

53) Further collations to CUSAS 28 — The following note is the by-product of preparing the texts published in CUSAS 28 for incorporation into the NaBuCCo database. ¹⁾ The collations and restorations suggested below are based on photographs and not on the examination of the tablets.

Previous corrections to the original publication are not pointed out below; these include: C. Waerzeggers' 2015 review of CUSAS 28, the corrigenda posted in L. Pearce's Academia.edu page (PEARCE 2015), and the additions and corrections given on CUSAS 28's webpage (Pearce/Wunsch, Additions & Correction). We also do not repeat C. Waerzeggers' collations (NABU 2017/86).

For each of our readings we also cite for convenience the original reading of CUSAS 28. Full restorations are indicated in **bold**, as are cases in which we agree with the identification of a sign but give a different reading. Notes and brief explanations are given in the case of suggestions that may not be instantly clear, especially in those few cases in which such new readings significantly modify the understanding of the text as given in the excellent editio princeps. All references made to text and line numbers refer to CUSAS 28.

no. 1

- l. 3: 'DUMU.KIN[?] šá*[?] lú[?]se-pi-ru (DUMU. 'KIN' lú[?]se-pi-ru)
l. 4: 'ib*-ba*-kám*-ma*[?] [a]- 'na[?] ('60(1+šú)[?] GUR[?] [x x] 40[(+x) x x x a]- 'na[?])

no. 2

- l. 1: ^{Id}+EN-LU[GAL-ÛR]U* (^{Id}+EN-LU[GAL-PA]P)
l. 9: [UD] 2*.KAM ([MU x]+2.KAM)

It is clear that the 2 stands alone and no decimal can be restored to its left. Since the tablet could not have been written in 2 Nbk (603/2 BCE), we must restore UD (*ūmu*) rather than MU (*šattu*). This also fits the context better, since otherwise, the due date for the payment would be an entire year. Finally, the narrower timeframe is probably the reason for the omission of the year at the end of the document (rather than a scribal error).

no. 4

- l. 9: SUM 'ina* u*-tur[?] ŠE.NU[MUN-šú] (SUM 'nu ina TUR[?] ŠE.NU[MUN-šú])

no. 5

- l. 19: 'taš*-lim*-tu*[?] (' x x x[?])
l. 28: iti [NE] (iti [ŠU])

We learn from lines 9–16 that the text was written after the transfer of the slave. Hence we argue that the tablet was written in the month of Abu, rather than in Tašrītu as suggested in CUSAS 28.

no. 6

l. 1: The end of this line may have continued to the right edge which cannot be read on the available photos, and further collation is needed. It could be a further description of the kind of silver, but for ina 1 GÍN *bit-qa* there is probably not enough space. Possibly the scribe started to write šá ^{Id}UTU-MU but realised that this would not fit and he therefore continued writing on the second line.

- l. 4: {10*+^r2 GÍN KÙ*.BABBAR*[?]} over incomplete erasure ('ú[?] {12[?] GÍN[?]}[?])
l. 6: KÙ.BABBAR [^{Id}UTU-MU] (KÙ.BABBAR [(...)])
l. 7: 'ra-pa-'-ia-a-ma i[t[?]*-ta[?]-dīn[?]] ('^rra-pa-'-ia-a-ma [SUM-nu])

no. 7

- l. 11: [**ba[?]-ni[?]**]-ia ([x x x]- 'ia[?])

This is a Babylonian name ending in *-ia*, hence most likely Bāniya.

no. 8

- l. 10: 'AMA[?]*[?]-šú ('DAM[?]-šú)

no. 9

- l. 12: na-áš-šī* (na-áš-šú-[ú])

Sg. rather than Pl.

no. 10

- l. 7: a-da-bu-'il*[?] (a-da-bu-'lu[?])
l. 18: ^d+AG*[?]-I ('^dPA[?]-I)

no. 13

- l. 12: UD 10^{over erasure*} .kam (UD 10.kam)
l. 13: ú-'ta-ra-am[?]-mu*[?] (ú-'ta-ra-am[?]-{mu[?]} -ma)

no. 14

l. 6: 3-ta¹* <ri>* -ba-a-tú (3 ri-ba-a-tú)

no. 15

l. 19: ¹ši-ki-na-a-ma ¹⁰ri-qa-na-a-ma (¹ši-ki-na-a-ma {x} ri-qa-na-a-ma)

This rather looks like a scribal joke: Šikin-Yaw has no dates to his name, so the scribe gives him the mock title “lazy-Yaw”, drawing on the phonetic proximity (in Late Babylonian) between /š/ and /r/ and /k/ and /q/.

no. 18

l. 6: [ina ŠE].BAR ((x) ŠE).BAR)

l. 7: šá ina* ŠU^{II} (šá {ina} ŠU^{II})

l. 8: ¹uš-tu-¹nu-¹ šá* e-¹bir-¹ ÍD šá ina* ŠU^{II} ¹mu-dam-qi*¹AG¹
 ([¹uš-tu-¹nu-¹ < lú NAM > e-¹bir-¹ ÍD šá {ina} ŠU^{II} ¹mu-dam-iq-¹AG¹)

For the translation of lines 6–8 and their context see LEVAVI in press.

no. 26

l. 3: [u]l-tu U[GU] ¹mi¹*-šir* ¹ha*-ra*-na-¹ ([u]l-tu U[GU-¹hi] ¹ul-li² x x¹-na-¹)

mišru, border, fits well in this context of describing a field.

l. 6: ^{1d}za-ba₄-<ba₄>-¹URU₃ (^{1d}za-ba₄-<ba₄>-[x])

no. 27

l. 5: ¹id*-da*¹-¹áš-šú (¹i²-ta²-¹áš-šú)

l. 10: [u-šu-u]z* ár-ki ([x x x x] ¹x¹ ár-ki)

l. 12: ¹HA*.LA*¹ šá ¹ni-ir-ia-a-ma (x x šá ¹ni-ir-ia-a-ma)

l. 13: [ia-a-nu ¹ni-ir-ia-a-ma] ¹ú ([...] ¹ú)

l. 14: [a-na u₄-mu ša-a-tí] ([...] ŠE.NUMUN šu-a]-tí)

l. 15: [a-na UGU-¹hi ŠE.NUMUN šu-a]-tí ([... ŠE.NUMUN šu-a]-tí)

l. 16: [ul i-rag-ga-mu u dabābu ia]-a-nu ([... ia]-a-nu)

no. 29

l. 7: HA.LA ¹A.ŠÁ (HA.LA {¹A.ŠÁ})

l. 12: 4² HA*.LA* (4² x x x)

l. 13: ŠE.NUMUN ¹ik*-ka¹*-lu*¹ (ŠE.NUMUN x x x)

l. 14: a-di²-i² [UD x.KAM] (a-di²-i² [x x (x x) pu² -ut²])

l. 15: IŠEŠ-ía-qa-¹am¹ iš*-¹šab*-bat*¹ (¹IŠEŠ-ía-qa-¹am na-š¹)

l. 16: ¹ú-¹šal-lu-¹mu²*¹ (¹ú-¹šal-¹lu-ú)

no. 30

l. 23: [šá MU.A]N.NA ([x MU.A]N.NA)

no. 31

l. 1: um-ma-nu šá ¹ú*-ru*-up* šá²*¹ PI^{II} (um-ma-nu šá ¹5² [x x x x] ¹meš² PI^{II})

Alternatively: um-ma-nu šá ¹SAG*.DU* šá²*¹ PI^{II}

l. 9: ¹ra-ap-¹a*-ma¹ (¹ra-ap-[pa-a-m]a)

l. 18: A-šú šá ¹d*+AG²*...¹ (A-šú šá [x x])

no. 32

l. 7: i[b*-ba-kam-m]a* (k[i-i HA.L]A)

The signs are squeezed in comparison to l. 15.

no. 33

l. 5: ¹IŠEŠ-ía-AD* (¹IŠEŠ-ía-ma¹)

If the sign after *ía* was indeed partly erased, it resulted in a *šu* rather than a *ma*. Further note that the scribe of no. 33 always wrote ¹ía-a-ma, and never ¹ía-ma. The person is not necessarily identical with the one in no. 34:3 (dated nine years later). Rather, no. 33 is linked to no. 15 in terms of prosopography, content, and date.

no. 34

l. 9: [¹x(-x)]-¹x-da²-bi²*-ni ([¹x (x)] ¹x x bi²* ni)

no. 37

l. 9: ina ¹*-et* rit*-tu₄* (ina KÁ <ka>-lak-ki¹ (TUM))

no. 41

l. 7: lú ¹HÚN*.GA*¹ (lú ¹ku²-[tal]-¹lu²)

no. 42

l. 18: lú gal-¹la*² (¹ lú GAL² ÉRIN¹?)

l. 19: ¹ lú ¹UMBISAG A (empty space)* lú ¹MU²*¹ (¹ lú ¹UMBISAG A lú ¹NAGAR²?)

no. 44

l. 16: ¹ ¹še²*-mar²*-ía-a-ma (¹[x]-¹mar²*-ía-a-ma)

l. 25: ši-pi-ni* (ši-pi-ri)

no. 45

- l. 6: ¹dan²-nu-tú³ ¹re*-qu*-tú*² (¹dan²-nu-tú³ ¹x x x²)
 l. 10: ¹x x ina² ka³*-ri-šú-nu⁴ [ma]-¹la* a-ḫa-meš² ([x x ina ka]-¹ri-šú-nu x x a-ḫa-meš²)
 l. 11: [¹ú-za-ma-z]ú²*-ú*³ ú*-[i]l⁴-tí⁵*meš⁶ * ([x x] ^dr x x x x x x x²)
 l. 13: ¹ú²-za-ma*-zu-ú³ (¹ú²-za-za³-zu⁴-ú)

no. 46

- l. 2: ¹si²-¹si*-¹[ia] (¹si-x²-[x])

no. 50

- l. 24: SUM.NA-din (SUM na-din)

no. 55

- l. 19: UD 13*.kam (UD 23.kam)

no. 60

- l. 1 and 6: ²/₃* MA.NA (% MA.NA)

no. 64

- l. 12: [MU]^{meš} II ŠU]^{II.meš} ([[(x x) ŠU]^r II².meš³)

no. 68

- l. 17 (end): [ma-hir]² ([[(x-x)])

no. 71 A+B

- l. 6: šá a-ḫi ul-la-a' šá ÍD* bit-qa (šá a-ḫi ul-la-' šá a-di bit-qa)

no. 74

- l. 13: i²-¹mi³-si-ma*{-nu-tu} (i²-¹mi³-si-šu-nu-tu)

The verb *immissi-ma* is derived from *emēdu* (G Pres. *immid*), with the accusative suffix *-ši*, “one will determine for him (= the debtor) the impost”. The form read by Pearce/Wunsch is not easily explicable and the tablet seems to have *ma*, not *šu*. Cf. Nos. 66, 72, and 73. The last two signs in line 13 are remnants of a previous text that the scribe had not erased, cf. at the end of lines 7, 8, and 9; the stray wedges before the ki-sign in l. 9 and the erased signs in l. 10.

Note that all redundant signs in text no. 74 are at the end of the lines. Clearly, the scribe was writing his text over another one that must have been structurally very similar (or even the same).

no. 75

- l. 6: ú-qa-ar*-bu*-ú {ri*-bu*-ú} (ú-qa-ta¹-¹ú (erasure){ú})

The scribe first wrote *-ar-bu-ú*, then apparently decided to add an improved reading with *ri* instead of *ar*.

no. 76

- l. 2: a-di-i² ¹ši*²-¹di-i-[t]² (a-di-i² ¹ú¹-¹di-i-[x])

no. 79

- l. 3: a-na 20 ¹GÍN*² [KÙ.BABBAR] ¹qa*-lu*-ú (a-na 20+²3 GUR² [x x] ¹x x²-ú³)

- l. 11: ¹*dan-na-^dU.GUR² (¹dan-na-^dU.GUR²)

no. 83

- l. 2: nu-up-tu₄ ¹maḫ*-ri²*-tu₄ [šá it-t]² (¹nu-up-tu₄ x x²-tu₄ [x x t]²)

no. 91

- l. 13: ¹ŠEŠ¹(T.: ^d+EN)-DÙ² (¹d+EN-DÙ²)

For this person, cf. nos. 87 and 88 written by the same scribe as no. 91 but spelled differently (wr. ¹ŠEŠ-ú-ba na).

no. 96

- l. 2: ¹ia-ḫu-ú-i-zi-ir²?* (¹ia-ḫu-ú-i-zi-ni)

Uncertain.

no. 98

- l. 8: u¹AD-du-ú-un (u¹ad-du-ú-nu)

The name Abdunu is spelled here with the logogram AD=*abu*

no. 100

- l. 18: [šá] ina UGU¹*-ḫi {šá} ([šá] ina UGU-ḫi šá)

Note: there is something wrong here: the UGU is not UGU, and the *šá* that follows it is redundant.

¹ <http://nabucco.arts.kuleuven.be/>. K. Abraham's work on this note has been funded by the Interuniversity Attraction Poles Programme initiated by the Belgian Science Policy Office (IAP VII/14: “Greater Mesopotamia: Reconstruction of its Environment and History). M. Jursa's work was done under the auspices of the project “Diplomatics and Palaeography of Neo- and Late Babylonian Archival Documents”, funded by the Austrian Science Fund (P 26104).

Bibliography

LEVAVI, Y. in press, A peculiar taxation practice of Judean exiles in rural Babylonia and its possible connection to building activity in late sixth century Judah, in: *Proceedings of the 2016 Minerva Conference in Leipzig*, A. Berlejung and A. Maier (eds.), Tübingen.

PEARCE, L. 2015, corrigenda to CUSAS 28, https://www.academia.edu/10981661/_2015_-_Corrigenda_to_CUSAS_28_appearing_in_second_press_run_.

PEARCE, L. & WUNSCH, C., *Documents of Judean Exiles and West Semites in Babylonia in the Collection of David Sofer* (CUSAS 28), Bethesda 2014.

PEARCE, L. & WUNSCH, C., Additions & Correction section in CUSAS 28's webpage, <http://cuneiform.library.cornell.edu/publications/documents-judean-exiles-and-west-semite-babylonia-collection-david-sofer-cusas-28>

WAERZEGGERS, C., 2015, Review of Laurie E. Pearce and Cornelia Wunsch, *Documents of Judean Exiles and West Semites in Babylonia in the Collection of David Sofer* Cornell University Studies in Assyriology and Sumerology (CUSAS) 28, *Strata: Bulletin of the Anglo-Israel Archaeological Society* 33: 179–194.

WAERZEGGERS, C., 2017, Collations of CUSAS 28, *NABU* 2017/86.

Kathleen ABRAHAM <kathleen.abraham@kuleuven.be>

Michael JURSA <michael.jursa@univie.ac.at>

Yuval LEVAVI <puyu79@gmail.com>