

Bibliography

- BARMASH, P. 2020: *The Laws of Hammurabi: At the Confluence of Royal and Scribal Traditions*, Oxford.
- CHARPIN, D. 2010: *Reading and Writing in Babylon*, trans. J. M. Todd, Cambridge, MA.
- DELNERO, P. 2012: “Memorization and the Transmission of Sumerian Literary Compositions,” *JNES* 71:189–208.
- 2016: “Literature and Identity in Mesopotamia during the Old Babylonian Period,” pages 19–50 in *Problems of Canonicity and Identity Formation in Ancient Egypt and Mesopotamia*, CNI 43, Copenhagen.
- DRIVER, G. and MILES, J. C. 1952: *The Babylonian Laws*, 2 vols, Oxford.
- FINET, A. 1973: *Le code de Hammurabi: Introduction, traduction et annotation*, Paris.
- HUROWITZ, V. A. 1994: *Inu Anum širum: Literary Structures in the Non-Juridical Sections of Codex Hammurabi*, OPKF 15, Philadelphia.
- KUPPER, J.-R. 1964: “L’opinion publique à Mari,” *RA* 58: 79–82.
- MOLINA, M. 2000: “Lexical and Other School Tablets in the Montserrat Museum,” pages 751–764 in S. GRAZIANI, M. C. CASABURI and G. LACERENZA (eds.), *Studi sul Vicino Oriente Antico dedicati alla memoria di Luigi Cagni II*, Naples.
- RICHARDSON, M. E. L. 2000: *Hammurabi’s Laws: Text, Translation and Glossary*, London.
- RIES, G. 1983: *Prolog und Epilog in Gesetzen des Altertums*, MBPAR 76, Munich.
- RÖMER, W. H. P. 1965: *Sumerische “Königshymnen” der Isin-Zeit*. Leiden.
- SIGRIST, M. 1988: *Isin Year Names*, IAPAS 2, Berrien Springs.
- STEIBLE, H. 2000: “Zu den Nahtstellen in den altesopotamischen Codices,” pages 447–455 in *Assyriologica et Semitica: Festschrift für Joachim Oelsner anlässlich seines 65. Geburtstages am 18. Februar 1997*, Münster.
- SULLIVAN, B. B. 1979: *Sumerian and Akkadian Sentence Structure in Old Babylonian Literary Bilingual Texts*, Ph.D. Dissertation, Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion. Ann Arbor, MI.
- TINNEY, S. 1999: “On the Curricular Setting of Sumerian Literature,” *Iraq* 61: 159–172.
- VANSTIPHOUT, H. L. J. 1978: “Lipit-Eštar’s Praise in the Edubba,” *JCS* 30: 33–61.
- 1979: “How Did They Learn Sumerian?,” *JCS* 31:118–126.

Dylan R. JOHNSON <dylan.johnson@uzh.ch>
University of Zürich, Zürich (SWITZERLAND)

108) The expression lu ga l - (1) a - ni - še₃ - a m₃, “it is (the loss/responsibility) of his owner alone” in the Old Babylonian school texts — The so-called warranty against flight, which occurs in some Old Babylonian contracts –recording antichretic pledges, or the hiring of workers¹⁾– refers to the owner’s responsibility for the permanent absence of the slave, whether due to flight (b a - z a h_{2/3}), death (b a - u š₂), or disappearance (u₂ - g u b a - a n - d e₂).²⁾ It is sometimes accompanied by warranty against delinquency, i.e. a temporary loss of service due to work stoppage (ĝ a₂ - l a b a - a n - d a g), or illness (t u - r a b a - a n - t u). In loan contracts with slaves as a pledge these clauses were intended to protect the creditor, and it is the debtor (i.e. the slave’s owner) who had to compensate the permanent or temporary loss of his pledge in the following ways: through payment of interest, compensation of the wages of the defaulting pledge, or repayment of the interest as well as the principal of the loan, thus terminating the loan (see Veenhof 2002–2005: 444; Skaist 1994: 213; Kienast 1978, I: 116–118).

Instead, in two Sumerian model contracts (TMH 11 1 §12 = Spada 2018: 33–34, and Education 180 = Wilson 2008: 272–273), the responsibility of the owner in the event of the permanent or temporary absence of his slave –given as a pledge or a hired worker– is expressed with a formula which, to the best of my knowledge, occurs only in school documentation (as shown below), stating that the loss and the responsibility “is of his/her (= of the slave’s) owner alone”, lu ga l - (1) a - ni - še₃ - a m₃. This expression, therefore, establishes the owner’s liability in a generic way, without specifying how he will have to compensate the creditor/hirer for the loss suffered. This probably indicates that the compensation was decided while the real-life contract was drawn up, based on the current situation. Therefore, the expression lu ga l - (1) a - ni - še₃ - a m₃ seems to have the same alluding function as the notation lu₂ - ki - in - im - ma - ti - bi - mu - bi, which in model contracts stands in place of the list of witnesses and of the date.

The first contract, whose central part is missing, likely records the hire of a slave:³⁾

TMH 11 1 §12 (side C ii 29–iii 22)

- 1 l saĝ-nita₂
 2 ¹ir₁₁-i⁸tar₂
 3 mu-ni-im
 4 arad₂ e-ri-ib-AN
 5 ki e-ri-ib-AN
ca. 10 lines missing
 16 šu a[?]-ra[?]ab-ti[?]¹
 17 ^lip-qt₂-ša
 18 ninda an-ni-ib-gu₇-e
 19 e-ri-ib-AN
 20 lugal-a-ni
 21 tug₂ an-ni-ib₂-mu₄-mu₄
 22 tukum-bi
 23 arad₂-da-a-bi
 24 ba-uš₂ / ba-ra[?]zah₂¹
 25 u₂-gu ba-an-ra[?]de₂¹
 26 u₃ tu-ra / ba-an-tu
 27 ^lugal¹-a-ni-še₃-ra[?]am₃¹

¹⁻⁵ A man named Warad-Ištar, (who is) the slave of Erīb-ilum, from Erīb-ilum... (*ca. 10 lines missing*)... ¹⁶ has received? ¹⁷⁻²¹ Ipquša will provide him with food, (whereas) Erīb-ilum, his owner, will provide him with clothing. ²²⁻²⁷ If that slave dies, flees, disappears, or falls ill, it is (the loss/responsibility) of his owner alone.”

Textual notes

16. This line, tentatively reconstructed as šu a[?]-ra[?]ab-ti[?]¹, could indicate an advance payment received by Erīb-ilum, Warad-Ištar’s owner, from his hirer Ipquša. This would also justify the final clause that makes the owner liable in the event of the permanent or temporary absence of his slave.

17–21. In these lines, it is established who has to provide for the needs of the slave during his period of service at Ipquša: the hirer bears the responsibility for his food (ninda an-ni-ib-gu₇-e), and the slave’s owner for his clothing (tug₂ an-ni-ib₂-mu₄-mu₄). This fair division of responsibilities between the hirer (or the creditor in the case of loans) and the slave’s owner is found in other model contracts,⁴⁾ but not in the lexical series *Ana ittišu*, where it reads: lu₂-ḫu⁸ĝ₂-ĝa₂-a-ni / ninda i₃-gu₇-e / tug₂ am₃-mu₄-mu₄ // a-gi-ir-[šu] / a-ka-lam u₂-ša₂-k[al] / u₃ šu-ba-ta u₂-lab-ba-[aš], “he (i.e. the hirer) will provide his hireling with food and clothing” (*Ai VI iii 18–20*). This same situation seems to be found in real-life contracts of hire, and in pledge documents, where the hirer (or the creditor) provides for the needs of the hireling or the pledge. However, Eichler (1973: 27–28) speculates that the rarity of an explicit support clause in the contracts may be explained as follows: the hirer/creditor always bears the responsibility of feeding the person in his service, and in a few instances he also accepts responsibility for clothing him, a primary obligation which would normally be incumbent upon the slave’s owner. Therefore, Eichler concludes that the presence of the support clause in only some contracts may be due to the unusual undertaking by the hirer/creditor to feed and clothe the slave.

22–27. The last line had been read and interpreted differently in Spada 2018: 33,⁵⁾ and it must be corrected there. This new reading is based on a similar clause found in a source of the Old Babylonian lexical list from Nippur ki-u-lu-ti-n-bi-še₃, Ist Ni 10307⁶⁾ (recently discussed in Spada 2021), where one can read:

- Di 1' [tuku]m-bi / ba-uš₂
 2' ^ltukum¹-bi / ba-zah₂
 3' tukum-bi / u₂-gu ba-an-de₂
 4' tukum-bi / ur-maḫ-e gu₇-a
 5' lugal-^lla[?]-ni-še₃-am₃

“[I]f he (i.e. the slave) dies, if he flees, if he disappears, if he is devoured by a lion, it is (the loss/responsibility) of his owner alone.”

In this context, the expression lugal-la-ni-še₃-am₃ is the Sumerian counterpart of the Akkadian *ana bēlišuma* which appears in the apodosis of § 244 in the Code of Hammurapi.⁷⁾ This provision establishes that a renter bears no liability for an ox or a donkey killed by a lion: *šumma awīlum alpam imēram ṭgurma ina šerim nēšum iddūkšu ana bēlišuma*, “if a man rents an ox or a donkey, and a lion kills it in the open country, it is (the loss) of the owner alone.”

We also find *lu gal - (1) a - ni - še₃ - a m₃* in another school text, a proverb which reads: *ša ḥ₂ šu a m₃ - kar - kar - re / i - gi₄ - in - zu ni₂ - te - ni - še₃ / lu gal - a - ni - še₃ - a m₃*, “He snatches things (like) a pig: as if (he does this) for himself, instead (he does this) for his master” (UET 6 275).⁸⁾

The second model contract containing this expression records a loan –most likely of silver, although this information has not been preserved on the tablet– with a female slave as a pledge:

Education 180 § 1 (obv. i 1'–19')

unknown number of lines missing

- 1' *ṛmu[?] 1[?]-e x x¹*
- 2' *ṛgeme₂-iš₈-tar₂ geme₂[?] a[?]-ba[?]-qar[?]*
- 3' *kug-ta gub-ba*
- 4' *ib₂-ta-gub*
- 5' *ud 1-še₃ a₂-ni-še₃*
- 6' *1(ban₂) zid₂-ta-am₃*
- 7' *a-ar₃-re*
- 8' *id₂-da*
- 9' *a-ra₂ 2-kam*
- 10' *<<a>> pu₂ a-ra₂ 3-kam*
- 11' *a mi-ib-si-si*
- 12' *giri₃ na₂-a*
- 13' *ab-luḥ-ḥa*
- 14' *kiḡ₂-gi₄<-a>-še₃*
- 15' *al-du₃-e*
- 16' *tukum-bi*
- 17' *ba-uš₂ u₃ ba-zaḥ₃*
- 18' *u₂-gu ba-an-de₂*
- 19' *lu gal - še₃:am₃*

“(Beginning of the contract missing)... 2'–4' Amat-Ištar, the female slave of Abaqar[?], will serve as a pledge. 5'–15' As her daily chores she will grind ten *sila* of flour; she will fill (a container) with water (taken) twice from the river and three times from the well; she will clean (the creditor's) feet in (his) bed (i.e. before he goes to bed); she will run errands outside the household (lit: she will act as a messenger). 16'–19' If she dies or flees, (or) disappears, it is (the loss/responsibility) of the owner alone”.

Textual notes

5'–14'. In these lines there is a list of the tasks Amat-Ištar has to perform in the creditor's house. These are some of the household chores normally assigned to the domestic female slaves: grinding flour, taking water from the river and the well, cleaning the landlord's feet, and running errands outside the household for her master (see Seri 2011: 55–57).

6'–7'. The task of grinding barley to make flour is also found in other school and real-life documents.⁹⁾

8'–11'. A similar clause also occurs in *Ai VI iii 13–15: id₂-da a-ra₂ 2 / pu₂-da a-ra₂ 3 / a-ta in-su₃-e // i-na id₂ [...] / i-na pu₂ [...] / i-na a-[meš] i-[sal-laḥ-šū]*, and probably in another model contract.¹⁰⁾

12'–13'. Washing the master's feet is another task that often appears in model contracts and real-life letters.¹¹⁾ Apparently, here it is specified that the feet will have to be cleaned before the master goes to bed.

14'–15'. A similar expression, *kiḡ₂-gi₄-a-še₃ al-DU*, had been interpreted as “he (i.e. the slave) will perform the (house)-work” in TMH 11 5 §1 (= Spada 2018: 61–62). The choice to translate the term *kiḡ₂-gi₄-a* as “house-work” had been made in order to distinguish it from the field-work mentioned in the previous line (*kiḡ₂ a-ša g₄-ga al-ak-e*, “he will do the field-work”). However, this solution did not explain the presence of the terminative *-še₃*. Another possibility would be to translate this expression, here and in TMH 11 5 §1, as: “(s)he will act as a messenger”. In his study on Babylonian slaves, as they appear in over 300 Old Babylonian letters, S. Richardson argues that their primary economic functions had to do with information and credit, rather than with labor in the agricultural sector. He emphasizes their role as messengers, stating that “at a pedestrian level, we might say that all this indicates that messaging simply *was* the work of slaves, rather than bundling sheaves, milling grain, etc. But by ‘messaging’ I mean the cluster of functions related to information transfer, transport, credit *and* decision-making” (Richardson 2019: 27). Thus, here it could refer to the slave's messaging capacity for the benefit of the temporary master.¹²⁾

19'. *lu gal - a m₃ - še₃* is here surely a mistake by the scribe for the expected *lu gal - (a - ni) - še₃ - a m₃*.

Notes

Abbreviations follow CDLI's list (https://cdli.ox.ac.uk/wiki/abbreviations_for_assyriology, accessed November 8, 2021) unless otherwise indicated.

1. The flight and delinquency clauses also occur in surety contracts, making sureties –sometimes identified as the slave's relatives– liable to pay compensation to the owner for his loss. See e.g. the twenty-nine surety contracts in the archive of Balaḡunamḡe of Larsa (for which cf. Van de Mieroop 1987 and, more recently, Spada 2021), or some contracts from Mari (ARM 8 63–65, 68, 70).

2. In Balaḡunamḡe's surety contracts the “if clause” –according to the terminology in Van de Mieroop 1987– can contain other much rarer expressions which, as far as I know, do not appear in other contracts outside this archive: e₂-g a l kabtam u₃ rabiām (e₂-m i₂) iše''i, “(if) he seeks the palace, an influential or important person (or the women's quarters)”; e₂-g a l kabtam u₃ rabiām isaḡḡur, “(if) he turns to the palace, to an influential or important person”; nakrum ileqqešū, “(if) the enemy takes him”; u r -m a ḡ idākšū/ikkalšū (Sum. i₃-g u₇), “(if) a lion kills/eats him.”

3. I exclude here the possibility that it is a loan contract with a slave as a pledge, since we would expect the contract to begin with the amount of silver (or barley) lent.

4. Cf. e.g. N 4976 (unpubl., see OBMC: <http://oracc.org/obmc/>), and IB 1567 (= Wilcke 2018: 389 no. 613) o. i 1–23. The edition of these model contracts will be offered in a study (currently in preparation) by the present writer.

5. ¹a₂²l-ni- /še₃ 'a-r a₂ 2¹-[k a m], “for his work a second time (he, i.e. Erīb-illum, will give to Iḡuša a second slave)”.

6. Cf. DCCLT, <http://oracc.iaas.upenn.edu/dcclt/P230150/html> (accessed November 8, 2021), where line D i 5' is read differently: lu g a l -x i₃-ḡ u ḡ²-a m₃.

7. See also the expression nam-lugal-la-ni-še₃ in YOS 1 28 §9', understood by Roth (1980: 138) “as the Sumerian equivalent of *ana bēlišuma* in LH §244.” For the parallelism between the Sumerian ...-še₃-a m₃ and the Akkadian *ana ...-ma* see also the grammatical list OBGT I 322–323, 536–538, 731, 735, 737 (= MSL 4: 49, 53–54, 57–58). For the equivalence in the usage of the Sumerian enclitic -a m₃ and the Akkadian enclitic -ma in focus-marking constructions, see Karahashi 2008: 85–91.

8. A slightly different version is found in TMH NF 3 45 obv. 4: š a ḡ₂-g i n₇ š u a b -¹kar¹-kar-re / i -g i₄-e [n -z u] / n i₂-te-a-ni lugal-¹a¹-ni-še₃-a m₃-e-še. Cf. Alster 1997: 166, Peterson 2019: 576; see also Wilcke 1968: 236.

9. Model contracts: N 4976 obv. i 5'–7': ud 1-e a₂-ni-še₃ / l (ban₂) še-ta-am₃ / in-ar₃-re; UET 5 366 obv. 9–11: ud 1-kam / l (ban₂) še-ta-am₃ / zid₂ ar₃-ra; ZA 101 §33: 10–11 (= Spada 2011: 231): l (ban₂) dabin-ta-am₃ / ud 1-e i₃-ar₃-e. Real-life documents: CT 33 32 obv. 5-6: a-na sa-ma-di-im / a-na mu 1-kam i-gur-šū; PBS 8/2 188 obv. 6: a-na ḡAR i-gu-ur-ši (for this reading see Stol 1993–1997: 174); SVJAD 38 obv. 4–6: a-na ši-pi₂-ir sa-ma-di-im / a-na iti 2-kam in-ḡu ḡ²-ḡ a₂ / l (barig) ni ḡ₂-ar₃-ra-ta-am₃ i-sa-am-mu-du.

10. In ZA 101 §33: 12 instead of 1/3 g i [ḡ₄ x] ¹u d¹ 1-kam, read id₂-da [a-r] a₂ 1²-kam.

11. Model contracts: CUSAS 43 38 §3: 5–6: ḡ u b₂-ni su-lu ḡ (cf. Spada 2019: 78: “it should be noted, however, that the term *feet* is expressed here by the Sumerian ḡ u b₂, which is not found in any other (model) contract, as far as I know”); UET 5 366 obv. 12: g i r i₃-ni lu ḡ -ḡ a. Real-life letters: CT 2 44 obv. 14–16: u₃ il-ta-ni / še₂₀-pi₂ ta-ra-am-saḡ-il₂ / i-mi-si₂-i; CT 48 57 obv. 9: še₂₀-pi₂-ša i-me-e-si₂; ARM 10 29 16–17: [l g e] m e₂ š a še₂₀-pi₂-ia i-me-es-su₂-u₂ / [u₂-ul i] d-di-nam.

12. Accordingly, the expression in Ai VI iii 16–17, u₃ ki ḡ₂-g i₄-a / ba-ab-tum₃-mu // u₃ ši-ip-ra ub-bal (translated by Landsberger in MSL 1: 83 as “und den Arbeitsauftrag wird er bekommen”) could be understood as “(s)he will bring the message”.

Bibliography

- ALSTER, B. (1997) *Proverbs of Ancient Sumer. The World's Earliest Proverb Collections*, Volume 1, Bethesda.
- EICHLER, B. L. (1973) *Indenture at Nuzi: The Personal Tidennūtu Contract and Its Mesopotamian Analogues*, YNER 5, New Haven.
- KARAHASHI, F. (2008) “Sumerian enclitic -ām and Akkadian enclitic -ma: from copula to focus marker”, in R. D. Biggs, J. Myers, M. T. Roth (eds.), *Proceedings of the 51st Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale held at the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago, July 18–22, 2005*, SAOC 62, Chicago, 85–91.
- KIENAST, B. (1978) *Die altbabylonischen Briefe und Urkunden aus Kisurra*, FAOS 2, Wiesbaden.
- PETERSON, J. (2019) *The Literary Sumerian of Old Babylonian Ur: UET 6/1–3 in Transliteration and Translation with Select Commentary, Part II: UET 6/2*, CDLP 16.
- RICHARDSON, S. (2019) “Walking Capital. The Economic Function and Social Location of Babylonian Servitude”, *Journal of Global Slavery* 4, 1–58.
- ROTH, M. T. (1980) “The Scholastic Exercise ‘Laws about Rented Oxen’”, *JCS* 32, 127–146.

- SERI, A. (2011) “Domestic Female Slaves During the Old Babylonian Period”, in L. Culberson (ed.), *Slaves and Households in the Near East*, OIS 7, Chicago, 49–67.
- SKAIST, A. (1994) *The Old Babylonian Loan Contract: Its History and Geography*, Ramat Gan.
- SPADA, G. (2011) “A Handbook from the Eduba’a: An Old Babylonian Collection of Model Contracts”, *ZA* 101, 204–245.
- (2018) *Sumerian Model Contracts from the Old Babylonian Period in the Hilprecht Collection Jena*, TMH 11, Wiesbaden.
- (2019) “Old Babylonian Model Contracts and Related Texts”, in A. R. George, G. Spada, *Old Babylonian Texts in the Schøyen Collection, Part Two, School Letters, Model Contracts and Related Texts*, CUSAS 43, University Park, 97–199.
- (2021) “If a Lion Eats Him...”, *ArOr* 89 (in press).
- STOL, M. (1993–1997) “Miete B.I. Altbabylonisch”, *RIA* 8, 162–174.
- VAN DE MIEROOP, M. (1987) “The Archive of Balmunamḫe”, *AfO* 34, 1–29.
- VEENHOF, K. R. (2002–2005) “Pfand”, *RIA* 10, 439–449.
- WILCKE, C. (1968) “Das modale Adverb i-gi₄-in-zu im Sumerischen”, *JNES* 27, 229–242.
- (2018) *Keilschrifttexte aus ISIN–IŠĀN BAḤRIYĀT. Ergebnisse der Ausgrabungen der Deutschen Forschungsgemeinschaft unter der Schirmherrschaft der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, ABAW NF 143, München.
- WILSON, M. (2008) *Education in the Earliest Schools. Cuneiform Manuscripts in the Cotsen Collection*, Los Angeles.

Gabriella SPADA <gabriella.spada@uniroma1.it>
Sapienza – Università di Roma (ITALY)

109) Noch einmal zu MARV I 27 + III 54 — Die Verwaltungsurkunde MARV I 27+III 54 vom 8. des Monats Kalmartu im Eponymat des Aššur-zēra-iddina, die Details einer königlichen Schenkung an Bauleute zur Zeit des assyrischen Königs Tukultī-Ninurta I. (1233-1197 v. Chr.) behandelt, ist an anderer Stelle bereits durch den Vf. im Zusammenhang mit der Untersuchung von Kompetenzbereichen innerhalb der mittelassyrischen Verwaltungshierarchie ausführlich gewürdigt worden.¹⁾ Eine vollständige Bearbeitung in Umschrift, Übersetzung und Kommentar wurde aber in neuerer Zeit durch H. Freydanck vorgelegt.²⁾ Er weist hier u. a. auf eine unvollständig erhaltene „Zeitbestimmung“³⁾ in Z. 30f. hin und widerspricht dabei zurecht der früheren Auffassung des Vf., der Anlass für das „Ehrengeschenk“ (*rīmuttu*)⁴⁾ bezöge sich auf die Fertigstellung des Marduk-Heiligtums in Kār-Tukultī-Ninurta.⁵⁾ Dass dort ein Tempel des babylonischen Gottes tatsächlich existiert hat, geht aus einer anderen Stelle des Textes klar hervor. Die Arbeitstrupps und Vorleute erhalten ihre aus Wolle bestehende Zuwendung des Herrschers aber aufgrund ihrer Tätigkeit im königlichen Palast, so dass ein Bezug zum Tempelbau in der Tat konstruiert wirkt. H. Freydanck liest:

30 ..i+na u₄-mi LUGAL x []
31 ú-šal-li-mu-ni i-tu-r[a-ni]
„...am Tag, (als) der König... [...] vollzogen hat (und) zurückgekehrt (ist)“

Im Kommentar wird vorgeschlagen, die „Zeitbestimmung“ in Zusammenhang mit dem „Vollzug einer kultischen Handlung“ zu sehen, die „in Assur bzw. Libbi-āli“ vollzogen wird, ehe der König in die Residenz Kār-Tukultī-Ninurta zurückkehrt.⁶⁾ Indem er versucht, in Z. 30 zu ^{u[du]?}SISKUR^{mes} (-te ša)...] zu ergänzen, denkt er offenbar an eine Situation wie sie etwa durch die „Zeitbestimmung“ in MARV I 10 dokumentiert ist.⁷⁾ Nach der Autographie⁸⁾ ist eine entsprechende Lesung, selbst mit Fragezeichen versehen, ausgeschlossen, so dass es hilfreich erscheint, sie anhand des vorzüglichen Fotos in der Datenbank von CDLI zu überprüfen.⁹⁾ Es zeigt sich, dass die Freydanck’sche Umzeichnung, die Vf. zu der Lesung É¹ [] geführt hatte (s. Anm. 6), die Verhältnisse auf der Tafel recht genau wiedergibt. „UDU“ scheidet somit in jedem Fall aus. Das beschädigte Zeichen am Bruch dürfte eher *ni-* zu lesen sein. Dieser Befund ermöglicht einen Ergänzungsvorschlag für die Zeile, die dem Kontext voll und ganz gerecht wird und zudem den Verweis auf die Rückkehr des Königs besser erklärt als die ca. 3 km lange „Rückreise“ von Assur nach Kār-Tukultī-Ninurta.