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By definition, a palace is the residence of persons of elevated status. Therefore access to the palace needs to be limited and controlled in order to protect the palace’s inhabitants and their belongings as well as the palace’s precious furnishings from the outside world. Following the Oriental tradition, moreover, a Neo-Assyrian palace consisted of different quarters—residential, representative and administrative—which had to be delimited from each other.

Most essential was of course the safety and the privacy of the palace’s most important occupant, the king. Many letters from the royal correspondence illustrate how secluded a life the Assyrian king led when residing in his palace. It was never easy to meet the king. Whoever wished to see him had to apply for an audience and wait until it was granted. Chance meetings were rare, and even the visits of close family relations were usually pre-arranged.

In order to control access to the palace and its various quarters, a number of means were employed. The concern for limited accessibility is reflected in the architecture of the Neo-Assyrian palaces. We may note the following general principles: the palaces were usually separated architecturally from the rest of the city; they could not be overlooked from the outside; and they had few and easily controllable entrances, both from the outside and between the different palace quarters. These entrances were equipped with one or, more commonly, two wooden door leaves which were reinforced by horizontal metal strips. With the help of these strips, the door leaves were attached to vertical door posts which turned on pivot-stones. The detailed set-up of such doors has been reconstructed from the remains of the temple doors from Imgur-Illil, modern Balawat.

Whenever deemed necessary, doors were equipped with bolts and locks. In order to protect a room from intruders, it is sufficient to bar a door from the inside with the help of a bolt. But in order to hinder somebody on the inside from leaving, a simple bolt is not enough; it has to be secured with a lock. Internal locks were installed at the exterior gates of a palace, but they may also have been deemed useful in order to lock up the women’s quarters or rooms housing guests. External locks, on the other hand, are necessary for the doors to all those quarters and rooms in which something or somebody is to be shut in without the possibility of opening the door from the inside. The most obvious example of a room for which this option was desirable is of course the

---

1 As always, I owe my thanks to Simo Parpola for allowing me to use the electronic Corpus of Neo-Assyrian for the preparation of this paper, originally a contribution to the 1999 symposium ‘Palace, King and Empire’, organised by M.T. Larsen in Copenhagen. I am grateful to M. Gibson, M. Liverani, J.N. Postgate, J.E. Reade and I. Winter for their remarks on that occasion. I also wish to thank Andreas Fuchs and Heather D. Baker for commenting on earlier drafts of this paper and J. Curtis for providing me with information on a metal find from Nimrud (see footnote 7). Both A. Fuchs and J. Curtis kindly allowed me to reproduce their drawings as Fig. 1 and 2 respectively.

2 The best evidence is found in a fragmentarily preserved letter from the reign of Esarhaddon (now re-published as SAA 18 100); see Parpola 1980: 172 and 176 n. 12.

3 Hence scholars advise Esarhaddon in various letters on days that are auspicious for his sons to visit him: e.g., SAA 10 73 (visit of the crown prince), SAA 10 52 (visit of the crown prince and prince Aššur-mukin-pale’a), SAA 10 207 (visit of the princes Aššur-mukin-pale’a and Sin-per’u-ukin), SAA 10 53, 70 and 74 (visits of prince Aššur-mukin-pale’a), SAA 10 54 (visit of an unknown man).

4 Cf. SAA 1 203, a list of door leaves with their measurements.

5 For an illustration of the reconstructed gates of Balawat see, e.g., Reade 1983: 23 fig. 25. For a thorough discussion of the technical aspects of ancient Near Eastern doors see Damerji 1973: 176–258.
treasury, but also storage rooms in general, armouries, libraries, prison cells and the living quarters of foreign hostages would come to mind.

Figure 1: ND 9222 (length 11.4 cm, maximum height 3.5 cm). Drawing by J. Curtis

Despite the general scarcity of metal remains from the Neo-Assyrian period, locks and parts of locks have been found in the palaces of Nineveh, Dur-Šarrukin and Kalḫu. The locks from Nineveh and Dur-Šarrukin were found in the pioneer days of Near Eastern archaeology and only their descriptions by Layard and Bonomi survive; both authors compare the finds to the ‘Egyptian Lock’ which was still widely in use at that time. More recently, David and Joan Oates identified a metal find from the Review Palace (ekal māṣartu = ‘Fort Shalmaneser’) at Kalḫu as part of a lock. They describe the piece as ‘a thin rectangular copper object with three longitudinal slots and a protruding knob’ (Fig. 1). I would like to identify this object as the lock’s holding bar, to be used with three bolt-pins (see below). In addition, fittings for locking mechanisms can be seen in the door jambs of various gates of Neo-Assyrian palaces; the best examples are again found at the Review Palace in Kalḫu, where Esarhaddon (680–669 BCE) had an elaborate gateway constructed on the southern façade whose inner and outer door could be locked.

Figure 2: Reconstruction of a Neo-Assyrian sikkatu lock

6 For the evidence from Nineveh see Layard 1853: 596 and from Dur-Šarrukin (Khorsabad) see Bonomi 1856: 170–1. See also the discussion of Potts 1990: 186–7.
7 ND 9222, found by the jamb of the west door of room NE 7, see Oates and Oates 2001: 160 with n. 23 (on p. 279). John Curtis kindly informs me that the piece has a length of 11.4 cm and a maximum height of 3.5 cm; I am grateful to him for permission to reproduce his previously unpublished drawing as Fig. 1.
8 A photograph of the gate is published in Mallowan 1966: II 465 fig. 379, though unfortunately the fittings are hidden behind a man standing in the doorway. The locking mechanisms have hitherto not been published in full; the most extensive description is found in Oates and Oates 2001: 154: ‘Both the inner and outer doors of the stone entrance chamber had been fitted with a single-leaf door, with a multiplicity of locking mechanisms and bolts.’
The archaeological evidence for locking mechanisms fits well with the contemporary description of a lock of the Neo-Assyrian period: in 714, Sargon II (721–705 BCE) had the lock of the Ḥaldi temple at Muṣarīṣ removed and taken to Assyria as booty. In his inscriptions the four components of the lock are described individually and in great detail, as they are made out of gold and fashioned as works of art. Andreas Fuchs recently succeeded in identifying these components and reconstructing the lock (Fig. 2): The locking mechanism consists of a heavy transverse bar, the aškuttu. In order to lock the gate a smaller holding bar, the sikkūru, is pushed through the appropriate hole in the transverse bar. The holding bar is in turn kept in place with the help of one or several bolt-pins, the sikkatu or, in plural, sikkāte. In order to open the lock, the bolt-pins have to be removed from the holding bar with the help of a key called namżāqu. The mechanism of this lock closely resembles that of the ‘Egyptian lock’, also known as the Greco-Roman balanos lock. In accordance with the naming of this lock type, which takes its name from the bolt-pin, Greek βάλανος ‘acorn’, Fuchs called the Assyrian lock type sikkattu lock, after the same component.

In addition to the protection offered by heavy doors and locks, the Assyrians relied on supernatural help in order to secure their entrances. In palaces and temples, all major entrances were furnished with images of protective deities, and in these buildings as well as in private houses, clay and metal statuettes of protective spirits, sometimes supplied with short inscriptions, were buried underneath the thresholds. Together with the execution of the appropriate rituals, these representations were thought to offer potent protection against both demonic and human intruders. Various examples of such apotropaic figures are illustrated and discussed in one of Jeremy Black’s most popular books, Gods, Demons and Symbols of Ancient Mesopotamia: an Illustrated Dictionary, co-authored with Anthony Green and illustrated by Tessa Rickards (Black and Green 1992). I offer the present paper to the memory of Jeremy whose far-ranging interests also encompassed the Neo-Assyrian period, as best illustrated by his publication of the Literary Texts from the Temple of Nabû, the fourth volume in the series Cuneiform Texts from Nimrud.

My paper will focus on the people who were entrusted with the control and supervision of the gateways and doors of the palaces. This task was shared by a number of officials: the attu ‘gatekeeper’, possibly assisted at times by the ša maṣṣartti ‘watchman’, the ša pān nērebi ‘entrance overseer’ and the rab sikkāte ‘lock master’. It will come as no surprise that some of these officials, specifically the gatekeepers and the lock masters, are also found in the context of temples. Just like palaces, temples were screened from the outside world and the methods employed—general architecture, doors, divine and human guards—are comparable.

It should be stressed that our evidence for these officials originates almost exclusively from the legal documents of the 7th century BCE from Nineveh, Assur and Kalḫu. This brings us to the

---

9 Discussed by Fuchs 1998: 97–107 who also reconstructs another version of a lock with a crank (uppu) instead of the smaller holding bar (sikkūru) to keep the transverse bar (aškuttu) in place; note that such an uppu is attested also in the 7th century letter SAA 13 62: 14 in which the up-pu ša si-[ka-ti] of certain temples seems to be missing. Fuchs was neither aware of the archaeological remains of locks from the Neo-Assyrian period nor of the work of Potts 1990 who, like himself, proposed the Egyptian lock (= balanos lock) as a model for the Mesopotamian lock. Potts’ identification of the various Akkadian terms with the parts of this lock type differs in some regards from Fuchs as he did not concentrate on one period’s evidence but used terminology from different ages; nevertheless, Potts’ and Fuchs’ overall results match very well. Note also the additional Old Babylonian evidence in an administrative text from Sippar, listing various parts of locks (BM 80394, for the edition see van Koppen 2001: 217–22 no. 3).

10 Cf. also Potts 1990: 188–9.

11 The most exhaustive information on the balanos lock, its use and the various possibilities for manipulating it is found in the account of Aeneas Tacticus, Περί τοῦ πώς χρη πολιορκουμένους ἀντέχειν, xviii–xx, written shortly after 360 BCE (edition: Loeb Classical Library no. 156).

12 For the rituals see Wiggermann 1992; for the representations of the protective deities see Rittig 1977 and Kolbe 1981.

13 A note concerning absolute dates after the year 648 BCE: as the sequence of the officials holding the office of year eponym after this date has not been handed down to us, it has to be reconstructed. Recently two
methodological aspects of this paper. The witness lists of the Neo-Assyrian legal documents, especially the long ones found in the sale texts, are to be counted among our best sources for the reconstruction of Neo-Assyrian society. A person’s place in the sequence of a witness list allows us to deduce that person’s status relative to the other witnesses. The general rule is: the earlier the person is mentioned in the list, the more important he is. That the sequence of the witnesses is by no means arbitrary is clear from the fact that the same sequence can be found in different texts which were written at different times. This leads to a second principle: witnesses of a certain profession are often attested together with colleagues or members of closely related professions. This fact is extremely useful when it comes to the interpretation of hitherto unidentified professions.

THE GATEKEEPER: ATU’ U
The title of gatekeeper is one of the most frequently attested professional titles in the Neo-Assyrian texts, and is always written with the logogram (\textup{\textit{\textit{a-ba}}} (\textit{\textit{a-ba}})). Its realization in Neo-Assyrian is probably (\textit{\textit{a-ba}}).\textsuperscript{14} Nothings speaks against the basic assumption that, as in the preceding periods,\textsuperscript{15} the task of the gatekeeper is indeed the guarding and surveillance of gateways and doors. To while away the time, the gatekeepers often seem to have taken to gambling.\textsuperscript{16}

Gatekeepers are found both in palaces and temples.\textsuperscript{17} Two titles for gatekeepers of superior rank are attested. While according to the known sources the office of a ‘great gatekeeper’ (\textit{\textit{a-ba}} (\textit{\textit{a-ba}})) existed exclusively at the Aššur temple, the ‘chief gatekeeper’ (\textit{\textit{a-ba}} (\textit{\textit{a-ba}})) is for the time being only attested at the royal palace at Nineveh.\textsuperscript{18} Best known is the chief gatekeeper Ḥa-baššu who held this office during the reigns of Esarhaddon (680–669) and Assurbanipal (668–c. 630 BCE). That the office of chief gatekeeper could be held by more than one person at a time is clear from the fact that Ḥa-baššu is mentioned together with his colleague, the chief gatekeeper Tariba-Issar, in two texts from early in the reign of Assurbanipal.\textsuperscript{19} In two other texts from the same period he is attested together with another chief gatekeeper, Nabu-Šumu-usur.\textsuperscript{20} However, Ḥa-baššu is by far the best known holder of this office. He is attested from 679 until 663.\textsuperscript{21} His promotion seems to coincide with Esarhaddon’s accession to the throne.\textsuperscript{22}

reconstructions differing from each other in detail have been published: S. Parpola apud Radner 1998: xviii–xx (henceforth Parpola 1998) and Reade 1998: 256–7. Both dating proposals are given in the following.

\textsuperscript{14} For a discussion of the Neo-Assyrian reading of the logogram (\textup{\textit{\textit{a-ba}}} (\textit{\textit{a-ba}})) including a rebuttal of J.V. Kinnier Wilson’s suggestion to read it as \textit{\textit{pētiu}} see Menzel 1981: I 230 with n. 3059.

\textsuperscript{15} Good evidence for the activities of gatekeepers is found in literary texts, especially in \textit{Ištar’s Descent to the Netherworld} and in \textit{Nergal and Ereshkīgal} (for references see CAD A/2 516–7: \textit{a-ba} A a) and in the Middle Babylonian text BE 14 129 (see CAD A/2 517: \textit{a-ba} A b.4.), but the most detailed information stems not from Mesopotamia, but from Anatolia: a Middle Hittite text from Boğazköy (IBOT 1 36) is a catalogue of regulations concerning security measures at the royal court, and its first section concerns the proper locking and unlocking of the palace gates (for an edition see Güterböck and van den Hout 1991: 4–5).

\textsuperscript{16} Note the carving of game-boards on the plinths of colossal figures standing in gateways of the royal palace of Dur-Šarrūkin now in London (British Museum, ME 118808–9) and Paris (Musée du Louvre, AO 19863), see Reade 2000: 611.

\textsuperscript{17} For the temple gatekeepers see Menzel 1981: I 230.

\textsuperscript{18} SAA 14 65 r. 7’ (dated 668) and SAA 14 66 r. 4’ (date lost).

\textsuperscript{19} Nabû-Šumu-usur is attested in SAA 6 307 r. 5 (dated 668) and SAA 6 308 r. 8 (date lost).

\textsuperscript{20} For a complete list of attestations see my contribution in Baker 2000: 435–6 s.v.: Ḥa-baššu 2.

\textsuperscript{21} According to the list of attestations given by Lipiński 1983: 128–30, Ḥa-baššu (‘Ahoubasti’) would be attested twice as a simple gatekeeper during Sennacherib’s reign. But one attestation, ADD 443 = SAA 6 348 r. 14’ (dated 686), refers to one \textit{\textit{a-ba}} (\textit{\textit{a-ba}}), and the other—the title is restored—indeed refers to Ḥa-baššu, but is to be dated to the reign of Assurbanipal due to its context in the Remanni-Adad archive; Lipiński’s dating to 696 is due to the erroneous join of 83-1-28, 372, as copied in ADD 297; today, the fragments are again separated from one another. The latter fragment, which bears the date, was published on its own as ADD 614 (most recent edition: SAA 6 128; note that this corresponds to ARU 93, not ARU 72), the two others were most recently edited as SAA 6 348. Hence, there are no attestations for Ḥa-baššu prior to the reign of Esarhaddon.
Arballaiu\textsuperscript{23} and Nabu’a,\textsuperscript{24} the two chief gatekeepers known during the reign of Sennacherib (704–681 BCE), are not attested at all during Esarhaddon’s reign. They may have been among those officials who lost their office and probably their life after the murder of Sennacherib and the subsequent war that led to Esarhaddon’s accession. The last chief gatekeeper known to us by name is Ququ; it is not known under which king he served.\textsuperscript{25}

It is likely that the dimensions of the royal palace at Nineveh made it necessary to organize the many gatekeepers hierarchically, with the appointment of several chief gatekeepers who were probably responsible for different parts of the palace. It is rather plausible that this office also existed in the earlier main residences of the Assyrian kings, at least at the enormous palace of Dur-Sarrukin.

THE WATCHMAN: ŠA MAŠŠARTI

The title ša maššarti\textsuperscript{26} means ‘watchman’, literally ‘He of the guard’, and is used to designate a person who guards a concrete object, in contrast to the title maššuru, which specifies an official of more far-reaching competence.\textsuperscript{27}

Only once is a watchman, one Inurta-šarru-usur from Assur, attested as a witness in a legal text, together with a gatekeeper and a lock master.\textsuperscript{28} Another watchman from Assur, a certain Mannum- [...], is mentioned in a judicial document in the context of supervising a river ordeal.\textsuperscript{29} The names of eighteen watchmen who are to protect twenty-two magnates and governors are known from an administrative text from Kalhu, dating to the reign of Sargon II.\textsuperscript{30}

Most other attestations of watchmen are found in the royal correspondence from Nineveh, as a rule without any mention of their names. In one such letter, the astrologer Balasi asks Esarhaddon to supply him with a watchman to protect him against the servants of the chief cupbearer who are causing damage to his estates.\textsuperscript{31} His access to the precious items which he is protecting could make the watchman the suspect in the case of damage. Hence an anonymous watchman was accused of theft by some augurs for whose protection he was responsible, according to a letter of Upaq-Šamaš to Sargon II. Although Upaq-Šamaš’s examination of the case showed that the watchman was innocent, he was replaced by a colleague, obviously because further collaboration with the augurs was impossible after these accusations.\textsuperscript{32} But usually watchmen seem to have been considered supremely trustworthy; thus the exorcist Nabu-nadin-iddin informs Esarhaddon that he has handed over the ingredients used in a ritual against the rābīsu demon, certainly objects of a rather sensitive nature, to an anonymous watchman.\textsuperscript{33} Tab-sîl-Ešarra, the governor of Assur, asks Sargon II to send him either a ša qurbūti, an honorary title designating officials who enjoyed the king’s trust,\textsuperscript{34} or else a watchman to supervise the workmen performing construction work in the palace of Ekalate.\textsuperscript{35} That the watchmen’s rank in the court hierarchy was inferior to that of a ša qurbūti is also clear from the evidence of divinatory queries to the sun god asking whether the members of court and

\textsuperscript{23} SAA 6 130 r. 8 (dated 696).

\textsuperscript{24} SAA 6 163 r. 11’ (dated 686).

\textsuperscript{25} SAA 14 126 r. 10 (date lost).

\textsuperscript{26} CAD M/I 341: ‘guard, watchman’; AHw 620: maššartu(m) 1.c. (no translation given).

\textsuperscript{27} For the maššar bet ili see Menzel 1981: I 245–6.

\textsuperscript{28} A 338 = STAT 1 20 = STAT 2 238 r. 10’: =ša–man–par ša–ma–šar–ti (dated to the eponymy of Upaqa-ana-Arbail = 633 [according to Parpola 1998] or 638 [according to Reade 1998]).

\textsuperscript{29} VAT 20361 = Deller, Fales and Jakob-Rost 1995: no. 111: 9–10: ’man-nu–[x x x] ša–EN, NUN–te (dated to the eponymy of Šîn-Šarru-šur, governor of Ḥindanu = 636 [according to Parpola 1998] or 634 [according to Reade 1998]).

\textsuperscript{30} CTN 3 86: 20: ša–EN, NUN.

\textsuperscript{31} SAA 10 58 r. 19-20: ’ša–EN, NUN [iš–iš–i] a lip–qi–du ‘May a watchman be appointed [for] me!’

\textsuperscript{32} SAA 5 163: 5, r. 9: ’ša–EN, NUN.


\textsuperscript{34} For a discussion of this title see Radner 2002: 13–14.

\textsuperscript{35} SAA 1 99 r. 17: ’ša–EN, NUN.
army would initiate a rebellion against Assurbanipal. The ša qurbūti officials are mentioned much earlier than the watchmen, who are listed after the mace bearers (ša huṭāri) and before the dispatch riders (kallāpu).\textsuperscript{36}

From the Neo-Assyrian attestations it is clear that a watchman is a member of the palace staff. His task is to protect specific persons or things, but it would appear that he was assigned to them only temporarily and not on a permanent basis. Although our sources offer no evidence for the fact that a watchman would guard an entrance, it may well have happened occasionally in order to reinforce the number of gatekeepers.

**THE ENTRANCE OVERSEER: ŠA PĀN NĚREBI**

That the official called ša pān něrebi\textsuperscript{37} is concerned with entrances is already clear from his title, which literally means ‘the one in front of the entrance’. The title is attested six times in five Neo-Assyrian texts. It is mentioned in three legal documents from Kalḥu, in a letter from the royal correspondence and in an administrative text from Nineveh.

Officials bearing this title seem to be active exclusively in palaces and are presently not attested in the context of temples. A connection with the control and surveillance of palace entrances is suggested not only by the title itself, but also because of the mention of a ša pān něrebi together with gatekeepers and a lock master in the witness lists of two legal texts from Kalḥu.\textsuperscript{38} By analogy with other professional titles of the type ša pān X, such as ša pān ecalli ‘palace supervisor’ or ša pān denānī ‘lawsuit supervisor’, we may assume that the ša pān něrebi did not physically stand guard in front of an entrance but held an administrative function controlling admittance to the palace. As entrance overseers are attested for the palaces at Kalḥu and Nineveh, we may suppose that these officials existed in every palace. It would seem likely that the entrance overseer was responsible for the organization of the guard of the various entrances of the palace and that he was therefore the direct superior of the gatekeepers, coordinating their service. The fact that Šalmu-ahḫētu, the entrance overseer of the Review Palace of Kalḥu, precedes the gatekeeper Šepe-Inurta-ašbat in the witness list would support this.

*The known office-holders*

- **Mannu-ki-Inurta**, entrance overseer in Kalḫu during the later reign of Assurbanipal (668–c. 630 BCE)
  \[1\] ND 3426 l.e. 3 = Wiseman 1953: pl. xii (copy) = Postgate 1976: no. 9 (dated 9.xii.649); Mannu-ki-Inurta \textsuperscript{4}ša-ša=ša-ša-Šámashšar-ušur is the last witness in a slave purchase document from the archive of the eunuch Šamaš-šarru-ušur. Most witnesses have a title: the gatekeepers Nur-Šamaš (r. 14) and Tutaia (l.e. 2), the lock master of the crown prince, Tur-dala (r. 16), the eunuchs Šīl-Bel-dalli (r. 8) and Dagil-ili (r. 10), the scribes Samidu (r. 9) and Issar-Šumu-iddina (r. 19), Nabu-le’i, a servant of the queen (r. 15), Dudu, temple administrator (laḫtišunu) of the Ninurta temple (r. 12), Urdu, cook of the Nabu temple (r. 13), Inurtanu, baker of the Ninurta temple (r. 18), as well as four fowlers and gooseherds. The appearance of these last witnesses can be explained due to Šamaš-šarru-ušur’s business interests in bird breeding.\textsuperscript{39}

- **Šalmu-ahḫētu**, entrance overseer (of the Review Palace) in Kalḫu during the reign of Sin-šarru-šikun (c. 626–612 BCE)
  \[2\] CTN 3 30: 14 (dated 4.iii.617 [after Parpola 1998] or 625 [after Reade 1998]; eponymy of Aššur-remanni): Šalmu-ahḫētu \textsuperscript{5}ša-ša-Šámash-nē-re-bi acts as a witness in a lawcase between the šakintu (the female equivalent of the palace manager for the queen’s household) of the Review Palace (‘Fort Shalmaneser’) and a man called Kabala’u; he is mentioned before the gatekeeper Šepe-Inurta-ašbat (l. 15) and after the curtier (\textsuperscript{6}DUMU–E.GAL) Taritāmmanni (l. 13), known from CTN 3 39: envelope l. 11 as the palace manager

\textsuperscript{36} SAA 4 142: 8: \textsuperscript{14}šē–d–e[N,N]UN,MEŠ; SAA 4 144: 8: šā–EN,UN,N,MEŠ. Together with dispatch riders, guards are mentioned also in a fragmentarily preserved letter to the king, SAA 16 6 r. 3: \textsuperscript{14}šē–EN,UN,N.

\textsuperscript{37} CAD N/2 177: nērebu in ša pan nēribi: ‘an official in charge of the entrance’. AHw 780: nērebu(m) 1 (no translation given).

\textsuperscript{38} ša pān nērebi together with gatekeepers in CTN 3 30 and ND 3426; ša pān nērebi together with lock master in ND 3426.

of the Review Palace.\textsuperscript{40} It can therefore be assumed with some certainty that Ṣalmu-ahḫutu was the entrance overseer of the Review Palace.

- \textit{[...]}ani, entrance overseer in Kalhu
  \textsuperscript{3} Copenhagen no. 7 r. 6´ = Fales 1987: 22 no. 7 (date lost): [\textsuperscript{1}x x]-\textit{a}-\textit{n}i \textsuperscript{14}šā–\textit{AGA}–\textit{nē–r}[e]\textit{-bi} and another entrance overseer, \textit{[...]}le (see \textsuperscript{4}), act as witnesses in a badly preserved document from Kalhu; other witnesses bearing professional titles are the scribe Balassu (r. 4´) and a commander-of-fifty (r. 2´).

- \textit{[...]}le, entrance overseer in Kalhu
  \textsuperscript{4} Copenhagen no. 7 r. 3´ = Fales 1987: 22 no. 7 (date lost): [\textsuperscript{1}x x]-\textit{a} \textsuperscript{14}šā–\textit{AGA}–\textit{nē–r}–\textit{bi} acts as a witness in the same text as the entrance overseer \textit{[...]}ani (see \textsuperscript{3}).

- Two anonymous entrance overseers in Nineveh in the 7th century
  \textsuperscript{5} ABL 875 = SAA 16 91: 7´ (reign of Esarhaddon): \textit{A \textsuperscript{14}šā–\textit{AGA}–\textit{nē–r}–\textit{bi}} whose name is lost is mentioned in a letter by a unknown author to the king, together with a number of members of the palace staff. The next official mentioned is \textit{Man[...]}, the overseer of the palace’s storage facilities (bēt qaṭē).

\textbf{THE LOCK MASTER: RAB SIKKĀTE}

The title of \textit{rab sikkāte} has never before been interpreted in the context of the guarding and control of entrances. In the following, I hope to make the identification as a lock master plausible.

The dictionaries fail to offer a satisfactory translation for the title \textit{rab sikkāte}, which, to my present knowledge, is attested twelve times in the Neo-Assyrian period. AHw discusses the title under \textit{sikkatu(m)} \textsuperscript{3} Nagel\textsuperscript{43} whereas CAD\textsuperscript{35} files it under its synonym, a lemma primarily attested in Old Assyrian documents, \textsuperscript{44} but also found in Old Babylonian texts.\textsuperscript{45} The Old Assyrian plural term \textit{sikkātum} refers to a religious festival,\textsuperscript{46} and the official \textit{rabi sikkītim/rabi sikkātim}—who was for a long time thought to be ‘a high military official’\textsuperscript{46}—is therefore likely to have been responsible for its organization.\textsuperscript{47}

For the Neo-Assyrian title, however, this translation is unsatisfactory; hence, we will investigate its meaning independently of the older evidence. The spellings with the logogram \textit{GAG} alone make it perfectly clear that the Neo-Assyrian title is based on the plural form of the term \textit{sikkatu} (NA \textit{sikkatu}) ‘nail, peg’.\textsuperscript{48} As the same person’s title is written once in syllabic and once in logographic writing in two texts from the same archive,\textsuperscript{49} there can be no doubt that the Neo-Assyrian realization of the logogram \textsuperscript{10}GAL–\textsuperscript{10}GAG MEŠ is indeed \textit{rab sikkāte}. The title’s verbatim translation is therefore ‘peg master’.\textsuperscript{50} Rather than assuming that the pegs in question

\textsuperscript{3} See Dalley and Postgate 1984: 6–7 for this official.
\textsuperscript{4} AHw 1041–2.
\textsuperscript{5} CAD S 252–4: \textit{sikkatu} B in \textit{rabi sikkāti} (\textit{rab sikkāti}).
\textsuperscript{6} AHw 1041–2: \textit{sikkatu(m)} A discusses in one entry those attestations which are filed under \textit{sikkatu} A and B in CAD.
\textsuperscript{7} The most important attestations are found in \textit{Enûma Eliš} i 151, ii 37, iii 41, 99 (Tiamat appoints Kingu to the office of \textit{rabbā sikkātim}). Cf. also footnote 56.
\textsuperscript{8} For recent discussions of its meaning see Kryszat 2004: 19–25.
\textsuperscript{9} See CAD S 252.
\textsuperscript{10} For a discussion of the title (with earlier literature) see Kryszat 2004: 25–8.
\textsuperscript{11} CAD S 247–51: \textit{sikkatu} A.
\textsuperscript{12} CTN 3 36: 15 and CTN 3 39: envelope l. 12. The following writings are attested: \textsuperscript{1}GAL–\textit{si–ka–a–te} (ND 2307 l.h.e. 2), \textsuperscript{2}GAL–\textit{si–ka–te} (ND 2308 r. 1), \textsuperscript{3}GAL–\textit{si–kāi} (text: KUR) (CTN 3 39: envelope l. 12), \textsuperscript{4}GAL–\textsuperscript{6}GAG MEŠ (SAA 14 62 r. 11), CTN 3 36: 15, ND 3420 r. 16, \textsuperscript{5}GAL–GAG MEŠ (ND 2316 r. 6, ND 3425 r. 17), GAL–GAG MEŠ (SAA 6 95 r. 6, ND 2315 r. 11), GAL–GAG (A 338 r. 7)
always had to be wooden, the frequent spelling with the wood determinative giš should be understood as a writing convention.

As already mentioned, Andreas Fuchs has recently stressed the central function of a building part named sikkatu (NA sikkatu) ‘peg’ in the construction of a type of lock which is well attested for the Neo-Assyrian period. Because of the importance of this component and by analogy with the naming of the Greek balanos lock, Fuchs called this type of lock the sikkatu lock. It would seem possible that the title rab sikkätē has to be understood in this context, especially considering that the term sikkatu is used in the names of three professions concerned with entrances which, however, are attested only in lexical texts: mušēlū sikkati ‘the one who lifts the bolt-pin’, nādū sikkati ‘the one who drops the bolt-pin’ and pētū sikkati ‘the one who opens the bolt-pin’.

An examination of the context of the Neo-Assyrian attestations shows that the title rab sikkätē can indeed be interpreted as an official dealing with entrances, as the official is always mentioned in a palace or temple context, usually among high-ranking personnel and very often together with gatekeepers and other officials controlling entrances. In the available sources (for attestations see below), the rab sikkätē is once mentioned with two gatekeepers and an entrance overseer, in another text together with a gatekeeper and a watchman, once with at least two gatekeepers, and another time with one gatekeeper. I therefore propose the translation ‘lock master’, assuming that the crucial component sikkatu denotes—pars pro toto—the lock in its entirety. This is all the more likely as the sikkatu is the central element of the more primitive locking mechanism which is attested all over the Near East from the Uruk period. This older system consisted of a peg, the sikkatu, which was used to block a door and which was then secured against tampering with the help of a sealing. Suzanne Herbordt, when studying the 565 Neo-Assyrian clay sealings from Nineveh, was unable to identify a single example for such a door sealing in the Neo-Assyrian period. This would seem to indicate that the system was no longer in use at that time, and I suggest that this was so because it had been replaced with the sikkatu lock.

At present, there are eleven known lock masters, attested so far at Assur and Kalḫu and only after the year 663 BCE (see below for attestations). For Kalḫu alone, four lock masters are attested during the reign of Assurbanipal, over a time span of approximately 25 years, while four other lock masters from Kalḫu are contemporaries serving during the reign of Sin-šarru-īškun. These groupings result from the fact that there were different lock masters for and active in different (parts of) palaces and temples. Each of these institutions seems to have one lock master at its service, with separate officials for the queen’s and crown prince’s quarters in the palace. The lock masters working in palaces seem to be the direct subordinates of the palace manager or, in the case of the queen’s household, of the ŝakintu. Sometimes the title of the lock master gives us details of his sphere of activity. From their titles we know that Indi is the lock master of the temple of Nabu in Assur, that Nabu-belu-ušur is the lock master of the queen’s household in Kalḫu and that Ṭur-dala is the lock master of the household of the crown prince in that city. In other cases we can extrapolate the lock master’s sphere of activity from the context. Hence Inurta-ḫu-iiddina is probably the Kalḫu Review Palace’s lock master, due to his connection with Tartimanni, the palace manager of the Review Palace. Aššur-mudammiq seems to be the lock master of the New Palace in Kalḫu, as he acts as a witness for this palace’s ŝakintu, the female equivalent of a palace manager in the queen’s household. As Aššur-mudammiq is of superior status to Nabu-belu-usur, the latter’s sphere of activity, known from his title as the lock master of the queen’s household, can be further specified as that of the lock master of the queen’s household at the New Palace of Kalḫu. He is therefore the successor of Šulmu-beli who held this same office some twenty years earlier, as can be assumed from the context in which he occurs. Due to their connection with palace managers,

51 See footnote 9.
52 In the Lû list, see Salonen 1961: 131–2 s. v. and CAD S 249: sikkatu A 2.
53 For bibliographical references see Herbordt 1992: 55 with n. 122 and 69 with n. 168.
54 Herbordt 1992: 69–70.
courtiers or palace slaves, the lock masters Kablu'-Issar, Nabu'a, Šulmu-šarri of Kallhu and [...]-ukin are also certain to have worked in palaces. Šulmu-šarri of Assur, on the other hand, may well have been the lock master of a temple in Assur, if not the Aššur temple itself, as he is attested with numerous high administrative temple officials.

There is no indication that lock masters were in any way connected with city gates. As the title of a rab abullātē ‘overseer of the city gates’ is attested in a letter from the royal correspondence, we may assume that the organization of the guard of the city gates was this official’s responsibility.

Unfortunately, the attestations known so far tell us nothing about the exact function of the lock master. Theoretically, several possible activities arise from dealings with locks and their components. One possibility is that the lock master is the craftsman who builds the locks; this seems unlikely for two reasons. Firstly, there is no connection whatsoever with related craftsmen such as smiths. Secondly, the lock master seems to enjoy considerably higher status than would be expected for such a craftsman. For the same reasons it is not plausible that he is the craftsman responsible for the maintenance of the lock, especially since such a simple mechanism as that of the sikkatu lock does not necessitate much maintenance work. As it is certain from the known attestations that the lock master holds a high-ranking administrative post, it is most plausible to assume that he was responsible for the safekeeping of the bolt-pins necessary for locking, and for the keys necessary for unlocking the locks, as well as for the actual locking and unlocking.

To conclude, it should be noted that the same interpretation very likely applies for the Old Babylonian usage, and certainly for the Neo-Babylonian attestations of the rab sikkātē. This official is clearly a high-ranking member of the temple staff and is so far attested for the Ebabbar in Sippar and the Eanna in Uruk. In the Ebabbar, one man, Šamaš-aḫa-iddina, held the post over the long period of 28 years.

The known office-holders

- Aššur-mudammīq, lock master in Kallhu during the reign of Sin-šarru-šikūn
  [1] ND 2307 l.e. 2 = Parker 1954: pl. vi (copy) = Postgate 1976: no. 14 (dated 8.xii.622 [after Parpola 1998 = Reade 1998]; eponymy of Daddi); 'aššur-mudam-iq GAL-si-ka-a-te is the fifth witness in the marriage document between Šubetu, daughter of Amat-Astarti, šakintu of the New Palace of Kallhu, and Milki-ramu, son of Abdi-Azuzu; other witnesses bearing professional titles are the mayor Arabai (r. 27), the priests Nabu-šumu-šūr (r. 28, also mentioned in text [6] with the lock master Nabu’a) and Iddin-Ada (r. 29), the courtier (‘KUR) Indabe (l.e. 1) and Nabu-belu-šūr, the lock master of the household of the queen (l.e. 3, cf. [7]). As Aššur-mudammīq precedes Nabu-belu-šūr in the witness list, we may suppose that he was considered to be of superior rank and it is therefore likely that he was the lock master of the New Palace.

- Indi, lock master of the Nabu temple in Assur during the latter years of the reign of Assurbanipal
  [2] A 338 r. 7 = STAT 1 20 = STAT 2 238 (dated 6.xii.633 [after Parpola 1998] or 638 [after Reade 1998]; eponymy of Upaq-na-Ana-Abail): S-in-di-i GAL-GAL SAG is one of the witnesses in a badly broken text documenting a sale by the scribe Etil-pi-Marduk son of Balassu. Other witnesses bearing professional titles are the gatekeeper Nabu-na’adi (r. 4´) and the watchman Inurta-šarru-šūr (r. 10´).

---

55 SAA 13 128 r. 17: LÜ.GAL-KA.GAL-MAŠ. This official is mentioned in a letter by Aššur-reshuwa, priest of the Ninurta temple of Kallhu, to the king. From the context of the letter it is clear that the overseer of the city gates held a rank inferior to that of the priest himself and the mayor (įaṣaruma) of Kallhu.

56 See now also Stol 2004: 666–7.

57 For attestations from the Ebabbar in Sippar see Bongenaar 1997: 134, for attestations from the Eanna in Uruk see Gellken 1990: 93–4. The interpretation as ‘Pflugscharmeister’ as suggested in AHw 1042 and adopted by Gehlken seems unlikely to me, especially as Bongenaar stressed that ‘no connection with the ploughmen of Ebabbar can be detected’.

58 Nabonidus 15 to Darius 12; for attestations see Bongenaar 1997: 134.
• Inurta-aḫu-iddina, lock master (of the Review Palace) in Kallu during the reign of Sin-šarru-iškun


• The only other witness with a professional title is the fuller Iqbi-adad (l. 16).

[4] CTN 3 39: envelope l. 12 (dated 19.i.615 [after Parpola 1998] or 617 [after Reade 1998]; eponymy of Sin-aliq-pani): imulator-UMMA-PAB-AS PARATOR-SI-ka-tel (copy: KUR) is the second witness mentioned on the envelope of an obligation note documenting a debt owed by Šalmu-šarrī-qiṭ to lady Attar-paltu, scribe of the queen. Inurta-aḫu-iddina, who is mentioned without title in the inner tablet (l. 14), is listed with the title on the envelope after the palace manager Tartimanni (l. 11). Although the lock master’s title is not further specified we may safely assume that he is the lock master of the Review Palace, just like Tartimanni is the palace manager of the Review Palace. Because of Inurta-aḫu-iddina’s involvement with the šakintu of the household of the queen and the queen’s scribe, a connection specifically with the queen’s household at the Review Palace may be possible. The position of the lock master of the household of the queen in the New Palace at Kallu is at that time held by Nabu-belu-usur.

• Kablu-issar, lock master, probably at Assur during the reign of Assurbanipal or his successors

[5] ADD 62 = SAA 6 95 r. 6 (no date mentioned; reign of Assurbanipal or later): imulator-UMMA-PAB-AS PARATOR-SI-ka-te is the first witness in a document concerning a field of the šakintu. Other witnesses bearing professional titles are Sana-il, messenger of the palace manager (r. 7), and the scribe Nabu-remanni (r. 8). Although the text is said to originate from Nineveh it probably comes from Assur originally, as the penalty clauses are in favour of Aššur and Mullissu—a typical feature of Assur legal texts. The document itself does not mention a date, which is rather unusual and should probably be explained as a mistake. But while the text was filed among the texts from the reigns of the kings Tiglath-pileser III (744–727 BCE) through to Esarhaddon in the latest edition, it should rather be dated to the reign of Assurbanipal or one of his successors, as indicated by the use of a penalty clause which is only attested from 650 BCE onwards.59

• Nabu’a, lock master in Kallu during the reign of Sin-šarru-iškun

[6] ND 2308 r. 1 = Parker 1954: pl. vii (copy) = Postgate 1976 no. 11 (dated 25.viii.616 [after Parpola 1998] or 621 [after Reade 1998]; eponymy of Bel-aḫu-usur): imulator-UMMA-PAB-AS PARATOR-SI-ka-te is the third witness in a text documenting the release of a female palace slave by one Manmu-ki-abu; other witnesses bearing professional titles are the mayor Arabai (r. 27), the priests Nabu-sumnu-usur (r. 28, also mentioned in [6] with the lock master Nabu’a) and Iddin-Aia (r. 29), the courtier (KUR) Indabe (li. Rd. 1) and the lock master Aššur-mudammiq and Nabu-belu-usur.

• Nabu-belu-usur, lock master of the household of the queen in Kallu during the reign of Sin-šarru-iškun

[7] ND 2307 l. 1 = Parker 1954: pl. vi (copy) = Postgate 1976 no. 14 (dated 8.xii.622 [after Parpola 1998 = Reade 1998]; eponymy of Daddi): imulator-UMMA-PAB-AS PARATOR-SI-ka-te is the sixth witness in the marriage document between Šubetu, daughter of Amat-astaštu, šakintu of the New Palace of Kallu, and Milki-ramu, son of Abdi-Azzi; other witnesses bearing professional titles are the mayor Arabai (r. 27), the priests Nabu-sumnu-usur (r. 28, also mentioned in [6] with the lock master Nabu’a) and Iddin-Aia (r. 29), the courtier (KUR) Indabe (li. Rd. 1) and the lock master Aššur-mudammiq (l.e. 2, see discussion under [1]).

• Šulmu-beli, lock master during the reign of Assurbanipal

[8] ND 2316 r. 6 = Parker 1954: pl. vii (copy) (dated 24.i.641 [after Parpola 1998] or 640 [after Reade 1998]; eponymy of Aššur-garau’a-nere): imulator-UMMA-PAB-AS PARATOR-SI-ka-te is the second witness in the marriage document between Milki-haia, a female palace slave of the New Palace of Kallu dedicated to the goddess Mullissu, and the weaver Mataqin-issar. Šulmu-beli is mentioned after the only other witness with a professional title, the weaver Qibit-Issar (r. 5). He may well be the predecessor of Nabu-belu-usur as the lock master of the queen’s household in the New Palace of Kallu.

59 See Radner 2002: 19 for the evidence on the clause adē ša šarrī ina qaṭeqšu ụbu’ī. ụ. 
Šulmu-šarri (A), lock master in Kalḫu during the reign of Assurbanipal  

Šulmu-šarri (B), lock master in Assur during the late reign of Assurbanipal (or possibly during the reign of his successors)  
[10] ADD 575+579+805 r. 11 = SAA 14 62 (date lost): ‘šulmu-[LUGAL] ȘULMU-[GAL]-GAL.GAL.MES is the seventh witness in a text of which only the lengthy witness list is preserved; all witnesses bear their titles: the eunuch and temple overseer Abda (r. 5’), the palace manager Aṣu-eriba (r. 6’), the temple scribe Marduk-šašlim-ahīhe (r. 7’), the eunuch and overseer of the royal tombs Nabu-šezibanna (r. 8’), the eunuchs and overseers of the mausoleum Nabu-gamil (r. 9’), and Šulmu-šarri (r. 10’), the (temple) brewer Mutakkilit-Assur (r. 12’), Urdu-Nanaia, priest of Šamaš (r. 13’), and the eunuchs Aššur-isṣe’a (r. 14’), and Kunaia (r. 15’). For prosopographical reasons, the text must have originated in Assur and it can be safely attributed to the late reign of Assurbanipal (or later). Note that the lock master Šulmu-šarri who is attested in Kalḫu (see [9]) could possibly be the same man.

Tur-dala, lock master of the (household of the) crown prince in Kalḫu during the reign of Assurbanipal  
[11] ND 3426 r. 18 = Wiseman 1953: pl. xii (copy) = Postgate 1976 no. 9 (dated 9.xii.649): ‘šulmu-[LUGAL] ȘULMU-[GAL]-GAL.GAL.MES Șš = MAN. The offices of lock master and entrance overseer are not attested at all prior to the reign of Assurbanipal and that they are unattested through lack of evidence, it is in my opinion more plausible that these offices were indeed an innovation at the beginning of the reign of Assurbanipal. They were

THE DATE OF INTRODUCTION OF THE OFFICES OF LOCK MASTER AND ENTRANCE OVERSEEER

The offices of lock master and entrance overseer are not attested at all prior to the reign of Assurbanipal. In addition, it seems that some of the lock master’s sphere of activity was taken over from the palace manager (who is clearly responsible for locks and locking in the Middle Assyrian period) and, in the case of the temples, from the lahḫinnu official.

Although it remains possible that these offices already existed already before Assurbanipal’s reign and that they are unattested through lack of evidence, it is in my opinion more plausible that these offices were indeed an innovation at the beginning of the reign of Assurbanipal. They were

60 For Ubru-Nabû see Dalley and Postgate 1984: 6–7.
61 Kwasman 1988: 56.
62 According to the Middle Assyrian Court and Harem Edicts § 1; edition: Weidner 1954/6: 268.
quite possibly created as a consequence of the traumatic experiences of the murder of Sennacherib by the hand of his own sons in 681 BCE, followed by Esarhaddon’s narrow escape from a conspiracy in 671/670 BCE fronted by one Sasi, to whom the oracle of the god Nusku is said to have promised the Assyrian throne.\textsuperscript{64}

If the Assyrian king had been carefully screened from the outside world before Sennacherib’s murder, his successor Esarhaddon was surely forced to lead a life of extreme seclusion, in constant fear, as is best witnessed by the many divinatory queries addressed to the sun god focussing on whether various members of the court were likely to plot against the king.\textsuperscript{65} The murder of Sennacherib was likely to have resulted in considerable changes to the surveillance of the palace; it was mentioned above that all chief doorkeepers active during Sennacherib’s reign seem to have lost their office (and probably their life) and were replaced by new officials. While the loyalty of the gatekeepers and the watchmen is put to trial in Esarhaddon’s queries to the sun god,\textsuperscript{66} mention of the lock keeper and the entrance overseer is conspicuously absent in this context. This seems to strengthen the hypothesis that the offices of lock master and of entrance overseer were created only at the beginning of Assurbanipal’s reign, when the recent uncovering of the Sasi conspiracy had shown that events similar to Sennacherib’s murder had only just been avoided and the need for a more sophisticated security system must have seemed overwhelming. By introducing these new offices to the palace administration the responsibility for controlling access to the palace, which previously was the domain of the gatekeepers, was now shared by several officials. This certainly reduced the power of the gatekeepers and hence diminished the risk of abuse of this power.

That the various officials responsible for the control and regulation of access to the palaces took their work seriously and that many a potential visitor would have been turned away at the palace door is clear from a proposal which the astrologer Nabu-mušesı made to the king in anticipation of his visit to the royal palace in Nineveh: ‘Maybe they won’t let me enter; let them give me an order sealed with the royal seal (\textit{ünqū})!’\textsuperscript{67} Such a document would certainly have dispelled all doubts and its holder would have been given admittance to the palace without much further ado.

\textsuperscript{64} See most recently Radner 2003.
\textsuperscript{66} Gatekeeper: SAA 4 142: 7; watchmen: SAA 4 142: 8. I am grateful to Andreas Fuchs for drawing my attention to this.
\textsuperscript{67} SAA 8 157 r. 7–8, cf. Frahm 1998: 120.
ABBREVIATIONS

Bibliographical abbreviations follow those listed in the *Chicago Assyrian Dictionary* and the *Chicago Hittite Dictionary*, with the following additions and exceptions:

AAICAB  see Grégoire 1996–2001
Adab    see Yang 1989
AMD     Ancient Magic and Divination
CST     see Fish 1932
GARES   Archivi Reali di Ebla: Studi
ARI     see Grayson 1972–6
ASI     *Acta Sumerologica* (Japan)
ATU     see Englund and Nissen 1993
AUWE    Ausgrabungen aus Uruk-Warka, Endberichte
BaF     Baghdader Forschungen
BAM     see Köcher 1964; 1980
BBVO    Berliner Beiträge zum Vorderen Orient
BSA     *Bulletin on Sumerian Agriculture*
CM      Cuneiform Monographs
DB      see Kent 1953 (edition of DB, pp. 116–A35)
DP      see Allotte de la Fuýe 1908–20
ECTJ    see Westenholz 1975b
Emar    see Arnaud 1985–7
ETCGL   see Black et al. 1998–2006
FAOS    Freiburger Altorientalische Studien
Fö      see Förtsch 1916
GAG     see Von Soden 1969
HdO     Handbuch der Orientalistik
HSASO   Heidelberger Studien zum Alten Orient
ISET    see Çığ et al. 1969 (ISET 1); Çığ, Kızılyay and Kramer 1976 (ISET 2)
KAR     see Ebeling 1919–20
LKA     see Ebeling 1953
MC      Mesopotamian Civilizations
MSVO    see Englund and Grégoire 1991
MVS     Münchner Vorderasiatische Studien
Nik     see Nikol’skil 1908
NYPL    New York Public Library
OBC     Orientalia Biblica et Christiana
OBO     Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis
OPSNKF  Occasional Publications of the Samuel Noah Kramer Fund
OSP 1    see Westenholz 1975a
PDT     see Çığ et al. 1956
PIHANS  Publications de l’Institut historique-archéologique néerlandais de Stamboul
PNA 2/I  see Baker 2000
RCU     P. Michalowski, *The Royal Correspondence of Ur* (diss., Yale Univ.)
RGTC    Répertoire Géographique des Textes Cunéiformes
RIA     Realelexikon der Assyriologie und Vorderasiatischen Archäologie
SAAB    *State Archives of Assyria Bulletin*
SAACT   State Archives of Assyria Cuneiform Texts
SAALT   State Archives of Assyria Literary Texts
SAN     Sources from the Ancient Near East
SAOC    Studies in Ancient Oriental Civilization
SCIAMVS Sources and Commentaries in Exact Sciences, Kyoto, Japan
SEL     Studi Epigrafici e Linguistici sul Vicino Oriente antico
SF      see Deimel 1923
SpTU 3   see Von Weirch 1988
StAT    Studien zu den Assur-Texten; see Radner 1999 (StAT 1), Donbaz and Parpola 2001 (StAT 2)
STH     see Hussey 1912
TCTI 2   see Lafont and Yıldız 1996
BIBLIOGRAPHY

TLB 3  see Hallo 1973
TSA  see de Genouillac 1909
UAVA  Untersuchungen zur Assyriologie und Vorderasiatischen Archäologie
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