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ABSTRACT

Umma₄ in-manda (literally “Troops of Manda”) is an Akkadian compound expression used to denote military entities and/or foreign peoples in a diverse number of texts pertaining to separate periods of ancient Near Eastern history. The dissertation initially discusses the various difficulties in ascertaining the etymology of the second component of the term Umma₄ in-manda. A very plausible etymology is proposed based on new research on the semantic range of the Sumerian word mandum.

The thesis then focuses mainly on the references made to the Umma₄ in-manda in the Neo-Assyrian and Neo-Babylonian sources, where it is used to denote the Cimmerians and Medes respectively. The starting point is that these references are making literary allusions to the Standard Babylonian version of the Cuthaean Legend. New information gained from these literary allusions provides insight into the significance of the term Umma₄ in-manda in the first millennium B.C.: it recalls the various attributes of the Umma₄ in-manda depicted in the Cuthaean Legend and applies these attributes to contemporary political events. The Cuthaean Legend envisions a powerful enemy that emerges unexpectedly from the distant mountains and establishes hegemony after a sudden burst of military power. This enemy will eventually be destroyed without the intervention of the Mesopotamian king. The thesis studies how the Neo-Assyrian and Neo-Babylonian sources allude to the Cuthaean Legend and in this way they identify the Cimmerians and the Medes as the Umma₄ in-manda.
INTRODUCTION

Ummān-manda (literally ‘army/troops of manda’) is an Akkadian compound expression used in a diverse number of texts pertaining to separate periods of ancient Near Eastern history. These sources use the expression for different ethnic groups and military groups, indicating the term is not bound by a particular ethnic group, but is used to designate different entities in different times. The specific reasons the term was used remains rather unclear, as well as the etymology of the word manda, the second component of the word Ummān-manda. Most previous treatments of Ummān-manda tried to understand the term by finding its etymology. There has been no agreement on the etymology of the term or the ways in which it is used in the primary documents of the first and second millennia. Particularly interesting in this regard has been the literary text known as the ‘Cuthaean Legend’ where the powerful enemy is called Ummān-manda (among other things), and there are Neo-Assyrian and Neo-Babylonian texts that respectively identify the Cimmerians and the Medes as the Ummān-manda. The Cuthaean Legend was a popular story amongst Neo-Assyrian and Neo-Babylonian scribal circles in the first millennium. This present study aims to address the etymological problems of the word Ummān-manda and to present the evidence as to how the Cuthaean Legend influenced its use in the first millennium BC.

Chapter 1 introduces the texts that use the word Ummān-manda or its second component. The orthographic forms in which the word Ummān-manda is attested in each one of these documents is analysed in order to see the regular written form of the word (1.1). This is followed by a discussion of the irregular written forms of the word Ummān-manda found in the Old Babylonian liver omens (1.2) and the Statue of Idrimi (1.3). Chapter 1 concludes with two tables that present the written form of the word Ummān-manda in every text known to have used it (Tables 1-2).

Chapter 2 reviews previous works that specifically analysed the word Ummān-manda. These works are grouped according to their etymological proposals. The common test for these proposals is whether they are able to explain the origin of the regular written form of the word discussed in chapter 1 and the use of the word in the

---

1 Previous works that collected all the primary sources that use the term Ummān-manda are G. Komoróczy, “Ummān-manda” Acta Antiqua Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae 25 (1977), pp. 43-62. The Idrimi Inscription excluded by Komoróczy should also be included. It will be discussed in 1.3. Other references to the Ummān-manda are found in some astrological texts, ABCD, pp. 75-77, 124-125, 202, 215, 239, 274-275; BPO 3, pp. 50-51, 260-261. Details are given in ch. 1. I collected all references to Ummān-manda known to me in Appendix 1.

2 This has been made clear especially in Komoróczy, “Ummān-manda”.

---
texts. The first etymological proposal reviewed is that the second component of the word Ummān-manda is derived from the word màdu(m) ‘many, numerous’ (2.1). The viability of this proposal is questioned on the basis of the incompatibility with the regular written form of the second component of the word Ummān-manda and the likelihood that a false scribal etymology emerged in the first millennium that saw the second component as a version of the word màdu(m) ‘many, numerous’.

Chapter 2 then analyses the proposed Hurrian origins (2.2) and Indo-European etymologies (2.3) for the word Ummān-manda. It is questioned whether the texts that use the word Ummān-manda substantiate the specific arguments raised to support these proposals. The texts that use manda, the second component of the word, to designate individuals with non Indo-European names become particularly significant in this discussion. The next etymological proposal to be discussed is Landsberger’s suggestion that the second component of the word is a dialectical form manda that ultimately derived from the phrase man ide ‘who knows?’ (2.4). This view is critically analysed, also taking into consideration that when Landsberger made his proposal some of the Old Babylonian texts that used the word Ummān-manda and its second component were not available to him. The final etymological proposal investigated in chapter 2 is Komoróczy’s hypothesis that the second component of the word Ummān-manda is a borrowing back of the Sumerian word màda ‘land’ into Akkadian (2.5). It is asked whether this proposed etymology accounts for the regular written form of the second component of the word Ummān-manda and whether there are any grounds by which the Sumerian word màda ‘land’ can be linked to the word Ummān-manda.

Chapters 3-4 follow up a proposal to investigate the possibility that the Sumerian word mandum some has relation to the word Ummān-manda. Chapter 3 begins with a discussion of the written form and complicated origins of the Sumerian word mandum (3.1). The next step has been to look at how lexical lists treat this word in order to come to an understanding as to how best to translate its semantic range (3.1.3). The emerging proposal to translate mandum as ‘terrain’ is applied to the use of the word in line 342 of the Sumerian epic dubbed ‘Lugalbanda-Enmerkar’. Previous treatments of this line struggled to explain what the word mandum denoted within the context of the relevant passage, in which Lugalbanda is said to have journeyed from Aratta to his home city Uruk (3.2). The proposal to translate mandum as ‘terrain’ in this passage is defended on the basis that the words (‘mountain wall’, ‘mountain base’, and ‘mountain roof’) found next to mandum in line 342 of ‘Lugalbanda-Enmerkar’ denote mountains and that the locative/terminative suffix attached to mandum has been
used similar to the way it marks the object of a verb in another epic known as Enmerkar and the Lord of Aratta (3.3). It is argued that ‘Lugalbanda-Enmerkar’ is saying Lugalbanda crossed over the mandum ‘terrain’ of the mountains and that in the context of his journey, mandum denotes the ‘terrain’ of the mountain lands between Anšan and Aratta (3.3).

Chapter 4 picks up on the use of the word mandum ‘terrain’ in ‘Lugalbanda-Enmerkar’ for the mountain lands between Anšan and Aratta, and that this is a zone east of, and distant to, the Mesopotamian heartland. It is proposed that the use of the word ‘terrain’, as it is used for a distant eastern zone, can explain the etymology the word Ummān-manda as ‘troops of the terrain (of the distant eastern zone)’ (4.1). The proposed mandum etymology is applied to the references to the Ummān-manda or its second component found in the omens, literary texts and second millennium sources with the purpose of assessing its plausibility. In the process, chapter 4 also has discussions of how the story dubbed ‘the Cuthaean Legend’, a Mesopotamian literary classic, and the omen literature, are very important for understanding the use of the term Ummān-manda in the second millennium texts. A decision is made, for purposes of limitation, to focus on the first millennium references to the Ummān-manda.

Chapter 5 opens with a discussion of certain distinct words in the first millennium Neo-Assyrian and Neo-Babylonian sources that are elsewhere found in the Cuthaean Legend, and observes that the word Ummān-manda is one of these words (5.1-4). The parallels concerning the characteristics and the political development of the peoples threatening Mesopotamia in the Cuthaean Legend and in the Neo-Assyrian/Neo-Babylonian sources that use the word Ummān-manda to designate the enemy are shortly described (5.3-4). Having given an introduction to some distinct words and parallels, chapter 5 then elaborates on the methodological framework that helps detect these and interpret the parallels that evoke the Standard Babylonian version of the Cuthaean Legend in the first millennium Neo-Assyrian and Neo-Babylonian documents that use the word Ummān-manda (5.5). Any unique word or expression that evokes the story Cuthaean Legend in another text is treated as a marker that signals a literary allusion to the story. The parallel themes found in the story and the other text(s) are seen as the reason for the literary allusions. The key argument for the present study is that the term Ummān-manda has been used as a marker to evoke certain themes about the powerful enemy described in the Cuthaean Legend in the Neo-Assyrian and Neo-Babylonian sources. Chapter 5 concludes with a synopsis of the Cuthaean Legend and a description of its unique pacifist teaching so that it will be possible to see, in the ensuing chapters,
how the content of the story influenced the portrayal of the Cimmerians and the Medes in Neo-Assyrian and Neo-Babylonian sources respectively (5.6).

Chapter 6 begins with a description of what the extant Neo-Assyrian sources reveal about the Assyrian knowledge of the Cimmerians, their homeland and their military capacities from the time of Sargon II (6.1). This knowledge is compared with the use of distinct words for the Cimmerians, including the term Umman-manda, in texts pertaining to the reign of Esarhaddon (6.1-2). It is argued that by the time of Esarhaddon there is already the view that the Cimmerians recall the Umman-manda of the Cuthaean Legend (6.2). Literary allusions to the Cuthaean Legend concerning the Cimmerians, and their leader Tugdammê, in sources pertaining to the time of Assurbanipal ’s inscriptions, are studied. Some of the unique circumstances that strengthened the identification of the Cimmerians as the Umman-manda during the reign of Assurbanipal are also analysed (6.3).

Chapter 7 studies the Neo-Babylonian references to the Umman-manda. The designation of the Medes as the Umman-manda in the Gadd Chronicle is approached in light of the parallels between the Neo-Babylonian knowledge of the Medes and the depiction of the enemy in the Cuthaean Legend. The parallels concern the enemy’s military might, distant eastern homeland and their eventual collapse. It is argued the Gadd Chronicle reflected what had become the traditional designation of the Medes as the Umman-manda because of the parallels seen between them and the enemy in the Cuthaean Legend (7.1). Chapter 7 then looks into the use of the term Umman-manda in Nabonidus’ inscriptions. Some of the problems with reconstructing the history of the Medes based on Nabonidus’ inscriptions are explained in chapter 7 by linking them to how the Babylonian tradition of identifying the Medes as the Umman-manda was taken up for Nabonidus’ own purposes. His inscriptions sought to relieve the Neo-Babylonian kings before him of the sacrilege of desecrating sanctuaries during the final Assyrio-Babylonian war because he wanted to rebuild one of these sanctuaries, Ehuulul in Harran. It is argued Nabonidus chose to put the blame entirely on the Medes, and in this context their designation as the Umman-manda was useful because, due to the way the term traditionally evoked themes from the Cuthaean Legend, the term was meant to describe an irreverent outside force that did not understand the Mesopotamian gods (7.2). Chapter 7 concludes with a discussion of how the term Umman-manda is used in the Cyrus Cylinder alongside the term ‘Gutium’ (7.3).
1 SOURCES AND WRITTEN FORM

1.1 An Overview

The earliest attestation of the word Ummān-manda is in the corpus of Old Babylonian liver omen texts. The corpus’ latest historical allusion is to Isbi-Irra, the founder of the dynasty of Isin (2017-1985 BC). The word is found in omens that concern the attack of a group designated the Ummān-manda. The attack is described with the phrases ‘attack (lit. foot) of the Ummān-manda’ (ṣi-ip um-ma-an ma-ad-da), the ‘foot of the Ummān-manda arises’ (ṣi-p (GīR) ERIN.MEŠ ba-da i-ta-ab-bi-a-am-ma), and ‘the Ummān-manda arise’ (ERI%N ma-an-da i-te-bi-am-ma). The written form ERIN.MEŠ ba-da occurs in only one tablet (VAT 602) as a way of rendering Ummān-manda (at least four times in this one text) in the Old Babylonian liver omens so far published, whereas the forms ERI%N, ERI%N.MES and umma each occur once. The variant forms ERI%, ERIN.MEŠ and ummān help establish ummān as the Akkadian for ERIN(.MES) in the first component of Ummān-manda. Ummān, same singular or plural, means ‘army, troops’, and is used for warriors and/or state labour, and occasionally means ‘crowd’. The available orthographical forms of the expression Ummān-manda indicate that the most widespread form of the second component is manda (see Table 1). The most widespread variant form of the second component is mandu(m) (see Table 2). The original form of the second component of the term Ummān-manda is expected to accord with this data. There are other variant written forms of the term Ummān-manda, but they are isolated cases and scribal etymologies. The etymology of

1 YOS 10, pp. 1-2.
2 YOS 10 44 53. The ‘foot’ mentioned in the apodosis of the omen was a ‘foot’ mark on the liver seen as denoting an attack or approach in military contexts. CAD S II 306.
3 VAT 602 5, 6, 7, 8 in J. Nougayrol, “Textes hépatoscopiques d’époque ancienne conservés au musée du Louvre (III)” RA 44 (1950), p. 16. Photograph in ibid., p. 44, pl. IV. For the interpretation of ‘the foot… arises’ as a military attack, see the previous footnote and CAD S II 304.
4 VAT 4102 4 in Nougayrol, “Textes hépatoscopiques”, p. 13. Photograph in ibid., p. 44, pl. IV.
5 Nougayrol suggests that VAT 602 9 has a fifth reference to Ummān-manda with the written form ERIN.MEŠ ba-da. This fifth reference is [umm][an- ba?]-[da?] in ibid., p. 16.
6 VAT 4102 4 in ibid., p. 13.
7 AHw 1413-1414.
8 These will be discussed in 1.2-1.3. Other variant written forms are easier to understand. The ME suffixed to man-dā in the Amurru letter to Ugarit (RS 17.286 6) (in Appendix 1.16) is only a plural determinative and does not affect the form manda. The writing ma-an-ba-da in the Middle Assyrian astrological omen (Appendix 1.17) is best understood as a scribal error. This scribal error is discussed in n. 32 below. The form ERIN.HI A ma-a'- [du] in Esarhaddon’s prism (Appendix 1.41) and the use of the word mādu ‘numerous’ for the second
the second component of the term Ummān-manda remains a mystery despite several good attempts. This makes it difficult to know precisely what the first component stands for in the context of each document mentioning the Ummān-manda. A provisional translation at this stage of the study is ‘army/troops of manda’.

The second component of the word Ummān-manda has also been used by itself in the Old Babylonian era. An administrative text from Mari dating to the time of Zimri-lim (1782-1759 BC) distributes shekels to fourteen men, including “four Manda-men” (LU Ma-an-da). Early Old Babylonian archival texts discovered in Choga Gavaneh, about 60 km west of Kermanshah in western Iran, refer to the provisioning of manda-soldiers. One of the year names for the reign of Ammiditana (1683-1647 BC) found in Old Babylonian chronological documents mentions Araḥaḥ ‘the man of the land’ (lú ma-da). The word mada ‘land’ in this year name has been treated as a reference to the second component of the word Ummān-manda, but there is no demonstrable link between this word and the term Ummān-manda.

A range of other documents employ the word Ummān-manda. The Hittite version of the Cuthaean Legend explicitly mentions the Ummān-manda as ERI%N MES MA-AN-DA. The fragmentary Babylonian version of the same composition found in the Great Temple of the Hittite capital Hattušaš does not contain the word Ummān-manda. The oldest known version of the Cuthaean Legend is Old Babylonian (BM 17215). The poorly preserved Old Babylonian component of the term Ummān-manda is based on a late scribal etymology that does not shed light on the original form of the term. For a discussion of this scribal etymology, see 2.1.1.

Discussed in ch. 2. ARM 7, p. 113, no. 221 10.


This will be discussed in 2.3.1.


KBo 3 16 16'; KBo 3 19 20'; IBot 4 7 1'. For these references, see H Tupsinna 79' in Appendix 2.

For the text and manuscripts, see Appendix 1.11. Henceforth abbreviated Bo Tupsinna.
The edition does not contain the word Ummān-manda. Its colophon states that Iddatum the ‘small’ scribe copied the manuscript in a fourteenth regnal year of Ammisaduqa (1646-1626 BC). The term Ummān-manda is attested in three other Hittite texts with the same written form (ERIN.MEŠ MA-AN-DA) as in the Hittite version of the Cuthaean Legend. Two of these texts are fragmentary, and may be attributed to Ḫāttuṣiliš I (1650-1620 BC).

One of them mentions Zāludis (written Za-a-lu-tīl-iš) the ‘leader’ (GAL) of the Ummān-manda. The other text is too fragmentary to see how the word Ummān-manda fits the context. The third Hittite source that uses the word Ummān-manda is the Hittite laws. Articles 54-55 of the Hittite law collection regulate the obligations of the military unit Ummān-manda towards the Hittite king. The royal inscription of Idrimi the king of Alalah (ca. 1475 BC), written on his statue, refers to diplomatic relations between Idrimi and the Hurrian king Barattarna the king of the Ummān-manda (written ERIN.MEŠ-(an)-wa-an-da). The peculiar written form of the term on the Idrimi Statue has raised a few eyebrows but Ummān-manda is the most likely reading. A terse letter (RS 17.286) from Sāwušgāmuwa the king of Amurru addressed to Ammisatamru II the king of Ugarit, written most probably in the late 13th century BC, refers to the Ummān-manda as ERIN.MEŠ man-dā.ME.

The use of two separate plural determinatives is unique and may limited to the scribal practice in Amurru. A middle Assyrian text (BM 121034) found at Nineveh in the Nabû Temple area, probably part of the Middle Assyrian tablets imported to Nineveh from Assur during or around the reign of Tiglath-pileser I (ca. 1100 BC),

---

19 For the Old Babylonian text and its manuscripts, see Appendix 1.9. Henceforth OB Tupsinna.
20 ‘Month Addar, 26th day, year (when) Ammisatamru the king (presented) a very large great copper platform’, OB Tupsinna II VI 5-7. The year name corresponds to the king’s fourteenth regnal year. For this date, see ch. 4, p. 85.
21 KBo 7.14 ii 14 and KBo 12 14 9’. For the texts, see Appendix 1.14-15. For a discussion of the historical background and bibliography, see M. de Stefano, Annali e Res Gestae Antico Ittiti. Pavia. Italian University Press. 2003, pp. 91-94.
22 [“Za-a-lu-tīl-iš KBo 7.14 ii 14 The name is found fully intact in the same text as “Za-a-lu-tīl KBo 7.14 ii 16.
23 KBo 12 14 9’.
24 KBo 6 2 iii 12; KBo 6 3 iii 15, KBo 6 6 i 19; Entire law article in KBo 6 2 ii 12-15; KBo 3 iii 15-18; KBo 6 i 19-23, KUB 13 11; KUB 29 15, KBo 19 4 o. 8-12; H. A. Hoffner, Jr., The Laws of the Hittites: A Critical Edition. Leiden, New York, Köln. Brill. 1997, pp. 65-66. For the passage, see Appendix 1.13.
26 Idrimi 46 in ibid., p. 50.
27 The written form of the term Ummān-manda in the Statue of Idrimi is discussed in 1.3.
28 Ammistamru II has synchronisms with a number of rulers of the ancient Near East including Tuthaliya IV of Hatti in the late 13th century BC. For these synchronisms, see H. Klengel, Syria 3000 to 300 BC. Berlin. Akademie Verlag. 1992, pp. 139-140.
30 See discussion in ABCD, p. 273.
mentions the attack of the Ummān-manda ((ZI-ut ER]IN ma-an-ba-da) in the apodosis to a lunar eclipse. This peculiar syllabic rendering of the second component as ma-an-ba-da is never attested again in the astrological omens. Astrological omens in the Old Babylonian era were expanded (with different variants in the Middle Babylonian and Middle Assyrian periods) and standardised in the astrological omen series Enuma Anu Enlil by the time of Assurbanipal and then also preserved in late Babylonian copies dating to the Achaemenid and Seleucid eras. This standardisation seems to have also influenced the way Ummān-manda is written in astrological omens because almost all the first millennium astrological omens write Ummān-manda as ERIN ma-an-da. The three exceptions to the form ERIN ma-an-da in astrological omens are the written forms ERIN ma-an-du, ERIN ma-an'-da, and ERIN ma-dum. The standard form ERIN ma-an-da is commonly found in those astrological omens that describe the political activities of the Ummān-manda in their apodoses.

The emergence of the Ummān-manda threat is expressed as “the rise of the Ummān-manda” (tibu (ZI-ut) ERIN ma-an-da) and “the Ummān-manda will arise” (ERIN ma-an-da ZI-ma). The former expression ‘the rise of the Ummān-manda’ is also found in an apodosis to an anomalous animal birth in the series Summa Izbu. In one astrological omen the former expression ZI-ut ERIN ma-an-da is used to denote the attack of the Ummān-manda on the ‘four regions’ (i.e. the known world). Two astrological omens employ the latter expression ERIN ma-an-da ZI-ma ‘the Ummān-manda will arise’ and predict the Ummān-manda will rule Mesopotamia. The expression ‘the Ummān-manda will arise’ is also found in the apodoses of Old Babylonian liver omen texts, where the term Ummān-manda is written in different forms (further discussed in 1.2) and the verb tibu ‘to arise’

31 BM 121034 20 in ABCD, pp. 274-275. The restoration of the protasis is secure due to evident parallels with EAE 15 Section 8, see ABCD, pp. 75, 273-275.
32 The insertion of ba into the second component of the term Ummān-manda in this Middle Assyrian omen is probably a scribal error. The parallel omen in EAE 15 Section 8 Line 3 renders the second component of the term Ummān-manda as ma-an-da, see ABCD, p. 75.
33 For a discussion, see ABCD, pp. 6-11, 18-29.
34 For the published astrological omens mentioning the Ummān-manda, see Komoróczy, “Ummān-manda”, pp. 55-56, nn. 77-92; ABCD, pp. 75-77, 124-125, 202, 215, 239, 274-275; BPO 3, pp. 50-51; also collected in Appendix 1.17, 21-40.
35 EAE 15 Section 8 Line 3 in ABCD, p. 75; Appendix 1.37.
36 EAE 15 (Recension B) 5 in ABCD, p. 202; Appendix 1.34.
37 EAE 15 (Recension B) 5 in ABCD, p. 202; Appendix 1.34.
39 EAE 15 Section 8 Line 3, specifically A (K 270 + 11308 + Sin 655) 35'-36', B (K 8483 + Sm 232 + K 12629 + K 8616) 34'-35, C (K 2275 + 11598 + BM 131654) 31 in ABCD, p. 239; ACh Sin III 7; ACh Adad XI 9; ACh Adad XIX 32; ACh Adad XXI 2; ACh Sin Suppl XLI 18; ACh 2 Suppl IX 32; ACh Istar XXI 95; K 2933 8 in BPO 3, pp. 260-261; VAT 10218 106 44' in BPO 3, pp. 50-51.
41 VAT 10218 106 44' in BPO 3, pp. 50-51.
42 ACh Sin IV 21; ACh 2 Suppl. XVIII 18.
43 For references to these Old Babylonian liver omens, see above p. 1.
is not written with the logogram ZI, as in the case in astrological omens, but rather syllabically (i-te-bi-am-ma, i-ta-ab-bi-a-am-ma).  

An astrological omen refers to the ‘destruction (brought) by the Ummān-manda’ (ṣalputtin (HUL-tim) ERIN man-[da]). The ‘destruction (brought) by the Ummān-manda’ refers to the destruction that the Ummān-manda will inflict on a given territory or opponent, as inferred from the use of the same expression in the Basalt-Stela of Nabonidus the Babylonian king.  

The Stela initially refers to the destruction brought upon Babylonia by Sennacherib, describing it as ṣa-al-pu-ut-tì ‘destruction’. The Stela later uses the term Ummān-manda for the Medes and refers to the destruction they brought upon Ḥarran and the Assyrian lands as ‘the destruction (brought) by the Ummān-manda’ (ṣal-pu-ut-tì ERIN man-du). Akkulanu, a priest of Assurbanipal the Assyrian king, quotes the same expression from an omen apodosis: ‘destruction (brought) by the Ummān-manda’ (ṣal-pū-ti ERIN Man-da).

The collapse of Ummān-manda power is described as ‘the fall of the Ummān-manda’ (migitti [SUB-tim] ERIN man-da) or ‘the Ummān-mandu will fall’ (ERIN ma-an!-du imaqqut [SUB-ut]) in two astrological omens. The latter omen contains a peculiar written form of the term, Ummān-mandu, which is otherwise found in the royal inscriptions of Nabonidus and very plausibly one more astrological omen. The written form ERIN man-da, which is the most common way of writing Ummān-manda in the astrological omens known to use the term, is also found in a range of other texts (Table 1). The written form ERIN man-da is employed in all the references to the Ummān-manda dating to the time of Assurbanipal (668-627 BC) or afterwards (including most of the standardized astrological omens discussed above in pp. 4-5), and seems to have become the standard

---

44 The syllabic written forms of the verb tebu ‘to arise’ in Old Babylonian liver omens are ERIN ma-an-da i-te-bi-am-ma in VAT 4102 4 in Nougayrol, “Textes hépatoscopiques”, p. 13; ERIN ba-da i-ta-ab-bi-a-am-ma in VAT 602 5, 6, 7, 8 in ibid., p. 16.
45 ṣalputti (HUL-tim) ERIN man-[da] in EAE 15 E (BM 32578+32586) 4’ in ABCD, p. 77; Appendix 1.36.
47 Basalt-Stela of Nabonidus I 37’.
48 Basalt-Stela of Nabonidus X 14’.
49 SAA 10 100 26. For the ‘destruction (brought) by the Ummān-manda’ in Akkulanu’s letter, see 6.3.2.
50 EAE 63 20 in BPO 1, p. 38.
52 For the written form Ummān-mandu in these texts, see Table 2. For a discussion of the other astrological omen that plausibly contains the written form Ummān-mandum, see ch. 2, pp. 23-24.
form at least in Assyrian scribal circles. The references to the Ummān-manda during the time of Assurbanipal include a letter written to the king by the priest Akkulanu, some of Assurbanipal’s royal inscriptions, the Weidner Chronicle (which also has Neo-Babylonian copies) and a literary text (the Standard Babylonian version of the Cuthaean Legend). The royal inscriptions are a dedication to Marduk, a letter to the god Aššur, and a cylinder inscription fragment.

The standard form ERI man-da is also used in the Assyrian king Esarhaddon’s (680-669 BC) prisms, but in a peculiar way. This prism has a number of copies and claims a victory over a certain Teus‘paya ‘the Cimmerian, the Ummān-manda’. The earliest prism (IM 59046) is dated to the 22nd of Ayarum, the eponym of Banbā (Esarhaddon’s fifth regnal year – 676 BC) and uses the standard form ERI man-da. This writing is maintained in two other prisms. There is, however, a switch to the writing ERI.HIA man-da by the addition of the plural determinative HIA in one prism dated to the month of Addaru, the last month for the eponym of Atar-ili (673 BC), Esarhaddon’s eighth regnal year. The latter writing ERI.HIA man-da is resumed in one other prism. One finds the variant writing ERI.HIA ma-a’-[du] in another prism fragment. Assurbanipal’s

---

53 SAA 10 100 27.
55 For the composite text of the Standard Babylonian edition of the Cuthaean Legend and references, see Appendix 1.20. Henceforth abbreviated SB Tupsima.
57 CT 35, pl. 45 t. 13. The entire inscription in CT 35, pl. 45; IWA, pp. 83-84.
58 BM 122616+ 19’ in BIWA, p. 200. For the entire inscription, see BIWA, pp. 199-200.
62 R. C. Thompson, The Prisms of Esarhaddon and Assurbanipal Found at Nineveh, 1927-8. London. Order of the Trustees. British Museum. 1931, p. 18: iii 44, pl. 6: iii 44; On the eponym, ibid., p. 28: vii 75, pl. 13: vi 75; A. Millard, The Eponyms of the Assyrian Empire, p. 86. Another prism dated to the same year may have had written Ummān-manda the same way (*ERI.HIA man-da) but this can only be conjectured, because the line where one would expect to find the mention of the Ummān-manda is not preserved, see Appendix 1.41, n. 170 for details.
extant texts using the term Umma-n-manda never change the standard form ERIN man-da. The two documents that circulated in scribal circles during and after the time of Assurbanipal that refer to the Umma-n-manda use the standard orthography ERIN man-da are the Weidner Chronicle\textsuperscript{65} and the Standard Babylonian version of the Cuthaean Legend.\textsuperscript{66} The documents composed after Assurbanipal that mention the Umma-n-manda use the written form ERIN man-da, which was most common in Assyrian texts, sometimes as it is and sometimes with modifications. They also use the form Umma-n-mandu. One can see all these with Nabonidus’ (556-539 BC) royal inscriptions that write the term both as Umma-n-manda and Umma-n-mandu: Um-man Man-da, Um-man Ma-an-da, LU ERIN Man-da, LU ERIN Man-du, Um-ma-an Man-du, Um-ma-an Ma-an-da, Um-man Ma-an-du, UM-\textsuperscript{KUR} Ma-an-da, UM-\textsuperscript{KUR} Ma-an-du, ERIN Man-du, ERIN\textsuperscript{1} Man-da.\textsuperscript{67}

These variant written forms found in Nabonidus’ inscriptions show that the determinatives LU and KUR can be prefixed to the term Umma-n-manda interchangeably. Nabonidus’ Sippar Cylinder\textsuperscript{68} prefixes the determinantive LÜ, the gentilic marker, to the term Umma-n-manda (written LÜ:ERIN man-da or LÜ:ERIN man-du),\textsuperscript{69} including Sippar Cylinder I 29. In two other manuscripts of Sippar Cylinder I 29, however, one finds the land deterministic KUR prefixed to the term (i.e. KUR Um-ma-an Ma-an-da, KUR Um-ma-an Ma-an-du).\textsuperscript{70} Sippar Cylinder I 29 states that Cyrus captured ‘Astyages the king of the Umma-n-manda’. In this case the epithet may mean that Astyages is ‘king of the Umma-n-manda’ or ‘king of the land of the Umma-n-manda’. It appears the scribes authoring the different manuscripts of the cylinder could treat the term Umma-n-manda as referring to a land or a group in Sippar Cylinder I 29. I think that one needs to know the etymology of the word ‘Umma-n-manda’ in the Sippar Cylinder of Nabonidus in order to understand how gentilic and land determinatives can be

---

\textsuperscript{64} R. C. Thompson, “A Selection from the Cuneiform Historical Texts from Nineveh (1927-32)” Iraq 7 (1940), p. 105 Fig. 14 No. 28. Note that Thompson has reconstructed ma-a’-[du-ti] but I reconstructed ma-a’-[du]. This is explained below in Appendix 1.41, n. 171. The date of this prism fragment has not been preserved.

\textsuperscript{65} Line 42 of the Weidner Chronicle. The entire text can be found in ABC, pp. 145-151; Al-Rawi, “Tablets from the Sippar Library”, 1990, pp. 2-13; Glassner, Mesopotamian Chronicles, pp. 264-269. Henceforth abbreviated Weidner Chronicle. For the specific passage that mentions the Umma-n-manda, see Appendix 1.18. The presence of the term Umma-n-manda in this line is not universally accepted. For a discussion of the term’s presence in this line, see Appendix 1.18, n. 76.

\textsuperscript{66} ERIN man-da in A(81-2-4,219) ii 8 and ERIN man-[da] in G(S.U. 51/67A) i 54, see Westenholz, Legends of the Kings of Akkade, p. 343. The references are both from the Neo-Assyrian copies of the Cuthaean Legend. Tablet 81-2-4,219 is from Nineveh and tablet S.U. 51/67A is from Sultantepe. For further details, see Westenholz, Legends of the Kings of Akkade, pp. 296-297.

\textsuperscript{67} For the references, see the entry Ummān-manda in Schaudig, Die Inschriften Nabonids von Babylon und Kyros’ des Großen, p. 714; also Tables 1-2 below.

\textsuperscript{68} For the entire text, see Schaudig, op.cit., pp. 415 – 440; Langdon, Die neubabylonischen Koniginschriften, pp. 219 – 229. Henceforth abbreviated Sippar Cylinder of Nabonidus. The passage relating to the Ummān-manda can be found in Appendix 1.47.

\textsuperscript{69} Sippar Cylinder of Nabonidus I 11, 23, 24, 28, 29.

\textsuperscript{70} Sippar Cylinder of Nabonidus I 29.
prefixed to the same word in different manuscripts. I will later discuss the etymology of the term Ummān-manda, lit. ‘Troops of Manda’.\footnote{Ch. 3–4.} It will then be possible to explain the alternating use of the gentilic and land determinatives for the Ummān-manda in Sippar Cylinder I 29.\footnote{Discussed in \ref{4.1.1.1}.}

Another Neo-Babylonian document, the chronicle dubbed the ‘Gadd Chronicle’,\footnote{For the entire text of the ‘Gadd Chronicle’, see C. J. Gadd, \textit{The Fall of Nineveh, The Newly Discovered Babylonian Chronicle, No 21,901 in the British Museum}. London. The British Museum. 1923, pp. 31 – 42, pl. I – VI; CCK, pp. 55 – 65, 79 –82, pl. III, IX – XII; ABC, pp. 90-96; Glassner, \textit{Mesopotamian Chronicles}, pp. 218-225. Henceforth abbreviated Gadd Chronicle. The passages mentioning the Ummān-manda can be found in \ref{Appendix 1.50}.} maintains for the term Ummān-manda the more common written form ERI.IN \textit{man-da} but in one instance prefixes the land determinative (KUR.ERI\textit{\text{-}da})\footnote{The land determinative is used with the term in Gadd Chronicle 59. The other two references to the Ummān-manda are Gadd Chronicle 38 and 65.} similar to some of the manuscripts of Sippar Cylinder I 29 (discussed above in pp. 7-8).


\subsection*{1.2 The Written Forms in the Old Babylonian Omens}

\footnote{For the references, see the entry Ummān-manda in Schaudig, \textit{Die Inschriften Nabonids von Babylon und Kyros’ des Großen}, p. 714. See also \ref{Tables 1-2} below.}

The earliest attestations of the term Ummān-manda in the Old Babylonian liver omens apparently indicate that its second component alternates between the forms ba-da, ma-an-da and ma-ad-da. Some have therefore argued manda was not the earliest form of the second component of Ummān-manda. Nougayrol observes that the written form ERIN.MEŠ ba-da is not a scribal error because it is written four times over in the Old Babylonian liver omen text VAT 602. Nougayrol suggests this variant form was limited to one scribal circle, and reconstructs the original form as b/ma(n)da based on all the variant writings found in the Old Babylonian liver omens, suggesting the second component of the expression Ummān-manda is a foreign word in origin, possibly with some relationship to Elam because Ummān-manda and Elam are mentioned together in the astrological omen ACh Sin IV 21-22. Nougayrol observes that the extispicy texts represent the threat of the Ummān-manda in the same manner as ascribed to Elam and Subaru. Nougayrol’s reconstruction and suggestion cannot be taken further because no foreign word has been found for the origin of the second component of the term Ummān-manda. While the scribe’s repeated writing of the variant ba-da demonstrates it was not a slip, there is the possibility he was ill informed about the meaning of the word and repeated his error. The scribe’s unique writing could reflect an isolated (and probably incorrect) idea about the meaning and writing of the word. Komoróczy sees ba-da in VAT 602 as exceptional and excludes it from the reconstruction of the original form. Komoróczy instead postulates the original form ma(n)da. Komoróczy includes the form ma-ad-da from another Old Babylonian liver omen text (YOS 10 44 53) in the reconstruction while excluding VAT 602’s ba-da, but the form ma-ad-da appears only in this one liver omen text (YOS 10 44 53) and should be treated as an exception and excluded from the reconstruction of the original form just like ba-da in VAT 602. One is faced with two different tablets (YOS 10 44 and VAT 602) with two different isolated readings, which can mean these are two isolated scribal practices. They do not prove the original form of the second component of the term Ummān-manda had ever been b/ma(n)da.

References are above in p. 1.


Nougayrol, op.cit., p. 20.

Similarly, von Soden writes out m/badda from the Old Babylonian liver omens, AHw 1413.

Nougayrol, op.cit., p. 20. For the entire apodosis, see Appendix 1.31.


Ibid., p. 63.

Komoróczy also includes the word māda ‘land’ found in the reference to Arahāb ‘the man of the land’ (lū ma-da) found in an Old Babylonian year name, ibid., p. 55, but there is no demonstrable link between this māda and the second component of the word Ummān-manda. This point is discussed in 2.3.1.
The scribe of each liver omen seems to have understood the second component of the word Ummān-manda differently, and this led to different writings. It is not clear why the scribes of YOS 10 44 and VAT 602 wrote *manda* differently (*Table 1*). The scribe of the remaining Old Babylonian liver omen text known to mention the Ummān-manda (VAT 4102 4) employs the form *manda*, the most widespread written form in the references to the Ummān-manda (*Table 1*). The earliest known occurrences of the term Ummān-manda in the Old Babylonian liver omens cannot be used to reconstruct the original form of the term’s second component because it is much more likely that these texts are the earliest known references to the term only because of an accident of discovery and are not the first ever sources to use the term.

### 1.3 The Written Form in the Statue of Idrimi

Whether one should actually read the term Ummān-manda (written Ummān-wanda) in Idrimi 46 is disputed, and requires some discussion. I propose that the pertinent passage reads as follows: 89

45. i-na še-eb-ī ša-na-ti a-na 1 Ba-ra-at-ar-na LUGAL-ri
46. LUGAL ERIN.MES-wa(?) 90 -an-wa-an-da a-iš-tā-pār ī ad-bu-ub
47. ma-na-h[a?]-t[e]? ŠE ša a-bu-te-ḪI.A-ya i-nu-ma
48. a-bu-te-ḪI.A-ya a-na UGU-šu-nu in-na-ḫu-ū

In the seventh year, to Barattarna, the king,

the king of the Ummān-wanda I wrote and spoke

---

88 The fact the scribe of VAT 602 wrote *ba-da* is simply mystifying. Perhaps he just made a mistake for no particular reason and repeated it. Another possibility is that ERIN.MES *ba-da* stands for a term other than Ummān-manda, especially because VAT 602 does not have anywhere in its text the written forms of the Ummān-manda found in the other Old Babylonian liver omens. Yet another possibility is that the form *ba-da* is a mistake for *ma-da*, since the signs *ba* and *ma* could be confused. If this is the case, then the form *ma-da* would compare with the form *ma-ad-da*, a form written as the second component of the term Ummān-manda in the other Old Babylonian liver omen YOS 10 44. The scribe of YOS 10 44 may have produced the form *ma-ad-da* in YOS 10 44 53 in order to conform it to a word such as *ma-at-la-am* ‘large’, found in the separate expression um-*ma-an na-ak-ri-im ma-at-la-am* ‘a large enemy army’ (attested for example in YOS 10 11 i 7). Another possibility is that the consonant *n* in *manda* assimilated and produced the form *madda* for the second component of the term Ummān-manda. The form *ma-ad-da* may be a forerunner to the habit of associating the word *mādu* with the second component of the word Ummān-manda in some of the first millennium sources. For this latter first millennium scribe etymology, see 2.1.1.

89 Idrimi 45-48.

90 The sign wat(?) is a new suggestion that will be discussed below in p. 13.
of the efforts of my ancestors when
my fathers labored for them…

Smith, the first scholar to publish an edition of the Idrimi Statue, rejected reading Ummān-manda in Idrimi 46 and suggested instead the personal name AN-wanda and translated as follows: a-na 1ba-ra su-tar-na šarrī(r) šar sabe٤٢٤٢ AN-wa-an-da aš-da-par “I sent in reply to lord Sutarna, the king, king of the warriors (of the Khurri-land] AN-wanda as messenger…” ٤١ Smith argued that the decisive reason for rejecting the Ummān-manda reading was that the verb ‘I sent’ (aš-da-par in Smith’s transliteration) in Idrimi 46 required an object, and that object is the person named AN-wanda. ٤٢ Oller argues that the verb šapaḍa, with the meaning ‘to write to someone’, does not need a direct object and one can translate “I wrote to Barattarna”. ٤٣ CAD supplies examples where the verb šapaḍa, with the meaning ‘to write (a letter)’, is used without a direct object but with the preposition ana, and one of the examples given is Idrimi 46: ana RN šarri… aš-tā-pār ‘I wrote to Barattarna’. ٤٤ An example from Mari is ana PN aš-ta-pa-ar ‘I have written to PN’. ٤٥ An example from Ugarit is ana RN akanna al-ta-pār ‘So I wrote to RN’. ٤٦ Von Soden provides an example from Old Babylonian: ana PN šu-pu-
ur. ٤٧

Another reason for rejecting the Ummān-manda reading in Idrimi 46 has been that Smith collated a person determinative between the MES and an signs in ERIN.MES-an. ٤٨ A number of scholars supported Smith’s collation and read Idrimi 45-46 taking into account a personal determinative: ٤٩

٤١ S. Smith, The Statue of Idri-mi. (Occasional Publications of the British Institute of Archaeology in Ankara No. 1). London. The British Institute of Archaeology in Ankara. 1949, pp. 16-17: 46. Smith’s reading Sutarna for the name of the Hurrian king has been abandoned by later research. The reading Ba-ra-at-tar-na has come to be universally accepted, see references in Oller, The Autobiography of Idrimi, p. 50.

٤٢ Smith, The Statue of Idri-mi, p. 18:46.


٤٤ One notes that CAD accepts the reading that treats Barattarna as the king (of the Ummān-manda), CAD S I 444.7’.

٤٥ ARM I 25:11 and passim in Mari apud CAD S I 442: 4’.

٤٦ MRS 9 54 RS 17,334: 3 apud CAD S I 444.7’.

٤٧ AbB 1, 105, 16 in AHw 1170.6.

٤٨ Smith, The Statue of Idri-mi, p. 18:46.

i-na še-se-eb-i ša-na-ti a-na ́Ba-ra-at-ar-na LUGAL-ri

LUGAL ERIN.MES (Hur-ri Ki) MAN-wa-an-da äš-tá-pár ù ad-bu-ub

In the seventh year I sent Anwanda to Barattarna, the king,
the king of (the Hurrian) warriors, and told him of...

The insertion of Hur-ri Ki ‘Hurri’ into the passage has been justified by the fact the expression ‘Hurrian warriors’ (ERIN.MES Hur-ri Ki) has been used in Idrimi 44, 49, and it has been argued that Hur-ri Ki was omitted in Idrimi 46 by mistake.100 This is very tentative because the scribe has not omitted Hur-ri Ki in Idrimi 44, 49. It is more likely that there is no omission of Hur-ri Ki in Idrimi 46 and that the words ‘king of the troops...’ (LUGAL ERIN.MES...) are part of an epithet needs to be completed in another way. The epithet ‘king of the Ummān-manda’ is well attested in first millennium sources.101 The proposed written form of the term Ummān-manda in Idrimi 46 (ERIN.MES wa-an-da)102 shows affinities with the written form of the term in other second millennium sources, exemplified by the Hittite texts that have the written form ERIN.MES MA-AN-DA and by the diplomatic letter from Amurru to Ugarit that has ERIN.MES-man-dā.ME (Table 1). They all have ERIN.MES for the first component and the only difference concerning the second component is that Idrimi 46 has an initial w consonant instead of the usual m in manda.103

One can always deliberate on the nature of the proposed name MAN-wa-an-da, even when no such name has been specifically found.104 Oller wonders why the Statue of Idrimi would need to mention an envoy by name, and in what unique capacity.105 Even if such a name had been found, it would not prove the name was used in

101 Assurbanipal’s dedicatory inscription for Marduk, line 20 (Appendix 1.44); Assurbanipal’s barrel cylinder, line 19* (Appendix 1.45); Nabonidus’ Sippar Cylinder I 29; Nabonidus’ Ḥarran Cylinder I’ 14’; Basalt-Stela of Nabonidus II 3’, 14’; Gadd Chronicle 38. The epithet ‘king of the Ummān-manda’ in these first millennium documents is discussed in ch. 7, p. 186.
102 Idrimi 46 quoted above in p. 10 has ERIN.MES-wa(?)-an-wa-an-da. I will discuss the signs -wa(?)-an below in p. 13.
103 The use of the plural determinative ME for the second component of the term in the Amurrian letter to Ugarit is unique and may be limited to the practice of the scribe who composed the letter. I will discuss the initial w in the form wanda below in pp. 13ff.
104 Smith argued the sign AN in the proposed name AN-wa-an-da may represent the word for ‘god’ in the language of the person Anwanda, Smith, The Statue of Idri-mi, p. 27, §5. d. For some comments and different proposals about the presumed name AN-wa-an-da, see J. Harmatta apud Komoróczy, “Ummān-manda”, p. 54, n.71; E. A. Speiser, “Reviewed work(s): The Statue of Idri-mi by Sidney Smith” JAOS 71 (1951), p. 152; B. Landsberger, “Assyrische Königliste und “Dunkles Zeitalter” (Continued)” JCS 8 (1954), p. 57.
Idrimi 46. Komoróczy and Klengel observe, very much to the point, that the main reason for rejecting the reading Ummān-manda and looking for a personal name with AN-wa-an-da is the person determinative Smith collated between the plural sign MES and an-wa-an-da in Idrimi 46. Dietrich and Loretz have themselves collated the text and supported Smith’s reading of the person determinative DIS. Gadd, Cornelius, and Oller have also collated the text but have not seen the DIS sign in Idrimi 46, and have alternatively supported reading Ummān-manda. I did not have the opportunity to collate the text, but there may be a way to make sense of these conflicting collations. Smith noted in his collation that the sign interpreted as the person determinative was “only a scratched line”, while the other DIS signs found in the Statue were “erroneous verticals”. Bunnens, who supports the reading Ummān-manda, describes this sign as a “clou vertical”. There is the possibility that the sign recognised as DIS by some and not so by others is a different sign. This sign between MES and an (in ERIN.MES-an) can be seen in Oller’s autograph of Idrimi 46. I argue that this sign looks like a wa except that it is missing the rightmost horizontal and its two horizontals are not at an angle as is usually expected with a wa sign. This sign can be compared with the way the wa sign is written more properly after ERIN.MES-an in the same line. I argue that the scribe of the Idrimi Statue did not like the way he wrote the wa sign immediately after ERIN.MES, but realized his mistake only after having written an as well, so he had to rewrite wa-an in order to render the form wa-an-da. This would suggest that while the text has ERIN.MES-wa(?)-an wa-an-da, it should be read ERIN.MES wa-an-da, or perhaps ERIN.MES-an wa-an-da (in this case –an would be a phonetic complement for ummān). The scribe’s confusing use of sign forms and errors in general have been noted in previous studies.

The final reason Smith had originally rejected the reading term Ummān-manda was that the inscription on the Statue of Idrimi had the written form of the term’s second component as wa-an-da, whereas initially one expects

112 See ibid.
113 See ibid.
ma as in *ma-an-da, the usual second component of Ummān-manda. Albright argues that confusion between wa and ma in the Statue that led to the written form wanda for the second component of the term Ummān-manda in Idrimi 46. Cornelius argues that the form wanda came out of the consonantal shift m>w exemplified in variant forms of north-Syrian place names in the second millennium documents, such as Iyaruwata for Yarimuta. Cazelles argues that the change between wa and ma is common to the era and region of the Idrimi Statue, and that it is exemplified with Iluwer, Ilu-mer. Oller observes, however, that the shift w>m had for the most part occurred by the Old Babylonian era and that all second millennium references to the Ummān-manda have manda for their second component. Oller is aware of the forms ba-da and ma-ad-da in the Old Babylonian liver omens (discussed in 1.2) and incorporates them while trying to explain how the second component of the term Ummān-manda could be written wanda.

Oller argues that the form wa-an-da found for the second component of the term Ummān-manda in the Idrimi inscription could have been an earlier form of the second component because the interchange w>m occurred in the Old Babylonian period (while the reverse is less expected) and a postulated earlier form *wanda could explain why there are variant forms in the Old Babylonian liver omens. If wanda was the origin of the variant written forms of Ummān-manda in the Old Babylonian liver omens, then there is the question how this presumed original form wanda survived in an inscription from Alalah and nowhere else. Jucquois observes that texts from Alalah, where the Idrimi Statue was found, do not attest to the w>m transition in a predictable manner and one cannot tell why the w is preserved in some cases and not in others. The form manda, which is the most widespread form for the second component of the term Ummān-manda, is attested in a variety of texts; the Old Babylonian liver omen VAT 4102 4, the Mari administrative text, and the documents from Hattuša and Ugarit (see Table 1). It is more likely that the form wanda is a local pronunciation from Alalah. There are at least two possible explanations for this local written form. The first is that the form wanda is a local pronunciation that emerged for reasons that are not apparent. In this case it compares with other irregular written forms attested for

---

121 Ibid., pp. 62-63.
the second component of the term Ummān-manda in the Old Babylonian liver omens (ma-ad-da) YOS 10 44 53 and (ba-da) VAT 602 5-9. The second possibility, for which arguments are given immediately below, is that the form wanda is a Hurrian pronunciation of the second component of the term Ummān-manda.

Some minor Hurrian influence on the Idrimi Statue has been noted. That Alalah has been under Hurrian influence is well known. Furthermore, the name of the scribe of the Idrimi Statue, Sarruwa, seems to be Hurrian. Sarruwa identifies Hurrian deities as his personal gods, pointing to his Hurrian background. These factors justify a search for Hurrian influence on the form wa-an-da in the Idrimi Statue. On rare occasions, initial m and w can interchange in Hurrian pronunciation, as evidenced by Hurrian personal names found in Akkadian texts from Nuzi: M/Wahri-Senni and M/Winnerke. This would not be the only instance where m is pronounced w in spite of the general rule w>m in Akkadian, since this exception to the consonantal shift m>w occasionally occurs also when some Akkadian words are pronounced in West Semitic and Greek. Bush has suggested, based on the variations of the Hurrian personal names M/Wahri-Senni and M/Winnerke, that m-signs are occasionally used in Hurrian to pronounce the labial fricative f, which is more usually indicated in writing by the variation of w with p/b. Given that the expression “Ummān-manda” is used for the Hurrians in the Idrimi Statue, it appears Sarruwa, the scribe of the Idrimi Statue, treated the second component of Ummān-manda as a Hurrian word in an Akkadian context, took the initial m to represent the Hurrian labial fricative, and wrote the

---

123 For the irregularities with the written forms found in the Old Babylonian liver omen texts, see 1.2.
126 Supported and discussed in Oller, The Autobiography of Idrimi, p. 131; J. M. Sasson, “On Idrimi and Sarruwa, the Scribe” in Studies on the Civilization and Culture of Nuzi and the Hurrians: In Honor of Ernest R. Lachemian on his Seventy-Fifth Birthday April 29, 1981. M. A. Morrison and D. I. Owen, eds. Winona Lake, Indiana. Eisenbrauns. 1981, pp. 316-317. Alternatively, Draffkorn treats the name as a hypocoristicon in Draffkorn, Hurrian and Hurrians at Alalakh, p. 51. The Akkadian word sarru ‘king’ has been used in Hurrian names, see sarrī in NPN, pp. 251-252. The second element, -wa is a Hurrian name element and seems to be a kind of formative, see NPN, p. 274. The presence of this second element –wa, and the evidence discussed by Oller and Sasson can be taken together to indicate the name Sarruwa is Hurrian.
127 Sarruwa is indentified as IR IM UTU XXX a AN.SUR “the servant of IM UTU XXX and AN.SUR” in line 98 of the Idrimi Statue. The words IM, UTU, XXX and AN.SUR have created problems for scholars. Oller carefully discusses these problems and makes a case for how IM, UTU, XXX and AN.SUR can stand for Hurrian deities Tēṣub, Simegi, Kūsūh and Sāuška, and points out the identification is not watertight because Alalah had an ethnically mixed population and among them were those who could read non-Hurrian deities for these words, see Oller, The Autobiography of Idrimi, pp. 132-140 The identification of XXX with Kūsūh, however, is well established, see ibid., pp. 137-138, and on strength of the fact the name Sarruwa is Hurrian (references in previous footnote), it seems very likely the other personal gods of Sarruwa are also Hurrian.
128 NPN, pp. 170, 274.
129 NPN pp. 173, 275.
130 von Soden and Röllig, Das Akkadische Syllabar, p. XXII.
second component of the term with an initial w. This is not to suggest that manda was originally a Hurrian word, but rather that the scribe treated it as such.\textsuperscript{132} I know of no evidence that would suggest the second component of the term Ummān-manda is Hurrian. If the second component of the term Ummān-manda was really a Hurrian word read wanda by Sarruwa, then the initial w would have been found as the dominant written form throughout other texts referring to Ummān-manda. The reason is that the consonant w in the presumed Hurrian word wanda would represent the Hurrian labial fricative. The labial fricative is represented in cuneiform writing with w/p/b; Bush observes that it is the variations between w and p/b (not m) that usually indicate a labial fricative in writing a Hurrian word.\textsuperscript{133} This means the Hurrian word wanda would have variant written forms beginning with p/b (*p/banda) and not m (manda). So the predominant writing of the second component of Ummān-manda, if it were Hurrian, would have been *p/b/wanda, instead of manda. If the Akkadian and Hittite texts were writing the Hurrian word wanda for the second component of the term, then not all of these texts would have changed it into manda – at least some would have retained the written form wanda, but this has not happened (Table 1). In other words, a Hurrian wanda would not have turned into the form manda to dominate all other texts because the consonants m and w in a Hurrian word very rarely interchange in an Akkadian context. This is obvious because it is only with great luck that there are even two known examples of this interchange (the two personal names M/Wāḥri-Senni and M/Winneke mentioned above in p. 15).

Sarruwa probably had a Hurrian word in mind when he rendered manda as wanda. An example of a Hurrian word that poorly approximates to wanda, pronounced with an initial labial fricative, is w/pant- “right (hand)”.\textsuperscript{134} This word is the stem of name elements such as wa-an-t/di, wa-an-ta(r) commonly used in Hurrian.\textsuperscript{135} Hurrian personal names stemming from w/pant- are very common.\textsuperscript{136} This very common Hurrian element, or a similar sounding Hurrian lexeme, could very easily have given the impression in areas under Hurrian influence that manda was a Hurrian word with an initial labial fricative. The reading wanda for the second component of Ummān-manda is therefore very possibly based on a Hurrian etymology some people genuinely thought was correct, although actually it was only a later interpretation found recorded in the Idrimi Statue. In any case, the form wanda seems to be a written form borne out of a false understanding of the word as Hurrian. There are

\textsuperscript{132} Another example of late and incorrect etymology, that was genuinely thought to be correct, was equating núdu with manda, as discussed in 2.1.1.
\textsuperscript{133} Bush, op.cit., pp. 72, 77.
\textsuperscript{134} Ibid., pp. 72, 317:105.
\textsuperscript{135} See the elements and the derived names in NPN, p. 274.
\textsuperscript{136} For the documentation, see NPN, pp. 170-171.
some further indications of a link between the use of the term Ummān-wanda in the Statue of Idrimi and the Hurrians. These will be discussed in 4.4.4-5.

Table 1: Orthography of the word Ummān-manda

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Written Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YOS 10 44 53 (Old Babylonian liver omen)</td>
<td>Um-ma-an-ma-ad-da</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAT 602 5-8, possibly 9 (Old Babylonian liver omen)</td>
<td>ERIN.MES-ba-da</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAT 4102 4 (Old Babylonian liver omen)</td>
<td>ERIN-ma-an-da</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARM 7 221 10 (administrative text from Mari)</td>
<td>LU Ma-an-da</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idrimi 46 (royal inscription from Alalah)</td>
<td>ERIN.MES-(an)-wa-an-da137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KBo 3 19 20’ (Hittite literary text)</td>
<td>ERIN.MES-MA-AN-DA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KBo 6 3 iii 15 (Hittite law)</td>
<td>ERIN.MES-MA-AN-D[A]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KBo 7 14 14 (fragment of Hittite text)</td>
<td>ERIN.MES-MA-AN-D[A]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KBo 3 16 16’ (Hittite literary text)</td>
<td>ERIN.MES-MA-AN-DA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IBoT 4 7 1’ (Hittite literary text)</td>
<td>ERIN.MES-MA-AN-DA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KBo 6 2 iii 12 (Hittite law)</td>
<td>ERIN.[MEŠ] MA-AN-DA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KBo 6 6 i 19 (Hittite law)</td>
<td>ERIN.MEŠ [MA]-AN-DA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KBo 12 14 9’ (fragment of Hittite text)</td>
<td>ERIN.MEŠ MA-AN-[DA]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS 17.286 6 (letter)</td>
<td>ERIN.MEŠ-man-dá.ME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM 121034 20 (astrological omen)</td>
<td>[ER]IN-ma-an-ba-da</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAE 15 Section 8 Line 3 (astrological omen)</td>
<td>ERIN-ma-an-da (in traces)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACh Sin III 7 (astrological omen)</td>
<td>ERIN-man-da</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACh Adad XI 9 (astrological omen)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACh Adad XXI 2 (astrological omen)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACh Adad XIX 32 (astrological omen)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACh Suppl XLV 18 (astrological omen)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAE 17 D ii 1 (= ACh Sin XXV ii 5) (astrological omen)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

137 Text has ERIN.MEŠ-wa(?)-an wa-an-da but this is either a scribal mistake for ERIN.MEŠ wa-an-da or it is the written form ERIN.MEŠ-an wa-an-da, discussed in 1.3.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>omen)</th>
<th>ACh Ištar XXI 95 (astrological omen)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACh Ištar XXI 96 (astrological omen)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 2933 8 (astrological omen)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACh Sin IV 21 (astrological omen)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACh 2 Suppl XVIII 18 (astrological omen)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAE 63 20 (astrological omen)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAE 21 Section 5 Line 1 (astrological omen)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAE 17 11’ (astrological omen)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAT 10218 106 (astrological omen)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Šumma Izbu V 79 (birth omen)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB Tupsinna 54 (literary text)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IM 59046 ii 2: (royal inscription)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAA 10 100 27 (letter)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 3408 r. 13 (letter of prayer)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 120B+ 20 (hymn)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM 12261+ 19’ (royal inscription)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gadd Chronicle 38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gadd Chronicle 65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harran Cylinder I’ 14’ (royal inscription)</td>
<td>ERINI-man-da</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACh 2 Suppl IX 32 (K 3773) (astrological omen)</td>
<td>ERIN-man-d[a]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAE 15 E 4’ (astrological omen)</td>
<td>ERIN-man-[da]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weidner Chronicle 42 (chronicle)</td>
<td>ERIN-[da]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TH 1929-10-12,1 iii 44 (=Nin A iii 44) (royal inscription)</td>
<td>ERIN.HLA-man-da</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VA 3827 (=Nin A 17) (royal inscription)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM, 48-10-31,2 ii 7 (=Nin B ii 7) (royal inscription)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 8542 ii 12 (=Nin C ii 12) (royal inscription)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

138 The presence of the term Ummān-manda in the Weidner Chronicle is not universally accepted. For a discussion of the term’s presence in Weidner Chronicle 42, see Appendix 1.18, n. 76.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Written Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gadd Chronicle 59 (chronicle)</td>
<td>KUR.ERIN-man-da[a]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sp. 158 + Sp. II, 962 r. 22 (Spartoli II - literary text)</td>
<td>LU.ERIN-ma-an-[da]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sippar Cylinder I 11, 23, 24, 28, 29 (royal inscription)</td>
<td>LU.ERIN-man-da</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ḥarran Cylinder I’ 12’ (royal inscription)</td>
<td>[LU.ERIN-man-d]a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basalt Stela of Nabonidus II 3’, 14’ (royal inscription)</td>
<td>Um-man-ma-an-da</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sippar Cylinder I 11, 23, 24, 28 (royal inscription)</td>
<td>Um-ma-an-ma-an-da</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sippar Cylinder I 29</td>
<td>KUR Um-ma-an-ma-an-da</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyrus Cylinder 13 (royal inscription)</td>
<td>Um-man-man-da</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 2: Orthography of the word Umma-mandu(m)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Written Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ChG 5 r. 7, 9; ChG 31 r. 15’; ChG 18 r. 7; ChG 34 r. 17’ (archival texts, Choga Gavaneh, Iran)</td>
<td>ma-an-di (genitive form of mandu)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAE 20 6 (Recension B) Line 5 (astrological omen)</td>
<td>ERIN-ma-an!-du</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 213+Rm.2,250 24 (astrological omen)</td>
<td>ERIN-man-dum139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basalt Stela of Nabonidus X 14’ (royal inscription)</td>
<td>ERIN-man-du</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sippar Cylinder I 11, 23, 24, 28, 29 (royal inscription)</td>
<td>LU ERIN-man-du</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sippar Cylinder I 11, 23, 24, 29</td>
<td>Um-man-ma-an-du</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sippar Cylinder I 11, 23, 24, 28, 29 (royal inscription)</td>
<td>Um-ma-an-ma-an-du</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sippar Cylinder I 11, 23, 24, 28</td>
<td>Um-ma-man-man-du</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sippar Cylinder I 11, 23, 24, 28</td>
<td>Um-ma-an-ma-an-du</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sippar Cylinder I 29</td>
<td>KUR Um-ma-an-ma-an-du</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

139 This written form is discussed in ch. 2, pp. 23-24.
ETYMOLOGY: PREVIOUS STUDIES

2.1 The Proposed mādu Etymology

The earliest attempts to make sense of the word Ummān-manda date to the late nineteenth century.\(^1\) One view that has survived from this era into contemporary scholarship is that manda is derived from the word mādu(m) ‘many, numerous’.\(^2\) Support for this view has been adduced from the prisms of Esarhaddon where Ummān-manda (with orthographies ERĪN man-da and ERĪN.H.I.A man-da) is written interchangeably with the expression ‘numerous army’ (ERĪN.H.I.A ma-a’-[du]).\(^3\) The use of ummān ma’du in Esarhaddon’s prism is seen as linked with Sennacherib’s inscription where the Assyrian army slays the ummān ma’du ‘numerous troops’ with the son of the Elamite king.\(^4\) Komoróczy observes, however, that the adjective mādu(m) changes according to the noun it describes (e.g. ummānī ma-at-ti, ummān-šu(nu) ma-at-tu/ma-a’-du, ummānāṭïya ma-a’-da-a-ti, ummānī-šu ma-du-tu,) whereas the second element of Ummān-manda does not decline.\(^5\) Furthermore, there is no evidence that the form manda is used for mādu(m) aside from the texts using the term Umman-mails for which an explanation is sought. The consonant n is foreign to the root m’d and is not used in the written forms of mādu.\(^6\) Von Soden cites only two attestations which he considers to be a form of mādu where the consonant n is used: ma-an-du, and ma-an-da-a-tum,\(^7\) and suggests at the beginning of his entry to mādu(m) that the form manda is a late development similar to the form ma’du.\(^8\) CAD takes an alternate approach\(^9\) and relates the form

---


\(^2\) ABCD, p. 214, n. 5; BIWA, p. 200.

\(^3\) ABCD, p. 214, n. 5; BIWA, p. 200. For references to Esarhaddon’s prisms, see ch. 1, p. 6.


\(^5\) For discussion and examples, see G. Komoróczy, “Ummān-manda” Acta Antiqua Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae 25 (1977), pp. 63-64.

\(^6\) See a convincing range of texts cited for the usage of mādu in CAD M I 20-24, AHw 573.

\(^7\) JEN 11 4 and ACh Adad 13:16 respectively, cited in AHw 573.

\(^8\) AHw 573.

\(^9\) See note at the end of the entry for mādu in CAD M I 24.
ma-an-du₄ to another verb, mādādu,¹⁰ and attributes the form ma-an-da-a-tum to another word, mänditu.¹¹ CAD’s approach is preferable because the context for the word ma-an-du₄ has been provided¹² and an example similar in form to ma-an-da-a-tum has been supplied.¹³ Contrary to CAD, these words appear without such supporting context in von Soden’s entry. On account of all this, the evidence known to me indicates the consonant n has never actually been used for the adjective mādu, and therefore this word cannot be used to explain the meaning of words that contain the consonant n, such as manda or mándu. The word mādu(m) ‘many, numerous’ does not seem to account for the second component of the term Ummān-manda.

2.1.1 The Interchange of mādu and manda/mandu(m)

However, it could still be argued that the n uniquely emerged in the verbal adjective mādu when it came to the formation of the second component of the term Ummān-manda. One cannot rule out the possibility that the consonant n emerged in the verbal adjectival form of the root m’d. For example, there is the dissimilation of the verbal forms imiddu and imindu.¹⁴ In fact, one finds that the expression ummān mā’du ‘numerous army’ has been used interchangeably with Ummān-manda in Esarhaddon’s prisms and a few other texts.¹⁵ So how to account for this? There are very serious difficulties with the proposed mādu etymology.¹⁶ These difficulties make me wonder whether there is another explanation for the alternating use of the expressions ummān mā’du ‘numerous army’ and Ummān-manda.

When the expression ummān mā’du is used in Sennacherib’s inscription (written ERĪN.H.I.A ma-a’-du), it refers to the size and strength of the troops under Sennacherib’s adversaries.¹⁷ This distinct expression is common. It is written with forms such as ERĪN ma-a’-[du], ERĪN ma-at-ti, ERĪN.H.I.A mat-ti, ERĪN mat-tum

---

¹⁰ ma-an-du₄ in JEN 11 4 is quoted with other examples for mādādu ‘to measure (length), to survey’ in CAD M I 7: b) 1’.
¹¹ One of the examples given for mänditu ‘surprise attack’ is ACh Adad 3:16 ma-an-da-a-tum ina GIŠ.[…] ‘there will be attacks by…’, CAD M I 209: 1. a).
¹² CAD observes the word ma-an-du₄ in JEN 11 4 has the same meaning as ma-ti-id in A.ŠÀ.MEŠ ina tayāri ša ekalli ma-ti-id (JEN 13 18), and both come from the same verb mādādu ‘to measure (length), to survey’, CAD M I 7: b) 1’. Also see ŠE ša… ana šibši ma-an-du ‘barley which is paid as šibšu-tax’, CAD M I 7: f’.
¹³ CAD supplies the form man-di-ti alongside ma-an-da-a-tum, both mean mänditu ‘surprise attack’ see CAD M I 209: 1. a).
¹⁴ For the forms and examples, see CAD M I 24, 26: 10’.
¹⁵ For these texts and their references, see Appendix 1.40, 41 and perhaps Appendix 1.1. I discuss these texts in 2.1 and 2.1.1.
¹⁶ Discussed above in pp. 20-21.
and in astrological omens denotes an enemy army of great size and strength that may attack the king and his realm. An Old Babylonian example of the expression occurs in one Old Babylonian liver omen which mentions the ‘large enemy army’ um-ma-an na-ak-ri-im ma-at-ta-am. I want to draw attention to the fact that while Esarhaddon’s prisms do use this expression interchangeably with Ummān-manda, the king’s earliest prism uses the standard form ERIN man-da and the other forms are attested in later prisms only. The scribe of the earliest prism wrote ERIN man-da without affixing the plural determinative –H.I.A, but used the plural determinative when, in the same text, he referred to ‘his (Teus-paya’s) troops’ ERIN.H.I.A-3u. This selective use of the plural determinative was lost with the scribes of the later prisms, who used the plural determinative –H.I.A indiscriminately for both the first component of word Ummān-manda (just like ERIN.H.I.A ma-a’-du in Sennacherib’s inscription) and the phrase ‘his (Teus-paya’s) troops’. The scribe of the earliest prism obviously felt the need to maintain such a selective usage of the plural determinative despite the common usage of the plural determinative –H.I.A in the other distinct phrase ummān ma’du ‘numerous troops’. A plausible explanation for this is that he copied the writing of the word Ummān-manda from a textual tradition that maintained the usual form ERIN man-da. The scribe did not want to artificially add the plural determinative to the form he was copying, regardless of what he may have thought the word meant. Other scribes probably utilized the text of this earlier prism for their own work, and not being exposed to the textual tradition available to their predecessor, saw that the form ERIN man-da contradicted the expression they are accustomed to seeing (e.g. ERIN.H.I.A ma-a’-du in Sennacherib’s inscription), and added the plural determinative to ERIN but still kept the second component as man-da. One of these later scribes changed the second component and just wrote ERIN.H.I.A ma-a’-[du]. The association of ma’du and manda can also be observed in the astrological omen EAE 63 20. The protasis of EAE 63 58 correlates with the one in EAE 63 20. The apodosis of omen EAE 63 58 has the ‘fall of

---

19 YOS 10 11 i 7.
21 A strong candidate for this textual tradition is one of the branches of the omen literature, especially the series EAE, which would have preserved the word Ummān-manda as ERIN man-da or ERIN ma-an-da. For example a Middle Assyrian astrological omen wrote the second component as *ma-an-da (the text actually writes ma-an-ba-da but the ba is an erroneous scribal insertion as explained in ch. 1, n. 32) and one reads ma-an-da in a Neo-Assyrian copy of the same omen in EAE 15 Section 8 Line 3 (Appendix 1.37). It is well known Esarhaddon’s inscriptions make explicit references to divination. For a discussion of this, see F. M. Fales and G. B. Lanfranchi, “The Impact of Oracular Material on the Political Utterances and Political Action in the Royal Inscriptions of the Sargonid Dynasty” Oracles et prophéties dans l’antiquité. Actes du Colloque de Strasbourg 15-17 Juin 1993. W. Heintz, ed. (Université des sciences humaines de Strasbourg, Travaux du Centre de recherche sur le Proche-Orient et la Grèce antiques 15). Paris. de Boccard. 1997, p. 108.
22 The omen is in BPO 1, p. 38.
23 On this correlation, see BPO 1, p. 15.
the numerous army’ (SUB-tim ERIN ma-at-ti) in place of ‘the fall of Ummān-manda’ (SUB-tim ERIN-man-da) in EAE 63 20. Both Umman-manda and ummānī matti ‘numerous army’ appear as the first item of the apodoses EAE 63 20 and EAE 63 58 respectively, therefore the scribes have associated them. All this evidence indicates that the scribes of the first millennium BC associated the phrase ummān ma’du ‘numerous troops’ with Ummān-manda out of the belief they meant the same thing, but they preserved the writing of the latter. The scribes, using their knowledge of Akkadian, must have equated ummān ma’du ‘numerous troops’ with Ummān-manda and therefore they came up with a scribal etymology for Ummān-manda they genuinely thought was correct. In this case, they could have regarded the different forms to be different ways of writing the same thing. The scribes used the word mādu ‘numerous’ for the second component of the word Ummān-manda due to a mistaken scribal etymology. In this regard, I draw attention to the phrase Ummān-mandu(m) found in two astrological texts and a royal inscription (listed in Table 2).

Two manuscripts of the same solar omen apodosis in the series EAE use the expressions ERIN man-dum ‘Umman-mandum’ and ERIN mat-tum ‘large army’ interchangeably. The variation between ERIN-man-dum and ERIN-mat-tum is not a copying error. Similar to the mistaken scribal mādu ‘numerous’ etymology for the form manda discussed above in pp. 21-23, it seems that the forms man-dum and mat-tum were also associated

24 In EAE 63 20, there is a text break after the term Ummān-manda: SUB-tim ERIN-man-da KI.MIN SUB-tim [...] ‘the fall of the Ummān-manda, variant: the fall of [...]’. Appendix 1.33. Komoróczy argues, on the basis of the relation between apodoses 20 and 58, that the expression ‘numerous army’ (ummānī matti) should be restored in the broken text found after the term Ummān-manda, Komoróczy, “Ummān-manda”, p. 63. Given that the two expressions are treated as alternatives to one another in EAE 63, the broken part in omen 20 is more likely to be followed by the expression ERIN.MU ‘my army’, as is the case in the apodosis of EAE 21 Section 5 line 1: ZI-ur ERIN-man-da KIMIN ERIN.MU ‘attack of the Ummān-manda, variant: my army’. For EAE 21 Section 5 Line 1, see ABCD, p. 239.

25 An earlier case may be coming from the Old Babylonian liver omen YOS 10 44. This is discussed in ch. 1, n. 88. It is possible that once the scribes thought manda was the Akkadian word mādu, the consonant n assimilated into d.

26 That the scribes came up with an etymology is not unexpected at all. Unlike this case, some ancient scribes are even known to have come up with deliberately incorrect etymologies for Akkadian words using their knowledge of Sumerian for artistic or speculative reasons. See a very brief discussion and references for this different phenomenon in S. J Lieberman, The Sumerian Loanwords in Old-Babylonian Akkadian: Volume One Prolegomena and Evidence. Missoula, Montana. Scholars Press. 1977, p. 3, nn. 2-3.

27 EAE 24 3 46 in van Soldt, Solar Omens of Enuma Anu Enlil, p. 32:III 46, photo in ibid., pl. 1, publication details for manuscript A in ibid., p. 16; ACh Samas 2:24; Appendix 1.40.

28 The two manuscripts are identical for the rest of the omen in EAE 24 3 46, and in general the two manuscripts show very few variations in the words they use. There is only one extant case where different words are interchanged, e.g. LUGAL là in Manuscript A 11 instead of [G]IS.GU.ZA in Manuscript B 35, see van Soldt, Solar Omens of Enuma Anu Enlil, p. 29: III 30. The manuscripts also have different ways of writing the same word, e.g. AS.TE in A 10 and GIS.GU.ZA in B r. 1 for ‘throne’ in ibid., p. 29:III 31. For examples of minor orthographic differences for the same word, e.g. the additional phonetic complement with AS.ME 2 in A 13 and AS.ME 2-tum in B r. 3 in ibid., p. 30:III 33, or with KIN-är in A 17 compared with KIN in B r. 10, see ibid., p. 31:III 40, for a grammatical variation, e.g. the singular URU in A 16 compared to the plural URU.URU in B r. 9 in ibid., p. 31:III 39.
with one another out of a false scribal etymology. In fact *mandu* is not *mādu* because the latter does not have the consonant *n* (as explained above in pp. 20-21). The lack of the consonant *n* in *mat-tum* means that this form is not the equivalent of the form *man-dum*. The scribe who maintained the writing *man-dum* in EAE 24 3 46 appears to have resisted changing the form he was copying whereas the other copyist of this solar omen switched *man* to *mat* to attain *mat-tum*, the latter being part of a written form for the common phrase ‘numerous troops’ *ummann ma’du*, which at least some scribes thought provided the etymology of Ummān-manda as discussed above in pp. 21-23.

It appears that *man-dum*, not related to *mādu* ‘numerous’, is used as an alternative written form of the second component of the Ummān-manda; the forms Ummān-mandu and Ummān-manda are used interchangeably in different manuscripts of certain texts (Table 2). A comparison of Table 1 and Table 2 indicates the term has been written both as Ummān-manda and with the variant form Ummān-mandu(m). Some scribes of the first millennium could have assumed that *mandu* is the adjective *mādum* despite the fact the latter is not written with the consonant *n*. It appears they could think of no other possible etymology for the word *mandu*. The forms *mandī* and *ma’du* were used interchangeably for an entirely different lexeme (*mandī* B),\(^{29}\) whereas in another lexeme (*mandī* A) the forms *mandī* and *maddī* are interchanged.\(^{30}\) These words exemplify how a word almost homophonic with *mandu* is alternatively pronounced *ma’du* or *maddī* without being related to the adjective *mādu*. The consonant *n* in the form *mandu* could lose its significance and somehow assimilate into the next consonant. The relationship between the *mandu(m)* form used in the phrase Ummān-mandu(m) (Table 2) with the predominant form Ummān-manda will be discussed later in 3.1.1 and chapter 4. The presence of this form Ummān-mandu(m) is clearly another reason for the mistaken scribal etymology of Ummān-manda as *ummnān-ma’du* ‘numerous troops’.

The treatment of the expression *zēr mandu(m)* in the lexical lists also unveils this scribal etymology and how not every scribe followed it. First of all, the second component of *zēr mandu(m)* was equated with *mātu* ‘land’ in the lexical list Hḫ XIV.\(^{31}\) Furthermore, the lexical list Hḫ XIV equated the second component *mandu(m)* with *ki* ‘earth, place, ground’.\(^{32}\) On the other hand, however, lexical lists also equated *zēr mandu(m)* with the Sumerian

\(^{29}\) The meaning of this lexeme is unclear, it may denote a pole, see *ma’du* in CAD M I 20 and *mandī* B in M I 210.

\(^{30}\) *mandī* A ‘base’ (a part of the liver) in CAD M I 209.

\(^{31}\) MSL 8/2, p. 41.

\(^{32}\) I will detail this in 3.1.3.1.
word a-za-lu-lu ‘multitude of living things, teeming life’. The second component of a-za-lu-lu is the reduplicated form of lu ‘many’ (as a noun), ‘to make numerous’ (as a verb). This may suggest that the corresponding second component of the expression zêr ṭanda(m) is µâdû ‘numerous’. But I just pointed out the second component of zêr ṭanda(m) was also explicitly equated with mētu ‘land’ and ki ‘earth, place, ground’. This reveals scribes had different ideas about ṭanda(m). I suggest that ṭanda(m) was treated as an Akkadian word (mētu) by some and as a Sumerian word by others (lu-lu). There was uncertainty about what ṭanda(m) meant. A variant form of the term Ummâ-n-manda was Ummâ-n-ṭanda(m), so the uncertainty can be carried to the etymology of the term. I argue this constitutes additional evidence for the existence of a false scribal etymology that employed µâdû to account for the second component of Ummâ-n-manda, because if µâdû was the clear meaning of the word’s second component (of which variant forms have ṭanda[m]), then the lexical lists would not have been ambivalent with the treatment of ṭanda(m) in the lexical lists.

I must add that there is no reason to assume the false µâdû etymology was limited to the first millennium. There may have been precedents to this scribal etymology in the second millennium since µâdû is a common Akkadian word that would have prompted the scribes to assume it was behind the second component of the term Ummâ-n-manda. Perhaps an example is when two Old Babylonian liver omens used the varying forms ma-ad-da and ma-an-da in order to render the second component of the term.

2.2 The Proposed Hurrian origin

As far as modern scholarship is concerned, the suggestion that the word manda comes from the word µâdû(m) ‘many, numerous’ was born not purely out of lexical and orthographical considerations. The fact that the word Ummâ-n-manda was used to denote different peoples such as the Cimmerians and the Medes meant there arose an expectation that the word by itself did not denote a specific group but was a generic term that can describe any ethnic group. Therefore Böhl derived the second component of the word Ummâ-n-manda from µâdû(m) to render Ummâ-n-manda as “numerous troops” and applied this to those peoples he expected were dominant at the

---

33 CAD Z 89.
34 SL 159.
35 References above in nn. 31-32.
36 Tables 1-2.
37 I discussed the possibility of a scribal etymology in the case of the Old Babylonian liver omens in ch. 1, n. 88.
early stage of Mesopotamia’s history. Böhl argued for the existence of three Hurrian polities during the early history of Mesopotamia: Ummān-manda, Ḫanigalbat and Mitanni, of which Ummān-manda was the most aggressive. Knowledge about Hurrian polities has changed since the time of Böhl. There is that a single powerful Hurrian state existed in northern Mesopotamia with both the names Mitanni and Ḫanigalbat at the time of Ḫattušiliš I. Idrimi does use the word Ummān-manda for the Hurrian kings and their leader Barattarna. The known links between some second millennium sources mentioning the Ummān-manda and the Hurrians will be discussed later in this study. The evidence does not suggest that the term was originally designed to denote the Hurrians but rather that it has been used for them only later, similar to the way Neo-Assyrian and Neo-Babylonian sources used the term for Cimmerians and the Medes respectively. Hrozný suggested that the name Mitanni may have originated from Manda. However, the sound forms of the two words are too different, and a relationship between them is unlikely.

2.3 The Proposed Indo-European Etymologies

Article 54 in the Hittite law code mentions the Ummān-manda alongside a number of cities and another Hittite text mentions Zayaludi (written Za-a-lu-ti-di-š) the head of the Ummān-manda. The Hittite version of the Cuthaean Legend mentions (as one finds in the later Standard Babylonian version of the story) the Ummān-manda invading the land of the Akkadian king Naram-Sin. These references seem to suggest a specific ethnic group to some scholars. The approach which saw the Ummān-manda as an Indo-European speaking tribe was defended during a time when awareness was growing of a number of words in cuneiform texts originating from

---

39 Ibid., p. 144.
40 See the evidence discussed in M. C Astour, “Ḫattušiliš, Ḫalab, and Ḫanigalbat” *JNES* 31 (1972), pp. 103-105.
42 4.4.5.
45 For references to these two texts, see *Appendix 1.13-14.*
46 Discussed in ch. 4, p. 81-82.
the Indo-European language family (hence some sort of Indo-European presence in the ancient Near East). Forrer associated some of the evidence for the Indo-European language in the cuneiform texts with the Ummān-manda and called the language ‘Mandaic’. Gurney notes this association did not receive acceptance. The main criticism was that the Hittite texts with Indo-European elements known to Forrer, such as the horse-training tablet of Kikkuli from Mitanni, do not explicitly mention the Ummān-manda.

Forrer connects the word Manda in the omen literature with the name of the Medes and the Manneans mentioned in the Assyrian inscriptions. The earliest known occurrence of the second component of Ummān-manda is in the Old Babylonian era whereas the Medes and the Manneans are first attested in the cuneiform texts is in the early first millennium. Cuneiform writing usually renders the ‘people/land of Mannea’ as Ma-na-a-a, and the writings never contain the syllable da (which Manda always does) – ‘Mannea’ does not make an adequate match with the second component of Ummān-manda. Ma-da-a-a is the usual rendering for the ‘people/land of the Medes’. This form lacks the consonant n, and therefore has limited orthographic similarity with the second component of the word Ummān-manda. The only written forms of Ummān-manda that lack the n consonant among all the documents mentioning the second component of the term Ummān-manda are madda and bada in Old Babylonian liver omens (Table 1). These written forms are exceptional and have been discussed in 1.2. There is no reason to link them to the word Media (Ma-da-a-a). The word ‘Media’ has been written


54 See the primary sources in Brown, “Medien (Media)”, pp. 619-623; Parpola, op.cit., p. 230 entry Madaja.

55 I also note that there is no demonstrable link between the word mada, found in an Old Babylonian year formula that mentions a ‘man of the land’ (lú ma-da), and the second component of the term Ummān-manda. For the discussion and references, see 2.3.1. The word mada found in this Old Babylonian year formula does not support a connection between the second component of the word Ummān-manda and ‘Media’ (Ma-da-a-a).
with the consonant  \textit{n} only once, as \textit{KUR Man-da-a-a}, in one of Sargon II’s inscriptions.\textsuperscript{56} This single case is not enough to substantiate a lexical connection between \textit{Ma-da-a-a} and \textit{Manda}. The written forms of ‘Media’ (\textit{Ma-da-a-a}) and Manda are different because the latter has the consonant \textit{n}, and this would not have been the case if the two words were truly connected. As Diakonoff notes, if there is any relationship between the toponym Media with Ummān-manda, it can only be that the latter in some way inspired the former.\textsuperscript{57} On this, Landsberger suggests that the Babylonians could have turned Ummān-manda into a kind of proper name by associating its second component \textit{manda} with the ethnonym ‘Mede’.\textsuperscript{58} Komoróczy suggests the Babylonians developed a learned etymology out of the term Ummān-manda for the ethnonym ‘Mede’.\textsuperscript{59} It is impossible to decide whether the similarity to the second component of Ummān-manda is coincidental, deliberate or a scribal error on the basis of comparing the orthographies in the royal inscriptions alone. It is nearly impossible that the second component of the Akkadian word Ummān-manda begat the ethnonym ‘Mede’ because the Old Persian texts also use \textit{Māda} to denote the Medes,\textsuperscript{60} suggesting an Iranian setting and origin for the ethnonym. It is unlikely the Old Persians would use an Akkadian term for the Medes with whom they were very close.\textsuperscript{61} If there has actually been a perceived resemblance between the word Media (\textit{Ma-da-a-a}) and the second component of the term Ummān-manda for the Babylonian scribes, then it must have been merely a subsidiary factor for using the latter word for the Medes.\textsuperscript{62} The Neo-Assyrian documents use the term Ummān-manda to denote the Cimmerians, and yet one cannot argue Assyrian scribes saw a similarity between the sounds forms of \textit{manda}, the second component of Ummān-manda, and the word \textit{Gimirāya} ‘Cimmerian’.


\textsuperscript{58} Landsberger considered scribal error more likely, especially with \textit{KUR Man-da-a-a} in Sargon II’s inscription, and ascribed such an error to a contamination of the terms Mada and Manna, see B. Landsberger and T. Bauer, “Zu neuveröffentlichten Geschichtsquellen der Zeit von Asarhaddon bis Nabonid” \textit{ZA} 37 (1927), p. 83 n. 1. A contamination is unlikely because the two lands are different geographical entities. For a discussion of the geography of Mannea and Media, see L. D. Levine, \textit{Contributions to the Historical Geography of the Zagros in the Neo-Assyrian Period}. University of Pennsylvania. PhD. Ann Arbor, Michigan. University Microfilms. 1969.

\textsuperscript{59} Komoróczy, “Ummān-manda”, p. 67.


\textsuperscript{61} The alternative would be positing a type of Mesopotamian influence on the early social and cultural development of Median identity, and a type of relationship between the Persians and the Medes, which is certainly going beyond the evidence available on that matter.

\textsuperscript{62} Further discussion is needed to elaborate on the main reasons the Neo-Babylonian documents use the term Ummān-manda for the Medes. Only then is it possible to put into perspective in what way the Babylonians could have seen the sound resemblance as a factor (if at all) for designating the Medes as Ummān-manda. This is discussed in ch. 7, n. 111.
Forrer sees in the Hittite law article, in which Ummān-manda are mentioned, a list of tribes and classes of profession. Forrer argues the Manda and the Sala listed alongside the cities were semi-nomadic cattle breeders contrasted to the agriculturalists and other professions. He proposes that the Ummān-manda lived between the Euphrates and the Taurus whereas Ḥemuwa was probably in ‘Armenia’. Diakonoff observes that there is no compelling evidence for this interpretation. Lewy, based on the same premise that the term refers to a population group with a fixed location, alternatively proposed for the Ummān-manda a location east of Halys. It is impossible to tell, purely on the basis of reading the Hittite law, in what way the term Ummān-manda relates to either the troops from the cities or the professional groups with whom it is listed in the same law article. The identity of the Ummān-manda in the Hittite laws remains a mystery despite several efforts.

Forrer argues that Manda designates ‘Aryan’ invaders in cuneiform sources, and that this led the Assyrians and the Babylonians to designate the Cimmerians and the Medes as the Ummān-manda. An administrative document from Mari lists individuals with Semitic names as “Manda-men”. Therefore the term Ummān-manda is not meant specifically for ‘Aryans’.

Cornelius identifies the Ummān-manda in the Hittite laws as Aryan warriors with a privileged standing and names them “die Reisigen” based on his argument that Manda comes from the Indo-European word *mandos, which Cornelius argues means ‘chariot horse’. Cornelius argues that the Ummān-manda whom Naram-Sin had to fight in the historical kernel of the Cuthaean Legend, and the Ummān-manda fought by Ammisaduqa (1646-1626 BC), had a specific military technology, the chariot horse, *mandos, which Cornelius associates with other

64 Ibid., p. 248.
65 Ibid., p. 248.
71 ARM 7, p. 113, no. 221 10. These names are discussed below in pp. 35-36.
instances in Mesopotamian history where the chariot may have provided military superiority. 

Cornelius argues his etymology is evidenced when it is used to interpret the Cuthaean Legend: the Indo-European chariot warriors overpower the foot soldiers of Naram-Sin because of their technological advantage. The Cuthaean Legend cannot support Cornelius’ etymology because its manuscripts do not make any reference to the military technology of the enemies of Naram-Sin. Similarly there is no reference to their presumed military technology against the Old Babylonian king Ammisaduqa in the apodosis of the ‘Venus Tablet’ EAE 63 20. Cornelius’ suggested etymology has been greeted with scepticism whereas his suggestion that the Ummān-manda were a military group did receive some approval. Cornelius argues that the term Ummān-manda is analogous to the expression Hāpiru because both terms presumably do not refer to a specific geographical region. Ummān-manda in this case may be a social group with a military nature based on the chariot horse instead of an ethnic group. This is an “appealing speculation” at best.

Cornelius’ expectation for an Indo-European etymology for manda is partly due to his argument for an expansion of Indo-European power into the Near East as early as 2300 BC on account of their presumed superior chariot technology. Cornelius additionally argues that the Hyksos dynasty established itself in Palestine through superior chariot technology. The primary documents mentioning the Ummān-manda do not ascribe any superior military technology to the peoples, groups or individuals designated by the term.

2.3.1 Araḥab the ‘Man of the Land’

---

75 EAE 63 20 in BPO 1, p. 38.
79 Westenholz, Legends of the Kings of Akkade, p. 266.
Cornelius argues that Araḥab the “Mada” who appears in a year date formula of Ammiditana (1683 – 1647 BC) is the oldest mention of a ‘Mede’.\(^82\) The personal name Araḥab has no clear Indo-Iranian etymology. The language of the Medes, despite many gaps in knowledge, appears to have been closely related to the Indo-Iranian languages.\(^83\) The word mada is a common Sumerian word for ‘ territory, (foreign) land’, and is used both for foreign lands and the land of Akkad,\(^84\) in the year names from the Ur III dynasty up to the First Dynasty of Babylon.\(^85\) Therefore, the Araḥab the ‘Mada’ is not a ‘Mede’, but a lú mada ‘man of the land’. It is not clear what exactly ‘the man of the land’ is meant to denote. Almost every other use of the word mada in the year names explicitly marks the territory of a specific foreign land.\(^86\) It is not clear who Araḥab is or from which ‘land’ he comes. The year name, our only source of information for him,\(^87\) says only the following:\(^88\)

\[
\text{mu am-mi-di-ta-na lugal-e usu(á-kal) maḥ-a ṣutu 4uṣu amar-utu-bi-da-ke₄ A-ra-ḥa-ab}
\]

(variant: 'A-ra-ḥa-ha-bi')\(^89\) lú ma-da m[u]\(^90\)...

the year Ammiditana, the king, (by) the great might of Šamas and Marduk, (defeated) Araḥab the man of the land.

It has been suggested Araḥab is militarily defeated.\(^91\) Horsnell points out that the year name most likely concerns a military exploit because usu maḥ and synonymous phrases such as usu gal, usu kala-ga, usu gir-ra, usu gal-gal are used in the year names to record military exploits.\(^92\) Pientka translates the words lú ma-da as “Mann des Umlandes”.\(^93\) Horsnell follows this and translates lú ma-da as “man of the hinterland”,

\(^{86}\) There are exceptions where the word refers to Babylonia. This is discussed below in p. 34.
\(^{87}\) As acknowledged in E. Ebeling, “Araḥab” \textit{RIA} 1 (1932), p. 128.
\(^{88}\) Manuscripts and references collected in Horsnell \textit{Year-Names Babylon} II, pp. 292-293: Ad 17.
\(^{89}\) Horsnell \textit{Year-Names Babylon} II, p. 293: 3094 228RSv. Only the heads of the signs are visible, Horsnell \textit{Year-Names Babylon} II, p. 293, n. 75.
\(^{90}\) Horsnell collates m[u]...and tentatively considers it to be the beginning of a verbal chain that has Araḥab as the subject, Horsnell \textit{Year-Names Babylon} II, pp. 292, n. 73; 293, n. 75.
\(^{92}\) See references in Horsnell \textit{Year-Names Babylon} II, p. 292, n. 73.
noting other English words that convey the sense of “Umland” as implied in his translation of ma-da, such as “outback”, “back country”, “land lying beyond the developed part of the country”. Pientka tentatively suggests that the year formula may be referring to a military dispute between Ammiditana and an otherwise unknown nomadic tribe for which the expression lú mada is used. A unique aspect of this year name, and something that may support Pientka’s suggestion that Araḥab was leading a nomadic group, is that Araḥab is not called a king but a ‘man’ (lú), and the phrase lú mada is used only for him. The problem, again, is that there is no other context or clue by which one can determine what unique aspect about Araḥab has been communicated by the use of the words lú ‘man’ and mada ‘land’. The lack of context implies this year name does not by itself dictate that mada is to be interpreted here any different from its attestations as the common word for ‘land, territory’ in the other year-names. When mada does have a sense of peripheral land or countryside, as attested in a range of other documents, it is associated with a specific city or land in many instances.

Jacobsen suggests the original meaning of mada in one of Gudea’s cylinder inscriptions was “level land such as may be found on the edge of the desert…sparsely inhabited if at all [emphasis mine], and contrasting with the well-populated settled areas dotted with towns and villages” and proposes this earlier specific meaning of mada changed and came to be used as a more general word that corresponds to Akkadian mātum ‘country’. Jacobsen obtains this meaning for mada after translating ma-da gú-sag šár-šár-ra-na Gú-edin-na 4Nin-giš-su-ka-ka in Cyl. A xiv 8-9 as “in his mada abounding in early legumes, in Ningirsu(k)’s Gueddinna(k)” and arguing this line stood in contrast to uru-dù-a á-dam-gar-ra-na Gú-giš-bar-ra 4Nanše-ka “in his (lands) built (up with) cities and settled populations, in Nanshe’s Gu-ishbarra(k)” in Cyl. A xiv 11-12. So Jacobsen argues the contrast between the lines also implies a contrast between the settled areas and the terrain denoted by mada. The lines Jacobsen translated need not be seen, however, as contrasting each other, and in fact they may be paralleling each other in a way that they denote countrysides of similar nature, but belonging to different regions. Admittedly the phrase gú-sag šár-šár-ra-na in Cyl. A xiv 8 is very difficult to translate. There is not

94 Horsnell Year-Names Babylon II, pp. 292, n. 73; 293.
95 Pientka, Die spätbabylonische Zeit, p. 227.
96 As discussed above in pp. 31-32.
97 A good selection of texts in H. Limet, “Étude Sémantique de Ma.da, Kur, Kalam” RA 72 (1978), pp. 2-6. The names of the specific cities and lands spelled out in many of these citations prove my point.
99 Ibid., p. 40, n. 47.
100 Ibid., p. 40, n. 47.
enough context to determine which of the many meanings of gú and sag should be used here. Nevertheless, the word ma-da in Cyl. xiv 18, and the phrase gú-sag sár-sár-ra-na which relates to ma-da in some way, describe the mada ‘land’ in the place called Gú-edin-na ᴺîn-gîr-su-ka ka-Gú-edin-na’ of Ningirsu’. Besides the obvious fact that Gú-edin-na literally means ‘edge of the steppe’, Edzard notes that it denotes a fertile land situated between Girsu and Umma, claimed by both cities. I note that gú is equated to mātum ‘land’ in a lexical list, and elsewhere one finds mada is also equated to mātu. Cyl. A xiv 10 indicates a levy was imposed on the land. I suggest a fertile land fought over by cities on which a levy was imposed is more likely to correspond to a countryside that is settled and cultivated. Black gave a brief but illustrative description of how the suburban countryside and the cultivated rural landscape are depicted in Sumerian texts. I suggest mada is used for this fertile land of ‘Gú-edin-na’ of Ningirsu’ in Gudea’s Cylinder A, and in general the sense of periphery found with the word mada refers to the suburban countryside and/or the cultivated rural area. Kraus suggested that mada may merely denote a flatland around a city. Edzard followed this and noted that Jacobsen seems to have rendered the meaning of mada more specific than necessary. Limet’s in-depth study of mada led to some well-documented conclusions concerning its rich and complicated semantic range, and one of the conclusions was that “il s’applique aux campagnes qui s’étendent entre les cités, qui sont parsemées de villages, qui sont cultivées, plantées de vergers ou parcourues par les troupeaux”. When mada means hinterland in some contexts, its area is still meant to contain settlements and the various types of human groupings associated with it. A nomadic leader, as suggested by Pientka, and his social group are not the only ones that such a hinterland can produce, even if mada had meant “hinterland” for the phrase lú ma-da in the formula for Ammiditana’s seventeenth regnal year. Furthermore, Arahāb could have been the leader of a conventional enemy of Babylon about whom there is an information gap due to the scarcity of evidence. The year-names can abbreviate the event recorded for the year to such an extend that crucial details can sometimes

---

101 For the different meanings of gú, see SL 84, 92; ePSD G gu[neck], for sаг, see SL 223; ePSD S sag[head]. Edzard does not translate this phrase in his edition of Cylinder A, see RIME 3/1, p. 78: xiv 8.

102 See note in RIME 3/1, p. 78: CylA xiv 9.

103 MSL 3, p. 77:26; Limet, “Étude Sémantique de Ma.da, Kur, Kalam”, p. 11. The word gú is literally ‘edge’, and is used in a number of other meanings, see SL 84; ePSD G gu[neck].


105 See RIME 3/1, p. 78: CylA xiv 10.


110 Ibid., p. 6:1.6. For plenty of examples, see ibid., pp. 2-6.

111 Pientka, Die spätaltbabylonische Zeit, p. 227.
only be known if a more detailed version of the year-name is found in one of the copies. For example the defeat of a certain enemy army can be expressed by the mere mention of its identity without any further reference, e.g. ‘year (of) the army of Ešnunna’ (mu ugnim ēs-nun\(^{112}\)). Hammurabi’s claim of victory over ‘all the enemies in the Subartu mountains’ has been abbreviated merely by the phrase ‘the year (of) all his enemy’ (mu kīlib gū-dā-a-bi) in some of the manuscripts. There is also an instance where kur, a word that can mean ‘foreign country’, has been used in isolation for Samsuiluna’s 20\(^{th}\) year: ‘year (of) the foreign country which was disobedient to him’ (mu kur nu-še-ga-ni!-n[e])\(^{114}\) and it is only thanks to other copies of the same year name by which one knows that the event is Samsuiluna’s victory over the army of Ešnunna.\(^{115}\) The lack of a country name does not by itself guarantee the enemy is from an unspecified peripheral land hospitable to nomads because for example Samsuiluna’s enemies Iadiabum and Mutūrašana are merely called ‘kings who became hostile towards him’ (lugal-lugal-la an-da-kūr-uš-a) and their lands are not mentioned.\(^{116}\) The former is otherwise known as the king of Ḥana.\(^{117}\) Ammiditana is said to have destroyed the wall of Udinim which Damqiilišu had built.\(^{118}\) Other sources say Damqi-ilšu was one of the kings of the ‘Sealand Dynasty’.\(^{119}\) After Hammurabi, the First Dynasty of Babylon started losing territory and influence to various powers such as the kingdom of Ḥana in the west and the ‘Sealand Dynasty’ in the south.\(^{120}\) There is no reason to think the current state of knowledge about the forces and political actors menacing Babylon is exhaustive. Arahāb could be a king of a specific city or land about whom there is a lack of information due to the current state of evidence. Another alternative, although less likely, is that Arahāb may have been a mercenary who revolted against Ammiditana.

The word mada is used to call the Ammiditana’s realm as ‘his land’ (ma-da-ni) in a year name about the remission of debts.\(^{121}\) The word ma-da replaces kalam in a year name with the same theme from the reign of Ammisaduqa.\(^{122}\) If ma-da can be used to denote the Babylonian land, Arahāb could have been called lú ma-da ‘man of the land’ because he was a mercenary or a soldier in Babylonia who created military problems for

---

113 Horsnell Year-Names Babylon II, p. 159:1189 141RSv; 4424 141RSv, for all the variants, see Horsnell Year-Names Babylon II, p. 159: Ha 39.
Ammiditana. Whatever was meant for Araḥab as ‘the man of the land’, it is at least clear the answer is not ‘Mede’ and this reference in the year name also has no demonstrable link to the Ummān-manda.

2.3.2 The Semitic names from Mari and Choga Gavaneh

There is evidence the second component of the word Ummān-manda can be used for any ethnicity and language group. The Semitic names in the bill of payment from Mari clearly demonstrate that the term Ummān-manda is not an exclusive term for Indo-Europeans.\textsuperscript{123} The bill of payments from Mari mentions four “Manda”-men (LU Ma-an-da) whose names are clearly not Indo-European: Addu-ma-Addu, Ri-im Da-gan, I-pi-iq-A-[r]a-ah!-tim, ḫa-bu-ni-ša-pa.\textsuperscript{124} Bottéro noted “le caractère sémitique” of these names.\textsuperscript{125} Some more information can be gleaned about their background. The name Addu-ma-Addu contains the name of Addu, the Amorite form for the weather god.\textsuperscript{126} Ri-im Da-gan means ‘Gift of Dagan’.\textsuperscript{127} Dagan is an Amorite deity with main cult centres at Mari, Yarmut, Ebla and Ḫana.\textsuperscript{128} Both individuals could be Amorites. I-pi-iq-A-[r]a-ah!-tim means ‘Protection of Araḥtu’.\textsuperscript{129} Araḥtu is, among other things, a Sutean goddess.\textsuperscript{130} Therefore the name may belong to a Sutean.\textsuperscript{131} ḫa-bu-ni-ša-pa is more difficult to understand. At least it is certain that the first element of this personal name is the West Semitic ḫapd-, *ḥbd ‘slave, servant’, which is used in Amorite personal names in Mari.\textsuperscript{132} If one transcribes the personal name as *Ḫabdū-Ḫišapa, there is the difficulty that the Sumerian goddess Nisaba is not expected in a West Semitic name. Bottéro alternatively transcribes the name as Ḫabdūnḫišapa.\textsuperscript{133} In either case, the meaning and significance of the second element is not apparent. One cannot rule out surprises; for example a rock relief inscription situated in western Iran, honouring Anubanini the Lullubean king, usually dated

\textsuperscript{123} As observed in A. Kempinski, Syrien und Palästina (Kanaan) in der Letzten Phase der Mittelbronze IIb-Zeit (1650-1570 V. Chr.). Wiesbaden. Otto Harrassowitz. 1983, p. 205, n. 16.


\textsuperscript{125} ARM 7, p. 225.


\textsuperscript{127} Rīnum ‘gift (from a god)’ is commonly used for personal names, as in Rī-im DN. See AHw 986.


\textsuperscript{129} Iqpu ‘grace, protection’ is used in personal names, CAD I/J 165.


\textsuperscript{131} On the Suteans, see Heltzer and Arbeli, The Suteans.


\textsuperscript{133} ARM 7, 1957, pp. 113, 225.
around the Ur III era or the Isin-Larsa era,\textsuperscript{134} mentions Nisaba (\textit{N[\ddash i\ddash j\ddash s]-ba}) as one of the patron deities.\textsuperscript{135} Note also that there are records of ‘Amorite \textit{mandu}-soldiers from Der’ (\textit{7 ma-an-dì A-mu-[ri] ša BĀD\textsuperscript{Ki}}) provisioned with barley in an early Old Babylonian archival text from the site of Choga Gavaneh, about 60 km west of Kermanshah in western Iran.\textsuperscript{136} This means it is possible for someone to have an Amorite background, be called a \textit{mandu}-soldier, and be situated in areas unexpected for Amorites, such as western Iran. The word \textit{mandu} can be seen as a variant writing of the second component of the term Ummān-manda because the written forms Ummān-mandu and Ummān-manda are used interchangeably in different manuscripts of the Neo-Babylonian royal inscriptions of Nabonidus (cf. \textit{Tables 1-2}). If the word \textit{mandu} is a variant written form for the second component of the term Ummān-manda, then the \textit{mandu}-soldier could be a type of military profession of which the designation somehow relates to the term Ummān-manda.\textsuperscript{137} The ‘Manda’-men (or Mandeans perhaps) in the administrative record from Mari have Semitic names and at least some have Amorite, Sutean and West Semitic backgrounds. Bottéro observes that the word \textit{Manda} in this Mari text is written similarly to the ethnonym “Élamites” (compare LU\textit{E-la-mu-ú} and LU\textit{Ma-an-da}), and suggests that the word LU\textit{Ma-an-da} may also refer to an ethnic group, with the difference that the latter may refer to a (semi-) nomadic tribe, since the lack of the post determinative KI indicates it is not a city name.\textsuperscript{138} The lack of the KI post determinative suggests that there is something unique about the word \textit{Manda}. This does not by itself demonstrate a link to a form of nomadism, but rather underlines its unique use like an ethnonym. Bottéro looks to the phrase \textit{lú mada} used for the individual named Arah\textsubscript{1}} in Ammiditana’s year formula and, on the basis of the written forms \textit{ma-ad-da} and \textit{ba-da} (found in the two Old Babylonian liver omens) for the second component of the term Ummān-manda, comments that the word \textit{mada} in the Old Babylonian year formula is used as the second component of the word Ummān-manda without the consonant \textit{n} whereas the Mari text uses the second component for individuals with the written form \textit{Manda}.\textsuperscript{139} As discussed above in 2.3.1, the phrase \textit{lú mada} in the year formula has no demonstrable link to the term Ummān-manda. The forms \textit{ma-ad-da} and \textit{ba-da} are isolated instances as discussed in 1.2. The Mari text uses the word ‘Manda’, the second component of the word Ummān-manda, by itself as a

\textsuperscript{134} Nasrabadi notes that the iconographic features of the two rock relief inscriptions honouring Anubanini can date from the end of the Old Akkadian era to the time of Ur III, whereas previous research on the date on the text has opted for the Ur III era or later in the Isin-Larsa period, or even the Old Babylonian era, B. M. Nasrabadi, “Beobachtungen zum Felsrelief Anubaninis” ZA 94 (2004), p. 292.

\textsuperscript{135} D. O. Edzard, “Zwei Inschriften am Felsen von Sar-i-Pul-i-Zoha: Anubanini 1 und 2” \textit{AfO} 24 (1973), p. 76: Kol II 44.


\textsuperscript{137} This possibility is discussed later in 4.4.1.

\textsuperscript{138} ARM 7, pp. 224-225.

\textsuperscript{139} \textit{Ibid.} p. 225.
designation for individuals with a Semitic background, and it is not exactly clear why.\textsuperscript{140} Designating individuals with Semitic background by using the second component of Ummān-manda by itself may relate to how archival texts from Choga Gavaneh use \textit{mandu}, elsewhere a variant form for the second component of the term Ummān-manda,\textsuperscript{141} for soldiers with mostly Semitic names.\textsuperscript{142} Beckman interprets the personal names of the \textit{mandu}-soldiers in the archival texts of Choga Gavaneh as Amorite, Akkadian, or as being of uncertain ethnicity.\textsuperscript{143} The Amorite names are [\textit{K}]a-na-na-ya and [\textit{M}]a-ta-tum. The Akkadian names are \textit{Wa-qar-dum}, \textit{UTU} \textit{-na-wi-ir}, Ta-a-bu-ni, [\textit{A}]-li-\textit{-a-hi}, A-\textit{k}i\textsuperscript{\textdagger}, Il-ta-ni, La-ma-sa-tum, I-\textit{su-\text{-\textdagger}}-nu, A-li-da-du-ya, A-\textit{ha}-Tu-tu, Si-i-\textit{-um-m[i]}, A-\textit{hi}-gu-al-\textit{-lu-[ub]}, Be-el-ta(m), Nu-ba-tum, [\textit{I}]a-s\textit{-u-nu}, A\textsuperscript{\textdagger}-\textit{ha}\textsuperscript{\textdagger}-\textit{-a}-\textit{h-ji} and Be-el-ta-ni.\textsuperscript{144} The one name described as being of ‘uncertain ethnicity’ is ḫ-s-ta-a.

Not all names associated with the Umma-manda are Semitic. For example the name of a leader of the Ummān-manda in a Hittite text fragment\textsuperscript{145} is usually considered to have an Indo-Iranian etymology: the text renders the name as \textit{Za-a-lu-di/i-š},\textsuperscript{146} which can be normalized as \textit{Zaludi} or \textit{Zayaludi}. The first component of the name \textit{Za-a-lu-\text{-\textdagger}}\textit{-di} has been explained as Indo-Aryan \textit{zhava} ‘victory’ while the rest of the name component (-\textit{ludi/i}) is undeterminable.\textsuperscript{147} In any case, it is not a Semitic name. Individuals involved with the Ummān-manda

\textsuperscript{140} Some suggestions are made in \textbf{4.4.2}. For the text from Mari, see Appendix 1.4.

\textsuperscript{141} As stated earlier, different manuscripts of Nabonidus’ royal inscriptions use the words Ummān-manda and Ummān-mandu interchangeably (Tables 1-2).

\textsuperscript{142} The archival texts from Choga Gavaneh mentioning the \textit{mandu}-soldiers are collected in Appendix 1.5-8. The \textit{mandu}-troops are discussed in \textbf{4.4.1}.

\textsuperscript{143} Beckman’s list of personal names from the Choga Gavaneh tablets marks those that may be Amorite or an uncertain ethnicity, and the unmarked ones are Akkadian, see Abdi and Beckman, “An Early Second-Millennium Cuneiform Archive from Choga Gavaneh”, pp. 68ff. The names of the \textit{mandu}-troops are found in ChG 31 and ChG 34, see ibid., pp. 59-60; Appendix 1.7-8. Beckman notes most names are Akkadian, Abdi and Beckman, “An Early Second-Millennium Cuneiform Archive from Choga Gavaneh”, p. 48.

\textsuperscript{144} ChG 34 contains 13 preserved names and only 9 are said to be \textit{mandu} soldiers. For references, see Appendix 1.8. It is not clear which nine of the thirteen are the \textit{mandu}-soldiers. The last seven Akkadian names listed above in brackets are from this document ChG 34. In ChG 34 they are the first eight names (two individuals have the name Ilassunu) and the ninth name in the list is Ištā, listed as a \textit{mandu}-soldier in another document (ChG 31 o. 8’—see next footnote for reference). This may mean the first nine individuals in ChG 34 are the \textit{mandu}-troops. Beckman interprets all the names in ChG 34 as Akkadian. In any case, the evidence suffices to make the point that Akkadian names are commonly used for \textit{mandu}-soldiers in the texts from Choga Gavaneh.

\textsuperscript{145} The Ummān-manda is not clear because the text is very broken. For the text, see Appendix 1.14. The term Ummān-manda clearly denoted a significant military opponent of Hattušiliš I during his campaigns in Syria, see discussion in \textbf{4.4.4}.

\textsuperscript{146} KBo 7.14 ii 14, 16.

\textsuperscript{147} P. E. Dumont apud W. F. Albright, “Further Observations on the Chronology of Alalakh” BASOR 146 (1957), p. 31; Nagel, \textit{Der mesopotamische Streitwagen}, p. 29. For doubts on the Indo-European etymology, see the references in Komoróczy, “Ummān-manda”, p. 52, n. 56. Gamkrelidze doubts the Indo-European etymology because there is no confirmation the designation \textit{manda} is used for any Aryan tribe in the Old Hittite era, T. V. Gamkrelidze, “The Hittite (Nesian) Consonant Shift” (in Russian) \textit{Pereedneaziatskij Consonant Shift. Voprosy Xettologii i Xarritologii}, I. M. Diakonoff and G. V. Tsereteli, eds. Moscow. 1961, p. 277, n. 209. Hurrian and Mitannian names often have elements that have been interpreted as Indo-European and the name Zayaludi can be seen as such a Hurrian name. This is discussed in ch. 4, p. 113. M. Mayrhofer merely states that the proposed Indo-
have names from different languages. Explanations for the significance of the Ummān-manda based on the linguistic affiliation of personal names attached to the term are off the mark.

Drews provides one of the latest attempts to relate the most ancient Indo-European speaking peoples with the Ummān-manda. Drews argues that Manda was derived from the name of an area beyond the perimeter of Mesopotamia. Cuneiform sources can name people after their locations, such as the “people of Ḫurri” and the Hittites were “the people of Ḫatti”, thus Ummān-manda were the “horde from Manda”.\footnote{R. Drews, \textit{The Coming of the Greeks: Indo-European Conquests in the Aegean and the Near East}. Princeton, New Jersey. Princeton University Press. 1988, pp. 226-227.} Drews takes up Forrer’s suggestion that Manda derived from the place names Mannea and Media.\footnote{\textit{Ibid.}, p. 227.} The problems with this association were already discussed above in pp. 27-28. Furthermore, the word ummān ‘troops’ is not the usual way Hittite sources denote a people of a particular region.\footnote{Landsberger and Bauer, “Zu neuveröffentlichten Geschichtsquellen”, p. 83; Beal, \textit{The Organisation of the Hittite Military}, p. 71, n. 248.} Drew’s suggestion that the word Ummān-manda means “Horde from Manda” is interesting, but there is no evident Indo-European ethnonym in the word manda.

\subsection*{2.4 The proposed man ide etymology}

Landsberger takes another approach in order to explain the term Ummān-manda, and regards it as a collective name for foreign peoples who cannot be more closely defined. Landsberger equates manda with a different word manda, mentioned in a lexical list as a particle (ZA 9 159 3), draws attention to this particle’s dialectical form minde which means “who knows the tribe?”, i.e. “any unknown tribe”, and argues Ummān-manda means ‘who knows the tribe?’ or ‘any unknown tribe’.\footnote{Landsberger and Bauer, “Zu neuveröffentlichten Geschichtsquellen”, p. 82.} Landsberger notes both forms manda and minde may have arisen from the phrase man ide ‘who knows?’.\footnote{B. Landsberger, “Ungnad, Arthur: Altbabylonische Briefe aus dem Museum zu Philadelphia umschrieben und übersetzt...” \textit{OLZ} 28 (1923), p. 73.} Von Soden notes the particle manda is an isolated late Babylonian form for minde ‘perhaps’ which can indeed be derived from *man ide “who knows?”.\footnote{GAG, pp. 176-177; W. von Soden, \textit{Ergänzungsheft zum Grundriss der Akkadischen Grammatik} (Analecta Orientalia 33/47). Roma. Pontificium Institutum Biblicum. 1969, pp. 176-177; W. von Soden, “Zum akkadischen Wörterbuch. 31-40” \textit{Or} 18 (1949), pp. 387-388.} The second component of the term Ummān-manda, on the other hand, is attested with the form manda from the Old Babylonian era.

\begin{thebibliography}{99}
\footnotesize
\item European etymology for the name is ‘ganz unglaubhaft’, M. Mayrhofer, “Zur kritischen Sichtung vorderasiatisch-arischer Personennamen” \textit{Indogermanische Forschungen} 70 (1965), p. 156, n. 44. Mayrhofer does not give any specific reason.
\item \textit{Ibid.}, p. 227.
\item Landsberger and Bauer, “Zu neuveröffentlichten Geschichtsquellen”, p. 82.
\end{thebibliography}
onwards (Table 1). The Old Babylonian documentation was not available at the time Landsberger proposed his etymology.

Landsberger’s proposition for the term Ummān-manda gained support partly because of the failure to identify an original historical Manda people. Diakonoff supports Landsberger’s etymology on the basis that the Ummān-manda remain unidentified with an ancient ethnic group and that the term originally designated some northern tribe considered barbarians by their southern neighbours. A parallel example is when the Byzantines, who, due to their commitment to classical and Hellenistic literary tradition, used the ethnonym ‘Scythian’, originally meant for a group of people in the northern Black Sea region, to designate ‘barbarian’ peoples such as the Huns and the Goths they encountered. Diakonoff argues that the term was part of the omen literature and literary sources and was used again in a changed meaning in the first millennium. This would be similar to the way the term Gutium originally denoted the Gutians in the Zagros and was later, in the first millennium, used in different sources for different peoples in the east such as the Urartians, the Mannaeans and the Medes. Diakonoff’s approach does not really help Landsberger’s etymological proposal because a ‘northern’ identification of the unidentified ancient ethnic group is expected to generate an etymology based either on their presumed ethnic name or on their geographical whereabouts rather than the inability to identify them. Another problem is that the people(s) for whom the term Ummān-manda was first ever used in cuneiform writing remains unknown, so the assumptions made about them will not really help any etymological proposal.

Liverani argues Landsberger’s etymology can be understood as ‘gente? chissà’ or ‘uomini, forse’ and that it fits well with the episode in the Cuthaean Legend where Naram-Sin doubts the enemy forces are human beings of bone and flesh (due to their physiognomy and invincibility in battle) and sends an official to ascertain if they bleed and are mortal. The key problem with Landsberger’s man ide ‘who knows?’ etymology is that the particle manda is a late Babylonian form whereas the second component of the term Ummān-manda is

---

155 Diakonoff, History of Media, p. 73, n. 7; Diakonoff, The Pre-History of the Armenian People, pp. 28, 141 n. 90.
157 I. M. Diakonoff, “The Last Years of the Urartian State according to Assyrian and Babylonian Sources” (in Russian) VDI 36/2 (1951), p. 35; Diakonoff, History of Media, p. 59 n. 1.
158 For this usage of Gutium, see Diakonoff’s table in ibid., p. 59, n. 1. The Neo-Babylonian use of the term Gutium for the Medes is discussed later in 7.3.1.
documented from the Old Babylonian period onwards, as explained above in pp. 38-39. This suggests that there must be another explanation for the use of the Ummān-manda in the Cuthaean Legend.\textsuperscript{160} Landsberger argued the term Ummān-manda was used to designate the Cimmerians and the Medes because both peoples came from distant districts, making it likely the peoples neighbouring them may also have been embraced under the term Ummān-manda.\textsuperscript{161} Komoróczy doubts an expression such as \textit{umma n minde} “perhaps a tribe” or “whether a tribe” would designate a group of people.\textsuperscript{162} Indeed, there is no evidence, for example, that the Cimmerians or the Medes were more of a mystery than the other peoples with whom the Assyrians and Babylonians interacted.

One of Landsberger’s starting points was that the term Ummān-manda was never used alongside other nations or countries in the sources available to him.\textsuperscript{163} The administrative document from Mari was published after Landsberger’s work on the Ummān-manda. The ‘four Manda men’ (4 LU Ma-an-da) are mentioned after three Elamites and Manda here is used as a gentilic similar to ‘Elamite’ in the same text.\textsuperscript{164} Bottéro argues that the appearance of the ‘Manda-men’ alongside the ‘Elamites’ and the absence of the post-positional land determinative KI with the word ‘Manda’ at least indicates Manda did not designate a city.\textsuperscript{165} The parallelism between the gentilic Elamites and Manda-men may indicate the latter refers to men from a region as distant as Elam.\textsuperscript{166}

Finally the particle \textit{manda} is not the only word that looks like the second component of the word Ummān-manda. The Sumerian word \textit{ma(n)du(m)}, which occurs in the Lugalbanda and Enmerkar epic and a number of other texts,\textsuperscript{167} clearly resembles the second component \textit{manda}. Komoróczy explored how another Sumerian word, \textit{mada}, which looks like \textit{manda} (except the consonant \textit{n} is missing), may be the key to the etymology of the latter.

### 2.5 The proposed \textit{mada} etymology

---
\textsuperscript{160} The use of the term Ummān-manda in the Cuthaean Legend is discussed in 4.2.
\textsuperscript{161} Landsberger and Bauer, “Zu neuveröffentlichten Geschichtsquellen”, p. 81.
\textsuperscript{162} Komoróczy, “Ummān-manda”, p. 65.
\textsuperscript{163} Landsberger and Bauer, “Zu neuveröffentlichten Geschichtsquellen”, p. 82.
\textsuperscript{164} ARM 7 221 10; \textbf{Appendix 1.4}.
\textsuperscript{165} ARM 7, p. 225.
\textsuperscript{166} This point is discussed in 4.4.2.
\textsuperscript{167} The word \textit{ma(n)du(m)} is discussed later in ch. 3.
Komoróczy argues Ummān-manda is a neologism created at the start of the second millennium B.C., based on an analogy with Sumerian expressions such as *u ā n i m and *er ī n m ā d a. Komoróczy argues ma(n)da is a borrowing back of the Sumerian word m ā d a ‘land’ into Akkadian, a word that was originally a loan into Sumerian from Akkadian mātu(m).  

Komoróczy arrives at this etymology by first placing the term Ummān-manda in the context of pejorative ideas attached to peoples who inhabit Mesopotamia’s periphery. Komoróczy argues that these ideas depend on the Sumerian ethnographic tradition, and that the Cuthaean Legend exhibits representations of the Ummān-manda similar to the depiction of foreign destroyers such as the Guteans and the Martu in Sumerian literature. Komoróczy draws attention to the contrast between the city and its periphery that existed in Mesopotamia, and argues that the provinces were depreciated, which in turn led to pejorative ideas expressed with the Sumerian word m ā d a ‘land’, which has the sense of ‘periphery, province, zone peripheral to a center’ more so than its Akkadian counterpart mātu ‘land’, resulting in the use of this Sumerian word as the second component of the term Ummān-manda. Komoróczy’s etymology offers a plausible explanation for the second millennium texts that seem to concern certain individuals and military groups – they are then the men and the military troops of the periphery. The Manda men (LU M a -a n -d a) in the administrative text from Mari and the Ummān-manda in the Hittite legal code would be well explained as individuals from the periphery if Komoróczy’s etymology holds.

Komoróczy observes that the proposed m ā d a-etymology would mean the term Ummān-manda did not originate from an ethnic name like the other peoples such as the Guteans and the Martu whose description the Sumerian tradition also influenced. One question is whether the influence of the Sumerian tradition would specifically induce the use of the Sumerian word m ā d a as opposed to another Sumerian word. For example the Sumerian word k u r ‘mountain’ is more commonly associated with foreign or hostile lands in Sumerian inscriptions and may carry pejorative connotations. The word m ā d a ‘land’ can sometimes refer to territory within Sumer whereas the word k u r ‘mountain’ always refers to territory outside mainland Sumer and is known

---

169 Ibid., p. 65-66.
170 Ibid., p. 67.
171 Ibid., p. 66.
172 Ibid., p. 66.
173 Ibid., p. 66.
to contrast with the word kalam ‘land’ which is used to refer to the land of Sumer.175 So why hasn’t any
expression such as *erín-kur-ra emerged? It is unclear to me why m a d a ‘land’ would specifically be used as
the second component of Ummān-manda. Komoróczy suggests the term designates the hostile entities that came
from the periphery of Mesopotamia – especially from the directions of east and north.176 Komoróczy accurately
pointed out mada has a strong sense of “Umgebung”.177 I note, however, that this sense of ‘periphery,
hinterland’ has connotations of a suburban countryside or a rural cultivated land.178 The direction of the
periphery is not important with the word m ada, while on the other hand the use of the term Ummān-manda
implies there is more to its semantics than just a non-directional periphery. As Komoróczy points out, the hostile
entities called Ummān-manda mainly come from the north and the east.179 For example Assyrians specifically
used the word Ummān-manda for the Cimmerians, but they did not use it for the other hostile entities in their
periphery such as the Egyptians or the Manneans. The Babylonians use the expression exclusively for the Medes,
while they certainly would be aware of other nations in their periphery, such as the Persians or the Lydians. The
problem is not only a matter of direction, but there is a need to explain why the word Ummān-manda is used for
some hostile groups in the northern and eastern periphery and not others. To account for these factors,
Komoróczy’s etymology requires mada go through some more conjectural undocumented semantic
development.

Finally, Komoróczy’s etymology faces the difficulty that the second component of Ummān-manda appears to
be manda and not mada;180 that means the consonant n remains unexplained if manda was derived from mada.
The latter word also faces difficulty explaining the form Ummān-mandu(m) (Table 2), the variant written form
of the term Ummān-manda. Komoróczy sees the word mada, as it is found the Old Babylonian formula for
Ammiditana’s seventeenth regnal year (there the king’s opponent Araḥab is described as 1ú ma-da ‘the man of
the land’), as a variant writing of the second component of Ummān-manda.181 However, the word mada
unequivocally means ‘land, territory’ in all the other Old Babylonian year names and positing on it any
connotation beyond this regular meaning only constitutes conjecture – there is not enough context in the year

175 Ibid., pp. 2-7.
177 Ibid., p. 66.
178 This aspect of mada is discussed above in pp. 31-32.
179 Komoróczy, op.cit., p. 67.
180 Discussed in ch. 1, p. 1.
181 Komoróczy, op.cit., p. 55.
formula to prove this conjecture.\textsuperscript{182} There is no proof the use of the word mada in this year formula is directly connected with the formation of the second component of the word Ummān-manda. Further demonstrating this point, the phrase lū ma-da used in this year formula is not compatible with the ‘Manda-men’ mentioned in an administrative document from Mari (ARM 7 221 10). The problem is that LU in the Mari document is a determinative for Ma-an-da, which is grammatically used like a general ethnonym to denote four individuals of the ‘Manda’ (4 LU Ma-an-da), translated by Bottéro as “Mandéens”,\textsuperscript{183} just like the way LŪ is used for the ‘three Elamites’ (3 LŪ E-la-mu-ū).\textsuperscript{184} In the Old Babylonian year name, however, Araḥab is described as an individual and lū is an ordinary word and not a determinative as it is in the Mari document because mada is not an ethnonym or the name of a specific toponym.\textsuperscript{185} Moreover, the form ma-ad-da (YOS 10 44 53) is an isolated scribal irregularity like the form ba-da\textsuperscript{186} and cannot be related to the word mada. The form ma-an-da has the consonant n both in one of the Old Babylonian liver omens (VAT 4102 4) and in this Old Babylonian Mari document (ARM 7 221 10).

The difficulties discussed concerning the proposed mada etymology (pp. 41-43) and the lack of a demonstrable link between the word mada in Ammiditana’s year formula and the second component of the word Umman-manda (2.3.1) indicate that mada is, at the very least, not the direct source for the etymology of the second component of the term Ummān-manda. Furthermore, the proposed mada etymology does not explain the origin of the consonant n in manda. I argue that manda has not been directly derived from mada. Komoróczy’s etymology, compared to other attempts, comes closer to explaining how the second component of Ummān-manda could also be used for individuals coming from a provincial area (e.g. the Manda men (LŪ Ma-an-da) in the administrative text from Mari)\textsuperscript{187} or how the term can denote a professional military in the countryside (e.g. the Ummān-manda in the Hittite laws)\textsuperscript{188}. Any alternative suggestion for the second component of the word Ummān-manda must be able to provide a similarly plausible explanation for such cases as well as account for the written form of the second component of the word Ummān-manda and deal with the difficulties faced in the search for the etymology of Ummān-manda.

\textsuperscript{182} Discussed in detail above in 2.3.1.
\textsuperscript{183} ARM 7, 1957, p. 113: 221 10. The precise use of manda in this document is discussed elsewhere in 4.4.2.
\textsuperscript{184} ARM 7 221 5.
\textsuperscript{185} That the word mada is not an ethnonym or a GN becomes clear after the discussion in 2.3.1.
\textsuperscript{186} The form ba-da is found in VAT 602 5, 6, 7, 8 (and possibly 9) in J. Nougayrol, “Texts hépatoscopiques d’époque ancienne conservés au musée du Louvre” RA 44 (1950), p. 16. The irregular scribal written forms in the Old Babylonian liver omens are described in 1.2.
\textsuperscript{187} Discussed in 4.4.2.
\textsuperscript{188} Discussed in 4.4.3.
3

ETYMOLOGY: MANDUM IN ‘LUGALBANDA – ENMERKAR’

3.1 Orthography and Semantics of mandum

The need for further research to clarify the relevance of the Sumerian word ma(n)du(m) ‘land’ for the second element of the expression Ummān-manda has been noted.¹ I attempt this research below. The word is found in the ‘Lugalbanda and Enmerkar’ epic, an inscription of Warad-Sin of Larsa (VA 5950), the incantation series Šurpu, the omen series Šumma Alu and in a number of references from lexical lists.²

All the variant writings of ma(n)du(m) are attested in three Old Babylonian manuscripts of line 342 of the Lugalbanda-Enmerkar epic: A, AA and T (T may go back to the Isin era on paleographic grounds).³ The manuscripts yield the following variant readings for the word ma(n)du(m): A gives [m]a-du-um-e, AA ma-du-ù, and T ma-an-du-um-e.⁴

The variant writings of ma(n)du(m) suggest that the original form of the word was mandum and that the consonants n and m drop in later instances of writing. A similar example of the orthographical dropping of the consonant n is found with the word bānda ‘junior, fierce, etc.’;⁵ for which the original form was bānda but sometimes it is written bada.⁶ An example for the orthographical omission of final –m can be exemplified with the word murum ‘lattice’, written also as muru and even mur.⁷ This suggests that the variant ma-du-ù in

² References to all these documents are provided in C. Wilcke, Das Lugalbandaepos. Wiesbaden. Otto Harrassowitz. 1969. p. 213: 342; CAD M I 209; CAD Z 89. Specific references are given below during the discussion.
⁴ See ibid., p. 122, n. 342: 2-2. For the manuscripts, see ibid., pp. 23-28, esp. p. 27.
⁵ For the various meaning of bānda, see PSD B II 83-87.
manuscript AA for line 342 of the Lugalbanda Enmerkar epic is another way of writing mandum with the omission of the consonants n and m. AA’s omission of the –e ending contrary to the other two manuscripts indicates some type of scribal error or there is another reason that is hard to discern. If the –û ending actually represented the Akkadian gentilic ending –û as Cohen suggested, the other manuscripts’ variant written forms would have preserved this gentilic and they would have omitted the –um ending and also the –e suffix similar to AA, but this is not the case. The –e postposition is crucial to the interpretation of the word mandum in line 342 of the Lugalbanda-Enmerkar epic (as will be discussed later below in 3.3).

3.1.1 Sumerian or Akkadian?

Wilcke interprets the word ma(n)dû(m) as an Akkadian loanword from mâtum ‘land’ and translates the word as ‘Flachland’ in line 342 of ‘Lugalbanda-Enmerkar’, but notes the translation is not secure, partly because its relationship with the Sumerian word mâda ‘country, territory, land’ (Sumerian loanword from the Akkadian word mâtum ‘land’) remains unclear. This uncertainty led Jacobsen to state that “the precise relation of these words to Akkadian mâtum – if such relation exists – is not clear to me”. Cohen notes that the variant readings of the word ma(n)dû(m) in the manuscripts of the Lugalbanda-Enmerkar epic may imply the word did not come from the Sumerian word mâda ‘land’ or the Akkadian word mâtum ‘land’ but that ma(n)dû(m) may be a geographical name ending in an –um ending similar to toponyms such as Abarnium, Amanum. The other attestations of ma(n)dû(m) discussed below indicate it is not a specific geographical place but a general word that can be used in different contexts. The ending –um in Sumerian words often stands for the Akkadian nominative singular ending and is indicative of a loanword from Akkadian but this is not true in every case. There are in fact Sumerian words that end with –um and have no Akkadian origin, and some are attested as Sumerian loanwords in Old Babylonian: murû, ‘lattice’, also written murû and mur, becomes Akkadian

8 One cannot exclude the possibility that the –e ending contracted into the final –u in manuscript AA. The –e ending is suffixed to the final –m in the other two manuscripts. There are cases when vowel contraction can take place when the vowel e is suffixed to a final –u, see for example *lû-e>lû-û in M.-L. Thomsen, The Sumerian Language: An Introduction to its History and Grammatical Structure. (Mesopotamia Copenhagen Studies in Assyriology Volume 10). Copenhagen. Akademisk Forlag. 1984, p. 41. There are also cases where the vowel contraction is in the reverse: *mu-e>me in ibid. , p. 41.
9 Cohen, Enmerkar and the Lord of Aratta, p. 54, n. 54.
10 Ibid., p. 213: 342.
The word *enkum* ‘temple treasurer’\(^{14}\) becomes Akkadian *enkummu*.\(^{15}\) A selection of Sumerian words that end with –um and are not loanwords from Akkadian include g/kūm ‘mortar, to crush, bruise’,\(^{16}\) gurūm₂, kurūm, ‘spy, to watch’,\(^{17}\) sum₄ ‘beard, carved beard (for statues)’,\(^{18}\) s/sūm ‘to give’,\(^{19}\) s/sūm ‘onion’,\(^{20}\) tum ‘work, action, arrow quiver, crossbeam’.\(^{21}\) So there is no guarantee ma(n)dū(m) is a word of Akkadian origin, but the situation is not certain. The word’s earliest attestations are in the Lugalbanda-Enmerkar epic and the inscription of Warad-Sin of Larsa,\(^{22}\) and in these texts the word is written in Sumerian. The manuscripts of ‘Lugalbanda-Enmerkar’ date to the Old Babylonian era.\(^{23}\) The lexical lists treat ma(n)dū(m) as an Akkadian word, written *mandu(m)*, as the second component of the compound word *zēr mandu(m)*, and the lists use the latter to explain Sumerian words.\(^{24}\) Why the genitive is not used in the compound word is not clear to me, but the genitive marks *mandu* in one case where one reads *zir man-di* in an incantation text.\(^{25}\) This may indicate confusion even amongst ancient scribes about whether the word ma(n)dū(m) was Sumerian or Akkadian in origin. That this confusion existed is also evidenced by the fact that the lexical texts equate the second component of the word *zēr mandu(m)* with mātu ‘land’, ki ‘earth, place, ground’ and lu-lu ‘many (as a noun), to make numerous (as a verb)’.\(^{26}\) So lexical texts are additionally ambivalent about the meaning of *mandu(m)* even when they use it as an Akkadian word that explains Sumerian words. I argue that all this ambiguity and confusion was because the original meaning of *mandu(m)* was forgotten (perhaps universally). I argue the same can be said for Ummān-mandū(m), a variant written form of Ummān-manda.\(^{27}\) I previously argued that some scribes only presumed that the term Ummān-manda was a version of the common expression *ummān-ma’du* ‘numerous army’.\(^{28}\) I think they simply did not know what Ummān-manda meant, and (probably many – but how many there is no way to tell) scribes took it for granted to account for its second component with the common

14 SL 63.
15 ePSD E enkum[treasurer]; SL 63; CAD E 168-169; AHw 218.
16 SL 92, 150; ePSD G gum[crush].
17 SL 94, 152; ePSD G gurum[inspection].
18 ePSD S sum[beard].
19 SL 240; ePSD S sum[give].
20 SL 240; ePSD S sum[garlic].
21 SL 281; ePSD T tum[cross-beam].
22 The use of ma(n)dū(m) in the inscription of Warad-Sin of Larsa (VA 5950) is discussed later in 3.1.4.
24 References collected in CAD Z 89. These references to *mandu(m)* are discussed below in 3.1.3.
25 Surpu VII: 70 in CAD Z 89. Note also that *mandu* is written in the genitive as *ma-an-di* when referring to the ‘mandu-troops’ in the early Old Babylonian archival texts from Choga Gavaneh. This seems to be coming from the scribal practice in Choga Gavaneh and is not relevant for the discussion here. For *mandu* as a designation for a military profession, see 4.4.1.
26 I discussed this in ch. 2, pp. 24-25.
27 Tables 1-2.
28 2.1.1.
Akkadian word *mādu* ‘numerous’, but the problems with this as the actual etymology have already been discussed. So how to solve this puzzle? From what original word did the second component of the term Ummān-manda originate? If one postulates this original word was Sumerian *ma(n)du(m)*, then the variant written forms Ummān-manda (*Table 1*) and Ummān-mandu(m) (*Table 2*) become explicable.

Those who coined the term Ummān-manda could have used the specific written form *mandu* and treated it as Sumerian. A written form *mandu* for mandum as a Sumerian word is not explicitly written out in any of the sources that use the word, but the sources are very few and do not represent all the possible variant forms. The available variant forms in cases where the word is interpreted as Sumerian (*madum, madu, and mandum*) are not so far off from *mandu*. The word, when interpreted as Akkadian, has the form *mandu* (*3.1.3*). So the Sumerian *mandu* is expected. In order to attain Ummān-mandu, ‘troops of *mandu*’, one would merely write the Sumerian *mandu*. The form Ummān-mandum in an astrological omen (in *Table 2*) can also be explained: the variant of the word, mandum, could have been used. The form Ummān-manda can be also explained. The written form for *manda*, the second component of Ummān-manda, would have been formed by the genitive –a(k) suffixed to *mandu*, out of the belief ma(n)du(m) was a Sumerian word: *mandu-a(k)>manda(k)*. In Sumerian, the –u ending can contract with a, for example as in *nāu10-a(k)>nāa*.

Those who believed *mandum* was an Akkadian word could have produced Ummān-mandu(m) in another way. The word *mandu(m)*, interpreted as Akkadian, can be used in a compound, as with *zer mandu*, without using the genitive (*3.1.3*). Given that the earliest documents known to use the word *mandu(m)* are Sumerian (*3.1, 3.1.4*), it is more likely that the word is Sumerian, and its treatment as an Akkadian word came later. The form *manda* in Ummān-manda was presumably formed by those who knew the Sumerian origins, and the form Ummān-manda was maintained by later scribal tradition regardless of whether they treated the word as Sumerian or Akkadian.

---

29 For this discussion, see ch. 2, pp. 20-21.
30 Nabonidus’ texts use both the forms Ummān-manda and Ummān-mandu in the different manuscripts of their texts. For the references, see the Sippar Cylinder and the Basalt-Stela of Nabonidus in *Tables 1-2*. The scribes of the different manuscripts used either form. It appears that both written forms were accepted ways of rendering Ummān-manda at least during the time of Nabonidus. The form *mandum* has also been used in an astrological omen as the second component of the term Ummān-mandum, *Table 2*.
31 For references to the variant written forms of *mandum*, see *3.1, 3.1.4*.
33 The expected genitive for the second component is found only once in an incantation series, Šurpu VII: 70 in CAD Z 89.
The proposition that the second component of the term is derived from mandu(m) is able to explain its variant forms of Ummān-manda and Ummān-mandu(m). Some aspects of the word ma(n)d(u)m require discussion because little is known about what it means. It will then be possible to investigate the possibility this word is the basis of the second component of Ummān-manda.

3.1.2 The relationship between mandum, mātum, and mada

The relationship between the Sumerian words mandum, mada and Akkadian mātum is very complicated. I will discuss some aspects of this relationship:

- The Semitic etymology of Akkadian mātum remains uncertain and the only other Semitic language that has the word is Aramaic. The Aramaic word is considered to be a loanword from Akkadian. It is not clear if the Akkadian word itself is an original Semitic word or a loanword.

- It has proven to be very conjectural (if not impossible) to propose that mandum, mada and mātum go back to an older (proto-)Akkadian word. Jacobsen tentatively introduced the possibility that the words mada and mandum go back to a hypothetical (proto-)Akkadian word derived from the Semitic root m–h–d, a root which produces Arabic words such as mahdu ‘soil’, muhdun and mihādūn ‘flat terrain’. Jacobsen suggested mada could derive from *mahd with a suffixation of –a whereas the same root may also have produced a theoretical Akkadian word such as *mādum, which then became a loanword in Sumerian as mandum after some semantic development. Jacobsen concluded that “the most satisfactory solution is perhaps to relinquish the suggested connection with Arabic m–h–d”.

- It is much more likely that the borrowing of Sumerian mada was from Akkadian mātum and not the other way around. The Sumerian word mada ‘land’ is usually taken to be an Akkadian loanword from

---


37 Ibid., p. 40, n. 47.

38 Ibid., p. 40, n. 47.

39 Ibid., p. 40, n. 47.
mātum formed with the Sumerian suffix –a. This view is justified because there are a number of loanwords from Akkadian with the same phonetic development: urda<wardum, šagina<šaknum, šabra<šapremium, maš-gāna<maškānum, etc. The time of this borrowing must predate the earliest known documentation of māda. An Old Akkadian text of Naram-Sin mentions kur gis̄erin ku₅, ma-da-ma-da-[bi] “the pure Cedar Mountain, its lands” and ma₂-gan₅ ma-da-[ma-da-bi] “the country of Magan, [its] land[s]”. Dated earlier than the Old Akkadian period is the Barton Cylinder (CBS 8383), from Nippur, that has the word ma-da written out in a section of the text. This particular section of the text lacks context, making it hard to discern for certain whether the word means ‘land’ in this instance. The terminus ante quem for the formation of māda is definitely the Old Akkadian era, and possibly the Early Dynastic Era III/b. The current state of evidence suggests that māda comes to be widely used in the documents of the Ur III rulers and Gudea onwards.

- Jacobsen observes that the early occurrences of Akkadian loanwords in Sumerian without the suffix –a are scarce and their range of time is not established. If the scarcity of the documents using mānum is an accident of discovery, there are various possible scenarios about the formation of mānum. Two of these can be provided. Firstly, given that Akkadian mātum may be non-Semitic, there is the possibility that it is a loanword from Sumerian mānum, dropping the consonant n. Sumerian would then have, on a separate occasion, borrowed Akkadian mātum as māda, before the latter’s earliest known attestation at least as early as the Old Akkadian era, even possibly during the Early Dynastic Era.

41 See these loanwords in ibid., p. 312.
42 Naramsin 1004 [E2.1.4.1004] 8’ cited as a document for ma-da-ma-da-bi, one of the written forms of māda, in ePSD Forms māda[land].
43 Naramsin 1004 [E2.1.4.1004] 10’ in ibid.
45 The lack of context is such that Alster and Westenholz explicitly state that they are not providing a “connected interpretation” for this section, ibid., p. 38: xx.
46 The electronic Pennsylvania Sumerian Dictionary takes the word ma as another form of māda and cites examples from the Early Dynastic era III/b. See these examples in ePSD M māda[land]. Jacobsen treats ma as related to māda because both are equated to Akkadian mātum ‘land’ in lexical lists, see Jacobsen, “The Reign of Ibbi-Suen”, p. 40, n. 47. If they are the same word, the word ma would come later because māda has been borrowed from Akkadian mātum under discernable phonetic rules, see Falkenstein “Kontakte zwischen Sumerern und Akkadern”, p. 312. This phonetic rule is discussed above in p. 49. In such a case, ma is either an abbreviation for māda or the second syllable of the latter word dropped to produce the word ma.
III/b. The second possibility assumes *mätum* goes back to a Semitic root, in which case *mandum* could have been borrowed from this Semitic and/or (proto-)Akkadian word.

- The word *mandum* is attested in only a few texts, and the earliest ones date to the Old Babylonian period: an inscription of Warad-Sin of Larsa and the manuscripts of the ‘Lugalbanda-Enmerkar’ epic.

If one conjectured this was not an accident of discovery, then I could tentatively suggest that the consonant *n* in *mandum* developed for purely coincidental orthographical reasons after Sumerian reborrowed the Akkadian word *mätum* (the first borrowing was with *mada*), presumably during the Old Babylonian period, in order to express a new semantic nuance for ‘land’. An example of a purely coincidental and orthographical addition of –*n*– is *mansium* ‘an emblem (of rulership)’, a word which Halloran suggests has been borrowed from Akkadian *mesu* I ‘pure, refined’. The Akkadian adjective *mesu* I ‘washed, refined’ is written without a consonant *n*. When Sumerian borrowed the word, there could have been the additional orthographical development of the consonant *n*. In support of a borrowing from *mätum*, Jacobsen noted that the unvoiced Sumerian sound represented with *d* could stand for Akkadian *t*. This presumes *mandum* went through its own semantic development that distinguished it from *mätum* and Sumerian *mada*.

- The electronic Pennsylvania Sumerian Dictionary regards the variant writing *ma-d-u-um* in the Lugalbanda-Enmerkar epic as a form of the word *mada*. The word *mandum* is attested in a number of different documents and cannot be regarded as a direct variant of *mada*. Nevertheless, the two words look somewhat connected on orthographic grounds and this raises the possibility that there is a semantic relationship as well. That their relationship is not clear is well accepted. If the Sumerian words *mandum* and *mada* did not form at different times, then *mandum* developed out of *mada* (both semantically and orthographically) because it is well established that Sumerian borrowed Akkadian *mätum* as *mada* with a *terminus ante quem* of the Old Akkadian era, and possibly even earlier at the

49 For the earliest known attestation of *mada*, see discussion above in p. 49.
50 Jacobsen proposed a word from the Semitic root *m-h-d*, as discussed above in p. 48.
51 For references, see 3.1, 3.1.4.
52 ePSD M mansium[unmng]: SL 165.
53 SL 165.
54 CAD M II 29-30.
56 The semantic range of *mandum* will be discussed below 3.1.3-4.
57 Discussed throughout this chapter.
59 This point is certain because Falkenstein provides examples of loanwords with the same phonetic rule, see Falkenstein “Kontakte zwischen Sumerern und Akkadern”, p. 312.
Early Dynastic III era. The orthographical change from mada to mandum is conceivable, and can be exemplified with the interchange of da and tum in the word tu-di-da ‘toggle-pin’, which is also written tu-di-tum. If da and tum can interchange, so can da and dum, the last syllables of mada and mandum respectively, because Sumerian writing can interchange the initial dental stops d/t of a CVC type syllable: some examples are duh/tuh ‘residue’, dun/tun ‘to heap up’, dur/tur ‘newborn, weakness’, tud/dud ‘to bear’, tuk/duk ‘creditor’. Thomsen notes that the earliest Akkadian system of writing does not distinguish between the voiced and voiceless (b, d, g and p, t, k) most probably because it was borrowed from the Sumerians, meaning Sumerian originally did not have the opposition between voiced and voiceless. The orthographical change from mada to mandum would then be explained by recourse to the need to express the new semantic development associated with mandum.

The information above can suggest a wide range of scenarios. Occam’s Razor would look at the few attestations of mandum in texts dated to the Old Babylonian era and favor a borrowing from Akkadian mātum as discussed above in this section 3.1.2, but the evidence is too scarce to be certain the razor is being used without undue harm to our understanding of the origin of the word mandum and its link to the words mada and mātum. In any case, these words are somehow related. A pressing concern is to study the semantic range and uniqueness of mandum.

3.1.3 Lexical Lists

The word mandum has been used as an Akkadian word, interchangeably with the Akkadian word mātum ‘land’, in the lexical list H X where the compound word žēr mandu (lit. ‘seed of mandu’) appears as a variant

---

60 For the earliest known attestation of mada, see discussion above in p. 49.
61 SL 277; ePSD T tuditum[toggle pin].
62 SL 50.
63 SL 51.
64 SL 52, 282.
65 SL 278.
66 SL 281.
67 Thomsen, The Sumerian Language, p. 43.
68 The semantic range of mandum will be discussed below 3.1.3-4.
writing for zēr mātu ‘seed of the land’. The interchange between mandu and mātu in the Akkadian section of the lexical list Hḫ IV indicates that the former has become part of Akkadian language (and is used to explain a Sumerian word) through this phrase zēr mandu, and mandu is possibly seen as synonymous to mātu ‘land’, unless the copyist who wrote zēr mātu did not know what mandu exactly meant and changed it to the more common mātu. Obviously they do not mean the exact same thing (or there would have been no mandu but only the common word mātu). The word mātu has a wide semantic range and by itself gives little idea about what may be semantically unique to mandu, but at least hints that the latter word means ‘land’ in general terms.

The lexical lists equate zēr mandu(m) ‘seed of mandu(m)’ with Sumerian a-za-lu-lu which is equated with a number of words that refer in general to living beings, human beings or animals. The word a-za-lu-lu has a wide semantic range meaning ‘multitude of living things, teeming life’. One lexical list explaining a-za-lu-lu uses the written form zēr ma-an-dum alongside words that refer in general to living beings, animals or humanity: a-me-lu-tum ‘humanity’, nam-maš-tum ‘herds of (wild) animals, moving things’, te-ni-še-e-tum ‘human kind’, and bu-ul da-šu-us (var. i-da-ša-us) ‘herds/wild animals of …’. This indicates zēr mandu(m) can refer to life in general, and humanity within that range, since it literally means ‘seed (i.e. life) of the land’.

3.1.3.1 The relationship between mandu and ki

---

69 Hḫ IV 383 and relevant note in MSL 8/2, p. 41. Von Soden tentatively asked if zēr could be read as kul (hence kulmandu?), AHw 1520, the sign for zēr can also be read kul but it is not clear what the latter would mean, whereas zēr ‘seed’ fits well with the sense ‘seed of the land’, as the ensuing discussion of the lexical lists indicate. CAD Z 89 reads zer manda.

70 See mātu in CAD M I 414-421; AHw 633-634.

71 These references are collected in CAD Z 89.

72 On a-za-lu-lu as ‘a multitude of living things, teeming life’, SL 8; ePSD A azalulu[multitude].

73 CAD N I 234-235. Von Soden treats nammaššum together with nammaššu because both go back to the verb nammašu ‘to set in motion, to start out’, AHw 728. The meaning of nammaššu is slightly different to nammašum although both have the same root and have similar meanings. The word nammaššu means ‘herds of (wild) animals’, but has additionally been equated with the words alim and A.DAM. The latter words denote ‘settlements, people’. The word nammaššu is discussed in ch. 4, pp. 98-99.

74 ZA 9 162 iii 23ff in CAD Z 89.

75 The word idašus may perhaps be derived as ‘sixty arms’ from idu ‘arm’ + šuši ‘sixty’, but this is not certain, AHw 364; CDA 124. CAD notes the meaning of idašus is uncertain, and that the variant forms dasus and tašus may indicate a different compound or a foreign word, perhaps re-formed by popular etymology, CAD I-J 8. The word bu-ul da-šu-us is probably another word for animals in masses because buulu is a general word that means ‘herds (of cattle, sheep or horses)’ or ‘wild animals’, CAD B II 313-316, AHw 137.

76 Hḫ IV 385 in MSL 8/2, p. 42.
Besides the type of words discussed above in this section 3.1.3, the lexical list Hḫ XIV lists ṣər ṁandu alongside two words relating to insect life: 77 kal-ma-tum ‘vermin, parasite,’ 78 louse (on animals, plants and human beings) 79 and na-a-bu ‘insect eggs,’ 80 butterfly eggs (also ṅēbu), 81 a louse. 82 Insects can obviously be living things on the surface of the ‘earth, ground’. This sense of ‘ground’ appears in another section of Hḫ XIV where Sumerian nīg 83 ki ‘vermin, small beasts’ corresponds both to ṣər ṁandu ‘seed of ṁandu’ and to nam-maṣ- tum 83 ‘herds of (wild) animals, people, settlement’, 84 whereas nīg-ki-ki-a, written with the duplication of the word ki, is equated with ṣər qaqq-qa-rum ‘seed of the ground’. 85 In these associations, Sumerian nīg ‘thing’ obviously corresponds to Akkadian ṣər ‘seed’, implying Sumerian ki ‘earth, place, ground’ corresponds to ṁandu while the plural ki-ki (kukku 2) 86 corresponds to qaqqarum. The words ṁandu and qaqqarum are semantically close enough to be equated to Sumerian ki and ki-ki (also read kukku 2) respectively. Therefore ṁandu is interchangeable with Sumerian ki in some contexts 87 and semantically related to qaqqarum. This is not to suggest ki is always equal to ṁandum or any other word for ‘land’, but rather that ki has a much wider semantic range, wherein it can correspond to other words for ‘land’ in some cases. This wider semantic range requires different translations in different contexts, such as ‘earth, soil, land, ground, territory, region, a specific country, place, dwelling’ and ki can stand for Akkadian words such as ṣeretu, mātu, ṣubtu, āṣuru, qaqqaru, šapā. 88 The semantic proximity of ṁandu to qaqqarum ‘ground’, a word that also has a wide semantic range, 89 helps narrow down, just a little bit, the semantic range of ṁandu when one looks at the specific instances where Sumerian ki is interchanged with ṁandu. The sense of ‘earth surface, ground’ applies well for both ki and

77 A V/2: 138ff in CAD Z 89.
78 AHw 426-427; CDA 143.
79 CAD K 86-87.
80 AHw 699; CDA 229.
81 CAD N Pt II vol. II 149.
82 na-bu B (a louse), CAD N Pt. I Vol II 40.
83 Hḫ XIV 401a-402 in MSL 8/2, p. 43.
84 For the meanings of this word, see n. 73 above.
85 Hḫ XIV 403 in MSL 8/2, p. 43.
86 The word ki.ki stands for kukku1 ‘land’ according to the lexical list Nigga 514 apud ePSD K kukku[land]. Note that kukku3 (ku<sup>10</sup>-ku<sup>10</sup>) is ‘(to be) dark’, ePSD K kukku[dark] and kukku<sub>2</sub> is ‘dark places’, ePSD K kukku[dark places]. Sumerian kukku ‘darkness’ is also a name for earth, W. Horowitz, Mesopotamian Cosmic Geography. Winona Lake, Indiana. Eisenbrauns. 1998, p. 269.
87 Further indication this is no surprise is that another word, mada, has also been equated to ki in a lexical list, Ura S 309 in ePSD M mada[land]. Limet cites examples from Gudea’s Cylinder B where ki is close to mada in meaning in some contexts, see H. Limet, “Étude Sémantique de Ma.da, Kur, Kalam” RA 72 (1978), p. 11.
88 ePSD K ki[place]; Hübner and Reizammer, Inim Kiengi II, pp. 541-542; ISL I, pp. 258-263; the uses of ki in Akkadian is extensive, see examples for ṣeretu ‘earth’ in CAD E 308-313; AHw 245; mātu ‘land’ is equated to Kl according to Izbu Comm 260 in CAD M I 415; ƙubtu ‘dwelling’ is equated ti Kl according to STT 395 r. 12 in AHw 1257 whereas Kl.TUS ‘territory, military camp’ is commonly used for ƙubtu in some contexts, CAD S III 181-184; examples for āṣur ‘place, region’ can be found in CAD A II 456-460; AHw 82-83. For examples with qaqqarum ‘ground’, see CAD Q 113-124; AHw 900-901.
89 qaqqarum can mean ‘ground, soil, terrain, territory, plot of land, location, area, region, open country, surface area, earth, netherworld, floor’ in various contexts, see CAD Q 113-124; AHw 900-901.
mandu in the lexical lists, and is also verified by translations such as “vermin, vermin of the earth” for the use of
the word zēr mandu (lit. seed [i.e. living thing] of the land [i.e. ground, earth surface]) in the omen series Summa
Alu and the incantation series Šurpu. In the latter reference, which is bilingual, ki in the Sumerian section is
used for mandu in the Akkadian. The semantic range of mandu(m) in zēr mandu includes a meaning of ‘earth
surface, ground’. This semantic range can be expressed by translating mandum specifically as ‘terrain’.

3.1.4 An inscription of Warad-Sin of Larsa

The word mandum ‘terrain’ may help to explain its hard to understand use in a very different and terse context.
An inscription of Warad-Sin of Larsa (VA 5950) uses the word ma-du-um to describe a series of constructions
regarding the city wall of Ur:

(94) hī-ri-tum-bi ḫu-mu-ba-al
(95) ma-du-um-bi ḫu-mu-da₅
(96) u₄ bād-urlₙ₁⁻ma (97) mu-dù-a

(94) I dug its channel,
(95) I encircled its terrain (ma-du-um),
(96-97) when I built the wall of Ur,
(the account continues with other details of the construction)

Falkenstein comments that the word ma-du-um in line 95 of VA 5950 may refer to the rampart that
surrounds the channel (hī-ri-tum) in line 94. In connection with this, Falkenstein suggests the word ma-du-
um may be the same as the one in the Lugalbanda-Enmerkar epic and cannot see how ma-du-um in line 95
can have an Akkadian origin. Jacobsen suggested translating ma-du-um as “moat” or “low ridge” (?). CAD

90 For the references in Šumma alu and Šurpu, see CAD Z 89.
91 VA 5950 94-97 in A. Falkenstein, “Eine Inschrift Waradsins aus Babylon” Baghdader Mitteilungen 3 (1964),
pp. 27, 29.
92 The use of the word mandum in ‘Lugalbanda-Enmerkar’ will be discussed below in 3.2-3.
93 Falkenstein, op.cit., p. 38.
states it may be a topographical feature. Wilcke cannot see any apparent connection between ma-du-um in VA 5950 95 and mandum in ‘Lugalbanda-Enmerkar’ line 342 as proposed by Falkenstein. Given that the semantic range of word mandum includes ‘earth surface, ground’, I suggest that ma-du-um in line 95 may denote the ‘terrain’, whatever type of terrain that may be. ‘Terrain’ could relate to the subsequent line in VA 5950 in the sense that Warad-Sin of Larsa is saying that he encircled the ‘terrain’ (ma-du-um) of Uruk when he built its city walls. The reference is terse and my proposition remains tentative.

3.2 Lugalbanda II 342-344: Previous Interpretations and mandum

The discussion above does not exhaust the semantic range of the word mandum, but helps understand its significance in the Lugalbanda-Enmerkar epic. The Lugalbanda-Enmerkar epic is one of the four Sumerian epics that are usually analysed together as a literary cycle or res gestae. The epics deal with the struggle for power and status between the Sumerian city-state Uruk-Kulaba with its king Enmerkar on the one hand, and Aratta, the yet unidentified city expected to be in the highlands east of Sumer, somewhere in Iran. The other three relevant epics are ‘Enmerkar and Ensuhkeşdanna’, ‘Enmerkar and the Lord of Aratta’, and ‘Lugalbanda in the Mountain Cave’. ‘Lugalbanda and Enmerkar’ follows ‘Lugalbanda in the Mountain Cave’ and together they form a self-standing epic cycle that focuses on the deeds of Lugalbanda during the conflict...
between Uruk and Aratta. The word *mandum* is used in the ‘Lugalbanda-Enmerkar’ epic during a description of the mountainous geography traveled by Lugalbanda on his return to Uruk-Kulaba from Enmerkar’s camp on the battlefront against Aratta.

342: The terrain at the mountain base and the mountain wall, 343: (and) from the boundary of Anšan to the ‘Head of Anšan’, 344: he crossed five, six, seven mountain ranges.

This passage has received several interpretations, and I need to discuss my translation in light of the various points elaborated above concerning the word *mandum*. Wilcke argues that there is a contrast in Lugalbanda II 342 between the words denoting mountains (*kur-úr-ra* and *kur-bàd-da*) marked by the locative postposition – a, and the word *mandum* marked by the locative/terminative postposition –e, and that the contrast is in the sense ‘from… to…’. Two aspects of Wilcke’s proposition interrelate: grammar and context. I first discuss the latter. Wilcke tentatively suggests the mountains in line 342 may be juxtaposed to *mandum ‘Flachland’*, which may be denoting the alluvial plain of Susa, and for this Wilcke takes cue from the grammatical construction ‘from… to…’ in line 343, where the ablative suffix – ta ‘from’ marks the word *zà-an-šàn-ta* and the terminative suffix – sè ‘to’ marks the word *sag-an-šàn*.

---


106 Lugalbanda II 342-344. The passage is found in manuscripts A, AA, and T. For information on the manuscripts, see Wilcke, *Das Lugalbandaepon*, pp. 23-28, esp. p. 27. The variant readings for the specific passage Lugalbanda II 342-344 are found in *ibid.*, p. 122.

107 The reading *u r* following manuscripts T and A. Manuscript AA has *u r*.


109 AA: mountain roof. Different translation due to variant syllable, see variant in previous footnote.

110 The word is literally a combination of *ḥur* ‘hole, valley’ and *sag* ‘points, peaks’, SL 116. It can have meanings of ‘mountain, foothills’ and in some contexts ‘steppe’, see ePSD H *hursag*[mountain]. Both the Sumerian word and its form as a loanword in Akkadian constitute a *plurale tantum*, meaning mountain (region), SL 116; CAD H 253-254.


112 The former will be discussed below, especially in 3.3.
Anšan'.\textsuperscript{113} For Wilcke this creates the possibility that Lugalbanda II 342- 343 refer to the same geographical area: the mountains marked with the locative in Lugalbanda II 342 would then be corresponding to the mountainous area of Anšan, and the word mandum marked in the terminative/locative case would correspond to the alluvial plain of Susa, hence tentatively translated ‘Flachland’ with this alluvial plain in mind.\textsuperscript{114} Wilcke translates Lugalbanda II 342-343 as: “(342) Am Fuße des Gebirges, im Hochgebirge, bis hin zum Flachland, (343) von der fernen Grenze Anšan’s bis nur nahen Grenze Anšan’s”.\textsuperscript{115} Wilcke argues that the Zagros, extending from the northwest to the southeast, is the range of mountains described in Lugalbanda’s journey from Aratta to Uruk in Lugalbanda II 342-343, for which Wilcke interprets kur-úr ‘Fuße des Gebirges’ in Lugalbanda II 342 to mean the eastern edge of the Zagros whereas kur-bàd ‘Hochgebirge’ would stand for Anšan and the Zagros range.\textsuperscript{116} Wilcke consequently identifies the word sag-an-ša₄-an₅-ša₄₆-aki ‘Grenze Anšan’s’ with the slopes of the Zagros chain, which makes the alluvial land of Susa identifiable with mandum, since this plain is found after the slopes of the Zagros chain.\textsuperscript{117}

The reference to Anšan in Lugalbanda II 343 does not by itself secure that the previous line refers to the same specific part of the Zagros. In his attempt to locate Mount Sābum, one of the toponyms in the Lugalbanda-Enmerkar epic, Wilcke discusses a reference to that mountain found during the description of Ibbi-Sin’s capture in the Ur Lamentation (UET VI 124):\textsuperscript{118}

34: i-bí-šu’en kur-elam-ma-sè giš-bûr-ra (var.: giš-bûr-re) du(-ù)-dè
35: iši-za-bu \textsuperscript{119} gaba-ḫur-sag-gá-ta (var.: gaba-a-ab-ba-ka-ta; gaba-ab-ba’-ta) zà-an-ša₄-an₅-ša₄₆-ana(AN)₂₆-šè
36: buru₄₆.muşen é-bi ba-ra-(an)-dal-(a)-gim uru-ni-sè nu-gur-ru-dè

34: Ibbi-Sin goes to Elam in fetters,
35: Mount Sābum, from the edge of the mountain range (var. sea), to the boundary of Anšan.
36: Like a bird that has flown from its abode, he is not returning to his city.

\textsuperscript{113} Wilcke, Das Lugalbandaepos, pp. 123:343; 213:342.
\textsuperscript{114} Ibid., pp. 35, 213:342.
\textsuperscript{115} Ibid., p. 123:342-343.
\textsuperscript{116} Ibid., p. 35.
\textsuperscript{117} Ibid., p. 35.
\textsuperscript{118} Quoted in ibid., pp. 33-34.
Wilcke infers from this passage that Mount Sâbum is mentioned before the distant border of Anšan, and argues that this inference can be compared with Lugalbanda II 342-344 because both passages use the term ‘boundary of Anšan’ (zá-an-ša₄-ana(AN)) in UET VI 124 35 and zá-an-ša₄-na in Lugalbanda I 343) and describe a strip of land associated with the territory of Anšan. The problem with Wilcke’s argument is that the Ur Lamentation uses the ablative – ta and the terminative –sè in UET VI 124 35 whereas Lugalbanda II 342 uses different postpositions (discussed below in 3.3). The use of the ablative/terminative in the Ur Lamentation can only be likened to the juxtapositional use of the ablative/terminative cases ‘from… to…’ in Lugalbanda II 343. Its use in the latter rather suggests Lugalbanda II 343 is describing the land of Anšan in an exclusive and comprehensivemanner as “from the boundary of Anšan to the ‘Head of Anšan’”. The Anšan highland appears as a unique geography that links the Elamite lowlands with the eastern mountains in Lugalbanda II. Lugalbanda II 342 must be describing another geographical area.

Van Dijk alternatively, but just as tentatively as Wilcke, translates Lugalbanda II 342 as follows: “à l’intérieur de la montagne, dans la montagne lointaine, dans le désert”,. Van Dijk suggests ma₄du(m) may refer to a ‘région désertique’ that separates the mountains of Iran from the Indus, and expects Aratta, due to its role in the lapis lazuli trade, to be located somewhere east of the Iranian mountains. Van Dijk’s edition of the passage Lugalbanda II 341-346 assumes the primacy of manuscripts that mention Aratta as the destination which Lugalbanda reaches after crossing over the ma₄du(m). The ensuing two lines, however, express jubilation over reaching Kulaba. Wilcke’s work on Lugalbanda II, published four years after van Dijk’s article, established that the scribes of manuscripts A and AA of Lugalbanda II accidentally inserted a reference to reaching Aratta in Lugalbanda II 344 (while he is supposed to reach Uruk!), and this erroneous insertion has been taken out of the modern editions of the epic. Lugalbanda reached Uruk-Kulaba after crossing over ma₄du(m). This means the word does not refer to a desert region between the Iranian mountains and the Indus. Van Dijk’s translation ma₄du(m) as ‘désert’ loses its basis. The mountainous terrain depicted in the Sumerian epics exhibit features that do not befit what comes naturally to mind as the a ‘région désertique’; for

---

119 Ibid., pp. 34-35.
120 This needs to be discussed within the context of Lugalbanda II 342. I will discuss it below in 3.3.
122 Ibid., p. 29.
123 Ibid., p. 29: 344.
124 Also quoted in ibid., p. 29:345-346.
example this terrain is said to have ‘the rivers of the mountain (are) the mother of abundance’ (ı₃-kur-ra ama ħe-nun-na).\(^{126}\)

Most other previous translations treat mandum as denoting some sort of non-alpine topographical feature that stands in contrast with the alpine features in Lugalbanda II 342. The word has been translated as ‘flat land’, \(^{127}\) ‘plains’, \(^{128}\) ‘ désert’, \(^{129}\) ‘ plateaus’\(^{130}\) and ‘ Hochflächen’.\(^{131}\) Steible did not translate ma(n)dum marked by the locative/terminative but merely called it “Madum”, and translated: “vom Fuße des Gebirges, das hohe Gebirge in Madum”.\(^{132}\) This translation suggests that the mountains described in line 342 are in what is denoted by the word mandum. Similarly, Cohen treated the “ma(n)dum territory” as a distinct geographical zone positioned after the Zubi Mountain and the mountains from the frontier of Anšan, as the final territory to be crossed over before reaching Aratta on the route from Uruk.\(^{133}\) Cohen expected mandum to turn out to be a geographic name.\(^{134}\) While the discussion above indicates it is a general word and not a toponym, its particular use in ‘Lugalbanda-Enmerkar’ requires further clarification.

3.3 Lugalbanda II 342-344: mandum and its Locative/Terminative Suffix

The word mandum uniquely has the suffix –e whereas two other nouns in Lugabanda II 342, each representing features of a mountainous landscape, are suffixed with –a. If the –a postposition suffixed to these nouns (kur-úr-ra [one manuscript has an alternative word: kur-ûr-ra] and kur-bàd-da) is treated as the locative, as previous translations have done, the suggested contrast ‘from… to…’ that is supposed to emerge out of the justapositional use of the locative and locative/terminative cases is still not evident. The locative/terminative suffix does not supply the precise sense of ‘motion towards’ that is required for this suggestion to work. That precise sense of ‘motion towards’ is rather conveyed with the terminative case (-eše) which is not found in

\(^{126}\) Lugalbanda II 239.
\(^{128}\) Vanstiphout, Epics of Sumerian Kings, p. 155: 342.
\(^{133}\) Cohen, Enmerkar and the Lord of Aratta, p. 57.
\(^{134}\) Ibid., p. 54.
Lugalbanda II 342. The locative/terminative case (-e) specifically means ‘motion arriving at, position next to, near to’.\(^{135}\) Interpreting the postposition –e depends on the range of factors that will be discussed below, and is not solely dependent on the meaning of the –a suffix found in the first two words of Lugalbanda II 342. Van Dijk could translate Lugalbanda II 342 as “à l’intérieur de la montagne (kur-úr-ra), dans la montagne lointaine (kur-bàd-da), dans le désert’ (ma(n)du(m)-e)”,\(^ {136}\) hence examplifying how the locative postposition –a need not be interpreted as grammatically contrasting ma(n)du(m)-e. Van Dijk’s translation does not express the difference between the –a postposition and the locative/terminative –e, and is perhaps assuming the contrast between the mountains and the ‘désert’ is evident without the grammatical nuance, but it is very likely that there is a distinction conveyed by the use of the different pospositions –a and –e. A closer look at what each word may be denoting in Lugalbanda II 342 is necessary.

The words kur-úr-ra and kur-bàd-da are hard to translate. Manuscripts T and A of ‘Lugalbanda-Enmerkar’ have kur-úr-ra.\(^ {137}\) The word úr means ‘base, floor’ and GIS.úr means ‘legs of a table’.\(^ {138}\) It joins with kur ‘mountain’ into the compound kur-úr, which is literally ‘mountain base’.\(^ {139}\) This compound can also be translated as ‘base/floor of the mountain’.\(^ {140}\) The word kur-úr-ra is usually translated ‘foot of the highlands/mountain(s)’.\(^ {141}\) This risks defining the word beyond what it means. What part of the mountain does ‘mountain base’ refer to? The word úr ‘base’ is uninformative by itself. The literal translation ‘mountain base’ is preferable, since there is the possibility that the word may be connected to the consequent noun compound kur-bàd, literally ‘mountain wall’,\(^ {142}\) formed with the word bàd ‘wall, fortress’.\(^ {143}\) The word ‘mountain wall’ is

\(^{135}\) The clear distinction between these two cases is explained in D. O. Edzard, *Sumerian Grammar.* (Handbook of Oriental Studies Volume 71). Leiden & Boston. Brill. 2003, p. 44. For the locative/terminative case, see *ibid*, pp. 43-45; Thomsen, *The Sumerian Language*, pp. 95-96.


\(^{137}\) References are in nn. 3-4 above.

\(^{138}\) ePSD U ur[base]; SL 300.

\(^{139}\) Also Jacobsen, *The Harps*, p. 341: 342.

\(^{140}\) A similar example of two nouns creating a compound is an ăš ‘midst of heaven’, literally ‘heaven-heart’, Thomsen, *The Sumerian Language*, p. 55.


\(^{143}\) Also Jacobsen, *The Harps*, p. 123: 342. The word bàd can mean ‘high’ as an adjective, SL 28. The adjectival use of the word could theoretically be used to create a compound word, similar to ki-gal-la ‘great earth’ in Lugalbanda II 337. The other word in Lugalbada II 342, kur-úr-ra, does not contain an adjective and is a noun compound, with a suffixed postposition –a. One can expect both words kur-úr-ra and kur-bàd-da to be grammatically similar, both being noun compounds and suffixed with the same postposition –a. This seems to be confirmed by the references ePSD cites for bàd, indicating it is usually used as a noun, see ePSD B bàd[wall]. ePSD does not even mention the adjectival use.
usually translated as ‘high mountain(s)/highlands’ or ‘mountain ranges’. The word ‘mountain wall’ (kur-bàd) may have a more comprehensive meaning because architectural similes (such as ‘base’, ‘wall’) could be used in order to denote mountains in general. The word ‘mountain base/floor’ may be linked with ‘mountain wall’ because the words ‘base’ (úr) and ‘wall’ (bàd) can be tied together in some contexts as part of the same architectural structure, for example in the lament for Sumer and Urim where it is stated that the dogs of Urim will sniff the ‘base of the wall’ (úr bàd-da).

The word (bàd) has been used to describe mountains. The expression ‘great wall of the mountains’ (bàd gal kur-ra) describes mountains in a praise poem of Ur-namma. The ‘mountain base’ (kur-úr) can be taken to refer to foothills, but given that the words ‘base’ (úr) and ‘wall’ (bàd) can refer to parts of the same architectural structure as described immediately above, and given that ‘mountain wall’ can denote mountains, ‘mountain base’ can represent another part of the same mountains.

The mountain ranges Enmerkar marched with his army in order to reach Aratta are simply called the ‘mountain’ (kur). The compound words ‘mountain base’ and ‘mountain wall’ seem also to represent the mountainous landscape in general, using architectural similes.

Manuscript AA of ‘Lugalbanda-Enmerkar’ has kur-úr in place of ‘mountain base’ (kur-úr). The word úr is the verb with meanings such as ‘to go along, sweep away, to drag’, and as a noun has meanings such as ‘entrance, mountain pass, roof (Akkadian ùru(m))’. If AA’s variant writing úr in kur-úr is not a mistake for the writing úr in kur-úr found in the other two manuscripts, then as a noun compound kur-úr can mean ‘mountain pass, mountain roof, etc.’. A meaning such as ‘mountain pass’, usually associated with its use in Akkadian texts, is not expected in Lugalbanda II 342 because such a meaning would not accord with how the other words have been used in Lugalbanda II 342. As explained above, the other compounds in the same line

146 ETCSL 2.2.3: line 350.
147 Translated ‘great fortresses of the mountains’ in ETCSL 2.4.1.3, line 81. For the Sumerian text, see ibid.
148 Lugalbanda I 49.
149 References are in nn. 3-4 above.
150 ePSD ûr[drag].
151 ePSD ûr[roof]; SL 300.
152 J. Halloran has informed me that he attained the meaning ‘mountain pass’ for úr in SL from the CAD entry for nerēbu. I thank him for this piece of information. The CAD entry cites lexical lists that equate ûr-[u] and [UR] with ne-re-bu ša X, MIN ša ki-x-… in A IV/4: 128f apud CAD N II 175 and ki.ûr.(.ra) with duru[ššu] and ni-ri-bu Ki-tim in Antagal 6 21f apud CAD N II 175. The Akkadian word that corresponds to úr in the lexical lists is usually used for mountain passes of specific areas. For example KUR ni-ri-bu ša URU Babite dûra ırisipu ‘they erected a wall at the pass of Babite’ in AKH 303 ii 24 apud CAD N II 176. This Akkadian word has also been used to denote general access to the mountains, see CAD N II 176: 2. b).
('mountain base' and 'mountain wall') denote mountains with architectural similes: 'base, floor' or 'wall'. This context suggests 'mountain roof' is the more likely translation for kur-ùr-ra because such a translation relates it (as does its alternative 'mountain base' found in the other two manuscripts of Lugalbanda II) to the 'mountain wall' as an architectural simile. The words roof (ùr) and wall (bàd) are used in apposition in a praise poem of Sulgi, where it is stated: "I shall kill on the roofs those [of the foreign lands] who lie on the roofs. I shall smite on the walls those who lie on the walls."\footnote{Translation is taken from ETCSL 2.4.2.04.} (211. [kur-ra] ùr-ra nú-a-bi ùr-ra ga-ȁm-mi-āg\footnote{ETCCL 2.4.2.04 has āj₂ for this sign.} 212. bàd-da nú-a-bi bàd-da ga-ȁm-mi-gaz).\footnote{ETCCL 2.4.2.04, line 211-212.} I suggest that the word 'mountain roof' (kur-ùr) refers to mountain summits, in some form of apposition to 'mountain wall' (kur bàd). Both 'mountain roof' and 'mountain wall' are used as similes to denote mountains.

The words 'mountain base' (kur-ùr), 'mountain wall' (kur-bàd), and 'mountain roof' (kur-ùr) seem to denote the types of challenging mountain terrain Lugalbanda had to traverse to get from Aratta to Uruk. This can be related to how the epics about Aratta also denote the mountain ranges between Uruk and Aratta using the words 'mountain' (kur)\footnote{e.g. Lugalbanda I 85, 140, 153, 170, Lugalbanda II 235.} and 'great mountain range (h ursag gal) by themselves.\footnote{Lugalbanda II 231, 335.} Steible comments that the words 'mountain' (kur) and 'mountain region' (h ursag) in Lugalbanda II 342 and 344 have different meanings.\footnote{H. Steible, Ein Lied an den Gott Haja, p. 72, n. 153.} These words can have different meanings, because kur originally meant only 'mountain', but in time it also attained a meaning of 'mountainous region' that can replace h ursag is some instances.\footnote{H. Limet, “Étude Sémantique de Ma.da, Kur, Kalam”, pp. 8-9.} The reason kur and h ursag are used in Lugalbanda II 342 and 344 respectively must be in order to differentiate between the mountainous territory (kur) specifically mentioned in Lugalbanda II 342 and the entire range of mountain chains (h ursag) between Uruk and Aratta mentioned in Lugalbanda II 344 (passage is quoted above p. 56). The Anšan highland was a distinct area covering the foothills of southern Zagros, and was centered on the site of Tepe Malyan identified as Anšan in western Fars, with a prominent place in the history of Elam due to its close ties with the Elamite lowlands.\footnote{I. M. Diakonoff, “Elami” in CAH Iran 2, pp., 5-6; J. Hansman, “Anshan in the Elamite and Achaemenian Periods” in CAH Iran 2, pp. 25ff; E. Reiner, “The Location of Anšan” RA 67 (1973), pp. 57-62; Cohen, Enmerkar and the Lord of Aratta, pp. 48-49.} Tepe Malyan is situated near the western edge of a valley system fed by the Kur River, at an elevation of 2500 metres, at a strategic point that connects the Elamite lowlands with the...
Zagros mountain chains. This makes the Anšan highland a region that opens Elam to the other mountain regions in the east. I suggest that Lugalbanda II 342 refers to the mountain regions between Anšan and Aratta. Lugalbanda crosses over them, beginning his journey from the land of Aratta. He then crosses over the mountain regions described in Lugalbanda II 342, after which he crosses over the Anšan highlands in Lugalbanda II 343. In the subsequent line, his entire journey is summarised by stating he crossed over ‘five, six, seven mountain regions’ (ḫur-sag-ia ḫur-sag-āš ḫur-sag-imin), after which he was finally in Uruk. Lugalbanda II 344’s use of the expression ‘five, six, seven mountain regions’ (ḫur-sag-ia ḫur-sag-āš ḫur-sag-imin) is formulaic. This formulaic expression also describes the entire mountainous terrain which the envoy traverses between Uruk and Aratta in ‘Enmerkar and the Lord of Aratta’. The text says that the areas traveled are the Zubi mountains, the land of Susa and Anšan highland, and the mountain regions before the land of Aratta. Given that the mountain ranges Lugalbanda crossed over between Aratta and Anšan are described by the words ‘mountain base’ (kur-úr), ‘mountain wall’ (kur-bàd), and ‘mountain roof’ (kur-ūr) in Lugalbanda II 342, how do these words relate to the word mandum suffixed with the postposition –e? The answer may lie with a reference in line 170 of ‘Enmerkar and the Lord of Aratta’, where the postposition –e is suffixed to the formulaic expression ‘five, six, seven mountain regions’.

ḫur-sag-ia ḫur-sag-āš ḫur-sag-imin-e im-me-ri-bal-bal

He (i.e. the envoy) crossed five, six, seven mountain ranges.

The postposition –e has the sense ‘near to’, expressing movement arriving into contact with an object or position adjacent to (or in contact with) an object. The text is literally conveying that the envoy traverses near to/adjacent to the mountain ranges, in effect crossing them. The locative/terminative case in line 170 of ‘Lugalbanda and the Lord of Aratta’ marks the expression ‘five, six, seven mountain ranges’ as the object of the verb ‘he crossed’ (im-me-ri-bal-bal). The same verb has as its object the word mandum marked with the same case ending in Lugalbanda II 342: ‘the mandum…he crossed’ (ma[n]du[m]-e…. im-me-ri-bal-

---

162 Lugalbanda II 322-341.
163 Lugalbanda II 344-346.
164 Enmerkar and the Lord of Aratta 170-171; 509-510.
165 Enmerkar and the Lord of Aratta 108-114, 164-171.
In the case of Lugalbanda II 342, the locative/terminative case merely expresses that Lugalbanda crossed over the mandum ‘terrain’, and can be rendered with a translation such as ‘the terrain... he crossed’ (ma[n]du[m]-e.... im-me-ri-bal-bal).  

The word mandum is semantically interchangeable with Sumerian ki, and is linked to Akkadian words qaqqarum and mātu, hence its semantic range covers meanings such as ‘ground, earth surface’ at least in some contexts, and this can be conveyed by the translation ‘terrain’. It can be argued that mandum as ‘terrain’ fits the context of Lugalbanda II 342 after having established that the other words in that line that refer to the mountain ranges between Anšan and Aratta: ‘mountain base’ (kur-úr), ‘mountain wall’ (kur-bâd), and ‘mountain roof’ (kur-úr). If these three words are marked in the locative, they may link with mandum as follows: kur-úr-ra (variant: kur-úr-ra) kur-bâd-da ma(n)du(m) “(he crossed) the terrain at the mountain base (var.: mountain roof) and the mountain wall”. If the postposition –a is genitive, a translation may be: “(he crossed) the terrain of the mountain base (var.: mountain roof) and the mountain wall”. The sense of Lugalbanda 342 is that Lugalbanda ‘crossed’ (im-me-ri-bal-bal) the terrain at or of the ‘mountain base (var. roof) and the mountain wall’, i.e. the terrain (mandum) of the mountain ranges.

The mandum ‘terrain’ of the mountains can be further explored by looking at the use of the word ki in Lugalbanda II 337: at the Urukean war camp in the land of Aratta, his brothers try to convince Lugalbanda not to travel alone to Uruk, but he responds that they cannot keep up with him while he travels ‘the great earth’ (ki-gal-la). This ‘great earth’, the terrain between Uruk and Aratta, is obviously the vast mountain terrain between the two cities, including the mountain regions in Lugalbanda II 342. In effect, Lugalbanda is crossing over the great ki, i.e. ‘the great earth’ (ki-gal-la). This compares to Lugalbanda crossing over ‘terrain’ (mandum) in Lugalbanda II 342.

The word ki is the ‘earth’ in the expression ‘earth (ki) at the Lulubi(?) mountain’ (kur-ra 1u₂-1u₂-bi-a ki) that is said to shake at the roar of the mythical Anzud bird. This expression connects ki to the ‘Lulubi(?)

---

168 Lugalbanda II 342, 344.
169 Lugalbanda II 342, 344.
170 As discussed above in 3.1.3.
171 Discussed above in pp. 60-63.
172 Lugalbanda II 329-336.
173 Lugalbanda II 337.
174 Lugalbanda II 337.
175 The name of the mountain is unclear. For a discussion of this toponym, see n. 186 below.
mountain’ with the latter marked in the locative –a ending. This example confirms that it is possible the words ‘mountain base’ (kur-úr), ‘mountain wall’ (kur-bád), and ‘mountain roof’ (kur-ùr) in Lugalbanda II 342 are marked with the –a postposition and connected with a word for earth, such as ‘terrain’ (mandum), to mean ‘the terrain at the mountain base (var.: roof) and mountain wall’. Another supporting example is the use of the locative in the expression ‘cold place of the mountain’ (kur-ra ki šed₃₉). This expression is used of the mountain terrain where Lugalbanda fell ill when the army had marched halfway to Aratta.177

These examples demonstrate that the word ki can be used to denote the terrain of the mountainous landscape. The interchangeability of mandum and ki found in all the other pertinent evidence occurs when ki is used with a general sense of ‘earth surface, ground, terrain’.179 The question then becomes why mandum is uniquely used to refer to the terrain of the mountain ranges between Anšan and Aratta in Lugalbanda II 342. It seems that there was something unique about these mountain ranges that prompted the use of the unique word mandum. I will seek to find what is unique about these mountain ranges. Lugalbanda I and Lugalbanda II describe a number of toponyms situated in the mountain ranges between Anšan and Aratta is available.

Lugalbanda’s prayer in the cave describes his loneliness in the mountain region where he fell ill: there is no family, no friends, no community and he is completely alone.180 He confirmed his isolation when he regained consciousness and discovered his mountainous environs.181 This mountain region is called ‘cypress mountain’ (kur ʰa-šu-úr-ra).182 Lugalbanda cries out to Inanna in the cave so that he may not perish in the ‘cypress mountain’ (kur ʰa-šu-úr-ra).183 Lugalbanda’s attempt to survive in this mountainous area is an important part of ‘Lugalbanda in the Mountain Cave’ (Lugalbanda I). Lugalbanda II begins with Lugalbanda trekking another mountain region. Lugalbanda sees the ‘many coloured carnelian mountain range of Inanna’ (ḥur-sag ʰa-gu-gűnu ʰI-a-nna-ka), which has on its summit (ugu-ba) the great eagle-tree of Enki that provides shade over the mountains (kur).184 Nearby (da-da-ba) there is the ‘mountain that knows no cypress’ (ʰa-šu-úr bu-zu kur-ra), where no life other than the burstu-az bird can dwell (i.e. there is no cypress, and not even

176 Lugalbanda II 46.
177 Lugalbanda I 85.
178 Lugalbanda I 75.
179 The evidence for this is discussed above in 3.1.3.
180 Lugalbanda I 154-164.
181 Lugalbanda I 278.
182 Lugalbanda I 196, 498.
183 Lugalbanda I 196.
184 Lugalbanda II 28-35.
scorpions or snakes.\textsuperscript{185} Another toponym mentioned may be the ‘Lulubi mountain’ (kur 1u₃-1u₃-bi-a), but this is not certain.\textsuperscript{186} Lugalbanda II describes a mountainous land where the fearsome bird Anzud hunts animals of the highland.\textsuperscript{187} After Lugalbanda manages to return to his brothers in the war camp against Aratta, they ask him how he survived the ‘great mountain range where no one can walk alone’ (ḫur-sag gal lú dili nu-du-û-da),\textsuperscript{188} ‘whence no one can return to humankind’ (lú-bi lú-ra nu-gi₄-gi₄-da).\textsuperscript{189} The mountain ranges between the Anšan highland and Aratta are described as a distant set of mountain ranges devoid of human civilization,\textsuperscript{190} desolate and dangerous, and sometimes mythological: e.g. the Anzu bird. This is what makes these eastern mountain ranges unique – they are beyond the boundaries of humanity known to Mesopotamians; placed between Anšan and the distant Aratta, the fabulous city that rivaled Uruk.\textsuperscript{191} It appears that mandum was used to denote the terrain of this unique and distant mountain geography in the east of Mesopotamia.

\textsuperscript{185} Lugalbanda II 36-39.
\textsuperscript{186} Lugalbanda II 46. Wilcke transliterates this toponym as kur LUL. LUL-bi-a and leaves it untranslated, Wilcke, \textit{Das Lugalbandaepos}, pp. 94-95: 46. An alternative transliteration is kur 1u₃-1u₃-bi-a (which is left untranslated as ‘Lulubi mountains’) in Vanstiphout, \textit{Epics of Sumerian Kings}, pp. 138-139: 46; Black et al., \textit{The Literature of Ancient Sumer}, p. 23; sometimes the toponym is transcribed as ‘Lulluhu’ as in J. Black, \textit{Reading Sumerian Poetry}, p. 58. Klengel takes kur 1u₃-1u₃-bi-a to be a toponym named Lulubi-Mountain, possibly associated with the Lullubeans, see H. Klengel, “Lullubum: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der altvorderasiatischen Gebirgsvölker” MIO 11 (1966), p. 350. Even Wilcke’s transliteration could stand for Lullubeans, because the sign LUL also occurs in an archival text from Umma, where it may stand for the Lullubeans, see B. R. Foster, \textit{Umma in the Sargonic Period.} (Memoirs of the Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences April Volume XX 1982). Hamden, Connecticut. Archon Books. 1982, p. 113. The sign LUL may have the same meaning in an Akkadian list of individuals from various professions and ethnic groups (Amorites and Barālšeans) in MDP 14 18. A. Westenholz notes some of the objections raised to this idea that LUL represents the Lullubeans but still observes it is a serious possibility, A. Westenholz and W. Sallaberger, \textit{Mesopotamien: Akkade-Zeit und Ur III-Zeit.} (Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis 160/3). Fribourg Suisse. Editions Universitaires. Göttingen. Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht. 1999, p. 94, n. 436. Jacobsen follows an entirely different approach and translates the phrase as ‘stillness of the mountain’ in his poetic translation of Lugalbanda II 46: ‘did, in the stillness of the mountains, the ground keep reverberating to its roar’ in Jacobsen, \textit{The Harps}, 1987, p. 324:46. Edzard follows this with ‘erbebte wegen des betreffenden Geschrei die Erde in der Stille des Berglandes’ in Römer and Edzard, \textit{Mythen und Epen I}, p. 513: 46. However, it is worthwhile to note there is mention of kur 1u₃-1u₃-bi-a as the toponym Lulubi-Mountain in the hymn ‘Inanna and Ebih’, alongside Elam(elam₃ᵏ), Subartu (su-bi₃ⱽ) and the ‘inner mountain’ (kur-sā-gā), cited in H. Klengel, “Lullubum”, p. 350. This may in fact be the ‘Lullubean’ mountain.\textsuperscript{187} Lugalbanda II 45-49.
\textsuperscript{188} Lugalbanda II 231.
\textsuperscript{189} Lugalbanda II 232.
\textsuperscript{190} Did the Lulubi Mountains contain Lullubeans? For the ‘Lullubean’ mountain, see n. 182 above. How this toponym was precisely conceived in Lugalbanda II is not clear and it is best not to speculate about it due to the current state of evidence. The references to the mountainous areas such as the ‘great mountain range where no one can walk alone’ or ‘whence no one can return to humankind’ does not by itself guarantee that there were no human beings conceived for the mountains east of Mesopotamia in Lugalbanda II. It can mean that the mountain ranges are very inhospitable and his brothers did not expect an ordinary human being such as Lugalbanda to survive such circumstances. Another text, the Cuthaean Legend (in some of its versions), conceives of a people living in the distant mountain region – but they certainly were not ordinary human beings, they were even confused with demons (as discussed in 4.2). There is no demonstrable direct link between the ‘Lullubean’ mountain in Lugalbanda II and the mountainous abode conceived at least in some versions of the Cuthaean Legend.
\textsuperscript{191} The prestige of Aratta can be discerned not only from the epics but also from a number of other references, collected for example in Wilcke, \textit{Das Lugalbandaepos}, pp. 39-40; Michalowski, “Mental Maps and Ideology”, p. 133. The word a-rat-ta is equated to the words kab-tum ‘abundant’ and ta-na-da-tum ‘glory’ in Diri IV 88-89
Given that Aratta is this distant eastern center of civilisation in Sumerian literature (the debates about whether Aratta exists or not are irrelevant to my point here), the terrain between this city and Uruk is really what is to be understood as the eastern mountain frontier of Mesopotamia that extends to the distance. The implication is that the word mandum can potentially be used to describe various types of distant lands (if a given text used the word in such a context), lands situated not only strictly in the eastern direction as modern folk would visualise with the compass as ‘east’ but also comprising the north-east and even the north, since the mountain range encircling Mesopotamia can also be found in those directions.

*apud* Cohen, *Enmerkar and the Lord of Aratta*, p. 55, n. 67. The word a-rat-ta has meanings such as ‘heavy, important, praise, glory’, ePSD aratta[important]. The Akkadian word *arattu* is an adjective meaning ‘excellent (lit. in the manner of Aratta)’, CAD A II 238-239. Aratta was clearly seen as a centre of ‘abundance’ and ‘glory’. The location (even the existence) of the city remains under scholarly debate, see references in n. 101 above.
ETYMOLOGY: PROPOSING MANDUM

4.1 The Inhabited World and mandum

Bezold and Boll saw a contrast between the Ummān-manda in the astrological omens and the expression Ummān-dadme (which they translated ‘Leute von (festen) Wohnsitzen’),¹ despite the fact the two expressions are not found in the same omen apodosis: ZI-ut ERĪN da-ād-me ‘attack of the troops of the settlements’ (ACh Adad X 11). Bezold and Boll based the contrast partly on the idea Ummān-manda originally meant ‘nomadic’,² but none of the evidence relevant to its etymology hint at any activity that could be directly linked to nomadism. This is in contrast to the word ERĪN.MEŠ na-me-e, of which the second component goes back to namū, which CAD describes as ‘pasture land’ or ‘steppe’ that contrasts cultivated areas.³ This is not to discard the possibility Ummān-manda has some indirect connection to nomadism, but only that its lexical content does not directly relate to this and its relation to dadmū is not apparent in such a light. Landsberger, Bauer and Komoróczy support the possibility Ummān-manda contrasts with the Ummān-dadme based on their proposed etymologies,⁴ but their etymologies face various difficulties.⁵ Above I argued that mandum was used in Lugalbanda II to denote the terrain of the distant eastern mountains between Anšān and Aratta (3.3). This raises the possibility that mandum can be used for the terrain of any distant mountainous land east of Mesopotamia. Consequently, words that describe civilized areas in Akkadian, such as dadmū ‘inhabitations, settlements, inhabited world’,⁶ should stand in some sort of contrast with the word mandum ‘terrain’ (as it has been used in Lugalbanda II). The type of contrast expected between the ‘inhabited world’ and mandum cannot be simplistic or mutually exclusive. Rather, mandum would describe the furthest eastern reaches of the inhabited world rather than areas outside it. The reason for suggesting this is that mandum denoted in Lugalbanda II an area devoid of human

² Ibid., p. 16.
³ For namū and ERĪN.MEŠ na-me-e, see CAD N I 249-251.
⁵ Discussed above in 2.4-2.5.
⁶ CAD D 18-20; AHw 149.
civilisation, but this area was still part of the inhabited world due to its location between Anšan and Aratta, both being centres of civilisation. There is a similar relationship between the word *dadmiu* ‘settlements, inhabited world’ and the word *nagu* ‘region, island, district’, of which the description will help illustrate the proposed distinction between the ‘inhabited world’ and mandum. I will then apply the proposed distinction to the Cyrus Cylinder between *dadmiu* and the term Ummān-manda which I will propose has mandum ‘terrain’ as its second component (4.1.1)

Horowitz observes that the term *dadmiu* can be synonymous with terms for ‘the lands’ and ‘the four regions’ in some contexts, and additionally argues it does not always include the earth’s entire surface in cosmological usage. Horowitz gives as an example a royal inscription of Nebuchadnezzar II where *dadmiu* may be interpreted as covering the area between the Upper Sea to the Lower Sea but not the *nagu* across the sea (VAB 4 146: 18-22). Horowitz further argues that the area covered by *dadmiu* seems to correspond to the central continent surrounded by the ocean in the ‘Babylonian World Map’. Nebuchadnezzar’s text reads, with Horowitz’s translation, as follows:


All the lands, the entire inhabited world from the Upper Sea to the Lower Sea, distant lands, the people of vast territories, kings of far away mountains and remote nagū in the Upper and Lower Sea [emphasis mine], whose lead-rope Marduk, my lord, placed in my hand in order to pull his yoke.

The late Babylonian tablet BM 92687, dubbed the ‘Babylonian World Map’, has a number of toponyms common to the Babylonian world (Assyria, Susa, Bit Yakin, Susa, etc.) surrounded by the ID *marratu* ‘salt

---

7 Discussed above in ch. 3, pp. 65-67.
8 For *nagu*, see CAD N I 121-123.
10 Ibid., p. 300.
11 Ibid., p. 300.
12 BE 1/1 85 ii 13-29 (VAB 4 146 ii 17-33) quoted in *ibid.*, p. 31.
sea’. At the edges of the map are triangular areas called nagū ‘region, district, island’. Horowitz notes that the common Neo-Assyrian use of the term nagū to denote areas such as Judah as district/province does not suit the nagū in the ‘Babylonian World Map’ because the latter may be islands across the sea. Horowitz argues that the Neo-Babylonian usage of the term nagū, which is rare, is closer to the ‘Babylonian World Map’ because it usually refers to islands or distant unspecified lands. Horowitz also notes that Assurbanipal’s inscriptions refer to Lydia, a land across the sea, with the term nagū, and argues this may verify the view that in the ‘Babylonian World Map’ the term nagū refers to islands or uncharted distant lands. Assurbanipal’s texts seem to be using the term nagū to denote distant lands, for example Lydia is called a ‘region across the sea’ (na-gu-ú ni-bir-ti A.AB.BA). This seems to harmonise easily with how other Neo-Assyrian texts use the word nagū for distant areas such as Judah, or Guriania (a nagū ‘region’ said to be located between Urartu and Cimmeria according to a Neo-Assyrian military report [its location is discussed in 6.1.1]) because Lydia is a distant land just like any other, regardless of the fact it is across the sea. The ‘Babylonian World Map’, on the other hand, does not use the word dadmū to describe any part of its geographical information. In fact, the generic expression ‘four edges’ (kib-ra-a-ti er-bet-ti) occurs in a broken line, at the end of the reverse side of the text, only after sections that describe the various nagū, concluding the entire text of the ‘Babylonian World Map’, suggesting the nagū too are part of the ‘four edges’. So even the ‘Babylonian World Map’ is not clear if the concept of dadmū ‘inhabited world’ excludes the nagū ‘region’, regardless of whether the latter are islands across the ocean or distant lands in the Map. Given the way nagū is used in Neo-Assyrian documents, it is likely the word nagū ‘region’ does not denote territories beyond dadmū ‘inhabited world’. The same applies to the use of the word nagū in the royal inscription of Nebuchadnezzar II. If the ‘remote nagū’ in the passage from Nebuchadnezzar II’s royal inscription (quoted above in p. 69) is to be interpreted as beyond the ‘entire inhabited world’ (gimir kala dadmi), then those areas mentioned alongside it, i.e. the ‘distant lands’, ‘people of vast territories [da-ad-mi]’, ‘far away mountains’ (see emphasized in Horowitz’s own translation cited above in p. 69), should also be interpreted as beyond the ‘inhabited world’. Another interpretation may be that these toponyms are parts of the ‘inhabited world’, but that the areas such as the ‘far away mountains’ and the ‘remote nagū’ are relatively further

13 Ibid., p. 20ff.
14 Ibid., pp. 21, 30-31.
15 Ibid., p. 30.
16 Ibid. pp. 30-31.
17 Ibid., pp. 31-32.
18 HT r. 13 in Ivantchik, Les Cimmeriens au Proche-Orient, p. 259; BIWA, p. 30: A II 95; F II 10; B II 93; C IV 1.
19 See the text of the Babylonian World Map in Horowitz, Mesopotamian Cosmic Geography, pp. 20-25.
20 Ibid., p. 25: 26’
away, to the effect that they are not really that much a part of the human civilisation known to the
Mesopotamians. The text seems to be interested in areas worth putting under Nebuchadnezzar II’s rule, even
distant ones, and such areas need human settlements which acknowledge the ‘yoke’ of the king, and all of them
seem to be part of dadmū. I propose that there is a similar distinction between dadmū ‘inhabitations, settlements,
inhabited world’\(^{21}\) and mandum, and that the word mandum refers to the further reaches of the dadmū
‘inhabited world’. I previously argued that the word mandum was indeed used in Lugalbanda II for the terrain
of distant mountainous landscape between the civilised places Anšan and Aratta (3.3). No contrast is apparent
between the expression ERIN da-ád-me and the term Ummān-manda in the context of the omens, but the
relationship between their respective second components makes sense when mandum ‘terrain’ is understood as
it is used in Lugalbanda II and denotes the further reaches of the inhabited world similar to nagū. I will now
discuss how this proposed relationship explains the use of the term Ummān-manda in the Cyrus Cylinder.

**4.1.1 Ummān-manda and the Inhabited World: Cyrus Cylinder**

In the Cyrus Cylinder, Mesopotamian civilisation is described with the following expressions: *nap-ḫar da-ād-mi*
‘all the cities (lit. settlements)’\(^{22}\), UKū.MEŠ KUR Šu-me-ri ᵤ .URI.KI ‘the people of Sumer and Akkad’\(^{23}\) and
*nap-ḫar KUR Šu-me-ri u URI.KI* ‘all of Sumer and Akkad’.\(^{24}\) In such a context, the word *da-ād-mi* ‘cities (lit.
settlements)’ represents the civilised inhabited world, i.e. ‘the people of Sumer and Akkad’. Cyrus, identified as
the king of Anšan, proclaims his victory over the ‘land of Gutium, the entire Ummān-manda’ (*KUR Qu-ti-i gi-
mir Um-man-man-da*).\(^{25}\) Both Mesopotamia and Anšan are distinguished from the defeated land of Gutium and
the Ummān-manda. The latter two are usually treated as distinct entities,\(^{26}\) but both are meant to describe those

\(^{21}\) I have only been interested in the traditional Mesopotamian usage of the word *dadmū*. The origin of this word
and its usage in other areas of the ancient Near East, such as the mid-third millennium city Ebla in Syria, appears
to present a more complicated picture. For a discussion, see J.-M. Durand, “L’Assemblée en Syrie à l’Époque
Pré-Amorite” in *Miscellanea Eblaitica*, 2. P. Fronzaroli, ed. (Quaderni di Semitistica 16). Dipartimento di
Linguistica. Università di Firenze, pp. 29ff.

\(^{22}\) Cyrus Cylinder 10.

\(^{23}\) Cyrus Cylinder 11.

\(^{24}\) Cyrus Cylinder 18.

\(^{25}\) Cyrus Cylinder 12-13.

\(^{26}\) For example the Ummān-manda invade the land of Gutium in the Standard Babylonian version of the
Cuthaean Legend, SB Tupsinna 56-57. The astrological omens treat the Guti and the Ummān-manda as different
entities and Gutium is a political entity usually used in the schema for the four cardinal points, see below in 4.1.2.
Guti is also mentioned alongside Ummān-manda in EAE 15 E 4’ in a broken context, Appendix 1.36.
who are similarly outside the civilisation described by the word *dadme* in the context of the Cyrus Cylinder. Gutians are traditionally depicted as uncivilised through pejorative stereotypes, and are associated with the eastern mountains. ‘Gutium’ in the Cyrus Cylinder probably has a pejorative aspect as well. The term Ummān-manda has a pejorative sense by the time of the Cyrus Cylinder. The pejorative sense of both the terms Gutium and Ummān-manda relates to their status as outsiders to Mesopotamian civilisation. I suggest that the Babylonian scribal tradition, intentionally or subliminally, assumed a distinction between *dadme* ‘inhabited world’ and Ummān-manda. The proposed *mandum*-etymology relates to this distinction. If the word *mandum* ‘terrain’ – as it is used in Lugalbanda II for distant mountain geography – is the source for the second component of Ummān-manda, then *mandum* ‘terrain’, as it is used in the term Ummān-manda as ‘troops of the terrain’, denotes an army from the eastern mountainous zones beyond the *dadme* ‘inhabited world’ in the Cyrus Cylinder.

The word *mandum* by itself denotes a distant eastern mountain region in Lugalbanda II (as discussed in 3.3), so then Ummān-manda (i.e., troops of the *mandum*) could be describing those foreign peoples and/or military groups whose origins are thought to be in the distant lands, in the ‘mountains’ east and north of Mesopotamia, away from centres of civilisation. This would explain the use of the term Ummān-manda for the Medes under Astyages, whose royal city was Ecbatana (modern Hamadan in western Iran).

How did the Babylonian scribal tradition assume a distinction between *dadme* ‘inhabited world’ and Ummān-manda? Did they know the etymology of Ummān-manda? The scribes who used the term Ummān-manda, with its second component understood as *mandum*, need not always be aware of the etymology and the origin of the term. Usually it is hard to know what the scribes thought the etymology was. Sometimes there are false scribal etymologies (1.2, 1.3, 2.1). There are, nonetheless, some hints that some Neo-Babylonian scribes believed the etymology of the second component of the term went back to *mandum*. Different manuscripts of Nabonidus’

27 Scholarly opinion is divided on whether the terms Gutium and Ummān-manda are both referring to the same Medes or not. These points are discussed in 7.3.1.
29 This pejorative aspect of the term Ummān-manda in Neo-Babylonian sources is discussed in ch. 7, pp. 185-186.
30 The significance of the appellation ‘Gutium’ in the Cyrus Cylinder will be discussed in 7.3.1.
31 Subliminal influence can be observed in cases where a scribe was influenced by a literary text or a tradition while composing another text, and was not fully aware of this because he was so steeped in the scribal tradition and immersed in its literature. Subliminal allusions are good examples to subliminal influence, and are discussed in ch. 5, pp. 138-139.
32 The extant evidence is ambivalent about treating *mandum* as a Sumerian or Akkadian word, as discussed in 3.1.1. If the proposed *mandum* etymology works for Ummān-manda, then the same ambivalence may also be present for the term.
33 The use of the term Ummān-manda in the Cyrus Cylinder will be further discussed later in 7.3.
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royal inscriptions have the interchangeable use of the term Ummān-manda and Ummān-mandu (Tables 1-2). It has been previously argued that a proposed mandum etymology for the second component of the term is able to explain both forms Ummān-manda and Ummān-mandu (3.1.1). If mandu and manda were considered equally legitimate rendering of the second component of the term, then it is very likely Nabonidus’ scribes knew that mandum was behind the etymology of manda. Lexical lists treat mandu as an Akkadian word whereas elsewhere it is treated as a Sumerian word (3.1.1). The same ambivalence may apply to the second component of the term Ummān-manda if the proposed mandum etymology holds.

It is not known when the term Ummān-manda was coined. It can be reasoned at least that the term was first coined in the Mesopotamian heartland because the earliest known use of the word Ummān-manda is in Old Babylonian liver omens and it is not likely the Mesopotamians imported the term from neighbouring cultures. I presume that the first users of the term understood its meaning and this was one of the reasons they used it. After the term was first coined in the Mesopotamian heartland, its use would become part of the scribal tradition. Scribes were employed in Mesopotamia and other centres of civilisation in the Near East. Even if some of them forgot the etymology, the tradition of using the term would be carried from generation to generation, from master scribe to apprentice through the transmission of Mesopotamian texts, such as the literary story of the Cuthaean Legend or the omens.

If the first users of the term took mandum for its second component (as mandum is used to denote the terrain of the distant eastern lands in Lugalbanda II [3.3]), then they would have used the term for groups, people and individuals that live in, or have some relation to, a distant region ‘east’ of the city and land where the scribes authored their texts. Scribal tradition can easily continue using the word Ummān-manda for peoples of distant ‘eastern’ lands while forgetting and/or having different ideas about the etymology of the word Ummān-manda. This is relevant especially for places to where Mesopotamian scribal tradition was imported and where one finds the use of the word Ummān-manda: the Hittite Kingdom, Alalaḫ, Amurru and Ugarit. If the cuneiform scribal tradition continued to employ the term Ummān-manda for entities in an eastern distant land due to an original mandum etymology, regardless of what they thought the term Ummān-manda actually meant, then an

---

34 It may be misleading to be more specific than saying ‘Mesopotamian heartland’ when proposing the mandum etymology for the second component of the term Ummān-manda because there is a complicated relationship between mandum and the words mada and mātu to which it is related (3.1.2) and the origin of the word mandum is not clear.
35 Since the circumstances of the first users of the term Ummān-manda are not known, it will not be possible to suggest other reasons they may have used the term Ummān-manda.
examination of the documents that use the term or its second component should substantiate this. The use of the term Ummān-manda in the Cyrus Cylinder has shown there is a distinction the scribe made between the world of civilisation saved by Cyrus II, and the Ummān-manda who are at the furthest reach in the inhabited world. Their location is Ecbatana and Media, clearly situated as a distant eastern land, supporting the mandum etymology. The argument is not that etymology explains everything, but it is part of the explanation, and that the mandum etymology will be able to make sense of how other documents used the term Ummān-manda. There will also be the opportunity to touch upon other aspects of the use of the term Ummān-manda, such as the significance of the Cuthaean Legend and the role of the omens.

4.1.1.1 Ummān-manda as Gentilic and Geographic Name

When different manuscripts for Nabonidus’ Sippar Cylinder I 29 refer to ‘Astyages the king of the Ummān-manda’, they either have the gentilic LU or the land determinative KUR prefixed to the term Ummān-manda. The etymology ‘troops of the terrain’ for the term Ummān-manda can explain the alternating use of the gentilic and land determinatives for the term Ummān-manda in Neo-Babylonian sources. Scribes authoring the different manuscripts of Nabonidus’ Sippar Cylinder I 29 may have understood the epithet ‘king of the Ummān-manda’ differently. Some could have conceived Ummān-manda as a geographical name, i.e. ‘land of the troops of the terrain (mandu[m])’. Some could have seen it as a name for the Medes under Astyages as a group, i.e. ‘troops of the terrain (mandu[m])’. As a geographical name, ‘king of the land of the Ummān-manda’ could mean something similar to ‘king of the land of the Medians’, whereas as a name for a group, it could mean ‘king of the Median troops’. In either case ‘terrain’ (mandum) would refer to the distant eastern land of the Medes. The proposed mandum-etymology is able to explain how the geographical and gentilic connotations of the term Ummān-manda can be intertwined. It can also explain why the Gadd Chronicle prefixes the land determinative before the term Ummān-manda in an instance where the term is not used as a land name but only designates the Median troops under Cyaxares, when the chronicle states that the Ummān-manda came to Nabopolassar’s aid. The scribe of the Gadd Chronicle perhaps saw it as a designation based on a geographic name similar to the Akkadian ethnonym ‘Median’. The ethnonym ‘Mede’ can be written with the land determinative. An example

---

36 As discussed above in pp. 71-72.
37 For these manuscripts and the variant writings of the term in Sippar Cylinder of Nabonidus I 29, see Appendix 1.47, n. 201.
38 Gadd Chronicle 59.
from the Gadd Chronicle is when the Medes (KUR Ma-da-a-a) are said to proceed to Arrapha.\textsuperscript{39} The ethnonym ‘Mede’ is literally ‘those of the land of Media’. The scribe of the Gadd Chronicle may have thought that the term Ummān-manda had a similar sense, such as ‘those of the land of troops of the terrain (mandum)’. The ‘land of troops of the terrain (mandum)’ refers the land of the forces from Media and Ecbatana under Cyaxares, the distant land in the ‘east’ denoted by mandum, the proposed origin for the second component of the term Ummān-manda. The proposed mandum-etymology for the term Ummān-manda is also able to explain the variant written form Ummān-mandu found in some manuscripts of Nabonidus’ texts (Table 2).

### 4.1.2 Ummān-manda and the Inhabited World: Astrology

The distinction between Ummān-manda and the ‘four regions’ is apparent in an astrological omen that mentions ‘the attack of the Ummān-manda on girgibira’ (VAT 10281 106).\textsuperscript{40} The omen, and a commentary fragment, state girgibira denotes the ‘four regions’ (erbū kibrati).\textsuperscript{41} Mesopotamian astrology used the cosmographic conception of the ‘four regions’ to correlate astral phenomena to the four directions north, south, east, west, and for these directions the names of political entities such as Subartu, Gutu, Amuru, Elam, Akkad were frequently used.\textsuperscript{42} Ummān-manda was not used with this frequency,\textsuperscript{43} but when it was associated with a direction, the direction was the east wind (IM.KUR.RA) in a lunar eclipse omen attested in duplicates.\textsuperscript{44} Steinkeller draws attention to the word šadium (IM.KUR.[.RA]) ‘east wind, east (as a cardinal point)’\textsuperscript{45} and its Sumerian loanword sa12-ti-um with the same meaning,\textsuperscript{46} which goes back to Old Akkadian and Ur III times, and provides evidence it was probably ‘a general term for the inhabitants of the north-eastern mountainous fringes of Mesopotamia and the territories beyond them’.\textsuperscript{47} The word mandum ‘terrain’ denoted distant terrain between Anšan and Aratta in Lugalbanda II as discussed especially in 3.3. The word ‘terrain’ can denote the furthest reaches of the inhabited

\textsuperscript{39} Gadd Chronicle 23.
\textsuperscript{40} Details of the inscription in Appendix 1.39.
\textsuperscript{41} BPO 3, pp. 50-51: 106; 54, n. 20; Appendix 1.39.
\textsuperscript{42} ABCD, pp. 51-55.
\textsuperscript{43} Also observed in R. D. Biggs, “The Babylonian Prophecies and the Astrological Traditions of Mesopotamia” JCS 37 (1985), p. 89.
\textsuperscript{44} ABCD, p. 55. For the duplicates of this omen, see Appendix 1.17; 1.37. Appendix 1.17 is the Middle Assyrian forerunner of Appendix 1.37. The latter is an omen from the later EAE series. For more information, see Appendix 1, n. 73. The fact that the eastern orientation of the Ummān-manda has been maintained during the timeframe of this textual transmission (going back to the Middle Assyrian era according to the extant evidence) indicates to me that the eastern orientation of the Ummān-manda is an accepted tradition.
\textsuperscript{45} CAD S 1 49, 59-61; AHw 1125.
\textsuperscript{46} ePSD S satium[wind].
world (4.1). If the word ‘terrain’ is used as the second component of the term Ummān-manda, then it is possible to explain how the term denotes a group from the ‘east’ who attacks the ‘four regions’. This ‘eastern’ origin of the Ummān-manda in the omens is not to be taken too literally, but rather covers the mountainous terrain east and north of Mesopotamia. A mandum etymology for Ummān-manda suggests the term denotes foreign peoples whose original homeland is somewhere distant in the mountainous geography east and northeast of Mesopotamia. They attack the ‘four regions’ from the distant ‘east’. This ‘eastern’ direction implied by the proposed mandum-etymology for the Ummān-manda also reveals one of the reasons why the term was used for the Cimmerians and the Medes and not other people in the periphery of Mesopotamia. These two peoples did not inhabit exactly the same location but both came from distant regions north and east of Mesopotamia.

4.2 The Mountain Terrain in the Cuthaean Legend

The geographical abode of Naram-Sin’s enemies in the Standard Babylonian version of the Cuthaean Legend fits well with the type of desolate and distant mountainous terrain that the word mandum may denote. Naram-Sin’s enemies grow up in the mountains, and the story describes this abode once again when it says they ride in the KUR.MEŠ KŪ.MEŠ, literally the ‘pure mountains’. KU.MEŠ stands for Akkadian elliḫtu. CAD states that Akkadian elliḫtu can refer to “objects and materials in secular use” such as daggers and pots, or can refer to shining purity of precious stones. From such a sense of the word come translations such as ‘shining mountains’ or ‘montagnes brillantes’. Westenholz alternatively translates KUR.MEŠ KŪ.MEŠ as ‘silver mountains’ and argues that KU.MEŠ (= elliḫtu) ‘pure’ does not apply to “secular terrestrial domains” in the story but rather to sacrifices, altars, and īštar with the sense of ‘pure, holy’. Westenholz then draws attention to the Old Akkadian Sargonic toponym (Sumerian ḫur-sag-kū-ša, Akkadian KUR.KUR.KU) and translates this

---

48 SB Tupsinna 36.
49 SB Tupsinna 47.
50 CAD E 103: 1 a) 1’.
51 CAD E 104: 1 c) 1’.
toponym as ‘silver mountains’. In this regard I draw attention to a bilingual incantation that mentions demons born in the ‘bright’ and ‘dark’ mountains:

7. bi ḫur.sag.gi₆.ga ba.ū.tu.ud.da.meš

si-bīt-tī šu-nu ina šā-ad e-reb 4UTU-šī i'-al-du

7. bi ḫur.sag.babbar.ra ba.bûlug.a.meš

si-bīt-tī šu-nu ina šā-ad ši-it 4UTU-šī ir-bu-ū

Seven of them in the dark mountains (Akkadian: mountain of the sunset) were born

Seven of them in the bright mountains (Akkadian mountain of the sunrise) were born

Sumerian ḫ ur.sag.babbar.ra, translates as ‘bright mountains’, whereas the Akkadian is ‘mountain of the sunrise’ (šā-ad ši-it 4UTU-šī). The Akkadian phrase indicates these are the eastern mountains, since the sun rises there. The Sumerian word babbar ‘silver’ may in this case denote the light that the rise of the sun brings upon the mountain. There is probably a similar use for the ‘silver’ or ‘shining, brilliant’ mountains of the Cuthaean Legend. So regardless of whether KU stands for ellsûtu ‘pure’ or kaspu ‘silver’, I suggest the sense is that of shining and brilliance. Since ellsûtu is the Akkadian for the other instances of the logogram KU.MES in the Cuthaean Legend, it is still convenient to translate KUR.MES KU.MES as ‘pure mountains’, bearing in mind it most probably refers to the mountains where the sun rises, i.e. the eastern mountains. This would also accord with the eastern orientation of the Ummān-manda in astrology and the use of word mandum to refer to mountainous territory east of Mesopotamia (as discussed in 4.1.2). It is interesting that the ‘mountain of the sunrise’ and ‘mountain of the sunset’ are mentioned in an incantation about the birth of demons (quoted immediately above), since later in the Cuthaean Legend Naram-Sin’s enemies will be confused with demons due to their bird like appearance and invincible military campaigns.

The Ummān-manda in the Cuthaean Legend ride the ‘pure (KU.MES) mountains’. The ‘mountain’ (KUR) is where they grew. The ‘pure mountain’, where their pseudo-demonic character is first displayed to Naram-Sin,

55 Ibid., p. 311: 47.
56 CT 16 44: 84-87 (98-101) apud Horowitz, Mesopotamian Cosmic Geography, p. 332.
57 SB Tupsinna 74, 106, 107.
58 The reference is in n. 56 above.
59 SB Tupsinna 31, 49-68.
60 SB Tupsinna 47.
may suggest that the sense of ‘pure’ in the Cuthaean Legend is ‘bright’ as in the Sumerian ‘bright mountains’
(hur.sag.babbar.ra), corresponding to its Akkadian translation as eastern mountain, i.e. ‘mountain of the
sunrise’ (ša-ad ši-iti), in the incantation (cited above in p. 77). Naram-Sin’s enemies who live in the ‘pure’
mountains first attack Purushandar in central Anatolia,2 suggesting the mountain homeland of Naram-Sin’s
enemies is nearby in eastern Anatolia or western Iran. Such a distant eastern mountain homeland for the
Ummān-manda in the Standard Babylonian version of the story Cuthaean Legend accords with the proposed
mandum ‘terrain’ etymology for the term. The earlier versions of the story are more fragmentary and reveal less
about Naram-Sin’s enemies. Nonetheless, I will discuss what these extant earlier versions have to say about the
abode of, and the use of the term Ummān-manda for, Naram-Sin’s enemies in the Cuthaean Legend.

There is evidence Naram-Sin’s enemies have been associated with a mountainous abode before the Standard
Babylonian version of the story. The extant Middle Babylonian version found in Boğazköy (Ḫattušaš) says:63

27’ [6] ME um-ma-an-šu-nu HUR.SAG.MES …
28’ [x].H.LA ú-ra-ab-bu-ú-šu-nu-iti […]

(27’) [Six] hundred were their troops, the mountains… (28’)… raised them (from childhood)

The lacuna obscures how the word ‘mountains’ (HUR.SAG.MES) is used precisely, but it appears to be part
of the description of Naram-Sin’s enemies, found after the number of their troops is given. As a geographical
reality, the word ‘mountains’ seems to refer to the abode of Naram-Sin’s enemies. The text breaks are
lamentable, obscuring what or who ‘raised them (from childhood)’ (ú-ra-ab-bu-ú-šu-nu-iti). Ea says he created a
‘host’ ([ERI]N.MES).64 This corresponds to the Standard Babylonian version of the story that says ‘in the midst
of the mountain they grew up’ (ina qé-reb KUR-i ir-ti-bu)65 and describes the enemy as an army, with its
divisions led by Anubanini’s sons.66 The extant Middle Babylonian version does not contain Anubanini’s name
but has six brothers (the later version adds one more) leading the enemy forces; both versions call the brothers
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63 SB Tupsinna 36.
62 SB Tupsinna 49-50. The military campaign route of Naram-Sin’s enemies is discussed in pp. 94-96.
63 Bo Tupsinna Prism I b 27’-28’. For translation and bibliographical details, see Appendix 1.11.
64 Bo Tupsinna I b 15’.
65 SB Tupsinna 36.
66 SB Tupsinna 37-46.
‘resplendent’ (šūpū) and ‘resplendent in beauty’ (šūpū baniatu). The theme of a host created in the mountains is found in both versions of the story. The broken text in line 28’ of the Middle Babylonian version means that it is not possible to find what – if anything – specifically corresponds to the ‘pure (KU.MES) mountains’ of the Standard Babylonian version.

The Cuthaean Legend has a mythological setting for the mountain homeland of Naram-Sin’s enemies; the continuities and changes relating to this mythological setting in the textual development of the Cuthaean Legend are partially revealed through a comparison of the Middle and Standard Babylonian versions of the story, as is evident from Table 3.

Table 3: Middle and Standard Babylonian versions of Naram-Sin’s enemies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Middle Babylonian ver., I b 5’-16’, 26’-28’</th>
<th>Standard Babylonian ver., lines 31-47</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5’ Before them, mankind went into caves. A city</td>
<td>31 Warriors of ‘cave-bird’ body, a people – their faces raven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6’ before them was not a city. Ground before them</td>
<td>32 The great gods made them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7’ was not ground. Six kings were they, brothers, res[plendent]</td>
<td>33 On earth the gods made the[ir] city</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8’ And six hundred were their troops, Ea, the lord…</td>
<td>34 Tiamat suckled them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9’ He sent them to be deprived of (things), his hand made the[m]</td>
<td>35 Their womb Bēlet-ili made (them) well (lit. beautiful)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10’ … them and the terror of lions,</td>
<td>36 In the midst of the mountain they grew up, reached manhood and acquired (full) measure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11’ death, plague, burning, epidemic …</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12’ [f]amine, shortage and (bad) market rate, which…</td>
<td>37 Seven kings, brothers, resplendent in beauty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13’ The great […] he sent with them. Ea, [the lord],</td>
<td>38 360,000 their troops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14’ opened [his mouth] and spoke to the gods his brothers:</td>
<td>39 Anubanini their father, the king (and) their mother queen Melili her name.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15’-16’ “I created this host, (and) you determine its destiny for the sake of not destroying humanity, its</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

67 Bo Tupsinna I b 7’, 11’-12’, 26’; SB Tupsinna 37.
68 For the transliterations and translations of the Middle Babylonian and Standard Babylonian texts, see Appendix 1.11 and Appendix 1.20 respectively.
(Ea’s description of the host’s expected behavior to fulfil this destiny is in I 17’-25’)

26’ [Six] kings were they, brothers, resplendent [in beauty]

27’ [Six] hundred were their troops, the mountains…

28’ … raised them (from childhood)

41 Their second brother, Međuđu his name
42 Their third brother, […]tapii (or […]pah) his name
43 Their fourth brother, Tartadađa his name
44 Their fifth brother, Baldahdâl his name
45 Their sixth brother, Aţudanâdîh his name
46 Their seventh brother, Ģurrakidû his name
47 In the ‘pure mountains’ they were riding

(continued with their campaign to the lands)

Both versions make it clear that Naram-Sin’s enemies are a federation of brother kings threatening civilisation from the mountains. The brothers in both versions are called ‘resplendent’ (sūpū) and they are created by divine agencies. The later version has expanded on some details. For example one more brother is added, and the family army is described in much more detail (this is magnified partly because the Middle Babylonian text breaks off at the relevant part). Ea is their creator in the Middle Babylonian version, and says that while he created them, the gods determine their destiny (šimatu).

Ea’s role is akin to the one in Atra-ḥaššu-nu, where he (also called Enki) creates the force that will destroy humanity (the flood) but has sympathy for them because he had a role in their creation.

The Standard Babylonian version states that the ‘great gods’ made Naram-Sin’s enemies. Tiamat and Bēlet-ilī appear as the creators of the host. Tiamat created the monsters in Enūma Eliš III whereas Bēlet-ilī has a role in the creation of the enemy forces in an Old Babylonian hymn.

The enemy in the Standard Babylonian version are said to have bird like features and are confused with various types of demons. Tiamat’s creatures often have animalistic attributes. The other goddess with a role in the creation of the host is Bēlet-ilī, described in the Standard Babylonian version of the Cuthaean Legend as being ‘their womb’ (ṣa-sur-šu-nu), the one who made Naram-Sin’s enemies in the mountains. She has also been called
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69 Bo Tupsinna I b 14’-16’.
71 SB Tupsinna 32.
73 SB Tupsinna 31, 63-68.
75 SB Tupsinna 35-36.
sas"uru/sassūru (translated by Lambert and Millard as ‘birth-goddess’)\textsuperscript{76} in the different manuscripts of Atra-ḥašīš, where she is involved with Ea in the creation of humanity.\textsuperscript{77} Note also that Sargon II’s letter to the god Assur, well known to Assyriology as the account of the Neo-Assyrian king’s campaign against Urartu (i.e. the ‘Eighth Campaign’), describes the fearsome mount Simirria, with its peak elevated above, as ‘the mountains, the dwelling of Bēlet-ilī’ (ḥur-ša-a-ni šú-bat\textsuperscript{4}Be-lit-DINGIR.MES).\textsuperscript{78} Clearly Bēlet-ilī can be associated with the mountains.

4.2.1 Identifying Ummān-manda in the Cuthaean Legend

The extant Hittite version of the Cuthaean Legend does not give information about the mountainous abode of Naram-Sin’s enemies or the specific divine agencies behind their creation.\textsuperscript{79} The extant elements of the Hittite version show affinities to the Standard Babylonian version,\textsuperscript{80} so if the relevant passage(s) had survived they would most probably have been similar to the Standard Babylonian version. One important piece of information gleaned from the Hittite version is that the gods use the term Ummān-manda to describe Naram-Sin’s enemy in the context of their response to the Akkadian king who pleads for salvation from his powerful enemies.\textsuperscript{81}

\begin{itemize}
\item 77’. [DINGIR.MEŠ-šša-aš-si a-ap-pa tar-ši-ik-ḫa-n-zi "Na-ra[-a]m-d30-aš
\item 78’. …]-ša(?) tar-aš-ki-u-en ka-a-aš k[a…] ERĪN.MEŠ-az
\item 79’. …-m]a-aš ERĪN.MEŠ MA-AN-DA ša-am-na-an ḫur-[zi]
\item 77’. [the gods] speak back to him: “Naram-Sin…
\item 78’. …we spoke this. By means of th[ese] troops…
\item 79’. …[he] holds them, the Ummān-manda…
\end{itemize}

\textsuperscript{76} For the epithet, see for example Lambert and Millard, \textit{Atra-ḥašīš}, p. 56:2; p. 62:11.
\textsuperscript{77} \textit{Ibid.}, pp. 8-9, 57-63.
\textsuperscript{79} For the extant Hittite version, see \textbf{Appendix 1.12}.
\textsuperscript{81} H Tupsinna 77’-79’ in \textbf{Appendix 1.12}.
It is unfortunate that there are text breaks that make it hard to demonstrate specifically how Umma-n-manda describes the enemy in this passage. I cannot see any other reason the term could be used in the response of the gods to Naram-Sin other than to describe the enemy in the context of their answer to the king's plea for salvation from that enemy. Moreover, the gods, after having used the term Umma-n-manda, give specific instructions to Naram-Sin:

80’. …z[i nu-uš-ši me-na-ab-ḫa-an-da GIS.N[ā- āš]

81’. [xe-eš-ki-š-k]i-ši nu-uš-ši tāg-ga-le-e[-ši82 le-]e

82’. [GI]S.[t][u]-rī-it-ti-it ʾš-ḥa-[a-i]


86’. … nu an-tu-ti … [M]ES

87’.-91’. (one on sign is extant)

80’. …and together with her (your wife) in bed

81’. you will [sleep], but with her you will [no]t lie in an embrace!

82’. …bind up your weapon(s)!


84’. [Stay at home!] Out of your land [unto him (the enemy)]

85’. [you must not go!] On that occasion a man…

86’.-91’.

Hoffner discussed how this passage seems to correspond, with certain deviations, with lines 157-165 of the Standard Babylonian version.84 SB Tupsinna 157-165 is the part of the Cuthaean Legend that urges pacifism in the face of the enemy.85 The enemy in this version is called Ummān-manda.86 I suggest that the Hittite passage is making a similar advice of pacifism, although this is harder to prove because the text break off at H Tupsinna 86’,

---

82 IBoT 4 7 3: tāg-ga-li-ši-ni
83 IBoT 4 7 5: KUR-e…
84 For this discussion, see Hoffner, “Remarks on the Hittite Version of the Naram-Sin Legend”, pp. 17-22.
85 The teaching of pacifism in the Standard Babylonian version of the Cuthaean Legend will be discussed later in 5.6.2.
86 Discussed later in pp. 91-96.
and that the gods are giving this advice after naming the enemy as Ummān-manda. The term Ummān-manda is used in line 79’ of the Hittite version. Line 80’ initiates the Hittite passage that corresponds to the Standard Babylonian version’s advice of pacifism in the face of the enemy begins.

The Middle Babylonian version does not contain the word Ummān-manda, but it is worth considering the possibility that the absence of the term in this version is an accident of text breaks because both the Middle Babylonian text and the Hittite version of the Cuthaean Legend have been found in the Hittite capital Ḫattušaš.87

The Hittite version uses the term Ummān-manda88 as discussed above (pp. 81-83). This is the earliest known use of the term in any version of the story. It would be very unlikely, however, that the Hittite version of the Cuthaean Legend in Boğazköy used the term Ummān-manda and the Middle Babylonian version did not.

Moreover, the description of Naram-Sin’s enemies in the Middle and Standard Babylonian versions is very similar and both ascribe a mountaonius abode for them (Table 3).89

The Old Babylonian version of the Cuthaean Legend (the oldest known version) is most puzzling: the first two columns (where perhaps there was some mention of the enemy’s homeland) are lost.90 The tablet (i.e. MLC 1364) deemed to be the representative of the Old Babylonian version of the story is so fragmentary that few of its passages, some unique to the text, are extant. MLC 1364 may be a different composition.91 However, there are parallels with later versions.92 The enemy may have been uniquely described with the word ḫa-ri-a-ti in MLC 1364 iii 18:93

16. a-na ḫu-ul-u-aq še-ri Ak-ka-di-i
17. [L]Ū.KÜR da-an-na id-ki-a-am-ma
18. [...]-ši-a-ta(or <<ga>>)–am ḫa-ri-a-ti Mal-gi-a
19. [...] gu uk ka ni a

87 For the location of the Middle Babylonian version in Ḫattušaš, see KBo 19 98-99.
88 H Tupsinna 79’.
89 The similarities are discussed above in pp. 80-81.
90 For the text of the Old Babylonian version of the Cuthaean Legend, see Appendix 1.9.
92 Noted in Westenholz, Legends of the Kings of Akkade, p. 267; Foster, Before the Muses, p. 344. Westenholz’s philological footnotes for the Old Babylonian version of the Cuthaean Legend make use of themes, words and phrases found in later versions, see Westenholz, op.cit., pp. 272ff.
93 OB Tupsinna I iii 16-19. For the Old Babylonian text, see Appendix 1.9.
16. To destroy the plain of Akkade
17. He (the god?) raised against me a mighty foe
18. … Harians of Malgium…
19. …

The role of Malgium here in MLC 1364 iii 18 is not clear at all. Finkelstein reads this line as ‘[…] battle against me as far as Malgium’ ([.]x-ši-a ta-am-ḫa-ri a-di Mal-gi-ä). Finkelstein suggests that the mention of Malgium relates to the military march of Naram-Sin’s enemies. Westenholz questions Finkelstein’s reading a-di with TI rendering /di/. Finkelstein accepts that di for TI is not originally found in Old Babylonian, but argues that it is typical for Old Akkadian writing and may be an archaism. Westenholz associates Malgium in MLC 1364 iii 18 with a group called the Harians (ḫa-ri-a-ti), thus reading the problematic line as ‘[rai]sed the Harians(?) (of) Malgium’ ([iš]-ši-a-<<ga>>-am ḫa-ri-a-ti Mal-gi-a). The ‘Harians’ are elsewhere attested in the story ‘Tenth Battle’, although with the different writing ḫa-ri-a-am. Westenholz suggests the feminine adjectival form in ḫa-ri-a-ti could refer to nišū found in column iv line 9’ later in the text. The restoration [(iš)] goes against the tiny traces of two verticals before the ši sign in MLC 1364 iii 18 according to Finkelstein’s autograph of tablet MLC 1364 in his 1957 article. These tiny traces may have been lost to later scholars by the passage of time. Furthermore, the reading ta is still a viable alternative to <<ga>> since in Finkelstein’s collation, the suggested ta sign looks like the ta-sign as it is drawn elsewhere in Finkelstein’s autograph of MLC 1364, but there may even be a scribal error in similar vein to another instance where the sign ta is very likely a scribal error for ša. MLC 1364 iii 18 lacks the precious context which would aid a more certain interpretation. The role of Malgium, the significance of the ‘Harians’, and the relationship between them remains unclear. This unclarity cannot be the basis on which to suggest that the Cuthaean Legend did not originally contain the term Umma n-manda or the distant mountain abode for Naram-Sin’s enemies. That question will have to remain uncertain due to the current state of evidence.

Ibid., p. 87.
Westenholz, Legends of the Kings of Akkade, p. 275.
Finkelstein, op.cit., p. 87:18.
See discussion in ibid., pp. 265; 275: iii 18.
Ibid., p. 275: iii 18.
See collation result on the autograph of the tablet MLC 1364 in Finkelstein, op.cit., p. 82.
See the ta-signs in the autograph of p. 85.
See OB Tupsinna I iii 2 in Appendix 1.9.
4.2.1.1 Umma-n-manda in the Omen Literature

The extant Old Babylonian version of the Cuthaean Legend in MLC 1364 leaves me clueless about who the enemy is, how they are actually qualified and whether the term Umma-n-manda was used at all. The native title of the Cuthaean Legend is not present in MLC 1364. Unlike MLC 1364, there is another Old Babylonian fragment, BM 17215,\(^{105}\) which contains the Akkadian title of the Cuthaean Legend (\textit{tupšenna pitema}).\(^{106}\) Its colophon clearly states it is a copy of the second tablet of the story, dating it according to the Old Babylonian year formula of king Ammisaduqa which states that the king presented a ‘very large great copper platform’ (\textit{urudu-du₈-maḫ gal-gal-la}).\(^{107}\) The same \textit{urudu-du₈-maḫ gal-gal-la} is found in the formula for Ammisaduqa’s fourteenth regnal year,\(^{108}\) establishing a clear date for the preparation of this copy. The Old Babylonian liver omens mentioning the Umma-n-manda date at least around this same time, and more probably to the early Old Babylonian era since the latest known historical allusion in the corpus of Old Babylonian liver omen texts is to Isbi-Irra, the founder of the dynasty of Isin (2017-1985 BC).\(^{109}\) The Old Babylonian liver omens that use the term concern the military attacks of the Umma-n-manda on the Mesopotamian heartland.\(^{110}\) The Old Babylonian liver omen apodoses are terse. They may just be stereotypical apodosis expressions that happen to employ the term Umma-n-manda. Alternatively there is some sort of link between these early omens and the Old Babylonian Cuthaean Legend that is lamentably not preserved in the copy of its second tablet BM 17215 (which otherwise has the title of the story). If I dare speculate beyond the limited evidence, I would draw attention to omens that often use names such as Sargon, Naram-Sin, Etana and Gilgamesh in their apodoses, known to Assyriology as the ‘historical omens’.\(^{111}\) Those names which appear in ‘historical omens’ also have links to the literary works pertaining to their deeds. For example there is the omen reference to Etana ‘who went to the

---

\(^{105}\) Tablet II: BM 17215 in \textit{Appendix 1.9}.


\(^{107}\) OB Tupsinna II vi 5-7.

\(^{108}\) See this year formula in Horsnell \textit{Year-Names Babylon} II, p. 343: Az 14.

\(^{109}\) YOS 10, pp. 1-2.

\(^{110}\) References and summary are in ch. 1, p. 1.
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heavens’ (šá ana šamē itelū). This is a clear reference to his flight in the Etana Epic. An omen mentioning Gilgamesh alludes to his quest for life like Ziusudra, i.e. his well-known quest for immortality in the Gilgamesh epic. There are two Old Babylonian omen texts that mention the ‘omen of the Apisalian whom Naram-Sin took prisoner’. This very likely alludes to the Old Babylonian epic ‘Naram-Sin and the Lord of Apisal’. Naram-Sin is promised victory over Apisal in the epic. The story breaks off after the mention of this promise, but it is clear from the ‘omen of the Apisalian whom Naram-Sin took prisoner’ that it is Naram-Sin’s victory promised in the epic that was used in this omen. If the Old Babylonian omens can mention the Apisalian of an Old Babylonian Naram-Sin epic, and accordingly use the term ‘Apisalian’ in an omen apodosis, then why not the same with the term Ummān-manda used in the Old Babylonian Cuthaean Legend? For example, an Old Babylonian liver omen states that the Ummān-manda will ‘fall [i]n their own confusion’ (i-na te-še-e rama-ni-sā i-ma-qu-ut). Could this have some sort of connection (but of what sort I will not speculate) with an earlier version of the Cuthaean Legend tradition known only from the later Standard Babylonian version, whereby the Ummān-manda fall not due to the military might of the Akkadian king but by themselves due to the will of the gods? The extant evidence for the versions of the Cuthaean Legend does not rule out the possibility I am raising, nor does it confirm it. In any case, this is not to say that every reference to the Ummān-manda in the omen literature alludes to the Cuthaean Legend. Rather, I suggest that ‘Ummān-manda’ has come to be a designation for a fierce enemy in omens concerning the welfare of the country, owing to its use in the Cuthaean Legend.

Furthermore, some of the first millennium omens could be the result of using archaic person and place names in order to codify much later political events in divinatory texts under the veil of ‘historical omens’. An example is the references to Sargon’s invasion of Elam and enlarging his palace in the Neo-Assyrian omen text K 2130, which Jeyes suggests may refer to Assurbanipal’s invasion of Elam and his building projects because these

---

112 Weidner, op. cit., p. 228.
113 Ibid., p. 228.
115 For the epic, see Westenholz, Legends of the Kings of Akkade, pp. 176-187.
117 VAT 602 9 in Appendix 1.2.
118 For the account in the Standard Babylonian version, see 5.6.2.
119 This is not to make any claims about when or by whom the term Ummān-manda was first coined or about the historical kernel of the Cuthaean Legend. No extant evidence known to me can answer these questions.
specific deeds attributed to Sargon are not found in other ‘historical omens’. Since, however, the later work known as the ‘Sargonic Geography’ does mention Sargon conquering Elam with the rest of the world, the Old Akkadian king’s invasion of Elam and enlarging his palace would be conceivable to the scribe who composed K 2130 and had in his mind Assurbanipal’s campaigns into Elam and the king’s palace projects. This suggests a complex link between literature, historiography and ‘historical omens’. The scribe of K 1230 is writing about contemporary events under the cloak of Sargon, without fabricating something new about the Old Akkadian king but rather using information known to the first millennium audience and modern Assyriologists from literary texts. K 2130 is an extreme case, but it indicates how it is possible contemporary political events could be written into omens using names of persons and tribes of an older era such as that of the Old Akkadian Empire. At other times contemporary events were written into omen texts with such details that the reader aware of these details would easily ascertain the specific political events described in the omen apodosis using the archaic terms, such as Ummān-manda. An example is an astrological omen (preserved in duplicates) where the Ummān-manda are said to attack and rule Mesopotamia, tear out the sanctuaries, abduct the statue of Marduk and carry it (since the statue of the chief deity is abducted, the abduction of the statues of other major Babylonian deities is implied) to Elam, and there is a prediction the ‘great gods’ will exact their revenge on the Elamites and the statues of the great gods, including Marduk, will return to Mesopotamia. This may be the codification of specific events into omen literature through historical sources or memory available to first millennium scribes. The specific event concerns the Elamite king Sutruk-Nahḫunte (ca. 1207-1171 BC), who entered Babylon with his son Kutur-Nahḫunte, took away sacred items from Babylon (including Marduk’s statue), and established his son on the throne of Babylon – it was Kutur-Nahḫunte’s ascension to their throne to which the Babylonians took the greatest offence. Official Babylonian history refused the title “king of Babylon” to Kutur-Nahḫunte and gave it to Enlil-nadin-aḫḫe who kept up the Kassite resistance three more years until Kutur-Nahḫunte put an end to it. Nebuchadnezzar I defeated the Elamites and retrieved Marduk’s statue; this was commemorated in a range of documents, reflecting its significance. It is clear that the astrological omen (duplicates in Appendix 1.31-125)

121 See references to ‘Gate of Susa’, Elam and Anšan in Horowitz, Mesopotamian Cosmic Geography, pp. 70-73.
122 For the text and its duplicates, see Appendix 1.31-32.
124 Ibid., p. 110.
32) uses Umma-manda for the Elamite forces in this context, and that the promise of revenge on the Elamites ‘in 30 years’ refers to Nebuchadnezzar I’s retrieval of Marduk’s statue and the defeat of the Elamites. The omen codification need not have occurred during the actual events. The event’s significance can mainly be attributed to the memory of the Elamite king’s shocking military success in Babylon, the pillaging of the temples and the abducting of Marduk’s statue in view of this god’s prominence in Babylonian religion. Assurbanipal depicted his complete destruction of Elam as a divinely ordained response to avenge Kutur-Nahhunte’s (written Ku-dār-na-an-ḫu-un-di) destruction of the land of ‘Akkad’ 1635 years before his own time. A late Babylonian literary text, known as one of the so-called Kedor-lā’omer texts (Spartoli tablets), refers to the same Elamite king Kutur-Nahhunte and his pillaging of Mesopotamia, and uses Ummān-manda to denote him and his Elamite forces in the literary text (Spartoli II). As stated earlier, one astrological omen also uses the term for the Elamite forces. The use of the term Ummān-manda for the Elamite forces in the literary text Spartoli II and the omens can be seen as representing the traces of a Babylonian scribal tradition that denoted Kutur-Nahhunte’s Elamite troops that temporarily overpowered Mesopotamia as Ummān-manda. In Appendix 3 there is the discussion of how the enemy in Spartoli II subliminally alludes to the Ummān-manda in the Standard Babylonian Cuthaean Legend - subliminal allusions can occur when the author alludes to an item from a given literary text without being aware of it, only because he is so steeped in the traditional literature. I discuss the details of how Spartoli II subliminally alludes to the Standard Babylonian Cuthaean Legend and uses the term Ummān-manda discussed in Appendix 3 because here such a discussion is too detailed and would be a diversion. Spartoli II, the astrological omen preserved in duplicates (Appendix 1.31-32), and the Standard Babylonian version of the Cuthaean Legend date much later than the references to the Ummān-manda in the Old Babylonian omens, but the discussion above indicates it is possible that the ‘historical omens’ used archaic people and place names to describe later historical events. The term Ummān-manda has once been used in the omen literature for such an event, and the use of the term Ummān-manda in the omens, when imported into a literary text such as Spartoli II, resembles the enemy in the Cuthaean Legend. It is possible the same things were going on with at least some of the Old Babylonian omen references to the Ummān-manda. If one posits that such usage of the

128 The significance of Ummān-manda for this literary text is discussed in Appendix 3.
129 For the text of the omen preserved in duplicates, see Appendix 1.31-32.
130 This point is discussed in Appendix 3.
131 The concept of subliminal allusion is discussed in ch. 5, pp. 138-139.
term is a post-Old Babylonian scribal art, even then a link between the Old Babylonian omens and literary text(s) concerning the Ummān-manda cannot be excluded, as exemplified by the mention of the ‘omen of the Apišal’ian whom Naram-Sin took prisoner’ in Old Babylonian omens.132 This ‘omen’ recalls the Old Babylonian epic ‘Naram-Sin and the Lord of Apišal’133 because it is in this epic that Naram-Sin is promised victory over Apišal.134

4.2.1.2 Ummān-manda in the ‘Venus Tablet’

Not all omen references to the Ummān-manda produce results like the astrological omen that refers to the Elamites (Appendix 1.31-32). Oppenheim treated the term Ummān-manda as an appellative used in historical omens for hostile groups that attacked the Mesopotamian civilisation, partly due to the difficulty in identifying the group designated by the term in many omens.135 The inability to find a historical historical group for the Ummān-manda in most apodoses with the Ummān-manda may be because most are probably ‘stock’ apodoses. ‘Stock’ apodoses occur in all types of omens with standard forms and they are independent from the protasis, at least some possibly may have been added later.136 Even if the Ummān-manda can be seen as part of the ‘historical omens’, it is very likely that in many instances scribes chose to use the term as a stereotypical term in ‘stock’ apodoses in order to describe the attack of a fierce enemy. There are some omens that may have a contemporary political background veiled as ‘historical omens’, but often there is not enough evidence to substantiate this. An example is EAE 63 20, an omen from Tablet 63 of the series Enu Anu Enil, dubbed the ‘Venus Tablet of Ammisaduqa’.137 The astronomical observations in this tablet are formally attributed to the time of the Old Babylonian king Ammisaduqa.138 Some scholars argue that the omen about the fall of the Ummān-manda was a real historical victory of Ammisaduqa over a group or people called Ummān-manda.

133 For the epic, see Westenholz, Legends of the Kings of Akkade, pp. 176-187.
134 See passage in ibid., p. 187: 8-15. Unfortunately the story breaks off but it is clear Naram-Sin’s victory was used in the omen literature.
135 Oppenheim, “Zur keilschriftlichen Omenliteratur”, pp. 221-22. Oppenheim partly based his analysis on Landsberger’s etymological proposal, ibid., p. 221. The problems with Landsberger’s etymology has been discussed in 2.4.
137 For the omen and references, see Appendix 1.33.
138 The reasons are explained in BPO 1, p. 9.
during his 16th or 17th regnal year.\textsuperscript{139} There are various astronomical and textual difficulties in ascribing a number of omens, including the one about the Ummān-manda, to the time of Ammišadaqu.\textsuperscript{140} Komoróczy points to the possibility that the apodosis about the Ummān-manda could have been inserted into the omen protasis at any time after its relevant astronomical observation was made for the protasis.\textsuperscript{141} I cannot speculate on the identity of the Ummān-manda in the Venus Tablet as long as there is no additional evidence that can actually prove the historicity of the omen EAE 63 20. The same problem of evidence also applies to an omen that may be reminiscing an attack of the Ummān-manda on the once powerful city Esnunna.\textsuperscript{142}

Most of the omen references to the Ummān-manda are terse and appear to be a part of formulaic apodoses about enemy attack and defeat. Nonetheless, the use of the term Ummān-manda in the omen literature since Old Babylonian times may go hand in hand with a lost version of the Old Babylonian Cuthaean Legend because in extant cuneiform evidence only later versions of this story is known to narrate a group called the Ummān-manda who fights Naram-Sin, a key figure in ‘historical omens’. The story associates them with the archaic figure of Naram-Sin and makes the Ummān-manda an archaic name for a powerful foe. A mandum etymology for the term Ummān-manda relates to the use of the term in the omen literature in that the omens use it to denote an enemy attacking the inhabited world from the east (discussed in 4.1.2).

4.2.2 Proposing mandum for Ummān-manda in the Cuthaean Legend

How the Cuthaean Legend and its use of the term Ummān-manda developed from the Old Babylonian era onwards is unclear. A more detailed study of how the different extant versions of the Cuthaean Legend relate to one another in the development of the story’s text is valuable, and would certainly contribute to our knowledge. This, however, would go much beyond the scope of this study on the Ummān-manda because of the issues and sources that would need to be covered, such as the secondary literature on the nature of the composition and how different versions of the story may (or may not) contain corrupted memories of historical events, comparing all the known versions in each stage (risking misleading interpretations with a good number of difficult and

\textsuperscript{140} The difficulties are discussed in BPO 1, pp. 21-23.
\textsuperscript{141} Discussion and references in Komoróczy, “Ummān-manda”, pp. 57-58.
\textsuperscript{142} This omen can be found in \textbf{Appendix 1.35}. 
uncertain passages), identifying all the changes introduced in different versions and trying to work out how these came about, the historical background of the manuscripts and the historical kernel (if any) of their content, interpreting their *Sitz im Leben*, etc. These would constitute a study with an exclusive focus on the Cuthaean Legend at the expense of studying how other documents used the term Ummān-manda. It would be a study similar in some ways to J. H. Tigay’s *The Evolution of the Gilgamesh Epic*.  

Observations based on the current state of evidence cannot be considered the final statement about when Naram-Sin’s enemies attained a distant mountainous in the development of the Cuthaean Legend and when the enemy was first called Ummān-manda. At least from the Middle Babylonian version onwards, there is a mountainous abode for Naram-Sin’s enemies, from where they launch an attack on human beings and cities. At some point, at least as early as the Hittite version of the story, this enemy is called Ummān-manda.  

The Standard Babylonian version of the Cuthaean Legend is the clearest among the versions of the story in using the term Ummān-manda for Naram-Sin’s enemy whose abode is described as an eastern mountainsous situated in the north-eastern frontier of Mesopotamia (4.2). In this regard, I should discuss the use of the term in the Standard Babylonian version of the Cuthaean Legend because there has been some doubt cast on whether it actually denotes the enemy. The term is attested in line 54 of the Standard Babylonian Cuthaean Legend. Its precise use has been hard to understand. The relevant passage is as follows:  

49. ri-eš sa-na-qī-šu-nu a-na URU Pu-ru-uš-ḥa-an-dar is-sa-qu-x-ni
50. URU Pu-ru-uš-ḥa-an-dar gi-mir(?)x-su it-tas-paḫ
51. URU Pū-ḥu-lu-u it-tas-paḫ
52. URU Pu-ra-an-šu-u it-tas-paḫ
53. lu sā-a-muḫ na- āš ḥu ḫu uḫ ḫa-ḫu-[rim]
55. u qē-reb Su-bar-ti DŪ-ša-nu id-[du-ku]  

144 Clearly the state of evidence about when the term Ummān-manda was first used is a bit misleading. There are hints that provoke the speculation that the term may have been part of the Cuthaean Legend from the Old Babylonian era onwards, as discussed in 4.2.1.1-2.
145 Westenholz, *Legends of the Kings of Akkade*, p. 313: 54. Westenholz' interpretation will be discussed immediately below.
146 SB Tupsinna 49-62. For the entire text, see Appendix 1.20.
56. *is-pu-hu-ma ti-a-ma-ti ana* (DIS) *Gu-ti-um is-sa-an-[qu]

57. *is-pu-hu-ma Gu-ti-um ana* KUR.NIM.MA.KI *is-sa-[an-qu]

58. *is-pu-hu-ma* KUR.NIM.MA.KI *ana sa-pan-ni ik-[al-du]

59. *id-du-ku šà ni-bi-ri SUB-ū ana a-[

60. *Dilmun.KI Mā-gan-na Me-luh-ḫa qē-reb tam-tim ma-la ba-šu-ū id-[du-ku]

61. 17 LUGAL.MEŠ adi (EN) 90 LIM um-ma-na-[ti-sù-nu]


49. At the beginning of their approach, they approached Purūšandar

50. Purūšandar was completely scattered

51. Puḫlu was scattered

52. Puranišū was scattered

53. Indeed mixed/allied (?) (or Should I go out against) the bearer (of?) ḫuḫuḫu(? of rav[ens]

54. … the greatness of the Ummān-manda, [their] camp (was) Šubat-En[lia]n

55. And in the midst of Subartu [they killed] all of them

56. They scattered the (upper) sea and they approached Gutium

57. They scattered Gutium and they approached Elam

58. They scattered Elam and they reached the flatland (variant: steppeland)

59. They killed those of the crossing, they threw to the …

60. Dilmun, Magan, Meluḫḫa in the midst of the (lower) sea they ki[lled] as many as (there) were [they killed].

61.-62. Seventeen kings, with them [their] troops up to 90,000, [we]nt to their aid

Güterbock and Gurney have opined that the term Ummān-manda in line 54 above denotes Naram-Sin’s powerful enemies, Anubanini and his sons. 147 Most scholars accept this, as inferred from their translations, which include “…the Umman-manda, [their] camp (was) the dwelling of En[lil] (or: was at Shubat-Enlil); 148 ‘...Des Oumman-manda, le camp était Shoubat-Enlil’, 149 ‘Should I have struck out into the midst of the host,

---


148 Ibid., p. 101: 54.

149 Labat, Les religions du Proche-Orient asiatique, p. 311: 54.
whose camp is Subat-Enlil?”. 150 “Is the greatness of that host whose camp is Shubat-Enlil…”? 151 Westenholz takes an exception to the majority view and approaches line 54 with a different interpretation of the first three words and the context: luppudu nárbi .umman-manda karā[ṣu] Šubat-En[li]l “Weakened were the powers of the Manda hordes, the camps of Šubat-En[li]l”. 152 Westenholz suggests that the Ummān-manda could be the direct object of the raid of Naram-Sin’s enemies, and that the word Ummān-manda does not denote Naram-Sin’s enemies but may rather be a late corruption of the country Mardaman, which is one of the lands claimed to be conquered by Sargon and Naram-Sin in the literary texts “Great Revolt against Naram-Sin” and “Sargon in Foreign Lands”. 153 The Old Babylonian liver omens mention the Ummān-manda around the same time Mardaman is mentioned in the Old Babylonian copy of the literary text “Sargon, the Conquering Hero”. 154

Concerning the interpretation of line 54, the military expansion of the enemy in the Cuthaean Legend is described in standard verbs such as sanāqum ‘to approach’, sapāhum ‘to scatter, disperse’ and dākum ‘to kill, beat’ in lines 49-52, 55-60. These verbs indicate the enemy’s destruction is fierce and conclusive. These words are not attested in lines 53-54, making it less likely the same type of destruction and conquest is described. Furthermore, to interpret the word as luppudu ‘weakened’ so as to suggest line 54 is referring to the weakened powers of the Ummān-manda would imply that Naram-Sin’s enemy defeated the Ummān-manda inconclusively. Such an interpretation does not fit the depiction of a powerful enemy that delivers conclusive defeats to the various lands in lines both preceding and following lines 53-54. Line 53 is very difficult and uncertain. The absence of the standard verbs that denote the enemy’s destructive military victories and the general inability to determine a clear reading for line 53 suggests that unique words are used and something unique is described. The word ‘rav[ens]’ (ha-hu-[rim]), if it is actually there, may be a description of the enemy, matching their bird-like description in line 31 as Westenholz suggests. 155 The meaning of the first word in line 54 is not clear to me. Gurney transliterates it as LUL-pu-du 156 but does not translate. Gurney finds lines 53 and the beginning of line 54 hopelessly corrupt, and merely suggests it may have enumerated a series of tribes who formed the Ummān-

151 Foster, Before the Muses, p. 351: 54.
152 Westenholz, Legends of the Kings of Akkad, p. 313: 54.
153 Ibid., p. 313: 54.
154 On the reference to Mardaman in “Sargon, the Conquering Hero”, see ibid., p.85: 16’. The Old Babylonian used in “Sargon, the Conquering Hero” is exemplified by the use of PI to render wa, ibid., p. 80.
155 Ibid., p. 313: 53.
manda army. The context does not seem to involve the enumeration of certain tribes but may contain a statement or description of the Ummān-manda. The first word in line 54 can be read in several ways and the broken context makes it hard to choose among the possible readings. Longman reads the first three words as: *lul-pu-du lib-bu-u ummān* (ERIN) *man-da* “Should I have struck out into the midst of the host…” Westenholz questions Longman’s proposed form *lulpudu*. Gurney hesitates with the use of a first person precative verb for line 53 and wonders how it fits the context. The same concern may apply for the first word in line 54, but even this is hard to say.

The second word in line 54 is clearer, agreeing with an expected description of a powerful Ummān-manda. The word *narbū* means ‘greatness, great power (of the gods)’. This word suggests that line 54 is referring to the greatness attained by Naram-Sin’s enemies. It is not a problem that *narbū* is usually associated with gods or heroes or that in this case it is distinctively used for the enemies of Naram-Sin. This distinct usage recalls SB Tupsinna 37 where the word *šūpū* ‘resplendent’ is used for Naram-Sin’s enemies. The word *šūpū* is also mostly used for gods, heroes, kings, cities and even the stars; it can be attributed with meanings such as ‘manifest, brilliant, shining, splendid, famous, great, exalted’. It may be relevant for appreciating the sense of *narbū* to quote its use with *šūpū*, since the latter word is also used to describe Naram-Sin’s enemies. The words *narbū* and *šūpū* are used together in two hymns: *šūpū narbūša* ‘famous is her greatness’ and 4*GASAN šūpū narbūki* ‘Lady, famous is your greatness’. I argue that the association of *šūpū* with *narbū*, as seen attested in these two hymns, indicate that *narbū* can also be used for Naram-Sin’s enemies just as *šūpū* has been in SB Tupsinna 37. A final point that may be relevant is that the word *narbū* literally has a sense of a process to become great because it is derived from the stative verb *rabū* - to become great. This arising greatness seems to correlate with the expansion of the enemy as described in lines 49-52, 55-60. Text breaks obscure how lines 53-54 precisely integrate into the context of the preceding and subsequent lines, but not all is lost. Tracing the localities that fall prey to Naram-Sin’s enemy in the story give a general idea about the military march of Naram-Sin’s enemies. This helps interpret how lines 53-54 fit in with the rest of the passage. The first target of the

---

159 Westenholz, *Legends of the Kings of Akkade*, pp. 313-314:54
161 CAD N I 350-351.
162 CAD S III 328-329, AHw 1281.
163 OB Agusaya VAS 10 214 i 9 in CAD S III 329.
164 SB hymn to Istar STC 2 pl. 75:8 in CAD S III 329.
enemy is Purušandar; it is attacked and completely scattered. \(^{165}\) ‘Purušandar’ of the Standard Babylonian Cuthaean Legend is originally a central Anatolian city (Burušattum, Purušattum, Purušanda), located perhaps south east of Tuz Gölü (‘Salt Lake’), \(^{166}\) and goes back at least to the Middle Bronze Age and was at one stage a powerful kingdom which Anitta of Neša had to subjugate. \(^{167}\) The story ‘King of Battle’, known from Hittite and Akkadian versions, is about Sargon of Akkad fighting Nur-Dagan of Purušanda, with the purpose of defending merchants in Anatolia. \(^{168}\) The Cuthaean Legend then portrays Naram-Sin’s enemies as consecutively attacking a number of regions. This presumably supplies at least a rough picture of their campaign route. After Purušandar, the enemy destroys Pušlu and Puranšu. \(^{169}\) Unfortunately the locations of these two toponyms are unknown. \(^{170}\) The next identifiable toponym is Šubat-Enlīl\(^{171}\) (modern Tell Leilan in the Ḥābūr Plains). Subat-Enlīl was in fact the choice of headquarters (instead of Nineveh or Aššur) for the crafty Samdi-Adad I who established his empire almost from scratch. \(^{172}\) This emphasizes its strategic position for northern Mesopotamia. The Standard Babylonian Cuthaean Legend has Naram-Sin’s enemies first attack Purušandar, a place in central Anatolia, and eventually they come to Subat-Enlīl where they establish camp according to line 54, a place known for its strategic position in northern Mesopotamia. Then line 55 states ‘and in the midst of Subartu [they kill]ed all of them’ (\(u\) \(qé-reb\) Su-bar-ti DŪ-ša-nu \(id\)-\(du-ku\)). \(^{173}\) Information about the location of this ‘Subartu’ can be derived from the text known as the ‘Sargon Geography’, known from Neo-Assyrian and Late-Babylonian manuscripts, \(^{174}\) which states ‘from the Cedar Mountain to Anšan is the Land of Subartu’ ([\(ulu\) ḫu.r.sag giš.eřeni an-za-an ]\(a-n\)-\(ni\) KUR su.bir\(a\)\(k\)\(^2\)). \(^{175}\) This makes Subartu a vast stretch of land from Lebanon and the Amanus ranges to western Iran, \(^{176}\) well covering northern Mesopotamia and the camp of the Naram-Sin’s enemies in Subat-Enlīl (Tell Leilan). The Cuthaean Legend then has the enemy marching through a number of places.

---

165 SB Tupsinna 49-50.
169 SB Tupsinna 51-52.
171 SB Tupsinna 54.
175 Ibid., pp. 68-69: 3.
176 Ibid., pp. 79-80.
toponyms, including familiar regions such as Gutium, Elam, Dilmun (Bahrain), Magan (coastal Arabia, Oman) and Meluhha (Nubia, elsewhere near Egypt or the Indus Valley). The sense is that the enemy has encircled and entrapped Naram-Sin. They first campaign into Anatolia and then ‘Subartu’ (i.e. northern Mesopotamia), then they go east, south and possibly west (if Meluhha is Nubia (or elsewhere near Egypt) instead of the Indus Valley). After the mention of this last ravaged toponym Meluhha, the Standard Babylonian version of the Cuthaean Legend states seventeen kings went over to the side of Naram-Sin’s enemy. In all this, it becomes clear that the term Ummān-manda is used as an appellation for Naram-Sin’s enemies during the stage of their military campaign in which they establish a camp in Subat-Enlil and slaughter those in ‘Subartu’ according to lines 54-55.

As a designation, the term Ummān-manda (accepting mandum as the etymology of its second component) refers to Naram-Sin’s enemy as the ‘army of the terrain’, the terrain being the distant eastern mountains they grew up in and were riding as an army (described in 4.2), an army that first entered central Anatolia and came to defeat the Akkadian king in battles and encircled his realm. Therefore the word mandum provides a very plausible etymology for Ummān-manda in the Standard Babylonian version of the Cuthaean Legend.

4.3 Ummān-manda in the Weidner Chronicle

The Weidner Chronicle is a literary text composed in the form of a letter allegedly written by a king of Isin to a king of Babylon (or Larsa); the letter’s author advises the addressee on how to keep Babylon under control: not interfering with the ritual offerings of Esagil. The original date of composition is not known but the earliest possible date is the second dynasty of Isin due to references in the text. While the range of royal names mentioned in the text do suggest it could be written as early as the 18th century, the dialect is Standard Babylonian and some phrases recall Neo-Babylonian royal inscriptions, so it may be of a later date. The Weidner Chronicle defends the necessity of maintaining cultic fish offerings to Marduk’s temple Esagil on the basis of the alleged history of previous Mesopotamian rulers’ cultic performance: those who made the offerings fared well and those who did not lost their kingship. The Weidner Chronicle is interested in Mesopotamian

---

177 SB Tupsinna 56-60. See the notes for these lines in Westenholz, *Legends of the Kings of Akkade*, pp. 134-135; Foster, *Before the Muses*, p. 351. Also see Horowitz, *Mesopotamian Cosmic Geography*, p. 79.
history as early as the Sumerian Early Dynastic Period in the third millennium. The Weidner Chronicle’s claim that a Marduk cult existed from the Sumerian Early Dynastic Era onwards militates against current knowledge about this deity and its cult: Marduk was recognized as the official chief of the pantheon only as early as the second dynasty of Isin, so Grayson states that the text is “a blatant piece of propaganda” written to warn monarchs to observe the cult of Marduk.\textsuperscript{181} The historical claims in the Weidner Chronicle were taken serious enough that it has both Neo-Assyrian and Neo-Babylonian copies.\textsuperscript{182} The Weidner Chronicle dates the cult of Marduk to the earliest times of Mesopotamia because if the chief deity of the Babylonian pantheon – Marduk – had not been the chief deity from the beginning of Mesopotamian history, his status would be put in some doubt. Glassner states that the aim to focus on the greatness of Babylon and Marduk came “at the price of some anachronisms”.\textsuperscript{183} Among the archaic rulers whose cultic performance is scrutinized is Enmerkar.\textsuperscript{184}

42. \textsuperscript{1}En-me-kár LUGAL UNUG.KI nam-maï-[še-e] ú-ššal-pît ER[IN] man-da šá a… šu …

43. ABGAL A-da-pà…DUMU(?) … la(?)… NUN(?)…

44. [x i-na k][i]-iš-si-šu el-li [iš]-me-ma ¹En-me-kár i-ru-ur…

45. [ù ⁴AMAR].UTU LUGAL-tu kîš-šat KUR.KUR id-din-šum-ma par-si-šû šu[…]

46. [x] x [xxx A]N NA ki-ma ši-šir ša-ma-mi ú-ban-ni-ma ina É-sag-il…[⁴AMAR.UTU]

47. [LUGAL] pa-qid kîš-šat AN u KI DUMU reš-tu-ú ana 600 600 600 600 600 20 xx tu MU.MES-šû[…]

42. Enmekar, king of Uruk, destroyed the people/settlement[s], Um[mān]-manda who…

43. The sage Adapa…

44. […]in] his pure shrine he heard and Enmekar cursed…

45. [Mar]duk gave him the kingship over all lands and his rites…

46. … he fashioned like celestial writing in Esagila…[Marduk],

47. [king] entrusted everything of the heavens and the earth, the foremost son, for 3,020… his years…

\textsuperscript{181} Grayson, \textit{op.cit.}, p. 180.

\textsuperscript{182} For information and bibliography on the Neo-Assyrian and Neo-Babylonian manuscripts, see ABC, p. 145; Al-Rawi, \textit{op.cit.}, pp. 1-2, Glassner, \textit{Mesopotamian Chronicles}, p. 263.

\textsuperscript{183} \textit{Ibid.}, p. 263.

\textsuperscript{184} Weidner Chronicle 42-47. For the restorations and the translation, see \textbf{Appendix 1.18}. 
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id-kaṣ-sum-ma

63. UN.MES-šu ma-ak-ka-ra-niš it-ta-di LUGAL-ut-su a-na ERĪN Gu-ti-um it-ta-din

64. Qu-tu!-u ša ta-zi-im-te DINGIR pa-la-ša la kul-lu-mu par-ši u GIS.HUR.MES šu-te-šu-ra la i-du-šu

65. 4UTU.ḪE.GAL Lšu-ku₄-dak-ka ina pa-at i- rat tam-tu₄ KU₄.MES ta-mar-tu₄ i-bar-ma

66. i-nu-šu nu-un šu-a-tu a-di a-na be-li GAL 4AMAR.UTU pe-ḫu-šu ana DINGIR ša-nim-ma ul uth-taḫ-ḫu

67. Gu-ti-um nu-nu ba-āš-šu la ūḫ-ša-a ina ŠU.2-šu i-ki-im-ma

68. ina qi-bi-ti-šu šiť-ri ERĪN-an Qu-ti-i a-na LUGAL-šu-tu KUR-šu i-ki-im-ma a-na 4UTU.ḪE.GAL it-ta-din

62. Naram-Sin destro[yen] the people/settlements of Babylon and twice he (Marduk) raised against him an attack of the Guti army.

63. (The Guti) goaded on his people. He (Marduk) gave his kingship to the Guti army.

64. The Guti, who were complained about, showing no fear of god, they did not know how to properly perform divine rites (and) ordinances.

65. Utu-Hegal, the fisherman, caught a fish as tribute at the edge of the sea

66. At that time that fish was to be offered to the great lord Marduk, it was not to be offered to any other god.

---

185 Weidner Chronicle 42. The presence of the term Ummān-manda in this line is not universally accepted. For a discussion of the term’s presence in this line, see Appendix 1.18, n. 76.
186 ABC, pp. 44-45.
187 ABC, p. 147: 32.
188 Al-Rawi, “Tablets from the Sippar Library”, p. 9: 42.
189 Glassner, Mesopotamian Chronicles, p. 267.
190 Weidner Chronicle 62-68. For the restorations and the translation, see Appendix 1.18.
67. The Guti took the cooked fish away from his hands before it was offered.

68. By his exalted command he (Marduk) took the kingship of his land away from the Guti army and gave it (the kingship) to Utu-Hegal.

Grayson argues that the Weidner Chronicle accuses Enmekar of destroying the population of Babylon. The reading ER[I]N\man-da is the only clue about the nature of the population destroyed in Weidner Chronicle 42. There are two puzzles here. The first one is what relationship could Enmerkar have with the Ummān-manda. The second one is how to compare the plural use of the word nammaššu in Weidner Chronicle lines 42 and 62 respectively.

4.3.1 ‘On Earth the Gods Made Their City’

The word nammaššu usually means ‘herds of (wild) animals’ and occasionally ‘people, settlement’. Grayson translates ‘people’ on the basis of Malku I 200 which associates the word with a-lum, and also on the basis of a lexical reference that indicates nammaššu corresponds, alongside a number of other Akkadian words (a-šu-u, šik-nat na-piš-tú, nam-maš-ti), to NIG.ZI.GAL, and denotes living beings – people as well as animals. The word alum, associated with nam-maš-šu-u in Malku I 200, has a wide semantic range and can stand for any sort of settlement in terms of size and complexity. Another word associated with nammaššu is the Sumerian word A.DAM, which means ‘human settlement’. It is mostly likely that nammaššē means ‘settlements’ or ‘people’ in the Weidner Chronicle, similar to its usage as ‘settlements’ in napṭar salmāt qaqqadī nam-maš-šu-ū tenēšēti idallalu qurdīki ‘all men [the black headed ones], the settlements [emphasis mine], mankind, praise your (Istar’s) heroic deeds’. There is also the phrase nam-maš-še-e KUR Šu-me-ri u URI ‘people of Sumer and Akkad’ found in the Weidner Chronicle.

---

191 ABC, pp. 44-45
192 CAD N I 233-234; AHw 728.
193 ABC, p. 147, n. 32. The lexical references are also found in CAD N II 233.
194 The word alum can mean city, city as social organisation, village, manor, estate, fort, see AHw 39; CAD A I 379-388.
195 CAD N II 233, AHw 28, ePSD A adam[habitation].
196 STC 2 pl. 76:24 apud CAD N II 234.
197 Weidner Chronicle 12, 18.
Can the Ummān-manda have settlements? This may be something similar to the ‘city’ of the Ummān-manda in the Standard Babylonian Cuthaean Legend. The story says ‘on earth the gods made the[ir] city’. The forthcoming destruction of the Ummān-manda is described within the framework of the ‘city’.

133. URU ERIN.MES šu-nu-ti in-[ne]-ru
134. i-qam-mu-ū i-lam-mu-u [K].DUR.MEŠ
135. URU dá-mu-šū-nu i-tab-ba-ku
136. KI-tum īs-pi-ki-ša GIS.GIŠIMMAR bi-lat-sā u-ma[t-ṭa
137. URU ERIN.MES šu-nu-ti i-mu[t-tu
138. URU KI URU É KI É [ ]i-nak-kir
139. AD K[I DUMU SE]Š KI SEŠ
140. [GURUS] KI GURUŠ ru-us-a KI it-ba-ri
141. it-[i] a-ḫa-meš [k]i-na-a-ti ul i-ta-mu-u
142. UN.MEŠ la ki-na-a-ti šu-ḫu-zā-ma šā na-tim al pa ra qu
143. URU nak-r[u] šu-ú i-dak-ku
144. URU šā-a-šú [U]RU nak-ru i-sab-ba-su

133. The inhabitants of the city will be massacred
134. They will burn and besiege the dwellings
135. The inhabitants of the city pour out their blood
136. The store of the earth and the yield of the date palm will diminish
137. The inhabitants of the city of those soldiers will die
138. City with [city, house] with house will become hostile
139. Fathe[r with son, broth]er with brother
140. Young man with young man, colleague with colleague
141. They will not speak the truth with one another
142. The people will be taught untruth and who fitting/proper…

---

198 SB Tupsinnā 33. For transliteration of the Akkadian, see Appendix 1.20.
199 SB Tupsinnā 133-144.
143. They will kill that hostile city

144. They will seize that city – the hostile city

Gurney and Westenholz note that the ‘city’ in lines 133, 135, and 137 seems to be used as a collective with the sense of ‘inhabitants of the city’ and the verbs appear to be impersonal third person plurals. The word ‘city’ here may refer to a range of settlements short of a metropolis. The same may apply to the plural use of nammaṣṣu in the Weidner Chronicle 42: nam-maṣ-[še-e]. This word is restored from the passage of the Weidner Chronicle that recounts Naram-Sin’s cultic performance – with more disastrous consequences. Weidner Chronicle 62 uses the word nammaṣṣu for the people Babylon, similar to the phrase nam-maṣ-[še-e] KUR Śu-me-ri u URIK1 ‘people of Sumer and Akkad’ found elsewhere in the Weidner Chronicle. Weidner Chronicle 42 could be using nammaṣṣu to describe the people of the Ummān-manda or their settlements. The text breaks obscure the context, and it is not clear in what way Enmerkar’s destruction of this nam-maṣ-[še-e] ‘people/settlements’ of the Ummān-manda relates to his own fate. Weidner Chronicle 43-44 suffers from text breaks and it is not clear what type of role Adapa has in the passage and whether it was Adapa or Marduk who cursed Enmerkar. Weidner Chronicle 45 then states that ‘[Mar]duk gave him the kingship over all lands…’. It is hard to understand who received the kingship due to the text breaks in the previous lines, and it will not be helpful to speculate on this.

The Standard Babylonian version of the Cuthaean Legend accommodated a situation in which Enmerkar had defeated the Ummān-manda and at the same time suffered a terrible end. Similarly, the Weidner Chronicle could have integrated Enmerkar’s victory over the Ummān-manda in a narrative that eventually gave the Sumerian king a bad ending. I propose that it is conceivable, for example, that the Weidner Chronicle stated that Enmerkar defeated Ummān-manda but did not honour Marduk for his victory.

4.3.2 Enmerkar and the Ummān-manda

---


203 Weidner Chronicle 12, 18.

204 There is another story concerning Adapa and Enmerkar, but the text is fragmentary and its main purpose remains unclear. For this text, see Foster, Before the Muses, pp. 531-532.

205 In the case of the Cuthaean Legend, the terrible fate was punishment in Enmerkar’s afterlife because he did not leave behind a stela about how he defeated the enemy that Naram-Sin faced, SB Tupsinna 23-30. This passage and Enmerkar’s victory over the Ummān-manda is discussed below in 4.3.2.
What type of tradition the Weidner Chronicle used regarding Enmerkar and Ummān-manda is not even hinted at due to the lamentable text breaks in Weidner Chronicle 42-47. There are some hints elsewhere of a possible tradition concerning Enmerkar’s dealings with Ummān-manda. Naram-Sin says in the Middle Babylonian Cuthaean Legend:

2'. [...] A-DU₅ ú-ul ḫa-ra-am-ma NA-[DU₅?]
3'. [ṣu-ū] ú-ul a-ḫi-ma û ri-e-īt-ti ú-ul

2'. He did not inscribe a stela (narû) and a st[ela?]
3'. [He was n]ot my brother and my hand
4'. [he did not take and so] before Šamaš I did not bless him

A fragmentary Hittite text also seems to be referring to Enmerkar (it is not clear if this text is part of the Hittite Cuthaean Legend):

2'. […] LUGAL ŠA KUR URUTE.UNŪK₁
3'. […] ma-a-an 1 MEᴷᵃᵃᵐ MUᴷᵃᵃᵐ pa-it
4'. […] ha-a)n-te-ezi-ia-[a]š-mi-š LUGAL-uš

2'. … king of the land of Uruk
3'. … when a hundred years went
4'. … my predecessor (lit. first one). King...

The first person speaker may be calling ‘king of the land of Uruk’ as ‘my predecessor (lit. first one)’. Naram-Sin could be referring to Enmerkar as his predecessor. The phrase ‘when a hundred years went’ may parallel ‘[…] elapsed’ ([…MEŠ ina ZI-hi])²⁰⁸ or ‘[…] passed’ ([…M]EŠ ina a-la-ki)²⁰⁹ as found in the context of the Standard Babylonian version of the Cuthaean Legend. The texts breaks in SB Tupsinna 7 and 8 are unfortunate

²⁰⁶ Bo Tupsinna 1 b 2’-4’.
²⁰⁷ H Tupsinna 2’-4’.
²⁰⁸ SB Tupsinna 7.
²⁰⁹ SB Tupsinna 8.
but they occur in the passage about Enmerkar, and at least one of them most probably refers to the passage of time described in the Hittite text. Westenholz restores SB Tupsinna 7 as ‘[…]years] had elapsed’ ([…MU.ME]Š ina ZI]-hi) and SB Tupsinna 8 as ‘[…]days] had gone by’ ([…UD.M]Š ina a-la-ki). It is unfortunate that this Hittite reference to Enmerkar is fragmentary. It would have added one more item to the close affinities between the known Hittite version of the story and the Standard Babylonian.

The Standard Babylonian version states that Enmerkar had defeated ‘those troops’ (ERÍ šu-a-tu) but had not written down or left behind a stela:

210 Westenholz, Legends of the Kings of Akkade, pp. 302-303.
211 These affinities are discussed in Hoffner, “Remarks on the Hittite Version of the Naram-Sin Legend”, pp. 17-22.
212 SB Tupsinna 28-29.
213 SB Tupsinna 23-30. Glassner points out the irony that Enmerkar was the inventor of cuneiform writing in a Sumerian epic, Glassner, Mesoopotamian Chronicles, p. 22. The text breaks in SB Tupsinna 23-30 obscure the precise details of Enmerkar’s punishment in the afterlife. It most probably relates to Naram-Sin’s decision not to bless Enmerkar’s spirit in the underworld. For the motivation to receive blessings as a reason to write a stela, see J. G. Westenholz, “Writing for Posterity: Naram-Sin and Enmerkar” in Kinattitu ša dārāti: Raphael Kutscher Memorial Volume. (Journal of the Institute of Archaeology of Tel Aviv University No. 1). A. F. Rainey, ed. A. Kempinski, M. Sigrist, D. Ussishkin, ed. board. Tel Aviv. Institute of Archaeology of Tel Aviv University. 1993, pp. 205-218.
Babylonian Cuthaean Legend for a specific type of powerful enemy – one that can appear from the distant mountains in the ‘eastern’ direction at the will of the gods. In other words, Ummān-manda is a concept such as Sumer and Akkad. Current evidence does not indicate that the Lullubeans (whose leader Anubanini is the main antagonist in the Standard Babylonian version) were always the Ummān-manda in the Cuthaean Legend, so the term is not in itself ethnic. Kings such as Enmerkar and Naram-Sin come and go, but the cities of Mesopotamia remain. Furthermore, Enmerkar and Naram-Sin are not from the same ethnic group but both are from the same civilisation. Similarly, I suggest that the story conceives Anubanini as the contemporary of Naram-Sin and assumes an unnamed predecessor of Anubanini who fought Enmerkar as the Ummān-manda, called only ‘those troops’ in the text. Enmerkar encountered the Ummān-manda leader(s) and forces in his own time. The Standard Babylonian version of the Cuthaean Legend makes it clear the Ummān-manda were only human beings despite their bird-like appearance. Furthermore, the story does not give their mythological creation in a strict chronology that ties it to the time of Enmerkar or Naram-Sin, but only states it as the origin of a strange looking people in a distant mountain land. The story provides their creation only as background information in order to describe the Ummān-manda alive during Naram-Sin’s time. How the story conceived the link between their creation and the description of Anubanini and his military family is not explicitly stated, so it is best not to assume much about it, except for the obvious conclusion that Anubanini and his family are not immortal beings that lived during the centuries between Enmerkar and Naram-Sin because the story says that the Ummān-manda Naram-Sin faced were mortal human beings and that Enmerkar defeated ‘those troops’ in his own time. The story does not conceive Enmerkar defeating the seemingly invincible military-family of Anubanini. The story treats Anubanini and his family as mortal human contemporaries of Naram-Sin. The implication is that Enmerkar, who lived many years before Naram-Sin, fought another leader and another army who was the Ummān-manda during the time of the Sumerian king. All this relates to the Weidner Chronicle in that its composer(s) would have no problem conceiving Enmerkar defeating, or interacting with, the Ummān-manda of his own time in some other way – lamentably the context is lost in the Weidner Chronicle, as discussed above in p. 102. The distant mountainous abode is what makes Ummān-manda unique and recalls the mountainous terrain denoted by the word mandum ‘terrain’ in Lugalbanda II, suggesting mandum can provide the etymology of the second component of the term. This has been discussed in the context of the Cuthaean
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214 Another question here would be who is the enemy in the various versions of the Cuthaean Legend throughout its development. The answer to that requires research about the versions of the Cuthaean Legend that is beyond the scope of this study, as mentioned above in pp. 90-91.
215 SB Tupsinna 28.
216 SB Tupsinna 66, 70-71.
217 SB Tupsinna 28, 66, 70-71.
Legend (in 4.2), and is the closest contribution a mandum etymology for Ummān-manda can make for the use of the term in the Weidner Chronicle, only because potentially relevant information has been lost to the text breaks. Finally, but speculatively, it is possible cuneiform literature elsewhere assumes the co-existence of Enmerkar and the Lullubeans (and by implication a Lulluean leader preceding Anubanini who challenged Naram-Sin in the Standard Babylonian version of the Cuthaean Legend). Lugalbanda encounters a toponym called the Lulubi-mountain in ‘Lugalbanda-Enmerkar’, the story where Enmerkar marches through the eastern mountains to besiege Aratta. The Lulubi-mountain is probably the ‘Lullubean’ mountain.

The tradition about Enmerkar and the Ummān-manda is most explicit in the Standard Babylonian version of the Cuthaean Legend. Arguably the earlier Middle Babylonian version and possibly the Hittite fragment (discussed above in pp. 102-103) are linked to the same tradition concerning Enmerkar. One possibility is that the composer(s) of the Weidner Chronicle assumed Enmerkar defeated the Ummān-manda from a reading of the Standard Babylonian Cuthaean Legend or another version of the story with the same information, and incorporated it into the narrative of the Weidner Chronicle. Alternatively, there was another tradition concerning Enmerkar and Ummān-manda.

4.4 Ummān-manda in the Second Millennium Documents

The mandum etymology for Ummān-manda, i.e. ‘army of the terrain’, can also explain the use of the term in a number of second millennium documents I have not mentioned so far. Their often-terse context, the fragmentary state of some of their tablets, and the various gaps of information (e.g. earliest stages of the formation of the Mitanni kingdom, the types of mercenaries used in second millennium ancient Near East) prevent more conclusive and detailed treatments. Such treatments would also require me to go into a range of topics and conjectures (e.g. the gaps of information that often come up with these sources, or uncertain topics such as the social context of the Hittite laws) at the expense of researching the significance of the term Ummān-manda in the first millennium Neo-Assyrian and Neo-Babylonian sources for which there is important ground to be covered. Nonetheless, I now briefly outline these second millennium sources because they yield some important points about the use of the term Ummān-manda.

---

\textsuperscript{218} Lugalbanda II 46.
\textsuperscript{219} See discussion of this toponym above in ch. 3, nn. 186, 190.
4.4.1 Mandu-Troops

The Old Babylonian Proto-Lu lexical list contains the words mandum, mandum-tur and mandum-libir-ra. The electronic PSD suggests mandum denoted a type of soldier. Westenholz already noted that there might be a link between the word mandum in Lugalbanda II and the lexical list. Support for this view may come from the archival texts found in Choga Gavaneh: their topic is provisioning the mandu. Each tablet mentions on average nine to eighteen mandu being provided with barley or clothing. The archival texts were found in an architectural complex in Choga Gavaneh, a site in western Iran, about 60 km to the west of Kermanshah. The word mandum has been used in Lugalbanda II for the terrain of the mountainous area east of Mesopotamia (3.3), corresponding neatly to the hilly geography of western Iran. Perhaps the word came to denote a profession that relates to such a terrain (at least initially?) and a provincial profession. In any case, one archival text from Choga Gavaneh (ChG 18) mentions the provisioning of a total of 18 mandu, and the text seems to be getting this number from a sum of ‘Seven of the Amor[ite] mandu’ (7 ma-an-di A-mu-ur-[ri]) in addition to ‘three substitute soldiers of Agade’ (3 ERIN pu-ḫu₃-um ša A-ga-de) and ‘eight (soldiers) of Silli, son of Idi, of Atušari’ (8 Șīl-li DUMU I-di ša A-tu-ša₃ sû-rī). ChG 18 indicates that mandu are soldiers coming from various cities and the Amorites, so actually it is better to translate mandu as mandu-soldiers, as in ‘seven Amorite mandu-soldiers from Der’. They may be seen as mercenaries ‘from the terrain, distant land (mandum)’ that can be employed in various sites, such as Choga Gavaneh. Their personal names are Akkadian or Amorite, an intriguing fact for a site in western Iran where one expects personal names from peoples such as the Elamites, Gutians or Lullubians.

Another point is that the profession name mandum, which is Sumerian in the Old Babylonian lexical list, is treated as Akkadian in the archival texts of Choga Gavaneh because it is written with a genitive declension.

---

220 MSL 12, p. 36: 106-108.
221 ePSD M mandum[soldier].
222 Westenholz, Legends of the Kings of Akkade, p. 266.
223 Texts ChG 5, ChG 18, ChG 31, ChG 34 published in K. Abdi and G. Beckman, “An Early Second-Millennium Cuneiform Archive from Choga Gavaneh, Western Iran” JCS 59 (2007), pp. 51, 54, 59-60. I thank J. G. Westenholz for drawing my attention to these texts.
224 For texts and translations, see Appendix 1.5-8.
225 Abdi and Beckman, op.cit., p. 39.
226 For the text and references, see Appendix 1.6.
227 Discussed in ch. 2, pp. 36-37.
(Table 2). The second component of the term Ummān-manda, on the other hand, does not decline (Tables 1-2). I can still argue it is possible that the word *mandu* in the Choga Gavaneh texts, as a designation for a military profession, is somehow linked to the second component of the term Ummān-manda and that only an absence of further evidence prevents more certain comments on this. Three reasons can be offered in defense of such a possibility. The first reason is that the word *mandum*, as it is used to denote distant lands in Lugalbanda II, provides an etymological explanation for both *mandu* in the Choga Gavaneh texts (4.4.1) and the second component of the term Ummān-manda (as discussed throughout chapter 4). If they can have the same etymological explanation, they may be a relation between them.

The second component of the term Ummān-manda has been used by itself in an administrative text from Mari to designate individuals with Semitic names as ‘Manda-men’ (their occupation is not evident from the document) (4.4.2). The Choga Gavaneh texts also use *mandu* for individuals with Semitic names and there is a Neo-Babylonian word *mandu* that is the variant written form for the second component of the term Ummān-manda. This Neo-Babylonian *mandu* may be connected with the Old Babylonian word *mandu* in the Choga Gavaneh texts. Hence the second reason, that it is possible the word *mandu* in the Choga Gavaneh texts is somehow linked to a variant written form for the second component of the term Ummān-manda.

The third reason is that it is possible that while *mandu* declines in the Choga Gavaneh texts, it can still be the second component of a compound word without being declined. The Sumerian word *mandum*, used in Lugalbanda II and a number of other texts (chapter 3), has been treated as an Akkadian word in lexical lists when it was used as the second component of the lexeme word *zēr mandu(m)* (3.1.1). The lists use *zēr mandu(m)* to explain Sumerian words. Contrary to what would happen to an Akkadian word as the second component of the compound word, only once does *mandu* in *zēr mandu(m)* decline in the genitive, in an incantation text where one reads *zir man-di*. It is possible that the genitive declension of the word *mandu* in the Choga Gavaneh texts (Appendix 1.5-8) is also exceptional.

4.4.2 The Manda Men in Mari

---

228 The Neo-Babylonian *mandu* is discerned from the interchangeable use of the written forms Ummān-mandu and Ummān-manda in different manuscripts of Nabonidus’ Neo-Babylonian royal inscriptions (cf. Tables 1-2).
229 References collected in CAD Z 89.
230 Surpu VII: 70 in CAD Z 89.
The Manda men (LÚ Ma-an-da) in the administrative text from Mari\(^{231}\) may be denoting soldiers as with the texts from Choga Gavaneh. Certainly both the texts in Choga Gavaneh and the Mari text give Akkadian and Amorite names (the Sutean name in the Mari text can be seen in light of the fact that the Suteans also belong to the Amorites)\(^{232}\) for them.\(^{233}\) The terse context of the text from Mari prevents a clear conclusion.\(^{234}\) In any case, the Manda men are listed alongside Elamite individuals.\(^{235}\) Bottéro argues that the mention of ‘Manda-men’ alongside the gentilic ‘Elamites’ and absence of the post-positional land determinative KI with the word ‘Manda’ rules out the possibility Manda is a city name.\(^{236}\) The mention of the ‘Manda-men’ alongside the ‘Elamites’ in the administrative record may indicate that the Mari text assumes for the ‘Manda-men’ a distant eastern region similar to Elam. This distant region could be like the ‘terrain’ (mandum) denoted in Lugalbanda II. The Semitic names do not contradict this, since there are references to Amorite soldiers in Iran as discussed above (4.4.1). The extant evidence does not say how the Mari scribe came up with the form Ma-an-da. By itself the form suggests a closer relation with the term Ummān-manda than the term mandu in the Choga Gavaneh archival texts. The scribes from Mari could have been familiar with the term Ummān-manda from the omen literature or with an Old Babylonian version of the Cuthaean Legend available to them (currently there is no evidence to support this, but it is very likely) and employed its second component to describe soldiers or individuals of another occupation who to the Mari scribe were easterners from a region near Elam.

4.4.3 Ummān-manda in the Hittite Laws

Articles 54-55 of the Hittite laws concern a legal ruling about a group called the Ummān-manda (ERI.MEŠ MA-AN-DA), mentioned alongside the ‘Sala troops’ (ERI.MEŠ SA-A LA),\(^{237}\) provincial troops from a number of cities (Tamalki, Hatra, Zalpa, Tashiniya, Ḥemuwa) and certain professional groups (bowmen, carpenters,}

\(^{231}\) For the text and translation, see Appendix 1.4.
\(^{233}\) The names are discussed in 2.3.2.
\(^{234}\) They may also members of a (semi-) nomadic tribal group. Bottéro suggests the Mari text may concern paying ‘chargés d’affairs’ from such a tribe, ARM 7, p. 225.
\(^{235}\) ARM 7 221 2-5; Appendix 1.4.
\(^{236}\) ARM 7, p. 225.
\(^{237}\) This is even a more mysterious term because all three known manuscripts lack the city determinative, see these three variants in Appendix 1.13.
chariot drivers, the karuhali-functionaries). The law article says that they originally did not carry out luzzi-services and šahhan-services, but were obliged to do so in similar fashion to their ‘companions/colleagues’ (a-re-es-me-es), called the ‘sons of Hatti, men of ILKUM-services’, after the latter demanded wages. The terse context of the law article makes it nearly impossible to know who exactly the term Ummān-manda designates or how to make any inferences about them. Nonetheless, a few points can be made.

Beal observes that it is troops from less known areas such as the cities in article 54 of the Hittite laws that are usually called troops of GN rather than those from large allied or tributary states such as Arzawa or Mira. The troops from these cities served the Hittite king and were not necessarily stationed near their original homes. The cities mentioned in article 54 of the Hittite laws are located on the eastern and northern peripheries of the Hittite Empire. Komoróczy interpreted ERIN.MEŠ MA-AN-DA as ‘troops (from) ma-an-da’ and suggested it comprises the other subjects mentioned in article 54 of the Hittite laws, such as the troops from the cities at the periphery of the Hittite heartland. This proposition that the term is meant to designate troops in cities peripheral to the Hittite heartland clearly comes from Komoróczy’s etymology of the term Ummān-manda (which is based on the Sumerian word mada ‘countryside’). The problems with a mada etymology for Ummān-manda have already been discussed: mada is not the most appropriate word for the etymology of the term (2.5). Komoróczy’s attempt did nevertheless appreciate the role of the ‘peripheral area’ for the etymology of Ummān-manda and its role in the Hittite law article. The problem specific to Komoróczy’s interpretation of Ummān-manda in the Hittite law article is that the term is written alongside the ‘Sala troops’ (ERIN.MEŠ ŠA-A-LA). The significance of the latter is also not apparent. In any case, it is unlikely that both the Ummān-manda and the ‘Sala troops’ comprise all the other groups mentioned in the Hittite law article. It is more likely these two terms are referring to unique military units, and then other military groups are listed in the law article.

The Ummān-manda mentioned in the Hittite laws could be referring to a specific military unit originating from the provincial terrain, like the other subjects of article 54. A mandum etymology for the second component of the term Ummān-manda could relate the term to a type of peripheral terrain similar to the way the word mandum denotes distant terrain in Lugalbanda II. The troops from the various cities mentioned in article...
54 of the Hittite laws originate from peripheral areas and the military unit designated by the term Ummān-manda should not be an exception.

Beal suggests that the Ummān-manda in the Hittite laws may have been some sort of tribal troops, following some of the previous literature that treats Ummān-manda as “some sort of wild tribesmen” in Mesopotamia, and partly because an analogy that can be drawn with two other military groups who may have been tribal forces who on occasion served under the Hittites (ERIN.MES SUTI and the Ḫapiru). Beal suggests that the Ummān-manda in the Hittite laws may have been some sort of tribal troops, following some of the previous literature that treats Ummān-manda as “some sort of wild tribesmen” in Mesopotamia, and partly because an analogy that can be drawn with two other military groups who may have been tribal forces who on occasion served under the Hittites (ERIN.MES SUTI and the Ḫapiru).243 Some scholars criticizing the Indo-European etymology prevalent in earlier Hittitology alternatively suggest that the term Ummān-manda may denote a nomadic group situated east of mainland Hatti. This interesting idea assumes that even if it is not an Indo-European ethnonym, the term Ummān-manda does not refer to an ordinary military group, but perhaps refers to one not subject to the same military discipline as other units in article 54 of the Hittite laws, hence nomadic and less settled. Freydank interprets the changes brought about the luzzi and šahhan-services in articles 54 and 55 of the Hittite laws as the delimitation of privileges of old tribal aristocracy.246 Freydank’s interpretation would suggest the Ummān-manda are also part of a military aristocracy, but the evidence is not enough to decide on this conclusively. The šahhan and luzzi obligations may have been forfeited in previous Hittite practice because the Ummān-manda and the others mentioned in article 54 were originally from peripheral areas (without necessarily being nomadic). It is very likely there were no custom to oblige them like the Hittites in the Hatti heartland (those called ‘sons of Hatti’ in line 1 article 55 of the Hittite laws)247, where the obligations were traditionally carried out. The troops of the cities described in article 54 are not necessarily always stationed in those provincial cities but it can only be ascertained that they served the Hittite king. If they served in Hattuṣaš and came to that city from their own cities of origin, it is possible then that they did not by tradition carry out the luzzi and šahhan-services unlike those in the Hatti mainland, the ‘sons of Ḥatti’. This

243 Beal, op.cit., pp. 72-73.
244 The earliest works sought an Indo-European etymology and background for Ummān-manda in the Hittite laws. The proposed Indo-European etymologies for the term Ummān-manda are untenable, as explained in 2.3.
247 For the reference to the ‘sons of Hatti’ and their demand for a wage, see Article 55, lines 1-2 in Appendix 1.13.
disparity may have provoked the ‘sons of Ḫatti’ to react and ask for wages. In any case, the current evidence does not reveal whether the military unit called the Ummān-manda in the Hittite texts is nomadic or not.\(^{249}\)

The Hittites sometimes employed the Ḫapiru like a military unit, but the latter were probably outcasts and brigands.\(^{250}\) One Old Hittite treaty mentions the Ḫapiru alongside chariot fighters, the *LIM ŠERI*,\(^{251}\) and perchance the Ummān-manda mentioned next to the latter two units (the reading is not clear, the alternatives are ERIN.MEŠ *M[a-an-da(?)]* or ERIN.MEŠ U[KU.US...]).\(^{252}\) The reading is so unclear that I hesitate to incorporate it into a discussion of the Hittite use of the term Ummān-manda. If in fact there is an Ummān-manda in this text, then it would be similar to the chariot fighters and the *LIM ŠERI* mentioned in this Old Hittite text, supporting the idea that Ummān-manda in article 54 of the Hittite laws denotes a military unit mentioned alongside other occupations in that law article.

Beal’s analogy with other possible “tribal” groups to explain the Ummān-manda in the Hittite laws is more helpful, although it does not settle the question. ERIN.MEŠ *ŠUTI* is mentioned as a military unit in the service of both the Hittites and their enemies; it was presumably a unit of a particular type of troops (a type of light troops perhaps) who may have conducted themselves in an unusual manner (possibly with a real or an imagined link with the Suteans).\(^{253}\) It has been suggested this unit originally consisted of the Suteans or were merely tribal war parties in the manner of the Suteans.\(^{254}\) The term Ummān-manda probably denoted a unique military unit in the Hittite laws, but the available evidence relating to the laws does not tell us what was unique about them. The Ummān-manda mentioned in Ḫattušiliš I’s ‘Zukraši Text’ appears to be referring to a military unit lead by a certain Zalud/tiš – the name is most probably Hurrian (details discussed immediately below in 4.4.4). This may mean the Ummān-manda refers to a special military unit of Hurrian warriors, or a unit conducting themselves in a way linked to the Hurrians. Unfortunately not enough is known about the Ummān-manda in the Hittite laws or the ‘Zukraši Text’ to corroborate this suggestion.

\(^{249}\) Similarly the omen texts do not prove the Ummān-manda are nomadic (as discussed above in p. 68). There is a possibility that the administrative text from Mari that mentions some ‘Manda-men’ are referring to a (semi-) nomadic tribe, but the context of that text prevents a firm conclusion (discussed in 4.4.2).

\(^{250}\) Beal, *op.cit.*, pp. 108-112.

\(^{251}\) *LIM ŠERI* can be translated as ‘thousand of the countryside’ or ‘clansmen of the countryside’, and refers to provincial troops and various city garrisons, see *ibid.*, pp. 92-104.

\(^{252}\) See references in *ibid.*, pp. 72, n. 251; 110.


4.4.4 Ummān-manda in the ‘Zukrašī-Text’

The ‘Zukrašī-Text’, a fragmentary account of Ḫattušiliš I’s war against the powerful king of Ḫaššu, mentions Zukraši, the general of the armies of Aleppo, and Zalud/tiš, the leader of the Ummān-manda (GAL ERIN.MES MA-AN-DA), as the allies of Ḫaššu. The Ummān-manda appear here as a chief ally of Ḫaššu. How the Ummān-manda here relates to the one in the Hittite laws is not clear. There is not enough knowledge about either of them. Zalud/tiš seems to be at least the equal of Zukraši, the general of the armies of Aleppo. His communication with the king of Ḫaššu is fragmentary in the text. The Ummān-manda in the ‘Zukrašī Text’ are most probably a powerful military unit whose leader is in the service of the king of Aleppo at a level equal to the general Zukraši. Oller argues that the ‘Zukrašī Text’ is best understood within the context of the confrontation between the Hittites on the one hand, and the ruler of Ḫalab and his Ḫurrian allies on the other hand. Oller assumes that Zukraši in the Hittite text is the commander of the Ḫalabian forces, and tentatively suggests that Zāludi led the Hurrian troops. The Hittites and the Hurrians were competing for dominance in Syria. The Hurrian kingdoms in Upper Mesopotamia and Eastern Anatolia eventually joined together to form Mitanni, various local kingdoms pledged allegiance to the king of Mitanni. The formation of Mitanni is still shrouded in mystery. Aleppo is known to be allied with Mitanni during the interval between Ḫattušiliš I’s and Mursiliš I’s campaigns. The Hurrians had to oppose the Hittite expansion by all means available to them. It is possible Zalud/tiš was an independent Hurrian warlord, or a senior military official of Hurrian background working for Aleppo, or even a Mitannian military leader who was liasing with Zukraši the general of Aleppo and was

255 See text and translation in Appendix 1.14. There is another document that mentions the Ummān-manda and Aleppo. It probably belongs Ḫattušiliš I as well, but it is too fragmentary for analysis, see this text and its translation in Appendix 1.15.
256 KBo 7 14 14-15, see Appendix 1.14.
257 KBo 7 14 16ff, see Appendix 1.14.
259 Ibid., p. 67.
260 Discussion and references in ibid., pp. 202-203.
trying to hamper Ḫattušiliš I’s advance in Syria. His name Zālud/tiš may have an Indo-European element.\textsuperscript{263} Hurrian and Mitannian names often have elements that have been interpreted as Indo-European.\textsuperscript{264}

A mandum-etymology for the second component of the term Ummān-manda in the ‘Zukraši Text’ implies that to the text’s Hittite authors, the group designated by the term should be associated with a land considered distant by the Hittites. A region around Aleppo satisfies this; it is distant to the Anatolian Hittite heartland. The etymology also stands if the term Ummān-manda in the ‘Zukraši Text’ relates to a Hurrian-related military unit who allied with Aleppo during Ḫattušiliš I’s time. Hurrian polities are known to have existed at least from the Old Akkadian times onwards, and are usually situated in peripheral areas north and northeast of Mesopotamia proper.\textsuperscript{265} The Hurrian kingdom of Mitanni was centered around Waššukkani, which was most probably located in the Ḥābūr region or slightly north near Mardin.\textsuperscript{266}

\textbf{4.4.5 Ummān-manda in the Statue of Idrimi}

Among the factors that led Oller to opt for reading the term Ummān-manda (written Ummān-wanda) in Idrimi 46 was the possible link between the Ummān-manda and the Hurrians.\textsuperscript{267} Oller argues for a link between the Hurrians and the Ummān-manda based on the ‘Zukraši Text’ that mentions the Ummān-manda leader Zāludi; he could be leading Hurrian troops.\textsuperscript{268} Oller’s argument about Zāludi has been supported in \textbf{4.4.4}, and the term Ummān-manda used in the ‘Zukraši Text’ very possibly has some connection with the Hurrians. Oller cautiously

\textsuperscript{263} Discussed in ch. 2, p. 37.
\textsuperscript{267} Oller, \textit{The Autobiography of Idrimi}, p. 67. One of Oller’s arguments is that viewing the Ummān-manda as part of the invading Indo-Aryans would support a link between the Hurrians and the Ummān-manda because there is some sort of relationship between the Hurrians and the Indo-European movements in the second millennium. \textit{Ibid}., pp. 63-64. It has been previously argued that Ummān-manda is not an exclusive term for Indo-Europeans (2.3).
\textsuperscript{268} \textit{Ibid}., pp. 65-67.
notes that there is need for further evidence in order to confirm whether Zāludi actually led Hurrian troops. This strong possibility does leave the impression that Idrimi 46 is not an isolated use of the term Ummān-manda for the Hurrians.

The term Ummān-manda in Idrimi 46 may relate to the land of the Hurrians that would be considered distant by the Alalahians. In the Statue of Idrimi this distant land would be the land of the Hurrians, called ‘Ḫurri’ (Ḫur-riKI) in the expression ‘Hurrian troops’ (ERIN.MES Ḫur-ri.KI). Barattarna is given the alternating epithets ‘king of the Hurrian warriors’ (LUGAL ERIN.MES Ḫur-ri.KI) and ‘king of the Ummān-wanda’ (LUGAL ERIN.MEŠ(-an) wa-an-da) in the inscription on the Statue of Idrimi. This could mean the term Ummān-manda in Idrimi 46 stands for the Hurrian warriors, i.e. warriors who come from the land of Hurri. The Hurrian territory in question is most probably the land of Mitanni, centered around Waššukkani as mentioned in 4.4.4. This land was peripheral to Alalah and other Syrian city-states. Such a distant location supports the proposed mandum etymology for the second component of the term Ummān-manda. Barattarna is the king of the troops of the distant Hurrian land.

The Statue of Idrimi states that Idrimi the monarch of Alalah befriends the hostile Hurrian leader Barattarna and the other ‘kings of the Hurrian warriors’ (LUGAL.ḪLA ša ERIN.MES Ḫur-ri.KI) by communicating his fathers’ previous labours for the Hurrians and entering a peace-treaty with them. The historical background to Idrimi’s relationship with Barattarna is not well known. The treaty mentioned in the Idrimi Statue is clearly a vassal-treaty where Barattarna approves Idrimi’s rule over Alalah. Barattarna’s precise position in the Mitanni state structure is not clear but Idrimi needed his approval as well as the approval of the ‘kings of the Hurrian warriors’ to ascend to the throne of Alalah. This means the Hurrians were at a position of hegemony at the time of Idrimi. There are gaps of information about specifically how the scribal circles interpreted the rise of Hurrian polities to hegemony in Syria.

Ibid., p. 67.

The expression ‘Hurrian troops’ (ERIN.MES Ḫur-ri.KI) is found in Idrimi 44, 49.

Idrimi 44, 46. For the discussion of the written form of Ummān-wanda, see 1.3.

Idrimi 44-55.


It should be obvious the Statue of Idrimi uses the term for the Hurrians for reasons more important than the term’s etymology. Most of these will not be obvious without further evidence. It is possible, nonetheless, to make some serious suggestions. The scribal tradition in Alalah does not even need to know what the original etymology of Ummān-manda was. Nothing is known about when and under what circumstances the term Ummān-manda was coined in the Mesopotamian heartland. It can be surmised that the etymology of Ummān-manda was originally known, and went hand in hand with its use for foreign peoples in lands considered distant by scribes who wrote about them. I argue that as Mesopotamian scribal tradition spread, its terminology, including the term Ummān-manda, made inroads into places such as Alalah. The Alalahian scribal tradition that designated Barattarna’s Hurrian warriors as Ummān-manda may have been aware of the Cuthaean Legend, a Babylonian classic known at least from Middle Babylonian copies and mentioning the Ummān-manda.275 One noticeable similarity between the enemy Ummān-manda in the Cuthaean Legend and Barattarna’s Hurrian warriors mentioned in the text on the Statue of Idrimi is that they are both from a distant eastern land.276 The other similarity is that both are structured as a confederation. The Ummān-manda are brother kings leading military divisions ravaging the ancient Near East in the Middle and Standard Babylonian versions of the Cuthaean Legend277 whereas the Idrimi Statue speaks of the ‘kings of the Hurrian warriors’ (LUGAL.HI.LA is ERIN.MES Hur-ri.KI) who are crucial to decision-making in Mitanni.278 There is some level of similarity between the depiction of Idrimi who submitted to the Hurrian warriors according to the inscription on the Statue, and Naram-Sin who remained passive in face of the enemy Ummān-manda in the Cuthaean Legend. According to the story, Naram-Sin did nothing in face of the enemy’s destructive campaigns because the gods counseled him not to attack the enemy, and the Akkadian king understands his pacifism is not cowardice but is very heroic.279 Idrimi’s effort to become Barattarna’s vassal can be seen as a noble act when one recalls that Naram-Sin’s pacifism in the Cuthaean Legend was also honourable. I know of no other extant story in Mesopotamian tradition that honours acts of submission or pacifism.280 The extant Hittite version of the Cuthaean Legend also seems to have had a passage about pacifism similar to the Standard Babylonian version.281 Considering the Hittites had access to such a passage with the theme of pacifism in the Cuthaean Legend, it is possible that Alalah had a version of the Cuthaean Legend that also had Naram-Sin urging pacifism in the face of the Ummān-

275 The use of the term Ummān-manda in the Cuthaean Legend is discussed in 4.2.
276 For the land of the Hurrians, see pp. 111-112. For the mountainous abode of the enemy in the Cuthaean Legend, see 4.2.
277 Table 3. Discussed above in p. 80.
278 Idrimi 49.
279 These points about the depiction of Naram-Sin in the Cuthaean Legend will be discussed in 5.6.1-2.
280 The pacifism in the Standard Babylonian version of the Cuthaean Legend will be discussed later in 5.6.2.
281 This Hittite passage is discussed above in pp. 82-83.
manda. It cannot be a coincidence both Idrimi and Naram-Sin are interacting with the ‘Ummān-manda’. These affinities between the Hurrians in the Statue of Idrimi and the enemy in the Cuthaean Legend (discussed above in p. 115), both called Ummān-manda, could mean that the scribal tradition in Alalah used the term Ummān-manda for the Hurrians in reaction to their hegemony in Syria and the subsequent submission of cities such as Alalah. I propose that in time the designation became conventional. Idrimi refers to informing the ‘king of the Ummān-manda’ about the efforts of his ancestors when his fathers labored for them.\footnote{Idrimi 46-48.} This may hint that the Hurrians were called Ummān-manda before the time of Idrimi, or that their hegemony, which inspired the use of the term, went hand in hand with a history of Alalahian submission.

There is currently no known version of the Cuthaean Legend known from Alalah. However, as previously stated, the existence of this story in which the term Ummān-manda is used, is very likely.\footnote{The Hittites, who used the term Ummān-manda for contemporary groups, had access to Akkadian and Hittite versions of the Cuthaean Legend. The term Ummān-manda is clearly used in the Hittite version. The term’s absence in the Middle Babylonian version found in Hattusaš is probably an accident of text preservation. The Hittite texts using the term can be found in Appendix 1.11-15. They are discussed in various parts of ch. 4.} Later Alalahian scribes who merely kept Ummān-manda as a traditional designation for the Hurrians could have neglected the original reasons why these peoples were called Ummān-manda. Some may even have taken the term Ummān-wanda’s second component as a Hurrian word. It is possible that Šarruwa, the scribe of the Idrimi Statue, pronounced the second component of the term Ummān-manda as \textit{wanda} because he believed it was a Hurrian word.\footnote{This possibility is discussed in ch. 1, pp. 15-16.} It is also possible Alalahian scribal tradition pronounced it Ummān-wanda for no specific reason other than local custom. If, however, despite possible etymological misconceptions, Šarruwa was aware of the affinities between the Hurrians and the enemy in the Cuthaean Legend, he could have used the term Ummān-manda for the Hurrian warlords as a literary tool to describe how a righteous and powerful leader such as Idrimi and his legitimate predecessors submitted to a higher power – only because they are Ummān-manda. It is also possible he used the designation without being aware of any of its nuances, but merely followed scribal tradition that originally saw the affinities between the great enemy in the Cuthaean Legend and the Hurrians who dominated Syria.

The tradition of designating the Hurrians as Ummān-manda is known from the Statue of Idrimi and possibly the ‘Zukraši Text’ (4.4.4). It can further be suggested that at least in the case of Alalah (and possibly in similar references lost today), the use of the term Ummān-manda for Hurrians is a remnant from a time in history when
the Mitannians and/or other Hurrians suddenly arose in the political scene and established an empire to which many ancient Near Eastern city states offered unwilling submission. The Hurrian military structure, nobility and hierarchical system made its presence (e.g. *maryanni*) felt in Alalah and other cities under Mitannian rule. Some of the scribal circles of these city-states hoped that the gods would eventually take away the Hurrian hegemony just like they promise to take away the power of the Ummān-manda of the Cuthaean Legend, so they used the term for the Hurrian forces that established hegemony.

4.4.6 Ummān-manda in a Letter to the King of Ugarit

RS 17.286 is an Akkadian letter sent from Amurru to Ugarit. No personal names are given but the references to Pendīšenni (=Bentešina, written 'ZAG.SEŠ') help fix the correspondents to king Ammistāmu II son of Niqmepa and Šaušgamuwa son of Pendīšenni. Ammistāmu II has synchronisms with a number of rulers of the ancient Near East including the Hittite king Tudhaliya IV in the late 13th century BC. Ammistāmu II was a vassal of the Hittite Empire; his foreign policy was dictated through the kingdom of Carchemish which represented Hittite interests in Syria and most documents from his reign concern internal affairs with only a few disputes with regional powers such as Siyannu and Amurru. RS 17.286 is one of those letters that seem to be concerning a regional affair between Amurru and Ugarit. The document mentions that a group of ‘lords’ (*be-lu.MES*), called the Ummān-manda, resolved their animosity with Ammistāmu II’s father with a treaty, and now they approach the current king of Ugarit for the enforcement of this treaty. The letter dates to the time of Tudhaliya IV since it was during the latter’s reign that Šaušgamuwa ascended the throne of Amurru.

The letter is very terse and it is hard to know what the affair is and the identity of the Ummān-manda. Liverani suggests the term Ummān-manda in the Ugarit letter refers to mercenaries serving somewhere in

---

285 For a detailed study in the social stratification of Alalah IV under Hurrian rule, see von Dassow, *Social Stratification of Alalah under the Mitanni Empire*.
287 RS 17.286 9, 12.
291 For references to the text of RS 17.286, see Appendix 1.16.
Syria. Liverani bases this on the observation that the second millennium texts use the term for mercenaries and armed bands (as in the Hittite laws) and that the term Ummān-manda is rather used to designate ethnic populations in first millennium sources. The second millennium sources do often use the term for military units rather than ethnic groups, so the suggestion has found support.

The Idrimi Statue does refer to the Hurrians as the Ummān-manda (as discussed in 4.4.5), in which case the term is used for an ethnic group even if the focus could have been their military and nobility – the same could be said of the Medes and the Cimmerians, their military successes can draw attention to their armies. Even then, the term is used for the Hurrians, Cimmerians or Medes almost like an ethnonym. The possibility that Ummān-manda can designate an ethnic group in the second millennium relates also to the use of the term in the letter to Ugarit. The letter first provides a history of previous affairs concerning the Ummān-manda. The letter states that they are ‘lords’ (be-lu.MES) who were once hostile to Ammistamru II’s father Niqmepa. The latter requested from Pendišenni: ‘bring them’ (le-qa-šu-nu), so that he could conclude ‘peace’ (šul-ma). The then king of Amurru obliged and ‘took them’ (il-te-qè-šu-nu) and ‘sent them’ (um-ta-šar-šu-nu) to Niqmepa who then ‘made peace with them’ (šul-ma it-ti-šu-n[u] [i-t]e-pu-uš). Šaušgamuwa concluded his letter with a new delineated section that describes the current situation to the king of Ugarit.

18. i-na-an-na a-na muh-hi-ka
19. il-la-ku ki-i-me-e
20. i-qâb-bu-ni a-kán-na
21. i-na KASKAL-ni šu-ku-un-šu

(18.-21.) Now they are coming to you as they say: “Make firm! Set it going!”

---

294 Ibid., pp. 121-124.
296 RS 17.286 7 in Appendix 1.16.
297 RS 17.286 8-12 in Appendix 1.16.
298 RS 17.286 12-17 in Appendix 1.16.
299 RS 17.286 18-21 in Appendix 1.16.
The expression *i-na KASKAL-ni šu-ku-un-šu* (lit. ‘to place in the road’) occurs in the letters found in Ugarit and has, as Nougayrol observes, a sense of “mettre un affair (juridique) en train”. What the group called the Umma-nanda demands to be ‘set going’ is the treaty which the king of Amurru says they concluded with Niqmepa. The letter articulates their demand in a way that evokes the Middle Babylonian version of the Cuthaean Legend. The letter states ‘they are coming’ (*il-la-ku*) to the king of Ugarit ‘as they say’ (*ki-i-me-e i-gâb-bu-nî*). The Middle Babylonian version from Ḫattušas states the Ummān-manda approached (*is-sâ-an-qû-nim*) Naram-Sin, after which it is stated ‘thus [they s]end (a message), [t]hey, thus [saying]’ (*ki-a-am i-ša-[ap-pa-ru] [um-ma š]u-nu-ma*) – the passage is as follows.301

8'. *[a]-na KU[R A]-kâ-dê.KI is-sâ-an-qû-nim a-na K[UR...]
9'. *[iš]-sâ-a[n-qû]-nim-ma a-na KÂ.GAL A-kâ-dê.K[I a-na]
10'. 3N[a-r]a-am.4EN.ZU LUGAL ki-a-am i-ša-[ap-pa-ru]
11a'. [um-ma š]u-nu-ma

They approached the land of Akkade. To the [and of...]
[t]hey approa[ched], and to the gate of Akkade, [to]
Naram-Sin, the king, thus [they s]end (a message),
[t]hey, thus [saying]: (continued with the message)

The Middle Babylonian text from Ḫattušas breaks off after a number of fragmentary lines where one also finds the word ‘[they/they went’ (*i-il-la-a[k/ku]*) in two separate lines – unfortunately the lines are very fragmentary and there is no context.302 It is possible that the verb ‘[they/they went’ (*i-il-la-a[k/ku]*) refers to the Ummān-manda, paralleling the verb ‘they are coming’ (*il-la-ku*) in the letter to Ugarit. Even without this latter point, there is a parallel between the Ummān-manda approaching and speaking to the king in both the Middle Babylonian version of the Cuthaean Legend and the letter to Ugarit. If this is not a coincidence, it may be a subliminal (or perhaps intentional) expression of disdain towards the whole affair by calling the forces that have a dispute with the king of Ugarit as ‘the Ummān-manda’. The designation Ummān-manda and the parallel with the Middle Babylonian Cuthaean Legend could even be a discrete warning to the king of Ugarit that he should

300 PRU IV, p. 180, n. 1.
301 Bo Tupsinna I c 8’-11a’ in Appendix 1.11.
302 Bo Tupsinna I c 18’, 21’ in Appendix 1.11.
resolve this affair before it gets out of hand. What exactly happens to Naram-Sin after the enemy approaches him and talks to him in the Middle Babylonian version of the Cuthaean Legend is not preserved, but it can be no good. The extant text of the Middle Babylonian version does not contain the term Ummān-manda but the text is fragmentary and there are indications the absence of the term is an accident of preservation.\textsuperscript{303} There is no known copy of the Cuthaean Legend from Ugarit but the Middle Babylonian version quoted here is from Ḫattušaš and is a second millennium copy\textsuperscript{304} – it is reasonable to suppose Ugarit had a similar copy.

How could the group designated the Ummān-manda be disastrous to the king of Ugarit? Due to a lack of context, it is hard to know if the warning in the letter to Ugarit is open and credible. The identity of the group designated as Ummān-manda eludes me. They are a group that can be diplomatically engaged through bilateral arrangements between Amurru and Ugarit, and they have a conflict with the latter. During the time this letter to Ugarit was written, neither Ugarit nor Amurru could independently settle a problem with a major state without the mention of Carchemish due to Hittite rule (Carchemish controlled Ugarit’s external affairs as discussed above in p. 117). The interference of Carchemish is absent in the letter. The Ummān-manda in the letter to Ugarit could be a group of mercenaries, but they are talking about ‘peace’ as if they are another polity Ugarit has to have dealings with. This may suggest the group, these ‘lords’ (be-lu.MES), are in fact leaders of a (semi-) nomadic tribe in Syria (akin to the Suteans?) with a clash of interest with Ugarit and diplomatic ties with Amurru. The Mari text mentions ‘Manda-men’ with Amorite and Sutean names (pp. 35-36 above and 4.4.2). Perhaps there is a similar situation here – the group can be a (semi-) nomadic tribe or mercenaries. In either case the king of Amurru could be gently proposing his Ugaritic counterpart to settle the issue without undue harm to either of them.

The manūm etymology for the term Ummān-manda could have been verified if there was some hint in the letter to Ugarit about the peripheral whereabouts of the group designated by the term. Quite possibly they are located in an area peripheral to Ugarit, with a line of communication and transportation to and from both Amurru and Ugarit. The etymology of the term does not have a significant bearing on the interpretation of the text.

4.5 The Plausibility of the manūm Etymology

\textsuperscript{303} Discussed above in p. 83.
\textsuperscript{304} For the location of the text in Ḫattušaš, see KBo 19 98.
A survey of the second millennium and some other texts indicates a mandum etymology for Ummān-manda offers some plausible explanations but the use of the term in these texts is mainly influenced by other factors. Most of them are not discernible due to terse context, text breaks and gaps of information. Some mystery will have to remain. Only attestations that have a demonstrable link to the components of the term Ummān-manda will help understanding it further. The words *ummānum* and *ū-ma-nūm*, toponyms in Sargonic inscriptions and Gudea’s Statue B respectively, the word Manda (written *Ma-an-da*), the personal name of an enemy in a letter from Ešnunna (Tell Asmar), and similar words yet to be found, will have to be considered as having a purely phonetic and coincidental resemblance to the individual components of the term Ummān-manda until evidence comes forth that they somehow relate to a collective group or members of such a group (e.g. a tribal or military group, a nation), as do all the documents known to use the expression Ummān-manda or its second component. When the word mandum is posited as the etymology for the second component of the expression Ummān-manda, it can explain a more diverse range of references to the term more satisfactorily than any other lexeme. Add to this the fact that mandum, when taken as the etymology for the second component of Ummān-manda, can explain its variant written form Ummān-mandu(m) (3.1.1). In spite of the unavoidable gaps of evidence and the fact that tracking the etymology of a word with such diverse documentation is open to conjecture, the term Ummān-manda could very well mean ‘troops of the terrain (i.e. terrain of the distant eastern mountain regions)’.

For purposes of limitation, the following chapters will focus the discussion on the first millennium Neo-Assyrian and Neo-Babylonian texts that refer to the Ummān-manda. They have comparatively fewer problems than their second millennium counterparts and offer a number of texts that give historians a richer depiction of the same peoples for whom the term is used. These first millennium sources also offer some important evidence that will throw new light on how the Neo-Assyrians and the Neo-Babylonians used the term. The suggested etymology with mandum is able to explain in part why Ummān-manda has been used in the first millennium Assyrian and Babylonian texts for the Cimmerians and the Medes: both peoples come, in the eyes of the Mesopotamians, from the northern and eastern highlands. The Neo-Assyrian and Neo-Babylonian use of the term Ummān-manda needs to be discussed further. There are some additional things in need of explanation. For example, why do the Assyrians and Babylonians use the term exclusively for the Cimmerians and Medes respectively (when there were other people in the northern and eastern highlands)?

---

305 Westenholz notes these in Westenholz, *Legends of the Kings of Akkade*, pp. 265-266.
THE CUTHAEAN LEGEND IN THE NEO-ASSYRIAN AND NEO-BABYLONIAN INSCRIPTIONS

5.1 Creation of Tiamat

The earliest Neo-Assyrian reference to the Ummān-manda is found in the royal prisms of Esarhaddon, concerning the Cimmerian leader Teuşpaya who was defeated in the land of Hubuša.1 Teuşpaya is described as ‘the Cimmerian, Ummān-manda whose abode is distant’ (KUR (var.LU) Gi-mi-ra-a-a ERIN-man-da šá a-šar-šú ru-ú-qu).2 The variant writings of Ummān-manda (ERIN.ḪI.A-man-da, ERIN.ḪI.A ma-a’-[du])3 indicate Esarhaddon’s scribes believed the term literally meant ‘numerous army’, and this scribal etymology was borne out of reasons that have no relation whatsoever with what the Assyrians knew about the Cimmerians.4 The other Neo-Assyrian texts that use the term Ummān-manda for the Cimmerians date to the time of Assurbanipal and show no clear indication of this scribal etymology. There is no reason to think that the perceived etymology of the term influenced the specific Neo-Assyrian choice to denote the Cimmerians as the Ummān-manda.

Akkulanu identifies the Cimmerians with the Ummān-manda in an astrological report for Assurbanipal.5 Akkulanu predicts the Ummān-manda will eventually lose the hegemony they attained.6 In this case, the significance of the term Ummān-manda comes from its application to contemporary political events as a term used in an astrological omen.7 Assurbanipal’s dedicatory inscription for Marduk calls the Cimmerian king Tugdammē ‘the king of the Ummān-manda, the creation of Tiamat, likeness of…’ (LUGAL ERIN-man-da ta-bn̂it ti-GĔME tam-šil DINGIR…).8 The expression ‘creation of Tiamat’ (ta-bn̂it ti-GĔME) immediately recalls the Cuthaean Legend, where concerning the origin of the enemy it is stated that ‘Tiamat suckled them’ (Ti-a-matu ú-še-niq-šú-nu-št).9 It is further stated that ‘their womb Bešet-ilî made (them) well (lit. beautiful)’ (ša-sur-šú-
and that they grew up in the mountains, and, among other things, became ‘resplendent in beauty’ (šu-pu-u ba-nu-tu). Unfortunately Assurbanipal’s text is broken when it comes to the expression ‘likeness of…’ (tam-šīl DINGIR…). The latter expression is usually restored tam-šīl ṣ[gal-le-e], following the expression ‘likeness of the gallūi-demon’ (tam-šīl gal₄-lā) that is used to describe Te-Umman, an Elamite king, in two other inscriptions of Assurbanipal. The latter inscriptions have the expression without the divine determinative. The presence of the divine determinative may have led R. Borger to avoid any restoration for tam-šīl [...] in line 20 of Assurbanipal’s dedicatory inscription for Marduk. In any case, ‘the creation of Tiamat, likeness of…’ (tab-nit ti-GÈME tam-šīl DINGIR…) recalls the Cuthaean Legend, where Naram-Sin is not certain whether his enemies are human beings or demons. Haas recognises that the story seems to blame Naram-Sin’s uncertainty on the enemies’ upbringing in the mountains and their bird-like appearance. Tiamat’s role in their creation is explicitly stated in the story. Haas sees a similarity between the pseudo-demonic character of the enemy in the Cuthaean Legend and Assurbanipal’s demonisation of the leader of the Umma₄n-manda. Haas argues that use of the word gallūi as a customary insult in the myth of Anzū is to be taken together with a text where Gudea insults his enemy as an asakku-demon. Haas sees the use the word gallū in Assurbanipal’s inscription as similar to the myth of Anzū and Gudea’s text, and argues that gallūi has been used as a strong insult for both for the Cimmerian Tugdammē and the Elamite Te-Umman. Haas suggests that the reference to Tiamat in Assurbanipal’s text comes from her role in creating the forces of chaos in the Enûma Eliš and argues that the enemy in Assurbanipal’s text is associated with the forces of chaos the goddess created, similar to the myth. Haas’ interpretation explains well the pejorative usage of gallū, but more needs to be said about Tiamat because her role in Enûma Eliš does not concern the Ummān-manda, the very term used in Assurbanipal’s text alongside the expression ‘the creation of Tiamat’ in order to describe the Cimmerian king
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10 SB Tupsinna 35.
11 SB Tupsinna 36-37.
12 K 120B⁺, line 20 in Appendix 1.44.
16 SB Tupsinna 66-68.
18 SB Tupsinna 34. The role of Tiamat in regards to the animalistic appearance of the enemy in the Cuthaean Legend has been described in ch. 4, p. 80.
19 Haas, “Die Dämonisierung”, p. 43.
20 Ibid. p. 43.
21 Ibid. p. 43.
22 Ibid., pp. 43-44.
Tugdammē. The Cuthaean Legend, on the other hand, refers to both Tiamat and the Ummān-manda, and therefore clearly has a closer relationship with Assurbanipal’s expression ‘creation of Tiamat’ (tab-nit ti-GĒME). Tiamat’s role as the leader of the evil forces in the Enūma Eliš is not entirely irrelevant, but that role seems to be borne out of the general traditional association of the goddess with demonic forces that comes through in the Cuthaean Legend, where she suckles Naram-Sin’s enemies who are human beings with bird-like features, and they cause a lot of death and destruction to the king’s realm before their own destruction is foretold. Whatever Assurbanipal’s intentions may have been (insulting the enemy, etc.), the specific naming of the enemy both as Ummān-manda and the use of the expression ‘creation of Tiamat’ recalls the Standard Babylonian Cuthaean Legend. There is no demonic army in the Cuthaean Legend but actually there is a pseudo-demonic army. Naram-Sin confuses the enemy with types of demons: evil spirits (še-e-du), namtar-demons (NAM.TAR), [utuk]ka-demons([ú-tuk]-lī), evil lurkers (ra-bi-su lem-nu-te), the work of Enlil (šē-pir 4En-līl). 23 If the restoration tam-sīl 4[gal-le-e] holds, then the use of the word gallu can make sense as an allusion to Tiamat’s pseudo-demonic Ummān-manda in the Cuthaean Legend. The Cimmerian king would then be treated as a pseudo-demonic entity that is in the ‘likeness of [a gallu-demon]’ (tam-sīl 4[gal-le-e]), just like Naram-Sin’s enemies in the Cuthaean Legend. The word gallu is used as a term for the members of Tiamat’s army as a group in the Enūma Eliš (and in this context Wiggerman translates the word as ‘soldiers’). 24 Another hint at this comes from the interchangeability of the words šēdu and gallu in the series Utukki Limnutti. One of the demonic entities Naram-Sin thought his enemy might have been is šēdu, 25 which is also mentioned in Tablet V of the Utukki Limnutti series as šē-e-du mu-na-aš-sīr ma-a-ti ‘spirits (that are) harm bringers of the land’. 26 The same forces are also referred to as gallu-demons. 27

5.2 Seed of Ruin

A cylinder of Assurbanipal calls the same Tugdammē ‘king of the Ummān-manda, the see[d of ruin]’ (LUGAL ERIN-man-da NUMU[N ḥal-qā-ṭi-i]). 28 The broken part is reliably restored from IIT, another inscription of
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23 SB Tupsinna 67-68.
25 SB Tupsinna 67.
27 Tablet V iv 15 in ibid., p. 68.
28 BM 122616+, 19’ in Appendix 1.45.
Assurbanipal, which calls Tugdamme ‘the king of the seed of ruin’ (LUGAL NUMUN *hal-qā-tí-[i]). Another text fragment also uses the expression. Translating this expression while appreciating its connotations has been a bit challenging. Von Soden takes its second component to be *halqum* ‘lost, fugitive’, derived from the stem *halāqu* ‘to vanish, flee, destroy’, and then translates the expression beyond its literal sense as ‘Nomade(n)’. It seems, however, that the stem *halāqu* can be translated differently depending on the contexts, for example it can mean ‘be destroyed’ (of ship, walls, goods, animals, people). CAD covers for *halāqu* meanings such as ‘disappear, vanish, become missing or lost, perish, escape, flee’, but its entry on *zēr ḫalqātī* has ‘accursed, rebellious (as an invective referring to an ethnic group)’. Westenholz notes that one reason for this may be that the words *zēra* and *halāqu/hulluqu* are found in curses. Cogan and Tadmor translate *zēr ḫalqātī* as ‘ruinous breed’, deriving it from *halāqu* D. Fales and Lanfranchi emphasize the invective character of the expression, as it seems to be used in a letter to Esarhaddon (ABL 1237), and comment that Cogan and Tadmor’s ‘ruinous breed’ can be seen in accordance with CAD’s translation but also etymologically related to *halāqu* as suggested by von Soden. Some translations of the expression are ‘barbarians’, ‘vagabonds’, ‘vengeance maudite’, ‘the perditious seed’. Westenholz translates the expression *zēr ḫalqātī* as ‘brood of destruction’ with the aim of capturing the nuance of the second noun affected by the presence of the factitive verbal stem *hulluqu* ‘to destroy’ in the same line of the Standard Babylonian Cuthaean Legend.
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30 IIT 142-143. The expression NUMUN *hal-qā-tí-i* is also in SB Tupsinna 130.
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35 CDA 101.
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41 S. Parpola in SAA 10 111 15.

42 Fales and Lanfranchi, “ABL 1237”, p. 15.


Westenholz translates ‘desist! destroy not the brood of destruction!’ The context in the story is that ‘Venus’ (MUL.Dil-bat) commands Naram-Sin not to destroy the enemy, naming them zēr ḫalqātī, and details how they will be destroyed without the interference of the Old Akkadian king. The text then has Naram-Sin say:

147. DINGIR.MES GAL.MES a-[n]a bi-bil-ti ū-bil-šā-nu-ti

148. qa-ti a-na da-a-ki ul ū-bil-šā-nu-ti

147. The great gods delivered them for the uprooting

148. I did not deliver them to my hand for the kill

After this statement, Naram-Sin tells future rulers and princes not to interfere with the enemy regardless of whatever harm they may bring, and that being passive against them is the only way they can spare themselves. In such a context, the expression zēr ḫalqātī may refer to the enemy’s inevitable destruction by the gods or the temporary destruction and lawlessness they will cause until the gods annihilate them. I think the translation ‘seed of ruin’ can cover both these possibilities (that is not to say previous translations do not). The earliest known use of the expression zēr ḫalqātī ‘seed of ruin’ in the Neo-Assyrian era dates to Esarhaddon, the letter (ABL 1237) addressed to him reveals the distrust towards the Cimmerians who promise the king they will not interfere with an Assyrian expedition into Mannea. The Cimmerian promise not to interfere is interpreted as follows:

15. pi-ir-ṣa-tu šī-i NUMUN LŪ.ḥal-qa-ti-i šu-nu

16. [m]a-me-ti\(^{52}\) šā DINGIR ū a-de-e ul i-du-ū

15. That (is a) lie! These are (the) ‘seed of ruin’!

16. Oath of god or treaty they know not!

---

\(^{46}\) SB Tupsinna 130.


\(^{48}\) SB Tupsinna 128-146.

\(^{49}\) SB Tupsinna 147-148.

\(^{50}\) SB Tupsinna 149-180.


\(^{52}\) The reading of the word [m]a-me-ti follows the collation note in Fales and Lanfranchi, “ABL 1237”, p. 15, n. 12.
The statement ‘oath of god or treaty they know not!’ indicates the Cimmerians have a reputation for being unreliable and for not keeping oaths. The well-known curses found in Neo-Assyrian treaties make it clear that not keeping treaties have divine consequences. This means that the Cimmerians, with their non-adherence to oaths, inevitably have to perish (or the oaths lose credibility). The fact that the use of the expression zēr ḫalqāti ‘seed of ruin’ triggers in the letter the explanation that the Cimmerians have a deceitful and disregarding attitude towards the power of the oaths means they are bound to perish due to the inevitable consequence of not keeping their oaths. Calling them zēr ḫalqāti is an expression of their inevitable future destruction. Tugdammē is also reported in Assurbanipal’s inscriptions (particularly the inscription IIT) for not keeping the oaths – it is in the context of his disregard for the oaths that he is called zēr ḫalqāti, after which his inevitable destruction is described. The context can be summarised as follows: first the king of Tabal violates his loyalty oath to Assyria and allies himself with Tugdammē, called zēr ḫalqāti, but the Tabalian king’s body is burned in a fire – so Tabal resubmits to Assyria in fear. IIT concludes the narrative about the Cimmerian king as follows: Tugdammē attempts to launch a campaign on Assyria but he falls ill and fire falls upon him and his army, so he opts for a peace treaty and promises to submit to Assurbanipal. Tugdammē breaks his oath and as a consequence dies from a disease and infighting erupts amongst his army. Assurbanipal’s dedicatory inscription for Marduk, after calling Tugdammē the ‘Umma-n-manda’ and the ‘creation of Tiamat’, states also that the Cimmerian king violated his oath and Marduk scattered his forces. Assurbanipal’s texts depict the destruction of Cimmerian power as the vengeance of the gods without Assurbanipal’s interference.

Güterbock noted long ago that the designations zēr ḫalqāti and Umma-n-manda denote the same enemy in the Cuthaean Legend. Both terms are used not only for Naram-Sin’s enemies in the Cuthaean Legend but also for the Cimmerians in Neo-Assyrian texts. The enemy in both sources are destroyed by the gods, and without the interference of the monarch. The details of how and why the gods destroy the enemy in the Cuthaean Legend and the Neo-Assyrian sources differ only in details. Naram-Sin is divinely assured the enemy will be destroyed,

53 Many examples are found in SAA 2.
55 IIT 146-157.
56 IIT 157-162.
57 Text in Appendix 1.44.
and ‘Venus’ commands him to remain passive against them, as mentioned above in p. 126. There is a strong
emphasis on the role of vassal treaties in the Neo-Assyrian era under Esarhaddon and Assurbanipal.\footnote{For a discussion of these vassal treaties, see N. K. Weeks, \textit{Admonition and Curse: the Ancient Near Eastern
Treaty/Covenant Form as a Problem in Inter-Cultural Relationships}. (Journal for the study of the Old Testament.

Obligations are framed as oaths under the witness of the gods. Those who do not keep the oaths risk the curses
that come from the gods according to these treaties.\footnote{See for example the treaties edited in SAA 2.} This goes hand in hand with an emphasis in Esarhaddon’s
and Assurbanipal’s royal inscriptions on the power of the oaths in the history of their reigns; those who did not
keep their treaty obligations with the Assyrian king are punished by the gods.\footnote{This role of the oaths in the Neo-Assyrian depiction of the Ummān-manda is discussed at various points in ch. 6. I did not include those points in this section because that would divert the current discussion.} In royal ideology a key theme is
the pious king who trusts the gods in his dealings. This theme, when expressed by calling the enemy both
Ummān-manda and ‘seed of ruin’ (zēr ḫalqāṭī), strongly evokes the pious king in the Cuthaean Legend: Naram-
Sin trusts his gods will destroy the Ummān-manda, the ‘seed of ruin’, Assurbanipal trusts his gods will destroy
the Cimmerians/Ummān-manda, the ‘seed of ruin’.

5.3 Ummān-manda Evokes Parallels with the Cuthaean Legend

The use of expressions such as ‘creation of Tiamat’ (tabnit Tiamat) and ‘seed of ruin’ (zēr ḫalqāṭī) evokes
themes found in the Standard Babylonian Cuthaean Legend. The use of the term Ummān-manda in these
contexts means that it can evoke these themes even at times when it is used by itself.\footnote{One final Neo-Assyrian text that refers to the Ummān-manda, left unmentioned so far, is Assurbanipal’s letter
to the god Aššur which refers to the Ummān-manda as the ‘dangerous enemy’ (LU KUR ek-su) in K 3408 r. 13
in \textit{Appendix 1.43}. The reference is to the Cimmerians, even if there is no explicit statement to this effect,
because all the other Neo-Assyrian references to the Ummān-manda concern Cimmerians. In this text,
Assurbanipal complains that the Urartians are talking with Ummān-manda, ‘the dangerous enemy’, and makes
an appeal to his god. Unfortunately the text is poorly preserved (see the passage in \textit{Appendix 1.43}). The poor
preservation and an information gap about the historical context make the assessment a bit tentative, but there
are still some interesting points that are better discussed later in ch. 6, pp. 159-161.} Neo-Babylonian sources
depict the powerful Medes similar to the way the Neo-Assyrians depict the Cimmerians: both lose their power
without the interference of the monarch, just like the enemy in the Cuthaean Legend.

The Medes in Neo-Babylonian sources appear as a powerful force that wipes Assyria off the map as a
political power (described in the Gadd Chronicle\footnote{\textit{Appendix 1.50.}} and the Basalt Stela of Nabonidus\footnote{\textit{Appendix 1.46.}}). The Medes remain
untouchable until Cyrus of Anšan defeats them without Babylonian military interference (mentioned in Nabonidus’ Sippar Cylinder\textsuperscript{66}, the Cyrus Cylinder\textsuperscript{67}, ‘Nabonidus Chronicle’\textsuperscript{68}). All these Neo-Babylonian sources, except for the ‘Nabonidus Chronicle’, designate the Medes with the term Ummān-manda. The explicit use of the term Ummān-manda is the only outright hint at the parallels with the origin and fate of the enemy in the Standard Babylonian Cuthaean Legend. Various aspects of the unique characteristics of the Medes, their military might and their collapse can also be traced less directly in the Neo-Babylonian sources (including some peculiar use of words), and make apparent the parallels of the Medes with the characteristics of the Ummān-manda in the Standard Babylonian Cuthaean Legend. Some of these will now be discussed (chapter 7 will go into more detail).

The fall of the Assyrian Empire, with the crucial role of the Medes, is described in the Gadd Chronicle where Cyaxares, the king of the Medes, is called ‘king of the Ummān-manda’ (LUGAL ERIN-man-day\textsuperscript{69}) and the Medes are called Ummān-manda.\textsuperscript{70} There had been some inquiry into whether the term Ummān-manda denoted the Scythians and/or their leader instead of the Medes in the Gadd Chronicle but Zawadski provided a detailed critique of this hypothesis.\textsuperscript{71} There are convincing reasons to think that the term Ummān-manda always designates the Medes in the Gadd Chronicle. Ummān-manda always denotes the Medes in every other Neo-Babylonian document using the term. They clearly name the Median king Astyages as the king of the Ummān-manda.\textsuperscript{72} They state that Cyrus II defeated the Ummān-manda.\textsuperscript{73} Cyrus’ victory is clearly over the Medes. The Basalt-Stela of Nabonidus states that the ‘king of the Ummān-manda’ supported Nabopolassar against Assyria during the final Assyrio-Babylonian war.\textsuperscript{74} The ally of the Babylonian king against Assyria was the Median king Cyaxares. The Gadd Chronicle states that Cyaxares the king of the Medes and Nabopolassar established an alliance in the twelfth regnal year of the Babylonian king.\textsuperscript{75} The Chronicle then states, notwithstanding the text breaks, that in Nabopolassar’s fourteenth year, the ‘king of the Ummān-manda’ approached the Babylonian king

\textsuperscript{66} Appendix 1.47. Nabonidus’ Basalt-Stela implies the end of Median supremacy in relation to Harran but does not elaborate, Appendix 1.46. Nabonidus’ Harran Cylinder is fragmentary, but at least refers to the time when the Medes prevented the reconstruction of the temple Ehulhul in Harran and appeared invincible, Appendix 1.48. The whole question of whether the Medes actually controlled Harran or merely surrounded it is discussed in 7.2.1.

\textsuperscript{67} Appendix 1.49.

\textsuperscript{68} For the text, autograph and photo of the Nabonidus Chronicle, see BHT, pp. 110-118, pl. XI; ABC, pp. 104-111, pl. XVII. Henceforth abbreviated Nabonidus Chronicle.

\textsuperscript{69} Gadd Chronicle 38.

\textsuperscript{70} Gadd Chronicle 59, 65.


\textsuperscript{72} Sippar Cylinder I 29; Harran Cylinder I’ 14’.

\textsuperscript{73} Sippar Cylinder I 27-29; Cyrus Cylinder 13.

\textsuperscript{74} Basalt-Stela of Nabonidus II I’-41’.

\textsuperscript{75} Gadd Chronicle 29.
and ‘they saw each other’ (a-ha-mēš i-ta-am-ru).\(^76\). Cyaxares’ name appears alongside the ‘king of Akkad’ in the subsequent line that is unfortunately mostly broken,\(^77\) but the chronicle then describes their march along the river Tigris and the siege of Nineveh.\(^78\) It is stated that Cyaxares returned to his land after the siege was successful.\(^79\) It is clear that the king of the Ummān-manda who met the Babylonian king is the same person who allied with him in Nabonidus’ Basalt-Stela. This person is Cyaxares the Median king.

The Gadd Chronicle says that the Ummān-manda aided Nabopolassar against Ḥarran two years later.\(^80\) The chronicle then says the Ummān-manda withdrew after the Babylonians seized the city.\(^81\) The Basalt-Stela of Nabonidus states that the king of the Ummān-manda ruined Eḫulḫul, the temple of Ḥarran and because of them the temple was in ruin for 54 years before Nabonidus’ accession,\(^82\) and continued to be under their power.\(^83\) Nabonidus’ Sippar Cylinder identifies the Median king Astyages as the king of the Ummān-manda and states that Cyrus defeated him.\(^84\) This means that Nabonidus’ inscriptions are holding the Medes responsible for the destruction of Eḫulḫul 54 years before the accession of the Babylonian king. The Gadd Chronicle only says that the Ummān-manda supported Nabopolassar’s siege of Ḥarran and returned home after it was finished.\(^85\) Rollinger notes that the Gadd Chronicle and the Basalt-Stela of Nabonidus agree that Ḥarran was under attack 54 years before Nabonidus’ accession, which corresponds to the sixteenth year of Nabopolassar, so they are referring to the same siege of Ḥarran.\(^86\) The chronicle and Nabonidus’ inscriptions acknowledge the Medes were involved with Ḥarran, but they make different historical claims about what precisely the Medes did in the city and temple.\(^87\) The relevant Neo-Babylonian sources in effect agree that the Ummān-manda’s activities in Ḥarran were Median activities. They identify the Ummān-manda as the Medes and no one else. That the Medes were Babylon’s ally against Ḥarran is also confirmed by a letter written by the crown prince Nebuchadnezzar.\(^88\) The letter mentions Nabopolassar’s campaign against Ḥarran and refers to the ‘numerous forces of the Medes’ (e-mu-

---

\(^76\) Gadd Chronicle 38-39.
\(^77\) Gadd Chronicle 40.
\(^78\) Gadd Chronicle 41-46.
\(^79\) Gadd Chronicle 47.
\(^80\) Gadd Chronicle 59.
\(^81\) Gadd Chronicle 63-65.
\(^82\) Basalt-Stela of Nabonidus X 12’-14’.
\(^83\) Basalt-Stela of Nabonidus X 12’-14’; Sippar Cylinder I 22-23; Ḥarran Cylinder I’ 10’-13’.
\(^84\) Sippar Cylinder I 27-29.
\(^85\) Gadd Chronicle 58-65.
\(^87\) The contradictory historical information about the Medes and what they did in Ḥarran will be discussed in 7.2.1.
qu ma-a-du ša \textsc{KUR Ma-da-a-a}) accompanying the Babylonian king.\textsuperscript{89} Von Voigtlander has noted the significance of the crown prince’s letter in confirming that the Ummān-manda in the Gadd Chronicle are the Medes.\textsuperscript{90} The conclusion is that the references to the Ummān-manda during the time of Nabopolassar and Nabonidus are to their contemporary Median kings and the Median kingdom.

Given that the Neo-Babylonian sources use the term Ummān-manda for the Medes, a term which by itself can evoke the portrayal of the enemy in the Cuthaean Legend, and given that the Babylonians have a historical memory of the Medes that also parallel the picture of the enemy in the same story, the subtle use of words concerning the Medes attain a new significance.

5.4 ‘In an Evil Manner’

The Gadd Chronicle portrays the Medes as being more ‘terrible’ than the Babylonians. Nabopolassar fails to capture the city of Assur and fights back and forth against the Assyrian king, but then the Medes enter the scene and on their own effort attain military victories over the Assyrians.\textsuperscript{91} The Gadd Chronicle describes the victory they attained over the city of Assur without Babylonian involvement as ‘they, terribly (lit. in an evil manner), inflicted a defeat upon a great people’ (BAD\textsubscript{2} .BAD\textsubscript{3} .UN.ME GAL.ME \textit{lim-nīš GAR-an}).\textsuperscript{92} The use of the adverb \textit{limnīš} ‘terribly, in an evil manner’ is noteworthy. In the Cuthaean Legend, after Naram-Sin is commanded not to touch the enemy, the text says: ‘in future days Enlil will call them for evil (\textit{ana ḪUL-tīm}).\textsuperscript{93} From the context in the Cuthaean Legend, the ‘evil’ (\textit{lemattīm}) referred to may be their own eventual destruction,\textsuperscript{94} but more probably it is the temporary destruction they will cause until they are destroyed.\textsuperscript{95} It seems that the Gadd Chronicle is portraying the destruction caused by the Medes as more severe than that which was caused by the Babylonians. This explains why the adverb \textit{limnīš} ‘terribly, in an evil manner’ changes to \textit{mādiš} ‘greatly’ when the defeat of the Assyrians involves the Babylonians, by themselves as in ‘(they) greatly inflicted a defeat upon

\textsuperscript{89} \textit{Ibid.}, pp. 27-28: 10-11.
\textsuperscript{91} Gadd Chronicle 16-26.
\textsuperscript{92} Gadd Chronicle 27 in \textit{Appendix 1.50}.
\textsuperscript{93} SB Tupsinna 131.
\textsuperscript{94} Described in SB Tupsinna 132-146.
\textsuperscript{95} Described in SB Tupsinna 166-169.
Assyria’ (BAD₂.BAD₂ KUR.Aš-šur ma-a-diš GAR-an)⁹⁶ or together with the Medes, where the chronicle says ‘they greatly inflicted [a defeat of a great people]’ ([BAD₂.BAD₂ UN.ME G]AL.ME ma-a-diš GAR-an). The Medes appear as a distant invincible power that enters and leaves the theatre of war between Assyria and Babylonia, changing events in favour of the latter, but limniš ‘terribly, in an evil manner’.

The particular emphasis on the violent and invincible power of the Medes is maintained in Nabonidus’ inscriptions that consistently dub their leader as the ‘king of the Ummān-manda’ during the fall of Assyria.⁹⁸ They do not, however, name him.⁹⁹ He is known to be Cyaxares from the Gadd Chronicle. The subsequent Median king Astyages, the contemporary of Nabonidus, is explicitly named.¹⁰⁰ The Basalt-Stela of Nabonidus narrates Sennacherib’s sacrilegious destruction of Babylon and calls it ‘evil’ (ḪUL-tim).¹⁰¹ Once, Sennacherib’s destruction is described as being conducted ‘in an evil manner’ (lim[niš]).¹⁰² Marduk exacts revenge first by making his son kill Sennacherib¹⁰³ and then by causing the ‘king of the Ummān-manda’ to devastate Assyria similar to the way Sennacherib destroyed Babylon, and the Basalt-Stela describes this with formulaic phrases that express complete and sacrilegious demolition.¹⁰⁴ The Median king’s invincible military might is described with the epithet ‘the king of the Ummān-manda, who has no rival’ (LUGAL Um-man-ma-an-da ša ma-ḫi-ri la i-šu-u).¹⁰⁵ The sacrilegious destruction of all the sanctuaries in Subartu (i.e. Assyria) is attributed exclusively to him,¹⁰⁶ hence the epithet ‘the king of the Ummān-manda, the fearless’ (LUGAL Um-man-ma-an-da la a-di-ru)¹⁰⁷ because he does not fear the wrath of the gods that will come upon him after his sacrilegious acts.

Nabonidus’ Sippar Cylinder claims that the king of the Ummān-manda also obliterated the Eḫuḫul temple in Ḥarran at the command of the moon-god Šin.¹⁰⁸ The Basalt-Stela claims that he also carried out sacrilegious demolitions against those cities in the Babylonian border territory that were hostile to the ‘king of Akkad’, i.e.

---

⁹⁶ Gadd Chronicle 22 in Appendix 1.50.
⁹⁷ Gadd Chronicle 43 in Appendix 1.50.
⁹⁸ Basalt-Stela of Nabonidus II 3’, II 14’; Sippar Cylinder of Nabonidus I 11.
⁹⁹ The reasons Nabonidus’ inscriptions do not name Cyaxares but only name Astyages are discussed later in 7.2.2, as it would otherwise divert the current discussion.
¹⁰⁰ Sippar Cylinder of Nabonidus I 23, 24, 29 (Astyages is named in line 29 whereas lines 23-24 refer to him); Ḥarran Cylinder I’ 14’ in Appendix 1.48 also names Astyages.
¹⁰¹ Basalt-Stela of Nabonidus I 1’.
¹⁰² Basalt-Stela of Nabonidus I 6’.
¹⁰³ Basalt-Stela of Nabonidus I’ 35’-41’.
¹⁰⁴ Basalt-Stela of Nabonidus II’ 1’-13’.
¹⁰⁵ Basalt-Stela of Nabonidus II 3’-4’.
¹⁰⁶ Basalt-Stela of Nabonidus II 14’-19’.
¹⁰⁷ Basalt-Stela of Nabonidus II 14’-15’.
¹⁰⁸ Sippar Cylinder of Nabonidus I 7-12.
Nabopolassar. Allegedly Nabopolassar does not get involved in the sacrilegious destruction and grieves the will of Marduk that has brought this about. The Basalt-Stela concludes that the Eḫḫu行事。
Nabonidus’ texts reveal that there is also a sacrilegious aspect to the violent and destructive power of the Medes – and the Babylonians are unable to overcome them militarily. This depiction of the Medes is taken for granted in the Neo-Babylonian texts, and resembles the enemy in the Cuthaean Legend where Naram-Sin is unable to overpower the enemy but has to trust that the gods will eventually destroy them.

Nabonidus’ inscriptions have a specific agenda in incorporating this picture of the Medes as the violent destructive power that ruined Assyria: absolving the Babylonians from any involvement in sinful deeds such as pillaging the temples in Assyria (but in fact they clearly had a role, for example they participated in plundering the temples of Nineveh and Harran), probably with the purpose of facilitating or promoting Nabonidus’ project to renovate the temple of Harran, as part of his religious policy that seems to have an unorthodox focus on the moon-god Sin – a focus that disturbed the more traditional circles in Babylon who venerated Marduk as the supreme deity. The Basalt-Stela’s claim that the Medes were responsible for the destruction of sanctuaries during the final Assyrio-Babylonian war could have had some truth to it. Otherwise I wonder how such a claim can be made. It is very likely that Babylonian-Median relations became tense after the common enemy was destroyed. It is possible, for example, that there were certain types of Median military action short of invasion alongside the Babylonian border territory. The details to this are hard to ascertain because there are a lot of unknowns about Neo-Babylonian political history. In any case, it is clear that Nabonidus’ inscriptions are twisting the truth – this would not have been evident without the Gadd Chronicle that makes it clear the Babylonians did pillage temples in Nineveh and Harran. The Gadd Chronicle could have been composed anytime between the Neo-Babylonian era and the end of the Achaemenid Empire. The ‘Nabonidus Chronicle’ describes the fall of Astyages and the end of his Median kingdom in a similar way to Nabonidus’ inscriptions in that Cyrus defeats the Medes and captures Astyages without Babylonian interference.

---

122 Gadd Chronicle 45.
123 Gadd Chronicle 64.
124 Nabonidus’ unique religious policy has stirred considerable research, and yet a lot remains unknown. For an introduction to Nabonidus’ exaltation of Sin in his royal inscriptions, see P.-A. Beaulieu, The Reign of Nabonidus: King of Babylon 556 – 539. (Yale Near Eastern Researches, 10). New Haven and London. Yale University Press. 1989, pp. 43-65. How Nabonidus’ religious agenda relates to the Neo-Babylonian use of the term Ummān-manda will be discussed later in 7.2.2.
125 Basalt-Stela II 1’-41’.
126 Some aspects of this relationship will be discussed below as far as it relates to the use of the term Ummān-manda in 7.2.
127 Gadd Chronicle 45, 64.
128 CCK, pp. 1, 4-5.
129 Nabonidus Chronicle ii 1-4.
Chronicle does not use the term Umma-manda, but neither does it use the ethnonym ‘Mede’ (Ma-da-a-a), whereas the Gadd Chronicle, which helps reveal Nabonidus’ attempt to deny the historical fact of Babylonian involvement in the sacrilegious obliteration of Assyria, uses both the term Umma-manda and the ethnonym ‘Mede’ (Ma-da-a-a). The Cyrus Cylinder celebrates the victory of the Persian king Cyrus II over Nabonidus and also alludes to the same downfall of the Medes reported in the ‘Nabonidus Chronicle’, proclaiming the defeat of the Umma-manda at the hand of the Persian king: ‘the land of Gutium, the entire Umma-manda were made to submit to his feet’ (KUR. Qu-ti-i gi-mir Um-man-man-da ú-ka-an-ni-ša a-na še-pi-ša).

The Neo-Babylonian tradition of designating the Medes as Umma-manda, and the resemblance of this depiction to the enemy in the Cuthaean Legend, is not limited to Nabonidus’ texts but is used by them for other purposes as discussed above.

5.5 Detecting Markers and Parallels

More detail will be provided about the parallels between the Neo-Assyrian and Neo-Babylonian sources that mention the Umma-manda and the Standard Babylonian Cuthaean Legend in chapters 6 and 7. Before doing so, however, there is a need for direction and a methodological framework: what to make of this evidence and how to interpret it. How does all the data come together? How can the relationship between the Cuthaean Legend and the Neo-Assyrian/Neo-Babylonian sources be evaluated? I propose that the data described in 5.1-4 can be understood in the following way: the Neo-Assyrian/Neo-Babylonian sources that mention the Umma-manda contain a number of common expressions, phrases and more importantly, themes that find parallels in the Standard Babylonian Cuthaean Legend. These can best be explained as direct or indirect, deliberate or subliminal, literary allusions to the Standard Babylonian Cuthaean Legend. These allusions provide information about the significance of the term Umma-manda in Neo-Assyrian and Neo-Babylonian sources. A good starting point for discussing the methods used to detect literary allusions in cuneiform sources is Weissert’s study of literary allusions to the Enûma Elîš from a passage in one of Sennacherib’s royal inscriptions that depicts the battle of Halule (that took place between the Assyrians and the Babylonian-Elamite coalition in 691 BC).

130 The Babylonians are said to have sacked ‘city and temple’ in Nineveh and Ḫarran in Gadd Chronicle 45, 64.
131 The reasons why the Gadd Chronicle uses both the ethnonym ‘Mede’ and the term Umma-manda may seem a bit odd at first, but this is discussed later in 7.1.
132 Cyrus Cylinder 13 in Appendix 1.49.
133 E. Weissert, “Creating a Political Climate: Literary Allusions to Enûma Elîš in Sennacherib’s Account of the Battle of Halule” in Assyrien im Wandel der Zeiten: XXXIX Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale,
Weissert treats a ‘literary allusion’ as a reference to another literary composition in a given text, detectable with *markers*. Explicit markers are usually quotations or paraphrases that are easy to detect (e.g. a quotation from the ‘Fable of the Fox’ used in Sennacherib’s description of the battle of Halule to describe the frightened flight of the enemy). More delicate are implicit markers: novel usages in phrases or words recognised as standing out against the background of the fixed formulae and stock phrases (especially in documents such as Assyrian royal inscriptions). The term ‘literary allusion’ is usually reserved for those references with an implicit marker, and it is with implicit markers that Weissert detects the five intentional literary allusions to *Enûma Eliš* from Sennacherib’s account of the battle of Halule in one of his royal inscriptions, the Oriental Institute Prism.

Weissert first detects words and phrases that are unique (standing out against the stock phrases and expressions of royal inscriptions) in the account of the battle of Halule, and at the same time are common with *Enûma Eliš*: these unique words and phrases are interpreted as implicit markers that reveal the literary allusions. The royal inscription is therefore the alluding text, the evoked text is *Enûma Eliš*, and the literary allusions are found with the implicit markers that unveil parallels between the two texts. These parallels help Weissert interpret the literary allusions. The description of the Babylonians as ‘wicked demons’ (*gallû* = *lemnu*/*lemnu*/*tum*/*tum*/*tum*) in the royal inscription resembles the army that aided Tiamat against Marduk. The use of the adverbial phrase ‘not (befitting) to his destiny’ (*ana la simātīšu*) is referring to the inappropriate enthronement of Mušezib-Marduk to the Babylonian throne by alluding to Tiamat appointing Kingu as puppet ruler in *Enûma Eliš*.


134 Ibid., p. 192.  
135 Ibid., p. 192, n. 7.  
136 Ibid., p. 192.  
137 Ibid., pp. 191-195.  
138 Ibid., pp. 193-195.  
139 Ibid., p. 193. Weissert notes that the link between *gallû* and its role in Tiamat’s army is evident even when the text of the *Enûma Eliš* contains only the word *gallû* but not the adjective ‘wicked’ (*lemnu*/*lemnu*/*tum*/*tum*/*tum*), and even when the expression *gallû lemmu/lemmu*/*tum*/*tum*/*tum* is used often in Mesopotamian literature, *ibid.*, p. 193, n. 14. Weissert argues that the association of *gallû*-demons with Tiamat occurs in an inscription of Assurbanipal, where Tugdamme is called “the likeness of [a demon]”, *tamsūš* *[gallû]*, *ibid.*, p. 193, n. 14. The restoration “the likeness of [a demon]”, *tamsūš* *[gallû]* is plausible, see 5.1. In any case, Tiamat is traditionally associated with demonic and evil forces, supporting the idea that the expression *gallû lemmu*/*lemmu*/*tum*/*tum*/*tum*, “wicked demons” evokes the demonic armies of Tiamat in *Enûma Eliš*. If there was any direct link to the expression *tamsūš gallû* in Assurbanipal’s inscriptions (BIWA, p. 97: B IV 74, C V 80), then the Oriental Prism might have had *tamsūš gallû* in place of *gallû lemmu*/*tum*/*tum*. Furthermore, the use of the expression *gallû lemmu/lemmu*/*tum*/*tum*/*tum* in other contexts could subliminally also conjure up images of an evil army bound to be defeated based on Tiamat’s traditional role in this regard.  
adverb ‘quickly’ (urruḫiš) connects the hastiness of the gods who aid Sennacherib and the impatience of Anšar who sends Marduk against the enemy.\textsuperscript{141} The rare idiom ‘to slash the throat’ (napištam parā’u) is used as an epithet for Sennacherib’s arrow and parallels the weapon given to Marduk to slash Tiamat’s throat, revealing the motif of endowing the warrior with a deadly weapon.\textsuperscript{142} The archaic Akkadian form of the word for ‘head’, rāṣu, is used instead of the usual form rēšu, both in the text of Sennacherib and in the Enûma Elisî in both texts the hero (Sennacherib/Âšûr in the Assyrian version of the Enûma Elisî) is crowned for war.\textsuperscript{143}

Weissert argues that the allusions in Sennacherib’s account were intentional – they aimed to bring new connotations to the battle of Halule in the narrative and to transfigure the battle onto a mythic level for the purposes of anti-Babylonian propaganda.\textsuperscript{144} Weissert observes that the markers of the literary allusions are concentrated around the battle of Halule and argues that this means the allusions are not unconscious.\textsuperscript{145} Weissert also argues that the political background was fertile for a conscious use of the evoked text (Enûma Elisî), as inferred from some texts relating to Sennacherib’s anti-Babylonian theological reforms that allude to Enûma Elisî.\textsuperscript{146} The third argument for an intentional allusion is the presence of a literary allusion to another literary work (Erra Epic) in the same text of Sennacherib.\textsuperscript{147} The final argument is based on the literary elevation of Sennacherib’s instruments of war to the rank of royalty with descriptions as royal titles: Weissert argues that such an elevation serves the ideological purpose of the allusions, i. e. the transfiguration of the battle of Halule to the mythic sphere in which the enemy becomes a demonic force and must be totally destroyed.\textsuperscript{148} Weissert discusses how and when this could have been done – and later discontinued – within the context of what is known to have actually happened in the battle of Halule, the ideological climate of Assyrian-Babylonian relations during and after the battle, and their impact on the narratives of the battle found in different inscriptions of Sennacherib.\textsuperscript{149}

The exact ideological purpose (propaganda, demonisation of the enemy, sheer hatred expressed with literature, etc.) behind the literary allusions is more difficult to ascertain and more open to interpretation (there is the web

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{141} Ibid., p. 194.
\item \textsuperscript{142} Ibid., p. 194-195. Weissert notes that the idiom napištam parā’u was used later in the narrative of Sennacherib’s text and also once perhaps during Tiglath-pileser III’s reign, see ibid., p. 194, n. 24.
\item \textsuperscript{143} Ibid., p.195.
\item \textsuperscript{144} Ibid., pp. 195-197.
\item \textsuperscript{145} Ibid., pp. 195-196.
\item \textsuperscript{146} Ibid., p. 196, n. 33-35
\item \textsuperscript{147} Ibid., p. 196.
\item \textsuperscript{148} Ibid., pp. 196-197.
\item \textsuperscript{149} Ibid., pp. 197-202.
\end{itemize}
of historical and literary evidence that needs to be assessed relating to Sennacherib’s reign with its unique uncertainties), but I think Weissert has made a good case about what type of evidence one needs in order to demonstrate that literary allusions exist, and are intentional: the markers are concentrated on a specific topic or passage, there is a political background that encourages literary allusions for some type of message (propaganda, demonisation of the enemy, etc.), there may be literary allusions to other text(s), and hopefully there is some evidence for specific political, ideological or other factors that would explain why the text’s author would be motivated to make these literary allusions. There is enough ground to think a literary allusion is intentional if there are a number of them in a specific passage or topic and if some type of authorial motivation can be shown to be plausible – even when the specific authorial intention or the precise Sitz im Leben may be open to interpretation. Weissert’s study solely focuses on the relationship between Enûma Eliš and one specific passage from Sennacherib’s inscriptions, and looks only at intentional literary allusions. Weissert’s work gives a clear picture of how a marker unveils a literary allusion to the evoked text (Enûma Eliš) that is found in the alluding text (Sennacherib’s text). The evidence of literary allusions between the Cuthaean Legend and the Neo-Assyrian/Neo-Babylonian sources mentioning the Ummān-manda present a slightly different situation. The alluding texts are multiple and not all their literary allusions have political intentions.

An author may have motives other than politics or ideology to make a literary allusion. Weissert mentions scribal erudition and amusement (for the author and/or the reader), which, in the case of Neo-Assyrian inscriptions, can be attributed to the highly traditional literary atmosphere within the learned circles of their royal court (e.g. Assurbanipal’s Tarbis inscription uses the epithets of the god Isûm from the Erra Epic, and this literary reference is only an adornment because it does not provide a new insight into the text, but only clarifies the epithet). These can be called ornamental allusions. Scribes steeped in the literary tradition could also make subliminal literary allusions. For example Parpola detects literary allusions in an emotional and personal letter of petition written by Urad-Gula to Assurbanipal, and it is not clear whether the author is influenced subliminally from his educational and literary background or whether they are deliberately grafted into the letter. The dividing line between the intentional and the subliminal is not always easy to define. The Neo-Assyrian and Neo-Babylonian scribes were steeped in the literary tradition and it is possible that the various (political, etc.) situations they faced could induce them to make subliminal literary allusions as well as intentional or ornamental

---

150 Ibid., pp. 192-193.
ones. Intentional or subliminal, the implicit markers can uncover literary allusions. Furthermore, the position of
the implicit markers in the passage and context of the alluding and evoked texts are relevant. The passages and
the context of the evoked text can be compared with that of the alluding text(s) to see if the former contributes to
the interpretation of the latter. Any improvement in understanding the context of the alluding text will also
improve the interpretation of various words used therein, including a word such as Umma

The main impetus for literary allusions comes from certain parallels the scribe(s) of the alluding text(s)
perceive (intentionally or subliminally) in their texts with the evoked text. In light of this, the implicit markers
should be seen as literary tools that express these parallels perceived by the scribes. This partly explains, for
example, how Weissert was able to detect literary allusions even when some of the unique words that marked
them could be found elsewhere in the Oriental Institute Prism or another text without making a literary
allusion. In Weissert’s case the allusions are intentional and very specific (one text to another), and finding the
markers is more important than looking for the parallels between the evoked and alluding text. There are clear
markers in the Neo-Assyrian/Neo-Babylonian sources (e.g. Umma-manda, ‘seed of ruin’) but the main impetus
comes from the acute parallels between the depiction of the Cimmerians or the Medes called Umma-manda in
the Neo-Assyrian/Neo-Babylonian sources (alluding texts) and the Umma-manda in the Cuthaean Legend
(evoked text). These are partially described above 5.1-4. The markers are still important; without them the
literary allusions are harder to prove despite the parallels between certain texts. Sometimes, however, the
parallels are less obvious at first glance and become apparent only after reading both the alluding and evoked
texts.

The markers that unveil literary allusions to the Standard Babylonian Cuthaean Legend (the evoked text)
made by the Neo-Assyrian/Neo-Babylonian documents mentioning the Ummā manda (the alluding texts) are
only the tip of the iceberg; they are the inevitable produce – intentional or subliminal – of the parallels seen by
the scribes between the Ummā manda of the Cuthaean Legend and the Ummā manda in their own times: the
Cimmerians for the Neo-Assyrians, and the Medes for the Neo-Babylonians.

5.5.1 A Conducive Background for Literary Allusions

---

152 See the examples in nn. 139, 142 above.
The Standard Babylonian version of the Cuthaean Legend has been discovered in a number of manuscripts.\textsuperscript{153} seven Neo-Assyrian copies (six from Nineveh, one from Sultantepe) and one Neo-Babylonian (perhaps from Kis).\textsuperscript{154} The story was taught in scribal schools. This is evident from school tablets copying literary and historiographic texts, including the Cuthaean Legend and the Weidner Chronicle.\textsuperscript{155} A composition (K 1351) ridiculing a certain Bel-ētir opens with the phrase ‘open the tablet-box, read the stele’ (\textit{tup-sin-na BAD-ma N\underline{a}_{4}.NA.RÜ.A šī-\allowbreak-[as-si…] xxx}).\textsuperscript{156} This phrase also opens the Standard Babylonian Cuthaean Legend.\textsuperscript{157} This story’s native title is \textit{tupo\textsuperscript{3}nna pī\textsuperscript{3}ma} “Open the tablet box”.\textsuperscript{158} Westenholz observes the composition (K 1351) is parodying the Cuthaean Legend to ridicule Bēl-ētir.\textsuperscript{159} This document indicates an author is willing to display their intimate knowledge of the Cuthaean Legend and allude to it for their own purposes when composing another document. The term Ummān-manda is also found in omen texts with direct or indirect links to the Cuthaean Legend.\textsuperscript{160} The omen literature is obviously a key occupation of the scribal circles. This means the term Ummān-manda was familiar to them both from the Cuthaean Legend and the omens. The current number of references to the Ummān-manda in the omen literature cannot be considered complete because many omen tablets are probably lost, not to mention that many still await being read in museums. Esarhaddon, Assurbanipal and Nabonidus, the royal patrons of all the Neo-Assyrian and most of the Neo-Babylonian inscriptions mentioning the Ummān-manda,\textsuperscript{161} were well disposed towards Mesopotamian divination and literature – their piety suggests this. The Assyrian kings traditionally portrayed themselves as wise, competent and pious kings.\textsuperscript{162} Fales and Lanfranchi observe that the royal inscriptions of Esarhaddon and Assurbanipal make more allusions to

\textsuperscript{153} Even if we may not have the exact manuscript of the Cuthaean Legend that produced the literary allusions in the Neo-Assyrian and Neo-Babylonian documents, the ability to detect implicit markers and ascertain parallels using the text as it is known to Assyriology today means we are methodologically on safe ground. Similarly, Weissert used the Babylonian version of the \textit{Enûma Elîs} to detect the literary allusions in Sennacherib’s Oriental Institute Prism while observing the king had used an Assyrian version of the myth, Weissert, “Literary Allusions to \textit{Enûma Elîs}”, p. 193, n. 12, p. 195. For information about the development of the Assyrian version, see W. G. Lambert, “The Assyrian Recension of \textit{Enûma Elîs}” in \textit{Assyriien im Wandel der Zeiten: XXXIX\textsuperscript{e} Rencontre Assyrilologique Internationale, Heidelberg 6.-10. Juli 1992}. H. Waetzoldt and H. Hauptmann, eds. (Heidelberg Studien zum Alten Orient – Band 6). Heidelberg. Heidelberger Orientverlag. 1997, pp. 77-79.

\textsuperscript{154} Westenholz, \textit{Legends of the Kings of Akkade}, pp. 296-297, 332.


\textsuperscript{156} SAA 3 29 1.

\textsuperscript{157} SB Tupsinna 1.

\textsuperscript{158} The title of the composition is discussed in ch. 1, n. 16.

\textsuperscript{159} Westenholz, \textit{Legends of the Kings of Akkade}, p. 263.

\textsuperscript{160} Various points on these links are discussed in 4.1.2, 4.2.1.1-2.

\textsuperscript{161} Cyrus the Great is obviously an exception to this but the Cyrus Cylinder is a standard product of Neo-Babylonian scribes, who portrayed the Persian king as a traditional Mesopotamian monarch.

divination than those of other kings. Fales and Lanfranchi suggest that the reason for the emphasis on
divination and prophecy was to promote themselves as benevolent wise kings. Starr suggests that the king’s
poor state of health could have contributed to his open-mindedness about divination, and it was not just
“superstition”. Esarhaddon states the gods chose him over his brothers against whom he fought a civil war.
This belief that the gods gave him his seat of power may have influenced the king’s more pious character. Both
Esarhaddon and Assurbanipal demanded to know the observations and interpretations of the astrologers.
Esarhaddon closely oversaw the copying of the haruspices’ corpus. Assurbanipal also appears pious. For
example he demands to be reminded of rituals. He claims to have mastered extispicy. Assurbanipal
personally oversaw the editing of various tablets including celestial omens and read them. The haruspices
Marduk-šumu-usur, Nasiru and Tabnī wrote to the king, probably Assurbanipal, that their own series need to be
seen. Assurbanipal and Nabonidus stand out with their antiquarian interests. Assurbanipal claims to have
the ability to read “the elaborate tablet of Sumer, the obscure Akkadian difficult to keep in order” (kam-mu nak-la
ša šumeri su-ul-la-la ak-ka-du-u ana šu-te-sa-ri aš-ta) alongside omen texts and antediluvian stone
inscriptions. Nabonidus declares that he unearthed and restored the statue of Sargon, the founder of the Old
Akkadian kingdom, and excavated the palace of Naram-Sin in Agade. To sum up all this evidence, the scribes
were clearly well exposed to the Cuthaean Legend and the omen literature that mentioned the Umma
4
presume that the story enjoyed royal approval, since Esarhaddon, Assurbanipal and Nabonidus display piety,
which also assumes an interest in traditional Mesopotamian literature and antiquity. What is known about

Action in the Royal Inscriptions of the Sargonid Dynasty” Oracles et prophéties dans l’antiquité. Actes du
Colloque de Strasbourg 15-17 Juin 1995. W. Heintz, ed. (Université des sciences humaines de Strasbourg,
104.
164 Ibid., pp. 110-114.
165 SAA IV, pp. XXXII-XXXIV.
166 Nin A I 8- II 11 in R. Borger, Die Inschriften Asarhaddons Königs von Assyrien, (Archiv für Orientforschung
167 See the letters in SAA 8 and SAA 10.
168 S. Parpola, “A Letter from Samaš-šumu-ukīn to Esarhaddon” Iraq 34 (1972), pp. 21-34; SAA 10 177 15 r. 5.
169 The scholar Akkulanu reminds the king of a ritual in Tarbisu lest the king gets angry at him for not reminding
him, SAA 10 93 7- r. 6.
171 SAA 10 101-103.
172 SAA 10 177.
173 References and discussion in P.-A. Beaulieu, “Antiquarianism and the Concern for the Past in the Neo-
175 For Nabonidus’ archaeological pursuits, see G. Goossens, “Les recherches historiques a l’époque néo-
babylonienne” RA 42 (1948), pp. 149-159.
Assurbanipal and Nabonidus suggests that they would cherish the Cuthaean Legend, a *narrī*-text purporting to be left from Naram-Sin himself, teaching wisdom about the powerful enemy Ummān-manda – the value of trusting the will of the gods through divination even if it means temporarily submitting to this enemy. This environment is conducive to making literary allusions to the Cuthaean Legend – one of those popular traditional Mesopotamian stories that shaped tastes and thoughts – and provides the obvious background for some of the evidence sketched above concerning literary allusions made to the Cuthaean Legend through the mention of Ummān-manda and related implicit markers in Neo-Assyrian and Neo-Babylonian sources (5.1-4).

5.6 Emerging Patterns

It becomes clear that the Neo-Assyrian and Neo-Babylonian documents used the term Ummān-manda and other implicit markers to allude to the popular Standard Babylonian Cuthaean Legend. This has an impact on the interpretation of the parts of the alluding texts that contain the implicit markers. The markers reveal parallels between the evoked text (the Standard Babylonian Cuthaean Legend) and the Neo-Assyrian/Neo-Babylonian alluding texts. It is not always possible to know the specific intention behind a literary allusion. It is possible that sometimes a literary allusion to the Cuthaean Legend is made indirectly and a third text that alludes to the Cuthaean Legend has influenced the alluding text. Even in these circumstances, the parallels between them and the Standard Babylonian Cuthaean Legend, confirmed by implicit markers, will provide indispensable information about the layers of meaning attributed to the term Ummān-manda in the Neo-Assyrian and Neo-Babylonian alluding texts. These parallels are detected by the markers but are not limited to them – so they need detailed discussion. The emerging patterns and information improve our understanding of the term Ummān-manda: its significance and why Neo-Assyrians and Neo-Babylonians exclusively identified the Cimmerians and Medes with this term. Such a discussion requires that I first give a brief account of the Cuthaean Legend. The summary of the story’s themes will facilitate the discussion in the ensuing chapters.

5.6.1 Cuthaean Legend: a Summary

The call to remain passive in the face of the Ummān-manda in the Cuthaean Legend is discussed later in 5.6.2.

Discussed above in pp. 137-139.

For example Assurbanipal’s influence on Nabonidus in the use of the term Ummān-manda. This will be discussed in 7.2.3.
The Standard Babylonian recension of the Cuthaean Legend opens with a declaration by Naram-Sin that this is his stela (\textit{narû}) for distant days.\textsuperscript{179} In the midst of many lacuna that make it hard to learn the details, Naram-Sin distinguishes himself from his predecessor Enmerkar who failed to leave a stela concerning the wisdom and weapons by which he defeated the enemy who the story calls ‘those troops’ (\textit{ERIN šu-a-tu}).\textsuperscript{180} The text then describes a mountain people with bird like features. Anubanini is their king and Melili their queen. They consist of seven brothers and 360,000 troops. They conquer and pillage the frontiers of Akkad from the northwest and the north to the east and southeast.\textsuperscript{181} They are called Ummân-manda when it is said they attained ‘greatness’ (\textit{narbû}) as a result of their destructive expansion.\textsuperscript{182}

Naram-Sin commissions his soldier to prick the enemy to see if they bleed and learns that they are mortal despite their appearance and strength, but the great gods – through divination – command Naram-Sin not to campaign against them.\textsuperscript{183} The king rejects the divine will, follows his own heart, attacks the powerful and destructive enemy and consequently suffers three great defeats.\textsuperscript{184} Naram-Sin falls into despair at the ensuing terror, famine and destruction in his dominion.\textsuperscript{185} Ea addresses the gods, and despite the lacuna in the text, it is obvious that Naram-Sin devoutly repents and queries the will of the gods in divination, but the precise result cannot be discerned due to the lacuna in the text – the omen(s) seem to involve harm against the enemy.\textsuperscript{186} The text then has Naram-Sin narrating the capture of enemy soldiers and their subsequent release due to the command of the great gods for their requital through divination.\textsuperscript{187} ‘Venus’ addresses Naram-Sin and commands him not to destroy the ‘seed of ruin’ (\textit{zêr halqâti}) and details how the gods will cause them to be destroyed without a military offensive from Akkad.\textsuperscript{188} Naram-Sin then states in the first person that he obeyed the gods and left the enemy to the gods instead of his own hands, and declares that he leaves behind a stela (\textit{narû}) in Cutha so that future rulers bless him, learn not to despair in the face of a seemingly unbeatable enemy, remain passive no matter how humiliating and trust the great gods in order to survive.\textsuperscript{189}

\textsuperscript{179} SB Tupsinna 1-3.  
\textsuperscript{180} SB Tupsinna 4-30.  
\textsuperscript{181} SB Tupsinna 31-62.  
\textsuperscript{182} SB Tupsinna 54.  
\textsuperscript{183} SB Tupsinna 63-78.  
\textsuperscript{184} SB Tupsinna 79-88.  
\textsuperscript{185} SB Tupsinna 88-98.  
\textsuperscript{186} SB Tupsinna 99-119.  
\textsuperscript{187} SB Tupsinna 120-127.  
\textsuperscript{188} SB Tupsinna 128-146.  
\textsuperscript{189} SB Tupsinna 147-180.
5.6.2 Converting Humiliation into ‘Heroism’

The Cuthaean Legend prescribes a series of reactions against the Umma-n-manda that amounts to a form of pacifism in the face of the powerful enemy. After having described Venus’ prediction that the Umma-n-manda will be destroyed, the Cuthaean Legend ends with Naram-Sin’s advice to his successors about the enemy:190


See this stela (narū) and listen to the words of the stela (narū)! Do not be bewildered! Do not be confused! Do not be afraid! Do not tremble! Let your foundations be firm! You, in the embrace of your wife, do (your) work! Strengthen your walls! Fill your ditches with water! Your chests, your grain, your silver, your goods, (and) your possessions, bring into your stronghold! Tie up your weapons and put (them) into the corners! Guard your heroism! Keep yourself intact! Let him roam through your land! Do not expel him! Let him scatter the cattle! Do not approach him! Let him eat the flesh of your soldiers! Let him murder (and) let him return… Be submissive, disciplined. Answer them, ‘Here I am my lord’. Requit their sacrilegious acts with kindness to kindness with gifts and additional (presents). Always precede them (i.e. do more than they ask)! May wise scribes declaim your stela. You who have read my stela (narū) and thus have gotten yourself out (of trouble). You who have blessed me, may a future (ruler) bless you!

Naram-Sin advises a type of pacifism that perseveres even in the face of humiliation at the hands of the abusive Umma-n-manda. It is even called ‘heroism’ (qar-ra-du-ti). The stark contrast with the traditional

---

190 SB Tupsinna 154-180.
Mesopotamian king who slays his enemies is obvious. There is a sense in the Cuthaean Legend that the enemy is militarily strong but is not wise, and is unaware of the terrible fate that awaits them. Grayson comments that the story teaches Naram-Sin was defeated because he did not listen to the omens and that the king warns future generations to learn from his experience. Grayson argues therefore that the Cuthaean Legend is a didactic document designed to convince the king of the diviner’s power. Longman observes that the last section of the Cuthaean Legend prescribes behaviour that amounts to pacifism in the face of the detestable enemy, suggesting that the main purpose of the story is not about convincing the king of divination. Longman argues that Naram-Sin’s advice is to mind domestic policy and forego military adventurism, and that this is the propaganda of the political idea of isolationism presented in the guise of traditional literature and ascribed to the revered personage of Naram-Sin of Akkad. It is at least clear that the Cuthaean Legend is teaching pacifism in the face of the enemy at all costs. Divination also plays a significant role. It reflects the will of the gods for the king to remain passive. It is after Venus tells the king that the gods will destroy the enemy that Naram-Sin gives his advice of pacifism. The story connects pacifism and piety because the former is advocated on the basis of trusting the gods.

The prize of pacifism is the defeat of the Ummān-manda.

Glassner comments that literary texts like the Cuthaean Legend aimed to study the past as a source of examples and precedents in order to educate the elite and governments, and to provide ethical and political lessons. Glassner points out, however, that the call in the Cuthaean Legend to leave the responsibility to wage war to the gods is an unrealistic prescription in real political situations, and as an example refers to an inscription of Assurbanipal in which, during the preparations of one of the final campaigns against Elam, the goddess Istar of Arbela urges Assurbanipal, in a dream, to leave to the gods the responsibility for carrying out the military campaign against the enemies. I think the question to ask is whether there is any way a pacifist teaching such
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191 A. K. Grayson, “Assyria and Babylonia” Or 49 (1980), p. 188.
192 Ibid., p. 188.
194 Ibid., pp. 116-117.
195 Glassner, Mesopotamian Chronicles, pp. 21-22.
196 Ibid., p. 22. This inscription of Assurbanipal (K 2652) can be found in Streck, Assurbanipal, pp. 189-195. If the call to leave the warfare to the gods meant not fighting the enemy, and Assurbanipal still did so, then Istar of Arbela’s word would be put into doubt. It is not likely that Assurbanipal and his scribes would allow the goddess to give a mistaken message. One finds, shortly after this message, a reference to the beheading of the Elamite king Teumman, ibid., p. 192: r. 16. In the next line, Assurbanipal praises ‘the power of Istar’ (da-na-an 4Is-tar), ibid., p. 192, r. 17. The goddess’ message to leave the warfare to the gods may rather be interpreted as assurance and comfort given to the king that the gods are ultimately in control of political events and that they desire a positive outcome for the Assyrian Empire. The context of Istar’s message is that the Elamite king Teumman has threatened Assurbanipal with war, and the goddess tells the king to stay in Arbela and allow the goddess to
as the one in the Cuthaean Legend can have any political relevance. On many occasions leaders may think they have to avoid direct warfare because otherwise they risk great loses. Their decision not to use military force may leave the impression that they are weak. I propose that the Cuthaean Legend maintained its relevance partly because it helped gloss over or justify involuntary submission or inactivity against a powerful enemy. The Cuthaean Legend helped comfort any ruler or prince in the future who faced the Umma-n-manda, whose destructive campaigns were temporary and whose fate was to be destroyed at the hands of the gods. In real life the ruler was unable to defeat the enemy, but in royal ideology and self-presentation, the ruler would be following Naram-Sin’s advice and remaining passive in the face of the enemy. Hence the Cuthaean Legend converted humiliation at the face of the Umma-n-manda into ‘heroism’ (qar-ra-du-ti). 197

The circumstance under which the Cuthaean Legend was written remains unknown, 198 but in any case different ancient Near Eastern readers would read the text within their own circumstances. For example, I argued that Idrimi had no choice but to submit to the Hurrians, but nonetheless, in the narrative of his inscription, he did not lose prestige in doing so because his submission was based on the precedent and teaching of pacifism and ‘heroism’ found in the stela of Naram-Sin described in the Cuthaean Legend. 199 The Neo-Assyrians and the Neo-Babylonians could not militarily control or overpower the Cimmerians and the Medes respectively. These people had to be engaged through diplomacy, they could not be overpowered, and they were a potential – and sometimes a real – threat to the Assyrians and the Babylonians. This created some level of humiliation and discomfort. The Cuthaean Legend converted this into ‘heroism’ and piety due to the wise teaching of Naram-Sin to remain passive in the face of the Umma-n-manda.

5.6.3 Identifying the Cimmerians and the Medes

The Cuthaean Legend envisions a powerful enemy that emerges unexpectedly from the distant mountains and establishes hegemony after a sudden burst of military power. They are an enemy who will eventually be destroyed without the intervention of the Mesopotamian king. The literary allusions to the Cuthaean Legend in engage the Elamite king in battle, Gerardi, Assurbanipal’s Elamite Campaigns, p. 136. It is possible to identify the battle that the inscription says demonstrates the power of the Istar by the beheading of Teumman. Assurbanipal and Teumman battled by the river Ulaya, the defeated Elamite king’s head was cut off and brought back to Assyria, ibid., p. 137. 197 ‘Guard your heroism (qar-ra-du-ti)! Keep yourself intact!’, SB Tupsinna 165. 198 Longman, Fictional Akkadian Autobiography, pp. 116-117. For the question of historical kernel, see 4.2.2. 199 Discussed in 4.4.5.
the Neo-Assyrian and Neo-Babylonian inscriptions provide insight into the significance of the term Ummān-manda in the first millennium in the following way: the term Ummān-manda appears to be an implicit marker that recalls themes from the Cithaean Legend and helps apply them to the contemporary political events concerning the Cimmerians and the Medes. The Neo-Assyrian and Neo-Babylonian sources allude to the Cithaean Legend and in this way identify the Cimmerians and the Medes as Ummān-manda – they see parallels between them. The ensuing chapters discuss these parallels and the significance of the usage of the term Ummān-manda in the first millennium BC.
6

NEO-ASSYRIAN SOURCES

6.1 The Cimmerians during the time of Sargon II

Cimmerian history is known from scanty sources that are hard to relate to one other: the cuneiform texts, the Classical tradition and archaeological material.¹ The cuneiform evidence is usually treated as reliable, but it deals with isolated episodes concerning mostly the pragmatic needs of the Assyrians. The Classical texts are written much later than the events and require scrutiny before using them to write Cimmerian history.² In any case, the cuneiform evidence offers valuable glimpses of how the Assyrians perceived the Cimmerian presence in their northern and eastern fronts. The ensuing discussion does not aim to write a Cimmerian history,³ but looks at the historical evidence that helps see what impression the Cimmerians left on the Assyrians and how this led to their designation as the Ummān-manda.

The earliest known references to the Cimmerians in Assyrian sources are found in the military reports made to Sargon II (721-705 BC).⁴ These reports concern the conflict between the Cimmerians and the Urartians – the latter were the king’s main opponent.⁵ The Urartian king campaigned against the land named Gamir(ra), which was the land of the Cimmerians mentioned in the Assyrian reports.⁶ The Urartian king’s defeat spread panic throughout Urartu. Crown prince Sennacherib’s letter to Sargon II states that ‘many (of) his forces died’ (LU.ē-mu-qi-šū a-na ma-la de-e-ka)⁷ and that ‘his eleven governors [with] their forces’ (were) cast away’ (11 LU.EN.NAM.MES-šū [TA] LU.ē-mu-qi-šū-nu še-e-lu-ut).⁸ The report further states that ‘his [turt]ānu and two

¹ This is sometimes dubbed ‘the Cimmerian problem’. For an outline of the problem in its details and references, see A. I. Ivantchik, “The Current State of the Cimmerian Problem” Ancient Civilizations 7 (2001), pp. 307-339
³ This has already been done with the current evidence, see n. 1 above.
⁴ SAA 1 30, 31, 32; SAA 5 92, 144, 145.
⁵ SAA 5, pp. XIII-XIV.
⁶ The land of the Cimmerians mentioned in the Assyrian reports is discussed below in this section 6.1.1.
⁷ SAA 1 31 10-11.
⁸ SAA 1 31 11-12.
governors [(were) captured] ([LÜ.tur]-[a]-nu-šu 2 LÜ EN.NAM.MES-te [sa-ab-tu]). The subsequent fragmentary section of the crown prince’s letter seems to be describing how the Urartian king fled from the scene of battle: the text contains statements such as ‘he took [the route of …]’ ([it-tal-ka [KASKAL ša…]-a is-essa-ba-ar]) and ‘(he)… came to (the land of)… ([ma-a…]-a-a il-lik-an-ni). Parpola restores ‘Mannea’ for the very broken line that immediately precedes the latter statement, to the effect that the Urartian king fled to Mannea. The king could alternatively have fled somewhere in Urartu since the fragmentary passage also mentions ‘[… the governors of his land’([… LÜ.GAR]-mu-te ša KUR-šu). Aşşur-resentwa, the royal delegate in Kumme, reports the fate of the Urartian king and soldiers after the ‘defeat’ (a-bi-ik-tú). Text breaks obscure the details, but it is clear that the soldiers fled to the land of Guriania after the defeat. Aşşur-resentwa says that the Urartian king made it to Turušpa (Van). The Assyrian military reports give some glimpses of the Cimmerian advance into Urartian territory after the battle. Urda-Sin’s letter states the ‘Cimmerian’ (LÜ.Ga-mi-ra-a-a) ‘went out from Mannea(?)’ ([i]-tu-[s] TA SÀ!-bi! KUR.Mal!-na!-a-a) and entered into Urartu (ina SÀ!-bi! KUR.URI). The governor of Waisi sent a messenger to Urzana, the king of Muşasir, for military aid. At the Cimmerians advance, ‘all of Urartu is greatly frightened’ (KUR.URI qab-bi-šu ip-ta-làh a-da-niš) and then ‘they are gathering their troops, planning to attack him’ (ina UGU-ḫi-šu) when there is more snow. The letter breaks off when it begins to talk about the booty ‘he plundered’ ([i]h-šu-ta-bat). This plundering had some sort of relation to the distant region (nagiu) of the city Arhi (ša na-gi-e ša URU.Ar!-bi!).

9 SAA 1 31 13-14.
10 SAA 1 31 14-15.
11 SAA 1 31 16.
12 SAA 1, p. 31:15.
13 SAA 1 31 17.
14 SAA 5 92 10.
15 SAA 5 92 11 - r. 16’.
16 SAA 5 92 r. 16’.
17 The reading of Mannea (KUR.Mal!-na!-a-a) is accepted in SAA 5 145 7, p. 109; Ivantchik, Les Cimmeriens au Proche-Orient, p. 174:7.
18 SAA 5 145 4-9.
19 SAA 5 145 14 - r. 5.
20 SAA 5 145 r. 6-8.
21 SAA 5 145 r. 14.
22 SAA 5 145 r. 9-14.
23 SAA 5 145 r. 19e.
24 SAA 5 145 s. 1-2.
Another report (name of the sender is lost) states that ‘the ‘Cimmerian’ established [camp] in Uṣunalı (an Urartian province)’ (KUR.Gi-mir-ra-a ina UGU-ḥi i-[xx] SÀ KUR.Ū-ṣu-nā-li [ma-dak-tū] i-sa-kan). Aware that Sargon II demands a ‘precise report’ (te-mu ḫar-ṣ[u]) about the king of Urartu, the reporter feels obliged to state that the report from the ‘Ḫuḫuškian’ (TA KUR.Ḫu-ub-buš-a-[a]) has not yet arrived, and that Urzana the king of Mušasir also has been contacted for a report.

Aššur-resuwa forwards Urzana’s (the king of Mušasir) message that ‘the Urartian king went against [Ga]mir’ (LUGAL! KUR.URI-a-a [ina KUR.PA]B'I-ir' bē-et il-lik-ū-ni), that ‘his forces (were) killed’ (L.U.e-mu-ğu-e-šā de-e-ka), and that ‘the governor of Waisi (is) killed (L.U.EN.NAM ša URU.Ū-a-si de-e-ke).’ From his source the Its’ean, Sennacherib reports that after the failed campaign the Urartians were ‘very fearful’ (pal-ḫu a-dan-niš) and ‘like women they tremble and are silent’ ([ma-a a-k])! MI.MES l'-ru'-bu' i-qūl'-lu. The data that is collected from all the extant military reports written to Sargon II indicates that the Cimmerians induced panic in Urartu. The Cimmerians defeated the Urartian king, killed and captured his governors and troops, marched into Urartu and plundered its districts.

6.1.1 Location of Cimmeria

Aššur-resuwa’s letter describes Guriania as ‘the region (na-gi-ū) between Urartu and Gamirra’ (KUR.na-gi-ū bir-te KUR.URI bir-te KUR.Ga-mir-ra). The land of the Cimmerians – Gamir(ra) – neighboured Guriania at least during the time of Sargon II. Guriania’s location is disputed. There are two lands with Urartian names that may be the equivalent of Akkadian Guriania (KUR.Gr-ri-a-ni-a). One Urartian inscription refers to the ‘land of Quriani(ni)’ (KUR.Gr-ri-a-ni-ni). Another Urartian inscription refers to the ‘land of Gurianai’ (KUR.Gr-ri-a-i-ni). Ivantchik identifies Guriania with the land Qurian, which is mentioned alongside the land of Eriahi situated
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26 SAA 5 144 r. 5'-7'.
27 SAA 5 144 6-8.
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34 SAA 1 32 14.
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37 Ibid., no. 118 II.
around modern Leninakan, and argues that Guriani is probably north or west of Eriahi, thus placing the land of the Cimmerians in central Transcaucasia. Kristensen alternatively consults a Neo-Assyrian letter that states the Cimmerians had moved into Urartu from Mannea (SAA 5 145), the other Urartian text that mentions the ‘land of Gurianai’; and the ‘Gouranians’ found in Strabo’s Geography (XI, 14, 14) where a certain group of Thracians are located ‘beyond Armenia near the Gouranians and the Medes’ (ὑπὲρ τῆς Ἄρμενιας πλησίον Γουρανίων κοί Μῆδων), and argues for a location south or southeast of Lake Urmia. There is not enough evidence to be certain about the location of Guriania mentioned in Aššur-resuwa’s letter. The Urartian toponyms are hard to locate with certainty. The Neo-Assyrian letters describing Cimmerian movements against the Urartians do not mention the larger background and are often troubled with text breaks. In any case, Guriania in Aššur-resuwa’s letter is said to be a region (nāgiū) bordering Urartu. The word nāgiu is used for districts or distant areas in Neo-Assyrian sources. In spite of the problems of putting Cimmeria on the map, it is clear that all the events concerning this conflict between the Cimmerians and the Urartians occur in regions considered distant to the Assyrians, on their frontier facing the mountains that surround Mesopotamia in the east and north.

6.2 Ummān-manda During the Reign of Esarhaddon

The Assyrians during Sargon II’s time, as far as the letters tell us, see the Cimmerians as a distant people who have inflicted a humiliating defeat upon their chief rivals the Urartians, in locations far removed from the Assyrian heartland. It is interesting that the panic (e.g. ‘they tremble and keep silent like women’) in Urartu comes after a failed Urartian attack on the land of the Cimmerians – a land northeast of Assyria. The Assyrian military reports did not openly liken this failed Urartian offensive to the way Naram-Sin launched an arrogant attack on the Ummān-manda, people in the distant mountain land, and as a result had to face invasion and panic in his realm in the Cuthaean Legend. The similarity, however, seems relevant to me because the Cimmerians, even if the extant evidence is silent about their activities until Esarhaddon, must have continued to cause problems similar to their conflict with Urartu. The knowledge of the activities of the Cimmerians, a nation

39 König, Handbuch der chaldischen Inschriften, no. 118 II.
41 SAA 5 92 5-6.
42 For a discussion of the word nāgū, see ch. 4, pp. 69-71, esp. 70.
known to Assyrians as coming from their land of Gamir(ra) in a distant region, clearly accumulated at least from the time of Sargon II onwards. By the time there are other glimpses of Cimmerian military activity during Esarhaddon’s reign, the Cimmerians are complicating the regional political balance and are posing a danger to Assyrian imperial interests in a geography spanning from its northwestern to the eastern fronts. This is discerned mainly from Esarhaddon’s extispicy reports. These reports contain results of extispicy based on observations from sheep’s entrails about favourable and/or unfavourable omens meant to answer questions posed to Šamaš the god of divination about pre-planned military/political actions that need to be acted upon or concerns about potential opponents in a given region.\textsuperscript{43} According to these reports, various Cimmerian tribes allied with Midas of Phrygia and Mugallu of Melid.\textsuperscript{44} Other Cimmerians threatened Cilicia.\textsuperscript{45} Some were hostile against the cities Pumu and Kulimmeri and the fortified cities in Subria.\textsuperscript{46} The Cimmerians in Media were also dispersed. They threatened places such as Šamaš-našir, Bit-Ḥāman\textsuperscript{47} and Parsumaš.\textsuperscript{48} Some Cimmerians allied with the Manneans and posed a danger to places in Media. The Cimmerians were a considerable force in Media alongside Kaštaritu, the Manneans and other Median city lords: they threatened Kišassu,\textsuperscript{49} Šubara,\textsuperscript{50} and Uṣiši.\textsuperscript{51} The Cimmerians also allied with Dusanni the Sapaardean.\textsuperscript{52} Cimmerian troops threatened Assyrian activities such as tribute collection at the cities of UD-pani, Ramadani, and ‘as far as the land of Arri’ (a-di KUR.Ār-ri-ī).\textsuperscript{53} Ivantchik suggests there are two groups of Cimmerians during the time of Esarhaddon – one active in the north/north-west of Assyria and the other in the east.\textsuperscript{54} The Cimmerians’ socio-political structure or their level of

\textsuperscript{43} SAA 4. pp. XIIIff.
\textsuperscript{44} SAA 4 1.
\textsuperscript{45} SAA 4 17.
\textsuperscript{46} SAA 4 18.
\textsuperscript{47} SAA 4 36.
\textsuperscript{48} SAA 4 40. The land of Parsumaš is also mentioned in an inscription of Assurbanipal. Cyrus (Ku-ra-ān) the king of Parsumaš is among the kings who submit to Assurbanipal after his violent invasion of Elam, IIT 115. The land of Parsumaš could very well be the same as Parsua, which is thought to be the land of the Persians. There are, however, a number of problems with this identification. The land Parsua described in Assyrian texts seems to be somewhere in the Mahidasht, and in any case the evidence does not automatically suggest the land of Fars, see discussion in L. D. Levine, Contributions to the Historical Geography of the Zagros in the Neo-Assyrian Period. University of Pennsylvania. PhD. Ann Arbor, Michigan. University Microfilms. 1969, pp. 129ff. There is also the question whether Cyrus II’s ancestor ‘Cyrus of Anshan’ (mentioned in Cyrus Cylinder 21) is the same person as Cyrus king of Parsumaš in Assurbanipal’s inscription, see D. T. Potts, “Cyrus the Great and the Kingdom of Anshan” in Birth of the Persian Empire. Volume 1. V. S. Curtis and S. Stewart, eds. London & New York. I. B. Tauris & Co Ltd. 2005, pp. 18-22. The identification of Parsua with Parsumaš in Assurbanipal’s inscription also requires that a shift took place from a Parsua that can be located in the Mahidasht to a Parsua in Fars because no other Assyrian document seems to be hinting at a location in Fars. The scarcity of additional evidence makes this proposed shift to Fars tentative, see Levine, op.cit., pp. 151-152.
\textsuperscript{49} SAA 4 43, 44.
\textsuperscript{50} SAA 4 48.
\textsuperscript{51} SAA 4 49.
\textsuperscript{52} SAA 4 45.
\textsuperscript{53} Alongside Mannean and Median troops in SAA 4 65.
political (dis)unity is simply impossible to detect from the extant evidence. The wide geographic range of military activity at least suggests that a number of Cimmerian warlords leading Cimmerian troops (mercenaries? tribes?) were involved. Here is a picture of Cimmerian warlords and their forces all across Assyria’s northern and eastern frontiers – this is an expansion of military and political activity dangerous to the Empire. This proliferation in activity comes from a people who originate from a distant land bordering Urartu, a people who created panic in Urartu and other places. The affinities with the Cuthaean Legend are apparent: in the story the brother kings originating from the distant eastern mountains spread terror throughout the civilised world. One of the terms used for this enemy in the Standard Babylonian version of the story is zēr ḫalqāti ‘seed of ruin’.55 I previously discussed how the expression zēr ḫalqāti ‘seed of ruin’ is an implicit marker for the Cuthaean Legend in Assurbanipal’s inscriptions and how this expression is used in a letter Bēl-uṣēzib wrote to Esarhaddon (ABL 1237) in order to describe the Cimmerians as a people who deceive and do not keep faith with treaties and oaths – for this the gods will eventually destroy them, hence they are a ‘ruined seed’ (5.2). This letter contains a series of statements about a cautious military entry into Mannean territory without dispatching all available troops, and this military advice is justified partly on the basis that the Cimmerians’ promise not to get involved in Mannea cannot be trusted since they are zēr ḫalqāti ‘seed of ruin’.

(9.-16.) As the king has written to his troops: Enter into Mannea. The entire army should not enter. (Rather) may the cavalry and the elite troops enter. The Cimmerians who say: “Mannea is at your disposal, we are staying away (lit. our feet is cut off)”, perhaps, but that (is a ) lie! There are (the) ‘seed of ruin’! Oath of god or treaty they know not!

55 SB Tupsinna 130.
56 SAA 10 111 9-16.
Fales and Lanfranchi argue that this entire passage is a quotation from Esarhaddon’s written message to his troops who were in a position to militarily enter Mannean territory and that the opinion expressed in this passage is not to be attributed to the astrologer Bēl-uṣēzīb because he would not be advising on technical military affairs. One of the problems they tackle to support their interpretation is that elsewhere in the letter, Bēl-uṣēzīb seems to be advising about a specific course of military action beyond his competence as an astrologer. On this Fales and Lanfranchi suggest that he felt obliged to offer some military advice because the king’s query was “replete with technical-military data”. They argue this firstly on the basis that Bēl-uṣēzīb previously states in the letter that the king should consult an expert who knows Mannea, and secondly that the military advice that he seems to be giving elsewhere uses uncommon vocabulary and short stilted clauses which indicate “the task of projecting his thoughts onto the battlefield did not come easily to him”. The stylistic features and the uncommon vocabulary of the passage do not by themselves inform negatively or positively about Bēl-uṣēzīb’s knowledge concerning the situation in Mannea. One of the arguments Fales and Lanfranchi advance in this regard is that the hapax legomenon ṣt participle of ḫalāqu (mu-uš-ta-hal-qu-ti), and the statement where this participle is found, i.e. ‘those caused to flee will be in addition to (our) fighting men, (once the latter are) among the enemy’ [according to Fales and Lanfranchi’s translation] (mu-uš-ta-hal-qu-ti ina UGU mun-dah-šu-ti ina LŪ.KUR), together allude to the Cimmerians or another people who abandoned the Manneans (hence the relation to the expression LŪ.ḥal-qā-ti-i). Such a relation to the expression ūzēr halqātī ‘seed of ruin’ is not apparent. The reference is only to a military advantage of Esarhaddon: ‘deserters (are) more than the fighters within the enemy’ (mu-uš-ta-hal-qu-ti ina UGU mun-dah-šu-ti ina LŪ.KUR). The letter does not talk about the ethnic identity of the deserters, so there is no obvious link to the Cimmerians in this statement.

Bēl-uṣēzīb’s advice that the king consult an expert on Mannea before deciding on what to do could mean that the expert has a more ‘on the ground’ knowledge (i.e. the ‘exit and entry of the land’ mu-šu-ú u e-re-bi šá KUR) which helps the king to decide a specific course of action. Bēl-uṣēzīb could have received his

58 SAA 10 111 r. 13-18.
59 Fales and Lanfranchi, op.cit., p. 22.
60 Ibid., pp. 21-24.
61 This word sequence is found in SAA 10 111 r. 13-14.
62 Fales and Lanfranchi, op.cit., p. 23.
63 SAA 10 111 r. 13-14. Parpola has a similar translation, SAA 10, p. 90.
64 SAA 10 111 r. 9-10.
information about the military details in Mannea through his correspondence with the king. There are at least two explanations for what seems to be the astrologer’s military advice in one part of the letter and Esarhaddon’s message to his troops in the other passage in ABL 1237. Either they are both quotations from Esarhaddon’s letter(s) containing suggestions on a military course of action or they are both the astrologer’s cautious (i.e. advising the king to talk to experts of Mannean terrain) commentary. The decision between these options influences our understanding of who (Bēl-uṣēzib or Esarhaddon) calls the Cimmerians NUMUN LU.ḫal-qā-ti-i ‘seed of ruin’ in ABL 1237. Whatever position is taken on this, it still appears that the expression NUMUN LU.ḫal-qā-ti-i ‘seed of ruin’ is considered by both the astrologer and the king to be a valid designation for the Cimmerians.

Fales and Lanfranchi specifically argue that the astrologer had access to Esarhaddon’s written message to his troops.⁶⁵ On this basis they argue that the main reason Esarhaddon expresses distrust of the Cimmerians and uses the designation NUMUN LU.ḫal-qā-ti-i ‘seed of ruin’ is not that he feared their treachery, but that he is bringing about the prejudices and the distrust held in Assyrian ideology against foreigners in order to convince his forces to halt a full scale operation, covering up his real concern about the feasibility of a military operation in Mannea.⁶⁶ If Bēl-uṣēzib is quoting Esarhaddon, then the quotation could have come from excerpts of his orders to Assyrian commanders in Mannea, or simply from previous correspondence between the astrologer and the king. In either case, Esarhaddon lets Bēl-uṣēzib peruse his words in order to receive astrological (and also military?) counsel. The designation NUMUN LU.ḫal-qā-ti-i ‘seed of ruin’ is used for the Cimmerians to express their unreliability and the implied divine curse that is bound to come down upon them because they are not maintaining their oaths.⁶⁷ Esarhaddon’s concern about a potential Cimmerian interference in Mannea during an Assyrian operation is not a subsidiary issue. In military thinking it is not wise to take for granted or act solely upon what potential opponents say. The Cimmerians are a military force independent of the Assyrians, and according to extispicy texts discussed above (p. 152), they pose a danger in a range of localities during the time of Esarhaddon. They are potential enemies in Mannea, capable of entering the land and inflicting harm. A military defeat in Mannea is a great risk for Assyrian efforts in their eastern frontier. The military conflict with Cimmerians in another location (Ḫubušna, discussed below in p. 156) vindicates the concerns about their unreliability expressed in Bēl-uṣēzib’s letter ABL 1237, and hence their designation as NUMUN LU.ḫal-qā-ti-i

⁶⁵ Fales and Lanfranchi, “ABL 1237”, p. 27: III.
⁶⁶ Ibid., pp. 28-31.
⁶⁷ Discussed in 5.2.
‘seed of ruin’. I previously argued how the expression zēr ḥalqātī ‘seed of ruin’, together with the term Ummān-manda, evokes the enemy of the Cuthaean Legend in Assurbanipal’s inscriptions (5.2). ABL 1237 employs the expression NUMUN LŪ.ḥal-qā-tī ‘seed of ruin’ and this letter dates to 675 BC. The term Ummān-manda is used in Esarhaddon’s prisms, including its earliest copy a year before ABL 1237 in 676 BC, to describe the Cimmerians defeated in Ḫubušna:69

\[\begin{align*}
&ú\] Te-uš-pa-a KUR (var. LŪ).Gi-mi-ra-a-a
&ERĪN-man-da (var. ERĪN.HĪ.A-man-da, ERĪN.HĪ.A ma-a’-[du]) šā a-šar-šū ru-ū-qu
&ina KI-tim KUR.Ḫu-bu-uš-na a-di gi-mir ERĪN.HĪ.A-šu
&ú-ra-si-ba ina GIŠ.TUKUL
\end{align*}\]

And Teušpaya the Cimmerian,
Ummān-manda whose abode is distant,
in the land of Ḫubušna together with all his troops,
I beat down with the weapon.

Ḫubušna is most probably situated near Tabal (Central Anatolia) and Hilakku (Cilicia),70 far removed from the Cimmerians in Bēl-ušēzib’s letter. In each case the Assyrians faced different Cimmerian forces. In one case the Assyrians wage battle against the Cimmerians and in another case (reported in ABL 1237) they received an offer of neutrality. Esarhaddon’s extispicy reports, discussed above (p. 152), unveil the geographical range of their activities. The mention of Teušpaya in Esarhaddon’s prism confirms that the term Ummān-manda was used for them before Assurbanipal’s time. The use of the term cannot be attributed to reasons uniquely pertaining to the reign of Assurbanipal.

There are connections between various formulaic terms used to describe the Cimmerians in Neo-Assyrian texts and the terms Ummān-manda and zēr ḥalqātī ‘seed of ruin’. The expression ‘Ummān-manda whose abode is distant’71 found in Esarhaddon’s prisms is one the epithets that expresses a range of ideas about the

---

68 For the date, see Fales and Lanfranchi, “ABL 1237”, p. 10; Ivantchik, Les Cimmeriens au Proche-Orient, pp. 77-78.
69 References, variant readings and bibliography in Appendix 1.41. On the date of the prisms, see ch. 1, p. 6.
70 See discussion and references in Ivantchik, Les Cimmeriens au Proche-Orient, pp. 57-61.
71 See reference in Appendix 1.41.
Cimmerians. The Assyrians had an idea where this homeland was but obviously this cannot be ascertained on the basis of what the prism says. There is, however, another link between the term Umma-n-manda and the distant abode. The expression ašar(šu) rāqu ‘(whose) abode is distant’ is formulaic and commonly occurs to describe distant homelands of various peoples.\(^{72}\) I argue that the combination of the term Umma-n-manda and the expression ‘whose abode is distant’ is not random and that it has a meaning. The Cimmerians are literally called ‘Umma-n-manda whose abode is distant’ in Esarhaddon’s prism and then they are called zēr halqātī ‘seed of ruin’ in ABL 1237, a letter to the same king. The Umma-n-manda in the Cuthaean Legend originate from a distant mountain land, they are brother kings who wreak havoc in the civilised world, and they are called ‘seed of ruin’.

The Cimmerians have a distant homeland bordering Urartu (6.1.1). The Neo-Assyrian scribal tradition and Esarhaddon himself are, intentionally or subliminally, associating the themes of the enemy in the Cuthaean Legend with the Cimmerians they are facing. The Cimmerians warlords threatened a range of locations on Assyria’s northern and eastern frontiers (pp. 152-153). These warlords and their forces, such as Teušpaya and his army in Esarhaddon’s prisms, were designated as Umma-n-manda whereas others near Mannean territory were called zēr halqātī ‘seed of ruin’ in ABL 1237 around the same time.\(^{73}\) The term ‘seed of ruin’ is used in the Cuthaean Legend to encourage Naram-Sin to stay put and wait for the gods to destroy the Umma-n-manda (5.2).

The Assyrian hope that the Cimmerians will be destroyed finds its clearest expression in Neo-Assyrian prophecies. Tablet K 2401, which may date to Esarhaddon’s first regnal year,\(^{74}\) records one of these prophecies. A deity (name lost in text breaks) makes a promise to Esarhaddon: ‘I will put the Cimmerians in his hand’ ([KUR].Gi-mir-a-a ina SU'-šū a-šā'-kan').\(^{75}\) The ensuing promise is to set Ellipi on fire.\(^{76}\) Ellipi is a land situated east of Assyria, possibly situated in northern Luristan.\(^{77}\) The Cimmerians who are the subject of this prophecy could have been nearby Ellipi. The other prophecy is from the prophetess Mulissu-kabtat, who addresses Assurbanipal when he is the crown prince: ‘I will finish off Cimmeria like Elam’ (ki-i KUR.NIM.KI KUR.Gi-mir a-gam-ar).\(^{78}\) By themselves the Neo-Assyrian prophecies can promise the defeat of any enemy – that is not

\(^{72}\) For references, see entry rāqu in M. Streck, Assurbanipal und die letzten assyrischen Könige bis zum Untergange Nineveh’s. III. Teil: Register. (Vorderasiatischen Bibliothek 7). Leipzig. J. C. Hinrichs’che Buchhandlung. 1916, p. 572.

\(^{73}\) For the respective dates of the letter and the prisms, see nn. 68-69 above.

\(^{74}\) The date discussed in S. Parpola, SAA 9, p. LXX. The historical references therein refer to Esarhaddon’s appointment as the crown prince, the subsequent civil war and his eventual victory, see details in M. Nissinen, References to Prophecy in Neo-Assyrian Sources. (State Archives of Assyria Studies 7). The Neo-Assyrian Text Corpus Project. Helsinki. Helsinki University Press. 1998, pp. 15-30.

\(^{75}\) SAA 9 3 ii 1.

\(^{76}\) SAA 9 3 ii 2.

\(^{77}\) Levine, Contributions to the Historical Geography of the Zagros, pp. 118-128.

\(^{78}\) Inferred from statements in SAA 9 7 3-7.

\(^{79}\) SAA 9 7 e.14.
exclusive for the Cimmerians. The data discussed above suggests that the hope expressed in the prophecies of an eventual collapse of the Cimmerians should not be seen in isolation but rather as part of the Cimmerian warlords’ and forces’ identification with the powerful Ummān-manda of the Cuthaean Legend who are ultimately doomed to destruction.

6.3 Ummān-manda During the Reign of Assurbanipal

Assurbanipal recognised that the Cimmerians were a danger for Assyria early in his reign. His royal prisms describe the Cimmerians as those ‘who do not fear my fathers or me, who do not submit to my royal feet’ (ša la ip-tal-la-ḫu AD.MES-ia ₂ at-tu-u-a (var. ipmap-lu) ₁ la is-ba-tū GİR.II LUGAL-ū-ti-ia ik-ṣu-ud). The earliest reference to the Cimmerians in Assurbanipal’s reign relates to the establishment of diplomatic relations with Gyges of Lydia. A number of Assurbanipal’s inscriptions narrate Gyges’ request for help against the Cimmerians in return for political submission. The earliest of these are the prisms E₁ and E₂ with a terminus post quem of 668 BC, possibly dating around 665 BC. The earlier of these E-prisms, E₁, is very fragmentary but states that the language of the Lydian rider (rakbû) was previously unknown. A later version, HT, possibly dates around 660 BC. The prisms A, B, C and F contain a fuller and updated version of the narrative. According to the narrative, Gyges of Lydia, who was under threat from the Cimmerians, established diplomatic contact with the king of Assyria, claimed that the god Aššur told him to submit to Assyria in a dream, and became a vassal. Gyges then defeated the Cimmerians and sent some war captives to Assurbanipal as part of the booty. Later the Lydian king stopped being a vassal and supported Psammetichus who became the king of Egypt and rebelled against Assyria. As a consequence, Assurbanipal cursed Gyges and the Cimmerians ravaged his land and killed him. Gyges’ son acknowledged that the Assyrian king’s curse killed his father and he re-submitted Lydia to Assyria. The Cimmerians in this narrative are described in ways that reveal affinities to the Cuthaean Legend even if there was no explicit use of the term Ummān-manda. This is inferred from the

80 BIWA, p. 31: A II 105-106, B II 99, C IV 9-10, F II 16-17.
82 For E₁, see Cogan and Tadmor, op.cit., p. 68; Ivantchik, Les Cimmeriens au Proche-Orient, pp 254-256; BIWA, p. 182.
83 For the text, see Ivantchik, Les Cimmeriens au Proche-Orient, pp. 259-261.
84 Ibid., pp. 97-98. For details of the transmission from the earlier E-prisms, see Cogan and Tadmor, op.cit., pp. 77-78.
85 BIWA, pp. 30-32; Ivantchik, Les Cimmeriens au Proche-Orient, pp. 261-266.
descriptions in the narrative that elsewhere are explicitly linked with the Ummān-manda both in some Neo-Assyrian texts mentioning the Cimmerians and the Standard Babylonian Cuthaean Legend.

6.3.1 Cimmerians and Lydia

Lydia is described as a ‘distant place’ (ašru rāgu), a ‘region across the sea’ (na-gu-ú ni-bir-ti A.AB.BA), with ‘vast settlements’ ([da-ad-m]e rap-ša-tu). Of Lydia, Assurbanipal says ‘the kings my fathers did not hear the utterance of its name’ (ša LUGAL.MEŠ AD.MEŠ-ia la iš-mu-u zi-kir MU-šu). The phrase ‘distant place’ (ašru rāgu) was used for the homeland of another Cimmerian warlord during Esarhaddon’s reign, when Teuspaya was called ‘Ummān-manda whose abode is distant (ša a-šar-šā ru-ū-qu)’. About the Cimmerians attacking Lydia, however, Assurbanipal says, in contrast to the Assyrian king’s fathers not knowing the name of Lydia, that they are ‘who do not fear my fathers and me’ (ša la ip-tal-la-ḫu AD.MEŠ-ia ú at-tu-u-a [var. i-a-ši]). The Cimmerians attack Lydia’s ‘vast settlements’ and are called the ‘dangerous enemy’ (KU & R ek-su). The epithet ‘dangerous enemy’ (LÜ.KUR ek-su) is found in Assurbanipal’s letter to the god Aššur alongside the term Ummān-manda. The fragmentary letter does explicitly write out Cimmerian ethnonym but all the other Neo-Assyrian references to the Ummān-manda concern the Cimmerians and this one can be no exception. Assurbanipal complains in this letter to Aššur that the Urartians are talking with Ummān-manda, ‘the dangerous enemy’:

r. 12. û LÜ.URI-a-a ša da-bab-ti šap-[…]

r. 13. a-na ERIN-man-da LÜ.KUR ek-su ú-šad-ha-b[u…

r. 14. ik-kib-ka GAL-a ka-a-a-an i-te-né-[ep-pu-šu…]

(r. 12.-14.) And the Urartians, the men of the faculty of speech, they cause (a messenger) to talk to the

86 E2 BM134454, A(V) 7 in ibid., p. 256; BIWA, p. 181; HT r. 13 in Ivantchik, Les Cimmeriens au Proche-Orient, p. 259; BIWA, p. 30: A II 96; B II 94; C IV 3; F II 12.
87 HT r. 13 in Ivantchik, Les Cimmeriens au Proche-Orient, p. 259; BIWA, p. 30: A II 95; F II 10; B II 93; C IV 1.
89 BIWA, p. 30: A II 96; B II 94; C IV 3; F II 12.
90 Discussed above in p. 154-155.
91 BIWA, p. 31: A II 105; B II 99; C IV 9-10; F II 16-17.
93 K 3408 r. 13 in Appendix 1.43.
94 K 3408, r. 12.-14. For bibliography, see Appendix 1.43.
Ummān-manda, the dangerous enemy… They constantly d[o] the great abomination….

There are several possibilities concerning the translation ū-ṣad-ba-b[u] and how the preposition ana, with its meanings such as ‘to, for, it’, relates it with the Urartians and the Ummān-manda in this passage because the verb sudbubu has a diverse range of meanings such as ‘to get someone to talk, make somebody plead a case, make a statement, give a cause to complain, to cause plotting, to induce’. 95 Bauer’s translation is ‘die Umman-manda, die wilden Feind, wiegelten sie auf’…’. 96 The political context cannot be discerned from this text or any other source known to me. Nothing is known about the relations between the Urartians and the Cimmerians during the time of Assurbanipal. Diakonoff proposes that the Urartians allied with the ‘Ummān-manda’ because the Cimmerians were raiding their land. 97 Assurbanipal could be claiming that the Urartians were inciting the Cimmerians, called Ummān-manda in this text, but it is hard to be sure about this due to the current lack of knowledge. 98 My translation above is based on a tentative inference from the available sources. One of Assurbanipal’s inscriptions mentions how the king of Tabal initially ‘talked enmity’ (id-bu-du da-sa-a-ti) against the Assyrians and ‘established his mouth’ (iš-ta-kan pi-i-ša) with the Cimmerian king Tugdamme. 99 A reference to a similar diplomatic initiative by the Urartians before the outburst of the first Assyrian – Cimmerian armed conflict is possible. If so, the text is not accusing the Urartians are directly inciting the Cimmerians against the Assyrians but rather that they were establishing diplomatic relations with Assyria’s enemy. The use of the term Ummān-manda for the Cimmerians in the context of the Urartians establishing diplomatic relations with them could have meant to evoke a specific theme in the Cuthaean Legend. The Ummān-manda are known to win over kings to their side during their destructive expeditions in various lands in the Cuthaean Legend: 'Seventeen kings, [their] troops up to 90,000, [we]nt to their aid'. 100

95 CAD D 13-14.
96 IWA, p. 84: r. 13.
98 Add to that other possible translations due to the semantic range of sudbubu with the preposition ana.
100 SB Tupsinna 61-62.
The term ‘dangerous enemy’ (LU.KUR ek-šu) in Assurbanipal’s letter to Aššur may specifically refer to the ability of the Umma-쌌 to scatter lands. In the Cuthaean Legend ‘they scattered’ (is-pu-ḫu) various lands and for example a land ‘was completely scattered’ (gi-mi˘r(?)-x-su it-tas-paḫ). Assurbanipal’s prayer letter is too fragmentary to confirm that the use of the epithet ‘dangerous enemy’ is referring to their ability to scatter lands, but in the Gyges narrative, Prism A states that the Cimmerians ‘attacked and scattered his entire country’ (it-bu-nim-ma is-pu-nu gi-mi˘r KUR-šu). Furthermore, Prism A substitutes the epithet ‘dangerous enemy’ with ‘harassers of the people of his lands’ (mu-dal-li-ḫu UN.MES KUR-šu). Cimmerians are called ‘harassers of his land’ (mu-dal-li-ḫu-un-ti KUR-šu) also when Gyges dispatches some Cimmerian prisoners-of-war as part of the booty to Nineveh.

Another aspect of the depiction of the Cimmerians was that they were a powerful force that is under the control of the gods, and kings had to obey the will of the gods if they wanted to survive this powerful enemy. Gyges’ initial military victory over the Cimmerians was attributed to his obedience to the command of the god Aššur who appeared in the Lydian king’s dream and told him to submit to the Assyrian Empire. The defeat of the Cimmerians was attributed to the power of the gods. Prism B states that Gyges’ victory was the ‘power of Aššur and Marduk’ (da-na-an AN.SÁR u 4AMAR.UTU). The Cuthaean Legend describes how the Umma-icensed were defeating Naram-Sin when the king disobeyed the will of the gods, and how the situation was reversed when the king was brave enough to heed the will of the gods and remain passive against the enemy (5.6.1). Prism A is the only text that narrates Gyges’ betrayal of Assyria after the Lydian king’s initial victory over the Cimmerians (which was won only because he had initially obeyed the will of the deity Aššur). Gyges’ betrayal is, among other things, described in the following way: ‘that which was from the word of Aššur my maker he did not keep’ (aš-šu ša a-mat AN.SÁR DINGIR DÙ-a la is-šu-ru). The ‘word of Aššur’ refers to the dream Gyges received earlier from Aššur urging him to become a vassal of Assyria. Gyges’ victory, attained while he was a vassal of Assyria, was regarded as the result of the power of the gods. But now Gyges ‘trusted his own

101 SB Tupsinna 51, 52, 56, 57, 58.
102 SB Tupsinna 50.
103 BIWA, p. 32: A II 120.
104 BIWA, p. 31: A II 104.
106 BIWA, p. 31: B III 4.
107 BIWA, p. 31: A II 112-113.
strength and became arrogant’ (a-na e-muq ra-man-i-šu it-ta-kil-ma ig-pu-uš ŠA-bu). As a response Assurbanipal cursed Gyges before the gods of Assyria:


‘I heard (this) and beseeched Aššur and Ištar: “May his body be cast down before his enemy and may they carry away his bones!” (And) as I appealed to Aššur, it came to pass. His body was cast down in front of the enemy and they carried away his bones, (that is) the Cimmerians who in the calling of my name trampled him under.’

Gyges’s son ascended to the throne and saw the terrible fate of his father. Assurbanipal describes it in Prism A as ‘the evil deed of the oath of my hands the gods my helpers: in front (of him [Gyges’ son]) the father his maker they laid across (his) hands’ (ep-šet ḪUL-tim ša ina ni-iš ŠU.II-ša DINGIR.MES tik-le-ia ina pa-an AD DÛ-šu ū-šap-ri-ku ina ŠU.II). Gyges’s son recognised Assurbanipal as follows: ‘You are the king whose strength is of god. You cursed my father and there was evil before him’ (LUGAL ša DINGIR i-du-ū-šu at-ta AD-u-a ta-ru-ur-ma MUNUS.HUL iš-ša-kin ina pa-ni-šu). The destruction brought upon the land and the death of the king are described as the ‘evil’ (ḪUL-tim) brought by Aššur and Ištar to whom Assurbanipal prayed. In the Cuthaean Legend, after Naram-Sin was commanded not to touch the enemy, the text says: ‘in future days Enlil will call them for evil (ana ḪUL-tim). The ‘evil’ (ḪUL-tim) refers most probably to the temporary destruction and havoc Naram-Sin’s enemies will cause in the king’s realm until they are destroyed. This theme of destruction with the word lemūttim ‘evil’ is uniquely used as an adverb in the Babylonian Gadd Chronicle to describe the destruction caused by the Medes whom the chronicle calls the Ummān-manda (5.4). The Basalt-
Stela of Nabonidus describes the destruction brought upon Assyria as ‘Marduk’s deed of impudence’ (ṣi-pi-ir d. AMAR.UTU ša ṣi-il-la-ti). 114

In the Cuthaean Legend Naram-Sin was in trouble when he trusted his own strength against the Ummān-manda but was saved when he started to trust the gods. In the Gyges narrative Gyges initially trusted the gods and was defeating the Cimmerians. He then became arrogant and trusted his own heart, and was destroyed by the Cimmerians, the ‘dangerous enemy’. The parallels found in the depiction of the Cimmerians in Assurbanipal’s Gyges’ narrative with the Cuthaean Legend serve the main purpose of the narrative: to glorify Assurbanipal as the pious king to whom all must submit in fear of the gods. The Assyrian sources do not name the Cimmerian warlord who invaded Lydia. The classical sources also mention the Cimmerian invasion of Lydia and the death of Gyges. The chronological harmonization of the data in Herodotus and other classical sources with the cuneiform evidence has been problematic. 115 Herodotus refers to the Cimmerians’ invasion of Sardis and their campaigns into Ionia, but places these events under the reign of Gyges’ son Ardys. 116 This may be an error in Herodotus’ Histories or it may ultimately go back to a tradition about another Cimmerian incursion into Lydia. Strabo preserves a classical tradition from Callinus that mentions a Cimmerian invasion of Sardis. 117 Elsewhere Strabo writes that Lygdamis led his followers ‘as far as Lydia and Ionia’ (μίχρι Λυδίας καὶ Ἰωνίας), took Sardis, but was killed in Cilicia. 118 A number of classical Greek sources indicate that the Cimmerians made incursions into Ionia, and some of the references hold Lygdamis responsible. 119 Strabo does not supply the name of the Lydian king who lived through Lygdamis’ sack of Sardis but his reference to this Cimmerian king’s Ionian campaigns (Geography I, 3, 21) strongly indicates Lydia was overrun at least once. The classical Greek sources and Assurbanipal’s texts are most probably referring to the same Cimmerians threatening Lydia in spite of the various chronological problems in reconciling the two historical traditions. 120 The name Lygdamis in the classical tradition corresponds to Tugdammē, the name of the Cimmerian king found in Assurbanipal’s royal inscriptions. The name Tugdammē is an Anatolian name rendered as Λυγδαμίς in Greek, and belongs to the Anatolian cultural milieu. 121 Tugdammē appears in some of Assurbanipal’s other texts as the king of the Cimmerians who even threatened the Assyrian Empire, as will be discussed below 6.3.3. It was probably

114 Basalt-Stela of Nabonidus II 33’-34’.
115 For a discussion and references, see Ivantchik, Les Cimmeriens au Proche-Orient, pp. 108-114.
116 Herodotus, Histories, I, 15.
117 Strabo, Geography, XIV, 1, 40.
118 Strabo, Geography, I, 3, 21.
119 Discussion and references in Ivantchik, Les Cimmeriens au Proche-Orient, pp. 106-107, 113-114.
120 On the problems, see ibid., pp. 108-114.
121 Discussion and references in ibid., pp. 115-117.
Tugdammē who led the destructive Cimmerian campaign in Lydia that is described in Assurbanipal’s Gyges narrative. This narrative employ various Mesopotamian literary themes and some of these relate to the clarification of the term Ummān-manda as has been discussed above.

6.3.2 Akkulanu and the Ummān-manda

The Assyrian scholar Akkulanu, usually based in the city of Aṣšur, reported to Assurbanipal a bad omen for ‘Amurru’ (KUR.MAR.TU) in a letter that dates to 657 BC. The bad omen is described as follows:

9. [DIS MUL šal-bat-a-na a-na MUL ŠU.GI TE-ḥi ina KUR.MAR.TU
10. BAL-tu GÁL-MA ŠEŠ ŠEŠ-xú GAZ-ak
11. E.GAL NUN KAR-a’ ni-šir-ti KUR DIŠ KUR šá-ni-tim-ma È
13a. ḤUL ša KUR.MAR šu-u-tú

(9.-13a.) Mars approaches the ‘Old Man’ (i.e. the Perseus constellation): in Amurru there will be a revolt and brother will kill brother. The palace of the ruler will be plundered, the treasure of the land will go out to another land. The emblem of the land will be tainted. His gods send the ‘king of the world’ (LUGAL SÚ) to his enemy. That is the evil for Amurru.

It is not very clear which land the term Amurru ‘Westland’ denotes in Akkulanu’s letter. Astrological reports use the term ‘Amurru’ for different lands. In one letter, Mar-Issar explains that Amurru ‘Westland’ refers to the Hatti land (which means Syria in Neo-Assyrian times), or the Sutean land (KUR Su-tu-u) the land of Chaldea. The term ‘Westland’ (Amurru) may refer to Tabal in another astrological letter, SAA 8 512. This letter cites an apodosis that the Ahlamu will eat the wealth of Amurru. The Itu’eans are called the Ahlamu, and the letter says they are sent against Mugallu the king of Tabal in a partially broken passage: ‘The Itu’eans whom the king

---

123 For the date and its astronomical basis, see LAS II, pp. 308-309.
124 SAA 10 100 9-13a.
126 SAA 8 512 2’-3’.
[my lord sent] against Mugal[lu]…’ ([LU]I-tu-ú-a-a ša LUGAL [be-li-a a-na] UGU-ḫi 1Mu-gal-[lu ʾis-pu-ru]).

The hope the Aḫlamu/Itu’eans will ‘eat’ the ‘Westland’ (Amurru) may mean they were sent to fight Mugallu king of Tabal, or alternatively they are visiting him, as part of their plan to attack elsewhere – the context is not preserved in the letter. Akkulanu also refers to the same apodosis of Aḫlamu eating the ‘Westland’ as a possible omen dependent on lunar visibility. This may mean ‘Westland’ denotes a land in Assyria’s northwest such as Tabal in SAA 8 512. The Cimmerians who overran Lydia and killed Gyges very possibly did similar things in other parts of Anatolia which also impacted Assyria’s northwestern frontier, where the lands that can be called ‘Westland’ (Amurru) are located. Hartman argues that Amurru should refer to Anatolia in Akkulanu’s letter because there is no explicit cuneiform evidence that the Cimmerians disturbed western Mesopotamia or Syria.

Parpola opts for the conventional use of the term Amurru for Syria and Palestine and argues that the Cimmerians took hegemony in Syria in a way similar to the Scythians described in Herodotus, *Histories* I 103-106 where the Assyrians experienced a period of weakness around 640 BC while the Scythians made themselves masters of all Asia. According to Parpola, Herodotus’ description of the Scythian rule as violent and consisting only of raids was passed over in silence by the Assyrian sources and applies to the Cimmerian hegemony. Parpola’s idea that the Cimmerians exercised some sort of control over Syria does not require a conjecture regarding Herodotus’ Scythian logos because it is perfectly possible that both the Cimmerians and the Scythians conducted similar military operations in these regions – unfortunately the available evidence from the cuneiform and classical sources do not allow a firm judgment about the authenticity and the sources of the data found in Herodotus’ *Histories*. Ivantchik identifies ‘king of the world’ šar kīššati(=LUGAL SÚ) in Akkulanu’s letter (for whom the bad omen to Amurru applies) with the king of the Cimmerians who after Lydia probably invaded some of the western possessions of the Assyrian Empire (denoted Amurru ‘Westland’ in the letter). The power attained by the Cimmerians is called kīššatu ‘hegemony’ in the letter. Ivantchik relates kīššatu ‘hegemony’ to the epithet šar kīššati ‘king of the world’. The latter is otherwise used as an epithet for the Assyrian kings, so Ivantchik argues this is as a way of saying the Cimmerian king attained a level of power and dominion that equaled Assyria – the use of an epithet reserved for Assyrian kings reflects the belief the Cimmerians power was

---

127 SAA 8 512 4'-5'.
128 SAA 10 100 r. 12-13.
130 LAS II, p. 308.
131 LAS II, p. 308.
133 SAA 10 100 13.
not legitimate.\textsuperscript{134} Strabo placed the death of Lygdamis (i.e. Tugdamme in Neo-Assyrian sources)\textsuperscript{135} in Cilicia.\textsuperscript{136} The first component of the name of Tugdamme’s successor (Sandakurr)\textsuperscript{137} is Sand/ta, a god local to Cilicia.\textsuperscript{138} It is likely that Cilicia and its environs was one of the primary regions of Cimmerian activity – so it makes sense that a bad omen for Assyria’s ‘Westland’ impacts the Cimmerians active around Cilicia. ‘Westland’ may have been used for Tabal in another letter (pp. 164-165), so the Cimmerian hegemony in the ‘Westland’, described by use of the epithet ‘king of the world’, can be interpreted such that the Cimmerians controlled more than Cilicia. Therefore I argue that the area designated by ‘Westland’ in Akkulanu’s letter was not limited to Cilicia but covered a larger domain in Assyria’s northwestern frontier. Akkulanu connects the bad omen on Amurru with the temporary hegemony of the Cimmerians. Akkulanu writes:\textsuperscript{139}

\begin{quote}
13. \textit{HUL ša KUR.MAR šu-u-tu DINGIR.MEŠ-ka šum-ma kiš-šu-tu₄}

14. [a]m-mar KUR.\textit{Gim-ra-a-a e-pu-u[š-u-n]}l Aššur DINGIR-ka

15. la i-na-aš-ša-an-ni a-na LUGAL EN-iä [l[a id-d]an-u-ni
\end{quote}

(13.-15.) That is the evil for Amurru. By your gods, the hegemony as much as the Cimmerians made, will Aššur your god not take it away and give (it) to the king my lord?

The bad omen for Amurru is described as the verification of the eventual removal of Cimmerian hegemony. This means Akkulanu applied the detailed apodosis of this bad omen for Amurru\textsuperscript{140} to the Cimmerians and explained the situation to Assurbanipal. In this case the epithet \textit{šar kēšati} ‘king of the world’ is used for the leader of a great Cimmerian political power, one that controlled territory beyond the lands described as ‘Westland’ in Akkulanu’s letter. Following his statement that the god Aššur will eventually take away Cimmerian power, Akkulanu cites a number of omens favourable to Akkad and associates them with Assyria.\textsuperscript{141} Then comes an omen that uses the term Ummān-manda:\textsuperscript{142}

---

\textsuperscript{135} For the correspondence between the two names, see \textit{ibid.}, pp. 115-117.
\textsuperscript{136} Strabo, \textit{Geography} I, 3, 21.
\textsuperscript{137} For the name Sandakurr, see \textbf{Appendix 1.44}, n. 184.
\textsuperscript{138} See discussion in Ivanthik, Les Cimmeriêns au Proche-Orient, pp. 121-122.
\textsuperscript{139} SAA 10 100 13-15.
\textsuperscript{140} The bad omen for Amurru isin SAA 10 100 9-13a, quoted above in p. 164.
\textsuperscript{141} SAA 10 100 16-24. For a translation, see \textbf{Appendix 1.42}.
\textsuperscript{142} SAA 10 100 25-26.
25. DIŠ ina ITI.GUD _MUL Şu-bat-a-nu IGL.A MI.KUR.MEŠ GÅL.MEŠ

26. şu-pú-ti ERIN-man-da

(25.-26.) (If) Mars becomes visible in the month of Iyyar: there will be great hostilities: the destruction (brought) by the Ummān-manda

The original omen is not known but the expression ‘destruction of the Ummān-manda’ (šal-pú-ti ERIN-man-da) appears to be a gloss for ‘great hostilities’ (MI.KUR.MEŠ GÅL.MEŠ) taken from a commentary to the series Enûma Anu Enlil. Hartman translates the gloss šal-pú-ti ERIN-man-da as ‘destruction by the barbarians’. Parpola alternatively argues that the gloss means Cimmerians are meant to suffer the ‘destruction’. In the extant astrological evidence the fall of the Ummān-manda is described with the word miqittum (SUB) whereas HUL-tim in one astrological omen (EAE 15 E 4’) can be read as šalputti and may refer to the destruction which the Ummān-manda inflict on a given territory or opponent, hence “the destruction (brought) by the Ummān-manda” (šalputti (HUL-tim) ERIN man-da). Unfortunately the omen is fragmentary and HUL-tim can also be read, lemuttim ‘evil’. The suggested use of šalputti in Akkulanu’s letter is rather inferred from the use of the same word in the Basalt-Stela of Nabonidus. The Stela initially refers to the destruction brought upon Babylonia by Sennacherib and describes it as ša-al-pu-at-ti ‘destruction’. The Stela later uses the term Ummān-manda for the Medes and refers to the destruction they brought upon Harran and the Assyrian lands as ‘the destruction (brought) by the Ummān-manda’ (šal-pu-at-ti ERIN man-da). In light of this evidence, Akkulanu’s wording šal-pú-ti ERIN man-da should be considered, as Hartman suggests, as the destruction caused by the Ummān-manda, and therefore translated as ‘the destruction (brought) by the Ummān-manda’. The ‘great hostilities’ (MI.KUR.MEŠ GÅL.MEŠ) in Akkulanu’s letter, then, concern the destruction caused by the Ummān-manda. Akkulanu explains to Assurbanipal that the Ummān-manda stands for the Cimmerians, which means there is a prediction that some more damage is expected from them according to this omen, but Akkulanu’s previous bad omen about Amurru means that the Cimmerians are expected to lose their power eventually (the omen is quoted above in p. 164). The use of the term Ummān-manda then fits into the context, especially when the fate of the
enemy in the Cuthaean Legend is recalled. Naram-Sin’s enemy acquires great territorial gains and power greater even than the king of Akkad, and they cause a lot of destruction. Eventually the gods destroy the Ummān-manda (5.6.1). The detailed apodosis Akkulanu cites for the bad omen regarding Amurru as the predestined removal of Cimmerian power compares well with the Cuthaean Legend that predicts and then describes the fall of the Ummān-manda. Akkulanu’s letter states, among other things, ‘brother will kill brother’.\(^{150}\) The Cuthaean Legend states that the enemy’s city will die and, among other things, ‘[broth]er’ will be hostile ‘with brother’.\(^{151}\) In both cases the enemy will be defeated through the will of the gods and without the interference of the Mesopotamian king.

### 6.3.3 Tugdammē Falls

The collapse of Tugdammē’s Cimmerian Empire is one of the central stories in Assurbanipal’s inscriptions. The terms ‘king of the Ummān-manda’, ‘creation of Tiamat’, ‘likeness of a [gallū-demon]’ and ‘seed of ruin’ (зер ḥalqāti) used for the Cimmerian king Tugdammē in Assurbanipal’s dedicatory inscription for Marduk and one of his cylinder inscriptions (BM 122616+)\(^{152}\) are implicit markers to the Cuthaean Legend as discussed in 5.1-2. Taken together, they identify the Cimmerians as an enemy similar to the Ummān-manda in the Standard Babylonian version of the Cuthaean Legend. The dedicatory inscription for Marduk states:\(^{153}\)

```
20. ū 1Tug-dam-mi-i LUGAL ERĪN-man-da tab-nīt ti-GĒME tam-šīl DINGIR [gal-le-e]\(^{154}\)
21. a-na la e-peš an-ni la ḥa-te-e mi-šīr KUR-ia ni-ilš DINGIR.MEš…
22. i-mīš la ik-kud-ma zi-kir-ka kab-tu ša 4i-gi-gi…
24. ki-i šip-ri DINGIR-ī-ka ša taḫ-pu-ra um-ma ū-sap-paḫ il-lat-x(ša(?))…
25. 1Sa-an-dak-KUR-ru DUMU ši-īt ŠA-ḫi-šu ša a-na te-ni-šu iš-ku-nu a-x[…
26. āš-me-a a-ta-id 4AMAR.UTU qar-du
```

---

\(^{150}\) SAA 10 100 10.
\(^{151}\) SB Tupsinna 137-139.
\(^{152}\) The cylinder inscription only preserves the epithets ‘king of the Ummān-manda’ and see[d of ruin] (NUMU[N ḥal-qa-ṭi-i]), BM 122616+ 19’ in Appendix 1.45.
\(^{153}\) K 120B+ 20-26 in Appendix 1.44.
\(^{154}\) For the restoration, see 5.1.
(20.-26.) And Tugdammē, the king of the Umma-manda, the creation of Tiamat, likeness of [a gallu-]demon… (That) which he was not to sin against, not to transgress the border of my land; the oath [of the gods…], he scorned, he showed no fear and your exalted name, which the Igigi… to the greatness of your lordship and the might of your divinity… because the message of your divinity which you sent, thus (saying): “I will scatter his(?) clan.” Sandakurru, son, offspring of his loins, whom they put as his substitute… I heard, I praised Marduk the valiant.

Marduk’s promise to scatter the ‘clan’ (il-lat) refers to the clan that is the ‘creation of Tiamat’ (tab-nit ti-GĒME). In the Cuthaean Legend Tiamat is one of the goddesses who created the Umma-manda nation, who were shaped as a family clan with Anubanini the father, Melili the mother and their seven sons. The gods predestine that they are eventually destroyed. Similarly here, in Assurbanipal’s dedicatory inscription, the fulfilment of Marduk’s promise to destroy the ‘king of the Umma-manda’ is acknowledged. Grafted into this narrative is how the Cimmerian king violated his treaty obligation not to transgress Assyria’s border. A common theme in Assurbanipal’s royal inscriptions is the power of the oaths: the gods punish those who did not keep their treaty obligations with Assyria. In Assurbanipal’s texts the gods used the Cimmerians to punish Lydia who broke its commitment to Nineveh as a vassal (6.3.1). The gods’ punishment for Tugdammē’s violation is described in detail in Assurbanipal’s large limestone inscription (IIT) found in the temple of Istar, chiefly towards the southeast side of the great foundation.155 IIT describes the last years of Tugdammē and was perhaps written around 640 BC, narrating the events surrounding his death in 642-641 BC.156 The relevant passage begins with the king of Tabal breaking his treaty obligations with Assyria and opting for an alliance with the Cimmerian king.157 IIT says that ‘he established talks with Tugdammē the king of the ‘seed of ruin’ (ii-ti Tugdam-mi-i LUGAL NUMUN ḫal-gā-ti-[i] ḫa-ta-kan pi-i-ṣū).158 The term zēr ḫalqati ‘seed of ruin’ recalls how the enemy of Naram-Sin was doomed to be ruined in the Cuthaean Legend. IIT then describes the first curse that befalls Tugdammē the ‘seed of ruin’ (zēr ḫalqati):159

AN.ŠAR KUR-ū GAL-u šā i-ta-a-šū la i-nē-e[ṛ-!] i-qu ik-šū-us-su-ma ina DINGIR.GIŠ.BAR
a-ri-ri pa-gar-šū ū-ṣaq-me ba-lu GIŠ.PAN ANŠE.KUR.RA.MEŠ ĖMEŠ-ŠU [qin]-nu-šū NUMUN Ė

157 IIT 138-143.
158 IIT 142-143.
159 IIT 143-145.
Aššur the great mountain, whose bounds are unchangeable, overcame him and burned his body in flaming fire, without a bow (or) horses. His brothers, his concubines, the seed of his father’s house, his vast troops, the help of his hands, horses, mules without number, of their own accord, they sent to Assyria.

The gods demonstrate their power over the ‘seed of ruin’ by burning his body without ‘bow (or) horses’. The Cimmerian king, however, soon disregards the power of the gods and the need to maintain peaceful relations with Assurbanipal:


Tugdamme the king of the mountainmen and Gutium, the arrogant, who did [n]ot know the fear of the god[s], trusted his own strength and called up his army in order to make war and battle. He pitched his camp on the border of Assyria.

Tugdamme’s epithet ‘king of the mountainmen and Gutium’ ([L]UGAL šad-a-a-u ú Gu-tu-um.KI) refers to his origin as a powerful king from the eastern mountains. The word šad-a-a-u is literally ‘mountainmen’. This appears to be regarded as a general word for ‘easterner’ and as a designation has deep roots in Mesopotamia. The Old Akkadian word šadim ‘east wind, east’ was a general term for the inhabitants of the north-eastern mountain fringes of Mesopotamia and the territories beyond them. The toponym ša-du-ú ‘mountain’ is found next to Urartu in the Babylonian World Map. This supports the idea that šad-a-a-u refers to people from a mountain region bordering Urartu, no doubt with some relation to the Cimmerian homeland which the Assyrians knew was

160 ITT 146-148.
161 For the reading šad-a-a-u and its translation ‘les montagnards’, see Ivantchik, Les Cimmeriens au Proche-Orient, pp. 119-120.
near Urartu. Another reason for this Gutium epithet may lie in the subsequent description of the Cimmerian king as ‘arrogant’, who did not know the fear of the god[s] (muš-tar-[ḫu] ša pa-laḫ DINGIR. [MEŠ l]a i-du-a) in the passage quoted immediately above. The Gutí are described in the Weidner Chronicle as ‘showing no fear of god’ (DINGIR pa-la-ḫa la kul-lu-ma). There seems to be a tradition that the Gutians are uncivilised and irreverent, and this tradition is imposed on the Cimmerian king. In IIT, Tugdamme trusts his own strength and establishes his war camp. He suffers greatly for his irreverence:

AN.SÂR 4NIN.LIL 4EN 4AG 4[X]V a-ši-bat šâ URU.LIMMU.DINGIR […] pi-i-šû er-hi e-zîz-û-ma
im-ta-ra-aš UGU-šû-un i-na a-mat [DINGIR]-ti-šû-nu GA[L-ti… [4GÎŠ.B]AR ul-tû AN-e im-qu-tam-ma
šâ-a-šû ERIN.HI-šû KARAS-su ú-[qal]-li-šû-nu-ti Tug-[dam-mi-i ip-lâ]f-ma na-kut-tu ir-šû-ma
[ER]ÎN.HI-šû KARAS-su is-suḫ-ma a-na EGR-[šû a]-na KUR-šû i-tur

Aššur, Ninlil, Bêl, Nabû, [Ištar] dwelling in Arbela … his aggressive mouth poured forth, he became ill, over them in the word of their great divinity … [fi]re from heaven fell and on himself, his army, his camp, it b[ur]nt them. Tugdamme fled and became anxious and removed his [tr]oops, his camp and back to [his] land he returned.

Once again the gods, without the interference of Assyria, create problems for the Cimmerian, who in turn falls into fear and returns to his land. The final column preserved in the fragments found for prism H of Assurbanipal’s annals (BM 123410), dating to his thirtieth year (c. 639 BC) and found in Babylon, parallels the final lines about Tugdamme in IIT. Prism H contains a detail not found in IIT regarding Tugdamme’s withdrawal after his failed attempt to invade Assyria: the Cimmerian king withdraws his camp and his army to a city named Ḥarsalle (URU.HÂR-ša-al-le-e). I know nothing else about this city or military base. It could very well be a real place. Another tablet relating to Prism H seems to be referring to the Tugdamme as ‘[gall]ü

164 For the Assyrian knowledge about Cimmeria, see 6.1.1.
166 Weidner Chronicle 64.
167 IIT 148-152.
169 Millard, op.cit., p. 106.
170 Ibid., p. 109: 9'.
demon?, seed of ruin’ ([gal-]? NUMUN ḫal-q[ā-ti-i]). The term ‘seed of ruin’ signals the Cuthaean Legend (5.2). The city of the Cimmerians mentioned in tablet BM 123410 of Prism H can be seen as a subliminal parallel with the city of the Ummān-manda in the Cuthaean Legend. BM 123410 uniquely says (unfortunately half understood due to text breaks) that ‘his (Tugdamme’s) land revolted against him’ (KUR-šu UGU-šu iḫ-bal-ki-tu), that ‘he dwelt in an evil place’ (ina KI ḪUL-eh u-šīb) and that ‘he spoke in the council of his troops’ (ina UKKIN ERIN.HI-ša i-dab-bu-ub). The context and details are lost to text breaks but clearly Tugdamme seems to have had some internal problems. It is possible that these problems also prevented him from launching his attack on Assyria and he perhaps returned to Harsalle to settle these disputes. This historical reality seems to have been put in a narrative using various literary and ideological themes in the texts IIT and Prism H that glorify Assurbanipal. The ‘council of his troops’ (UKKIN ERIN.HI-ša) may hint at the Cimmerian warlords in Tugdamme’s service. Prism H subliminally may have likened them to the brother kings who were subservient to their father Anubanini in the Cuthaean Legend. The main theme, among others, is that Tugdamme the ‘seed of ruin’ is unable to touch Assyria because Assurbanipal the pious king knows to trust the gods to ultimately destroy the Cimmerians similar to Naram-Sin who trusts the gods against the ‘seed of ruin’ in the Cuthaean Legend. The enemy in the Cuthaean Legend also had their own city and military leaders of the same clan. Tugdamme temporarily saves his life because he fears the power of the gods who make him ill and rain fire on his army, so he establishes a peace treaty with Assurbanipal – allegedly submitting to the Assyrian king. Soon the Cimmerian king violates his treaty obligations. The violation of the oath brings upon him a terrible death:

[i]m-ma-šiḏ-ma sī-ḫu-lu ʾiš-[ša-kin ina ŠA-bišī E]ME-šī-um-mar-ta ma im-qit GĪŠ-šī ina za-a-bi u ḫa-a-li u-e-a a-a iq-ta-ti na-piš-tuš...ina h[at-ṭi] ra-ma-ni-šī-nu [urassībī a]-ḥa-mēš ina GĪŠ.TUKUL.MEŠ i-dal-la-lu ta-ni-ti AN.ŠAR EN GAL-[e EN]-ia ina UD-me an-na-a ḫ[ī]-m[a]-u-i
al-b[ī]-in ap-pi ina la-ban a[p-pi at-ta]-ʾi-id da-na-an DINGIR.MEŠ GAL.MEŠ EN.MEŠ-ia...[ša il-li]-ku re-su-ti si-it-ti LŪ.KUR.MEŠ la kan-šu-[tī] pu-luḫ-ti AN.ŠAR ʾ Bucc[N.LIL] [ʾ XV ašibatšā]

172 For the information about the ‘city’ of the Ummān-manda in the Cuthaean Legend, see 4.3.1.
174 IIT 152-157.
175 IIT 157-159a.
176 IIT 159b-165.
LIMMU.DINGIR.KI DINGIR.MEŠ… a-na z[i-kir] MU-ia ip-tal-la-hu

[A]ššur my lord overwhelmed him and he went mad and [i]n the collapse of sa[n]i[ty] his hand weakened, (disease) [s]truck half his body and thorn was es[tablished within him,] his [to]ngue he scraped off and it fell, his penis in meltdown and disintegration in woe (and) misery he bowed. The life… in his own s[i]n [he (or it (life)) fell. (Slaughtering) e]ach other in weapons they praised Aššur the great lord my [lord]. In this day I li[s][ten[ed], I stro[ke]d the [n]ose, I praised the might of the great gods my lords… [who ca]me to the aid. Those remaining enemies not submissi[ve], the fear of Aššur, Ni[n][lil], [Īstar who dwells in] Arbela, the gods…to the ut[terance] of my name they (the enemies) were fearful.

The statement ‘(Slaughtering) [e]ach other in weapons they praised Aššur’ particularly resembles how the Ummān-manda in the Cuthaean Legend will be massacred according to the will of the gods without the interference of the Mesopotamian king.177 The untimely death of Tugdamnē and the subsequent elimination of the great Cimmerian threat to the Assyrian Empire without the latter’s interference, as described in IIT, is clearly one of the main reasons why Assurbanipal’s texts liken this Cimmerian king and his empire to the enemies of Naram-Sin in the Cuthaean Legend with a range of epithets, implicit markers, and parallels, including the use of the term Ummān-manda.

Ivanchik argues that terms like Ummān-manda and zēr ḫalqātī ‘seed of ruin’ were archaic designations stemming from cuneiform literary texts and were used in Assyrian inscriptions for ornamental purposes to describe barbaric and non-civilised peoples.178 Lanfranchi treats these terms, including Ummān-manda, as tools of Assyrian royal ideology and argues that they were generic appellations that developed out of the literary and omen literatures, particularly astrology, and were used in different contexts to refer to a force hostile to Mesopotamia.179 Sauter argues that the term Ummān-manda was a label used for nomadic tribes that the Assyrians used for the Cimmerians.180 Little is known about the Cimmerians’ socio-political structure, partly

177 SB Tupsinna 133.
180 H. Sauter, Studien zum Kimmerierproblem. (Saarbrücker Beiträge zur Altertumskunde Band 72) (http://www.kimmerier.de/start.htm), 9.2.1.3.
because there is a problem about determining their precise material culture. In any case the question of nomadism has no relation with the use of the term Ummān-manda for the Cimmerians. If this really had been the case, one expects the term would have also been used for the Scythians as it has been used for the Cimmerians – both are usually considered to be nomadic or pastoralist societies. Ivantchik has made a good point that these terms cannot be used literally to reconstruct Cimmerian history, e.g. arguing for a specific location for the Cimmerian homeland from the expression ‘Ummān-manda whose abode is distant’. There does seem to be, nonetheless, a range of actual things observed about the Cimmerians that have shaped the use of these terms in Assyrian documents. Lanfranchi’s interpretation helps see the archaic terms used as stock expressions within a framework of Assyrian royal ideology and how they were general descriptors of the hostile Cimmerians. The discussion in chapter 5 and throughout this chapter indicates there is more to the significance of these terms than just being stock expressions, especially Ummān-manda and zēr ḫālqātī ‘seed of ruin’; the latter two were implicit markers for literary allusions to the Cuthaean Legend when they were used to describe the Cimmerians, so there was a literary aspect to their use that unveiled further layers of meaning. The literary allusions to the Cuthaean Legend and the way these parallel Cimmerian descriptions indicate that the main reasons the term Ummān-manda designates them are their distant homeland, their ability to pillage countries, and the proliferation of a number of Cimmerian warlords across Anatolia and Iran. How these evoke the enemy of the Cuthaean Legend has been discussed throughout this chapter.

---

181 The problems with interpreting their material culture are discussed in Ivantchik, “The Current State of the Cimmerian Problem”.
182 Ibid., p. 314.
NEO-BABYLONIAN SOURCES

7.1 Ummān-manda in the Gadd Chronicle

The Medes’ powerful presence in the last years of the conflict between Assyria and Babylonia is described in the Gadd Chronicle.¹ Nabopolassar, the founder of the Neo-Babylonian Empire, failed to take the city of Assur in his eleventh year and was pushed back to the fortress of Takritain on the bank of the Tigris, but managed to fight off the ensuing Assyrian offensive.² In the month of Marchesvan of the same year, the Medes burst into the scene. Text breaks obscure some of the Medes’ first urban targets in Assyria but among their military successes are the capture of Tarbis[u in the province of Nineveh and the defeat and the demolition of Assur during the twelfth regnal year of Nabopolassar.³ The Gadd Chronicle says that Nabopolassar was unable to reach Assur before its demolition, but that he and Cyaxares established ‘good (relations) and peace with one another’ (Dûgtû u su-lum-mu-KI a-ḫa-meš) before the Median king returned to ‘his land’ (ana KUR-si).⁴ The Gadd Chronicle depicts the Medes as very powerful, i.e. they are able to demolish the mighty city of Assur whereas Nabopolassar failed to capture it.⁵ This is a way the image of the Medes entertained by the author of the Gadd Chronicle comes across in the text.

7.1.1 The Untouchable Medes

The Gadd Chronicle first uses the term Ummān-manda for the Medes during their activities in Nabopolassar’s fourteenth regnal year.⁶ This means the term is used only after the establishment of the friendly relationships with the Medes during the Babylonian king’s twelfth year.⁷ The ‘king of the Ummān-manda’ meets up with

¹ The passages in the Gadd Chronicle that mention the Medes are provided in Appendix 1.50.
² Gadd Chronicle 16-22.
³ Gadd Chronicle 23-27.
⁴ Gadd Chronicle 28-30.
⁵ Gadd Chronicle 16-27.
⁶ Gadd Chronicle 38.
Nabopolassar in the latter’s fourteenth regnal year and they jointly conquer Nineveh.\(^8\) Cyaxares returns to his land on 20\(^{th}\) of Elul, and ‘after him’ (EGIR-šu) the ‘king of Akkad’ conducts military operations as far as Našbin.\(^9\) It is noteworthy that only after the Medes have left for their homeland does Nabopolassar conduct these operations. This may mean the Babylonian king had to restrain himself when the Ummān-manda were around.

The Gadd Chronicle then draws attention to the Assyrians who maintained their kingship in Ḫarran after the fall of Nineveh.\(^10\) Nabopolassar marched ‘authoritatively’ (šal-ta-niš) in Assyria, then his ally the Ummān-manda came back and they marched together against Ḫarran.\(^11\) The text does not say that the Medes halted Nabopolassar’s ‘authoritative’ march. On the contrary, they were on friendly terms. The issue is that Nabopolassar marched ‘authoritatively’ only when the Medes were not around, so in effect he has to share his ‘authoritative’ march with the Ummān-manda. Nabopolassar had failed to capture the city of Assur but the Medes demolished that city without Babylonian partnership.\(^12\) Nabopolassar could not reach Assur before the Medes ‘demolished’ (it-ta-qar) the city of Assur.\(^13\) The demolition of Assur, carried out by the Medes ‘terribly, in an evil manner’ (limniš), without Babylonian partnership, recalls the forces of the Ummān-manda in the Cuthaean Legend (5.4). The Medes appear more powerful and merciless than the Babylonians in the Gadd Chronicle. This cannot have sat too comfortably with any Babylonian. Nonetheless, the joint forces of the king of Ummān-manda and king of Akkad conquered Ḫarran and plundered the ‘heavy booty of city and temple’ (ši-lat URU u É.KUR DUGUD-tū).\(^14\)

The last mention of the Medes in the Gadd Chronicle is that the Ummān-manda, who came to aid the Babylonians, ‘[w]ithdrew’ ([it]-te-eh-su),\(^15\) no doubt to their homeland to which they had returned earlier in the chronicle.\(^16\) Throughout the Gadd Chronicle, there comes across the sense that the Medes were a formidable

---

\(^8\) Gadd Chronicle 38-45.
\(^9\) Gadd Chronicle 47-49.
\(^10\) Gadd Chronicle 49-52.
\(^11\) Gadd Chronicle 58-61.
\(^12\) Gadd Chronicle 16-27.
\(^13\) Gadd Chronicle 27-28. There is also the letter VS 6 202 that concerns the provisioning of temple oblates to be sent to the city of Assur as soldiers in Nabopolassar’s twelfth regnal year. For discussion and references, see Jursa, “Observations”, p. 173, n. 28.
\(^14\) Gadd Chronicle 58-64.
\(^15\) Gadd Chronicle 65.
\(^16\) Gadd Chronicle 30.
force that the Babylonians could not touch. In the Cuthaean Legend, the Ummān-manda were invincible and only the gods could bring their downfall (5.6.1-2).

### 7.1.2 ‘Land of Ecbatana’

The Medes’ return to their homeland reveals another aspect of their image: they have a particular place to return to after their military operations in Mesopotamia. The geographical connotation of the term Ummān-manda is a serious factor behind its use for the Medes. The Ummān-manda represent a people from a distant mountain land in the Cuthaean Legend (4.2). Diakonoff treated Ummān-manda as a purely traditional archaic geographical term that designated the Medes and other “northern tribes” (sebernoe plemya), such as the Cimmerians, from the Babylonian point of view. The way the Ummān-manda in the Neo-Babylonian texts resemble the ones in the Cuthaean Legend, as discussed in 5.3-4 and throughout this chapter, indicates that the term is more than a traditional designation. Diakonoff’s view that the term denotes ‘northern tribes’ does not address the situation clearly because the term is not used for every nation that could be described as ‘northern tribes’. The geographical location of the Cimmerians (6.1.1) and the Medes are relevant specifically because they both come from a distant land situated in the northeastern/eastern frontier of Mesopotamia. It is from such a distant land in the ‘east’ that the Ummān-manda come in the Cuthaean Legend and some other sources. The Ummān-manda homeland of the Medes in the Gadd Chronicle is most probably the region centred around Ecbatana (modern Hamadan in north-western Iran), the royal city of the Median kingdom during the time of Nabonidus according to another Babylonian chronicle. The Nabonidus Chronicle calls this homeland the ‘land of Ecbatana’ (KUR A-gam-ta-nu). There is no explicit use of the geographical name ‘Media’ in the Nabonidus Chronicle but clearly ‘land of Ecbatana’ (KUR A-gam-ta-nu) was considered to be in the land of the Medes under Astyages and his predecessor Cyaxares. The Neo-Babylonian texts mentioning the Medes and their land are scarce and do not

---

17 Gadd Chronicle 30, 47, 65.  
19 As discussed particularly in 4.1-2.  
20 For the archaeology of Ecbatana (Hamadan), see the introductory comments in D. Stronach, “Independent Media: Archaeological Notes from the Homeland” in CE, pp. 242-245.  
21 Ecbatana is said to be the royal city of Astyages, Nabonidus Chronicle ii 3-4. Astyages was the successor of Cyaxares.  
22 Nabonidus Chronicle ii 3-4.  
23 Nabonidus Chronicle ii 3-4.
truly reveal all that the Babylonians knew about Median political geography. Nonetheless, some information can be gleaned from them. The discussion below will try to discern from the Neo-Babylonian sources how the land of the Medes was seen as part of Babylon’s eastern frontier and whether it is possible that the Babylonians could conceive that ‘Media’ contained different lands such as the ‘land of Ecbatana’.


The connection drawn between these two letters is not substantiated because there is no ‘Media’ mentioned in BIN I 93 and there is no mention of ‘mountain-dwellers’ in GCCI II 395. There is also no discernable connection between the individuals mentioned in these letters. The meaning of šad-da-a-a ‘mountain dwellers’ can be discerned from the use of word šad-a-a-u found in a Neo-Assyrian text where it literally means ‘mountainmen’. The Cimmerian king Tugdamme was called ‘the king of the mountainmen and Gutium’ ([L]UGAL šad-a-a-u ú Gu-tu-um.KI). Steinkeller notes that the word šaddā’a, šaddā’u is derived from the same base as the Old Akkadian word šadium. The word šadium ‘east wind, east’ is a general term in Old Akkadian texts for the inhabitants of the

24 For an overview of the archival Neo-Babylonian references to the Medes and Media, see M. Jursa, “Observations on the Problem of the Median “Empire” on the Basis of Babylonian Sources” in CE, pp 170-171. Most of these archival sources provide no information about what the Babylonians knew about Median geography.


27 Ibid., no. 293, p. 236: 9.

28 Ibid., no. 293, p. 236: 22.
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north-eastern mountain fringes of Mesopotamia and the territories beyond them.\textsuperscript{33} The toponym \textit{ša-du-ú} ‘mountain’ is found next to Urartu in the Babylonian World Map.\textsuperscript{34} This confirms that \textit{šadu} ‘mountain’ can be used to describe the eastern frontier of Mesopotamia. The word \textit{šad-da-a-a} ‘mountain dwellers’ in the Neo-Babylonian letter BIN I 93 also appears to be a general descriptor for the inhabitants of the eastern mountains. ‘Media’ can be considered to be in the eastern mountains but it is not likely the Babylonians thought ‘Media’ was the only land in the eastern mountains or that the Medes were the only inhabitants of the mountains. The Babylonian references do not inform about size of ‘Media’, the distribution of power among the Median cities or the nature of Cyaxares’ and Astyages’ control over their realm. This lack of knowledge makes it hard to know what ‘Media’ stands for in a Neo-Babylonian letter GCCI II 395. Gutium, a label used for ‘Media’ that bordered the Neo-Babylonian realm (\textsection{7.3.2}), could very well have been the abode of the ‘mountain-dwellers’ in BIN I 93 only because the eastern lands denoted by the expression ‘mountain-dwellers’ were under the control of the Median kingdom, although these lands were originally outside the Median heartland centred around Ecbatana. The term Ummān-manda is reserved for the Medes under Cyaxares and Astyages, whose homeland is the region specifically centred around Ecbatana. This region does not constitute all of what the Babylonians deemed ‘Media’ but only a part of it, because the Neo-Babylonians used the term Gutium for ‘Media’ and the Cyrus Cylinder indicates that the Neo-Babylonians saw Gutium as a boundary for the realm of civilisation that included places such as Susa and Anšān (\textsection{4.1.1, 7.3.2}). The Babylonian knowledge of Median political geography must have been more complicated than the scarce sources reveal.

Some of the Babylonian information about the Medes can reasonably assumed to be similar to what the Assyrians knew about them. The Assyrians recognized that the Medes had many settlements, \textit{bēl ālāni} ‘city lords’.\textsuperscript{35} For example Sargon II receives tribute from 28 \textit{bēl ālāni} ‘city lords’ of the ‘powerful Medes’ (KUR.\textit{Ma-da-a dan-nu-ti}).\textsuperscript{36} Assyrian contact with the Medes from Ecbatana may have begun with Sargon II but this is not certain.\textsuperscript{37} Sennacherib campaigned once in central Zagros, conquered Ellipi in his second campaign

\begin{itemize}
\item[\textsuperscript{33}] \textit{Ibid.}, pp. 1-8.
\item[\textsuperscript{35}] For a summary of the Assyrian campaigns into Median settlements, see S. C. Brown, “Median (Media)” \textit{RIA} 7 (1987-1990), pp. 619-623.
\item[\textsuperscript{37}] For this possibility, see I. N. Medvedskaya, “Have the Assyrians Been in Ecbatana?” (in Russian) \textit{VDI} 213/2 (1995), pp. 147-155. Medvedskaya’s argument requires that Mt. Bikni ‘the lapis lazuli mountain’, the easternmost location reached by the Assyrians, be identified with Damavand and nowhere west of that, see especially \textit{ibid.}, pp. 147-151. For a critique of the identification with Damavand and an alternative view on the location of Mt. Bikni, see L. D. Levine, \textit{Contributions to the Historical Geography of the Zagros in the Neo-Assyrian Period}. University of Pennsylvania. PhD. Ann Arbor, Michigan. University Microfilms. 1969, pp.
\end{itemize}
Esarhaddon’s extispicy reports reveal that the powerful city lord Kaštaritu of Karkašši threatened Assyrian interests in its eastern front, even preparing for war.\(^{39}\) There are some chronological problems with identifying him with Phraortes from Herodotus’ *Histories*.\(^{40}\) Assyrian sources are blank about Cyaxares of the Gadd Chronicle. This may be an accident of discovery. Herodotus writes that Madyes son of Protothyes (Akkadian *Bartatua*) fought off Cyaxares who was besieging Nineveh.\(^{41}\) The Scythians entered Asia by ‘taking the Caucasus to their right’ and defeated the Medes and spread all across Asia.\(^{42}\) Cyaxares eventually managed to defeat the Scythians and his Median kingdom became the hegemonic power.\(^{43}\) Untangling the authentic sources from ancient Greek story telling in Herodotus’ narrative of a Scythian hegemony in the ancient Near East is well beyond the scope of this research.\(^{44}\) The traditions and sources Herodotus used may have confused some of the details of the Scythian activity in the ancient Near East with that of Tugdammê the Cimmerian king who at one stage threatened Assurbanipal.

Despite all the problems about the historical background to Cyaxares’ Median kingdom, it is clear that he emerges as the dominant power, centered on Ecbatana. I argue that the Babylonians were aware, as the Assyrian were, that the land of Media originally comprised of competing city lords. Cyaxares gained dominance among them. For the Babylonians, Cyaxares was the city lord of Ecbatana who dominated the Medes and then extended his activities beyond. In the Standard Babylonian Cuthaean Legend, the Umnā-manda represent a powerful force that spread their activities beyond the eastern mountains whence they came (4.2). The Babylonians connected this Umnā-manda with the Medes specifically under Cyaxares. The focus of the term Umnā-manda in the Gadd Chronicle is therefore Cyaxares himself.

---

39 All documents pertaining to Kaštaritu are extispicy reports. For these, see SAA 4.
7.1.3 Astyages Falls

One of the significant themes in the Cuthaean Legend is that the Umma-n-manda are a force that the gods will eventually destroy, regardless of how powerful they are and how the Mesopotamian king is unable to defeat them (5.6.1-2). The Nabonidus Chronicle describes the fall of the Median kingdom:

1. [id]-ki-e-ma ana UGU 1Ku-raš LUGAL An-šá-an ana ka-š[á-di i]l-lik-ma…
2. 1Is-tu-me-gu ER İN-šá BAL-su-ma ina ŠU.2 ša-bit a-na 1Ku-raš id-d[il]n]
3. 1Ku-raš a-na KUR A-gam-ta-nu URU LUGAL-ú-tu <il-lik-ma> KÚ.BABBAR KÚ.GI NÍG.SU NÍG.GA…

1. He (i.e. Astyages) [su]mmoned and [m]arched against Cyrus the king of Anšan to con[quer] and…
2. Astyages, his army rebelled against him and (his) hands bound, del[ivered] to Cyrus
3. Cyrus <went> to Ecbatana the royal city. Silver, gold, property…
4. of Ecbatana they plundered and he took to Anšan the goods (and) property of the arm[y…

The collapse of the Umma-n-manda in the Cuthaean Legend is described around the massacre of their city arranged by the gods, without any Akkadian interference. 47 Similarly the Medes had their own city, Ecbatana, the Persians captured it and the Babylonians did not interfere. The author of the Gadd Chronicle (BM 21901), or whoever is responsible for first using the term Umma-n-manda, may have known in hindsight that the Medes, who appeared so powerful in the account of the war against Assyria, eventually collapsed without the interference of the Babylonian kingdom. It is also possible that the term Umma-n-manda was used in the chronicle before the Median kingdom collapsed, and that the use of the term reflected the Babylonian hopes that the gods would one day destroy the Medes. I have discussed how the Assyrians used the term Umma-n-manda for the Cimmerians during the time of Esarhaddon, during which they were a vibrant force and had not collapsed

45 Nabonidus Chronicle ii 1-4.
46 Smith’s collation does not include the last two signs, see BHT, p. 111: ii 4, pl. XII: ii 4, but Grayson reads them, see ABC, p. 106: ii 4. The last two signs are also read by Glassner in J.-J. Glassner, Mesopotamian Chronicles. B. R. Foster, ed. (Writings from the Ancient World 19). Atlanta. Society of Biblical Literature. 2004, p. 234: ii 4.
47 SB Tupsinna 133-144.
48 The power of the Medes and how this evoked the power of the Umma-n-manda in the Cuthaean Legend is discussed in 7.1.1.
One of the reasons the Cimmerians were called Ummān-manda during the time of Esarhaddon was the hope that they will in fact lose their undeserved political power. The use of the term ‘seed of ruin’ for the Cimmerians during the time of Esarhaddon should also be seen in this context.

The Gadd Chronicle could have been written well before the fall of Astyages. Unfortunately the date of the chronicle’s composition remains unknown. Even if the sources used by the chronicler were contemporaneous with the events mentioned in the chronicle, the chronicle itself could have been written anytime after the events mentioned in it. Zawadski argues that the tablet of the Gadd Chronicle (BM 21901) is a copy and not the original. For this, Zawadski argues that the missing phrase the ‘seventeenth year’ šatti 17<sup>Kām</sup> (in Gadd Chronicle 66) must have been in the original tablet and the copyist could have omitted it out of negligence. This argument is very plausible. Unfortunately there is no further evidence that can help identify the period this copy was prepared or the time the original chronicle was written.

Nabonidus’ inscriptions and the Cyrus Cylinder describe Marduk as the real force behind historical events such as Sennacherib’s destruction of Babylonia, and the rise and fall of the Ummān-manda of their own times, the Medes. Babylonians believed Marduk was in control of human affairs. Even Nabonidus, committed to Sin, could not avoid this doctrine, so for example he includes Marduk next to Sin in the description of his dream in which he is given the divine commission to rebuild the Ehulḫul in the Sippar Cylinder. The scribe(s) behind the Gadd Chronicle were no doubt traditional Babylonians and assumed Marduk’s control of history.

The account of the Babylonian looting of Ḥarran in the Gadd Chronicle contradicts Nabonidus’ version of the looting and it is clear that Nabonidus has another religious agenda that seeks to promote the temple of Ehulḫul.

---

49 This is discussed in ch. 6, pp. 157-159.
50 There is no agreement on the nature of the sources for the Neo-Babylonian Chronicles. These sources may include astronomical and/or divinatory documents. For discussion and references, see ABC, pp. 11-14; M. Gerber, “A Common Source for the Late Babylonian Chronicles Dealing with the Eighth and Seventh Centuries” JAOS 120 (2000), pp. 553-569; Glassner, Mesopotamian Chronicles, pp. 47-48.
52 Ibid., p. 116.
53 As Glassner points out, the extant chronicle documents are expected to be copies, Glassner, Mesopotamian Chronicles, p. 37.
54 This will be discussed in 7.2-3.
56 Sippar Cylinder I 16-17.
57 This is confirmed by the chronicle’s colophon that asks ‘those who love Nabu and Marduk’ to preserve the tablet, Gadd Chronicle 78.
which traditional Babylonians hated. Grayson argues that the chronicles were compiled to write history for its own sake. This statement stems from the historical reliability of these chronicle series. Historians have amply used them to write Neo-Babylonian history. The admission of defeats in the Babylonian documents indicates that they are reliable. The authenticity of the Neo-Babylonian chronicles does not mean they lack a theological basis. The Babylonian commitment to the deity Marduk and his power over events has been known in Assyriology for a long time. Neo-Babylonian chronicles other than the Gadd Chronicle write about different periods of Babylonian history, and events up to the time of the Seleucids. The Babylonians, and especially their scribes, had to explain why foreigners such as the Assyrians, the Persians and the Greeks ruled and continued to rule over them for centuries without diminishing the power of Marduk over human affairs. This necessitates the theological doctrine that Marduk is in control of political events. The Babylonians, especially the educated circles, would traditionally see Marduk’s omnipotence behind the rise and fall of the Medes, their homeland, their attributes, their destructive campaigns and their downfall without Babylonian interference. The resemblances with the Ummān-manda in the Cuthaean Legend suggest itself for those immersed in Akkadian literature; the Ummān-manda originated from a distant land in the ‘east’, they conducted destructive campaigns, they rose and fell beyond the control of Akkad. The scribe(s) of the Gadd Chronicle most probably picked up on a Neo-Babylonian tradition of calling the Medes under Cyaxares as Ummān-manda, due to all the affinities between the Ummān-manda in the Cuthaean Legend and the Medes under Cyaxares and Astyages, as discussed above in pp. 175-182.

Zawadski sees the term Ummān-manda as a pejorative term used for the Medes, based on the argument that the Gadd Chronicle (BM 91201) represents a modified version of an earlier chronicle that portrayed the Medes

58 Nabonidus’ agenda and his own version of the desecration in Harran will be discussed in 7.2.
59 ABC, pp. 10-11.
60 e.g. CCK; von Voigtlander, A Survey of Neo-Babylonian History.
61 ABC, p. 10; Glassner, Mesopotamian Chronicles, p. 48. There is no reason to assume the Babylonian chronicles recorded every single defeat or complex political problem the Neo-Babylonian Empire endured. One major reason for this is clearly that the chronicler has a limited amount of space on the tablet and has to select the data that is most important for the livelihood of the Babylonian kingdom.
62 For a discussion of how Mesopotamian theology requires authentic historical information, see Glassner, Mesopotamian Chronicles, pp. 22-27.
63 See e.g. R. F. Harper, “Prayers from the Neo-Babylonian Historical Inscriptions” The Biblical World 23 (1904) 428-434.
64 For these, see ABC; Glassner, Mesopotamian Chronicles.
65 It is less likely that the scribe(s) of the Gadd Chronicle came up with the designation themselves. The Neo-Babylonian chronicles were not the type of documents that invited creativity. They usually followed predictable patterns and it is not likely they would use terms the readers were unaccustomed with.
without the term Ummān-manda. Zawadski argues that the chronicle was modified, and the term Ummān-manda was inserted, in order to minimise the Medes’ contribution to the fall Assyria, and that this happened after Babylonian relations with Medes broke down. Zawadski searches for the possibility that the term Ummān-manda had never been used in the original of the Gadd Chronicle. Zawadski argues that there are certain omissions from idiomatic phrases in the Gadd Chronicle that prove this. Zawadski observes that the word šar ‘king’ is missing before KUR Ma-da-a-a and Ummān-manda in the Gadd Chronicle except for line 38, and that the name of Cyaxares stands alone without the royal title and the name of his kingdom (šar KUR Ma-da-a-a ‘king of Media’) – this to Zawadski is evidence that some of the literary conventions that were presumably kept in the original version of the chronicle have been altered. There are, however, always exceptions to patterns. On the other hand, for arguments sake, even if one presumed there is some alteration, this by itself does not prove that the alterations are done out of antagonism towards a particular former enemy or ally. For example the Assyrian enemy is called ‘king (šar) of Assyria’. If the hated enemy can be called ‘king’, then it means deleting the word ‘king’ does not by itself indicate a textual alteration out of antagonism.

Zawadski argues that another characteristic omission is that the words u ummānī-šū ‘and his troops’ are lacking whenever the Gadd Chronicle describes the Medes arriving into Mesopotamia and participating in combat, but they are used when their retreat is described; these words should be used every time the name of the Median country is given. Zawadski sees this pattern of omission as a primitive device to belittle the significance of their military involvement against Assyria. While Zawadski’s observations about the pattern of omission are interesting, again they do not prove the role of the Medes were minimised. The Gadd Chronicle portrays a powerful Median army and the term Ummān-manda, with its first component ummān ‘troops’, by itself can be a substitute for the expression u ummānī-šū ‘and his troops’. The term Ummān-manda stands for a powerful military force. The main difficulty with Zawadski’s argument is that there is no evidence outside the Gadd Chronicle that can demonstrate the role of the Medes in the fall of Assyria was minimised in the chronicle. Zawadski looks for such evidence in the Gadd Chronicle’s account of the capture of Harran, and suggests that the Gadd Chronicle means to say that the Medes did not participate in the capture of the town and did not get

67 Ibid., pp. 132ff.
68 Ibid., p. 116.
69 Ibid., p. 116.
70 Ibid., pp. 118-120.
71 Gadd Chronicle 17.
72 Zawadski, The Fall of Assyria and Median-Babylonian Relations, pp. 120-121.
73 Ibid., p. 120.
their share of the booty while the inscriptions of Nabonidus suggest that the ‘king of the Ummān-manda’ (i.e. Cyaxares) destroyed temple Eḥulḥul of Ḥarran and other sanctuaries in Assyria.\(^{74}\) There is evidence that the Babylonians were in firm control of Syria, Ḥarran and the Assyrian heartland after the collapse of the Neo-Assyrian Empire.\(^{75}\) So the Medes departed the region after their military objective to destroy Assyria was over. In light of this fact,\(^ {76}\) the Gadd Chronicle’s account of Ḥarran should be considered historically reliable. Furthermore, the Gadd Chronicle states that the Babylonians plundered the temples of Nineveh and Ḥarran during their final war against Assyria.\(^ {77}\) Nabonidus’ inscriptions deny that the Babylonians pillaged the city and temple in Ḥarran, and this denial is not believable.\(^ {78}\) The Gadd Chronicle makes it clear that Nabopolassar had seized Ḥarran and it was against him that the Assyrian’s launched their campaign to regain the city.\(^ {79}\) It is much more likely the Babylonians did the looting in Ḥarran. The Gadd Chronicle does not deny the Medes plundered Ḥarran. The Gadd Chronicle states that Nabopolassar and Cyaxares ‘mixed their armies together’ (ERIN.ME-šū-[speaker]ŠÂ a-ḫa-mēš is-mu-hu) and then ‘they marched’ (DU.ME) against Ḥarran.\(^ {80}\) The Gadd Chronicle is therefore involving the Medes in the capture (and by implication the pillaging) of the city. It is much more likely that the chronicle did not describe the Medes’ acts of pillaging because it focused on what the Babylonian king did in the captured city, and mentioned only the return of the Medes to their own land after it was all over.

Zawadski raises a number of other points to support his view.\(^ {81}\) Zawadski’s observations are very interesting, but again, they do not support the very specific view that the term Ummān-manda belongs to a later version of the original chronicle with the purpose of belittling the role of the Medes in the final Babylonian-Assyrian conflict. One problem with Zawadski’s interpretation is that it does not satisfactorily explain why the ethnonym Madaya and the term Ummān-manda have been used together and why the editor did not simply erase all references to the ethnonym. Another problem is that the contribution of the Medes is very well appreciated in the Gadd Chronicle – an editor who wanted to minimise the role of the Medes could have done better. The term Ummān-manda is pejorative, but the sort of pejorative beliefs about the Medes that led to the use of the term

\(^{74}\) Ibid., pp. 121-124.
\(^{75}\) The evidence is discussed in R. Rollinger, “The Western Expansion of the Median “Empire”: A Re-examination” in CE, pp. 291-297. I will later discuss the significance of this evidence for evaluating Nabonidus’ claims about the role of the Medes regarding Ḥarran in 7.2.1.
\(^{76}\) I will also discuss the patterns of Cyaxares’ entry into and exit out of the theatre-of-war during the final Assyrio-Babylonian conflict. This discussion is later in pp. 197ff.
\(^{77}\) Gadd Chronicle 45, 64.
\(^{78}\) I will discuss later in 7.2.2 why Nabonidus wanted to absolve his Babylonian predecessors of any responsibility for ruining the temple Eḥulḥul in Ḥarran.
\(^{79}\) Gadd Chronicle 63, 66-69.
\(^{80}\) Gadd Chronicle 60-61.
\(^{81}\) Zawadski, The Fall of Assyria and Median-Babylonian Relations, pp. 125ff.
need clarification, and should be based on why the term has been used for the Medes in the first place. The parallels with and literary allusions to the Cuthaean Legend discussed in 5.3-4 and in this chapter indicate that the Babylonian depiction of the Medes; their distant eastern mountain homeland, their military might, their eventual destruction without Babylonian interference, all of these resemble the Ummān-manda in the Cuthaean Legend. The term Ummān-manda is pejorative in that those who use the term for the Medes treat them as an arrogant power who temporarily enjoys being powerful but are doomed by the gods – as is the case with Naram-Sin’s enemies in the Cuthaean Legend (5.6.1-2). ⑧2

Gadd Chronicle 38 refers to Cyaxares as the ‘king of the Ummān-manda’ (LUGAL ERIN-man-da) who meets the king of Akkad. ⑧3 Zawadski argues that Gadd Chronicle 38 originally had KUR Ma-da-a-a, but that the editor introduced the term Ummān-manda while leaving the word šar (=LUGAL) only in Gadd Chronicle 38, and wrote the determinative KUR ‘land’ before the term Ummān-manda in Gadd Chronicle 59 because the editor was not sure which determinative was meant to precede the term, since according to Zawadski the term is a substitute for KUR Ma-da-a-a. ⑧4 The expression LUGAL ERIN-man-da ‘king of the Ummān-manda’ is a standard epithet found in other texts and is written without the land determinative. ⑧5 Why the land determinative is used in Gadd Chronicle 59 and not in Gadd Chronicle 65 need not be explained by reasons restricted to the Gadd Chronicle because there is also variation in the use of the determinatives for the term Ummān-manda in another document, Nabonidus’ Sippar Cylinder. Some manuscripts of Sippar Cylinder I 29 have the land determinative prefixed to the term Ummān-manda whereas others either have the gentilic determinative LU prefixed, or they write the term without any determinative. ⑧6 An explanation stemming from the etymology of Ummān-manda has been proposed in order to explain the alternating use of the determinatives prefixed to the term in Sippar Cylinder I 29 and the solitary use of the land determinative for the term in Gadd Chronicle 59. ⑧7

Zawadski tries to explain the co-existence of the ethnonym KUR Ma-da-a-a and the term Ummān-manda by conjecturing that the editor deleted the word šar ‘king’ in Gadd Chronicle 23-24, 28 to belittle the role of the

⑧2 Obviously the Babylonians may have had various other pejorative ideas about the Medes. Due to current evidence it is not possible to comment on all of these. The influence of the Cuthaean Legend and the pejorative aspect of the term Ummān-manda are, nonetheless, very relevant. ⑧3 Gadd Chronicle 38. ⑧4 Zawadski, The Fall of Assyria and Median-Babylonian Relations, pp. 127-128. ⑧5 The specific term ‘king of the Ummān-manda’ is used in line 20 of Assurbanipal’s dedicatory inscription for Marduk (Appendix 1.44), Assurbanipal’s barrel cylinder, line 19’ (Appendix 1.45), Nabonidus’ Sippar Cylinder I 29, Nabonidus’ Harran Cylinder I’ 14’ and Basalt-Stela II 3’, 14’. ⑧6 For the variant writings of Ummān-manda in Sippar Cylinder I 29, see Appendix 1.47, n. 201. ⑧7 See 4.1.1.1.
Medes in the war against Assyria but could not do this in Gadd Chronicle 38 because it would have been awkward if the king of Akkad only met ‘the Mede’ or the Medes, so the editor kept šar and replaced KUR Ma-da-a-a with Ummān-manda. The term ‘king of the Ummān-manda’ is a standard epithet found in a number of other inscriptions, suggesting that it is unlikely that Ummān-manda was artificially placed after šar ‘king’ in Gadd Chronicle 38. Furthermore, there is an instance where the name of Nabopolassar is written only with a personal determinative and without the word šar ‘king’ in a section of the Gadd Chronicle. The lack of the word ‘king’ does not take away the dignity and strength of Nabopolassar, the hero of the Gadd Chronicle, so the lack of the word ‘king’ in the lines mentioning the Medes does not minimise their role. Zawadski’s proposition that the word ‘king’ was deleted from an original chronicle remains unsubstantiated. Zawadski observed that the chronicles and other historical texts refer to the Chaldean kings as šar Akkādı ‘king of Akkad’ in order to convey the association between the Neo-Babylonians and the magnificence going back to the first kingdom of Akkad at the end of the third millennium. So Zawadski argues that in Gadd Chronicle 38 the editor juxtaposed the dignified ‘king of Akkad’ from the third millennium with the equally ancient term ‘king of the Ummān-manda (Barbarians)’ and that the editor continued to use the term in the remainder of the text after seeing its propagandistic effect. Given all the difficulties with Zawadski’s arguments for a term Ummān-manda added later into the chronicle for the purpose of minimizing the role of the Medes in the final conflict between Assyria and Babylonia, and given the resemblances discussed so far between the Ummān-manda of the Cuthaean Legend and the ones in the Gadd Chronicle, it seems that what Zawadski had said for the ‘king of Akkad’ applies also for the ‘king of the Ummān-manda’, but in a different way. If the original text had the ‘king of Akkad’, then it also could have had ‘king of the Ummān-manda’. The latter term conveys associations with the powerful enemy from the glorious past of Akkad, as inferred from the Cuthaean Legend. The fact that the term is first used to describe Cyaxares as ‘the king of the Ummān-manda’ could relate to the alliance forged between the Babylonians and the powerful Medes who came from the eastern direction and resembled the enemy in the Cuthaean Legend in various ways. Before the alliance they are merely called the ‘Medes’ in the Gadd Chronicle. Komoróczy argues that the term denotes hostile and destructive people on the Mesopotamian horizon and that the term is used for the Medes when they destroy an Assyrian metropolis. An earlier part of the Gadd Chronicle

88 Zawadski, The Fall of Assyria and Median-Babylonian Relations, p. 128.
89 References are in n. 85 above.
90 Gadd Chronicle 1, 3.
91 Zawadski, The Fall of Assyria and Median-Babylonian Relations, p. 128-129.
92 Ibid., p. 129
describes how the Medes defeated the city of Assur ‘in an evil manner’ and demolished it. This earlier part does not have the term Ummān-manda, but the peculiar use of the adverb limnis ‘in an evil manner’ suggests that the enemy already resembled the one in the Cuthaean Legend (5.4). The characteristics of the Ummān-manda are seen in the Medes (their homeland, etc.) even before the first attestation of the term in the Gadd Chronicle.

A specific reason why the term was first written out in Gadd Chronicle 38 in the context of the chronicle can be adduced from lines 29-30. Gadd Chronicle 29 states ‘the king of Akkad’ and ‘Cyaxares’ made an alliance. This creates a juxtaposition of the archaic term ‘king of Akkad’ and the personal name of the king of the Medes. Gadd Chronicle 30 then states ‘Cyaxares and his army returned to his land’ ([…Ú-ma-ki-i]š-tar u ERIN.ME-šū ana KUR-šū it-tur). The singular verb ittur ‘he returned’ indicates that the subject ‘Cyaxares and his army’ is treated as a collective singular in Gadd Chronicle 30. I argue that Gadd Chronicle 38 substitutes the epithet ‘king of the Ummān-manda’ for the collective singular ‘Cyaxares and his army’ after the alliance was established with Babylon. The context of the chronicle when the term is first used is that the ‘king of the Ummān-manda’ is approaching the ‘king of Akkad’. Since the chronicler uses the archaic term the ‘king of Akkad’, he had to use a similarly archaic term to describe ‘Cyaxares and his army’ in Gadd Chronicle 38. It may have been awkward to use the archaic term for the Babylonians while continuing to use a contemporary designation for the Medes or repeating the name of Cyaxares and his army. The ‘king of the Ummān-manda’ literally means Cyaxares is the king of the group of people called Ummān-manda. Ummān-manda takes plural verbs when it is used by itself.

Gadd Chronicle 59 has the verb ‘they came’ in ‘the Ummān-mand[a..], they came [to] the [a]id of… and’ (ERIN-man-d[a... ana r]i-[s]u?-ut... DU.ME-nim-ma). Gadd Chronicle 65 says for the Ummān-manda that ‘they returned’ ([it]-te-eh-su) to their land. The use of the plural verbs indicates the term Ummān-manda is used specifically a plural subject. They are the Medes, as a group.

---

94 Gadd Chronicle 26-27.
95 As discussed above in pp. 175-182.
96 Gadd Chronicle 29.
97 Gadd Chronicle 30.
98 Gadd Chronicle 38.
99 Zawadski recognised how the two archaic terms go together, Zawadski, The Fall of Assyria and Median-Babylonian Relations, pp. 128-129. However, Zawadski attributed the use of the title ‘king of the Ummān-manda’ as a later editorial insertion. This proposition is problematic, as I have discussed immediately above. That ‘Ummān-manda’ is a term as traditional as ‘Akkad’ is also obvious from the use of the former in the Weidner Chronicle, see remarks in ch. 4, pp. 103-104. Some of the manuscripts for the Weidner Chronicle are Neo-Babylonian, Appendix 1.18, n. 74. The term Ummān-manda is not originally an ethnic term, but is used like one when attached to an ethnic group, as I will explain immediately below.
100 Gadd Chronicle 59.
101 Gadd Chronicle 65.
The ways in which the term Ummān-manda denotes the Medes can be further explored by looking at the Sippar Cylinder of Nabonidus. In the cylinder’s narrative, Marduk and Sin command Nabonidus to rebuild the temple Eḫuḫulul in Ḥarran, but the Babylonian king gives them a reason he cannot do that.\textsuperscript{102}

\L{U} \text{ERIN-man-da} sa-ḫi-ir-šum-ma pu-ug-gu-lu e-mu-qā-a-šu

The Ummān-manda surrounds it (the temple) and enormous (is) his strength.

The singular verb sa-ḫi-ir and the possessive suffix –šu ‘his’ in e-mu-qā-a-šu ‘his strength’ is used for ‘the Ummān-manda’ (\L{U} \text{ERIN-man-da}). The Ummān-manda is a singular subject in this passage. Marduk’s reply to Nabonidus in the narrative reveals more about the way the term Ummān-manda can be used. In this reply, Marduk promises the downfall of the ‘the Ummān-manda’ and the kings subservient to the Median king:\textsuperscript{103}

\L{U} \text{ERIN-man-da šá taq-bu-ú ša-a-šu KUR-šu ū LUGAL.MEŠ a-liš i-dišu ul i-ba-aš-ši}

‘The Ummān-manda about whom you spoke; he, his land, and the kings who go by his side will not exist.’

When Marduk says ‘the Ummān-manda about whom you spoke’, the deity refers to the same singular entity about whom Nabonidus says ‘Ummān-manda surrounds it (the temple) and enormous (is) his strength’. When Marduk promises about the Ummān-manda that ‘he, his land, and the kings who go by his side will not exist’, the deity is describing the singular subject Ummān-manda’s power which Nabonidus had described as ‘enormous (is) his strength’. The pronoun ša-a-šu ‘he’ in Marduk’s reply refers to the same singular subject Ummān-manda. The expression ‘his land, and the kings who go by his side’ in Marduk reply describes what Nabonidus called ‘his (Ummān-manda’s) strength’ (e-mu-qā-a-šu). In the context of Marduk’s reply, the term Ummān-manda is used for the singular subject whom the deity calls ‘the Ummān-manda about whom you spoke; he (ša-a-šu)’. This ‘he’ (ša-a-šu) corresponds to Astyages. ‘His land’ refers to his territorial realm, and ‘the kings who go by his side’ comprise his military power. The term Ummān-manda has therefore been used for the person of Astyages in the Sippar Cylinder of Nabonidus. I argue that the sense is like naming Astyages as ‘the

\textsuperscript{102} Sippar Cylinder I 23.
\textsuperscript{103} Sippar Cylinder I 24-25.
Mede’ and that there is a plural sense in calling Astyages as ‘the Ummān-manda’ because while he is called ‘the Ummān-manda’ in Nabonidus’ plea and Marduk’s comforting promise, the Median king is called the ‘king of the Ummān-manda’ later in the Sippar Cylinder. This suggests that the term is used for a group of whom Astyages is the king. The Gadd Chronicle used for the Medes both the ethnonym ‘Median’ (Ma-da-a-a) and the term Ummān-manda. For this I suggest that the Gadd Chronicle used the term Ummān-manda like an ethnonym, and that this usage reflected a Neo-Babylonian scribal convention that uses the term for the Medes in remembrance of some of their characteristics that resemble the Ummān-manda in the Cuthaean Legend. Specifically, it is the Medes under Cyaxares, and under Astyages in Nabonidus’ inscriptions, who are called Ummān-manda.

The Sippar Cylinder of Nabonidus describes Astyages’ kingdom and refers to ‘the kings who go by his side’ (LUGAL.MEŠ a-lik i-di-ṣa). Who are these kings? Are they Astyages’ non-Median allies/vassals or the Median warlords serving under him? They could be both or either. Their description may resemble the allies of the Ummān-manda in the Cuthaean Legend: ‘seventeen kings, with them [their] troops up to 90,000, [we]nt to their (i.e. the enemy’s) aid’ (17 LUGAL.MEŠ adi (EN) 90 LIM um-ma-na-[ti-sū-nu] it-šu-nu ana ri-šu-ti-šum it-[ta-al-ka-ni]). The distinction made in the Cuthaean Legend between the Ummān-manda and the kings who ally with them becomes relevant. Only Anubanini’s family and the forces under his sons, the ‘seven kings, brothers’ (7 LUGAL.MEŠ-ni at-ḫu-ū), constitute the Ummān-manda (Table 3) and the kings who ally with them are identified separately in SB Tupsinna 61-62. If the reference with ‘the kings who go by his side’ in the Sippar Cylinder is to non-Median vassal states, then they resemble the kings who ally with the Ummān-manda in the Cuthaean Legend (hence the vassal kings themselves are not the Ummān-manda). If the reference is to the Median warlords serving Astyages, then ‘the kings’ resemble the brother kings of the Ummān-manda who share power with the leader. In either case the Ummān-manda are always the Medes.

Landsberger and Bauer argued that the term Ummān-manda was a name in the Neo-Babylonian sources that embraced the Medes and the neighboring peoples who come from districts that are at a distance from the

104 Sippar Cylinder I 29.
106 Sippar Cylinder of Nabonidus I 24-25, quoted above in p. 189.
107 SB Tupsinna 61-62.
108 SB Tupsinna 37.
Mesopotamian homeland. Landsberger and Bauer argued that the exchange between the ethnonym ‘Mede’ and Umman-manda in the Gadd Chronicle is based on the fact that the Medes had founded a coalition and connected various peoples in a state-like manner, summarized under the historical name Ummān-manda. In light of the discussion above, the interchange of the terms Ma-da-a-a and Ummān-manda should be interpreted to mean that both are used like ethnonyms for the Medes and there is no indication other ethnic groups were implied with the use of the term Umman-manda, even with the reference to the ‘kings’ who are said to go by Astyages’ side in Nabonidus’ Sippar Cylinder, as discussed immediately above. The multi-ethnic character of the Median kingdom is a different matter and does not relate to the term Ummān-manda, which only denoted the Medes.

7.2 Ummān-manda in the Inscriptions of Nabonidus

Nabonidus’ inscriptions use the Babylonian convention of designating the Medes as the Ummān-manda in their narrative that seeks to deny the Babylonian involvement in the destruction of Assyrian sanctuaries in the final Assyrian-Babylonian war (including the ones in Harran), in order to promote Sin and the renovation of the cult of Harran after years of neglect under Babylonian rule. The Basalt-Stela of Nabonidus provides its own version of the historical background for the destruction of Assyrian sanctuaries with a theological justification.

Sennacherib desecrated the sanctuaries of Babylon and abducted the statue of Marduk but Marduk, the chief god of the Babylonian pantheon, waited for 21 years and then made his son kill the Assyrian king. Marduk’s divine wrath punished Assyria further when he supplied Nabopolassar with an ally called the ‘king of the Ummān-manda’, ‘who has no rival’ (šá ma-ḫi-ri la iššu-u). The latter epithet expresses the power of the Ummān-manda, a power that resembles the ones in the Cuthaean Legend. This raw military power was greater
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110 Ibid., pp. 87-88.
111 Landsberger and Bauer and other scholars saw the sound resemblance between the ethnonym Ma-da-a-a and the second component of the term Ummān-manda as a possible factor in explaining the use of the latter term for the Medes. For references to this view and the problems with it, see ch. 2, pp. 27-28. Ch. 7 discusses various other reasons why the term Ummān-manda has been used for the Medes. If the sound resemblance is a factor, then it is a minor one. As a minor factor, it would support the idea that the term and the ethnonym ‘Mede’ were seen as interchangeable.
112 Basalt-Stela of Nabonidus I 1'-41”.
113 Basalt-Stela of Nabonidus II 1'–8'. The epithet ‘who has no rival’ (šá ma-ḫi-ri la iššu-u) for the ‘king of the Ummān-manda’ also parallels an EAE omen where concerning the Ummān-manda it is said ‘he will have no opponent’ (GABA.RI NU.TUKU), Appendix 1.22. Obviously, the phrase in the omen could be stereotypical, but it may also stem out of the complicated relationship between the Cuthaean Legend tradition that visualises an invincible Ummān-manda and the omen literature. I chose to keep the omens beyond the scope of this study, but for some preliminary remarks on the relationship between the Cuthaean Legend and the omens, see 4.2.1.1.
than the Babylonian king, but this supremacy came from the gods and was temporary. This aspect of the power of the Ummān-manda is evident from the fact that the Basalt-Stela describes Nabonidus as ‘unequalled’ (ša-ni-ni ul i-ši). This epithet of Nabonidus refers to his unequalled wisdom and strength to rule Babylonia whereas the epithet ‘who has no rival’ (ša ma-hi-ri la i-šu-u) for the ‘king of the Ummān-manda’ uniquely employs the root maḫārum ‘face, confront, oppose’, which in its own context in Basalt-Stela column II refers to the fact that no one could oppose the Medes’ march of sacrilegious destruction throughout Assyria. The destruction of Assyrian sanctuaries, including Eḫulḫul in Ḥarran, is described as being the sole responsibility of the ‘king of the Ummān-manda’.

Above and below, right and left, he flattened like a flood. He avenged (lit. returned the favour to) Babylon. He exacted revenge. The king of the Ummān-manda, the fearless, desecrated their sanctuaries – those of the god (gods?) of Subartu, all of them. And he desecrated the cities of the border districts of Akkad which were hostile towards the king of Akkad and did not come to his aid. He left none of their cults. He made desolate their shrines. He became like a flood.

Stereotypical phrases describe the utter demolition created by the Ummān-manda is similar intensity to their destruction of the inhabited world in the Cuthaean Legend. The Basalt-Stela also draws a contrast between the ‘king of the Ummān-manda’ as the powerful and irreverent leader and the reverent mourning Nabopolassar who is allegedly powerless to stop the sacrilegious demolition.
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114 Basalt-Stela of Nabonidus V 13’.
115 Basalt-Stela of Nabonidus II 8’-31’.
116 It is not clear if the logogram is singular. See discussion in Appendix 1.46, n. U9U.
117 See previous footnote.
118 Basalt-Stela of Nabonidus II 32’-41’.
(For) the king of Babylon, Marduk’s deed of impudence was a taboo to him. He did not lift his hands to the cults of all the gods. He was confused greatly. He laid down (on) the ground (as his) bed.

In the narrative of the Basalt-Stela, Marduk ultimately orders Nabonidus to rebuild the temple of Ehulhul in Harran. It had been ‘cast down for 54 years by the destruction (brought) by the Ummān-manda: the shrines devastated’ (in-na-du-u 54 MU.MEŠ ina šal-pu-ut-ti ERIN man-du uš-taḥ-rī-bi eš-re-tī). The ‘destruction’ (šal-pu-ut-ti) caused by the Ummān-manda was the revenge for the ‘destruction’ (ša-al-pu-ut-ti) brought upon Babylonia years ago by Sennacherib: earlier in the Basalt-Stela the Assyrian king was described as ‘the king of Subartu (i.e. Assyria) who in the anger of Marduk brought destruction (ša-al-pu-ut-ti) to the land’. The Ummān-manda were agents of ‘Marduk’s deed of impudence’ (ši-pi-ir 4 AMAR.UTU ša ši-il-la-tī). The word šillatu also means ‘booty’, and the way the sanctuaries are desecrated may suggest there is even a sort of pun here that the ‘booty’ was impudent and/or it was Marduk taking the booty and not really the Ummān-manda. The Sippar Cylinder, another inscription of Nabonidus, narrates in detail how the king received a dream revelation from Marduk and Sin to rebuild the temple after it remained in ruins for 54 years. The Sippar Cylinder says that Sin ‘raised the Ummān-manda and obliterated that temple and turned it to ruin’ (L.U.ERIN-man-da ū-šat-ba-amma É ša-a-ti ub-bi-it-ma ū-ša-liṅ-šu kar-mu-tu). This means that the cylinder dates the destruction to a time 54 years before Nabonidus’ reign, since the dream about Marduk’s and Sin’s command to rebuild the temple is revealed, in the Babylonian king’s words, ‘in the beginning of my everlasting kingship’ (i-na re-eš LUGAL-ū-ti-ia da-rī-ti). Nabonidus fears that he could not rebuild the temple but was assured of the coming destruction of the Ummān-manda:


119 Basalt-Stela of Nabonidus X 1’-31’.
120 Basalt-Stela of Nabonidus X 13’-15’.
121 Basalt-Stela of Nabonidus X 14’.
122 Basalt-Stela of Nabonidus I 37’.
123 Basalt-Stela of Nabonidus I 35’-38’.
124 Basalt-Stela of Nabonidus II 33’-34’.
125 Sippar Cylinder I 11-12.
126 Sippar Cylinder II 12-20.
127 Sippar Cylinder I 22-29.
That temple which you told (me) to build, the Ummān-manda surrounds it and enormous (is) his strength.”

Marduk spoke with me: “The Ummān-manda about whom you spoke, he, his land, and the kings who go by his side will not exist.” When the third year came, he (Marduk) set him in motion, (namely) Cyrus the king of Anšan his insignificant servant. He scattered the extensive Ummān-manda with his few troops. He seized Astyages the king of the Ummān-manda and took his captive to his land.

The narrative in the Sippar Cylinder condenses the history of the Ummān-manda under Cyaxares and Asytages for its own purposes. Marduk caused the Ummān-manda to arise and to wreak destruction 54 years before Nabonidus and then in Nabonidus’ reign caused their downfall. The divinely determined rise and fall of the Ummān-manda clearly parallels the same theme found in the Cuthaean Legend. Nabonidus faced an enemy more powerful than he but trusted the gods will destroy the enemy, just like Naram-Sin in the Cuthaean Legend. The Sippar Cylinder says Marduk and Sin assured Nabonidus (as ‘Venus’ assured Naram-Sin) that the Ummān-manda would be destroyed. Nabonidus’ cylinder ends the narrative concerning the Ummān-manda by describing their fall during Nabonidus’ reign.128

7.2.1 The Medes in Ḫarran?

Some scholars are trying to revise the history of the Medes with a critical appraisal of the cuneiform, classical and archaeological evidence.129 A comprehensive assessment of these efforts is beyond the scope of this study. Looking into one way in which the depiction of the Medes in Nabonidus’ texts has been reinterpreted provides me the framework to discuss another aspect of the use of the term Ummān-manda in Nabonidus’ inscriptions. Two of Nabonidus’ inscriptions, talking about the impediment to the reconstruction of Ehuljlul, state that ‘the Ummān-manda surrounds it…” (L.U.ERIN-man-da sa-ḫi-ir-šum-ma).130 Rollinger discusses the evidence from the Babylonian chronicles that the Babylonians – not the Medes – controlled the territories of Syria, Cilicia and
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128 Sippar Cylinder of Nabonidus I 26-29.
129 For a good starting point on this, see the contributions in CE.
130 Sippar Cylinder of Nabonidus I 11 23; Ḫarran Cylinder I’ 12’.
the Assyrian heartland after the fall of the Neo-Assyrian Empire. Nabonidus’ texts hold the Ummān-manda solely responsible for the destruction of the sanctuaries in Assyria and this is already known to contradict the Gadd Chronicle’s information that the Babylonians pillaged the temples in Nineveh and Ḥarran. Rollinger notes that when taken literally, the phrase ‘the Ummān-manda surrounds it and...’ (L.U.ERIN-man-da sa-ḫi-ir-šum-ma) is rather to be interpreted as the Medes encircling specifically the ruined temple of Eḫūllḫul instead of the other view that they are said to be encircling the vicinity of Ḥarran. Rollinger comments that because the verb saẖaru hum ‘to go around’ literally relates to the temple, the text is describing the physical presence of the Medes in Ḥarran. Rollinger observes that the only thing the Babylonian chronicles and Nabonidus’ inscriptions agree on is that the temple in Ḥarran was destroyed 54 years before the Babylonian king’s accession. Rollinger suggests Nabonidus’ inscriptions claim a 54 year occupation of Ḥarran, which contradicts the chronicles’ data that the Babylonians controlled Syria and Assyria, and consequently Rollinger argues that the claim in Nabonidus’ texts is probably a fabrication aiming to absolve the Babylonians of any responsibility for the desecration of sanctuaries. Rollinger argues that Nabonidus’ stela and Adad-guppi stela in Ḥarran do not mention the Ummān-manda while describing the restoration of Eḫūllḫul, and this proves the claim of 54 year Median overlordship of Ḥarran was not advocated in the city itself but is found only in texts from far away places such as Babylon and Sippar where the Basalt-Stela of Nabonidus and the Sippar Cylinder mention the Ummān-manda. Rollinger notes that the Ḥarran Cylinder, which uses the term Ummān-manda, was indeed located in Ḥarran but was not publicly exhibited because it was a foundation deposit.

Since Nabonidus’ texts are mainly concerned with the reconstruction of Eḫūllḫul temple, it is specifically this temple for which the Sippar Cylinder says ‘the Ummān-manda surrounds it and...’ (L.U.ERIN-man-da sa-ḫi-ir-

132 Gadd Chronicle 45, 64.
133 Discussion and references in Rollinger, “The Western Expansion of the Median ‘Empire’”, p. 299, n. 50.
134 Ibid., p. 299, n. 50.
135 Ibid., pp. 299-300.
136 Ibid., pp. 300-303.
137 Ibid., p. 303.
138 Ibid., p. 303, n. 71. Rollinger also looks at the discrepancy in the date of Cyrus’ victory over Astyages in the Sippar Cylinder and the Nabonidus Chronicle. The former ascribes the victory to Nabonidus’ third year whereas the latter implies the sixth year. Rollinger suggests that this discrepancy and the presence of literary constructions found in other sources from Nabonidus support the idea the 54 year Median occupation is fabricated, Ibid., p. 304. The validity of these supporting arguments solely depends on the other arguments advanced by Rollinger. For example Cyrus’ defeat of Astyages and the Medes is a historical fact regardless of discrepancies about their date in Babylonian documents and/or the presence of literary constructions. Whether the same can be said about the 54 year hegemony of the Medes depends the other issues raised by Rollinger. These issues will be discussed below.
If this statement is taken very literally, however, it has to be Astyages who is surrounding Ehuljul because in this instance, the Sippar Cylinder uses the term for the person of Astyages and the verb is in the singular: ‘The Ummān-manda surrounds it...’ (LU.ERIN-man-da sa-hi-ir-šum-ma). The use of the term for the person of Astyages indicates that the statement ‘the Ummān-manda (i.e. Astyages) surrounds it (i.e. the temple of Ehuljul)’ cannot be taken too literally or one has to visualise Astyages walking around the ruins of the temple. So there always has to be a less then literal interpretation of how the Medes are represented by the use of the term Ummān-manda for the Medes in the person of Astyages. There is room to interpret what is conveyed by the encirclement of the temple by Median power. The interpretation that the Medes surrounded Harran from its vicinities rather than occupying the city itself cannot be excluded. It is more likely, as Rollinger has argued, that the text is saying Astyages is occupying Harran with his forces and preventing the restoration of the temple. Does this mean the Medes controlled Harran at a given time? When? Are the historical claims in the inscriptions of Nabonidus fabricated or real? I will try to answer these questions because the relevant extant evidence from Nabonidus uses the term Ummān-manda for the Medes.

The Gadd Chronicle says that Nabopolassar seized Harran after the Assyrians lost it to the coalition of the Babylonians and the Medes. The Gadd Chronicle states that the Assyrians failed in their offensive to take Harran back from the Babylonians but ‘they (i.e. the Assyrians) did not withdraw’ (ul īhṭisū), then Nabopolassar campaigned into the region of Izalla and the ‘numerous cities in the mountains’ (āānī šā šadānī). Then comes a description of a military campaign up to the border of Urartu; there is also a long text break here: ‘the army of [...] [ma]rched as far as the province of Urartu’ (ERIN.ME [...] EN pi-hat 13U]U-ra-ās-ṭu [D]U). Diakonoff proposed inserting the name of Cyaxares and his epithet ‘king of the Ummān-manda’ into this long text break and argued that the Babylonians would be preoccupied with the Assyrian offensive to recapture Harran and that
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139 Sippar Cylinder of Nabonidus I I 23; Harran Cylinder I’ 12’.
140 Sippar Cylinder I 23. The same written form of the term is restored for Harran Cylinder I’ 12’. For the restoration, see Appendix 1.48.
141 See discussion for this above in pp. 189-190.
142 For example Baltzer translates sa-hi-ir-šum-ma in Sippar Cylinder I 23 as ‘sie treiben sich herum’ and proposes that the Medes exercised an influence on Harran from the north but did not occupy it, D. Baltzer, “Harran nach 6U0 ‘medisch’? Kritische Überprüfung einer Hypothese” WO 7 (1973), pp. 93-95. Baltzer casts doubt on whether the term Ummān-manda refers exclusively to the Medes since it has been used for other peoples such as the Cimmerians, and because of Landsberger’s etymology ‘who knows the tribe?’, ibid., p. 93. Landsberger’s etymology is problematic, as discussed in 2.4. The Neo-Babylonian sources use the term Ummān-manda exclusively for the Medes, ch. 5, pp. 129-130.
144 Gadd Chronicle 63.
146 Gadd Chronicle 72-73.
the Medes would not have deserted the theatre of war at such a critical time.\textsuperscript{147} The Gadd Chronicle does in fact record the absence of the Medes at critical times of the Assyrio-Babylonian war in the thirteenth and fifteenth regnal years of Nabopolassar.\textsuperscript{148} Izalla, where the Babylonian king campaigned in after the chronicle states that the Assyrians ‘did not withdraw’ after losing Ḫarran,\textsuperscript{149} is located east or north east of Ḫarran and this location accords with the ensuing mention of the Urartian border.\textsuperscript{150} It is much more likely Nabopolassar went into Izalla and the ‘cities in the mountains’ in order to challenge the Assyrians who were still threatening Ḫarran because ‘they did not withdraw’, and extended his campaign ‘as far as the province of Urartu’ (EN \textit{pi-ḫat} \textsuperscript{URU} \textit{Ur-ra-āš-tu [D]U}).\textsuperscript{151} Nabopolassar campaigned once more to Izalla in response to renewed Assyrian attempt to regain Ḫarran.\textsuperscript{152}

According to the Gadd Chronicle, the Medes first appeared in the month of Marcheswan of Nabopolassar’s eleventh regnal year (615 BC).\textsuperscript{153} After a short text break the chronicle describes them as active until the month of Ab in 614 BC.\textsuperscript{154} They besieged Nineveh together with the Babylonians between the months of Sivan and Ab in 612 BC.\textsuperscript{155} They returned to their land in Elul of the same year.\textsuperscript{156} They reappeared in the month of Marcheswan in 610 BC,\textsuperscript{157} and returned to their land after the successful collaboration with the Babylonians against Ḫarran.\textsuperscript{158} Therefore the Medes entered Mesopotamia in the months of Marcheswan (October/November) or Sivan (May/June) and returned in Ab (July/August) and Elul (August/September). It is interesting that the Medes would return to their home no later than September in all the attestations. The siege of Nineveh required its own strategic timing and would be carried out at any time of the year, so their arrival at the month of Sivan (May/June) is an exception to the otherwise obvious pattern that they come in Marcheswan (October/November) and stay until Ab or Elul (July-September). They seem to be conducting their operations from the beginning of

\textsuperscript{147} I. M. Diakonoff, “The Last Years of the Urartian State according to Assyrian and Babylonian Sources” (in Russian) \textit{VDI} 36/2 (1951), p. 31.  
\textsuperscript{148} Gadd Chronicle 31-37, 53-57.  
\textsuperscript{149} Gadd Chronicle 69-70.  
\textsuperscript{150} CCK, p. 82: 70.  
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\textsuperscript{152} Gadd Chronicle 66-75.  
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\textsuperscript{155} Gadd Chronicle 42.  
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the Mesopotamian winter up to the end of summer. Their absence in the thirteenth and fifteenth regnal years of Nabopolassar\textsuperscript{159} appears deliberate.

Josephus writes about the Egyptian king Necho’s campaign both against the Medes and the Babylonians who destroyed the kingdom of Assyria.\textsuperscript{160} Zawadski argues that this reference means the Medes never left Harran and that the Gadd Chronicle’s omission can be corrected from Josephus’ reference to Necho’s campaign, which Zawadski allocates to 609 BC, the year when Gadd Chronicle 66-75 treats the Medes as absent from the theatre of war.\textsuperscript{161} If this Egyptian presence does not relate to their force which deserted Harran together with the Assyrians upon the sight of the joint might of the Babylonians and the Medes in 610 BC according to Gadd Chronicle 61-62, and if it refers to the Egyptians who presumably partook in the Assyrian offensive to regain Harran, then it is much more likely that Josephus did not have access to a document like the Gadd Chronicle that could give precise details such as the absence of the Medes in particular years, but rather he was describing the events from a general perspective in which the Assyrians and the Egyptians were fighting the Babylonians and the Medes for supremacy in the ancient Near East. The specific information provided in the Gadd Chronicle cannot be denied on the basis of Josephus’ information.

Zawadski argues that Nabonidus’ texts, which hold the Medes responsible for the demolition of the cities and temples in the Assyrian heartland, and in those parts of Babylonia that opposed the Babylonian king during the final war against Assyria, prove that the Medes were much more involved in Mesopotamia than is admitted in the Gadd Chronicle and that these texts indicate the Medes helped suppress opposition against Nabopolassar.\textsuperscript{162} This is no basis to deny the accuracy of the Gadd Chronicle’s information that the Medes were absent during the critical thirteenth and fifteenth regnal years of Nabopolassar in the final Assyrio-Babylonian war\textsuperscript{163}. Why the Medes under Cyaxares pursued such a course of action is not known due to the current state of evidence. The Medes most probably chose to assist the Babylonians in order to ensure the destruction of the Assyrian Empire, and their actions were limited to achieve this specific purpose. They could have pursued their goal in a restrained manner in order to preserve their resources for other pursuits which related to their internal and external affairs.

\textsuperscript{159} Gadd Chronicle 31-37, 53-57.
\textsuperscript{160} Josephus, \textit{Jewish Antiquities}, X, 5, 1.
\textsuperscript{161} Zawadski, \textit{The Fall of Assyria and Median-Babylonian Relations}, pp. 125-126. Even if the Gadd Chronicle had been distorting events, this does not mean the use of the term Umma\textsuperscript{4}n-manda is relevant in this respect as Zawadski argues. Zawadski’s interpretation of the use of the term in the Gadd Chronicle is discussed throughout 7.1.
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There is no contemporary textual evidence that can shed light on the nature of these other pursuits. To assume there were no such pursuits is simply impossible. Hegemony over regions in the Zagros, Mannea, Elam, Persia, and other Median city-states would be on Cyaxares’ agenda, if he had not already conquered these regions by the time of the final Assyrio-Babylonian war. Old Persian and Classical sources give hints as to some of the other regions that were of close interest to the Medes, such as Sagartia, Parthia, Hyrcania and Bactria. The Achaemenid king Darius talks about suppressing a series of rebellions in lands located in the Persian Empire’s eastern frontier that derived their legitimacy from the Median Kingdom. In Sagartia, a certain Ciçantakhma claimed to be king on the basis he was from ‘Cyaxares’ family’ (Uvaxstrahyā taumāyā). The Median rebel Fravartīš also claimed to be from ‘Cyaxares’ family’. The Parthians and the Hyrcanians called themselves people ‘of Phraortes’ (Fravartīš). These claims made by rebels against the Persian king Darius assume some of the lands on Media’s eastern frontier, the lands Sagartia, Parthia and Hyrcania, had some form of previous loyalty to the Medes. Briant observes that the revolts against Darius occurred around the same time in May-June 522 BC. Briant argues that the rebels’ claims of Median heritage were linked to their support for the Median rebel leader Fravartīš in several parts of the Iranian Plateau. The claims from rebels in Sagartia, Parthia and Hyrcania may indicate that these regions were under Ecbatana’s control before Cyrus. Briant comments that these revolts may either be an incidental interregional collaboration or a more concerted effort, but in any case the hints about the political heritage of the Medes and the way they influenced the revolts must be analysed with caution. Classical sources claim the Medes had a conflict with the Scythians in the ancient Near East that ended with Median victory, and with the Saka over the land of Parthia during the time of Cyaxares that ended with the Medes acquiring this land. Briant looks at the classical sources that describe Cyrus’ victory over the Medes and argues that the Persian king took over Media’s zone of influence in the east after defeating
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Astyages. Photius uses Ctesias as his source and writes that the Bactrians submitted to Cyrus only after learning that Amytis the daughter of Astyages had married the Persian king and that Astyages had become Cyrus’ father. Nicolas of Damascus writes, possibly from Ctesias, that Cyrus’ victory over Astyages prompted the Hyrcanians, Parthians, the Saka and the Bactrians to submit to the Persian king. Diakonoff argues that the fact Cyrus had to confront the Massagetae in Central Asia and the people of Bactria after he took over Media means that the Persian king, by taking over the Median realm, had already attained the submission the regions situated further west of the Massagetae, these regions being Hyrcania, Parthia, Hara (the valley of Tejen-Hari-rud), and perhaps also Drangiana. The classical sources were written much later than the actual events and were no doubt making errors and omissions. Nonetheless, the classical sources at least confirm the links implied between Hyrcania, Parthia and the Medes in Darius’s Bisitun Inscription.

The Medes had a range of easier targets before entering into any potential conflict with the Babylonians who were replacing the Assyrians as the dominant force in Mesopotamia and Syria. Cyaxares probably chose to expand his domain in areas not in the immediate sphere of Babylonian interest. Unhappily there is no contemporary Babylonian evidence that can confirm they knew the extent of the Median polity under Cyaxares. Diakonoff argues that by 590 BC Urartu was part of the Median Kingdom because the five-year Lydian-Median war described in Herodotus’ Histories 1 73-74 ended with a solar eclipse in 585 BC. If Herodotus’ information is taken literally – and there are indications this should not be done – there is still an information gap of 20 years between the Babylonian capture of Harran (610 BC) and the start of the Lydian-Median war (590 BC). The details of the Medes’ political expansion remains a mystery but there is no doubt it occurred. If the Medes were occupying Harran by the time of Nabonidus, then there is no real contradiction with the information in the Babylonian chronicles that describe Babylonian control over Cilicia, Syria and the Assyrian heartland shortly after the fall of Assyria. There is no guarantee that the Medes did not snatch away some of the Babylonian
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possessions and/or at least caused a lot of problems for these regions after relations broke apart with Babylon, possibly after Astyages came to power. The extant Babylonian chronicles mention the Medes only in relation to their war against Assyria and defeat at the hands of the Persian king Cyrus II. This means that the chronicles omitted the Median military expansion in all that time. This omission may have been because the growth of Median power was too humiliating or because the Median expansion was disregarded as long as it did not impact on the livelihood of the Babylonian state.

The designation of the Medes as the Umma indicates that the Gadd Chronicle drew a picture of a powerful foreign nation, with certain characteristics recalling the Umma of the Cuthaean Legend, militarily aiding Nabopolassar and conducting a series of planned campaigns where they entered Mesopotamia at certain times and were absent at others (discussed above in pp. 197-201). The Umma in the Cuthaean Legend is a force that expands into territories that encircle the kingdom of Akkad (pp. 94-96). Furthermore, the use of the term Umma for the Medes may reflect Babylonian awareness that the Medes had significant territorial possessions in lands peripheral to the Babylonian kingdom during the war against Assyria.

Unfortunately there is no contemporary evidence that can verify Nabonidus’ claim that the Medes occupied Harran during his reign. The extant evidence does not necessarily contradict everything Nabonidus is claiming about the Medes, for example they could have gained control of Harran after the time of Nabopolassar or Nabuchadnezzar. But it is at least clear that Nabonidus’ inscriptions are distorting some of the historical facts, for example they deny Babylonian involvement in the desecration of the temples in Harran (pp. 185, 195). The next section will discuss why Nabonidus picked up on this Babylonian convention of naming the Medes as the Ummān-manda and distorted some of the historical facts about Median involvement in Harran and elsewhere during the final Assyrio-Babylonian war.

7.2.2 Fifty-Four Years of the Destruction (Brought) by the Ummān-manda

I suggest that Nabonidus’ texts are careful that the Medes mentioned only in regards to their desecration of the Assyrian sanctuaries, including Ešulḫul in Harran, 54 years before Nabonidus, and then in regards to their
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control of Harran during Nabonidus’ reign. The rest is untold in the texts. They do not explicitly claim or deny that there was a 54-year occupation of Harran. The Basalt-Stela has the phrase ‘Harran, the temple Eḫulḫul, which had been cast down for 54 years by the destruction (brought) by the Ummān-manda’ (Ḫur-ra-nu.KI ĖḪULḪUL ša in-na-du-u 54 MU.MES ina šal-pu-ut-ti ERIN man-du).\textsuperscript{184} The word šal-pu-ut-ti ‘destruction’ refers to the destruction caused by the Ummān-manda.\textsuperscript{185} Being ‘cast down by the destruction (brought) by the Ummān-manda’ for 54 years can be a description of the ruined state of the temple after it was desecrated 54 years ago in a one-off event, without any suggestion about the political developments within that timeframe. Alternatively the 54 years of ruin could mean anything from an abusive Median political control to harassing military incursions into Harran that made the Babylonian hold on that city ineffective. I suggest that this ambiguity in Nabonidus’ texts about the Median control of Harran is deliberate. There is an attempt to twist historical truth, perhaps even a denial of it. The reason for having the ‘king of the Ummān-manda’ and his deeds in the narrative of Nabonidus’ texts is to absolve the Babylonians from looting the temple in Harran. It is very likely that Nabonidus’ scribes looked to the state of Median-Babylonian affairs at a time when the Medes were no longer a threat, i.e. when Cyrus defeated Astyages. Nabonidus’ scribes recalled the type of Median supremacy and the consequent state of affairs that may have existed north and northeast of Babylon during the first years of Nabonidus’ reign. The scribes read this state of affairs back 54 years from Nabonidus’ reign in an anachronistic way, but carefully avoiding details of what happened in the 54 years.

Nabonidus’ inscriptions name only Astyages as ‘the king of the Ummān-manda’ and omit the name of Cyaxares, the king of the Ummān-manda who lived 54 years before Nabonidus.\textsuperscript{186} Cyaxares’ names was probably left out to prevent any confusion in the narrative and to ensure that the Ummān-manda are seen as a monolithic block in the description of the changing fortunes of Harran in Marduk and Sin’s divine plan to restore the temple Eḫulḫul. The sole mention of Astyages as the king of the Ummān-manda was perhaps borne out of the desire to see the Ummān-manda as exclusively responsible for the desecration of Eḫulḫul and the other sanctuaries in Syria and Assyria. The scanty evidence still indicates that relations between the Babylonians and the Medes may have been tense even before the time of Nabonidus, with border clashes and raids.\textsuperscript{187} Von Voigtlander observes that the situation is unknown but suggests that Harran may have been a no-man’s land
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during Nabonidus’ time, menaced by Median raids and not held strongly enough by the Babylonians to allow for restoration. Nabonidus’ texts were perhaps exploiting this type of state of affairs to discreetly portray Cyaxares, ‘the king of the Ummān-manda’ who allegedly committed all the sacrilege 54 years ago, as someone like his successor Astyages who was most probably known to be aggressive and/or arrogant towards Babylon.

A total fabrication of a 54 year Median overlordship would have been the laughing stock even in those places far away from Ḫarran such as Babylon and Sippar. There is some reason to believe that the propaganda was not the primary purpose of Nabonidus’ texts – although this is hard to know, perhaps they were poor propaganda. There was no way the king could make the Babylonians in places such as Babylon or Sippar rejoice in the restoration of Eḫulḫul in Ḫarran. Ḫarran was the final seat of power of the hated Assyrian Empire. The Verse Account, written after Nabonidus’ reign, fiercely opposes the restoration of Eḫulḫul. The temple is called a ‘taboo’ (ik-ki-bi) in this document. The Verse Account portrays Nabonidus in a very bad light mostly on the basis of his attempt to restore the temple Eḫulḫul in Ḫarran. A much later Babylonian document dubbed the ‘Dynastic Prophecy’, which dates to the Hellenistic era, describes Nabonidus as a rebel prince who tried to establish the ‘rule of Ḫarran’ (pale Ḫar-ra-an.KI) and cancelled the festival of Esagila in Babylon. The Verse Account looks like propaganda but it still could be speaking some truth about the deeds and character of Nabonidus amidst the fierce reaction against his religious policies. Nabonidus, as the king of the Babylonian Empire, was probably trying to disregard the Babylonian involvement in the destruction of his beloved Eḫulḫul out of his commitment to the cult of Sin in Ḫarran.

Beaulieu argues that it was Nabonidus’ special devotion to Sin that accounted for his decision to restore Eḫulḫul in Ḫarran, and describes the king’s interests in using history in his own royal inscriptions with a unique treatment of Neo-Assyrian and Neo-Babylonian states as one “imperial continuity”. Following Beaulieu’s argument, I suggest that Nabonidus’ personal commitment to Sin and his desire to defend this “imperial
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continuity” required him to defend the restoration of Eḫḫulḫul without blaming any of his predecessors.

Nabonidus was therefore obliged to distort historical facts about Nabopolassar’s involvement in the desecration of the Assyrian Empire. He certainly did more precarious things out of his own religious doctrine than distorting history in inscriptions under his patronage. For example his own stela erected in Ḫarran says his decision to rebuild Eḫḫulḫul drew harsh reactions in Babylon where even treason was plotted against him. Nabonidus says that he then deserted his capital for Arabia. Nabonidus’ commitment to the moon god of Ḫarran could owe a lot to his mother Adda-guppi, whose devout faith in Sin of Eḫḫulḫul is described in the Adda-guppi stela.

Nabonidus’ commitment to Sin despite severe opposition, the nature of this opposition, and the complicated background needs a lot of discussion that is beyond the scope of this study. The Sippar and Ḫarran Cylinders are foundation deposits which were not publicly exhibited. The Basalt-Stela was found in the royal palace at Babylon. Beaulieu argues that the Basalt-Stela presents Nabonidus’ project to restore Eḫḫulḫul as a legitimate concern for a Babylonian ruler and a logical outcome of Neo-Babylonian history according to Marduk’s decrees. There is no primary document that helps discern the social context of the Basalt-Stela, so how the message of the Stela was used is a mystery. In any case, Nabonidus’ texts absolve the previous Babylonian king Nabopolassar of the destruction of Eḫḫulḫul and put the blame on the Medes in order to convince the Babylonians to support its restoration (if so, an attempt which failed) or for some other reason not appreciated due to the current state of knowledge. Nabonidus wanted to rebuild the temple in Ḫarran, but as a Babylonian king he could not accuse Nabopolassar, the founder of the Neo-Babylonian Empire, as being the desecrator and the looter of the city and temple. Otherwise there would have been a curse imposed upon Nabopolassar according to the narrative found in Nabonidus’ texts, which emphasises the power of the gods, especially of Sin, to punish the destruction of their abodes.

Beaulieu suggests that Nabonidus’ project of rebuilding Eḫḫulḫul might also be connected to the contest of hegemony between the Babylonians and the Medes. Restoring this temple is a clear objective of Nabonidus,
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but it has no discernable relationship with his foreign policy. The claims in Nabonidus’ inscriptions about
Cyaxares’ sacrilegious deeds serve ultimately to absolve the Babylonians from any destructive role and to give
the Neo-Babylonian monarch the role of the restoring the temple Ehulhul. Furthermore, Nabonidus’ call to
restore Ehulhul did not appeal to the traditional Babylonians (as discussed in pp. 203-204) and would have been
counter-productive in the needed national unity against the Medes. It is clear, at least, that Nabonidus could have
been trying to play on the feelings of animosity harboured against Median hegemony in order to achieve his own
goal of restoring the temple in Harran.

Beaulieu argues that the Basalt-Stela, among other things, did “nothing less than declaring war on the Medes”
by depicting Nabonidus as the avenger of Babylonia against the Medes who doomed themselves by daring to
gesture against Ehulhul and Harran.202 Beaulieu argues that the Stela did this by picturing Nabonidus’ role of the
avenger by reference to the way Nabopolassar who, as part of the traditional Babylonian ideology behind the
declaration of war against Assyria, avenged Sennacherib’s devastation of Babylon by destroying Assyria, so
Nabonidus was now the avenger of Babylon like Nabopolassar was earlier.203 The problem with this proposition
is that Nabopolassar personally defeated the Assyrians in battle with the aid of the Medes according to the Gadd
Chronicle whereas in Nabonidus’ texts it is Cyrus II, and not Nabonidus, who defeated the Medes in battle. The
Basalt-Stela narrates the sequence of events involving the Medes that eventually made possible the restoration of
Ehulhul, but there is no declaration of war against Astyages. The role of Nabonidus within the narrative of his
own inscriptions is not the avenger of Babylon against the Medes.

Nabonidus’ Basalt-Stela draws a picture of Nabopolassar that contradicts the traditional anti-Assyrian view of
Nabopolassar avenging Babylon. The Basalt-Stela claims that Nabopolassar mourned the destruction of Assyrian
sanctuaries and that he believed it was sacrilege (in the words of the stela, ‘Marduk’s deed of impudence was a
taboo to him’ [(ši-pi-ir d] AMAR.UTU ša šī-il-la-ti ik-kib-šu)).204 This picture of Nabopolassar in the Basalt-Stela
is really an imposition of Nabonidus’ aversion to the destruction of places such as his beloved Ehulhul in Harran.
It can be argued Nabonidus’ aversion passed on to him from his mother who was committed to the moon god.205
The more traditional Neo-Babylonian attitude towards the role of the Babylonians in the destruction of Assyrian
sanctuaries, and very probably the more historical (if not completely reliable) picture of what Nabopolassar

---

202 Ibid., p. 115.
203 Ibid., p. 115.
204 Basalt-Stela of Nabonidus II 33’-35’.
205 See remarks above, pp. 203-204.
thought on this same issue can be adduced from the tablet BM 55467. BM 55467 is a text containing the first
person speech of Nabopolassar speaking bitter accusations relating to Sennacherib’s destruction of Babylon,
declaring how Marduk chose him, and committing to fight the Assyrian royal house. Gerardi suggests that BM
55467 is a copy of a Babylonian document dating to the first part of Nabopolassar’s reign (626-605 BC). This
date can at least be taken as a terminus post quem. In this text Nabopolassar says that Marduk chose him ‘to
avenge Akkad’ (a-na tu-ru gi-mil KUR.URI.KI) and promises to the Assyrian king that he will destroy the
‘foundations of the land’ (iš-di KUR). Another fragment (BM 34793), dubbed the ‘Nabopolassar Epic’,
describes one of Nabopolassar’s military victories over the Assyrians and his coronation. The fragment is
clearly part of a larger text now lost. Nonetheless the extant text has the ‘nobles of Akkad’ (rabūti Akkādi)
calling the king to ‘[av]enge Akkad’ (... gi-mil KUR.URI.KI). Unfortunately both BM 55467 and BM 34793
are only partially preserved, but what content they have does not depict Nabopolassar with a motivation to spare
the sanctuaries while destroying the rest of the enemy. These texts say Nabopolassar wants to avenge Babylon.
Nabopolassar’s desire to utterly destroy the enemy comes across when the Gadd Chronicle says that the king
‘did not [leav]e a single man (alive)’ (e-du LÚ ul e-[zib]) in the city of Ruggulitu in the Upper Euphrates
region. The Gadd Chronicle mentions the looting of ‘city and temple’ in Nineveh and Harran as part of the
joint Babylonian-Median military victory over the Assyrians. The traditional Neo-Babylonian approach would
be to cherish the destruction of Assyria and to hate the revival of any element from it, including Eḫulḫul in
Harran. Nabonidus’ texts, on the other hand, grieve the destruction of Assyria and cherish the prospects for the
revival of Eḫulḫul in Harran.

When Nabopolassar is said to mourn the destruction of the sanctuaries brought about by the ‘king of the
Ummān-manda’, Nabonidus’ Basalt-Stela is claiming that his predecessor, who lived when Eḫulḫul was ruined
54 years ago, shared the Babylonian king’s love for sanctuaries (by implication including the one in Harran). The
Basalt-Stela of Nabonidus holds the ‘king of the Ummān-manda’ responsible for the destruction of every
Assyrian shrine against the will of Nabopolassar. If the Medes/Ummān-manda were the only ones responsible
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for the irreverent desecration of the temples, then only they would fall under the resulting curse of the gods. ‘The king of the Ummān-manda’ is described as ‘fearless’ (la a-di-ru) because he did not fear the gods when he was destroying all the sanctuaries in Assyria. In Nabonidus’ thinking, however, the gods will eventually punish the Medes. This way Nabonidus’ texts ensure that Nabopolassar would not be under any curse, and neither would Nabonidus, who is depicted in his own inscriptions as the legitimate successor of Neo-Babylonian kings.

In the narrative of Nabonidus texts, Cyaxares’ sacrilegious deeds against the sanctuaries and the inability of the Babylonians to stop them necessitate a different role for Nabonidus. One of the ways this becomes apparent is the use of the term Ummān-manda for the Medes. Nabonidus is like Naram-Sin in the Cuthaean Legend. Naram-Sin trusted the promise he received from Venus that the gods will destroy the Ummān-manda (5.6.1) and remained passive in the face of their hegemonic activities (5.6.2). The use of the term Ummān-manda for the Medes, by allusion to the Cuthaean Legend, implies their forthcoming destruction and the value of Babylonian pacifism in the face of their hegemony. Nabonidus, like Naram-Sin in the Cuthaean Legend, remains passive in the face of the Ummān-manda and trusted the divine message that the mighty enemy will be destroyed without his own intervention. Nabonidus remains passive in the face of Astyages, about whom one of his texts say pu-ug-gu-lu e-mu-gá-a-šu ‘enormous (is) his strength’216. In the Sippar Cylinder, Nabonidus receives a promise from Marduk that the powerful Astyages, called ‘the Ummān-manda’, and the king at his side, will cease to exist.217 The curse of the gods that fell on the Ummān-manda, due to their destruction of Assyrian sanctuaries during the time of Cyaxares, is fulfilled when the Persian king Cyrus defeats the Ummān-manda according to the will of Marduk:218

\[
\]

When the third year came, he (Marduk) set him in motion, (namely) Cyrus the king of Anšan his small servant. He scattered the extensive Ummān-manda with his few troops. He seized Astyages the king of the Ummān-manda and (as) took his captive to his land.
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Astyages and the Medes, called the Ummān-manda, lose their kingdom without Babylonian military interference. According to his own inscriptions, Nabonidus is the pious king who persevered and trusted the gods and saved Babylon from the Ummān-manda. Without him the Medes would not have been destroyed, and Cyrus II, in this narrative, is only a tool of Marduk.

The scribal convention of naming the Medes as the Ummān-manda, as exemplified by the Gadd Chronicle (7.1), was picked up in Nabonidus’ texts to defend the restoration of Eḫuḫul by putting the blame of the Medes and absolving the Babylonians of any responsibility for previous sacrilegious deeds. It is also interesting how the narrative of Nabonidus’ inscriptions made his piety and trust in the gods the key explanatory factor in the fall of Astyages’ kingdom, in effect taking away Cyrus II’s glory and giving it to Marduk, the deity Nabonidus claimed favoured him and his moon god Sin.

7.2.3 The Influence of Assurbanipal

The expression ‘extensive Ummān-manda’ (LU.ERIN-man-da rap-ša-a-ti) in Nabonidus’ Sippar Cylinder parallels the reference to the Cimmerian king Tugdamme’s army as ‘his vast troops’ (ERIN.HI.A-šu DAGAL-tum [=rapaštum]) in Assurbanipal’s Ištar Inscription. The Cimmerian king is called ‘king of the Ummān-manda’ in other inscriptions of Assurbanipal. The Sippar Cylinder uses the verb ‘he scattered’ (ú-sap-pi-iḫ) in turn parallels the phrase ‘I will scatter’ (ú-sap-paḫ) in Assurbanipal’s dedication to Marduk. Both the Sippar Cylinder and the dedicatory inscription for Marduk refer to Marduk’s promise to ‘scatter’ the Ummān-manda; in Assurbanipal’s text Marduk is quoted as saying ‘I will scatter’ whereas in Nabonidus’ text Cyrus of Anšan does the scattering at the command of Marduk. The use of the same verb and the adjective in both Assurbanipal’s and Nabonidus’ texts about the peoples whom they respectively denote the Ummān-manda is best explained as the influence of Assurbanipal’s texts. Assurbanipal’s dedicatory inscription for Marduk may by itself indicate a tradition associating Marduk with Ummān-manda was present before Nabonidus. How precisely
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Nabonidus’ scribes accessed Assurbanipal’s narratives using the term Ummān-manda cannot be determined due to the current state of evidence but the Assyrian king has a well documented influence on Nabonidus for a number of reasons.

In the Sippar Cylinder, shortly after the narrative about the downfall of the Ummān-manda, Nabonidus speaks about finding the foundation inscription (temennu) of Assurbanipal in Eḫulḫul of Ḥarran. Later in the text Nabonidus states he saw his ‘inscription’ (mušarū) and ‘written name’ (šīṭir šumi) in the same temple. The terms ‘foundation (inscription)’ (temennu), ‘inscription’ (mušarū) and ‘written name’ (šīṭir šumi) may be referring to the same foundation deposit the king found. Assurbanipal’s inscriptions state that the Assyrian king restored Eḫulḫul in Ḥarran and sacrificed there in person, took the statues of Śi-n and Nusku to their refurbished cellas, made dedications to members of the Ḥarran pantheon and acknowledged Śi-n for enabling the king to win military victories.

Assurbanipal’s involvement with Eḫulḫul is enough to make him a personal hero for Nabonidus. The Ḥarran Cylinder, which uses the term Ummān-manda, concerns the making of the statues of Eḫulḫul. According to this cylinder, Nabonidus makes the following statement: ‘the statues of Śi-n, Ningu, Nusku, Sadarnunna and the gods, those in Ḥarran… I will renew and will make complete’ (ALAN[NA] dNI[NGAL] dPA.KU dSA.DÅR.NUN.NA u DINGIR.MEŠ šu-ut URU KA[SKAL x] [xxx] ud-da-āš-ma ū-šak-la-la). The Basalt-Stela describes the return of Śi-n’s statue to Eḫulḫul after the temple remained ‘cast down by the destruction (brought) by the Ummān-manda’ for 54 years. Nabonidus describes here the significance of Assurbanipal’s ‘jasper cylinder’ (NAKISIB NAaš-pú-u):231
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The valuable jasper seal, the stone of kingship on which Assurbanipal the king of Assyria drew up and made the image of Sin to utter his name, on that seal he wrote the praise of Sin and on the neck of Sin he placed, to display its features during the destruction (brought) by the enemy in distant days so that his directives do not cease in Esagil, the house that protects the lives of the gods.

The seal found in the temple Esagil provided the imagery that helped restore the statue of Sin. Assurbanipal is therefore the wise king who fashioned this seal and ensured the preservation of its features during the destruction (brought) by the enemy in distant days’. ‘The destruction (brought) by the enemy’ (šal’-pu-ut-ti LÚ.KUR) that has happened according to the Basalt-Stela is the ‘destruction (brought) by the Umma-manda’ (šal-pu-ut-ti ERIN man-du).

A well known influence of Assurbanipal on Nabonidus is the royal titulary used by the latter. The Sippar Cylinder has the following titulary for the king: ‘I am Nabonidus the great king the strong king the king of the world…’ (a-na-ku 9Na-bi-um-na-‘i-id LUGAL ra-bu-ú LUGAL dan-nu LUGAL kiš-šá-ti). Beaulieu observes that these are Neo-Assyrian royal titulary and suggests that the discovery of the building inscriptions of Assurbanipal at Ḫarran during Nabonidus’ excavations of the temple Eḫulḥul influenced their adoption by the Babylonian king. Beaulieu argues that the use of the Neo-Assyrian title šar kīššati in an inscription of Nabonidus solely intended for Ur, where there is no need to highlight Assyrian culture, indicates the Babylonian king is claiming Assyrian heritage. There may have been other factors involved in the Assyrian influence detected from his texts. This apparent influence of Assurbanipal on Nabonidus is one of the reasons the latter used the term Ummān-manda. This explains the occurrence of words used in the Assyrian king’s dedicatory
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inscription for Marduk that parallel those in the Sippar Cylinder. Assurbanipal’s influence on Nabonidus also explains the fact both use the specific term ‘king of the Ummān-manda’. Assurbanipal was one of Nabonidus’ role models for the restoration of Eḫuḫulu in Ḥarran. The texts of Assurbanipal and Nabonidus contain some identical words (as discussed above in p. 208) that are markers for the Cuthaean Legend that tells the story of the powerful Ummān-manda who were ultimately destroyed by the gods. The implication is that the allusions to the Cuthaean Legend are made in a similar manner by both Assurbanipal and Nabonidus. All these factors suggest that Assurbanipal’s inscriptions influenced Nabonidus’ use of the term Ummān-manda, especially since the Babylonian king used the term in the context of his texts that narrated the restoration of Eḫuḫulu.

7.3 Ummān-manda in the Cyrus Cylinder

D’Agostino draws attention to the similarities between the Cyrus Cylinder and the Basalt-Stela of Nabonidus: the power is in the hands of a ruler disagreeable to the gods, Marduk seeks and installs a ruler, and the Babylonians approve. D’Agostino argues that the author of the Cyrus Cylinder mastered the propaganda style found in Nabonidus’ inscriptions and deliberately followed their scheme. The similarities between these two texts prove D’Agostino’s point that the style and scheme of Nabonidus’ texts influenced the Cyrus Cylinder, but to what extend this style can be characterised as propaganda is a different issue beyond the scope of this study. D’Agostino notes that the Cyrus Cylinder is aware that the defeat of the Medes occurred by the blessing of Marduk as it is also described in the Sippar Cylinder. The Cyrus Cylinder says that ‘the land of Gutium, the entire Ummān-manda were made to submit to his feet’ (KUR. Qu-ti-i gi-mir Um-man-man-da ú-ka-an-ni-sa a-na še-pi-si-su). This is portrayed as part of Marduk’s decision to give Cyrus dominion over ‘all civilisation’ (kul-la-

---
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The word *naphar* literally means ‘sum, total’ and has therefore been used with meanings such as ‘all, whole, universe, totality’. In the cylinder, the entirety of the Mesopotamian cities is implied (hence the translation ‘all civilisation’ for *kul-la-ta nap-har*). Corresponding to this are the expressions *nap-har da-ád-mi* ‘all the cities’, UKÜ.MES KUR Šu-me-ri ü URI.KI ‘the people of Sumer and Akkad’ and *nap-har KUR Šu-me-ri u URI.KI* ‘all of Sumer and Akkad’. All of these refer to the same Mesopotamian civilisation over which Marduk names Cyrus as king. Gutium and the Ummān-manda are outside this civilisation both in a geographical way and in a pejorative sense, as discussed previously in 4.1.1.

The Cylinder reverses the use of the term Ummān-manda for the Medes in Nabonidus’ texts. The latter portray the downfall of the Medes as part of Marduk’s and Sin’s divine plan for the restoration of Eḫulḫul. The Cyrus Cylinder, on the other hand, depicts the victory of Persian king over the Medes as Marduk’s decision to make him king of everything, and to stop Nabonidus from oppressing the Babylonians with his religious policies that disrespected the supreme deity of Babylon. The Cyrus Cylinder promotes Cyrus as opposed to Nabonidus and for this purpose uses themes found in the texts of the latter monarch. The term Ummān-manda is not used in any connection with the Cuthaean Legend. Its use is only due to the term’s occurrence in the texts of Nabonidus. The Cyrus Cylinder uses the memory of Cyrus II’s victory over the Medes as one of the Persian king’s acts that prove he is the ideal ruler for the Babylonians. There is disagreement about what ‘Gutium’ denotes alongside the Ummān-manda in the Cyrus Cylinder and what Gutium means other Neo-Babylonian sources. I will discuss these sources in order to understand how ‘Gutium’ is used in the Cyrus Cylinder.

### 7.3.1 Gutium in Neo-Babylonian Sources

Gutium is mentioned in the Cyrus Cylinder not only alongside the Ummān-manda defeated by Cyrus but elsewhere when the Persian king undertook some restorations:

\[
iš-tu \, [\text{ŠU.AN.NA.}^\text{K}] \, a-di \, \text{URU} \, \text{Aš-šur}^{\text{KI}} \, Ū \, \text{MŪS.EREN}^{\text{KI}} \, A-kā-de^{\text{KI}} \, \text{KUR} \, Ėš-nu-nak \, \text{URU} \, \text{Za-am-ba-an}\]
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250 Nabonidus and his religious policies are depicted in a bad light in Cyrus Cylinder 1-11.
From [Babylon] to Assur and Susa, Akkad, the land of Ešnunna, the city of Zamban, the city of Meturnu, Dēr until the border of Gutium, the shrin[es on the oth]er side of the Tigris, of which their dwellings were in ruin from early (times), I returned to their places the gods who dwelled in their midst and established for them eternal dwelling (and) all their peoples I gathered and returned to their settlements.

The expression a-di pa-at KUR.Qu-ti-i, translated ‘until the border of Gutium’ above, has received different translations. Weißbach translates ‘nebst dem Gebiete des Landes Gutium’. Oppenheim translates ‘as well as the region of the Gutians’. Eilers translates ‘jusqu’au pays de Gutium’ and therefore sees Gutium as the clear boundary for Cyrus’ restoration. Berger makes a similar translation: ‘bis zum Gebiet des Gutiumlandes’. Schaudig has ‘bis zur Grenze zum Land der Gutäer’. Zadok thinks like Eilers and translates the expression a-di pa-at KUR.Qu-ti-i as ‘until the border of Gutium’ and argues that in the context of the Cyrus Cylinder there was the restoration of sanctuaries ‘until the border of Gutium’ in an exclusive manner whereby ‘Gutium’ was a land without sanctuaries, which Zadok takes to mean that Gutium was not a Babylonian province. Hallo notes that the use of the term ‘Gutium’ in first millennium texts was usually vague, and that it was one of the designations for the entirety or parts of the Transtigridian land. Based on this, and the phrase ‘until the border of Gutium’, Zadok suggests that Gutium referred to a region that bordered north/north-east of Babylonia, covering at least part of western Media as well as north-eastern Assyria.

---

The interpretation of Gutium as a specific province bordering Babylonian territory also involves Ugbaru ‘the governor of Gutium’ (Ug-ba-ru LÚ.NAM KUR.QU-ti-um) mentioned in the Nabonidus Chronicle. The chronicle says that Ugbaru and the army of Cyrus entered Babylon without battle and captured Nabonidus. The chronicle states that the ‘shields of Gutium’ (KUS.tuk-su ME ša KUR.QU-ti-um) surrounded (NIGIN) the gates of Esagil and there was no interruption in Esagil and the temples of Babylon. After Cyrus entered Babylon, Gubaru (Gu-ba-ru) administered Babylon on behalf of the Persian king. The names Ugbaru and Gubaru in the chronicle possibly belong to the same individual. The name Ugbaru/Gubaru is Old Persian *Gaubaruva. After Gubaru’s appointment of governors in Babylon, the chronicle mentions the return of images, i.e. ‘gods of Akkad’, between the months of Kislev and Adar, and then states that Ugbaru died on the night of 11 Marcheswan. Zadok argues that because the name Ugbaru/Gubaru is Iranian, it is more likely that he was the governor of an Achaemenid province named ‘Gutium’ rather than having any previous Neo-Babylonian loyalties, and his province’s geographical proximity to Babylonia naturally placed him as the first to enter Babylon. Zadok therefore doubts Nabonidus appointed an Iranian to a region bordering Media. Beaulieu agrees with Zadok that Gutium stands for a province bordering Babylonia, but looks at the similarities between Ugbaru/Gubaru in the Nabonidus Chronicle and Gobyras in Xenophon’s Cyropedia (in both sources he is the first to enter Babylon with Cyrus’ soldiers, but only the latter source says he previously served the Babylonian king) in a less skeptical light, and argues that Ugbaru/Gubaru was originally the Neo-Babylonian appointee over the Neo-Babylonian province of ‘Gutium’, but that the later went over to Cyrus and was the Persian king’s main troop leader into Babylon due to his province’s proximity to, and his own familiarity with,
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Beaulieu draws support for this view by looking at the references to Gutium in Neo-Babylonian sources in order to determine its political status. Beaulieu agrees with Zadok that the expression a-di pa-at KUR. Qu-ti-i found in the passage quoted above in pp. 212-213 means ‘until the border of Gutium’ and refers to the beginning of a territory named Gutium, a province that marked the border between the Babylonian and Persian realms. The Cyrus Cylinder describes Cyrus’ victory over the Ummān-manda with the statement ‘the land of Gutium, the entire Ummān-manda were made to submit to his feet’ (KUR. Qu-ti-i gi-mir Um-man-manda ā-ka-an-nī-ša a-na še-pi-šu). Beaulieu argues that in this passage the Ummān-manda exclusively refers to the Medes and that this means Gutium refers to another land that was not part of the Median kingdom that Cyrus conquered. Beaulieu suggests that Gutium was an independent region or a Neo-Babylonian province before Cyrus conquered it a few years before the fall of Babylon. The views expressed by Zadok and Beaulieu assume ‘Gutium’ stands for a specific province bordering Babylonia, a region distinct from Media. The use of the term ‘Gutium’ can be approached in a different light. Jursa argues that Gutium is used for the Medes as an archaic term paired with the pejorative term Ummān-manda in order to describe the Medes, and that the Gutian troops said to be surrounding Esagil in the Nabonidus Chronicle are Medes. Jursa’s interpretation is supported below, but with some qualifications and additional evidence.

The Cyrus Cylinder used the term Ummān-manda because it was used in Nabonidus’ inscriptions (7.3). I propose that the same reason for the use of ‘Gutium’ in the Cyrus Cylinder. The starting point for understanding ‘Gutium’ in the Cyrus Cylinder should therefore begin with its use in Nabonidus’ inscriptions. The term ‘Gutium’ used in Nabonidus’ Basalt-Stela. The Stela says that Neriglissar renewed and clothed Anunitum ‘who dwells in Sippar-Anunitum, whose dwelling the enemy had previously carried into Arrapha, and whose cult ‘Gutium’ ruined’ (a-sī-bat ZIMBIR.KI a-nu-ni-tu, ša i-na pa-ni LŪ.KU[R] šu-bat-sū a-na qē-reb ar-ra-ap-

---
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275 Jursa, “Observations”, p. 174, n. 31. Jursa follows Liverani’s etymological proposal for the term Ummān-manda, ibid., p. 174, n. 31. The problems with Liverani’s etymology are discussed in 2.4. Jursa translates the words KUR. Qu-ti-i gi-mir Um-man-man-da in Cyrus Cylinder 13 as ‘the land of Gutium, viz. all the Umman-manda’, ibid., p. 174, n. 31. This translation excludes the possibility Gutium may be referring to Median polities other than Astyages’ kingdom. This possibility is discussed below. To include this possibility, the more literal translation ‘the land of Gutium, the entire Ummān-manda’ is adopted throughout this study.
Beaulieu observes that the ‘enemy’ in this passage is Sennacherib because this misdeed is ascribed to him in another text of Nabonidus (Inscription 16 iii 26-29) and the events concerning Sippar-Anunitum happened in the seventh century. This other text refers to Sennacherib’s demolition of the temple of Eulmaš in Sippar-Anunitum, and here he is called ‘the enemy’: ‘the king of Assyria, the hostile enemy, turned the city and its temple into ruin’ (LUGAL KUR Aš-sur LÚ.KUR sama-nu-ú URU ú É ša-a-ša ú-ša-li₃ kar-mu-tu₃). Sennacherib’s destructive policies in the city of Babylon were accompanied with action against other parts of Babylonia including Sippar-Anunitum, but the precise dates when Sennacherib carried this out remains unclear. If the Basalt-Stela is taken seriously, then one concludes that Sennacherib destroyed the temple in Sippar-Anunitum and stole its divine image of Anunitum. Esarhaddon reversed Sennacherib’s anti-Babylonian policies and took action to restore Babylon. As part of his policies, Esarhaddon returned divine statues to some Babylonian cities, including ‘Sippar-Aruru’. Brinkman notes Sippar-Anunitum and ‘Sippar-Aruru’ in Esarhaddon’s texts are the same. In his inscription, Esarhaddon says he returned to ‘Sippar-Aruru’ (ZIMBIR.KI₃-A-ru-ru) the divine images of ḫum-hum-ia₃, ṣu-qa-šu-na and ṣi₃-šu₄-šu₄. There is no mention of the return of Anunitum’s image. It is not known whether Esarhaddon returned it, but the Basalt-Stela of Nabonidus may be assuming that the Gutians ruined the divine image of Anunitum when it was in Arrapha deep in Assyrian territory after Sennacherib took it there, and Neriglissar refashioned the divine image true to its original. Esarhaddon’s inscriptions would have mentioned the return of Anunitum’s divine image if it had occurred. In any case, the term Gutium is never used for the Assyrians. The Gutian ruination of Anunitum’s divine image must date after Sennacherib and before Neriglissar. Beaulieu argues that the Gutians merely represent the archetypical barbaric enemies of Babylonia and not the actual
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inhabitants of the region called ‘Gutium’. The Basalt-Stela, however, is making a historical claim about what happened to the divine image of Anunī tum, so Gutium must have been used for an actual group. An identification of this group can be proposed. In the Basalt-Stela, ‘Gutium’ is the subject of the third person plural ū-šā-al-pi-tu ‘they ruined’. This means Gutium stands for a plural subject other than Sennacherib and his armies. One needs to find who could be called ‘Gutium’ and could have been responsible for the ruination of Anunī tum’s divine image in the Assyrian territory of Arrapha after Sennacherib and before Neriglissar. Other inscriptions of Nabonidus, including other passages in the Basalt-Stela (Appendix 1.46), hold the Medes exclusively responsible for the destruction of Assyrian territory, cities and temples during the Assyrian-Babylonian war, and the term Umma-n-manda is used for them in this context (7.2). I suggest, therefore, that the Basalt-Stela held the Medes responsible also for the destruction of Arrapha. The Gadd Chronicle clearly states that the Medes descended into Assyria by proceeding down to Arrapha. I infer that Nabonidus’ Basalt-Stela is using ‘Gutium’ for the Medes who, in their destructive campaigns, also ruined the image of Anunī tum that was held in Arrapha. They are the ones held responsible for destroying cities and temples after Sennacherib and before Neriglissar, and they would easily be called ‘Gutium’ as a destructive eastern people, being the subject for the third person plural verb ū-šā-al-pi-tu ‘they ruined’ in the Basalt-Stela. The reference to the Medes’ rampage in Arrapha in Gadd Chronicle 23 strengthens the proposal that Gutium in Nabonidus’ Basalt-Stela stands for the Medes under Cyaxares who ravaged Assyria. It becomes clear that Nabonidus’ inscriptions simultaneously use the terms Umma-n-manda and Gutium for the Medes. Previously it has been discussed that the Cyrus Cylinder used the term Umma-n-manda for the Medes because it was used in Nabonidus’ inscriptions (7.3). The term Umma-n-manda refers to the Medes, but that does not mean another label cannot be used for the same Medes in the same text. I argue that the Cyrus Cylinder also used the term ‘Gutium’ for the Medes because that term has been used for the Medes by Nabonidus, as the Basalt-Stela exemplifies. The Cyrus Cylinder therefore declared victory over all the Medes before conquering Babylon and called them both Gutium and Umma-n-manda.

Seeing the term ‘Gutium’ as a designation for the Medes can also help interpret the expression a-di pa-at KUR.Qu-ti-i found in the Cyrus Cylinder (passage quoted above in pp. 212-213). Cyrus restores the shrines in Babylon, Assur, Susa, Akkad, the land of Ešnunna, the city of Zamban, the city of Metenu, and Dēr, returns

---
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their gods to their dwellings and their peoples to their settlements. In the narrative of the Cyrus Cylinder, Gutium was outside Mesopotamian civilization alongside Ummān-manda (4.1.1). I argue that Cyrus’ shrine restorations are depicted as covering all of Mesopotamian civilization and Susa (similar to the way the Cyrus Cylinder distinguished not only Mesopotamia but also Anšan from the defeated land of Gutium and the Ummān-manda, as discussed in 4.1.1) ‘until the border of Gutium’ (a-di pa-at KUR. Qu-ti-i), that is until the land of Media, where there are no more sanctuaries to restore. The reference in the Cyrus Cylinder about the submission of Gutium and the Ummān-manda marks Cyrus’ role as saving the Babylonians from the Median menace under Astyages.

There is almost no information about Babylonia’s eastern front in the aftermath of Cyrus’ victory over Astyages. Given that the term Ummān-manda was used specifically for the Medes under the dynasty of Cyaxares and Astyages, as discussed throughout this chapter, it is possible that the term ‘Gutium’ refers to other Median polities Cyrus subdued after capturing Astyages. The submission of ‘Gutium’ in the Cyrus Cylinder may be aiming to put across the idea that Cyrus defeated all Medes who opposed him. If ‘Gutium’ designated an eastern land other than Astyages’ Median kingdom centered around his royal city Ecbatana, then it may correspond to the ‘kings who go by his side’ (LUGAL.MES a-lik i-di-šu) in Nabonidus’ Sippar Cylinder. Gutium may, in this scenario, be referring to any polity that was subservient to Astyages in the lands east of Mesopotamia. The expression in the Sippar Cylinder may refer to the allies of the Medes and/or the Median warlords serving Astyages. It is much more likely, however, that ‘Gutium’ refers to the Medes under Astyages just like the term Ummān-manda in the Cyrus Cylinder because ‘Gutium’ is used in the Basalt-Stela of Nabonidus for the Medes under Cyaxares, as discussed above in pp. 215-217. As stated earlier, Hallo observes that the term ‘Gutium’ in the first millennium texts is a designation for the entirety or parts of the Transtigridian land. The Cyrus Cylinder shows that Gutium/Media bordered the Babylonian realm and Susa (passage is quoted above in pp. 212-213) and constituted the boundary during Cyrus’ shrine restorations. The land of ‘Media’ during the

288 Cyrus Cylinder 30b-32.
289 The possibility there were some Mesopotamian shrines (perhaps insignificant in size and wealth) in Media cannot be excluded. The details about the social make-up of the Median kingdom, with all its dominion during the time of Astyages, remain a mystery due to an absence of evidence. It is possible, for example, that Mesopotamian expatriates lived in parts of Media and had their own shrines. The lack of sanctuaries to restore in Media during Cyrus II’s reign must be seen within the narrative of the Cyrus Cylinder. The restoration of sanctuaries signifies that Cyrus is restoring the glory of Babylonian civilisation, which the Persian king saved from the Medes and the heretic king Nabonidus. Media is outside Babylonian civilisation and its sanctuaries that need restoration, so the Cyrus Cylinder cannot mention any sanctuaries in Media if there were actually any.
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Neo-Babylonian era must have expanded to include the Zagros and the Transtigridian lands during the reigns of Cyaxares and Astyages, eventually bordering Babylonia’s eastern frontier and causing scribes to label Media as ‘Gutium’. Arguably the pejorative aspect of Gutium also motivated its use for the Medes. The Gutians were depicted as uncivilised, in depreciative stereotypes, and were associated with the eastern mountains in cuneiform tradition.293

Interpreting ‘Gutium’ as a label for the entirety or a part of ‘Media’ also makes sense of another Neo-Babylonian reference to ‘Gutium’. A small Neo-Babylonian chronicle fragment mentions the city of Yanu (Ia-annu) as the ‘city of Gutium’ (URU šá KUR.Gu-ti-i).294 The chronicle fragment seems to date to the time of Xerxes I due to his mention as the son of Darius in a line that is hard to read.295 The entire chronicle fragment is very broken and its content is unclear, also obscuring the context in which this ‘city of Gutium’ is mentioned. Zadok interprets the city name ‘Yanu’ (Ia-annu) as Old Iranian *yāna ‘favour, boon’.296 Such an Iranian city name is well suited for a city in Media, a region where Iranian name elements are expected. Furthermore, Ugbaru/Gubaru ‘the governor of Gutium’ in the Nabonidus Chronicle would be the Persian king Cyrus’ governor for ‘Media’ at the time he entered Babylon. The ‘shields of Gutium’ that surround Esagil would be the Medes, as Jursa has suggested.297
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CONCLUSION

The present study has sought to solve some of the mystery about the word Ummān-manda and has taken up two inter-connected topics. One has been its obscure etymology. The other is its literary aspect revealed by its use in the story the Cuthaean Legend that used to be popular in the Neo-Assyrian and Neo-Babylonian eras. The study of both these topics have yielded some inter-connected conclusions.

It has become clear that Ummān-manda is not a simple pejorative term used for any barbaric or nomadic group. The first conclusion of this present study is that the Neo-Assyrian and Neo-Babylonian sources identify the Cimmerians and the Medes as Ummān-manda by alluding to the Cuthaean Legend. This is the significance of the Ummān-manda in the first millennium BC.

The second conclusion is that the term Ummān-manda recalls the various attributes of the Ummān-manda depicted in the Cuthaean Legend. The Neo-Assyrian/Neo-Babylonian sources ascribe these attributes to the Cimmerians and the Medes respectively. The Ummān-manda in the Cuthaean Legend are a powerful enemy who come from the eastern direction but are ultimately doomed to fall. The contemporary political circumstances surrounding the Cimmerians and the Medes prompted the Neo-Assyrian and Neo-Babylonian scribes to see the parallels between the Ummān-manda in the Cuthaean Legend, and the Cimmerians and Medes respectively: the Ummān-manda of their own times. These parallels between the Neo-Assyrian/Neo-Babylonian alluding texts and the evoked text of the Cuthaean Legend indicate the following characteristics of the Ummān-manda:

- The Ummān-manda originate from a distant land in the ‘east’. This ‘east’ is not to be taken too literally, but refers to the mountainous terrain east and north of Mesopotamia.
- The Ummān-manda conduct destructive military campaigns in civilised areas and gain great power
- The Ummān-manda are destined to be destroyed by the gods without the interference of the Mesopotamian king

The starting point for these two conclusions has been to look at the words ‘the creation of Tiamat’ and ‘seed of ruin’ in the Neo-Assyrian sources, and the adverb ‘terribly, in an evil manner’ in the Neo-Babylonian sources.
These recall the Umma-n-manda in the Cuthaean Legend. The use of the word Ummān-manda itself in the Neo-Assyrian/Neo-Babylonian sources similarly evokes images from Naram-Sin’s enemy in the Standard Babylonian story. These words are implicit markers because they are unique words recognised as standing out against the background of the fixed formulae and stock phrases. Detecting these implicit markers make apparent the literary allusions to an evoked text. Literary allusions can be deliberate or subliminal. Either way the allusions in the alluding Neo-Assyrian/Neo-Babylonian texts provide information about their use of the term Ummān-manda. The implicit markers are only the tip of the iceberg, and they are there because of the larger parallels the scribes see between the Ummān-manda in the Standard Babylonian Cuthaean Legend (evoked text) and the Ummān-manda in their own texts (alluding texts). These parallels can be classified into three: a distant eastern homeland, destructive military campaigns, and downfall without Mesopotamian interference.

8.1 The Distant Eastern Homeland

The ‘eastern’ homeland of the Ummān-manda can be anywhere east and north of Mesopotamia. The Ummān-manda in the Standard Babylonian version of the Cuthaean Legend come from the distant eastern mountains (4.2). The Cimmerian homeland known to the Assyrians laid somewhere near Urartu, fitting well with the type of distant land in the ‘east’ ascribed to the Ummān-manda in the Cuthaean Legend (6.1-2). The Babylonians knew that the Medes under Cyaxares and Astyages came from Ecbatana, modern Hamadan. This is clearly a distant eastern land as well (7.1).

The distant eastern location of the groups designated by the term Ummān-manda is connected with the proposed mandum ‘terrain’ etymology for the second component of the term because then it means ‘troops of the terrain (of the distant eastern zone)’. The plausibility of the mandum ‘terrain’ etymology for the term stems from the fact that it can account for the regular written form of the word Ummān-manda (3.1.1) and can explain its use in texts (chapters 3-4). The result of the present study’s etymological inquiry is that the most plausible explanation for the second component of the term is based on the word mandum ‘terrain’, by which the term Ummān-manda referred to a military force that comes from a distant eastern land. The results concerning the role of the story Cuthaean Legend in the use of the term Ummān-manda indicates its etymology is not the primary reason it has been used, but rather it is subservient to the eastern homeland for the enemy force evoked in the story.
8.2 Destructive Military Campaigns

The Ummān-manda in the Cuthaean Legend carries out destructive campaigns and the Akkadian king cannot militarily defeat them and the gods will not bless a direct military offensive against them (5.6.1-2). The destructive campaigns of the Cimmerians in Urartu and Lydia are described in Neo-Assyrian documents. They spread all across Assyria’s northern and eastern fronts by the time of Esarhaddon, posing all types of danger (chapter 6). The Medes are the destructive powerful force that tilts the balance of power in favour of the Babylonians in their war against the Assyrians. Nabonidus’ texts exclusively blame the Medes for the desecration of the Assyrian temples during this conflict and call them Ummān-manda. The purpose is to absolve the Babylonians and their king Nabopolassar from the desecration of the temples since Nabonidus aims to restore Eḫuḫulī in Ḥarran as a Babylonian king (chapter 7). The image of the Ummān-manda and their destructive campaigns, implied by the fact the term evokes the destructive enemy in the Cuthaean Legend, becomes a literary topos for Nabonidus’ inscriptions.

8.3 Downfall without Mesopotamian Interference

Venus promises the Ummān-manda who have overpowered Naram-Sin will eventually be destroyed without Akkadian involvement (5.6.1-2). Bēl-ūṣēzib’s letter to Esarhaddon (ABL 1237), the king’s inscription about Teušpaya the Cimmerian chief, and the Neo-Assyrian prophecies indicate the Assyrians were looking forward to the downfall of the Cimmerians at the hands of the gods at least from the time of Esarhaddon onwards (6.1-2). The climax of Cimmerian power was under their king Tugdammē, who lost his life without any interference of the Assyrian Empire. Assurbanipal’s inscriptions depict him as the king of the Ummān-manda who is doomed because he does not take the curse of the oaths seriously. These texts describe his fate with clear overtones to the Ummān-manda of the Standard Babylonian Cuthaean Legend (6.3). The Persian king Cyrus II defeats Astyages the king of the Medes without the interference of the Babylonian kingdom since by Marduk’s and Sin’s will they were destined to lose their power because they desecrated the shrines of Assyria. The gods arrange their downfall just like the Ummān-manda of the Standard Babylonian Cuthaean Legend (7.1-2). The Cyrus Cylinder reverses the theme of the Ummān-manda from Nabonidus’ Basalt-Stela in the sense that now it is by Marduk’s will that Cyrus defeats both the Ummān-manda and Nabonidus, the king who oppressed the Babylonians (7.3).
8.4 Implications

The present thesis has contributed to the study of literary allusions in the field of Mesopotamian literature. Words and expressions distinct to a given literary text, once they appear in other texts, open up the possibility that the literary text has some sort of influence on the other text(s). Ummān-manda is most probably not the only archaic term with a literary aspect. Terms such as Gutium, Martu appear in various literary works. Scribes who used these terms in other texts were well versed in the literary texts. The use of these terms can be studied similar to the study of the term Ummān-manda in the present thesis. The present study merely opens ‘the tablet box’. Future research has a lot to discover about how literary allusions and archaic terms can improve the scholarly understanding of cuneiform texts.

The other implication of the study concerns the Cuthaean Legend. While it was already known that the story was popular in scribal circles (5.5.1), the present study has provided evidence it has more influence than previously known. Its influence on the use of the term Ummān-manda does not appear to be limited to the Neo-Assyrian and Neo-Babylonian sources. There are traces of its influence in other sources (4.2.1.1, 4.3, 4.4.5-6, Appendix 3). Future discoveries are expected to verify this. A text-critical study of the Cuthaean Legend will also be helpful (4.2.2), although the extant incomplete evidence would still prevent results beyond doubt.
APPENDIX 1

PRIMARY SOURCES USING THE TERM UMMÂN-MANDA OR ITS SECOND COMPONENT

1.-3. Old Babylonian Liver Omen references to the Ummân-manda

1. YOS 10 44 53

DIŠ AS ki-ma ši-ip er-bi-im ša-am-da-at ši-ip um-ma-an-ma-ad-da

“The foot (is) like a bound ‘locust-foot’: the foot of the Ummân-manda”

2. VAT 602 5-9

5. [iš-tu (?) qabah ru-qš šipu it-bi-e-ma m[a]zāza ik-šu-ud šip ERIN.MES ba-da [i-ta-ab-bi-a-am-ma...]
6. [iš-tu (?) isid (DU(?)) ru-qš šipu (GIR) it-bi-e-ma manzą[a] (K1.[G][UB]) ik-šu-ud i-na ap-pi-ša šelu nadi šip ERIN.MES ba-da i-ta-ab-bi-a-am-ma ina libbi ummānī (ERIN.MES)-ka i-ma-[q]i-ut
7. [iš-tu (?) arkat ru-qš šipu it-bi-e-ma manząza ina libbi-ša šelu nadi šip ERIN.MES ba-da i-ta-ab-bi-a-am-ma ina libbi m[at]-ka i-[ma]-qi-ut
8. […] ri-qš šipu it-bi-e-ma […] ū arka pa-at-ra-at ERIN.MES ba-da i-ta-ab-[bi-a-am-ma i-na li]bhi ummāni-k[a] ši-ul i-ka-ša-ad
9. […] ru-qš šipu it-bi-e-ma [manząza(?)] ik-šu-ud ū i-na ap-pi-ša pi-lu-ur-tum [umm]ān(ERIN.MES)-ba(?)-d[a(?)] ša i-na te-š-e ra-ma-ni-sā i-ma-qī-ut

5. … from the middle of the ‘concave surface’ (of the liver) the foot arises and reaches the ‘presence’: the foot of the Ummân-bada [arises and…]
6. … from the base of the ‘concave surface’ (of the liver) the foot arises and reaches the ‘presence’ (and) there is a ‘hole’ in its nose: the foot of the Ummân-bada rises but fa[l]ls in the midst of your troops
7. … from the back of the ‘concave surface’ (of the liver) the foot arises and reaches the ‘presence’ (and) in its midst there is a ‘hole’: the foot of the Ummân-bada arises and falls in the midst of your land.
8. …’[concave surface]’ (of the liver)… the foot arises… and the back is loosened: the Ummân-bada ar[ise] and do not reach [the mi]dst of your army
9. … of the ‘concave surface’ (of the liver). The foot ar[ises] and reaches [the ‘presence’] and on its ‘nose’ (there is a) ‘cross’: [Umm]ān-bada […] fall [i]n their own confusion.

3. VAT 4102 4

[šu-ma] n[i-i]ru me-[eḫ]-re-t šibti k[i]-ma ši-in-ni mu-uš-ti pu-tu-ur-ma lu-pu-ut i-na pa-ni i[i(?)] ū lu ERIN-ma-an-da i-te-bi-am-ma a-na libbi māt ša nakri i-[ma-qī-ut]¹

² The transliteration is from Nougayrol, “Textes hépatoscopiques”, p. 16. It was not possible to pick out the logograms from the photo of the text in ibid., p. 44, pl. IV. In the case of the logograms for the word Ummân-manda, they are obtained from G. Komoróczy, “Ummân-manda” Acta Antiqua Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae 25 (1977), p. 57.
³ Transliteration from Nougayrol, “Textes hépatoscopiques”, p. 13. It was not possible to pick out the logograms from the photo of the text in ibid., p. 44, pl. IV. In the case of the logograms for the word Ummân-manda, they are obtained from Komoróczy, “Ummân-manda”, p. 57.
[if the y]o[ke] fac[ing the ‘increase’ is loose like the tooth of a comb and touches the front of […] or the Ummān-manda arise and fall in the midst of the land of the enemy.

4. Administrative Document from Mari, ARM 7 221

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>KU.BABBAR</th>
<th>TUG.H.I.A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 MA.NA</td>
<td>4 TUG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2/3 MA.NA</td>
<td>3 TUG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5/6 MA.NA</td>
<td>3 TUG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>3 LU E-la-mu-ú</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>½ MA.NA</td>
<td>3 TUG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>5 GIN</td>
<td>1 TUG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>5 GIN</td>
<td>1 TUG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>5 GIN</td>
<td>1 TUG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>4 LU Ma-an-da</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Silver Garments
2 1 mina 4 garments Mayaya
3 2/3 mina 3 garments Innerri
4 5/6 mina 3 garments Apil-ili
5            3 Elamites
6 ½ mina 3 garments Adduma-Addu³
7 5 shekels 1 garment Rim-Dagan
8 5 shekels 1 garment Ipiq-Arahtim
9 5 shekels 1 garment Habduni-Šapa
10            4 Manda-men

5. - 8. Early Old Babylonian Archival Texts in Choga Gavaneh, Iran⁹

5. ChG 5

Obverse
1. 2,1.0 NU[MUN]
2. [N][G][S]U 4EN.ZU-x
3. [na]m-[l]at-ti
4. mBe-el-su-mu

Lower Edge
5. [l][k][a]³Pa?-lum⁴

Reverse

⁴ Restoration follows i-ma-[q]u-[u] VAT 602 6, i-ma-qu[u]-u VAT 602 9, i-[ma]-qu-[u] VAT 602 7. For these texts see Nougayrol, “Textes hépatoscopiques”, p. 16 and Appendix 1.2.
⁵ Bottéro notes the uncertainty in reading the IM sign, see ARM 7, 1957, p. 113: 221 6. The sign is problematic but it is not too far away from the two versions of IM in ARM 7 92:8. The sign KI, as it is written in ARM 7 104 iii r. 13, also looks like the IM here, but how that would produce an obviously more understandable name has not been obvious.
⁶ The reading ah! follows Bottéro’s collation in ARM 7, 1957, p. 113: 221 9. This reading could also be justified because it helps read the name of a Sutean goddess. For this name, see ch. 2, p. 35.
⁷ Bottéro is not certain about the reading here despite his expertise in the Mari documents and his collation of the text. This second part of the personal name is also elusive, and will remain a mystery without new evidence, see this name discussed in ch. 2, pp. 35-36.
⁸ For a discussion of the difficult etymologies of these personal names, see ch. 2, pp. 35-36.
⁹ Published as ChG 5, ChG 18, ChG 31, ChG 34 in K. Abdi and G. Beckman, “An Early Second-Millennium Cuneiform Archive from Choga Gavaneh, Western Iran” JCS 59 (2007), pp. 51, 54, 59-60. The collations marked throughout Appendix 1.5-8 are from Beckman’s readings in ibid.
6. e-zu-ub
7. 7 ZIZ ma-an-di SE
8. ma-ah-ri-tim
10. KA(or SAG) NIG.GA xx

Obverse
1. 2,1.0 se[ed]
   2. in the care of Sin-x
   3. [re]-ce[pt]
   4. (of) Bēlsunu

Lower Edge
5. (Town of) Palum

Reverse
6. Received
7. 7 emmer of the ‘mandu-soldier barley’ (i.e. barley to be provisioned for the mandu-soldiers)\(^{10}\)
8. Previous
9. [T]otal: 15 of the ‘mandu-soldier barley’\(^{10}\)
10. ...

6. ChG 18

Obverse
1. 7 ma-an-di A-nu-ur-[ri]
2. ša BĀDKI
3. 3 ERIN pu-hu'-um
4. ša A-ga-de
5. 8 Šiš-li DUMU I-di
6. ša A-tu-ša'-riKI

Reverse
7. 18 UGULA'I IM' ma-an-di
8. SE

Obverse
1. Seven of the Amor[ite] mandu
2. of Der
3. Three substitute soldiers
4. of Agade
5. Eight (soldiers) of Šišli, son of Iddi
6. of Atušari

Reverse
7.- 8. (Total) eighteen inspector? tablet? of the ‘mandu-soldier barley’\(^{10}\)

7. ChG 31

Obverse
1'. [0,0.1] Wā-qar-[um]
2'. 0,0.1 A.UTU'-na-wi-ir
3'. 0,0.1 7a-a-bu-ni
4'. [0,0.1] A-li-a-li
5'. 0,0.1 A-k[ī]'-tum
6'. 0,0.1 II-ta-ni
7'. 0,0.1 La-ma-sa-tum
8'. 0,0.1 Is-ta-a
9'. [0,0.1] I-su-šu-nu

\(^{10}\) An archival text from Choga Gavaneh (ChG 18) indicates mandu is referring to certain mandu-soldiers. For the discussion, see 4.4.1. In this light mandu in the genitive with SE ‘barley’ seems to be referring in some ways to an amount of barley that is allocated for the mandu-soldiers.
10'. [0,0.1] K'a-na-na-ya
11'. [0,0.1] M'a-ta-tum

Reverse
12'. (traces)
13'. 0,0.1 A-li-da-du-ya
14'. 0,0.1 A-ha-Tu-tu
15'. 0,4.3 mä-an-di SE
16'. X mu x zu' X nu

Obverse
1'. [0,0.1] (for) Waqart[um]
2'. 0,0.1 (for) Šamas-nawir
3'. 0,01 (for) Tābunī
4'. [0,0.1] (for) [A]li-aḫī
5'. 0,0.1 (for) Ak[i]tum
6'. 0,0.1 (for) Ilīani
7'. 0,0.1 (for) Lamassatum
8'. 0,0.1 (for) Išṭa
9'. 0,0.1 (for) Isuḫunu
10'. [0,0.1] (for) [K]ananaya
11'. [0,0.1] (for) [M]attatum

Reverse
12'. (traces)
13'. 0,0.1 (for) Ali-daduya
14'. 0,0.1 (for) Aḫa-Tutu
15'. 0,4.3 of the “mandu-soldier barley”¹⁰
16'. …

8. ChG 34

Obverse
1'. [0,0.2] Ši-i-[um-m[i]
2'. 0,0.2 A-ḫi-gu-ul-la-[ub]
3'. [0,0.2] Be-el-[tu[m
4'. 0,0.2 Nu-ba-[tum
5'. 0,0.2 [I]-ša-[šu-nu
6'. 0,0.2 I'-[a]-su-[nu
7'. 0,0.2 A'-ḫa'-ar'-aḫi
8'. 0,0.2 Be-el-ta-ni
9'. 0,0.2 Iš'-ta-[a
10'. 0,0.2 Ka-l-hi-[tum
11'. [0,0.2] Wa-qar'-ba'-li³

Reverse
13'. (traces)
14'. 0,0.2 ARAD-ta-[\]
15'. 0,0.2 Nu-[u]-r-3[\]

16'. 2 TUG.HLI.A
17'. 9 ma-an-d[i SE]¹¹

Obverse
1'. [0,0.2] (for) Ši-umm[i]
2'. 0,0.2 (for) Aḫi-gullu[b]
3'. [0,0.2] (for) Be[tu[m
4'. 0,0.2 (for) Nūbatum
5'. 0,0.2 (for) [Il]assunu
6'. 0,0.2 (for) [Il][a]ssunu

Tablet I: MLC 1364

Col. III

1 im-ta-ḫa-as da-ab-da-a ú-ul i-zi-[i(b)]
2 iḫ-na ša!14 -ni-2 š[u-si] li-mi um-ma-na u-še-si-am-ma
3 im-ta-ḫa-as da-[a]-d[u]-a ú-ma-al-li še-ra
4 i-na ša-ša-li i-li-mi um-ma-na u-še-si-am-ma
5 e-li ša pa-na u-wa-at-te-er ša-a-ti
6 ši-tu 6 ša-si li-mi um-ma-andi ní-ri
7 im-ta-ḫa-as da-ab-da-a ra-bi-a
8 a-na-ku es-si-[hi] en-ni-ši
9 a-ka-ad a-na-ah a-šu-aš am-ti-ma
10 un-ma a-na-ku-m[a] DINGIR a-na BALA-yā mi-nam ub-lam
11 a-na-ku šar-rum la mu-ša-lim ma-ti-šu
12 ū SIPA la mu-ša-lim ni-ši-šu
13 ya-aši BALA-e mi-nam ub-lam
14 ki-i lu-aš-ta-ak-kan-ma
15 pa-ag-ri ū ra-ma-ni lu-še-si
16 a-na ṣu-ul-lu-uq še-ri Ak-ka-di-i
17 [L]U.KUR da-an-na id-ki-a-am-ma
18 […]-si-a-ta(or <<ga>>)-am ḫa-ri-a-ti Mal-gl-d15
19 […] gu uk ka ni a

12 This document, in its extant form, does not contain the term Ummān-manda but is included in this collection because it is the earliest known extant version of the Cuthaean Legend, a story that is known to refer to the Ummān-manda in its Hittite and Standard Babylonian versions.
13 J. J. Finkelstein, “The So-Called ‘Old Babylonian Kutha Legend’” JCS 11 (1957), pp. 83-88; C. B. F. Walker, “The Second Tablet of tupšenna pitema, an Old Babylonian Naram-Sin Legend?” JCS 33 (1981), pp. 191-195; J. G. Westenholz, Legends of the Kings of Akkade: The Texts. Winona Lake, Indiana. Eisenbrauns. 1997, pp. 267-289. Tablet I Column I is destroyed, Columns II and V are too fragmentary for any translation that would contribute to our understanding of the text. The extant text in Tablet II Columns II and V consists of only traces of few signs. See transliterations in references provided. The fragmentary state of Tablet I (MLC 1364) has led to the suggestion it may be a different composition, Finkelstein, “The So-Called ‘Old Babylonian Kutha Legend’”, pp. 87-88. Tablet II (BM 17215) has the Akkadian title of the Cuthaean Legend but not enough of it has survived to help determine if Tablet I (MLC 1364) is genuinely the Old Babylonian version of the story. Nonetheless, there are passages, themes, phrases and words paralleled with later versions of the Cuthaean Legend, Westenholz, Legends of the Kings of Akkade, p. 267; B. R. Foster, Before the Muses: An Anthology of Akkadian Literature. Third Edition. Bethesda, Maryland. CDL Press. 2005, p. 344, and see the philological notes in Westenholz, Legends of the Kings of Akkade, pp. 267-289. The collations and emendations for Appendix 1.9 are from Westenholz’s work unless otherwise stated.
14 Written ṭa.
15 The text is difficult and there are alternative readings. For these readings and the position of Malgium, see ch. 4, pp. 83-84.
Tablet II: BM 17215

Col. I
1 qä-ab-lam is-ta-tu i-na mu-uh-hi-ša
2 ki-ma kar-mi uš-te-wi
3 ba a[b] NE te! im du
4 …
(break)

Col. VI
1 […] x x […]
2 […] ERIN GIŠ(?) MI …
3 DUB.2.KAM.MA tš-pš-na pi-te-e-ma
4 SU ld-da-tum DUB.SAR.TUR
5 ITI.SE.GUR ub.KU3 UD.26.KAM
6 mu Am-mi-sa-du-qä lugal-e
7 urudu-duš-mah gal-gal-la

Tablet I: MLC 1364

Col. III
1 He inflicted a defeat, he did not leave (anyone alive)
2 In the second (time), I sent forth 120,000 troops but
3 he inflicted a defeat, he filled the plain (with corpses)
4 In the third (time), I sent forth 60,000 troops but
5 He made that (defeat) exceed the previous
6 After he had slain my 360,000 troops,
7 he inflicted great bloodshed
8 I was bewildered, confused,
9 frightened, exhausted, distressed, felt belittled and
10 thus I said: “What has god brought upon my reign?

16 Foster notes the text Wa-ri-x could refer to Warium, a term some scholars interpret as an ancient name for northern Babylonia. For references, see Foster, Before the Muses, p. 346, n. 1.
11 I am a king who has not kept his land safe
12 and a shepherd who has not kept his people safe!
13 What has my reign brought me?
14 How may I proceed that
15 I may get myself out (of this ordeal)?
16 To destroy the plain of Akkade
17 He (the god?) raised against me a mighty foe
18 … Harians of Malgium…
19 …
20 […] the plain of Akkade, the flatlands
21 …

Col. IV

1’ …
2’ The sanctuaries…
3’ The land was destroyed…
4’ The […] of Adad roared over the land
5’ He trampled its (Akkade’s) hustle and bustle, scattered its intelligence
6’ He leveled cities, tells and temples
7’ He transformed everywhere equally
8’ like the flood of water that had happened
9’ among the first peoples
10’ He transformed the land of Akkade
11’ He destroyed the land
12’ He reduced all of it as if it had never existed
13’ Leveled was the land, all of it turned around
14’ In the anger of the gods…
15’ Cities were destroyed, the tells leveled
16’ The hustle and bustle of the la[nd] was reduced and trampled
17’ Like the flood of the canal he transformed the land
18’ …he des[tro]yed [Akkad(?)]/Wari(um)?

Tablet II: BM 17215

Col. I
1 He wove battle against it
2 He transformed (it) into a ruin
3 …
4…
(break)

Col. VI

1 …
2 …troop …

3 The second tablet of (the series) “open the tablet-box”
4 (By) the hand of Iddatum the junior scribe
5 Month Addar, 26th day
6 Year (when) Ammisaduqa the king
7 (presented) a very large great copper platform

---

17 Foster suggests ‘Akkad(?)’ as the object of destruction in *ibid.*, p. 346, n. 1. For Warium, see previous footnote.
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10. Statue of Idrimi, lines 42-58

42.  aḥ-hē-ḪI.A-ya X i-ḪI.A-ya ap-pu-na
43.  MU 7 KAM.HI.ḪI.ḪI.ḪI.ḪI a-ra-at-tar-na LUGAL dan-nu
44.  LUGAL ERIN.MEŠ Ḫur-ri.KI i-na-kīr-an-ni
45.  i-na š-e-bi ša-na-ṭi a-na a-ra-at-tar-na LUGAL-ri
46.  LUGAL ERIN.MEŠ-va(?)-an-wa-an-da ʾaš-tā-pār ū ad-bu-ub!
47.  ma-na-h[?]-e? HĒ ša a-bu-te-ḪI.A-ya i-nu-ma
48.  a-bu-te-ḪI.A-ya a-na UGU-šu-nu in-na-ḫu-ū
49.  ū [a-w]a-ti-ni a-na LUGAL.ḪI.ḪA ša ERIN.MEŠ Ḫur-ri.KI da-mi-iq
50.  ū 20 a-na bi-ri-šu-nu NAM.ERIM dan-nu
51.  [i]š-ku-nu-nim-ma!(NA) LUGAL dan-nu ma-na-ḫa-te-MEŠ
52.  ša pa-nu-ṭi-ni ū NAM.ERIM ša bi-ri-šu-nu ḫis-me!-ma
53.  ū i-nu-mi-ti ip!-ta-la!-aḫ aš-ṣum a-wa-at
54.  ma-mi-ti ū aš-ṣum ma-na-ḫa!-te-MEŠ-ni śu-ul-mi-ya
55.  im-ta-ḫar ū KI.BU SA RI.DU.Ū SA SIZKUR
56.  ū-ṣar-bi ū E ḫal-qū ū-te-er-su
57.  i-na LU-ti-ya i-na ki-nu-ti-ya PĀD an-na-am
58.  a-as-bat-šu ū LUGAL-ku a-na URU A-la-la-aḥ.KI

42. my brothers I?… them. 21 Now
43. (for) seven years, Barattarna, the mighty king
44. the king of the Hurrians treated me as an enemy.
45. In the seventh year, to Barattarna, the king,
46. the king of the Umma n-wanda I wrote and spoke
47. of the efforts of my ancestors when
48. my fathers labored for them,
49. and our word was pleasing to the kings of the Hurrian warriors,
50. and between them, a binding oath
51. they placed. The mighty king (concerning) our earlier efforts,
52. and the oath (sworn) between them, heard.
53. And with (regard to) the oath, he had respect. Because of the content
54. of the oath, and because of our efforts, my ‘peace’
55. he accepted. And ….. sacrifices
56. I increased. And I returned (his) lost household to him.
57. As to my status as a loyal vassal, that “oath”
58. I swore to him. And I was king in Alalah.

19 The written form of the term Ummān-wanda is discussed in 1.3.
20 Sign is half broken.
21 The meaning of the word ū-ḪI.A-ya ap-pu-na has been problematic, see Oller, The Autobiography of Idrimi, p. 49. The part of the inscription that concerns the use of the word Ummān-manda begins after this elusive word, after which the word appuna ‘now, moreover’ at the end of line 42 signals the beginning of a different part of Idrimi’s career, his dealings with the Hurrian king Barattarna.
11. The Middle Babylonian version of the composition *tupšînna piṭêma* “open the tablet box” from Ḫattušaš (Boğazköy), 22 Bo Tursinna 23

Prism I: KBo 19 98
Side b
(break)
1' ... i ki na ...

2' […] A-DU₄ ū-ul iš-tu-ra-am-MA NA-[DU₄?] 25
3' [...šu-ü-ul] a-hi-ma ū ri-e-it-ti ū-ul
4' [ši-bat-ma] ma-ḥar "UTU ū-ul ak-ru-ub-šu-ma

5' [a]-wi-li-tum i-ru-ib a-na pa-ni-[šu-nu a-na ū-ur-ri URU.KI 6
6' a-na pa-ni-[šu-nu ū-ul URU.KI-um qa-qa-ra a-na pa-ni-[šu-nu]
7' ū-ul qa-qa-ra 6 LUGAL.MES šu-nu at-ḥu-ú šu-[pu-ú]
8' ū 6 ME um-ma-an-[šu-nu] "E-a be-lum […]
9' [a-na] šu-mi iš-pu-ar qa-ti-šu ib-ni-[šu-mu-[ti]
10' […] šu-ni-ti-ma ša-šu-um-ma-at UR.MAH.[MES]
11' mu-ṭ-tam nam-ta-ra gi-i-li-e še-bi-[i [...]
12' [ni-ib-i]-ta ḫu-ša-[a]-ḫa ṭu KI.LAM ša an-niš! 24 an ga
13' […] ra-bi-ū it-ṭi-[šu-nu ir-ru-ud "E-a [be-lum]
14' [pa-ša] i-pu-śa-[am-MA iz-za-kār a-na DINGIR.MES ŠE-[MES šu

15' [ERI[N[MES an-ni-a-am a-na ku ab-ni at-tu-nu ši-ma-ti šu
16' ši-i-ma aš-sum la ḫu-šu-ul-uq-qī a-ši-šu-tim šu-ma šu
17' lu-ū zi-ki-ir a-na wa-ar ki-[a-at u-[mi-im
18' [...]-ip-la-[ḫu-ma BĀD ū SIG₄ BĀD lu-[?[ša DINGIR-lum
19' šu-nu li-[ši-ki-e-[nu

20' a-ya iš-bar URU[KI "UTU qī-ra-[da a-y-a iš-lu-ul
21' šal-la-tam-ma li-ib-ba-[a-a y-a ib-[lu-ut
22' a-ya i-ku-ul NINDA bu-[lul-li ib-bi a-y-a i-si-in
23' [ni-p]-iš-[ši]-i-ra-aš me-e li-[ši-ti-[i-ma
24' [...]-it-ta-ag-gi-[ši a-na ka-la u-[mi-i-na mu-[ši
25' [...]-it-ta-la-[ma a-y-a i-[še-[a-[šu sittum

26' [6 LUGAL.MES šu-nu at-ḥu-ú šu-pu-[šu ba-nu-tu] [26
27' [...]] ME um-ma-an-[šu-nu HUR.SAG.MES ...
28' [...]-[x].HLÅ u-ša-[ab]-bu-ú-[šu-nu-ši [...] [...]
29' [...]-ri i-[b-i-ri ma-a-tam 28 x-[[…

---

22 This document, in its extant form, does not contain the term Ummān-manda but is included in this collection because it is the Middle Babylonian version of the Cuthaean Legend, a story that is known to refer to the Ummān-manda in its Hittite and Standard Babylonian versions. Given that this Akkadian version is found in the Hittite capital city, where the Hittite version using the term Ummān-manda has also been found, it is worth considering the possibility the absence of the term in this Middle Babylonian version is an accident of text breaks.

23 KBo 19 98-99; T. Longman, *Fictional Akkadian Autobiography: A Generic and Comparative Study*. Yale University, PhD. Ann Arbor, Michigan. University Microfilms. 1983, pp. 310-314; Westenholz, *Legends of the Kings of Akkade*, pp. 280-293. Note that side a and side c 2'-7' of KBo 19 98 is not about the Cuthaean Legend and side d is too fragmentary for a translation that would provide reliable information. KBo 19 99 is not included because its side a, the only extant part of the prism other than the much better preserved colophon, is too fragmentary for translation and while it may be a version of the Cuthaean Legend, it does not provide reliable information relating to the current research. See text and transliterations in references provided. The collations and emendations in Appendix 1.11 are from Westenholz, *Legends of the Kings of Akkade*, unless otherwise stated.

24 Written *qa*. On the reading of this line, see *ibid.*, pp. 278: v 14'; 287: b 12'.

25 Restored from ‘six kings’ (6 LUGAL.MES) in Bo Tupsinna I c 11'.

26 *ba-nu-tu*? ‘beauty’ suggested in Westenholz, *op.cit.*, p. 288: 26'.

27 Sign is mostly broken, KBo 19 98 b 27'. Restoration following ‘six hundred troops’ (6 ME um-ma-an-ni) in Bo Tupsinna I c 12'.

28 The reading *ma-a-tam* suggests the accusative form of *mātum* ‘land’. For the *tam-sign*, compare the sign in KBo 19 98 b 29' and HZL 316.
Side c

Kbo 19 98

8' [a]-na KU[R.A]-kà-dè: KI is-sà-an-qù-nim a-na K[UR…]
9' [sì]-sà-a[n-qù]-nim-ma a-na KÀ.GAL A-kà-dè: K[1 a-na]
10' *N(a-r)a-am-EN.ZU LUGAL ki-a-am i-śa-[a-pa-ru]
11' [am-ma šu-nu-ma 6 LUGAL.MES ni-i-nu at-la-[i šu-pu-ū]
12' x ba-nu-tum ü 6 ME um-ma-an-ni ü it-[i…]
13' [?] x SIPA x KÀ.BAR qi-in-na-[a-at(?)]
14' [ti-a]m-tim is-sà-an-qù-ni-ik-ku zi-mi […]
15' [a]-nu(?) m-a-[h-ri-[ka]

16' [x] *Na-ra-[a]m-EN.ZU-ma id-di-ma-[…] [a-at(?)]
17' pa-ni-üt […] ü […]-se-tim lu- […]
18' i-il-la-a[k/ku…] li-ik […]
19' *Na-ra-am-EN.ZU…
20' um-ma šu-ma […]
21' i-il-la-a[k/ku…]
22' ū-lu ma-a […]
23' [a-n]a(?) LÚ […]
24' (traces of two signs)
25' šu-x […]
26' ū-lu […]
27' (traces of one sign)
(break)

Prism I: KBo 19 98

Side b
(break)
1’ …

2' He did not inscribe a stela (naru) and a st[ela?]…
3' [He was n]ot my brother and my hand
4' [he did not take and so] before Šamaš I did not bless him

5' Before them, mankind went into caves. A city
6' before them was not a city. Ground before them
7' was not ground. Six kings were they, brothers, res[plendent]
8' And six hundred were their troops, Ea, the lord…
9' He sent them to be deprived of (things), 30 his hand made the[m]
10’ … them and the terror of lions, death, plague, burning, epidemic …
12’ [f]amine, shortage and (bad) market rate, which…

29 Westenholz proposes qi-in-na-[a-at(?)] ‘comrades/clansmen’, Westenholz, Legends of the Kings of Akkade, pp. 288-289: c 13’. The collation in KBo 19 98 c 13’ indicates only qi-in-na. The rightmost corner of this line appears to be broken and there is a possibility that the signs a-at were there.
30 Westenholz suggests that zu-mi may relate to zummu ‘beraubt sein, entbehren’ (AHw), and translates it as ‘to be dispensed with’, Westenholz, Legends of the Kings of Akkade, p. 286: b 9’. The verb zummû can ‘to lack, to be deprived of’ or ‘to cause to miss, to deprive of’, CAD Z 156-157. The verb can be translated as ‘to be deprived of (things)’ because the verb, with this sense, may in fact be relating to Ea’s upcoming description of the host’s expected behavior to fulfill its destiny in lines b 17’-25’ below, where they are deprived of various things such as booty, conquest, bread, beer and sleep. The word zu-mi is used in line b 9’ as a description of Ea’s intentions, and these intentions are later described in these lines b 17’-25’.
31 Westenholz notes that qilî ‘burning, incineration’ (denoting perhaps a type of fever) is from qalî ‘to burn’, AHw 1228, and gi-i-li-e could alternatively be ‘mourning’, but only if the word is emended to gi-ih-le-e, AHw 1556, see discussion in Westenholz, Legends of the Kings of Akkade, p. 286: b 11’.
32 Westenholz suggests that the word sè-bi-it can be taken as sîbîtu ‘epidemic, plague’, or alternatively it might be a mistake for another word, i.e. sipittu ‘mourning’, see ibid., p. 287: b 11’.
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13’ The great [...] he sent with them. Ea, [the lord],
14’ opened [his mouth] and spoke to the gods his brothers:

15’-16’ ‘I created this host, (and) you determine its destiny for the sake of not destroying humanity, its name.
17’ May it be the command always
18’ May they fear walls and may the bricks of the walls be a god
19’ which they will worship.

20’ May it not seize the city of Samaš the hero! May it not carry off
21’ booty and may its heart not enjoy life!
22’ May it not eat the bread of life! May it not fill up its heart
23’ with the scent of beer, may it drink water and
24’ let it wander around all the days! In the night
25’ let it lie down, but may [sleep] not seek [it]!

26’ [Six] kings were they, brothers, resplendent [in beauty] 34
27’ [Six] hundred were their troops, the mountains…
28’ … raised them (from childhood) 35
29’ …of the edge, the land…
30’ …plunder(?)…
31’ …[they] saw…

KBo 19 98 Side c

8’ They approached the land of Akkade. To the land of…
9’ [they] approached, and to the gate of Akkade, [to]
10’ Naram-Sin, the king, thus [they send (a message),
11’ [they] say: ‘Six kings are we, brother[s, resplendent]
12’ (in) beauty and six hundred are our troops and w[ith…
13’ … shepherd… shepherd of low rank, 37 clan(?)…
14’ of the s[e], they have approached you in force
15’ before(?) [your] presence.’

16’ Naram-Sin and he laid down…
17’ Before the… and…
18’ [They/he went…may…
19’ Naram-[Sin]…
20’ Thus he said: ‘…
21’ [They/he went…
22’ or indeed…
23’ [To(?) the men of…
24’-27’ (too fragmentary for translation)
(break)

33 The translation ‘for the sake of’ is based on the fact that the preposition aššum before an infinitive has meanings such as ‘that’, ‘about’, ‘concerning’, ‘so that’ and ‘in order to’ in various contexts, see the examples in CAD A II 469: c.
34 For the restoration, see footnote 26.
35 The context is broken and a very literal could be ‘made them great’, but I have argued this phrase has a relationship with the growth of the Umma n-manda in the mountains according to the Standard Babylonian version of the Cuthaean Legend. For the relevant discussion, see ch. 4, pp. 78-79.
36 For the reading, see footnote 28.
37 See footnote 29.
38 For kaparru (KA.BAR) ‘shepherd of low rank’, see CAD K 176-177; AHW 442.
39 The translation ‘clan(?)’ assumes the reading qi-in-na-[a-at(?)] but the text only has qi-in-na. The reading qi-in-na-[a-at(?)] is possible, see this point discussed in footnote 29. The word qi-in-na, standing by itself, could be the accusative form of the word qinnum ‘nest (of bird, snake), lair’, CAD Q 257-258; AHW 922. ‘Clan’ comes from the word’s feminine form qinnatu, which means ‘family, clan, kinsman’, CAD Q 258-260; AHW 922. This latter sense of the word is also known to be written without the –at suffix, e.g. Bêlet-ili … qin-na iskun ‘Bêlet-ili established a family’ in CT 13 32 r. 13 apud CAD Q 258. The unreadable signs interspersed in this line steal the context and make translation uncertain.
12. The Hittite version of the composition *tupšinna pitēma* “open the tablet box” from Ḫattušaš (Boğazköy), H Tupsinna, Composite Text

Episode I: Enmerkar the king of Uruk

1'. …-m[i]

2'. [LUGAL SA KUR] UBU-TE.UNU

3'. […] ma-a-an 1 ME.KAM MU.KAM pa-it

4'. … āa-an-te-ez-zi-ia-[a]-š-mi-iš LUGAL-uš

5'. […] d[i]-in-za-i

6'. […]-li-iš-i-ta

7'. […]-an ú-…

8'. […] pa-ah-sa-nu-nu,[un]

Episode II: The release of enemy prisoners

9'. … ku-i

10'. … DINGIR.MES-aš tar-as-k[i-an-zi…]

11'. …

12'. … pi-e-da-ah

13'. […] (a)-ši-kán-zi

14'. …-ua u-ni ERIN.MES-an

15'. … U[M](?)-[M]A(?)[N]-ra-am-e 30-na a-[

16'. […] E.N.NU.[U]-N-IA har-m[i]

17'. DINGIR.MES-sa-aš-ši k[i]-iš-ša-an…[tar-si-kán-zi]

18'. LU.MES SA.GAZ I.NA E.N.[NU.UN…

19'. […]K]-A-x(?)-[i]-zu-uš-ta pa-ra-a …

20'. tar-na aš-s(?)-uš-ta lu-ut-[a] …

21'. a-ar-ru-[a]-š…

22'. ha-…

23'. u[g]-…

24'. nu-…

25'. šu-ši-š…

26'. …

Episode III: The enemy’s display of power

27'. […] e-sa-an-da

28'. […]-an-zi-ma

29'. […] ra-a-iš

30'. […]-i-r

31'. […] KUR A.GA.DE aš

32'. […]-ua-aš-kán-zi

33'. […]-sa-an pri-e-er

34'. […] e-eš šar-ku

35'. […] ki-i-ma nam-ma

36'. […] p[i] kat-ti-iš-sum-mi

---


40 This episode is is found in a fragmentary text and how it connects with the rest of the Hittite version of the Cuthaean Legend is not clear. There is a possibility that the fragmentary text may belong to another story. For its sources, see H Tupsinna Text Score in Appendix 2.

41 Güterbock states that the additional *nu* is visible in his collation, Güterbock, “Die historische Tradition und ihre literarische Gestaltung bei Babylonien und Hethitern bis 1200. Zweiter Teil: Hethiter”, p. 51, n. 6. There is a very minor trace that would fit the sign *nu* better than *as* in KBo 3 20 8'.

42 Güterbock’s collation suggests there is a gap between the signs *na* and as, Güterbock, “Die historische Tradition und ihre literarische Gestaltung bei Babylonien und Hethitern bis 1200. Zweiter Teil: Hethiter”, p. 58, n. 10, contrary to the copy in KBo 3 20 r. 12’.
Episode IV: Naram-Sin’s defeat and the support of his gods

Naram-Sin’s ideas about the Umma

---

45'. …

44'. …

48'. […]

41'. …

65'.

47'. …LU

40'. …

71'.

61'. [EN-

39'. …

73'. […]

74'.

53'.

52'.

77x269

4A, n. 2. This, however, does not fit the context where a word that contrasts

tablet Bo 433 and suggested that the sign may have been ARAD ‘servant, slave’. For Forrer’s note, see BoTU 2,
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Variant line: KBo 3 18 1': [EN--

KBo 3 18 13': [EN--

KBo 3 18 3': [EN--

KBo 3 16 1': 190,000 ERIN.MEŠ

KBo 3 16 6': tar-aš-ki-it SAG.DU-an

KBo 3 16 6': ta-an-ku-ua-ia-ua-ta

KBo 3 18 12': šu-up-pi-ia-ah-hu-{ti}

KBo 3 18 13': [š]e-eš-ki-ah-hu-ši

---

43. Figulla et al observe that the sign DINGIR has been written over another sign in the tablet Bo 433, see note in KBo 3 16 10, p. 44. Figulla et al did not collate these traces. Forrer, however, collated these traces on the same tablet Bo 433 and suggested that the sign may have been ARAD ‘servant, slave’. For Forrer’s note, see BoTU 2, 4A, n. 2. This, however, does not fit the context where a word that contrasts ta-an-du-ki-iš ‘humans, mortals’ is expected. Otten and Sturmi’s collation of another copy (the one sided tablet Bo 785) of the same line indicates there are some traces of the erased sign, see KUB 31 11, p. 1. The traces from this collation fit the first component of the sign AZAG ‘taboo, demon, giant’, of which the second component is the AN sign, see HZL 69 for the sign AZAG. The sign AZAG also explains the sign erased in Bo 433 as observed by Forrer and Figulla. It would be unlikely both copies Bo 433 and Bo 785 made the same mistake. Rather, it seems that the scribes had AZAG for all the manuscripts whereas later some scribes decided the sense of the ‘immortality’ crucial to Naram-Sin’s ideas about the Ummān-manda are better expressed with the Sumero-gram DINGIR ‘god’.

44. Variant line: KBo 3 18 1': [EN--ašši] a-ap-pa me-mi-er UMA-MA "Na-ra-\-am-30aš"
Episode I: Enmerkar the king of Uruk

1'. …

2'. … king of the land of Uruk
3'. … when a hundred years went
4'. … my predecessor (lit. first one). King…
5'. …
6'. …
7'. …
8'. … I confirmed/protected

Episode II: The release of enemy prisoners

9'. … who…
10'. … the gods are speak[ing]
11'. …
12'. … I carried over…
13'. … they are [speaking]king
14'. … that crowd…
15'. … thus says Naram-Sin…
16'. [I am] holding (them) in prison
17'. The gods [are speaking] to him as follows
18'. “The killers in the prison…
19'. …forward…
20'. …he left (i.e. let the prisoners go) …
21'-26'. (too fragmentary for translation)

Episode III: The enemy’s display of power

27'. …
28'. …
29'. … he rose
30'. …

31'. … the land of Akkad
32'. … they keep coming…
33'. … to them [?] he [Naram-Sin?] sent
34'. … excellent
35'. … but this again
36'. … with them
37'. … ‘sit!’
38'. … he spoke: “with them

---

51 KBo 3 19 19': [talk-ši-ga-u-e-en
52 IBoT 4 7 3: tāg-ga-li-ši-ni
53 IBoT 4 7 5: KUR-e…
Episode IV: Naram-Sin’s defeat and the support of his gods

46’. …
47’. … my manhood I am seeing…
48’. [Naram-Sin] speaks to the thousand [ruler]s
49’. … they go. Three servants went. Strong ones…
50’. …and they went, they saw, and blood…
51’. I give them the tapulli

52’. When he goes, I will cut\(^*\) with the špās,
53’. and he cuts off with the tapulli, [a]nd if from them [blood]
54’. spurt[s],[\(^{55}\) these are human beings
55’. and I will campaign on them. If from them blo[o]d does not spurt,
56’. these are gods [originally ‘demons’]\(^{56}\) and I will not campaign on them

57’. When the servants went, one of this servant lords
58’. cut (them) with the špās,
59’. (and) cut off with my tapulli.
60’. And his blood spurted, back to Naram-Sin
61’. their lord they brought the news. Naram-Sin speaks: (Variant line: … they spoke back to [their lord].
Naram-Sin verily says:)  
62’. …and their blood spurted. Why don’t I
63’. go into battle against them?

64’. The [fi]rst turn I led 180,000 troops
65’. They beat them. The second time I led 120,000 troops.
66’. They beat them again. The third time 60,000 troops
67’. I led, they beat them again.

68’. Naram-Sin laid the lamentation with Ištar
69’. “Speak to me in my gloom,”
70’. (for) the lands in my hand I speak.” Ištar to him
71’. speaks back: ‘Go become (ritually) purified!
72’. Sleep in the (ritually) pure bed! Upon your gods
73’. [c]all! Wail to your gods!
74’. Naram-Sin became (ritually) purified and in the (ritually) pure bed
75’. he laid to sleep. He calls h[is gods].
76’. I [laid] his wailing to his gods.

77’. [the gods] speak back to him: “Naram-Sin…
78’. …we spoke this. By means of th[ese] troops…
79’. …[he] holds them, the Ummān-manda…
80’. …and together with her (your wife) in bed[d]
81’. you will [sleep], but with her you will [no]t lie in an embrace!
82’. …bind up your weapon(s)!
83’. Put [them in a corner place. Hold onto [you]r [boldness]
84’. [Stay at home!] Out of your land [unto him (the enemy)]

\(^{55}\) The verb īškar- may go back to the Indo-European root (s)ker with the primary meaning ‘to cut’, for the root, see J. Pokorny, *Indogermanisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch*. I. Band. Bern und München. Francke Verlag. 1959, pp. 938-940. The extended forms of the root indicate it is a well-established root, see *ibid.*, pp. 940-947. Pokorny does not give Hittite examples probably because the place of Hittite within the Indo-European languages was less established during Pokorny’s publication. I thank Dr. James L. O’Neil for drawing my attention to this.

\(^{56}\) The middle voice of the root šā+, šiy- has a meaning ‘spurt/squirt’, see CHD S Fasc 1, p. 20:7.
13. Articles 54-55 in the Hittite Laws

Article 54

Line 1
KBo 6 3 iii 15. ka-ru-ú ERIN.MEŠ MA-AN-DA ERIN.MEŠ ŠA-A-LA URU Ta-ma-al-ki ERIN.MEŠ URU Ḥa-at-ra-a]

Line 2
KBo 6 2 iii 13. ERIN.MEŠ URU Za-al-pa ERIN.MEŠ URU Ta-aš-hi-ia ERIN.MEŠ URU Ḥé-[mu]-wa LÜ.MEŠ GIS.[BAN] [LU.MEŠ NAGAR GIS-SI]
KBo 6 3 iii 16. ERIN.MEŠ URU Za-al-pa ERIN.MEŠ URU Ta-aš-hi-ia ERIN.MEŠ URU Ḥé-mu-wa LÜ.MEŠ GIS.[BAN LÜ.MEŠ NAGAR GIS-SI]
KBo 6 6 i 20-21. ERIN.MEŠ URU Za-al-pa ERIN.MEŠ URU Ta-aš-ḥé-ni-ia ERIN.MEŠ URU Ḥi-im-[w]a LÜ.MEŠ GIS.[BAN LÜ.MEŠ NAGAR GIS-SI]

Line 3
KBo 6 2 iii 14. LÜ.MEŠ.KUŠ; Ū LÜ.MEŠ.ka-ru-ḥa-le-eš-me-eš-ṣa lu-uz-zi na-at-ta kar-p[i-er]
KBo 6 3 iii 17. LÜ.MEŠ.KUŠ; Ū LÜ.MEŠ.ka-ru-ḥa-li-iš-me-eš-ṣa [lu]-uz-zi Ú-UL [kar-pi-er]
KBo 6 6 i 21-23. LÜ.MEŠ.KUŠ; Ū LÜ.MEŠ.ka-ru-ḥa-le-eš-me-eš-ṣa [lu]-uz-zi Ú-UL kar-pi-e[r]

Line 4
KBo 6 2 iii 15. [ša]-ah-ḥa-an na-at-ta i-šš-e-še-r
KBo 6 3 iii 18. ša-ah-ḥa-an Ú-UL e-[eš]-še-r
KBo 6 6 i 23 [ša-ah-h]a-an Ú-UL e-[eš]-še-r

Article 55

Line 1
KBo 6 2 iii 16. [ma]-a-an DUMU.MEŠ URU ḤA-AT-TI LÜ.MEŠ IL-KI ú-e-er A-NA A-BI LUGAL a-ru-wa-[a- an-zı]
KBo 6 3 iii 19. ma-a-an DUMU.MEŠ URU ḤA-AT-TI LÜ.MEŠ IL-KI ú-e-er nu A-BI LUGAL a-ru-wa-a-[n-zı]
KBo 6 6 i 24-25. ma-a-an DUMU.MEŠ URU [ḤA-AT-TI LÜ].MEŠ IL-KÍ… nu A-BI LUGAL a-ru[-wa-a-an-zı]
KBo 19 4 i 2. … l][L-KI ú-e-er…

Line 2
KBo 6 2 iii 17. [nu tar]-ši-kān-zì ku-ū-ša-an-na-aš-za\(^{58}\) na-at-ta ku-ū-ši-ki i-e-[e[z]-zı]
KBo 6 3 iii 20. nu tar-aš-kān-zì ku-ū-ša-an-na Ú-UL ku-ū-ši-ki i-e-ez-zı
KBo 6 6 i 26. …………………………………… Ü-UL ku-ū-ši-ki…
KBo 19 4 i 3. … tar-si-kān-zì ku-ū-ša-an-[-na-aš…

Line 3
KBo 6 2 iii 18. nu-wa-an-na-aš-za mi-im-ma-an-zı LÜ.MEŠ IL-KI-wa šu-me-eš nu A-BI LUGAL [tu-li-i-a…]
KBo 6 3 iii 20-21. nu-wa-an-n[wa-aš-za] me-em-ma-an-zı LÜ.MEŠ IL-KI-wa šu-me-eš nu A-BI LUGAL tu-li-i-a-
KBo 6 6 i 27. ……………………………………LU.MEŠ IL-KI…
KBo 19 4 i 4-5. [nu-wa-an-n]a-aš-za me-em-ma-an-[-zı... …]tu-li-ia…


\(^{58}\) Hoffner notes ku-ū-ša-an-na-aš-za is written over erasure, ibid., p. 67, n. 226.
KBo 6 2 ii 19. nu-uš an-da ši-it-ta-ri-et i-i-it-te-en ma-a-ah-ḫa-an-da a-re-e'[š-me-eš]
KBo 6 3 ii 22. nu an-da [ši]-it-ta-ri-et i-i-it-te-en ma-a-ah-ḫa-an a-re-eš-me-eš
KBo 6 6 i 28. nu an-da ši-e-[e]t-ta-ri-et i-i-it-te-en ma-a-ah-ḫa-an a-re-eš-me-eš
KBo 19 4 i 6. ..........................................................ma-a-ah-ḫa-an...

KBo 6 2 ii 20. šu-me-eš-ša a-pé-ni-iš-ša-an i-iš-te-e[n]
KBo 6 3 iii 22-23. šu-[me-eš-ša] a-pé-ni-iš-ša-an e-eš-te-e[n]
KBo 6 6 i 29. šu-me-eš a-pé-ni-iš-ša-an e-eš-[te]-en

Article 54
1. Formerly, the Ummān-manda, the Šala troops, the troops of Tamalki, Ḥatra,
2. Zašpa, Šašiiniši (and) Hemuwa, (and) the bowmen, the carpenters,
3. the chariot drivers and the kariḫal-functionaries did not render the luzzi-services,
4. they did not perform the šahhar-services.

Article 55
1. When the sons of Hatti, men of ILKUM-services, came, they bowed to the father of the king.
2. They said: “No-one pays us a wage,
3. and they said to us ‘You are men of ILKUM-services!’’. The father of the king [entered] the assembly,
4. He secured them a sealed deed:59 “Perform (the ILKUM-services) as your companions/colleagues,
5. you (pl.) thus perform.

14. Fragment of an account (from Ḫattišiliš I?), KBo 7 14, ‘Zukraš Text’60

1. …2 LÜ.MEŠ [URU.] Za-al-put(?)-wa(?)
2. …pi-ra-an e-eš-kán-ta-ši
3. …me-na-ah-ḫa-an-ša a-i-it-te-en A-NÁ LÜ URU ḤA-ASH-SI te-it-te-en
4. …ta pa-imu ni me-na-ah-ḫa-an-da e-ḫu
5. [ṭāk-ku ṑ]a-at-ta-ša Ṽa-wa-ši μu-ut-ta ḫa-rē-tāk-ša ma-a-ān
6. […]a(?)-ši-ki-mi61 nu tu-ah-hi-ya-at-ti-it a-ak-ti
7. [nu LÜ URU] ḤA-AS-SI LUΓAL-i me-na-ah-ḫa-an-da za-ah-hi-ša ii-it
8. [nu-uš-si] ḤI.KASKAL ma-az-zē nu a-pi-e tāk-ka-li-it
10. …[ma(?)]-e-e a tāk-ka-li-it62 Ḫa-ta-a-ta-ša u-ba-a-ti
11. [ku-š]-i-ta a-as-si-as u-ba-a-ti62 "Ki-ya-ru-as-sa
12. [ku]-ra-ah-nu-i-li-i-as DUMU-ás a-ap-pa-an-da-a-i(š)
13. [nu]-wa pa-ah-ha-sa mu-ut-te-en

14. [“Za-ta-ši-ša-gal ERIN.MEŠ MA-AN-DA”63 Zu-us-ka-ša-ša GUUGA UKU.UŠ.E.NE
15. [LU URU] Ḫa-la-ap QA-DU ERIN.MEŠ-SU ŠU GIŠ.GIGIR.HI-ÅŠÑURU Ḫal-pa-az
16. [pa-ra-ša] u-e-er64 "Za-ra-li-ta-gal A-NÁ LÜ URU ḤA-AS-SI TUP-PAT-
17. …ēš-ka-ah-ḫa-ri zi-ik-wa QA-D[U…]
18. …hu-ri-mu-ti ta-wa-x[i…]
19. …an-mu-sum[u65 Ḫa-ša-ša…

r. 1’ …

r. 2’ …]LI ERIN.MEŠ GĪR Ū(?) 2 ME ERIN.MEŠ G[IŠ.GIGIR…

59 Hoffner translates “instructed(?) them under his seal” and notes that the accusative plural –uš has been preserved only in the Old Hittite copy KBo 6 2 iii 19, see ibid., p. 68, n. 229. The accusative plural –uš clearly denotes the accusative object of the verb anda šittariya. Hoffner suggests the verb means ‘to secure a sealed deed’, see ibid., p. 298.
61 For various restorations, see de Stefano, Annali e Res Gestae Antico Ittiti, p. 110, n. 330. One problem is that the autograph in KBo 7 14 6 looks more like [a]n, and this does not accord with any of the suggested restorations. Not enough of the sign has been preserved to be certain it is [a]n either.
62 Signs look like a half broken ǔḫ in the autograph KBo 7 14.
1. two men of Zalpa
2. they sat opposite
3. You (pl.) went [against me]! Say to the man of Haššu:
4. I will campaign and you, come here against (me)!
5. [And if] you are [not coming (against me), then you like the bear]
6. I will […] and you will die with a gasp


64 The broken text probably had a verb that denoted a kind of killing or hunting. The bear is a game animal in Hittite texts, see Collins, The Representation of Wild Animals in Hittite Texts, pp. 98-101. Collins suggests that in this text the bear symbolizes the enemy who becomes the prey whose raw power is overcome, see B. J. Collins, “Animals in Hittite Literature” in A History of the Animal World in the Ancient Near East. B. J. Collins, ed. Leiden, Boston and Köln. Brill. 2002, p. 241. The verb seems to have used in line 8 to describe Li-KASKAL’s activity in a sense of “to enclose”, whereas in line 9 the same verb is used to describe a sort of encirclement of the enemy at the “back and the front”. A translation “to cover” seems suitable therefore for the use of the same verb in lines 8 and 9.


66 ma-az-zé is a third person singular verb from Old Hittite, see CHD L-N, pp. 213-214.

Kempinski comments that tāk-ka-li-it is a third person singular preterite derived from the verb takkaliya– “to enclose, embrace”, which in the military context of the present document would be suitably rendered by a meaning such as “to encircle”, see A. Kempinski, Syrien und Palästina (Kanaan) in der Letzten Phase der Mittelbronze II-B-Zeit (1650-1570 V. Chr.). Wiesbaden. Otto Harrassowitz. 1983, p. 45:8. The verb seems to have used in line 8 to describe Li-KASKAL’s activity in a sense of “to embrace” rather than to “encircle” because a specific area seems to be referred to with the word a-pi-e “there”, whereas in line 9 the same verb is used to describe a sort of encirclement of the enemy at the “back and the front” a-ap-pa-an-na pi-ra-an-na. A translation “to cover” seems suitable therefore for the use of the same verb in lines 8 and 9.
r. 2' … foot soldiers and (?) 200 soldiers of the chariot
r. 3' He came (to?) Ḫattušas, but from Ḫattušas
r. 4' he [cam]e and took the army (to?) the city of xxxx
r. 5'-6' (too fragmentary for translation)

15. Fragment of an account (from Ḫattušiliš I?), KBo 12 14

1' (one half broken sign with an ensuing tiny trace of another)
2' …-i du-wa-[r-na-…
3' …ni-[r]-i-ik-ta-ti š[a…
4' …kat-ta-an tu-uz-zi…

5' …iš-[r]a-na-aš URU A-m[a-
6' …-]mi ša-am-ni-it …
7' …d[a-a]-ša ke-e-[wa ku[-…
8' …ḪUR.SAG.MES-aš ḫar-ši…
9' …]-an-na ta ERIN.MES MA-AN-[DA…
10' …]-an a-ša-t-ti…
11' …]-zi hu-[u]-ḫa-aš-mi-š…
12' …iš-sa ḫu-[u]-ḫi-šš[i…
13' … Ir]-kab-tu-um…
14' …zi-[i]q-qa UR[U…

r. 1 …][x-aš(?)]-aš-ta ARAD.MES e-e[iš-ta…
2' … kar-pi-ir…
3' …]e]-pu-e-ni URU Ḫa-at-ta-š[a…
4' …]-an su-u LUGAL-aš URU Ḫal-pa[aš…
5' …]ARAD.MES-SU URU Ḫal-pi KA.GAL…
6' …]-ni-ir mu LUGAL-un e-ep-p[r…
7' …]-i la URU A-na-ša-ap-r[i…
8' …tu-uz-z[i]-i n da-a-šš…
9' … e-ep-pi-[r…

1' (one half broken sign with an ensuing tiny trace of another)
2' …-bre[i…
3' … he mobilized…
4' … down the army…

5' … to hear, the city Am[a…
6' … he raised/created…
7' “… he placed these…”
8' … you are holding the mountains…
9' … and the Ummān-manda…
10' … you are seeing the…
11' … my grandfather…
12' … to his grandfather…
13' … Ir]-kabtu…
14' … yo[u] and the cit(y of…

r. 1 … [they] we[re] servants/captives…
2' … they accomplished/lifted…
3' … we are apprehending, Ḫattušaš…
4' … the king [of] Aleppo…
5' … his servants to the great gate of Aleppo…
6' … and they grabbed the king…
7' … the city of Anašap[r…
8' … he placed [the army]…
9' … they grabbed[d…
16. Letter from Šaušgamuwa the king of Amurru addressed to king Ammīštamru II of Ugarit, RS 17.286

1. um-ma [LU]GAL KUR a-mur-ri
2. a-na LUGAL KUR u-ga-ri-it
3. SES-ia qi-bi-ma

4. lu-ū šul-ma a-na muh-ḥi-ka
5. DINGIR.MES a-na šul-ma-ni PAB-ra-ka
6. a-nu-ma ERIN.MES man-dā.ME an-nu-tum
7. be-la.MES LU.KUR ša a-bi-ka
8. ʿu a-bu-ka il-tap-ra
9. a-na muh-ḥi ʿZAG.SES
10. ma-a le-qa-šu-nu a-na muh-ḥi-ia
11. ʿu šul-ma it-ti-šu-nu-ma
12. lu-ū i-pa-aš ʿu ʿZAG.SES
13. il-te-gē-šu-nu
14. ʿu a-na muh-ḥi a'69-bi-ka
15. um-la-zar-šu-nu
16. šul-ma it-ti-šu-[nś]
17. [i70]e-pu-us

18. i-na-an-na a-na muh-ḥi-ka
19. il-la-ku ki-i-me-e
20. i-gāb-bu-ni a-kān-na
21. i-na KASKAL-ni šu-ku-un-šu
22. IGI

22. IGI
1. Thus the [k]ing of Amurru
2. to the king of Ugarit,
3. my brother, say:

4. May it be well to you.
5. May the gods guard you safely.

6. Here are those Ummān-manda,
7. the enemies of your father.
8. Your father has sent
9. to Pendīšennī
10. thus: “Bring them to me,
11. so that with them
12. I shall make peace.” So Pendīšennī
13. took them
14.-15. and sent them to your father.
16.-17. He made peace with them
18.-20. Now they are coming to you as they say: “Make firm!
21. Set it going!”
22. Seen (by the scribe).72

68 RS 17.286 6 in PRU IV, p. 180, pl. XXXIV; S. Izre’el, Amurru Akkadian: A Linguistic Study… Volume II. Atlanta, Georgia. Scholars Press. 1991, pp. 81-83. The names of the kings are not explicitly mentioned but see H. Klengel, Syria 3000 to 300 BC. Berlin. Akademie Verlag. 1992, pp. 139-140
69 The collation is from PRU IV, p. 180, pl. XXXIV; Izre’el, op.cit., p. 82: 14.
70 There are some traces of the sign i, see autograph in PRU IV, pl. XXXIV.
71 The expression ina ḫarrāni šakāmū is discussed in ch. 4, p. 119.
72 The logogram IGI seems to be used in the context of a colophon, where one would usually expect the name of the scribe to follow the logogram, see for example IG[1 Sar-ra]u-wa in the colophon of a text from Alalakh, which indicates the tablet was written by the scribe Sarruwa, see AT 104 apud N. Na’aman, “A Royal Scribe and His Scribal Products in the Alalakh IV Court” OA 19 (1980), p. 108. In this letter from Ugarit the scribe chose not to insert his name.
17. A Middle Assyrian Astrological Omen, BM 121034 20

[DIŠ AN.MI ina IM.KUR.RA SAR-ma IM.KUR.RA DU ZI-ut ER]IN-ma-an-ba-da

“If an eclipse begins in the east and the east wind blows, (then) the rise of the Um[m]ān-manda”

18. Weidner Chronicle, lines 42-47, 62-68


42. Enmekar, king of Uruk, destroyed the peop[le/settlemen]ts, Um[m]ān-manda who...
43. The sage Adapa...
44. [...] in his pure shrine he heard and cursed Enmekar...
45. [Mar]duk gave him the kingdom over all lands and his rites...
46. ... he fashioned like celestial writing in Esagila...[Marduk],
47. [king] entrusted everything of the heavens and the earth, the foremost son, for 3,020... his years...

73 For the text, see ‘Appendix 1’ in ABCD, pp. 274-279. For the restoration and transliteration of the omen, see ABCD, pp. 275, 273-275. Rochberg points out that BM 121034 is transmitting Babylonian astrological tradition also attested in Old Babylonian exemplars and the later EAE series, ABCD, p. 273. So this Middle Assyrian omen is a forerunner of the later EAE omen EAE 15 Section 8 Line 3, which also mentions the Ummān-manda. This latter EAE omen is listed here in Appendix 1.37.
75 Restored from nam-maš-še-e in line 53 below. There is also the phrase nam-maš-še-e kūršu-me-ri u URI³¹ ‘people of Umer and Akkad’ in Weidner Chronicle 12, 18.
76 Gurney has suggested the reading ERIN in O. R. Gurney, “The Sultantepe Tablets (Continued). V. The Tale of the Poor Man of Nippur” AnSt 6 (1956), p. 163. Grayson treats Gurney’s reading as a possibility and reads the sign as ER[IN] in ABC, p. 285. Komoróczky supports this reading in Komoróczky, “Ummān-manda”, p. 61. Al-Rawi and Glassner do not see the word ER[IN] in this line but their transcriptions indicate there is room for a sign before man-da, Al-Rawi, op.cit., p. 4: A 32; Glassner, op.cit., p. 266: 42. It is possible that the sign ERIN, which Gurney proposed in his 1956 article, and which Grayson saw feasible as ER[IN], became harder to read, perhaps even erased, by the time Al-Rawi and Glassner studied the text.
77 Var. ad-din-šum-ma ‘I gave him’. For this variant, see Al-Rawi, op.cit., p. 5: A 35; Glassner, op.cit., p. 267, n. 6.
78 Al-Rawi transliterates si in par-sišú in Al-Rawi, op.cit., p. 5: S 3. This seems to be a typing error. Al-Rawi’s autograph indicates the sign is ši in par-sišú, see the sign in ibid., p. 12.3, compared with si Labat, Manuel, 147.
79 The word is from an unpublished manuscript in the British Museum, Glassner, Mesopotamian Chronicles, pp. 266: 63, 291 n. 5.
80 The sign tu has been noted for its unusual form in the editions of the Weidner Chronicle quoted in footnote 74 above.
81 The word nammāššū is discussed in ch. 4, pp. 99-101.
62. Naram-Sin destroyed the people/settlements of Babylon and twice he (Marduk) raised against him an attack of the Guti army.
63. (The Guti) gored on his people. He (Marduk) gave his kingship to the Guti army.
64. The Guti, who were complained about, showing no fear of god, they did not know how to properly perform divine rites (and) ordinances.
65. Utu-Hegal, the fisherman, caught a fish as tribute at the edge of the sea
66. At that time that fish was to be offered to the great lord Marduk, it was not to be offered to any other god.
67. The Guti took the cooked fish away from his hands before it was offered.
68. By his exalted command he (Marduk) took the kingship of his land away from the Guti army and gave it (the kingship) to Utu-Hegal.

19. A Birth Omen, Šumma Izbu V 79

BE U₈ UR.MAH U.TU-ma 8 GIR.2-šū ŽI-ut ERIN man-da NUN KUR-šū a-[šam-qat]

“If ewe begats lion (and it) has eight feet: attack of the Ummān-manda, the noble will d[efeat] his enemy.”

20. The Standard Babylonian version of the composition ṭuššinna piṭēma ‘open the tablet box’, SB Tupsinna

1 [ṭuššenna piṭēma] NA.DU.A ši-tas-si
2 [ša anāku Naram-Sin] DUMU¹ LUGAL.GLNA
3 [aššurimmā ezībūsu ana] u-e-me ša-a-tī
4 [ […] KUR-a e-mid
5 […] KUR-a e-mid
6 [Enmerkar šar Uruk mu-m)a-‘i-r ma-a-tī
7 […]MES ina ZI-hū
8 […]MES ina a-la-ki
9 […]ša-an]-ni mi-li-šā
10 […]-x-ma ir-kab
11 [Enmerkar išāl] DINGIR.MES GAL.MES
12 [Istar Ilabu] Za-ba₂,ba₂ A-nu-ni-tum
13 [Ṣulṭān Ḥanīš Samaš] qu-ra-du
14 [iššī mārē bārē] ū-ma-‘i-r
15 [7 ana pān 7] SILA₁ [i]-pu-tu
16 [ušīn GUH] SU.MES [K]U².MES
17 [mārē bārē] ki-a-am iq-bu-ū-ni
18 […]-šū ti riq KUM/qu u lid(?) + lam? […]kam
19 [ṭ]u-ru-ku zi-i-ma
20 […] GIM […]a(?) i-id-šī
21 [ina] KI.TA [ ḫ?] par-gud pa-gar-ka
22 a-dī-[na iqbani DINGIR].MES GAL.MES
23 En-me-kär LU.UL[š-su …] di-na mar-sa ṭUTU GAR-[un]
24 di-en-šū ES.BAR […] GIDIM-šī GIDIM.GI[DIM…]
25 GIDIM IM.RI.[A]-šī GIDIM NUN[UA] šī GIDIM NUNUZ NUNUZ-šū ṭUTU q[u-ra-du]
26 EN AN.TA.MES u KI.TA.MES EN ṭA-nun-na-ki EN e-šin-me

See previous footnote.

82 See previous footnote.


85 G 7: […]-sa-hī
86 G 8: [a-]la-ku
87 C i 4: UDUUG NUNUZ-šū UDUUG NUNUZ […]
88 C i 5: 4E-ni-[…]
27 ša A.MES dal-ḫu-te NAG u A.MES za-ku-te NU NAG.MEŠ
28 ša igi-gal-la-sú G.IS.TUKUL-sù98 ERIN šu-a-tu ik-mu-ú ik-sú-du i-na-ru
29 i-na NA.DU.A. ul SAR ul TAG-e-am-ma pag-ri u pu-ut-ti
30 MU ul u-še-ši-ma ul ak-ta-rab-sù90
31 ERIN.MEŠ pag-ri is-su95 hur-ri a-me-lu-ta92 a-ri-bu pu-nu-sú-un
32 ib-nu-sú-nu-ti-ma DINGIR.MEŠ GAL.MEŠ
33 i-na qaš-qar ib-nu-ú DINGIR.MEŠ a-lu-sú-[nu]
34 Ti-a-ma-tu ú-še-niq-šú-nu-ti
35 ša-sur-sú-nu91 Beslet-i-li ú-ban-ni
36 ina qé-reb KUR.î ir-ti-bu-ma93 i-te-šú-la ir-ta-šú-u mi-na-ti
37 7 LUGAL.MEŠ-ni at-ḫu-ú šu-pu-u ba-nu-tu
38 6 LIM.A.AN um-ma-na-tu-sú-nu
39 Anu-ba-ni-ni AD-su-nu LUGAL.AMA-sú-nu ša[r]-ra-tuSA1 Me-li-lim MU.NI
40 SES-sú-nu GAL-ù a-liq pa-ni-sú-nu94 Me-ma-an-daḫ MU.NI
41 2-i SES-sú-nu 'Mi-du-dù95 MU.NI
42 3-sú SES-sú-nu '{x]-ta-pis96 MU.NI
43 4-i SES-sú-nu 'Tar-ta-da-du MU.NI
44 5-sú SES-sú-nu 'Bal-daḫ-daḫ MU.NI
45 6-sú SES-sú-nu 'A-ḫu-da-na-di-iḫ MU.NI
46 [?] ti SES-sú-nu 'Hur-ra]-ki-du-u MU.NI
47 KUR.MEŠ KU.MEŠ ir-ka-bu-nim-ma
48 ri-du-u is-ba-su-nu-ti-m[la]m-ḫa-su ša-par-sú-un
49 ri-eš sa-na-qi-su-nu a-na [g][u-ša]ša-an-dar is-sa-qu-x-ni
50 URI89 pu-ra-ša-ḫa-an-dar gi-mir(?)x-su it-tas-paḫ
51 URI90 'pā-ḫu-lu-ù97 it-tas-paḫ
52 URI 'Pu-ra-an-su-u it-tas-paḫ
53 lu ša-a-maḫ nu-aḫ šu šu an ḫa-ḫu-[rim]
55 u qé-reb Šu-baš-ši DÜ-sú-nu id-[du-ku]98
56 is-pu-ḫu-ma ti-a-ma-ti ana (DIS) Gù-ti-un is-sa-an-[qu]
57 is-pu-ḫu-ma Gù-ti-un ana KUR.NI.MA.KI is-sa-[an-qu]
58 is-pu-ḫu-ma KUR.NI.MA.KI ana sa-pan-ni99 ik-[al-du]
59 id-ku-su ša ni-br-ri SUB-ù ana a-[…]
60 Dilman.KI Má-ga-nu Me-luḫ-ḫa qé-reb tam-tim ma-la ba-šu-ú id-[du-ku]
61 LUGAL.MEŠ adi (EN) 90 LIM um-ma-na-[ti-sú-nu]
62 it-ti-sú-nu100 ana ri-sú-ti-sú-nu it-[ta-al-ku-ni]
63 [a]-l-si ri-da-a û-ma'-'ir
64 [l]u-da-[a] šil-la-a ana q[i]-aš-ti-šu u-mal-li
65 ina lu-[d][i]-e lu-pu-ut ina ši-li-[e] šu-hul
66 [šum]-ma [US.MEŠ ii-su-u-ni k]i na-sí-ma LÚ.MEŠ šú-nu
67 [šum]-ma US.MEŠ la ši-su-[u]-ni še-e-du NAM.TAR
68 [i-tuk-î] ki ra-bi-su lem-nu-te ši-pir-4'Enlil šú-nu
69 re-du-ù tē-en-sú ū-šir-ram-ma


99 G ii 3: še-rī
100 G ii 7: KI-šú-nu
70 ina [lu-di]-e al-pu-ut
71 ina [sîl]-l-e âs-hul-ma da-me 103 it-ta-su-ni
72 al-sî DUMU.MES LÜ.HAL.MES ú-ma'-ir
73 [7 ana pa-a]n 7 UDU.SILÎ al-pu-ut 102
74 [ú-ki]-nU GI.GUH.Sû.MES KÛ.MES
75 a-sal-m[a... DINGIR.MES GAL.MES
76 [4ša-tar [Il-á]-ba,] Zá-ba,-ba,4 nu-ni-tum
77 [4ší [A Hanîš] UTU qu-ra-du
78 nam[z-aq] DINGIR.MES GAL.MES ana a-la-ki-ya u za-qî-qî-âl u l-di-na-am-ma
79 ki-a-am aq-bi ana SÂ-bi-îâ um-ma lu-u a-na-ku-ma
80 a-a-ú UR.MAHI bi-ri ib-ri
81 a-a-ú UR.BAR.RA [a]-al sa-il-tu
82 lun-lîk ki 103 DUMU hab-ba-ti ina me-gir SÂ-bi-ya
83 ù lu-ud-di šá DINGIR-ma ya-a-ti 104 lu-ùs-bat
84 MU.AN.NA mahr-ri-tu ina ka-sâ-di
85 2-US LIM ERIN-ni ú-še-sî-ma ina SÂ-šu-nu 1-en TI NU GUR.RA
86 2-tum MU.AN.NA ina KUR-di 90 LIM KMIN
87 3-tum MU.AN.NA ina KUR-di 60 LIM 7 ME KMIN
88 es-sî-tu en-ni-sâ a-ka-la a-sî-ù ús-ta-ni-êh
89 ki-a-am aq-bi a-na SÂ-ši-ya um-ma lu-u a-na-ku-ma
90 a-na pa-li-e mi-na-a 105 e-zib
91 a-na-kU LUGAL la mu-sâl-li-mu KUR-sâ
92 ú ri-ê-um la mu-sâl-li-mu um-ma-ni-sâ
93 ki lu-ùs-tak-can-ma pug-ri u pu-ti lu-še-si
94 šá-lun-mat ni-e-sî 106 mu-u-tu nam-tar a-ù-ar-tâ
95 na-mur-ra-tu ûr-ba-sâ ši-ib-su-u ni-ib-ri-tu
96 [ši-su-ah]-tu û-dî-lip-tu ma-la ba-sù-a [lit-tî]-šu-nu it-tar-da
97 4l-nu-ma ina UK[KIN (s)]-sâ-kin a-bu-bu
98 šap-la-a-nu ina [Ki a-bu]-hu ba-si
99 4ща (DIŚ) EN n[aq-bi pa-a-ša ŠU-ma i-lgab-bi
100 MU-râ 107 a-na [DINGIR.MES at-ih]-ê-sî
101 DINGIR.MES GAL.MES mi-na-a te-pur-ša
102 4ba-nim-ma [...]k]
103 ú sub-su-ù ša [...]d)(?)] ta zur [...]a
104 ZAG.MUK šâ 4-ti M[U ina ka-ša-dî]
105 ina te-me-qî šâ šE-a [...]a šà DINGIR.MES [GAL.MES]Š
106 SISKUR.SISKUR ZAG.MUK.MES [aq-qî]
107 4te-rî-e te KÜ.MES šâ-[te-]t-i
108 al-sî DUMU.MES LÜ.HAL.MES ú-[ma'-lit]r
109 7 a-na pa-an 7 UDU.SILÎ al-p[u]-lit
110 ú-kin 108 GI.GUH.Sû.MES K[U.MES]Š
111 a-sal-ma [...] DINGIR.MES G[AL.MES]Š
112 4šs-tar [Il-a-ba] Za-ba,-ba,4 nu-ni-tum
113 4ša-[4Hanîš] UTU qu-ra-du
114 DUMU.MES LÜ.HAL.MES ki-a-am iq-bu-u-ni]
115 šu[m-ma... i]-na-âš-ši[i... MES
116 [...]l-ša-âš-sî [...]j
117 [...]m-tak-ta-âš-sî [...]j
118 [da-me] u-šar-da-a qul-mu [...]
119 […]ina] da-me i-tib-[bu…]
120 ina SÁ-bi-šú-nu 12 LU.ERIN.MES ip-par-šu-in-n[i…]
121 […] EGIR-šú-nu ar-du-ud aḫ-mat ur-ri-liḫ […]
122 ERIN.MES šá-šú-nu ak-šu-su-nu-[l]
123 ERIN.MES šá-šú-nu ú-tür-raš-šú-[nu-ti]
124 ki-a-am aq-bi ana SÁ-bi-ya [um-ma lu-u a-na-ku-ma]
125 ba-lu bi-ri še-ri-ta ū […] ul ub-h[a…]
126 UDU.SILAZ ana UGU-bi-šú-nu al-pu-[ut-ma]
127 nam-za-aq DINGIR.MES GAL[MES g[i]-mil-šú-nu […]
128 MUL,DiL-bat KU-tum is-tu AN-e ki-a-am is-sa-q[ar]
129 a-na Na-ram-3010 DUMU [L][UGAL].GI.NA
130 e-zib NUMUN hal-qa-ti-i la tu-hal-laq
131 ana ár-kat u-r iç-En-líl11 ana HUL-tím i-na-aš-šá ri-su-un112
132 ana aq-gt SÁ-bi113 En-líl113 ú-qa-ú-[u]114 ri-ē-šú
133 URU ERIN.MES šu-nu-ti in-[ne]-ru
134 i-qam-mu-ti i-lam-mu-[u] K[J].LDUR.MES
135 URU da-mu-šú-nu ita-ba-ku
136 KI-tum is-pi-kí-šá GIS.GÍSIMMAR bi-lat-sá u-mat-ta
137 URU ERIN.MES šá-šú-ti i-mat-tu
138 URU KI URU E KI E [ ]-i-nak-kir
139 AD15 [K[I] DUMU Sé][Š] KI SéS
140 GURUS KI GURUS ru-[u]-a KI it-ba-ri
141 it-[i] a-ha-mes [k][i]-na-a-ti ul i-ta-mu-u
142 UN.MES la ki-na-a-ti šu-bu-za-ma šá na-tim al pa ra qu
143 URU nak-[u] su-ši i-duk-ku
144 URU šá-a-sú [U]NUK nak-ru i-sab-ba-su
145 a-na 1 [MA.NA K]U BABBAR [GIS].BÁN.SE.BAR i-mah-hár
146 LUGAL dan-[nu] iḫ šá MUG(?) su-[u] i-na KUR ul115 ib-ši
147 DINGIR.MES GAL.MES a-[n]a bi-bil-tu ú-bil-šú-nu-ti
148 ga-ti a-na da-ki ul it-bil-šú-na-ti
149 at-ta man-nu lu-u LU.PA.TE.SI u NUN lu-u mim-ma šá-na-ma
150 ša DINGIR i-nam-bu-šú-ma [LU] GAL-ta DÚ-uš

Westenholz suggests the restoration issa[nqa] but notes it is unexpected for Standard Babylonian. For the suggested restoration, see Westenholz, Legends of the Kings of Akkade, p. 322:128. Another restoration is possible: is-sa-q[ar] ‘she declared’. The word kiam ‘thus to me’ is followed by a word denoting speech in all other instances: kiam aqbiini ‘thus they spoke to me’ in line 17, kiam aqbi ‘thus I said to myself’ in lines 79, 89, 124. Gurney had hesitantly restored is-sa-[kar?] in Gurney, ‘The Sultantepe Tablets: The Cuthaean Legend of Naram-Sin’, p. 104 and later switched to is-sa-[aq-ra] in Gurney, ‘The Sultantepe Tablets (Continued). V. The Tale of the Poor Man of Nippur’, 1956, p. 164. The autograph of the line indicates there is a single trace of a horizontal wedge belonging to the sign written after the signs is-su. The signs aq and kar do not fit with this trace as autographed by Gurney immediately after the sign sa, see STT 30 128. From the autograph it can be seen that the sign qar can fit with that trace. Hence my suggestion is is-sa-q[ar]. The signs is-su cannot be read iz-za because the ša sign in the text cannot be read as za. The sign za may be suggested instead of sa but za is never used to render za in the text. The verbs zakārum and saqārum are interchangeable (see examples in CAD Z 16-20) and the latter is attested in Old Babylonian as well as later dialects, for example saqārum is used both in the Old Babylonian and late Assyrian copies of the literary composition Atra-Hasis, see manuscripts A (Old Babylonian BM 78941+78943), F (Old Babylonian BM 17596a) and L (late Assyrian K 6831) in W. G. Lambert and A. R. Millard. Atra-Hasis: The Babylonian Story of the Flood. Oxford. Oxford University Press. 1969, p. 50:119. The verb zakārum is used by itself with the meaning ‘to declare’, see examples in CAD Z 16: zakāru A 1 a. The verb saqārum seems to have been used to introduce a information given to Naram-Sin by Istar in her form of Venus, which begins with a direct address to the king in line 129: ana Naram-Sin mār Šarrukin ‘To Naram-Sin son of Sargon’.  
151 ūt-šin-na e-pu-ùš-[a N]A.DU.A āš-tur-ka
152 i-na GU.DU₂.A.KI ma EMES.LAM
153 i-na pa-paḥ ḃU.GUR e-zi-bak-ka
154 NA₄.NA.DU.A an-na-a a-mur-ma
155 ša pi-i NA₄.NA.DU.A an-na-a ši-me-ma
156 la te-si-îh-hu la te-en-niš-šū
157 la ta-pal-laḫ la ta-tar-ru-ur
158 iš-da-ka⁴⁰ lu-u ki-na
159 at-та i-na su-un SAL-ka ši-pir lu-u² DU-uš
160 BAD.MES-ka tuk-kil
161 hi-ra-ti-ka A.MES mul-li
162 pi-ša-an-na-ti-ka SE.AM-ka KY.BABBAR-ka NIG.SU-ka NIG.GA-ka
163 ana URU [xx] tš-ti-ka šu-rib
164 [GIŠ].TUKUL.MES-ka ru-ku-us-ma túb-ga-ti um-[mid]
165 qar-ru-ti-ka ú-šur pu-ut-ka šul-lim
166 li-ta-giš KUR-ka e tu-si-šū
167 li-it-ti-di bu-la e ta-as-niš-šū
168 li-kul UZU ri-du-[ti]-ka
169 li-sag-gi-ši li-tur-[…]
170 lu åš-ra-ta lu-u sa-an-[qa-ta]
171 an-nu-u be-li a-pal-su-nu-ti
172 ana gul-lul-ti-ši-nu ri-ib dum-qí
173 ana dum-qí qis-sa-a-ti u ta-as-ba-ti
174 ana mah-ri-ši-nu e-te-it-ti-iq
175 LU.DUB.SAR en-qu-te
176 liš-ka-ru NA.DU.A-ka
177 šu-at NA₄.NA.DU.A-e-a ta-mu-ru-ma
178 pu-ut-ka tu-še-su-u
179 šu-at-yā-ši tak-tar-ba ar-ku-u
180 lik-ta-rab-ka ku-a-ša
Colophon A [ekat'AN.SAR].DÜ.A
[šar kiššati šar mār] AN.SAR.KI

1 [Open the tablet-box] read out the stela (naru)
2 [that I, Naram-Sin,] son of Sargon
3 [wrote and left it for] distant days
4 […] he passed away (lit. stood on the mountain)
5 […] he passed away (lit. stood on the mountain)
6 [Enmerkar the king of Uruk rul]er of the land
7 […] elapsed
8 […] passed
9 […] changed the plan for it (the land)
10 […] and (the enemy?) rode
11 [Enmerkar asked] the great gods
12 [Istar Ilaba] Zababa Annunitum
13 [Sullat Hanîš Šamas] the hero
14 [He called the diviners (and)] instructed
15 They touched the [seven] lambs [for the seven (gods)]
16 [He set up] the pure reed-altars
17 [The diviners] thus spoke:
18 …¹²³

¹⁷ G iv 2; ši-mi-ma
¹¹⁸ C iv 17; te-is-si-îh-hu
¹¹⁹ C iv 19; iš-da-ka
¹²⁰ B iv 16; lu
¹²¹ G iv 8; [x-r]a-tu-ka
¹²² A iv 2; […]q[u]-tī
19 ...they became darkened124 with respect to face125
20 ...
21 [in the] under(world)... may your body li[e...]
22 On[ce] the great gods [spoke,]
23 Enmerkar, [his corp]se... Samaš establish[ed] the severe judgment
24 His judgment, the verdict... his etemmu-spirit, the etemmu-spirits ...
25 the etemmu-spirit(s) of his family, the etemmu-spirit(s) of his offspring, the etemmu-spirit(s) of his offspring’s offspring, (by the verdict of) Samaš the h[ero],
26 lord of the heavens and the under(worlds), lord of Anunnaki, lord of the etemmu-spirits,
27 (the verdict being) that126 they will drink muddy waters and will not drink clean water.
28 He whose wisdom and the weapons bound, conquered (and) killed those troops,
29 on a stela (naru) he did not write (and) did not leave (it) to me
30 he did not make a name for himself, therefore I did not bless him127
31 Warriors of ‘cave-bird’ body, a people – their faces raven
32 The great gods made them
33 On earth the gods made the[ir] city
34 Tiamat sucked them
35 Their womb128 Bēlet-li]-ili made (them) well (lit. beautiful)
36 In the midst of the mountain they grew up, reached manhood and acquired (full) measure
37 Seven kings, brothers, resplendent in beauty
38 360,000 their troops
39 Anubanini their father, the king (and) their mother queen Melili her name.
40 Their eldest brother, their leader, Memandaḫ his name
41 Their second brother, Mešdub his name
42 Their third brother, [...]lapsi (or [...]pah) his name
43 Their fourth brother, Tartadaña his name
44 Their fifth brother, Baldadaḫ his name
45 Their sixth brother, Ahudiandaḫ his name
46 Their seventh brother, Ḥurrakidu his name
47 In the ‘pure mountains129’ they were riding
48 The soldier (tried to) be in control of (lit. seize) them but they beat their thighs
49 At the beginning of their approach, they approached Purūšāndar
50 Purūšāndar was completely scattered
51 Pūḫlu was scattered
52 Puranšu was scattered
53 Indeed mixed/allied(?) the bearer (of?) hubhuh(?) of rav[ens]130
54 …131 the greatness of the Umma-manda, [their] camp (was) Šubat-E[ni]l
55 And in the midst of Subartu [they killed] all of them
56 They scattered the (upper) sea and they approached Gutium
57 They scattered Gutium and they approached Elam
58 They scattered Elam and they reached the flatland (variant: steppeland)

124 [lt]-ru-ku can be taken as the third masculine plural D stative turruku.
125 Longman alternatively interprets this line as [...]lu? ra-qa zi-i-ma ‘...mark on the entrail’ in ibid., p. 286:19.
126 sā seems to be introducing the second part of Šamaš’ judgment and verdict on Enmerkar. The description of the judgement begins with the phrase di-en-šū ES.BAR ‘his judgement, the verdict’ in line 24. The first part of the verdict’s description is the mere mention of the subject of the punishment: the ghosts of Enmerkar, his family and offspring in lines 24-25. The enforcer of the verdict, Šamaš, is mentioned again with his epithets in lines 25-26. Then sā introduces the second part of the verdict, the punishment of drinking polluted water and being deprived from clean water, in line 27.
127 Lines 29-30 are difficult due to a number of problems concerning the subjects, objects and the parsing of the phrases. Alternative translations depend on the different solutions to these problems. For discussion and references, see Westenholz, Legends of the Kings of Akkade, pp. 306-308.
128 This is a traditional epithet of the goddess. Lambert and Millard translate it, found as sas-stu/saš-tu in the different manuscripts of Atra-šasis, as ‘birth-goddess’ in Lambert and Millard, Atra-šasis, pp. 57-63.
129 Alternately ‘silver mountains’ or ‘shining mountains’. Probably denotes the eastern mountains, see discussion in ch. 4, pp. 76-78.
130 Alternative translation: ‘Should I go out against...?’, Foster, Before the Muses, p. 350: 53. This line is very uncertain and there are a range of suggestions, see Westenholz, Legends of the Kings of Akkade, p. 313:53.
131 The translation of the first word in line 54 is uncertain. For the discussion, see ch. 4, pp. 91-96.
59 They killed those of the crossing, they threw to the …
60 Dilmun, Magan, Meluhha in the midst of the (lower) sea they killed as many as (there) were.
61-62 Seventeen kings, with them [their] troops up to 90,000, went to their aid
63 [I called] the soldier, I instructed (him)
64 [I filled his han]d [the ludu] (and) the sillû-pin:
65 “Touch (them) with the ludû, [prick (them)] with the sillû-pin
66 [I]f blood comes out, then they are people like us
67 [If blood does not come] out, (then they are) evil spirits, namtar-demons
68 [utuk]ku-demons, evil lurkers, the work of Enlil.”
69 The soldier brought back his report:
70 “I touched (them) with [the ludû],
71 I pricked (them) with the [sillû]-pin and blood came out.”
72 I called the diviners, I instructed (them)
73 I touched seven lambs [to the seven (gods)]
74 [I set] up pure reed-altars
75 I then asked […] the great gods
76 Istar, Ilaba, Zababa, Anunnûtum
77 Sul[lat], [Hanis], Samaš the hero
78 The lock (lit. latch-hook) of the great gods did not grant me my going (against the enemy) or my zaqâqû-dream.
79 Thus I said to my heart, saying verily I:
80 What lion conducted extispicy?
81 What wolf asks the dream-interpreter?
82 I will go like a bandit according to the will of my heart!
83 And I will cast aside that (latch-hook) of the god(s) so that I will be in control of myself
84 When the first year arrived
85 I send out 120,000 troops against them, not one returned alive
86 When the second year arrived, I sent out 90,000 troops against them, not one returned alive
87 When the third year arrived, I sent out 60,700 troops against them, not one returned alive
88 I was bewildered, confused, sunk in gloom, distressed (and) exhausted
89 Thus verily I said to my heart, saying:
90 What have I left to the reign?
91 I am not a king who keeps his land safe
92 and a shepherd who keeps his crowd (lit. troops) safe
93 How may I proceed that I may get myself out (of this ordeal)?
94 Terror of lions, death, plague, famine,
95 panic, frost, losses, hunger
96 [short]age, anxiety, as many as (there) were, came down with them
97 Above in the co[uncil] the flood was decided
98 Below on [earth the flo]od came into being
99 Ea, lord of the [deep, opened his mouth and] spoke,
100 saying to the [gods his broth]ers:
101 “Great gods! [What have you do]ne?
102 You ordered and I c[alled the flood]
103 And the creation of…
104 [When] the new year festival of the fourth y[ear arrive]d,
105 in devout prayer of Ea […] of the great gods
106 [I sac]rificed the pure sacrifices of the new year
107 I sought pure omens
108 I called the diviners, I [instructed] (them)
109 I to[ch]ed seven lambs to the seven (gods)
110 I set up p[u]re reed-altars
111 I then asked […] the great gods
112 Istar, [Ilaba, Zababa, Anunî]tum
113 Sul[lat], [Hanis, Samaš the her]o
114 The di[viners thus to me spo]ke:
115 If[…]aries…
116 …(there) exists…
117 …it hangs down…
118 The qulmu-axe made [the] blood flow…
119 […in] blood [they will drown…
120 From their midst, twelve soldiers fled (lit. flew) from me
121 I pursued them, I hurried, I hastened
122 I overtook those soldiers
123 I brought those soldiers back
124 Thus I said to my heart, [saying verily I:
125 “Without the examination of the entrails, punishments… I will not carry out…
126 I touched the lamb concerning them
127 The lock (lit. latch-hook) of the great gods [uttered] their favour.”
128 Bright Venus from heaven declared to me:
129 “To Naram-Sin son of Sargon,
130 Leave alone the ‘seed of ruin’! Do not destroy!
131 In future days Enlil will call them for evil
132 They are awaiting the angry heart of Enlil
133 The inhabitants of the city will be massacred
134 They will burn and besiege the dwellings
135 The inhabitants of the city pour out their blood
136 The store of the earth and the yield of the date palm will diminish
137 The inhabitants of the city of those soldiers will die
138 City with [city, house] with house will become hostile
139 Father with son, brother with brother
140 Young man with young man, colleague with colleague
141 They will not speak the truth with one another
142 The people will be taught untruth and who fitting/proper…
143 They will kill that hostile city
144 They will seize that city – the hostile city
145 One seah of barley is worth one [mina] of silver.”
146 The strong king… he was not in the land.
147 The great gods delivered them for the uprooting
148 I did not deliver them to my hand for the kill
149 You, whoever you are, whether governor or prince or anyone else,
150 whom the gods call to perform kingship
151 I made a tablet-box for you and inscribed a stela (narū) for you,
152 in Kutha, in the Emeslam,
153 in the cela of Nergal, I left (it) for you
154 See this stela (narū) and
155 listen to the words of the stela (narū)!
156 Do not be bewildered! Do not be confused!
157 Do not be afraid! Do not tremble!
158 Let your foundations be firm!
159 You, in the embrace of your wife, do (your) work!
160 Strengthen your walls!
161 Fill your dichtes with water!
162 Your chests, your grain, your silver, your goods, (and) your possessions,
163 bring into your stronghold!
164 Tie up your weapons and put (them) into the corners!
165 Guard your heroism! Keep yourself intact!
166 Let him roam through your land! Do not expel him!

---

132 On NUMUN ḫal-qa-ti-i ‘the seed of ruin’, see 5.2.
133 The translation ‘(Enlil) will call them’ (i-na-dā-šā ri-su-un) is based on the phrase reša našu. Westenholz suggests that reša našu has two relevant nuances that can suit the context, one is ‘to summon’ and the other is ‘to honour’, Westenholz, Legends of the Kings of Akkade, p. 323: 131. Enlil summoning and/or honouring the enemy reflects the belief that the god is ultimately in control of Naram-Sin’s enemies.
134 Gurney and Westenholz note that ‘city’ in lines 133, 135, and 137 seems to be used as a collective with the sense of ‘inhabitants of the city’ and the verbs appear to be impersonal third plurals, discussed in Gurney, “The Sultantepe Tablets: The Cuthaean Legend of Naram-Sin”, 1955, p. 112; Westenholz, Legends of the Kings of Akkade, p. 323:133-143. Gurney restores in-ne-ru ‘will be massacred’ in Gurney, “The Sultantepe Tablets: The Cuthaean Legend of Naram-Sin”, 1955, p. 106:133a. Westenholz alternatively restores in[naqgar] ‘will be demolished’ in Westenholz, Legends of the Kings of Akkade, pp. 322-323:133.
Let him scatter the cattle! Do not approach him!
Let him eat the flesh of your soldiers!
Let him murder (and) let him return…
Be submissive, disciplined.
Answer them, 'Here I am my lord'
Requit their sacrilegious acts with kindness
to kindness with gifts and additional (presents)
Always precede them (i.e. do more than they ask)!
May wise scribes
declaim your stela
You who have read my stela (narū) and thus
have gotten yourself out (of trouble)
You who have blessed me, may a future (ruler)
bless you
Colophon A [The Palace of Assur]banipal
[King of the world, king of] Assyria

21. - 40. Astrological Omens (Neo-Assyrian –Late Babylonian period)\(^{135}\)

21. \textbf{ACh Sin III 7-8}

7. \textit{DIS Sin(30) ina IGI-ŁA-śū GIM MUL.MUL šu-par-ru-ur} \textit{EN-LLIL} \textit{ana KUR ana GEME.HUL} \textit{u-šar ZI-ut ERIN-man-da ana KUR GAL-ma}
9. \textit{ina IGI-ŁA-śū ša-qu-ma} IGI \textit{KIMIN KI 20 IGI-ma}

7. Sin in its appearance spreads out like the Pleiades: Enlil leaves the land to evil, the attack of the Ummān-manda to the land occurs and
8. that land will be ruined. An eclipse is established over the entire\(^{136}\) Peliades as the entirety\(^{135}\),
9. in its appearance, (Sin) is seen high, ditto: it is seen with the sun.

22. \textbf{ACh Adad XI 9}\(^{137}\)

\textit{DIS 4İŞKUR GÜ-śū GIM UR.GU.LA SUB ZI-ut ERIN-man-da GAR GABA.RI NU.TUKU}

If Adad, his roar, comes out like a lion: the attack of the Ummān-manda is established, he will have no opponent.\(^{138}\)

23. \textbf{ACh Adad XXI 2}


\(^{136}\) The translation of \textit{ka-li-tum} (var. \textit{ka-li-tim}) as ‘entire’ and ‘entirety’ in line 8 is very uncertain. Possibly \textit{ka-li-tum} (var. \textit{ka-li-tim}) has nothing to do with \textit{ka-lī ‘totality’}. An alternative translation is not known to me.

\(^{137}\) This omen is to be found in EAE 44-46, perhaps EAE 44. Tablets EAE 44-46 deal with thunder under various circumstances, H. Hunger and D. Pingree, \textit{Astral Sciences in Mesopotamia}, p. 18.

\(^{138}\) I argue that NU.TUKU takes a singular subject here, and that the singular subject is ‘Ummān-manda’ as a collective singular, or as its king. For the use of \textit{nu-tuku} with a singular subject, see for example \textit{ur. sağ (…) gaba.ṣu. gar nu-tuku ‘the hero who has no adversary’}, Gudea cyl. A ii 10 in M.-L. Thomsen, \textit{The Sumerian Language: An Introduction to its History and Grammatical Structure}. (Mesopotamia Copenhagen Studies in Assyriology Volume 10). Copenhagen. Akademisk Forlag. 1984, p. 191.
… GABA GAR-ma\textsuperscript{139} GANA₂.ZI TUR ZI-ut ERIN-man-da ana KUR GĀL-ši

… and the cultivated field becomes small, the attack of the Umman-manda occurs against the land.

24. \textit{ACh Adad XIX 32}

31. [DIS \textsuperscript{4}ISKUR] GŪ-šā GIM UR.MAH :: GIM UR.GU.LA BÂ-ut ERIN...
32. …[Z]I-ut ERIN-man-da DUMU […]LUGAL ZĀ[I]…

31. [If Adad,] his roar, is like a lion = like the roar of a lion, omen of the troops of…
32. …[the a]ttack of the Umma\textsuperscript{4}n-manda, the son… the king perishes…

25. \textit{ACh Suppl. XLV 18}

[DIS\textsuperscript{m}a ʰTIR.AN.NA KUR₄ ina MU.BI ZI ERIN-man-d[а…

[an]d the ‘rainbow’\textsuperscript{140} is thick in that year: the attack of the Ummān-manda[а…

26. \textit{ACh 2 Suppl. IX 32 (K 3773)}\textsuperscript{141}

DIS KUN(MUL)GİR.TAB KIMIN zi-qît-tum GIM TÜR NIGIN-šā ina MU.BI ZI-ut ERIN-man-d[а…

If the tail, ditto sting, of the Scorpio surrounds it (i.e the moon) like a halo – in that year, attack of the Ummān-manda[а…

27. \textit{EAE 17 D ii 1-2}\textsuperscript{142} (= \textit{ACh Šīn 25 ii 5-6)}

1. […] ERIN-man-da ZI-ma ana KUR i-ra-ka-ha-ma KIMIN KUR i-šal-lal-ma ub-bu-tū GĀL-ma
2. UN.MES TUR.MES-ši-na ana KU.BABBAR BUR.MES EŠ.SANA SAL.KUR KIN-ar-ma

1. […] the Ummān-manda arise and overrun the land, variant: the land is plundered and there is famine and…
2. the people sell their children for silver (and) king\textsuperscript{143} sends messages of hostility.

\textsuperscript{139} I have left GABA GAR untranslated. It could be translated as ‘front edge is established’, and alternatively GABA(R.L.A) could be ‘opponent’. In any case, the loss of the preceding words prevents me from making sense of this part of the omen.

\textsuperscript{140} Literally tir-an-na it means ‘bow of the sky’, and means ‘rainbow’, SL 277. Although in this case I wonder if the word tir, which means ‘forest, grove, thicket’ when prefixed with the wood determinative gis (SL 277) could be more relevant, since the ʰTIR.AN.NA is described in this omen as being ‘thick’ (KUR₄ [kabru]). But I do not know what ʰTIR.AN.NA actually represents. I do know, however, that ʰTIR.AN.NA is not a star, but something that ineracts with the stars. Reiner notes that it is an object which the omens say surrounds (NIGIN) Venus like a ‘net’ (sa-pâr), and can be crowned above this planet, BPO 3, p. 11: 6.3. Reiner maintains the translation ‘rainbow’ for ʰTIR.AN.NA in BPO 3, 54, n. 1; 56-57: 35-36, 63: 7. I follow Reiner’s translation ‘rainbow’ for ʰTIR.AN.NA. If ʰTIR.AN.NA represents a constellation, this omen could be from EAE 50-53, 57. Tablets 50-53, and 57 (only partially) are concerned with constellations, H. Hunger and D. Pingree, \textit{Astral Sciences in Mesopotamia}, p. 19.

\textsuperscript{141} ACh 2 Suppl. IX 32 is part of EAE 6, as discussed in E. Weidner, “Die astrologische Serie Enûma Anu Enlil” \textit{AfO} 14 (1941/1944), p. 311. The extant copy of this omen reads as follows: … TÜR NIGIN-šē ina MU.BI ZI-ut ERIN-man-d[a… ‘the halo around it, in that year: the attack of the Ummān-manda[a…’. The other aspects of this omen have been restored from duplicates. For the duplicates (they do not contain the term Ummān-manda but help restore the protasis), see \textit{ibid}., p. 311, n. 124.

\textsuperscript{142} For the text, called ‘text D’ in Rochberg’s edition of EAE 17, see ABCD, pp. 124-125. For the entire omen and its manuscripts, see ABCD, pp. 123-126. I note that this omen is a duplicate of the omen in \textbf{Appendix 1.38}. Tablet D ii 1ff used here in \textbf{Appendix 1.27} is used to restore a gap a specific gap in EAE 17, but by itself does not contain what is immediately before ERIN-man-da. The entire extant omen can be seen in \textbf{Appendix 1.38}, which contains the duplicate that contains what is immediately before ERIN-man-da.
28. *ACh Ištar XXI* 95

95. [DIŠ MUL.]MAR.GIDA ip-rik-ma GUB ZI-ut ERĪN-man-da[…]

95. The Wagon lies across and stands: attack of the Ummān-manda…

29. *ACh Ištar XXI* 96

96. [DIŠ MUL.]MAR.GIDA a-dir ZI-ut ERĪN-man-da ZI-ma MU.6.KĀM…

96. The Wagon becomes obscured: the Ummān-manda attack and the sixth year…

30. *K 2933* 8\(^{144}\)

…ana SAL.]IJUL ú-šar-ra ZI-ut ERĪN-man-da ana KUR GĀL-si

…bends down [for] evil: attack of the Ummān-manda on the land occurs.

31. *ACh Sin IV* 21-22 + *LBAT* 1256 r. 1-3\(^{145}\)

21. DIŠ UD.20.KĀM Sin(30) u Šamaš(20) KI AH.MEŠ IG.MEŠ û ERĪN-man-da ZI-ma KUR EN-el BARAG.MEŠ DINGIR.MEŠ GĀL.MEŠ ZI.MEŠ

22. \(^{4}\)EN ana KUR.NIM.MA.KI DU DU₁₁.GA ina 30 MU.MEŠ tuk-tu-ū ut-tar-ru DINGIR.MEŠ GĀL.MEŠ KI-šu-nu i-tar-ru

21. If, the 20\(^{th}\) day, Sin and Šamaš appear together and Ummān-manda attack, they rule the land, they tear out the sanctuaries of the great gods.\(^{146}\)

22. Bēl (Marduk) goes to the land of Elam, it is commanded: in 30 years the great gods will exact revenge, they will return to their land.\(^{147}\)

32. *ACh 2 Suppl. XVIII* 18-19\(^{149}\)

\(^{144}\) The alternative translation to ‘king sends messages of hostility’ is ‘king will send hostile messages to king’ as in ABCD, p. 125: D ii 2. An additional ‘to king’ is assumed. The same apodosis is found with this additional ‘to king’ ana LUGAL written out explicitly in EAE 17 D ii 9 apud ABCD, p. 125. The use of the sign ESSANA (written 2.30) instead of LUGAL in ABCD, p. 125: D ii 2 has led me to omit this additional ‘to king’. One can transliterate directly as ESSANA whereas it can be transliterated as 3.20 as in ABCD, p. 125: D ii 2. It is known that 3.20 is ESSANA ‘king’, Labat, *Manuel*, 593.


\(^{146}\) The copies ACh Sin IV 21-22 + LBAT 1256 r. 1-3 are duplicates with exactly the same wording, so I listed them together. Another duplicate of this omen is in *Appendix 1.32*.

\(^{147}\) BARAG.MEŠ DINGIR.MEŠ GĀL.MEŠ ZI.MEŠ can alternatively be translated as ‘the sanctuaries of the great gods are torn out’.

\(^{149}\) The enemy’s abduction of Marduk’s statue is described as Marduk going to Elam. If the statue of the chief deity is abducted, the abduction of the statues of the other ‘great gods’ is also implied. The return of the ‘great gods’ to Babylon includes the return of Marduk’s statue as well as the other ‘great gods’.

\(^{149}\) The only difference from its duplicates in *Appendix 1.31* is that the Akkadian word qā-bi written in place of DU₁₁.GA.
18. DIŠ UD.20.KÁM Sin(30) u Šamaš(20) KI AH.MEŠ IGL.MES ERIN-man-da ŽI-ma KUR EN-elu
BA[RAG.MES DINGIR.MEŠ GAL.MEŠ ZL.MEŠ]
19. 9En ana KUR.NIM.MA.KI a-DU qá-bi ina 30 MU.MEŠ û-tu-u û-ta-tu-ru DINGIR.MEŠ GAL.MEŠ KI-
šu-nu i-ta-ru]

18. If, the 20th day, Sin and Šamaš appear together, Ummān-manda attack and rule the land, [they tear out] the sanctuaries of the great gods. 146
19. Bēl (Marduk) goes to the land of Elam, it is commanded: 147 in 30 years [the great gods will exact r]evenge, [they will return to their land]. 148

33. EAE 63 20 150


On the 15th day of the month Addaru, Venus disappears in the east, [it is concealed in the] sky for three months and nine days (and) in the 25th day of the month of Simanu it appears in the west: the fall of the Ummān-manda, variant: the fall of […]

34. EAE 20 6 (Recension B) Lines 1-7

1. DIŠ ina ITI.KIN UD.14.KÁM AN.MI GAR-ma DINGIR ina KAXMI-šú ŠÁ IM.KUR.RA KI.TA KAX[M]-ma ŠÁ IM.U₁₈,LU AN.TA iz-ku]
2. IM.MAR.TU EN.NUN AN.USAN₂ iz-qat-ti IM.SI.SÁ EN.NUN MURUB₂ BA…x i-ni xx u a-di BAR-tú ĐU-
ik
3. DINGIR ša ina KAXMI-šú ŠÁ IM.KUR.RA KI.TA KAXMI-ma ŠÁ IM.U₁₈,LU AN.TA iz-ku ŠÁ
SAL.KUR GAR-an
6. KUR ana KUR ši-ma-ti i-ḫa-aq ma-a-a-[šu-ú] ana KUR in-na-aš-ši
7. ina bi-ri-ša-nu HI.GAR G[ÁL …]

1-2. If an eclipse occurs on the 14th day of Ululu, and the god, in his eclipse, becomes dark on the side east below, [and clears on the side south above]; the west wind (var. the north wind) ends the first watch (var. the middle watch)… and goes until the ‘midpoint’. 153
3-4. Observe his eclipse, (that of) the god who, in his eclipse, became dark on the side east below and [clear]ed [on the side south above], and bear in mind the west wind. [The prediction is given] for [Akkad]
5. If in Ululu ‘the midpoint’, the Ummān-manda will fall. The ki[ng of Akkad] will establish hostilities in his midst.
6. Country will mix with country in armed conflict. A signal will be raised for the country.
7. [There will be] a revolt among them.

35. EAE 21 Section 5 Line 1

DIŠ ina ITI.NE UD.14.KÁM AN.MI GAR-ma ina IM.U₁₈,LU SAR-ma 155 ina IM.KUR.RA iz-ku ina EN.NUN
AN.USAN₂ KIMIN ina EN.NUN U₂.ZAL.LI SAR-ma AN.MI ina IM.KUR.RA SAR-ma IM.KUR.RA DU

150 Transliteration following BPO 1, p. 38.
151 Transliteration and translation following ABCD, pp. 200-202.
152 This an-sign is Rochberg’s reading in ABCD, p. 202: 5 (S 69).
153 For the translation BAR-tú ‘midpoint’, see ABCD, p. 201, n. 4.
154 Transliteration and most of the translation following ABCD, p. 239. Rochberg translates the apodosis as follows: “There will be an uprising of the Ummān-manda, variant: my army. Battle will rage (lit. weapons will become wild). One man will kill another man in battle (variant: [king] will kill king in battle)”, see ABCD, p. 239.
155 Variant reading KAXMI-ma in ABCD, p. 239: B: 33.

“If an eclipse occurs on the 14th day of Abu, and it begins (var. becomes dark) in the south and clears in the east; it begins in the evening watch, variant: the morning watch, and ends and clears up. You observe his eclipse and bear in mind the south. Its prediction is given for the king of Ea

36. EAE 15 E 4¹⁵⁸

…[K]l(?) u Gu-ši-e ḤUL-tim ERIN-man-[da]

Land of… and Guti, the destruction¹⁵⁹ (brought) by the Ummān-manda

37. EAE 15 Section 8 Line 3¹⁶⁰

[DIŠ AN.MI ina IM.III SAR-ma IM.III DU ZI-ut (?)] ERIN-ma-an-da (in traces)¹⁶¹

“If an eclipse begins in the east and the east wind blows: the attack of the Ummān-manda”

38. EAE 17 10'-12¹⁶²

10'. [...U]N.MEŠ BE-ma ina AN.MLIḪ ḤIŠKUR KA-šū SUB
11'. […]LU]GAL BE-ut ERIN-man-da ZI-ša ana KUR U₂₃-ma
12'. [KIMIN KUR i-sul-lal-ma ub-bu-tu GÁL-ma UN.MEŠ] TUR.MEŠ-ši-na ana KÚ.BABBAR BÚR.MEŠ LUGAL ana LUGAL.SAL.KUR KIN-arg

10'. […] people. If in that eclipse, Adad, his roar falls,
11'. […]The king dies: the Ummān-manda arise and overrun the land,
12'. [variant: the land is plundered, and there is famine and the people] sell their children for silver and king sends messages of hostility to king.

39. VAT 10218 106 43'-46¹⁶³

43' MUL Dil-bat 9 ITI ina ḤIŠKUR Ė 9 <ina> ḤIŠKUR.SU.A KI.GUB-sū KUR.KUR KIMIN GUR.[GUR]
44' ZI ERIN-man-da DIȘ gir-gir-bi-ra aššū gir-gir-bi-ra la ti-du-ū; GIR [x x]
45' kib-ra-a-ti er-bi-u kib-ra-a-ti ina liša-a-ni da(?)-gil(?) PEŠ šá-lá-[šu/saš]
46' GI iš-tên EN x-a-te ina ša-a-ti da-[gil]

43' If Venus for 9 months in the east, 9 in the west changes, variant: turns back, her position:

¹⁵⁶ Variant reading GIS.TUKUL.MEŠ in ABCD, p. 239: B 35.
¹⁵⁷ Variant reading [LUGAL] LUGAL ina GIS.TUKUL GAZ in ABCD, p. 239: B: 36.
¹⁵⁸ Transliteration from ABCD, p. 77.
¹⁵⁹ Transliteration from ABCD, p. 75. Its Middle Assyrian forerunner is in Appendix 1.17.
¹⁶⁰ For the restoration and the reading of the traces, see ABCD, pp. 67-69, 75.
¹⁶¹ Transliteration and restored text is from ABCD, p. 124. For the entire omen and its manuscripts, see ABCD, pp. 123-126. This omen is a duplicate of the omen in Appendix 1.27.
¹⁶² Transliteration and most of the translation following BPO 3, pp. 50-51: 106. Reiner’s translation of the apodosis is as follows: “attack of the Manda-troops for girgibira – if you do not know (the term) girgibira, gir […] regions, four regions, is seen’ in the commentary, PES = šalas(u) ‘three’, GI = isten ‘one’, …is seen in the word list.”, see BPO 3, p. 51. A commentary (K 148) suggests that VAT 10218 may belong to EAE 61, but Reiner observes that this commentary deals with omens from Iqqur ıpš and omits omens found in VAT 10218, so the precise relationship of VAT 10218 with EAE 61 remains unclear, see BPO 3, p. 1.
44’ attack of the Ummān-manda on164 *girgibira* – if you do not know (the term) *girgibira*, gir[^…], 45’ of the regions, four regions (is) seen(?) in the commentary, PES = thre[e], 46’ GI = one, … se[en] in the word list.

40. K 213+Rm.2,250 24 (EAE 24 3 46)165

*ina* ITI.BĀR UD.11.KAM 3 AŠ.ME-tum Ė.MES-ni ERIN-man-dum ZAH

If on the eleventh of Nisanu three disks come up: the Ummān-mandum166 will perish.

41. Esarhaddon’s Prisms167

u168 1*Te-uš-pa-a* KUR169 *Gi-mi-ra-a-a*


164 Reiner translates DIS as ‘for’ on the possibility it stands for the word *ana*. Reiner also notes the other possibility is that DIS already introduces the comment, BPO 3, p. 54 n. 34. The word *ana* can be taken together with the word ZI to mean ‘attack…on’.


166 Van Soldt translates the second element of this word according to the word ERIN-mat-tum ‘large army’ found on another manuscript for EAE 24 3 46, see manuscript B r 16 in *ibid.*, p. 32: III 46, for the text and publications of this manuscript see *ibid.*, p. 16. The second element of the word ERIN-man-dum is different from the word *mat-tum* ‘many’, see ch. 2, pp. 23-24.


169 Variant: LÚ in BM, TH 1929-10-12,1 iii 43 in *ibid.*. For the text and publications, see *ibid.*, p. 16. The second element of the word ERIN-man-dum is different from the word *mat-tum* ‘many’, see ch. 2, pp. 23-24.


169 Variant: LÚ in BM, TH 1929-10-12,1 iii 43 in *ibid.*. For the text and publications, see *ibid.*, p. 16. The second element of the word ERIN-man-dum is different from the word *mat-tum* ‘many’, see ch. 2, pp. 23-24.


169 Variant: LÚ in BM, TH 1929-10-12,1 iii 43 in *ibid.*. For the text and publications, see *ibid.*, p. 16. The second element of the word ERIN-man-dum is different from the word *mat-tum* ‘many’, see ch. 2, pp. 23-24.

And Teuşpaye the Cimmerian, 
Ummân-mandta whose abode is distant, 
in the land of Hubusna together with all his troops, 
I beat down with the weapon.

42. Akkulanu’s letter to Assurbanipal

Obverse
1. [a-na] LUGAL be-li-ia
2. [ARAD-kA] 16 Ak-kul-la-nu
3. [lu-š]ul-mu a-na LUGAL be-li-ia
4. [MUL]Sal-bat-a-nu ina KASKAL šu-ut 1EN-LIL it-ti GIR.2.MEŠ
5. [MUL]ŠU.GI it-ta-ni-mar un-nu-ut pu-su ša-ki
6. [ITI].GUD UD.26 KÂM a-ta-mar a-du iš-qa-an-ni
7. [hu]-ra-me-me a-na LUGAL EN-iâ as-sap-ra pt-xê-er-su
8. [DIS][MUL]Sal-bat-a-nu a-na MUL.SU.GI TE-ḫi ina KUR.MAR.TU
9. BAL-tu GAL-ma SES SES-šu GA-zak
10. E.GAL NUN KAR-a ni-ši-ti KUR DIS KUR ša-ni-tim-ma È
diš 11 N.IR NUR KUR HUL.MES LUGAL SU DINGIR.MES-šâ DIS KUR-šâ u-sah-ḫa-râ-lâ-šu

12. HUL ša KUR.MAR ša-u-ti DINGIR.MES-ka sum-ma kis-su-tu
13. [a-na]LUGAL DINGIR.MES-ka sum-ma kis-su-tu ak
14. [a]-ni KUR.ŠAM.GI iš-šar ša KUR DIS ša-ni-tim-ma È
diš 15 N.IR NUR KUR HUL.MES LUGAL SU DINGIR.MES-šâ DIS KUR-šâ u-sah-ḫa-râ-lâ-šu

16. [DIS][MUL]MAN-MA DIS 1EN.ME.ŠAR.RA TE-ḫi ŠA KUR DUG-[a[b UN.MEŠ DAGAL.MEŠ]
17. [MUL]MAN-MAŠa-bat-a-nu du-un-qu ša LUGAL EN-iâ [ša-u-tu]
19. ina MU BI LUGAL NIM.MA.Å.1 BA.UG1
20. DIS[UGUR] ina IGL.DU.Å.Ša šu-ḫur pu-su ša-ki
21. GIM MUL an-e ma-diš um-mul a-na KUR.URL.1 ARHUS TUG
22. A ERIN-iâ GUB-az-ma KUR GAZ-aK ERIN KUR ina IGI ERIN-iâ, lâ GUB-az
23. bu-ši KUR.URL.1 par-Ša-ni ša EDIN NÂ ŠE.ŠE.GIŠ,Î
24. u ZU.Ü.U.Å.MA SLS.Å.MES DINGIR.MES DIS KUR.URL.1 ARHUS TUG.MES
25. DIS ina ITI.GUD [MUL-Sal-bat-a-nu IGL.LA.MI.KUR.MES.GAL.MEŠ
26. šal-pâ-ti ERIN-man-da
27. ERIN-man-da LU.GIM-ra-a-a

28. AN.MI ša ina INI.BARAG 4UTU iš-kum-u-ni
29. qaq-qa-ra ša KUR.SUR.Å.BR.4 la il-pi-ut
30. ü MUL.SAG.ME.GAR KI.GUB-su us-sa-lim
31. 15 UD.MES DIR.MES GUB-iz SIG.3 šu-u-tu

Edge 32. DIS[UGUR] ina IGL.DU.Å.Ša šu-ḫur pu-su ša-ki

Edge 33. KUR.ŠAR.RA KUR.URL.1-IM-ma ša LUGAL EN-iâ

word as ma-a’-[du] because it is likely this expression is meant to resemble ERIN.HI.A ma-a’-du ‘numerous army’ found in Sennacherib’s Nebi Yunus Inscription (H 4) 30 in D. D. Luckenbill, The Annals of Sennacherib. (The University of Chicago Oriental Institute Publications) 2). Chicago. The University of Chicago Press. 1924, p. 87.

172 Variants: er-še-et in BM, 48-11-4,315 iii 1 in Abel and Winckler, Keilschrifttexte zum Gebrauch bei Vorlesungen, p. 25; BM, TH 1929-10-12,1 iii 45 in Thompson, The Prisms of Esarhaddon and Assurbanipal, p. 18, pl. 6.


174 SAA 10 100. The collations mentioned in Appendix 1.42 are by S. Parpola in SAA 10 100.
Reverse
1. ù ina UGU ŠEG.MES ša MU.AN.NA an-ni-ti
2. im-tu-u-ni BURUši.MES la in-ni-piš-u-ni
3. du-un-qu ša TI.LLA ZL2.MES ša LUGAL
4. EN-îa šu-tu îs-su-ri LUGAL be-li i-qab-bi
5. ma-a ina SÀ mi-i-ni ta-a-mur gi-bi-i'a
6. ina SÀ û-il-ti ša ṣam.E.A-mu-šal-lim
7. ša a-na ta.MES SUM.PAP.MES EN-sù îs-pur-u-ni šà-tir
8. sum-ma GISKIM ina AN-e DU-kam-ma pi-îs-sà-tu la ir-ši
9. sum-ma a-na ma-qa-at ŠEG.MES ib-sî-ka
10. [E]SSANA KASKAL.MES na-ki-ri šu-us-bit
11. [e]-ma DU-ku i-kaš-šad UD.MES-sù GÎD.DA.MES
12. [DIS 30 ina] ITI.SIGi. UD.30.KAM IGI.LA
13. [nû]-du MAR.TU.KI aḫ-la-mu-u KU
14. [an-na-ti] (G)ISKIM.MES ša KUR.MAR HUL.MES
15. [ʾAš-šur ʾE]N ʾNÀ DINGIR.MES-ka
16. [sum-ma nak-re-tî] ina SU.2 LUGAL EN-îa […]
17. […]SUB]-iî LŪ.K[UR.MES…]
18. …a …
19-21. …
22. …ḫu-tum
23. … bu-u-ni
24. …ḫu-nim-ma
25. … KU.MES SUB.MES
(remainder of about six lines lost)

Obverse
1. [To] the king my lord
2. [your servant] Akkulanu
3. [May there be good] well-being for my lord
4. May [Nabû] and Marduk bless the king my lord
5. [M]ars has appeared in the path of the Enlil stars at the feet
6. of the ‘Old Man’ (i.e. the Perseus constellation). It is faint and has become white.
7. I saw it on the 26th of Iyyar when it had risen high.
8. I am sending therefore to the king my lord. I have written down its disclosures.

9. Mars approaches the ‘Old Man’ (i.e. Perseus): in Amurrû
10. there will be a revolt and brother will kill brother
11. The palace of the ruler will be plundered, the treasure of the land will go out to another land
12. The emblem of the land will be tainted. His gods send the king of the world175 to his enemy.

13. That is the evil for Amurrû. By your gods, the hegemony
14. as much as the Cimmerians made, will Aššur your god
15. not take it away and give to it the king my lord?

16. The strange star approaches the god Enmešarra: the country will be happy [(and the people will multiply)].
17. The strange star: Mars; good for the king my lord
18. (If) Mars lights up faintly176 and its glow is yellowish, (then)
19. in that year the king of Elam will die.
20. (If) in his appearance Nergal is small and has become white,

175 SU = kiššatu ‘world’. For a discussion of the epithet ‘king of the world’ used in the letter, see ch. 6, pp. 165-166.
176 For ‘faintly’, see LAS I 110 o. 7’; SAA 10, p. 77:18; LAS II, pp. 308-309.
177 There has been some debate as to whether the ‘destruction’ (šal-pū-tî) here is the destruction caused by the Ummân-manda or their own collapse. It is more likely to be the former, see discussion in ch. 6, p. 167.
43. Assurbanipal’s letter to the god Aššur, K 3408, r. 12-26

r. 12. ʿu LÚ.URI-a-a ša da-bab-ti šap-[

r. 13. a-na ERIN-man-da LÚ.KUR ek-su u-šad-ba-b[u…

r. 14. ik-kib-ka GAL-a ka-a-an i-te-né-[ep-pu-šu…]

r. 15. i-nan 179.[aššur KUR GAL-ú ina a-mu-t…

r. 16. ka-bit-ti DINGIR.MES GASAN GAL A[N?…

r. 17. aš-sa ka-šad LÚ.KUR an-ni-i…

r. 18. am-ḫur DINGIR-ut-ka GAL-ti LUGAL DING][IR.MEŠ…

r. 19. še-me su-pi-ia li-qi un-ni-ni-[i…

r. 20. ina qi-bit-ti-ka sīr-te ḫa-at-t[i…

r. 21. lut-ta-at-ṣa al bu-un-ni-ka…

r. 22. lu-uk-tam-me-sa ma-ḫar-ka

r. 23. ši-pir-ti 16[Asšur-[DU.A…]

r. 24. a-na ʿAššur a-ṣiḫ Ē.[HUR.SAG.GAL.KUR.KUR.RA]

r. 25. a-na TI-e un-n[?]-ni-šu…

r. 26. sa-kin LÚ.KUR-sù ni-[ir…

r. 12. And the Urartians, the men of the faculty of speech,
r. 13. they cause (a messenger) to talk, 181 to the Ummān-manda, the dangerous enemy…
r. 14. They constantly d[o] the great abomination….

178 CT 35 44-45; IWA, pp. 83-84.
179 For the sign nan, see Labat, Manuel, 331.
181 For the translation of the verb šububu, see ch. 6, p. 160.
r. 15. Now Asšur the great mountain, in the word…

r. 16. of eminence. The gods, the great lady…

r. 17. Because of the conquest of these enemies…

r. 18. I appeal to your great divinity, king of the gods…

r. 19. Hear my prayer and receive [my] petition…

r. 20. in your command the exalted scepter…

r. 21. May I become a man in your image…

r. 22. May I kneel down in front of you…

r. 23. The message of Assurbanipal…

r. 24. to Assur who dwells in th temple of E[hursaggalkurkuru]

r. 25. to receive the petition…

r. 26. he places his enemy (under) the yoke of…

44. Assurbanipal’s dedicatory inscription for Marduk, K 120B+, lines 20-25\textsuperscript{182}

20. ù¹Tug-dam-mi-i LUGAL ERIN-man-da tab-ni-it ti-GME TAM-siš DINGIR [gal-le-ε]\textsuperscript{183}
21. a-na la e-peš an-ni la ha-te-e mi-šir KUR-ia ni-iš DINGIR.MES…
22. i-šiš la ik-kud-ma zi-ki-ša ka-bi tu ša aš-gi-gi…
24. ki-ši-pe DINGIR-ti-ka ša taš-pa-ra um-ma ū-sap-paḥ il-lat-x(sū(?))…
25. ¹Sa-an-dak-KUR-ru⁺ DUMAN ši-it SA-bi-šiš ša a-na te-ni-šu iš-ku-uru a-x[…
26. aš-me-a at-ta-ta-id⁺ AMAR.UTU qar-du

20. And Tugdamme, the king of the Ummān-manda, the creation of Tiamat, likeness of [a gallū-demon]\textsuperscript{186}…
21. (That) which he was not to sin against, not to transgress the border of my land; the oath [of the gods…]
22. he scorned, he showed no fear and your exalted name, which the Igigi…
23. to the greatness of your lordship and the might of your divinity…
24. because the message of your divinity which you sent, thus (saying): “I will scatter his(?) clan.”
25. Sandakurru,\textsuperscript{188} son, offspring of his loins, whom they put as his substitute…
26. I heard, I praised Marduk the valiant.

45. A barrel cylinder of Assurbanipal, BM 122616⁺ (=BM 122616 + BM 127966)\textsuperscript{185}

1’ …
2’ …E-p[iš …
3’ …][x] na ni-s[š[i…]GL2.MES-sū-[u…
4’ …][]-il f.GARš.MES-sū…
5’ …][t][a ša qa-še-šu NINA.KI É.GAŠAN.KALAM.MA…
6’ … DINGIR.MES] GAL.MES EN.MES-ia ma-ša-ze-sū-[u…
7’ …]U.D.KA.BAR AN.BAR…
8’ …BARAG.MES-sū KU.MES…
9’ …ša(?)[!] KU.BABBAR KU.GI lu-uru aš-tak-kan É …
11’ …(m)²-na-a-ti si-mat É.KUR ša KU.BABBAR KU.GI [lu-uru aš-tak-kan…
12’ …]N[a-na-a GAŠAN GAL-tu u[tu…
13’ …[J]na É.H[I.L][I].AN.NA ša ta-rum-[m][u…
14’ …DIŠ ar-sip [šašak]-liš sat-tuk-ke-sū-[u] bar-[l]u-uru aš-ki-šu…
15’ …MES]-ia uš-ša-bi-mu AN.DUL-sū-[u] DÜG.G[A UGU]-ia it-ru-[u…
16’ …a-na GIŠ.SUDUN-ia uš[ašak]-ni-šu…
17’ …DIŠ ma-hi-[r ul i-si URU.Ni-i’] URU LUGAL-ši KUR Mu-[šu[r…

\textsuperscript{182} K 120B+ line 20 in BIWA, p. 202 The entire inscription in BIWA, pp. 201-203.
\textsuperscript{183} A possible restoration is tam-šiš [gal-le-ε] ‘likeness of a gallū-demon’, see 5.1.
\textsuperscript{184} The more common reading is ¹Sa-an-dak-sat-ru. In support of the reading ¹Sa-an-dak-KUR-ru, see Ivantchik, Les Cimmeriens au Proche-Orient, 1993, pp. 120-123.
\textsuperscript{185} BM 122616 in Thompson, “A Selection from the Cuneiform Historical Texts from Nineveh (1927-32)”, p. 106, Fig. 18, no. 33; BM 127966 in A. R. Millard, “Fragments of Historical Texts from Nineveh: Ashurbanipal” Iraq 30 (1968), pl. XXVI as BM 122616+. The join is made in ibid., 1968, p. 111; Borger collated four lines missed out in the previous two works, see BIWA, pp. 199-200.
18’...a-di la ba-še-e ū-ša-li-k DINGIR.MEŠ.-šu DINGIR.15.MES-[šu...]
19’...Tug-dam-imi i96 LUGAL ERIN-man-da NUMU[N ĥal-qā-ti-i187...
20’...[a?]-ni-ir ī-ŠAM-qīt KUR.Ma-ta-a a KUR.Man-na-a-a K[UR?...
21’...KUR Lu-up-pi188 u KUR Qa-de-e ša ina a-[hi...
22’...āš?-bu ina qi-bi t AN.SAR 3NIN.LIL 4EN 4AG DINGIR ...
23’...ia la kan-šu da-na-an AN.SAR 3NIN.LIL 4EN 4AG...
24’... ūUTU-ši a-di tam-tim š[ap-li-ti...
25’...la na-par-ka-a man-da-at-[ta...  
26’ (only traces)

1’...to do...
2’...in the o[alth]eir [w]itness...
3’...its walls...
5’...in the midst of Nineveh the temple of the Lady of the Land...
6’...the great [gods] my lords, the[i[r] shrines...
7’...[iron...
8’...its pure shrines...
9’...silver (and) gold I indeed placed. The temple...
10’...Em[eslam, the temple of Nergal in K[utha...
11’...the symbol of the temple, of silver and gold [I indeed placed]
12’...Jani the great lady, I[rom...
13’...in Eḫilianna which she love[s...]
14’...I erected and [perfec]ted. Their regular offerings which had ceased [I (re)established...]
15’...my... they completed, their favourable protection [they extended over me...]
16’...unto my yoke they su[mitted]...
17’...there was not a rival. Thebes the royal city of Egypt[...]
18’...I reduced to nothingness, its gods, [its] goddesses...
19’...[Tugdam]me, king of the Ummān-manda, the see[d of ruin...]
20’...[I?/he?] slew, I/he killed,189 the land of Media, the land of Mannea, [land of?... 
21’...the land of L]uppi171 and the land of Qade in...
22’...I dwelled(?). By the command of As[ur, Ninlil, Bēl, Nabû, ...
23’...not submissive to the strength of As[ur, Ninlil, Bēl, [Nabû...
24’...to the I[ower] sea... 
25’...without ceasing tribut[e...]
26’ (only traces)

186 Restored from ‘Tug-dam-mi-i in Dedication to Marduk K 120B+, line 20, see Appendix 1.44.
187 The expression ‘seed of ruin’ is restored from IIT 143. For a discussion of this expression, see 5.2.
188 Alternatively ...KUR Lu-up-pi ‘land of Kuppi’. For the discussion, see BIWA, p. 200.
189 There is a text break both at the end of this line and the subsequent line contains first or third person verbs that may be referring to Assurbanipal’s military victories in Media and Mannea. Alternatively the verbs [a?]-ni-ir ī-ŠAM-qīt ‘[I?/he?] slew, I/he killed’ relate to the Cimmerian king described with epithets in the cylinder inscription. The text breaks could contain another doer of the verb, hence the uncertain restoration [a?]-ni-ir ‘[I?] slew’, and the two possible translations ‘I/he killed’ for ī-ŠAM-qīt. Elsewhere the Neo-Assyria sources attribute the defeat of the Cimmerians to the gods without Assurbanipal’s interference (discussed in 5.2, 6.3.3). This should be considered in any type of interpretation offered to translate BM 122616+ 19’-20’a. Of course it is possible the king proclaims military victory in the first person as part of traditional phrases without any significant contribution for understanding the portrayal of the Cimmerians and their leader in the Neo-Assyrian documents. The reference is very short and is clearly formulaic.
I (1') [ik]-ta-pu-ud HUL-ti (2') [i]-ra-UG SÁ-ba-šú (3') i-ta-ma-ia ħi-ti-ti (4') ni-še-e ma-[at URI]45 (5') ta-a-ra u f[u] il ir-šē (6') li-im-[ni]-iš (7') a-na TIN.TIR.48 (8') is-ni-il q(8') ₁u-na-am-mi (9') èś-re-e-ti-ès (10') ₁u-sa-al-hi (11') ₁u-sa-ra-a (12') pel-lu-de-e (13') ₁u-sa-al-pi-ti-ti (14') ₁u-ti-ni ṢAMAR.UTU (15') ₁u-sa-al-ba-at-ma (16') ₁u-se-ri-ib (17') qèb-rel BALA.TI.LA (18') ki-ma uz-zi DINGIR-ma (19') i-te-pu-us KUR (20') u l-[p]-šu-ur (21') [k]mil-ta-šu (22') ṢAMAR.UTU (23') 21 MU.MES (24') qèb-rel BALA.TI.LA (25') ir-ta-me šu-bat-su (26') [t]m-lu-û UD.MES (27') ik-su-da a-dan-nu (28') ₁u-nu-ih-ma (29') uz-za-šu (30') saš LUGAL DINGIR.DINGIR EN.ME (31') E.SAG.IL (32') u KA.DINGIR.RA45 (33') ₁i-hu-us (34') ₁u-ba-be-lu-ti-šú (35') LUGAL SU.BIR.ŠI (36') saš i-na uz-zu- zamów DINGIR.UTU (37') saš-a-pu-ut-ti (38') KUR is-ku-nu (39') DUMU si-ti ŞÁ-bi-šú (40') i-ni GI.TUKUL (41') ₁u-ra-as-si-ti-šú II (1') re-su ₁u-din-šum (2') tap-pa-₁u ₁u-šar-ši-is (3') LUGAL Um-ma-nan-an-da (4') sa ₁u-hi-li i-ta-šu (5') ₁u-šak-ni-is (6') qi-bi-tu-us-šu (7') ₁u-šak-li-ne re-su-ta-su (8') i-li-ti ₁u-sa-pi-lis (9') im-u ₁u-su-me lu (10') a-bu-ba-niš is-pu-un (11') ₁u-tir gi-mil-šu (12') TIN.TIR.45 (13') ₁i-ba-tuk-te-e (14') LUGAL Um-ma-nan-an-da (15') la a-di-ru (16') ₁u-ša-al-pi-ti-ti (17') èś-re-šu-at-un (18') sa DINGIR.49 KUR.SU.BIR.ŠI (19') ka-la-šu-ma (20') u URU.MES pa-at KUR.KURI (21') ₁a-ti LUGAL KUR.KURI (22') na-ak-ru-ma (23') la il-lu-ku (24') re-su-še-at (25') ₁u-ša-al-pi-at-ta (26') ₁a-ma-nu-lu (27') ma-na-ma la i-zib (28') ₁u-sa-li-ib (29') ma-₁a-zis-su-un (30') ₁u-ša-ti (31') ₁a-li-li (32') LUGAL TIN.TIR. (33') si-pi-iš ARAM.UTU (34') sa ₁i-il-la-ti (35') ₁u-ša-ti (36') ₁a-li-ŠU.2-še-šu (37') a-na pel-lu-de-e (38') DINGIR.MES ka-la-ma (39') ₁u-si-ma-la-a (40') 1904 a-a a-al-qar (41') i-nə-na X (1') ₁a-si-otional (2') ñi-ši-ta-su-un (3') la ir-mu-₁u ₁u-su-ta-su-nu (4') ṢAMAR.UTU be-li ya-ti (5') ₁q-ad-a-an-ni-ma (6') ₁u-te-ed-du-uš mundial re DINGIR (7') ₁u-ša-ša-ul at ŠU.2-₁i-a (8') ₁u-ul-ul-ul (k)u-mu DINGIR.MES ze-ne-ti (9') ₁u-su-ma-₁u ₁u-su-ta-su-un (10') 1a-pi-₁i-ši-šu (!) NušMIN-₁u ta-me (11') a-na pa-le-e-a (12') Har-ra-nu.KI E.HUL (13') ₁a-in-nu-du-a (14') ₁u-sal-₁u-pu-at-er IN a-man-du (15') ₁u-tah-₁u-e es-re-ti (16') ₁i-te-ek-pu-us (17') ₁i-ti DINGIR.MES (18') a-da-nu sa-li-ma (19') 54 MU.MES (20') e-ne-mu (21') 1i-ta-ru aš-re-ta-su (22') 1i-an-an-nu (23') a-na aš-si-šu (24') ₁u-ra-am-ma (25') 54 EN a-gi (26') ₁i-hu-su ₁u-sha-su (27') sa-ti-ti u DINGIR.MES (28') ma-la-ti-šú (29') ₁u-su-ul (aš) ku-am-mi-šú (30') ṢAMAR.UTU-ma LUGAL DINGIR.MES (31') 1q-ta-bi pa-₁a-ha-tu (32') NAKISIB ṢA-pi (33') ₁u-qu-ru NAXA LUGAL-tu (34') ₁a-AN.SAR (SAR xES).DI.BILA (35') LUGAL KUR.Aš-sar ša-lam (36') ₁u-an zï-kî-ši MIŠ (37') ₁u-sa-ab-šu-ja (38') ₁b-nu-₁u a-ni-su-šu (39') ta-ti-ti (40') ina ṢA-PISIB su-₁u (41') ₁i-ta-ru-ta-₁u-ma (42') ina GŰ (30') ₁u-nil-nil (43') 1a-in U.45 MES al-lu-ti (44'-45') kuš-mu-bu-un-na-a-ni-ša-šu (46') ina ša-pu-ut-ti LÜ.KUR (47') a-na la ba-ta-₁u (48') 1ẹ-re-e-ti-šu (49') ina E.SAG.IL (50') ₁a- dł-ši-₁u (51') na-pi-ti DINGIR.GAL.MES


191 Schaudig’s edition has ṢA-DINGIR ‘of the god’ in the singular in Schaudig, Die Inschriften Nabonids von Babylon und Kyros’ des Großen, p. 516: ii 18’. Langdon’s earlier edition had interpreted the same word as ‘of the gods’ ša ilânî, in Langdon, Die neubabylonischen Königsgeschichten, p. 272: ii 18. It is possible the plural sign or a second DINGIR logogram that provided a plural meaning has been erased by the time of Schaudig. Alternatively there is an original scribal omission, perhaps an error, or the reference ‘god of Subartu’ is to the deity Assur, the chief of the Assyrian pantheon.
I (1') He (i.e. Sennacherib) [pl]anned evil (2') The ‘minder of the people’,\(^{192}\) his heart, (3') spoke of sin. (4') To the people of the la[n of Akkad] (5') [he showed no] mercy. (6') In an evil manner (7') he [prophecied] Babylon, (8') turned (it into ruin). (9') The sanctuaries (10') he ruined. (11') The ordinances, (12') the purifications (13') he desecrated. (14') The hand of Prince Marduk (15') he seized and (16') carried (17') (into) the midst of Assyria (18') due to the anger of the god, and (19') took the land into custody. (20') He did not unleash (21') his anger. (22') Prince Marduk, (23') for 21 years, (24') in the midst of Assyria, (25') he established his dwelling. (26') The days were [fully]filled. (27') The fixed day arrived. (28') Then became exhausted (29') his anger, (30') that of the king of the gods, the lord of the lords. (31') Esagila (32') and Babylon – (33') he remembered (34') his seat of lordship. (35') (As for) the king of Subartu (36') who in the anger of Marduk (37'-38') brought destruction to the land, (39') the son out of his loins (40'-41') smote him with the weapon.

II (1') He gave him aid. (2') He provided the partner: (3') the king of the Ummān-manda, (4') who has no rival. (5'-6') He caused (him) to bow to his command. (7') He caused him to go his aid. (8') Above and below, (9') right and left, (10') he flattened like a flood. (11') He avenged (lit. returned the favour to) (12') Babylonia. (13') He exacted revenge. (14') The king of the Ummān-manda, (15') the fearless, (16') desecrated (17'-18') their sanctuaries – those of the god (gods?)\(^{193}\) of Subartu, (19') all of them. (20'-25') And he desecrated the cities of the border districts of Akkad which were hostile towards the king of Akkad and did not come to his aid. (26'-27') He left none of their cultic rites.\(^{194}\) (28') He made desolate (29') their shrines. (30') He became (31') like a flood. (32') (For) the king of Babylon, (33') Marduk’s deed (34') of impudence (35') was a taboo to him. (36') He was confused greatly (37') He laid down (on) the ground (as his) bed. (38') (For) the king of Subartu, (39') which had been cast down for 54 years (40') he laid on his hands (41') to the cults (42') of all the gods. (43') He did not lift his hands (44') to the shrines (45') of the god(s)?\(^{195}\) of Subartu, (46') all of them. (47') (For) the enemy in distant days (48') so that his directives do not cease (49') in Esagil, (50') the house that protects (51') the lives of the gods.

X (1'-2') Their storerooms which were pl[undered]. (3') Their dwelling was not established. (4') Marduk my lord (5') waited for me and (6'-7') put in my hands (the task of) renewing the divine purification (rituals). (8'-11') In his pure utterance he commanded the calming (of) the anger of the gods (and) the establishment their dwelling for my reign. (12'). (For) Ḫarran, the temple Ehulhul, (13') which had been cast down for 54 years (14') by the destruction (brought) by the Ummān-manda: (15') the shrines devastated. (16'-17') The consent of the gods, (18') the fixed day of reconciliation, (19') is 54 years: (20') when Sin (21') returns to his place. (22') Now (23') to his place (24') he returned and (25') Sin the lord of the tiara (26') remembered his dwelling (27') of splendour and the gods (28') (who) as many as with him, (29') left his cella. (30') Therefore Marduk, the king of the gods, (31') commanded their gathering. (32'-33') The valuable jasper seal, the stone of kingship (34'-38') on which Assurbanipal the king of Assyria drew up and made the image of Sūn to utter his name, (39'-41') on that seal he wrote the praise of Sūn to utter his name, (42') on the neck of Sūn = the house that protects (51') the lives of the gods.

\(^{192}\) Schaudig proposes that ṭārī nīṣī “(Fort)führer der Menschen” refers to Sennacherib, see Schaudig, Die Inschriften Nabonids von Babylon und Kyros’ des Großen, p. 515, n. 766. The epithet [ṭa-ri UG] is usually reserved for Marduk, whose statue the Assyrian king abducts later in the narrative of this inscription. Marduk is called ‘the minder of his people’ (\(^{4}\)AMAR.UTU EN GAL ta-ru-ī UKU.MES-šu) in the Cyrus Cylinder, line 14, for this latter reference see below Appendix 1.49. In column I line 2’ of the Basalt-Stela of Nabonidus, the form ṭārī is probably a variant form of the nominative ṭāriu (for the latter, see CAD T 245; AHw 1336) with the final u omitted because it is used in the construct [ṭa-ri UG]. It is possible that the epithet is used for Sennacherib, probably with a pun to Marduk, who is considered the real power behind the political events. Marduk moves Sennacherib to ruin Babylon out of divine anger. Alternatively, the epithet ṭārī nīṣī is to be treated to be in the genitive, agreeing with genitive lemattī ‘evil’ in the previous line which states iktapud ḤUL-tī (lemattī) ‘he (Sennacherib) planned the evil. In this case the translation for the first two lines could be ‘he (i.e. Sennacherib) planned the evil of the ‘minder of the people’ (i.e. Marduk), (which was) in his heart...’

\(^{193}\) See footnote 191 above.

\(^{194}\) The subsequent line mentions the destruction of shrines. This supports the translation for the present line as ‘he left none of their cults intact’. The word mēsu means ‘cultic rites, rituals’ and it is pluralē tantum, see CAD M II 35; AHw 647.
47. Sippar Cylinder of Nabonidus, I 8 – 29\textsuperscript{195}

I (7) Ẽ.H.U.Ł. Ł. Ẽ.\textsuperscript{1}EN.ZU ša qé-reb URU. Ĥar-ra-mu (8) ša ul-tu U₂₃-mu ša-a-ti \textsuperscript{4}EN.ZU EN ra-bu-ū (9) šu-ba-tu tu-ab ŠA-bi-š[a] r[a-mu]-ū qé-re-eb-ši (10) e-li URU ẽ šá-a-šu šA-bu-ūš i-zu-az-na (11) LU.ERI-NMAN-da\textsuperscript{196} ut-sat-ba-am-ma šE šá-a-ti ub-bi-it-ma (12) ša-sa-liš-šu kar-ma-tu i-na pa-li-e-a ki-i-ni; (13) \textsuperscript{3}EN.ZU EN GAL-i na-\-ra-am LUGAL-uš-ti-ia (14) a-na URU ẽ šá-a-šu is-li-mu ir-šu-ī ta-a-ri (15) i-na re-eš LUGAL-uš-ti-ia da-rī-ti ūša-bu-ū i-in-ni šu-ut-ti (16) \textsuperscript{4}AMAR.UTU EN GAL ẽ \textsuperscript{4}EN.ZU na-an-na-ri AN-e ẽ KI-ti (17) iži-zu kI-lal-la-an \textsuperscript{4}AMAR.UTU i-ta-ma-a it-ti-ia (18) \textsuperscript{4}NA.NI.TUKU LUGAL TIR\textsuperscript{14} i-na ANŠE.\textsuperscript{RA} ru-kù-bi-ka (19) iš SIG, ĦI A Ẽ.H.U.Ł. Ẽ.PU-UŠ-MA \textsuperscript{4}EN.ZU EN GAL-ū (20) i-na qé-er-bi-šu šU-ur-ma-a šu-ba-at-su (21) pa-al-hi-ši a-ta-ma-a a-a-nE.\textsuperscript{4}EN.LIL DINGIR.MES \textsuperscript{4}AMAR.UTU (22) E ša-a-ti ša taq-bu-ū e-pe-šu (23) LU.ERI-NMAN-da\textsuperscript{197} ša-hi-ir-sum-ma pu-ug-gu-lu e-mu-qi-a-šu (24) \textsuperscript{4}AMAR.UTU-MA i-ta-ma-a it-ti-ia LU.ERI-NMAN-da\textsuperscript{198} ša taq-bu-ū (25) ša-a-šu KUR-šu ẽ LUGAL.\textsuperscript{MES} a-lik i-di-šu ul i-ba-aš-ši (26) i-na ša-šu-šu MU.\textsuperscript{ANA} i-na ka-ša-du (27) ūšat-bu-nīš-sum-ma ʾKu-ra-aš LUGAL KUR.\textsuperscript{AN.ZA-AN} IR-su ša-a-ti (28) i-na um-ma-ni šu i-su-tu LU.ERI-NMAN-da\textsuperscript{199} rap-ša-a-ti ša-sap-pi-iš (29) Ṭis-tu-[me]-gu\textsuperscript{30} LU]GAL LU.ERI-NMAN-da\textsuperscript{201} iš-bat-ma ka-mu-šu a-na KUR-šu il-qi

I (7) The temple of Eblulul, the temple of Sin in the midst of Ḥararan, (8) which since days of old belongs to Sin the great lord, (9) the dwelling (where) the goodness of his [heart is] d[well]ing within it. (10) He became angry over the city and temple of his and (11) raised the Umma and obliterated that temple and (12) turned it to ruin. During my legitimate reign, (13) Sin the great lord, in love of my kingdom, (14) became reconciled (and) came to mercy with the city and temple. (15) In the beginning of my everlasting kingship they caused me to see a dream. (16) Marduk, the great lord, and Sin, the light of the heaven and earth, (17) were both standing. Marduk talked with me: (18) “Nabonidus, king of Babylon, in your horse chariot (19) carry bricks, build Eblulul and (for) Sin the great lord (20) establish his dwelling in its midst.” (21) Reversely I talked to the Enil of the gods, Marduk: (22) “That temple which you told (me) to build, (23) the Ummān-manda surrounds it and enormous (is) his strength.” (24) Marduk spoke with me: “The Ummān-manda about whom you spoke, (25) he, his land, and the kings who go by his side will not exist.” (26) When the third year came, (27) he (Marduk) set him in motion, (namely) Cyrus the king of Anšan his insigificant servant. (28) He scattered the extensive Ummān-manda with his few troops. (29) He seized Astyages the king of the Ummān-manda and took his captive to his land.

\textsuperscript{195} For the text, see Schaudig, \textit{Die Inschriften Nabonids von Babylon und Kyros’ des Großen}, pp. 415-440; Langdon, \textit{Die neubabylonischen Königsinschriften}, pp. 219 – 229. The restorations are based on Schaudig’s edition unless otherwise stated. Schaudig’s edition of the text contains the orthographical variants from the different manuscripts. These have not been included except for the words Išumegu (Astyages) and Ummān-manda. This document can be called the ‘Sippar Cylinder’ only because most of the manuscripts were found in Sippar, Ecbabbar. For references to the manuscripts and fragments, see Schaudig, \textit{Die Inschriften Nabonids von Babylon und Kyros’ des Großen}, pp. 409-415; Berger, \textit{Die neubabylonischen Königsinschriften}, p. 371. The collations and emendations mentioned in \textit{Appendix I.47} are from Schaudig, \textit{op.cit.} unless otherwise mentioned.


\textsuperscript{200} Variant writings: [ű]š-tu-me-e-gu, [űš]-tu-me-gt, [űš]-tu-me-e-gu in \textit{ibid.}, p. 428: 29.

48. Ḥarran Cylinder of Nabonidus. I’ 1’-17


I’ (1’) [Statues] of Sin, N[i]gal, Nu[sku], Sadarnunna (2’) and the g[od]s, those in the m[i]dst of Ḥarran, … (3’) …of which y[j]ou commanded I will accomplish and … (4’) … your exalted command I will not neg[lect…]. (5’) … in accordance with[ ] your utterance the sta[tues] of Sin, Ni[gal], (6’) [Nusku], Sadarnunna and the gods, those in Ḥarran… (7’) … I will renew and will make complete 203. their… E.HUL.HUL (8’) (swiftly) I carried out and made lovable its (i.e. E.HUL.HUL’s) midst their dwelling. (9’) [Rev]erently I spoke to the Enlil of the gods, Marduk, (10’) [the lord] of lords, the merciful Marduk, (and said): that city and temple (15’). [The gods of Ḥa][rran will inhabit [its m]i[d]st. (16’) … with me… the str[ength]? … (17’) … (text breaks off for column I)

202 V. Donbaz. “Deux nouvelles inscriptions de Nabonide, roi de Babylone” Anatolia Antiqua 1 (1987), pp. 19-20; Schaudig, Die Inschriften Nabonids von Babylon und Kyros’ des Großen, pp. 473-474. Schaudig’s restorations have been used unless otherwise stated. The collations and emendations mentioned throughout Appendix 1.48 are from Schaudig’s work unless otherwise mentioned.

203 The gap before “30” is implied in Donbaz’s translation in Donbaz, “Deux nouvelles inscriptions de Nabonide”, p. 19.

204 Following Donbaz’s restoration in ibid., p. 19: Col I. 2.


206 Donbaz collates this word as x-x-ši-šu-un in Donbaz, “Deux Nouvelles Inscriptions de Nabonide”, p. 19: Col I 7). Donbaz reads ši-pir-ši-šu-un ‘die Arbeit an ihnen’ in Schaudig, Die Inschriften Nabonids von Babylon und Kyros’ des Großen, pp. 473: 1’ 7’. Consequently, Donbaz mentions an ép-sign after in his transliteration but it is not included in his autograph of the text, see Donbaz, “Deux Nouvelles Inscriptions de Nabonide”, pp. 19-20. It is not clear whether Donbaz forgot to include it in his autograph. Schaudig does not read it. If it exists, it may have stood for a word that connected the entire sentence to the temple E.HUL.HUL, perhaps ina ‘in’.

207 Donbaz collates AB BA in ibid., p. 19: Col I 10). Schaudig interprets these signs as um[a]-ma, noting it may be the used similar to the speaking introduce particle used m[a] in the Assyrian dialect, Schaudig, Die Inschriften Nabonids von Babylon und Kyros’ des Großen, p. 473, n. 654.

208 The reading u É! ši-a-tu follows ibid., p. 473: 1’ 10. Note however that Donbaz collates only X X X for this part of the text, Donbaz, “Deux Nouvelles Inscriptions de Nabonide”; p. 19: Col I. 10.


210 The sign looks like a ma-sign except it has two verticals superimposed on one other. It is clearly an error for ERIN, as noted in both Donbaz’ and Schaudig’s editions. See the sign in line 14’ before man-da from the autograph in Donbaz, “Deux Nouvelles Inscriptions de Nabonide”, p. 20.

211 Donbaz has […] x x be nu u šēš-še-bu ki X[… in ibid., p. 19: Col I. 15.

212 The previous first person present future and the context suggest the final u in u-šak-la-lu is purely orthographical. For such non-grammatical endings, see J. P. Hyatt, The Treatment of Final Vowels in Early Neo-Babylonian. (Yale Oriental Studies Researches Vol 23). New Haven. Yale University Press. 1941.
49. The Cyrus Cylinder 1-19

1. ...x-ni-šu
2. ...[l]-ib-ra-a-tim
3. ...x.x.GAL ma-tu-ú û-sa-ak-na a-na e-nu-ta ma-ti-ši
4. si-x.x.[...)t?]-li û-sa-ši-ki-ki na-re-šu-an
5. ta-am-ši-li E.SAG.I. I-te-[paš...ti?]m? a-na šEŠ.UNUG.KI û si-it-ta-a-tim ma-ša-za
6. pa-ra-as la si-ma-a-ti-šu-nu ta-[x]...pa-lih u-mi-sa-am-ša id-de-né-eb-bu-ub a a-na ma-[a]g-ri-tim
7. sat-tuk ki-si-ba-li lii-li(a-ša-pi-it) pe-lu-de-a-ú û-ša-si-[ka-an qe-reb ma-ša-si-pu-la-la-ša 4AMAR.UTU
LUGAL.DINIRG.IME û-si-[m]ûn kar-šu-ú-su
11. ú UKÜ.IME KUR.Šu-me-ri ū URI.KI ša i-mu-ú ša-lam-ta-ás ú-sa-šaḫ!-ḫi-ir ka-x-x-x ir-ta-ši ta-a-a-ra kul-lat ma-ta-a-ta ka-li-ši-na i-ḫi-ḫi ib-re-e ma
15. a-na URU-sú KÁ.DINIRG.IME KI a-la-ak-šu iq-bi ú-ša-ša-bi-it-su ma-ḫar-ra-nu TIN.TIR.KI ki-ma ib-ri ú tap-pe-e t-ša-la-la ka i-da-a-su
16. um-ma-ni-šu rap-sa-a-tim ša ki-ma me-e ID la ú-ta-ad-du-uš ni-ba-su-an GIŠ.TU.KUL.IME-šu-nu ša-an-du-ma i-sa-ad-di-ša i-da-a-su
19. be-lu ša i-na tu-kul-ti-ša ú-bal-li-ti ū mi-tu-ta DINGIR i-na pu-uš-šu qu ú-de e ig-mi-lu kul-la-ta DINGIR ta-bi-ši iš-ta-ar-ra-bušu iš-tam-mar-Ša ri-ki-ir-šu
20. ...

²¹⁴ For the entire text, see P.-R. Berger, “Der Kyros-Zylinder mit dem Zusatzfragment BIN II Nr. 32 und die akkadischen Personennamen im Danielbuch” ZA 64 (1975), pp. 194-203; Schaudig, Die Inschriften Nabonids von Babylon und Kyros’ des Großen, pp. 551-556; F. H. Weißbach, Die Keilschriftexten der Achameniden. (Vorderasiatische Bibliothek, Bd 3). Leipzig. J. C. Hinrichs’sche Buchhandlung. 1911, pp. 2-8. The collations mentioned in Appendix 1.49 are from Schaudig, op.cit. unless otherwise mentioned.

11. and the people of Sumer and Akkad who had become like a corpse… he had mercy. He (Marduk) saw he (Nabonidus) was sinning in all of the lands and
12. he sought therefore (a) just king of (his) heart’s desire. He grasped his hand. Cyrus king of Anšan arose. He gave his (Cyrus’) name to the kingship of all civilisation.216
13. The land of Gutium, the entire Ummān-manda were made to submit to his feet. The black-headed people whom his hands conquered.
14. He transformed them in reliability and justice. Marduk, the great lord, the minder of his people, joyfully looked at the goodness of the achievement(s) of (Cyrus’ hands) and the straightness of his (Cyrus’) heart.
15. Towards his city Babylon he (Marduk) spoke his (Cyrus’) going and made him take he road to Babylon. Friends and partners went at his side.
16. His extensive army whose number, like waters of a river, is unknown (with) their readied weapons passed along at his side.
17. Without battle and clash he (Marduk) took him (Cyrus) into Babylon. He (Marduk) spared Babylon his city in hardship. Nabonidus the king who did not revere him, he handed over to him (Cyrus).
18. The people of Babylon, all of them, the entire land of Sumer and Akkad, the rulers and the governors, submitted under him, they kissed his feet, they rejoiced, their faces looked to his kingship.
19. The lord who makes the dead live with his support; the god (who) spares (those) in hardship and affliction; all the gods bless him continually in friendship (and) continually praise his name.217

50. Gadd Chronicle, BM 21901, lines 16-30, 38-52, 58-65218

Years 11-12 of Nabopolassar

17. [ina UD…] AM ša ITI.SIG₄ šal-tū ana SĀ URU DU-ma URU ul is-bat LUGAL KUR.Aš-sur ERIN.ME-šū id-kām-ma
18. LUGAL URI.KI TA BAL.TIL.KI is-kip-ma EN URU. Tak-rī-i-ta-in [URU] ša GŪ İ-dīq-lat EGIR-šū DU-ik
20. ina UGU ERIN-ni LUGAL URI.KI ša [dana URU]. Tak-rī-i-ta-[i n] šu-šu-šu id-di-ma
21. 10. UD.ME šal-tū ana lib-bī-shū-nu DŪ-sūš-ma URU ul is-bat ERIN-ni LUGAL URI.K[I] ša ana bir-tū šu-šu-šu
22. BAD₂-BAD₁ KUR.Aš-sur ma-a-diš GAR-an LUGAL KUR.Aš-sur u ERIN.ME-[šū…x]-ma a-na KUR-sū i-tu
23. ina ITI.APIN KUR.Ma-da-a-a ana KUR.A-rap-h₄₂¹⁹ ur-[d]am-[m[a] šal-tū ana S[À URU DŪ-ma…]\textsuperscript{220}
24. MU.12 KAM ina ITI.NE KUR.Ma-da-a-a ana UGU NINA.KI ki-i-

216 The words kullata naphar can be translated “all civilisation”, see the remarks in ch. 7, p. 212.
218 For BM 21901, see C. J. Gadd, The Fall of Nineveh, The Newly Discovered Babylonian Chronicle, No 21,901 in the British Museum. London. The British Museum. 1923, pp. 31 – 42, pl. I – VI; CCK, pp. 55 – 65, 79 – 82, pl. III, IX – XII, ABC, pp. 90-96. The signs in the tablet seem to have been more visible during C. J. Gadd’s study as compared to later studies. On the other hand, there are occasions when Wiseman and Grayson collate signs missed by Gadd. Variant readings are included only if they add something new to the understanding of the text.
219 The text has ri. This appears to be a scribal error, see Gadd, The Fall of Nineveh, p. 33, no. 1, pl. II: 23; CCK, p. 56, n. 1.
220 Apparently the last four signs were visible during Gadd’s collation, see Gadd, The Fall of Nineveh, pl. II:23 whereas two decades later they appear more erased in Wiseman’s study, see CCK, pl. X:23. Grayson’s study indicates the last four signs are no longer visible, see ABC, p. 92:23. The ensuing restoration is based on the last seven signs found in Gadd Chronicle line 26 below.
The Fall of Nineveh

Year 14 of Nabopolassar

39. [...]-ū a-ha-meš i-ta-am-ru
40. [LUGA]L [URI.[KI...] ...]-m[a-[ki]-š-tar [...]-a-ni i-še-bir-me
41. [GJ] ID.I-di-lat DU.ME-ma [...]na UGU NI.[NA.KI SUB].MEŠ
42. TA ITI.SIG₂ EN ITI.NE 3.TA.A[M...]-ū
43. sal-tū dan-na-tū ana ȘA URU DŪ-su ITI.NE [UD... KAM...BAD₂ BAD₂ UN.ME G]AL.ME ma-a-diš GAR-an
44. ina u-mi-šu-ma [³³]30-Lugal-Gar-an Lugal Kur. Aš-š[u...
45. šil-lat URU u E.KUR DUGUD-tū iš-tal-lu URU] a]na DU₅₂ u k[a]r-me GUR-ru... Lugal]
46. šī Kur. Aš-sūr la-IGI [LUGA]L,²²¹ iš-hi-tam-ma TA[A]? Lugal Uri.KI...
47. ITI.KIN UD.20 KAM 17-ma-kīš-tar u ERIN.ME-šū ana Kur-šī it-tur EGER-šū Lugal Ur[I.KI...]
48. a-di URU.Na-st-bi-ni il-li-ku hu-ub-ti u ga-lu-tu ka-[-
49. u Kur.Ru-su-pu ana pa-ni Lugal Uri.KI ana NINA.KI ú-bil-lu-ni ina ITI...³³ Sār-ū-bal-līṭ]
50. ina URU.Har-ra-nu ana Lugal-ur Kur.Aš-sūr ina AS.TE TUš-AB EN ITI...
51. ina NINA[KI...] TA UD.20 KAM šā ITI[... Lugal...
52. is-suḥ-ma ina UR[...]...

Year 16 of Nabopolassar

58. MU.16.KAM ina ITI.GU₄ Lugal Uri.KI ERIN.ME-šū id-di-ḫe-ma ana KurAš-šūr DU-iq T[Â ITI...?] EN ITI.APIN
59. ina Kur.Aš-šūr šal-ta-nīš DU.ME ina ITI.APIN Kur.ErIN-man-d[a... ana r]-i-[s]u?-ut Lugal Uri.KI DU.ME-nima
60. ERE.NE-šū-nu ana ȘA a-ha-mēš is-mu-ha-ma ana URU.Har-ra[n]a u ana UGU]L²²¹ Aš-š[u]-Ur-TIN]-išt šā ina Kur.Aš-šūr ina AS.TE uši-bi
62. hat-tū L.KUR im-qut-su-ni-ti URU u mašš[r]-u-ra-ma... i-bi-ru
63. Lugal Uri.KI a-na URU.Har-ra-ni ik-su-dam-ma [...]URU is-su-bat
64. šil-lat URU u E.KUR DUGUD-tū iš-ta-lal ina ITI.ŠE Lugal [UR].KL[1...]-š[u]-u ū-maš-šir-ur
65. šā-ā ana Kur-šū GUR-ra u ERIN-man-da ša ana ri-su-utter²²² Lugal Uri.KI Đ[U.ME ana EGER-šū-nu it]-te-eh-su

Years 11-12 of Nabopolassar

16. [The eleventh year: the king] of Akkad called his army and marched along the bank of the river Tigris and in the month of Iyyar he encamped against Assur.
17. [in the ?th [day] of the month Sivan he engaged in battle against the city but did not seize (it). The king of Assyria called his army and pushed the king of Akkad back from Assur and marched after him as far as Takritain, [a city] on the bank of the Tigris.
19. The king of Akkad station[ed] his army [in the fortress of Takritain. The [k]ing of Assyria and [his] army encamped against the army of the king of Akkad which was [s]tationed in T[akri]ta[n] and

²²¹ The damaged sign is hard to discern. It looks much more like Lugal in C. J. Gadd’s collation, see Gadd, The Fall of Nineveh, pl. IV:46. It appears to have worn out even more in Wiseman’s collation, see CCK, pl. XI: 46 whereas unrecognisable during Grayson’s study, see ABC, p. 94:46.
²²² The sign is visible in Gadd, The Fall of Nineveh, pl. V: 65; CCK, pl. XII: 65 but not in ABC, p. 96:65.
21. battled against them for 10 days but he (the king of Assyria) did not seize the city. The army of the king of Akkad, which had been stationed in the fortress, 22. greatly inflicted a defeat upon Assyria. The king of Assyria and [his] army... and returned to his land. 23. In the month of Marchesvan the Medes proceeded [d]own to Arraphu an[d] [engaged] in battle against the [city...]

24. The twelfth year: in the month of Ab, the Medes against Nineveh like... 25. ... hastened and they s[ei]zed Tarbišu, a city in the province of Nineveh... 26. ...they proceeded along [the river Ti]gris and encamped against Assur. They engaged in battle against the city and... 27. ...demolished. They, terribly (lit. in an evil manner), inflicted a defeat upon a great people. Its plunder he plundered, [its] bo[oty he carried off] 28. [The king of A]kkad and his [ar]my, who had gone to the aid of the Medes, did not reach the battle. The ci[t[y...]

29. [The king of Akka]d and C[yaxa]res met one another in front of the city (and) they established good (relations) and peace with one another. 30. [...Cyaxa]res and his army returned to his land. The king of Akkad and his army returned to his land.

Year 14 of Nabopolassar

38. [The fourteenth year:] the king of Akkad cal[led] his [a]rmy [and to the land of...]. The king of the Ummān-manda towards the king of Akkad... 39. ... they saw each other 40. [K]ing of Akkad...[Cy]a[x]ares...introduced and 41. they marched along the [ba]nk of the river Tigris and... [they encamp]ed against Ni[neveh] 42. from the month of Sivan until the month of Ab, for three [...] 43. They engaged in a fierce battle against the city. In the month of Abu, [on the 7th day], they greatly inflicted [a defeat of a g]reat [people]. 44. On that day, Sin-sar-ra-is[kun, king of Assyria... 45. They plundered the weighty booty of city and temple, they [turned] the [c]ity to mound and he[ap... the king] 46. of Assyria escaped from before the [kin]g and... the king of Akkad... 47. On the twentieth day of the month Elul Cya[xares and his army returned to his land. After him, the king of Akka[d... 48. they went as far as Naṣībin. Plunder and the exiles... 49. and they carried (the people of) Ruṣapu to the presence of the king of Akkad at Nineveh. In the mo[nth of...Aššur-uballit] 50. sat to the throne of kingship of Assyria in Ḥarran until the month of... 51. in Nineveh[...] from the twentieth day of the month [...] the king of [...] 52. rose up and in the ci[t[y of...
18. [i-nu-um]²²³ ... "E[N(?)]²²⁴ [iz-kur šaḫ-ša-uq-tum
19. ... x x x ū[T]-ši ki-mi-lu-tum
20. he-[pe-e] KUR "EN,IL [I]q-ta-bi²²⁵ Su-me-ri-iš
21. a-a-u’ KU.KU.KU.[MAL e-šip lim-ni-e-tum
22. id-kam-ma LU.ERIN-ma-an-[da ... š-is-pu-a]n KUR EN,ILIL
23. u-na-am-na-am-ma ši-[x x x ] x x ina a-bi-ši-šu

18. [When... Be(?)] uttered destruction
19. ...he showed wrath.
20. The crushing of the land of En[lil?.. he commanded for Sumer²²⁷
22. He called therefore the Umma
23. he layed desolate and […]... at their side.


²²⁴ The restoration i-nu-um ‘when’ is based on the fact that the same word is found at the beginning of all three passages delineated into sections on the reverse of Spartoli II before this passage in Appendix 1.51. The delineated passage that follows this passage in Appendix 1.51 also begins with i-nu-um ‘when’. For these occurrences, see Spartoli II r. 2, 6, 10, 24.

²²⁵ The reading [q-ta-bi] follows Lambert, “The Fall of the Cassite Dynasty”, p. 70:18. The alternative reading is [...] ‘en-li’ in Lambert, “The Fall of the Cassite Dynasty”, p. 70:18. The interpretation of this name also has a bearing on which deity is summoning the Elamite king and the Umma-manda in this passage. For the pertinent discussion, see Appendix 3, pp. 279-282.

²²⁶ The reading iq-ta-bi follows Lambert, “The Fall of the Cassite Dynasty”, p. 70:20. Foster’s translation ‘he commanded’ suggests the same reading, Foster, Before the Muses, 373:20. On the basis of these works that are based on collations, one has to reject Jeremias’ alternative reading [...]“Umma[nd-man-da ḫarrān” in Jeremias, “Die sogenannten Kedorlaomer-Texte”, p. 88: r. 20.

²²⁷ Lambert translates line 20 as ‘In Sumerian he commanded the break-up of Enlil’s land’, Lambert, “The Fall of the Cassite Dynasty”, p. 71:20. Lambert argues that the speech in Spartoli II. r. 21 is a Sumerian quotation that has been translated into the Akkadian language of the text in accordance with Near Eastern custom, W. G. Lambert, “A Sumerian-speaking king of Elam?” N.A.B.U. 1995 (1), p. 9. Foster translates line 20 as ‘he commanded for Sumer the smashing of En[lil’s] land’in B. Foster, Before the Muses, p. 373: 20. Foster’s rendering ‘for Sumer’ is preferable because –iš ending in Ši-me-ri-iš can be seen as the terminative –iš ending ‘to, unto’. The terminative –iš ending ‘to, unto’ is used elsewhere in Spartoli II, in the phrases ‘went down to the Abyss’ (u-ri-du-ma gab-bi-iš) Spartoli II r. 12, ‘surrounded the heavens’ (il-ma-a ša-ša-mi-iš) Spartoli II r. 13, ‘entered Borsippa’ (KUUB Bar-si-piš-iš), Spartoli II r. 32.
APPENDIX 2
H TUP SIN NA TEXT SCORE

Manuscripts

KBo 3 16
KBo 3 17
KBo 3 18
KBo 3 19
KBo 3 20
KUB 31 1
IBoT 4 7

1'. KBo 3 20 1': …]-m[1]

2'. KBo 3 20 2': …] LUGAL SA KUR ^URU-TE.UNU^ Kl

3'. KBo 3 20 3': …] ma-a-an l ME^ KAM^ MU*KAM pa-it

4'. KBo 3 20 4': …ha-a]n-te-ez-zi-ia-[a]š-mi-iš LUGAL-aš

5'. KBo 3 20 5': …] d[i]-in-za-ní

6'. KBo 3 20 6': …]-li-šši-it-ta

7'. KBo 3 20 7': …]-an ú-…

8'. KBo 3 20 8': …] pa-ah-ša-nu-nu^2-[un]

9'. KBo 3 20 r. 1': … ku-i

10'. KBo 3 20 r. 2': … DINGIR.MEŠ-aš tar-aš-k[i-an-zi…]

11'. KBo 3 20 r. 3': …

12'. KBo 3 20 r. 4': … pi-e-da-ah

It is possible that KBo 3 17 and 20 are not part of the Hittite Cuthaean Legend. The episodes found in these tablets are fragmentary. How they connect with the rest of the Hittite version of the Cuthaean Legend is not clear. There is a possibility these episodes do not belong to the Hittite Cuthaean Legend.

Güterbock states that the additional nu is visible in his collation, H. G. Güterbock. “Die historische Tradition und ihre literarische Gestaltung bei Babylonern und Hethitern bis 1200. Zweiter Teil: Hethiter” ZA 44 (1938), pp. 51, n. 6. There is a very minor trace that would fit the sign nu better than un in KBo 3 20 8'.
Güterbock’s collation suggests there is a gap between the signs na and aš, Güterbock, “Die historische Tradition und ihre literarische Gestaltung bei Babylonien und Hethitern bis 1200. Zweiter Teil: Hethiter”, 1938, p. 58, n. 10, contrary to the copy in KBo 3 20 r. 12'.
31’. KBo 3 17 5’: […] KUR A.GA.DEÈ-aš

32’. KBo 3 17 6’: […]-ua-aš-kán-zi

33’. KBo 3 17 7’: […]-ša-an pi-i-i-er

34’. KBo 3 17 8’: […]-e-eš šar-ku

35’. KBo 3 17 9’: […] ki-i-ma nam-ma

36’. KBo 3 17 10’: […]-p[ ]i kat-ti-iš-šum-mi

37’. KBo 3 17 11’: […] e-eš

38’. KBo 3 17 12’: […]me-mi-iš-ki-iz-zi kat-ti-iš-mi-ua

39’. KBo 3 17 13’: […]-u-u[ ]a-ad-du nu-mu ku-it

40’. KBo 3 17 14’: […] na-ak-ki-ia-an-ni-eš-ši

41’. KBo 3 17 15’: […]-la me-mi-iš-ki-iz-zi

42’. KBo 3 17 16’: […]-ia ú-ua-an-zi

43’. KBo 3 17 17’: […]-li-an pu-nu-uš-zi

44’. KBo 3 17 18’: […] na-ak-ki-ia-an-ni-mi

45’. KBo 3 17 19’: […]na-ak-ki-ia-]a-tar-še-me-et

46’. KUB 31 1 1’: […]-a[n(?)]-ni(?)-it a(?)-a[b][?][…]

47’. KBo 3 16 1’: […]

KUB 31 2’: […]-L[ ]Ü (?)-na-tar-mi-it u-uḫ-ḫi[…]

48’. KBo 3 16 2’: […]Na-ra-amÈ30-n]a-aš A-NA [PA.LU.MES LI-IM tar-aš-ki-iz-zi]


49’. KBo 3 16 3’: […] pa-a-an-zi 3 í[R.MES pa-a-ir da-aš-ša-u-e-eš[…]

KUB 31 4’: […] pa-a-an-zi 3 ÎR.[MES pa-a]-ir da-aš-ša-u-e-e[š]
50'. KBo 3 16 4': ...
KUB 31 5': ...

51'. KBo 3 16 5': [Urdu] ta-pu-ul-li-as-sa-ma-aš pi-il-ḫi
KUB 31 6': [Urdu] ta-pu-ul-li-as-sa-ma-aš pi-il-ḫi

52'. KBo 3 16 6': ma-a-an pa-iz-zi is-pa-an-ni-it is-kar-[ḫi]
KUB 31 7': ma-a-an pa-iz-zi is-pa-an-ni-it is-kar-ḫi


54'. KBo 3 16 8': ši-ia-a-ri a-pi-e ta-an-du-ki-is
KUB 31 9': ši-ia-a-ri a-pi-e ta-an-du-ki-is

55'. KBo 3 16 9': ta-aš-ma-aš pa-a-i-mi ma-a-an-ša-ma-aš-ta e-[eš-ḫar UL ši-ia-ri]
KUB 31 10': ta-aš-ma-aš pa-a-i-mi ma-a-an-ša-ma-aš-ta e-[eš-ḫar UL ši-ia-ri]

56'. KBo 3 16 10': a-pi-e DINGIR(over AZAG).MES-ši ta-aš-ma-aš UL-UL pa-a-i-[i]
KUB 31 11': a-pi-e DINGIR(over AZAG).MES-ši ta-aš-ma-aš UL-UL pa-a-i-ši

57'. KBo 3 16 11': ma-a-an IRMES-ma pa-a-ir 1.ÉN ÎR-ZU

58'. KBo 3 16 12': is-pa-an-ni-it is-ga-ar-ri-it

59'. KBo 3 16 13': [Urdu] ta-pu-ul-li-ia-am-mi-it ku-e-er-ta

60'. KBo 3 16 14': ta-aš-ši-ši-ta e-eš-ḫar ši-ia-ti šE Gir-pa A-Na "Na-ra-am430-na

61'. KBo 3 16 15': [EN] aš-ši ḫa-lu-kán pi-e-te-er "Na-ra-am430-na aš tar-aš-ki-iz-zi
KBO 3 18 r. 1: [EN--aš-ši] a-ap-pa me-mi-er UM-MA "Na-ra[-am430-aš

62'. KBo 3 16 16': ...]-u-aš-ma-aš-ta ši-ḫar [a] ši-ia-ti [u-uk-ma-aš-ma-aš
KBO 3 18 r. 2: ...a[n(?)]-ša-ma-aš-ta e-eš-ḫar-ra ši-ia-[ti]

63'. KBo 3 16 17': [IGI-a]n-da za-ah-ḫi-ia ku-ua-at UL-UL pa-a-i-mi
KBO 3 18 r. 3: [u-g]-aš-ma-aš me-na-ah-ha-an-da UL-UL pa-[a-i-mi]

64'. KBo 3 16 1': [IGI]-zî BAL-šî 190,000 ERÎN.MES-pi-e-ḫu-te-nu-u[n]
KBo 3 18 r. 4-5: [ḥa-a]n-te-ez-zi-ia BAL-ṣi 180,000 ERIN.MEŠ || [pi-e-]hu-te-mu-un

65'. KBo 3 16 2': [ṣa-an] ḫu-ul-le-e-er ta-an-an 120,000 ERIN.MEŠ pi-ḥu-te-mu-un
KBo 3 18 r. 5-6: ṣa-an ḫu-ul-le-e-er [120,000 ERIN.MEŠ || pi-e-ḥu-te-mu-un

66'. KBo 3 16 3': [i]a-an nam-ma ḫu-ul-le-e-er 3-na 60,000 ERIN.MEŠ
KBo 3 18 r. 6-7: ṣa-an nam-ma ḫu-ul-le-e-er || [te-ri-i]a-an-na 60,000 ERIN.MEŠ

67'. KBo 3 16 4': [pi]-e-ḥu-te-mu-un ṣa-an nam-ma ḫu-ul-li-e-ir
KBo 3 18 r. 7-8: pi-e-ḥu-te-mu-un || [ṣa-a]n nam-ma ḫu-ul-li-i-r

68'. KBo 3 16 5': ["Na]-ra-am.430-na-aš-kán A-Na 4U.DAR ú-e-eš-ki-u-ua-an da-a-iš
KBo 3 18 r. 9: ["Na]-ra-am.430-na-aš A-Na 4U.DAR ú-e-eš-ki-u-ua-an [da-a-iš

69'. KBo 3 16 6': [zi-i]k-mu tar-aš-ki-št SAG.DU-an ta-an-ku-ua-ia-ua-ta
KBo 3 18 r. 10: [zi-i]k-mu tar-aš-ki-št da-an-ku-ua-ia-ua

70'. KBo 3 16 7': [ut-n]e ke-eš-šar-ta te-eḥ-hi 4U.DAR-iš-ṣa-aš-ši
KBo 3 18 r. 10-11: KUR-e || [ki-iš]-š-[i]-t-ta te-eḥ-hi 4U.DAR-ṣa-aš-ši

71'. KBo 3 16 8': [a-ap-p]a tar-aš-ki-iz-zi i-it šu-up-pi-ia-ah-ḥu-ut
KBo 3 18 r. 12: [a-ap-pa tar-ši-ki-š]-zi i-it šu-up-pi-ia-ah-ḥu-[i]

72'. KBo 3 16 9': [šu-up]-pi-ia-aš GIS.NA-aš še-eš-ki-ia-ah-ḥu-ut DINGIR.MEŠ-KA
KBo 3 18 r. 13: [šu-up-pi-ia-aš GIS.NA-aš-š]-e-eš-ki-ah-ḥu-ut DINGIR.MEŠ-KA

73'. KBo 3 16 10': [da-a-r]i-ia-nu-ut nu DINGIR.MEŠ-KA mu-ga-i
KBo 3 18 r. 14: [da-a-r]-i-ia-nu-ut nu DINGIR.MEŠ-KA m[u-ga-i

74'. KBo 3 16 11': ["Na]-ra-am.430-na-aš šu-up-pi-ia-ah-ḥa-ti šu-up-pa-ia-aš [GIS].NA-aš
KBo 3 18 r. 14-15: ["Na]-ra-[m.430-aš || šu-up-pi-ia-ah-ḥa-ti šu-up-pi-i]-a-aš GIS.NA-[aš]

75'. KBo 3 16 12'-13': [še-eš-k]i-iš-ki-u-ua-an da-a-iš || [DINGIR.MEŠ-S]U da-ri-ia-nu-ut nu
KBo 3 19 16'-17': [še-eš-ki-iš-ki-u-ua-an d]i-a-a-iš DINGIR.MEŠ- SU || [da-ri-ia-nu-ut n]u

76'. KBo 3 16 13': DINGIR.MEŠ,SU mu-ki-iš-ki-u-an da-a-iš
KBo 3 19 16'-17': DINGIR.MEŠ- SU mu-ki-iš-ki-u-an [da-a-iš ]

77'. KBo 3 16 14': [DINGIR.MEŠ-S]a-aš-ši EGIR-pa tar-ši-ik-kán-zi
KBo 3 19 18': [DINGIR.MEŠ-S]a-aš-ši] a-ap-pa tar-ši-kán-zi ["Na]-ra-[a]-m.430-aš
78'. KBo 3 16 15': …]-ša(?) tar-aš-ki-u-en
   KBo 3 19 19': …[tar-ši-ga-u-e-en ka-a-aš k[a…] ERIN.MES-az

79'. KBo 3 16 16': …]-aš ERIN.MES-MA-AN-D[A]
   KBo 3 19 20': … ERIN M]EŠ MA-AN-DA ša-am-na-an ḥar-[zi]
   IBoT 4 7 1': …-m]a-aš ERIN.MES MA-AN-D[A]

80'. KBo 3 16 17': …z[i nu-uš-si
   KBo 3 19 21': […nu-u-uš-si me-na-ah-ḫa-an-da GIŠ.N[Ā-aš]
   IBoT 4 7 2': …-z[i nu-uš-si me-na-ah-ḫa-an-ta

81'. KBo 3 19 22': [še-eš-ki-š][iš-si nu-uš-si tāq-ga-le-ef-ši le-][e
   IBoT 4 7 3': […] tāq-ga-li-iš-ni

82'. KBo 3 19 23': … [GI]Š.d[u]-uru-it-it iš-ḫa-[a-i]

83'. KBo 3 19 24': [nu-at ḫal-ḫal-t][u-u-ma-ri-ia da-a-i nu-za-k[ān …ti-i]t e-ep
   IBoT 4 7 4': …ḫal-ḫa[lu-u-ma-ri

84'. KBo 3 19 25': [ḫa-an-za ḫar-ak] ut-ni-ia-az ti-it-ta-ā[š]-ši-iš-ta]
   IBoT 4 7 5': …] KUR-e…

85'. KBo 3 19 26': [le-e pa-i-ši] a-pi-ia-ak-ku LÜ-aš […]-u-e-en-ta

86'. KBo 3 19 27': … nu-an-tu-ti … [M]EŠ

87'. KBo 3 19 28': …

88'. KBo 3 19 29': …

89'. KBo 3 19 30': …

90'. KBo 3 19 31': …

91'. KBo 3 19 32': … ]-ši
APPENDIX 3

UMMÁN-MANDA IN SPARTOLI II

The late Babylonian ‘Spartoli Tablets’ (Sp. 158 + Sp. II, 962, Sp. III, 2 and Sp. II, 987) describe foreign kings who sacked Babylon and committed sacrileges during various times in history, and suffered divine retribution for their behaviour.¹ The Spartoli Tablets’ date of composition and social context is unknown. The earliest suggested date is the Persian Achaemenid period (6th-4th centuries).² The Spartoli Tablet that employs the term Ummān-manda is Sp. 158 + Sp. II, 962 (=Spartoli II).³

Spartoli II depicts Kukukukumal (i.e. Kudur-Nahḫunte)⁴ plundering temples in Nippur, Borsippa and Babylon in a poetic language ornamented with various obscure words.⁵ The appeal of a text for its obscurity can

---

² Ibid., p. 369. Astour thinks the texts have a mid-seventh century date while noting Jeremias’ opinion that their extant copies date much later to the Arcasid era (i.e. after 142 BC), Astour, “Political and Cosmic Symbolism”, p. 81. Foster suggests a Babylonian scholar saw analogies between the Elamites and the “rapacious” post-Darius monarchs alongside a historical interest in this important Elamite invasion, Foster, Before the Muses, p. 369.
⁴ For the identification of the Sumerogram KU.KU.KU.MAL with Kudur-Nahḫunte, and the associated orthographical and historical problems, see Astour, “Political and Cosmic Symbolism”, 1966, pp. 90-94. The problems do not rule out against a deliberate identification with Sutruk-Nahḫunte’s son Kudur-Nahḫunte. A flexibility (even error) in the use of Sumerograms and possible fabrication of some historical data (e.g. the details of this Elamite king’s demise) for schematic purposes (e.g. all foreign kings desecrating Babylonian temples suffer the same kind of death) by the composer(s) of the Spartoli tablets are factors worth considering. The authorial intentions behind the Spartoli tablets are not all that clear. The composer(s) could have been motivated to collect or invent such data because it made Marduk’s wrath on these foreign kings very obvious. The social context of the Spartoli tablets remains obscure. The identification of the other foreign kings (also written in cryptograms) is even more problematic. There are also gaps of information even about the suggested historical personages.
⁵ The fragmentary state of the text suggests descriptions of other temples that fell prey to the Elamite looting are lost.
be appreciated for example by Assurbanipal’s boast about mastering texts with ‘obscure Akkadian difficult to keep in order’ (šu-ul-lu-lu ak-ka-du-šu ana šú-te-sú-ri aš-ta).

1 Bēl or Enlil?

The reverse of Spartoli II narrates the plundering of Babylon and Borsippa and is delineated into separate passages. One of these passages employ the term Ummān-manda for the Elamite king’s force:

\[
\begin{align*}
& [i-nu-um… 4E(N(?) iz-kur šah-lu-uq-tum \\
& \quad \ldots x ir-ta-ši ki-mil-tum \\
& \he-[pe-e] \text{KUR } 4\text{EN.LI}q-ta-bi Šu-me-ri-iš \\
& \quad a-a-á \text{KU.KU.KU.[MAL e-]} \piš \lim-ni-e-tum \\
& \text{id-kam-} \text{L.U.ERIN-ma-an-[da } \text{is-pu-a]n KUR EN.LIL} \\
& \quad ú-na-am-ma-am-ma ši-[x x x] x x ina a-ḫi-šu-nu
\end{align*}
\]

[When… Bēl(?)] uttered destruction
\ldots he showed wrath.

The crushing of the land of En[lil?.. he co]mmanded for Sumer
“Which one is Kukukuku[mal] the evil [d]oer?”
He called therefore the Ummān-man[da… he devastat]ed the land of Enlil
\ldots he layed desolate and […]… at their side

There is an astrological omen, preserved in duplicates, that says in its apodosis that the Ummān-manda attack and rule Mesopotamia, tear out the sanctuaries, abduct the statue of Marduk, carry it to Elam and the omnipotent Marduk promises revenge. Both the omen and the literary text refer to the events around the historical person of Kudur-Nahunte and his forced rule of Babylon, and in this context use the term Ummān-manda for him and his Elamite army. Designating the Elamite forces as Ummān-manda seems to be part of a Babylonian scribal

---

7 Lambert notes that the obverse of Spartoli II that narrates the desecration of Nippur seems to be alluding to cultic facilities that usually belong to Babylon, and suggests that either the same facilities were present in both cities or the author of Spartoli II did not intend to be precise in detail and attributed to Nippur what he knew from Babylon, Lambert, “The Fall of the Cassite Dynasty to the Elamites”, p. 67.
8 Spartoli II r. 18-23. For references, bibliography and discussion of some of the readings, see Appendix 1.51.
9 Appendix 1.31-32.
10 Albright interpreted ACh Sin IV 21-22 as a reference to the Hittite destruction of Babylon, W. F. Albright. “New Light on the History of Western Asia in the Second Millennium B.C. (Continued)” BASOR 78 (1940), p. 31. There is no supporting evidence that links the Hittite incursion into Babylon with ACh Sin IV 21-22
tradition. The term Ummān-manda ornaments Spartoli II with a religious fervour that foresees their eventual destruction after a period of rule, similar to the astrological omen (Appendix 1.31-32).

The fragmentary passage of Spartoli II quoted above (p. 280) makes it hard to know if it is Bēl (i.e. Marduk) or Enlil who is summoning the Elamite king for destruction. The name of the deity that utters the destruction caused by the Ummān-manda in this passage is not clearly legible. The reading [[^E]N(?)] in this passage is very unclear.11 Bēl is previously mentioned in Spartoli II as allowing evil to be plotted against Babylon.12 Foster and Lambert have collated Spartoli II and they propose Enlil in place of Bēl. The format of Foster’s edition does not allow for an Akkadian text but Enlil is seen as the deity summoning the Elamite king as the agent of divine wrath.13 Lambert reads […] en-lí[l] and treats Enlil as the subject in Spartoli II 18-21.14 Spartoli II r. 20 states Enlil’s land is desecrated. This may support the proposition the deity behind the evil Elamite king is Enlil, since presumably only this deity will allow his own land to be demolished. However, there is an alternative interpretation where the property belongs to Enlil and yet the instigator of the Elamite king is Bēl. This alternative interpretation takes its cue from Spartoli II r. 3-9. Enlil is enraged that the Elamite king looted the temple of Esharra.15 Here it is explicitly stated Bēl allowed the Elamite king to plot evil against Babylon and strike fear in Esharra.16 On the whole, Spartoli r. 3-9 presents a situation where Bēl is allowing the Elamite king to do evil on the temple of Esharra where Enlil dwells and Enlil is enraged. A similar situation may be applicable for the passage quoted above (p. 280). Bēl allows the Elamite king to demolish Enlil’s land. ‘Enlil’s land’ refers to Sumer. This is inferred from Spartoli II r. 20 where it is ‘for Sumer’ that the deity commands the crushing of ‘Enlil’s land’.17 The most likely conclusion is that Bēl is the deity that summons the Elamite king for destruction in Spartoli II. Bēl should be seen as the subject for the first clause in Spartoli II r. 22 which states ‘he called therefore the Ummān-man[da]’. The term Ummān-manda is preceded by the gentilic marker LU and literally refers to Kudur-Naḥḫunte, ‘the Ummān-manda’ summoned by Bēl. The ensuing destruction in Sumer ‘the land of Enlil’ caused by ‘the Ummān-manda’ is described with singular verbs ‘[he devastat]ed ‘ and ‘he layed

12 Spartoli II r. 5.
13 Foster, Before the Muses, p. 373, n. 2.
15 Spartoli II r. 7-9.
16 Spartoli II r. 3-5.
17 The translation ‘for Sumer’ is discussed in Appendix 1.51, n. 227.
desolate’. Literally Kudur-Naḥunte is called ‘the Ummān-manda’ but this designation is meant to include the Elamite forces under him, similar to Astyages being called ‘the Ummān-manda’ in person.\textsuperscript{18}

### 2 Subliminal Allusions to the Cuthaean Legend

Indirectly, some themes associated with the Ummān-manda in the Cuthaean Legend come across in Spartoli II. Another passage in Spartoli II says:\textsuperscript{19}

\begin{verbatim}
GIŠ.GIŠ.MUS.GIŠ.TUK is-suḫ-ma it-ta-di ṣe-le-niš
GIM 4ĚR-ra la ga-mił i-ra-um-ma kisal(U+ŠU)-maḫ-iš
iz-ziz-ma ina kisal(U+ŠU)-maḫ i-na-at-tal Ė.KUR
KA-šu DŪ-am-ma KI LŪ.DUMU.MEŠ i-dab-bu-ub
ana kal-la qu-ra-de-e-šu ʿu-samaṯ ma-ag-ri-tum
šu-ul-la-aʿ šal-lat Ė.KUR le qa-a-ma bu-su-su
suḫ-ša-aʿ ʿu-sur-ta-šu šup-ri-sa-a sak-ke-e-šu
\end{verbatim}

He ripped out the door of Ištar of… and threw (it) on its side.

Like merciless Erra he entered Kisalmāḫ.

He stood up in Kisalmāḫ, he gazed at the temple of Ekur.

He opened his mouth and spoke with the sons.

He hastened malice towards all his warriors

“Plunder the plunder of Ekur! Take also its property!
Rip out its building plan! Cut off its rites!”

Here the Elamite king is encouraging his ‘sons’/‘warriors’ to pillage Ekur. This recalls the Ummān-manda in the Standard Babylonian Cuthaean Legend, who are the sons of Anubanini and also leaders of the military divisions of this army. The Elamite army brings graphically described destruction upon Babylon in Spartoli II. The Ummān-manda in the Cuthaean Legend bring utter destruction to Naram-Sin’s kingdom but Venus assures

\textsuperscript{18} The use of the term Ummān-manda for the person of Astyages is discussed in ch. 7, p. 189-190.
\textsuperscript{19} Spartoli II o. 8-14. For the readings \textsuperscript{4}MUS.GIŠ.TUK in Spartoli II 8 and \textit{kisal(U+ŠU)-maḫ-iš} in Spartoli II 9, see Lambert, “The Fall of the Cassite Dynasty to the Elamites”, p. 72.
the king that his enemy will eventually be destroyed. Another Spartoli tablet indicates his own son killed the Elamite king. So the Elamites wreak terror in Mesopotamia but are eventually defeated. There are enough similarities between the Ummān-manda of the Standard Babylonian Cuthaean Legend and Spartoli II to suggest that the composer(s) of the latter were aware of the Cuthaean Legend. Spartoli II is known to make at least one literary allusion to another text in the passage just quoted above (p. 282). Spartoli II says about the Elamite king that ‘like merciless Erra he entered Kisalmān.’ (GIM 4ÈR-ra la ga-mi-l i-ru-um-ma kisal(U+SU)-ma-h-iš). When the Elamite king is said to be ‘like merciless Ira’, it recalls the Erra Epic, in which Erra, dubbed the ‘warrior of the gods’ (qarrad ilānī), calls upon the seven gods (4Sibitti) to massacre the ‘black headed people’ (i.e. the Babylonians) and says to the sixth god: ‘go out to the above and the below (i.e. everywhere) and show mercy to none’ (še-is-ša um-ta-‘i-ir e-liš u šap-liš ba-a’-ma la ta-gam-nil mam-ma). Erra makes sure the forces under his control show no mercy to the Babylonians. The author of Spartoli II sees the Elamite king similarly, and the literary allusion to ‘merciless Erra’ is natural for the scribe versed in Mesopotamian literary tradition. The literary allusion made to the Erra Epic should be seen as an ornament. An ornamental allusion does not add to the context, but only makes an elegant description of the Elamite king’s vicious desire to harm what is sacred to Babylonians. There are, nonetheless, some other subliminal connections behind the literary allusion to the Erra Epic. The seven gods in the Erra Epic could be subliminally connecting with Kudur-Nahhunté’s ‘sons/warriors’ to whom he address in the same passage quoted above (p. 282). This may also subliminally allude to the seven sons of the Ummān-manda in the Standard Babylonian Cuthaean Legend. In any case, Spartoli II interweaves at least two allusions (one from the Erra Epic, the other from the omen literature with indirect links to the Cuthaean Legend) into its narrative with all its ornamental and subliminal significance for the Elamite king and his forces desecrating Babylon. The intentional reason for calling the Elamite forces Ummān-manda seems to be purely ornamental. By ornamental usage, I mean that the ornamental term does not

20 See Foster, Before the Muses, p. 375.
21 Spartoli II o. 9.
23 Erra Epic I 5 in ibid., p. 58.
24 Erra Epic I 8-9 in ibid., p. 58.
25 Erra Epic I 37 in ibid., p. 62.
26 Ornamental allusions are discussed ch. 5, p. 138.
27 Subliminal allusions can occur when the author alludes to an item from a given literary text without being aware of it, only because he is so steeped in the traditional literature. This concept is discussed in ch. 5, pp.138-139.
28 It would be beyond the scope of this study to go into more detail about other aspects of the narrative in Spartoli II.
add to the context of the text but is there only to beautify the narrative. It can be argued that this ornamental usage comes from a Babylonian scribal tradition of using the term Ummān-manda to denote the Elamite forces under the historical person of Kudur-Nahhunte as Ummān-manda. Traces of this tradition have come down to Assyriology through the omen literature (exemplified by the duplicates of the astrological omen in Appendix 1.31-32) and the literary text Spartoli II.

---

29 For ornamental usage, see n. 26 above.
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