I. Introduction and Text

The purpose of the present publication is to make available without delay a text of extraordinary significance for the history and historiography of ancient Mesopotamia. It is not the aim of this article to pursue all the lines of inquiry opened or re-opened by the information supplied in this text, as that would have entailed a greater delay and a recapitulation of material and arguments—especially concerning the "Assur-Bel Canaanite Question"—that have already been well-covered by others. The bearing of the new text upon such matters will therefore be left to those who have previously considered these matters more deeply with them. The remarks in the present article will be limited to points that are directly relevant to the understanding of the text itself, and to general lines of inquiry as an outgrowth of the text in a direct way.

The text in question is BM 88326, of the "Hedge Collections" of the British Museum, its provenance used likely being Suppar. It is not a text of the "archaic" tradition, but gives every appearance of belonging to some administrative archive; as will become evident, it served a practical purpose at a specific occasion or on a number of similar occasions. It looks like a roster of personal names—those on the obverse being all unfamiliar as such—which probably accounts for the tablet's neglect until the present. The obverse is well preserved except for the missing lower right corner of the text, but the surface of the lower edge and reverse is in large part worn away. Also, the script of the reverse below the ruled line is noticeably smaller than the rest, and becomes progressively cramped, a feature which, combined with the poorly preserved surface, renders the reading in some instances difficult. A notable feature is the presence of a tick mark on the left edge opposite each of the names recorded on the reverse. The mark does not appear against these names appearing on the lower edge; this might have been prevented by considerations of space—nor against those names appearing on the reverse, where there is no apparent reason for its omission. One may wonder in the light of what is to follow whether the tick marking on the obverse relates to the relative unfamiliarity of names appearing there— the mark being therefore the way in which the scribe checked off these names, perhaps some other written names he had before him, by comparison with the names appearing on the reverse, which, as will be apparent, consists of the names of the rates of the First Dynasty of Babylon, and were therefore a matter of the most common knowledge of the day, which the scribe could have written down from memory without any difficulty.
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The Genealogical List

While normal procedure would suggest a line-by-line commentary on the individual names, certain features in the present list which will soon become apparent make it necessary to modify our approach.

Since the list concludes with the entire series of kings of the First Dynasty of Babylon from Sumuabum to Ammadianum, the father and protocess of Ammadianum on whose behalf the text was composed, there is every reason to assume that the nineteen names preceding Sumuabum were at the time of writing conceived as a consecutive series of earlier kings and/or ancestors. It is less certain that they were consciously thought to have been "kings" ruling over some known and defined city or territory; it is equally possible that they were conceived of as no more than tribal sheikhs or patriarchs. As the ensuing discussion will make clear, however, the entire series must have been believed at the time of its composition to constitute a single sequence of "generations" spanning a period of many centuries, a fact which is crucial to the historiographic significance of the text as a whole.

One of the most obvious features of the first part of the list (hereinafter referred to as OHD), especially of lines 4-10, is the presence of names of individual persons of what are known from many other sources to have been names of West
Sudden or "Amorite" tribes. This in itself is not surprising. It is a phenomenon paralleled in biblical tradition about the origins of the Hebrews and similar beliefs about their own origins are entertained by the eastern bedouin tribes of the Arabian peninsula. What is perhaps most striking is the correspondence of some of these names with certain of the names in the first section of the Amarna King List (hereinafter AKL), which presents a sequence of seventeen "kings who dwelt in tents" (i.e. desert sheikhs). The following correspondences will be well-attested:

GHD line | AKL no.
--- | ---
3 | 10
4 | 10
5 | 9
6 | 10
7 | 9
8 | 11
9 | 11

That the first two of these names are those of tribes needs no extended documentation here. A preoccupation might on this basis be justified, despite the absence thus far of any positive evidence for it, that Amarna/Deir 'ala very likely represents a trivial name as well. But the more interesting question that suggests itself at this point is the possibility of discovering other correspondences among the names in the two lists. Towards this end, it might be noted at the outset that the names in the first three lines of GHD are very noticeably longer than those on the lines immediately following. It will also be apparent that the interpretation of these lines as individual names by means of some simpler linguistic structure or vocabulary would present some serious difficulties. The clue to understanding these three lines suggested itself to the present writer by a comparison of line three of GHD with line two of AKL as arranged in the SDAS text (c) where we find the following pairs of names:

2. References to the Amarna King List (hereinafter AKL) for the text published by Geffcken of the Kaiser- schaft (Kisch) and the Seventy Days Enveloper Society (SDAS) in JNES XII (1943) 209 f. With Pages XIX-XVII.
3. The systematic commentary to the individual names follows below, after the analysis of the special relation of the first three lines of GHD to the first three names of AKL.
4. The Kisch text begins with Tushratta standing alone on the first line, with the two-metre-long arrangement remaining only with Adamu in line 2. nickell shifts the two-metre-long arrangement from the latter, thus preserving its form, but in that form makes parallelism almost nonexistent for the first three lines of GHD, though not in the same

Such close resemblance could hardly be coincidental, and there would be every presumption in favor of viewing the two lines as containing the same name or names albeit in somewhat varying forms. This fact in turn is strongly corroborated by Kraus' recent discovery that the SDBS King List Deir 'ala is echoed in a fragmentary copy of an inscription of Shamlumma, VAT XV 156, in which the end of line 3 reads, bē-bā-e ma-nu, with the end of the previous line concluding with e bē-4-bā-e "the ancestor." Kraus correlated, correctly, that line 2 of this text contains nothing else but the very names in line 3 of the SDAS text of AKL in practically identical form. This, in turn, makes it almost certain that the first line of GHD lama-'u-am-dig-ša-ša in itself nothing but a variant rendering of the three names of line 3 of SDAS, Deir 'ala and Mattata, and by the same token, of the ancestor's throne. Aided in the Semitic studies of Karsh Mazarak.

Thus two of the first three lines of GHD seems to consist of fused forms of the names of two persons in each line, corresponding to similarly coupled names in AKL, where, in contrast, the distinctiveness of each name in either pair is still retained.

5. O. R. Kraus, "Kisch, die in deinen weiten..." in the following notes. Materialien der Orientalischen Abteilung des Wiener Kongresses, AKL, Orientalische Abteilung, Vienna, Reidel, 1960, II (1960) XII, f. 117 ff. (hereinafter abbreviated Kraus, "Kisch").
6. The text was first correctly identified and discussed by Broom, JHS 1931 185 ff.
7. I recall that when I first showed my copy of JHS to Kraus about two years ago, he thought he detected a repudiation of the first line of line 3 of the Semitic text, and I was so in this effect. At that time he had not yet seen the "unwritten" of the latter to the line of AKL, and so both he dismissed the apparent similarity as not significant. With Kraus subsequent dole about the Semitic text and AKL relationship, he failed to see it finally proved to have been well-founded.
Finally, to complete the circle, Van Garderen offers the suggestion that line 2 of GHD, "Îršéra-Šu-ma" is nothing else than a glossed and, in part metathesized form of the first pair of names in AKL: "Îršéra-Šu-ma". This suggestion is so immediately convincing that no further argumen-
tation need be made in support of it. Thus it is shown that the first three lines of GHD really consist of two names, each corresponding to identical.

Pair of names as recorded in the first three lines of AKL (SDAS text).

Wasty, but encouraged by the discoveries made in this far, one is tempted to press for completeness beyond those already considered, and it is with somewhat less assurance that the following addi-
tional correspondences between GHD and AKL are suggested:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GHD Line</th>
<th>AKL (SDAS) Line</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Akiš,ša-eru</td>
<td>a) Nadum-a: b) Sīn-šar-aššu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ešašu-eru</td>
<td>b) Namšu-ša-eru</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The grounds for suggesting these correspondences—albeit tentatively—are as follows: Line 4 of the SDAS text is the only one in the entire first section of AKL in which three names rather than two are placed on a single line, with both Ešašu and Šar-eru cramped together inside the left half-column. The similarity of the two names and the similarity of the signs ša and šar lead all to the suspicion that the two names are really dou-
bles, and that originally only one name was in-
tended for the space. It is possible, then, that some ambiguity developed at an early stage about the name intended at this point—perhaps as a result of damage to a prototype text— which resulted itself into the text as follows: Names in the manuscript tradition in which AKL has come down to us. The SDAS text preserves the arrange-
ment in which the scribes originally copied it, and includes both names in his total of seventeens for the entire section. If Ešašu and Šar-eru are then to be considered as variant correspondences to Namšu, or Nagel of GHD, it is in the form as given in GHD that must be considered to be authentic if the name is to be equated with a well-known similarly spelled toponymic name in Babylonian (see commentary to the individual lines below).

For the equation Namšu, Našu, we must start with the assumption that Našu can represent nothing else but the well-known tribal and geographic name of the Old Babylonian period Našu/Nagel (Nomel). Whatever the cause for the name being written as Namšu in GHD rather than its more usual spelling, it is likely that the "Našu" form of the prototype AKL text preserved the name in its more normal form. Having begun to interpret the names as "Našu-ša-eru" (or the like), the scribes' eyes may have wandered back to the name just previ-
ously entered, Šar-eru, and as a result digraphed -ša-eru in error after the šar, rather than the in-
tended -ša-eru, the result being thereafter per-
petuated in the ms. family of AKL that has come down.

If these two last equations are ultimately proved valid, then we shall have accounted for the first eleven names in GHD (counting two names in each of the first three lines) with the first eleven names in AKL. But even if these two equations are to be rejected, nine out of the eleven names in AKL are accounted for in GHD beyond any reasonable doubt. There can therefore be no question but that the genealogical traditions of the Hammurapi dynasty and those of the Aryan King List—the first two sections of which must almost certainly be identified as the "Aha-nepiri" of Samsi-
Addu—1 are one and the same name in they represent a consciousness of tribal origins.

Comments to the individual names, by line number.

1. The only plausible way in which Harshašu could have turned into the A-she-še-šu of our text is to assume that the source used by the scribe for the name was a written one, in which the name began with the signs Šar-Šar-bar, with the Semitic phonetic value of ar-sur or as-ša—Akl. er-re-asu(m) "miller." The word is known from the Old Babylonian period, being found in personal names, and may have thus been under-
stood by the writer of the present text, or, alter-
natively, he might have simply etymologized the name and coinuted it with the second name on the line—which he apparently no longer recog-
nized as a separate name—constructing the whole perhaps as "The Miller of Madakz". The form of the name given in AKL and in the Babyloniaca text, Haršašu or Haršašu, is almost certainly the original and correct one. Like Madakz, it was a tribal geographical name to begin with. 8

It is difficult to decide which of the two versions of the name is a closer approximation to the "original" name, Tustiga of AKL, or Tustiga(ha) of GID. The likelihood is that both forms are garbled versions of a name that originally came down in an oral tradition. At some point in the background of the GID tradition there must have arisen the notion that the name or element is to be considered as a West Semitic nominal form of *Qā'a, as, e.g., in the names Ḥawwīyā, Ṭawīyah, possibly also Ṣawwīyā (אבגד). If Tustiga is to be considered closer to the original, one might think of Ḥawwīyā "high" or "lying behind the name, which would conform well with the known utilization of animal names as Semitic tribal designations, and would parallel in this respect the name Ḥawwīyā. (AKL, no. 2 = GID) "march."  

It is even more difficult to choose between Ṣawwīyā (GID) and Ṣawwīya (AKL). In favor of the GID tradition is the fact that it represents the clearest parallel, in distinction to West Semitic connotations, and "unramifies" the Semitic tribe or tribes, which are otherwise conspicuously absent in the GID set, and indeed stronger evidence for the best known of the West Semitic or "Amorite" tribal names of the Old Babylonian period. Yet in this context it is precisely the familiar ring of the name which makes its antiquity suspect, for it may represent only the attempt on the part of the scribe, either deliberately or inadvertently, to impose a form familiar and meaningful to him of a more that had somehow come into his scriptural or non-semantic form. For Ṣawwīyā, while on the surface having the form of a possible compound Semitic personal name, it is not a way to be compared with Bālamūš (line 15 of GID), Ḥawwīyā, or fragment in form of Ṣawwīyā (in charge of house of deity). Ṣawwī(yā) is a Wes-preteric verb, "to speed," so in the other sense of the same word, as that which the name or element is to be considered as a Semitic nominal form of *Qā'a, the name Tustiga.  

11. O. W. Goetz, König und Marriage in Early Assur 140-108, 229 f. Note also the number of animal names among the names of the first text collection after the "Flood" in the Semitic King List, Amarna 175 XI 74, 75 f.  
12. Krueger op. cit., suggests another explanation of Ṣawwīyā, as "companion women."  
13. Hoffman, "Amorite Personal Names of the Assur Texts," has called into question the Benjamite gen- erally preferred view that the verbal element in these names is now "dโช" on the ground that other derivatives, hand, there are better grounds for viewing AKL's Adam as being closer to the original name. This, there is the name of a City of Adumon known in the place records, and from the name Adam the better known place name Adumon, occurring as well in the Old Babylonian Empire from Laxe.  
14. Finally, Adam occurs as a personal name of a woman in the Old Babylonian texts from Carchar Bābūm. The weight of the present evidence would therefore seem to favor the version of the two names as given in AKL, yet a ready and fast preference is not yet warranted.  

5. Assuming that the line concerns two names rather than one, on the basis of AKL, the first line to be settled is the distinction between the two names, since the forms given in both sources ensure the suspicion that whatever the original names might have been, they were totally misunderstood and garbled in both sources. On the ground that AKL stresses on the whole to preserve a more reliable tradition about these early ceremonial names — if only by virtue of its retention of some separate names in the first line (which, GID, there had already preserved them as three names — would prefer to divide the GID line on the basis of the parallel pair of AKL thus: Ṣawwīyā and Sep/Yāyā (Sep/meh). Landoltberger suggests, however, the division of the line as Vayippēa and Ṣawwī(yā), which, on first blush, appears to ring true that it would give us the same Adumon in the same tribal name in the Old Babylonian period, possibly in addition to 303 mention in the present text on the personal and place name. But once again, it is precisely because of its division that I should discard this evidence. Among all the tribal names preserved in both AKL and GID, more interesting is the etymology of Babylonian and Adumon from the second millennium BC onward as identical to the Akkadian, which,
towards the end of that millennium, became the most-visited shrine in the state, owing to the fact that it housed the remains of Lord Buddha. The temple complex is an important pilgrimage site for Buddhists from around the world. It is believed that the temple was originally constructed as a small structure by King Ashoka. Over the centuries, the temple has undergone several renovations and expansions, making it one of the largest and most well-maintained temples in India.

The temple complex is surrounded by a large moat, and there are several smaller shrines and pavilions within the temple grounds. The main shrine houses a large statue of Lord Buddha, which is believed to be the oldest surviving statue of the Buddha. The temple also houses a library with thousands of ancient manuscripts, as well as a museum that displays artefacts related to the history and philosophy of Buddhism.

The temple complex is an important centre for Buddhist education and is home to several monasteries and convents. It is visited by thousands of pilgrims and tourists every year, who come to pay their respects to the Buddha and to learn more about the teachings of Buddhism.
Upper Euphrates region, loosely allied with the Turkestan and the Yarkand, the four together being identified by the Manichaean administration as the Yarkand ("Southern") Turkestan. The Anarshas—or Amurath, as the name was probably first pronounced and occasionally still written—probably constituted one of the descents of the Alorante tribes who contributed to the downfall of the Ur III Dynasty in the south of Sumer, for by the middle of the late Dynasty period, elements of this tribe assumed the dominant political role in Ur, where Shajdat founded an independent dynasty, styling himself "King of Amurath" in addition to taking some of the more traditional elements of Mesopotamian royal titulary. This royal family of Ur was allied to the Hammurabi Dynasty at least by marriage, and the recently discovered correspondence of the dynasty in Ur proves that the Akkadian-Yahhur royal confederations of Northern Babylonia was periodically called upon by the Ur kings for military support. 11. I know of no analogue to the first element of this name. Were the potestis potextis intended, one might have expected the writing sp-te rather than sp-t. It is possible to connect with apyn(m) "yield, tribute" (CAD T 1714a, Littm 858). 12. The interpretation of this name is rendered especially difficult by virtue of the orthographic antiquity that afflicts each of its component radicals. If a West Semitic derivation is to be looked for, one might be reminded of the Biblical Balaam, but the etymology of that name is itself obscure. 13. Perhaps to be explained as sám(m) + šalatija "the Name of the king" and thus similar in construction to the name Shamashu. Note the writing of **š** in this form and in line 20, in contrast to **š** in line 7. 14. May be understood as "The Guilt (simn) of Aha-ba." For the first component as a WS deity of Noah, HPO 122 2. For parallelism to the orthography note Nis-iq-pa-di (Yagm-mesha) in the seal-legend of RUt XIII (1936) 8. Similarly 20. Anušas, 499 2, 222 167. 21. On this dynasty and its relations with the earlier kings of the Hammurabi Dynasty, see now Palmanarian, Babylonian Archives 2 (1936) 20 2. On the same, see also (13) 12. 22. Cf. Nit-ah, IAR 238, Kuehler-Sabatier Biblical of Hebrew-Latin lexicons of (1936) 12 17. 23. Ya-us-q-pu-ka, Ed. 335 9; vs the parallel Ya-us-ki-pu-ku-M, ibid. 228 (VAS XI 104) 45. 24. Probably identifies with the name Akka-smu-ur, Lagman, Le Temps des Rois d'Ur, no 707: 12. 25. 30-19. It is especially unfortunate that the text is damaged at this point, for it is virtually certain that the names contained in those lines were authentic inscriptions, and were probably the immediate ancestors of Shamashu. No, 16 recalls the name š2-šiya-kk-ui, VAS II 25 17; which Edzard (ZER 128) interprets as šiya-aššu-um-an, on grounds which I fail to see, other than the absence of the name Shamashu of the Old Babylonian Dynasty of Kish. What does seem to be clear is that in the "Literate" text just cited, a number of names are interposed among the names of the En-kings, who do not belong to that dynasty, but those names, which follow upon that of Bar-Suma (line 11), are only fragmentarily preserved. Line 15 thus offers a name, šk šiya-an, which Edzard (loc. cit.) tentatively equates with Yamdat-sh, a local ruler of Mari of the Old Babylonian period? Line 17 of the same text... 25. On the composition of this name see note 13 above. 26. See lastly IVS 145 6. Whether šiya-šiya-ki-un can be restored in the later text will depend on the relation of the title of the text read by Edzard as MA. 36. It would of course be tempting to restoring that line with equal the names in line 17 of the text, but the text seems to be against it. Edzard, already noted in his preface to VAS II p. 17, the text is not of southern origin, despite its concern in the section with king kings, but of Babylonian provenance, either from Sippar or Babylon. Indeed, careful scrutiny of all the lines in the "Literate" text following the mention of Bar-Suma (line 24) suggests that C. Frank's assumption (Kudittin 41) that the name of the late king is inaccurate, is supported in subsequent lines, e.g., Shamashu in line 25 and Damigu-ššu in line 27, it being very shaky. It is already established that the name is line 18, 21, and 22 cannot be those of his kings. Of the names in lines 27, 21, and 25 not a single trace is preserved so that Frank also leaves these passages blank in his transcription. But in line 24 there seems to be a verbal wedge at the end of the broken sign, and this would not support any form of writing of the name of Shamsu, i.e., either šiya-šiya-ki-un or šiya-šiya-ki-un. It would seem on the other hand perfectly with the restoration of the time Ash-Shu (vestibule at end of line) that all the names were written with šiya-šiya-ki-un, and in line 27 the signs-CUR after the break does not easily support a reading of 4-šiya-šiya-ki-un, but would equally well if not better, support the restoration of the name as šiya-šiya-ki-un. In short, whatever one might consider the same name in lines 19 and 25...
it is of course hazardous to attempt to explain what is meant precisely by the poet’s in that text, but the one that might most readily come to mind would be something like “age, era, etc.” Thus, the poet Sūlu might not even be just the reign of that king, but of the entire Third Dynasty of Ur, identified by the longest lived and most ex- cellular monarch of that dynasty. What is de- noted by the last, poet Sūlu (2490), is self-evident. It is the second of these poems, Amurru, which is of greatest interest, however, and it seems to the present writer inevitable that [45 of this text, BAR 415 MART 72, should be brought into a form of relation to it. In view of its position between the two, Sūlu and the next, it can hardly be doubted that it represents the middle part of a chronologio sequence. As such it might well denote the entire period between the downfall of the third Dynasty of Ur and the end of the First Dynasty of Babylon, an age characterized by a series of longer or smaller kingdoms for the most part organized or dominated by families of Amorite or West Semitic origin. Using the poet Sūlu as a more exact analogy, however, it might well be supposed that the poet Amurru denoted more specifically the First Dynasty of Babylon, which, alone among all the Amorite dynasties established in Mesopotamia during the “Second Intermediate” period, was able under Hammurapi to achieve the unification of all of Babylonia, Assyria, the Upper Euphrates, and Amorites, thereby estab- lishing its renown in the later historiographi- cal, and literary tradition. In other words even if the “poet” Sūlu may be thought to embrace the entire “period” between the Ur III period and that of the Kassites, the same life for this “poet” might have denoted more specifically the Amurru- dynasty period, that of Babylon. Assuming that there is at least some overlapping of definition between the poet Amurru and the next, it is of our text, we must suppose that line 29 denotes that portion of the genealogy beginning with Amurru and ending with the poet Amurru, that is to the end, i.e., to Amurru. Having already decided in our answer to question (1) that GUD is to be considered as a single chronologio sequence, it now follows that the remaining spec- trum must be answered thus: 

2b) The meaning of h a a a’s “parallel” the genealogical list. Furthermore, the fourth of these
by the document. Therefore, to be succeeded by the head of the successor, just as he had, upon his own accession, installed a king that took over from that of his predecessor. The natural extension of this notion is that of "dynasty," which is a series of consecutive incumbents of a throne, as discrete from one another, such terms. But the notion of "dynasty" as used in the cuneiform sources is peculiar to certain Mesopotamian notions about past political history and does not include the idea of a "Dynastic Line", i.e., a "royal list" based on some real or imagined degree of consanguinity such as is familiar to us from the more recent traditions of Europe. These connotations of "dynasty" were in fact alien to Mesopotamian thought.

The Mesopotamian conception of a "dynasty" as denoted by 

(b) is best exemplified by the Sumerian King List (abbrev. SKL), and more particularly in a series of texts of SKL which supplemented as a single "family", two of which, and , were expanded in the middle period of the First Dynasty of Babylon, the Shulgi, the Kassite, and the Babylonian. This group of texts is distinguished by its use of the expression 

(b) to indicate dynastic change, i.e., the transfer of the Kingship from one city to the city which succeeded it as, so to speak, "heir" to the Kingship, and (b) city (city) of the "dynasty of city". The controlling element in the concept is the eschatological function of the expression of the Kingship of the city: a specific city for a longer or shorter period of time; it is of no consequence whether or not the succession of the kings of one such single (b) constituted a chain of a single family who followed each other in some acceptable form of succession (e.g., father-son or brother-son). This is in contrast to the numerous instances in which SKL united any chronological division between a sequence of two or more kings of a "Dynastic Line", whereas, in other sequences, such indications are provided, and the applicability of the term (b) in those instances such as the "Dynasty of Ur" or the "Third Dynasty" of Urartu, where the "Dynasty" consisted of but a single king. Most telling of all, however, is the

40. Jacobsen, AS 41 (1936) 71; (on the family relationships of these two men, see Tod, p. 48. Note also Krauss, ZA N.F. 15 (1942) 55.

41. As it happens, the example of this male family, being all fragmentary texts, no longer preserves the socioeconomic implications of this phenomenon, but it remains in
peculiar feature of SKL, as demonstrated by Jacobsen, that even in certain instances where a sequence of rules in a particular city constituted a dynasty in the modern, or historical sense, as known from other sources, the author of SKL apparently wrenched that sequence out of its single line of successive rulers. This the author of SKL did, not out of ignorance of the historical record in such instances—the opposite must be presumed to have been the case—but because his own peculiar understanding of the baala, with which the whole idea of "The Kingship" is ecstatically bound up, was of paramount importance, and the fact that in a single city an orderly succession of kings of one family occupied the throne was at best subordinated to the controll ing notion. This the baala, even in the sense approximating that of "dynasty", retains the fundamental notion of a "turn"—i.e., the onset of one during which a particular city theoretically held sway by virtue of the fact that it is at that stretch of time, the "Kingship" was believed to have "reigned" there. In the view of the author of SKL, some cities, e.g., Uu and Uruk enjoyed a number of such turns, others but a single turn, and still others—cities such as Lagash, which were known to have enjoyed wide political influence—were omitted from the scheme altogether. Even in the larger cities, therefore, the baala is a segment of time, a period of influence or dominion. The way to render the baala in any given context will depend wholly on the name of reference of that context.

What then is the frame of reference of line 29-32—more exactly, from 29-31—of the present text? This would appear to be a "history" of the West Semitic tribes, the extension of their political influence through time and space, even though the formula characterizing this group of rules was used throughout S kl. Note too Jacobsen's view that the author of the prototype "Y" line of this first family "interpreted his text of the King List to a thorough grammatical revision" (fbd. ff.). This revision was by no means limited to the introduction of the formula discussed here. May one conclude from this evidence that the extension of the old notion of the baala to include such lines as "dynasty" terms and their "turns", was original with the newly settled "Jewish people after the Ur period"?—

42. Jacobsen, fbd. 123 ff.

pecially in the settled lands of the riverine plain, all of which is coordinated with the historical traditions of Sumer and Akkad that had already been assimilated by dynasties of Western Semitic origin since acculturated in Mesopotamia, and articulated by means of a concept, the baala, which was adapted from this older tradition in order to "historize", as it were, their native geomorphological traditions. The time span involved appears to begin with the Gannan dynasty, ca. 2200 B.C., continuing to Amnaliyan's own time, i.e., about 200 years. The three successive "paths" of Urnigirs, (Gudub), Yaruru, and (Sirah) Amurrirs are thus to be understood as three successive "ages" or "eras" or "dynasties" (as the same used in S Kl) into which West Semitic tribal history can be aligned from the vantage point of Amurriru's dynasty, of that of the Hammurapi dynasty in general. The fact of these is almost certainly to be synchronized in some way with the Gannan domination in Mesopota mia after the breakup of the Akkadian Empire, and it might therefore be supposed that the "paths" which is not recorded on this tablet" (line 32) embraces the Akkadian period and all preceding ages. Such a four-path abbaba was felt necessary by virtue of the fact that the existence of these periods in Mesopotamian history was known to the authors and readers of the Old Babylonian period, but no individual names were known to the "genealog ical" court of the city of Hammurapi. Dynasty preceding that of Amurriru's dynasty, and a number of his successors, were thought by the Hammurapi family to have been Gutians. Rather the first group of names in Gudub were conceived as having lived or "ended" at a time when the Gutians were thought to have been the overlords in the area where these early West Semitic ancestors were believed to have flourished. Evidence in support of this interpretation can be culled from other sources.

1. It has long been recognized that in Southern Mesopotamia the impact of the Gannan "Dynasty", as given in SKL, is hardly to be detected.

43. The Shaman dice used here follow the "incant atory" terminology for convenience only.

For the exact record statement see Gudub, CTA 10, 91, line 45: The Gannan kings have left ..., very little mark on Babylonian history, and very few moun-
It is in fact recognized that this "dynasty," credited by SKL, with a rule of 91 years, in actual fact overlapped with the Akkad Dynasty to a great extent, leaving a gap between the last known ruler of the Akkad Dynasty, Šu-Turul (ca. 2139-2114), and Unu-Edin, the vanquisher of the last Guti ruler (Tirikku), ca. 2139, of little more than thirty years. Nevertheless, the impact of the "invasion" was so strongly felt in Mesopo- tamian historiography and related literary tra- ditions that it cannot be dismissed: the Gutians must have established themselves strongly some- where in the Mesopotamian plain not in Sumur and Akkad proper. There is sufficient evidence that this invasion was the Upper Euphrates. In other words, there is reason to believe that the Gutian "horde," like the Elamites about 20 years after them, established their main stronghold in the Upper Euphrates region, intermingling with West- ern Semitic tribes, who constituted at this time the dominant ethnic strain in the area, but who at that time were incapable of achieving or retaining political control of their own territory. 

a) The inscriptions of Šu-turul. Though few in number, these derive from the region of Bass and Eshnunna, and indicate that this last king of the Akkad Dynasty, whose SKL credits with a reign of fifteen years, retained within his control the immediate provinces of Akkad and at least part of the Diyala region. Had the Gutian invasion of the Mesopotamian plain come directly from their homeland in the Zagros mountains in the East against the heartland of the Akkad empire one might have expected the Eshnunna region to be among the first to have fallen under their con- trol, and this appears to have been the case. The evidence from Ashur, where, there was a violent destruction of the Ishtar temple of the Akkad period, suggests that the descent of the Gutians into the plain took a strategy directed well to the north of Akkad proper, with Ashur lying in their direct path westwards.

b) A striking number of apparently Gutian names are found in the Old Babylonian tablets from Choga Zanbil, including the same Šu-ti- ka-an, which is already recognized by Gadd— is identical with the name of the last datal last ruler of the Gutian dynasty. Other names in these texts with the ending -an are Aššu-šu-an and Meš-ša-ša-an. That these ought to be equally understood as Gutian is suggested by the name Bi-ga-an, found in an unpublished Old Babylon- ian tablet from the vicinity of Sippur or Kish, who is identified in the text as a šu man Ga-an. This suggests the additional possibility that a group of names in the same texts with the ending -an ought not to be read as Semitic (i.e., An or En), but also as Gutian. This group would then include the names Bi-ša-an, Iq-ša-an, Ki-eš- ma-an, ku-ša-an, Ki-eš-ša-an, U-ša-an, Ešša-an, Zā-ša-an, Iri-ša-an, Ešša-an, Ku-eš-ša-an, Ki-eš-ša-an, and Tu-šal-ša-an.

c) It is significant, in this respect, that the names of the Gutian dynasty after the first ten, as given in SKL, suddenly turn Semitic, some even West Semitic. Of the seven Gutian kings begin- ning with Kurršu (1st in the series) who bear Semitic names, Bēdalas is definitely West Semitic, and this is possibly true of his two predeces- sors, Lāršum and Irnīšu. Noteworthy too is the fact that in the next generation, again Semitic, the line begins with Manu (3rd in the series) who bears a Gutian name, Handbook is definitely West Semitic, and this is possibly true of his two predeces- sors, Lāršum and Irnīšu. Noteworthy too is the fact that in the next generation, again Semitic, the line begins with Manu (3rd in the series) who bears a Gutian name, 

The application of the ethno-geog. (or the like) to certain individuals in Old Babylonian texts whose names are either Akkadian or Amorite. This is true of one West Semitic, who is associated with a Mandák-Nírat, 9 PA-MÁRÉTU, in one of the 13th-annum tests dealing with wine prisoners [Pana], and in the West records, see Yaka-Dubba, as described in Qa-ubu. 11 This suggests that in the post-Gutian period, especially after the West Semitic tribes had come into their own politically, the Gutians still dwelling among them gradually merged with the ethnic majority culturally, and even in communities, but remaining clearly distinct from that majority.

On the basis of the foregoing, one might even be tempted to construct the bare outline of the Gutian "interregnum" in Mesopotamian history along the following lines: Possibly as early as Naram-Sîn, the Gutian began to drift into the Mesopotamian plain, the main brunt of their concentration being in the North and Northeast rather than in Sumer and Akkad. Then they constituted from the first isolated ethnic islands in a Semitic sea, but gradually became "Akkadianized" to even "Aryanized" culturally and linguistically, yet retaining for long time some consciousness of their ethnic distinctiveness, very much like the Assyrian First Dynasty of Babylon more than 900 years later. At the time of the Gutian incursions, however, the West Semitic tribes were not politically united or otherwise effectively organized, existing the Gutian minority to seize political control of the region. An analog is available also for this situation in the history of the second millennium when, around 1300 B.C., a sort of Indus-Aryan element was able to seize and maintain political control over much the same territory at a time when it was largely populated by Hittites. In seizing this control, however, the Gutians came into conflict with the kings of the Akkadian dynasty.
occurred even earlier, as either assumption there could not have been any appreciable difference in time, and the conflict would have been the same. The Amorites, as West Semites, thereby took firm control of the Western and Upper Euphrates, an area in which the last Third Dynasty of Ur exerted only nominal authority.8 In the traditions of the leading class of these peoples, a sack, Suhu, or similar pan dominating the Ur III period, who not only contributed to, but also commented on the points they established were their own. Indeed, within three generations of the founding of the Ur III dynasty, under Su-ili, a "Chimer Wall"9 had to be constructed somewhere to the Northwest of Ur in a vain effort to keep the Amorites from further invading the Sumerian heartland, as the downfall of the Ur Dynasty only a generation later was to prove.

2. The evidence from chronology. (a) In the Urtext inscription of Samsi-Addu, the king states that seven "generations" (še-Sara, l. 188) elapsed between the death of Akkad and his own, which presumably means his accession as king of Assyria (ca. 1180) released from it, in which he scored the town of Naram. a. 144 (f). There are, to be sure, serious difficulties that impair the utilization of this datum for precise chronological purposes. It cannot yet be determined whether Samsi-Addu ought to be understood in this context approximately as per Agade, i.e., the seventh of the Amorite power, or in some sense approximating "definite," or "cool," which might better fit the context. Nor can a precise definition be given the term in years of time, it is almost certainly a normal or ideal human life-span, and has been variously interpreted as denoting sixty or seventy years.10 The details are nevertheless important for us in that it proves that there already existed for Samsi-Addu—as there existed for later Assyrian kings down to Esarhadon11—perfectly reliable documents as well as traditions that afforded him a substantially accurate conception of elapsed time extending back some four to five hundred years.12 Bearing in mind that the genealogies of a KI. (the first two sections) and GHD must, at least in part, over the period of time described under Samsi-Addu's seven days, it might be profitable to scrutinize the number of those ancestors in the two documents. In AKI this number is twenty-six, omitting Ugila and Apištu in the second section, as they are already accounted for in the first section. In GHD, counting six names in the first three lines rather than three, the number of predecessors of Hammurapi is twenty-seven. Since we know that the later survived Samsi-Addu by some thirty years, the error count of the two genealogies in this respect is almost untenable. Several of the same names in either list are evidently artificial or apocryphal, this apparent agreement might be dismissed as chance coincidence. Before doing so, however, it would be wise to consider the time-span covered respectively by the two genealogies to the same point. The first task will be to assign a mean average for the two genealogies, regarding which neither of the two sources offers any testimony. For the period in question there exists, however, parallel information from other sources, as follows:

11. The kings of Amor (1857-1714); average: the first fifteen years.
12. Twenty kings of Larsa (2052-1734); average: the first fourteen years.
13. Five kings of Babylon (pre-Hammurapi) (1904-1833); average: twenty years.

These, it should be remembered, are mean averages for relatively stable "dynasties" in settled areas, even though the genealogy has covered a "mixed" dynasty. But the first section of AKI, and the earlier part of GHD— and in AKI, explicitly— refer to actual, stable, and territorially defined kingdom, but in a congeries of bedouin tribes, clans, and their sheikhs. With almost perpetual wars, raids, and a more harmless
way of life generally, the period of its incumbency of their leaders — even when they styled themselves as "kings" — must have seen, on the average, comparatively shorter than those of the kings of Jain, brake, and Babylon. For this early period, a better analogy is provided by the Gutian "dynasty" which, according to SKL, consisted of no less than twenty-one kings, who reigned, however, for a total of only ninety-one years (and forty days), i.e., with an average incumbency of less than five years each. Yet even of this information is assumed to be reliable, it might well reflect a highly artificial situation even for non-ruled times and places, making it impossible to draw upon the Gutian information for a parallel to the earliest patterns of the GDI and AKL genealogies. The analogy is cited only in support of the choice of the fifth year — the lowest average incumbency for the three historical dynasties cited above — as a hypothetical and liberal average for the entire series of ancestors given in both the AKL and GHD genealogies, taking note of the fact that these descendants run for a period of about 500 years. 20. A situation that was perhaps analogous to the prevailing in Mari at the time of Yawel-Hus in which, if the first-step mentioned (181.3-180.64) 5 years of his life, the situation of "seven years, kings of Babylon" (l'awwa) ab-bad-zi-a" at a time when in his own history, he is described as "king of the land of Babylon," and 20. At the time of Mari and Text. 21. Further Kuper, Nimes, 22. 21. It need hardly be pointed out that five today, and during the time, the importance of the vertical point of view, the life expectancy of adult males has

figure of 390 to 420, or even with the round figure of 400, the precise elapsed time between Tudaya and Sanat-it-Adi to put aside显正义 for us as the fact that an any of these figures, by backward look, reckoning from the Atroclous year of Sanat-it-Adi in 1823 — or from Sanat-it-Adi's accession perhaps one year later — we shall have reached back up to the period of the later Akkadian rule, with whom the entire Gutian dynasty were contemporaneous. We may, therefore, to the conclusion that the genealogies of Sanat-Adi and Hammurapi, represented respectively by the first two sections of AKL and GHD, span a period of about four hundred years (reckoning in GHD only to Hammurapi), going back to the time during which the Gutians had obtained a foothold in Mesopotamia, approximately during the reigns of Samsuilul-ili so soon thereafter, i.e., c. 2320 B.C. or slightly later. This leads to the further conclusion that the text. 22. Of paragraph 31 refers in fact to the period of the Gutian "dynasty" or "interregnum" of SAK, which historically overlapped largely with the later kings of the Akkadian Dynasty. Thus, the earliest group of ancestors in GHD who are parallel to their contemporaries in AKL, who, however, are not preserved in the historical genealogies, or as is more likely — a "dummie name" "artificially" conceived (by utilization of tribal geographical names) in order to fill out gaps in time, or "incumbencies", were contemporary with these Gutian dynasts of SAK.

"We may thus turn to the question: at what point in GHD does the text Gustium end and the text of Samsi-ilulil begin? The answer will be obvious; With the early Gutian name "Hammurapi" appearing in the first line of the genealogy. The six names of the first three lines of GHD represent therefore the earliest West Semitic "Schechiru" lineage. The tradition, and were conceived as being coeval with the Gutian period of the Sumerian tradition. It is noteworthy that if these six names may be said to account for the barely pointed the figure of Gutium. Sanat-Adi was therefore using his term that it is educable of a figure, probable that the name Samsi-ilulil is an expression excepted in the south names when a particularly "blinded" individual obtained the "topol of the race" of ancient Gutium or some other place.

23. The term was used by W. R. Smith, op. cit., 46 to describe the "value of artistic names" without the "real name of a man" (for c. 60) and is utilized by Kupper (op. cit.), in the same way, in connection with the tribal genealogical traditions.
entire period of ninety-one years assigned by SKL to the Gutian "interregnum" the shortest im-
reminiscence for each turns out to be almost precisely fifteen years, the average figure suggested earlier.
RABN'S shows. It was already suggested above that the genealogies of the West Semitic tribes took no account of the Ur III Dynasty, despite the retention in the learned Earlier, tradition of lesser times of a RABN Suq that might have denoted this dynasty as a whole, and that this notation is probably to be ascribed to the rela-
tive independence of the West Semitic tribes at this time from real control by the kings of Ur. Their position vis-à-vis the Ur III kings might be contrasted with the position of Assyria at the same time, which was firmly in the grip of the Sumerian monarchs of the South. 66 From the standpoint of Sardan-Ahad, a monarch conscious of his Æneas affiliations—or for that matter, from the standpoint of the family of Zuîtiq in Mari, the age-
old rival of the Sardan-Ahad family in its pretensi-
ons and aspirations for pre-eminence among the Æneas tribes and clans—the Æneas pose, if they conceived of this notion at all, would have continued in uninterrupted fashion at least from the end of the Sardan-Ahad onward to his own day. But it is even more likely that no division at all was recognized by Sardan-Ahad among his pre-
sumed forebears from Tudaya onward, other than that the first seventeen of them still "lived in the tents." As far as he was concerned they were all Æneas. In short, it appears that the genealog-
ists of Sardan-Ahad were really not concerned, as their contemporaries in Babylonia were, to divide the genealogical history of their royal family in terms of pubs, and this might account for the placement of the eponymous Æneas in the sixth position in the AKL sequence as contrasted with the seventh position of Æneas in GHD. It will already have been noted, moreover, that AKL and GHD, while agreeing in the placing of the first six names in their respective lists, are in disagree-
ment as to the sequence of these names. GHD

66. As proved by its kibbutzim etc., who was
appointed to his post under Sardan-Ahad, it was in the reign of Amor-Bel, during which time he dedicated the Temple of Amor-Bel, and was later transferred to the Temple of the Sun God, TBAT 21:59
If the kibbutzim of Mari during the same period, . . . any real allegiance to the Ur III kings, it is not included in any of their surviving inscriptions.

would seem to be focused, quite naturally, on the Anorite pose, and concede to the Æneas only their priority in time, and a total of only two in-
surmountable Æneas (Æneas), Naam (Æneida) (Æneas (Æn) ARC/2), Distrak (Æneas), Zuîtiq (Æneas (Æn-
on), also); Naam (Æneas) (Æneas); since it is only up to this point in GHD that the names can be in any way be seen to parallel those of AKL. It might be supposed, then, that the inauguration of the Æneas, according to the tradition of GHD, and in accordance with the reconstruction of Gutian history suggested above, coincided with the defeat of Telispis by Ur-Arkap, ca. 2190 B.C., or even somewhat earlier.

BALF ADAN MARI. It is not difficult to identify the point in GHD where the Anorite pose was believed to have been commenced by the family of Yammati. Beginning with Amudan, line 9, no. 19, AKL and GHD take their separate ways. Am-
dunan, together with Yammu, line 10, no. 13, are the two tribes or clans with which the Yam-
mati Dynasty is most closely identified. Also after these two names in GHD are the last in the series that can be positively identified as tribal names; it is probably safe to say that all the names in GHD beginning with Yiptamud, line 14, line 11, constitute a tradition about real personalities, even if some of these names might have come down to the time of Amor-Bel in corrupt form. Not the possibility be excluded that from this point onward, the series of names also constitute the mythical pedigrees of Yammati, even if we re-
main in ignorance of the locale in which these figures exercised their "kingship" or "sheishp-
ship." The new series support from the Mari archeologists from which we know that the Am-
matu and Yammu tribes were constituent of the group known to the local authorities as the 'gub or "sons of the South."" The latter claim to the effect are to be taken at face value. These ummnite Yammati tribes, spread through all of Upper Mesopotamia and Syria in heavy concentrations, were in turn related
to other sections of clans of the same tribes who at the same time or even earlier had inhabited Sumer and Akkad, where they became for the most part sedentary and "Akkadized" although retaining at the same time the consciousness of their Amorite tribal origins, as is proved by the Harranians and in the case of the Ur Dynasty of Sin-Marduk. In the strict sense, therefore, the genealogy of the Hamassrians Dynasty proper may be said to begin with the name of Ammuzus. But in the strictest sense of all, this genealogy may be thought to begin only with the name of Ishpiyuwalla, and for two reasons: (1) Ammuzus and Ishpiyuwalla, patently Egyptian names of tribes probably fill an "island" innumerable, the geographical tradition apparently having no knowledge of names prior to Ishpiyuwalla; (2) territorially and chronologically, these two names fill innumerable blanks for locations that in time and place (the South of Sumer and Akkad and even Babylon) would have been under the strict control of the Ur Dynasty kings. For by dead reckoning backwards from the accession year of Samsuiluna in 2170, and operating with our mean innumerable figure of fifteen years, we arrive at year 2692 for a hypothetical "cession of Ammuzus." But this turns out to be the 28th year of Sulu, a time in which it is hardly conceivable that an Amorite tribal chief in Babylon would have been able to wrestle against an Assyrian army in Babylon proper. It is therefore safe to view the two "mysterious" names of Ammuzus and Ishpiyuwalla as representative of a period of relatively innumerable innumerable of Babylonians of the tribe so named, under the watchful eyes of the Ur Dynasty. The beginnings of the political autonomy of these tribes may then be said to have occurred under the leadership of a tribal chief in the name of Ishpiyuwalla, or something like it, and this event may be tentatively placed at ca. 2029 B.C.E. I.e., the beginning of the reign of Ibbi-Sin, the last of the Ur Dynasty. Considering, however, that we have been utilizing the fifteen-year average innumerable figure in a somewhat rigid manner until this point, it would be safe to allow some flexibility in assigning a specific year, for this event. It is, nevertheless, clear from the foregoing that the royal beginnings of the Hamassrians family - in a feudal, not a sace, that was probably not Babylon - coincided almost exactly with the beginning of the Ila Dynasty under Ibbi-Sin (2017) and that of the Eanna Dynasty under Naram-Sin (2250). We may here summarize our estimate of the Kishohmauth of the genealogies of GHD and AKK, as distinct from their chronological and geographical interes- tent. For GHD this is a relatively easy matter. Beginning with the name of Ishpiyuwalla in line 11, it appears that the text offers an authentic record of the genealogy - or of the predecessors - of Samsuiluna. It is not at all certain that these names are in every instance preserved in their original and authentic form, nor that the actual sequence was historically exactly as given in this text. But it is safe to say that the names have an authentic ring, and none of them, at any rate, is otherwise known as a tribal or geographic name. The names cannot be said for the first time in the text. Almost all the names in those lines can be securely identified with names of tribes known to us from other sources, or as topographic names. Moreover, the first three lines of the text contain paired names that match similar pairs in AKK. This seems therefore to confirm the suggestion that these lines consisted of "rightful pairs of names," suggesting the possibility that this segment of the tradition was originally preserved as some kind of desert chant - perhaps as part of some epic of early tribal heroes - that seems to have been common to all the bedouin tribes in early Mesopota- mannian history, and which might have included some of the other sections of the tribal genealogy as well. Upon becoming settled and "civilized" in Babylon, it was felt necessary to harmonize and codify this tribal tradition in the accepted style of Mesopotamian historiography, by means of the concept of the paucis. Upon estab- lishing their own, independent kingdoms, written documents afforded them a reliable record of the true dynastic pedigree, and this was then linked up with the older tribal tradition to form the genealogical list preserved in GHD. This linkage may still be detected between Ishpiyuwalla, the last of the tribal names, and Ishpiyuwalla, the first of the authentic names, and this determination is re- inforced by the independent speculation that the transition from "numismatic" to "history" coincided with the end of the Ur Dynasty. AKK, as we now know, utilizes the same tradition found in GHD but, in contrast to the latter, 46. Cfr. Koss, "König" 4.
explores the tradition for a tradition's purpose. For although it appears that by the turn of the First Millennium BCE Assyrian learned circles accepted the tradition at face value as an authentic part of the Assyrian King List, it was equally apparent that at an earlier stage—perhaps during the lifetime of Shalmaneser I himself—it was utilized by papers concerned with legitimizing and justifying the claims of the Assyrian Adad line on the Assyrian throne. The original form of the document thus employed might well have been one that served a purpose similar to that of GED. Such a prototype document must have begun with the name "Assurbanipal" and continued with a series of names which are less true than tribal eponyms. This tradition—reflected more or less intact in the first section of AEL, the "seventeenth kings who lived in tents"—was then coupled to the authentic pedigree of Assurbanipal, beginning at least with Ishat, as demonstrated by Landsberger. This linkage thus corresponds to that detected in GED between the base tribal name Tal-Rummanu, a cycle to "...the list of Assyrian kings. The line of authentic 'native' Assyrian kings, that of Puzur-Adad I and his successors, had very likely compiled some form of king-list of its own, traced back to Uriyia, whose historicity in beyond question despite the absence of its inscriptions, since his building activities were known to such later Assyrian kings as Shalmaneser I and Assur-Nadin-apli and almost certainly to Sargon-Adad himself.26 The names of Uriyia and his son Assur-apli (if authentic) were only secondarily interpolated into the enlarged Sargon-Adad "Ahashenadu" (the first two-sections of AEL), either by Sargon-Adad himself or by the later.

67 See note 30 above.

68 For Shalmaneser, JAK 226 in which it might be of interest to note that Umayia (226) is acknowledged by S as an ancestor (226), but Assurbanipal is not, although in the parallel JAK 226 he is thus acknowledged. For Barhumadi, see Burger, AJO 13/3 9 p. 30 ff.

69 The Khid temple of Enlil in Ashur rebuilt by Assurbanipal and named by him Elambugi (JAK 226), would seem to be related to, if not identical with, the Elambugi temple rebuilt by Shalmaneser I (bid. 126 f.), which credits Uriyia with being the Egi builder, so that Assurbanipal must have known that fact too. Of JAK 22 note, with third 126 f. note 4, portions of his line. It cannot yet be decided whether this was accomplished by "wrenching apart" a real continuity in the original pedigree between Amurrak and Assurbanipal inscribing the two cycles of the known Assyrian kings between them, or whether it entailed a replacement of two earlier names, or "incompleteness" (2 and 3), that were, so to speak, "forced out" in order to accommodate the names of the two Assyrian rulers. At any event, it was from this time onward that the Assyrian Adad genealogy, thus altered, entered the stream of Assyrian tradition, ultimately gaining acceptance as an integral part of the Assyrian King List.

The genealogical traditions of the Hammurapi Dynasty and of the Urmi-Adad family may now be presented in the scheme on the following page.

IV

The Purpose of the Text (lines 83-143)

The final section of the text provides the necessary clue to the "...the list of their names are not recorded on this tablet."

33. The (soldier) who fell in the d. of their lord. The only established meaning for the personal name which might fit the present context is that of "...peril, hard times"; the meaning "defence" seems to be unsuited to the context, giving little point to the line. The idea seems to be that the famous foot-soldiers who gave their lives while in the service of their royal lords deserve to be preserved by the king at least as a collectivity on the occasions when the ancestors of the king are individually recalled by name. On this interpretation, the idea would appear to be analogous to the occasions especially set in our own times for

20. Having observed above (section 26) that the extent of twenty-six "assassins" of Assyrian in AEL is in perfect harmony with the extent of twenty-seven from the beginning of GED to Hammurapi, the chronic hess would be in favor of putting ancestors "X" and "Y" who were replaced by Ulhaya and Assurbanipal. This would also agree with the view expressed as to the "common sense of rules at times past, making it less likely that Sargon-Adad would have distorted this ape in order to accommodate the names of the two Assyrian kings.
commemorating the dead, particularly of those "Un-
known Dead" of national war. A conceptual
framework that would support such a service
might at first sight appear anarchistic in the
context of ancient Mesopotamian society, but if
we substitute the Babylonian king for the modern
"stake" of "victory" the war appeared not so far
forward. Denua here, and in the Haimunam
Lang 5211, must therefore mean nothing like
"victory" (campaign).71
- Lines 35-36. With these two stanzas the author
means to include in the memorial the dead royal
princes and公主esses, whose names are lost or
forgotten, yet who — by virtue of royal birth —
deserve to be recalled as a distinctive group.
71. Note the parallel use of personae later in these
lines 524, 525.

Line 35-36. In these lines we have at one
the last and most inclusive category of the soul who
are to be remembered on the occasion when this
text was read, and the most important class as to
what kind of occasion it was.

The key terms are ṯuḫḫu and Ġurum. Those
are activities having to do with the "carrying
and feeding of the dead. For the ṯuḫḫu in
"sacred contexts there are the following: in ṯuḫ-
ḫūtu, ṯuḫḫu, ṯuḫḫu, the šurum uṣuru. "Have you seen
the one whose ghost has no one to serve as its pū?
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the ghost who has none to recall the memorial service") (CT XVI 16 v 9 f).

The term adhara in this context presents some difficulty. A participle of adhara in the sense of "one who seeks or someone, or "a who seeks himself" with some activity, would not be inappropriate to the context, as, e.g., in the phrase adhara damati "one who seeks, or is solicitous for, the good," or as in adhara pastoru "one who is preoccupied with dining" (KAR 103 pbf. 12 [W. G. Lambert BWL 144]), and thus hope as "one who is solicitous, concerns himself with" the needs of the dead. Yet in the standard literature devoted to such mortuary activity, the term adhara, in contrast to papis, is not encountered. We find in its stead only the verb adhar in such or huru of the excerpt quoted above, and without specification of the noun java meaning "name" but nevertheless to be understood in the following quotation: uama ubhuma na mahusas na sabelu sa asupa in asupa in 054 "You, O ghost without any relation, who have none to bury you, nor to invoke your name?" (TLI 132 51 f.). Considering the close similarity of this line with its counterparts in our text, a suspicion is raised of some confusion or interference in the literary tradition between adhara and adhara/adhara, both of which activities might have been originally appropriate in the mortuary ceremonies. However close, one is inclined to interpret adhara in this context, it would be difficult to dissociate altogether the adhara in idea of our text and adhara in idea of the ritual text cited just above. The papisulu is probably to be understood as "necromancer," i.e., the one (normally a son or close relative) who sees to it that the dead ancestor or relative is provided with regular offerings of food and drink; the adhara would then be either a near-synonym of papisulu (for a picturesque variant of adhara) the one who invokes the ancestral spirit by name. In lines 36-38, Azanthes become is therefore seen to be invoking those (unfortuitously "orphanned") spirits at large — who, as the presence of relatives of their own to look after "the souls," must subsist on the standard hyperborean diet of dut and filthy water, or feast on the humus tributes to food on

72. I.e., a question whether this variation is to be interpreted as adhara example of the k/a/ interchange (see Arthur 1936) as well as being a "light display," or k/a/k illustration, "familiar," or ad example of near double verbs such as adhara/adhara "overthrow." 

73. R. A. S. ("Doctrines of Jakat") rev. 31 f., cf. CT 15 40 rev. 3 38, and Castellino, ZA N. S. 3. 1937 p. 49

their refuse" — inviting them to come once and share a "decent meal" with his own ancestors, in gratefulness for which they will heap blessings on their royal benefactor, together with the blessings expected from the spirits of his royal ancestors, predecessors, relatives, and their relations who died on the field of battle.

Lines 30-39. The restorations of the impromp' u labil' and 36 in this lines respectively are suggested in part by the traces of the poorly preserved sigla, and in part by the unmistakable context of the whole as a kipsa-offering to the dead (to be elaborated immediately below), which consisted of food and drink. The greatest amount of — but hardly varied — information about these kipsa offerings is to be found in the administrative archives of Mari, where a fairly standard offering of food and drink was made at the beginning and on the 16th day of every month as the kipsa to LULUM "the mortuary offering to the (dead) kings." These occasions were not all of equally "magico-scope, for in a letter from Kilas-Dagan of Tepha to Ezida-Lim, the latter is directed by divine channel through a "prophet" (magus) to offer a kipsa to the ghost (demum) of Yaldim-Lim, but that may have been a special offering occasioned by some extraordinary circumstance, of possibly greater relevance to the context of the present article is the letter of Yarsagi-Adad to his son Yasaq-adad in Mari, in which the king informs the latter of his scheduled arrival 74. Gilg. XII 153: hidabu dagatu dabilgi it is in the same spirit would include "the ghost who has no papisu" eats food-wraps from the food and bonfire embers that have been thrown into the street.

75. Professor Lassus suggests, whose only insight into the nature of the text and the present writer to identify it as a form of kipsa ceremony, suggests receiving the two verbs as "son" and "consumer." While it would appear that my own suggestions are more appropriate to the central act of the kipsa—the offering of food and drink —only a more careful analysis of the tablet might prove decisive. See the postscript at the end of this paper.

For this class of documentation cf. ANET VII 159; IX 261 f., X 145 f., XII 31, 26.

76. ANET XIII 40.
in Terras on the day of the hippom. This feature must be linked with the long known inscription of Sashid-Adad found as the site of Terras (Tell "Alalkh), which commemorates the king's con-


stagram at Terras of the S-kisi-giga (=Old King) dedicated to the god Dagon. A clue to the

kinds of ceremonies that took place in the building, in addition to the actual setting out of the hlap-o-

offering, is provided in line 7 of the inscription, in which the building is further described by the king as S KU-ur-3-ta, the meaning of which has so far remained elusive. It is here proposed that it be read as perhaps the "house of his divinization," i.e., the building where the living king (or his representative) takes on the name of his dead su-

corces in an atmosphere of lavish reverent at-

A summary of the hippom that was offered to the dead in tribute specifically directed towards evoking their benedictory effect; on these occasions the hippom was likely to be, however, not of departed relatives, but of strangers, especially those who suf-

tered. 76. 78. 32:16-17.

77. 32:15.

80. 36:1-4; 32:24-28. In the

81. 36:1; 36:12.

83. 36:11.

84. 36:12.

feared unnatural deaths, or whose corpus remained unburied. This type of hippom ceremony seems not to have been involved here. It is most likely, how-

ever, that the occasion on which the text of SM 32295 was compiled was not an ordinary or regular day of hippom at either the first or sixteenth day of the month. The inclusion of the spirits of other than the dead ancestors, including even the ghosts of anyone and everyone "from Ra to West," who otherwise has no one to offer them the hippom, suggests that the occasion was an extraordinary one, but the text itself offers no clues as to what it might have been. The performance might still have been scheduled for the first or sixteenth day of the month, but this would have been coinci-

dential with some other non-occasional occasions which ended for a more inclusive notion "feast". One might think of the coronation of the new king as an occasion suitable for such an exegesis of royal "hippom" - when perhaps even the living popu-

lation received something above their normally serviceable fare. What could be done appropriate for Ammisadu, as the newly crowned no rela-

tion, than to demonstrate his concern for his people's welfare by a special food distribution to all - to the dead as well as the living? 7

V Summary

The information disclosed by BM 32295 throws much unexpected light in a number of directions.

1. The text shows conclusively that the Sennir-

then was of the Euphrates and of the Upper Euphrates region had evolved and elaborated
genealogical traditions at an early age - prob-
ably not later than the turn of the Third Millenni-
num bc. - which were linked together by a belief in a series of early ancestors common to all of them. This phenomenon seems to be at least a rough prototype of the genealogical tradition that arose in the Arabic peoples soon after the victory of Islam. Beginning at about that time, the Arabic genealogists constructed an all-encompass-

ing, but in large part artificial, pedigree for some

82. As an exception "tableau" of such context is em-

phasized in the visual created by Kühler, Fed. 141.

85. The major work on the subject is the all-com-

prising Gebrüder Walliser der mittelalterlichen Kultur und Familien (182518251832) in two parts, including not set out in the form of genealogical tree, by J. Wendorf.
600 tribe groups; the Southern, the 'Yemenite' group, all descended from Qa'b, and the Central and North groups, from Qa'b. The former, as the 'Qa'bites' group, has been studied with biblical genealogy. This division is curiously comparable to the one given in the Zuni archives, the Southern 'Yazzins' and the North, 'Inu 'Ini'.

2. The text precisely confirms the identification of the first section of the Assyrian King List, the 'seventeen kings who lived in tena', as forming the first part of the 'Amenhatet' of Sandali-Adad I, and the second section of which was already thus identified by Leander. It demonstrates further that this 'Amenhatet' in its original form had nothing whatever to do with the kings of Assyria; whatever royal status any of these personages may have enjoyed—whether as they might have been viewed as historical at all—must have had for its territorial background the region of Mari and Tera in the Upper Euphrates. The later incorporation of this 'Amenhatet' in the Assyrian King List should now be evaluated as a piece of successful propaganda.

3. By the discovery of BM 83238 we have, as it were, stumbled upon a hitherto unsuspected genre of document, which may now take its place along with royal inscriptions, compiled genre lists, and the like, upon which the Semitoparamonomastics.

4. Despite the validity of the restoration offered above for line 19, the text may provide the first clue to the antecedents of Sutummum and the First Dynasty of Babylon. That family will have been of major political consequence already at the time of the earlier kings of Isin and Larsa; the death of Sin-dumuzi—presumably a contemporary of Ur-Nipirtu of Isin and of Apsu-Ishtar of Larsa—would not otherwise have been noted in a date-formula of the time (of the Isin Dynasty). The text of this family's political authority at that time—presumably other than Babylon—remains to be discovered.

5. Lines 20-22, if correctly understood, represent a broadened use of the concept of the pali, in the approximate meaning 'age', and reflect a concern, at least on the part of the later kings of the First Dynasty of Babylon, to 'periodize' the genealogical history of the West-Semitic tribes, as they conceived that history, according to the historiographical norms they had assimilated from the Surrum-Akkadian tradition, a tradition which they proceeded to elaborate and develop further.
POSTSCRIPT

The writer has had the opportunity of collating the text after the tablets had been baked and cleaned, but too late to alter the autograph copy, so the article was by then already in print. The collation resulted in the following determination:

- Line 19: BA is clear; AD, considerably more certain than suggested by the copy; NA, a good possibility, the final vertical row being clear.

Line 39: AL at the beginning, how clear: a-am-ra as end positively excluded, AR not excluded. IA virtually certain, of the form of the sign in lines 21, 22, and 38. AU reading A-a-e-a/i-a excluded by traces. More of SI is now visible than appears in the copy. TI for the next sign not excluded by traces.

[Added in page proofs: Page 192, comment to line 14 of the text, of, also the name Atam-TI-ES, p. 107 below, under b.]