I.C. BEFORE THE SECOND SANGA

From the time of the independent rulers of Sippar and the first kings of Babylon until somewhere during the reign of Sabium, the sanga of Šamaš appears alone, not accompanied by a second sanga.

Although there was no second sanga, we see that the role of second witness was filled by people who must then have occupied the second highest rank in the temple hierarchy.

We will discuss the careers of five persons occupying this place from the earliest texts until the appearance of the second sanga.

1. Ilum-mušallim

a. Seal Inscription (B 26\(^2\) = 24\(^3\) = 51\(^4\) = GW 1980 14a = GW 1988 pl. XXIV 182a)

![Seal Inscription](Fig. 12)

dingir-mu-ša-lim
i.du,
ká ga-gu-um

b. Attestations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Genre</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Seal</th>
<th>First sanga</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VS 8, 4</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Im oath</td>
<td>wedding</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VS 8, 5</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>[...</td>
<td>L.E. second(^6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BDHP 14</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Im oath</td>
<td>inheritance</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C(^7)</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>L.E.(^8) top</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


c. Comments

In our two earliest documents the second witness is Ilum-mušallim, whose profession is not given in the texts but appears from his seal impression on the case of, e.g., BDHP 14 to be doorkeeper of the gagûm (i.du, ká ga-gu-um) which, contrary to what might seem, must not have been a lowly function\(^9\).

We have six texts in which he is a witness\(^10\). Concerning the sealing order as reflecting the hierarchy, we have to distinguish between his absolute and his relative position in the witness list.

---

\(^1\) See already Harris (1975, 194).

\(^2\) The seal inscription, as transliterated in BLOCHER 1992a, p. 25 only gives the first sign of each line. Since Ilum-mušallim is the only doorkeeper in the text, it must be his seal.

\(^3\) Again, the inscription is broken but what remains of it together with the figure allows us to identify this with Ilum-mušallim’s seal, especially since he is one of the witnesses. B 24 is to be found on MHET 7.

\(^4\) This is the impression of this seal on CT 45, 1 (a drawing is also given in the CT volume), given in BLOCHER 1992a as tablet X. We have not listed it since it contains no sanga.

\(^5\) For the order of the texts, we refer to our discussion of the first sanga Annun-pi-Šamaš, son of Warad-Sin, above.

\(^6\) Only the figure is visible, not the seal legend.

\(^7\) Only the textual variants vis à vis the tablet are given in BDHP, not the seals.

\(^8\) Complete legend.

\(^9\) Cf. the similar remarks in Harris (1975, 165) concerning the courtyard sweeper of the Ebabbar (kisal.luḫ ē babbar).

\(^10\) CT 4, 47b (mu Iši-Sumu-abu ab.u cfr Podanyi 2002, 1=Im); VS 8, 4/5 (Im); BDHP 14 (Im); CT 4, 50a (Im+Sle); MHET 7 (Im); BDHP 31/CT 45,1 (Sle+Bti).
As to his absolute position in the whole of the witness list, he is second, fourth, fifth, eighth or ninth witness. How are we to interpret this changing position? Generally, in these early times, the group of temple personnel as a whole appears in the middle of the witness list. They are always recognisable by the fact that they have no patronymics, in contrast with the other witnesses. Visibly only the presence of a sanga could move this group to the top of the list, as in VS 8, 4, BDHP 14 and MHET 7, though not always, as in CT 4, 50a (cf. supra Sanga’s not first witnesses). This absolute position is thus not relevant for the determination of the temple hierarchy.

As to his position relative to the other temple personnel, it is clear that as soon as the overseer of the 

\[\text{nadi\'atum}\]

is present, under Immerum, he takes the second place after the sanga and Ilum-mušallim moves to the third place.\(^\text{11}\) In MHET 7 (Im), he even moves to the fourth place after the sanga, Būr-Nunu the overseer and Būr-Nunu’s sister who also is an overseer. Exceptionally, he heads the temple personnel in CT 4, 47b (year Iši-Sumu-Abum died) and BDHP 31/CT 45, 1 dated Sumu-la-El-Bunta/h+brevebelowtun-ila, no doubt simply in the absence of the overseer and the sanga. In all of his six texts Ilum-mušallim comes before people known to be messengers (rā.gab) from other texts: Damu-galzu\(^\text{12}\), Lu-dāri \(^\text{13}\) and Utu-ENGUR.A-nišī\(^\text{14}\). In other words, Ilum-mušallim ranked lower than the sanga and the overseer of the \nadi\'atum\ (as soon as there was one) but higher than the other temple personnel, being the messengers, except for a singer (nar), as we shall see in the next section.

Amurrum-bāni, his son, will follow in his father’s footsteps as doorkeeper of the \nagūm\, as we learn from his seal inscription (B 81\(^\text{15}\)) rolled on CT 48, 31\(^\text{16}\) dated to Sumu-la-El. His career extends from Sumu-la-El to Sabium\(^\text{17}\). Amurrum-bāni will never take the second witness position which confirms our idea that the two texts in which his father was second witness were exceptions. When Amurrum-bāni, the son of Ilum-mušallim, takes over the title of doorkeeper, under Sumu-la-El, he moves yet one more place down because the order now is: sanga, overseer, rā.gab, doorkeeper. This order is maintained during the reign of Sumu-la-El\(^\text{18}\).

In conclusion, Ilum-mušallim had to be mentioned since he sealed two documents after the sanga but in reality he did so—in all probability—only because an overseer was absent or otherwise engaged.

d. Location of the Seal

As a second witness, he rolls his seal under that of the first sanga on the left edge of the case. When the sanga seals at the top of the left edge, the seal of Ilum-mušallim is the top one of the left edge (BDHP 14). When the sanga seals at the top of the left edge, the seal of Ilum-mušallim is the second one on this same edge (VS 8, 5).

The next two second witnesses, Imlik-Sîn and Būr-Nunu, belong to the well known family of overseers of the \nadi\'atum\ of Samaš. We will discuss their sealing practice and elaborate a little on their family.

2. Imlik-Sîn

a. Seal

There is no seal impression available for this person.

\(^{11}\) Lion 2001, 28 n 64 quite correctly states that the reading of this seal in Al-Rawi/Dalley 2000, 126 is mistaken: the last line is not é lugal ‘gu-du’, but kā ga-gu-um, a reading that (with some goodwill) can be reconciled with the copy on plate 53.

\(^{12}\) Attested once as dub.sar in CT 4, 47b (year in which Iši-Sumu-abum died) and rā.gab NIG é ‘utu in MHET 7 dated to Immerum. Out of the six texts (see note 11) he is absent in CT 4, 50a only. He always comes right after Ilum-mušallim.

\(^{13}\) He is rā.gab according to CT 4, 50a, dated to Immerum and Sumu-la-El. Present in CT 4, 47b, VS 8, 4/5 and CT 4, 50a.

\(^{14}\) Who is rā.gab NIG é ‘utu in CT 45, 1 (case of BDHP 31), dated to Sumu-la-El and Buntaštun-ila. Present in CT 4, 47b, VS 8, 4/5 and BDHP 31/CT 45, 1.

\(^{15}\) \(\text{d}[\text{mar}].\text{tu}-\text{ba}-\text{ni}\)

dumu dingir-mu-ja-lim

i.du₇₄

ša kā ga-gi-im

\(^{16}\) Case of CT 8, 44a.

\(^{17}\) CT 6, 26a, CT 47, 1 and MHET 28. Later, there is an Ilaluš son of Ilum-mušallim who is ugula lukur ‘utu (CT 6, 33b, AS 8) also mentioned without title but with patronymic in CT 6, 46 (AS 13), CT 6, 35a (s.d.) and MHET 661 (s.d.). It seems probable that this is a younger brother who is overseer of the \nadi\’atum\ under Apil-Sīn.

\(^{18}\) Without a sanga as first witness he is second in CT 33, 42 (s.d.), CT 33, 43 (s.d.), MHET 784 (s.d.), Walker 1978, 235-36 (Sumu-la-El). With a sanga he is third in CT 47, 1 (Sumu-la-El), CT 6, 30a (Sumu-la-El), CT 45, 2 (Sumu-la-El), CT 33, 43 (Sumu-la-El).