In order to establish our primary thesis, a fairly detailed analysis of each text in the sample is necessary. Important aspects regarding various personnel, commodities, disputes, institutional relationships, and other information contained or alluded to in the texts require extended discussion. This chapter and the next, therefore, examine each text individually and assess the collective import of related sets of texts.¹ Those documents that appear to have been drafted in situations that do not relate to a trial or another event directly connected with litigation come under examination in this chapter, while the next chapter considers texts generated within a judicial context. Thus, this chapter looks at documents regarding work orders, deadlines for deliveries of commodities, special restrictions on certain individuals, and other such imposed duties and obligations. Since the vast majority of our texts come from the Eanna temple archive, most—though not all—of these duties are those of temple workers, both temple oblates and those free citizens who had a contractual relationship with the temple. Among other things, these texts provide insight into the administration of the temple’s economic endeavors, its duties owed to the royal administration, and its dealings with independent contractors. The chapter will attempt to demonstrate that, with each occurrence of the hitu-clause in a non-judicial context, a violation of an administrative nature (that is, non-criminal and non-contractual) is at stake and that the tripartite relationship of overlord-assignor-assignee is evident in each situation and is, in large part, what motivates the use of the hitu-clause in the document.

A number of the texts under discussion bear important similarities to each other. Several texts, for instance, all relate to the delivery of animals and contain deadlines by which those deliveries are to be made. Discussing these sorts of similar texts together will help to highlight

¹ The emphasis will be on legal-historical analysis; most of the philological analysis occurs in our text editions.
In the course of conducting its regular affairs, an administrative agency or business enterprise necessarily regulates the activities of its members or employees. The Eanna temple at Uruk is an interesting case in point, since it functioned primarily as an administrative agency within the larger governmental bureaucracy of the time but also engaged in wide range of economic endeavors. For both administrative and business reasons, Eanna officials sought to exert extensive control over their subordinates and business partners and, in fact, frequently found themselves having to deal with situations where personnel under their authority had attempted to skirt such control and to profit by means of unauthorized use or even outright theft of temple assets. One manifestation of these regulartory efforts comes in the form of injunctions, i.e., orders that explicitly prevent subordinate personnel from taking particular actions. There are ??? texts containing the hitu-clause that fit this category of injunctions that were issued within a non-judicial context. All but ?? come from the type of situation just described with respect to the Eanna temple.

The documents that record these injunctions tend to follow a similar pattern. The opening clause typically identifies the person(s) bound by the terms of the injunction, and the names of such persons often come at the very beginning of the document. The subsequent statement specifies the precise activities in which the enjoined person’s participation is forbidden. What
may be the key statement in all of these documents usually occurs next. It simply states that if
the person does indeed carry out the prohibited actions, then the person will be subject to a hitu
of (the gods and) the king. The protasis of this sentence thus contains an affirmative statement
(i.e., if a person does something), whereas the corresponding protases in most of our other
documents contain negative statements (i.e., if a person does not do something). While the
elements of this pattern are fairly uncomplicated, other details of these texts raise questions.

Two texts from the sample appear to prohibit herdsmen from allowing livestock to graze
in arable fields owned by the temple. YOS 7 85 is clear in this regard. The document begins by
naming seven men (each has a patronymic but no family name), one of whom is designated as a
sasinnu (“maker of bows and arrows”; written as li₃U.MUG). These men take a promissory oath
that they will not allow the sheep, cattle, or donkeys of the sasinnū (probably “bow-makers”) to
graze on arable fields owned by the temple and under the supervision of the rent farmer,
Ardiya/Nabu-bān-ahi (lines 10-14). The text then states (lines 14-15): ki-i ra-aq-šú ina
ŠE.NUMUN it-tan-mar hi-tu šá LUGAL i-šad-da-du “if (evidence of) his (their?) laxity is seen in
the fields, they will be subject to a penalty of the king.”² The injunction placed on the seven men
is plain; unfortunately, the background of this situation remains obscure.

It is not clear exactly whose livestock these are. Do they belong to the seven men named
in the text? Or are these men simply the hired herdsmen for the real owners? The animals are
said to belong to the “bow-makers,” and perhaps the man identified as a bow-maker at the outset,
Nabū-ētir, is one of the owners or at least the owners’ representative. In addition, it is quite likely
that the men are herdsmen in the employ of Eanna since the temple can issue orders to them in
this way. Such herdsmen “tended concurrently to the temple’s animals, their private herds, and

² The word raqšu is problematic. It seems to come from the word riaqu and may be a participal, but why it has a
singular rather than a plural pronominal suffix is unclear.
perhaps another person’s animals on contract.” Thus, it seems evident is that the livestock in these men’s care does not consist of temple livestock or, perhaps, not entirely of temple livestock. It is not the case that the temple refused to have any animals graze at times on its agricultural fields. In YOS 6 26, a temple herdsman complains to the Eanna royal commissioner that his livestock have no place to graze. The official then grants him some arable land (šE NUMUN) for this very purpose. ANOTHER SENTENCE
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3 Kozuh, Sacrificial Economy, 42.
4 See the discussion of this text in Kozuh, Sacrificial Economy, 42-43.