimil-Nānāya</td>
<td>local elite; family integrated in temple administration</td>
<td>4 Cyr</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ileʾ-ʾarduk/Nabū-šum-ukin/Eṭtu</td>
<td>local elite; member of the temple administration</td>
<td>6 Cyr - 1 Camb</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ardia/Nabū-bān-āḫi/Rēmūt-Ea</td>
<td>outsider/local elite (?)</td>
<td>8 Cyr - 7 Camb</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

939 Note, however, that Cocquerellat claimed that the crown prince Belšazzar was responsible for the fragmentation of the rent farms (1968: 95f.). She assumed that this process was started in 11 Nbn when Belšazzar withdrew a part of Ibni-ʾIštar’s farm because he was unhappy with the rent farmer’s performance: of the original 2,081 kurru Ibni-ʾIštar was left with a farm of only 625 kurru of land. This interpretation, based on YOS 6 150, is wrong. As was shown on p. 203 this contract in fact attests the constitution of Ibni-ʾIštar’s rent farm. He had in total 2,081 kurru of land at his disposal; of this he annually worked only 625 kurru, as the land was subjected to a three-year fallow cycle.

940 Nabū-ʾēṭer (napšāti), son of Innīn-taḫnī-usur (Kūmμμ1 1979: 120).

941 The local rent farmers Nergal-išuš, Dīḫummu and Nabū-balāṭ-šarri-iqbi, who may have been connected to some royal institution, are not included in the table.
The interest the king took in the temples was officially grounded in the royal ideology − caring and providing for the households of the gods belonged to the principal duties of a king. However, economic and political considerations were also at play here. Aiding and strengthening the economies of the temples, benefited the state economy in the long run through incoming taxes. By appointing royal officials to the temple administration (qipu, bel piqitti) and loyal individuals to economically important posts (e.g., rent farmers) the king ensured a greater control of the provincial centres in political and in economic terms.

The royal involvement in the temple agriculture was manifold: the kings reinstated land to the temple; members of the royal family donated land to the gods; the royal administration interfered in the management of the temple agriculture by granting land leases to external or endorsing internal rent farmers, or by proposing administrative models aimed at improving the efficiency of agricultural production (the ‘Edict’). Some land leases were granted directly by the king (Nabonidus in YOS 6 11), or the crown prince (Belšazzar in YOS 6 150), or were instigated on the orders of the satrap of Babylon during the Achaemenid era (Gübaru in PTS 2044). In other cases, the royal involvement is visible in the presence of royal officials as witnesses at the setting up of rent farms (Nabû-kibsu-šarrī-usur in VS 20 88, or Ayigašu in YOS 6 40; state officials were present as witnesses also in YOS 6 11 and 150).

Even though the employment of external rent farmers, as in the case of Šum-ukin, may have served to consolidate the power of the king in the region, these measures benefited above all the temples. The royal concern for the temple agriculture is also visible in the ‘Edict of Belšazzar’, although it is questionable to which extent these prescriptions were implemented by the temples. As far as is visible from the sources, Eanna usually followed different standards when assigning land to rent farmers. Only the rent contract of Ibnī-uštar followed the standards of the ‘Edict’ (see table below). It is certainly no coincidence that this land lease was endorsed by Belšazzar himself.

The support the king showed for some of the rent farmers, e.g., for Kalbïya with respect to his arrears (YOS 3 2), may have been considered intrusive and was certainly challenging for the temple administration. In the end, however, the temple managed to go through a process of settling of accounts with Kalbïya, despite the backing of the king that he initially enjoyed.

The royal court was the authority to which the temple administration turned when in need of solutions for certain problems: the complaints about Kalbïya’s arrears, for instance, were addressed to the king (YOS 3 2). However, the agricultural entrepreneurs could also complain directly to the court. This was the case with Zerbibi, who wrote to the crown prince Belšazzar about a land dispute he had with another rent farmer, Ibnī-uštar (SAKF 155).

The “fragmentation” of the rent farm, to use Coqueville’s term, did happen during Cyrus’s reign. As was mentioned above, a split in separate farms for dates and barley occurred in 8 Cyr. This was followed by the re-introduction of the more direct form of management of the arable cultivation through bel epinni in 1 Camb. There is no evidence to suggest that the cause for the

---

942 The title of Nabû-kibsu-šarrī-usur is lost in a break; but he must have been a royal official, to judge by his name. Ayigašu is designated in the text as ša rēš šarrī, and from 4 Nbn he is also attested as the official in charge of the cash box of the king (ša muḫḫi qippti ša šarrī; Kleber 2008: 37).

943 However, there was a number of rent contracts which were not made in the presence of any royal officials other than the bel piqetti of Eanna (YOS 6 41, TCL 12 90, TCL 13 182).

944 Neriglissar had usurped the throne and sought to create a support base in Uruk. For this reason he not only helped Šum-ukin start his business relationship with Eanna, but he also installed a new šatammu, a qipu and a šakin ŋemī (see Kleber 2008: 12).

945 This particular case was, however, referred back to the temple administration.
fragmentation of the rent farms lay in some official policy: neither of the king, seeking to punish a rent farmer for his bad performance, nor of the temple, attempting to diminish the royal influence on temple agriculture. Perhaps it was simply a matter of human resources. It is conceivable that there were no individuals around with an adequate amount of personal assets (or royal backing, especially with the new Achaemenid dynasty in power) who would embark on such a demanding and risky business as the management of temple lands. For this reason the temple may have been forced to split the farm into smaller, better manageable pieces. The process of fragmentation was reversed again in the accession year of Darius when the širku Gimillu was employed as a rent farmer for barley and dates. Whether he was particularly courageous for taking on the lease, or whether he was forced to do it by the temple administration, we cannot tell. At any rate, his rent farm was somewhat smaller than the one managed by Šum-ukin and Kalbäya. Nevertheless, the fact that the temple reverted back to this form of exploitation after an interim of direct management speaks in favour of the rent farm as a successful system.

Finally, a trend that one sees over the years during which the rent farm system was in place is a gradual virtual decrease of the workload of a plough team. The decrease from Šum-ukin’s 30 kurru of land per team, via 25 kurru professed by the ‘Edict’ and found in the rent contract of Ibnī-Ištar in 11 Nbn (YOS 6 150), to 20 kurru required of Gimillu’s plough teams and finally the 10 kurru which were promised to his successor Bēl-gimlanni (see table on p. 263), was a sign that over time the temple was making concessions to its rent farmers. As a consequence, the strain on their personal assets was gradually reduced. This was in itself a sign that the entrepreneurs were willing (or able) to invest less and less in the rent farming business. Uruk, a city at the periphery of the Babylonian kingdom quite distant from the main trade and communication routes, was economically underdeveloped when compared to the capital Babylon and the cities in its vicinity, Sippar and Borsippa. This is reflected by the rather traditional regime based on arable cultivation followed by the Eanna temple (see p. 373). This agricultural regime had less potential for growth than the temple agriculture of the Ebabbar of Sippar, for instance, which concentrated on the more intensive date cultivation. Hence Uruk and Eanna were probably not the most attractive sites for people willing to invest in agriculture. The limited assets of those entrepreneurs who remained loyal to this region may have forced the temple to make compromises (cf. TCL 13 182). As for the ploughmen, their workload probably remained constant over time. It is to be assumed that they were always forced to work to their maximum. However, the actual amount of land they worked was most certainly smaller than what can be assumed on the basis of the rent contracts, as these implicitly counted with additional workforce provided by the rent farmer. The lack of manpower for arable cultivation (both of temple ploughmen and of adequate substitutes provided by the rent farmers) was indeed the biggest impediment for the rent farming business and the temple agriculture in general. As a consequence, the goals set by the rent contracts could hardly be met by the rent farmers.

Another important development was a decrease of the rent payment for Gimillu’s rent farm: he had to pay annually 10,000 kurru of barley, as opposed to Šum-ukin’s and Kalbäya’s 25,000 kurru. This probably indicates that the amount of arable land under his responsibility decreased compared to Šum-ukin’s farm. At the same time it raises several crucial questions: If Gimillu was in charge of only a fraction of the temple’s arable land (e.g., 1,000 kurru, or 2,000 kurru if fallowing is taken into consideration) what happened to the remaining land? Was it cultivated directly by temple’s own rab epinnis? Or was this land in the process of being converted to date plantations? Does this also mean that the temple had to do with a considerably smaller income in barley? If so, how was this deficit compensated? Unfortunately, for archival reasons there is no possibility to answer these questions. These developments occurred at a moment when our documentation stops and so there is no evidence for their consequences.

The date cultivation seems to have been unproblematic on the whole. There are hardly any accounts apart from TCL 13 227. This text, which records the income in agricultural products stemming from Šum-ukin’s and Kalbäya’s farm and from other sources for a number of years, demonstrates that their rent obligation for dates was more realistic than their barley quota. Several imittu lists concerning Ardia’s rent farm for dates show that he was also more or less on target with his date deliveries. Furthermore, Ardia’s, and subsequently Gimillu’s, rent obligation in dates amounted to 12,000 kurru of dates, which was 2,000 kurru or 20 % more than the rent of Šum-ukin
and Kalbāya. Here the opposite trend to arable agriculture is visible: a rise in the rent payment is probably indicative of a growth in productivity of date cultivation. Whether this growth was possible only at the expense of arable cultivation remains unclear. Having in mind that date plantations are generally more work intensive than cereal fields and considering the ubiquitous lack of manpower in the temple this at least seem plausible. It seems feasible that the rent farmers consciously focused on the date production as it was more profitable than the arable cultivation. At any rate it appears that Eanna was modernizing its economy by concentrating on a more intensive form of agriculture and thus following, even if with a delay, the example of the Ebabbar temple of Sippar. The basis for this change in Eanna may well be attributed to the investment and management strategies of the rent farmers.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>text</th>
<th>VS 20 88 (+ duplicates)</th>
<th>YOS 6 11</th>
<th>YOS 6 41</th>
<th>YOS 6 40</th>
<th>TCL 12 90</th>
<th>YOS 6 150</th>
<th>PTS 2044</th>
<th>TCL 13 182</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>date</td>
<td>5-VIII-35 Nbk</td>
<td>28-I-1 Nbn</td>
<td>23-VI-3 Nbn</td>
<td>23-VI-3 Nbn</td>
<td>(6 Nbn)</td>
<td>10-V-8 Nbn</td>
<td>28-[x]-11 Nbn</td>
<td>(acc Dar) 13-IV-2 Dar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rent farmer</td>
<td>Nergal-nāṣir</td>
<td>Šum-ukin + Kalbāya</td>
<td>Nergal-nāṣir</td>
<td>Arad-Innin + Sin-ibni</td>
<td>Kalbāya</td>
<td>Nergal-nāṣir</td>
<td>Ibnī-l̄star</td>
<td>Ardi a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>type of crop</td>
<td>b(arley)</td>
<td>b + d(ates)</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>b + d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rent (in kurru)</td>
<td>4,000* b</td>
<td>25,000 b + 10,000 d</td>
<td>1,000 b + 60 s + 20 c</td>
<td>1,240 b + 1 ox + 15 sheep</td>
<td>3,000 b</td>
<td>3,500 b</td>
<td>5,000 b + 3,000 bundles of straw</td>
<td>12,000 d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>surface area (in kurru)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6,000 + date plantations</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>865;1.4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,081</td>
<td>- (all orchards, except hāllān)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yield factor</td>
<td>8.3**</td>
<td>4.3**</td>
<td>8*</td>
<td>10**</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. of farmers</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. of oxen</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. of ploughs</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>land per plough</td>
<td>30 kurru</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>25 kurru</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20 kurru</td>
<td>10 kurru</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 23: Eanna’s rent farmers and their rent contracts.
Explanatory notes:

i The contract stipulates the provision of additional 50 workers and 200 oxen in the following year.

ii See previous note.

iii The yield factor is derived from the amount of seed provided by the temple, i.e. 1,000 kurru. At the same time this figure would indicate that 1,000 kurru of land were worked, but since we do not know under which fallow cycle, it is impossible to compute the total amount of land put at Gimillu’s and consequently Bēl-gimlanni’s disposal.

iv Again this figure is derived from the area worked as indicated by the amount of seed provided.

v Of the 2,081 kurru of land only 625 kurru were worked (in a three year cycle, with the surplus allotted to the share croppers). Using this figure the yield factor and the workload per plough team were calculated.

vi The text states that the land will be cultivated in a three year fallow cycle, i.e. of the total amount only 288;1.4 kurru will be worked yearly (l. 6f.). The yield factor of ca. 4.3 is derived from this figure.

vii Only 3,000 kurru of land had actually been worked yearly, since the land was under a two year fallow cycle. This is also the amount of seed provided to the rent farmers. From these figures one derives the yield factor of 8.3 and the workload of 30 kurru of land per plough team.
3. Land lease contracts

The following chapter will deal with the land lease contracts attested in the Eanna archive. Though many of these contracts have formed the basis for numerous studies of the Neo-Babylonian land lease practices in the past, a number of new previously unpublished texts justify another look at them. So far 45 land lease contracts (including duplicates, special types and two private contracts) spanning a period from 3 Nbk to 2 Dar have been identified among the Eanna material. They are listed in the table at the end of the chapter, including the information on the formal type of contract, the type of land and lease, the payable rent, the tenant and the lessor. Of these, 20 texts, some of which – like the contract for Ardia’s general farm for dates – very important, come from the unpublished material.

3.1. Formal aspects

All the land lease contracts have a number of features in common. Just as all the other types of legal documents they end with a list of witnesses, the scribe and the place and date of drafting. In addition to this obligatory information, the main body of the contract contains facts, with varying degrees of detail, on the leased land (size, location, type of land), the identity of the tenant and the lessor (sometimes only implicitly), the type of lease, the stipulated rent (type, quantity) and the obligations of the tenant. Additional optional clauses (e.g., against a breach of contract) could also be included. However, the way these documents were formally constructed could vary. One can distinguish roughly two styles for the Neo-Babylonian land lease contracts: a subjective style, found in what is called Zwiegesprächsursunde and characterised by the inclusion of direct speech, and an objective style, which was limited to the formulations in the third person. The documents written in the objective style can in turn be formulated ex latere conductoris, i.e. from the point of view of the tenant, or ex latere locatoris, i.e. from the point of view of the lessor. The distribution of these styles varies over time and locally. In Uruk we find the Zwiegesprächs-type (ca. 24 contracts) attested since 3 Nbk (YOS 17 7) all throughout the sample with an emphasis on the Chaldean era. The slightly less numerous objective type (ca. 16 contracts) starts appearing increasingly during the time of the Achaemenid rulers, though it is sporadically attested even earlier (e.g., in YBC 3543, 23 Nbk). It is interesting to note that the objective type ex latere conductoris, which is so common in Sippar, does not appear in the Uruk sample at all.

---

946 In addition to occasional studies dealing with individual texts, which will not be listed here, Coequerillat edited and discussed a number of the agriculturally relevant land leases from Eanna known at that time (1968: 37-51). An overview of the Neo-Babylonian lease contracts from both the institutional and the private sector, including the texts from the Murašû archive can be found in Ries 1976 (for a more recent and concise overview see Jursa 2004b). The comparable material from Sippar received a detailed treatment by Jursa 1995a: 117-146.

947 For a brief summary see Jursa 2004b: 175. A more thorough study of the form of these contracts can be found in Ries 1976: 5ff. and 55ff.

948 The lessor is not always explicitly recorded in cases in which this information was assumed to be self-evident (e.g., in some leases of temple land).


951 This distribution stands in clear opposition to the generalisation made by Jursa 2004b: 175 “Bis zur frühen Achämenidenzeit ist die subjektive Stilisierung als Zwiegesprächsurkunden seltener und vor allem Verträgen vorbehalten, in denen bedeutende Ländereien vergeben werden.” As evidence for local/temporal variation he notes, however, that in the later Achaemenid Murašû archive from Nippur the Zwiegesprächs-type is more common.

952 This type may indeed be a peculiarity of the Ebabbar material, as generally the contracts formulated ex latere locatoris are more common.
1. The Zwiegesprächsurkunde normally starts out by stating in the third person that the tenant addressed the lessor, either the temple officials or, in case of sub-leasing, the higher-order tenants, e.g., the general contractors (ša muḫḫī šātī):

“[Tenant] went to [lessor] and said as follows” (PN\textsubscript{1} (tenant) \textit{ana} PN\textsubscript{2}... (lessor(s)) \textit{ilikma kiam iqbi}\textsuperscript{953}).

Then follows the direct speech in which the tenant describes the object of lease, asks for it to be given to him, sometimes stating the type of work to be conducted or the type of rent to be paid, concluding with the promise to carry out the necessary work on this land:

“Give me [object of lease] for [purpose of lease] and I will do the work therein” (object of lease (e.g., \textit{züru pī šulpi, kirū, etc.; location of the plot; other legally relevant information: bit ritti ša PN, ša šātī ša PN, etc.) purpose of lease (\textit{ana nukuribbūti, errēšūti, šātī, etc.) binamma dullu ina libbi lūpuš}).

The text then reverts to the third person, stating that the lessor accepted (šēmū) the tenant’s plea and gave (\textit{nadānu}) him the requested land. Usually this part of the document is a repetition of the facts concerning the land, type of lease and rent, which appeared in the direct speech, but additional information including the work obligations, more detailed stipulations on the size and composition of the rent and possible remuneration of the tenant could also be given.

This type is labelled as 1.a in the table listing the land lease documents from Uruk which is given at the end of this chapter. A slight variant is attested in the cases in which the king or the crown-prince were directly involved in the proceedings (e.g., YOS 6 11 and YOS 6 150). Befitting the more formal circumstances, the language of the contracts reveals a more subservient attitude of the supplicants. The request was not simply stated (\textit{qabū}) in the presence of the king/crown-prince. Rather, the petitioners supplicated (\textit{ullū}) him for granting the lease. Furthermore, the imperative form of \textit{nadānu} is not used in the direct speech, but rather a humbler (third person) precative form (“may the king/crown-prince our/my lord give us/me”\textsuperscript{954}). This type is marked as 1.b in the table.

Another variant of the Zwiegesprächs-type (marked as 1.c) is found in one document recording probably a private arrangement (YBC 4143). The distinctive feature of this form is the appearance of the first person of the verb \textit{uzuzzu} (“to occupy, to take up position”) instead of the usual imperative of \textit{nadānu}.\textsuperscript{955} The use of this verb is usually associated with the objective style contracts, \textit{ex latere conductoris}, found in significant numbers in the Ebabbar archive from Sippar.\textsuperscript{956}

2. The form of the objective style contracts has been treated in detail by Ries 1976: 55ff. and will not be presented here again. Generally it can be said that the same type of information as in the Zwiegesprächs-type is provided by these documents\textsuperscript{957} while the wording of the text is kept in the third person. As was already noted, only the \textit{ex latere locatoris} type appears among the Eanna material, characteristically stating that a lessor (a representative of the temple or a rent farmer) gave (\textit{iddin}) land to a tenant. What follows are the detailed obligations of the tenant and, when applicable, stipulations on his remuneration, guarantee clauses, etc. This type is marked as 2.a in the table of rent contracts. A variant can be found in YOS 7 38 and BM 114450, in which the preterit form of \textit{paqādu (ipqid)} is used instead of \textit{nadānu}. This is marked in the table as 2.b.

\textsuperscript{953} This phrase is frequently constructed omitting the verb \textit{alāku}.

\textsuperscript{954} YOS 6 11, 5: ... lugal en-a-\textit{ni lid-di-na-an-ši-ma}; YOS 6 150, 4: ... dumu lugal en-a \textit{lid-din-nam-ma}. Parallel formulations can be found in BM 61744, the lease contract of the Ebabbar rent farmer Ana-amāt Bēl-atkal (Jursa 1995a: 88).

\textsuperscript{955} YBC 4143 uses a precative form of \textit{uzuzzu} (ll. 6-7: \textit{ina} (land...) \textit{a-na} ₃₄ \textit{nu za₄ kiri₄-ū-tu / lu-uz-ziz-ma}).


\textsuperscript{957} As Ries noted, the style of the Zwiegesprächsurkunden is simply an elaboration of the objective style (“Das Zwiegesprächsformular ist pachrechtlich nichts anderes als die Erweiterung des objektiven Formulares um den in direkter Rede stilisierten Teil und die Schilderung des Vertragsangebotes und der Vertragsannahme.” 1976: 7).
3.2. Lessors

Since our texts essentially concern the land which was temple property, usually expressed as (makkûru) ša Bêlî ša Ḫarrî (u Nanâyâ),\(^{958}\) the role of the lessor was frequently taken up by a representative of this institution. Thus in about a half of the texts we find members of the higher temple administration, the administrator (šatammu), the resident (qipû), the royal commissioner (ša rêš šarrî bêl piqitti Eanna, in this chapter bêl piqitti for short) or the temple scribe(s) (tupšar(rû) Eanna), acting on behalf of the ‘landladies’, Ištar and Nanâyâ. These officials could appear in the contracts on their own,\(^{959}\) accompanied by their colleagues\(^{960}\) or by an ad hoc group of temple officials designated as bêl piqêtì.\(^{961}\) The bêl piqêtì is the only official who does not act alone – he is either accompanied by other high temple officials (šatammu, qipû, the scribes) or the bêl piqêtì.

Sub-leases of temple land are also attested and in these cases we often find the original tenants, notably those known as “rent farmers” or “general contractors” (ša mûḫḫî sûtî) who had large tracts of temple land at their disposal for farming purposes, acting as lessors. One of the first large-scale rent farmers, Šûm-ukîn, from the Basia family, is attested as early as 1 Ner, i.e. before his major contract with the temple for 6,000 kurru of arable land from 1 Nbn, renting out arable land of the temple both for a fixed rent (ana sûtî) to temple ploughmen (PTS 2344, edited on p. 49), and for sharecropping (YBC 3750). In 6 Nbn Šûm-ukîn acts as a lessor of a date orchard (W 17718 lx). Ardia, from the Rêmuê-Ea family, the rent farmer for dates, is attested three times as lessor of date orchards for the task of orchard tending (ana nukuribbûtî).\(^{962}\) The rent farmer Gimillû, son of Ištar-Šûm-ibni, is represented with six rent contracts, two of which were hitherto unpublished and three unedited, concerning both orchards ana nukuribbûtî (NCBT 630, NCBT 677, Spar, Studies, no. 8, YOS 21 214), and arable land for sharecropping (YOS 21 207, 208).\(^{963}\)

Similarly, the people in charge of the prebendary hallatu-orchards, the rab banês, also appear as lessors. These orchards, which were formally temple property and were entrusted to this special class of prebendaries for the purpose of providing dates and fruit for the offerings to the deities, could be inherited or even sold by the rab banês. Consequently, the existence of sub-leases of the hallatu-orchards by their ‘holders’ is unsurprising.\(^{964}\)

In a few special cases we encounter the top members of the state administration acting as lessors of temple land. The king Nabonidus was addressed in his first regnal year while on a visit to

---

\(^{958}\) An exception is probably YBC 4143 (38 Nbk, see below for an edition) which seems to be a private arrangement concerning an orchard of a certain Innin-Šar-ûṣûr (perhaps to be identified with the temple’s rab bûlû) and his father Nergal-ûṣûlim.

\(^{959}\) E.g., šatammu: YOS 7 51, YOS 17 6, YBC 3543; qipû: PTS 2134; tupšar Eanna: BM 114559.

\(^{960}\) E.g., qipû and šatammu: YOS 17 7; šatammu and bêl piqîtì: YOS 7 47, PTS 2044; šatammu, bêl piqîtì and tupšarri ša Eanna: PTS 2089; šatammu, qipû and bêl piqêtì: TCL 13 182. Note that the order in which these officials appear was significant with respect to their ranking within the temple administration. For the Ebabbar of Sippar Bongenaar (1997: 6f.; cf. also Jursa 1995a: 117) noted the order of the two top officials, the qipû and the šangû. See now also Da Riva 2002: 53f. who rightly questioned such a rigid scheme. The sequence provided by Kümmel (1979: 138) for Uruk and Eanna is too simplistic as is shown by Kleber 2008: 7ff. The evidence for the ranking of these officials from the land lease contracts is not very dense, as the cases in which more than one of the high officials is present are not that frequent. However, their relative order of appearance which is visible in these texts generally conforms to the observations made by Kleber based on a much larger corpus of texts.

\(^{961}\) E.g., qipû and bêl piqêtì: VS 20 88; ša rêš šarrî (who became later bêl piqêtì) and bêl piqêtì: TCL 12 73, YOS 6 26; bêl piqêtì and bêl piqêtì: PTS 2249, PTS 2821, TCL 12 90; bêl piqêtì, qipû and bêl piqêtì: YOS 6 33.

\(^{962}\) E.g., qipû and bêl piqêtì: BM 114559.

\(^{963}\) The rent farmer Iñnâ-û, son of Balâtu, is also attested as a “lease”-giver in YOS 19 71 (12 Nbn), a contract for the performance of agricultural work (ana dullû), not an actual land-lease contract. The text is edited on p. 31.

\(^{964}\) For hallatu-orchards in general see Coquerrillat 1973/74 and below.
Larsa by two members of the Basia clan, Šum-ukin and his nephew Kalhâya: they asked to rent 6,000 kurru of land of the Lady of Uruk and the king granted their request (YOS 6 11 and duplicates).

The crown-prince Belšazzar appears in the same role in 11 Nbn in YOS 6 150 granting temple land to the širku Ibni-Ištar, son of Balitu, against a fixed rent (sîtu) of 5,000 kurru of barley. Similar involvement of the state administration in the temple’s organisation of agriculture can be observed during Persian rule. Ardia, the rent farmer for dates of the Lady of Uruk, was given the temple’s entire date plantations in lease by the šatammu and the bēl piqitti of Eanna in 8 Cyr (PTS 2044). However, this lease was explicitly stated to have been conducted at the orders of Gubaru, the governor of Babylonia and Across-the-River. All these contracts had in common that large areas and revenues were involved which warranted the special interest of the state. Note, however, that the equally important transfer of Gimillu’s rent farm to Bēl-gimilanni (TCL 13 182, 2 Dar) was not sanctioned by the king or any of his officials.

3.3. Tenants

The list of the people who are known to us from the rent contracts as lessees of temple land is certainly not exhaustive. Not all the contracts have come down to us and some tenants, as, for instance, the fermier général Gimillu, are only known from other documents. It must be assumed that a number of the temple’s tenants are not known to us.

The lessees could act on their own, or jointly with another person (or rarely two, as in YBC 4143), to whom they could, but need not, be related (brothers, fathers and sons, and once an uncle and a nephew are attested in joint ventures).

No women are attested as tenants in the rent contracts which are available to us. It is, however, probable that they too appeared in this role (albeit on a smaller scale), since some women are known to have had imittu obligations for date orchards, which may imply that they were the tenants of these.

As for the male tenants, they tend to come from various social strata. Men with tripartite names, i.e. of higher social standing, both from the local Urukean elite (e.g., Kuri, Ekur-zakir) and from the outside (e.g., Basia), appear among the tenants of Eanna. A number of tenants with only a patronymic is also attested, and it is these who are most difficult, sometimes even impossible, to trace prosopographically. In addition to these, unfree or semi-free individuals, mostly temple dependants, could also lease land from the temple. Among these we find ploughmen (ikkaru), širku, and a slave of the royal commissioner of Eanna (qallu ša PN ša rēš šarrī (bēl piqitti Eanna)). Information on the profession or official function of the tenants is rarely given. Beside one ikkaru, two herdsmen (nāqidas) are attested as lessees (YOS 6 26 and PTS 2249). Two official titles, namely, one royal official (ša rēš šarrī) and one official in charge of the cash box (ša mûhḫi ḡuppi) are also attested as tenants on temple land in PTS 2089 and TCL 13 182 respectively.

The social status of a tenant had no implications for the scale of his lease. The širku Gimillu and Bēl-gimilanni (cf. TCL 13 182), for instance, were responsible for most of the temple’s date plantations and large stretches of its arable land. It seems rather that the tenant’s personal
resources, which even in the case of some temple oblates could be considerable, influenced the size of his enterprise.

### 3.4. Land

The main focus of the lease documents was on the land and it was their objective to describe and define this land in terms of its legal status, its quality and location and sometimes its size. Hence an array of expressions appears in our texts, including general, administrative and legal terms as well as terminology related to the quality of the soil and to the types of cultivation and work conducted on the land.

#### 3.4.1. Size and location of land

The size of the plots or field complexes leased out is rarely given in the texts. Where the size is noted, it is usually given in the seed system (expressing the area of the fields in terms of the seed volume presumably needed for sowing the field and covering the costs accrued during this work) and it is attested for both relatively small (or rather average) date plantations (2;2.3 kurru in YOS 6 67) and large stretches of arable land (6,000 kurru in YOS 6 11), for arable land leased against a fixed rent (ana sütü), for planting date palms (ana zaqipüüt) and for orchard-tending (ana nukuribbiüt):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Surface area of land in kurru</th>
<th>Type of lease</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YOS 6 67</td>
<td>2,2,3</td>
<td>ana zaqipüüt (+ errësüüt after 10 years)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 7 47</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>ana nukuribbiüt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTS 2344</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>ana sütü</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 6 40</td>
<td>865;1.4</td>
<td>ana sütü</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 6 150</td>
<td>2,081</td>
<td>ana sütü</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 6 11</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>ana sütü</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 24: Size of land recorded in lease contracts

The only exception is PTS 2089, a lease of land composed of two adjacent plots for orchard planting, which gives the lengths of all the sides and the surface area in the so-called seed system:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Surface area of land in kurru</th>
<th>Type of lease</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PTS 2089</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>ana sütü</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTS 2089</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>ana sütü</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTS 2089</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>ana sütü</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTS 2089</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>ana sütü</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

was certainly much larger than the average. (According to van Driel (1988: 133) the majority of the orchards will not have exceeded a surface of 2-3 kurru.)

---

973 See also Ries 1976: 26f.
974 In particular, the fodder for draught animals (Powell 1984: 64).


“[...] of the Lady of Uruk [...] 70 3/5]5 cubits, the upper flank to the west, next to the [hallatu-orchard which is at the disposal of] Balâtu, son of Nabû-bûn-šûtur.⁹⁷⁵ 63 cubits, [the lower flank to the east], next to ... 65 cubits, the upper frontage to the north, next to [...] 55 cubits, the lower frontage to the [south, next to ...], in total: 2 sîtu [3 5/6 [...] - the first] measurement.

25 cubits, the upper flank to the north, next to the land [...] 25 cubits, the lower flank to the south, next to [the first'] plot (literally: measurement), 10 cubits, the upper frontage to the west next to the nakkandu-land on which the širkus are settled, 10 cubits, the [lower] frontage to the east, next to the hallatu-orchard, which is at the disposal of [PN]; in total: 9 akalu surface area, the second measurement.

Grand total: 2 sîtu 3 5/6 [qi] 9 akalu[lu...].⁹⁷⁶

Nabû-mukin-zêrî, the chief administrator of Eanna, son of Nâdin, descendant of Dâbibî, Nabû-ahl-iddin, the royal commissioner of Eanna, and the scribes of Eanna gave (this plot) for the purpose of (orchard) planting to Silim-ilî, the royal official. He will plant Dîlmûn date palms and [date palms?] there. Everything he cultivates below [...] Dîlmûn dates will be at his disposal for ten years.

In the presence of: A[nu-šar-uṣur], the resident of Eanna,
Kalbâya, son of Iqišâ, descendant of Basia,
Šamaš-zêr-iqिशâ, son of Inûn-šar-uṣur,
Ardia, son of Šamaš-šum-ukîn, descendant of Mandîdu;
Scribe: Gimillû, son of Inûn-žêr-iddin;
Uruk; 8-VII-1 Cyr, king of lands.”

Such detail in location and the measurements of the plot is quite exceptional for rent contracts.⁹⁷⁷

The reason for this may have been on the one hand the fairly small surface area of the plots, in total 0;0,2,3.9 (= ca. 1,104 m²). On the other, this could have been the proximity of the loosely defined nakkandu-land⁹⁷⁸ on the west, and of the prebendary hallatu-orchards, on the east, with our plots as a buffer in between. This could have potentially given rise to territorial disputes. Assuming that the two plots were newly assigned for planting from the nakkandu-land which had previously not been put to any particular use (this is not explicitly stated, but may have been noted in the broken section at the beginning of the text), noting the exact measurements of the sides of the plots would make sense.

---

⁹⁷⁵ This is probably the same person as Balâtu/Nabû-bûn-šûtur/Râb-bânê who appears as a witness in YBC 4149 (see p. 291), a lease of a hallatu-orchard from the reign of Cambyses.

⁹⁷⁶ The conversion of the surface area into the seed system was approximate as far as we can tell. Only the measurements of the second plot are completely extant. The plot with the sides of 10 and 25 cubits would have had a surface area of 250 square cubits or 8.33 akalu. In the text this was rounded up to 9 akalu. The situation for the larger plot is more difficult as the surface area, the number of sîla in particular, is either broken off (l. 7) or unclear because of breaks on the tablet (l. 14). Furthermore, the numerals signifying the length of the western flank are partially broken (l. 2). If the surface area of this plot was 2 sîtu 3 qû, as is suggested in the transliteration, then the length of the western flank can be reconstructed to 75 cubits.


⁹⁷⁸ Approximately “land held in reserve for assignation”, see below.
The information on the location of the leased temple land can be very vague at times. Usually at least one major topographical feature will be specified in the contract. For instance, it can be stated that the leased land is situated on a certain canal (e.g., BM 114559, YBC 4149) or in a certain place (or places) (e.g., YOS 6 26, VS 20 88, TCL 12 90). Additionally one of the neighbours (e.g., YOS 6 33, NBC 4889, YBC 3750) or two features (two canal intakes or secondary canals: YOS 17 6, YBC 4143; two neighbouring plots or administrative areas: PTS 2249, YOS 21 214) delimiting or bordering on the two (long) sides of the plot could be named. The lower border of the plots, i.e. the side located the furthest away from the canal on which the plot lies, is practically never identified (an exception is Spar, Studies, no. 8). It appears that most of the time natural limitations were of relevance here. Sometimes, however, no localisation whatsoever is given in the texts. This is particularly the case in the ferme générale contracts, i.e. contracts dealing with extended areas of agricultural land (YOS 6 11, TCL 13 182) or entire agricultural cultures (all of the temple’s date orchards, except the ḫallatu-orchards: TCL 13 182, PTS 2044). But occasionally also smaller leases (50 kurru in PTS 2344; see also YOS 19 71) lack a localisation of the land. It is clear, however, that the temple and its rent farmers were not as unspecific about the land as these contracts may suggest. Certain land lease documents, especially from the first half of Nabonidus’s reign from the time when Šum-ukin had a major lease on temple land, specify that the land in question had not been already assigned to this rent farmer, indicating that this type of information was probably booked in other (administrative) documents, which have not come down to us, rather than lease contracts (qaqqaru ša ina sùtī ša Šum-ukin lā šaṭru, YOS 6 67: 6).

3.4.2. Terminology for land

Two general terms for land are qaqqaru and zēru (še-numun). They could be used more or less synonymously. Though qaqqaru appears less frequently in the rent contracts, it designates land which could be leased out, just as zēru, for different purposes. In the lease contracts qaqqaru could designate land suitable for planting date palms or grapevines (in the zāqipūtu-contracts YOS 6 33, 67, YOS 17 6 and PTS 2134). Apparently the term is not used to designate land leased out for orchard tending (ana nukuribbüti). Only in one case qaqqaru refers to an existing orchard. The specific terms for orchards (bit kirî, bit gišimmari, etc.) are only used in apposition to zēru (and once eqlu in BM 114444). The two terms could also appear together in one text in apposition to each other. In PTS 2344 the tenant asked for 50 gur / še-numun qaqqar (ll. 7-8, also in l. 12), and in YOS 6 67 for 2;2.3 še-numun ... (localisation) / qaqqar ša gašan ša umugki (ll. 3-5).

The two terms could be applied to both arable land and date orchards in different stages of cultivation and they had no particular connotations concerning the quality of the land, apart from the above mentioned restrictions for the use of the term qaqqaru. In other words, they could not only include agriculturally productive land (bit gišimmari, bit dulli/bit mēreši) or land ready for development (bit taptē, land leased ana zāqipūti), but also land of lower quality, some of which unsuitable for cultivation (kaslu, kālū, gabbu, bit mé, bit nizli), which was generally used for pasturing cattle and sheep as is evident from YOS 6 26, YOS 6 40 and PTS 2249. According to YOS 6 33 some qaqqaru of the Lady of Uruk consisted of kaslu and kālū types of land (see below for these) but could be turned into a date plantation.

---

979 The lower portions of the basins were usually composed of lower quality, sometimes waterlogged, land and the further one went away from the irrigation canal, which most commonly ran parallel to the upper front of a field, the less suitable the land became for cultivation.
980 No such text is known from Uruk, but a ledger recording the lengths of the sides and the neighbours of the plots assigned to a rent farmer has come down to us from Sippar (Jursa 1995a: 110ff. (BM 74646 = no. 30)).
981 Note also the equivalent, but in terms of administrative record less explicit expression zēru ... ša Šum-ukin ... lā isḥatu from YOS 6 40 ll. 11-14.
982 E.g., in YOS 6 33 and YOS 17 6 for orchard planting (ana zāqipūti), in VS 20 88 and PTS 2821 as arable for a fixed rent (ana sùtī), in TCL 12 64 and BM 114559 as arable (in the latter text as bit taptē) for sharecropping.
983 AnOr 9 11 ll. 12-15: še-numun pi-š šal-pu / še-gišimmarr qaqqar še ša PN. Here qaqqaru refers to a bow fief, land on which both cereals and dates were cultivated.
Another general term, *eglu* (a-šā) is usually translated as “field”. However, since it could signify both arable land and date orchards, a translation “plot” is more accurate. It designated smaller units of land and probably referred to particular, perhaps specifically delimited parcels.

### 3.4.2.1. Arable land

*pī šulpi* was the general term used for arable land, i.e. land intended for cereal cultivation. It was usually preceded by the word *zēru*. It could be leased out against a fixed rent (*ana sitio*), for sharecropping (*ana errēšit*) and for developing (*ana taptē*).

The land designated as *pī šulpi* could be further defined in terms of the stage of cultivation or grade of productivity. For instance, it could be characterised as *bēt dulli* or *bēt mēreši*. These two terms were interchangeable and they implied cultivated and fully productive arable land. The term *eršu* which appears in YBC 3543 also designated cultivated, i.e. ploughed and sown land.

Another sub-category of *pī šulpi* was *taptū* (or *bēt taptē*), usually translated as “freshly broken land” (van Driel 1990: 220f.) or “Neubruchland” (Ries 1976: 27; Jursa 1995a: 141). It represented previously uncultivated land, i.e. land which had not been ploughed but was intended to be cultivated. In the following, the translation “unbroken”, i.e. (previously) unploughed, land is preferred to van Driel’s “freshly broken land” in order to stress the fact that no tilling had been conducted on the land prior to the lease. In the texts *taptū* was contrasted with *bēt dulli* and since it required more strenuous work than the already developed land, the share to be paid for it to the temple was smaller than for the productive land. The word *mayyārur* could designate both a type of plough and the land which was worked up (dekā) with this kind of plough. The *mayyārur*-ploughing was probably conducted after the initial procedure of “opening” of land. According to Jursa, in terms of the stage of cultivation, *mayyārur*-land should be placed between *bēt mēreši/bēt dulli* and *taptū* (1995a: 141). However, note that in YOS 21 207, edited below, the only work procedure, stipulated for land designated as *pī šulpi* *bēt dulli u taptē* was, apart from the general *dulla epēšu*, *mayyārā dekā* (II.6-7). Should this be taken for an indication that the terms *bēt taptē* and *mayyārur* could be used more or less synonymously?

Other terms for land of lower productivity were *apītu* (YBC 4143) and *barrātu* (NCBT 677). According to CAD A II: 170f. *apītu* designates “inarable land”. Most of the attestations of this term are from the Middle-Babylonian period, but one attestation (YOS 9 80), perhaps from Sīn-šar-īškun’s reign, is also registered by the CAD. However, in the light of the new occurrence in YBC 4143, in which *apītu* was clearly to be subjected to agricultural cultivation, a modification of the proposed translation (at least for the Neo-Babylonian period) seems in order. Rather than “inarable”, *apītu* seems to have designated previously uncultivated land. A further characteristic of this land was that it was overgrown with shrubbery, since the text stipulates that this was to be overgrown with reeds which needed to be cleared before cultivation was possible.

984 Cf. Ries 1976: 271f.; van Driel 1990: 220f. The word *šulpu*, with the basic meaning “stalk”, was used also in the sense of “area under cultivation, cultivated field” in the Old-Babylonian period (CAD S III: 256f.). The meaning “area under cultivation” (as opposed to newly broken ground) may derive from the meaning stalk; the cultivated area is measured in terms of stalks (*ana pišulpim/pišulpi*). In NB, the phrase *pi šulpi* was reinterpreted to designate grain fields as opposed to date palm groves” (CAD S III: 276).

985 E.g., YOS 6 11, YOS 6 150.

986 Both in YOS 21 207, for instance.

987 YOS 6 150 2-3: 625 gur *še*-numun *še*-numun *pi-i šul-pu* šā *gašan šā* unug; YOS 21 207 1; [x] gur *še*-numun *pi-i šul-pu* ē *dul-la* āt* tap-tu-ū.*


989 In YOS 21 207 (see note 987). See also Jursa 1995a: 126.

990 Von Soden connects the term *apītu* etymologically to *apu*, “reed” (AHw: 58). Perhaps this was land overgrown with reeds which needed to be cleared before cultivation was possible.

991 The tenants are to have usufruct of the cultivated *apītu*-land for four years (YBC 4143 16f.: *a-pi-tu₄ ma-la ag-numum-mu / i še₅ *šu ip-pu-šu...*).

for parts of the barrātu-land located in front of the leased orchard which were cultivated by the tenant.\footnote{L. 10'f.: <\$c>~numun ma-la ina bar-ra-ti pa-na-ar gišimmari / ip-pu-sš...}{ It is at the moment not possible to determine what the differences, if there were any, between the land designated by the terms taptû, apîtu and barrātu were. In the texts in which apîtu and barrātu appear as designations for arable land, as opposed to date orchards, which were the main concern of these two leases, the activities to be conducted on the arable were mattyāra dekû, taptē putû and abatingi (working up the mayyāru-land, “breaking/opening” the previously unploughed land and removing shrubbery) according to YBC 4143 and taptē putû according to NCBT 677, activities generally connected to taptû-land. Therefore it is even conceivable that the three terms could be used synonymously.

3.4.2.2. Date orchards

The general terms for date orchards are kirû (usually written logographically \síkiri,\footnote{In the Old Babylonian sources this space between the date palms, in which barley could be cultivated, was called teriqûtu (ki-ud) (Stol 2004b: 172). The term birrātu “unerschlossenes Land?” could be a variant of barrātu (Jursa 2004b: 173).} and bit gišimmari (\č\ gišimmmar), which frequently appear in combination with other terms for land or date plantations. kirû alone is attested in the private lease YBC 4143 (see p. 310). zérû bit kirî appears in Šum-ukî’s and Kalhâyâ’s rent contract YOS 6 11 (+ duplicates) where it is contrasted with arable land (zérû pî šulpî). zérû bit gišimmari is attested in the lease BIN 1 117. Another way of designating date orchards was zérû gišimmari zaqpu, i.e. “land planted with date palms” (AUWE 11 214, YOS 7 38, PTS 2044), or simply zérû zaqpu, “planted land” (NCBT 360, Spar, Studies, no. 8).

Prebendarv orchards are identified by adding the term ḫallatu: the designation eqlu kirû gišimmari zaqpu kirû ḫallatu is attested in BM 114444 and zérû kirû ḫallatu in YOS 7 162 and YBC 4149.

Rarely, general terms for land are used alone when referring to date plantations. In NBC 4889 zérû was leased out for the purpose of orchard tending (ana nukuribbit) and in YOS 17 7 a plot (eqlu) of the Lady of Uruk was leased against a fixed rent in dates.\footnote{NCBT 677 10'f.: zérû mala ina barrātu pînuš gišimmari / ippušu.}

Sometimes the texts specify that there were young date palms in the orchards. In YOS 7 47 and 51 this is expressed as zérû gišimmari šeḫherîtu ina zēri (literally “land: young date palms are on the land”). This type of information was important since these palms were not mature and not fully productive. Hence, the prospective revenues from these plots were lower.

In between the date palms there was ample space\footnote{See for instance BIN 1 117, Spar, Studies, no. 8, NBC 4889, NCBT 630, 677.} for planting cereals, vegetables or even fruit trees. This is evident from the frequent stipulations for work (\síllu) or digging (\herîtu) which had to be conducted underneath the date palms (ina šúpāl gišimmari) using spades and/or ploughs.\footnote{Sometimes the texts specify that there were young date palms in the orchards. In YOS 7 47 and 51 this is expressed as zérû gišimmari šeḫherîtu ina zēri (literally “land: young date palms are on the land”). Arable land included in orchard leases was sometimes situated in front of the date palms. In NCBT 630, for instance, the leased land is described as zérû zaqpu u pînassu pî šulpî (“planted land and arable land in front of it”). The lease NCBT 677 mentions uncultivated land in front of the date palms which could be worked up. Not knowing the point of view of the speaker, it is difficult to picture exactly where this land was situated. NCBT 630 mentions, unfortunately in a somewhat damaged section, an area in front of the (orchard) on the banks of the irrigation canals. After a break the text continues with the conditions for shares due from different types of arable land cultivated. This probably indicates that arable land could be found also on the} for parts of the barrātu-land located in front of the leased orchard which were cultivated by the tenant.\footnote{It is at the moment not possible to determine what the differences, if there were any, between the land designated by the terms taptû, apîtu and barrātu were. In the texts in which apîtu and barrātu appear as designations for arable land, as opposed to date orchards, which were the main concern of these two leases, the activities to be conducted on the arable were mattyāra dekû, taptē putû and abatingi (working up the mayyāru-land, “breaking/opening” the previously unploughed land and removing shrubbery) according to YBC 4143 and taptē putû according to NCBT 677, activities generally connected to taptû-land. Therefore it is even conceivable that the three terms could be used synonymously.}
strip of land between the orchard and the canal located on the levee. These instances of arable in front of the orchards should be viewed as exceptions to the generally assumed layout of the southern Mesopotamian field systems with orchards up on the levees and grain fields stretching behind them in the basins (e.g., van Driel 1988: 131).

NCBT 630

1. še-numun zaq-pi ‘pa-na-at-su pi-i šul-pu
é rit-tu4 sā ḫi-na’a a-šū sā ḫre-mu4 gū id-lugal sā e-li’é
ē4ža-am-ma-il nib-qa4 gαšαn sā unug4 ki u4 na-ña-a sā gk4bān
sā ‘gi-ml-lu a-šū sā ḫinnin-na-mu-du14 sā ḫmu-ḫi gk4bān sā ḫaša� sā unug4 ki

5. ‘gi-ml-lu a-na14 mu-qa4 kiri4-ḫu4 tu a-na 4ba-la-tu a-šū
sā 4śinnin-na-numun-bad id-din dul-lu ina lib-bi iḫ-pu-uš tap-tu-if
u-ḫu-ši4 iḫ-e-ru tu ina šu-pa4 gk4gšimmarr iḫ-er-re-id4a
šu iḫ-er-re-e-ma me-e u4 ša-aḫ-bat
he-ru-tu ma-la ina šu-pa4 gk4 gšimmarr iḫ-er-ru-if

10. ḫi-mar-ri ina muḫ-ḫi 1 ġur 5 ġur u 4āpa4n ina muḫ-ḫi
1 ġur 4 ġur zu-šum-ma sis-sin-nu ‘gi-ml-lu a-na
4ba-la-tu i-nam-din pu-ut ma-aš-sar-tu4 ša lib-bi
ḫa-ru-ḫu-te4 da-a-šu4 gk4 gšimmarr u gk4hi-le-pi4
ša pa-na-at-šu4 ḫa-la-tu n-aš pa-na-at a-ša

lo.e.

15. gū id-lugal u id4aš ina a-ša4 ḫi4hi-le-pi4
4i-t4ša’-kan4 še-numun ma-la ina pa-na-at-šū14 i-fr4-ri4-šu14

rev.
ē ‘da4[U]14 4e tap-4ḫu4 t-šu4 5-šu4 4ē me4-e śu414
ē ‘taḫ-tu414 šal-šū ḫa-la a-na4 gαšαn sā unug4ki i-nam-din
1 ġur še-numun ina 1 lim ša x x x (x) gū id-lugal ‘din

20. iḫ-pu-uš-ma 4u-ḫa-la a-na4 gαšαn sā unug4ki i-nam-din14
1-en-nu4aš-ša-ta-ru il-ḫu-u
μu4mu-kin1 [.....]
in4šinnin-numun-du14 [.....]
[.....]

(three blank lines)

25. iXu4umbišag1 šiḫ-la-a a-šū sā i4šiḫ-lu4-nu4-umur a cli4-din4-amar-utu
[.....] x ki in ud 4-kam mu 1-kam
[iq4a-gni4-shul-ur] luγαl cki4 u kur-kur

“Gimillu gave to Balatu, son of Innin-zîr-ilişir, the land planted (with date palms) with arable land in front of it, bit ritti of Kiniya, son of Rēmūtu, (situated on) the bank of Nār-šarrī above998 Bit-Šama’il, property of the Lady of Uruk and Nannaya, pertaining to the rent farm (sītu) of Gimillu, son of Innin-šum-ibni, the rent farmer of the Lady of Uruk, for the purpose of orchard-tending. He will do the work there. He will break the unbroken land. He will do the digging under the date palms. He will dig its (the orchard’s) irrigation canals and supply them with water. For as much digging as he does below the date palms Gimillu will give to Balatu as sissimtu ša kurru (of dates) per each surface kurru (worked) with a spade and 4 kurru of dates per each surface kurru (worked) with a plough. Balatu guarantees for the guarding of the frends and shoots (and against) the felling of date palms and willows which (grow) in front of them. In front of the plot, on the bank of Nār-šarrī and (along) the irrigation canals which are on the plot he will plant willows. For as much land as he cultivates in front of it (the orchard) he will give to the Lady of Uruk 1/5 (of the harvest) for the unbroken land irrigated by buckets, (and) 1/3 (of the harvest) as share for the unbroken land with readily available water.”999 Balatu will cultivate 1 kurru of land in the šimu ... on the bank of Nār-šarrī and will give 1/4 (of the harvest) as share to the Lady of Uruk. Each took (a copy of) the document.

Witnesses: [.....] Ištar-zîr-ibni7 [.....],
Scribe: Śiliya, son of Innin-šum-uṣur, descendant of Kidin-Marduk;

998 If the point of view was from Uruk then above means “north of”.
999 For bit mé qātī see below.
x (= place of drafting); 4-VI-1 [Nbk IV], king of Babylon and of lands.

3.4.2.3. Low quality land

A number of terms signifying land of low quality and productivity are known from the land lease contracts (apîtu, barrātu, kaslu, kālā, gabību, ḫummuṭu, appāru, bit mê, bit nizli, manzalṭi mê).\(^{1000}\) Though the exact meaning of most of these words is difficult to determine, as is demonstrated by the relevant entries in the dictionaries, it is beyond doubt that the land in question was of limited use for the temple agriculture. apîtu and barrātu were discussed on p. 272. appāru designated a swampy terrain.\(^{1001}\) Similarly, permanently or periodically waterlogged areas were probably implied by the terms bit mê,\(^{1002}\) bit nizli\(^{1003}\) and manzalṭi mê.\(^{1004}\) ḫummuṭu (TCL 12 90) may perhaps have designated a barren and arid region to judge by basic meaning of the root *ḥmṭ (CAD I: 64, ḫamāṭu B: “to burn, scorch”).\(^{1005}\) However, it can not have been all too barren since cattle and sheep were to be pastured in this area according to TCL 12 90: 22f. The term kālā was used in the Middle-Babylonian period to signify a “dike (surrounding fields to keep the irrigation water inside the field)” (CAD K: 104), but in the Neo-Babylonian period the meaning of the word has changed to signify a kind of land, “a type of marshy ground affected by salinity” (CAD K: 104),\(^{1006}\) often adjacent to date orchards (van Driel 1988: 140; 1990: 222). According to CAD K: 244 kaslu was “land drained by ditches”. This interpretation was based on the connection with Aramaic kislā, “Graben, Furche” made by von Soden (1966: 12). However, there is no evidence in our material whatsoever for this type of land being in any way connected to drainage ditches. Finally, for lack of a better understanding, gabību is rendered as “land suitable for pasture” in CAD G: 6.

Usually these types of land appear in the context of cattle and sheep herding which is sometimes mentioned in the land lease contracts. The tenants were occasionally asked by the

---

\(^{1000}\) These terms have been discussed by van Driel 1990: 222f. See also Jursa 1995a: 141 and Da Riva 2002: 88f.

\(^{1001}\) The word appears in TCL 12 90; “reed marsh, reed bed, lagoon” (CAD A II: 179).

\(^{1002}\) Apart from YOS 6 40 in which bit mê is attested, it appears also in a lease from Sippar BM 60454 (Jursa 1995a: 145f.). Jursa rightly opts against the interpretation of CAD M II: 156, “land suitable for flood irrigation”, and translates it as ‘Wasserfeld’ (p. 146). The attestation from the Muraṭš archive (BE 9 7) recorded by CAD M II: 156 sub bit mê should be deleted from this entry and the translation of bit mê modified to “waterlogged soil” or similar. The Murāṭš text mentions in fact bit mê qāṭi, not just bit mê. The former term was connected to the circumstances related to the irrigation (for a discussion see below) and while one could argue that bit mê qāṭi could be interpreted as “land suitable for flood irrigation”, this is certainly not a correct translation for the term bit mê.

\(^{1003}\) The word appears in YOS 6 40 and TCL 12 90. According to CAD N II: 304 bit nizli was “drained land”, from nazālu, “to pour, drain”. In view of its low utility for agricultural cultivation per se, it is more likely that bit nizli was land, probably at the lower end of the cultivated fields, used for diverting surplus irrigation water from the fields, i.e. for draining them, and with van Driel 1990: 223 “a waterlogged or seasonably waterlogged area”.

\(^{1004}\) The word appears in TCL 13 182 and was semantically related to nīzlu. CAD M I: 230 gives the translation “drainage” for this term. See also previous note.

\(^{1005}\) The CAD I: 235 does not offer a translation for ḫummuṭu in TCL 12 90 (“uncertain meaning”). In YOS 3 200 the term seems to designate a type of tree (l. 5: 8šhum-mu-ṭu ni-tukš-e ā š4a-lu). The CAD I: 235 translates here “early (bearing) Telmum-palms” based on the meaning of ḫamāṭu A, “to haste, be quick” (CAD I: 62).

\(^{1006}\) On p. 105 the CAD remarks that “most refs. to kālā come from Uruk and denote a marshy soil which because of salinization is no longer suitable for growing barley but only for planting date groves and other kinds of trees that endure salinity and for pasturing”. The salinization of the soil is in fact never explicitly mentioned in our texts. This inference is probably based on the lack of evidence for the use of kālā for the cultivation of salt-intolerant cereals and on YOS 6 33 according to which kaslu and kālā land were to be turned into a date orchard. (Note that van Driel (1990: 223) proposed reading ē-mun, “salty soil”, in the Egibi text Cyr. 3 at the end of line 3, as a type of land sold together with cultivated (mērešu) and lower quality land (kālā u gabību). However, Wunsch (2000 II: 161f.), who collated the text, opposed this reading, suggesting that these signs were in fact the remains of an erasure and should be read: {gi*-bi*-\[bi\]}.) On kālā land see also Da Riva 2002: 88f.
temple authorities to let the temple cattle and sheep graze on the land apparently not used for agricultural purposes. Therefore it can be assumed that some sort of wildly growing vegetation which could provide food for the animals covered these types of land. According to TCL 12 90 kaslu, ṣummu₃₄, kalû, apparu₄ and bit nūṣī₄ were to be used for pasturing livestock (ll. 22f.). In YOS 6 40 the range kaslu, kalû, gabibu₄, bit mē₃ and bit nūṣī₄ (ll. 18f.) and in TCL 13 182 zēru ḳas₃₅-lu₄ ᵤ₃ man-zal-tu₄ me-e (l. 28) are intended for the same purpose. In PTS 2249 kaslu, kalû and gabibu (ll. 6f.) were to be used as grazing grounds by a herdsman who rented the land specifically for the purpose of acquiring pasture for his herd. Nevertheless, the herdsman had to make a rent payment in barley:

PTS 2249

Nbn

1. [... (1/2 line broken) a]-šū ša₄ dig₄ mu₄ mu₄ li₄ na-qa₃d (erasure)

2. [...]

3. [...]

4. [...]

5. [...]

6. [...]

7. [...]

8. [...]

9. [...]

10. [...]

11. [...]

12. [...]

13. [...]

14. [...]

15. [...]

16. [...]

17. [...]

18. [...]

19. [...]

20. [...]

21. [...]

22. [...]

23. [...]

24. [...]

25. [...]

26. [...]

27. [...]

28. [...]

29. [...]

30. [...]

"PN", son of Nabû-ṣum-iddin, herdsman [of the Lady of Uruk and Naniya], said to Nabû-ṣar-usur, the royal commissioner of Eanna, and the officials of Eanna as follows: ‘Give me land of the Lady of Uruk, which is in the large estate of Bit-Sín-asārid, from the upper Nār-ṣarri to Ḥuşṣctu-ṣa-Nabû-bān-aḫi, and I will pasture the small and large cattle of the Lady of Uruk, which is at my disposal, on the low quality land, as much as there is. [...] (From) the cultivated land there I will give to the Lady of Uruk yearly 360 kurr₃₄ barley using the measure of the Lady of Uruk at the (navigable) watercourses, one bull (and) [five sheep]. Nabû-ṣar-usur and the officials of Eanna accepted and gave him the arable land which is on the estate of the Lady of Uruk in Bit-Sín-asārid, from [the upper Nār-ṣarri] to the Ḥuşṣctu-ṣa-Nabû-bān-aḫi [...] on the estate of [...] Yearly he will give to [the Lady of Uruk ...] 360 kurr₃₄ of barley [using the measure of the Lady of Uruk] at the (navigable) watercourses, one bull and five [sheep]. Small and large cattle [of the Lady of Uruk],

1007 The reconstruction of the year is not certain. It is based on YOS 6 33, 40 and 41, texts written in 3 Nbn by the same scribe and with partly the same witnesses as in PTS 2249.
which is at his disposal, will graze there. (This is) apart from the arrears [which are charged against him].

Witnesses: Bēl-uballīt, son of Miṣallīm-Marduk, descendant of [Gimil-Nanāya],
Innîn-šar-ushur, son [Nergal-ūsallīm, descendant of Šin-leqe-uninnī],
Ina-teš-ētēr, son of Šākīn-šum̄i, [descendant of Šin-leqe-uninnī],
Madān-ahḫē-iddīn, [son of Gimilū], descendant of Šīgīa,
Nabū-ētēr-napšātī, son of [Arad-ī]ēl, descendant of Egībī,
Nabū-bān-ālī, son of Nabū-balāssu-itīqbi, descendant of Šin-leqe-uninnī,
Innîn-šum-ushur, son of Iddīn-Nabū, descendant of Kidīn-Marduk,
Nabū-ūsallīm, son of Kudurru, descendant of Rēš-sattūkki;

Scribe: Nabīn, son of Bel-abḫē-iqīšā, descendant of Egībī;
Uruk; 23-VI-[3'] Nbn, king of Babylon."

Besides providing for the temple’s livestock, the temple administration expected a revenue in cereals from the land it leased out to the herdsman.\textsuperscript{1008} The lease must have therefore included also some productive land. The rent in cereals was not considerable – 360 kurru of barley; however, this was at any rate more than one plough team could manage.\textsuperscript{1009} By contrast, the impost in cattle, one bull and five sheep, was very low. This should probably be seen as an extra payment on top of the barley rent. The herdsman’s actual cattle impost must have been regulated by a separate herding contract.

Unfortunately, we do not know how extensive the leased land was. For this reason nothing can be said about its productivity: it could have been a small, but productive plot; alternatively, and this seems more probable, the land in question could have been extensive, allowing for ample grazing grounds, but not very productive (hence the relatively low rent). Some of the rent contracts, especially those concerning larger stretches of land leased against a fixed rent (ana sūtī) make it evident that low quality land was often adjacent to the productive arable land, probably further down in the basins, and was (automatically?) included in the leases to be put to other uses (e.g., pasture) by the tenants (TCL 12 90, YOS 6 40, TCL 13 182).

Van Driel (1990: 223) speculated whether the order in which the various types of low quality land were listed in the texts was significant. Possibly it was a sign for progressively decreasing productivity of the land, however, this is difficult to verify. While some types of land seem to have been in a (permanently?) waterlogged condition, to judge by their names, and hence unsuitable for cultivation, other types, notably kaslu and kālū, were reclaimable for agricultural purposes. This is indicated by YOS 6 33, a contract for orchard planting (ana zāqipūtī), according to which land (qaggaru) of the Lady of Uruk, further characterised as kasal u kālū (l. 4f.), was to be planted with Dilmun date palms after removing the wildly growing shrubbery (abattu\textsuperscript{1010}).

3.4.2.4. Terms for land related to tillage and irrigation techniques

The terms bit marri, “land worked with a spade”, and bit epinni, “land worked with a plough”,\textsuperscript{1011} appear in the context of the cultivation of the land beneath the date palms. For this work the gardener was to receive remuneration (sissinnu) in dates in proportion to the area worked. For the more strenuous work with the spade he was rewarded with a bigger amount of dates than

\textsuperscript{1008} A comparable lease of land for pasture with a fixed rent in barley is YOS 6 26. None of the above discussed terms for land appear in this text, though. The land leased out is designated as a šīḫu of the Lady of Uruk.

\textsuperscript{1009} According to a general accounting model applied in Šu’m-ukīn’s rent contract, for instance, 250 kurru of barley were expected from one plough team. It has already been discussed that these accounting models imposed heavy loads on the plough teams.

\textsuperscript{1010} Cf. Jursa 1995a: 123 with further literature. Jursa comes to the conclusion that abattu must have been an organic material, not “limestone” as proposed by the CAD (A I: 40f.), growing wildly on canal banks and in untended gardens. It was probably a mixture of shrubs and reeds which needed to be removed.

\textsuperscript{1011} Occurrences, for instance, in: YOS 7 47, BIN 1 117, 125, NBC 4889, NCBT 630, Spar, Studies, no. 8.
for the land worked with a plough, as is exemplified by NBC 4889, a contract for orchard-tending (see also below):

NBC 4889

2-VI-2 Camb

obv. 1. še-numun ša i-na id eš-šú e rit-ti
ša[] en-šeš-me-su ša ús-sa-du šeš-lu-mur
a-šu ša ’dinkir-ka tak-la-ku nig-ga ’gašan ša unug kī
u ’na-na-a ša gš-bān ša īr-iā

2. ašu ša[] ag-dū-šeš a ’re-mut-bad
’a-na[] gš-kirī a-na šeš-ia-a-li-da
’u[] za-ba-ša-lugal-ūru dumu meš
ša[] šu-zu-3u id-din dul-ru ina lib-bī
ip-pu-šu-ma a-na ’hr-ia ū-kal-lam-u

5. ’id[] me-e ū-sā-aš-ba-tu-u’
[lib-bi] ’u3 ha-ru3-ut-tua3 ina-3aš-šar-u3

10. ’is-sin-nu] ū ša mu 2-kam e-tīr’-ru-u’
’1-en-tam ša-ša-ri il-qu-u
’lu[mu-kin-nu] ag-en-šu-nu a-šu[] in-nin-mu-kam
a[] bad-di[nir-t]-dū1-hr-in a-šu ša
’lu[] ag-dib-ud-da a ’e-gi-bī

15. ’is-sin-nu] ū ša mu 2-kam e-tīr’-ru-u’
’1-en-tam ša-ša-ri il-qu-u
’lu[mu-kin-nu] ag-en-šu-nu a-šu[] in-nin-mu-kam
a[] bad-di[nir-t]-dū1-hr-in a-šu ša
’lu[] ag-dib-ud-da a ’e-gi-bī

u.e.
lugal e[] lugal kur-ku’re

“(Ardia) gave to Āḫ-yālid and Zababa-šar-uṣur, the sons of Šūzubu, the land which is on Nārū-eššu, bīt ritī of Bēl-āḫē-eriba, next to (the plot of) Āḫ-lūmur, son of Ili-taklāk, property of the Lady of Uruk and Nannīya, pertaining to the rent farm of Ardia, son of Nabū-bān-ahi, descendant of Rēmut-Ea, for the purpose of orchard-tending. They will do the work there and show it to Ardia. They will supply the irrigation canals with water. They will protect the fronds and shoots. For as much work as they do below the date palms he will give them as sissinnu 5 kurru (of dates) per each surface kurru (worked) with iron spades, and 4 kurru (of dates) per each surface kurru (worked) with a plough. [sisrinnu] for the second year (of Cambyses) is paid. Each took (a copy of) the document.

Witnesses: Nabū-bēlšunu, son of Ištar-šum-ēreš, descendant of Ea-ilūta-bānī,
Adad-Bēl, son of Nabū-mušetiq-uddē, descendant of Egībi,
Scribe: Nabū-šum-uki, son of Nādin-ahi, descendant of Gaḥul;
Nājallu; 2-VI-2 Camb, king of Babylon (and) of lands.”

The terms bīt dāli and bīt mē qāti are related to the irrigation practices and appear mostly in the context of arable cultivation. The latter term, which has so far been attested in only one published text from the late Achaemenid Murāšu archive from Nippur (BE 9 7), has not been properly identified in the earlier studies of this archive. It is incorrectly quoted as bīt mē in the secondary literature and the CAD M II: 156 (see note 1002). Now the same term appears in three new texts from Eanna (YOS 21 208, NCBT 630 and 677) and a variant of the expression can be found in YBC 3543. These different types of irrigation had an effect on the productivity of the land and entailed different degrees of effort on the part of the cultivators. For this reason the two categories of land were treated differently by the temple administration when it came to determining the harvest shares to be paid for them. Manual irrigation by buckets, which is implied

1012 This arable land could, however, be adjacent to date orchards as NCBT 630 and 677 demonstrate.
1013 E.g., Stolper 1985: 50; Læssøe 1953: 78.
by the word dâlu1014 required a greater effort to judge by the harvest shares expected from the land treated in this way. The share that the temple received from bit dâli is generally smaller than the share from bit mé qâti. In the Murâšû text, the tenant was to deliver 1/3 of the harvest plus 1 shekel of silver per each kurru of surface area for the bit mé qâti.1015 For the bit dâli he had to deliver 1/4 of the harvest and 2/3 of a shekel per kurru of surface area worked. In the Eanna text YOS 21 208 the ratio is 1/2 share for bit mé qâti and 1/3 share for dâlu-land:

YOS 21 208

30-V-1 Nbk IV

obv. 1. [ ]

1014 dâlu designated a bucket and the irrigation conducted using buckets (CAD D: 56f.; cf. also YOS 6 4, a privatê contract for dâlu-irrigation edited in the Appendix 1). It could also refer to the land irrigated in such manner in the expressions bit dâli or simply dâlu (e.g., in NCBT 677 (see below) and the imittu lists YOS 17 44 (l. 3 after collation: še-bar sag-du zá ša da-lu nîg-d[u]) and NCBT 361 (l. 2: še-bar zá ša da-lu ša um-la-su-tu)).

1015 Against CAD D: 57 which translates the passage from BE 9 71 9-10: ina še-numun é a₅₈ šu₉ šal-sù ḫa-la aₓ₁ / u ina è da-lu 1₄⁻¹ ḫa-la a ḫa-la a₅₈ ni-id-din as “we shall pay (you) the water due (lit. the share of the water) (at the ratio of) two-thirds from the field (irrigated) by canals and one third for the field (irrigated) by drawing water”. “šu₉ šal-sù” does not mean “two-thirds” and “¹⁻¹” which the CAD appears to have read as “3⁻¹” is not “one third”, but “one quarter”. Furthermore, the CAD omits the continuation of the text which reads: u ana 1 gur še-numun é a₅₈ šu₉ ḫa-la 1 gın kû-babbar u ana 1 gur še-numun / tê d[a]-la 1₄⁻¹ šu₉ a₉-kû-babbar ... / ni-id-din. Stolper recognised the correct figures for the shares, without commenting on the translation of the CAD, or the question of what “qâti” may signify in this context: “they are to pay one third of the crop watered by direct flow (E A.MES = bit mé) and one fourth of the crop from land watered by bucket irrigation (bit dâli). In addition, they are to pay one shekel of silver for each kur of area of the former land, and two-thirds shekel for each kur of the latter” (1985: 50). (Augapfel in his edition of the text comments on qâti, on its syntactical misplacement presumably as part of a numerical fraction expression, however, he does not translate the text accordingly (1917: 81f.).)

1016 Itá-šu-tu-ú-a or alternatively /a-šu-tu-ú-a probably designates some heretofore unattested ethnic group.

1017 makallû was a drainage ditch at the far end of a field running parallel to its lower short side (van Driel 1988: 139; Jursa 1995a: 184).

1018 See Zadok 1985: 178, mus-šû. Ibûlû and unûbûlû are mentioned in texts from Nippur and Uruk. The Ibuleans should perhaps be identified with the Aramaic tribe Ubûlù mentioned in the Neo-Assyrian sources (Brinkman 1968: 270f.).
Lady of Uruk and Nanāya, pertaining to the rent farm of Gimillu, son of Innin-šum-ibni, the rent farmer of the Lady of Uruk, for sharecropping. He will do the work there. He will work up the mayyāru-land. For as much land as he cultivates there, he will give for the land irrigated by buckets a third (of the harvest as) share and for the land with readily available water half (of the harvest as) share to the Lady of Uruk. Each took (a copy of) the document.

Witnesses: Gimillu, son of Aššur-lāstar, descendant of Ḥunuz, Anu-zēr-šubāši, [son of Marduk], descendant of Gilim-Nanāya, [Nanāyâ]-êrēš, son of Gimillu,

[Scribe: Innin]-šum-ûṣur, son of Nergal-ûṣēzib, [descendant of Kidin-Marduk];

[GN]; 30-V-1 [Nbk IV, king of Babylon and of lands]."

The same ratio, 1/2 share for bit mē qāti and 1/3 share for dālu-land, can be found in the orchard lease NCBT 677:

NCBT 677 23*-V-[1 Nbk IV]

obv. 1’ [u d] na-na-a [šā g6 bān šā 1 gi-mil-lu a-šū šā ldi ù anna-mu-dū]
[šā m3ub-ḥi g6 bān šā g5ašan šā unug ki gi-mil-lu]
[na a ep-šu [dul-li] a-na 1 ldi 30-dingir a-šū šā PN
id-din dul-1u3 ina [lib-bi i-pu-šu]

5’ tap-tu-ū ú-pat-[tu hé-ru-tu ina šu-pat g8 gišimmar i-he-er-re]
i6men-šū i-he-[er-re-ma me-e u-šā-as-bat]
[he-ru-tu ma-īa ina šu-pat g8 gišimmar i-he-er-ru-ū]
ē g6mar-ri an-[bar ina muṣ-ḥi 1 gur 5] gur
ē g6apin ina muṣ-ḥi 1 gur [4] gur zū-lum-ma sis-sin-nu 3 šu a-na

10’ 1 ldi 30-dingir i-nam-din <5e>-numun ma-la ina bar-ra-ti pa-na-ar 3 g8 gišimmar
ip-pu-šū ē me-e šu 1 a-hi ḫa-la ū da-1lu
lo.e.
šal-šī ḫa-la a-na 3 gašan šā unug ki i-nam-din
pu-ut e-pe-šu šā dul-lu ma-ṣar-tu3
šā lib-bi ḫa-ra-ut-tu 1 ud a-ku šā 2 gišimmar

rev. 15’ 1 ldi 30-dingir na-šī (erasure) zū-lum-ma
ū-il-ṭımka ma-la 1 ldi 30-dingir i-3-i-il-ma a-na 1 Ṽa-qād meš
i-nam-di-nu ki-pi-i u-il-ti šū ša <ina> muṣ-ḥi 1 ldi 30-dingir i-3-i-lu
šu ina lib-bi ū-šu-uz mukin 1 ū-bar a-šū ša ra-hi-im-me

1 gīm-a a-šī ša ḫa-ra-hi-im-me
20’ 1 ldi 30-na-ah kam a-šū ša gi-mil-lu 1r-4tu a-šū ša 1 ša-šu-la-a 5šę-igši a-šū ša ldi 1 n-in-LUGAL-RIT

(one blank line)
i6 umbisag ldi innin-na-mu-ūru a-šū ša ldu-gur-ū-še-žib a 1 ki-d [in-dar-amutu]

uṣur[2] d 2 es-ši 1 iti ne ud 23’ [-kam mu 1-kam]

(remainder of rev. and u.e. broken off)

“[Gimillu] gave [to Sīn-ili, son of PN1020, [... property of the Lady of Uruk and] Nanāya, [from the rent farm of Gimillu, son of Innin-šum-ibni,] for the purpose of performing [work]. He will do the (necessary) work there. He will cultivate the unbroken land. [He will do the digging below the date palms.] He will dig its (orchard’s) irrigation canals [and supply them with water.] For as much digging [as he does below the date palms] Gimillu will give to Sīn-ili as sissimu [5 kurru (of dates) per each surface kurru] (worked) with an iron spade, and [4] kurru (of dates) per each surface kurru (worked) with a plough. For as much of the previously uncultivated land in front of the date palms as he cultivates, he will give to the Lady of Uruk a half (of the harvest as) share for the land with

---

1019 Ṽu-bul is not recorded in Zadok 1985, however, Ṽu-bu-lu₄ are (p. 317). This place should probably be connected to the aforementioned Ibuleans (the initial phoneme may have been an umlaut); see previous note.
1020 Perhaps this Sīn-ili can be identified with Sīn-ili, son of Ana-Eanna-turrū, who appears in the imtitu list for dates, YOS 21 219 (= NCBT 861, 1 Nbk IV), pertaining to Gimillu’s rent farm. A Sīn-ili, without a patronymic, appears in the similar imtitu list YOS 21 211 (= NCBT 662, 1 Nbk IV). Both texts concern dates from the orchards on Nāru-eššu.
readily available water, and a third (of the harvest as) share for the land irrigated by buckets. Sin-ilii guarantees for the performance of the (necessary) work, for the guarding of the fronds and shoots and (against) the felling of date palms. Gimillu will have a right to the dates from the debt notes, which Sin-ilii will charge (against) and give to the herdsmen, in accordance to the debt notes which Gimillu will charge against Sin-ilii.

Witnesses: Ubâr, son of Raḥîm,
Kinâya, son of Raḥîm,
Nanâya-erēš, son of Gimillu,
Arad-Šamaš, son of Šulâya,
Ab-lûmûr, son of Innin-ašarîtutu.1021

Scribe: Innin-šum-uṣur, son of Nergal-uṣezib, descendant of Kid[i-in-Marduk];
Nâru-eššu; 23°-V-[1 Nbk IV, king of Babylon, king of lands.]”

In the similar but somewhat damaged nukarībbâtu contract NCBT 630 another category of land (bît taptê) appears next to bît mê qâti and bît dâli. Here a 1/5 share for taptû0land irrigated by buckets (l. 17: cē da1-[a-lu] cē tap3-tu-u), and a 1/3 share for taptû0land which was at the same time bît mê qâti (ll. 17-18: cē me-e Šu1/1 / cē tap-tu-u?) was to be paid. Clearly the work on the bît mê qâti was less strenuous than on bît dâli and the productivity of bît mê qâti seems to have been higher, as a larger share was to be paid for the bît mê qâti. This had already been observed by the scholars working on the Murašû texts, who proposed interpreting the term as “land irrigated by flooding”. While irrigation by flooding cannot be excluded for this type of land, this being a common method of irrigation, the term probably signifies the availability of water, rather than a particular irrigation technique. Literally, the “water of the hand” indicated precisely that water was at hand, i.e. readily available.1022

The last text which will be presented in this context is older than the other three (it is dated to the reign of Nebuchadnezzar II) and the expression mê ša qâti is used in it instead of bît mê qâti. Furthermore, bît dâli is not mentioned, but the text stipulates that the land was to be irrigated by buckets (l. 6: zērâ idallû). In this text also, there are stipulations on different shares to be paid to the temple. For the land cultivated in the twenty third year (note that the lease was made in the third month of the same year) a fifth of the harvest was to be delivered to the temple. But then the text differentiates between the land in which the work had been done and (the land) ¡a mê ¡a qâti. The work mentioned will have implied the irrigation by buckets referred to in line 6. For this land a 1/6 of the harvest was the share of the temple. For the land with readily available water a share of 1/3 was to be paid:

YBC 3543

1-III-23 Nbk

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Obv.</th>
<th>Rev.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>a-ša</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a-di</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ša ḏašān ša unug[e] iḏamar-utu-du-numun a-ši ša iḏamar-utu[mu]-ūru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a-[b]qal-du-[b]ša-tam e-an-na a-na 'ap-la-a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>a-šu ša iḏag-kal a-ši [sipa] u iḏag-gi a-šu ša šu-la-a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a-[b]tug-[babbar a-na e-re-šu-tu id-din še-numun ša [i]-da-al-lu-ū</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>er-šu ša mu 23-kam er-šu 5-šu u še-numun ša dul-lu ina lub-ib</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ip-pu-šu 6-šu ša me-e ša [šu3]-šu ši-ib-šu (erasure)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a-na'gašān ša unug[b] i-nam-di-nu pu-ut e[p[e-šu]}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>ša dul-lu 'ap-la-a u [a[g-gi na-šu-ū]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1021 The last two elements of the name id in-nin-LUGAL-RIT are perhaps a cryptographic writing of the word (a)šarîtutu.
1022 mê qâti, “basin (of metal) for washing the hands (after meal)”, CAD M II: 155, has doubtless nothing to do with our bît mê qâti. Rather, one should connect this expression to a certain usage of the word qâitu employed to designate (an object) at the disposal of or available to someone ((object) ša qât PN or personal pronoun suffix)), see CAD Q: 190 and AHw: 910.
a-šú šá id a-šú šá id a-šú šá id
15. a-šú šá id a-šú šá id a-šú šá id
15. a-šú šá id a-šú šá id a-šú šá id
a-šú šá id a-šú šá id
en-in-ibila-úru 1t-ti-sig-d ag
en-re-ma-ni 1e-gi-bi id en-sú-nu
ag-šes-mu a'e-gi-bi
u 1umbisag 1i-kud-11-1mar a-šú šá 're-mat
a 1gal-1-lim unug 1i sig, ud 1-kam
15. [mu] 23-kam id a-nig-du-úru lugal tin-tir

“Marduk-šapik-zéri, son of Marduk-šum-iddin, descendant of Rab-banê, the chief administrator of Eanna, gave [the fields] of the Lady of Uruk, from the kingšu1023 to the lower limu,1024 which are on the canal Ḥarru-ša-Lábaši, (property) of the Lady of Uruk, to Apláya, son of Nabû-udammiq, descendant of Rê-ù, and Nabû-usallim, son of Šulâya, descendant of Ašlaku, for cultivation. They will irrigate the land by buckets. (For) the land which was cultivated in the year 23 they will give one fifth, (then) for the land which they work up (and irrigate by buckets?) they will give one sixth, and for (the land) with readily available water they will give one third (of the harvest as) share to the Lady of Uruk. Apláya and Nabû-usallim guarantee for the performance of the (necessary) work.

Witnesses: [PN, son of PN], descendant of Šamaš-bârî,
[PN], son of Marduk-erîba, [descendant of PN],
[PN], son of Marduk-zêr-ibni, descendant of [PN],
[PN], son of Marduk-zêr-ibni, descendant of Bêl-apla-usur,
Itti-enî-Nabû, son of Bêl-rêmanni, descendant of Egibi,
Bêlûnu, son of Nabû-âįhî-iddin, descendant of Egibi,
Scribe: Dayân-Marduk, son of Rêmût, descendant of Rab-îmi;
Uruk; 1-III-23 Nbk, king of Babylon.”

3.4.2.5. Administrative and legal categories

3.4.2.5.1. šiḫu

The meaning of the term šiḫu is not entirely clear. The AHw: 1232 translates as “Gehöft, Domäne” while the CAD Š II: 418f. attempts no exact translation (“a type of real estate?”). Apart from one occurrence in a kudurru of the 9th century Babylonian king Marduk-zâkir-šumi1025 all the attestations of the word šiḫu come from the Eanna archive and refer to temple property.1026 It usually appears with the supplement ša Bêlti ša Uruk1027 in the Eanna texts and in the majority of its occurrences it accompanies another geographical designation. Most frequently it appears as an apposition to a place name in the clause recording the place of drafting at the end of a document: GN, šiḫu ša Bêlti ša Uruk. Among these geographical names, the names of places (with or without the determinative uru, place names starting with Bê-..., quays (Kār-...), etc.), canals or tamirtu, in other words, the names of places in the rural hinterlands of Uruk appear.1028 The documents in which this phrase can be found are typically debt notes or lists of agricultural products (imittu or zittu/šiḫšu debt notes or lists). However, it is by no means restricted to the texts from the sphere of agriculture.1029 The term šiḫu can also be used in the phrase šiḫu (ša Bêlti ša Uruk) ša GN. Some of

1023 This term, which is normally translated as “knee, shin or calf of leg” (CAD K: 373), will have designated some sort of topographic feature, a part of, or perhaps a structure on an irrigation canal.
1025 VAS 1 35 r. 39; a field is said to be adjacent to ši-ḫi šá 4 uras.
1026 “… šiḫu refers to a type of agricultural district located along water courses and is part of the temple’s real estate holdings” (CAD Š II: 419).
1027 Once šiḫu ša Ištar Uruk is attested (YOS 7 172).
1028 Just a selection of these can be given here: Bîrât, Bîrtu-ša-Bažâya, Bit-bârî, Bit-Nabû, Bit-Šama-il, Bitqu-ša-Bêl-êter, Hârru-ša-Nadnîya, Kār-Eanna, Kār-Nanîya, Mâškan-ilî, Naṣîbâta, Šîliḫtu, Takkîrû, Til-agurrêti.
1029 E.g., BIN 2 116 concerns small cattle, YOS 6 96 maššartu disbursements, YOS 6 119 a bail protocol, and BM 114472 the lease of a house.
the geographical names used are the same as the ones appearing in the previously discussed phrase indicating that there is no factual difference between the two expressions. Their purpose seems to be to indicate that the land in question belonged to the administrative sphere of the temple. Not all the land in a šīḫu belonged to the temple, however. According to YBC 4143 (p. 310), a private lease contract, a privately owned orchard could be situated in a šīḫu of the Lady of Uruk.

An entire šīḫu of the Lady of Uruk could be leased. This is recorded in YBC 3750 in which two individuals jointly rent one šīḫu of the Lady of Uruk situated on the Nār-Bānītu and neighbouring the estate of a certain Šīlāya for sharecropping. In PTS 2249 (p. 276) a herdsman rented land of the Lady of Uruk situated in the big šīḫu of Bīt-Sīn-āṣarīd for the purpose of pasturing sheep and cattle. From this text we know that a šīḫu could be composed of both agriculturally productive land (bīt dūllī (l. 9)) and of land of lower quality (kasal kālū u gabību (ll. 6-7)) which, in this particular case, was used for pasturing livestock.

The relationship between the terms tamirtu and šīḫu is not clear. Irrigation districts (tamirtu, see below) are sometimes referred to as the šīḫu of the Lady of Uruk (e.g., gārin Bīrat šīḫu ša Bēlti ša Uruk, PTS 3008). However, there are at least two attestations of šīḫu being preceded by the sign gārin, tamirtu, which should probably be understood as a determinative in these cases: the place of drafting in YOS 6 119 (8 Nbn) 16f.: uru-ibīt-qū / ša-ibīn-sūr gārin ši-i-ḫu ša-ibīn-gasān ša unūg ki and the place of drafting in YBC 4100 (34 Nbk) 16: gārin ši-i-ḫi ša-ibīn-gasān ša unūg ki. It would seem that the terms could be used as partial synonyms, with tamirtu having more concrete connotations of a geographical area enclosed by irrigation canals and šīḫu representing a purely administrative entity.

Exceptionally, šīḫu could appear as an independent toponym as well. In YBC 4100 the expression gārin šīḫu ša Bēlti ša Uruk was used to designate the place of drafting in the closing date formula of this debt note for barley. šīḫu alone with the determinative uru and designating a place from which barley deliveries originated is attested in GC 2 216 (ll. 1. 14 unū-gi-i-ḫu).

Considering all of the above, we can conclude that šīḫu was an administrative/legal category applied to the land belonging to the temple, best translated as “estate”. The term was probably more or less equivalent to the more general makkūru, “property”, but its use was restricted to real estate of the temple.

3.4.2.5.2. tamirtu

The term tamirtu (usually written logographically: gārin) is not very frequent in the land lease contracts, where it only appears in the passages that give information on the localisation of the rented land. It is usually followed by a geographical name, and as such is a constituent part of the toponym, though it is not sure whether it was pronounced or just served as a determinative. The term is conventionally translated as “irrigation district”. It designated larger geographical units in the rural areas around the cities. According to van Driel a tamirtu was “a rural district based on a common hydrological feature” (1988: 143), i.e. an irrigation canal or a river. Originally tamirtu probably referred to a topographical feature, a “basin” enclosed by the intersecting irrigation canals and rivers, which could be partially or periodically waterlogged, and occasionally it still appeared with this meaning in the Neo-Babylonian texts.
3.4.2.5.3. limu

Another administrative term for land was *limu*, “thousand”, written either syllabically or logographically as a numeral (1 limu).\textsuperscript{1036} It was used for institutional land.\textsuperscript{1037} Beside the *limus* of the temple, a royal *limu* is attested in YBC 9448 (edited in Janković 2007: 219ff.). The term probably went back to some land division scheme introduced by a central authority and could have been related to the dimensions of the plots, perhaps the length of the frontage or the surface area (cf. Peat 1983: 126ff.). Note, however, that the dimensions of some *limus* which are known to us do not necessarily conform to this theory. The east and the west sides of the *limu* situated near the *Šamaš*-gate of Uruk recorded in the cadastral text PTS 2076 (rev. ll. 9'-13') both measure 1,425 cubits, the southern frontage is 1,420 cubits and the northern one is only 1'450 or 1'550 cubits long. The *limu* in *AnOr* 9 19 (ll. 1-5) had a rectangular shape with the sides with the length of 26,300 and 2,800 cubits. *limus* were usually situated on canals and in the *tamír tus*\textsuperscript{1038} and parts of them could be leased out.

3.4.2.5.4. nakkandu\textsuperscript{1040}

*nakkandu* (nakkamtu) is derived from the verb *nakāmu*, “to cover”. It could simply mean a “storehouse”, usually expressed as *biṭ nakkandī*,\textsuperscript{1041} but it was also a term for land, occasionally specified as belonging to the king (*ša šarrī*).\textsuperscript{1042} It is not always apparent to which institution a *nakkandu* belonged when it is not further specified. However, there are clear cases in which this term designated land which belonged to the temple.\textsuperscript{1043} In YOS 6 150 the land characterised as *zēru biṭ mēresi nakkandu ša Bélī ša Uruk* (l. 11) is said to be at the disposal of a tenant who was supposed to cultivate parts of it and leave others fallow. Though this passage bears some difficulties, it would seem that he was supposed to leave parts of the land not currently in use to the temple as *nakkandu* (ll. 13f.),\textsuperscript{1044} presumably so that the temple could put it to other use. According to Montserrat 1 land planted with date palms which reverted to temple property was to be registered as *nakkandu*. PTS 2089 informs us that temple oblates (*širkus*) could be settled (ašābu) on the *nakkandu*-land; however, the implications of this are not evident. (Did the temple receive a rent from these *širkus* for this land, as it did from those settled on urban properties belonging to it, or was this land assigned to them as subsistence fields?) Van Driel comes to the conclusion that this was “land (belonging to an estate) available for assignation” for some sort of exploitation and proposes for *nakkandu* the meaning “land held in reserve” either by the temple or some royal institution (2002: 197).

\textsuperscript{1036} For general remarks and attestations see Janković 2007: 224f. Note that the dictionaries, which translate *limu* as “region, neighbourhood” (CAD L: 198) or “Umkreis” (AHw: 554), derive the word not from the numeral “thousand”, but from *lavātu*, “to encircle, surround, etc.” CAD L: 69. Many writings using numeral signs speak against this interpretation (Janković 2007: 224\textsuperscript{12}); however, these writings could be based on a *Volksytymologie*.

\textsuperscript{1037} There is no evidence so far that also private individuals could own *limus*. Rarely *limu* appears in connection to personal names (e.g., *limu ša Šar-igbi* in YOS 21 207: 2), but these instances also concern institutional land.

\textsuperscript{1038} E.g., *limu šapālu ša ina muḫḫi Ḫarru-ša-Lābāši* (YBC 3543), *limu ša biṭ ili ša ina gu₄₄nin Aṣšuritu* (PTS 3032), *limu ša ṣubāni Raṭu* (YOS 19 86).

\textsuperscript{1039} E.g., *qaqqaru ša limāṭi* (1 limu) ša Bélī ša Uruk (TCL 12 64), *zēru pī šulī biṭ dulli u taptē [ša] ina limi ša Šar-igbi makkār Bélī ša Uruk* (YOS 21 207). Note also that *biṭ ritti* could be situated in the *limus* according to YOS 7 38. On *biṭ ritti* see below.

\textsuperscript{1040} For general remarks and attestations see Janković 2007: 224f. Note that the dictionaries, which translate *limu* as “region, neighbourhood” (CAD L: 198) or “Umkreis” (AHw: 554), derive the word not from the numeral “thousand”, but from *lavātu*, “to encircle, surround, etc.” CAD L: 69. Many writings using numeral signs speak against this interpretation (Janković 2007: 224\textsuperscript{12}); however, these writings could be based on a *Volksytymologie*.

\textsuperscript{1041} There is no evidence so far that also private individuals could own *limus*. Rarely *limu* appears in connection to personal names (e.g., *limu ša Šar-igbi* in YOS 21 207: 2), but these instances also concern institutional land.

\textsuperscript{1042} E.g., *limu šapālu ša ina muḫḫi Ḫarru-ša-Lābāši* (YBC 3543), *limu ša biṭ ili ša ina gu₄₄nin Aṣšuritu* (PTS 3032), *limu ša ṣubāni Raṭu* (YOS 19 86).

\textsuperscript{1043} E.g., *qaqqaru ša limāṭi* (1 limu) ša Bélī ša Uruk (TCL 12 64), *zēru pī šulī biṭ dulli u taptē [ša] ina limi ša Šar-igbi makkār Bélī ša Uruk* (YOS 21 207). Note also that *biṭ ritti* could be situated in the *limus* according to YOS 7 38. On *biṭ ritti* see below.

\textsuperscript{1044} See van Driel 2002: 197ff.; 1988: 137; Coqquerillat 1968: 20\textsuperscript{38}.

\textsuperscript{1045} In the sense of “storehouse”, but without *biṭ*, it appears for instance in NBC 4786, Beaulieu 2005: 66f. On the other hand, *biṭ nakkandī* clearly designates a type of land in CT 55 83 (Jursa 1995a: 144).

\textsuperscript{1046} Especially in the Murāsu archive, see Stolper 1985: 89f.; see also the attestations collected by van Driel 2002: 198f.

\textsuperscript{1047} YOS 6 150 and Montserrat 1 from Eanna, and CT 55 83 (Jursa 1995a: 144) from Ebabbar of Sippar. (Nār-nakkandī mentioned in JCS 28 no. 21 should probably be understood as a specific hydronym.)

\textsuperscript{1048} The text is broken in l. 14: [ú-maš]-šar.
3.4.2.5.5. gizzētu

The term gizzētu (gizzētu) has most recently been discussed by van Driel 2002: 195f. (for earlier literature see ibid.: 195f.). However, he did not reach a definitive conclusion. While it originally may have referred to land confiscated by the royal authorities (according to kudurrū inscriptions), this interpretation is not entirely applicable to its use during the Neo-Babylonian period, as van Driel notes. The word appears in three land lease contracts from Eanna. In YOS 6 40 it refers to an area on the Nār-šarrī bordering on the leased land and was not necessarily temple property.1045 In YOS 6 67, a lease ana zāqipūrī, the land which was to be planted was situated in the gizzētu of Nār-Innin (ll. 3f.) and was property of the Lady of Uruk. In PTS 2821 probably the same tenant1046 as in YOS 6 67 rented arable land against a fixed sum in the same area, namely gizzētu of Nār-Innin (l. 4: qaqqar gi-iz-ze-e-ti ša id-4ininn). Clearly gizzētu could refer to temple property. Royal gizzētu (gizzāt šarrī) is attested once in an Egibi text from Babylon (TCL 13 190), but also gizzētu ša PN1047 or a group of people1048 are known. One orchard was designated as gizzētu in the cadastral text PTS 2076 rev. l. 20: rēššišišiši 5, še-numun ša šu-ti ša di-na še-numun dā-nu-še-[mu u lú utu-numun-s]i]-šā1. It appears that here gizzētu was a part of a larger complex of land. Anu-abšiddin and his brother Šamaš-šum-lišir, two prebendary gardeners, were holders of an orchard which was adjacent to the gizzētu. While the orchard of the two brothers had direct access to a canal, the gizzētu, which was also entrusted to them, did not. It lay on an empty riverbed, which implies a second-rate quality of land and at any rate a diminished suitability for a date plantation in this case. It remains unclear at the present state of our information whether the term gizzētu had general implications for the quality of the land.

3.4.2.5.6. bīt ritti

The still not completely understood expression bīt ritti was the subject of many studies in the past.1049 Literally the “hand house”, bīt ritti is a term applied to agricultural land, both grain fields and orchards,1050 which has been in use in Babylonia from the Neo-Babylonian to the Hellenistic period. Contrary to the assertions in some older literature (e.g., Joannès 1982: 15, Stolper 1985: 252) it was not a part of the system originally introduced by the Persians. This has already been noticed by Dandamayev (1986: 466) after the publication of Neo-Babylonian texts from the British Museum in the volumes CT 55, 56 and 57 (in particular the text CT 55 75, a lease from the reign of Nabonidus (year destroyed) mentioning a bīt ritti). Jursa listed other attestations of bīt rittis from the Ebabbar archive dating from well before the Achaemenid rule (1995a: 120f.). The rent contract from Uruk (PTS 2134, edited below) from 43 Nbk can be added to this list.

Plots of land designated as bīt ritti were frequently stated to be the property (makkūru) of a deity (i.e. a temple)1051 and were at the same time attributed to certain individuals (bīt ritti ša PN)
who could occupy, exploit or transfer them to a third party for exploitation.\textsuperscript{1052} As far as we can tell, all the \textit{bit rittis} were established on institutional land and there is no doubt that the actual owners were the institutions.\textsuperscript{1053} However, the ‘holders’ of the \textit{bit rittis} had extensive rights over them. They were entitled to lease, pledge, divide, testate and even sell (sales are attested in the Hellenistic period) this land “as if private property”.\textsuperscript{1054} Petschow explained this with the concept of the divided ownership: “... bei \textit{bit ritti} und \textit{hallatu} scheint das Eigentum als funktionell beschränktes Eigentum geteilt gewesen zu sein zwischen Tempel oder König einer- und den Inhabern andererseits” (1956: 147). The temple ceded certain rights of use to the holder of a \textit{bit ritti} in return for some service or payment (in kind), but it retained an \textit{Eigentumsrest}. Thus the temple could establish a \textit{bit ritti} and also withdraw it from its holder. In Sippar a case is attested of the temple authorities withdrawing the lease of a \textit{bit ritti} from one holder who failed to pay his dues (his \textit{situ}) to the temple and transferring it to another individual.\textsuperscript{1055}

Through PTS 2134 we can for the first time witness the formation of a \textit{bit ritti}. Formally the text is no different from the ‘regular’ planting and sharecropping contracts. The tenant asked for land, a \textit{bit ritti}, in order to plant grapevines where the soil is suitable, in a region which seems to have been under development since other planters (\textit{zaqipànus}) were active there (l. 6). No temporal limitations were imposed on the lease and the only obligation of the tenant toward the temple, besides planting grapevines, was a half-share of the yield.

PTS 2134 17-IV-43 Nb

\begin{verbatim}
  1. \textit{ab-na-a' a-sù šá \textit{la} im-ma-a-da
     a-na igi \textit{ri}30-mu \textit{ti} q-i-pi šá ē-an-na}
     il-lik-ma ki-a-\textit{am} iq-bi \textit{um-ma}
     i-na qa-qar šá \textit{d} ga\textit{s}an šá unug\textit{k} šá ina ugu

  5. \textit{ba-ri-sá-\textit{la} sum-na-a pa-na-at}
     a-\textit{meš} šá za-qi-pa-né-e a-\textit{sar}
     a-\textit{na} za-qáp\textit{t} šá \textit{g}e\textit{š}in ta-a-bu e kišib \textit{še-num}
     bi-\textit{in}-\textit{nam-ma} (erasure)
     \textit{geš}in\textit{a} ina li-bi a-na \textit{d} gašan šá unug\textit{k} lu-uz-qup

  10. \textit{\textit{la}30-mu iš-me-šu-\textit{ú-ma} e kišib}
     ina ugu \textit{ba}-ri-sá-\textit{la} sum-na-a ul-tu mi-\textit{šir}\textit{t}

  15. \textit{ab-na-a a-di-din a-\textit{sar} a-na za-qáp ta-a-bu}
     \textit{geš}in i-za-qáp a-\\textit{hi} ḥa-la it-ti \textit{d} gašan šá unug\textit{l}
     ik-kal

\end{verbatim}

\begin{verbatim}
(a one blank line)
\textit{mu-kin-mu la}\textit{mar-utu-mu mu a-sù šá \textit{la} ag-din-su-e}
\textit{a \textit{šu-d} na-na-a' gi-mi-lu a-sù šá \textit{h}umun-\textit{lå}

20. \textit{a \textit{ši-gu-ú-a' kár-} en a-sù šá a-a a \textit{l}\textit{ár-rab-tú}
\textit{pir'-u a-sù šá \textit{mu}-a a \textit{mu} \textit{pap-sukkal} na-din}
\textit{a-sù šá gi-mi-lu a \textit{dan-né-e-a}
\textit{a} \textit{mar-utu-mu mu a-sù \textit{la} u-gur-pab a \textit{la} en-a-pab
\textit{e} \textit{en-din-it a-sù šá \textit{bad} mu a \textit{šu-d} bad

\end{verbatim}

\footnote{1052} Cf. BM 60237 and BM 61126 (Jursa 1995a: 124 and 128), two leases of \textit{bit ritti} land in which the holders of the \textit{bit ritti} act as lessors.

\footnote{1053} Van der Spek notes that no designation for land such as: “\textit{makkùr PN, bit ritti PN}” is ever attested (1995: 192).

\footnote{1054} In the Hellenistic time these rights of use could be so extensive (including the right to sell a \textit{bit ritti}) that the holder of a \textit{bit ritti} “de facto became owner” (van der Spek 1995: 191f.).

\footnote{1055} BM 75542 (= no. 46), Jursa 1995a: 120, 139f. Therefore the question posed by van der Spek (1995: 192), namely, “whether the temple was in a position to withdraw the possession” of a \textit{bit ritti}, can be answered in the affirmative thanks to this text.

\footnote{1056} The fact that he has a foreign name is probably not significant. The majority of the holders of \textit{bit rittis} have Babylonian names (see the table below).
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iłuğiti šu ud 17-kam mu 43-kam

{ič-cur-zi-ki}

"Abnā, son of Addu-mād, went to Sīn-iddin, the resident of Eanna, and said as follows: ‘Give me land (as) a bit ritti, from the land of the Lady of Uruk, which is on Ḥarru-ša-Nadnāya, in front of the plots of the planters, wherever it is suitable for planting grapevines, and I will plant grapevines there for the Lady of Uruk.’ Sīn-iddin consented and gave to Abnā a bit ritti on the Ḥarru-ša-Nadnāya, from the upper border to the lower border, in front of the plots of the planters, where there are no date palms. Wherever it is suitable for planting he will plant grapevines. He will consume a half-share ((with the Lady of Uruk)).

Witnesses: Marduk-šum-iddin, son of Nabū-balāssu-iqbi, descendant of Gimil-Nanāya, Gimillu, son of Zērīa, descendant of Šīgūa, Mušēzib-Bēl, son of Apāliya, descendant of Arrabtu, Pir’u, son of Šumāya (or Iddīnāya/Nadnāya), descendant of Iddīn-Papsukkal, Nādin, son of Gimillu, descendant of Dannēa, Marduk-šum-iddin, son of Nergal-nāsir, descendant of Bēl-apla-usur, Bēl-uballit, son of Ea-iddin, descendant of Amīl-Ea,

Scribe: Nabū-bān-āḫi, son of Ibbīnaya, descendant of Ekur-zakir;

Uruk; 17-IV-43 Nbk, king of Babylon."

Generally, the question of the duties incumbent on the holder of a bit ritti is still open. PTS 2134 hardly illuminates the matter. The impression this text and also some texts from the Ebabbar of Sippar give us, is that there was no difference between a bit ritti and regular tenancy land, as far as the imposed obligations go. Here the arrangement was for sharecropping, but bit rittis with a sūtu obligation are also known from Ebabbar. The Hellenistic sale or lease documents mention duties toward the temple, without being specific, however. The general term for doing service, palalu, is used in these texts. The texts from the Muraš archive from the later Achaemenid period do not mention any fiscal or service encumbrances on bit rittis. According to some texts from Sippar the tithe (eśru) was occasionally imposed on bit rittis and, infrequently, military duties appear in connection with these properties (Jursa 1995a: 120; 1998: 13ff.). These were, however, duties incumbent on bit qaštis (bow fiefs), which could constitute a complex bit ritti, and had nothing to do with the bit ritti per se (Jursa 1998: 13ff.). Furthermore, bit rittis could apparently be composed of temple and state land (ibid.).

Joannès (1982: 11ff., esp. 15f.) considered relating the bit rittis to the system of subsistence fields well known from the Ur III and Old Babylonian periods, according to which the members of a temple or a palace household would get subsistence (šuku) fields as reward for a service they performed for the institution. In case they could not cultivate their šuku-fields due to some obligation toward the crown (e.g., military campaign), the holders of these fields could rent them out. Jursa (1995a: 120f.) followed this idea by stating: “Das bit ritti auf Tempelland läßt sich nach wie vor am besten als eine Art Versorgungsland von Tempelangehörigen, mit einer (moderaten?) Abgabe belastet und vielleicht mit gewissen Funktionen verbunden, verstehen.”

The examples from Eanna of bit rittis at the disposal of groups of craftsmen, the bow makers (lūza-mēk, YOS 17 298) and perhaps the smiths (naggālu, NBC 4833) would seem to support this interpretation. However, for the most part the holders of bit rittis known by name cannot be

---

1058 At the same time this practice took the pressure off the ration system, since members of institutional households were entitled either to rations or subsistence fields.
1061 See note 1074.
identified, since they are usually not given a filiation. It is impossible to establish whether they belonged to the temple household at all, let alone if they had any ‘functions’ in the temple.\footnote{1062}

The evidence from Eanna is, at any rate, rather uniform. It comes from a relatively short time span: apart from a lease contract from 43 Nbк (PTS 2134), all the texts in which bit ritti is mentioned can be dated to the reigns of Cyrus, Cambyses and Nebuchadnezzar IV. They appear in one letter, four imittu lists for dates, five lease contracts concerning orchards and ten imittu debt notes for dates.\footnote{1063} The texts only show bit ritti in the context of the agriculturally used temple land and the dues there from.\footnote{1064} In the imittu lists usually an amount of dates, indicated as stemming from a bit ritti of PN/profession, was (to be) delivered by another person. In the imittu debt notes the owed amount of dates is generally stated to be from a plot (eqstu) in a certain locality, which was the bit ritti of PN and which usually belonged to the ‘general farm’ (sūtu) of PN₂ (the large-scale rent farmer). The dates were charged against yet another person (PN₁) who probably tended the orchard himself and who had no apparent connection to the holder of the bit ritti. How this type of constellation could emerge, is evident from lease contracts such as NBC 4889 and NCBT 630 in which the fermier général sub-leased bit ritti of certain individuals to third parties. As far as the witness lists are extant, we can observe that the holders of the bit ritti were not present at these transactions. It is not known under which circumstances the fermiers généraux received the responsibility over and the right to sub-lease these bit rittis. Possibly they automatically got this right by virtue of their rent farm granted by the temple authorities.\footnote{1065} In such an arrangement, the temple would receive the date rent (sūtu) consisting of individual impost (imittu), the fermier général would presumably make profit on any surplus production, and the gardener would receive dates as remuneration (sissinnu). Only the holder of the bit ritti would end up without an obvious gain, which would defeat the purpose of both tenancy land and a šuku-type property. That is, unless the customary share of the holder of the bit ritti was (automatically) taken into account and paid out to him (without leaving a trace in the written documentation).

As far as the evidence from Eanna goes, there seem to have been at least two ways in which a holder of a bit ritti could use this property. On the one hand, a text like PTS 2134 demonstrates that he had the right to exploit the land and enjoy a part of the yield like a regular tenant.\footnote{1066} The existence of the ‘passive’ bit ritti holders, on the other, is also evident. However, it poses the question of the rights and benefits that holding a bit ritti implied, not to mention the obligations toward the temple (if any specific ones were implicit at all). While one cannot hope to find a solution to this problem at the present state of the information, one wonders if “this ‘neutrality’ regarding obligations and rights represents the essence of the term bit ritti” and if it was not intentional (van Driel 2002: 307). Perhaps bit ritti was indeed “a kind of catch all phrase” meaning “no more than ‘holdings (as far as they are) in the hands of PN’”, as van Driel suggested (2002: 307).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Patronymic</th>
<th>Location of the bit ritti\textsuperscript{1067}</th>
<th>Text type\textsuperscript{1068}</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YOS 21 206</td>
<td>15-V-1 Nbк</td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td>(łx)</td>
<td>Gadētu</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTS 2134</td>
<td>17-IV-43 Nbк</td>
<td>Abnā’</td>
<td>Addu-mād</td>
<td>Ḥarru-ṣa-Nadnāya</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 21 78</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Ah-iddin-Marduň</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIN 1 103</td>
<td>1-VI-5 Camb</td>
<td>Arad-Anu\textsuperscript{1069}</td>
<td>Erēbšu</td>
<td>Bitqu-ṣa-Bēl-ēṭer</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{1062} Note, however, that the holder of a bit ritti of Šamaš (Sippar), a certain Marduň, was a širku of Šamaš (Dar. 427).

\textsuperscript{1063} See the table below.

\textsuperscript{1064} In case of Eanna there is only evidence for bit ritti as (date) orchards, but this must be a coincidence. From the Ebabbar of Sippar we know of bit rittis on arable land.

\textsuperscript{1065} Cf. YOS 7 38, in which the temple authorities leased out of someone’s bit ritti for carrying out the gugallu-service (ana gugallūti) to another individual.

\textsuperscript{1066} This is perhaps also the case with Šamaš-uballītu from YOS 21 219 (see note 1077). Note also that Arad-Anu, the ‘passive’ holder of a bit ritti in BIN 1 103, was himself active in the temple agriculture as is demonstrated by an imittu debt note for dates (NCBT 858) in which he appears as the debtor (see note 1069).

\textsuperscript{1067} In this column PD stands for place of drafting of the document.

\textsuperscript{1068} “a” stands for imittu debt notes for dates, “b” for land lease contracts and “c” for imittu lists for dates.
| BM 114643 | 26-VI-7 Camb | Arrabu | Lasûtu (PD: Bit-Šakín-šumi) | a |
| NCBT 562 | 4-VI-[x] Camb | Balâtu\(^{1070}\) | Nabû-bân-ahî | Bit-qu-ša-Bêl-êter | a |
| NBC 4889 | 2-VI-2 Camb | Bêl-ahê-eriba | Nârû-êššu (PD: Nahallû) | b |
| BIN 1103 | 1-VI-5 Camb | Bêl-êter | Nabû-bân-ahî | Bit-qu-ša-Bêl-êter | a |
| JCS 28 no. 57 | [x]-V-[x] Camb | Bêl-iddin | Bit-qu-ša-Bêl-êter | a |
| YOS 2124 | [x]-[x]-1 Nbk IV | Bêl-iddin | Bûbûlîya | Dûr-Ugüm(?) (PD: Bit-qu-ša-Bêl-êter) | b |
| YOS 378 | 3-VIII-4 Cyr | Ina-ûlî-Nanîya | limu of Harrû-ša-Lâbiûši | b |
| YOS 738 | 3-VIII-4 Cyr | Įnûn-ûlû-ûsâšši | limu of Lasûtu | b |
| YOS 738 | 3-VIII-4 Cyr | Įûs-ûr-ûni | Rûmût | (PD: Uruk) | b |
| YOS 795 | 15-VI-7 Camb | Įûs-ûr-ûni | Nâr-ûsarrî(?) (PD: Bûb-Nâr-Ašûrûtu) | a |
| NCBT 630 | 4-VI-1 [Nbk IV] | Kûnûya | Rûmût | on Nûr-ûsarrî above Bit-Šama-il | b |
| YOS 738 | 3-VIII-4 Cyr | Mûrûdûkûn-ûsûr | in limu of Harrû-ša-Lâbiûši | b |
| YOS 2124 | [x]-[x]-1 Nbk IV | Nabû-êreš | Dûr-Ugüm(?) (PD: Bit-qu-ša-Bêl-êter) | b |
| YOS 2124 | 5 Camb | Nappûbu\(^{1074}\) | | 1075 c |
| NCB 4912 | 5 Camb | Silûn-ûlu | - 1076 c |
| BM 113400 | 25-VII-1 Nbk IV | Sîn-ûdîn | | 1077 c |
| YOS 2121 | 1 Nbk IV | Sîn-ûrû-ûnû | Ina-Naru-eššu | c |
| YOS 2129 | 1 Nbk IV | Šamašûùû | Nûrû-êššu | a |
| YOS 2129 | 1 Nbk IV | Šamaš-ùbûlû\(^{1077}\) | Ina-Naru-eššu | c |
| YOS 21798 | 6-VII-1 Nbk IV | Nûzûadîm\(^{1078}\) | on Takkûru (PD: Bit-qu-ša-Bêl-êter) | a |
| TCL 1223 | 1-VII-1 Nbk IV | Žûrîa | Nûr-Bîtqu (PD: Kûr-Eanna) | a |

Table 25: Holders of bit rittis

\(^{1069}\) Arad-Anû/Erêbšuû is debtor in the imittu debt note for dates NCBT 858 (Nbk IV) from the rent farm of Gimillû drafted in [Kûr]-Nânûya on Bit-qu-ša-Bêl-êter.

\(^{1070}\) This imittu debt note for dates from the farm of Ardia, describes the property from which the dates are due as: a-šâ / [ê] rît-tî šâ-1ba-la-šu a-šu šâ-3âg-dû-êššu / [ê] \(^{1071}\) gummîmar tur-tur šâ-4ba-šâ-a-6û-šâ-an-ni (ll. 1-3). The role of this Ishûši is not entirely clear. He was perhaps responsible for the delivery of dates.

\(^{1071}\) The entry in ll. 14-15: 1+û gu r è rît-tî šâ-5ha-na-nâ-a-[x] (x) / ĭ jû-iz-ê-e-tî šâ-6û-gurî-1-paûb.

\(^{1072}\) Note that the tenant Nabû-ûmûdîn-ùûnû requested from the temple authorities to be given the bit rittî of his father Nanûya-êreš for the purpose of orchard tending. Unfortunately the background of this lease is not known and so the implications for heredity of this type of land are not clear.

\(^{1073}\) The heading of this imittu list for dates reads as follows: zû-lûm-ûma zagh-lûlû a-šâ\(^{1078}\) šà-1lûzûdîm\(^{1078}\) / šà mu 5-kám \(^{1073}\) kûm-bû-zi-îlâ lugal \(^{1073}\) lugal kur-kur (ll. 1-2).

\(^{1074}\) The entry in ll. 35 of this imittu list for dates is: 1 gu r è rît-tû 4ûmû ûmû 5û-pû lûû [û-šû] (x). The end of the line is unfortunately not clear, but it appears that Šamaš-ûdûnû, a shepherd, was responsible for the delivery of the dates due from the bit rittî of the smith(s)?.

\(^{1075}\) The following onomastics appear in the list: Nûrû-ša-Bît-îlî, Kûkkabtu and Ñlîlîlûtâmîr.

\(^{1076}\) Most of the other entries in this section of this imittu list for dates name Nûrû-àtâmûmû as the place of origin of the dates due. However, Nûr-ûsûrûtu is also mentioned.

\(^{1077}\) The son of Šamaš-ûbûlî, Didêa, is responsible for the delivery of the impost of 14 kurru of dates according to this imittu list. This is perhaps an indication that they worked in the orchard themselves.
3.4.2.5.7. hallatu

hallatu-orchards were a special type of orchards found in some of the lease documents. They belonged to the temple and were put at the disposal of the prebendaries called rab banê, whose duty was to supply the temple with products from these orchards for the cultic meals of the gods. The prebendaries had extensive rights over the hallatu-orchards and could lease them out to other parties. So far one such lease was known from Uruk, YOS 7 162 from 3 Camb, but now two new texts can be added: BM 114444 (16 Nbn) and YBC 4149 ([3] Camb). Generally it can be observed that the lessors were members of the Rab-banê family. They were probably the prebendaries to whom the hallatu-orchards were entrusted. In two of the texts, YOS 7 162 and YBC 4149, the tenant was a certain Luttu-Utu, son of Nabû-amiddin, who is not otherwise known. In the latter text he is joined by Šamaš-zēr-iddin, son of Nabû-ahhê-bullît, another otherwise unknown individual. Interestingly, in BM 114444 the tenant is another member of the Rab-banê family. One wonders if he was also a prebendary. Furthermore, a conspicuous number of members of the Rab-banê family witnessed these leases. These were perhaps colleagues of the involved parties. Furthermore, the family ties may also have justified their presence at these transactions.

The orchards were leased for the purpose of orchard-tending (ana nukuribbatû) for a limited period of time, either three (YBC 4149) or four years (YOS 7 162, BM 114444), and on sharecropping terms. In BM 114444 the tenant was to receive one fourth and in YOS 7 162 and YBC 4149 one fifth of the yield of the plot ([fraction] ina ebiur eqli). This presumably implied the yield of all the plants growing in the orchard, though we only hear of dates explicitly. First, BM 114444 will be presented:

BM 114444            25-V-16 Nbn
obv.  1.   a-sá 4kiri, ùgišimmar zaq-pi 4kiri, 4hal-la-tu,
    šá 6našan šá 6unugtu 4na-na-a šá 6in-in-na-mu-gar-un
    ú 6na-na-a-4tu-ia 4med šá 6šu
    a 4gal-dû šá ká 6har-ri-šá 4gub-ba-a
5.   a-na 6[60-zalag-dingir]med a-sú šá 6u-gur-sur a 6gal-dû
    a-na 6[4mu-gé]kiri, 4ú-tu a-di 4ta
    mu-an-na 4med 4id-di-nu i-ga (text: ta)-4ru 4kiri
    ip-pu-us gi-iš-su i-nak-kis
lo.e.  4-ú ina buruí, a-šá ha-la
10.  šá 6id 60-zalag-dingir 4mek 4it-ti 6id 6in-in-na-mu-gar-un
rev.  4ú 6na-na-a 4ia-4tu-ia ik-kal
    na-bal-kat-ta-nu 5 gin kù <babbar> i-tur-ru
    6mu-kin-nu 6a-mu-šeš-mu a-šú šá
    6en-da a 6gal-dû 660-su a-šú
15.  šá 7i-15 a 6am-4a-nu <<dub>>
    6ba-lat-su a-šú 6ba-ša 6amar-4tu-ia 6má-laḫa
    4umbisag 4ir-4in-in-na a-šú šá 6ag-mu-mu
    a 6id 30-tab-ni unugti iti ne
u.e.  ud 25-kam mu 16-kam 4lag-i
20. lugal tin tík

“The plot of land, an orchard planted with date palms, a hallatu-orchard of the Lady of Uruk and Nanaya, of Innin-šum-škun and Nanaya-šamšia, the sons of Gimillu, descendant of Rab-banê, which is (situated) on the intake of Ḫarru-ša-Gubbāya, they gave for the purpose of orchard-

1078 On the rab banê and the hallatu-orchards see Cocquerillat 1973-74: 96ff. For the situation in Sippar see Jursa 1995a: 57ff. (with earlier literature on the subject) and Da Riva 2002: 136ff.
1079 See YOS 6 222 in which a rab banê was accused of delivering bad quality dates and pomegranates for the cultic meals and was put in shackles.
1080 The rab-banûtu prebendaries attested in the Eanna archive all seem to stem from the Rab-banê family (Kümmel 1979: 95). Though conversely, not all the members of the Rab-banê family were necessarily rab-banûtu prebendaries.
tending for four years to Anu-nur-ili, son of Nergal-êter, descendant of Rab-banê. He will build the orchard wall and cut the (thorny) bushes. One quarter of the yield of the plot is the share of Anu-nur-ili, which he will consume ((with Innin-šum-iškun and Nanây-a-Samšia)). Whoever transgresses (the agreement) will pay 5 shekels of silver.

Witnesses: Anu-ah-iddin, son of Bêl-le'i, descendant of Rab-banê,
Anu-eriba, son of Nâ'id-Istar, descendant of Rim-Anu,
Balâssu, son of Iqiša-Marduk, descendant of Malâşu,
Scribe: Arad-Innin, son of Nabû-gâmil, descendant of Sîn-tabni;
Uruk; 25-V-16 Nbn, king of Babylon.”

The tenant was expected to build a garden wall. This was a task usually included in planting-contracts (ana zqiperti, e.g., YOS 17 6, YOS 6 33). Furthermore he was to cut bushes (gi''u) growing on the plot. This task, which is not otherwise attested in the institutional land lease contracts, resembles the more frequent task of removing shrubbery (abatta nasêk) also found as preparatory work for planting orchards (e.g., YOS 7 47). It appears that the orchard in BM 114444 was overgrown and neglected. Other tasks, common for the nukuribtu contracts, are required from the tenants in YBC 4149 and YOS 7 162. They are to supply the irrigation canals with water, protect the dates and the shoots and fronds of the palms. Furthermore it is stipulated that the yield-estimation (imittu) of the date yield was to be conducted while the fruit was still on the palms (including the young, not fully productive palms in YBC 4149) after which the dates were to be harvested (nakâsu):

YBC 4149
24-VIII-[31081] Camb

1. še-numun eškirē ḫal-la-ti ša d innin [gaš]an ša unug ša ina muḫ-ḫi
   id-lugal ugu-ū ša id-in-nin-num-num-dû a-šû ša lid ag-ga-mil
   a lid-gal-du a-na nu eškirē-ū-tu a-na 'lu-ut-tu-ū-a
   a-šû ša lid ag-šêk-mu a lid utu-num-num-mu a-šû ša lid ag-šêk nega, bul-ši id-din id ḫar-ri-ti-šû
5. a nega ū-ša-ās-bat-'ū lib-ni ū ḫa-ru-ut-ītu
   i-na-ša-ar-'u pu-ut ma-āš-šar-tu ša ū-ḫi-in-nu
   na-[šu]-ū a-di 3 mu-an-na nega a-ša ina igi
   'lu-ut-tu-ū-a ša lid utu-num-num-mu 5 ḫa-la ina e-bu-usa a-ša
   'lu-ut-tu-ū-a ša lid utu-num-num-mu ki lid in-nin-num-num-dû
10. ik-ša-ū ū-ḫi-in-nu ina muḫ-ḫi ešgimmur tur
   i-mi [...-si ma i-nak-ki-is
   mu-kin-nu lid en-mu a-šû ša lid u-gur-mu
   a lap-pa-a-a-zâl-aq-e a-šû ša lid 'u-šu'-gur'-mu nî
   a lid gal-du ba-la-ū a-šû ša lid ag-bu-un-šu-tu
15. a lid gal-du re-mut-en a-šû ša lid-ītu
   a lid gal-du lid 60-tu-itū a-šû ša lid 13-dîn
   ta ku-1 ba-[a-šu] 'umbisag a-ši šâ
   in-nim-in-num-num-mu unug nî iti apin
   ud 24-kam [mu 3]-kam kam-bu-zi-īâ
20. lugal tin-ī[ir] lu lugal kur-kur

“(Concerning) the land, a hallatu-orchard of Ištar, the Lady of Uruk, which is on the upper Nâr-šarrī, which Innin-zēr-ibni, son of Nabû-gâmil, descendant of Rab-banê, gave for the purpose of orchard-tending to Luttu'a, son of Nabû-ahhê-bullû. They will supply its irrigation canals with water. They will protect the fronds and shoots. They guarantee for the guarding of the fresh dates. For three years the plot is at Luttu’a’s and Šamaš-zēr-

1081 The date is reconstructed on the basis of YOS 7 162 in which the same tenant, scribe and witnesses appear. The only variation in the witness lists of the two texts was in the second witness: in YBC 4149 this was Nûrêa/Nergal-iddin/Rab-banê and in YOS 7 162 this was Innin-zēr-ibn/Nabû-gâmil/Rab-banê. The two texts are, however, not parallel (YOS 7 162 is edited by Coquerillat 1968: 46. 111). In YOS 7 162 Luttu’a leased a hallatu-orchard from a certain Balâtu/Sulîya/Rab-banê. The orchard was, as in YBC 4149, situated on the upper Nâr-šarrî.
iddin’s disposal. 1/5-share from the yield\(^{1082}\) of the plot Luttu’a and Šamaš-zēr-iddin will consume ((with Innin-zēr-ibni)). He will conduct the *imittu* procedure (also) for the dates on the young date palms and will harvest (them).\(^{1083}\)

Witnesses:  
Bēl-iddin, son of Nergal-iddin, descendant of Pappāya,  
Nūrēa, son of Nergal-iddin⁷, descendant of Rab-banē,  
Balātu, son of Nabû-bûn-šītur, descendant of Rab-banē,  
Rēmût-Bēl, son of Bānia, descendant of Rab-banē,  
Anu-Šamšia, son of Ibni-Ištar, descendant of Kūrī,  

Scribe:  
Balātu, son of Innin-[zēr-iddin];  
[Uruk]; 24-VIII-[3] Camb, king of Babylon, king of lands.”

### 3.5. Types of leases

The leases can be classified according to the type of rent that was to be paid and according to the type of work and cultivation depending on the type of land leased. There are of course overlaps between these two categories and also hybrid forms of leases within one category.

#### 3.5.1. According to rent:

#### 3.5.1.1. *ana sūti*

A lease *ana sūti* “for (a fixed) rent” designates a lease of land against a fixed rent determined in the contract and expressed in absolute figures.\(^{1084}\) The following attestations are known from Eanna:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Land</th>
<th>Rent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YOS 17 7</td>
<td>10-XI-3 Nbk</td>
<td><em>eqlu ša BšU</em></td>
<td>120 <em>kurru</em> dates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VS 20 88</td>
<td>5-VIII-38 Nbk</td>
<td><em>qaqqaru</em></td>
<td>4,000 [+ x <em>kurru</em> barley], 100 <em>kurru</em> kasia, [x] sesame, [x cress or spelt] + 10 lambs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTS 2344</td>
<td>8-II-1 Ner</td>
<td>50 <em>kurru</em> zērû <em>qaqqaru</em></td>
<td>600 <em>kurru</em> barley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 6 41</td>
<td>28-I-1 Nbn</td>
<td>6,000 <em>kurru</em> zērû pî šulpi (elat zērû bît kirī)</td>
<td>25,000 <em>kurru</em> barley + 10,000 <em>kurru</em> dates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCL 12 73</td>
<td>8-II-1 Nbn</td>
<td><em>ešrū ša BšU</em> (^{1086})</td>
<td>500 <em>kurru</em> barley &amp; dates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 6 26</td>
<td>12-III-1 Nbn</td>
<td>zērû ša <em>BšU</em></td>
<td>400 <em>kurru</em> barley + 1 flawless bull + 10 sheep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 6 41</td>
<td>11-II-3 Nbn</td>
<td>zērû ša <em>BšU</em></td>
<td>1,000 [+ x <em>kurru</em> barley] + 60 <em>kurru</em> sesame + 20 <em>kurru</em> cress</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

\(^{1082}\) *ebūš* in line 8 stands for *ebûr*. The intervocalic *r* was frequently articulated as some sort of sibilant and was sometimes rendered in the cuneiform script with signs containing the consonant *š* or *z* (Jursa 2003: 235f.). In this case the *r* is postvocalic. However, *ebūš* is followed by the word *eqlī*. The articulation of this *status constructus* compound may well have been a sandhi with an expulsion of the initial glottal stop in *eqlī* thus placing the final consonant of the *nomen regens* in an intervocalic environment.

\(^{1083}\) The subject of this clause is probably the lessor.

\(^{1084}\) For examples of different ways of expressing the *sūtu*, e.g., as a multiple of the cultivated area, see Jursa 2004b: 177.

\(^{1085}\) And duplicates TEKR 37 and *A/K* 2, p. 107ff.

\(^{1086}\) The object of this lease is not directly land, but the tithe (*ešrū*) of the Lady of Uruk, incumbent on certain specifically delimited areas (e.g., on the land stretching from Uruk to Babylon and from Nār-šarri to the Euphrates, and the fields of the Lady of Uruk in certain localities (II. 4-9)).
Table 26: Land leases *ana sūti*

The term *sūtu* itself rarely appears in the contracts. Instead, the fixed amount of agricultural produce is recorded as rent for which the lease is granted. After stating his request, in the *Zwiegesprächs*-type contracts, the tenant usually expressed the intention of annually delivering so-and-so much agricultural products to the Lady of Uruk. In the one attested contract *ex latere locatoris* (PTS 2044) this was formulated in the third person as part of the clause recording the granting of the land and repeated as one of the obligations of the tenant. This type of rent appears mostly in connection with arable land. But, date plantations were also exploited *ana sūti*, especially on a larger scale in the so-called “general farm” arrangements (barley and dates: YOS 6 11 and TCL 13 182; only dates: PTS 2044). On the other hand, rent *ana sūti* practically does not appear in the small-scale leases of date orchards. Normally, the revenues from the orchards were established annually during a yield-estimation procedure (*imittu*) and were variable. The only exception is YOS 17 7 according to which a plot (*eqlu*) of the Lady of Uruk in a certain locality was leased for 120 *kurru* of dates annually:

YOS 17 7  
10-XI-3 Nbk

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>obv.</th>
<th>1.</th>
<th>5.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>šat-ti</em> 1 me 20 gur zū-lum-ma a-na</td>
<td><em>šat-ti</em> 1 me 20 gur zū-lum-ma[a a-na]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>ša</em> na-na-a-kam a-na ‘pa-ni’ mera.gt₃₁</td>
<td><em>ša</em> na-na-a-kam a-na ‘pa-ni’ mera.gt₃₁</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>maš</em>-lugal-pab <em>gi</em>-i-pi <em>ag-na-din-mu</em> ša-tam (ca. 8 signs erased) *il-lik-*ma</td>
<td><em>maš</em>-lugal-uru (ca. 5 signs erased) <em>iš-me</em>-šu-ma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>ki</em>-*a-*iq-<em>bi</em>-um-<em>ma</em> a-<em>ša</em> ša <em>gašan</em> ša <em>unug</em>₃</td>
<td>*a-<em>ša</em> ša <em>ša</em> ḫa-na-na-ra-bi bi-na-nim-ma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>²⁵</td>
<td>²⁵</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>lo.e.</th>
<th>10.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>šat-ti</em> 1 me 20 gur zū-lum-m[a a-na]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>ša</em> na-na-a-kam a-na ‘pa-ni’ mera.gt₃₁</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>maš</em>-lugal-pab <em>gi</em>-i-pi <em>ag-na-din-mu</em> ša-tam (ca. 8 signs erased) *il-lik-*ma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>ki</em>-*a-*iq-<em>bi</em>-um-<em>ma</em> a-<em>ša</em> ša <em>gašan</em> ša <em>unug</em>₃</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>²⁵</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>rev.</th>
<th>15.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>ag-numun-dū</em> a-<em>šu</em> ša <em>ba</em>-ša a <em>ša</em> gal-dū</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>ši</em>-gu-₃-a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>ša</em> ₃⁴</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>ša</em> <em>mu</em>-šib-<em>ši</em> a-<em>šu</em> ša <em>numun-gin</em> a <em>ki</em>-din-₃⁴</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>ša</em> ₃⁴</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>ša</em> ₃⁴</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In PTS 2044 the lease was granted for yearly 12,000 *kurru* of dates, against a fixed rent (ll. 4f.: *a-na mu-an-n[a 12 lim gur zū-lum]-ma / a-na *ša*=₂₃ bān). In PTS 2821, a sub-lease of arable land, the tenant referred to a previous arrangement and asked for land to be given to him from the land which had been given against a fixed rent to Nergal-nāṣir (ll. 6f.: *ša* na-na-a-ra-bi bi-na-nim-ma / *ša* na-na-a-ra-bi bi-na-nim-ma). In TCL 12 90 the expression *zāra ana sūti* nadānu also appears in reference to earlier arrangements (ll. 12-13: *še-numun* ša *ša* ₃⁴ a-na *ša*=₂₃ bān a-na PN₁ / *ša* PN₂ na-ad-mu).
Ardaya, son of Nanaya-ereš, went to Ninurta-šar-usur, the resident, (and) Nabu-nadin-šumi, the chief temple administrator, and said as follows: ‘Give me the plot of the Lady of Uruk which is in Ḫannarabi, and yearly I will give 120 kurru of dates to the Lady of Uruk.’ Ninurta-šar-usur (and) Nabu-nadin-šumi accepted and gave him the plot in Ḫannarabi. Yearly Ardaya will give 120 kurru of dates to the Lady of Uruk.

Witnesses: Kudurru, son of Mukin-zēri, descendant of Ḫunzû, Nabu-ēter-napšāti, son of Bēl-lēʾi, descendant of Šigūa, Mušēši, son of Zēr-ukîn, descendant of Kidin-Marduk, Nabu-zēr-ibni, son of Iqiša, descendant of Rab-banē, Kudurru, son of Šumāya, descendant of Rēʾi-sattukki, Nabu-udammiq, son of Nabu-zēr-ukîn, descendant of Ekur-zakir,

Scribe: Marduk-ēter, son of Bēl-šum-iškun, descendant of Dābibi, the temple scribe; Uruk; 10-XI Nbk, king of Babylon.”

This text, as most of the other ana suti leases, does not give much information on the obligations of the tenant. Other than the payment of rent, which can range from the relatively modest 120 kurru of dates (as here) to the imposing 35,000 kurru of barley and dates (YOS 6 11), nothing else is recorded in this text. From time to time the texts make stipulations on the mode of the rent payments. The rent was frequently to be paid using the measure (mašīhu) of the Lady of Uruk (YOS 6 11, TCL 12 73, YOS 6 26, PTS 2249, PTS 2344, PTS 2821, VS 20 88, TCL 12 90). This was specifically stated because there were different mašīhu-measures with different capacities in use in Eanna. It is, however, not certain whether metrological manipulations played a role in Eanna, as was the case in the Ebabbar of Sippar.

In the land lease YOS 6 150 which was endorsed by the crown prince Belšazzar it is exceptionally stated that the barley was to be delivered using the mašīhu ša šarri (ll. 5, 9). The dates and the barley were to be delivered “at the big waters”, ina muḫḫi mē rabûti (TCL 12 73, YOS 6 26, YOS 6 41, PTS 2821), or simply “at the waters”, ina muḫḫi (YOS 6 11, YOS 6 40, PTS 2249). This expression designates the place of delivery, i.e. at large, navigable watercourses. This was of relevance for the further transportation of the agricultural products to

1088 The standard size of the mašīhu seems to have been 36 qû (at least this is the most commonly attested size: YOS 17 159, YOS 19 170, NBC 4684, NCBT 183, 197, PTS 2756). However, a mašīhu of 45 qû was also in use (YOS 17 150, NCBT 620). It is unfortunately still not known what the size of the mašīhu ša Bēlti ša Uruk was.

1089 From Sippar it is known that a ‘regular’ mašīhu had a capacity of 1 pānu, i.e. 6 sūtu (= 36 litres). The mašīhu which appears in the imittu lists for dates, however, was assigned a fictitious capacity of 5 sütu (= 30 litres). Thus, in order to deliver 1 kurru of dates, the gardener had to fill the mašīhu-vessel six instead of only five times. In other words, he had to pay one extra mašīhu per each kurru of dates he had to deliver, i.e. 20 % more (Jursa 1995a: 151f.).

1090 The size of this measure is not certain. In BM 114513, a debt note for sesame, it is stated that the payment was to be made using the mašīhu ša 1 pi / [sā] lugal (ll. 5-6). Does this mean that the mašīhu ša šarri had the capacity of 1 pānu (i.e. 36 qû) or was a special pānu ša šarri (of unknown capacity) intended in this text?

1091 Cocquerillat translates the relevant passages as “hautes eaux”, to be understood as “flooding season”, probably following AHw: 937 which mentions “Hochwasser”. In southern Mesopotamia the flooding season would have been in II-III month (May-June), i.e. during or shortly after the barley harvest. While it could be a suitable moment for barley deliveries, it is somewhat problematic that in YOS 6 11 and TCL 12 73 (and also in the debt note YOS 6 159), both barley and dates were supposed to be delivered ina muḫḫi mē (rabûti). Delivering both crops at the same time would have been a logistical challenge to say the least, since their harvesting seasons lay roughly half a year apart. The flooding season would have been some months before the date harvest and if this means that the dates harvested in the autumn of the previous year were to be delivered together with the barley during the II-III month, then it would also imply that they were to be stored by the gardeners or rent farmers for about a half a year, which seems rather impractical both for the temple and the tenants/gardeners. Already San Nicolò (1948: 282) understood the expression to designate the place
storage facilities or the temple, as the transportation was probably conducted by water. It is, however, not clear whether the temple or the tenants bore the shipping costs. Other leases anasítu stipulate that the agricultural products were to be delivered in the temple: īna Eanna (YOS 6 150, PTS 2344, TCL 12 90). Here it seems the tenants bore the shipping costs.

Another rent payment related directive is found in TCL 13 182. Here it is stated that the dates were to be delivered at once (ina īšēt ritti), which is a very frequent stipulation in the imittu debt notes for dates.

Occasionally, however, we hear of other obligations of the tenant concerning the use of land, irrigation works, additional taxes and dues, and the care for and upkeep of the means of production. Some of the land was cultivated in a fallow system. The fallow,1092 for which a two-year (YOS 6 11) and a three-year cycle (YOS 6 40, YOS 6 150) are attested, was usually indicated with the term nabalkattu.1093 Additionally, in YOS 6 11 it is stated that half of the land would be left to rest each year (l. 9: īna mu-an-na mišīl še-numun ī-pa-dāš-sā-ḥa).1094 One text stipulates that land which could not be cultivated directly, i.e. using the temple’s own plough teams, was to be given to sharecroppers for cultivation (YOS 6 150). Parts of the land which were apparently not used for agricultural production were to be put at the disposal of temple herds for grazing (YOS 6 40, TCL 12 90, TCL 13 182).

In PTS 2044, a lease of all of the temple’s date plantations, for instance, there is talk of the digging work (heritā herū) and supplying the irrigation canals with water, obligations typical for orchard leases. The tenant in TCL 12 90 is responsible for the regulation of the water flow/level in the main irrigation canal (Nār-šarrī) on the land at his disposal (ll. 19-20: pu-ut bi-it-qu u kī-rik-tū ša id-lugal / a-na ma-la še-numun ša ʾašan ša unug ša īna pa-ni-šū ʾu-gur-na-sīr na-sti). The tenant in TCL 13 182 is obliged to dig large, i.e. navigable, canals at the cost of the temple (l. 26: id gal-ti ul-tu nig-ga ē-an-na i-he-ru-ṭū).

Taxation-related obligations are recorded in PTS 2344 and PTS 2044. The tenant in the former text was obliged to provide two equipped urāšu-workers1095 to the lessor and the tenant in PTS 2044 had to deliver cattle as a “present” (nāmuṭtu) of the king. Other dues of the tenants in addition to the rent, which mostly consisted of by-products of the cereal and date cultivation, could include bundles of straw (YOS 6 1501096), which was a valuable building material, and parts of the date palm (e.g., mangāgu, liblibbu (“bast, fronds”))1097 in PTS 2044.

Finally, the last type of obligations found in sātu-contracts concern the means of production. They are characteristic for leases of arable land anasítu, especially the large-scale ones, and appear practically only in these texts.1098 The means of production, consisting of barley for seed (and animal fodder), manpower (ikkarus), draught animals (oxen and cows), tools of delivery. It is somewhat unusual that the texts use the word water, rather than waterway (nāru, ḫarru, or similar), in this context. San Nicolò considered the possibility that mé rabūtī (or simply mé) designated a standing body of water as opposed to flowing water. As an example for flowing water he cited GC 2 102 in which it is stated that watch-posts are located on a big river (l. 9: kadānu ša muḫḫi nāri rabūtī). However, this example comes from a different context and cannot be contrasted with the payment stipulations from the land lease contracts. Note also that Joannès 1982: 138 translates the relevant passage from Šum-ukīn’s and Kalbāya’s rent contract (TEBR 37 l. 19) as “au bord des canaux” and understands the phrase to designate the delivery at a canal which is navigable the whole year round (p. 162).

1092 For fallow see van Driel 1990: 235ff.
1093 Cf. AHw: 694 nabalkattu = “Überschreitung”. For the NB attestations in the context of arable cultivation, the dictionary opts for the translation “war darüber hinausgeht”. However, understanding the term as “passing over”, i.e. “leaving out, omitting”, fits this context better than “exceeding”, since a part of the land was to be left out of cultivation. The CAD N 1:10 interprets the term as “part of a field left fallow”.
1094 The translation “Boden umbrechen??” suggested by AHw: 841 for puššuḫu in the agricultural context must be rejected for YOS 6 11, since the basic meaning of the verb, “beruhigen”, fits better. For other occurrences of the verb in connection to date orchards in texts from Borsippa see van Driel 1990: 236. Here, this was an action to be avoided by the gardeners. Van Driel considers the possibility of the verb signifying “leaving the tree barren” or “not performing (artificial) pollination” in these cases.
1095 These were workers employed in state service for various digging or construction works. References are made to these occasions in connection with the ploughmen (see p. 59f.).
1096 This attestation should be added to the ones listed by Jursa 2004b: 177.
1098 PTS 2344, YOS 6 11, YOS 6 150, TCL 13 182.
(ploughs, spades, and so on) and iron for the repair of tools, and occasionally of rations for the ploughmen, were an investment on the part of lessor, the temple. The tenants who, though not explicitly, were also expected to invest in their agricultural enterprise, as this was probably the only way to reach the annual goals set by the contract and make profit, were obliged to take care of the temple’s assets. The numbers of livestock were to be kept up. The texts occasionally state that the cows and oxen are “made of iron” and that “they shall not die”\(^{1099}\). For this purpose cows were provided. With their offspring the tenants could keep the numbers of the draught animals up to strength.\(^{1100}\) Since these animals were temple property it was stipulated that the tenant would show the offspring to a representative of the temple, usually the bêl pigîtti, who would have them branded with the mark of the Lady of Uruk and return them to the tenant (YOS 6 11 ll. 12-15; YOS 6 150 ll. 18-21). The ploughs (and other tools\(^{1101}\)) provided were to be kept in good repair.\(^{1102}\) This was probably to be done with the iron which was also provided by the temple.\(^{1103}\)

3.5.1.2. ana errêšûtu\(^{1104}\)

Though the expression ana errêšûtu literally means “for cultivation”, all the leases in which the term errêšûtu appears were sharecropping agreements, according to which the tenant kept a part of the harvest and delivered the other part to the lessor. The expression therefore referred to the form of the rent paid rather than to a specific type of cultivation (Jursa 2004b: 177ff.). It could be used in connection with different types of arable land which were to be treated differently according to their stage of productivity. But also orchards could be subjected to sharecropping arrangements. In these cases, however, the term errêšûtu was not used as it was reserved for arable farming.

Only four leases, all of which concern arable land, are explicitly designated as ana errêšûtu.\(^{1105}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Type of land</th>
<th>Rent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YBC 3543</td>
<td>1-III-23 Nbk</td>
<td>eqatu ša BšU</td>
<td>1/5 in the year 23 Nbk, (then) 1/6 and 1/3 zît̂tu</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{1099}\) YOS 6 11 l. 12: gu₄me āb-gal ina lih-bi i-mut-ti; YOS 6 150 ll. 17-18: gu₄mek āb-gal ina lih-bi ul i-mut-tu₂ / ša an-bar'ru šī-NU. Cf. also the ‘Edict of Belûziâr’, YOS 6 3 ll. 20-21: gu₄mek ul i-mut-ti / ša an-bar šī-NU.

\(^{1100}\) YOS 6 11 ll. 10-11: 100 āb-galmek a-na bat qa ša 400 gu₄me a-na PN₁ / ū PN₂ (tenants) id-din. See van Driel 1990: 231f. From Uruk one could also add the work contract YOS 19 71 according to which two men were to receive four oxen, one ploughshare (lišānu), one appatu-tool and two spades (marra) (and 20 kurru of barley seed). The private orchard lease YBC 4143 is also interesting in this context. The three men who were to cultivate the orchard and the soil below the palms were to receive three iron spades, one iron hoe, and one iron sickle (l. 24: 3 q₃mar an-barmek 1+en qul-mu-û an-bar 1+en nig-gal-la an-bar), and food and wool rations from the lessor. That spades and even ploughs were used for the cultivation of the ground below the date palms is also known from numerous other orchard leases from the clauses on the remuneration (sissīnumu) of the gardener.

\(^{1101}\) YOS 6 11 ll. 15-16: bat qa / ša q₄apimmek ina lih-bi i-sab-ba-ti; YOS 6 150 l. 21: bat qa q₄apimmek ša ina lih-bi i-sab-bat.

\(^{1102}\) In YOS 6 11 l. 21) 10 talents of iron and in YOS 6 150 l. (22) 5 talents 20 minas of iron were provided. Cf. van Driel’s considerations on the weight of the iron supplied by the temple and the weight of the tools (1990: 232). He comes to the conclusion that this iron was to be used for repairs and additions to the existing tools, rather than for the production of new ones.


\(^{1104}\) TCL 12 64 also mentions land leased ana errêšûtu; however, the text itself is not a lease, but rather a division of the leased property between two tenants by means of lot. The arrangement concerns land previously leased to two brothers for sharecropping. It enumerates the plots in question, but apart from deliveries of cattle as present for the lessor Šum-ukin, who by all appearances acted on behalf of Eanna, no obligations or stipulations on the rent are recorded in the text. This is not surprising as the rent must have been of marginal concern in this document, the primary purpose of which was to establish a division of the leased plots. The rent will have been determined by the actual lease contract, or following common practice in case there was no written contract to begin with.
Some other leases obviously concern sharecropping arrangements, but the term errēšūtu is not explicitly used in these texts. The tenant in BM 114559, a lease of ‘unbroken’ land (taptû) in which the word errēšūtu does not appear, for instance, had to pay one quarter of the harvest as rent. As was noted, errēšūtu is also never mentioned in orchard leases, even when these were to be cultivated under sharecropping terms. Rather, these leases were classified as either ana nukuribbûti or ana zâqipûtî.\footnote{Jursa 2004b: 178 notes that leases of orchards cultivated under sharecropping terms were extremely rare. The examples discussed in the following can be added to the attestations recorded by him. The sharecropping arrangement in the lease of a ḫallatu-orchard, YOS 7 162, referred to, against Jursa, the entire orchard production, not just the crops grown below the date palms.}

Furthermore, the sharecropping terms, without the explicit use of the word errēšūtu, appear frequently in orchard leases and are applied to the crops grown below the date palms, whereas the date output of the orchard was subjected to an imittu procedure (see below).

A leased plot could contain land of different qualities, and for these, shares at different rates could be called for. Thus, in YOS 21 207 the shares for previously cultivated (bît dullî) and uncultivated land (bît taptê) differ. For bît dullî, which was more productive and easier to till, a half-share was to be paid, while for the bît taptê a third of the harvest was the share of the lessor. In YBC 3543 a uniform rate of one-fifth of the harvest as share is to be paid for the first year (the year in which the lease was made), followed by two different rates, namely, one-sixth-share for land which was probably irrigated by buckets, and a third-share for land with readily available water (i.e. land which could be irrigated by flooding, which was less arduous than bucket-irrigation).

\footnote{Remarks in \{} are information not explicitly stated in the text, but implied by it.}
Generally, smaller shares were due from the land which entailed more strenuous work (e.g., a third-share from bit dāli, as opposed to half-share from bit mé qāti in YOS 21 208 and NCBT 677).\textsuperscript{1108}

The shares were expressed using the terms zittu or šibšu, sometimes with additions of words designating land (e.g., zittu qaqqari, šibšu eqlī).\textsuperscript{1109} zittu (ḫa-la), “share”, was the more general term used also in non-agricultural contexts. In the agricultural context it could be applied to dues in barley and other cereals, as well as dates. It could designate the share of both the landowner and of the sharecropper.\textsuperscript{1110} šibšu had the more specific connotation of “(harvest) share (paid as rent)”\textsuperscript{1111} and it was applied only to cereals, be they planted on cereal fields or on the land below the date palms, but never to dates. The two terms could be used as partial synonyms and placed in apposition to one another (e.g., 1/4 zittu šibšu ša qaqqari in BM 114559). The size of the share was specified by placing a fraction before the word zittu. A half-share was always expressed as aḫt zittu (a-hi ḫa-la). Other attested shares include: 1/3, 2/3, 1/4, 3/4, 1/5, 4/5, 1/6, 5/6 and 1/10. The shares could be expressed from the point of view of the tenant (the tenant will receive an x-share) or the lessor (the tenant will give an x-share to the lessor). This usually depended on the size of the share: There was a tendency to use the fractions with the numerator 1 wherever possible, as this was simpler to express in writing. Thus, if the share of the lessor was, for instance, 5/6, this would be expressed in terms of the share of the tenant, i.e. 1/6. Sometimes the shares were not further specified by a fraction. šibšu eqlī appears for instance in YOS 7 51 and in numerous debt notes.\textsuperscript{1112} These instances indicate that there existed a customary rate for shares in agricultural leases. In all of these cases the size of the actual share was unspecified. This is also the case in the lease YBC 3750, according to which the share was to be paid in the same way as was done by other sharecroppers, who work on the land of the Lady of Uruk (zittu qaqqari aki errešē ša ina qaqqari ša Bēlti ša Uruk zēra irrišū):

YBC 3750
4-XI-2 Ner

obv. 1. 'nu-ḫa-a a-sū ša ild[ag]-šu-il-sa-bat u 'dinkur-na-tan a 'man-nu-li-qim
a-na igi 1mu-gin a-sū ša ild-en-numun [a] ḫa-si-ia
6en pi-qi-ti ša lugal il-lik-ma ki-a-am iq-bi
um-ma 1 ši-i-[h]u ša 'gašan ša unuqši ša id-du-ti 'ina ūs-la-sa-du

5. ši-li-a a-bi-in-na-si-ma še-numun ina lī-bi
ni-ri-ši-ma ḫa-la qaqr-qr a-na 'gašan ša unuqši
ni-id-din 'mu-gin iš-me-e-šu-nu-ti-ma 1 ši-i-ḫu
ša 'gašan ša unuqši ša id-du-ti inq ūs-sa-du ši-il-la-a
a-na ur-re-[šu-tu a-na] 'nu-ḫa-a u 'dinkir-na-tan

10. ul-tu it ša mu 2-kam 'u-gur-lugal-ūru
lugal tuk-tiši id-din še-numun ma-la ina lī-bi
a-na e-reš ša-a-bi ir-ri-[šu-ma]
še-numun ma-la ina lī-bi a-na e-[resh] la

lo.e. ta-bu-a-ma 'nu-ḫa-a 'dinkur6-n[a-ta]n

15. u-maš-šar-ši-šu-ma la ir-ri-ši
a-na er-si 'gašan ša unuqši il-li

rev. a-na la er-si 'nu-ḫa-a u 'dinkir-na-tan
il-šu-ū ḫa-la qaqr-qar a-ki-i (erasure)
ša-re-reš-e ša 'ina qaqr-qar ša 'gašan ša unuqši

20. še-numun i-ri-si a-na 'gašan ša unuqši i-nam-di-nu

garš Jeremiah ša la 'mu-gin ul i-ri-si-ū
l+en gu šu-lu-lu-lu-lu ša 2-a-ne uš-qat-tu-ū
u 1 udu gal-ū a-na na-muš-ti ša 'mu-gin
i-nam-di-nu e-lat gišimmarš ạ a-na i-mit-ti
25. *im-mi* text: *du-du-ša-ner-tu*

(one blank line)

\[ \text{mu-kin, } \text{ba-la-tu a-šú šá } \text{a-sur-ki-na} \]
\[ \text{amar-utu-mu-uru a-šú šá } \text{si-lim-šen a } \text{ba-si-ia} \]
\[ \text{šu-la-a a-šú šá } \text{30-na-din-mu} \]

u.e. \[ \text{in-nin-numun-bad a-šú šá } \text{gar-mu umbisag } \text{ba-la-tu} \]

30. *a-šú šá* \[ \text{mu-ši-zib-šen unug-ši iti zid } \text{4-kam} \]

\[ \text{mu } \text{2-kam } \text{mu-gur-lugal-uru} \]

\[ \text{lugal } \text{tin-tiš} \]

“Nūhāya, son of Nabû-qāt-šabat, and Il-natan, son of Mannu-liqim, went to Šum-ukin, son of Bel-zeri, descendant of Basia, the agent of the king, and said as follows: ‘Give us one estate of the Lady of Uruk, which is on Nār-Bānitu (and) next to (the plot of) Šillāya. We will cultivate the land there and will give a share (of the harvest) of the land to the Lady of Uruk.’ Šum-ukin consented and gave to Nūhāya and Il-natan one estate of the Lady of Uruk, which is on Nār-Bānitu (and) next to (the plot of) Šillāya, for sharecropping from the first month of the second year of Neriglissar.\[1113\]

They will cultivate as much land there as is suitable for cultivation and the land which is [not] suitable for cultivation they will leave and will not cultivate. The Lady of Uruk will take over the cultivated land, and Nūhāya and Il-natan will take over the uncultivated land.\[1114\] They will give a share (of the harvest) of the land to the Lady of Uruk in the same way as (the other) sharecroppers who cultivate land of the Lady of Uruk. They will not cultivate the x-irrigation district\[1115\] without Šum-ukin’s consent. They will give one two-year-old\[1116\] flawless bull and one fully grown sheep as present of Šum-ukin. (This is) apart from the date palms which he (Šum-ukin) will subject to the yield estimation procedure for them.\[1117\]


There are no indicators in the texts from Eanna what the size of a standard, customary, share might have been. On the basis of one text from the Eabbar of Sippar, which seems to indicate a parallelism between the expressions *mišil ēṣrū* and *šibšu ēṣrū*,\[1118\] Jursa proposed that a half-share could be implied by the occurrences of *šibšu* without a fraction specifying its size. However, he conceded that more evidence would be needed in order to make a stronger argument for this interpretation (1995a: 82).

\[1113\] The text was drafted on 4-XI-2 Ner, i.e. some ten months after the commencement of the lease (1-2 Ner). That lease contracts could be made without (or prior to) the existence of written documents has been noted by Ries 1976: 59.\[140\]

\[1114\] See CAD E: 125 for this interpretation of *ēlū*. This stipulation had the objective to ensure that all of the land which was suitable for agricultural use was cultivated by the two tenants for the benefit of the temple. The remaining land, which was probably of lower quality, was to be left to the tenants for their own use, conceivably animal husbandry. This seems plausible because they were supposed to deliver cattle to the lessor as an additional due.

\[1115\] The identification of *garn-BUR* is not known to me.

\[1116\] Literally: “a flawless bull which completed (its) second (year)”. 2-ē-tu (*šanūtu*) must stand for the ordinal *šanītu*.

\[1117\] Apparently, there were also (a few?) date palms on the plot which Šum-ukin was to subject to an *imittu* procedure.

\[1118\] Jursa (1995a: 81f.) interprets these expressions as “half-(share and) tithe” and “šibšu (and) tithe” respectively.
3.5.1.3. **imittu**\(^{119}\)

A third type of rent payment, to be distinguished from the fixed rent (**sūtu**) and the shares (**zittu**, **šibšu**), was entitled **imittu**. This term designated both the procedure of yield-estimation and the resulting impost on the cultivator. The yield-estimation was conducted shortly before the harvest both on arable land and in the date orchards by a special commission consisting of estimators (**ēmidus**), scribes, or sometimes individuals simply designated as free citizens (**mār banē**) without any professional specifications. The purpose of the yield-estimation was to determine the prospective output of the temple’s fields and orchards and thus avoid any embezzlement of the crops during or shortly after the harvest. Furthermore, it was significant for determining the size of the obligations of the ploughmen, gardeners and sharecroppers.

In the sense of an “impost”, **imittu** could, however, be used in reference to different types of rent payments, especially in **imittu debt** notes. It could, namely, stand in apposition to the shares of the sharecroppers (**zittu**, **šibšu**), and the **sūtu** of the ploughmen.\(^{1120}\) Somewhat confusingly, **imittu** also designated the dues of the gardeners, which were different from the **sūtu**-obligations of the **ikkarus** and the shares of the **errešus**.\(^{1121}\)

The absolute size of the shares of the sharecroppers, which were a fraction of the yield, could only have been determined on the basis of a yield-estimation. The evidence from other archives shows that in the debt notes written on this occasion the dues of the sharecroppers were designated as “**šibšu eyewitness, imittu**”.\(^{1122}\) It is, however, somewhat surprising that **imittu** is never mentioned in the leases in connection to the rent paid by the sharecroppers. At any rate, **imittu** is never mentioned in the leases of arable land **ana errešü**. However, it does appear in the **nukuribbutu**-leases of the **hallatu**-orchards, which were technically sharecropping arrangements.

The gardeners had to deliver the impost (**imittu**) on their orchards determined during a yield-estimation and were to receive a salary in dates (**sissinnu**), calculated on the basis of the size and type of land worked below the date palms. It is assumed that the impost (**imittu**) of an orchard which was to be delivered to the temple consisted of the main part of, if not the entire, yield of the orchard minus the **sissinnu** (Jursa 2004b: 179, with earlier literature).\(^{1123}\)

The term **imittu** itself rarely appears in the lease contracts and when it does, only in the **nukuribbutu**-leases (YBC 4149, YOS 7 47, 51, 162) and one **gugallūtu**-lease (YOS 7 38). Sometimes it is stated that the procedure would be conducted by Eanna (**ultu Eanna**, YOS 7 38, 47 and 51).\(^{1124}\) The **hallatu**-orchard leases stipulated that the impost on the dates was to be done while these were still on the palms, i.e. before the harvest, after which they should be harvested (e.g., YOS 7 162 ll. 14-15: **ú-hi-in-nu ina muh-ki **\(^{6} **gišmar i-mid-d-si-ma / i-nak-ki-is**).\(^{1125}\) The great majority of the **nukuribbutu**-contracts in fact only tacitly implied that the orchards were to be subjected to an **imittu** procedure. The only specific stipulations on rent payments one finds in them concern the arable land below the palms which was to be tilled at sharecropping terms.

---


\(^{1120}\) For attestations of **imittu** in connection to **šibšu** see Ries 1976: 79. None of these examples are from Eanna, though. For **imittu** in apposition to **sūtu** see YOS 6 55, a debt note for barley charged against an **ikkaru** (ll. 1-2: 2 me 75 gur **še-bar sag-du zag** **gišmar** / **ša lde** **en-šec**-mu **léngar**; edited on p. 52).

\(^{1121}\) The obligations of the gardeners are, with one exception, never designated as **sūtu or zittu** in the texts, but only as **imittu**. However, in TCL 12 59, a list of date deliveries, the gardeners were entitled to a quarter-share (**zittu** or **suttu**) of the orchard production.

\(^{1122}\) E.g., “**x kurru** barley, **šibšu** of the field, **imittu** ... charged against PN (= sharecropper)”; for attestations see the notes 541, 542 and 543 in Ries 1976: 79.

\(^{1123}\) However, note the already mentioned **imittu** list TCL 12 59 (1 Ami) in which the gardeners of Eanna kept one quarter of the estimated harvest for themselves, and there was no talk of **sissinnu**.

\(^{1124}\) YOS 7 38 is quite specific. The text states further that the yield estimators would make the **imittu** according to which the dates were to be paid to the temple (ll. 6-9: **zú-lum-ma ma-la iš-tu ē-an-na i-nem-midu / a-ki-i i-mi-tu₃, ša lde** **emi-de-e** ša ē-an-na / **im-mi-du** PN (tenant) **zú-lum-ma a-na / ē-an-na i-nam-di-in**). YBC 4149 also mentions young date palms (l. 10: **gišmar** tur) which should be subjected to an **imittu** procedure. By contrast, YOS 7 47, a lease of an orchard with some mature and some young palms, specifies that only the yield of the mature, fruit baring date palms (l. 13: **gišmar** is-si **bil-tu₃** should be estimated in the first five years.
3.5.2. According to type of cultivation:

Here we can differentiate between the land leased for development, i.e. for breaking the soil for the purpose of cereal cultivation (ana taptê) and for creating new (date) orchards (ana zₕqip¹ti) on the one, and for the cultivation of already productive land (ana nukuribb¹ti in case of orchards) on the other hand.

3.5.2.1. ana taptê

Lease contracts for developing arable land (ana taptê, literally “for opening”) are not well represented in the Eanna material. Only two such documents have come down to us, of which one concerns land composed of both previously cultivated (b²t dulli) and uncultivated (b²t taptê) land:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Land</th>
<th>Rent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BM 114559</td>
<td>20-VII-[x] Camb</td>
<td>qaqqaru ša BŠU bit taptê</td>
<td>1/4 zittu šibšu ša qaqqari</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 21 207</td>
<td>26-V-1 Nbk IV</td>
<td>zérù pi šulpi bit dulli u taptê ...</td>
<td>aḫi zitti for bit dulli + 1/3 zittu for bit taptê</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 29: Land leases ana taptê

Both contracts are sharecropping agreements and the shares were to be paid immediately to the temple. In BM 114559 the share amounted to a quarter of the yield:

BM 114559  20-VII-[x] Camb

1. "Id na-na-a-mu a-šú šá li in-nin-mu-úru
   a-é-[kur-za]-¹timer a-na iga na-din
   a-šú šá li en-šes-med-su¹ a-é-gi-bi
   il-lik-ma ki-a-am iq-bi um-ma
5. qaqqar é tap-tu-ú šá gú id-li in-nin
   qaqqar šá gašan šá unug ki i-bi-nam-ma
   dul-lu ina lib-bi lu-pu-us³ na-din
   is-me-síi-ma qaqqar é tap-tu-ú
   i-daš-šu 4-ú ha-la šib-sú³
10. šá³ qaqqar a-na³ gašan šá unug ki
    i-nam-din
revised
1. [šu³]mu-[kin-nu³] gi³-mil³-lu a-šú šá li ag-mu-mu
   [a-šu³] na-na-a li utu-šes³-mu
   [a-šú ša³] utu-mu-mu a³ am³ d-a-mu
15. [šu³]umbisag³ utu-du³ a-šú ša³ gi³-mil³-lu

(one blank line)

"Nanaya-iddin, son of Innin-šum-usur, descendant of Ekur-zakir, went to Nadin, son of Bel-abbi-eriba, descendant of Egibi, and said as follows: ‘Give me uncultivated land on the bank of Nar-Innin, land of the Lady of Uruk, and I will do the work there.’ Nadin accepted and gave him uncultivated land. He will give one quarter-share as harvest share of the land to the Lady of Uruk. Witnesses: Gimillu, son of Nabû-šum-iddin, descendant of [Gimil]-Nanaya,

1126 For productive arable land no specific terms other than the general dullu are used. Instead, these types of leases are defined in terms of the rent, i.e. ana sittu or ana erréšittu.
Šamaš-ab-iddin, [son of] Šamaš-šum-iddin, descendant of Rim-Anu,
[Scribe:] Šamaš-ibni, son of Gimillu;
[Uruk]; 20-VII-[x] Camb; [king] of Babylon, king of lands.”

The text is not informative about the tasks to be undertaken on taptû-land. The tenant is obliged to do the work in the field and deliver a quarter-share to the temple. The contract implies that the amount of land to be worked was not limited and that the tenant was to pay rent for as much land as he was capable of tilling. YOS 21 207 is more informative on the activities on taptû-land: It reports that the mayyâru-land was to be worked up (dekû). Furthermore, two rates for rent are stipulated: a half-share for the cultivated land (bît dullî) and a third-share for the previously uncultivated land (bît taptê). This means that here land in different stages of productivity was leased:

YOS 21 207

---

Apart from these two documents we hear of uncultivated land in orchard leases ananakuribbûti. This land could be leased as part of existing orchards. It was referred to in these contracts either generally as “arable land” (pî šulpi in NCBT 630) or explicitly as previously uncultivated land (bît taptê in NCBT 630, apîtu in YBC 4143 and barrîtû in NCBT 677). In addition to the rent paid immediately, as in the two taptû-contracts, an alternative mode for rent payments is known from one of these orchard leases, similar to the one from the zaqipûtu-contracts (see below). In YBC 4143, the tenant is supposed to cultivate the apîtu land adjacent to the orchard he leased and have the usufruct of this land for four years. No stipulations are made for the
period after these four years. Similarly, in the lease Camb. 102, from Sippar it is recorded that the rent payments were to commence after three years. During the period of three years, the land was to be “opened” and cultivated, and all the produce of the field went to the cultivator. Jursa (1995a: 141) suggests that the actual work of “opening” the land took about two years, as in the Old-Babylonian teptitu-leases, and consisted of two phases. In the first year the soil would be broken (taptê puttû), then the hard, big lumps of earth would be removed (paškî našû) and the first sowing would be conducted. The second season entailed a second round of ploughing (màyâra dekû), “crumbling” of the soil (pašâru) and the first regular sowing (zaqâpu). Such a range of work procedures as presented in Camb. 102 is not known from the Uruk texts. Apart from the solitary mayyâra dekû from YOS 21 207, however, some orchard leases which included previously uncultivated arable land mention also the ‘opening’ of the soil (taptê puttû) and the removal of shrubbery (abatta nasâku). The order in which these procedures are listed was probably not significant. One would in fact expect the work to progress in exactly the opposite direction. Namely, the wild-growing vegetation would have to be removed first, so that the first round of ploughing, the ‘opening’ of the soil could be carried out. This would be followed by a second round of ploughing, expressed as mayyâra dekû, if one is to follow Jursa’s interpretation of the term (1995a: 141). However, the exact implications of the word mayyâru are not clear, as was discussed earlier (see p. 272). The attestation of mayyâru in YOS 21 207 as a designation of land may indicate that the term could be used synonymously to bit taptê mentioned at the beginning of this text.

3.5.2.2. ana zâqipûti

Five contracts “for planting” have come down to us from the Eanna archive:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Land</th>
<th>Rent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YOS 17 6</td>
<td>23-III-21 Nbk</td>
<td>qaqqaru ša BšU</td>
<td>usufruct for 5 years then ahi zitti (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTS 2134</td>
<td>17-IV-43 Nbk</td>
<td>bit ritti zêru ina qaqqari ša BšU</td>
<td>ahi zitti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 6 33</td>
<td>19-IX-3 Nbn</td>
<td>qaqqaru ša BšU</td>
<td>usufruct for 10 years then 2/3 zittu dates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 6 67</td>
<td>14-XI-4 Nbn</td>
<td>2;2.3 zêru ... qaqqaru ša BšU</td>
<td>usufruct for 10 years then 2/3 zittu dates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTS 2089</td>
<td>8-VII-1 Cyr</td>
<td>exact measures of the plot, zêru</td>
<td>(usufruct for 10 years on everything he grows below the palms)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 30: Land leases ana zâqipûti

These contracts concern planting of date orchards. Only in one case (PTS 2134) grapevines (karânu) were to be planted. This is so far the first and only lease contract for the planting of grapevines from Eanna. Contracts for planting fruit tree orchards, which are relatively common among the texts from Ebabbar in Sippar (Jursa 1995a: 129ff.), are also not attested for Eanna.

---

1129 Stol 2004b: 170. According to these leases no rent was to be paid in the first two years, and in the third a share of one fifth of the harvest was due to the lessor.
1130 The same procedure appears also in a similar context in YOS 21 208, a lease ana errêšêti (edited on p. 279).
1131 BIN 1 125, NCBT 630, NCBT 677, Spar, Studies, no. 8, YBC 4143.
1132 YBC 4143.
1134 Note, however, that fruit trees (gapnu, written ga-pa-nu) were to be planted in an already existing orchard leased ana nukuribûti (YOS 21 214 l. 9-10: ši-kit-ti šû³ ga-pa-nu / ina lib-bi i-šak-kan).
The land in these leases was designated either as zēru or qaqqaru or both, as is to be expected for undeveloped land. In one case (YOS 6 33) the land is further specified as kasal u kālū, i.e. low quality, perhaps periodically waterlogged, land. In another document (PTS 2134) the tenant was supposed to carry out the planting where there were no date palms and where the land was suitable (ḫābu), in an area where other planters (zaqipānum) were active, in other words, in an area under development.

The date palms in newly planted orchards would reach maturity only after about ten years. The date palms in newly planted orchards would reach maturity only after about ten years. The gardener had the usufruct of these for five years. After this period they were to be submitted to the temple: compensation for their work.1135 In YOS 6 33 this is expressed as: “For ten years, everything that he cultivates there will be at the disposal of (the tenant) as compensation for (his) work” (II. 11-13: a-di 10-ta mu-an-našok mim-ma ma-la / ina lib-bi ip-pu-šu ku-um e-pi-ši ša dul-lu iger PN / id-da-gal). After the palms reached maturity and became fully productive the tenant would have to start paying rent for the orchard. In the examples from Uruk the rent was always a share of the yield: one half and two thirds are attested here.1136 Only PTS 2134, the lease for grapevine planting, does not stipulate a ‘maturing’ period for the plantations, but calls for rent payments of a half share from the start. According to YOS 17 6, which is presented below, the tenant was to have usufruct of the young date palms there and will consume whatever grows there […] after five years […] he will give the yield (of these palms) to Eanna according to the im[post] determined by Eanna”, ll. 15018:

YOS 17 6 23-I-III Nbk

obv. 1. ḫag-numun-ba-šā a-šū šā ḫeṣšok-e-a 1 kur-i a-na
    pa-ni  ḫamar-utu-dub-numun a-šū šā ḫamar-utu-mu-ūru a ḫgal-душā
    ša-tam  ē-an-na il-lik ma ki-a-am iq-bi
    um-ma qaq-qar ša  ḫaššan ša unugši gū id-lugal ul-tu ugu id ba-ru (?)
5. a-di kā ḫid-aš-ši a-di 5-ta mu-an-našok mim-ma ma-la
    a-ar-e-an-na a-na za-qi-pu-pu bi-in-nam ma dul-lu ina lib-bi lu-pu-uš
    ḫamar-utu-dub-numun ăš-me-šu-na qaq-qar a-na za-qi-pu-pu
    [?]l-da-āš-ši a-di 5-ta mu-an-našok mim-ma ma-la
    (ina ili) lib-bi il-la-a' pa-mi ḫag-numun-ba-šā id-da-gal
10. [a-bat]-tu₄ ina lib-bi ina-as-suk śi-šit-ti ina lib-bi
    [i-šā]k₂-kam₁ i-ga-ri šakiri₄ ip-pu-uš id [x/0]

lo.e. [x x x (x)] [x] ar⁻¹-ku 5-ta mu-an-našok
[x x x (x)] [x] x₄ [x' il]⁻¹la₄-a' a-ši ḫa-la
 [...] [x₃] ü ina igi

rev. 15. [...]  ḫta₃-mir-ti ib-ni
    [išu-mu-kin-nu PN a-šū ša PN] a ḫši-gu-ū-a
    [PN a-šū ša PN] a ḫen-a-ūru
    [dū-ia a-šū ša]  ḫ̣ab-nē-e-a a ḫšu-ša
    [na₈₄] din a-šū ša ḫid a-gur-pab a ḫuš-bar
20. [ḫag⁻¹ ] sur a-šū ša sum-na₄ a ša ṣag-gil-ia
    [ḫeṣšok-cons] ba-ša a-šū ša ḫkar-ḫamar-utu a e-ge-bi
    [muš]e-zib₆-k a-šū ša um-la-a a ḫur-rab-ti
    [็ก]l₄ ḫamar-utu₄-mu-šiş a-šū ša ḫre-mut a ḫen-ū-sat
    ḫutu-kal a-šū ša ḫa-sa-a a ḫsip a
25. u ḫumbisag ḫu-gur-din-it a-šū ša ḫid a-šu₄-sanga-ba
    ḫu kar-č-ān-na iti sig₄ ud 23-kam

1135 This is only specifically stated in YOS 7 47, a lease of an orchard (ana nukuribbūti), in which there were also young date palms. The gardener had the usufruct of these for five years. After this period they were to be submitted to the ḫimitu procedure like the other mature date palms in the orchard (“for five years he will tend the young date palms there and will consume whatever grows there […] after five years […] he will give the yield (of these palms) to Eanna according to the im[post] determined by Eanna”, II. 15-18; 88 ḫagšimmur tur-tur ša ina lib-bi a-di 5 mu-an-našok / ḫur-rab-bi ebur₄ mim-mu ša ina lib-bi il-la-a ik-kal […] / […] egir 5-ta mu-an-našok a-ki-i-i-mit-tu ša) / [u]lu₄ ē-an-na i-nem-mi-di ebur a-na ē-an-na [i-nam-din]).
1136 PTS 2089 does not record any terms on the payment of rent after ten years. Perhaps the lease was to expire after ten years anyway, making such stipulations unnecessary.
“Nabû-zêr-iqiša, son of Aḫḫēa, descendant of Kûrî, went to Marduk-šâpîk-zêrî, son of Marduk-šum-usur, descendant of Rab-banē, the chief administrator of Eanna, and said as follows: ‘Give me the land of the Lady of Uruk on the bank of Nār-šarrī from the x-canal to the intake of the Nār-Aššûritu facing Kâr-Eanna for the purpose of planting (date palms) and I will do the work there.’ Marduk-šâpîk-zêrî accepted and gave him the land for planting. For five years whatever grows there will be at Nabû-zêr-iqiša’s disposal. He will remove [the shrubbery] from there. He will make a plantation there. He will build an orchard wall. [He will ...] canal(s). After five years, [for whatever] grows [...] he will [give] one half (of the harvest) as share [to the Lady of Uruk]."

Witnesses: [PN, son of PN], descendant of Šigûa,
[PN, son of PN], descendant of Bēl-apla-usur,
[Bânia, son of] Tabnēa, descendant of Bâ’îru,
Nâdîn, son of Nergal-nâšîr, descendant of îšparu,
[Nabû]-êter, son of Nadnâya (or Iddnînya), descendant of Sagilîa,
[Bēl]-aḫḫê-îqiša, son of Mušêzib-Marduk, descendant of Egîbi,
Mušêzib-Bēl, son of Apîlîya, descendant of Arrabtu,
Marduk-šum-lîârî, son of Rêmût, descendant of Bēl-usâît,
Šamaš-udammîq, Iqîšîya, descendant of Rê-û;
Scribe: Nergal-uballît, son of Nabû-šûm-êrėš, descendant of Șangû-parakki;
Kâr-Eanna; 23-III-21 Nbk, king of Babylon.”

The text does not stipulate the planting of date palms among the tasks expected from the tenant. This can be taken to indicate that (some) palms, which were still immature, had been planted there earlier, and would explain the relatively short ‘maturing’ period. The planting (zaqîpu) of date palms was, of course, the main task of the tenant in these documents (e.g., YOS 6 67 l.10-11: ẖîšimmâr i-zaq-qap û / dul-su ina lib-bi īp-pu-ûš, “he (the tenant) will plant the date palms and do the (necessary) work there”). The palms to be planted are sometimes specified to be Dîlmûn date palms (YOS 6 33, PTS 2089). Apart from these, and the above mentioned grapevines (PTS 2134), we also hear of willows (ẖîlêpu) which were to be planted along the canal banks (in addition to date palms in YOS 6 67). Some zaqîtûitu-contracts also mention the creation of a “plantation” (šikittu šakānu) as one of the major tasks (YOS 17 6, YOS 6 33, YOS 6 67). These plantations were to all likelihood to be found below the date palms (and the fruit trees) and contained vegetables (though we do not hear of any of these specifically). Other tasks mentioned by our texts include the clearing of the terrain in preparation for cultivation, i.e. “removing of (wildly growing) shrubbery” (abatta nasâku) in YOS 17 6 and YOS 6 33, the building of a garden wall (igâr kîrî epēšu in YOS 17 6 or igârâ lamî in YOS 6 33), and the creation of irrigation canals (YOS 6 67 l. 12: id mâaẖî-šû i-ḫe-er-re-e-ma me-e ti-šā-aṣ-bat, “he will dig its canals and supply them with water”).

---

1137 Cf. YOS 7 47 discussed in note 1135.
1138 YOS 6 67 l. 13: ẖî-le-pi ina ugu id-šû i-šak-kan. Planting of willows in an already existing orchard is attested in NCBT 630 and in the private lease YBC 4143.
1139 Cf. Stol 1987: 65 and CAD Š II: 431 “plantation, garden plot” in connection with onions (in the texts from the Nûr-Sîn archive) and vegetables (buqul (an Aramaic loanword) in the letter CT 22 79). Cf. also Jursa 1995a: 130. In the nukaribîtuu-lease YOS 21 214 šikîtu and fruit trees are to be planted in the date orchard (l. 9-10: ši-kit-tu ẖî gas-pa-nu / ina lib-bi i-šak-kan). Note that a šikîtu could also contain grapevines (BM 63900 l. 7, Jursa 1995a: 135).
1140 See Jursa 1995a: 130.
Sixteen orchard leases *ana nukuribbûti*, “for orchard-tending”, are known from the Eanna archive. One of these texts is a private arrangement (YBC 4143, see below) and three concern ḫallatu-orchards (BM 114444, YBC 4149, YOS 7 162), which have been treated earlier.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Type of land</th>
<th>Rent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YBC 4143</td>
<td>5-VII-38 Nbk</td>
<td>kîrû (kîrîkûnu ša ina šînu ša BŠU)</td>
<td>5/6 zittu dates (usufruct of previously uncultivated land for 4 years)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W 17718 lx</td>
<td>14-[x]-6 Nbn</td>
<td>[orchard]</td>
<td>mentions šîbu and 5 sheep as nâmûru ša šarrû</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM 114444</td>
<td>25-VI-16 Nbn</td>
<td>eqül kîrû gishimmārî zaqpu kîrû ḫallatu ša BŠU u Nanûya</td>
<td>3/4 zittu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM 114450</td>
<td>[x-x] Cyr</td>
<td>[orchard]</td>
<td>- [dates according to imittu]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUWE 11 214</td>
<td>11-VI-4 Cyr</td>
<td>zêrû gishimmârî zaqpu ša BŠU</td>
<td>[x]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 7 47</td>
<td>3’-XIa-5’ Cyr</td>
<td>5 kurrû zêrû gishimmârû šehrîtu u pi šulpi ina zêrî makkûr IU</td>
<td>dates from 12 productive palms according to imittu + esrû šîbu for pi šulpi (usufruct of small palms for 5 years, then yield according to imittu goes to Eanna)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 7 51</td>
<td>28-VI-5 Cyr</td>
<td>zêrû gishimmârî šehrîtu ina zêrî makkûr IU (bît ritti of the tenant’s father)</td>
<td>dates according to imittu + šîbu eqül for the barley from pi šulpi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIN 1 125</td>
<td>[x-x-x Camb]</td>
<td>[orchard]</td>
<td>[dates according to imittu] + 1/5 zittu qassqarî for land below the palms irrigated by buckets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NBC 4889</td>
<td>2-VI-2 Camb</td>
<td>zêrû (bît ritti ša PN) ... makkûr BŠU u Nanûya</td>
<td>[dates according to imittu]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YBC 4149</td>
<td>24-VIII-[3] Camb</td>
<td>zêrû kîrû ḫallatu ša Ištar BŠU, (for 3 years)</td>
<td>4/5 zittu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 7 162</td>
<td>24-VIII-3 Camb</td>
<td>zêrû kîrû ḫallatu ša Ištar BŠU, (for 4 years)</td>
<td>4/5 zittu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIN 1 117</td>
<td>27-VI-5 Camb</td>
<td>zêrû bît gishimmârî</td>
<td>[dates according to imittu] + esrû zittu for land below palms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spar, <em>Studies</em>, no. 8</td>
<td>4-I-1 Dar</td>
<td>zêrû zaqpu makkûr BŠU u Nanûya</td>
<td>[dates according to imittu]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 21 214</td>
<td>[x]-[x]-1 Nbk IV</td>
<td>[orchard]</td>
<td>[dates according to imittu]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCBT 677</td>
<td>23-V-[1 Nbk IV]</td>
<td>[orchard]</td>
<td>[dates according to imittu] + aḥû zittu for bît mê qâṭî + 1/3 zittu for dâlu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCBT 630</td>
<td>4-VI-1 [Nbk IV]</td>
<td>zêrû zaqpu u pânassu pi šulpi... makkûr BŠU u Nanûya (bît ritti ša PN)</td>
<td>[dates according to imittu] + 1/5 (share) for bît dâlu, bît taptî, + 1/3 zittu for bît mê qâṭî, bît taptî</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 31: Orchard leases *ana nukuribbûti*

---

The attested leases of temple land span a period from 6 Nbn to 1 Dar, with an emphasis on the Achaemenid period. The temple officials, the fermiers généraux (ša muḫḫi sūti) and the rab banē prebendaries appear as lessors of orchards. Interestingly, during the reigns of Nabonidus, Cambyses and Darius (and Nebuchadnezzar IV) the lessors were without exception the ša muḫḫi sūti, Šum-ukin, Ardia and Gimillu. Only during Cyrus’s reign, before Ardia was granted his rent farm for dates and while there were no rent farmers for dates in office, we find temple officials in the function of the lessors. This nicely demonstrates that the administration of the date plantations, especially the employment of gardeners, was chiefly in the hands of the large-scale rent farmers, as far as these were present.

The specifications of the leases could concern only date orchards (e.g., AUWE 11 214, BM 114450, NCBT 4889, YOS 21 214 and the hallatu-leases) or date orchards together with arable land below the date palms or adjacent to them (e.g., BIN 1 117, 125, NCBT 630, 677, Spar, Studies, no. 8, YOS 7 47, 51, W 17718 1x). As for the rent payments, these were by and large to be determined by the imittu procedure and probably consisted of the entire yield of the orchard (minus the remuneration of the gardener and other administrative costs). Only the hallatu-orchards and the private orchard from YBC 4143 were leased out under sharecropping terms. However, in the documents involving both orchards and arable land, a share of the harvest of the arable was to be paid in addition to the impost (imittu) on the date palms. These shares could be charged using different rates depending on the availability of water and the type of irrigation conducted (e.g., NCBT 630 and 677, see above).

The gardeners received a ‘salary’ (sissinnu) for their efforts and this was regularly noted in the contracts.\textsuperscript{1142} It was calculated on the basis of the type of work they conducted and the invested effort per each kurru of surface area cultivated. Thus the work on the land tilled with a spade, called bit marri, was valued more than the work on the land tilled with a plough, bit epinni, since it was more arduous. For bit marri four or five kurru of dates and for bit epinni three or four kurru of dates respectively were the remuneration per kurru of area worked.\textsuperscript{1143} One uniform rate is recorded in BM 114450 (ll. 15-16): for each surface kurru worked, four kurru of dates were the sissinnu. According to YOS 7 51 the sissinnu was to be paid out in the same way as the sissinnu of the neighbouring gardeners (ll. 13-14: dul-lu ma-la ina lib-bi ip-pu-šā ki-i pi-šu \textsuperscript{16}us-sa-du \textsuperscript{mek} / sissin-nu i-na-āš-šū). The sissinnu was probably subtracted from the date harvest which was due to the temple under the designation imittu.

The obligations of the gardeners were usually designated as “work”, dullu (e.g., dulla ina libbi epēšu in: NBC 4889, NCBT 630, Spar, Studies, no. 8). Sometimes they were obliged to show this work to the lessor (NBC 4889, in this case to the ša muḫḫi sūti Ardia: dullu ina lib-bi / ip-pu-šu-ma a-na ‘ir-ia ú-kal-lam-u’ (ll. 8-9)). Orchards which contained young date palms needed special care of the tenant. In YOS 7 47 this is expressed as ‘raising’ (rubbû) the date palms (l. 12: ĝišimmari tur-tur ša ina lib-bi ú-rab-bi). In YOS 7 51, a lease of another orchard with young date palms, the tenant had to guarantee for taking care (suddudu) of the palms and also planting (zaqāpu) palms (in addition to guarding the orchard and doing work there (ll. 9-11)).

Similarly, the work on the arable land in the orchards could be put in general terms, as doing the work below the date palms (dulla ina šupāl gišimmari epēšu (BIN 1 117, NBC 4889)) or digging below the date palms (Herētu ina šupāl gišimmari herū (NCBT 630, 677, Spar, Studies, no. 8)). This could be further differentiated as removing shrubbery (abatta nasāku (YOS 7 47)), ‘opening’ the previously uncultivated land (tapē puttā (BIN 1 125, NCBT 630, Spar, Studies, no. 8)), or making a vegetable plantation and planting fruit trees (šikitta u gapnī šākānu (YOS 21 214)). Sometimes the land below the palms required irrigation by buckets (zēra dalā (BIN 1 125)). That the land in the orchards could also be irrigated by gravity flow (i.e. flooding) is indicated by the texts which mention bit mē ĝāti in contrast to bit dālī (e.g., NCBT 630 and 677, see above). As for the irrigation work in the orchards in general, the obligation to dig the irrigation canals and

\textsuperscript{1142} sissinnu is normally not attested in the orchard leases under sharecropping terms or in the zaqipūtu-contracts, since in these cases the gardeners either kept a part of the harvest or had the usufruct of the orchard for a certain period of time.

\textsuperscript{1143} This information stems from BIN 1 117, 125, NBC 4889, NCBT 630, Spar, Studies, no. 8 and YOS 7 47. In other relevant texts the figures are lost on account of damage of the tablets (e.g., AUWE 11 214, NCBT 677, YOS 21 214).
supply them with water was one of the most common tasks of the tenants recorded in the nukirbītu-contracts (nārāti ḫerū u mē šuṣbutu) (BIN 1 117, 125, NBC 4889, NCBT 630, YOS 21 214, Spar, Studies, no. 8).

Some of these obligations are recorded in the following lease:

YOS 21 214

obv. 1. [


“Gimillu gave to Sin-āḫ-bullît, son of Aḫ-lakin, [...] property of the Lady of Uruk and [Nanāyā, ...] Dur-Ugum ... [...] planted (with date palms), from the border of [...] bit ʾitti of Nabû-ēreš, to the plot, bit ʾitti of Bêl-iddin, son of Bābilâya, (land) pertaining to the rent farm of Gimillu, son of Innin-šum-ibni, for the purpose of orchard-tending. He will plant [...] and will make a (vegetable) plantation and plant fruit trees there, and will surround it [with a wall] [...]. He will dig its (the orchard’s) irrigation canals and supply them [with water]. For as much digging [as he does below the date palms] Gimillu will give to Sin-āḫ-bullît as sissinmu x kurrû (of dates) per each surface kurru (worked) with an iron spade, and x kurrû (of dates) per each surface kurru (worked) with a plough. [Sin-āḫ-bullît] guarantees for the guarding of [the fronds and shoots] and

---

1144 The erased sign was probably ʾū, of which the first part, the Winkelhaken, is still visible. The scribe probably wrote the sign ʾū again at the beginning of line 5. However, this cannot be verified due to a break in the text.

1145 The writing i-zaq-PI-ma must stand for izaqqap-ma. The scribe was probably influenced by the expression (ē) zaq-pi, which frequently appears in orchard leases. The object of the planting was noted at the end of line 8, but cannot be identified due to a break in the text.

1146 ga-pa-nu must stand for gapnu, “fruit tree”. The term occurs frequently in the leases of from the Ebabbar of Sippar, on its own or in connection with fruits such as apples, pomegranates, grapes and figs; cf. Jursa 1995a: 132ff.

1147 The sequence of signs kāt-til-lu (l. 10) followed by the word lamû, “to encircle, surround”, does not make any obvious sense. lamû usually appears together with igāru, “wall”, in stipulations for building such a structure around the orchard. Perhaps igāru should be reconstructed in the gap in l. 10 following the word isakkanma.

1148 Note the defective orthography for usashaṭ.
(against) the felling of date [palms]. Whoever transgresses (the agreement) will pay 1 [mina] of silver.

Witnesses:  Bêl-êrêš, son of Balâssu,
          Anu-ana-bitîšu, son of Anu-ah-iddin, descendant of Eriba-Anu,
          [x]-iškun}, son of Ḫazapi,
          Šamaš-eriba, son of Nabû-mukin-apli,

Scribe:   Ardia, son of Ininn-ṣum-uṣur, descendant of Kidin-Marduk;
Bitqu-ša-Bêl-ṭer, estate of the Lady of Uruk; [x]-[x]-1 Nbk IV, king of Babylon and of lands.

The plot is at his disposal [for x ye]ars."

In addition to these duties, the tenants were obliged to keep watch of the orchard (pût naṣārī ša māṣartī ... naṣî [YOS 7 51]). In particular they were to guard the shoots and fronds of the palms and guarantee that no felling of palms or other trees took place in the orchards (e.g., NCBT 630 ll. 12-14: pu-ut ma-âṣ-sar-tû šà lib-bi / ḥa-ru-ut-tû, da-a-ku šá gišimar u ḥi-le-pi / šà pa-na-at-šû (tenant) na-šî, “the tenant guarantees for the guarding of the fronds and shoots (and against) the felling of date palms and willows which (grow) in front of them”). BM 114450 even stipulates pecuniary fines for any damage on the vegetation of the orchard. For each felled palm one mina of silver and for any (plant) torn out of the orchard ten shekels of silver had to be paid to the Lady of Uruk.\textsuperscript{1149}

BM 114450

[x-x-x] Cyr

obv.  1. ni-din-ti-[ni] 
     [en ša-tam é-an-na] 
     a-šū šà ẖag-gin-[numun a ḫ-da-hi-bî] [x]1
     ū x x [x x (x)] ẖa-šû ḫ x x [x x (x)] x sī-i-hu

5. ū x x [x x (x)] [x x x (x)] x sā iškun šà unug[kî] [a-na]
     nu-kiš-è-ú-tu a-na si-lim-dingir a-šū šà
     i-na-na-a-kam ip-gi-du idmek i-he-re-e-ma
     a<<-ha>>mek ū-šū-aṣ'-ba'\textsuperscript{1149} dul-lu ina šu-pa-lu ẖi-gišimar
     ip-pu-[šu]1 [pu-ut ḫe]-ru-ut-tû4

10. da-a-ku [šà gišimar] na-ši šà ẖi-gišimar
    i-du-ku 1 ma-na ẖi-kû-babbar [u] šà
    ta lib-bi i-na-sa-ḫu ḫ10 gîn kû-[babbar a-na]
    gašan šà unug[e] ẖi-nam-din

rev.   dul-lu ma-lat ina šu-pa-lu ẖi-gišimar ip-pu-šu

15. a-na 1 gur 4 gur zû-lum-ma sist-nu
    i-nam-di-ni-iš-šû
    mu-ki-nu idag-lg-in a-šû šà id amar-utu-mu-mu a ḫ11 din
    ag-sig-iq a-šû šà id ag-sur a šû-na-na-a
    ḫ11 in-nin a-šū šà ġû-2 ḫ15 a šû-na-na-a\textsuperscript{1149}

20. ūtu-numum-ba-šû a-šû šà ġû in-n[mu]-lûru\textsuperscript{1149}
    a ġû30 ti-ēr [ir]-[ia a-šû šà]
    ūtu-mu-gin a ḫ12 man-dî-dî
    umbisag "mi-mî-lûlu [a-šû šà ġû in-nin-numum-mu]

u.e.   unug\textsuperscript{1149} [i ti [x ud x-kam mu x-kam]

25. ḫu-raš [lugal e\textsuperscript{1149} lugal kur-kur]

\textsuperscript{1149} For actual cases of illicit felling of date palms which were charged with a fine of one mina of silver per palm tree see p. 213 with note 751.
silver to the Lady of Uruk. For the work he does beneath the date palms they will give him 4 kurru of dates per 1 kurru (of surface area) as sissinnu.

Witnesses: Nabû-udammiq, son of Nabû-êter, descendant of Gimil-Nanîya,
Adad-Innin, son of Iblîs, descendant of Gimil-Nanîya,
Šamaš-zêr-iqûa, son of Innin-šum-usur, descendant of Šin-leqê-unninnî,
Ardia, son of Šamaš-šum-ûkin, descendant of Mandîdu;

Scribe: Gimillu, [son of Innin-zêr-iddin];
Uruk; [x-x-x] Cyr, [king of Babylon, king of lands]."

The next document which will be presented here is exceptional in more than one way. It is a private lease of an orchard. The lessor Innin-šum-usur, son of Nergal-uššîlim, should probably be identified with the individual of the same name from the Šîn-leqê-unninnî family, who was a rab bûli of Eanna, attested from 38 Nbk to 9 Nbn (see Kümmel 1979: 62). He leased out the orchard of his father which was situated in an estate of the Lady of Uruk to a certain Nabû-zêr-ûddîn, son of Šiliyá, for orchard-tending (ana nukurîbbûtî). The contract was a sharecropping agreement, which is quite rare for orchard leases. As is indicated in ll. 21-22 the tenant was to receive one sixth of the date yield for his efforts. In addition to this, for a period of four years he had the usufruct of previously uncultivated land, from which the wildly growing vegetation had to be removed and which had to be ‘opened’ and ploughed (ll. 11-12). The tenant was obliged to bring two of his brothers and do the work in the orchard together with them. The provision of (additional) work force was apparently generally a duty of the orchard tenants, but this was never explicitly stated in the institutional contracts, unlike here. Another exceptional feature of this text is the provision of rations in the first year and tools (three spades, one hoe and one sicle) for the tenant and his two brothers by the lessor. Normally one would expect the tenant in a sharecropping arrangement to supply the means of production. This practice which is sometimes found in the institutional sutù-leases may be explained by noting that the share of the tenants was rather small (one sixth of the date harvest). Besides, the rations provided were not substantial. The barley rations, for instance, were enough to cover a period of five to six months.\(^{1150}\) The cress and salt rations could cover a period of about four months, to follow the standard found in the texts concerning travel provisions.\(^{1151}\) The sesame seed provided would amount to about two litres of oil which would allow for about two monthly rations per man in this case (i.e. 0.33 litres). Therefore it is clear that these rations were not intended to provide for the tenant and his brothers for a full year, but were rather meant to help them out at the start:

YBC 4143

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Obv.</th>
<th>5-VII-38 Nbk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>[lag-numun-mu a šú ša šil-la-a a-na pa-an]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[in-nin-lugal-uru a šú ša u-gur-gi il-lik-ma]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[ka-a-am iqt bi um-ma ina 6kiri, ku-nu]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>šá i-na ši-i-hu šá 4gaššu šá unugki]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>šá gu id-lugal šá ul-tu ká id eš-šu e-le-nu-ú</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a-di-i ká id šá é dingirmek a-na 6kuškiri, ú-tu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>lu-uz-ziz-ma dul-lu ina lib-bi lu-pu-uš 6in-n[a-lug]al-pab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iš-me-šu-ma ina 6kiri, šu-nu šá gu id-lugal úša-az-ziz-zu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[lag-numun-mu 2 šešmek šú ib-bak-kam-ma]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>it-it-šu dul-lu ina 6kiri, šá u-gur-gi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ip-pu-šu-u’ ma-a-ari i-de-ku-ú tap-tu-ú</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ú-pat-tu-ú a-bai-tu₄ i-nam-su-ku-u’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>lib-bi ú ḫa-ra-ut-tu i-nam-ša-ru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6he-el-pi ina ugu idmek i-šak-kan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{1150}\) This is calculated on the basis of monthly rations of 60 or 75 litres of barley, which can be found in YOS 6 150 (120 kurru of barley for 30 ikkarus (per year)) and in the ‘Edict of Belšazzar’ (20 kurru of barley for a plough team, i.e. 5 kurru of barley per man per year).

\(^{1151}\) The monthly standard in Uruk seems to have been 1 litre of salt and cress each (Janković 2008: 445f.).

\(^{1152}\) The sesame to oil ratio was usually 6:1 (Janković 2008: 447).
Nabû-zēr-iddin, son of Šillāya, went to Innin-šar-ushur, son of Nergal-ushallim, and said as follows: ‘May I be installed in your (plural) orchard, which is in the estate of the Lady of Uruk, which is situated on the bank of Nār-iقار from the intake of the upper Nār-eššu to the intake of Nār-uššu, for the purpose of orchard-tending and do the work there.’ Innin-šar-ushur consented and installed him in their orchard, which is on the bank of Nār-iقار. Nabû-zēr-iddin will bring his two brothers and they will work with him in the orchard of Nergal-ushallim. 1153 They will work up the mayyārū-land and break the unploughed land. They will remove the shrubbery. They will protect the fronds and shoots (of the date palms). They will plant willows along the canal banks. Nabû-zēr-iddin guarantees for the performance of (the necessary) work together with his two brothers. As for the previously uncultivated land (apītu) which Nabû-zēr-iddin and his two brothers work up and from which they remove the shrubbery: all the land with shrubbery which they clear and cultivate will be at Nabû-zēr-iddin’s and his brothers’ disposal for five years. Under the planted date palms they will do the work and will receive 1/6 of the date (yield). Innin-šar-ushur will give 6 kurru of barley, 2 satu of cress, 2 satu of sesame, 2 satu of salt, 5 minas of wool, three iron spades, one iron hoe, and one iron sickle to Nabû-zēr-iddin and his brothers. Whoever transgresses (the agreement) will pay 1 mina of silver.


Scribe: Ibnī-Ištar, son of Rēmūt;
Naḥallu; 5-VII-38 Nbk, king of Babylon.”

1153 This was probably the lessor’s father.
1154 The last two witnesses have been added on the left edge disregarding the regular line arrangement: their names are written parallel to a part of the date formula, as is indicated in the transliteration.
3.5.3. Special types of leases

Some of the land lease contracts are different from the other texts discussed above in that they are not made for the purpose of land cultivation, or at least not primarily. Among these one finds leases of offices (gugallûtu) or rights to collect obligations incumbent on land (ešrû) and leases of land for pasturing livestock.

Two leases of pasture land are known from Eanna. PTS 2249 has been edited above (p. 276) and YOS 6 26 has been edited and discussed by San Nicolò (1948: 279ff.). The tenants both in YOS 6 26 and PTS 2249 are herdsmen (nâqidûš) of the Lady of Uruk who had temple herds at their disposal. The size of the land they rented cannot be determined, but it is probable that it was extensive. It included some productive land but was probably composed mostly of agriculturally unused (or rather useless?) land where the animals could graze. PTS 2249 is explicit about this. It mentions bit dullû for which a barley rent was to be paid and kasal kâlû u gabiû on which the cattle was to be pastured. The main objective of these leases was to provide the herdsmen with pasture for their herds. Interestingly, even though the herds in question were ultimately temple property, the temple administration did not automatically provide the herdsmen with grazing grounds.\(^\text{1155}\) It granted them some land, but at the same time it expected a fixed rent in barley for the right to use this land. The rent was not very high (360 kurru in PTS 2249 and 400 kurru of barley in YOS 6 26),\(^\text{1156}\) but this probably had to do with the low quality of the granted land. In addition to this the temple was also to receive payments in livestock (1 bull and 5 sheep in PTS 2249 and 1 bull and 10 sheep in YOS 6 26). It is more than likely that these livestock-payments were over and above their obligations arising from their status as herdsmen of the Lady of Uruk. According to the herding contract YOS 6 155, for instance, the temple expected an annual revenue of 66.83 % of the initial number of ewes in the herd.\(^\text{1157}\) By comparison, the nâqidû in YOS 6 26 had 2,000 heads of small cattle at his disposal. The obligation to pay annually ten sheep represents only 0.5 % of the entire herd. The figures are difficult to compare, because we do not know how many ewes there were in the herd from YOS 6 26. But if the ratio of ewes here is anything like in YOS 6 155 (1,065 ewes to a herd of 2,050 heads of small cattle), still the obligation to deliver ten sheep was far below the requirements that would have been imposed by a herding contract.\(^\text{1158}\) Clearly, the temple was not going to give away its land for nothing, even though the livelihood of its own livestock depended on it. It was obviously in a position to exert pressure on the people contractually bound to it by imposing additional obligations on them. These two texts may serve to demonstrate that the temple used every possible occasion to maximise its returns in agricultural products (and cattle) by expanding the land under cultivation. The fact that the temple reverted to herdsmen for expanding its agricultural production may be a reflection of the general shortage of workforce, which plagued the temple at the time (see Janković 2005: 174ff.). On the other hand, the herdsmen’s need to embark upon such an arrangement may indicate that land, at least such which was useful for agriculture and animal husbandry, was not available in large quantities.

\(^{1155}\) The nâqidû in YOS 6 26 explicitly complained about not having a place (maškattû) for the animals and having to keep them in the steppe, which for some reason was deemed unfavourable (wild animals, territorial conflicts with other pastoralists, or simply lack of appropriate fodder?).

\(^{1156}\) By comparison, a ‘model plough team’ of the ‘Edict of Belâzzar’ was supposed to deliver annually 250 kurru of barley. These herdsmen’s leases then would not have required the work of more than two plough teams.

\(^{1157}\) The text is edited by von Bolla 1940: 125ff.; see also van Driel 1993: 223.

\(^{1158}\) To follow the ratio of YOS 6 155, the herd in YOS 6 26 would have hypothetically had approximately 1,039 ewes. The annual return from these should have been about 694 sheep (66.83 %).
Two other atypical leases of land from Eanna do not entail any cultivation of this land but rather the collection of payments due from it. YOS 7 38 (4 Cyr) is a lease of date plantations, a bīt ritti of a certain individual, for the performance of the guggallu-service (ana guggallüti). The tenant was supposed to deliver the dates due from the orchards in the area under his responsibility. These dates were the impost (imittu) determined by the yield-estimation commission of the temple. In addition to this he had to discharge other dues, collect habû uḫinu from the gardeners, a kind of supplement payment, and pay a half of the obligation called námurtu ša šarrī for the land (see note 800 and p. 319). The text also deals with the territorial rights of the holders of the bīt rittis affected by this lease, and it states that the tenant would do the (necessary) work on the plots (ll. 13-14: dul-\textit{\textit{lu} ina a-ša\textit{\textit{ka}}/ ip-pu-us\textit{\textit{u}}}). Though this phrase is quite common in the regular land leases, here it does not imply that the tenant was to engage in the cultivation of the orchards or the organisation of labour (by sub-leasing, for instance). Rather it should be understood in a more general sense of doing what is necessary in order to ensure that the imposts of the individual plots would be delivered to the temple.\footnote{1160}

The other text is TCL 12 73 (1 Nbn), a lease of land for the purpose of collecting the tithe (ešrû) incumbent on this land and due to the Lady of Uruk.\footnote{1161} The agricultural tithe was generally due from the temple land leased out to sharecroppers.\footnote{1162} It usually (but not always) represented one-tenth of the yield and was to be paid in addition to a share of the harvest (Jursa 1998: 4ff.).\footnote{1163} In TCL 12 73, the tenant, Innin-Šum-ùsùr, son of Nanây-èrerû, is assigned a large area, from Uruk to Babylon and from the Euphrates to the När-šarrû, from which to collect the tithe of the Lady of Uruk. Further specific localities are named which were in the vicinity of Uruk.\footnote{1164} As Jursa noted, not all the land in this area belonged to the temple and was subjected to the tithe payments (1998: 8), since the returns would have been too small: the lease stipulated 500 k\textit{\textit{uru}} of barley and dates as annual rent. Unlike the previously discussed lease of the guggallûti-service which was to be paid according to the annually determined impost (imittu), this contract had a fixed sum as rent (sûtu). The text specifies that it was to be paid using the measure of the Lady of Uruk at the big watercourses and makes provisions in case the current fermier général, Šum-ûkin, collected barley and dates from the land allotted to Innin-Šum-ùsùr, since their territories would have probably overlapped. No work obligations are recorded in the text, as the main concern of Innin-Šum-ùsùr

\footnote{1159} Edited by Cocquerillat 1968: 67. 123 and Joannès 1982: 13f. A translation of the text is also given here on p. 131.\footnote{1160} A comparable text is known from the Ebabbar of Sippar (BM 76043, MacGinnis 1998: 213f.). The text is badly damaged, but it is evident from it that both date orchards and arable land of Ša\textit{\textit{ma}} were leased out to an uncertain number of individuals who were to deliver the dates and barley to the temple in addition to date by-products. Apparently also some digging was part of the obligations of the tenants. See also VS 5 122, a lease contract for guggallûtu, from the Tattannu archive. For guggallûtu contracts from Borsippa see Jursa and Waerzeggers 2009: 240ff.\footnote{1161} The text was edited by Moore 1935: 76ff. and re-edited here in the Appendix 1. See also Jursa’s comments on the text (1998: 7f. 21). For a thorough treatment of the tithe, ešrû, based chiefly on the documents from the Ebabbar of Sippar, see Jursa 1998.\footnote{1162} Note that ešrû (or alternatively \textit{erbu}) payments could also be made by people not directly related to the temple’s agricultural sector (e.g., shepherds, fowlers, officials or members of the royal family; see Jursa 1998: 61ff.).\footnote{1163} According to Jursa (1998: 8f.) other types of land could also be subjected to a tithe payment to the temple. This land was not temple property or was not under the direct control of the temple administration and was only nominally temple property. Among these types of land one finds estates of state and military officials and members of the royal family, bīt rittis and bīt qašitis and settlements of non-Babylonian ethnic groups. Jursa offers a hypothetical explanation for the right of the temple to draw ešrû-payments from this land on p. 85: Since the Ebabbar had more land than it could cultivate using its own resources, the royal administration allotted some of the unused temple land to the members of the military, mercenaries or deportees, reserving the right to collect the tithe from these estates for the temple.\footnote{1164} The place names are preceded by “100 of ...” (e.g., 1 me ṣa \textit{garu}-ṣa-kil-lat 1 me ṣa \textit{karu}-ku-ša-\textit{a} 1 me ṣa \textit{garu}-nam-\textit{zu}-\textit{a}, etc. (l. 7)). The meaning of this expression is not entirely clear. Joannès (1982: 121f) associated this text to a list of properties TBER pl. 31 which uses a similar expression, and suggested understanding the numerals as the length (in cubits) of the frontage of properties in given localities (p. 120). Possibly there could be a connection with the \textit{ha\textit{n}šis-} and \textit{l}\textit{imû}-types of land and these properties also may have originated from some land division scheme (see also here p. 358).
would have been the collection of tithe from the land which had already been assigned for agricultural cultivation.\textsuperscript{1165}

The two texts are both examples of leasing of income rights from the temple land without having to engage in the (organisation of) agricultural production. However, the two leases involve different modes of rent payment and in consequence different types of income for the tenants. In the gugallûtu-contract the rent was variable. It was the annually determined imittu. There was no possibility for the tenant to extract more from the gardeners, as imittu implied that most of the harvest went to the temple. The gardeners received a more or less fixed salary (sissinu) based on the area tilled and the type of work conducted there. Similarly, the income of the gugallûtu was more or less fixed and was based on the area under his responsibility and the number of orchards there (1 kurrû of dates per orchard was the gugallûtu-payment\textsuperscript{1166}). The ešrû-contract was an arrangement for a fixed rent. In this respect and in terms of the profit of the tenant it bears more resemblance to the regular sîtu-leases. By collecting more from the cultivators of the land than the temple expected to receive as tithe, the tenant had the opportunity to make a profit for himself. In other words, his potential income depended on the productivity of the land. The ša muḫḫī sūtīs were expected to invest in the development of the land from their own resources thus maximising the possibility for a gain. It is not clear to what extent, if at all, the ša muḫḫī ešrī could actively influence the returns of the land under their responsibility, and in turn their own profit.

3.6. Overview of the obligations of the tenant

Rent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>delivery</th>
<th>YOS 6 11, TCL 12 73, YOS 6 26, PTS 2821, VS 20 88, PTS 2344, PTS 2249, TCL 12 90</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ina mašši ša BišU</td>
<td>YOS 6 150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ina mašši ša šarrî</td>
<td>TCL 12 73, YOS 6 26, PTS 2821, YOS 6 41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ina muḫḫî mé rabûti</td>
<td>YOS 6 11, YOS 6 40, PTS 2249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ina muḫḫî mé</td>
<td>YOS 6 150, PTS 2344, TCL 12 90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ina Eanna</td>
<td>TCL 13 182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sullupû ina iššût rittû nadânu</td>
<td>YOS 6 150, YOS 6 40, PTS 2249, TCL 12 90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

additional dues

| cattle                | VS 20 88, TCL 12 64, YBC 3750, YOS 6 26, YOS 6 40, PTS 2249, PTS 2044, TCL 13 182 |
| straw bundles         | YOS 6 150                                                                   |
| date palm by-products  | PTS 2044                                                                    |
| provision of urâštu-workers | PTS 2344                                                                  |

Work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>cultivation and preparatory work</th>
<th>YBC 4889, NCBT 630, YOS 21 207, 208, Spar, Studies, no. 8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>dulla ina libbi epēšu</td>
<td>YOS 6 33, YOS 7 47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ṣuru ina Šupâl ġišimmarî epēšu</td>
<td>NCBT 677, NCBT 630, YBC 4143, YBC 7 47, YOS 21 207, 208, Spar, Studies, no. 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>giššâna rubûtû</td>
<td>YOS 7 47, YBC 4143, BûN 1 117, NBC 4889, YOS 17 6, YBC 3750 (mûli in libbi ana erēšī tābu irīši)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ābatû ašâkû</td>
<td>BM 114444, BM 114444, BM 17 6, YOS 6 33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{1165} No parallel contracts are known from Sippar. BM 101334 published by MacGinnis 1998: 214 as no. 8 is a special case (as Jursa 1998: 21 notes), since the land in question is the bit ritti of the tenant. Here, the tenant is also expected to pay a fixed sum as rent (ll. 6-9: eš-ru-û nêg-ga ʾutû ṣeɻe-ri-ti-it-ia / [l] bi-in-nim-ma ina mu-\textsuperscript{an}-na a-̃/na ə-[babbar-ra] / [x] me 60 gur zu-lu-ma 2 gur 3₂ 2₃ 2₄ 2₅ [be]-[bar] / [lud-din]...).

\textsuperscript{1166} This is not stipulated by the contract, but the gugallûtu-payment is known mainly from imittu debt notes for dates; see p. 128.
providing the workforce YBC 4143, YOS 6 150

planting
- gišimmari zaqāpu YOS 6 33, YOS 6 67, [PTS 2089]
- asnē zaqāpu PTS 2089
- žilēpi zaqāpu/sakānu YBC 4143, YOS 6 67, NCBT 630
- karāna zaqāpu PTS 2134
- šikitta sakānu YOS 6 67, YOS 17 6, YOS 21 214

harvesting
- uḫini nakāsu YBC 4149, YOS 7 162

irrigation
- zēra dalû YOS 6 67, BIN 1 125, YOS 7 162, BIN 1 117, NBC 4889, NCBT 630, YOS 21 214, PTS 2044
- ḫarrātšu mē šušbutu YBC 4149
- nērkāt šu šušbutu YOS 7 51, YOS 21 214, NCBT 630
- ṭātu ša gišimmari NCBT 677, NCBT 630 (u žilēpi), YOS 21 214, BM 114450
- ṭātu maššartu ša uḫini našā YBC 4149, YOS 7 162

Other obligations
- let cattle graze on unused land YOS 6 40, TCL 12 90, TCL 13 182
- draught animals not to die, offspring to be shown YOS 6 11, YOS 6 150
- to a representative of the temple YOS 6 11, YOS 6 150
- keep tools in good repair YOS 6 11, YOS 6 150

3.7. Overview of the obligations/services of the lessor

providing means of production
- water PTS 2344 (pūt mē Šum-ukin (lessor) našā)
- seed PTS 2344, YOS 6 11, YOS 6 150, YOS 19 71, TCL 13 182
- ikkaru PTS 2344, YOS 6 11, YOS 6 150, TCL 13 182 (VS 20 88?)
- draught animals PTS 2344, YOS 6 11, YOS 6 150, TCL 13 182
- tools YBC 4143, YOS 19 71 (YOS 6 11, YOS 6 150, PTS 2344, TCL 13 182)1169
- iron YOS 6 11, YOS 6 150
- rations YBC 4143, YOS 6 150

remuneration of the tenant (sisinnu)
- sisinnu like the neighbours YOS 7 51
- bit marri: 4 kurru dates; bit epinni: 3 kurru dates YOS 7 47, BIN 1 125, BIN 1 117
- bit marri: 5 kurru dates; bit epinni: 4 kurru dates NBC 4889, NCBT 630, Spar, Studies, no. 8
- ana 1 gur 4 gur suluppā sisinnu BM 114450

conducting the imittu procedure
(uḫini ina muḫḫi) gišimmari emēda YBC 3750, YBC 4149, YOS 7 162

---

1167 The tenant has to bring his two brothers along in order to tend the orchard together with him.
1168 The tenant has to employ errēšu where necessary.
1169 In these texts the provision of tools (ploughs) is implicit.
3.8. The duration of the leases

Leases lasting from one to 60 years and once even in perpetuity (ana ūmē šātī) are attested in the Neo-Babylonian documents (Ries 1976: 114; Jursa 2004b: 180). In Uruk the extant leases are limited to a duration from three to five (or perhaps ten) years. But generally the duration of the leases is rarely stated in the texts. As is evident from the table below, the number of contracts which have an absolute limitation on the duration of the lease is relatively small. Among these contracts are three leases of prebendary hallatu-orchards limited to three or four years and one lease of arable land for a fixed rent limited to five years. More frequent are the temporal limitations connected to a change of conditions of a lease, which in turn was related to a change in ‘status’ of a property. This type of limitation is typically found in zāqipūtu-contracts, i.e. leases of properties which change their productivity status over time, usually within a period from five to ten years. Generally starting off as land with no agricultural output, after about ten years the most, after the planting, the necessary work and the tending of the young date palms had been carried out, this land would become a fully productive date orchard. At this point the lease conditions would change. While during the first stage the tenant had the usufruct of the entire orchard, or parts of these (of just the young date palms, in case the orchard was only partially productive as in YOS 7 47), once it became fully productive, the annual rent payments would have to commence (or the rent had to be paid at a different rate in case parts of the property had already been productive).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Type of lease</th>
<th>Special conditions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YBC 4149</td>
<td>3 years</td>
<td>ana nukuribbi</td>
<td>usufruct of previously uncultivated land (apītu) for 5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM 114444</td>
<td>4 years</td>
<td>ana nukuribbi</td>
<td>usufruct of young palms for 5 years, then imittu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 7 162</td>
<td>4 years</td>
<td>ana nukuribbi</td>
<td>usufruct for 10 years for what grows below the palms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VS 20 88</td>
<td>5 years</td>
<td>ana sītī</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTS 2089</td>
<td>10 years</td>
<td>ana zāqipūti</td>
<td>usufruct for 10 years, then 2/3 share to temple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 6 33</td>
<td></td>
<td>ana zāqipūti</td>
<td>usufruct for 10 years, then 2/3 share to temple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 6 67</td>
<td></td>
<td>ana zāqipūti</td>
<td>usufruct for 10 years, then 2/3 share to temple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 17 6</td>
<td></td>
<td>ana zāqipūti</td>
<td>usufruct for 5 years, then 1/2 share to temple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 7 47</td>
<td></td>
<td>ana nukuribbi</td>
<td>usufruct of young palms for 5 years, then imittu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YBC 4143</td>
<td></td>
<td>ana nukuribbi</td>
<td>usufruct of previously uncultivated land (apītu) for 5 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 32: Duration of the leases

Nonetheless, the temporal limitations in the zāqipūtu-contracts do not indicate the expiration of a lease, and even the contracts with a definitive expiry date do not necessarily imply that they could not have been (tacitly) prolonged at the end of the term. What is more, the question of the numerous contracts without any stipulations on the duration of the lease remains uncertain. Ries (1976: 116f.) considered this question, arriving at the conclusion that such leases most probably automatically lapsed after a year, though there was always the possibility to tacitly prolong the lease. This, however, can hardly be substantiated.

---

1170 PTS 2089 is not entirely clear. The contract for planting date palms gives a limitation of ten years for the usufruct of everything cultivated below the date palms. Other zāqipūtu-contracts which also give a limitation of ten years for the usufruct of the orchard usually stipulate at what rate the rent was to be paid after this period. This is not the case in PTS 2089 and therefore it is conceivable that the lease was intended to expire after the ten years. However, an accidental omission of the new conditions in the text or even a tacit reliance on customary rent forms (shares or imittu) are possible in this case.

1171 The previously uncultivated land in YBC 4143 apparently took four years to reach full productivity.
In conclusion, can anything be said about developments and the general agricultural strategies of the temple on the basis of the land lease contracts? Looking at the distribution of the contracts over time with respect to the type of land leased and the type of work to be conducted may give some clues in this respect. A preponderance of leases of date orchards might indicate a more intensive form, while conversely a preponderance of arable leases would point in the direction of a more extensive form of agriculture. Furthermore, leases of land for reclamation or setting up of new plantations can be taken as a sign of expansion of the temple’s arable holdings and its agricultural production.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>leases</th>
<th>Nbk</th>
<th>Ner</th>
<th>Nbn</th>
<th>Cyr</th>
<th>Camb</th>
<th>Nbk IV</th>
<th>Dar</th>
<th>total ¹⁄²²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>suṭu</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nukuribbiṭu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>errešiṭu</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zaqqipitu</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tapṭu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>arable land</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>orchard</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a + o</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total ¹⁄²³</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 33: Number and distribution of different types of land lease contracts

Unfortunately, there are only forty documents at our disposal, covering a period from 3 Nbk to 2 Dar (some 83 years). The material is not dense enough to allow for any definite conclusions. One can observe a slight preference for date orchards as opposed to arable land (22 vs. 15 contracts); however, this may be explained by the fact that arable land tended to be leased out en gros by the temple much more frequently than orchards, which would result in a higher number of orchard leases. Of course, this discrepancy in numbers could also be the consequence of accidents of discovery.

Both arable land and orchard leases are more or less evenly represented across the time sample at our disposal. There is no indication then that the temple was attempting to intensify its agricultural production through a shift toward horticulture. A point of interest is the peak during the reign of Nabonidus when arable land leases and leases ana suṭṭi are attested more frequently. Generally, it can be observed that the majority of all the lease contracts from Eanna (32.5 %) come from this period. If nothing else, this cluster indicates an increased activity in the temple’s agricultural sector, especially involving outsourcing. The interest and the involvement of the state administration during Nabonidus’s reign played a decisive role in this process.¹¹⁷⁴ Notably, some of the largest leases were granted by the king or the crown-prince. What is more, the majority of the leases from Nabonidus’s reign were authorised by the royal representative in the temple, ša rēš

¹¹⁷² The numbers of the documents listed in the first part of the column treating different types of leases do not add up to the total of 40, because some documents could combine two types of leases relative to the rent and the type of work to be conducted (e.g., zaqqipitu and errešiṭu, nukuribbiṭu and errešiṭu, tapṭi and errešiṭu).

¹¹⁷³ The table does not include the private lease YBC 4143 (38 Nbk) and the gugallṭu-contract YOS 7 38 (4 Cyr), but it does include TCL 12 64 (1 Ner), which is a document recording a division of rented property between two tenants.

¹¹⁷⁴ This was a cross-regional trend. Note the comparable land leases from the Ebabbar archive and the ‘Edict’ of Belšazzar, which give evidence for the involvement of the crown in the temple agriculture during this period.
However, placing the number of rent contracts in relation to the duration of the reigns of the rulers it becomes evident that the greatest density of land lease contracts (almost two thirds) comes from the reign of Nebuchadnezzar IV, i.e. from the end of the archive.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ruler</th>
<th>Nbk</th>
<th>Ner</th>
<th>Nbn</th>
<th>Cyr</th>
<th>Camb</th>
<th>Nbk IV</th>
<th>Dar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>total no. of leases</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. leases per regnal year</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>8.33</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>leases per regnal year in %</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>8.58</td>
<td>6.52</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>6.43</td>
<td>71.44</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: General distribution of land lease contracts

In this sense the distribution of the lease contracts reflects the general distribution of texts within the Eanna archive (cf. Table 1) and is in no way indicative of a particular diachronic development. This is visible in the following diagram, which juxtaposes the total number of texts (in percent) per regnal year of a given ruler to the number of leases (in percent) per regnal year of that ruler:

![Figure 1: General distribution of land lease contracts and texts in the Eanna archive](image)

As for the expansion of the land under cultivation, there is evidence (taptû- and zâqipûtu-contracts[1177]) that this was being done, but not much more than that can be said. The texts are too few to allow any attempts at quantification or conclusions on the possible diachronic trends.

The availability of cultivated/cultivable land ties in with the question of expansion. Overall, land was not the limiting factor for the Babylonian agriculture. The rural areas which were not exhaustively cultivated could have been turned into cultivable land by expanding the irrigation system. However, in practice this cannot have been that simple. In fact it seems that the temple estates were indeed limited, most probably by a lack of infrastructure. In the lease contracts there

---

1175 This trend may have started earlier though, with the qîpu during Nebuchadnezzar’s, and the rent farmer Šum-ukin, who was a royal representative (bêl piqitti ša šarri) at the time, during Neriglissar’s reign. The šatammu appeared in the leases in the twenties of Nebuchadnezzar and later only from Cyrus’s reign onwards. It should be noted, however, that from Cyrus onwards šatammu appeared in all the leases authorised by the temple officials. Should one interpret this as heightening (or regaining) of control of the temple’s own affairs by the local temple personnel?

1176 For Darius only the first twenty-nine regnal years were taken into account, as the archive ends at this time.

1177 Contracts ana taptê: BM 114550 ([x] Camb), YOS 21 207 (1 Nbk IV); contracts ana zâqipîtu: YOS 17 6 (21 Nbk), PTS 2134 (43 Nbk; this was a lease for planting grapevines), YOS 6 33 (3 Nbn), YOS 6 67 (4 Nbn), PTS 2089 (1 Cyr).
are several instances of gifts for the lessors stipulated by the contracts\textsuperscript{1178} or competitive rent payments.\textsuperscript{1179} These indicate that the temple was in a position to put tenants under pressure and that land leases were in demand. Was this the result of a limitation on agriculturally useful land? The option to expand the cultivable lands was still present, but in reality this would have been possible only with the support of the king who had the means to carry out such large projects. Private entrepreneurs had to rely on the already existent infrastructure of the temple estates. Indeed, they were responsible for the upkeep of the irrigation system as the pertinent stipulations in numerous rent contracts demonstrate.\textsuperscript{1180} This included the digging of (minor) irrigation ditches; however, the larger irrigation canals were to be dug using the resources of the temple, as is stipulated in one rent contract.\textsuperscript{1181} It is uncertain to which extent the temple was self-sufficient in this respect and to which it depended on investments from the outside, notably the king, for the expansion of its estates.

To sum up, the land lease contracts give some evidence for an ongoing expansion of temple estates through reclamation of arable land and creation of new date orchards. The evidence is too sparse, however, to allow for a quantification or the assessment of the intensity of these efforts. The few occasional instances of leases \textit{ana taptê} and \textit{ana zqipûti} do not necessarily imply far-reaching attempts at expansion of temple estates and land amelioration. It is conceivable that the temple relied on the input of the external rent farmers to this effect. As a result a large rent farm and a number of smaller ones were created during Nabonidus’ reign. This increased activity concerning the outsourcing in the realm of temple agriculture was prompted by the state administration. These royal policies were not necessarily innovative, similar modes of outsourcing had been applied by the temples before; however, the scale at which the land was leased out was something hitherto unseen. Nevertheless, the success of these policies was doubtful. On the one hand, the rent farmers were not supplied by the temple with an adequate number of ploughmen and draught animals and clearly had difficulties in organising additional workforce. On the other, agriculturally useful land was apparently limited. It would have probably been more sensible to invest in the expansion of the irrigation network, as was done in the Sippar region during Nebuchadnezzar’s reign. The logistical support and the funding for a project of a similar magnitude could only have come from the king; however, no such investments were made in the Uruk region during the time span covered by the Eanna archive. For this reason the expansion of the temple estates probably only happened on a minor scale.

\textsuperscript{1178} In VS 20 88 the tenant is obliged to make a gift of ten lambs to the temple; in TCL 13 182 the tenant has to deliver ten flawless bulls for the offerings to the temple. Stipulations for presents of cattle in other rent contracts include: one bull and fifteen sheep (YOS 6 40), one flawless bull and ten sheep (YOS 6 26), one bull and five sheep (PTS 2249). This cattle was intended for the temple. But the lessor in TCL 12 64 and YBC 3750, Šum-ûkin, who was a royal official at the time leasing out temple land, was also entitled to gifts in cattle (one bull and one bull and one sheep respectively). Cattle as present of the king (\textit{nāmuru ša Sarrī}) is also attested: five sheep in W 17718 x and \([x]\) bulls and sheep in PTS 2044.

\textsuperscript{1179} In TCL 12 90 the prospective new tenant, Nergal-nāṣir/Nañāya-ibni, offers to top the rent (3,000 \textit{kurru} of barley) which the previous tenant, Kallā/iqša/Basia, had to pay for the land in question by ca. 17 % and deliver 3,500 \textit{kurru} of barley. In TCL 13 182, the transfer of the general rent farm from Gimillu to Bél-gimlanni, the new tenant accepts to undertake this work under not so favourable conditions which the previous tenant complained about. TCL 12 73 also records the transfer of a lease of \textit{ešrat}-land from one lessor to another. It is not clear how the temple benefited from this transfer. It appears that the new tenant rented a much larger area than his predecessor and paid a higher rent accordingly.

\textsuperscript{1180} See p. 314.
\textsuperscript{1181} \textit{nārāti rabātī ultu makkûr Eanna ūrû}, TCL 13 182.
\textsuperscript{1182} The digging of the royal canal north of Sippar funded by Nebuchadnezzar largely benefited the Eabbar temple which gained new agricultural estates in this region. For Uruk no comparable royally sponsored digging or building activities are attested, at least not during the period covered by the archive.
### 3.10. Overview of the land lease contracts – Table 35:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Type of land and lease</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YOS 17 7 (p. 293)</td>
<td>10-XI-3 Nbk</td>
<td>1.a</td>
<td>eqšlu ša BššU, {ana sūti}^{1185}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 17 6 (p. 304)</td>
<td>23-III-21 Nbk</td>
<td>1.a</td>
<td>qaqqaru ša BššU, ana zāqipūtī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YBC 3543 (p. 281)</td>
<td>1-III-23 Nbk</td>
<td>2.a</td>
<td>eqšetu ša BššU, ana errēšūtī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VS 20 88 (p. 152)</td>
<td>5-VIII-38 Nbk</td>
<td>1.a</td>
<td>qaqqaru, {ana sūti}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YBC 4143 (p. 310)</td>
<td>5-VII-38 Nbk</td>
<td>1.c</td>
<td>kirū (kirišumu ša ina šīlu ša BššU), ana nukurribūtī {sharecropping}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTS 2134 (p. 286)</td>
<td>17-IV-43 Nbk</td>
<td>1.a</td>
<td>bit ritti zēru (ina qaqqari ša BššU), {ana zāqipūtī &amp; sharecropping}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTS 2344 (p. 49)</td>
<td>8-II-1 Ner</td>
<td>1.a</td>
<td>50 kurrū zēru qaqqaru, {ana sūti}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YBC 3750 (p. 298)</td>
<td>4-XI-2 Ner</td>
<td>1.a</td>
<td>1 šīlu ša BššU, ana errēšūtī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEBR 37^{1186} = YOS 6 11= A/J 2, p. 107ff.</td>
<td>28-I-1 Nbn</td>
<td>1.b</td>
<td>6,000 kurrū zēru pi šulpi (elat zēru bit kirī), {ana sūti}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCL 12 73^{1188}</td>
<td>8-II-1 Nbn</td>
<td>1.a</td>
<td>ešrū ša BššU, {ana sūti}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 6 26^{1189}</td>
<td>12-III-1 Nbn</td>
<td>1.a</td>
<td>zēru ša BššU (for keeping cattle and sheep of BššU there), {ana sūti}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 6 41^{1190}</td>
<td>11-II-3 Nbn</td>
<td>1.a</td>
<td>zēru ša BššU, {ana sūti}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 6 40^{1191}</td>
<td>23-VI-3 Nbn</td>
<td>1.a</td>
<td>865;1.4 zēru ša BššU, {ana sūti}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

^{1183} OIP 122 50 is probably another rent contract, but is not included in the table due to its bad state of preservation. The conditions of the contract and the identity of the tenant are not known. The text mentions 10,000 kurrū of dates and 400 ploughmen, as well as the name of the king Nabonidus. Among the witnesses a member of the Basia family appears (ll. 10'11' [... ] a-šū ša 'en-nunum a ʰba*-^[st*-ia*-...]; I am grateful to M. Jursa for kindly allowing me to use his collation of this text). This may have been Šum-ukīn or his brother Śilim-Bēl. To judge by the amount of dates and the number of ploughmen, the conditions may have been the same as Šum-ukīn’s and Kalbāya’s rent contract. This text may have recorded the transfer of the rent farm to Kalbāya after his uncle backed out of it around 8 Nbn. This is highly conjectural though.

^{1184} For the formal aspects of the leases see p.265f. The types 1.a, 1.b, and 1.c are all variants of the Zwiegesprächs-type: 1.a uses the imperative and 1.b the precative of nadānu; 1.c uses the precative of šuzzuzu. Type 2 contracts are formulated ex latere locatoris, 2.a using the preterit of naşnu and 2.b the preterit of paşḫu.

^{1185} Remarks in { } are information not explicitly stated in the text, but implied by it.


^{1187} The text is edited together with YOS 6 11 by Schwenzner 1924-25: 107ff; cf. also Cocquerillat 1968: 38f.

^{1188} Edited by Moore 1935: 76ff. and in the Appendix 1.

^{1189} Edited by San Nicolò 1948: 279ff.

^{1190} Edited by Cocquerillat 1968: 39f. 108f.

^{1191} Edited by Cocquerillat 1968: 40. 109.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rent</th>
<th>Tenant</th>
<th>Lessor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>dates: 120 kurru</td>
<td>Ardāya/Nanāya-ēreš</td>
<td>qīpu &amp; šatammu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- (usufruct for 5 years, aḫḫi zitti mentioned in broken context)</td>
<td>Nabū-zēr-iqša/Aḥḥēa/Kurī</td>
<td>šatammu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>barley: 1/5, 1/6 and 1/3 zitti</td>
<td>Aplāya/Nabū-udāmmiq/Rēʾū &amp; Nabū-uṣallim/Šulāya/aššāku</td>
<td>šatammu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>barley: 4,000 [+ x kurru], kasia: 100 kurru, sesame: [x], [ṣahlu or spelt: x]; 10 lambs</td>
<td>Nergal-nāṣir/Nanāya-ibni (previous tenants: Ibnī-Ištar/Nabū-ṣum-ibni &amp; Nabū-šum-ibni)</td>
<td>qīpu &amp; bēlē piqnēti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dates: 5/6 zitti (usufruct of previously uncultivated land for 4 years)</td>
<td>Nabū-zēr-iddin/Šillāya (&amp; 2 brothers)</td>
<td>Innin-šar-uṣur/Nergal-uṣallim/[Ši-n-leqe-unninni, rab būli(?)]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grapes: aḫḫi zitti</td>
<td>Abnāʾ/Addu-mād</td>
<td>qīpu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>barley: 600 kurru</td>
<td>Nanāya-ah-iddin/Nergal-inā-tēši-ēter, ikkaru ša BšU</td>
<td>Šum-ukin, mār šipri ša Nergilissar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zitti qaqqari akiṭu errēšē ša ina qaqqari ša BšU zēra irrīšī (+ 1 bull &amp; 1 sheep as present of Šum-ukin)</td>
<td>Nulṣāya/Nabū-qatā-šabat &amp; Il- nātan/Manu-lišim</td>
<td>Šum-ukin, bēl piqitti ša šarri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>barley: 25,000 kurru, dates: 10,000 kurru</td>
<td>Šum-ukin/Bēl-zērī/Basia &amp; Kallāya/Iqša/Basia</td>
<td>Nabonidus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>barley &amp; dates: 500 kurru</td>
<td>Innin-šum-uṣur/Nanāya-ēreš</td>
<td>ša rēš šarri &amp; bēlē piqnēti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>barley: 400 kurru, 1 flawless bull, 10 sheep</td>
<td>[x]/Nanāya-ēreš, nāqida ša BšU</td>
<td>ša rēš šarri &amp; bēlē piqnēti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>barley: 1,000 [+ x kurru], sesame: 60 kurru, cress: 20 kurru</td>
<td>Nergal-nāṣir/Nanāya-ibni</td>
<td>bēl piqitti &amp; bēlē piqnēti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>barley: 1,240 kurru, 1 bull, 15 sheep</td>
<td>Šīn-ibni/Samaṣ-udāmmiq/Rēʾi-alpi &amp; Arad-Innin/Innī-Ištar</td>
<td>bēl piqitti &amp; bēlē piqnēti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTS 2249</td>
<td>23-VI-{3'}</td>
<td>Nbn  1.a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 6 33</td>
<td>19-IX-3 Nbn</td>
<td>1.a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 6 67</td>
<td>14-XI-4 Nbn</td>
<td>1.a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTS 2821</td>
<td>20-IV-5' Nbn</td>
<td>1.a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W 17718 lx</td>
<td>14-[x]-6 Nbn</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCL 12 90</td>
<td>10-V-8 Nbn</td>
<td>1.a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 6 150</td>
<td>28-[x]-11 Nbn</td>
<td>1.b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM 114444</td>
<td>25-V-16 Nbn</td>
<td>2.a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM 114450</td>
<td>[x-x-x] Cyr</td>
<td>2.b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTS 2089</td>
<td>8-VII-1 Cyr</td>
<td>2.a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUWE 11 214</td>
<td>11-VI-4 Cyr</td>
<td>2.a'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 7 38</td>
<td>3-VIII-4 Cyr</td>
<td>2.b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 7 47</td>
<td>3'-XIIa-5'</td>
<td>1.a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 7 51</td>
<td>28-VI-5 Cyr</td>
<td>1.a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTS 2044</td>
<td>6-II-8 Cyr</td>
<td>2.a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIN 1 125</td>
<td>[x-x-x Camb]</td>
<td>2.a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM 114559</td>
<td>20-VII-[x] Camb</td>
<td>1.a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1192 Edited by Cocquerillat 1968: 45. 110. In line 5 read “šá ina 1 lim” instead of Cocquerillat’s “šá (gé)bán igi(!)“.
1193 Edited by Cocquerillat 1968: 46. 110f.
1194 Edited by Moore 1935: 92ff; cf. also Cocquerillat 1968: 40f.
1195 Edited by Cocquerillat 1968: 42. 109f.
1196 Edited by Cocquerillat 1968: 67. 123 and Joannès 1982: 13f.; see also the translation and discussion here on p. 131.
1197 Edited by Cocquerillat 1968: 46. 111f.
1198 Edited by Cocquerillat 1968: 46. 111.
1199 Edited by Cocquerillat 1968: 47. 112.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rent</th>
<th>Tenant</th>
<th>Lessor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>barley: 360 kurru (from the bit dulli), 1&lt;sup&gt;7&lt;/sup&gt; bull, 5 [sheep]</td>
<td>[x]/Nabû-šum-iddin, nāqida ša BšU</td>
<td>bēl piqitti &amp; bēlû piqnēti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dates: 2/3 zittu (usufruct for 10 years, then 1/3 zittu for tenant)</td>
<td>Ša-Nabû-iḫallim, qallu ša Nabû-šar-uṣur, ša rēš šarri</td>
<td>bēl piqitti, qīpu &amp; bēlû piqnēti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dates: 2/3 zittu (usufruct for 10 years, then 1/3 zittu for tenant)</td>
<td>Nabû-bēššunu/Marduk/Kurî</td>
<td>bēl piqitti &amp; bēlû piqnēti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>barley: 300 kurru, sesame: 5 kurru</td>
<td>Bēššunu/Marduk (= Nabû-bēššunu/Marduk/Kurî(?))</td>
<td>bēl piqitti &amp; bēlû piqnēti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dates; šīḫu mentioned as well as 5 sheep nāmurtu ša šarri</td>
<td>Ibniyā/Nanūya-iddin (Bānia/Nanūya-iddin)</td>
<td>Šum-ukin/Bēl-zēri, š.m.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>barley: 3,500 kurru (= 3,350 kurru barley + 50 kurru sesame)</td>
<td>Nergal-nāṣir/Nanūya-ibni (previous tenant: Kalbaya/Iqṭša/Basia)</td>
<td>bēl piqitti &amp; bēlû piqnēti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>barley: 5,000 kurru, 3,000 bundles of straw</td>
<td>Ibni-Štar/Balṭu, širku ša BšU</td>
<td>Belšazzar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dates: 3/4 zittu (i.e. 1/4 of the harvest is the share of the tenant)</td>
<td>Anu-nūr-ili/Nergal-ēṭer/Rab-banē</td>
<td>Innin-šum-iṣkun/Gimmillu/Rab-banē &amp; his brother Nanūya-Šamšia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- {dates: according to imittu}</td>
<td>Silim-ili/Nanūya-ēre$</td>
<td>šatammu, bēl piqitti &amp; [x]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- (usufruct of everything he grows below the palms for 10 years)</td>
<td>Silim-ili, ša rēš šarri</td>
<td>šatammu, bēl piqitti &amp; ūpšari ša Eanna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[x]</td>
<td>Nanūya-iddin/Iddin-Nabû</td>
<td>[x]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dates: according to imittu</td>
<td>Nanūya-ēre$/Gimmillu</td>
<td>šatammu &amp; bēl piqitti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dates from 12 productive palms according to imittu + ešrā šīḫu for pī šulpî (usufruct of young palms for 5 years, then yield according to imittu)</td>
<td>Innin-šum-uṣur/Ša-pīšu, širku ša IU</td>
<td>šatammu &amp; bēl piqitti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dates: according to imittu, barley: šīḫu eqlī from pī šulpî</td>
<td>Nabû-šum-iddin/[x/x]</td>
<td>šatammu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dates: 12,000 kurru</td>
<td>Ardia/Nabû-bān-ʾalḥ/Rēmūt-Ea</td>
<td>šatammu &amp; bēl piqitti (ina qibāt Gubaru)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>{dates: according to imittu} + 1/5 zitti qaqqari for land below the palms irrigated by buckets</td>
<td>Nanūya-iddin/Ambanu &amp; Nidintu/Nanūya-ʾalḫ-iddin</td>
<td>[Ardia/Nabû-bān-ʾalḥ/Rēmūt-Ea, š.m.s.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NBC 4889 (p. 278)</td>
<td>2-VI-2 Camb</td>
<td>2.a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YBC 4149 (p. 291)</td>
<td>24-VIII-[3] Camb</td>
<td>2.a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 7 162&lt;sup&gt;1200&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>24-VIII-3 Camb</td>
<td>2.a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIN 1 117&lt;sup&gt;1201&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>27-VI-5 Camb</td>
<td>1.a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 21 214 (p. 308)</td>
<td>[x]-[x]-1 Nbk IV</td>
<td>2.a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCBT 677 (p. 280)</td>
<td>23-V-[1 Nbk IV]</td>
<td>2.a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 21 207 (p. 302)</td>
<td>26-V-1 Nbk IV</td>
<td>2.a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 21 208 (p. 279)</td>
<td>30-V-1 Nbk IV</td>
<td>2.a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCBT 630 (p. 274)</td>
<td>4-VI-1 [Nbk IV]</td>
<td>2.a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spar, Studies, no. 8</td>
<td>4-I-1 Dar</td>
<td>2.a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCL 13 182&lt;sup&gt;1202&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>13-IV-2 Dar</td>
<td>1.a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>1200</sup> Edited by Cocquerillat 1968: 46. 111. In line 14 read “i-mdš-sî-ma” instead of Cocquerillat’s “i-mdš-ma(?)-ma”.
<sup>1201</sup> Edited by Cocquerillat 1968: 47. 112.
<sup>1202</sup> Edited by Moore 1935: 186ff; see also Cocquerillat 1968: 43 and here p. 239.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rent</th>
<th>Tenant</th>
<th>Lessor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>{dates: according to imittu}</td>
<td>Ahy-ylid &amp; Zababa-ar-usur, sons of Šuzubu</td>
<td>{Ardia/Nabû-bäni-ahlj/Rëmüta-Ea, š.m.s.}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dates: 4/5 zittu</td>
<td>Luttu'a/Nabû-ahlj-iddin &amp; Šamaš-zär-iddin/Nabû-ahlhē-bullīt</td>
<td>Inninn-zär-ibni/Nabû-gämil/Rab-banē</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dates: 4/5 zittu</td>
<td>Luttu'a/Nabû-ahlj-iddin</td>
<td>Arad-Inninn// Rab-banē</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>{dates: according to imittu} + ešrē zittu for land below palms</td>
<td>Balātu/Sillāya</td>
<td>Ardia/Nabû-bäni-ahlj/Rëmüta-Ea, š.m.s. ša suluppī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>{dates: according to imittu}</td>
<td>Sin-ahl-bullīt/Ahy-lakün</td>
<td>Gimillum/Inninn-šum-ibni, š.m.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>{dates: according to imittu} + aḫī zitti for bīt mé qāti + 1/3 zittu for dālu</td>
<td>Sin-il/[x]</td>
<td>[Gimillum/Inninn-šum-ibni, š.m.s.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>barley: aḫī zitti for bīt dullī + 1/3 zittu for bīt taptē</td>
<td>Talim/Šum-ukin</td>
<td>Gimillum/Inninn-šum-ibni, š.m.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/3 zittu for bīt dāli + aḫī zitti for bīt mé qāti</td>
<td>Iddin-Nergal/Nergal-dān</td>
<td>Gimillum/Inninn-šum-ibni, š.m.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>{dates: according to imittu} + 1/5 (share) for bīt dāli, bīt taptē + 1/3 zittu for bīt mé qāti, bīt taptē</td>
<td>Balātu/Inninn-zär-ušabān</td>
<td>Gimillum/Inninn-šum-ibni, š.m.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>{dates: according to imittu}</td>
<td>Šamaš-ahlj-iddin/Inninn-zär-ibni &amp; Anu-apla-iddin, his son</td>
<td>Gimillum/Inninn-šum-ibni, š.m.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>barley: 10,000 kurru, dates: 12,000 kurru, in the first year 10 flawless bulls</td>
<td>Bēl-gimlanni/Madān-ēreš, širik IU, ša muḫḫī quppi Eanna</td>
<td>Šatammu, qipu &amp; bēl piqitti</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Aspects of Urukean topography: Eanna’s estates

4.1. The general geographical setting

A reconstruction of the Urukean topography based on textual material has been attempted by Cocquerillat 1968 and in her follow-up articles in Revue d’Assyriologie (1981, 1983, 1984a). In her articles on the imittu debt notes for dates from the rent farm of Ardia and Gimillu (1981 and 1983) Cocquerillat pointed out a regularity with which place names, i.e. places in which the orchards were situated as well as the places in which the debt notes were drafted, appeared in these texts. This regularity reflects the practice of the yield estimation commissions to follow year after year a certain route when visiting and inspecting the individual orchards. The string of place names emerging from the texts was used by Cocquerillat to show the relative position of these places along the commission’s itinerary. However, new texts show that the routes taken by the estimation commission were not strictly linear. Some of the places were revisited after a couple of days, for instance, and not always the same itinerary was followed, simply because the estates were not all strung in a line along a single canal, but some of them extended into adjacent areas. While Cocquerillat is frequently right about the rough localisation of the sites, there are still numerous difficulties posed by (seemingly?) conflicting information provided by the texts for some sites or simply insufficient data for others. Some of her localisations are based on rather skimpy evidence, or, one would get the impression, hunches even. Unfortunately, in her maps she does not distinguish between the more soundly based and the hypothetical reconstructions, which diminishes their usefulness. The uncertainty entailed in such detailed reconstruction of the Urukean topography is demonstrated by Cocquerillat herself, who emended and changed some of her previously proposed localisations in the articles which she wrote some years after the publication of her thesis. Thus Cocquerillat’s reconstructions cannot be accepted at face value, but should rather be taken as suggestions regarding the general area where certain localities should be looked for.

Joannès (1982: 115ff.) also objected to Cocquerillat’s reconstructions pointing out the gaps in her map, in particular to the east of the city. He gives the general outline of the Uruk countryside by describing the larger water-courses (p. 117) and discusses the geographical categories (e.g., tamirtu, p. 117f.) and toponymic elements (e.g., bitu, dûru, ḫuṣṭu, etc; p. 118f.) which appear in the textual evidence. He also notes the frequent phenomenon of the alternating use of geographical categories (canal (id or ğarru), settlement (uru) and district (garin)) for one and the same locality on p. 119f. Finally Zadok in his catalogue of textually attested toponyms from the Neo-Babylonian period, Répertoire Géographique (1985), uses mainly the insights of Cocquerillat and Joannès when it comes to the proposed localisation of the sights. Falkenstein’s study of the topography of Uruk of the Seleucid period should also be mentioned (Falkenstein 1941). Though there is no attempt at a reconstruction of the city plan, it provides a useful collection of names of city gates, quarters, streets, and so on, with some information on their relative localisation.

An archaeological approach describing the developments in the hinterlands of Uruk can be found in Adams and Nissen 1972. Adams’ surface reconnaissance was designed to reveal settlement and irrigation patterns from the middle of the fourth millennium to well into the modern times (20th century AD). The Neo-Babylonian and the Seleucid periods are treated together, including the last two centuries of the Neo-Assyrian rule (this covers the period from roughly 800

---

1203 Portions of this chapter were previously published in Janković 2010. The quoted passages are individually marked.
1204 As the most representative data-set see the table with the imittu debt notes pertaining to the rent farm of Gimillu from 1 Nbk IV in the Appendix 5.
1205 For instance, Kār-Nanaya, which she placed within the city close to the temple mound in her monograph (1968) later she localised outside the city on the royal canal (1983: 165). In yet another article (1984a) she argued against her previously proposed localisation of the district Ḫarrūtu, changing it from south of the city to the north (1984a: 5718; see also the schematic map on p. 62). In order to do so, however, she had to revert to emendations of some clearly written portions of the text (AnOr 9 19) which is problematic in itself.
to 120 BC; Adams and Nissen 1972: 55-57). The Neo-Babylonian period is characterised by numerous small and widely scattered settlements which generally seem to have persisted into later times. In many places the “overlying layers of later debris” made the evaluation of the surface area occupied during the Neo-Babylonian time difficult (p. 55). The authors faced a similar problem with respect to the irrigation system: “The later levee deposits obscure those of the Neo-Babylonian and Achaemenid periods” (p. 57). Hence the map sketched for the Neo-Babylonian period (fig. 19, p. 56) is rather disappointing as it leaves whole areas blank and offers little detail. Nevertheless, the authors presume continuity in site and canal locations and a similarity to patterns from later times, in particular the Parthian period. The map drawn for this period (fig. 20, p. 60) shows a denser canal network around the city. It is assumed that the Uruk countryside in the Neo-Babylonian period, too, especially around the city, was characterised by an extensive network of artificial irrigation canals, “a largely dendritic system in which a few straight, main canals supplied many lateral offtakes” (p. 57). This is indeed the picture one would expect based on the textual evidence from the Eanna archive. However, while this pattern seems more than likely, it still cannot be combined successfully with all the toponyms which have come down to us, nor is it realistic to expect to achieve this goal with the kind of information available to us.

In consideration of all this, a graphic reconstruction of the Uruk hinterlands will not be attempted here, partly because it would duplicate to a large extent the work of Cocquerillat and partly because of the limitations of our evidence, which would only allow for hypothetical localisations for a substantial number of sites. Suffice it here to give a rough outline of the Uruk countryside which was circumscribed by three major watercourses, Euphrates, Takkiru and Nār-šārri. The following rough sketch of the estates of Eanna will cover the regions to the north of Uruk, to the west and south-west. Estates to the east or south of the city could not be identified, not because they did not exist but because our localisations hinge on the watercourses of which only the major ones, namely Nār-šārri in the north, Euphrates in the west and Takkiru probably in the south-west, could be identified with some degree of certainty.

4.1.1. Euphrates

The Euphrates (Purattu) which flowed to the west of Uruk marked the western border of the Uruk hinterlands. It seems that the land which lay directly on its banks was of marginal importance for the temple agriculture. Only a small number of sites which lay on the Euphrates could be identified (e.g., Kurbat, Bīt-Zugunabu, perhaps also Gadētu) and their importance for the temple agriculture seems to have been limited. With the exception of one, namely the Takkiru-canal (YOS 7 172), all the offshoots of the Euphrates in the Uruk region also seem to have been of marginal importance for the temple agriculture. These were probably situated to the north and included: Ḥarru-ša-Nabû-šum-lišir, on which sharecroppers were employed for grain production (GC 2 387) and from which also kasia was delivered (BIN 1 166), Ḥarru-ša-Marduk-apla-iddina, on which ḫanšī-allocments were created in the eighth century (AnOr 9 1) though it is not certain that temple estates were there as well, and perhaps also Ḥarri-kibbi, on which temple land was leased for gardening (YOS 7 51).

---

1206 Note the map in Adams and Nissen which shows a well developed network of irrigation canals to the east of Uruk. Ironically their map exhibits a gap to the west of the city because this region could not be surveyed owing to the presence of cultivated land and seasonal swamps there (1981: 56f.).
1207 For a reconstruction of the course of Euphrates see for instance van Driel 1988: 125f. and see the map on p. 151.
1208 In Kurbat dates, sesame and kasia were being produced and the contractors Nabû-bān-aḫi, Ardia and Gimillu were active there. For Bīt-Zugunabu there is only one attestation for barley production by sharecroppers (GC 2 387).
4.1.2. Takkiru

Takkiru, on the other hand, was of paramount importance for the temple agriculture, especially the date production. The exact course of this Euphrates offshoot cannot be determined. Cocquerillat suggested that it approached the city from the west or the south-west, which is plausible, even if not verifiable. Furthermore Cocquerillat assumed that the Takkiru ended within the city walls (1968: 16), which is also not certain. This was based on a text which mentioned that Takkiru flowed toward the irrigation district Rudaya (YOS 6.35), and another text which implied that Rudaya was inside the city (TCL 12.8). The simittu list YOS 6.35 states that a certain amount of dates was from an area stretching “from Dûr-Ugumu to the canal ḫarrû-ša-Lābāši, along the bank of Takkiru, toward Rudaya” (ll. 46-48: pab 834:2.1.3 uš-tu bâd ṣar-ri-ša-la-a-i-ti-iš-a ša tak-ku-ru / a-na ḫaniš-da-a-a). The early land sale document TCL 12.8 (1 Šamaḫ-šum-ukin) concerns a grain field whose one frontage bordered Rudaya and the other one the royal canal which was within Uruk (l. 7-8: ṣag-ki ṣap-li-ti ru-da-a-a / ṣag-ki an-ū’ id-lugal ša qir-bi unûgu). The situation of the lower frontage suggests that Rudaya was in this instance a watercourse which, at least in part, ran parallel to the royal canal. To make things more confusing the introductory lines describe the plot as being in the Uruk region (piḫāt Uruk). This terminology was commonly used for plots which were not within the city itself. Furthermore, the district Rudaya, designated as qallu, i.e. the Lesser Rudaya, which appears in the cadastral text RA 54, 86-87, is said to be some 6 km away from the royal highway and thus can hardly be found within the city as suggested by Cocquerillat (1968: 17, see also the map on plate 3b).

Despite these uncertainties concerning the course of Takkiru, we know that it fed several canals. A number of settlements significant mainly for the date production can be associated to it or its offshoots. The canals which branched off of Takkiru were Bitquṣ-bēl-ēṣer, Nāru-ša-Silim-Bēl, Nār-Lasītu, Ḫarru-ša-Lābāši, Namrī-saparrātu and perhaps also Nāru-ša-Bīt-īli and Nār-bîni. The quay Kār-Nānīya and the settlement/estate Bit-Nābû-ahḫē-šûlim were directly on the Takkiru. Other places which were situated on the Takkiru or one of its offshoots were Dûr-Ugumu, Gizzētû-ša-Nergal-nāṣir, Kakkabtu, Lasītu, Dûr-ša-Latiru, Miḫṣanu. In this region, Bitquṣ-ša-Bēl-ēṣer, a settlement probably situated on the homonymous canal, and Kār-Nānīya, which must have been relatively close by, were the major administrative centres in which most of the debt notes for dates from the surrounding estates were composed. However, even settlements north of Uruk which were

---

1209 Cereal production seems to have been of marginal importance in this area – there are only a few attestations which point to the presence of sharecroppers in Lasītu, Kakkabtu and around Ḫarru-ša-Lābāši and Bitquṣ-ša-Bēl-ēṣer. Ploughmen (ikkarus) are attested in Dûr-ša-Latiru with deliveries of sesame.

1210 The suggested identifications with modern riverbeds (Cocquerillat 1968: 16) can likewise not be verified.

1211 The other text which Cocquerillat quotes to prove the connection between Takkiru and Rudaya (1968: 16), the letter YOS 3.30, in fact does not warrant such a connection. The two geographical names are mentioned in different contexts, and furthermore it seems that the Rudaya mentioned here, though written without a determinative, was a watercourse, as the addressee was instructed to “open” it for the purpose of irrigation.

1212 See previous note.

1213 Perhaps this field was only partially within the city, crossing the city border as the city walls were probably not in place in their entirety at this time.

1214 Note that Cocquerillat erroneously understands GAL-la to designate the Greater Rudaya. The one without further designation was the Lesser Rudaya according to her (1968: 17).

1215 The section (ll. 6-8) describes a piece of land with the surface area of 840 kurrû within the irrigation district Šakillatu, which appears to be delimited by the royal highway and the district Rudaya: “3,500 (cubits) – frontage, 12,000 (cubits) – flank, from the royal highway to the lesser Rudaya; in total: 840 kurrû within the district Šakillatu belonging to Ištar of Uruk” (3 lim 5 me ṣak-ki 12 lim uš iš-tu kaskal lugal / a-di-i ḫaniš-da-a-a GAL-la pab 8 me 40 gur / ina ḫaniš-sa-ki-il-li-ti iš-taʾi ṣinnin unûgu).
normally associated with the Nār-šarri, occasionally depended on these administrative centres.  

Contact between the two regions, around the Takkiru in the (south-)west and the Nār-šarri in the north, may have been provided by the canal Nāru-ša-Bit-ilî, which can be associated to both areas.  

4.1.3. Nār-šarri

The royal canal, Nār-šarri, was another major waterway on which the Uruk agriculture depended. It flowed from north to south, from the Nippur region toward Uruk, probably in an abandoned bed of the Euphrates known today as Šaṭṭ el-Nil (Cocquerillat 1968: 16), and entered the city from the north. According to Cocquerillat, the royal canal terminated within the city walls (1968: 16), however, this too is hypothetical. It is equally possible that it continued eastwards following the course of the royal highway which connected Uruk and Larsa (cf. ḫarrān šarri ša Larsa). After all, the Nār-šarri ran parallel to ḫarrān šarri in the region north of the city and may well have continued in this course. Alternatively, it is conceivable that it carried on past Uruk following roughly the same north-south course as above the city to join the Euphrates at some point further south. This seems possible in view of the map drawn by Adams and Nissen (1972: 56) which marks the traces of an ancient waterway in roughly this location. In the textual sources the royal canal is sometimes designated as “upper” (elû or elênu) which Cocquerillat understood to designate the portion which flowed within the city (1968: 16). This, however, is incorrect. Nār-šarri-elû designated its course above, i.e. north, of the city. There are also two attestations of a “lower” Nār-šarri (šaplu), however, they are not conclusive with respect to the localisation of this portion of the canal (UCP 9/1 74: 4-5; NCBT 638: 1). By analogy, it can be assumed that this was the part of the watercourse which left the city and continued south- or eastward.

Numerous places and watercourses were associated with the royal canal. The texts leave little doubt that the canals Aššuritu, Nāru-češšu, Nāru-ša-Bit-ilî and Nār-Baru(?) were its offshoots. Ḫarru-ša-Nadnâya was also closely related to the royal canal, though there is no unequivocal proof that they were connected. The same can be said for Ḫiltu and to a lesser extent Nār-Innin. The places Kār-Eanna, Naḥallu and Šanâpû lay directly on the royal canal. Other places which must have been in the vicinity of Nār-šarri or one of its offshoots include: Bit-Nabû, Bīrāta, Naṣûbûta, Nuḫânu, Kapru-ša-nâqidâti, Bit-Šama-il and perhaps also Bāb-maḫîri. The estates in the region of the royal canal were on the whole used both for barley and date production.

---

1216 Note, for instance, the debt note PTS 2243 which was written in Bitqu-ša-Beš-ṭêr and which concerns an orchard in Naḫallu, a place situated north of Uruk. The debt note BM 114467 which concerns an orchard in Bāb-maḫîri, probably also situated north of Uruk, was written in Kār-Nanâya.

1217 That is, unless “Nāru-ša-Bit-ilî” is a generic term for any canal belonging to the temple. It appears in one imittu list for dates which records the income from various places along the Takkiru. It also appears in several imittu debt notes as the place in which the orchards in question were situated, while the place of drafting is always Bitqu-ša-Beš-ṭêr (BIN 1 102, 105, CD 84, NCBT 829, BM 113422). Its connection to Nār-šarri is provided by the lease contract YBC 4143 (see p. 310) which implies that Nāru-ša-Bit-ilî was its offshoot.

1218 Montserrat 1. 23': kaskal II lugal ša ud-unuŋ ki.

1219 Note, for instance, the sale document YBC 7429 which describes a plot with frontages situated on the upper Nār-šarri and ḫarrān šarri, thus indicating that they ran parallel to each other.

1220 However, this map also shows a watercourse east of the city leading toward Larsa which is compatible with the previous suggestion.

1221 The above-mentioned sale contract YBC 7429, which concerns a plot with one frontage on the upper Nār-šarri, states in the caption that the property is in the Uruk region (nam unuŋ) and not within the city. The cadastre Montserrat 1 explicitly states that properties situated on Nār-šarri-elû are in front of the city (muḫḫi ʾālî) in ll. 10'-14' and ll. 15'-19'.

1222 This canal was in fact close to the royal highway according to YOS 6 14, which in turn ran, at least partially, parallel to the royal canal.
4.1.4. Barley production centres

As was noted earlier, the region around the Nār-šarrī is known for both barley and date production and the agricultural regime of the Takkīru and its catchment area focused almost exclusively on date plantations. However, a number of important sites and districts which specialised in barley production are also known. These included Angillu, Bit-bārī, Rātu, Til-agurrēti, Til-ḫurāši and others. These places are usually difficult to localise as they are rarely related to any of the major watercourses. This apparent dissociation from waterways can in part be explained by the fact that barley fields were generally not situated directly on the canals, unlike date orchards which require a more intensive irrigation, but rather further down the levees. What is more, it is conceivable that these places had a prominence of their own, being large production centres, and for this reason did not require specifications to their localisation in the written documentation. Then again some of the barley production centres appear in connection with both the Takkīru and the Nār-šarrī. Since these were important routes of transportation for the harvested crops, it is conceivable that barley from these places was also transported to the city along these waterways. Furthermore this could be taken as an indicator for the localisation of these sites in the western and the north-western section of the Uruk countryside, an area roughly delimited by the Takkīru and the Nār-šarrī (and the Euphrates further to the west), i.e. somewhere in between these watercourses. Besides being very rough, these proposed localisations are quite hypothetical. It has to be acknowledged that for most of these places the evidence for localisation remains inadequate at the present state of our information.

YOS 17 45, a short imittu list from the beginning of Nebuchadnezzar’s reign, can serve as an example, even if not entirely typical, for the amounts of barley produced in these centres. The text presents us with a list of barley imposts (imittu) from different localities and is dated to the first month of the second year of Nebuchadnezzar. To judge by the date, the figures in this list probably represent estimates of the grain yield made before the harvest. No caption or vertical rulings typical for the tabulated imittu lists are present. Nevertheless, the obverse of the tablet is closely related to this type of document. It records imposts of three ploughmen from Til-ḫurāši and, in a section marked off by a horizontal line, of four sharecroppers. The most interesting part of the text is on the reverse of the tablet. Originally the date formula was set at the bottom of the tablet and most of the reverse was left empty. At a later point six lines of text were inserted in the gap (the signs are smaller and impressed more lightly here). Fairly high figures followed by place names are recorded in these lines. These numbers are probably capacity measures of barley. It is not clear whether these figures represent pre-harvest estimates or the barley harvested in and/or delivered from these places. The administrative purpose of this memo remains unclear. Perhaps it was to be used as a kind of checklist for some larger account of barley income, or simply as a help for the scribe to get a rough idea of the amount of barley available. Unfortunately the signs are not well preserved and reading the place names is very difficult or even impossible. There is no obvious connection to the imposts from Til-ḫurāši recorded on the obverse. Whatever the significance of these entries may be, it seems probable that they reflect realistic amounts, either fairly accurate harvest estimates or actual harvested barley, i.e. amounts which the scribe may have copied from individual (tabulated) imittu lists. The figures suggest that we are not dealing with wildly hypothetical amounts which would typically be rounded. However, since the lower capacity units do not appear either (as is the case on the obverse of the tablet), it seems more likely that these were harvest estimates rather than actual harvested amounts. Either way, the text gives us an idea of the possible magnitude of Eanna’s barley income in 2 Nbk:

YOS 17 45

obv. 1. 2 me 20 gur še-bar i-mit-ti šā jdag-da a ṭ[z]-ṭl-bi
     1 me l+šu <<erasure>> gur zag x šā en-šū-nu1 a ṭd-ag-ú-še-zib

1223 Against Cocquerillat (1968: 17), Angillu was not within the city walls. A private sale document TCL 12 12 associates it with the upper Nār-šarrī, which means that it was north of the city.
1224 This region did not only concentrate on cereals but also had a strong date production.
Already some of the imposts on the obverse of the tablet are not negligible. Nabû-lēʾi’s impost of 220 kurru of barley implies a plot of a size comparable to the models of institutional planning used by the ‘Edict of Belšazzar’ or the large-scale land leases, i.e. plots with a surface between 20 and 30 kurru which were to be tilled by one plough team. At a yield factor of 10, for instance, Nabû-lēʾi’s plot could have had a surface of 22 kurru. The imposts of the other two ploughmen, and respectively their plots, were smaller. The really large figures, however, are recorded on the reverse of the tablet. In total, these amounts, including the imittu and the share of the sharecroppers from Til-ḫurāši from the obverse, add up to 10,907 kurru of barley. By comparison, Šum-ukin’s rent was 25,000 kurru of barley and Gimillu’s 10,000 kurru. In other words, the total recorded in YOS 17 45, barley stemming from only eight localities, was just under 44 % of Šum-ukin’s rent. At the same time it surpassed Gimillu’s rent by 907 kurru. We cannot tell with much certainty whether the 10,907 kurru were Eanna’s total barley income in 2 Nbk or just a part of it. The latter seems more probable considering the relatively small number of localities

1225 This sequence of signs also appears in the list of limus BM 114571 (see below for an edition) in line 4: 1 lim 1 me giš šu sum pab ša ṣu-ub-bu-и-и-a. I have no suggestion for a reading or an interpretation.

“220 kurru of barley, impost of Nabû-lēʾi, son of Zibi; 160 kurru, impost of Bēššunu, son of Nabû-ušezib; 100, Rēmut, son of x-Bēl; In total: 480 (kurru of) barley, impost of the ploughmen from Til-ḫurāši.

44 kurru, Apkallu, the sharecropper;
2, Nergal-iddin, son of Nabû-zēr-lišir;
10, Nabû-nāṣir, son of Nabû-x;
12, Bēššunu, son of Nabû-[x];
In total: 68 (kurru of) barley and spelt from the sharecroppers.

3,221 (from) Re-....
1,685 from Našḫāta;
1,493 from Tūranu;
495 from Biranatu and Rātu;
2,462 from Til-attūnati;
1,003 from ...

27-I-2 Nbk, king of Babylon.”
recorded in the text. But even if this had been the total barley income for 2 Nbk it goes to show that Eanna was doing comparably well even without the institution of the *ferme générale*: a few decades after its introduction one of its last and certainly most notorious proponents, the rent farmer Gimillu, was failing at providing the temple with less than what the temple apparently managed on its own in 2 Nbk.

4.2. Development and growth

In his major study of Babylonian economy Jursa demonstrated that the hinterlands of Sippar and the estates of the Ebabbar temple underwent a dynamic development (2010b: 322ff.). They had a relatively late start but they benefited immensely from royal investment and experienced a dynamic growth through a shift toward horticulture. A large-scale canal building project north of the city, which probably began early in the reign of Nebuchadnezzar, is responsible for most of the changes within the Ebabbar’s agricultural economy visible in the sources. The digging of the Nār-šarri which connected the Euphrates with the Tigris opened up a large area of previously unexploited or at best under-exploited land for increasingly intensive cultivation. The work began at the latest early in Nebuchadnezzar’s reign, continued on a large scale until the very end of Nabonidus’s reign. Generally, Ebabbar’s estates on the Nār-šarri began bearing fruit only after the beginning of the reign of Nabonidus, and even then they consisted mostly of arable land with occasional sesame plots. These can be seen as attempts to intensify land use to some degree. The temple estates in Gilûšu, which are first mentioned at the time of Nebuchadnezzar, were primarily a grain producing centre. The land was farmed by temple’s own ploughmen and a larger part was rented out to sharecroppers. However, date orchards started appearing in Gilûšu during the reign of Darius, which must be understood as a sign of further intensification of agrarian production in this area. A similar development can be observed for other settlements along the Nār-šarri, e.g. Ḥallab and Laḫarar, used originally for cereal cultivation. Here also date orchards started appearing in the reign of Darius. Probably one of the last estates on the Nār-šarri to become productive was Raqqaṭ-Samaš. Though it appears already from the reign Nebuchadnezzar on in the context of public works (in the texts from Eanna of Uruk), deliveries of sharecroppers from this area are attested in the Ebabbar texts only from the reign of Cyrus onwards. The progressive expansion of the temple’s holdings through the reclamation of new land along the Nār-šarri is clearly visible in the sources. The strong focus on grain farming in this region during the reign of Nabonidus and in the first years of Achaemenid rule is owed to the fact that on these newly-established estates date gardens had first to be planted. Indeed, in the early Achaemenid period, during the reign of Darius in particular, the references to date gardening on the Nār-šarri become increasingly more numerous. This is a certain sign of the progressive intensification of agriculture through a shift to horticulture.

When looking for signs of agricultural intensification, very soon it becomes evident that the data from Uruk does not mirror a development as the one attested for Sippar. Our data is inconclusive, at best. Indeed, there are places which are first attested with barley deliveries for the temple and which later start appearing in the context of date production. However, the inverse pattern is also attested: places which first appear in the texts as date producing centres, at a later date also appear as barley suppliers. Already relatively early, at the end of the seventh century, date and sesame producers working for Eanna are attested in the temple documentation. With a delay of several years, which is certainly purely coincidental, the first deliveries of barley start appearing in the archive. Though, of course, a (steady?) growth in agricultural production can

---

1226 Parts of the following section already appeared in print in Janković 2010: 420ff.
1227 This may be owed to difficulties caused by its particular topographical characteristics – the name suggests after all a swampy or at least seasonally inundated area.
1228 This is the case for instance in the district Rudîya and the canal Aššaritu.
1229 Dates from Kakkabtu (which is located on the canal Takkîru) and Dîru-ša-Iatri appear in 6 Npl in a short *imittu* list (YBC 6935) and sesame from Kurbat (located on the Euphrates north-west of the city) and Dîru-ša-Iatri in 10 Npl in a list recording the deliveries of the ploughmen (PTS 3021).
1230 Barley from Angillu in 15 Npl (PTS 2756) and Sumandar in 17 Npl (TCL 12 20). Note that the ploughmen are already mentioned in 10 Npl as producers of sesame (PTS 3021).
be assumed for the ensuing period, it is simply not tangible in our sources, as could be demonstrated for Sippar. Generally, the attestations are not dense enough to ensure that the emerging patterns are not merely an effect of the find coincidence. Furthermore, it is questionable how much weight can be placed on an argument which is based on the higher frequency of attestations of date groves and date deliveries. While this may work well for the evidence from the Eabbar archive, the Eanna archive poses a special case: toward the end of the archive a disproportionately high number of texts dealing with date gardening has come down to us. The specific make-up of the archive should be attributed to the circumstances which brought about its reorganisation in the second year of Darius, a veritable crisis probably caused by a shortage of manpower in the agricultural sector.\textsuperscript{1231} This crisis culminated when one of the general contractors, Gimillu, son of Innin-šumu-ibni, withheld the imittu-related documentation from the temple authorities. The upshot of this incident was that the last major file of the Eanna archive consisted of precisely these withheld documents concerning date gardening, while the corresponding file concerning the arable cultivation, which was apparently the more problematic sector of the temple agriculture, had not been sorted out at that time and has not come down to us at all.\textsuperscript{1232} As a consequence the written material toward the end of the archive is largely misbalanced in favour of date cultivation. Rather than a reflection of a structural development which could be interpreted as an intensification of the temple agriculture, this slant in the documentation is the result of the re-organisation of the archive.

Overall, no rapid developments are visible in our documentation. On the one hand, the textual material from the end of the seventh and the beginning of the sixth century is simply not dense enough to allow for a quantitative comparison with the later period, e.g., the comparably well documented era of the general contractors which started roughly at the same time as the reign of Nabonidus and lasted until the end of the archive. On the other, no major building projects ameliorating the rural hinterlands of Uruk are directly attested for the sixth century.\textsuperscript{1233} What royally sponsored construction work took place, must have done so before this time. At least in one instance there is indirect evidence for a canal (re-)construction by a Babylonian king in the eighth century: the canal of Marduk-apla-iddina (Iḫarru-ša-Marduk-apla-iddina, attested in \textit{AnOr} 9 1, ABL 747 and YOS 3 74), which branched off of Euphrates somewhere north of Uruk, was probably (re-)dug by the king of this name who was in power from 721 to 710 BC. What is more, land along this canal was restructured into ḫanši-uniș units and allotted to 91 individuals, designated as rab ḫanšē according to \textit{AnOr} 9 1, a text dated to the fourth year of Marduk-apla-iddina. Other texts recording ḫanšē-allotments give evidence for royal efforts in the eighth and seventh century to reorganise the countryside around Uruk.\textsuperscript{1234} However, it is not clear if and how the temple was affected by this restructuring.

Further restructuring of the Uruk countryside which directly benefited Eanna was undertaken in the seventh century by Assurbanipal during the Assyrian domination (\textit{AnOr} 9 2). On this occasion orchards, mostly within the city or just outside it, were taken from the Urukeans and returned to the temple of Ninurta, a sanctuary dependent on Eanna.\textsuperscript{1235} Evidence for the expansion of temple estates in the sixth century through royal grants comes from three other cadastral texts according to which the Chaldean kings and members of their families donated land to Ištart of Uruk. These texts are treated in more detail below. The following

\textsuperscript{1231} Though this cannot be the sole explanation for the composition of the archive, as it contained other files not related to the organisation of the temple agriculture.

\textsuperscript{1232} See p. 244.

\textsuperscript{1233} There certainly were changes on a smaller scale whose impact cannot be gauged, though. For instance, a settlement, perhaps including also a canal-annex, called Asšuritu-ša-Bullûtiya was created at the end of Cyrus’s reign (it is attested from 8 Cyr to 1 Nbk IV) on the already existent canal Asšuritu (attested from 21 Nbk to 1 Nbk IV).

\textsuperscript{1234} For these texts see below.

\textsuperscript{1235} The text records seven orchards which Assurbanipal, king of Assyria, returned after an inspection (\textit{masnaqtu}) of Uruk to Ninurta of Uruk (\textit{AnOr} 9 2: 62-63). They were returned from the Urukeans. The implication is that the citizens encroached on the land belonging to the temple. For a discussion of this passage see below. The same episode is also referred to in PTS 2076 rev. 23-24.
is an overview of land grants made by kings, members of the royal family and high officials of the state administration.\footnote{A land grant to Ištar of Uruk from the Kassite period, dubbed “The Donation of Kurigalzu” by (Foster 2005: 365), is recorded in CT 36 pl. 6-7. The size of the donated land is quite impressive, namely 60 šaru (= 524.88 square kilometres). This together with the fact that the inscription is only attested as copy on variant tablets has led some scholars to question the authenticity of the text (ibid.). For an edition of the text see Ungnad 1923: 19ff. See also the translation and further bibliographical remarks in Foster 2005: 365f.}

RA 19, 86-87\footnote{This was a Neo-Babylonian copy of a text which was engraved on a cylinder seal which was hung around the neck of the statue of the goddess Ušur-amāsu (this can be deduced from the colophon). The donation recorded in this text could possibly be dated to the 11\textsuperscript{th} or the 10\textsuperscript{th} century (Beaulieu 2000: 30). The text was originally published by Thureau-Dangin 1922: 86ff., then by Frame 1995: 84f. and finally by Beaulieu 2000: 29f.}

The text records an early land donation of a governor of Sealand, Kaššū-bēl-zēri. The beneficiary was the goddess Ušur-amāsu. The granted land with a surface area of 12 kurru was situated on the Nār-šarri at the Adad-gate.

\begin{itemize}
  \item RT 36, 188-90 no. 24\footnote{A duplicate of this text was published in TCL 12 13. For an edition and references to earlier editions of these texts see Frame 1995: 258f.}
  A governor of Ur, Sīn-šar-ušur, donated land to Ištar and Nanāya for the good health of the king Šamaš-šam-ukīn. The frontage of the plot was 660 cubits long. It bordered a certain Atrāya, and stretched to the estates of the simmagir-official. The flanks of the plot stretched from the Euphrates to the town Sūrānu. Their length is not given.
  \item Montserrat 1
  (ll. 15'019')
  This passage deals with the orchard of Nabû-aḫḫē-iddin, šatammu, which Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon, had given to the Lady of Uruk. It was situated to the right of the upper Nār-šarri in front of the city (i.e. just north of Uruk). The orchard had a surface of 3;0.4.4 and was planted with date palms.
  \item RA 54, 86-87
  (ll. 4'5'-5')
  This text mentions a plot ([... x] +100 frontage, 2000 (cubits) flank) on Nār-šarri which Kaššāya, the princess, gave to Ištar of Uruk. The length of the frontage is damaged. Assuming that it was 1,100 cubits long, which was a typical frontage for a limu-plot, for instance, then the surface area of the plot could have had a surface area of 44 kurru.
  \item PTS 2076
  (ll. 5'9'-9')
  The prince Itti-Šamaš-balātu\footnote{For this prince see p. 348.} donated to the Lady of Uruk a large orchard with a surface area of over 21 kurru, of which 9 kurru were planted with date palms. The orchard was situated next to the royal highway in the vicinity of the Šamaš-gate.
\end{itemize}

(rev. ll. 9014)

Another grant of the prince Itti-Šamaš-balātu to the Lady of Uruk was an orchard close to the Meslamtaea-gate. It had a surface area of 1;2.4.4.8, of which 0;4.2 were planted with date palms.

The temple did not only rely on royal grants for the enlargement of its estates. Several sale contracts recording land purchases undertaken by Eanna are known.\footnote{E.g. the temple purchased three uncultivated plots in Uruk in YBC 3955 (6 Kan) (JCS 36, no. 8), a cereal field on Nār-šarri in BIN 1 130 (15 Npl), land close to Larsa in YBC 9169 (16 Npl), and so on.} Additionally, not
infrrequently the temple confiscated urban or rural property of its debtors, typically people involved in some business with it.\textsuperscript{1241}

While the temple may have been expanding its estates through royal grants, purchases or confiscations of the properties of their debtors, this did not automatically mean that the agricultural production was being expanded, as the land could have been left fallow or put to other uses. Only the contracts for reclamation of land, either for cereal cultivation (\textit{ana taptê}) or planting date orchards (\textit{ana zäqipüti}), give us unequivocal evidence for agricultural expansion. These documents are unfortunately scarce. Of some 40 extant land lease contracts from 3 Nbk to 2 Dar only seven land reclamation leases are known to us. Two \textit{zäqipüti}-contracts from Nebuchadnezzar’s and Nabonidus’s reign each and one from Cyrus’s reign, and one lease \textit{ana taptê} from Cambyses’s and Nebuchadnezzar IV’s reign each are known.\textsuperscript{1242} This is little more than anecdotal evidence which does not render itself to quantification. However, it shows that all throughout the sixth century efforts to raise the productivity of land were an ongoing process.

\section*{4.3. A quantitative estimate of Eanna’s estates\textsuperscript{1243}}

Making estimates for the size of the temple estates and their output is not easily done and can only amount to rough approximations. At least for the time of Nabonidus when the temple employed a general contractor we can make a few suggestions about the temple's arable holdings. From the land lease contract (YOS 6 11) of the general contractor Šum-ukûn, son of Bêl-zêrî, from the Basia family, we know that the temple owned at least 6,000 \textit{kurru} (7,500 ha) of arable land. Other rent contracts attested during Nabonidus’s reign suggest that Eanna held more land on top of this. The lease YOS 6 40 from the third year of Nabonidus concerns over 865 \textit{kurru} of land. According to YOS 6 41, a land lease recorded on the same day as YOS 6 40, the tenant was granted a plot of unknown size for which he had to pay a rent of over 1,000 \textit{kurru} of barley, 60 \textit{kurru} of sesame and 20 \textit{kurru} of cress. Using the same land to rent ratio as in YOS 6 40 we can assume a surface area of roughly 770 \textit{kurru} for the plot in YOS 6 41. Still more land must have been available to the temple as is evident from the lease TCL 12 90 from 8 Nbn. This contract concerns the land which had previously been granted to Šum-ukûn’s nephew Kalbîya, son of Iqiša, presumably in addition to the 6,000 \textit{kurru} of land. The amount of land is not given in the contract, but the rent is: Kalbîya was obliged to pay 3,000 \textit{kurru} of barley annually.\textsuperscript{1244} Under the assumption that Kalbîya rented the land on similar conditions as his uncle (see below) this would enable us to derive the surface area of the land at his disposal. Given the same surface to rent ratio as in YOS 6 11 this would make approximately 720 \textit{kurru} of arable land. Adding these figures up the total surface area of Eanna’s arable estates can be estimated at approximately 8,355 \textit{kurru} of land (ca. 10,444 ha).\textsuperscript{1245}

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item A case of confiscated property is recorded, for instance, in the cadastre Montserrat 1 rev. ll. 20°-24°. A plot (3;3) of a certain Nabû-alhēš-šullim, son of Nabû-udammîq, was seized by the temple as a compensation for his arrears. From other texts we know that this was a temple dependant (\textit{širkû}) engaged in the management of the cereal production as an overseer of the ploughmen. Another confiscation is recorded in PTS 2076 (rev. ll. 30°-37°). Here 2,1.1.0.3.3 of orchard were taken by the temple instead of the outstanding debt in cattle.
\item For more details see the chapter on land lease contracts.
\item The following section already appeared in print in Janković 2010: 425ff.
\item Note that the new tenant of this same land promised to pay a higher rent, namely 3,500 \textit{kurru} of barley, which may indicate that the land was not being farmed very intensively in the first place.
\item Note that Cocquerillat also attempted an estimate of the arable holdings of Eanna and arrived at almost 13,000 \textit{kurru} of land (12,922 \textit{kurru}; 1981: 169). This figure is certainly too high, because she indiscriminately added up the values from all known rent contracts. For instance, YOS 6 150, which concerns 2,081 \textit{kurru} of land (not 2,706 as assumed by Cocquerillat), should not be included in this calculation since it was written in 11 Nbn, after the rent farms of Šum-ukûn and possibly of other small-scale tenants had been dissolved. This means that this land may well have been included in one of the earlier leases. Furthermore, her estimates for size of the leased land derived from the amount of rent are inexplicably high (1,250 \textit{kurru} for YOS 6 41 and 2,100 \textit{kurru} for TCL 12 90).
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
For the 6,000 kurru of land, which were to be cultivated in a two-year fallow cycle (i.e. each year 3,000 kurru were to be tilled), Šum-ukin had to pay a rent of 25,000 kurru of barley. However, the temple administration was apparently over-optimistic with respect to the expected returns. In terms of simple arithmetic 6,000 kurru, or, since half of it was left fallow, rather 3,000 kurru of land could have easily produced this amount of barley, but the decisive factor was the workforce. The temple could (in theory) provide only 400 workers and draught-animals that could operate 100 plough teams. The workload per plough team amounted to the impossible surface area of 30 kurru (37.5 ha). Of course, it was the duty of the general contractor to overcome this deficit by subletting the land, employing sharecroppers and so on. Whatever Šum-ukin’s efforts were, he still could not reach this high target. Only at the start of his arrangement with the temple was Šum-ukin able to pay the expected 25,000 kurru of barley. He probably had to cover a part of this rent payment from his own reserves. In the following years he only managed to pay from 38 to 68 % of the required amount. The account TCL 13 227 listing the temple’s income in agricultural commodities from 3 to 7 Nbn gives the following figures for Šum-ukin’s barley rent payments: in 4 Nbn 16,647;1.1.3 (66.6 % of the expected rent), in 5 Nbn 10,568;0.5 (42.3 %), in 6 Nbn 9,570;4.3 (38.3 %) and in 7 Nbn 17,000 kurru of barley (68 %) were delivered. In the seventh year of Nabonidus Kalbiya also delivered 2,000 kurru of barley. This was presumably the rent for the land he had leased according to TCL 12 90 and for which a rent of 3,000 kurru of barley was being expected. Though it is very difficult to make an estimate for the total barley income of the temple, the figures from TCL 13 227 suggests that the actual productivity of the temple estates lay considerably below the predictions of its accountants. To go by the estimate for the size of the estates of Eanna proposed above (8,355 kurru of land) and the land productivity assumed by Šum-ukin’s rent contract YOS 6 11, the total output of the temple land could amount to almost 35,000 kurru of barley. However, this figure could be reached only if adequate work force was available. We know that this was not the case and the account TCL 12 227 demonstrates the effect of this deficit only too well. With the efficiency of Šum-ukin’s rent farm in mind, which is evident from this account, it seems that 19,000 to 20,000 kurru of barley were probably the maximum that Eanna could realistically expect from its estates during the reign of Nabonidus.

After a period of direct exploitation of arable land through temple’s own ploughmen without the involvement of a general contractor, another contractor, Gimillu, appeared at the end of Cambyses’s reign and took up only 1,000 kurru of temple land for a rent of 10,000 kurru of barley (TCL 12 182). Whether this implied a drastic decrease in barley income for the temple is not certain, because it is possible that at that time the temple still had other land under direct exploitation. Still the problem of scarce work-force was pressing. Gimillu had only 50 plough teams at his disposal and formally complained about this to the temple administration since the workload per plough team was very high – 20 kurru (25 ha) of land (TCL 12 182). The temple administration acknowledged that by conceding to double the work force for the contractor who succeeded Gimillu. Whether the temple could follow through with this promise, is yet another matter. We are not informed about this because the archive breaks off at this point. It is at any rate clear, that the main problem which hampered the temple’s cereal production, scarce manpower, had not been tackled successfully from the time of the Chaldean rule at least until Darius’s reign.

With respect to the date production, the forecasts of the temple administration seem to have been more realistic. At the beginning of Nabonidus’s reign Šum-ukin rented all of the temple’s date plantations with the exception of the prebendary or chards of the rab banê. The surface area is not recorded in the contract, but the rent amounted to 10,000 kurru of dates. Most of the time Šum-ukin was able to reach this objective and sometimes even surpass it. Only in the second year of Nabonidus was there a considerable deficit when he managed to pay only 7,130 kurru (OIP 122 82). The account TCL 13 227 records following rent payments: 10,020 kurru in 3 Nbn, over 11,427

---

1246 For this general problem see for instance Janković 2005. The quality and productivity of land was yet another factor, however, we have no information about this.

1247 This is evident from the balanced account of incoming and outgoing agricultural commodities for 2 Nbn (OIP 122 82).

1248 See van Driel 1990: 248ff. for a discussion of this text and the tabular representation of the text here in Appendix 2.
in 4 Nbn, over 9,845 in 5 Nbn and 11,050 in 6 Nbn. Ardia, son of Nabû-băn-aḫḫu, descendant of Rēmût-Ea, the next contractor who rented all of the temple’s date plantations (except the prebendary orchards) some 25 years later at the end of Cyrus’s reign (PTS 2044, 8 Cyr) had to pay a 20% higher rent, namely 12,000 kurru of dates. Whether this raise should be interpreted as a sign of agricultural growth, brought about by the creation of more orchards, for instance, or simply as a reflection of the temple’s strong position and its ability to put its contractors under pressure by increasing the rent payments for its land, it nevertheless shows a potential for growth in the date production. At the very beginning of his enterprise as a contractor for date plantations Ardia was just under 180 kurru of dates short of this target. How he fared in the following years, we do not know. But the same amount of rent was imposed on the next contractor, Gimillu, some nine years later, probably indicating that this was an acceptable figure. For the period before the reign of Nabonidus we have no information on the temple’s income in dates which could lend themselves to comparison. But from the remarks above it can be concluded that during Nabonidus’s rule the temple could expect over 10,000 kurru of dates yearly and from the end of Cyrus’s reign 12,000 kurru of dates not including the dates from the prebendary gardeners on which we have hardly any information. The size of the land covered by date plantations is not known, but a very rough approximation can be made on the basis of an average date output per surface kurru. To use the model found in the so called ‘Edict of Belšazzar’ (YOS 6 103), which assumed that 35 kurru of dates were an average yield of an orchard of 1 kurru surface area, the revenue of 10,000 or 12,000 kurru of dates would have required the existence of orchards with an area of approximately 286 kurru (357 ha) or 343 kurru (429 ha) respectively. Thus the total of Eanna’s agricultural land can be roughly estimated at a minimum of 8,700 kurru (ca. 10,875 ha).

4.4. Cadastral texts, land division schemes and related texts

This group of texts is of particular interest because they offer a range of insights concerning the Urukean topography. Besides throwing light on purely topographical issues some of them also illuminate parts of the Urukean history which are not covered by the Eanna archive. They show the royal involvement in the reorganisation of the Uruk countryside and the temple properties at an early stage (eighth and seventh century) which is generally beyond the scope of the archive. In addition to this, some of the extant cadastres offer information on the agrarian regimes in place, land use patterns and the social make-up of the Uruk hinterlands.

The term ‘cadastral’ is used loosely here. The texts subsumed under this caption can formally vary to a considerable degree. The variations in the type of information and the amount of detail provided in the texts are readily observable. Determining the Sitz im Leben of these texts and the potential differences in this respect, however, is more difficult.

---

1249 This is according to a debt note from the ninth year of Cyrus (AnOr 8 63; edited by Cocquerillat 1968: 73. 127) which states that Ardia had delivered to the temple 11,820;3.2 of dates as his rent payment for the previous year.
1250 For an edition and a discussion of this text see van Driel 1987-88; see also 2002: 166ff. The ‘Edict’ in fact gives 40 kurru as the yield per 1 kurru of orchard. However, the remuneration of the gardener, the sissinnu of 5 kurru was included in this amount. From the imittu debt notes from Uruk we know that the sissinnu was not included in the rent payments, but was paid extra to the gardeners.
1251 Cocquerillat suggests that the date orchards included in the ferme générale covered an area of at least 300 kurru, basing her calculation on the average 40 kurru of dates per kurru (1981: 168).
4.4.1. *AnOr* 9 2

The text registers 49 orchards of Ištar and Nanäya which are in the neighbourhood of Uruk or within the city itself. Following the caption the orchards are listed giving the length of one frontage in cubits and the name of an individual. The introductory lines of the text identify these men as gardeners and farmers (*iššakkus*). Unfortunately the text is not clear here, it reads “*nu-gškirš, ša AN ŠU Ti* *ū ěnšmeš*” (l. 2), leaving us in the dark about the identity of these people, their social status or institutional affiliation. Only the first names of these individuals are listed in the text. In the similar text *AnOr* 9 3 (see below), in which some of these men reappear, they are listed with their patronymics. However, no other attestations of these men could be found. The conjecture that these were members of the Urukean elite rewarded by the Assyrian king with these orchards because of their loyalty during the rebellion of Šamaššum-ukín is not supported by the prosopographic data. An alternative assumption is that these men were lower-class agricultural workers assigned by the king to work on the temple land (perhaps for a share in the harvest?) in an attempt to help strengthen the temple’s economy. The mention of *nukuribbu* and *iššakkus* in the caption speaks in its favour.

The frontage lengths of the listed orchards range from 40 to 600 cubits; most common are 100 and 200 cubits. Most of the frontage lengths exhibit rounded figures. This indicates that these orchards stem from a centralised division scheme.

The listed entries were organised in seven sections, each followed by a subscript. This summary included the number of orchards in the preceding list, or their total frontage, or both, and gave information on their location. The first group consisted of 11 orchards with a total of 1,300 cubits of frontage situated above (i.e. north of) the city. The second group counted seven orchards with 1,800 cubits of frontage which belonged to the god Gilgameš. The third group records three orchards on the upper Nār-šarrī with 1,100 cubits of frontage. There were four orchards in the fourth section with 700 cubits of frontage. They were situated at the gate of Adad. The fifth group contained eight orchards below (i.e. south of) the city with a total frontage of 1,180 cubits. In the sixth group there were eight orchards with a frontage of 720 cubits, which are said to belong to the orchards of Bit Ea. It is not clear whether this was a topographical piece of information or whether it expressed that the orchards counted (at least nominally) to the property of the Ea temple. The seventh section contained seven orchards, three of which were inside the city, behind the Ninurta temple and next to the city wall, or on the canal Ḫarru-Ninurta just across the city wall behind the Ninurta temple. The other four were outside the city situated on the city moat (Ḫarišu) and the canal Ḫarru-Ninurta just across the city wall behind the Ninurta temple.

---


1253 For a suggestion that *AnOr* 9 2 was composed at the same time as *AnOr* 9 3, which was written in 2 Kan, see Beaulieu 2000: 36f. It is argued here that *AnOr* 9 2 was written slightly later than *AnOr* 9 3. The time gap between the two texts cannot be determined with much precision, but it was certainly not longer than a single generation. See below for a discussion.

1254 This term could designate territorial rulers or a type of farmer according to CAD I/J: 262ff. As a designation for a farmer it went out of use in the early NB period to be replaced by the term *ikkaru* (ibid. p. 267).

1255 The significance of this sign sequence eludes me.

1256 There are 13 orchards with a frontage of 100 and nine with a frontage of 200 cubits.

1257 For the defied legendary king of Uruk, Gilgameš, see Beaulieu 2003: 340. Not much is known about him in the Neo-Babylonian period. It is not known whether he had a separate sanctuary or whether he was worshiped in Eanna.

1258 Beaulieu (2000: 34f.) provides an edition of this portion of the text (II. 53-63). The first three entries of this section give measurements for both the flanks (*uš*) and the frontages (*sag*) of the orchards. The other four orchards are listed with only one measurement, without further specification. The text records a total frontage of 800 cubits (l. 60). The figures in the text, however, add up to 1,124 cubits for the seven orchards. The explicitly specified frontages of the first three plots add up to only 524 cubits. Unless this was a scribal error, a possible explanation is given by Beaulieu (2000: 35ff): he suggests that the four unspecified measurements were in fact flank lengths. The unspecified frontages then must have had an average length of 69 cubits.
The fourth and the seventh section are of particular interest. The orchards in the fourth section are said to be recorded on a lapis lazuli cylinder seal of the goddess Ušur-amässu.\footnote{This interpretation is the result of the improved reading provided by Beaulieu’s collations of the text (2000: 33). See also Beaulieu’s discussion of the possibility of recording land grants on cylinder seals in the light of another text dealing with an earlier (10th-11th century BC) land donation to Ušur-amässu (2000: 31). The colophon of this document (RA 19, 86-87; see note 1237) states that the text represents “that which is on a cylinder seal which belongs to the necklace of the goddess U’ur enabled.} It is stated here that Assurbanipal had taken (lit. returned) the orchards from the Urukeans and made gardeners occupy them. Note that Beaulieu interprets this passage\footnote{\textit{AnOr} 9 2 ll. 32-33: Assurbanipal ... \textit{in}a $\text{šu}$ $\text{lú}$ $\text{unu}g$’a-a / $\text{lú}$-\text{ter-ram}’-\text{ma} $\text{nu}$-\text{ka} $\text{kiri}$, $\text{us}$-\text{ša}’-\text{aš}’-\text{bi}-.\text{tu}$. \textit{AnOr} 9 2 ll. 62-63: Assurbanipal ... \textit{in}a \text{mas-naq-ti ša} $\text{unu}g$’a / \textit{in}a $\text{šu}$ $\text{li}$$\text{nuu}g$’a-a $\text{ú}$-\text{ter-ram}’-\text{ma} $\text{a}$-\text{na} \text{nir-unu}$\text{s}$$\text{a}$ $\text{unu}g$’a $\text{id-di}$.} differently: (orchards which) “Assurbanipal, king of Assyria, returned to the people of Uruk and entrusted to the gardeners” (2000: 33), speculating on the possibility that the orchards had been misappropriated by Aramaic or Chaldean tribesmen, perhaps during the unstable times of the Šamaš-šum-ukin rebellion, and returned to their rightful owners, namely the citizens of Uruk and the temples once the rebellion had been crushed in Assurbanipal’s 20th regnal year (\textit{ibid:} 39f.). The orchards listed in the seventh section are also said to have been returned by Assurbanipal from the Urukeans. This time, however, it is specified that this was done during an inspection (\textit{masnaqtu}) of Uruk and that the orchards had been given to Ninurta of Uruk.\footnote{That the people were aware of a distinction between private and institutional property (and the necessity of keeping written documentation as evidence for one’s claims) is demonstrated for instance by YOS 19 92, a text edited by Beaulieu 2000: 37f., which records a dispute over land between the temple and a private individual.} This event was dated tentatively by Beaulieu to Assurbanipal’s 20th year (\textit{ibid.}). He understands this passage to refer to orchards “which Assurbanipal, king of Assyria, after checking (the cadastre of properties) in Uruk, returned to the people of Uruk and gave to the god Ninurta of Uruk” (2000: 35). Beaulieu’s interpretation of both phrases is problematic. The fact that the king entrusted the orchards to the gardeners in the first case or that he gave them to the god Ninurta in the second, contradicts the supposed restitution of the orchards to the citizens of Uruk. It can hardly be imagined why a king would restore private property only to infringe on the rights of the owners by assigning the plots to (dependent?) agricultural workers and why this would pass without a further comment in the text. Similarly, it makes little sense that property returned to the citizens would at the same time be given over to a temple, since, leaving aside special forms of property such as prebendary orchards or bit-rittis, at this time a clear distinction was made between private and institutional property.\footnote{The dative object of the preposition $\text{in}a$ $\text{qât}$ is not explicitly stated in the fourth section. By analogy, however, we can assume that the beneficiary here was the goddess Ušur-amässu. While Beaulieu’s considerations concerning the dating of Assurbanipal’s restitution of misappropriated land are on the whole still valid, it would appear that the urban population of Uruk, rather than some unruly tribesmen, encroached upon the properties of the gods at some point prior to Assurbanipal’s \textit{masnaqtu} of Uruk.} The interpretation hinges on the understanding of the preposition $\text{in}a$ $\text{qât}$. It has an ablative-separative meaning and the Urukeans in the expression $\text{in}a$ $\text{qât}$ uruk$\text{ša}’$ya cannot be translated as a dative object, as proposed by Beaulieu.\footnote{The dative object of the verb $\text{turru}$ stands in conjunction with the verb $\text{nad}$$\text{ánu}$. The dative object is not explicitly stated in the fourth section. By analogy, however, we can assume that the beneficiary here was the goddess Ušur-amässu. While Beaulieu’s considerations concerning the dating of Assurbanipal’s restitution of misappropriated land are on the whole still valid, it would appear that the urban population of Uruk, rather than some unruly tribesmen, encroached upon the properties of the gods at some point prior to Assurbanipal’s \textit{masnaqtu} of Uruk.} The phrase can only signify that the land had been taken “from the Urukeans” and restituted to the temple property.\footnote{Note that Cocquerillat 1968: 24 understands and translates this expression correctly (Her translation of the lines 31-32, however, is incorrect in the light of the collations made by Beaulieu). \textit{CAD T}: 267 also understands the phrase in this way.} In the seventh section the beneficiary of the returned land, the god Ninurta, was explicitly noted. Here he is not directly dependent on the verb $\text{turru}$ but stands in conjunction with the verb $\text{nad}$$\text{ánu}$. The dative object is not explicitly stated in the fourth section. By analogy, however, we can assume that the beneficiary here was the goddess Ušur-amässu. While Beaulieu’s considerations concerning the dating of Assurbanipal’s restitution of misappropriated land are on the whole still valid, it would appear that the urban population of Uruk, rather than some unruly tribesmen, encroached upon the properties of the gods at some point prior to Assurbanipal’s \textit{masnaqtu} of Uruk.

Another interesting aspect of this text is the fact that estates of several deities are listed in it (Ušur-amässu, Gilgameš, Ea and Ninurta), but the caption of the text identifies them as belonging to Ištar and Naniya. This probably means that the Eanna temple, being the largest in the city, administered the properties of other gods, whose sanctuaries, if they were separate households at all, rather than shrines within the Eanna precinct, depended on it in some way or another.
known that the temple of Uṣur-amāssu was within the Eanna temple complex (Beaulieu 2003: 252). Ninurta had a separate sanctuary, but his estates seem to have belonged to him only nominally. They were in fact administered by the Eanna temple and were practically the property of the Lady of Uruk and Nanāya. This is demonstrated by an unpublished inittu debt note for dates (PTS 3175) quoted by Beaulieu (2003: 302) which states that the plot from which the impost is due is “located on (the estates of) the temple of Ninurta” and is the property of Ḫstar of Uruk (ll. 1-3: [x]+2 gur zû-lum-ma sag-du  ’zag¹ / ṭsá¹ [a]-ṣâ  ṭsá ina ê  ’maš nîg-ga / ṭ333;innin³ unug¹). As for the cult of Gilgameš in Uruk – practically nothing is known about it (see note 1257). The cult of Ea and his apparently independent sanctuary in Uruk are also briefly discussed by Beaulieu (2003: 337f.). Our text demonstrates that the estates of these deities, of which some were worshipped within Eanna and others had separate sanctuaries, stood under the control of the administration of Eanna.

4.4.2. AnOr 9 31265 (2 Kan)

This text is formally very similar to the previously discussed AnOr 9 2. The caption is unfortunately damaged. Line 1 reads: azăkiri,meš šá é dingir meš […]. The sign meš could be understood as a plural marker. The phrase would mean then: “Orchards of the temples […?]”. Alternatively meš which is written just before the break could be read as the beginning of the word mešatu/mešātu which also fits in the context of cadastral texts. In this case the caption would read: “Orchards of the temple, measu[rement(s) ...]”. This is followed by a list of orchards, organised in sections, giving the frontage in cubits and the personal name of an individual in some way responsible for it. This text records 52 orchards, of which seven were large plots. Most frequently the frontages of the orchards were 100 or 200 cubits, but there were some smaller and larger ones as well. Some of the properties were considerably larger then the others, with frontages of 1,000 cubits in four instances, 2,000 cubits in two instances, and 4,000 cubits in one instance. The largest of these were not attributed to any individuals, but are just given a location.

Some of the personal names and even entire orchard groups from specific locations from AnOr 9 2 reappear in this text (see the table below). AnOr 9 3 is divided into five sections, with a caption and a colophon (by contrast, AnOr 9 2 has seven sections). The first section includes ten orchards (possibly totalling 1,300 cubits of frontage1266) from “above the city”. The second one lists seven orchards (1,600 cubits) of the god Gilgameš. The third section enumerates 10 orchards (1,120 cubits) from “below the city”. The fourth section contains nine orchards (680 cubits) of the Ea temple. The fifth section is not uniform, but records 16 orchards (and larger plots) from various localities: the Akītu-house of the steppe, Bit-Mūrat-Sīn, Bītu-ša-Bazzīya, Bit-Zabûnu, Bit-Saggāya on the canal Nār-šāngī, Bīt-Sīn-karābī-īšme, the canals Ḫarru-ša-Rēmūt, Nār-šārri, Nār-Bānītu, Nārū-ešētu, Ḫarru-tābu and Nār-Amurr. The text also has a colophon. The scribe Nabû-ušallim//Sīn-leqe-unninni, is a kalû-singer of Ḫstar, a scribe of Eanna and the šangū of Nusku. This provides the only obvious connection to the Eanna temple, since this temple or its main goddesses are not otherwise mentioned in the text. Together with the fact that some of the orchards appearing in this text are almost certainly identical with some from the cadastre AnOr 9 2, which names Ḫstar and Nanāya as owners of these orchards, it is more than likely that the estates enumerated in AnOr 9 3 also belonged to Eanna.

The following table shows how the sections of the two texts co-relate. Small variations in the number of orchards in the given section or in the total length of the frontages can be observed; however, no particular trend could be established. The total frontage length is smaller in several cases in AnOr 9 3 (sections II, III, IV), but the number of orchards in the given localities varies in both directions: there are fewer orchards in section II, but more in sections III and IV in comparison to the corresponding sections of AnOr 9 2. Thus the variations in frontage length cannot be correlated with the changing number of orchards in a direct way:

---

1265 The text is partially edited by Cocquerillat (1968: 2441. 107) and discussed by her (1984a: 55). It is also briefly commented on by Beaulieu (2000: 36f.).
1266 A portion of the figures for the frontage lengths is damaged. Following reconstructions seem possible: l. 4: 1 me [Ø]; l. 5: 1 me [Ø]; l. 6: 5[0 Ø]; l. 7: 5[0 Ø]; l. 8: 1 [me Ø]; l. 9: 1 [me Ø]; l. 10: 2 [me Ø]; l. 11: 2 [me Ø].
Not only are the same regions represented in both texts, but, as was noted earlier, a number of orchards and individuals responsible for them appear in both texts. This is exemplified in the following samples:

- **Orchards above the city**

  *AnOr* 9 2, section I
  1. 8: 50 Bēl-ah-iddin/Marduk
  1. 9: 50 Aḫ-širši
  1. 11: 100 Bēl-ipuš
  1. 12: 200 Ḫešu
  1. 14: pab 11 gškiri₆ me₆ 1,300 mi-ši-iḫ-ti qaqa-ru šā ugu uru
  “In total: 11 orchards; (total frontage:) 1,300 (cubits); measurement of land, which is above the city.”

  *AnOr* 9 3, section I
  1. 6: [50 ṭ] Marduk/Dummuq
  1. 7: [50 ṭ] Aḫ-širši/Multarriḫ-Adad
  1. 9: [100 ṭ] Bēl-ipuš/Nabû-šum-iškun
  1. 10: [200 ṭ] Ḫešu/Rémīt
  1. 12: pab [10 gškiri₆ me₆] ugu uru
  “In total: [10 orchards] above the city.” (Total frontage: 1,300° cubits)

- **Orchards of Gilgameš**

  *AnOr* 9 2, section II
  1. 21: 500 Bēl-erība
  1. 22: pab 7 gškiri₆ me₆ 1,800 mi-ši-iḫ-ti qaqa-ru gškiri₆ d gškiri₆ šar-kal-Šem
  “In total: 7 orchards; (total frontage:) 1,800 (cubits); measurement of the land, orchards of Gilgameš."

---

1267 The name Multarriḫ-Adad (multarriḫ is a Dt participle of šarāḫu) appears as a patronymic twice in *AnOr* 9 3, in line 7 and 23. The first sign, mul, has a somewhat peculiar form. Originally the sign was comprised of three dingir signs. In the later periods this was usually written as a combination of the sign naṭu followed by one dingir sign. In *AnOr* 9 3 the first part of the sign looks like zálag followed by dingir embedded between two horizontal wedges (this is shown in the copy and is verified by a collation using a photo of the tablet). In other words, the number and the orientation of the wedges correspond to the sign mul; their arrangement, however, is deviant. While the sign mul was rendered accurately, the copy exhibits some errors and omissions following this sign (both in line 7 and 23). The following signs appear in the copy: *mul-tar-ri-ri-bi*. After consulting a photo of the tablet the reading of the name could be corrected to *mul-tar-ri-ri-biš*škur. Though the signs are clear the copyist for some reason inserted a redundant ri and omitted *š*škur at the end of the line.
AnOr 9 3, section II
l. 13: 500 Bēl-eriba/Dummuq
l. 20: pab 7 gūkiri₆₇ mel dē u-bi₂₉-ta₂₆₇ mes... ¹²⁶⁸
“In total: 7 orchards of Gilgameš.” (Total frontage: 1,600 cubits)

• Orchards below the city

AnOr 9 2, section V
l. 34: gūkiri₆₇ mel šā ki-ta uru mu-ne
“Orchards which are below the city; his name¹²⁶⁹:”
l. 35: 100 Bēl-iṣuš
l. 36: 100 Nabū-uṣalli
l. 37: 100 Aḫ-lirši
l. 43: pab 8 gūkiri₆₇ mel 1,180 mi-ši-iḥ-ti 'qaq-ga-ru¹ šā ki-ta uru
“In total: 8 orchards; (total frontage:) 1,180 (cubits); measurement of the land which is below the city.”

AnOr 9 3, section III
l. 20: ... : gūkiri₆₇ mel šā ki-ta uru mu-ni
“Orchards which are below the city; his name:”
l. 21: 100 Bēl-iṣuš/Nabū-ṣum-iṣkun
l. 22: 100 Nabū-uṣalli/Šamšia
l. 23: 100 Šulāya/Multariḫ-Adad¹²⁷⁰
l. 31: pab 10 gūkiri₆₇ mel šā ki-ta uru
In total 10 orchards [which are below the city].” (Total frontage: 1,120 cubits)

• Orchards of Bit Ea

AnOr 9 2, section VI
l. 44: 40 Šumāya
l. 50: 200 Erēšu
l. 51: 70 Bēl-eriba
l. 52: pab 8 gūkiri₆₇ mel 720 sag-ki 'qaq-ga-ru šā gūkiri₆ e ē-a
“In total: 8 orchards; (total) frontage: 720 (cubits); land of the orchards of Bit Ea.”

AnOr 9 3 section IV
l. 37: 100 Šumāya/Ittabṣi
l. 39: 100 Erēšu/Rēmût
l. 40: 70 gūkiri₆₇ mel šā ē uru-a-mat-su Bēl-eriba/Dummuq
l. 42: pab 9 gūkiri₆₇ mel e ē-a
“In total: 9 orchards of Bit Ea.” (Total frontage: 680 cubits)

The fact that certain individuals are attested in both texts indicates that the chronological gap between the two texts cannot have been very large. The appearance of a certain Marduk, son of

¹²⁶⁸ This portion of the line is followed by three Winkelhaken placed one above the other signifying a caesura in this place. What follows (gūkiri₆₇ mel šā ki-ta uru mu-ne) should be understood as a caption for the next section (section III). In fact, this same caption appears in AnOr 9 2 in a separate line (l. 34) introducing the corresponding section V.
¹²⁶⁹ This remark refers to the following list of people to which the orchards are entrusted.
¹²⁷⁰ Šulāya and Aḫ-lirši were probably brothers, since in AnOr 9 3: 7 (section I) Aḫ-lirši has the same patronymic (for the reading see note 1267) as Šulāya. Here the orchard was swapped between the two brothers for some reason.
Dummuq, in section I of $AnOr$ 9 3 (l. 6) with a plot of 50 cubits “above the city” and of a certain Bēl-ah-iddin, son of Marduk, in the corresponding section of $AnOr$ 9 2 (l. 8) with a plot of 50 cubits in the same region of the Uruk countryside, suggests that the plot in $AnOr$ 9 3 was most probably transferred from father to son in $AnOr$ 9 2.\footnote{That we are dealing with the same plot here is also suggested by its position within the sequence of the listed orchards in both texts.} \footnote{Edited by Cocquerillat 1968: 20ff. 105f. and discussed in 1984a: 56ff.} In this case $AnOr$ 9 2 must have been composed slightly later than $AnOr$ 9 3, namely probably shortly after Assurbanipal’s twenty-third regnal year (= 2 Kan).

4.4.3. $AnOr$ 9 19\footnote{A possible exception is a short section (ll. 45-46) dealing with the land of Bīt-Nabû ($še$-$numun šá ō$) in section II. It is not clear whether this should be understood as the temple of Nabû or simply a toponym.} (not dated; probably Nbn)

Unfortunately this land register is not dated, but it can be placed in the reign of Nabonidus on prosopographical grounds (see below). The text differs from the other two $AnOr$ land registers in several formal aspects. It does not have a caption or a subscript and it is divided in sections which treat properties of widely varying sizes, from single orchards to entire irrigation districts. In general, however, it focuses on larger types of estates such as *šilṣuṣ* and *šumūṣu*. The properties are treated in greater detail than in the other two $AnOr$ texts: generally the dimensions and orientation of all the sides are given together with neighbours or adjacent topographical features. Frequently, the total surface area in seed-measure and the number of date palms planted on the property are also recorded. The text does not in any way allude to Eanna or its gods, nor is the owner of the land in any of the sections of the text mentioned.\footnote{This information must have been obvious to whichever person or institution drew up this document. Judging by the quantities of land recorded, it is beyond doubt that the text is dealing with institutional, either temple or crown, properties. However, Eanna seems the more likely candidate on account of the archival context.} This text has been interpreted by the scribe: pab (gap) *ina li-$b$-$bi$ $še$-$numun šá ina šu $lu$ $ša$-$hi$-$še$ tur-$ru$. The gap should have contained the total surface area of this *šumūṣu*, which was 1420;1 (or some 1,775.25 ha). This land, or at least a part of it, in case one more set of figures was supposed to be entered in the gap, was returned from the *māḥiṣuṣu*.\footnote{The implications of this brief remark are not clear. The instigator and the beneficiary of this restitution are not explicitly stated. It can be assumed that the land in question had been returned to the temple property (perhaps through royal action as is attested in $AnOr$ 9 2). However, why and when the *māḥiṣuṣu* encroached on temple land and when the restitution took place cannot be ascertained.}

The first section (ll. 1-6) deals with the *šumūṣu* of the irrigation district Ḥarrātū, which is in front of Dūr-Ugūm. In the west it borders on the canal (Nār-)Ḥarrātū and the land of men designated as *māḥiṣuṣu*.\footnote{Cocquerillat sees in the *tur-$ru$ at the end of l. 6, not as a stative of the verb *turru*, but as the adjective *še$hr$u* (tur-$ru$), thus interpreting the summary as “ensemble des terres arables de cette circonscription qui sont aux mains de jeunes défricheurs”. This interpretation, however, can be excluded because of the incongruence of numerus of the adjective *še$hr$u* and the noun *māḥiṣu*.} In the east it borders on the land of the *šangū* and the *nakkan$u$-land. These flanks are 26,300 cubits long. Both frontages measure 2,700 cubits. One of them borders on the Takk²ru in the north and the other one on Bēb$°$ilti and the land of the *māḥiṣuṣu* in the south. This is followed by a summary (l. 6) which has not been completed by the scribe: pab (gap) *ina li-$b$-$bi$ $še$-$numun šá ša$ $lu$ $ša$-$hi$-$še$ tur-$ru$. The gap should have contained the total surface area of this *šumūṣu*, which was 1420;1 (or some 1,775.25 ha). This land, or at least a part of it, in case one more set of figures was supposed to be entered in the gap, was returned from the *māḥiṣuṣu*.\footnote{Cocquerillat sees in the *šumūṣu* settlers of the Urukean hinterlands whose main task was the reclamation of the land for agricultural production (“défricheurs”, 1968: 20$^{\text{36}}$; 1984a: 70). While *māḥiṣu* can denote a ploughman (working with a *mav$u$ru*-plough), this usage seems to be restricted to the Old-Babylonian period (though the verb *māḥiṣu* appears once in an agricultural albeit unclear context in *Dar.* 273: 16 (cf. CAD Š/2: 339 sub *še$ši$tu*). Equivalents from lexical lists (e.g., lū ū$⁵$ban tag-ga) suggest that *māḥiṣu* were equipped with bows (this is also noted by Cocquerillat 1968: 20$^{\text{36}}$) and could designate hunters or military personnel (CAD M/1: 102). For the Neo-Babylonian period the term is translated as “military scout” by the CAD. It is suggested there (p. 103) that the *māḥiṣu* are not the same in this period as the archers who are designated as *še$hr$u*-ban. Furthermore a text from Nippur implies that the *māḥiṣu* were organized in *ḥatrus* (PBS 2/1 41:3). This indicates that the land they occupied may well have been a kind of military-fief, a part of the land-service system employed by the crown at that time.}
The text then deals with another smaller plot adjacent to the one just described, apparently separated from it by the canal ħiltu (ll. 7-10). It was situated south of Bāb-Ḫiltī and occupied a surface of 70;1 kurru (2,700×1,300 cubits = 87.75 ha). A portion of this land was measured and characterised as date orchards (l. 10: ... ina še-numun šé-kiriš, zaq-pu). The following five sections of the text (ll. 11-32) describe five adjacent date orchards. These orchards were perhaps part of the larger plot situated south of Bāb-Ḫiltī which was described in ll. 7-10. They are introduced as “šé-kiriš, (in one case: a-šà) šà PN”. The identity of these people could not be established with much certainty. Their names are: Ubār-Naša(Y/Nabû-šum-iddin, Nabû-tukulti-ēdu/Qurdā(ya, Bēltu-ērēš/Abušā(ya (? |a-bu-ga-a), Tāb-Uruk/Aqrā(ya and Nabû-nâṣir/Nabû-[x]. Only Nabû-tukulti-ēdu could be identified in another text. He appears in the debt note AnOr 9 11 (acc Dar) as the father of Zēria, a gardener (or sub-lessee) under Ardia, Eanna’s rent farmer for dates. The debt in dates is transposed into 13;1 barley and is to be repaid at harvest time using the measure of the Lady of Uruk in the settlement Bāb-Ḫiltī. The date debt is in fact an imittu obligation which stems from the fifth regnal year of Cambyses1276, which Zēria obviously did not deliver on time. The text gives us a point of reference for the temporal setting of AnOr 9 19: as the maximum temporal gap between the two texts is one generation, AnOr 9 19 can be dated to the reign of Nabonidus. Another point of interest is the identity of Zēria, and therefore also of his father and his fellow companions in AnOr 9 19. Zēria was clearly entrusted with an orchard which belonged to the temple and was part of Ardia’s rent farm for dates. Similarly then, the five orchards described in the cadastral text AnOr 9 19 could be temple land entrusted to gardeners or sub-lessees of large-scale rent farmers. Perhaps the orchard of Nabû-tukulti-ēdu was the same as the one referred to in AnOr 9 11, the use of which must have simply been transferred to his son Zēria. The appearance of Bāb-Ḫiltī as place of delivery for the owed barley in AnOr 9 11 may support this identification. However, it should be noted that Zēria also held arable land and a date orchard in this area as a bow fief. According to the debt note this land was mortgaged as security for the debt.1277 The existence of bow fiefs in this area, in the hands of the son of one of the protagonists, makes it seem equally possible that the orchards described in AnOr 9 19 were bow fiefs or similar land-for-service types of properties, i.e. land distributed by the crown. Again, the only thing that speaks in favour of Eanna as the owner of the land listed in AnOr 9 19 is the archival context of the tablet.

These five orchards were of uniform size 0;3.3 (350×100 cubits = 8,750 m²), which is indicative of institutional planning, be it the palace or the temple. These sections also state how many (mature and young) date palms were planted on the plots, which demonstrates that the density of planting was about 286 (ll. 11-14) or 300 palms per surface kurru (ll. 15-18 and 19-22).1278

The next section (ll. 33-38) is not entirely clear. It gives three sets of measurements, starting with a smaller plot with a surface area of 280 kurru (2,000×7,000 cubits = 350 ha). It is designated as bit ʾx,1, perhaps bit dūlī as suggested by Cocquerillat (1968: 105: ʾdulī for ʾdul-(lu) at the end of line 33), i.e. arable land. The description of this plot occupies only one line and no details on the neighbours or the orientation of the sides is given. The next measured plot is larger (with a surface area of some 600 kurru or approximately 750 ha) and is described in more detail. It is referred to as šihū ša qatuš rabū (l. 34: ši-iḫḫi ša šu′nu gal-lu). This description, “the narrow, large estate”, to all likelihood refers to the shape of the property.1279 Its flanks which are 12,000

1276 The text does not name the monarch, but Cambyses is the only possible candidate, since Ardia was the rent farmer from 8 Cyr to 7 Camb.
1278 See also Cocquerillat 1968: 22. The figures for the last two sections are not clear. In l. 26 100 mature and a number of young palms are recorded. The copy only shows two Diš signs for the second numeral which Cocquerillat interprets as 120. This kind of notation seems unusual. A collation is necessary to help decide whether this interpretation should be accepted or whether the copy should be emended to 1 meš in this place. The pertinent spot in the last section is damaged (l. 31). The copy shows 50 mature palm trees followed by a Diš and a break. Cocquerillat’s reconstruction to [160] young palm trees is purely hypothetical.
1279 It measures roughly 6,000×1,250 metres. Note that Cocquerillat translates this phrase as “exploitations petites et grandes” (1968: 21).
cubits long\footnote{1280} border in the east and west on plots of named individuals and a *nakkandu* (in the west). The northern frontage of 3,000 cubits lies on Ḫarru-ša-Nadnāya and the southern one (2,000 cubits) is next to the settlement Šingu and the tells (l. 37: da *ši-in-gu u duₙₕₚ*).\footnote{1281} The last part of this section is not entirely clear. It reads: 4 lim uₘₚₙₕₚ *ma-li re-e-li ka-šu-ú* (l. 38), i.e. a plot with a flank of 4,000 cubits was waterlogged, while the rest of the land is characterised as *kālū*, lower quality land. Perhaps this should be understood as further specification of the previously described 600 *kurru* plot. In this case the remaining *kālū* land would have a flank length of 8,000 cubits and would represent two thirds of the entire plot. In other words, of the 600 *kurru* of land, one third was presumably uncultivable because of waterlogging, while the other two thirds were not cultivated, but could be reclaimed for date cultivation. However, it is still not clear how the first plot with a surface area of 280 *kurru* (l. 33) is connected to the rest of the plots described in this section.

A place not otherwise attested is the subject of the next section (ll. 39-44). A *limu* ša ḫulḫulu (6,800×1,100 cubits = 187 ha) borders with its western frontage on the Euphrates and with its eastern one on the land of the *māḫīšus*. The northern and the southern flanks border on the *nakkandu* and the (land of) the *šangū* and the *nakkandu* respectively. Of the total surface of 149;3 *kurru* (a gap was left empty for this figure in l. 44) 10 *kurru* were *t=<x*lu. Cocquerillat (1968: 106) reads *dul(?)-lu*, but the traces do not conform with the sign *dul*. They would rather suggest a more elongated sign, perhaps *da*. The land in question could then be *bit dāli*, land irrigated by buckets, or in other words land without direct access to an irrigation canal.

The following section is short (ll. 45-46) and concerns the land of the Nabû temple according to the caption (l. 45: *š-e-numun ša é *āg). Possibly Bit-Nabû should be understood as a toponym here. It just gives the measurement of 800 cubits (= 400 m) for the northern frontage and informs us that the northern and the southern frontage bordered on a *nakkandu*.

The next section deals with the *limu* or *šiḫu*\footnote{1282} of Bāb-maḫīri in Bit-Amukanu which is on all sides surrounded by *nakkandu*-land (ll. 47-55). Of this land (3,850×350 cubits = 26;4.4.3 or approximately 33.69 ha; the total surface area was again left out by the scribe) 2;0.3 (= 2.625 ha) are planted with 630 date palms and 1;0.5 (= 1.46 ha) of land with 350 palms. In both cases this amounted to 300 date palms per *kurru* of land. An area of 2;2.1.3 (350×350 cubits = 3.06 ha) is said to be *kālū* (land of lower quality which could be reclaimed for date cultivation).

Land planted with date palms in the estate of Šakillatu is treated next (ll. 56-61). Some 3;4.1.3 of land (700×275 cubits = 4.81 ha) are planted with 500 date palms which gives a relatively low average of 130 date palms per *kurru* of land. The neighbouring plot with a surface of 2;2.3 (500×250 cubits = 3.13 ha) is designated as *kaslu*, another term for uncultivated land or land of lower quality.

4.4.4. RA 54, 86-87\footnote{1283} (no date extant; Nbk or later)

This fragmentary land register is similar to the preceding one in that it deals with larger types of properties. They are, however, explicitly designated as belonging to *Ištar* of Uruk. This register is not as detailed as *AnOr* 9 19 since it omits the orientation of the sides of the plots and records the measurements for just one set of sides, i.e. one frontage and one flank.

The first estate (ll. 1-3) is situated to the right of Nār-šarri. The frontage of [1,300 cubits] was on the canal and the flank of 2,000 cubits (bordered on) the settlement Šanābu. This estate had a total surface area of 52 *kurru* of land (= 65 ha).

The next section (ll. 4-5) describes the property donated by the princess Kaššiyā\footnote{1284} to *Ištar* of Uruk. The size of the frontage, which is on Nār-šarri, is unfortunately broken off ([x]+100) and the flank was 2,000 cubits long. The total surface area of this plot is not given.

\footnote{1280} Cocquerillat erroneously reads these numerals as “u 2,000” (1968: 105). The side measurements are generally not introduced by an *u*, nor are the flank measurements in this very section.

\footnote{1281} The “tells” signified perhaps smaller (abandoned?) settlements.

\footnote{1282} The text reads: IGI-I-MU ša kā ki-lam *ina é a-mak-a-nu* (l. 47). This could be an unusual writing for *limu*; lim白色 or li-I-mu (the reading *li* was in use in the first millennium according to von Soden/Röllig 1976: 51). Alternatively this could be a garbled writing intended to express the word *šiḫu* (*ši-I-lu/bī*).

\footnote{1283} The text was published by Labat 1960 and discussed by Cocquerillat 1968: 23 and 1984a: 60.

\footnote{1284} Kaššiyā was a daughter of Nebuchadnezzar, see Beaulieu 1998a with further references to this princess.
The following section (ll. 6-8) describes a plot in the district Šakillatu with a frontage of 3,500 cubits and a flank of 12,000 cubits stretching from the royal highway to the district Lesser Rudâya. This amounted to 840 kurrû of land (= 1,050 ha) of Ihtar of Uruk in Šakillatu.

The next section (ll. 9-10) deals with a property with a frontage (its length is lost in a break) bordering on the district lesser Rudâya. The length of the flank is 5,000 cubits, and the total surface measures over 200 kurrû (the numeral is damaged), i.e. over 250 hectares.

The rest of the text is badly damaged. Only the place name Ḫussêtu is still decipherable in line 11.

4.4.5. Montserrat I (no date extant; 13 Nbn or later)  

This fragmentary text was published and edited by Wunsch 1997: 141ff. It deals with properties of Eanna outside and within the city, including orchards and larger estates (e.g., a šihû) and giving detailed information on the side measurements, orientation and neighbours. There is no date in the extant portion of the text, but a purchase of a plot in the thirteenth year of Nabonidus is mentioned, which gives the terminus post quem for the composition of this text.

The first extant section (ll. 1'-5') is badly damaged. It deals with a plot bordering on a canal in the west. The name of the canal is broken off, but could have been Ḥarrû-ša-Nanâûya, which would place the plot in the vicinity of the plot treated in the following section. Its surface area was 3340.1 (= 4.76 ha).

The second section (ll. 6'-9'), which is also badly broken gives the measurements of a plot (of approximately 0.96 ha) of a certain Balâssu, which was bought for silver in 13 Nbn. The purchaser was presumably the Eanna temple. Its northern and southern flanks were 450 cubits long and bordered temple land (libbû eqli).  

The length of the western frontage was 85 cubits and it bordered on the drainage ditch of the ḥanšû-properties (makallû ša ḥanšê). The eastern frontage was next to Ḥarrû-ša-Nanâûya.

The well preserved third section (ll. 10'-14'), concerns an estate on the upper Nâr-šarri, above the city. The northern flank of 8,250 cubits was next to a nakkandu. The southern flank of [8],000 cubits was next to a nakkandu and a plot of a certain Inâín-zêr-iqîša, son of Nergal-êṭer. The frontages both measured 1,100 cubits. The western one lay on the canal Nâr-elepêṭi and the eastern one on the Nâr-šarri. The total surface area of this plot was 1673.4.3 (= 209.69 ha). A portion of this land, namely 24;1 kurrû (= 30.25 ha), was planted with date palms and occupied by the prebendary gardeners rab banê. Further remarks indicate that this area was to be inspected (ana amârû) and the remainder of the planted land was to be registered (ana šatârû) as nakkandu.

An orchard of the šatammu Nabû-ahlê-iddûn, a donation of the king Nebuchadnezzar to the Lady of Uruk, is the subject of the next section (ll. 15'-19'). Its eastern flank was situated on the

---

1285 Note the possibility that this text formed a join with PTS 2076 (p. 348) for which a later dating (4 Cyr or later) must be assumed (see note 1291).

1286 Instead of a reference to a neighbour, a person (or rather his estate) or a topographical feature, some plot surveys have the remark eqlu libbû eqli or its abbreviated form libbû eqli. The CAD translates the expression as “field (which was before) part of the (same) field” (CAD L: 173). The meaning of this expression was discussed by Steinmetzer (1934: 203ff.). In particular in land sale documents this could indicate that the purchased plot bordered on the land which already belonged to the purchaser. This typically happened when landowners expanded their property “at the expense” of their neighbours. The purchased plot and the adjoining land had a common border which was expressed with (eqlu) libbû eqli and which at the moment of purchase ceased to be a border. This expression also appears in the context of purchases of two or more contiguous plots, where again it designates their common border. This was particularly the case with plots of irregular shape which had been split up for surveying purposes into two or more regularly shaped polygons. In such cases the expression (eqlu) libbû eqli was used to indicate the side adjoined by the next surveyed polygon (Wunsch 2000 I: 28f.). The term libbû eqli also appears in our land registers several times. In some cases the second use of the term, i.e. in case of contiguous plots or sub-plots (PTS 2076: sections nine and twelve), is applicable. Most of the time, however, this usage of the term does not fit as the surveyed plots are not direct neighbours with the subsequently listed plots. In these cases libbû eqli simply indicates that the surveyed plot, which was temple property, had the same owner as that particular neighbouring plot. In other words, it indicated that here temple land bordered on temple land.

1287 It is not clear exactly which terms of ownership are expressed by the phrase: kirû ša Nabû-ahlê-iddyin šatammu ša Nabû-kudur-uṣur šar Bâbîli ana Bêlit ša Ūruk ıddînu. On the one hand it is evident that the
upper Nār-šarrī above the city and the southern frontage on Ḫarrū-ša-Abûl-Adad, which was apparently an offshoot of the right bank of the royal canal and which probably flowed close to the Adad-gate of the city. The northern frontage bordered on the property of Innin-zēr-qiṣṭā, son of Nergal-êter. This was probably the same neighbour as in the previous section, meaning that the ‘orchard of the šαtαmmu’ was situated south of the estate from the third section and west of the upper Nār-šarrī, with just the property of Innin-zēr-qiṣṭā in between. The total surface area of the orchard was 3;0.4.4 (= 3.94 ha).

The fifth section (ll. 20′-24′) deals with the plot of a certain Nabû-âlḫē-šullîm, son of Nabû-udammîq, which had been confiscated by the temple as compensation for the arrears charged against him. This man is known from other sources as a ploughman (ikkaru) and an overseer of the ploughmen (rab ikkarâti) and the arrears in question most probably stem from his agricultural activities. The plot with a surface of 3;3 kurru (500×360 cubits = 4.5 ha) was apparently not very productive. It was designated as zēru kālû and it was only partially planted with date palms; only 3 siṭu of the land (= 1,250 m²) were planted with 30 palm trees. This, however, corresponds to the regular planting density, found for instance in AnOr 9 19, of 300 palms per kurru of land. Nevertheless, this was a well situated plot. In the north it bordered on the canal Nār-damqat, in the south on the ballatu-orchards, which probably means it was close to the city, in the west on the property of the provincial governor šakin mātî and in the east on the royal highway which led to Larsa (ḫarrān šarrī ša Larsa).

The next section (ll. 25′-28′) is damaged. It deals with a property within the city, left of the Šamaš-gate, and next to the houses of the Urukeans, i.e. private houses. It is mentioned in a broken context that the measurements (of the plot) have not changed, apart from a plot of 0;0.1.3 (= 625 m²) of a certain Eṭirtû, which, it seems, has been appropriated by her. At the end of the section it is remarked that this was recorded according to an old ledger (l. 28′: a-ki-i gû da sumun ša-ṭir). Similar remarks reappear in the ninth section (ll. 34′-37′) which is also broken and concerns a plot next to Nār-Bānîtu. At the end of section nine the remark ana dabâbî, “to be contested (in court)”, is still visible meaning that the status of the property was for some reason disputed.

The remainder of the tablet, sections seven to nine, is badly damaged. However, an interesting remark from the eighth section should be mentioned here. In l. 31′ which refers to a plot on the Nār-Bānîtu, it is stated that the measurements were taken “according to his tablet” (ki-i pi-i imdub-šû ma-ši-ilî) indicating that the entries in these land registers could be made based on written documentation, without actual surveys. At other times surveys were considered necessary as is indicated by the remark ana amârî found in section three.

---

1288 This individual is not attested elsewhere.
1289 See pp. 114ff. Nabû-âlḫē-šullîm is attested with the title rab ikkarâti in acc Ner (BIN 1 123), but he has been active in the temple agriculture at least since 26 Nbk (VS 20 134) and also had the function of a rab ešerti (“overseer of ten plough teams”) in 34 Nbk (YBC 4000, published by Janković 2005).
This text is very similar to Montserrat 1. Not only the content and the handwriting (as far as could be discerned from the photos) but also the shapes of these two tablet fragments suggest that they could be joined. I have not had a chance to see the original in Spain, but C. Wunsch published a photo of the tablet was used to check whether the two texts can be joined. The photos of the two fragments were scaled and put together. Even though the shape of the break matched well it became obvious that they do not form a direct join. The text on both fragments is organised in sections of two or, more frequently, more lines which are divided by incised horizontal lines. The sections on the two fragments together with their division lines do not match up when put together. If the two fragments nevertheless stemmed from one tablet, then several lines are missing between them. This would result in a peculiar format of a large and very elongated tablet. It should be noted furthermore, that the two fragments match up in such a way that the obverse of the one and the reverse of the other tablet are on one side. What I classified as the obverse of PTS 2076, because of its more flattened surface, matches up with what Wunsch classified as reverse. As I did not have a chance to inspect the Montserrat tablet there is no way of telling whether the obverse-reverse classification should be swapped for this tablet, or whether this is definitive proof that the two fragments did not belong to one tablet. At the very least they may have belonged to a series of cadastral texts.

Just like Montserrat 1 the Princeton text deals with orchards or occasionally larger plots (e.g., šīlu). The two texts exhibit a similar amount of detail: localisation, size and orientation of the plots are noted. In addition to this, they sometimes give information on the size of land actually planted with date palms.

Top part of the tablet is broken off. An unknown number of lines went missing. The first partially extant section (ll. 1'04') is in a desolate state of preservation. Not much can be said about its contents other than that it concerned a property with an eastern frontage on the canal När-Bânîtu.

The second section (ll. 5'09') is also very fragmentary. It describes an orchard, apparently a donation of the prince (dumu [ugal]) Itti-Šamaš-balâtu to the Lady of Uruk. Another land donation of this prince is recorded on the reverse of the tablet in section eight. This is to my knowledge the first attestation of the prince Itti-Šamaš-balâtu. According to Beaulieu, if a son or a daughter of a king is mentioned without specifying the king’s name, they must have been the offspring of the ruling king (1998a: 173:\textsuperscript{3}). As the text mentions Nabonidus’s 15\textsuperscript{th} regnal year in line 36' could this mean that Itti-Šamaš-balâtu was a hitherto unattested son of Nabonidus?\textsuperscript{1291} Its western frontage was next to the royal highway of the Šamaš-gate (rev. l. 7": ḫarrān šarrī [ša kā]-gal ūtu).\textsuperscript{1292} The plot was of considerable size − over 22 kurru surface area (22:\textsuperscript{1};1.4.2.5 = over 27.5 ha) of which at least 9 kurru (= 11.25 ha) were probably planted with date palms.

The third section (ll. 10'14') concerns a lūmu situated right and left of the Šamaš-gate on the city moat (Ḫaršû). The western flank (1,425 cubits) was next to [PN], a šakin mātî. The eastern flank (1,425 cubits) was next to the plot of a certain Lābāšī/Mûrānu. The southern frontage (1,420

\textsuperscript{1290} The text is edited in the Appendix 1. A few brief comments on the text were made already by Beaulieu 2000: 35, who noted the reference to Assurbanipal’s restitution of land to the god Ninurta (section ten), which also appears in the earlier cadastre AnOr 9 2.

\textsuperscript{1291} Unless it is presumed that a son of one of the Achaemenid rulers assumed a Babylonian name, for which, however, there is no evidence. If Itti-Šamaš-balâtu was indeed a son of Nabonidus, and Beaulieu’s assumption on the use of names of the members of the royal family is correct, this would imply that the text was composed toward the end of Nabonidus’s reign, i.e. between his 15\textsuperscript{th} and 17\textsuperscript{th} regnal year, and not later. However, this is refuted by the appearance of the šakin ūmî Imbia as one of the neighbours in section three. Imbia is attested in this office only from 4 Cyr to 6 Camb (Kümmel 1979: 140; Kleber 2008: 39). Before him Nāдин, son of Balâtu, was the šakin ūmî of Uruk from 13 Nbn to 1 Cyr, followed by Šulaya/Ṭâbiya/Ḫunzû in 2 Cyr and Nabû-šar-uṣur/Bûnû in 3 Cyr (Kleber \textit{ibid.}). Therefore the text cannot be dated prior to 4 Cyr and Beaulieu’s theory about the members of the ruling royal family and their appearance in texts is at least in this case not applicable.

\textsuperscript{1292} This was the part of the highway which passed through the Šamaš-gate and which perhaps led to Larsa.
cubits) was next to Imbia, the šakin 麾m. This and what seems to be temple property (libbû egli; this portion of the text is damaged). The northern frontage was shorter: it was 550 cubits long (the neighbours are broken off). This complicated the calculation somewhat so the scribe left the line giving the total surface area blank. The surface of this limu amounted to about 28;0.2.1.0.5 kurrû of land (= 35.09 ha).

The fourth section (ll. 15'-20') describes an orchard left of Nār-Bānuṭu, which was at the disposal of Anu-ah-iddin and Šamaš-zēr-lišir, the sons of Šamaš-iddin, two prebendary gardeners (rab banē). The details on the sides and neighbours are very fragmentary, it can only be deduced that the eastern frontage was on the Nār-Bānuṭu. At the end of this section there is mention of land which was (recorded) in the ledger of the rab banē (l. 18': ści-numun ina ṣama da ša lû-gal dû(m)), indicating that separate documentation concerning the land allotted to the prebendary gardeners was kept by the temple administration. This is followed by a remark about the land at the Šamaš-gate which was at the disposal of a certain Bēl-ipuš, the rab banē. Perhaps this meant that the plot in question, the orchard at the disposal of the two brothers Anu-ah-iddin and Šamaš-zēr-lišir, was (erroneously?) assigned to the prebendary gardener Bēl-ipuš in the land register of the rab banē.

The next section (ll. 21'-30') also treats land assigned to the two brothers, the prebendary gardeners Anu-ah-iddin and Šamaš-zēr-lišir. This orchard is designated as gizzêtu, part of the orchard of the two brothers (l. 21': ędzi-kiri₃ gi-iz-ze-tu₄ ša ina ści-numun ędzi-kiri₃ ša PN₁ u PN₂). The specific legal or administrative connotations of the term gizzêtu are unfortunately not known to us. It may have implied property which had been confiscated by an administrative institution. Be that as it may, this gizzêtu-orchard is situated opposite “the royal highway of the Kanisurra-gate” (ḥarrān šarrī ša abul Kanisurra). Four neighbours are listed as adjacent to the western flank: Iqiša-Marduk, son of Arad-Gula, Arad-Innin, son of Amil-Nabû, Anu-ah-iddin, son of Nabû-balâssu-iqbi, and Arad-Innin, son of Bēl-iddin. These plots are said to be counted as the property of the king (l. 25': a-na nib-ga lug[a]l CLU-ma-nu-û!). It appears that this land, which belonged to the crown, was entrusted to certain individuals for use. The three latter neighbours also appear in this function in the seventh section of the tablet. Here also the neighbouring plots were counted to the property of the king, which makes it probable that we are dealing with the same set of plots, meaning that the orchards in sections five and seven shared these neighbours. Beside these individual plots the west side also bordered on other temple land (libbû egli), an empty river bed (nāru nadi) and akkullātu-land. One neighbour, a certain Balâṭu, son of Nabû-ēṭer, is listed as adjacent to the eastern flank. The northern frontage bordered on an empty river bed and akkullātu and the southern frontage on plots which are at the disposal of the two brothers, the prebendary gardeners Anu-ah-iddin and Šamaš-zēr-lišir, who appear as holders of the orchards in section four. It is then quite likely that this gizzêtu-orchard was adjacent to orchard described in the previous section and was situated to the north of it. The gizzêtu-orchard measured in total approximately 1;4.0.0.3.2 (= 2.25 ha).

The last extant section on the obverse of the tablet (ll. 31'-38') deals with the orchard of a certain Nādîn, son of Ištar-Šum-èrcû, and Šûlâyâ, son of Aḫulap-Ištar, which was situated on the

---

1293 See note 1291.
1294 No such texts are known from Eanna. However, from the Ebabbar of Sippar several texts containing more or less detailed surveys of land allotted to the rab banē have been identified (see Da Riva 2002: 141ff. for an edition and discussion of these texts).
1295 For a discussion of this term see p. 285.
1296 The term akkullātu designates clods of earth found on fields which were to be removed or broken up in the course of cultivation. It could also be used to designate a type of cereal fields (CAD A/1: 275f.). But contrary to what one might suspect on the grounds of akkullātu being something unwelcome which had to be carried away, these were not necessarily neglected fields with low productivity. This is demonstrated by one text from Sippar (CT 56 536) according to which the yield rates for the akkullātu-fields were to be determined by the relatively high factors of 11, 16 and even 23 (or rather 13?!) (Jursa 1995a: 165).
1297 The canal Nār-Bānuṭu ran along a north-south axis in this area. It ran to the east of the orchard in section four. This orchard was situated directly on the Nār-Bānuṭu. The orchard in the fifth section, however, did not have direct access to this watercourse. This means that it must have made a turn eastwards at the border of the two orchards.
left bank of the lower Nār-Bānītu. The northern flank was on the canal Nār-Bānītu. The neighbouring plots to the south and the west were assigned to a certain Šili̲la̲ya, son of Bānia, but counted to the property of the king. The neighbours along the eastern frontage were a certain Šama̲š-šum-lîšir and his brothers, the sons of Šilim-Bēl. These were probably the uncles of Šuláya, to whom (a part) of the plot in question originally belonged. The text goes on to clarify that the land (in total approximately 2;1.0.3.3 (= 2.79 ha)) was confiscated in 15 Nbn from Nādin and Šuláya as property of Eanna instead of the cattle arrears of Nādin’s father, and Šuláya’s grandfather, Šilim-Bēl. This demonstrates nicely how debts were transferred from generation to generation and could even be ‘inherited’ from grandfathers.

The seventh section (ll. rev. 1-8), which is the first one on the reverse of the tablet, is not entirely clear. The property, perhaps an orchard (the signs are broken off), attributed to a certain İn่า-qāt-[x], son of Bēl-ubûr, is said to have been measured according to his tablet (ki 珺ipišu mašiḥ). Unlike the other sections, however, this one does not give the complete information on the length of sides of the plot or their orientation. Only one flank of 40 cubits is mentioned. It bordered on the city moat (Haṛisû) and the wall-street (l. 6: sùq dîrī). This was then a relatively small plot (with one flank of approximately 20 m) in the immediate vicinity of the city. Several neighbours are listed, however, without giving their exact situation relative to our plot. One of the neighbouring plots is a hallatu-orchard at the disposal of a certain Šama̲š-iddin, son of Bēl-ipū. An additional remark specifies that this property (i.e. the hallatu-orchard) was registered as neighbouring the nakkan̲du of Ištar of Uruk. This probably means that the plot of İn่า-qāt-[x] appears in another document, perhaps in another one of the temple’s land registers, as temple’s nakkan̲du-land. Clearly the status of İn่า-qāt-[x]’s property was at stake here. This is confirmed by the following remark: “to be enquired into and registered” (l. rev. 3: ana mašālīti u šaṭārī). Other neighbours of the property are listed by name. These include Anu-ah-iddin, son of Nabû-balâ-su-iqbi, Arad-Iinnin, son of Amûl-Nabû, and Arad-Iinnin, son of Bēl-iddin and these plots are said to be counted as property of the king. As was noted, these three individuals already appear in section five as neighbours of the orchard described there. Therefore it is possible that the plots in section five and seven where not far from each other. The remainder of the section is not clear. Again the remarks ki pi ūppišu and ana šaṭārī appear.

The next section (ll. rev. 9-14) is less complicated. It concerns an orchard to the left of the Meslamtaea-gate, yet another donation of the prince (mar šarri) İtti-Šamaš-balatu (cf. section two). The western flank of the orchard (450 cubits) was next to the (city) wall and the eastern flank (350 cubits) next to the canal Nār-Lamassu. The northern frontage (210 cubits) was next to a certain Arrab, son of Bēl-usût. This plot counted to the property of the king (ša ana makkûr šarri immani). The southern frontage (120 cubits) was next to 2 sîtu of land designated as (zēru) aškuttu and three houses of the shepherds of the regular offerings (rēʾi sattukki). In total this orchard had the surface of 1;2.4.4.8 (= 1.95 ha), and of this 0;4.2 of land (= 1.08 ha) were planted.

The ninth section (ll. rev. 15-22) records an orchard left of the canal Ḥarru-ša-Nānâya. It was situated at the junction of this canal with the wall-street, i.e. close to the city wall. Whether it was inside or outside the city we cannot tell, because we do not know whether the wall-street followed the inner or the outer perimeter of the city wall. The temple appropriated this orchard from a certain Nâniya-ečēš, son of Nabû-ušallim, in place of his cattle arrears. As the orchard had an irregular shape, the measurements were taken separately for two portions of this plot. First the measurements of the larger portion were recorded. Its (western) flank (310 cubits) was next to the wall-street. The eastern flank (160 cubits) bordered on the houses of the Urukeans, i.e. private houses. The northern frontage (270 cubits) bordered on the aškuttu and the second portion of the plot (this is implied by the remark libbû eqlī), and the southern frontage (220 cubits) was next to the property of a certain Bēl-ahḫē-ḥeqṣa, son of Nabû-bēl-šumâtî, descendant of Šin-tabnî. The surface area of the first part of the orchard was 1;0.4.3.3 (= 1.44 ha). The portion of the plot

---

1298 Note that here the canal runs here along an east-west axis. See previous note.
1299 Note the similar expression (ki pi ūppišu mašiḥ) from Montserrat 1 (l. 31’).
1300 According to CAD A/2: 444f. aškuttu was “an earth structure in fields and around houses”. The AHw (p. 81) offers the following interpretation: “bei Grundstücken etwa Trennmauer”. Van Driel (1988: 144), however, notes that aškuttu was part of the original field and that “its dimensions exclude a construction like a wall”. According to Wunsch (2000 I: 71) this was a “spitz zulaufende oder unebene Fläche”.
1301 The remark zaqpu implies that the land was planted with date palms.
measured second was located north of the first. The western [frontage] (100+\text{x}/0) cubits) was next to the wall-street and the eastern one ([\text{x}] cubits) was next to the houses of the Urukeans. Its northern flank (100 or 110 cubits) was on the canal Ḫarru-ša-Naḫa-ya. The southern flank (90 cubits) was next to a part of the plot previously measured (libbu eqli). This portion of the orchard had the surface area of 1 pānu (= 0.25 ha)\textsuperscript{1302} and the total area amounted to 1;1.4.3.3 (= 1.69 ha), of which 0;4.4 (= 1.17 ha) were planted.

The beginning of the tenth section (ll. rev. 23-24) is lost in a break, some six to eight signs are totally or partially damaged. It is not certain how this gap should best be reconstructed, but it is conceivable that orchards were mentioned here together with details on their localisation or total surface area. The remainder of the phrase can be reconstructed following AnOr 9 2. 62f. as: [...] ša Aššur-bānī-apli ina mas[naqti] ša Ṣṣɜ [r]uk ina q]āt Uškāya uterramma ana Ninurta ša Uruk [iddīnu]. In other words, this short section refers to the restitution of orchards undertaken by the king Assurbanipal, perhaps around his 20\textsuperscript{th} regnal year as Beaulieu suggested (see above).\textsuperscript{1303} The land was taken from the Urukeans and given to the god Ninurta of Uruk, whose property was apparently administrated by the Eanna temple. The wording of this section which follows the earlier tablet AnOr 9 2 closely, suggests that the scribe of PTS 2076 had access to this older land register on which he based this entry. It is interesting to note that even after so much time it was still remembered and considered noteworthy that particular estates of the temple were restored to it by an Assyrian king. This is perhaps a sign that the status of those properties again became (or was still) disputed in the sixth century.

The exact localisation of the orchard treated in the next section (ll. rev. 25-28) is uncertain. The text states that it is situated ana Uruk, “toward Uruk”. Perhaps we are dealing here with an ellipsis for ana muḫḫi, ana imitti/shuḫ-mēlī or the like. The text clarifies further that the orchard was to the right of the canal Ḫarru-ša-Aška’ītu. On three sides it was surrounded by the houses of the Urukeans and the eastern flank was next to the wall-street. The plot had a surface of 0;0.5.1.2 (= 0.22 ha) and was entirely planted.

The twelfth section (ll. 29-36) deals with another orchard to the right of the canal Ḫarru-ša-Aška’ītu. It was measured in two stages. The northern flank (190 cubits) of the first portion of the plot was next to the aškuttu and the second portion. The [southern] flank (200 cubits) was next to the property of [x], son of Marduk-šum-ibni, which counted to the property of the king, and next to the house [of x]. The western frontage (150 cubits) was next to a narrow street which runs between the orchards and the eastern frontage was next to the canal Ḫarru-ša-Aška’ītu. The surface area of the first portion of the orchard was 0;2.4.[x] (= over 0.67 ha). The measurements of the second portion, which was north of the first portion, are badly damaged. Its western side was also on the (narrow) street between the orchards, and the northern side bordered on unbuilt plots. In total this orchard had a surface area of just over 0;3.0.1 (= 0.76 ha).

The last (partially) extant section of this tablet (ll. rev. 37-40) is badly damaged. It can be discerned that the property in question was located left of the Ninurta temple and the western side bordered on a street, perhaps the wall-street.

The ownership of the plots recorded in Montserrat 1 and PTS 2076 is for the most part not spelled out. Perhaps such information would have been found in a caption or a colophon, had those been existent and extant. Nevertheless, it is assumed here that all the entries in the two tablet fragments concerned properties of the Eanna temple. This is specifically stated only in five cases: Montserrat 1, section four, deals with Nebuchadnezzar’s donation of an orchard to the Lady of Uruk, and section five records a plot which was confiscated by the temple in place of arrears accrued by the original owner (kūm rēḫi ša muḫḫišu ana Eanna naṣū); in PTS 2076 two orchards were donated to the Lady of Uruk by the prince Itti-Šamaš-balātu in the sections two and eight respectively, and in section six one orchard was confiscated by the temple on account of arrears in cattle.

Other entries of the two texts do not mention the temple explicitly as the owner of the land in question, but there are some hints that point in this direction. For instance, section nine of PTS...
2076 deals with an orchard also confiscated on account of a backlog in cattle. Neither the Eanna nor the Lady of Uruk, nor anyone else is mentioned as the confiscating party, but it is more than likely that this entry was parallel to those explicitly mentioning the temple. Otherwise, the omission of this kind of information would hardly be explicable. Section ten of PTS 2076 mentions the land returned by the Assyrian king Assurbanipal to the god Ninurta. This episode has already been discussed above in the context of AnOr 9 2. As was noted there, the estates of the Ninurta temple in Uruk were managed by the Eanna temple and treated more or less as its own property. The orchards in sections four and five of PTS 2076 are associated with two rab banē, the brothers Anu-äh-iddin and Šamaš-šum-lišir. In one instance this relationship is expressed as kirî ša PN₁,₂ (PTS 2076, 2¹), only to appear a couple of lines later as zērū ša ina pān PN₁,₂ (PTS 2076, 2₈f.). This second instance suggests that this was not private property of the two brothers. It was only put at their disposal, most probably by the temple, since these two prebendary gardeners were associated to this institution. The subject of section three of Montserrat 1 is a larger plot, a šīhu. The owner is not named, but since a part of this property was assigned to the prebendary gardeners, it can safely be assumed that this too was temple land. The text specifies further that the property was to be inspected (l. 1₄ª: ana amārî) and the remainder of the planted land, i.e. the land not taken by the rab banē, to be registered (in the books) as nakkandu, i.e. “reserve”-land (l. 1₄ª: rēhet zērî zaqpi ana nakkandu ana šatārî). These instructions were intended for the institution which managed this land, in all probability the temple, which can also be taken as another indication that this text was part of the Eanna archive and the land treated in it temple property.

Some of the other entries are less clear on the ownership of the plots. Section two of Montserrat 1 is badly broken, but it seems to deal with the land of a certain Balāssu (l. 8ʰ: zērū ša Balāssu [...] ). It is not clear whether the (original) ownership status is intended by this, as the text breaks off after the personal name. It resumes to state that the land was bought (ana kaspi mahra) in the thirteenth year of Nabonidus without naming the buyer. This was probably the temple. Section seven of PTS 2076 treats the land of a certain Ina-qāt-x, a property which on two sides neighboured the land of Eanna (a hallatu-orchard and nakkandu-land of Istar of Uruk) and which had disputed borders as is indicated by the phrase ana mašālti u šatārî (rev. l. 3). The closing remark of this section perhaps reveals its status: Še-numun-šû šā igi (rev. l. 8). The logogram igi could be taken to stand for amāru and the whole expression for “his land, which had been inspected” (ša amra). However, it could just as well stand for mahāru, and mean “his land, which had been received”, perhaps short for ša ana kaspi mahra as in section two of Montserrat 1. By analogy one could assume that here also the beneficiary of this transfer was the temple. This is all quite speculative, and perhaps this was at least one instance of private property within this otherwise temple-oriented register which was only booked in because of the disputed border with the temple land. Be that as it may, other entries do not give any specification on the ownership of the plots they deal with. The omission of this kind of information speaks for the temple as the owner, since this could have been deemed redundant in the more straightforward cases, i.e. cases not involving land donations or confiscations of private property.

While it is fairly certain that Montserrat 1 and PTS 2076 deal with land which is either temple property or to which the temple laid claim, the question of the localisation of the land and the systematics of the texts remains open. Some of the properties are explicitly stated to be outside the city (e.g., Montserrat 1, sections three and four, on the upper Nār-šarrī, muḫḫi ʾālī), others were inside the city (ina qabalti ʾālī, Montserrat 1, section six). In most of the cases, however, the text is ambiguous in this respect. Usually the properties are associated to some prominent feature, a city gate, the city wall or moat, or a canal, without specifying the localisation with respect to the perimeter of the city. Therefore we can hardly go beyond stating that the properties described in Montserrat 1 and PTS 2076 were situated either within the city itself or just outside it.

Despite the fact that the localisation of the gates¹³⁰⁴ and some of the canals is mainly unknown, it is nevertheless possible to discern a pattern governing the arrangement of the entries on the tablets. Generally plots situated in the same region were grouped together in the text. The repeated appearance of the Šamaš-gate and the Nār-Bānītu as information on localisation on the

¹³⁰⁴ Falkenstein provides a catalogue of gates and city quarters of Uruk, but refrains from attempting to localise them (1941: 50ff.)
obverse of PTS 2076 is conspicuous (sections one to four, six; this information is also summarized in the table below). We are informed by the text that the royal highway passed through the Šamaš-gate (ḫarrān šarrī ša abul Šamaš in section two, line 8') and that the city moat (Ḫaššu) also flowed in the region of this gate (section three). 1305 A connection between the Šamaš-gate and the canal Nār-Bānītu is provided in section four. The localisation of Nār-Bānītu is not known, but it appears that it flowed in the vicinity of the Šamaš-gate. The property described in section four, an orchard of the rab banē, had its eastern frontage on this canal. At the same time the text states that it was recorded in the ledger of the prebendary orchards of the Šamaš-gate (ll. 19'-20'). This indicates a certain proximity of this gate and the Nār-Bānītu. 1306 This canal must have also run close to the Kanisurra-gate, 1307 which appears in section five. At any rate, the road which led through this gate (ḫarrūnu ša abul Kanisurra) may have been in the vicinity of Nār-Bānītu, because the property in section four, which was situated west of this canal, was probably adjacent to the property in section five, which was in front of the road of the Kanisurra-gate. We have no explicit information on the localisation of the Šamaš-gate (or Nār-Bānītu), however, assuming that this was the gate through which the god Šamaš, or rather his statue, came on his visits to Uruk from Larsa, we should look for this gate on the eastern perimeter of the city. In this case the properties described on the obverse of PTS 2076 were situated in the eastern segment of the city and its hinterlands. It should be noted that the plots on the ‘reverse’ of Montserrat I, which possibly joins with the obverse of PTS 2076, were also associated with this general region: the Šamaš-gate appears in section six and the plots in sections eight and nine were close to the Nār-Bānītu. The plot in section five bordered on the royal highway to Larsa (ḫarrān šarrī ša Larsa), which fits nicely with placing these properties to the east of Uruk. This was perhaps the same road as ḫarrān šarrī ša abul Šamaš mentioned in section two of PTS 2076.

The situation on the reverse of PTS 2076 is less clear. Here the city moat (Ḫaššu; section seven) and the wall-street (ṣūq dūrī; sections seven and nine), the Meslamtaea-gate and Nār-Lamassu (section eight), Ḫarru-ša-Nanīya (section nine), Ḫarru-ša-Aška’itu (sections eleven and twelve) and the Ninurta temple (section thirteen) 1308 appear. The exact localisation of the Ninurta temple within Uruk is not known. However, it appears that it was situated close to the city wall and in turn relatively close to the Ḫaššu and the wall-street which presumably ran along the city wall. This is suggested by AnOr 9.2 (ll. 53ff.) which describes orchards of Ninurta situated among other places behind the Ninurta temple and next to the (city) wall (l. 53), or on the Ḫaššu (l. 60). One of these orchards is on Ḫarru-ša-Aška’itu (l. 55), which is perhaps an indicator that this canal was also in the vicinity of the Ninurta temple. Next to nothing is known about the Meslamtaea-gate and Nār-Lamassu 1310 which are mentioned in section eight. The Meslamtaea-gate (listed in Falkenstein 1941: 50) was opposite the settlement Biranātu according to the private land sale TCL 13 249. The localisation of this place, too, is uncertain. The sold plot is said to border on [x] lugal ša a-na u-dan-nu. Coquerillat (1968: 20 15) suggests restoring ḥarrān in the gap and placing Udamnu north of Uruk. If this localisation is correct, then the plot bordered on a section of the royal highway north of the city and the Meslamtaea-gate should be placed on the northern (or north-eastern) perimeter of the city. Ḫarru-ša-Naniya is known to have flown within the city of Uruk (RA 24, 38: 2f.) and outside it (AnOr 9 7: 3). The part of the canal which appears in the text in section nine was in the vicinity of the city wall. More accurate localisation of these canals and places is not possible. It should be noted, however, that on the matching side of the fragment

---

1305 It is generally assumed that the Ḫaššu followed the city’s perimeter; however, it is not known whether it extended along the entire circumference of the city or just a part of it.

1306 That is, unless the fact that the orchard was entered in the wrong ledger, namely the one dealing with the land close to the Šamaš-gate, was of concern here. It seems more likely, however, that the point of contention here was that the orchard was registered under the name of a certain Bēl-ipuš, a rab banē, and not An-aljiddin and Šamaš-zēr-lišir, two brothers, prebendary gardeners, to whom the orchard in question rightfully belonged (at least from the perspective of PTS 2076). In other words, not the localisation of the orchard was disputed, but its attribution to this Bēl-ipuš.

1307 For this little known goddess and her cult in Uruk see Beaulieu 2003: 316ff.

1308 Note that section ten treats properties returned by Assurbanipal to the god Ninurta, but without giving their localisation.

1309 This was a small sanctuary independent of the Eanna temple (Beaulieu 2003: 301).

1310 Nār-Lamassu is attested elsewhere only in TCL 12 32: 26.
Montserrat 1 (obv.) Ḥarru-ša-Nanāya is also mentioned (section two), as well as Nār-šarrī (sections three and four). According to Cocquerillat (1968: 24) Ḥarru-ša-Aška'ītu, which flowed within Uruk (AnOr 8 2: 2f.), was a tributary of Nār-šarrī; however, I do not see any evidence for this suggestion. Nevertheless, in the light of our text it can be assumed that the two canals have been in some way connected or at least ran in each other’s proximity. Section four of Montserrat 1 specifies that the property was outside the city on the upper Nār-šarrī (and at the same time on Ḥarru-ša-Abul-Adad, which indicates that the Adad-gate was also close by). At least this property then was north of Uruk. Perhaps this should be taken as an indicator that the other plots described on the reverse of PTS 2076 and the obverse of Montserrat 1 were north of Uruk or in the north(eastern) region of the city.

A link between the properties recorded on the two sides of PTS 2076 is perhaps provided by the sections five (obv.) and seven (rev.). As was noted earlier the properties described in these two sections shared some of the neighbours. This indicates that they were situated close to each other.

One of the arrangement principles of these cadastral texts was of a topographic nature then: One side of the tablet listed properties (south(east) and the other north(east) of Uruk, or within the corresponding parts of the city. However, were the texts systematic in listing all the temple properties in the given regions? This question cannot be answered easily. In my opinion this was not the case. The clue for this is provided by the remarks ana šaṭāri, ana amārī and ana dabābi which are found repeatedly in the texts (for an overview of these remarks see the last column of the table below). The remark “to be registered” (ana šaṭāri) implied that the properties in question were to be entered into some sort of register, either into a complete register of the temple land (if there was such a document), or perhaps into central cadastres kept by the city administration. The status of the disputed properties had to be settled before they could be entered in the cadastral books. This is what the remarks “to be inspected” (ana amārī), “to be enquired into” (ana mašālti) and “to be debated (in court)” (ana dabābi) are alluding to. Further remarks found in the text such as ki ṭuppišu mašīh (“measured according to his tablet”) and aki lē'ī labīrī šātir (“registered according to an old ledger”) suggest that the properties in question had not been actually surveyed, which too could give rise to future disputes. A look at the table below makes it obvious that almost all the properties listed in the two texts had a disputed, or at least potentially controversial, status. This includes land restitutions and donations by various kings or members of the royal family, confiscations on account of indebtedness, questionable borders, change of designation of purpose, etc. In just a few cases the status of the listed properties is not obviously problematic (PTS 2076, sections three, five, eleven and twelve). It appears therefore that these land registers were designed to record special cases only, cases that would (potentially) require further clarification and action. Therefore it is not likely that the texts were representative of the temple’s entire land holdings in the given regions.1311 It seems possible, although this is purely speculative, that these land registers were written in anticipation of a general census undertaken by the city or state administration. This must have occurred periodically; however, we cannot say when it happened precisely (it may have happened at least once after 4 Cyr) since the texts are not dated and it is not certain whether they (at least the ones with greater formal similarity, i.e. AnOr 9 19, RA 54, 86f., Montserrat 1 and PTS 2076) were compiled on one or on separate occasions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Localisation</th>
<th>Status peculiarities/remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Montserrat 1</td>
<td>1 (obv.)</td>
<td>[?]</td>
<td>west flank on Ḥarru-[x]</td>
<td>[?]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(Temple?)</td>
<td>east flank on Ḥarru-ša-Nanāya</td>
<td>bought for silver in 13 Nbn (from Balāssu?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(Temple)</td>
<td>in front of the upper Nār-šarrī and in front of the city (i.e. north of Uruk); western frontage on Nār-šarī; eastern frontage on Nār-šarī</td>
<td>part of the land occupied by rab banē, to be inspected (ana amārī); the rest to be entered as nakkandu (ana šaṭāri)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1311 That the temple had other properties in the regions treated by the texts is suggested by some of the cases in which the listed plot’s neighbours were referred to as libbiā eqli. This implied that the given plots bordered on temple properties which were not further considered by the texts.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Owner/Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Temple</td>
<td>right (i.e. west) of the upper Nār-šarri, in front of the city; eastern flank on Nār-šarri, southern frontage on Ḥarru-ša-Abul-Adad</td>
<td>donation of Nebuchadnezzar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 (rev.)</td>
<td>Temple</td>
<td>northern flank on Nār-damqat; eastern frontage on royal highway to Larsa</td>
<td>confiscated by Eanna on account of debt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>[?]</td>
<td>inside the city, left of Šamaš-gate</td>
<td>(plot’s) measurements have not changed (mesḫassu ʾiš taṣnī); entered according to the old ledger (ʾaki lāʾi labiri šaṭir)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>[?]</td>
<td>to be entered (ana šaṭi)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>[?]</td>
<td>close to Nār-Bānītu</td>
<td>measured according to his tablet (ki ʾi ṭuppīṣu maṣil); to be entered (ana šaṭi)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>[?]</td>
<td>close to Nār-Bānītu</td>
<td>(plot’s) measurements have not changed (mesḫassu ʾiš taṣnī); entered according to the old ledger (ʾaki lāʾi labiri šaṭra); to be contested (ana dabābi)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PTS 2076</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 (obv.)</td>
<td>[?]</td>
<td>close to Nār-Bānītu</td>
<td>[?]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Temple</td>
<td>close to Šamaš-gate and royal highway; western frontage on the royal highway of the Šamaš-gate</td>
<td>donation of prince Itti-Šamaš-balātu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>(Temple?)</td>
<td>left and right of Šamaš-gate, on the bank of city moat (Ḫarīsu)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>(Temple)</td>
<td>left of Nār-Bānītu (eastern frontage on Nār-Bānītu); close to Šamaš-gate (?)</td>
<td>property entered in the ledger of the rab banē under the name of another person (not the prebendary gardeners in charge)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>(Temple)</td>
<td>in front of the road of Kanisurra-gate</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Temple</td>
<td>left of the lower Nār-Bānītu</td>
<td>confiscated by Eanna on account of debt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 (rev.)</td>
<td>(Temple?)</td>
<td>on the city moat (Ḫarīsu) and next to the wall-street</td>
<td>plot borders to be enquired into and entered (ana mašāli u šaṭi); to be entered according to his tablet (ki ṭuppīṣu ana šaṭi); his land which had been bought (?) (ẓeršu ša ʾig)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Temple</td>
<td>left of Meslamtaea-gate; western flank next to the (city) wall; eastern flank next to Nār-Lamassu</td>
<td>donation of prince Itti-Šamaš-balātu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>(Temple)</td>
<td>left of Ḥarru-ša-Nanāya; northern flank on Ḥarru-ša-Nanāya</td>
<td>confiscated on account of debt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Temple</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Assurbanipal’s restitution of orchards to Ninurta of Uruk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>[?]</td>
<td>in front (?) of Uruk; to the right of Ḥarru-ša-ʾAškaṭi</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>[?]</td>
<td>to the right of Ḥarru-ša-ʾAškaṭi; eastern frontage on Ḥarru-ša-ʾAškaṭi</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>[?]</td>
<td>left of Ninurta temple; western side on wall-street</td>
<td>[?]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 37: Montserrat 1 and PTS 2076**

An interesting aspect of the cadastral texts, particularly Montserrat 1 and PTS 2076 which concentrate on the urban agricultural properties and the areas just outside the city, is that they give us a glimpse of the agrarian and to a lesser extent social make-up of these regions. As could be expected, inside and just outside the city, date orchards were prevalent. There was

---

1312 The following section already appeared in print in Janković 2010: 423f.
apparently no arable land here. At least that is the impression one gets from the available land sale documents and cadastral texts. Properties of the prebendary gardeners, the rab banê, were typically found close to the city, a situation which is also known from Sippar. The orchards inside the city could be surrounded by private houses (houses of the Urukeans) or they could be adjacent to other plots, canals and streets. These cadastres focus on the temple property and it has to be kept in mind that their scope and perspective are therefore limited. Nevertheless, the impression produced by them is that the social composition of, at least some, neighbourhoods in and around the city was fairly mixed. The temple estates bordered on the private properties of the Urukeans, plots of the members of the city administration (e.g., šakin ūmī) or royal estates which had been entrusted to certain individuals. As an example, an interesting constellation is presented by the (confiscated) property of the temple oblate Nabû-ahḫê-šûlîm, son of Nabû-udammaq, which bordered on a canal, the royal highway, the prebendary orchard of a rab banê, and the plot of the provincial governor (šakin mâtî).

4.4.6.1. Intensity of farming

What is remarkable is that not all the land in and close to the city was farmed very intensively. At least this can be claimed for the land which belonged to the temple during Nabonidus’s reign (or later). This is in sharp contrast to what is known about the orchards of the Borsippa urban elite, which were relatively small but produced high returns, meaning that they were farmed fairly intensively. For some of the orchards listed in the cadastres from Eanna it is mentioned that only a portion of the plot was in fact planted with date palms. Some plots were qualified as kâlû. This was a term used for unproductive, perhaps waterlogged, land which could, however, be converted into date plantations. For instance, of the plot with a surface of 3;3, zēru kâlû, in Montserrat 1 ll. 20'-24', only 0;0.3 had been planted. Just outside the city on the Nār-šarri there was a considerable stretch of unused land, nakkandu. This term designated land held in reserve by the king or the temples and which could be assigned for use to their dependants. Of the available 167;3.4.3 (210 ha) only 24;1 (30.25 ha) had been taken by the prebendary gardeners and were presumably converted into orchards. The remainder of the land was to be assigned to nakkandu which was surrounding this plot (Montserrat 1 ll. 10'-14'). The following table lists the known examples of only partially exploited land:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text and designation of plot</th>
<th>Size of plot</th>
<th>Planted plot</th>
<th>% planted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>kirû</td>
<td>1;2.4.4.8</td>
<td>0;4.2</td>
<td>55.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kirû</td>
<td>1;1.4.3.3</td>
<td>0;4.4</td>
<td>68.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kirû</td>
<td>21;1.4.2.5</td>
<td>9 kurru [+ x/0]</td>
<td>40.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montserrat 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>šûhù</td>
<td>167;3.4.3</td>
<td>24;1</td>
<td>14.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eqlu (zēru kâlû)</td>
<td>3;3</td>
<td>0;0.3</td>
<td>2.78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See for instance the sections III and V in Montserrat 1, as well as ll. 14'-29' in PTS 2076.

For instance in PTS 2076 in ll. 25-28.

PTS 2076 ll. rev. 9'-13'.

The text would name the neighbour, but remark that the plot counted to the property of the king (a-na nig-ga lugal im-ma-mu-û; e.g. PTS 2076 rev. ll. 30'-37').

Montserrat 1 rev. ll. 20'-24'.

The following section already appeared in print in Janković 2010: 424ff.

The two cadastres are not dated, but Montserrat 1 mentions the 13th and PTS 2076 the 15th year of Nabonidus, which gives the post quem dates for these texts.

Jursa 2010b: 360ff.

kirû designates a date orchard; eqlu is a neutral term “plot” and could be applied to both cereal fields and orchards; šûhù and limû designate larger administrative units: šûhù could be rendered as “estate” and limû, literally “thousand”, were large estates which perhaps originated from land allotment schemes similar to the ḫanšû-système.

This text deals with the land further away from the city unlike the other two.
While the temple may have been expanding its estates through royal grants, purchases or confiscations of the properties of their debtors, this did not automatically mean that the agricultural production was being expanded, as the land could have been left fallow or put to other uses. Only the contracts for reclamation of land, either for cereal cultivation (*ana taptê*) or planting date orchards (*ana zàqipùti*), give us unequivocal evidence for agricultural expansion. These documents are unfortunately scarce. Of some 40 extant land lease contracts from 3 Nbk to 2 Dar only seven land reclamation leases are known to us. Two *zàqipùtu* contracts from Nebuchadnezzar’s and Nabonidus’s reign each and one from Cyrus’s reign, and one lease *ana taptê* from Cambyses’s and Nebuchadnezzar IV’s reign each are known. This is little more than anecdotal evidence which does not render itself to quantification. However, it shows that all throughout the sixth century efforts to raise the productivity of land were an ongoing process.

### 4.4.7. *limu*-lists and related texts

A small number of texts from Uruk, and presumably the Eanna archive, list of properties which are designated as *limu* – “thousand”. Originally the name is probably derived from the dimensions of these properties: typically their frontages measured 1,000 or 1,100 cubits. The additional 100 cubits in the latter frontage length resulted from differing metrologies used by the royal and the temple administrations. It appears that the royal cubit was slightly larger than the temple cubit, and the royal *limu* corresponded to 1,100 cubits of the temple. A considerable number of *limu*-plots have a frontage of 1,100 cubits. This can be taken for an indicator of their origin. Though this is nowhere explicitly stated, the *limus* may have been allocated to the temple by the crown in land allotment schemes comparable to the *hasšù*-system (see below). In a discussion of the *hasšù* and *esërtu* systems van Driel detected a connection with the *limus* suggesting that “on the other side of the scale in a land division came the *limu*, “thousand”, which was assigned, it would seem, to (urban) institutions” (2002: 298). For lack of evidence it cannot be decided for the time being whether the *limus* originated from royal land grants, from the temple’s internal land divisions or from some combination of the two.

References to *limu*-plots appear sporadically in rent contracts and texts recording *imittu* obligations. Systematic lists of *limus* are very rare. One of these is TCL 13 230, which has been edited by Joannès 1982: 124. The text is not dated, has no caption or subscript and is tersely formulated. The entries follow the simple scheme “1 ,000 ____ (geographic name)”. There are 19 entries of this sort. Presumably “thousand” refers to plots of standardized size in the given localities, possibly with a frontage of a length of 1,000 cubits. The text is not very informative. For one it is not certain whether we are dealing here with the property of Eanna at all. Secondly, if this is assumed to be the case on account of archival context, we do not know whether the *limu*-plots represented the total land that Eanna owned in these localities or just specific plots singled out from there for a reason unknown to us. Thus the value of this text for our knowledge concerning the Eanna properties is fairly limited.

Another undated list of *limus*, BM 114571, is more instructive. The properties recorded in this text are explicitly designated as belonging to the Lady of Uruk. They are situated in various

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><em>limu</em></th>
<th>1420;1</th>
<th>70;1</th>
<th>4.94</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>limu</em></td>
<td>26;4.4.3</td>
<td>2;0.3 + 1;0.5</td>
<td>12.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 38: Intensity of farming

---

1323 For these contracts see p. 301 and 303.
1324 For a preliminary discussion of this term see Janković 2007: 224f. See also here p. 284.
1325 Note, however, that there are also properties designated as *limus* which do not conform to this standardized frontage length. For instance, the *limu* described in the third section of PTS 2076 (ll. 10'-14') has flanks of 1,425 cubits and frontages of 1,420 and 550 cubits. The *limu* in the first section of *AnOr* 9 19 (ll. 1-6) has a flank of 26,300 cubits and a frontage of 2,700 cubits. The *limu* described in the lines 39-44 of the same texts, however, has a frontage 1,100 cubits (and a flank of 6,800 cubits).
1326 Coquerillat suggested this (1968: 2545) on the basis of a remark at the end of line 4 of *AnOr* 9 1, a *hasšù*-allotment text from the fourth year of Marduk-apla-iddina II, which reads: I lim 1 me é dingir 1 lim lugal (“1,100 (cubits of) the temple (corresponds to) 1,000 (cubits of) the king”).
1327 For attestations of *limu*-land see Peat 1983: 125 and Janković 2007 with note 11.
localities in a general area called Puqûdu (the variant Piqûdu is also attested), a tribal area in southern Babylonia (see Zadok 1985: 249ff.). A badly preserved duplicate of this text (YBC 11584) could be identified in the Yale Babylonian Collection. Here only the edition of the British Museum text will be offered:

BM 114571 not dated

obv. 1. 1 lim meŠ aŠ gašan ša unug  ši ina ku pu-qu-du la maš-ḫa
  1 lim 1 me gaŠin ma-ag-da-a-ru 3 lim i-šad-da-ad
  1 lim gaŠin la-su-tu 2 lim i-šad-da-ad
  1 lim 1 me gašiš-ša-Š bu-ub-bu-ú-a 3 lim i-šad-da-ad
  5. 1 lim 1 me lugal- iq-bi a-di ša la me-e i-šad-da-ad
  1 lim 1 me ša anŠŠŠŠ pa-na-at duš Š hi-im-ma-ru
      2 lim i-šad-da-ad
  1 lim 1 me ta-ka-du 2 lim i-šad-da-ad
  1 lim 1 me man-ki-ti 3 lim i-šad-da-ad

(rev. blank)

“The lîmu-plots of the Lady of Uruk, which are in Mât-Puqûdu, (and which) have not been measured:
1,100 (cubits, frontage of a plot in) Magdûnu, stretches for 3,000 (cubits)
1,000 (cubits, frontage of a plot in) Lasûtu, stretches for 2,000 (cubits)
1,100 (cubits, frontage of a plot in) Binû-ša-Bûbbû’a, stretches for 3,000 (cubits)
1,100 (cubits, frontage of a plot in) Šarru- iqbi, stretches until there is no water
1,100 (cubits, frontage of a plot) in Imûrû (?) in front of Til-ûimmari, stretches for 2,000 (cubits)
1,100 (cubits, frontage of a plot in) Takûdu, stretches for 2,000 (cubits)
1,100 (cubits, frontage of a plot in) Mankiti, stretches for 3,000 (cubits).”

In each entry the first figure, 1,100 or in one case only 1,000 (l. 3), to all probability represents the length of the frontage measured in cubits. The second figure, ranging from two to three thousand cubits, represents the length of the flank of the plot. Only in one instance the exact length of the flank is not given, but it is stated that the plot stretches until there was no water (l. 5: adi ša là mê išaddad). Presumably water for irrigation was meant by this.

The remark là mašḫa (“not measured”) in the first line is surprising, considering that the figures that follow seem to be pairs of plot measurements. Perhaps the remark meant to signify that no actual survey had been conducted on the site and the round figures provided by the text are to some extent fictitious.

It is not clear whether this list included only specific plots of the temple in given localities or all the land Eanna possessed there. Be that as it may, potentially over 407.5 ha of temple land are recorded in this list. Of the places appearing in the text only Lasûtu is well attested. This was a settlement situated south of Uruk on the canal Takkûru. Here Eanna owned at least 40 kurru of land (= 50 ha).

TBER pl. 31, edited by Joannès 1982: 121f., is formally similar to the lîmu-lists. However, the properties recorded in this text are not lîmus, but apparently smaller units – “hundreds” (meat). This list, just like TCL 13 230, has no caption or subscript and follows the scheme: “x me _____ (geographic name)” – e.g., “1 me gaŠin bir-ḫi-šu” (l. 33). Some 32 properties appear in the text introduced by a numeral, either one hundred or a multiple thereof, which presumably designates the length of its frontage. This is the only register of “hundreds” known to us. Its value for the reconstruction of the temple’s agricultural properties and the agricultural hinterlands of Uruk is,  

1328 The entry for Šarru-iqbi (l. 5) was not taken into consideration as the length of the flank is not specified.
1329 The numeral 100 appears most frequently, namely eleven times, followed by 200, eight times, and 400, four times. The numerals 300, 1,000, 1,200 and the exceptional 260 (l. 17) appear one time each.
1330 A short list of “hundreds” from various localities does appear, however, in the rent contract TCL 12 73 (1 Nbn) which is edited in the Appendix 1. The contract enumerates the properties leased out for the purpose of collecting the tithe (ešrû) and some of them appear in the form “1 me ša _____ (geographical name)”. Already Joannès noted this parallelism (1982: 122f.).
just like that of TCL 13 230, mostly limited to providing an inventory of places in which the temple probably owned land. But does this text provide clues for another type of a land division scheme? If so, the underlying basic unit would seem to be 100 cubits, the length of the frontage. The larger frontages, the multiples of 100, were probably secondary creations formed by the merging of several basic plots. Thus a logical step between the ḫansūs and the limus is provided by the “hundreds”. However, it should be kept in mind that ḫansūs often had frontages which were multiples of 100 (being itself a multiple of 50) and so it is not certain that we are dealing here with a special system after all.

4.4.8 Measurements of fields

One more text should be cited in the context of land registers: BIN 1 158 (not dated), which records measurements of fields from at least three, probably four, localities.1331 It is not a cadastral text in a strict sense as it is not concerned with the exact localisation of the plots which would be provided by stating the plots’ neighbours, the exact measurements of the sides and their orientation. Only the surface area in seed measure is given, followed by a personal name. These people were either the cultivators or in some way responsible for the plots (e.g., tenants). Only in lines 22, 29, 30 and perhaps 32 are the listed people designated as ploughmen. Other professions may have also been attested in lines 25, 26 and 31. Here the determinative la appears, but owing to the tablet’s state of preservation the following professions (or ethnic designations?) cannot be read. The sign traces, however, speak against reading engar in these instances. The text is organised in four sections, grouping the field measurements around different localities. Each of the sections has an introductory line naming the locality in question (e.g., line 1: mešḫat zēri ša šiḫi ša Ḥarru-ša-Lābaši, “measurements of the arable land in the district of Ḥarru-ša-Lābaši”), followed by the measurements and a summary line stating the total surface of the measured land in the given locality.1332 The text is presented here in transliteration, but it will be refrained from a complete translation because of the text’s sketchy structure. Only the introductory and summary lines are translated:

BIN 1 158 not dated

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>obv.</th>
<th>1. mešḫat še-numun šā ši-i-ḫu šā ḫar-ri šā 1 la-4 ba1-ši</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10 gur še-numun šā</td>
<td>1d innin-na-numun-dū</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 (gur)</td>
<td>1d ānumun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 pi</td>
<td>1d muq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. pab 13 gur 3 pi</td>
<td>še-numun ḫar-ri &lt;šā&gt; 1 la-a-ba-ši</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mešḫat še-numun šā</td>
<td>ina du, 1 šu-la-a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 gur</td>
<td>1d dug-ša-unugì</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 gur</td>
<td>1d u-gur-duš-a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:1.3</td>
<td>1d kal-ba-a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. 23</td>
<td>1d ag-duš-šēš</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 (gur) 1 pi</td>
<td>1d utu-mu-mu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:1.3</td>
<td>1d ka-da-la &lt;&lt;diš&gt;&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 pi</td>
<td>1d ag-kil-la-an-ni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0:3.2</td>
<td>1d ag-šu ll šu-ša-bat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. 2:1.3</td>
<td>nu-lu-a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pab 76;2.3 še-numun ina du, 1 šu-la-a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ina li-bi 2,2 1:3 da-la</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mešḫat še-numun šā</td>
<td>1d ānumun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 (gur)</td>
<td>1d ānumun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. 2:3.2</td>
<td>ar-rab-bi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0:3.5</td>
<td>1d din-su</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 (gur)</td>
<td>1d ag-gin-a u 1‐si-lim d en 1h enga[r]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1331 A fourth locality probably appears in the partially damaged line 36.
1332 A summary line is missing for the last section.
1333 Alternatively this sign could be read pi. This entry would record a plot of 0;3 in this case.
Measurements of the arable land from the district of Ḥarru-Ša-Lābāši:
10 kurru under the responsibility of Innin-zēr-ibni
... (3 plots)

Measurements of the arable land from Til-Šulāya:
... (9 plots)
In sum: 13;3 − arable land (from) Ḥarru-Ša-Lābāši.

Measurements of the arable land from Nār-Innin:
... (14 plots)
In sum: 76;2.31334 − arable land from Til-Šulāya;17 of this 2;2.3 is land irrigated by buckets.

Measurements of the arable land on Nār-Innin:
... (14 plots)
In sum: 76;2.31334 − arable land from Til-Šulāya;17 of this 2;2.3 is land irrigated by buckets.

The individual entries add up to 76;2.5.

The total surface area of plots in the area of Nār-Innin depends on the reading of the value in line 21: this plot had the size of either 0;3.5 or 0;3 and the sum of the plots was 32;0.2 or 31;4.3 respectively. It is not clear to me how either sum can be reconciled with the visible traces, namely: 3 šē [x x x] [x...].

The meaning of ĥarsū, a term which can be placed in an agricultural context according to AHw p. 328, which appears in line 36 is unclear.

1334 The individual entries add up to 76;2.5.
1335 The total surface area of plots in the area of Nār-Innin depends on the reading of the value on line 21: this plot had the size of either 0;3.5 or 0;3 and the sum of the plots was 32;0.2 or 31;4.3 respectively. It is not clear to me how either sum can be reconciled with the visible traces, namely: 3 šē [x x x] [x...].
1336 The meaning of ĥarsū, a term which can be placed in an agricultural context according to AHw p. 328, which appears in line 36 is unclear.
the surface area with the yield factor would enable the temple administration to calculate the prospective yield and make prognoses on the temple’s barley income. Yield factors are not featured in BIN 1 158. Aside from assigning specific plots to cultivators/tenants it is beyond speculation whether our text had an accounting purpose similar to that of the Sipparean “îmmittu-Vermessungen”.

As with the cadastral texts, and assuming that the properties in BIN 1 158 indeed belonged to the temple, we are not in a position to say whether the listed plots represented the total amount of land held by the temple in the given localities. However, the value of this text lies mostly in the fact that it gives us a whole range of sizes of plots used to all probability for arable cultivation and thus furthers our knowledge on land use patterns in Uruk. This aspect is discussed further in the chapter on land use patterns.

4.5. Size of plots and productivity

Plot measurements are unfortunately not near as frequent in the Eanna material as in the Ebabbar archive. Individual orchard measurements can be found in the cadastral texts; however, they are too few to be statistically reliable (only 18 usable data sets could be identified). In addition to these there is only one text recording plot measurements of probably arable land in three localities north of Uruk (BIN 1 158). Twenty-six plot sizes are recorded in BIN 1 158, the smallest being 2 pànu (5,000 m²) and the largest 23 kurrū (28.75 ha). Approximately 77 % of the plots are smaller than 4 kurrū (5 ha). The distribution of the plot sizes from BIN 1 158 is presented in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size (kurrū)</th>
<th>Number of attestations</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>s ≤ 1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 &lt; s ≤ 2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 &lt; s ≤ 3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 &lt; s ≤ 4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>26.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 &lt; s ≤ 5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 &lt; s ≤ 10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 &lt; s ≤ 20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 &lt; s ≤ 30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total:</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 39: Size of plots in BIN 1 158

The mean is 4;3.4 (5.91 ha) and the median, which is probably more reliable because of the fact that more than three quarters of the sample lie below the arithmetic mean, is roughly 2;4.1.1 (3.55 ha). This is comparable to the plot sizes from Sippar which were on average somewhat smaller (2 kurrū).

For orchards an even smaller sample of 18 values is available. The data comes from the cadastral texts Montserrat 1, PTS 2076 and AnOr 9 19. The values for the entire plots, not just the planted portions, have been taken into consideration and the extreme value of over 21 kurrū for an orchard donated to the temple by a prince, which appears in the cadastre PTS 2076, has been left out as it would distort the results too much. The smallest orchard in the sample has a surface of 0;0.5.1.2 (2,125 m²) while the largest measures 3;4.1.3 (4.81 ha). Almost 78 % of the plots in the sample are smaller than 2.5 kurrū (3.13 ha) while the majority falls into the range from 0.5 to 1 kurrū (6,250 m² to 1.25 ha):

1337 The following section already appeared in print in Janković 2010: 429ff.
1338 Other larger plots attested in this list: 10, 20 and 22 kurrū. They are all attested one time each.
1339 Jursa 2010b: 349.
The mean size is 1;3.4.3 (2.19 ha), while the median is 1;2.1.5 (1.83 ha). These values are slightly smaller than the average of 1;4.2 established for Sippar (based on 93 data sets) but still stand the comparison.\textsuperscript{1340}

The Eanna archive is very rich in *imittu*-related documents, especially concerning dates. Numerous values for *imittu* deliveries have come down to us from lists of deliveries and individual debt notes. Altogether, this sample encompasses just under 500 usable figures from the reign of Nebuchadnezzar (II) to the reign of Nebuchadnezzar IV. The distribution of this data set is presented below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><em>imittu</em> in <em>kurru</em></th>
<th>Number of attestations</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$i \leq 10$</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>21.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10 &lt; i \leq 20$</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>19.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20 &lt; i \leq 30$</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>10.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$30 &lt; i \leq 40$</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>8.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$40 &lt; i \leq 50$</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>8.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50 &lt; i \leq 60$</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>7.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$60 &lt; i \leq 70$</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$70 &lt; i \leq 80$</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$80 &lt; i \leq 90$</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$90 &lt; i \leq 100$</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100 &lt; i \leq 110$</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$110 &lt; i \leq 120$</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$120 &lt; i \leq 130$</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$130 &lt; i \leq 140$</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$140 &lt; i \leq 150$</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$150 &lt; i \leq 200$</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$200 &lt; i \leq 300$</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$300 &lt; i \leq 400$</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total:</td>
<td>499</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 41: Size of *imittu* deliveries

The smallest *imittu* value is 3 sūtu, the largest 350 *kurru*. More than a fifth of the *imittu* deliveries falls into the lowest range of up to 10 *kurru* and seems to have come from relatively modest-sized orchards. But about 15\% of the values lie above the 100 *kurru* mark, indicating the presence of

\textsuperscript{1340} Jursa 2010b: 351.
orchards of impressive size. These high amounts probably came from orchard-complexes sub-leased by small-scale contractors, and not from individual gardeners. The mean *imittu* delivery is roughly 44 *kurru* and the median 28 *kurru*.

This data, numerous though it is, does not tell us much about the size of the orchards and their productivity. Unfortunately, unlike in Sippar (Jursa 2010b: 352 with note 2066), from Uruk we do not have any texts correlating the *imittu* delivered and the size of the orchard. What we occasionally do get in the *imittu* debt notes and lists for dates beside the *imittu* values are the gardeners’ salaries. This salary, called *sissinnu*, was directly proportional to the surface area below the date palms worked by the gardener. According to the ‘Edict of Belšazzar’, for one surface *kurru* worked, the gardener would get 5 *kurru* of dates as his remuneration. In Uruk there is no such flat-rate. Here it was differentiated between the types of work conducted. For the more strenuous labour with a spade the gardener would usually get 4 *kurru* of dates and for the land cultivated with a plough only 3 *kurru* per each *kurru* of surface area. If we then take 3.5 *kurru* to be the average *sissinnu* per surface *kurru*, then this figure can be brought into relation with the actually attested 52 *sissinnu* values and the corresponding orchard sizes can be worked out:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Number of attestations</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>s ≤ 0;2.3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0;2.3 &lt; s ≤ 1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>34.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 &lt; s ≤ 1;2.3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>32.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1;2.3 &lt; s ≤ 2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 &lt; s ≤ 2;2.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2;2.3 &lt; s ≤ 3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 &lt; s ≤ 7;2.3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total:</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 42: Size of orchards based on *sissinnu*

The smallest *sissinnu* of 1 *kurru* would suggest an orchard of 0;1.3 and the largest *sissinnu* of 25 *kurru* an orchard(-complex) of 7;0.3.1. Over 75 % of the sample indicate orchards smaller than 1.5 *kurru*. The mean size is 1;2.1.3 (ca. 1.79 ha) and the median is 1;0.4.1 (1.43 ha). Since the *sissinnu* values are always coupled with the *imittu* amounts of the corresponding orchards, the extrapolated orchard sizes can be correlated with the *imittu* values to find out the average productivity of the orchards. The mean *imittu* per surface *kurru* thus calculated amounts to 31.97 *kurru*. The median is 26.69 *kurru*. This compares very well to the average (*imittu*) productivity established for the Ebabbar orchards, namely 26.78 *kurru* of dates per surface *kurru*.

If these average productivity rates are linked to the average *imittu* deliveries attested in all the pertinent lists and debt notes (it will be remembered that the mean was 44 and the median 28 *kurru*) the average size of the orchards would be 1;1.5.1 (1.72 ha) and 1;0.1.3 (1.31 ha) respectively.

The average size of the Eanna’s date orchards reconstructed on the basis of the extant cadastral material and the attested *sissinnu* and *imittu* values can be summarised as follows:

---

1341 Something similar had also been attempted by Cocquerillat 1968: 89f. She used the *sissinnu*-values known to her and the corresponding *imittu* values (15 data-sets) in order to determine the average yield per *kurru* of land and arrived at 44 *kurru* of dates per *kurru* of land (p. 90). However, she based her calculations on the false assumption that the *sissinnu* amounted to 7 *kurru* of dates per *kurru* of surface area. This figure was obtained by adding up the 3 *kurru* for plough work and 4 *kurru* for spade work which appear in the rent contracts (1968: 49), disregarding that these were in fact alternative possibilities. Cocquerillat’s error had already been noted by Jursa 1995a: 149 who suggested that halving her result for average date yield would give a more realistic figure.

1342 Jursa 2010b: 352.
Table 43: Size of orchards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>size of orchards</th>
<th>based on cadastral texts</th>
<th>based on sissinnu (3.5 kurru/kurru)</th>
<th>based on imittu</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mean</td>
<td>1;3.4.3 (2.19 ha)</td>
<td>1;2.1.3 (1.79 ha)</td>
<td>1;1.5.1 (1.72 ha)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>median</td>
<td>1;2.1.5 (1.83 ha)</td>
<td>1;0.4.1 (1.43 ha)</td>
<td>1;0.1.3 (1.31 ha)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>size of data-set</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>499</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Even though it is based on two approximations, the average _sissinnu_ and the average productivity rate, the last set of values ("based on _imittu_"), the median in particular, is probably the most reliable indicator of the average orchard size on the temple estates of Eanna, owing to the considerable size of the data-set. The average orchards, slightly larger than 1 _kurru_, are smaller than the average found in Ebabbar. Still they fall into the same approximate range as the institutional Sippar orchards and stand in sharp contrast to the fragmented but very productive patrimonies of the clergy from the Borsippa region.1344

4.6. Excursus: _hanšu_-allotments1345

Examples of systematic restructuring of urban hinterlands undertaken by the palace are provided by the practice of colonising large tracts of land, called _hanšu_. Numerous attestations of this _hanšu_-land can be found in the texts from several major Babylonian cities. The pertinent attestations have been collected and discussed by van Driel (2002: 297ff.).1346 The word _hanšu_, with the basic meaning “fifty”, can be used to designate different administrative entities and its meaning in such instances depends on the administrative context as van Driel points out (2002: 297). On the one hand this term could designate a (work) gang of fifty men directed by a _rab _hanšê, “overseer of fifty”1347. On the other it could refer to plots of land allotted to individuals called in these instances also _rab _hanšê. A possible connection between the “overseer of fifty” and the allotted _hanšu_-land is discussed below.

It is this so-called _hanšu_-land which is of interest for us in the general framework of the Urukian topography. The nature of the _hanšu_-properties is not entirely clear and their or their owners’ connection to Eanna is not illuminated by our texts. There is no clear evidence to associate this land and the people to which it had been allotted with the temple. It should be noted that two of the _hanšu_-lists from Uruk (BIN 1 159 and NBC 4848) have been copied by a person who was probably a temple scribe. His name is Nergal-ina-tēši-ēter, son of Marduk-šākin-šumi, descendant of Šin-leqe-uninni according to BIN 1 159. In NBC 4848 he appears only as the son of Šākin-šumi. While he is not attested elsewhere the fact that Nergal-ina-tēši-ēter stems from a prominent scribal family makes it probable that he too was a temple scribe. However, even if this is so, it is not entirely clear whether these tablets belonged to the administrative files of the Eanna archive (and if so, why?) or were just part of the scribal syllabus.1348 Perhaps it is significant with respect to the temple’s special interest in these texts that BIN 1 159 records four larger plots among the

---

1343 And the rate of productivity derived from the _sissinnu-imittu_ correlation.
1344 For the orchards of Borsippa see Jursa 2010b: 360ff. He calculated the mean size of the Borsippian orchards as 0;1.5.3 (5,170.5 square metres) and the median as 0;1.2 (3,604.5 square metres) (ibid.: 366). The average _imittu_ per surface _kurru_ was about 48 _kurru_ of dates (ibid.: 373ff.).
1345 This topic has been treated in detail by Peat 1983 and more recently by van Driel 2002: 297ff. See also the brief remarks made by Brinkman 1995: 25, Jursa 2010b: 321f., and MacGinnis 2012: 33f.
1346 Two new attestations from Kišt presented and discussed by Nielsen (2010: 95ff.) should be added to van Driel’s catalogue of _hanšu_ attestations.
1347 See for instance Kleber 2008: 115ff. on the organisation of building projects for which Eanna had to provide the workforce and the _rab _hanšê as headmen of workers in this context.
1348 Unless SBTU 4 223, another _hanšu_ related division of land, should be considered a stray find (Oelsner 1995: 385), it too could have been part of a scholar’s library like the vast majority of tablets found in the _Planquadrat_ U 18 in Uruk.
hanšū-plots allotted to individuals listed by name. These larger plots were apparently allotted to the temple.\(^{1349}\) Three of them have a frontage of 1,100 cubits which is a size typical for the so called limu-properties. Only one of the plots is apparently larger exhibiting a frontage of 1,600 cubits (l. 43). Does this mean that during this particular land division scheme plots were allotted both to individual beneficiaries and the temple? Be that as it may, the particular interest of the hanšū-texts lies in the fact that they offer good evidence for the developments in the rural hinterlands of Uruk (and other major Babylonian cities) at a time when no data is available from the Eanna archive. They show the attempts of the royal administration to strengthen the urban centres and in turn its control of the countryside.

The evidence for the shape and size of hanšū-land which comes from Eanna, the lists of hanšū allotments in particular, show that these plots were generally rectangular and of a uniform size within any given division scheme. These texts are: AnOr 9 1 and NBC 4848 (with the duplicate Crozer 201), both written in the fourth year of Marduk-apla-iddina II, BIN 1 159 (8 Kan) and YBC 11566 (15 Kan). They will be discussed in more detail below. The frontage of each individual hanšū-plot was usually situated next to a watercourse. Its length is stated in the texts in absolute terms, in cubits. In the hanšū-lists from Uruk the following frontage lengths are attested: 70 cubits (NBC 4848), 150 cubits (AnOr 9 1), 300 cubits (YBC 11566) and 400 cubits (BIN 1 159). Occasionally plots with larger frontages appear in these lists. These are almost invariably multiples of the standard frontage lengths appearing in the individual lists. This means that for some reason certain beneficiaries received multiple hanšū-plots within one allotment scheme. Thus, for instance, the first two beneficiaries in the list BIN 1 159 who are recorded with plots with an 800 cubit frontage will have received two hanšū-plots à 400 cubits each. The length of the flank is usually stated in relative terms. The plots are said to stretch until some topographical boundary such as a drainage ditch, makallû (AnOr 9 1), or a canal (BIN 1 159) at the lower end of the fields. In Uruk the length of the flank is given only once in absolute terms: NBC 4848 states that the plots stretch for 5,000 cubits. Typically the hanšū-plots were narrow, elongated, but not unsubstantial stretches of land. Those in NBC 4848, for instance, measured 70×5,000 cubits which is roughly equivalent to a surface of 8.75 hectares.\(^{1350}\)

It has been speculated that the magnitude “fifty” played a role in naming these properties hanšū, since in many cases the length of the frontage represented a multiple of 50 cubits (van Driel 2002: 297).\(^{1351}\) Van Driel also considered the possibility that the hanšū land division schemes were based on allotments of fifty uniform plots of land whose size varied from scheme to scheme (ibid. p. 298). While it is true that the size of the hanšū-plots varied from scheme to scheme, van Driel’s assumption as regards the quantity of the allotted plots is not entirely supported by our texts. AnOr 9 1 and NBC 4848 record the distribution of 91 hanšū-plots each and BIN 1 159 has 42\(^{1352}\) entries. YBC 11566 with its 49 entries comes closest to this conjectured model. There have also been attempts to find a connection between the rab hanšē as headman of fifty workers and the rab hanšē as holder of hanšū-land. However, van Driel discards the assumption that the alleged fifty underlings of the rab hanšē were assigned equal parts of the hanšū plots for cultivation on account of the narrow shape of the plots. The extreme example quoted by him (ibid. p. 298\(^{1355}\)), a hanšū-plot

---

\(^{1349}\) BIN 1 159, line 7: 1 lim 1 me ë dingir ina gurin-hi-il-šu-ri; line 20: 1 lim 1 me ë dingir ina gurin-šu-da-da; line 30: 1 lim 1 me id-sa-ši-ri; line 43: 1 lim 6 me ë dingir ina ë-bal).

\(^{1350}\) Another flank length of a hanšū is known from an early text from Babylon, TCL 12 11 (Šamaš-šum-ukín 14). Here the frontage was 250 cubits, while the flank had a length of 1 bēru, i.e. 21,600 cubits or 10.8 km (l. 3). The plot was extremely elongated and had a surface area of 100 kurrū or 135 ha.

\(^{1351}\) The private sale document for hanšū-land from Babylon, TCL 12 11, fits in particularly nicely with this assumption (see also Jursa’s comments on this text, 2010b: 321\(^{1380}\)). In it two hanšū-plots and one ešrū-plots are sold. The ešrū has a frontage of 50 cubits, while the frontages of the two hanšūs measure 250 cubits each. In other words, the hanšū could be subdivided into five ešrūs with a frontage of 50 cubits each. However, none of the frontages attested in the Uruk hanšū-lists are exactly 250 cubits long, although most of them are multiples of 50: 150 (AnOr 9 1), 300 (YBC 11566) and 400 (BIN 1 159). The frontage of 70 cubits which appears in NBC 4848 is clearly an exception.

\(^{1352}\) Of these 42 entries four concern larger plots of the temple (perhaps limus) and another one a similarly large plot associated with the estate of a certain Ahhêšîya, son of Naniya-usallî, perhaps the šakin fémi under Šamaš-šum-ukín (l. 44). In other words, only 37 entries concern actual hanšū-plots.
with a frontage which measured only four furrows (this could amount to anywhere between 1.2 and 3.2 metres) in a text from Dilbat, OECT 10 395, does not in fact represent the entire hanšū-plot but only a part of it.\footnote{The pertinent portion of the text is phrased as follows: pap 4 [ši]-ir-e-ti ina harin GN / ina 50-e ša PN (OECT 10 395ll. 9-10). The preposition ina in this instance has a paritive connotation, i.e. “in total four furrows in the irrigation district GN, part of the hanšū of PN”.} This indicates that sub-divisions of hanšū-land were indeed possible and should not be dismissed so lightly.\footnote{See note 1351.} Perhaps such subdivisions of hanšū-land were recorded in SBTU 4 223, an undated list of shares on Ḫarru-ša-Lābāši, a canal south-east of Uruk. Unfortunately, we are not informed about the size of these shares. Furthermore, the understanding of the text is hampered by several breaks and the rather laconic phrasing. The caption, consisting of two lines separated from the rest of the text by a horizontal ruling, is damaged, but mentions shares (ḥa-la\textsuperscript{med}), a certain Šumāya and Aḥḫēa. It is followed by a list of seven entries in the form of: ḫa-la ša PN\textsuperscript{11} a-ša ša PN\textsuperscript{5}. This is summarized in lines 10-11 as: ḫa-la\textsuperscript{med} ša 50-e ša šu-ma-a ša šes\textsuperscript{med} -[e]-a sum\textsuperscript{2} na\textsuperscript{1356} / ša ugu ḫar-ri ša la-ba šši, “shares of the hanšū of Šumāya, which was/were (?) given by Aḥḫēa, (and) which is/are situated on Ḫarru-ša-Lābāši”\footnote{This restoration is suggested by Oelsner 1995: 385.}. It is not clear who this Aḥḫēa was. It is also not clear what the relationship between him and Šumāya, presumably the holder of the hanšū-land, and the seven individuals listed was. Should we emend the text to šu-ma-a a’ šes\textsuperscript{med} -[e]-a?\footnote{Did he allot the hanšū-land to Šumāya or was he responsible for the distribution of the shares? Two more similar sections follow, each recording the shares of two individuals (in one case they were brothers). The text is summarized in lines 17-18 as follows: pap pap 11 luba\textsuperscript{med} ša 50-e ša šu-ma-[a 0] / ša ugu ḫar-ri ša la-ba šši, “in total 11 overseers of hanšū of Šumāya, which is situated on Ḫarru-ša-Lābāši”\footnote{Was Šumāya a rab hanšē, i.e. the person in charge of a work-force of fifty (and the corresponding piece of land) and the listed men his underlings? If so, then it is puzzling to find them designated as aklū where one would expect an unqualified workforce, or should we assume that only the overseers of the workers (perhaps eširtu units?) were entrusted land?}. Indeed, the text is puzzling to say the least. Perhaps these aklū should simply be equated with rab hanšē – this at least is what BIN 1 159 implies.} It should be noted that rab hanšē could receive plots in different localities or up to two hanšū-plots within the same division scheme. Thus, for instance, the set of 91 rab hanšē that appears in AnOr 9 1 receive plots à 150 cubits frontage on the canal Ḫarru-ša-Marduk-apla-iddina. The same lot receives plots à 70 cubits frontage in a different locality according to NBC 4848. This adds up to 220 cubits of frontage per beneficiary. If a uniform flank of 5,000 cubits, as recorded in NBC 4848, is assumed for all of these plots, then their surface would amount to approximately 27.5 hectares for each rab hanšē. In the list BIN 1 159 some of the rab hanšē appear twice. The frontage of the plots assigned to them totals from 600 to 800 cubits. Fourteen individuals from BIN 1 159 appear also as beneficiaries in YBC 11566 and their properties total a frontage of 700 cubits (400 + 300 cubits respectively). In two instances two individuals are assigned three plots: Marduk-šum-iddin, son of Nergal-ibni, receives 400 + 400 cubits in BIN 1 159 (ll. 6 and 8) and 300 cubits in YBC 11566 (l. 40), in total 1,100 cubits; Nā‘id-Marduk, the šakin tēmi, receives two plots à 300 cubits in YBC 11566 (ll. 30 and 52) and 400 cubits in BIN 1 159 (l. 18), i.e. in total 1,000 cubits. Hypothetically then the plots with, for instance, a cumulative frontage of 700 cubits and a presumed fronted of 5,000 cubits would provide a surface area of 87.5 hectares, an area certainly not

\footnote{The preposition ina in this instance has a paritive connotation, i.e. “in total four furrows in the irrigation district GN, part of the hanšū of PN”.} \footnote{See note 1351.} \footnote{“ḫa-la ša” appears only in the first entry. The other entries consist only of personal names.} \footnote{This restoration is suggested by Oelsner 1995: 385.} \footnote{Then this section should be understood as: “shares of the hanšū which was/were (?) given by Šumāya, son of Aḥḫēa, (and) which is/are situated on Ḫarru-ša-Lābāši”.} \footnote{Oelsner (1995: 385) tentatively suggests reading the unclear signs in line 17 following the numeral 11 as luba\textsuperscript{med} ša 50-e. I prefer reading here luba\textsuperscript{med}, as this reading would involve a smaller emendation of the copy and the spacing of the signs hardly allows enough room for the numeral 50 after the sign lub. Furthermore the title aklū is already attested in the context of hanšū-allotments in BIN 1 159 in lines 1 and 47. The introductory lines of this list read: “Plots of the steppe, division of the overseers (zu-zu ša luba\textsuperscript{med}, which (stretch) from the head of Bit-Zabunu to Ḫumelātu (and) which were given to 32 rab hanšē…” (see below for a transliteration of this part of the text).} \footnote{These overseers, however, would presumably have been called rab eširtu.}
manageable by one person (or family) alone.\textsuperscript{1360} Division in sub-plots would be viable and necessary in these cases if the land was intended to be cultivated in its entirety. Alternatively some sort of communally organized cultivation has to be envisaged for an area of this size. 87.5 hectares, for instance, could be divided in fifty plots à 1.75 hectares.\textsuperscript{1362} Such a plot could not necessarily provide the sustenance of a family,\textsuperscript{1362} but perhaps this was not the purpose of \textit{hanšū}-land to begin with. If it is assumed that the \textit{hanšū}s were meant to provide the sustenance only for the 50 men under the supervision of a \textit{rab ūanšē}, perhaps even only for the duration of the military or work mission they were engaged in, then 1.75 hectares of land per person would certainly be enough.\textsuperscript{1363} It would be enough to also cover the costs of cultivation (e.g., under sharecropping terms) and even allow for a profit of the \textit{rab ūanšē}. However, this is all just a conjecture based on the size of these plots. There is in fact no evidence whatsoever that the \textit{rab ūanšē} had any alimony obligations toward the men under his control. Furthermore, this hypothetical model must be treated with caution for other reasons as well. Firstly, the flank length of 5,000 cubits is attested only once in the caption of a text and in connection with comparably narrow plots. Even if long flanks cannot be considered as exceptional for land division scheme such as \textit{hanšū}, there is no evidence to support the assumption that this figure is representative for all the \textit{hanšū} plots.\textsuperscript{1364} The second concern is the practicability of cultivation. Given the extremely elongated shape of the plots the question must be raised how feasible it was to cultivate and evenly irrigate the entire stretch of land if the only source of water was at the upper end of the plot.\textsuperscript{1365} In other words we cannot be sure that the entire plot was indeed put under cultivation.

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{1360} Assuming the same flank length (5,000 cubits) Marduk-Šum-iddin, son of Nergal-ibni, would have had ca. 114.6 hectares and the \textit{sākim ū Emmi} Nād-Marduk 104.2 hectares of land at their disposal.
  \item \textsuperscript{1361} Note that a subdivision of the \textit{hanšū} described in the text from Babylon, TCL 12 11, would provide 50 plots à 2.7 ha.
  \item \textsuperscript{1362} That is assuming an average nuclear family consisted of four members. As a subsistence field 1.75 hectares could cover the costs of living of almost three persons (see also the following note). This is under the assumption that the monthly costs of living amounted to 50 litres of barley per person (cf. Janković 2008: 441), and that the productivity of the land was calculable using the 8.3 yield factor found for instance in Šum-ukin’s rent contract. This, however, is a comparably low yield factor. A higher factor, for instance, the average factor of 12 found in the Sippar documentation (Jursa 1995: 138), would ensure a yield high enough to provide for an entire family.
  \item \textsuperscript{1363} Using the relatively low factor of 8.3 a plot of 1.75 hectares could be expected to produce just less than 2,100 litres of barley per year. This is more than enough to cover the basic living costs of one person for a year (600 litres of barley) or to pay a monthly wage of 1 \textit{kurru} of barley for almost an entire year (2,160 litres).
  \item \textsuperscript{1364} The narrow shape of fields with extremely elongated flanks was a typical feature of institutionally organized land colonisation efforts and \textit{hanšū} allotment schemes certainly fall within this category. With this in mind a 5,000 cubits long flank for a \textit{hanšū} plot does not seem exceptional at all. However, was this a typical length for a \textit{hanšū} plot? It should be noted that the \textit{hanšū} in TCL 12 11 had an even longer flank, namely 21,600 cubits (= 10.8 km). (Other comparable flank lengths are known from Neo-Babylonian and especially Ur III sources; see for instance Fig. 26 in Liverani 1996: 40 which lists some examples from the two periods.)
  \item \textsuperscript{1365} Liverani pointed out the benefits of the elongated field shapes with respect to ploughing and irrigation (1990: 171). On the one hand this field shape is time and energy saving as regards the ploughing. As there are fewer but longer furrows (aligned with the long flank of the field) this means that the cumbersome process of turning the plough at the end of the plot needs to be carried out less frequently. On the other hand the elongated shape of the fields, with the flank more or less perpendicular to a watercourse and the narrow frontage bordering directly on it, ensured that more fields had access to water necessary for irrigation (and subsequently for transportation of agricultural produce). According to Liverani (\textit{ibid.}) the elongated shape of the plots is an indicator that furrow irrigation was being practiced. In other words, water was distributed onto the fields along the lines of the furrows which ran perpendicular to a canal. While furrow irrigation can indeed be practiced efficiently on long runs of gently sloping land, only furrow lengths from 50 to 300 metres are convenient for this type of irrigation (Charles 1988: 17). Other methods of irrigation must have been applied beyond this range then. In modern day Iraq (in the 50’s of the last century) a combination of two irrigation methods could be observed: furrow irrigation on palm trees, vegetables and cotton, and ‘controlled flood irrigation’ (i.e. border or basin irrigation) on winter cereals, legumes and oil seeds (Charles 1988: 19, Buringh 1960: 249). While it is conceivable that basin irrigation was being practiced further down the levees,
Thus none of the considerations presented above are conclusive. More material is needed before we can resolve these questions. In the meantime we can concentrate on the information available in the texts. As for the initiators of these division schemes it is beyond any doubt that they originated from the state administration. According to the subscript of YBC 11566 the land allotted to the rab ḫansē is a “present” of the king: an-na-a-ta qaq qa-ra-a-ta ša 45 kīr 50 re-mut dugal, “This is the land of 45 rab ḫansē, present of the king” (YBC 11566 l. 57). The caption of AnOr 9 1 states that the rab ḫansē seized the land in the presence of the king Marduk-apla-iddina II.1366 In the subscript of this same text it is said that the 91 rab ḫansē were allotted their plots by a certain Ina-qi-ibél-abluṭ, the kerdippu: ina-qi-bi-*en-ab-luṭ kir dib ū-sā-ās-bi-tu, “Ina-qi-ibél-abluṭ, the kerdippu, let (them) take (the land) (i.e. installed them on the land)” (AnOr 9 1 l. 100). The related text NBC 4848 also mentions Ina-qi-ibél-abluṭ in the subscript in a short remark following the date formula; however, he is not given an official title here. He is simply the person under whose authority the division scheme took place: it-ti l-na-qi-bi-4-en-ab-luṭ, “with (the authorisation of) Ina-qi-ibél-abluṭ” (NBC 4848 l. 40). The kerdippu (kartappu) was a professional title which goes back to the Ur III û-il kîr-d-abs, designating personnel that works with mules. The term itself is related to the practice of leading these animals by the nose, a nose-ring or a rope pulled through it, more precisely.1367 While originally the term designated a simple “groom (for leading donkeys and horses...)” it evolved into a profession of the military sphere1368 and later into a high official of the state administration1369 (cf. CAD K: 225). This Ina-qi-ibél-abluṭ, who was responsible for at least two land division schemes in the fourth year of Marduk-apla-iddina II, certainly was a high state official. If the identification proposed by Cocquerillat (1984a: 51) notes, a certain Ina-qi-ibél-abluṭ appears in a clause, the royal official (ša rēš šarrī), kerdippu, the provincial governor (piḫātu), etc. (col. ii l. 20ff.). While his high position within the hierarchy of the state administration is beyond doubt, the nature of his function remains speculative. His frequent appearance in kudurru and in our ḫansū-text as the land-allotting instance, indicates that he was in some way involved in the administration of the state land.

The beneficiaries of these division schemes were, where identifiable, members of the local urban elites. This is especially evident from the Borsippa material. Here the ḫansū properties were associated with the prominent city families, many of which provided prebendary services to the local temples.1371 In land sale or lease documents as well as in imittu-related texts, the land in question is frequently located in ḫansūs of prominent families or of particular members of these families. This is usually expressed as “ḫansū ša (biḫ) PN” where PN can either designate a family or an individual from a certain family. As texts from Borsippa demonstrate, sales and leases of land located in the ḫansūs were conducted under the same conditions as those of regular privately owned land without mention of any particular obligations connected to the ḫansū-properties (but see below).

The ḫansū-texts from Uruk, which provide long lists of personal names, do not allow an identification of the recipients of the ḫansū-land. However, there is some evidence from the private certain factors such as soil type and permeability, land slope and irrigation stream size, all unknown to us, could still pose limitations in terms of maximum surface area irrigable using this method.

1366 In BM 46799+, a sale of two ḫansū-plots from Kiš published by Nielsen (2010: 98ff.), it is stated that the ḫansūs were situated in a zu’atta of Marduk-apla-iddina II, i.e. land apportioned by this king.

1367 See for instance Heimpel 1994: 10f. See also the translation of the Akkadian loanword kartappu in the Ahw (p. 451) as “Pferde-, Zugtierführer”.

1368 According to Sassmannshausen (2001: 54f.) the kartappu (and its Kassite equivalent sakrumsa) in the middle Babylonian period designated a chariot soldier (“Streitwagenkämpfer”).

1369 According to Brinkman (1968: 305) in post-Kassite Babylonia the kerdippu is attested from the early twelfth century through to the late ninth, most of the time as a witness in kudurru and once in a clause against future claims on a kudurru. His official function is not known, but he must have been an important official as he invariably appears towards the top of the witness list, even preceding the governors of Isin and Babylon. The sequence of officials in the clause against future claims in the kudurru inscription of Marduk-zākir-šumi (published by Thureau-Dangin 1919), for instance, names the king in the first place, followed by the prince (mar šarrī), the royal official (ša rēš šarrī), kerdippu, the provincial governor (piḫātu), etc. (col. ii ll. 20ff.). While his high position within the hierarchy of the state administration is beyond doubt, the nature of his function remains speculative. His frequent appearance in kudurru and in our ḫansū-text as the land-allotting instance, indicates that he was in some way involved in the administration of the state land.

1370 As Cocquerillat (1984a: 51) notes, a certain Ina-qi-ibél-ab-<lut> appears in a kudurru of Marduk-apla-iddina II with this title (VAS I, 37 col. v l. 5).

1371 For attestations see van Driel 2002: 301ff.
The systematic use of three-tier genealogies in texts from Uruk started relatively late according to Nielsen (2011: 187f.). The first such attestation is for the scribe of a land sale document (YBC 7407), Z®r0 because these texts are generally outside the chronological scope of the Eanna archive and contemporary private documents are scarce. No further characterisation of these people is given, in form of professional titles or the like, with one important exception. In the hitherto unpublished text YBC 11566 (15 Kan) in line 30 a certain Nã'id-Marduk, the šakin ţemi, appears. He probably reappears again in line 52 of the same text, here without a title but with the patronymic Ûm-19-ušur (or -nāṣir; the exact reading of the name 'u_r-20-1-lá-kam-pab is uncertain). Nã'id-Marduk, son of 'u_r-20-1-lá-kam-pab, also appears in line 18 of BIN 1 159 (8 Kan) and already Kümmel (1979: 139) suggested identifying him with the šakin ţemi of Uruk of the same name. Considering the unusual patronymic this seems quite likely. According to Beaulieu (1997: 380) Nã'id-Marduk was one of the “leaders of the pro-Assyrian faction in Uruk”. The land allotments recorded in BIN 1 159 and YBC 11566 may be seen as rewards for Nã'id-Marduk’s loyalty to the Assyrian regime and/or as an attempt of the Assyrian king to consolidate his control in the Uruk region. As for Nã'id-Marduk, he promptly disappears from the documentation and probably also the political scene after Nabopolassar took over the Babylonian throne. In the function of the governor of Uruk he was replaced in Nabopolassar’s accession year by a supporter of this ruler, An-ţal-iddin. Van Driel suggested that the purpose of the royal restructuring of the urban land-holding, of which the ţansu-land was an important part, was to counter the effects of the “tribalisation of the country caused by the entry of new population elements and the decline of the towns with their autochthonous population” (2002: 297). This was done by strengthening the urban population’s agricultural basis. At the same time this allowed the royal authorities to create a support base for their own political interests in and around the cities rendering them more controllable. Perhaps this was the primary objective of the royal land division schemes.

Another aspect of the royal land allotment schemes in general were special obligations toward the king as attested for the land-for-service systems represented by the qaštu and the later ḥadru-holdings. Service obligations may also have been tied to the ţansu-land. However, neither in the numerous ţansu-land sales and leases from Borsippa nor in the allotment documents from Uruk is there any mention of service obligations. An exception may be an early text from Nippur: As observed by van Driel (2002: 297), TuM 2/3 132 (36 Assurbanipal) associates the ţiku-service with the ţansu-land. Here one party says to the other: “Give me half of your share in the royal division scheme in the ţansu of Nabû-zêr-ibni and I will do the service (attached to the land) together with you”. There is no later evidence for service obligations in connection to ţansu-land. But there are numerous indications that the ţab ţansê were indeed involved in the collection of ţiku-payments. The question remains how these men were connected to the ţansu-land.

In sum, it is conceivable that at least originally ţansu-land entailed service for the crown. Perhaps these obligations became void once the Assyrian rulers were ousted from Babylonia. The

---

1372 This is evident from the land sale documents YBC 4031//BM 114527 (13 Nbk) and YBC 3947 (18 Nbk). The main protagonists of this archive were not prebendaries of the temple. They were, however, involved with the temple in the animal husbandry sector.

1373 The systematic use of three-tier genealogies in texts from Uruk started relatively late according to Nielsen (2011: 187f.). The first such attestation is for the scribe of a land sale document (YBC 7407), Žēr-Bāбли from the Šinnu-family, and is dated to the reign of Kandalânû.

1374 He is attested as šakin ţemi of Uruk in the role of a witness in two sale documents from the archive of Nabû-ţēlîlim (Hunger 1970) both from the 17th year of Kandalânû (NU 2 l. 29, sale of an unbuilt plot; NU 6 l. 31, sale of a part of a baker’s prebend). He also appears in the letters ABL 815 and 1387.

1375 This is the impression one gains especially from the letters ABL 815 and 1387 addressed to Assurbanipal for a discussion see Dietrich 1970: 90f.).

1376 See Beaulieu (1997: 381) for further changes in the office of the governor of Uruk during the first few unstable years of Nabopolassar’s reign.

1377 TuM 2/3 132 ll. 2-5: ... ḫa-la-ka ina zu-1-uz-ti lugal / ina 50-še-e ša ƙag-numum-du ƙa ƙu ina lib-bi / bi-nam-ma il-ku-šu it-ti-ka / lul-lîk.

evidence from Sippar, however, is problematic. While some ḫanṣû-properties are attested in connection with certain individuals (ḫanṣû ša PN), they are never associated with the local families as is the case in Borsippa. What is more, it appears that all the attested ḫanṣû-properties in the Sippar region were administrated by the Ebabbar temple. This stands in contrast to what is known about this type of property from other cities. While it is possible that some of these properties came into the possession of the temple through purchases or confiscations, the fact that all the known ḫanṣûs from Sippar were associated with the temple cannot be accounted for. Van Driel suggests that the ḫanṣû-scheme in Sippar was set up at a time when this type of land division was a thing of the past (2002: 300). This may serve as an explanation for the atypical situation in Sippar. It would at any rate be consistent with the generally late development of the Sippar countryside relative to the other Babylonian cities.

4.6.1. Overview of the ḫanṣû-texts from Uruk

- AnOr 9 1

The text lists 91 rab ḫanṣê. (91 entries)

Il. 1-4: lûgal ša ina pa-ni lû ṣa-a-rî ša-a ṣa-a-ibila-mu / lugal tin-tir gu lû ṣa-a-rî ša-a ṣa-a-ibila-mu / ul-tu ugu mi-sîr ša ê-zu-gu-na-bu / l me 50-aš qa qa-ru ša-bu 1 lim 1 me ê dingir 1 lim lugal

“rab ḫanṣê, who in the presence of Marduk-apla-iddina (II), king of Babylon, seized (each) 150 (cubits) of land on the bank of Ṣarru-Marduk-apla-iddina, from the boundary of Bit-Zugunabu. 1,100 (cubits) of the temple (equals) 1,000 (cubits) of the king.”


“In total 91 rab ḫanṣê who each seized 150 (cubits of) land from Ḥarru-ṣa-Marduk-apla-iddina, (the plots) stretch until the drainage ditch of the ḫanṣû of Ḥarru-ṣa-Nabû-šum-lišir. 4th year of Marduk-apla-iddina (II), king of Babylon. Ina-qibi-Bêl-ablut, the kerdippu, installed (them on the land).”

- NBC 4848 (4 Mai)

(+ duplicate Crozer 201)

The text lists 91 rab ḫanṣê. This text was closely related to AnOr 9 1 but not a duplicate according to Goetze (1947), who only published its opening and closing lines. The remarks ṭepi eššû which appear in the text indicate that it was a copy.

---

1379 For a discussion of this evidence see van Driel 2002: 300.
1380 For attestations see van Driel 2002: 304.
1381 Jursa 2010b: 358f.
1382 Cocquerillat partially edited (1968: 2545. 107) and discussed (1984a: 50ff.) this text.
1383 I have not had a chance to see this text. According to Goetze (1947), Crozer 201 is a duplicate of NBC 4848. Its beginning and end are lost, and only a fragment of one of the closing lines was published by Goetze (ibid.).
1384 Cocquerillat (1984a: 505) transliterated and translated the lines published by Goetze. Some of her readings should be corrected, though. In l. 35 read: ša 1*+en lûgal 50-e. The signs lib-bi which she reads at the end of this line do not correspond to the traces copied by Goetze, nor do they make much sense in this context. Perhaps they were the remnants of an erasure. In l. 37 read mi-sîr an*-ta*-ê* ê* ê*. Line 38 is difficult. Cocquerillat’s proposed î(?)-mad(?)-da(?)-dû(?) at the beginning of the line is improbable for several reasons. The visible traces do not come near these signs, there is hardly enough space for all these signs in the broken part of the line and the writing with the sign dû for a syllabic du would be highly anomalous.
prosopographic enquiry was not particularly fruitful. Only one of the individuals could potentially be the seventh century according to which 1

... (new break) ... (new break).

ll. 35-41: ḫa-la-mes šá 1+en ḫi gal 50-e 5;4.1 še-numlar> (erasure) ḫa-ripeššu ina *gur*lu^1^-da-
du-ul-tu du,^2^ gur-da-qal-tu, / a-di mi-sir an-ta-i šá ina *gur*lu^1^-ú-ti / ƙ x x (ƙ) mi^3^-ši-ih *šá zu^3^-uz-e-ti
(lugal) / unu^4^ iit api un 4-kam mu 4-kam ñamar-uttu-a-mu lugal tin-tin^5^ / it-ti ƙ-qa-bi^6^-en-ab-
luⁿ / im ñ-gur-in-sú-sú-sur a-sú šá *gar*-mu pa-li̇h ñag nu-túm-šú

“91 ḫa-ripeššu, of which each rab ḫa-ripeššu (received/seized) 5;4.1 land (new break) in Ḫudadu, from Til-daqlu until the upper border, which is in Ta'luta; ... the measurement of the divisions of the king.

Uruk, 4-VIII-4 Marduk-apla-iddina (II), king of Babylon.

With (the authorisation of) Ina-qibi-Bēl-abluṭ. Tablet of Nergal-inā-tēši-ēṭer, son of Šakín-šumi. He who revere Nabû must not remove it.”

- SBTU 4 223 (not dated; perhaps Kan^1387^)

The text lists 11 overseers (ḫu uguša) entitled to shares within the ḫanṣū of Šumāyā. 1388

ll. 1-2: ḫa-la-mes šá [...] / šá *šu*-ma-a [ƙ x x ša] / šeš-mes-e-a ƙsum²-nu²-ni

“Shares of […] of Šumāyā […] which was given by Abḫēa.”

ll. 10-11: ḫa-la-mes šá 50-e ƙš-*šu*-ma-a šeš-mes-e ƙa ƙsum²-nu²-ni / šá ugu ƙdi-ḫa-ra-ri-ša-ƙa-la-ba-ƙši

“Shares of the ḫanṣū of Šumāyā, which was given by Abḫēa, (and) which is situated on Ḫarru-ša-Lābāšī.”

ll. 17-18: pap pap 11 ḫi uguša / uguša šá 50-e ƙš-*šu*-ma-[ƙ a (ƙ)] / šá ugu ƙdi-ḫa-ra-ri-ša-ƙa-la-ba-ƙši

“In total 11 overseers of ḫanṣū of Šumāyā, which is situated on Ḫarru-ša-Lābāšī”

What follows in Cocquerillat’s view are the signs šš-*i*-ḫe na-sir 2;2 <ki>šiš which she translates as “en exploitation et surveillance: 2 1/5 kur de terre”. After a collation the reading of this line can be improved to:

ƙ x x (ƙ) mi^3^-ši-ih *šá zu^3^-uz-e-ti (ługal)*

This must have been the length of the flank.

The surface area of 54.1 corresponds to 70x5,000 cubits (or 8.75 ha) in the seed-measure system used in the seventh century according to which 1 kurrù = 60,000 square cubits.

As the other tablets found in the Planquadrat U18 are generally dated to the Hellenistic period, Beaulieu wondered whether the ḫanṣū-allotments still played a role at this time (and SBTU 4 223 should be dated to the Hellenistic period), or whether the tablet at hand was “kept as a curiosity” (1998b: 315). Whatever the reason for the presence of this text among tablets of such a late date may be, it certainly deserves an earlier dating: as Oelsner notes (1995: 385), ḫanṣū-properties are attested only up until the early fifth century. The prosopographic enquiry was not particularly fruitful. Only one of the individuals could potentially be identified in another text: Ṣa-Nabû-šu, son of Nabû-ūšēzû, also appears in AUWE 5 40 from 16 Kan. Here he is responsible for a cattle herd counting 203 heads. It is questionable whether these two attestations concern one and the same person, as the names in question are not uncommon. Some of the patronymics from SBTU 4 223 could be identified in the other ḫanṣū-allotment texts (e.g. Naniya-ipuš (AnOr 9 1: 71), Balāsū (AnOr 9 1: 25, 62; BIN 1 159: 32), Ina-ṭēši-ēṭer (BIN 1 159: 10; YBC 11566: 10), Kudurrû (AnOr 9 1: 23, 43, 56; BIN 1 159: 40; YBC 11566: 46, 55). Again, these names are not uncommon and so no meaningful identification could be made. (It should also be noted that, for instance, there are at least five different Kudurrûs in these three ḫanṣū-texts and even if Kudurrû, father of Ardâya, from SBTU 4 223: 14 were to appear in one of these texts, we could not say which one exactly he was.) Thus, for dating purposes the only clue, even if not a very solid one, is provided by the identification of Ṣa-Nabû-šu in AUWE 5 40. Note that in line 14 the ḫanṣū of a certain Ardâya, son of Kudurrû, is mentioned in connection with the shares of a certain Igîša and Aplaṣya. However, in the final summary these two men are counted with the 11 aklû of the ḫanṣū of Šumāyā.
 BIN 1 159\textsuperscript{1389} (8 Kan)

As Cocquerillat noticed this text and NBC 4848 were copied by the same scribe (1984a: 50f.). The caption of the text speaks of 32 rab ḫansê, but in the text there are in fact the names of 34 different individuals with three names repeated once. There are four more entries recording larger estates of the temple (e.g., l. 7: 1,100 ḫu-me-la-ti šá è šešmek-šá-a a-šú šá id-na-na-a-sizkur-sizkur re-mut lugal). In total there are 42 entries. It should be further noted that 17 individuals from this text reappear in YBC 11566 (see below).

ll. 1-3: a-šá edin zu'-á-zu šá bi ugušmek šá ul-tu qaqq-a-du è za-bu-nu / a-di ḫu-me-la-ti šá a-na 32 lú galmek 50mek a-na 1-en 50i-ū / 4 me ina 1 kūš sum-nu mu 8-kam lkan-da-la-na lugal tin-tir\textsuperscript{k}

“Plots of the steppe,\textsuperscript{1391} division of the overseers, which (stretch) from the top of Bit-Zabunu to ḫumelat\textsuperscript{u} (and) which were given to 32 rab ḫansê (at a rate of) 400 (cubits of frontage) per ḫansê. Year 8 of Kandalû, king of Babylon.”


“These are the rab ḫansê, who seized (the land) from the dam of the overseers stretching until Nāru-eššetu.
Tablet of Nergal-in-a-tēši-četar, son of Marduk-šākin-šumi, descendant of Sin-leqe-unninni. He who reveres Nabû must not remove it.”

YBC 11566 (15\textsuperscript{7} Kan)

The text has 49 entries in which 48 different individuals are listed (one person appears twice). The summary of the text, however, speaks of 45 rab ḫansê. Of these 17 individuals already appear in BIN 1 159.

\textsuperscript{1389} The text is partially edited (1968: 25\textsuperscript{46} 107) and discussed (1984a: 50ff.) by Cocquerillat.
\textsuperscript{1390} See Kümmel 1979: 139\textsuperscript{222} and Frame 1992: 279. If the identification of this Aḥḫēšīya with the šakin tēmi is correct, the entry in l. 44 would indicate a land donation either by Esarhaddon, Assurbanipal or Šamaš-šum-ukin to this official. This of course would have happened a long time before the land allotment scheme described in BIN 1 159 which is dated to 8 Kan. So why was this property listed in a division scheme which was apparently initiated at a much later date, namely in 8 Kan? Or does the date of the text not indicate the date of the allotment scheme? Were in fact all the allotments distributed at a date prior to the composition of the text, say sometime during Assurbanipal’s reign? If this were so, was the present list composed subsequently as a type of land survey? This could probably also explain the presence of temple properties within the list. On the other hand, the caption and the subscript of the text do not speak in favour of interpreting the text as a land survey. While no satisfactory answer can be found to these questions they can simply be evaded if we assume that Aḥḫēšīya, who was granted land, is not to be identified with the šakin tēmi. However, then the question of the temple properties within this ḫansê-scheme still remains open.

\textsuperscript{1391} According to Brinkman (1995: 24) the term eqīl šērī, “steppeland”, which appears in purchases of land intended for cultivation, probably referred to land which was situated “outside the previous village-town-city agricultural network”. The implication in our case is that this land had not been put to any (officially acknowledged) use prior to the division scheme.

\textsuperscript{1392} This word appears only in this text in ll. 2 and 44. While it seems that the word was used as a designation for some type of land or estate its exact meaning and origin are unclear.
The topographical files from Ebabbar show that the hinterlands of Sippar experienced a comparatively late development (Jursa 2010b: 358f.). This had mainly political reasons, namely the wars between the Assyrians and Babylonians in the seventh century which afflicted this area greatly. Only after Nabopolassar was firmly in power, could the royally funded canal-digging and re-structuring of land commence. Despite the relatively late start the agricultural sector of Ebabbar benefited immensely from royal investment and experienced a dynamic growth through a shift toward horticulture. No such dynamic development is discernible from the comparable sixth century files from the Eanna temple of Uruk. While it can be demonstrated that the main sanctuary of the southern Babylonian city expanded its estates continuously, from the late seventh century at least until the start of the Persian rule, be it through purchases, confiscations or royal grants of land, a trend toward an intensification of production by focusing on horticulture as in the Ebabbar of Sippar could not be detected. If Eanna ever experienced a similar period of growth due to royal involvement, this must have predated the archive and could be reflected in the land reorganization schemes undertaken by the kings in the eighth and the seventh century.

Despite some structural similarities – the average field and orchard sizes as well as the average orchard productivity were similar in both temples, for instance – there were some major differences between the agricultural regimes of Eanna and Ebabbar and in consequence of the land-use patterns in the hinterlands of their respective cities. While Eanna owned over six times more land than the Ebabbar (roughly 8,700 kurru vs. 1,400 kurru), the two temples had a similar income in dates (over 12,000 kurru). This means that relatively speaking Eanna invested much less in horticulture than its northern counterpart. The date to barley ratio from Eanna (according to the arrangement of the general contractor) was 1:2.5. In Ebabbar the situation was opposite: the date income was more than twice the barley income. In terms of land the date orchards (more than 343 kurru) occupied from 3.3 % to 3.9 % of Eanna’s estates. The mainstay of Eanna’s agriculture was clearly the cereal production, even though there were serious problems in this sector, mainly due to the lack of adequate work force. In consequence, it can be concluded that the estates of Eanna, though more extensive than those of Ebabbar, were much less intensively farmed. Still there are signs of growth for Eanna, too. Unless we are dealing with wishful prognostications of the temple administration, there seems to have been a 20 % increase in the date production from the beginning of Nabonidus’s reign until the end of Cyrus’s rule, to judge by the rents payable by the general contractors. Furthermore, occasional contracts for (small-scale) reclamation of land, both for the purpose of cereal and date cultivation, are attested from Nebuchadnezzar’s reign on, indicating a continuous, even if not very intensive, process of land amelioration.

Parts of the following section already appeared in print in Janković 2010: 435f.

This is also betrayed by the cadastral texts which record considerable stretches of unused land in the direct hinterland of Uruk.
In general, Eanna concentrated on a more traditional form of agriculture, perhaps because of its somewhat isolated position in the south, away from the core of the empire. The impetus of the extensive royal investments such as the building of the royal palace in Babylon or the construction of the royal canal north of Sippar under Nebuchadnezzar certainly was not as keenly felt as in the northern Babylonian cities.
5. Summary and Conclusion

5.1. The Organisation of labour

The organisation of the temple agriculture entailed several levels of responsibilities. The cultivators, the people who tilled the land and planted and tended the orchards can be found at the lowest tier of the hierarchy. Their main responsibility was tied to the plot of land assigned to them: to produce agricultural commodities on it for the supply of the temple. At the next organisational level one finds an array of agricultural managers and overseers who were responsible for groups of cultivators, usually tied to specific localities. These overseers were not only responsible for the collective deliveries of agricultural produce of the cultivators under their authority but were also obliged to organise work gangs consisting of these men and head them in non-agricultural projects (e.g. building projects, canal digging, etc.). On the highest level of the hierarchy were the top officials of the temple, the šatammu, the qīpu, and the royal commissioner (bēl piqitti), who occasionally got personally involved in the practical issues of the agricultural management. A group of ‘accountants’ recruited from among the temple scribes was also involved in the organisation of the temple agriculture. Some of them, for instance, were in charge of making prognoses of the yields, which determined the obligations of the cultivators. They can be seen as an auxiliary branch of the management, as they were not subordinated to the managers and the overseers, but also held no authority over them.

The hierarchy of the organisation of the temple agriculture from top down looked as follows:

- top temple officials
  (šatammu, qīpu, bēl piqitti, ṭupšar Eanna)
- managers and overseers
  (ša muḫḫi sūti, rab ikkarāti, gugallu, rab epinnis, rab ešertis)
- cultivators
  (ikkarus, errēšus, nukuribus)

We can distinguish between the internal and the external personnel. The internal personnel were members of the temple staff and could be officials, prebendaries or temple dependants, širkus. The external personnel were outsiders who were not socially or legally connected to the temple. The top tier of the agricultural hierarchy and the ‘accountants’ were staffed exclusively by the temple personnel – the high temple officials and the scribes. However, at the lower two levels we find both internal and external personnel, i.e. both members of the temple household and outsiders. As a consequence, especially at the level of the cultivators, the agricultural exploitation could take on a direct or an indirect form.

---

1395 These officials were responsible for numerous leases of temple land, for instance. Their involvement in organisational matters is also exemplified in the letter YOS 3 84: here the qīpu of Eanna gives instructions to the overseer of the ploughmen concerning the organisation of the labour in the various irrigation districts (see Cocquerillat 1968: 92, 136 for an edition).

1396 On a more general note, the ‘accountants’ were responsible for documenting various aspects of the agricultural production and it is this documentation which represents the primary sources for the present study.

1397 The special status of the officials introduced by the royal administration to the temple, the qīpu and the bēl piqitti, is disregarded here as it was of little consequence for the organisation of the temple agriculture. In this context these officials acted on behalf of the temple and in its best interest.
The sharecroppers (errēšus) were the agents of the indirect agriculture. They worked on arable land like the ikkarus, but frequently they focused their efforts on the sesame and kasia cultivation, i.e. on the more intensive forms of agriculture. The sharecroppers were no more than simple peasants who worked the land themselves, or with their families. Unlike their institutional counterparts, the ikkarus, the errēšus were free individuals and were never deployed by the temple administration for non-agricultural work. The errēšus were allotted temple land, but could not depend on the temple for the organisation of the workforce and the means of production – this was their duty. In return they were to pay only a share of the harvest to the temple. By contrast, the temple provided the ikkarus with the means of production (tools and draught animals), but they had to deliver almost the entire yield of the land assigned to them. Jursa demonstrated that the Ebabbar of Sippar relied heavily on the work of the sharecroppers. About two thirds of the temple land were cultivated by the errēšus (Jursa 1995a: 84). Unfortunately, there is no comparable quantitative data for Uruk. While it is clear that the Eanna temple also employed errēšus, it appears that their contribution was far less significant than in the agriculture of Ebabbar.

In the sphere of horticulture there is no terminological opposition between the internal and the external gardeners: both are referred to with the term nukuribbu. There was no dichotomy here like the one reflected by the pair ikkaru – errēšu in the area of arable cultivation. This is probably owed to the circumstance that the temple’s own gardeners worked under the same conditions as the external gardeners.\(^{1398}\)

The internal personnel at the level of the overseers and the cultivators usually implied a širkūtu-status. In other words, these men were un-free individuals who economically and legally depended on the temple. This also means that the temple administration could dispose of their internal labour as it wished and that they could additionally be deployed for various non-agricultural projects. Among the cultivators we find the ploughmen and the gardeners (ikkarus and nukuribbus). The overseers were usually recruited from the ranks of these cultivators and could fill the posts of the overseers of the plough teams (rab ešertis and rab epinnis), the “estate managers” (gugallus), and the overseer of the ploughmen (rab ikkarāti). The rab ešertis (“overseers of ten (plough teams)”) are attested during Nebuchadnezzar’s reign, while the rab epinnis (“overseers of ploughs”) appear during the Achaemenid rule. The individuals attested with these two titles had similar responsibilities, which indicates that the two titles were used in different periods to designate the same type of official. There was only one rab ikkarāti at a time and he was the top agricultural manager at this intermediary level. By contrast, several rab ešertis/epinnis and gugallus were attested simultaneously and were subordinated to the overseer of the ploughmen. Although the duties and the activities of the rab ešertis/epinnis and the gugallus frequently overlapped it appears that the gugallus were superior to these overseers. In other words, the hierarchy of the internal intermediary management was arranged from top down as follows:

- overseer of the ploughmen (rab ikkarāti)
- estate managers (gugallus)
- overseers of ten/ploughs (rab ešertis/epinnis)

The ploughmen, ikkarus, could be recruited from the ranks of the temple’s dependants, širku; however, also outsiders (free persons or private slaves) could be hired by the temple to do the ploughing. When the temple provided them with the means of production these people were also designated as ikkarus and they worked under the same conditions as the temple ploughmen. The social or legal status of the cultivators was not of primary importance for the temple, but whether they were in possession of their own means of production or not. For this reason a distinction between an ikkaru and an errēšu was far more significant than between, say, a free hired worker employed as a ploughman and a širku working as a ploughman.

The main task of the ikkarus was the production of the winter crops, barley, spelt, and wheat, and of the summer crop sesame.\(^{1399}\) For the winter crop cultivation the ploughing season

\(^{1398}\) In individual cases it is frequently impossible to decide whether a certain gardener belonged to the temple personnel or not.

\(^{1399}\) In Sippar the cultivation of sesame was the task of the sharecroppers and the gardeners -- the ikkarus are almost unattested as sesame producers (Jursa 1995a: 178).
lasted probably some four months and was set within the period from the fifth to the tenth month. The harvesting was conducted from the end of the first to the third month. To judge by the dates of the texts recording the issues of sesame for seed, this crop was sown in the fourth month. It was harvested in a period from the sixth to the seventh month.

The ploughmen were organised in plough teams. These teams ideally consisted of four men, four oxen used for drawing the plough, and two cows intended for sustaining the required number of the draught animals with their offspring. The plough team was headed by a foreman who usually appears in the written documentation on behalf of his team.\textsuperscript{1400}

This type of plough team was an administrative norm which was often not reached in practice. Manpower and draught animals were scarce and many plough teams were under-strength.\textsuperscript{1401} The exact number of ploughmen and teams that Eanna had at its disposal is not known. Šum-ukín’s and Kalbaya’s rent contract speaks of 100 plough teams, i.e. 400 ploughmen; however, it is questionable whether the temple could really provide them with this work force. A later rent farmer, Gimillu, had to make do with half that number, namely, 50 plough teams. He complained about it demanding that the number of plough teams be doubled. The temple authorities only consented to raise the number of plough teams to 100 for the rent farmer Bēl-gimlanni who succeeded Gimillu. There is, however, no evidence to prove that the temple actually fulfilled its promise to Bēl-gimlanni. By comparison, Jursa estimated that the Ebabbar of Sippar employed only 30 to 40 plough teams as the inspection lists from the time of Nabonidus record a maximum of 120 ploughmen (1995a: 191). In Uruk there was a minimum of 50 plough teams. Their number was almost certainly higher, but it is questionable whether it reached 100.

The plough team was a basic unit used by the temple administration to determine the work load and the output of its agricultural workforce. Plots of land were assigned per team. In rent contracts and a cross-regional administrative model, the so-called ‘Edict of Belêazzar’, the plot size varied from 20 to 30 kurru (25 - 37.5 ha). These were heavy work-loads which could not be managed by the plough teams in a reasonable amount of time. In fact, the evidence from Sippar which stems from practical texts shows that the plough teams on average tilled between 10 and 15 kurru of land (12.5 - 18.75 ha). This discrepancy only goes to show that the temple could provide only about a half of the necessary workforce. It was the duty of the rent farmer to organise and finance the remaining labour.

The evidence for plot sizes from the Eanna archive is scarce. One text (BIN 1 158) lists plot measurements. While larger plots of 10, 20, 22 and 23 kurru appear in this text, the majority (77 \%) of the recorded measurements is smaller than 4 kurru (5 ha). The median value is 2;4.1.1 (3.55 ha). The evidence for plot sizes from Sippar is more abundant. Here the average plot had the surface of 2 kurru. The situation was apparently not very different from the one in Uruk. The implication of these relatively small surface areas is that a plough team had to work on more than one plot in a single ploughing season.

In the accounting models the yield was directly proportional to the size of the land. Other factors which may have influenced the productivity of land were not taken into consideration for prognostication purposes. The ‘Edict of Belêazzar’ prescribes twelve-fold returns, i.e. 12 kurru of barley per 1 kurru of tilled land. The yield factor 12 is also confirmed as an average value by the practical evidence from Sippar. Here yield factors between 2 and 30 are attested, but those ranging from 10 to 15 are the most common ones. In other words, the average yield was about 1,728 litres of barley per hectare. This is about 24 \% more than the average yields recorded in the Ur III and the Old Babylonian period. This increase is understood as evidence for an intensification of agriculture in the Neo-Babylonian period (Jursa 2010b: 48ff.). On the one hand, technological innovation indicated by the use of iron for tools and ploughshares probably raised the efficiency of agricultural work. On the other, the sowing was conducted more intensively (i.e. the spacing between the furrows was decreased, more seed was expended per unit of surface area, and there were more furrows per unit of surface area than in the previous periods). These factors influenced

\textsuperscript{1400} In Sippar these foremen were designated as rab epinnî. In Uruk they are usually not given a special title other than ikkaru. The title bēl epinni is attested once (YOS 7 102) and is probably equivalent to the Sipparean rab epinnî.

\textsuperscript{1401} This is explicitly attested for the Ebabbar of Sippar (Jursa 1995a: 17). The situation was probably similar in Uruk.
the increased productivity of the Neo-Babylonian period. There is no practical evidence for yields from Uruk. The only relevant information is provided by the rent contracts. The yield factors recorded therein fall within the range of the average yields found in Sippar. One exception is the rent contract of Šum-ukin and Kalbaya for the largest rent farm ever set up in Eanna (or in Babylonia for all we know): for a surface area of 6,000 kurru (7,500 ha) of which only one half was to be tilled while the other half was to be left fallow the temple expected a revenue of 25,000 kurru of barley. This meant that a fairly low yield factor of 8.33 was applied. The rent of 25,000 kurru of barley did not represent the entire expected yield from 3,000 kurru of land. There were other running costs beside the rent which needed to be covered, namely the seed and animal fodder for the following ploughing season. These would have amounted to another 3,000 kurru of barley. Presumably the rent farmer could make a profit on top of the running costs; however, we have no information whatsoever on his profit margin. The running costs alone (without the profit of the rent farmer) implied a productivity of 1,344 litres of barley per hectare. This is lower than the average productivity of the Ebabbar land and comes fairly close to the Ur III and Old-Babylonian models. This comparatively low productivity does not necessarily indicate that land in the south of Babylonia, in the region of Uruk, was generally less productive than land in the north. It may in fact be a reflection of the special conditions under which Šum-ukin and his nephew Kalbaya agreed to work for the temple and which allowed for a larger margin of profit. As was noted, other rent contracts from the Eanna archive record the same average level of productivity (yield factor 12) as the one attested for the hinterlands of Sippar or in the ‘Edict’.

The gardeners, nukuribbus, were in charge of the temple orchards. Their main task was to produce dates for the temple, either by tending existing orchards or by creating new date plantations. They also cultivated the land below the date palms and planted fruit trees, vegetables and cereals there. The people who appear as debtors in the imittu debt notes for dates usually cannot be identified with much certainty. Some of them bore tripartite names, indicating that they stemmed from higher social strata. These were probably tenants of the temple orchards who did not actually work in them. Others, generally without a family name, may have been the gardeners working in the orchards. The documentation does not make a distinction here. Furthermore no distinction was made between the external and internal gardeners – they all worked under the same conditions. Occasionally we hear of gardeners employed at non-agricultural work such as canal-digging or brick-making. These gardeners were presumably temple dependants.

Seven or more people, frequently members of one family, worked in one orchard under a ‘main’ gardener.\(^{1402}\) The gardeners were tied to specific localities and stood under the authority of the agricultural managers and overseers (gugallu, rab esertis, rab ikkaräti, and the large-scale rent farmers).

An annual estimation procedure conducted by temple scribes and estimators (êmides) predicted the yield and the impost (imittu) which the gardeners had to deliver to the temple. This was done by inspecting the temple’s orchards shortly before the date harvest in the sixth or the seventh month. At this occasion the impost for each orchard was recorded in a debt note charged against the gardener responsible for the given orchard. The impost did not represent the entire yield of the orchard as there were other costs and administrative fees which needed to be covered over and above the amount of dates owed to the temple. In order to allow for the additional costs and even a profit of the orchard tenant, the imittu must have amounted to between 75 and 80% of the entire yield.

According to the ‘Edict of Belšazzar’ an average orchard with a surface area of 1 kurru produced an imittu of 35 kurru (plus 5 kurru as the remuneration of the gardener). This meant a total productivity between 43.75 and 46.67 kurru of dates per kurru of surface.\(^{1403}\) While this level of productivity is not unrealistic – in fact the productivity of the private orchards from the hinterlands of Borsippa was even higher with an average imittu of 48 kurru of dates per kurru of land\(^{1404}\) – the institutional orchards generally did not reach it. The data from Uruk and Sippar suggest average imittus of approximately 27 kurru of dates. The total productivity of the

---

1402 This is especially evident in the documentation from the Ebabbar of Sippar (Jursa 1995a: 36).
1403 These figures are obtained on the assumption that the imittu was between 75 and 80% of the entire yield.
1404 Jursa 2010b: 373f.
institutional orchards was then between 34 and 36 kurru of dates per kurru of land (or from 4.896 to 5.184 litres per hectare). The average size of the institutional orchard plots in Uruk was just over 1 kurru (1;0.1.3 = 1.31 ha). This is somewhat smaller but still comparable to the average orchards from Sippar which had a surface area of 1;4.2 (Jursa 2010b: 351).

We are not informed about the deliveries of products grown below the date palms, but it appears that the gardeners were entitled to a share in them. In addition to these and the impost, the gardeners also had to deliver date palm by-products to the temple: a basket made of palm leaves, leaflets, fibre, and a load of wood. They also had to pay certain administrative fees which amounted to 5.83% of the impost during the time of Cambyses and to 8.33% during the reign of Nebuchadnezzar IV. The same amount of 8.33% of the impost is also recorded in the ‘Edict of Bel¡azzar’. Over and above these payments the gardeners of Eanna also had to deliver 1 kurru of dates per orchard as a fee for the gugalšu-official.

As remuneration the gardeners usually received a salary in dates, sissinu. This could vary between 3 and 5 kurru of dates per kurru of surface depending on the type of work conducted. In addition to this the gardeners could keep a share of the produce grown below the date palms. In certain circumstances, in particular when the orchards were newly planted or when they contained young, not fully productive date palms, the gardener was allowed a usufruct of the entire or a part of the orchard for a period from five to ten years. There is also some indication that sharecropping existed as a form of cultivation of temple orchards. Two texts from the Eanna archive (TCL 12 59 and NBC 4739) suggest that the gardeners were entitled to a quarter-share from the orchards at their disposal. It is not clear whether these two instances should be considered as exceptional or rather as the norm before the appearance of the large-scale rent farms. Sharecropping in the context of date cultivation is at any rate not attested in the Ebabbar of Sippar.

5.2. Modes of exploitation

The employment of internal and external personnel and the corresponding modes of exploitation, i.e. direct vs. indirect, follows an old Mesopotamian tradition. Jursa demonstrated that the two categories for land used in the Old-Sumerian, Ur-III and Old-Babylonian temples can also be found in the Neo-Babylonian institutions (1995a: 195): gân-nig-en-na or gân-gū₄, the third millennium categories for directly exploited land, correspond to the land worked by the temples’ own ikkaru in the first millennium; gân-apin-lā or gân-nig-gāl-la, land worked by external personnel under sharecropping terms, corresponds to the land leased out to the errēšās. A third category of institutional land, šuku, designating plots allotted to the members of an institution for subsistence purposes could not be easily identified in the temples of the first millennium, though it probably did exist. Jursa found clear evidence for land (without any particular designation) allocated to the temple enterers (ērib bitēs) of Ebabbar in the locality Til-gubbi (1995a: 231). Furthermore Joannès suggested that the bit rittis could be related to the subsistence land designated as šuku in the third millennium institutions (1982: 15f.).

There is a sense of continuity with regard to the modes of exploitation extending over three millennia of Mesopotamian history. This is supported both by the evidence from Ebabbar and from Eanna. Nevertheless, the quantitative distribution of these types of exploitation changed considerably over time as Jursa demonstrated for the Ebabbar temple. He compared this Neo-Babylonian temple with the Ur III Nam-ha-ni temple in Lagaš. In the Ur III temple some 67% of the estates were exploited directly, 8% were leased out and 25% were allocated to temple personnel as subsistence land. The proportional distribution in the Ebabbar of Sippar was significantly different. While the role of the subsistence land could not be quantified, only about a third of the temple’s estates were exploited directly and approximately two thirds were exploited by sharecroppers. This heavy reliance on external workforce is a reflection of the manpower problem and it indicates that the Ebabbar temple operated in a different socio-economic setting than its third millennium counterpart (Jursa 1995a: 196f.). The evidence for the importance of the sharecroppers for the Eanna temple is scanty. Nevertheless, it offers a different picture, even though this temple too suffered from a lack of an adequate workforce. The role of the errēšās was apparently not as prominent in Eanna. According to the account TCL 13 227 in the fifth regnal year of Nabonidus they only supplied 9.8% of barley, 13.8% of spelt and 19.4% of sesame relative to the total
income for that year. Although this evidence stems from a period when large-scale rent farmers managed the temple agriculture and the actual scale of the sharecroppers’ contribution may have been obscured by the collective sātu delivered by the rent farmers, the presence of the errēṣīs in the texts from Eanna, especially the imitti lists, is not as ubiquitous as in the comparable texts from the Ebabbar archive. Thus it appears that the Eanna temple retained a more traditional approach with regard to the modes of exploitation.

An innovation of the first millennium temples was the employment of the large-scale rent farmers (ṣa muḫḫī siti)\textsuperscript{1405}. These contractors rented large tracts of land for a net annual rent payment in agricultural produce. They played an intermediary role between the landlord, i.e. the temple, and the agricultural workers. Depending on the scope of their rent farms, the temple occasionally put its own workforce, temple ploughmen and gardeners, cattle and agricultural tools at their disposal. This was generally not enough to meet the obligations toward the temple so the rent farmers had to organise additional workforce by subletting the temple land, either to small-scale contractors or to sharecroppers, or by hiring agricultural workers, thus supervising both the internal and the external workforce. The rent farm system was conceptualised in a way that the rent farmer was supposed to provide up to 50% of the work force and the means of production. In a sense, the rent farm system was a hybrid form combining the direct and the indirect agricultural exploitation.\textsuperscript{1406}

The temple relied heavily on the agricultural income from the rent farms. The account TCL 13 227 demonstrates that the rent paid by Šum-ukīn and Kalbāya from 2 to 7 Nbn amounted to between ca. 83 and 90% of the temple’s total income in dates and cereals even if some of these commodities were not produced on the temple estates but had to be purchased elsewhere.\textsuperscript{1407}

The emergence of the rent farm system, especially at a scale unattested prior to Nabonidus’s reign, points to two major structural weaknesses of the Neo-Babylonian temples. On the one hand, they did not have enough labour – both manpower and draught animals were deficient. On the other, the temples were under-capitalised (cf. Jursa 2010b: 768). The rent farm system was designed to counter these weaknesses. The temples were dependent on the inflow of capital from the outside. This could be provided by the king (e.g. land donations, development of infrastructure, especially irrigation canals; all this enabled the expansion of the temple estates) or by agricultural contractors, whose primary duty involved tackling the labour problem. No significant royal investments in the infrastructure of the Uruk countryside are attested for the duration of the archive. The major challenges of the temple agriculture, it appears, were delegated to the rent farmers. The largest investments were expected from independent businessmen like Šum-ukīn. However, Eanna also had to rely on its own enterprising personnel, who were not necessarily free economic agents and who could probably contribute less to the temple agriculture in terms of capital inflow. The reason for this was no official policy of the temple (e.g. an attempt to gain more control over its agricultural production by employing temple affiliates as rent farmers as was suggested by Coquellelliat 1968: 95), but rather the result of a lack of adequate investors. Uruk was economically underdeveloped in comparison to the northern Babylonian cities; the temple agriculture followed a traditional extensive regime which left little opportunity for fast growth. For this reason it was probably not as attractive a location for investors as the capital and the cities in its vicinity.

\textsuperscript{1405} As Jursa (1995a: 196) notes, quoting van Driel (1989: 213ff.), rent farming was a typical phenomenon of the Neo-Babylonian period. It was a variant of the widespread practice of farming out of rights to collect income in various branches of economy, and some of its aspects may have had their forerunners in the Old-Babylonian Palastgeschäft (see, for instance, Renger 2004).

\textsuperscript{1406} The social background of the rent farmers reflects this duality on another level. The two most famous rent farmers of Eanna who managed the largest rent farm known so far, Šum-ukīn and Kalbāya, were outsiders who moved to Uruk from Babylon. However, not all the ṣa muḫḫī siti were independent businessmen who came from outside the temple structure. In fact, most of them were in one way or another connected to the temple, as temple officials or dependants, or they belonged to the local urban elite with family ties which extended to the temple.

\textsuperscript{1407} In 4 Nbn 3,712 kurru of dates (32% of that year’s rent for dates) were purchased in the Sealand and Marad.
5.3. Agricultural regime and growth

Eanna expanded its estates continuously from the late seventh century at least until the start of the Persian rule. This was done mainly through purchases, confiscations or royal grants of land. The land lease contracts also give some evidence for an on-going expansion of agriculturally used land through reclamation of arable land and creation of new date orchards. However, the process of land acquisition and amelioration, although steady, was apparently not very intensive. The temple chiefly relied on the input of the rent farmers for growth. As a result, a large rent farm and a number of smaller ones were created during Nabonidus’s reign with the support of the royal administration. However, the success of these policies was not very far-reaching. Although the rent farm system was relatively stable, the rent farmers were weighed down with inadequate numbers of labourers and draught animals. Furthermore, agriculturally useful land was limited.

A royal investment in the expansion of the irrigation network would have probably had a greater impact on the growth of the temple agriculture. This can be demonstrated with the example of the Ebabbar of Sippar (Jursa 2010b: 355ff.). This temple’s agriculture underwent a comparatively late but dynamic development after Nabopolassar consolidated his rule in Babylonia and the royally sponsored canal-digging began. The (re-)construction of canals, in particular the Nār-Šamaš, enabled the creation of prebendary orchards in the immediate hinterland of the city only at the beginning of Nebuchadnezzar’s reign. Prior to that, the members of the Ebabbar priesthood held land south of the city, on the Nār-mašēnī. The region of the Nār-mašēnī also experienced the beneficial involvement of the king through the setting up of the hansū-properties under Nabopolassar and early in the reign of Nebuchadnezzar. This royal action probably gave the impulse for the intensification of production reflected in the creation of date plantations which appear as fully productive already during the time of Nabonidus. The most dramatic development in the Sippar countryside, however, was induced by a large-scale reclamation project begun probably at the beginning of Nebuchadnezzar’s rule. The construction of the royal canal, the Nār-šarrī, north of Sippar linking the Euphrates with the Tigris, provided the temple with a whole new area into which to expand its agricultural activities. The estates along the Nār-šarrī typically start appearing in the documentation during the reign of Nebuchadnezzar as centres of cereal cultivation. Occasional references to sesame deliveries from this area demonstrate the attempts to intensify the production. Subsequent appearances of date orchards during the reign of Darius demonstrate that the process of intensification was an on-going one in the region.

No such dynamic development can be observed for the estates of Eanna. The royal restructuring of the Uruk hinterlands falls outside the scope of the Eanna archive. No major royal investments in the infrastructure of the Uruk countryside are attested in the archive. But more importantly, even though Eanna and Ebabbar exhibit substantial structural similarities – the organisation of agricultural production, the average field and orchard sizes as well as the average productivity were similar in both temples – there were some major differences between their agricultural regimes. The most striking observation is that the two temples had similar annual incomes in dates (over 12,000 kurru) even though Eanna’s estates were more than six times larger than Ebabbar’s (approximately 8,700 kurru vs. 1,400 kurru). In other words, Eanna invested much less in horticulture than Ebabbar. The mainstay of Eanna’s agriculture was the more extensive cereal cultivation. According to the rent contract of Šum-ukīn Eanna expected an annual income of 2.5 times more barley than dates. In Ebabbar this ratio was just the opposite: the date income was more than double the barley income. Ebabbar intensified its agriculture by a shift towards horticulture while Eanna employed a more conservative, traditional agricultural regime based primarily on cereal cultivation. The reason for this traditional approach has already been mentioned: Eanna had a somewhat isolated position in the south, far away from the core of the empire and the main trade and communication routes. And while the capital Babylon and the cities in its vicinity profited on various levels from the royal building projects, the effects of these royal investments were not far-reaching enough as to promote the growth of the Urukean temple agriculture comparable to that of Ebabbar, for instance.

Nevertheless, a certain amount of growth and perhaps a trend toward intensification can be observed for Eanna, too. Eanna’s income in dates from the general contractors was 10,000 kurru during Nabonidus’s reign. The rent increased to 12,000 kurru at the end of Cyrus’s reign. This indicated a 20 % increase in the date production. Conversely, the barley quota imposed on the
large-scale contractors decreased over time, indicating that they were willing (or able) to invest less and less in arable agriculture. In general, the date cultivation on the estates of Eanna appears less problematic than the cereal production. The account TCL 13 227 shows that Šum-ukin and Kalbāya usually had no problems to deliver the date rent, but most of the time they fell short of the barley target. Considering the chronic lack of work force that plagued Eanna, and the fact that horticulture is more work-intensive than cereal cultivation, it appears that the contractors intentionally laid greater emphasis on the date production. It was, after all, more profitable in terms of yield per surface area and more likely to produce a surplus.\(^\text{1408}\) There is no clear evidence which demonstrates that the increase of the temple’s date income attested for the Achaemenid period happened at the expense of cereal cultivation; however, the performance of the rent farmers Šum-ukin and Kalbāya and the generally restrained resources of the temple point in this direction. It appears that the Eanna temple followed the example of its northern counterpart by shifting the emphasis on the date production. Unfortunately it is not possible to assess to which extent this shift occurred as the scope of the archive limits our understanding of this development. However, it is interesting to note that the driving forces behind this change were not the royal investments and the development of the infrastructure as was the case in the Sippar countryside, but rather the strategies of the rent farmers. Consequently this development was somewhat delayed and probably not as profound as in the north of the country.

In his survey of the institutional economy Jursa concludes that “the model of the ‘closed’ redistributional system of an ideally self-sufficient institutional household is not applicable to the sixth-century temple households” (2010b: 770). The examination of the agriculture of Eanna offers plenty of evidence to support this conclusion. The temple’s agricultural production could not cover the temple’s requirements in agricultural commodities, rather it had to engage in monetised exchange with the outside world.\(^\text{1409}\) Its own workforce was not sufficient for conducting the necessary agricultural work – a part of the temple estates had to be ceded to external cultivators.\(^\text{1410}\) It depended on the investments from the outside – from the king or from the agricultural contractors it employed. In other words, the temple agriculture was set in an open economic system. All in all, in the sixth century the temples were still big economic players and important landowners, but they stopped dominating the economic lives of their cities.

Eanna was embedded within a society undergoing dynamic economic growth.\(^\text{1411}\) However, not all the regions of Babylonia experienced this change at the same rate. Owing to its position at the periphery of the empire the development of the temple economy as reflected in the sphere of agriculture was comparably slow and limited. In contrast to the Ebabbar temple of Sippar, Eanna relied on the more traditional modes of exploitation, it laid greater emphasis on an extensive agrarian regime and undertook more moderate attempts at intensification. The particular patterns of Eanna’s agrarian development fit well within the Agrarkreise model developed by Johann von Thünen in the mid-nineteenth century and discussed by Jursa in the context of Babylonia.\(^\text{1412}\) In Jursa’s words, “proximity to a city and its consumers should cause commercialisation and intensification of agricultural production, whereas agrarian regimes aiming at self-sufficiency of producers and characterised by extensive production are more common as distance from the urban centre increases” (2010b: 784). As an institution on the margin of the Babylonian empire Eanna’s

\(^{1408}\) A surplus in date deliveries is indeed attested for the years 3, 4 and 6 Nbn according to TCL 13 227.

\(^{1409}\) For the time of Nabopolassar and Nebuchadnezzar significant purchases of barley from the Sealand are attested for Eanna (Jursa 2010b: 93). There is at least one attestation of a considerable amount of dates imported from the Seeland and Marad by the rent farmers Šum-ukin and Kalbāya (TCL 13 227). The temple’s well developed sector of animal husbandry provided its cash crop – wool. The Ebabbar temple, on the other hand, had to purchase sheep and cattle for the regular offerings. Its cash crop were the dates (Jursa 2010b: 573).

\(^{1410}\) Still to a lesser extent than was done in the Ebabbar of Sippar.

\(^{1411}\) Note the ‘commercialisation model’ applied by Jursa to Babylonia of the sixth century BC (2010b: 44ff. and 784ff.). According to this model the interplay of factors such as population growth and urbanisation, intensification and market-orientation of agricultural production, monetisation of economic exchange, increased labour specialisation, among others, is understood to indicate intensive economic growth.

\(^{1412}\) See Jursa 2010b: 43f.
agriculture is a good example for regional variation in economic development existent in Babylonia in the sixth century BC.
6. Appendices

6.1. Appendix 1: Additional text editions

"On the 7th day of the XIIth month of the 5th year of Cyrus, king of Babylon, king of the lands, Ardia, son of Фkin0¡umi, descendant of Sîn0tabni, will go to Uruk and litigate against Nidinti0B®l, son of Nabû0muk²n0z®ri, descendant of D¤bib², the chief administrator of Eanna, and Nabû0a©0iddin, the royal commissioner to Eanna, before the royal judges, concerning the slave that Фkin0¡umi, son of Ibni0I¡tar, descendant of Sîn0tabni, Ardia's father, had received from Silim0B®l, son of Apl¤ya, who has arrears of the Lady of Uruk at his charge. If he does not come, he will pay to the Lady of Uruk the quitrent of the slave for the period he had him at his disposal and will return him. Witnesses: Nabû0muk²n0apli, son of N¤din, descendant of D¤bib²; Šama¡0tabni0u'ur, son of Marduk0¡¤pik0z®ri, descendant of Sîn0leqe0unninn²; İ¡tar0a©0iddin, son of Innin0z®r0iq²¡a, descendant of R®Ýi0sattukki; Scribe: Šama¡0muk²n0apli, son of N¤din, descendant of Egibi; Uruk; 18-XI-5 Cyr, king of Babylon, king of lands."

YBC 9161 1414

1413 The text is discussed on p. 92.
1414 The text is discussed on p. 117.
“45 kurru of dates, pertaining to the sîtu of Nabû-alḫē-šullim, son of Nabû-udammīq, property of the Lady of Uruk and Nanâya, share of Zêria, son of Kînênya, and Nabû-bêl-li, son of Nanâya-êreš, are the debt of Zêria, son of Kînênya, and Nabû-bêl-li, son of Nanâya-êreš. On the 20th day of the XIIth intercalary month they will deliver all the dates to Eanna. If they do not deliver (the dates), they shall deliver barley to Nabû-alḫē-šullim according to the dates which Amurru-mukîn-apli had delivered instead of barley. They will take the remainder of 45 kurru of dates and give it to Nabû-alḫē-šullim.

Witnesses: Marduk, son of Balâssu,
Šamaš-šum-lišir, son of Šamaš-ipuš,
Scribe: Šûkin-šumi, son of Ĭbni-Ĭstar;
Estate of the Lady of Uruk, which is situated on Bitqu-ša-Bêl-êter; 16 XIIa 42 Nb, king of Babylon,
10 típus will pay.”

YOS 7 174\(^{1417}\)

1. 14 δuŋ\(\text{dan-nu-tu ri-qu-tu la-hi-ru-tu}\)
\(\text{sâ ina šu}^\text{II} \text{lù ṣṣ-sâ-bê-e sâ}^\text{III} \text{na-ṣi-ba-a-ta a-di}\)
2 \(\text{dan-nu-tu} \text{ṣâ}^\text{III} \text{lù ṣṣ-sâ-bê-e sâ}^\text{III} \text{unbi-ra-a-ta u}^\text{I} \text{t}
\(10 \text{δuŋ \text{t}a} \text{ša}^\text{III} \text{lu engar-mek \(\text{t}e\) rin\(\text{t}e\) mek \(\text{šu}^\text{III} \text{sù}^\text{I} \text{pa}^\text{I} \text{b}^\text{I} 24 \text{δuŋ \text{t}a} \text{nu-tu}\)

5. \(\text{ri-qu-tu la-hi-ru-tu nî-ga} \text{injin unug}\)
\(\text{u}^\text{III} \text{na-na-a ina muḫ-hi}^\text{II} \text{ṣu-la-a a-šu}\)
\(\text{sâ}^\text{III} \text{lù 50-sum-mu}^\text{I} \text{lu engar}^\text{III} \text{ri-gi} \text{injin unug}\)
\(\text{u}^\text{II} \text{d} \text{kam-sâ}^\text{II} <\text{inina}> \text{iti gan i-na-aṣ-ši-ma}\)

YOS 7 174\(^{1417}\)

1. 14 δuŋ\(\text{dan-nu-tu ri-qu-tu la-hi-ru-tu}\)
\(\text{sâ ina šu}^\text{II} \text{lù ṣṣ-sâ-bê-e sâ}^\text{III} \text{na-ṣi-ba-a-ta a-di}\)
2 \(\text{dan-nu-tu} \text{ṣâ}^\text{III} \text{lù ṣṣ-sâ-bê-e sâ}^\text{III} \text{unbi-ra-a-ta u}^\text{I} \text{t}
\(10 \text{δuŋ \text{t}a} \text{ša}^\text{III} \text{lu engar-mek \(\text{t}e\) rin\(\text{t}e\) mek \(\text{šu}^\text{III} \text{sù}^\text{I} \text{pa}^\text{I} \text{b}^\text{I} 24 \text{δuŋ \text{t}a} \text{nu-tu}\)

5. \(\text{ri-qu-tu la-hi-ru-tu nî-ga} \text{injin unug}\)
\(\text{u}^\text{III} \text{na-na-a ina muḫ-hi}^\text{II} \text{ṣu-la-a a-šu}\)
\(\text{sâ}^\text{III} \text{lù 50-sum-mu}^\text{I} \text{lu engar}^\text{III} \text{ri-gi} \text{injin unug}\)
\(\text{u}^\text{II} \text{d} \text{kam-sâ}^\text{II} <\text{inina}> \text{iti gan i-na-aṣ-ši-ma}\)

YOS 7 174\(^{1417}\)

1. 14 δuŋ\(\text{dan-nu-tu ri-qu-tu la-hi-ru-tu}\)
\(\text{sâ ina šu}^\text{II} \text{lù ṣṣ-sâ-bê-e sâ}^\text{III} \text{na-ṣi-ba-a-ta a-di}\)
2 \(\text{dan-nu-tu} \text{ṣâ}^\text{III} \text{lù ṣṣ-sâ-bê-e sâ}^\text{III} \text{unbi-ra-a-ta u}^\text{I} \text{t}
\(10 \text{δuŋ \text{t}a} \text{ša}^\text{III} \text{lu engar-mek \(\text{t}e\) rin\(\text{t}e\) mek \(\text{šu}^\text{III} \text{sù}^\text{I} \text{pa}^\text{I} \text{b}^\text{I} 24 \text{δuŋ \text{t}a} \text{nu-tu}\)

5. \(\text{ri-qu-tu la-hi-ru-tu nî-ga} \text{injin unug}\)
\(\text{u}^\text{III} \text{na-na-a ina muḫ-hi}^\text{II} \text{ṣu-la-a a-šu}\)
\(\text{sâ}^\text{III} \text{lù 50-sum-mu}^\text{I} \text{lu engar}^\text{III} \text{ri-gi} \text{injin unug}\)
\(\text{u}^\text{II} \text{d} \text{kam-sâ}^\text{II} <\text{inina}> \text{iti gan i-na-aṣ-ši-ma}\)

1415 Amurru-mukîn-apli should probably be identified with the gugallu of the governor of the Sealand who was involved with Eanna and its agricultural officials on several occasions (p. 127). It appears that he owed barley to the temple but had delivered this amount instead as dates. The two debtors, Zêria and Nabû-bêl-li, are obliged to deliver 45 kurru of dates by a certain date. Failing this they are supposed to deliver barley instead, namely, precisely the amount of barley which Amurru-mukîn-apli should have delivered. This is probably what is indicated by the phrase a-ki-i zû-lum-ma\(^3\) sâ\(^4\) ṣû-gal-gin-ilâ / a-na še-bar it-tan-ni in ll. 8f. The amount of barley originally owed by Amurru-mukîn-apli was apparently smaller than the debt of Zêria and Nabû-bêl-li. For this reason they are to deliver the remainder of their debt (as dates?) to Nabû-alḫē-šullim, who was an agricultural official and the person in charge of the dues of the ploughmen and the sharecroppers (p. 116).

1416 This could be the same category of people that appears in YOS 17 33: 5 (p. 88), designating extra workers attached to the ploughmen (for a discussion of the term see note 65). It is not clear how they fit into the context of this debt note.

1417 The text is discussed on p. 107.
15. ḫumbisag ẖi-miš-lu a-šū šā ẖi-in-nin-numun-mu
    īnu-na-ši-ba-a-ta ši-iḫu šā ġašan šā unug ẖi
    iti gan ud l-kam mu ḫ4-kam ḫi-kam-bu-zi-ia
    lugal tin-tir ẖi lugal kur-kur

"14 empty, old vats, which were at the disposal of the villagers of Naṣibāta, including two vats of
the villagers of Bīrāta, and 10 vats of the ploughmen, his workers; in total 24 empty, old vats,
property of Ištar of Uruk and Nanāya, are owed by Šulāya, son of Sīn-nādin-šumi, the ploughman
(and) oblate of Ištar of Uruk. On the fifth day of the ninth month he will take (the vats) and give
them in Udānnu to Nabū-āḫ-iddin, the royal commissioner of Eanna. (This is) apart from his
arrears.
Witnesses: Šulāya, son of Rēmūt, descendant of Kūri,
          Ėrišu, son of Ubār-eššu,
          Madān-šar-ūṣur, son of Marduk-nāṣir,
Scribe: Gimmillu, son of Innin-zēr-iddin;
Naṣibāta, estate of the Lady of Uruk; 1-IX-4 Camb, king of Babylon, king of lands."

YOS 6 41418 6-VII-acc Nbn

obv.  1. ḫi-u-gur-mu ḫa-na-din ḫi-utu-du
    ḫi-ag-sip-ú-ḪI ḫa-na-na-mu
    a-na da-ḪI ina igi ḫi-si-lim ḫI-en
    a-šū šā ḫI-en-numun a ḫba-si-ia
5. ḫi-zi-zi-u-du ḫul-lu šā ḫi-si-lim ḫI-en
    ḫi-pu-uš-šu-ḪI ni-ḪI-ḪI
    u šuk ḫI-e-ḪI a-ḪI ḫI-bal ḫI ḫI-met
    i-nam-da-ḪI-ḪI-ḪI mu-ta šā e-lat
    ina a-ḪI mu i-bat-i-ḪI ḫI-ḫun-ḫa
(Concerning) the house of Marduk-eriba, son of Apláya, in the district of the Meslamtaea gate, which had been given in 7 Nbn from the property of Eanna for 5 minas of silver for merchandise (mēreštu)\textsuperscript{1421} to Ištarr-Šum-čereš and Eanna-šadunu, sons of Nabû-zēr-lišir, descendants of Šangu-Ninurta, (and) the built house with doorframes in place in the Egaḫalanki district, belonging to Šum-ukin, son of Bēl-zēri, which had been given from the property of Eanna for 6 minas 6 sekel of silver for merchandise to Ištarr-šum-čereš and Eanna-šadunu\textsuperscript{1423} in total 11 minas 6 sekel of silver, which had been given to Ištarr-šum-čereš and Eanna-šadunu from the property of Eanna for merchandise, (for which) they, however, had not delivered any merchandise to Eanna. The two houses were until this day at their disposal and at the disposal of An-šum-mudammiq, son of Eanna-šadunu. The houses collapsed while at their disposal and the doors, the beams, and wickerwork, everything that was in them, was carried away. The houses became ruins. Then, in the seventh month of 3 Camb, king of Babylon, king of lands, (for) the house of Marduk-eriba, in the district of the Meslamtaea gate, (a new price of) 2 minas of silver was determined, and (for) the house of Šum-ukin, in the Egaḫalanki district, (a new price of) 4 1/2 minas of silver (was

\textsuperscript{1421} The text is discussed on p. 167.

\textsuperscript{1422} I.e. for trading purposes.

\textsuperscript{1423} In other words, the two men were given houses instead of cash in order to purchase goods for the temple.
determined). In sum, 6 1/2 minas of silver is the price of the two houses. Of this (amount) 1 mina of silver, the claim [against] Šin-êreš, son of Nabû-šum-lišir, descendant of Ibni-il, [Šin-âh-iddin], and the wife of Nabû-šum-êreš, who had seized the house given as pledge, Šin-âh-iddin [gave (to the temple)]. The remainder of the silver from the debt note, property of Ištar of Uruk, [charged against Innin-šum]-êreš and Eanna-šadûnu, was received from An-šum-mudammîq, [son of] Eanna-šadûnu, for the property of Eanna. [...] the two houses have reverted to the property of Eanna. [All] sealed documents and contracts (concerning this matter), wherever they may be found, belong to the property of Eanna.

In the presence of Nabû-mukîn-apli, the administrator of Eanna, son of Nâdin, descendant of Dûbibi, (and) [Nabû-âh-iddin], the royal commissioner of Eanna.

[Witnesses:]
Marduk-šum-iddin, son of Nabû-âh-he-bullit, descendant of Balatu,
[Arad-Marduk], son of Zêria, descendant of Egibi,
Šin-êreš, son of [Nabû-šum-lišir], descendant of Ibni-il,
Šamaâ-mukîn-apli, son of Madân-âh-he-iddin, descendant of Šîgûa,
[Nâdin, son of] Bêl-âh-he-iqîša, descendant of Egibi,
Lâbîši-Marduk, son of [Arad-Bêl], descendant of Egibi,
Bêl-nâdin-apli, son of Marduk-šum-iddin, descendant of Bêl-apla-ûsûr,
Arđa, son of Šâkin-ûumi, descendant of Gimil-Nannaya,
Innin-šum-ûsûr, son of Gimillu, descendant of Kurî,
Scribe: Nabû-mukîn-apli, son of Marduk-šum-ûsûr, descendant of Balatu;
Uruk; 13-VII-3 Camb, king of Babylon, king of lands.”

AnOr 8 191424

obv. 1. šešem4 μu a-ṣû ša li en-sur ina ḫu-ud lib-bi-ṣû 
mi-ša-du-û-ša-a mi-gal-lat-su’a-na-li ag-bu-ni-îâ 
dumu-ṣî gal-û <en-e-tê-u<ri>>> 4 ṭu tu dumu-ṣû tar-den-ni 
μ mu-n-num-û li en-pi-qit-ti ša gam-an-gil-ân, 
id-di-nu a-na šām gam-rû-tu a-na 
'mu-gin a-ṣû ša li' en-numum a 'ba-si ia id-din
5. pap 4 a-me-lu-tû a-na 1 5/6 ma-na kû-babbar šām
1 me gur še-bar ša a-na re-e-ê-ê ša lugal ša ina muh-ê-ê-ṣû 
a-na, ’ag-numum-giš li en-pi-qit-ti ša gâm-an-gil-ân, 
id-di-nu a-na šām gam-rû-tu a-na 
'l'mu-gin a-ṣû ša li' en-numum a 'ba-si ia id-din
10. pu-ut si-lu-u pa-qîr-a-nu li dumu-dû-û-tu 
û li ir lugal-tû-tû ša ina ugu mi-ša-du-û-ša-a 
'na-li ag-bu-ni-îâ <<a>> li en-e-tê-u<ri>>> 4 ṭu tu 
û mi-d a-na-ê-ê-ti-in-ni ša iš-l-a-a 
lag-numun-gin a-ṣû ša ’man' na1-da-mu-û1 [û]
lo.e. 15. ’a-a a-ṣû ša šum-nu-a a ’ê-kur-za-kir]
rev. ina šu11 mu-gin na-šu-û šešem1 mu ū1 
lid ag-numun-gin ina1 en u ’ag ū ina a-de-e 
ša li ’ag i lugal tin-tir3 it-te-mu ū-kî-i 
am-ê-lu-tû ša ni-du a-na ’mu-gin ni-id-di-nu 
20. ’mu-gin 'mu-se-zib-û amar-utu a-ṣû ša ’ina-suš-sur 
û li ’ag-gir-ku ’mar-utu-pap a-ṣû ša li30 šeš-mu 
a ’hu-û-ṣu ‘re-mut a-ṣû ša li ag-lugal-šešme-ṣû 
a ’kur-ê šag-gil a-ṣû ša ’ad-ra-am 
înîn-mu-kam a-ṣû ša ’hiq-du a ’šu4 da-na-na-a 
25. ’umbisag ’ba-la-tu a-ṣû ša ’mu-se-zib-û <en 
bit-a-ê ša li en-sur ši-i-hu ša ’gašan ša unug4 ši
i ki ud 15-ka-mu sap-nam-lugal-la 
"ag-i lugal tin-tirki

1424 The text is discussed on p. 166.
“Aḥḫē-iddin, son of Bēl-čēr, sold of his own volition for the full price to Šum-ukin, son of Bēl-zērī, descendant of Basia, Ḫadūbāya, his slave-woman, Ana-Nabū-būnia, her elder son, Bēl-ēṭērī-Samaš,1425 her younger son, and Nanāya-ḫiṭṭini, her suckling daughter, in total four slaves, for 1 5/6 minas of silver, the equivalent of 100 kurrū of barley, which he gave1426 to Nabū-zēr-lišir, the commissioner of the Angillu-district, for the remainders of the king,1427 which are charged against him. Nabū-zēr-ukin, son of Manna-damū, and Aplāya, son of Iddināya, descendant of Ekur-zakir, bear responsibility before Šum-ukin, for (any) lawsuit or claim (concerning) the status of free citizen or the status of royal slave which may arise for Ḫadūbāya, Ana-Nabū-būnia, Bēl-ēṭērī-Samaš and Nanāya-ḫiṭṭini. Aḥḫē-iddin and Nabū-zēr-ukin swore by Bēl, Nabū and by the majesty of Nabonidus as follows: “We did not give to Šum-ukin slaves for whom there is (any kind of) claim.”

Witnesses: Muṣēzīb-Marduk, son of Ina-ṭēšī-čēr, descendant of Arad-Nergal, Marduk-nāṣir, son of Sin-ḥē-iddin, descendant of Būṣū, Rēmūt, son of Nabū-ṣar-ahḫēšu, descendant of Kūrī, Esagil, son of Ab-rām, Ištar-šum-ēṛēš, son of Kuḍurru, descendant of Gimil-Nanāya,

Scribe: Balāṭu, son of Muṣēzīb-Bēl;

Bitqu-ša-Bēl-čēr, estate of the Lady of Uruk; 15-VI-acb Nbn, king of Babylon.”

TCL 12401429 10*-III*-23 Nbk

1. 3 ma-na kū-babbar šā 1 mu (text: ū)-gi-na
   a-šū šā 1 en-numun a 1 ba (text: ū)-si-ia ina muḫ-ḫi
   1a-š[ba₄₅]-ba₄₅-mu-mu a-šū šā 1 1 en-du-ūs
   a-šan-a₅ gašan-ni-nū-a 1 a-na
5. kaskal li mim-ma ma-la ina uru u edin
   aḫi ina ú-tu₅ 1a-š[ba₄₅]-ba₄₅-mu-mu
   it-ti 1 mu-gin ik-ka₅ 1 kū-babbar 1

1425 The name is written both times, in line 3 and 12, as 1 1 en-e-NE-d utu. Names with the element 1 in (“eye”) are attested (i.e. Sin-in-mātim, Šamaš-in-ūšu; CAD I-J: 156), however, not in connection with two gods. It is proposed here to read the name as Bēl-ēṭērī-Šamaš, which is a well attested name. The emendation of the middle element to e-tē<ri> is perhaps not even necessary, if it is considered that in the Neo-Babylonian period the consonant r was articulated as some sort of sibilant (Jursa 2003: 235). Assuming a loss of the final vowel i in eṭērī, r would come to stand next to the initial s of Šamaš. As the two consonants were pronounced similarly, they could merge in the articulation and a scribal error not necessarily familiar with the etymology and the regular orthography of the name could render it as 1 1 en-e-ṭē-d utu.

1426 Aḥḫē-iddin in fact did not give the 100 kurrū of barley to Nabū-zēr-lišir. Šum-ukin probably undertook to pay this obligation for him and was subsequently compensated for it by Aḥḫē-iddin, who ‘sold’ him his four slaves. The sale was a legal fiction then. Šum-ukin received the slaves in exchange for the 100 kurrū of barley which he paid to Nabū-zēr-lišir on Aḥḫē-iddin’s behalf. Thus the obligation of Aḥḫē-iddin toward Nabū-zēr-lišir was met at the time of drafting of the document. For this reason the text is formulated as if Aḥḫē-iddin had delivered (iddin) the barley himself. As far as he was concerned, he had indeed discharged this obligation.

1427 The remainders of the king were the “leftovers” of the offerings in the temple which remained after the gods “consumed” their daily meals. The king was apparently entitled to a ‘ration’, a share of the divine meals. This is indicated by the attestations of people responsible for the king’s rations (ša kurrumat šarrī). These men were in charge of bringing a basket containing the “leftovers” of the offerings (cakes, oil, Dilnun-dates, beer, salt) from the temple to the king. For more details see Kleber 2008:292ff. It is not clear why Aḥḫē-iddin was obliged to deliver 100 kurrū of barley for the remainders of the king. Perhaps he was one of the people in charge of the rations of the king. However, he does not appear among the people attested as ša kurrumat šarrī listed by Kleber 2008:306ff. If he was nevertheless one of the ša kurrumat šarrī, the possibility to discharge this obligation simply by delivering a certain quantity of a cashcrop rather than the actual “leftovers”, suggests that this practice lost its religious-cultic character – which it must have had originally – and eroded to yet another form of taxation. Alternatively, the “remainders” could have designated here the arrears of another kind of obligation due to the king.

1428 The term niḍu designates a (legal) claim, a query or an objection and, according to Jursa, it should be connected to the use of the verb naṭu in the sense of “to accuse” (Waerzeggers and Jursa 2008: 30).

1429 The text has previously been edited by Moore 1935: 48f. It is discussed on p. 159.
"3 minas of silver belonging to Šum-ukin, son of Bēl-zēri, descendant of Basia, are charged against Zababa-šum-iddin, son of Bēl-epuš, descendant of Šangū-Bēlet-Ninua. (The money is used) for the purpose of a harrānu-business. Zababa-šum-iddin will share half of the profits (he makes) in the city or in the steppe with Šum-ukin. He will not use the silver for expenses without Šum-ukin’s consent.

Witnesses: Bēl-ahḫē-eriba, son of Nergal-uballit, descendant of Nannâya, Gimillum, son of Bēl-iddin, descendant of Bā’iru, Šulâya, son of Bēl-epuš, descendant of Šangū-Bēlet-Ninua,

Scribe: Zababa-šum-iddin, son of Bēl-epuš, descendant of Šangū-Bēlet-Ninua; Babylon; 10\°.III-23 Nb, king of Babylon.

It is the silver from the harrānu-business of Rēmût, descendant of Basia."

PTS 250\textsuperscript{1430} [x]-I-37 Nb

obv. 1. zú-lum-ma šá 1ki-na-a

a šú ašú ša 1šá

taši-k laši

ašú ša īršil-dingir
ša la šu-giš−lī−ma

5. isšu-u iššu-aššu

ašú ša 1ki-na-a

šu-ašŠalšaštu

mu 37-kam išša

šu-gin aššu ša 1šalšaštu

aššu aššu ša 1šalšaštu

ana šu-un-šu-ta

ul ša-pu-šu (+ erasure)

rev. ina gub ša mu-ra-nu aššu ša

ša ša aššu ša īršiššu
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Šum-ukin’s consent: Marduk-šum-uṣur, son of Kīnaya, descendant of Gallābu, will not make a deduction (of these dates) at the settling of accounts for the year 37 with Šum-ukin, son of Bēl-zēri. In the presence of: Mūrānu, son of Ša-Nabû-šû, descendant of Lē’i-Innin’, Rēmūt, son of Bānia, descendant of Muṣezib, İddin-ah, son of Iqīša-Marduk, descendant of Gallābu, Marduk-eriba, son of Nidin[ti-x], Bānia, son of Balātu,

[Scribe:] Babylon; [x]-I-37, NbK, king of Babylon.”

BIN 2 109

“The significance of the particle ulla in this context eludes me. Perhaps it is a defective form of the expression ulti ulla, “since distant time” (cf. CAD U: 74), i.e. “long time ago”. The writing ‘ra-ṣil-dingir for Rāši-il is also attested in BE 8/1 10: 1, 13, 14. Cf. CAD R: 194 for variant writings of the name. petû is occasionally used elliptically with just the commodity specified. The opening of a container or a storage facility (and the subsequent removing of the commodity) is implied (see CAD P: 345). The text is discussed on p. 170. The reconstructions are based on the parallel text PTS 2046. This text is reserved for publication by K. Kessler.
passages presented here. It is also discussed on p. 393.

Scribe: Anu0udammiq, son [of PN, descendant of PN]; Nabû0®†er, son of Apl¤ya, [descendant of PN], "Nabû0b¤n0a©i, son of Apl¤ya, said to Ibn¤ya, son of Apl¤ya, as follows: 'We will split up between the commissioner of Neriglissar, the king of Babylon, for sharecropping. We will do [the work] there.

The text was previously edited by Moore 1935: 68ff. Some alternative interpretations of the damaged passages presented here. It is also discussed on p. 393.

Nabû-bân-aḫi, son of Aplâya, said to Ibnâya, son of Aplâya, as follows: 'We will split up between the land from the limu-properties of the Lady of Uruk, the limu in Tamırtu-ša-Šer-Antu, the limu in Ḥarru-ša-Lâbaši, and the limu in Til-Šulâya, which we took from Šum-uki, son of Bēl-zēri, the commissioner of Neriglissar, the king of Babylon, for sharecropping. We will do [the work] there and [deliver] their rent.'

[x-share for] the limu in Tamırtu-ša-Šer-Antu (and the limu in Ḥarru-ša-Lâbaši, [and x-share for the limu] in Til-Šulâya. [Let us] cast [the lot]. The one to whose lot the limu in Tamırtu-ša-Šer-Antu and the limu in Ḥarru-ša-Lâbaši fall will give [...]. The one to whose lot the limu in Til-Šulâya falls will give a flawless bull to Šum-uki, son of Bēl-zēri. The limu in Tamırtu-ša-Šer-Antu and the limu in Ḥarru-ša-Lâbaši fell to the lot of Ibnâya, and the limu in Til-Šulâya fell to the share of Nabû-bân-aḫi.

Witnesses: Bânia, son of Bēl-iddin, descendant of Kûrî, Nabû-ēter, son of Aplâya, [descendant of PN], Arad-Bēl, son of Bēl-[x, descendant of PN],

Scribe: Anu-udammîq, son [of PN, descendant of PN];
limitu of the Lady of Uruk in Til-Šulâya; 4-VI-1 Ner, king of Babylon.

[According] to the debt notes of Šum-ukin [which are] charged [against them].”

TCL 12 68

obv. 1. 1 me gur še-bar šu-pel-ti šâ
1 me gur zû-lum-šâ šâ 1d é-a-lu-mur
ina ugu 1d bit-qa-šâ 1d en-sur
ik-ki-su nig-ga 1d gašan šâ unug ki
5. u 1d na-na-a [ina ugu] 1d
na-na-šêš-mu a-sü
šâ 1a-na-š ag-tak-lak ud 20-kam
šâ iti sig4 ina 1d mašši-šu
šâ 1d gašan šâ unug ki ina ē-an-na
10. a-na mu-še-zib-šêmarâ-utu 1d ši-i-pi
šâ ē-an-na u 1d ū-ia
1d ša-tam ē-an-na
i-nam-din

rev. ū-il-šâ šâ 1 me gur še-bar šâ ina ugu
15. 1d é-a-lu-mur šâ ē-an-na
1d mu-gin i-na-asša-am-ma a-na
1d na-na-šêš-mu i-nam-din
1d mu-kin-nu 1d utu-su a-sü
šâ 1d ag-[aq]-bi-si-šâ
20. 1d hu-šu-šu a-sü šâ ki-ne-na-a-a
1u umbisag ba-la-tu a-sü
šâ 1mu-še-zib-š ên kar-š na-na-a
ši-i-hu šâ 1d gašan šâ unug ki
iti sig4 ud 15-kam mu 2-kam
25. 1d u-gur-lugal-ūrû
ugal tin-tir ki

“100 kurru of barley, in exchange for 100 kurru of dates which Ea-lûmûr harvested in Bitqu-ša-Bêl-êter, property of the Lady of Uruk and Nanâya, are the debt of Nanâya-aḫ-iddin, son of Ana-Nabû-taklûk. On the 20th of the third month using the measure of the Lady of Uruk he will deliver (the barley) in Eanna to Mušezib-Marduk, the gîpu of Eanna, and to Bûnia, the šatammu of Eanna. Šum-ukin will bring the debt note concerning 100 kurru of barley charged against Ea-lûmûr, which is in Eanna, and give it to Nanâya-aḫ-iddin.

Witnesses: Šamaš-eriba, son of Nabû-taqbi-lišir,
Iâluṭu, son of Kinnenâya,

Scribe: Bâlûtû, son of Mušezib-Bêl;
Kâr-Nanâya, estate of the Lady of Uruk; 15-III-2 Ner, king of Babylon.”

TCL 12 73

obv. 1. 1d in-nin-mu-ūrû a-sü šâ 1d na-na-a-kam a-na pa-ni 1d
ag-lugal-ūrû lu sag lugal ū lu en mek pi-iq-nê-e-ti
šâ 1a-na il-liq-ma ki-a-am iq-bi um-ma eṣ-rû-ū
šâ 1d gašan šâ unug ki šâ ul-tu unug ki a-di tin-tir ki ul-tu

1438 Cf. note 616. The text was edited by Moore 1935: 72f.
1439 The text was edited by Moore 1935: 76ff. but since it was collated and our understanding of the text has much improved since 1935 it is re-edited here. The improved readings are marked with an asterisk. It could be also observed that at the beginning of the first four lines of the reverse the damaged portions could accommodate more signs (from two to four) than is indicated in the copy. The reconstructions made here took this extra space into consideration. Note also the discussion of the text on p. 313.
5. *muh-hi* id-lugal a-di muh- hi id-pur-rat-ti a-ša ša d-gašan ša unug ki
ša ina bād-ša-ē-da-ku-ru 1 me ša garin hi-šu-ba-ti 1 me ša garin ṛaq-qa-nu
1 me ša garin ša-ki-lat 1 me ša garin ku-ša-a-a 1 me ša garin nam-zu-u
1 me ša kā-ki-lam 1 me ša ḫu-ūṣ-ṣe-e-ti-ša-dumu-lugal ṛaq-qa-nu ša id-amar-utu-a-ūru
eṣ-ru-ū ša e-a-muk-a-nu ša ina ȋɗu-ia a-ši ša ina nam-za-a-mu

10. *bi-nam-ma* ina mu-an-na 5 me gur še-bar ū zu-lum-ma
[ina] šak ma-ši-hu ša d-gašan ša unug ša ina ugu me-e galmek a-na
[gušašn] ša unug ki ludi-din 14-ag-lugal-ūru 1i[saq lagal ūu]
[14] enmek pi-iq-<n> e-ti ša è-an-na is-mu-šu-ma
[id-din-n]u-niš-šu ina mu-an-na 5 me še-bar ū

15. *zu-lum-ma* ina šak ma-ši-hu ša d-gašan ša unug ki [ina]
[ugu mel] e galmek a-na “gašan ša unug ki i-nam [din še-bar u]
rev.
[zu-lem]-ma ma-la mu-gin "gal engar"mek ša d-gašan ša un[ug] ki*
[u-tu] ṛaq-lectual s-aša ina u-îl-ni4 ina muh-hi id-in-ni-mu-ūru
[i]-nam-šu-ū ina šu-ba-iš ši-ti-šu i-nam-din su-tu1-[su] ši ȋ-i]

20. [e-lat re]-ba-ū u e-piś nīg-ka, mah-ru-tu ša ina ȋ[î] in-in-ni-mu-ūru
[ina gub]-lzaš ki “gab-ši-dingir”mek[ag-lugal-ūru] qa-i-pi ša è-an-na
id-lgemek din-ī-a-ši ša ȋ-ṣ-šu u ȋ×a-umibag 14

25. a-śu ša e-tel-lu a ȋ-e-gi-ib 14 na1-din a-ši ša 1a a ȋ×a-umibag 14
šil-la-a a-šu ša din-su a ȋ×sa-gur
mu 1-kam “ag-ni-tuk lugal tin-tir ki”

“Innin-šum-uṣur, son of Nanaya-črees, went to Nabū-ṣar-uṣur, the royal official, and to the Eanna officials, and said as follows: Give me the tithe of the Lady of Uruk, which (extends) from Uruk to Babylon, from Nār-šarrī to the Euphrates, the plots of the Lady of Uruk, which are in Dūru-ša-Bīt-Dakūru, a *meat* 1440 of Ḫubabati, a *meat* of Raqqanu, a *meat* of Šakillatu, a *meat* of Kuṣāya, a *meat* of Namzi, a *meat* of Bāb-majiri, a *meat* of Ḫuṣṣētu-ša-mar-šarrī, land of Marduk-apla-uṣur, the tithe of Bīt-Amūkānu, which is at the disposal of Bānia, son of Nanaya-ibni, 1441 and I will deliver to the Lady of Uruk per year 500 *kurru* of barley and dates using the measure of the Lady of Uruk at the big watercourses. Nabū-ṣar-uṣur, the royal official, and the officials of Eanna, consented and gave it to him. Per year he will deliver to the Lady of Uruk 500 *kurru* of barley [and dates] using the measure of the Lady of Uruk [at] the big watercourses. [Barley and dates], as much as Šum-ukīn, the overseer of the ploughmen of the Lady of Uruk, takes [from] the land, which is in the debt notes charged against Innin-šum-uṣur, he (Innin-šum-uṣur) will deliver together with him (Šum-ukīn) as part of his rent payment (śūtu). [It is his] rent [payment]. 1442 (This is) apart from the arrears and earlier accounts at the disposal of Innin-šum-uṣur.

In the presence of Gabbi-ilani-šar-uṣur, the resident of Eanna, (and) Nabū-ahḫē-bullīt, son of Ša-Nabu-šū, the temple scribe.

Witnesses:

Bēl-nadin-aplu, son of Zēr-Bābīlī, descendant of Ile-ī-Marduk
Nabū-ētēr-našātī, descendant of Bēl-iqīša, descendant of Bēl-apla-uṣur
Marduk-zēr-ibni, son of Etellū, descendant of Egībi
Nāḏin, son of Aplāya, descendant of Aḫḫū
Ṣillāya, son of Balāssu, descendant of Nabū-ētēr

---

1440 This term, literally “one hundred”, designated a type of property and may have been similar to the “thousands” and “fifties” attested elsewhere. For a discussion see p. 358.
1441 Both Marduk-apla-uṣur in line 8 and Bānia, son of Nanaya-ibni, in line 9 cannot be identified. The nature of Marduk-apla-uṣur’s connection to the land expressed by ša is not clear. Was he the owner or the lessor of the land? Or was ṛaqqaru ša Marduk-apla-uṣur simply a toponym? At least in the case of Bānia it appears that he was a lessor of land in Bīt-Amūkānu and that Innin-šum-uṣur took over his lease.
1442 This stipulation concerns the overlapping areas of responsibility of the rent farmer Šum-ukīn and Innin-šum-uṣur. Whatever commodities Šum-ukīn took from the localities under Innin-šum-uṣur’s responsibility (they would appear in the debt notes pertaining to his šūtu) would count as the rent payment of Innin-šum-uṣur.
Scribe: Nabû-mukin-apli, son of Zèria; Uruk; 8-II-1 Nbn, king of Babylon.

Scribe: Nabû-mukin-apli, son of Zèria; Uruk; 8-II-1 Nbn, king of Babylon.

BIN 2 130

20-Vla-acc Camb

obv. 1. 28 šu-si gi’mek é ép-suš
ñ ab-ta ki-ti é-gál-hal-an-ki šá qè-reb unug
45 šu-si an-ú im-kur-ra da su-ú-qu rap-suš
mu-ta-qu šú un’mek

5. 45 šu-si ki-ú im-mar-tu da é
kar-’en dumu-suš šá 1ba-ri-ki-dingir
33 šu-sag-ki an-ta im-si-sá da é
kar-’en dumu-šú šá 1ba-ri-ki-dingir
30 šu-sag-ki-ta im-uš-lu da é

10. ina-gissu-ša dumu-suš šá 1ag-mu-sè-ti-iq-ud-da
pab 28 šu-si gi’mek mi-ših-tu4
é šu-a-ti é šú-amar-utu-mu-ú-sur dumu-suš šá 1si-lim-’en

dumu 1ba-as-si-ia ki-ti 6 ma-na kù-babbar pe-šu-ú
šam ka-si-ia ú-íl-ti šá 1da-šaman-utu dumu-suš

15. šá 1ag-mu-gin dumu 1’e-tè-ru šá ugu 4gù-bán
šá še-bar šá 1gaš-ta šá unug 8 šá e-li 1šaman-utu-mu-ú-sur
dumu-suš šá 1si-lim-’en dumu 1ba-as-si-ia šá gi’mek šú šá ina tin-ši’u u unug
u mim-na-a-šú šá uru u edin maš-ka-nu šab-ta, ina še-bar šá ugu
1da-šaman-utu a-na ní-ša è-an-na id-di-in

20. šú-tam u šú-ag-šèš-mu ú-il-ti šá kù-babbar-a4
6 ma-na a-di hu-bul-lu4 šá 1da-šaman-utu šá e-li
šú-amar-utu-mu-úr a-na 4šú-amar-utu-mu-úru
id-di-šu

rev.

1-na gu-bzu šá 4šú-giša-ibila šú-tam é-an-na dumu-suš

25. šá 1na-di-nu dumu 1da-bí-bi
šú-ag-šèš-mu 4šú sag lugal 8 en pi-qit-tu4 è-an-na
i-gi 1šú-amar-utu dumu 1šú šá 1ze-ri-ia dumu 1’e-gi-bi
šú-utu-giša-ibila dumu-suš šá 4di-kud-šèš’mek dumu 1šú-gù-lu-ú-a
šú-šú-a-šú-šaman-utu dumu-suš šá 1ir-’en dumu 1’e-gi-bi

šú-in-nin dumu-suš šá 1gar-mu dumu 1šú-da-na-na-a
šú-ag-din-it dumu-suš šá ina-è-sag-il-numum dumu 1šú-da-šu
šú-en-su pe mu-šu dumu-suš šá 1ki-šú-amar-utu-din dumu 4šú-amar-utu-mu-úru
šú-en-šú-na dumu-suš šá 4šú-na-di-nu dumu 4šèš’mek-šù-ú-tu

35. šú-in-nin-mu-úr dumu-suš šá 1gi-mil-lu dumu 4šú ku-ri-i
šú-du-šèš dumu-suš šá 1ib-nî-15 dumu 1šú-da-na-na-a
šú-kal-ba-a dumu-suš šá 1ba-sa dumu 1ba-as-si-ia
šú-na-di-nu 4šú-dub-sar dumu-suš šá 4šú-en-šèš’mek-ba-ša

dumu 1’e-gi-bi unug 8 iti kin-2-kam ud 20-kam

40. mu sag-nam-lugal-la 1kam-bu-zi-ia
lugal tin-tü’lu lugal kur-kur

“28 reeds 6 cubits and 8 fingers – a built and derelict house in the Egahalanki-district in Uruk:
45 cubits: upper flank to the east, next to a wide street, thoroughfare of the people; 45 cubits:
lower flank to the west, next to the house of Mušzêb-Bêl, son of Barîk-il; 33 cubits: upper frontage
to the north, next to the house of Mušzêb-Bêl, son of Barîk-il; 30 cubits: lower frontage to the
south, next to the house of Ina-šùllîya, son of Nabû-mušêtiq-uddê; in total: 28 reeds 6 cubits and 8

1443 The text is discussed on p. 217.
fingers is the measurement of this house. The house of Marduk-šum-usur, son of Silim-Bēl, descendant of Basia, equivalent to 6 minas of white silver, price of kasia, (from) a debt note of Ile’i-Marduk, son of Nabû-šum-ukin, descendant of Eṭērū, the rent farmer of the Lady of Uruk, which are charged against Marduk-šum-usur, son of Silim-Bēl, descendant of Basia, and for which his houses in Uruk and Babylon and all of his possessions in city and in steppe were pledged, he (Marduk-šum-usur) transferred to the temple property (instead of) a part of the barley which is charged against Ile’i-Marduk. The chief temple administrator and Nabû-āl-iddin gave the debt note for these 6 minas plus the interest belonging to Ile’i-Marduk and which were charged against Marduk-šum-usur to Marduk-šum-usur.

In the presence of Nabû-mukin-apli, the chief administrator of Eanna, son of Nādin, descendant of Dābibi, (and) Nabû-āl-iddin, the royal commissioner of Eanna.

Witnesses:
- Arad-Marduk, son of Zēria, descendant of Egibi,
- Šamaš-mukin-apli, son of Madān-āḫē-iddin, descendant of Šigūa,
- Lābāš-Marduk, son of Arad-Bēl, descendant of Egibi,
- Bēl-nādin-apli, son of Marduk-šum-iddin, descendant of Bēl-apla-usur,
- Arad-Innin, son of Šakin-šumī, descendant of Gimil-Nānaya,
- Nabû-uballit, son of Ina-ESagil-zēr, descendant of Amil-Ea,
- Bēl-supē-muljur, son of Itti-Marduk-balātu, descendant of Bēl-apla-usur,
- Nabû-bēlšunu, son of Nādin, descendant of Aḫūtu,
- Innin-šum-usur, son of Gimillu, descendant of Kurī,
- Šomaš-bān-āḫī, son of Ibin-Ištar, descendant of Gimil-Nanāya,
- Kalbāya, son of Iqiša, descendant of Basia,

Scribe: Nādin, son of Bēl-āḫē-iqiša, descendant of Egibi; Uruk; 20-VIa-acc Camb, king of Babylon, king of lands.”

---

AnOr 8 66 1-III-1 Camb

obv. 1. 30 gur še-bar ina ši-pir-ti ša'1 mu-še-zib-4 en
     a-šu ša'1 ba-ri-ki-dingir ba-lāš-ši-sū
     ul-tu 1 mu-še-zib-4 en ša'1 ina unuğ ki
     ša g3b-bān <ša'1 da'>-4 amar-uṭu a-šū ša'1 ag-mu1 -gin
     5. a e-te-ru ša'1 ugu g3b-bān ša'1 gaš-an ša'1 unuğ ki
     4-gin-[x (x)] a-šū ša'1 30-ib-ni ina šu11
     bl 1 ag-[gin-i-bi] la ša'tam é-an-na
     u1 1 ag-šeš-mu la sag lugal en pi-qīt
     é-an-na ma-ḫi-ir

rev. 10. 1 le-šu mu-šaaku na-din-ibila
     a-šū ša'1 ba-ni-ia a šu-ša
     1d amar-uṭu-sur a-šiš ša'1 3-din-įt
     a lu-ta[a] 1 re-mud-ě en a-šu ša'1
     1 e-gi-bi a 1 pa-[š][e] 1 lu umbisag
     15. šu a-šu ša'1 ag-mu-mu a šu-un-zu-ū
     unuğ 1 šu sig, ud 1-kam mu 1-kam
     1 kam-bu-zi-ia lugal tin-tur'1 lugal kur-kur
     1 en-na-ta-a' il-te-qi-ū

“Mukin-[x], son of Sīn-ibni, received from Nabû-[mukin-ap]li, the chief administrator of Eanna, and Nabû-āl-iddin, the royal commissioner of Eanna, at the orders of Muṣēzib-Bēl, son of Barik-il, the taššu-official, 30 kurru of barley pertaining to the rent of Ile’i-Marduk, son of Nabû-šum-ukin, descendant of Eṭērū, the rent farmer of the Lady of Uruk, from the house of Muṣēzib-Bēl, which is in Uruk.”

1444 The text is discussed on p. 217.
1445 Not much is known about the taššu Muṣēzib-Bēl. His house, which is situated within the city of Uruk, may be the same one mentioned above in BIN 2 130: 6. 8 (p. 396).
Witnesses: Bēl-nādin-apli, son of Bā’ēru, Marduk-ēter, son of Bēl-uballit, descendant of Amīl-Ea, Rēmût-Bēl, son of Egebi, descendant of Isin-ērya,

Scribe: Gimillu, son of Nabû-šum-iddin, descendant of Ūnzû; Uruk; 1-III-1 Camb, king of Babylon, king of lands.

They took one (copy) each."

YOS 7 177\textsuperscript{1446} 8-IV-5 Camb

\textbf{obv. 1.} pu-ut\textsuperscript{1} da\textsuperscript{d}-amar-utu \textsuperscript{f}a\textsuperscript{l}-šū šā\textsuperscript{1d} ag-mu-gin a \textsuperscript{1}e-ṭè-ru
\textsuperscript{ki-dîn\textsuperscript{2}} amar-utu a-šū šā\textsuperscript{1d} ag-mu-gin a \textsuperscript{1}e-ṭè-ru
u\textsuperscript{l} en-mu a-šū šā\textsuperscript{1d} amar-utu a \textsuperscript{1}e-ṭè-ru
a-na a-la-ku a-na tin-tī\textsuperscript{k}a ina šū\textsuperscript{1d} ag-gin-a

\textbf{5.} ṣā-tam ē-an-na a-šū šā \textsuperscript{1}na-din a \textsuperscript{1}da-bi-bi
na-šū-ū i-na iti šū a-na tin-tī\textsuperscript{k}a
a-na pa-nī \textsuperscript{1}na-ḫu-ğu il-la-ku \textit{ki-i}
a-na a-šar šā-nam-ma it-tal-ku \textit{hi-ṭu}
šā\textsuperscript{1d} gu-bar-ru \textsuperscript{lū} en nam tin-tī\textsuperscript{k}a \textit{u} \textit{[e-bir id]}

\textbf{10.} i-ṣād-da-du

\textbf{rev.} \textit{mu-kin-nu \textsuperscript{br}d-amar-utu a-šū šā \textsuperscript{1}[numun-ia]}
\textit{a \textsuperscript{1}e-gi-bi\textsuperscript{1}d-utu-gin-a a-šū šā \textsuperscript{1}[di-kud-šē\textsuperscript{br}]-mū]\textsuperscript{d}
a- \textit{si-ğu-ū-a \textsuperscript{d} en-sum-a a-šū šā \textsuperscript{1}[amar-utu-mū]-mu}
a- \textit{en-a-ūrū \textsuperscript{l}d-ag-gin-a a-šū šā \textsuperscript{1d}[mar-utu-mū]-mu}

\textbf{15.} a \textit{ba-la-tu \textsuperscript{lū} umbisag \textsuperscript{ld-ag-še-tīq-ud-d\textsuperscript{a}}}
a-šū šā \textit{zi-lag-e-a a \textsuperscript{a}mu\textsuperscript{3}d-pap-sukkal unug\textsuperscript{ki}}
iti šū \textsuperscript{1d} \textsuperscript{5}8-kam mu \textsuperscript{5}5-kam \textit{km-hu-zi-īa}
lugal tin-tī\textsuperscript{k}a lugal kur-kur

“Kidin-Marduk, son of Nabû-šum-ukīn, descendant of Eṭēru, and Bēl-iddin, son of Iqiṣa-Marduk, descendant of Eṭēru, guarantee for Ile’i-Marduk, son of Nabû-šum-ukīn, descendant of Eṭēru, to Nabû-mukīn-apli, the chief administrator of Eanna, son of Nādin, descendant of Dābībi, that he (Ile’i-Marduk) will go to Babylon. In the fourth month he will go before Nabû-ĝu in Babylon. If he goes somewhere else, they will incur the punishment of Gûbaru, the governor of Babylon and Across-the-River.


YBC 11541\textsuperscript{1447} 23-III-4 Cyr

\textbf{obv. 1.} 53 gur še-bar \textit{šu-pel-tu₄} zū-ulum-ma šā [x x x x]
ū-ṭi-ṭu ša\textsuperscript{1} kal-ba-a a-šū ša\textsuperscript{1} ba-ša a \textsuperscript{1}ba-si-ia
ša ina muḫ-ḫi \textsuperscript{1}bi-bē-e-a nega\textsuperscript{d} gašan ša unug\textsuperscript{ki} ū\textsuperscript{d}[na-na-a]
inu muḫ-ḫi \textsuperscript{1}bi-bē-e-a a-šu šā\textsuperscript{1d} ag kal ina iti šu

\textbf{5.} 26 gur 2\textsuperscript{pi} 3\textsuperscript{hān} ina unug\textsuperscript{d} ū \textit{ina iti aπin} 26 gur 2\textsuperscript{pi} 3\textsuperscript{hān}
inu ka-ḫi-il-tu₄ ina \textsuperscript{g}ma-ši-ṭu ša\textsuperscript{1d} gašan ša unug\textsuperscript{ki} i-nam-din \textit{mu-še-zib}-\textsuperscript{d}en a-šu ša\textsuperscript{1d} ag-sig-ši-q
pu-ut e-ṭè-ri ša (erasure) \textit{še-bar a₄}

\textsuperscript{1446} The text is discussed on p. 218.

\textsuperscript{1447} See p. 195.
part of the arrears charged against Kalbaya. Muṣṣizi b-Dāl, son of Nabû-udammīq, guarantees for
the payment of these 53 kurru of barley in exchange for dates, which [... from the] debt note of Kalbaya, son of Iqiṣa, descendant of Basia, which was the debt of Bībēa, property of the Lady of Uruk and [Naṇaya], are the debt of Bībēa, son of Nabû-udammīq. Using the measure of the Lady of Uruk he will deliver to the Lady of Uruk 26;2.3 in the IVth month in Uruk and 26;2.3 in the VIIIth month in Bāb-[bīl]īti as part of the arrears charged against Kalbaya. Muṣṣezib-Bēl, son of Nabû-udammīq, guarantees for the payment of these 53 kurru of barley.


PTS 2076

(several lines missing)

(see more lines missing)


IV 15. šākišu, ša a-na 150 ša id [l-dū]-1tuš 1 [ša ina ig] 1 ḫu-nu-šēššu-nu u [l-du-num-num-si-sā] i[š]a [ša] 1 [f]1[utu]-1mu 1 [ša]l-gal dū[l] 1 me 1333 uš, im-2 uš-sa-[1 du šā] aš-šāš] [x x x uš im-1 uš],-1sa-duš 1 [ba-1x-] 1 x 1 [x x x sag] 1 [ša]-1 gū 1 id [dû]-1tuš 1 me 32 sag [im]-4 da [ša]l 1 aš-šāš [pab (blank)] [x x x x] 1 1 dinda še-numum (erasure) ina 1 [ša]g 1 [ša]l-gal du[l] 1 me 1 x x še]-num-num

20. šā k[a]-gal 1 [f]1[utu] a-na ugu 1 [l]-dū-uš 1 [ša]l-gal dū [l]-1a-z-[a]-ru]

V šākišu, ša ina še-numum 1 šākišu, ša a-na-šēššu-[mu u l]-du-um-num-si]-l 1 a-na ugu kasksal 1 šā k[a]-gal ka-ni-sur-ra 1 me 1 uš 5 uš [g] [im]-4 [x x] uš-sa-duš 1 baša-amūtu a 1 ir-[gu]-la 1 ir-[in]-nin a lūd 1 uš-sa-duš aš-šā uš-sa-duš 1 l-[a]-nu-šēššu-nu a 1 aš-di-nu-sū 25. uš-sa-duš 1 ir-[in]-nin a 1 l-[a]-nu-ša a-na nig-ga lugal 1 [ša]-ma-num-ū 1 uš-ša-duš 1 in na-du-ū 1 ak-[kul]-la-[tuš 1] [x x x] šā

The text is discussed on pp. 348ff.
Section I:

[... Gula-zêr-uṣabši ...]

200° (cubits) eastern frontage on the Nār-Bânitu [...]

Section II:

Orchard, which the prince Itti-Šamaš-balatu [gave] to the Lady of [Uruk]:

1,065 (cubits) northern [flank] next to [...];

[... Anu-[x], Nabû-[x], son of Šu-[x];

[x] western [frontage] next to the royal highway of the Šamaš-gate [...];

In total: 22°;1.4.2.5 of land; [of this] 9 kurru of land [are planted].

Section III:

limu to the right and left of the Šamaš-gate on the city moat:

1,425 (cubits) western flank next to [PN]-ahi/uṣur, the šakin mâtî;

1,425 (cubits) east flank next to Lâbîši, [son of] Mûranu;

550 (cubits) northern frontage [next to ...];

1,420 (cubits) southern frontage next to [Imbia], the šakin ţêmi, and next to a temple [plot];

In total: ... (left blank)

Section IV:

Orchard to the left of Nār-Bânitu, [which is at the disposal of] Anu-ahl-iddin and [Šamaš-zêr-lišir, sons of Šamaš]-iddin, the prebendary gardeners:

133 (cubits) northern flank next to [a temple plot];

[x (cubits) souther flank] next to Ba-[x ...];

[x (cubits)] eastern [frontage] on Nār-Bânitu;

132 (cubits) [western] frontage next to a temple plot;

[In total: x +] 1 qû 2 akalu of land in the ledger (lê'u) of the prebendary gardeners [...], land at the Šamaš-gate, which is [registered (in the ledger)] for Bêl-ipuš, the prebendary gardener.

Section V:

Orchard, gizzêtu, which is part of the orchard of Anu-ahl-iddin and Šamaš-zêr-lišir, (situated) opposite the highway of the Kanisurra-gate:

665 (cubits) western [flank ...] next to Iqiša-Marduk, son of Arad-Gula, Arad-Innin, son of Amil-Nabû, next to temple land, next to Anu-ahl-iddin, son of Nabû-balâssu-iqbi, next to Arad-Innin, son of Bêl-iddin, (plots) which count to the property of the king, and next to an empty river bed and (a plot covered with) clods of earth [...];

700 (cubits) eastern flank next to Balâtu, son of Nabû-êcer;

130 (cubits) northern [frontage] next to the empty river bed and (a plot covered with) clods of earth;

132 (cubits) southern frontage next to a temple plot, the land at the disposal of Anu-ahl-iddin and Šamaš-zêr-lišir, sons of Šamaš-iddin, the prebendary gardeners;

In total: ... (left blank)

Section VI:

Orchard of Nâdin, son of Ištar-šum-êreš, on the lower Nār-Bânitu, to the left:

---

1449 For a discussion of the term libbû eqlî see note 1286.
1450 For this term see p. 285.
1451 The plot described in section V may have been adjacent to the one in section IV. Both of them were assigned to the same two brothers, who were prebendary gardeners. The common border could have been the northern flank of the plot in section IV and the southern frontage of the plot in section V. In this case libbû eqlî would designate the common border of the two plots. Nār-Bânitu which runs east of the plot in section IV does not border on the plot in section V. This means that there either was another plot between the canal and the plot in section V, or that the canal made a right turn at the height of this plot.
838 (cubits) southern flank next to Şillâya, son of Bânia, (a plot) which counts to the property of the king;
865 (cubits northern) flank on Nâr-Bânîtu;
135 (cubits) western frontage next to Şillâya, (a plot) which counts to the property of the king;
127.5 (cubits eastern) frontage next to Šamaš-šum-lišîr and his brothers, the sons of Silim-Bêl, the son of Šum-ukîn;
In total: ... (left blank), land of Nâdîn, son of Ištar-šum-êreš and Šulîya, son of Ahulap-Ištar, which was confiscated for the property of Eanna in 15 Nbn instead of the cattle arrears of Ištar-šum-êreš, father of Nâdîn, [and of] Silim-Bêl, grandfather of Šulîya.

Section VII:
[...] of Ina-qāt-[x], son of Bêl-ab-ûsûr, measured according to his tablet:
next to the prebendary orchard which is at the disposal of Šamaš-iddin, son of Bêl-ipuš, which is registered as the neighbour of the nakkandu-land of Ištar of Uruk; to be inquired into and registered;
next to Anu-âḫ-iddin, son of Nabû-balâssu-îqbi, next to Arad-Innin, son of Amîl-Nabû, and next to Arad-Innin, son of Bêl-iddin, (plots) which count to the property of the king;
40 (cubits) upper' flank [...] next to the lower bank of the city moat, and next to the wall-street;
next to [Arad-Innin], son of Bêl-iddin, and Anu-âḫ-iddin, son of Nabû-balâssu-îqbi;
Tablet for [...], to be registered according to his tablet; it is his land, which was received/seen.

Section VIII:
Orchard left of the Meslamtaea-gate, which the prince Itti-Šamaš-balâtu gave to the Lady of Uruk:
450 (cubits) western flank next to the wall;
350 (cubits) eastern flank next to Nâr-Lamassû;
270 (cubits) northern frontage next to Arrab, son of Bêl-usât, (plot) which counts to the property of the king, (and) next to Bêl-kešîr, son of Marduk-zûr-îbni, the Babylonian;
120 (cubits) southern frontage next to 2 sîtu of land, the aškuttu, and three houses in which shepherds of the regular offerings live;
In total: 1;2.4.4.8; of this 0;4.2 of land are planted (with date palms).

Section IX:
Orchard left of Ḥarru-ša-Nanâya; taken instead of cattle arrears from Nanâya-êreš, son of Nabû-uâllîm:
310 (cubits western) flank (next to) the wall-street;
160 (cubits) eastern flank next to the houses of the Urukeans;
270 (cubits) northern frontage next to aškuttu, the other part of the plot;
220 (cubits) southern frontage next to Bêl-ahḫê-iqîša, son of Nabû-bêl-šûmâti, descendant of Šîn-tabni;
In total: 1;0.4.3.3 of land, first measurement;
110 (cubits) northern frontage of the aškuttu on Ḥarru-ša-Nanâya;
90 (cubits) southern flank next to the other part of the plot;
100' (cubits) western [frontage] next to the wall-street;
100 (cubits) eastern frontage next to the houses of the Urukeans;
In total: [1 pânu, land of] the aškuttu;
Grand-total: 1;1.4.3.3, of land, of which 0;4.4 of land are [planted].

Section X:
[...] which Assurbanipal, king of Assyria, (took) from the Urukeans at the inspection of Uruk and returned to Ninurta of Uruk [...].

Section XI:
Orchard, opposite Uruk, which is to the right of [Ḫarru-ša-]Aška'îtu:

\[^{1452}\] For this term see note 1300.
\[^{1453}\] The reconstructions follow AnOr 9 2 l. 62f.
165 (cubits) western (flank) next to the houses of the Urukeans;
[x] (cubits) eastern flank next to the [narrow] street;
60 (cubits) northern frontage next to the houses of the Urukeans;
45 (cubits) southern (frontage) next to the houses of [the Urukeans?];
In total: 0;0.5.1.2 planted land.

Section XII:
Orchard to the right of Ḥarru-ša-Aška’ītu […]:
190 (cubits) northern flank next to aškuttu, other part of the plot;
200 (cubits) [southern] flank [next to PN], son of Marduk-šum-ibni, (a plot) which counts to the property of the king and the house[ ...];
150 (cubits) western frontage next to the narrow street which runs between [the orchards];
[x (cubits) eastern frontage] next to Ḥarru-ša-Aška’ītu;
In total: 0;2.4.[∅/x, first measurement];
110² (cubits) northern flank of the aškuttu next to unbuilt plots;
[x (cubits) southern flank next to the other part of the plot];
[x] (cubits) western frontage next to the street which runs between the orchards;
[x (cubits) eastern frontage next to...];
[In total: x], land of the aškuttu;
Grand total: 0;3.0.1.2² [of land, of which x of land are planted].

Section XIII:
[Orchard] to the left of the Ninurta temple […]
[…]alḫē-iddin, descendant of Šigūa […]
[…] western [flank/frontage] next to the wall-street […]
[…] (rest of the tablet broken off)

1454 The expression ana Uruk is unclear. Perhaps it is an ellipsis for ana muḫḫi Uruk, in which case a localisation in front of or opposite the city, is implied.
6.2. Appendix 2: OIP 122 82 and TCL 13 227

The table below summarises the information concerning the rent deliveries of the rent farmers Šum-ukin and Kalbäya which can be gleaned from the two accounts OIP 122 82 and TCL 13 227. The former text concerns the temple’s income in agricultural products from 2 Nbn, while the latter text deals with a period from 3 to 7 Nbn. The table lists rent deliveries in kurru according to commodity (b = barley; sp = spelt; d = dates; se = sesame). The delivered rent is expressed as the percentage of the total required rent (% of the expected total šitu). On the basis of the required rent (25,000 kurru of barley and 10,000 kurru of dates) a balance is calculated as well as the cumulative arrears for the period from 2 to 7 Nbn. The table also lists the temple’s total income (erbu) in agricultural commodities for the given years as stated in the two accounts and puts the rent payments of the two rent farmers in relation to this income (% of erbu).

It should be noted that TCL 13 227 is not a complete account: The barley rent for 3 Nbn and the date rent for 7 Nbn are not recorded. Furthermore, the income for 3 and 4 Nbn is lumped together and the sum is stated to be the remainder of the income (II. 21ff: pab ... re-ḫi-it er-bi ú bān šitu mu 3-kam u mu 4-kam). For this reason the calculated arrears and percentages should be seen as approximations only.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OIP 122 82 sītu of Šum-ukin &amp; Kalbäya</th>
<th>Nbn 2</th>
<th>Nbn 3</th>
<th>Nbn 4</th>
<th>Nbn 5</th>
<th>Nbn 6</th>
<th>Nbn 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25,000 b + sp 7,130 d</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCL 13 227 sītu of Šum-ukin &amp; Kalbäya</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10,020 d</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15,198 b 11,061 1.1 sp 350 kasia 7,157 3.3 d 2,000 0.5 d (Sealand) 1,712 d (Marad)</td>
<td>9,568 0.5 b 784 sp 72 se (216 b) 9,845 2 d</td>
<td>8,951 b 568 sp 171.3 se (514.3 b) 11,050 d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Σ sītu barley, spelt...</td>
<td>25,000 (100 %)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>16,654 1.1 3 66.6 %</td>
<td>10,568 0.5 b 42.3 %</td>
<td>9,570 4.3 (38.3 %)</td>
<td>17,000 (68 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Σ sītu dates</td>
<td>7,130 (71.3 %)</td>
<td>10,020 (100.2 %)</td>
<td>11,427 3.2 (114.3 %)</td>
<td>9,845 2.5 (98.5 %)</td>
<td>11,050 (110.5 %)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Σ sītu balance</td>
<td>32,130</td>
<td>10,020</td>
<td>28,081 4.3 3.3</td>
<td>20,413 2.5</td>
<td>20,620 4.3</td>
<td>17,000 total arrears:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of the expected total sītu</td>
<td>-2,870</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-14,586 2.1</td>
<td>-14,379 0.3</td>
<td>-18,000</td>
<td>-49,835 2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>erbu</td>
<td>&gt; 38,495</td>
<td>53,372 3.3 3.3</td>
<td>24,013 2.5</td>
<td>23,008 4.1</td>
<td>20,454</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of erbu</td>
<td>&lt; 83.5 %</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>85 %</td>
<td>89.6 %</td>
<td>83.1 %</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1455 For an edition of TCL 13 227 see Moore 1935: 230ff. See also van Driel 1990: 248f.
1456 It is assumed here that the 2,000 kurru of barley delivered by Kalbäya did not count as part of Šum-ukin’s and Kalbäya’s joint rent of 25,000 kurru but rather that they were treated separately (see p. 188).
1457 In Nbn the rent farmers had purchased additional dates in the Sealand and in Marad. These probably went toward the payment of their rent for dates.
1458 These figures in brackets represented the percentage of the barley or date rent delivered to the temple.
1459 As the text is damaged the exact amount of the erbu for 2 Nbn is not known.
### 6.3. Appendix 3: Agricultural calendar according to Neo-Babylonian institutional texts from Uruk

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Winter Crops</th>
<th>Summer Crops</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dec/Jan</td>
<td>Issue of oxen</td>
<td>Imittu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov/Dec</td>
<td>Ploughing</td>
<td>Date deliveries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Okt/Nov</td>
<td>Issue of seed</td>
<td>Imittu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept/Okt</td>
<td>Issue of oxen</td>
<td>Imittu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug/Sept</td>
<td>Ploughing</td>
<td>Date deliveries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul/Aug</td>
<td>Issue of oxen</td>
<td>Imittu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun/Jul</td>
<td>Issu of seed</td>
<td>Imittu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May/Jun</td>
<td>Harvest</td>
<td>Date deliveries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr/May</td>
<td>Harvest</td>
<td>Date deliveries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar/Apr</td>
<td>Harvest</td>
<td>Date deliveries</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- Bold entries indicate that a predominant number of attestations come from this month (e.g. *imittu* debt notes for dates are attested mostly in the sixth and the seventh month).
- Entries in parentheses indicate a small number of attestations.
6.4. Appendix 4: Catalogue of tablets from the Basia archive

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Contents</th>
<th>Place of drafting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NBC 4569</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>related to agriculture (palace scribe dossier)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 17 23</td>
<td>9-XIIa-17 Nbk</td>
<td>debt note for silver</td>
<td>Babylon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTS 2839</td>
<td>16-I-19 Nbk</td>
<td>contract (badly preserved)</td>
<td>Babylon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTS 2275</td>
<td>[x]-II-20 Nbk</td>
<td>debt note for silver, price of a house</td>
<td>Babylon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCBC 575</td>
<td>5-XII-20 Nbk</td>
<td>debt note for barley</td>
<td>ḫarrūbat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTS 2993</td>
<td>6-IX-20 Nbk</td>
<td>debt note for barley</td>
<td>ḫarrūbat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTS 3231</td>
<td>20-IX-21 Nbk</td>
<td>ḫarrūnu-contract</td>
<td>ḫarrūbat*; Huṣṣêṭu-ša-Ruṣapâya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTS 3297</td>
<td>7-XI-21 Nbk</td>
<td>debt note for barley</td>
<td>Babylon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTS 2621</td>
<td>30-XII-21 Nbk</td>
<td>ḫarrūnu-contract</td>
<td>Bāb-Nār-Dērat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTS 2515</td>
<td>23-I-22 Nbk</td>
<td>debt note for barley</td>
<td>Borsippa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCL 12 40</td>
<td>10'-[x]-23 Nbk</td>
<td>ḫarrūnu-contract</td>
<td>Babylon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OṣAn 25, 30 No. 1 (PTS 2864)</td>
<td>11-I-23 Nbk</td>
<td>boat sale</td>
<td>Bāb-Nār-Ṣarrāni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTS 3041</td>
<td>15-XII-23 Nbk</td>
<td>debt note for silver</td>
<td>Ālu-ša-rab-mungi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTS 2533</td>
<td>13-I-24 Nbk</td>
<td>debt note for dates</td>
<td>Babylon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTS 2234</td>
<td>8-[x]-27 Nbk</td>
<td>debt note for barley</td>
<td>ḫarrūbat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YBC 9130</td>
<td>11-XII-28 Nbk</td>
<td>debt note for barley</td>
<td>Ālu-ša-ummānu on Nāru-ša-Nergal-dān</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLP 1544</td>
<td>23-IX-33 Nbk</td>
<td>debt note for barley</td>
<td>Babylon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCL 12 48</td>
<td>28-XII-33 Nbk</td>
<td>debt note for silver</td>
<td>Babylon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCBT 941</td>
<td>[x]-VII-34 Nbk</td>
<td>debt note for sesame</td>
<td>[x]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GC 1 167</td>
<td>4-IX-34 Nbk</td>
<td>debt note for silver</td>
<td>Babylon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD 89</td>
<td>1-III-35 Nbk</td>
<td>debt note for barley</td>
<td>Nār- Başṣu in Ālu-ša-Bēl-ēṭer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCBT 352</td>
<td>3-X-36 Nbk</td>
<td>debt note for dates and silver</td>
<td>Babylon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTS 2501</td>
<td>[x]-I-37 Nbk</td>
<td>related to agriculture</td>
<td>Babylon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NBC 6181</td>
<td>24-V-38 Nbk</td>
<td>debt note for barley</td>
<td>Babylon*; Bit-Abdi-Bēl??</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTS 2719</td>
<td>25-VI-39 Nbk</td>
<td>debt note for barley</td>
<td>Ālu-ša-ṭupšar-ekalli*; ḫarrū-sa-Ṭāb-Adad(?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTS 2937</td>
<td>17-I-40 Nbk</td>
<td>debt note for barley</td>
<td>Nāru-ēṣṣu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTS 2868</td>
<td>1-I-40 Nbk</td>
<td>debt note for barley</td>
<td>ḫarrūbat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OIP 122 31</td>
<td>13-I-41 Nbk</td>
<td>debt note for barley</td>
<td>Bāb-Nār-Zizannu*; Nāru-ša-Nabû-ēx-x¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTS 2109</td>
<td>24-XII-41 Nbk</td>
<td>debt note for barley</td>
<td>ḫarrūbat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD 93</td>
<td>[x]-acc Ami</td>
<td>debt note for barley</td>
<td>Adab-il</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YBC 11459</td>
<td>[x]-acc Ami</td>
<td>ḫarrūnu-contract</td>
<td>ḫarrūbat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTS 2046</td>
<td>15-VII-acc Ami</td>
<td>receipt of silver/barley</td>
<td>ḫarrūbat*; Babylon</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

In some texts the place of drafting of the document and the place of payment of the transacted commodity are not the same. Where there is a different “place of payment”, the place name is marked with an asterisk.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BIN 2 109</td>
<td>20-VII-acc Ami</td>
<td>receipt of silver/barley (palace scribe dossier)</td>
<td>Harrubat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTS 2220</td>
<td>23-1-1 Ami</td>
<td>debt note for barley</td>
<td>Nāru-eššu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YBC 3518</td>
<td>4-[x]-2 Ami</td>
<td>work contract concerning arable land</td>
<td>Harrubat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM 114585</td>
<td>13-V-3 Ner</td>
<td>purchase of slave</td>
<td>Uruk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTS 2218</td>
<td>12-VIII-[3] Ner</td>
<td>receipt of silver (house rent)</td>
<td>[Uruk]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NBC 4534</td>
<td>23-I-acc Lab</td>
<td>debt note for oxen</td>
<td>Uruk*; Babylon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AnOr 8 19</td>
<td>15-VI-acc Nbn</td>
<td>purchase of slave</td>
<td>Angillu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 6 5</td>
<td>7-XI-acc Nbn</td>
<td>purchase of slave</td>
<td>Babylon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD 92</td>
<td>29-XI-[x] Nbn</td>
<td>debt note for barley</td>
<td>Ālu-ša-Nabû-bēl-ili*; Ḫudada</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM 114676</td>
<td>11-VIII-1 Nbn</td>
<td>purchase of oxen</td>
<td>Tamḥatû</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTS 2957</td>
<td>[x]-I'-2 Nb[n]</td>
<td>legal, concerning female slaves</td>
<td>Borsippa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>? YBC 3450</td>
<td>17-[x]-4 Nbn</td>
<td>hire of a person</td>
<td>Bitqu-ša-Bēl-ēter(?)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 6 85</td>
<td>[x]-X-4 Nbn</td>
<td>house rent contract</td>
<td>Uruk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GC 1 413</td>
<td>7-XII-5 Nbn</td>
<td>debt note for silver (house rent)</td>
<td>Kurbat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In order to determine and keep track of the obligations of the ploughmen, gardeners and sharecroppers, the temple administration conducted annual yield estimations. A commission of yield estimators (ēmidus) inspected the fields and orchards shortly before the harvest, estimated the prospective yield and determined the impost, imittu, which was to be paid to the temple. This impost was set down in written form as a debt note. In case of the sharecroppers the debt was designated as “share”, zittu, rather than imittu. This share too was determined by an imittu procedure.

The formulary of the imittu debt notes evolved over time. As in any debt note formulary, the amount and type of commodity owed, the name of the debtor and the creditor were the essential features. The debt note closed with a list of witnesses, the scribe, the place and date of drafting. The owed commodity is usually designated as the impost or the share, sometimes also as pertaining to a rent payment (sītu). Other information could also be included in the debt note: the person who had the responsibility over the debtor and his obligation could also be named. During the time when rent farms existed, this person was the rent farmer. At other times these could have been agricultural officials like the rab ikkarāti. The localisation of the plot on which the yield estimation was conducted could also be noted. The time and place of delivery of the owed commodities were also frequently specified in the debt notes. The place of delivery was either the temple (bīt ili, Eanna), an enclosure (ḥāṣaru), or generally the locality in which the plot in question was situated. Other stipulations included provisions for payments of additional fees, taxes, and extra obligations. These included the deliveries of high quality dates (makkasū) and of date palm by-products: tuḥallu, a kind of basket made from palm leaves, liblibbū (“leaflets”) and mangāgu (“fibre”); the gugallu-fee, and taxes designated as rations (kurummātu) or kīṣir esitti (u) balāṭu (ana) Bēl. Frequently the debt notes also recorded whether the gardener had been paid his salary (sissinnu).

The earlier debt notes generally offer less information and were not as standardised as the later ones. The stipulations for the additional fees, for instance, only start appearing during Neriglissar’s reign. The most standardised and complete imittu debt notes stem from Cambyses’s and Nebuchadnezzar IV’s reigns.

In the tables below the imittu debt notes are organised chronologically and according to commodity: debt notes concerning barley and cereals are grouped separately from those concerning dates. A much smaller number of debt notes for barley has come down to us, mainly from the reign of Nabonidus, while debt notes for dates are more numerous. This distribution can be attributed to archival reasons. Owing to the amount of information the tables stretch over two pages. They include information on the text (publication), the date, the type and amount of owed commodity (in kurrū), the responsible official or rent farmer, the debtor, the scribe, the plot (its localisation or other characteristics), the time and place of the payment of the debt, the place of drafting of the document and, where applicable, the extras, i.e. additional stipulations on by-products, administrative fees, salaries, etc.

---

1463 The names of the rent farmers are abbreviated using the initial letter: Š for Šum-ukīn, K for Kalbāya, A for Ardia, N for Nabī-bān-āji and G for Gimillu.
1464 Female debtors are marked with a superscript f before the name.
**Imittu debt notes for dates from the reign of Nebuchadnezzar**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Responsibility of</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Debtor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YOS 17 364</td>
<td>25-VI-11 Nbk</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>Šulāya/Ša-Nabû-šû</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 17 36</td>
<td>8-VIa-21 Nbk</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>Nabû-sum-iskun/Nabû-zēr-iqīša u Ša-Nabû-šû/Šum-iddin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 17 38</td>
<td>16-VIa-21 Nbk</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>[x]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YBC 11617</td>
<td>13-VIII-26 [Nbk]</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>24;2.2</td>
<td>[x]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GC 1 231</td>
<td>27-VIa-[4]1 Nbk</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5²;1</td>
<td>Nabû-balāssu-iqbi/Nanāya-êreš</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GC 1 248</td>
<td>[x]-VIa-41 Nbk</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3;2.3</td>
<td>Innin-mukin-apli/Nabû-zēr-iqīša</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YBC 9161</td>
<td>16-XIIa-42 Nbk</td>
<td>Nabû-aḫḫē-ḫullim/Nabû-udammiq</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Zēria/Kidināya, Nabû-bēl-ili/Nanāya-êreš</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCBT 1059</td>
<td>27-V-43 Nbk</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,280</td>
<td>[x]/Ea-iddin/Amīl-Ea, [x]/Nabû-iddin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scribe</td>
<td>Plot</td>
<td>Date &amp; Place of Payment</td>
<td>Place of Drafting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[x]/Mukin-zēri</td>
<td>Ḫarru-ša-Nadnāya</td>
<td>20-X³;</td>
<td>šiḫu [x]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no scribe or witnesses!</td>
<td>Dūru-ša-latīru</td>
<td>bit ili</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bēl-ah-iddin/Bunēne-ibni/Nagāru</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>ina ḫaṣāri</td>
<td>Kuttain</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nabū-bān-ahī/Ibnāya/Ekur-zakir</td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td>Uruk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bēl-balāssu-iqbi/Bēl-[x]</td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eanna-šum-ibni/Aḫḫēšāya</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>VIII; Eanna</td>
<td>Kār-Eanna</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eanna-šum-ibni/Aḫḫēšāya</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>VIII; Eanna</td>
<td>Kār-Eanna</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Šākin-šumi/İbnī-İstar</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20-XIIa; Eanna</td>
<td>Bitqu-ša-Bēl-eṭer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marduk-šum-iddin/Nergal-nāṣir/Bēl-apla-uṣur</td>
<td>Ḫarru-ša-Nadnāya</td>
<td>VIII; [Ḫarru-ša]-Nadnāya</td>
<td>Bit-ana-pān-ili</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**imittu** debt notes for barley from the reign of Nebuchadnezzar

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Responsibility of</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Debtor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YBC 4092</td>
<td>10-VI-34 Nbk</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9;3 B for 6 D</td>
<td>Bēl-iddin/Balāṭu/Asū</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YBC 9213</td>
<td>27-VI-34 Nbk</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100 B</td>
<td>Ininn-šum-ušur/Balāṣu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTS 3012</td>
<td>24-X-35 Nbk</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15 B for D</td>
<td>Nergal-ipuš &amp; Nanāya-ah-iddin, sons of Nabū-zēr-lišir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YBC 4056</td>
<td>1-IX-37 Nbk</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11;3 B for 7;3.4 D</td>
<td>Nabū-ēcher-napšāti/Šarid/Rab-banē</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**imittu** debt notes for dates from the reign of Neriglissar

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Responsibility of</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Debtor</th>
<th>Scribe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NBC 6127</td>
<td>23-VI-00</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Zēria/Aḥḫēšu</td>
<td>Balāṭu/Muṣṣēzib-Bēl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YBC 6868</td>
<td>4-VIII-[x]</td>
<td>Nabū-ahḫē-šullim/Nabū-udammiq</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>sons of Nergal-ipuš 6 Marduk/Balāṣu</td>
<td>[x]/Marduk-eriba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIN 1 123</td>
<td>22-[x]-acc</td>
<td>Nabū-ahḫē-šullim/Nabū-udammiq</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Ardia/Šar-ēter</td>
<td>Bunānu/Nabū-ahḫē-bulliṭ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq 59, no. 12</td>
<td>15-[x]-1 Ner</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>Nabū-[x]/Ibnāya, Mūrānu/Šir[ikti]</td>
<td>Eanna-lip-ušur/Ibnī-līṭar/Puṣāya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCL 12 66</td>
<td>26-VI-2 Ner</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>9;1.3</td>
<td>Šiṣāya/Nabū-šum-ibni</td>
<td>Balāṭu/Muṣṣēzib-Bēl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTS 2422</td>
<td>18-VII-2 Ner</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8;2.3</td>
<td>Kāṣīr/Šulāya</td>
<td>Nabū-μuṣīn-apli/Zēria</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1465 This and another two documents (YBC 4092, PTS 3012, YBC 4056) record obligations to pay barley in exchange for dates. They were drafted after the date harvest, but for some reason the debtors could not discharge their obligation in dates and so the debt was converted to barley and was to be repaid after the barley harvest the following year. Note that the conversion rate was not 1:1 in the two Yale texts.

1466 The year numeral was omitted by the scribe.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scribe</th>
<th>Plot</th>
<th>Date &amp; Place of Payment</th>
<th>Place of Drafting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eanna-šum-ibni/Alḫēšāya</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>II; Eanna</td>
<td>Uruk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nabû-bân-aḫi/Ibnāya/Ekur-zakir</td>
<td>(in Til-ḫurāṣi)</td>
<td>II; Nār-šarri</td>
<td>Nahjallu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anu-šum-ibni/Ibnī-Štar/Puṣāya</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>III; Eanna</td>
<td>Til-agurrēti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ištar-mukīn-apli'/Zēria</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>III; Eanna</td>
<td>Uruk</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plot</th>
<th>Date &amp; Place of Payment</th>
<th>Place of Drafting</th>
<th>Extras</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nahjallu</td>
<td>VIII; Nahjallu</td>
<td>Nahjallu</td>
<td><em>ina muḫḫi 1 kurru tuḫalla līlibbī u mangāga inamdīn; 5 kurru sissimuṣu eter</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td><em>ina ḫaṣāri</em></td>
<td><em>[x]</em></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Kār-Nanāya</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ḥarru-ša-Dālē</td>
<td>VIII; Eanna</td>
<td>Kār-Nanāya</td>
<td><em>ina libbī 20 kurru makkasū; ina muḫḫi 1 kurru tuḫalla u mangāga inamdīn</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nahjallu</td>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>Kār-Eanna</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nār-Bānītu</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Uruk</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### imittu debt notes for barley from the reign of Nabonidus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Rent farmer</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Debtor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PTS 3008</td>
<td>[x-x-x] Nb[n]</td>
<td>Š+K</td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td>Ša-Nabû-šu/Bēl-nāṣir², ikkaru, &amp; Marduk-eriba/Kudurru, ikkaru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 19 85</td>
<td>22-I°-I°-acc Nbn</td>
<td>Š</td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td>Šamaš-zēr-ušabši/Silim-Bēl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 19 86</td>
<td>18-[x]-1 Nbn</td>
<td>Š</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>Nabû-mukin-apli/[x]-eriba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIN 1 97</td>
<td>12-I-1 Nbn</td>
<td>Š</td>
<td>35(zittu)</td>
<td>Kâlba‘ya/Nergal-šum-ibni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 6 24</td>
<td>11°+I-1 Nbn</td>
<td>Š</td>
<td>22°</td>
<td>Nabû-zēr-iddin/Šamaš-iddin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 6 43</td>
<td>1-IV-2 Nbn</td>
<td>Š</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>Nabû-ahhē-šullim/Bala‘tu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 19 87</td>
<td>12-XII-2 Nbn</td>
<td>Š</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>Bala‘tu/Nabû-šum-ušur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YBC 3522</td>
<td>3-[x]-3 Nbn</td>
<td>Š</td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td>[x]/Nabû-šum-ēreš</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 6 84</td>
<td>5-II-3 Nbn</td>
<td>Š</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>Nabû-ahhē-šullim/Bala‘tu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 6 47</td>
<td>10-II-3 Nbn</td>
<td>Š</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>Nazia/Nergal-nāṣir, ikkaru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 6 55</td>
<td>13-II-3 Nbn</td>
<td>Š</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>Bēl-ahhē-iddin/Nabû-ēreš, ikkaru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTS 2863</td>
<td>13-II-3 Nbn</td>
<td>Š</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>Šamaš-ēd-ušur/Mušēzib-Bēl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEBR 38</td>
<td>17-[II]-3 Nbn</td>
<td>Š</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>Nanaya-iddin/Bala‘tu, ikkaru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 6 45</td>
<td>25-II-3 Nbn</td>
<td>Š</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>Šamaš-ippa/Ardaya, ikkaru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VS 20 69</td>
<td>19-[x]-5 Nbn</td>
<td>Š</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Ḥaṣdīa/Iqūṣāya’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scribe</strong></td>
<td><strong>Plot</strong></td>
<td><strong>Date and Place of Payment</strong></td>
<td><strong>Place of Drafting</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balatu/[x]</td>
<td>Birat</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>Birat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Šamaš-zēr-uṣabš[i]/Silim-Bēl</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>III; Takkīru</td>
<td>Maškan-il</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anu-mukin-apli/[Innin-tabni-uṣur]/Gimil-Nanīya</td>
<td>Rāṭu</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>ṣ[u][x]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anu-mukin-apli/Innin-tabni-uṣur/Gimil-Nanīya</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>III; Nār-Šakillat</td>
<td>Bit-Šama-il</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anu-mukin-apli/Innin-tabni-uṣur/Gimil-Nanīya</td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>Bit-Šama-il</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balatu/Mušezib-Bēl</td>
<td>Bit-Nabū</td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td>Til-x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aplāya/Nabū-ē[ter]</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>Nār-Innin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balatu/Mušezib-Bēl</td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td>Maškan-il</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Balatu]/Mušezib-Bēl</td>
<td>Bit-Nabū u Aššurītu</td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td>Aššurītu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balatu/Mušezib-Bēl</td>
<td>Bit-bārī</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>Bit-bārī</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balatu/Mušezib-Bēl</td>
<td>Imḫūnu</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>Birtu-ša-Bāzāya</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balatu/Mušezib-Bēl</td>
<td>Imḫūnu</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>Birtu-ša-Bāzāya</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Balatu]/Mušezib-Bēl</td>
<td>Taḫudāya</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>Taḫudāya</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balatu/Mušezib-Bēl</td>
<td>Tabīnu-ša-Šum ukīn</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>Tabīnu-ša-Šum-ukīn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balatu/Mušezib-Bēl</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td>Uruk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### imittu debt notes for dates from the reign of Nabonidus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Rent farmer</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Debtor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YBC 11582</td>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td>[x]/Ardia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YBC 7377</td>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
<td>[x]+6</td>
<td>Kînia/Šum-iddin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YBC 6843</td>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td>Nabû-eṭer-napšati/š-x-x¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YBC 11455</td>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td>Rēmût/Nergal-ušallim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 6 199</td>
<td>6-VI-[x] Nbn</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td>Ištar-zēr-ibni/Nabû-bēlšunu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YBC 7374</td>
<td>8-VI-1° Nbn</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td>Šulâya/Marduk-[x], Basia/Marduk-šûm-ibni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD 101</td>
<td>7-VI-1 Nbn</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Nabû-bân-aḫi/Aplâya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTS 2036</td>
<td>19-VII-1 Nbn</td>
<td>$+K</td>
<td>50¹¹</td>
<td>Šakin-šumi/Šillâya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 6 44</td>
<td>28-V-2 Nbn</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td>Bēl-ab-ušabši/Marduk-iddin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 6 49</td>
<td>[x]-VI-3 Nbn</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Sin-zēr-ušabši/Rēmût, Ištar-zēr-ibni/Sin-nâdin-šumi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 6 158</td>
<td>10-VI-3 Nbn</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td>Šamaš-zēr-iqiša/Itti-Šamaš-balâtu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 6 25</td>
<td>15-VI-3 Nbn</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>Nabû-kāšir/š-x-x¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 6 36</td>
<td>16-VI-3 Nbn</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>Iddin-Marduk/Nabû-erîba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTS 2343</td>
<td>17-VI-3 Nbn</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Bibēa/Nabû-udammiq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scribe</td>
<td>Plot</td>
<td>Date &amp; Place of Payment</td>
<td>Place of Delivery</td>
<td>Extras</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[x]</td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td>VIII; Kapru-ša-[Naqidäti]</td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Balātu]/Arad-Gula/Gimil-Nanāya</td>
<td>Ḥarru-ša-Nadnāya</td>
<td>VIII; Ḥarru-ša-Nadnāya</td>
<td>Ḥarru-ša-Nadnāya</td>
<td>itti 1 kurru tuhallalla, liblibbi [u] mangāga inamdin; ina muḫḫi [100] (kurru ) 10 kurru suluppi ana makkasi ṣabbāt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balātu/[x]</td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td>VII</td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td>ina muḫḫi 1 kurru tuhallalla, liblibbi u mangāga inamdin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balātu/[x]</td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td>VII</td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td>ina muḫḫi 1 kurru tuhallalla, liblibbi u mangāga inamdin; [sissinnu] ēṭer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innin-tabni-uṣur/Arad-Gula/Gimil-Nanāya</td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>Bitqu-ša-Bēl-ēṭer</td>
<td>itti 1 kurru tuhallalla, liblibbi u mangāga inamdin; [...]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balātu/Arad-Gula/Gimil-Nanāya</td>
<td>Kār-Eanna</td>
<td>VIII; Kār-Eanna</td>
<td>Kār-Eanna</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anu-mukin-apli/Innin-tabni-uṣur/Gimil-Nanāya</td>
<td>Nār-Innin</td>
<td>IX; Nār-Innin</td>
<td>Uruk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balātu/Muṣēzib-Bēl</td>
<td>Bāb-Maḫiri</td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td>Bitqu-ša-Bēl-ēṭer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balātu/Muṣēzib-Bēl</td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td>VII</td>
<td>Kurbat</td>
<td>itti 1 kurru tuhallalla, liblibbi u mangāga inamdin; sissinnušu ēṭer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balātu/[Arad-Gula/Gimil-Na[nāya]</td>
<td>Aṣṣuritu</td>
<td>VIII; Aṣṣuritu</td>
<td>Aṣṣu[ritu]</td>
<td>itti 1 kurru tuhallalla, liblibbi u mangāga inamdin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Balātu]/Arad-Gula/Gimil-Na[nāya]</td>
<td>Nāru-eṣṣu</td>
<td>VIII; Nāru-eṣṣu</td>
<td>Nāru-eṣṣu</td>
<td>sissinnušu ēṭer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balātu/Arad-Gula</td>
<td>Ḥarru-ša-Nadnāya</td>
<td>VIII; Ḥarru-ša-Nadnāya</td>
<td>Ḥarru-ša-Nadnāya</td>
<td>itti 1 kurru tuhallalla, liblibbi u mangāga inamdin; sissinnušu ēṭer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balātu/Arad-Gula/Gimil-Nanāya</td>
<td>Ḥarru-ša-Nadnāya</td>
<td>VIII; Ḥarru-ša-Nadnāya</td>
<td>Ḥarru-ša-Nadnāya</td>
<td>itti 1 kurru tuhallalla, liblibbi u mangāga inamdin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balātu/Arad-Gula</td>
<td>Bāb-Ḥilti</td>
<td>VIII; Bāb-Ḥilti</td>
<td>Bāb-Ḥilti</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Rent farmer</td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>Debtor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dillard 37 (FLP1561)</td>
<td>28-VI-3 Nbn</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>Bazuzu/Nabû-zêr-iqêšu, ša-Nabû-shû/Sum-iddin(?), Etillu/Nabû-zêr-iqêša</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTS 2292</td>
<td>30-VI-3 Nbn</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Nergal-iddin/Badi-il</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 19 76</td>
<td>27-VI-5 Nbn</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>Nabû-nâşir/Nabû-zêr-lišir, Nabû-uşuršu/Gula-zêr-ibni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 6 65</td>
<td>12-VI-6 Nbn</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Nanâyâ-âl-iddin/Ba-[x...]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 19 82</td>
<td>8-[x]-7 Nbn</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>[x]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 6 82</td>
<td>8-[x]-7 Nbn</td>
<td>S+K</td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td>Nabû-mukîn-aplî/Bêl-îpuš/Kuri, Lûši-ana-nûrî/Zêría</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YBC 11463</td>
<td>1-[x]-7 [Nbn]</td>
<td>S+K</td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td>Nanâyâ-êreš/Bâ‘u-êreš</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 19 78</td>
<td>15-[x]-7 Nbn</td>
<td>S+K</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Nabû-zêr-ukîn/Shillâya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YBC 3466</td>
<td>17-V-[7] Nbn</td>
<td>S+K</td>
<td>[x]:4.2.4</td>
<td>Bânia/Taribi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTS 2481</td>
<td>18-V-7 Nbn</td>
<td>S+K</td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td>Nabû-šum-uşur/Nabû-âl-iddin, Kudur[ru’]/Arad-Innin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 6 107</td>
<td>28-V-7 Nbn</td>
<td>S+K</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>†x³ slave (qallu) of Šâkin-šumi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 6 101</td>
<td>28-V-7 Nbn</td>
<td>S+K</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>Innin-ina-têši-êter/Mardu-k-êpik-zéri/Nagâru, Anu-zêr-ibni/Nabû-zêr-ušâbsî</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 6 86</td>
<td>15-VI-7 Nbn</td>
<td>S+K</td>
<td>[x]:6</td>
<td>Šamaš-eriba/Îašdia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 6 185</td>
<td>24-VI-[7] Nbn</td>
<td>S+K</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>Nabû-nâşir/Nabû-zêr-ukîn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scribe</td>
<td>Plot</td>
<td>Date &amp; Place of Payment</td>
<td>Place of Delivery</td>
<td>Extras</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Itti-Šamaš-balātu/Nabû-šum-ukin</td>
<td>[Dûru]-ša-Bit-Dakûru</td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td>Dûru-ša-Bit - Dakûru</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nabû-mukîn-apli/Rēḫētu</td>
<td>Bitqu-Ladannu</td>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>Bitqu-Ladannu</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innîn-sum-uṣur/Nergal-uṣēzib/Kidin-Maṣûlu</td>
<td>Bitqu</td>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>Bitqu</td>
<td>itti 1 kurru tuḫalla, liblibbī u mangāga inamdin; ina libbi 10 kurru sulūppi ana makkasī, sissinnušunu ana atēr</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**imittu** debt notes for dates from the reign of Cambyses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Rent farmer</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Debtor</th>
<th>Scribe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AUWE 11 215</td>
<td>[x]-VI-[x] Camb</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td>[x/x/]Bā’iru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JCS 28, no. 56</td>
<td>[x]-VI[a’]-[x Camb]</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>Anu-ikṣur/Innīn-šum-usur</td>
<td>[x/Nabû-ikṣur/[x]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EHE 451</td>
<td>[x-x-x] Camb</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td>Bēl-ibnī/Nabû-duk-IPAš u līb’nāyāl/Bēl-uṣallim</td>
<td>[x]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VS 20 66</td>
<td>11-[x-x] Camb</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>[x]/Nānīya-ēreš</td>
<td>[Itti-Nabû-balātu /]Tabnēa/[Ur-Nanna]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JCS 28, no. 57</td>
<td>[x]-V-[x] Camb</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Bēl-iddin/Bānīa/[x]</td>
<td>Śamaš-mu[kin-apli]/Eanna-[nādin-šumi/Babītu]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VS 20 63</td>
<td>[x]-V[a’] Camb</td>
<td>[A]</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Ištar-lūmur/[x]</td>
<td>Itti-Nabû-balātu /[Tabnēa]/Ur-Nanna[na]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIN 1 115</td>
<td>27’-VI-[x] Camb</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td>Iḫa-[x]-ba-qa/Bānīa</td>
<td>Nabû-šum-ukin /Nādin-ahī/Gašul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plot</td>
<td>Date &amp; Place of Payment</td>
<td>Place of drafting</td>
<td>Extras</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[x]</td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td>[Kapru-ša-nā]qidāti</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[&quot;Namri]-Šaparrātu</td>
<td>itti 1 kurra tuḥalla, liblibī u mangāga inamdīn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[x]</td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[x]</td>
<td></td>
<td>Aššuritu</td>
<td>[x... ] liblibī, [...]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bīt ritti ša Bēl-iddīn</td>
<td>VII; ina ḫašāri</td>
<td>Bitqu-ša-Bēl-ēťer</td>
<td>itti [1 kurru] 0;0.1.4 ½ kisir esitti u balāţu ana Bēl, bita ša ḫuṣābi, liblibī u mangāga inamdīn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[x]</td>
<td></td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td>itti 1 kurru [tuḥalla], liblibī u mangāga [u bita] ša ḫuṣābi elait [...] inamdīn; kū-b. ša habi [uḫīnī] ina pānīšu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kapru-ša-nāqīdāti</td>
<td>VII; ina ḫašāri</td>
<td>Kapru-ša-nāqīdāti</td>
<td>itti 1 kurru bitla, tuḥalla, liḥbī, mangāga, giḏī, 0;0.1.4 ½ kisir esitti u balāţu ana Bēl; 5 kurrusissinnu maḥīr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[x]</td>
<td></td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td>itti 1 kurru 0;0.1.4 ½ kisir esitti u balāţu ana Bēl, bita ša ḫuṣābi, tuḥalla, liblibī, mangāga inamdīn; elāt 2 kurrusā gugallī</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takkiru</td>
<td>VII; ina ḫašāri</td>
<td>Bitqu-ša-Bēl-ēťer</td>
<td>itti 1 kurru bitla, tuḥalla, liblibī mangāga, 0;0.1.4 ½ kisir esitti u balāţu ana Bēl inamdīn; 1 kurru sissinnu ēṭer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ḥarru-ša-Lābīšī</td>
<td>[x]; ina ḫašāri</td>
<td>Bitqu-ša-Bēl-ēťer</td>
<td>[...]5 qū kisir esitti [...] bitla ša ḫuṣābi, tuḥalla [...] inamdīn [...] ša gugallī</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII; ina ḫašāri</td>
<td>Bitqu</td>
<td>itti &lt;1 kurru&gt; 0;0.1.4[½ kisir esiti]ji u din ana še[n, bita ša ḫuṣābi, tuḥalla, liblibī, mangāga] inamdīn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text</td>
<td>Date (month-day)</td>
<td>Rent farmer</td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>Debtor</td>
<td>Scribe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 7 98</td>
<td>Vla-4</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1;1.4</td>
<td>Nabû-dir-êdu/Nabû-šum-ıšku</td>
<td>Anu-mukin-apli/Nabû-zêr-ıqiša</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JCS 28, no. 25</td>
<td>Vla-10</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>Iqišiya/Kinâya/Egibi</td>
<td>Itti-Nabû-balâtu/Tabnêa/Ur-Nanna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GC 2 116</td>
<td>Vla-10</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>28;2.3</td>
<td>Šamaš-âl-iddin/Lûšum, Ina-šilli-Nanâya/Innîn-zêr-ûšabši</td>
<td>Itti-Nabû-balâtu/Tabnêa/Ur-Nanna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GC 2 118</td>
<td>Vla-12</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>13;2.3</td>
<td>Kinâya/Rêmut/Ekur-zakir</td>
<td>Itti-Nabû-balâtu/Tabnêa/Ur-Nanna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GC 2 112</td>
<td>Vla-13</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>24;2.3</td>
<td>Dannu-âlḫēšu-ibni/Nanâya-iddin</td>
<td>Itti-Nabû-balâtu/Tabnêa/Ur-Nanna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GC 2 117</td>
<td>Vla-15</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Ardia/Šamaš-šum-ûkin/Mandîdu, Nanâya-iddin/Nergal-ûşizib</td>
<td>Itti-Nabû-balâtu/Tabnêa/Ur-Nanna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GC 2 218</td>
<td>Vla-20&lt;sup&gt;1/2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Ardia/Nabû-iddin</td>
<td>Itti-Šamaš-balâtu/[x]-zêr-ûkin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GC 2 114</td>
<td>Vla-21</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Ardia/Nergal-âl-iddin</td>
<td>Itti-Nabû-balâtu/Tabnêa/Ur-Nanna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JCS 28, no. 27</td>
<td>Vla-21</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Šulâya/Sîn-nâdin-šumi, Nâ'id-Ištar/Arad-Înnûn</td>
<td>Itti-Nabû-balâtu/Tabnêa/Ur-Nanna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 7 105</td>
<td>Vla-21</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Nanâya-šamšîa/Nabû-âl-iddin</td>
<td>Itti-Nabû-balâtu/Tabnêa/Ur-Nanna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 7 104</td>
<td>[x]-25</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>Itti-Nabû-balâtu/Tabnêa/Ur-Nanna</td>
<td>Marduk-šāpiq-zêr/[Balâtu]/Miširîyya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GC 2 115</td>
<td>VII-29</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Kamazzâ/Nâid-îlí</td>
<td>Gimillû/Înnîn-zêr-iddin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plot</td>
<td>Date &amp; Place of Payment</td>
<td>Place of Drafting</td>
<td>Extras</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birāt; bīt ritti ša Lābāši/Nabū-zēr-iddin</td>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>Birātu</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>Naḥallu</td>
<td>ina muḥhi 1 kurr tuḥalla, liblibbī, mangāga, biṭa, elāt kurummāti</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nāru-ša-Bīt-ilī</td>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>Alu-ša-Nabū-bān-aḥi</td>
<td>itti 1 kurr tuḥalla, liblibbī, mangāga, biṭa ša ḥuṣābi u kurummāti</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>Bīt-Šama-il</td>
<td>itti 1 kurr tuḥalla, liblibbī, mangāga, biṭa, elāt kurummāti</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>Naḥallu</td>
<td>itti 1 kurr tuḥalla, liblibbī, mangāga, biṭa ša ḥuṣābi elāt kurummāti inamdin; kaspi ša ḥabi uḫīni ina pānišu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[x]</td>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>Nāru-eššu</td>
<td>itti 1 kurr tuḥalla, liblibbī, biṭa ša ḥuṣābi, spi ša ḥabi uḫīni, elāt kurummāti, inamdin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alu-ša-taššiši</td>
<td>VII</td>
<td>Bī[r]ā[t]u</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aššurītu</td>
<td>VIII; ina  ḥaṣāri</td>
<td>Kapru-ša-naqidāti</td>
<td>itti 1 kurr tuḥalla, liblibbī, [mangāga] u bīta ša ḥuṣābi, [kaspi ša ḥa]bi uḫīni, elāt kurummāti, inamdin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aššurītu</td>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>Kapru-ša-naqidāti</td>
<td>itti 1 kurr tuḥalla, liblibbī u biṭa ša ḥuṣābi, kaspi ša ḥabi uḫīni, elāt kurummāti, inamdinū</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naṣibāta</td>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>Kapru-ša-naqidāti</td>
<td>itti 1 kurr tuḥalla, liblibbī, mangāga, kaspi ša ḥabi uḫīni, elāt kurummāti, inamdin; 3 kurrussissimmu ejet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bāb-Nār-Bītqu</td>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>La[sūtu]</td>
<td>itti 1 kurr tuḥalla, liblibbī, mangāga, elāt kaspi ša ḥabi uḫīni u kurummāti, inamdin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ekallatu</td>
<td>VIII; Ekallatu</td>
<td>Kahillini</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 1 Camb

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Date (month-day)</th>
<th>Rent farmer</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Debtor</th>
<th>Scribe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GC 2 119</td>
<td>[x]-15</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Mannu-aki-ilia/Šilîiya</td>
<td>[GN-x]/Issûru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCBT 952</td>
<td>V-16</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>59;3</td>
<td>Ardia/Eanna-šum-ibni</td>
<td>Nabû-bêlšunu/Ištar-šum-èreš/Ea-ilūta-bānî</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 7 117</td>
<td>VII-8</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Šamaš-ah-iddin/Arad-Bêl</td>
<td>Innin-šum-ušur/Nergal-šar-ušur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM 114466</td>
<td>VII-16</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Bêl-käsîr/Nabû-zêr-ušâšî/Ea-patânu, Arrabu /Šilîiya</td>
<td>Šamaš-balâssu-iqbi/Issûru¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCBT 1084</td>
<td>XI-11</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>6;3,2 (rêhit imitti)</td>
<td>Lūsi-ana-nûrî[x]</td>
<td>Innin-šum-ušur/Nergal-šar-ušur</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ The year and the name of the king are broken off, but on account of the scribe and the localisation of the plot this text can be assigned to Cambyes’s second year.

### 2 Camb

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Date (month-day)</th>
<th>Rent farmer</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Debtor</th>
<th>Scribe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NCBT 991</td>
<td>V-26</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>32;2,3</td>
<td>Aḥḫē-[x]/Ibnâya</td>
<td>Nabû-šum-uke/Nâdin-ahî/Gaḥul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GC 2 407</td>
<td>VI-4</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Mâdân-šar-ušur/Nâtan</td>
<td>Nabû-bêlšunu/Ištar-šum-èreš/Ea-ilûta-bānî</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 7 135</td>
<td>VI-9</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>Bēlšunu/Nûrêa, Šamaš-mukin-apî/x, Dannu-ahîḫēšû-ibî/Nabû-lêî</td>
<td>Nabû-bêlšunu/Ištar-šum-èreš/Ea-ilûta-bānî</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCBT 420</td>
<td>VI-10¹⁴⁶⁷</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>[x]/Nâdin/[x], Lâbišî[ʃ]/[x]</td>
<td>Nabû-šum-û/[ke/Nâdin-ahî/Gaḥul</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹⁴⁶⁷ The year and the name of the king are broken off, but on account of the scribe and the localisation of the plot this text can be assigned to Cambyes’s second year.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plot</th>
<th>Date &amp; Place of Payment</th>
<th>Place of Drafting</th>
<th>Extras</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kurbat</td>
<td>VII</td>
<td>Kurbat</td>
<td>itti 1 kurru tuḫalla, liblibbi ʾu biltu ša ʾuṣšābi inamdīn; elāt kaspi ša ḫabi uḫīnī u kurummāti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nāru-eššu</td>
<td>VII; ʾina ḥašāri</td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td>itti 1 kurru 0;0.1.4 ½ kiṣir esitti u balātu Bēl inamdīn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurbat</td>
<td>VII</td>
<td>Kurbat</td>
<td>itti 1 kurru tuḫalla, liblibbi, maŋgāga inamdīn; sisinnu eṯer, elāt kaspi ša ḫabi uḫīnī u kurummāti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurbat</td>
<td>VII</td>
<td>Kurbat</td>
<td>itti 1 kurru tuḫalla, liblibbi, maŋgāga, biltu ša ʾuṣšābi inamdīnū, elāt kaspi ḫabi uḫīnī u kurummāti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nāru-eššu</td>
<td>[x]; Takkiru</td>
<td>Nāru-eššu</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plot</th>
<th>Date &amp; Place of Payment</th>
<th>Place of Drafting</th>
<th>Extras</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[Nāru-eššu, bīt ritti ša Šamaš-ibni]</td>
<td>VII; ʾina ḥašāri</td>
<td>Nāru-eššu</td>
<td>itti 1 kurru ʾbilta¹, tuḫalla, ʾliblibbi maŋgāga¹, gipī, [0;0.1.4 ½ kiṣir es]itti u din ana ²[en inamdīn]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nāru-eššu, Gizzētu</td>
<td>VII</td>
<td>Nāru-eššu</td>
<td>itti 1 kurru biltu, tuḫalla, liblibbi maŋgāga, gipī; 0;0.1.4 ¼ kiṣir esitti u balātu ana Bēl inamdīn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nāru-eššu</td>
<td>VII; ʾina ḥašāri</td>
<td>Nāru-eššu</td>
<td>itti 1 kurru [bīltu], tuḫalla, liblibbi, maŋgāga, gipī; 0;0.1.4 ½ kiṣir esitti u din ša ⁴[en inamdīn]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kakkabtu</td>
<td>VII; ʾina ḥašāri</td>
<td>Bitqū-ša-Bēl-ēṯer</td>
<td>itti 1 kurru biltu, tuḫalla, liblibbi, maŋgāga, 0;0.1.4 ¼ kiṣir esitti u din ana ⁴[en inamdīn], 5 kurru sisinnu eṯer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ḥiltu</td>
<td>VII; ʾina ḥašāri</td>
<td>Aššuritu</td>
<td>itti 2⁵ kurru biltu, tuḫalla, liblibbi maŋgāga, 0;0.1.4 ¼ kiṣir esitti u din [ana ⁷[en] i[namdīn]; 10 kurru sisinnu eṯer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aššuritu, next to the royal road</td>
<td>VII; ʾina ḥašāri</td>
<td>Aššuritu-ša-Bullūṭāya</td>
<td>itti &lt;1 kurru&gt; 0;0.1.4 ½ kiṣir esitti u balātu ana Bēl, biltu, tuḫalla, liblibbi, maŋgāga inamdīnū</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aššuritu-ša-Bullūṭāya</td>
<td>VII</td>
<td>Bit-[t-Nab]ū</td>
<td>itti bilti, tuḫalli, liblibbi, maŋgāgi 0;0.1.4 ½ kiṣir esitti u balātu ana Bēl inamdīnū; 8 kurru sisinnu eṯrā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aššuritu</td>
<td>VII</td>
<td>Iṯar-[r-u-x]</td>
<td>biltu [ša ʾuṣšābi], maŋgāga; 1,4.5 qa […] u din ana ⁴[en]; 3 kurru […]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2 Camb

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Date (month-day)</th>
<th>Rent farmer</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Debtor</th>
<th>Scribe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NCBT 957</td>
<td>VI-18</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Bānia/[x]</td>
<td>Nabû-šûm-ukin/Nādin-ahî/Gaḫul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 7 134</td>
<td>VI-18</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>Anu-ah-iddin/Nabû-ahḫē-eriba, Šamaš-bēl-ili/Marduk</td>
<td>Nabû-šûm-ukin/Nādin-ahî/Gaḫul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIN 1 98</td>
<td>VI-23</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>Ile'î-Marduk/Nabû-šûm-ukin/Eṣēru</td>
<td>Nabû-šûm-ukin/Nādin-ahî/Gaḫul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GC 2 357</td>
<td>VI-24</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>4;2.3</td>
<td>Nabû-ēṭer/Rēmût</td>
<td>Marduk-šāpiḫ-zēri/Balātu/Miṣirāya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTS 2825</td>
<td>VI-24</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>Mušēzib-Bēl/Balāssu/Amīl-Ea (individual debtors are 3 ikkaru; Šamaš-eriba, Iddin-Amûru, Innin-šûm-ibni)</td>
<td>Nabû-šûm-ukin/Nādin-ahî/Gaḫul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIN 1 105</td>
<td>VI-24\textsuperscript{1}</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td>Šulaya/Šamaš-zēr-iqiša</td>
<td>Nabû-šûm-ukin/Nādin-ahî/Gaḫul</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3 Camb

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Date (month-day)</th>
<th>Rent farmer</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Debtor</th>
<th>Scribe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TCL 13 155</td>
<td>VI-8</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Kīnēnāya/Nergal-ibni</td>
<td>Nabû-bēlšunu/Ištar-šûm-ēreš/Ea-ilûta-bânî</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCBT 541</td>
<td>VII-14</td>
<td>[A]</td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td>Šamaš-mukin-apli</td>
<td>Nabû-bēlšunu/Ištar-šûm-ēreš/Ea-ilûta-bânî</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plot</td>
<td>Date &amp; Place of Payment</td>
<td>Place of Drafting</td>
<td>Extras</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bit-gubbu VII</td>
<td>ina ḥašārī</td>
<td>Bitqu-ša-Bēl-ēter</td>
<td>itti 1 kurru bīlt[a, tuḥalla, liblibbi], mangāga […] inamdin; ēlāt 5₄ […] ša kum süluppi imiters ša m[u x-kam]; 2 kurru sissinnu ēṭer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purattu adi muḥḫiḥi</td>
<td>[x]; ina ḥašārī</td>
<td>Bitqu-ša-Bēl-ēter</td>
<td>itti [1 kurru] tuḥalla, liblibbi, mangāga […] kišir esitti u [din ana ^en] inamdinū; 4¹ₓ⁻² kurru sissinnu ēṭer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takkiru</td>
<td>ina ḥašārī</td>
<td>Bitqu-ša-Bēl-ēter</td>
<td>itti 1 kurru bīlt[a, tuḥalla, liblibbi mangāga, 0;0.1.4 ½ kišir esitti u balātu ana Bēl inamdin; 10 kurru sissinnu ēṭer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>ina ḥašārī</td>
<td>Bitqu-ša-Bēl-ēter</td>
<td>itti 1 kurru bīlt[a, tuḥalla, liblibbi mangāga, [x] 0;0.1.4 ½ kišir esitti u balātu ana Bēl inamdin; [x]+2;2.3 kurru sissinnu ēṭer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>ina ḥašārī</td>
<td>Bitqu-ša-Bēl-ēter</td>
<td>itti 1 kurru bīlt[a, tuḥalla, liblibbi mangāga, 0;0.1.4 ½ kišir esitti u balātu ana Bēl inamdin; 4 kurru sissinnu ēṭer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nāru-ša-Bit-ili, bit ritti ša [x]-qu</td>
<td>ina ḥašārī</td>
<td>Bitqu-ša-Bēl-ēter</td>
<td>itti 1 kurru bīlt[a, tuḥalla, liblibbi mangāga, 0;0.1.4 ½ kišir esitti u balātu ana Bēl inamdin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nāru-ša-Bit-ili</td>
<td>ina ḥašārī</td>
<td>Bitqu-ša-Bēl-ēter</td>
<td>itti 1 kurru bīlt[a, tuḥalla, liblibbi mangāga, 0;0.1.4 ½ kišir esitti u balātu ana Bēl inamdin; 3 kurru sissinnu ēṭer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Nār-I]nnin</td>
<td>ina ḥašārī</td>
<td>Uruk</td>
<td>itti 1 kurru bīlt[a, tuḥalla, liblibbi mangāga, 0;0.1.4 ½ kišir esitti u balātu ana Bēl inamdin; 5 kurru sissinnu ēṭer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plot</th>
<th>Date &amp; Place of Payment</th>
<th>Place of Drafting</th>
<th>Extras</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nār-šarri</td>
<td>VII</td>
<td>Ḥarru-ša-Nadnāya ²</td>
<td>itti 1 kurru 0;0.1.4 ½ kišir esitti u balātu Bēl; itti 1 kurru tuḥalla, liblibbi, mangāga u bita ša ḫushābi inamdin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purattu</td>
<td>VIII; ina ḥašārī</td>
<td>Bit-šaddain</td>
<td>itti 1 kurru [0;0.1.4 ½] kišir esitti u balātu ana Bēl, bita ša ḫushābi, tuḥalla, liblibbi u mangāga inamdin; 10 kurru sissinnu maḥīr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text</td>
<td>Date (month-day)</td>
<td>Rent farmer</td>
<td>Amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIN 1 110</td>
<td>V-11</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 7 175</td>
<td>VI-2</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>13,2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCBT 562</td>
<td>VI-4</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>[x]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM 114590</td>
<td>VI-12</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Date (month-day)</th>
<th>Rent farmer</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Debtor</th>
<th>Scribe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BIN 1 129</td>
<td>[x]-5</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1;2</td>
<td>Nabū-din-[x]/Ina-pa-an-da-nu?</td>
<td>Bēl-ıqiša/Bānīa/Bā’iru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIN 1 128</td>
<td>V-15</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Šamaš-ıqiša/Nabū-ēṭer</td>
<td>Šamaš-mukin-apli/Eanna-nādin-šumi/Babītu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIN 1 119</td>
<td>V-18</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>Ea-zēr-ıddin/Nabū-bēl-āhi</td>
<td>Šamaš-mukin-apli/Eanna-nādin-šumi/Babītu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIN 1 116</td>
<td>V-26</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Aḥ-ıddin/tar-ba-ru-šu</td>
<td>Šamaš-mukin-apli/Eanna-nādin-šumi/Babītu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIN 1 103</td>
<td>VI-1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>Nabū-ēṭer-napšati/[x]-ia/Rēmūt-Bēl, Nabū-balāssu-iqbi/Ša-Nabū-šu</td>
<td>Šamaš-mukin-apli/Eanna-nādin-šumi/Babītu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIN 1 102</td>
<td>VI-4</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>Nādin &amp; Anu-iqbi, [sons of x]-ia/Innin-zēr-[x]</td>
<td>Bēl-ıqiša/Bānīa/Bā’iru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 7 181</td>
<td>VI-23</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Nūnāya/Silim-Bēl</td>
<td>Bēl-ıqiša/Bānīa/Bā’iru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCL 13 172</td>
<td>VII-22</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Bānīa &amp; Dalanna, sons of Tērik-šarrūssu</td>
<td>Bēl-ıqiša/Bānīa/Bā’iru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plot</td>
<td>Date &amp; Place of Payment</td>
<td>Place of Drafting</td>
<td>Extras</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nāru-eššētu</td>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>Uruk</td>
<td>itti 1 kurrū [1, 4.5] qā kišir esitti [u balātu ana] Bēl, bita ša ḫuṣābi, [tu]ḥalla, liblibbi u mangāga inamdin; 2 kurrū sissinnu maḥir</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x adi gisimmari šehrūtī ša Sin-aḥḥē-bullīt</td>
<td>VII</td>
<td>Kapru-ša-naqiditī</td>
<td>itti 1 kurrū 0;0.1.4 ½ kišir esitti u balātu ana Bēl, bita ša ḫuṣābi, ṭuḥalla, liblibbi u mangāga inamdin; 2 kurrū sissinnu maḥir; elāt 1 kurrū ša gugalli</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bīt ritti ša Balātu/Nabū-bānu-aḫti</td>
<td>VII; ina ḫašāri</td>
<td>[Bit]qu-ša- Bēl-ēter</td>
<td>itti 1 kurrū 0;0.1.4 ½ kišir esitti u balātu ana Bēl, bita ša ḫuṣābi, ṭuḥalla, liblibbi, mangāga inamdin; elāt 1 kurrū ša gugalli</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bīt-rēʾi elunūtu</td>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>ṣa-[x]-du</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plot</th>
<th>Date &amp; Place of Payment</th>
<th>Place of Drafting</th>
<th>Extras</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[x]</td>
<td>VII; ina ḫašāri</td>
<td>Bit-Nāʾid-[x]</td>
<td>itti 1 kurrū tuḥalla, liblibbi u mangāga inamdin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurbat</td>
<td>VII; ina ḫašāri</td>
<td>Kurbat</td>
<td>itti 1 kurrū 0;0.1.4 ½ kišir esitti u balātu Bēl, bita ša ḫuṣābi, ṭuḥalla, liblibbi, [mangāga] inamdin; elāt [x]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lasūtu</td>
<td>VII; ina ḫašāri</td>
<td>Lasūtu</td>
<td>itti 1 kurrū 0;0.1.4 ½ kišir esitti u balātu Bēl, bita ša ḫuṣābi, ṭuḥalla, liblibbi u mangāga inamdin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nār-Saḥīru-ša-Nabū-iqiša</td>
<td>VII; ina ḫašāri</td>
<td>Kār-Nanāya</td>
<td>itti 1 kurrū 0;0.1.4 ½ kišir esitti u balātu Bēl, bita ša ḫuṣābi, ṭuḥalla, liblibbi u mangāga inamdin; elāt 1 kurrū ša gugalli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ʿBitquʿ</td>
<td>VII; ina ḫašāri</td>
<td>Bitqu-ša-Bēl-ēter</td>
<td>[itti 1 kurrū 1b] 4.5 qā kišir esitti u balātu ana Bēl, bita ša ḫuṣābi, ṭuḥalla, liblibbi u mangāga inamdın; elāt 2 kurrū ša gugalli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nāru-ša-Bīt-ilī</td>
<td>VII; ina ḫašāri</td>
<td>Bitqu-ša-Bēl-ēter</td>
<td>itti 1 kurrū 0;0.1.4 ½ kišir esitti u balātu ana Bēl, bita ša ḫuṣābi, ṭuḥalla, liblibbi u mangāga inamdin; elāt 2 kurrū ša gugalli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nāru-eššu</td>
<td>VII; ina ḫašāri</td>
<td>Kapru-ša-naqiditī</td>
<td>itti 1 kurrū 0;0.1.4 ½ kišir esitti u balātu ana Bēl, bita ša ḫuṣābi, ṭuḥalla, liblibbi u mangāga inamdin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Šatarrāya</td>
<td>VII; ina ḫašāri</td>
<td>urû[k]</td>
<td>itti 1 kurrū 0;0.1.4 ½ kišir esitti u balātu ana Bēl inamdın</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text</td>
<td>Date (month-day)</td>
<td>Rent farmer</td>
<td>Amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truro 17</td>
<td>VI-19</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Date (month-day)</th>
<th>Rent farmer</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Debtor</th>
<th>Scribe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6 Camb</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Date (month-day)</th>
<th>Rent farmer</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Debtor</th>
<th>Scribe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NCBT 829</td>
<td>[x]-5</td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td>32 [+x/0]</td>
<td>Kalbîaya/Nabû-re-fx¹</td>
<td>Šamaš-mukin-apli/Eanna-nadin-šumi/Babûtu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM 113384</td>
<td>V-11</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Ayya-yada'/Nabû-šabît</td>
<td>Šamaš-mukin-apli/Eanna-nadin-šumi/Babûtu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM 114641</td>
<td>V-25</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>Innin-šum-iškun/Gimillu/Kurî</td>
<td>Šamaš-mukin-apli/Eanna-nadin-šumi/Babûtu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM 113536</td>
<td>VI-5</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Eribîaya/Nabû-zêr-ukiñ, Aḫ-iddin/Nabû-êter</td>
<td>Šamaš-mukin-apli/Nadin/Babûtu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM 114645</td>
<td>VI-14</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Marduk-šum-[x/x]/Šutia</td>
<td>Šamaš-mukin-apli/Eanna-nadin-šumi/Babûtu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 7 195</td>
<td>VI-14</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Balâtu/Innin-zêr-ušabši</td>
<td>Šamaš-mukin-apli/Eanna-nadin-šumi/Babûtu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JCS 28, no. 35</td>
<td>VII-2</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>Ištar-ḫ-iddin/Innin-zêr-ušabši</td>
<td>Šamaš-mukin-apli/Eanna-nadin-šumi/Babûtu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM 114487</td>
<td>VII-4</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>Šamaš-zêr-iddin/Lâbîši</td>
<td>[x/x/x]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM 113429</td>
<td>VII-6</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>Marduk-šapik-zêri/Balâtu/ Miširâya</td>
<td>Šamaš-mukin-apli/Eanna-nadin-šumi/Babûtu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plot</td>
<td>Date &amp; Place of Payment</td>
<td>Place of Drafting</td>
<td>Extras</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dûr-Ugumu</td>
<td>VII</td>
<td>Bitqu-ša-Bêl-êter</td>
<td>itti 1 kurru 0;0.1.4 ½ kîšir esittû balâtu Bêl, bitla ša ḫuṣâbû, tuḫallâ, liblibbî u mangâga inamdûn; elât 1 kurrû ša gugallî</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nâru-ša-Bît-ilî</td>
<td>VII</td>
<td>Bitqu-ša-[Bêl-êter]</td>
<td>itti 1 kurrû 0;0.1.4 ½ kîšir esittû balâtu Bêl, bitla ša ḫuṣâbû, tuḫallâ, liblibbî u mangâga inamdûn; elât 1 kurrû ša gugallî</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurbat'</td>
<td>VII</td>
<td>Kurbat'</td>
<td>itti 1 kurrû 0;0.1.4 ½ kîšir esittû balâtu ana Bêl, bitla ša ḫuṣâbû, tuḫallâ, liblibbî u mangâga inamdûn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bit- Nabû-šum-lišir</td>
<td>VII</td>
<td>Uruk</td>
<td>itti 1 kurrû 0;0.1.4 ½ kîšir esittû balâtu ana Bêl, bitla ša ḫuṣâbû, tuḫallâ, liblibbî u mangâga inamdûn; elât 5 kurrû kasîa šîbâšu šupâl gîšîmmûrî</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a-ša šâ 10 muššû</td>
<td>VII</td>
<td>Nâru-eššu</td>
<td>itti 1 kurrû 0;0.1.4 ½ kîšir esittû balâtu ana Bêl, tuḫallâ, liblibbî, mangâga u bitla ša ḫuṣâbû inamdûnin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naḥallû</td>
<td>[X]; ina ḫâṣârî</td>
<td>Bâb-Aṣṣurûtu</td>
<td>itti 1 kurrû 0;0.1.4[4] ½ kîšir esittû balâtu Bêl, bitla ša ḫuṣâbû, tuḫallâ, liblibbî u mangâga inamdûn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nâr-šarri</td>
<td>VII; ina ḫâṣârî</td>
<td>Bâb-Aṣṣurûtu</td>
<td>itti 1 kurrû 0;0.1.4 ½ kîšir esittû balâtu ana Bêl, bitla ša ḫuṣâbû, tuḫallâ, liblibbî u mangâga inamdûn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lasûtu</td>
<td>[X]; ina ḫâṣârî</td>
<td>Bit-Šâkin-šumu</td>
<td>itti 1 kurrû 0;0.1.4 ½ kîšir esittû balâtu Bêl, bitla ša ḫuṣâbû, tuḫallâ, liblibbî u mangâga inamdûn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takkîru</td>
<td>VII; ina ḫâṣârî</td>
<td>Bitqu-ša-Bêl-êter</td>
<td>itti 1 kurrû 0;0.1.4 ½ kîšir esittû balâtu ana Bêl, bitla ša ḫuṣâbû, tuḫallâ, liblibbî, mangâga inamdûn; elât 1 kurrû ša gugallî</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takkîru</td>
<td>VII; ina ḫâṣârî</td>
<td>Bitqu-ša-Bêl-êter</td>
<td>itti 1 kurrû 0;0.1.4 ½ kîšir esittû balâtu ana Bêl, bitla ša ḫuṣâbû, tuḫallâ, liblibbî, mangâga inamdûn; elât 1 kurrû ša gugallî</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ḥarrû-ša-Lâbiši</td>
<td>VII; ina ḫâṣârî</td>
<td>Âlu-Nârsaparrâtu</td>
<td>itti 1 kurrû 0;0.1.4 ½ kîšir esittû balâtu Bêl, bitla ša ḫuṣâbû, tuḫallâ, liblibbî, mangâga inamdûn; elât 1 kurrû ša gugallî</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lasûtu</td>
<td>VII; ina ḫâṣârî</td>
<td>Bitqu-ša-Bêl-êter</td>
<td>itti 1 kurrû 0;0.1.4 ½ kîšir esittû balâtu Bêl, bitla ša ḫuṣâbû, tuḫallâ, liblibbî, mangâga inamdûn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### imittu debt notes for dates from the first regnal year of Nebuchadnezzar IV

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Date (month-day)</th>
<th>Rent farmer</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Debtor</th>
<th>Scribe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VS 20 62</td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Ša-pî-kalbi/Ţumb[um]’-x</td>
<td>[x]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUWE 11 216</td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td>[G]</td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td>Šillâya/Innin-šum-ušur/ Ki[din-Marduk]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 17 37</td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>40’’</td>
<td>Bulti[aya &amp; PN sons] of Nabû-nâsîr</td>
<td>Šillâya/Innin-šum-ušur/ Kidin-Marduk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 17 299</td>
<td>[V]-24</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>24 + 18</td>
<td>Innin-šum-ušur/Silim-il</td>
<td>Šillâya/Innin-šum-ušur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 17 35</td>
<td>V-18</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Yâdā/Nabû-zabâdû</td>
<td>Innin-šum-ušur/Nergal-ušur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 17 287</td>
<td>V-24</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Nabû-eribâ/Zakîr</td>
<td>Šillâya/Innin-šum-ušur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 17 288</td>
<td>V-26</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Ṭâbía/Šamaš-udammiq, Šamaš-âl-hî-eribâ/Bêl-î-dîn</td>
<td>Šillâya/Innin-šum-ušur/ Kidin-Marduk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM 114636</td>
<td>V-26</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Nabû-utîr, slave (qalli) of Kînnêa</td>
<td>Šillâya/Innin-šum-ušur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM 114617</td>
<td>V-26</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Aḥ-lûmûr’/x</td>
<td>Innin-šum-ušur/Nergalu-šêzîb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM 114630</td>
<td>V-29</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Bêl-âl-hî-î-dîn/Arad-Innin/Aḥ-î-dîn’, Šamaš-eribâ/Arad-Innin/Ḫûnûzi</td>
<td>Šillâya/Innin-šum-ušur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM 114650</td>
<td>VI-1</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>Šum-î-dîn/Muḫallim-Marduk</td>
<td>Šillâya/Innin-šum-ušur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plot</td>
<td>Date &amp; Place of Payment</td>
<td>Place of Drafting</td>
<td>Extras</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[x]</td>
<td>VII</td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td>itti 1 kurru 0;0.2. [3...] inamdin; ina libbi […] 1 kurru makkasū […]; elāt 1 kurru […] sissinnumu […]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[x]</td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td>[…] kurummāti, lib[libbī ...] hita ša [huṣābi ...] inamdin; ina libbi [...], sissinnu [...], elāt 1 kurru [ša gugalli]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[x]</td>
<td>VII; ina ḫaṣārī</td>
<td>Bitqu-ša-Bēl-ēter, [Kār-Nān]āya</td>
<td>itti 1 kurru 0;0.2.3, tuḥalla, ḫibī, mangāga, hita ša huṣābi inamdin; ina libbī 6 kurru makkasū; 6 kurru sissinnumu eṣer; elāt 1 kurru ša gugalli</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aššurītu-ša-Bulluṭāya</td>
<td>VII; ina ḫaṣārī</td>
<td>Ḥarru-ša-Nadnāya</td>
<td>itti 1 kurru […] libbī, mangāga, […] huṣābi inamdin; ina libbī […], elāt 1 kurru ša gugalli, sissinnumu eṣer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kār-Eanna</td>
<td>VII; ina ḫaṣārī</td>
<td>Kār-Eanna, Ālu-ša-Anu-āḫ-iddin</td>
<td>itti 1 kurru 0;0.2.3 kurummāti, libbī, mangāga, hita ša huṣābi inamdin; ina libbī 4 kurru makkasū; elāt 2 kurru ša gugalli u kaspi ša ḫa-ḇi ‘uḥištu; sissinnumu Innin-šum-ibni eṣer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaddētu</td>
<td>VII; ina ḫaṣārī</td>
<td>Gaddētu</td>
<td>itti 1 kurru 0;0.2.3 kurummāti, libbī, mangāga u hita huṣābi inamdīnā; elāt 1 kurru ša gugalli; Šamaš-żēr-iddin sissinnumu eṣer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaddētu</td>
<td>VII; ina ḫaṣārī</td>
<td>Gaddētu</td>
<td>itti 1 kurru 0;0.2.3 kurummāti, libbī, mangāga u hita huṣābi inamdīnā; elāt 1 kurru ša gugalli; Šamaš-żēr-ibni sissinnumu eṣer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurbat</td>
<td>VII</td>
<td>Kurbat</td>
<td>itti 1 kurru 0;0.2.3 kurummāti, libbī, mangāga, hita ša huṣābi inamdīnā; elāt 1 kurru ša gugalli; ina libbī 1;2.2 makkasū; sissinnumu eṣer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kār-Eanna</td>
<td>VII; ina ḫaṣārī</td>
<td>Kār-Eanna, Ālu-ša-Anu-āḫ-iddin, Uruk</td>
<td>itti 1 kurru 0;0.2.3 kurummāti, libbī, mangāga inamdīn; ina libbī 1;3.2 makkasū; elāt 1 kurru ša gugalli u kaspi ša ḫa; sissinnumu Nabū-eriba eṣer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nāru-eššu</td>
<td>VII; ina ḫaṣārī</td>
<td>Nāru-eššu</td>
<td>itti 1 kurru 0;0.2.3 kurummāti, libbī, mangāga u hita ša huṣābi inamdīnā; 1 kurru makkasū; elāt 1 kurru ša gugalli; sissinnumu Ţābia u Šamaš-āḫḫē-eriba eṭrū</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nāru-eššu</td>
<td>VII; ina ḫaṣārī</td>
<td>Nāru-eššu</td>
<td>itti 1 kurru 0;0.2.3 kurummāti, libbī, mangāga u hita ša huṣābi [inamdin]; ina libbī 1;3.2 makkasū; elāt 1 kurru ša gugalli; sissinnmu u eṣer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nāru-eššu</td>
<td>VII</td>
<td>Nāru-eššu</td>
<td>itti 1 kurru 0;0.2.3, libbī, mangāga u hita ša huṣābi inamdin; ina libbī 1;[x.x] makkasū; ‘elāt 1[1] kurru Šamaš-āḫḫē-eriba eṣer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kakkabtū</td>
<td>VII; ina ḫaṣārī</td>
<td>Kār-Nanāya, Takkiru</td>
<td>itti &lt;1 kurru&gt; 0;0.2.3 kurummāti, tuḥalla, ḫibī, mangāga, hita ša huṣābi inamdin; 4 kurru sissinnumu eṣer; [ina libbī x makkasū; elāt 2 kurru ša gugalli]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kār-Šara</td>
<td>VII; ina ḫaṣārī</td>
<td>Nahallu</td>
<td>itti 1 kurru 0;0.2.3 kurummāti, libbī, mangāga u [hitla] ša huṣābi inamdin; ina libbī 6 kurru [makkasū]; elāt 1 kurru ša gugalli; sissinnumu Šumu-iddin eṣer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text</td>
<td>Date (month-day)</td>
<td>Rent farmer</td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>Debtor</td>
<td>Scribe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCL 12 22</td>
<td>VI-2</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>Iddinîya/Innin-šum-uṣur/Sîn-leqe-unninnî</td>
<td>Şillâya/Innin-šum-uṣur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 17 289</td>
<td>VI-2</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Nabû-mukkelîp/Nûrânu</td>
<td>Şillâya/Innin-šum-uṣur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 17 290</td>
<td>VI-3</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>7;2.3</td>
<td>Aråda/Šamaš-uballît</td>
<td>Şillâya/Innin-šum-uṣur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM 114642</td>
<td>VI-3</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Šamaš-erîba/Tâb-x</td>
<td>Şillâya/Innin-šum-uṣur/Kidin-Marduk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAKF 136</td>
<td>VI-3</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Nabû-kâşîn/Šamaš-bân-aḫî</td>
<td>Şillâya/Innin-šum-uṣur/Kidin-Marduk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM 114644</td>
<td>VI-3</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Nabû-aḫḫē-iddin/Marduk-šum-iddin/Bēl-apla-uṣur</td>
<td>Şillâya/Innin-šum-uṣur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 17 291</td>
<td>VI-8</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>Šamaš-iqiša/Sîn-ḫab-iddin</td>
<td>Şillâya/Innin-šum-uṣur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTS 3014</td>
<td>VI-12</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Kalbâya/Ibni-Ištar, Lâbâši/Bânia</td>
<td>Şillâya/Innin-šum-uṣur/Kidin-Marduk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 17 292</td>
<td>VI-13</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Nabû-[^x]-[^1]-[^x]/Anu-anabitišu</td>
<td>Şillâya/Innin-[šum-uṣur]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTS 2243</td>
<td>VI-29</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>Šamaš-na-[^x]-[^x]/Gimillu</td>
<td>[Şillâya]/Innin-šum-uṣur/ [Kidin-Marduk]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM 114467</td>
<td>VI-29</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>Tattannu/Ibnîya</td>
<td>Şillâya/Innin-šum-uṣur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCL 12 23</td>
<td>VII-1</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Ki-Šamaš/Iddinûnu</td>
<td>Şillâya/Innin-šum-uṣur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plot</td>
<td>Date &amp; Place of Payment</td>
<td>Place of Drafting</td>
<td>Extras</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[x]</td>
<td>VII; <em>ina ḥasārī</em></td>
<td><em>Nāhallu</em>¹</td>
<td>ITTI 1 Kurru 0;0.2.3 Kurummāti, libbi, Mangāga U Bilta Ša Ḥusābi Inamdin; Ina Libbi 5:2.2 Makkasā; Elāt 1 Kurru Ša Gugalli; Sissinnu Iddināya ejet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ḥirī[tu]</td>
<td>VII; <em>ina ḥasārī</em></td>
<td>Nāhallu</td>
<td>Itti 1 Kurru 0;0.2.3 Kurummāti, Libbi, Mangāga U Bilta Ša Ḥusābi Inamdin; Ina Libbi 3 Kurru Makkasā; Elāt 1 Kurru Ša Gugalli; Sissinnušu [ejet]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ʿBaḥt-Šalti-il</td>
<td>VII; <em>ina ḥasārī</em></td>
<td>Bāb-Ăşšuritū</td>
<td>Itti 1 Kurru 0;0.2.3 Kurummāti, Libbi, Mangāga U Bilta Ša Ḥusābi Inamdin; Ina Libbi 1 Kurru Makkasā; Sissinnu ʿArdiya ejet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Șušamman</td>
<td>VII; <em>ina ḥasārī</em></td>
<td>Bāb-Ăşšuritū</td>
<td>Itti 1 Kurru 0;0.2.3 Kurummāti, Libbi, Mangāga U Bilta Ša Ḥusābi Inamdin; Ina Libbi […] Gugalli […] ejet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nāhallu</td>
<td>VII</td>
<td>Bāb-Ăşšuritū</td>
<td>Itti 1 Kurru 0;0.2.3 Kurummāti, Libbi, Mangāga U Bilta Ša Ḥusābi Inamdin; Ina Libbi 1 Kurru Makkasā; Sissinnušu Nabū-āḥjē ejet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ḥarišu</td>
<td>VII; <em>ina ḥasārī</em></td>
<td>Kapru-ša-naqidātī</td>
<td>Itti 1 Kurru 0;0.2.3 Kurummāti, Libbi, Mangāga U Bilta Ša Ḥusābi Inamdin; Ina Libbi 1 Kurru Makkasā; Sissinnušu Nabū-alaḥē ejet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ăşšuritū</td>
<td>VII</td>
<td>Šakillat</td>
<td>Itti 1 Kurru 0;0.2.3 Kurummāti, Libbi, Mangāga U Bilta Ša Ḥusābi; Ina Libbi 15 Kurru Makkasā; Elāt 2 Kurru Ša Gugalli</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ɗūru-ša-Gidānu</td>
<td>VII</td>
<td>Ḥarru-ša-Nadnāya</td>
<td>Itti 1 Kurru 0;0.2.3 Kurummāti[, Libbi, Mangāga[ U Bilta Ša Ḥusābi; [...] Elāt 1 Kurru Ša Gugalli; 3 Kurru [...] Ina Libbi Ina […]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ḥarru-ša-Nadnāya</td>
<td>VII; <em>ina ḥasārī</em></td>
<td>Ḥarru-ša-Nadnāya</td>
<td>Itti 1 Kurru 0;0.2.3, Tuḥalla, Libbi, Mangāga U Bilta Ša Ḥusābi Inamdin; [...] Elāt 2 Kurru [Ša Gugalli]; 2 Kurru Sissinnu [ejet]; Ina Libbi 6 Kurru Makkasā</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[x]</td>
<td>VII; <em>ina ḥasārī</em></td>
<td>Nāhallu</td>
<td>Itti 1 Kurru 0;0.2.3 Kurummāti, Libbi, Mangāga U Bilta Ša Ḥusābi Inamdin; Ina Libbi 3;2.2 Makkasā; Elāt 1 Kurru Ša Gugalli</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nāhallu</td>
<td>VII; <em>ina ḥasārī</em></td>
<td>Bitqu-ša-Bel-ejet</td>
<td>Itti 1 Kurru 0;0.2.3 Kurummāti, Tuḥalla, Liblibbi, Mangāga, Bilta Ša Ḥusābi Inamdin; Ina Libbi 3;2.3 Makkasā; Elāt 1 Kurru Ša Gugalli; [Sissinnu] ejet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ɓāb-maḥīri</td>
<td>VII; <em>ina ḥasārī</em></td>
<td>Ƙār-Nanāya</td>
<td>Itti 1 Kurru 0;0.2.3 Kurummāti, Tuḥalla, Liblibbi, Mangāga U Bilta Ša Ḥusābi Inamdin; Ina Libbi 13 Kurru Makkasā; Elāt 1 Kurru Ša Gugalli; Sissinnušu Tattannu ejet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nār-Bitqu, bit ritti ša Zēria</td>
<td>VII; <em>ina ḥasārī</em></td>
<td>Ƙār-Nanāya</td>
<td>Itti 1 Kurru 0;0.2.3 Kurummāti, Tuḥalla, Libbi, Mangāga U Bilta Ša Ḥusābi Inamdin; Elāt 1 Kurru Ša Gugalli; Sissinnušu Ki-Šamaš ejet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text</td>
<td>Date (month-day)</td>
<td>Rent farmer</td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>Debtor</td>
<td>Scribe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM 114637</td>
<td>VII-2</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Balatu/Shillaya</td>
<td>Shillaya/Innin-sum-usur/Kidin-Marduk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM 114570</td>
<td>VII-2</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>Nabû-[x]-mu/Nabû-[x], Shillaya/Nergal-iddin</td>
<td>Shillaya/Innin-sum-usur/Kidin-Marduk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 17 293</td>
<td>VII-3</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>Nanaya-al-iddin/Nabû-alḫē-eriba, Šumaya/Nabû-kehr</td>
<td>Shillaya/Innin-sum-usur/Kidin-Marduk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 17 294</td>
<td>VII-3</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>Zēria &amp; Nabû-alḫē-iddin, sons of Bēl-ereš</td>
<td>Shillaya/Innin-sum-usur/Kidin-Marduk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 17 295</td>
<td>VII-3</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>Nabû-ereš/Nabû-din-ipuš</td>
<td>Shillaya/Innin-sum-usur/Kidin-Marduk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM 114620</td>
<td>VII-3</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>Šamaḫ-zēr-iddin/Lábāši</td>
<td>Shillaya/Innin-sum-usur/Kidin-Marduk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAKF 153</td>
<td>VII-3</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td>Shillaya/Innin-sum-usur/Kidin-Marduk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 17 296</td>
<td>VII-5</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>4;2.3</td>
<td>Nanaya-al-iddin/Ardia</td>
<td>Shillaya/Innin-sum-usur/Kidin-Marduk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 17 297</td>
<td>VII-5</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>Lábāši/Nanaya-al-iddin</td>
<td>Shillaya/Innin-sum-usur/Kidin-Marduk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 21 213</td>
<td>VII-5</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Šamaḫ-al-iddin/Gimillu</td>
<td>Shillaya/Innin-sum-usur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 21 212</td>
<td>VII-5</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>Nabû-balāssu-iqbi/[x]</td>
<td>Shillaya/Innin-sum-usur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM 113352</td>
<td>VII-5</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>Balatu/Shillaya</td>
<td>Shillaya/Innin-sum-usur/Kidin-Marduk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM 113422</td>
<td>VII-5</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>Ištar-al-iddin/Aḫulap-Ištar</td>
<td>Shillaya/Innin-sum-usur/Kidin-Marduk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plott</td>
<td>Date &amp; Place of Payment</td>
<td>Place of Drafting</td>
<td>Extras</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takkiru</td>
<td>VII; ina ḥaṣāri</td>
<td>Bitqu-ša-Bēl-ēter</td>
<td>itti 1 kurru 0;0.2.3 kurummāti, tuḥalla, libbī, mangāga u bīlta ša ḥuṣābī inamdin; ina libbī 2 kurru makkasū; elāt 1 kurru ša gugalli; sissinnusu Balāṭu ēṭer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takkiru</td>
<td>VII; ina ḥaṣāri</td>
<td>Bitqu-ša-Bēl-ēter, Kār-Nanāya</td>
<td>itti 1 kurru 0;0.2.3 kurummāti, tuḥalla, libbī, mangāga u bīlta ša ḥuṣābī inamdin; ina libbī 15 kurru makkasū; elāt 1 kurru ša gugalli; 6 kurru sissinnusu ḥistar-āl-iddin ēṭer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milḥānu</td>
<td>VII; ina ḥaṣāri</td>
<td>Bitqu-ša-Bēl-ēter, Kār-Nanāya</td>
<td>itti 1 kurru 0;0.2.3 kurummāti, tuḥalla, libbī, mangāga u bīlta ša ḥuṣābī inamdin; ina libbī 16 kurru makkasū; 15 kurru sissinnusu ul ēṭer; elāt 1 kurru ša gugalli</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ḩimmu ṣa ḥarrātī</td>
<td>VII; ina ḥaṣāri</td>
<td>Bitqu-ša-Bēl-ēter</td>
<td>itti 1 kurru 0;0.2.3 kurummāti, tuḥalla, libbī, mangāga u bīlta ša ḥuṣābī inamdin; ina libbī 13 kurru makkasū; elāt 1 kurru ša gugalli; 13 kurru sissinnusu ēṭrā</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ḩimmu ṣa ḥarrātī</td>
<td>VII; ina ḥaṣāri</td>
<td>Bitqu-ša-Bēl-ēter</td>
<td>itti 1 kurru 0;0.2.3 kurummāti, tuḥalla, libbī, mangāga, bīlta ša ḥuṣābī inamdin; ina libbī 18 kurru makkasū; 10 kurru sissinnusu ēṭrā; elāt 2 kurru ša gugalli</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dūr-Ugumu</td>
<td>VII; ina ḥaṣāri</td>
<td>Bitqu-ša-Bēl-ēter</td>
<td>itti 1 kurru 0;0.2.3 kurummāti, tuḥalla, libbī, mangāga, bīlta ša ḥuṣābī inamdin; ina libbī 5 kurru makkasū; elāt 1 kurru ša gugalli; 5 kurru sissinnusu Nabū-čerē ēṭer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takkiru</td>
<td>VII; ina ḥaṣāri</td>
<td>Bitqu-ša-B[e]l-ēter</td>
<td>itti 1 kurru 0;0.2.3 kurummāti, tuḥalla, libbī, mangāga u bīlta ša ḥuṣābī inamdin; ina libbī 12 kurru makkasū; elāt 1 kurru ša gugalli; sissinnusu šāmuš-zēr-iddin ēṭer, 5 kurru sissinnusu ēṭer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takkiru</td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td>Bitqu-ša-Bēl-ēter, Kār-Nanāya</td>
<td>itti 1 kurru 0;0.2.3, tuḥalla, libbī, mangāga, bīlta ša ḥuṣābī inamdin; ina libbī 1 kurru makkasū; 3 kurru sissinnusu ēṭer; elāt 1 kurru ša gugalli</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bitqu</td>
<td>VII; ina ḥaṣāri</td>
<td>Bitqu-ša-Bēl-ēter</td>
<td>itti 1 kurru 0;0.2.3 kurummāti, tuḥalla, libbī, mangāga u bīlta ša ḥuṣābī inamdin; 1 kurru sissinnusu ēṭer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bāb- Bitqu</td>
<td>VII; ina ḥaṣāri</td>
<td>Bitqu-ša-Bēl-ēter, [K]ār-Nanāya</td>
<td>itti 1 kurru 0;0.2.3 kurummāti, tuḥalla, libbī, mangāga u bīlta ša ḥuṣābī inamdin; ina libbī 19 (kurru) makkasū; 25 kurru sissinnusu ēṭer; elāt 1 kurru ša gugalli</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bitqu</td>
<td>VII; ina ḥaṣāri</td>
<td>Bitqu-ša-Bēl-ēter</td>
<td>itti 1 kurru 0;0.2.3 kurummāti, tuḥalla, libbī, mangāga u bīlta ša ḥuṣābī inamdin; elāt gugalli; 1 kurru sis[ṣinnu ēṭer]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bitqu</td>
<td>[x]; ina ḥaṣāri</td>
<td>Bitqu</td>
<td>[itti 1 kurru 0;0.2.3 kurummāti, [libbī, mangāga] bīlta ša ḥuṣābī [inamdin]; ina libbī 1 kurru makkasū; elāt 1 kurru ša gugalli; 5 kurru sissinnusu ēṭer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takkiru</td>
<td>VII; ina ḥaṣāri</td>
<td>Bitqu-ša-Bēl-ēter</td>
<td>itti 1 kurru 0;0.2.3, tuḥalla, libbī, mangāga u bīlta inamdin; elāt 1 kurru ša gugalli; 10 kurru sissinnusu ēṭer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nāru-ṣa-Bīṭ-iłī</td>
<td>VII; ina ḥaṣāri</td>
<td>Bitqu-ša-Bēl-ēter</td>
<td>itti 1 kurru 0;0.2.3 kurummāti, tuḥalla, libbī, mangāga u bīlta ša ḥuṣābī inamdin; ina libbī 4 kurru makkasū; elāt 1 kurru ša gugalli; 5 kurru sissinnusu ḥistar-āl-iddin ēṭer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text</td>
<td>Date (month-day)</td>
<td>Rent farmer</td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>Debtor</td>
<td>Scribe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOS 17 298</td>
<td>VII-6</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>Šamaš-iddin/Kāṣir/Basīa</td>
<td>Șillāya/Innin-šum-uṣur/Kidin-Marduk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM 114584</td>
<td>VII-16/1</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Iddināya/Innin-šum-ibni</td>
<td>Șillāya/Innin-šum-uṣur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIN 1 99</td>
<td>VII-13</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Nānāya-[ēr]eš/Mukkēa</td>
<td>İnnin-šum-uṣur/Nergal-nāṣir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM 113400</td>
<td>VII-14</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>Sīn-aḫḫē-bulliT/Aḫ-lakūn</td>
<td>Șillāya/[Innin-š]um-uṣur/Kidin-Marduk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plot</td>
<td>Date &amp; Place of Payment</td>
<td>Place of Drafting</td>
<td>Extras</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taptîru</td>
<td>VII; <em>ina ḫaṣāri</em></td>
<td>Bitqu-Ša-Bêl-ētêr</td>
<td><em>itti</em> 1 kurru 0;0.2.3 kurummatî, tuḥalla, libbî, mangûga u bilta ša ḫuṣâbi inamdîn; <em>ina</em> libbî 13 kurru makkasû; elât 4 kurru ša gugallî; 15 kurru sissinmu eṯer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[x]</td>
<td>VII; <em>ina ḫaṣāri</em></td>
<td>Bitqu-Ša-Bêl-ētêr, Kûr-Nânîya</td>
<td><em>itti</em> 1 kurru 0;0.2.3 kurummatî, tuḥalla, libbî, mangûga, u bilta ša ḫuṣâbi inamdîn; <em>ina</em> libbî 4 kurru makkasû; 5 kurru sissinmušu eṯer; elât 1 kurru ša gugallî</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bitqu-Ša-Bêl-ētêr</td>
<td>VII</td>
<td>Bitqu-[Sha-Belt]-ētêr</td>
<td><em>itti</em> 1 kurru 0;0.2.3, tuḥalla, libbî, mangûga u bilta ša ḫuṣâbi inamdîn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bâb-Bitqu-Ša-Bêl-ētêr</td>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>Bitqu-Ša-Bêl-ētêr</td>
<td><em>itti</em> 1 kurru 0;0.2.3 kurummatî, tuḥalla, libbî, mangûga u bilta ša ḫuṣâbi inamdîn; <em>ina</em> libbî 3;3.3 makkasû; 5 kurru sissinmu eṯer; elât 1 kurru ša gugallî</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dûr-Ugumu</td>
<td>VII; <em>ina ḫaṣârî</em></td>
<td>Bitqu-Ša-Bêl-ētêr</td>
<td><em>itti</em> 1 kurru 0;0.2.3 kurummatî, tuḥalla, libbî, mangûga u bilta ša ḫuṣâbi inamdîn; <em>ina</em> libbî 8 kurru makkasû; [x kurru] sissinmušu eṯer; [...]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Abstract

The aim of this thesis is the representation of several aspects of institutional agriculture of the Eanna temple in the south-Babylonian city of Uruk in the first millennium BC. The primary sources used here, the Neo-Babylonian cuneiform tablets, stem from the archive of the Eanna temple which covers a period from approximately 615 BC to 522 BC. The focus of this study lies within this time frame. Urukean agriculture is examined with respect to the organization of the cultivation of temple lands and the so-called rent farm system in particular, the land lease contracts, as well as the topography and the temple properties in and around the city of Uruk. Accordingly, this study is divided into five parts: 1. Introduction, 2. Organisation of labour, 3. Land lease contracts, 4. Aspects of Urukean topography, and 5. Summary and Conclusion. This is accompanied by a set of appendices including text editions, a reconstruction of the agricultural calendar and catalogues of tablets.

After a general introduction the second part of this thesis (Organisation of labour) follows the development of the management of the temple agriculture starting with the phase preceding the introduction of the large-scale rent farm. The organisation and the roles of different agricultural professions such as ploughmen, sharecroppers, gardeners, and a whole range of overseers is treated in detail. Where appropriate the individual chapters are complemented by prosopographic tables.

The section dealing with the large-scale rent farming is mainly devoted to the rent farmers while tracing the evolution of this system. Previously unpublished texts enhance the picture of this extensively studied phenomenon and even modify it with regard to particular developments in Uruk. Especially the private archive of Shum-ukin, the first large-scale rent farmer, enlarged by a considerable number of new texts, sheds light on his social background, his economic activities and the beginnings of his career. Aspects such as the success of the rent farm system and royal interference in its workings are studied and the role of the rent farmers is put in relation to the main structural weaknesses of the Eanna temple, namely the lack of manpower and under-capitalisation.

In the third part, which deals with the land lease contracts, the formal aspects, typology and terminology of the contracts are examined. A significant number of hitherto unpublished texts (twenty of a total of forty extant land leases) greatly improves our knowledge of this group of texts. An analysis of the temporal distribution of these texts is attempted and its use as evidence for Eanna’s agricultural strategies and policies is discussed.

The topographic part gives an outline of the general geographical setting and the more significant land holdings of the temple, taking the watercourses around which these estates were situated as a starting point. A range of cadastral texts is presented and their Sitz im Leben is discussed. The land use patterns and the size and productivity of plots on the estates of Eanna are examined. This, together with evidence from the land lease contracts, allows for deliberations on the total size of the temple estates and the temple’s income in agricultural commodities.

In the general concluding remarks the organisation of labour and the agricultural regime of the Eanna temple are put into perspective through comparison to other known Babylonian institutions and regions. Despite many structural similarities with respect to the management of agriculture, the development and the regime of Eanna’s agriculture is shown to be distinct from the comparable Eabbar temple in north-Babylonia. The specific circumstances, primarily the temple’s isolated position at the margins of the empire, which led to its particular development are outlined.
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