XXX.

SOME CASE-TABLETS FROM TEL-LOH.

BY THEOPHILUS G. PINCHES, M.R.A.S.

THOUGH many tablets from Tel-loh have been published, both by the Trustees of the British Museum, the Berlin Museum, and others, but little has been written about their contents, the principal work upon the subject being Radau's most noteworthy *Early Babylonian History*, in which many of the tablets of the Very Rev. E. A. Hoffman's collection are dealt with—a collection apparently rich in rare dates. It has therefore seemed to me that it would be of interest to contribute a few notes upon a section of these documents, as far as I have been able to study them. The collection upon which I have been more especially engaged is that of Lord Amherst of Hackney, to whom I am indebted for kind permission to publish transcriptions and translations of two of these texts,¹ for which I express my sincerest thanks.

As has been repeatedly pointed out, the tablets from Tel-loh are mainly temple-accounts, some of them being of considerable length, though the precise nature of a few may still leave room for doubt. In general, they are regarded as of but little interest, the script and language being non-Semitic, i.e. Sumero-Akkadian, and their details dry and uninteresting. The historical details contained in their dates were largely forestalled by the lists of dates referring to the reigns of Dungi, Bur-Sin, and Gimil-Sin, published by Hilprecht in vol. i, pt. 2, of *Old Babylonian Inscriptions chiefly from Niffer*, pls. 25 and 28. Concerning Radau's examination of these dates there is much to be said,

¹ Nos. 1 and 2, below.

especially with regard to the long reign attributed to Dungi, and somewhat increased if we add to it certain dates beginning 'year after' or 'second year after' contained in Lord Amherst's collection.

Of special importance, however, are the tablets with envelopes, known as 'case-tablets.' These inscriptions, which are short, generally refer to one—seldom to more—deliveries of some kind of produce, animals, skins, or leather. The document was first written on a small tablet of clay, of about an inch and a half high by an inch and a quarter wide, and about five-eighths in its thickest part, though these dimensions vary considerably. Having been completed, it was enclosed in an envelope, also of clay, upon which the same inscription as that on the small tablet within was written, and having been impressed with the seal of the receiver, the whole was baked.

It is generally supposed that the reason for making two copies of the transaction recorded and enclosing the first in the second was for the sake of greater security, as, if the outer document became defaced and unreadable, that enclosed within it would still be available as a record. There is hardly any doubt that this was one of the reasons, but as, at this early period, the inner tablet was never sealed, whilst the envelope is invariably covered with seal-impressions, another reason must be sought. The earliest known document with an envelope, which is in the possession of Lord Amherst of Hackney, is a tablet with offerings of fish. There is no inscription on the envelope, except a few words stating that the fish were the offerings of the fishermen, and it was sealed, in the form of a cross, with the cylinder of the superintendent of the women's palace, in the district belonging to which, apparently, the fish were caught. In this case the object was to lay before the goddess of the region, Nina, who was a kind of fish-goddess, a list of the fish offered, in an envelope attesting the nature of the document within.

Now there is an interval of more than a thousand years between this early document and the inscriptions from

Tel-loh, and time, therefore, for any number of changes. Nevertheless, this suggests that the reason why the tablet was enclosed in a sealed envelope may have been the same, namely, because they were a kind of *ex-voto*—something offered to a deity by means of a tablet, and sealed by the person who received the offering, thus attesting that it had really been made. This is also suggested by the slight change in the wording which is generally made, as shown by the following example:—

1. TEXT RECORDING AN OFFERING OF GRAIN.

Tablet.

Mina ušu še gur lugala	2 gur 180 qa of royal grain,
še ħur-ra erin ê D.P. Innana	bread of the people of Ištar,
ki Lu-gi-na-ta	from Lu-gina,
ma Sur-D.P. Lama-ta	by the ship of Sur-Lama,
A-kal-la pa	Akalla the official
šu-ba-ti	has received.
Iti Še-il-la	Month Še-illa.
Mu Ħu-ħu-nu-ri D.S. ba-ħula	Year he (king Bur-Sin)
	ravaged Ħuħunuri.

Envelope.

Mina ušu še gur lugala	2 gur 180 qa of royal grain,
še ħur-ra erin ê D.P. Innana	bread of the people of Ištar,
ki Lu-gina-ta	from Lu-gina,
ma Sur-D.P. Lama pa-ap-ħala-ta	by the ship of Sur-Lama the ferryman.
Duba A-kal-la pa ê D.P. Innana	Tablet of Akalla, the official of the house of Ištar.
Iti Še-il-la	Month Še-illa.
Mu Ħu-ħu-nu-ri D.S. ba-ħula.	Year he ravaged Ħuħunuri.

From the above it will be seen that, whilst the inner tablet has ‘Akalla the official has received it,’ the envelope has ‘Tablet of Akalla, the official of the house (temple) of Ištar.’

2. AN OFFERING OF GRAIN.

Tablet.

U-aš lama šuš še gur lugala	11 gur 240 qa of grain royal,
šag-gala erina-ku	sustenance for the people,
ki Lu-kal-la-ta	from Lu-kalla
Sur-nigin-gara	Sur-nigin-gara
šu-ba-ti	has received.
Iti Še-gur-kuda	Month Adar,
mu Ša-aš-ru-um D.S. ba-ḫula	year he ravaged Šašru.

Envelope.

U-aš lama šuš še gur lugala	11 gur 240 qa of grain royal,
šag-gala erin-na	sustenance for the people,
ki Lu-kal-la-ta	from Lu-kalla.
Dub Sur-nigin-gara	Tablet of Sur-nigin-gara.
Iti Izin-D.P. Ba-u	Month Chisleu,
mu Ša-aš-ru D.S. ba-ḫula.	Year he ravaged Šašru.

Here we have the same peculiarity—in the text of the tablet the wording is ‘Sur-nigin-gara has received it,’ and in that of the envelope ‘Tablet of Sur-nigin-gara.’ The people for whose sustenance the grain was intended were probably the staff of a temple.

In the first example, there are certain variants which are noteworthy. In the tablet, l. 4, the wording is simply ‘by the ship of Sur-Lama,’ but in the text of the envelope ‘the ferryman’ is added. In line 5 of the tablet Akalla is simply described as ‘the official (*pa*),’ but the envelope has ‘the official of the temple of Ištar.’ In the name of the district mentioned in the date the scribe of the tablet has incorrectly written $\text{𒌦} < \text{𒌦}$, *ri*, for $\text{𒌦} < \text{𒌦}$, *hu*, at the beginning of the word. These variants, in this case at least, suggest that the inner inscription was really a rough draught.

In the second example the variants are less numerous.

In the second line the envelope has *erinna* for the *erina-ku*

of the tablet—a change involving no difference of meaning. In the sixth line the name of the month appears as the Sumerian equivalent of Adar, the last month of the year, but in the text of the envelope it is ‘the month of the festival of Bau,’ which, according to the tablets (see Radau’s *Early Babylonian History*, pp. 287 ff.), was the ninth month of the year, corresponding with Chisleu. How the envelope of the tablet has been dated three months in arrear or nine months in advance of the tablet, is very difficult to explain. It would seem, however, to be due to a blunder of the scribe, who must have written, on the tablet within, the current month, instead of dating the document three months back (the delivery having presumably been made in the month Izin-Bau or Chisleu), as on the envelope.

3. A TABLET REFERRING TO CLOTHING.¹

Obverse.

1. << IIII E 𐎶
2. E E 𐎶 𐎶 E 𐎶
3. 𐎶 𐎶 E 𐎶 𐎶
4. 𐎶 𐎶 𐎶 𐎶 𐎶 E
5. 𐎶 𐎶 𐎶 𐎶

1. Man ussa tug ² muga	28 mukku-garments,
2. tug-ba erina 𐎶u-ku-bu	clothing of the people <i>hukubu</i> ,
3. 𐎶 D.P. Gimil-D.P. Sin	for the house of Gimil-Sin
4. u 𐎶 Nam-𐎶a-ni-ku	and the house of Nam𐎶ani,
5. ki Lu-uš-gi-na-ta	from Lu-uš-gina,

¹ This and the following are transcribed into the late Babylonian character.

² *Tug* is one of the usual Sumerian words for garment (*W. Asia Inscr.*, v, pl. 14, 33), and *tú* (*ibid.*, l. 32) seems to be a shortened form of the same word. A Babylonian duplicate of W.A.I., v, pl. 28, gives 𐎶𐎶 < and 𐎶𐎶 𐎶𐎶 (*tú, tug*) in lines 6 and 7 *cd*, as if these words had been borrowed in Semitic Babylonian. *Tú* seems to be the Sumerian dialectic form.

Reverse.

- 6.
-
- 7.
-
- 8.
-

6. mu šabra-ne-ku in the name of the seers.
7. Duba Lu-D.P. Dumu-zi Tablet of Lu-Dumuzi.
8. Mu ma-gur¹ maḥ ba-dim Year Gimil-Sin built the
sublime bark.

In this example the inner tablet has the same phrasing as the envelope, the only variants being for in the first line, and the following after line 6:—

- Duba Lu-D.P. Dumu-zi Tablet of Lu-Dumu-zi
dumu Sur-gu-la son of Sur-gula.
- Ner(?) Lu-Ḫu-ne-ru D.S. Carrier(?): Lu-Ḫuneru.

References to cloth and clothing of various kinds are numerous, and the king here named, Gimil-Sin, seems to have encouraged greatly the weaving industry of his little kingdom, which, like the rest of Babylonia, seems to have become celebrated for its woven stuffs.

In the above we see the name of the deity Dumu-zi (Tammuz) compounded with that of the scribe, whose name

¹ This word occurs in *Cuneiform Texts from Babylonian Tablets*, pt. xii, pl. 11, line 26 abc: *ša D.P. ma-gur, ma-kur-ru^m*, which explains that has the value of *gur* in *ma-gur* = Semitic *ma-kur-ru^m*.

means 'Man of Tammuz.' In the following inscription we are furnished with a statement of the cattle dedicated to that divinity in the month of his festival :—

4. GIFT OF CATTLE TO TAMMUZ.

Tablet—Obverse.

1.	⋈⋈⋈	𐎶	𐎶
2.	𐎶𐎶𐎶		𐎶𐎶𐎶
3.	𐎶𐎶𐎶	𐎶𐎶𐎶	𐎶𐎶𐎶
		𐎶𐎶𐎶	𐎶𐎶𐎶
4.	𐎶𐎶𐎶	𐎶𐎶𐎶	𐎶𐎶𐎶

1.	Ušu lama	udu	34	sheep,
2.	âš	maš	6	kids,
3.	ki	I - ta - ê - a - ta	from	Ita - êa.
4.	Lu-D.P.	Ši-ma-ku	Lu -	Šimaku

Reverse.

5.	𐎶𐎶𐎶	𐎶𐎶𐎶
6.	𐎶𐎶𐎶	𐎶𐎶𐎶
		𐎶𐎶𐎶
7.	𐎶𐎶𐎶	𐎶𐎶𐎶
		𐎶𐎶𐎶
8.	𐎶𐎶𐎶	𐎶𐎶𐎶

5.	ni	-	ku	the	niku,
6.	sa-dug	D.P.	Dumu-zi	due of	Tammuz.
7.	Iti Izin	D.P.	Dumu-zi	Month	Izin-Dumuzi,
8.	Mu	Gimil - D.P.	Sin	year of	Gimil-Sin,
	lugala			the king.	

Envelope—Obverse.

1. <<< W E W W -IΔI
2. E E E I -I E I H E E
3. E E E E E E E I W E E
4. E E E E E E E I -I E I E E

1. Uśu lama udu, âš maš	34 sheep, 6 kids,
2. sa-dug D.P. Dumu-zi-ku	due for Tammuz,
3. ki I - ta - ê - a - ta	from Ita - êa.
4. duba Lu-D.P. Ši-ma-ku aba	tablet of Lu - Šimaku
the <i>aba</i> .

Reverse.

5. <<< E E E I -I E I E E E
6. E E E I -I E I E E E

5. Iti Izin D.P. Ba-u	Month of Izin-Bau,
6. mu en D.P. Nannar-
kar-zi ba-tuga	Year he invested the
lord of Nannar-kar-zi.

This is a noteworthy inscription, not so much on account of the variants in the record as in the different dates which it exhibits. In the text on the envelope, the statement that the animals offered were those given to the temple of Tammuz is transferred from just before the date (l. 6) to the second line, and the postposition 'for' is added. The inner tablet does not contain the words *šu-ba-ti*, 'he (Lu-Šimaku) has received them,' perhaps by a mistake of the scribe, but the envelope has the usual variant 'tablet (*duba*) of Lu-Šimaku,' and adds his title, *aba*, which would thus *seem* to be a synonym of *niku* on the inner tablet, p. 821.

The important part of this inscription, however, is, as has already been remarked, the date. The tablet, which was

written first, has 'Year of Gimil-Sin, the king,' that is, the year when Gimil-Sin ascended the throne of Ur.¹ The envelope, which was written after the tablet, is dated in the year when the king invested the lord (generally regarded as meaning 'the high priest') of Nannar-kar-zi—a name usually written Nannar-kar-zida, and apparently meaning 'Nannar of the everlasting sanctuary.' This date is placed by Radau at the end of the reign of Bur-Sin, the predecessor of Gimil-Sin, in accordance with the indications of the list of dates published by Hilprecht. If, however, the statements of this tablet and its envelope are correct, it is probable that Hilprecht's tablet should be restored as follows:—

1. Year Bur-Sin became king.
2. Year Bur-Sin, the king, devastated Urbillu^m.
3. Year he built the supreme throne of Bel.
4. Year he invested the supreme great lord of Anu.
5. Year he invested the lord of the great abode (?)
of Ištar.
6. Year he ravaged Šašru.
7. Year he ravaged Huḫnuri.
8. Year he invested the lord of Eridu.
- [9. Year he invested] the lord of Nannar-²
- [10. Year of Gimil-Sin, the king.]
- [11. Year he invested the lord of Nannar-kar-zida.]
- [12. Year he consecrated the ark Dara-abzu.]
- [13. Year he devastated Simanu^m.]
- [14. Year he built] the western wall.
15. Year he made the sublime inscription of Bel.
16. Year Gimil-Sin, king of Ur, devastated the land of
Zabšalu.

Here the list comes to an end, but it may be supposed that other dates had to be inserted, including certain 'years after,' which latter, according to the dated tablets, are as follows:—

¹ Mugheir, identified with Ur of the Chaldees.

² Radau regards this as being date No. 11, and if this be correct (as is possible) No. 10 would then have been omitted by the scribe.

- 1a. Year after Bur-Sin became king.
- 2a. Year after he devastated Urbillum.
- 8a. Year after he invested the lord of Eridu.
- 12a. Year after he consecrated the ark Dara-abzu.
- 13a. Year after he devastated Simanu.
- 14a. Year after he built the western wall.¹

Returning to the tablet and its envelope, it might naturally be explained that the whole was written at a much later date, and that two scribes, each with a different opinion as to the year, had been engaged upon it. It is worthy of note, however, that the month mentioned on the tablet—that of the festival of Tammuz—would be just the one in which offerings to that divinity would be made. The month on the envelope, on the other hand, is that of the festival of Bau, ten or eleven months later, according as there was a second Adar or not that year.

But the present paper was not for the purpose of discussing early Babylonian chronology—an altogether uncertain science at the present time—but simply for the purpose of presenting non-Assyriologists in particular with a few simple notes upon these numerous but comparatively uninteresting documents, and the information, meagre as it is, which may be obtained from them. Besides grain, cattle, and woven stuffs, the receipt of many other articles are recorded upon them. Thus we find mention of dates, sesame, oil, meal, hides, skins (leather), and also silver. In all probability every kind of produce of the earth and of trade formed the subject of offerings to the temples of early Babylonia.

Though an attempt has been made to indicate the pronunciation of the Sumero-Akkadian words contained in the short texts inserted in this paper as illustrations, it is by no means certain that the values given are correct. It must be admitted, however, that more than one transcription is in some cases likely to have been in use. Moreover, certain of the renderings of these inscriptions into modern languages

¹ It is possibly this which occurs as the second line of the reverse of the tablet published by Hilprecht.

have to be given with all reserve. In the inscriptions referring to grain we find , *še gur*, as the expression of the produce and of the measure used, followed, especially in the time of Dungi and Bur-Sin, by the character , *lugala*, 'king,' used in these cases, apparently, with the meaning of 'royal.' But is it the grain, or the measure (*gur*) which was royal? Radau is of opinion that it was the former, and the parallel texts, referring to woven stuffs, imply that he is right. With regard to the grain, it would seem that there was a special word used when it was of 'royal' quality, as the following extract from a four-column syllabary shows:—

	Sum. pronunc ⁿ .	Group.	Name of Group.	Sem. pronunc ⁿ .	Meaning.
1. 11.	Lil-la-an		šê-lugallaku	lil-la-nu	royal grain.
1. 12.	Še-sag		do.	ya-a-ra-aḥ-ḥu	white grain.

As the ideograph shows, *lillan* and *še-sag*, and *lillanu* and *yārahḫu* are respectively synonyms—indeed, in all probability *še-sag*, one of the pronunciations of , is the , *še-gur-sag-gala*, of the tablets of an earlier period, in which, as in the case of , *še gur lugala*, the measure is placed after the first element. The addition of *gala*, 'being,' at the end naturally makes no difference to the sense.¹

As the syllabary referred to above has an important bearing upon many expressions found in the inscriptions, I give the text here (see Plates) as far as my copy goes. Unfortunately I do not know its number, so have been unable to revise it, and it is therefore given, especially where doubtful, *with all reserve*.

¹ Referring to the group *še-gur*, Professor Sayce writes to me: "I have long supposed that in is merely a determinative of measure. *Ságal* [i.e. *sag-gala*] would be equivalent to *saga* with the suffix *-l*, and the text seems to show that is the equivalent of *saga*." M. Thureau-Dangin has also recognized the possible equivalence of *še gur lugala* and *še-gur-sag-gala*.

From this inscription, lines 9-16 (Plate I), we find that there were several other kinds of grain besides that designated 'the royal,' which would seem to have been the best white wheat.¹ Line 13 has *šeštub*, Semitic *arsuppu*, ideograph , 'ox-grain.' After that is *šemuš*, Sem. *šigušu*, ideograph . As , with the pronunciation of *uš*, means 'blood,' which is also one of the translations of , it is probable that the grain intended was of a red colour,² and if this be the case, *uš* is for *wuš* (*muš*), a Sumerian dialectic form. It is from the non-dialectic *šeguš* that the Semitic equivalent *šigušu* has come. In *Cuneiform Inscriptions of Western Asia*, v., pl. 26, *ef*, l. 22, this word has the prefix for 'wood' or 'tree,' as has also *šeštub* = *arsuppu*. All the names of seeds, therefore, as far as line 20 — *Še-zah* = *lurutu*^m, *še-šal* = *dillatu*^m, *karatin* = *kurullu*, *kiššu*, and *naqabbu* (? gourds)—are possibly those of plants or shrubs rather than cereals. *Ezinu*, the Sumerian pronunciation of the Semitic (divine) *Ašnan*, (the god of) grain and bread (l. 9), is also noteworthy.

In lines 20 and 21 are names of birds, *uš* = *usu*, and *bibe* = *paspasu*, 'duck' (acc. to Jensen). After this are apparently names of plants or grain without the distinctive prefix — *parra* = *parrū*; *imgaga* = *kunašu*, *buṭuttu*^m, and *dišip-taḥḥu*; *kiraši* = *alappanu*. Lines 26 and 27 have the names of drinks made from these—*ulušin*, Sem. *ulušinnu*; *ulušin-maḥ*, Sem. *ulušin-maḥḥu*, 'supreme *ulušin*,' probably a very favourite drink. Names of other drinks follow, the first, l. 28, called *dida*, Semitic *billatu*^m. The ideographic group is , which occurs often in the numerous tablets referring to deliveries of food, drink, and oil, of the date of the case-tablets translated above. In l. 29 the same drink, made from *imgaga* (*dida-imgaga*), is referred to, the Semitic equivalents being *dišip-dahḥu* and *alappanu* (see lines 24 and 25). Lines 30 and 31 give two ideographic groups for a drink called *piḥu* in both Sumerian and Semitic, of a similar nature to those already mentioned.

¹ See p. 825.

² This naturally suggests lentils.

Lines 32 and 33 have the various words for wine—*kurun* in Sumerian, *kurunnu*, *šikari*, *sibu*, *karanu*, and *damu*, ‘blood’ (a wine apparently so named because it was red), in Semitic Babylonian. The group is the well-known , and the second component is written in an imitation of the archaic form. Other drinks in the list are *kašbir* = Semitic *hîqu* (?), *issû*, *šikar šalultu^m*, and *alappanu* (lines 34, 35); *ēbla* = *ēblaku* (36); and *mud* = *huburu*, the rendering of two groups. L. 39 is defective, so that it can only be seen that the non-Semitic word probably ended in *-na*, and the Semitic rendering, derived from it, in *-nu*. In lines 40–43 the Sumerian words are likewise lost, and as the Semitic column contains only the ditto-sign in three of the cases, the words cannot be restored—in l. 43 the Semitic rendering is defective. *Lum* = *lummu*, and *lut* = *luṭṭu* and *nalpatu^m* (lines 44–46), are probably all names of jars or vases.

The back begins with a different character, namely, , which is the first character of each group as far as line 24. At first the explanatory words are mostly verbs: ll. 1–3: *nāri*, ‘to destroy,’ *šābu*, probably similar in meaning, *sakāpu*, ‘to overthrow.’ *Sapāri* and *ukkuku* are probably similar, but if the latter be *ukkušu*, it means ‘to end.’ *Šumsuku*, ‘to hide,’ *maḥāšu*, ‘to smite.’ L. 4 has *maḥāšu* and *šābu*. L. 5, *pašāšu*, ‘to spread,’ *napāšu*, ‘to spread out,’ *pašāšu*, probably similar. L. 8 has *rasānu* and *ramāku*, ‘to sprinkle.’

Line 9 has *umašu*, ‘enclosure,’ ‘snare,’ also ‘creation (?)’ (Delitzsch). L. 10 *šurru^m*, probably meaning ‘to make,’ and *nabnītu^m*, ‘creation.’ Lines 11–13 have a group of apparently connected ideas—*ma’iri*, ‘(one) sending,’ ‘leading,’ ‘ruling,’ *sarri*, ‘rebel,’ *šarraqu*, ‘thief,’ *pallišu*, ‘housebreaker (?)’, *simatu^m*, probably miscopied for , *habbatu^m*, ‘plunderer,’ *muttaḥlilu*, ‘liar in wait.’

Line 14 has *ēmuqu*, ‘force.’ L. 15 *šamāru*, apparently ‘to conceive’ both mentally and bodily, and *kirimmu*, ‘womb.’ L. 16 gives the doubtful words *idabal issa* . . . —perhaps incorrectly copied on account of the break. L. 17 gives *gamiru*, ‘(one) completing,’ followed by the character *šit*, perhaps to be completed *šitpuru*, ‘to send off,’ or something

similar. L. 18 has *šitpušu*, probably meaning 'to be perfect,' from *šapašu*, 'to be strong,' 'perfect in strength.'

From this point to line 45, and perhaps l. 47, the groups begin with , and are mostly, therefore, articles of clothing or things of a similar nature. *Aktum* = *šabšu* in l. 25 would seem to have been a physician's robe (, *tug* + *asu*, 'cloth of a physician').¹ *Ballā*² in lines 26, 27 are male and female headdresses respectively—*ubur zikari* ('of a male') and *ubur sinništu* ('of a woman'). Lines 28–30 have three groups rendering *pala*, 'king's robe,' 'lord's robe,' and 'lady's robe'—*tediq šarri*, *tediq bêlu*, *tediq bêltum*. L. 31 has *lamaḥuš*, Semitic *lamaḥuššū*.³ This last also renders *zulumḥi* in ll. 34 and 36, and the same group as in l. 31 (with a different Sumerian pronunciation) again in l. 42. The usual ideograph is ,⁴ which is often found in the case-tablets and other inscriptions of an early date.

In l. 32 it is possible that my copy is incorrect in the name of the group, which, I suspect, should be *tukul aragub* (i.e. *šešikku*), followed by , in which case the Sumerian would be *tugini*, and the Semitic renderings *tuginū* and *šubat mukku*. This was a garment like that spoken of on p. 819 (No. 3, l. 1), where, however, the group is different. L. 33 has *tušē* = *tunšu*; l. 34 ff., *zulumḥi* = *zulumḥū*, *edqu*, *kititum*, *raqqatum*, *lubuštum*, and *lamaḥuššū*; 37, *uttuku* = *ubakku* and *maḥiṣatum*; 38, 39, [*gadmaḥ*] = *tuzzu*,⁵ *nalbašu*, and *gadmaḥu*⁶; 40–42, the same as 34–36, but without *zulumḥū*, whilst the remainder of the inscription has only incomplete words (with the exception of *lū* and

¹ 'Medical bandage' seems less probable.

² Or *mallā* (?).

³ *Lamaḥuššū* in *W. Asia Inscr.*, v, pl. 14, l. 33 *cf.* where it translates the same ideograph.

⁴ In W.A.I., v, 14, 46 *cd.* it occurs with the determinative prefix , and in pl. 28, 54 *cd.* with an additional character (?), suggesting (*tug*) *ša melamma*, "(dress) which is glorious"—*cf. ibid.*, l. 5 *ab.*

⁵ Given as *tāzu* in K. 7331, rev. i, l. 1.

⁶ *Gada-maḥu* in K. 7331, rev. i, l. 3.

*kippu*¹), with which I will not now trouble the reader, as their meanings are naturally uncertain.

Though very few of these words occur in the inscriptions of which examples have been given, those which they do bear upon are likely to be better understood in consequence. With regard to the others, future discoveries may bring to light examples of their use, and in any case they add to the vocabularies of the languages of which they deal, and will help to elucidate many other texts, both Sumerian and Assyro-Babylonian.

¹ As the name is [*tukul*]-*maštin-ra-a-nū*, it may be conjectured that the ideographic group was (IV) 7.

[illegible]

¹ This character should be like that in line 38, *i.e.* without the final $\langle$. From a marginal note, I seem to have thought that I saw, instead of $\langle$, ∇ following Ξ within $\langle \nabla$.

² In my copy of the additional fragment, there is ¶ instead of the second ¶.

[illegible]

¹ has the name of *hikū*, and may be the character intended here.

² Possibly $\Xi\Upsilon$, *ma*, or a mistake for $\Xi\Upsilon$, *pa*.

³ As a crack crosses this line, the characters must be regarded as doubtful.