

90) OIP 122 12 : some remarks – This tablet, recently published by Weisberg,¹ is a duplicate of TCL 12 19. It records a sale of 9 reeds (c. 110.25 m²) of unbuilt land in the Kumar district of Babylon. The tablet was not written during the reign of Nabonidus, as its editor suggests on the grounds of its supposed archival attribution (see below); rather its date can be restored as 21-VI₂-15 Nabopolassar (611 BC) on the basis of the duplicate. A number of corrections can be made to the edition :²

- 1. 3' In place of [...] umbisag ... read [...] lú]sanga ... (family name : lú]sanga-é.nam.ti.la, Šangû-Enamtila).
- 1. 5' In place of *mi-ti-ta-šú-nu* read *mi-ših-ta-šú-nu*, “their measurement” (cf. TCL 12 19, 9).
- 1. 9' In place of *šá* bar *šá* a.šà read *šá* 1/2 GAR a.šà, “per half GAR (i.e. per reed) of land”.
- 1. 17'f Following 1. 17' there is a line of text omitted from the transliteration which is visible on the published photograph : *ul gur^{meš}-ma ana a-ħa-meš* (cf. TCL 12 19, 20).
- 1. 30' In place of ^dl₂alag-im read ^dkal-iškur, family name Mudammiq-Adad (cf. TCL 12 19, 31).
- 1. 33'. In place of ^dl₁mu-amar.utu read ^dir-gir₄.kù, family name Arad-Nergal (cf. TCL 12 19, 34).
- 1. 36' In place of ^dšá-ugu-ħi-iá read ^dšá-ka-en, Ša-pī-Bēl (cf. TCL 12 19, 37).
- 1. 37' Restore [a ^dna-an-na-a]-^da¹, “[descendant of Nannay]a” (cf. TCL 12 19, 37).

The proposed connection with the Nūr-Sîn archive (OIP 122 p. 35) can be excluded on the grounds of the revised dating of the tablet. Moreover, the presence of witnesses belonging to the Nūr-Sîn family has no direct bearing on the archival attribution since such a contract would normally be kept by the purchaser, who is in this case called Balāssu, son of Bulluṭu.

The property was sold by a certain Mušallim-Marduk, son of Nabû-

zēr-līšir, of the Mudammiq-Adad family. Via the family of this seller an indirect connection can be established between OIP years later, in 603 BC. The latter records the sale of a small plot (3 kūš gi^{mes}, i.e. c. 5.25 m²) of unbuilt land in the same district (Kumar) as that sold in the preceding transaction. In this case the seller was Šamaš-per³-ušur, son of Aplaya, of the Mudammiq-Adad family, who was the second-named witness in OIP 122 12 // TCL 12 19. He sold the plot to Bēl-aḥḥē-iddin, son of Ilī-bāni, of the Rē³i-sīsī family, who already owned a house to the east. The plot itself was very narrow at its north and south ends (c. 0.33 m and c. 1.17 m respectively), with long perimeters (both c. 10.5 m) on the west and east sides. Though it is not explicitly stated in the tablet, this narrow unbuilt strip was perhaps purchased to form an exit leading from the buyer's house to the narrow street (*sūqu qatmu*) at its south end; given its width it may have formed only part of a wider exit shared with one or more neighbours.

There is no direct evidence to confirm that this plot was situated in the immediate vicinity of that sold in OIP 122 12 // TCL 12 19. However, there are three possible indicators : (1) the east and west sides of both properties were of identical length (1 1/2 GAR, c. 10.5 m) ; both properties were bordered on the south by a narrow street (*sūqu qatmu*) ; the eastern and part of the northern perimeters of the plot sold in OIP 122 12 // TCL 12 19 were adjacent to properties described as *eqlu libbū eqli*, i.e. they were plots contiguous with the one being sold. It seems likely that both sellers, Mušallim-Marduk and Šamaš-per³-ušur, were related, and that their properties belonged to what had once been more extensive Mudammiq-Adad family holdings in this part of Babylon. Fragmentation of these holdings is evident in Šamaš-per³-ušur's ownership of a long, thin strip of land which was bordered on three sides by properties owned by individuals who were not related to him and on the fourth side by a street. It is hardly surprising that he wanted to sell it, since it is hard to imagine how it might have been of use to him. Finally, the apparent family connection between these two documents does not illuminate their archival attribution, which remains obscure ; the properties were purchased by different individuals and the documents ought therefore to have ended up in different archives. However, in the absence of further evidence for their background the archival affiliation of these tablets must be considered uncertain.

1. D.B. Weisberg, *Neo-Babylonian Texts in the Oriental Institute Collection*.
OIP 122 (Chicago 2003).

2. Not all of the signs whose readings are questioned here are easily visible
on the published photograph.

Heather D. BAKER (03-11-2004)