



State Archives of Assyria Bulletin
Volume XXX Issue 1 (2024)

ABL 307: A REGIONAL COLLECTION OF APPEALS TO THE KING?*

Mikko Luukko

Abstract

This paper presents an edition of the partially broken tablet ABL 307 (K 1078), a unique Neo-Assyrian text whose classification has been elusive. The tablet is neither a letter nor a royal decision, but most likely a regional memorandum from Nuhub (location uncertain) with appeals to the king. The article also discusses the structure, possible date and personal names of the tablet with extensive textual notes.

Keywords: Appeals — crimes — Esarhaddon — Nuhub — Sargon II — witnesses

The fascinating document ABL 307 (K 1078) has not been republished in transliteration and translation since Leroy Waterman's first and now hopelessly outdated edition before SAA 23 appeared.¹ This state of affairs was probably due to the unusual nature of the document among Neo-Assyrian texts. Since this difficult document has been variously described as a letter, a court decision,² or a court record,³ we attempt to determine its genre more precisely, if possible, and to discuss its possible date. In the *Prosopography of the Neo-Assyrian Empire* (PNA), all entries on ABL 307 state that the document dates from the reign of Sargon II.⁴ However, this assumption has not been substantiated anywhere, and I would be more inclined to date it to the late reign of Esarhaddon with the help of some other documents.

* I would like to thank Simo Parpola for his help in interpreting this unique document, and Simonetta Ponchia for reading an early draft of this article and making many valuable suggestions. Access to the database of the Neo-Assyrian Text Corpus Project was a great help in the preparation of this article, as it contains a transliteration of the document on which the later SAA 23 edition is based. A high-quality digital photograph of K 1078 is available, for example, at https://www.britishmuseum.org/collection/object/W_K-1078.

1. Waterman 1930, 212f., now also known as SAA 23 279.
2. For a court decision, see, e.g., SAA 6 264 (beginning with the words *dēnu ša sartinnu ana PN ēmedūni*) and SAA 6 265, decided by the vizier (*šukkallu*).
3. ABL 307 has been interpreted as a letter repeatedly in PNA (1/I, 203f., s.v. Aššur-našir no. 7; 1/II, 409a, s.v. Ezbu no. 5; 2/II, 942a s.v. Nergal-ašared no. 3; and 3/I, 1017b, s.v. Quia no. 3), also so by Wells 2004, 131. But see Watanabe 1985, 151 according to whom “ABL 307: K.1078 (nA) ist kein Königsbrief”, and Luukko 2004, 206, n. 18, “ABL 307 is not a proper letter but a royal decision”.
4. See the PNA references in the previous note.

In what follows, I will first present the text in transliteration and translation, followed by a brief commentary discussing its main points. It should be stressed, however, that this document still contains several controversial points for which only speculative interpretations can be offered. This is mainly due to the fact that a considerable part of the document has been broken off and several lines are only fragmentary.

ABL 307 (K 1078)

Transliteration

Obverse

1. *a-bat* LUGAL *ina* UGU-*hi* ^m*aš-šur*–PAB
 2. ARAD *šá* LÚ*.GAR.KUR URU.*nu-hu-ba-a-a*
 3. *ša* ŠU.2 ^m*qu-u-a* LÚ*.*šá-ziq¹-ni*
 4. ^m*ez-bu* ARAD *šá* LÚ.GAL–A.BA
 5. *ina* IGI-*šú* UDU.MEŠ-*šu i-ra-’a*
 6. UDU.MEŠ-*šu* LÚ.GAR.KUR *it-ti-ši*
 7. *šu-ú da-a-ni mi-ha-ar-šú¹*
 8. *ú-se-ri-bi ina* É-*šú i-ša-bat*
 9. NÍG.GUB *ša* SIG₄.MEŠ *i-sa-kan-šú*
 10. GIŠ.*ha-tu* ‘*x x*’ [*x x*]x-‘*ka²*’
 11. ^mSHUŠ–URU.[*šá*–URU² *x x x x*]
 12. *i-si*–[*x x x x x*]
- rest broken away

Reverse

Beginning broken away

- 1'. ŠE *x*[*x x x x x x*]
- 2'. *ina* ŠÀ-*bi* [*x x x x x*]
- 3'. *ik-ta-r*[*a-ar x x x ma-a²*]
- 4'. *mu-ki-nu-te-šú* [*ina* IGI]
- 5'. LUGAL *šup¹-ra mu-ki-nu*
- 6'. *ša is-si-šú ú-kan-nu-ni*
- 7'. ^m*bé-su-a-a* URU.ŠÀ–URU-*ia*
- 8'. *ba-ti-qu-šú a-ki* MAN
- 9'. *iq-bu-u-ni i-ki-bu-su-ni*
- 10'. ^{md}UTU–AD–PAB URU.*nu-uh-ba-ia*
- 11'. A.ŠÀ *šá* ^mU.GUR–MAŠ *ip-tu-ga*
- 12'. ^mU.GUR–MAŠ *ma-a a-ta-a*

Top Edge

- 13'. A.ŠÀ *ta-pu-ga-ni*
- 14'. *ma-a ha-du-a-a*
- 15'. *i-ka-bu-su*

Left Side

1. *ma-a a-lik 7-šú* MAN *ina* UGU-*hi-iá* m[*u-hur*]
2. DUG₄.DUG₄ *an-ni-u* MAN *lu-ka-ni* LÚ*¹. [x (x)]

Translation

(1) A “king’s word” concerning Aššur-našir, a servant of the prefect of the Nuhubeans, in custody of Quia, a bearded courtier. (4) Ezbu, a servant of the chief scribe, was grazing his sheep in his presence, (when) the prefect took away his sheep. (7) He made his equal enter into his house by force and imprisoned (him there), setting up for him the builder’s hod. (10) *A (shepherd’s) staff* ... [...] ... (11) Ubru-[*Libbali*] (12) ... [.....]

(Break)

(Rev. 1') *grain* [.....] (2') there [.....] (3') he thr[ew ... and said]: (4') “Send his witnesses [into the presence of] the king!” (5') The witness who testified with him, Bessu'aya, a man from Assur, his informer, when he mentioned the king and trod (*the field*). (10') Šamaš-abu-ušur, a Nuhubean, took by force the field of Nergal-ašared. (12') Nergal-ašared said: “Why did you appropriate my field?” (14') He said: “They tread it at my pleasure! Go and a[ppeal] to the king seven times because of me!” Let the king settle this case. (Side 2) The [...].

Structure of the Text

Lines 1–11(ff.): The text is labelled as a royal order, at least nominally, and the protagonists are introduced: Aššur-našir, the defendant, and Ezbu, the plaintiff. Their superiors are also mentioned, and Aššur-našir’s crimes are specified.

r.1'–3': Fragmentary, but possibly outlining another crime in Nuhub.

r.3'–5': Apparently quoting an official who wants to send his witnesses to the king. Probably not those of Ezbu, as this may be a different case.

r.5'–9': A witness called Bessu'aya, who is said to be his informer, is introduced; he is probably one of the witnesses (to be) sent to the king. An appeal to the king seems to be implied (“when he mentioned the king”).

r.10'–15': Another case of a dispute (or perhaps more likely a continuation of previous lines) over a field is presented. The parties (Šamaš-abu-ušur and Nergal-ašared) are introduced.

s.1–2: Nergal-ašared asks for someone to act as his representative to present his case to the king. The document ends with a statement, possibly by its anonymous author, saying that the king should settle this case.

Only in lines r.12', 14'e, s.1, we have an extant *mā* for introducing direct speech, but the end of r.3' may also have included it (now restored). It has been suggested that the obverse and reverse should be changed with one another (see fn. 9 below), but if we make this change, then, side 1 (= the left edge of the tablet) with *mā*, would directly follow the now broken obverse which may not have contained dialogue but only the narrative at the end.

Also, the sequence of *hadû'āya* / *ikabbusū* / *abat šarri ina muhhi Aššur-našir* ... may appear very difficult to explain both syntactically and as a logical flow of information in the document by suddenly introducing new people.

Commentary

The tablet now measures 6.0×4.0×2.3 cm, its width and thickness are fully preserved, but as a lower part of the tablet is missing, it is slightly below its original height. Originally it may have contained ca. 36–38 lines in total: the obverse may have contained at most ca. 14–15 lines, followed almost certainly by three lines at the bottom edge (as on the top of the tablet); the reverse, which now contains twelve lines, is correspondingly missing ca. two to three lines, followed by three well-preserved lines at the top of the tablet. The left side of the document ends with two more lines, which do not quite reach the end, but not much is missing. We lose the narrative after line 9 on the obverse, only to find it again on the reverse, line 4'. Therefore, we have no certainty about the odd ten lines in the middle of the document. The tablet is clearly of high quality: very well formed, coherently written, with deeply incised wedges.

Obv. 1–3: It is well known that Neo-Assyrian royal letters regularly begin with *abat šarri ana* PN / (professional) TITLE “The king’s word to PN/TITLE” and not with *abat šarri ina muhhi* PN, to be interpreted here as “A ‘king’s word’ concerning PN”.⁵ In other words, since *abat šarri ana* is deeply rooted as the opening formula of Neo-Assyrian royal letters and is not interchangeable with any similar expression, it would be a violation of letter etiquette to use *abat šarri ina muhhi*. Even if it is true that *ina muhhi*, like *ana*, has the meaning of “to”, they are mainly interchangeable in connection with some of the most common verbs, such as *ana/ina muhhi ... alāku*, “to go to”, *ana/ina muhhi ... šapāru*, “to send, write to”, and *ana/ina muhhi ... ubālu*, “to bring; (Š stem) send to”. However, since ABL 307 is not an ordinary letter or an exponent of any other type of known document, its nature is unique, although this has led to misinterpretations (see fn. 3 above). Its uniqueness or “oddity” may be, at least in part, the reason why the document was not published in the *State Archives of Assyria* before the final volume of the series. Stylistically and syntactically, a relatively close comparison to these first lines of the document can be found in TH 2, 5–r.2; it reads, *a-bat LUGAL ša DU-ka[n-ni] / ina UGU LÚ*.qe-e-p[i] / ša ŠU^{md}MAŠ-E a-na LÚ*.EN.NAM / i-din-ni*, “(PN ...) has delivered to the governor (of Guzana) the king’s order which has come; it concerns the royal delegate under Inurta-iqbi” (see now also Dornauer 2014, 33).

1–4: These lines introduce the protagonists of the tablet (or at least of its first case): Aššur-našir and Ezbu; they are respectively said to be the servants of two high-ranking officials: the prefect of the Nuhubeans and the chief scribe. The way in which Aššur-našir is introduced is complicated; for a somewhat similar introduction of a person see, e.g., SAAS 5 14, 2–6 (slightly corrected by Radner 1997–98, 383).

5. In this paper, we can leave aside a group of diplomatic letters which begin with *tuppi/IM RN₁ šar māt-Aššur ana RN₂ LUGAL GN*, “A tablet from RN₁, king of Assyria, to RN₂, king of GN”.

2: Here, exceptionally, LÚ*.GAR.KUR is further modified by a rather unknown geographical name with a nisbe ending, URU.nu-hu-ba-a-a, “the prefect of the Nuhubeans” (a slightly shorter spelling of this name, also with a nisbe ending, appears in r.10). The NA sources mostly use the reading LÚ.GAR.KUR with a geographical name without a nisbe ending, meaning “the governor of GN”. For the interpretation here, however, see also Bagg 2017, 470.

3: The clause *ša qātē Qūia ša-ziqni*, “in custody of Quia, a bearded courtier”, may give us a clue as to the whereabouts of Aššur-našir at the time of the incident, when he was probably arrested and held in the palace complex.

4–6: The fact that the chief scribe and his servant are mentioned in connection with the sheep may have something to do with the role of the former in ritual and/or sacrificial divination. For the presence of the chief scribe in Assur see, e.g., Luukko 2007, 252 (especially n. 163). Note also that Sargon’s chief scribe was from Assur, cf. *ibid.* 230 (n. 17). Presumably, the chief scribe was part of the king’s entourage when the ruler stayed in Assur at the end of the year for the New Year celebrations. On these festivities in Assur and the king’s stay there, see Maul 2000, 389–402.

6–7: *da’āni/da’annatti*, “by force, violently, coercively”, is expressed elliptically instead of *ša da’āni* (SAA 16 65, r.9’; SAA 19 89, r.12; 127, r.6’; these two passages from the Nimrud Letters were misinterpreted in CTN 5, 56f.; 210f.), or *kī da’āni* (SAA 2 6, 177, cf. Watanabe 1987, 182b *sub* § 15 177). A servant of the chief scribe is probably not equal to the prefect of the Nuhubeans, and thus Aššur-našir, a servant of the prefect of the Nuhubeans, must be the real subject of these lines.

8: Here *i-ša-bat* is the 3rd person masculine singular perfect derived from *šabātu*, the spelling itself is ambiguous as it can also stand for the 3rd person masculine singular present. Interestingly, we have a sequence of four perfect forms in close succession: *ittiši*, *ussērībi*, *iššabat*, and *issakanšu*; they all have the same subject: nominally the prefect of the Nuhubeans, but Aššur-našir acts as his representative.

9: CAD K 496b reads and translates NĪG.DU *ša libnāte issakanšu* “he imposed the brick basket upon him”. For the dubious use of NĪG.GUB in this case, see *ibid.* 497. The translation may or may not seem entirely satisfactory, but the idea seems to be that a man forces another person to work for him. We have chosen “the builder’s hod” instead of “the brick basket”.

10: GIŠ.ha-tu, “sceptre, staff, stick”, seems a more likely reading than the strange *pa-ha-tu* given by Waterman 1930, 212, which cannot mean, for example, a “province”. Regarding the first sign, it is not uncommon for the horizontal tails of a sign to be longer than in their standardised forms in sign lists; in this case, the two horizontal wedges cross over a vertical wedge. The usual spelling of *haṭtu* is GIŠ.PA, but see, e.g., GIŠ.haṭ-tu SAA 13 34, r.3 (CT 53 41); *haṭ-tu* SAA 22 10, 6’ (ABL 998); and GIŠ.haṭ-ti SAA 3 47, 3 (BA 5 657). In this context, see especially lines 5–6, our conjectural translation, a “(shepherd’s) staff” may make good sense. The signs that follow this word seem uncertain, though, one might

read *ina šá-kan x* [x] ‘x-ka’/[U]GU, “in placing [...] on”. The first sign may be *ina*, but whether it is followed by a *šá* is uncertain. I can tentatively suggest ‘SAG’⁶, but there are many other possibilities. The last sign of the line is less visible than in Harper’s copy, but it may well be ‘ka’ or [U]GU.

11: Since the crime probably took place not too far from Assur, Ubru-[*Libbali*] is the most likely restoration. However, the determinative URU is also attested in the following personal names with Ubru as the first element in the Neo-Assyrian sources: Ubru-Harran, Ubru-Kalhi and Ubru-Ninua, but geographically they may be a poorer match.

12: Since we have *is-si-šú* in r.6’, it seems unlikely, though not excluded, that *i-si-[x]* here stands for the preposition *issi*, “with”, followed by a personal suffix. Instead, a verbal form or a noun can be expected, and possibilities include, amongst others, *i-si-[qí]*, “too[k]; *i-si-[sī]*, “rea[d out]”; *i-si-[ta-a-ti]*, “tow[ers]”, etc.

Rev. 1’: Perhaps read ŠE.NU[MUN’ = *zar’u*, “seed(s); arable land, sown field”.

2’: Alternatively, “in [...]”.

3’: Or “*pile[d up]*”, “*lai[d]*”, the former especially if the correct interpretation is “seed(s)” in r.1’. The broken end of this line may have contained *mā* (restored) or *muk*, as the following two lines are part of the author’s direct speech or a quotation of someone else’s speech (cf. r.12, 14, and s.1).

4’–5’: In the Neo-Assyrian period the word *mukinnu*, “(testifying) witness”, is used almost exclusively in Neo-Babylonian letters that concern disputes between officials (see SAA 18 54; 83; 121; 123; 160⁶). In a Neo-Assyrian letter, SAA 1 244, 4, the word is restored, and thus appears somewhat uncertain, but witnesses, written IGI.MEŠ-šú and probably to be transcribed as *šībūtīšu*, are, e.g., to be produced in SAA 14 200–201 (no. 201 is the inner tablet of no. 200). Usually *šupra*, including the ventive ending -a, means “write/send me”, but the correct restoration at the end of r.4’ is in all likelihood [*a-na*], [*ina* IGI] or [*ina* UGU], cf. e.g. SAA 5 81, r.2, [*ina* UGU], cf. SAA 5 204, 11–12, or [*ina* IGI/*pa-an*], having all the same meaning with *šapāru*, “send his witnesses [to/into the presence of] the king!”. These witnesses are to be heard in the presence of the king. Similarly, in a Neo-Babylonian letter, SAA 18 83, the witnesses (*mukinnē*) were brought together with the criminals (*bēlē hītu*) to the king for questioning. The reason for specifying the role(s) of Bessu’aya in the case (ll. 5’–8’) may derive from the practice that did not usually allow an individual to assume both the roles of a “testifying witness” and “informer” at the same time (for a discussion on these roles, see, e.g., Wells 2004, 130–132 and Faist 2020, 134f., n. 509).

6’: For the interpretation “to testify” see SAA 10 113, r.10; 120, r.6–7; SAA 13 179, r.7’; 185, 12’; SAA 14 201, 5, 8; SAA 17 152, r.17; cf. also the restored translation in SAA 18 125, r.11. In this context, *issīšu* could be alternatively translated as “against him”.

6. Unlike the other four letters with a *mukinnu* (or *mukinnus*) in SAA 18, this letter from a servant (Šuzubu) to his lord (Aqarā, possibly the governor of Babylon; see Frame 1992, 286) shows no involvement of the king of Assyria.

7': Bessu'aya. This individual is not dealt with in PNA 1/II, 340f. *s.v.* Bēssū'aia or Bēs-sū'a.

8'–9': These two lines may be crucial for the interpretation of the whole document, but they also present us with syntactical difficulties because of the subordinate clause introduced by *akī šarru* ..., which, at least in theory, could belong either to the previous or to the following section. Although “temporal clauses usually precede the main clause” (Hämeen-Anttila 2000, 127, 4.5.3), here it is more likely that this clause ends a longer sentence (for a more ordinary meaning of *akī šarru (bēlī) iqbūni* see, e.g., SAA 5 162, 11–12 and cf. SAA 10 286, r.2'–3'). For recent discussions on *bātiqu*, “informer”, a type of plaintiff, see Jas 1996, 50 and Wells 2004, 131f. (cf. also on r.4'–5' above). Surprisingly, this line contains two different graphic manifestations of the sign BU in *iq-bu-u-ni* and *i-ki-bu-su-ni*, cf. also the same sign in ll. 4, r.13e, and 15e. According to the dictionaries the verb *kabāsu* (AHw 415f.; CAD K 5–11) has a number of different meanings, but it is not entirely clear what *kabāsu* G, usually, “to tread, to trample; to subjugate”, means in this case: does it have a specific nuance in Assyro-Babylonian legal terminology? The interpretation “to tread; to subjugate the land or people” may not be sufficient in some cases; instead it could refer to ownership or property rights to goods in general, even in letters.⁷ Despite the spelling *i-ki-bu-su-ni*, the form is unlikely to be *ikkibusūni* (CAD K, 11a), an N-stem preterite of the 3rd person m.pl, but rather *ikbusūni*, a G-stem preterite of the 3rd person m.sg, which does not differ formally from m.pl, with an epenthetic vowel after the first syllable. It would be more difficult to interpret the form as a scribal error for the present 3rd person masculine sg. or pl. *ikabbusūni*. In this case, the clause seems to relate to an appeal to the king and is therefore important.

10': The use of *kabāsu* in lines r.9' and r.15e suggests that this line does not introduce another case, but presumably refers to the previous sentence. More generally, it is noticeable that the surviving part of this document does not contain any horizontal rulings, which were common in administrative use, perhaps indicating that the surviving part has no sectional boundaries.⁸

11' and 13': The object of *puāgu*, “to deprive, to take by force”, is also “field(s)/land” in SAA 5 149, r.2; SAA 10 173, 16, r.5; SAA 19 89, 7–8; 180, 4–6; for these land disputes see Galil 2009, 96–102, 108f. Note also the prohibition against claiming, “(they) took away the field by force”, after a completed land sale in document TR 4001, 12–13 (Postgate 1970, 31f. and Pl. 11), preceding its penalty clause. It is easy to see that many Neo-Assyrian

7. For “treading the land” see SAA 1 1, r.52–53; and for “treading on (the authority of) the Palace” SAA 16 63, 21–22; “subjugating a widow, son or daughter” SAA 1 21, 6'–9'; *amēlu kabsu* may be “a subdued man” as in SAA 15 104, 11, but not an “old ram” as in SAA 16 5, r.6, where the critical apparatus erroneously comments on UDU.*kab-su*; the meaning of “treading (earth)” may refer to preparing the land before sowing in SAA 15 156, r.5, especially as it is somehow opposed to or connected with “cultivating the seeds” in r.4f.

8. Note the use of rulings, e.g., in SAA 21 140 (entitled “Appeal to Assurbanipal”) and the very fragmentary SAA 23 282: two documents which differ from the present text but which may share some essential features with it.

disputes arose from the ownership or usufruct of land, something for which Galil, among others, blames the king: “One of the main reasons for these protracted disputes over the issue of the ownership of these fields is the king himself: his main motives were to restrict the power of the governors and to fuel endless conflicts between them; to weaken them and prevent rebellions. Accordingly, the king preferred to donate land deliberately in other provinces and did not hurry to solve these conflicts” (Galil 2009, 114). Nevertheless, it may not be a coincidence that Galil does not discuss the many appeals that would probably have been settled in the presence of the king. The large number of petitions to the king clearly shows that the various officials were not silenced by the disputes and injustices they may have experienced, but they thought that the king could rectify the situation, even though he was probably the last and only chance for the officials to do so.

12': It is noteworthy that the name Nergal-ašared is repeated here as the subject of the following clauses for the sake of clarity.

14'–15': This difficult passage is quoted in CAD K, 7b: *hādūaya i-ka-bu-su mā*, though not translated there, but listed under “to bother, to make people do work, to press people”. Our rendering, “They tread it at my pleasure!”, assumes that *ha-du-a-a* can stand for the infinitive *hadû* to which the first-person singular suffix is attached. Frahm has recently discussed (2010, 99f.) a similar passage in YBC 11382 15 (SAA 23 120); it reads *hadûni anînu kî ša libbînîni neppaš*, “(It is) our pleasure to act as we please”, and he has interpreted *hadûni* (*ibid.* p. 100) as an idiomatically used infinitivus absolutus with a plural suffix in the first person. It is somewhat surprising that the subject in r.15 is the third person masculine plural (*ikabbusû*) after a question from Nergal-ašared to Šamaš-abu-ušur: I assume that the interrogative clause (r.12–13) is merely rhetorical and that Nergal-ašared is continuing his speech, referring to his own servants (if “they tread it at my pleasure” is to be understood positively) or to those of Šamaš-abu-ušur (if it is to be understood negatively). I cannot help thinking that it is Šamaš-abu-ušur who answers Nergal-ašared in r.14–15. But then I would expect his name to be repeated. Thus, the most plausible solution for the quotation particle *mā* (r.12, 14 and s.1) is that it introduces Nergal-ašared's initial reaction and then his continuous speech, which may be addressed to another person (first to Šamaš-abu-ušur and then to the official who wrote the tablet).

The left side appears to have been written from top to bottom in relation to the obverse of the tablet.⁹ However, this is a rare practice and adds uncertainty to the interpretation between the two faces of the tablet. With the current knowledge, it may not be possible to distinguish the obverse from the reverse of the document with certainty, especially as the

9. According to Watanabe 1985, 151: “Vs. und Rs. sind zu vertauschen: S. CAD M2 187a”. It cannot be ruled out that the left side is to be read from bottom to top and that the order of obverse and reverse is to be changed, but for the other letters which use the exceptional direction of the writing on the left side see SAA 16 48 (note *ad* s.1 in SAA 16, p. 44), 65 (note on SAA 16, p. 64), SAA 19 197 (confirmed by ML in the British Museum on 16/1/2007) and CTN 3 3. For an example of a document wrongly attributed as an “*abat šarri*” see ND 3471 by Wiseman 1953, 147 (Pl. 13): it is not a royal order, but *abat šarri* begins the reverse of the tablet which is a letter from Nashir-Bel to Nabû-le'i (see PNA 2/II, 932 s.v. Nashir-Bel or Nashur-Bel no. 1).

end of the “obverse” is broken away. On the other hand, the remaining obverse of the tablet, if correctly assigned, is purely descriptive, while the reverse contains dialogue or at least (quoted) direct speech (r.4–5, 12–s.1). Accordingly, I find it unlikely that the left side is the direct continuation of the present obverse.

1: The clause *seb ’išu šarru ina muhḫīya muhur* is not attested elsewhere in the Neo-Assyrian sources, but in this case it may be an affirmation or exclamation concerning the reliability of a person. For example, the recitation of a prayer “seven times” is a typical feature of rituals. For *seb ’išu* or *adi seb ’išu* in archival texts, see SAA 8 447 r.1 and SAA 19 6 r.7’ (in a negative light). Alternatively, “seven times” may be used to emphasise the gravity of the situation (e.g., in SAA 17 102 r.16–18). In the phrase “to appeal to someone”, the preposition *ana* can be omitted, see, e.g., SAA 5 260 r.5’–6’; SAA 10 156 r.4’–5’; SAA 10 169 12; SAA 13 66 r.7’; SAA 15 1 r.7’; SAA 15 169 11; and SAA 16 29 r.1. The problem with this line is to whom were these words of Nergal-ašared addressed? My hypothesis is that the writer of the document may have added his profession at the end of the document (see the note on the next line). Presumably, there is no room to restore [*ma-a*] at the end of the line, so the last line is no longer part of Nergal-ašared’s speech.

2: *lu-ka-ni*: one might expect a spelling ending in *-in*, but the form need not be interpreted as a scribal error. What we seem to have here is *lukanni*:¹⁰ a hybrid form between *luka ’in* and *lukinni/lukīn*. In Neo-Assyrian, the variation between (the weak “Babylonian”) *CuCCu* and (the strong “Assyrian”) *Ca ’uCu* conjugation in the II-weak verbs of the D-stem must have been relatively common (see Luukko 2004, 146f.) and it concerns verbs such as *kullu* ~ *ka ’ulu*, *kunnu* ~ *ka ’unu*, *ṭubbu* ~ *ṭa ’ubu*. It would be tempting to restore at the end L[Ú*.GAL–A.BA], “The [*chief scribe (wrote this tablet).*]”, as the chief scribe, royal scribe, palace scribe or a scribe working at the palace chancery may have appeared as the final word of the document on the left side. In this lawsuit, the involvement of Ezbu, a servant of the chief scribe, may support this conjectural interpretation. On the other hand, such a restoration may be considered too speculative, as the tablet may not have had much room for the title of an official. However, the last partly visible sign is LÚ*, written similarly as in lines 4 and 6, and not *in* as in Waterman 1930, 212. To have a professional — possibly scribal — title at the end of the document is plausible to confirm the authorship of the document.

Context, Date and Personal Names of the Document

ABL 307 is undoubtedly a puzzling document, and one may wonder: Did the interests of the two highest officials (the prefect of the Nuhubeans and the chief scribe) of the document coincide and create a conflict, or did their servants act purely in their own interests? The latter scenario is possible, but it is equally likely that the prefect of the Nuhubeans and the chief scribe had given orders to their servants, leading to a situation where interests clashed (cf. notes on lines 6–7 and 8). In such a situation, the authority of the king may have been needed to mediate between the two parties. The role of the king in settling

10. The reading *lu-ka-ni-i[n]* (> *luka ’in*) (Luukko 2004, 147), is to be corrected accordingly.

legal disputes is beyond the scope of this article, but there is more indirect than direct evidence for it.¹¹ Suffice it to say that, according to many letters, individuals, especially various officials, frequently appealed to the king for intervention, using standard phrases in Neo-Assyrian like (*ana*) *šarri/šarru bēlī(ya) mahāru*, “to appeal to the king, my lord”, and *abat šarri zakāru*,¹² literally “to invoke the king’s word”.

There are also cases where the king is either asked “to settle a dispute”, “in whose presence a case should be settled”, or is asked for “doing justice” to individuals. The first clause might be worded with a form of *kuānu* in the meaning “to settle, to establish”: *šarru bēlī (dabābu/dēnu ina birtunni) luka’ in/lukīnāni/ukāna/ukannūni*, “Let the king, my lord, settle (the matter/dispute/case between us)”, etc.;¹³ the last one as *šarru (bēlī) dēnī lēpuš*, “May the king(, my lord,) do me justice”.¹⁴

On the other hand, it is worth remembering that it was not only the king himself who could issue royal orders (*abat šarri*), but also some of his highest officials. For example, in a Neo-Assyrian letter from Nimrud, Ahu-lamur asks his superior, the chief eunuch, to send a royal order to a certain Nergal-belu-uda’an.¹⁵ Usually legal cases were decided by various officials who could act as judges (Radner 2003, 890; 2005, 49–53, 55–60, 65–67; Faist 2020, 108–112). However, in the very interesting SAA 23 280 (BM 29391), a document that informs us of a case concerning the inheritance of Zakir at the Ezida temple in Borsippa, the wording of the text suggests an active role for Assurbanipal, who is said to have decided the case and made a statement about the status of an heir.¹⁶ On the other hand, it is difficult to determine whether Assurbanipal actually presided over the case, and an alternative interpretation of this text allows a greater role for his representatives, to whom he may have delegated the case and who then acted on his behalf.

ABL 307 is not dated, and arguments for an approximate and/or tentative dating must be based on other factors. In this case, the most helpful factors may be the personal names and professional details. In addition, at least in theory, a palaeographic analysis of the scribe’s handwriting could also be instructive, since we do not know who wrote the document — but we will not undertake this here. However, an interesting detail in this respect is the graphic variant of LÚ*, a variant that can be more precisely defined as LÚ*+¹⁷, a rarity that appears in lines 2 and 3 and possibly also in s.2. It has a total of six wedges and its appearance is somewhere between LÚ and LÚ*:



11. Letters provide a great deal of indirect evidence, while no actual royal decisions survive from the Neo-Assyrian period, although see SAA 23 280 (discussed briefly below).
12. See, e.g., Postgate 2007, 338f.; Radner 2003, 887; Faist 2020, 109, n. 397.
13. See, e.g., SAA 1 236 8'; SAA 15 270 r.5'–9'; SAA 16 43 r.7–9; 44 r.4'–5' (*ina pān šarri ... lukīni*); SAA 19 89 r.14–17 (*ina pān šarri bēlīya lūkīnu*); cf. also a statement in the present tense in SAA 1 77 r.10f. Note also with *parāsu*, e.g., in SAA 15 24 r.13–20.
14. SAA 10 173 r.6–8 (including *šarru attahar*); SAA 16 39 12–13 (cf. also r.4).
15. SAA 19 38 r.8–10 (see the comment by Saggs 2001, 296 on lines 25–27). This is related to the delegation of power in the Assyrian Empire by means of stamp (“bureau”) seals (Radner 2008).
16. The document is written in the Neo-Babylonian dialect and script and has been previously edited in Waerzeggers 2010, 681–682 (with further bibliography).
17. This is according to an (unpublished) system developed by Parpola; + stands for an additional wedge.

Altogether seven persons are mentioned by name in the extant part of the document. They are: Aššur-našir, Bessu'aya, Ezbu, Nergal-ašared, Quia, Šamaš-abu-ušur, and Ubru-[*Libbali*]. In addition to these seven individuals, the king and two unnamed high officials are mentioned: the prefect of the Nuhubeans and the chief scribe. Almost all the personal names of the document are relatively common in Neo-Assyrian sources:

Aššur-našir (“Aššur is protector”, line 1). PNA 1/I, 203f., esp. nos. 3–6 from the reigns of Tiglath-pileser III and Sargon II appear interesting, as well as nos. 8–9 from Assur, and a high official during the reign of Esarhaddon and Assurbanipal (no. 13); but it is difficult to make a good match between any of them and a “subordinate of the governor of Nuhub” (no. 7), who is now interpreted as a “servant of the prefect of the Nuhubeans”; however, on the most promising candidate, no. 10, see Šamaš-abu-ušur below.

Bessu'aya (“my lady”, r.5'; Attestation from ABL 307 is missing from PNA 1/II, 341), is explicitly said to be from Assur (URU.ŠÀ–URU-*iá*). Notable is that nine out of ten people having the more common related name Bessu'a listed in PNA (1/II, 340f.) and the only Bessu'aia (i.e., how given in PNA) come from Assur, but there seems to be no certainty in linking our Bessu'aya to any of these persons.

Ezbu (“The abandoned one”, line 4). PNA 1/II, 409, lists altogether 14 persons carrying this name from whom only two are connected to Assur (nos. 10 and 11), but there is no compelling evidence that the man in ABL 307 (no. 5) would be the same person as any of the other men known as Ezbu.

Nergal-ašared (“Nergal is foremost”, r.11'–12'). According to PNA 2/II, 942, there are ten different individuals and one entry in a list of specimen names with this name, but no clear correspondence between our man (no. 3) and others with the same name. According to SAA 19 39 6, Šarru-emuranni, deputy governor of Isana, used to exact corn taxes from a man called Nergal-ašared. Theoretically, this Nergal-ašared could be the same man as in ABL 307, if one accepts the location of Isana as argued by Radner 2006, 44, 46. Another letter from Nimrud, SAA 19 94, may have been sent by a man called Nergal-ašared who seems to have been active in the east.

Quia (meaning unknown, line 3), a bearded courtier (PNA 3/I, 1017, *s.v.* Quia no. 3), has two interesting namesakes recorded in PNA 3/I, no. 2 is also a bearded courtier, attested in an administrative document from Kalhu (ND 2443+ ii 2). The document is partly broken and no longer dated, but it can be dated to the (early) reign of Tiglath-pileser III with the help of Bel-Harran-bel-ušur, who is mentioned three times in this document and interpreted as the famous palace herald of the same name.¹⁸ In addition, no. 4 is an individual from Assur and is interesting because of his geographical connection.¹⁹ When it comes to a relatively rare name (PNA separates six individuals), the match between no. 2 and our Quia (no. 3) seems quite strong because of the same profession. However, the

18. See PNA 1/II, 301 *s.v.* Bēl-Ḥarrān-bēlu-ušur, no. 2, c.

19. The date of the document (SAAB 5 42) is lost, but it is roughly dated to the eighth or early seventh century.

geographical and chronological details of the two documents seem less satisfactory.²⁰ As an alternative explanation for the assumption that they do not refer to the same person, I would suggest the practice of papponomy, whereby the family gave the son the name of his grandfather.²¹ In this interpretation, a date in the reign of Esarhaddon for ABL 307 would not be a problem. In this context, I would also like to emphasise the profession of “bearded courtier”, and not, for example, “eunuch”, two professions, titles, or court statuses which are often seen as vertically opposed. Therefore, the familial continuity of a profession such as “bearded courtier” would at least make sense, even if it is not explicitly attested, although some bearded courtiers were also scholars whose ancestors held the same profession.

Ubru-Libbali (“The guest of the Inner City”, line 11), with the Inner City element in his name, restored in ABL 307. This would be a characteristic personal name from Assur, although only five further attestations are known from Neo-Assyrian sources. The servants of the son of Ubru-Libbali are mentioned in a letter titled “Carchemish under Assyrian Yoke”, from the reign of Sargon II (SAA 1 183 20'). A man named Ubru-Libbali²² is the sender of SAA 19 197 which concerns an orchard in Kiširtu; the same man may have been a recruitment officer of the bodyguard cavalry and stationed in Arzuhina (ND 2386+ ii 8'), see PNA 2/II, 950 s.v. Nergal-mušallim, during the reign of Sargon II. Three generations later, another Ubru-Libbali acts as a witness for Nabû-zero-iddina in the late reign of Assurbanipal (639*) StAT 3 61 (VAT 19497), r.16'.

It is convenient to discuss *Šamaš-abu-ušur* (“O Šamaš, protect the father!”, r.10', PNA 3/II, 1189a, no. 4) last. SAA 6 289 (lines 4, 14) and its duplicate SAA 6 290 (lines 3, 11) are extremely interesting in relation to ABL 307, since the first two documents attest to a slave sale in which Šamaš-abu-ušur buys a man called Ahu-le'iti from Aššur-našir, and the two documents are dated to 670. In ABL 307, the two individuals named Aššur-našir and Šamaš-abu-ušur are the only ones explicitly associated with Nuhub. Of course, without further evidence it cannot be proved that the two men in SAA 6 289–290 are the same as those in ABL 307, although this possibility cannot be ruled out. If this identification proves to be correct, then there is also the possibility that ABL 307 refers to a single case instead of two or even three. Since several lines are broken off, Aššur-našir appears only on the obverse of ABL 307, while Šamaš-abu-ušur is attested on the reverse of the tablet. Finally, it is worth noting that “Adad, the lord of Kilizi” appears in the penalty clause of SAA 6 289. This may raise the question: Could Nuhub have been located somewhere between Assur and Kilizi? Without going into complicated details which are open to various interpretations and have been discussed by others in the past, I suspect that Nuhub and the related Kannu' are to be sought northeast of Assur.²³

20. I.e., Kalhu ~ Nuhub and Tiglath-pileser III ~ uncertain (but not earlier than Sargon II).

21. See, e.g., Pearce & Doty 2000, 331 (n. 3), 334. In Neo-Assyrian papponomy was almost certainly a relatively common practice, but the nature of the available sources, which rarely touch on the genealogy of non-royalty, makes it difficult to study.

22. Not Ishdi-libbi-ali as in CTN 5, p. 104.

23. Nuhub was probably in the proximity of Kannu' (a relatively well-attested town whose location is

Conclusion

All entries in PNA concerning the persons of ABL 307 state that the document probably dates from the reign of Sargon II. However, this assumption is nowhere substantiated, and can at least be questioned, if not proven wrong. In the light of comparative evidence, and especially because of Šamaš-abu-ušur, I would alternatively suggest dating the text to the late reign of Esarhaddon or to the early years of the reign of Assurbanipal. At least nominally, Esarhaddon may have been willing to settle cases, as suggested, for example, by a letter from an anonymous sender entitled “How to Deal with Appeals for Royal Intervention” (SAA 16 64),²⁴ although admittedly the situation was probably not much different with Sargon, who also received many appeals.

Importantly, none of the persons are mentioned both on the obverse and the reverse of the document. This may imply that the tablet concerns two or three separate cases. Another significant factor is that the crimes or reasons for grudge between these people are clearly different. On the obverse, the crime is a theft of sheep and coercion of an equal to work for the accused. On the other hand, the animosity on the reverse of the tablet derives its origin from a field appropriated by Šamaš-abu-ušur from Nergal-ašared and is therefore a different type of crime.

It is worth stressing that a servant of the chief scribe is involved in a dispute recorded in the document, the original events of which may have taken place in Nuhub. Several details, especially some people, clearly link this document to both to Assur and Nuhub, whose location may have been close to Assur.²⁵ The document may contain up to three separate appeals from Nuhub to the king: line 1 may alternatively be interpreted elliptically expressed as “an appeal to the king concerning Aššur-našir”;²⁶ Bessu’aya (or a person whose name is broken away) mentions the king (*akī šarru iqbûni*) in r.8’–9’, presumably to appeal to him, and at the end of the tablet (s.1f.) there is an appeal to the king through another person (*šarru ina muhḫīya m[uhur]*), possibly the author of this document. Interestingly, these three appeals are all worded differently. However, since ABL 307 was excavated in Nineveh (Kuyunjik), it may also represent a memorandum of an original written in Assur or its environs. Another, probably equally plausible, interpretation is that the king eventually received the disputants in Nineveh.

disputed; on Kannu’, see, e.g., Zadok 2012 and Bagg in 2017, 287f., both with previous literature), since according to SAA 6 211, 1’–3’ (ADD 460): “... fie[ld in] Kannu’, adjoining the *side road* of Kannu’ and the road that leads to Nuhub”.

24. In line 1, the text contains a fascinating plural spelling *a-bat-šar-ra-a-te*, a rarity in which the word “king” is written syllabically with a feminine ending, apparently in congruence with the gender of the *abutu*. This seems to indicate a frozen construct (*abat šarri* sg., *abat šarrâte* pl.) that differs from the normal plural replacement form *dibbī* (for a suppletive stem of *abutu* see e.g. Luukko 2004, 144): *dibbī ša šarri*, “the words(/matters) of the king” (SAA 15 33, 11’; SAA 17 126, r.12e [broken context]; SAA 22 93, 13’; 121, r.8), which may have a more neutral meaning; it can also be used syntactically differently, i.e., not as a periphrastic genitive, but *ša* as a relative pronoun, *dibbī ša šarru*, “the words/matters which the king” (cf., e.g., SAA 17 90, 8 and SAA 18 54, 6).
25. Regarding the chief scribe and Assur, see note on lines 4–6 above.
26. Cf. SAA 18 121, 6, or elliptically “a ‘king’s word’ (was invoked) concerning Aššur-našir”. As early as the 1970s, Postgate (1974, 424 n. 23) pointed out that *abat šarri* with *zakāru/qabû* can be understood as an *appeal* in indirect speech, and more or less so in direct speech, albeit expressed elliptically.

ABL 307 is neither a letter nor a royal decision, but is most likely a regional collection of information for a forthcoming legal case or cases that may be the subject of the king's decision.²⁷ This could be clarified later with the help of the notes offered in this text. Geographically, both the obverse and the reverse of the tablet are related as they both refer to Nuhub. Speculatively, one can also play with the idea that the syntactically complicated language of the document might have something to do with the chief scribe, who or whose servant is involved as a victim of a crime.

LITERATURE

- ABL = Harper R.F. 1892–1914, *Assyrian and Babylonian Letters belonging to the Kouyunjik Collection of the British Museum*, Parts I–XIV, London - Chicago.
- Bagg A.M. 2017, *Die Orts- und Gewässernamen der neuassyrischen Zeit. Teil 2: Zentralassyrien und benachbarte Gebiete, Ägypten und die Arabische Halbinsel (Répertoire géographique des textes cunéiformes (Beihefte zum Tübinger Atlas des Vorderen Orients) 7/2 = Tübinger Atlas des Vorderen Orients Beiheft 7/7/2)*, Wiesbaden.
- Dornauer A. 2014, *Das Archiv des assyrischen Statthalters Mannu-kī-Aššūr von Gūzāna/Tall Halaf (Vorderasiatische Forschungen der Max Freiherr von Oppenheim Stiftung 3/III)*, Wiesbaden.
- Faist B. 2020, *Assyrische Rechtsprechung im 1. Jahrtausend v. Chr.* (dubsar 15), Münster.
- Frahm E. 2010, “Hochverrat in Assur”, in S.M. Maul, N.P. Heeßel (eds.), *Assur-Forschungen*, Wiesbaden, pp. 89–137.
- Frame G. 1992, *Babylonia 689–627 B.C. A Political History (Publications de l’Institut historique-archéologique néerlandais de Stamboul 69)*, Leiden.
- Galil G. 2009, “Appropriation of Land by Officials in the Neo-Assyrian Period”, in G. Galil, M. Geller, A. Millard (eds.), *Homeland and Exile: Biblical and Ancient Near Eastern Studies in Honour of Bustenay Oded (Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 130)*, Leiden - Boston, pp. 95–119.
- Hämeen-Anttila J. 2000, *A Sketch of Neo-Assyrian Grammar (State Archives of Assyria Studies 13)*, Helsinki.
- Jas R. 1996, *Neo-Assyrian Judicial Procedures (State Archives of Assyria Studies 5)*, Helsinki.
- Luukko M. 2004, *Grammatical Variation in Neo-Assyrian (State Archives of Assyria Studies 16)*, Helsinki.
- 2007, “The Administrative Roles of the ‘Chief Scribe’ and the ‘Palace Scribe’ in the Neo-Assyrian Period”, *State Archives of Assyria Bulletin* 16, pp. 227–256.
- Maul S.M. 2000, “Die Frühjahrsfeierlichkeiten in Assur”, in A.R. George, I.L. Finkel (eds.), *Wisdom, Gods and Literature: Studies in Assyriology in Honour of W.G. Lambert*, Winona Lake, IN, pp. 389–420.
- Pearce L.E., Doty L.T. 2000, “The Activities of Anu-belšunu, Seleucid Scribe”, in J. Marzahn, H. Neumann (eds.), *Assyriologica et Semitica: Festschrift für Joachim Oelsner anlässlich*

27. That is, a kind of draft or memorandum.

- seines 65. Geburtstages am 18. Februar 1997 (*Alter Orient und Altes Testament* 252), Münster, pp. 331–341.
- Postgate J.N. 1970, “A Neo-Assyrian Tablet from Tell Al Rimah”, *Iraq* 32, pp. 31–35.
- 1974, “Royal Exercise of Justice under the Assyrian Empire”, in P. Garelli (ed.), *Le Palais et la Royauté (Archéologie et Civilisation)*. XIXe Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale, Paris, pp. 417–426.
- 2007, “Invisible Hierarchy: Assyrian Military and Civilian Administration in the 8th and 7th Centuries BC”, in J.N. Postgate, *The Land of Assur and the Yoke of Assur. Studies on Assyria 1971–2005*, Oxford, pp. 331–360.
- Radner K. 1997–98, Review of R. Jas, *Neo-Assyrian Judicial Procedures (State Archives of Assyria Studies 5)*, *Archiv für Orientforschung* 44/45, pp. 379–387.
- 2003, “Mesopotamia: The Neo-Assyrian Period”, in R. Westbrook (ed.), *A History of Ancient Near Eastern Law*. 2 vols. (*Handbook of Oriental Studies Section I: The Near and Middle East*, Volume 72), Leiden, pp. 883–910.
- 2005, “The Reciprocal Relationship between Judge and Society in the Neo-Assyrian Period”, *Maarav* 12, pp. 41–68.
- 2006, “Provinz. C. Assyrien”, *Reallexikon der Assyriologie und vorderasiatischen Archäologie*, pp. 42–68.
- 2008, “The Delegation of Power: Neo-Assyrian Bureau Seals”, in P. Briant, W.F.M. Henkelman & M.W. Stolper (eds.), *L’archive des Fortifications de Persépolis: État des questions et perspectives de recherches (Persika 12)*, Paris, pp. 481–515.
- SAA 1 = S. Parpola, *The Correspondence of Sargon II, Part I. Letters from Assyria and the West (State Archives of Assyria 1)*, Helsinki 1987.
- SAA 2 = S. Parpola, K. Watanabe, *Neo-Assyrian Treaties and Loyalty Oaths (State Archives of Assyria 2)*, Helsinki 1988.
- SAA 3 = A. Livingstone, *Court Poetry and Literary Miscellanea (State Archives of Assyria 3)*, Helsinki 1989.
- SAA 5 = G.B. Lanfranchi, S. Parpola, *The Correspondence of Sargon II, Part II. Letters from the Northern and Northeastern Provinces (State Archives of Assyria 5)*, Helsinki 1990.
- SAA 6 = Th. Kwasman, S. Parpola, *Legal Transactions of the Royal Court of Nineveh, Part I. Tiglath-pileser III through Esarhaddon (State Archives of Assyria 6)*, Helsinki 1991.
- SAA 8 = H. Hunger, *Astrological Reports to Assyrian Kings (State Archives of Assyria 8)*, Helsinki 1992.
- SAA 10 = S. Parpola, *Letters from Assyrian and Babylonian Scholars (State Archives of Assyria 10)*, Helsinki 1993.
- SAA 13 = S.W. Cole, P. Machinist, *Letters from Assyrian and Babylonian Priests to Kings Esarhaddon and Assurbanipal (State Archives of Assyria 13)*, Helsinki 1998.
- SAA 14 = R. Mattila, *Legal Transactions of the Royal Court of Nineveh, Part II. Assurbanipal through Sin-šarru-iškun (State Archives of Assyria 14)*, Helsinki 2002.
- SAA 15 = A. Fuchs, S. Parpola, *The Correspondence of Sargon II, Part III. Letters from Babylonia and the Eastern Provinces (State Archives of Assyria 15)*, Helsinki 2001.
- SAA 16 = M. Luukko, G. Van Buylaere, *The Political Correspondence of Esarhaddon (State Archives of Assyria 16)*, Helsinki 2002.
- SAA 17 = M. Dietrich, *The Babylonian Correspondence of Sargon and Sennacherib (State Archives of Assyria 17)*, Helsinki 2003.
- SAA 18 = F. Reynolds, *The Babylonian Correspondence of Esarhaddon and Letters to Assurbanipal and Sin-šarru-iškun from Northern and Central Babylonia (State Archives of Assyria 18)*, Helsinki 2003.
- SAA 19 = M. Luukko, *The Correspondence of Tiglath-pileser III and Sargon II from Calah/Nimrud (State Archives of Assyria 19)*, Helsinki 2012.
- SAA 21 = S. Parpola, *The Correspondence of Assurbanipal, Part I: Letters from Assyria,*

- Babylonia, and Vassal States (State Archives of Assyria 21)*, Helsinki 2018.
- SAA 22 = G. Frame, S. Parpola, *The Correspondence of Assurbanipal, Part II: Letters from Southern Babylonia (State Archives of Assyria 22)*, Helsinki 2022.
- SAA 23 = M. Luukko, G. Van Buylaere, *Supplement to SAA I–XXII: Letters, Treaties, Literary Texts, Legal and Administrative Documents, Astronomical Reports, Oracle Queries, and Rituals (State Archives of Assyria 23)*, Helsinki 2024.
- Saggs H.W.F. 2001, *The Nimrud Letters (Cuneiform Texts from Nimrud 5)*, London.
- Waerzeggers C. 2010, *The Ezida Temple of Borsippa: Priesthood, Cult, Archives (Achaemenid History 15)*, Leiden.
- Watanabe K. 1985, “Die Briefe der neuassyrischen Könige”, *Acta Sumerologica Japonica* 7, pp. 139–156.
- 1987, *Die adê-Vereidigung anlässlich der Thronfolgeregelung Asarhaddons (Baghdader Mitteilungen, Beiheft 3)*, Berlin.
- Waterman L. 1930, *Royal Correspondence of the Assyrian Empire, Part 1: Translation and Transliteration*, Ann Arbor, MI.
- Wells B. 2004, *The Law of Testimony in the Pentateuchal Codes (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für Altorientalische und Biblische Rechtsgeschichte 4)*, Wiesbaden.
- Wiseman D.J. 1953, “The Nimrud Tablets, 1953”, *Iraq* 15, pp. 135–160.
- Zadok R. 2012, “Kannu”, in G.B. Lanfranchi et al. (eds.), *Leggo! Studies Presented to Prof. Frederick Mario Fales on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday (Leipziger Altorientalistische Studien 2)*, Wiesbaden, pp. 875–891.