

^{m30}- DÜ PAB; Tallqvist (1918) 202; Stamm (1939) 158.

1. Official responsible for salted meats, from Kalhu (8th century): ^{m30}-*tab-ni*-PAB LÜ.šá-*me-di-li-šú* is mentioned with four minas of copper in an administrative text concerning *ilkakāte*-payments CTN 3 87:19 (not dated). → Radner (1999) 120-26 (on professions of the type *ša x-šu*).

2. Governor of Ur, son of the governor Nikkal-iddin, brother of his predecessors Sin-balassu-iqbi and Sin-šarru-ušur (reign of Assurbanipal): Sin-tabni-ušur appears to have been appointed governor of Ur sometime after the beginning of Šamaš-šumu-nkin's revolt (652) and before the 23rd Si-manu (iii.) 650 (see Brinkman [1969a] 342f). He may have remained in office for the remainder of the war (i.e. until 648). As governor of Ur he is attested both as the sender and recipient of letters to and from the king, and is also mentioned in other royal correspondence. Unfortunately, the letters are often fragmentary and difficult to interpret, so that their sequence is not easily established. The correspondence generally dates to the period of Šamaš-šumu-ukin's rebellion (652-648). For the historical background see Brinkman (1984) 93-104; Frame (1992) 131-90.

a. Family background: Sin-tabni-ušur is explicitly identified as a son of Nikkal-iddin in two haruspical queries of Assurbanipal regarding his appointment as governor of Ur and his loyalty to Assyria (see b.). He had at least two brothers, Sin-balassu-iqbi and Sin-šarru-ušur. All three of the sons of Nikkal-iddin succeeded their father as governor of Ur. Following the tenure of Sin-balassu-iqbi, Sin-šarru-ušur was appointed prior to Šamaš-šumu-ukin's revolt (652-648) (see Durand [1981] 181-5); during the course of the revolt he was succeeded by Sin-tabni-ušur.

b. Appointment and titles: Assurbanipal consulted diviners in order to find out whether [^{m30}]o-*tab-ni*-ŠEŠ son of Nikkal-iddin would be a loyal, pro-Assyrian governor or if he would support his brother Šamaš-šumu-ukin; the diviner Dannaia provides the king with a favourable report SAA 4 300:5 (date lost, but presumably written before 23-iii-650 [see the following]). He is first referred to as LÜ.GAR.KUR ŠEŠ.UNUG.KI in a text dated 23-iii-650 at Nina (Frame [1992] 163, 279 n. 65); he also bears this title in several other legal documents from Ur (see d.). At some point during the rebellion, Assurbanipal consulted diviners once again to determine whether [^{m30}]o-*tab-ni*-ú-šur son of Nikkal-iddin would turn against Assyria and join Šamaš-šumu-ukin; the haruspe's report contains ten unfavourable omens SAA 4 301 r. 8 (date lost). Since the date of this haruspical query is not preserved and Sin-tabni-ušur is not given any titles, it is not known whether this text pre-dates his appointment.

c. Sin-tabni-ušur's career:

1'. In letters from Assurbanipal to Sin-tabni-ušur: In a letter addressed to ^{m30}-*tab-ni*-ŠEŠ, Assurbanipal states that he did not believe the slanderous remarks that Sin-šarru-ušur and Umman-nigaš made about him; the Assyrian king expresses his faith in Sin-tabni-ušur, and commends him for

Sin-tabni-ušur ("O Sin, you have created [a son, now] protect [him!]"); Akk.; masc.; wr. ^{m30}-*tab-ni*-ú-šur, ^{m30}-*tab-ni*-ŠEŠ, ^{m30}-*tab-ni*-PAB,

enduring anti-Assyrian rebels and famine for two ABL 290:1 (not dated). Although the exact of this letter is uncertain, it has been suggested by Frame (1992) 165 that it was written after the commencement of Šamaš-šumu-ukin's revolt; according to the chronology of events presented by Frame, this letter would have been written in late 651 or early 650. Brinkman (1965) 254 suggests that the text could date to 647, after the rebellion in Babylonia had been quelled. Durand (1981) 184f suggests that ABL 290 was written before with the "two years" to 655/654 and when there was an absence of a strong central authority, and when the rivalry between Assyria and Babylonia was beginning to heat up. He supports his theory by suggesting that the "pro-Babylonian" Sin-šarru-ušur would not have been corresponding with Assurbanipal while aiding Šamaš-šumu-ukin in his rebellion against Assyria, that Umman-nigaš was the Elamite king Humban-nikaš II who appears to have been killed early in the revolt (c. 652), and that there is no evidence in the letter suggesting that Sin-tabni-ušur was already the governor of Ur. However, if this letter was composed during the revolt, and after Sin-tabni-ušur's installation as governor, then Sin-šarru-ušur may have been trying to cause trouble for his brother, hoping to regain control in Ur (Frame [1992] 166 n. 165).

In another letter, Assurbanipal writes to ^{m30--}ŠU¹ -PAB¹ commending him for having fulfilled his duties as governor for a third year ABL 523:1 (not dated); see Frame (1992) 165 n. 160 for the reading of the name. It has been suggested that this letter was composed after the worst pressure on Ur had been relieved. Assuming that anti-Assyrian rebels put pressure on Ur in 652, at the commencement of the revolt, then this may that Ur had been relieved as early as 650, Assyria began gaining the upper hand in northern Babylonia and in the vicinity of Uruk (Frame [1992] 165f).

2'. Letters addressed to Assurbanipal by Sin-tabni-ušur: In a very fragmentarily preserved letter, ^{m30}-tab-ni-ŠEŠ informs the Assyrian king that Esarhaddon had aided his father Nikkal-iddin when the Sealander Nabû-zer-kitti-lišir made raids against Ur; the governor of Ur appears to have been asking for the same protection against Nabû-bel-šumati ABL 1248:2 (not dated). This letter may also allude to the anti-Assyrian Sealander destroying parts of Ur in his raids (interpretation uncertain) see Frame (1992) 164; Dietrich (1970) 202f no. 159 (for possible restorations). ^{m30--}tab-ni-ŠEŠ reports to the Assyrian king on an expedition to Uruk by Sin-šarru-ušur ABL 1207:1 (not dated); Sin-šarru-ušur may have been trying to rally support in Uruk, perhaps in an attempt to regain control of Ur. In this same letter, Sin-tabni-ušur also claims to have captured a rebel, fettered him and sent him to Nineveh for interrogation; the identity of the adversary is not preserved, but it is not impossible that it was Sin-šarru-ušur who was detained by the troops of Ur. In a third letter to Assurbanipal, ^{m30--}[tab-ni-ŠEŠ] boasts that he took prisoners from the Sealander, and informs the

king about Bel-uballiṣ, son of his wet nurse; in addition, he requests aid in protecting some citizens of the town Ekuš ABL 920:2 (not dated). Since this letter is not dated and the name of the author is only partially preserved, the sender could be either Sin-balassu-iqbi, Sin-šarru-ušur, or Sin-tabni-ušur; the latter appears to be the most likely candidate. Frame (1992) p. 167 and n. 167 suggests that this letter may refer to Ur aiding Bel-ibni in his subjugation of the Sealander.

3'. Sin-tabni-ušur as the possible author of letters: Two fragmentarily preserved letters in which the name of the sender is missing may be tentatively assigned to Sin-tabni-ušur; the sender invokes Sin and Nikkal, suggesting an origin in Ur or its vicinity. In a letter to Assurbanipal [^{m30--}tab-ni-ŠEŠ⁷] makes a report on two men affiliated with tribal chieftains(?) or lovers(?) (interpretation uncertain) CT 54 210:1 (date lost); the second letter to the king from a governor of Ur [^{m30--}tab-ni-ŠEŠ⁷] is too badly damaged to ascertain the nature of its contents CT 54 249:2 (date lost).

4'. In a letter addressed to Assurbanipal by the citizens of Ur: In a letter addressed to the king, the citizens of Ur make a report on the pitiable condition of Ur and claim that ^{m30}-tab-ni-ŠEŠ // [^{m30}]-tab-ni-ŠEŠ had submitted to Šamaš-šumu-ukin only out of sheer desperation, and was indeed a loyal Assyrian subject ABL 1274:7 13 r. 7 (not dated); see Dietrich (1970) 202f no. 160 for possible restorations. Although the exact date of ABL 1274 is uncertain, it appears to have been written when Ur's access to food and reinforcements had been completely cut off; pleas to Assurbanipal for aid appear to have received no immediate response since Assyrian forces could not penetrate that far south. Frame (1992) 166 and n. 164 dates the letter during the revolt, but finds the submission of Sin-tabni-ušur difficult to explain since there is no other evidence suggesting that Ur was ever occupied by anti-Assyrian rebels. Frame suggests that he may have been forced to offer some kind of submission to Šamaš-šumu-ukin, but help may have arrived as soon as Sin-tabni-ušur began to negotiate the surrender of Ur; it is possible that this letter pre-dates ABL 290 (see c.1'). For texts reflecting the scarcity of food in Ur, see Frame (1992) 166 and Brinkman (1984) 98. On the other hand, Durand (1981) 184f dates ABL 1274 to before the revolt, when Sin-šarru-ušur and Sin-tabni-ušur were for power (655/654 and 653/652).

5'. In letters addressed to the king by other officials in Babylonia: Nabû-ušabši (governor of Uruk), in a report to the Assyrian king about Puqudean raids in the vicinity of Uruk and Ur, mentions that the Puqudu managed successfully to attack the town of Bit-il-ahtir, taking two or three thousand troops of ^{m30--}tab-ni-ŠEŠ // ^{m30--}tab-ni-[ŠEŠ] prisoner ABL 1028 r. 6, 16 (not dated); since the passage is fragmentarily preserved it is not impossible that the troops of Sin-tabni-ušur captured the Puqudu (Frame [1992] 164 n. 151). [^{m30}-tab-ni-ŠEŠ] is mentioned in a damaged passage of a letter of Nabû-ušabši to the king concerning a certain Sin-ibni's raids on Uruk, Ur, and

Sin-taklāk

Eridu ABL 753:9 (not dated). In another letter addressed to the Assyrian king, the sender (name lost) reports that Nabû-bel-šumati was trying to win over the Gurasimmu tribe in an attempt further to isolate Ur; the author implies that the Gurasimmu were under the jurisdiction of ^{md}30—*tab-ni-ú-šur* (interpretation uncertain) ABL 1236:16 (not dated). Kudurru of Uruk reports to Assurbanipal that ^{md}30—*tab-ni-šēš* made an appeal to him and to the Assyrian Aplāia (governor of Arrapha); the governor of Ur claims that the Gurasimmu had rebelled against him at the instigation of Šamaš-šumu-ukin, and if aid was not forthcoming then Ur would fall into rebel hands ABL 754+:4; Kudurru and five or six hundred archers from Uruk, together with Aplāia and Nurea went to the rescue of [^{md}30—*tab-ni-šēš*] ABL 754+:12; the sender also mentions that [^m]30—*tab-ni-šēš* // [^{md}]30—*tab-ni-šēš* had detained five or six influential rebels and handed them over to Aplāia ABL 754+:17, 18; the expedition was apparently successful, but since Bel-ibni (military commander of the Sealand), Aplāia, and ^{md}[30—*tab-ni-šēš*] had to conduct additional military manœuvres against the Puqudu, it is unlikely that all the pressure on Ur had been relieved ABL 754+:21 (not dated). → Dietrich (1970) 75, 85, 89, 92f, 100, 115, 124, 128; Frame (1992) 160f, 164f.

d. Sin-tabni-ušur in legal documents from Nina and Ur: Sin-tabni-ušur appears as the principal witness with the title LÚ.GAR.KUR ŠEŠ.UNUG.KI in one transaction from Nina and two from Ur: BM 113929:34 = Brinkman - Kennedy (1983) 22 J.11 (dated 23-iii-650); Frame (1992) 162f n. 142, 166 n. 162f, 279 n. 65. BM 113928:30 = Brinkman - Kennedy (1983) 22 J.13 (dated 29-i-649); Frame (1992) 166 n. 163, 279 n. 65. ^{md}30—*tab-ni-šēš* LÚ.GAR.KUR ŠEŠ.UNUG.KI UET 4 23 24 = Brinkman - Kennedy (1983) 24 J.39 (date lost); Frame (1992) 279 n. 65. It is likely that his name (rather than Sin-šarru-ušur) is to be restored in another document from Ur: [^{md}30—*tab-ni-šēš*] LÚ.GAR.KUR ŠEŠ.UNUG.KI U 30656 r. 6 (date lost); see Frame (1992) 279 n. 65.

J. R. Novotny