

55) **Collations to BiMes 24** – During my stay in Chicago for the 51st Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale I had the opportunity to collate the Late Babylonian tablets in the Oriental Institute collection copied and published by D.B. Weisberg in BiMes 24. The results of my observations are noted below. My thanks are due to Prof. W. Farber, curator of the collection, for his kind permission to examine these tablets and to J. Tinney for all practical help in the tablet room of the Oriental Institute.

- BiMes 24 42: obv. 8': Anu-aḫḫē-iddin instead of Anu-aḫ-iddin.

- BiMes 24 44: rev. 10': ^{md}60-šeš-me (Anu-aḫ-ušabši) instead of ^{md}60-šeš-lá (Anu-aḫ-tuqqin) both for the witness and the witness's grandfather. The orthography is rather rare, but it also appears in BRM 2 5: 14. In BRM 2 1: 16 + U.E. Clay's copy looks rather like ^{md}60-šeš-lá, but in his index of personal names (p. 47) it appears under the heading Anu-aḫ-ME. Collation¹ of the original in Yale proved that the reading ^{md}60-šeš-lá is correct.

- BiMes 24 44: U.E 1: on the seal a standing archer facing right with a crescent moon on the left is depicted (no winged quadruped).

- BiMes 24 52: This fragment is not simply a small part of a typical administrative tablet from Hellenistic Uruk as it looks like on Weisberg's copy on pl. 130. As already noted by Doty in his review of BiMes 24 (AfO 40/41 [1993/94] 115) l. 1' is in fact l. 1 because the edge above is clearly visible over some 3,5 cm. It probably is the upper edge because the other side is uninscribed. Moreover, a small part of the left edge (some 5 mm) is preserved next to "u" at the beginning of l.3 and an even smaller part of the right edge on top of the tablet. This means that we have the complete width of the tablet (some 4,5 cm). Additional proof of this observation can be found in the reading of ll. 2-3: mu-20-kám ^mse-lu-ku u ^man-ti-ku-su lugal.meš clearly is a complete year formula without any signs missing between l. 2 and l. 3. With a width of 4,5 cm and a thickness of 1 cm at the upper edge and 2 cm at the lowest preserved part (how long the tablet was originally is unknown), this is a very atypical tablet for Hellenistic Uruk. Also the museum number of BiMes 24 52 is completely different from the other Late Babylonian tablets at the Oriental Institute published in BiMes 24 (A1738 while all others are either 2500 or in the range 3400-3700). The catalogue of the Oriental Institute's accession files provided a clue to this problem. It turned out that BiMes 24 52 = A1738 arrived in Chicago much earlier than the other Hellenistic tablets:

¹ My thanks are due to E. Payne for collating the Yale tablets for me.

A1738 belongs to accession n° 103, a gift from R. Campbell Thompson. The accession file contains several documents concerning this gift. One is a letter from Thompson, dated December 7, 1907, to Dr. Judson, President of the University of Chicago, in which he offers a collection of Babylonian Antiquities to the University of Chicago. In a typed list of Babylonian antiquities accompanying the letter (list A, list B concerns other miscellaneous antiquities) 46 perfect or almost perfect contract tablets of the later Babylonian empire are mentioned (the museum numbers A1548-A1594 were later added with ink) followed by 80 pieces of contracts, etc., of the same period (that received the museum numbers A1595-A1757 together with literary texts and some older tablets from the same gift). A 1738 probably was one of these “pieces of contracts”. A note in Breasted’s handwriting in the accession file n° 103 adds that R. Campbell Thompson bought the lot from a man who had received it from one of Shemtob’s agents in Baghdad 16 years earlier. This means that BiMes 24 52 = A1738 was on the antiquities market at the beginning of the 1890ies, a rather early date for an Uruk tablet from the Hellenistic period. Together with the for Hellenistic Uruk atypical shape it is therefore unlikely that BiMes 24 52 originates from this city. The other tablets from the same accession lot might give a clue to its origin: a part of the gift was published in 1911 by I.L Holt² and one of the fragments was recognized as a Babylon tablet from the Parthian period (RCT 2, p. 194 and 212). Since several Babylon tablets were on the market in the 1890ies and all published Neo-Babylonian tablets from accession n° 103 that have a location preserved on the tablet, were composed in Babylon (RCT 9, 15, 18 and 22, for A1614, A 1622 and A1687 see OIP 122, others belong the well known Egibi archive from Babylon), we therefore propose that BiMes 24 52 = A1738 as a Babylon tablet, dated to 20 SE = 292/1 BC.

Tom BOUY (20-08-2005)

Katholieke Universiteit Leuven-Blijde-Inkomststraat 21, B-3000 LEUVEN (BELGIQUE)

² I.L. Holt, “Tablets from the R. Campbell Thompson collection in Haskell Oriental Museum, the University of Chicago”, in *AJSL* 27 (1911) 193-232.