

suffisamment riches pour démontrer que, au moyen âge, c'étaient, outre les gisements de l'Inde, de l'Arabie, du Caucase, de l'Oural, de l'Altai, du Deccan, de l'Égypte et du Soudan Occidental, aussi les mines de l'Afrique Orientale et de celle de Nord-Est qui produisaient les grandes quantités d'or. La plus grande partie de l'or est-africain parvenait, au moyen âge, aux marchés arabes et persans comme Bagdad, les ports de l'Arabie, l'Alexandrie, le Caire et Sirāf; cependant il est aussi très vraisemblable que l'on expédiait une partie de l'or est-africain vers les pays non-arabes, surtout aux Indes et en Chine et peut-être aussi aux royaumes de l'Asie du Sud-Est, comme Khmer et Śrīvijaya.

MATERIAUX ET BIBLIOGRAPHIE

STEFAN ZAWADZKI

SOME REMARKS CONCERNING THE PROPERTY OF
THE EANNA TEMPLE IN URUK (7th c. B. C.)

In 1934 Alfred Pohl published two neo-Babylonian documents from the area of Uruk issued by Ashurbanipal and Kandalanu and concerning orchards of this town¹. At first the two documents failed to draw scholars' attention. A. Falkenstein was the first to use them while working on the topography of Uruk during the time of Seleucids². D. Cocquerillat made a fuller use of them in her work on palm groves and cultivations on the Eanna estate³ and then during her research on the orchards of the akitu temples in southern Babylonia⁴. In her opinion, by issuing the Pohl II 2 document Ashurbanipal deprived the Eanna of a part of its demesne belonging to the goddesses Ishtar and Nana for the benefit of his followers. Formally, the orchards were to be given to the

¹ A. Pohl, *Neubabylonische Rechtsurkunden II*, *Analecta Orientalia IX*, Rom 1934, Nos 2—3 (we quote Pohl II 2 and Pohl II 3).

² A. Falkenstein, *Topographie von Uruk*. I Teil. *Uruk zur Seleukidenzeit*, Leipzig 1941 (Ausgrabungen der Deutschen Forschungsgemeinschaft in Uruk = Warka, Bd 3), pp. 48—49.

³ D. Cocquerillat, *Palmeraies et cultures de l'Eanna d'Uruk* (559 — 520), Berlin 1968, pp. 106—107 (fragments of transliteration of both texts) and pp. 23—25 and notes 43—45 (fragments of translation with a comment). In Pohl II 2: 43 instead of 1 lim 1 me^{mes} we should read 1 lim 1 me 80, and in Pohl II 3: 64 instead of LÚÉ. MAŠ we should read LÚKID, BAR = Šangû, cf. K. Deller, *Or* 34, 1966, p. 468.

⁴ D. Cocquerillat, *Recherches sur le verger du temple compagnard de l'Akitu* (KIRI₆ ḫallat), *Welt des Orients*, 7, 1973, pp. 105—107.

god of war Ninurta, and in fact to users who were to maintain the Assyrian army⁵. The author assumes, then, that the priests of Uruk did not belong to the followers of Ashurbanipal during the fratricidal war and therefore were punished after the war. However, there are no data at present justifying this standpoint.

Below we shall attempt a detailed interpretation of this document as well as Pohl II 3 which is closely connected with it. They will also reveal some aspects of the economy of Uruk, the structure of the orchards and their users' position.

Both documents are copies of the originals⁶, both are written according to a similar pattern. Every verse starts with mentioning the width of an orchard (SAG. KI) in ells, that is, the side which most probably adjoined an irrigational ditch. It is followed by the name of its user. The first one, Pohl II 2, dated from the reign of Ashurbanipal, comes either from the period just before the outbreak of the open conflict with Shamash-shum-ukin, or from the period just after its outbreak, i.e., from 651 or a bit earlier from the end of 652⁷. Ashurbanipal could not have made such

⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 107 and 116.

⁶ Cf. Pohl II 2: mi-ḫi-ru DA KIRI₆ li-mi-ti UNUG_{KI} šá ḫIš-tar u ḫNa-na-a „a copy of the tablet concerning orchards of the Uruk district belonging to Ishtar and Nana” and Pohl II 3: ḫAG-u-šal-lim A mXXX-TI. A. RA. ZU⁶⁴ LU⁶⁵KID. BAR ḫNUSKU eš-šeš iš-tur-ma (...) ⁶⁵ (ina É)-an-na u-kin „Nabu-ushalim, son of Sin-leqe-uninni, (qalu of Ishtar of Uruk, scribe of the Eanna temple) shangû of Nusku has recopied (the tablet) ... and deposited (in the E) anna”.

⁷ M. Dietrich, *Die Aramäer Südbabyloniens in der Sargonidenzeit* (700 — 648), Neukirchen-Vluyn 1970 (= AOAT 7), pp. 81—89. The latest documents from Uruk, dated according to Shamash-shum-ukin, come from 14th Teshritu (VII—VIII) of the fifteenth year of his reign (652) — Bag. Mitt. Bd 5, No 19:15 = No 20:16. It means they were written three months before the outbreak of the open conflict. The first document dated according to Ashurbanipal comes from 15th Aiaru of the eighteenth year of his reign (651) — Bag. Mitt. Bd 5, No 5: 29; cf. also WdO Bd VI, H. 2, p. 160. In D. Cocquerillat's opinion, this document comes from the second half of 648, that is, from the period after the failure of Shamash-shum-ukin's uprising, cf. WdO 7, 1973, p. 107. In the light of this dating two questions arise which are difficult to solve: 1. why, only two years later, Kandalanu had to issue a new legal act concerning the same grounds (which we justify below), 2. why most of the users of the orchards changed in such a short period of time. The dating we propose seems to answer both these questions.

serious changes as those introduced by the document without destroying his relations with Shamash-shum-ukin. The other document is dated more precisely, as it comes from the second year of Kandalanu's reign, that is 646.

The problem to be solved now is the character of the document, that is, answering the question of for whom the orchards were actually meant. Pohl II 2 states at the beginning that the document concerns the orchards of Ishtar and Nana (v. 1), and then that these were given to Ninurta of Uruk (v. 63). It seems that the inconsistency is only apparent. The Eanna was the abode of Ishtar and Nana. The tablet containing the Pohl II 3 document, which, as we shall see, repeats to a certain extent Pohl II 2, was deposited in the Eanna (v. 65). The indirect conclusion follows, then, that also Ninurta had his chapel in the Eanna and that he had some estate as well which, however, was eventually regarded as belonging to Ishtar and Nana, the main deities of Uruk of tish period⁸. Thus, the text is a document of donation to the Eanna meant specially for Ninurta.

It is worth observing here that Pohl II 2 as a rule gives the name of a user only and in a few cases also the name of his father, while in Pohl II 3 we always find the name of a user and that of his father.

We have already stressed the fact that both documents are written according to a similar pattern. The similarities, however, are much more profound.

Particular attention should be given to verses 3—51 in Pohl II 2 and verses 2—41 in Pohl II 3. These two texts describe orchards situated in UGU URU (in the „upper town”) and in É ḫEa. In Pohl II 2 the orchards of ḫPA. BIL. SAG. MES and KI TA URU (that is, the ones of the „lower town”) are divided into two groups

⁸ Ninurta's chapel and sacrifices to this god are particularly frequently mentioned in texts from the neo-Babylonian and Persian period, cf. H. Freydank, *Spätbabylonische Wirtschaftstexte aus Uruk*, Berlin 1971, pp. 147—148: bīt ḫNinurta. That this document, like Pohl II 3, states a donation to the temple and not vice versa is also supported by the fact that they were later copied and kept in the temple. Otherwise, the action taken to preserve the decisions of the document would be strange. Also a donation to Ninurta — the god of war — during the operations then in progress is natural and understandable.

including 15 orchards together and covering the total area of about 19 ha.⁹, while in Pohl II 3 they belong to one group of 7 orchards covering 11,50 ha. In Pohl II 3 there is a group of orchards whose location has not come down to us, and which were situated, at least partially, in KI. TA URU, that is in the „lower town”, as can be judged on the basis of Pohl II 2. Naturally, the question arises if the similarities are only superficial or if both documents describe the same grounds, in spite of the fact that there are some differences in the number and size of the plots in particular groups in the two texts. The supposition that it is the description of the same grounds¹⁰ is justified by the fact that the same sizes of plots in particular groups recur. This conviction is strengthened first of all by prosopographic studies, as the same people appear in both texts. Here is a detailed list of the similarities:

1. Pohl II 2: 9 = Pohl II 3: 7 — Aḫ-irašši, son of ṁx-tarririh: an orchard of a side 50 ells long in UGU URU

2. Pohl II 2: 11 = Pohl II 3: 9 — Bel-epuš, son of Nabu-šum-iškun: an orchard of a side 100 ells long in UGU URU

3. Pohl II 2: 12 = Pohl II 3: 10 — Eriši, son of Rimutu: an orchard of a side 200 ells long in UGU URU

4. Pohl II 2: 21 ṁPA. BIL. SAG = Pohl II 3: 13 ṁPA. BIL. SAG KIRI, ša KI. TA URU — Bel-eriba, son of Dummuqu: an orchard of a side 500 ells long

5. Pohl II 2: 35 KI. TA URU = Pohl II 3: 21 [] — Bel-epuš, son of Nabu-šum-iškun: an orchard of a side 100 ells long

6. Pohl II 2: 36 KI. TA NRU = Pohl II 3: 22 [] — Nabu-ušalli, son of Šamaš-ia: an orchard of a side 100 ells long

⁹ When calculating the areas of the orchards D. Cocquerillat's conception was accepted that the plots were square and that the royal ell equalled 0,50 m, cf. D. Cocquerillat, *Palmeraies...*, p. 25, note 45 Remarques L. 4. It must be observed, however, that Pohl II 2: 54 gives both dimensions of a field although it is a square, which makes the assumption that all the fields were squares dubious. The other dimension was probably determined by some natural obstacle.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 25.

7. Pohl II 2: 4 UGU URU = Pohl II 3: 23 [] — Šula, son of ṁx-tarririh: an orchard of a side 100 ells long

8. Pohl II 2: 51 É ṁEa = Pohl II 3: 40 É ṁEa — Bel-eriba, son of Dummuqu: an orchard of a side 70 ells long

We have also such situations in which the same person appears in both texts but his possessions are different. According to Pohl II 2: 44, Shuma, son of Ittabshi owned only one plot of a side 40 ells long (0,04 ha.) situated in É ṁEa, and according to Pohl II 3 two plots, one of unknown location 0,36 ha. in area (i.e., of a side 120 ells long (v. 26)) and another one of 0,25 ha. situated in É ṁEa (v. 37). In all these cases there are no names of fathers in Pohl II 2, but because of the same location and size of the plots the identification is unquestionable. One more conclusion follows from items 5—7. In Pohl II 2 the two first plots (items 5—6) were situated in KI. TA URU, the third one in UGU URU. In Pohl II 3 all three are included in one group; we do not know how it was termed because of damages of the text. The conclusion can be drawn, however, that terms like KI. TA URU or UGU URU are justly not treated as precise topographic notions, as these were colloquial everyday terms denoting fields lying on elevations or depressions of the terrain. The same field, described by some as UGU URU, was described by others as KI. TA URU. There was a different, third term for some of these fields, perhaps for those situated on a slope. If we moved items 5—6 to the KI. TA URU group, to which they belong in Pohl II 2, we would get, in Pohl II 3, 1800 ells as the joint length of the side, i.e., the same as in Pohl II 2. The number and size of the orchards (according to D. Cocquerillat's criteria) would not be the same, but, taking into consideration the above remarks, it is quite possible. Some of them might have been split up, some shifted to another group and vice versa.

From the above comparison of appropriate parts of the documents it follows that we should rather speak of Ashurbanipal's donation and Kandalanu's redonation, as far as the orchards in Uruk are concerned. After the several years of fratricidal war the life in the town became disorganized to a certain extent and a serious confusion in the system of ownership appeared. Certainly, the short administration of Shamash-shum-ukin's followers was

not without some influence¹¹. Therefore, the ruler's intervention was necessary again. Perhaps the temple, too, made such a suggestion in order to get a confirmation, and most probably also an enlargement, of the old donations in the new situation. The further part of the documents differs only in that Pohl II 3 seems to express not only a confirmation of the previous donation but also its enlargement. It must be stressed, however, that the copyist of Pohl II 2 may have not copied in this document the whole of the original, as verses 64—65 mention tablets describing grounds situated at the royal ditch¹².

Another problem to be solved is the economic situation of the people who cultivated the orchards. In the light of the discussed texts, their situation was fairly differentiated. Generally speaking, it must be observed that the plots were relatively small-sized. An average size of a plot in Pohl II 2 was about 1 ha., which is more or less consistent with the exact data given in verses 53—55 where both dimensions of the fields are given. These plots had the areas of 0,50, 0,65 and 1 ha., respectively. However, there was quite a considerable difference between the largest and the smallest plots. Two largest plots in Pohl II 2 covered 9 and 6,25 ha., the smallest one — 0,04 ha. Out of 50 orchards mentioned in this document (see the note under the table) 19 were from 1 to 9 ha. in area, and 31 from 0,04 to 0,65 ha. As many as 9 orchards had the area of less than 15 ares, 13 covered 0,25 ha. and the remaining 8 less than 0,50 ha. The largest plots were in the group ^aPA. BIL. SAG. MES and ^ÍD. LUGAL elinu. The ten orchards situated there covered 50 % of the area of all the grounds mentioned in the document. The smallest orchards occurred in the group ^É ^aEa; 8 had the area of 2,18 ha., none of them more than 1 ha. large, and 7 had less than 0,15 ha. Equally small orchards were found in the group UGU URU, 8 out of 11 belonged to those up to 0,25 ha.

The situation described in Pohl II 3 is more complicated. In the group of UGU URU orchards no relevant changes occurred. In the groups ^aPA. BIL. SAG. MES and ^É ^aEa we can observe

¹¹ M. Dietrich, *Die Aramäer...*, pp. 89—93.

¹² D. Cocquerillat, *Palmeraies...*, p. 24, note 43, L. 64—65 and WDO 7, 1973, p. 106.

a further decrease in the average dimensions of orchards from 2,14 ha. to 1,64 ha. and from 0,27 ha. to 0,16 ha. In the remaining verses, in which there is no doubt that we actually deal with one orchard, their sizes do not differ from those listed in Pohl II 2. In some cases where the user was not always mentioned there appear 4 plots of 25 ha. each, two of 100 ha. and one of 400 ha. It is unquestionable that we deal here with over ten or even several tens of orchards the division of which was not taken into consideration in the document. This especially concerns the 100 ha. and 400 ha. complexes, whose user was not given as undoubtedly there were quite a number of them. Even if we leave this group aside, we must notice that the largest plot was very many times bigger than the smallest one. The smallest one, 0,04 ha., was 250 times smaller than the largest one covering 9 ha. In fact, financial differences were not so great; it often happened that a few plots were owned by one person, each plot as a rule coming from a different group. In both documents there are 64, or 61¹³, people together and their assets looked as follows: (see page 194). To this we should add 25 ha. cultivated by two people together, independently of the plots each of them owned separately (Pohl II 3: 60). These 64 people possessed together grounds of 92 ha. In our considerations we shall omit the two last positions as clearly differing from the average. It turns out that agglomeration of plots covering jointly 0,25 ha. in one hand was the most characteristic. 45 people — heads of families — owned plots of up to 1 ha., and nearly all the people were in possession of plots 0,50 ha. in area. So the financial differentiation although, it did exist, was not so conspicuous as a superficial survey of the document might suggest. Larger plots may have occupied poorer soil, not so well watered, and anyhow lying outside the town. Within the town we meet only one plot of 6,25 ha. and 4 ones of 2,25 ha. The remaining ones, as a rule, occupied the area of much less than 1 ha.

¹³ It results from the damages of the texts. Neither can we say for sure if there were two or three people of the name Erishi, nor do we know if Ah- and Nabu- from Pohl II 3: 29, 27 were identical with people whose names started with this same element. To make things easier we shall treat them as different persons.

Size of orchards (in ha.) owned by one person	Number of people owning plots of this size
0,04	2
0,06	1
0,25	18
0,31	2
0,50	5 *
0,56	6
0,65	2
0,85	1
1,00	10
1,15	1
1,27	1
1,56	3
2,25	5
2,40	1
2,61	1
5,00	1
6,25	1
6,37	1
9,00	1
25,00	1
67,08	64

* A plot of 1 ha owned by two people is treated as two plots of 0,50 ha.

Only a few people were outstandingly wealthy and their orchards were considerably above the average. And thus Kuzub-ilāni (Pohl II 2: 3, 16) and Bel-eriba (Pohl II 2: 21, 51) owned each two plots of 5 ha. and 6,37 ha. within the town walls. Also Bel-ibni (Pohl II 3: 2, 38) and Bel-ah-iddina (Pohl II 2: 8, 20, 46) were opulent, and their respective plots covered jointly 2,61 ha. and 2,40 ha. Finally, plots of 2,25 ha. located in the town were owned by Dana-Marduk (Pohl II 3: 11, 16, 41), Zer-ukin (Pohl II 2: 17) and Tabnea in the vicinity of the Shamash' Gate (Pohl II 2: 27). Besides his own plot, Zer-ukin together with Kudurru cultivated also 0,25 ha. lying in É^aEa (Pohl II 2: 48). Some people possessed quite considerable grounds, but outside the town. Zakir was the

owner of an orchard 6,25 ha. large situated at the royal ditch (Pohl II 3: 51 ÍD. LUGAL). Nabu-ah-eresh owned a 9 ha. orchard in another section of the ditch (Pohl II 2: 23 ÍD LUGAL elinu). A few families stood out for their wealth. Here one should mention the sons of Dummugu: Bel-eriba, whose name has already appeared, and his brother Marduk who cultivated 1,15 ha. by himself (Pohl II 3: 6, 14, 35) and 25 ha. together with Dana-Marduk (Pohl II 3: 60). It is quite probable that Bel-ah-iddina, the owner of orchards of 2,40 ha. in area, is his son. And above-mentioned Dana-Marduk has also orchards of 2,25 ha. in the town (Pohl II 3: 11, 16, 41). The second son of Ina-šilli-Bel — Lakipi — was still richer. He owned a small orchard of 0,25 ha. at the royal ditch (Pohl II 3: 48) and another one, covering 25 ha., at the ditch ÍD ħarri ša Remutu (v. 45). Erishi, son of Remutu, was equally wealthy as he possessed orchards of 1,25 ha. in the town (Pohl II 3: 10, 39) and 25 ha. in É DUMU. MÍ^aSin (Pohl II 3: 53).

One the basis of the above analysis we can distinguish 4 groups considerably differing in wealth. There was a small group of poor people, cultivating orchards occupying a few ares, a group of people who were relatively well-to-do, owing 1 ha. orchards most probably satisfactory for maintaining them, a group of wealthy people owning from 2 to 9 ha. of orchards and a small group of very opulent people possessing orchards of even more than 10 ha. The first two groups undoubtedly cultivated their orchards with their own hands. It could not have been their only or main occupation, as the area they owned was not sufficient for maintaining their families. The third group might have employed additional manpower not mentioned by the documents. The fourth one certainly represents not the immediate producers but those who supervised or owned the orchards, The employment of labour hands must have been quite considerable here.

We are left with the question about the social and legal status of the people mentioned in the documents. Pohl II 2 says: šá ŠAR. DŪ. IBILA LUGAL KURÁŠ-šur (...) ina ŠUⁿ LŪUNUG^{ki}-a-a ú-ter-ram-ma a-na^a NIN-URTA šá UNUG^{ki} id-di-nu „(orchards) which Ashurbanipal, king of Assyria, (...) turned over to the citizens of Uruk (and) gave to Ninurta of Uruk...”

The quotation mentions the citizens of Uruk, and this term was used to denote citizens with full rights. As a rule, the names of their fathers were given too, which was not practised when dealing with slaves. A number of people, related with one another, were given very large plots, which suggests that they played an important role in Uruk also before the donation, and most probably it only increased their influence. This is supported by Pohl II 2: 54 which says that Ubar, shangu of the god Ninurta, was given an orchard of 1 ha. Verses 1—2 of Pohl II 2 are an appendix to the document made simultaneously with the copy describing the status of those people. They are called ^{LÚ}KIRI₆. MEŠ ša DINGIR „gardeners of the god”. It may suggest their personal dependence incompatible with their status as full-right citizens. Hence, it seems most probable that Ashurbanipal and later Kandalanu donated to the temple not orchards as such but the income from them. The term ^{LÚ}KIRI₆. MEŠ DINGIR denotes those people who at a given time were obligated to services for the temple on account of their possessing the orchards.

One of neo-Assyrian documents ¹⁴ mentions a sale of an orchard which was a ginû of the god Ashur and his wife Ninlil. We can suppose that, like in Pohl II 2—3, first a „donation” of this orchard to the temple of Ashur took place, consisting in fact in a donation of a part of the income. It did not in the least restrict the owner's rights to a free disposition of the orchard, its sale included, since the duty was imposed not on an owner, who could change, but on the land. A change of the owner did not influence a change or extinction of the obligation. The new owner had to fulfil it.

From what has been said above one conclusion of a very general nature can be drawn. When texts speak of orchards etc. belonging to gods, it may mean either that temples actually owned them or that they had only the right to a part of the income from these grounds. In the discussed texts the statements „orchards of Ishtar and Nana” and „orchards of gods” mean the right of the temple to the income from these lands. The names of their users only help to identify the grounds, indicating at the same time the people who are personally responsible for the fulfilment of the duty. In Pohl II 3: 54—59 the names of the users do not appear

at all. It may suggest that either the obligation was imposed on all the grounds situated at the ditches or whole localities, or in the case of small plots their situation did not raise the problem of identification. In the texts under consideration the essence of the duty remains elusive.

¹⁴ ARU 371.