

Shana Zaia

Everything Must Go

Consequences of State Projects and Controlling the Levant for the Eanna Temple (591–590 BCE)

<https://doi.org/10.1515/aof-2021-0011>

Abstract: This paper presents a study of YOS 17, 360, a collection of 30–33 administrative records from the Eanna temple in Uruk that are dated to Nabû-kudurri-ušur (Nebuchadnezzar) II's 14th year. The first few columns contain transactions concerning gold, while the rest are largely related to prebendary payments. In addition to providing an edition of YOS 17, 360 and related texts, this study seeks to understand why these particular transactions were collected and what insight it gives us into the historical circumstances. The evidence suggests that Eanna experienced a financial crisis at this time, during which it sold off its assets and had difficulties paying its priests. The cause of the crisis seems to have been royal demands put on the temple to provide money and manpower in support of the king's building and/or military endeavors, possibly including Babylonian movements into the Levant and resulting clashes with Egypt.

Keywords: Nabû-kudurri-ušur (Nebuchadnezzar) II, Neo-Babylonian Empire, Tyre, Opis, temple administration, economics

The Curious Case of YOS 17, 360

YOS 17, 360 (YBC 4189) is a remarkable Neo-Babylonian text from the Eanna temple in Uruk. Not only is it a rare example of a collection of administrative records, but the transactions are all dated to the same year, two of which even preserve the original witness lists, and it shares an entry with another collection that seems to have served a different purpose, whereas other contemporary and relevant records were not included in the collection. YOS 17, 360 is not a small collection either—it is a six-column tablet, portrait-oriented and measuring 186 × 126 × 31 mm, containing between 30 and 33 entries of transactions related to the Eanna temple.¹ Each entry is delineated with a ruling and contains a date formula, with the possible exception of section **H**, which was partially erased. The entries are dated to the 14th year of Nabû-kudurri-ušur (Nebuchadnezzar) II (Nbk) (591–590 BCE) and, while not arranged strictly chronologically, there are distinct subgroupings that progress in order, with several transactions occurring in the same month.² The first two columns and part of the third column are dedicated to gold (sections **A–J**), while the remainder of the tablet is concerned primarily with prebendary payments (sections **K–DD**). The text is written in a clear and uniform Neo-Babylonian script, probably by one scribe.

The question at hand is: why would such a text have been compiled? In general, it is not known why, how, or when these collections were created. That they would have been copied from a set of originals on individual tablets that were then lost or (purposefully) destroyed is certain. However, their composition does not seem to have been the regular practice of temple administration and some collections were written long

¹ There is unfortunately no accession or conservation information except that the tablet was baked at some point and the two pieces were glued together. The record can be found at <https://collections.peabody.yale.edu/search/Record/YPM-BC-018254> or under CDLI number P305496.

² See **Appendix B**.

after many of the original transactions were concluded, so their utility for accounting purposes is unclear.³ Nor do these collections aim to depict a holistic image of income and expenditures in the temple archives during certain time periods or even for certain commodities. In other words, there would have been a special reason to collect these specific transactions on one tablet, as it was not “business as usual.” Determining this reason (or reasons) is a challenge, as Neo-Babylonian administrative and archival texts, by their very nature, were not meant to convey historical contexts and only provide a partial and incomplete perspective into the contemporary circumstances. The contents of YOS 17, 360 strongly suggest that there was an extraordinary situation taking place in the temple at the time, prompting its composition. Therefore, this study employs a micro-historical approach to make sense of what might have been happening in Eanna, not only mining the text itself for details but also providing contemporary data known from other texts. While the identification of the tablet’s *Sitz im Leben* must rest on partly circumstantial arguments, a plausible hypothesis can be proposed.

The evidence suggests that Eanna experienced a financial crisis during Nabû-kudurri-ušur II’s 14th year (591–590 BCE) that was significant enough that the temple began clearing out its warehouse, liquidating its assets, and shortchanging its priests, as the contents of YOS 17, 360 largely comprise gold sales and irregularities in prebendary payments. It will be argued that the temple’s newly liquidated wealth was primarily sent away to Opis and Tyre to fund either war efforts or state building projects (or both). Moreover, YOS 17, 360 sheds light on how Eanna moved goods and people in and out of the temple and on its relationships with other state institutions and officials, giving a unique insight into how the temple may have responded to external demands made by the state.

Edition of YOS 17, 360

Transliteration	Translation
Col. i (Obv.)	Col. i (Obv.)
A	A
1. KU ₃ .GI er-bi ša ₂ a-na KU ₃ .BABBAR SUM-nu	Gold, the income that was given for silver and/or was disbursed.
2. u a-na te-lit i-lu-u ₂	Ayyāru, 14 th year of Nabû-kudurri-ušur, king of Babylon.
3. ITI.GU ₄ MU.14.KAM	
4. ^{md} AG-NIG ₂ .DU-URU ₃ LUGAL TIN.TIR.KI	
<hr/>	<hr/>
B	B
5. 2 GIN ₂ KU ₃ .GI a-na man-di-ti	2 shekels of gold were given for (i.e., to create) the attachment of
6. ša ₂ ^{na} tuk-pi-ti er-bi ša ₂ LUGAL	the kidney-shaped precious stone, the income of (i.e., given by)
7. na-din	the king. 1 shekel (and) 1/3 of 1 shekel of gold for repairs of (the
8. 1 GIN ₂ 3-ti 1 GIN ₂ KU ₃ .GI a-na bat-qa	encasement) in which the <i>hinšu</i> is mounted. Total: 3 shekels that
9. ša ₂ hi-in-šu ₂ ina ša ₃ -bi šab-tu	were given in Ayyāru for the work. Ayyāru, 14 th day, 14 th year of
10. PAP 3 GIN ₂ 3-ti 1 GIN ₂ KU ₃ .GI	Nabû-kudurri-ušur, king of Babylon.
11. ša ₂ ina ITI.GU ₄ a-na dul-lu na-dan	
12. I[TI.GU] ₄ UD.14.KAM MU.14.KAM	
13. ^{md} AG-NIG ₂ .DU-URU ₃ LUGAL TIN.TIR.KI	
<hr/>	<hr/>
C	C
14. 7 GIN ₂ KU ₃ .GI ša ₂ ina šu ^{ll} ^{md} UTU-MU-PAP	7 shekels of gold brought by Šamaš-šuma-ušur, son of Apkallu the
15. A ^m NUN-ME LU ₂ .UD.UNUG ^{ki} -u ₂ -a	Larsean. Ayyāru, 23 rd day, 14 th year of Nabû-kudurri-ušur, king of
16. na-ša ₂ -a’ ITI.GU ₄ UD.23.KAM	Babylon.
17. MU.14.KAM ^d AG-NIG ₂ .DU-URU ₃ LUGAL TIN.TIR.KI	

³ Jursa (2004: 154–155, 161–162). On the use of writing boards to collect entries based on clay originals, see *ibid.* 178.

Transliteration

D (D₁ and D₂)

18. 1 *ma-na* 3 GIN₂ KU₃.GI *ina* KU₃.GI
 19. *na-al-ṭar er-bi ša₂* LUGAL Ša₂ *ina* ITI.BAR₂
 20. *i-ru-bu* 58 GIN₂ KU₃.GI
 21. 1-*et li-ša₂-nu* PAP 2 *ma-na* KU₃.GI
 22. *ina* KU₃.BABBAR ša₂ ^{md}AG-KAR-ZI.MEŠ
 23. LU₂ 2-*u₂ ša₂* ^{kur}*tam-ti₃ ša₂* *ina* NIG₂.GA
 24. *ina ši-pir-ti ša₂* LU₂.GAR.KUR
 25. ^{md}AG-ŠEŠ.MEŠ-MU *a-na* ^{uru}*u₂-pi-ia₃*
 26. *it-ta-ši* [erasure]

[Break of about 9–10 lines]

- 40'. [...traces] [*er-bi ša₂* LU]GAL
 41'. PAP 1 *m[a-n]a* 3 GIN₂ KU₃.GI
 [erasure]
 42'. ša₂ *ina* šU^{ll} ^m*na-šir* A ^{md}AG-KAL
 43'. DUMU LU₂.SIPA *a-na* ^{md}AG-ŠEŠ.MEŠ-MU
 44'. *a-na* ^{uru}*u₂-pi-ia* šU-bu-ul
 45'. ITI.NE UD.10.KAM MU.14.KAM
 46'. ^dAG-NIG₂.DU-URU₃ LUGAL TIN.TIR.KI

E

- 47'. 5 GIN₂ 2-*ta* šU^{ll}.MEŠ KU₃.GI
 48'. TA *er-bi ša₂* *a-na* pit₂-qa
 49'. SUM-nu šul-lul-ti 1 GIN₂ *ina* pit₂-qa
 50'. *in-da-ṭu* *ina* šU^{ll}
 51'. ^m*ina-gi*Š.MI-^d*na-na-a* A ^m*ni-ša₂-nu*
 52'. *a-na* ^{md}AG-PAP.ME-MU *a-na* ^{uru}*u₂-pi-ia₃*
 53'. šU-bu-ul ITI.NE UD.16.[KAM]
 54'. MU.14.KAM ^dAG-NIG₂.DU-URU₃ LUGAL TIN.TIR.KI

Col. ii (Obv.)

F

1. 11 ⁵/₆ *ma-na* 6 GIN₂ KU₃.BABBAR
 2. ŠAM₂ 1 *ma-na* ¹/₂ GIN₂ KU₃.GI
 3. *na-al-ṭar a-di-i* 2 ḤAR KU₃.GI *er-bi*
 4. ša₂ ^m*bul^l-luṭ* ša₂ *ina* šU^{ll} ^m*ki-na-a* A ^m*ra-šil^l*³
 5. A LU₂.šU.I *na-ša₂-a³*
 6. *ina* DU-zu ša₂ ^mNUMUN-*ia₂* A ^m*ba-la-ṭu*
 7. ^mMU-^dAG A ^mIR₃-*a* A ^m*ki-din^d*šU₂
 8. ^{md}AG-TIN-su-E A-šU₂ ša₂ ^{md}AG-SUR
 9. A ^{md}30-TI-ER₂
 10. ^m*mu-še-zib*.^dEN A ^mA-*a*
 11. A ^m*ar-rab-ti*
 12. ^m*man-nu-a-ki-i-ar₂-ba-il*
 13. LU₂.EN *pi-qit-ti ša₂* LU₂ *qi-i-pi*
 14. ^m*la-ba-ši* LU₂.EN *pi-qit-ti*
 15. A ^{md}AG-EN-šU-nu
 [approximately 2 lines unscribed or erased]
 16. ITI.šU UD.7.KAM MU.14.KAM
 17. ^dAG-NIG₂.DU-URU₃ LUGAL TIN.TIR.KI

Translation

D (D₁ and D₂)

1 mina and 3 shekels of gold from *nalṭar*-gold, the income of the king, which entered during Nisānu. 58 shekels of gold (and) 1 gold ingot (lit. “tongue”). Total: 2 minas of gold (as partial payment) of the silver of Nabû-ēṭir-napšāti, the *šanû* of the Sealand, which is from the warehouse; by the order of the *šakin māti* (of the Sealand), Nabû-aḥḥē-iddin took (it) to Opis.

[Break of about 9–10 lines]

[...] income of the king. Total: 1 mina and 3 shekels of gold, which was sent by Nāšir, son of Nabû-udammiq, descendant of Rē'û, to Nabû-aḥḥē-iddin to Opis. Abu, 10th day, 14th year of Nabû-kudurrī-ušur, king of Babylon.

E

5 and ²/₃ shekels of gold from the income that was given for smelting; ¹/₃ of 1 shekel went missing during the smelting; this was sent by Ina-šilli-Nanāya, son of Nišānu, to Nabû-aḥḥē-iddin to Opis. Abu, 16th day, 14th year of Nabû-kudurrī-ušur, king of Babylon.

Col. ii (Obv.)

F

11 minas and 56 shekels of silver, the price of 1 mina (and) ¹/₂ shekels of *nalṭar*-gold, including 2 gold rings, the income of Bulluṭ, which was brought by Kināya son of Rāšī-ili, descendant of Gallābu in the presence of Zēriya, descendant of Balātu: Iddin-Nabû, son of Ardīa, descendant of Kidin-Marduk; Nabû-balāssu-iqbi, son of Nabû-ēṭir, descendant of Sīn-lēqi-uninni; Mušēzib-Bēl, son of Aplāya, descendant of Arrabti; Mannu-akī-Arbail, the *bēl piqitti* of the *qīpu*; Lābāši, the *bēl piqitti*, son of Nabû-bēlšunu. Dūzu, 7th day, 14th year of Nabû-kudurrī-ušur, king of Babylon.

Transliteration

G

18. 9 GIN₂ KU₃.BABBAR ŠAM₂
 19. 1 GIN₂ 3-ti 1 GIN₂ KU₃. [GI]
 20. a-na 7-u₂ mdX[...]
 21. A mdAG-e-ḫa-a-[...]
 22. it-ta-ši it[...]
 23. UD.15.KAM MU.[14².KAM]
 24. dAG-NIG₂.DU-URU₃ LU[GAL TIN.T]IR.[KI]

(faint ruling)

H

25. 2 ½ ma-na 5² (7²) GIN₂ KU₃.GI
 26. 5 mu-kar-ri-ša₂-nu er-bi ša₂ LUGAL
 27. [#] GIN₂ te-ḫir-ti ša₂ ina šu^{ll} LU₂.KU₃.DIM^l
 28. [na-ša]-a' 15 ½ GIN₂ KU₃.GI šu-re-e
 29. [...] X GAR-nu šu-re-e UN.MEŠ
 30. [...] 54 ½ GIN₂ KU₃.GI [...]
 31. [Broken]
 32. [#] GIN₂ KU₃.GI i-na KU₃. [GI] [ša₂ ḫ]-na uGU-ḫi m[XX]
 33. ki-i 25 ma-na 50 GIN₂ KU₃.BA[BBAR]
 34. 8 GIN₂ 3 4-tu₂.MEŠ a-na 7 GIN₂ [...]
 35. ki-i 1 ma-na 1 GIN₂ 4-ut KU₃. [BABBAR]
 36. PAP 26 ma-na 50² (51²) GIN₂ 4-ut KU₃. [BABBAR]
 37. ŠAM₂ 2 ⅙ ma-na [...]
 38. 3 IGI 4
 [Rest of column erased, only traces remain]

Col. iii (Obv.)

I

1. 10 ma-na KU₃.BABBAR ŠAM₂ 1 ma-na KU₃. [GI]
 2. ša₂ ina šu^{ll} mdNIG₂.DU A-šū₂ ša₂ mA-[a]
 3. A mdDU₃-eš-DINGIR na-ša₂-a[]
 4. ITI.ŠE UD.12.KAM MU.14. [KAM]
 5. dAG-NIG₂.DU-URU₃ LUGAL TIN.TIR. [KI]

J

6. 10 ma-na KU₃.BABBAR ŠAM₂ 1 ma-na [KU₃.GI]
 7. ša₂ ina šu^{ll} md30-MU A md30-[...]
 8. u mKI-dAMAR.UTU-TIN A mdAG-[...]
 9. na-ša₂-a' 2 ma-na KU₃.BABBAR
 10. a-na mŠEŠ-IGI u LU₂.GAL 10-ti
 11. na-din ITI.ŠE UD.23.KAM
 12. MU.14.KAM dAG-NIG₂.DU-URU₃
 13. LUGAL TIN.TIR.KI

K

14. 2² (3²) GIN₂ su-ud-du-u' [KU₃].BABBAR
 15. ša₂ 2-ta šu^{ll}.MEŠ ša₂ gis ma-ši-ḫu
 16. ša₂ 1 UD ITI.BARA₂ 4 UD.ME ITI.GU₄
 17. IGI dGAŠAN ša₂ UNUG.KI ša₂ mna-din mA-a
 18. [A m]dAG-ke-šir₃ it-ta-ši
 19. ITI.BARA₂ MU.[14²].KAM [dAG-NIG₂.DU]-URU₃
 20. LUGAL TIN.TIR.KI

Translation

G

9 shekels of silver, the price of 1 shekel (and) ⅓ shekel of 1 shekel of gold for ⅓ (of a shekel of gold for 1 shekel of silver), PN son of Nabê-ha[...] took (it) away. [Month X], 15th day, [14th?] year of Nabû-kudurri-ušur, king of Babylon.

(faint ruling)

H

2 ½ minas and 5 (or 7) shekels of gold (and) 5 mukarrišu-vessels, the income of the king. [#] shekels, the remainder, which was brought by the goldsmith(s); 15 ½ shekels of gold šūrû-objects which were placed in the ...: šūrû-objects of the (common) people; 54 ½ shekels of gold [...] [#] shekels of gold from the gold . . . which is owed by PN for 25 minas and 50 shekels of silver, 8 shekels (and) ¾ (of 1 shekel) for 7 shekels [...] for 1 mina (and) 1 ¼ shekels of silver. Total: 26 minas, 50 (or 51?) and ¼ shekels of silver, the price of 2 ⅙ minas [of gold] [...] ¾.

[Rest of column erased, only traces remain]

Col. iii (Obv.)

I

10 minas of silver, the price of 1 mina of gold, which was brought by Kudurru, son of Aplāya, the descendant of Eppeš-ilī. Addāru, 12th day, 14th year of Nabû-kudurri-ušur, king of Babylon.

J

10 minas of silver, the price of 1 mina of gold, which was brought by Šin-iddin, son of Šin-X and Itti-Marduk-balātu, son of Nabû- [...]. 2 minas of silver were given to Aḫu-lūmur and the (his?) decurion. Addāru, 23rd day, 14th year of Nabû-kudurri-ušur, king of Babylon.

K

2 (or 3?) shekels (and) ⅙ (of 1 shekel) of silver, corresponding to ⅔ of the mašīḫu of 1 day of Nisānu (and) 4 days of Ayyāru before the Lady of Uruk, of Nādīn: Aplāya son of Nabû-kēšir took (it) away. Nisānu, 14th year, [Nabû-kudurri]-ušur king of Babylon.

Transliteration

L

21. 4 GIN₂ KU₃.BABBAR ina 2-ta šu^{II}.MEŠ ša₂ I[TI...]
 22. [MU[?].]14[?].KAM ^{md}AG-SUR A ^mSUM-na-a
 23. [it-ta-ši ITI.GU₄ UD.[8[?]].KAM
 24. [MU.14[?]].KAM ^dAG-NIG₂.DU-URU₃ LUGAL.TIN.TIR.KI

(ruling faint or absent)

M (M₁ and M₂)

25. 1[?] GIN₂ KU₃.BABBAR ša₂ hu-ša-bu ina IGI ^msi-lim-^dEN
 26. A ^mIR₃-^dINNIN.NA 1/2 GIN₂ KU₃.BABBAR ša₂ hu-ša-bu
 27. ina IGI ^msi-lim-^dEN A ^mi-sin-na-a-a
 28. ITI.GU₄ UD.23.KAM MU.14.KAM
 29. ^{md}AG-NIG₂.DU-URU₃ LUGAL.TIN.TIR.KI

[Break of about 5 or 6 lines, may have contained a ruling]

- 35'. ša₂ a-na ŠE.BAR a-na E₂.GAL na-dan
 36'. ITI.GAN UD.30.KAM MU.14.KAM
 37'. ^{md}AG-NIG₂.DU-URU₃ LUGAL.TIN.TIR.KI

N

- 38'. 1/2[?] GIN₂ KU₃.BABBAR ina 2-ta šu^{II}.MEŠ ša₂ ^{gis}ma-ši-hu
 39'. ša₂ ŠE.BAR ina UD.MEŠ-šu₂ LU₂.LUNGA₃-u₂-tu
 40'. IGI ^dna-na-a ša₂ ^mNIG₂.DU A ^mDU-NUMUN
 41'. ^{md}AMAR.UTU-NUMUN-DU₃ DUMU-šu₂ it-ta-ši
 42'. ITI.ŠU UD.27.KAM MU.14.KAM
 43'. ^dAG-NIG₂.DU-URU₃ LUGAL.TIN.TIR.KI

O

- 44'. 5 GIN₂ KU₃.BABBAR 1 KUŠ.TAB.BA a-na 1/2 GIN₂
 [KU₃.BABBAR]
 45'. PAP 5 1/2 GIN₂ KU₃.BABBAR ina 2-ta šu^{II}.MEŠ
 46'. ša₂ ^{gis}ma-ši-hu ša₂ ina NIG₂.GA
 47'. [^mGAR]-MU A ^{md}EN-ŠEŠ.MEŠ-MU GIŠ
 48'. ITI.NE UD.1.KAM [...]
 49'. ^dAG-NIG₂.DU-URU₃ [LUGAL.TIN.]TIR.KI

Col. iv (Rev.)

P

1. 4 GIN₂ KU₃.BABBAR ša₂ 2-ta šu^{II}.MEŠ ša₂ ^{gis}[ma-ši-hu?]
 2. ša₂ ina NIG₂.GA im-mir-ku-u₂ ša₂ ITI.NE
 3. u ITI.KIN ^mre-mut A ^{md}IM-ŠEŠ-SU GIŠ
 4. ITI.KIN UD.13.KAM MU.14.[KAM]
 5. ^dAG-NIG₂.DU-URU₃ LUGAL.TIN.TIR.KI

Q

6. 2 1/2 GIN₂ KU₃.BABBAR ša₂ 1 MAŠ₂.TUR ina 2-t[a] šu^{II}.MEŠ
 7. ša₂ ^{gis}ma-ši-hu ša₂ UD.MEŠ-šu₂ LU₂.LUNGA₃-u₂-tu
 8. ITI.BARA₂ IGI ^dna-na-a
 9. ša₂ ^{md}AG-ŠEŠ.MEŠ-MU A LU₂.SANGA-^dUTU
 10. ^{md}AG-MU-MU A ^mKAR-^dEN GIŠ
 11. 2 GIN₂ šal-šu₂ 1 GIN₂ ŠAM₂ 1 MAŠ₂.TUR
 12. ina 2-ta šu^{II}.MEŠ ša₂ ^{gis}ma-ši-hu

Translation

L

4 shekels of silver as partial payment for 2/3 (of the *mašīhu*) of month [...] 14th year(?), Nabû-ētir, son of Iddinaya, took (it) away. Ayyāru, 8th(?) day, 14th(?) year of Nabû-kudurrī-ušur, king of Babylon.

(ruling faint or absent)

M (M₁ and M₂)

1(?) shekel of silver for firewood at the disposal of Silim-Bēl, son of Arad-Innin. 1/2 shekels of silver for the firewood at the disposal of Silim-Bēl, son of Isinnāya. Ayyāru, 23rd day, 14th year of Nabû-kudurrī-ušur, king of Babylon.

[Break of about 5 or 6 lines, may have contained a ruling]

...which was given for barley for the palace. Kislīmu, 2nd day, 14th year of Nabû-kudurrī-ušur, king of Babylon.

N

1/2(?) shekels of silver as partial payment for 2/3 of the *mašīhu* of barley of his brewer's (prebendary) days before Nanāya of Kudurru, son of Mukīn-zēr; Marduk-zēra-ibni, his son, took (it) away. Dūzu, 27th day, 14th year of Nabû-kudurrī-ušur, king of Babylon.

O

5 shekels of silver, 1 tanned hide for (i.e., instead of) 1/2 shekels of silver. Total: 5 1/2 shekels of silver as partial payment of 2/3 of the *mašīhu*, which [Šākin]-šumi, son of Bēl-aḥḥē-iddin, took away from the warehouse. Abu, 1st day, [14th year] of Nabû-kudurrī-ušur, king of Babylon.

Col. iv (Rev.)

P

4 shekels of silver corresponding to 2/3 of the *mašīhu*, which had remained (unpaid) in the warehouse; that of Abu and Ulūlu. Rēmūt, son of Adad-aḥa-erība, took (it) away. Ulūlu, 13th day, 14th year of Nabû-kudurrī-ušur, king of Babylon.

Q

2 1/2 shekels of silver for 1 young male goat corresponding to 2/3 of the *mašīhu* of his brewer's (prebendary) days (in) Nisānu before Nanāya, which Nabû-aḥḥē-iddin, descendent of Šangū-Šamaš (and) Nabû-šuma-iddin, son of Mušēzib-Bēl, took away. 2 shekels (and) 1/3 (of) 1 shekel, the price of 1 young male goat, corresponding to 2/3 of the *mašīhu* of (his) baker's prebend (in) Dūzu before Nanāya; Zēriya, son of Rēmūt-Gula, took (it) away.

Transliteration

13. LU₂.MU-*u₂*-*tu* ITI.ŠU IGI ^d*na-na-a*
 14. ^mNUMUN-*ia₂* A ^m*ri-mut*-^d*gu-la* GIŠ
 15. 2 GIN₂ *šal-šu₂* 1 GIN₂ KU₃.BABBAR ŠAM₂ 1 MAŠ₂.TUR
 16. *ina 2-ta* ŠU^{ll}.MEŠ *ša₂* ^{gis}*ma-ši-ḫu*
 17. LU₂.LUNGA₃-*u₂*-*tu* IGI ^dINNIN UNUG.KI
 18. ^{md}EN-ŠEŠ-GAL₂-*šī^l* A LU₂.SANGA ^dEN GIŠ
 19. 2² GIN₂ *šal-šu₂* 1 GIN₂ ŠAM₂ [1 MAŠ₂.TUR]
 20. ŠAM₂ 3 *šal-šu₂* ^{gis}*ma-ši-ḫu* *ša₂* ZU₂.LUM.MA
 21. 2 *ina* ŠA₃-*bi re-e-ḫu* UD.MEŠ
 22. *ša₂* ITI.KIN IGI ^d*na-na-a*
 23. *ša₂* ^{md}EN-ŠEŠ.MEŠ-MU A LU₂.NI.GAB
 24. *u₃* 1 *šal-šu₂* *ina* UD.MEŠ *ša₂* ^{md}*ša₂*-^dAG-*šu₂*-*u*
 25. ITI.GU₇ IGI ^dINNIN UNUG.KI
 26. 1 1/2 GIN₂ ŠAM₂ 1-*et* UZ₃
 27. *ina 2-ta* ŠU^{ll}.MEŠ *ša₂* ITI.SIG₄
 28. IGI ^dINNIN UNUG.KI *ša₂* ^{md}AG-EN-MU.MEŠ
 29. A ^mAŠ-SUR ^mA-a *u* ^m*bul-luṭ*
 30. DUMU.MEŠ *ša₂* ^{md}*gu-la*-NUMUN-DU₃
 31. *it-ta-šu-u₂*
 32. 4² GIN₂ ŠAM₂ 2 MAŠ₂.TUR.MEŠ
 33. *ša₂* 8 UD-*me* ITI.KIN IGI ^d*na-na-a*
 34. ^{md}AG-ŠEŠ.MEŠ-MU A LU₂.NI.GAB GIŠ
 35. PAP 6 MAŠ₂.TUR.MEŠ 1-*et* UZ₃
 36. ^mTUKUL-*ti*-^dAMAR.UTU LU₂.SIPA SA₂.DUG₄
 37. IGI-*ir* MAŠ₂.TUR.MEŠ *ša₂* *ina 2-ta* ŠU^{ll}.MEŠ
 38. *ša₂* ^{gis}*ma-ši-ḫu* *ša₂* *ina* NIG₂.GA
 39. *a-na* LU₂.LUNGA₃.MEŠ *u* LU₂.MU.MEŠ *na-dan*
 40. ITI.KIN UD.16.KAM M[U.10+3+X].KAM
 41. ^dAG-NIG₂.DU-URU₃ LUGAL TIN.TIR].KI

R

42. 1 GIN₂ ŠAM₂ 12 *bil-tu₄* *ša₂* *ḫu-ša-bi*
 43. 1 1/2 GIN₂ ŠAM₂ 1-*et* U₈
 44. PAP 2 1/2 GIN₂ KU₃.BABBAR *ina 2-ta* ŠU^{ll}.MEŠ
 45. *ša₂* ^{gis}*ma-ši-ḫu* ^{md}U.GUR-PAP GIŠ
 46. 1 1/2 GIN₂ ŠAM₂ 1-*et* U₈
 47. *ina 2-ta* ŠU^{ll}.MEŠ *ša₂* ^{gis}*ma-ši-ḫu*
 48. ^{md}AG-KAR-ZI.MEŠ GIŠ
 49. PAP 3 GIN₂ KU₃.BABBAR ŠAM₂ 2 U₈.MEŠ
 50. ^{md}AG-SUR-ZI.ME *u* ^{md}U.GUR-PAP GIŠ
 51. ITI.KIN UD.20.KAM MU.14.KAM
 52. ^dAG-NIG₂.DU-URU₃ LUGAL TIN.TIR.KI

Col. v (Rev.)

S

1. 3 1/2 GIN₂ KU₃.BABBAR *ina 2-ta* ŠU^{ll}.MEŠ
 2. *ša₂* ^{gis}*ma-ši-ḫu* *ša₂* ITI.GU₄
 3. *ša₂* 8 UD.ME ITI.ŠU IGI ^dINNIN UNUG.KI
 4. ^m*gi-mil-lu* A ^mDU-NUMUN *e-ṭer*
 5. ITI.KIN UD.21.KAM MU.14.KAM
 6. ^dAG-NIG₂.DU-URU₃ LUGAL TIN.TIR.KI

Translation

2 shekels (and) 1/3 (of) 1 shekel of silver, the price of a young male goat, corresponding to 2/3 of the *mašīḫu* of (his) brewer's prebend before Ištar of Uruk; 'Bēl-aḫa-šubši,¹ son of Šangū-Bēl, took (it) away. 2 (and) 1/3 (of) 1 shekel, the price of [1 young male goat], the price of 3 and 1/3 *mašīḫu* of dates, 2 of them are the remainder of the days of Ulūlu before Nanāya of Bēl-aḫḫē-iddin, descendant of Atū, and 1 1/3 are from the days of Ša-Nabū-šū (in) Dūzu before Ištar of Uruk. 1 1/2 shekels, the price of 1 female goat corresponding to 2/3 of (the *mašīḫu* of) Simānu before Ištar of Uruk, which Nabū-bēl-šumāti, son of Ēda-ēṭir, (and) Aplāya and Bulluṭ, sons of Gula-zēra-ibni, took away. 4(?) shekels, the price of 2 young male goats of 8 days of Ulūlu before Nanāya; Nabū-aḫḫē-iddin, descendant of Atū, took (it) away. Total: 6 young male goats and 1 female goat were received from Tukultī-Marduk, the *rē'i sattukki*: these are the goats that correspond to a partial payment for 2/3 of the *mašīḫu*, which were given from the temple stores to the brewers and the bakers. Month Ulūlu, 16th day, 14th(?) year of Nabū-kudurri-ušur, king of Babylon.

R

1 shekel, the price of 12 firewood bundles; 1 1/2 shekels, the price of 1 ewe. Total: 2 1/2 shekels of silver corresponding to 2/3 of the *mašīḫu*, Nergal-nāšir took (it) away. 1 1/2 shekels, the price of 1 ewe as partial payment for 2/3 of the *mašīḫu*, Nabū-ēṭir-napšāti took (it) away. Total: 3 shekels of silver, the price of two ewes, Nabū-ēṭir-napšāti and Nergal-nāšir took away. Ulūlu, 20th day, 14th year of Nabū-kudurri-ušur, king of Babylon.

Col. v (Rev.)

S

3 1/2 shekels of silver as partial payment for 2/3 of the *mašīḫu* of Ayyāru (and) of 8 days of Dūzu before Ištar of Uruk. Gimillu, son of Mukīn-zēri, has been paid (it). Ulūlu, 21st day, 14th year of Nabū-kudurri-ušur, king of Babylon.

Transliteration

T

7. 1 GIN₂ ŠAM₂ 1-en^{na4} nar-ka-bu
 8. ina 2-ta šu^{ll}.MEŠ-šū₂ m^{si}-lim-d^{EN}
 9. A mⁱ-sin-na-a-a GIŠ
 10. ITI.NE UD.16.KAM MU.14.KAM
 11. d^{AG}-NIG₂.DU-URU₃ LUGAL TIN.TIR.KI

U

12. 2 GIN₂ KU₃.BABBAR ina 2-ta šu^{ll}.MEŠ-šū₂
 13. m^{NIG}₂-DU A m^{DU}-NUMUN GIŠ
 14. ITI.KIN UD.18.KAM MU.14.KAM
 15. d^{AG}-NIG₂.DU-URU₃ LUGAL TIN.TIR.KI

V

16. 1 GIN₂ 2-ta šu^{ll}.MEŠ KU₃.BABBAR
 17. ŠAM₂ 1 GUR 2 (PI) 2 BAN₂ ka-si-ia₂
 18. ina 2-ta šu^{ll}.MEŠ-šū₂ m^dAG-PAP
 19. A m^[X]-AMAR.UTU u [PN....]-an?-na?-[...]
 20. A m^{DU}₃-a it-ta-šū-u₂
 21. ITI.KIN UD.26.KAM MU.14[?].KAM
 22. d^{AG}-NIG₂.DU-URU₃ LUGAL TIN.TIR.KI

W

23. 2 UDU pag-ra-nu a-na 2 ½ GIN₂ KU₃.BABBAR
 24. ina 2-ta šu^{ll}.MEŠ-šū₂ ša₂ ina MU.14.KAM
 25. m^{gi}-mil-lu A m^{NUMUN}-ia GIŠ
 26. ITI.APIN UD.7.KAM MU.14.KAM
 27. d^{AG}-NIG₂.DU-URU₃ LUGAL TIN.TIR.KI

X

28. 1 GIN₂ KU₃.BABBAR ša₂ 2-ta šu^{ll}.MEŠ ša₂ s^{is}ma-ših
 29. ša₂ 2 UD-me LU₂.[erasure] LUNGA₃-u₂-tu
 30. ITI.ŠE IGI d^{na}-na-a
 31. m^A-a m^dAMAR.UTU-MU-ĐU₃ GIŠ
 32. ITI.APIN UD.16.KAM MU.14.KAM
 33. d^{AG}-NIG₂.DU-URU₃ LUGAL TIN.TIR.KI

Y

34. ša₂ 2 GIN₂ KU₃.BABBAR hu-ša-bu
 35. ina IGI m^dU.GUR-PAP A m^a-qar-a
 36. ša₂ m^dU.GUR-re-šu-u₂-a
 37. lu₂qal-la-šū₂ iš-šū-u₂
 38. ITI.APIN UD.21.KAM MU.14.KAM
 39. d^{AG}-NIG₂.DU-URU₃ LUGAL TIN.TIR.KI

Z

40. 2 GIN₂ KU₃.BABBAR ša₂ ina 2-ta šu^{ll}.MEŠ-šū₂
 41. m^dAG-u₂-še-zib ša₂ a-na IGI
 42. LU₂.GAR.KUR Šap-ru it-ta-šī
 43. ITI.GAN UD.5.KAM MU.14.KAM
 44. d^{AG}-NIG₂.DU-URU₃ LUGAL TIN.TIR.KI

Translation

T

1 shekel, the price of 1 upper millstone as partial payment for his ⅔ (*mašīhu*), Silim-Bēl, son of Isinnāya, took (it) away. Abu, 16th day, 14th year of Nabû-kudurri-ušur, king of Babylon.

U

2 shekels of silver as partial payment for his ⅔ (*mašīhu*), Kudurru, son of Mukīn-zēri, took (it) away. Ulūlu, 18th day, 14th year of Nabû-kudurri-ušur, king of Babylon.

V

1 ⅔ shekels of silver, the price of 1 *kur* 2 *pānu* and 2 *sūtu* of dodder-plant as partial payment for his ⅔ (*mašīhu*), Nabû-nāšir, son of Gimillu, [and PN], son of Ibnāya, took (it) away. Ulūlu, 26th day, 14th year of Nabû-kudurri-ušur, king of Babylon.

W

2 sheep carcasses for 2 ½ shekels of silver corresponding to his ⅔ (*mašīhu*) which, in the 14th year, Gimillu, son of Zēriya, took (it) away. Araḥsamnu, 16th day, 14th year of Nabû-kudurri-ušur, king of Babylon.

X

1 shekel of silver corresponding to ⅔ of the *mašīhu* of the 2 days (of) the brewer's prebend (during) Kislīmu before Nanāya. Aplāya, son of Marduk-šuma-ibni, took (it) away. Araḥsamnu, 16th day, 14th year, Nabû-kudurri-ušur, king of Babylon.

Y

Firewood for 2 shekels of silver is at the disposal of Nergal-nāšir, son of Aqara, which Nergal-rēšūa, his slave, took. Araḥsamnu, 21st day, 14th year of Nabû-kudurri-ušur, king of Babylon.

Z

2 shekels of silver which is a partial payment for his ⅔ (*mašīhu*). Nabû-ušēzib, who was sent before the *šakin māti*, took (it) away. Kislīmu, 5th day, 14th year of Nabû-kudurri-ušur, king of Babylon.

Transliteration

AA

45. 2 GIN₂ KU₃.BABBAR ina 2-ta šu^{II}.MEŠ
 46. ša₂ ITI.KIN LU₂.MU-u₂-tu
 47. IGI^dGAŠAN ša₂ UNUG.KI
 48. ^{md}AMAR.UTU-SUR A ^{md}AG-ŠEŠ.MEŠ-MU
 49. A ^me-gi-bi it-ta-ši
 50. ITI.GAN UD.15.KAM MU.14.KAM
 51. ^dAG-NIG₂.DU-URU₃ LUGAL TIN.TIR.KI

Col. vi (Rev.)

BB

1. 1 2-ta šu^{II}.MEŠ ^{gis}ma-ši-ḫu
 2. ša₂ ZU₂.LUM.MA re-ḫe-et UD-me
 3. ša₂ ITI.ŠE IGI^dna-na-a
 4. ša₂ ^{md}AG-MU-DU₃ u ^msi-lim-^dEN
 5. 2 šal-šu₂ ina UD.MEŠ ša₂ ^msi-lim-^dEN
 6. A ^mi-sin-na-a-a
 7. PAP 4 ^{gis}ma-ši-ḫu ša₂ ZU₂.LUM.MA
 8. KA₂-ti 5 ^{gis}ma-ši-ḫu
 9. EN 1 ^{gis}ma-ši-ḫu IGI-u₂
 10. ša₂ ina UD-me ša₂ ^msi-lim-^dEN GIŠ-u₂
 11. ša₂ 6 UD-me ITI.ŠE IGI^dna-na-a
 12. ša₂ ^msi-lim-^dEN ^{md}AG-MU-DU₃
 13. u ^msi-lim-^dEN A ^mIR₃-^dINNIN.NA
 14. iš-šu-u₂ ITI.AB UD.1.KAM
 15. MU.14.KAM [^dA]G-NIG₂.DU-URU₃
 16. LUGAL TIN.TIR.KI

CC

17. 5 GIN₂ 3-ti GIN₂ KU₃.BABBAR ŠAM₂
 18. 5 GUR 1 (PI) 4 BAN₂ ka-si-ia
 19. a-di 1 GIN₂ 6-a' LA₂ KU₃.BABBAR
 20. ŠAM₂ [...]ti ša₂ ^{md}AG-PAP[?]
 21. iš-šu-u₂ ina 2-ta šu^{II}.ME
 22. ^mINNIN.NA-MU-PAP A ^mDU₃-A GIŠ
 23. ITI.AB UD.4.KAM MU.14.KAM
 24. ^dAG-NIG₂.DU-URU₃ LUGAL TIN.TIR.KI

DD

25. 1 GIN₂ 3 4-tu₂.MEŠ KU₃.BABBAR ina 2-ta šu^{II}.ME-šu₂-nu
 26. ša₂ ITI.AB 8 GIN₂ 4-ut KU₃.BABBAR
 27. ina ŠE.BAR-šu-nu ša₂ ITI.ŠE u ITI.BARA₂
 28. PAP 11 GIN₂ KU₃.BABBAR ina UD.MEŠ-šu₂-nu
 29. ša₂ ITI.ŠE u ITI.BARA₂
 30. ^{md}AMAR.UTU-NUMUN-DU₃ A ^mNIG₂.DU GIŠ
 31. ina DU-zu ša₂ ^mman-nu-a-ki-i-ar₂-ba-il
 32. LU₂ EN pi-qit-ti ša₂ ^{lu}qi-i-pi
 33. ITI.AB UD.8.KAM MU.14.KAM
 34. ^dAG-NIG₂.DU-URU₃ LUGAL TIN.TIR.KI

Translation

AA

2 shekels of silver as partial payment for $\frac{2}{3}$ (of the *mašīḫu*) of Ulūlu (for) the baker's prebend before the Lady of Uruk. Marduk-ēḫir, son of Nabû-aḫḫē-iddin, descendant of Egibi, took (it) away. Kislimu, 15th day, 14th year of Nabû-kudurrī-ušur, king of Babylon.

Col. vi (Rev.)

BB

1 $\frac{2}{3}$ *mašīḫu* of dates, the remainder of the days of Addāru before Nanāya of Nabû-šuma-ibni and Silim-Bēl; 2 (and) $\frac{1}{3}$ from the days of Silim-Bēl, son of Isinnāya; a total of 4 *mašīḫu* of dates; which makes up 5 when including the previous *mašīḫu*, which they took from the days of Silim-Bēl, for 6 days (of) Addāru before Nanāya, belonging to Silim-Bēl: Nabû-šuma-ibni and Silim-Bēl, son of Arad-Innin, took (it). Ṭebētu, 1st day, 14th year of Nabû-kudurrī-ušur, king of Babylon.

CC

5 $\frac{1}{3}$ shekels of silver, the price of 5 *kur 1 pānu* and 4 *sūtu* of dodder-plant including $\frac{3}{6}$ (of a shekel of) silver, the price of [an object], which Nabû-nāšir(?) took, as partial payment for $\frac{2}{3}$ (of the *mašīḫu*). Innin-šuma-ušur, son of Ibnāya, took (it) away. Ṭebētu, 4th day, 14th year of Nabû-kudurrī-ušur, king of Babylon.

DD

1 shekels (and) $\frac{3}{4}$ (of a shekel) of silver corresponding to their $\frac{2}{3}$ (*mašīḫu*) of Ṭebētu, 8 $\frac{1}{4}$ shekels of silver from (i.e., instead of) their barley of Addāru and Nisānu, Marduk-zēra-ibni, son of Kudurru, took (it) away. In the presence of Mannu-akī-Arbail, the *bēl piqitti* of the *qīpu*. Ṭebētu, 8th day, 14th year of Nabû-kudurrī-ušur, king of Babylon.

Textual Notes

B

Line 9: A *ḥinšu* is a “whip or goad” associated with sacred chariots (CAD H s.v. *ḥinšu*).

Line 10: This line is missing in Weisberg’s copy.

Line 12: The GU₄ is just barely visible.

F

Line 4: The name Bulluṭ is difficult to read and was written over an erasure.

G

This section shows that 1 1/3 shekels of gold were sold for 9 shekels of silver at a rate of 1 : 7. Normally, the phrasing in **G** would indicate the sale of outgoing silver for incoming gold, but, considering the context, we should understand it as outgoing gold for incoming silver. This is discussed further below. It is possible that the scribe made a mistake or, more likely, abbreviated two separate exchanges so that it appears to be one transaction; i.e., the gold was sold for silver, and it was subsequently disbursed (“PN son of Nabê-ha[...] took (it) away”).

For the West Semitic name Nabê-ḥa-[X], see the prosopography in **Appendix B**.

H

This entry is problematic for several reasons. First, the verb that would clarify whether the gold was incoming or outgoing is missing, presumably because of the break. Nonetheless, because the other entries around it concern outgoing gold, one can reasonably assume that this would be the case for **H** as well. The second problem is the curious nature of the composition; namely, that the scribe seems to have stopped abruptly after the first three signs of line 38. The clay is smooth in this area, with no indication of damage or writing that was later erased. Even more perplexing is that there are traces of signs lower down that are consistent with erasure, suggesting that there was another entry below **H** that was later removed. This is difficult to account for—perhaps the scribe determined that those entries were not relevant or did not in fact belong to this collection, but this does not fully explain why one entry was abruptly aborted, while the following was written and erased. In essence, **H** is highly suggestive for a crisis in the temple, but cannot be conclusive because of these irregularities.

Line 28–29: The *šūrû*-objects are difficult to interpret; Weisberg (OIP 122, 120) left the term untranslated. Bongenaar (1997: 359) translates “pegs,” often in the construction *šūrû u sikkatu*, “pegs and nails.” Golden pegs are possible, especially if they are not meant as functional ones; indeed, an earlier translation by Joannès (RIA 8, 110) identifies *šūrû* as rod-shaped ingots, which would certainly be appropriate for gold, though they are generally qualified as iron. Thus far, only the present text and OIP 122, 120 have examples of gold *šūrû*. In this text, *lišānu* “tongue” is understood to be an ingot (see **D**₁), but *šūrû* may designate a similar concept in a different (perhaps smaller) form. In OIP 122, 120, the *šūrû* are listed with scrap metal (*ḥušû*), which could be used to make *šūrû* and *sikkatu* (BM 60380, Bongenaar 1997: 373), so a semi-processed form of gold in the shape of a peg would be fitting. One might compare it to *pāšû*, “hatchet-shaped” ingots (Jursa 2010: 501; other known terms for ingots are found in Powell 1996: 237–238). Since the gold *šūrû* comes as *erbu* “from the people” in both the present text and OIP 122, 120, perhaps it was simply a smaller form of ingot or bead-like object, one that was particularly suited for donations to the temple as opposed to the ingots and dust that the temple acquired through trade.

Line 38: 3 IGI 4 could also be read 3 LIM 4 (i.e., 3004) but such a high number is unexpected, whereas the Sumerian-style fraction is attested in other Eanna texts, such as YBC 7383 and YBC 9031 (3.IGI.4.GAL₂.LA.ME, see also Streck 1995: 62). These texts will be published in YOS 24 by E. Payne and Y. Levavi, whom I thank for these references.

K

Weisberg’s copy skips this entry.

Line 19: The dating formula omits the day.

Understanding the Text

YOS 17, 360 presents immediate difficulties as it does not contain much useful meta-data. The first section (A) appears to act as a heading that identifies the text as recording gold income that was spent for silver and/or was disbursed, and it is dated to Ayyāru in the 14th year of Nabû-kudurri-ušur II. However, only the next two entries are dated to this month—these entries also do not mention silver—and most entries are much later in the year.⁴ Thus, section A identifies the starting point for the collection, indicating that the following transactions were reckoned from Ayyāru in the 14th year and onwards.⁵ Moreover, the text does not contain any summaries, subscripts, or information about when it was written and by whom.⁶ The numerous scribal corrections are remarkable: there are not only small erasures in D, F, and X, but also entry H was mostly erased, leaving the remainder of the column bare (with only some traces present) and ending the text abruptly, preserving no personal names or date formula. Two entries contain the witnesses from the original tablets: F and DD.⁷ F names several witnesses with their patronyms or titles, though a scribe's name is not included. Notable is Mannu-akī-Arbail's participation: not only is he the *bēl piqitti* of the *qīpu*, the royal resident (i.e., the highest governmental official) in the Eanna temple,⁸ but he is also the sole witness in DD.⁹ That said, most of the types of transaction recorded in YOS 17, 360 almost certainly did not originally include these elements.

Comparative examples for the present text are rare, but a few relevant exemplars from the Eanna archive exist.¹⁰ One such text is OIP 122, 120, which is a compiled list of transactions relating to incoming gold that was then disbursed for cultic purposes.¹¹ Its entries are moreover from years 14–17 of Nabû-kudurri-ušur II, joining YOS 17, 360 as one of several collections of transactions related to the first two decades of his reign.¹² Slightly smaller than YOS 17, 360 at 95 × 118 × 34 mm and four columns, OIP 120, 122 comprises at least 11 entries, arranged chronologically: Nisānu (I) year 13, Nisānu (I) year 14, Ayyāru (II) day 23 year 14, Tašritu (VII) day 29 year 14, Dūzu (IV) day 15 year 15, Dūzu (IV) year 15, year 16 (month and day lost), Ṭebētu (X) day 26 year 17, Šabātu (XI) day 14 year 17, Addāru (XII) year 17, and the last date is lost (but was presumably from year 18). Telling for the process of recordkeeping is the penultimate entry, which gives the date and the simple note “not written” (NU.SAR); i.e., that the transactions for that month (Addāru) were not recorded for some reason, either originally or in this collected text.

⁴ One can compare this to a similar heading in YBC 4028, which starts with the commodity and means—“barley (acquired) for wool, and (of the barley acquired) from the tithe”—then contains the name of the Sealand governor and the persons responsible for the accounting, plus a date identifying the starting point of collection as the 13th day of Simānu (III) in Nabû-apla-ušur (Nabopolassar) year 13 (Beaulieu 2002: 103-105). The following entries progress chronologically from Abu (V) to Šabātu (XI).

⁵ Only section K (from Nisānu) predates this, but it is the start of the prebendary payments.

⁶ See Jursa (2004: 151–152) on “multiple transaction receipts” and lists.

⁷ This is unusual, as information such as scribes' names and witness lists suggest that the entire original was copied, not only the information that would have been useful for an administrative summary. Comparable is a legal compendium from Eanna that contains 13 sections related to sheep deficits from Dūzu and Abu in Nabû-kudurri-ušur II's 13th year (Zilberg/Levavi 2019). This text was likewise compiled from individual tablets into individually ruled sections and is fairly large, with 8 columns and the extant portion measuring 108.3 x 117.5 mm. The sections are dated but are not arranged strictly in chronological order. Zilberg and Levavi point to BagM 5, 17 as a parallel not only in format but also in the inclusion of witnesses and scribes in the compendium. Moreover, BaM 5, 17 comprises 15 promissory notes dating from Nabû-apla-ušur's reign until Nabû-kudurri-ušur year 12; thus, it was almost certainly composed during the same timeframe (Hunger 1970: text 17). However, Zilberg and Levavi's text is legal in nature and BagM 5, 17 comes from a private archive, so they were compiled for different reasons than YOS 17, 360 was.

⁸ Beaulieu (2002: 101). The *qīpu* at this time was Ninurta-šarra-ušur.

⁹ Mannu-akī-Arbail is also known from YOS 17, 306 (as the *qallu ša qīpi*) and BIN 1, 108 (as *bēl piqitti*), and his name suggests an Assyrian origin.

¹⁰ Jursa (2004: 154–155). A few examples come from Nabû-na'id's (Nabonidus') reign or begin then; for instance, YOS 19, 213 (*ibid.* 156), BM 50509 (from Sippar, Da Riva 2002: 33–34), and BM 92742, which includes entries from the first years of Nabû-kudurri-ušur II's reign as well (from Sippar, *ibid.* 39–40). NCBT 686 is a collection relating to activities in Opis during the latter part of Nabû-kudurri-ušur II's reign (Kleber 2008: 156–157). There are later exemplars as well, such as those from Ebabbar during Cyrus' reign (Jursa 2004: 155), and exemplars of uncertain date such as NBC 4896, which is a collection of transactions relating to livestock and wool.

¹¹ This text was edited by Weisberg (2003). Appendix A includes an updated translation based on collations by Michael Jursa.

¹² Zilberg/Levavi (2019) and UCP 9/2 no. 60, which is dated to Nabû-kudurri-ušur II's sixth or seventh year and collects silver expenditures (Jursa 2004: 156).

Remarkably, YOS 17, 360 and OIP 122, 120 share an entry in common: the former's section **C** is duplicated in the latter's Col. i. lls. 11'–14'.¹³ The entry records that Šamaš-šuma-ušur/Apkallu from Larsa brought 7 shekels of gold to Eanna. Šamaš-šuma-ušur is identified as a scribe in a Larsean document about silver loaned to the Ebabbar temple dated to Nabû-kudurri-ušur II year 21.¹⁴ Larsa was a satellite city of Uruk and there is ample evidence for the Larsean Ebabbar temple's dependence on Eanna for provisions.¹⁵ Gold came into this relationship when Ebabbar needed the expert craftsmen in Uruk to fashion cultic implements for the Šamaš cult in Larsa, and Šamaš-šuma-ušur may therefore have brought the gold from Ebabbar's warehouse to Eanna for such a purpose, though the subsequent disbursement is omitted from the record.¹⁶ The entries are written identically in the two texts, with the exception of the personal name, Šamaš-šuma-ušur, whose last element is written URU₃ in OIP 122, 120 and PAP in YOS 17, 360. Perhaps coincidental is that the duplicate is the third entry in both collections. It is unclear if the two collections both used an original or if OIP 122, 120 excerpted the relevant section from YOS 17, 360 itself. Why this particular entry was duplicated is not made explicit but it is reasonable that OIP 122, 120 included it because it recorded incoming gold, and it is likely that the gold was then further disbursed, meriting its inclusion in YOS 17, 360, even though the purpose for which the gold was subsequently used is left implicit.

Not all potentially relevant tablets were copied into YOS 17, 360, however. For example, PTS 3020, another Eanna text that shows gold leaving the temple's warehouse during the period in which the texts included in YOS 17, 360 were composed—YOS 17, 360 has entries from Kislimu 5 and 15 and PTS 3020 is dated to Kislimu 10, year 14—, was not included in the collection.¹⁷ The other extant gold transactions from Nabû-kudurri-ušur II's reign are not from year 14, which suggests that there was indeed something exceptional about this year that prompted the collection of gold transactions that took place during it.¹⁸

An important hint for its purpose is that YOS 17, 360 was likely composed by the temple's principal warehouse (*makkūru*), in which precious materials and other commodities mentioned in the transactions were secured. Indeed, a few of the entries state explicitly that goods were withdrawn from the warehouse (**D**₁, **O**, and **P**). As will be seen below, the gold transactions record outgoing gold, not incoming (as is the norm), and the prebendary payments are partial, delayed, or given in substitute. These are all indications of a scenario in which the warehouse was being cleared out due to unusually high external financial demands made upon the temple, extraordinary circumstances that would justify this collection of texts recording the consequent transactions.

Outgoing Gold: Sales and Silver

Almost half of YOS 17, 360 (sections **A–J**) records gold transactions. Gold was not a form of currency but was rather a traded luxury good that the Empire either channeled into Babylon, where Eanna traded wool or silver for it, or, in the case of the expensive *nalṭar* gold, imported into Babylonia from Arabia via the Sealand (or Sealand officials) as dust, ingots, or nuggets starting in the 7th century.¹⁹ Because gold was a precious imported commodity, it was, in general, highly controlled by the crown and state institutions, including temples, which kept it accounted for and secured in their warehouses until needed.²⁰ Temples used gold to

¹³ This duplication was noted already in Joannès (2005: 184).

¹⁴ YOS 17, 19.

¹⁵ Levavi (2018: 147–150), Jursa (2010: 105–110), Beaulieu (1991).

¹⁶ Jursa (2010: 110).

¹⁷ See **Appendix A**.

¹⁸ For instance (D.M.Y): BIN 1, 138 (1.IX.13), YOS 17, 242 (15.III.21), YOS 17, 230 (12.VI.21), GC 1, 37 (28.III.4), and GC 1, 6 (24.IX.2). GC 1, 6 is a contemporaneous example of a witnessed gold transaction in Eanna, including the witness Nergal-nāšir/Aqara//Bēl-apla-ušur, who appears as a priest in section **Y**.

¹⁹ Kleber (2016: 121–134). Jursa (2010: 613) mentions a letter (YOS 3, 112) in which someone receives almost 14 minas of silver, apparently for purchasing gold in Babylon. GC 1, 37, dated to Nabû-kudurri-ušur 14, records the purchase of 1.5 shekels of gold for 15 shekels of silver from unnamed people from the Sealand by Balāssu.

²⁰ Neo-Assyrian letters from Babylonia show the level of control over gold and the warehouse; see, for instance, SAA 10, 349 and 369, SAA 17, 129, and SAA 15, 184.

create, embellish, and repair cultic implements and, consequently, most temple records related to gold were composed in this context, since it was allocated to and processed by goldsmiths.²¹ On occasion, the Esagil temple in Babylon provided gold to Eanna for this purpose or Eanna sent its gold to Esagil so that the expert goldsmiths there could fashion it into cultic accessories for Eanna.²²

Eanna not only sold silver or traded other commodities for gold but also received gold through gifts (*erbu* “income”), usually directly from the king, which might have originated from taxes, tribute, or war spoils from conquered regions.²³ Indeed, section **A** identifies the gold in the present text as *erbu* and sections **B**, **D**, and **H** specify the respective origin as *erbu ša šarri* “income of the king.” There are two other identified sources: the *erbu* of a certain man named Bulluṭ (name uncertain, section **F**), who unfortunately cannot be identified but was in possession of 1 mina and 1/2 shekel of gold (including 2 gold rings), and a Larsean scribe named Šamaš-šuma-ušur (discussed above, section **C**), though in the latter case the gold was probably meant to return to Larsa as a finished cultic object. Section **H** mentions *šūrû*-vessels of the *nišē* “(common) people,” and, though these are not qualified as gold, they may well have been, given their context. There is also the possibility that some quantity of gold was collected from the gates (*erbu ša bābi*) or came from trade or other unspecified sources.²⁴ It would be unusual for private citizens to have gold, but contemporary records, for instance, also record gold *erbu* “income” *ša nišē* “of the (common) people” (OIP 122, 120, PTS 3020); of Bēl-šuma-iškun/Nabê-PIR-la’, the governor of Puqūdu (OIP 122, 120, YOS 17, 242); and of Princess Kaššāya (OIP 122, 120), indicating that gold was not fully restricted to the king but could be in the possession of other royal family members, high officials, and perhaps individuals who were simply wealthy.²⁵ OIP 122, 120 shows surprisingly large quantities as well: almost 2 minas from the people and almost 3 minas from Bēl-šuma-iškun, which were delivered in three installments. Sections **D** and **F** mention the Arabian *naṭṭar*-gold, which would have come via long-distance trade.²⁶ Finally, some of the gold was withdrawn explicitly from the temple’s warehouse (**D**₁), so the ultimate origins are unknown.

What is remarkable about the gold in the present text is that the majority of entries are not about how it was purchased and allocated for internal use within the temple, as one would expect; instead, it is *outgoing* gold, withdrawn from the warehouse and sold in exchange for silver, transported elsewhere, or both. As mentioned, section **A** identifies the gold as sold for silver and/or disbursed (*ana tēliti elū*). Only section **B** earmarks gold for cultic objects specifically (the standard type of gold transaction), and goldsmiths are attested in only one other section (**H**), though no individual goldsmiths are mentioned by name. In contrast, section **E** records gold that was smelted down, which was typically the first step in turning it into cultic jewelry, but, since this gold was sent to Opis instead of being used for the cult, perhaps it was fashioned into ingots. Section **D** (**D**₁, **D**₂) also mentions gold sent to Opis, while sections **F–J** are sales of gold for silver.²⁷ The phrasing of these latter cases is somewhat ambiguous and it is tempting to read them as sales of silver for gold, as Eanna did not typically sell its gold.²⁸ However, section **J** makes it clear that it is gold being sold for silver: 10 minas are given as the price of 1 mina of gold, of which 2 minas of silver were then disbursed by Eanna to a decurion. Entries **F** and **I** are structured identically and should thus be read in the same way; i.e., [quantity] of silver (the price of [quantity] of [outgoing] gold) was brought by PN.²⁹ Given that the gold is explicitly outgoing in sections **D** and **E**, it is not surprising that outgoing gold is the organizing principle, broadly speaking, for the first half of the text.

²¹ Payne (2007: 203–211).

²² Jursa (2010: 70–71) and BIN 1, 138, in which some of the gold that had been taken for the *dullu ana Esagil* came back to Eanna.

²³ Jursa (2010: 750–751).

²⁴ See Jursa (2010: 511 fn. 2751, 544–547), who claims that the *erbu ša bābi* “may refer to more or less voluntary gifts offered by visitors to the temple” and could include gold as well as the more commonly given silver.

²⁵ There was no explicit prohibition against private ownership of gold and some sources, such as dowries, show gold ownership (as jewelry or otherwise) by those who belonged to the higher socio-economic classes. Some officials are also known to have given *erbu* such as *bēl piḫāti* and *rab tābiḫi* (Jursa 2010: 546).

²⁶ Kleber (2016).

²⁷ Section **D** may have originally been two entries with a ruling that is missing due to the break.

²⁸ YBC 9235 (dated to Nbk 32) records another rare case in which Eanna sold gold for silver. An edition will be published in YOS 24 by E. Payne and Y. Levavi, whom I thank for bringing this text to my attention.

²⁹ Sections **G** and **H** are problematic because of breaks in the text, see textual notes.

Moreover, the transactions record large quantities of gold. Gold allocated for repairing cultic implements tended to be a matter of shekels, as in section **B** (3 shekels), section **C** (7 shekels), and section **E** ($5\frac{2}{3}$ shekels). In contrast, except for section **G**, the other entries record more than 1 mina of gold each: 2 minas in **D₁**, 1 mina in **D₂**, 1 mina and $\frac{1}{2}$ shekel in **F**, $2\frac{5}{6}$ minas in **H**, and 1 mina each in **I** and **J**. Altogether, this is a substantial amount of gold leaving the temple's warehouse. Furthermore, sections **D₁** and **F** mention *nalṭar*-gold, the most expensive kind of gold, purchased at a rate of about 1 : 12, which was the standard pricing during the 6th century.³⁰ Unqualified gold is sold at approximately 1 : 10 in this text and other contemporaneous texts from Eanna show similar rates: YOS 17, 230 (Nbk 2) gives a rate of approximately 1 : 9, GC 1, 6 (Nbk 2) contains the rate 1 : 8.5, and GC 1, 37 (Nbk 4) gives the anticipated 1 : 10 ratio. Section **G** has the lowest rate at 1 : 7. Why the gold in **G** was sold at a much lower rate is unclear, but, as noted above, it is the only sale for less than 1 mina of gold; indeed, the amount in **G** is only $1\frac{1}{3}$ shekels of gold. The small quantity of gold—or perhaps also its quality or form—may have affected the price. All told, the temple expended over 9 minas of gold in exchange for a considerable sum of silver: over 57 minas.

In two cases, the gold is qualified as finished objects, which is unexpected. Section **H** is especially significant in this regard, as it lists 5 *mukarrišu*-vessels given by the king and *šūrû*-objects whose origins are uncertain due to a break in the text.³¹ Furthermore, as mentioned above, the *erbu* of Bulluṭ in section **F** included 2 rings (*semeru*). These objects, many of which would have normally been melted down and processed by the goldsmiths, were apparently sold as is for silver. That the temple would sell some finished gold objects such as bowls and implements, much less the remainder from goldsmithing projects, is remarkable, giving the distinct impression that the temple cleared out its warehouse of its gold inventory. With several transactions per month, and considering the amount of gold and silver at hand, it is clear that the temple had a dire, relatively urgent, and consistent need for liquid capital, i.e., silver, to support other purchases or purposes that exceeded the temple's normal operations.

Where this wealth went and for what reasons are important considerations. The destinations for the silver are unfortunately not specified except for 2 minas of silver that were allocated to Aḫu-lūmur and his decurion (section **J**). Nonetheless, the second half of the text contains disbursements of silver, some of which may have come from this newly acquired capital. Sections **D₁**, **D₂**, and **E**, on the other hand, state that gold was taken to Opis, a trading post and strategic crossroad in northern Babylonia near the confluence of the Diyālā and Tigris Rivers.³² **D₁** explicitly qualifies this as a partial repayment of a debt to the Sealand administration, as it was the *šakin māti* (governor) of the Sealand who ordered Eanna's *šatammu* (the highest temple official) to withdraw 2 minas of gold from Eanna's warehouse and take them to Opis.

In general, the sale of gold for silver, the quantity involved, its reallocation from the warehouse and goldsmithing projects, and the transactions that include finished products such as rings, bowls, and implements are all indicative of a financial problem that required asset liquidation to solve. While some sections clearly show Eanna sending gold and silver to Opis, some of the newly acquired silver was probably disbursed internally, as the remainder of the text contains numerous prebendary payments in silver, though only in small amounts and as partial payments. Indeed, the gold transactions are not the only suggestion that the temple needed to raise funds, since the prebendary payments themselves are problematic.

Partial, Substitute, and Delayed Prebendary Payments

The remaining sections (**K** onwards) comprise the majority of the collection and record prebendary payments. The prebendary system is a central feature of the Neo-Babylonian priesthood, as being a priest required the legal

³⁰ Kleber (2016: 123) identifies the present text as the earliest attestation of this rate, which she calculates to be 1 : 11.83. She (*ibid.*: 126) notes that most texts about *nalṭar*-gold are dated to the reign of Nabû-na'id, when Eanna had a high demand for gold in order to complete a plating project in the sanctuary.

³¹ The *mukarrišu*-vessels are bowls tentatively linked to oil and incense (*CAD* s.v. *mukarrisu* a–b); *šūrû* is less clear, see textual notes.

³² See discussion below.

title of “prebend” (*isqu* “share”) along with temple service and the requisite qualifications.³³ The prebend could be inherited patrilineally or granted by the king.³⁴ This title allowed its holder to participate in the temple cult, defined the holder’s responsibilities to certain gods, and designated when and for how many days in a year these obligations had to be carried out.³⁵ Roles related to food preparation and presentation comprised the largest category of prebendaries since deities required daily feeding.³⁶ Within this category, the brewers (*sirāšu*) were at the top of the hierarchy, followed by the bakers (*nuḫatimmu*) and the butchers (*tābiḫū*).³⁷ Where specified, the priests mentioned in the present text were either brewers or bakers; other roles are not represented.³⁸ Five brewers are mentioned by name: Kudurru/Mukin-zēr (**N**); Nabû-aḫḫē-iddin//Šangû-Šamaš, Nabû-šuma-iddin/Mušezib-Bēl, Bēl-aḫa-šubši/Šangû-Bēl (**Q**); and Aplāya/Marduk-šuma-ibni (**X**). Two bakers are named: Zēriya/Rimut-Gula (**Q**) and Marduk-ētir/Nabû-aḫḫē-iddin//Egibi (**AA**).³⁹ One man, Nabû-aḫḫē-iddin, is listed as the descendant of Atû, a family named after the priestly office they traditionally held: *atû* “porter” or “door-keeper” (**Q**).⁴⁰ Unsurprisingly, the deities to whom the prebendary services were dedicated were the most prominent goddesses of the Eanna temple: Ištar of Uruk (**Q** and **S**; as the Lady of Uruk in **AA**) and Nanāya (**N**, **Q**, **X**, **BB**).

Priests responsible for food preparation were remunerated and issued the staples required to carry out their duties in the form of a *maššartu*, which was made up of the *sattukku* (the commodities that would be prepared and offered to the gods) and the *pappasu* (the remuneration for the prebend).⁴¹ The present text does not use *maššartu*, however, but instead refers to *mašīḫū*, which is normally the capacity measure by which the *maššartu* was measured and paid out.⁴² This meaning of *mašīḫū* is attested in section **Q**, in which 2 1/3 shekels of silver are said to be “the price of [1 young male goat], the price of 3 1/3 *mašīḫū* of dates,” and in section **BB**, which records 5 *mašīḫū* of dates. In all other cases, *mašīḫū* seems to be bookkeeping shorthand for *maššartu*, perhaps best seen in section **DD**, in which the silver *mašīḫū* is given “(instead of) their barley.” Moreover, all the other prebend payments in this text are only 2/3 of the share (i.e., 2/3 of the *maššartu* as a whole), never a full payment, and their contents are not qualified, which is otherwise unusual for a volume measure. As with the curious nature of the gold sales records, this shows a deviation from the usual procedures, especially since the priests were also not paid in kind but with partial, delayed, or substitute payments, often in silver but sometimes with poor equivalents, such as sheep carcasses (**W**) and firewood (**Y**), for instance. The only occasion on which the prebendary payment was genuinely given in kind is in section **BB** (the 5 *mašīḫū* of dates), but it is still a partial payment. In general, the nature of these payments gives an impression of a temple operating under financial stress and with reduced resources.

Payments made with silver are recorded in sections **K**, **N**, **P**, **S**, **U**, **X**, **Z**, **AA**, and **DD**, which each specify a certain amount of silver corresponding to 2/3 of a *mašīḫū*. These entries include varying combinations of information concerning the specialization of the person (either brewer or baker), the god for whom the service was undertaken (either Ištar of Uruk or Nanāya), and the days or months of service. For instance, section **S** details: “3 1/2 shekels of silver as partial payment for 2/3 of the *mašīḫū* of Ayyāru (and) of 8 days of Dūzu before Ištar of Uruk.” Section **DD** specifies that the silver is paid to the priest instead of barley, which would have

³³ Waerzeggers (2010: 34–37), including the definition of “priest.”

³⁴ Waerzeggers (2010: 36–37).

³⁵ According to Waerzeggers (2010: 35), “a priest’s share in this process could consist of delivering or even moving sacrificial resources, cooking, brewing or otherwise preparing the various foodstuffs, arranging and presenting the food on the altar, performing rituals or even single parts thereof, manufacturing the various implements, clothes, furnishings, and statues required for worship, and, finally, guarding the sanctity of the building at crucial junctures of its layout.”

³⁶ Waerzeggers (2010: 47).

³⁷ Waerzeggers (2010: 48, 38–39).

³⁸ Iddin-Nabû, one of the witnesses to the gold transaction in **F**, is known as a butcher from another text, see the prosopography in **Appendix B**.

³⁹ Bulluṭ/Gula-zēr-ibni is mentioned elsewhere as a baker and Nergal-nāšir/Aqara was possibly one as well, see the prosopography in **Appendix B**.

⁴⁰ Section **Q** also mentions Bēl-aḫḫē-iddin, descendant of *Atû*, which could be a scribal error for Nabû-aḫḫē-iddin (who is attested in other texts) rather than two separate individuals. He may have been a baker, see the prosopography in **Appendix B**.

⁴¹ Van Driel (2002: 92–93), Waerzeggers (2010: 61). The *maššartu* also designated the administrative time period for the supply, which, in the Eanna’s administrative calendar, meant four three-month *maššartus* per year, see Waerzeggers (2010: 61–63).

⁴² Van Driel (2002: 160).

been payment in kind. The “Opis dossier” (discussed below) suggests that much of the barley may have been sent away to sustain laborers or soldiers involved in state projects, resulting in a shortage of internal barley supplies that would normally be expended to pay the priests.⁴³ Generally speaking, the substitution of silver for payments in kind would not be unprecedented as a sign of crisis; for instance, another Urukian text (BM 30210 [1841-7-26, 56]) records silver payouts for priests as well, which Zawadzki suggests was due to a period of unrest from 626/5–620/19 BCE.⁴⁴ One should note that the silver that Eanna paid out is also a relatively small amount, especially considering how much silver the temple acquired through the gold sales, suggesting that the temple’s wealth was largely being sent elsewhere.

Other sections record payments in kind, which would be more similar to the traditional prebendary payouts, but these are either calculated in silver or in a mixed form of payment-in-kind and silver. The sections in which the payment in kind is reckoned by prices in silver include section **R**, which has silver prices for firewood bundles and ewes; section **T**, in which 1 shekel is given as the price of one upper millstone (perhaps associated with a baker’s prebend); and section **V**, in which $1\frac{2}{3}$ shekels are given as the price of 1 *kur* 2 *pānu* and 2 *sūtu* of dodder-plant. Finally, in section **CC**, $5\frac{1}{2}$ shekels are given for 5 *kur* 1 *pānu* and 4 *sūtu* of dodder-plant and the recipient also gets $\frac{5}{6}$ shekels of silver, the price of an object whose exact nature is lost in a gap in the text. Dodder-plant (*kasū* “cuscuta”) was an important ingredient for beer-making, so the priests named in sections **V** and **CC**, Nabû-nāšir/Gimillu and Innin-šuma-ušur/Ibnāya, were likely holders of brewer prebends.⁴⁵

Sections **O** and **Q** record mixed payouts of silver and objects valued in silver. Section **O** contains “5 shekels of silver (and) 1 tanned hide for (i.e., instead of) $\frac{1}{2}$ shekels of silver” to make up the total partial payment for $\frac{2}{3}$ of a *mašīhu*. Section **Q** is the longest in the present text, containing six transactions of goats given by the temple’s *rē’i sattukki*, Tukulti-Marduk, with their values given in silver. The total of seven goats (6 young males and 1 female) correspond to $\frac{2}{3}$ of the *mašīhu* given to the brewers and the bakers. This indicates that the goats were given as substitutes for the silver payment, which was itself a substitute for the payment in kind to these bakers and brewers. The amount of silver value per goat is largely standardized: $2\frac{1}{3}$ shekels for 1 young male goat (with one for $2\frac{1}{2}$ shekels) and $1\frac{1}{2}$ shekels for 1 female goat. As these goats came from the *rē’i sattukki* (who usually provided livestock for the temple’s sacrificial offerings) and the goats are explicitly qualified as from the temple warehouse, this would suggest that the temple had already cleared out most of its assets.⁴⁶ The same can be said for section **O**, in which the 5 shekels and a tanned hide were withdrawn from the warehouse as well. Finally, section **W** records the disbursement of two dead sheep as payment, quite a poor substitute for payment in kind. These sheep carcasses are valued at $2\frac{1}{2}$ shekels of silver and may have also come from Tukulti-Marduk, as dead sheep from the temple’s pastures were unsuitable for sacrifice and would consequently have been sold off cheaply or otherwise disbursed.⁴⁷

Two sections, **M** and **Y**, do not have an explicit prebendary context but, given the nature of the other transactions, likely also reference prebendary payments, especially as the two protagonists, Silim-Bēl/Arad-Innin and Silim-Bēl/Isinnāya, are also mentioned in section **BB** as priests. Section **M** was most likely two

⁴³ The silver payouts range from $\frac{1}{2}$ –1 shekel to $6\frac{1}{6}$ shekels for $\frac{2}{3}$ of a *mašīhu*, which is presumably related to the different roles or lengths of time designated for the respective prebend. As most sections do not state the amount of time for which the prebend is intended, it is difficult to make firm conclusions: for instance, $\frac{2}{3}$ for two different eight-day prebends are listed as $3\frac{1}{2}$ and either 4 or 5 shekels of silver (**S** and **Q**, respectively). Jursa (2010: 670) suggests that Eanna was already accustomed to paying silver instead of rations in kind by the 6th century, so this would be a natural adaptation for the temple if less barley was available; indeed, **M**₁ seems to indicate that barley was dispatched to the palace, so at least some barley was being sent elsewhere, which is also suggested in the “Opis dossier.” Normally, the temple would purchase barley from the palace and the Sealand or, in cases of shortages, from nearby areas, see Jursa (2010: 102, 550–551 [Kleber], 663). A more general shortage or famine is unlikely and would not account for why some priests received silver instead of other commodities.

⁴⁴ Zawadzki (2013). For other occasions in which priests were paid silver instead of payments in kind, see Jursa (2010: 219 and 552 [Kleber]). For this period of unrest, see also Beaulieu (1997).

⁴⁵ Stol (1994).

⁴⁶ In YOS 17, 66, Tukulti-Marduk also provided sheep to Rēmūtu, who sent them to the *šatammu* in Opis in a text dated to Kislimu, day 26, year 14 of Nabû-kudurrī-ušur II’s reign, which is notable for the same reason; that is, that the *rē’i sattukki* does not typically allocate livestock for non-sacrificial purposes (see Zaia/Cauchy 2019). The text does not indicate whether the livestock expenditures put the regular sacrifices at risk; in theory, the temple avoided this at all costs, but it is possible that this crisis affected the daily cult as well.

⁴⁷ See van Driel (1995: 232–233) and Kozuh (2010).

separate transactions, but, as the middle of the entry is missing, it is difficult to make any firm conclusions. In the first half, **M**₁, 1 ½ shekels of silver were disbursed for firewood for two people; **M**₂ only contains enough information to suggest that something was given “for barley to the palace.”⁴⁸ Section **Y**, interestingly enough, shows the opposite situation: firewood valued at 2 shekels of silver was given to Nergal-rēšūa, the slave of Nergal-nāšir/Aqara, who was likely also a prebend holder, though it is not specified. Firewood was often associated with bakers, who required wood for their ovens, and one might thus suggest that the individuals mentioned in relation to firewood (sections **M**, **R**, and **Y**) were priests who held baker’s prebends.⁴⁹

Finally, a few payments were clearly delayed. Section **P** identifies the prebendary payment in silver as one that “had remained (unpaid) in the warehouse.” Section **DD** shows payments of silver for prebendary days that had taken place in Addāru and Nisānu in a transaction dated to Ṭēbetu, meaning that these payments were delayed for at least nine months. Similarly, section **S** mentions a partial payment of the *mašīḫu* of Ayyāru and eight days in Dūzu that was finally paid in Ulūlu a few months later. Section **Q** is dated to Ulūlu and records the payment of several *mašīḫu* owed in Nisānu, Simānu, Dūzu, and Ulūlu; like section **P**, these payments have come from the temple warehouse. Even the only case of payment in kind, section **BB**, is dated to Ṭēbetu and chronicles payments of dates that were the remainder of prebendary days served in Addāru, including a previous *mašīḫu* payment, which would suggest almost a year’s delay for remuneration.⁵⁰

As mentioned, it is compelling that a few payments were explicitly withdrawn from the warehouse (**D**₁ in the gold section, **O**, and **Q**), especially when combined with the delays and substitutions, plus the paltry quantities of silver given instead of payments in kind. It appears that the normal prebendary payments were beyond the capacity of the temple, which was forced to clear out its warehouse or use some of the silver that it had acquired by trading its gold. If the delay in section **BB** is representative of a general trend, the pressure began already in year 13, though it seems that the early months of year 14 were particularly difficult for the temple, and it was only starting around mid-year that Eanna was able to begin paying its priests (albeit largely in silver) as the prebendary transactions are mostly dated to the latter half of year 14. Some priests in these transactions may have also been given delayed or partial payments because they were absent from the temple during their prebendary days (see below), a situation that may have been caused by the same factors that resulted in the downsizing of the temple warehouse.

Possible Explanations: Construction, Conflict, Crisis

Eanna within the Network of Resource Exchange

Temples were significant actors in the movement of resources within the imperial network of the Neo-Babylonian Empire (626–539 BCE). While temples were often the recipients of the wealth and imported goods that entered the Empire through conquest or trade, they also took an active role, trading their local goods and resources within and between cities. Eanna, Ištar’s temple in Uruk, was no exception: the temple’s economic records reveal that it routinely sold its locally sourced wool for silver and purchased grain, dates, and beer within Uruk.⁵¹ Eanna personnel also traveled to the capital Babylon, where they sold wool (often to the palace) for silver, grain, and gold and had access to trade in base metals, dyes and textiles, resins, spices, and other prestige goods as well.⁵² Moreover, smaller temples depended on Eanna for their basic functions, such as the Šamaš temple in nearby Larsa, which often asked Eanna for livestock and dates for their routine sacrifices.⁵³

⁴⁸ On barley sent from Eanna to the palace, which was generally related to taxes, see Kleber (2008: 63–64) and Jursa (2010: 67 fn. 38, 69 fn. 325, 74).

⁴⁹ Waerzeggers (2010: 230 fn. 859).

⁵⁰ It should be noted that the text is not explicit about whether the payments are scheduled for the future or to resolve an existing debt, but it would be very unusual to schedule a payment months in advance, much less as substitute payments, and, given the context, it is much more likely that these were meant to cover existing debts.

⁵¹ Kleber (2017), Jursa (2010: 64–79).

⁵² Kleber (2017), Jursa (2010: 64–79).

⁵³ Beaulieu (1991).

These regional and interregional exchange patterns not only affected goods but also meant a constant movement of personnel; for instance, Eanna’s priests and staff regularly travelled to the capital, and Uruk was in turn visited by cultic officials from other temples, such as Esagil in Babylon and Ezida in Borsippa.⁵⁴ Temples used these networks to sustain their internal supplies and personnel in order to ensure that the daily cult could continue without interruption, which was their most important responsibility.⁵⁵

Temples were not entirely autonomous actors, however; they were subject to external forces, the most significant of which was the Babylonian king. The king was the great patron of Babylonia’s temples, investing his efforts and wealth into gifts for the gods and extravagant renovations of their shrines. Indeed, administrative archives record the king’s financial support in the form of *erbu* “income” and other supplies meant to ensure the continuation of the cult, while the royal inscriptions detail (re)construction projects and royal interest in cultic procedures.⁵⁶ In reality, however, the transfer of resources was not one-directional: for state-sponsored projects, which included military expeditions and construction works, the king reallocated labor and goods by imposing obligations upon his citizens and institutions.⁵⁷ While temples were theoretically protected from anything that would affect normal operations of the cult, state demands could nonetheless result in labor and resource shortages as people were conscripted and materials were sent to the project site, and these endeavors could last for years.⁵⁸

Overall, the impression given by YOS 17, 360 is that Eanna liquidated much of its assets in a relatively short period of time and sent most of its monetary gains elsewhere, expending minimal resources for prebendary payments. In general, the temple prioritized the accumulation of silver currency over its own warehouse holdings and priestly staff. As far as explanations go, an internal crisis is not impossible, but, given that there are clear indications in the text that the newly liquid capital was sent to other parts of the Babylonian Empire (e.g. Opis), it is far more likely that the squeeze on temple holdings was catalyzed by external forces; namely, royal pressure on the temple to provide support for some state-sponsored project(s). State matters are certainly indicated by sections such as **D₁** and **D₂**, which record that the delivery of a gold payment for the *šanû* (“deputy”) of the Sealand was instead taken from Eanna’s warehouse to Opis by the temple’s *šatammu* personally by order of the Sealand’s *šakin māti*.⁵⁹ The Sealand is also mentioned in section **Z**, in which a priest had been sent to see the *šakin māti* for some unstated official business, resulting in a partial prebendary payment for him.⁶⁰ As mentioned, the Sealand was critical for trade into Babylonia, including the acquisition of *nalṭar*-gold; moreover, its governor had administrative oversight of Uruk.⁶¹ Major state endeavors tended to fall into two categories: construction initiatives and military actions. The impacts of such projects have been observed on temples across Babylonia in previous studies.⁶² Unfortunately, because it is not clear in the extant text corpus which military and building ventures were undertaken by Nabû-kudurri-uṣur II in his 14th year, it cannot be said with certainty what may have instigated the temple’s liquidation of assets and reduction of prebendary payments. Nonetheless, there are some possibilities within both categories and, as will be demonstrated below, Eanna’s crisis in year 14 was likely caused by a combination of pre-existing commitments to building projects and the onset of a military escalation that placed further demands on already strained resources.

⁵⁴ Zaia/Cauchy (2019).

⁵⁵ Waerzeggers (2011: 61–62).

⁵⁶ Da Riva (2008: 11–14, 108–112), Da Riva (2012: 44–49). See also Kleber (2008: 255–310) for an overview of royal responsibilities to Eanna.

⁵⁷ See, for instance, the claims in Nabû-kudurri-uṣur II’s Etemenanki Cylinder, in which Uruk was one of many cities and territories explicitly conscripted to build the Etemenanki (Da Riva 2008: 12). See also Jursa (2010: 66–67).

⁵⁸ See Jursa (2010: 66–67, 769). Some examples of rulers in other periods depleting temple treasuries are given in Ambos (2003: 190–191).

⁵⁹ Who the acting Sealand *šakin māti* was at this time is not known. From Nabû-apla-uṣur’s 13th to Nabû-kudurri-uṣur II’s 7th year, the office was held by Ea-dayān (Beaulieu 2002: 101–102). On this official, see Kleber (2008: 311–326) and Levavi (2021).

⁶⁰ See Kleber (2008: 324–325).

⁶¹ Jursa (2010: 91, 613 [Kleber]), Kleber (2008: 326–331), Levavi (2021).

⁶² Jursa (2015: 348–355), Waerzeggers 2010: (349–351), Levavi (2018: 176–188), Kleber (2008: 118–123).

Building Projects in the Opis-Sippar Area

The Eanna temple supported numerous state works under Nabû-kudurri-ušur II. For instance, several administrative texts show Eanna's contributions to the North Palace in years 18–29, and BIN 1, 138, dated to Kislimu in year 13, records that the temple sent gold for work on the Esagil temple in Babylon; the amount was likely generous, as almost 1 mina was sent back and partially reallocated to a goldsmith, while the rest presumably reentered the treasury.⁶³ Moreover, several of Nabû-kudurri-ušur's other major construction works were conducted or concluded around the date of YOS 17, 360 (591–590 BCE). For example, Uruk contributed to the ziqqurrat in Babylon, which was completed in 590, while Nabû-kudurri-ušur's early reign also saw the construction of the Nār-Šarri (later Nār-Nabû-kudurri-ušur) canal between the Euphrates and the Tigris Rivers, essentially from Sippar to Opis, and the so-called Median Wall alongside it.⁶⁴ By year 15, Eanna was also involved in a building project in Jādaqu.⁶⁵ An Eanna text dated to Nabû-kudurri-ušur year 12 records over 7.5 minas of silver *ultu libbi erbi ša Addāru* “from the income of Addāru” that was disbursed by Eanna in order to pay the *rēḫānu ša dulli* “remainder of the work” for years 9 through 11, a transaction that was witnessed by Ninurta-šarra-ušur, the *qīpu*.⁶⁶ A few other projects in the Sippar area also placed a demand on Eanna's resources, including work undertaken at Raqqat-Šamaš, for example, though this was probably late in Nabû-kudurri-ušur's reign.⁶⁷ Letters suggest that the Sealand was heavily involved in state building projects to which Eanna contributed as well, possibly including the North Palace project or the projects in Opis.⁶⁸ In general, Eanna was consistently involved in supporting state construction works during Nabû-kudurri-ušur's reign and existing commitments to building projects may have been a contributing factor in the crisis behind the transactions in YOS 17, 360.

The appearance of Opis in YOS 17, 360 is significant for this point. Located to the northeast of Uruk near the confluence of the Diyālā and Tigris Rivers, Opis (ancient Upia, likely modern Tulūl al-Muḡaili') was an important trading post and strategic crossroad.⁶⁹ Because Opis had a prominent role in long-distance trade, one might initially suppose that gold being sent there would be designated for trading purposes. This is not likely, however, as the gold was being handled by high-status administrators, including Sealand officials, and **D₁** explicitly qualifies the gold as a partial payment for a debt to the Sealand's *šanû* Nabû-ētir-napšāti. Moreover, Eanna is not known to have traded its gold (its cash crop was wool); indeed, gold was acquired primarily via the Sealand or in Babylon, where Eanna itself would purchase some of its supply.⁷⁰ More probable is that these transactions were related to the long-term construction project in Opis, which included defensive structures about which there is unfortunately little further information.⁷¹ It is certain, however, that the project was overseen by the *šatammu* and the temple scribe; as mentioned, the *šatammu*, Nabû-aḫḫē-iddin, was responsible for taking the gold from Uruk to Opis in **D₁**, either during early Abu (V) or earlier. He then remained in Opis, where he subsequently received gold sent by others from Eanna on the 10th and 16th days (in **D₂** and **E**, respectively). Thus, the temple sent at least 3 minas of gold to Opis, much of which was originally earmarked for other purposes: in **D₁** for a payment to the *šanû* of the Sealand, Nabû-ētir-napšāti; and in **E**, for

⁶³ Beaulieu (2005).

⁶⁴ An overview of Eanna's contributions to building projects is given in Kleber (2008: 135–173). See also Jursa (2010: 326–328). Princess Kaššāya (from OIP 122, 120) donated a plot to Nār-Šarri; this canal is mentioned in a text dated to Nbk 14 (MMA 86.11.223), see Jursa (2010: 85–86). Also possibly relevant are Levavi (2018: nos. 123, 124 [letters from Nabû-aḫḫē-iddin to Nergal-ina-tēšī-ētir related to canal building]).

⁶⁵ Kleber (2008: 137).

⁶⁶ Sack (1994: no. 13).

⁶⁷ Jursa (2010: 331–332), Kleber (2008: 166–168). Gimillu/Zēriya, mentioned in YOS 17, 360, was the scribe of the work at Raqqat-Šamaš in NCBT 487 (16.IX.32, see Kleber 2008: 167).

⁶⁸ Levavi (2018: nos. 115, 116). See Levavi (2021) for the relationship between Eanna and the Sealand.

⁶⁹ Kleber (2008: 154–155).

⁷⁰ The personnel that Eanna sent to Babylon or to the Sealand to purchase gold, for instance, are occasionally identified as goldsmiths or jewelers (Kleber 2017: 18–19). Kleber (2017: 19 fn. 49) also suggests the possibility that Opis acquired gold through trade from Iran and Central Asia via a northern route. While this is more speculative, there is no persuasive evidence that Opis would acquire gold for the purpose of trade from Eanna.

⁷¹ Kleber (2008: 155–159, including relevant texts).

repairing cultic implements.⁷² The *šatammu* seems to have traveled back and forth several times that year, since PTS 3020 shows him traveling again on Kislimu (IX) 10 and YOS 17, 33, dated to Kislimu (IX) 26, records that the *šatammu* received sheep in Opis that were provided by Eanna's *rē'i sattukki*, Tukulti-Marduk. If the Opis building project is indeed the reason behind the transactions recorded in YOS 17, 360, then this text shows the crown compelling the temple to sell its gold to raise money for this undertaking and to send staples like barley and dates (which would normally be used to pay priests) to sustain the laborers.

Perhaps the clearest indication that a substantial portion of the liquidated funds were utilized to support personnel sent to the Opis region is GC 1, 256.⁷³ This text indicates that some of Eanna's oblates (*širku*) had been sent to Opis, where their basic costs were covered on credit by Kināya/Rāši-ili. Kināya is also mentioned in section F, where he purchased over 1 mina of *naltar*-gold for almost 12 minas of silver. Kināya's exact role is not specified, but it is clearly one in which he dealt in large sums of silver and gold with Eanna. To repay Kināya for financially supporting the oblates in Opis, Nabû-aḥḥē-iddin sent him 12 shekels of gold, which he had purchased from Širiktu using the temple's silver *erbu* of the month of Nisānu (I).⁷⁴ Again, instead of disbursing its gold purchases for internal use, GC 1, 256 is another case of Eanna sending gold to Opis to cover costs related to state projects outside of Uruk. What the oblates were doing in Opis is, however, not clear—they may have been used as labor for state building projects or they may have been sent onwards for military purposes (as discussed below).

That the Eanna temple was wrapped up in several concurrent state projects at this time is clear from the letters in the "Opis dossier."⁷⁵ Several letters to and from Nabû-aḥḥē-iddin belong to this dossier, as he was stationed in Opis and wrote repeatedly to Eanna asking for dates, barley, and silver for worker's rations and wages to support the project he was overseeing there. For example, a letter to Nabû-aḥḥē-iddin from Nabû-ušabši mentions a dam and requests several iron spades and shovels.⁷⁶ A different official, Innin-zēra-šubši, reports severe shortages in silver and labor for a state project possibly located in the Sealand, asking Nabû-aḥḥē-iddin to intervene.⁷⁷ Specifically, Innin-zēra-šubši writes that fewer men had arrived than Nabû-aḥḥē-iddin was expected to send, that they were not accompanied by a decurion to supervise them, and that he would have to employ an additional 130 laborers (*agru*) as workmen to assist the 80 serfs sent as corvée workers (*šābu*) who did show up, lamenting, "we are always short these days and the lord should not forsake us. Let the lord quickly send 100 corvée workers (*šābtu*) and a decurion . . . The lord cannot n[eglect] it . . . the hired laborers (*agru*) are doing all the work of the corvée workers."⁷⁸ In other words, they were forced to use hired laborers, who are far more expensive than the corvée workers they were expecting. One might note a possible connection with section J, which mentions silver given to a decurion, but it is not clear what role the decurion has in that case. In addition, one letter, sent from Nabû-aḥḥē-iddin in Opis to Nabû-ušallim in Eanna, which Kleber dates to around Nabû-kudurri-ušur year 14, may in fact refer obliquely to the situation in the first half of YOS 17, 360, as it ends with the question "what is this gold that I keep hearing about?"⁷⁹

Military Mobilization to the Levant

Opis was moreover a border city with a garrison and acted as a base for military excursions into the Levant, which presents another possible explanation: warfare.⁸⁰ Eanna is known to have stationed archers in the city for watch

⁷² On this *šatammu*, see Kleber (2008: 156) and Levavi (2020b).

⁷³ See the edition in **Appendix A**.

⁷⁴ Širiktu is also mentioned in letters, such as Levavi (2018: no. 160), in which he received over 1 mina of gold for silver from Nabû-na'id. Levavi (*ibid.*) suggests that he may have been a high official of some sort and that this letter may have had a military context.

⁷⁵ Levavi (2018: 79), Kleber (2008: 33 fn. 129). **D**₁ mentions a letter from the *šakin māti* that would likely have belonged to this dossier.

⁷⁶ Levavi (2018: no. 93).

⁷⁷ Levavi (2018: no. 116), including the possibility that it could be about the North Palace project.

⁷⁸ Levavi (2018: 184–185 and no. 116).

⁷⁹ Levavi (2018: no. 83).

⁸⁰ Jursa (2010: 81), including that Eanna sent archers there. CT 22, 3 and CT 56, 555 (dated to year 15) may also suggest that Eabbar was called upon to provide military assistance in Opis around this time as well. See also Kleber (2008: 214–219).

duties on the Tigris and would have sent over money and staples for the military forces. In support of military action as an interpretation is PTS 3020, also dated to Nabû-kudurri-ušur year 14 (Kislimu [IX], 10th day), which lists spades, shovels, axes, and quivers, along with 40 daggers for a contingent of farmers and 1200 arrows that were sent to personal guards (*tašlišus*), 10 of whom belonged to Eanna's *šatammu*, Nabû-aḥḥē-iddin, and 10 to the temple scribe, both of whom personally traveled to deliver a considerable amount of gold from the *erbuša nišē* and the temple's stores.⁸¹ The initial destination was likely Opis, where the *šatammu* was stationed in year 14, but, given the overtly military nature of the provisions recorded in PTS 3020, it is unlikely that they were intended for endeavors such as canal building in Opis and were probably sent onwards to Tyre for martial purposes instead.

The case for military motivations behind the presence of the Sealand and the Eanna administration in Opis as well as the high levels of investment becomes stronger when considering that Opis was a collection point for campaigns to the Levant.⁸² Indeed, the historical context suggests that military escalation in the Levant was driving the demand for labor, money, tools, and weapons. At the time of YOS 17, 360, the Eanna's royal representative, the *qīpu* Ninurta-šarra-ušur, was based in Tyre in Lebanon. In one letter, he demands that Nabû-aḥḥē-iddin settle his accounts and send silver and 20 ploughmen right away (presumably to Tyre),⁸³ following up in another letter that Nabû-aḥḥē-iddin must send him laborers, 10 talents of iron, 300 tools, and silver for wages, sternly reminding him that these are the king's orders and threatening to report him to the king if he does not comply promptly.⁸⁴ Ninurta-šarra-ušur's phrasing betrays urgency and a possible outbreak of violence: "send the silver quickly [...] they have killed the replacements (*ḥalpu*). Quickly, send me 20 ploughmen."⁸⁵ Perhaps in response to these very letters, Nabû-aḥḥē-iddin sent Nabû-ušabši and Ibni-Ištar 20 ploughmen, instructing the Eanna officials to send them to Ninurta-šarra-ušur along with anything else the *qīpu* requests.⁸⁶ Nabû-aḥḥē-iddin further instructs the officials to purchase bows and military equipment with the silver he sent them, using the temple's stores if additional money was needed, and to bring lances and weapons from the warehouse: "send iron lances from the warehouse and a leather scabbard with stakes . . . Get 10 shekels [of silver from] the warehouse, (and) do your work."⁸⁷ This equipment was likely destined for Tyre along with the ploughmen. Administrative texts such as NBC 4665, also dated to Nabû-kudurri-ušur year 14, confirm that the *qīpu* received at least iron, tools, and shovels in large quantities from the temple: "4 talents and ½ minas of iron, finished goods; 62 *ḥālilu*-tools, 4 shovels, which were sent to Tyre (Šūru) to the *qīpu*."⁸⁸ Likewise, NBDMich 32 mentions two people, including a *tašlišu*, who took silver to the *qīpu* in Tyre earlier that year (Ulūlu, 10th day).⁸⁹ Several other texts dated to year 14 record goods sent to the *qīpu* in Tyre, including YOS 17, 225 and NCBT 757, in which he received silver and tools.⁹⁰ As discussed above, GC 1, 256 demonstrates that Eanna sent oblates to Opis and it is possible that they were sent onwards to Tyre in order to assist with military efforts in the Levant. The amount of gold that the *šatammu* sent to them is significant and may have been intended to provision the oblates not (or not only) for a stay in Opis but also for a journey westward. It may be that Nabû-kudurri-ušur II dispatched the *qīpu* and the *šatammu* to Tyre and Opis, respectively, to manage a supply chain of people and provisions from the Eanna temple in Uruk (presumably also including from the nearby Ebabbar temple) to the collection point in Opis before sending them onward for mobilization in Tyre and the greater Levant.

Relations with the Levant at this time also support the military hypothesis. Tyre (Šūru), an island city off the coast of Lebanon, had long been considered a strategic location, both as a commercial hub and as a military stronghold.⁹¹ Not only did Tyre provide access to vast trading routes, but it was also well situated for

⁸¹ See **Appendix A** for an edition. NBCT 686 (Kleber 2008: 156–157) shows that the temple scribe was often based in Opis during Nabû-kudurri-ušur's reign, as the text contains records of rations for people sent to him there between years 27–32.

⁸² Van de Brugge/Kleber (2016: 198).

⁸³ Levavi (2018: no. 84).

⁸⁴ Levavi (2018: no. 85).

⁸⁵ Levavi (2018: no. 84).

⁸⁶ Levavi (2018: no. 86).

⁸⁷ Levavi (2018: no. 86).

⁸⁸ Kleber (2008: 144).

⁸⁹ Kleber (2008: 144).

⁹⁰ Kleber (2008: 144).

⁹¹ Van de Brugge/Kleber (2016).

empires with aspirations for naval dominance, providing an ideal location and workforce for ship-building and navigation that could enable campaigns to Northern Africa, for instance.⁹² The Egyptian pharaohs and the Neo-Assyrian kings, for example, repeatedly sought to control this city-state for these reasons, and the Neo-Babylonian kings seem to have followed suit.⁹³ There are few direct data for military missions to the Levant, as much of the information comes from the Babylonian Chronicle or later (non-Akkadian) sources, but it appears that Tyre was a vassal of the Neo-Babylonian Empire in Nabû-kudurri-ušur's 7th year at the earliest (598/7 BCE), given its appearance in the *Hofkalender*.⁹⁴ It is not until Nabû-kudurri-ušur's 14th year, however, that Tyre is attested in administrative texts from the Eanna archive (YOS 17, 360 and the aforementioned texts), which is quite suggestive for explaining why YOS 17, 360 was compiled in the first place.⁹⁵

As the Neo-Assyrian state collapsed, it left a power vacuum in the Levant and Syria that both the rising Neo-Babylonian regime and Egypt were rushing to fill.⁹⁶ The Babylonian Chronicle and biblical sources suggest that the Babylonian king campaigned regularly to the area but did not maintain stable or long-lasting hegemony there.⁹⁷ This includes Nabû-kudurri-ušur II's (in)famous siege of Tyre, which was recorded only in later Greco-Roman or biblical sources; consequently, the exact dates of this siege, if it occurred at all, are still disputed.⁹⁸ There does seem to have been a consistent military presence in Tyre, especially late in Nabû-kudurri-ušur's reign and into Amêl-Marduk's, given a dossier of Babylonian texts dated between Nbk 31–AM 1.⁹⁹ Van de Brugge and Kleber believe the later dossier is indicative of stable military occupation (after the presumed siege);¹⁰⁰ nonetheless, neither the texts from Nbk 14 nor later sources are unequivocally indicative of a long-term siege taking place. By this time, there are military camps (*madāktu*) and resources for soldiers, which may have been built up as part of the efforts chronicled in the year 14 texts.¹⁰¹ In the case of YOS 17, 360 and contemporary texts, military mobilization, occupation, and perhaps even escalation are possible, though it seems more likely that Tyre was still within the Babylonian sphere of influence and these measures were either meant to install a strong military presence there or to use Tyre as a base from which to campaign elsewhere. There is no evidence, after all, that Nabû-kudurri-ušur removed the local king, Ittô-Ba'al III, from power.¹⁰²

Why Nabû-kudurri-ušur would have wanted to install and/or maintain a strong Babylonian military presence in Tyre is probably related to the perennial struggle with Egypt over the Levantine states in general and over Tyre in particular. Tyre was an advantageous location from which to campaign directly against Egypt, if necessary, and to push back Egyptian influences in other Levantine states. Additionally, rivalries with Egypt provide a compelling reason for why Nabû-kudurri-ušur was so concerned with Tyre at this particular time: the reigning pharaoh, Psamtik II (595–589 BCE), embarked on a journey to Byblos and the Phoenician coast in 592–591.¹⁰³ The exact reasons for this excursion are unknown—they may have been alliance-making or -strengthening or they may have been overtly military in nature—but YOS 17, 360 and contemporary texts would indicate that the visit at least provoked an official response from the Babylonian regime. Thus, it is probable that the funneling of resources and people from Eanna and the Sealand through Opis and onwards

⁹² Schaudig (2008: 543), van de Brugge/Kleber (2016).

⁹³ Van de Brugge/Kleber (2016).

⁹⁴ Van de Brugge/Kleber (2016).

⁹⁵ For the Neo-Babylonian Empire's relations with Tyre and the Levant, see Levavi (2020a).

⁹⁶ Fantalkin (2017: 203–204) believes that Egyptian hegemony in the area was in place already around 640–635.

⁹⁷ Van de Brugge/Kleber 2016: (196–197).

⁹⁸ See discussions in van de Brugge/Kleber (2016), Schaudig (2008), and Zawadzki (2008, 2015). There are no contemporary or Neo-Babylonian sources for such a long-term siege, and, while scholars have often suggested corrections to the numbers in Josephus and proposed dates for this siege, one should probably challenge the reliability of the claim that the siege took thirteen years or that a multi-year siege happened at all. There were certainly campaigns to the area, some of which were presumably successful; Schaudig (2008: 534) suggests that a Tanit stele was taken by Nabû-kudurri-ušur as spoils of one such campaign, for instance.

⁹⁹ Van de Brugge/Kleber (2016: 199–200), Kleber (2008: 145–149), Zawadzki (2008).

¹⁰⁰ Van de Brugge/Kleber (2016: 198–200).

¹⁰¹ Zawadzki (2008), Kleber (2008: 145–149).

¹⁰² Some have suggested that Ittô-Ba'al III took the throne in Tyre at this time (Kleber 2008: 141–145), but see the contrasting opinion in Schaudig (2008: 536–538), which has Ittô-Ba'al already in power in Nbk 7; one should note that the suggestions related to Ittô-Ba'al III's reign rely upon Josephus.

¹⁰³ Kahn 2008 and Fantalkin 2017.

to Tyre may have been crisis measures to strengthen existing garrisons, to build new military encampments, or to actually set up for and/or conduct campaigns in the Levant, all to maintain Babylonia's hold on Tyre and its seaports, and to protect it against possible Egyptian advances.¹⁰⁴ In the latter case, it is likely that Nabû-kudurri-ušur himself was in the area at the time, which would certainly be supported by the fact that the *šakin māti*, *qīpu*, *šatammu*, and other high-level administrators from the Sealand and Eanna were also stationed away from their usual duties in order to oversee operations in Opis and Tyre.

The Ensuing Crisis in the Eanna

Whether they were military in nature, related to construction, or a combination of both, the state projects during Nabû-kudurri-ušur's 14th year affected the basic functions of the Eanna temple, not only resulting in asset liquidation but also in the crippling of the prebendary system. As the financial strain rapidly emptied the temple's warehouse, it consequently resulted in substitute and delayed payments for priests, likely necessitating the partial $\frac{2}{3}$ *mašīhu* payments as well, since the temple could not afford full payments or payments in kind. Even the silver income from gold sales that went towards internal payments rather than being sent away seems to have been stretched thin, with some priests receiving a substitute valued in silver instead, e.g., in **W** (sheep carcasses instead of silver corresponding to $\frac{2}{3}$ *mašīhu*) and **Y** (firewood instead of silver). Nonetheless, since the crown imposing service obligations was a standard feature of construction and military projects, this could provide an alternate reason for why priests received partial payments, as they would have missed their designated days of service to the temple because of deployment for state business.¹⁰⁵ Indeed, some of these officials were clearly elsewhere at the time of payment: one priest's son took the payment on his behalf (**N**), one had his slave pick it up (**Y**), and one had been sent to the *šakin māti* in the Sealand (**Z**). In addition, many of the items issued as substitute payments were portable, perhaps also indicating that people were traveling at this time. Of course, the situation was most likely precipitated by a combination of many factors: it is possible that Eanna, already stretched thin from its contributions to ongoing building endeavors, entered into a crisis mode under sudden military demands, which would explain the relatively rapid selling-off of assets and clearing out of the warehouse via multiple transactions per month, as well as the absence of its administrators and priests. A perceived threat from the Egyptian pharaoh would certainly account for the severity and exceptionality of these measures, as well as for the timing to 591–590 BCE.

If this interpretation of the circumstances behind YOS 17, 360 is correct, there are several important implications. First, this text shows the clear contrast between the king's ideological claims as a patron of temples and actual practice, in which the king's demands put at risk the main concern of temples: an uninterrupted cult. The trickle-down effects of state projects could clearly be quite severe. Second, it suggests an administrative reason for the composition of YOS 17, 360 as a collection of exceptional payments due to exceptional demands the king made upon Eanna, possibly catalyzed by foreign aggression against the Empire's hegemony. Third, YOS 17, 360 and contemporary texts may not only provide data for the ongoing construction projects in Nabû-kudurri-ušur's early reign, but may also give unique insights into the highly-disputed and poorly-attested Babylonian military involvement in the Levant and tensions with Egypt. In sum, this unusual compilation of economic records, while covering less than two years of the Eanna archive, illustrates how actively the temple participated in the interregional movement of people and goods and how it was itself subject to the ways in which the Neo-Babylonian king directed and reallocated these same resources across the Empire.

¹⁰⁴ Van de Brugge/Kleber (2016: 197–198). See Fantalkin (2017) in support of strong Babylonian military measures, contra Kahn (2008).

¹⁰⁵ Sometimes Urukeans held prebends in the Ebabbar temple of Larsa as well, but there is no persuasive evidence that this was the case here (Beaulieu 1993).

Appendix A: Editions

PTS 3020¹⁰⁶

Obv.

1. 1 ME MA[R.M]E AN.BAR
2. 1 ME na-aš₂-^hh^l-pa-a-^tta¹
3. 7 ^rX¹ ḥa-lil ^rX¹ [...]
4. 4 ^rX¹ qul-ma [AN.BAR(?)]
5. 40 ^{kuš}ša₂-la-^ttu ina ^{kuš}šal-^ttu 30 [^gšil-ta-^hu]
6. PAP 1 LIM 2 ME ^giršil^l-ta-^hu ina šA₃-bi
7. 40 GIR₂.AN.BAR.MEŠ ina IGI ^{md}U.GUR-ina-SUH₃-SUR u LU₂.ENGAR.ME
8. 10 ^{kuš}til-lu rak-su-tu₂ ina pa-ni

Lower Edge

9. ^{lu}taš-liš.MEŠ ša₂ LU₂.šA₃.TAM
10. 10 KI.MIN ina IGI ^{lu}taš-liš ša₂ LU₂.UMBISAG ^rE₂¹

Rev.

11. ^rer-b^l ša₂ it-ti LU₂.šA₃.TAM u LU₂.UMBISAG E₂
12. 1 MA.NA 18 GIN₂ KU₃.GI er-bi
13. ša₂ UN.MEŠ a-di KU₃.^rGI¹ er-bi
14. ša₂ TA ^{na}ka-ma-ru TA E₂. [NIG₂.GA OR AN.NA]
15. na-ša₂-[a] LU₂.šA₃.TAM u LU₂.UMBISAG E₂
16. it-ti-šū₂-nu GIŠ-u₂ ITI.GAN UD.10. [KAM]
17. MU.14.KAM ^dAG-NIG₂.DU.URU₃ LUG[AL TIN.TIR.KI]
18. 1 ak-kul-la-nu AN.BAR [...]
19. ^re¹-lat ina IGI ^{md}INNIN-na- [...]

Obv.

- 100 iron spades
100 shovels
7 shovels(?)
4 iron(?) axes
40 leather bow-cases, in (each) bow-case 30 [arrows]
Total: 1200 arrows (in them)
40 daggers at the disposal of Nergal-ina-tēšī-ēṭir and the farmers.¹⁰⁷
10 laced up¹⁰⁸ leather quivers at the disposal of

Lower Edge

- the *tašlīšus* of the *šatammu*.
10 of the same at the disposal of the *tašlīšus* of the temple scribe.

Rev.

- Income which (has been sent) with the *šatammu* and the temple scribe (is as follows):
the *šatammu* and the temple scribe took with them 1 mina (and) 18 shekels of gold, the income from the people, including gold (which is) the income that was brought from the coffers of the warehouse/Eanna.
Kislīmu, 10th day, 14th year of Nabû-kudurri-ušur, king of Babylon.
1 iron object [...] in addition at the disposal of Innin- [...].

OIP 122, 120 (Translation Only)

Col. i'

[1 mina(?)] of gold metal corresponding to 2 *mukarrišu*-vessels, [5]7 shekels of gold *šūrû*-objects and scrap-metal (*ḥušû*), the income (given to the temple by) the people. Total: 1 mina, 57 shekels of gold, the income of Nisānu, 13th year of Nabû-kudurri-ušur, king of Babylon.

2 minas of gold, the income (given by) the king; 7 shekels (and) $\frac{2}{3}$ shekels of gold, the income (given by) Bêl-šuma-iškun, son of Nabê-PIR-la'.¹⁰⁹ Total: 2 minas, 7 shekels (and) $\frac{2}{3}$ shekels of gold, the income of Nisānu, 14th year.

¹⁰⁶ Photo available under CDLI number P471112.

¹⁰⁷ Nergal-ina-tēšī-ēṭir (/Zabidāya) is attested as an *ikkaru* “ploughman, farmer” as well as a *rab ešerti* “decurion” in Nabû-kudurri-ušur year 19 and as a *gugallu* “irrigation controller” by Nabû-kudurri-ušur year 34 (Jankovic 2013: 49, 95). Jankovic (*ibid.*: 83–85) adds that these titles were largely interchangeable, and that he had some agricultural responsibilities. The group of ten over whom the decurion had oversight could be agricultural or military. See also the letters and discussion in Levavi (2018: 374–378).

¹⁰⁸ This term could mean “attached,” “tied closed,” or “laced” (Gombert 2018: 293).

¹⁰⁹ Bêl-šuma-iškun is attested in the *Hofkalender* as the governor of Puqūdu and possibly the father of Nergal-šarru-ušur (Neriglisar) (Beaulieu 2002: 101, Jursa 2010: 101 fn. 539). Nabê-PIR-la' is another West Semitic name. The reading of the second element is uncertain. Names with similar constructions are known: Nabû-da-la'/Agria is attested in the Eanna archive, Gabria/Nabû-da-la' in

7 shekels of gold brought by Šamaš-šuma-ušur, son of Apkallu the Larsean. Ayyāru 23rd day, 14th year of Nabû-kudurri-ušur, king of Babylon.

½ minas (and) 7 shekels of gold, the income of Bêl-šuma-iškun, son of Nabê-PIR-la'. Tašrītu, 29th day, 14th year of Nabû-kudurri-ušur, king of Babylon.

Col. ii'

2 stone amulets which (have) a gold attachment [...], 2 *gišrētu*-stones which have (a gold?) attachment [...], 2 golden earrings/rings, 1 *maššānu*-utensil of *pappardilû*-stone which was put (in) a gold attachment,¹¹⁰ 1 golden stamp seal ring (with) 1 *pappardilû*-stone in it, 1 stone *arzallu* of NI-*lu*-stone (and) *pappardilû*-stone, 1 cylinder seal of *pappardilû*-stone which (has) a gold attachment, 4 kidney-shaped precious stones, 1 NI-*lu*-stone (of?/and?) *muššāru*-stone, 2 *gadru*-stones (of) gold, 1 jewelry mounting(?) of *anzakuku*-glass. Total: the income of Kaššāya, princess, Dûzu, 15th day, 15th year.

½ mina (and) 1 ¾ shekels of gold, income of Dûzu, 15th year, Nabû-kudurri-ušur, king of Babylon.

Col. iii'

[Bêl-šuma-iš]kun, son of Nabê-PIR-la' [...] 15th year [...# day] *mukarrišu*-vessels [...] in the 15th year [...] income from the king [... i]ncome from the people. Total [...] gold, income of [...] 16th year.

[Rest of column traces or lost]

Col. iv'

2 ⅓ shekels of gold that is from the dust was withdrawn. 1 ¾ shekels (and) ⅓ [...], income of the people. Total: 2 ¾ shekels of gold, Ṭebētu, 26th day, 17th year.

2 ⅓ shekels of the gold that is from the dust, which was taken¹¹¹ (away) from the cella [...] 3 ¾ shekels (and) ⅓ of gold, income of the peo[ple]. Total: 5 ¾ shekels and(?) ⅓ shekels of gold, Šabātu, 14th day, 17th year.

Addāru, 17th year, not written.

4 ¾ shekels of gold *šūrû*-objects and reddish [...]

[Remainder traces or lost]

Borsippa, and Nabû-lu-la'/Nabû-aḥḥē-uballit in Ālu-ša-Nabû-iqbi (Zadok 2003: 515, 524, 543). See also YOS 17, 242, which records 9 minas and 19 ½ shekels of silver for 19 shekels of gold, the *erbu* of the same protagonist.

¹¹⁰ Read *na -'du'-u*, collation Michael Jursa.

¹¹¹ Collated by Michael Jursa as *n[a-ša-a]* or *n[a-šu-u]*, i.e., either “taken” or “brought.”

GC 1, 256

Obv.

1. 2 ½ MA.NA KU₃.BABBAR ina KU₃.BABBAR e[r-bi]
2. ša₂ ITI.BARA₂ ku-um 15 GIN₂ [KU₃.GI]
3. ša₂ ^{md}AG-ŠEŠ.MEŠ-MU ina ŠU^{II} mšī-[rik-ti]
4. iš-ša₂-am-^lma a-na¹ mki-na-a
5. A ^mra-ši-DINGIR [S]UM-nu mšī-^lrik-ti¹ GIŠ
6. 12 GIN₂ ku-[u]m KU₃.BABBAR ša₂ ina ^{uru}u₂-pi-ia
7. a-na ^{lu}šī-ra-ku SUM-nu

Lower Edge

8. 1-ta dan-[nu KAŠ ^m] ^dEN-BA-ša₂

Rev.

9. it-ta-ši
10. ITI.BARA₂ UD.12.KAM MU.[+/-14.KAM]
11. ^dAG-NIG₂.DU-URU₃ LUGAL [TIN.TIR.KI]

2 ½ minas of silver, from the silver income of Nisānu, instead of 15 shekels of [gold], which Nabû-aḥḥē-iddin has received from Ši[riktu] and given to Kīnāya, son of Rāši-ili: Širiktū has received (it). 12 shekels (of gold thereof) were in compensation for the silver that was given in Opis to the oblates. Bēl-iqīša has taken away one vat [of beer]. Nisānu, 12th day, 14th+/- year of Nabû-kudurri-ušur, king of Babylon.

Appendix B: Selected Prosopography (Name/Patronym//Family Name) and Dates Overview

Individuals Mentioned in Gold Transactions (A–J)

Aḥu-lūmur (Col. iii 10//): possibly the commander of the *rab ešerti*.

Iddin-Nabû/Ardia//Kidin-Marduk (Col. ii 7//F): a prebendary butcher (PTS 2262, 8.III.7 Npl); also mentioned in GC 2, 248: 7 (prebend-related, no family name) and AnOr. 8, 12: 2 (Nbk 22.V.22, also mentions Šākin-šum/Bēl-aḥḥē-iddin).

Ina-šilli-Nanāya/Nišānu (Col. i 51'/E): also mentioned in YOS 17, 189: 2 (responsible for taking sheep to Babylon, Nbk 13.XII.10) and PTS 2847 (worker of an *ešertu*; no date).

Kīnāya/Rāši-ili//Gallābu (Col. ii 4//F): involved in the provisioning of Eanna's workers in the Opis area (GC 1, 256). Mentioned in NCBT 370 (Kleber 2008: 136) as receiving wool for the ziqqurat building project, probably in Babylon, which suggests that he was a royal official of some sort (dated Nbk 15.XII.28). He also appears in GC 1, 256 as a recipient of silver given to the temple in exchange for gold. He may not have been based in Uruk: TCL 9, 132, tentatively dated to 3–13 Nabû-na'id (Nabonidus) (Kleber 2008: 182), is a letter between Nabû-šarra-ušur to the *šakin tēmi* telling him that the king's son ordered 20 minas of gold for the work in Eanna, one mina of which is owed by Kināya/Rāši-ili; he therefore orders the *šakin tēmi* to take this gold from Kīnāya and bring it to Eanna. In PTS 2581 (37.I Nbk), he has business dealings with the proto-rent farmer Šuma-ukīn.

Lābāši/Nabû-bēlšunu (Col. ii 14//F): *bēl piqitti*.

Mušēzib-Bēl/Aplāya//Arrabti (Col. ii 10//F): he is attested over a long time (until Nbk 43), often as a witness for transactions, which are mostly related to wool (Kleber 2017: nos. 44, 66, 71, 91, 96, 103–111, 117–120, 122, 133–134, 138), and is often mentioned with Gimillu/Zēriya//Šigū'a.

Nabû-aḥḥē-iddin (Col. i 25//D, 43'/D; 52'/E): *šatammu*. His patronym is /Nergal-ušallim//Nūr-Sin and he held the *šatammu* position until Nbk 19, see Jursa/Gordin (2018).

Nabû-balāssu-iqbî/Nabû-ēṭir//Sîn-lēqi-uninni (Col. ii 9/F): his father, Nabû-ēṭir/Iddinaya, is mentioned in section **N**. His ancestor is the famous scribe (see YOS 17, 361: 19), see Sack (1994 no. 77 [reign of Nabû-naʿid] and no. 90 [Nbk 35]). He was active for a long time, see Kleber (2017 no. 116 [Nbk 38]). The same name and genealogy are attested in AnOr 8 76: 10 (Camb.5.XII.11), but the father's name is broken, and the text's date is too late to be referring to the same person.

Nabû-ēṭir-napšāti (Col. i 22/D): *šanû* of the Sealand. He is well attested, see numerous letters in Levavi (2018). He has this title in YOS 17, 198: 2 as well (Nbk 1, receipt of silver). A text dated to Nbk 19 lists him as a *qīpu* of the Sealand (Beaulieu 2002: 117).

Nāšir/Nabû-udammiq//Rē'û (Col. i 42'/D): also attested in YOS 17, 361: 16.

Šamaš-šuma-ušur/Apkallu (Col. i 14/C): Larsean. He is identified as a scribe in YOS 17, 19: 14.

Zēriya//Balātu (Col. ii 6/F): Zēriya/Bulluṭu/Balātu was a priest and exorcist who played an important role in Eanna and whose descendants also served as exorcists (Jursa/Gordin 2019: 38). Also mentioned in Sack (1994 no. 88) with Kudurru/Mukīn-zēr/Hunzu (below).

[X]/Nabê-ha-[...] (Col. ii 20/G): this name is of Western Semitic/Aramaic origin. Names with the theophoric element Nabê existed contemporaneously with Nabû-names and one could reconstruct the latter half of the name with one of the following options: *-ḥa-a-ni*, *-ḥa-a-ta*, *-ḥa-qa-bi*, or *-ḥa-ze-e* (*-ḥāzē*), all of which are attested in West Semitic names of the Neo- or Late Babylonian period.¹¹² Nabê-ḥa'aru/i is also a possibility, as similar West Semitic names are known.¹¹³ Unfortunately, the protagonist's name is too damaged for reconstruction.

Individuals Mentioned in Prebendary Transactions (K-DD)

Bēl-aḥḥē-iddin//Atû (Col. iv 23/Q): it is possible that this name is a scribal error for Nabû-aḥḥē-iddin//Atû (see below).

Bulluṭ/Gula-zēr-ibni (Col. iv 29/Q): brother of Aplāya. In NBC 4773 (14.VI.20 Nbk; as Bulṭāya), he receives a prebendary payment on behalf of Ša-Nabû-šû, who is also mentioned in **Q**, just four days after the date of the **Q** entry. Other prebend-related attestations for him are NCBT 675 (26 Nbk, *maššartu*, bakers) and NBC 4613 (33 Nbk).

Gimillu/Zēriya (Col. v 25/W): mentioned in Kleber (2017 no. 30 [PTS 2500]) buying dodder-plant. In Kleber (2008: 167 [16.IX.32 Nbk]), he is the scribe of the work of Raqqat-Šamaš. It is unclear if this is the same person as Gimillu/Zēriya/Šigua (see, i.a., GC 1 95: 8, 113: 11, 189: 8, 213: 2, 262: 10). See also GC 2, 90: 14.

Kudurru/Mukīn-zēr (Col. iii 40'/N, v 13/U): descendant of Hunzû (see GC 2, 362: 2, AnOr. 8, 32) and father of Marduk-šuma-ibni (section **N**). Also mentioned in Sack (1994 no. 88) with Zēriya//Balātu and in several other Eanna documents (mostly as a witness).

Marduk-zēra-ibni/Kudurru/Mukīn-zēr (Col. iii 36/N, Col. vi 30/DD): Mukīn-zēr is his grandfather, not his ancestor.

Nabû-aḥḥē-iddin//Atû (Col. iv 34/Q): may be identical with Bēl-aḥḥē-iddin (above). He is attested elsewhere, see YOS 17, 136: 3 and 324:1 (1 shekel of his silver for firewood from the warehouse, Nbk 12). In NCBT 675 (26 Nbk), he is mentioned among several other bakers who receive *maššartu* payments.

Nabû-ēṭir/Iddinaya (Col. iii 22/L): he is the father of Nabû-balāssu-iqbî (section **N**), see YOS 17, 361: 19. He also appears as a prebendary baker(?) in the *maššartu* text AUWE 11, 173: 11' (reign of Nabû-kudurri-ušur II), and as a witness in the legal text YBC 9230 (22 Nbk).

Nergal-nāšir/Aqara (Col. v 35/Y): a member of the Bēl-apla-ušur family. He is frequently attested as a witness, e.g., GC 1, 6 (24 Nbk), BM 114488 (21 Nbk), BM 114663 (24 Nbk); debtor of barley: FLP 1532 (16 Nbk). He was a priest, probably a baker: in NCBT 1172 (23 Nbk), he receives dates, raisins, figs, honey, and butter for a ritual (*riksu*); see also UCP 9/2, 56.

Nergal-rēšûa (Col. v 36/Y): slave.

¹¹² Zadok (1977: 38–39, 384).

¹¹³ Zadok (2003: 530, 535, 550).

Silim-Bēl/Arad-Innin (Col. iii 25/M; vi 13/BB): descendant of Nabû-šarḫi-ilāni. He appears in TCL 12, 33/AO 6869-Nbk 12 as the buyer of an “unbuilt lot in the temple district of Lugalirra in Uruk” (Nabucco database: https://nabucco.arts.kuleuven.be/uruk_archives_rim_anu_profile; accessed 13.04.2021).

Šākin-šum/Bēl-aḫḫē-iddin (Col. iii 47'/O): this priest is attested in several administrative texts dealing with *maššartu* or similar deliveries (e.g., AnOr. 8, 12, as with Kudurru/Mukīn-zēri; Sack 1994 no. 108, 27.VII.13 Nbk; NCBT 715, 40.III.16 Nbk).

Tukulti-Marduk (Col. iv 36/Q): *rē'i sattukki*, known from many other texts (see Zaia/Cauchy 2019).

Individual Mentioned in Both Gold and Prebendary Contexts

Mannu-akī-Arbail (Col. ii 12/F; vi 31/DD): *bēl piqitti* of the *qīpu*, also attested in BIN 1, 108 as *bēl piqitti* and in YOS 17, 306 as the *qallu ša qīpi*. See also Levavi (2018: nos. 131–133).

Dates in Order of Occurrence (M.D.Y)

A: Ayyāru (II).0.14 (heading)	P: Ulūlu (VI).13.14
B: Ayyāru (II).14.14	Q: Ulūlu (VI).16.14
C: Ayyāru (II).23.14	R: Ulūlu (VI).20.14
D: Abu (V).10.14	S: Ulūlu (VI).21.14
E: Abu (V).16.14	T: Abu (V).16.14
F: Dūzu (IV).7.14	U: Ulūlu (VI).18.14
G: [X].15.14	V: Ulūlu (VI).26.14(?)
H: No date preserved	W: Araḫsamnu (VIII).16.14
I: Addāru (XII).12.14	X: Araḫsamnu (VIII).16.14
J: Addāru (XII).23.14	Y: Araḫsamnu (VIII).21.14
K: Nisānu (I).0.14	Z: Kislīmu (IX).5.14
L: Ayyāru (II).8.14	AA: Kislīmu (IX).15.14
M ₁ : Ayyāru (II).23.14	BB: Ṭebētu (X).1.14
M ₂ : Kislīmu (IX).2.14	CC: Ṭebētu (X).4.14
N: Dūzu (IV).27.14	DD: Ṭebētu (X).8.14
O: Abu (V).1.14	

Acknowledgements: This research was conducted as part of the project “The King’s City: A Comparative Study of Royal Patronage in Assur, Nineveh, and Babylon in the First Millennium BCE,” which was funded by a Marie Skłodowska-Curie Fellowship (European Commission Horizon 2020, Grant ID: 749965) and conducted at the University of Vienna. I am grateful to Michael Jursa for access to and assistance with unpublished texts, particularly with respect to the prosopography, and to both him and Yuval Levavi for their comments and substantial improvements to this paper. I am further indebted to Elizabeth E. Payne, who was responsible for several of the transliterations consulted, and to Peter Zilberg. I also thank Agnete Lassen for details about YOS 17, 360, and Klaus Wagonsonner and Jonathan Beltz for photos of several Yale texts, including YOS 17, 360.

References

- Ambos, C. (2003): Kult und Kriminalität, *Isimu* 6, 185–196.
- Beaulieu, P.A. (1991): Neo-Babylonian Larsa: A Preliminary Study, *Or. NS* 60, 58–81.
- Beaulieu, P.A. (1993): Prébendiers d’Uruk à Larsa, *RA* 87, 137–152.
- Beaulieu, P.A. (1997): The Fourth Year of Hostilities in the Land, *BagM* 28, 367–394.
- Beaulieu, P.A. (2000): Legal and Administrative Texts from the Reign of Nabonidus (YOS 19), New Haven.
- Beaulieu, P.A. (2002): Ea-Dayān, Governor of the Sealand, and other Dignitaries of the Neo-Babylonian Empire, *JCS* 54, 99–123.
- Beaulieu, P.A. (2005): Eanna’s Contribution to the Construction of the North Palace at Babylon. In: H.D. Baker/M. Jursa (ed.), *Approaching the Babylonian Economy (AOAT 330)*, Münster, 45–73.
- Bongenaar, A.C.V.M. (1997): The Neo-Babylonian Ebabbar Temple at Sippar: Its Administration and its Prosopography (PIHANS 80), Istanbul.

- Da Riva, R. (2002): Der Ebabbar-Tempel von Sippar in frühneubabylonischer Zeit (640–580 v. Chr.) (AOAT 291), Münster.
- Da Riva, R. (2008): The Neo-Babylonian Royal Inscriptions: An Introduction (GMTR 4), Münster.
- Da Riva, R. (2012): The Twin Inscriptions of Nebuchadnezzar at Brisa (Wadi Esh-Sharbin, Lebanon): A Historical and Philological Study (AFO Beih. 32), Vienna.
- Dietrich, M. (2003): The Neo-Babylonian Correspondence of Sargon and Sennacherib (SAA 17), Helsinki.
- Dougherty, R.P. (1923): Archives from Erech: Time of Nebuchadnezzar and Nabonidus (GC 1), New Haven.
- Fantalkin, A. (2017): In Defense of Nebuchadnezzar II the Warrior, *AoF* 44, 201–208.
- Fuchs, A./S. Parpola (2001): The Correspondence of Sargon II. Part 2: Letters from Babylonia and the Eastern Provinces (SAA 15), Helsinki.
- Gombert, B. (2018): L'armée en Babylonie du VIe au IVe siècle av. n. è. Ph.D. dissertation, Université Paris 1 Panthéon-Sorbonne.
- Hunger, H. (1970): Das Archiv des Nabû-ušallim, *BagM* 5, 139–304.
- Janković, B. (2013): Aspects of Urukian Agriculture in the First Millennium BC. Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Vienna.
- Joannès, F. (2005): Review of Neo-Babylonian Texts in the Oriental Institute Collection by D. Weisberg, *RA* 99, 182–184.
- Jursa, M. (2004): Accounting in Neo-Babylonian Institutional Archives: Structure, Usage, Implications. In: M. Hudson/C. Wunsch (ed.), *Creating Economic Order: Record-Keeping, Standardization, and the Development of Accounting in the Ancient Near East* (International Scholars Conference of Ancient Near Eastern Economics 4), Bethesda, 145–198.
- Jursa, M. (2010): Aspects of the Economic History of Babylonia in the First Millennium BC: Economic Geography, Economic Mentalities, Agriculture, the Use of Money and the Problem of Economic Growth (AOAT 377), Münster.
- Jursa, M. (2015): Labor in Babylonia in the First Millennium. In: P. Steinkeller/M. Hudson (ed.), *Labor in the Ancient World: A Colloquium held at Hirschbach (Saxony), April 2005* (International Scholars Conference of Ancient Near Eastern Economics 5), Dresden, 345–396.
- Jursa, M./S. Gordin (2018): The Ousting of the Nūr-Sîns: Micro-Historical Evidence for State-Building at the Neo-Babylonian Empire's "Augustan Threshold" during the Reign of Nebuchadnezzar, *Hebrew Bible and Ancient Israel* 7, 42–64.
- Jursa, M./S. Gordin (2019): Urukian Priests and the Neo-Babylonian State, *JANER* 19, 35–54.
- Kahn, D. (2008): Some Remarks on the Foreign Policy of Psammetichus II in the Levant (595–589 B.C.), *Journal of Egyptian History* 1, 139–157.
- Keiser, C. E. (1918): Letters and Contracts from Erech Written in the Neo-Babylonian Period (BIN 1), New Haven.
- Kleber, K. (2008): Tempel und Palast: Die Beziehung zwischen dem König und dem Eanna-Tempel im spätbabylonischen Uruk (AOAT 358), Münster.
- Kleber, K. (2016): Arabian Gold in Babylonia, *Kaskal* 13, 121–134.
- Kleber, K. (2017): Spätbabylonische Texte zum lokalen und regionalen Handel sowie zum Fernhandel aus dem Eanna-Archiv (BabA 7), Dresden.
- Kozuh, M. (2010): Lamb, Mutton, and Goat in the Babylonian Temple Economy, *JESHO* 53, 531–578.
- Levavi, Y. (2018): Administrative Epistolography in the Formative Phase of the Neo-Babylonian Empire (Spätbabylonische Briefe 2), Münster.
- Levavi, Y. (2020a): The Neo-Babylonian Empire: The Imperial Periphery as Seen from the Centre, *Journal of Ancient Near Eastern History* 7, 1–25.
- Levavi, Y. (2020b): The Sacred Bureaucracy of Neo-Babylonian Temples. In: T. Ganzel/S. Holtz (ed.), *Contextualizing Jewish Temples* (Brill Reference Library of Judaism 64), Leiden, 6–22.
- Levavi, Y. (2021): The Interaction between Eanna and the Sealand in the Neo-Babylonian Period. In: A.M. Maeir, et al. (ed.), *New Perspectives on Aramaic Epigraphy in Mesopotamia, Qumran, Egypt and Idumea* (ORA 40), Tübingen, 17–33.
- Lutz, H.F. (1972): Neo-Babylonian Administrative Documents from Erech (UCP 9/2), Berkeley.
- Parpola, S. (1993): Letters from Assyrian and Babylonian Scholars (SAA 10), Helsinki.
- Payne, E.E. (2007): The Craftsmen of the Neo-Babylonian Period: A Study of the Textile and Metal Workers of the Eanna Temple. Ph.D. dissertation, Yale University.
- Powell, M. (1996): Money in Mesopotamia, *JESHO* 39, 224–242.
- Sack, R.H. (1994): Cuneiform Documents from the Chaldean and Persian Periods, Selinsgrove.
- Schaudig, H. (2008): A Tanit-Sign from Babylon and the Conquest of Tyre by Nebuchadnezzar II, *UF* 40, 533–545.
- Stol, M. (1994): Beer in Neo-Babylonian Times. In: L. Milano (ed.), *Drinking in Ancient Societies: History and Culture of Drinks in the Ancient Near East. Papers of a Symposium held in Rome, Mai 17–19 1990* (HANES 6), Padua, 155–183.
- Streck, M. (1995): Zahl und Zeit: Grammatik der Numeralia und des Verbalsystems im Spätbabylonischen (CunMon. 5), Groningen.
- van der Brugge, C./K. Kleber. (2016): The Empire of Trade and the Empires of Force: Tyre in the Neo-Assyrian and Neo-Babylonian Period. In: J.C. Moreno García (ed.), *Dynamics of Production in the Ancient Near East, 1300-500 BC*, Oxford, 187–222.
- van Driel, G. (1995): Cattle in the Neo-Babylonian Period, *BSA* 8, 215–240.
- van Driel, G. (2002): Elusive Silver: In Search of a Role for a Market in an Agrarian Environment: Aspects of Mesopotamia's Society (PIHANS 95), Leiden.
- Waerzeggers, C. (2010): The Ezida Temple of Borsippa: Priesthood, Cult, *Archives* (Achaemenid History 15), Leiden.
- Waerzeggers, C. (2011): The Babylonian Priesthood in the Long Sixth Century BC, *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies* 54, 59–70.
- Weisberg, D.B. (1980): Texts from the Time of Nebuchadnezzar (YOS 17), New Haven.

- Weisberg, D.B. (2003): *Neo-Babylonian Texts in the Oriental Institute Collection (OIP 122)*, Chicago.
- Zaia, S./R. Cauchi. (2019): *Destination Eanna: Cultic Assemblies Visiting Uruk During the Neo-Babylonian Period*, *Akkadica* 140, 161–178.
- Zadok, R. (1977): *On West Semites in Babylonia during the Chaldean and Achaemenian Periods: An Onomastic Study*, Jerusalem.
- Zadok, R. (2003): *The Representation of Foreigners in Neo- and Late-Babylonian Legal Documents*. In: O. Lipschits/J. Blenkinsopp (ed.), *Judah and the Judeans in the Neo-Babylonian Period*, Winona Lake, IN, 471–590.
- Zawadzki, S. (2008): *Nebuchadnezzar's Campaign in the 30th year (575 B.C.): A Conflict with Tyre?* In: M. Cogan/D. Kahn (ed.), *Treasures on Camels' Humps: Historical and Literary Studies from the Ancient Near East Presented to Israel Eph'al*, Jerusalem, 331–336.
- Zawadzki, S. (2013): "Era of Unrest" and Uruk Prebendaries in the Light of a New Document, *ZA* 103, 230–336.
- Zawadzki, S. (2015): *The Chronology of Tyrian History in the Neo-Babylonian Period*, *AoF* 42, 276–287.
- Zilberg, P./Y. Levavi (2019): *A New Legal Compendium from the Eanna Archive*, *ZA* 109, 75–89.

