THE NETWORK OF RESISTANCE: ARCHIVES AND POLITICAL ACTION IN BABYLONIA BEFORE 484 BCE

Caroline WAERZEGGERS
(Leiden University)[1]

The Neo-Babylonian text corpus is a copious and varied source of documentary evidence on many aspects of Babylonia's history under Assyrian, Babylonian, and Persian rule. What is often not realized, however, is that two-thirds of this rich corpus was created in a single year (484 BCE)[2] by a single intervention, and that as a result of this intervention processes of archive production, that had taken place in a decentralized and organic fashion until 484 BCE, became politicized and homogenized during the corpus' final moments of formation.

The political nature of this intervention was discussed in my article on the Babylonian revolts against Xerxes (2003/2004). I argued that in the autumn of 484 BCE, in the immediate aftermath of the revolts of Šamaš-erība and Bēl-šimânni, individuals and temples in cities throughout central and northern Babylonia abandoned or otherwise deposited their archives. The scale and concerted nature of these acts of storage led to the production of two-thirds of the corpus that we today associate with the long sixth century. As these acts of disposal happened in the very specific context of counter-insurgency, it may be surmised on the basis of synchronicity that the 'end of archives' was a phenomenon tied to state intervention in the wake of the uprisings. While concurrence implies a connection, it is, however, a second quality that bears out the politicized nature of this phenomenon.

Certain individuals were able to carry their tablet collections across 484 BCE. These people were local clients of Persia's governing elite in Babylonia; individuals who had been co-opted or recruited into the empire through direct ties of mutual dependence, for instance as caretakers or managers of estates

[1] This paper was written in the framework of ERC CoG project 682241 (Persia and Babylonia). The evidence for the inter-city network of Nabû-ittannu from Dilbat, presented below (2.4.2), was gathered by Bastian Still; I wish to thank him for allowing me to publish it here. I also wish to thank the Trustees of the British Museum for providing access to the study room of the Middle East Department and for permission to cite from unpublished cuneiform texts from their collections.

[2] To be clear, with 'created' I do not mean 'written' or 'composed', but deposited in such a way that the tablets could be found and retrieved in modern times, in the 19th and 20th centuries.

owned by absentee Persian landlords, or as entrepreneurs providing services to such estates. The patron-client hierarchies tying these Babylonian individuals to the imperial state were short-stretched and anchored in the countryside; these men connected the highest levels of state to Babylonia's rural populations. The Yaḫudu archival complex, which mostly came to light after 2004, fits this general typology: the archival control of deported communities in Babylonia's rural south-east was maintained across the crucial year of 484 BCE.[3] An entirely different profile emerges from a social analysis of the persons who deposited their archives in the aftermath of the revolts. These men and women were city-dwellers, anchored in different types of patron-client networks. Their orientations were not centred primarily around Persian elites but around urban institutions with deep roots in Babylonian political tradition: the temples and the city governorships. These institutions had been established long before the advent of the Persian Empire and were run by limited numbers of families tightly connected through marriage, residence, education, employment and status.

These contrasting profiles suggest that in the context of counter-insurgency, the fates of archives in 484 BCE Babylonia were decided along lines of political allegiance. Individuals affiliated to temples and city governorships, i.e. the urban elites of mostly northern and central Babylonian cities, abandoned their tablet collections (or parts thereof), whereas those closely associated with the Persian state and its systems of land tenure maintained and continued their archival production. Based on these contrasting profiles and behaviours, I argued in 2003/2004 that the latter group should be considered a pro-state faction in Babylonian society at the time of the revolts against Xerxes, while the former group should be seen as a pro-insurgency faction that eventually fell 'victim' to the Persian state's counter-insurgency. The simultaneous disappearance, in Babylonia's south, of elite families with roots in the city of Babylon, suggests that Xerxes' punitive measures tracked down social networks that reached beyond the area of unrest.[4]

Scholars contest the nature of this group's 'victimhood'. Historians of the Persian Empire stress the efficiency and measuredness of Xerxes' policy.[5] Archaeologists emphasize the lack of evidence for violent destruction in the

[3] Pearce and Wunsch 2014, 4.

[4] See Kessler 2004; Baker 2014, 192–193; and Beaulieu, this volume, for the replacement of Babylon-based elites with local ones in Uruk, at the time of the revolts in the north. Note that it is possible that Uruk's participation in the revolts has gone unrecorded so far. The Egibi archive from Uruk could fit in such a scenario; see 1.5 below and Kessler, this volume.

[5] See among others Rollinger 2008; Henkelman et al. 2011; Kuhrt 2014 ("Xerxes is emerging, more and more, as one of the most important architects of a stable and successful Persian empire", 169).

wake of the revolts.[6] Assyriologists are sensitive to the short-term effects on the lives of the individuals and families involved as well as to the longer-term signs of change in Babylonia's society and religion following the revolts.[7] Despite these disagreements, there is a common ground in this debate. First, the closure of archives in 484 BCE is accepted as a consequence of targeted actions against those who participated or supported the insurgency of Šamaš-erība and Bēl-šimânni. Second, these actions are thought to have had repercussions in the lives of these people beyond the management of their archives. In the broadest sense, these repercussions may be described as a removal from privileges enjoyed previously. The elite shift in Uruk offers one well-documented scenario that we may use to fill out the blanks, but individual fates were doubtlessly diverse and ultimately remain beyond our grasp.

The aim of this paper is to reflect, not on the nature of Xerxes' reprisals, but on the effects of this intervention on the shape and structure of the corpus of the long sixth century BCE. As a product of a particular event, the Neo-Babylonian text corpus needs to be historicized: whose records does it contain and why? Thinking about these issues leads us, on the one hand, to a recognition of structural restrictions inherent in the corpus because it was shaped through a process of homogenization. On the other hand, we also learn to look out for hints of diversity that are present, even if marginalized. Historicizing the corpus, therefore, does not only entail thinking about restrictions, but also about reorientations and possibilities. I will argue that we can read the corpus 'backwards' as a residue of the social networks that had formed in Babylonia in the decades prior to the revolts and that enabled (anti-imperial) political action in 484 BCE. In this way, we can use the limitations of the corpus to our advantage.

My approach in this paper is indebted to the 'archival turn' in the humanities and in history in particular.[8] Since the early 1990s, historians have increasingly turned their attention to archives as objects to be interrogated and studied in their own right, rather than as repositories of data where answers to historical questions can be discovered in a straightforward manner. This shift is driven by the insight that the archive is not simply a place where knowledge is preserved but also the place where knowledge is produced and shaped by power

[6] Heinsch, Kuntner and Rollinger 2011 stress the lively continuation of Babylonian culture (p. 472: "Vielmehr ist von einem lebendigen Fortbestehen der babylonischen Kultur auszugehen (…)"); see also Heinsch and Kuntner 2011; Kuntner and Heinsch 2013.

[7] The social implications of re-organizing the Babylonian cults are discussed by Jursa 2013 and Baker 2014; see also Kessler 2004, Berlejung 2009. Abolishment of the prebend system in northern Babylonia: Hackl 2013 and Hackl, this volume. Changes in officialdom: Hackl and Jursa 2015. See also the Introduction to the present volume.

[8] See among others Burton 2005; Burns 2010. For a general introduction into the history, nature, and objectives of the archival turn see King 2016 and de Vivo 2013, 460–462.

relations current at the time.[9] Ann Laura Stoler, among many others, urged historians to study colonial archives as tools of domination, reflective of the operations of the state itself.[10] While this focus on state authority is less suitable for studying the Babylonian archives of the long sixth century, which mostly derive from private and temple contexts, it is no less essential for us to direct our attention from the 'archive-as-source' to the 'archive-as-subject'. Because the Babylonian corpus was shaped (to a large extent) by a single event, historicizing it as an artefact of that particular event is a necessary step in our thought process concerning the corpus. Moreover, as this intervention was initiated by the state during an operation of counter-insurgency, we might, even if only in an indirect way, be able to read refractions of state power in the shape of the corpus.

Another reorientation that I want to propose in this contribution is a shift away from the aftermath of the revolts to their prelude. Discussions about the events in Babylonia in 484 BCE have focused mostly on Xerxes' punishment of Babylonia and its intensity. Was his response measured or was it violent? Did it have punctual or long-lasting effects on Babylonian society? This debate is conditioned by earlier discussions that have taken place in ancient history since the 1980s.[11] While it is important to ask questions about the exact nature of the punishment(s) suffered by his Babylonian opponents, Xerxes' reactions remain hard to judge in view of the decline of written sources at the very moment when his response takes effect and in view of the inconclusiveness of the archaeological evidence. New pathways into the events of 484 BCE present themselves when we look at the genesis and prehistory of the revolts rather than at their aftermath. There are several aspects of this prelude that require our attention, for instance, the question of why the Babylonians revolted, what they hoped to achieve by re-establishing an independent monarchy in Babylon, and how they had experienced Persian rule since 539 BCE.[12] Another aspect that has been ignored so far is the question of how Šamaš-erība and Bēl-šimânni mobilized support among the Babylonian citizens. Which channels were available to them as a basis for collective action? How did people in different cities organize themselves in opposition to the state? In this paper, I am concerned with this latter set of questions, relating to the social anatomy of the revolts.

[9] Steedman 2002, 2.
[10] Stoler 2002 and 2009; Dirks 2002.
[11] See the introduction to this volume.
[12] See the contributions of Pirngruber and Sandowicz in this volume.

1. The shape of the corpus

The end-of-archives in 484 BCE can be imagined in two contrasting ways. On the one hand, we can describe it as an end point, when archives that had been long in the making were abandoned or stored by their owners. On the other hand, we can picture it as a moment of generation and production, when much of the corpus of the long sixth century came into being. The events of 484 BCE, while no doubt disruptive for the people involved, thus had the effect of preserving archives for posterity. The end-of-archives is, in that sense, also the beginning of *our* (present-day) corpus. In this section, I will examine how the events of 484 BCE shaped the corpus that has come down to us, on various levels: its size, its structure, its content, and its social orientation.

1.1. *Size*. First, in terms of size, the intervention of 484 BCE led to the deposit of as much as two-thirds of the tablets that we today associate with the long sixth century. This figure, which will be explained below, is no more than an educated guess because neither the then-existing part of the corpus nor the part generated through new deposits in 484 BCE can be measured exactly. In part, this is due to the corpus' incomplete state of publication and recovery, but there are other problems involved that preclude exact assessments. A major difficulty is establishing the date of an archive's disposal from its contents. The moment of storage does not necessarily approximate, let alone coincide with, the date of the last dated record contained in the archive deposited. If owners removed the most valuable items from their tablet collections before depositing them in 484 BCE, as is generally assumed, many recent documents will be missing. There is, therefore, a very real possibility of disjunction between the break-off point of the archive and the date of its storage. Another problem relates to the identification of 'archives' in Neo-Babylonian tablet collections, which mostly lack archaeological provenance. Following accepted practice in the field, 'archives' will be defined here as collections of tablets that were produced during activities, intellectual, legal, or administrative, by an institution, person, or family and that were, with reasonable certainty, deposited together. In view of the lack of archaeological context, the former criterion, which builds on prosopography, dominates in most cases. Even the excavated tablets from Babylon are difficult to sort into clear-cut archives.[13]

The figure of two-thirds that I presented above is arrived at by splitting the surviving Neo-Babylonian archives in groups.[14] The first group consists of

[13] Pedersén 2005; Baker 2008.

[14] This study uses 136 archives of the Neo-Babylonian text corpus: archives deposited prior to 484 BCE, in 484 BCE, and spanning 484 BCE. Late Achaemenid and Hellenistic archives are not considered here; Hackl discusses several of these in his contribution to this volume. Most archives are described in Jursa's guidebook (2005a). Added to these are the small archives from

archives that had already been closed off by the time of the revolts. The cut-off point is arbitrarily fixed at Dar 14 for an archive's last dated record. This date is sufficiently removed from 484 BCE to eliminate most effects of the disjunction described earlier. Archives in this group are labelled 'A' in the table below. Into the second group I have selected archives that were stored, with reasonable certainty, in 484 BCE. This includes archives that stretch into the time of unrest itself, but also archives that terminate up to a few years earlier, between Dar 35–Xer 2.[15] In the table below, these archives are labelled 'B'. A third, in-between, category (labelled 'A–B') consists of uncertain contenders for the end-of-archives scenario. Archives that terminate in the period between Dar 15 and Dar 34 may have been deposited in 484 BCE after extensive removal of the most recent materials, in which case they belong to the end-of-archives phenomenon, but it is also possible that they had already been stored at that moment.[16] In any case, the classification of the corpus that I suggest here is merely a heuristic tool; the labels A, B and A–B may be contested in specific cases, but they do reveal a general trend.[17]

Together, groups A, B, and A–B count c. 51.000 tablets; a substantial majority (67%) of these were deposited in or shortly before 484 BCE. This effect is largely caused by the Ebabbar archive, which dominates group B with its c. 30.000 tablets. But also in group A there are archives that are disproportionately large, notably the Eanna archive (c. 8.000 tablets) and the early Ebabbar archive (c. 5.000). In order to minimize distortions caused by such exceptional finds, we may opt to proceed with a minor corpus that excludes uncommonly large archives. In this minor corpus, the A–B group (with c. 1.630 tablets) gains more weight: c. 1.930 tablets remain in group A and c. 4.320 tablets remain in B. These figures suggest that of the minor corpus only 25% had been formed by

Nippur identified by Zadok (1986), the Ir'anni archive from Babylon (Jursa 1999, 5 and Wunsch 2005, 366), the well-stratified tablet finds from Babylon (Pedersén 2005; Baker 2008), the small archive excavated at Babylon in a house west to the temple of Ištar of Akkad (Baker 2008, 105), and the Yaḫudu archive and associated texts (Pearce and Wunsch 2014). Note that stray finds and incoherent text groups from the Babylon excavations are not included in this study (Pedersén 2005; for the archival coherence of this material, see Baker 2008). Several hundred unassigned tablets from Borsippa and the Sippar temple library have also been left out. The total number of tablets in the Neo-Babylonian text corpus is therefore larger than what I work with in this paper. All data can be found in the table appended to this paper.

[15] To the list in Waerzeggers 2003/2004, 156–157 can be added the following archives. From Babylon: Ea-eppēš-ilī A from Homera Mitte (Jursa 2005a, 62–63; Baker 2008, 106–107); N9c from house XVII in the Merkes district (Pedersén 2005, 194, 196–198; Oelsner 2007, 292; Baker 2008, 106); N12 from the same district in Babylon (Pedersén 2005, 208–217; Baker 2008, 105). From Borsippa: the Aḫiya'ūtu archive, Ibnāya B-C-D archive, the Mār-bīti temple file, the tablets of Nabû-aplu-iddin of the Ea-ilūtu-bāni family (Waerzeggers 2010, 367, 526–527; Waerzeggers 2005, 363 and 357). From Sippar: the Maštuk archive (Jursa 2005a, 130–131) and probably the archive of Bēl-aplu-iddin from the same archival cluster (Jursa 2005a, 130), but by ending in Dar 34 the latter does not formally fall within this category.

[16] See also 1.5 (below) on the A–B archives.

[17] The table in the appendix provides one more category, C, consisting of archives that extend across 484 BCE, belonging to the pro-Persian faction discussed in the introduction of this paper.

the start of Dar 15. The extent to which the events of 484 BCE impacted the minor corpus depends on the status of the uncertain A–B archives. In one extreme scenario, if all of them should have to be attributed to the end-of-archives phenomenon, 75% of the minor corpus would have been generated in 484 BCE. In the other extreme scenario, if all of them had already been deposited by Dar 35, then 45% of the minor corpus was generated in 484 BCE. In reality, a figure somewhere in-between these extremes will probably be correct (see also 1.5 below).

This means that c. two-thirds of the corpus of the long sixth century, as known today, was produced by a single intervention at the very end of its history of formation. Of the minor corpus (discounting the large and potentially distorting archives from Sippar and Uruk), perhaps as much as 75% but certainly not less than 45% resulted from this event in 484 BCE.

1.2. *Multi-archive clusters*. The majority of archives deposited in 484 BCE were stored collectively, in close proximity to each other or in clusters. Earlier storage practices had yielded more atomized, better-delineated archival units without extensive interconnections. How should we interpret this contrast?

Let us start by examining the nature and extent of clustering more closely. Multi-archive assemblages are in evidence in the major cities affected by the end-of-archives phenomenon, especially in Sippar and Borsippa where the effect is most striking. Almost all archives that were deposited in these two cities in 484 BCE were stored collectively, in multiple clusters of varying size. The largest cluster, comprising several tens of thousands of records, comes from Sippar. It is made up of the (late) Ebabbar archive and a mix of private materials, including the archive of Marduk-rēmanni with its seven smaller satellite archives. All these tablets seem to stem from only two rooms in the Ebabbar temple complex.[18] While a rough classification of these texts in archival groupings can be produced, at a finer level it is hard to assign tablets to particular owners because the protagonists entertained such close relationships with each other. For instance, Marduk-rēmanni, as a College Scribe of Ebabbar, was deeply involved in the temple's record production; he may have kept his private texts in the temple archive, or *vice versa*, certain temple records may have ended up in his personal archive. He also shared multiple professional and social networks with the protagonists of the satellite archives. As I argued elsewhere, these individuals were all part of an extensive patronage network gathered around the powerful family of city governors, Ša-nāšišu, in the reign of Darius I.[19]

[18] On Rassam's excavations at Sippar in 1881–1882, see Walker and Collon 1980; De Meyer and Gasche 1980; Reade 1986; Pedersén 1998, 193–194; Bongenaar 2000; Jursa 2011. On the archive of Marduk-rēmanni and its satellite archives, see Waerzeggers 2014.

[19] Waerzeggers 2014, 14, 22, 137.

There are several other instances of collective storage associated with 484 BCE, including at least two more from Sippar. The Maštuk group is a cluster of three archives deposited in 484 BCE.[20] Discovered separately from the late Ebabbar cluster, it represents a distinct storage unit. As in the former case, strong social ties connect the protagonists of the Maštuk group's sub-archives: the Maštuk and Ṣāḫ̮it-ginê families were members of an émigré community from Babylon living in Sippar, and the Ṣāḫ̮it-ginês and Bēl-aplu-iddin operated interlinked business enterprises.[21] Again, we are dealing not just with a physical assemblage of archives, randomly deposited in close proximity to each other, but with a social unit. A third instance of clustering from Sippar involves the two small archives of ^{f}Aqūba and Šamaš-iddin, deposited in 484 BCE and constituting a separate find; the protagonists do not seem to share a specific social network, but they do share their modest social origins and business interests.[22]

With at least fourteen archives closed off in 484 BCE, Borsippa was as deeply affected by the end-of-archives phenomenon as Sippar. Here too, the majority of archives were deposited collectively, in clusters.[23] The largest cluster contains over one thousand tablets, of which 91% can be assigned to particular archives (based on prosopography) while the remainder is unclassified.[24] Again, we observe multiple social connections between the principals of these records. The majority are priests of the Ezida temple and their families; one file derives directly from the temple administration itself.[25] There is a preponderance of brewers' archives in this cluster. Worthy of note is the admixture of older archives: while five of its archives were deposited in 484 BCE, several others had (long) been out-dated by that year. This could indicate that an old depot was being re-used, or that residues of older archives had survived among the records of later people. A similar observation applies to the satellite archives of Marduk-rēmanni, some of which had also been idle for several decades by 484 BCE (see 2.6 below).

[20] The combined Maštuk and Balīḫ̮u archives reach up to Dar 35; the Ṣāḫ̮it-ginê B archive stretches to Xer 1; and the archive of Bēl-aplu-iddin ends in Dar 34. In total, over 70 tablets are involved. See Waerzeggers 2014, 22–23, 148; Jursa 2005a, 129–132. The Arkât-ili archive from Elammu may also belong to this cluster (7 or 8 tablets; dated in mid-Nabonidus; cf. Jursa 2005a, 149–150).

[21] Waerzeggers 2014.

[22] A fourth possible cluster from Sippar is composed of the archive of Bel-rēmanni, with its medicinal component, and the cache of Ile'i-Marduk tablets, which entertains an unknown relationship to the former two groups. Jursa 1999, 3; Jursa 2011, 200.

[23] The exception is the small archive of ^{f}Inṣabtu, which seems to have had a unique dispersal history; Waerzeggers 2000.

[24] This is the so-called Rē'i-alpi group; Waerzeggers 2005.

[25] Records in the *iškaru* file keep track of the daily production of flour for the sacrificial meals of Nabû and his divine household; Waerzeggers 2010, 214–223.

The second cluster from Borsippa is with c. 680 texts somewhat smaller but structurally very comparable.[26] Here too, we find strong professional associations between the principals in these texts, this time centred on the ranks of Ezida's bakers and butchers. It also contains an admixture of older collections that had been idle for a while by 484 BCE. As in the previous instance, a dossier straight from the temple's administration found its way into this cluster (the so-called 'DAR' group), alongside the varied materials from private archives of priests. The third and smallest cluster from Borsippa consists of four archives, all deposited in 484 BCE and all heavily interconnected through Ezida's association of brewers.[27]

The extent of clustering in evidence at Sippar and Borsippa is unparalleled in other cities, where fewer archives were deposited in 484 BCE, or where fewer such archives were retrieved in modern times. In Babylon, the Šangû-Ninurta archive with its admixture of records from a seemingly unrelated minor archive may constitute an instance of clustering associated with the year 484 BCE.[28] Other Babylon archives associated with 484 BCE survive in reasonably well-stratified contexts and seem to represent single finds. The Egibi archive was reportedly found in sealed jars; the N12 and N9c archives were each dug up in a house; the Ea-eppēš-ilī A archive is associated with a particular trench; the Nappāḫu archive's museum distribution pattern is unique enough to suggest a distinct provenance.[29] In Dilbat, the Dābibī archive contains contracts from the Eimbianu temple archive; this can be another instance of clustering. Dābibī's protagonist was a College Scribe at this temple — a similar set-up as with the late Ebabbar and Marduk-rēmanni cluster at Sippar. In Kiš, the only archive (known) that was stored in 484 BCE seems to represent an individual deposit.

How do these findings compare with earlier storage practices? Archives deposited prior to Dar 15 (group A) seldomly survive in clusters. The so-called 'small archives' from Nippur, including the archive of Nergal-iddin, may represent the only known instance: this mixed group of records was probably found in close proximity to each other and exhibits strong internal links, for instance, through the activity of scribes.[30] But with only c. 60 tablets this cluster is very modest in size compared to those generated in 484 BCE.[31] On the whole, clustering does not happen with the same frequency and intensity in

[26] The Bēliya'u group; Waerzeggers 2005, 358–360.

[27] This is the so-called Mannu-gērûšu cluster; Waerzeggers 2005.

[28] Wunsch 2005, 366; Jursa 1999, 5.

[29] On the Egibi jars, see Wunsch 2000, 1. On N9c (house XVII) and N12, see Pedersén 2005, 194, 208–211. On Ea-eppēš-ilī A, see Baker 2008, 106–107 (N23). On the Nappāḫu archive, see Baker 2004.

[30] See the chart in Zadok 1986, 286. Jursa (2005a, 115) proposes to unite several of the archives that Zadok delineated in this cluster. The archive of the sons of Līšir may have a different provenance profile than the rest of this cluster.

[31] Zadok 1986, 283–285.

group A as it does in B. Archives in group A generally constitute identifiable, atomized entities linked to a particular origin, documented in excavation or museum stratigraphy. In Nippur, for instance, except for the cluster just described, A archives constitute distinct text groups with reasonably clear physical and social boundaries: an 8th century BCE letter archive was found in a pit next to a girl's coffin (128 tablets),[32] a 7th century archive was excavated in the courtyard of a house (Ninurta-uballiṭ, 28 tablets),[33] the archive of Bēl-eṭēri-Šamaš (38 tablets) and the Carian dossier (8 tablets) have distinct distribution patterns in present-day museums which suggest separate origins.[34] Similar observations pertain to A archives from other sites. In Dilbat, for instance, all A archives have distinct distribution patterns.

What conclusions can be drawn from this overview? The picture is not black and white: some clustering occurs among earlier archives (A) and some archives deposited in 484 BCE (B) were stored individually. Nevertheless, a tendency for clustering is apparent in the latter group, and for individual storage in the former. Because both bodies of clay tablets derive to a large extent from uncontrolled or poorly recorded diggings, we can rule out the possibility that clustering resulted from modern excavation practices. It seems more satisfactory to explain the structural contrast as a result of ancient storage. The patterns that we observe in group A are suggestive of decentralized, uncoordinated acts of storage — acts that were informed by individual circumstances and decisions. In 484 BCE, by contrast, collective storage strategies were at play: not only did many people decide to store their archives at the same time, they also stored them in close proximity, especially in Borsippa and Sippar. The high social cohesion between records deposited in this way indicates that the tablet owners were linked through pre-existing social networks. In other words, the multi-archive clusters are no random collections of texts, deposited by strangers in some accidental fashion. They pertain to collectivities that shared professional affiliations to temple priesthoods and administrations; in the case of the Marduk-rēmanni cluster, ties of patronage to the Ša-nāšišu family, who supplied several Governors of Babylon in the reign of Darius I, also played a role.

1.3. *Archive typology*. When looking at the shape, structure and composition of the archives deposited in 484 BCE, as compared to those discarded at earlier occasions, we notice that certain types of archives were involved more than others. It seems possible, therefore, that these archival shapes reflect conditions that surrounded their disposal in 484 BCE. Several typologies yield meaningful patterns.

[32] Cole 1996, 1.
[33] Pedersén 1998, 198–201; Jursa 2005a, 115.
[34] Jursa 2005a, 112–113.

1.3.1. Dead or semi-discarded?

A common typology used in Neo-Babylonian studies distinguishes between dead and living archives.[35] This refers to the usage of the archive at the time of its disposal:[36] a dead archive was no longer relevant to its owner at storage, while a living archive still possessed actuality. The former type of archive is thought to have come about through practices of archival management: inactive files that had been accumulating in a running archive were removed in order to maintain its functionality.[37] Discoveries of living archives, by contrast, are usually thought of as resulting from unforeseen events that impacted on the archive holder's life: nobody would voluntarily leave behind documents of value. One problem with this classification is that the separation between dead and living archives is made on the basis of two different kinds of variables that can lead to opposite results. It is important to discuss this problem at some length here, because the notion of 'dead archive' has been cited repeatedly in discussions about the end-of-archives as an important indication for the nature of the Persian response to the revolts.

In Neo-Babylonian studies, the distinction between dead and living archives is usually based on the absence or presence of tablets that have current and/or lasting value to their final owners.[38] Dead archives lack recent property deeds of real estate, as well as active business files such as tablets documenting outstanding credits or accountancy texts. They rather consist of outdated texts with little or no relevance to ongoing affairs or property claims. Based on these internal criteria, archives deposited in 484 BCE have often been classified as dead archives. Recent title deeds are indeed mostly absent and a drop in the number of preserved texts can usually be observed in the very last years before storage, in particular running accounts and ongoing administration.[39] A number of conclusions are drawn from these features. One is that the active or living parts of these archives must have been moved elsewhere and that, consequently, the owners had time to organize their tablet collections in the aftermath of the revolts. This, in turn, suggests that a measured or administrative response by the Persian authorities is a more likely scenario than one involving instant

[35] Another typology refers to the nature of the archive-producing entity and distinguishes between private and official (or between family, temple, and palace) archives, distinctions that are often blurred (e.g. Veenhof 1986, 10, van Driel 2000, Brosius 2003, 11). For an extensive discussion of Neo-Babylonian archival typology in institutional archives, see Jursa 2004.

[36] These terms are used inconsistently in the various subfields of Assyriology, see Brosius 2003 for an overview.

[37] Van Driel 1992, 40–42; Veenhof 1986.

[38] Van Driel 1987, 168 and 1989, 203–204; Jursa 2005a, 58; more recently adopted by Lauinger for the study of tablets from Alalaḫ (2011).

[39] Ea-ilūtu-bāni: van Driel 1992, 42; von Dassow 1994, 110. The Ebabbar archive as a dead archive: Bongenaar 2000, 74; Jursa 2004, 164–170, 193; Jursa, this volume.

punishment.[40] While I was among those who formulated this conclusion, I now think that the appreciation of these matters needs some more nuance. Let it be clear, however, that in no way do I intend to resuscitate the old paradigm of Xerxes' destruction of Babylonian temples.[41]

First, the idea that owners needed time to sort out their archives in 484 BCE is based on the assumption that they kept their tablet collections in a disorganized state. Such an assumption is difficult to substantiate because we know very little about practices of archive-keeping. Would owners have maintained no order in their tablet collections? Given the size of some of the archives involved, this seems unlikely. It is worthwhile to recall Heather Baker's reservations in this regard:

> "[…], it cannot be excluded that archival practices involved a continuing process of tablet sorting for the sake of storage. If valuable documents such as title deeds were kept physically separate from those of short-term interest, then the archive-holder need only have grabbed the former and fled if necessary. Therefore the act of sorting need not have been precipitated by events but may rather have been routine." (Baker 2008, 109 n. 13)

Archives were indeed subject to regular care and clearing. This is suggested by traces of multiple life cycles found in some better studied archives.[42] Moreover, the example of the Egibi archive from Uruk, found *in situ* in an undisturbed context,[43] shows that idle collections of tablets could be stored in such a way that they were still accessible to their owners. The Ingallēa archive, which was found in two pots — one focused on business activities and the other on the documentation of ownership rights — actually attests to such a set-up.[44] In how far this reflects standard archival practice is difficult to say. What is clear, however, is that we do not, and can not, know how much time archive keepers would have needed to separate their active files from their inactive files in the aftermath of the revolts, as duly pointed out by Heather Baker (above). It is therefore difficult to infer the nature of the Persian response from the 'deadness' of these archives.

Second, the typology of dead and living archives is poorly defined and conceptualized. In current definitions, the presence or absence of property deeds is considered a key criterion for classification of private archives. However, archaeological evidence sometimes cross-cuts the classifications that are

[40] Jursa 2004, 193; Waerzeggers 2003/2004. Note that Jursa, this volume, also comes to a more nuanced appreciation of the storage actvities and selection processes that were involved in creating the Ebabbar archive as deposited in 484 BCE.

[41] E.g. Heinsch, Kuntner, and Rollinger 2011, 472.

[42] Joannès 1989, 119–126; Waerzeggers 2014, 18–19. See also Jursa, this volume, for the complex history of the Ebabbar archive in its final years of existence.

[43] Castel 1995, 127.

[44] Pedersén 2005, 203–205.

obtained through this internal feature. In 1995, Corinne Castel proposed a typology of first millennium BCE private archives based on their find context. Archives found *in situ* in undisturbed contexts are considered 'vivantes' because they were accessible to residents; those discarded, buried or re-used as fill are 'mortes'. At least one archive in her latter category would, on internal grounds, have been labelled 'living' by Neo-Babylonian Assyriologists. The Šigûa archive, excavated in the Merkes district of Babylon in a house where it had been re-used mostly as floor fill, contains a large number of title deeds, including from the final generation.[45] The archaeological context makes it clear that the archive had been discarded despite it still possessing value as proof of property. The Egibi archive from Uruk constitutes a similar case: based on internal criteria, the classification 'dead' would apply to this archive, but its archaeological context suggests that it was 'alive' (Castel 1995, 127).

Third, the assertion that the tablets deposited in 484 BCE no longer had any value for their last owners is incorrect. It is true that recent property deeds of real estate were mostly not left behind,[46] but many of the discarded tablets would still have had currency. In 1992, G. van Driel used the word 'semi-discarded' to describe the mixed status of the Ea-ilūtu-bāni archive, one of the many private archives deposited in Borsippa in 484 BCE.[47] It seems to me that this description has a major advantage because it invites a more nuanced evaluation of the issue of pertinence and does not enforce a binary typology between dead and living. Among the tablets left behind in 484 BCE we find a significant number of so-called *ēpišānūtu* contracts dated to the revolts or only a few months or years earlier. In total, six archives from three different cities contain such material.[48] *Ēpišānūtu* contracts are at the core of record-keeping in priestly archives. Cultic continuity was a matter of deep concern closely monitored by temple authorities and *ēpišānūtu* contracts were designed to allocate responsibility in the case of ritual failure. The fact that such contracts became obsolete in the wake of the revolts — not just in one archive, but in a string of archives across several Babylonian cities — could indicate that either the sacrificial cult, the prebendary system regulating it, or the agreements of cooperation and exchange between priests had fallen in disarray.[49] Another element that is

[45] Castel 1995, 127; Pedersén 2005, 198–199.

[46] But there are exceptions; for instance, the Dābibī archive from Dilbat contains several recent property deeds (Jursa 2005a, 99) and the Rē'i-alpi archive from Borsippa contains one (BM 26501, Waerzeggers 2010 no. 205).

[47] Van Driel 1992, 42.

[48] Sippar, Bēl-rēmanni archive: VS 5 109 (Jursa 1999, 264–265). Marduk-rēmanni archive: Waerzeggers 2010 nos. 173, 178, 179, 180 and perhaps 181. Ša-nāšišu A archive: BM 74570. Dilbat, Dābibī archive: VS 5 110 and VS 6 331, the latter written during the revolt of Bēl-šimânni. Borsippa, Bēliya'u archive: BM 29234. Lā-kuppuru archive: VS 6 182.

[49] Such ruptures may already have started before the outbreak of the revolts, as can be seen in the panicked correspondence of Borsippean families about non-payment of their prebendary

difficult to reconcile with the idea of 'dead' archive, is the fact that among the discards of 484 BCE we find remains of running accounts of active administrations. One of these attests to the work of a bureau overseeing the tasks of cultic bakers of Ezida, another contains the private accounting of a brewer of Ezida.[50] The N12 Egibi archive from Babylon's Merkes district displays a concentration, rather than the expected drop, of tablets in its very last years.[51] Another striking feature shared by archives deposited in 484 BCE is that they often count rent contracts among their very last tablets, stipulating work and rent obligations of third parties,[52] business agreements,[53] or even very recent slave sale contracts.[54] These texts were not outdated by the end of the revolts, unless these families had lost their houses, gardens and flocks, or could no longer rely on the services of their tenants, gardeners, herdsmen and business partners.

To sum up, the binary typology of dead vs. living archives seems too restricted to capture the complex and mixed features of archives deposited in 484 BCE. While these archives are devoid of recent property deeds and, in most cases, of active administrations, they do display elements of actuality that we would not expect if they had lost all value to their present owners. With regard to the amount of time that owners would have needed to sort out their archives, we should keep in mind that record-keeping practices are too poorly understood to give a reliable sense of the state these archives were in before the outbreak of the revolts.

dues shortly before the rebellions (Jursa 2013). Not only in private archives, but also in the Ebabbar archive a larger quantity of cult-related files is in evidence in the archive's final years (Jursa, this volume).

[50] The former is the so-called *iškaru* file (n. 25 above); the latter is found in the Ilšu-abūšu A archive (Hackl in Jursa 2010, 637). See also van Driel 1992, 40 on the actuality of the latter file.

[51] According to the catalogue compiled by Pedersén 2005, seventeen of the archive's 163 tablets date from Xer 1, three date from Xer 0 and one dates from Xer 2. N12 was identified by Baker 2008 and Oelsner 2007, 292 as part of the end-of-archives phenomenon.

[52] Bēliya'u archive from Borsippa: BM 29020 (cultivation contract, dated in Xer 2), VS 5 117 (contract for building reparations with a duration of four years, dated in Xer 0). Mannu-gērûšu from Borsippa: Ungnad 1959/1960 no. 24 (cultivation contract, dated in Xer 0). Egibi archive: *ZA* 3, 157 (house rent contract, dated during the revolt of Šamaš-erība), BM 33980 Bertin 2851 (house rent contract, dated in Xer 1). Ea-eppēš-ilī A archive from Babylon: BE 8 119 (laundry contract, dated in Xer 1). Marduk-rēmanni: Waerzeggers 2014 no. 176 (house rent contract, dated in Xer 1) and no. 182 (house rent contract, dated during the revolt of Šamaš-erība). Gurney 1982 no. 3 is a boat rental contract written in Babylon in Xer 2, but apparently found in Kiš; it is unassigned as far as I am aware. Unassigned from Borsippa: BM 26653 and BRM 1 85 (both are house rent contracts and date to Xer 2 shortly before the revolts), BM 26615 (a lease contract of a flock of sheep, dated in Xer 1). Unassigned from Sippar's Maštuk group: FLP 1482 (lease of a heifer, dated in Xer 1; Stolper 1990, 588).

[53] Bēliya'u archive from Borsippa: BM 29005 and duplicate BM 96201 (Borsippa, Xer 1).

[54] BM 28877 (Xer 1; slave bought by archive holder, Borsippa); NBC 6156 (Xer 1; idem, Sippar); Stigers 1976 no. 58 (Dar 29; idem; Sippar). VS 5 116 (Še 0; Borsippa, unassigned slave sale contract).

1.3.2. Densities and lengths

The typology of Neo-Babylonian archives has received little attention beyond the basic distinctions between dead and living archives, and between private, temple, and state archives. When looking at the corpus in the aggregate, several additional sets of properties yield meaningful patterns that suggest structural differences between archives deposited in 484 BCE (group B) and those deposited at earlier occasions (group A). One of these relates to the density and length of private archives.

The majority of private archives that were deposited before 484 BCE (group A) have low tablet densities. They usually do not contain more than one tablet for every active year; half contain even less than 0.5.[55] The distribution of tablets within these archives can be shallow overall (when the entire length of the archive is poorly populated) or it can be imbalanced (when the archive is unpopulated for long stretches of time but more concentrated in a specific period). The Dullupu archive from Babylon is a good example of a long archive of the latter type. It covers a period of 101 years but it is empty during much of this time; most tablets pertain to the last generation of the family with only a few older tablets. The Esagilāya archive, also from Babylon, is similar. The Ḫuṣābu archive from Borsippa is overall shallow: it covers three generations at a rate of only 0.1 tablets per year on average. The Ea-qarrād-ilī archive from Dilbat is short but still only sparsely populated (0.4 tablets for each of its 35 years). Only a minority of private archives deposited before 484 BCE display higher densities.[56] On the whole, we can conclude that under normal circumstances private people tended to store thin collections of tablets.

Private archives deposited in 484 BCE tend to be more densely populated, with rates of 3.0 and more tablets per year being no exception.[57] Another feature of this group, correlated with high density, is the long coverage that some of these archives achieve over multiple generations. Among the deposits of 484 BCE, we find several archives that contain uninterrupted documentation across

[55] Of private archives deposited prior to 484 BCE, 42 have a density ratio of one tablet per year or less, 27 have a ratio of half a tablet per year or less. Only six private archives have larger densities. Note that very small archives with only a handful of tablets, such as those from Nippur, have been left out of consideration here.

[56] Six out of 51, to know: Itti-Šamaš-balāṭu from Larsa (3.33), Bēl-eṭēri-Šamaš from Nippur (2.0), Arkât-ili (4.0), Sîn-uballiṭ from Ur (8.6), Bēl-aplu-uṣur from Uruk (3.24), Bēl-eṭēri from Sippar (2).

[57] Of 30 archives in group B, 14 have densities of 1.0 and up; nine are considerably more populated: a much higher percentage of the total find compared to the A group (previous note): N9c (3.1), N12 (5.4), Egibi with Nūr-Sîn (13.9), Nappāḫu (3.3), Bēliya'u (5.5), Ilšu-abūšu A (8.3), Rē'i-alpi (2.9), Marduk-rēmanni (2.9), Bēl-rēmanni (3.2 with the medicinal archive included, or 2.2 if only the archival material is counted).

three, four, five, and even six generations.[58] Such well-stocked multi-generation archives are absent in group A.[59]

The differences in density and length between groups A and B are tendencies; these features are not mutually exclusive: some exceptions can be found on either side. However, in general, we do notice that private archives deposited in 484 BCE tended to be bulkier in size and more historical in depth than the collections that were stored at earlier occasions.

1.3.3. Uniform vs. varied

In terms of content, archives in the A group are often homogenous and punctual: they tend to consist of a particular type of text or to relate to a specific kind or period of activity. Many of the tablet groups found in the palace of Babylon, for instance, are focused on day-to-day personnel management in a particular period. The malt file from Borsippa is also topical in nature. As for private archives, we can point to the Šigûa archive (N10) with its many property deeds. Even more homogenous are the Sîn-uballiṭ archive from Ur, the Nippur letter archive, and Bēl-aplu-uṣur's baker archive from Uruk. Many more examples can be cited, including modest ones such as the Šumāya archive from Babylon and the Akkad-ēreš archive from Cutha, each containing about a dozen tablets focused on trade.[60]

In comparison, the archives in group B are more varied in content. Most of them hold a mix of text types, both ephemeral and longer-lasting, notarial and administrative, recent and historical,[61] reflective of the full range of activities that the owners engaged in.[62] The inventory of texts represented in the Nappāḫu archive from Babylon is exemplary: family documents about dowries and adoptions; property documents about purchases (land, houses, prebends, slaves) and inheritance divisions; business documents consisting of promissory notes, receipts, leases, and work contracts; texts relating to litigations; inventories and internal administrative texts.[63] This list of text types can be applied wholesale

[58] E.g. Nappāḫu: three generations; Ṣāḫit-ginê A: three; Ea-eppēš-ilī A of Babylon: three; Aḫiya'ūtu: three; Šangû-Ninurta: three; Atkuppu: four; Rē'i-alpi: five: Egibi: five; Maštuk: five; Ea-ilūtu-bāni: six.

[59] The Itti-Šamaš-balāṭu archive from Larsa, with three generations covered, is an exception; however, most tablets of this archive relate to one generation only.

[60] Of 65 archives (private and institutional), 24 have uniform or topical contents.

[61] Of 33 archives, only three have homogenous contents: the Ilšu-abūšu A archive, the *iškaru* file and the Mār-bīti file.

[62] See Jursa 1999, 31 who explicitly argues in favour of the representativeness of the contents of Bēl-rēmanni's archive.

[63] Baker 2004, 9–10.

to nearly all private archives abandoned in 484 BCE, sometimes in addition to letters, school texts, and other genres.[64]

I suggest that these differences in uniformity are related to differences in storage practice. Compared to earlier deposits, the tablet collections stored in 484 BCE had not been subject to thorough selection. Their contents closely reflect the mother archive (*Stammarchiv*), from which only the most valuable documentation had been retrieved. This is also in keeping with my observations in 1.3.1, where I suggested that far from being closed-off 'dead' entities, the archives deposited in 484 BCE were 'semi-discarded' and still possessed some actuality.

1.4. *Social background*. The men and women who abandoned their archives in 484 BCE belonged to a specific layer of society.[65] As members of the traditional Babylonian elite, their families had dominated the religious life and civic administration of Babylonian cities for many generations. In view of the scale of their deposits in 484 BCE (see 1.1), this group disproportionately left its mark on the corpus of the long sixth century. In part, this is a natural outcome of their dominant role in society: as property owners, priests, investors, lessors, etc. they participated in transactions that made the recourse to cuneiform writing and archival documentation necessary or desirable. But the conditions of 484 BCE significantly contributed to their homogenizing effect on the corpus. This can be appreciated if we compare the social background of archives deposited in 484 BCE (group B) with that of archives stored earlier (group A).

Seventy per cent of archives deposited in 484 BCE have a temple background, either originating in the administration of temples or in the milieu of the priesthood. The other archives stored that year belong to people who were connected through patronage to the temples or to the city governorships, particularly that of Babylon. Apart from sharing resource portfolios and patronage networks, these people enjoyed the same levels of literacy and adhered to the same cultural and social norms (as seen, for instance, in their use of family names). They also shared the same geographical space and city-based environment in the metropolitan area around Babylon.

Group A yields a more varied picture. Here too, many archives belong to temples or priests, but their proportion (c. 40%) is significantly smaller than in group B. In A, we also encounter people with different resource portfolios, e.g. rural colonists, traders, and craftsmen. The social and linguistic backgrounds in A are also more varied. While several archive-keepers were city dwellers

[64] For letters from Neo-Babylonian private archives, many originating in deposits from 484 BCE, see Hackl, Jursa and Schmidl 2014. Two examples of private archives that include school texts (besides other varied content) are Bēl-rēmanni (Jursa 1999, 12–31) and the Ea-eppēš-ilī A archive from Babylon (Pedersén 2005, 287–288).

[65] Waerzeggers 2003/2004, 160.

who spoke Babylonian and bore family names, others lived in villages, spoke Aramaic or other languages, and did not advance genealogical affiliations. In terms of institutional affiliation, we also find more variation in group A, which includes palace archives besides temple administrations.

In short, while priests and temples dominate the Neo-Babylonian text corpus as a whole, alternative 'voices' can be heard particularly in archives whose storage was not triggered at the time of the counter-insurgency of 484 BCE. An awareness of this diversity might help to correct certain strains in our perception of Babylonian society. Much research capital is being invested in the study of the groups affected by the events of 484 BCE. This interest is a consequence of the historical importance of this group, but it is also conditioned by the shape of the corpus, as it is this group's documentation that is the most extensive in size (see 1.1), the most varied in content (1.3.3), the longest-living in temporal scope, and the best in coverage of the Neo-Babylonian text corpus (1.3.2).

1.5. *The A–B archives*. Having identified a number of tendencies, in form and content, in archives deposited in 484 BCE, I now turn to the middle group of archives (A–B). The end points of these archives are close to the time of the revolts but not close enough to attribute their disposal to these events on the basis of synchronicity alone. However, based on their formal characteristics, several of these archives may be considered more likely contenders of the end-of-archives phenomenon than others. The Ea-eppēš-ilī B and Sîn-ilī archives from Babylon display the clustered storage practice, the high density, the long coverage, the tight social enmeshing (through marriage), and the temple connection that we have identified as recurring features of archives deposited during Xerxes' counter-insurgency measures.[66] The Ilia archives from Borsippa are similarly deep in historical length (five generations), with a high annual average of tablets (2.26), mixed 'semi-discarded' contents, and clustered storage conditions shared with the large Rē'i-alpi cluster. With two exceptions, the A–B archives from Sippar are satellites of the Marduk-rēmanni archive, and therefore part of the huge cluster made up of late Ebabbar materials. They probably survive as out-dated files within the deposits of 484 BCE. Running ahead of the discussion in 2.3 and 2.4 below, the two exceptions, Ea-eppēš-ilī A and B, exhibit links to archives from the B group, respectively in Babylon and Sippar, and therefore fit the networked nature of archives deposited in 484 BCE. A last contender is from Uruk, a city which was affected by the aftermath of the revolts without directly participating in the revolts, as far as we know.[67]

[66] See Baker 2011 for the connections and shared find-spot of these archives. The connections to the Nappāḫu archive (a deposit of 484 BCE) also fit the scenario of the 'network of resistance' presented in part 2 of this paper. See Baker 2004, 13 for these connections.

[67] See n. 4 above.

The Egibi archive excavated there ends in Dar 33 but it displays the high density measure and mixed contents that we often find in deposits made in Xer 2. Moreover, as a Babylon family in Uruk, its keepers were probably among those who negatively experienced the elite shift in this city following the revolts.

2. The network of resistance

How were Šamaš-erība and Bēl-šimânni able to mount their rebellion and recruit support in Babylonia's northern and central cities? This question has remained unresolved, even unasked, so far. The lack of engagement with this matter can in part be explained from the fact that we know so little about the rebel leaders. Who were Šamaš-erība and Bēl-šimânni? Governors? Army officers? Religious leaders? We know that they bore Babylonian names and we know that they aspired the Babylonian throne, but beyond that we are ignorant of their origins, motivations, or aims. Equally unclear is their relationship to each other. They coordinated the timing of their insurgence and in that sense, they may be considered comrades. But, almost certainly, they also competed against each other. They started out in their own territories, Šamaš-erība in Sippar and Bēl-šimânni to the south of Babylon, but after a few weeks the latter gave up and Šamaš-erība extended his influence southwards until the Persians regained control of the situation not long afterwards.[68]

While the rebel leaders remain elusive, we are better informed about the supporters of their movement. Among their supporters figured the men and women who, in the aftermath of the revolts, fell 'victim' ([69]) to Persian reprisals and abandoned their archives (group B). As I will show in this section, we can use their archives to investigate the processes that united these individuals into a political faction. Before setting out, it bears repeating that I am not concerned with the motivations or ideologies that inspired the insurgency, but with the conduits, pathways, and channels that made the insurgency possible.

2.1. *Connections*. While each of the 33 archives deposited in 484 BCE pertains to a single family, individual, or institution, there is considerable overlap in the prosopographies of these archives. This indicates that the people who were punished for their anti-imperial sympathies in 484 BCE, were previously acquainted and had had the opportunity to share ideas and aspirations with each other. Contact between these individuals is documented in multiple ways. First, there is evidence of interpersonal contact. These personal

[68] A timeline of the revolts is provided in the Introduction to this volume.

[69] See my comments in the introduction to this chapter on the restricted meaning of this word in the present context.

networks can be traced at the local level within cities (2.2–2.3) and at the regional level across cities (2.4). The intersection of highly-connected local networks with more sparsely populated interregional networks provided opportunities for local groups to reach out to each other across distances. Second, there is evidence of what may be called person-place-person relationships: these are connections that are implied by the fact that individuals regularly visited the same place (2.5). Such relationships are only significant if the persons appear in places that are not part of their daily movement routines. Third, at a more general level, the people represented in group B shared similar worldviews, cultural identities, resource portfolios, etc., which would have made it easy to mobilize them for the same course. The social cohesion of this group was discussed earlier in this paper (1.4), and will not be brought up again in this section. It is, however, important to keep this aspect in mind, as it provides a baseline on which sympathies could have been built during the insurgency. Fourth, I will use the archives in group A as a control group in order to evaluate the significance of the interconnections that are attested between archives deposited in 484 BCE (2.6).

2.2. *Clusters as evidence of deep local networks*. In 1.2, I have shown that many archives deposited in 484 BCE were stored collectively. These clusters exhibit strong interpersonal connections. In some cases, the owners of such archives had been in almost daily contact with each other, e.g. as colleagues working in the same priestly collegium, as cousins, in-laws, neighbours, etc. The prosopographical overlaps are such that it is often difficult to delineate one archival group from the other, a sign of intensely interwoven networks. If we look at how these networks are structured, we discern two types. In Borsippa, the clustered archives of brewers, bakers and butchers indicate that employment in priestly colleges provided a strong common ground. In Sippar, we find a similar pattern. Bēl-rēmanni, Marduk-rēmanni, and the owners of several of the latter's satellite archives, were prebendaries of the Ebabbar temple. There is also a second type of network at play in Sippar, one stretching to a different, though closely related, institution — the governor (*šākin ṭēmi*) of the province of Babylon. Marduk-rēmanni and the owners of several of his satellite archives were clients of the powerful Ša-nāšišu family (Waerzeggers 2014). This family controlled the top offices in the civic and religious administration of the Sippar-Babylon area in Darius the Great's reign. As we will see below, the Ša-nāšišu family's patronage network extended not only among Šamaš-erība's supporters in Sippar but also among those in Babylon; in this way, it could well have served as a conduit for marshalling dissent across cities.

2.3. *Inner-city contacts across archival boundaries*. Extending from the deep networks attested within archive clusters, we may consider the evidence for

interpersonal contact between clusters, or between archives that were stored independently but at the same site in 484 BCE. In Babylon, most archives deposited after the revolts were stored individually (1.2), but the owners were nevertheless closely connected. The protagonist of the Ea-eppēš-ilī A archive wrote two tablets for Itti-Marduk-balāṭu, head of the Egibi family, on a journey to Humadēšu in Iran.[70] As travel companions in a distant city, they must have known each other well. There is further evidence for contact between these two archives.[71] The excavated Egibi archive from Babylon (N12) is unpublished so far, except for Pedersén's brief notes and catalogue; based on this information, Heather Baker detected multiple contact points with the well-known archive produced by Nabû-aḫḫē-iddin's branch of the Egibi family.[72] She showed that the two branches were probably related and that direct and indirect contacts between them are attested from the reign of Nebuchadnezzar II into the Persian period, indicating a long and stable history of acquaintance. Contacts between the Nappāḫu and Egibi archives have also been attested.[73]

In Borsippa, the three main clusters overlap substantially in prosopography. The Mannu-gērûšu cluster has close ties with the Rē'i-alpi group,[74] the Rē'i-alpi group is tied through marriage and property investments with the Bēliya'u group,[75] and there are countless instances of scribes, witnesses, and protagonists criss-crossing all of these clusters. The evidence from the Bēliya'u archive may serve as an example of these intricate patterns. It shares a creditor and a debtor with the Rē'i-alpi archive,[76] and a lessor of prebendary income with Ibnāya B.[77] Three baker colleagues of Šaddinnu//Bēliya'u appear in three other archives,[78] and the relatives of at least two men from whom Šaddinnu bought houses, are known from the Rē'i-alpi archive.[79] Other archives from Borsippa

[70] *Camb*. 388 and Hecker 1966 no. 47; see Tolini 2011, 223–224.

[71] Jursa 2010, 253–254.

[72] Pedersén 2005, 208–217; Baker 2008, 111–112.

[73] Baker 2004, 12.

[74] Waerzeggers 2005, 351. E.g. Nabû-ana-mēreḫti//Aḫiya'ūtu (Rē'i-alpi cluster) and Nabû-aḫu-ittannu/Kalbā/Mannu-gērûšu (the protagonist of the Mannu-gērûšu archive) regularly appear in each other's tablets as witnesses.

[75] The Ilia A and Bēliya'u families were connected through marriage (BM 26483, Dar 14); they also owned property in the same villages around Borsippa.

[76] Bēl-iddin/Tabnēa/Ibnāya: BM 96150 (Dar 21); BM 26650 and duplicate BM 27857 (Dar 13); BM 82742 (date lost); VS 4 141 (Dar 15). Mušēzib-Bēl/Sîn-aplu-iddin/Iddinā: BM 17665 (Dar 16); BM 29487 (Dar 12); BM 96168 (Dar 9); BM 29484 and duplicate BM 29448 (Dar 12).

[77] Waerzeggers 2010 nos. 94 and 122.

[78] Lâbâši/Rēmūtu/Kidin-Sîn: see Waerzeggers 2010, 239 for attestations in the Bēliya'u archive, with BM 82724 (Rē'i-alpi) and BM 85562 Dar 22 (Iddin-Papsukkal B). Gimillu/Tabnēa/Kidin-Sîn: e.g. BM 28925 (Dar 12) and BM 82754 (Dar 1); the latter from the Rē'i-alpi archive. Nabû-bēl-šumāti/ Marduk-nāṣir/Šēpê-ilia: e.g. BM 29400 (Dar 5) and VS 4 174 (Dar 28; Atkuppu archive).

[79] Murašû/Libluṭ/Imbu-īnia: VS 6 150 (Dar 27); BM 29019 (Dar 6?). Mušēzib-Marduk/Taqīš-[x]/Sāmu: BM 96143 (Dar 20); BM 26572 (Dar 10); BM 26652 (Nbn 16); YOS 6 157 (Nbn 9); BE 8 35 (Ner 1).

exhibit the same level of interconnectedness. The platform enabling these links is the Ezida temple, where all these families held prebendary offices.

In Sippar, we find a similarly tight web of relationships between clusters. Archives in the Maštuk cluster pertain to people who were closely linked to Marduk-rēmanni and his patrons of the Ša-nāšišu family. The Maštuks belonged to the same community of Babylon immigrants living in Sippar as Marduk-rēmanni and the Ša-nāšišus. The Ṣāḫ̭it-ginê B archive belongs to cousins of Marduk-rēmanni, and Bēl-aplu-iddin was a trader who carried out his business activities in close proximity to Marduk-rēmanni on the quay of Sippar. The archive of Bēl-rēmanni exhibits multiple connections to both the Marduk-rēmanni and Maštuk clusters. As in Borsippa, the ties between these latter archives are based on their owners' common associations with the Ebabbar temple of Sippar, where they or their in-laws held priestly charges. In addition to Ebabbar, the powerful Ša-nāšišu family tied several of these groups together.[80]

2.4. *Inter-city contacts*. In the years leading up to the revolts, the people who would eventually rally behind Šamaš-erība and Bēl-šimânni were already integrated in a regional network that enabled interaction and communication across cities. It would be worthwhile to map and quantify the emergence of this network over time as this would allow us to seek answers to several pertinent questions, e.g. how did this network come into being and did activity within the network intensify towards the outbreak of the revolts? A quantitative approach is unfortunately impossible at present because the prosopographical data necessary for such a task are unavailable. But we may approach the topic more impressionistically for the time being, by reviewing the evidence that is so far available for this inter-city network and by identifying the occasions that brought these people into contact with each other.

2.4.1. Sippar-Babylon contacts

Despite the fact that only one Egibi tablet was written in Sippar,[81] there is plenty of evidence that the Egibis of Babylon were in regular contact with Marduk-rēmanni and members of his social circle in Sippar.[82] The history of these contacts can be traced back to the earlier sixth century BCE when Marduk-rēmanni's ancestors first moved to Sippar from Babylon together with other families, like the Ša-nāšišus. The community of immigrants that formed in Sippar as a result of these relocations was tight-knit and its members

[80] For the interconnections between the archive of Marduk-rēmanni and the other archives from Sippar, see Waerzeggers 2014. For the central role of the Ša-nāšišu family, see Waerzeggers 2016.

[81] Jursa 2010, 122 n. 687.

[82] This section summarizes the findings presented in Waerzeggers 2014, 24, 99–101.

maintained regular contact with relatives and acquaintances who had remained in Babylon. Such contacts were kept alive from one generation to the next. Marduk-rēmanni was still closely connected to the Egibis several generations after his ancestor moved to Sippar. Although we have no evidence that Marduk-rēmanni ever met Marduk-nāṣir-apli (his contemporary at the head of the Egibi family) in person, this seems likely. Not only did Marduk-rēmanni occasionally meet Marduk-nāṣir-apli's father-in-law, several of Marduk-rēmanni's relatives can also be linked to this man, including his father, sister and uncle; moreover, Marduk-rēmanni selected as future daughter-in-law a girl who lived in a neighbourhood frequented by the Egibis. In addition, Marduk-rēmanni and the Egibis shared a close connection to the Ša-nāšišu brothers, who governed the province of Babylon during much of the reign of Darius I. Marduk-rēmanni's career at the Ebabbar temple of Sippar had propelled thanks to the protection of this family, and Marduk-nāṣir-apli too depended on the Ša-nāšišus for lucrative tax-farming contracts.[83] In brief, the contacts between Marduk-rēmanni and the Egibis were built partly on common historical roots, partly on the re-activation of these roots through new connections, and partly on common ties to the Ša-nāšišu family.

There are other ways to map Sippar-Babylon contacts besides through personal networks.[84] The fact that the career paths of the Ša-nāšišu brothers and of Marduk-rēmanni and his son Bēl-bullissu evolved in the same direction is certainly important. They moved from posts with local responsibilities in Sippar (*šangû*, College Scribe) to posts with provincial (*šākin ṭēmi* of Babylon) and 'national' responsibilities (*šatammu* of Esangila, retinue of *qīpu* of Esangila; Waerzeggers 2014). This movement implies not only a greater command of resources, but also a greater potential to mobilize people in a wide area.

2.4.2. Dilbat-Babylon-Borsippa-Sippar contacts

In the years before the revolts, Nabû-ittannu of the Dābibī family, who was to deposit his archive in the city of Dilbat in 484 BCE, was in contact with various other individuals who would rally behind Šamaš-erība and Bēl-šimânni, including the Egibis and Nappāḫus of Babylon and Marduk-rēmanni from Sippar.[85] Moreover, as a College Scribe of Eimbianu, he must have been involved

[83] Abraham 2004, 135.

[84] In addition to the links between Marduk-rēmanni and the Egibis, we can also point to the connection between the Ea-eppēš-ilī A archive from Babylon and the like-named Ea-eppēš-ilī A archive from Sippar: CT 55 117 places the protagonists of both archives in Bīt-šar-Bābili at the end of Nabonidus' reign (Jursa 2005a, 64 n. 398). Note, however, that the Sippar Ea-eppēš-ilī A archive belongs to the A–B group of archives that cannot be firmly tied to the end-of-archives phenomenon (see 1.5 above).

[85] All evidence, which is presented in the next paragraph, was generously provided by Bastian Still.

in setting up the kind of collaboration between the temples of Dilbat, Babylon, and Borsippa that is mentioned in a newly published letter sent during the revolt of Šamaš-erība.[86] The network built up around this man thus straddles the entire area that attempted to break free of Persian rule.

Contacts with the Egibis of Babylon can be established through several middlemen. (1) Sūqāya/Bēl-zēri/Burāqu witnessed two tablets of the Egibi archive in Babylon and one tablet of Nabû-ittannu in Dilbat; he also acted as guarantor for a debt due to the Eimbianu temple which was administered by Nabû-ittannu. These contacts took place in the latter part of Darius' reign.[87] (2) Zēria/Bēl-zēri/Egibi similarly acted as a witness both for the Egibis and Nabû-ittannu,[88] as did (3) Bēl-rēmanni/Tāqiš-Gula/Ṭābiḫ-kāri, (4) Zēria/Iqīšāya/Šigûa, and (5) Bulṭā/Ibnā/Saggillāya.[89] Nabû-ittannu can also be linked to the Nappāḫu family of Babylon, through (6) Iddin-Nabû/Pir'u/Nannûtu.[90] (7) Bēl-iddin/Bēl-nipšaru/Šarru-arazu supplies a triple connection between the Egibis, Marduk-rēmanni and Nabû-ittannu, that is, between Babylon, Sippar and Dilbat.[91] (8) Bēl-ibni/Rēmūtu/Bābūtu connects Nabû-ittannu with the Nappāḫus of Babylon and with the Ilia family of Borsippa.[92] This latter contact was recorded in Susa, where Bēl-ibni may have been present to attend one of the regularly held court ceremonials.

2.4.3. Inclusions and exclusions

In network theory, the absence of ties is as important as the presence of ties, as it is the combination of both that determines the flow of information within the network. The dominant actors in the network that emerges from the data presented above are the Egibis of Babylon and Marduk-rēmanni and his son Bēl-bullissu of Sippar. Although this network can only be a very rough approximation of the complex interactions that must have accompanied the insurrection, these individuals can be identified as being ideally positioned to facilitate coordinated action. For instance, a man like Bēl-rēmanni, who was recruited in

[86] Spar and Jursa 2014 no. 140.

[87] Egibi tablets: *Dar*. 342 (Abraham 2004 no. 111; Dar 12), *Dar*. 491 (Wunsch 2000 no. 186; Dar 19); Dilbat tablets: VS 5 108 (Dar 35) and BM 77411 (Dar 26).

[88] Egibi: *Dar*. 382 (Wunsch 2000 no. 231; Dar 14). Dābibī: VS 5 108 (Dar 35).

[89] For Bēl-rēmanni, see Egibi: *Dar*. 171 (Wunsch 2000 no. 157; after Dar 5); Dābibī: VS 6 171 (Dar [x]). For Zēria, see Egibi: *Dar*. 509 (Abraham 2004 no. 129; Dar 20); Dābibī: VS 5 74 and duplicate VS 5 75 (Dar 11). For Bulṭā, see Egibi: *Dar*. 449 (Dar 17); Dābibī: BM 77411 (Dar 26).

[90] Dābibī: VS 5 76 (Dar 13) and VS 5 105 (Dar 32). Nappāḫu: Baker 2004 nos. 51, 113, 116, 118, 171, 187, 221 (Cyr 8?–Dar 5).

[91] Egibi: *Cyr*. 264 (Wunsch 2000 no. 71; Cyr 7). Marduk-rēmanni: Waerzeggers 2014 no. 86. Dābibī: VS 5 74 and duplicate VS 5 75 (Dar 11).

[92] Ilia C archive: VS 6 155 (Dar 29); Dilbat: VS 5 104 (Dar 31) and VS 5 105 (Dar 32); Nappāḫu: Baker 2004 nos. 174 (Dar 29) and 229 (Dar 23).

the anti-imperial movement of Šamaš-erība, had little occasion to meet like-minded people outside his hometown of Sippar, but through his connection with Marduk-rēmanni, he was only one step removed from the Egibis and other individuals in Babylon and the metropolitan area. This means that he was well-placed to receive information about collective actions from Marduk-rēmanni but less so to spread it; Bēl-rēmanni was unlikely to have played a fundamental role in the unfolding of the revolts. The Nappāḫus of Babylon are located at a similar position in the margins of the network.[93]

2.5. *Person-place-person relationships*. Šamaš-erība and Bēl-šimânni recruited support in the major cities of Babylon's metropolitan area based on pre-existing networks. These networks do not only materialize in interpersonal contacts, but also in the shared movements of people. One city in particular stands out for having drawn many of the key supporters together. Surprisingly perhaps, this city was not Babylon or one of its sister-cities in Mesopotamia's heartland; it was the Empire's capital in Elam, Susa.

Darius I began using the old Elamite capital of Susa as a venue for regular court ceremonials not long after he came to power. These events were attended by delegations from all over lower Mesopotamia.[94] Many of the persons, who would later support the revolts of Šamaš-erība and Bēl-šimânni, had been at Darius' court as part of such delegations. Of the archive-owners, who (or whose sons) eventually deposited their archives in 484 BCE, the following are attested in Susa: Marduk-šumu-ibni and Iddin-Bēl of Borsippa's Ilia archives,[95] Marduk-nāṣir-apli of the Egibi family, Marduk-rēmanni and several members of his family from Sippar, and Rēmūt-Bēl of the Ilšu-abūšu A archive from Borsippa. Many other dignitaries visited Susa in the course of Darius' reign, including the governors (*šākin ṭēmi*) of Babylonian cities, the heads of temples (i.e. *šangû*, *šatammu, qīpu*, *šāpiru*, *bēl piqitti*, College Scribes), members of the priesthoods (e.g. temple enterers, bakers, etc.), tax collectors and tax farmers, and judges.[96] The regularity of these gatherings created a stable and predictable context in which highly placed officials from all over Babylonia could meet, get to know each other, and exchange ideas. Several of these people were also in touch with each other back home in Babylonia, but the court ceremonials at Susa provided a more concentrated occasion for interaction on a larger scale.

2.6. The levels of connectivity that are seen in archives of the B group are lacking in the A group. In fact, based on my knowledge of their contents, which

[93] On the Nappāḫu family's limited spheres of movement, see Baker 2014, 185.
[94] Waerzeggers 2010a and 2014, 102; Tolini 2011.
[95] Ilia A and Ilia D. Note that these archives belong to the A-B group. Its likely membership to the end-of-archives dynamic was discussed in 1.5 above.
[96] Waerzeggers 2010a, 797–798.

is far from exhaustive, there is no evidence of contact between the various archive-keepers within this group. However, we do find some prosopographical overlap between A group and B group archives. This happens mostly in the old admixtures that are found in the clusters from Sippar and Borsippa. In those cases, the older files probably survive as part of later deposits. For instance, the Banê-ša-ilia archive is closely connected to the Atkuppu archive, deposited in 484 BCE; it may be a sub-archive of the latter. Similarly, the Ḫuṣābu archive, dated between 590 and 536 BCE, may be a sub-file of the Ea-ilūtu-bāni archive, which stretches into 485 BCE and was in all likelihood closed off in 484 BCE. The small dossier of the sons of Nabû-zēru-iqīša probably survives within the Ilia A archive. Outside of these clustered formations, we find little evidence of contact between A and B group archives. The connection between the Dullupu and Nappāḫu archives from Babylon constitutes a rare exception.[97]

3. Conclusion

The revolts of 484 BCE had a major impact on the surviving text corpus of the long sixth century. Its size, composition and structure were determined by the large-scale, often collective acts of archival storage that happened in the course of counter-insurgency. In this paper, I have argued that the archives abandoned in 484 BCE can be used to reconstruct the emergence of a network of resistance that served as a conduit for coordinated action under the leadership of Šamaš-erība and Bēl-šimânni. Reading the testimony of the archives 'backwards', it becomes clear that in the decades prior to the revolts, those individuals who would eventually support the rebels were increasingly being drawn together in a cross-regional network. The members of this network of resistance shared social capital, cultural backgrounds, economic behaviour, patronage networks, and very likely aspirations and frustrations; they also had the opportunity to connect with each other, exchange ideas, and commit to concerted action. The regular gatherings at the palace of Susa initiated by Darius I could well have played a role in bringing people from all over Babylonia together and in supplying them with a reliable and predictable meeting schedule.

[97] Baker 2004, 12.

Appendix: Table of archives used in this study

column 1: internal numbering
column 2: customary name of the archive
column 3: period covered by the archive (dates are approximate)
column 4: number of tablets currently attributed to the archive
column 5: average number of tablets per year
column 6: homogenous or varied contents ('-' signifies a lack of insight into the contents of the archive in question)
column 7: social background
column 8: attested generations of archive-keeping family (only in private archives)
column 9: additional remarks, including key publication

A group (archives ending before Dar 15)

Babylon

	archive	timespan	size	average	h/v	background	generations	remarks
1	[N1] South palace, vaulted building	595–571 (24 yr)	303	12.6	h	palace		Pedersén 2005, 111–127
2	[N2] Ištar gate	597–593 (4 yr)	25	6.25	h	palace		Pedersén 2005, 128–129; perhaps part of N1 (Baker 2008, 103)
3	[N3] South palace, gate	602–592 (10 yr)[98]	41	1.8	h	palace		Pedersén 2005, 130–132; the find-spots of individual tablets are uncertain (Baker 2008, 102)
4	[N5] Ninmaḫ temple	601–561 (40 yr)	128[99]	3.2	h	temple		Pedersén 2005, 135–143; three distinct groups found in three rooms, each displaying high internal coherence

[98] This date range relates to the finds made south of the gate only.
[99] This figure excludes the miscellaneous finds that were made in the Emah temple (Pedersén 2005, 137).

	archive	timespan	size	average	h/v	background	generations	remarks
5	[N10] Šigûa	c. 663–580 (83 yr)	36	0.4	h[100]	private, temple brewers	mostly 2	Pedersén 2005, 198–202
6	[N11] Ingallēa	690–628 (62 yr)	49	0.8	h	private, temple barbers	probably 2	Pedersén 2005, 203–208; found in two jars, each with its own focus
7	Dullupu	641–540 (101 yr)	40	0.4	v	private, artisans	mostly 1	Jursa 2005a, 62
8	Esagilāya	620–518 (102 yr)	70	0.6	v	private, priestly	2	Sandowicz 2009
9	Šumāya	661–651 (10 yr)	11	1.0	h	private, trade	1	Jursa 2005a, 72

Borsippa

	archive	timespan	size	average	h/v	background	generations	remarks
10	Ḫuṣābu	590–536 (54 yr)	8	0.15	v	private, temple brewers	3	Jursa 2005a, 79
11	Banê-ša-ilia	676–588 (88 yr)	11	0.12	v	private, not temple related	1	Jursa 2005a, 80
12	Gallābu	570–507 (63 yr)	59	0.94	v	private, not temple related	4	Jursa 2005a, 82
13	Ibnāya A	573–532 (41 yr)	42	1	v	private, temple butchers	4	Waerzeggers 2010, 525–527
14	sons of Nabû-zēru-iqīša	549–524 (25 yr)	6	0.24	v	private, priestly?	1	Waerzeggers 2005, 358
15	Kudurrānu A	630–517 (123 yr)	35	0.3	v	private, temple brewers	5	Jursa 2005a, 90
16	Kudurrānu B	629–588 (41 yr)	6	0.15	v	private, trade	2	Jursa 2005a, 360
17	malt file	551–c. 535 (c. 15)	10+	c. 1	h	institutional		Waerzeggers 2005, 363

[100] The archive contains a library section, and in that sense, it is 'varied'. However, its archival section is quite homogenous in being focused on acquisitions of landed estates and prebends.

Cutha

	archive	timespan	size	average	h/v	background	generations	remarks
18	Akkad-ēreš[101]	555–522 (33 yr)	c. 12	c. 0.35	h	private, trade	2	Jursa 2005a, 149

Dilbat

	archive	timespan	size	average	h/v	background	generations	remarks
19	Ea-qarrād-ilī	580–545 (35 yr)	15	0.4	v	private, agricultural entrepreneur	1	Jursa 2005a, 99
20	Egibi of Dilbat	701–c. 626 (c. 75 yr)	17	0.2	h	private, priestly	mostly 1	Jursa 2005a, 100
21	Šangû Dilbat	655–651 (4 yr)	4	1	-	private, priestly	1	Jursa 2005a, 101
22	Upāqu	680–666 (14 yr)	5	0.35	-	private	1	Jursa 2005a, 101

Elammu

	archive	timespan	size	average	h/v	background	generations	remarks
23	Arkât-ili	549–548 (2 yr)	8	4	h	private, artisan	1	Jursa 2005a, 149; may be part of Sippar's Maštuk cluster

Isin

	archive	timespan	size	average	h/v	background	generations	remarks
24	Silim-Bēl/Arrabi	508–503 (5 yr)	4	0.8	h	private, rent farmer	1	Jursa 2005a, 102

[101] According to Jursa (2005a, 149) this archive may come from Borsippa but it mentions Cutha often.

Kiš

	archive	timespan	size	average	h/v	background	generations	remarks
25	Gaḫal	635–531 (104 yr)	40	0.4	v	private, priestly as well as entrepreneurial	3	Jursa 2005a, 105
26	Paḫḫāru	594–556 (38 yr)	30	0.79	v	private, trade	mostly 1	Jursa 2005a, 107

Larsa

	archive	timespan	size	average	h/v	background	generations	remarks
27	Itti-Šamaš-balāṭu	588–528 (60 yr)	c. 200	3.33	v	private, priestly as well as entrepreneurial	3	Jursa 2005a, 108–109

Nippur

	archive	timespan	size	average	h/v	background	generations	remarks
28	Governor's archive	c. second half of 8th century	128	?	h	institutional?	?	Cole 1996
29	Bēl-eṭēri-Šamaš	550–529 (21 yr)	38 or 42[102]	c. 2	h	private, entrepreneur	1	Jursa 2005b
30	Carian archive	527–521 (6 yr)	8	1.3	h	state or private?, colonists on state land	1	Jursa 2005a, 113
31	Nergal-iddin	577–525 (52 yr)	14	0.27	v	private, entrepreneurial	3	Jursa 2005a, 114 and Zadok 1986, 286

[102] Jursa 2005b, 197; Jursa 2005a, 112.

	archive	timespan	size	average	h/v	background	generations	remarks
32	Ninurta-uballiṭ	702–626 (76 yr)	28	0.34	v	private	2	Jursa 2005a, 115
33	Ninurta-ušallim, son of Nabû-usippi	635–618 (17 yr)	5	0.3	v	private	1	Zadok 1986, 283
34	Libluṭ, son of Ninurta-ibni	602–597 (5 yr)	4	0.8	v	private	1	Zadok 1986, 283
35	daughter of Sîn-zēru-līšir	c. 579	2	?	-	private	1	Zadok 1986, 283
36	unnamed	606–602 (4 yr)	3	0.75	-	private	1	Zadok 1986, 283
37	sons of Šamaš-šumu-līšir	575–555 (20 yr)	11	0.55	v	private, priestly	1	this archive is listed as two separate ones by Zadok 1986, 283–284; Jursa 2005a, 115 considers it as a single archive
38	son of Usātu	569–550 (19 yr)	3	0.16	-	private	1	Zadok 1986, 284
39	Zēru-ukīn son of Pir'u, and his son Lâbâši	567–525 (42 yr)	8	0.2	h	private or state?, military commander	2	this archive is listed as two separate ones by Zadok 1986, 284–285; Jursa 2005a, 115 considers it as a single archive
40	sons of Līšir	534–post 522 (min. 12 yr)	6	< 0.5	h	state or private?	1	this archive is listed as two separate ones by Zadok 1986, 284–285; Jursa 2005a, 115 considers it as a single archive; this is probably not part of the same cluster as the other small archives from Nippur
41	Aplāya son of Ninurta-uballiṭ	c. 529	3	-	-	private?	1	Zadok 1986, 284
42	Ninurta-mutēr-gimilli	541–534 (17 yr)	5	0.3	v	private	1	Zadok 1986, 284; Jursa 2005a, 116

Sippar

	archive	timespan	size	average	h/v	background	generations	remarks
43	early Ebabbar	c. 640–580 (c. 60 yr)	c. 5,000	c. 80	v	temple		Da Riva 2002
44	Adad-šamê	574–532 (42 yr)	18	0.4	v	private, trade	2	satellite of Marduk-rēmanni archive (Waerzeggers 2014, 19–22); in the second generation, Bēl-ušallim worked as a scribe for the temple
45	Bēl-eṭēri	611–603 (8 yr)	16	2	h	private, trade	1	part of early Ebabbar archive (Jursa 2005a, 122); archive-keeper worked as scribe for the temple
46	Rē'i-sisê	546–519 (27 yr)	9	0.3	v	private	1	satellite of Marduk-rēmanni archive (Waerzeggers 2014, 19–22); Jursa 2005a, 124–125
47	Mušēzib	536–520 (16 yr)	4	0.25	v	private, female owner, priestly	1	widow of a *rab banê* priest of Ebabbar; Jursa 2005a, 131

Ur

	archive	timespan	size	average	h/v	background	generations	remarks
48	Damqia	7th century	3	-	h	private	2	property deeds; Jursa 2005a, 133
49	Sîn-uballiṭ	624–617 (7 yr)	60	8.6	h	private, military supplier	1	Jursa 2005a, 135–136
50	early Neo-Babylonian archive from Ur	658–648 (10 yr)	3	0.3	h	private, priestly	2	property deeds; Jursa 2005a, 137

Uruk

	archive	timespan	size	average	h/v	background	generations	remarks
51	Eanna	c. Nbp to Dar 2 (with some later texts)	c. 8,000	> 60	v	temple		Jursa 2005a, 138; note that the break in Dar 2 is not absolute, but until Dar 29 fewer texts are preserved
52	Basia	588–549 (39 yr)	40	1	h	private, rent farmer of temple	1	Jursa 2005a, 141 considers this part of the Eanna archive
53	Damiqu	567–546 (21 yr)	10	0.5	v	private, temple clerk	1	Jursa 2005a, 142 considers this part of the Eanna archive
54	Gimil-Nanāya	597–583 (14 yr)	3	0.2	v	private	1	Jursa 2005a, 142–143; archive of a cattle breeder with business contacts to the Eanna temple
55	Kurī A	610–585 (25 yr)	8	0.32	v	private, entrepreneurial	2	Jursa 2005a, 143; no obvious connection to Eanna
56	Nabû-aḫḫē-bulliṭ	578–553 (25 yr)	3	0.12	h	private, temple scribe, slave trade	1	Jursa 2005a, 144
57	Nūr-Sîn	610–586 (24 yr)	24	1	v	private, priestly	2	Jursa 2005a, 144; *šatammu* of Eanna
58	Rīm-Anu	602–560 (42 yr)	15	0.35	v	private, entrepreneurial	2	Jursa 2005a, 145; animal husbandry with connection to Eanna
59	Sîn-leqe-unninnī A	570–544 (26 yr)	26	1	v	private, priestly and trade	2	Jursa 2005a, 145–146; probably part of Eanna archive
60	Mušēzib-Marduk of the Sîn-nāṣir family	678–633 (45 yr)	32	0.7	h	private	1	Frame 2013; property deeds
61	Bēl-aplu-uṣur	554–529 (25 yr)	81	3.2	v	private, priestly	1	Kessler 1991
62	Kurī C	646–601 (45 yr)	7	0.2	v	private, priestly	1	Kessler 1991
63	Šamšēa	700–593 (107 yr)	32	0.3	v	private, priestly	3	Kessler 1991

Varia

	archive	timespan	size	average	h/v	background	generations	remarks
64	Nanāya temple	8th c.	30	-	-	temple		Jursa 2005a, 150
65	Neirab	565–c. 515 (c. 50 yr)	27	0.5	v	private?, colonists on state land	2	Tolini 2015

B group (archives ending between Dar 35 and Xer 2)

Babylon

	archive	timespan	size	average	h/v	background	generations	remarks
66	Ea-eppēš-ilī A [partly N23]	574–485 (89 yr)	71	0.8	v	private, priestly and entrepreneurial	3	Jursa 2005a, 62; Pedersén 2005, 287–288; Baker 2008, 106–107
67	[N9c] house XVII in Merkes	493–485 (8 yr)	25	3.1	v	private	1	Pedersén 2005, 194
68	[N12] Egibi	514–484 (30 yr) (Dar 8[103] – Xer 2)	163	5.4	v	private	1	Pedersén 2005, 208–217
69	Egibi and Nūr-Sîn	606–484 (122 yr)	c. 1700	c. 14	v	private, entrepreneurial	5	a.o. Wunsch 2000
70	Nappāḫu	573–485 (88 yr)	291	3.3	v	private, priestly	3	Baker 2004
71	Šangû-Ninurta	c. 575[104]–485 (c. 90 yr)	90	c. 1	v	private, priestly	3	Wunsch 2005; Jursa 2005a, 71–72

[103] One tablet is dated much earlier, in Camb 5; with this tablet included, the total time span of the archive is 41 years, and the average number of tablets per year is 4.0.

[104] The regnal year of Nebuchadnezzar II, when the archive starts, has not yet been mentioned in the literature.

	archive	timespan	size	average	h/v	background	generations	remarks
72	Kittia//Ir'anni	510–487 (23 yr)	at least 7	0.3	-	private	-	Wunsch 2005; seems to cluster with the Šangû-Ninurta archive

Borsippa

	archive	timespan	size	average	h/v	background	generations	remarks
73	Ea-ilūtu-bāni	683–485 (199 yr)	325	1.6	v	private, priestly	6	Joannès 1989; temple goldsmiths and temple enterers
74	Aḫiya'ūtu	541–484 (57 yr)	16	0.2	v	private, priestly	3	Waerzeggers 2010, 367; temple brewers
75	Ardūtu	500–485 (15 yr)	7	0.5	v	private, priestly	1	Jursa 2005a, 79; temple brewers
76	Atkuppu	607–485 (122 yr)	110	0.9	v	private, priestly	4	Jursa 2005a, 80; temple reed workers
77	Bēliya'u	552–484 (68 yr)	375	5.5	v	private, priestly	2	Waerzeggers 2010, 475–481; temple baker
78	Ibnāya B–C–D	533–487 (46 yr)	26	0.6	v	private, priestly	2	Waerzeggers 2010, 525–527; temple butchers
79	Ilšu-abūšu A	487–484 (3 yr)	25	8.3	h	private, priestly	1	Jursa 2005a, 88–89; temple brewers
80	*iškaru*	499–484 (15 yr)	56	3.7	h	temple		Waerzeggers 2010, 214–223
81	Mār-bīti temple	487–486 (2 yr)	11	5.5	h	temple		Waerzeggers 2005, 363
82	Lā-kuppuru	506–484 (22 yr)	30	1.4	v	private, priestly	2	Waerzeggers 2010, 457–458; temple brewers
83	Mannu-gērûšu	502–484 (18 yr)	30	1.7	v	private, priestly	1	Waerzeggers 2010, 460–461; temple brewers
84	Inṣabtu	512–485 (37 yr)	16	0.5	v	private, female owner	1	Waerzeggers 2000
85	Rē'i-alpi	622–484 (138 yr)	400	2.9	v	private, priestly	5	Waerzeggers 2010, 553–566; temple oxherds

	archive	timespan	size	average	h/v	background	generations	remarks
86	Nabû-aplu-iddin, family Ea-ilūtu-bāni	499–486 (13 yr)	5	0.4	v	private, priestly	1	Waerzeggers 2005, 357

Dilbat

	archive	timespan	size	average	h/v	background	generations	remarks
87	Dābibī	554–484 (70 yr)	30	0.4	v	private, priestly	1	Jursa 2005a, 98–99; temple scribe and gardener (*rab banê*)

Kiš

	archive	timespan	size	average	h/v	background	generations	remarks
88	Bēl-ana-mēreḫti and Nergal-aḫu-iddin	497–484 (13 yr)	7	0.5	v	private, entrepreneur in temple economy	1	Jursa 2005a, 104

Sippar

	archive	timespan	size	average	h/v	background	generations	remarks
89	late Ebabbar	c. 570–484 (c. 86 yr)	c. 30,000	c. 350	v	temple		Jursa 2005a, 118–120; Jursa 2010
90	Marduk-rēmanni (Ṣāḫit-ginê A)	548–484 (64 yr)	187	2.9	v	private, priestly and entrepreneurial	3	Waerzeggers 2014
91	Ṣāḫit-ginê B	512–485 (27 yr)	21	0.78	v	private, trade	1	Waerzeggers 2014
92	Ša-nāšišu A	532–487 (45 yr)	6	0.1	v	private, priestly and entrepreneurial	2	Jursa 2005a, 126; Waerzeggers 2014 (satellite of the Marduk-rēmanni archive); temple brewers

	archive	timespan	size	average	h/v	background	generations	remarks
93	Bēl-rēmanni (Šangû-Šamaš A)	570–485 (85 yr)	184[105]	2.2	v	private, priestly	1	Jursa 1999
94	Šangû-Šamaš B	604–486 (118 yr)	33	0.28	v	private, priestly	4	Jursa 2005a, 128–129; temple enterers, brewers, *rab banê*
95	Aqūba	495–487 (8 yr)	16	2	v	private	1	Jursa 2005a, 129–130
96	Šamaš-iddin son of Rēmūtu	529–487 (42 yr)	8	0.2	v	private	2	Jursa 2005a, 129–130
97	Bēl-aplu-iddin	498–488[106] (10 yr)	6	0.6	v	private, trade	1	Jursa 2005a, 130
98	Maštuk	618–487 (131 yr)	47	0.36	v	private, priestly and entrepreneurial	5	Jursa 2005a, 130–131

A–B group (archives ending in the period between Dar 15 and Dar 34)

Babylon

	archive	timespan	size	average	h/v	background	generations	remarks
99	[N8] Emašdari	dates mentioned: Dar 15, Nbn 8, Kand 16	44	-	v	temple		Pedersén 2005, 188–192
100	Ea-eppēš-ilī B	548–490 (58 yr)	18	0.3	v	private, priestly	4	Jursa 2005a, 64–65; Baker 2011; clustered with Sîn-ilī archive

[105] This figure does not include the medicinal tablets that were probably part of the archive (Jursa 1999).

[106] This archive ends in Dar 34, one year before the cut-off point for archives of the B group; I count it with this group because it is clustered with the Maštuk and Ṣāḫit-ginê B archives (Waerzeggers 2014, 148).

	archive	timespan	size	average	h/v	background	generations	remarks
101	[N14] Sîn-ilī	599–504 (95 yr)	c. 550	5.8	v	private, entrepreneurial	3	Pedersén 2005, 228–247; clustered with Ea-eppēš-ilī B; note that the N14 tablet dated to Xerxes (Pedersén 2005, 230) was found in a dump and appears to be extraneous to the main archive (Baker 2008, 106)
102	[N9b] house XVIII in Merkes; archive of Nabû-ittannu	519–497 (22 yrs)	12	0.5	v	private	-	Pedersén 2005, 192–194
103	Gaḫal	520–499 (21 yr)	15	0.7	h	private	1	Jursa 2005a, 67–68
104	Rabâ-ša-Ninurta	552–496 (56 yr)	16	0.3	v	private	1	Jursa 2005a, 69
105	Šumu-iddin son of Aplāya	c. 525–501 (c. 24 yr)	19	c. 0.8	-	private	1	Jursa 2005a, 72
106	tablets found in a house to the west of the temple of Ištar of Akkad	489–488 (2 yr)	4	2	-	private	-	Baker 2008, 105

Borsippa

	archive	timespan	size	average	h/v	background	generations	remarks
107	DAR	497–494 (3 yr)	180	60	h	temple		Zadok 2005
108	Iddin-Papsukkal A	540–492 (48 yr)	21	0.44	v	private	2	Jursa 2005a, 84–85
109	Iddin-Papsukkal B	507–491 (16 yr)	8	0.5	v	private, priestly	1	Jursa 2005a, 85; temple enterer
110	Ilia A	587–489 (119 yr)	269	2.26	v	private, priestly	5	Waerzeggers 2010, 372–434; temple brewers
111	Ilia C	493–490 (3/4 yr)	4	1	v	private, priestly	1	Waerzeggers 2005, 355–356
112	Ilia D	c. 575–500 (c. 75 yr)	56	c. 0.7	v	private, priestly	4	Waerzeggers 2010, 434–435; temple brewers

	archive	timespan	size	average	h/v	background	generations	remarks
113	Balāṭu, slave of Rēmūt-Bēl	515–491 (24 yr)	19	0.8	h	private, priestly	1	Waerzeggers 2010, 437–438
114	Ilšu-abūšu B	539–502 (37 yr)	16	0.4	v	private, priestly	1	Waerzeggers 2010, 441–442
115	Bā'iru	509–499 (10 yr)	8	0.8	v	private, entrepreneurial	1	Waerzeggers 2005, 357

Kissik

	archive	timespan	size	average	h/v	background	generations	remarks
116	Ningal temple	c. 503–500 (3 yr)	c. 3	-	-	temple		Jursa 2005a, 102

Kiš

	archive	timespan	size	average	h/v	background	generations	remarks
117	Eppēš-ilī	521–490 (31 yr)	7	0.2	v	private, entrepreneurial	1	Jursa 2005a, 104
118	Rē'i-alpi	508–506 [4]	4	1.25	v	private	1	Jursa 2005a, 107

Nippur

	archive	timespan	size	average	h/v	background	generations	remarks
119	Ekur temple (early archive)	568–490 (78 yr)	40	0.5	v	temple		Jursa 2005a, 110–111

Sippar

	archive	timespan	size	average	h/v	background	generations	remarks
120	Ea-eppēš-ilī A	539–488 (51 yr)	18	0.35	v	private, priestly	3	Jursa 2005a, 122–123; temple brewers

	archive	timespan	size	average	h/v	background	generations	remarks
121	Balīḫu	510–488 (22 yr)	19	0.86	v	private, priestly	1	Jursa 2005a, 121; temple brewers; satellite of Marduk-rēmanni archive
122	Ea-eppēš-ilī B	509–490 (19 yr)	5	0.26	v	private, priestly	1	Jursa 2005a, 123; temple brewers
123	Iššar-tarībi	522–499 (23 yr)	25	1	v	private, trade	1	Jursa 2005a, 124; satellite of Marduk-rēmanni archive
124	Rē'i-sisê	546–519 (27 yr)	9	0.3	v	private	1	Jursa 2005a, 124–125; satellite of Marduk-rēmanni archive
125	Ša-nāšišu B	508–492 (16 yr)	5	0.3	v	private, priestly	1	Jursa 2005a, 126–127; temple brewers; satellite of Marduk-rēmanni archive
126	Šangû-Ištar-Bābili	541–504 (37 yr)	9	0.24	v	private, priestly	1	Jursa 2005a, 132–133

Ur

	archive	timespan	size	average	h/v	background	generations	remarks
127	Imbia	514–498 (16 yr)	4	0.25	v	private, priestly	1	Jursa 2005a, 137 notes that this archive possibly contains eight additional administrative texts from a temple archive

Uruk

	archive	timespan	size	average	h/v	background	generations	remarks
128	Atû	593–500 (93 yr)	18	0.2	v	private, priestly	3	Jursa 2005a, 140–141
129	Egibi of Uruk	550–489 (61 yr)	205	3.36	v	private, priestly	2	Jursa 2005, 147; Kessler, this volume

C group (archives reaching across 484 BCE)

Babylon

	archive	timespan	size	average	h/v	background	generations	remarks
130	[N6] Kasr (Babylon)	596–400 (196 yr)	1022	5.2	v	private and/or state?	-[107]	Jursa 2005a, 61
131	Tattannu (Borsippa)	506–386 (120 yr)	69	0.6	v	private and/or state?	4	Jursa 2005a, 94–97
132	Šangû-Ištar-Bābili (Cutha)	retroacts from Dar 16 (506 BCE) onwards; the main archive dates between 459–435 (24 yr)	25	-	v	private	2	Jursa 2005a, 98
133	Gallābu (Ur)	576–332 (244 yr)	51	0.23	v	private, priestly	7	Jursa 2005a, 133–134
134	Sîn-ilī (Ur)	517–482 (35 yr)	11	0.3	v	private	2	Jursa 2005a, 135
135	Gimil-Nanāya B (Uruk)	510–477 (33 yr)	7	0.2	v	private, priestly	1	Jursa 2005a, 142; Beaulieu, this volume
136	Yaḫudu cluster	572–477 (95 yr)	c. 260?	c. 2.7	v	private and/or state?	-[108]	Pearce and Wunsch 2014

[107] Several family units are represented in this composite archive.
[108] Several family units are represented in this composite archive.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abraham, K. 2004: *Business and Politics Under the Persian Empire: The Financial Dealings of Marduk-nāṣir-apli of the House of Egibi (521–487 B.C.E.)*, Bethesda.

Baker, H.D. 2004: *The Archive of the Nappāḫu Family* (*AfO* Beiheft 30), Vienna.

Baker, H.D. 2008: "Babylon in 484 BC: The Excavated Archival Tablets as a Source for Urban History", *ZA* 98, 100–116.

Baker, H.D. 2011: "The Statue of Bēl in the Ninurta Temple at Babylon", *AfO* 52, 117–120.

Baker, H.D. 2014: "Temple and City in Hellenistic Uruk: Sacred Space and the Transformation of Babylonian Society", in E. Frood and R. Raja (eds.), *Redefining the Sacred: Religious Architecture and Text in the Near East and Egypt 1000 BC – AD 300*, Turnhout, 183–208.

Berlejung, A. 2009: "Innovation als Restauration in Uruk und Jehud", in E.-J. Waschke (ed.), *Reformen im Alten Orient und der Antike: Programme, Darstellungen und Deutungen*, Tübingen, 71–111.

Bongenaar, A.C.V.M. 2000: "Private Archives in Neo-Babylonian Sippar and their Institutional Connections", in A.C.V.M. Bongenaar (ed.), *Interdependency of Institutions and Private Entrepreneurs: Proceedings of the Second MOS Symposium (Leiden 1998)* (PIHANS 87; MOS Studies 2), Istanbul and Leiden, 73–94.

Brosius, M. 2003: *Ancient Archives and Archival Traditions: Concepts of Record-Keeping in the Ancient World*, Oxford.

Burns, K. 2010: *Into the Archive: Writing and Power in Colonial Peru*, Durham.

Burton, A. (ed.) 2005: *Archive Stories: Facts, Fictions, and the Writing of History*, Durham.

Castel, C. 1995: "Contexte archéologique et statut des documents: les textes retrouvés dans les maisons mésopotamiennes du I^{er} millénaire av. J.-C.", *RA* 89, 109–137.

Cole, S.W. 1996: *Nippur IV: The Early Neo-Babylonian Governor's Archive from Nippur* (OIP 114), Chicago.

Da Riva, R. 2002: *Der Ebabbar-Tempel von Sippar in frühneubabylonischer Zeit (640–580 v. Chr.)* (AOAT 291), Münster.

von Dassow, E. 1994: "Archival Documents from Borsippa Families", *Aula Orientalis* 12, 105–120.

Dirks, N.B. 2002: "Annals of the Archive: Ethnographic Notes on the Sources of History", in B.K. Axel (ed.), *From the Margins: Historical Anthropology and Its Futures*, Durham, 47–65.

van Driel, G. 1987: "Continuity or Decay in the Late Achaemenid Period: Evidence from Southern Mesopotamia", in H. Sancisi-Weerdenburg (ed.), *Sources, Structures and Synthesis* (Achaemenid History 1), 159–181.

van Driel, G. 1989: "The Murašûs in Context", *JESHO* 32, 203–229.

van Driel, G. 1992: "Neo-Babylonian Texts from Borsippa", *BiOr* 49, 28–50.

van Driel, G. 2000: "Institutional and Non-Institutional Economy in Ancient Mesopotamia", in A.C.V.M. Bongenaar (ed.), *Interdependency of Institutions and Private Entrepreneurs: Proceedings of the Second MOS Symposium (Leiden 1998)* (PIHANS 87; MOS Studies 2), Istanbul and Leiden, 5–23.

Frame, G. 2013: *The Archive of Mušēzib-Marduk, Son of Kiribtu and Descendant of Sîn-nāṣir: A Landowner and Private Property Developer at Uruk in the Seventh Century BC* (*BaAr* 5), Dresden.

Gurney, O.R. 1982: "Three Contracts from Babylon", in M.A. Dandamaev (ed.), *Societies and Languages of the Ancient Near East: Studies in Honour of I. M. Diakonoff*, Warminster, 120–128.

Hackl, J. 2013: *Materialien zur Urkundenlehre und Archivkunde der spätzeitlichen Texten aus Nordbabylonien*. PhD Dissertation, University of Vienna.

Hackl, J. and M. Jursa 2015: "Egyptians in Babylonia in the Neo-Babylonian and Achaemenid Periods", in J. Stökl and C. Waerzeggers (eds.), *Exile and Return: The Babylonian Context* (BZAW 478), Berlin, 157–180.

Hackl, J., M. Jursa and M. Schmidl 2014: *Spätbabylonische Privatbriefe* (Spätbabylonische Briefe 1; AOAT 414/1), Münster.

Hecker, K. 1966: *Die Keilschrifttexte der Universitätsbibliothek Giessen* (Berichte und Arbeiten aus der Universitätsbibliothek Giessen 9), Giessen.

Heinsch, S. and W. Kuntner 2011: "Herodot und die Stadtmauern Babylons. Bemerkungen zur archäologischen Befundsituation der Landmauern", in R. Rollinger, B. Truschnegg and R. Bichler (eds.), *Herodot und das Persische Weltreich / Herodotus and the Persian Empire* (CleO 3), Wiesbaden, 499–529.

Heinsch, S., W. Kuntner, and R. Rollinger 2011: "Von Herodot zur angeblichen Verödung babylonischer Stadtviertel in achaimenidischer Zeit: Kritische Bemerkungen zum archäologischen Befund auf dem Merkes sowie zur vermeintlichen Zerstörung des Tempels der Ištar von Akkade durch Xerxes im Jahre 484 v. Chr.", in R. Rollinger, B. Truschnegg and R. Bichler (eds.), *Herodot und das Persische Weltreich / Herodotus and the Persian Empire* (CleO 3), Wiesbaden, 471–498.

Henkelman, W.F.M., A. Kuhrt, R. Rollinger and J. Wiesehöfer 2011: "Herodotus and Babylon Reconsidered", in R. Rollinger, B. Truschnegg and R. Bichler (eds.), *Herodot und das Persische Weltreich / Herodotus and the Persian Empire* (CleO 3), Wiesbaden, 449–470.

Joannès, F. 1989: *Archives de Borsippa: La Famille Ea-ilûta-bâni: Étude d'un lot d'archives familiales en Babylonie du VIII^e^ au V^e^ siècle av. J.-C.*, Genève.

Jursa, M. 1999: *Das Archiv des Bēl-rēmanni*, Leiden.

Jursa, M. 2004: "Accounting in Neo-Babylonian Institutional Archives: Structure, Usage, Implications", in M. Hudson and C. Wunsch (eds.), *Creating Economic Order: Record-keeping, Standardization, and the Development of Accounting in the Ancient Near East*, Bethesda, 145–198.

Jursa, M. 2005a: *Neo-Babylonian Legal and Administrative Documents*: *Typology, Contents and Archives* (GMTR 1), Münster.

Jursa, M. 2005b: "Das Archiv von Bēl-eṭēri-Šamaš", in H.D. Baker and M. Jursa (eds.), *Approaching the Babylonian Economy: Proceedings of the START Project Symposium Held in Vienna, 1–3 July 2004* (AOAT 330), Münster, 197–268.

Jursa, M. 2010: *Aspects of the Economic History of Babylonia in the First Millennium BC: Economic Geography, Economic Mentalities, Agriculture, the Use of Money and the Problem of Economic Growth* (with contributions by J. Hackl, B. Janković, K. Kleber, E.E. Payne, C. Waerzeggers and M. Weszeli; AOAT 377), Münster.

Jursa, M. 2011: "Cuneiform Writing in Neo-Babylonian Temple Communities", in K. Radner and E. Robson (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Cuneiform Culture*, Oxford, 184–204.

Jursa, M. 2013: "Epistolographic Evidence for the Trips to Susa by Borsippean Priests and for the Crisis in Borsippa at the Beginning of Xerxes' Reign", *ARTA* 2013/003.

Kessler, K. 1991: *Uruk: Urkunden aus Privathäusern: Die Wohnhäuser westlich des Eanna-Tempelbereichs, Teil I: Die Archive der Söhne des Bēl-ušallim, des Nabû-ušallim und des Bēl-supê-muḫur* (AUWE 8), Mainz.

Kessler, K. 2004: "Urukäische Familien versus babylonische Familien: Die Namengebung in Uruk, die Degradierung der Kulte von Eanna und der Aufstieg des Gottes Anu", *AoF* 31, 237–262.

King, M.T. 2016: "Working With/In the Archives", in S. Gunn and L. Faire (eds.), *Research Methods for History*, Edinburgh.

Kuhrt, A. 2014: "Reassessing the Reign of Xerxes in the Light of New Evidence", in M. Kozuh et al. (eds.), *Extraction & Control: Studies in Honor of Matthew W. Stolper* (SAOC 68), Chicago, 163–169.

Kuntner, W. and S. Heinsch 2013: "Die babylonischen Tempel in der Zeit nach den Chaldäern", in K. Kaniuth et al. (eds.), *Tempel im Alten Orient* (ICDOG 7), Wiesbaden, 219–262.

Lauinger, J. 2011: "An Excavated Dossier of Cuneiform Tablets from Level VII Alalaḫ?", *BASOR* 362, 21–64.

De Meyer, L. and H. Gasche 1980: "Contributions à la topographie de Abū Ḥabbah", in L. De Meyer (ed.), *Tell ed-Dēr: Sounding at Abū Ḥabbah (Sippar)*, Leuven, 23–36.

Oelsner, J. 2007: "Das zweite Regierungsjahr des Xerxes (484/3 v. Chr.) in Babylonien", in M. Köhbach et al. (eds.), *Festschrift für Hermann Hunger zum 65. Geburtstag gewidmet von seinen Freunden, Kollegen und Schülern* (*WZKM* 97), Vienna, 289–303.

Pearce, L.E. and C. Wunsch 2014: *Documents of Judean Exiles and West Semites in Babylonia in the Collection of David Sofer* (CUSAS 28), Bethesda.

Pedersén, O. 1998: *Archives and Libraries in the Ancient Near East, 1500–300 B.C.*, Bethesda.

Pedersén, O. 2005: *Archive und Bibliotheken in Babylon: Die Tontafeln der Grabung Robert Koldeweys 1899–1917* (ADOG 25), Saarbrücken.

Reade, J. 1986: "Introduction. Rassam's Babylonian Collection: The Excavations and the Archives", in E. Leichty (ed.), *Catalogue of the Babylonian Tablets in the British Museum, Vol.* 6: *Tablets from Sippar* 1, London, xii–xxxvi.

Rollinger, R. 2008: "Babylon in der antiken Tradition – Herodot, Ktesias, Semiramis und die Hängenden Gärten", in J. Marzahn and G. Schauerte (eds.), *Babylon: Wahrheit*, Munich, 487–502.

Sandowicz, M. 2009: "Depositaries, Depositors, and Courthouse in Sixth-Century BC Babylon", *Palamedes* 4, 15–25.

Spar, I. and M. Jursa 2014: *The Ebabbar Temple Archive and Other Texts from the Fourth to the First Millennium B.C.* (CTMMA 4), New York and Winona Lake.

Steedman, C. 2002: *Dust: The Archive and Cultural History*, Brunswick.

Stigers, H.G. 1976: "Neo- and Late-Babylonian Business Documents from the John Frederick Lewis Collection", *JCS* 28, 3–59.

Stoler, A.L. 2002: "Colonial Archives and the Arts of Governance", *Archival Science* 2, 87–109.

Stoler, A.L. 2009: *Against the Archival Grain: Epistemic Anxieties and the Colonial Common Sense*, Princeton.

Stolper, M.W. 1990: "Late Achaemenid Texts from Uruk and Larsa", *BagM* 21, 559–622.

Tolini, G. 2011: *La Babylonie et l'Iran: Les relations d'une province avec le cœur de l'empire achéménide (539–331 avant notre ère)*. PhD Dissertation, Université Paris I, Panthéon-Sorbonne.

Tolini, G. 2015: "From Syria to Babylon and Back: The Neirab Archive", in J. Stökl and C. Waerzeggers (eds.), *Exile and Return: The Babylonian Context* (BZAW 478), Berlin, 58–93.

Ungnad, A. 1959/1960: "Neubabylonische Privaturkunden aus der Sammlung Amherst", *AfO* 19, 74–82.

Veenhof, K.R. 1986: "Cuneiform Archives: An Introduction", in K.R. Veenhof (ed.), *Cuneiform Archives and Libraries*, Leiden, 1–36.

de Vivo, F. 2013: "Heart of the State, Site of Tension: The Archival Turn Viewed from Venice, ca. 1400–1700", *Annales* 68, 457–485.

Waerzeggers, C. 2000: "The Records of Inṣabtu from the Naggāru Family", *AfO* 46/47, 183–200.

Waerzeggers, C. 2003/2004: "The Babylonian Revolts Against Xerxes and the 'End of Archives'", *AfO* 50, 150–173.

Waerzeggers, C. 2005: "The Dispersal History of the Borsippa Archives", in H.D. Baker and M. Jursa (eds.), *Approaching the Babylonian Economy: Proceedings of the START Project Symposium Held in Vienna, 1–3 July 2004* (AOAT 330), Münster, 343–363.

Waerzeggers, C. 2010: *The Ezida Temple of Borsippa: Priesthood, Cult, Archives* (Achaemenid History 15), Leiden.

Waerzeggers, C. 2010a: "Babylonians in Susa: The Travels of Babylonian "Businessmen" to Susa Reconsidered", in B. Jacobs and R. Rollinger (eds.), *Der Achämenidenhof / The Achaemenid Court* (CleO 2), Wiesbaden, 777–813.

Waerzeggers, C. 2014: *Marduk-rēmanni: Local Networks and Imperial Politics in Achaemenid Babylonia* (OLA 233), Leuven.

Waerzeggers, C. 2016: "The Silver Has Gone… Temple Theft and a Divided Community in Achaemenid Babylonia", in K. Kleber and R. Pirngruber (eds.), *Silver, Money and Credit: A Tribute to Robartus J. van der Spek on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday*, Leiden, 73–85.

Walker, C.F.B. and D. Collon 1980: "Hormuzd Rassam's Excavations for the British Museum at Sippar in 1881–1882", in L. De Meyer (ed.), *Tell ed-Dēr III*, Leuven, 93–114.

Wunsch, C. 2000: *Das Egibi-Archiv. I: Die Felder und Gärten* (CM 20), Groningen.

Wunsch, C. 2005: "The Šangû-Ninurta Archive", in H.D. Baker and M. Jursa (eds.), *Approaching the Babylonian Economy: Proceedings of the START Project Symposium Held in Vienna, 1–3 July 2004* (AOAT 330), Münster, 365–379.

Zadok, R. 1986: "Archives from Nippur in the First Millennium BCE", in K.R. Veenhof (ed.), *Cuneiform Archives and Libraries*, Leiden, 278–288.

Zadok, R. 2005: "The Text Group of Nabû-ēṭer", *AfO* 51, 147–197.