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The article deals with the kalû priest and his repertoire (kalûtu) in Assyria. It is argued that the office of kalû was a Babylonian institution, gradually imported into Assyria, until its final acceptance in Assyrian religion in the seventh century BCE. The article first discusses individual kalûs and their ancestral affiliation according to Assyrian sources. Then it proceeds to survey the copyists of kalûtu literature and the Neo-Assyrian libraries in which kalûtu tablets were found. Following, the serialization of the kalûtu literature in Nineveh is discussed vis-à-vis evidence from other Assyrian cities on the one hand, and Babylonia on the other hand. In addition, the way in which the Assyrian king related himself to the kalûtu literature is examined. Finally, the article points at some possible influences of the kalûtu literature on Neo-Assyrian literature.
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I. Introduction

The following article will deal with the kalûtu literature and the priest associated with it—the kalû—in Assyria.1 Although the reconstruction of kalûtu literature is largely based on materials from Nineveh and important information on the kalû priest is provided by Neo-Assyrian letters and reports, it will be argued in this article that the office of kalû was a Babylonian institution, gradually imported into Assyria beginning at the end of the second millennium BCE, and that although fully integrated into Assyrian religion in the seventh century BCE, the kalû and his repertoire still maintained their foreign nature in Assyria in some aspects. The first part of the article (II) will deal with the kalû himself in Assyria, mainly according to letters, reports, administrative documents, and colophons dating to the Neo-Assyrian period. The second part (III-VII) will deal with the position of the kalûtu literature in Assyria, specifically in Nineveh.2

II. The kalû in Assyria

1. The kalû and the ašīpu: The main temple personnel in the first millennium BCE

Before turning to the position of the kalû in Assyria, the following section will present a general sketch of the kalû in the first millennium BCE, based mainly on Babylonian materials, but on Assyrian texts as well.
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1 I would like to thank Dr. Amitai Baruchi-Unna and Dr. Daisuke Shibata for reading and commenting on an earlier version of this article. I am also grateful to Dr. Jaume Llop for providing me with an important reference regarding the Middle Assyrian period (see II.3). I thank Dr. Gene McGarry for correcting my English. Abbreviations are according to RIA (Realeksikon der Assyriologie und Vorderasiatischen Archäologie), vol. 12, Berlin 2009–2011, iii–l.

2 For previous studies dedicated to kalûs and kalûtu in the Neo-Assyrian period, see Krecher 1966, 18–28; Menzel 1981, 233–237; Cohen 1988, 15–23.
The kalû was one of the most important personnel in the temple cult of Babylonia. The kalû (Sumerian gala) was associated with the nāru musician (Sumerian nar) in the third and second millennia BCE due to the musical performance that was part of his cultic repertoire (Gelb 1975; Shehata 2009). In the first millennium BCE, the kalû was still occasionally associated with the nāru, but he was also associated with the āšipu. Both the āšipu and kalû were considered the two most significant cultic personnel and were in charge of most major cultic occasions. The repertoires of both the kalû and the āšipu were attributed to the god Ea.3

The cultic activity of the kalû is especially associated with the regular calendrical temple cult (Gabbay, forthcoming a, 158–168). But the kalû could also perform many of the important non-calendrical rituals in Mesopotamia, such as the mīs-pî initiation ritual for cultic images, building rituals, canal-digging rituals, battle rituals, and rituals to avert the harm of malevolent omens.4 Nevertheless, such non-calendrical rituals are mostly much better known from the repertoire of the āšipu,5 and in general the āšipu and his repertoire were more prominent in the cult of the first millennium BCE in relation to the kalû and his repertoire.

Like the āšipu, the kalû’s interests were not limited to his cultic duties but included other religious and scholarly knowledge, such as celestial and terrestrial omens, medicine, and astronomy (e.g., SAA 10, 160). Thus, like āšipus, kalûs are known as copyists of scholarly literature not directly related to their repertoire, and as senders of scholarly letters and reports to the king (see II.3 and III.2.i below). However, although both the kalû and the āšipu were scholars as well as clergymen, there was a growing tendency for scholarly literature to be associated with the āšipu, rather than the kalû.6 Thus, according to the “āšipûtu-manual,” which lists the curriculum of the āšipu, diagnostic texts and physiognomic omens were actually included in the corpus of āšipûtu, and the same manual also recommends the study of other divinatory and medical texts for the education of the āšipu.7

In short, the kalû was considered one of the most important cultic personnel in the temple; his repertoire, quite large in quantity, was part of the basic temple cult and was divinely attributed; and his scholarship was part of the scholastic tradition of Mesopotamian learnedness. Nevertheless, he was somewhat inferior in status to his colleague the āšipu.

2. The kalû and the āšipu in Assyria
The cultic importance of the kalû is also reflected in sources from the Neo-Assyrian period, especially dating to the eighth and seventh centuries BCE.8 Kalûs and kalamâhus, often associated with specific cities, are documented in a variety of sources.9 The kalû in Assyria is traditionally associated with the nāru musician,10 but may also act as the equal of the āšipu, as

---

3 Lambert 1962, 64, I:1–4; for kalûtu as the “wisdom of Ea,” see also in the colophon “Asb. type o” below (III.2.ii).
5 For the cults of the āšipu, see Jean 2006.
6 For the scholarly distinction between the kalû and āšipu (as well as other functionaries), see Frahm 2011, 19.
7 For the latest and most updated edition and analysis of the “āšipûtu-manual,” see Jean 2006, 62–82.
8 Note that the kalû receives the neck, the regular Babylonian portion distributed to kalûs (cf. Beaulieu 2000, 10–11, with references), in SAA 12, 81, i: 16′ (later reign of Esarhaddon onwards).
seen in instances where a ritual is carried out by both an ăšipu and a kalû (each according to his own repertoire). In addition to mastering his professional cultic repertoire, the kalû, according to Neo-Assyrian sources, is also a scholar who shares the study of Mesopotamian wisdom with other cultic professionals—and in particular the ăšipu—as seen in the reports by the Assyrian kalû Urad-Ea to the Assyrian king that refer to divinatory knowledge, as well as in other sources (see II.3 below).

On the other hand, as in Babylonia the kalû seems to be inferior to the ăšipu, and he and his kalûtu repertoire are mentioned much less frequently than the ăšipu and his ăšipûtu in Neo-Assyrian sources. In the Neo-Assyrian period, however, the kalû’s status slips even lower with respect to the ăšipu. Thus, although the chief or royal kalû is attested as corresponding with the king on various matters, the number of attestations is much smaller than those featuring ăšipus (see II.3 below). In the scholarly realm too, although the kalû reports to the king on celestial matters, exhibiting his knowledge of the divinatory corpus, only a few such reports by an Assyrian kalû (namely, Urad-Ea) are known (SAA 8, 181–183). In addition, rituals containing a performance by the kalû are mentioned much less frequently in the royal correspondence than rituals of the ăšipu. Another unusual phenomenon is that when the repertoire of the kalû does appear in the Neo-Assyrian correspondence, many of the attestations refer to Eršaḫuĝas, although this genre is not the most significant part of the regular repertoire of the kalû and does not necessarily belong to the kalûtu series (see III.2.ii with n. 64 below).

This odd status of the kalû in Assyria was already observed by Radner (2009, 222–223):

9 Cf. the following selected sources and references according to city (in alphabetical order; not including evidence from colophons, which is treated below): Arbela: SAA 13, 138: rev. 17. Assur: PKT 40, i: 11, rev. iv: 13 (see n. 16 below); STAT 2, 258: 3; note also ritual texts from Assur and Nineveh dealing with the performances of kalûtu in Assur (e.g., Menzel 1981, T 61, no. 35, rev. vii: 13', T 74, no. 36, B ii': 6’–13'; Maul 2000). Harrân: Urad-Ea, kalû of Sin of Harrân (see II.3 and II.4 below). Khorsabad: Sargon installs a kalamâḫu (“surmahhu”) when he builds Dûr-Šarrukin (Fuchs 1994, 236:157; see VI.1 below). Kurba’il: CTN 2, 35: 6 (see n. 10 below). Nimrud: letters by or concerning the kalû Pûlu (SAA 13, 131–134; see II.5 below); SAA 13, 128: rev. 10; Mallowan 1966, 270, fig. 251. Nineveh: Urad-Ea and his son Nabû-zêru-ididdina (see II.3 and II.4 below); cf. also SAA 7, 1, rev. i: 1–7. Note that Watanabe (1979, 277) suggested that foreign kalûs are mentioned in CTN 3, 121: 7 and 10 (ŠÚMES), but this is most unlikely.

10 CTN 2, 35 documents the sale of an estate in Kurba’il by singers (nâru) and the kalû Kurba-ilâya (line 6). SAA 7, 142: 6–7, lists provisions to kalûtu and male and female singers. The undated document SAA 11, 151, ii: 8’–10’, lists kalûtu(s) and nârus. In SAA 12, 95: rev. 11–12, from Kalhu, a kalû acts as a witness, listed with the chief singer (nârgallû) of Nabû. The nârus are paired with kalûtu also in inscriptions of Esarhaddon, see Leichty 2011, 101, no. 45: 6’–8’, 116, no. 54: 12’, and see also n. 11 below. For a Middle-Assyrian attestation, see MARV 4, 74, discussed below (II.3). Another interesting association of the kalû, perhaps indicating that he was a eunuch (related to his role as a cultic singer), may be seen in STAT 2, 258 (Assur; probably late eighth or early seventh century), which documents the sale of a house, adjoining, among others, the house of Nabû-šadâni, the kalû (line 3), as well as the house of Nabû-şuṣuranni, the ša É MI-KUR (“he of the house of the queen”; likely to be a eunuch) (line 5), and the house of Kulu’u, the ša É A-MAN (“he of the house of the crown prince”); the name likely referring to him being a eunuch, see the translation “[emasculated] devotee” of this name in Baker 2000, 636; cf. Gabbay 2005, 51–52; George 2006, 175–177) (line 6).

11 See SAA 8, 163: 7 (written by Addad-šumu-usur, king’s ăšipu); SAA 13, 189: 9’; SAA 10, 212: rev. 9–11. Note the cultic performance by a kalûtu and an ăšipu in Sennacherib’s Bavian inscription, Luckenbill 1924, 81: 27 (cf. Bagg 2000, 348: 27). See also the enumeration of ăšipus, kalûtu, and nârus together in inscriptions of Esarhaddon; see Leichty 2011, 114, no. 53: rev. 1, 207, no. 105, vi: 23–24, 224, no. 110, i: 3’–4’.

12 Compare, for example, the reference in SAA 10 to ca. twenty Namburbi attestations, one attestation each of Šurpu and Maqlû, over five (Akkadian) Šuilas, and over ten references to incantations (şiptu), all related to ăšipûtu, as opposed to only five attestations of Eršaḫuĝas and five attestations of a performance with the ăšipu, both related to kalûtu. In addition the kalûtu profession is mentioned only twice in the corpus of letters in SAA 10, while the ăšipu is mentioned over twenty times. Cf. references in the index of SAA 10, 322–372, s.v.v.
While the presence of singers and musicians at court is well known from the Middle-Assyrian records, lamenters are not attested at all so far; but it must be pointed out that also the Neo-Assyrian attestations are surprisingly rare, and the lamenters are more often than not missing when the royal scholars are listed as a group in Neo-Assyrian texts. It may not be pure coincidence that theirs is by far the smallest group in the surviving scholarly correspondence of Esarhaddon and Assurbanipal.

In the following I would like to take Radner’s observation as a starting point and demonstrate how, according to my understanding of the preserved material, the kalû and his repertoire were not part, at least not an integral or significant part, of Assyrian cult in the Middle Assyrian and early Neo-Assyrian period, but that over time, especially under the Sargonids, they gradually entered into the Assyrian cult.

3. The kalû in Neo-Assyrian correspondence and administrative records

As noted by Radner (2009, 222–223, cited above), the kalû seems to be almost entirely absent from the Assyrian cult in the Middle Assyrian period according to archival documentation. There is only one Middle Assyrian administrative document that mentions kalûs, MARV 4, 74, from Kār-Tukulti-Ninurta, dated to an unplaced eponymate during the reign of Tukulti-Ninurta I. The document lists rations of food for various persons, among them singers (lines 15, 25, 42: za-ma-ru), as well as kalûs (lines 18, 41). Some of the individuals listed in the document are Kassites, i.e., Babylonian deportees (lines 36–37), and in fact the rations listed in line 41 are for a ka-ši-ú, “Kassite (= Babylonian) kalû.” This agrees well with the Babylonian origins of the kalûtu corpus, and more specifically with Tukulti-Ninurta I’s report on bringing Eršaḫuḫa tablets from Babylonia to Assyria (see III.1 below). There is only one other mention of a kalû in this period, in the colophon of KAR 9+, an Emesal composition that seems to belong to the late Middle Assyrian period (see III.1 below). When one looks at early Neo-Assyrian records, the kalû is likewise hardly attested. As noted by Radner (2009, 223, n. 8), for example, an edict dated to Assurnasirpal II contains a list of scholars and cultic functionaries in the sequence ṭupšarru—bārû—āšipu—asû, but the kalû is absent (SAA 12, 82: 6 and 83: rev. 5); later too, in SAA 10, 7, the kalû is absent from a similar sequence of cultic professions (ṭupšarru—bārû—āšipu—asû—dāgil-iṣṣūri). When the kalû does appear within this sequence, he is mentioned after the other main cultic and scholarly professionals, followed only by foreign professionals, as seen in SAA 7, 1, which lists experts in the following order: ṭupšar-Enûma-anu-enlil—āšipu—bārû—asû—kalû, followed only by the foreign augurs (dāgil-iṣṣūri) and Egyptian scholars and scribes. The placement of the kalû between the traditional Mesopotamian professional scholars and the foreign ones attests both to his inferior rank among the Mesopotamian group and to his
perception as a foreign, non-Assyrian professional, due to his Babylonian associations.

The low number of attestations of the kalû, and his absence or low rank in relation to other cultic personnel and scholars, especially in earlier periods of the Neo-Assyrian empire (before the Sargons), may indicate that he held a relatively less significant status than he did in Babylonia, where although secondary to the āšipu, he was still a most significant actor in the religious, cultic, and scholastic realms. It is likely that later, when the Neo-Assyrian kingship began ruling over Babylonia in some way or the other, due to Babylonian influence on Assyrian religion the kalû and his repertoire gained more significance in cult, although they still did not have a natural place in the traditional temple hierarchy.

The ambiguous status of the kalû in the Neo-Assyrian court is demonstrated by the correspondence of Esarhaddon and Assurbanipal with kalûs. Only three Assyrian individuals corresponding with the king could be identified as kalûs. These are Urad-Ea and his son Nabû-zēru-iddina (Radner 2011; see below) and the kalû Pûlu from Nimrud (SAA 13, 131–134; see below). Of special interest are the first two, namely Urad-Ea, the kalamâḫu of the king and the god Sîn, known from letters and reports dated mainly to 673–669 BCE, and his son Nabû-zēru-iddina, known from a few letters and from colophons of scholarly and religious texts written by him (see II.4 and III.2.i below). These two were considered part of the “inner circle” of scholars regularly corresponding with the king and advising him on different matters (S. Parpola, in SAA 10, xxv–xxvii). Indeed, Urad-Ea’s mastery of knowledge not connected to kalûtu is seen in his astronomical reports to the king (SAA 8, 181–183). On the one hand, the kalû’s inclusion among these high-ranking scholars points at his high status. On the other hand, the number of letters and reports that he composed himself is very small compared to the output of other functionaries: seven letters by Urad-Ea and two letters by his son Nabû-zēru-iddina (SAA 10, 338–346), mostly matter-of-fact communications regarding cult and the performance of Emešal prayers (usually in relation to the king), as opposed, for example, to fifty-six by the king’s exorcist Adad-šumu-uṣur, and thirty-nine and fifteen by the chief exorcists Marduk-šâkin-šumi and Nabû-nādin-šumi, respectively (S. Parpola, in SAA 10, xxvi), all usually elaborate correspondences exhibiting a more personal relation with the king. Urad-Ea is also mentioned in letters by other scholars (SAA 10, 29, 238, 240, 287, 377) and appears as cosender of a few letters (SAA 10, 1, 25, 212), but is never mentioned first in the senders’ introduction to these letters. In SAA 10, 212, which Urad-Ea coauthored according to the introduction to the letter, he is mentioned in the third person while the main writer, Adad-šumu-uṣur, appears in the first person.

4. The Šumu-libši family in Assyria

One other factor distinguishes Urad-Ea from some of the other prominent scholars corresponding

---

18 In addition to these kalûs, who wrote in the Assyrian dialect to the king, there is also a Babylonian kalû, Bêl-šumu-ušškun, who wrote three astrological reports to the king (SAA 8, 469–471). See also III.2.i below, ad Iddin-Papsukkal.

19 Note that “ARAD-ē-a, mentioned as the “father” of the scribe Nabû-le’i in the colophon of CTN 4, 187 (written in Babylonian script), is not the kalamâḫu Urad-Ea discussed above, as Radner (2011, 1397) supposed. Rather, this is most probably Arad-Ea, the ancestor of a scholarly Babylonian family; see Lambert 1957 and recently Lambert 2005, xiv–xv.

20 Note also Issar-šumu-ēres’ assurance to the king in SAA 10, 29: 1’, that Urad-Ea’s purification ritual was performed well, implying perhaps that the king was not entirely secure about the effectiveness of his chief kalû’s rituals, and needed the assurance of his chief scribe and scholar for this.
with the king. At least four members of the “inner circle” belonged to the prominent family of Gabbu-ilāni-ēreš,21 and were descendants of the well-known scholar Nabû-zuqqu-pōnu (Parpola 1983b, xvii–xx; Frahm 1999, 78–79; Šašková 2010). These are Nabû-zuquq-pōnu’s sons Nabû-zēru-lēšir, the chief scribe and king’s scholar, and Adad-šumu-ušur, the king’s exorcist; and later their sons Issar-šumu-ēreš and Urad-Gula, respectively (S. Parpola, in SAA 10, xxvi; Šašková 2010). This family is known to have served the king for many generations; many of its prominent figures changed residence when the capital changed in order to stay close to the king (Šašková 2010).

The family affiliation of Urad-Ea is also known (from colophons; see below). He belonged to the prestigious family of Šumu-libši, whose history is linked not to the Assyrian court but to the city of Babylon. Šumu-libši was considered the chief kalû of the Esağil itself, and his family included several kalûs associated specifically with the city of Babylon, as well as scribes and scholars from various periods (Gabbay, forthcoming a, 241–242). In opposition to the Gabbu-ilāni-ēreš family of scholars and exorcists, discussed above, who had served the king for some generations, following him from one capital to the next, Urad-Ea and Nabû-zēru-iddina, although writing in the Neo-Assyrian dialect and script, traced their origins to a Babylonian family.22 In the beginning of his career Urad-Ea was not connected to the king’s residence; he was originally the chief kalû of Šīn in Ḫarrān, according to the colophon of a ritual text mentioning the performance of Emesal prayers (Elat 1982, 13–16; cf. Hunger 1968, no. 500). The connection to Ḫarrān may also be seen in SAA 10, 338, dealing with the akītu festival of Šīn in Ḫarrān (cf. Novotny 2002, 193, with n. 11). Accordingly, Urad-Ea’s blessing formulas in his letters invoke Šīn and Nikkal (following Nabû and Marduk) (SAA 10, 338–344). Later, Urad-Ea is designated in a colophon of the Emešal Vocabulary as the chief kalû of the king (K.4240; Borger 1998, 31), and in the colophon of the Emešal text BL 158+ and in Sm.80 (only colophon preserved), as chief kalû of Šīn and the king, probably indicating that he followed the king to Nineveh and perhaps served there in the cult of Šīn.23 A letter referring to instructions for a performance with the lilissu in the palace may indeed indicate Urad-Ea’s presence in Nineveh at this time (SAA 10, 341).24 In colophons, Urad-Ea’s son Nabû-zēru-iddina identified himself as a kalû of the king and of Šīn,25 suggesting that he resided in Nineveh. His letters begin with an invocation of several high-ranking gods, including Šīn and Nikkal, but they do not occupy a dominant position in the sequence (SAA 10, 345–346).26

Besides Urad-Ea and his son, a kalû of the Šumu-libši family is also mentioned in SAA 11, 153, a seventh-century tablet from Nineveh listing Babylonian individuals belonging to

---

21 Use of the designation “family” for the affiliations with Gabbu-ilāni-ēreš and with Šumu-libši (and others) below is for the sake of convenience, and the two do not necessarily refer to the same social affiliation. For a discussion of the concept of family lineage and kin groups, see Nielsen 2011, 1–19.

22 Note that according to Radner (2011, 1397) even the writing of Urad-Ea’s name “with -dÉ.A betrays his Babylonian origins” (in Assyrian names this theophoric element is often written a-a).

23 For a temple of Šīn (and other gods) in Nineveh, see Frahm 1998, 117–118.

24 Note also Urad-Ea’s mention in Nineveh in SAA 7, 5, i: 51 (cf. Radner 2011, 1397), but this does not necessarily indicate his permanent residence there (cf. M. Fales and N. Postgate, in SAA 7, xix).

25 BL 158+ (cf. Hunger 1968, no. 499) and K.4240 (Borger 1998, 31); probably also in K.20267+ (Borger 1998, 35) and Sm.80 (cf. Hunger 1968, no. 524).

26 Note Nabû-zēru-iddina’s mention with other kalûs in Nineveh in SAA 7, 1, rev. i: 1–7, but this does not necessarily indicate his permanent residency there (cf. M. Fales and N. Postgate, SAA 7, xix).
prestigious families who were exempted from claims by a certain Nabû-bēłšunu and returned to their kin houses in Babylon to serve Marduk (cf. Nielsen 2011, 60–61). These individuals include the kalû Itti-Marduk-balāṭu/Šāpik-zēri/Balāssu, belonging to the family “of the house of Šumu-libši” (qin-ni šá É "MU-” “ŠUM-
lu-ub-si GALA) (lines 6–11).

Members of the Šumu-libši family are also known from colophons of religious and scholarly tablets from Nineveh; see III.2.i below. The Sultantepe tablet STT 232 was written by Nabû-ēṭir-napšāti, a descendant of the Ḫarriru family27 and a kalû (?) of Marduk, and is a copy of a tablet from Babylon that probably belonged to the Šumu-libši family.28

5. The kalû as an “outsider” in the Assyrian temples?

There may be some indications that the kalû was regarded as an “outsider” in Assyrian temples, although this is somewhat speculative. In two instances, a kalû is suspected by other temple clergy to have stolen precious materials from the temple (SAA 13, 128 and 138). In other instances in which persons are suspected of theft from temples, these are not high-ranking clergy, and usually not even cultic functionaries, but rather other professionals who were involved with the temple institution, such as shepherds or guards (S. Cole and P. Machinist, in SAA 13, xviii–xix). This may indicate the kalû’s status as something of an alien among the temple staff, despite his high rank. If the charges against him were correct, this may indicate his own perception of himself as an outsider in the temple, despite his important cultic status. If the charges were false, this may indicate that because he was perceived as an outsider by colleagues, he was easy to blame for internal problems in the temple.

The tension between the kalû’s high cultic status and the accusation of theft is nicely demonstrated in the last words of Aššur-ḥammatu’a in a letter he sent to the king, blaming Nabû-ēpuš, a šangû of Ea in a temple in Arbela, of theft: “Nabû-ēpuš who committed the robberies is a kalû: no one beside him (is allowed) in the parakkû!” (SAA 13, 138, lines rev. 15–18).29 The kalû’s status allows him to enter the parakkû, the inner cella of the god, but this also turns him, especially in an environment which does not easily accept him, into a likely suspect in any theft of its contents.

Another interesting case is SAA 13, 134, a complaint letter against Pūlu, a kalû from Kālḫu, who was probably active during the reign of Esarhaddon or Assurbanipal.30 He is described in the letter as changing the traditional rites of the temple, perhaps referring to an attempt to change the Assyrian rites to Babylonian ones. Indeed, Pūlu himself is portrayed in two other letters as an active, meticulous scholar and priest, showing great interest in cultic matters; he checks

27 For this family, see Nielsen 2011, 174–177.
28 See Maul 1988, 46–52. The small space for the cultic profession before the name of Marduk, as well as the content of the tablet, makes it likely that [ŠU] is to be restored; cf. Maul 1988, 52. The family name is written “MU’]-HE. GAL(-)Sú; see Maul 1988, 52 (but cf. Oelsner 1993, 146). Note that ŠU at the end of the name may stand for kalû or serve as a phonetic complement in the writing of the name (Šumu-libšu). As suggested to me by Daisuke Shibata, it may not be mere chance that Sultantepe yielded a tablet related to this family, of which another member, namely Urad-Ea discussed above, served (in the early period of his career) as a kalû of Šin in the nearby city of Ḫarrān.
29 S. Cole and P. Machinist, in SAA 13, 110, translate “he is not to ascend the dais,” understanding e-la-šú as a verb, but this would be awkward, and e-la-šú is to be understood as a preposition followed by a pronominal suffix (so already CAD E, 74a).
30 For the dating of this letter, see Pongratz-Leisten 1994, 249.
anomalous kidneys in the sacrificial sheep and informs the king about them (SAA 13, 131 and 133). In the complaint letter SAA 13, 134, as in the two other complaints against kalûs mentioned above, the writer implies that Pûlu’s access to sacred zones makes him a suspect in the theft of temple property, by hinting at the precious goods found there (lines 30–rev. 4).

III. The corpus of Emesal prayers in Assyrian libraries

1. Emesal literature in the libraries of the Neo-Assyrian period (besides Nineveh)

From the end of the second millennium BCE, Babylonian literature, including religious texts, began entering into Assyria. Twenty-four known Middle Babylonian tablets found their way from Babylonia to Assur (Weidner 1952/53, 200). Most of them contain omens (which could potentially assist the king; Heeßel 2011), and only one of these tablets contains an Emesal text (KAR 375; Enlil Balağ). In addition, while many other bodies of literature are preserved in Middle Assyrian tablets (written in Assyrian ductus) from Assur, there are very few such tablets in Emesal, and these few contain Eršahuğas (or compositions related to this genre; see below), closely associated with the king. In fact, a literary account of Tukulti-Ninurta I recalls his plundering of Babylonian tablets and bringing them to Nineveh, and lists Eršahuğas as the only Emesal examples among the various genres of Babylonian literature.

While kalûtu literature is richly documented in Nineveh, elsewhere in Assyria it usually appears in a much smaller proportion in relation to other corpora, especially the corpus of the kalû’s close colleague, the āšipu, as well as omen literature. Besides Nineveh, which will be dealt with later, Emesal tablets and other texts related to the kalû are known from Assur, Nimrud, and Sultantepe. Libraries at the last two sites, Nimrud and Sultantepe, have yielded a significant amount of literary, scholarly, and religious texts, but the number of Emesal tablets is extremely small. At Assur, the corpus of Emesal texts, although larger than that from Nimrud and Sultantepe, is also relatively small in relation to other corpora. When Emesal tablets are found in these three sites, they are more likely to contain Eršahuğas and Šuīlas, which are associated with the king, than Balağs and Eršemas, the core of kalûtu literature.

Following is a short summary of the Emesal materials found in the various Assyrian cities (listed alphabetically) apart from Nineveh, which will be treated separately. Assur: Up to now the number of Emesal texts from Assur was not very large, but this impression will probably change with the publication of new tablets by Stefan Maul. Still, the number of Emesal texts from Assur is small in relation to other genres attested there, especially texts related to āšipūtu. Of course, these proportions could be misleading, since many of the literary, religious, and scholarly texts from Assur came from a library belonging to an āšipu (Maul 2010).

The Emesal texts from Assur seem more locally oriented, as they contain a relatively large number of tablets with Šuīlas, mostly directed to Aššur, that have been associated with the Assyrian king by the addition at the end of a blessing naming him; the king was probably also involved in their performance. In addition, of the few published manuscripts of Balağs, two

---

31 Weidner (1952/53) assumed that these formed part of the library of Tiglathpileser I, but this has been questioned by Lambert (1976b, 85–86, n. 2); for this collection, see also Pedersén 1985, 31–42; Heeßel 2011, 372–373.
32 Lambert, 1957/58, 44, B: 6; see Hallo 1992, 780.
33 The following paragraphs are based on my presentation of this material and its discussion in Gabbay, forthcoming a, chapter IX.
relatively early fragments (which may belong to the same tablet) are locally oriented, containing the Balağ zi-bu-um zi-bu-um addressed to Aššur. The other published Emesal material from Assur contains Eršaḫuğa, known to be associated with the king, and perhaps Ritual Eršema that end with typical Eršaḫuğa formulas and may indicate a similar ritual performance. In addition to these, there is a summary tablet including the Balağ nir-ğal lú ê-NE with its Eršema, and a Middle Babylonian tablet containing a Balağ to Enlil (KAR 375; see above).

The small number of published texts from Assur which preserve colophons does not allow a clear description of their writers. Nevertheless, it is interesting that the (late) Middle Assyrian tablet KAR 9+, which contains a partly syllabically written Eršaḫuğa or Ritual Eršema with the incipit ฤtu-gin, ḫ-ta (Maul 1988, 82–89; Gabbay, forthcoming b, no. 64), was written by a kalû (Nabû-ēṭir). Another tablet, KAR 99+305+, a Neo-Assyrian syllabically written summary tablet of the Balağ nir-ğal lú ê-NE (including its Eršema), was written by the apprentice Nādin-šumi-ilu, son of Marduk-uballit(?), a kalû, son(?) of Nabû-[...], whose profession was connected to Aššur, for the viewing (苒martu) of a certain Tukultī-Marduk (Hunger 1968, no. 226; Gabbay, forthcoming b, no. 92). Apart from this, KAR 346, containing the Šuila mu-lú é-a ku₄-ra-zu-ta, was probably written or owned by Nabû-ubalisu / Nabû-ēpuš / Nabû-kettī-ide, the Assyrian scribe (Maul 1998, 170, 176; Shibata forthcoming, text no. 14). That the copyist (or owner) of this tablet was a “scribe,” perhaps related to the Assyrian court, and not a kalû may be due to the importance of the Šuila in the royal cult.

(Khorsabad): The colophons of two tablets from Nineveh, BM 121055 (Eršaḫuğa) and BM 122647 (ritual and Eršaḫuğa), name Nabû-kabti-ahḫēšu, son of the palace scribe of Sargon (Maul 1988, 347–352, nos. 103–104). Maul (1988, 352) proposed that the father of this individual may be identified with an āšipu of the same name from Assur, but it is more likely in my opinion that he should be identified with the palace scribe of Sargon bearing this name, known from SAA 6, 31, a legal tablet relating to his purchase of land in Dūr-Šarrukin (Bagg and Baker 2001, 838, ad 1). If so, it is likely that the original provenance of the tablets was Dūr-Šarrukin (Khorsabad), and that they were later brought to Nineveh.

Nimrud: The Nabû temple library in Kalḫu contains only Šuilas, some of which were locally reoriented to address Nabû and Kalḫu (see IV below). CTN 4, 171 is a Middle Assyrian tablet that may contain a Šuila to Aššur. In addition, there is one tablet containing an unidentified Balağ.


36 KAR 161 (Eršaḫuğa; Maul 1988, ad no. 1); KAR 9+348+ (Eršaḫuğa or ritual Eršema ḫtu-gin, ḫ-ta; Maul 1988, 82–89 and pls. 65–66; Lührnert 2009, 178–179, text A2; Gabbay, forthcoming b, no. 64); LKA 21 (Eršaḫuğa or Ritual Eršema; Maul 1988, 303–306 and pl. 69; Gabbay, forthcoming b, no. 114).

37 KAR 99+KAR 305+; Cohen 1988, 468–469; Gabbay, forthcoming b, no. 92.

38 Cf. a similar phenomenon in Nineveh, 4R², 9+ (see III.2.i below, ad Gabbu-ilāni-ēreš).

39 However, since the tablets were written by the son of the palace scribe, it is also possible that he copied the tablet after Sargon’s reign, already in Nineveh.


41 See Shibata, forthcoming, ad no. 4, n. 290. I thank D. Shibata for pointing out to me that the ductus of this tablet is (late) Middle Assyrian.
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or Eršema written in Babylonian script (CTN 4, 175).

**Sultantepe**: Only two Emesal texts are known from Sultantepe:42 STT 155 (Eršema umun-ĝu₉₀₀ za-e; Cohen 1981, 136–138, no. 13; Gabbay, forthcoming b, no. 13) and STT 156 (Balaḫ abzu pe-el-lá-âm; Cohen 1988, 47), as well as STT 232, a cultic text containing a building ritual that mentions the performance of Emesal texts (Maul 1988, 46–52; Ambos 2004, 196–197). Unsurprisingly, STT 232 was probably written according to an original stemming from the collection of the Babylonian Šumu-libši family (see II.4 above).

2. The kalûtu literature in the libraries of Nineveh

The situation is of course entirely different in Nineveh, which contains the entire corpus of kalûtu, in a few copies, and which actually mostly represents the Babylonian kalûtu tradition (see below). According to library records from Nineveh, Emesal texts (designated kalûtu) were among tablets seized from Babylonian scholars and taken to Nineveh.43 Indeed, the tablet collection of Assurbanipal’s library was composed not only of tablets written in Nineveh in Assyrian script, but also of tablets written in Babylonian script, many of which had been copied in Babylonia and brought to Nineveh (Fincke 2003/2004).

i) kalûs in colophons of tablets in Nineveh

An interesting picture arises from the examination of colophons naming kalûs, mostly but not exclusively on Emesal tablets brought to the royal libraries of Nineveh from elsewhere, usually Babylonia. These kalûs belong to the most prominent Babylonian families associated with kalûs, especially Šumu-libši, Iddin-Papsukkal, šá-DIŠ.LUḪ, and Sín-lēqi-unnīni, as well as Šangû-Sîn.

**Šumu-libši**: As noted above (II.4), this was a prominent family of kalûs from Babylon that traced its origins to Šumu-libši, kalamâḫu of Esaĝil. As discussed above, the chief kalûs of the Assyrian king, Urad-Ea and his son Nabû-zēru-iddina, were members of this family. Six tablets found in Nineveh, mostly containing compositions related to Emesal texts and bearing colophons, were written by Nabû-zēru-iddina at various stages of his career.44 According to these colophons, Nabû-zēru-iddina and his father were descendents of the Šumu-libši family. Only one of these tablets, BL 158+(+), belongs to an Emesal prayer (Balaḫ ukkin-ta eš bar til-la). Three other tablets are also connected to the kalû: the kalû battle-ritual 81-2-4, 306 (Elat 1982, 11–16) and two tablets of Emesal V ocabulary (K.4240+ and K.20627+). The other two fragments, Sm.80 and K.14576, only preserve the colophons. These tablets were probably part of the private library of Nabû-zēru-iddina, and may have moved with him from Ḫarrān to Nineveh, and perhaps later

42 Note that STT 50, 51, 124, 192–196, listed by Jean (2006, 158) as Eršaḫuĝas and ritual texts for the covering of a drum belonging to the kalûtu corpus, are actually Akkadian prayers with the rubric Eršaḫuĝa (cf. Mayer 1976, 398; Oshima 2011, 124) that do not belong to the corpus of kalûtu, and texts concerning the instruments used for āšipūtu (cf. Schramm 2008, 94–99), respectively.

43 Parpola 1983a, 12, no. 1, i: 15’, 14, iii: 1’ (SAA 7, 49, i: 19’, iii: 2’); perhaps also umun-ĝu₁₀ in Parpola 1983a, 27, col. A: 6’ (SAA 7, 54, i: 6’), and perhaps also in the previous lines, see Parpola 1983a, 28. Note also Eršaḫuĝas mentioned in Lambert 1976a, 314, K.14067+Rm.150: 9, also likely to be an inventory of tablets brought from Babylonia to Nineveh (see Lambert 1976a, 313). Cf. also the mention of kalûtu in a late description of Assurbanipal’s tablet collecting, Frame and George 2005, 274:9.

44 BL 158+(+). (cf. Hunger 1968, no. 499); K.4240 (Borger 1998, 31); K.20627+ (Borger 1998, 35); 81-2-4, 306 (Elat 1982, 13–16; cf. Hunger 1968, no. 500); Sm. 80 (cf. Hunger 1968, no. 524); K.14576. All tablets were collated from the original or from photographs.
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within Nineveh, from his own collection to the royal collection. The colophons of the two tablets that directly bear on the cultic duties of the kalû (BL 158+ and 81-2-4, 306) specifically trace the text on them to the “house of Šumu-libši,” perhaps referring here to the actual estate of this family in Babylon. 45

Except for the tablets written by Nabû-zêru-iddina, other tablets written by Babylonian members of the Šumu-libši family and found in Nineveh do not contain Emesal texts. This attests to the broad knowledge and scholarly interests of the members of this family, beyond their professional literature:

CT 16, 38 (Udug-ḫul), written in Assyrian script, is a copy from a tablet that was originally written by a member of the Šumu-libši family. The colophon of this tablet states that it is a copy (made by the chief scribes of Assurbanipal and of Arbelu) of a tablet from Babylon written by […]-Mar[du(?)] // Šumu-libši, kalû(?), of Marduk, 46 during the reigns of Šalmaneser III and the Babylonian king Nabû-apla-iddina.

Two Babylonian tablets from Nineveh, 81-2-4, 202 (CT 38, 25; Šumma-ālu; see Freedman 1998, 284; Hunger 1968, no. 444), and K.2848 (3R, 52, 3; “Diviner’s manual”; photograph: Oppenheim 1974, 213–214), were written by a kalû of 4KU.GAL named 4KU.SUD.NUN.TU-šumu-ibni(?), descendant of Šumu-libši. 4KU.GAL and 4KU.SUD.NUN.TU are both titles of Sumuqan/Šakkan, 47 which would supposedly yield the name and title Sumuqan-šumu-ibni, kalû of Sumuqan. However, it is possible that these are sophisticated writings for a different god, namely Ea, who is identified with Sumuqan/Šakkan. 48 If so, the writings would indicate the name and title Ea-šumu-ibni, kalû of Ea, which would be more appropriate for a Babylonian scholar.

Two other Babylonian tablets from Nineveh, K.2719+K.3014 (Šumma-ālu; Freedman 1998, 138) and K.2542+ (lists of therapeutic stones; Schuster-Brandis 2008, 192–193; photograph: Horowitz 1998, pls. 8–9), mention an individual with a name very similar to Sumuqan/Ea-šumu-ibni, namely 4KU.GAL-zêru-ibni (likely to be understood as Ea-zêru-ibni, as in the name above). According to K.2542+ this individual was a descendant of Šumu-libši and probably a novice kalû. 49

The Babylonian fragment K.6145 from Nineveh, which preserves only one line, obviously from its colophon, mentions [ ]-ibni, descendant of Šumu-libši, kalû of 4MAR.TU (again likely to be a sophisticated writing for Ea through a syncretism with Sumuqan). 50 This individual is probably to be identified with the individual(s) named in the colophons of the four tablets mentioned above.

Iddin-Papsukkal: The Iddin-Papsukkal family was a well-known family from Borsippa, with

49 Schuster-Brandis (2008, 193) reads mu-kal-lim, but this should be read MU-lib-šî (for this spelling, see Lambert 1957); she also reads the profession as 4ŠAMAN.LA "TUR", but this should probably be read 4ŠAMAN.LA U[Š].KU/.KU]
whom many kalûs were associated.\textsuperscript{51} One Babylonian Emesal tablet belonging to a member of the Iddin-Papsukkal family is known from Nineveh: K.3328 (Balağ úru ám-ma-ir-ra-bi; Cohen 1988, 829; Volk 1989, 10 and pl. V), written by Bēl-šumu-iškun // Iddin-Papsukkal. It is possible that he is to be identified with the Babylonian kalû Bēl-šumu-iškun, author of three astrological reports to Esarhaddon (SAA 8, 469–471).

\textit{šá-DIŠ.LUḪ}: This family was also associated with Borsippa, and many kalûs are associated with it (Gabbay, forthcoming a, 243). The reading of the name is uncertain. It cannot be ruled out that the writing actually represents the Iddin-Papsukkal family or some branch within it (Waerzeggers 2010, 601; Gabbay, forthcoming a, 243, n. 154). The \textit{šá-DIŠ.LUḪ} family is represented in the Nineveh libraries by the kalû Bēl-ikṣur // \textit{šá-DIŠ.LUḪ}, who is mentioned in K.5168+ (first tablet of the Balağ en zu sá mar-mar) and probably in K.5174+ (Balağ gu_4-ud nim kur-ra with Eršema; Gabbay, forthcoming b, no. 28), most likely as the owner of the tablets who commissioned other scribes to write them for him.\textsuperscript{52} In K.5168+ that scribe’s name is not preserved, but he was probably a son or descendant of DN\textsuperscript{3}-ēṭer(i)\textsuperscript{3} (x x e\textsuperscript{3}-ê\textsuperscript{3}-ri). K.5174+ names Nabû-balāssu-iṣbi, son or descendant of […]-iškun\textsuperscript{7} ([ ] x GAR), an apprentice kalû(?) (\textsuperscript{10}ŠAGAN.LÁ \textsuperscript{10}G[ALÁ ] x), as the scribe of that tablet. According to these colophons, the tablets were copies from Babylon, but since the \textit{šá-DIŠ.LUḪ} family is associated especially with Borsippa, perhaps the tablets originated in Borsippa.

\textbf{Šangû-Sîn}: In the Nineveh libraries this family is represented by the tablet K.69 (Craig 1895)+ (Balağ a gal-gal buru\textsubscript{14} su-su), which was written by Itti-Marduk-balāṭu // Šangû-Sîn. This family is otherwise not directly associated with kalûs, but Bab. 13987, a Neo-Babylonian building ritual from Babylon involving the kalû, was written by a member of this family (cf. Ambos 2004, 188, colophon C).

\textbf{Sîn-lēqi-unnīni}: This family is a well-known family from Uruk, with which kalûs were associated (Beaulieu 2000). \textit{BL} 189+\textsuperscript{(+)} (cf. Gabbay 2007), the second tablet of the Balağ a úru-ğu\textsubscript{10} im-me, was written by Nabû-ēṭir of the Sîn-lēqi-unnīni family (Hunger 1968, no. 458). It is likely that this tablet was brought to Nineveh from Uruk (Gabbay 2007).

\textbf{(Gabbu-ilāni-ēreš)}: The colophon of 4R\textsuperscript{2}, 9+ from Nineveh (Šuila ū-mu-un nir-ĝál dim-me-er-e-ne to Sîn), indicates that it was written by the chief scribe Issar-šumu-ēreš, son of Nabû-zēru-lēšir (of the Gabbu-ilāni-ēreš family) (Sjöberg 1960, 166–178; Shibata, forthcoming, no. 6). For this individual, see II.4 above. As Emesal texts are usually written by kalûs, it is remarkable that this tablet was written by an individual who is not a kalû. It may be no coincidence that this is a manuscript of a Šuila, whose performance was connected to the king and not only to the kalû, and was therefore copied by a scribe directly associated with the palace.\textsuperscript{53}

\textbf{ii) Placement and purpose of Emesal texts in the two main libraries of Nineveh}

As noted and discussed by others, the “library” of Assurbanipal was actually comprised of a few

\footnotesize

\textsuperscript{52} Another tablet most probably written by the same scribe, although not preserving the colophon, is BA 10/1, 4a+, the second tablet of the Balağ en zu sá mar-mar (including its Eršema nam-mu-un-šub-bé-en; Cohen 1981, 29–35, no. 29; Gabbay, forthcoming b, no. 22).

\textsuperscript{53} Cf. the same phenomenon in \textit{KAR} 346 from Assur, where a Šuila is copied by a “scribe”; see III.1 above.
collections of tablets within the acropolis of Nineveh, situated in different places and assembled for different purposes. The Emesal texts, too, belonged to different collections in Nineveh. Since the exact find spot within Nineveh was not systematically registered, the main evidence for the location of the tablets comes from colophons, when preserved. The colophons of Emesal texts usually explicitly indicate two locations of the tablets, namely the palace (referred to in several forms of colophons) and the library of the Nabû temple.

The “palace library”: The “palace library” was organized both as an institutional library (the “palace”) and as a private scholarly library of Assurbanipal. The institutional nature of this library is unique, since usually institutional libraries are connected to the temple; a “palace library” is an institution otherwise unknown from ancient Mesopotamia. Most preserved Assurbanipal colophons of Emesal tablets belonging to this group note that the tablets simply belong to the palace of Assurbanipal, at times stating his piety to the gods (often the god to whom the prayer is addressed and Nabû), with no purpose stated for the copying of the tablets. For example:

(Copied and collated according to its original). Palace of Assurbanipal, king of the world, king of the land Assur, son of Esarhaddon … who trusts in Marduk and Zarpânîtu. May he who trusts you not be shamed, oh Nabû!

Often, only the first two phrases appear, without Assurbanipal’s family affiliation and the piety statement. These two types of colophons do not necessarily imply Assurbanipal’s personal and scholarly involvement in the production and use of the tablet, but rather the institution of the “palace” (cf. Lieberman 1990; Frame and George 2005, 278–279). There are, however, rare cases in which a personal scholarly involvement of Assurbanipal is stated, which would indicate a greater tendency towards a private scholarly library context for those specific tablets (cf. Lieberman 1990), rather than the more institutional context of the former group:

Assurbanipal, great king, mighty king, king of the universe, king of the land Assur … I copied, checked, and collated this tablet in the assembly of the scholars according to tablets and writing-boards, exemplars from the land Assur, the land of Sumer and Akkad. For my royal viewing, I placed (it) in the midst of my palace. Whoever erases my inscribed name and writes his own name, may Nabû, the scribe of everything, erase his name!

This colophon nicely demonstrates the combined nature of the “palace library.” It is both a place of scholarly activity of Assurbanipal himself, used for his “viewing,” i.e., for study and reference, but also as an institutional library, as the placing (kunnu) of tablets almost always refers to an institution, normally the temple library, but here indicating the institution of the “palace,” which naturally combines both the private or professional residence of the king, as well

---

55 See Reade 1986; Lieberman 1990; Pedersén 1998, 158–165. Another library in Nineveh, in which at least one Emesal tablet was probably found, was located in the Istar temple of Nineveh (the tablet is BM 128025, a Šuila to Ninlil reoriented to address Istar-of-Nineveh; see Shibata, forthcoming, no. 15 with n. 504); see Reade 2005, 382.
56 Colophon “Asb. type v” (Hunger 1968, nos. 334 and 335), e.g., BL 19, BL 192+, CT 51, 189, 4R², 27, 2+ (Shibata, forthcoming, no. 3); cf. Maul 1988, 126–127. A similar colophon (“Asb. type b”; Hunger 1968, no. 322) is preserved on Sm.954 (AL³, 34–36; Cohen 1981, 131–135, no. 34.2; Gabbay, forthcoming b, no. 42).
57 Colophon “Asb. type a” (Hunger 1968, no. 317), found, e.g., on 82-5-22, 541 (+) Rm. 2, 494 (Gabbay, forthcoming b, no. 28) and BL 9a+BL 73 (Gabbay, forthcoming b, no. 54).
58 Colophon “Asb. type b” (Hunger 1968, no. 318), preserved on two Emesal tablets: BA 5/3, 23 (Eršema an-na za-e mah-me-en, Gabbay, forthcoming b, no. 62) and BM 128083 (Cohen 1988, 830; see Borger 1990, 31). It is possible that the different “palace” colophons indicate different locations in the palace.
59 Note the same purpose in the colophon of KAR 99+ (see III.1 above).
as the institution of kingship.

As noted, the more common “palace colophons” do not give any indication as to the purpose of the tablets that bear it. Still, they must have had some practical purpose. Unlike the Emesal tablets of the “temple library,” which are usually multi-columned and very large (see below), the “palace” Emesal tablets are small and single-column, i.e., easy to handle and hold. Indeed, unlike the “temple library” Emesal texts, which are distributed into “tablets” (tuppur) (see below), the “palace” texts are distributed into smaller units of “extract copies” (nisḫu). These tablets were not used for making other copies, but were themselves copies from other tablets, probably made mainly for study and for practice before ritual occasions, and perhaps also for scholarly study (this may be indicated by the colophon “Asb. type b” cited above).

There is one more category that should probably be associated with the palace library. These are tablets (often also designated as tuppu) brought from other places in Assyria and Babylonia, such as the tablets discussed above (III.2.i). The very likely mention of the palace of Assurbanipal in the colophon of one of these tablets makes it probable that the Babylonian tablets were all placed in the “palace library.”

**Nabû-Temple library (girginakku):** Colophons of Emesal texts indicating that they were located in the “temple library” (girginakku), which was housed in the temple of Nabû in Nineveh, are preserved so far on ten tablets (Hunger 1968, no. 328; Gabbay, forthcoming a, 276). As with other genres found with specific colophons relating to this location, the characteristic colophon from the temple library refers specifically to the genre of Emesal texts. The kalûtu colophon is found on tablets containing Balağs (including their Eršemas), Ritual Eršemas, and at least one Šuila tablet, as well as the Nineveh kalûtu catalogue 4R², 53+, but is not known from Eršaḫuğa. The kalûtu catalogue indicates that the kalûtu series consisted of Balağs (including their Eršemas), Ritual Eršemas, and Šuila (and no Eršaḫuğa), corresponding exactly to the genres on the tablets that were indeed placed in the girginakku as kalûtu literature according to their colophons. Following is a translation of this colophon:

```
For Nabû, perfect son … —
Assurbanipal, the ruler, favored by Aššur, Bēl, and Nabû, shepherd, provider of the shrines of the great gods, establisher of their regular offerings …—
For the preservation of his life, the length of his days, the well-being of his offspring, the establishment of his throne of kingship, the hearing of his prayers, the acceptance of his supplications, for handing over the ones disobedient to him,
According to tablets, copies from the land of Assur and the land of Akkad, I wrote on tablets, checked, and collated the wisdom of Ea, kalûtu, secret of an apkallu sage, which is appropriate for the appeasement of the hearts of the great
```

---

60 See 79-7-9, 239 (Cohen 1988, 829) + Rm.373 (BA 10/1, 31): [KUR “AN.ŠÁR-DÙ-A MAN ŠÚ MAN] [KUR] AN.[ŠÁR]. Cf. also Reade 1986, 220.
62 K.3113+K.16728 (Shibata, forthcoming, no. 18). Another possible Šuila preserving this colophon may be 4R², 28, 2 (Schwemer 2001, 189–190, 1018–1019).
63 DT 209 (Maul 1988, 276 and pl. 43, no. 66) is probably a Balağ that contains formulae otherwise known mainly from Eršaḫuğa (but also Eršemas); it does not have a genre subscript designating it as an Eršaḫuğa, which is usually the case for Eršaḫuğa in Nineveh. Cf. also Maul 1988, 277.
64 The exclusion of the Eršaḫuğa genre from the category of kalûtu may be explained by its literary distinction from the rest of the Emesal genres, since it deals with the individual lament and not with a lament over a city or temple; also, unlike the rest of the Emesal genres, it is recited by the king and not the kalût alone (Maul 1988, 26–27).
65 Colophon “Asb. type a”; see Hunger 1968, no. 328; Borger 1970, 168; Gabbay forthcoming a, 276–279.
gods. I deposited (it) in the library of Ezida, the temple of Nabû of the midst of Nineveh, my lord. Therefore, Nabû, king of the entirety of heaven and earth, look happily at this library! As for Assurbanipal, the servant, who reveres your divinity—daily at the setting up of the (Balağ) prayer (ina šakān takribti), announce his life! May I praise your great divinity!

As seen in this and other temple library tablets, the tablets belonging to the temple library were dedicated, since they are not a private or royal possession, but rather the temple’s possession, or theologically Nabû’s possession. The act of dedication, as is customary in the dedication of other objects in ancient Mesopotamia, is accompanied by a prayer by the dedicator, here Assurbanipal, asking for his life and stability of his kingship.

Unlike the “palace library” tablets, which are always single-column, small in size, and distributed into nisḫus, the “temple library” tablets can be very large, two-column, containing a much larger amount of text, and are always divided into “tablets” (tuppu), i.e., the strict scriptural-textual distribution and not the practical one.

What was the purpose of the tablets in this location? Unlike tablets from private libraries that were written for didactic, scholarly, or practical reasons, temple library tablets never have a purpose written on them. They are dedicated to the temple and its god, and the dedication includes a request for the good fortune of the writer, their dedicator. Their textual purpose, therefore, is not practical: it is “scriptural.” Of course, this scriptural nature also has a practical side to it: it provides an excellent Vorlage from which other manuscripts can be copied.

IV. Kalûtu and local Assyrian traditions

While the Nineveh material exhibits mostly the expected Babylonian tradition, with very few local allusions, some of the tablets from Assur and Nimrud incorporate local traditions related to those cities and their gods. In Nimrud, there is one (and perhaps a second) manuscript of the Šuila mu-lu é-a ku₄-ra-zu-ta that is directed to Nabû (and not to Marduk, as in the rest of the manuscripts of this composition), supplemented with epithets related to Nabû and Borsippa, and most importantly, also Kalḫu (Maul 1998, 160–183; Shibata, forthcoming, no. 7; see III.1 above), as well as one possible Middle Assyrian Šuila to Aššur (CTN 4, 171; see III.1. above). In Assur too one finds many manuscripts of the Šuila mu-lu é-a ku₃-ra-zu-ta to Aššur, perhaps based on a composition originally to Enlil (Maul 1998, 192–194), which was locally directed to the god Aššur and his city Assur (Maul 1998, 183–188; Shibata, forthcoming, no. 14; see III.1 above).

A unique case is the Balağ zi-bu-um zi-bu-um to Aššur, sharing its incipit with an Enlil Balağ (Cohen 1988, 347–373; Löhner 2009, 385–445), and known in Assyria as an independent composition to Aššur. This is the only such Balağ. Manuscripts of this Balağ were found in Assur (Cohen 1988, 342–346). The Balağ even entered the canonical grouping and sequence of Nineveh as indicated by its inclusion in the Nineveh catalogue 4R², 53⁺ (but see below), and by at least one tablet that contains this Balağ (with its Eršema) (81-7-27, 107; Gabbay, forthcoming b, no. 16 and pl. 10). This seems to be an early attempt to create a locally oriented Assyrian Balağ tradition, an attempt that was later abandoned in favor of the regular Babylonian tradition.⁶⁷

When did these local changes occur? To begin with the Šuilas: Maul (1998, 190–191) noted

---

that since the Šuila mu-lu ē-a ku₄-ra-zu-ta is otherwise known as a Marduk Šuila, listing names and epithets of Marduk and Babylon, it does not seem to be the basis of this Šuila directed to Aššur; instead, Aššur epithets were added to an Enlil Vorlage to create this Šuila. In fact, this hypothesis finds support from D. Shibata’s identification of the fragment K.14827 from Nineveh, written in Babylonian script, which contains a version of this Balaḡ directed to Enlil and Nippur, not to Marduk and Babylon (Shibata, forthcoming, no. 14). According to Maul (1998, 190–191), the Assur version mentioning Enlil/Nippur and Aššur/Assur must point to the traditional, pre-Sennacherib identification of Aššur with Enlil, rather than his identification with Marduk, known from Sennacherib’s reign.

The same could be said of the Aššur Balaḡ zi-bu-um zi-bu-um. It is likely that this is a pre-Sennacherib attempt to harness the Babylonian Enlil tradition to Aššur. It is significant that this is the only known attempt to create a new Assyrian Balaḡ; later, the Babylonian tradition was simply taken over in Assyria. Its place in the Nineveh canon is suggestive of its ambiguous nature. On the one hand, this Assyrian Balaḡ did find its way into the Nineveh canon, and is listed in the Nineveh catalogue 4R², 53+, i–ii: 15, after the Enlil Balaḡ of the same name. On the other hand, a remark following it notes that it is an “Aššur Balaḡ,” i.e., it is excluded from the corpus of “Enlil Balaḡs” in which it is listed.

Aside from the Assyrian Balaḡ zi-bu-um zi-bu-um in Nineveh, there is one Šuila to Ninlil, preserved in BM 128025, probably from the Ištar temple in Nineveh, that exhibits a local tradition of Ištar of Nineveh, and is likely to have been recited during the akītu festival in Nineveh (Shibata, forthcoming, no. 15). The rest of the tradition found in the kalûtu corpus of Nineveh is strictly Babylonian.

V. The serialization of Emesal prayers: Assurbanipal’s kalûtu?68
The focus of the following section is the serialization of the kalûtu literature, making use especially of evidence from Nineveh, which is compared to texts from other provenances. The Nineveh libraries present the most consistent serialization of various groups of texts,69 including the Emesal texts. The basic tools for the reconstruction of the serialization of Emesal texts are the Nineveh catalogue of Emesal tablets 4R², 53+70 and the catchlines on tablets.

67 It is possible that it is not by chance that the Balaḡ zi-bu-um zi-bu-um is the only known Balaḡ to Aššur. Unlike other Balaḡs, it does not contain a lamentation over a destroyed city but rather calls the god to rise (zi-bu-um zi-bu-um, “Rise! Rise!”), which in the cultic sphere probably refers to a procession, but theologically signifies rising towards battle. Such a motif is usually absent from Enlil Balaḡs, and calling him to rise (for battle) is indeed unique to the Balaḡ zi-bu-um zi-bu-um of Enlil (Cohen 1988, 347–373; Löhnert 2009, 385–445). The Balaḡs do not wish to call Enlil to rise up, since this also triggers his rage, which can turn back against his own city. On the contrary, the Balaḡs seek to calm Enlil, usually by seating him back on his throne. The call to battle is found in Ninurta Balaḡs, where Ninurta serves as Enlil’s avenger.

68 After the title of Ulla Jeyes’s (1997) article “Assurbanipal’s bārûtu.” The following paragraphs are based on my discussion of this material in Gabbay, forthcoming a, chapter VIII.

69 For various discussions on the serialization and canonization of other groups of texts in Nineveh, cf., e.g., Maul 1994, 216–221; Jeyes 1997.

70 K.2529 (4R², 53)+K.3276 (BL 103)+K.16853 (unpublished), new copy by S. M. Maul (unpublished). The Ritual Eršemas are known from two additional catalogues: BL 151 (new copy; Gabbay, forthcoming b, pl. 28) and K.2 (Gabbay, forthcoming b, pl. 28). For a summary and discussion of the catalogue, see Cohen 1988, 15–16. A transliteration of the catalogues with some notes is found in Gabbay, forthcoming b, chapter I, excursus 2 (cf. also Cohen 1981, 42–47).
As discussed above, like other bodies of literature, the corpus of Emesal prayers in Nineveh was based to a large extent on Babylonian materials. This raises two questions: Does the Emesal corpus and its organization reflect a purely Babylonian tradition, or does it have specifically Ninevite features? And secondly, if the tradition reflected in Nineveh is Babylonian in nature, what is the relationship between Nineveh and other Assyrian cities in regard to the corpus of Emesal prayers and their organization?

1. Serialization of Balağs in and outside Nineveh

The fixed sequence of Balağs is known almost only from Nineveh. While in Nineveh the last tablet (or nisḫu) of a Balağ (usually containing an Eršema) will have a catchline to the next Balağ, this is not the case in Babylonia, and while catchlines are attested in Babylonian tablets linking one tablet to the next within a composition, they do not occur on the last tablet of a composition to indicate the next Balağ. However, a group of extract tablets from Ur, perhaps dating to the seventh century BCE, contain excerpts of several Balağs (on each tablet), which are to a large extent, thought not entirely, parallel to the sequence of Balağs in Nineveh (Cohen 1988, 17; Black 1991, 33, n. 85; Cavigneaux 1993, 253–254). The situation in other cities in Assyria is less clear, due to the scarce attestations of Emesal tablets from Assyrian cities. KAR 99+, a summary tablet containing the entire Balağ nir-ĝál lú è-NE, including its Eršema, does not contain a catchline to the next tablet at its end. However, the nature of this tablet, which includes a shortened excerpt of the Balağ written syllabically, suggests it was not a standard text and thus not in its regular sequence, and not necessarily evidence for the non-existence of a sequence of Balağs in Assur. On the other hand, STT 155, from Sultantepe, containing the sixth and last tablet of the Balağ e-lum gu₄-sún, has a catchline to the next Balağ (am-e bára-an-na-ra), corresponding to the Nineveh tradition (as evidenced by Sm.1259 and the sequence in the Nineveh catalogue 4R², 53+, i–ii: 13–14) (Cohen 1981, 136–138, no. 13; Gabbay, forthcoming b, no. 13).

Besides the sequencing of Balağs there is also a division of Balağs into two groups: “Enlil Balağs” and “Inana Balağs” (see the rubrics of the sums in the Nineveh catalogue 4R², 53+, 41 and 60), roughly corresponding to Balağs addressed to male deities and Balağs addressed to female deities (Black 1985, 12; Cohen 1988, 17; Gabbay, forthcoming a, 195–198). The sequence of “Enlil Balağs” is arranged according to gods in the following order: Enki/Ea, Enlil (including Gula), Marduk, Utu/Šamaš, Iškur/Adad, Ninurta, Nabû, Nergal. This is followed by “external” (aḫû) Balağs. Was the enumeration of all these Balağs as one group of “Enlil Balağs” particular to Nineveh?

---

71 An interesting exception is Sm.954 (AL³, 34–36; Cohen 1981, 131–135, no. 34.2; Gabbay, forthcoming b, no. 42), which does not contain a catchline to the next Balağ.

72 Incidentally, the Eršema preserved on this tablet is not one of the two Eršemas assigned to this Balağ in the Nineveh tradition; see Gabbay, forthcoming b, no. 92.

73 In addition to the “Enlil Balağs” and “Inana Balağs” there is also one “Aššur Balağ,” listed in the Nineveh catalogue within the “Enlil Balağs” due to identical incipits; see IV above.

74 For the “external” (aḫû) Balağs, see Cohen 1988, 18–19; Gabbay, forthcoming a, 198. It should be noted that both groups are listed in the Nineveh catalogue 4R², 53+ as part of the “series of kalûtu” (iškar kalûti), and hence one cannot distinguish between Balağs belonging to the “series” (iškaru) and ones “external” to it (aḫû), as is done (regarding omens) in SAA 10, 8: rev. 8; cf. Rochberg-Halton 1984; Lieberman 1990, 307–308. It is possible that although both groups shared the same level of textual transmission, it was only the first group, that of “regular” Balağs, that actually had a role in cult.
Four tablets from late Achaemenid and perhaps early Seleucid Uruk, namely TCL 6, 56, TCL 6, 57, BaM Beih. 2, 17, and probably MLC 1852 (Cohen 1988, 812–813), contain a reference in their colophons to the group of “Enlil Balağs” (BALAG ⁴⁵⁰). The first tablet, TCL 6, 56, from the reign of Artaxerxes, contains the Eršema ṣ-nil-li en zu sá mar-mar (Gabbay, forthcoming b, no. 4), belonging to the Balağ ṣ-uzu-gin; è-ta, which is a Balağ directed to Enlil (Löhnert 2009). TCL 6, 57 contains the Balağ nir-ĝál lú è-NE to Ninurta but is still designated as an “Enlil Balağ” (BALAG ⁴⁵⁰), indicating that this refers, as in the Nineveh catalogue, to the group of Balağs directed mostly to male deities. Similarly, BaM Beih. 2, 17 contains the Balağ úru ḫul-a-ke₄ of Gula, but is also designated as an “Enlil Balağ” (BALAG ⁴⁵⁰), just as this Gula Balağ is part of the group of “Enlil Balağs” in the Nineveh catalogue (4R², 53, i–ii: 12). Lastly, MLC 1852 (Cohen 1988, 812–813), was assigned by Cohen (1988, 605) “on the thinnest of threads” to the Balağ im-ma-al gù dé-dê of Inana, reading the traces of the sign before the remark NU AL.TIL as the end of DÊ. However, the composition on this tablet is most probably a Gula Balağ: it mentions the Lady of Isin (lines 2, 14, 18), preserves the standard Gula / Isin litany (lines 31–39), and adds Egalmah(?!) and Erabriri to the standard toponym litany (rev. 29’–30’) (cf. Cohen 1988, 620–623). The signs after the break should be restored as the end of ⁴⁵⁰ (i.e., [BALAG ⁴⁵⁰] r!┌ ⁵⁰┐ NU AL.TIL), as in the tablets discussed above.⁷⁵ Since the composition preserved on this tablet seems to be a Balağ of Gula, it is likely that it is either the Balağ úru ḫul-a-ke₄ of Gula or mu-tin nu-nus dim-ma, both “Enlil Balağs” according to the Nineveh catalogue (4R², 53+, i–ii: 11–12).

The largest group of “Enlil Balağs” is those specifically addressed to Enlil (including Gula). Is it possible to find a logic to the sequence of Balağs within this subgroup as attested in Nineveh? The evidence does not come only from Nineveh, indicating, perhaps, that even if the textual and sequential subgrouping was done in Nineveh, it was based on a more widespread Babylonian cultic tradition. The sequence of Balağs to Enlil in Nineveh (known from the catalogue 4R², 53+ and from catchlines) may be divided into four subgroups. The first subgroup includes the Balağs ⁴-uzu-gin; è-ta, u₄-dam ki àm-ûs, and am-e amaš-a-na (4R², 53+, i–ii: 5–7), that share a similar predawn ritual context according to cultic attestations from various periods and localities (and not only Neo-Assyrian Nineveh), reflected in their content as well (Gabbay, forthcoming a, 178–180). Three Balağs mentioned in the Nineveh catalogue, namely the Balağs e-lum di-da-ra, e-ne-eğ-gá-ni i-li i-liu, and an-na e-lum-e (4R², 53+, i–ii: 8–10), form the second subgroup. These three compositions, when mentioned in rituals, again not only in rituals known from Neo-Assyrian Nineveh, are addressed to “the gods” (ana DINGIR.DIDLI) and not to a particular god.⁷⁶ Following these Balağs to “the gods,” the two Gula compositions, Balağ mu-tin nu-nus dim-ma and Balağ úru ḫul-a-ke₄ of Gula (4R², 53+, i–ii: 11–12), form the third subgroup (which as seen above were considered “Enlil Balağs” also outside of Nineveh). Finally, the fourth sub-group includes Balağs to Enlil, namely the Balağs e-lum gu₄-sún-e, am-e bára-an-na-ra, zi-bu-um zi-bu-um to Enlil (preceded by the Balağ of the same name to Aššur, but which is explicitly excluded from this group by the designation “Aššur Balağ”), and a-ab-ba ḫu-luḫ-ḫa of

⁷⁵ Confirmed by collation, courtesy of Prof. Eckart Frahm.
Enlil (and perhaps also the following incipit [ ] x-bi nu-pâ-da, although this may be a Marduk Balağ)\textsuperscript{77} (4R\textsuperscript{2}, 53+, i–ii: 13–17/18), that are addressed to specific gods in cultic texts (Gabbay, forthcoming a, 200–201). This group consists of various compositions that cannot be assigned to one of the previous three subgroups (i.e., predawn Balağs, Balağs “to the gods,” and Gula Balağs). To sum up, although this sequence of Balağs to Enlil is not known outside of Nineveh, the logic behind its subgrouping is mostly cultic, existing also in Babylonia.

2. Serialization of Ritual Eršemas in and outside Nineveh

A parallel to the fixed sequence of Ritual Eršemas in Nineveh (as seen by the Nineveh catalogues and catchlines) is found only in CT 42, 21 (Cohen 1981, 118–121, no. 35.2; Gabbay, forthcoming b, no. 50), a tablet from Dēr that was brought to Uruk in antiquity (Oelsner 1995). The catchline to the Eršema lugal nam-ta-è follows the Eršema úru a-še-er-ra èn-šè ba-an-gul-e, which corresponds to the Nineveh sequence.\textsuperscript{78} However, other than this, there is evidence for a different sequence of Ritual Eršemas, also in Dēr. This is evident from the sequence of three Ritual Eršemas found on the tablets CT 42, 12, MLC 382, and CTMMA 2, 14,\textsuperscript{79} the last tablet also contains a list of other Ritual Eršemas by incipit, which were not copied, and a catchline (lines rev. 19–28; see Maul 2005, 97). This sequence does not correspond to that of Nineveh, and may reflect a cultic grouping. Interestingly, CT 42, 12 (from Dēr) was probably written by the same scribe as CT 42, 21, which, as noted above, exhibits a correspondence.\textsuperscript{77}

3. Serialization of Šuilas in and outside Nineveh

The serialization of Šuilas was not as rigid as Balağs and Eršemas. Catchlines preserved on manuscripts of Šuilas from Nineveh only partly correspond to the sequence found in the Nineveh catalogue (Shibata, forthcoming, I.3.4). Even in the Nineveh catalogue, it is explicitly mentioned that they are listed according to gods (unlike the other genres),\textsuperscript{80} and this may be an indication that the sequence of the composition was not textually fixed. The sequence of Šuilas in the Nineveh catalogue (4R\textsuperscript{2}, 53+, rev. iii: 43–iv: 29) begins with the common numerical sequence of the gods, from Anu (= 60) to Adad (= 10), but continues in a sequence that seems to be based on some common cultic tradition, since it shares some similarities with the sequence of gods listed in a ritual, as well as in Neo-Babylonian administrative texts from Uruk. The ritual, directed against an enemy attack, is known from Nineveh (but is based on a Babylonian tradition, as there are no Assyrian characteristics in it).\textsuperscript{81} Even though not all the gods in the catalogue are listed in the ritual, the position of Nergal and Nuska in the ritual (lines 1’–7’) after the gods numbered 60–10 (Anu, Enlil, Ea, Sîn, Šamaš, Adad; lines 1–9) is in agreement with the sequence of gods in the Šuila section of the Nineveh catalogue. As to the Neo-Babylonian administrative texts from Uruk, the sequence of gods mentioned in some of the prebend sale texts from this period

\textsuperscript{77} Contra Black (1987, 35) and Cohen (1981, 45 and 1988, 18–19), who understand this line as a scribal remark and not as an incipit.

\textsuperscript{78} See the colophon of BL 63 (Gabbay, forthcoming b, no. 50), as well as 4R\textsuperscript{2}, 53+ // BL 151, rev. iii: 2–3.


\textsuperscript{80} See 4R\textsuperscript{2}, 53+, rev. iii: 43: ŞU.ŠU.LÁ.KAM+MEŠ [ša² DINGIR.DIDL]I ‘MU’ NE.

\textsuperscript{81} Maul 1988, 33–39, rit. nos. 1–3. Note that the first line does not contain the personal name \textsuperscript{4}aš-šur-ZI(napišta)-PAP\textsuperscript{asur}, as was understood in previous editions (Maul 1988, 33 and 37; Cohen 1988, 21), but the sequence of signs should rather be read as DINGIR.DIDL ‘ša²’ ‘ZI’ KUR (= itīb nakrī) (collated).
and place (Beaulieu 1992, 55–56) is very similar to that of Nineveh, especially considering the distinction made there between male and female gods as in the Emesal tradition, including the Šuilas. In fact, the similarities between the sequence of the Uruk texts and the sequence of Šuilas are even closer than the similarities between the former and the god lists An-Anu and An-Anu ša amēli, which were pointed out by Beaulieu (1992, 55–60).

4. Serialization of Eršaḫuğas in and outside Nineveh

Although tablets of Eršaḫuğas from Nineveh often contain catchlines to the next Eršaḫuğa (Maul 1988, 3–4), a fixed serialization of this genre does not seem to have existed, since the designation “tablet x” or a reference to a series of Eršaḫuğas does not exist (see Maul 1991, 68). The only clear attestation for this comes from BM 121055 (Maul 1988, 349, no. 103) from Nineveh, written by the son of the palace scribe of Sargon, which is designated in the colophon as “Tablet 8 (of the) Eršaḫuğa (series).” Other than that, the only other possible reference to a serialization comes from BM 76501, from Babylonia, which contains the remark AL.TIL in its colophon, referring to a serialization (Maul 1991, 69: rev. 6).

5. Serialization in Nineveh: Conclusions

Nineveh had the most complete and explicit serialization of the kalûtu series, in comparison to both Assyria and Babylonia. Cohen (1988, 20) assumed that this sequence was the product of the compiler of the Nineveh catalogue 4R², 53+. However, it is possible that this serialization was based on some Babylonian traditions or criteria, both textual and cultic, even if not explicitly formulated in Babylonia. These elements were brought to an extreme textual formulation in Nineveh. Another way of looking at it, although less likely in my opinion, is that the similarities between the Nineveh material and some of the Babylonian materials, which are usually later, is due to an Assyrian influence on Babylonia (Beaulieu 1997, Beaulieu 2010). In such a case, the influence may have been transmitted by the priests, including kalûš, installed by Esarhaddon in the Esaĝil while restoring it. Although these may have been locals and not necessarily Assyrians brought in by Esarhaddon, he surely preferred such high functionaries to be pro-Assyrian. Nevertheless, although it is possible to see some Assyrian influence on Babylonia in the fields of religion and textuality, it seems more likely to me that the textual materials from Nineveh represent Babylonia more than Assyria.

VI. The relation of kalûtu to the Assyrian king and royal literature

1. Kalûtu and the king

Emesal prayers relate to cities and temples, but references to the king are remarkably absent from most of them. How then did the Assyrian king, who was so dominant in the Assyrian religious life, relate to this more and more dominant body of literature in his land?

---

82 For a full discussion, see Gabbay, forthcoming a, 204–207.
83 For DT 209, Maul 1988, 276, no. 66, see n. 63 above. Note also that Eršaḫuğas do not belong to the series of kalûtu, strictly speaking; see III.2.ii with n. 64 above.
84 Unless the tablet is actually a Balağ or an Eršema; cf. Maul 1991, 68. But according to the copy the genre designation does indeed seem to end with GĀ; see Maul 1991, 73.
85 See Leichty 2011, 114, no. 53: rev. 1, 207, no. 105, vi: 23–24, 224, no. 110, i: 3’–4’.
The main involvement of the king with the *kalû* and his repertoire was through the Eršaḫuğa genre (which was actually formally not considered part of the *kalûtu* corpus, see III.2.ii with n. 64 above). This genre differs from the other Emesal compositions in its personal nature, emphasizing the misfortunes of the individual and asking the gods for his deliverance, while other genres emphasize the misfortunes of the cities and temples. This individual nature was closely related to a specific individual, the king; ritual texts attest that Eršaḫuğas were performed in his presence and indeed often actually recited by him (with the help of dictation by the *kalû*; Maul 1988, 26–27), or in the presence of a representation of him, specifically, his garments, as seen in Neo-Assyrian letters (SAA 10, 338–339). Eršaḫuğas are mentioned with other apotropaic rituals for the king during the period of a substitute king (and later his burial) in two letters to Esarhaddon by Mār-Issar (SAA 10, 351: rev. 14, 352: 19), as well as in an unassigned letter (SAA 10, 381: 2).

Still, it is noteworthy that when Urad-Ea mentions the performance of Eršaḫuğas to the king, as well as when he mentions a performance with the *lilissu* (probably implying a Balağ), he always assures the king that these performances will “bless the king.” This emphasis may reflect an apologetic tendency: it may have been added by Urad-Ea, since it is not entirely clear why these texts, which do not mention the king at all, should have any effect on the king.

Another way in which the king was involved in Emesal prayers was through the Šuila genre, which was performed in processions, especially during the akītu festivals of various cities (which in Assyria were connected to royal triumphal processions as well; see Pongratz-Leisten 1994, 79–83; Weissert 1997, 347–350). This genre (but only in Assyria!) often ends with a blessing of the kings participating in the processions by name, such as Assurbanipal and Sîn-šar-iškun (Shibata, forthcoming, I.4.4).

But these are exceptions, as the most regular cult of the *kalû* involved the regular performance of Balağs and their accompanying Eršemas, which was unrelated to the king. However, the Assyrian king had a most prominent role in cult and theology, and so it is expected that he would attempt to associate himself with this cult. Indeed, Assurbanipal was able to involve himself in the performance of Emesal prayers. Just as Urad-Ea assured Esarhaddon that his specific ritual performances would “bless the king,” so too Assurbanipal managed to involve himself with and benefit from the daily and most regular cultic performance of Emesal prayers that had nothing to do with him by stating the following in the colophon appended to Emesal tablets in the Nabû temple library of Nineveh: “As for Assurbanipal, the servant, who reveres your divinity—daily at the setting up of the (Balağ) prayer (ina šakān takribti), announce his life! May I praise your great divinity!” (see III.2.ii above). Thus, the king, through this phrase, asks that the regular daily performance of Balağs will also be a time of intercession in his favor.

The king also had another way of connecting himself to *kalûtu*, at least institutionally. He was the one who was in charge, not always actively, of the temples and the cultic objects in them, as well as the appointment of their priests. Three inscriptions of Sargon and Sennacherib seem

---

86 Unusually, also when the *lilissu* is played, probably implying a special performance of a Balağ (but note the performance of an Eršaḫuğa with the *lilissu* in Maul 2000, 406: 35’–36”; cf. Maul 1988, 26), the king’s garments are present as well in SAA 10, 340 (for the performance of a Balağ, although also with Er(šem)šaḫuğas, over the king’s garments; see also RAcc, 36:26–27).

to relate to the installation of the institution of kalûtu as part of these kings’ building enterprises. Sargon, when building Dūr-Šarrukin and initiating the cult of its temples, installs three categories of priests: nêšakku, ramku, and surmaḫḫu (Fuchs 1994, 236:157), the last a learned name for the kalamāhu, the chief kalû.88 Sennacherib, in an inscription exhibiting the Aššur-theology that incorporates Marduk’s characteristics, cultically covers and dedicates a lilissu drum, the main musical instrument of kalûtu in the first millennium BCE, for the pacifying of the heart (of Aššur), which is the purpose of kalûtu (Luckenbill 1924, 149; Frahm 1997, 221–222). In another inscription, Sennacherib mentions his installing of kalûs for the same purpose, “pacifying the heart” (Grayson and Novotny 2012, 84, no. 11).89

2. Emesal prayers and royal inscriptions
As discussed in the previous section, the king was directly associated only with the Eršaḫuĝa and Šuila genres in cult. Did this association have a literary impact on other genres related to the king? In a recent article, Baruchi-Unna (2013) has shown how the prayer of Assurbanipal found in the episode of Marduk’s return to Babylon in the L4 inscription is closely related to Emesal literature. The prayer asks Marduk to return to Babylon after it has been destroyed by his anger, and to look favorably on the city. Baruchi-Unna (2013, 619–622) has shown that this prayer is related to Emesal prayers both thematically and theologically (the god’s anger causing destruction, the god looking favorably at his city), as well as in the vocabulary and phraseology used in it (especially kišādu turru, “to turn the neck”). Interestingly, while the theology portrayed in this prayer is in accordance with Balaĝ and Eršema prayers, the use of the phrase kišādu turru is almost exclusively used in Eršaḫuĝas,90 the more dominant genre in Assyria, especially in relation to the king, who is also the one who performs the prayer in the royal inscription (and perhaps also in reality).91

Since Emesal prayers deal with the destruction of Babylonian cities, it would be interesting to compare not only the restoration of Babylon discussed above but also the destruction preceding it. Is it possible to draw connections between the literary description of the destruction of Babylonian cities described in Emesal prayers and the actual destruction that befell Babylon during the reign of Sennacherib? From a literary point of view, the description of Babylon being destroyed by a flood in the Bavian inscription of Sennacherib (Luckenbill 1924, 83: 51–54; Frahm 1997, 154) is typical of descriptions of destruction in Emesal prayers.92 The same image is maintained in Esarhaddon’s inscription of the same event, although it does not name Sennacherib as actively bringing this flood, but rather attributes it to Marduk.93 Indeed, the theological

---

88 For the equation sur = kalû, see Veldhuis 1997/98, 120–121; Volk 2006, 94: 15; Gabbay, forthcoming a, 67.
89 For another installation of kalûs in Assyria(?), cf. perhaps an inscription of Esarhaddon, Leichty 2011, 116, no. 54: 12’.
90 Cf. references listed in Maul 1988, 415. Note also that masi, “enough,” mentioned in Assurbanipal’s prayer, is also quite frequent in Eršaḫuĝas; see references in Maul 1988, 440.
91 This combination of motifs and vocabulary known from both Eršaḫuĝas and Balağs is in agreement with Assurbanipal’s claim that he pacified the gods of Babylon with a takribtu (i.e., a Balağ) and an Eršaḫuĝa; see Borger 1996, 45, iv: 88–89 (cf. Baruchi-Unna 2013, 621, n. 46).
92 See, e.g., in reference to Babylon: úru a du1-qa a giš-ra-[zu] tin-tir a du1-qa a ta mar-ra-[zu] // a-šu, sâ na-AK-ru a(š)-am-mu-[u₂₃] (vacat) sâ ana me-e sa-nil-[u₃₃], “[Your] city which was ruined and flooded (Akk: The city which the enemy flooded)! [Your] Tintir (= Babylon), which was ruined and submerged in water!” (Eršema dilmun’ niğinn- na 1, lines 20–21; see Gabbay, forthcoming b, no. 1, and parallels).
justification for Babylon’s destruction appears only later, in the inscriptions of Esarhaddon. This theology is very close to the typical Babylonian theological perception, found most often also in Emesal prayers, of the raging god (Marduk) leaving his city and thereby causing destruction. Thus, for example, in the Babylon Prism A of Esarhaddon the following chain of events is portrayed (Leichty 2011, 196, no. 104, i: 34–ii: 9; see Brinkman 1983): Marduk became enraged and decided to abandon his city Babylon for a certain period of time (seventy years), leading to its destruction (under the reign of Sennacherib), and later was appeased (during the reign of Esarhaddon, after 11 years instead of 70, justified through an exegesis of the cuneiform signs) and returned. This theology is also the theology that one encounters in Emesal prayers: Enlil (or Marduk) rages and leaves his city, causing its destruction; then he is asked to calm down (and consequently to return to his rebuilt city). In Emesal texts too, the destruction is limited in duration, as evident by the frequent use of the noun ūmu, “day,” for the destructive power. This is usually translated as “storm,” but the original meaning of the word as “day” signals the understanding of destruction as a temporary event (Gabbay, forthcoming a, 23, 29).

This parallelism does not necessarily point at a connection between Emesal prayers and the royal inscription on a literary level. Rather, it refers to an acceptance of the common Babylonian theology of divine rage, abandonment, reconciliation, and return, which is most vividly portrayed in Emesal prayers. Nevertheless, it is still significant that this theology is found in inscriptions from Babylon, regarding Marduk and Babylon (cf. Cogan 2009, 166), but is never applied to Aššur and his land, Assur.

VII. Emesal literature and Assyrian literary texts

1. Possible intertextual connections between Emesal literature and Akkadian literature from the Neo-Assyrian period

Some themes or formulas characteristic of Emesal texts are occasionally found in Neo-Assyrian literary texts. Thus, although connected to other genres and to a common theology and not exclusively dependent on Emesal texts, the request for divine pacification at the end of royal prayers, as exhibited in SAA 3, 2 (rev. 20) and SAA 3, 4 (rev. ii: 17”), is reminiscent of the “heart pacification” at the end of Babylonian royal prayers (Brinkman 1983, 39–40; Cogan 2009, 166). Nevertheless, in the Esarhaddon inscription too, this bad behavior is not understood to be governed by human will, but by malevolent omens (lines i: 20–21 and parallels; Brinkman 1983, 39–40; note, however, that in two fragments from Nineveh, the malevolent omens occur after the human behavior and the divine wrath; see Leichty 2011, 220, no. 108, i–ii: 18’ and 244–245, no. 116, i: 1–17”). Note also that in a different inscription from Babylon (Leichty 2011, 229–230, no. 113: 8–15), this behavior follows the divine rage and does not precede it, and thus cannot be the reason for it. It is significant that the version presented in this inscription may be the latest (dated after 672 BCE; cf. Leichty 2011, 229).

In SAA 3, 2; rev. 20, the vocabulary is also identical with the Akkadian renderings found in Emesal texts. Thus lu-nu-ut lib-bu-uk ša e-gu-gu lip-šaḫ ka-ba-tukša ša is-bu-us-su is lexically related to the very characteristic šà—ḫuĝ / bar—sed // libbu nāju / kabattu pašâju in Emesal texts. In SAA 3, 4, rev. ii: 17”, the heart pacification (found after a dividing line as in Emesal literature) is also connected to the physical rest on the goddess’s seat (muḫ mu-ra-ti 30 “Calm down, daughter of Sin, settle in your seat!”), a common perception in Emesal prayers (cf., e.g., Erêma ušum gud nú-a, line 57: ḫuĝ-gà-u ni te-na dûr ki-a-ba-an ma-ra-ab // mu-ûḫ ṣup-ši-êl ṣub-tû ne-êl-tû ti-ṣab, “Calm down! Be pacified! Take your seat of rest!”; see Gabbay, forthcoming b, no. 3).
pacification units” at the ends of Emesal prayers (Cohen 1981, 21–28; Gabbay, forthcoming a, 33–34).95

A structural feature that may be influenced by Emesal prayers is found in SAA 3, 9, a Neo-Assyrian literary composition praising(?) various cities. This composition contains two parts, each consisting of identical phrases, but enumerating different cities and temples. This is one of the most common features of the litanies of Emesal prayers (Krecher 1966, 42–45; Black 1991, 29–30).

2. STT 360 (SAA 3, 16) and Emesal literature
One Assyrian text, STT 360 (SAA 3, 16) seems to be dependent, from a literary point of view (and not only theologically or ideologically) on Emesal literature.96 Deller (1965, 464) pointed out the affinity of this text with K.890 (SAA 3, 15), an elegy about a woman who died while giving birth: both compositions are written in the Neo-Assyrian dialect and known only from one tablet each, both are lamentful in nature, and both contain peculiar plene writings. There is another interesting parallelism between these two compositions: SAA 3, 16 is an independent composition influenced by the kalûtu body of literature (see below), and SAA 3, 15 is an independent composition influenced by the āšipūtu body of literature, specifically the corpus of rituals and incantations dealing with a woman having problems in childbirth that describe her as a boat on the water (cf. Stol 2000, 62).

Although an independent composition, the following motifs and influences from the corpus of Emesal literature can be found in SAA 3, 16:

General: The literary genre of SAA 3, 16, as of the Emesal prayers, is lament. Structurally, like Emesal prayers, which are divided into sections by the use of dividing lines, SAA 3, 16 is also distributed into sections by dividing lines.

Lines 1–6: The mention of the “merchant” (tamkāru) is reminiscent of the epithet of Enlil as a merchant (dam-gâr) in Emesal prayers (Civil 1976). Note especially that a Balağ section describes the destruction caused by the “merchant” leaving his city (Löhner 2009, 314–345), similar to the death of animals related to the “merchant” in the Assyrian composition. Note also that the description of the “merchant” as “giving a word/mouth” in the Assyrian composition (lines 2, 5: ša KA SUM-ni) recalls the characteristic destructive word (e-ne-ēg) uttered by Enlil in Emesal compositions (Krecher 1966, 46–47).97

Lines 13–16: The description of turning the house into the house of a morning or evening god is reminiscent of the motif in Emesal prayers of the “house” (i.e., the temple) turning into the house

---

96 One more tablet is somewhat related to Emesal literature. This is a bilingual hymn, ending with a personal prayer for Bēl-Kundi-ilu’a, the chief scribe and scribe of Aššur’s temple, from Assur, written in Sumerian, with some Emesal forms (Cavigneaux and Ismail 1998). The descendants of this family were indeed engaged in scholarly and cultic knowledge, as seen in the colophons of tablets on which they are mentioned (Hunger 1968, nos. 504, 508–510, 518–519, 526). Interestingly, one of these descendants, Marduk-šallim-āḫḫē, the composer of some letters to the king (SAA 13, 8–17) alludes in one of them to the lilissu drums, associated with the kalû’s repertoire, a subject not normally touched upon in letters not written by kalûs (SAA 13, 12: rev. 11–14) (it is assumed that this individual should indeed be identified with the scribe bearing this name, descendent of Bēl-Kundi-ilu’a; this is also implied by the title given by S. Cole and P. Machinist, in SAA 13, 11, to the letters by him; cf. Baker 2001).

of a phantom, referring to its abandonment. See, for instance, lil-la-aš mu-un-DU, “he turned (the House) into a (place of) phantoms” in a few Eršemas, as well as similar phrases in Balağs (usually using the verb ku₄).

**Lines 17–23:** The killing of professionals in the realm of their profession: “The shepherd has been killed amidst the sheep, the ploughman over the plough. The gardener has been killed in the orchard, the canal administrator has been killed amidst his exertions. We are crying bitterly. We have cried for our gardener, for our gardener, for our canal administrator, whose fruit we ate wholeheartedly, (who) was praised in grapes and wine” (translation following A. Livingstone, in SAA 3, 39). A passage literally related to this is found in a Balağ to Enki, as part of the lament of the roaming goddess circling the outskirts of the city after its destruction: “My one of the ditches lies in the ditches (…)! My one of the canals lies in the canals (…)! My one who went to the vegetation was carried off. My one who went to the water was carried off. My one who carried vegetation does not carry vegetation for anyone, he was carried off. My one who carried water does not carry water for anyone, he was carried off!” (Cohen 1988, 55–56: 92–97).

**Lines rev. 5–8:** The motif of birds and nests: Various motifs involving images of birds, including the chasing of birds from their nests, reed-beds, or hiding places, are known from Emesal prayers (Black 1996; Löhnert 2009, 280–282).

**VIII. Concluding remarks: The kalû and kalûtu in the Neo-Assyrian period as a reflection of the Babylonization of Assyrian religion**

The kalûtu literature was not a traditional part of the Assyrian cult but was gradually introduced into Assyria from the end of the second millennium BCE. It is actually quite understandable why kalûtu literature was not part of the Assyrian religious tradition. As seen by the toponyms and gods mentioned in this corpus, the traditions and theology in them are centered in Babylonia and do not relate to Assyria. In addition, the Mesopotamian king is almost entirely absent from this literature, a phenomenon that does not comport with the central role the Assyrian king played in the cult of his land.

When we do meet the Emesal texts in Assyria, there is a relatively high percentage of Šuīlas, since this genre was closely associated with the king. Šuīlas were probably performed in his presence during important festivals, such as the akītu festival, and they often named specific kings at their end, a phenomenon known so far only from Assyria. Unlike the more “conservative” genres of Balağs and Eršemas, the genre of Šuīlas allowed Assyrian toponyms and gods to be added to the Babylonian ones.

The other genre popular in Assyria is the Eršaḫuĝa, a personal Emesal prayer that is known to have been performed in the presence of the king (or a representation of him). In fact, when a ritual performance by the kalû is mentioned in correspondences to the Assyrian king, it is usually this genre which is mentioned. Therefore, it is not surprising that already Tukulti-Ninurta I brought Eršaḫuĝa tablets to Assyria from Babylonia, according to his epic.

---

98 See, e.g., Eršema ša-sud-ra e-ne-ēğ-zu, line a+10 (Gabbay, forthcoming b, no. 2; see also Gabbay, forthcoming b, chapter I, ad Table 3) and Cohen 1988, 103: a+210.

99 An exception is the Balağ zi-bu-um zi-bu-um of Aššur (see IV above), but this is the only known Assyria-oriented Balağ.
There is only one example of an Assyrian Balağ (zi-bu-um zi-bu-um to Aššur); apart from that, the Balağs are known in their Babylonian form, almost exclusively from copies dating to the seventh century BCE, i.e., during the period in which Assyrian religion was under much Babylonian influence.

This Babylonization of the Assyrian cult by the introduction of the Babylonian kalûtu repertoire is also evidenced by the fact that the best known kalûs in Assyria belong to the prestigious Babylonian Šumu-libši family, considered descendants of the kalamâḫu of the Esağil in Babylon bearing this name. As seen above, although the kalû had a high cultic status in the Assyrian temple cult, he may have been considered an alien element, externally introduced into the Assyrian temples under direct protection of the king.

Thus, the evidence seems to indicate that the kalû and his repertoire were not an integral part of the original or traditional Assyrian cult. The process whereby the kalû and his repertoire were imported into Assyria, or at least grew more significant, was dependent on the ever increasing political involvement of Assyria in Babylonia, occurring in different forms and at various levels of intensity in succeeding periods, and which was accompanied by other cultural and religious Babylonian influences on Assyria (cf. Frame 1999; Galter 2007). Thus, according to his epic, after Tukulti-Ninurta I’s sack of Babylon in the thirteenth century BCE, he brought back tablets of Eršaḫuğas, closely associated with the royal cult. Nevertheless, in this period the evidence for Middle Assyrian Eresal texts, as well as Middle Babylonian Eresal texts found in Assur, is extremely scarce, especially in comparison to other genres (such as omens). Later, as the involvement of Assyria in Babylonia grew, especially from the eighth century BCE onwards in the reigns of Tiglath-Pileser III and especially Sargon, even more so during the reign of Sennacherib, and finally during the reigns of Esarhaddon and Assurbanipal, when Assyrian religion in general became more and more Babylonized (Porter 1993, 137–153; Frahm 1997, 283), so did the place of the kalû and kalûtu in Assyrian cult grow.

References

The kalû Priest and kalûtu Literature in Assyria


Frahm, E. 1997: Einleitung in die Sanherib-Inschriften, AFoB 26, Vienna.


—— 1994: Zukunftsbewältigung: Eine Untersuchung alterorientalischen Denkens anhand der babylonisch-assyrisch Löserituale (Namburbi), BaF 18, Mainz.


44–45, 115–128.


